

SINGULAR SYMPLECTIC SURFACES

ALICE GARBAGNATI, MATTEO PENEGINI, ARVID PEREGO

ABSTRACT. In this paper we classify all singular irreducible symplectic surfaces, i.e., compact, connected complex surfaces with canonical singularities that have a holomorphic symplectic form σ on the smooth locus, and for which every finite quasi-étale covering has the algebra of reflexive forms spanned by the reflexive pull-back of σ . We moreover prove that the Hilbert scheme of two points on such a surface X is an irreducible symplectic variety, at least in the case where the smooth locus of X is simply connected.

1. INTRODUCTION AND NOTATION

Irreducible symplectic manifolds are compact Kähler manifolds that are simply connected and carry a holomorphic symplectic form that spans the space of holomorphic 2-forms. They appear as one of the three building blocks of compact Kähler manifolds with trivial first Chern class by the Bogomolov Decomposition Theorem, the two others being complex tori and irreducible Calabi-Yau manifolds.

In dimension 2 the irreducible symplectic manifolds are exactly the K3 surfaces, and Hilbert schemes of points on K3 surfaces provide higher dimensional examples. Few other examples of irreducible symplectic manifolds have been described over the years, starting from moduli spaces of sheaves either on K3 surfaces or on Abelian surfaces.

The notion of irreducible symplectic manifold may be generalized in the singular setting in at least three non-equivalent ways. One of them is in the context of orbifolds, and was introduced by Campana in [9]:

Definition 1.1. *An **irreducible symplectic orbifold** is a compact Kähler orbifold X that verifies the three following conditions:*

- (1) *the smooth locus X^s of X is simply connected;*
- (2) *on X^s there is a holomorphic symplectic form σ ;*
- (3) *the space $H^0(X^s, \Omega_{X^s}^2)$ is spanned by σ .*

It is immediate to notice that an irreducible symplectic orbifold is smooth if and only if it is an irreducible symplectic manifold. Moreover, in [9] a Bogomolov Decomposition Theorem for orbifolds is proved, and irreducible symplectic orbifolds appear as one of the three building blocks of compact Kähler orbifolds with trivial first Chern class. Examples of irreducible symplectic orbifolds appear in [29], [30], [31], [6] as terminalization of quotients of Hilbert schemes of points on K3 surfaces (or generalized Kummer varieties) by the action of symplectic automorphisms, or as quotients of products of K3 surfaces; in [10] a complete family of irreducible

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 14B05, 14J28, 14J42, (14E20, 14N20).
Key words and phrases. K3 surfaces, Irreducible Symplectic Varieties.

symplectic orbifolds is described, as deformation of a quotient of Hilbert schemes of two points on K3 surfaces by the action of a symplectic involution.

A second possible generalization to the singular setting of the notion of irreducible symplectic manifold was proposed in [20]:

Definition 1.2. *An **irreducible symplectic variety** is a normal compact Kähler space X that verifies the three following conditions:*

- (1) *it has canonical singularities,*
- (2) *it admits a holomorphic symplectic form σ on its smooth locus, that we will view as a global section of $\Omega_X^{[2]} := (\Omega_X^2)^{**}$,*
- (3) *for every finite quasi-étale covering $f : Y \rightarrow X$ we have that*

$$\bigoplus_p H^0(Y, \Omega_Y^{[p]}) = \mathbb{C}[f^{[*]}\sigma]$$

as a \mathbb{C} -algebra, where we recall that a finite quasi-étale morphism is a finite morphism which is étale in codimension 1.

It is worthwhile to mention that as a consequence of the Bogomolov Decomposition Theorem for manifolds and of the fact that irreducible symplectic varieties are simply connected by [18], an irreducible symplectic variety is smooth if and only if it is an irreducible symplectic manifold.

Moreover, in [22] and [1] a generalization of the Bogomolov Decomposition Theorem for klt varieties is proved, and irreducible symplectic varieties are one of the three building blocks of normal compact Kähler spaces with klt singularities and trivial first Chern class. A consequence of this is that irreducible symplectic orbifolds are irreducible symplectic varieties (see Proposition 2.14 of [38]).

Examples of irreducible symplectic varieties appear in [29], [30], [31], [6], [38] as quotients of Hilbert schemes of points by the action of symplectic groups, in [39] as moduli spaces of sheaves on K3 or Abelian surfaces, or in [8] using relative Prym varieties.

A further generalization of the notion of irreducible symplectic manifold to the singular setting was first considered in [13] in the context of orbifolds, and then in [34]:

Definition 1.3. *A **primitive symplectic variety** is a compact Kähler symplectic variety X such that $h^1(X, \mathcal{O}_X) = 0$ and $H^0(X^s, \Omega_{X^s}^2)$ is spanned by the class of a holomorphic symplectic form σ .*

It is worthwhile to mention that irreducible symplectic varieties are primitive symplectic varieties (see Proposition 2.19 of [38]), and that since [34] and [2] we know that on the free part of the second integral cohomology of a primitive symplectic variety there is an integral non-degenerate quadratic form and that a local and global Torelli Theorem hold. The symmetric product of a K3 surface is an example of primitive symplectic variety.

Remark 1.4. In the definition of a primitive symplectic variety X we ask that X is a symplectic variety: this means, following Beauville, that X has a holomorphic symplectic form on its smooth locus, that extends to a holomorphic 2-form on a (and hence any) resolution of the singularities. By Theorem 6 of [34] a normal Kähler space X having a holomorphic symplectic form on its smooth locus is a symplectic variety if and only if it has rational Gorenstein singularities.

Remark 1.5. The notion of primitive symplectic variety appears in several papers and the definition is not always equivalent to Definition 1.3. An important example of this is given by the notion of *primitive symplectic orbifold* that appears in [12], which is more restrictive than that of primitive symplectic variety: following Definition 1.3, a primitive symplectic orbifold, as defined in [12], is an orbifold that is a primitive symplectic variety with terminal singularities.

We notice that the examples in [39] are all irreducible symplectic varieties which are not orbifolds, and hence not irreducible symplectic orbifolds. Moreover, the quotients of Hilbert schemes of 2 points on a K3 surface by a natural automorphism of prime order at least 3 is an orbifold and an irreducible symplectic variety (see Proposition 2.15 of [38]) but it is not an irreducible symplectic orbifold since its smooth locus is not simply connected. The symmetric products of K3 surfaces are examples of primitive symplectic varieties which are not irreducible symplectic.

Some examples of irreducible symplectic varieties have a symplectic resolution of the singularities: in this case, the resolution is an irreducible symplectic manifold (see [39], [38]). Other examples do not have any symplectic resolutions at all (see again [39]). There are moreover examples of singular symplectic varieties having a symplectic resolution of the singularities which is an irreducible symplectic manifold and which are not irreducible symplectic varieties (e. g. the symmetric product of a K3 surface): they are however always primitive symplectic varieties (see Proposition 2.19 of [38]).

A classification of primitive symplectic varieties, irreducible symplectic varieties and irreducible symplectic orbifolds is far from being obtained. One of the aims of the present paper is to study the case of the smallest possible dimension, i.e., the case of surfaces, and to construct examples of higher dimensional primitive symplectic varieties, irreducible symplectic varieties or irreducible symplectic orbifolds starting from this kind of singular surfaces. We will use the following:

Definition 1.6. *Let X be a normal, compact Kähler surface whose smooth locus has a holomorphic symplectic form.*

- (1) *If X is a primitive symplectic variety, we will call it **primitive symplectic surface**.*
- (2) *If X is an irreducible symplectic variety, we will call it **irreducible symplectic surface**.*
- (3) *If X is an irreducible symplectic orbifold, we will call it **simple symplectic surface**.*

The first aim of this paper is to present a classification of primitive symplectic surfaces, irreducible symplectic surfaces and simple symplectic surfaces. The smooth ones are the K3 surfaces, as well known, so we only need to classify the singular ones.

Remark 1.7. The general discussion above shows that simple symplectic surfaces are irreducible symplectic, and that irreducible symplectic surfaces are primitive symplectic. As we will see there are primitive symplectic surfaces which are not irreducible symplectic, and there are irreducible symplectic surfaces which are not simple symplectic.

Moreover, we notice that a normal compact Kähler surface is symplectic if and only if it is a 2-dimensional compact Kähler holomorphic symplectic orbifold, i.e.,

a compact Kähler orbifold of dimension 2 that carries a holomorphic symplectic form on its smooth locus.

Indeed, if X is symplectic then the singularities of X are canonical. Since canonical singularities on a surfaces are ADE singularities, and these are all quotient singularities, it follows that X is a 2-dimensional orbifold. Conversely, a 2-dimensional compact Kähler holomorphic symplectic orbifold is a normal, compact Kähler surface with rational Gorenstein singularities that has a holomorphic symplectic form on its smooth locus: by Theorem 6 of [34] we get that X is symplectic.

It follows that primitive symplectic surfaces are all compact Kähler holomorphic symplectic orbifolds. It moreover follows that a primitive symplectic surface is simple if and only if its smooth locus is simply connected.

The first result we will prove is the following, which provides a characterization of the surfaces we are willing to classify:

Theorem 1.8. *Let X be a normal compact Kähler surface whose smooth locus carries a holomorphic symplectic form.*

- (1) *The surface X is primitive symplectic if and only if it is the contraction of an ADE configuration B of rational curves on a K3 surface S .*
- (2) *The surface X is irreducible symplectic if and only if it is the contraction of an ADE configuration B of rational curves on a K3 surface S , where B does not contain any configuration of the list appearing in Theorem 3.6.*
- (3) *The surface X is simple symplectic if and only if it is the contraction of an ADE configuration B of rational curves on a K3 surface S , where B has a primitive embedding in $NS(X)$ and does not contain any configuration in the list appearing in Theorem 3.6, nor $B_{\mathfrak{A}_5}$, $B_{\mathfrak{A}_6}$, $B_{L_2(7)}$, $B_{M_{20}}$ (see Remark 3.16 for the definitions).*

The proof of Theorem 1.8 is contained in sections 2 and 3. More precisely Corollary 2.3 proves the first point, Theorem 3.7 proves the second and Theorem 3.17 and its lattice theoretic version, Corollary 3.20, proves the last.

Once this characterization is obtained, we see that in order to get a complete classification of primitive symplectic, irreducible symplectic and simple symplectic surfaces we need to get a complete list of the ADE configurations that may be realized as ADE configurations of rational curves on K3 surfaces. This is the content of sections 4 and 5, and the summary of the results we get is the following:

- Theorem 1.9.**
- (1) *There are exactly 5836 different ADE configurations on K3 surfaces whose contraction is a singular primitively symplectic surface.*
 - (2) *There are exactly 5826 different ADE configurations on K3 surfaces whose contraction is a singular irreducible symplectic surface.*
 - (3) *There are exactly 4697 different ADE configurations on K3 surfaces whose contraction is a singular simple symplectic surface.*
 - (4) *There are exactly 81 different ADE configurations on K3 surfaces whose contraction is a singular irreducible symplectic surface that admits a smooth finite quasi-étale cover.*

As contractions of different ADE configurations of rational curves on a K3 surface provide surfaces with different singularities, the previous result provides 5826 different locally trivial deformation classes of irreducible symplectic surfaces.

Theorem 1.9 is a combination of some results that have been known since several years, see [13], [46] and [42], here reinterpreted in view of the definitions of singular

symplectic surfaces we provided before. We add the complete computations of the ADE configurations and describe their geometric properties with respect to the existence of quasi-étale covers.

The proof of Theorem 1.9 is the content of sections 4 and 5 of the paper. In particular: point (1) follows from point (1) in Theorem 1.8 and by the algorithm described in section 4.2, see Theorem 4.11; point (2) follows from point (2) in Theorem 1.8 and from Theorem 3.7 and Proposition 4.9; point (3) follows from point (3) in Theorem 1.8, see Theorem 4.13 for the precise number; point (4) is a direct consequence of [46], see Remark 3.15.

Besides giving explicit proofs of all the results (in sections 3 and 4), we will provide a computer program that allows to write explicitly the list of all the possible contractions, and a complete list of all the possible ADE configurations of rational curves on K3 surfaces: this is described explicitly in section 5.

The last part of the paper is about the construction of higher dimensional examples of singular symplectic varieties from singular symplectic surfaces. A classical construction of irreducible symplectic manifolds of higher dimension is given by the Hilbert scheme of n points on K3 surfaces. It is natural to ask if the Hilbert scheme of n points on an irreducible (resp. primitive, simple) symplectic surface is an irreducible symplectic variety (resp. primitive symplectic variety, irreducible symplectic orbifold) as well.

The result we prove in this direction is that this is the case as soon as the surface is simple and n is 2. More precisely, we have the following (see Corollary 7.7):

Theorem 1.10. *Let X be a primitive irreducible symplectic surface.*

- (1) *The Hilbert scheme $\text{Hilb}^2(X)$ is a 4-dimensional primitive symplectic variety.*
- (2) *If X is simple, then $\text{Hilb}^2(X)$ is an irreducible symplectic orbifold.*

Finally, we will calculate the second rational cohomology of all these examples: this is a very important locally trivial deformation invariant of a primitive symplectic variety by the Global Torelli Theorem proved in [2].

By a result of Fu and Menet [12] we know that if X is a primitive symplectic variety of dimension 4 which is an orbifold with terminal singularities, then $3 \leq b_2(X) \leq 23$. In [12], [29], [30], [31] and [6] there are examples of irreducible symplectic orbifolds of dimension 4 with terminal singularities and $b_2 \in \{3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 14, 16, 23\}$. A natural question is if it is possible to fill the gaps in this list. By calculating the second rational cohomology group of the irreducible symplectic orbifolds of Theorem 1.10 we prove the following:

Theorem 1.11. *For every integer $3 \leq n \leq 23$ there exists an irreducible symplectic orbifold X of dimension 4 with $b_2(X) = n$.*

Remark 1.12. It is worthwhile to mention that Theorem 1.11 does not answer to the question about filling the gaps in the list of the possible second Betti numbers found in [12]: the reason is that the irreducible symplectic orbifolds realizing the missing values of b_2 in the list of [12] that we present have canonical but not terminal singularities, since their singular locus has codimension 2.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors wish to thank F. Catanese, S. Kondo, M. Loenne, V. Bertini and L. Li Bassi for fruitful discussions. They were partially supported by the Research

Project PRIN 2020 - CuRVI, CUP J37G21000000001. Arvid Perego was partially supported by the Research Project PRIN 2022 PEKBY - *Symplectic varieties: their interplay with Fano manifolds and derived categories*, CUP J53D23003840006. Matteo Penegini and Arvid Perego wish to thank the MIUR Excellence Department of Mathematics, University of Genoa, CUP D33C23001110001; Alice Garbagnati wishes to thank the MIUR Excellence Department of Mathematics, University of Milano. The authors are members of the INDAM-GNSAGA.

2. PRIMITIVE SYMPLECTIC SURFACES AS CONTRACTIONS OF K3 SURFACES

A primitive symplectic surface X is a normal singular surface, so there is a smooth surface S such that X is the contraction of a family of curves on S . Of course, not every contraction of curves on a surface is a primitive symplectic surface: hence, the condition on X of being a primitive symplectic surface imposes several conditions on the possible smooth surfaces S whose contraction is X . In this section we investigate the relations between these conditions and in particular we prove that S is necessarily a K3 surface. Moreover we discuss the geometric properties of the contractions.

We recall that a resolution of the singularities of X is a map $f : \tilde{X} \rightarrow X$ from a smooth surface \tilde{X} to X which is an isomorphism outside the singularities of X . It is called *minimal* if for every resolution $g : \tilde{X}' \rightarrow X$ there is a morphism $\psi : \tilde{X}' \rightarrow \tilde{X}$ such that $g = f \circ \psi$. It follows that if $f : \tilde{X} \rightarrow X$ is a minimal resolution and $p \in \text{Sing}(X)$, then $f^{-1}(p)$ does not contain any (-1) -curve.

The first result we prove is about the possible smooth minimal models of a surface with a holomorphic symplectic form on its smooth locus.

Proposition 2.1. *Let X be a possibly singular normal surface whose smooth locus carries a holomorphic symplectic form, and let S be its minimal model.*

- (1) *The surface S is either a K3 surface or a 2-dimensional complex torus.*
- (2) *If $h^1(X, \mathcal{O}_X) = 0$, then S is a K3 surface.*

Proof. We notice that the surface S has the same Kodaira dimension of X , and since X is symplectic it follows that $K_X = 0$. As a consequence the Kodaira dimension of X , and hence of S , is 0.

Let now $f : \tilde{X} \rightarrow X$ be a minimal resolution of X and denote $E = \bigcup_{i=1}^n E_i$ the exceptional locus of f , where E_1, \dots, E_n are the irreducible components of E .

The smooth locus of X is isomorphic to $\tilde{X} - E$, hence $\tilde{X} - E$ is endowed with a holomorphic symplectic form. It follows that the canonical bundle of $K_{\tilde{X}}$ restricted to $\tilde{X} - E$ is trivial, so that

$$K_{\tilde{X}} = \sum a_i E_i, \quad a_i \geq 0.$$

Since E is a contractible set, the intersection form on the lattice $\langle E_1, \dots, E_n \rangle$ is negative definite. As a consequence we get

$$K_{\tilde{X}}^2 \leq 0 \text{ and } K_{\tilde{X}}^2 = 0 \text{ if and only if } a_i = 0 \forall i.$$

In particular $K_{\tilde{X}}^2 = 0$ if and only if $K_{\tilde{X}} = 0$. By definition of minimal resolution we see that \tilde{X} contains no (-1) -curves. Indeed, suppose that R is a (-1) -curve on \tilde{X} . By the genus formula we get that $RK_{\tilde{X}} = -1$, so $R \sum a_i E_i = -1$ with $a_i \geq 0$ and E_i irreducible curves. Hence there is $1 \leq i \leq n$ such that $R = E_i$, which contradicts the hypothesis that \tilde{X} is a minimal resolution.

It follows that \tilde{X} is a minimal surface, and hence $\tilde{X} = S$. In particular we get that $K_S = K_{\tilde{X}}$, so if $K_S \neq 0$, we have that S is a minimal surface such that $K_S^2 < 0$ and $\kappa(S) = 0$: this is of course impossible, so $K_S = 0$ and S is either a K3 surface or a complex torus.

For the second point of the statement, notice that as X has ADE singularities, then X has canonical, and hence rational singularities. By the Leray spectral sequence we then have that

$$h^1(X, \mathcal{O}_X) \simeq h^1(S, \mathcal{O}_S),$$

and the result readily follows by the Enriques-Kodaira classification of compact Kähler surfaces. \square

Remark 2.2. By Remark 1.7, point (1) of Proposition 2.1 is equivalent to Lemma 6.6 in [13].

An immediate corollary of Proposition 2.1 is then the following, which is point (1) of Theorem 1.8:

Corollary 2.3. *A normal compact Kähler surface is primitive symplectic if and only if X is the contraction of an ADE configuration of rational curves on a K3 surface.*

Proof. If X is a primitive symplectic surface, then it is a symplectic variety, hence it has canonical singularities. Since canonical singularities are ADE singularities on surfaces, if $f : S \rightarrow X$ is a minimal resolution, then f is the contraction of an ADE configuration of curves on S . Moreover, as $h^1(X, \mathcal{O}_X) = 0$, by Proposition 2.1 we see that S is a K3 surface.

Conversely, if X is the contraction of an ADE configuration of curves on a K3 surface S , we have that $h^1(X, \mathcal{O}_X) = h^1(S, \mathcal{O}_S) = 0$ as in the proof of Proposition 2.1, and by [19, Theorem 1.5 and Remark 1.5.2] we have that

$$h^{[2],0}(X) = h^0(X, \Omega_X^{[2]}) = h^{2,0}(S) = 1,$$

hence $H^0(X^s, \Omega_{X^s}^2)$ is spanned by the class of a holomorphic symplectic form on X^s . The fact that X is a symplectic variety follows from the fact that S is a symplectic resolution of X . \square

Remark 2.4. We recall that a curve on a K3 surface has negative self intersection if and only if it is smooth and rational and its self-intersection is -2 . Since the lattices spanned by their roots are the ADE lattices we obtain that all the contractions of a K3 surface are contractions of ADE configurations of smooth rational curves and are in particular canonical.

As a consequence of Corollary 2.3, it follows that in order to classify all possible primitive irreducible symplectic surfaces one needs to classify all ADE configurations of rational curves on K3 surfaces. This will be the aim of sections 4 and 5.

We now wish to notice that there are primitive symplectic surfaces which are not irreducible symplectic surfaces: the reason is that while conditions (1) and (2) of Definition 1.2 are always verified by all contractions of ADE configurations of rational curves on K3 surfaces, condition (3) is not trivially satisfied, as the following well known example shows.

Example 2.5. Let T be a 2-dimensional complex torus and $\iota : T \rightarrow T$ the involution mapping $p \in T$ to $-p$. Let $X := T/\iota$, so that X is a singular symplectic surface having 16 singular points, and the resolution of the singularities $f : S \rightarrow X$ is such that S is a K3 surface. The morphism f is a contraction of 16 disjoint (-2) -curves, but the surface X is not irreducible symplectic: the quotient morphism $q : T \rightarrow X$ is a finite quasi-étale covering, but since $H^0(T, \Omega_T^1) \neq 0$ we see that the algebra of holomorphic forms on T is not spanned by the pull-back of the symplectic form on X .

Therefore, in order to classify the irreducible symplectic surfaces one needs not only to classify all possible ADE configurations of rational curves on K3 surfaces, but also to give necessary and sufficient conditions that guarantee that their contraction satisfies condition (3) of 1.2.

We will use the following notation: if S is a K3 surface and B is an ADE configuration of (-2) -curves on S , we let $f_B : S \rightarrow X_B$ be the contraction morphism of the curves in B , and we let X_B be the singular surface obtained with this contraction.

In order to understand under which conditions the surface X_B is an irreducible symplectic surface, we need to consider all finite quasi-étale coverings $Y \rightarrow X_B$, and to calculate the dimension of $h^0(Y, \Omega_Y^{[p]})$ for $p = 0, 1, 2$. To do so we first relate the finite quasi-étale coverings of X_B with some induced coverings of the K3 surface S , as follows:

Proposition 2.6. *Let S be a K3 surface, B an ADE configuration of (-2) -curves on S , and $f_B : S \rightarrow X_B$ the contraction of the curves in B . Let $g : Y \rightarrow X_B$ be a finite quasi-étale covering of degree n , let $Z := S \times_{X_B} Y$ and $\tilde{g} : Z \rightarrow S$ be the natural projection. Then \tilde{g} is a generically finite covering of degree n whose branch locus is contained in the exceptional locus B of f_B .*

Proof. Let $D \subseteq X_B$ be the branch locus of g and $U := X_B \setminus D$. As g is quasi-étale, we see that D is given by a finite number of points. Moreover, we let $Y_U := g^{-1}(U)$, which is an open subset of Y , and $S_U := f_B^{-1}(U)$, which is an open subset of S .

Notice that $g|_{Y_U} : Y_U \rightarrow U$ is étale of degree n , and if we let $Z_U := S_U \times_U Y_U$ (which is an open subset of Z), then the projection $\tilde{g}|_{Z_U} : Z_U \rightarrow S_U$ is étale and has the same degree of $g|_{Y_U}$. It follows that $\tilde{g} : Z \rightarrow S$ is generically finite of degree n .

We are only left with showing that $D \subseteq f_B(B)$, where we notice that $f_B(B)$ is the singular locus of X_B . To prove this, suppose that $p \in D$ is a smooth point of X_B . Hence $f_B^{-1}(p)$ is a single point of S which is contained in the branch locus of \tilde{g} . But since S is smooth and Z is normal, by purity the branch locus of \tilde{g} has no isolated points, and we get a contradiction. \square

The previous result tells us that any finite quasi-étale covering $g : Y \rightarrow X_B$ induces by base change a generically finite covering (of the same degree) $\tilde{g} : Z \rightarrow S$ of the K3 surface S , whose branch locus is contained in B . Next section will be aimed to understand the geometry of Z and of the branch locus of \tilde{g} .

3. COVERINGS OF SINGULAR SYMPLECTIC SURFACES

Let X be an n -dimensional orbifold with only isolated singularities, such that every singular point p of X has an open neighbourhood isomorphic to a quotient

\mathbb{C}^n/G_p for some subgroup G_p of $SL(n, \mathbb{C})$. Let $\pi : Y \rightarrow X$ be a covering of X : we want to understand the geometric structure of Y . We have two possibilities: either π is a Galois covering, or it is not.

3.1. Galois and non Galois covers. Suppose first that π is a Galois covering branched on a subset of $Sing(X)$.

Lemma 3.1. *Let X be an n -dimensional orbifold with only isolated singularities and $\pi : Y \rightarrow X$ a Galois covering branched only on a subset of $Sing(X)$. Then Y is an n -dimensional orbifold with only isolated singularities, and if q is a singular point of Y then q has an open neighbourhood which is isomorphic to a quotient \mathbb{C}^n/H_q where H_q is a normal subgroup of $G_{\pi(q)}$.*

Proof. Consider the restriction $\pi' : Y \setminus \pi^{-1}(Sing(X)) \rightarrow X \setminus Sing(X)$ of π . Then π' is an étale Galois covering of the manifold $X \setminus Sing(X)$, so that $Y \setminus \pi^{-1}(Sing(X))$ is smooth.

Let us analyse locally what happens around a singular point $p \in Sing(X)$. The point p has an open neighbourhood U_p which is isomorphic to \mathbb{C}^n/G_p , for some subgroup G_p of $SL(n, \mathbb{C})$. The universal covering of U_p is \mathbb{C}^n , so each Galois covering of U_p is a quotient of \mathbb{C}^n by a normal subgroup H_p of G_p . Each connected component of $\pi^{-1}(U_p)$ is of the form \mathbb{C}^n/H_p , hence each point q such that $q \in \pi^{-1}(p)$ has an open neighbourhood which is isomorphic to \mathbb{C}^n/H_p . \square

Suppose now that $\pi : Y \rightarrow X$ is not Galois. As before $Y \setminus \pi^{-1}(Sing(X))$ is smooth, and we still look at what happens around a singular point $p \in Sing(X)$. Let U_p be an open neighbourhood of p in X which is isomorphic to \mathbb{C}^n/G_p . Then we have a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \mathbb{C}^n & \\ & \swarrow \quad \searrow & \\ V_p & \xrightarrow{\pi} & U_p \end{array}$$

(Note: The diagram in the image shows V_p on the left and U_p on the right, with arrows from \mathbb{C}^n to both. The arrow from \mathbb{C}^n to V_p is labeled $/H_p$ and the arrow to U_p is labeled $/G_p$. The arrow from V_p to U_p is labeled π .)

where V_p is one of the connected components of $\pi^{-1}(U_p)$: in this case the group H_p is still a subgroup of G_p , but it is not necessarily normal.

In the following will be useful to compare a non Galois covering with its Galois closure. Hence we recall the definition and well known properties of the Galois closure.

Definition 3.2. *Let $\pi : Y \rightarrow X$ be a finite covering and L the Galois closure of the function fields extension $k(X) \subset k(Y)$. The Galois closure of π is given by Z , which is the normalization of Y in L , and the induced maps $\alpha : Z \rightarrow X$, $\beta : Z \rightarrow Y$.*

Notice that α and β are Galois coverings and that α does not factorize into further Galois covers by the minimality of the extension L .

Lemma 3.3. *Let $\pi : Y \rightarrow X$ be a finite covering with branch locus D , and let $\alpha : Z \rightarrow X$ be its Galois closure. Then the branch locus of α is D .*

Proof. The Galois closure of π is such that $\alpha : Z \rightarrow X$ is a Galois G -covering such that $\alpha = \beta \circ \pi$ for $\beta : Z \rightarrow Y \simeq Z/H$ for a certain subgroup $H \leq G$. So we have

the following diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 Z & & \\
 \beta \searrow & & \\
 & Y = Z/H & \\
 \alpha \searrow & \downarrow \pi & \\
 & X = Z/G &
 \end{array}$$

If $p \in X$ is a point in the branch locus of π , then its inverse image under $\alpha = \pi \circ \beta$ has cardinality strictly less than $|G|$, therefore it is in the branch locus of α .

If $q \in X$ is a point in the branch locus of α but not in that of π , then each point in $\pi^{-1}(q)$ is in the branch locus of β . Since β is a Galois cover, there exists a subgroup K of G that stabilizes each point in $\beta^{-1}(\pi^{-1}(q)) = \alpha^{-1}(q)$. The action of K on $\alpha^{-1}(q) \subset Z$ is then the identity, so every $k \in K$ commutes with any element in G : this implies that K is a normal subgroup of G . It follows that α factorizes through the quotient Z/K , contradicting the minimality of the Galois closure. \square

As a consequence, whenever we have a covering of an orbifold with isolated singularities, we may always suppose that it is a Galois covering without changing the branch locus.

3.2. Covers of K3 surfaces. Let us look at what happens in the case of orbifolds of dimension 2 with ADE singularities.

Proposition 3.4. *Let X be a surface with only ADE singularities and $\pi : Y \rightarrow X$ a finite covering whose branch locus is contained in $\text{Sing}(X)$. Then Y has only ADE singularities and $\kappa(X) = \kappa(Y)$.*

Proof. Since X is an orbifold a singular point p of X is such that there exists an open neighbourhood isomorphic to \mathbb{C}^2/G_p where G_p is a finite subgroup of $GL(2, \mathbb{C})$. The singularity in p is an ADE singularity if and only if $G_p \subset SL(2, \mathbb{C})$.

As seen in Section 3.1, the surface Y is a 2-dimensional orbifold with only isolated singularities, and if q is a singular point of Y , then it has an open neighbourhood isomorphic to a quotient \mathbb{C}^2/H_q where H_q is a subgroup of $G_{\pi(q)}$: it is then a finite subgroup of $SL(2, \mathbb{C})$, and hence Y is a surface with only ADE singularities.

Finally, since the restriction $\pi' : Y \setminus \pi^{-1}(\text{Sing}(X)) \rightarrow X \setminus \text{Sing}(X)$ of π is étale and the ADE singularities are canonical singularities, the Kodaira dimension of Y equals the one of X . \square

As a consequence we see that finite quasi-étale coverings of contractions of ADE configurations of (-2) -curves on K3 surfaces may only be of very special type, i.e., their minimal models can only be either K3 surfaces or 2-dimensional complex tori. More precisely, we have the following:

Corollary 3.5. *Let S be a K3 surface, B an ADE configuration of (-2) -curves on S and $f_B : S \rightarrow X_B$ be the contraction of the curves in B . Let $\pi : Y \rightarrow X_B$ be a finite covering of X_B . Then Y is a possibly singular compact complex surface with only ADE singularities, and the minimal model of Y is either a K3 surface or a 2-dimensional torus.*

Proof. By construction X_B has only ADE singularities and $\kappa(X_B) = 0$. By Proposition 3.4 we then see that Y has only ADE singularities and $\kappa(Y) = 0$.

Now, let Y' be a minimal model of Y . As the minimal model of X is the K3 surface S , we see that $p_g(S) = 1$ and hence $p_g(Y') \geq 1$. But as $\kappa(Y') = \kappa(Y) = 0$, it follows that $p_g(Y') = 1$. The statement then follows by the Enriques-Kodaira classification of compact Kähler surfaces. \square

As a consequence of Corollary 3.5, it follows that a contraction X_B of an ADE configuration B of (-2) -curves on a K3 surface S is an irreducible symplectic surface if and only if X_B does not admit any finite quasi-étale covering whose minimal model is a 2-dimensional complex torus and it is simple if and only if it does not admit any finite quasi-étale covering at all, in particular with K3 surfaces. For this reason, in Subsection 3.3 we consider the K3 surfaces which admit coverings with tori, in Subsection 3.4 we consider the K3 surfaces which admit covering with tori and this allows us to describe the simple symplectic surfaces in subsection 3.5.

3.3. Coverings with tori. By Proposition 2.6 and Corollary 3.5, a contraction X_B of an ADE configuration B of (-2) -curves on a K3 surface S is an irreducible symplectic surface if and only if S has no generically finite covering whose branch locus is contained in B and which is given by a surface birational to a 2-dimensional complex torus.

The classification of the branch loci of the coverings of K3 surfaces which are birational to 2-dimensional complex tori may be obtained as a consequence of a result of Fujiki: more precisely, in [14] the groups G of automorphisms of a 2-dimensional complex torus A such that A/G is birational to a K3 surface $\widetilde{A/G}$ are classified.

In particular, in [14, Lemma 3.19] the points of A with non trivial stabilizer are classified. Some of them are identified by the action of the group. In [36], [5], [43], [15], [40] the configuration of curves in the branch locus of $A \rightarrow \widetilde{A/G}$ and the attached lattices is given for all the groups (the order two case is studied in [36], the other cyclic cases in [5], the remaining ones in [43], [15] and [40]). These known results are summarized in the following theorem.

Theorem 3.6. ([14], [36], [5], [43], [15], [40]) *Let $f : A \rightarrow S$ be a finite covering of a K3 surface S where A is a smooth surface birational to a torus, and let B its branch locus. Then the ADE configuration type of B is one of the following:*

- (1) $B_1 := A_1^{\oplus 16}$;
- (2) $B_2 := A_2^{\oplus 9}$;
- (3) $B_3 := A_3^{\oplus 4} \oplus A_1^{\oplus 6}$;
- (4) $B_4 := A_5 \oplus A_2^{\oplus 4} \oplus A_1^{\oplus 5}$;
- (5) $B_5 := D_4^{\oplus 2} \oplus A_3^{\oplus 3} \oplus A_1^{\oplus 2}$;
- (6) $B_6 := D_4^{\oplus 4} \oplus A_1^{\oplus 3}$;
- (7) $B_7 := D_5 \oplus A_3^{\oplus 3} \oplus A_2^{\oplus 2} \oplus A_1$;
- (8) $B_8 := E_6 \oplus D_4 \oplus A_2^{\oplus 4} \oplus A_1$;
- (9) $B_9 := A_3^{\oplus 6} \oplus A_1$;
- (10) $B_{10} := A_5 \oplus A_3^{\oplus 2} \oplus A_2^{\oplus 4}$.

This allows us to state and prove the following, which is point (2) of Theorem 1.8:

Theorem 3.7. *Let S be a K3 surface, B an ADE configuration of smooth rational curves on S and $f_B : S \rightarrow X_B$ the contraction morphism. Then X_B is an irreducible symplectic surface if and only if B does not contain any of the ADE configurations of Theorem 3.6.*

Proof. Suppose first that X_B is an irreducible symplectic surface and that in B there is an ADE configuration B' of the list given in Theorem 3.6. By [36], [5], [43], [15], [40], there is a Galois covering of $\pi : A \rightarrow S$ whose branch locus is B' , where A is a 2-dimensional complex torus.

Let now $g : A \rightarrow A'$ be the contraction of the curves in $\pi^{-1}(B')$: then there is a finite quasi-étale covering $\pi' : A' \rightarrow X_B$ such that the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A & \xrightarrow{g} & A' \\ \pi \downarrow & & \downarrow \pi' \\ S & \xrightarrow{f_B} & X_B \end{array}$$

is commutative.

Notice that $h^{[1],0}(A') = h^{1,0}(A) \neq 0$ since A is a torus, contradicting the fact that X_B is an irreducible symplectic surface. It follows that if X_B is an irreducible symplectic surface, then B cannot contain any ADE configuration of Theorem 3.6.

Let us now suppose that B does not contain any of the ADE configurations in the list of Theorem 3.6, and let us prove that X_B is then an irreducible symplectic surface.

As X_B has ADE singularities and has a holomorphic symplectic form on its smooth locus, in order to prove that it is an irreducible symplectic surface we just need to prove that if $g : Y \rightarrow X_B$ is a finite quasi-étale covering, then

$$h^0(Y, \Omega_Y^{[p]}) = \begin{cases} 1, & p = 0, 2 \\ 0 & p = 1 \end{cases}$$

Notice that if $\deg(g) = 1$, then $Y = X_B$ and g is an automorphism of X_B . By [20] we get $h^0(X_B, \Omega_{X_B}^{[p]}) = h^0(S, \Omega_S^p)$, and we are done in this case since S is K3.

If now $\deg(g) > 1$, by Corollary 3.5 we know that Y is birational either to a K3 surface or to a torus (see also e.g. [44, Theorem 3.4]), and by Theorem 3.6 it cannot be a torus if B does not contain any of the configurations of Theorem 3.6. \square

The main consequence of Theorem 3.7 for our purposes is that in order to classify all the irreducible singular surfaces, one has to classify all the possible ADE configurations of (-2) -curves on K3 surfaces, and then exclude the ones containing a subconfiguration that is of the form listed in Theorem 3.7.

3.4. Covers with K3 surfaces. Having completely characterized primitive and irreducible symplectic surfaces in Corollary 2.3 and Theorem 3.7 in terms of contractions of curves on K3 surfaces, we are left with finding a similar characterization for simple symplectic surfaces, i.e., irreducible symplectic surfaces whose smooth locus is simply connected.

As simple symplectic surfaces are irreducible symplectic, by Theorem 3.7, they are obtained by contractions of ADE configurations of curves on K3 surfaces that do not contain any of the configurations in the list of Theorem 3.6. By Corollary

3.5 any finite quasi-étale covering of such a contraction has to be birational to a K3 surface.

The possible ADE configurations of curves on K3 surfaces which are the branch locus of a finite covering with another K3 surface have been studied and classified by Xiao in [46]. The main result in this direction is the following.

Theorem 3.8. (Xiao, [46]) *Let $f : Y \rightarrow S$ be a finite covering of a K3 surface where Y is a smooth surface birational to K3 surface, and let B its branch locus. Then the ADE configuration type of B is one of the 81 configuration in Table [46, Table 2].*

The proof of the previous result is contained in [46], where the Galois covers of K3 surfaces with a K3 surface are classified. More precisely, Xiao proves that if W is the quotient of a K3 surface by finite group, the exceptional locus of the desingularization of W forms an ADE configuration among the 81 possibilities listed in [46, Table 2]. Conversely, Xiao proves that for every ADE configuration B contained in [46, Table 2] there is a K3 surface S having B as ADE configuration of (-2) -curves, and that has a Galois covering whose branch locus is B .

We notice that each ADE configuration in [46, Table 2] corresponds uniquely to a group G such that there exists a G -Galois cover branched on that configuration. For this reason we denote the configuration in [46, Table 2] as B_G (and with B_G^i , $i = 1, 2$ in the cases $G = Q_8, T_{24}$, since in these cases the same group is attached to more than one ADE configuration). We observe that if G and G' are two different groups, then $B_G \neq B_{G'}$.

Remark 3.9. It is important to notice that even if for every ADE configuration B_G in [46, Table 2] there is a K3 surface S (actually, a family of K3 surfaces) for which B_G appears as the branch locus of a finite G -Galois covering of S , it is not necessarily true that if S is a K3 surface which has B_G as an ADE configuration of (-2) -curves, then there is a G -Galois covering of S whose branch locus is B_G . Example 3.11 shows this phenomenon.

In order to classify the possible covers that a K3 surface has, we need the following:

Definition 3.10. *An (effective) divisor D is an (effective) n -divisible class in the Picard group of a surface S if there exists $L \in \text{Pic}(S)$ such that $nL \sim D$.*

An effective divisible class is associated to a cyclic cover of the surface branched on it (see e.g. [3, Chapter 1, Section 17]). A priori on a K3 surface there could be no effective divisible classes, one effective divisible class or more than one. In the latter case one has more than one cyclic cover of the surface, and possibly a Galois cover whose Galois group is not cyclic.

Example 3.11. Let us consider the first entry of [46, Table 2]: the group G in this case is $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$ and the configuration type of $B_{\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}}$ is $A_1^{\oplus 8}$, which geometrically corresponds to a set of 8 disjoint rational curves.

There are two different families of (non projective) K3 surfaces admitting this configuration of curves: the first family, denoted F_1 , is given by the K3 surfaces whose Néron-Severi lattice contains primitively $A_1^{\oplus 8}$: the generic member of this family is a K3 surface S such that $NS(S) \simeq A_1^{\oplus 8}$ and the transcendental lattice is $T(S) \simeq U^{\oplus 3} \oplus A_1^{\oplus 8}$.

The second family, denoted F_2 , is given by the K3 surfaces whose Néron-Severi lattice primitively contains the so-called Nikulin lattice N , i.e., a negative definite lattice of rank 8 and length 6 spanned by eight classes N_i , $i = 1, \dots, 8$ with $N_i N_j = -2\delta_{i,j}$ and by the class $(\sum_i N_i)/2$. This is an overlattice of index 2 of $A_1^{\oplus 8}$ and it is the lattice obtained requiring that the 8 disjoint rational curves form a 2-divisible set of curves. The generic member of this family is such that $NS(S) \simeq N$ and $T(S) \simeq U^{\oplus 3} \oplus N$.

It follows that among the two families of K3 surfaces admitting $B_{\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}} \simeq A_1^{\oplus 8}$ as an ADE configuration of rational curves, the K3 surfaces which are general member of the family F_i admit a double cover with a K3 surface branched on $B_{\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}}$ if and only if $i = 2$.

Remark 3.12. There is a fundamental difference between the list in [46, Table 2] and the one in Theorem 3.6. Indeed in the latter, each ADE configuration is necessarily the branch locus of a Galois cover with a torus. This is not the case for the list in [46, Table 2], as the previous Example shows.

This is due to the fact that the existence of the curves of an ADE configuration in Theorem 3.6 forces the minimal lattice spanned by these curves to have some divisibility relations, which allows to construct the required Galois cover. This was already known by Nikulin, see [36] in the cases of the classical Kummer construction: if a K3 surface admits 16 disjoint rational curves, it admits a double cover with a 2-dimensional complex torus. The generalizations of the Nikulin's result to other Galois covers with tori are contained in [5], [43], [15], [40]. In particular, if an ADE configuration as in the list in Theorem 3.6 is present on a K3 surface, then its contraction is not simple.

By the previous Remark, the existence of a given ADE configuration B_G of rational curves on a K3 surface S is not enough to guarantee the existence of a (rational) G -cover of S with a K3 surface. Nevertheless Proposition 3.13 shows that there is a lattice theoretic condition characterizing the K3 surfaces admitting a (rational) G -cover with another K3 surface: it is not sufficient to consider the lattice associated with the ADE configuration B_G , but one has to consider a specific overlattice of it.

To fix the notation needed in the following, we recall that the second cohomology group of any K3 surface, endowed with the cup product, is isometric to the unique even unimodular lattice of signature $(3, 19)$. This lattice will be denoted Λ_{K3} .

Proposition 3.13. *Let G be a group acting symplectically on a K3 surface and B_G (resp. B_G^i for $i = 1, 2$ for $G = Q_8, T_{24}$) the corresponding ADE configuration in [46, Table 2].*

- (1) *There is a finite index overlattice M_G (resp. M_G^i) of B_G (resp. B_G^i) characterizing the K3 surfaces S admitting a (rational) G -cover with another K3 surface, i.e., if there is a K3 surface Y such that $G \subset \text{Aut}(Y)$ and S is birational to Y/G then M_G (resp. M_G^i) is primitively embedded in $NS(S)$.*
- (2) *The quotient M_G/B_G (resp. M_G^i/B_G^i) is not trivial if and only if $G \neq \mathfrak{A}_5, \mathfrak{A}_6, L_2(7)(= PSL(2, 7)), M_{20}$.*
- (3) *if M_G (resp. M_G^i) is embedded in $NS(S)$ for a K3 surface S , then the embedding is primitive and S admits a Galois cover with a K3 surface.*

Proof. The complete list of the groups acting symplectically on a K3 surface is known after [33], [25], [46]. In particular in [46] the set of points with non trivial

stabilizer for the action of G on a K3 surface are given: this provides the list of the lattices B_G contained in [46, Table 2] of the ADE configurations resolving the singular points of the quotient. The lattice M_G is by definition the minimal primitive sublattice of the Néron–Severi group of a K3 surface which is the minimal resolution of the quotient of a K3 by a symplectic automorphism containing the curves arising by the desingularization of the quotient, which are the curves in B_G . Hence it is primitively embedded in the Néron–Severi of the surface.

One can directly check that there are no different groups attached to the same ADE configuration.

Moreover in the seventh column of [46, Table 2], there is a description of the divisible sets of curves appearing in the lattice M_G . With the exceptions mentioned in the statement, for all the group G appearing, there are divisible classes in B_G , so M_G/B_G is not trivial in these cases. Since every divisible class is associated with a cyclic cover branched on the set of curves which is divisible, we obtain that if G appears in the list [46, Table 2] and $G \neq \mathfrak{A}_5, \mathfrak{A}_6, L_2(7), M_{20}$, then S admits a Galois cover. The uniqueness of M_G is proved in [46, Lemma6] and the fact that the embedding of M_G in the Néron–Severi group of a K3 surface implies the presence of a branched G -Galois cover is proved in [37] for the cyclic group G and in [44] for all the other groups $G \notin \{\mathfrak{A}_5, \mathfrak{A}_6, L_2(7), M_{20}\}$.

The cases of the ADE configuration B_G where $G \in \{\mathfrak{A}_5, \mathfrak{A}_6, L_2(7), M_{20}\}$ are discussed in [44]. More precisely, if $G \in \{\mathfrak{A}_5, \mathfrak{A}_6, L_2(7), M_{20}\}$, in [44, Question 3.1] and in the discussion below, the author proves that if $M_G = B_G$ admits a unique (up to isometry) embedding in Λ_{K3} , then all the K3 surfaces with the ADE configurations of curves given by B_G are G -covered by a K3 surface (essentially because the fundamental group of surfaces obtained removing the ADE configuration B_G is necessarily G). If $G = \mathfrak{A}_5, M_{20}$, then the embedding of $B_G = M_G$ in Λ_{K3} is unique, while if $G = \mathfrak{A}_6, L_2(7)$ there are two different embeddings of $B_G = M_G$ in Λ_{K3} (see [44]).

Nevertheless, if $G = \mathfrak{A}_6, L_2(7)$ there are also two different symplectic actions of G on a K3 surface. Indeed, a symplectic action of G on a K3 surface determines an action of G on Λ_{K3} and hence two lattices $\Gamma_G := \Lambda_{K3}^G$ and $\Omega_G := (\Lambda_{K3}^G)^\perp$. In [21] the lattices Γ_G are determined for each group G acting symplectically on a K3 surface. In particular, if $G \in \{\mathfrak{A}_6, L_2(7)\}$ there are two different lattices Γ_G^1 and Γ_G^2 , meaning that G has two different actions on Λ_{K3} , both related with a symplectic action on a K3 surface.

Let now Y_i , $i = 1, 2$ be a K3 surface whose transcendental lattice T_{Y_i} is isometric to Γ_G^i . Then Y_i admits a symplectic action of G , and Y_1 and Y_2 are general members of two different families of K3 surfaces with a symplectic action of G . Hence Y_i/G is a singular surfaces whose resolution S_i is a K3 surface containing an ADEs configuration B_G , and S_1 and S_2 are members of different families of K3 surfaces. Each of them corresponds to one of the two different embeddings of $B_G = M_G$ in Λ_{K3} . We conclude that each embedding of $B_G = M_G$ with $G \in \{\mathfrak{A}_6, L_2(7)\}$ corresponds to a K3 surface admitting a G -Galois cover. \square

Remark 3.14. By a direct inspection, there are no lattices in the list of Theorem 3.7 which are contained in the list in [46, Table 2]: this means that the lattices associated with the existence of a cover of a K3 surface S with another K3 surface do not contain any lattice associated with the existence of a cover of S with a torus.

Remark 3.15. Let Y be a K3 surface admitting a symplectic action of the group G . Let S be the resolution of Y/G and B_G the lattices generated by the curves resolving the singularities. Let X_{B_G} the contraction of B_G . Then $X_{B_G} = Y/G$ and the quasi-étale cover $Y \rightarrow Y/G = X_{B_G}$ is smooth. Vice versa, if a Galois quasi-étale cover of X_B (a contraction of a K3 surface S) is smooth, then it is induced by a quotient of a group G acting symplectically on the cover surface; in particular it is branched on all the singular points of X_B and B is either a B_G in [46, Table 2] or in the list of Theorem 3.6.

Remark 3.16. By point (2) of Proposition 3.13 if $G \in \{\mathfrak{A}_5, \mathfrak{A}_6, L_2(7), M_{20}\}$, then $B_G = M_G$. By [46, Table 2] we have the following:

- if $G = \mathfrak{A}_5$, then $B_G = A_4^{\oplus 2} \oplus A_2^{\oplus 3} \oplus A_1^{\oplus 4}$;
- if $G = \mathfrak{A}_6$, then $B_G = A_4^{\oplus 2} \oplus A_3^{\oplus 2} \oplus A_2^{\oplus 2} \oplus A_1$;
- if $G = L_2(7)$, then $B_G = A_6 \oplus A_3^{\oplus 2} \oplus A_2^{\oplus 3} \oplus A_1$;
- if $G = M_{20}$, then $B_G = D_4 \oplus A_4^{\oplus 2} \oplus A_2^{\oplus 3} \oplus A_1$.

If we let $\mathcal{S} := \{B_{\mathfrak{A}_5}, B_{\mathfrak{A}_6}, B_{L_2(7)}, B_{M_{20}}\}$, we have that if $M_G \simeq B_G \in \mathcal{S}$ the existence of an embedding of $B_G \in \mathcal{S}$ in the Néron–Severi group of a K3 surface S guarantees that S admits a G -Galois cover even if there are no divisible classes in B_G .

3.5. Simple symplectic surfaces. We are now in the position to prove a characterization of simple symplectic surfaces in terms of contractions of curves on a K3 surface, which is as follows:

Theorem 3.17. *Let S be a K3 surface, B an ADE configuration of smooth rational curves on S , $f_B : S \rightarrow X_B$ the contraction morphism, and suppose that X_B is an irreducible symplectic surface. The following are equivalent:*

- (1) *the surface X_B is simple symplectic;*
- (2) *for every subconfiguration B' of B appearing in [46, Table 2], there is no Galois covering of S branched along B' ;*
- (3) *there is no lattice M_G as in [46, Table 2] which is embedded $NS(S)$ and whose corresponding ADE configuration B_G is contained in B .*

Proof. Suppose first that X_B is simple, and let B' be a subconfiguration of B that appears in [46, Table 2]. Suppose that there is a Galois covering $\pi : W \rightarrow S$ branched along B' . Let $g : W \rightarrow W'$ be the contraction of the curves in $\pi^{-1}(B')$: hence there is a finite quasi-étale covering $\pi' : W' \rightarrow X_B$ whose degree is the one of π . This implies the existence of a non-trivial element of the fundamental group of the smooth locus of X_B , contradicting the fact that X_B is simple.

Conversely, suppose that for every subconfiguration B' of B appearing in [46, Table 2], there is no Galois covering of S branched along B' . If X_B was not simple, there would be a non-trivial finite quasi-étale covering $\pi : Y \rightarrow X_B$. Since X_B is an irreducible symplectic surface, the surface $Z := Y \times_{X_B} S$ has a K3 surface as a minimal model, and it is a finite covering of S . As in the proof of Theorem 3.7, this implies that S has a Galois covering by a surface that is birational to a K3 surface, hence by Theorem 3.8 the branch locus B' is in [46, Table 2]. Since B' is contained in the exceptional locus of f_B , which is B , we get a contradiction.

By Proposition 3.13, the existence of a Galois cover branched on B' implies that B' is one of the ADE configurations B_G appearing in [46, Table 2] and that the overlattice M_G of B_G is embedded in the Néron–Severi group of S . \square

As a particular case we get the following:

Corollary 3.18. *Let S be a K3 surface and B an ADE configuration of (-2) -curves on S that does not contain any configuration of [46, Table 2]. Then the contraction X_B of the curves in B is a simple symplectic surface.*

Proof. Since all the configurations listed in Theorem 3.6 contain at least one configuration in [46, Table 2], by Theorem 3.7 it follows that X_B is an irreducible symplectic surface. Now simply apply Theorem 3.17, which can be applied because B has no subconfigurations appearing in [46, Table 2]. \square

Example 3.19. We may now consider again the contraction of the ADE configuration $B_{\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}} \simeq A_1^{\oplus 8}$ for the K3 surfaces of the families F_1 and F_2 that were described in Example 3.11.

By Theorem 3.17 and Example 3.11, and using the fact that there is no subconfiguration of $B_{\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}}$ appearing in [46, Table 2] beside $B_{\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}}$ itself, we then get that the contraction of the curves of $B_{\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}}$ on a K3 surface in the family F_1 is a simple symplectic surface, while the contraction of the curves of $B_{\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}}$ on a K3 surface in the family F_2 is a non-simple irreducible symplectic surface.

Besides the cases of the configurations having a subconfiguration in the set \mathcal{S} defined in Remark 3.16, Theorem 3.17 allows us to get a complete characterization of simple symplectic surfaces. More precisely, we get the following, which is point (3) of Theorem 1.8:

Corollary 3.20. *Let S be a K3 surface, B an ADE configuration of (-2) -curves on S , and suppose that the contraction X_B of B is an irreducible symplectic surface. Then X_B is a simple symplectic surface if and only if the embedding of B in $NS(S)$ is primitive and B does not contain any configuration in the set \mathcal{S} defined in Remark 3.16.*

Proof. Suppose first that B is primitively embedded in $NS(S)$ and B does not contain any configuration in the set \mathcal{S} . If X_B admits a finite quasi-étale cover, then S admits a G -Galois cover branched on a subconfiguration of B . This implies that B contains a configuration B_G of curves and that $NS(S)$ contains primitively M_G . Since B does not contain any of the configuration of the set \mathcal{S} , we see that $G \neq \mathfrak{A}_5, \mathfrak{A}_6, L_2(7), M_{20}$ (see Remark 3.16), so by Proposition 3.13 the lattice M_G is a proper finite index overlattice of B_G , so B_G is not primitively embedded in $NS(S)$, getting a contradiction. It follows that X_B is simple.

Conversely, suppose that X_B is simple and that B is embedded in $NS(S)$, but either the embedding is not primitive or B contains a configuration in \mathcal{S} . This implies that either there is a divisible class in $NS(S)$, which forces the existence of a cyclic cover of S branched on the curves of the divisible class, or S admits a G -cover with $G \in \{\mathfrak{A}_5, \mathfrak{A}_6, L_2(7), M_{20}\}$. Hence S admits a Galois cover branched on some curves in B : this implies that X_B admits a quasi-étale Galois cover, contradicting the fact that X_B is simple. \square

As a conclusion of this section, we may summarize all the previous results in the following:

Theorem 3.21. *Let S be a K3 surface, B an ADE configuration of (-2) -curves on S and X_B the contraction of the curves in B .*

- *If B does not contain any configuration in the list 3.7, then:*
 - (1) *the surface X_B is irreducible symplectic;*

- (2) *the surface X_B is simple symplectic if and only if B is primitively embedded in $NS(S)$ and does not contain any configuration in \mathcal{S} .*
- *If B contains a configuration in the list in 3.7, then X_B is primitive symplectic but not irreducible symplectic.*

Remark 3.22. In the proof of Theorem 4.13 we will consider the ADE configurations which can appear on a K3 surface and which contains an ADE configuration which is an element of \mathcal{S} . In particular we obtain that there are exactly nine ADE configurations which do not satisfy the hypothesis “ B does not contain any configuration in \mathcal{S} ” of the previous theorem.

4. THE ADE CONFIGURATIONS ON K3 SURFACES

As we saw in the previous section, in order to classify all primitive symplectic surfaces, we need to provide a complete classification of all possible ADE configurations of (-2) -curves on K3 surfaces: the primitive symplectic surfaces are then the contractions of these ADE configurations; the irreducible symplectic surfaces are those obtained by contracting the configurations which do not contain any ADE configuration in the list of Theorem 3.7, and the simple ones are obtained by contracting a configuration which is primitively embedded in the Néron–Severi group and does not contain moreover the configurations in the set \mathcal{S} .

The aim of this section is to provide a complete list of the ADE configurations of (-2) -curves on K3 surfaces.

A synthetic description of the possible ADE configurations of (-2) -curves on K3 surfaces is provided in [42], where some conditions to find a complete list of these configurations are given, even if there is neither an explicit algorithm nor a complete list. The purpose of this section is to describe an explicit algorithm which provides such a complete list. Moreover, we identify the ADE configurations whose contraction produce irreducible or simple symplectic surfaces.

In order to do so, recall that an ADE configuration of rational curves on a K3 surface S corresponds to a lattice, namely the lattice spanned by the classes of these curves in the Néron–Severi lattice of S . A given ADE configuration B exists on a K3 surface S if and only if the associated lattice Λ can be embedded (not necessarily primitively) in the Néron–Severi of S . Hence, a K3 surface with a given ADE configuration B of (-2) -curves exists if and only if the lattice associated to B can be embedded (not necessarily primitively) in the lattice Λ_{K3} .

Let $\Lambda = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{\alpha} A_{a_i} \oplus \bigoplus_{j=1}^{\delta} D_{d_j} \oplus \bigoplus_{h=1}^{\epsilon} E_{e_h}$ be the lattice associated to an ADE configuration. The lattice Λ is a negative definite even lattice of rank

$$\text{rank}(\Lambda) = \sum_{i=1}^{\alpha} a_i + \sum_{j=1}^{\delta} d_j + \sum_{h=1}^{\epsilon} e_h.$$

Given a lattice L , the length $\ell(L)$ of L is the minimal number of generators of the discriminant group $A_L := L^\vee/L$. Recall moreover that the discriminant group A_L of a lattice L is naturally endowed with a quadratic form q_L induced by the bilinear form on L and called discriminant form.

The discriminant group and form of the ADE lattices are as follows:

$$(A_L, q_L) = \begin{cases} \left(\mathbb{Z}/(i+1)\mathbb{Z}, \left[-\frac{i}{i+1} \right] \right) & L = A_i \\ \left(\mathbb{Z}/4\mathbb{Z}, \left[\frac{-(2n+1)}{4} \right] \right) & L = D_{2n+1} \\ \left((\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})^2, \begin{bmatrix} -\frac{n}{2} & -\frac{1}{2} \\ -\frac{1}{2} & -1 \end{bmatrix} \right) & L = D_{2n} \\ (\{1\}, -) & L = E_8 \\ \left(\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}, \left[-\frac{3}{2} \right] \right) & L = E_7 \\ \left(\mathbb{Z}/3\mathbb{Z}, \left[-\frac{4}{3} \right] \right) & L = E_6. \end{cases}$$

Finally, we recall that the discriminant group of a direct sum of lattices is the product of the discriminant groups of each summands and the discriminant form is the one induced, i.e., two different summands are orthogonal with respect to the discriminant form and on each summand the discriminant form is the one of the associated lattice. This allows to compute the discriminant group, the discriminant form and the length of each possible ADE configuration.

Lemma 4.1. *If a negative definite lattice L is primitively embedded in Λ_{K3} , then $\text{rank}(L) \leq 19$ and $\ell(L) \leq \min(\text{rank}(L), 22 - \text{rank}(L))$.*

Proof. The lattice Λ_{K3} is the unique unimodular even lattice of signature $(3, 19)$ and the lattice Λ is an even negative definite lattice, so the result follows by [35, Theorem 1.12.2]. For the reader convenience we write an explicit proof.

Since L is negative definite, the rank of L has to be less than or equal to the one of the negative part of Λ_{K3} . Moreover, for every lattice M , $\ell(M) \leq \text{rank}(M)$, which clearly implies that $\ell(L) \leq \text{rank}(L)$. Since Λ_{K3} is unimodular and L is primitively embedded in Λ_{K3} , its orthogonal complement $L^{\perp \Lambda_{K3}}$ has the same discriminant group of L (see [35, Proposition 1.6.1]) and in particular the same length. So $\ell(L) = \ell(L^{\perp \Lambda_{K3}}) \leq \text{rank}(L^{\perp \Lambda_{K3}}) = 22 - \text{rank}(L)$, which concludes the proof. \square

Lemma 4.2. *Let $\Lambda := \bigoplus_{i=1}^{\alpha} A_{a_i} \bigoplus \bigoplus_{j=1}^{\delta} D_{d_j} \bigoplus \bigoplus_{h=1}^{\epsilon} E_{e_h}$.*

- (1) *If there exists a K3 surface S on which there is the ADE configuration of rational curves of type $\bigoplus_{i=1}^{\alpha} A_{a_i} \bigoplus \bigoplus_{j=1}^{\delta} D_{d_j} \bigoplus \bigoplus_{h=1}^{\epsilon} E_{e_h}$, then the lattice Λ is embedded in $NS(X)$ and hence in Λ_{K3} .*
- (2) *If the lattice Λ is primitively embedded in Λ_{K3} , then there exists a K3 surface S with an ADE configuration $\bigoplus_{i=1}^{\alpha} A_{a_i} \bigoplus \bigoplus_{j=1}^{\delta} D_{d_j} \bigoplus \bigoplus_{h=1}^{\epsilon} E_{e_h}$ of smooth disjoint rational curves.*

Proof. If S is a K3 surface on which there exists the required configuration, each curves of such a configuration is an algebraic class on X . Hence the lattice spanned by these curves is contained in $NS(S)$.

Conversely, if Λ can be primitively embedded in Λ_{K3} and Λ is a negative definite lattice, by the surjectivity of the period map there exists a K3 surface S (indeed a family of Λ -polarized K3 surfaces) such that $NS(S) \simeq \Lambda$. Then S is a non-projective K3 surface. By Riemann–Roch theorem, each class with self intersection -2 contained in the Néron–Severi group of a K3 surface is either effective, or the opposite of an effective class. So, up to a sign, we assume that the generators of Λ are effective and represent a possibly reducible curve. Since the ADE lattices are generated by their roots and $\rho(X) = \text{rank}(\Lambda)$, one obtains that there exists irreducible rational curves with the required configuration. \square

4.1. Divisible classes. Consider an ADE lattice Λ that is not primitively embedded in the lattice Λ_{K3} . There might be an overlattice Λ' of Λ of finite index which can be primitively embedded in Λ_{K3} , and in this case Λ is embedded (but not primitively) in Λ_{K3} . Under precise conditions on Λ'/Λ , this guarantees that the ADE configuration of curves attached to Λ appears on a K3 surface. This is exactly the case of the lattices $\Lambda = B_G$ and $\Lambda' = M_G$ considered in Proposition 3.13.

Our aim is to produce such an overlattice Λ' for a given lattice Λ . To do so, we will add to Λ some divisible classes, which are the generators of Λ'/Λ , as we explain now.

Let L be a lattice and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let v be a linear combination of the elements of a basis of L with coefficients in $\frac{1}{n}\mathbb{Z}$. If $\langle L, v \rangle$ is an even lattice, the linear combination v has to satisfy some conditions: first of all, in order to get that $\langle L, v \rangle$ is a lattice (with the natural pairing induced by \mathbb{Q} -linear extension by the one of L), we need to have $\lambda \cdot v \in \mathbb{Z}$ for every $\lambda \in \Lambda$, which implies $v \in L^\vee$. Moreover, in order to have that $\langle L, v \rangle$ is even, we need $v \cdot v \in 2\mathbb{Z}$. The two conditions we mentioned are well known and are equivalent to require that $v \in A_L$ spans an isotropic subspace of A_L with respect to the discriminant form q_L .

In our context, L is an ADE lattice Λ which is embedded in the Néron–Severi group of a K3 surface S , so we need moreover that the (-2) -classes generating Λ represent (up to a sign) smooth irreducible curves on S . This imposes several further restrictions on v , which in particular can not represent a -2 class, see e.g. [15] and [41].

So, to construct an overlattice Λ' of finite index of Λ , we have to add a class v such that $v \in L^\vee$, $v \cdot v \in 2\mathbb{Z}$ and $v \cdot v < -2$. By construction, $nv \in \Lambda$ is an effective class, which is divisible since $v \in NS(S)$.

Conversely, assume that a given set of smooth rational curves on a K3 surface S is divisible. Hence there exists a linear combination D (with integer coefficient) of these curves such that $\frac{1}{n}D \in NS(S)$ for some positive integer n . This implies that the lattice Λ spanned by the set of these smooth rational curves is embedded in $NS(S)$, but not primitively embedded, and that the lattice $\Lambda' := \langle \Lambda, \frac{1}{n}D \rangle$ is an overlattice of finite index of Λ embedded in $NS(S)$.

This shows that the existence of an overlattice Λ' of Λ of finite index which is embedded in $NS(S)$ is equivalent to the existence of a divisible class in $NS(S)$, and hence of a branched cover of S .

We preliminarily fix some notation:

- given an integer $n \geq 1$, let C_1, \dots, C_n be the irreducible curves in an A_n -configuration on a surface S numbered in such a way that $C_i C_{i+1} = 1$ for every $i = 1, \dots, n-1$ and $C_i C_j = 0$ if $|i-j| \geq 2$;
- given integers $n_1, \dots, n_m \geq 1$, we let $C_i^{(j)}$ be the irreducible curves in the configuration A_{n_j} , and $C_1^{(j)}, \dots, C_{n_j}^{(j)}$ are numbered as described in the previous point.
- we denote $\sum_{i=1}^{n_j} [\alpha_i]_n C_i^{(j)}$ the linear combination such that $\alpha_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $[\alpha_i]_n$ is the class of α_i in $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$.
- we let

$$[V]_n^{(j)} := \sum_{i=1}^{n_j} [i]_n C_i^{(j)}, \quad [kV]_n^{(j)} := \sum_{i=1}^{n_j} [ki]_n C_i^{(j)}.$$

In particular we observe that $[V]_n^{(j)}/n$ spans the discriminant group of A_{n_j} .

Proposition 4.3. *Let Λ be the lattice of an ADE configuration of rational curves on a K3 surface S and Λ' be an overlattice due to the presence of effective divisible classes. Then there are only a finite number of ways to construct Λ' , each of them obtained by adding a finite number of divisible classes, and in each case the lattice Λ has to contain a particular sublattice Γ that depends on the divisible classes one has to add. The lattices Λ with minimal rank which admit an overlattice with a prescribed lattice Λ'/Λ are listed in Table 1: the first column gives the number of divisible classes that are added; the second column gives the divisibility of the added classes; the third column gives the sublattice Γ ; the fourth column gives the class that becomes divisible; the fifth column gives the Galois group of the cover branched on all the divisible classes; the last column has a T if the cover is a torus, and has K3 otherwise.*

Proof. As a title of example we discuss the cases related with 2–divisible classes, which are essentially contained in [36] and [37].

In [36] it is proved that the 2–divisible classes of disjoint rational curves consists either of 8 or of 16 curves. In the first case the double cover surface is birational to a K3 surface, in the latter to a 2–dimensional complex torus.

Moreover, it is also proved that on a K3 surface there are at most 16 disjoint rational curves and if there are 16 rational curves, then they form a divisible set. In this case there are also other divisible classes, which are the one described in the case 5).

Assume now that there are less than 16 disjoint rational curve. Each divisible classe is of the sum of 8 curves, and two different divisible classes have share some curves. Moreover, If v_1 and v_2 are two 2–divisible classes sharing k curves, then $v_1 + v_2$ gives a divisible class which is the sum of $16 - 2k$ curves, so that $k = 4$.

It follows that all the 2–divisible classes are given by the sum of 8 disjoint rational curves, and that two classes have exactly 4 curves in common. This forces the choice of the classes v_1, v_2, v_3 and v_4 to be as described. This is due to Nikulin and contained in [37].

All the other cases in which the cover is a K3 surface are discussed in [37], the ones in which the cover is a torus are discussed in [5]. \square

We now notice that the existence of a divisible class of order pq with $(p, q) = 1$ is equivalent to the existence of both a p -divisible class and of a q -divisible class. Since by [37] the order of the divisible class is at most 8, combining the previous results one obtains the cases which are covers with Galois groups $\mathbb{Z}/6\mathbb{Z}$ (composition of cyclic covers by $\mathbb{Z}/3\mathbb{Z}$ and $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$) and $\mathbb{Z}/6\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$ (composition of the Galois cover with Galois groups $(\mathbb{Z}/2)^2$ and $\mathbb{Z}/3\mathbb{Z}$).

Remark 4.4. In Proposition 4.3, we consider the lattices Λ with minimal rank among those admitting a given set of divisible classes. Of course, the configurations listed in Proposition 4.3 may appear as sublattices of other ADE configurations of higher rank. For example, the lattice A_7 contains the lattice $A_3^{\oplus 2}$, and so if one is looking for e.g. the configuration $A_3^{\oplus 4} \oplus A_1^{\oplus 2}$, one can find it embedded in $A_7^{\oplus 2} \oplus A_1^{\oplus 2}$. Similar phenomena appear considering the lattices D_n, E_6 and E_7 . For example, the lattice D_5 contains $A_3 \oplus A_1$ and the generator of A_{D_5} contains classes both in

TABLE 1. Possibilities for overlattices of a given ADE lattice

m	n_i	Γ		$G = \Lambda'/\Lambda$	
1	2	$A_1^{\oplus 8}$	$\sum_{j=1}^8 [V]_2^{(j)}$	$\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$	K3
2	2 2	$A_1^{\oplus 12}$	$\sum_{j=1}^8 [V]_2^{(j)} + \sum_{h=9}^{12} [V]_2^{(h)}$	$(\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})^2$	K3
3	2 2 2	$A_1^{\oplus 14}$	$\sum_{j=1}^8 [V]_2^{(j)} + \sum_{h=9}^{12} [V]_2^{(h)} + \sum_{j=0}^4 \left([V]_2^{(1+4j)} + [V]_2^{(4j+2)} \right)$	$(\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})^3$	K3
4	2 2 2 2	$A_1^{\oplus 15}$	$\sum_{j=1}^8 [V]_2^{(j)} + \sum_{h=9}^{12} [V]_2^{(h)} + \sum_{j=0}^4 \left([V]_2^{(1+4j)} + [V]_2^{(4j+2)} \right) + \sum_{j=1}^8 [V]_2^{(2j-1)}$	$(\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})^4$	K3
5	2 2 2 2	$A_1^{\oplus 16}$	$\sum_{j=1}^8 [V]_2^{(j)} + \sum_{h=9}^{12} [V]_2^{(h)} + \sum_{j=0}^4 \left([V]_2^{(1+4j)} + [V]_2^{(4j+2)} \right) + \sum_{j=1}^8 [V]_2^{(2j-1)} + \sum_{j=1}^{16} [V]_2^{(i)}$	$(\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})^5$	T
1	3	$A_2^{\oplus 6}$	$\sum_{i=1}^6 [V]_3^{(i)}$	$\mathbb{Z}/3\mathbb{Z}$	K3
2	3 3	$A_2^{\oplus 8}$	$\sum_{j=1}^6 [V]_3^{(j)} + \sum_{h=7}^9 [2V]_3^{(h)}$	$(\mathbb{Z}/3\mathbb{Z})^2$	K3
3	3 3 3	$A_2^{\oplus 9}$	$\sum_{j=1}^6 [V]_3^{(j)} + \sum_{h=7}^9 [2V]_3^{(h)} + \sum_{j=1}^4 \left([V]_3^{(2j-1)} + [2V]_3^{(2j)} \right) + [V]_3^{(9)}$	$(\mathbb{Z}/3\mathbb{Z})^3$	T
1	5	$A_4^{\oplus 4}$	$\sum_{i=1}^2 [V]_5^{(2i-1)} + [2V]_5^{(2i)}$	$\mathbb{Z}/5\mathbb{Z}$	K3
1	7	$A_6^{\oplus 3}$	$[V]_7^{(1)} + [2V]_7^{(2)} + [3V]_7^{(3)}$	$\mathbb{Z}/7\mathbb{Z}$	K3
1	4	$A_3^{\oplus 4} \oplus A_1^{\oplus 2}$	$\sum_{i=1}^4 [V]_4^{(i)} + \sum_j = 5^6 [V]_2^{(j)}$	$\mathbb{Z}/4\mathbb{Z}$	K3
2	4 2	$A_3^{\oplus 4} \oplus A_1^{\oplus 4}$	$\sum_{i=1}^4 [V]_4^{(i)} + \sum_{j=5}^6 [V]_2^{(j)} + \sum_{i=1}^2 [2V]_4^{(i)} + \sum_{j=5}^8 [V]_2^{(j)}$	$\mathbb{Z}/4\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$	K3
2	4 4	$A_3^{\oplus 6}$	$\sum_{i=1}^4 [V]_4^{(i)} + [2V]_4^{(5)} + [2V]_4^{(2)} + [3V]_4^{(2)} + \sum_{i=3}^6 [V]_4^{(i)}$	$(\mathbb{Z}/4\mathbb{Z})^2$	K3
3	4 2 2	$A_3^{\oplus 4} \oplus A_1^{\oplus 6}$	$\sum_{i=1}^4 [V]_4^{(i)} + \sum_{j=5}^6 [V]_2^{(j)} + \sum_{i=1}^2 [2V]_4^{(i)} + \sum_{j=5}^8 [V]_2^{(j)} + \sum_{i=2}^3 [2V]_4^{(i)} + \sum_{j=5}^6 [V]_2^{(j)} + \sum_{h=9}^{10} [V]_2^{(h)}$	$(\mathbb{Z}/4\mathbb{Z}) \times (\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})^2$	T
1	8	$A_7^{\oplus 2} \oplus A_3 \oplus A_1$	$[V]_8^{(1)} + [3V]_8^{(2)} + [V]_4^{(3)} + [V]_2^{(4)}$	$\mathbb{Z}/8\mathbb{Z}$	K3

the copy of A_3 and in the copy of A_1 embedded in D_5 . If one is looking for e.g. the configuration $A_3^{\oplus 4} \oplus A_1^{\oplus 2}$, one can find it embedded in $D_5^{\oplus 2} \oplus A_3^{\oplus 2}$ (with each of the two copies of $A_3 \oplus A_1$ embedded in on D_5). We don't describe all these kinds

of embeddings, since this would produce a long and tedious list, but the program described in Section 5 recognises and uses all of them.

All the previous results lead to the main one of this section:

Theorem 4.5. *A K3 surface S contains an ADE configuration of smooth rational curves associated to a lattice Λ if and only if either Λ or an overlattice of finite index Λ' of Λ obtained as in Proposition 4.3 is primitively embedded in Λ_{K3} .*

Proof. The result is a consequence of Lemma 4.2 and of the fact that when one adds the divisible classes described in Proposition 4.3, one is not adding (-2) -classes. This guarantees that the (-2) -classes generating Λ are (up to a sing) classes of smooth irreducible rational curves, see e.g. [15, Proposition 3.2] and [41, Corollary 1.2]. \square

Hence, in order to establish if a K3 surface with a given ADE configuration B of rational curves exists, one just needs to understand if the lattice Λ associated to B , or an overlattice Λ' obtained from Λ by adding divisible classes as in Proposition 4.3 is primitively embedded in Λ_{K3} . This is a completely lattice theoretical problem, and will be treated in the next section.

4.2. Finding the list of all the ADE configurations of rational curves.

In order to determine if a given lattice Λ or one of the overlattices Λ' one may construct as described in Proposition 4.3 are primitively embedded in Λ_{K3} , we start by recalling some of the results of Nikulin about the existence of an embedding of a lattice into a unimodular one. We observe that Λ (and hence its overlattice Λ') is, in our context, a negative definite lattice, since the ADE-lattices are negative definite.

The main result is [35, Theorem 1.12.2], that we state here under the assumption that the unimodular lattice is Λ_{K3} and the lattice Λ is negative definite, which is the case of our interest. In the following, if Λ is a lattice, we will let Λ_p be the p -adic lattice.

Theorem 4.6. *Let M be a negative definite even lattice with discriminant form q_M . The following properties are equivalent:*

- *There is a primitive embedding of M into Λ_{K3} with rank $\text{rank}(M)$, signature $(\text{rank}(M), 0)$ and discriminant form q_M .*
- *The following conditions are simultaneously satisfied:*
 - (1) $\text{rank}(M) \leq 19$, $22 - \text{rank}(M) \geq \ell(M)$;
 - (2) *if p is an odd prime such that $22 - \text{rank}(M) = \ell(M_p)$, then we have that $-|A_M| = d(q_{A_{M_p}}) \pmod{(\mathbb{Z}_p^*)^2}$;*
 - (3) *if $22 - \text{rank}(M) = \ell(M_2)$ then either $q_M = q_{\langle 2 \rangle} \oplus q_{M'}$ for a certain lattice M' or $|A_M| = \pm d(q_{A_{M_p}}) \pmod{(\mathbb{Z}_2^*)^2}$.*

The previous Theorem has an important consequence, which is [35, Corollary 1.12.3], that again we state here under the assumption that the unimodular lattice is Λ_{K3} and Λ is negative definite.

Corollary 4.7. *If M is a lattice such that $\text{rank}(M) \leq 19$ and $\ell(M) \leq 21 - \text{rank}(M)$, then there exists a primitive embedding of M in Λ_{K3} .*

We first construct all the possible ADE configurations whose corresponding lattice Λ is such that $\text{rank}(\Lambda) \leq 19$, and we let \mathcal{L}_{tot} be the list of all the corresponding lattices.

Starting from \mathcal{L}_{tot} we extract the sublist \mathcal{L}_{real} of the ADE configurations that are realized as ADE configurations of (-2) -curves on some K3 surfaces. To do so we consider the following procedure which has to be applied to each $\Lambda \in \mathcal{L}_{tot}$.

- (1) First, construct the overlattice Λ' of Λ of maximal finite index r (possibly $r = 1$) as in Proposition 4.3. If Λ' satisfies Corollary 4.7 then Λ' can be primitively embedded in Λ_{K3} : in this case $\Lambda \in \mathcal{L}_{real}$ and the procedure ends.
- (2) If Λ is not as in (1), and $\ell(\Lambda') > 22 - \text{rank}(\Lambda) = 22 - \text{rank}(\Lambda')$, then Λ is not in \mathcal{L}_{real} and the procedure ends.
- (3) If Λ is not as in (1) and (2), then $\ell(\Lambda') = 22 - \text{rank}(\Lambda) = 22 - \text{rank}(\Lambda')$; we check if conditions (2) and (3) of Theorem 4.6 are satisfied: Λ is contained in \mathcal{L}_{real} if and only if both conditions are satisfied (for every prime p) and the procedure ends.

By Corollary 2.3, the list \mathcal{L}_{real} gives the list of all possible primitive symplectic surfaces. The calculations to compile the list \mathcal{L}_{real} described in the previous procedure will be performed using some GAP4 and SAGE programs, that we describe in the next section.

Remark 4.8. There is a delicate point in step (3) of the previous procedure. If $\Lambda \neq \Lambda'$ and $\ell(\Lambda') = 22 - rk(\Lambda')$, then one has to check the discriminant form of the overlattice Λ' in order to determine if it admits a primitive embedding in Λ_{K3} (indeed one has to check the conditions (2) and (3) in Theorem 4.6).

The discriminant form depends on the divisible classes we are adding. It is possible that there exists two overlattices Λ'_1 and Λ'_2 of Λ such that $\left| \frac{\Lambda'_1}{\Lambda} \right| = \left| \frac{\Lambda'_2}{\Lambda} \right|$ (so $\ell(\Lambda'_1) = \ell(\Lambda'_2)$) but the discriminant forms of Λ'_1 and of Λ'_2 are different: this implies that the generators of $\frac{\Lambda'_1}{\Lambda}$ are not mapped to the ones of $\frac{\Lambda'_2}{\Lambda}$ by an isometry of Λ .

As a consequence it is possible that exactly one between Λ'_1 and Λ'_2 admits a primitive embedding in Λ_{K3} . Of course if at least one of them admits such an embedding, Λ is an admissible ADE configuration, i.e., $\Lambda \in \mathcal{L}_{real}$.

This implies that if a lattice Λ does not fall into the steps (1) and (2) of the previous procedure, in order to establish if $\Lambda \in \mathcal{L}_{real}$ one has to check the conditions (2) and (3) of Theorem 4.6 for all the possible overlattices of Λ such that $\ell(\Lambda') = 22 - rk(\Lambda')$ (and not just for one). If the conditions are satisfied for at least one overlattice, then $\Lambda \in \mathcal{L}_{real}$.

For computational reasons our algorithm produces only one overlattice Λ' and not all of them. Hence a priori it is possible that the algorithm discards lattices which have to be considered because the choice of the divisible classes is not the right one. However, we are able to recognise these cases by comparing our list with the criterion given by Shimada, as explained in Remark 5.1.

To conclude the proof of Theorem 1.9 we will finally provide a partition of \mathcal{L}_{real} into two subsets \mathcal{L}_{Kum} and \mathcal{L}_{irr} where Λ is in \mathcal{L}_{Kum} if and only if Λ contains one of the lattices listed in Theorem 3.6: as a consequence, by Theorem 3.7 the list \mathcal{L}_{irr} provides the list of all possible irreducible symplectic surfaces, while the list \mathcal{L}_{Kum}

provides the list of all primitive symplectic surfaces having a finite quasi-étale covering by a 2-dimensional complex torus. We now characterize these configurations:

Proposition 4.9. *There are exactly 10 ADE configurations on K3 surfaces whose contraction is a singular K3 surface which admits a quasi-étale cover by a complex torus and in particular is not a singular irreducible symplectic surface. These ADE configurations are exactly those listed in Theorem 3.6.*

Proof. By Theorem 3.7, the ADE configurations whose contraction is a singular surface having a finite quasi-étale cover that is a torus have to contain one of the ADE configurations B_1, \dots, B_{10} listed in Theorem 3.6. As the ADE configurations on a K3 surface have rank at most 19, and as the configurations B_5, \dots, B_{10} have rank 19, it follows that if B is an ADE configuration of (-2) -curves on a K3 surface contains B_i for $i = 5, \dots, 10$, then $B = B_i$.

Suppose now that B is an ADE configuration of (-2) -curves on a K3 surface S that contains $B_1 = A_1^{\oplus 16}$. The finite index overlattice of $A_1^{\oplus 16}$ which is contained in Λ_{K3} contains five 2-divisible classes, and there are no overlattices of an ADE configuration on K3 surfaces which contain more than five 2-divisible classes (see [36]).

If B contains properly B_1 , its rank has to be $r = 16 + h$ for some $h > 0$, and its length has to be $\ell = 16 + x$ for some $x \geq 0$. The finite index overlattices of the lattice Λ associated to B which are due to the presence of 2-divisible classes in Λ have rank r and length $\ell' = 6 + x$. The condition $\ell' \leq \min(r, 22 - r)$ is $6 + x \leq 6 - h$ therefore $x \leq -h$ which is impossible, so $B = B_1$.

Let us now suppose that B contains $B_2 = A_2^{\oplus 9}$: the finite index overlattice of $A_2^{\oplus 9}$ which is contained in Λ_{K3} contains three 3-divisible classes and there are no overlattices of ADE configurations on K3 surfaces which contain more than three 3-divisible classes. The argument for this is similar to the one of the previous case: if there were other divisible classes, the minimal model of the cover branched on the associated curves should be a surface with trivial canonical bundle and Euler characteristic different from 0 and 24, which is impossible.

The same proof of the previous case implies that $B = B_2$ or $B = B_2 \oplus A_1$. In the latter case the rank is 19, and the length of the finite index overlattice obtained adding the 3-divisible classes is 3. Hence one has to check the discriminant form and in particular condition (2) in Theorem 4.6. A direct computation shows that this lattice does not admit a primitive embedding in Λ_{K3} , so $B = B_2$.

Similar arguments apply to the cases (3) and (4) of Theorem 3.6. \square

Remark 4.10. There is a more geometric argument to show that an ADE configuration Λ which properly contains a configuration Γ in Theorem 3.6 does not appear on a K3 surface, at least when $\Lambda = \Gamma \oplus R$ for an ADE configuration R . Indeed, let S be the K3 surface containing the ADE configuration Λ , $f : A \rightarrow S$ be the cover of S branched on Γ and $\beta : A \rightarrow A'$ be the contraction of A to its minimal model A' . The inverse image $f^{-1}(R)$ of R consists of rational curves, which are not (-1) -curves and are disjoint from the curves contracted by β (the curves contracted by β lie on $f^{-1}(\Gamma)$). So A' would be a torus containing rational curves, which is impossible. The argument is more delicate if Γ is not a direct summand of Λ , since in this case the rational curves in A intersect some (-1) -curves and one should exclude that they are contracted by β .

We are now ready to state and prove the following, which provides the proof of points (1) and (2) of Theorem 1.9:

Theorem 4.11. *The list \mathcal{L}_{real} contains 5836 lattices and for all $\Lambda \in \mathcal{L}_{real}$ the exists a $20 - \text{rank}(\Lambda)$ dimensional family of K3 surfaces whose generic element contains an ADE-configuration B of smooth rational curves associated Λ .*

The list \mathcal{L}_{Kum} contains 10 lattices. For each $\Lambda \in \mathcal{L}_{Kum}$, the contraction X_B of a configuration B associated to Λ is a primitive symplectic surface which is not irreducible symplectic.

The list \mathcal{L}_{irr} contains 5826 lattices. For each $\Lambda \in \mathcal{L}_{irr}$, the contraction X_B of a configuration B associated to Λ is an irreducible symplectic surface.

Proof. The number of lattices contained in each list is the output of the algorithm implemented on SAGE and described in details in the next Section. By Theorem 4.5, if $\Lambda \in \mathcal{L}_{real}$ and Λ' is constructed as in point (1) of the previous algorithm, the family of the K3 surfaces such that Λ' is primitively embedded in their Néron–Severi group generically contains K3 surfaces which admits the ADE configuration described by Λ as set of rational curves. Since Λ' is an overlattice of finite index of Λ , $\text{rank}(\Lambda) = \text{rank}(\Lambda')$ and the family of the K3 surfaces such that Λ' is primitively embedded in their Néron–Severi group has dimension $20 - \text{rank}(\Lambda')$. The results on the sublist \mathcal{L}_{Kum} and \mathcal{L}_{irr} are a consequence of Theorem 3.7. \square

The algorithm described above can be refined in order to obtain the ADE configurations whose contraction produce a simple symplectic surface, and hence proving point (3) of Theorem 1.9.

Definition 4.12. *We consider the following two sets of lattices:*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T} &= \{D_4 \oplus A_4^{\oplus 2} \oplus A_2^{\oplus 3} \oplus A_1, D_5 \oplus A_4^{\oplus 2} \oplus A_2^{\oplus 2} \oplus A_1^{\oplus 2}, D_7 \oplus A_4 \oplus A_2^{\oplus 3} \oplus A_1^{\oplus 2}, \\ &E_6 \oplus A_4^{\oplus 2} \oplus A_2 \oplus A_1^{\oplus 3}, E_8 \oplus A_4 \oplus A_2^{\oplus 2} \oplus A_1^{\oplus 3}\}; \\ \mathcal{S} &= \{B_{\mathfrak{A}_5}, B_{\mathfrak{A}_6}, B_{L_2(7)}, B_{M_{20}}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 4.13. *There are 4697 ADE configurations which correspond to simple symplectic surfaces. They are the ADE configuration whose lattice Λ is primitively embedded in Λ_{K3} (without adding further divisible classes) with the exception of the lattices contained in $\mathcal{S} \cup \mathcal{T}$.*

Proof. By Corollary 3.20, we have to consider the ADE lattices $\Lambda \in \mathcal{L}_{irr}$ such that Λ admits a primitive embedding in Λ_{K3} , and in particular it is not necessary to add a divisible class (since each divisible class gives rise to a cyclic cover). Moreover, the lattices in \mathcal{S} correspond to Galois covers even if they do not contain divisible classes, by [46, Table 2].

The lattices $B_{\mathfrak{A}_6}, B_{L_2(7)}, B_{M_{20}} \in \mathcal{S}$ have rank 19, so there are no higher rank lattices containing one of them and which is contained in \mathcal{L}_{irr} .

The lattice $B_{\mathfrak{A}_5} = A_4^{\oplus 2} \oplus A_2^{\oplus 3} \oplus A_1^{\oplus 4}$ has rank 18. If a rank 19 lattice Λ contains primitively $B_{\mathfrak{A}_5}$, then there exists a Galois \mathfrak{A}_5 -cover of the K3 surfaces containing the ADE configuration corresponding to Λ , because these K3 surfaces are at the boundary of the family of K3 surfaces whose Néron–Severi group is $B_{\mathfrak{A}_5}$ and the K3 surfaces in this family admit the required cover by [46]. So we look for the rank 19 lattices containing $B_{\mathfrak{A}_5}$. These may be obtained in four ways: by adding to $B_{\mathfrak{A}_5}$ a copy of A_1 ; by adding a root to one of the A_j lattices appearing as direct summands of $B_{\mathfrak{A}_5}$; by connecting two direct summands A_j and A_i of $B_{\mathfrak{A}_5}$ with an

extra root; by connecting three direct summands A_i , A_j and A_k of B_{2l_5} with an extra root. The lattices one obtains in this way are:

- $A_4^{\oplus 2} \oplus A_2^{\oplus 3} \oplus A_1^{\oplus 5}$,
- $A_4^{\oplus 2} \oplus A_2^{\oplus 4} \oplus A_1^{\oplus 3}$,
- $A_4^{\oplus 2} \oplus A_3 \oplus A_2^{\oplus 2} \oplus A_1^{\oplus 4}$,
- $A_5 \oplus A_4 \oplus A_2^{\oplus 3} \oplus A_1^{\oplus 4}$,
- $D_5 \oplus A_4 \oplus A_2^{\oplus 3} \oplus A_1^{\oplus 4}$,
- $A_4^{\oplus 2} \oplus A_3 \oplus A_2^{\oplus 3} \oplus A_1^{\oplus 2}$,
- $A_4^{\oplus 3} \oplus A_2^{\oplus 2} \oplus A_1^{\oplus 3}$,
- $A_6 \oplus A_4 \oplus A_2^{\oplus 3} \oplus A_1^{\oplus 3}$,
- $E_6 \oplus A_4 \oplus A_2^{\oplus 3} \oplus A_1^{\oplus 3}$,
- $A_5 \oplus A_4^{\oplus 2} \oplus A_2 \oplus A_1^{\oplus 4}$,
- $A_7 \oplus A_4 \oplus A_2^{\oplus 2} \oplus A_1^{\oplus 4}$,
- $E_7 \oplus A_4 \oplus A_2^{\oplus 2} \oplus A_1^{\oplus 4}$,
- $A_9 \oplus A_2^{\oplus 3} \oplus A_1^{\oplus 4}$,
- $D_4 \oplus A_4^{\oplus 2} \oplus A_2^{\oplus 3} \oplus A_1$,
- $D_5 \oplus A_4^{\oplus 2} \oplus A_2^{\oplus 2} \oplus A_1^{\oplus 2}$,
- $D_7 \oplus A_4 \oplus A_2^{\oplus 3} \oplus A_1^{\oplus 2}$,
- $E_6 \oplus A_4^{\oplus 2} \oplus A_2 \oplus A_1^{\oplus 3}$,
- $E_8 \oplus A_4 \oplus A_2^{\oplus 2} \oplus A_1^{\oplus 3}$.

A direct inspection on the output of the program described in Section 5, shows that exactly the last five lattices are primitively embedded in Λ_{K3} . These are the lattices contained in the set \mathcal{T} defined above.

By [46, Table 2] and the discussion above, the lattices in $\mathcal{S} \cup \mathcal{T}$ correspond to the branch locus of a cover of a K3 surface by a surface birational to a K3, hence they do not correspond to simple symplectic surfaces. \square

For each $\Lambda \in \mathcal{L}_{real}$ we now consider again point (1) of the previous algorithm: the lattice Λ' is the finite index overlattice of Λ (constructed as in Proposition 4.3) with maximal index r . If $r = 1$, $\Lambda = \Lambda'$ and Λ is necessarily primitively embedded in Λ_{K3} : this determines at least one family of K3 surfaces whose Néron–Severi group contains primitively Λ . We don't know a priori if the primitive embedding of Λ in Λ_{K3} is unique up to isometries, so we don't know if this determines just one family or more than one.

If $r > 1$, Λ' is primitively embedded in Λ_{K3} and this determines at least one family of K3 surfaces whose generic member admits an ADE configuration associated to Λ . But it is possible that there exists another lattice Λ'' such that $\Lambda \hookrightarrow \Lambda'' \hookrightarrow \Lambda'$, where all the inclusions are of finite non trivial index, and Λ'' admits a primitive embedding in Λ_{K3} . In this case there is also a family of K3 surfaces associated to the primitive embedding Λ'' in Λ_{K3} , and the generic member of this family admits as well the ADE configuration associated to Λ . As $\Lambda' \neq \Lambda''$, we conclude that there are at least two different families of K3 surfaces whose generic member admits the same ADE configuration of curves, described by the lattice Λ . This is exactly the phenomenon described in Example 3.11 with $\Lambda = \Lambda'' = A_1^{\oplus 8}$ and $\Lambda' = N$; see also Theorem 4.14 below for the the cases $\Lambda = A_1^{\oplus k}$, $k = 1, \dots, 15$.

In conclusion, the same ADE configuration of rational curves may correspond to more than one family essentially for two different reasons: either there are several different finite index overlattices of Λ which can be primitively embedded in Λ_{K3} ;

or there is an overlattice of finite index (possibly 1) of Λ having more than one primitive embedding in Λ_{K3} . This second phenomenon appears for example for the lattices $B_{\mathfrak{A}_6}$ and $B_{L_2(7)}$, see [44, Discussion below Question 3.1] and the proof of Proposition 3.13.

As a matter of example we focus our attention on irreducible symplectic surfaces with the simplest possible singularities, i.e., A_1 singularities. In this case the same configuration of curves may correspond to more than one family, and the first phenomenon described above appears. As above we denote Λ' the overlattice of maximal finite index of an ADE configuration Λ obtained as in Proposition 4.3.

Theorem 4.14. *Let X be a symplectic surface with k singular points, all of type A_1 . Then $k \leq 16$ and X is obtained by contracting an ADE configuration associated to the lattice $\Lambda \simeq A_1^{\oplus k}$ on a K3 surface S . Let moreover X be an irreducible symplectic surface, then $k \leq 15$ and:*

- (1) *if $1 \leq k \leq 7$, then $\Lambda = \Lambda'$ and X is simple;*
- (2) *if $k = 8, 9, 10, 11$ then $\Lambda'/\Lambda = \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$ and there are two possibilities: either Λ is primitively embedded in Λ_{K3} and X is simple or Λ' is primitively embedded in Λ_{K3} and X is not simple;*
- (3) *if $k \geq 12$, then X is not simple and the following possibilities appear:*
 - *if $k = 12$ then $\Lambda'/\Lambda = (\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})^2$ and either Λ' is primitively embedded in $NS(S)$ or Λ'' is primitively embedded in $NS(S)$, where Λ'' is an overlattice of index 2 of Λ ;*
 - *if $k = 13, 14, 15$ then $\Lambda'/\Lambda = (\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})^{k-11}$ and the minimal primitive overlattice of Λ primitively embedded in $NS(S)$ is necessarily Λ' .*
- (4) *there are 21 irreducible families of symplectic surfaces with singularities of type A_1 , among them 20 correspond to irreducible symplectic surfaces and among them 11 correspond to simple surfaces. The general member is non-projective.*

Proof. The Theorem follows directly by checking the overlattices of $A_1^{\oplus k}$ constructed in Proposition 4.3 which admit a primitive embedding in Λ_{K3} (applying the algorithm described above). See also [36] and [16, Theorem 8.6, Corollary 8.9, Remark 8.10] for more detailed computations in case $k = 16$ and $k \leq 15$ respectively. \square

By the previous theorem (as by Example 3.11) we see that the same ADE configuration could correspond to different families of irreducible symplectic surfaces, and it could happen that one of them is a family of simple symplectic surfaces, the others are not.

5. ABOUT THE GAP4 AND SAGE SCRIPTS FOR SINGULAR K3 SURFACES

In this section we explain the GAP4 program `ADE_K3_Vectors_for_SAGE.gap` and the SAGE program `ADE_X_SAGE_v2.sage` we used to determine the singular symplectic surfaces whose quasi-étale covers are birational only to K3 surfaces, and therefore yielding irreducible symplectic surfaces.

As explained in section 4, the first step is to present the list \mathcal{L}_{tot} of all possible ADE configurations according to the Picard rank rk of their associated lattices for a potential primitive symplectic surfaces.

By Lemma 4.1 we have that $1 \leq rk \leq 19$. Recall that, geometrically, lattices of ADE type occur as configurations of exceptional divisors of minimal resolutions

of rational double points. Therefore they come with a natural intersection matrix (see e.g. [24, Chapter 14]).

The list `All_Possible_ADE_List` presents the list \mathcal{L}_{tot} of all of ADE type lattices, and it is provided by the function `CompileADEList`, which takes as input a positive integer rk (the rank of the lattice) and returns the list of all possible ADE configurations whose associated lattice has rank rk .

This function is purely combinatoric: it takes the rank of ADE singularities and adds them up until it reaches the rank. As a matter of example, the rank of the configuration $A_2 \oplus D_4 \oplus E_8$ is 14. These data are then stored into a record `dato` of the form:

```
dato:=rec(SingTypeA=[0,1], SingTypeD=[1], SingTypeE=[0,0,1]).
```

Of course this does not mean that there exists a K3 surface that is the resolution of this configuration of singularities: as explained in section 4 only few of these lattices are really attached to a K3 surface, and one needs a more delicate analysis of each lattice.

The second step is to attach to each ADE configuration its intersection matrix. This is done by the functions `BM_ADE`, that take as input the record `dato` and presents as output the enriched record `dato` (with the same name) with the intersection matrix of the configuration.

We are now in the position to check if the configuration yields a primitive symplectic surface.

To do so we first make use of the following algorithm applying Lemma 4.3:

```
Require: List  $L := \text{All\_Possible\_ADE\_List}$  of data, where each dato is a record
containing the singularities and the intersection matrix
for dato  $\in L$  do
  if We can add a two divisible class to dato then
    Add a two divisible class to dato updating with it the record;
  end if
end for
return (All_Possible_ADE_List)
```

After running the previous algorithm, the list `All_Possible_ADE_List` contains the data that are updated, i.e if one can add a 2-divisible class it has been added to the record. Then we perform the very same algorithm in the search of a second 2-divisible class, and we do this four times adding up to four 2-divisible independent vectors.

Afterwards, instead of considering 2-divisible classes we look at 3-divisible classes and add all of them. We perform this new algorithm two times.

Finally we look for 4-divisible classes and we perform the algorithm only once.

The function `Compile_ADE_List_with_vectors` of the program, which has as input the list `All_Possible_ADE_List`, outputs a printed list of lattices providing their intersection matrices, and with the list of divisible classes that we have been added.

This last list deserves now a more careful analysis since we have to check the conditions $\ell \leq 22 - rk$, and if we have equality we have to check the conditions given in Theorem 4.6 [35, Theorem 1.12.2].

To do so we transfer the list to SAGE, where `associated_dynkin_lattice` returns the intersection matrix of the overlattice of each given lattice adding the divisible classes, whenever there are divisible classes that can be added.

Now we calculate the length ℓ of the discriminant group of all these overlattices and check if $\ell < 22 - rk$. If this is the case then the lattice is added to the list `GoodList` of lattices that correspond to a K3 surface and also to an irreducible symplectic surface (see the Remark 5.2).

If $\ell > 22 - rk$, the data is added to the list `DistList` of discarded cases. Finally, if $\ell = 22 - rk$ the lattice is added to the list `NikList` of the cases that deserve the study of the genus of their bilinear intersection form.

At this point SAGE's implemented routines calculate the genus of each lattice (or intersection matrix) and we can read from it the conditions of Theorem 4.6 in a case by case analysis: this is done by the function `Nikulin_Test_Final`.

The final product of this program is the required list of configurations that correspond to irreducible symplectic surfaces.

All the scripts of the programs and the lists (SAGE input and output) can be found at the following web site.

<https://github.com/TeoGini/Singular-K3-Surfaces>

Remark 5.1. We have checked the consistency of our algorithm with the results provided by Shimada in [42]. Initially, we found some discrepancies, which we determined were due to the following reasons: our algorithm does not account for 8-divisible classes for example, and when searching for divisible classes to add, it does not ensure they are sufficient to achieve the optimal overlattice as explained in Remark 4.8. Through a meticulous, case-by-case examination, our list is now consistent with Shimada's. All the initially different cases are pointed out in the github files `Input_ADE_SAGE.zip`.

Remark 5.2. Warnings: the algorithm we described discharges the configurations listed in Theorem 3.6, for example $A_1^{\oplus 16}$ that corresponds to the Kummer K3 surface. This is because we perform the algorithm adding 2-divisible classes only four times, and in order to get the configuration $A_1^{\oplus 16}$ we would have needed to run the algorithm a fifth time to find the missing fifth 2-divisible class one needs to add. As we are not interested in this case, since we already know that its contraction gives a primitive symplectic surface which is not irreducible symplectic, we decided to remove it from the analysis. The same happens to all the configurations which contains 16 disjoint lines. In the very same way all the configurations given in Theorem 3.6 are not included in our good lists. This means that the list we provide is not the list of all possible ADE configurations of rational curves on K3 surfaces, but the list of all possible ADE configurations of rational curves on K3 surfaces whose contraction is an irreducible symplectic surface. By Proposition 4.9, the complete list of the ADE configurations is the output of the program plus the ten ADE configurations in the list of Theorem 3.6.

6. FURTHER REMARKS ON SINGULAR IRREDUCIBLE SURFACES

Before moving to the study of Hilbert schemes of points on singular irreducible symplectic surfaces, we wish to add some further observations about irreducible symplectic surfaces.

We first notice that if B is an ADE configuration of smooth rational curves that may be realized on a K3 surface, the general member of the family of K3 surfaces admitting B as an ADE configuration of rational curves is non-projective, but there is at least one projective K3 surface in this family. This is made precised by the following, that was already used by Shimada in [42].

Lemma 6.1. *Let B be an ADE configuration appearing on a K3 surface, and let \mathcal{F} be the family of K3 surfaces admitting B as an ADE configuration of rational curves.*

- (1) *The general member of the family \mathcal{F} is non-projective.*
- (2) *There are K3 surfaces in the family \mathcal{F} that is projective.*

Proof. The ADE configuration B corresponds to a negative definite lattice Λ . Since B appears as an ADE configuration of rational curves on a K3 surface, we see that Λ is embedded in the Néron-Severi group of some K3 surface. It follows that Λ is embedded in Λ_{K3} : its saturation Λ^s in Λ_{K3} is then a lattice which is primitively embedded in Λ_{K3} and which has Λ as a finite index sublattice. Notice that a priori Λ^s is not uniquely determined by Λ , since it depends on the embedding of Λ in Λ_{K3} .

By the surjectivity of the period map, there is a K3 surface S such that $NS(S) = \Lambda^s$ and the transcendental lattice Γ is the lattice orthogonal to Λ^s in Λ_{K3} . The existence of S is due to the surjectivity of the period map. Since $NS(S) \simeq \Lambda^s$ is negative definite, we see that S is non-projective. Moreover, since $\Lambda \subset NS(S)$, the surface S contains an ADE configuration B of rational curves.

Now, the transcendental lattice Γ of S has signature $(3, 19 - \text{rank}(\Lambda))$. Let $A \in \Gamma$ be a class with positive self-intersection, and let Δ be the lattice that is orthogonal to A in Γ . Then Δ is primitively embedded in Γ , and hence in Λ_{K3} , and its signature is $(2, 19 - \text{rank}(\Lambda))$.

By the surjectivity of the period map there is a K3 surface S' whose transcendental lattice is Δ . By construction, the Néron-Severi of S' contains the positive class A and the lattice Λ . It follows that S' is a projective K3 surface admitting B as an ADE configuration of rational curves. \square

Remark 6.2. The self-intersection of the class A in the proof of the previous Lemma may verify some further conditions. This means that each ADE configuration which is admissible for a non-projective K3 surface is admissible also for a projective one, but *a priori* the degree of the polarizations of the projective model may assume only particular values. For example, it is known that there exist projective K3 surfaces admitting sixteen disjoint rational curves and an orthogonal polarization of degree d if and only if d is a multiple of 4 (see [36])

As a consequence of the previous Lemma we get the following result, showing that all examples of singular irreducible symplectic surface may be realized by projective surfaces. More precisely, we have the following:

Theorem 6.3. *For every ADE configuration B in the list \mathcal{L}_{irr} there is a projective irreducible symplectic surface whose singularities are the contraction of B .*

Proof. By Lemma 6.1 there is a projective K3 surface S which admits the ADE configuration B of rational curves. Since $B \in \mathcal{L}_{irr}$, by Theorem 3.7 the contraction of the curves in B produces a singular irreducible symplectic surface, which is projective since S is. \square

Another interesting property is that the transcendental lattice of every singular irreducible symplectic surface may be realized as the transcendental lattice of a K3 surface, as the following proves:

Proposition 6.4. *Let X be an irreducible symplectic surface. The transcendental lattice $T(X)$ of X and its Néron–Severi group $NS(X)$ are primitively embedded in Λ_{K3} , and there is a K3 surface S such that $T(X) \simeq T(S)$. Moreover, if X is non simple we have that $\text{rank}(T(X)) \leq 14$.*

Proof. By Corollary 2.3 the surface X is the contraction of an ADE configuration B of rational curves on a K3 surface S . Let $f : S \rightarrow X$ be the contraction map and let Λ be the lattice corresponding to the ADE configuration B . Then $H^2(S, \mathbb{Z}) \simeq H^2(X, \mathbb{Z}) \oplus \Lambda$ and $\Lambda \subset NS(S)$. It follows that $T(X) \simeq T(S)$ and that $NS(X)$ is isometric to the orthogonal lattice of Λ in $NS(S)$. Since $T(S)$ and $NS(S)$ admit primitive embeddings in Λ_{K3} , the same holds for $T(X)$ and $NS(X)$.

Finally, notice that if X is non-simple, by Proposition 2.6 there is a Galois cover of S : by [46, Table 2], the rank of $NS(S)$ is at least 8, concluding the proof. \square

We now look at the automorphism group of a singular irreducible symplectic surface:

Proposition 6.5. *Let X be a primitive symplectic surface obtained as a contraction of a K3 surface S . Then $\text{Aut}(X) \subset \text{Aut}(S)$.*

Proof. Let B be the ADE configuration of rational curves on S whose contraction gives X , and let $f : S \rightarrow X$ be the contraction morphism. Let $\alpha \in \text{Aut}(X)$: then α restricts to an automorphism of the smooth locus X^s of X . As $X^s \simeq S \setminus B$, it follows that α induces an automorphism α' of $S \setminus B$.

As $\alpha(\text{Sing}(X)) = \text{Sing}(X)$, we may define an automorphism $\tilde{\alpha} \in \text{Aut}(S)$ such that $\tilde{\alpha}|_{S \setminus B} = \alpha'$.

To do so, notice that if $x \in \text{Sing}(X)$ and $\alpha(x) = x$, then α is defined in a neighbourhood of x (in particular on the tangent space of such a neighbourhood) and hence it extends to the blow-up which resolves the singularity in x , and this action glues with the one defined on the smooth locus.

If $x \in \text{Sing}(X)$ and $\alpha(x) = y \neq x$, then x and y are singularities of the same type, hence in particular resolved by the same configuration of curves. Then α maps a neighbourhood of x to one of y , and as before this allows to extend α to the blow-up in x and y which resolves the two singularities. Gluing this with the action of the smooth locus we define $\tilde{\alpha}$. \square

Remark 6.6. Let X be a primitive symplectic surface and $\alpha \in \text{Aut}(X)$ a finite order automorphism. The quotient X/α is a primitive symplectic surface if and only if α is symplectic, i.e., it preserves the symplectic form defined on the smooth locus of X . Moreover, X/α is obtained by contracting an ADE configuration of rational curves on $S/\tilde{\alpha}$ (see the proof of Proposition 6.5 for the definition of $\tilde{\alpha}$). If W is the minimal model of $S/\tilde{\alpha}$, since $S/\tilde{\alpha}$ is obtained contracting an ADE configuration on W we obtain that X/α is obtained contracting an ADE configuration on the K3 surface W .

It is interesting to remark how the fundamental group of the smooth part of an irreducible symplectic surface is related with the lattice properties of the ADE configuration considered. So we recall the following result, due to Xiao [46, Lemma 2] but re-written in our context

Proposition 6.7. *Let S be a K3 surface which contains an ADE configuration B . Let Λ be the lattice spanned by the curve of B and Λ' the minimal primitive overlattice of Λ contained in $NS(S)$. Let $S \rightarrow X_B$ the contraction of B , X_B^s the smooth locus of X_B and $G := \pi_1(X_B^s) \simeq \pi_1(S - B)$. Then*

$$\left(\frac{G}{[G, G]} \right)^* = \frac{\Lambda'}{\Lambda},$$

where $(G/[G, G])^*$ is the dual of $G/[G, G]$.

We observe that G is necessarily one of the groups acting symplectically on a K3 surface and that $\frac{G}{[G, G]}$ is an Abelian group acting on a K3 surface. So the Abelianization of the fundamental group of the smooth part of an irreducible symplectic surface is trivial or contained in $\{\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}, (\mathbb{Z}/a\mathbb{Z})^2, \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}^i, \mathbb{Z}/j\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}\}$ where $n = 2, \dots, 8$, $a = 2, 3, 4$, $i = 3, 4$, $j = 4, 6$. For each group G , the datum Λ'/Λ is given in [46, Table 2].

7. HILBERT SCHEMES OF POINTS ON SINGULAR IRREDUCIBLE SYMPLECTIC SURFACES

Let X be a primitive symplectic surface, and let S be the K3 surface which is the smooth minimal model of X . The aim of this section is to discuss the following questions:

- (1) Is $Hilb^n(X)$ an irreducible (or primitive) symplectic variety?
- (2) Does $Hilb^n(X)$ admit a symplectic resolution $\widetilde{Hilb^n(X)}$? In this case, is $\widetilde{Hilb^n(X)}$ an irreducible symplectic manifold?
- (3) If yes, is $\widetilde{Hilb^n(X)}$ deformation equivalent to $Hilb^n(S)$?

Many contributions to answer these questions exist in the literature and we firstly summarize here the state of art. Then, we state our main result: the Hilbert scheme of two points of a simple singular irreducible symplectic surface, is an irreducible symplectic variety, see Corollary 7.7. This allows us to prove that there exists irreducible symplectic orbifolds of dimension 4 with $b_2 = b$ for every values of $b \in \{3, \dots, 22\}$ (see Corollary 7.10).

Lemma 7.1. *Let X be a primitive symplectic surface and S its smooth minimal model. Then any resolution of the singularities of $Hilb^n(X)$ is birational to $Hilb^n(S)$.*

Proof. The surfaces S and X are birational by definition. Hence S^n and X^n are birational. The symmetric product $Sym^n(S)$ is the quotient of S^n by the natural action of the group \mathfrak{S}_n , and the action of \mathfrak{S}_n on S^n induces an action of \mathfrak{S}_n on X^n , whose quotient is $Sym^n(X)$.

Let B be the ADE configuration of rational curves on S whose contraction is X , and X^s be the smooth locus of X . Then X^s and $S \setminus B$ are isomorphic, and the action of \mathfrak{S}_n on the open subset $(S \setminus B)^n$ of S^n and on the open subset $(X^s)^n$ of X^n coincide.

It follows that $Sym^n(S)$ and $Sym^n(X)$ are birational. Since $Hilb^n(Y)$ is birational to $Sym^n(Y)$ for any variety Y , we obtain the statement. \square

An immediate consequence of the previous Proposition is the following, which answers question 3.

Corollary 7.2. *Let X be a primitive symplectic surface and S its smooth minimal model. If $\widetilde{Hilb}^n(X)$ admits a symplectic resolution $\widetilde{Hilb}^n(X)$ which is an irreducible symplectic manifold, then $\widetilde{Hilb}^n(X)$ is deformation equivalent to $Hilb^n(S)$.*

Proof. The two manifolds $\widetilde{Hilb}^n(X)$ and $Hilb^n(S)$ are two irreducible symplectic manifolds which are birational by Lemma 7.1, hence they are deformation equivalent by [23, Theorem 4.6]. \square

The problem of the existence of a symplectic resolution for $Hilb^n(X)$ where X is a primitive symplectic surface is still open to our knowledge. A partial result is the following:

Proposition 7.3. *Let X be an irreducible symplectic surface with a unique singular point. Then $Hilb^n(X)$ admits a symplectic resolution.*

Proof. The existence of such a resolution is a local problem. In [11, Theorem 5.5] is proved that $Hilb^n(\mathbb{A}^2/\Gamma)$ admits a unique symplectic resolution if $\Gamma \subset SL(2, \mathbb{Z})$, i.e., if \mathbb{A}^2/Γ has an ADE singularity. The proposition follows. \square

We observe that if X has more than one singular point, one cannot simply iterate the previous result since one has to consider also the point $(p_1, \dots, p_n) \in X^n$ where the points p_i are different singular points of X .

Other results in this direction are obtained when $Hilb^2(X)$ is birational equivalent to the variety of lines on a certain singular cubic fourfold see [7, 27, 45].

Even if X and S (resp. $Hilb^n(X)$ and $Hilb^n(S)$) are deformation equivalent, the deformation is not locally trivial, and hence $Hilb^n(X)$ and $Hilb^n(S)$ belong to different locally trivial deformation classes.

Our aim is to answer to the first question we asked, i.e., if $Hilb^n(X)$ is an irreducible (resp. primitive) symplectic variety as soon as X is a singular irreducible (resp. primitive) symplectic surface, at least in the case $n = 2$.

To do so, we first need a result about the fundamental group of a Hilbert scheme of points on a smooth surface, not necessarily compact. The following is a classical result for compact complex surfaces (see for example [26]), and the proof for the non-compact case is identical: we write a proof for the convenience of the reader.

Lemma 7.4. *Let S be a (non necessarily compact) smooth complex surface. Then there is an isomorphism*

$$\pi_1(Hilb^2(S)) \simeq \frac{\pi_1(S)}{[\pi_1(S), \pi_1(S)]}.$$

Proof. Consider a path $\alpha : [0, 1] \rightarrow S$ and let $p_0 := \alpha(0)$ and $p_1 := \alpha(1)$. We suppose that $p_1 \neq p_0$, and consider the two continuous paths

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_1 : [0, 1] &\rightarrow S \times S, & \alpha_1(t) &:= (p_0, \alpha(t)), \\ \alpha_2 : [0, 1] &\rightarrow S \times S, & \alpha_2(t) &:= (\alpha(t), p_0). \end{aligned}$$

Clearly we have $\alpha_1(0) = (p_0, p_0)$, $\alpha_1(1) = (p_0, p_1)$, $\alpha_2(0) = (p_0, p_0)$ and $\alpha_2(1) = (p_1, p_0)$.

It then follows that the path $\beta := \alpha_1^{-1} * \alpha_2$ is a path in $S \times S$ starting at (p_0, p_1) and ending at (p_1, p_0) .

Let now

$$\sigma : S \times S \rightarrow S \times S, \quad \sigma(p, q) := (q, p),$$

and notice that $\beta = \sigma \circ \beta^{-1}$: indeed, for every $t \in [0, 1/2]$ we have

$$\beta(t) = \alpha_1^{-1}(2t) = \alpha_1(1 - 2t) = (p_0, \alpha(1 - 2t))$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma \circ \beta^{-1}(t) &= \sigma(\beta(1 - t)) = \sigma(\alpha_2(2(1 - t) - 1)) = \\ &= (\sigma(\alpha(1 - 2t), p_0)) = (p_0, \alpha(1 - 2t)), \end{aligned}$$

while for every $t \in [1/2, 1]$ we have

$$\beta(t) = \alpha_2(2t - 1) = (\alpha(2t - 1), p_0),$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma \circ \beta^{-1}(t) &= \sigma(\beta(1 - t)) = \sigma(\alpha_1(1 - 2(1 - t))) = \\ &= \sigma(p_0, \alpha(2t - 1)) = (\alpha(2t - 1), p_0). \end{aligned}$$

Let now Δ_S be the diagonal of $S \times S$, and notice that Δ_S has real codimension 4 in $S \times S$: it follows that there is a path γ in $S \times S$ which is path-homotopic to β and such that for every $t \in [0, 1]$ we have $\gamma(t) \notin \Delta_S$.

Notice that since γ and β are path-homotopic, we have that

$$\sigma \circ \gamma^{-1} \simeq (\sigma \circ \beta^{-1}) = \beta \simeq \gamma,$$

where \simeq denotes the path-homotopy equivalence. Notice that both γ and $\sigma \circ \gamma^{-1}$ do not intersect Δ_S , and as Δ_S has codimension 4 in $S \times S$, the path-homotopy equivalence between γ and $\sigma \circ \gamma^{-1}$ may be realized in $S \times S \setminus \Delta_S$. It follows that $\gamma \simeq \sigma \circ \gamma^{-1}$ in $S \times S \setminus \Delta_S$.

Let now Z be the blow-up of $S \times S$ along Δ_S with reduced structure and let $\rho' : Z \rightarrow S \times S$ be the blow-up morphism. If we let E' be the exceptional divisor of ρ' , we have that ρ' gives an isomorphism between $Z \setminus E'$ and $S \times S \setminus \Delta_S$: as consequence, the path γ defines a path γ' in $Z \setminus E'$ whose starting point is $z_0 := (\rho')^{-1}(p_0, p_1)$ and whose ending point is $z_1 := (\rho')^{-1}(p_1, p_0)$. Moreover, if we let $\sigma' : Z \rightarrow Z$ be the lifting of σ , then the path-homotopy between γ and $\sigma \circ \gamma^{-1}$ gives a path-homotopy between γ' and $\sigma' \circ (\gamma')^{-1}$ in $Z \setminus E'$.

We now let $\pi' : Z \rightarrow \text{Hilb}^2(S)$ be the morphism such that the following diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} Z & \xrightarrow{\rho'} & S \times S \\ \pi' \downarrow & & \downarrow \pi \\ \text{Hilb}^2(S) & \xrightarrow{\rho} & \text{Sym}^2(S) \end{array}$$

is commutative, where $\pi : S \times S \rightarrow \text{Sym}^2(S)$ is the quotient morphism for the action of \mathfrak{S}_2 , and $\rho : \text{Hilb}^2(S) \rightarrow \text{Sym}^2(S)$ is the Hilbert-Chow morphism.

Let E be the exceptional divisor of ρ , and $\bar{\gamma} := \pi' \circ \gamma'$: then $\bar{\gamma}$ is a loop in $\text{Hilb}^2(S) \setminus E$ whose base point is $y_0 := \pi'(z_0)$ (i.e., the subscheme of S given by the two distinct points p_0 and p_1), and we have

$$\bar{\gamma}^{-1} = \pi' \circ (\gamma')^{-1} = \pi' \circ \sigma' \circ (\gamma')^{-1} \simeq \pi' \circ \gamma' = \bar{\gamma},$$

and hence $\tau := [\bar{\gamma}] \in \pi_1(\text{Hilb}^2(S) \setminus E, y_0)$ is an element of order 2.

Now, notice that since Δ_S has real codimension 4 in $S \times S$, we have the following chain of group isomorphisms

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_1(Z \setminus E', z_0) &\simeq \pi_1(S \times S \setminus \Delta_S, (p_0, p_1)) \simeq \pi_1(S \times S, (p_0, p_1)) \simeq \\ &\simeq \pi_1(S \times S, (p_0, p_0)) \simeq \pi_1(S, p_0) \times \pi_1(S, p_0). \end{aligned}$$

But now notice moreover that $\pi' : Z \setminus E' \longrightarrow \text{Hilb}^2(S) \setminus E$ is a topological covering of degree 2, so there is an exact sequence

$$1 \longrightarrow \pi_1(Z \setminus E', z_0) \longrightarrow \pi_1(\text{Hilb}^2(S) \setminus E, y_0) \longrightarrow \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z} \longrightarrow 1.$$

Since the class $\tau \in \pi_1(\text{Hilb}^2(S) \setminus E, y_0)$ is the class of the path $\bar{\gamma}$ whose lift to $Z \setminus E'$ is the path γ' , which is not a loop, we see that τ maps to the generator of $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$.

Moreover, since τ has order 2, we see that the previous exact sequence splits, and hence we get an isomorphism

$$\pi_1(\text{Hilb}^2(S) \setminus E, y_0) \simeq \pi_1(Z \setminus E', z_0) \rtimes \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z},$$

and τ acts on the normal subgroup as

$$\tau \cdot [\delta] := [\gamma' * (\sigma' \circ \delta) * (\gamma')^{-1}].$$

Under the isomorphism $\pi_1(Z \setminus E', z_0) \simeq \pi_1(S, p_0) \times \pi_1(S, p_0)$, this action becomes the action that flips the two factors, i.e., we have an isomorphism

$$\pi_1(\text{Hilb}^2(S) \setminus E, y_0) \simeq \pi_1(S, p_0) \times \pi_1(S, p_0) \rtimes \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$$

where the action of τ on the normal subgroup is

$$\tau \cdot ([a], [b]) := ([b], [a]).$$

Now, consider a tubular neighborhood U of E in $\text{Hilb}^2(S)$, and let $r : U \longrightarrow E$ be the retraction. Then r is a homotopy equivalence, and its restriction $r_0 : U \setminus E \longrightarrow E$ is a topological fibration whose fibers are homotopically equivalent to S^1 . We now may choose $y_0 \in U \setminus E$ and τ to be a generator of the fundamental group of $F := r_0^{-1}(r(y_0))$.

Using the Seifert-van Kampen Theorem we see that $\pi_1(\text{Hilb}^2(S), y_0)$ is the push-out of the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \pi_1(U \setminus E, y_0) & \longrightarrow & \pi_1(\text{Hilb}^2(S) \setminus E, y_0) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \pi_1(U, y_0) & \longrightarrow & \pi_1(\text{Hilb}^2(S), y_0) \end{array}$$

and notice that $\pi_1(U, y_0) \simeq \pi_1(E, r(y_0))$.

Now, the topological fibration r_0 gives an exact sequence

$$\pi_1(F, y_0) \longrightarrow \pi_1(U \setminus E, y_0) \longrightarrow \pi_1(E, r(y_0)) \longrightarrow 1,$$

and $\pi_1(F, y_0) = \mathbb{Z}\tau$. The image of τ under the morphism $\pi_1(F, y_0) \longrightarrow \pi_1(U \setminus E, y_0)$ is simply τ itself: we then conclude that

$$\pi_1(\text{Hilb}^2(S), y_0) \simeq \pi_1(\text{Hilb}^2(S) \setminus E, y_0) / \langle\langle \tau \rangle\rangle \simeq \pi_1(S, p_0) \times \pi_1(S, p_0) \rtimes \langle\tau\rangle / \langle\langle \tau \rangle\rangle.$$

Finally, consider two elements $a, b \in \pi_1(S, p_0)$. The action of τ gives $\tau(a, 1)\tau = (1, a)$, and $(a, 1)$ and $(1, b)$ commute. It follows that when one takes the quotient under the relation $\tau = 1$, we get an identification of $(a, 1)$ and $(1, a)$, and the resulting class commutes with the class of $(b, 1)$. As a consequence, the morphism

$$\pi_1(S, p_0) \times \pi_1(S, p_0) \times \langle\tau\rangle / \langle\langle \tau \rangle\rangle \longrightarrow \pi_1(S, p_0) / [\pi_1(S, p_0), \pi_1(S, p_0)]$$

mapping (a, b, τ) to \overline{ab} is an isomorphism. \square

We now recall that if Y is a normal compact Kähler space, we let $h^{[p],0}(Y)$ be the dimension of the space of reflexive p -forms on Y , i.e.,

$$h^{[p],0}(Y) = \dim H^0(Y, \Omega_Y^{[p]}).$$

These numbers are birational invariants, as the following shows:

Lemma 7.5. *Let X and Y be two normal compact Kähler spaces with canonical singularities. If X and Y are birational, then $h^{[p],0}(X) = h^{[p],0}(Y)$ for every $p \geq 0$.*

Proof. Let \tilde{X} (resp. \tilde{Y}) be a resolution of the singularities of X (resp. of Y). Then by [20] we have that

$$h^{[p],0}(X) = h^{p,0}(\tilde{X}), \quad h^{[p],0}(Y) = h^{p,0}(\tilde{Y}).$$

Since X and Y are birational, it follows that \tilde{X} and \tilde{Y} are birational, and since they are compact Kähler manifolds we have $h^{p,0}(\tilde{X}) = h^{p,0}(\tilde{Y})$, so the result follows. \square

The two previous lemmas allow us to prove the following, which describes the fundamental group of the smooth locus of $\text{Hilb}^2(X)$ for a singular irreducible symplectic surface, and calculates the numbers $h^{[p],0}$.

Proposition 7.6. *Let X be primitive symplectic surface and U its smooth locus. Let $\text{Hilb}^2(X)^s$ be the smooth locus of $\text{Hilb}^2(X)$.*

- (1) *We have a group isomorphism $\pi_1(U)/[\pi_1(U), \pi_1(U)] \rightarrow \pi_1(\text{Hilb}^2(X)^s)$.*
- (2) *For every $p \geq 0$ we have that*

$$h^{[p],0}(\text{Hilb}^2(X)) = \begin{cases} 1, & p = 0, 2, 4 \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Proof. Let $Z := \{p_1, \dots, p_n\}$ be the singular locus of X , i.e., $Z = X \setminus U$. Moreover let $\pi : X \times X \rightarrow \text{Sym}^2(X)$ be the quotient under the action of \mathfrak{S}_2 interchanging the two factors and $\rho : \text{Hilb}^2(X) \rightarrow \text{Sym}^2(X)$ be the Hilbert-Chow morphism. Let Δ_X be the diagonal of $X \times X$ and $D_X := \pi(\Delta_X)$. So $\rho : \text{Hilb}^2(X) \rightarrow \text{Sym}^2(X)$ is the blow-up of $\text{Sym}^2(X)$ along D_X .

Notice that $U \times U \subseteq X \times X$ is the smooth locus of $X \times X$, and the image of $U \times U$ in $\text{Sym}^2(X)$ under π is $\text{Sym}^2(U)$. Let $Z_i := \pi(\{p_i\} \times X) = \pi(X \times \{p_i\})$, and notice that $\text{Sym}^2(X)$ is singular along $D_X \cup Z_1 \cup \dots \cup Z_n$. Notice that D_X and Z_i are isomorphic to X for every $i = 1, \dots, n$, hence the singular locus of $\text{Sym}^2(X)$ has codimension 2 in $\text{Sym}^2(X)$.

Moreover, $\text{Sym}^2(U) = \text{Sym}^2(X) \setminus (Z_1 \cup \dots \cup Z_n)$. We let Δ_U be the diagonal of U and $D_U := \pi_{|U \times U}(\Delta_U)$, then $D_U = D_X \cap \text{Sym}^2(U) \subset \text{Sym}^2(X)$, therefore $\text{Sym}^2(U)$ is singular along $D_U = \text{Sym}^2(U) \cap D_X$.

It follows that $\rho^{-1}(\text{Sym}^2(U))$ is the blow of $\text{Sym}^2(U)$ along D_U : we then have that $\rho^{-1}(\text{Sym}^2(U)) = \text{Hilb}^2(U)$, and since $\text{Sym}^2(U)$ is open in $\text{Sym}^2(X)$ it follows that $\text{Hilb}^2(U) \subseteq \text{Hilb}^2(X)$ is an open subset.

Moreover, notice that $\text{Hilb}^2(U)$ is smooth, since U is a smooth surface, and hence $\text{Hilb}^2(U)$ is contained in the smooth locus $\text{Hilb}^2(X)^s$ of $\text{Hilb}^2(X)$. Notice that $2p_i := \pi(\{p_i\} \times \{p_i\}) \in Z_i$ for every $i = 1, \dots, n$, and let $W_i := \rho^{-1}(Z_i \setminus \{2p_i\})$. We see that the singular locus of $\text{Hilb}^2(X)$ is $\overline{W}_1 \cup \dots \cup \overline{W}_n$.

Notice that $\rho^{-1}(2p_i)$ is isomorphic to the projectivization of the Zariski tangent space $T_{p_i}X$ of X at p_i (see for example [28], Prop. 2.19). As p_i is an ADE singularity, and as ADE singularities on surfaces are hypersurface singularities, the dimension of the Zariski tangent space of X at p_i is 3, so that $\rho^{-1}(2p_i) \simeq \mathbb{P}^2$.

Then $\overline{W}_i \cap \rho^{-1}(2p_i)$ is isomorphic to a closed subset of \mathbb{P}^2 , and hence $V := \text{Hilb}^2(X)^s \setminus \text{Hilb}^2(U)$ is given by a finite number of dense open subsets of \mathbb{P}^2 : it follows that V has real codimension 4 in $\text{Hilb}^2(X)^s$, and hence there is a group isomorphism $\pi_1(\text{Hilb}^2(U)) \longrightarrow \pi_1(\text{Hilb}^2(X)^s)$. ([17, Theorem 2.3, Chapter X]).

As U is a smooth surface, by Lemma 7.4 we get the first item of the statement.

To conclude the proof we only have to calculate the numbers $h^{[p],0}(\text{Hilb}^2(X))$. To do so, recall that from Theorem 1.8 there is a K3 surface S such that X is a contraction of an ADE configuration of smooth rational curves on S . By Lemma 7.1 we then have that $\text{Hilb}^2(X)$ and $\text{Hilb}^2(S)$ are two compact Kähler spaces with canonical singularities which are birational: by Lemma 7.5 we then have

$$h^{[p],0}(\text{Hilb}^2(X)) = h^{p,0}(\text{Hilb}^2(S)),$$

and the second item of the statement follows since $\text{Hilb}^2(S)$ is an irreducible symplectic manifold. \square

As a corollary we get the following, which proves Theorem 1.10:

Corollary 7.7. *Let X be a primitive symplectic surface.*

- (1) *The variety $\text{Hilb}^2(X)$ is primitive symplectic.*
- (2) *If X is a simple symplectic surface, then $\text{Hilb}^2(X)$ is an irreducible symplectic orbifold of dimension 4.*

Proof. We first remark that since X has quotient singularities, the same holds for $\text{Hilb}^2(X)$, which is then an orbifold. It then follows that the singularities of $\text{Hilb}^2(S)$ are rational Gorenstein. Moreover we know by [11] that on the smooth locus of $\text{Hilb}^2(X)$ there is a holomorphic symplectic form: by [34] it then follows that $\text{Hilb}^2(S)$ is a symplectic variety.

By point (2) of Proposition 7.6 we know that $h^{[2],0}(\text{Hilb}^2(X)) = 1$, so the space of holomorphic 2-forms on the smooth locus of $\text{Hilb}^2(S)$ is spanned by a holomorphic symplectic form.

Moreover, let $W \longrightarrow \text{Hilb}^2(X)$ be a resolution of the singularities. As the singularities of $\text{Hilb}^2(X)$ are rational, the Leray spectral sequence implies that $h^1(\text{Hilb}^2(X), \mathcal{O}_{\text{Hilb}^2(X)}) = h^1(W, \mathcal{O}_W)$. As W is smooth, we have that $h^1(W, \mathcal{O}_W) = h^{1,0}(W)$, and by Lemma 7.1 we have that W is birational to $\text{Hilb}^2(S)$, where S is the smooth minimal model of X . As S is a K3 surface by Proposition 2.1, we get that $h^{1,0}(W) = h^{1,0}(\text{Hilb}^2(S)) = 0$, so we conclude that $\text{Hilb}^2(X)$ is a primitive symplectic variety.

Let us now suppose that X is simple. Then the smooth locus U of X is simply connected. It follows that $\pi_1(U) = \{1\}$, and by point (1) of Proposition 7.6 it follows that $\text{Hilb}^2(X)^s$ is simply connected as well. It then follows that $\text{Hilb}^2(X)$ is an irreducible symplectic orbifold. \square

We now conclude with the proof of Theorem 1.11, for which we still need an important ingredient about the Hodge numbers and the Betti numbers of quotients of projective orbifolds by the action of a finite group:

Lemma 7.8. *Let Z be a complex projective variety that is an orbifold, G a finite group action on Z and $Y := Z/G$. Then for every $n, p, q \geq 0$ we have*

$$H^n(Y, \mathbb{Q}) \simeq H^n(Z, \mathbb{Q})^G, \quad H^{p,q}(Y) \simeq H^{p,q}(Z)^G,$$

where if k is a field and V is a k -vector space on which G acts, we let V^G be the G -invariant subspace of V .

Proof. This result is well-known when Z is smooth. In the singular case notice that Z is a CW-complex, and as it is an orbifold we have Poincaré duality. It follows that there is the Cartan-Leray spectral sequence in cohomology

$$E_2^{p,q} = H^p(G, H^q(Z, \mathbb{Q})) \leftarrow E^{p+q} = H^{p+q}(Y, \mathbb{Q}).$$

As G is finite and $H^q(Z, \mathbb{Q})$ is a \mathbb{Q} -vector space, we have that $H^p(G, H^q(Z, \mathbb{Q})) = 0$ for every $p \geq 1$, so we get an isomorphism

$$H^n(Y, \mathbb{Q}) \simeq H^0(G, H^n(Z, \mathbb{Q})) \simeq H^n(Z, \mathbb{Q})^G$$

for every $n \geq 0$.

Finally, recall that as Z and Y are both orbifolds, we have a Hodge decomposition on $H^n(Z, \mathbb{Q})$ and $H^n(Y, \mathbb{Q})$ for every $n \geq 0$, so for every $p, q \geq 0$ such that $p+q = n$ we have

$$H^{p,q}(Y) \simeq H^{p,q}(Z)^G,$$

concluding the proof. \square

This allows us to prove that the second Betti number of the Hilbert scheme of 2 points on a singular irreducible symplectic surface X is one more than the second Betti number of X , generalizing a well-known result on K3 surfaces (see for example [4]). More precisely, we have:

Proposition 7.9. *Let X be a primitive symplectic surface. Then*

$$H^2(\text{Hilb}^2(X), \mathbb{Q}) \simeq H^2(X, \mathbb{Q}) \oplus \mathbb{Q}.$$

Proof. The proof is exactly as in the smooth case, using the fact that as X is all the varieties that are involved are orbifolds: more precisely, let Z be the blow-up of $X \times X$ along the diagonal. Then as in the smooth case we have

$$H^2(Z, \mathbb{Q}) \simeq H^2(X, \mathbb{Q}) \oplus H^2(X, \mathbb{Q}) \oplus \mathbb{Q}.$$

The action of \mathfrak{S}_2 on $X \times X$ extends to an action on Z , whose quotient is $\text{Hilb}^2(X)$. But then by Lemma 7.8 the statement follows. \square

Now, let X be a primitive symplectic surface obtained by contracting an ADE configuration B of rational curves on a K3 surface S (the case where X is smooth is the case where B is empty and $X = S$). Let Λ be the lattice associated to B . Then we have

$$b_2(X) = b_2(S) - \text{rank}(\Lambda) = 22 - \text{rank}(\Lambda).$$

Using this, we then get Theorem 1.11:

Corollary 7.10. *For every $3 \leq b \leq 23$ there is a 4-dimensional irreducible symplectic orbifold X such that $b_2(X) = b$.*

Proof. The classification of simple symplectic surfaces we provided shows that for every $0 \leq r \leq 19$ there is a simple symplectic surface X obtained by contracting an ADE configuration B of rational curves on a K3 surface such that the rank of lattice Λ associated to B is r (the case $r = 0$ corresponds to the case where B is empty, i.e., the irreducible symplectic surface is smooth). Moreover, by Theorem 6.3 we may suppose that X is projective.

By Corollary 7.7 and Proposition 7.9 then $\text{Hilb}^2(X)$ is a 4-dimensional irreducible symplectic variety whose second Betti number is

$$b_2(\text{Hilb}^2(X)) = b_2(X) + 1 = 23 - r.$$

Since $0 \leq r \leq 19$ we see that $4 \leq b_2(\text{Hilb}^2(X)) \leq 23$, and $b_2(\text{Hilb}^2(X)) = 23$ if and only if X is smooth.

This provides an example of a 4-dimensional irreducible symplectic orbifold whose second Betti number is any $4 \leq b \leq 23$. The case $b_2 = 3$ may be realized as in [12]: by [32] there is an irreducible symplectic manifold X of dimension 4 which carries a symplectic automorphism σ of order 11. The quotient X/σ is an irreducible symplectic variety by Proposition 2.15 of [38], and as in [12] we have that $b_2(X/\sigma) = 3$. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] Bakker B., Guenancia H., Lehn C.: *Algebraic approximation and the decomposition theorem for Kähler Calabi-Yau varieties*. *Inv. Math.* **228** (2022), 1255–1308.
- [2] Bakker B., Lehn C.: *The global moduli theory of symplectic varieties*. *J. reine angew. Math.* **790** (2022), 223–265.
- [3] Barth W., Hulek K., Peters C., van de Ven A.: *Compact Complex Surfaces*. Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften, Vol. 4, Second enlarged edition, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2003.
- [4] Beauville A.: *Variétés kähleriennes dont la première classe de Chern est nulle*. *J. Differential Geometry* **18**, (1983), 755–782.
- [5] Bertin J. M.: *Réseaux de Kummer et surfaces K3*, *Invent. Math.* **92** (1988), 267–284.
- [6] Bertini V., Grossi A., Mauri M., Mazzon E.: *Terminalization of quotients of compact hyperkähler manifolds by induced symplectic automorphisms*, arXiv:2401.13632
- [7] Boissière S., Comparin S., Li Bassi L.: *The Fano variety of lines on singular cyclic cubic fourfolds* Preprint ArXiv 2312.15317.
- [8] Brakkee E., Camere C., Grossi A., Pertusi L., Saccà G., Viktorova S.: *Irreducible symplectic varieties via relative Prym varieties*. Preprint arXiv:2404.03157.
- [9] Campana F.: *Orbifolds à première classe de Chern nulle*. The Fano Conference, Univ. Torino, Torino (2004), 339–351.
- [10] Camere C., Garbagnati A., Kapustka G., Kapustka M.: *Projective orbifolds of Nikulin types* *Algebra and Number Theory* **18**, (2024), 165–208.
- [11] Craw A.: *An introduction to Hilbert schemes of points on ADE singularities*. *Adv. Stud. Pure Math.*, **88** Mathematical Society of Japan, Tokyo, 2023, 119–157.
- [12] Fu L., Menet G.: *On the Betti numbers of compact holomorphic symplectic orbifolds of dimension four* *Math Z.* **299**, (2021), 203–231.
- [13] Fujiki A.: *On Primitively Symplectic Compact Kähler V-Manifolds of Dimension Four*. In *Classification of algebraic and analytic manifolds*. *Progr. Math.* **39** (1983), 71–250.
- [14] Fujiki A.: *Finite automorphism groups of complex tori of dimension two*. *Publ. RIMS Kyoto Univ.* **24** (1988), 1–97.
- [15] Garbagnati A.: *On K3 surface quotients of K3 or Abelian surfaces*, *Canad. J. Math.* **69** (2017), 338–372.
- [16] Garbagnati A., Sarti A.: *Kummer surfaces and K3 surface with $(\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})^4$ symplectic action*, *Rocky Mountain Journal of Mathematics* **46**, (2016), 1141–1206.
- [17] Godbillon C.: *Éléments de topologie algébrique*, Collection: Méthodes (1997), pp 248.
- [18] Greb D., Guenancia H., Kebekus S.: *Klt with trivial canonical class - Holonomy, differential forms, and fundamental group*. *Geometry & Topology* **23**, (2019), 2051–2124.
- [19] Greb D., Kebekus S., Kovacs S., Peternell T.: *Differential forms on log canonical spaces*. *Pub. Math. de l’IHES* **114**, (2008), 87–169.
- [20] Greb D., Kebekus S., Peternell T.: *Singular spaces with trivial canonical class*. In *Minimal models and extreme rays, proceedings of the conference in honor of Shigefumi Mori’s 60th birthday*. *Adv. Stud. in Pure Math.*, Kinokuniya Publishing House, Tokyo, (2011).
- [21] Hashimoto K.: *Finite Symplectic Actions on the K3 Lattice*, *Nagoya Math. J.* **206**, (2012), 99 – 153
- [22] Höring A., Peternell T.: *Algebraic integrability of foliations with numerically trivial canonical bundle*. *Inv. Math.* **216**, (2019), 395–419.
- [23] Huybrechts D.: *Compact hyperkähler manifolds: basic results*, *Inv. Math.* **135**, (1999), 63–113.

- [24] Huybrechts D.: *Lectures on K3 Surfaces*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/CBO9781316594193 (2016).
- [25] Kondo S.: *Niemeier lattices, Mathieu groups, and finite groups of symplectic automorphisms of K3 surfaces*, With an appendix by Shigeru Mukai, Duke Math. J. **92**, (1998), 593–603.
- [26] Lehn M.: *Symplectic Moduli Spaces*. Lecture Notes, School and Conference on Intersection Theory and Moduli, Trieste (2002), available at <https://download.uni-mainz.de/mathematik/Topologie%20und%20Geometrie/Lehre/symplecticmoduli.pdf>
- [27] Li Bassi L.: *GIT stable cubic threefolds and certain fourfolds of K3[2]-type*. Preprint arXiv:2301.11149.
- [28] Li Bassi L.: *Degenerations of automorphisms on irreducible symplectic varieties*. PhD Thesis.
- [29] Menet G.: *On the integral cohomology of quotients of manifolds by cyclic groups*. J. Math. Pures Appl. **119**, (2018), 280–325.
- [30] Menet G.: *Beauville-Bogomolov lattice for a singular symplectic variety of dimension 4*. J. of Pure and App. Math. **219**, (2014), 1455–1495.
- [31] Menet G.: *Thirty-three deformation classes of irreducible symplectic orbifolds*. Preprint arXiv:2211.14524.
- [32] Mongardi G.: *Automorphisms of hyperkähler manifolds*. PhD Thesis, University of Rome 3 (2013)
- [33] S. Mukai: *Finite groups of automorphisms of K3 surfaces and the Mathieu group*, Invent. Math. **94**, (1988), 183–221.
- [34] Namikawa Y.: *Extension of 2-forms and symplectic varieties*. J. Reine Angew. Math. **539**, (2001), 123–147.
- [35] Nikulin V. V.: *Integral symmetric bilinear forms and some of their applications*, Math. USSR Izv. **14**, (1980), 103–167.
- [36] Nikulin V. V.: *Kummer surfaces* Math. USSR Izv. **9** (1975), 261–275
- [37] Nikulin V. V.: *Finite automorphism groups of Kähler K3 surfaces* Trans Moscow Math. Soc. **2**, (1980), 71–135,
- [38] Perego A.: *Examples of irreducible symplectic varieties*. In Birational Geometry and Moduli Spaces, Springer INdAM Series **39**, Springer (2020).
- [39] Perego A., Rapagnetta A.: *The moduli spaces of sheaves on K3 surfaces are irreducible symplectic varieties*. Alg. Geom. **10**, (2023), 348–393.
- [40] Roulleau X.: *On generalized Kummer surfaces and the orbifold Bogomolov-Miyaoka-Yau inequality*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **371**, (2019), 765–7668.
- [41] Schuett M.: *Divisibilities among nodal curves*, Math. Res. Lett. **25**, (2018), 1359–1368.
- [42] Shimada I.: *On Normal K3 Surfaces*, Michigan Math. J. **55**, (2007), 395–416
- [43] Wendland K.: *Consistency of orbifold conformal field theories on K3*, Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. **5**, (2001), 429–456.
- [44] Whitcher U.: *Symplectic automorphisms and the Picard group of a K3 surface*, Comm. in Algebra **39(4)** (2011), 1427–1440.
- [45] Yamagishi R.: *Singularities of Fano varieties of lines on singular cubic fourfolds*. J. Math. Soc. Japan, **74(2)**, (2022), 549–570.
- [46] Xiao G.: *Galois covers between K3 surfaces*. Ann. Inst. Fourier **46**, (1996), 73–88.

Alice Garbagnati Università degli Studi di Milano, Dipartimento di Matematica “Federigo Enriques”, I-20133 Milano, Italy. *E-mail* alice.garbagnati@unimi.it

Matteo Penegini, Università degli Studi di Genova, DIMA Dipartimento di Matematica, I-16146 Genova, Italy. *E-mail* penegini@dima.unige.it

Arvid Perego, Università degli Studi di Genova, DIMA Dipartimento di Matematica, I-16146 Genova, Italy. *E-mail* perego@dima.unige.it