SPLITTING OF VECTOR BUNDLES ON TORIC VARIETIES

MAHRUD SAYRAFI

ABSTRACT. We prove a Horrocks-type splitting criterion for arbitrary smooth projective toric varieties under an additional hypothesis similar to the case of products of projective spaces by Eisenbud–Erman–Schreyer.

1. INTRODUCTION

The study of algebraic vector bundles as a rich source of high dimensional varieties, nonsingular subvarieties, and moduli problems is classical in algebraic geometry [Har74, Har79]. Moreover, the equivalence of the categories of algebraic and holomorphic vector bundles on a complex algebraic variety connects this study to mathematical physics.

One central problem here is determining the indecomposability of a given vector bundle. By a famous result of Horrocks, a vector bundle \mathcal{E} on \mathbb{P}^n splits as a direct sum of line bundles if and only if $H^q(\mathbb{P}^n, \mathcal{E}(a)) = 0$ for all $q = 1, \ldots, n-1$ and all twists $\mathcal{O}(a) \in \operatorname{Pic} \mathbb{P}^n$ [Hor64]. Barth and Hulek gave an inductive proof of this by restricting to a linear subspace \mathbb{P}^{n-1} and using Grothendieck's theorem for \mathbb{P}^1 as the base [BH78, Lem. 1].

Horrocks' splitting criterion inspired similar criteria for splitting of vector bundles over other classes of varieties: products of projective spaces [CM05, EES15], Grassmannians and quadrics [Ott89], rank 2 vector bundles on Hirzebruch surfaces [Buc87, AM11, FM11, Yas15], and Segre–Veronese varieties [Sch22], among others. See [Ott24] for a recent survey.

We prove an analogous splitting criterion for vector bundles on smooth projective toric varieties, under an additional hypothesis similar to that of Eisenbud–Erman–Schreyer's criterion for products of projective spaces [EES15, Thm. 7.2] and the recent joint work with Brown for the Picard rank 2 case in [BS24, Thm. 1.5].

Theorem 1. Suppose \mathcal{E} is a vector bundle on a smooth projective toric variety X and $\mathcal{E}' = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{n} \mathcal{O}(D_i)^{r_i}$ is a sum of line bundles on X such that $D_{i+1} - D_i$ is ample for 0 < i < n. If $H^q(X, \mathcal{E} \otimes \mathcal{L}) = H^q(X, \mathcal{E}' \otimes \mathcal{L})$ for all $q \ge 0$ and $\mathcal{L} \in \operatorname{Pic} X$, then $\mathcal{E} \cong \mathcal{E}'$.

The main ingredient in the proof of Theorem 1 is a construction of resolutions of toric subvarieties by line bundles due to Hanlon–Hicks–Lazarev [HHL24] (c.f. [FH23, And23, BE24]). The proof consists of a Beilinson-type spectral sequence which computes the Fourier–Mukai transform corresponding to a resolution of the diagonal. Similar ideas have been used to great success in [CM05, FM11, AM11, EES15, BS24].

In our case, a significant obstacle is introduced by the difference between the nef and effective cones for arbitrary toric varieties. In all previous incarnations of the criterion, either the nef and effective cones are identical or the Picard rank is low (one or two). Without either of these restrictions, the analysis of the cohomology of line bundles requires new ideas.

²⁰²⁰ Mathematics Subject Classification. 13D02, 14F06, 14F08.

Outline. We begin in \S^2 with a recipe for proving Horrocks-type splitting criteria for arbitrary smooth projective varieties, which illustrates the proof. Then in \S^3 we prove Theorem 1.

Acknowledgments. The author thanks Christine Berkesch, Lauren Cranton Heller, Jay Yang, Gregory Smith, Michael Brown, Daniel Erman, Andrew Hanlon, Jeff Hicks, Oleg Lazarev, David Favero, Jesse Huang, Devlin Mallory, and David Eisenbud for valuable conversations. This paper was written while the author was supported by the Doctoral Dissertation Fellowship at the University of Minnesota.

2. A GENERAL RECIPE FOR SPLITTING CRITERIA

Let X be a smooth projective variety with a resolution of the diagonal \mathcal{K} and \mathcal{E} a coherent sheaf on X. Similar to the case in [BS24, §4], we use a Fourier–Mukai functor with kernel \mathcal{K} to construct a monad which is quasi-isomorphic to \mathcal{E} and whose terms are prescribed by the terms of \mathcal{K} with ranks given by sheaf cohomology of twists of \mathcal{E} . The recipe for the splitting criteria proved in this section is a consequence of appropriate vanishing of the terms of this spectral sequence.

The diagonal embedding $X \to X \times X$ defines a closed subscheme $\Delta \subset X \times X$. Let π_1 and π_2 denote the natural projections of $X \times X$ onto X and for the rest of this paper suppose \mathcal{K} is a locally free resolution for \mathcal{O}_{Δ} , the structure sheaf of Δ , with terms given as direct sums of sheaves of the form $\mathcal{G} \boxtimes \mathcal{L} := \pi_1^* \mathcal{G} \otimes \pi_2^* \mathcal{L}$, where \mathcal{G} is a locally free sheaf and $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{O}(E)$ is a line bundle corresponding to a divisor E on X.

The Fourier–Mukai transform with kernel \mathcal{K} is the composition of functors:

$$\Phi_{\mathcal{K}} \colon \mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(X) \xrightarrow{\pi_1^*} \mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(X \times X) \xrightarrow{\cdot \otimes \mathcal{K}} \mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(X \times X) \xrightarrow{\mathbf{R}\pi_{2*}} \mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(X).$$

In particular, $\Phi_{\mathcal{K}}$ is the identity functor on the derived categories, meaning that $\Phi_{\mathcal{K}}(\mathcal{E})$ will be quasi-isomorphic to \mathcal{E} . We evaluate the last functor, derived pushforward, by resolving the first term of each box product with a Čech complex to obtain a spectral sequence

$$E_1^{-p,q} = \mathbf{R}^q \pi_{2*}(\pi_1^* \mathcal{E} \otimes \mathcal{K}_p) = \bigoplus_i \mathcal{G}_i \otimes H^q(X, \mathcal{L}_i) \Rightarrow \mathbf{R}^{p-q} \pi_{2*}(\pi_1^* \mathcal{E} \otimes \mathcal{K}) \cong \begin{cases} \mathcal{E} & i=j\\ 0 & i\neq j, \end{cases}$$

where the direct sum ranges over summands $\mathcal{G}_i \boxtimes \mathcal{L}_i$ of \mathcal{K}_p (c.f. [BCHS21, §3.3] and [BS24, §4]).

Definition 2.1. For a convex cone $\mathcal{A} \subset \operatorname{Pic} X$, say \mathcal{K} is cohomologically supported in \mathcal{A} if any summand $\mathcal{G} \boxtimes \mathcal{O}(E)$ of \mathcal{K}_p has $H^q(X, \mathcal{O}(E - D)) = 0$ for all q < p and $D \in \mathcal{A}$. This means the terms along dotted diagonals with k > 0 in (2.1) vanish when $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{O}(-D)$.

For instance, Beilinson's resolution of the diagonal for \mathbb{P}^n [Bei78], its variant for products of projective spaces (e.g. [BES20]), and the resolutions constructed in [BS24] are all cohomologically supported in Nef $X \subset \text{Pic } X$. Note that only the Picard group for \mathbb{P}^n has a total ordering, hence any direct sum of line bundles on \mathbb{P}^n can be increasingly ordered by Nef \mathbb{P}^n .

Lemma 2.2. Let \mathcal{E} be a coherent sheaf on a smooth projective variety X with a resolution of the diagonal \mathcal{K} such that $\Phi_{\mathcal{K}}(\mathcal{O}_X) = \mathcal{O}_X$. Consider the spectral sequence $E_1^{-p,q} \Rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ above.

- (1) If $E_1^{-p-1,p} = 0$ for all p (the red terms vanish), then $E_1^{0,0}$ is a direct summand of \mathcal{E} .
- (2) If \mathcal{K} is supported in \mathcal{A} and $\mathcal{E} = \bigoplus \mathcal{O}(D_i)$ with $-D_i \in \mathcal{A}$, then $E_1^{-p-1,p} = 0$ for all p.

Proof. The proof of the first part is identical to [BS24, Lem. 4.1] and [EES15, Lem. 7.3]. Using [EFS03, Lem. 3.5], there exists a complex with terms that are the same as the totalization $\text{Tot}(E_1)$ (along the dotted diagonals in (2.1)) which is quasi-isomorphic to \mathcal{E} . The vanishing of the first term of the totalization (colored in red) implies that all differentials with source or target $E_r^{0,0}$ are zero, therefore $E_1^{0,0}$ is a summand of $E_{\infty}^{0,0} = \mathcal{E}$.

The second part immediately follows from Definition 2.1, as $\Phi_{\mathcal{K}}$ commutes with direct sums and the totalization $\operatorname{Tot}(E_1)$ corresponding to $\Phi_{\mathcal{K}}(\mathcal{O}(-D))$ for any divisor $D \in \mathcal{A}$ is zero in positive homological degrees (i.e., terms along dotted diagonals with k > 0 vanish).

Remark 2.3. The additional hypothesis present in the splitting criteria proved in [EES15, BS24] avoids the problem of missing a total ordering in the case of higher Picard rank by proving a criterion for a smaller cone $\mathcal{A} = \operatorname{Nef} X$. Nevertheless, to date we do not know whether such hypotheses are necessary. In contrast, for varieties such as Hirzebruch surfaces, there are resolutions of the diagonal supported in $\operatorname{Eff}(X)$, yielding a splitting criterion which requires a strictly weaker additional hypothesis.

Proposition 2.4. Suppose X is a smooth projective variety X with a locally free resolution of the diagonal \mathcal{K} such that \mathcal{K} is cohomologically supported in \mathcal{A} and $\Phi_{\mathcal{K}}(\mathcal{O}_X) = \mathcal{O}_X$. Let \mathcal{E} be a vector bundle and $\mathcal{E}' = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n \mathcal{O}(D_i)^{r_i}$ a sum of line bundles on X such that $D_{i+1} - D_i \in \mathcal{A}$ for 0 < i < n. If $H^q(X, \mathcal{E} \otimes \mathcal{L}) = H^q(X, \mathcal{E}' \otimes \mathcal{L})$ for all $q \ge 0$ and $\mathcal{L} \in \operatorname{Pic} X$, then $\mathcal{E} \cong \mathcal{E}'$.

Proof. Following a similar road map as [BS24, Thm. 1.5] and [EES15, Thm. 7.2], twist \mathcal{E} and \mathcal{E}' by the highest line bundle $\mathcal{O}(-D_n)$ so that without loss of generality we can assume $\mathcal{E}' = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{n-1} \mathcal{O}(D_i)^{r_i} \oplus \mathcal{O}_X^{r_n}$. Let $E_1(\mathcal{E})$ denote the spectral sequence corresponding to $\Phi_{\mathcal{K}}(\mathcal{E})$.

 $\mathcal{E}' = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{n-1} \mathcal{O}(D_i)^{r_i} \oplus \mathcal{O}_X^{r_n}. \text{ Let } E_1(\mathcal{E}) \text{ denote the spectral sequence corresponding to } \Phi_{\mathcal{K}}(\mathcal{E}).$ By hypothesis, $E_1(\mathcal{E})$ and $E_1(\mathcal{E}')$ have the same terms, so $E_1^{0,0}(\mathcal{E}) = E_1^{0,0}(\mathcal{E}') = \mathcal{O}_X^{r_n}.$ Since $-D_i \in \mathcal{A}$ for all *i*, Lemma 2.2(b) implies that $E_1^{-p-1,p}(\mathcal{E}) = E_1^{-p-1,p}(\mathcal{E}') = 0$ for all *p*. Using Lemma 2.2(a), the term $E_1^{0,0}(\mathcal{E}) = \mathcal{O}_X^{r_n}$ is a summand of \mathcal{E} . Induction on the complement of $\mathcal{O}_X^{r_n}$ in \mathcal{E} and \mathcal{E}' finishes the proof. \Box

Remark 2.5. Proposition 2.4, combined with resolutions of the diagonal constructed by Beilinson [Bei78] and Kapranov [Kap88], recovers the splitting criteria for \mathbb{P}^n by Horrocks and Grassmannians and quadrics by Ottaviani [Ott89], respectively. Further, one can show that given resolutions of the diagonal \mathcal{K} and \mathcal{K}' supported in \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{A}' for X and X', respectively, $\mathcal{K} \boxtimes \mathcal{K}'$ is a resolution of the diagonal for $X \times X'$ supported in $\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}'$. In particular, the splitting criterion [EES15, Thm. 7.2] for products of projective spaces can be recovered from Beilinson's resolution for \mathbb{P}^n , similarly for products of Grassmannians, etc.

3. Smooth Projective Toric Varieties

In [HHL24], Hanlon, Hicks, and Lazarev construct resolutions of toric subvarieties by line bundles on a smooth toric variety X. The case of interest here is the diagonal subvariety, where the resolution of the structure sheaf of the diagonal \mathcal{K} consists of line bundles from the Thomsen collection on $X \times X$ (compare with [BE24]).

We will need the following technical lemma on properties of the terms of \mathcal{K} . We denote by N_X and its dual $M_X = \text{Hom}(N_X, \mathbb{Z})$ the lattices of one-parameter subgroups and characters of the torus, respectively, and $N_{X,\mathbb{R}}$ or $M_{X,\mathbb{R}}$ the corresponding real vector spaces. Further, for a ray $\rho \in \Sigma(1)$ denote by D_{ρ} the corresponding torus-invariant prime divisor on X.

Lemma 3.1. Suppose $\mathcal{O}(E') \boxtimes \mathcal{O}(E)$ is a summand of \mathcal{K}_p constructed as in [HHL24].

(I). The divisor -E is an effective Cartier divisor on X; that is,

$$E = -\sum d_{\rho}D_{\rho}$$
 for $d_{\rho} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ and $\rho \in \Sigma(1)$.

(II). The bundle $\mathcal{O}(E)$ is a summand of a high toric Frobenius pushforward of \mathcal{O}_X ; that is, there is a Cartier Q-divisor \widetilde{E} linearly equivalent to E such that

$$\widetilde{E} = -\sum c_{\rho} D_{\rho} \quad \text{for } c_{\rho} \in [0,1) \text{ and } \rho \in \Sigma(1).$$

(III). The dimension of the polyhedron P_{-E} of the divisor -E is at least p; that is,

if $\mathcal{O}(E') \boxtimes \mathcal{O}(E)$ is a summand of \mathcal{K}_p , then $p \leq \dim P_{-E}$.

Proof. The Thomsen collection for $X \times X$ consists of products of bundles from the Thomsen collection for X [HHL24, Rem. 1.3], hence the first two properties follow from $\mathcal{O}(E)$ being in the Thomsen collection for X [HHL24, §5].

The third point is more subtle, as it implies that not all line bundles from the Thomsen collection for $X \times X$ appear in \mathcal{K} , and only a subset may appear in any given term \mathcal{K}_p . The diagonal embedding is induced by an inclusion of lattices $\bar{\phi} \colon N_X \to N_{X \times X}$. The dual map on the character lattices $\bar{\phi}^* \colon M_{X \times X} \to M_X$ induces a short exact sequence of real tori:

$$0 \to L_{\mathbb{R}} \to M_{X \times X, \mathbb{R}} / M_{X \times X} \to M_{X, \mathbb{R}} / M_X \to 0.$$

The construction of \mathcal{K} begins with a stratification S of the ambient real torus $M_{X \times X,\mathbb{R}}/M_{X \times X}$ labeled by divisors on $X \times X$ introduced by Bondal [Bon06] (c.f. [HHL24, §3.4]). In the case of the diagonal, the dimension of the kernel $L_{\mathbb{R}} \cong M_{X,\mathbb{R}}/M_X$ equals dim X and the kernel inherits the stratification S (c.f. [HHL24, Exa. 3.13]).

We need to show that if $\mathcal{O}(E') \boxtimes \mathcal{O}(E)$ is a summand of \mathcal{K}_p then $p \leq \dim P_{-E}$. It follows from the construction of \mathcal{K} in [HHL24, eq. (18)] that the line bundle summands of \mathcal{K}_p correspond to labels on the *p*-dimensional strata in *S*. In particular, the stratification on $L_{\mathbb{R}}$ is the same as the stratification on $M_{X,\mathbb{R}}$ when constructing the resolution of a point on *X*, only in that case the labels are divisors on *X* rather than $X \times X$. Specifically, if a *p*-dimensional stratum S_{σ} has label $\mathcal{O}(E') \boxtimes \mathcal{O}(E)$ in \mathcal{K}_p , then S_{σ} has label $\mathcal{O}(E)$ in the resolution of a point on *X*. We will use this correspondence to bound the dimension of P_{-E} .

Given a line bundle $\mathcal{O}(E)$ in the Thomsen collection, let S_{-E} denote the union of strata with that label in Bondal's stratification on $M_{X,\mathbb{R}}/M_X$. It follows from [FH22, Lem. 5.6] that $S_{-E} = (P_{-E} \setminus \bigcup_{\rho \in \Sigma(1)} P_{-E-D_{\rho}})/M_X$. Since -E is effective, P_{-E} is nonempty, and because the section polytopes are closed, S_{-E} is open and dim $S_{-E} = \dim P_{-E}$. Putting this all together, any *p*-dimensional stratum S_{σ} which is labeled by the line bundle $\mathcal{O}(E') \boxtimes \mathcal{O}(E)$ in \mathcal{K}_p must satisfy $p = \dim S_{\sigma} \leq \dim S_{-E} = \dim P_{-E}$.

Remark 3.2. While the stratifications considered in [HHL24, §3.4] and [FH22, §5] are both versions of the stratification studied by Bondal in [Bon06], they have a subtle difference: the union of the strata with the same label in [HHL24] is the unique strata with that label in [FH22], which is contractible by [FH22, Lem. 5.6].

In order to use Lemma 2.2, we need the following analysis of the support of \mathcal{K} .

Proposition 3.3. The resolution of the diagonal \mathcal{K} is cohomologically supported in Ample(X).

Proof. Suppose $\mathcal{O}(E') \boxtimes \mathcal{O}(E)$ is a summand of \mathcal{K}_p . We show that:

 $H^q(X, \mathcal{O}(E-D)) = 0$ for q < p and any ample divisor D.

First, using d_{ρ} and c_{ρ} from (I) and (II), since $\left[d_{\rho} - (1-\epsilon)c_{\rho}\right] = d_{\rho}$ for any $\epsilon \in [0,1]$,

$$-\lceil D + (1-\epsilon)\widetilde{E} - E \rceil = -\lceil D + \sum (d_{\rho} - (1-\epsilon)c_{\rho})D_{\rho} \rceil$$
$$= -\lceil D + \sum d_{\rho}D_{\rho} \rceil = -\lceil D - E \rceil = E - D.$$

Second, by linear equivalence in (II) it follows that $\tilde{E} - E \sim 0$. Hence,

$$D + (1 - \epsilon)\widetilde{E} - E = D + (\widetilde{E} - E) - \epsilon\widetilde{E}$$

 $\sim D - \epsilon\widetilde{E},$

which, for sufficiently small ϵ , is ample, and hence nef, because D is ample by hypothesis. Third, since both D and $-\epsilon \tilde{E}$ are effective,

$$\dim P_{D+(1-\epsilon)\widetilde{E}-E} = \dim P_{D-\epsilon\widetilde{E}}$$
$$\geq \dim P_{-\epsilon\widetilde{E}} = \dim P_{-\widetilde{E}} = \dim P_{-E}.$$

Hence by Batyrev–Borisov Vanishing (see [CLS11, Thm. 9.3.5(b)]),

$$H^{q}(X, \mathcal{O}(E-D)) = H^{q}(X, \mathcal{O}(-\lceil D + (1-\epsilon)\tilde{E} - E\rceil)) = 0 \text{ for all } q < \dim P_{-E}.$$

Therefore by (III), the weaker vanishing $H^q(X, \mathcal{O}(E-D)) = 0$ for q < p holds.

The proof of the main theorem is a direct application of the recipe from Section 2.

Proof of Theorem 1. Since \mathcal{K} is cohomologically supported in Ample(X) by Proposition 3.3 and the consecutive differences $D_{i+1} - D_i$ are ample by hypothesis, the proof follows immediately using the recipe in Proposition 2.4.

References

- [AM11] Marian Aprodu and Marius Marchitan, A note on vector bundles on Hirzebruch surfaces, Comptes Rendus Mathématique. Académie des Sciences. Paris 349 (2011), no. 11-12, 687–690. MR2817392 ↑1
- [And23] Reginald Anderson, A Resolution of the Diagonal for Smooth Toric Varieties, arXiv, 2023. ↑1
- [BCHS21] Juliette Bruce, Lauren Cranton Heller, and Mahrud Sayrafi, Characterizing Multigraded Regularity and Virtual Resolutions on Products of Projective Spaces (2021). ↑2
 - [BE24] Michael K. Brown and Daniel Erman, A short proof of the Hanlon-Hicks-Lazarev theorem, Forum of Mathematics. Sigma 12 (2024), Paper No. e56, 6. ↑1, 4

- [Bei78] A. A. Beilinson, Coherent sheaves on Pⁿ and problems of linear algebra, Rossiiskaya Akademiya Nauk. Funktsionalnyi Analiz i ego Prilozheniya 12 (July 1978), no. 3, 214–216. ↑3
- [BES20] Christine Berkesch, Daniel Erman, and Gregory G. Smith, Virtual resolutions for a product of projective spaces, Algebraic Geometry 7 (2020), no. 4, 460–481. MR4156411 ↑3
- [BH78] Wolf Barth and Klaus Hulek, Monads and moduli of vector bundles, Manuscripta Mathematica 25 (1978), no. 4, 323–347. MR509589 ↑1
- [Bon06] Alexey Bondal, Derived categories of toric varieties, Oberwolfach Reports, 2006, pp. 284–286. ↑4, 5
- [BS24] Michael K. Brown and Mahrud Sayrafi, A short resolution of the diagonal for smooth projective toric varieties of Picard rank 2, Algebra & Number Theory 18 (October 2024), no. 10, 1923–1943. ↑1, 2, 3
- [Buc87] N. P. Buchdahl, Stable 2-Bundles on Hirzebruch surfaces, Mathematische Zeitschrift 194 (1987), no. 1, 143–152. MR871226 ↑1
- [CLS11] David A. Cox, John B. Little, and Henry K. Schenck, *Toric varieties*, Graduate Studies in Mathematics, vol. 124, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2011. ↑5
- [CM05] L. Costa and R. M. Miró-Roig, Cohomological characterization of vector bundles on multiprojective spaces, Journal of Algebra 294 (2005), no. 1, 73–96. MR2179715 ↑1
- [EES15] David Eisenbud, Daniel Erman, and Frank-Olaf Schreyer, Tate resolutions for products of projective spaces, Acta Mathematica Vietnamica 40 (2015), no. 1, 5–36. ↑1, 3
- [EFS03] David Eisenbud, Gunnar Fløystad, and Frank-Olaf Schreyer, Sheaf cohomology and free resolutions over exterior algebras, Transactions of the American Mathematical Society 355 (July 2003), no. 11, 4397–4426. ↑3
- [FH22] David Favero and Jesse Huang, Homotopy path algebras (2022), available at 2205.03730. ↑4, 5
- [FH23] _____, Rouquier dimension is Krull dimension for normal toric varieties, European Journal of Mathematics 9 (2023), no. 4, Paper No. 91, 13. ↑1
- [FM11] Mihai Fulger and Marius Marchitan, Some splitting criteria on Hirzebruch surfaces, Bulletin mathématique de la Société des Sciences Mathématiques de Roumanie 54 (102) (2011), no. 4, 313-323. ↑1
- [Har74] Robin Hartshorne, Varieties of small codimension in projective space, Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society 80 (1974), 1017–1032. ↑1
- [Har79] _____, Algebraic vector bundles on projective spaces: A problem list, Topology. An International Journal of Mathematics 18 (1979), no. 2, 117–128. MR544153 ↑1
- [HHL24] Andrew Hanlon, Jeff Hicks, and Oleg Lazarev, Resolutions of toric subvarieties by line bundles and applications, Forum of Mathematics. Pi 12 (2024), Paper No. e24. MR4831691 ↑1, 4, 5
- [Hor64] G. Horrocks, Vector bundles on the punctured spectrum of a local ring, Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society. Third Series 14 (1964), 689–713. MR169877 ↑1
- [Kap88] M. M. Kapranov, On the derived categories of coherent sheaves on some homogeneous spaces, Inventiones Mathematicae 92 (October 1988), no. 3, 479–508. [↑]3
- [Ott24] Giorgio Ottaviani, Vector bundles without intermediate cohomology and the trichotomy result, Rendiconti del Circolo Matematico di Palermo Series 2 73 (October 2024), no. 6, 2297–2311. ↑1
- [Ott89] _____, Some extensions of Horrocks criterion to vector bundles on Grassmannians and quadrics, Annali di Matematica Pura ed Applicata. Serie Quarta **155** (1989), 317–341. MR1042842 ↑1, 3
- [Sch22] Frank-Olaf Schreyer, Horrocks splitting on Segre-Veronese varieties, Mathematische Zeitschrift 300 (2022), no. 2, 1351–1358. MR4363781 ↑1
- [Tho00] Jesper Funch Thomsen, Frobenius direct images of line bundles on toric varieties, Journal of Algebra 226 (2000), no. 2, 865–874. MR1752764 ↑
- [Yas15] Kazunori Yasutake, A cohomological splitting criterion for rank 2 vector bundles on Hirzebruch surfaces, Tokyo Journal of Mathematics 38 (2015), no. 2, 327–330. MR3448859 ↑1

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA, MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA, 55455 Email address: mahrud@umn.edu

URL: https://math.umn.edu/~mahrud/