

GENERAL DEGREE  $g - 1$  LINE BUNDLES  
ON REDUCIBLE CURVES

E. Ballico

Department of Mathematics

University of Trento

38 123 Povo (Trento) - Via Sommarive, 14, ITALY

e-mail: ballico@science.unitn.it

**Abstract:** Let  $X$  be a reduced and connected projective curve. Here we show the existence of a degree  $p_a(X) - 1$  line bundle  $L$  on  $X$  such that  $h^1(X, L) = 0$ . If  $X$  is semistable, then we may take  $L$  semibalanced in the sense of Caporaso.

**AMS Subject Classification:** 14H51, 14H10, 14H20

**Key Words:** semistable curve, balanced line bundle

### 1. Introduction

Let  $X$  be a reduced and connected projective curve. Set  $g := p_a(X) = 1 - \chi(\mathcal{O}_X)$ . For any integer  $d$  let  $\text{Pic}^d(X)$  denote the set of all degree  $d$  line bundles on  $X$ . The algebraic scheme  $\text{Pic}^d(X)$  has pure dimension  $g$ . If  $X$  is irreducible, then  $\text{Pic}^d(X)$  is irreducible and its general member,  $L$ , has the following properties: if  $d \leq g - 1$ , then  $h^0(X, L) = 0$ . If  $X$  is reduced, but reducible, then  $\text{Pic}^d(X)$  is not connected. In this case we prove that the same occurs in at least one of these connected components, i.e. we prove the following result.

**Proposition 1.** *Let  $X$  be a reduced and connected projective curve. Fix an integer  $d \geq p_a(X) - 1$ . Then there exists  $L \in \text{Pic}^d(X)$  such that  $h^1(X, L) = 0$ .*

If  $X$  is semistable, then it is essential to find  $L$  which is semibalanced in the sense of [2], [3], [4] and [6]. Here we prove the following result.

**Theorem 1.** *Let  $X$  be a semistable curve of genus  $g \geq 2$ . Then there is a semibalanced line bundle  $L$  on  $X$  such that  $\deg(L) = g - 1$  and  $h^1(X, L) = 0$ .*

### 2. The Proofs

For any reduced projective curve  $Y$  let  $\mathcal{B}(Y)$  denote the set of its irreducible components.

**Lemma 1.** *Let  $Y$  be a reduced projective curve and  $A, B$  proper subcurves of  $Y$  such that  $Y = A \cup B$  and  $A \cap B$  is finite. Fix  $L \in \text{Pic}(Y)$ . The restriction map  $\rho_{L,B} : H^0(Y, L) \rightarrow H^0(B, L|_B)$  (resp.  $\rho_{L,A} : H^0(Y, L) \rightarrow H^0(A, L|_A)$ ) is surjective if the natural injective map  $h^1(B, \mathcal{I}_{A \cap B} \otimes L|_B)$  (resp.  $h^1(A, \mathcal{I}_{A \cap B} \otimes L|_A)$ ) is surjective. Hence  $\rho_{L,B} : H^0(Y, L) \rightarrow H^0(B, L|_B)$  (resp.  $\rho_{L,A} : H^0(Y, L) \rightarrow H^0(A, L|_A)$ ) is surjective if  $h^1(B, \mathcal{I}_{A \cap B} \otimes L|_B) = 0$  (resp.  $h^1(A, \mathcal{I}_{A \cap B} \otimes L|_A) = 0$ ).*

*Proof.* For the map  $\rho_{L,B}$  use the exact sequence of sheaves on  $B$ :

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{I}_{A \cap B} \otimes L|_B \rightarrow L|_B \rightarrow L|_{A \cap B} \rightarrow 0. \tag{1}$$

In the same way we get the surjectivity of  $\rho_{L,A}$ . The last assertion of the lemma is obvious. □

**Lemma 2.** *Let  $Y$  be a reduced projective curve and  $A, B$  proper closed subcurves of  $Y$  such that  $Y = A \cup B$  and the scheme  $A \cap B$  has dimension zero. Fix  $L \in \text{Pic}(Y)$  such that  $h^1(A, L|_A) = 0$  and  $h^1(B, \mathcal{I}_{A \cap B} \otimes (L|_B)) = 0$ . Then  $h^1(Y, L) = 0$ .*

*Proof.* Look at the Mayer-Vietoris exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow L \rightarrow L|_A \otimes L|_B \rightarrow L|_{A \cap B} \rightarrow 0. \tag{2}$$

By assumption we have  $h^1(A, L|_A) = 0$ . Since  $h^1(B, \mathcal{I}_{A \cap B} \otimes (L|_B)) = 0$  and  $B$  is a curve,  $h^1(B, L|_B) = 0$ . Since  $h^1(B, \mathcal{I}_{A \cap B} \otimes (L|_B)) = 0$ , the restriction map  $H^0(B, L|_B) \rightarrow H^0(A \cap B, L|_{A \cap B})$  is surjective. Hence the long cohomology exact sequence of (2) gives  $h^1(Y, L) = 0$ . □

We recall the following well-known observation.

**Remark 1.** Let  $Y$  be a reduced projective curve. Then the natural map  $\text{Pic}(Y) \rightarrow \times_{T \in \mathcal{B}(Y)} \text{Pic}(T)$  is surjective. If  $A$  and  $B$  are connected subcurves of  $Y$  and  $Y = A \cup B$ , then the natural map  $\text{Pic}(Y) \rightarrow \text{Pic}(A) \times \text{Pic}(B)$  is surjective.

**Lemma 3.** *Fix an integral projective curve  $T$ , a zero-dimensional scheme  $Z \subset T$  and an integer  $d \geq \text{length}(Z)$ . Let  $L$  be the general element of  $\text{Pic}^d(T)$ . Then  $h^1(T, \mathcal{I}_Z \otimes L) \leq \max\{0, d - \text{length}(Z) - p_a(T) + 1\}$ .*

*Proof.* Since the case  $T \cong \mathbb{P}^1$  is trivially true, we may assume  $p_a(T) > 0$ . First assume  $d = \text{length}(Z)$ . Fix a general  $S \subset T_{reg}$  such that  $\sharp(S) = \text{length}(Z)$ . Any sheaf  $\mathcal{I}_Z \otimes \mathcal{O}_T(S)$  is a degree 0 torsion free sheaf on  $T$  with rank 1. If  $Z$  is not a Cartier divisor, then  $\mathcal{I}_Z \otimes \mathcal{O}_T(S)$  is not trivial (for any  $S$ ) and hence  $h^0(T, \mathcal{I}_Z \otimes \mathcal{O}_T(S)) = 0$ . Riemann-Roch gives  $h^1(T, \mathcal{I}_Z \otimes \mathcal{O}_T(S)) = p_a(T) - 1$ . Hence the lemma is true in this case. Now assume that  $Z$  is a Cartier divisor. Thus each  $\mathcal{I}_Z \otimes \mathcal{O}_T(S)$  is a line bundle. Since  $p_a(T) > 0$  for general  $S$  this line bundle is not trivial. Hence  $h^0(T, \mathcal{I}_Z \otimes \mathcal{O}_T(S)) = 0$ . Thus  $h^1(T, \mathcal{I}_Z \otimes \mathcal{O}_T(S)) = p_a(T) - 1$ , proving the lemma in this case. Now assume  $d > \text{length}(Z)$ . By induction on  $d$  we may assume  $h^1(T, \mathcal{I}_Z \otimes M) \leq \max\{0, d - \text{length}(Z) - p_a(T) + 2\}$  for a general  $M \in \text{Pic}^{d-1}(T)$ . If either the previous inequality is strict or  $h^1(T, \mathcal{I}_Z \otimes M) = 0$ , then for any  $P \in T_{reg}$  the line bundle  $L := M(P)$  satisfies the lemma. Hence we may assume  $h^1(T, \mathcal{I}_Z \otimes M) = d - \text{length}(Z) - p_a(T) + 2 > 0$ . Fix a general  $P \in T_{reg}$ . Since  $M$  is a subsheaf of  $M(P)$  and  $\dim(T) = 1$ ,  $h^1(T, \mathcal{I}_Z \otimes M(P)) \leq h^1(T, \mathcal{I}_Z \otimes M)$ . Hence it is sufficient to prove that for general  $P$  the previous inequality is strict. By duality (see [1]) it is sufficient to prove  $h^0(T, \text{Hom}(\mathcal{I}_Z \otimes M(P), \omega_T)) < h^0(T, \text{Hom}(\mathcal{I}_Z \otimes M, \omega_T))$  for general  $P$ , knowing that the latter integer is  $\text{Hom}(\mathcal{I}_Z \otimes M, \omega_T)$  has a global section  $\sigma \neq 0$ . Since  $\text{Hom}(\mathcal{I}_Z \otimes M, \omega_T)$  has no torsion, the evaluation of  $\sigma$  at a general  $Q \in T_{reg}$  is non-zero. Take  $P := Q$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition 1.* By twisting with an effective Cartier divisor of degree  $d - p_a(X) + 1$  we easily reduce to the case  $d = p_a(X) - 1$ . If  $X$  is irreducible, then the result is well-known (or take the case  $Z = \emptyset$  of Lemma 3). Assume  $r := \sharp(\mathcal{B}(X)) \geq 2$  and that the result is true for all reduced and connected curves with at most  $r - 1$  irreducible components. There is an ordering  $T_1, \dots, T_r$  of  $\mathcal{B}(X)$  such that for every  $i \in \{2, \dots, r - 1\}$  the curve  $\cup_{j=1}^i T_j$  is connected. Set  $A := \cup_{j=1}^{r-1} T_j$  and  $B := T_r$ . Since  $A$  and  $B$  are connected, we have  $p_a(X) = p_a(A) + p_a(B) + \text{length}(A \cap B) - 1$ . By the inductive assumption there is  $M \in \text{Pic}(A)$  such that  $\text{deg}(M) = p_a(A) - 1$  and  $h^1(A, M) = 0$ . Lemma 3 gives the existence of  $R \in \text{Pic}(B)$  such that  $h^1(B, \mathcal{I}_{A \cap B} \otimes R) = 0$  and  $\text{deg}(R) = p_a(A) + \text{length}(A \cap B) - 1$ . Remark 1 gives the existence of  $L \in \text{Pic}(Y)$  such that  $L|_A \cong M$  and  $L|_B \cong R$ . Fix any such line bundle  $L$ . We have  $\text{deg}(L) = p_a(Y) - 1$ . Lemma 2 gives  $h^1(X, L) = 0$ .  $\square$

**Remark 2.** Let  $X$  be a semistable curve of genus  $g \geq 2$ . Fix  $L \in \text{Pic}(X)$ .  $L$  is semibalanced if and only if  $p_a(Z) - 1 \leq \text{deg}(L|_Z) \leq p_a(Z) - 1 + \delta_Z$  for every proper subcurve  $Z$  of  $X$ .

*Proof of Theorem 1.* If  $X$  is irreducible, then every line bundle on  $X$  is semibalanced. Hence we may assume that  $X$  is reducible. Assume  $r :=$

$\#(\mathcal{B}(X)) \geq 2$ . There is an ordering  $T_1, \dots, T_r$  of  $\mathcal{B}(X)$  such that for every  $i \in \{2, \dots, r-1\}$  the curve  $\cup_{j=1}^i T_j$  is connected. We take as  $L|_{T_1}$  a general line bundle on  $T_1$  with degree  $p_a(T_1) - 1$ . Then we construct step by step  $L|(T_1 \cup T_2)$ ,  $L|(T_1 \cup T_2 \cup T_3)$  and so on, with the multidegrees obtained by the inductive proof of Proposition 1. Remark 2 gives that each line bundle  $L|(T_1 \cup \dots \cup T_i)$ ,  $2 \leq i \leq r$ , is semibalanced.  $\square$

### Acknowledgements

The author was partially supported by MIUR and GNSAGA of INdAM (Italy).

### References

- [1] A. Altman, S. Kleiman, Introduction to Grothendieck duality theory, *Lect. Notes in Math.*, **146**, Springer, Berlin (1970).
- [2] L. Caporaso, Néron models and compactified Picard schemes over the moduli stack of stable curves, *Amer. J. Math.*, **130**, No. 1 (2008), 1-47.
- [3] L. Caporaso, Brill-Noether theory of binary curves, *ArXiv*: math/0807.1484.
- [4] L. Caporaso, Linear series on semistable curves, *ArXiv*: math/0812.1682.
- [5] D. Gieseker, Lectures on moduli of curves, *Tata Inst. Fund. Res. Lectures on Math. and Phys.*, **69**, Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York (1982).
- [6] M. Melo, Compactified Picard stacks over  $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_g$ , *ArXiv*: math/0710.3008; *Math. Z.*, published on line DOI 10.1007/s00209-008-0447-x.