

# EXCEPTIONAL SEQUENCES OF LINE BUNDLES ON PROJECTIVE BUNDLES

KLAUS ALTMANN, ANDREAS HOCHENEGGER, AND FREDERIK WITT

ABSTRACT. For a vector bundle  $\mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^\ell$  we investigate exceptional sequences of line bundles on the total space of the projectivisation  $X = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E})$ . In particular, we consider the case of the cotangent bundle of  $\mathbb{P}^\ell$ . If  $\ell = 2$ , we will completely classify the (strong) exceptional sequences and show that any maximal exceptional sequence is full. For general  $\ell$ , we prove that the Rouquier dimension of  $\mathcal{D}(X)$  equals  $\dim X$ , thereby confirming a conjecture of Orlov.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Let  $X$  be a smooth projective variety over an algebraically closed field  $k$  such that

$$\mathbb{R}\Gamma(X, \mathcal{O}_X) = k \quad \text{and} \quad \text{rk } K_0(X) < \infty;$$

this will hold for all varieties considered in this paper. Then, a sequence of line bundles<sup>1</sup>  $\mathcal{L}_1, \dots, \mathcal{L}_n$  is *exceptional* if there are no nontrivial backwards Ext-groups:

$$\text{Ext}^k(\mathcal{L}_j, \mathcal{L}_i) = 0 \quad \text{whenever } i < j.$$

Since  $\text{Ext}^k(\mathcal{L}_j, \mathcal{L}_i) = H^k(X, \mathcal{L}_j^{-1} \otimes \mathcal{L}_i)$ , this boils down to require that the line bundles  $\mathcal{L}_j^{-1} \otimes \mathcal{L}_i$  have no cohomology, that is, they belong to the *immaculate locus*

$$\text{Imm}(X) := \{\mathcal{L} \in \text{Pic}(X) \mid \mathbb{R}\Gamma(X, \mathcal{L}) = 0\}$$

of cohomologically trivial line bundles<sup>2</sup>. The length  $n$  of an exceptional sequence of line bundles is bounded by the rank of  $K_0(X)$ . We say that the sequence is *maximal* if actually  $n = \text{rk } K_0(X)$ . It is useful to think of an exceptional sequence more generally in terms of a subset  $s \subseteq \text{Pic}(X)$  for which exists a (in general non-unique) *exceptional order*  $<_O$ , that is, a total order turning  $s$  into an exceptional sequence.

In [AW], the first and third author discuss a combinatorial approach to the structure of maximal exceptional sequences on smooth projective toric varieties of Picard rank two. By results of Kleinschmidt [Kle88], these varieties arise as the total space of the projectivised bundle  $\mathbb{P}(\bigoplus_{j=0}^r \mathcal{L}_i) \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^\ell$  given by a direct sum of line bundles. We subsequently refer to this as the *toric case*.

The goal of this sequel is threefold: First, to put the combinatorial arguments into a more geometric context. Second, to extend the methods past toric varieties. Thirdly, to discuss applications involving strongly exceptional sequences. For this we consider the family of projective bundles  $X_\ell = \mathbb{P}(\Omega_{\mathbb{P}^\ell}) \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^\ell$  given by the cotangent bundle of  $\mathbb{P}^\ell$  (for technical reasons, we actually consider the bundle  $\Omega_{\mathbb{P}^\ell} \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^\ell}(-1)$  which, however, induces the same projectivised bundle). We set out to prove the following model theorems.

---

MSC 2020: 05E14, 06A11, 14F08, 14J60 14M25, 52C05; Key words: toric varieties, projectivised bundles, derived category, strongly exceptional sequences, Rouquier dimension.

<sup>1</sup>By abuse of language we always speak of line and vector bundles even if invertible or locally free sheaves would sometimes be more appropriate.

<sup>2</sup>Here and in the sequel, we identify line bundles with their classes in the Picard group.

**Theorem A.** *Classification of the maximal exceptional sets of  $X$ .*

The statement is deliberately vague. In the best case, classification means enumeration of any maximal exceptional sequence. Less ambitiously, we can settle for a classification of the underlying maximal exceptional sets. For other applications such as Theorem C below, a classification of maximal exceptional sequences up to *helixing* is sufficient. In the toric case, classification of the maximal exceptional sets was achieved, cf. [AW]. Here, we will actually classify the maximal exceptional sequences for  $\ell = 2$ . In principle, the methods also extend to higher  $\ell$  at least for a classification of the maximal exceptional sets, but unlike the toric case we failed to find a general pattern which is why we restrict to  $\ell = 2$ .

**Theorem B.** *Classification of strongly exceptional maximal exceptional sets of  $X$ .*

Strongly exceptional sets enjoy the additional property that  $\text{Ext}^k(\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{L}') = 0$  for all  $\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{L}' \in s$  and all  $k > 0$ . Homologically, they are interesting for their connections with tilting bundles, see Section 2. Combinatorially, because they are *effective* which, roughly speaking, means that they are the most flexible sets for finding exceptional orders, cf. Subsection (3.2). We prove Theorem B for the toric case and  $X_2 = \mathbb{P}(\Omega_{\mathbb{P}^2})$ . Here, classification means to determine explicitly the sets of Theorem A underlying a strongly exceptional set.

**Theorem C.** *Every maximal exceptional set of line bundles is full.*

A maximal exceptional sequence is *full* if as a set it generates  $\mathcal{D}(X)$ . In general, this is false due to the existence of phantom categories, see [BGKS15]. On the other hand, Kuznetsov conjectured in his ICM '14 talk that if there exists at least one full maximal exceptional sequence (not necessarily of line bundles), then any other maximal sequence is also full [Kuz14]. Here, we establish Theorem C for  $X_2$ ; the toric case was treated in [AW]. The idea consists in exhibiting a suitable system of representatives of maximal exceptional sets up to helixing and to reduce these to sequences of *Orlov-type* discussed in Section 2.

As an aside on the theme of strongly exceptional sequences and tilting bundles we shall also prove that the Rouquier dimension of  $\mathcal{D}(X_\ell)$  equals  $\dim X_\ell$  for  $\ell \geq 2$ , thereby lending further support for a conjecture by Orlov [Orl09]. In passing we note that the same method also applies to the toric case provided the anti-canonical line bundle  $-K_X$  is nef. In fact, Orlov's conjecture holds for any toric variety, see the recent preprint [FH23].

*Plan of the paper.* Section 2 reviews some background on exceptional sequences. Section 3 investigates the intersection of all possible exceptional orders on a given exceptional set, thereby deriving a criterion for strong exceptionality. Section 4 discusses the general setup of projective bundles  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}) \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^\ell$ , while Sections 5 and 6 investigate the toric case and  $X_\ell$ , respectively. Finally, we gather some results on the Rouquier dimension in Section 7.

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

We recall some background on exceptional objects and related notions. A good reference is [Rud90].

Let  $X$  be a smooth projective variety over an algebraically closed field  $k$  and  $\mathcal{D}(X)$  the bounded derived category of coherent sheaves on  $X$ . Given a functor  $F$ ,  $\mathbb{R}F$  denotes, if it exists, its right derived functor.

**Definition 2.1.** An object  $E$  in  $\mathcal{D}(X)$  is called *exceptional* if  $\mathbb{R}\text{Hom}(E, E) = k$ . A pair  $(E, F)$  of exceptional objects is *exceptional* if in addition  $\mathbb{R}\text{Hom}(F, E) = 0$ .

**Definition 2.2.** For an exceptional object  $E$  we define<sup>3</sup> the *left mutation functor*  $\mathbf{L}_E$  on  $\mathcal{D}(X)$  by the triangle of functors

$$\mathbb{R}\mathrm{Hom}(E, -) \otimes E \xrightarrow{\mathrm{ev}} \mathrm{Id} \rightarrow \mathbf{L}_E.$$

Dually, we have a *right mutation functor*  $\mathbf{R}_E$  given by

$$\mathbf{R}_E \rightarrow \mathrm{Id} \xrightarrow{\mathrm{coev}} \mathbb{R}\mathrm{Hom}(-, E)^\vee \otimes E.$$

Let  $E$  be an exceptional object in  $\mathcal{D}(X)$ . We put

$$E^\perp = \{F \in \mathcal{D}(X) \mid \mathbb{R}\mathrm{Hom}(E, F) = 0\} \quad \text{and} \quad {}^\perp E = \{F \in \mathcal{D}(X) \mid \mathbb{R}\mathrm{Hom}(F, E) = 0\}.$$

**Proposition 2.3.** *The left mutation functor of an exceptional object  $E$  satisfies*

$$\mathbf{L}_E(E) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{L}_E: E^\perp \xrightarrow{\sim} {}^\perp E.$$

*Similarly, the right mutation functor satisfies*

$$\mathbf{R}_E(E) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{R}_E: {}^\perp E \xrightarrow{\sim} E^\perp.$$

**Example 2.4.** Since we assume  $\mathbb{R}\Gamma(X, \mathcal{O}_X) = k$ , any line bundle on  $X$  considered as an element in  $\mathcal{D}(X)$  is exceptional. Since for two line bundles  $\mathcal{L}$  and  $\mathcal{L}'$ ,

$$\mathbb{R}\mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{L}', \mathcal{L}) = \mathrm{Ext}^\bullet(\mathcal{L}', \mathcal{L}) = \mathrm{H}^\bullet(X, \mathcal{L}'^{-1} \otimes \mathcal{L}),$$

$(\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{L}')$  defines an exceptional pair if and only if  $\mathcal{L}'^{-1} \otimes \mathcal{L}$  lies in the so-called *immaculate locus*

$$\mathrm{Imm} := \mathrm{Imm}(X) := \{\mathcal{L} \in \mathrm{Pic}(X) \mid \mathrm{H}^k(X, \mathcal{L}) = 0 \text{ for all } k \geq 0\} \subseteq \mathrm{Pic}(X)$$

of cohomologically trivial line bundles.

Let  $(E, F)$  be an exceptional pair. The pairs obtained by *left* and *right mutations*, namely  $(\mathbf{L}_E F, E)$  and  $(F, \mathbf{R}_F E)$ , are again exceptional and generate the same triangulated subcategory as  $(E, F)$ . Moreover, the left and right mutations are inverse to each other in the sense that

$$\mathbf{R}_E \mathbf{L}_E F = F \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{L}_F \mathbf{R}_F E = E.$$

**Remark 2.5.**  $\mathbf{L}_E$  and  $\mathbf{R}_F$  have a particularly simple expression if both pairs  $(E, F)$  and  $(F, E)$  are orthogonal, that is,  $\mathbb{R}\mathrm{Hom}(E, F) = 0 = \mathbb{R}\mathrm{Hom}(F, E)$ . In this case  $\mathbf{L}_E F = F$  and  $\mathbf{R}_F E = E$  so that mutation just interchanges  $E$  and  $F$ .

**Definition 2.6.** A sequence  $E_1, \dots, E_n$  of exceptional objects is *exceptional* if

$$\mathbb{R}\mathrm{Hom}(E_j, E_i) = 0 \quad \text{for all } j > i.$$

An exceptional sequence is *full* if it generates  $\mathcal{D}(X)$ .

**Example 2.7.** On  $\mathbb{P}^n$ , we have the full exceptional sequence of line bundles

$$(\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{O}(1), \dots, \mathcal{O}(n)),$$

the so-called *Beilinson sequence* [Bei78].

One can think of exceptional sequences in terms of linearly independent subsets of the Grothendieck group; a full sequence yields an identification  $K_0(X) \cong \bigoplus_{i=1}^n \mathbb{Z}E_i$ . In particular, the length of any exceptional sequence is bounded by  $\mathrm{rk} K_0(X)$ . The sequence is *maximal* if equality holds. Therefore, fullness implies maximality while the converse is wrong in general.

---

<sup>3</sup>We ignore the technicalities behind defining a functor as a cone; they are of no importance here, as we apply these functors only to objects.

**Proposition 2.8.** *Let  $E_1, \dots, E_n$  be exceptional objects in  $\mathcal{D}(X)$ , and  $1 \leq i < n$ . Then  $(E_1, \dots, E_n)$  is a (full) exceptional sequence if and only if*

$$(E_1, \dots, E_{i-1}, \mathbf{L}_{E_i} E_{i+1}, E_i, E_{i+2}, \dots, E_n)$$

*is a (full) exceptional sequence. An analogous statement holds for right mutations.*

**Remark 2.9.** Mutating an exceptional sequence of vector bundles yields honest complexes in  $\mathcal{D}(X)$  in general. There are, however, a few cases of interest where mutation preserves invertibility or at least local freeness up to a shift. Let  $(\mathcal{O}_X, \mathcal{L})$  be an exceptional pair of line bundles, that is,  $\mathcal{L}^{-1}$  is immaculate.

- (i) If  $\mathcal{L}$  is also immaculate, then  $\mathcal{O}_X$  and  $\mathcal{L}$  are mutually orthogonal, so (left) mutation means just interchanging the line bundles.
- (ii) If, on the other hand,  $\mathcal{L}$  is globally generated with  $\mathbb{R}\Gamma(X, \mathcal{L}) = H^0(X, \mathcal{L})$ , then the triangle defining left mutation becomes the short exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \mathbf{L}_{\mathcal{O}_X} \mathcal{L}[-1] \rightarrow H^0(X, \mathcal{L}) \otimes \mathcal{O}_X \rightarrow \mathcal{L} \rightarrow 0$$

so that  $\mathbf{L}_{\mathcal{O}_X} \mathcal{L}[-1]$  is a vector bundle of rank  $\dim H^0(X, \mathcal{L}) - 1$ .

**Definition 2.10.** Let  $s = (E_1, \dots, E_n)$  be an exceptional sequence in  $\mathcal{D}(X)$  and  $K_X$  the canonical line bundle on  $X$ . The operation on sequences given by

$$h_L(s) := (E_n \otimes K_X, E_1, \dots, E_{n-1})$$

is called *helixing to the left*. Similarly, we say that the sequence

$$h_R(s) := (E_2, \dots, E_n, E_1 \otimes K_X^{-1})$$

is obtained by *helixing to the right*.

**Remark 2.11.** This definition is slightly non-standard, as one would rather use the Serre functor  $S_X = - \otimes K_X[\dim(X)]$ . However, we continue to ignore possible shifts to keep exposition tight.

**Proposition 2.12.** *Exceptional objects  $E_1, \dots, E_n$  in  $\mathcal{D}(X)$  define a (full) exceptional sequence  $(E_1, \dots, E_n)$  if and only if helixing to the left (or right) yields a (full) exceptional sequence.*

**Remark 2.13.** For full exceptional sequences, helixing is actually nothing else than a special instance of mutating: If  $(E_1, \dots, E_n)$  is a full exceptional sequence, then  $E_n \otimes K_X$  and  $\mathbf{L}_{E_1} \circ \dots \circ \mathbf{L}_{E_{n-1}} E_n$  differ only by a shift. An analogous statement holds for right mutations.

A *semi-orthogonal decomposition* of  $\mathcal{D}(X)$  is a collection  $\mathcal{T}_1, \dots, \mathcal{T}_n$  of full triangulated subcategories generating  $\mathcal{D}(X)$  such that  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{D}(X)}(T_j, T_i) = 0$  for all  $1 \leq i < j \leq n$  and objects  $T_i \in \mathcal{T}_i, T_j \in \mathcal{T}_j$ . For instance, a full exceptional sequence  $(E_1, \dots, E_n)$  gives rise to the semi-orthogonal decomposition  $\mathcal{T}_1, \dots, \mathcal{T}_n$  of  $\mathcal{D}(X)$  where  $\mathcal{T}_i = \langle E_i \rangle$  is the triangulated category generated by  $E_i$ .

**Example 2.14.** Consider a vector bundle  $\mathcal{E} \rightarrow Y$  of rank  $\text{rk}(\mathcal{E}) = r + 1$  with associated projective bundle

$$\pi: X = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}) := \text{Proj}(\text{Sym}^\bullet \mathcal{E}^\vee) \rightarrow Y$$

and relative hyperplane section  $H$  determined by  $\pi_* \mathcal{O}(H) = \mathcal{E}^\vee$ . By [Orl92], we have the semi-orthogonal decomposition

$$\mathcal{D}(X) = \langle \pi^* \mathcal{D}(Y), \pi^* \mathcal{D}(Y) \otimes \mathcal{O}(H), \dots, \pi^* \mathcal{D}(Y) \otimes \mathcal{O}(rH) \rangle$$

given by  $\mathcal{T}_i = \langle \pi^* \mathcal{D}(Y) \otimes \mathcal{O}(iH) \rangle$ ,  $i = 0, \dots, r$ . For instance, let  $(F_{i,0}, \dots, F_{i,\ell})$ ,  $0 \leq i \leq r$ , be (full) exceptional sequences on  $Y$ . Then

$$(\pi^* F_{0,1}, \dots, \pi^* F_{1,\ell}, \dots, \pi^* F_{r,1} \otimes \mathcal{O}(rH), \dots, \pi^* F_{r,\ell} \otimes \mathcal{O}(rH)) \quad (1)$$

defines a (full) exceptional sequence on  $X$ .

**Definition 2.15.** An exceptional sequence on  $X = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E})$  is of *Orlov type* if it has the form (1).

**Definition 2.16.** A *strongly exceptional* sequence is an exceptional sequence which in addition satisfies

$$\mathbb{R}^k \mathrm{Hom}(E_j, E_i) = \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{D}(X)}(E_j, E_i[k]) = 0 \text{ for all } k > 0 \text{ and } i, j.$$

One reason for studying full and strongly exceptional sequences is that any such sequence  $(E_1, \dots, E_n)$  gives rise to the *tilting object*  $T = \bigoplus_i E_i$  of  $\mathcal{D}(X)$ . By definition, this means that  $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{D}(X)}(T, T[i]) = 0$  for  $i \neq 0$ . Further,  $\mathcal{D}(X)$  is the smallest triangulated subcategory containing  $T$  which is full and thick, i.e., closed under taking direct summands.

**Remark 2.17.** Note that helixing of an exceptional sequence will not preserve strongness in general. We call a full and strongly exceptional sequence  $(E_1, \dots, E_m)$  *strongly cyclic* if it does. (This definition is not completely standard as we assume fullness.)

### 3. EXCEPTIONAL POSETS

From now on, the term exceptional set / sequence will always refer to an exceptional set / sequence of line bundles.

We study the combinatorics of an exceptional set via its poset of exceptional orders. In particular, we will derive a criterion for strong exceptionality.

**3.1. The poset associated with an exceptional set.** We call a subset  $s \subseteq \mathrm{Pic}(X)$  *exceptional* if there exists a total order  $<_O$  on  $s$  turning  $s$  into an exceptional sequence. Any such order will be itself referred to as *exceptional*.

For an exceptional set  $s$  we define its *associated poset*

$$P = P(s) := \bigcap \{O \mid O \text{ is an exceptional order on } s\} \cup \{(A, A) \mid A \in s\} \subseteq s \times s$$

which induces a partial order  $\leq_s$  on  $s$ . To describe  $\leq_s$  in terms of a generating set, we consider

$$F = F(s) := \{(A, B) \in s \times s \mid A - B \notin -\mathrm{Imm}(X)\} \subseteq s \times s.$$

Since  $A - B \notin -\mathrm{Imm}(X)$  implies  $A \leq_O B$  for any exceptional order  $O$  on  $s$ ,  $F \subseteq P$ . We write  $A \leq_F B$  if  $(A, B) \in F$  and  $\langle F \rangle$  for the poset given by the *transitive hull* of  $F$  inside  $P$ . By definition, this is the set consisting of  $F$  and all pairs  $(A, B) \in s \times s$  such that there exist  $C_1, \dots, C_m \in s$  with  $A \leq_F C_1 \leq_F C_2 \cdots \leq_F C_m \leq_F B$ .

**Proposition 3.1.** *Let  $s$  be an exceptional set and  $F = F(s)$ .*

- (i) *A total order  $O$  on  $s$  is exceptional if and only if  $F \subseteq O$ .*
- (ii)  *$\langle F \rangle = P$ .*

*Proof.* (i) By design,  $F \subseteq O$  for any exceptional order  $O$  on  $s$ . Conversely, assume that  $F \subseteq O$  for some total order  $O$  on  $s$ . If  $O$  were not exceptional, then there would exist  $A, B \in s$  with  $A <_O B$ , but  $B - A \notin -\mathrm{Imm}(X)$ . Hence  $(B, A) \in F(s) \subseteq O$ , that is,  $B <_O A$ , contradiction.

(ii) Assume that  $(A, B) \notin \langle F \rangle$ . In view of Lemma 3.2 below, there exists a total order  $O$  containing  $\langle F \rangle$  and  $(B, A)$ . In particular,  $(A, B) \notin O$ . As  $O$  is exceptional by (i),  $(A, B) \notin P$  whence  $P \setminus \langle F \rangle = \emptyset$ .  $\square$

As we could not find a suitable reference we include a proof of the following folklore

**Lemma 3.2** (Extension of partial orders). *Let  $P \subseteq X \times X$  be a partial order on a set  $X$  and assume that for some  $x \neq x' \in X$ ,  $(x', x) \notin P$ . Then there exists a partial order  $P'$  with  $(x, x') \in P'$  which extends  $P$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $Q := P \cup \{(x, x')\}$  and write  $q \leq_Q q'$  if  $(q, q') \in Q$ . Let  $P' := \langle Q \rangle$  be the transitive hull of  $Q$ . Since  $P$  is a partial order on  $X$ , we have  $(x, x) \in P \subseteq P'$  for all  $x \in X$ .

It remains to check the anti-symmetry of  $P'$ . Let  $(y, z), (z, y) \in P'$ . Then there exist  $q_1, \dots, q_s$  and  $q'_1, \dots, q'_t$  with

$$y \leq_Q q_1 \leq_Q \dots \leq_Q q_s \leq_Q z \quad \text{and} \quad z \leq_Q q'_1 \leq_Q \dots \leq_Q q'_t = y.$$

This gives  $Q$ -chains  $y \leq_Q \dots \leq_Q z \leq_Q \dots \leq_Q y$  and  $z \leq_Q \dots \leq_Q y \leq_Q \dots \leq_Q z$ .

If none of these chains contains a pair of two consecutive elements equal to  $x$  and  $x'$ , we can replace all  $\leq_Q$ -relations by  $\leq_P$ -relations and conclude  $y = z$ . Otherwise, such a pair, say in  $y \leq_Q \dots \leq_Q y$ , yields the chains  $x' \leq_P \dots \leq_P y$  and  $y \leq_P \dots \leq_P x$  whence  $x' \leq_P x$ , contradiction.  $\square$

To investigate  $F(s)$  further, we introduce the map

$$\delta_s: s \times s \rightarrow \text{Imm} \cup \{\mathcal{O}_X\} \cup -\text{Imm}, \quad \delta_s(A, B) = B - A.$$

This is well-defined since  $s$  is exceptional. Namely, for all distinct elements  $A, B \in s$  there exists an exceptional order  $O$  with either  $A <_O B$  or  $B <_O A$ , that is,  $\delta_s(A, B) \in -\text{Imm} \cup \text{Imm}$ . By definition, we immediately obtain the

**Lemma 3.3.** *Let  $s$  be an exceptional set. Then*

$$F(s) = \delta_s^{-1}(\{\mathcal{O}_X\} \cup -\text{Imm}(X) \setminus (\text{Imm}(X) \cap -\text{Imm}(X))).$$

**3.2. Effective exceptional sets.** Let  $\text{Eff}(s) \subseteq F(s)$  be the subset of pairs  $(A, B)$  with

$$B - A \in \text{Eff}(X) := \{\mathcal{L} \in \text{Pic}(X) \mid H^0(X, \mathcal{L}) \neq 0\};$$

we also write  $A \leq_{\text{eff}} B$ . Put differently,

$$\text{Eff}(s) = \delta_s^{-1}(\{\mathcal{O}_X\} \cup (\text{Eff}(X) \cap -\text{Imm}(X)))$$

**Definition 3.4.** We call an exceptional set  $s$  *effective* if  $\text{Eff}(s) = F(s)$ .

Recall from Section 2 that an exceptional sequence  $(\mathcal{L}_1, \dots, \mathcal{L}_N)$  was called strongly exceptional if for all  $1 \leq i, j \leq N$ ,  $\mathcal{L}_i^{-1} \otimes \mathcal{L}_j$  lies in the *acyclic locus*

$$\text{Acyc}(X) := \{\mathcal{L} \in \text{Pic } X \mid H^k(X, \mathcal{L}) = 0 \text{ for all } k \geq 1\}.$$

In particular, strong exceptionality is a condition on the underlying exceptional set. Via the generating set of its associated poset we can characterise this as follows.

**Proposition 3.5.** *An exceptional set  $s$  is strongly exceptional if and only if*

$$\delta_s(F(s)) \subseteq \text{Acyc}(X).$$

*Proof.* Since  $\mathbb{R}\Gamma(X, \mathcal{O}_X) = k$  only the converse needs proof and it is enough to consider  $A \neq B \in s$ . We assume without loss of generality that  $A <_O B$  for some exceptional order  $O$ . In particular,  $A - B \in \text{Imm}(X) \subseteq \text{Acyc}(X)$ . If  $B - A \in \text{Imm}(X)$ , we are done. Otherwise,  $(A, B) \in F$  so that by assumption,  $\delta_s(A, B) = B - A \in \text{Acyc}(X)$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 3.6.** *If an exceptional set  $s$  is strongly exceptional, then*

$$F(s) = \text{Eff}(s),$$

*that is, a strongly exceptional sequence is effective.*

*If in addition  $\text{Eff}(X) \cap -\text{Imm}(X) \subseteq \text{Acyc}(X)$ , then the converse holds, too.*

*Proof.* Since  $\text{Acyc}(X) \subseteq \text{Imm}(X) \cup \text{Eff}(X)$ , Proposition 3.5 and Lemma 3.3 show that

$$\delta_s(F(s)) \subseteq \{\mathcal{O}_X\} \cup (\text{Eff}(X) \cap -\text{Imm}(X)).$$

In particular,  $F(s) \subseteq \text{Eff}(s)$ .

Conversely,  $F(s) = \text{Eff}(s)$  implies

$$\delta(F(s)) \subseteq \{\mathcal{O}_X\} \cup (\text{Eff}(X) \cap -\text{Imm}(X)).$$

If  $\text{Eff}(X) \cap -\text{Imm}(X) \subseteq \text{Acyc}(X)$ ,  $s$  is strongly exceptional by Proposition 3.5.  $\square$

**Remark 3.7.** If  $\text{Eff}(X)$  is a convex polyhedral cone (as it will be the case in Sections 5 and 6),  $\text{Eff}(s)$  is transitive so that  $P(s) = \text{Eff}(s)$  for any effective sequence. Indeed, let  $(A, B), (B, C) \in \text{Eff}(s)$  with  $A \neq B, B \neq C$ . Then  $A <_O B$  and  $B <_O C$  for any exceptional order whence  $C - A \in -\text{Imm}(X)$ . Moreover,  $B - A, C - B \in \text{Eff}(X)$  so that  $C - A \in \text{Eff}(X)$ . Hence  $(A, C) \in \text{Eff}(s)$ .

#### 4. PROJECTIVE BUNDLES OVER $\mathbb{P}^\ell$

We reexamine the setup of Example 2.14 for  $Y = \mathbb{P}^\ell$  and consider a vector bundle  $\mathcal{E} \rightarrow Y$  of  $\text{rk}(\mathcal{E}) = r + 1$ . This induces the projective bundle

$$\pi: X = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}) \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^\ell,$$

together with the relative hyperplane section  $H$ . Recall our convention  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}) := \text{Proj}(\text{Sym}^\bullet \mathcal{E}^\vee)$  so that in particular,  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E})_y = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_y)$  for the fibres over  $y \in Y$ .

Let  $h$  be the pullback of a hyperplane section of  $\mathbb{P}^\ell$ . Then

$$\text{Pic}(X) \cong \mathbb{Z} \cdot h \oplus \mathbb{Z} \cdot H;$$

in particular, the line bundle corresponding to  $ih + jH$  is  $\pi^* \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^\ell}(i) \otimes \mathcal{O}(jH) = \mathcal{O}_X(ih + jH)$ , which we will denote simply by  $(i, j)$ . We refer to these coordinates on  $\text{Pic}(X)$  as *natural*.

**Remark 4.1.** Note that the projectivisation  $\pi: \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}) \rightarrow Y$  only determines  $\mathcal{E}$  up to a twist with a line bundle. However, twisting  $\mathcal{E}$  with  $\mathcal{O}(D)$  yields the new hyperplane section  $H' = H - \pi^*D$ .

The well-known cohomology of line bundles on projective spaces and standard results of the cohomology of projective bundles yields the following

**Proposition 4.2.** *We have*

$$\mathbb{R}\Gamma(X, \mathcal{O}_X(ih + jH)) = \mathbb{R}\Gamma(\mathbb{P}^\ell, \mathcal{O}(i) \otimes \text{Sym}^j \mathcal{E}^\vee) \quad \text{for } i \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ and } j \geq 0.$$

In the range  $-r \leq j \leq -1$ , subsequently referred to as the horizontal strip  $\mathcal{H}$ , the line bundles  $\mathcal{O}_X(ih + jH)$  are immaculate, that is,  $\mathcal{O}_X(ih + jH) \in \text{Imm}(X)$ . See also Figure 1.




FIGURE 1. Line bundles belonging to the immaculate locus of  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}^{r+1}) \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^\ell$  are drawn in magenta (drawn for  $\ell = 4$  and  $r = 3$ ).

**Remark 4.3.** A *horizontal chain* is a set of  $\ell + 1$  consecutive points  $\mathcal{O}_X(ih + jH)$ ,  $i = i_0, \dots, i_0 + \ell$  on the line  $[y = j]$ , that is, it is the pull-back to  $X$  of the Beilinson sequence  $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^\ell}(i_0), \dots, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^\ell}(i_0 + \ell)$  on  $\mathbb{P}^\ell$  twisted with  $\mathcal{O}_X(jH)$ . The sets underlying exceptional sequences of Orlov-type consist thus of  $r + 1$  consecutive horizontal chains. In the language of [AW], these are just the *trivial* sequences.

**Remark 4.4.**  $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \cdot h$  is an extremal ray of the pseudo-effective cone  $\overline{\text{Eff}}(X)$ . As  $H$  is effective, the second extremal ray is of the form

$$H_{\text{eff}} = a_{\text{eff}} \cdot h + b_{\text{eff}} \cdot H$$

with  $a_{\text{eff}} \leq 0$  and  $b_{\text{eff}} > 0$ .

Since  $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^\ell}(1)$  is very ample,  $h$  is still nef on  $X$ . So  $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \cdot h$  is also an extremal ray of the nef cone, and  $\text{Nef}(X) = \langle h, H_{\text{nef}} \rangle \subseteq \text{Eff}(X)$  for

$$H_{\text{nef}} = a_{\text{nef}} \cdot h + b_{\text{nef}} \cdot H$$

with  $a_{\text{eff}}/b_{\text{eff}} \leq a_{\text{nef}}/b_{\text{nef}}$ .

In the following, we will refer to the coordinates on the Picard group induced by the primitive generators  $h$  and  $H_{\text{nef}}$  of the nef cone as *nef coordinates*.

The subsequent Sections 5 and 6 will consider two concrete instances of this setup, namely for a direct sum of line bundles and the cotangent bundle of  $\mathbb{P}^\ell$ .

## 5. THE PROJECTIVE BUNDLE OF A DIRECT SUM OF LINE BUNDLES

The simplest case of a vector bundle  $\mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^\ell$  is given by the direct sum of line bundles

$$\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^\ell}(c^0) \oplus \dots \oplus \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^\ell}(c^r)$$

for integers  $c^0 \geq \dots \geq c^r$ . Since we are free to twist  $\mathcal{E}$  with a further line bundle we assume without loss of generality that  $c^0 = 0$ . We write  $c = (c^1, \dots, c^r)$  and

$$X = X(\ell, r; c) := \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^\ell} \oplus \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^\ell}(c^1) \oplus \dots \oplus \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^\ell}(c^{r+1})).$$

In the so-called *product case* where  $c = 0$  we simply obtain  $X = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^\ell}^{r+1}) = \mathbb{P}^r \times \mathbb{P}^\ell$ . Otherwise, we speak of the *twisted case* which still yields a toric variety. In fact, Kleinschmidt's result [Kle88] asserts that any complete, smooth toric variety of Picard rank 2 arises this way. We therefore embrace the product and the twisted case by referring to the *toric case*.

**5.1. The immaculate locus.** The integer quantities

$$\alpha := -c^r \quad \text{and} \quad \beta := -\sum_{i=1}^r c^i$$

associated with  $X(\ell, r; c)$  are particularly important [AW]. Almost by definition we have the *effective inequality*

$$\beta \leq \alpha r. \tag{2}$$

In terms of the geometry of  $X$  we find  $\beta = -c_1(\mathcal{E})$ . The interpretation of  $\alpha$  is slightly more subtle. First,

$$\pi_* \mathcal{O}_X(-\alpha h + H) = \mathcal{E}^\vee(-\alpha) = \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^\ell}(-\alpha) \oplus \dots \oplus \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^\ell}(-\alpha - c^{r-1}) \oplus \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^\ell}$$

so that the divisor  $-\alpha h + H$  is effective. More generally, for  $ih + jH$  with  $j > 0$  we obtain

$$\pi_* \mathcal{O}_X(ih + jH) = \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^\ell}(i) \otimes \text{Sym}^j \mathcal{E}^\vee = \bigoplus_{1 \leq k_1, \dots, k_j \leq r} \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^\ell}(-c^{k_1} - \dots - c^{k_j} + i). \tag{3}$$

If  $i < 0$  with  $i + \alpha j < 0$ , then  $\alpha j \leq -c^{k_1} - \dots - c^{k_j}$  for all  $1 \leq k_1, \dots, k_j \leq r$ , that is,  $ih + jH$  is not effective. In particular,  $-\alpha h + H$  is an extremal ray of the



pseudo-effective cone of  $X$ , or in the notation of Remark 4.4 (ii),  $a_{\text{eff}} = -\alpha$  and  $b_{\text{eff}} = 1$ . Since  $X$  is toric, the pseudo-effective cone equals the effective cone whence

$$\text{Eff}(X) = \langle h, -\alpha h + H \rangle.$$

For the nef cone we find

$$\text{Nef}(X) = \langle h, H \rangle. \quad (4)$$

Indeed, assume to the contrary that  $a'h + b'H$  with  $a' < 0$  and  $b' > 0$  is an extremal ray of the nef cone. Taking a suitable positive multiple of this divisor if necessary we may assume that  $a' < -\ell$  and  $(a' + 1)h + b'H$  is very ample. From (3) it follows that  $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(a)$  is a direct summand of  $\pi_*\mathcal{O}_X(ah + bH)$  by choosing all  $i_j = 0$ . Since  $a < -\ell$ ,  $\mathcal{O}_X(ah)$  has non-trivial  $\ell$ -th cohomology and so has  $\mathcal{O}((a + 1)h + bH)$ , contradicting the very ampleness. Consequently,  $H$  is an extremal ray of the nef cone. In particular, the natural coordinates on  $\text{Pic}(X)$  are nef, cf. Remark 4.4.

Next we describe the immaculate locus next which is the complement in  $\text{Pic}(X)$  of the (not necessarily disjoint) union of the sets

$$\mathcal{H}^k(X) := \{\mathcal{L} \mid H^k(X, \mathcal{L}) \neq 0\}, \quad k = 0, \dots, \ell + r.$$

In [ABKW20, (5.1)] it was shown that that these sets are either empty or the strongly convex cones given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}^0(X) &= \langle (1, 0), (-\alpha, 1) \rangle \subseteq \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \\ \mathcal{H}^\ell(X) &= (-\ell - 1, 0) + \langle (-1, 0), (0, 1) \rangle \subseteq \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \\ \mathcal{H}^r(X) &= (\beta, -r - 1) + \langle (1, 0), (0, -1) \rangle \subseteq \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}_{< 0} \\ \mathcal{H}^{\ell+r}(X) &= (\beta - \ell - 1, -r - 1) + \langle (-1, 0), (\alpha, -1) \rangle \subseteq \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}_{< 0}. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

The immaculate locus  $\text{Imm}(X)$  is thus completely determined by the quantities  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ . The canonical bundle is given by  $K_X = (\beta - \ell - 1, -r - 1)$ . Figure 2 illustrates the typical shape for the product and twisted case.




FIGURE 2. The immaculate locus for  $X(\ell, r; c)$  with  $\ell = 4$  and  $r = 3$ . On the left hand side the product case with  $c = 0$ , on the right hand side the twisted case with  $\alpha = 1$  and  $\beta = 2$ . The nef cone is shaded in yellow.

**5.2. Maximal exceptional sequences in the toric case.** In view of establishing Theorem B in the toric case, we recall the toric version of Theorem A from [AW, Theorems 7.7 and 10.2]. The following arguments use nef coordinates.

Let  $\sigma$  be the  $\text{Pic}(X)$ -involution given by

$$\sigma : \mathbb{Z}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^2, \quad (i, j) \mapsto (j, i). \quad (6)$$

For an exceptional set  $s$  we may assume without loss of generality that it fits into a rectangle of at most  $2(\ell + 1)$  rows. In the product case, this holds possibly after substituting  $s$  by  $\sigma(s)$ , cf. [AW, Theorems 6.1 and 9.8].

Then up to normalisation, that is, up to twisting  $s$  with a suitable line bundle,  $s$  is one of the following sets. First, consider an *admissible set*

$$\mathcal{X} \subseteq \Delta^{\text{up}} := \{(i, j) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \mid -\beta < i, r < j, \text{ and } i + \alpha j \leq \ell + \alpha(r + 1) - \beta\}$$

determined by the properties below.

(Ai) Vertical spatial boundedness: The horizontal layers

$$\mathcal{X}(k) := \mathcal{X} \cap [y = k]$$

are empty for  $k \neq r + 1, \dots, 2r + 1$ .

(Aii) Normalisation: If  $X \neq \emptyset$ , then  $(\ell - \beta, r + 1) \in \mathcal{X}$ .

(Aiii) Ascending slimness: For each  $k \geq r + 1$  and  $(x, k + 1) \in \mathcal{X}(k + 1)$  the points  $(x, k), (x + 1, k), \dots, (x + \alpha, k)$  belong to  $\mathcal{X}(k)$ , that is, ascending layers of  $\mathcal{X}$  become smaller. In particular,  $\mathcal{X}(k) = \emptyset$  implies  $\mathcal{X}(k + 1) = \emptyset$ .

Second, we extend the layers  $\mathcal{X}(k) \neq \emptyset$  successively to the left until we obtain a horizontal chain in  $[y = k]$  (cf. Remark 4.3). Whenever  $\mathcal{X}(k) = \emptyset$ , we freely choose a horizontal chain. Denote by  $\mathcal{Y}(k)$  the new points in the layer  $[y = k]$ . Since  $\mathcal{X}(k) \subseteq \Delta^{\text{up}}$ ,  $\mathcal{Y}(k)$  is necessarily nonempty. We let  $\mathcal{Y} := \bigcup_k \mathcal{Y}(k)$  and define

$$\mathcal{Z} := \mathcal{Y} + (\beta, -r - 1).$$

Then  $\mathcal{Z} \cup \mathcal{X}$  defines a maximal exceptional set on  $X$ , and any maximal exceptional set arises this way. See also Figure 3 which visualises this construction; elements of  $\mathcal{X}$ ,  $\mathcal{Y}$ , and  $\mathcal{Z}$  correspond to red, blue and green points, respectively.




FIGURE 3. The sets  $\mathcal{X}$ ,  $\mathcal{Y}$  and  $\mathcal{Z}$  for maximal exceptional sets  $s$  on  $X(4, 3; 0)$  (left-hand side) and  $X(4, 3; c)$  with  $\alpha = 1$  and  $\beta = 2$  (right-hand side).

**Remark 5.1.** An exceptional order on  $\mathcal{Z} \cup \mathcal{X}$  is given by the *vertical lexicographical order*  $<_{\text{vert}}$  defined by

$$(i_1, j_1) <_{\text{vert}} (i_2, j_2) \text{ if and only if } j_1 < j_2 \text{ or } (j_1 = j_2 \text{ and } i_1 < i_2).$$

Similarly, we define the horizontal lexicographical order. In particular, any maximal exceptional set can be vertically ordered (twisted case) or vertically / horizontally ordered (product case). By Proposition 3.1, the maximal effective sequences are precisely those maximal exceptional sets  $s$  which can be ordered both vertically and

horizontally. In fact,  $P(s)$  is contained in any global term order used in computer algebra.

As a remarkable matter of fact, this feature is proper to maximal exceptional sets and Picard rank 2. There are counterexamples for non-maximal non-extendable exceptional sets [AW, Example 8.1] and for maximal exceptional sets on  $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$  [AA22, Example 3.5].

Summarising, an exceptional set is completely determined by  $\mathcal{Z}$ . For practical reasons we let

$$\mathbf{K}_{\text{free}} := \{k \in \mathbb{Z} \mid 0 \leq k \leq r \text{ and } \mathcal{X}(k+r+1) = \emptyset\} \subseteq \{0, \dots, r\},$$

and

$$\mathcal{Z}_{\text{free}} := \bigcup_{k \in \mathbf{K}_{\text{free}}} s(k) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{Z}_{-\infty} := \mathcal{Z} \setminus \bigcup_{k \in \mathbf{K}_{\text{free}}} s(k)$$

be the *free* and the *residual part* of  $\mathcal{Z}$ , respectively. The reason for the subscript  $-\infty$  will become clear in Subsection (5.3).

**Remark 5.2.** [AW, Proposition 5.3] implies that a maximal exceptional set  $s$  on  $X(\ell, r; c)$  which can be vertically ordered satisfies

$$j_2 - j_1 \geq -r \quad \text{for all } (i_1, j_1) < (i_2, j_2) \text{ in } s. \quad (7)$$

Therefore, if two consecutive line bundles  $(\mathcal{L}_0, \mathcal{L}_1)$  are not vertically ordered, mutating to the left yields  $(\mathbf{L}_{\mathcal{L}_0} \mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_0) = (\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_0)$ , cf. Remark 2.9 and Figure 4. In particular, we can achieve vertical lexicographical order by successively mutating line bundles to the left. This gives rise to a fullness preserving operator

$$\text{Lex} : \{\text{maximal exceptional sequence}\} \rightarrow \{\text{maximal exceptional sequence}\}$$

which sends a given maximal exceptional sequence to a vertically ordered maximal exceptional sequence. Combining this operator with helixing to the right yields the *helex (!) operator*  $\tilde{h} := \text{h}_R \circ \text{Lex}$  which also preserves fullness. Theorem A then implies that up to applying  $\tilde{h}$  a finite number of times, any maximal exceptional set can be transformed into maximal exceptional sequence of Orlov types, cf. also [AW, Proposition 7.2]. Theorem C follows immediately.

**5.3. Strongly exceptional maximal sets.** Knowing the shape of the maximal exceptional sets we can in principle determine the generating sets  $F$  of the associated partial order. At any rate, we derive a direct criterion for strongness.

Let

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F} &:= -\text{Imm}(X) \setminus (-\text{Imm}(X) \cap \text{Imm}(X)) \\ &= -\text{Imm}(X) \setminus \{(i, j) \in -\text{Imm}(X) \mid 0 < |i| \leq \ell, 0 < |j| \leq r\}, \end{aligned}$$

cf. also Figure 4. By Lemma 3.3,

$$F(s) = \bigcup_{\mathcal{L} \in s} \{\mathcal{L}\} \times (s \cap (\mathcal{L} + \mathcal{F})). \quad (8)$$

For strong exceptionality we need  $F(s) \subseteq \text{Acyc}(X)$ , the acyclic locus of  $X$ , cf. Proposition 3.5. From Figure 5 (product case) and Figure 7 (twisted case) we immediately gather that any pair  $(\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{L}') \in F(s) \setminus \text{Eff}(s)$  must involve the free part  $\mathcal{Z}_{\text{free}}(s)$ : If the horizontal chains are torn too far apart we obtain pairs  $(\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{L}')$  in  $F$  with  $\mathcal{L}' - \mathcal{L} \notin \text{Acyc}(X)$ .

To formulate this more neatly, we introduce the “thick layers”

$$s(-\infty) := \mathcal{Z}_{-\infty} \quad \text{and} \quad s(\infty) := \mathcal{X}$$




FIGURE 4. The magenta shaded area including the boundary forms  $\mathcal{F}$  (drawn for  $\ell = 4$  and  $r = 3$  and  $\alpha = 1$  and  $\beta = 2$ ). The black circles represent the intersection  $-\text{Imm}(X) \cap \text{Imm}(X)$ .




FIGURE 5. Two maximal exceptional sets on  $X = X(4, 7; 0)$ . On the left-hand side, the layer  $s(5)$  is displaced:  $(s(4)^R, s(5)^L) \in F(s)$ , but  $s(5)^L - s(4)^R \notin \text{Acyc}(X)$ . The maximal exceptional set on the right-hand side is strongly exceptional.

and extend  $K_{\text{free}}$  to

$$K_{\text{layers}} := K_{\text{free}} \cup \{-\infty, \infty\} \subseteq \{-\infty, 0, \dots, r, \infty\}.$$

Since any exceptional order on  $s$  restricts to the natural total order of the integers on  $s(k) \subseteq [y = k] \cong \mathbb{Z}$  (cf. [AW, Lemma 5.1]), we can define the points

$$s(k)^L := \min s(k) \quad \text{and} \quad s(k)^R := \max s(k), \quad k = 0, \dots, r.$$

Provided that  $\mathcal{Z}_{-\infty}$  (and thus  $\mathcal{X}$ ) is not empty, we also set

$$s(\infty)^L := \min s(r+1) \quad \text{and} \quad s(-\infty)^R := \max s(k_0) \quad (9)$$

where  $k_0$  is the maximal integer such that  $\mathcal{Z}_{-\infty} \cap [y = k_0] \neq \emptyset$ . Put differently,  $s(\infty)^L \in \mathcal{X}$  is the lower left corner of  $\mathcal{X}$  while  $s(-\infty)^R$  is the upper right corner of  $\mathcal{Z}_{-\infty}$ . In particular, vertical slimness implies

$$A \leq s(-\infty)^R \quad \text{and} \quad s(\infty)^L \leq B \quad \text{for all } A \in \mathcal{Z}_{-\infty}, B \in \mathcal{X}. \quad (10)$$

Finally, we let

$$s(\infty)^R := s(\infty)^L + (\ell, 0) \quad \text{and} \quad s(-\infty)^L := s(-\infty)^R - (\ell, 0)$$

so that

$$s(k)^R - s(k)^L = (\ell, 0)$$

for all  $k \in K_{\text{layers}}$ . Note, however, that  $s(\infty)^R \notin \mathcal{X}$  and  $s(-\infty)^L \notin \mathcal{Z}_{-\infty}$ .

We call a layer  $s(k)$ ,  $k \in K_{\text{layers}}$ , *displaced* if there exists  $k' \in K_{\text{layers}}$  with

$$k' < k \quad \text{and} \quad s(k')^L \not\leq_{\text{nef}} s(k)^L,$$

cf. again Figure 5 for illustration.




FIGURE 6. The triple intersection  $\text{Eff}(X) \cap -\text{Imm}(X) \cap \mathcal{H}^\ell(X)$ . The left-hand side displays  $X(\ell, r; c)$  for  $\ell = 2 = r = 2$  and  $\alpha = \beta = 2$ . For the right-hand side we have  $\ell = 4$ ,  $r = 3$  and  $\alpha = 1$ ,  $\beta = 2$ . In particular, Proposition 5.4 applies.

Then the discussion at the beginning of Subsection (5.3) implies

**Theorem 5.3** (Theorem B for the toric case). *Let  $X = X(\ell, r; c)$ . A maximal exceptional set  $s$  is strongly exceptional if and only if there are no displaced layers. Equivalently,  $\leq_{\text{nef}}$  induces a total order on the set  $\{s(k)^L \mid k \in K_{\text{layers}}\}$ .*

**5.4. Proper effective maximal exceptional sets.** Finally, we look for effective maximal exceptional sets which are *proper*, that is, which are not strongly exceptional. By Corollary 3.6, their existence requires  $\text{Eff}(X) \cap -\text{Imm}(X) \not\subseteq \text{Acyc}(X)$ .

**Proposition 5.4.**  *$\text{Eff}(X) \cap -\text{Imm}(X) \subseteq \text{Acyc}(X)$  if and only if  $\ell \geq \alpha r$ . In particular,  $X$  must be necessarily Fano.*

*Proof.* Assume that  $\mathcal{L} = (i, j) \in \text{Eff}(X) \cap -\text{Imm}(X)$  is not acyclic. This happens precisely if there exists  $1 \leq k \leq \dim X = \ell + r$  with  $H^k(X, \mathcal{L}) \neq 0$ . Since  $\mathcal{L} \in \text{Eff}(X)$  implies  $j \geq 0$ , we deduce from (5) on Page 9 that  $k = \ell$ . Hence

$$\text{Eff}(X) \cap -\text{Imm}(X) \subseteq \text{Acyc}(X) \quad \text{if and only if} \quad \text{Eff}(X) \cap -\text{Imm}(X) \cap \mathcal{H}^\ell(X) = \emptyset.$$

Since  $\beta \leq \alpha r$  by the effective inequality (2) on Page 8, points of minimal abscissa in  $\text{Eff}(X) \cap -\text{Imm}(X)$  must be in the horizontal strip and therefore in  $\{x = -\alpha r\}$ , cf. also Figure 6. Hence  $\text{Eff}(X) \cap -\text{Imm}(X) \cap \mathcal{H}^\ell(X)$  is empty if and only if  $-\ell - 1 < -\alpha r$ , or equivalently,  $\ell \geq \alpha r$ . In particular,  $\ell \geq \beta$ , which by [Kle88] implies that  $X$  must be Fano.  $\square$

Next we characterise effective sets in terms of layers as follows. For  $k \in K_{\text{layers}}$ , we call  $s(k)$  *bad* if there exists  $k' \in K_{\text{layers}}$  with

$$k' < k, \quad s(k')^L \not\leq_{\text{nef}} s(k)^L \quad \text{and} \quad s(k')^R \not\leq_{\text{eff}} s(k)^L.$$

In particular, a bad layer is necessarily displaced, but the converse is false as shown by Figure 7.

**Proposition 5.5.** *Let  $X = X(\ell, r; c)$ . A maximal exceptional set  $s$  is effective if and only if there are no bad layers.*

*Proof.* We will prove the contraposition.

Assume first that for  $k \in K_{\text{layers}}$ ,  $s(k)$  is a bad layer. Taking  $k' \in K_{\text{layers}}$  with  $k' < k$ ,  $s(k')^L \not\leq_{\text{nef}} s(k)^L$  and  $s(k')^R \not\leq_{\text{eff}} s(k)^L$ , we have  $s^L(k)_1 - s^R(k')_1 \leq -\ell - 1$ . Therefore,  $s^L(k) - s^R(k') \in \mathcal{H}^\ell(X) \cap -\text{Imm}(X)$  so that  $s^L(k) - s^R(k') \notin \text{Imm}(X)$ . It follows that  $(s^R(k'), s^L(k)) \in F(s)$  which implies that  $s$  is not effective.

Conversely, assume that  $s$  is not effective. Then there exists a pair  $(A, B) \in F(s)$  with  $B - A \notin \text{Eff}(X)$ . In particular,  $A <_{\text{vert}} B$  and  $A - B \notin -\text{Imm}(X)$ . It follows




FIGURE 7. Examples of strongly and proper effective exceptional sets on  $X(3, 3; (0, 0, -2))$ . On the left hand side no layer is displaced. On the right hand side, the layer  $s(3)$  is bad while  $s(\infty)$  is displaced, but not bad.




FIGURE 8. On the second Hirzebruch surface  $X = X(1, 1; (0, -2))$  the exceptional set given by the black points is effective, yet not strongly exceptional: The layer  $s(1)$  is displaced, but not bad.

that  $1 \leq (B - A)_2 \leq r$  and

$$B - A \in \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \setminus (\text{Eff}(X) \cup (\text{Imm}(X) \cap \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0})) \subseteq \mathcal{H}^\ell(X)$$

whence  $B_1 - A_1 \leq -\ell - 1$ .

Therefore, we cannot have  $A$  and  $B$  both in  $\mathcal{Z}_{-\infty}$  nor in  $\mathcal{X}$  whence  $A \in \mathcal{Z}_{-\infty}$  and  $B \in \mathcal{Z}_{\text{free}}$ , or  $A \in \mathcal{Z}_{\text{free}}$  and  $B \in \mathcal{X}$ . Put  $b := B_2$  if  $B \in \mathcal{Z}_{\text{free}}$  and  $b := \infty$  otherwise. Similarly,  $a := A_2$  if  $A \in \mathcal{Z}_{\text{free}}$  and  $a := -\infty$  otherwise. Then  $a, b \in \mathcal{K}_{\text{layers}}$  and  $a < b$ . Further,  $B - A \notin \text{Eff}(X)$  implies  $s(a)^R \not\leq_{\text{eff}} s(b)^L$ . Finally,

$$s(b)_1^L - s(a)_1^L - \ell = s(b)_1^L - s(a)_1^R \leq B_1 - A_1 \leq -\ell - 1.$$

Hence  $s(b)$  is a bad layer.  $\square$

Figure 8 illustrates an example of an effective, yet not strongly exceptional set.

## 6. THE PROJECTIVE BUNDLE OF THE COTANGENT BUNDLE

In this section we take  $\mathcal{E} = \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^\ell}(-1)$ ,  $\ell \geq 2$ , and look at the projectivisation

$$\pi: X = X_\ell := \mathbb{P}(\Omega_{\mathbb{P}^\ell}(-1)) \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^\ell.$$

The twist implies that the natural coordinates on  $\text{Pic}(X)$  are nef.

**6.1. Immaculate locus.** We compute the immaculate of locus  $X_\ell$  again by determining the maculate regions with non-vanishing cohomology inside  $\text{Pic}(X_\ell)$ . Under the identification  $\mathbb{P}(\Omega_{\mathbb{P}^\ell}(-1)) \cong \mathbb{P}(\Omega_{\mathbb{P}^\ell}) \cong \mathbb{F}l(1, \ell, \ell + 1)$ , the projection  $X_\ell \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^\ell$  becomes the natural map  $\mathbb{F}l(1, \ell, \ell + 1) \rightarrow \mathbb{F}l(1, \ell + 1) = \mathbb{P}^\ell$ . The subsequent theorem is then a straightforward application of Borel–Bott–Weil, cf. for instance [Bri05] or [Lui]. Alternatively, use Proposition 4.2.

**Theorem 6.1.** *Let  $\mathcal{L} = (i, j)$  be a line bundle on  $X_\ell$ .*

(i) *For  $j \geq 0$  we have*

- $\mathcal{L} \in \mathcal{H}^0(X_\ell) \iff (i, j) \in \langle (1, 0), (0, 1) \rangle$
- $\mathcal{L} \in \mathcal{H}^1(X_\ell) \iff (i, j) \in (-\ell, 1) + \langle (0, 1), (-1, 1) \rangle$
- $\mathcal{L} \in \mathcal{H}^\ell(X_\ell) \iff (i, j) \in (-\ell - 1, 0) + \langle (-1, 1), (-1, 0) \rangle$

(ii) For  $j < 0$  we have

- $\mathcal{L} \in \mathcal{H}^{\ell-1}(X_\ell) \iff (i, j) \in (-\ell, 1) + \langle (1, 0), (1, -1) \rangle$
- $\mathcal{L} \in \mathcal{H}^{2\ell-2}(X_\ell) \iff (i, j) \in (0, -\ell - 1) + \langle (1, -1), (0, -1) \rangle$
- $\mathcal{L} \in \mathcal{H}^{2\ell-1}(X_\ell) \iff (i, j) \in (-\ell, -\ell) + \langle (-1, 0), (0, -1) \rangle$ .

In particular, at most one cohomology group of  $\mathcal{L}$  is non-zero, and its dimension is

$$\dim H^k(X, \mathcal{L}) = \left| \binom{i-j+\ell}{\ell} \binom{j+\ell}{\ell} - \binom{i-j+1+\ell}{\ell} \binom{j-1+\ell}{\ell} \right|.$$

**Corollary 6.2.**  $\mathcal{L} = (i, j)$  is immaculate if and only if it lies in the union of the horizontal strip  $\mathcal{H} := \{(i, j) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \mid -\ell+1 \leq j \leq -1\}$ , the vertical strip  $\mathcal{V} := \{(i, j) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \mid -\ell+1 \leq i \leq -1\}$  and the anti-diagonal strip  $\mathcal{D} := \{(i - \ell, -i) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \mid i \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ .

See also Figure 9 for a schematic sketch of the immaculate locus.




FIGURE 9. The immaculate locus of  $X_\ell = \mathbb{P}(\Omega_{\mathbb{P}^\ell}(-1))$  (drawn in magenta for  $\ell = 3$ ).




FIGURE 10. The immaculate locus of  $X_\ell^\vee = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{P}^\ell}(2))$  (drawn in magenta for  $\ell = 3$ ).

**Remark 6.3.** Note that we get an analogous statement for  $X^\vee = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{P}^\ell}(2)) \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^\ell$  as  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{P}^\ell}(2)) \cong \mathbb{F}(1, 2, \ell + 1)$ . Alternatively, using  $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{P}^\ell} \cong \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^\ell}^\vee$ , Serre duality implies for  $j \geq 0$  that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{R}\Gamma(X^\vee, \mathcal{O}_{X^\vee}(ih + jH^\vee)) &= \mathbb{R}\Gamma(\mathbb{P}^\ell, \mathcal{O}(i + 2j) \otimes \text{Sym}^j \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^\ell}) \\ &= H^{\ell-\bullet}(\mathbb{P}^\ell, \mathcal{O}(-\ell - 1 - i - 2j) \otimes \text{Sym}^j \mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{P}^\ell})^\vee \\ &= H^{\ell-\bullet}(X, \mathcal{O}_X(-(\ell + i + j + 1)h + jH))^\vee. \end{aligned}$$

For  $j < 0$ , we apply first Serre duality on  $X^\vee$  to reduce to the case of  $j \geq 0$ , before applying Serre duality on  $X$ . This yields the picture of Figure 10.

**Remark 6.4.** For  $\ell > 2$  we get the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & & \mathbb{F}(1, 2, \ell, \ell + 1) & & \\ & & \downarrow \Psi & & \\ & p & & q & \\ & \swarrow & V_1 \subset V_2 \subset V_\ell \subset k^{\ell+1} & \searrow & \\ \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{P}^\ell}(2)) \ni V_1 \subset V_2 \subset k^{\ell+1} & & & & V_1 \subset V_\ell \subset k^{\ell+1} \in \mathbb{P}(\Omega_{\mathbb{P}^\ell}(-1)) \\ \downarrow & & \searrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathbb{G}r(2, \ell + 1) & & \mathbb{P}^\ell & & \check{\mathbb{P}}^\ell \end{array}$$

where we used that  $\mathbb{G}r(2, \ell + 1) = \mathbb{F}(2, \ell + 1)$ ,  $\mathbb{P}^\ell = \mathbb{F}(1, \ell + 1)$  and  $\check{\mathbb{P}}^\ell = \mathbb{F}(\ell, \ell + 1)$ . Both  $p$  and  $q$  are projective bundle maps. In particular,

$$p^* : \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{P}(\Omega_{\mathbb{P}^\ell})) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{F}(1, 2, \ell, \ell + 1)) \quad \text{and} \quad q^* : \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{P}^\ell})) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{F}(1, 2, \ell, \ell + 1))$$

are fully faithful. This implies that the (im)maculate loci of  $\text{Pic}(X_\ell)$  and  $\text{Pic}(X_\ell^\vee)$  can be obtained as hyperplanes of  $\text{Pic}(\mathbb{F}(1, 2, \ell, \ell + 1))$ . Regarding  $\mathbb{F}(1, 2, \ell, \ell + 1)$  as a projective bundle over  $\mathbb{G}r(2, \ell + 1)$ ,  $\mathbb{P}^\ell$  and  $\check{\mathbb{P}}^\ell$  respectively, this accounts for the three immaculate strips which occur in  $\text{Pic}(X_\ell)$  and  $\text{Pic}(X_\ell^\vee)$ .

**6.2. The associated lattice.** It is useful to reduce  $\text{Pic}(X)$  further by taking the quotient with an *admissible* sublattice  $\Lambda$ , that is,

$$\Lambda \cap (\text{Imm}(X) \cup -\text{Imm}(X)) = \emptyset.$$

This is motivated by the following

**Lemma 6.5.** *If  $\Lambda$  is an admissible sublattice of  $\text{Pic}(X)$ , then for any exceptional set  $s$  the composition*

$$s \hookrightarrow \text{Pic}(X) \twoheadrightarrow \text{Pic}(X)/\Lambda$$

*is injective.*

*Proof.*  $\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{L}' \in s$  are mapped to the same point in  $\text{Pic}(X)/\Lambda$  if  $\mathcal{L}_i - \mathcal{L}_j \in \Lambda$ . But  $\mathcal{L}_i - \mathcal{L}_j \in \text{Imm}(X) \cup -\text{Imm}(X)$ , contradiction.  $\square$

In the following we let  $\phi_\Lambda : \text{Pic}(X) \rightarrow \text{Pic}(X)/\Lambda$  be the natural projection.

**Example 6.6.** For the toric case,  $\Lambda = \langle K_X, \pi^* K_{\mathbb{P}^\ell} \rangle$  is admissible, cf. also [AW, Subsection (3.4)]. In this case,  $\text{Pic}(X)/\Lambda$  contains exactly  $\text{rk } K_0(X)$  elements, so that an exceptional set of line bundles  $s$  is maximal if and only if  $\phi_\Lambda$  restricted to  $s$  is a bijection.



However, the lattice in Example 6.6 is no longer admissible for  $X = X_\ell$ :  $K_X \otimes \pi^* \omega_{\mathbb{P}^\ell}^{-1}$  lies in  $\text{Imm}(X)$ . On the other hand,  $X$  has two projections  $\pi_1$  and  $\pi_2$  onto  $\mathbb{P}^\ell$ . Then

$$\Lambda = \langle \pi_1^* K_{\mathbb{P}^\ell}, \pi_2^* K_{\mathbb{P}^\ell} \rangle$$

is admissible and formally agrees with the lattice of the product case since  $K_{\mathbb{P}^\ell \times \mathbb{P}^\ell} = \pi_1^* K_{\mathbb{P}^\ell} \otimes \pi_2^* K_{\mathbb{P}^\ell}$ . In particular, any exceptional set  $s$  injects into  $\text{Pic}(X)/\Lambda \cong (\mathbb{Z}/(\ell+1)\mathbb{Z})^2$ .

**Remark 6.7.** Other choices for admissible lattices are possible, for instance,  $\Lambda' = \langle K_X, \mathcal{O}_X((\ell+2)h) \rangle$ .

Unlike the toric case we do not get a bijection since  $\text{rk } K_0(X) = \ell(\ell+1)$ . There are, however, constraints on the image of  $\Phi_\Lambda$ . Let

$$\Delta := \{(a, a) \mid a \in \mathbb{Z}/(\ell+1)\mathbb{Z}\}$$

and consider the ‘‘shifted diagonals’’  $p + \Delta$  for  $p \in \text{Pic}(X)/\Lambda$ .

**Proposition 6.8.** *Let  $s$  be an exceptional set on  $X = X_\ell$ . The image  $\Phi_\Lambda(s)$  consists of at most  $\ell(\ell+1)$  points where none of the shifted diagonals  $p + \Delta$  contains more than  $\ell$  points.*

*Furthermore, for a maximal exceptional set  $s$  the intersection of  $\Phi(s)$  with each shifted diagonal in  $\text{Pic}(X)/\Lambda$  consists, in this order, of the points*

$$p + (1, 1), p + (2, 2), \dots, p + (\ell, \ell)$$

*for some uniquely determined gap point  $p$ , namely the missing point of the shifted diagonal  $p + \Delta$ .*

*Proof.* The set  $\Phi_\Lambda(\text{Imm}(X_\ell))$  equals  $\text{Pic}(X)/\Lambda \setminus \{\Phi(\mathcal{O}_X), \Phi(K_X)\}$ . Thus, if  $\mathcal{L}_i, \mathcal{L}_j \in s$  are elements of an exceptional sequence with  $\pi(\mathcal{L}_j) = \pi(\mathcal{L}_i) + (1, 1)$ , then necessarily  $i < j$ .

Consequently, a shifted diagonal  $p + \Delta$  cannot entirely belong to an exceptional sequence  $s$  since it is periodic. Therefore, we necessarily have gaps; for a maximal exceptional set  $s$ , there cannot be more than one.

Let then  $p \in \text{Pic}(X)/\Lambda$  be this unique  $s$ -gap in its own shifted diagonal  $p + \Delta$ . The remaining elements are

$$p + (1, 1), p + (2, 2), \dots, p + (\ell, \ell)$$

which belong to the image of  $s$  under  $\Phi$ , and any element in  $\Phi_\Lambda^{-1}(p + \nu \cdot (1, 1)) \cap s$  necessarily precedes any element in  $\Phi_\Lambda^{-1}(p + (\nu+1) \cdot (1, 1))$ .  $\square$

**Remark 6.9.** The proposition can be also regarded as a consequence of the admissibility of  $\Lambda'$  in Remark 6.7.

**6.3. Maximal exceptional sequences on  $X_2 = \mathbb{P}(\Omega_{\mathbb{P}^\ell}(-1))$ .** As discussed in Subsection (6.1), we can subdivide the immaculate locus into four parts: The common intersection of the (anti-)diagonal and the horizontal and vertical line; and the diagonal / horizontal / vertical line minus that common intersection. Inside the quotient  $\text{Pic}(X_2)/\Lambda$  this is reflected by the disjoint union of equivalence classes

- $\{(2, 0), (0, 2)\}$  coming only from points on the diagonal
- $\{(0, 1), (2, 1)\}$  coming only from points in the horizontal line
- $\{(1, 0), (1, 2)\}$  coming from points in the vertical line
- $\{(1, 1)\}$  coming from the intersection of all three parts.

We use colours for the three basic building blocks of the immaculate locus: Blue represents the diagonal, red the horizontal and green the vertical strip, see Figure 11 for illustration. We refer to a point in a maximal exceptional set as a blue, green or red point if its image in  $\text{Pic}(X_2)/\Lambda$  is a point of corresponding colour. As the image of a maximal exceptional set consists of six points, at least one colour occurs necessarily twice.




FIGURE 11. The coloured immaculate loci  $\mathcal{I}(X_2) \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^2$  and  $\Phi_\Lambda(\mathcal{I}) \subseteq (\mathbb{Z}/3\mathbb{Z})^2$

**Theorem 6.10.** *Up to helixing and changing the order of mutually orthogonal elements, any maximal exceptional sequence is either a vertically or horizontally lex ordered maximal exceptional sequence.*

*Proof.* Assume that  $s = (s_1, \dots, s_6)$ ,  $s_i = (a_i, b_i)$ , is a maximal exceptional sequence which is not vertically lex ordered. Then there exists  $1 \leq i \leq 5$  with  $b_{i+1} - b_i < 0$ . If  $s_{i+1} - s_i \in -\text{Imm} \cap \text{Imm}$ , then mutation just exchanges  $s_i$  and  $s_{i+1}$  in the sequence. Therefore, there must exist  $1 \leq i \leq 5$  such that either

- (i)  $s_{i+1} - s_i = (k + 2, -k)$ ,  $k \geq 2$ ;
- (ii)  $s_{i+1} - s_i = (1, -k)$ ,  $k \geq 4$ ;
- (iii)  $s_{i+1} - s_i = (1, -2)$ ,

cf. Figure 12. Helixing and normalising if necessary we may assume that  $i = 1$  and  $s_1 = \mathcal{O}_X$ .




FIGURE 12. The set  $-\text{Imm} \setminus (-\text{Imm} \cap \text{Imm})$ . The points in  $-\text{Imm} \cap \text{Imm}$  are displayed in black.

CASE 1. Assume that  $s_2 = (2 + k, -k)$ ,  $k \geq 2$ . The set of possible successors is given by

$$\text{Suc}(s_2) = \{(1, 3), (1, 1 - k), (3, 1), (3 + k, 1), (1 + k, 1 - k), (3 + k, -1 - k)\}.$$

Existence of at least one pair of coloured points requires  $k = 2$ , see Figure 13 in which case we have two red points. However, these exclude any green point, contradiction. Hence Case 1 does not occur.

CASE 2. Assume that  $s_2 = (1, -k)$ ,  $k \geq 4$ . The set of possible successors is given by

$$\text{Suc}(s_2) = \{(1, 1 - k), (1, 2 - k), (2 - k, 1), (2, 1), (2, 0), (1 + k, 1 - k)\},$$




FIGURE 13. The set of successors  $\text{Suc}(4, -2)$  (black points).

see Figure 14.





FIGURE 14. The set of successors  $\text{Suc}(1, -4)$  (black points).

Here, we cannot have a pair of red or blue points. Therefore, we must have two green points which results in the sequences



These are horizontally ordered.

CASE 3. Finally, assume that  $s_2 = (1, -2)$ . The set of possible successors is given by

$$\text{Suc}(1, -2) = \{(1, -1), (1, 0), (0, 1), (2, 1), (2, 0), (3, -1)\},$$

cf. Figure 15. Note that a possible blue point on  $(3, -1)$  cannot occur in a sequence with either the red point  $(0, 1)$  or the green point  $(1, 0)$  and the red point  $(2, 1)$ . On the other hand, a red point on  $(0, 1)$  prevents a blue point on  $(3, -1)$ ; together with a green point on  $(1, -1)$  it prevents a blue point in  $(2, 0)$ .






FIGURE 15. The set of successors  $\text{Suc}(1, -2)$  (black points).

(i) If we have two blue points, then we get the maximal exceptional sequences




The first one is horizontally ordered. Computing the class of maximal exceptional sequences obtained by successively helixing to the right yields a horizontally ordered maximal exceptional sequence (cf. the third sequence of Class (iv) of Corollary 6.11 below).

(ii) If we have two red points, then we get the maximal exceptional sequences



These sequences are equivalent under helixing to the right to a sequence which can be horizontally ordered (namely the third sequence of Class (v) and the first sequence of Class (iii)' below).

(iii) We are left with the case of two green, one blue and one red point which leaves us with the maximal exceptional sequence




which is horizontally ordered. This finishes the proof. □


Note that the involution  $\sigma$  from Equation 6 on Page 10 exchanges vertical with horizontal lex order. For a complete classification of maximal exceptional sets it therefore suffices to determine the maximal exceptional sequences with vertical order. A straightforward, if tedious computation yields the full list of maximal exceptional sequences in Corollary 6.11. We subdivide this list into the equivalence classes under helixing (i)-(v). The sequences displayed here are obtained by applying  $h_R$  from the left to the right. The remaining maximal exceptional sequences are obtained by applying  $\sigma$  since  $K_X$  is fixed under  $\sigma$ . This yields the corresponding Classes (i)'-(v)'. We do not display those; at any rate (ii)'=(ii), (iv)'=(iv) and (v)'=(v).

**Corollary 6.11** (Theorem A for  $X_2$ ). *Up to applying  $\sigma$ , any maximal exceptional sequence on  $X = \mathbb{P}(\Omega_{\mathbb{P}^2}(-1))$  is one of the following:*


*Class (i) (the arrow indicates that we can move the middle line freely to the left or to the right; the fourth point lies by definition on  $\mathcal{O}_X(a, 1)$ ):*




*Class (ii):*




Class (iii):



Class (iv):



Class (v):



From Corollary 6.11 we can immediately compute  $F(s)$  via Equation (8) on Page 11. Since we always have  $\text{Eff}(\sigma) \subseteq F(s)$ , we merely compute the complement

$$F_0(\sigma) := F(s) \setminus \text{Eff}(\sigma).$$

Moreover, we only give the stable range for the sequences of Class (i).

**Corollary 6.12** (Theorem B for  $X_2$ ). *The partial order associated with the maximal exceptional sequences of Corollary 6.11 have the following generating sets:*

Class (i): For the first sequence, we find

$$F_0(s) = \begin{cases} \emptyset, & a \geq 1 \\ \{(s_i, s_j) \mid 1 \leq i \leq 3; 4 \leq j \leq 6\}, & a \leq -6. \end{cases}$$

For the second sequence, we find

$$F_0(s) = \begin{cases} \{(s_3, s_6), (s_4, s_6), (s_5, s_6)\}, & a \geq 5 \\ \emptyset, & a = 1 \\ \{(s_i, s_j) \mid i = 1, 2; 3 \leq j \leq 5\}, & a \leq -4. \end{cases}$$

For the third sequence, we find

$$F_0(s) = \begin{cases} \{(s_i, s_j) \mid 2 \leq i \leq 4; j = 5, 6\}, & a \geq 7 \\ \emptyset, & a = 1 \\ \{(s_1, s_2), (s_1, s_3), (s_1, s_4)\}, & a \leq -4. \end{cases}$$

The first sequence is strongly exceptional if  $a \geq 1$ , whereas the other sequences are strongly exceptional only if  $a = 1$ . In fact, they are all strongly cyclic for  $a = 1$ .

Class (ii):  $F_0(s) = \emptyset$ . Thus, all sequences are strongly exceptional. In particular, this class is strongly cyclic.

Class (iii):

$$F_0(s) = \{(s_2, s_3), (s_4, s_5)\} | \{(s_1, s_2), (s_3, s_4)\} | \{(s_2, s_3)\} \\ \{(s_1, s_2), (s_5, s_6)\} | \{(s_4, s_5)\} | \{(s_3, s_4), (s_5, s_6)\}.$$

Class (iv):

$$F_0(s) = \{(s_3, s_4)\} | \{(s_2, s_3), (s_5, s_6)\} | \{(s_1, s_2), (s_4, s_5)\} \\ \{(s_3, s_4)\} | \{(s_2, s_3), (s_5, s_6)\} | \{(s_1, s_2), (s_4, s_5)\}.$$

Class (v):

$$F_0(s) = \{(s_3, s_4)\} | \{(s_2, s_3), (s_5, s_6)\} | \{(s_1, s_2), (s_4, s_5)\} \\ \{(s_3, s_4)\} | \{(s_2, s_3), (s_5, s_6)\} | \{(s_1, s_2), (s_4, s_5)\}.$$


**6.4. Fullness of maximal exceptional sets on  $X_2$ .** We are now in a position to prove Theorem C.

**Theorem 6.13** (Theorem C for  $X_2$ ). *On  $X = \mathbb{P}(\Omega_{\mathbb{P}^2}(-1))$  any maximal exceptional sequence can be mutated to a sequence of Orlov-type. In particular, any maximal exceptional set is full.*

*Proof.* We only need to check the statement for a single exceptional sequence in each of the helix classes listed in Corollary 6.11.

Case (i) is obvious by considering the first sequence. For Case (ii) we take the third, and for Case (iii) the fourth sequence, where we have the mutually orthogonal pairs  $((1, -1), (0, 2))$  and  $((1, 1), (0, 2))$ . Changing the order immediately reveals that these sequences are of Orlov-type, too.

Finally, after tensoring with a suitable line bundle we can appeal to Lemma 6.14 below and mutate the fourth sequences of Cases (iv) and (v) into exceptional sequences of Orlov-type as follows:




□

It remains to prove the

**Lemma 6.14.** *On  $X = \mathbb{P}(\Omega_{\mathbb{P}^2}(-1))$ , the two (non full) exceptional sequences*

$$((-2, 1), (-1, -1), (-1, 0)) \longleftrightarrow ((-1, -1), (-1, 0), (0, 0))$$


*are related by mutating  $(-2, 1)$  to the right, or alternatively, mutating  $(0, 0)$  to the left. More precisely,  $\mathcal{O}(-2h + H)[-1] = \mathbf{L}_{\mathcal{O}(-h-H)}\mathbf{L}_{\mathcal{O}(-h)}\mathcal{O}$  where we ignore the shift in the exceptional sequences above.*



*Dually, the two (non full) exceptional sequences*

$$((0, 0), (1, 0), (1, 1)) \longleftrightarrow ((1, 0), (1, 1), (2, -1))$$

*are related by mutating  $(0, 0)$  to the right, or alternatively, mutating  $(2, -1)$  to the left. More precisely,  $\mathcal{O}(2h - H)[1] = \mathbf{R}_{\mathcal{O}(h+H)}\mathbf{R}_{\mathcal{O}(h)}\mathcal{O}$*



*Proof.* To ease notation we use  $X \cong \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{P}^2})$  as  $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{P}^2} \cong \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^2}(-3)$ , and we write  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\Omega$  for  $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{P}^2}$  and  $\Omega_{\mathbb{P}^2}$ , respectively. In particular, we find  $H = 2h + H'$  for the relative hyperplane section  $H'$  of  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{T})$ .

Recall that there is a tautological morphism  $\phi: \pi^*\Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(H')$  which yields the short exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \ker \phi \rightarrow \pi^*\Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(H') \rightarrow 0.$$

To compute  $\ker \phi = \mathcal{O}(ih + jH')$  we use  $c(\mathcal{T}) = (1+h)^3 = 1 + 3h + 3h^2 \in A(\mathbb{P}^2) = \mathbb{Z}[ht]/h^3$  and [Ful98, Example 8.3.4]. We obtain

$$A(\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{T})) = \mathbb{Z}[h, H']/(h^3, (H')^2 + 3hH' + 3h^2).$$

In particular,  $c(\ker \phi) = c(\pi^*\Omega)/c(\mathcal{O}(H'))$ , or more explicitly,

$$1 + ih + jH' = (1 - 3h + 3h^2)/(1 + H') = 1 - 3h - H'$$

in  $A(\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{T}))$ . As a result, we arrive at the short exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(-3h - H') \rightarrow \pi^*\Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(H') \rightarrow 0.$$

With respect to the nef basis  $(h, H)$  of  $X = \mathbb{P}(\Omega(-1))$  on  $\text{Pic}(X)$  this is

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(-h - H) \rightarrow \pi^*\Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(-2h + H) \rightarrow 0, \quad (11)$$

which can be also written as the triangle

$$\mathcal{O}(-2h + H)[-1] \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(-h - H) \rightarrow \pi^*\Omega.$$

One checks that  $\text{Hom}^\bullet(\mathcal{O}(-2h + H), \pi^*\Omega) = 0$ . Therefore, the triangle implies that

$$\text{Hom}^\bullet(\mathcal{O}(-h - H), \pi^*\Omega) \cong \text{Hom}^\bullet(\pi^*\Omega, \pi^*\Omega) \cong \mathbb{C}$$

whence  $\mathbf{L}_{\mathcal{O}(-h-H)}\pi^*\Omega = \mathcal{O}(-2h + H)[-1]$ .

On the other hand,  $\pi^*\Omega$  also fits into the pullback of the Euler sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \pi^*\Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(-h)^{\oplus 3} \rightarrow \mathcal{O} \rightarrow 0,$$

so  $\mathbf{L}_{\mathcal{O}(-h)}\mathcal{O} = \pi^*\Omega$ . Putting everything together, we can carry out the following sequence of mutations:

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathcal{O}(-h - H), \mathcal{O}(-h), \mathcal{O}) &\rightsquigarrow (\mathcal{O}(-h - H), \pi^*\Omega = \mathbf{L}_{\mathcal{O}(-h)}\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{O}(-h)) \\ &\rightsquigarrow (\mathcal{O}(-h + H)[-1] = \mathbf{L}_{\mathcal{O}(-h-H)}\pi^*\Omega, \mathcal{O}(-h - H), \mathcal{O}(-h)) \end{aligned}$$

In other words,  $\mathcal{O}(-2h + H)[-1] = \mathbf{L}_{\mathcal{O}(-h-H)}\mathbf{L}_{\mathcal{O}(-h)}\mathcal{O}$ . The second case follows dually.  $\square$

## 7. SOME REMARKS ON THE ROUQUIER DIMENSION

Given a tilting object  $T$  in a triangulated category  $\mathcal{T}$  we can consider the following ascending chain of (not necessarily triangulated) subcategories of  $\mathcal{T}$ :

- (i)  $\langle T \rangle_0 = \text{add}(T)$  the smallest full subcategory which contains the summands of  $T$  and is closed under direct sums, shifts and isomorphisms.
- (ii)  $\langle T \rangle_i$  the smallest full subcategory which is closed under direct sums and shifts and contains all objects  $X$  that fit into triangles  $A \rightarrow B \rightarrow X \oplus X'$  with  $A \in \langle T \rangle_{i-1}$ ,  $B \in \langle T \rangle_0$ , and  $X'$  an object complementing  $X$  to the cone of  $A$  and  $B$ .

The *generation time* of  $T$  is the smallest integer  $i \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\mathcal{T} = \langle T \rangle_i$ . The *Rouquier dimension* of  $\mathcal{T}$  is the minimum over the generation times of all tilting objects in  $\mathcal{T}$ .

**Theorem 7.1.** *Let  $X$  be a smooth projective variety.*

- (i)  $\dim(X)$  is smaller or equal to the Rouquier dimension of  $\mathcal{D}(X)$  [Rou08].
- (ii) For a given tilting object  $T \in \mathcal{D}(X)$  let  $i_0$  be the largest  $i$  such that

$$\mathbb{R}^i \mathrm{Hom}(T, T \otimes K_X^{-1}) = \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{D}(X)}(T, T \otimes K_X^{-1}[i]) \neq 0.$$

*Then the generation time of  $T$  is equal to  $\dim(X) + i_0$  [BF12].*

*In particular, the Rouquier dimension of  $\mathcal{D}(X)$  is bounded by  $\dim(X) + i_0$ .*

**Example 7.2.** Let  $\pi: X = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}) \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^\ell$  be a  $\mathbb{P}^r$ -bundle. Replacing  $\mathcal{E}$  by  $\mathcal{E}(D)$  for some divisor  $D$  if necessary, we may assume that the relative hyperplane section  $H$  is sufficiently positive. This implies that the full exceptional sequence of Orlov-type

$$(\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{O}(h), \dots, \mathcal{O}(\ell h), \mathcal{O}(h+H), \dots, \mathcal{O}(\ell h+rH)) \quad (12)$$

is strongly exceptional. Let  $T$  be the tilting object given by the direct sum of these line bundles. Since

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{R}^k \mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{O}_X(i_1 h + j_1 H), \mathcal{O}_X(i_2 h + j_2 H) \otimes K_X^{-1}) \\ &= \mathrm{H}^k(\mathbb{P}^\ell, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^\ell}(i_2 - i_1) \otimes \mathrm{R}\pi_* \mathcal{O}_X((j_2 - j_1)H \otimes K_X^{-1})) \end{aligned}$$

and  $\mathrm{R}\pi_* \mathcal{O}_X((j_2 - j_1)H \otimes K_X^{-1})$  is of the form  $\mathcal{O}(i') \otimes \mathrm{Sym}^j \mathcal{E}^\vee$  and thus a bundle on  $\mathbb{P}^\ell$ , we have  $\mathbb{R}^i \mathrm{Hom}(T, T \otimes K_X^{-1}) = 0$  for  $i > \ell$ . Hence the generation time of  $T$  is bounded by  $\dim(X) + \ell$ .

A conjecture of Orlov states that the Rouquier dimension of  $\mathcal{D}(X)$  actually coincides with  $\dim(X)$ . We can sharpen the previous estimate in order to support this conjecture in the following two cases:

**Proposition 7.3.** *The Rouquier dimension of  $\mathcal{D}(X)$  is equal to  $\dim(X)$  if*

- (i)  $X = X(\ell, r; c)$  and  $-K_X$  is nef.
- (ii)  $X = X_\ell$ .

*Proof.* We consider the tilting bundle from Example 7.2.

- (i) Since  $-K_X = (\ell + 1 - \beta)h + (r + 1)H$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{H}^k(X, \mathcal{O}_X((i_2 - i_1)h + (j_2 - j_1)H) \otimes K_X^{-1}) \\ &= \mathrm{H}^k(X, \mathcal{O}_X((i_2 - i_1 + \ell + 1 - \beta)h + \underbrace{(j_2 - j_1 + r + 1)H}_{>0})). \end{aligned}$$

In order for this to vanish, we gather from the shape of the immaculate locus that the only higher cohomology group to avoid is  $H^\ell$ . This requires  $i_2 - i_1 + \ell + 1 - \beta > -\ell - 1$ , or equivalently,  $\beta \leq i_2 - i_1 + 2\ell + 1$ . As  $i_2 - i_1 \geq -\ell$ , the  $\ell$ -th cohomology vanishes if and only if  $\beta \leq \ell + 1$ , that is,  $\ell + 1 - \beta \geq 0$  which is tantamount to saying that  $-K_X$  is nef.

- (ii) Since  $K_{X_\ell} = \mathcal{O}(-\ell, -\ell)$ ,  $\mathrm{Hom}^\bullet(T, T \otimes \omega^{-1})$  is concentrated in degree zero.  $\square$

**Remark 7.4.** In the recent preprint [FH23], Orlov's conjecture has been established for any toric variety  $X$ . In particular, the nefness of  $-K_X$  in Proposition 7.3 (i) is not a necessary condition.

**Remark 7.5.** For  $X_\ell^\vee := \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{P}^\ell}(2))$  the proof above does not work if  $\ell \geq 3$ . Indeed, consider the exceptional sequences of Orlov-type

$$\begin{aligned} & ((0, 0), (1, 0), \dots, (\ell, 0), \\ & (a_1, 1), (a_1 + 1, 1), \dots, (a_1 + \ell, 1), \\ & \dots \\ & (a_{\ell-1}, \ell - 1), \dots, (a_{\ell-1} + \ell, \ell - 1)) \end{aligned}$$



for some integers  $a_0 = 0, a_1, \dots, a_{\ell-1}$ . Such a sequence is strong if and only if  $a_{i+1} - a_i \geq \ell - 1$  for all  $i$ . In particular,  $a_{\ell-1} \geq (\ell - 1)^2$ .

Using that  $K_{X_\ell^\vee} = (-2, -\ell)$ , we see that

$$\mathrm{Hom}^\bullet(\mathcal{O}((a_{\ell-1} + \ell)h + (\ell - 1)H), \mathcal{O} \otimes \omega^{-1}) = H^\bullet(\mathcal{O}((2 - a_{\ell-1} - \ell)h + H)).$$

Note that  $2 - a_{\ell-1} - \ell \leq -\ell^2 - \ell + 3 \leq -3\ell$  if  $\ell \geq 3$ . By Theorem 6.1,  $H^\ell(\mathcal{O}((2 - a_{\ell-1} - \ell)h + H)) \neq 0$  for  $\ell \geq 3$ , which merely yields  $\dim(X_\ell) + \ell$  as an upper bound for the Rouquier dimension.

Although we did not check all full exceptional sequences of line bundles on  $X_\ell$ , we believe that one cannot obtain a lower bound for the Rouquier dimension using those as soon as  $\ell \geq 3$ . Since Orlov's conjecture is commonly supposed to be true one has to look for a more sophisticated way of producing tilting bundles.

## REFERENCES

- [AA22] Klaus Altmann and Martin Altmann. Exceptional sequences of 8 line bundles on  $(\mathbb{P}^1)^3$ . *J. Algebr. Comb.*, 56(2):305–322, 2022. [arXiv:2108.11806](#).
- [ABKW20] Klaus Altmann, Jarosław Buczyński, Lars Kastner, and Anna-Lena Winz. Immaculate line bundles on toric varieties. *Pure Appl. Math. Q.*, 16(4):1147–1217, 2020. [arXiv:1808.09312](#).
- [AW] Klaus Altmann and Frederik Witt. The structure of exceptional sequences on toric varieties of Picard rank two. [arXiv:2112.14637](#).
- [Bei78] A.A. Beilinson. Coherent sheaves on  $\mathbb{P}^n$  and problems in linear algebra. *Funktsional. Anal. i Prilozhen.*, 12(3):68–69, 1978.
- [BF12] Matthew Ballard and David Favero. Hochschild dimensions of tilting objects. *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN*, (11):2607–2645, 2012. [arXiv:0905.1444](#).
- [BGKS15] Christian Böhning, Hans-Christian Graf von Bothmer, Ludmil Katzarkov, and Pawel Sosna. Determinantal Barlow surfaces and phantom categories. *J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)*, 17(7):1569–1592, 2015. [arXiv:1210.0343](#).
- [Bri05] Michel Brion. Lectures on the geometry of flag varieties. In *Topics in cohomological studies of algebraic varieties. Impanga lecture notes*, pages 33–85. Birkhäuser, 2005. [arXiv:math/0410240](#).
- [FH23] David Favero and Jesse Huang. Rouquier dimension is Krull dimension for normal toric varieties. [arXiv:2302.09158](#), 2023.
- [Ful98] William Fulton. *Intersection theory*, volume 2 of *Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete*. Springer-Verlag, 1998.
- [Kle88] Peter Kleinschmidt. A classification of toric varieties with few generators. *Aequationes Math.*, 35(2-3):254–266, 1988.
- [Kuz14] Alexander Kuznetsov. Semiorthogonal decompositions in algebraic geometry. In *Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians (ICM 2014), Vol. II*, pages 635–660. Seoul: KM Kyung Moon Sa, 2014. [arXiv:1404.3143](#).
- [Lui] Luis Solá Conde. Geometry of rational homogeneous spaces. Manuscript Łukęcin September 9-13, 2019.
- [Orl92] Dmitri Orlov. Projective bundles, monoidal transformations, and derived categories of coherent sheaves. *Izv. Math.*, 41(1):133–141, 1992.
- [Orl09] Dmitri Orlov. Remarks on generators and dimensions of triangulated categories. *Mosc. Math. J.*, 9(1):153–159, back matter, 2009. [arXiv:0804.1163](#).
- [Rou08] Raphaël Rouquier. Dimensions of triangulated categories. *J. K-Theory*, 1(2):193–256, 2008. [arXiv:math/0310134](#).
- [Rud90] Alexei Rudakov, editor. *Helices and vector bundles: seminaire Rudakov*, volume 148 of *Lond. Math. Soc. Lect. Note Ser.* Cambridge University Press, 1990.

INSTITUT FÜR MATHEMATIK, FU BERLIN, KÖNIGIN-LUISE-STR. 24-26, D-14195 BERLIN  
*Email address:* [altmann@math.fu-berlin.de](mailto:altmann@math.fu-berlin.de)

DIPARTIMENTO DI MATEMATICA “FRANCESCO BRIOSCHI”, POLITECNICO DI MILANO, VIA BONARDI 9, I-20133 MILANO  
*Email address:* [andreas.hochenegger@polimi.it](mailto:andreas.hochenegger@polimi.it)

FACHBEREICH MATHEMATIK, U STUTTGART, PFAFFENWALDRING 57, D-70569 STUTTGART  
*Email address:* [witt@mathematik.uni-stuttgart.de](mailto:witt@mathematik.uni-stuttgart.de)