

MINIMAL RATIONAL GRAPHS ADMITTING A QHD SMOOTHING

MÁRTON BEKE

ABSTRACT. Using the picture deformation technique of De Jong-Van Straten we show that no singularity whose resolution graph has 3 or 4 large nodes, i.e., nodes satisfying $d(v) + e(v) \leq -2$, has a QHD smoothing. This is achieved by providing a general reduction algorithm for graphs with QHD smoothings, and enumeration. New examples and families are presented, which admit a combinatorial QHD smoothing, i.e. the incidence relations for a sandwich presentation can be satisfied. We also give a new proof of the Bhupal-Stipsicz theorem on the classification of weighted homogeneous singularities admitting QHD smoothings with this method by using cusp singularities.

1. INTRODUCTION

The study of complex surface singularities is a central area of interest in algebraic geometry. A key problem is understanding the various ways a singularity can be deformed into a smooth surface through a process called smoothing. This paper investigates a specific type of deformation known as a rational homology disk (QHD) smoothing. These are the topologically simplest kinds of deformations, and so we have hope of a complete classification. The conjecture is attributed to Wahl, who had an unpublished list of singularities admitting a QHD smoothing, stating that this list is complete. This paper presents further evidence for Wahl's Conjecture, namely

Theorem 1.1. *No complex surface singularity whose resolution graph has at most three large nodes of any degree, or at most four nodes of degree 3, and no further nodes can admit a QHD smoothing.*

Moreover we give a new proof of the classification theorem for weighted homogeneous graphs.

Theorem 1.2 (Bhupal-Stipsicz 2010 [1]). *The starshaped graphs admitting a QHD smoothing are precisely the graphs depicted on Figure 1 and Figures 9-15.*

Besides the algebro-geometric perspective, these spaces are also important in low-dimensional topology motivated by the rational blow-down operation of Fintushel-Stern [4], which uses QHD fillings of linear graphs and a cut-and-paste operation to generate topologically smaller exotic 4-manifolds. In a way this problem also tries to classify all possible rational blowdowns of 4-manifolds.

Our result can be interpreted also as a generalisation of the observation ([2, Theorem 2.5, Remark 2.6]), that a starshaped graph, which admits a QHD smoothing cannot have a too negative node, which is the same as the large nodes discussed here ($e(v) + d(v) \leq -2$).

To achieve these results, we use the deformation theory of sandwiched singularities developed by de Jong and van Straten in [3]. This reduces the question of finding deformations of surface singularities to deformations of curves with some intersections prescribed by the surface singularity. We will be mostly dealing with the combinatorial properties of these intersection patterns. Using Donaldson's diagonalisability theorem strong necessary conditions were imposed on graphs admitting a QHD smoothing by Stipsicz-Szabó-Wahl [15], in particular the study of graphs with QHD smoothings is essentially reduced to the families $\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{W}, \mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C}$, a fact we will rely on in what follows. The proof of Theorem 1.1 is as follows: under the assumption of a graph having large nodes and a QHD smoothing, we find a reduction algorithm (3.2), so if a graph admits (the combinatorics of a) QHD smoothing, then some smaller graph does so too. This, and information about the general shape of our graphs reduces the problem to a finite amount of graphs (Lemma 3.23). We then show (Theorem 4.1), that any graph, which admits a combinatorial solution to its QHD smoothing problem admits $Z_K^2 + n = 0$, where n is the number of vertices of the graph, and Z_K is the anticanonical cycle. Using this statement, we can search through all possible graphs to finish the proof of the theorem.

The proof of the Bhupal-Stipsicz theorem is a case analysis of possible solutions to the QHD smoothing problem of graphs in $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C}$ (since the other cases have been settled already, see [15, Section 8]). This argument is notably simpler and shorter, then the original proof utilizing the combinatorics of symplectic curves and McDuff's theorem, and accordingly the result is weaker, since we only rule out the $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C}$ graphs with one star from having a QHD smoothing, while [1] rules them out from having a symplectic filling. This gap will hopefully be filled by an upcoming paper of Plamenevskaya-Starkston. In [13] they expand the de Jong-van Straten theory into the symplectic case, if the

corresponding curve singularity has only smooth branches, the general case is work in progress.

The paper is organized as follows: In Section 2 we review details on the $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C}$ families, and the deformation theory for sandwiched singularities. Section 3 gives specific introduction to minimal rational graphs, and describes and proves the reduction algorithm. Section 4 shows some necessary conditions for a graph to admit a combinatorial QHD smoothing. Section 5 is dedicated to examples of graphs, which do admit combinatorial QHD smoothings, and Section 6 consists of an introduction to the case when the curves can have cusp singularities, and the proof of the Bhupal-Stipsicz theorem.

1.1. Notation. A number k on the edge of a graph Γ means a path consisting of k vertices framed -2 . In some cases, k is allowed to be -1 ; in this case, we identify the two endpoints of the edge with k and frame it $e + f + 2$, where e, f are the framings of the two endpoints of the edge with k over it.

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \begin{array}{ccc}
 \text{a} & & \text{b} \\
 \circ & \text{---} k \text{---} & \circ
 \end{array} \\
 \\
 \begin{array}{ccccccc}
 & & & \text{---} k \text{---} & & & \\
 & & & \text{---} -2 \text{---} & \cdots & \text{---} -2 \text{---} & \\
 \text{a} & \text{---} & \circ & \cdots & \circ & \text{---} & \text{b}
 \end{array} \\
 \\
 \begin{array}{ccc}
 \text{e} & & \text{f} \\
 \circ & \text{---} -1 \text{---} & \circ
 \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \text{e+f+2} \\ \circ \end{array}
 \end{array}$$

1.2. Acknowledgments. The author is thankful to András Némethi, and András Stipsicz for their continued help and support with this project. The author is thankful for enlightening conversations to Marco Golla, László Koltai and Olga Plamenevskaya.

The project supported by the Doctoral Excellence Fellowship Programme (DCEP) is funded by the National Research Development and Innovation Fund of the Ministry of Culture and Innovation and the Budapest University of Technology and Economics.

2. PRELIMINARIES

2.1. Graphs Admitting a QHD smoothing. In [15] Stipsicz-Szabó-Wahl derive strong restrictions on the resolution graph of a singularity if it admits a QHD smoothing.

Definition 2.1. A resolution graph Γ on n vertices is called a *symplectic plumbing tree* if its intersection lattice Q_Γ admits an embedding

into the negative definite trivial lattice $(\mathbb{Z}\langle e_1, \dots, e_n \rangle, n\langle -1 \rangle)$ such that $K = \sum e_i$ represents the anticanonical cycle of Q_Γ .

Theorem 2.2 ([15, Corollary 2.5]). *If a complex surface singularity admits a $\mathbb{Q}HD$ smoothing, its resolution graph is a symplectic plumbing tree.*

The minimal resolution graphs with this property are completely classified; they belong to one of 7 classes. The first, \mathcal{G} , consists of linear graphs, with framings the negatives of the Hirzebruch-Jung continued fraction coefficients of $\frac{p^2}{pq-1}$ for $p > q > 0$ coprime integers. The next three $\mathcal{W}, \mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M}$ are depicted in Figure 1.




FIGURE 1. The graphs of \mathcal{W}, \mathcal{N} and \mathcal{M} where $p, q, r \geq -1$.

The remaining $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C}$ are defined by repeated blowups of an edge next to the unique -1 vertex or the -1 vertex itself, beginning from the graph of Figure 2. After the blowups, the framing of the -1 vertex (which is always unique) is changed to $-4, -3, -2$ to obtain an element of the $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C}$ classes, respectively.

Theorem 2.3 ([15, Theorem 1.8]). *The set of minimal symplectic plumbing trees \mathcal{S} equals $\mathcal{G} \cup \mathcal{W} \cup \mathcal{N} \cup \mathcal{M} \cup \mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{C}$.*

This is only a necessary condition; for the first four classes, a converse of Theorem 2.2 also holds.




FIGURE 2. The starting graph for the construction of the $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C}$ families. $(a, b, c) = (3, 3, 3), (2, 4, 4), (2, 3, 6)$ respectively.

Theorem 2.4 ([15, Theorem 1.10]). *For every element $\Gamma \in \mathcal{G} \cup \mathcal{W} \cup \mathcal{N} \cup \mathcal{M}$, there is a complex surface singularity with resolution graph Γ admitting a $\mathbb{Q}HD$ smoothing.*

The case of the $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C}$ classes is only partially resolved, but there is a complete classification for weighted homogeneous singularities in [1, Theorems 1.4, 1.6], which will be proven in Section 6.

2.2. Deformations of sandwiched singularities.

Definition 2.5. A resolution graph Γ is called a *sandwich graph* if it arises as a subgraph of a graph that can be blown down to the empty graph. A singularity is called *sandwiched* if its resolution graph is a sandwich graph.

The deformation theory of sandwiched singularities essentially reduces to deformations of plane curves, as will be explained momentarily. We rely on the picture deformation method developed in [3].

Let $\rho : (\tilde{A}, E) \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}^2, 0)$ be obtained by point blowups starting from $(\mathbb{C}^2, 0)$ and the singularity X be obtained by contracting the non- (-1) curves from \tilde{A} . Choose one transverse *curvetta* \tilde{C}_i on each -1 curve of \tilde{A} . Now \tilde{A} can be seen as a good embedded resolution of $\rho(\tilde{C})$.

Reversing the blowup process, De Jong and Van Straten define:

Definition 2.6 ([3, Definitions 1.3, 4.1]). A *decorated curve* is a pair (C, l) , where $C = \cup_I C_i \subset (\mathbb{C}^2, 0)$ is a curve with $|I|$ irreducible components and a function $l : I \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ assigning to each irreducible component a number. Let $m(i)$ denote the sum of the multiplicities of the i th branch in the minimal resolution of C , then

$$(1) \quad m(i) \leq l(i)$$

for each $i \in I$. For discussing deformations, it is useful to encode the decoration l as a divisor on the normalization \tilde{C} of C .

From a decorated curve, we obtain a surface singularity as follows:

Definition 2.7 ([3, Definition 1.4]). Let (C, l) be a decorated curve. The modification $\tilde{A}(C, l) \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}^2, 0)$ determined by (C, l) is obtained from the minimal resolution of C by $l(i) - m(i)$ further blowups at the i th branch of C . The analytic set $X(C, l)$ is obtained by contracting the exceptional curves not intersecting any branch of C in $\tilde{A}(C, l)$.

Remark 2.8. If during the blowup process, we don't reach the minimal *good* resolution of C , the analytic set can have multiple singular points.

Note that the same surface singularity may be presented in multiple ways from different decorated curves.

Next, they define the corresponding notion of deformation of sandwich singularities from the decorated curve data.

Definition 2.9 ([3, Definition 4.2]). A one-parameter deformation of a decorated curve (C, l) is a δ -constant deformation $C_\Delta \rightarrow \Delta$ of C (where $\Delta := (\mathbb{C}, 0)$) and a flat deformation $l_\Delta \subset \tilde{C} \times \Delta$ (where \tilde{C} is the normalisation of C) under the multiplicity condition of Equation 1.

The multiplicity condition means a divisor on each fiber $l_t = l_\Delta \cap C_t = \sum_{p \in C_t} m_p p$ subject to $\sum_{p \in (C_t)_i} m_p = \sum_{p \in (C_0)_i} m_p = l(i)$, where $(C)_i$ denotes the i th irreducible component of the curve C .

The important theorem for us is the following:

Theorem 2.10 ([3, Theorem 4.4]). *For every one-parameter deformation of (C, l) , there exists a one-parameter deformation of $X(C, l)$, and every one-parameter deformation of $X(C, l)$ appears in this form!*

Mostly we are interested in smoothing components, and it is folklore, that for rational singularities (which sandwich singularities are, see [14]) every component in the base space of the semi-universal deformation space of X (denoted $\mathcal{B}(X)$) is a smoothing component (i.e. over a generic point of this component smoothing occurs). A one-parameter deformation is always induced from a well-defined component of $\mathcal{B}(X)$, and the generic fiber can be described by a particularly simple special case of the previous theorem.

Definition 2.11 ([3, Definition 4.6]). A one parameter deformation (C_Δ, l_Δ) is called a *picture deformation*, if for generic $t \neq 0$ the divisor l_t is reduced.

Remark 2.12. It follows that the generic fiber of the δ -constant deformation C_t only has transverse m -tuple points as singularities. Following [3] we call 1-tuple points 'free'.

The general fiber of a picture deformation in general consists of a collection of curves, with the m -tuple points marked for $m > 1$, and

possibly some further marked points on each component, so that in total, each component C_i contains $l(i)$ marked points. Since in the following we will only be working with the intersection patterns of these curves, we will identify curves with their marked points, so that they are finite (multi-)sets.

We mention one particularly useful construction, which produces a smoothing over the *Artin component* of $\mathcal{B}(X)$, called the *Scott deformation* of X .

Theorem 2.13 (See [3, Proposition 1.10], [13, Proposition 4.1]). *Let (C, o) be an isolated curve singularity of multiplicity m . There is a 1-parameter deformation, the general fiber of which only has singularities of the following two types:*

- *singularities of C after blowing up o*
- *an m -tuple point.*

Given a sandwiched singularity using Theorem 2.10 and iterating Theorem 2.13, we obtain a picture deformation of X , the Milnor fiber of which is isomorphic to the resolution of X . This will be useful when we compare QHD smoothings to the resolution of the singularity in Section 4.

One can gather all of the incidence information of this combinatorial setup into a $|\{\text{points}\}| \times |\{\text{number of curves}\}|$ matrix $I := (\iota_{mn})$ where $\iota_{mn} = 1$ if point m is on curve n , and 0 otherwise.

Theorem 2.14 ([3, Theorem 5.2]). *There is an exact sequence*

$$(2) \quad 0 \rightarrow H_2(F) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}\langle p \in C_t : m_p \neq 0 \rangle \xrightarrow{I} \mathbb{Z}\langle (C_t)_i \rangle \rightarrow H_1(F) \rightarrow 0$$

where F is the Milnor fiber of the picture deformation.

Using [7, Theorem 2.], which states that for any smoothing of a normal surface singularity, the Milnor fiber F satisfies $b_1(F) = 0$, we get

Corollary 2.15.

$$\text{rk } H_2(F) =: \mu(F) = \#\{\text{points}\} - \#\{\text{number of curves}\}.$$

Finally, we mention a method to recover the intersection lattice of the Milnor fiber of the smoothing from a picture deformation.

Theorem 2.16 ([3, Theorems 5.5, 5.11]). *The intersection form on $H_2(F) \subset \mathbb{Z}\langle p \in C_t : m_p \neq 0 \rangle$ is the restriction of the Euclidean negative definite inner product on the latter space. Moreover, the canonical class is represented by $(1, 1, \dots, 1)$ in this basis.*

3. COMBINATORIAL SMOOTHINGS

3.1. The minimal rational case. Throughout this section, we assume Γ to be a minimal rational graph with a given sandwich presentation where each component of the corresponding decorated curve is smooth.

Definition 3.1. In a tree graph Γ we denote the unique path between two vertices $v, w \in \Gamma$ by $p(v, w) := (v = v_1, \dots, v_n = w) \subset V(\Gamma)$.

Definition 3.2. Given a minimal rational graph Γ , choose a vertex $v \in \Gamma$. Add $-(\deg(v) + e(v)) - 1$ many -1 leaves to it, and $-(\deg(w) + e(w))$ many -1 leaves to every other vertex (\deg denotes the degree of the vertex in the graph Γ , and e is the Euler number of the vertex). This larger graph $\tilde{\Gamma}$ is a *sandwich presentation of Γ with smooth branches*, where *the blowdown ends at v* .

We will be only interested in the incidence structure of the smoothings. To this end, we identify the components of the deformed curve $(C)_i$ with the support of their decoration divisor $(l)_i$. We make this identification concrete with the following definition.

Definition 3.3. Given a sandwich presentation of Γ with smooth branches define a *combinatorial smoothing* to be a tuple (V, \mathcal{C}) , where V is a set of points, and $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathcal{P}(V)$ represents the curves corresponding to each -1 leaf of the presentation. We denote a curve on a vertex $w \in \Gamma$ by C_w , and v denotes the last vertex of the blowdown. The curves have to abide by the following two rules:

- (1) $|C_w| = |p(w, v)| + 1$
- (2) $|C_w \cap C_z| = |p(w, v) \cap p(z, v)|$

Remark 3.4. Using the Noether multiplicity formula, it is clear that given a sandwiched singularity with smooth branches, this is the incidence structure of a picture deformation.

Again, we note that curves are identified with the support of their decoration divisor, and so are finite sets.

There are many different ways to give a sandwich presentation of Γ with smooth curves, this corresponds to the choice of v in Definition 3.2, the vertex where we put one curve less than would be required to blow it down. [3, Theorem 4.16.] tells us how to relate combinatorial smoothings under a change of this last vertex v .

Theorem 3.5 ([loc. cit.]). *Given a sandwich presentation of Γ with smooth branches, ending at a vertex v , a combinatorial smoothing (V, \mathcal{C}) and another vertex w with $\deg(w) + e(w) < 0$ one gets another sandwich*

presentation of Γ with smooth branches, ending at w by adding an extra -1 leaf to v , and removing one from w . There is a combinatorial smoothing of this graph (\tilde{V}, \tilde{C}) obtained as follows:

- (1) $\tilde{V} := V$
- (2) choose an arbitrary C_w curve to remove
- (3) the new curve $\tilde{C}_v := C_w$
- (4) for $C \neq C_w$ and $p \in V$ we have $\tilde{C} = C_w \triangle C$

Remark 3.6. Switching from C_v to C_w , and then back to C_v , gives back the original smoothing.

Definition 3.7. We put a partial ordering on the graph: $x > y$ if $y \in p(x, v)$ where v is the last vertex to be blown down.

Remark 3.8. From the definition it is clear, that if $x \leq y$, then $|C_x \cap C_y| = |C_x| - 1$, or stated differently $\exists! p \in C_x : C_x \setminus \{p\} \subset C_y$. On the other hand, if $x \not\leq y$ and $z \geq y$, then $|C_x \cap C_y| = |C_x \cap C_z|$. These basic properties will be used many times in the following.

Definition 3.9. A *reducing triple* consists of three (not necessarily distinct) vertices $v \leq w \leq z$, subject to the following conditions:

- (1) $\{deg(v), deg(w), deg(z)\} \subset \{1, 2\}$ or $v = w = z$
- (2) there is one curve on w and at least one on v and z
- (3) no vertex in $p(v, z) \setminus \{v, w, z\}$ has any curves
- (4) $\Gamma \setminus p(v, z)$ and $p(v, z)$ only connect with edges in Γ at v and z

(2) is to be understood additively, i.e., if say $v = w$, then it should have at least two curves (one for w and at least one more for v).

Definition 3.10. For a reducing triple $v \leq w \leq z$, we let the blowdown end at v and pick a distinguished curve on z and denote it C_z , the curve on w is denoted C_w . We name $C_w \setminus C_z =: \{Q\}$, $C_w \cap C_z =: P$, $C_z \setminus P =: Q'$. Similarly, we will denote curves on a vertex x by C_x^1, C_x^2 , and so on.

3.2. The reduction algorithm. Next, we prove a few simple statements in the context of a given reducing triple. From now on, we also suppose that every node satisfies $deg(v) + e(v) \leq -2$.

Lemma 3.11. *Let $w \neq x \in \Gamma$ be a vertex. If $Q \in C_x$, then $Q \in C_a$ for all $x \leq a$.*

Proof. Since $Q \in C_x$, either $Q' \subset C_x$ if $x \geq z$, or $\exists! q' \in Q' : q' \in C_x$ if $x \not\geq z$. Either way $Q \notin C_a$ implies $C_x \setminus \{Q\} \subset C_a$, which in turn implies $Q \in C_a$, contradiction. \square

Corollary 3.12. *If $Q \in C_x$, $Q \notin C_y$, then $x \neq y$ unless $w = z = x = y$. \square*

Remark 3.13. By this corollary, we can say that a vertex $v \in \Gamma$ contains Q or not, dependent on if its curves do.

Lemma 3.14. *If $a, b \in \Gamma$ are in different components of $\Gamma \setminus \{v\}$ and $Q \in C_a$, then $Q \notin C_b$.*

Proof. The $\deg(v) = 1$ case is vacuous. Secondly, if $\deg(v) = 2$, $Q \in C_a \cap C_b$ suppose $z < a$, now b being in a different component means, that C_b has to intersect C_a once, but from $Q \in C_b$, we get that there is also a $q' \in Q'$ which is in C_b . $z < a$ implies that $Q' \subset C_a$, thus $|C_a \cap C_b| \geq 2$, a contradiction.

In the third case, when the reducing triple is v, v, v , Q' consists of a single point, and the same argument shows that $Q \in C_a \cap C_b$ implies $Q' \in C_a \cap C_b$, but $|C_a \cap C_b| = 1$ by assumption. \square

Lemma 3.15. *Let $(w \neq)x < a, b$ with $a \not\geq b$ in two different components of $\Gamma \setminus \{x\}$. If $Q \notin C_x^1, C_x^2$, then Q cannot be in both C_a and C_b .*

Proof. Assume $x > z$ and let $n + 1 = |C_x^i|$, if $Q \in C_a$, then there is a point $q' \in Q'$ which is in C_a and a point $p \in P$ with $p \notin C_a$. Call $C_x^i \setminus C_x^j = \{p_i\}$. Since C_a does not contain a point of P , it contains both p_i 's. This means, that if $Q \in C_b$ were true, then C_a and C_b would intersect in at least $n - 2$ points of $C_x^1 \cap C_x^2$, in Q and p_1, p_2 for a total of at least $n + 1$ points, a contradiction, since they have to intersect n times by assumption.

If x is in another component of $\Gamma \setminus \{v\}$, we argue similarly. The C_x^i intersect C_w, C_z in a single point, which can be in $C_x^1 \cap C_x^2$, or the p_i 's. In either case, C_a, C_b have to intersect in the remaining at least n points of $C_x^1 \cup C_x^2$, and in Q , a contradiction. \square

We can extend the notion of reducing triple to the case where we replace (1) of Definition 3.9 with $v = w$, $\deg(v) = \deg(w) < 3$ and $\deg(z) > 2$.

Lemma 3.16. *With the modified assumption on the reducing triple, we have, that $C_z^1 \cap C_z^2 \cap C_v = \{P\}$.*

Proof. Let the blowdown end at v . We choose one of the curves on z to be $C_z := C_z^1$, and denote $C_z \cap C_v =: \{P\}$, $C_v \setminus \{P\} =: \{Q\}$ and $C_z \setminus \{Q\} =: Q'$ as usual. Furthermore, assume that $Q \in C_z^2$. Pick $x > z$ with a curve. Without loss of generality, assume that $P \in C_x$, then $Q' \subset C_x$, since it missed $Q \in C_z^2$, and it cannot intersect C_z^2 enough times otherwise. This implies $C_z \subset C_x$, contradiction. \square

This tells us which point of C_v to label Q , now we only need to check that only one component of $\Gamma \setminus \{z\}$ and $\Gamma \setminus \{v\}$ can contain curves with Q , afterwards Lemma 3.11 and Lemma 3.15 are applicable.

Lemma 3.17. *If $x \not\geq y$ are in two different components of $\Gamma \setminus \{z\}$, then x, y cannot both contain Q .*

Proof. The assumption $Q \in C_x \cap C_y$ implies that C_x and C_y intersect $n + 1$ times, since they have to contain $(C_z^1 \cup C_z^2) \setminus \{P\}$, contradiction. \square

Lemma 3.18. *Consider $x > z$ and y in another component of $\Gamma \setminus \{v\}$, then x, y cannot both contain Q .*

Proof. By $Q \in C_x$, we get that $Q' \subset C_x$, and by the assumption on y , we get that $C_y \cap Q' = \emptyset$, so $C_y \cap C_z = \emptyset$, contradiction. \square

Consider a graph Γ and a $\mu = 0$ combinatorial smoothing of it (V, \mathcal{C}) . In this case, the map I of Theorem 2.14 is injective, in particular invertible, so by [3, 5.12-13], such a combinatorial smoothing is a qG-smoothing (see [8]) and, in particular, has no free points. This guarantees us that there will be a curve besides C_w containing Q . The preceding lemmas tell us that there is an edge of the graph that separates the vertices containing Q from the vertices not containing it. We call such an edge a *separating edge*.

Now, if there is a reducing triple in Γ , we can construct a smaller graph and a combinatorial smoothing for it by contracting a separating edge, deleting Q from V and C_w from \mathcal{C} . This can be iterated until the graph has no further reducing triples. A graph with no reducing triples consists of nodes with two curves and other vertices supporting at most one curve, such that every component of $\Gamma \setminus \{\text{nodes}\}$ has at most two curves total.

Definition 3.19. We call such a graph *reduced*.

Remark 3.20. Note that during reduction, the number of nodes, leaves, and components of $\Gamma \setminus \{\text{nodes}\}$ can only decrease.

Definition 3.21. Given a sandwich graph Γ we define

$$\delta(\Gamma) := \left(\sum_{v \in \Gamma} -e(v) - d(v) \right) - 1 - |V(\Gamma)|.$$

Remark 3.22. Note, that given (\mathcal{C}, V) , a combinatorial smoothing of Γ with smooth branches we see $\delta = |\mathcal{C}| - |V(\Gamma)|$. Notice also, that $\delta(\Gamma) = 1 - \sum_{\Gamma} (e(v) + 3)$, and compare with Wahl's formula in [17, Theorem 8.1], which states, that the dimension of a QHD smoothing

component is given by $h^1(S) - \sum_{\Gamma}(e(v) + 3)$, where S is the sheaf of logarithmic vector fields, the kernel of the map $T_X \rightarrow \oplus \nu_v \rightarrow 0$.

For graphs in $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C}$, this quantity is always $3 - s$, if the graph only has degree 3 nodes, and $2 - s$ if it has a degree 4 node, where $s := \#\{v \in \Gamma : \deg(v) > 2\}$.

The above proposed algorithm leaves this quantity unchanged.

Lemma 3.23. *After reducing a graph $\Gamma \in \mathcal{A}^3, \mathcal{B}^3, \mathcal{C}^3$ with s many nodes, the reduced graph γ satisfies $|\gamma| \leq 7s - 2$. Similarly for a graph $\Gamma \in \mathcal{A}^4, \mathcal{B}^4, \mathcal{C}^4$ we have $|\gamma| \leq 7s + 1$.*

Proof. In the first case $\Gamma \setminus \{\text{nodes}\}$ has at most $2s + 1$ components, so γ has at most this many.

This implies, that γ has at most $2s + 2(2s + 1) - 1 = 6s + 1$ curves, writing $3 - s \leq 6s + 1 - |\gamma|$ and rearranging gives the result.

For the case where Γ has a degree 4 node, we compute similarly: $2s + 2(2s + 2) - 1 = 6s + 3$ is the upper bound on the curves, $2 - s \leq 6s + 3 - |\gamma|$ and the statement follows. \square

Using Lemma 3.23 and computer checking we obtain special cases of [1, Theorem 1.4, 1.6] and [17, Theorem 8.6]:

Corollary 3.24. *Let $\Gamma \in \mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{C}$ be a graph with one node of degree 3 (resp. 4) with framing at most -5 (-6), then Γ cannot admit a QHD smoothing.*

Proof. Suppose the graph has a QHD smoothing; apply the reduction algorithm to its incidence structure. The reduced graph still has $\delta = 2$ (1), with $e(v) = -2$ if $\deg(v) = 1$, $e(v) \in \{-2, -3\}$ if $\deg(v) = 2$, $e(v) = -\deg(v) - 2$ otherwise. A linear graph under these framing restrictions has $\delta \leq -1$, an immediate contradiction. Thus, the graphs have a node and at least 3 leaves. This means that they have $\delta \leq 0$, which is a contradiction. \square

Corollary 3.25. *Let $\Gamma \in \mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{C}$ be a graph with two nodes of degree 3 and framing at most -5 , then Γ cannot admit a QHD smoothing.*

Proof. Suppose Γ admits a QHD smoothing, choosing a sandwich presentation for Γ with smooth curvetas (since it is assumed to be minimal rational), we get a combinatorial QHD smoothing, to which we apply the reduction algorithm, after which we obtain a reduced graph γ .

By Lemma 3.16, we have the same framing possibilities as before. Since δ stays constant, we know that the reduced graph has $\delta = 1$, since this is true for the starting graphs. By the previous corollary, graphs with a single node have $\delta \leq 0$, so all possible graphs have

two nodes. Checking all trees γ with $|\gamma| \leq 12$ under the constraints derived thus far, we see that there is no reduced graph with non-square determinant. \square

Furthermore, we can extend this to graphs with a degree 4 and a degree 3 node, and to the cases with 3 and 4 nodes as well. In these cases, the determinant can be a square, so we need to rely on Theorem 4.1, proved below, which states that for a graph admitting a combinatorial QHD smoothing, one has $Z_K^2 + |\Gamma| = 0$. Unfortunately the computation of the d -invariant¹ for general reduced graphs remains elusive.

Theorem 3.26. *Let $\Gamma \in \mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{C}$ be a graph with one node of valency 4 and framing at most -6 , and at most 2 nodes of valency 3 and framing at most -5 . Then Γ cannot admit a QHD smoothing.* \square

Theorem 3.27. *Let $\Gamma \in \mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{C}$ be a graph with at most four nodes of valency 3, and framing at most -5 , then Γ cannot admit a QHD smoothing.* \square

4. LATTICE EMBEDDINGS

In this brief section, we wish to prove the following:

Theorem 4.1. *If a sandwiched graph Γ admits a combinatorial rational homology disk smoothing, then the anticanonical cycle of the graph Z_K satisfies $Z_K^2 + |\Gamma| = 0$.*

Proof. Consider a sandwiched graph Γ with a fixed sandwich presentation $\tilde{\Gamma}$, which admits a combinatorial QHD smoothing. Following [3], we let $P' = \mathbb{Z}^l$ denote the free abelian group generated by the points of the combinatorial QHD smoothing and endow it with the trivial negative definite intersection form. Similarly, let $L = \mathbb{Z}^l$ denote the free abelian group generated by the set of curvetas of the sandwich presentation $\tilde{\Gamma}$. Consider the map $J : P' \rightarrow L$ where $p \mapsto \sum_{p \in L_i} L_i$, i.e., the incidence matrix of the combinatorial smoothing. Since $\text{rk } P' = \text{rk } L$, by [3, Corollary 5.10], the matrix of this map in the natural bases is invertible over \mathbb{Q} .

Consider also the incidence map of the Scott deformation $I : P = \mathbb{Z}^{l+n} \rightarrow L$. As mentioned in [3, Corollary 1.11] and [13, Subsection 4.2], the Milnor fiber of this deformation is diffeomorphic to the resolution of the singularity; thus, by Theorem 2.16, we have $Q_\Gamma \hookrightarrow P$.

Next note, that $II^* = JJ^* = Q_{artin}$ in the language of [3], thus $J^{-1}II^*J^{*-1} = (J^{-1}I)(J^{-1}I)^* = id$, which means, that the rows of the

¹i.e. $(Z_K^2 + |\Gamma|)/4$, see e.g. [12]

matrix $J^{-1}I$ form an orthonormal basis for $\ker(J^{-1}I)^\perp = \ker(I)^\perp \leq P \otimes \mathbb{Q}$.

Let $1_\alpha = (1)_1^\alpha$, the product $I1_{l+n} = (|L_i|)_1^l$, and since the number of points on each curvetta is determined by the sandwich presentation $\tilde{\Gamma}$, the same is true for $J1_l$, thus $J^{-1}I1_{l+n} = 1_l$, which means that denoting the rows of $J^{-1}I$ by f_i we get a basis where taking $K = \sum_{p \in P} p$ we have

$$(3) \quad (J^{-1}I)^*(J^{-1}I)K = \sum f_i$$

Up until now, we were concerned with $\ker(I)^\perp$. We have $P \otimes \mathbb{Q} = (\mathbb{Q}^{l+n}, \langle -1 \rangle^{l+n})$, and an embedded $(\mathbb{Q}^l, \langle -1 \rangle^l)$. By Witt's cancellation theorem ([11, 4.4]) this means, that the orthogonal complement generated by $\ker(J^{-1}I)$ is isomorphic to $(\mathbb{Q}^n, \langle -1 \rangle^n)$.

By Equation 3 the orthogonal projection of K onto $\ker(I)^\perp$ is equal to $\sum f_i$, and so has square $-l$, which implies that the orthogonal projection to $\ker(J^{-1}I)$ will have square $-n$. From Theorem 2.16, this projection represents the anti-canonical cycle of Γ , we get that $Z_K^2 = -n$. \square

Proposition 4.2. *If a sandwiched graph Γ admits a combinatorial rational homology disk smoothing, then $Q_\Gamma \subset U$ for some unimodular lattice U , with $\text{rk } U = |\Gamma|$.*

Proof. Let $I : P \rightarrow L$ denote the incidence matrix of the Scott deformation, and $J : P' \rightarrow L$ denote the incidence matrix of a combinatorial QHD deformation, as previously. By Figure 3 ([3, Diagram 5.9]) we get that I is surjective and J is injective. In particular $H^2(F_J) \leq H_1(\partial F_J)$ is a subgroup of the discriminant group of Q_Γ (which is isomorphic to $H_1(\partial F)$ of size $\sqrt{H_1(\partial F)}$). By commutativity of the diagram and the fact that P is endowed with the trivial negative definite intersection form, this subgroup is isotropic, which by [10, 1.7.1] gives an integral unimodular overlattice U for Q_Γ in Q_Γ^* . \square

5. SOME GRAPHS ADMITTING A COMBINATORIAL QHD SMOOTHING

Example 5.1. Let us denote by $fpp(n)$ the star-shaped graph with $n^2 + n + 1$ arms, each of length $n - 1$, with the node having framing $-n^2 - n - 2$, and all other vertices -2 . A combinatorial QHD smoothing of this graph is the finite projective plane of order n . $\det(fpp(n)) = n^{(n+1)n}(n+1)^2$, and they all have $Z_K^2 + n = 0$.

By modifying the finite projective plane configuration, we obtain further graphs with combinatorial QHD smoothings. Pick a point x and all lines through it. Add further points a_1, \dots, a_l , and curves $\{x, a_i\}$ to

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc}
 & & & 0 & & 0 & & & \\
 & & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & & \\
 & 0 & \longrightarrow & L^* & \longrightarrow & L^* & \longrightarrow & 0 & \\
 & \downarrow & & \downarrow f^* & & \downarrow f \circ f^* & & \downarrow & \\
 0 & \longrightarrow & \ker f & \longrightarrow & P & \xrightarrow{f} & L & \longrightarrow & \operatorname{co} \ker f \longrightarrow 0 \\
 & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & \\
 0 & \longrightarrow & H_2(F_f) & \longrightarrow & H^2(F_f) & \longrightarrow & H_1(\partial F_f) & \longrightarrow & H_1(F_f) \longrightarrow 0 \\
 & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & \\
 & 0 & & 0 & & 0 & & 0 &
 \end{array}$$

FIGURE 3. f denotes the incidence matrix of a combinatorial smoothing, and F_f the Milnor fiber ([3, Diagram 5.9])

the configuration, and for all lines that do not contain x , add all of the a_i . This is a QHD smoothing for the graph we denote $fpp(n)_l$.

Example 5.2. Consider k "clusters" consisting of n points each: $\{A_i\}_1^k$ with $|A_i| = n$. Define sets of curves as follows: $C_j^i = \cup_{l \neq i} A_l \cup \{a_j\}$ where $a_j \in A_i$. This is a combinatorial QHD smoothing of a graph, which we denote $Cl(k, n)$.

(Similarly one can take $C_j^i := \cup_{l \neq i} A_l \cup A_i \setminus \{a_j\}$, the corresponding graph $Cl(-k, n)$ is linear with coefficients the negatives of $[2 \times p - 2, p + 2] = \frac{p^2}{p-1}$.)




FIGURE 4. The graph $Cl(k, n)$ for $k > 1$. The number x on an edge represents a path of x many -2 vertices.

Remark 5.3. We define cluster extension of the graphs $Cl(k, n)$. Here, consider an additional set B , with $|B| = b$ (which we call the parameter of the extension), and add its points to all existing curves. Furthermore add new curves $D_i = \cup A_l \cup \{b_i\}$ (or $\cup A_l \cup B \setminus \{b_i\}$ for $b < 0$). The construction corresponds to a combinatorial smoothing of a graph, if $b \geq n > 1$ with $k > 0$, and in all cases if $k < -1$.




FIGURE 5. The graph we obtain after cluster extending $Cl(k, n)$ for $k > 1$. For $k < -1$, we still get some $\frac{p^2}{pq-1}$ linear graphs, which admit a \mathbb{Q} HD smoothing.

Another construction one can make is the star extension of $Cl(k, n)$. Add a new point x and a new set B of size b . Add the elements of B to the existing curves, and define new curves $S_i = \{x\} \cup \{b_i\}$ and $F = \cup_1^k A_i \cup \{x\}$.





FIGURE 6. The graph we obtain after star extending $Cl(k, n)$ for $k > 1$.

Example 5.4. Using the complement idea, we generalize the family of Wahl [16, 5.9.2]. In this case we consider 3 sets A, B, C of sizes $|a|, |b|, |c|$, the curves are $A \cup \{b_i\}$, $B \cup \{c_i\}$, $C \cup \{a_i\}$, or one can take the complements of the singletons inside their containing sets. We denote this choice by flipping the sign of the set, that the corresponding curves contain, i.e. $a, -b, c$ uses the curves $A \cup \{b_i\}$, $B \cup (C \setminus \{c_i\})$, $C \cup \{a_i\}$. This gives combinatorial smoothings for the graphs we denote $t(a, b, c)$. If all parameters are positive, we get Wahl's family (Figure 1 left), if one or two is negative, we get the \mathcal{N} family (Figure 1 right). If all three are negative with $|a| > |b| = |c|$ we get the graph of Figure 7.


 FIGURE 7. The graph $t(-a, -b, -b)$.

6. WEIGHTED HOMOGENEOUS SINGULARITIES – STARS

This section presents a new proof of the main theorem of [1], namely the classification of weighted homogeneous singularities admitting a QHD smoothing. From Theorem 2.4, we only need to check the star-shaped elements of $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C}$. In contrast to Section 3, not all graphs will be minimal rational; most curvetas will be ordinary cusps.

6.1. The degree 3 case. Let us begin with some generalities, which will be used multiple times in the following. We will be dealing with star-shaped graphs with three arms, where two of the arms have length 1 and decorations $-a$ and $-b$, respectively. We will always put $\max\{a-2, 0\}$ many -1 framed vertices on the $-a$ vertex and $\max\{b-3, 0\}$ many -1 framed vertices to the $-b$ vertex. Denote curvetas on these vertices by S_i and L_i , respectively. The third "long" arm will be blown down starting from the end and decorated as necessary. Take an arbitrary order on the -1 vertices of every vertex, and denote the j th curvetta of the i th vertex by C_i^j .




FIGURE 8. The general case graph with the curves indicated.

Since the node has framing at most -2 , we know that the C_i^j will be star-shaped and the L_i, S_i will be smooth. We provide their intersections in Table 1b.

Curve	L_i	S_i	C_i^j
# of points	2	3	$5+i$

(A) Point data

(\cdot, \cdot)	L_a	S_a	C_a^b
L_i	1	1	2
S_i		2	3
C_i^j			$6 + \min\{i, a\}$

(B) Intersection data

TABLE 1. The combinatorial information in our setup

The multiplicity sequence of these cusps are easily computed to be $(2, 1, \dots, 1)$, so C_i^j must all have one double (2-tuple) point and further simple points (i.e., at all but one point the curve is locally irreducible). For a cusp curve C , we define $X(C)$ to be the point in P which it contains with multiplicity 2. From this, it is simple to compute how many points each curve has to contain and their intersection multiplicities, this is collected in Table 1a. We denote the points where these curves intersect by $\{p_i : 1 \leq i \leq 4 + n\}$.

In this section, n will always denote the number of vertices on the "long" arm (on which the C_i^j are located). From the construction of the $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C}$ classes, it is easy to see by induction that there will always be $4 + n$ many curves in total in the sandwich presentation described above. We will mostly be interested in the smooth curves, the curves at the very end C_n^α , and the curve closest to the node. We let ℓ denote the index where there exists C_ℓ^1 , and for every $k < \ell$, there is no C_k^1 .

Remark 6.1. As before, we work with the intersection pattern of the given sandwich presentation of the graph, and by a small abuse of notation, we identify curves with the intersection points they contain.

We note some simple facts about these curves:

Lemma 6.2. *Consider C_i^j and C_a^b for $i \leq a$. If $X(C_i^j) \neq X(C_a^b)$, then $C_i^j \subset C_a^b$ (as sets, without multiplicities). If $X(C_i^j) = X(C_a^b)$, then there is a single $p \in C_i^j$ with $p \notin C_a^b$.*

Proof. If their double points differ, then $p_d := X(C_a^b) \in C_i^j$, otherwise, $(C_a^b, C_i^j) \leq 5 + i < 6 + i$, and if $p_d \in C_i^j$, then it has to go through every point for the intersection to reach $6 + i$.

On the other hand, if their double points coincide, then there are a further $3 + i$ simple points to make $2 + i$ intersections. The claim follows. \square

Corollary 6.3. *The C_n^α curves all have distinct double points, where all other C_i^j must have a single point. The L_i and S_i cannot go through these points.*

Proof. Since the C_n^α curves contain $5 + n$ points with multiplicity, and there are $4 + n$ points in total, they go through all points, i.e., it is impossible for the second case of Lemma 6.2 to occur.

Both L_i and S_i would intersect the C_n^α curves too many times if they went through the double points. \square

We state the following for emphasis:

Corollary 6.4. *All C_i^j must go through every other C_a^b 's double point.*

6.1.1. *Graphs in \mathcal{C} .* We begin the case analysis with the class \mathcal{C} .




FIGURE 9. Graphs in \mathcal{C}_6 admitting a QHD smoothing

Theorem 6.5. *In \mathcal{C}_6 , only the family depicted in Figure 9 can admit a QHD smoothing.*

Proof. In this case, there are no L_i, S_i , only the cusps. The known case is $\ell = n$, we want to rule out any other possibility. It is easy to see by induction that there will be $6 + \ell$ many C_n^α curves if $\ell < n$. By Corollary 6.4, C_ℓ^1 would have to contain $2 + 6 + \ell > 5 + \ell$ many points, a contradiction. \square




FIGURE 10. The graphs for the \mathcal{C}_3 case, $p \geq 0, q \geq -1$.

Theorem 6.6. *In \mathcal{C}_3 , only the graphs of Figure 10 can admit QHD smoothings.*

Proof. In this case, we have three L_i 's in addition to the cusps. If $\ell = n$, we are done, so let $\ell < n$. Simple induction shows that there will be $3 + \ell$ many C_n^α 's, so C_ℓ^1 contains their double points, its double point and no further point. This means that the L_i have to go through this point to intersect it twice by Lemma 6.3.

If there would be another C_k^α with $\ell \leq k < n$, then it intersects C_ℓ^1 least $7 + \ell$ times by Corollary 6.4, a contradiction. So there is C_ℓ^1 , and the C_n^α curves. This means that $3 + \ell = 4 + n - 3 - 1$, ergo $\ell = n - 3$, and this is the other known case. \square




FIGURE 11. The graphs for the C_2 case, $p \geq 0, q \geq -1$.

Theorem 6.7. *In \mathcal{C}_2 , only the graphs of Figure 11 can admit a $\mathbb{Q}HD$ smoothing.*

Proof. In this case, there will be four S_i curves and the cusps. Let $\ell < n$. There will be $2 + \ell$ many cusps on the last vertex.

Counting the number of points of C_ℓ^1 it has (besides the C_n^α double points) $p_d := X(C_\ell^1)$ and a further simple point denoted p_s . All of the S_i have to go through p_d and p_s since $(S_i, C_\ell^1) = 3$. This also means that they have a further point each p_{S_i} . If there is a second C_i^j for some $\ell \leq i < n$, then $X(C_i^j) = p_d$ or p_s .

If $X(C_i^j) = p_d$, then p_s will be the point C_i^j misses by Lemma 6.2, and $p_{S_i} \in C_i^j$. If there were a third C_a^b curve with $i \leq a < n$, we see that $X(C_a^b) = p_d$ by Corollary 6.4. By the same argument we get that $p_{S_i} \in C_a^b$ for $i = 1, \dots, 4$.

Every subsequent curve has to meet these same requirements. Let $K := \mathcal{C} \setminus \{S_i, C_n^\alpha, C_\ell^1\}$, with $|K| = k$. Let $\tilde{K} := \cup K \setminus \{X(C_n^\alpha) : 1 \leq n \leq \ell + 2\} \subset V$ with $|\tilde{K}| = \tilde{k}$. Counting the curves and points of the configuration, we get

$$(4) \quad 2 + \ell + 1 + 4 + k = 2 + \ell + 2 + 4 + \tilde{k} = 4 + n,$$

implying $k = 1 + \tilde{k}$.

Claim. $C_i^j = C_{\ell+3}^1$.

Proof. If C_i^j would contain any further points, then the curves in K restricted to the points of \tilde{K} give a solution to the combinatorial smoothing problem for a linear graph, since $X(C) = p_d$ for all $C \in K$. This implies $k \leq \tilde{k}$, a contradiction. \square

Any further curve would also go through p_d and p_{S_i} , which means it would intersect $C_{\ell+3}^1$ $10 + \ell > 9 + \ell$ times, a contradiction. Substituting $k = 1$ into Equation 4 we see that $\ell = n - 4$, this is the third graph of Figure 11.

The other case plays out similarly. If $X(C_i^j) = p_s$, then every other curve has to have its double point at p_s and go through p_d to intersect S_i and C_ℓ^1 enough times. The same argument shows that $C_i^j = C_\ell^2$, there are no further curves and $\ell = n - 4$. This is the second graph of Figure 11.

If there is only one cusp curve that is not on the last vertex, then we have $4 + n = 2 + \ell + 1 + 4$, ergo $\ell = n - 3$. The C_n^α 's require $2 + n - 3 = n - 1$ points, C_ℓ^1 an additional 2. We have only 3 points left, which is a contradiction since the S_i need 4 additional points besides the previously mentioned ones.

Finally, if $\ell = n$, we get the first graph of Figure 11. \square

6.1.2. *Graphs in \mathcal{B} .* We continue with the \mathcal{B} class.




FIGURE 12. The graphs for the B_2 case, $p \geq 0, q \geq -1$.

Theorem 6.8. *In \mathcal{B}_2 , only the graphs of Figure 12 can admit a QHD smoothing.*

Proof. In this case, there is L_1, S_1, S_2 and the cusps. Suppose that not every blowup happened on the edge next to the leaf. In this case, the setup of the cusps is identical to the \mathcal{C}_2 case, the curve C_ℓ^1 has (besides the $X(C_n^\alpha)$ points) a double and one further simple point p_d and p_s , respectively. $p_s, p_d \in S_i$ to intersect C_ℓ^1 three times (and both have one further point p_{S_i}). L_1 has to go through p_d to intersect C_ℓ^1 twice, and thus it contains one further point p_{L_1} .

We continue similarly to the \mathcal{C}_2 case. Any further curve can have its double point at either p_d or p_s , and all of them have to be at the same point. Denote the curve with the next smallest index after ℓ by C_i^j . From here, the same argument provides that C_i^j is $C_{\ell+1}^1$ in both cases (it either contains p_{S_1}, p_{S_2} in the p_d or p_d, p_{L_1} in the p_s case). In both cases, there are no further curves because they would intersect $C_{\ell+1}^1$ too many times. This gives the second graph of Figure 12.

Lastly, if every blowup happens next to the leaf, we get the first graph of Figure 12. \square




FIGURE 13. The graph for the B_4 case, $p \geq 0$.

Theorem 6.9. *In \mathcal{B}_4 , only the graph of Figure 13 can admit a $\mathbb{Q}HD$ smoothing.*

Proof. In this case, we have L_1 and the cusps. Suppose not every blowup happened next to the leaf. Then a simple induction shows that there are $4 + \ell$ many C_n^α curves. This means C_ℓ^1 goes through $6 + \ell$ points with multiplicity, an immediate contradiction. \square




FIGURE 14. The graphs for the A_3 case, $p \geq 0$.

6.1.3. Graphs in \mathcal{A} .

Theorem 6.10. *In \mathcal{A}_3 , only the graph of Figure 14 can admit a $\mathbb{Q}HD$ smoothing.*

Proof. In this case, there is S_1 and the cusps. Suppose not every blowup happened next to the leaf. There will be $3 + \ell$ curves at the last vertex by induction. C_ℓ^1 will go through the double points of the C_n^α curves, and it has its double point and no more. By Corollary 6.3, S_1 can only

intersect C_ℓ^1 at p_d , so at most 2 times instead of the required 3, an immediate contradiction. Thus, we are left with the case when every blowup happens next to the leaf, depicted in Figure 14. \square

6.2. The degree 4 case. Most of the setup stays unchanged in this case; there will still be $4 + n$ many curves, the end curves have to go through all points, etc. In addition to the L_i, S_i , there will also be some exceptional cusps Γ_i . They intersect the L_i, S_i as do the C_i^j , and intersect the C_i^j curves 6 times.

Lemma 6.11. $X(C_n^\alpha) \notin \Gamma_i$ for any i .

Proof. If this were not the case, they would intersect 7 times. \square

In the following, we will assume that not all blowups happen next to the leaf as previously, a simple calculation shows, that C_ℓ^1 has three points (besides the double points of the C_n^α curves of course): its double point denoted p_d , and two simple points p_{s_i} . We fix this notation in this section.

Lemma 6.12. Every curve after C_ℓ^1 can have their double points in at most two of the three points p_d, p_{s_1}, p_{s_2} .

Proof. There are two cases to consider. The first curves have their double points at p_d, p_{s_1} or p_{s_1}, p_{s_2} and both are similar. If there is a curve with double point at p_d besides C_ℓ^1 , it has to miss one of the p_{s_i} , say p_{s_2} , this means no curve can have its double point at p_{s_2} by Corollary 6.4.

Symmetrically, if every subsequent curve has its double point at the p_{s_i} , no curve can have its double point at p_d since it would have to miss one of the p_{s_i} by Lemma 6.2. \square

We state the following corollary of the proof for emphasis:

Corollary 6.13. If $X(C_i^j) = p_d$, then $X(C_a^b) = p_d$ for any $a < i$.

Proof. Such curves have to miss one of the p_{s_i} 's, and so a point of any curve with double point at any of these two points, which is a contradiction. \square

Lemma 6.14. If every curve B after C_ℓ^1 until C_i^j has $X(B) = p_d$ and the next curve C satisfies $X(C) = p_{s_1}$, then all subsequent curves have their double points at p_{s_1} . The same statement is true if we change the order of p_d, p_{s_1} or replace p_d, p_{s_1} with p_{s_1}, p_{s_2} .

Proof. Let us denote a curve after C by C' with $X(C) \neq X(C')$. If $X(C_i^j) = p_d$, then by assumption we know, that $p_{s_1} \in C_i^j \not\subset p_{s_2}$, thus

we only have to rule out $X(C') = p_d$. This is automatic by Lemma 6.2 since $p_d, p_{s_1}, p_{s_2} \in C$, the curve C' will also contain these points and thus all points of C_ℓ^1 , a contradiction, since $X(C_\ell^1) = X(C')$.

The case where $X(C_i^j) = p_{s_1}$ is simpler; if $X(C) = p_d$, then $p_{s_2} \notin C$, a contradiction since $p_{s_2} \in C_i^j$.

If $X(C) = p_{s_2}$, then $X(C') \neq p_d$, since it would miss a point of C_i^j, C . Since $X(C) \neq X(C') = X(C_i^j)$ we get that $C_i^j \subset C \subset C'$, a contradiction. \square

The strategy of the proof follows the $\mathcal{C}_2, \mathcal{B}_2$ cases: we analyze the configuration of the existing L_i, S_i, Γ_i curves in relation to C_ℓ^1 , then we take every other cusp, which is not a C_n^α , and use them to construct a solution to the combinatorial smoothing problem of a linear graph, i.e. a sequence of sets A_i satisfying Definition 3.3.

This is done by observing, that if some cusps C_i have $X(C_i) = X(C_{i'})$, then by "forgetting" the multiplicity of the double point the definition is already satisfied. Furthermore if there are larger (in the sense, that they correspond to vertices of the graph farther from the node) curves D_i with $X(D_i) = X(D_{i'}) \neq X(C_i)$ if we remove $X(C_i)$ from D_i the definition is satisfied. Furthermore we delete points, which are contained in every curve, and identify points which we know must be either contained or missed together.




FIGURE 15. The valency 4 graphs, which admit a QHD smoothing, where $[a, b, c, d] \in \{[3, 3, 3, 4], [2, 4, 4, 3], [2, 3, 6, 2]\}$ and $p \geq 0$.

6.2.1. Graphs in \mathcal{C} .

Theorem 6.15. *In \mathcal{C}^4 , only the graph of Figure 15 can admit a QHD smoothing.*

Proof. We have five Γ_i exceptional cusps and the C_i^j on the fourth arm. If there is no C_ℓ^1 , we are done, otherwise, there are $1 + \ell$ many C_n^α curves. Counting points, we see that C_ℓ^1 has three points besides

the double points of the C_n^α , its double point p_d , and two simple points p_{s_i} . $(\Gamma_i, C_\ell^1) = 6$ can only happen, if every Γ_i has its double point at p_d and contains both p_{s_i} by Lemma 6.11.

A simple checking of cases shows that all of the Γ_i have to go through a further point together, denote it p_Γ , and have a final point, which is not on any other Γ_j , call them p_i . Every C_i^j curve which is not C_ℓ^1 or C_n^α will have to contain either p_Γ or the p_i to intersect the Γ_i 6 times (but not both). Note, that a "switch" lemma, similar to Lemma 6.14 applies to these two possibilities as well, if some curves contain, say p_Γ , and the next curve contains the p_i , then every subsequent curve has to contain the p_i as well, since the curves C_i^j have to contain the previous ones' points except for at most one.

Every further curve C_i^j with $i < n$ has to have its double point at p_d or one of the p_{s_i} . By Lemmata 6.12-6.14 we have to consider the cases where some curves after C_ℓ^1 have double points at p_d or p_{s_1} and possibly some later curves have their double points at p_{s_1} in the former, or p_{s_2} in the latter case.

We construct a new system of curves as follows: take the points of $X := C_\ell^1 \setminus \{A\}$, where A denotes the double point of the first curve after C_ℓ^1 . Take every curve with index $(i, j) \neq (\ell, 1)$ or (n, α) . Our new curves will be $C_i^j \setminus X$ if the double point of this curve was at A , or $C_i^j \setminus \{X \cup \{A\}\}$ if its double point was not at A , with the modification, that the p_i are combined into a single point P , and finally with an added new curve $S_0 = \{p_\Gamma, P\}$. These curves give a combinatorial solution to the smoothing problem of a linear graph, thus in particular it has at least as many points, as curves. From this we deduce, that $k + 1 \leq \tilde{k} + 3$, where k denotes the number of curves in the original configuration besides $C_\ell^1, C_n^\alpha, \Gamma_i$, and \tilde{k} denotes the number of points in the original configuration besides the points of $C_\ell^1, p_\Gamma, p_1, \dots, p_5$.

Suppose there existed a QHD smoothing, then we would have

$$1 + \ell + 5 + 1 + k = 1 + \ell + 3 + 1 + 5 + \tilde{k} \leftrightarrow k = \tilde{k} + 3.$$

Thus $\tilde{k} + 3 \leq \tilde{k} + 2$, contradiction. \square

6.2.2. Graphs in \mathcal{B} .

Theorem 6.16. *In \mathcal{B}^4 , only the known case admits a QHD smoothing.*

Proof. We have L_1, S_1, S_2, Γ_1 besides the C_i^j . If every blowup happens next to the leaf of the fourth arm, we are in the known case, otherwise there are $1 + \ell$ many C_n^α curves, and C_ℓ^1 has three points which are not double points of the C_n^α 's, denoted p_d, p_{s_1}, p_{s_2} as before. Besides these three points, Γ_1 has two further points p_Γ, p_1 . L_1 contains two

points. These can be either p_d and a new point p_L , or p_{s_1}, p_{s_2} . In this latter case, there can be no further C_i^j , since either $X(C_i^j) = p_d$ which forces $(C_i^j, L_1) = 1$, or $X(C_i^j) = p_{s_1}$, which implies $(C_i^j, L_1) = 3$. This means that this case cannot occur since we would have fewer curves than points. The S_i have to go through p_d to intersect C_ℓ^1 three times, and either they both go through p_{s_1} , and have one extra point p_2, p_3 , or $p_{s_i} \in S_i$, and they meet at a further point p_S .

In the latter case no further C_i^j can exist, since $X(C_i^j) = p_d$ is forced, and so $p_{s_1} \in C_i^j \not\cong p_{s_2}$, thus $(C_i^j, S_2) = 2$, a contradiction. Thus this case cannot happen, since there are at least two curves on the long arm, which are not on the end by the construction of the \mathcal{B} class.

If both S_i go through p_{s_1} then either all C_i^j after C_ℓ^1 have their double points first at p_{s_1} , then p_{s_2} , or at p_d , then p_{s_1} or at p_d then p_{s_2} (with the "switch" possibly not happening) by Lemma 6.14 or if p_{s_2} is the double point of the first curve, then all curves will have their double points there.

For all of these cases we derive a combinatorial smoothing for a linear graph using the same method as previously. Let A denote $X(C_i^j)$ where C_i^j is the next curve after C_ℓ^1 . Let $X := (C_\ell^1 \cup L_1 \cup S_1 \cup S_2) \setminus \{A\}$. If $X(C) = A$, then consider $C \setminus X$, otherwise we take a curve to be $C \setminus (X \cup \{A\})$. Finally add a curve $\{p_\Gamma, p_1\}$. The validity of this configuration shows that $k + 1 \leq \tilde{k} + 3$. On the other hand we can calculate

$$1 + \ell + 5 + k = 1 + \ell + 8 + \tilde{k} \leftrightarrow k = \tilde{k} + 3,$$

which is a contradiction. □

6.2.3. Graphs in \mathcal{A} .

Theorem 6.17. *In \mathcal{A}^4 only the known case admits a QHD smoothing.*

Proof. We have Γ_1, Γ_2, S_1 and the cusps. The known case is when every blowup happens towards the leaf, otherwise $1 + \ell$ is the number of C_n^α curves, besides their double points C_ℓ^1 has its double point and two simple points p_d, p_{s_1}, p_{s_2} . Γ_1, Γ_2 have their double points at p_d to intersect C_ℓ^1 enough times, they intersect at one more point p_Γ and have a single point each p_1, p_2 . S_1 contains p_d, p_{s_1} and a further point p_S .

The proof is essentially the same as the previous two cases. The double points of subsequent curves can be at two of the three possible points p_d, p_{s_1}, p_{s_2} . Let A denote the double point of the first curve. We create a solution to the combinatorial smoothing problem of a linear graph by identifying the points p_1, p_2 into a single point P , taking

$X = C_\ell^1 \setminus \{A\}$ and considering the curves $C_i^j \setminus X$ if $X(C_i^j) = A$ and $C_i^j \setminus (X \cup \{A\})$ if $X(C_i^j) \neq A$, and finally adding $S_0 = \{P_\Gamma, P\}$ to the beginning of the configuration. This means that $k + 1 \leq \tilde{k} + 3$. Assuming the existence of a QHD smoothing, we compute

$$1 + \ell + 4 + k = 1 + \ell + 7 + \tilde{k} \Leftrightarrow k = \tilde{k} + 3.$$

□

Remark 6.18. The known families already ruled out in e.g. [6, Proposition 4.2] can also be ruled out from having a QHD smoothing using this method. Similarly to Section 5 one can find many graphs with a fixed sandwiched presentation admitting a combinatorial QHD smoothing. Unlike the minimal rational case, this is even possible inside the $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C}$ families.

More generally, there are graphs which are rational, and have more than one -2 node in the $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C}$ families, which don't have a sandwich presentation using only smooth and cusp curves, and in fact there are rational graphs in $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C}$, which are not sandwiched at all.

REFERENCES

- [1] Mohan Bhupal and András I Stipsicz. Weighted homogeneous singularities and rational homology disk smoothings. *American journal of mathematics*, 133(5):1259–1297, 2011.
- [2] Mohan Bhupal and András I Stipsicz. Smoothings of singularities and symplectic topology. In *Deformations of surface singularities*, pages 57–97. Springer, 2013.
- [3] T. De Jong and D. Van Straten. Deformation theory of sandwiched singularities. *Duke mathematical journal*, 95(3):451–522, 1998.
- [4] Ronald Fintushel and Ronald J Stern. Knots, links, and 4-manifolds. *arXiv preprint dg-ga/9612014*, 1996.
- [5] Jacob R Fowler. *Rational homology disk smoothing components of weighted homogeneous surface singularities*. PhD thesis, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 2013.
- [6] David T. Gay and András I. Stipsicz. On symplectic caps. *Perspectives in Analysis, Geometry, and Topology: On the Occasion of the 60th Birthday of Oleg Viro*, pages 199–212, 2012.
- [7] Gert-Martin Greuel and Joseph Steenbrink. *On the topology of smoothable singularities*. Universität Kaiserslautern. Fachbereich Mathematik, 1981.
- [8] J Kollár. Flips, flops, minimal models, etc. *Surveys in differential geometry*, 1(1):113–199, 1990.
- [9] Henry B Laufer. Taut two-dimensional singularities. *Mathematische Annalen*, 205:131–164, 1973.
- [10] Eduard Looijenga and Jonathan Wahl. Quadratic functions and smoothing surface singularities. *Topology*, 25(3):261–291, 1986.
- [11] John Willard Milnor, Dale Husemoller, et al. *Symmetric bilinear forms*, volume 73. Springer, 1973.

- [12] András Némethi. *Normal Surface Singularities*, volume 74. Springer Nature, 2022.
- [13] Olga Plamenevskaya and Laura Starkston. Unexpected stein fillings, rational surface singularities and plane curve arrangements. *Geometry & Topology*, 27(3):1083–1202, 2023.
- [14] Mark Spivakovsky. Sandwiched singularities and desingularization of surfaces by normalized Nash transformations. *Annals of mathematics*, pages 411–491, 1990.
- [15] András I Stipsicz, Zoltán Szabó, and Jonathan Wahl. Rational blowdowns and smoothings of surface singularities. *Journal of Topology*, 1(2):477–517, 2008.
- [16] Jonathan Wahl. Smoothings of normal surface singularities. *Topology*, 20(3):219–246, 1981.
- [17] Jonathan Wahl. On rational homology disk smoothings of valency 4 surface singularities. *Geometry & Topology*, 15(2):1125–1156, 2011.