

# COMPACTIFICATIONS OF AFFINE HOMOLOGY 3-CELLS INTO BLOW-UPS OF THE PROJECTIVE 3-SPACE WITH TRIVIAL LOG CANONICAL DIVISORS

MASARU NAGAOKA

ABSTRACT. In this paper we classify all the compactifications of affine homology 3-cells into the blow-ups of the projective 3-space along smooth curves such that the log canonical divisors are linearly trivial. As a result, we prove that each embedded affine 3-fold is isomorphic to the affine 3-space except one example.

## CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Topological Euler numbers	4
3. Projective equivalence classes of cubic surfaces	5
3.1. Normal and rational cubic surfaces	5
3.2. Non-normal cubic surfaces	8
4. Curves in cubic surfaces	8
4.1. Smooth rational curves in $G_1, G_2, G_3$ or $G_5$	9
4.2. Smooth curves in the cones over elliptic curves	14
4.3. Curves in non-normal cubic surfaces	14
5. The case $p_a(C) \geq 1$	14
6. The case $p_a(C) = 0$ and $S_2$ is normal	16
7. The case $p_a(C) = 0$ and $S_2$ is non-normal	21
8. Contractibilities	26
9. Isomorphism classes	27
Acknowledgement	31
References	31

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Throughout the paper we work over the field of complex numbers  $\mathbb{C}$ . In [Nag18], we investigate about the following problem:

**Problem 1.1** ([Kis05]). *Let  $V$  be a smooth Fano 3-fold with the second Betti number  $B_2(V) = 2$ ,  $U$  a contractible affine 3-fold which is embedded into  $V$ , and  $D_1$  and  $D_2$  irreducible hypersurfaces such that  $V \setminus U = D_1 \cup D_2$ . Classify such triplets  $(V, U, D_1 \cup D_2)$ .*

---

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 14J10, 14J30, 14M27, 14R10.

*Key words and phrases.* Affine homology threefolds; compactifications; blow-ups of the projective 3-space.

We also showed that there are exactly 14 deformation equivalence classes of  $V$  as in Problem 1.1 when the log canonical divisor  $K_V + D_1 + D_2$  is linearly trivial. Among them, exactly six equivalence classes parametrize the blow-ups of the projective 3-space  $\mathbb{P}^3$  along smooth curves.

The aim of this paper is to give the complete solution to Problem 1.1 when  $(V, U, D_1 \cup D_2)$  as in Problem 1.1 satisfies the following conditions:

- (1)  $K_V + D_1 + D_2 \sim 0$ .
- (2) There is a blow-up morphism  $\varphi: V \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^3$  along a smooth curve  $C \subset \mathbb{P}^3$ .

In the above situation, [Nag18, Proposition 3.4] shows that we may assume that  $\varphi_*D_1$  is a hyperplane not containing  $C$  and  $\varphi_*D_2$  is a cubic surface containing  $C$  with multiplicity one. This assertion still holds if we drop the assumption that  $V$  is Fano 3-fold, and if we replace the contractibility of  $U$  as that  $U$  is an affine homology 3-cell, i.e., a smooth affine 3-fold with  $H_i(U, \mathbb{Z}) = 0$  for  $i \geq 1$  (see Lemma 2.1). For this reason, we consider the following problem instead of Problem 1.1:

**Problem 1.2.** *Let  $C \subset \mathbb{P}^3_{[x:y:z:t]}$  be a smooth curve,  $S_1$  a hyperplane not containing  $C$ , and  $S_2$  a cubic surface containing  $C$  with multiplicity one. Take  $\varphi: V \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^3$  as the blow up along  $C$  and write  $D_i$  as the strict transform of  $S_i$  in  $V$  for  $i = 1, 2$ . Write  $U := V \setminus (D_1 \cup D_2)$ . Then classify  $(C, S_1, S_2, U)$  such that  $U$  is an affine homology 3-cell.*

The following example shows that  $U$  as in Problem 1.2 may not be isomorphic to  $\mathbb{A}^3$  even if  $U$  is an affine homology 3-cell.

*Example 1.1.* In  $\mathbb{P}^3_{[x:y:z:w]}$ , let  $C = \{x = y = -z\}$ ,  $S_1 = \{z = 0\}$  and  $S_2 = \{x^2z + y^3 = 0\}$ . Take  $\varphi: V \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^3$  as the blow up along  $C$  and write  $D_i$  as the strict transform of  $S_i$  in  $V$  for  $i = 1, 2$ . Then  $V$  is the Fano 3-fold of No. 33 in [MM82, Table 2] and  $U := V \setminus (D_1 \cup D_2)$  is isomorphic to  $\mathbb{A}^1 \times W(3, 2)$ , where

$$(1.0.1) \quad W(3, 2) := \left\{ \frac{(zx + 1)^2 - (zy + 1)^3 - y}{y} = 0 \right\} \subset \mathbb{A}^3_{(x,y,z)}$$

is a contractible affine surface with the logarithmic Kodaira dimension one constructed in [tDP90]. In particular,  $\mathbb{A}^1 \times W(3, 2) \not\cong \mathbb{A}^3$  because the Zariski cancellation problem has an affirmative answer in dimension two [Fuj79, MS80].

Our main result consists of two theorems. One is Theorem 1.2, which determines all the 3-tuple  $(C, S_1, S_2)$  as in Problem 1.2 when  $U$  is an affine homology 3-cell. Throughout the statement of Theorem 1.2,  $G_i$  and  $R_i$  for  $i \geq 1$  denote the cubic surfaces defined as in Definition 3.2 and Theorem 3.4 respectively.

**Theorem 1.2.** *We use the notation as in Problem 1.2. Then  $U$  is an affine homology 3-cell if and only if one of the following holds:*

- (a) *The curve  $C$  is a smooth elliptic curve of degree three or four. The surface  $S_2$  is the cone over an elliptic curve whose vertex  $S_1$  contains. Moreover,  $\sharp(C \cap S_1) = B_2(S_1 \cap S_2)$ .*

- (b) *The curve  $C$  is a smooth rational curve of degree three or four. The pair  $(S_1, S_2)$  is projectively equivalent to  $(\{y = \gamma x\}, R_1)$  for some  $\gamma \in \mathbb{C}$ . Moreover,  $\sharp(C \cap S_1) = B_2(S_1 \cap S_2)$ .*
- (c) *The curve  $C$  is a smooth rational curve of degree three or four. The pair  $(S_1, S_2)$  is projectively equivalent to  $(\{y = \gamma x\}, R_2)$  for some  $\gamma \in \mathbb{P}^1$ . Moreover,  $\sharp(C \cap S_1) = B_2(S_1 \cap S_2) + 1$ .*
- (d) *The curve  $C$  is a smooth rational curve and  $(S_1, S_2)$  is projectively equivalent to one of the following:*
  - $(\{y = 0\}, G_1), (\{z = \gamma y\}, G_5)$  for some  $\gamma \in \mathbb{P}^1$ ,
  - $(\{t = 0\}, G_6), (\{y = 0\}, G_9), (\{y = 0\}, G_{10}), (\{x = t\}, G_{11}),$
  - $(\{x = 0\}, R_1), (\{y = \gamma x\}, R_3)$  for some  $\gamma \in \mathbb{P}^1$ , and  $(\{x = 0\}, R_4)$ .

*Moreover,  $\sharp(C \cap S_1) = 1$ .*
- (e) *The curve  $C$  is a smooth rational curve and  $(S_1, S_2)$  is projectively equivalent to one of the following:*
  - $(\{y = 0\}, G_2), (\{y = 0\}, G_4)$ , and  $(\{y = \gamma x\}, R_4)$  for some  $\gamma \in \mathbb{A}^1$ .

*Moreover, the inclusion  $C \setminus (C \cap S_1) \hookrightarrow S_2 \setminus (S_2 \cap S_1)$  induces an isomorphism  $H_1(C \setminus (C \cap S_1), \mathbb{Z}) \cong H_1(S_2 \setminus (S_2 \cap S_1), \mathbb{Z})$ .*
- (f) *The triplet  $(C, S_1, S_2)$  is projectively equivalent to the subvarieties constructed as in Example 1.1.*

The other is Theorem 1.3, which determines the isomorphism classes of  $U$  as in Problem 1.2.

**Theorem 1.3.** *We use the notation as in Problem 1.2. Suppose that one of the cases (a)–(e) of Theorem 1.2 holds. Then  $U \cong \mathbb{A}^3$ .*

Hence we obtain the following as a corollary of Theorems 1.2 and 1.3:

**Corollary 1.4.** *In the notation as in Problem 1.2,  $U$  is an affine homology 3-cell if and only if  $U \cong \mathbb{A}^3$  or  $\mathbb{A}^1 \times W(3, 2)$ . If the latter holds, then  $(C, S_1, S_2)$  is projectively equivalent to the subvarieties constructed as in Example 1.1.*

We now give an outline of the paper using the notation of Problem 1.2.

§2–§4 present some preliminaries. In §2, we show that if the complement of a reduced member  $D' \in |-K_V|$  is an affine homology 3-cell, then we can determine the linear equivalence classes of irreducible components of  $D'$ . After that, we set up notation and prove a lemma on topological Euler numbers. In §3, we recall some facts on projective equivalence classes of cubic surfaces. In §4, we summarize facts on curves in certain cubic surfaces.

We start proving main theorems from §5.

In §5, we prove Theorems 1.2 and 1.3 when  $C \not\cong \mathbb{P}^1$ . In the remainder of this paper, we assume that  $C \cong \mathbb{P}^1$ .

In §6 and §7, we determine the projective equivalence class of  $(S_1, S_2)$  assuming that  $U$  is an affine homology 3-cell. §6 (resp. §7) deals with the case where  $S_2$  is normal (resp. non-normal).

In §8, we look closely at the contractibility of  $U$  for each  $(S_1, S_2)$  which we determined in §6 and §7. Combining the results of §5–8, we complete

the proof of Theorem 1.2. We also show that  $U \cong \mathbb{A}^3$  when the case (d) of Theorem 1.2 holds.

In §9, we prove that  $U \cong \mathbb{A}^3$  when one of the cases (b), (c) and (e) of Theorem 1.2 holds to complete the proof of Theorem 1.3.

**Notation.** Throughout this paper, we use the following notation:

- $\mathbb{F}_d$ : the Hirzebruch surface of degree  $d$ .
- $f_d$ : a fiber of  $\mathbb{F}_d$ .
- $\Sigma_d$ : the minimal section of  $\mathbb{F}_d$ .
- $\mathbb{Q}_0^2$ : the quadric cone in  $\mathbb{P}^3$ .
- $E_f$ : the exceptional divisor of a birational morphism  $f$ .
- $\text{Sing } X$ : the singular locus of a variety  $X$ .
- $Y_{\widetilde{X}}$ : the strict transform of a closed subscheme  $Y$  of a normal variety  $X$  in a birational model  $\widetilde{X}$  of  $X$ .
- $B_i(X)$ : the  $i$ -th Betti number of a topological space  $X$ .
- $\chi_{\text{top}}(X)$ : the topological Euler number of a topological space  $X$ .
- $\deg R$ : the degree of a curve  $R$  in the ambient projective space.
- $p_a(R)$ : the arithmetic genus of a projective curve  $R$ .
- $\text{Aut}(X)$ : the automorphism group of  $X$ .

## 2. TOPOLOGICAL EULER NUMBERS

In the beginning of this section, we confirm that the acyclicity of  $U$  and the linear triviality of  $K_V + D_1 + D_2$  as in Problem 1.1 determine the linear equivalence classes of  $D_1$  and  $D_2$  even if  $V$  is not Fano but the blow-up of  $\mathbb{P}^3$  along a smooth curve. After that, we set up notation and prove a lemma needed in the remainder of the paper.

**Lemma 2.1.** *Let  $C \subset \mathbb{P}^3$  be a smooth curve and  $\varphi: V \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^3$  the blow-up along  $C$ . Let  $D_1$  and  $D_2$  be prime divisors such that  $V \setminus (D_1 \cup D_2)$  is an affine homology 3-cell and  $K_V + D_1 + D_2 \sim 0$ . Then  $D_i \sim \varphi^* \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(1)$  for some  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ .*

*Proof.* For  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ , write  $D_i \sim \varphi^* \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(a_i) - b_i E_\varphi$  with  $a_i, b_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Then  $a_1 b_2 - a_2 b_1 = \pm 1$  by [Fuj82, Corollary 1.20]. Since  $K_V + D_1 + D_2 \sim 0$ , we have  $a_1 + a_2 = 4$  and  $b_1 + b_2 = 1$ . On the other hand, let  $L \subset \mathbb{P}^3$  be a line disjoint from  $C$  and not contained in  $\varphi(D_1 \cup D_2)$ . Then  $0 \leq (L_V \cdot D_i) = a_i$  for  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ .

If  $a_1 = 0$ , then  $\pm 1 = -a_2 b_1 = -4b_1$ , a contradiction. Hence  $a_1 \neq 0$ . Similarly, we obtain  $a_2 \neq 0$ . On the other hand, if  $a_1 = a_2 = 2$ , then  $\pm 1 = 2(b_2 - b_1)$ , a contradiction. Hence  $(a_1, a_2) = (1, 3)$  or  $(3, 1)$ . If the former holds, then  $\pm 1 = a_1 b_2 - a_2 b_1 = 1 - 4b_1$ . Therefore  $b_1 = 0$  and  $D_1 \sim \varphi^* \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(1)$ . Similarly, if the latter holds, then  $D_2 \sim \varphi^* \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(1)$ .  $\square$

**Notation 2.2.** In the remainder of this paper, we use the notation as in Problem 1.2. We also use the following notation in addition:

- $F := S_2|_{S_1} \in |\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(3)|$ .
- $\sigma: \overline{S}_2 \rightarrow S_2$ : the normalization.
- $\tau: \widetilde{S}_2 \rightarrow \overline{S}_2$ : the minimal resolution.
- $\mu := \sigma \circ \tau$ .
- $E \subset S_2$  (resp.  $\overline{E} \subset \overline{S}_2$ ): the conductor locus of  $\sigma$ .

- $\tilde{E} := \overline{E}_{\tilde{S}_2} \subset \tilde{S}_2$ .
- $J_i := \{\varphi\text{-exceptional curves in } D_i \cap E_\varphi\}, N_i := \#J_i$  for  $i = 1, 2$ .
- $J_{1 \cap 2} := \{\varphi\text{-exceptional curves in } (D_1 \cap D_2) \cap E_\varphi\}, N_{1 \cap 2} := \#J_{1 \cap 2}$ .

We note that  $E$ ,  $\overline{E}$  and  $\tilde{E}$  are empty when  $S_2$  is normal. We can also interpret  $N_1$ ,  $N_2$  and  $N_{1 \cap 2}$  as  $\#(C \cap S_1)$ ,  $\#(C \cap \text{Sing } S_2)$  and  $\#(C \cap S_1 \cap \text{Sing } S_2)$  respectively.

**Lemma 2.3.** *If  $U$  is an affine homology 3-cell, then the following holds:*

- (1)  $\chi_{\text{top}}(F) = \chi_{\text{top}}(S_2) + 2p_a(C) + N_1 + N_2 - N_{1 \cap 2} - 2$ .
- (2)  $N_1 + N_2 - N_{1 \cap 2} \geq 1$ . Moreover, the equality holds if and only if  $(N_1, N_2, N_{1 \cap 2}) = (1, 0, 0)$  or  $(1, 1, 1)$ .

*Proof.* (1) For  $i = 1, 2$ , an easy computation shows that

$$\begin{aligned}
 (2.0.1) \quad \chi_{\text{top}}(D_i) &= \chi_{\text{top}}(D_i \setminus \bigcup_{L \in J_i} L) + \chi_{\text{top}}(\bigcup_{L \in J_i} L) \\
 &= \chi_{\text{top}}(S_i \setminus \bigcup_{L \in J_i} \varphi(L)) + N_i \chi_{\text{top}}(\mathbb{P}^1) \\
 &= \chi_{\text{top}}(S_i) - N_i + 2N_i = \chi_{\text{top}}(S_i) + N_i.
 \end{aligned}$$

Substituting  $\chi_{\text{top}}(S_1) = \chi_{\text{top}}(\mathbb{P}^2) = 3$  into this, we obtain

$$(2.0.2) \quad \chi_{\text{top}}(D_1) = N_1 + 3 \text{ and } \chi_{\text{top}}(D_2) = N_2 + \chi_{\text{top}}(S_2).$$

In the same manner we obtain

$$(2.0.3) \quad \chi_{\text{top}}(D_1 \cap D_2) = \chi_{\text{top}}(F) + N_{1 \cap 2}.$$

On the other hand, the Mayer-Vietoris exact sequence gives

$$(2.0.4) \quad \chi_{\text{top}}(D_1 \cap D_2) = \chi_{\text{top}}(D_1) + \chi_{\text{top}}(D_2) - \chi_{\text{top}}(D_1 \cup D_2),$$

$$(2.0.5) \quad \chi_{\text{top}}(D_1 \cup D_2) = \chi_{\text{top}}(V) - 1 = 5 - 2p_a(C)$$

since  $\chi_{\text{top}}(U) = 1$ . Combining (2.0.2)–(2.0.5), we get the assertion.

(2) The inequalities  $N_1 \geq 1$  and  $N_{1 \cap 2} \leq \min\{N_1, N_2\}$  implies the first assertion. Now suppose that the equality holds. Then  $0 \leq N_2 - N_{1 \cap 2} = 1 - N_1 \leq 0$ . Hence  $N_2 = N_{1 \cap 2} \leq N_1 = 1$ , which implies the second assertion.  $\square$

### 3. PROJECTIVE EQUIVALENCE CLASSES OF CUBIC SURFACES

In this section, we compile some results on projective equivalence classes of cubic surfaces in  $\mathbb{P}^3$ .

**3.1. Normal and rational cubic surfaces.** We recall that cubic surfaces are canonically parametrized by  $\mathbb{P}^{19}$  since  $H^0(\mathbb{P}^3, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(3)) = \mathbb{C}^{20}$ , and there is an  $\text{Aut}(\mathbb{P}^3)$ -action on  $\mathbb{P}^{19}$  such that its  $\text{Aut}(\mathbb{P}^3)$ -orbits correspond to projective equivalence classes of cubic surfaces. Brundu-Logar [BL98] roughly classified projective equivalence classes of normal and rational cubic surfaces as follows:

TABLE 1. The defining equations of  $G_{i,p}$ 

$i =$	The defining equation of $G_{i,p}$ in $\mathbb{P}_{[x,y,z,t]}^3$
1	$xy^2 + yt^2 + z^3$
2	$xyt + xz^2 + y^3$
3	$xyt - xzt + y^3$
4	$x^2y - x^2z - xy^2 + xz^2 + y^3 - y^2t + yzt$
5	$x^2y + xz^2 + y^2t$
6	$xy^2 + xyt + xzt + yt^2$
7	$2x^2y - x^2z + xy^2 - xyz - xyt - y^2t + yzt$
8	$x^2y - x^2z - 2xy^2 + 2xyz - xyt - xz^2 + xzt + y^2t$
9	$x^2y - x^2z + xy^2 - xyz + xz^2 - y^2t$
10	$x^2y - x^2z - 2xyz + xz^2 + y^2t$
11	$x^2y + x^2z - xy^2 + xyt - xzt - yt^2$
12	$x^2y + xyz - 2xyt - xz^2 + xzt - y^2t + yzt$
13	$axy(x-t) + b(y-z)(x^2 - xy - xz + 2yt)$ for some $[a : b] \in \mathbb{P}^1$
14	$x^2y - 2x^2z - xy^2 + xyz - y^2t + yzt + yt^2$
15	$x^2y - xy^2 + xz^2 - yt^2$

**Theorem 3.1** ([BL98, Theorem 1.1]). *There is a finite disjoint union of quasi-projective varieties*

$$(3.1.1) \quad Q := \bigsqcup_{i=1}^{13} T_i \sqcup \bigsqcup_{(d,s) \in J} U_{d,s} \subset \mathbb{P}^{19}$$

such that each normal and rational cubic surface is projectively equivalent to the cubic surface corresponding to some point in  $Q$ , where

- $J := \{(4,0), (3,1), (2,2), (2,1), (1,3), (1,2), (1,1), (0,4), (0,3)\}$ .
- $T_i$  is a point for  $i = 1, \dots, 12$  and an open subset of a line in  $\mathbb{P}^{19}$  for  $i = 13$ .
- For each  $(d,s) \in J$ ,  $U_{d,s}$  is an open subset of a  $d$ -dimensional linear subspace in  $\mathbb{P}^{19}$  which represents cubic surfaces having  $s$  singular points and  $r$  lines with  $r = s + (d+2)(d+5)/2$ .

**Definition 3.2.** Let  $G_{i,p}$  denote the cubic surface which corresponds to a point  $p$  in  $T_i$  when  $1 \leq i \leq 13$ , in  $U_{0,3}$  when  $i = 14$  and in  $U_{0,4}$  when  $i = 15$ . When  $i \neq 13$  in addition, we often write it  $G_i$  for short because  $p$  is the unique point in  $T_i$ ,  $U_{0,3}$  or  $U_{0,4}$ .

**Corollary 3.3.** *Each normal and rational cubic surface  $S$  with  $B_2(S) \leq 3$  is projectively equivalent to  $G_i$  for some  $i = 1, \dots, 12, 14, 15$ , or  $G_{13,p}$  for some  $p \in T_{13}$ .*

*Proof.* We may assume that  $S$  corresponds to a point in  $U_{d,s}$  for some  $(d,s) \in J$ . Then  $S$  contains exactly  $s + (d+2)(d+5)/2$  lines. Combining [BW79, p. 255] and  $B_2(S) \leq 3$ , we obtain  $s + (d+2)(d+5)/2 \leq 9$ . Hence  $(d,s) = (0,3), (0,4)$  and  $S$  is projectively equivalent to  $G_{14}$  or  $G_{15}$ .  $\square$

For each  $G_{i,p}$ , Brundu-Logar also determined its defining equation as in Tables 1 and its singularity as in Tables 2. Moreover, we can write down all the lines in  $G_{i,p}$  as in Table 3.

TABLE 2. The singularity of  $G_{i,p}$ 

$i =$	The singularity of $G_{i,p}$
1	$([1:0:0:0], E_6)$
2	$([0:0:0:1], A_5), ([1:0:0:0], A_1)$
3	$([0:0:0:1], A_2), ([0:0:1:0], A_2), ([1:0:0:0], A_2)$
4	$([0:0:0:1], A_5)$
5	$([0:0:0:1], D_5)$
6	$([0:0:1:0], A_4), ([1:0:0:0], A_1)$
7	$([0:0:0:1], A_2), ([0:1:1:0], A_2), ([0:0:1:0], A_1)$
8	$([0:0:0:1], A_3), ([1:0:0:1], A_1), ([0:0:1:1], A_1)$
9	$([0:0:0:1], D_4)$
10	$([0:0:0:1], D_4)$
11	$([0:0:1:0], A_4)$
12	$([0:0:0:1], A_1), ([0:1:1:0], A_3)$
13	$([0:0:0:1], A_2), ([0:1:1:0], A_2)$
14	$([0:1:1:0], A_2), ([0:0:1:0], A_1), ([0:0:1:-1], A_1)$
15	$([1:0:0:1], A_1), ([0:1:1:0], A_1), ([1:0:0:-1], A_1), ([0:1:-1:0], A_1)$

The symbol  $(\alpha, \beta)$  in the right column means that  $\alpha \in G_{i,p}$  is a DuVal singularity of type  $\beta$ .

TABLE 3. The lines in  $G_{i,p}$ 

$i =$	All the lines contained in $G_{i,p}$
1	$\langle y, z \rangle$
2	$\langle y, z \rangle, \langle x, y \rangle$
3	$\langle y, z \rangle, \langle x, y \rangle, \langle y, t \rangle$
4	$\langle y, z \rangle, \langle x, y \rangle, \langle y, x - z \rangle$
5	$\langle y, z \rangle, \langle x, y \rangle, \langle x, t \rangle,$
6	$\langle y, z \rangle, \langle x, y \rangle, \langle x, t \rangle, \langle y, t \rangle$
7	$\langle y, z \rangle, \langle x, y \rangle, \langle x, t \rangle, \langle x - t, y - z \rangle, \langle x, y - z \rangle$
8	$\langle y, z \rangle, \langle x, y \rangle, \langle x, t \rangle, \langle x - t, y - z \rangle, \langle y, x + z - t \rangle$
9	$\langle y, z \rangle, \langle x, y \rangle, \langle x, t \rangle, \langle x - t, y - z \rangle, \langle y, x - z \rangle,$ $\langle x - t, z - t \rangle$
10	$\langle y, z \rangle, \langle x, y \rangle, \langle x, t \rangle, \langle x - t, y - z \rangle, \langle y, x - z \rangle,$ $\langle x - t, y - z + t \rangle$
11	$\langle y, z \rangle, \langle x, y \rangle, \langle x, t \rangle, \langle x - y, y - t \rangle, \langle y, x - t \rangle,$ $\langle x - y, z + t \rangle$
12	$\langle y, z \rangle, \langle x, y \rangle, \langle x, t \rangle, \langle x - t, y - z \rangle, \langle y, z - t \rangle,$ $\langle x, y - z \rangle, \langle x - t, y - z + t \rangle$
13	$\langle y, z \rangle, \langle x, y \rangle, \langle x, t \rangle, \langle x - t, y - z \rangle, \langle y, x - z \rangle,$ $\langle x, y - z \rangle, \langle x - t, y - z + t \rangle$
14	$\langle y, z \rangle, \langle x, y \rangle, \langle x, t \rangle, \langle x - t, y - z \rangle, \langle x - y, z + t \rangle,$ $\langle x - y, z + t \rangle, \langle x - y, y - t \rangle, \langle x + t, y - z \rangle$
15	$\langle y, z \rangle, \langle x, y \rangle, \langle x, t \rangle, \langle x - t, y - z \rangle, \langle x - y, z + t \rangle,$ $\langle x - y, z - t \rangle, \langle x - t, y + z \rangle, \langle x + t, y - z \rangle, \langle x + t, y + z \rangle$

The symbol  $\langle a, b \rangle$  means the line defined by  $a = b = 0$ .

**3.2. Non-normal cubic surfaces.** Lee-Park-Schenzel [LPS11] classified non-normal cubic surfaces up to projective equivalence as follows:

**Theorem 3.4** ([LPS11, Theorem 3.1]). *Each non-normal cubic surface in  $\mathbb{P}_{[x:y:z:t]}^3$  is projectively equivalent to one of the following:*

$$\begin{aligned} R_1 &= \{x^2z + y^3 = 0\}, \\ R_2 &= \{x^2z + y^3 + y^2z = 0\}, \\ R_3 &= \{x^2z + y^3 + y^2t = 0\}, \\ R_4 &= \{x^2z + y^3 + xyt = 0\}. \end{aligned}$$

We note that  $R_i$  is the cone over a curve if and only if  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ . On the other hand, there is the classification of non-normal Gorenstein del Pezzo surfaces [Rei94, AF03]. In particular, they classified non-normal cubic surfaces as follows:

**Theorem 3.5** ([AF03, Theorem 1.5]). *Let  $S$  be a non-normal cubic surface with the normalization  $\sigma: \bar{S} \rightarrow S$ . Let  $D \subset S$  (resp.  $\bar{D} \subset \bar{S}$ ) be the conductor locus. Then  $D$  is a line and one of the following holds:*

- (C)  $\bar{S} \cong \mathbb{F}_1$ ,  $\sigma^*(-K_S) \sim \Sigma_1 + 2f_1$  and  $\bar{D} \sim \Sigma_1 + f_1$ .
- (E1)  $\bar{S}$  is isomorphic to the cone  $S_3 \subset \mathbb{P}^4$  over the twisted cubic in  $\mathbb{P}^3$ . Moreover,  $\sigma^*(-K_S) \sim \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^4}(1)|_{S_3}$  and  $\bar{D}$  is the sum of two rulings or a non-reduced ruling of length two.

Let us check the correspondence of the notation of non-normal cubic surfaces in Theorems 3.4 and 3.5.

**Lemma 3.6.** *Fix  $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$  and let  $\sigma: \bar{R}_i \rightarrow R_i$  be the normalization. Write  $D \subset R_i$  (resp.  $\bar{D} \subset \bar{R}_i$ ) as the conductor locus. Then:*

- (1)  $R_i$  belongs to the class (E1) if  $i \leq 2$  and the class (C) if  $i \geq 3$ .
- (2)  $\bar{D}$  is irreducible if  $i = 3$  and reducible if  $i = 4$ .

*Proof.* (1) Since the class (E1) corresponds to the cones over curves, the assertion holds.

(2) Suppose that  $i \in \{3, 4\}$ . Then  $R_i$  belongs to the class (C). Let  $L \neq D$  be a line in  $R_i$  and write  $L_{\bar{R}_i} \sim a\Sigma_1 + bf_1$  with  $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Since  $1 = (-K_{R_i} \cdot L) = (-\sigma^*K_{R_i} \cdot L_{\bar{R}_i}) = (\Sigma_1 + 2f_1 \cdot a\Sigma_1 + bf_1) = a + b$ , we obtain  $L_{\bar{R}_i} \sim \Sigma_1$  or  $f_1$ . Hence we have

$$\begin{aligned} (3.2.1) \quad \bar{D} \text{ is irreducible} &\iff \Sigma_1 \cap \bar{D} = \emptyset \\ &\iff \text{There is a line in } R_i \text{ disjoint from } D. \end{aligned}$$

Now suppose that  $i = 3$ . Then  $\{z = y + t = 0\}$  is a line in  $R_3$  disjoint from  $D = \{x = y = 0\}$  and hence  $\bar{D}$  is irreducible. On the other hand, suppose that  $i = 4$ . Then  $R_4 \setminus D = R_4 \cap \{x \neq 0\} \cong \mathbb{A}^2$  contains no proper curves and hence  $\bar{D}$  is reducible.  $\square$

#### 4. CURVES IN CUBIC SURFACES

In this section, we will look closely at curves in cubic surfaces.



**4.1. Smooth rational curves in  $G_1, G_2, G_3$  or  $G_5$ .** In this subsection, we determine smooth rational curves in  $G_1, G_2, G_4$  or  $G_5$ . For this, we use the following notation:

**Notation 4.1.** We assume that  $S_2 = G_i$  for some  $i \in \{1, 2, 4, 5\}$ . Let  $R \subset S_2$  be a smooth rational curve of degree  $n$ . By [Ye02, Appendix: Configurations of the Singularity types],  $\tilde{S}_2$  is given by the successive blow-ups  $\{\eta_j: S_{2,j} \rightarrow S_{2,j-1}\}_{j=1}^6$  with  $S_{2,0} := \mathbb{P}^2$  and  $S_{2,6} = \tilde{S}_2$  at points  $p_1, \dots, p_6$  which correspond to the bullets as in Figure 1. Write  $\eta := \eta_1 \circ \dots \circ \eta_6: \tilde{S}_2 \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^2$ . Set  $H = \eta^* \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(1)$ ,  $E_6 := E_{\eta_6}$  and  $E_i = (\eta_6 \circ \dots \circ \eta_{i+1})^* E_{\eta_i}$  for  $1 \leq i \leq 5$ . Write  $R_{\tilde{S}_2} \sim aH - \sum_{i=1}^6 b_i E_i$  with  $a, b_1, \dots, b_6 \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

**Notation for Figure 1**

- The upper left pictures represent the configurations of important lines in  $\mathbb{P}^2$ .
- The lower right pictures represent the configurations of all the curves with negative self-intersection numbers in  $\tilde{S}_2$ .

Table 4 gives all the linear equivalence classes of  $(-2)$ -curves in  $\tilde{S}_2$ .

TABLE 4.  $(-2)$ -curves in  $\tilde{S}_2$

$i =$	Linearly equivalence classes of $(-2)$ -curves in $\tilde{S}_2$ in the case where $S_2 = G_i$
1	$H - E_1 - E_2 - E_3, E_1 - E_2, E_2 - E_3, E_3 - E_4, E_4 - E_5, E_5 - E_6$
2	$H - E_1 - E_2 - E_3, E_1 - E_2, E_2 - E_3, H - E_1 - E_5 - E_6, E_3 - E_4, E_5 - E_6$
4	$H - E_1 - E_2 - E_3, E_1 - E_2, E_2 - E_3, H - E_1 - E_5 - E_6, E_3 - E_4$
5	$H - E_1 - E_2 - E_3, E_1 - E_2, E_2 - E_3, E_3 - E_4, E_4 - E_5$

**Lemma 4.2.** *We follow Notation 4.1. Suppose that  $i = 1, 2$  or  $4$ . Take  $p$  as the singular point of  $S_2$  when  $i = 1$  or  $2$  and as the  $A_5$ -singularity in  $S_2$  when  $i = 4$ . Then the projection  $\pi: S_2 \dashrightarrow \mathbb{P}^2$  from  $p$  satisfies  $\eta = \pi \circ \mu$ .*

*Proof.* We give the proof only for the case where  $i = 1$ ; the same proof works for the case where  $i = 2$  or  $4$ .


Let  $N \subset |-K_{S_2}|$  be the net defining  $\pi$ . Then the free part of  $\mu^* N$  defines  $\pi \circ \mu$ . Since the sum of all the  $(-2)$ -curves are contained in the fixed part of  $\mu^* N$ , the free part of  $\mu^* N$  is the same as that of

$$(4.1.1) \quad N_1 := \mu^* N - (H - E_2 - E_3 - E_6) \subset |2H - E_1 - E_4 - E_5|.$$

Since  $(2H - E_1 - E_4 - E_5 \cdot E_3 - E_4) = -1$ , the fixed part of  $N_1$  contains the  $(-2)$ -curve linearly equivalent to  $E_3 - E_4$ . Hence the free part of  $N_1$  is the same as that of  $N_1 - (E_3 - E_4)$ . We continue in this fashion to conclude that the free part of  $\mu^* N$  is the same as that of

$$(4.1.2) \quad \mu^* N - (2H - E_1 - E_2 - E_3 - E_4 - E_5 - E_6) \subset |H|.$$

Since  $|H|$  is a free net,  $\pi \circ \mu$  is defined by  $|H|$ . Hence  $\eta = \pi \circ \mu$ .  $\square$

FIGURE 1. The construction of  $\tilde{S}_2$  when  $S_2 = G_1, G_2, G_4$  or  $G_5$

**Lemma 4.3.** *We follow Notation 4.1. Suppose that  $S_2 = G_1$ . Then  $R_{\tilde{S}_2}$  is linearly equivalent to either  $E_6$  or  $H - E_1$ .*

*Proof.* By assumption,

$$(4.1.3) \quad n = (R_{\tilde{S}_2} \cdot -K_{\tilde{S}_2}) = (aH - \sum_{i=1}^6 b_i E_i \cdot 3H - \sum_{i=1}^6 E_i) = 3a - \sum_{i=1}^6 b_i.$$

Since  $R$  is smooth rational curve, the genus formula yields

$$(4.1.4) \quad n - 2 = R_{\tilde{S}_2}^2 = a^2 - \sum_{i=1}^6 b_i^2.$$

Now suppose that  $\mathrm{Sing} S_2 \notin R$ . Then  $a = n$  by Lemma 4.2. We also have  $b_1 = b_2 = b_3 = b_4 = b_5 = b_6$  and  $a = b_1 + b_2 + b_3$  since  $R_{\tilde{S}_2}$  is disjoint from each  $(-2)$ -curve. Then (4.1.4) yields  $0 = a^2 - \sum_{i=1}^6 b_i^2 - n + 2 = 3b_1(b_1 - 1) + 2$ , which contradicts the assumption that  $b_1 \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

Hence  $\mathrm{Sing} S_2 \in R$ . Then  $a = n - 1$  by Lemma 4.2. We also have  $\#(R_{\tilde{S}_2} \cap E_\mu) = 1$  since  $R$  is smooth. In particular, one of the following holds:

- (1)  $b_1 = b_2 = b_3 = b_4 = b_5 = b_6$  and  $a = b_1 + b_2 + b_3 + 1$ .
- (2)  $b_1 = b_2 = b_3 = b_4 + 1 = b_5 + 1 = b_6 + 1$  and  $a = b_1 + b_2 + b_3 + 1$ .
- (3)  $b_1 = \dots = b_j = b_{j+1} + 1 = \dots = b_6 + 1$  and  $a = b_1 + b_2 + b_3$  for some  $1 \leq j \leq 5$ .
- (4)  $b_1 = \dots = b_j = b_{j+1} + 1 = b_{j+2} + 2 = \dots = b_6 + 2$  and  $a = b_1 + b_2 + b_3$  for some  $1 \leq j \leq 4$ .

If the case (1) (resp. (2)) holds, then  $n - 3a + \sum_{i=1}^6 b_i = -1$  (resp.  $-4$ ), a contradiction with (4.1.3). Similarly, the case (4) implies  $n - 3a + \sum_{i=1}^6 b_i = -2$  when  $j = 1$  or  $4$ , and  $-4$  when  $j = 2$  or  $3$ , a contradiction.

Hence the case (3) holds. (4.1.3) now yields  $j = 1$  or  $5$ . Suppose that  $j = 1$ . Then (4.1.4) yields  $0 = a^2 - \sum_{i=1}^6 b_i^2 - n + 2 = (3b_1 - 2)(b_1 - 1)$ . Since  $b_1 \in \mathbb{Z}$ , we obtain  $b_1 = 1$ . Hence  $R_{\tilde{S}_2} \sim H - E_1$ .

Suppose that  $j = 5$ . Then (4.1.4) yields  $0 = a^2 - \sum_{i=1}^6 b_i^2 - n + 2 = b_1(3b_1 - 1)$ . Since  $b_1 \in \mathbb{Z}$ , we obtain  $b_1 = 0$ . Hence  $R_{\tilde{S}_2} \sim E_6$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 4.4.** *We follow Notation 4.1. Suppose that  $S_2 = G_2$ . Then  $R_{\tilde{S}_2}$  is linearly equivalent to one of the following:*

$$E_4, E_6, H - E_1, H - E_5, 2H - E_1 - E_2 - E_5.$$

*Proof.* As in the proof of Lemma 4.3, we obtain (4.1.3) and (4.1.4). On the other hand,  $E_5 - E_6$  corresponds to a  $(-2)$ -curve and  $E_6$  is a  $(-1)$ -curve by construction.

Suppose that  $b_5 < 0$ . Then  $(R_{\tilde{S}_2} \cdot (E_5 - E_6) + E_6) = b_5 < 0$ . Hence  $R_{\tilde{S}_2} \sim E_6$  and  $b_5 = 0$ , a contradiction. On the other hand, if  $b_6 < 0$ , then  $(R_{\tilde{S}_2} \cdot E_6) = b_6 < 0$ , which implies  $R_{\tilde{S}_2} \sim E_6$ . In the rest of the proof, we may assume that  $b_5 \geq 0$  and  $b_6 \geq 0$ .

Write  $p \in S_2$  as the  $A_5$ -singularity of  $S_2$ . Suppose that  $p \notin R$ . Then  $a = n$  by Lemma 4.2. We also have  $b_1 = b_2 = b_3 = b_4$  and  $a = b_1 + b_2 + b_3 = b_1 + b_5 + b_6$  since  $R_{\tilde{S}_2}$  is disjoint from  $E_\mu$ . (4.1.4) now yields  $0 = a^2 - \sum_{i=1}^6 b_i^2 - n + 2 = (b_1 - 1)(b_1 - 2) + 2b_5b_6$ . Since  $b_1 \in \mathbb{Z}$ , we obtain

$b_5b_6 = 0$  and  $b_1 = 1$  or  $2$ . On the other hand, we have  $(R_{\tilde{S}_2} \cdot E_5 - E_6) = b_5 - b_6 = 2(b_1 - b_6)$ . Since  $R$  is smooth, we obtain  $b_1 = b_6 = b_5$ . Hence  $b_5b_6 = b_1^2 > 0$ , a contradiction.

Hence  $p \in R$ . Then  $a = n - 1$  by Lemma 4.2. We also have  $\#(R_{\tilde{S}_2} \cap \mu^{-1}(p)) = 1$  since  $R$  is smooth. In particular, one of the following holds:

- (1)  $b_1 = b_2 = b_3 = b_4$  and  $a = b_1 + b_2 + b_3 + 1 = b_1 + b_5 + b_6$ .
- (2)  $b_1 = b_2 = b_3 = b_4 + 1$  and  $a = b_1 + b_2 + b_3 + 1 = b_1 + b_5 + b_6$ .
- (3)  $b_1 = b_2 = b_3 = b_4$  and  $a = b_1 + b_2 + b_3 = b_1 + b_5 + b_6 + 1$ .
- (4)  $b_1 = b_2 + 1 = b_3 + 1 = b_4 + 1$  and  $a = b_1 + b_2 + b_3 = b_1 + b_5 + b_6 + 1$ .
- (5)  $b_1 = \dots = b_j = b_{j+1} + 1 = \dots = b_4 + 1$  and  $a = b_1 + b_2 + b_3 = b_1 + b_5 + b_6$  for some  $1 \leq j \leq 3$ .
- (6)  $b_1 = \dots = b_j = b_{j+1} + 1 = b_{j+2} + 2 = \dots = b_4 + 2$  and  $a = b_1 + b_2 + b_3 = b_1 + b_5 + b_6$  for some  $1 \leq j \leq 2$ .

If one of the cases (2), (4) and (6) holds, then  $n - 3a + \sum_{i=1}^6 b_i = -1$ , a contradiction with (4.1.3).

Suppose that the case (3) holds. Then (4.1.4) yields  $0 = a^2 - \sum_{i=1}^6 b_i^2 - n + 2 = b_1(b_1 + 1) + 2b_5b_6$ . Since  $b_1 \in \mathbb{Z}$ , we obtain  $b_5b_6 = 0$  and  $b_1 = -1$  or  $0$ . In each case, we have  $b_5 + b_6 = 2b_1 - 1 < 0$ , which contradicts the assumption that  $b_5 \geq 0$  and  $b_6 \geq 0$ . Hence one of the cases (1) and (5) holds.

Suppose that the case (1) holds. Then (4.1.4) yields  $0 = a^2 - \sum_{i=1}^6 b_i^2 - n + 2 = b_1(b_1 - 1) + 2b_5b_6$ . Since  $b_1 \in \mathbb{Z}$ , we obtain  $b_5b_6 = 0$  and  $b_1 = 0$  or  $1$ . On the other hand, we have  $(R_{\tilde{S}_2} \cdot E_5 - E_6) = b_5 - b_6 = 2(b_1 - b_6) + 1$ . Since  $R$  is smooth, we obtain  $b_1 = b_6 = b_5 - 1$ . Since  $b_5b_6 = b_1(b_1 + 1) = 0$ , we conclude that  $b_1 = 0$  and  $R_{\tilde{S}_2} \sim H - E_5$ .

Suppose that the case (5) holds. Then (4.1.4) yields  $0 = a^2 - \sum_{i=1}^6 b_i^2 - n + 2 = b_1(b_1 - 1) + 2b_5b_6$ . Since  $b_1 \in \mathbb{Z}$ , we obtain  $b_5b_6 = 0$  and  $b_1 = 0$  or  $1$ .

Suppose that  $j = 1$  in addition. Then  $a = 3b_1 - 2 \geq 0$  by the nefness of  $H$ . Hence  $b_1 = 1$  and  $R_{\tilde{S}_2} \sim H - E_1$ . Similarly, if  $j = 2$ , then  $b_1 = 1$  and  $R_{\tilde{S}_2} \sim 2H - E_1 - E_2 - E_5$ .

Suppose that  $j = 3$  in addition. Then  $(R_{\tilde{S}_2} \cdot E_5 - E_6) = b_5 - b_6 = 2(b_1 - b_6)$ . Since  $R$  is smooth, we obtain  $b_1 = b_5 = b_6$ . Since  $b_5b_6 = b_1^2 = 0$ , we conclude that  $b_1 = 0$  and  $R_{\tilde{S}_2} \sim E_4$ .

Combining these results, we complete the proof.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.5.** *We follow Notation 4.1. Suppose that  $S_2 = G_4$ . Then  $R_{\tilde{S}_2}$  is linearly equivalent to one of the following for some  $i \in \{5, 6\}$ :*

$$\begin{aligned} &E_4, E_i, H - E_1, H - E_i, 2H - E_1 - E_2 - E_i, \\ &3H - E_1 - E_2 - E_3 - E_4 - 2E_i, 3H - E_1 - E_2 - E_3 - 2E_i, \\ &4H - E_1 - E_2 - E_3 - E_4 - 3E_i, 6H - 2E_1 - 2E_2 - 2E_3 - 2E_4 - 4E_i. \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* As in the proof of Lemma 4.3, we obtain (4.1.3) and (4.1.4). On the other hand,  $E_5$  and  $E_6$  are  $(-1)$ -curves by construction.

If  $b_i < 0$  for some  $i \in \{5, 6\}$ , then  $(R_{\tilde{S}_2} \cdot E_i) = b_i < 0$  and hence  $R_{\tilde{S}_2} \sim E_i$ . In the rest of the proof, we may assume that  $b_5 \geq 0$  and  $b_6 \geq 0$ .

Suppose that  $\text{Sing } S_2 \not\subset R$ . Then  $a = n$  by Lemma 4.2. We have  $b_1 = b_2 = b_3 = b_4$  and  $a = b_1 + b_2 + b_3 = b_1 + b_5 + b_6$  since  $R_{\tilde{S}_2}$  is disjoint from  $E_\mu$ .

As in the proof of Lemma 4.4, we also obtain  $b_5 b_6 = 0$  and  $b_1 = 1$  or  $2$ . Hence  $R_{\tilde{S}_2} \sim 2H - E_1 - E_2 - E_3 - E_4 - 2E_i$  or  $4H - 2E_1 - 2E_2 - 2E_3 - 2E_4 - 4E_i$  for some  $i \in \{5, 6\}$ .

In the remainder of the proof, we assume that  $\mathrm{Sing} S_2 \in R$ . As in the proof of Lemma 4.4, one of the cases (1) and (5) holds.

Suppose that the case (1) holds. Then  $b_5 b_6 = 0$  and  $b_1 = 0$  or  $1$ , which implies  $R_{\tilde{S}_2} \sim H - E_i$  or  $4H - E_1 - E_2 - E_3 - E_4 - 3E_i$  for some  $i \in \{5, 6\}$ .

Suppose that the case (5) holds. Then  $b_5 b_6 = 0$  and  $b_1 = 0$  or  $1$ . Suppose that the former holds in addition. Then  $a = j - 3$ . By the nefness of  $H$ , we obtain  $j = 3$  and  $R_{\tilde{S}_2} \sim E_4$ . If the latter holds, we obtain  $R_{\tilde{S}_2} \sim H - E_1$  when  $j = 1$ ,  $2H - E_1 - E_2 - E_i$  when  $j = 2$  and  $3H - E_1 - E_2 - E_3 - 2E_i$  when  $j = 3$  for some  $i \in \{5, 6\}$ .

Combining these results, we complete the proof.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.6.** *We follow Notation 4.1. Suppose that  $S_2 = G_5$  and  $n \leq 2$ . Then  $R_{\tilde{S}_2}$  is linearly equivalent to one of the following:*

$$\begin{aligned} &E_5, E_6, H - E_1 - E_6, H - E_1, H - E_6, \\ &3H - E_1 - E_2 - E_3 - E_4 - E_5 - 2E_6. \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* As in the proof of Lemma 4.3, we obtain (4.1.3) and (4.1.4). The Cauchy-Schwarz inequality now shows that

$$(4.1.5) \quad a^2 - (n - 2) = \sum_{i=1}^6 b_i^2 \geq 6 \left( \frac{\sum_{i=1}^6 b_i}{6} \right)^2 = \frac{(3a - n)^2}{6}$$

and hence  $2(n^2 - 3n + 6) \geq 3(a - n)^2$ . Combining (4.1.3), (4.1.4) and this inequality, we conclude that the 8-tuple  $(n, a; b_1, \dots, b_6)$  is one of the following up to the action of the symmetric group  $\mathfrak{S}_6$  on the second factor of  $\mathbb{Z}^2 \oplus \mathbb{Z}^6$  as a permutation:

$$(4.1.6) \quad \begin{array}{lll} (1, 0; -1, 0^5), & (1, 1; 1^2, 0^4), & (1, 2; 1^5, 0), \\ (2, 1; 1, 0^5), & (2, 2; 1^4, 0^2), & (2, 3; 2, 1^5). \end{array}$$

On the other hand, we have  $0 \leq b_i - b_{i+1} \leq 1$  for each  $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$  and  $0 \leq a - b_1 - b_2 - b_3 \leq 1$  since  $R_{\tilde{S}_2}$  intersects with each  $(-2)$ -curve with multiplicity at most one. Combining (4.1.6) and these inequalities, we get the assertion.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.7.** *We follow Notation 4.1. Suppose that  $S_2 = G_1$ . If  $R' \subset S_2$  is a cuspidal cubic, Then  $R'_{\tilde{S}_2} \sim H$ .*

*Proof.* Since  $R'$  is a Cartier divisor, we have  $\mathrm{Sing} R' = \mathrm{Sing} S_2$ . Hence  $R'_{\tilde{S}_2}$  is a smooth rational curve. Write  $R'_{\tilde{S}_2} = aH - \sum_{i=1}^6 b_i E_i$  with  $a, b_1, \dots, b_6 \in \mathbb{Z}$ . An analysis similar to that in the proof of Lemma 4.6 shows that  $(n, a; b_1, \dots, b_6)$  is one of the following up the  $\mathfrak{S}_6$ -action:

$$(4.1.7) \quad (3, 1; 0^6), \quad (3, 2; 1^3, 0^3), \quad (3, 3; 2, 1^4, 0), \quad (3, 4; 2^3, 1^3), \quad (3, 5; 2^6).$$

On the other hand, we have  $0 \leq b_i - b_{i+1}$  for each  $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$  and  $0 \leq a - b_1 - b_2 - b_3$  since  $R'_{\tilde{S}_2}$  is distinct from any  $(-2)$ -curves in  $\tilde{S}_2$ . Combining (4.1.7) and these inequalities, we get the assertion.  $\square$

**4.2. Smooth curves in the cones over elliptic curves.** Next we investigate smooth curves in the cones over an elliptic curves.

**Lemma 4.8.** *Suppose that  $S_2$  is the cone over an elliptic curve. Let  $R$  be a smooth curve in  $S_2$ . Then  $\deg R \neq 2$ . Moreover,  $p_a(R) = 0$  when  $\deg R = 1$ ,  $p_a(R) = 1$  when  $\deg R = 3$  or 4, and  $p_a(R) \geq 4$  when  $\deg R \geq 5$ .*

*Proof.* Take  $C_0$  and  $f$  as the minimal section and a fiber of  $\mathbb{P}^1$ -bundle structure on  $\tilde{S}_2$  respectively. Write  $R_{\tilde{S}_2} \equiv aC_0 + bf$  with  $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ . Since  $R$  is smooth, we have  $b - 3a = (R_{\tilde{S}_2} \cdot C_0) = 0$  or 1. The genus formula now yields

$$(4.2.1) \quad p_a(R_{\tilde{S}_2}) = \begin{cases} 1 + \frac{3}{2}a(a-1) & \text{if } b = 3a > 0, \\ 1 + \frac{1}{2}(3a+2)(a-1) & \text{if } b = 3a + 1. \end{cases}$$

Hence  $g_a(R) = 0$  when  $a = 0$ ,  $g_a(R) = 1$  when  $a = 1$  and  $g_a(R) \geq 4$  when  $a \geq 2$ . We also have  $\deg R = (-K_{S_2} \cdot R) = (C_0 + 3f \cdot aC_0 + bf) = b$ . Combining these results, we obtain the assertion.  $\square$

**4.3. Curves in non-normal cubic surfaces.** Finally we investigate curves in non-normal cubic surfaces.

**Lemma 4.9.** *Suppose that  $S_2 = R_1$  or  $R_2$ . Let  $R \subset S_2$  be a smooth curve distinct from  $E$ . Then  $\deg R \neq 2$ . Moreover,  $p_a(R) = 0$  when  $\deg R \leq 4$ , and  $p_a(R) \geq 2$  when  $\deg R \geq 5$ .*

*Proof.* By Lemma 3.6,  $S_2$  belongs to the class (E1) as in Theorem 3.5. Write  $R_{\tilde{S}_2} \sim a\Sigma_3 + bf_3$  with  $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ . Since  $R$  is smooth, we have  $b - 3a = (R_{\tilde{S}_2} \cdot \Sigma_3) = 0$  or 1. The genus formula now yields

$$(4.3.1) \quad p_a(R_{\tilde{S}_2}) = \begin{cases} 1 + \frac{1}{2}a(3a-5) & \text{if } b = 3a > 0, \\ \frac{3}{2}a(a-1) & \text{if } b = 3a + 1. \end{cases}$$

Hence  $g_a(R) = 0$  when  $a \leq 1$  and  $g_a(R) \geq 2$  when  $a \geq 2$ . We also have  $\deg R = (R_{\tilde{S}_2} \cdot \mu^*(-K_{S_2})) = (a\Sigma_3 + bf_3 \cdot \Sigma_3 + 3f_3) = b$ . Combining these results, we obtain the assertion.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.10.** *Suppose that  $S_2 = R_3$  or  $R_4$ . Let  $R \subset S_2$  be a curve distinct from  $E$ . Write  $R_{\tilde{S}_2} \sim a\Sigma_1 + bf_1$  with  $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ . Then  $\deg R = a + b$ . Moreover, each line in  $R_4$  is the image of a fiber of the  $\mathbb{P}^1$ -bundle structure on  $\tilde{S}_2 \cong \mathbb{F}_1$ .*

*Proof.* By Lemma 3.6,  $S_2$  belongs to the class (C) as in Theorem 3.5. Hence  $\deg R = (R_{\tilde{S}_2} \cdot \mu^*(-K_{S_2})) = (a\Sigma_1 + bf_1 \cdot \Sigma_1 + 2f_1) = a + b$ , which is the first assertion. In particular,  $R_{\tilde{S}_2} \sim \Sigma_1$  or  $f_1$  when  $\deg R = 1$ . If  $S_2 = R_4$ , Lemma 3.6 shows that there is a curve  $L \sim f_1$  such that  $\mu(L) = \mu(\Sigma_1)$ . Hence the second assertion holds.  $\square$

## 5. THE CASE $p_a(C) \geq 1$

In the rest of the paper, we prove Theorems 1.2 and 1.3. In this section, we treat the case where  $p_a(C) \geq 1$ .

**Lemma 5.1.** *If  $U$  is an affine homology 3-cell, then  $p_a(C) \leq 1$ .*

*Proof.* Combining Lemma 2.3 and [Nag18, Theorem 2.1], we obtain

$$(5.0.1) \quad \begin{aligned} \chi_{\mathrm{top}}(F) &= \chi_{\mathrm{top}}(S_2) + 2p_a(C) + N_1 + N_2 - N_{1 \cap 2} - 2 \\ &\geq 1 + 2p_a(C) + 1 - 2 = 2p_a(C). \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, we have  $4 \geq \chi_{\mathrm{top}}(F)$  since  $F \subset S_1$  is a plane cubic. Hence  $2 \geq p_a(C)$  and it suffices to show that  $p_a(C) \neq 2$ .

Conversely, suppose that  $p_a(C) = 2$ . Then (5.0.1) shows that  $\chi_{\mathrm{top}}(S_2) = 1$  and hence  $S_2$  is the cone over an elliptic curve by [Nag18, Theorem 2.1]. However, Lemma 4.8 shows that  $S_2$  contains no smooth curve with  $p_a = 2$ , a contradiction.  $\square$

**Lemma 5.2.** *If  $U$  is an affine homology 3-cell and  $p_a(C) = 1$ , then  $S_2$  is the cone over an elliptic curve.*

*Proof.* As in the proof of Lemma 5.1, we obtain

$$(5.0.2) \quad 4 \geq \chi_{\mathrm{top}}(F) = \chi_{\mathrm{top}}(S_2) + N_1 + N_2 - N_{1 \cap 2} \geq 1 + \chi_{\mathrm{top}}(S_2).$$

Suppose that  $S_2$  is non-normal. Since  $S_2$  contains a smooth curve with  $p_a = 1$ , Lemma 4.9 shows that  $S_2$  belongs to the class (C). Then (5.0.2) shows that  $3 \geq \chi_{\mathrm{top}}(F) - 1 \geq \chi_{\mathrm{top}}(S_2) = \chi_{\mathrm{top}}(\mathbb{F}_1) - \chi_{\mathrm{top}}(\tilde{E}) + \chi_{\mathrm{top}}(E) = 6 - \chi_{\mathrm{top}}(\tilde{E})$ . Hence  $\tilde{E}$  is reducible and  $F$  is the sum of three lines intersecting in one point. However,  $S_2$  has no such lines by Lemma 4.10, a contradiction.

Hence  $S_2$  is normal. It suffices to exclude the case where  $S_2$  is rational. Conversely, suppose that  $S_2$  is rational. Then  $B_2(S_2) = 1$  and  $\chi_{\mathrm{top}}(F) = 4$  by (5.0.2). Hence  $S_2$  is projectively equivalent to  $G_i$  for some  $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$  by Corollary 3.3 and  $F$  is the sum of three lines intersecting in one point. Table 3 shows, however, that  $S_2$  has no such lines, a contradiction.  $\square$

**Proposition 5.3.** *If  $U$  is an affine homology 3-cell and  $p_a(C) \geq 1$ , then the case (a) of Theorem 1.2 holds.*

*Proof.* By Lemmas 5.1 and 5.2, we have  $p_a(C) = 1$  and  $S_2$  is the cone over an elliptic curve. Lemma 4.8 now shows that  $\deg C = 3$  or 4. On the other hand, (5.0.2) shows that  $\chi_{\mathrm{top}}(F) = 1 + N_1 + N_2 - N_{1 \cap 2} \geq 2$ . Hence  $F$  is a sum of rulings. In particular,  $S_1$  contains the vertex of  $S_2$  and hence  $N_2 = N_{1 \cap 2}$ . Therefore  $B_2(F) = N_1 = \sharp(C \cap S_1)$ , and the assertion holds.  $\square$

Next let us check that  $U \cong \mathbb{A}^3$  if the case (a) of Theorem 1.2 holds.

**Proposition 5.4.** *Suppose that the case (a) of Theorem 1.2 holds and  $\deg C = 3$ . Then  $U \cong \mathbb{A}^3$ .*

*Proof.* We can change the coordinate  $\{x, y, z, t\}$  of  $\mathbb{P}^3$  such that  $S_1 = \{x = 0\}$ ,  $S_2 = \{f(x, y, z) = 0\}$  and  $C = \{t = 0\}|_{S_2}$  for some cubic form  $f$ . Hence  $U \cong \{wf(1, y, z) + t = 0\} \subset \mathbb{A}_{(y, z, t, w)}^4$ . Therefore  $U \cong \mathbb{A}^3$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 5.5.** *Suppose that the case (a) of Theorem 1.2 holds and  $\deg C = 4$ . Then  $U \cong \mathbb{A}^3$ .*

*Proof.* Since  $C$  is the complete intersection of two quadrics, there is a quadric fibration structure  $\psi: V \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$  defined by  $|\varphi^* \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(2) - E_\varphi|$ .

Step 1: Let us show that  $U$  is a contractible affine 3-fold. Let  $R$  be a smooth member of  $|\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(1)|_{S_2}|$  and  $R^0 := R \setminus (R \cap S_1)$ . Then  $S_2^0 := S_2 \setminus F$  is an  $\mathbb{A}^1$ -bundle over  $R^0$ . Since  $\sharp(C \cap S_1) = B_2(F)$ , a curve  $C^0 := C \setminus (C \cap S_1) \subset S_2 \setminus F$

is a section of this  $\mathbb{A}^1$ -bundle. [KZ99, Corollary 3.1] now shows that  $U$  is a contractible affine 3-fold because  $U$  is the affine modification of  $\mathbb{A}^3$  with the locus  $(C^0 \subset S_2^0)$ .

Step 2: Let us show that each fiber of  $\psi|_{V \setminus D_2}$  is isomorphic to  $\mathbb{A}^2$ . Take  $Q$  as a  $\psi$ -fiber. Since  $S_2$  contains no conic, there are lines  $l_1$  and  $l_2$  in  $Q_{\mathbb{P}^3}$  (maybe  $l_1 = l_2$ ) such that  $S_2|_{Q_{\mathbb{P}^3}} = C + l_1 + l_2$  and hence  $D_2|_Q = l_1 + l_2$ .

Suppose that  $Q \cong \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$ . Then  $l_1$  and  $l_2$  are distinct from each other since  $l_1 + l_2$  is a  $(1, 1)$ -divisor. Hence  $Q \cap (V \setminus D_2) = \mathbb{A}^2$ .

In particular,  $D_2$  is non-normal by the generic smoothness. Since  $2D_2 \sim -K_V + Q$ , [Nag19, Lemma 2.7] now shows that  $\text{Sing } D_2$  forms a  $\psi$ -section.

Suppose that  $Q \cong \mathbb{Q}_0^2$ . Then  $D_2|_Q$  is singular at  $\text{Sing } D_2 \cap Q$ , which is distinct from the vertex of  $Q$ . Hence  $l_1 = l_2$  and  $Q \cap (V \setminus D_2) = \mathbb{A}^2$ .

Step 3: Let us show that  $\psi|_U$  is an  $\mathbb{A}^1 \times \mathbb{C}^*$ -fibration whose special fibers are all isomorphic to  $\mathbb{A}^2$ . For this, it suffices to show that each  $\psi$ -fiber  $Q$  satisfies  $Q \cap D_1 \cap (V \setminus D_2) \cong \mathbb{A}^1$  or  $\emptyset$ .

We note that  $\text{Sing } D_2$  is the same as the  $\varphi$ -exceptional curve over the vertex of  $S_2$  by the choice of  $C$ . Hence  $\text{Sing } D_2 \subset D_1$ . Thus  $D_1|_Q$  is a member of  $|- (1/2)K_Q|$  containing  $\text{Sing } D_2 \cap Q$ , and  $D_2|_Q$  is the unique member of  $|- (1/2)K_Q|$  singular at  $\text{Sing } D_2 \cap Q$ . Hence  $Q \cap D_1 \cap (V \setminus D_2) = \mathbb{A}^1$  when  $D_1|_Q \neq D_2|_Q$  and  $\emptyset$  when  $D_1|_Q = D_2|_Q$ .

Step 4: Finally let us show the assertion. Let  $m$  be the number of special fibers of  $\psi|_U$ . By the contractibility of  $U$ , we have

$$(5.0.3) \quad 1 = \chi_{\text{top}}(U) = (\chi_{\text{top}}(\mathbb{P}^1) - m) \chi_{\text{top}}(\mathbb{A}^1 \times \mathbb{C}^*) + m \chi_{\text{top}}(\mathbb{A}^2) = m.$$

Take  $Q$  as the unique  $\psi$ -fiber such that  $Q \cap U \cong \mathbb{A}^2$ .

On the other hand, since  $D_2$  is non-normal, [Nag19, Theorem 4.2] shows that  $U' := V \setminus (D_2 \cup Q) \cong \mathbb{A}^3$ . Then  $\psi|_{U'}: U' \rightarrow \mathbb{A}^1$  is an  $\mathbb{A}^2$ -bundle by [Kal02, Main Theorem]. Since  $D_1 \cap U'$  is a sub  $\mathbb{A}^1$ -bundle of  $\psi|_{U'}$ , we obtain  $U \setminus (U \cap Q) = U' \setminus (U' \cap D_1) \cong \mathbb{A}^2 \times \mathbb{C}^*$  by [BD93, Theorem B]. [Kal02, Main Theorem] now yields  $U \cong \mathbb{A}^3$  because  $U$  is a contractible affine 3-fold and  $U \cap Q \cong \mathbb{A}^2$ .  $\square$

Combining Propositions 5.3–5.5, we complete the proof of Theorems 1.2 and 1.3 when  $p_a(C) \geq 1$ .

## 6. THE CASE $p_a(C) = 0$ AND $S_2$ IS NORMAL

In the subsequent sections §6–8, we prove Theorem 1.2 when  $p_a(C) = 0$ . In this section, we assume the following:

**Assumption 1.**  $p_a(C) = 0$ ,  $U$  is an affine homology 3-cell and  $S_2$  is normal.

Under this assumption, we show that  $(S_1, S_2)$  is projectively equivalent to one of the pairs listed in the case (d) or (e) of Theorem 1.2. Firstly let us check the rationality and the singularity of  $S_2$ .

**Lemma 6.1.**  $S_2$  is rational.



*Proof.* We note that [Nag18, Lemma 2.4] still holds if it is just assumed that the affine modification  $N$  is an affine homology 3-cell. Hence it leads to

$$(6.0.1) \quad H_i(S_2 \setminus (F \cup \text{Sing } S_2), \mathbb{Z}) = \begin{cases} \mathbb{Z} & i = 0, \\ \mathbb{Z}^{\sharp(C \cap (\text{Sing } S_2 \cup F)) - 1} & i = 1, \\ \mathbb{Z}^{\sharp(\text{Sing } (S_2 \setminus F))} & i = 3, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

by setting  $X = \mathbb{P}^3 \setminus S_1 \cong \mathbb{A}^3$ ,  $S = S_2 \setminus F$  and  $r = C \setminus (C \cap S_1)$ .

By [HW81, Theorem 2.2], we only have to exclude the case where  $S_2$  is the cone over an elliptic curve. Conversely, suppose that  $S_2$  is the cone over an elliptic curve. Then  $C$  is a ruling of  $S_2$  by Lemma 4.8.

If  $F$  is smooth, then  $H_2(S_2 \setminus (F \cup \text{Sing } S_2), \mathbb{Z}) \cong \mathbb{Z}^3$  since  $S_2 \setminus (F \cup \text{Sing } S_2)$  is homeomorphic to  $\mathbb{C}^* \times F$ , a contradiction with (6.0.1). Hence  $F$  is the sum of rulings. Then  $H_1(S_2 \setminus (F \cup \text{Sing } S_2), \mathbb{Z}) \cong \mathbb{Z}^{B_2(F)+1}$  since  $S_2 \setminus (F \cup \text{Sing } S_2) = S_2 \setminus F$  is homeomorphic to  $\mathbb{A}^1 \times (R \setminus (F \cap R))$  for some smooth member  $R \in |-K_{S_2}|$ . On the other hand, both  $C \cap F$  and  $C \cap \text{Sing } S_2$  coincides with the vertex of  $S_2$ . (6.0.1) now yields  $B_2(F)+1 = 0$ , a contradiction. Hence we have the assertion.  $\square$

**Lemma 6.2.**  $S_2 \setminus F$  is smooth.

*Proof.* Set  $S := S_2 \setminus F$  and  $\text{Sing } S := \{p_1, \dots, p_n\}$  ( $n \geq 0$ ). For  $1 \leq i \leq n$ ,  $p_i \in S$  is a DuVal singularity and hence we can take an analytically open neighborhood  $U_i$  of  $p_i$  homeomorphic to the quotient of  $\mathbb{C}^2$  by a finite group action. In particular  $U_i$  is contractible by [KPR89]. We may also assume that  $U_i \cap U_j = \emptyset$  whenever  $i \neq j$ . Then the Mayer-Vietoris exact sequence for the open covering  $\{S \setminus \text{Sing } S, \bigcup_{i=1}^n U_i\}$  gives the following exact sequence of homologies:

$$(6.0.2) \quad \begin{aligned} \cdots &\longrightarrow H_2(S \setminus \text{Sing } S, \mathbb{Z}) \longrightarrow H_2(S, \mathbb{Z}) \\ &\longrightarrow \bigoplus_{i=1}^n H_1(U_i \setminus \{p_i\}, \mathbb{Z}) \longrightarrow H_1(S \setminus \text{Sing } S, \mathbb{Z}) \longrightarrow \cdots \end{aligned}$$

As in the proof of Lemma 6.1, [Nag18, Lemma 2.4] yields (6.0.1). On the other hand,  $H_2(S, \mathbb{Z})$  is a free  $\mathbb{Z}$ -module since  $S$  is an affine surface. (6.0.2) now shows that, for each  $i \geq 1$ ,  $H_1(U_i \setminus \{p_i\}, \mathbb{Z})$  is also a free  $\mathbb{Z}$ -module. Hence  $p_i \in S$  is the  $E_8$ -singularity for each  $i \geq 1$  by [Bri68, Satz 2.8] and [BD89, Theorem 1.4 (a)]. Since  $9 = \chi_{\text{top}}(\tilde{S}_2) \geq \chi_{\text{top}}(S_2) + 8n \geq 3 + 8n$ , we obtain  $n = 0$  as desired.  $\square$

Next we discuss the intersection  $F$ .

**Lemma 6.3.** It holds that  $B_1(F) = 0$  and  $B_2(F) = B_2(S_2) + \sharp(C \cap F) - 1$ . Moreover,  $B_2(S_2) \leq 3$ .

*Proof.* First let us consider the following exact sequence of cohomologies:

$$\begin{aligned}
 (6.0.3) \quad & \cdots \longrightarrow H^1(\tilde{S}_2, \mathbb{Z}) \longrightarrow H^1(F_{\tilde{S}_2} \cup E_\mu, \mathbb{Z}) \\
 & \longrightarrow H^2(\tilde{S}_2, F_{\tilde{S}_2} \cup E_\mu, \mathbb{Z}) \longrightarrow H^2(\tilde{S}_2, \mathbb{Z}) \longrightarrow H^2(F_{\tilde{S}_2} \cup E_\mu, \mathbb{Z}) \\
 & \longrightarrow H^3(\tilde{S}_2, F_{\tilde{S}_2} \cup E_\mu, \mathbb{Z}) \longrightarrow H^3(\tilde{S}_2, \mathbb{Z}) \longrightarrow \cdots
 \end{aligned}$$

Combining the Lefschetz duality, Lemma 6.2 and (6.0.1), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 (6.0.4) \quad H^i(\tilde{S}_2, F_{\tilde{S}_2} \cup E_\mu, \mathbb{Z}) &\cong H_{4-i}(\tilde{S}_2 \setminus (F_{\tilde{S}_2} \cup E_\mu), \mathbb{Z}) \\
 &\cong H_{4-i}(S_2 \setminus F, \mathbb{Z}) \\
 &\cong \begin{cases} \mathbb{Z} & i = 4 \\ \mathbb{Z}^{\sharp(C \cap F) - 1} & i = 3 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}
 \end{aligned}$$

We also have  $H^1(\tilde{S}_2, \mathbb{Z}) = H^3(\tilde{S}_2, \mathbb{Z}) = 0$  since  $S_2$  is rational. Combining these results, we conclude that

$$(6.0.5) \quad B_1(F_{\tilde{S}_2} \cup E_\mu) = 0, \quad B_2(F_{\tilde{S}_2} \cup E_\mu) = B_2(\tilde{S}_2) + \sharp(C \cap F) - 1.$$

Next let us consider the following exact sequence of cohomologies given by [Nag18, Lemma 2.5]:

$$\begin{aligned}
 (6.0.6) \quad & 0 \longrightarrow H^1(S_2, \mathbb{Z}) \longrightarrow H^1(\text{Sing } S_2, \mathbb{Z}) \oplus H^1(\tilde{S}_2, \mathbb{Z}) \longrightarrow H^1(E_\mu, \mathbb{Z}) \\
 & \longrightarrow H^2(S_2, \mathbb{Z}) \longrightarrow H^2(\text{Sing } S_2, \mathbb{Z}) \oplus H^2(\tilde{S}_2, \mathbb{Z}) \longrightarrow H^2(E_\mu, \mathbb{Z}) \\
 & \longrightarrow H^3(S_2, \mathbb{Z}) \longrightarrow H^3(\text{Sing } S_2, \mathbb{Z}) \oplus H^3(\tilde{S}_2, \mathbb{Z}).
 \end{aligned}$$

We note that the homomorphism  $H^2(\tilde{S}_2, \mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow H^2(E_\mu, \mathbb{Z})$  has finite cokernel by the negative definiteness of  $E_\mu$ . Hence

$$(6.0.7) \quad B_1(S_2) = B_3(S_2) = 0.$$

[Nag18, Lemma 2.5] gives another exact sequence as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
 (6.0.8) \quad & \cdots \longrightarrow H^1(S_2, \mathbb{Z}) \longrightarrow H^1(F, \mathbb{Z}) \oplus H^1(\tilde{S}_2, \mathbb{Z}) \longrightarrow H^1(F_{\tilde{S}_2} \cup E_\mu, \mathbb{Z}) \\
 & \longrightarrow H^2(S_2, \mathbb{Z}) \longrightarrow H^2(F, \mathbb{Z}) \oplus H^2(\tilde{S}_2, \mathbb{Z}) \longrightarrow H^2(F_{\tilde{S}_2} \cup E_\mu, \mathbb{Z}) \\
 & \longrightarrow H^3(S_2, \mathbb{Z}).
 \end{aligned}$$

Combining (6.0.5), (6.0.7) and (6.0.8), we conclude that  $B_1(F) = 0$  and  $B_2(F) = B_2(S_2) + B_2(F_{\tilde{S}_2} \cup E_\mu) - B_2(\tilde{S}_2) = B_2(S_2) + \sharp(C \cap F) - 1$ , which are the first and second assertions. Since  $3 \geq B_2(F) = B_2(S_2) + \sharp(C \cap F) - 1 \geq B_2(S_2)$ , the third assertion follows.  $\square$

**Corollary 6.4.**  $S_2$  is projectively equivalent to  $G_i$  for some  $i \in \{1, \dots, 12, 14, 15\}$  or  $G_{13,p}$  for some  $p \in T_{13}$ .

*Proof.* Combining Corollary 3.3 and Lemma 6.3, we have the assertion.  $\square$

**Corollary 6.5.** One of the following holds:

- (CU)  $F$  is a cuspidal cubic, and  $(B_2(S_2), \sharp(C \cap F)) = (1, 1)$ .
- (L1)  $F$  is a non-reduced line of length three, and  $(B_2(S_2), \sharp(C \cap F)) = (1, 1)$ .
- (QL)  $F$  is the sum of a smooth conic and its tangent line at a point, and  $(B_2(S_2), \sharp(C \cap F)) = (2, 1)$  or  $(1, 2)$ .
- (L2)  $F$  is the sum of a line and a non-reduced line of length two, and  $(B_2(S_2), \sharp(C \cap F)) = (2, 1)$  or  $(1, 2)$ .
- (L3)  $F$  is the sum of three lines intersecting in one point, and  $(B_2(S_2), \sharp(C \cap F)) = (3, 1), (2, 2)$  or  $(1, 3)$ .

*Proof.* Since  $F$  is a plane cubic, the assertion follows from Lemma 6.3.  $\square$

**Definition 6.6.** Let  $\mathcal{L}(F_{\tilde{S}_2} + E_\mu)$  be the free  $\mathbb{Z}$ -module generated by irreducible components of  $F_{\tilde{S}_2} + E_\mu$ . The group homomorphism  $\Theta : \mathcal{L}(F_{\tilde{S}_2} + E_\mu) \rightarrow \text{Pic}(\tilde{S}_2)$  is given as the quotient morphism by the linear equivalence.

**Lemma 6.7.** *The morphism  $\Theta$  is surjective.*

*Proof.* We have the following exact sequence of homologies:

$$(6.0.9) \quad H_2(F_{\tilde{S}_2} \cup E_\mu, \mathbb{Z}) \longrightarrow H_2(\tilde{S}_2, \mathbb{Z}) \longrightarrow H_2(\tilde{S}_2, F_{\tilde{S}_2} \cup E_\mu, \mathbb{Z}).$$

We note that  $H_2(F_{\tilde{S}_2} \cup E_\mu, \mathbb{Z}) \cong \mathcal{L}(F_{\tilde{S}_2} + E_\mu)$ . Combining the universal coefficient theorem and the rationality of  $\tilde{S}_2$ , we obtain

$$(6.0.10) \quad H_2(\tilde{S}_2, \mathbb{Z}) \cong H^2(\tilde{S}_2, \mathbb{Z}) \cong \text{Pic}(\tilde{S}_2).$$

Combining the universal coefficient theorem and (6.0.4), we have

$$(6.0.11) \quad H_2(\tilde{S}_2, F_{\tilde{S}_2} \cup E_\mu, \mathbb{Z}) \cong \mathbb{Z}^{B_2(S_2 \setminus F)} \oplus \{\text{torsion part of } H_1(S_2 \setminus F, \mathbb{Z})\} \\ \cong 0.$$

Therefore we can rewrite (6.0.9) as

$$(6.0.12) \quad \mathcal{L}(F_{\tilde{S}_2} + E_\mu) \longrightarrow \text{Pic}(\tilde{S}_2) \longrightarrow 0,$$

which shows the surjectivity of  $\Theta$ .  $\square$

Now we can prove that  $(S_1, S_2)$  is projectively equivalent to one of the pairs listed in the case (d) or (e) of Theorem 1.2.

**Proposition 6.8.** *Suppose that  $B_2(S_2) = 1$ . Then  $(S_1, S_2)$  is projectively equivalent to  $(\{y = 0\}, G_1)$  or  $(\{y = 0\}, G_2)$ .*

*Proof.* We may assume that  $S_2 = G_i$  for some  $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$  by Corollary 6.4 and need only consider the five cases as in Corollary 6.5. Throughout the proof, we follow Notation 4.1.

Suppose that the case (CU) holds. Then Lemma 6.2 shows that the point  $\text{Sing } F$  contains  $\text{Sing } S_2$ , which implies  $S_2 = G_1$ . Lemma 4.7 now yields  $F_{\tilde{S}_2} \sim H$ . Hence  $\text{Coker } \Theta$  equals

$$\frac{\mathbb{Z}[H] \oplus \bigoplus_{i=1}^6 \mathbb{Z}[E_i]}{\left( \begin{array}{c} H, H - E_1 - E_2 - E_3, E_1 - E_2, \\ E_2 - E_3, E_3 - E_4, E_4 - E_5, E_5 - E_6 \end{array} \right)} \cong \frac{\mathbb{Z}[E_1]}{(-3E_1)} \cong \mathbb{Z}/3\mathbb{Z},$$

a contradiction with Lemma 6.7.

Suppose that the case (L1) holds. Then Lemma 6.2 shows that  $(S_2, F) = (G_1, 3\langle y, z \rangle)$  or  $(G_2, 3\langle y, z \rangle)$ . However it is easy to see that there is no element of  $| -K_{G_2} |$  whose support is  $\langle y, z \rangle$ . Hence the former holds and  $(S_1, S_2) = (\{y = 0\}, G_1)$ .

Suppose that the case (QL) holds. Then Lemma 6.2 shows that the point  $\text{Sing } F$  contains  $\text{Sing } S_2$ , which implies  $S_2 = G_1$ . Lemma 4.3 now yields that  $F_{\tilde{S}_2}$  is the sum of  $E_6$  and a member of  $|H - E_1|$ . Moreover, an easy computation shows that  $S_2 \setminus F \cong \tilde{S}_2 \setminus (F_{\tilde{S}_2} \cup E_\mu) \cong \mathbb{A}^1 \times \mathbb{C}^*$  and the  $\mathbb{P}^1$ -fibration on  $\tilde{S}_2$  associated with  $|H - E_1|$  induces the second projection of  $\mathbb{A}^1 \times \mathbb{C}^*$ . On the other hand, [KZ99, Theorem 3.1] shows that the inclusion  $C \setminus (C \cap S_1) \hookrightarrow S_2 \setminus (S_2 \cap S_1)$  induces an isomorphism  $H_1(C \setminus (C \cap S_1), \mathbb{Z}) \cong H_1(S_2 \setminus (S_2 \cap S_1), \mathbb{Z})$ . Hence  $(C_{\tilde{S}_2} \cdot H - E_1) = 1$ . However, Lemma 4.3 yields  $(C_{\tilde{S}_2} \cdot H - E_1) = 0$ , a contradiction.

Suppose that the case (L2) holds. Then  $S_2 \neq G_1$  since  $G_1$  has exactly one line. Moreover,  $S_2 \neq G_3$  since all the three lines in  $G_3$  are coplanar. Hence  $S_2 = G_2$ . Since  $G_2$  has exactly two lines  $\langle y, z \rangle$  and  $\langle x, y \rangle$ , we conclude that  $(S_1, S_2) = (\{y = 0\}, G_2)$ .

We note that the case (L3) cannot occur since both  $G_1, G_2$  and  $G_3$  do not contain three lines intersecting in one point.

Combining these results, we complete the proof.  $\square$

**Proposition 6.9.** *Suppose that  $B_2(S_2) = 2$ . Then  $(S_1, S_2)$  is projectively equivalent to  $(\{y = 0\}, G_4)$ ,  $(\{z = \gamma y\}, G_5)$  for some  $\gamma \in \mathbb{P}^1$  or  $(\{t = 0\}, G_6)$ .*

*Proof.* We may assume that  $S_2 = G_i$  for some  $i \in \{4, 5, 6, 7, 8\}$  by Corollary 6.4 and need only consider the cases (QL), (L2) and (L3) as in Corollary 6.5. Throughout the proof, we follow Notation 4.1.

Suppose that the case (QL) holds. Take  $L$  and  $Q$  as the line and the conic respectively such that  $F = L + Q$ . Then Lemma 6.2 shows that  $L \cap Q \supset \text{Sing } S_2$  and hence  $S_2 = G_4$  or  $G_5$ .

Suppose that  $S_2 = G_4$  in addition. Since  $\mu^*(F) - L_{\tilde{S}_2} - Q_{\tilde{S}_2}$  must be a sum of  $(-2)$ -curves, Table 4 shows that  $(L_{\tilde{S}_2}, Q_{\tilde{S}_2}) \sim (E_4, H - E_1)$  or  $(E_j, H - E_j)$  for some  $j \in \{5, 6\}$ . If the former holds, then  $\text{Coker } \Theta$  equals

$$\frac{\mathbb{Z}[H] \oplus \bigoplus_{i=1}^6 \mathbb{Z}[E_i]}{\begin{pmatrix} E_4, H - E_1, H - E_1 - E_2 - E_3, E_1 - E_2, \\ E_2 - E_3, E_3 - E_4, H - E_1 - E_5 - E_6 \end{pmatrix}} \cong \frac{\mathbb{Z}[E_5] \oplus \mathbb{Z}[E_6]}{(-E_5 - E_6)} \cong \mathbb{Z}.$$

If the latter holds, then  $\text{Coker } \Theta$  equals

$$\frac{\mathbb{Z}[H] \oplus \bigoplus_{i=1}^6 \mathbb{Z}[E_i]}{\begin{pmatrix} E_j, H - E_j, H - E_1 - E_2 - E_3, E_1 - E_2, \\ E_2 - E_3, E_3 - E_4, H - E_1 - E_5 - E_6 \end{pmatrix}} \cong \frac{\mathbb{Z}[E_1]}{(-3E_1)} \cong \mathbb{Z}/3\mathbb{Z}.$$

These contradict Lemma 6.7.

Hence  $S_2 = G_5$ . Since  $\text{Sing } S_2 \in L$ , Table 3 shows that  $S_1 = \{z = \gamma y\}$  for some  $\gamma \in \mathbb{C}$  or  $\{x = \gamma y\}$  for some  $\gamma \in \mathbb{C}^*$ . If the latter case holds, then Lemma 4.6 yields  $L_{\tilde{S}_2} \sim H - E_1 - E_6$  and  $Q_{\tilde{S}_2} \sim H - E_1$  since  $Q_{\tilde{S}_2}$  is disjoint

from  $\langle x, t \rangle_{\tilde{S}_2} = E_6$ . Hence  $\text{Coker } \Theta$  equals

$$\frac{\mathbb{Z}[H] \oplus \bigoplus_{i=1}^6 \mathbb{Z}[E_i]}{\left( \begin{array}{c} H - E_1 - E_6, H - E_1, H - E_1 - E_2 - E_3, \\ E_1 - E_2, E_2 - E_3, E_3 - E_4, E_4 - E_5 \end{array} \right)} \cong \frac{\mathbb{Z}[H]}{(-2H)} \cong \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z},$$

a contradiction with Lemma 6.7. Therefore  $(S_1, S_2) = (\{z = \gamma y\}, G_5)$  for some  $\gamma \in \mathbb{C}$ .

Suppose that the case (L2) holds. Take  $L_1$  and  $L_2$  as lines such that  $F = L_1 + 2L_2$ . Since all the three lines in  $G_4$  are coplanar, we have  $S_2 \neq G_4$ . We also have  $L_2 \supset \text{Sing } S_2$  by Lemma 6.2. Hence  $S_2 = G_5$  or  $G_6$ .

Suppose that  $S_2 = G_5$  in addition. Then the support of  $F$  is either  $\langle x, y \rangle \cup \langle x, t \rangle$  or  $\langle y, z \rangle \cup \langle x, y \rangle$ . We note that  $\langle x, y \rangle_{\tilde{S}_2} \sim H - E_1 - E_6$  and  $\langle x, t \rangle_{\tilde{S}_2} \sim E_6$ . If the former holds, then  $\text{Coker } \Theta$  equals

$$\frac{\mathbb{Z}[H] \oplus \bigoplus_{i=1}^6 \mathbb{Z}[E_i]}{\left( \begin{array}{c} H - E_1 - E_6, E_6, H - E_1 - E_2 - E_3, \\ E_1 - E_2, E_2 - E_3, E_3 - E_4, E_4 - E_5 \end{array} \right)} \cong \frac{\mathbb{Z}[H]}{(-2H)} \cong \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z},$$

a contradiction with Lemma 6.7. Hence  $(S_1, S_2) = (\{y = 0\}, G_5)$ .

Suppose that  $S_2 = G_6$  in addition. Then  $L_2 = \langle y, t \rangle$  since  $L_2 \supset \text{Sing } S_2$  and  $L_1 = \langle x, t \rangle$  because  $\langle y, z \rangle, \langle x, y \rangle$  and  $\langle y, t \rangle$  are coplanar. Hence  $(S_1, S_2) = (\{t = 0\}, G_6)$ .

Suppose that the case (L3) holds. Then  $S_2 = G_4$  or  $G_5$  because the point  $\text{Sing } F$  contains  $\text{Sing } S_2$  by Lemma 6.2. Since all the three lines in  $G_5$  are not coplanar, we have  $S_2 \neq G_5$ . Hence  $(S_1, S_2) = (\{y = 0\}, G_4)$ .

Combining these results, we complete the proof.  $\square$

**Proposition 6.10.** *Suppose that  $B_2(S_2) = 3$ . Then  $(S_1, S_2)$  is projectively equivalent to  $(\{y = 0\}, G_9)$ ,  $(\{y = 0\}, G_{10})$  or  $(\{x = t\}, G_{11})$ .*

*Proof.* We may assume that  $S_2 = G_i$  for some  $i \in \{9, \dots, 12, 14, 15\}$  or  $G_{13,p}$  for some  $p \in T_{13}$  by Corollary 6.4. Moreover, the case (L3) holds by Corollary 6.5. Lemma 6.2 now shows that the point  $\text{Sing } F$  is the same as  $\text{Sing } S_2$ . Therefore Tables 2 and 3 give the assertion.  $\square$

## 7. THE CASE $p_a(C) = 0$ AND $S_2$ IS NON-NORMAL

In this section, we assume the following:

**Assumption 2.**  $p_a(C) = 0$ ,  $U$  is an affine homology 3-cell and  $S_2$  is non-normal.

Then  $S_2$  is projectively equivalent to  $R_i$  for some  $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$  by Theorem 3.4. In this section, we show that  $(C, S_1, S_2)$  belongs to one of the six cases of Theorem 1.2 when  $i \leq 2$ , and that  $(S_1, S_2)$  is projectively equivalent to one of the pairs listed in the case (d) or (e) of Theorem 1.2 when  $i \geq 3$ .

**Proposition 7.1.** *Suppose that  $S_2 = R_1$ . Then one of the following occurs:*

- $S_1 = \{x = 0\}$ .
- $S_1 = \{z = 0\}$  and  $\deg C = 1$ .
- $S_1 = \{y = \gamma x\}$  for some  $\gamma \in \mathbb{A}^1$ ,  $\deg C = 3$  or  $4$ , and  $\sharp(F \cap C) = B_2(F)$ .

In particular, the second case gives the triplet  $(C, S_1, S_2)$  projectively equivalent to the subvarieties as in Example 1.1.

*Proof.* Since  $p_a(C) = 0$ , Lemma 4.9 shows that  $\deg C = 1, 3$  or  $4$ . Moreover,  $F$  is either a cuspidal cubic or the sum of rulings.

Suppose that  $F$  is a cuspidal cubic. Then Lemma 2.3 (1) yields  $N_1 + N_2 - N_{1 \cap 2} = 1$ . On the other hand, we have  $N_2 = \sharp(C \cap E) = \sharp(C \cap \{x = 0\}) \geq 1$ . Hence  $N_1 = N_2 = N_{1 \cap 2} = 1$  by Lemma 2.3 (2). Since  $F \cap E$  also consists of one point, say  $p$ , we conclude that  $C \cap F = C \cap E = F \cap E = \{p\}$ . We note that  $p$  is distinct from the vertex of  $S_2$ .

If  $\deg C = 1$ , then  $C = E$  since  $C$  is the ruling containing  $p$ , a contradiction with the assumption in Problem 1.2. Hence  $\deg C \geq 3$ . Since  $(C_{\tilde{S}_2}, F_{\tilde{S}_2}) = \deg C \geq 3$ , the curve  $C_{\tilde{S}_2}$  intersects with  $F_{\tilde{S}_2}$  at  $\mu^{-1}(p)$  tangentially. Since  $\mu$  contracts the tangent direction of  $F_{\tilde{S}_2}$  at  $\mu^{-1}(p)$ , it also contracts that of  $C_{\tilde{S}_2}$  at  $\mu^{-1}(p)$ . Hence  $C$  is singular at  $p$ , a contradiction.

Therefore  $F$  is the sum of rulings. Lemma 2.3 (1) now shows that

$$(7.0.1) \quad N_1 + N_2 - N_{1 \cap 2} = B_2(F).$$

Suppose that  $\deg C = 1$ . Then both  $C \cap F$  and  $C \cap E$  is the vertex of  $S_2$ . Hence  $N_1 = N_2 = N_{1 \cap 2} = 1$  and  $B_2(F) = 1$ . Therefore  $S_1 = \{x = 0\}$  or  $\{z = 0\}$ .

Suppose that  $\deg C = 3$ . Then  $N_1 = B_2(F)$  and  $N_2 = 1$ . On the other hand,  $N_{1 \cap 2} = 1$  if  $E \subset F$  and 0 otherwise. (7.0.1) now shows that  $E \subset F$  and hence  $S_1 = \{y = \gamma x\}$  for some  $\gamma \in \mathbb{P}^1$ .

Suppose that  $\deg C = 4$ . Since  $C_{\tilde{S}_2} \sim \Sigma_3 + 4f_3$ , we have

$$(7.0.2) \quad N_1 = \begin{cases} B_2(F) + 1 & \text{if } F_{\tilde{S}_2} \cap C_{\tilde{S}_2} \cap \Sigma_3 = \emptyset \\ B_2(F) & \text{if } F_{\tilde{S}_2} \cap C_{\tilde{S}_2} \cap \Sigma_3 \neq \emptyset, \end{cases}$$

$$(7.0.3) \quad N_2 = \begin{cases} 2 & \text{if } \tilde{E} \cap C_{\tilde{S}_2} \cap \Sigma_3 = \emptyset \\ 1 & \text{if } \tilde{E} \cap C_{\tilde{S}_2} \cap \Sigma_3 \neq \emptyset, \end{cases}$$

$$(7.0.4) \quad N_{1 \cap 2} = \begin{cases} N_2 & \text{if } F \supset E \\ 1 & \text{if } F \not\supset E. \end{cases}$$

Assume that  $F \not\supset E$ . Then (7.0.1) implies  $(N_1, N_2) = (B_2(F), 1)$ . Hence  $F_{\tilde{S}_2} \cap (C_{\tilde{S}_2} \cap \Sigma_3) \neq \emptyset$  and  $\tilde{E} \cap (C_{\tilde{S}_2} \cap \Sigma_3) \neq \emptyset$ . This implies, however, that  $\tilde{E} \subset \mathbb{F}_3$  is the fiber of  $\mathbb{P}^1$ -bundle passing through the point  $C_{\tilde{S}_2} \cap \Sigma_3$  and  $F_{\tilde{S}_2}$  contains such a fiber. Hence  $F \supset E$ , a contradiction.

Therefore  $F \supset E$  and  $S_1 = \{y = \gamma x\}$  for some  $\gamma \in \mathbb{P}^1$ . (7.0.1) now shows that  $\sharp(C \cap F) = B_2(F)$ .

Combining these results, we obtain the first assertion. Now suppose that  $S_1 = \{z = 0\}$  and  $\deg C = 1$ . Then  $C = \{y = ax, z = -a^2y\}$  for some  $a \in \mathbb{C}^*$ . Now take  $f$  as the automorphism of  $\mathbb{P}_{[x:y:z:t]}^3$  such that  $f^*(x) = x$ ,  $f^*(y) = a^{-1}y$ ,  $f^*(z) = a^{-3}z$  and  $f^*(t) = t$ . Then  $f(S_i) = S_i$  for  $i \in \{1, 2\}$  and  $f(C) = \{x = y = -z\}$ , and the second assertion holds.  $\square$

**Proposition 7.2.** *Suppose that  $S_2 = R_2$ . Then  $S_1 = \{y = \gamma x\}$  for some  $\gamma \in \mathbb{P}^1$ ,  $\deg C = 3$  or  $4$ , and  $\sharp(F \cap C) = B_2(F) + 1$ .*

*Proof.* An analysis similar to that in the proof of Proposition 7.1 shows that  $\deg C = 1, 3$  or  $4$  and  $F$  is the sum of rulings. Lemma 2.3 (1) now shows that

$$(7.0.5) \quad N_1 + N_2 - N_{1 \cap 2} = B_2(F) + 1 \geq 2.$$

Suppose that  $\deg C = 1$ . Then both  $C \cap F$  and  $C \cap E$  is the vertex of  $S_2$ . Hence  $N_1 = N_2 = N_{1 \cap 2} = 1$ , a contradiction with (7.0.5).

Suppose that  $\deg C = 3$  and  $F \not\supset E$ . Then  $N_1 = B_2(F)$ ,  $N_2 = 2$  and  $N_{1 \cap 2} = 0$ , a contradiction with (7.0.5).

Suppose that  $\deg C = 4$  and  $F \not\supset E$ . Then we have

$$(7.0.6) \quad N_1 = \begin{cases} B_2(F) + 1 & \text{if } F_{\tilde{S}_2} \cap C_{\tilde{S}_2} \cap \Sigma_3 = \emptyset \\ B_2(F) & \text{if } F_{\tilde{S}_2} \cap C_{\tilde{S}_2} \cap \Sigma_3 \neq \emptyset, \end{cases}$$

$$(7.0.7) \quad N_2 = \begin{cases} 3 & \text{if } \tilde{E} \cap C_{\tilde{S}_2} \cap \Sigma_3 = \emptyset \\ 2 & \text{if } \tilde{E} \cap C_{\tilde{S}_2} \cap \Sigma_3 \neq \emptyset, \end{cases}$$

$$(7.0.8) \quad N_{1 \cap 2} = 1.$$

As in the proof of Proposition 7.1, these equations yield  $F \supset E$ , a contradiction.

Hence  $\deg C \geq 3$  and  $F \supset E$ . In particular,  $S_1 = \{y = \gamma x\}$  for some  $\gamma \in \mathbb{P}^1$  and  $\sharp(C \cap F) = B_2(F) + 1$  by (7.0.5).  $\square$

Next we prove lemmas needed to treat the case where  $S_2 = R_3$ .

**Lemma 7.3.** *Suppose that  $S_2 = R_3$ . Then the following hold:*

- (1) *The morphism  $\mu_* : H_2(\mathbb{F}_1, \mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow H_2(S_2, \mathbb{Z})$  maps  $[\Sigma_1] + [f_1]$  to  $2[E]$ .*
- (2)  *$H_i(S_2, \mathbb{Z}) = \mathbb{Z}$  for  $i = 0, 4$ ,  $\mathbb{Z}^2$  for  $i = 2$ , and  $0$  otherwise.*
- (3)  *$\{[E], \mu_*[f_1]\}$  is a  $\mathbb{Z}$ -basis of  $H_2(S_2, \mathbb{Z})$ .*

*Proof.* (1) For  $i \geq 0$ , we have the following commutative diagram with exact rows:

$$(7.0.9) \quad \begin{array}{ccccccc} \cdots & \longrightarrow & H_{i+1}(\overline{E}, \mathbb{F}_1, \mathbb{Z}) & \longrightarrow & H_i(\overline{E}, \mathbb{Z}) & \xrightarrow{\delta_i} & H_i(\mathbb{F}_1, \mathbb{Z}) & \xrightarrow{\epsilon_i} & H_i(\overline{E}, \mathbb{F}_1, \mathbb{Z}) & \longrightarrow & \cdots \\ & & \downarrow \zeta_{i+1} & & \downarrow \theta_i & & \downarrow \mu_* & & \downarrow \zeta_i & & \\ \cdots & \longrightarrow & H_{i+1}(E, S_2, \mathbb{Z}) & \longrightarrow & H_i(E, \mathbb{Z}) & \xrightarrow{\delta'_i} & H_i(S_2, \mathbb{Z}) & \xrightarrow{\epsilon'_i} & H_i(E, S_2, \mathbb{Z}) & \longrightarrow & \cdots \end{array}$$

Then  $\theta_2 = 2 \times \mathrm{id}_{\mathbb{Z}}$  by the construction of  $R_3$ . Hence  $\mu_*([\Sigma_1] + [f_1]) = \mu_*[\overline{E}] = 2[E]$ .

(2) By [Spa66, Chap.4, Sect.8, Theorem 9],  $\zeta_i$  is an isomorphism for  $i \geq 0$ . By Lefschetz duality, we have  $H_i(\overline{E}, \mathbb{F}_1, \mathbb{Z}) \cong H_c^{4-i}(\mathbb{F}_1 \setminus \overline{E}, \mathbb{Z}) \cong H^{4-i}(\mathbb{P}^1, \mathbb{Z})$ . Hence the bottom of (7.0.9) gives the assertion.

(3) Since  $H_2(\mathbb{F}_1, \mathbb{Z})$  is generated by fundamental classes  $[\overline{E}] = [\Sigma_1] + [f_1]$  and  $[f_1]$ ,  $H_2(\overline{E}, \mathbb{F}_1, \mathbb{Z})$  is identified as the free  $\mathbb{Z}$ -module generated by  $[f_1]$ . Hence  $\epsilon_2$  has a section, say  $s$ . Therefore  $\mu_* \circ s \circ \zeta_2^{-1}$  is a section of  $\epsilon'_2$  and we have the assertion.  $\square$

**Lemma 7.4.** *Suppose that  $S_2 = R_3$  and  $N_1 + N_2 - N_{1 \cap 2} = 1$ . Then the canonical map  $\xi : H_2(F, \mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow H_2(S_1, \mathbb{Z}) \oplus H_2(S_2, \mathbb{Z})$  is injective. If  $H_1(F, \mathbb{Z}) = 0$  in addition, then  $\mathrm{Coker} \xi \cong \mathbb{Z}$ .*

*Proof.* By Lemma 2.3 (2), we have  $(N_1, N_2, N_{1 \cap 2}) = (1, 0, 0)$  or  $(1, 1, 1)$ . In particular  $\sharp(C \cap (E \cup F)) = 1$ . Hence  $G := E_\varphi \cap U$  is isomorphic to  $\mathbb{A}^2$ . Applying the Thom isomorphism to the pair  $(U, G)$ , we get the following exact sequence:

(7.0.10)

$$\cdots \longrightarrow H_{i-1}(\mathbb{A}^2, \mathbb{Z}) \longrightarrow H_i(U \setminus G, \mathbb{Z}) \longrightarrow H_i(U, \mathbb{Z}) \longrightarrow H_{i-2}(\mathbb{A}^2, \mathbb{Z}) \longrightarrow \cdots.$$

Since  $U \setminus G \cong \mathbb{P}^3 \setminus (S_1 \cup S_2)$ , this sequence shows that  $H_i(\mathbb{P}^3 \setminus (S_1 \cup S_2), \mathbb{Z}) \cong 0$  for  $i \geq 2$ . On the other hand, the Lefschetz duality gives the following exact sequence:

(7.0.11)

$$\begin{aligned} \cdots \longrightarrow H_{6-i}(\mathbb{P}^3 \setminus (S_1 \cup S_2), \mathbb{Z}) &\longrightarrow H^i(\mathbb{P}^3, \mathbb{Z}) \longrightarrow H^i(S_1 \cup S_2, \mathbb{Z}) \\ &\longrightarrow H_{6-(i+1)}(\mathbb{P}^3 \setminus (S_1 \cup S_2), \mathbb{Z}) \longrightarrow \cdots. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore  $H^2(S_1 \cup S_2, \mathbb{Z}) = \mathbb{Z}$  and  $H^3(S_1 \cup S_2, \mathbb{Z}) = 0$ . By the universal coefficient theorem, we obtain  $H_2(S_1 \cup S_2, \mathbb{Z}) = \mathbb{Z}$  and  $H_3(S_1 \cup S_2, \mathbb{Z})$  is a torsion. Finally let us consider the following Mayer-Vietoris exact sequence:

(7.0.12)

$$\begin{aligned} \cdots \longrightarrow H_3(S_1, \mathbb{Z}) \oplus H_3(S_2, \mathbb{Z}) &\longrightarrow H_3(S_1 \cup S_2, \mathbb{Z}) \\ &\longrightarrow H_2(F, \mathbb{Z}) \xrightarrow{\xi} H_2(S_1, \mathbb{Z}) \oplus H_2(S_2, \mathbb{Z}) \longrightarrow H_2(S_1 \cup S_2, \mathbb{Z}) \\ &\longrightarrow H_1(F, \mathbb{Z}) \longrightarrow \cdots. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 7.3 (2), we have  $H_3(S_1, \mathbb{Z}) \cong H_3(S_2, \mathbb{Z}) \cong 0$ . Then  $H_3(S_1 \cup S_2, \mathbb{Z})$  is a submodule of a free  $\mathbb{Z}$ -module  $H_2(F, \mathbb{Z})$ . Hence  $H_3(S_1 \cup S_2, \mathbb{Z}) \cong 0$ . Now (7.0.12) gives the following exact sequence:

$$(7.0.13) \quad 0 \longrightarrow H_2(F, \mathbb{Z}) \xrightarrow{\xi} H_2(S_1, \mathbb{Z}) \oplus H_2(S_2, \mathbb{Z}) \longrightarrow \mathbb{Z} \longrightarrow H_1(F, \mathbb{Z}),$$

and the assertions hold.  $\square$

Now we can determine  $S_1$  in the case where  $S_2 = R_3$ .

**Proposition 7.5.** *Suppose that  $S_2 = R_3$ . Then  $S_1 = \{y = \gamma x\}$  for some  $\gamma \in \mathbb{P}^1$ .*

*Proof.* It suffices to show that  $F \supset E$ . Conversely, suppose that  $F \not\supset E$ . By Lemma 2.3, we have  $\chi_{\text{top}}(F) = 2 + N_1 + N_2 - N_{1 \cap 2} \geq 3$ . Hence  $F$  is one of the following:

- (1) The sum of a line and a non-reduced line of length two,
- (2) The sum of a smooth conic and its tangent line at a point,
- (3) The sum of three lines.

The former two cases imply that  $N_1 + N_2 - N_{1 \cap 2} = \chi_{\text{top}}(F) - 2 = 1$  and  $H_1(F, \mathbb{Z}) = 0$ . On the other hand, Lemma 4.10 shows that each line in  $S_2$



is either  $E$ ,  $\mu_*(\Sigma_1)$  or the image of a member of  $|f_1|$  in  $\tilde{S}_2 \cong \mathbb{F}_1$  by  $\mu$ . Since  $F \not\supset E$ , the case (3) also implies that  $N_1 + N_2 - N_{1 \cap 2} = \chi_{\mathrm{top}}(F) - 2 = 1$ .

Suppose that the case (1) holds. Let  $F = L_1 + 2L_2$  be the irreducible decomposition. Then  $(L_1)_{\tilde{S}_2} \sim \Sigma_1$  and  $(L_2)_{\tilde{S}_2} \sim f_1$  because Theorem 3.5 shows that  $\mu^*(-K_{S_2}) \sim \Sigma_1 + 2f_1$ . Hence

$$\mathrm{Coker} \xi = \frac{H_2(S_1, \mathbb{Z}) \oplus H_2(S_2, \mathbb{Z})}{([\mathcal{O}_{S_1}(1)], 2[E] - \mu_*[f_1]), ([\mathcal{O}_{S_1}(1)], \mu_*[f_1])} \cong \mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z},$$

a contradiction with Lemma 7.4.

Suppose that the case (2) holds. Let  $L, Q$  be the line and the conic respectively such that  $F = L + Q$ . Then  $L_{\tilde{S}_2} \sim f_1$  and  $Q_{\tilde{S}_2} \sim \Sigma_1 + f_1$  since  $\mu^*(-K_{S_2}) \sim \Sigma_1 + 2f_1$ . Hence

$$\mathrm{Coker} \xi = \frac{H_2(S_1, \mathbb{Z}) \oplus H_2(S_2, \mathbb{Z})}{([\mathcal{O}_{S_1}(1)], \mu_*[f_1]), ([\mathcal{O}_{S_1}(2)], 2[E])} \cong \mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z},$$

a contradiction with Lemma 7.4.

Suppose that the case (3) holds. Then there are lines  $L_1, L_2, L_3$  such that  $F = L_1 + L_2 + L_3$ ,  $(L_1)_{\tilde{S}_2} \sim (L_2)_{\tilde{S}_2} \sim f_1$  and  $(L_3)_{\tilde{S}_2} \sim \Sigma_1$ . However  $\xi([L_1]) = \xi([L_2]) = \xi(\mu_*[f_1])$ , a contradiction with Lemma 7.4.

Therefore  $F \supset E$ , which implies  $S_1 = \{y = \gamma x\}$  for some  $\gamma \in \mathbb{P}^1$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 7.6.** *Suppose that  $S_2 = R_4$ . Then  $S_1 = \{y = \gamma x\}$  for some  $\gamma \in \mathbb{P}^1$ .*

*Proof.* By Lemma 2.3, we have  $\chi_{\mathrm{top}}(F) = 1 + N_1 + N_2 - N_{1 \cap 2} \geq 2$ . Hence  $F$  is one of the following:

- (1) A cuspidal cubic,
- (2) A non-reduced line of length three,
- (3) The sum of a smooth conic and a line,
- (4) The sum of a line and non-reduced line of length two,
- (5) The sum of three lines.

There is also the irreducible decomposition  $\tilde{E} = \tilde{E}_1 + \tilde{E}_2$  such that  $\tilde{E}_1 \sim \Sigma_1$  and  $\tilde{E}_2 \sim f_1$  by Lemma 3.6.

Suppose that the case (1) holds. Then  $N_1 + N_2 - N_{1 \cap 2} = \chi_{\mathrm{top}}(F) - 1 = 1$  and  $N_2 = \sharp(C \cap E) = \sharp(C \cap \{x = 0\}) \geq 1$ . Lemma 2.3 (2) now shows that

$$(7.0.14) \quad N_1 = N_2 = N_{1 \cap 2} = 1.$$

On the other hand, we have  $F_{\tilde{S}_2} \sim \mu^*(-K_{S_2}) \sim \Sigma_1 + 2f_1$ . Since  $F$  has a cuspidal singularity, both  $F_{\tilde{S}_2} \cap \tilde{E}_1$  and  $F_{\tilde{S}_2} \cap \tilde{E}_2$  coincide with the unique point in  $\tilde{E}_1 \cap \tilde{E}_2$ , say  $\tilde{p}$ . In particular  $F \cap E = \{p\} := \{\mu(\tilde{p})\}$ . Combining this result and (7.0.14), we obtain  $C \cap E = C \cap F = \{p\}$ . Since  $C$  is smooth, we also obtain  $C_{\tilde{S}_2} \cap F_{\tilde{S}_2} = C_{\tilde{S}_2} \cap \tilde{E} = \{\tilde{p}\}$ .

Now write  $C_{\tilde{S}_2} \sim a\Sigma_1 + bf_1$  with  $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ . Then  $(a, b) \neq (1, 0)$  or  $(0, 1)$  since  $C_{\tilde{S}_2} \not\subset \tilde{E}$ . Hence  $C_{\tilde{S}_2}$  intersects with  $F_{\tilde{S}_2}$  at  $\tilde{p}$  with multiplicity  $a + b \geq 2$ . Since  $\mu$  contracts the tangent direction of  $F_{\tilde{S}_2}$  at  $\tilde{p}$ , it also contracts that of  $C_{\tilde{S}_2}$  at  $\tilde{p}$ . Hence  $C$  is singular at  $p$ , a contradiction.

Suppose that the case (3) holds. Let  $L$  and  $Q$  be the line and the conic respectively such that  $F = L + Q$ . We note that  $L \neq E$  since  $S_2$  is smooth

at the generic point of  $L$ . Then  $L_{\tilde{S}_2} \sim f_1$  and  $Q_{\tilde{S}_2} \sim \Sigma_1 + f_1$  by Lemma 4.10. Let  $L_{\tilde{S}_2} \cap Q_{\tilde{S}_2} = \{\tilde{q}\}$ ,  $L_{\tilde{S}_2} \cap \tilde{E}_1 = \{\tilde{p}_1\}$  and  $Q_{\tilde{S}_2} \cap \tilde{E}_2 = \{\tilde{p}_2\}$ . Since  $L$  intersects with  $Q$  at  $\mu(\tilde{q})$  transversally, we have  $\mu(\tilde{p}_1) = \mu(\tilde{p}_2) =: p$  and hence  $\chi_{\text{top}}(F) = 2$ .

An analysis similar to that in the argument on the case (1) shows that  $C \cap E = C \cap F = E \cap F = \{p\}$ . Hence both  $C_{\tilde{S}_2} \cap (L_{\tilde{S}_2} \cup Q_{\tilde{S}_2})$  and  $C_{\tilde{S}_2} \cap (\tilde{E}_1 \cup \tilde{E}_2)$  are contained in  $\{\tilde{p}_1, \tilde{p}_2\}$ .

Now write  $C_{\tilde{S}_2} = a\Sigma_1 + bf_1$  with  $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ . Then  $(a, b) \neq (1, 0)$  or  $(0, 1)$  since  $C_{\tilde{S}_2} \not\subset \tilde{E}$ . If  $a = b$ , then  $C_{\tilde{S}_2} \cap L_{\tilde{S}_2}$  contains a point distinct from  $\tilde{p}_1$  and  $\tilde{p}_2$ , a contradiction. Hence  $0 < a < b$ . Since  $C_{\tilde{S}_2}$  intersects with both  $\tilde{E}_1$  and  $\tilde{E}_2$ , it must contain  $\tilde{p}_1$  and  $\tilde{p}_2$ . Hence  $p \in C$  is a nodal singularity, a contradiction.

Therefore  $F$  consists of lines. Since  $\mu^*(F) \sim \Sigma_1 + 2f_1$ , Lemma 4.10 now shows that  $F \supset E$ . Hence  $S_1 = \{y = \gamma x\}$  for some  $\gamma \in \mathbb{P}^1$ .  $\square$

## 8. CONTRACTIBILITIES

In §6 and 7, we show that if  $p_a(C) = 0$  and  $U$  is an affine homology 3-cell, then either  $(S_1, S_2)$  is projectively equivalent to one of the pairs listed in the cases (d) or (e), or  $(C, S_1, S_2)$  belongs to one of the cases (b), (c) and (f). In this section, we seek equivalent conditions for  $U$  to be an affine homology 3-cell in the former situation, and we show that  $U$  is a contractible affine 3-fold in the latter situation.

**Proposition 8.1.** *Suppose that  $p_a(C) = 0$  and  $(S_1, S_2)$  is projectively equivalent to one of the pairs listed in the case (d). Then the following are equivalent:*

- (1)  $U$  is an affine homology 3-cell.
- (2)  $\sharp(C \cap S_1) = 1$ .
- (3)  $U \cong \mathbb{A}^3$ .

*Proof.* Since (3)  $\Rightarrow$  (1) is trivial, it suffices to show that (1)  $\Rightarrow$  (2)  $\Rightarrow$  (3).

Let  $G := E_\varphi \cap U$  and  $S := S_2 \setminus F$ . Then  $G \cong \mathbb{A}^1 \times (C \setminus (C \cap S_1))$ . For each case, it is also easy to check that there is a coordinate  $\{x, y, z\}$  of  $\mathbb{P}^3 \setminus S_1 \cong \mathbb{A}^3$  such that  $S = \{x = 0\}$ . In particular,  $S \cong \mathbb{A}^2$ .

(1)  $\Rightarrow$  (2): By [KZ99, Theorem 3.1], we have an isomorphism of homology rings  $\mathbb{Z} \cong H_*(S, \mathbb{Z}) \cong H_*(G, \mathbb{Z}) \cong H_*(C \setminus (C \cap S_1), \mathbb{Z})$ . Hence  $\sharp(C \cap S_1) = 1$ .

(2)  $\Rightarrow$  (3): The assumption implies that  $C \setminus (C \cap S_1) \cong \mathbb{A}^1$ . Then we may assume that  $C \setminus (C \cap S_1) = \{x = y = 0\}$  by the Abhyankar-Moh-Suzuki theorem [Suz74, AM75]. Hence  $U$  is the affine modification of  $\mathbb{A}^3$  with the locus  $(\{x = y = 0\} \subset \{x = 0\})$ , which is isomorphic to  $\mathbb{A}^3$ .  $\square$

**Definition 8.2.** In what follows,  $\Delta: H_1(C \setminus (C \cap S_1), \mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow H_1(S_2 \setminus F, \mathbb{Z})$  stands for the homomorphism induced by the inclusion  $C \setminus (C \cap S_1) \hookrightarrow S_2 \setminus F$ .

**Proposition 8.3.** *Suppose that  $p_a(C) = 0$  and  $(S_1, S_2)$  is projectively equivalent to one of the pairs listed in the case (e). Then the following are equivalent:*

- (1)  $U$  is an affine homology 3-cell.
- (2)  $\Delta$  is an isomorphism.

(3)  $U$  is a contractible affine 3-fold.

In particular, if  $U$  is an affine homology 3-cell, then  $\sharp(C \cap S_1) = 2$ .

*Proof.* Let  $G := E_\varphi \cap U$  and  $S := S_2 \setminus F$ . Then  $G \cong \mathbb{A}^1 \times (C \setminus (C \cap S_1))$ . For each case, it is also easy to check that  $S \cong \mathbb{A}^1 \times \mathbb{C}^*$ . In particular  $H_i(G, \mathbb{Z}) \cong H_i(S, \mathbb{Z}) \cong 0$  for all  $i \geq 2$ . Since  $\varphi_* : H_1(G, \mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow H_1(S, \mathbb{Z})$  factors through  $\Delta$ , [KZ99, Theorem 3.1, Corollary 3.1] now yields

$$\begin{aligned} & U \text{ is an affine homology 3-cells} \\ \iff & \varphi_* : H_*(G, \mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow H_*(S, \mathbb{Z}) \text{ is an isomorphism} \\ \iff & \varphi_* : H_1(G, \mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow H_1(S, \mathbb{Z}) \text{ is an isomorphism} \\ \iff & \Delta \text{ is an isomorphism} \\ \iff & U \text{ is a contractible affine 3-fold,} \end{aligned}$$

which is the first assertion. The second assertion follows from  $H_1(S, \mathbb{Z}) \cong H_1(\mathbb{A}^1 \times \mathbb{C}^*, \mathbb{Z}) \cong \mathbb{Z}$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 8.4.** *Suppose that one of the cases (b) and (c) holds. Then  $U$  is a contractible affine 3-fold.*

*Proof.* For each case,  $\varphi_* : H_1(E_\varphi \cap U, \mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow H_1(S_2 \setminus F, \mathbb{Z})$  factors through  $\Delta$  and is an isomorphism by the condition on  $\sharp(C \cap S_1)$ . Hence the assertion follows from [KZ99, Corollary 3.1].  $\square$

Now we can prove Theorem 1.2.

*Proof of Theorem 1.2.* First suppose that  $p_a(C) \geq 1$ . If  $U$  is an affine homology 3-cell, then the case (a) holds by Proposition 5.3. On the other hand, if the case (a) holds, then  $U \cong \mathbb{A}^3$  by Propositions 5.4 and 5.5.

In the remainder of the proof, we may assume that  $p_a(C) = 0$ . Suppose that  $S_2$  is normal. Then  $B_2(S_2) \leq 3$  by Lemma 6.3. Combining Propositions 6.8–6.10, 8.1 and 8.3, we conclude that  $U$  is an affine homology 3-cell if and only if one of the cases (d) and (e) holds.

Suppose that  $S_2$  is non-normal. Then we may assume that  $S_2 = R_i$  for some  $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$  by Theorem 3.4.

Firstly suppose that  $i = 1$ . If  $U$  is an affine homology 3-cell, then Proposition 7.1 shows that one of the cases (b), (d) and (f) holds. On the other and, if the case (b) holds, then  $U$  is a contractible affine 3-fold by Proposition 8.4. If the case (d) holds, then  $U \cong \mathbb{A}^3$  by Proposition 8.1. If the case (f) holds, then  $U \cong \mathbb{A}^1 \times W(3, 2)$  by Example 1.1.

Next suppose that  $i = 2$ . Then  $U$  is an affine homology 3-cell if and only if the case (c) holds by Propositions 7.2 and 8.4.

Finally suppose that  $i \geq 3$ . Then  $U$  is an affine homology 3-cell if and only if one of the cases (d) and (e) holds by Propositions 7.5–8.1 and 8.3.

Combining these results, we complete the proof.  $\square$

## 9. ISOMORPHISM CLASSES

In this section, we prove Theorem 1.3. When the case (a) (resp. (d)) of Theorem 1.2 holds, then Propositions 5.4 and 5.5 (resp. Proposition 8.1) yields  $U \cong \mathbb{A}^3$ . For this reason, we will treat only the cases (b), (c) and (e).

**Lemma 9.1.** *Suppose that the case (e) of Theorem 1.2 holds with  $(S_1, S_2) = (\{y = 0\}, G_2)$  and  $\deg C \leq 2$ . Then  $U \cong \mathbb{A}^3$ .*

*Proof.* First let us determine the linear equivalence class of  $C$  using Notation 4.1. It is easy to check that  $S_2 \setminus F \cong \tilde{S}_2 \setminus (F_{\tilde{S}_2} \cup E_\mu) \cong \mathbb{A}^1 \times \mathbb{C}^*$  and the  $\mathbb{P}^1$ -fibration on  $\tilde{S}_2$  associated with  $|H - E_1|$  induces the second projection of  $\mathbb{A}^1 \times \mathbb{C}^*$ . Since  $\Delta$  is an isomorphism, we have  $(C_{\tilde{S}_2} \cdot H - E_1) = 1$ . Lemma 4.4 now yields  $C_{\tilde{S}_2} \sim H - E_5$ . In particular,  $\deg C = 2$ .

We have  $(C_{\tilde{S}_2} \cdot E_5 - E_6) = (C_{\tilde{S}_2} \cdot H - E_1 - E_2 - E_3) = 1$ . Hence  $\text{Sing } S_2 \subset C$  and the linear hull  $P \subset \mathbb{P}^3$  of  $C$  is written as  $\{z = ay\}$  for some  $a \in \mathbb{C}$ . Thus  $U$  is the affine modification of  $\mathbb{P}^3 \setminus S_1 \cong \mathbb{A}_{(x,z,t)}^3$  with the locus

$$(\{xt + xz^2 + 1 = 0, z = a\} \subset \{xt + xz^2 + 1 = 0\}).$$

Therefore we have

$$\begin{aligned} U &\cong \{w(xt + xz^2 + 1) + z - a = 0\} \subset \mathbb{A}_{(x,z,t,w)}^4 \\ &\cong \{w(xt + 1) + z = 0\} \cong \mathbb{A}^3 \end{aligned}$$

as desired.  $\square$

**Lemma 9.2.** *Suppose that the case (e) of Theorem 1.2 holds with  $(S_1, S_2) = (\{y = 0\}, G_2)$  and  $\deg C \geq 3$ . Then  $U \cong \mathbb{A}^3$ .*

*Proof.* By Lemma 4.4, we obtain  $C_{\tilde{S}_2} \sim 2H - E_1 - E_2 - E_5$  in Notation 4.1. In particular,  $\deg C = 3$ . Then  $\text{Sing } S_2 \subset C$  since  $(C_{\tilde{S}_2} \cdot E_2 - E_3) = (C_{\tilde{S}_2} \cdot E_5 - E_6) = 1$ .

Take a general point  $p \in \langle x, y \rangle$  and  $Q$  as the quadric surface containing  $C$ ,  $p$  and a general point of  $\langle y, z \rangle$ . Then  $Q$  contains  $\langle y, z \rangle$  since  $\sharp(\langle y, z \rangle \cap Q) \geq 3$ . Moreover,  $Q$  contains  $\langle x, y \rangle$  because Lemma 4.4 shows that  $\langle x, y \rangle$  is the unique curve of degree at most two containing  $p$ . Hence  $S_2|_Q = C + \langle x, y \rangle + \langle y, z \rangle + L$  for some line  $L \subset S_2$ . If  $L = \langle y, z \rangle$ , then  $C \sim -K_{S_2}$ , a contradiction. Hence  $S_2|_Q = C + 2\langle x, y \rangle + \langle y, z \rangle$  and we can write  $Q = \{xz + yl(x, y) = 0\}$  for some linear form  $l$ . Thus  $U$  is the affine modification of  $\mathbb{P}^3 \setminus S_1 \cong \mathbb{A}_{(x,z,t)}^3$  with the locus

$$(\{xt + xz^2 + 1 = 0, xz + l(x, 1) = 0\} \subset \{xt + xz^2 + 1 = 0\}).$$

Therefore we have

$$\begin{aligned} U &\cong \{w(xt + xz^2 + 1) + xz + l(x, 1) = 0\} \subset \mathbb{A}_{(x,z,t,w)}^4 \\ &\cong \{w(xt + 1) + xz + l(x, 1) = 0\} \\ &\cong \{w + xz + l(x, 1) = 0\} \cong \mathbb{A}^3. \end{aligned}$$

as desired.  $\square$

**Lemma 9.3.** *Suppose that the case (e) of Theorem 1.2 holds with  $(S_1, S_2) = (\{y = 0\}, G_4)$  and  $\deg C \leq 2$ . Then  $U \cong \mathbb{A}^3$ .*

*Proof.* As in the proof of Lemma 9.1, the  $\mathbb{P}^1$ -fibration on  $\tilde{S}_2$  associated with  $|H - E_1|$  induces an  $\mathbb{A}^1$ -bundle  $S_2 \setminus F \cong \mathbb{A}^1 \times \mathbb{C}^* \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^*$ . Then  $(C_{\tilde{S}_2} \cdot H - E_1) = 1$  since  $\Delta$  is an isomorphism. Lemma 4.5 now yields  $C_{\tilde{S}_2} \sim H - E_i$  for some  $i \in \{5, 6\}$ . In particular,  $\deg C = 2$ .

Since  $(C_{\tilde{S}_2} \cdot H - E_1 - E_2 - E_3) = (C_{\tilde{S}_2} \cdot E_i) = 1$ , we have  $\sharp(C \cap \mu_*(E_i)) = 2$ . Hence the linear hull  $P \subset \mathbb{P}^3$  of  $C$  satisfies  $S_2|_P = C + \mu_*(E_i)$ . On the other hand, we have  $3\langle y, z \rangle = \{z = y\}|_{S_2} \in |-K_{S_2}|$ . Since we can not write  $-K_{\tilde{S}_2} - 3E_j$  as a sum of  $(-2)$ -curves when  $j = 5$  or  $6$ , we obtain  $\langle y, z \rangle_{\tilde{S}_2} \sim E_4$ . Hence  $\mu_*(E_i)$  is either  $\langle x, y \rangle$  or  $\langle x - z, y \rangle$ .

Suppose that  $\mu_*(E_i) = \langle x, y \rangle$ . Then  $P = \{x = ay\}$  for some  $a \in \mathbb{C}$  and  $U$  is the affine modification of  $\mathbb{P}^3 \setminus S_1 \cong \mathbb{A}_{(x,z,t)}^3$  with the locus

$$\left( \begin{array}{l} \{x = a, x^2 - x^2z - x + xz^2 + 1 - t + zt = 0\} \\ \subset \{x^2 - x^2z - x + xz^2 + 1 - t + zt = 0\} \end{array} \right).$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} U &\cong \{w((z-1)(t-x^2+x(z+1))+1)+x-a=0\} \subset \mathbb{A}_{(x,z,t,w)}^4 \\ &\cong \{w(zt+1)+x=0\} \cong \mathbb{A}^3. \end{aligned}$$

The same conclusion can be drawn for the case where  $\mu_*(E_i) = \langle x - z, y \rangle$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 9.4.** *Suppose that the case (e) of Theorem 1.2 holds with  $(S_1, S_2) = (\{y = 0\}, G_4)$  and  $\deg C \geq 3$ . Then  $U \cong \mathbb{A}^3$ .*

*Proof.* As in the proof of lemma 9.3, we have  $(C_{\tilde{S}_2} \cdot H - E_1) = 1$ . Lemma 4.5 now yields  $C_{\tilde{S}_2} \sim 2H - E_1 - E_2 - E_i$  for some  $i \in \{5, 6\}$ . In particular,  $\deg C = 3$ . Since  $(C_{\tilde{S}_2} \cdot E_2 - E_3) = (C_{\tilde{S}_2} \cdot E_i) = 1$ , we have  $\text{Sing } S_2 \in C$  and  $\sharp(C \cap \mu_*(E_i)) = 2$ .

Take a general point  $p \in \langle y, z \rangle$  and  $Q$  as the quadric surface containing  $C$ ,  $p$  and a general point of  $\mu_*(E_i)$ . Then  $Q$  contains  $\mu_*(E_i)$  since  $\sharp(Q \cap \mu_*(E_i)) \geq 3$ . Moreover,  $Q$  contains  $\langle y, z \rangle$  because Lemma 4.5 shows that  $\langle y, z \rangle$  is the unique curve of degree at most two containing  $p$ . Hence  $S_2|_Q = C + \mu(E_i) + \langle y, z \rangle + L$  for some line  $L \subset S_2$ . If  $L$  is the other line in  $S_2$ , then we have  $C \sim -K_{S_2}$ , a contradiction.

We have checked that  $\mu_*(E_i)$  is either  $\langle x, y \rangle$  or  $\langle x - z, y \rangle$  in the proof of Lemma 9.3. Now suppose that  $\mu_*(E_i) = \langle x, y \rangle$ . Assume that  $L = \langle x, y \rangle$  in addition. Then we can write  $Q = \{yl(x, y) + yt + zx = 0\}$  for some linear form  $l$ . Now take  $f$  as the automorphism of  $\mathbb{P}^3 \setminus S_1 \cong \mathbb{A}_{(x,z,t)}^3$  such that  $f^*(x) = x$ ,  $f^*(z) = z - 1$  and  $f^*(t) = t - x^2 + x(z + 1)$ . Then we have

$$f(S_2 \setminus F) = \{zt + 1 = 0\} \cong \mathbb{A}_{(x)}^1 \times \mathbb{C}^*,$$

$$f(C \setminus (C \cap S_1)) = \{zt + 1 = 0, l(x, 1) + t + x^2 - x = 0\}$$

in  $\mathbb{P}^3 \setminus S_1 \cong \mathbb{A}_{(x,z,t)}^3$ . The projection  $\text{pr}_t: f(S_2 \setminus F) \rightarrow \mathbb{A}_{(t)}^1 \setminus \{0\}$  is the same as the second projection of  $\mathbb{A}^1 \times \mathbb{C}^*$ . Since the morphism  $f(C \setminus (C \cap S_1)) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^*$  induced by  $\text{pr}_t$  is a dominant map of degree two, we have  $\Delta = 2 \times \text{id}_{\mathbb{Z}}$ , which contradicts the assumption that  $(C, S_1, S_2)$  belongs to the case (e).

Therefore  $S_2|_Q = C + \langle x, y \rangle + 2\langle y, z \rangle$ . We can write  $Q = \{yl(y, z) + x(z - y) = 0\}$  for some linear form  $l$ . Thus  $U$  is the affine modification of  $\mathbb{P}^3 \setminus S_1 \cong \mathbb{A}_{(x,z,t)}^3$  with the locus

$$\left( \left\{ \begin{array}{l} x^2 - x^2z - x + xz^2 + 1 - t + zt = 0, \\ l(1, z) + x(z - 1) = 0 \end{array} \right\} \subset \left\{ \begin{array}{l} x^2 - x^2z - x + xz^2 \\ + 1 - t + zt = 0 \end{array} \right\} \right).$$

Therefore  $U$  is isomorphic to

$$\begin{aligned} & \{w((z-1)(t-x^2+x(z+1))+1)+l(1,z)+x(z-1)=0\} \subset \mathbb{A}_{(x,z,t,w)}^4 \\ & \cong \{w(zt+1)+l(1,z+1)+xz=0\} \\ & \cong \{w+xz+l(1,z+1)=0\} \cong \mathbb{A}^3. \end{aligned}$$

The same conclusion can be drawn for the case where  $\mu_*(E_i) = \langle x-z, y \rangle$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 9.5.** *Suppose that the case (e) of Theorem 1.2 holds with  $(S_1, S_2) = (\{y = \gamma x\}, R_4)$  for some  $\gamma \in \mathbb{C}$ . Then  $U \cong \mathbb{A}^3$ .*

*Proof.* Take  $\psi: P \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^3$  as the blow-up along  $E$ . Then  $P$  has a  $\mathbb{P}^2$ -bundle structure  $p: P \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$  associated with  $|\psi^*\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(1) - E_\psi|$ . Write  $F_t$  as the  $p$ -fiber over  $t \in \mathbb{P}^1$  and take  $\infty \in \mathbb{P}^1$  as the point such that  $F_\infty = (S_1)_P$ . Since  $(S_2)_P$  is linearly equivalent to  $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(3) - 2E_\psi$ , it is a sub  $\mathbb{P}^1$ -bundle. Hence  $(S_2)_P = \tilde{S}_2$ . We have  $(S_2)_P \setminus ((S_2)_P \cap ((S_1)_P \cup E_\psi)) \cong \mathbb{A}^1 \times \mathbb{C}^*$  by assumption and  $p$  induces the second projection of  $\mathbb{A}^1 \times \mathbb{C}^*$ . Since  $\Delta$  is an isomorphism, we have  $(C_P \cdot \psi^*\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(1) - E_\psi) = 1$ . Hence  $C_P$  is a  $p$ -section.

On the other hand,  $E_\psi|_{(S_2)_P}$  is reducible by Lemma 3.6. Hence there is the unique point, say  $0 \in \mathbb{P}^1$ , such that  $E_\psi|_{(S_2)_P}$  is the sum of  $\Sigma_1$  and  $F_0|_{(S_2)_P}$ . Since  $\sharp(C_P \cap ((S_1)_P \cup E_\psi)) = \sharp(C \cap S_1) = 2$ , we obtain  $C_P \cap \Sigma_1 \subset (S_1)_P \cup F_0$ . Moreover,  $E_\psi$  contains  $C_P \cap F_a$  if  $a = 0$ , and only if  $a = 0$  or  $\infty$ .

Now take  $\chi: W \rightarrow P$  as the blow-up along  $C_P$ . By construction,  $U$  is the same as the affine modification of  $P \setminus ((S_1)_P \cup E_\psi)$  with the locus  $(C_P \setminus (C_P \cap ((S_1)_P \cup E_\psi))) \subset (S_2)_P \setminus ((S_2)_P \cap ((S_1)_P \cup E_\psi))$ . Hence  $U \cong U' := W \setminus ((S_1 \cup S_2)_W \cup (E_\psi)_W)$ . On the other hand, we have a morphism  $f := (p \circ \chi)|_{U'}: U' \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1 \setminus \{\infty\} \cong \mathbb{A}^1$ . By virtue of [Kal02, Main Theorem], it suffices to show that each  $f$ -fiber is isomorphic to  $\mathbb{A}^2$  in order to prove  $U \cong \mathbb{A}^3$ .

Let  $a \in \mathbb{A}^1 \setminus \{0\}$  be a point. Then  $C_P \cap F_a \not\subset E_\psi$ . Hence  $f^{-1}(a)$  is the affine modification of  $F_a \setminus (F_a \cap E_\psi) \cong \mathbb{A}^2$  with the locus  $(C_P \cap F_a \subset (S_2)_P \cap F_a \setminus ((S_2)_P \cap E_\psi \cap F_a) \cong \mathbb{A}^1)$ , which is isomorphic to  $\mathbb{A}^2$ .

On the other hand, we have  $C_P \cap F_0 \subset E_\psi$ . Hence  $f^{-1}(0) \cong F_0 \setminus (F_0 \cap ((S_2)_P \cup E_\psi))$ . Since  $(S_2)_P|_{F_0} = E_\psi|_{F_0}$ , we obtain  $f^{-1}(0) \cong \mathbb{A}^2$ . Hence we have the assertion.  $\square$

**Lemma 9.6.** *Suppose that the case (b) of Theorem 1.2 holds. Then  $U \cong \mathbb{A}^3$ .*

*Proof.* Take  $\psi: P \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^3$ ,  $p: P \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$ ,  $F_t$  and  $\infty \in \mathbb{P}^1$  as in Lemma 9.5. Then  $(S_2)_P$  is a sub  $\mathbb{P}^1$ -bundle and hence  $(S_2)_P = \tilde{S}_2$ . On the other hand,  $E_\psi|_{(S_2)_P}$  consists of  $\Sigma_3$  and a non-reduced member of  $|2f_3|$ . Hence there is the unique point, say  $0 \in \mathbb{P}^1$ , such that  $E_\psi|_{(S_2)_P} = \Sigma_1 + 2F_0|_{(S_2)_P}$ .

We note that  $C_P$  is a  $\psi$ -section. Since  $\sharp(C_P \cap ((S_1)_P \cup E_\psi)) = \sharp(C \cap S_1) = B_2(F) = 2$ , we obtain  $C_P \cap \Sigma_1 \subset (S_1)_P \cup F_0$ . Moreover,  $E_\psi$  contains  $C_P \cap F_a$  if  $a = 0$ , and only if  $a = 0$  or  $\infty$ . Therefore analysis similar to that in the proof of Lemma 9.5 shows that  $U \cong \mathbb{A}^3$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 9.7.** *Suppose that the case (c) of Theorem 1.2 holds. Then  $U \cong \mathbb{A}^3$ .*

*Proof.* Take  $\psi: P \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^3$ ,  $p: P \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$ ,  $F_t$  and  $\infty \in \mathbb{P}^1$  as in Lemma 9.5. Then  $(S_2)_P$  is a sub  $\mathbb{P}^1$ -bundle and hence  $(S_2)_P = \tilde{S}_2$ . On the other hand,

$E_\psi|_{(S_2)_P}$  consists of  $\Sigma_3$  and a reduced member of  $|2f_3|$ . Hence there are two point, say  $0, 1 \in \mathbb{P}^1$ , such that  $E_\psi|_{(S_2)_P} = \Sigma_1 + F_0|_{(S_2)_P} + F_1|_{(S_2)_P}$ . We note that  $\infty$  may coincide with 0 or 1.

By the choice of  $C$ ,  $C_P$  is a  $\psi$ -section. Since  $\sharp(C_P \cap ((S_1)_P \cup E_\psi)) = \sharp(C \cap S_1) = B_2(F) + 1$ , we obtain  $C_P \cap \Sigma_1 \subset (S_1)_P \cup F_0 \cup F_1$ . Moreover,  $E_\psi$  contains  $C_P \cap F_a$  if  $a = 0$  or  $1$ , and only if  $a = 0, 1$  or  $\infty$ . Therefore analysis similar to that in the proof of Lemma 9.5 shows that  $U \cong \mathbb{A}^3$ .  $\square$

Combining Propositions 5.4, 5.5, 8.1, and Lemmas 9.1–9.7, we complete the proof of Theorem 1.3.

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The author is greatly indebted to Professor Hiromichi Takagi, his supervisor, for his encouragement, comments, and suggestions. He wishes to express his gratitude to Professor Takashi Kishimoto for his helpful comments and suggestions. He also would like to express his gratitude to Doctor Akihiro Kanemitsu and Doctor Takeru Fukuoka for their helpful comments.

This work was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number JP19J14397 and the Program for Leading Graduate Schools, MEXT, Japan.

#### REFERENCES

- [AF03] Makoto Abe and Mikio Furushima. On non-normal del Pezzo surfaces. *Math. Nachr.*, 260:3–13, 2003.
- [AM75] Shreeram S. Abhyankar and Tzuong Tsieng Moh. Embeddings of the line in the plane. *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, 276:148–166, 1975.
- [BD89] Lawrence Brenton and Daniel Drucker. Perfect graphs and complex surface singularities with perfect local fundamental group. *Tohoku Math. J. (2)*, 41(4):507–525, 1989.
- [BD93] S. M. Bhatwadekar and Amartya K. Dutta. On residual variables and stably polynomial algebras. *Comm. Algebra*, 21(2):635–645, 1993.
- [BL98] M. Brundu and A. Logar. Parametrization of the orbits of cubic surfaces. *Transform. Groups*, 3(3):209–239, 1998.
- [Bri68] Egbert Brieskorn. Rationale Singularitäten komplexer Flächen. *Invent. Math.*, 4:336–358, 1967/68.
- [BW79] J. W. Bruce and C. T. C. Wall. On the classification of cubic surfaces. *J. London Math. Soc. (2)*, 19(2):245–256, 1979.
- [Fuj79] Takao Fujita. On Zariski problem. *Proc. Japan Acad. Ser. A Math. Sci.*, 55(3):106–110, 1979.
- [Fuj82] Takao Fujita. On the topology of noncomplete algebraic surfaces. *J. Fac. Sci. Univ. Tokyo Sect. IA Math.*, 29(3):503–566, 1982.
- [HW81] Fumio Hidaka and Keiichi Watanabe. Normal Gorenstein surfaces with ample anti-canonical divisor. *Tokyo J. Math.*, 4(2):319–330, 1981.
- [Kal02] Sh. Kaliman. Polynomials with general  $\mathbb{C}^2$ -fibers are variables. *Pacific J. Math.*, 203(1):161–190, 2002.
- [Kis05] Takashi Kishimoto. Compactifications of contractible affine 3-folds into smooth Fano 3-folds with  $B_2 = 2$ . *Math. Z.*, 251(4):783–820, 2005.
- [KPR89] Hanspeter Kraft, Ted Petrie, and John D. Randall. Quotient varieties. *Adv. Math.*, 74(2):145–162, 1989.
- [KZ99] Sh. Kaliman and M. Zaidenberg. Affine modifications and affine hypersurfaces with a very transitive automorphism group. *Transform. Groups*, 4(1):53–95, 1999.
- [LPS11] Wanseok Lee, Euisung Park, and Peter Schenzel. On the classification of non-normal cubic hypersurfaces. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, 215(8):2034–2042, 2011.

- [MM82] Shigefumi Mori and Shigeru Mukai. Classification of Fano 3-folds with  $B_2 \geq 2$ . *Manuscripta Math.*, 36(2):147–162, 1981/82.
- [MS80] Masayoshi Miyanishi and Tohru Sugie. Affine surfaces containing cylinderlike open sets. *J. Math. Kyoto Univ.*, 20(1):11–42, 1980.
- [Nag18] Masaru Nagaoka. Fano compactifications of contractible affine 3-folds with trivial log canonical divisors. *Internat. J. Math.*, 29(6):1850042, 33, 2018.
- [Nag19] Masaru Nagaoka. On compactifications of affine homology 3-cells into quadric fibrations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.10626*, 2019.
- [Rei94] Miles Reid. Nonnormal del Pezzo surfaces. *Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci.*, 30(5):695–727, 1994.
- [Spa66] Edwin H. Spanier. *Algebraic topology*. McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York-Toronto, Ont.-London, 1966.
- [Suz74] Masakazu Suzuki. Propriétés topologiques des polynômes de deux variables complexes, et automorphismes algébriques de l’espace  $\mathbf{C}^2$ . *J. Math. Soc. Japan*, 26:241–257, 1974.
- [tDP90] Tammo tom Dieck and Ted Petrie. Contractible affine surfaces of Kodaira dimension one. *Japan. J. Math. (N.S.)*, 16(1):147–169, 1990.
- [Ye02] Qiang Ye. On Gorenstein log del Pezzo surfaces. *Japan. J. Math. (N.S.)*, 28(1):87–136, 2002.

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, THE UNIVERSITY OF TOKYO, 3-8-1 KOMABA, MEGURO-KU, TOKYO 153-8914, JAPAN

*E-mail address:* nagaoka@ms.u-tokyo.ac.jp