

On reducible hyperplane sections of 4-folds

By Antonio LANTERI and Andrea L. TIRONI

(Received Jan. 17, 2000)

Abstract. We describe 4-dimensional complex projective manifolds X admitting a simple normal crossing divisor of the form $A + B$ among their hyperplane sections, both components A and B having sectional genus zero. Let L be the hyperplane bundle. Up to exchanging the two components, (X, L, A, B) is one of the following: 1) (X, L) is a scroll over \mathbf{P}^1 with A itself a scroll and B a fibre, 2) $(X, L) = (\mathbf{P}^2 \times \mathbf{P}^2, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{P}^2 \times \mathbf{P}^2}(1, 1))$ with $A \in |\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{P}^2 \times \mathbf{P}^2}(1, 0)|$, $B \in |\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{P}^2 \times \mathbf{P}^2}(0, 1)|$, 3) $X = \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{P}^2}(\mathcal{V})$ where $\mathcal{V} = \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{P}^2}(1)^{\oplus 2} \oplus \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{P}^2}(2)$, L is the tautological line bundle, $A = \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{P}^2}(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{P}^2}(1)^{\oplus 2})$, and $B \in \pi^*|\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{P}^2}(2)|$, where $\pi: X \rightarrow \mathbf{P}^2$ is the scroll projection. This supplements a recent result of Chandler, Howard, and Sommese.

Introduction and statement of the result.

The study of the structure of projective manifolds admitting some special variety among their hyperplane sections is a classical subject in algebraic geometry. Recently, Chandler, Howard, and Sommese [CHS] started to study projective manifolds $X \subset \mathbf{P}^N$ in terms of a reducible hyperplane section, which is a union of distinct smooth irreducible components A_1, \dots, A_r , $r \geq 2$, meeting transversally. In particular they studied the case in which every component A_i has minimal sectional genus $g(A_i, L_{A_i}) = h^1(\mathcal{O}_{A_i})$, $i = 1, \dots, r$, where $L = \mathcal{O}_X(1)$. They proved [CHS, Corollary 4.6] that if X has dimension $n \geq 5$, then only one possibility is allowed: namely (X, L) is a scroll over a smooth curve and all components are fibres, except one, which meets every fibre along a hyperplane. For $n \leq 4$ the situation is quite richer and hence more interesting than in higher dimensions. In fact, restricting to the case $n = 4$, $r = 2$, in [CHS, Corollary 4.8] a short list of possibilities is given for pairs (X, L) such that $g(A_i, L_{A_i}) = 0$, $i = 1, 2$. In this paper we rule out one of them; namely we show that (X, L) cannot be a Mukai 4-fold in the above situation. As a final output the result of [CHS, Corollary 4.8] is improved as follows.

THEOREM. *Let L be a very ample line bundle on a smooth complex projective 4-fold X . Assume that $|L|$ contains an element $A + B$, with A, B smooth irreducible*

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 14J35; Secondary 14J45, 14C20, 14N30.

Key Words and Phrases. 4-folds; Hyperplane sections; Adjunction theory; Simple normal crossing divisors; Fano manifolds.

divisors meeting transversally. If $g(A, L_A) = g(B, L_B) = 0$, then (X, L) is one of the following:

- (1) a scroll over \mathbf{P}^1 ;
- (2) $(\mathbf{P}^2 \times \mathbf{P}^2, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{P}^2 \times \mathbf{P}^2}(1, 1))$; or
- (3) $(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{P}^2}(\mathcal{V}), \xi_{\mathcal{V}})$, where $\mathcal{V} = \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{P}^2}(1)^{\oplus 2} \oplus \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{P}^2}(2)$ and $\xi_{\mathcal{V}}$ is the tautological line bundle.

Moreover, up to exchanging components, A itself is a scroll and B is a fibre of the scroll projection in case (1), $A \in |\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{P}^2 \times \mathbf{P}^2}(1, 0)|$, $B \in |\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{P}^2 \times \mathbf{P}^2}(0, 1)|$ in case (2), and $A = \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{P}^2}(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{P}^2}(1)^{\oplus 2}) \cong \mathbf{P}^2 \times \mathbf{P}^1$, $B \in \pi^*|\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{P}^2}(2)|$, where $\pi : X \rightarrow \mathbf{P}^2$ denotes the scroll projection, in case (3).

During the preparation of this paper the first author was supported by the MURST of the Italian Government, in the framework of the National Research Project ‘‘Commutative Algebra, Algebraic Geometry, and Computational Aspects’’ (Cofin. 97).

1. The proof.

In [CHS] it is shown that if (X, L) is not as in cases (1)–(3) of the Theorem with A, B as above, then

$$(1.1) \quad (X, L) \text{ is a Mukai 4-fold, i.e. } -K_X = 2L.$$

We retake the proof at this point, showing that case (1.1) cannot occur. We use the standard notation and terminology from algebraic geometry; moreover, we adopt the same symbols as in [CHS] simply omitting hat accents, since we do not need reductions. In particular, we denote by h the smooth surface $A \cap B$. We recall that case (1.1) arises from the following situation: $K_X + 3L$ is nef and

$$(1.2) \quad (h, L_h) = (\mathbf{P}^1 \times \mathbf{P}^1, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{P}^1 \times \mathbf{P}^1}(2, 2)),$$

which implies that

$$(1.3) \quad g(h, L_h) = 1.$$

First, by adjunction we have

$$-2 = 2g(A, L_A) - 2 = (K_A + 2L_A)L_A^2 = (K_X + L)AL^2 + L^3A + A^2L^2,$$

and

$$-2 = 2g(B, L_B) - 2 = (K_B + 2L_B)L_B^2 = (K_X + L)BL^2 + L^3B + B^2L^2.$$

Summing up these two expressions we get

$$\begin{aligned} -4 &= (K_X + L)L^3 + L^4 + (A^2 + B^2)L^2 \\ &= (K_X + L)L^3 + 2L^4 - 2ABL^2 \\ &= (K_X + 3L)L^3 - 2ABL^2 \\ &= 2g(X, L) - 2 - 2L_h^2. \end{aligned}$$

Now, if (X, L) is as in (1.1) then $L_h^2 = 8$ by (1.2) and so $g(X, L) = 7$. Thus the genus formula gives

$$(1.4) \quad L^4 = 12.$$

We claim that the second Betti number of X is ≥ 2 . Assume otherwise; then $\text{Pic}(X) \cong \mathbf{Z}$ generated by an ample line bundle, say A . Thus $[A] = aA$, $[B] = bA$ with a, b positive integers; hence $L = tA$ for some integer $t \geq 2$. On the other hand $-K_X = 2tA$ by (1.1) and since the Fano index of X cannot exceed $\dim X + 1 = 5$ we get $t \leq 2$. Therefore $t = 2$, i.e. $-K_X = 4A$, which implies by the Kobayashi–Ochiai theorem that $(X, L) = (\mathbf{Q}^4, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{Q}^4}(2))$. But this gives $L^4 = 2^4 \cdot 2 = 32$, which contradicts (1.4). Therefore $b_2(X) \geq 2$. Now note that the fundamental linear system of X is L , which is very ample; hence the assumption (0.1) in [W] is trivially satisfied. Then, by the classification result of Wiśniewski [W, Theorem 0.2] (see also [IP, Theorem 7.2.15, p. 148 and Table 12.7, p. 225]) there are only two possibilities:

- i) $X = \mathbf{P}^1 \times V$, where $V = V_3 \subset \mathbf{P}^4$ is a smooth cubic hypersurface and $L = p^* \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{P}^1}(1) \otimes q^* \mathcal{O}_V(1)$, p, q denoting the projections of X onto the factors;
- ii) there is a morphism $\pi : X \rightarrow \mathbf{P}^2 \times \mathbf{P}^2$ expressing X as a double cover branched along a smooth divisor in the linear system $|\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{P}^2 \times \mathbf{P}^2}(2, 2)|$, and $L = \pi^* \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{P}^2 \times \mathbf{P}^2}(1, 1)$.

We need a case-by-case analysis.

In case i) we have

$$A \in |p^* \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{P}^1}(a_1) \otimes q^* \mathcal{O}_V(a_2)| \quad \text{and} \quad B \in |p^* \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{P}^1}(b_1) \otimes q^* \mathcal{O}_V(b_2)|,$$

for some integers $a_i, b_i, i = 1, 2$ such that

$$(1.5) \quad a_1 + b_1 = a_2 + b_2 = 1.$$

Let l and γ denote a fibre of q and a curve section in a fibre of p respectively. Of course we can choose these curves in such a way that they are contained neither in A nor in B . Hence

$$a_1 = A \cdot l \geq 0, \quad a_2 = A \cdot \gamma \geq 0$$

and

$$b_1 = B \cdot l \geq 0, \quad b_2 = B \cdot \gamma \geq 0.$$

Up to exchanging A and B we thus conclude that $a_1 = b_2 = 1$, $a_2 = b_1 = 0$, i.e.,

$$A \in |p^* \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{P}^1}(1)| \quad \text{and} \quad B \in |q^* \mathcal{O}_V(1)|.$$

In case ii) we have

$$A \in |\pi^* \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{P}^2 \times \mathbf{P}^2}(a_1, a_2)| \quad \text{and} \quad B \in |\pi^* \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{P}^2 \times \mathbf{P}^2}(b_1, b_2)|,$$

for some integers $a_i, b_i, i = 1, 2$ satisfying (1.5) again. Let $l_i \subset \mathbf{P}^2 \times \mathbf{P}^2$ be a line contained in a fibre of the j -th projection, where $j \neq i$. Of course we can choose l_1 and l_2 in such a way that they are contained neither in $\pi(A)$ nor in $\pi(B)$. Hence

$$a_i = A \cdot \pi^{-1}(l_i) \geq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad b_i = B \cdot \pi^{-1}(l_i) \geq 0 \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2.$$

Thus, up to exchanging A and B , we conclude that $a_1 = b_2 = 1$, $a_2 = b_1 = 0$ as before, i.e.,

$$A \in |\pi^* \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{P}^2 \times \mathbf{P}^2}(1, 0)| \quad \text{and} \quad B \in |\pi^* \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{P}^2 \times \mathbf{P}^2}(0, 1)|.$$

This shows that in both cases i) and ii) A and B are nef divisors. But this combined with (1.3) leads to a contradiction, in view of the following

LEMMA. *Let (X, L) be as in (1.1) and suppose that $|L| \ni A + B$, with A, B smooth divisors meeting along a smooth surface h . If A is nef, then $g(h, L_h) \leq g(A, L_A)$.*

PROOF. By adjunction we have

$$\begin{aligned} (*) \quad 2g(A, L_A) - 2 &= (K_A + 2L_A)L_A^2 \\ &= (K_X + A + 2L)L^2A \\ &= (K_X + 3L - B)LA(A + B) \\ &= (K_X + 3L)A^2L + (K_X + 2L)ABL \\ &= (K_X + 3L)A^2L + 2g(h, L_h) - 2. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, since A is nef, we get from (1.1)

$$(K_X + 3L)A^2L = A^2L^2 \geq 0,$$

and then the assertion follows from (*). □

References

- [CHS] K. A. Chandler, A. Howard, and A. J. Sommese, Reducible hyperplane sections I, *J. Math. Soc. Japan*, **51** (1999), 887–910.
- [IP] V. A. Iskovskikh and Yu. G. Prokhorov, Fano Varieties, *Algebraic geometry V* (A. N. parshin and I. R. Shafarevich, eds.), *Enc. Math. Sciences*, vol. 47, Springer, Berlin–Heidelberg, 1999.
- [W] J. Wiśniewski, Fano 4-folds of index 2 with $b_2 \geq 2$. A contribution to Mukai classification, *Bull. Polish Acad. Sc. Math.*, **38** (1990), 173–178.

Antonio LANTERI and Andrea L. TIRONI

Dipartimento di Matematica “F. Enriques”

Università degli Studi di Milano

Via C. Saldini 50

I-20133 Milano

Italy

E-mail: lanteri@mat.unimi.it

atironi@mat.unimi.it