FOUR-BY-FOUR PFAFFIANS

N. MOHAN KUMAR, A. P. RAO, AND G. V. RAVINDRA

This paper is dedicated to Paolo Valabrega on his sixtieth bitrhday.

Abstract. This paper shows that the general hypersurface of degree ≥ 6 in projective four space cannot support an indecomposable rank two vector bundle which is Arithmetically Cohen-Macaulay and four generated. Equivalently, the equation of the hypersurface is not the Pfaffian of a four by four minimal skew-symmetric matrix.

1. Introduction

In this note, we study indecomposable rank two bundles E on a smooth hypersurface X in $\mathbf{P}^4$ which are Arithmetically Cohen-Macaulay. The existence of such a bundle on X is equivalent to X being the Pfaffian of a minimal skew-symmetric matrix of size $2k \times 2k$, with $k \geq 2$. The general hypersurface of degree ≤ 5 in $\mathbf{P}^4$ is known to be Pfaffian ([1], [2] [5]) and the general sextic in $\mathbf{P}^4$ is known to be not Pfaffian ([4]). One should expect the result of [4] to extend to all general hypersurfaces of degree ≥ 6. (Indeed the analogous statement for hypersurfaces in $\mathbf{P}^5$ was established in [7].) However, in this note we offer a partial result towards that conclusion. We show that the general hypersurface in $\mathbf{P}^4$ of degree ≥ 6 is not the Pfaffian of a 4×4 skew-symmetric matrix. For a hypersurface of degree r to be the Pfaffian of a $2k \times 2k$ skew-symmetric matrix, we must have $2 \leq k \leq r$. It is quite easy to show by a dimension count that the general hypersurface of degree $r \geq 6$ in $\mathbf{P}^4$ is not the Pfaffian of a $2r \times 2r$ skew-symmetric matrix of linear forms. Thus, this note addresses the lower extreme of the range for k.

2. Reductions

Let X be a smooth hypersurface on $\mathbf{P}^4$ of degree $r \geq 2$. A rank two vector bundle E on X will be called Arithmetically Cohen-Macaulay

Date: November 15, 2005.

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 14F05.

Key words and phrases. Vector Bundles, hypersurfaces, Pfaffians.

(or ACM) if $\oplus_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} H^i(X, E(k))$ equals 0 for $i = 1, 2$. Since $\mathrm{Pic}(X)$ equals $\mathbb{Z}$, with generator $\mathcal{O}_X(1)$, the first Chern class $c_1(E)$ can be treated as an integer t. The bundle E has a minimal resolution over $\mathbf{P}^4$ of the form

$$0 \to L_1 \xrightarrow{\phi} L_0 \to E \to 0,$$

where L_0, L_1 are sums of line bundles. By using the isomorphism of E and $E^\vee(t)$, we obtain (see [2]) that $L_1 \cong L_0^\vee(t-r)$ and the matrix ϕ (of homogeneous polynomials) can be chosen as skew-symmetric. In particular, F_0 has even rank and the defining polynomial of X is the Pfaffian of this matrix. The case where ϕ is two by two is just the case where E is decomposable. The next case is where ϕ is a four by four minimal matrix. These correspond to ACM bundles E with four global sections (in possibly different degrees) which generate it.

Our goal is to show that the generic hypersurface of degree $r \geq 6$ in $\mathbf{P}^4$ does not support an indecomposable rank two ACM bundle which is four generated, or equivalently, that such a hypersurface does not have the Pfaffian of a four by four minimal matrix as its defining polynomial.

So fix a degree $r \geq 6$. Let us assume that E is a rank two ACM bundle which is four generated and which has been normalized so that its first Chern class t equals 0 or -1. If $L_0 = \oplus_{i=1}^4 \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{P}}(a_i)$ with $a_1 \geq a_2 \geq a_3 \geq a_4$, the resolution for E is given by

$$\oplus_{i=1}^4 \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{P}}(t - a_i - r) \xrightarrow{\phi} \oplus_{i=1}^4 \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{P}}(a_i).$$

Write the matrix of ϕ as

$$\phi = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & A & B & C \\ -A & 0 & D & E \\ -B & -D & 0 & F \\ -C & -E & -F & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Since X is smooth with equation $AF - BE + CD = 0$, the homogeneous entries A, B, C, D, E, F are all non-zero and have no common zero on $\mathbf{P}^4$.

Lemma 2.1. *For fixed r and t (normalized), there are only finitely many possibilities for (a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4).*

Proof. Let a, b, c, d, e, f denote the degrees of the poynomials A, B, C, D, E, F. Since the Pfaffian of the matrix is $AF - BE + CD$, the degree of each matrix entry is bounded between 1 and $r - 1$. $a = a_1 + a_2 + (r - t), b = a_1 + a_3 + (r - t)$ etc. Thus if $i \neq j$, $0 < a_i + a_j + r - t < r$ while $\sum a_i = -r + 2t$. From the inequality, regardless of the sign of a_1, the other three values a_2, a_3, a_4 are < 0. But again using the inequality, their pairwise sums are $> -r+t$, hence there are only finitely many choices for them. Lastly, a_1 depends on the remaining quantities. □

It suffices therefore to fix $r \geq 6$, $t = 0$ or -1 and a four-tuple (a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4) and show that there is no ACM bundle on the general hypersurface of degree r which has a resolution given by a matrix ϕ of the type $(a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4), t$.

From the inequalities on a_i, we obtain the inequalities

$$0 < a \leq b \leq c, d \leq e \leq f < r.$$

We do no harm by rewriting the matrix ϕ with the letters C and D interchanged to assume without loss of generality that $c \leq d$.

Proposition 2.2. *Let X be a smooth hypersurface of degree ≥ 3 in $\mathbf{P}^4$ supporting an ACM bundle E of type $(a_1 \geq a_2 \geq a_3 \geq a_4), t$. The degrees of the entries of ϕ can be arranged (without loss of generality) as:*

$$a \leq b \leq c \leq d \leq e \leq f$$

Then X will contain a curve Y which is the complete intersection of hypersurfaces of the three lowest degrees in the arrangement and a curve Z which is the complete intersection of hypersurfaces of the three highest degrees in the arrangement.

Proof. Consider the ideals (A, B, C) and $D, E, F)$. Since the equation of X is $AF - BE + CD$, these ideals give subschemes of X. Take for example (A, B, C). If the variety Y it defines has a surface component, this gives a divisor on X. As Pic(X)= $\mathbb{Z}$, there is a hypersurface $S = 0$ in $\mathbf{P}^4$ inducing this divisor. Now at a point in $\mathbf{P}^4$ where $S = D = E = F = 0$, all six polynomials $A, \ldots, F$ vanish, making a multiple point for X. Hence, X being smooth, Y must be a curve on X. Thus (A, B, C) defines a complete intersection curve on X. □

To make our notations non-vacuous, we will assume that at least one smooth hypersurface exists of a fixed degree $r \geq 6$ with an ACM bundle of type $(a_1 \geq a_2 \geq a_3 \geq a_4), t$. Let $\mathcal{F}_{(a,b,c);r}$ denote the Hilbert flag scheme that parametrizes all inclusions $Y \subset X \subset \mathbf{P}^4$ where X is a hypersurface of degree r and Y is a complete intersection curve lying on X which is cut out by three hypersurfaces of degrees a, b, c. Our discussion above produces points in $\mathcal{F}_{(a,b,c);r}$ and $\mathcal{F}_{(d,e,f);r}$.

Let $\mathcal{H}_r$ denote the Hilbert scheme of all hypersurfaces in $\mathbf{P}^4$ of degree r and let $\mathcal{H}_{a,b,c}$ denote the Hilbert scheme of all curves in $\mathbf{P}^4$ with the same Hilbert polynomial as the complete intersection of three hypersurfaces of degrees a, b and c. Following J. Kleppe ([6]), the Zariski tangent spaces of these three schemes are related as follows: Corresponding to the projections

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{F}_{(a,b,c);r} & \stackrel{p_2}{\rightarrow} & \mathcal{H}_{a,b,c} \\ \downarrow p_1 & & \\ \mathcal{H}_r & & \end{array}$$

if T is the tangent space at the point $Y \stackrel{i}{\subset} X \subset \mathbf{P}^4$ of $\mathcal{F}_{(a,b,c);r}$, there is a Cartesian diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} T & \stackrel{p_2}{\rightarrow} & H^0(Y, \mathcal{N}_{Y/\mathbf{P}}) \\ \downarrow p_1 & & \downarrow \alpha \\ H^0(X, \mathcal{N}_{X/\mathbf{P}}) & \stackrel{\beta}{\rightarrow} & H^0(Y, i^*\mathcal{N}_{X/\mathbf{P}}) \end{array}$$

of vector spaces.

Hence $p_1 : T \to H^0(X, \mathcal{N}_{X/\mathbf{P}})$ is onto if and only if $\alpha : H^0(Y, \mathcal{N}_{Y/\mathbf{P}}) \to H^0(Y, i^*\mathcal{N}_{X/\mathbf{P}})$ is onto. The map α is easy to describe. It is the map given as

$$H^0(Y, \mathcal{O}_Y(a) \oplus \mathcal{O}_Y(b) \oplus \mathcal{O}_Y(c)) \stackrel{[F,-E,D]}{\longrightarrow} H^0(Y, \mathcal{O}_Y(r)).$$

Hence

Proposition 2.3. *Choose general forms A, B, C, D, E, F of degrees a, b, c, d, e, f and let Y be the curve defined by $A = B = C = 0$. If the map*

$$H^0(Y, \mathcal{O}_Y(a) \oplus \mathcal{O}_Y(b) \oplus \mathcal{O}_Y(c)) \stackrel{[F,-E,D]}{\longrightarrow} H^0(Y, \mathcal{O}_Y(r))$$

is not onto, then the general hypersurface of degree r does not support a rank two ACM bundle of type $(a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4), t$.

Proof. Consider a general Pfaffian hypersurface X of equation $AF - BE + CD = 0$ where A, B, C, D, E, F are chosen generally. Such an X contains such a Y and X is in the image of p_1. By our hypothesis, $p_1 : T \to H^0(X, \mathcal{N}_{Y/\mathbf{P}})$ is not onto and (in characteristic zero) it follows that $p_1 : \mathcal{F}_{(a,b,c);r} \to \mathcal{H}_r$ is not dominant. Since all hypersurfaces X supporting such a rank two ACM bundle are in the image of p_1, we are done. □

Remark 2.4. Note that the last proposition can also be applied to the situation where Y is replaced by the curve Z given by $D = E = F = 0$, with the map given by $[A, -B, C]$, with a similar statement.

3. Calculations

We are given general forms A, B, C, D, E, F of degrees a, b, c, d, e, f where $a + f = b + e = c + d = r$ and where without loss of generality, by interchanging C and D we may assume that $1 \leq a \leq b \leq c \leq d \leq e \leq f < r$. Assume that $r \geq 6$. We will show that if Y is the curve $A = B = C = 0$ or if Z is the curve $D = E = F = 0$,depending on the conditions on a, b, c, d, e, f, either $h^0(\mathcal{N}_{Y/\mathbf{P}}) \stackrel{[F,-E,D]}{\longrightarrow} h^0(\mathcal{O}_Y(r))$ or $h^0(\mathcal{N}_{Z/\mathbf{P}}) \stackrel{[A,-B,C]}{\longrightarrow} h^0(\mathcal{O}_Z(r))$ is not onto. This will prove the desired result.

3.1. **Case 1.** $b \geq 3, c \geq a+1, 2a+b < r-2$.
In $\mathbf{P}^5$ (or in 6 variables) consider the homogeneous complete intersection ideal

$$I = (X_0^a, X_1^b, X_2^c, X_3^{r-c}, X_4^{r-b}, X_5^{r-a} - X_2^{c-a-1} X_3^{r-c-a-1} X_4^{a+2})$$

in the the polynomial ring S_5 on $X_0, \ldots, X_5$. Viewed as a module over S_4 (the polynomial ring on $X_0, \ldots, X_4$), $M = S_5/I$ decomposes as a direct sum

$$M = N(0) \oplus N(1)X_5 \oplus N(2)X_5^2 \oplus \cdots \oplus N(r-a-1)X_5^{r-a-1},$$

where the $N(i)$ are graded S_4 modules. Consider the multiplication map $X_5 : M_{r-1} \to M_r$ from the $(r-1)$-st to the r-th graded pieces of M. We claim it is injective and not surjective.

Indeed, any element m in the kernel is of the form nX_5^{r-a-1} where n is a homogeneous element in $N(r-a-1)$ of degree a. Since $X_5 \cdot m = n \cdot X_5^{r-a} \equiv n \cdot X_2^{c-a-1} X_3^{r-c-a-1} X_4^{a+2} \equiv 0 \mod (X_0^a, X_1^b, X_2^c, X_3^{r-c}, X_4^{r-b})$ we may assume that n itself is represented by a monomial in $X_0, \ldots, X_4$ of degree a. Our inequalities have been chosen so that even in the case where n is represented by X_4^a, the exponents of X_4 in the product is $a + a + 2$ which is less than $r - b$. Thus n and hence the kernel must be 0.

On the other hand, the element $X_0^{a-1} X_1^2 X_2^{c-a-1} X_3^{r-c-a-1} X_4^{a+1}$ in M_r lies in its first summand $N(0)_r$. In order to be in the image of multiplication by X_5, this element must be a multiple of $X_2^{c-a-1} X_3^{r-c-a-1} X_4^{a+2}$. By inspecting the factor in X_4, this is clearly not the case. So the multiplication map is not surjective.

Hence dim $M_{r-1} <$ dim M_r. Now the Hilbert function of a complete intersection ideal like I depends only on the degrees of the generators. Hence, for any complete intersection ideal I' in S_5 with generators of the same degrees, for the corresponding module $M' = S_5/I'$, dim M'_{r-1} $<$ dim M'_r.

Now coming back to our general six forms A, B, C, D, E, F in S_4, of the same degrees as the generators of the ideal I above. Since they include a regular sequence on $\mathbf{P}^4$, we can lift these polynomials to forms A', B', C', D', E', F' in S_5 which give a complete intersection ideal I' in S_5.

The module $\bar{M} = S_4/(A, B, C, D, E, F)$ is the cokernel of the map

$$X_5 : M'(-1) \to M'.$$

By our argument above, we conclude that $\bar{M}_r \neq 0$.

Lastly, the map $H^0(\mathcal{O}_Y(a) \oplus \mathcal{O}_Y(b) \oplus \mathcal{O}_Y(c)) \stackrel{[F,-E,D]}{\to} H^0(\mathcal{O}_Y(r))$ has cokernel precisely $\bar{M}_r$ which is not zero, and hence the map is not onto.

3.2. **Case 2.** $b \leq 2$

Since the forms are general, the curve Y given by $A = B = C = 0$ is a smooth complete intersection curve, with $\omega_Y \cong \mathcal{O}_Y(a + b + c - 5)$. Since $a + b \leq 4$, $\mathcal{O}_Y(c)$ is nonspecial

(1) Suppose $\mathcal{O}_Y(a)$ is nonspecial. Then all three of $\mathcal{O}_Y(a), \mathcal{O}_Y(b), \mathcal{O}_Y(c)$ are nonspecial. Hence $h^0(\mathcal{N}_{Y/\mathbf{P}}) = (a + b + c)\delta + 3(1 - g)$ where $\delta = abc$ is the degree of Y and g is the genus. Also $h^0(\mathcal{O}_Y(r)) = r\delta + 1 - g + h^1(\mathcal{O}_Y(r)) \geq r\delta + 1 - g$. To show that $h^0(\mathcal{N}_{Y/\mathbf{P}}) < h^0(\mathcal{O}_Y(r))$, it is enough to show that

$$(a + b + c)\delta + 3(1 - g) < r\delta + 1 - g.$$

Snce $2g - 2 = (a + b + c - 5)\delta$, this inequality becomes $5\delta < r\delta$ which is true as $r \geq 6$.

(2) Suppose $\mathcal{O}_Y(a)$ is special (so $b + c \geq 5$), but $\mathcal{O}_Y(b)$ is nonspecial. By Cliffords theorem, $h^0(\mathcal{O}_Y(a)) \leq \frac{1}{2}a\delta + 1$. In this case $h^0(\mathcal{N}_{Y/\mathbf{P}}) < h^0(\mathcal{O}_Y(r))$ will be true provided that
$\frac{1}{2}a\delta + 1 + (b + c)\delta + 2(1 - g) < r\delta + (1 - g)$
or $r > \frac{b+c}{2} + \frac{1}{\delta} + \frac{5}{2}$.
Since $c \leq \frac{r}{2}$ and $b \leq 2$, this is achieved if
$r > \frac{2+r/2}{2} + \frac{1}{\delta} + \frac{5}{2}$ which is the same as $r > \frac{14}{3} + \frac{4}{3\delta}$.
But $c \geq 3$, so $\delta \geq 3$, hence the last inequality is true as $r \geq 6$.

(3) Suppose both $\mathcal{O}_Y(a)$ and $\mathcal{O}_Y(b)$ are special. Hence $a + c \geq 5$. Using Cliffords theorem, in this case $h^0(\mathcal{N}_{Y/\mathbf{P}}) < h^0(\mathcal{O}_Y(r))$ will be true provided that
$\frac{1}{2}(a + b)\delta + 2 + c\delta + (1 - g) < r\delta + (1 - g)$.
This becomes $r > \frac{1}{2}(a + b) + \frac{2}{\delta} + c$. Using $c \leq \frac{r}{2}$, $a + b \leq 4$, and $\delta \geq 3$, this is again true when $r \geq 6$.

3.3. **Case 3.** $c < a + 1$.
In this case $a = b = c$ and $r \geq 2a$. Using the sequence

$$0 \to \mathcal{I}_Y(a) \to \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{P}}(a) \to \mathcal{O}_Y(a) \to 0,$$

we get $h^0(\mathcal{N}_{Y/\mathbf{P}}) = 3h^0(\mathcal{O}_Y(a)) = 3[\binom{a+4}{4} - 3]$
while $h^0(\mathcal{O}_Y(r)) \geq h^0(\mathcal{O}_Y(2a)) = \binom{2a+4}{4} - 3\binom{a+4}{4} + 3$. Hence the inequality $h^0(\mathcal{N}_{Y/\mathbf{P}}) < h^0(\mathcal{O}_Y(r))$ will be true provided
$\binom{2a+4}{4} > 6\binom{a+4}{4} - 12$.
The reader may verify that is reduces to
$10a^4 + 20a^3 - 70a^2 - 200a + 7(4!) > 0$
and the last inequality is true when $a \geq 3$. Thus we have settled this case when $r \geq 6$ and $a \geq 3$. If $r \geq 6$ and a (and hence b) ≤ 2, we are back in the previous case.

3.4. **Case 4.** $2a + b \geq r - 2$ and $r \geq 82$.
For this case, we will study the curve Z given by $D = E = F = 0$ (of degrees $r - c, r - b, r - a$) and consider the inequality $h^0(\mathcal{N}_{Z/\mathbf{P}}) < h^0(\mathcal{O}_Z(r))$
Since $a, b, c \leq \frac{r}{2}$, $2a + 2 \geq r - b \geq \frac{r}{2}$, hence $a \geq \frac{r}{4} - 1$. Also $b \geq a$ and $2a + b \geq r - 2$, hence $b \geq \frac{r}{3} - \frac{2}{3}$. Likewise, $c \geq \frac{r}{3} - \frac{2}{3}$.

Now $h^0(\mathcal{O}_Z(r - a)) = h^0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{P}}(r - a)) - h^0(\mathcal{I}_Z(r - a)) \leq \binom{r-a+4}{4} - 1$ etc., hence
$h^0(\mathcal{N}_{Z/\mathbf{P}}) \leq \binom{r-a+4}{4} + \binom{r-b+4}{4} + \binom{r-c+4}{4} - 3 \leq \binom{\frac{3r}{4}+5}{4} + 2\binom{\frac{2r}{3}+\frac{14}{3}}{4} - 3$
or $h^0(\mathcal{N}_{Z/\mathbf{P}}) \leq G(r)$, where $G(r)$ is the last expression.

Looking at the Koszul resolution for $\mathcal{O}_Z(r)$, since $a + b + c \leq \frac{3r}{2} < 2r$, the last term in the resolution has no global sections. Hence $h^0(\mathcal{O}_Z(r)) \geq h^0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{P}}(r)) - [h^0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{P}}(a)) + h^0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{P}}(b)) + h^0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{P}}(c))] \geq \binom{r+4}{4} - \binom{a+4}{4} - \binom{b+4}{4} - \binom{c+4}{4} \geq \binom{r+4}{4} - 3\binom{\frac{r}{2}+4}{4}$, or $h^0(\mathcal{O}_Z(r)) \geq F(r)$, where $F(r)$ is the last expression.

The reader may verify that $G(r) < F(r)$ for $r \geq 82$.

3.5. **Case 5.** $6 \leq r \leq 81$, $2a + b \geq r - 2$, $b \geq 3, c \geq a + 1$.
We still have $\frac{r}{4} - 1 \leq a \leq \frac{r}{2}, \frac{r}{3} - \frac{2}{3} \leq b, c \leq \frac{r}{2}$. For the curve Y given by $A = B = C = 0$, we can explicitly compute $h^0(\mathcal{O}_Y(k))$ for any k using the Koszul resolution for $\mathcal{O}_Y(k)$. Hence both terms in the inequality $h^0(\mathcal{N}_{Y/\mathbf{P}}) < h^0(\mathcal{O}_Y(r))$ can be computed for all allowable values of a, b, c, r using a computer program like Maple and the inequality can be verified. We will leave it to the reader to verify this claim.

References

[1] Adler, Allan; Ramanan, S. *Moduli of abelian varieties*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, 1644. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1996.

[2] Beauville, Arnaud . *Determinantal hypersurfaces*, Dedicated to William Fulton on the occasion of his 60th birthday. Michigan Math. J. 48 (2000), 39–64.

[3] Chiantini, Luca ; Madonna, Carlo . *ACM bundles on a general quintic threefold*, Dedicated to Silvio Greco on the occasion of his 60th birthday (Catania, 2001). Matematiche (Catania) 55 (2000), no. 2, 239–258 (2002).

[4] Chiantini, Luca ; Madonna, Carlo. *A splitting criterion for rank 2 bundles on a general sextic threefold*, Internat. J. Math. 15 (2004), no. 4, 341–359.

[5] Iliev, A.; Markushevich, D. *Quartic 3-fold: Pfaffians, vector bundles, and half-canonical curves*, Michigan Math. J. 47 (2000), no. 2, 385–394.

[6] Kleppe, Jan. *The Hilbert-flag scheme, its properties and its connection with the Hilbert scheme. Applications to curves in 3-space.* Thesis, University of Oslo (1981).

[7] Mohan Kumar, N.; Ravindra, G. V.; Rao, A.P. *Arithmetically Cohen-Macaulay bundles on hypersurfaces*, preprint (2005).

Department of Mathematics, Washington University in St. Louis, St. Louis, Missouri, 63130

E-mail address: kumar@wustl.edu

URL: http://www.math.wustl.edu/~ kumar

Department of Mathematics, University of Missouri-St. Louis, St. Louis, Missouri 63121

E-mail address: rao@arch.umsl.edu

Department of Mathematics, Washington University in St. Louis, St. Louis, Missouri, 63130

E-mail address: ravindra@math.wustl.edu