

# Notes on very ample vector bundles on 3-folds

HIDETOSHI MAEDA AND ANDREW J. SOMMESE

ABSTRACT. Let  $\mathcal{E}$  be a very ample vector bundle of rank two on a smooth complex projective threefold  $X$ . An inequality about the third Segre class of  $\mathcal{E}$  is provided when  $K_X + \det \mathcal{E}$  is nef but not big, and when a suitable positive multiple of  $K_X + \det \mathcal{E}$  defines a morphism  $X \rightarrow B$  with connected fibers onto a smooth projective curve  $B$ , where  $K_X$  is the canonical bundle of  $X$ . As an application, the case where the genus of  $B$  is positive and  $\mathcal{E}$  has a global section whose zero locus is a smooth hyperelliptic curve of genus  $\geq 2$  is investigated, and our previous result is improved for threefolds.

## Introduction

In what follows, varieties are always assumed to be defined over the field  $\mathbb{C}$  of complex numbers.

Let  $\mathcal{E}$  be a very ample vector bundle of rank  $n - 1$  on a smooth projective variety  $X$  of dimension  $n \geq 3$ . Then there exists a global section  $s \in \Gamma(\mathcal{E})$  whose zero locus  $C = (s)_0$  is a smooth curve on  $X$ .

If  $K_X + \det \mathcal{E}$  is nef and big, then there exist a birational morphism  $\pi : X \rightarrow X'$  expressing  $X$  as the blow-up of a smooth projective variety  $X'$  along a finite set  $B$  of points (possibly empty) and an ample vector bundle  $\mathcal{E}'$  of rank  $n - 1$  on  $X'$  such that  $\mathcal{E} = \pi^* \mathcal{E}' \otimes \mathcal{O}_X(-\pi^{-1}(B))$  and that  $K_{X'} + \det \mathcal{E}'$  is ample. The polarized pair  $(X', \mathcal{E}')$  is called the *first reduction* of  $(X, \mathcal{E})$ . In this case, under the assumption that  $C$  is a hyperelliptic curve of genus  $g \geq 2$ , we have proved in [MS]

$$n \geq \tau \geq \frac{(n-1)(g+t+1)+2}{2(g-1)} - 1,$$

where  $\tau$  is the nefvalue of the polarized pair  $(X', K_{X'} + \det \mathcal{E}')$  and  $t$  is the number of exceptional divisors with respect to the first reduction morphism  $\pi : X \rightarrow X'$ .

As a continuation of the above research, we investigate the case where  $K_X + \det \mathcal{E}$  is nef but not big in case  $n = 3$ . According to [BS1, Theorem 3.1], there are five possibilities in this case. In this article we restrict ourselves to especially the following three cases among them, where a suitable positive multiple of  $K_X + \det \mathcal{E}$

---

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 14J60; Secondary 14F05, 14C20, 14J30.

defines a morphism  $X \rightarrow B$  with connected fibers onto a smooth projective curve  $B$ .

- (a)  $X$  is a  $\mathbb{P}^2$ -bundle over a smooth curve  $B$ , and  $\mathcal{E}_F \cong \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(2) \oplus \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$  for any fiber  $F$  of the projection  $\pi : X \rightarrow B$ ;
- (b)  $X$  is a  $\mathbb{P}^2$ -bundle over a smooth curve  $B$ , and  $\mathcal{E}_F \cong T_{\mathbb{P}}$  for any fiber  $F$  of the projection  $\pi : X \rightarrow B$ , where  $T_{\mathbb{P}}$  is the tangent bundle of  $\mathbb{P}^2$ ;
- (c) there exists a surjective morphism  $\pi : X \rightarrow B$  onto a smooth curve  $B$  such that a general fiber  $F$  of  $\pi$  is a smooth quadric surface  $\mathbb{Q}^2$  in  $\mathbb{P}^3$  with  $\mathcal{E}_F \cong \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{Q}}(1)^{\oplus 2}$ .

We note that  $K_X + \det \mathcal{E} = \pi^* H$  for some ample line bundle  $H$  on  $B$  in every case. The purpose of this article is to give an inequality in each of the above cases concerning the third Segre class of  $\mathcal{E}$  by using the double point formula. The precise statement of our result is as follows:

**Theorem 1.** *Let  $\mathcal{E}$  be a very ample vector bundle of rank two on a smooth projective 3-fold  $X$ , and assume that  $(X, \mathcal{E})$  is one of (a), (b) or (c). Let  $D$  denote the third Segre class  $s_3(\mathcal{E})$  of  $\mathcal{E}$ , let  $q$  be the genus of  $B$ , and let  $\rho = \deg(H - K_B)$ . Then*

- (1)  $D(D - 20) \geq 200(q - 1) + 37\rho$  in case (a);
- (2)  $D(D - 20) \geq 168(q - 1) + 21\rho$  in case (b);
- (3)  $D(D - 20) \geq 168(q - 1) + 20\rho + k$  in case (c), where  $k$  is the number of singular fibers of  $\pi$ .

By Lemma 4, the singular fibers in case (c) are biholomorphic to irreducible and reduced quadric surfaces in  $\mathbb{P}^3$ .

This article is organized as follows. In Section 0 we collect preliminary material. Section 1 is devoted to the proof of Theorem 1. As an application of Theorem 1, in Section 2 we come back to the case where  $C$  is a hyperelliptic curve of genus  $\geq 2$ , and show that case (a) does not occur and that case (b) is very restricted when the genus of  $B$  is positive. This allows us to improve [MS, Theorem 6] in case of 3-folds. It also complements the result [LPS, Theorem 2.4] as noted in [LPS, Remark 2.5].

Thanks are due to the referee for useful remarks.

## 0. Background material

We use the standard notation from algebraic geometry. The tensor products of line bundles are denoted additively. The numerical equivalence is denoted by  $\equiv$ . The pullback  $i^* \mathcal{E}$  of a vector bundle  $\mathcal{E}$  on  $X$  by an embedding  $i : Y \hookrightarrow X$  is denoted by  $\mathcal{E}_Y$ . For a vector bundle  $\mathcal{E}$  on  $X$ , the tautological line bundle on the projective space bundle  $\mathbb{P}_X(\mathcal{E})$  associated to  $\mathcal{E}$  is denoted by  $H(\mathcal{E})$ . A vector bundle  $\mathcal{E}$  on a projective variety  $X$  is said to be *very ample*, if the tautological line bundle  $H(\mathcal{E})$  on  $\mathbb{P}_X(\mathcal{E})$  is very ample. We denote by  $K_X$  the canonical bundle of a smooth variety  $X$ . Let  $\mathcal{E}$  be a vector bundle of rank  $n - 1$  on a smooth projective variety  $X$  of

dimension  $n \geq 3$  such that there exists a global section  $s \in \Gamma(\mathcal{E})$  whose zero locus  $C = (s)_0$  is a smooth curve on  $X$ . Then we should note that  $K_C = (K_X + \det \mathcal{E})_C$ .

Let  $X$  be a smooth projective variety of dimension  $n \geq 3$ , and let  $\mathcal{E}$  be a very ample vector bundle of rank  $n - 1$  on  $X$ . Assume that  $K_X + \det \mathcal{E}$  is nef. Then, by the base point free theorem, a suitable positive multiple of  $K_X + \det \mathcal{E}$  is spanned and defines a morphism  $\pi : X \rightarrow B$  with connected fibers onto a normal projective variety  $B$ . Assume furthermore that  $\dim B = 1$ . Then, from [BS1, Theorem 3.1] for  $n = 3$  and [ABW, Theorem B] for  $n \geq 4$ ,  $(X, \mathcal{E})$  is one of the following:

- (a)  $X$  is a  $\mathbb{P}^{n-1}$ -bundle over a smooth curve  $B$ , and  $\mathcal{E}_F \cong \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(2) \oplus \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(1)^{\oplus(n-2)}$  for any fiber  $F$  of the projection  $\pi : X \rightarrow B$ ;
- (b)  $X$  is a  $\mathbb{P}^{n-1}$ -bundle over a smooth curve  $B$ , and  $\mathcal{E}_F \cong T_{\mathbb{P}}$  for any fiber  $F$  of the projection  $\pi : X \rightarrow B$ , where  $T_{\mathbb{P}}$  is the tangent bundle of  $\mathbb{P}^{n-1}$ ;
- (c) there exists a surjective morphism  $\pi : X \rightarrow B$  onto a smooth curve  $B$  such that a general fiber  $F$  of  $\pi$  is a smooth hyperquadric  $\mathbb{Q}^{n-1}$  in  $\mathbb{P}^n$  with  $\mathcal{E}_F \cong \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{Q}}(1)^{\oplus(n-1)}$ .

It should be emphasized that  $K_X + \det \mathcal{E} = \pi^*H$  for some ample line bundle  $H$  on  $B$  in every case.

In all that follows, suppose that  $(X, \mathcal{E})$  is one of (a), (b) or (c). Since  $\mathcal{E}$  is very ample, there exists a global section  $s \in \Gamma(\mathcal{E})$  whose zero locus  $C = (s)_0$  is a smooth curve on  $X$ . Let  $g$  denote the genus of  $C$ . We note that the restriction  $\pi_C : C \rightarrow B$  of  $\pi$  to  $C$  is surjective. Hence the Riemann-Hurwitz formula tells us that

$$2g - 2 = d(2q - 2) + r,$$

where  $q$  is the genus of  $B$ ,  $d$  is the degree of  $\pi_C$ , and  $r$  is the degree of the ramification divisor of  $\pi_C$ . Since  $d = c_{n-1}(\mathcal{E}_F)$ , we have  $d = 2$  in cases (a), (c) and  $d = n$  in case (b). On the other hand,

$$K_C = (K_X + \det \mathcal{E})_C = (\pi^*H)_C = \pi_C^*H,$$

so that

$$2g - 2 = d\delta,$$

where  $\delta = \deg H$ . Hence

$$d\delta = d(2q - 2) + r.$$

This implies that  $r$  is an integer multiple of  $d$ . Let  $r = d\rho$ . Then

$$(0.1) \quad \delta = 2q - 2 + \rho,$$

and we conclude that

$$\rho = \deg(H - K_B).$$

It should be kept in mind that

$$(0.2) \quad 2g - 2 = d(2q - 2 + \rho).$$

The following lemma tells us that  $\rho > 0$ .

**Lemma 2.** *The morphism  $\pi_C : C \rightarrow B$  can never be unramified.*

*Proof.* Let  $X_C$  denote the fiber product  $X \times_B C$  of  $X$  and  $C$  over  $B$ . Then  $X_C$  is connected. Let  $p_1 : X_C \rightarrow X$  be the first projection, and let  $p_2 : X_C \rightarrow C$  be the second projection. Note that  $p_1^* \mathcal{E}$  is ample and that  $p_1^{-1}(C)$  is the zero locus of the pullback of the section  $s$  defining  $C$ . Thus  $H^0(p_1^{-1}(C), \mathbb{Z}) \cong H^0(X_C, \mathbb{Z}) = \mathbb{Z}$  by the Lefschetz-Sommese theorem [LM2, Theorem 1.1] (note that its proof is valid without assuming the connectedness of  $p_1^{-1}(C)$ ), so that  $p_1^{-1}(C)$  is connected. On the other hand,  $p_1^{-1}(C)$  decomposes into a curve  $C'$  and a curve  $C''$ , where  $C'$  is the image of the section of  $p_2$  defined by sending  $x \in C$  to  $(x, x) \in X_C$ . If  $\pi_C$  is unramified, then  $C' \cap C'' = \emptyset$ . This contradicts the connectedness of  $p_1^{-1}(C)$ .  $\square$

Moreover, if  $C$  is a hyperelliptic curve of genus  $g \geq 2$  and if  $q > 0$ , then we have the following

**Lemma 3.** *Assume that  $C$  is a hyperelliptic curve of genus  $g \geq 2$ . If the genus  $q$  of  $B$  is positive, then  $\rho$  is either 1 or 2.*

*Proof.* By Lemma 2 we know that  $\rho > 0$ . Letting  $H = K_B + \mathcal{H}$  for some line bundle  $\mathcal{H}$  on  $B$ , we have  $\rho = \deg \mathcal{H}$  and  $K_C = \pi_C^*(K_B + \mathcal{H})$ . Since  $C$  is hyperelliptic,  $|K_B + \mathcal{H}|$  cannot take any smooth curve of positive genus as its image. Therefore  $\deg \mathcal{H} \leq 2$ .  $\square$

## 1. Proof of Theorem 1

From now on, throughout these notes, we assume that  $n = 3$ , and use the same notation as in Section 0. Let  $M = \mathbb{P}_X(\mathcal{E})$  be the projective space bundle associated to  $\mathcal{E}$ , let  $p : M \rightarrow X$  be the bundle projection, and let  $H(\mathcal{E})$  be the tautological line bundle on  $M$ . Then  $H(\mathcal{E})$  is very ample. As mentioned, we have  $K_X + \det \mathcal{E} = \pi^* H$ . Thus  $K_M + 2H(\mathcal{E}) = p^*(K_X + \det \mathcal{E}) = p^* \pi^* H$ .

Let  $Z$  be a general element of  $|H(\mathcal{E})|$ , let  $S$  be a general element of  $|H(\mathcal{E})_Z|$ , and let  $\varphi : S \rightarrow B$  be the restriction of  $\pi \circ p$  to  $S$ . Then  $K_S = \varphi^* H$ . Let  $G$  be a general fiber of  $\pi \circ p$ , and let  $f = S \cap G$ . Since  $S$  can be regarded as the zero locus of a section  $t \in \Gamma(M, H(\mathcal{E})^{\oplus 2})$ ,  $f$  is the zero locus of the section  $t_G \in \Gamma(G, H(\mathcal{E})_G^{\oplus 2})$ . Hence  $f \neq \emptyset$ , and  $\varphi$  is surjective. In particular, this implies that  $f$  is a 1-equidimensional smooth fiber of  $\varphi$ . On the other hand, since  $H^0(f, \mathbb{Z}) \cong H^0(G, \mathbb{Z}) = \mathbb{Z}$  by [LM2, Theorem 1.1],  $f$  is a smooth curve in  $S$  and we conclude that  $\varphi$  has connected fibers.

Now let us apply the double point formula [BS2, Theorem 13.1.5] to  $(Z, H(\mathcal{E})_Z)$ , which tells us that

$$e(Z) - 48\chi(\mathcal{O}_Z) + 84\chi(\mathcal{O}_S) - 11K_S^2 - 17K_S H(\mathcal{E})_S - (K_Z + H(\mathcal{E})_Z)^3 + D(D - 20) \geq 0,$$

where  $D = H(\mathcal{E})_Z^3 = H(\mathcal{E})^4$ , and  $e(Z)$  is the topological Euler characteristic of  $Z$ . Then

$$D = s_3(\mathcal{E}) = c_1(\mathcal{E})^3 - 2c_1(\mathcal{E})c_2(\mathcal{E}),$$

where  $s_3(\mathcal{E})$  is the third Segre class of  $\mathcal{E}$ . We have

$$K_S^2 = (\varphi^*H)^2 = 0$$

and

$$(K_Z + H(\mathcal{E})_Z)^3 = (K_M + 2H(\mathcal{E}))_Z^3 = (p^*\pi^*H)_Z^3 = 0.$$

Let us compute  $\chi(\mathcal{O}_Z)$ ,  $\chi(\mathcal{O}_S)$  and  $K_S H(\mathcal{E})_S$ . First, since  $Z$  is the blow-up of  $X$  along  $C$ ,  $Z$  is birational to  $X$ . Thus

$$\chi(\mathcal{O}_Z) = \chi(\mathcal{O}_X) = \chi(\mathcal{O}_B) = 1 - q.$$

Next, since  $K_S = \varphi^*H$  and  $\varphi$  has connected fibers, we have

$$h^0(K_S) = h^0(H).$$

Furthermore, by the Kodaira vanishing theorem,

$$0 = h^1(K_M + 2H(\mathcal{E})) = h^1(H),$$

since  $K_M + 2H(\mathcal{E}) = p^*\pi^*H$ . Moreover, from the exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_Z(-S) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_Z \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_S \rightarrow 0,$$

we see that

$$h^1(\mathcal{O}_S) = h^1(\mathcal{O}_Z) = q.$$

Therefore, the Riemann-Roch theorem applied to  $(B, H)$  gives

$$\begin{aligned} 2q - 2 + \rho = \delta = \deg H &= h^0(H) + q - 1 \\ &= h^0(K_S) + q - 1 = h^0(\mathcal{O}_S) - h^1(\mathcal{O}_S) + h^2(\mathcal{O}_S) + 2q - 2 \\ &= \chi(\mathcal{O}_S) + 2q - 2. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently

$$\chi(\mathcal{O}_S) = \rho.$$

Finally, we have

$$\begin{aligned} K_S H(\mathcal{E})_S &= (\varphi^*H)H(\mathcal{E})_S = (p^*\pi^*H)_Z H(\mathcal{E})_Z^2 = (p^*\pi^*H)H(\mathcal{E})^3 \\ &= \delta \mathbb{P}_F(\mathcal{E}_F)H(\mathcal{E})^3 = \delta H(\mathcal{E}_F)^3 \\ &= \delta(c_1(\mathcal{E}_F)^2 - c_2(\mathcal{E}_F)) = \delta(c_1(\mathcal{E}_F)^2 - d) \\ &= (2q - 2 + \rho)(c_1(\mathcal{E}_F)^2 - d). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, in sum,

$$(1.0) \quad e(Z) - 48(1 - q) + 84\rho - 17(2q - 2 + \rho)(c_1(\mathcal{E}_F)^2 - d) + D(D - 20) \geq 0.$$

We proceed now by cases.

(1.1) *Case (a)*. In this case we have

$$e(Z) = e(X) + e(C) = e(\mathbb{P}^2)e(B) + e(C) = 3(2 - 2q) + 2 - 2g.$$

Combining this with (0.2) gives  $e(Z) = 6(1 - q) - d(2q - 2 + \rho)$ . Since  $c_1(\mathcal{E}_F)^2 = 9$  and  $d = 2$ , (1.0) tells us that

$$6(1 - q) - 2(2q - 2 + \rho) - 48(1 - q) + 84\rho - 119(2q - 2 + \rho) + D(D - 20) \geq 0.$$

An easy calculation shows that

$$D(D - 20) \geq 200(q - 1) + 37\rho,$$

and the result is proved.

(1.2) *Case (b)*. Here we have  $c_1(\mathcal{E}_F)^2 = 9$  and  $d = 3$ . By the same argument as that in (1.1), we get

$$6(1 - q) - 3(2q - 2 + \rho) - 48(1 - q) + 84\rho - 102(2q - 2 + \rho) + D(D - 20) \geq 0.$$

Consequently

$$D(D - 20) \geq 168(q - 1) + 21\rho.$$

(1.3) *Case (c)*. Before proceeding with the proof, we present the following

**Lemma 4.** *Let  $(X, \mathcal{E})$  be as in case (c). Then every fiber of  $\pi$  is an irreducible and reduced quadric surface in  $\mathbb{P}^3$ .*

*Proof.* We set  $L = \det \mathcal{E}$ . Then, as we pointed out,  $K_X + L = \pi^*H$ .

We first claim that every fiber  $F$  of  $\pi$  is irreducible and reduced. Suppose to the contrary that  $F$  is not irreducible and reduced for some  $F$ . Then we can write  $F = n_1F_1 + \cdots + n_rF_r$  for distinct integral surfaces  $F_1, \dots, F_r$  and positive integers  $n_1, \dots, n_r$  with  $n_1 + \cdots + n_r \geq 2$ . Hence a general element  $T \in |L|$  must meet  $F$  in a curve  $f = n_1f_1 + \cdots + n_rf_r$  for distinct integral curves  $f_1, \dots, f_r$ . Now we know that  $Lf_i \geq 2$  for any  $i$  from [LM1, Corollary 1]. If  $Lf_i = 2$  for some  $i$ , then  $f_i \cong \mathbb{P}^1$  by [LM1, Corollary 2]. Since  $f_i \in |L_{F_i}|$ , we see that  $f_i \cap \text{Sing}(F_i) = \emptyset$ , where  $\text{Sing}(F_i)$  is the singular locus of  $F_i$ . Thus  $\text{Sing}(F_i) \subset F_i - f_i$ . Since  $\text{Sing}(F_i)$  is a compact algebraic set and  $F_i - f_i$  is affine, we conclude that  $F_i$  has at most isolated singularities. This implies that  $F_i$  is normal, and the classification of the polarized surfaces of sectional genus zero applies to  $(F_i, L_{F_i})$  (see for example [BS2, Corollary 3.2.10]). However, since  $L_{F_i}E \geq 2$  for any rational curve  $E$  on  $F_i$ ,  $(F_i, L_{F_i})$  must

be  $(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(2))$ . Therefore  $L_{F_i}^2 = 4$ . On the other hand,  $L_{F_i}^2 = L_{F_i} f_i = 2$ . This is a contradiction. Consequently  $L f_i = L_{F_i}^2 \geq 3$  for any  $i$ . We should note that  $L f = L_F^2 = 8$  because  $\mathcal{E}_G \cong \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1}(1, 1)^{\oplus 2}$  for a general fiber  $G$  of  $\pi$ . Moreover, since  $K_X + L = \pi^* H$ , we have  $K_T = \pi_T^* H$ , where  $\pi_T$  is the restriction of  $\pi$  to  $T$ . Thus  $T$  is a properly elliptic minimal surface, so that [S, Lemma 0.5.1] tells us that  $\pi_T : T \rightarrow B$  has no multiple fibers. As a direct result of this observation, we obtain  $r = 2$  and  $n_1 = n_2 = 1$ . Since  $K_T = \pi_T^* H$ , we have  $(K_T + f_i) f_i = f_i^2$  for  $i = 1, 2$ . Moreover, since  $f = f_1 + f_2$ , we get  $f_i(f_1 + f_2) = 0$ . Thus  $f_1^2 = -f_1 f_2 < 0$ , since  $\pi_T$  has connected fibers. Similarly  $f_2^2 < 0$ . Hence  $f_1 \cong \mathbb{P}^1$  and  $f_2 \cong \mathbb{P}^1$ , and so by the same argument as above we have  $F_1 \cong \mathbb{P}^2$  and  $F_2 \cong \mathbb{P}^2$ . Now we know that  $F = F_1 + F_2$ , so that  $\mathcal{O}_{F_1}(F_1 + F_2) \cong \mathcal{O}_{F_1}$ . Since  $F_1$  meets  $F_2$  in a curve, the normal bundle  $N_{F_1/X} = \mathcal{O}_{F_1}(F_1)$  to  $F_1$  in  $X$  is negative. By a well-known theorem of Grauert (see for example [BS2, Theorem 3.2.7]) there exists a holomorphic map  $p : X \rightarrow Y$  onto a normal analytic variety  $Y$  such that  $p(F_1)$  is a point,  $y$ , and  $p$  induces a biholomorphism  $X - F_1 \cong Y - \{y\}$ . In particular,  $F_1 \cap F_2$  is contracted. However, this is absurd because  $F_1$  has no curves with negative self-intersection. Consequently every fiber  $F$  of  $\pi$  is irreducible and reduced.

If  $F$  is smooth, then  $(F, \mathcal{E}_F) \cong (\mathbb{Q}^2, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{Q}}(1)^{\oplus 2})$ , where  $\mathbb{Q}^2$  is a smooth quadric surface in  $\mathbb{P}^3$ . Let  $F$  be a singular fiber of  $\pi$ . We claim that  $F$  is a singular quadric surface in  $\mathbb{P}^3$ . To see this, take a general element  $T \in |L|$ . Then  $T$  meets  $F$  in an irreducible and reduced curve  $f$ . We note that the arithmetic genus of  $f$  is one because  $(K_T + f)f = 0$ . If  $f$  is not smooth, then  $f$  has a single singular point, so that  $\text{Sing}(F)$  contains a curve  $\gamma$  with  $L\gamma = 1$ . This contradicts the fact that  $L\gamma \geq 2$ . Hence  $f$  is smooth, and the same argument as above again shows that  $F$  is normal. Since  $K_X + L = \pi^* H$ , we have  $K_F + L_F = \mathcal{O}_F$ , and we conclude that  $F$  is a normal Gorenstein Del Pezzo surface with  $K_F^2 = 8$ . According to [Br, Theorem 1],  $F$  is one of the following:

- (i)  $F$  is a singular quadric surface in  $\mathbb{P}^3$ ;
- (ii)  $F$  is the space obtained by blowing down the zero section  $\Delta$  of a  $\mathbb{P}^1$ -bundle  $P$  on a smooth elliptic curve  $\Gamma$ ;
- (iii)  $F$  is a rational surface with only rational double points as singularities, obtained from  $\mathbb{P}^2$  by blowing up some number  $\alpha \leq 8$  points (iterations allowed) then blowing down some number  $\beta \leq \alpha$  smooth rational curves, each with self-intersection  $-2$ .

In case (ii) we can write  $K_P + \mathcal{O}_P(k\Delta) = \sigma^* K_F$  for some integer  $k$ , where  $\sigma$  is the blowing-down of  $\Delta$ . Since  $(K_P + \mathcal{O}_P(\Delta))_{\Delta} = K_{\Delta} = \mathcal{O}_{\Delta}$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{O}_{\Delta} &= (\sigma^* K_F)_{\Delta} = (K_P + \mathcal{O}_P(k\Delta))_{\Delta} \\ &= (K_P + \mathcal{O}_P(\Delta) + \mathcal{O}_P((k-1)\Delta))_{\Delta} = \mathcal{O}_{\Delta}((k-1)\Delta). \end{aligned}$$

This implies that  $k = 1$ . Hence  $K_P + \mathcal{O}_P(\Delta) = \sigma^* K_F$ . Set  $\Delta^2 = -r$  for some positive integer  $r$ . Then  $K_P \equiv -2\Delta - r\rho$ , where  $\rho$  is a fiber of the bundle projection  $P \rightarrow \Gamma$ . Thus  $-\sigma^* K_F \equiv \Delta + r\rho$ , so that

$$L_F \sigma(\rho) = -K_F \sigma(\rho) = (-\sigma^* K_F) \rho = (\Delta + r\rho) \rho = 1.$$

This contradicts  $L_F\sigma(\rho) \geq 2$ . In case (iii), let  $\varphi : G \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^2$  be the composite of  $\alpha$  blowing-up morphisms, and let  $\tau : G \rightarrow F$  be the composite of  $\beta$  blowing-down morphisms. Then  $K_F^2 = K_G^2 = K_{\mathbb{P}^2}^2 - \alpha = 9 - \alpha$ . Hence  $\alpha = 1$ , since  $K_F^2 = 8$ . Consequently  $G$  is the first Hirzebruch surface. Moreover, either  $\beta = 0$  or  $\beta = 1$ . If  $\beta = 0$ , then  $F = G$ . This is impossible because  $F$  is singular. However, the case  $\beta = 1$  is also impossible because  $G$  has no  $(-2)$ -curves. Therefore case (iii) does not occur. Consequently  $F$  must be a singular quadric surface in  $\mathbb{P}^3$ , and the result is proved.  $\square$

We return to the proof of Theorem 1. In case (c), let  $F'$  be a singular fiber of  $\pi$ , and let  $k$  denote the number of singular fibers of  $\pi$ . Then, since  $F'$  is a singular quadric with an isolated singularity by Lemma 4, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} e(Z) &= e(X) + e(C) = e(X - kF') + ke(F') + e(C) \\ &= 4(2 - 2q - k) + 3k + 2 - 2g = 8(1 - q) - k - d(2q - 2 + \rho). \end{aligned}$$

Since  $c_1(\mathcal{E}_F)^2 = 8$  and  $d = 2$ , it follows from (1.0) that

$$8(1 - q) - k - 2(2q - 2 + \rho) - 48(1 - q) + 84\rho - 102(2q - 2 + \rho) + D(D - 20) \geq 0.$$

Therefore

$$D(D - 20) \geq 168(q - 1) + 20\rho + k,$$

and we have thus proved Theorem 1.

## 2. The case of a hyperelliptic curve

Let  $\mathcal{E}$  be a very ample vector bundle of rank two on a smooth projective 3-fold  $X$ , and assume that  $(X, \mathcal{E})$  is one of (a), (b) or (c). In this section we set up the following condition:

- (\*) There exists a global section  $s \in \Gamma(\mathcal{E})$  whose zero locus  $C = (s)_0$  is a smooth hyperelliptic curve of genus  $g \geq 2$ , and the base curve  $B$  has genus  $q > 0$ .

**Theorem 5.** *Under the assumption (\*), case (a) does not occur.*

*Proof.* The proof is by contradiction. Let  $(X, \mathcal{E})$  be as in case (a). Then we can write  $X = \mathbb{P}_B(\mathcal{V})$  for some vector bundle  $\mathcal{V}$  of rank three on  $B$ . Since  $\mathcal{E}_F \cong \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(2) \oplus \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(1)$  for any fiber  $F$  of  $\pi$ ,  $\mathcal{F} := \pi_*(\mathcal{E} \otimes (-2H(\mathcal{V})))$  is a line bundle on  $B$ , and we have an exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow 2H(\mathcal{V}) + \pi^*\mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{E} \rightarrow Q \rightarrow 0$$

for some line bundle  $Q$  on  $X$ . Then  $Q_F = \det \mathcal{E}_F - 2H(\mathcal{V})_F \cong \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(1)$ . Hence  $Q = H(\mathcal{V}) + \pi^*L$  for some line bundle  $L$  on  $B$ . We note that  $Q$  is very ample, because  $\mathcal{E}$  is very ample. Let  $\mathcal{G} = \pi_*Q$ . Then, since  $Q_F \cong \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(1)$  for any  $F$ ,  $\mathcal{G}$  is a vector bundle of rank three on  $B$  such that  $(X, Q) \cong (\mathbb{P}_B(\mathcal{G}), H(\mathcal{G}))$ . Thus  $\mathcal{G}$  is very



ample. We can write numerically  $2H(\mathcal{V}) + \pi^*\mathcal{F} \equiv 2H(\mathcal{G}) + \mu F$  for some integer  $\mu$ . Thus  $\det \mathcal{E} = 2H(\mathcal{V}) + \pi^*\mathcal{F} + Q \equiv 3H(\mathcal{G}) + \mu F$ . Since  $K_X + \det \mathcal{E} = \pi^*H$  for some ample line bundle  $H$  on  $B$ , it follows from (0.1) that  $K_X + \det \mathcal{E} \equiv (2q - 2 + \rho)F$ . Therefore

$$K_X \equiv -\det \mathcal{E} + (2q - 2 + \rho)F \equiv -3H(\mathcal{G}) + (2q - 2 + \rho - \mu)F.$$

On the other hand, from the basic relation  $K_X = -3H(\mathcal{G}) + \pi^*(K_B + \det \mathcal{G})$ , we have

$$K_X \equiv -3H(\mathcal{G}) + (2q - 2 + x)F,$$

where  $x = \deg \mathcal{G}$ . Consequently  $\rho - \mu = x$ , i.e.,  $\mu = \rho - x$ .

Now, from the above exact sequence,  $c_2(\mathcal{E}) = (2H(\mathcal{V}) + \pi^*\mathcal{F})Q \equiv 2H(\mathcal{G})^2 + \mu H(\mathcal{G})F$ . As observed in Section 1,  $D = c_1(\mathcal{E})^3 - 2c_1(\mathcal{E})c_2(\mathcal{E})$ . Hence

$$\begin{aligned} D &= (3H(\mathcal{G}) + \mu F)^3 - 2(3H(\mathcal{G}) + \mu F)(2H(\mathcal{G})^2 + \mu H(\mathcal{G})F) \\ (2.1) \quad &= 15H(\mathcal{G})^3 + 17\mu H(\mathcal{G})^2 F = 15x + 17\mu \\ &= 17\rho - 2x. \end{aligned}$$

From Theorem 1, we have  $D(D - 20) \geq 200(q - 1) + 37\rho$ . Moreover, under the assumption (\*), by Lemma 3  $\rho$  is either 1 or 2. Hence  $D(D - 20) \geq 37$ . This implies that  $D \geq 22$ . Combining this with (2.1) gives  $22 \leq 17\rho - 2x < 17\rho$ , since  $x > 0$ . Thus  $\rho = 2$ . We claim that  $q = 1$ . To see this, suppose that  $q \geq 2$ . Since  $\rho = 2$ , we obtain  $D(D - 20) \geq 274$ . Thus  $D \geq 30$ . By using (2.1) again, we have  $x = 17 - (1/2)D \leq 2$ . Since  $x = H(\mathcal{G})^3$  and  $H(\mathcal{G})$  is very ample, we have a contradiction. Therefore  $q = 1$ , and  $D(D - 20) \geq 74$ . Hence  $D \geq 24$ , and by (2.1) we get  $x = 17 - (1/2)D \leq 5$ . On the other hand, applying [IT, Proposition 1] to  $\mathcal{G}$  gives  $x \geq 7$ . This is also absurd.  $\square$

**Theorem 6.** *Under the assumption (\*), let  $(X, \mathcal{E})$  be as in case (b). Then  $g = 4$  and  $q = 1$ .*

*Proof.* We can write  $X = \mathbb{P}_B(\mathcal{G})$  for some vector bundle  $\mathcal{G}$  of rank three on  $B$ . Let  $x = \deg \mathcal{G}$ . Then, since  $K_X = -3H(\mathcal{G}) + \pi^*(K_B + \det \mathcal{G})$ , we have

$$(2.2) \quad K_X \equiv -3H(\mathcal{G}) + (2q - 2 + x)F.$$

Let  $\mathcal{V} = \pi_*(\mathcal{E} \otimes (-H(\mathcal{G})))$ . Then, since  $\mathcal{E}_F \cong T_{\mathbb{P}}$  for any  $F$ ,  $\mathcal{V}$  is a vector bundle of rank three on  $B$ , and we have an exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \pi^*L \rightarrow (\pi^*\mathcal{V}) \otimes H(\mathcal{G}) \rightarrow \mathcal{E} \rightarrow 0$$

for some line bundle  $L$  on  $B$ . Let  $l = \deg L$  and let  $v = \deg \mathcal{V}$ . Then

$$(2.3) \quad \det \mathcal{E} = 3H(\mathcal{G}) + \pi^* \det \mathcal{V} - \pi^*L \equiv 3H(\mathcal{G}) + (v - l)F.$$

Thus, by (2.2),

$$K_X + \det \mathcal{E} \equiv (2q - 2 + x + v - l)F.$$

On the other hand, since  $K_X + \det \mathcal{E} = \pi^*H$ , it follows from (0.1) that

$$K_X + \det \mathcal{E} \equiv (2q - 2 + \rho)F.$$

Hence

$$(2.4) \quad \rho = x + v - l.$$

From the above exact sequence, we get

$$c_2(\mathcal{E}) + (\pi^*L) \det \mathcal{E} = c_2((\pi^*\mathcal{V}) \otimes H(\mathcal{G})) = 3H(\mathcal{G})^2 + 2(\pi^* \det \mathcal{V})H(\mathcal{G}).$$

Thus, by (2.3), we see that

$$c_2(\mathcal{E}) \equiv 3H(\mathcal{G})^2 + 2vH(\mathcal{G})F - lF(3H(\mathcal{G}) + (v - l)F) = 3H(\mathcal{G})^2 + (2v - 3l)H(\mathcal{G})F.$$

Using this and the above exact sequence again, we obtain

$$3l = c_2(\mathcal{E})\pi^*L = c_3((\pi^*\mathcal{V}) \otimes H(\mathcal{G})) = H(\mathcal{G})^3 + (\pi^* \det \mathcal{V})H(\mathcal{G})^2 = x + v.$$

Therefore by (2.4), we have  $\rho = x + v - l = 3l - l = 2l$ , so that  $\rho$  is even. We know from Lemma 3 that  $\rho$  is either 1 or 2 under the assumption (\*). Thus  $\rho = 2$  and  $l = 1$ . Let us compute  $c_1(\mathcal{E})^3$  and  $c_1(\mathcal{E})c_2(\mathcal{E})$ . First, by (2.3) and (2.4),

$$\begin{aligned} c_1(\mathcal{E})^3 &= (3H(\mathcal{G}) + (v - l)F)^3 = 27H(\mathcal{G})^3 + 27(v - l)H(\mathcal{G})^2F = 27x + 27(v - l) \\ &= 27(x + v - l) = 27\rho = 54. \end{aligned}$$

Next,

$$\begin{aligned} c_1(\mathcal{E})c_2(\mathcal{E}) &= (3H(\mathcal{G}) + (v - l)F)(3H(\mathcal{G})^2 + (2v - 3l)H(\mathcal{G})F) \\ &= 9H(\mathcal{G})^3 + (9v - 12l)H(\mathcal{G})^2F = 9(x + v - l) - 3l = 9\rho - 3l = 15. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $D = c_1(\mathcal{E})^3 - 2c_1(\mathcal{E})c_2(\mathcal{E})$ , we have  $D = 24$ . On the other hand, Theorem 1 tells us that  $D(D - 20) \geq 168(q - 1) + 42$ , because  $\rho = 2$ . If  $q \geq 2$ , then  $D(D - 20) \geq 210$ , which implies that  $D \geq 28$ , a contradiction. Consequently  $q = 1$ . Recalling that  $d = 3$ , we conclude with the aid of (0.2) that  $g = 4$ .  $\square$

Especially for 3-folds, Theorem 5 allows us to improve [MS, Theorem 6] as follows:

**Theorem 7.** *Let  $\mathcal{E}$  be a very ample vector bundle of rank two on a smooth projective 3-fold  $X$ . Assume that  $g(X, \mathcal{E}) = 2$ . Then  $(X, \mathcal{E})$  is one of the following:*

- (1)  $X$  is a  $\mathbb{P}^2$ -bundle over a smooth curve  $B$  of genus 2, and  $\mathcal{E}_F \cong \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}(1)}^{\oplus 2}$  for any fiber  $F$  of the projection  $X \rightarrow B$ ;
- (2)  $X$  is a  $\mathbb{P}^2$ -bundle over  $\mathbb{P}^1$ ,  $\mathcal{E}_F \cong \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}(2)} \oplus \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}(1)}$  for any fiber  $F$  of the projection  $\pi : X \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$ , and  $K_X + \det \mathcal{E}$  is the pullback of a line bundle of degree 1 on  $\mathbb{P}^1$  by  $\pi$ ;
- (3) there exists a surjective morphism  $\pi : X \rightarrow B$  onto a smooth curve  $B$  of genus  $\leq 1$  such that a general fiber  $F$  of  $\pi$  is a smooth quadric surface  $\mathbb{Q}^2$  in  $\mathbb{P}^3$  with  $\mathcal{E}_F \cong \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{Q}(1)}^{\oplus 2}$ , and  $K_X + \det \mathcal{E}$  is the pullback of a line bundle of degree 1 on  $B$  by  $\pi$ .

## REFERENCES

- [ABW] M. Andreatta, E. Ballico and J. A. Wiśniewski, *Vector bundles and adjunction*, Internat. J. Math. **3** (1992), 331–340.
- [BS1] M. C. Beltrametti and A. J. Sommese, *Comparing the classical and the adjunction theoretic definition of scrolls*, Geometry of Complex Projective Varieties, Cetraro, 1990 (A. Lanteri, M. Palleschi and D. C. Struppa, eds.), Sem. Conf., vol. **9**, Mediterranean, Rende, 1993, pp. 55–74.
- [BS2] M. C. Beltrametti and A. J. Sommese, *The Adjunction Theory of Complex Projective Varieties*, de Gruyter Exp. Math., vol. **16**, de Gruyter, Berlin, 1995.
- [Br] L. Brenton, *On singular complex surfaces with negative canonical bundle, with applications to singular compactifications of  $\mathbb{C}^2$  and to 3-dimensional rational singularities*, Math. Ann. **248** (1980), 117–124.
- [IT] P. Ionescu and M. Toma, *On very ample vector bundles on curves*, Internat. J. Math. **8** (1997), 633–643.
- [LM1] A. Lanteri and H. Maeda, *Adjoint bundles of ample and spanned vector bundles on algebraic surfaces*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **433** (1992), 181–199.
- [LM2] A. Lanteri and H. Maeda, *Ample vector bundle characterizations of projective bundles and quadric fibrations over curves*, Higher Dimensional Complex Varieties, Trento, 1994 (M. Andreatta and T. Peternell, eds.), Walter de Gruyter, Berlin-New York, 1996, pp. 247–259.
- [LPS] A. Lanteri, M. Palleschi and A. J. Sommese, *On the adjunction mapping of very ample vector bundles of corank one*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **356** (2004), 2307–2324.
- [MS] H. Maeda and A. J. Sommese, *Very ample vector bundles of curve genus two*, Arch. Math. (Basel) **79** (2002), 74–80.
- [S] A. J. Sommese, *On the nonemptiness of the adjoint linear system of a hyperplane section of a threefold*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **402** (1989), 211–220.

Hidetoshi Maeda  
Department of Mathematical Sciences  
School of Science and Engineering  
Waseda University  
3-4-1 Ohkubo, Shinjuku-ku  
Tokyo 169-8555  
Japan  
e-mail: hmaeda@mse.waseda.ac.jp

Andrew J. Sommese  
Department of Mathematics  
University of Notre Dame  
Notre Dame, INDIANA 46556  
U. S. A.  
e-mail: sommese@nd.edu