

III Minimal regular models

Setup S (integral) Dedekind scheme

C/η smooth projective connected curve

By applying resolution of singularities to any proper flat model of C (see next chapter)

we get X/S proper flat with X regular connected.
and $X_\eta \cong C$.

Goal: Modify X to make it "minimal".

The resulting theory is very similar to the study of minimal models of smooth projective surfaces over an alg. closed field (see [Hartshorne, V]).

The two theories can be developed in parallel, and the fibered case is somewhat easier because vertical divisors play a distinguished role.

def 1 | A fibered surface is a proper flat morphism
 $f: X \rightarrow S$ with $\begin{cases} X \text{ 2-dim. noetherian} \\ S \text{ Dedekind scheme.} \end{cases}$

• Fibers of such a morphism are proper curves over general fields, which can be very singular. (For X regular, they are at least l.c.i.).

rmk X curve. (over field) $\xrightarrow{\text{X reduced}} X \text{ l.c.i.} \Rightarrow \omega_{X/k}$ exists and is invertible.
 \downarrow (S1) \downarrow [Lin 8.2.18]
 X has no embedded points $\Leftrightarrow X$ Cohen-Macaulay $\Rightarrow \omega_{X/k}$ exists.

1) Degree of divisors on singular curves:

• In this section, X is a proper curve on a field k (not necc. irred or reduced).

• Recall that if A is a noetherian 1-dim ring and $f \in A$ is not a zero-divisor, then the length $\text{len}_A(A/f)$ is finite, and that

$$\text{len}_A(A/f^2) = \text{len}_A(A/f) + \text{len}_A(A/f) \quad [\text{Lin, Lemma 7.1.26}].$$

def 2 | Let $x \in X^{(0)}$ and $f \in \mathcal{O}_{X,x}$ non-zero-divisor. The multiplicity of f at x is
is $\text{mult}_x(f) := \text{len}_{\mathcal{O}_{X,x}}(\mathcal{O}_{X,x}/f) < \infty$.

• Because of additivity, we can extend mult_x to the total ring of fractions.

def 3 | Let D be a Cartier divisor on X . The multiplicity of D at x is $\text{mult}_x(D) := \text{mult}_x(f_x) - \text{mult}_x(g_x)$ for $\frac{f_x}{g_x} \in \text{Frac}(\mathcal{O}_{X,x})$ local representative of D .

• The associated Weil divisor is then $\sum_{x \in X^{(0)}} \text{mult}_x(D) \cdot [x] \in \mathbb{Z}^1(X)$.

def 4 | The (total) degree of D is $\deg(D) := \sum_{x \in X^{(0)}} \text{mult}_x(D) \cdot [\kappa(x) : k]$ (Δ depends on k)

• We have $\begin{cases} \deg(D_1 + D_2) = \deg(D_1) + \deg(D_2) \\ \deg(D) = \dim_k H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_D) \text{ if } D \text{ is effective.} \end{cases}$

• The basic fact of life, as in the case of smooth curves, is:

thm 5 | (Riemann-Roch)
 $\chi(\mathcal{O}_X(D)) = \deg D + \chi(\mathcal{O}_X)$.

The proof is the same as in the smooth case, by reduction to the effective case.
[Lin, 7.3.17].

cor 6 | Let $f \in \kappa(X)$. Then $\deg(\text{div}(f)) = 0$. (proof: $\mathcal{O}(\text{div } f) \simeq \mathcal{O}$ via f)

def 7 | Let \mathcal{L} be a line bundle on X . Its (total) degree is $\deg(\mathcal{L}) := \chi(\mathcal{L}) - \chi(\mathcal{O}_X)$.

def 8 | The arithmetic genus of X is $p_a(X) := 1 - \chi(\mathcal{O}_X)$.

• To go further in the study of RR, want to apply Serre duality.

prop | (RR + duality)
 X proper CM curve
 $\dim_k H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(D)) - \dim_k H^0(X, \omega_{X/k}(-D)) = \deg D + 1 - p_a(X)$.

• def 9 | X proper l.c.i. curve. A Cartier divisor $K_{X/k}$ with $\mathcal{O}(K_{X/k}) \simeq \omega_{X/k}$ (which is invertible in this case) is called a canonical divisor.

X proper l.c.i.

prop 10 | $\deg(\omega_{X/k}) = 2(p_a - 1)$.

[Lin, 7.3.31] • $\dim_k H^0(X, \omega_{X/k}) = p_a$ if X is geom. red. and geom. connected.

- Clearly, if X is not irreducible, then the total degree is a rather weak invariant. However:

prop 11

a) X is projective.

b) Let D be a Cartier divisor on X . Then

$$D \text{ ample} \iff \forall Y \text{ irred. comp of } X, \deg(D|_Y) > 0.$$

idea of proof [Lin, ex. 4.1.16, 7.5.3, 7.5.4]

The order of proof is: (a) for normal curves \Rightarrow b) \Rightarrow a).

- a) for normal curves is proved by patching embeddings of affine opens:

If $C = \bigcup U_i$ affine open cover and $U_i \hookrightarrow Y_i$ with Y_i/\mathbb{A}^1 projective, then the natural map $\bigcap U_i \rightarrow \prod Y_i$ extends to C by normality and valuative criterion and gives a projective embedding.

- b): By Serre's criterion, enough to show that for all $\bar{J} \in \text{Coh}(X)$

$$\text{and } n \gg 0, \quad H^1(X, \bar{J} \otimes \mathcal{O}(nD)) = 0.$$

Let $\pi: X' \rightarrow X$ be the normalization. Then $\deg(\pi^* \mathcal{O}(nD)) = \deg(\mathcal{O}(nD))$

hence (by the usual argument, since X' is projective) $\pi^* \mathcal{O}(nD)$ is ample (to be precise, need to do this for each irred. comp of X')

We have a short exact sequence

$$(+)\quad 0 \rightarrow \pi_* \pi^! \bar{J} \rightarrow \bar{J} \rightarrow \mathcal{F} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{with } \pi^! \bar{J} := \mathcal{H}om_{\mathcal{O}_X}(\pi_* \mathcal{O}_{X'}, \bar{J})$$

\uparrow
 skyscraper sheaf

equipped with its natural coherent $\mathcal{O}_{X'}$ -module structure (π finite)

$$\text{and } H^1(X, (\pi_* \pi^! \bar{J}) \otimes \mathcal{O}(nD)) \cong H^1(X, \pi_* (\pi^! \bar{J} \otimes \pi^* \mathcal{O}(nD)))$$

projection formula

$$\cong H^1(X', \pi^! \bar{J} \otimes \pi^* \mathcal{O}(nD))$$

π finite

$$\cong 0 \quad \text{for } n \gg 0$$

$\pi^* \mathcal{O}(nD)$ ample

The result then follows from the LES of (+).

- a): it is then enough to construct an effective Cartier divisor which meets every irreducible component of X . But, given any locally noetherian scheme X and any non-associated point x , there is an effective Cartier divisor on X with support containing x . □

• Application to fibered surfaces (surprisingly not used in the sequel: remember that equations are evil!)

thm 12 (Lichtenbaum [Lin, 8.3.16])

Let $f: X \rightarrow S$ be a regular fibered surface (i.e. X regular)

Then f is projective (in the sense of EGA, not Hartshorne)

proof: Let $\pi: Y \rightarrow T$ be a proper morphism of noetherian schemes, and \mathcal{L} be a line on Y . We need the following classical fact about ampleness:

| If for all $t \in T$, \mathcal{L}_t is ample on Y_t , then π is projective (in EGA-sense).

• We can assume X connected $\Rightarrow X_\eta$ connected.

• Let $x \in X_\eta^{(0)}$ be a closed point. Then $D_0 = \overline{\{x\}}$ is a

Weil = Cartier divisor on X . Since $\mathcal{O}(D_0)_\eta$ is ample by X connected, curve,

there exists $U \subseteq S$ non-empty open with $(s \in U \Rightarrow (D_0)_s \text{ ample})$

Let $S \setminus U = \{s_1, \dots, s_n\}$.

lemma 13 | There exists an effective divisor D_i which meets all irreducible components of X_{s_i} .

(see [Lin, 8.3.35 a]) for the proof)

Then $D := D_0 + D_1 + \dots + D_n$ is a Cartier divisor

such that $\forall s \in S$, $\mathcal{O}(D)_s$ is ample. □

rmk: for $f: X \rightarrow S$ smooth or S "nice" (e.g. quasi-excellent), f has finitely many singular fibers and we can dispense with D_0 .

rmk: - Smooth proper surfaces over a field are projective. [Bachmann, Thm 1.2.8].

- There exist normal proper non-projective surfaces [Schroer].

2) Intersection theory on a regular fibered surface

- Intersection theory in general: try to define intersection pairing $CH^i(X) \times CH^j(X) \rightarrow CH^{i+j}(X)$ on cycle groups up to rat. equivalence.
- On a surface, only interesting case is 2 divisors.
- Pb 1: without some form of properness, intersections are not invariant under rational equivalence.

Sol: only allow intersections with at least one divisor proper.

- Pb 2: $CH^2(X)$ is hopelessly complicated and not so interesting for us.

Sol: only keep track of intersection degrees.

- Write $\text{Div}(X)$ for the group of all Cartier divisors on X
 $\text{Div}_h(X)$ for the subgroup of horizontal divisors ($\begin{matrix} \text{for } D \text{ prime,} \\ \text{is } D \text{ surjective} \\ \downarrow \\ \text{finite} \end{matrix}$)
 for $s \in S^{(0)}$, $\text{Div}_s(X)$ for the subgroup of divisors with support in X_s .
 $\text{Div}_v(X) = \sum_{s \in S} \text{Div}_s(X)$ for the subgroup of vertical divisors.

def: Let $D \in \text{Div}(X)$, $E \in \text{Div}_v(X)$.

Write $E = \sum n_\Gamma \cdot [\Gamma]$ with Γ running through the irred. components of closed fibers.

Put $i(D, E) = \sum n_\Gamma \deg_{k(s)} (\mathcal{O}(D)|_\Gamma) \in \mathbb{Z}$.

(this makes sense because $\Gamma/k(s)$ is a proper curve).

thm (i) $i: \text{Div}(X) \times \text{Div}_v(X)$ is a bilinear form.

(ii) $i: \text{Div}_v(X) \times \text{Div}_v(X)$ is symmetric.

(iii) If $D \sim D'$ (i.e. $D' - D = \text{div}(F)$ for $F \in k(X)^\times$)

we have $i(D, E) = i(D', E)$.

(iv) If D, E are effective, with no common component, we have:

$$i(D, E) = \sum_{x \in |D| \cap |E|} [k(x): k(f(x))] \cdot \text{len}_{\mathcal{O}_{X,x}} \left(\mathcal{O}_{X,x} / (\mathcal{O}_X(-D)_x + \mathcal{O}_X(-E)_x) \right) \geq 0$$

proof: (i): • Linearity in E is by construction.

• Linearity in D follows from additivity of degree.

(iii): $D \sim D' \Rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X(D) \cong \mathcal{O}_X(D') \Rightarrow i(D, E) = i(D', E)$.

(iv): • First, the condition on supports imply that in a neighborhood of $x \in |D| \cap |E|$, the point x is the only pt of intersection of the supports. This implies

$$m_x \leq \sqrt{\mathcal{O}_X(-D)_x + \mathcal{O}_X(-E)_x}$$

hence $\mathcal{O}_{X,x} / \mathcal{O}_X(-D)_x + \mathcal{O}_X(-E)_x$ is an artinian ring $\Rightarrow \text{length} < \infty$.

• D has no embedded points + condition on supports $\Rightarrow \exists D|_E$ effective on E

with $\mathcal{O}_X(D)|_E \underset{(+)}{\cong} \mathcal{O}_E(D|_E)$ [Lin, lemma 7.1.29].

$$\Rightarrow i(D, E) = \deg(\mathcal{O}_E(D|_E)) = \sum_{x \in |E|} \text{mult}_x(D|_E) \cdot [k(x) : k(s)].$$

$$\text{We have } \text{mult}_x(D|_E) = \text{len} \left(\mathcal{O}_{E,x} / \mathcal{O}_E(-D|_E)_x \right) \\ \underset{(+)}{\uparrow} \text{S} \\ \text{len} \left(\mathcal{O}_{X,x} / \mathcal{O}_X(-D)_x + \mathcal{O}_X(-E)_x \right) \checkmark$$

(ii): Can reduce to $D = \Gamma_i$, $E = \Gamma_j$ for Γ_i, Γ_j 2 components of a fiber X_s . Then it follows from symmetry in (iv) for $i \neq j$, and it is obvious for $i = j$.

□

$$\text{notat}^\circ \left| \begin{array}{l} D \cdot E := i(D, E) \\ E^2 := i(E, E) \end{array} \right.$$

rmk: Compared with case of smooth proj surface [Hartshorne, IV § 1]:

- no Bertini thm to always reduce to transversality
- still a moving lemma [Lin, 9.1.10.1]
- but not necessary for theory.