

CHARACTERIZATION ON PROJECTIVE SUBMANIFOLDS OF CODIMENSIONS 2 AND 3

PING LI AND FANGYANG ZHENG

ABSTRACT. In this article we give a necessary and sufficient condition to characterize projective submanifolds in \mathbb{P}^N with codimensions 2 and 3. The conditions involve the Chern classes of the manifold and a very ample line bundle on the manifold. This generalizes our earlier characterization for hypersurfaces. The higher codimensional cases are proposed as a general question.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction and statements of results	2
Organization of this article	4
2. Algebraic reduction	4
2.1. The reduction of the condition $\sigma_k(X, L) = 0$	5
2.2. The second fundamental form of X	7
3. The algebraic question	9
4. Proof of Theorem 1.3	11
5. Proof of Theorem 1.4	13
5.1. Preliminaries	13
5.2. The completion of the proof	18
Appendix A. Proof of Lemma 3.5	18
Appendix B. Proof of Lemma 3.8	23
Appendix C. 5×5 system without rank 2 elements	30
References	33

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 57R20, 32Q55, 53C55, 57R22.

Key words and phrases. Chern class, Chern class inequality, very ample line bundle, codimension, second fundamental form, Gauss map, tangent variety, secant variety.

The first author was partially supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 11722109).

1. INTRODUCTION AND STATEMENTS OF RESULTS

In our recent article [LZ20], we obtained the following characterization for hypersurfaces in complex projective space ([LZ20, Thm 2.2]).

Theorem 1.1. *A complex projective manifold X^n with dimension $n \geq 2$ can be realized as a hypersurface in \mathbb{P}^{n+1} if and only if X admits a very ample line bundle L such that*

$$\sigma_2(X, L) := \frac{1}{2}(n+2)(n+1)L^2 - (n+2)Lc_1 + c_1^2 - c_2 = 0$$

as a cohomology class, where c_i is the i -th Chern class of X .

The purpose of this article is to generalize the above result and give characterization to projective submanifolds of codimensions two and three.

Before stating the results, let us fix some notations. Let X^n be a projective manifold of dimension n and L a very ample line bundle on X . Let $i : X \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}^N$ be a holomorphic embedding. We will always assume that it is *non-degenerate*, namely, $i(X)$ is not contained in any hyperplanes of \mathbb{P}^N . The embedding i is said to be *associated to L* , if $i^*(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^N}(1)) = L$.

If we take a basis $\{s_0, \dots, s_{N_0}\}$ of $H^0(X, L) \cong \mathbb{C}^{N_0+1}$, the space of all global holomorphic sections of L on X , then we get a non-degenerate holomorphic embedding $i_0 : X \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}^{N_0}$ via

$$\begin{aligned} X &\xrightarrow{i_0} \mathbb{P}(H^0(X, L)^*) \cong \mathbb{P}^{N_0}, \\ x &\longmapsto [s_0(x) : s_1(x) : \dots : s_{N_0}(x)]. \end{aligned}$$

This i_0 will be called the *Kodaira map* of L .

Clearly $N_0 \geq N$, and any non-degenerate embedding i associated to L is given by $i = \pi \circ i_0$ where $\pi : \mathbb{P}^{N_0} \setminus P_1 \rightarrow P_2 \cong \mathbb{P}^N$ is the projection determined by a linear subspace $P_1 \cong \mathbb{P}^{N_0-N-1}$ ($\mathbb{P}^{-1} := \{pt\}$) in \mathbb{P}^{N_0} which does not intersect $i_0(X)$. More precisely, P_1 does not intersect $\text{Sec}(i_0(X))$, the secant variety of $i_0(X)$, and more details can be found in the proof of Lemma 4.2.

Denote by

$$r_L := \min \{N - n \mid X \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}^N \text{ associated to } L\}, \quad r_X := \min \{r_L \mid \text{very ample } L\},$$

and call them the *codimensions* of (X, L) and X , respectively.

Once we have an embedding i associated to L , it will induce a *Gauss map* γ sending $x \in X$ to the n -dimensional *projective tangent space* $\tilde{T}_x X$ in \mathbb{P}^N , which is defined as the limiting position of all chords \overline{xy} as $y \rightarrow x$, and can be uniquely identified with an $(n+1)$ -dimensional linear subspace in \mathbb{C}^{N+1} :

$$(1.1) \quad \begin{aligned} X &\xrightarrow{\gamma} \mathbb{G}_n(\mathbb{P}^N) \cong G_{n+1}(\mathbb{C}^{N+1}) \\ x &\longmapsto \tilde{T}_x M, \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbb{G}_n(\mathbb{P}^N)$ is the Grassmannian variety of n -dimensional projective subspaces in \mathbb{P}^N , which is isomorphic to $G_{n+1}(\mathbb{C}^{N+1})$, the usual complex Grassmannian of $(n+1)$ -dimensional linear spaces in \mathbb{C}^{N+1} . Denote by Q the universal quotient bundle of $G_{n+1}(\mathbb{C}^{N+1})$. It turns out that the Chern class of γ^*Q , the pull back of Q by γ , depends only on the pair (X, L) and is independent on the choice of the embedding i associated to L . Indeed, as a straightforward

computation, we get in [LZ20, §5] that the k -th Chern class of γ^*Q is given by

$$\sigma_k(X, L) := c_k(\gamma^*Q) = \sum_{i=0}^k \binom{n+k}{k-i} \cdot L^{k-i} \cdot s_i(X),$$

where $s_i(X)$ is the i -th Segre class of the holomorphic tangent bundle TX , defined as the i -th component of the formal inverse $s(X)$ of the total Chern class $c(X)$. Namely, $s(E)c(E) = 1$ for any vector bundle E . In particular,

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_1(X, L) &= (n+1)L - c_1; \\ \sigma_2(X, L) &= \frac{1}{2}(n+2)(n+1)L^2 - (n+2)Lc_1 + c_1^2 - c_2; \\ \sigma_3(X, L) &= \binom{n+3}{3}L^3 - \binom{n+3}{2}L^2c_1 + (n+3)L(c_1^2 - c_2) - (c_1^3 - 2c_1c_2 + c_3); \\ \sigma_4(X, L) &= \binom{n+4}{4}L^4 - \binom{n+4}{3}L^3c_1 + \binom{n+4}{2}L^2(c_1^2 - c_2) + \\ &\quad - (n+4)L(c_1^3 - 2c_1c_2 + c_3) + (c_1^4 - 2c_1^2c_2 + c_1c_3 - c_2^2 + c_4). \end{aligned}$$

Since Q is globally generated and so is γ^*Q , it is well-known that $\sigma_k(X, L) \geq 0$ as a cohomology class. Namely, $\int_Y \sigma_k(X, L) \geq 0$ for any k -dimensional irreducible subvariety $Y \subset X$. Moreover, it turns out that the k -th Chern form of $\gamma^*(Q)$ with respect to the canonical connection is a nonnegative (k, k) -form in the strong sense ([Li20, Prop. 3.1]).

In the mean time, the rank of $\gamma^*(Q)$ is $N - n$, the codimension of X^n in \mathbb{P}^N . So we know that $\sigma_k(X, L) = 0$ whenever $k > \min\{n, N - n\}$. In particular, for any integer $n \geq k \geq 2$, if $r_L < k$, then $\sigma_k(X, L) = 0$. It is natural to ask if the converse is true:

Question 1.2. Let $k \geq 2$ be an integer, and L a very ample line bundle over a projective manifold X^n with $n \geq k$ such that $\sigma_k(X, L) = 0$. Is it true that $r_L < k$?

A possibly weaker question would be, under the same assumption, is it true that $r_X < k$? In [LZ20, Thm 2.2] (= Theorem 1.1), we have already seen the affirmative answer to Question 1.2 for $k = 2$. Namely, the equality $\sigma_2(X, L) = 0$ implies that $r_L < 2$ so X can be embedded in \mathbb{P}^{n+1} .

The first main result in this article is that the same is true for $k = 3$, namely we have

Theorem 1.3. *If X^n is a projective manifold with $n \geq 3$ and L a very ample line bundle on it with $\sigma_3(X, L) = 0$, then $r_L < 3$. Consequently, a projective manifold X^n with $n \geq 3$ can be embedded in \mathbb{P}^{n+2} if and only if it admits a very ample line bundle L such that $\sigma_3(X, L) = 0$.*

This gives a necessary and sufficient condition characterizing submanifolds in projective space of codimension less than or equal to two.

As we shall see in the proofs (see Corollary 4.3), r_L is always no larger than the rank of the second fundamental form of $X \subset \mathbb{P}^N$, which we denote by l , when l is less than the dimension of X . The reason that we have the above result for $k = 2$ and $k = 3$ cases is simply because $l < k$ under the assumption $\sigma_k(X, L) = 0$. When $k \geq 4$, l is no longer always less than k . For instance, the Segre fourfold $X = \mathbb{P}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^2 \subset \mathbb{P}^8$ satisfies $\sigma_4(X, L) = 0$ but $l = 4$. In this case, we still have $r_L = 3 < 4$, since the secant variety of X is 7-dimensional. So when $k \geq 4$ one needs to dig deeper into the structure of the manifolds. As a trial case analysis, we obtain the following affirmative answer to the $k = 4$ case of Question 1.2 when $n \geq 5$:

Theorem 1.4. *If X^n is a projective manifold of dimension $n \geq 5$ and L a very ample line bundle on X with $\sigma_4(X, L) = 0$, then $r_L < 4$. Consequently, a projective manifold X^n with $n \geq 5$ can be embedded in \mathbb{P}^{n+3} if and only if it admits a very ample line bundle L with $\sigma_4(X, L) = 0$.*

We believe that Theorem 1.4 should still hold when $n = 4$, but our proof only covers the $n \geq 5$ case.

Organization of this article. The rest of this article is organized as follows. In Section 2 we reduce the restriction $\sigma_k(X, L) = 0$ to an algebraic condition (Lemma 2.3) as well as relate it to the second fundamental form of X in \mathbb{P}^N (Lemma 2.5). Then in Section 3 a related algebraic question is proposed, and the solutions in the cases of $k = 3$ and $k = 4$, Lemmas 3.5 and 3.8, are the main technical results in this article. By applying them the proofs of Theorems 1.3 and 1.4 are presented respectively in Sections 4 and 5. The reasoning process of Lemmas 3.5 and 3.8 is routine but quite tedious, so for the conciseness of this article we put them to the last three appendices.

2. ALGEBRAIC REDUCTION

The main purpose of this section is to reduce the condition $\sigma_k(X, L) = 0$ to an algebraic result, and relate this algebraic result to the second fundamental form of X in \mathbb{P}^N .

First note that $\gamma^*(Q)$ is a quotient of the trivial bundle $\underline{\mathbb{C}}^{N+1}$, and we endow it with the induced metric from the trivial one on $\underline{\mathbb{C}}^{N+1}$. Then the k -th canonical Chern form of this Hermitian vector bundle $\gamma^*(Q)$, denoted by $C_k(\gamma^*(Q))$, is a nonnegative (k, k) -form in the strong sense (cf. [Li20, Prop. 3.1]). So the condition $\sigma_k(X, L) = 0$ is equivalent to $C_k(\gamma^*(Q)) = 0$ *pointwisely* as a form, from which we shall derive the restrictions. To this end, we shall calculate the curvature matrix of $\gamma^*(Q)$ under some local frame and *explicitly* write down $C_k(\gamma^*(Q))$.

As before, let L be a very ample line bundle over X^n and $X \subset \mathbb{P}^N$ be a non-degenerate embedding associated to L . Let $[Z_0 : \cdots : Z_N]$ be a homogeneous coordinate on \mathbb{P}^N . Denote by $\gamma : X \rightarrow G_{n+1}(\mathbb{C}^{N+1})$ the Gauss map, and by S and Q the universal subbundle and quotient bundle of $G_{n+1}(\mathbb{C}^{N+1})$, and we have the bundle exact sequence on X :

$$(2.1) \quad 0 \rightarrow \gamma^*S \rightarrow \underline{\mathbb{C}}^{N+1} \rightarrow \gamma^*Q \rightarrow 0.$$

Let us for later convenience fix the index range throughout the article:

$$(2.2) \quad 1 \leq i, j, k \leq n, \quad n+1 \leq \alpha, \beta \leq N, \quad 1 \leq a, b \leq N,$$

and sometimes make the Einstein summation convenience if no confusions arise.

For a fixed point $x \in X$, we can take a unitary change of Z , which for the sake of simplicity we will still denote by Z , so that $x = [1 : 0 : \cdots : 0]$ and near x the manifold X is defined by $z^\alpha = f^\alpha(z^1, \dots, z^n)$ for each $n+1 \leq \alpha \leq N$, where $z^a := \frac{Z_a}{Z_0}$ for $1 \leq a \leq N$, (z^1, \dots, z^n) gives a local holomorphic coordinate in X centered at x , and the holomorphic functions f^α satisfy

$$(2.3) \quad f^\alpha(0) = 0, \quad f_i^\alpha(0) := \frac{\partial f^\alpha}{\partial z^i}(0) = 0, \quad \forall n+1 \leq \alpha \leq N, \quad \forall 1 \leq i \leq n.$$

2.1. The reduction of the condition $\sigma_k(X, L) = 0$. For technical reasons we treat the dual bundle γ^*Q^* instead of $\gamma^*(Q)$. Our first lemma is the following

Lemma 2.1. *There exists a local holomorphic frame of γ^*Q^* around x such that the curvature matrix $\Theta = (\Theta_{\alpha\beta})$ ($n+1 \leq \alpha, \beta \leq N$) at x is given by*

$$(2.4) \quad \Theta_{\alpha\beta}(x) = - \sum_{j=1}^n \xi_j^\alpha \wedge \overline{\xi_j^\beta}, \quad \xi_j^\alpha := \partial f_j^\alpha(0) = \sum_{i=1}^n f_{ij}^\alpha(0) dz^i, \quad f_{ij}^\alpha := \frac{\partial^2 f^\alpha}{\partial z^i \partial z^j}.$$

Proof. The proof is similar to the arguments in [LZ20, §7.2], where a curvature matrix for $\gamma^*(S)$ is presented. For the reader's convenience, we still include a proof here.

Let $\{e_0, e_1, \dots, e_N\}$ be the standard frame of the trivial bundle $\underline{\mathbb{C}}^{N+1}$ on X in (2.1), and $\{e_0^*, e_1^*, \dots, e_N^*\}$ the frame in the trivial bundle $(\underline{\mathbb{C}}^{N+1})^*$ dual to $\{e_0, \dots, e_N\}$. In a neighborhood $x \in U \subset X$, a local holomorphic frame of γ^*S is given by $\{V_0, V_1, \dots, V_n\}$ where

$$V_0 = e_0 + z^i e_i + f^\alpha e_\alpha; \quad V_j = e_0 + e_j + f_j^\alpha e_\alpha, \quad 1 \leq j \leq n.$$

Write

$$w = 1 - \sum_{i=1}^n z^i, \quad U_0 = \frac{1}{w}(V_0 - \sum_{i=1}^n z^i V_i), \quad U_j = V_j - U_0 \quad (1 \leq j \leq n),$$

we get a new local holomorphic frame $\{U_0, U_1, \dots, U_n\}$ of γ^*S such that

$$U_j = e_j + h_j^\alpha e_\alpha, \quad 0 \leq j \leq n,$$

where

$$h_0^\alpha = \frac{1}{w}(f^\alpha - z^i f_i^\alpha); \quad h_j^\alpha = f_j^\alpha - h_0^\alpha, \quad 1 \leq j \leq n.$$

Let

$$Y_\alpha = e_\alpha^* - \sum_{j=0}^n h_j^\alpha e_j^*, \quad n+1 \leq \alpha \leq N.$$

Then $\{Y_{n+1}, \dots, Y_N\}$ forms a local holomorphic frame of γ^*Q^* . Let $g = \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ be the restriction on γ^*Q^* of the flat metric of the trivial bundle $(\underline{\mathbb{C}}^{N+1})^*$ so that $\{e_0^*, e_1^*, \dots, e_N^*\}$ is unitary, then

$$(2.5) \quad g = (\langle Y_\alpha, \overline{Y_\beta} \rangle) = (\delta_{\alpha\beta} + \sum_{j=0}^n h_j^\alpha \overline{h_j^\beta}) = I_{N-n} + F \overline{F}^t, \quad F = (h_j^\alpha).$$

Here and in what follows $\delta_{\alpha\beta}$ always denotes the Kronecker delta, I_r the identity matrix of rank r , and “ t ” the transpose of a matrix.

At the origin x , we have

$$(2.6) \quad \begin{cases} h_0^\alpha(0) = 0, & dh_0^\alpha(0) = 0, & (n+1 \leq \alpha \leq N) \\ h_j^\alpha(0) = 0, & dh_j^\alpha(0) = df_j^\alpha(0), & (n+1 \leq \alpha \leq N, 1 \leq j \leq n) \end{cases}$$

and so

$$(2.7) \quad g(0) = 0, \quad dg(0) = (0).$$

Thus at the origin x the curvature matrix of γ^*Q^* under the frame $\{Y_{n+1}, \dots, Y_N\}$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
(\Theta_{\alpha\beta})(0) &= \bar{\partial}[(\partial g) \cdot g^{-1}](0) \\
&= -\partial F \wedge (\overline{\partial F})^t(0) \quad (\text{by (2.5) and (2.7)}) \\
&= -(\partial h_i^\alpha) \wedge (\overline{\partial h_j^\beta})^t(0) \\
&= \left(-\sum_{j=0}^n \partial h_j^\alpha \wedge \overline{\partial h_j^\beta} \right)(0) \\
&= \left(-\sum_{j=1}^n \partial f_j^\alpha \wedge \overline{\partial f_j^\beta} \right)(0), \quad (\text{by (2.6)})
\end{aligned}$$

which gives the desired (2.4) and thus completes the proof. \square

Definition 2.2. Denote the symmetric $n \times n$ matrix $H^\alpha := (f_{ij}^\alpha(0))$ ($n+1 \leq \alpha \leq N$). For any column vector u , let us write $H_u^\alpha := H^\alpha \cdot u \in \mathbb{C}^n$. For k column vectors $u^{(1)}, \dots, u^{(k)}$, we simply denote the linear dependence of them by $u^{(1)} \wedge \dots \wedge u^{(k)} = 0$. As usual we denote by $\ker(H^\alpha) := \{u \in \mathbb{C}^n \mid H_u^\alpha = 0\}$.

Since the condition $\sigma_k(X, L) = 0$ is trivial when $k > N - n$. So we focus on the cases $k \leq N - n$. With Lemma 2.1 in hand, we are now ready to show the following

Lemma 2.3. *With the above notation and symbols understood and assume that $2 \leq k \leq N - n$. Then $\sigma_k(X, L) = 0$ is equivalent to*

$$(2.8) \quad H_u^{\alpha_1} \wedge \dots \wedge H_u^{\alpha_k} = 0, \quad \forall n+1 \leq \alpha_1 < \dots < \alpha_k \leq N, \quad \forall u \in \mathbb{C}^n.$$

Proof. Denote by S_k the group of symmetry for k elements, and write $\alpha_I = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k)$ where $n+1 \leq \alpha_1 < \dots < \alpha_k \leq N$ for any multi-index of length k . Then at the origin x , The Chern-Weil theory via Lemma 2.1 tells us that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left(\frac{2\pi}{\sqrt{-1}} \right)^k C_k(\gamma^*Q^*) \\
&= \sum_{\alpha_I} \sum_{\tau \in S_k} \text{sgn}(\tau) \Theta_{\alpha_1 \alpha_{\tau(1)}} \wedge \dots \wedge \Theta_{\alpha_k \alpha_{\tau(k)}} \\
&= \sum_{\alpha_I} \sum_{\tau, \sigma \in S_k} \frac{1}{k!} \text{sgn}(\tau) \text{sgn}(\sigma) \Theta_{\alpha_{\sigma(1)} \alpha_{\tau(1)}} \wedge \dots \wedge \Theta_{\alpha_{\sigma(k)} \alpha_{\tau(k)}} \\
&= \sum_{\alpha_I} \sum_{\tau, \sigma \in S_k} \sum_{j_1, \dots, j_k=1}^n \frac{(-1)^k}{k!} \text{sgn}(\tau) \text{sgn}(\sigma) \xi_{j_1}^{\alpha_{\sigma(1)}} \wedge \overline{\xi_{j_1}^{\alpha_{\tau(1)}}} \wedge \dots \wedge \xi_{j_k}^{\alpha_{\sigma(k)}} \wedge \overline{\xi_{j_k}^{\alpha_{\tau(k)}}} \\
&= \sum_{\alpha_I, \tau, \sigma, j_i} \frac{(-1)^k}{k!} \text{sgn}(\tau) \text{sgn}(\sigma) (-1)^{\frac{1}{2}k(k-1)} \xi_{j_1}^{\alpha_{\sigma(1)}} \wedge \dots \wedge \xi_{j_k}^{\alpha_{\sigma(k)}} \wedge \overline{\xi_{j_1}^{\alpha_{\tau(1)}}} \wedge \dots \wedge \overline{\xi_{j_k}^{\alpha_{\tau(k)}}} \\
&= (-1)^k k! \sum_{\alpha_I, J} (-1)^{\frac{1}{2}k(k-1)} \Psi_J^{\alpha_I} \wedge \overline{\Psi_J^{\alpha_I}},
\end{aligned}$$

where $J = (j_1, \dots, j_k)$ with each j_i running from 1 to n , and for fixed α_I and J ,

$$\Psi_J^{\alpha_I} = \frac{1}{k!} \sum_{\pi \in S_k} \xi_{j_{\pi(1)}}^{\alpha_1} \wedge \dots \wedge \xi_{j_{\pi(k)}}^{\alpha_k}.$$

Since as a form

$$(\sqrt{-1})^k (-1)^{\frac{1}{2}k(k-1)} \Psi_J^{\alpha_I} \wedge \overline{\Psi_J^{\alpha_I}} \geq 0$$

for each α_I and J , we know that the (k, k) -form $(-1)^k C_k(\gamma^* Q^*) \geq 0$ everywhere on X , and when $\sigma_k(X, L) = c_k(\gamma^* Q) = 0$, this form is identically zero as $c_k(\gamma^* Q) = 0$ is represented by it, so each $\Psi_J^{\alpha_I} = 0$. This means that for any given $n+1 \leq \alpha_1 < \dots < \alpha_k \leq N$ and any $1 \leq j_i \leq n$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, k$, we have

$$(2.9) \quad \sum_{\pi \in S_k} \xi_{j_{\pi(1)}}^{\alpha_1} \wedge \dots \wedge \xi_{j_{\pi(k)}}^{\alpha_k} = 0.$$

At the origin x , we have $\xi_j^\alpha = \sum_{i=1}^n f_{ij}^\alpha(0) dz_i$ and $f_{ij}^\alpha(0)$ are the components of the matrices H^α . Now it is not hard to see that the condition (2.9) is equivalent to (2.8). \square

The condition (2.8) does not mean much if the matrices H^α are highly degenerate. But in our case they are not as we have the following fact, which gives another restriction on the matrices H^α for *generic* x .

Lemma 2.4. *For generic $x \in X$, we have*

$$(2.10) \quad \bigcap_{\alpha=n+1}^N \ker(H^\alpha) = 0.$$

Proof. First note that $(X, L) \neq (\mathbb{P}^n, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n}(1))$, otherwise $N = n$, a contradiction. Recall a classical fact that ([BS95, p. 159]), for an ample line bundle L , the line bundle $(n+1)L + K_X$ is always ample, provided that $(X, L) \neq (\mathbb{P}^n, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n}(1))$. Here K_X is the canonical line bundle of X . This implies that

$$\sigma_1(X, L) = c_1(\gamma^* Q) = (n+1)L - c_1$$

is ample.

By Lemma 2.1 we know that $c_1(\gamma^* Q)$ is represented by the following nonnegative $(1, 1)$ -form:

$$-C_1(\gamma^* Q^*) = -\frac{\sqrt{-1}}{2\pi} \sum_{\alpha=n+1}^N \Theta_{\alpha\alpha} = \frac{\sqrt{-1}}{2\pi} \sum_{\alpha=n+1}^N \sum_{j=1}^n \xi_j^\alpha \wedge \overline{\xi_j^\alpha}.$$

So at any generic point x in X , this $(1, 1)$ -form must be positive-definite. That is, for any $(1, 0)$ -type tangent vector $0 \neq \sum_{i=1}^n u_i \frac{\partial}{\partial z^i}$ at x , there exists some α and some j such that

$$0 \neq \xi_j^\alpha \left(\sum_{i=1}^n u_i \frac{\partial}{\partial z^i} \right) = \sum_{i=1}^n f_{ij}^\alpha(0) u_i,$$

which, in the notation of Definition 2.2, is equivalent to the fact that for any column vector $0 \neq u \in \mathbb{C}^n$ we have $H_u^\alpha \neq 0$ for some α . This is exactly (2.10). \square

2.2. The second fundamental form of X . In this subsection we relate the matrices $H^\alpha = (f_{ij}^\alpha(0))$ to the second fundamental form of X in \mathbb{P}^N . More precisely, we show in Lemma 2.5 that they can be realized as the coefficients of this second fundamental form under some local frame field, which shall be used in the proof of the Theorems stated in Section 1.

Now let \mathbb{P}^N be endowed with the Fubini-Study metric and $X^n \subset \mathbb{P}^N$ be endowed with the induced metric. We take $x \in X$ and still follow the notation and symbols introduced at the beginning of Section 2. Denote by $N_x X \cong \mathbb{C}^{N-n}$ the orthogonal complement of $T_x X$ in $T_x \mathbb{P}^N$, and by V^\perp the $N_x X$ -component of any $V \in T_x \mathbb{P}^N$. The complex vector bundle NX

can be *smoothly* identified with the normal bundle of X which is the holomorphic quotient $T\mathbb{P}^N/TX$. The second fundamental form II of $X \subset \mathbb{P}^N$ is the symmetric bilinear map

$$\begin{aligned} II : TX \times TX &\longrightarrow NX \\ (V, V') &\longmapsto II(V, V') := (\nabla_V V')^\perp \end{aligned}$$

for any type $(1,0)$ tangent vector fields V, V' in X , and ∇ is the Levi-Civita connection of \mathbb{P}^N .

Lemma 2.5. *Around x there exists a local tangent frame $\{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$, and a local normal frame $\{e_{n+1}, \dots, e_N\}$ such that*

$$(2.11) \quad II(e_i, e_j) = \sum_{\alpha=n+1}^N f_{ij}^\alpha e_\alpha, \quad 1 \leq i, j \leq n.$$

Moreover $\{e_1, \dots, e_N\}$ is orthonormal at x .

Proof. We still adopt the notation and symbols before. Write $\varepsilon_i := \frac{\partial}{\partial z^i}$ ($1 \leq i \leq N$). Then under the natural tangent frame $\{\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_N\}$, the Fubini-Study metric around the origin x is represented by the matrix ([Zhe00, p. 174])

$$(2.12) \quad g = (g_{i\bar{j}}) = \frac{1}{\eta} I_N - \frac{1}{\eta^2} \bar{z}^t z; \quad \eta := 1 + \sum_{i=1}^N |z^i|^2, \quad z = (z^1, \dots, z^N).$$

Its inverse matrix is given by

$$g^{-1} = \eta(I_N + \bar{z}^t z).$$

Thus the matrix of the Levi-Civita connection under the frame $\{\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_N\}$ is

$$\theta = (\partial g)g^{-1} = -\frac{1}{\eta} [(\partial\eta)I_N + \bar{z}^t dz],$$

or equivalently

$$(2.13) \quad \theta_{ab} = -\frac{1}{\eta} \left(\delta_{ab} \sum_{c=1}^N \bar{z}^c dz^c + \bar{z}^a dz^b \right), \quad \forall 1 \leq a, b \leq N,$$

and so

$$(2.14) \quad \nabla \varepsilon_a = \sum_{b=1}^N \theta_{ab} \varepsilon_b, \quad \forall 1 \leq a \leq N.$$

Let

$$(2.15) \quad e_i := \varepsilon_i + \sum_{\beta=n+1}^N f_i^\beta \varepsilon_\beta, \quad e_\alpha := \varepsilon_\alpha^\perp. \quad (1 \leq i \leq N, \quad n+1 \leq \alpha \leq N)$$

Then $\{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$ form a local homomorphic tangent frame of X and $\{e_{n+1}, \dots, e_N\}$ become a local frame in the normal bundle NX . It is easy to see that $\{e_1, \dots, e_N\}$ is orthonormal at x . It suffices to verify (2.11), which is a routine calculation. Indeed, by adopting the index

range (2.2) we have for any fixed $1 \leq i, j \leq n$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\nabla_{e_i} e_j &= \sum_{\alpha, \beta} \nabla_{(\varepsilon_i + f_i^\alpha \varepsilon_\alpha)} (\varepsilon_j + f_j^\beta \varepsilon_\beta) \\
&= \sum_{\alpha, \beta} [\nabla_{\varepsilon_i} \varepsilon_j + f_i^\alpha \nabla_{\varepsilon_\alpha} \varepsilon_j + \varepsilon_i (f_j^\beta) \varepsilon_\beta + f_j^\beta \nabla_{\varepsilon_i} \varepsilon_\beta + f_i^\alpha \varepsilon_\alpha (f_j^\beta) \varepsilon_\beta + f_i^\alpha f_j^\beta \nabla_{\varepsilon_\alpha} \varepsilon_\beta] \\
&= \sum_{\alpha, \beta} [\theta_{j\alpha}(e_i) \varepsilon_\alpha + f_{ij}^\beta \varepsilon_\beta + f_j^\beta \theta_{\beta\alpha}(e_i) \varepsilon_\alpha] \quad (\text{by (2.14)}) \\
&= \sum_{\beta} f_{ij}^\beta \varepsilon_\beta + \sum_{\alpha, \beta} [\theta_{j\alpha}(e_i) + f_j^\beta \theta_{\beta\alpha}(e_i)] \varepsilon_\alpha \\
&= \sum_{\beta} f_{ij}^\beta \varepsilon_\beta + \sum_{k, \beta} [\theta_{jk}(e_i) + f_j^\beta \theta_{\beta k}(e_i)] \varepsilon_k + \sum_{\alpha, \beta} [\theta_{j\alpha}(e_i) + f_j^\beta \theta_{\beta\alpha}(e_i)] \varepsilon_\alpha \\
&= \sum_{\beta} f_{ij}^\beta \varepsilon_\beta - \frac{1}{\eta} (\eta_i \varepsilon_j + \eta_j \varepsilon_i) - \sum_{\alpha} \frac{1}{\eta} [f_i^\alpha \eta_j + f_j^\alpha \eta_i] \varepsilon_\alpha \quad (\text{by (2.13), } \eta_i := \overline{z^i} + \sum_{\alpha} f_i^\alpha \overline{z^\alpha}) \\
&= \sum_{\beta} f_{ij}^\beta \varepsilon_\beta - \frac{1}{\eta} (\eta_i e_j + \eta_j e_i).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$II(e_i, e_j) = (\nabla_{e_i} e_j)^\perp = \sum_{\alpha=n+1}^N f_{ij}^\alpha \varepsilon_\alpha^\perp = \sum_{\alpha=n+1}^N f_{ij}^\alpha e_\alpha.$$

□

3. THE ALGEBRAIC QUESTION

It turns out that a key factor in analyzing the codimension $N - n$ of the projective submanifold $X \subset \mathbb{P}^N$ is the dimension of the linear space spanned by $\{H^{n+1}, \dots, H^N\}$, under the restrictions (2.8) and (2.10). So we give the following

Definition 3.1. (1) Fix positive integers $n \geq k \geq 2$. A set of symmetric $n \times n$ matrices $\mathcal{H} = \{H^1, \dots, H^r\}$ (r can vary and $r \geq k$) is called an (n, k) -system if it satisfies the *width- k condition*:

$$(3.1) \quad H_u^{i_1} \wedge \dots \wedge H_u^{i_k} = 0, \quad \forall 1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_k \leq r, \quad \forall u \in \mathbb{C}^n,$$

and the *non-degeneracy condition*:

$$(3.2) \quad \bigcap_{i=1}^r \ker(H^i) = 0.$$

(2) We define $l(n, k)$ to be

$$l(n, k) := \max \{ \text{rank}(\mathcal{H}) \mid \mathcal{H} \text{ are } (n, k)\text{-systems} \}.$$

With this definition in hand, the algebraic situation we are concerned with becomes the following

Question 3.2. What is the value of $l(n, k)$? When $l(n, k) \geq k$, for those (n, k) -systems \mathcal{H} with $\text{rank}(\mathcal{H}) \geq k$, what kind of special structure must they possess?

Clearly $l(n, k) \leq \frac{1}{2}n(n+1)$, which is the dimension of the space of all $n \times n$ symmetric matrices. On the other hand we have the following lower bound.

Example 3.3. We have

$$l(n, k) \geq \frac{1}{2}(k-1)(k-2) + 1, \quad \text{when } k \geq 4.$$

Indeed we can take a basis all symmetric $(k-2) \times (k-2)$ matrices by adding zero blocks at right and bottom to be our $\{H^1, \dots, H^m\}$, where $m = \frac{1}{2}(k-1)(k-2)$, and add on one more non-degenerate $n \times n$ matrix H^{m+1} . Note that $m \geq k-1$ when $k \geq 4$, and the first m matrices satisfy the width- $(k-1)$ condition. So the whole $\{H^1, \dots, H^m, H^{m+1}\}$ satisfy the width- k condition and it also satisfies the non-degeneracy condition as $\ker(H^{m+1}) = \{0\}$, thus it is an (n, k) -system.

This example shows that, $l(n, k) \geq k$ when $k \geq 4$. So the real question is what can we say about an (n, k) -system \mathcal{H} when $\text{rank}(\mathcal{H}) \geq k$?

For $k = 2$, the answer is rather special: l must be 1 regardless of the value of n , namely, $l(n, 2) = 1$.

Lemma 3.4. *If two symmetric $n \times n$ matrices H^1 and H^2 satisfy the condition $H_u^1 \wedge H_u^2 = 0$ for any $u \in \mathbb{C}^n$. Then they must be proportional. Namely, one is a constant multiple of the other.*

This was proved at the end of [LZ20] as the algebraic component of the proof of Theorem 2.2 there, which characterizes hypersurfaces by the condition $\sigma_2(X, L) = 0$.

For $k = 3$, we have the following slightly more informative statement.

Lemma 3.5. *Let $\{H^1, H^2, H^3\}$ be three symmetric $n \times n$ matrices that are linearly independent and $H_u^1 \wedge H_u^2 \wedge H_u^3 = 0$ for any $u \in \mathbb{C}^n$. Then the common kernel $\bigcap_{i=1}^3 \ker(H^i)$ is $(n-2)$ -dimensional.*

We will postpone the proof of this lemma to Appendix A. Write $H^w = \sum_{i=1}^3 a_i H^i$ for $w = (a_1, a_2, a_3)$. It is clear that

$$\bigcap_{i=1}^3 \ker(H^i) = \bigcap_{w \in \mathbb{C}^3} \ker(H^w).$$

So each H^w has rank at most 2. It is also easy to see that:

Remark 3.6. Let $\{H^1, H^2, H^3\}$ be as in Lemma 3.5. For any two linearly independent $\{w, w'\}$, the intersection of their kernels is already equal to $\bigcap_{i=1}^3 \ker(H^i)$.

As an immediate corollary, Lemma 3.5 implies that in Question 3.2, we have $l(n, 3) \leq 2$.

Corollary 3.7. Let $\mathcal{H} = \{H^1, H^2, \dots, H^r\}$ ($r \geq 3$) be any $(n, 3)$ -system ($n \geq 3$). Then $\text{rank}(\mathcal{H}) \leq 2$.

Proof. Suppose on the contrary $\text{rank}(\mathcal{H}) \geq 3$. Without loss of generality, let us assume that $\{H^1, \dots, H^l\}$ forms a basis of $\{H^1, \dots, H^r\}$ so $l \geq 3$. By applying Lemma 3.5 to $\{H^1, H^2, H^3\}$, we know that the space $K := \bigcap_{i=1}^3 \ker(H^i)$ is $(n-2)$ -dimensional. Also, by Remark 3.6, we know that $\ker(H^1) \cap \ker(H^2) = K$.

For any $3 \leq j \leq l$, by applying Lemma 3.5 to $\{H^1, H^2, H^j\}$, we get $\ker(H^j) \supset K$ thus $\bigcap_{i=1}^l \ker(H^i) = K$.

For any $j > l$, H^j is a linear combination of $\{H^1, \dots, H^l\}$, hence $K = \bigcap_{i=1}^l \ker(H^i) \subset \ker(H^j)$. In summary, we have $\bigcap_{i=1}^r \ker(H^i) = K$ is $(n-2)$ -dimensional and is nonzero since $n \geq 3$. This contradicts to the non-degeneracy condition of \mathcal{H} . \square

For $k = 4$, we no longer have the luck of $l(n, k) < k$ as in the cases of $k = 2$ and $k = 3$. In this case $l(n, 4) \geq 4$ as illustrated by Example 3.3. Another example with $\text{rank}(\mathcal{H}) \geq 4$ for $k = 4$ is given by the second fundamental form of the Segre fourfold $\mathbb{P}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^2 \subset \mathbb{P}^8$. The four matrices H^i are given by:

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Clearly they are linearly independent, and satisfy the width-4 condition as well as the non-degeneracy condition. Note that this computation of second fundamental form also indicates that the Chern form $C_4(\gamma^*Q)$ vanishes everywhere, thus giving an alternative proof of the fact that $\sigma_4(X, L) = c_4(\gamma^*Q) = 0$.

For $k = 4$, we do have the following positive answers.

Lemma 3.8. *Let $n \geq 4$ and $\mathcal{H} = \{H^1, \dots, H^r\}$ ($r \geq 4$) be an $(n, 4)$ -system. Namely, \mathcal{H} satisfies the width-4 condition (3.1) and the non-degeneracy condition (3.2). Then*

- (1) $\text{rank}(\mathcal{H}) \leq 4$.
- (2) *When $\text{rank}(\mathcal{H}) = 4$ and $n \geq 5$, we may assume that $\{H^1, \dots, H^4\}$ are linearly independent. Replacing $\{H^1, \dots, H^4\}$ by another basis of $\text{Span}\{H^1, \dots, H^4\}$ if necessary, the first three matrices will lie in a \mathbb{C}^2 . That is, there exists a nonsingular $n \times n$ matrix A such that*

$$A H^i A^t = \begin{bmatrix} * & 0 \\ 0 & 0_{n-2} \end{bmatrix}, \quad i = 1, 2, 3.$$

In other words $l(n, 4) = 4$, and more importantly, when $n \geq 5$ and $\text{rank}(\mathcal{H}) = 4$, the system only comes with the above special structure. This special structure will be crucial for us in the proof of Theorem 1.4. Again we will postpone the proof of this algebraic lemma to the last two appendices: Appendices B and C.

4. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.3

With the algebraic results in Section 3 in hand, we are now able to prove in this section our first main result, Theorem 1.3.

First let us recall several notions in algebraic geometry, which play crucial roles in the proof. The *tangent variety* $\text{Tan}(X)$ and *secant variety* $\text{Sec}(X)$ of an n -dimensional projective submanifold X in \mathbb{P}^N are defined by

$$(4.1) \quad \text{Tan}(X) := \bigcup_{x \in X} \tilde{T}_x(X), \quad \text{Sec}(X) := \overline{\{\text{lines } \overline{uv} \mid u, v \in X, u \neq v\}},$$

whose maximal dimensions are $2n$ and $2n + 1$, respectively. Here $\tilde{T}_x(X)$ denotes the n -dimensional *projective* tangent space of X at x introduced in (1.1) and “ $\overline{(\cdot)}$ ” the Zariski closure. $\text{Tan}(X)$ and $\text{Sec}(X)$ are both closed irreducible subvarieties in \mathbb{P}^N , with $\text{Tan}(X) \subset \text{Sec}(X)$. The *second osculating space* $\tilde{T}_x^{(2)}X$ at x is the span of the second osculating spaces at x to all curves lying in X ([GH79, p. 372]).

For our later convenience, several well-known facts in algebraic geometry related to the above notions are collected in the form of the following two lemmas.

Lemma 4.1. (1) *Let $X \subset \mathbb{P}^N$ be a projective manifold, then either $\dim \text{Tan}(X) = 2n$ and $\dim \text{Sec}(X) = 2n + 1$, or else $\text{Tan}(X) = \text{Sec}(X)$.*

(2) *We have*

$$(4.2) \quad \dim \tilde{T}_x^{(2)}X = n + \text{rank}\{H^{n+1}, \dots, H^N\}.$$

(3) *For generic $y \in \text{Tan}(X)$ and $y \in \tilde{T}_x(X)$ for generic x , we have*

$$(4.3) \quad \tilde{T}_y \text{Tan}(X) \subset \tilde{T}_x^{(2)}(X).$$

Proof. The first part is a classical result due to Fulton and Hansen ([FH79, Coro. 4] or [La04, p. 215]). The second part follows from (2.11) and the relation between the second osculating space and the second fundamental form ([GH79, (1.45)]). The third part can be directly checked by the definition (cf. [BF04, Lemma 1]). \square

The following result is a well-known fact in algebraic geometry. We include a proof here for the reader’s convenience.

Lemma 4.2. *For any non-degenerate embedding $X \subset \mathbb{P}^N$ associated to L , $\dim \text{Sec}(X)$ depends only on (X, L) and not on the particular embedding. Moreover, $r_L = \dim \text{Sec}(X) - n$.*

Proof. Let $i : X \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}^N$ be the inclusion map, and let $s = \{s_0, \dots, s_N\}$ be the restriction on X of a basis of $H^0(\mathbb{P}^N, \mathcal{O}(1))$. Extend s to a basis $s' = \{s_0, \dots, s_{N_0}\}$ of $H^0(X, L)$. Then s' gives via the Kodaira map a non-degenerate embedding $i_0 : X \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}^{N_0}$. Let $P \cong \mathbb{P}^{N_0 - N - 1}$ be the linear subspace in \mathbb{P}^{N_0} given by $\{[0 : \dots : 0 : * : \dots : *]\}$, where the first $N + 1$ coordinate components are zero. Any point of $i_0(X)$ is not in P . Also, any line joining two points of $i_0(X)$ does not intersect P , so $S \cap P = \emptyset$, where S is the secant variety of $i_0(X)$ in \mathbb{P}^{N_0} . Let $\pi : \mathbb{P}^{N_0} \setminus P \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^N$ be the projection map, then we have $i = \pi \circ i_0$, and the restriction of π on $i_0(X)$ gives an isomorphism between $i_0(X)$ and $i(X)$. Clearly, π also gives an isomorphism between S and $\text{Sec}(X)$. In particular, $\dim(\text{Sec}(X)) = \dim S$, so it depends only on X and L but not on the particular embedding i associated to L . Denote by $m := \dim \text{Sec}(X)$. Then in \mathbb{P}^N , if we choose a linear subspace $P' \cong \mathbb{P}^{N - m - 1}$ which does not intersect $\text{Sec}(X)$, then the restriction on X of the projection map $\pi' : \mathbb{P}^N \setminus P' \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^m$ will give us an embedding $X \subset \mathbb{P}^m$ associated to L , and this is clearly the smallest codimension possible. So $r_L = m - n$ as claimed. \square

Combining the above two lemmas, we get

Corollary 4.3. *Let $X^n \subset \mathbb{P}^N$ be an embedding associated to L , and $l := \text{rank}\{H^{n+1}, \dots, H^N\}$ at a generic point of X . If $l < n$, then $r_L \leq l$.*

Proof. By (4.2) and (4.3) in Lemma 4.1, and our assumption, we have

$$\dim(\text{Tan}(X)) \leq n + l < 2n.$$

Hence $\text{Tan}(X) = \text{Sec}(X)$ by the first part in Lemma 4.1. With Lemma 4.2 we have

$$r_L = \dim \text{Tan}(X) - n \leq l.$$

□

This immediately gives us the proof of Theorem 1.3:

Proof of Theorem 1.3. Let X^n be a projective manifold with $n \geq 3$ and L a very ample line bundle on it with $\sigma_3(X, L) = 0$. Let $X \subset \mathbb{P}^N$ be a non-degenerate embedding associated to L . If the codimension $N - n \leq 2$, then we are done. So suppose on the contrary that $N - n \geq 3$. In this case by Lemmas 2.3 and 2.4 the set $\mathcal{H} = \{H^{n+1}, \dots, H^N\}$ forms an $(n, 3)$ -system at a generic point. By Corollary 3.7, we know that $\text{rank}(\mathcal{H}) \leq 2 < n$. So we get $r_L \leq 2$ by Corollary 4.3 above. □

Similarly by Lemma 3.8 we get the following codimension upper bound in the case of $k = 4$.

Theorem 4.4. *Let X^n be a projective manifold with $n \geq 5$ and L a very ample line bundle on it with $\sigma_4(X, L) = 0$. Then $r_L \leq 4$. In particular, such an X can be embedded in \mathbb{P}^{n+4} .*

Proof. Let $X \subset \mathbb{P}^N$ be a non-degenerate embedding associated to L . If $N - n \geq 4$, as above the set \mathcal{H} forms an $(n, 4)$ -system at a generic point. We know by Lemma 3.8 that $\text{rank}(\mathcal{H}) \leq 4 < n$. So by Corollary 4.3 we get $r_L \leq 4$. □

5. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.4

Suppose that L is a very ample line bundle on a projective manifold X^n of $n \geq 5$, satisfying $\sigma_4(X, L) = 0$. By Theorem 4.4, there is an embedding $X \subset \mathbb{P}^{n+4}$ associated to L . Our goal is to show that $r_L \leq 3$.

5.1. Preliminaries. First we shall need the following relative version of the aforementioned Fulton-Hansen theorem, which is essentially due to Fulton-Hansen and Zak ([Za93]), and a proof can be found in [Ru16, Thm 3.2.1].

Lemma 5.1. *Let $X^n \subseteq \mathbb{P}^N$ be an irreducible projective variety of dimension n and $Y \subset X$ a closed subvariety of dimension n' . Then either $\dim T^*(Y, X) = n' + n$ and $\dim S(Y, X) = n' + n + 1$, or $T^*(Y, X) = S(Y, X)$.*

Here $S(Y, X)$ is the *relative secant variety of X with respect to Y* , defined as the Zariski closure of the union of all lines \overline{xy} with $x \in X$, $y \in Y$, and $x \neq y$. $T^*(Y, X)$ is called the *relative tangent star of X with respect to Y* , defined as the union of $T_y^*(Y, X)$ for all $y \in Y$, where

$$(5.1) \quad T_y^*(Y, X) = \overline{\lim_{u \rightarrow y, x \rightarrow y} \text{lines } \overline{ux} \mid u \in Y, x \in X, u \neq x}$$

In particular, $T_y^*(\{y\}, X) = C_y X$ is the *tangent cone* of X at y , and $T_y^*(X, X) = T_y^* X$ is called the *tangent star* of X at y . One always has $C_y X \subset T_y^* X \subset \tilde{T}_y X$, where the last term is called the *tangent space* of X at y , which is the smallest linear subspace in \mathbb{P}^N containing the tangent cone. When X is smooth at y , one has $C_y X = T_y^* X = \tilde{T}_y X$.

Similarly, $T(Y, X) = \cup_{y \in Y} \tilde{T}_y X$ is called the *relative tangent variety of X with respect to Y* .

Write $N = n + 4$. We may assume that the rank $l(x)$ of the second fundamental form at a generic point $x \in X$ is equal to 4, as otherwise we would have $r_L \leq 3$ already. Denote by X' the open dense subset of X where $l(x) = 4$. By the second part of Lemma 3.8, we get a special structure about the second fundamental form at the points in X' .

Fix a point $x \in X'$. With Lemma 2.5 in mind, we may assume that $\{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$ and $\{e_{n+1}, \dots, e_{n+4}\}$ be unitary frame of the tangent space $T_x X$ and the normal space $N_x X$ in \mathbb{P}^N at x , and by an abuse of notation, denote by H^α the e_α -component of the second fundamental form:

$$H^\alpha(\cdot, \cdot) := \langle II(\cdot, \cdot), e_\alpha \rangle, \quad n+1 \leq \alpha \leq n+4 = N.$$

It is a symmetric bilinear form on the tangent space $T_x X$. For simplicity we will still denote by H^α the symmetric $n \times n$ matrix under the basis $\{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$ and $H_{ij}^\alpha := H^\alpha(e_i, e_j)$. In terms of H^α , the second part of Lemma 3.8 implies that there exist subspace $N'_x \subset N_x X$ and $F_x \subset T_x X$, with $N'_x \cong \mathbb{C}^3$ and $F_x \cong \mathbb{C}^{n-2}$, such that F_x is the common kernel of H^w for all $w \in N'_x$.

Here we have adopted the notation that $H^w := \sum_{i=1}^4 w_i H^{n+i}$ for $w = \sum_{i=1}^4 w_i e_{n+i}$. Note that the subspace $N'_x \subset N_x X$ is uniquely determined as the set of all $w \in N_x X$ such that $\text{rank}(H^w)$ is at most 2, by the fact $n \geq 5$ and the non-degeneracy condition (2.10). So F_x , as the common kernel of H^w for all $w \in N'_x$, is also uniquely determined. In the open dense subset X' of X , F forms a distribution.

Lemma 5.2. *F is a holomorphic foliation.*

Proof. With the above notation in mind, let $\{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$ be a local unitary frame of X , and $\{e_{n+1}, \dots, e_{n+4}\}$ be a local unitary frame for the normal bundle, such that $\{e_3, \dots, e_n\}$ spans F and $\{e_{n+1}, \dots, e_{n+3}\}$ spans N' at each point. We may extend this local frame along X to a local unitary tangent frame of an open subset in \mathbb{P}^N ($N = n + 4$), and denote by θ , Θ the matrix of connection and curvature of \mathbb{P}^N under the frame $\{e_1, \dots, e_N\}$. Let φ_a ($1 \leq a \leq N$) be the coframe dual to e_a . Then we have

$$d\varphi = -\theta^t \wedge \varphi, \quad \Theta = d\theta - \theta \wedge \theta.$$

Since $\{e_a\}$ is unitary, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Theta_{ab} &= \sum_{c,d=1}^N R_{c\bar{d}a\bar{b}} \varphi_c \wedge \bar{\varphi}_d = \sum_{c,d=1}^N (\delta_{cd}\delta_{ab} + \delta_{cb}\delta_{ad}) \varphi_c \wedge \bar{\varphi}_d \\ (5.2) \quad &= \delta_{ab} \sum_{c=1}^N \varphi_c \wedge \bar{\varphi}_c + \varphi_b \wedge \bar{\varphi}_a. \end{aligned}$$

Let us fix the index range throughout the proof of this lemma:

$$(5.3) \quad 1 \leq i, j \leq n; \quad n+1 \leq \alpha, \beta \leq N = n+4; \quad 1 \leq a, b \leq N = n+4.$$

Restricted on (an open subset of) X , which is defined by $\varphi_\alpha = 0$ for all α , we know that $\theta_{i\alpha}$ are $(1,0)$ -forms and give the second fundamental form

$$\theta_{i\alpha} = \sum_j H_{ij}^\alpha \varphi_j.$$

By our construction of N' and F , we know that

$$(5.4) \quad \theta_{i\alpha} = 0 \quad \forall i = 3, \dots, n, \quad \forall \alpha = n+1, n+2, n+3,$$

while

$$(5.5) \quad \theta_{i\alpha} = \sum_{j=1}^2 H_{ij}^\alpha \varphi_j, \quad \forall i = 1, 2, \quad \forall \alpha = n+1, n+2, n+3.$$

Let us fix $i > 2$ and $\alpha < n+4$. By (5.2), we have $\Theta_{i\alpha} = 0$ since $\varphi_\alpha = 0$, and so

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \Theta_{i\alpha} = d\theta_{i\alpha} - \sum_a \theta_{ia} \theta_{a\alpha} = - \sum_a \theta_{ia} \theta_{a\alpha} \\ &= - \sum_j \theta_{ij} \theta_{j\alpha} - \sum_\beta \theta_{i\beta} \theta_{\beta\alpha} = - \sum_{j=1}^2 \theta_{ij} \theta_{j\alpha} - \theta_{iN} \theta_{N\alpha} \end{aligned}$$

So we get

$$(5.6) \quad \sum_{j=1}^2 (H_{1j}^\alpha \varphi_1 + H_{2j}^\alpha \varphi_2) \wedge \theta_{ij} = (H_{i1}^N \varphi_1 + \cdots + H_{in}^N \varphi_n) \wedge \theta_{N\alpha}$$

for each $i > 2$ and $\alpha < N$. Let us write $\psi = \psi' + \psi''$ for the decomposition of a 1-form into its (1,0) and (0,1) parts. Taking the (1,1)-part in (5.6), we get

$$\sum_{j=1}^2 (H_{1j}^\alpha \varphi_1 + H_{2j}^\alpha \varphi_2) \wedge \theta_{ij}'' = (H_{i1}^N \varphi_1 + \cdots + H_{in}^N \varphi_n) \wedge \theta_{N\alpha}''$$

If $H_{ik}^N = 0$ for all $i, k > 2$, then the common kernel $\bigcap_{\beta=n+1}^N \ker(H^\beta) \neq 0$ as $n > 4$, so by the above identity we must have $\theta_{N\alpha}'' = 0$, and then $\theta_{i1}'' = \theta_{i2}'' = 0$ since H^w has rank 2 for generic $w \in N'$. This means that $\nabla_{\bar{Z}} F \subset F$ for any (1,0)-type vector field Z , so F is holomorphic.

Next, for any (1,0)-form ψ , let us denote by $\tilde{\psi}$ the part modulo $\{\varphi_1, \varphi_2\}$. That is, if ψ is given by $\sum_{j=1}^n a_j \varphi_j$, then $\tilde{\psi} = \sum_{j=3}^n a_j \varphi_j$. Modulo $\{\varphi_1, \varphi_2\}$ in (5.6), we get $\tilde{\theta}_{iN} \wedge \tilde{\theta}_{N\alpha} = 0$. So if $\tilde{\theta}_{N\alpha} \neq 0$, then it will force the lower right $(n-2) \times (n-2)$ block of H^N to have rank at most 1. This will lead to a nonzero element in the common kernel of H if $n \geq 6$, contradicting with the non-degeneracy condition.

So when $n \geq 6$ we must have $\tilde{\theta}_{N\alpha} = 0$ for any $\alpha < N$. Let us write $\theta_{N\alpha} = p_\alpha \varphi_1 + q_\alpha \varphi_2$. Also write $H_{11}^\alpha = a_\alpha$, $H_{12}^\alpha = b_\alpha$, and $H_{22}^\alpha = c_\alpha$. Formula (5.6) leads to

$$\theta_{1\alpha} \tilde{\theta}_{i1} + \theta_{2\alpha} \tilde{\theta}_{i2} = \tilde{\theta}_{iN} \theta_{N\alpha}.$$

Or equivalently,

$$\begin{aligned} a_\alpha \tilde{\theta}_{i1} + b_\alpha \tilde{\theta}_{i2} &= -p_\alpha \tilde{\theta}_{iN} \\ b_\alpha \tilde{\theta}_{i1} + c_\alpha \tilde{\theta}_{i2} &= -q_\alpha \tilde{\theta}_{iN} \end{aligned}$$

Since H^w has rank 2 for generic $w \in N'$ by Remark 3.6, the above equations lead to

$$(5.7) \quad \tilde{\theta}_{i1} = \lambda \tilde{\theta}_{iN}, \quad \tilde{\theta}_{i2} = \mu \tilde{\theta}_{iN}$$

for some functions λ and μ , independent of $i > 2$. Now by the structure equation, modulo $\{\varphi_1, \varphi_2\}$, we have

$$-d\varphi_1 = \sum_{i=1}^n \theta_{i1} \varphi_i \equiv \sum_{i>2} \tilde{\theta}_{i1} \varphi_i = \sum_{i>2} \lambda \tilde{\theta}_{iN} \varphi_i \equiv \lambda \sum_{i,j>2} H_{ij}^N \varphi_i \varphi_j = 0.$$

Similarly, $d\varphi_2 \equiv 0$ modulo $\{\varphi_1, \varphi_2\}$. So F is a foliation. Next let us consider the case $n = 5$. In this case we no longer always have $\tilde{\theta}_{N\alpha} = 0$ for all $n + 1 \leq \alpha \leq n + 3$. Instead, by (5.6), we get

$$(5.8) \quad \tilde{\theta}_{iN} \wedge \tilde{\theta}_{N\alpha} = 0, \quad 3 \leq i \leq n, n < \alpha < N$$

We may assume that not all $\tilde{\theta}_{N\alpha}$ are zero, otherwise the proof for the $n \geq 6$ case above will show that F is a foliation. Also, there must be $i > 2$ such that $\tilde{\theta}_{iN} \neq 0$, as otherwise the lower right $(n - 2) \times (n - 2)$ block of H^N is zero, contradicting with the non-degeneracy condition since $n \geq 5$. By (5.8), we know that

$$H^N = \begin{bmatrix} * & * & x^t \\ * & * & y^t \\ x & y & zz^t \end{bmatrix},$$

where x, y, z are column vectors in \mathbb{C}^3 with $x \wedge y \wedge z \neq 0$, while

$$\theta_{N\alpha} = p_\alpha \varphi_1 + q_\alpha \varphi_2 + r_\alpha \psi, \quad \theta_{iN} = x_i \varphi_1 + y_i \varphi_2 + z_i \psi, \quad \text{where } \psi = \sum_{i=3}^5 z_i \varphi_i.$$

Plug into (5.6), we get

$$\theta_{1\alpha} \tilde{\theta}_{i1} + \theta_{2\alpha} \tilde{\theta}_{i2} = (x_i r_\alpha - z_i p_\alpha) \varphi_1 \psi + (y_i r_\alpha - z_i q_\alpha) \varphi_2 \psi,$$

or equivalently,

$$(5.9) \quad \begin{cases} a_\alpha \tilde{\theta}_{i1} + b_\alpha \tilde{\theta}_{i2} = (x_i r_\alpha - z_i p_\alpha) \psi \\ b_\alpha \tilde{\theta}_{i1} + c_\alpha \tilde{\theta}_{i2} = (y_i r_\alpha - z_i q_\alpha) \psi \end{cases}$$

By a unitary rotation of $\{e_{n+1}, e_{n+2}, e_{n+3}\}$ if necessary, we may assume that $r_\alpha = 0$ for $\alpha = n + 1$ and $n + 2$. By Lemma 3.8 and Remark 3.6, we know that H^w has rank 2 for generic $w \in \text{Span}\{e_{n+1}, e_{n+2}\}$, so by applying (5.9) for $\alpha = n + 1$ and $n + 2$, we get

$$\tilde{\theta}_{i1} = \lambda z_i \psi, \quad \tilde{\theta}_{i2} = \mu z_i \psi$$

for λ, μ independent of i . Thus modulo $\{\varphi_1, \varphi_2\}$, we have

$$d\varphi_1 \equiv -\tilde{\theta}_{i1} \wedge \varphi_i = -\lambda z_i \psi \wedge \varphi_i = -\lambda \psi \wedge (z_i \varphi_i) = -\lambda \psi \wedge \psi = 0.$$

Similarly, $d\varphi_2 \equiv 0$, so F is a foliation. This completes the proof of the lemma. \square

Note that in the case $n = 5$ we also have

$$\tilde{\theta}_{i1} = \lambda \tilde{\theta}_{iN}, \quad \tilde{\theta}_{i2} = \mu \tilde{\theta}_{iN}$$

for λ, μ independent of i . Since $\Theta_{iN} = 0$ by (5.2), so we have

$$d\theta_{iN} = \theta_{i1} \theta_{1N} + \theta_{i2} \theta_{2N} + \sum_{j>2} \theta_{ij} \theta_{jN} + \theta_{iN} \theta_{NN}.$$

Therefore,

$$(5.10) \quad d\psi \equiv 0 \pmod{\{\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \psi\}}$$

So each leaf Y of F is foliated by hypersurfaces Z defined by $\psi = 0$.

Lemma 5.3. *Let Y be the leaf of F passing through a generic point x . Then either $\tilde{T}_y^{(2)} Y = P$ is constant for all $y \in Y$, or Y is holomorphically foliated by hypersurfaces, and along each hypersurface Y_1 , $\tilde{T}_y^{(2)} Y = P$ is constant for all $y \in Y_1$. In both cases, $P \cong \mathbb{P}^{n-1}$ is a linear subspace in \mathbb{P}^N , and P does not contain $Y \cap \Omega$ for any small neighborhood Ω of x .*

Proof. Along Y , we have $\varphi_1 = \varphi_2 = 0$, and the second fundamental form of $Y \subset \mathbb{P}^N$ is given by $\tilde{\theta}_{iN}$, $\tilde{\theta}_{i1} = \lambda\tilde{\theta}_{iN}$, $\tilde{\theta}_{i2} = \mu\tilde{\theta}_{iN}$, and $\theta_{i\alpha} = 0$ for $n+1 \leq \alpha \leq n+3$. Write

$$(5.11) \quad \tilde{e}_1 = e_1 - \lambda e_N, \quad \tilde{e}_2 = e_2 - \mu e_N, \quad \tilde{e}_N = \bar{\lambda}e_1 + \bar{\mu}e_2 + e_N.$$

Then $\{\tilde{e}_1, \tilde{e}_2, \tilde{e}_N\}$ form a basis of $\text{Span}\{e_1, e_2, e_N\}$, with \tilde{e}_N perpendicular to \tilde{e}_1 and \tilde{e}_2 . The normal bundle NY splits as the orthogonal sum of $N'Y := \text{Span}\{e_{n+1}, e_{n+2}, e_{n+3}, \tilde{e}_1, \tilde{e}_2\}$ and $\mathbb{C}\tilde{e}_N$, and its second fundamental form is trivial in $N'Y$ directions but non-trivial in the \tilde{e}_N direction, as $\tilde{\theta}_{i\bar{1}} = \tilde{\theta}_{i1} - \lambda\tilde{\theta}_{iN} = 0$ and similarly $\tilde{\theta}_{i\bar{2}} = 0$, while $\tilde{\theta}_{i\bar{N}} = (1 + |\lambda|^2 + |\mu|^2)\tilde{\theta}_{iN} \neq 0$.

So the second fundamental form of Y forms an one-dimensional space, and the second osculating space $\tilde{T}_y^{(2)}Y$ is the linear space of dimension $n-1$ in \mathbb{P}^N passing through y and containing the directions of

$$(5.12) \quad \text{Span}\{e_3, \dots, e_n, \tilde{e}_N\}$$

at y . Let $\gamma^{(2)}$ be the second Gauss map of Y , sending a point $y \in Y$ to the second osculating space of Y at y . By [GH79, (1.69)-(1.73)], the image of $\gamma^{(2)}$ is at most one-dimensional. If the image is zero-dimensional, namely, $\gamma^{(2)}$ is a constant map, then $\tilde{T}_y^{(2)}Y$ is constant for all $y \in Y$, and denote by $P = \tilde{T}_x^{(2)}Y \cong \mathbb{P}^{n-1}$ this linear subspace. It contains the tangent variety $\text{Tan}(Y)$ of Y , hence is equal to (the closure of) $\text{Tan}(Y)$, since the latter has dimension $n-1$.

If the map $\gamma^{(2)}$ has one-dimensional image, then its fibers will foliate Y into hypersurfaces. Let Y_1 be a generic fiber. Then $\tilde{T}_y^{(2)}Y$ remains constant for all $y \in Y_1$, and the second case of the lemma occurs. Again write $P = \tilde{T}_x^{(2)}Y \cong \mathbb{P}^{n-1}$ for this linear space. Note that in any neighborhood Ω of x , P cannot contain $Y \cap \Omega$, as otherwise it will force $\gamma^{(2)}$ to be a constant map. This completes the proof of the lemma. \square

The following statement is more or less obvious, and we include a proof here for the sake of completeness.

Lemma 5.4. *Let $P \subset Q$ be linear subspaces in \mathbb{P}^N of dimensions n and m respectively. Then the tangent bundle TQ is parallel along P .*

Proof. Let $Z = [Z_0 : \dots : Z_N]$ be a unitary homogeneous coordinate of \mathbb{P}^N such that

$$P = \{[Z_0 : \dots : Z_n : 0 : \dots : 0]\}, \quad Q = \{[Z_0 : \dots : Z_m : 0 : \dots : 0]\}.$$

In the open chart $U = \{Z_0 \neq 0\}$, (z^1, \dots, z^N) becomes holomorphic coordinates and $\{\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_N\}$ becomes a tangent frame, where $z^i = \frac{Z_i}{Z_0}$ and $\varepsilon_i = \frac{\partial}{\partial z^i}$. As we have seen in (2.12) and (2.13), under the frame ε , the entries of the matrices of Fubini-Study metric and Levi-Civita connection are

$$g_{i\bar{j}} = \frac{1}{1+|z|^2}\delta_{ij} - \frac{1}{(1+|z|^2)^2}\bar{z}^i z^j, \quad \theta_{ij} = -\frac{1}{1+|z|^2}\left(\delta_{ij} \sum_{k=1}^N \bar{z}^k dz^k + \bar{z}^i dz^j\right), \quad 1 \leq i, j \leq N.$$

In our setting, P is defined in U by $z^\alpha = 0$, $n+1 \leq \alpha \leq N$, and $\{\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_n\}$ forms a tangent frame of P and $\{\varepsilon_{n+1}, \dots, \varepsilon_N\}$ forms a unitary normal frame of P . For any $n+1 \leq \alpha \leq m$, any $m < \alpha' \leq N$, and any $1 \leq i, j \leq n$, we have

$$\theta_{\alpha\alpha'}(\varepsilon_j) = \theta_{i\alpha'}(\varepsilon_j) = 0.$$

So the bundle $TQ = \text{span}\{\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_m\}$ is parallel along P . \square

Since Q is a linear space in \mathbb{P}^N , we have $\tilde{T}_y Q = Q$ for any $y \in Q$.

5.2. The completion of the proof. Now we are ready to finish the proof of Theorem 1.4.

Proof. Let $X \subset \mathbb{P}^N$ be a non-degenerate embedding associated to L , such that $n \geq 5$, $N = n + 4$, and $\sigma_4(X, L) = 0$. Assume that the rank $l(x)$ of the second fundamental form of X at a generic point x is equal to 4. Then an open dense subset $X' \subset X$ admits a holomorphic foliation F . Let Y be the leaf of F passing through x . For any $y \in Y$, denote by P_y the linear subspace in \mathbb{P}^N passing through y and containing the directions $\{e_3, \dots, e_n, \tilde{e}_N\}$ at y , which is just $\tilde{T}_y^{(2)}Y$ by (5.11) and (5.12).

By Lemma 5.3, we know that $P_y = P_x = P$ with $P \cong \mathbb{P}^{n-1}$ either for all $y \in Y$, or for all $y \in Y_1$, a smooth hypersurface in Y which is a generic fiber of the second Gauss map of Y .

Write $E_y = \text{Span}\{e_1, \dots, e_n, e_N\}$ and $E_y^\perp = \text{Span}\{e_{n+1}, e_{n+2}, e_{n+3}\}$ for bundles over P .

First consider the case when $\tilde{\theta}_{N\alpha} = 0$ for all $n + 1 \leq \alpha \leq n + 3$. In this case, since $\tilde{\theta}_{1\alpha} = \tilde{\theta}_{2\alpha} = \tilde{\theta}_{N\alpha} = 0$, we see that E^\perp , hence E , is parallel along Y .

Now let $Q \cong \mathbb{P}^{n+1}$ be the linear subspace in \mathbb{P}^N passing through x containing the directions $\{e_1, \dots, e_n, e_N\}$ at x . Then $P \subset Q$ and so TQ is parallel along P by Lemma 5.4.

By Lemma 5.3, either $Y \subset P$ or $Y_1 \subset P$, and in the latter case Y cannot be contained in P in any small neighborhood of x .

Let Y' be the irreducible component of $P \cap X$ passing through x . Then $Y' = \bar{Y}$ in the first case while $Y' = \bar{Y}_1$ in the second case. Suppose we are in the first case. Since TQ is parallel on P , it is also parallel on Y . Now both E and TQ are parallel bundles over Y , and $E_x = T_x Q$. So for any $y \in Y$, we have $E_y = T_y Q$, hence $T_y X \subset E_y = T_y Q$, which leads to $\tilde{T}_y X \subset \tilde{T}_y Q = Q$ for all $y \in Y$ hence for all $y \in Y'$ by taking the limit. Therefore, $T^*(Y', X) \subset Q$, so by Lemma 5.1 we get $S(Y', X) \subset Q$ hence $X \subset Q$, a contradiction to the assumption that $X \subset \mathbb{P}^N$ is non-degenerate. In the second case we get the same contradiction by using Y_1 instead of Y .

Next let us assume that not all $\tilde{\theta}_{N\alpha} = 0$. By the discussion right after the proof of Lemma 5.2, we know that Y is foliated by holomorphic hypersurfaces defined by $\psi = 0$. Let Z be such a hypersurface and consider $\gamma^{(2)}|_Z$, the restriction on Z of the second Gauss map of Y . It will once again have image of dimension either 0 or 1. Note that E^\perp , hence E , is parallel along Z , hence the same argument as before on Z or Z_1 , a generic fiber of $\gamma^{(2)}|_Z$, would lead to a contradiction to the non-degenerateness of X . This shows that the assumption $l(x) = 4$ actually cannot occur when $n \geq 5$, so $r_L \leq l(x) \leq 3$ and we have completed the proof of Theorem 1.4. \square

APPENDIX A. PROOF OF LEMMA 3.5

First let us recall and fix some notations, which shall be used throughout this and the next two appendices. Let $V \cong \mathbb{C}^n$ be a complex vector space, $\mathcal{H} = \{H^1, \dots, H^r\}$ be a set of quadratic (i.e., symmetric bilinear) forms on V . For $u \in V$, denote by $H_u^i := H^i(u, \cdot)$ the element in the dual space V^* , and by $\ker(H^i) := \{u \in V \mid H_u^i = 0\}$ the kernel of H^i . This set \mathcal{H} is said to satisfy the *non-degeneracy condition* if $\bigcap_{i=1}^r \ker(H^i) = 0$, and when $r \geq k$, to satisfy the *width- k condition* if $H_u^{i_1}, \dots, H_u^{i_k}$ are linearly dependent in V^* for any $u \in V$ and any $1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_k \leq r$.

Under any basis $\{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$ of V , each H^i is represented by a symmetric $n \times n$ matrix, which we still denote by H^i when there is no danger of confusion. In this situation, all the relevant notations above are compatible with those in Definition 2.2.

Let $W = \mathbb{C}^r$, and write $H^w = \sum_{i=1}^r c_i H^i$ for any $w = (c_1, \dots, c_r)$. It is easy to see that the non-degeneracy and width- k conditions are invariant when replacing \mathcal{H} by another basis of the span of these r quadratic forms. In what follows we will call this a *scrambling* of these H^i . Note that for any fixed H^w , we can always choose a suitable basis of V so that H^w is represented by the matrix

$$(A.1) \quad H^w = \begin{bmatrix} I_p & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad p = \text{rank}(H^w).$$

We begin with the following

Lemma A.1. *Let H be a quadratic form on $V \cong \mathbb{C}^n$. For any hyperplane V' in V , denote by $\tilde{H} := H|_{V' \times V'}$ the restriction. Then for generic choice of a hyperplane V' , it holds that $\ker(\tilde{H}) = \ker(H) \cap V'$.*

Proof. Clearly, we always have $\ker(\tilde{H}) \supset \ker(H) \cap V'$ for any hyperplane V' . It suffices to show that

$$(A.2) \quad \dim \ker(\tilde{H}) \leq \dim(\ker(H) \cap V'), \quad \text{for generic } V'.$$

To see this, let us take a basis $\{e_i\}$ of V so that H is in the block diagonal form (A.1) under $\{e_i\}$. Suppose that V' is spanned by $n - 1$ vectors $v_i = \sum_{j=1}^n A_{ij} e_j$, $1 \leq i \leq n - 1$. Then under the basis $\{v_i\}$ of V' , \tilde{H} is represented by the matrix $AH A^t = B B^t$, where we wrote $A = (B, C)$ and B is the left $(n - 1) \times p$ block of the $(n - 1) \times n$ matrix A , where $p = \text{rank}(H)$.

If $p = n$, then $B = A$ and $\tilde{H} = A A^t$. In this case the equality in the lemma holds when \tilde{H} is non-degenerate, or equivalently when the matrix $A A^t$ is non-degenerate. This is clearly the case for generic choice of A .

If $p < n$, then for generic choice of A , the $(n - 1) \times (n - 1)$ matrix $B B^t$ will have rank p , which is the maximum possible value. So $\ker(\tilde{H})$ has dimension $n - 1 - p$, while the dimension of $\ker(H) \cap V'$ is at least $n - p - 1$. This completes (A.2) and thus the proof of the lemma. \square

Proof of Lemma 3.5. Assume that the conclusion fails. Then there exist integers $\hat{n} \geq 4$, $n \geq 3$ and a linearly independent set $\{Q^1, Q^2, Q^3\}$ of quadratic forms on some $\hat{V} \cong \mathbb{C}^{\hat{n}}$ such that Q^i satisfy the width-3 condition and their common kernel $K = \bigcap_{i=1}^3 \ker(Q^i)$ has codimension n .

Let $V \cong \mathbb{C}^n$ be a linear subspace such that $\hat{V} = V \oplus K$, and let H^i be the restriction of Q^i on V . Then it is easy to see that the quadratic forms H^1, H^2, H^3 on $V \cong \mathbb{C}^n$ satisfy the the width-3 condition as well as the non-degeneracy condition. Let us assume that $n \geq 3$ is the *smallest* such numbers, namely, such a set does not exist on any V with dimension between 3 and $n - 1$. We want to derive a contradiction.

We will divide the discussion into two cases, depending on $n > 3$ or $n = 3$.

Case 1: $n > 3$.

In this case, let us choose a *generic* hyperplane $V' \cong \mathbb{C}^{n-1}$ in V , and consider the set of restriction quadratic forms $\{\tilde{H}^1, \tilde{H}^2, \tilde{H}^3\}$ on V' . It clearly satisfies the width-3 condition, and

by Lemma A.1

$$\bigcap_{i=1}^3 \ker(\tilde{H}^i) = \bigcap_{i=1}^3 (\ker(H^i) \cap V') = \left(\bigcap_{i=1}^3 \ker(H^i) \right) \cap V' = 0,$$

so it satisfy the non-degeneracy condition as well. Since $n - 1 \geq 3$, by our assumption on the *minimality* of n , the set $\{\tilde{H}^1, \tilde{H}^2, \tilde{H}^3\}$ must be linearly *dependent*. Replacing $\{H^1, H^2, H^3\}$ by another basis of the spanning space if necessary, we may assume that $\tilde{H}^1 = 0$. Choosing a basis $\{e_i\}$ of V so that V' is spanned by $\{e_2, \dots, e_n\}$, we have

$$(A.3) \quad H^1 = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda & x^t \\ x & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad H^2 = \begin{bmatrix} a & y^t \\ y & A \end{bmatrix}, \quad H^3 = \begin{bmatrix} b & z^t \\ z & B \end{bmatrix},$$

where x, y, z are column vectors in \mathbb{C}^{n-1} and A, B are $(n-1) \times (n-1)$ matrices. To streamline the writings, let us divide the discussion into three subcases, depending on the vanishing of λ and a, b .

Subcase 1a: $\lambda \neq 0$.

In this case, if we replace H^i by the new basis $\{H^1, H^2 - \frac{a}{\lambda}H^1, H^3 - \frac{b}{\lambda}H^1\}$, which we shall frequently call a scrambling of H^i , we may *assume that* $a = b = 0$. For any column vector $u \in V \cong \mathbb{C}^n$ in the form $u = \begin{pmatrix} t \\ v \end{pmatrix}$ where $v \in V'$, we have

$$(A.4) \quad H_u^1 = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda t + \langle x, v \rangle \\ tx \end{bmatrix}, \quad H_u^2 = \begin{bmatrix} \langle y, v \rangle \\ ty + A_v \end{bmatrix}, \quad H_u^3 = \begin{bmatrix} \langle z, v \rangle \\ tz + B_v \end{bmatrix}$$

where $\langle x, v \rangle$ means the usual dot product. Their wedge product is zero by the width- k condition. The components containing e_1 give us

$$(A.5) \quad (\lambda t + \langle x, v \rangle)(ty + A_v) \wedge (tz + B_v) - \langle y, v \rangle tx \wedge (tz + B_v) + \langle z, v \rangle tx \wedge (ty + A_v) = 0.$$

This is a cubic polynomial in t . By looking at the t^3 term, we get

$$\lambda y \wedge z = 0.$$

So y and z are *parallel*. If both of them are zero, then (A.5) becomes

$$(\lambda t + \langle x, v \rangle)A_v \wedge B_v = 0.$$

This implies that $A_v \wedge B_v = 0$ for any $v \in V'$. By Lemma 3.4, we know that A is proportional to B , so $\{H^2, H^3\}$ is linearly dependent (recall that we have assumed that $a = b = 0$!), a contradiction. Thus y and z cannot be both zero. Without loss of generality, let us *assume that* $y \neq 0$. Then $z = cy$ for some constant c . Replace H^3 by $H^3 - cH^2$, we may *assume that* $z = 0$. The equation (A.5) now takes the form

$$(A.6) \quad (\lambda t + \langle x, v \rangle)(ty + A_v) \wedge B_v - \langle y, v \rangle tx \wedge B_v = 0.$$

Letting $t = 0$, we get

$$\langle x, v \rangle A_v \wedge B_v = 0$$

for any $v \in V'$. If $x \neq 0$, then for generic $v \in V'$, $\langle x, v \rangle \neq 0$, so we know that $A_v \wedge B_v = 0$ for generic hence all $v \in V'$. On the other hand, if $x = 0$, then (A.6) becomes

$$t^2 \lambda y \wedge B_v + t \lambda A_v \wedge B_v = 0,$$

so again we have $A_v \wedge B_v = 0$. Thus A and B are proportional by Lemma 3.4. *We have* $B \neq 0$ since we have assumed that $b = 0$ and $z = 0$, and so $A = cB$ for some constant c . Replacing H^2 by $H^2 - cH^3$, we may *assume that* $A = 0$. Now (A.6) simply means

$$y \wedge B_v = 0, \quad \langle y, v \rangle x \wedge B_v = 0$$

for all $v \in V'$. Since $y \neq 0$ and $B \neq 0$, as otherwise H^2 or H^3 would be zero, the first equation above implies that B is a constant multiple of the rank one matrix yy^t , while the second equation implies that $x = cy$ for some constant c . With all these assumptions (A.3) now reduces to

$$(A.7) \quad H^1 = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda & (cy)^t \\ cy & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad H^2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & y^t \\ y & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad H^3 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & yy^t \end{bmatrix}.$$

Now take any $0 \neq v_0 \in V'$ with $\langle v_0, y \rangle = 0$, we know that v_0 lies in the common kernel of all three H^i in (A.7), a contradiction. This completes the argument for this subcase.

Subcase 1b: $\lambda = 0$, $(a, b) \neq (0, 0)$.

Without loss of generality, let us assume that $b = 1$. Replace H^2 by $H^2 - aH^3$, we may assume that $a = 0$. The three column vectors (A.4) now become

$$H_u^1 = \begin{bmatrix} \langle x, v \rangle \\ tx \end{bmatrix}, \quad H_u^2 = \begin{bmatrix} \langle y, v \rangle \\ ty + A_v \end{bmatrix}, \quad H_u^3 = \begin{bmatrix} t + \langle z, v \rangle \\ tz + B_v \end{bmatrix},$$

and the components containing e_1 in their wedge product give us

$$(A.8) \quad \langle x, v \rangle (ty + A_v) \wedge (tz + B_v) - \langle y, v \rangle tx \wedge (tz + B_v) + (t + \langle z, v \rangle) tx \wedge (ty + A_v) = 0.$$

By looking at the highest and lowest order terms in t , we get

$$x \wedge y = 0, \quad \langle x, v \rangle A_v \wedge B_v = 0.$$

Note that $x \neq 0$ since $H^1 \neq 0$, so the above equations lead to $y = cx$ for some constant c , and $A_v \wedge B_v = 0$ for any generic hence for all $v \in V'$. Thus A and B are proportional to each other, still by Lemma 3.4. Replacing H^2 by $H^2 - cH^1$, we may assume that $y = 0$. This implies that $A \neq 0$. So $B = c'A$ for some constant c' . Replacing H^3 by $H^3 - c'H^2$, we may assume that $B = 0$. Now (A.8) gives us

$$\langle x, v \rangle z \wedge A_v = 0, \quad x \wedge A_v = 0$$

for any $v \in V'$. This means $A = cx x^t$ and $z = c'x$ for some constants c, c' . Once again it will lead to the non-triviality of the common kernel of the three matrices H^i .

Subcase 1c: $\lambda = a = b = 0$.

In this case the three column vectors become

$$H_u^1 = \begin{bmatrix} \langle x, v \rangle \\ tx \end{bmatrix}, \quad H_u^2 = \begin{bmatrix} \langle y, v \rangle \\ ty + A_v \end{bmatrix}, \quad H_u^3 = \begin{bmatrix} \langle z, v \rangle \\ tz + B_v \end{bmatrix},$$

and the components containing e_1 in their wedge product give us

$$(A.9) \quad \langle x, v \rangle (ty + A_v) \wedge (tz + B_v) - \langle y, v \rangle tx \wedge (tz + B_v) + \langle z, v \rangle tx \wedge (ty + A_v) = 0.$$

Let $t = 0$, we get $\langle x, v \rangle A_v \wedge B_v = 0$. Since $x \neq 0$ otherwise $H^1 = 0$, for generic hence all v , $A_v \wedge B_v = 0$. Thus A and B are proportional. By scrambling $\{H^2, H^3\}$, we may assume that $A = 0$. This will force x and y to be linearly independent because $\{H^1, H^2\}$ is so. Since the dimension of V is $n \geq 4$ by our assumption, the vanishing in the V' part of the wedge product of the three column vectors gives us

$$(A.10) \quad tx \wedge ty \wedge (tz + B_v) = 0.$$

So $x \wedge y \wedge z = 0$. Hence $z = cx + c'y$ for some constants c and c' as x and y are linearly independent. Replacing H^3 by $H^3 - cH^1 - c'H^2$, we may assume that $z = 0$. By (A.10), we

also have $x \wedge y \wedge B_v = 0$ for all v . Thus B must live in the plane spanned by x and y , that is,

$$B = \alpha x x^t + \beta(x y^t + y x^t) + \gamma y y^t$$

for some constants α, β, γ . Equation (A.9) now takes the form

$$(\langle x, v \rangle y - \langle y, v \rangle x) \wedge B_v = 0.$$

Combining the above two lines, we get $Q(v)x \wedge y = 0$, where

$$Q(v) = \alpha \langle x, v \rangle^2 + 2\beta \langle x, v \rangle \langle y, v \rangle + \gamma \langle y, v \rangle^2.$$

Since $B \neq 0$ as otherwise $H^3 = 0$, the three constants α, β, γ cannot be all zero, thus Q cannot be identically zero, a contradiction. This completes the proof of the case when $n > 3$.

Case 2: $n = 3$.

Without loss of generality, let us assume that H^1 has rank p , and p is the *smallest* for all H^w . Clearly p is either 1 or 2 here. First let us assume that $p = 1$. Write the three matrices as

$$H^1 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad H^2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & x^t \\ x & A \end{bmatrix}, \quad H^3 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & y^t \\ y & B \end{bmatrix},$$

where x, y are column vectors in \mathbb{C}^2 and A, B are 2×2 matrices. For $i = 2$ and 3, we have replaced H^i by $H^i - (H_{11}^i)H^1$ to ensure that their $(1, 1)$ -th entries are both zero. For column vector $u \in \mathbb{C}^3$ in the form $u = \begin{pmatrix} t \\ v \end{pmatrix}$, we have

$$H_u^1 = \begin{bmatrix} t \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad H_u^2 = \begin{bmatrix} \langle x, v \rangle \\ tx + A_v \end{bmatrix}, \quad H_u^3 = \begin{bmatrix} \langle y, v \rangle \\ ty + B_v \end{bmatrix}$$

The width-3 condition says that $(tx + A_v) \wedge (ty + B_v) = 0$ for any $t \in \mathbb{C}$ and any $v \in \mathbb{C}^2$. Thus

$$(A.11) \quad x \wedge y = 0, \quad A_v \wedge B_v = 0, \quad x \wedge B_v = y \wedge A_v.$$

By Lemma 3.4, A and B are proportional to each other. So after scrambling $\{H^2, H^3\}$ we may assume that $A = 0$. Thus $x \neq 0$, hence $y = cx$ for some constant c . So replace H^3 by $H^3 - cH^2$, we may assume $y = 0$. Hence $B \neq 0$.

Now by the third equation of (A.11) we get $x \wedge B_v = 0$ for any v , so $B = cx x^t$ for some constant c . Taking $0 \neq v_0 \in \mathbb{C}^2$ with $\langle x, v_0 \rangle = 0$, we know that v_0 lies in the common kernel of all three H^i , a contradiction.

Next let us assume that $p = 2$. Now we may take a basis of V so that the three matrices are in the form

$$H^1 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & I_2 \end{bmatrix}, \quad H^2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & {}^t x \\ x & A \end{bmatrix}, \quad H^3 = \begin{bmatrix} b & {}^t y \\ y & B \end{bmatrix}.$$

Here we scrambled $\{H^2, H^3\}$ to ensure that $H_{11}^2 = 0$. For $u \in \mathbb{C}^3$ in the form $u = \begin{pmatrix} t \\ v \end{pmatrix}$, we have

$$H_u^1 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ v \end{bmatrix}, \quad H_u^2 = \begin{bmatrix} \langle x, v \rangle \\ tx + A_v \end{bmatrix}, \quad H_u^3 = \begin{bmatrix} bt + \langle y, v \rangle \\ ty + B_v \end{bmatrix}.$$

We have

$$[\langle x, v \rangle (ty + B_v) - (bt + \langle y, v \rangle) (tx + A_v)] \wedge v = 0.$$

Hence

$$(A.12) \quad bx \wedge v = 0, \quad (\langle x, v \rangle B_v - \langle y, v \rangle A_v) \wedge v = 0, \quad (\langle x, v \rangle y - \langle y, v \rangle x + bA_v) \wedge v = 0.$$

If $b \neq 0$, then $x \wedge v = 0$ for all $v \in \mathbb{C}^2$ will force $x = 0$. In this case, the only non-trivial part of the matrix $H^2 - cH^1$ is the 2×2 block $A - cI_2$. When c equals to an eigenvalue of A , this

matrix has rank 1, contradicting with our assumption of the minimal rank $p = 2$. So we must have $b = 0$. The same argument shows that x, y cannot be zero, and they must be linearly independent for the same reason, as otherwise some H^w will have rank 1.

Let $V^0 \subset \mathbb{C}^2$ be the open dense subset consisting of v such that $\langle x, v \rangle$ and $\langle y, v \rangle$ are not both zero. From the third equation of (A.12), we know that for any $v \in V^0$ there will be a unique constant $c(v)$ such that

$$v = c(v)(\langle x, v \rangle y - \langle y, v \rangle x).$$

Taking the dot product with v , we get that $\langle v, v \rangle = 0$ for all $v \in V^0$, which is absurd. This completes the proof of Case 2 and Lemma 3.5. \square

APPENDIX B. PROOF OF LEMMA 3.8

In this section, we will prove Lemma 3.8. Throughout it, we will assume that $n \geq 4$ and $\mathcal{H} = \{H^1, \dots, H^r\}$ is a set of symmetric $n \times n$ matrices, satisfying the non-degeneracy condition and the width-4 condition. We will call such a \mathcal{H} simply as a *system*.

As before, we will write $H^w = \sum_{i=1}^r a_i H^i$ for $w = (a_1, \dots, a_r) \in W \cong \mathbb{C}^r$, and replace \mathcal{H} by another more convenient basis from time to time, and will call this a *scramble* of \mathcal{H} .

Definition B.1. The system \mathcal{H} is said to be *special*, if there exists a linearly independent set $\{w_1, w_2, w_3\}$ in W such that $\bigcap_{i=1}^3 \ker(H^{w_i})$ is $(n - 2)$ -dimensional.

In these terminologies, Lemma 3.8 simply says that, given a system \mathcal{H} , then $l := \text{rank}(\mathcal{H}) \leq 4$, and if $l = 4$ and $n \geq 5$, then the system \mathcal{H} is special. Equivalently, we can rephrase this as, (a) any special system \mathcal{H} has $l \leq 4$; (b) any non-special system must have $l \leq 4$, and $l = 4$ only when $n = 4$.

Lemma B.2. *Let \mathcal{H} be a special system, then $l \leq 4$.*

Proof. By a scramble if necessary, we may assume that H^1, \dots, H^l are linear independent and given by

$$H^1 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad H^2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad H^3 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad H^i = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & x_i^t \\ 0 & 0 & y_i^t \\ x_i & y_i & A^i \end{bmatrix}$$

with $4 \leq i \leq l$, where each x_i, y_i is a column vector in \mathbb{C}^{n-2} , and each A^i is an $(n-2) \times (n-2)$ symmetric matrix. The upper left 2×2 corner of H^i is zero because we can scramble by adding suitable combination of the first three matrices.

Assume on the contrary that $l \geq 5$. Then we may consider the set $\{H^1, H^2, H^4, H^5\}$. To avoid too much subscripts, let us write $x_4 = x, y_4 = y, A^4 = A$, while $x_5 = x', y_5 = y', A^5 = B$. For column vector u in the form $u^t = (t, s, v^t)$, the vectors H_u^i for $i \in \{1, 2, 4, 5\}$ are

$$\begin{bmatrix} t \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ s \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \begin{bmatrix} \langle x, v \rangle \\ \langle y, v \rangle \\ tx + sy + A_v \end{bmatrix}, \quad \begin{bmatrix} \langle x', v \rangle \\ \langle y', v \rangle \\ tx' + sy' + B_v \end{bmatrix}.$$

The vanishing of their wedge product leads to

$$ts(tx + sy + A_v) \wedge (tx' + sy' + B_v) = 0$$

for any $t, s \in \mathbb{C}$ and any $v \in \mathbb{C}^{n-2}$. Thus

$$(B.1) \quad \begin{cases} x \wedge x' = y \wedge y' = x \wedge y' + y \wedge x' = 0, \\ x \wedge B_v - x' \wedge A_v = y \wedge B_v - y' \wedge A_v = 0, \\ A_v \wedge B_v = 0. \end{cases}$$

The last equation in (B.1) implies that A and B are proportional, so by a scramble we may assume that $A = 0$. Thus x and y cannot be both zero. Without loss of generality, let us assume that $x \neq 0$. We will fix this H^4 now.

By $x \wedge x' = 0$, we know that $x' = cx$ for some constant c . Replace H^5 by $H^5 - cH^4$, we may assume that $x' = 0$. Now the rest of the equations in (B.1) take the form

$$y \wedge y' = x \wedge y' = 0, \quad x \wedge B_v = y \wedge B_v = 0.$$

Therefore $y' = \lambda x$ and $B = \mu x^t x$ for some constants λ and μ . Since $x' = 0$, we know that y' and B cannot be both zero, and the non-vanishing of either of them will lead to $y \wedge x = 0$.

Since $n \geq 4$, we may take $0 \neq v_0 \in \mathbb{C}^{n-2}$ so that $\langle x, v_0 \rangle = 0$. This v_0 will lie in the kernel of H^4 as well as the kernel of H^5 . Clearly it also lies in the kernel of H^i for any $i > 5$. This violates the non-degeneracy condition, so $l \geq 5$ is impossible. \square

Now let us focus on the non-special systems. Again to streamline writings, let us first consider a simpler case, where there is some H^w with rank one.

Lemma B.3. *Let \mathcal{H} be a non-special system that contains a rank one matrix, then $l \leq 4$ and $l = 4$ only when $n = 4$.*

Proof. Assume on the contrary that $l \geq 5$. Without loss of generality, let us assume our l matrices are given as

$$H^1 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & & \\ & 0_{n-1} & \end{bmatrix}, \quad H^i = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & {}^t x_i \\ x_i & A^i \end{bmatrix}, \quad 2 \leq i \leq l,$$

where each x_i is a column vector in \mathbb{C}^{n-1} and each A^i a symmetric $(n-1) \times (n-1)$ matrix. Still with the column vector $u = \begin{pmatrix} t \\ v \end{pmatrix}$ and $v \in \mathbb{C}^{n-1}$, the column vectors H_u^i now take the form

$$H_u^1 = \begin{bmatrix} t \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad H_u^i = \begin{bmatrix} \langle x_i, v \rangle \\ tx_i + A_v^i \end{bmatrix}.$$

We will take four matrices, $\{H^1, H^i, H^j, H^k\}$, where $2 \leq i < j < k \leq l$. The width-4 conditions now gives

$$(B.2) \quad (tx_i + A_v^i) \wedge (tx_j + A_v^j) \wedge (tx_k + A_v^k) = 0,$$

In particular, $x_i \wedge x_j \wedge x_k = 0$, so the space V_x spanned by $\{x_2, \dots, x_l\}$ has dimension $p \leq 2$. Note that the case $p = 0$ cannot occur, as in this case all $x_i = 0$, thus $\{A^2, \dots, A^l\}$ is linearly independent, satisfies the non-degeneracy condition, and also satisfies the width-3 condition as by (B.2) we have $A_v^i \wedge A_v^j \wedge A_v^k = 0$ for any v . This will make the system \mathcal{H} to be special due to Lemma 3.5. We are left with two possibilities: $p = 1$ or $p = 2$.

Case 1: $p = 1$.

We show that in this case $l \leq 3$.

By a scramble we may assume that $x_2 \neq 0$, and $x_3 = \cdots = x_l = 0$. If $l \geq 5$, then by $A_v^3 \wedge A_v^4 \wedge A_v^5 = 0$ we know that \mathcal{H} is special due to Lemma 3.5, a contradiction. So we must have $l \leq 4$.

If $l = 4$. Then $\{A^3, A^4\}$ is linearly independent, and the equation (B.2) becomes

$$(B.3) \quad A_v^2 \wedge A_v^3 \wedge A_v^4 = 0, \quad x_2 \wedge A_v^3 \wedge A_v^4 = 0.$$

If $\{A^2, A^3, A^4\}$ is linearly independent, then by the first equation in (B.3) and Lemma 3.5 we know that \mathcal{H} is special, a contradiction. So $\{A^2, A^3, A^4\}$ is linearly dependent. The second equation in (B.3) implies that x_2 belongs to that plane. So A^2 must be a linear combination of A^3 and A^4 . By a scramble, we may assume that $A^2 = 0$. The second equation in (B.3) implies that $(x_2 x_2^t)_v \wedge A_v^3 \wedge A_v^4 = 0$. So again $\{x_2 x_2^t, A^3, A^4\}$ is linearly dependent, meaning that a linear combination of A^3 and A^4 is equal to $x_2 x_2^t$. By a scramble, we may assume that $A^3 = x_2 x_2^t$. Then $\{H^1, H^2, H^3\}$ makes \mathcal{H} special, a contradiction to our assumption. So l cannot be 4.

Case 2: $p = 2$.

We may assume that $x_2 \wedge x_3 \neq 0$ and $x_4 = \cdots = x_l = 0$. By (B.2), we get $x_2 \wedge x_3 \wedge A_v^4 = 0$ for any v . This means that

$$A^4 = a x_2 x_2^t + b(x_2 x_3^t + x_3 x_2^t) + c x_3 x_3^t$$

for some constants a, b, c . For simplicity, we will denote this by $R(A^4) \subset \text{sp}\{x_2, x_3\}$, and say that the ‘range’ of A^4 is contained in the plane spanned by x_2 and x_3 . Note that this can be made precise under appropriate frames, and this loose description will not affect the correctness of the argument. If $l \geq 5$. Then $\{A^4, A^5\}$ is linearly independent, we have $R(A^4) \subset P$ and $R(A^5) \subset P$ where $P = \text{sp}\{x_2, x_3\}$. By considering the wedge product equation for $\{H^1, H^2, H^4, H^5\}$, we get $A_v^2 \wedge A_v^4 \wedge A_v^5 = 0$. If $\{A^2, A^4, A^5\}$ is linearly independent, then they form 2×2 system, hence $R(A^2) \subset P$. If $\{A^2, A^4, A^5\}$ is linearly dependent, then A^2 must be a linear combination of A^4 and A^5 as the latter two are independent. So again we will have $R(A^2) \subset P$. Similarly, $R(A^3) \subset P$, and of course $R(A^i) \subset P$ for $i > 5$ if any. This means that \mathcal{H} forms a 3×3 system, contradicting with the non-degeneracy condition. Hence we must have $l \leq 4$.

If $l = 4$. By (B.2) we also have $A_v^2 \wedge A_v^3 \wedge A_v^4 = 0$. If $\{A^2, A^3, A^4\}$ is linearly dependent, then after a scramble we may assume that $A^2 = 0$. Equation (B.2) gives us

$$x_2 \wedge x_3 \wedge A_v^4 = 0, \quad x_2 \wedge A_v^3 \wedge A_v^4 = 0.$$

The first one says that $R(A^4) \subset P := \text{sp}\{x_2, x_3\}$. If A^4 is not a multiple of $x_2 x_2^t$, then the second equation implies that for generic, hence all v , we have $x_2 \wedge x_3 \wedge A_v^3 = 0$, so $R(A^3) \subset P$, thus \mathcal{H} forms a 3×3 system, a contradiction. On the other hand, if A^4 is a constant multiple of $x_2 x_2^t$, then $\{H^1, H^2, H^4\}$ form a 2×2 system so \mathcal{H} is special, a contradiction.

Therefore $\{A^2, A^3, A^4\}$ must be linearly independent. Then the vanishing of their wedge product implies that they form a 2×2 system. If A^4 has rank 2 here, then $R(A^2)$ and $R(A^3)$ are contained in the plane $R(A^4)$ which is P , so \mathcal{H} will form a 3×3 system, a contradiction. So A^4 must have rank one. By scrambling H^2 and H^3 if necessary, we may assume that $A^4 = x_2 x_2^t$. In this case, P is spanned by x_2 and another vector $x_4 \in \mathbb{C}^{n-1}$, where $x_2 \wedge x_3 \wedge x_4 \neq 0$, and the non-degeneracy condition forces n to be 4 here. Under the basis $\{e_1, x_2, x_4, x_3\}$, it is a

straightforward computation that $\{H^1, H^4, H^2, H^3\}$ is in of the following two ‘normal’ forms:

$$(B.4) \quad \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} 1 & & & \\ & 0 & & \\ & & 0 & \\ & & & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 0 & & & \\ & 1 & & \\ & & 0 & \\ & & & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & \\ & & & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} & & & 1 \\ & & 1 & \\ & 1 & & \\ 1 & & & \end{bmatrix} \right\};$$

or

$$(B.5) \quad \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} 1 & & & \\ & 0 & & \\ & & 0 & \\ & & & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 0 & & & \\ & 1 & & \\ & & 0 & \\ & & & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & \\ & & & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} & & & 1 \\ & 0 & 0 & \\ & 0 & 1 & \\ 1 & & & \end{bmatrix} \right\}.$$

In particular, $l = 4$ would imply that $n = 4$. This completes the proof of the lemma. \square

After these two lemmas, now we may assume that the system \mathcal{H} is not special and does not contain any rank one matrix. We want to show that $l \leq 4$, and $l = 4$ only if $n = 4$. We start with the first part.

Lemma B.4. *Let \mathcal{H} be a non-special system without any rank one matrix. Then $l \leq 4$.*

Proof. Assume the contrary, namely, $l \geq 5$. Let $n \geq 4$ be the smallest dimension so that such a system exists.

Claim: *Some linear combination in \mathcal{H} has rank 2.*

Proof. If $n = 4$, the set of all symmetric 4×4 matrices is $S^2\mathbb{C}^4 \cong \mathbb{C}^{10}$. Denote by Σ the subset of matrices with rank at most 2, then it is easy to see that Σ has dimension 7. So $\mathbb{P}(\Sigma)$ is a 6-dimensional subvariety in \mathbb{P}^9 , thus any \mathbb{P}^3 in $\mathbb{P}(S^2\mathbb{C}^4) \cong \mathbb{P}^9$ will intersect $\mathbb{P}(\Sigma)$. That is, for any linearly independent set of 4 or more symmetric 4×4 matrices, some combination will have rank equal to 2 or less.

If $n \geq 5$, we may take a generic hyperplane V' in $V \cong \mathbb{C}^n$, and restrict the system onto V' . By Lemma A.1, the restriction system will again satisfy the non-degeneracy condition. So by the ‘minimality’ of n , the restricted system can no longer be linearly independent, thus a linear combination H^w will have zero restriction on V' , which implies that H^w has rank at most 2, and the claim is proved. \square

By a scrambling if necessary, we may assume that H^1 has rank 2, and the system \mathcal{H} is given by

$$(B.6) \quad H^1 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & & & \\ & 1 & & \\ & & & \\ & & & 0_{n-2} \end{bmatrix}, \quad H^i = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & b_i & {}^t x_i \\ b_i & c_i & {}^t y_i \\ x_i & y_i & A^i \end{bmatrix}, \quad 2 \leq i \leq l,$$

where x_i, y_i are column vectors and A^i are symmetric $(n-2) \times (n-2)$ matrices. The $(1, 1)$ -th position of H^i is zero because we may subtract a suitable multiple of H^1 from it. For column vector u in the form $u = (t, s, v^t)^t$ where the column vector $v \in \mathbb{C}^{n-2}$, we have

$$(B.7) \quad H_u^1 = \begin{bmatrix} t \\ s \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad H_u^i = \begin{bmatrix} b_i s + \langle x_i, v \rangle \\ b_i t + c_i s + \langle y_i, v \rangle \\ t x_i + s y_i + A_v^i \end{bmatrix}, \quad 2 \leq i \leq l.$$

For any $2 \leq i < j < k \leq l$, the vanishing of wedge product $H_u^1 \wedge H_u^i \wedge H_u^j \wedge H_u^k$ first of all gives

$$(tx_i + sy_i + A_v^i) \wedge (tx_j + sy_j + A_v^j) \wedge (tx_k + sy_k + A_v^k) = 0,$$

or equivalently

$$\begin{aligned} (B.8) \quad & x_i \wedge x_j \wedge x_k = y_i \wedge y_j \wedge y_k = 0, \\ & A_v^i \wedge A_v^j \wedge A_v^k = 0, \\ & \mathfrak{S}\{x_i \wedge x_j \wedge y_k\} = \mathfrak{S}\{x_i \wedge y_j \wedge y_k\} = 0, \\ & \mathfrak{S}\{x_i \wedge x_j \wedge A_v^k\} = \mathfrak{S}\{y_i \wedge y_j \wedge A_v^k\} = \mathfrak{S}\{(x_i \wedge y_j + y_i \wedge x_j) \wedge A_v^k\} = 0, \\ & \mathfrak{S}\{x_i \wedge A_v^j \wedge A_v^k\} = \mathfrak{S}\{y_i \wedge A_v^j \wedge A_v^k\} = 0, \end{aligned}$$

where \mathfrak{S} means the cyclic sum, namely when (ijk) are cyclicly permuted. By looking at the terms in $H_u^1 \wedge H_u^i \wedge H_u^j \wedge H_u^k$ involving $e_1 \wedge e_2$, we get

$$\mathfrak{S}\{Q_i(t, s)(tx_j + sy_j + A_v^j) \wedge (tx_k + sy_k + A_v^k)\} = 0.$$

where

$$Q_i(t, s) = b_i(t^2 - s^2) + c_i t s + \langle y_i, v \rangle t - \langle x_i, v \rangle s.$$

This is a degree 4 polynomial in t and s , and by looking at the coefficients, we get a bunch of equations. The degree 1 terms give

$$(B.9) \quad \mathfrak{S}\{\langle y_i, v \rangle A_v^j \wedge A_v^k\} = \mathfrak{S}\{\langle x_i, v \rangle A_v^j \wedge A_v^k\} = 0.$$

The degree 2 terms give

$$\begin{aligned} (B.10) \quad & \mathfrak{S}\{b_i A_v^j \wedge A_v^k + \langle y_i, v \rangle (x_j \wedge A_v^k - x_k \wedge A_v^j)\} = 0, \\ & \mathfrak{S}\{-b_i A_v^j \wedge A_v^k - \langle x_i, v \rangle (y_j \wedge A_v^k - y_k \wedge A_v^j)\} = 0, \\ & \mathfrak{S}\{c_i A_v^j \wedge A_v^k - \langle x_i, v \rangle (x_j \wedge A_v^k - x_k \wedge A_v^j) + \langle y_i, v \rangle (y_j \wedge A_v^k - y_k \wedge A_v^j)\} = 0. \end{aligned}$$

The degree 3 terms give

$$\begin{aligned} (B.11) \quad & \mathfrak{S}\{b_i(x_j A_v^k - x_k A_v^j) + \langle y_i, v \rangle x_j x_k\} = 0, \\ & \mathfrak{S}\{-b_i(y_j A_v^k - y_k A_v^j) - \langle x_i, v \rangle y_j y_k\} = 0, \\ & \mathfrak{S}\{b_i(y_j A_v^k - y_k A_v^j) + c_i(x_j A_v^k - x_k A_v^j) + \langle y_i, v \rangle (x_j y_k + y_j x_k) - \langle x_i, v \rangle x_j x_k\} = 0, \\ & \mathfrak{S}\{c_i(y_j A_v^k - y_k A_v^j) - b_i(x_j A_v^k - x_k A_v^j) - \langle x_i, v \rangle (x_j y_k + y_j x_k) + \langle y_i, v \rangle y_j y_k\} = 0, \end{aligned}$$

and finally, the degree 4 terms give

$$\begin{aligned} (B.12) \quad & \mathfrak{S}\{b_i x_j x_k\} = \mathfrak{S}\{b_i y_j y_k\} = \mathfrak{S}\{c_i(x_j y_k + y_j x_k)\} = 0, \\ & \mathfrak{S}\{b_i(x_j y_k + y_j x_k) + c_i x_j x_k\} = 0, \\ & \mathfrak{S}\{b_i(x_j y_k + y_j x_k) - c_i y_j y_k\} = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Let V_x, V_y be respectively the space spanned by $\{x_2, \dots, x_l\}$ or $\{y_2, \dots, y_l\}$, and denote by p_x, p_y their dimensions. Then we have $p_x, p_y \leq 2$ due to the first equation in (B.8). Without loss of generality, let us assume that $p_x \geq p_y$.

Claim: $p_x = 2$.

Proof. If $p_x = 0$, then $p_y = 0$, all the $x_i = y_i = 0$. There are at least four A^i satisfying the width-3 condition by (B.8). So they cannot be all linearly independent, otherwise by Lemma 3.5 \mathcal{H} is special and contradicts to the assumption in Lemma B.4. So we may, by a scrambling

if necessary, *assume that* $A^2 = 0$. In this case H^2 has only the upper left 2×2 corner, so $H^2 - \lambda H^1$ for suitable λ will have rank one, a contradiction. So we must have $p_x \geq 1$.

If $p_x = 1$, then we may assume that $x_2 \neq 0$ and $x_3 = \dots = x_l = 0$. By (B.9), we get $\langle x_2, v \rangle A_v^j \wedge A_v^k = 0$ for any v and any $2 < j < k$. Since $x_2 \neq 0$, $\langle x_2, v \rangle \neq 0$ for generic v , so for generic v hence all v we have $A_v^j \wedge A_v^k = 0$. Thus A^3, \dots, A^l are proportional to each other. With a scramble, we may assume that $A^4 = \dots = A^l = 0$. Now since $p_y \leq 1$, y_4 and y_5 are proportional, so by a scramble of $\{H^4, H^5\}$, we may assume that $y_4 = 0$. Now H^4 has only the upper left 2×2 corner, by subtracting a multiple of H^1 , it will have rank 1, a contradiction. This completes the proof of the claim. \square

So we have $p_x = 2$. Let us assume that $x_2 \wedge x_3 \neq 0$, and $x_4 = \dots = x_l = 0$. By the first equation of (B.12) applied to the cyclic permutation (23i) with $i \geq 4$, we get $b_i x_2 \wedge x_3 = 0$, hence

$$(B.13) \quad b_4 = \dots = b_l = 0.$$

By (B.9), we have $\langle x_2, v \rangle A_v^4 \wedge A_v^5 = 0$, hence $A_v^4 \wedge A_v^5 = 0$ for all v so A^4, A^5 are proportional. Similarly, *all* A^4, \dots, A^l are mutually proportional. Also, by the third equation in (B.8) and the fact $x_4 = 0$, we have $x_2 \wedge x_3 \wedge y_4 = 0$, so $y_4 \in P_x = \text{sp}\{x_2, x_3\}$. Similarly, $y_i \in P_x$ for any $i \geq 4$.

If $y_4 = y_5 = 0$, then a linear combination of H^4 and H^5 will have its lower right corner vanishes, thus with only its upper left 2×2 corner possibly non-zero. By subtracting a multiple of H^1 from it, we get a rank 1 matrix, a contradiction.

If $y_4 \wedge y_5 \neq 0$, then $P_y = \text{sp}\{y_4, y_5\} = P_x$. By the fourth equation in (B.8) and by our assumption that $p_y \leq p_x = 2$, $y_4 \wedge y_5 \wedge A_v^i = 0$ for any $i \neq 4, 5$. So $R(A^i) \subseteq P_y$. Similarly, $x_2 \wedge x_3 \wedge A_v^j = 0$ for any $j \neq 2, 3$, so $R(A^j) \subseteq P_x$. Therefore, all x_i, y_i and all A^i have range in $P = P_x = P_y$, so \mathcal{H} forms a 3×3 system, a contradiction.

We are left with the case when y_4 and y_5 are not both zero but $y_4 \wedge y_5 = 0$. Without loss of generality, let us assume that $y_4 \neq 0$ and $y_5 = 0$. Since $b_5 = 0$, $x_5 = y_5 = 0$, the second line of (B.12) applied to $(ijk) = (235)$ gives us $c_5 x_2 \wedge x_3 = 0$. Hence $c_5 = 0$. Also, since $A_v^4 \wedge A_v^5 = 0$, by the first line of (B.10) applied to (245), we get $\langle y_4, v \rangle x_2 \wedge A_v^5 = 0$ for all v . Hence $x_2 \wedge A_v^5 = 0$ for all v , and A^5 is proportional to $x_2 x_2^t$. Now $b_5 = c_5 = 0$, $x_5 = y_5 = 0$, so H^5 has rank 1, a contradiction. This completes the proof of the lemma. \square

Lemma B.5. *Let \mathcal{H} be a non-special system without any rank one matrix and $l = 4$. Then $n = 4$.*

Proof. Assume that the conclusion fails, namely, there exists a non-special system $\mathcal{H} = \{H^1, \dots, H^4\}$ without rank one element such that $n > 4$. We want to derive a contradiction, and the proof will be analogous to that of Lemma B.4, except that we need a lot more argument since we don't have H^5 to help us now.

We may assume that $n \geq 5$ is the *smallest* dimension where such a system exists. If $n > 5$, then by restricting the system onto a generic hyperplane of $V = \mathbb{C}^n$ and applying Lemma A.1, we know that there will be some H^w in the system with rank 2. When $n = 5$ this trick can no longer be used, and *we will discuss this case separately in Appendix C*, to rule out the possibility of a system of 4 symmetric 5×5 matrices where no H^w can be of rank 2 or lower. So *from now on we will assume that $n \geq 5$ and H^1 has rank 2.*

We assume that the system is given by (B.6), with column vectors given by (B.7). The width-4 condition gives us equations (B.8) through (B.12). Let P_x, P_y and p_x, p_y be as before, and assume that $p_x \geq p_y$. Again we have $p_x \leq 2$.

If $p_x = p_y = 0$, then we notice that $\{A^2, A^3, A^4\}$ must be linearly independent, as otherwise we may assume by a scramble that $A^2 = 0$ hence H^2 will only have its upper left 2×2 corner, and some $H^2 - cH^1$ will be rank 1, a contradiction. By (B.8), $A_v^2 \wedge A_v^3 \wedge A_v^4 = 0$ for any v , thus $\{A^2, A^3, A^4\}$ forms a 2×2 system, hence \mathcal{H} forms a 4×4 system, a contradiction. So we must have $p_x = 1$ or $p_x = 2$.

Case 1: $p_x = 1$.

Assume $x_2 \neq 0$ and $x_3 = x_4 = 0$. Since $p_y \leq 1$, we may assume that $y_4 = 0$ while $y_2 \wedge y_3 = 0$. We will further divide the discussion into two subcases: (a) $y_3 \neq 0$, and (b) $y_3 = 0$.

Subcase 1a: $y_3 \neq 0$.

In this case, by a scramble we may assume that $y_2 = 0$. Since $x_4 = y_4 = 0$, the matrix A^4 cannot be zero, as otherwise some $H^4 - cH^1$ will have rank one. By (B.9), we get

$$\langle y_3, v \rangle A_v^2 \wedge A_v^4 = 0, \quad \langle x_2, v \rangle A_v^3 \wedge A_v^4 = 0.$$

So A^2, A^3 are proportional to A^4 . Subtract multiples of H^4 from H^2 and H^3 , we may assume that $A^2 = A^3 = 0$. Now by (B.10), we get $\langle y_3, v \rangle x_2 \wedge A_v^4 = 0$, which implies that $x_2 \wedge A_v$ for generic hence all v , so A^4 is a multiple of $x_2 \wedge x_2$. Regardless of whether y_3 is parallel to x_2 or not, the system \mathcal{H} has dimension at most 3, a contradiction.

Subcase 1b: $y_3 = 0$.

In this case we have $x_3 = x_4 = y_3 = y_4 = 0$, so $\{A^3, A^4\}$ is linearly independent, as otherwise a linear combination of H^1, H^3 and H^4 would have rank 1. On the other hand, by (B.9) we have $\langle x_2, v \rangle A_v^3 \wedge A_v^4 = 0$. So for generic hence all v , $A_v^3 \wedge A_v^4 = 0$, which will force $\{A^3, A^4\}$ to be linearly dependent, a contradiction. This completes the proof of Case 1.

Case 2: $p_x = 2$.

Let us assume that $x_2 \wedge x_3 \neq 0$ and $x_4 = 0$. By (B.8), we get $x_2 x_3 y_4 = 0$, so $y_4 \in P_x$, and $x_2 x_3 A_v^4 = 0$, so $R(A^4) \subset P_x$. On the other hand, by (B.12) and (B.11), we get $b_4 x_2 \wedge x_3 = 0$ so $b_4 = 0$, and

$$(B.14) \quad c_4 x_2 x_3 + (b_2 x_3 - b_3 x_2) y_4 = 0, \quad \langle y_4, v \rangle x_2 x_3 + (b_2 x_3 - b_3 x_2) A_v^4 = 0.$$

If $y_4 = 0$, then $c_4 = 0$, and $(b_2 x_3 - b_3 x_2) A_v^4 = 0$. Since both $b_4 = c_4 = 0$, we know that A^4 must have rank at least two since H^4 does, so the vector $b_2 x_3 - b_3 x_2 = 0$, which implies that $b_2 = b_3 = 0$. The third line of (B.11) now gives $(c_2 x_3 - c_3 x_2) A_v^4 = 0$, so $c_2 x_3 - c_3 x_2 = 0$, thus $c_2 = c_3 = 0$. Note that all b_i and $c_i = 0$, we have $H_u^2 \wedge H_u^3 \wedge H_u^4 = 0$, so \mathcal{H} is special, a contradiction.

Therefore we must have $y_4 \neq 0$. Let us divide the discussion into three subcases: (a) $p_y = 1$, (b) $p_y = 2$ and $P_y = P_x$, and (c) $p_y = 2$ but $P_y \neq P_x$.

Subcase 2a: $p_y = 1$.

Since $y_4 \neq 0$, by a scramble we may assume that $y_2 = y_3 = 0$, and $y_4 = x_2$. In this case, by (B.12), we get $b_2 = c_2 = c_4 = 0$, so only b_3, c_3 are possibly non-zero. The four equations of (B.11) now give us

$$b_3 x_2 A_v^4 = \langle x_2, v \rangle x_2 x_3, \quad b_3 x_2 A_v^2 = 0, \quad b_3 x_2 A_v^2 = c_3 x_2 A_v^4, \quad c_3 x_2 A_v^2 + b_3 x_2 A_v^4 + \langle x_2, v \rangle x_2 x_3 = 0.$$

Plug the first two into the last two, we get

$$c_3 x_2 A_v^4 = 0, \quad c_3 x_2 A_v^2 = -2 \langle x_2, v \rangle x_2 x_3.$$

Since $x_2 \neq 0$, the second equation in the above line tells us that $c_3 \neq 0$, so the first equation in this line implies that $x_2 A_v^4 = 0$ for all v . Plug this into the first equation involving b_3 , we get $0 = \langle x_2, v \rangle x_2 x_3$, which means $0 = \langle x_2, v \rangle$ for all v , a contradiction.

Subcase 2b: $y_4 \neq 0$ and $P_y = P_x$.

By a scramble, we may assume that $y_2 = 0$. In this case, $\{x_2, x_3\}$ and $\{y_3, y_4\}$ are two basis of $P = P_x = P_y$. By (B.8), we get $x_2 x_3 A_v^4 = 0$, $y_3 y_4 A_v^2 = 0$, so $R(A^4) \subset P$ and $R(A^2) \subset P$. To finish the proof in this case, it suffices to show $R(A^3) \subset P$, as it implies that \mathcal{H} forms a 4×4 system. To show this, let us first assume that $\{A^2, A^4\}$ is linearly independent. If $\{A^2, A^3, A^4\}$ is linearly dependent, then A^3 must be a linear combination of A^2 and A^4 , thus $R(A^3) \subset P$. On the other hand, if $\{A^2, A^3, A^4\}$ is linearly independent, then since we have $A_v^2 A_v^3 A_v^4 = 0$ by (B.8), these three A^i form a 2×2 system, so $R(A^2) + R(A^4) = P$ which contains $R(A^3)$.

Now let us assume that $\{A^2, A^4\}$ is linearly dependent. By (B.12), we have $b_4 x_2 x_3 = 0$ and $b_2 y_3 y_4 = 0$. So $b_2 = b_4 = 0$. By the first equation of (B.10), we have

$$b_3 A_v^2 A_v^4 - \langle y_3, v \rangle x_2 A_v^4 + \langle y_4, v \rangle (x_2 A_v^3 - x_3 A_v^2) = 0.$$

The first term is zero since $\{A^2, A^4\}$ is linearly dependent. Wedge with x_3 , we get

$$\langle y_4, v \rangle x_2 x_3 A_v^3 = 0.$$

So $x_2 x_3 A_v^3 = 0$ for generic thus all v . This means that $R(A^3) \subset P$ and we are done.

Subcase 2c: $y_4 \neq 0$ and $P_y \neq P_x$.

Again by a scramble we may assume that $y_2 = 0$. We have $x_2 x_3 y_4 = 0$ by (B.8), so $y_4 \in P_x \cap P_y$. Similarly, $x_2 \in P_x \cap P_y$ as well. Scale H^4 , we may assume that $x_2 = y_4 = z$. It lies in $P_x \cap P_y$, and $\{x_3, y_3, z\}$ forms a basis of the space $P = P_x + P_y$.

From (B.12), we get $b_2 = b_4 = c_2 = c_4 = 0$. By (B.11), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} z \wedge \{b_3 A_v^4 - \langle z, v \rangle x_3\} &= z \wedge \{b_3 A_v^2 - \langle z, v \rangle y_3\} = 0, \\ z \wedge \{b_3 A_v^2 - c_3 A_v^4 + \langle z, v \rangle y_3\} &= z \wedge \{c_3 A_v^2 + b_3 A_v^4 + \langle z, v \rangle x_3\} = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Plug the second one in the first line into the first one on the second line, we get

$$z \wedge \{-c_3 A_v^4 + 2 \langle z, v \rangle y_3\} = 0.$$

Taking the wedge product of the last equation with x_3 , we get

$$c_3 x_3 z A_v^4 = 2 \langle z, v \rangle x_2 z y_3.$$

By (B.8), we have $x_2 x_3 A_v^4 = 0$, while $x_3 z y_3 \neq 0$ by our assumption, so we get $\langle z, v \rangle = 0$ for all v , which is absurd. This completes the proof of the case, thus the lemma. \square

APPENDIX C. 5×5 SYSTEM WITHOUT RANK 2 ELEMENTS

In this appendix, we will show that for any system $\mathcal{H} = \{H^1, \dots, H^4\}$ of symmetric 5×5 matrices, there always exists some H^w with rank 2 or less, and complete the proof of Lemma 3.8.

Proof. Let r be the smallest rank of any H^w in the system. Assume the contrary, namely, $r \geq 3$. We want to derive a contradiction. Clearly, $r \leq 4$.

Case 1: The minimum rank of H^w is 4.

By a scramble, we may assume that

$$H^1 = \begin{bmatrix} I_4 & \\ & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad H^i = \begin{bmatrix} A^i & x_i \\ x_i^t & a_i \end{bmatrix}, \quad 2 \leq i \leq 4,$$

where each x_i is a column vector in \mathbb{C}^4 and each A^i a symmetric 4×4 matrix. For column vector u such that $u = (v^t, t)^t$ where $v \in \mathbb{C}^4$ and $t \in \mathbb{C}$, we have

$$H_u^1 = \begin{bmatrix} u \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad H_u^i = \begin{bmatrix} A_v^i + tx_i \\ \langle x_i, v \rangle + ta_i \end{bmatrix}, \quad 2 \leq i \leq 4.$$

The terms containing e_5 in $H_u^1 \wedge H_u^2 \wedge H_u^3 \wedge H_u^4 = 0$ gives us

$$v \wedge \mathfrak{S}\{(\langle x_i, v \rangle + ta_i)(A_v^j + tx_j) \wedge (A_v^k + tx_k)\} = 0,$$

where the cycle (ijk) runs through all cyclic permutations of (234) . This is a cubic polynomial in t , and the t^3 terms give us

$$(C.1) \quad v \wedge \mathfrak{S}\{a_i x_j \wedge x_k\} = 0.$$

By a scramble, we may assume that $a_3 = a_4 = 0$. So the last equation takes the form $v \wedge a_2 x_3 \wedge x_4 = 0$ for all v . Hence $a_2 x_3 \wedge x_4 = 0$. If $a_2 \neq 0$, then $x_3 \wedge x_4 = 0$. By a scramble of $\{H^3, H^4\}$, we may assume that $x_4 = 0$. Now H^4 has only the upper left block A^4 , and $H^4 - cH^1$ for a suitable constant c would have rank less than 4, a contradiction. So we may assume that $a_2 = 0$.

In this case, notice that in $H_u^1 \wedge H_u^2 \wedge H_u^3 \wedge H_u^4 = 0$, the terms without e_5 also gives us $v \wedge x_2 \wedge x_3 \wedge x_4 = 0$, which implies that $x_2 \wedge x_3 \wedge x_4 = 0$. So by a scramble we may assume that $x_4 = 0$ once again, which leads to a contradiction as before. So we know that this case does not occur.

Case 2: The minimum rank of H^w is 3.

Assume that

$$H^1 = \begin{bmatrix} I_3 & & \\ & 0 & \\ & & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad H^i = \begin{bmatrix} A^i & x_i & y_i \\ x_i^t & a_i & b_i \\ y_i^t & b_i & c_i \end{bmatrix}, \quad 2 \leq i \leq 4,$$

where each x_i, y_i is a column vector in \mathbb{C}^3 and each A^i a symmetric 3×3 matrix. For column vector u such that $u = (v^t, t, s)^t$ where $v \in \mathbb{C}^3$ and $t, s \in \mathbb{C}$, we have

$$H_u^1 = \begin{bmatrix} v \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad H_u^i = \begin{bmatrix} A_v^i + tx_i + sy_i \\ \langle x_i, v \rangle + ta_i + sb_i \\ \langle y_i, v \rangle + tb_i + sc_i \end{bmatrix}, \quad 2 \leq i \leq 4.$$

The terms containing $e_4 \wedge e_5$ in $H_u^1 \wedge \dots \wedge H_u^4 = 0$ are

$$(C.2) \quad v \wedge \mathfrak{S}\{Q_{ij}(tx_k + sy_k + A_v^k)\} = 0,$$

where the sum is for (ijk) to take all cyclic permutations of (234), and

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{ij} &= (\langle x_i, v \rangle + ta_i + sb_i)(\langle y_j, v \rangle + tb_j + sc_j) - (\langle x_j, v \rangle + ta_j + sb_j)(\langle y_i, v \rangle + tb_i + sc_i) \\ &= t^2(a_i b_j - b_i a_j) + s^2(b_i c_j - c_i b_j) + ts(a_i c_j - c_i a_j) + (\langle x_i, v \rangle \langle y_j, v \rangle - \langle y_i, v \rangle \langle x_j, v \rangle) \\ &\quad + t(a_i \langle y_j, v \rangle + b_j \langle x_i, v \rangle - a_j \langle y_i, v \rangle - b_i \langle x_j, v \rangle) \\ &\quad + s(b_i \langle y_j, v \rangle + c_j \langle x_i, v \rangle - b_j \langle y_i, v \rangle - c_i \langle x_j, v \rangle) \end{aligned}$$

For $2 \leq i \leq 4$, let us write

$$B^i = \begin{bmatrix} a_i & b_i \\ b_i & c_i \end{bmatrix}.$$

We will divide the discussions into three subcases, depending the behavior of those B^i .

Subcase 2a. $\{B^2, B^3, B^4\}$ is linearly independent.

With a scramble, we may assume that the matrices $\{B^2, B^3, B^4\}$ are given by

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix},$$

respectively. In other words, we have $a_2 = b_3 = c_4 = 0$ and all other a_i, b_i, c_i are zero. By the cubic terms (in t and s) in (C.2), we get

$$y_2 = x_4 = 0, \quad y_3 = x_2, \quad y_4 = x_3.$$

Now by the s^2 term in (C.2), we get

$$v \wedge \{A_v^2 - \langle x_2, v \rangle y_3\} = 0.$$

Since $y_3 = x_2$, the above equation says that $I_v \wedge (A^2 - x_2 x_2^t)_v = 0$ for any $v \in \mathbb{C}^3$, thus $A^2 - x_2 x_2^t = c I_3$ for some constant c . This means that

$$H^2 - cH^1 = \begin{bmatrix} x_2 x_2^t & x_2 & 0 \\ x_2^t & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} x_2 \\ 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \cdot [x_2^t, 1, 0],$$

which has rank 1, a contradiction.

Subcase 2b: $\{B^2, B^3, B^4\}$ is linearly dependent but not all zero.

By a scramble, we may assume that $B^4 = 0$. The cubic terms in (C.2) now gives

$$v \wedge \gamma x_4 = v \wedge \alpha y_4 = v \wedge (\beta x_4 + \gamma y_4) = v \wedge (\alpha x_4 + \beta y_4) = 0,$$

where

$$\alpha = b_2 c_3 - c_2 b_3, \quad \beta = a_2 c_3 - c_2 a_3, \quad \gamma = a_2 b_3 - b_2 a_3.$$

If $x_4 = y_4 = 0$, then H^4 has only the upper left corner, thus $H^4 - cH^1$ for suitable constant c would have rank less than 3, a contradiction. If $x_4 \neq 0$, then by the above equations, we get successively $\gamma = 0$, $\beta = 0$, and $\alpha = 0$. Similarly, if $y_4 \neq 0$, the same thing holds, so we always have $\alpha = \beta = \gamma = 0$. This means that B^2 and B^3 are proportional. So by a scramble of $\{H^2, H^3\}$, we may assume that $B^3 = 0$. Under our case assumption, we have $B^2 \neq 0$.

By looking at the terms containing one of e_4, e_5 but not both in $H_u^1 \wedge \cdots \wedge H_u^4 = 0$, the highest order terms in t and s give us

$$\begin{aligned} (C.3) \quad & v \wedge \mathfrak{S}\{a_i x_j x_k\} = v \wedge \mathfrak{S}\{b_i x_j x_k\} = v \wedge \mathfrak{S}\{b_i y_j y_k\} = v \wedge \mathfrak{S}\{c_i y_j y_k\} = 0, \\ & v \wedge \mathfrak{S}\{a_i(x_j y_k + y_j x_k) + b_i x_j x_k\} = v \wedge \mathfrak{S}\{b_i(x_j y_k + y_j x_k) + c_i x_j x_k\} = 0, \\ & v \wedge \mathfrak{S}\{a_i y_j y_k + b_i(x_j y_k + y_j x_k)\} = v \wedge \mathfrak{S}\{b_i y_j y_k + c_i(x_j y_k + y_j x_k)\} = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Since $B^3 = B^4 = 0$, the above equations imply that, if $x_3 \wedge x_4 \neq 0$, then $a_2 = b_2 = c_2 = 0$, a contradiction. So we must have $x_3 \wedge x_4 = 0$. Similarly, $y_3 \wedge y_4 = 0$. By a scramble of $\{H^3, H^4\}$, let us assume that $x_4 = 0$. Then $y_4 \neq 0$, as otherwise H^4 will have only the upper left corner, so $H^4 - cH^1$ for suitable c would have rank less than 3. Therefore, $y_3 = c'y_4$ for some constant c' . Replace H^3 by $H^3 - c'H^4$, we may assume that $y_3 = 0$. This will imply that $x_3 \neq 0$. By (C.3), we also get

$$a_2x_3y_4 = b_2x_3y_4 = c_2x_3y_4 = 0.$$

So by $B^2 \neq 0$ we get $x_2 \wedge y_4 = 0$. Scale H^3 if necessary, let us assume that $x_3 = y_4$, and denote this non-zero vector in \mathbb{C}^3 as v_0 . By the degree two (in t and s) terms in (C.2), we get

$$v \wedge a_2v_0 \langle v_0, v \rangle = -v \wedge c_2v_0 \langle v_0, v \rangle = -2v \wedge b_2v_0 \langle v_0, v \rangle = 0$$

for any $v \in \mathbb{C}^3$. This implies that $a_2 = b_2 = c_2 = 0$, so $B^2 = 0$, a contradiction.

Subcase 2c: $B^2 = B^3 = B^4 = 0$.

Again by looking at the terms containing e_4 but not e_5 in $H_u^1 \wedge \cdots \wedge H_u^4 = 0$, we get

$$v \wedge \mathfrak{S}\{\langle x_i, v \rangle x_j \wedge x_k\} = 0.$$

If $x_1 \wedge x_2 \wedge x_3 \neq 0$, let us express $v = \sum_{i=1}^3 v_i x_i$ and plug into the above equality, we get

$$\langle v, v \rangle x_2 \wedge x_3 \wedge x_4 = 0,$$

or equivalently, $\langle v, v \rangle = 0$ for all v , which is a contradiction. So $\{x_2, x_3, x_4\}$ must be linearly dependent. Similarly, $\{y_2, y_3, y_4\}$ is linearly dependent. By a scramble, let us assume that $x_4 = 0$. Then $y_4 \neq 0$, so by another scramble (without changing H^4) we may assume that $y_3 = 0$. Now by the t -terms in (C.2), we get

$$\langle y_4, v \rangle v \wedge \{\langle x_3, v \rangle x_2 - \langle x_2, v \rangle x_3\} = 0.$$

Since $y_4 \neq 0$, we can drop the factor $\langle y_4, v \rangle$. Wedge it with x_3 , we get $v \wedge \langle x_3, v \rangle x_2 \wedge x_3 = 0$. So $x_2 x_3 = 0$. Similarly, by $x_3 \neq 0$, we get $y_2 \wedge y_4 = 0$. Now replacing H^2 by $H^2 - cH^3 - c'H^4$ for suitable constants c, c' , we may assume that $x_2 = y_2 = 0$. This will mean H^2 has only the upper left corner, so after subtracting a multiple of H^1 from it, we will get a matrix with rank less than 3. This completes the proof. \square

REFERENCES

- [BF04] E. Ballico, C. Fontanari: *On a lemma of Bompiani*, Rend. Sem. Mat. Univ. Politec. Torino **62** (2004), 205-207. [12](#)
- [BS95] M. Beltrametti, A. Sommese: *The adjunction theory of complex projective varieties*, Walter de Gruyter, Berlin, New York, 1995. [7](#)
- [FH79] W. Fulton, J. Hansen: *A connectedness theorem for projective varieties, with applications to intersections and singularities of mappings*, Ann. of Math. (2) **110** (1979), 159-166. [12](#)
- [GH79] P.A. Griffiths, J. Harris: *Algebraic geometry and local differential geometry*, Ann. scient. Ec. Norm. Sup. **12** (1979), 355-432. [12](#), [17](#)
- [La04] R. Lazarsfeld: *Positivity in Algebraic Geometry. I*, Classical setting: line bundles and linear series, Results in Mathematics and Related Areas. 3rd Series. A Series of Modern Surveys in Mathematics, vol. 48, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2004. [12](#)
- [Li20] P. Li: *Nonnegative Hermitian vector bundles and Chern numbers*, Math. Ann. (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00208-020-01974-x> [3](#), [4](#)
- [LZ20] P. Li, F. Zheng: *Chern class inequalities on polarized manifolds and nef vector bundles*, arXiv: 2004.09224 [2](#), [3](#), [5](#), [10](#)
- [Ru16] F. Russo: *On the geometry of some special projective varieties*, Lecture Notes of the Unione Matematica Italiana, Springer International Publishing Switzerland, 2016. [13](#)

- [Za93] F. Zak: *Tangents and secants of algebraic varieties*, Translations of Mathematical Monographs, 127. Amer. Math. Society, Providence, RI, 1993. 13
- [Zhe00] F. Zheng: *Complex differential geometry*, AMS/IP Studies in Advanced Mathematics 18, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI 2000. 8

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, TONGJI UNIVERSITY, SHANGHAI 200092, CHINA

E-mail address: pingli@tongji.edu.cn, pinglimath@gmail.com

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, CHONGQING NORMAL UNIVERSITY, CHONGQING 401331, CHINA

E-mail address: franciszheng@yahoo.com