

UPPER LEVEL SETS OF LELONG NUMBERS ON HIRZEBRUCH SURFACES

ALİ ULAŞ ÖZGÜR KİŞİSEL AND OZCAN YAZICI

ABSTRACT. Let \mathbb{F}_a denote the Hirzebruch surfaces and $\mathcal{T}_{\alpha,\alpha'}(\mathbb{F}_a)$ denotes the set of positive, closed $(1,1)$ -currents on \mathbb{F}_a whose cohomology class is $\alpha F + \alpha' H$ where F and H generates the Picard group of \mathbb{F}_a . $E_{\beta}^+(T)$ denotes the upper level sets of Lelong numbers $\nu(T, x)$ of $T \in \mathcal{T}_{\alpha,\alpha'}(\mathbb{F}_a)$. When $a = 0$, ($\mathbb{F}_a = \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$), for any current $T \in \mathcal{T}_{\alpha,\alpha'}(\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1)$, we show that $E_{(\alpha+\alpha')/3}^+(T)$ is contained in a curve of total degree 2, possibly except 1 point. For any current $T \in \mathcal{T}_{\alpha,\alpha'}(\mathbb{F}_a)$, we show that $E_{\beta}^+(T)$ is contained in either in a curve of bidegree $(0, 1)$ or in $a + 1$ curves of bidegree $(1, 0)$ where $\beta \geq (\alpha + (a + 1)\alpha')/(a + 2)$.

Keywords Positive closed currents, Lelong numbers, Hirzebruch surfaces

Mathematics Subject Classification 32U05, 32U25, 32U35, 32U40.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let T be a positive closed current of bidimension (p, p) on a complex manifold X . We consider the upper level sets

$$E_{\alpha}(T) = \{z \in X \mid \nu(T, z) \geq \alpha\}, \quad E_{\alpha}^+(T) = \{z \in X \mid \nu(T, z) > \alpha\}$$

where $\nu(T, z)$ is the Lelong number of T at $z \in X$ and $\alpha \geq 0$ (see [4] for the definition of Lelong numbers). It is well known by Siu's result [10] that when $\alpha > 0$, $E_{\alpha}(T)$ is an analytic subvariety of X of dimension at most p .

When $X = \mathbb{P}^n$ and T is a closed positive current of bidimension $(1, 1)$ (or bidegree $(n - 1, n - 1)$), Coman [1] proved that $E_{2/3}^+(T)$ is contained in a complex line and $|E_{1/2}^+(T) \setminus L| \leq 1$ for some complex line L . In dimension 2, $|E_{2/5}^+(T) \setminus C| \leq 1$ for some conic C [1]. In our recent paper [9], we showed that $|E_{1/3}^+(T) \setminus C| \leq 2$ for some cubic curve C . In [1, 3, 7, 8] further geometric properties of upper level sets $|E_{\alpha}^+(T)|$ are obtained where T is a positive closed current of bidimension (p, p) in \mathbb{P}^n .

Geometry of upper level sets were studied for the currents on $X = \mathbb{P}^m \times \mathbb{P}^n$ in [3] and for the currents on multiprojective spaces $X = \mathbb{P}^{n_1} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{P}^{n_k}$ in [2]. Proposition 4.1 in [3] implies that if $T \in \mathcal{T}_{a,b}(\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1)$ (see Section 2.3 for the definition of $\mathcal{T}_{a,b}(X)$), then the upper level set $E_{(a+b)/2}^+(T)$ is contained either in a vertical or horizontal fiber of the projections of $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$ onto its factors. Since the vertical fibers of $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$ are bidegree $(1, 0)$ curves and the horizontal fibers are bidegree $(0, 1)$ curves on $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$, this result gives us information about the threshold for the upper level set to be contained in a total degree 1 curve. Furthermore, this threshold is optimal.

In this paper, we first prove a result for thresholds for such upper level sets to be contained in total degree 2 curves. More precisely, we prove:

Theorem 1.1. *Suppose that $T \in \mathcal{T}_{a,b}(\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1)$. Say $\alpha \geq (a + b)/3$. Then, $E_{\alpha}^+(T)$ is contained in a curve of total degree 2 (i.e. a curve of bidegree $(2, 0)$, $(1, 1)$ or $(0, 2)$), possibly except 1 point.*

Date: May 11, 2023.

We will prove this theorem in Section 3. Example 3.1 in Section 3 shows that $\alpha = (a + b)/3$ is sharp in Theorem 1.1.

In Section 4, we consider currents on Hirzebruch surfaces $\mathbb{F}_a = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{O} \oplus \mathcal{O}(a))$ and prove the following geometric property for upper level sets:

Theorem 1.2. *Suppose that $\alpha' \geq 0$, $\alpha + a\alpha' \geq 0$ and $T \in \mathcal{T}_{\alpha, \alpha'}(\mathbb{F}_a)$. Say $\beta \geq (\alpha + (a + 1)\alpha')/(a + 2)$. Then, $E_\beta^+(T)$ is contained in either in a curve of bidegree $(0, 1)$ or in $a + 1$ fibers of φ (i.e. curves of bidegree $(1, 0)$).*

Fibers of φ , curves on Hirzebruch surfaces and the currents $T \in \mathcal{T}_{\alpha, \alpha'}(\mathbb{F}_a)$ will be defined in the next chapter.

Remark 1.3. Notice that if $a = 0$, $\mathbb{F}_a = \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$, and the result coincides with Coman and Truong's result (Proposition 4.1 in [3]) about total degree 1 curves on $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$

Example 4.1 in Section 4 shows that the threshold in the theorem above is sharp when $\alpha \geq \alpha'$. In the case of $\alpha < \alpha'$, it is not clear to us that whether the threshold in Theorem 1.2 is sharp or not.

2. PRELIMINARIES

2.1. Hirzebruch Surfaces. Let us consider rational ruled surfaces, namely ruled surfaces over \mathbb{P}^1 . By Grothendieck's theorem, every rank 2 locally free sheaf on \mathbb{P}^1 is isomorphic to $\mathcal{O} \oplus \mathcal{O}(a)$ for a unique non-negative integer a , and also note that every projective bundle over the projective line arises as the projectivization of a vector bundle (see for instance [6], pp. 515-516). The surface $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{O} \oplus \mathcal{O}(a))$ is called the a -th Hirzebruch surface, and it will be denoted by \mathbb{F}_a . Notice that \mathbb{F}_0 is isomorphic to $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$. Unless $a = 1$, these surfaces will not contain any -1 -curves and will be minimal surfaces.

Hirzebruch surfaces can also be written in the form of a GIT quotient:

$$\mathbb{F}_a = (\mathbb{C}^2 - \{0\}) \times (\mathbb{C}^2 - \{0\}) / \sim$$

where the equivalence relation \sim identifies points in a given orbit of the following $(\mathbb{C}^*)^2$ action:

$$(\lambda, \mu) \cdot (X_0, X_1, Y_0, Y_1) = (\lambda X_0, \lambda X_1, \lambda^{-a} \mu Y_0, \mu Y_1).$$

The map sending the equivalence class of (X_0, X_1, Y_0, Y_1) to $[X_0 : X_1]$ is well-defined and this provides us with the ruling map $\varphi : \mathbb{F}_a \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$. Fibers of φ are themselves isomorphic to \mathbb{P}^1 , which demonstrates that \mathbb{F}_a is a rational ruled surface. For future reference, denote $\{0\} \times \mathbb{C}^2 \cup \mathbb{C}^2 \times \{0\}$ by Z and the quotient map from $\mathbb{C}^4 \setminus Z$ to \mathbb{F}_a described above by π .

2.2. Picard Group and Curves. Let F be the class of a fiber of φ and H be the divisor class corresponding to the invertible sheaf $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{F}_a}(1)$. Then it is well-known that

$$Pic(\mathbb{F}_a) = \mathbb{Z}F \oplus \mathbb{Z}H.$$

Furthermore, $F^2 = 0$, $H^2 = a$ and $F \cdot H = 1$. If $a > 0$, then there is a unique irreducible curve C on \mathbb{F}_a with negative self-intersection, with $C^2 = -a$. The class of C in $Pic(\mathbb{F}_a)$ (denoted by the same letter) is given by $C = H - aF$.

One can easily describe curves representing these cohomology classes in terms of the coordinates above: The fibers are clearly movable, and fixing $[X_0 : X_1]$ to be equal to any value $[c_0 : c_1]$ gives us one such fiber. On the other hand for $a > 0$, the unique irreducible curve C with $C^2 = -a$ is not movable, and it is given by $Y_0 = 0$. Let us also remark that a curve of the form $Y_1 = 0$ represents H , and it is movable: it can be thought of as coming from the section $(1, 0)$ of the vector bundle $\mathcal{O} \oplus \mathcal{O}(a)$. Taking any other section $(1, \sigma)$ of this bundle would give us the moving family (and incidentally shows that $H^2 = a$). In contrast, C can be identified with the section $(0, 1)$ of the

bundle $\mathcal{O}(-a) \oplus \mathcal{O} \cong \mathcal{O} \oplus \mathcal{O}(a)$. The fact that $\mathcal{O}(-a)$ has no non-zero sections indicates that C is not movable.

Curves on \mathbb{F}_a can be described by using the GIT quotient description given above. Let $(\alpha, \alpha') \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ such that $\alpha' \geq 0$ and $\alpha + a\alpha' \geq 0$. Then a polynomial $P(X_0, X_1, Y_0, Y_1)$ is called bihomogeneous of bidegree (α, α') if

$$P(\lambda X_0, \lambda X_1, \lambda^{-a} \mu Y_0, \mu Y_1) = \lambda^\alpha \mu^{\alpha'} P(X_0, X_1, Y_0, Y_1).$$

It is clear that the locus $\{P = 0\}$ is a well-defined curve in \mathbb{F}_a . Conversely, it is a fact that every curve on \mathbb{F}_a arises in this way. A curve is said to be of bidegree (α, α') if it is the zero-locus of a polynomial of bidegree (α, α') . A linear polynomial in X_0, X_1 is of bidegree $(1, 0)$, hence fibers representing F are curves of bidegree $(1, 0)$. The polynomial Y_0 is of bidegree $(-a, 1)$, hence C is a curve of bidegree $(-a, 1)$. The polynomial Y_1 is of bidegree $(0, 1)$, hence any curve representing H is of bidegree $(0, 1)$.

2.3. Currents on Hirzebruch surfaces. Following Guedj [5], we now describe currents on \mathbb{F}_a . Let $\mathcal{T}(\mathbb{F}_a)$ denote the cone of positive, closed currents of bidegree $(1, 1)$ on \mathbb{F}_a . If $T \in \mathcal{T}(\mathbb{F}_a)$ then $\pi^*(T)$ is a positive, closed current of bidegree $(1, 1)$ on $\mathbb{C}^4 \setminus Z$. However, Z is of codimension 2 in \mathbb{C}^4 , hence $\pi^*(T)$ extends to a $(1, 1)$ -current on \mathbb{C}^4 . By the $\partial\bar{\partial}$ -Poincaré lemma for currents, there exists a plurisubharmonic function ψ on \mathbb{C}^4 such that $\pi^*T = dd^c\psi$. Theorem 3.1 in [5] strengthens this as follows: Let $(\alpha, \alpha') \in \mathbb{R}^2$. Define $\mathcal{P}_{\alpha, \alpha'}$ to be the set of PSH-functions ψ on \mathbb{C}^4 having their supremum on the unit ball in \mathbb{C}^4 equal to 0 and such that

$$\psi(\lambda X_0, \lambda X_1, \lambda^{-a} \mu Y_0, \mu Y_1) = \alpha \log |\lambda| + \alpha' \log |\mu| + \psi(X_0, X_1, Y_0, Y_1).$$

The cone of positive, closed currents of bidegree $(1, 1)$ on \mathbb{F}_a decomposes as $\mathcal{T}(\mathbb{F}_a) = \cup \mathcal{T}_{\alpha, \alpha'}(\mathbb{F}_a)$ where $\mathcal{T}_{\alpha, \alpha'}(\mathbb{F}_a)$ denotes the set of positive, closed $(1, 1)$ -currents on \mathbb{F}_a whose cohomology class is $\alpha F + \alpha' H$. We should note that the class of $\alpha F + \alpha' H$ is pseudoeffective, i.e. $\mathcal{T}_{\alpha, \alpha'}(\mathbb{F}_a) \neq \emptyset$ if and only if $\alpha' \geq 0, \alpha + a\alpha' \geq 0$. Guedj shows that for $T \in \mathcal{T}_{\alpha, \alpha'}(\mathbb{F}_a)$ there exists unique $\psi \in \mathcal{P}_{\alpha, \alpha'}$ such that $\pi^*(T) = dd^c\psi$.

The currents on $\mathbb{F}_0 = \mathbb{P}_1^1 \times \mathbb{P}_2^1$ can be written in terms of the Fubini-Study form on \mathbb{P}^1 . Let

$$\pi_1 : \mathbb{P}_1^1 \times \mathbb{P}_2^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_1^1, \quad \pi_2 : \mathbb{P}_1^1 \times \mathbb{P}_2^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_2^1$$

be the canonical projections. Define

$$\omega_1 = \pi_1^*\omega, \quad \omega_2 = \pi_2^*\omega$$

where ω is the Fubini-Study form on \mathbb{P}^1 . Then $\mathcal{T}_{a,b}(\mathbb{P}_1^1 \times \mathbb{P}_2^1)$ is the set of positive, closed $(1, 1)$ -currents on $\mathbb{P}_1^1 \times \mathbb{P}_2^1$ whose cohomology class is $a\omega_1 + b\omega_2$.

3. THRESHOLDS FOR LELONG NUMBERS ON $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$ FOR DEGREE 2 CURVES

Let us consider $X = \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$ in this section. Suppose that $T \in \mathcal{T}_{a,b}$. Let $\nu(T, z)$ denote the Lelong number of the current T at a point $z \in \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$. For $\alpha \geq 0$, define the upper level sets

$$E_\alpha(T) = \{z \in \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1 \mid \nu(T, z) \geq \alpha\}, \quad E_\alpha^+(T) = \{z \in \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1 \mid \nu(T, z) > \alpha\}.$$

By Siu's theorem [10], we know that $E_\alpha(T)$ is an analytic subvariety of $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$ of dimension at most 1. Let π_1 and π_2 denote the projection maps from $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$ to its factors. Let us first show that the threshold for the upper level sets in Theorem 1.1 is sharp.

Example 3.1. Let V_1, V_2, V_3 be three distinct fibers of π_1 and H_1, H_2, H_3 be three distinct fibers of π_2 . Denote the currents of integration along these curves by the same letters. Then the $(1, 1)$ -current

$$T = \frac{a}{3}(V_1 + V_2 + V_3) + \frac{b}{3}(H_1 + H_2 + H_3)$$

lies in $\mathcal{T}_{\alpha,b}$. Let S denote the set of nine points of intersections of V_i 's with H_j 's. Then for any $p \in S$, we have $\nu(T, p) = (a+b)/3$. Therefore, if $\alpha < (a+b)/3$, then $S \subset E_\alpha^+(T)$. We claim that $E_\alpha^+(T)$ cannot be contained in a curve of total degree 2 possibly except 1-point: First, let us consider the bidegree $(1, 1)$ case. Such a curve would be either irreducible or reducible. An irreducible $(1, 1)$ -curve intersects any horizontal or vertical fiber at 1 point. Therefore, it can contain at most 3 points from S . A reducible $(1, 1)$ -curve is the union of a vertical fiber and a horizontal fiber, hence it can contain at most 5 points from S . Then let us consider the cases of bidegree $(2, 0)$ or $(0, 2)$. Such curves are necessarily reducible, and can contain at most 6 points of S . In any case, there are at least 3 points of S not contained in the curve, which proves our claim. This example shows that the threshold $(a+b)/3$ in Theorem 1.1 is optimal.

Proof. (of Theorem 1.1) Assume, to the contrary, that there doesn't exist any curve of total degree 2 containing $E_\alpha^+(T)$ possibly except 1 point. Note that a $(1, 1)$ -curve on $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$ is the zero locus of a polynomial of the form $a_{00}X_0Y_0 + a_{01}X_0Y_1 + a_{10}X_1Y_0 + a_{11}X_1Y_1$, so there exists a $(1, 1)$ -curve passing through any 3 points in $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$ (this curve is unique unless all 3 points lie on a vertical fiber or on a horizontal fiber). Therefore, the assumption implies that $E_\alpha^+(T)$ must contain a subset $A = \{P_1, P_2, P_3, P_4, P_5\}$ of 5 points. Let $m_{i,j}(A)$ denote the maximum number of points of A contained in a curve of bidegree (i, j) .

Case 1: Suppose that $m_{1,1}(A) = 3$. In this case, neither of $m_{1,0}(A)$ and $m_{0,1}(A)$ can be more than 2. Let us first consider the subcase where $m_{1,0}(A) = m_{0,1}(A) = 1$. Let \mathcal{X} be the space of bihomogeneous polynomials of bidegree $(2, 2)$ passing through all points of A and with multiplicity at least 2 at P_1 . Passing through each P_i imposes 1 linear condition and the vanishing of two partial derivatives at P_1 imposes 2 more linear conditions, hence $\dim(\mathcal{X}) \geq 9 - (5 + 2) = 2$. Take a $(1, 1)$ -curve C_1 through P_1, P_2, P_3 and a $(1, 1)$ -curve through C_2 through P_1, P_4, P_5 . (Under the current assumptions, these curves are uniquely determined and each contain precisely 3 points from A .) Then, clearly $Q_1 = C_1C_2 \in \mathcal{X}$, where we allow the ambiguity in the notation so as to denote the equation of curves with the same letters. Since $\dim(\mathcal{X}) \geq 2$, there exists $Q_2 \in \mathcal{X}$ such that Q_1, Q_2 are linearly independent. We claim that Q_1 and Q_2 do not have a non-trivial common factor. Indeed, first observe that C_1 and C_2 have to be irreducible since $m_{1,0}(A) = m_{0,1}(A) = 1$. Since irreducible $(1, 1)$ -curves in $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$ are smooth, C_1 and C_2 have to be smooth. If C_1 divides Q_2 , then $Q_2 = C_1C$ for some degree $(1, 1)$ -curve. Since C_1 doesn't pass through P_4, P_5 and has multiplicity 1 at P_1 (given that it is smooth), the curve C must pass through P_1, P_4 and P_5 . But now, by Bezout's theorem, the intersection number of C and C_2 being greater than 2 implies that they share a component, hence $C = C_2$. This contradicts the linear independence of Q_1 and Q_2 . A similar argument shows that C_2 cannot divide Q_2 , proving the claim. Now, define

$$u = \frac{1}{2} \log(|Q_1|^2 + |Q_2|^2).$$

Then by Theorem 3.1 in [5], $dd^c u$ determines a current $S \in \mathcal{T}_{2,2}(\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1)$. Since S is smooth except at finitely many logarithmic poles, by a result of Demailly [4], the intersection $T \wedge S$ is a well-defined positive measure. We observe that

$$2(a+b) = \int_X T \wedge S \geq \sum_{i=1}^5 T \wedge S(P_i) \geq \sum_{i=1}^5 \nu(T, P_i) \nu(S, P_i) > 6\alpha.$$

The second inequality follows from Demailly's comparison theorem for Lelong numbers (Corollary 5.10 in [4]). The last inequality follows from $\nu(T, P_i) > \alpha$ for all i , $\nu(S, P_1) \geq 2$ and $\nu(S, P_j) \geq 1$ for $j = 2, 3, 4, 5$. We deduce that $\alpha < (a+b)/3$, which is a contradiction.

The remaining subcase is when at least one of $m_{1,0}(A)$ or $m_{0,1}(A)$ is equal to 2. Assume that $m_{0,1}(A) = 2$ without loss of generality. We will refer to $(0, 1)$ -curves as horizontal lines and $(1, 0)$ -curves as vertical lines. Assume, without loss of generality again, that P_1 and P_2 lie on a horizontal

line. First suppose that there exists a point of A , say P_5 , which does not lie on a horizontal or vertical line through any other point of A (see Figure 1). We may assume that P_3 does not lie on the vertical line through P_2 and P_4 does not lie on the vertical line through P_1 , if necessary by reordering P_3 and P_4 . Now, the $(1, 1)$ -curve C_1 through P_1, P_4, P_5 and the $(1, 1)$ -curve C_2 through P_2, P_3, P_5 both have to be irreducible. Therefore we can repeat the argument for the subcase $m_{1,0}(A) = m_{0,1}(A) = 1$ to finish the proof (with P_5 instead of P_1 , etc.). The remaining case is when every point of A is on a vertical or a horizontal line through another point of A . But in this case there must exist a vertical and a horizontal line which contain in total 4 points of A (see Figure 2). This contradicts the assumption that $m_{1,1}(A) = 3$.




FIGURE 1. A configuration of A when $m_{1,1}(A) = 3, m_{0,1}(A) = 2$.




FIGURE 2. Other configurations of A when $m_{1,1}(A) = 3, m_{0,1}(A) = 2$.

Case 2: Suppose that $m_{1,1}(A) = 4$ and $m_{1,0}(A) = m_{0,1}(A) = 1$. Say C_1 is a curve of bidegree $(1, 1)$ passing through P_1, P_2, P_3, P_4 without loss of generality. Clearly, C_1 must be irreducible and $P_5 \notin C_1$. Since $E_\alpha^+(T)$ is not contained in a bidegree $(1, 1)$ -curve except one point, by the standing assumption, there exists a sixth point $P_6 \in E_\alpha^+(T)$ such that $P_6 \notin C_1$. Suppose first that P_6 is not on a common vertical or horizontal line with P_5 . Since P_6 can be on a common vertical (resp. horizontal) line with at most 1 point from $\{P_1, P_2, P_3, P_4\}$, we may assume without loss of generality that P_6 is not on a common vertical or horizontal line with P_1 (see Figure 3(a)). Then, the $(1, 1)$ -curve C_2 passing through P_1, P_5 and P_6 must be irreducible. The intersection number of C_1 and C_2 is 2, hence C_2 can contain at most one more point from A , say P_4 . Now, we can conclude by repeating the argument in the first part of Case 1 for the irreducible curves C_1, C_2 and the points P_1, P_2, P_3, P_5, P_6 .

The remaining subcase is where P_5 and P_6 lie on a common vertical or horizontal line (see Figure 3(b)). Since these two cases are similar, let us assume without loss of generality that they lie on a common horizontal line. Let $B = \{P_1, P_2, P_3, P_5, P_6\}$. We claim that $m_{1,1}(B) = 3$: Indeed, suppose that there exists a $(1, 1)$ -curve C passing through 4 (or more) points of B . If C contains all of P_1, P_2, P_3 then its intersection number with C_1 exceeds 2. But C_1 is irreducible, so $C = C_1$. This is a contradiction since neither of P_5, P_6 lie on C_1 . The remaining case is when C contains both P_5 and P_6 , and two of P_1, P_2, P_3 . But then C must be reducible as the union of the horizontal line through P_5, P_6 and a vertical line through two of P_1, P_2, P_3 . This contradicts $m_{1,0}(A) = 1$, proving the claim. Replacing the set A by the set B , we go back to Case 1.




FIGURE 3. Configurations of A when $m_{1,1}(A) = 4, m_{0,1}(A) = m_{1,0}(A) = 1$.

Case 3: Suppose that $m_{1,1}(A) = 4, m_{1,0}(A) = 2$, and $m_{0,1}(A) \leq 2$. As the first subcase, assume that there exists an irreducible $(1, 1)$ -curve C_1 passing through 4 of the points in A , say through P_1, P_2, P_3, P_4 . Since $m_{1,0}(A) = 2$, there exists a vertical line containing 2 points from A . One of these points must be P_5 since C_1 is irreducible. Without loss of generality, assume that the other point on this vertical line is P_1 . Then, P_5 can lie on the same horizontal line with at most 1 point in A , say P_4 . Now, the $(1, 1)$ -curve C_2 passing through P_2, P_3 and P_5 is irreducible. One can then repeat the argument in the first subcase of Case 1 with these two curves to conclude (P_3 here will play the role of P_1 in that subcase).

The remaining case is when there is no irreducible $(1, 1)$ -curve through any 4 points of A . Then a $(1, 1)$ -curve through 4 points of A , which exists by assumption, must be a union of a horizontal line and a vertical line. Since $m_{1,0}(A)$ and $m_{0,1}(A)$ are both at most 2, both the horizontal and the vertical line must contain two points each. Without loss of generality, suppose that P_1, P_2 lie on a horizontal line and P_3, P_4 lie on a vertical line. Also, we may assume without loss of generality that P_5 and P_3 are not on the same horizontal line, and P_5 and P_1 are not on the same vertical line. Then, the $(1, 1)$ -curve C_1 passing through P_1, P_3, P_5 is irreducible. If also P_5 does not lie on the vertical line through P_2 and does not lie on the horizontal line through P_4 (see Figure 4), then the $(1, 1)$ -curve C_2 passing through P_2, P_4, P_5 is also irreducible, and we can use C_1, C_2 as in the first subcase of Case 1.




FIGURE 4. A configuration of A when $m_{1,1}(A) = 4, m_{1,0}(A) = m_{0,1}(A) = 2$.

Let us now exhaust the remaining possibilities. We may assume that P_4 and P_5 lie on the same horizontal line without loss of generality. Since $E_\alpha^+(A)$ is not contained in a $(1, 1)$ -curve except one point by the standing assumption, there must exist another point $P_6 \in E_\alpha^+(A)$ which does not lie on the first $(1, 1)$ -curve, namely does not lie on either of the lines through P_1, P_2 or P_3, P_4 . We finally analyze the possibilities for the position of P_6 : If P_6 is not on the horizontal line through P_4 and P_5 and also P_2 and P_6 are not on a vertical fiber (see Figure 5(a)), then the curve C_2 through P_2, P_4, P_6 is irreducible. Using the curves C_1, C_2 as in the first subcase of Case 1 will finish the argument. Likewise, if P_6 is not on the horizontal line through P_4 and P_5 and also P_1 and P_6 are

not on a vertical fiber, then the curve C_2 through P_1, P_4, P_6 is irreducible and again C_1, C_2 can be used in the same way. The only remaining case is when P_6 lies on the horizontal line through P_4 and P_5 . If P_2 and P_6 are not on the same vertical line (See Figure 5(b)), then the curve C_2 through P_2, P_3, P_6 is irreducible and we can finish as before. If P_2 and P_6 are on the same vertical line (see Figure 5(c)), then set $B = \{P_1, P_2, P_3, P_5, P_6\}$. We claim that $m_{1,1}(B) = 3$. Indeed, a $(1, 1)$ -curve passing through 4 points of B must contain at least one of P_2 or P_6 . But both of these points are on junctions of vertical and horizontal lines each containing 2 points of B , so this implies that such a $(1, 1)$ -curve would have to be reducible. But then we immediately check that no reducible $(1, 1)$ -curve contains 4 points of B , which proves the claim. Replacing A with B takes us back to Case 1.




FIGURE 5. Other configurations of $A \cup \{P_6\}$ when $m_{1,1}(A) = 4, m_{1,0}(A) = m_{0,1}(A) = 2$.

Case 4: Suppose that $m_{1,1}(A) = 4, m_{1,0}(A) = 2$ and $m_{0,1}(A) = 3$. Since a horizontal line and a vertical line together cannot contain 5 distinct points in view of $m_{1,1}(A) = 4$, we may assume without loss of generality that P_1, P_2, P_3 lie on a horizontal line, and P_1, P_4 lie on a vertical line. Then P_5 does not lie on these two lines and we may also assume without loss of generality that P_5 does not lie on the same vertical line with P_2 . Also, there must exist $P_6 \in E_\alpha^+(A)$ which does not lie on the first two lines (see Figure 6). Let $B = \{P_1, P_2, P_4, P_5, P_6\}$. If $m_{1,1}(B) = 3$, then we can replace A with B and go back to Case 1. Otherwise, we must have $m_{1,1}(B) = 4$. It is clear that no 3 points of B are on the same vertical line, so $m_{1,0}(B) = 2$. If $m_{0,1}(B) = 2$ as well, then replace A with B and return to Case 3.




FIGURE 6. Configuration of $A \cup \{P_6\}$ when $m_{1,1}(A) = 4, m_{1,0}(A) = 2, m_{0,1}(A) = 3$.

The only remaining possibility is that $m_{0,1}(B) = 3$. This can happen only if P_4, P_5, P_6 are on the same horizontal line. Since $E_\alpha^+(A)$ is not contained in a degree $(0, 2)$ -curve possibly except one point, there must exist $P_7, P_8 \in E_\alpha^+(A)$ which do not lie on the two horizontal lines through the previous 6 points (see Figure 7). If P_7 does not lie on the vertical line through P_1 and P_4 , then set $D = \{P_1, P_2, P_4, P_5, P_7\}$. We then have $m_{1,1}(D) = 3$ since any irreducible $(1, 1)$ -curve can pass through at most one of P_1, P_2 and at most one of P_4, P_5 , furthermore any reducible $(1, 1)$ -curve can pass through at most 3 of these points by the given assumptions. Hence, we can replace A by D and go back to Case 1. If P_7 lies on the vertical line through P_1 and P_4 , then let $D = \{P_2, P_3, P_4, P_5, P_7\}$. By the choices made, we have $m_{1,1}(D) = 4$ and $m_{1,0}(D) = m_{0,1}(D) = 2$, so replacing A by D we go back to Case 3. This finishes the proof in Case 4.




FIGURE 7. Special configuration of $A \cup \{P_6\}$ when $m_{1,1}(A) = 4, m_{1,0}(A) = 2, m_{0,1}(A) = 3$.

Case 5: Suppose that $m_{1,1}(A) = 5$. First assume that there exists an irreducible $(1,1)$ -curve C passing through all points of A . Then by the assumption, $E_\alpha^+(A)$ is not contained in C possibly except 1-point. Hence, there must exist $P_6, P_7 \in E_\alpha^+(A)$ which are not on C . Let $B = \{P_1, P_2, P_3, P_6, P_7\}$. Then $m_{1,1}(B) \leq 4$ since any $(1,1)$ -curve other than C intersects C in at most 2 points, hence misses at least 1 point of B . Replacing A by B , we go back to one of the cases 1, 2, 3 or 4.

The remaining subcase is when a reducible $(1,1)$ -curve passes through all points of A . Without loss of generality, we may assume that a horizontal line contains at least as many points of A as any vertical line.

Suppose first that P_1, P_2, P_3 lie on a horizontal line which doesn't contain P_4, P_5 , and so P_4, P_5 lie on a vertical line. Then, there must exist $P_6, P_7 \in E_\alpha^+(A)$ which are not on these two lines (see Figure 8). Set $B = \{P_2, P_3, P_4, P_6, P_7\}$. Then, no $(1,1)$ -curve can contain all points of B : An irreducible curve would miss at least one of P_2, P_3 and a reducible curve can't contain them all by the choices made. Hence $m_{1,1}(B) \leq 4$ and we can replace A by B in order to go back to one of cases 1, 2, 3 or 4.

Second, assume that P_1, P_2, P_3, P_4 are on a horizontal line which does not contain P_5 . Again, there must exist $P_6, P_7 \in E_\alpha^+(A)$ which are not on this horizontal line and the vertical line through P_5 (see Figure 9). Set $B = \{P_3, P_4, P_5, P_6, P_7\}$. Again, a $(1,1)$ -curve cannot contain all points of B : An irreducible $(1,1)$ -curve would miss at least one of P_3 and P_4 , and a reducible curve cannot contain them all by the choices made. Hence $m_{1,1}(B) \leq 4$ and we can replace A by B in order to go back to one of cases 1, 2, 3 or 4 again.

Finally, assume that P_1, P_2, P_3, P_4, P_5 lie on a horizontal line. Then there must exist $P_6, P_7 \in E_\alpha^+(A)$ which are not on this horizontal line and which don't lie on a common vertical line. Set $B = \{P_3, P_4, P_5, P_6, P_7\}$. Similar to the subcases above, no $(1,1)$ -curve can contain all points of B : An irreducible curve would miss at least two of P_3, P_4, P_5 and a reducible curve cannot contain them all either. Hence $m_{1,1}(B) \leq 4$ and we can replace A by B in order to go back to one of cases 1, 2, 3 or 4. This finishes the proof of this case and also the proof of the theorem. \square




FIGURE 8. The configuration of A when $m_{1,1}(A) = 5, m_{0,1}(A) = 3$.




FIGURE 9. The configuration of A when $m_{1,1}(A) = 5, m_{0,1}(A) = 4$.

4. THRESHOLDS FOR LELONG NUMBERS ON \mathbb{F}_a

In this section we consider currents on Hirzebruch surfaces \mathbb{F}_a . As defined in the introduction, let $\mathcal{T}_{\alpha,\alpha'}(\mathbb{F}_a)$ denote the set of positive, closed $(1,1)$ -currents on \mathbb{F}_a whose cohomology class is $\alpha F + \alpha' H$. Let $T \in \mathcal{T}_{\alpha,\alpha'}(\mathbb{F}_a)$. For $\beta \geq 0$ define

$$E_\beta(T) = \{z \in \mathbb{F}_a \mid \nu(T, z) \geq \beta\}, \quad E_\beta^+(T) = \{z \in \mathbb{F}_a \mid \nu(T, z) > \beta\}.$$

By Siu's theorem, for any $\beta > 0$, $E_\beta(T)$ is an analytic subvariety of \mathbb{F}_a of dimension at most 1. Let us first show that the threshold for the upper level sets in Theorem 1.2 is sharp when $\alpha \geq \alpha'$.

Example 4.1. Let C be the (unique) curve of bidegree $(-a, 1)$ on \mathbb{F}_a and let F_1, F_2, \dots, F_{a+2} be $a+2$ distinct fibers of φ . Denote the currents of integration along these curves by the same letters. Then the $(1,1)$ -current

$$T = \left(\frac{\alpha + (a+1)\alpha'}{a+2} \right) (F_1 + F_2 + \dots + F_{a+1}) + \left(\frac{\alpha - \alpha'}{a+2} \right) F_{a+2} + \alpha' C$$

lies in $\mathcal{T}_{\alpha,\alpha'}(\mathbb{F}_a)$ when $\alpha \geq \alpha'$. Let P be the point of intersection of F_{a+2} with C . Let

$$S = F_1 \cup F_2 \cup \dots \cup F_{a+1} \cup \{P\}.$$

Then for every $q \in S$ we have $\nu(T, q) = (\alpha + (a+1)\alpha')/(a+2)$. Suppose we now choose β such that $\beta < (\alpha + (a+1)\alpha')/(a+2)$. Then we will have $S \subset E_\beta^+(T)$. The set S is clearly not contained in $a+1$ fibers of φ . We claim that it is not contained in a curve of bidegree $(0,1)$ either: An irreducible $(0,1)$ -curve can only contain finitely many points from each fiber of φ , hence cannot contain S . A reducible $(0,1)$ -curve has to be the union of C and a fibers of φ , hence it cannot contain the $a+1$ distinct fibers. This shows that the bound for β in Theorem 1.2 is sharp when $\alpha \geq \alpha'$.

Proof. (of Theorem 1.2) Let us first note that a $(0,1)$ -curve on \mathbb{F}_a is the zero locus of a polynomial which is a linear combination of the monomials $Y_1, X_0^a Y_0, X_0^{a-1} X_1 Y_0, \dots, X_1^a Y_0$. In particular, there exists a $(0,1)$ -curve passing through any $a+1$ points in \mathbb{F}_a . Suppose, to the contrary to the statement of the theorem, that $E_\beta^+(T)$ is not contained in a curve of bidegree $(0,1)$ or $a+1$ fibers of φ . Then, in particular, there must exist a subset $A = \{Q_1, Q_2, \dots, Q_{a+2}\}$ of $E_\beta^+(T)$ such that no two of Q_i 's lie on the same fiber of φ .

Let \mathcal{Y} be the vector space of bihomogeneous polynomials of bidegree $(1,1)$, namely the set of $P(X_0, X_1, Y_0, Y_1)$ such that

$$P(\lambda X_0, \lambda X_1, \lambda^{-a} \mu Y_0, \mu Y_1) = \lambda \mu P(X_0, X_1, Y_0, Y_1).$$

Since a basis for \mathcal{Y} is given by the monomials $X_0 Y_1, X_1 Y_1, X_0^{a+1} Y_0, X_0^a X_1 Y_0, \dots, X_1^{a+1} Y_0$, we observe that $\dim(\mathcal{Y}) = a+4$. Let \mathcal{X} be the subspace of \mathcal{Y} vanishing at all points of A . Since each point of A imposes at most one independent linear condition, we get that $\dim(\mathcal{X}) \geq 2$. Let C_1 be a curve of bidegree $(0,1)$ through Q_1, \dots, Q_{a+1} and C_2 be a curve of bidegree $(1,0)$ through Q_{a+2} . Then C_2 doesn't pass through any Q_j with $j \leq a+1$ by our initial assumption. We have $P_1 = C_1 C_2 \in \mathcal{X}$ and since $\dim(\mathcal{X}) \geq 2$, there exists $P_2 \in \mathcal{X}$ such that P_1 and P_2 are linearly independent.

We now want to show that P_1 and P_2 above do not have any non-trivial common factor, if necessary after modifying the choice of A . There are several subcases:

Case 1: First, let us assume that C_1 is irreducible and $m_{0,1}(A) = a + 1$, that is the maximum number of points of A contained in a curve of bidegree $(0, 1)$ is $a + 1$. If C_2 divides P_2 , then we can write $P_2 = CC_2$ where C is of bidegree $(0, 1)$. Then, C would have to contain Q_1, \dots, Q_{a+1} since C_2 doesn't contain any of these points. But now, C and C_1 intersect at $a + 1$ points, which is 1 more than the upper bound allowed by Bezout's theorem. Hence, $C = C_1$. This contradicts the linear independence of P_1 and P_2 . If C_1 divides P_2 , then we can write $P_2 = CC_1$ where C is of bidegree $(1, 0)$. Since $m_{0,1}(A) = a + 1$, the point Q_{a+2} cannot be on C_1 . Thus $Q_{a+2} \in C$. This shows that $C = C_2$, again contradicting the linear independence of P_1 and P_2 .

Case 2: Assume that C_1 is reducible and $m_{0,1}(A) = a + 1$. Then we can write $C_1 = C'F_1F_2 \dots F_a$ where C' is the (unique, irreducible) curve of bidegree $(-a, 1)$ and F_i 's are fibers of φ . The curve C' contains exactly 1 point from $A \setminus \{Q_{a+2}\}$, say Q_{a+1} , since otherwise either two points from A would have to be contained in the same fiber of φ , or C' together with a other fibers would contain all $a + 2$ points of A , violating the assumption $m_{0,1}(A) = a + 1$ (see Figure 10). Then, each F_i has to contain precisely 1 point of $A \setminus \{Q_{a+2}\}$, say Q_i . Now, if C' divides P_2 , then $P_2 = C'C$ where C is a curve of bidegree $(a + 1, 0)$ passing through Q_1, Q_2, \dots, Q_a and Q_{a+2} . But then we necessarily have $C = F_1F_2 \dots F_aC_2$, contradicting the linear independence of P_1 and P_2 . If some F_i , say without loss of generality F_1 , divides P_2 , then write $P_2 = F_1C$ where C is a bidegree $(0, 1)$ curve passing through Q_2, Q_3, \dots, Q_{a+2} . The intersection number of a curve of bidegree $(0, 1)$ and the curve of bidegree $(-a, 1)$ on \mathbb{F}_a is 0. However, C and C' share the point Q_{a+1} . This implies that C is divisible by C' . Writing $C = C'C''$ we see that C'' must be a bidegree $(a, 0)$ curve through $Q_2, Q_3, \dots, Q_a, Q_{a+2}$, hence it must coincide with $F_2F_3 \dots F_aC_2$. Again, this contradicts the linear independence of P_1 and P_2 .




FIGURE 10. The configuration of A when $m_{0,1}(A) = a + 1$.

Case 3: Assume that $m_{0,1}(A) = a + 2$. Say C is a $(0, 1)$ -curve passing through all points of A . First, assume that C is irreducible. Since we assume that $E_\beta^+(T)$ is not contained in a curve of bidegree $(0, 1)$, there must exist a point $Q_{a+3} \in E_\beta^+(T)$ which does not lie on C . Since no two points of A lie on the same fiber of φ , Q_{a+3} might be on the same fiber with at most one of the point of A , say Q_{a+2} . Let $B = \{Q_1, Q_2, \dots, Q_{a+1}, Q_{a+3}\}$. By the choice of the set B , no two points of B lie on the same fiber of φ . We claim that $m_{0,1}(B) = a + 1$. Else, there exists a $(0, 1)$ -curve \tilde{C} passing through all points of B . The intersection number of two $(0, 1)$ curves on \mathbb{F}_a is equal to a , but C and \tilde{C} share the $a + 1$ points Q_1, \dots, Q_{a+1} . Since C is irreducible, we must have $C = \tilde{C}$. This is a contradiction since $Q_{a+3} \notin C$. Therefore $m_{0,1}(B) = a + 1$. We can now replace A by B and go back to Case 1 or Case 2.

Now we assume that C is reducible. Then we can write $C = C'F_1F_2 \dots F_a$ where C' is the (unique, irreducible) curve of bidegree $(-a, 1)$ and F_i 's are fibers of φ . By our initial assumption on the set A that no two points of A are on the same vertical fiber, C' contains at least two points of A , say $Q_{a+1}, Q_{a+2} \in C'$. Since we are assuming that $E_\beta^+(T)$ is not contained in a $(0, 1)$ -curve, we can

modify our choice of A such that only Q_{a+1}, Q_{a+2} are contained in C' , Q_1, \dots, Q_a are contained in a distinct fibers F_1, \dots, F_a and no two points of A lie on the same fiber of φ . Moreover, there exist a point $Q_{a+3} \in E_\beta^+(T) \setminus C$ (see Figure 11). Q_{a+3} might be on the same fiber with at most one of the point of C' , say Q_{a+2} . Set $B = \{Q_1, Q_2, \dots, Q_{a+1}, Q_{a+3}\}$. By the choice of the set B , no two points of B lie on the same fiber of φ . We claim that $m_{0,1}(B) = a + 1$. Else, there exists a $(0, 1)$ -curve \tilde{C} passing through all points of B . The intersection number of \tilde{C} and C' is 0, but they share the point Q_{a+1} . Hence C' must divide \tilde{C} . But then \tilde{C} must be divisible by all F_i in order to contain Q_1, \dots, Q_a , so $\tilde{C} = C$. This is a contradiction since Q_{a+3} is not on C . This finishes the proof of this case and the proof that P_1 and P_2 have no common factor, possibly after modifying the choice of A




FIGURE 11. The configuration of A when $m_{0,1}(A) = a + 2$.

Now, By Theorem 3.1 in [5],

$$\frac{1}{2} dd^c \log(|P_1|^2 + |P_2|^2)$$

determines the $(1, 1)$ -current $S \in \mathcal{T}_{1,1}(\mathbb{F}_a)$.

Since S is smooth except at finitely many logarithmic poles, by a result of Demailly [4], the intersection $T \wedge S$ is a well-defined positive measure. We have

$$\alpha + (a + 1)\alpha' = \int_{\mathbb{F}_a} T \wedge S \geq \sum_{i=1}^{a+2} T \wedge S(Q_i) \geq \sum_{i=1}^{a+2} \nu(T, Q_i)\nu(S, Q_i) > (a + 2)\beta.$$

The second inequality follows from Demailly's comparison theorem for Lelong numbers (Corollary 5.10 in [4]). This gives us $\beta < (\alpha + (a + 1)\alpha')/(a + 2)$, which is a contradiction. This finishes the proof. □

Acknowledgments. We would like to thank the referee for his/her remarks and corrections which helped to improve the presentation of the paper. The first author is supported by CIMPA Research in Pairs Program and TŰBITAK 2219 Program. The second author is supported by TŰBITAK 3501 Proj. No 120F084 and TŰBITAK 2518 Proj. No. 119N642.

Conflict of interest. The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

REFERENCES

[1] Coman, D. Entire Pluricomplex Green Functions and Lelong Numbers of Projective Currents. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 134 (2005), 1927-1935. [1](#)
 [2] Coman, D.; Heffers, J., Lelong numbers of bidegree (1,1) currents on multiprojective spaces. *Math. Z.* 295 (2020), no. 3-4, 1569-1582. [1](#)
 [3] Coman, D.; Truong, T.T., Geometric properties of upper level sets of Lelong numbers on projective spaces. *Math. Ann.* 361, 981-994 (2015). [1](#), [1.3](#)
 [4] Demailly, J.P., Monge-Ampère operators, Lelong numbers and intersection theory, in *Complex analysis and geometry*, pp. 115-193. Plenum, New York (1993) [1](#), [3](#), [4](#)
 [5] Guedj, V., Dynamics of polynomial mappings of \mathbb{C}^2 . *Amer. J. Math.* 124 (2002), no. 1, 75-106. [2.3](#), [3](#), [4](#)

- [6] Griffiths, P., Harris, J., Principles of Algebraic Geometry, John Wiley and Sons, USA (1978) 2.1
- [7] Heffers, J.J., A property of upper level sets of Lelong numbers of currents on \mathbb{P}^2 . *Int. J. Math.* 28(14), 1750110, 18 (2017). 1
- [8] Heffers, J.J., On Lelong numbers of positive closed currents on \mathbb{P}^n . *Complex Var. Elliptic Equ.* 64, 352-360 (2019). 1
- [9] Kisisel, A. U. O.; Yazici, O., Upper level sets of Lelong numbers on \mathbb{P}^2 and cubic curves. *Math. Z.* 300 (2022), no. 3, 2917-2930. 1
- [10] Siu, Y.T., Analyticity of sets associated to Lelong numbers and the extension of closed positive currents. *Invent. Math.* 27, 53-156 (1974). 1, 3

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY, 06800 ANKARA, TURKEY
Email address: akisisel@metu.edu.tr

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY, 06800 ANKARA, TURKEY
Email address: oyazici@metu.edu.tr