

Extendible Estimates of multipoint Seshadri Constants

Brian Harbourne

Department of Mathematics and Statistics
University of Nebraska-Lincoln
Lincoln, NE 68588-0323
USA
email: bharbour@math.unl.edu
WEB: <http://www.math.unl.edu/~bharbour/>

Joaquim Roé

Departament de Matemàtiques
Edifici C
Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona
08193 Bellaterra (Barcelona)
Spain
e-mail: jroe@mat.uab.es
September 4, 2003

Abstract: Working over $\mathbf{C}$ and formalizing and sharpening approaches introduced in [X3], [S] and [R1], we give a method for verifying when a divisor on a blow up of $\mathbf{P}^2$ at general points is nef. The method is useful both theoretically and when doing computer computations. The main application is to obtaining lower bounds on multipoint Seshadri constants on $\mathbf{P}^2$. In combination with methods developed in [HR], significantly improved explicit lower bounds are obtained.

I. Introduction

Given a positive integer n , the codimension 1 multipoint Seshadri constant for points $p_1, \dots, p_n$ of $\mathbf{P}^N$ is the real number

$$\varepsilon(N, p_1, \dots, p_n) = \sqrt[N-1]{\inf \left\{ \frac{\deg(Z)}{\sum_{i=1}^n \text{mult}_{p_i} Z} \right\}},$$

where the infimum is taken with respect to all hypersurfaces Z , through at least one of the points. We also take $\varepsilon(N, n)$ to be defined as $\sup\{\varepsilon(N, p_1, \dots, p_n)\}$, where the supremum

We would like to thank Prof. Ferruccio Orecchia for supplying us with a calculation used in Example II.8. Harbourne would also like to thank the NSA for its support. Roé would also like to thank the support of the *Programa Ramón y Cajal* of the spanish MCyT, and of the projects CAICYT BFM2002-012040, 2000SGR-00028 and EAGER.

is taken with respect to all choices of n distinct points p_i of $\mathbf{P}^N$ (see [N1], [D] and [X2]). It is well known and not difficult to prove that $\varepsilon(N, p_1, \dots, p_n) \leq 1/\sqrt[n]{n}$, but lower bounds are much more challenging.

An apparently simpler problem consists in studying the existence of hypersurfaces with a given sequence of multiplicities $\mathbf{m} = (m_1, \dots, m_n)$ at given points $p_1, \dots, p_n \in \mathbf{P}^N$. Let us denote by $\alpha(N, \mathbf{m}, p_1, \dots, p_n)$ (respectively, $\alpha_0(N, \mathbf{m}, p_1, \dots, p_n)$) the least degree of a hypersurface (respectively, irreducible hypersurface) passing with multiplicity at least m_i (respectively, exactly m_i) through each point p_i . If the points are in general position in $\mathbf{P}^N$, we write simply $\alpha(N, \mathbf{m})$ and $\alpha_0(N, \mathbf{m})$. With this notation, the Seshadri constant can be defined more simply as a limit. Indeed, arguing as in the proof of Corollary 5 of [R2] (to reduce to the case that the multiplicities are all equal) and using subadditivity of α (and hence the fact that $\alpha(N, (qm + r)^{[n]}) \leq q\alpha(N, m^{[n]}) + \alpha(N, r^{[n]})$, where we use the shorthand $m^{[k]}$ to denote the sequence $(m, \dots, m)$ of length k), it follows that

$$\varepsilon(N, n) = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \sqrt[N-1]{\frac{\alpha(N, m^{[n]})}{nm}}.$$

(In this form, Seshadri constants were also studied in [C].)

It is not immediately clear how helpful explicit computations of values of α are in estimating the value of $\varepsilon(N, n)$, but it follows from Theorem 1.1(a) of [HH] that for all $m \geq 1$ we have

$$\frac{\alpha(N, (m(N + k))^{[n]})}{nm(N + k)} \geq \frac{\alpha(N, (k + 1)^{[n]}, p_1, \dots, p_n)}{n(N + k)}$$

and hence for any $k > 0$ we have $\varepsilon(N, n) \geq \sqrt[N-1]{\alpha(N, k^{[n]}, p_1, \dots, p_n)/(n(N + k - 1))}$. If the points p_i are sufficiently general, then we also have $\sqrt[N-1]{\alpha(N, k^{[n]}, p_1, \dots, p_n)/(nk)} \geq \varepsilon(N, n)$. Thus, computing values of $\alpha(N, k^{[n]}, p_1, \dots, p_n)$ gives, in principle, a computational approach for obtaining arbitrarily good estimates for $\varepsilon(N, n)$.

Unfortunately, when $N = 2$ this method is not computationally efficient enough (at least given the computational resources available to us as this is written) to use it to obtain estimates that improve on results obtained using geometric methods; see, for example, [B], [H] and [T], which give the best currently known lower bounds for $\varepsilon(2, n)$. As good as these bounds are, however, it is not clear to what extent these geometric methods can be used (in combination with computer computation, say) to obtain arbitrarily accurate estimates of $\varepsilon(2, n)$. In this paper, refining an approach of [S] which in turn refines and extends the method used in [X3], we give a method that does provide a basis for obtaining arbitrarily accurate estimates of $\varepsilon(2, n)$, which we apply to obtain lower bounds for $\varepsilon(2, n)$ which for almost all n improve on the bounds cited above. Although the main results of this paper do not depend on computer computation, our method is compatible with computer computation. See Example II.8 for an explicit demonstration of our method, and to see an example of its use in conjunction with a computer calculation. Our method is also *extendible*, in the sense that it can improve on previous bounds on $\varepsilon(2, n)$ by using them as a starting point. See, for example, the discussion after Example II.8 of the bounds given in Table II.10 when $n - 1 > 9$ is a square.

Since we will be interested in the case $N = 2$, we will denote $\varepsilon(2, n)$, $\alpha(2, \mathbf{m})$ and $\alpha_0(2, \mathbf{m})$ simply by $\varepsilon(n)$, $\alpha(\mathbf{m})$ and $\alpha_0(\mathbf{m})$. It is well known that $\varepsilon(n) \leq 1/\sqrt{n}$, with

equality if n is a square. By results of Nagata [N1], $\varepsilon(n)$ is known for $n < 10$, so there is no loss of interest if we assume $n \geq 10$, which we will at times do, if it is convenient. Moreover, when $n \geq 10$ is not a square, Nagata [N2] conjectured (in different terminology) that $\varepsilon(n) = 1/\sqrt{n}$. Although this conjecture has not yet been verified for any $n \geq 10$ not a square, the general belief is that it is correct, hence the attention paid here and elsewhere to obtaining lower bounds for $\varepsilon(n)$.

For any specific n , our best lower bound on $\varepsilon(n)$ is obtained by direct application of the method we demonstrate in Example II.8. This direct approach is algorithmic; by analyzing the algorithm, we are also able to give weaker but explicit lower bounds in terms of n (see Remark I.2 and Corollary I.4).

Our method involves two steps. The first step, which Section II of this paper is mainly devoted to and which culminates in the proof of Theorem I.1, shows how to convert estimates of values of α to bounds on $\varepsilon(n)$. (To apply Theorem I.1, one must verify certain lower bounds involving α . If for some $n \geq 10$ one of these lower bounds is violated, then Nagata's conjecture is false. In such a case, it follows from Lemma II.1 that one can compute $\varepsilon(n)$ exactly with an explicit finite calculation.) The second step, which Section III of this paper is mainly devoted to and which culminates in the proof of Theorem I.3 and Corollary I.4, concerns actually making the estimates of the values of α , and is based on our work in [HR].

Theorem I.1: *Let $n \geq 10$ be an integer, and $\mu \geq 1$ a real number.*

(a) *If $\alpha(m^{[n]}) \geq m\sqrt{n - \frac{1}{\mu(1-2/(n+1))}}$ for every integer $1 \leq m < \mu$, then*

$$\varepsilon(n) \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sqrt{1 - \frac{1}{n\mu(1 - 2/(n+1))}} > \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sqrt{1 - \frac{1}{(n-2)\mu}}.$$

(b) *If $\alpha_0(m^{[n]}) \geq m\sqrt{n - \frac{1}{\mu}}$ for every integer $1 \leq m < \mu$, and if $\alpha_0((m^{[n-1]}, m+k)) \geq \frac{mn+k}{\sqrt{n}} \sqrt{1 - \frac{1}{n\mu}}$ for every integer $1 \leq m < \mu/(n-1)$ and every integer $k^2 \leq (n/(n-1))\min(m, m+k)$, then*

$$\varepsilon(n) \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sqrt{1 - \frac{1}{n\mu}}.$$

Remark I.2: Since $\alpha(m^{[n]}) \geq m\sqrt{n}$ for $n \geq 10$ and $m \leq \lfloor \sqrt{n} \rfloor (\lfloor \sqrt{n} \rfloor - 3)/2$ (see the proof of Corollary I.2(a) of [HR]), taking $\mu = (n - 5\sqrt{n} + 4)/2 = (\sqrt{n} - 1)(\sqrt{n} - 4)/2 \leq \lfloor \sqrt{n} \rfloor (\lfloor \sqrt{n} \rfloor - 3)/2$, we see the hypotheses of Theorem I.1(b) hold (note that the hypotheses involving $k \neq 0$ are vacuous when $\mu/(n-1) \leq 1$), and hence we have

$$\varepsilon(n) \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sqrt{1 - \frac{2}{n^2 - 5n\sqrt{n} + 4n}}. \quad (*)$$

This result, which is already an improvement on previously known bounds for most $n \geq 59$, depends only on Section II. All of Section III, and thus much of the effort of this paper,

is devoted to the refinements needed to prove Theorem I.3 and Corollary I.4, which give stronger bounds than (*). $\diamond$

Theorem I.3: *Let $1 \leq \mu \leq n(n-1)$ be integers with $n \geq 10$, and define $d = \lfloor \sqrt{n} \rfloor$, $g = (d-1)(d-2)/2$ and $r = \lfloor d\sqrt{n} \rfloor$. Assume that*

$$\frac{(\mu-1)r + g - 1}{d} \geq (\mu-1)\sqrt{n - \frac{1}{\mu}}.$$

Then $\varepsilon(n) \geq (1/\sqrt{n})\sqrt{1 - 1/(\mu n)}$.

To obtain from Theorem I.3 the explicit simpler statement of Corollary I.4 and to provide a basis for making comparisons of different lower bounds on $\varepsilon(n)$, it is convenient to write them in the form $\varepsilon(n) \geq (1/\sqrt{n})(\sqrt{1 - 1/f(n)})$, where f is a function of n .

It is worth emphasizing that the bounds presented in Corollary I.4 are obtained by making simplifying estimates based on analyses of the underlying methods presented in Section II and in [HR]. For specific values of n , we can obtain even better results by applying the methods directly, a demonstration of which is given in Example II.8. Table II.10 shows the results of doing so for all nonsquares $10 \leq n \leq 99$ except $n = 41$ and $n = 50$. (The results shown in Table II.10 for $n = 41$ and $n = 50$ were known previously and are as good or better than what we obtain. All other results shown in Table II.10 are better than what was known previously.)

Corollary I.4: *Let $n > 16$ be a nonsquare integer, let $d = \lfloor \sqrt{n} \rfloor$ and consider $\Delta = n - d^2 > 0$. Let us define*

$$f(n) = \begin{cases} n(n-1) & \text{if } \Delta = 2, \\ n(n-3\sqrt{n}-4)/2 & \text{if } \Delta > 2 \text{ is even,} \\ n^2 & \text{if } \Delta \text{ is odd and } \Delta \geq 4\sqrt[4]{n} + 1, \\ n(n-3\sqrt{n}-1) & \text{if } \Delta \text{ is odd and } \Delta < 4\sqrt[4]{n} + 1; \end{cases}$$

then $\varepsilon(n) \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\sqrt{1 - \frac{1}{f(n)}}$.

Before discussing in more detail the conceptual basis for our approach, we compare the bounds we obtain with previously known bounds. Note that the larger $f(n)$ is, the better is the bound. Perhaps the best previous general bound for $n \geq 10$ is given in [T], for which $f(n) = 12n + 1$. As Corollary I.4 shows, for our bounds $f(n)$ is quadratic in n , so for n large enough (indeed, for $n \geq 59$), our bounds involve larger values of $f(n)$.

For special values of n , [B] also gives bounds better than those of [T], and these bounds are also quadratic in n . (In particular, if $n = (ai)^2 \pm 2i$ for positive integers a and i , then $f(n) = (a^2i \pm 1)^2$, and, if $n = (ai)^2 + i$ for positive integers a and i with $ai \geq 3$, then $f(n) = (2a^2i + 1)^2$.) However, except when $n - 1$ is a square, our bounds are better, for n large enough (when $n \pm 2$ is a square, make a direct comparison; otherwise, look at coefficients of the n^2 term in $f(n)$).

Bounds are also given in [H]; they apply to all values of n and are almost always better than any bound for which $f(n)$ is linear in n (more precisely, given any constant a , let $\nu_a(n)$ be the number of integers i from 1 to n for which $f(i)$ from [H] is bigger than ai ; then

$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \nu_a(n)/n = 1$). Nonetheless, although the bounds in [H] are not hard to compute for any given value of n , they are not explicit or simple enough to make them easy to work with. Moreover, computations for specific values of n (see, for example, Table II.10) show in almost all cases that the bounds we obtain here are better than those of [H].

We now describe the conceptual basis for our approach. Given general points $p_i \in \mathbf{P}^2$, $1 \leq i \leq n$, let X be obtained from $\mathbf{P}^2$ by blowing up the points. Let L be the pullback to X of the divisor class of a line in $\mathbf{P}^2$, and E_i be the divisor class of the exceptional curve obtained by blowing up p_i . Then $\varepsilon(n)$ is the supremum of all real numbers t such that $F = (1/t)L - (E_1 + \cdots + E_n)$ is nef (where *nef* means $F \cdot C \geq 0$ for all effective divisors C). Since nefness of classes of positive selfintersection is Zariski open, finding particular points $p_1, \dots, p_n$ such that F is nef with $F^2 > 0$ is enough to show that $\varepsilon(n) \geq t$. For a given t for which $F^2 > 0$, we first produce an explicit finite list of divisor classes containing the classes of all reduced, irreducible divisors C (if any) with $F \cdot C < 0$. Lemma II.1 already gives such a list of test classes; most of the effort in Section II is related to making the list of test classes smaller, which ultimately results in Theorem I.1.

If each test class on the list is shown not to be the class of an effective divisor, it follows that F is nef and hence that $\varepsilon(n) \geq t$. Thus our approach is in fact a method for verifying that a divisor class is nef. (Given nonnegative integers $m_1, \dots, m_n$, it also applies more generally to finding values of t such that $F = (1/t)L - (m_1 E_1 + \cdots + m_n E_n)$ is nef.) In order to verify that certain divisors are not effective, we use an intersection theoretic algorithm developed in [HR] for obtaining lower bounds for the least degree α of curves passing through given points with given multiplicities. In Section III we analyze this algorithm to obtain explicit formulas in some cases, which we then apply in order to prove Theorem I.3 and Corollary I.4. (See Example II.8 for an explicit demonstration of our approach, and Table II.10 for the best current bounds on $\varepsilon(n)$ for nonsquares $10 \leq n \leq 99$.)

Finally, as an application of our results, Section IV gives a criterion for ampleness, substantially extending ampleness criteria given in [X3], [B] and [T].

II. Abnormal Curves

Let X be obtained by blowing up distinct points $p_1, \dots, p_n \in \mathbf{P}^2$. Let $m_i \geq 0$ be integers, not all 0, and let $d = \sqrt{m_1^2 + \cdots + m_n^2}$. Consider the $\mathbf{R}$ -divisor class $F = dL - m_1 E_1 - \cdots - m_n E_n$, so $F^2 = 0$, and let $F_\delta = \sqrt{(d^2 + \delta)}L - m_1 E_1 - \cdots - m_n E_n$. For each real $\delta > 0$, there is a finite set of test classes H such that if none of these test classes is the class of an effective divisor, then F_δ is nef:

Lemma II.1: *Let X , F , and F_δ be as above assuming the points $p_1, \dots, p_n \in \mathbf{P}^2$ are general, where $\delta \geq 0$. If H is the class of a reduced irreducible divisor such that $F_\delta \cdot H < 0$, then $H = tL - h_1 E_1 - \cdots - h_n E_n$ for nonnegative integers $h_1, \dots, h_n$ and t such that:*

- (a) $h_1^2 + \cdots + h_n^2 < (1 + d^2/\delta)^2/\gamma$ if $\delta > 0$, where γ is the number of nonzero coefficients $h_1, \dots, h_n$, and
- (b) $h_1^2 + \cdots + h_n^2 - a \leq t^2 < (m_1 h_1 + \cdots + m_n h_n)^2/(d^2 + \delta)$, where a is the minimum positive element of $\{h_1, \dots, h_n\}$.

Proof: Suppose there is a reduced irreducible curve C such that $F_\delta \cdot C < 0$. The class of

C must be of the form $H = tL - h_1E_1 - \cdots - h_nE_n$, where $t \geq 0$ (since C is effective) and each h_i is nonnegative (since C is irreducible and $F_\delta \cdot E_i \geq 0$ holds for all i).

First consider (b). By [X1], we have $C^2 \geq -a$, hence $h_1^2 + \cdots + h_n^2 - a \leq t^2$, while $F_\delta \cdot C < 0$ gives $t^2 < (m_1h_1 + \cdots + m_nh_n)^2/(d^2 + \delta)$.

Now consider (a). Let $h = \sqrt{h_1^2 + \cdots + h_n^2}$ and note that $d = \sqrt{m_1^2 + \cdots + m_n^2}$. From (b) we have $h^2 - a < (m_1h_1 + \cdots + m_nh_n)^2/(d^2 + \delta) \leq d^2h^2/(d^2 + \delta)$, or $h^2 < d^2h^2/(d^2 + \delta) + a$. But $a^2 \leq h^2/\gamma$, so we have $h^2 < d^2h^2/(d^2 + \delta) + h/\sqrt{\gamma}$, and solving for h gives the result. $\diamond$

In the case that some of the coefficients h_i are equal, the list of test classes can be made considerably smaller. Indeed, generalizing the terminology used in [N1], given any divisor class F with $F^2 \geq 0$, let us say a curve C is F -*abnormal* if C is reduced and irreducible with $F \cdot C < 0$. In case $F = \sqrt{n} - (E_1 + \cdots + E_n)$, we will refer to an F -abnormal curve simply as *abnormal*. (Thus, with n understood, an abnormal curve here is the same as in [N1], which is also what Szemberg [S] calls a *submaximal* curve.) The following lemma generalizes a result of [S]:

Lemma II.2: *Let X be obtained by blowing up distinct points $p_1, \dots, p_n \in \mathbf{P}^2$ and let $F = dL - m_1E_1 - \cdots - m_nE_n$ be an $\mathbf{R}$ -divisor class on X such that $m_i \geq 0$ are integers, not all 0, $d > 0$ and $F^2 = 0$. Let $C_1, \dots, C_r$ be distinct F -abnormal curves. Then their divisor classes $[C_1], \dots, [C_r]$ are linearly independent in the divisor class group on X .*

Proof: We have $F = F_0$. Using a sufficiently small positive δ , we may assume that $F_\delta^2 > 0$ with $F_\delta \cdot C_i < 0$. If $[C_1], \dots, [C_r]$ are dependent, we can find a nontrivial nonnegative integer combination D of some of the classes $[C_1], \dots, [C_r]$ and another nontrivial nonnegative integer combination D' of the rest of the classes $[C_1], \dots, [C_r]$, such that $D = D'$. But $F_\delta \cdot D < 0$, so by appropriately increasing δ slightly, we can assume that $F_\delta \cdot D = 0$, and hence by the index theorem we must have $D^2 < 0$, which contradicts $D^2 = D \cdot D' \geq 0$. $\diamond$

We now apply our foregoing results in the simplest case of specific interest, generalizing and extending methods and results of [X3], [S] and [R1]. Similar but more complicated results can be obtained when the coefficients $F \cdot E_i$ are not all equal.

Corollary II.3: *Let X be obtained by blowing up $n \geq 10$ general points $p_1, \dots, p_n \in \mathbf{P}^2$ and let F be the $\mathbf{R}$ -divisor class $\sqrt{n}L - E_1 - \cdots - E_n$. Then the class H of an F -abnormal curve (if any) must be of the form $H = tL - m(E_1 + \cdots + E_n) + kE_i$, where $t > 0$, $m > 0$ and k are integers such that:*

- (a) $1 \leq i \leq n$;
- (b) $-m < k$, $k^2 < (n/(n-1)) \min(m, m+k)$; and
- (c) $m^2n + 2mk + \max(k^2 - m, k^2 - (m+k), 0) \leq t^2 < m^2n + 2mk + k^2/n$ when $k^2 > 0$, but $m^2n - m \leq t^2 < m^2n$ when $k = 0$.

Proof: Because the points are general and F is uniform, permuting the coefficients of the class H of an F -abnormal curve gives another such class. Since all such permutations are in the subspace orthogonal to $F - (F \cdot H/t)L$, it follows from Lemma II.2 that there are at most n such curves. But it is not hard to check that there are always more than n permutations unless at most one of the coefficients is different from the rest. Thus H is of

the form $H = tL - m(E_1 + \cdots + E_n) + kE_i$ with $1 \leq i \leq n$, which gives (a).

Consider (b). Since H is the class of a reduced irreducible curve with $t > 0$, we must have $H \cdot E_i \geq 0$ for all i , hence $-m \leq k$. But for $r \geq 9$, it is known that $\varepsilon(r) \geq 1/\sqrt{r+1} = (1/\sqrt{r})(\sqrt{1-1/(r+1)})$. (For $r = 9$ this is because $\varepsilon(9) = 1/3$; for $r > 9$ see [ST].) Thus no curve abnormal for r is ever abnormal for $r+1$. Thus a curve D abnormal for a given $r \geq 10$ has $D \cdot E_i > 0$ for all i . In particular, we have $m+k > 0$.

By Lemma II.1(b) with $\delta = 0$ and $a = \min(m, m+k)$, we have $m^2n + 2mk + k^2 - a < (mn + k)^2/n$, which simplifies to give $k^2 < (n/(n-1))a$.

Likewise, taking $\delta = 0$, (c) follows from Lemma II.1(b) in the case that $k = 0$, as does $m^2n + 2mk + \max(k^2 - m, k^2 - (m+k)) \leq t^2 < m^2n + 2mk + k^2/n$ when $k \neq 0$. If $k \neq 0$, then $tL - m(E_1 + \cdots + E_n) + kE_1$ and $tL - m(E_1 + \cdots + E_n) + kE_n$ are classes of distinct irreducible curves, so their intersection is nonnegative, hence $m^2n + 2mk \leq t^2$, so we have $m^2n + 2mk + \max(k^2 - m, k^2 - (m+k), 0) \leq t^2$ as claimed. $\diamond$

We call a class of the form $tL - m(E_1 + \cdots + E_n)$ *uniform*, and following [S], we call a class of the form $tL - m(E_1 + \cdots + E_n) + kE_i$ *almost uniform*. If $m < n$, we now obtain more refined versions of the results above.

Lemma II.4: *Let X be obtained by blowing up $n \geq 10$ general points $p_1, \dots, p_n \in \mathbf{P}^2$. Assume $[C] = tL - (m+k)E_1 - mE_2 - \cdots - mE_n$ is the class of an almost uniform abnormal curve C with $n > m > 0$. Then $m+k > 0$ and $-\sqrt{m} \leq k \leq \sqrt{m}$. Moreover, if $k \neq 0$, then also $2mk = t^2 - m^2n$ (or equivalently $C^2 = -k^2$) and $m\sqrt{n} - 1 < t < m\sqrt{n} + 1$.*

Proof: To see $-\sqrt{m} \leq k \leq \sqrt{m}$, observe that $m < n$ implies $mn/(n-1) \leq m+1$; now apply $k^2 < mn/(n-1)$ from Corollary II.3(b). Note that Corollary II.3(b) also gives $m+k > 0$.

Now, assume that $k \neq 0$. By Corollary II.3(c) we have $t^2 - nm^2 - 2mk < k^2/n$, but now $k^2/n < 1$; Corollary II.3(c) also tells us that $t^2 - nm^2 - 2mk \geq 0$. Therefore, putting both inequalities together we must have $t^2 - nm^2 - 2mk = 0$, proving $2mk = t^2 - m^2n$ and thus $C^2 = -k^2$.

Finally, as C is abnormal, we have $t < m\sqrt{n} + k/\sqrt{n} < m\sqrt{n} + 1$. On the other hand, since $-k^2 = C^2 \geq -(m+k)$ by [X1], we have $(k-1/2)^2 \leq m+1/4 < n$, so $k > 1/2 - \sqrt{n}$ and $t = \sqrt{m^2n + 2mk} > \sqrt{m^2n - 2m(\sqrt{n} - 1/2)} \geq \sqrt{(m\sqrt{n} - 1)^2}$, and we conclude $t > m\sqrt{n} - 1$. $\diamond$

Remark II.5: We note that when Lemma II.4 applies, there is for each m at most one $k \neq 0$ and one t for which an abnormal curve $[C] = tL - (m+k)E_1 - mE_2 - \cdots - mE_n$ could exist. Indeed, $2mk = t^2 - m^2n$ implies that t^2 has the same parity as m^2n , and only one integer t in the range $m\sqrt{n} - 1 < t < m\sqrt{n} + 1$ has this property. $\diamond$

The next corollary is just a refined version of Lemma II.1. Note that

$$(1/\sqrt{n})(\sqrt{1-1/(\mu n)}) = 1/\sqrt{n+\delta}$$

is equivalent to $\delta = (\mu - 1/n)^{-1}$. We will denote an almost uniform class of the form $tL - m(E_1 + \cdots + E_n) + kE_i$ by $C(t, m, k)$, with n being understood.

Corollary II.6: *Let X be obtained by blowing up $n \geq 10$ general points of $\mathbf{P}^2$. Let $\mu \geq 1$ be real and consider the $\mathbf{R}$ -divisor class $F_\delta = \sqrt{n+\delta}L - (E_1 + \dots + E_n)$, where $\delta = (\mu - 1/n)^{-1}$. Then any F_δ -abnormal class is of the form $C(t, m, k)$, where t, m and k are as in Corollary II.3 and where $0 < m < \mu$ and either $k = 0$ or $m(n-1) < \mu$.*

Proof: Let C be an F_δ -abnormal class. Then $C = C(t, m, k)$, where t, m and k satisfy the criteria of Corollary II.3. First, say $k = 0$; then $m^2n - m \leq t^2$, while $F_\delta \cdot C < 0$ implies $t\sqrt{n+\delta} < mn$, hence $m^2n - m < m^2n^2/(n+\delta)$ or $(1/n)(1 - 1/(mn)) < 1/(n+\delta)$. This simplifies to $m - 1/n < 1/\delta = \mu - 1/n$, or $m < \mu$. Now assume $k \neq 0$. This time we have $t\sqrt{n+\delta} < mn + k$ and $m^2n + 2mk + \max(k^2 - m, k^2 - (m+k), 0) \leq t^2$, hence $(m^2n + 2mk)/(mn + k)^2 \leq t^2/(mn + k)^2$. Note that $(1/n)(1 - 1/(mn(n-1))) \leq (m^2n + 2mk)/(mn + k)^2$ is the same as $1 - 1/(mn(n-1)) \leq (m^2n^2 + 2mkn)/(mn + k)^2 = 1 - k^2/(mn + k)^2$ or $mn(n-1)k^2 \leq (mn + k)^2$. This holds when $k > 0$ because in this case $k^2 < mn/(n-1)$. It also holds when $k < 0$, because now $k^2 < (m+k)n/(n-1)$ or $mn(n-1)k^2 < (m+k)mn^2$, but $(m+k)mn^2 \leq (mn + k)^2$ holds since it simplifies to $mn(2-n) < |k|$. So, putting everything together, we have

$$\frac{1}{n} \left(1 - \frac{1}{mn(n-1)} \right) \leq \frac{m^2n + 2mk}{(mn + k)^2} \leq \frac{t^2}{(mn + k)^2} < \frac{1}{n + \delta}.$$

But $(1/n)(1 - 1/(mn(n-1))) < 1/(n + \delta)$ simplifies to $m(n-1) - 1/n < 1/\delta = \mu - 1/n$, or $m(n-1) < \mu$. $\diamond$

Proof of Theorem I.1: We prove first part (b) of the theorem, which we will show implies part (a). Since $(1/\sqrt{n})(\sqrt{1 - 1/(\mu n)}) = 1/\sqrt{n+\delta}$, the statement that $\varepsilon(n)$ is at least as big as $(1/\sqrt{n})(\sqrt{1 - 1/(\mu n)})$ is equivalent to claiming that $F_\delta = \sqrt{n+\delta}L - (E_1 + \dots + E_n)$ is nef. If F_δ were not nef, then there would exist an F_δ -abnormal class $C = C(t, m, k)$, hence $0 > F_\delta \cdot C = t\sqrt{n+\delta} - (nm+k) \geq \alpha_0((m^{[n-1]}, m+k))\sqrt{n+\delta} - (nm+k)$, hence $\alpha_0((m^{[n-1]}, m+k)) \leq (nm+k)/\sqrt{n+\delta} = ((nm+k)/\sqrt{n})\sqrt{1 - 1/(\mu n)}$ if $k \neq 0$ (resp., $\alpha_0(m^{[n]}) \leq m\sqrt{n-1/\mu}$, if $k = 0$). By hypothesis, this cannot occur if $1 \leq m < \mu/(n-1)$ and $k^2 \leq (n/(n-1))\min(m, m+k)$ (resp., $1 \leq m < \mu$), but these conditions hold by Corollary II.3 and Corollary II.6.

Let us now see how (b) implies (a). For every integer $1 \leq m < \mu$, assume that $\alpha(m^{[n]}) \geq m\sqrt{n-1/(\mu(1-2/(n+1)))}$. Then, whenever $1 \leq m < \mu' = \mu(1-2/(n+1))$, we claim that $\alpha_0(m^{[n]}) \geq m\sqrt{n-1/\mu'}$, and whenever $1 \leq m < \mu'/(n-1)$, $k^2 \leq (n/(n-1))\min(m, m+k)$, we claim that $\alpha_0((m^{[n-1]}, m+k)) \geq ((mn+k)/\sqrt{n})\sqrt{1-1/(n\mu')}$. The first claim is immediate, for $m < \mu'$ implies $m < \mu$ and then

$$\alpha_0(m^{[n]}) \geq \alpha(m^{[n]}) \geq m\sqrt{n - \frac{1}{\mu(1-2/(n+1))}} = m\sqrt{n - \frac{1}{\mu'}}.$$

For the second claim, given a reduced and irreducible curve $C = C_n$ with multiplicity m at general points $p_1, \dots, p_{n-1}$, multiplicity $m+k$ at p_n and $L \cdot C = \alpha_0((m^{[n-1]}, m+k))$, consider curves $C_1, \dots, C_{n-1}$ such that C_i has multiplicity $m+k$ at p_i and multiplicity m at the other points (which exist because the points are general). Then $D = C_1 +$

$\dots + C_n$ is a reducible effective curve with multiplicity $nm + k$ at each of the points. But $k^2 \leq (n/(n-1))\min(m, m+k)$ implies that $k \leq m$. (If not, then certainly $0 < k$ and $k \geq m+1$, but it is easy to see that $(m+1)^2 > n(2m+1)/(n-1)$, since $n \geq 10$, and $(m+i)^2 - n(2m+i)/(n-1)$ is an increasing function of i for $i \geq 1$.) So if $m < \mu'/(n-1)$, then $nm + k \leq (n+1)m < (n+1)\mu'/(n-1) = \mu$, and

$$\alpha_0((m^{[n-1]}, m+k)) \geq \frac{1}{n}\alpha((nm+k)^{[n]}) \geq \frac{nm+k}{n}\sqrt{n-\frac{1}{\mu'}} = \frac{nm+k}{\sqrt{n}}\sqrt{1-\frac{1}{n\mu'}},$$

as claimed. $\diamond$

Example II.8: We demonstrate how to use the results of this section to obtain lower bounds on Seshadri constants. To verify $\varepsilon(n) \geq (1/\sqrt{n})\sqrt{1-1/(\mu n)}$ for some choice of $\mu > 1$, make a list of all (t, m, k) with $m < \mu$ satisfying the criteria of Corollary II.3. The bound $\varepsilon(n) \geq (1/\sqrt{n})\sqrt{1-1/(\mu n)}$ is equivalent by Corollary II.6 to the statement that, for each triple (t, m, k) , either $C(t, m, k)$ is not the class of an effective, reduced, irreducible divisor, or $F_\delta \cdot C(t, m, k) \geq 0$, where $\delta = (\mu - 1/n)^{-1}$.

In practice, of course, one does not know ahead of time what μ to pick, so one finds all triples (t, m, k) satisfying Corollary II.3, starting with $m = 1$, and successively increasing m . For each triple, compute $e(t, m, k)$ defined by $\delta' = (e(t, m, k) - 1/n)^{-1}$, by solving $F_{\delta'} \cdot C(t, m, k) = 0$ for δ' . The desired μ is the largest value such that, for each triple (t, m, k) with $m < \mu$, either $e(t, m, k) \geq \mu$ (and hence $F_\delta \cdot C(t, m, k) \geq 0$ for $\delta = (\mu - 1/n)^{-1}$) or $C(t, m, k)$ can be shown not to be the class of an effective, reduced, irreducible divisor.

We now carry this out for $n = 10$. Here is a list of all triples (t, m, k) satisfying Corollary II.3 for $n = 10$, with $m \leq 93$:

t	m	k	e	t	m	k	e	t	m	k	e	t	m	k	e
3	1	0	1	80	25	3	711.21	160	50	6	711.21	228	72	1	51984.1
6	2	-1	36.1	98	31	0	160.16	177	56	0	101.16	228	73	-9	51984.1
12	4	-2	36.1	117	37	0	1369	191	60	4	6080.26	234	74	0	1369
22	7	0	8.16	139	44	0	49.64	191	61	-6	6080.26	256	81	0	88.66
41	13	0	18.77	154	48	7	2635.21	196	62	0	160.16	271	85	7	1883.2
60	19	0	36.1	154	49	-3	2635.21	197	63	-7	995.2	275	87	0	116.44
79	25	0	69.44	158	50	0	69.44	215	68	0	308.26	294	93	0	160.16

Table II.9: All Corollary II.3 test classes $C(t, m, k)$ with $m \leq 93$ and corresponding values $e(t, m, k)$.

It is easy to see that none of $C(3, 1, 0)$, $C(6, 2, -1)$ and $C(12, 4, -2)$ can be the class of an effective divisor (use the fact that there is a unique plane curve of degree $3m$ with 9 general points of multiplicity m). By [CCMO], no abnormal curve occurs with $n \geq 10$, $m \leq 20$ and $k = 0$, which rules out $C(22, 7, 0)$, $C(41, 13, 0)$ and $C(60, 19, 0)$. We would like to thank Professor Ferruccio Orecchia, who used the program discussed in [CCMO] to verify that $C(139, 44, 0)$ is not the class of an effective divisor (the least degree of a plane curve with 10 general points of multiplicity 44 is 140). If (to two decimals) we take $\mu = 69.44$, we now see there is no triple (t, m, k) such that $m < \mu$, $e(t, m, k) < \mu$, and $C(t, m, k)$ is effective. Thus $F = (250/79)L - (E_1 + \dots + E_{10})$ is nef, $F \cdot C(79, 25, 0) = 0$, and we have $\varepsilon(10) \geq 79/250 = (1/\sqrt{10})\sqrt{1-1/(10\mu)}$. To improve on this bound, we would

need to show that $C(79, 25, 0)$ and $C(158, 50, 0)$ are not the classes of reduced, irreducible curves (it suffices, of course, to show neither is the class of an effective divisor). Were we able to do this, we next would need to deal with $C(256, 81, 0)$, and so on. $\diamond$

We close this section with a list of the best currently known values of $f(n)$ when n is not square, for $10 \leq n \leq 99$. For each n , the table below gives the best value we know for $f(n)$ (truncated to two decimals), along with a possible abnormal curve $C(t, m, k)$ which we are unable to rule out but which would have to be ruled out in order to verify a larger value for $f(n)$. Thus the bound on $\varepsilon(n)$ we obtain for each n is $\varepsilon(n) \geq (1/\sqrt{n})(\sqrt{1 - 1/f(n)})$, and if there actually is such a curve $C(t, m, k)$, then we would have equality. (Since $k = 0$ for each case listed, we write $C(t, m)$ in place of $C(t, m, 0)$.) The listed values are better than all previously known values except in two cases: the value for $n = 41$, which comes from [H] (our method also obtains this value, but doesn't improve on it), and the value for $n = 50$, which comes from [B]. With two variations, the remaining values come from applying the method presented in Example II.8, in some cases using the intersection theoretic algorithm of [HR] to show certain classes cannot be the classes of effective divisors. (The [HR] algorithm, which depends on two parameters r and d which can be chosen somewhat arbitrarily, is discussed in detail in Section III.)

The first variation applies for $10 \leq n \leq 99$ unless $n - 1$ is a square bigger than 10. Here, when necessary, we use the algorithm from [HR] with $d = \lfloor \sqrt{n} \rfloor$ and $r = \lfloor d\sqrt{n} \rfloor$. The listed classes $C(t, m, k)$ are just ones with $F_\delta \cdot C(t, m, k) = 0$ but which the [HR] bound on effectivity is not good enough to rule out (and thus prevent us from obtaining a larger value for $f(n)$). It is possible that by employing other choices for r and d we could improve some of the bounds even further. The second variation applies when n is 17, 26, 37, 50, 65 or 82. It is the same as above, except in addition we use the known bound $\varepsilon(n) \geq (1/\sqrt{n})(\sqrt{1 - 1/(2n - 1)^2})$ given in [B] when $n - 1$ is a square as an additional criterion: the class $C(t, m, k)$ of any abnormal curve must satisfy $e(t, m, k) \geq (2n - 1)^2/n$.

n	f	C(t,m,0)	n	f	C(t,m,0)	n	f	C(t,m,0)
10	694.44	C(158,50)	41	1025	C(160,25)	71	6819.08	C(792,94)
11	402.28	C(106,32)	42	1306.94	C(149,23)	72	3008.34	C(263,31)
12	300.52	C(83,24)	43	1741.5	C(236,36)	73	8129.89	C(786,92)
13	325	C(90,25)	44	1985.5	C(252,38)	74	9085.64	C(929,108)
14	740.6	C(86,23)	45	3782.25	C(275,41)	75	9409	C(840,97)
15	566.78	C(89,23)	46	3140.26	C(217,32)	76	5337.1	C(462,53)
17	1389.43	C(305,74)	47	7109.17	C(994,145)	77	13862.75	C(1246,142)
18	466.94	C(89,21)	48	1521.39	C(187,27)	78	5698.52	C(627,71)
19	1241.33	C(122,28)	50	9801	C(700,99)	79	19525.09	C(2142,241)
20	660.64	C(143,32)	51	3313.98	C(407,57)	80	5107.27	C(474,53)
21	1187.1	C(142,31)	52	6257.33	C(274,38)	82	29674.47	C(3115,344)
22	804.57	C(150,32)	53	3499.89	C(313,43)	83	8381.98	C(829,91)
23	576	C(115,24)	54	5713.2	C(338,46)	84	7709.47	C(724,79)
24	1009.2	C(142,29)	55	2370.64	C(304,41)	85	5802.66	C(295,32)
26	3166.44	C(571,112)	56	3193.01	C(419,56)	86	14198.76	C(1493,161)
27	997.96	C(161,31)	57	2608.42	C(234,31)	87	5497.02	C(457,49)
28	1304.25	C(201,38)	58	9802	C(396,52)	88	8530.92	C(666,71)
29	639.45	C(113,21)	59	3352.27	C(192,25)	89	7281.81	C(566,60)
30	1230.76	C(219,40)	60	7562.5	C(852,110)	90	13690	C(702,74)
31	1093.26	C(128,23)	61	5380.2	C(328,42)	91	5126.33	C(372,39)
32	940.52	C(147,26)	62	12164.13	C(1496,190)	92	13370.32	C(1103,115)
33	1093.55	C(178,31)	63	2242.33	C(246,31)	93	6076	C(405,42)

34	1731.93	C(239,41)	65	18841.46	C(2209,274)	94	14950.51	C(1367,141)
35	974.47	C(136,23)	66	5410.98	C(593,73)	95	6390.76	C(614,63)
37	6283.45	C(961,158)	67	5550.49	C(532,65)	96	18070.33	C(1695,173)
38	1898.97	C(265,43)	68	4442.13	C(437,53)	97	4773.3	C(453,46)
39	1779.7	C(231,37)	69	8283.45	C(407,49)	98	29804.08	C(2950,298)
40	1601.66	C(196,31)	70	5603.33	C(343,41)	99	6892.38	C(587,59)

Table II.10: Current best known values of $f(n)$ for nonsquares
 $10 \leq n \leq 99$.

III. Bounds

In order to apply Theorem I.1, we need to verify certain lower bounds on minimum degrees α of curves with points of given multiplicities. A means of deriving such bounds is given in [HR]. Indeed, as pointed out in Remark I.2, using bounds given in [HR] in the case of uniform multiplicities, Theorem I.1 already establishes $\varepsilon(n) \geq \sqrt{n}\sqrt{1 - 1/(n(n - 5\sqrt{n} + 4)/2)}$ for $n \geq 10$. The main point of this section is to analyze the method of [HR] to obtain explicit bounds (given in Theorem III.2) when the multiplicities are only *almost*-uniform, which we then use to obtain the improved bounds on $\varepsilon(n)$ given in Theorem I.3 and Corollary I.4.

The approach developed in [HR] for obtaining lower bounds for the least degree $\alpha(\mathbf{m})$ of a curve with multiplicities $\mathbf{m} = (m_1, \dots, m_n)$ at a set of n general points depends on choosing arbitrary positive integers $r \leq n$ and d , and then involves specializing the n points and using semicontinuity. The specialization consists in choosing first an irreducible plane curve C of degree d , and then choosing points $p_1, \dots, p_n$ such that: p_1 is a general smooth point of C ; p_i is infinitely near p_{i-1} for $2 \leq i \leq n$; and p_i is a point of the proper transform of C on X_{i-1} for $i \leq r$ (more precisely, so that $E_i - E_{i+1}$ is the class of an effective, reduced and irreducible divisor for $0 < i < n$ and so that the class of the proper transform of C to X is $dL - E_1 - \dots - E_r$). Denoting by $\alpha'(\mathbf{m})$ the least degree t such that $|tL - m_1E_1 - \dots - m_nE_n|$ is non-empty (for this special position of the points) we have $\alpha(\mathbf{m}) \geq \alpha'(\mathbf{m})$ by semicontinuity. Now [HR] gives a numerical algorithmic criterion for $h^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(t_0L - m_1E_1 - \dots - m_nE_n))$ to vanish. If t satisfies the criterion (and hence $h^0 = 0$), then $\alpha'(\mathbf{m}) > t$. The largest t which satisfies the criterion is our lower bound.

To describe the criterion, we recall some notation from [HR]. Given a class $D_0 = t_0L - m_1E_1 - \dots - m_nE_n$ such that $m_1 \geq \dots \geq m_n \geq 0$ and given $[C] = dL - E_1 - \dots - E_r$ as above, we define classes D'_i and D_i for $i \geq 0$. First, $D'_i = D_i - [C]$. Then D_{i+1} is obtained from D'_i by *unloading*; i.e., let $F = D'_i$, let $N_j = E_j - E_{j+1}$ for $1 \leq j < n$ and let $N_n = E_n$. Whenever $F \cdot N_j < 0$, replace F by $F - N_j$. Eventually it happens that $F \cdot N_j \geq 0$ for all j , in which case we set D_{i+1} equal to the resulting F . (Since under the specialization each N_j is the class of a reduced irreducible divisor, in the event that D'_i is the class of an effective divisor, unloading just amounts to subtracting off certain fixed components of $|D'_i|$. Although it is convenient to define D_i for all i , we are only interested in D_i when i is reasonably small. Indeed, for i sufficiently large, D_i always takes the form of a negative multiple of L ; the multiplicities all eventually unload to 0. In fact, when D_0 is understood, we will denote by ω' the least i such that $D_i \cdot E_j = 0$ for all $j > 0$.)

Denote $D_i \cdot L$ by t_i . Let j be the least index i such that $t_i < d$ and let $g_C = (d-1)(d-2)/2$ be the genus of C . The criterion of [HR] (see the discussion after the proof of Lemma II.3 of [HR]) is that $\alpha'(\mathbf{m}) > t_0$ if: $D_i \cdot C \leq g_C - 1$ for $0 \leq i < j$ and $(t_j + 1)(t_j + 2) \leq 2(dt_j - D_j \cdot C)$.

The results of [HR] are obtained by analyzing this criterion with respect to particular choices of the parameters d and r describing C . The results we obtain here mostly involve choosing $d = \lfloor \sqrt{n} \rfloor$ and $r = \lfloor d\sqrt{n} \rfloor$, however other choices can also be useful, as (b) shows.

From now on we restrict our attention to almost uniform sequences $\mathbf{m} = (m + k, m, \dots, m)$ of n multiplicities satisfying the inequalities imposed by Corollary II.3 or Lemma II.4. To apply the criterion of [HR], the multiplicities in $\mathbf{m}$ should be nonincreasing. Thus we will assume $\mathbf{m} = (m + k, m, \dots, m)$ when $k \geq 0$ and $\mathbf{m} = (m, \dots, m, m + k)$ when $k \leq 0$. In the special case that $m < n$ and $k \geq 0$, we have $k^2 \leq m$ by Lemma II.4, in which case we let $\mathbf{m}'$ denote $(m + 1, \dots, m + 1, m, \dots, m)$, where the $m + 1$ entry occurs k times. (In the terminology of [HR], $\mathbf{m}'$ is then n -semiuniform.) If $m < n$ but $k < 0$, we take $\mathbf{m}' = \mathbf{m}$. Since after the specialization of [HR], $E_i - E_{i+1}$ is the class of an effective divisor for each $i > 0$, clearly $\alpha'(\mathbf{m}) \geq \alpha'(\mathbf{m}')$, so a lower bound for $\alpha'(\mathbf{m}')$ is also a lower bound for $\alpha'(\mathbf{m})$ and hence for $\alpha(\mathbf{m})$.

Lemma III.1: *Let n be a positive integer. Let $d = \lfloor \sqrt{n} \rfloor$, $r = \lfloor d\sqrt{n} \rfloor$, and assume $[C]$ as above is $dL - E_1 - \dots - E_r$ and $0 \leq k^2 \leq n$. Let $D_0 = tL - (m+1)E_1 - \dots - (m+1)E_k - mE_{k+1} - \dots - mE_n$ if $k \geq 0$, or $D_0 = tL - mE_1 - \dots - mE_2 - (m+k)E_n$ if $k < 0$, and let ω' be the least $i \geq 0$ such that $D_i \cdot E_j = 0$ for all $j > 0$. Then $dt - (mr + k) \geq D_i \cdot C$ for all $0 \leq i < \omega'$. Moreover, if $k < 0$ and $n - d^2$ is even, then $dt - mr \geq D_i \cdot C$ for all $0 \leq i < \omega'$.*

Proof: The proof is similar to that of Lemma II.3 of [HR]. Also, it is obviously true if n is a square, since then $C^2 = 0$, so we may assume that n is not a square. Now assume that $k > 0$. The choice $r = \lfloor d\sqrt{n} \rfloor$ ensures that $r^2/n - d^2 \leq 0$, while $k^2 \leq n$ implies that $\min(k, r) = k$ and $\min(k, r) - kr/n = k(n-r)/n \leq d(n-r)/n < 1$. On the other hand, $D_0 \cdot C = dt - (mr + k)$; thus it is enough to show that $(D_i - D_0) \cdot C \leq i(r^2/n - d^2) + \min(k, r) - kr/n$. Let $A_0 = 0$, and for $0 < j \leq n$ let $A_j = -E_1 - \dots - E_j$. For $0 \leq i < \omega'$, one can check that $D_i = (t-id)L - (m-i+q)E_1 - \dots - (m-i+q)E_n + A_\rho$, where $k + i(n-r) = qn + \rho$ and $0 \leq \rho < n$. (To see this, note by construction that D_i always must have the form $(t-id)L - b(E_1 + \dots + E_n) + A_c$ for some b and c . To determine b and c , use the fact that ω' is such that for $i < \omega'$, the sum of the coefficients of the E_j in D_i is just the sum of the coefficients of the E_j in $D_0 - iC$, hence $bn + c = mn + k - ir$.) It now follows that

$$D_i \cdot C - D_0 \cdot C = i(r - d^2) - rq + A_\rho \cdot C + \min(r, k).$$

The claim now follows using $A_\rho \cdot C = -\min(\rho, r)$, since clearly $(k + i(n-r))(r/n) = (r/n)(qn + \rho) \leq rq + \min(\rho, r)$.

Assume now that $k < 0$. Note that $\sqrt{n} - 1 \leq d$ so $n - \sqrt{n} - 1 \leq d\sqrt{n} - 1 \leq r$, hence $n - r - 1 \leq \sqrt{n}$. Also, $|k| \leq \lfloor \sqrt{n} \rfloor = d$, so $|k|(n-r-1) < d\sqrt{n}$, hence $|k|(n-r-1) \leq r \leq n-1$. For $1 \leq i \leq |k|$, one can argue in a way similar to that used before (noting for $i \leq |k|$ that the coefficient of E_n is unaffected), to see that $D_i = (t-id)L - (m+1-i)E_1 - \dots - (m+$

$1 - i)E_{i(n-1-r)} - (m - i)E_{i(n-1-r)+1} - \dots - (m - i)E_{n-1} - (m + k)E_n$. Thus $D_i \cdot C = (t - id)d - rm - i(n - 1) + 2ri$, hence $(D_{i-1} - D_i) \cdot C = d^2 + n - 2r - 1 > (\sqrt{n} - d)^2 - 1 \geq 0$. Thus $D_0 \cdot C \geq D_i \cdot C$ for $0 \leq i \leq |k|$.

Note that $D_{|k|} = (t - |k|d)L - (m - |k|)E_1 - \dots - (m - |k|)E_n + A_\rho$, where $|k|(n - r - 1) = \rho$. So for $|k| \leq i < \omega'$, we are in a situation similar to that above: we have $D_i = (t - id)L - (m - i + q)E_1 - \dots - (m - i + q)E_n + A_\rho$, where $k + i(n - r) = qn + \rho$ and $0 \leq \rho < n$, and an analogous argument shows $(D_i - D_0) \cdot C = i(r - d^2) - rq + A_\rho \cdot C \leq i(r^2/n - d^2) - kr/n$.

We now consider two cases, depending on whether $n - d^2$ is even or odd. First say it is even. For some $1 \leq \delta \leq d$, we can write $n = d^2 + 2\delta$ and $r = d^2 + \delta - 1$, hence $n = 2r - d^2 + 2$. Using this expression for n we have $(i(r^2 - d^2n) - kr)/n = (i(r - d^2)^2 - 2d^2 + k(d^2 - r))/n$, and using $-k < i$, we have $(i(r - d^2)^2 - 2d^2 + k(d^2 - r))/n \leq (i(r - d^2)^2 - d^2 + k(d^2 - r))/n = (i/n)(\delta^2 - \delta - d^2) + (\delta - 1)(|k| - i)/n < 0$. Thus $dt - mr = D_0 \cdot C \geq D_i \cdot C$ for $0 \leq i \leq \omega'$.

Finally, say $n - d^2$ is odd. Here we have $n = d^2 + 2\delta + 1$ and $r = d^2 + \delta$ for $0 \leq \delta \leq d - 1$, hence $n = 2r - d^2 + 1$ and $r - d^2 = \delta$. Using these expressions for n and r we have $(i(r^2 - d^2n) - kr)/n = (i(r - d^2)^2 - 2d^2 + k(d^2 - r))/n$, and using $-k < i$, we have $(i(\delta)^2 - d^2 - kr)/n < r|k|/n < |k|$. Thus $dt - (mr + k) = |k| + D_0 \cdot C > D_i \cdot C$ for $0 \leq i \leq \omega'$. $\diamond$

The following theorem extends Theorem I.3 of [HR] to almost uniform classes for our particular choice of r and d . Given a multiplicity sequence $\mathbf{m} = (m_1, \dots, m_n)$, define u and ρ by: $u \geq 0$, $0 < \rho \leq r$ and $m_1 + \dots + m_n = ur + \rho$.

Theorem III.2: *Given an integer n , let $d = \lfloor \sqrt{n} \rfloor$, $r = \lfloor d\sqrt{n} \rfloor$, and let $\mathbf{m}$ be almost uniform as above, with $k^2 \leq m < n$. Define u and ρ as above, denote the genus $(d - 1)(d - 2)/2$ of a plane curve of degree d by g and let s be the largest integer such that we have both $(s + 1)(s + 2) \leq 2\rho$ and $0 \leq s < d$. Then*

$$\alpha(\mathbf{m}) \geq 1 + \min(\lfloor (mr + k + g - 1)/d \rfloor, s + ud).$$

Moreover, if $k < 0$ and $n - d^2$ is even, then $\alpha(\mathbf{m}) \geq 1 + \min(\lfloor (mr + g - 1)/d \rfloor, s + ud)$.

Proof: As discussed above, we may replace $\mathbf{m}$ by $\mathbf{m}'$, hence we may assume $\mathbf{m} = (m, m, \dots, m, m + k)$ if $k \leq 0$, and $\mathbf{m} = (m + 1, \dots, m + 1, m, \dots, m)$ if $k > 0$. In either case, we define m_i by $(m_1, \dots, m_n) = \mathbf{m}$, and let $D_0 = tL - (m_1E_1 + \dots + m_nE_n)$. Our aim is to show that if $t \leq \min(\lfloor (mr + k + g - 1)/d \rfloor, s + ud)$ (or $t \leq \min(\lfloor (mr + g - 1)/d \rfloor, s + ud)$ in case $k < 0$ and $n - d^2$ is even), then $D_i \cdot C \leq g_C - 1$ for $0 \leq i < j$ and $(t_j + 1)(t_j + 2) \leq 2(dt_j - D_j \cdot C)$, where j is the least index i such that $t_i < d$.

It is easy to check that ω' , defined above, is $\lceil (mn + k)/r \rceil = u + 1$, so if $t \leq s + ud$, it follows that $t_{\omega'} \leq s - d < 0$, and thus $\omega' \geq \omega$, where ω is the least i such that $t_i < 0$, and hence $\omega = j + 1$. Lemma III.1 now gives $D_i \cdot C \leq dt - (mr + k)$ (resp., $D_i \cdot C \leq dt - mr$, if $n - d^2$ is even and $k < 0$) for all $0 \leq i \leq \omega - 2$, so $t \leq \lfloor (mr + k + g - 1)/d \rfloor$ (resp., $t \leq \lfloor (mr + g - 1)/d \rfloor$) implies $D_i \cdot C \leq g - 1$. To conclude that $\alpha'(\mathbf{m}) \geq t + 1$, it is now enough to check that $(t - i'd + 1)(t - i'd + 2) \leq 2v_{i'}$ for $i' = \omega - 1$, where for any i we define $v_i = dt_i - D_i \cdot C$.

If $i' = u$ (i.e., $\omega' = \omega$), we have $\rho = v_{i'}$. But $t - i'd = t - ud \leq s$ by definition, hence $(t - i'd + 1)(t - i'd + 2) \leq (s + 1)(s + 2) \leq 2\rho = 2v_{i'}$. If $i' < u$ (so $\omega' > \omega$), by

definition of i' we at least have $t - i'd \leq d - 1$, so $(t - i'd + 1)(t - i'd + 2) \leq d(d + 1)$, as desired. But $\omega' > \omega$ implies $v_{i'} \geq r$, and $r \geq d^2$ implies $d(d + 1) \leq 2r$, so again $2v_{i'} \geq 2r \geq d(d + 1) \geq (t - i'd + 1)(t - i'd + 2)$. $\diamond$

We can now prove Theorem I.3 and Corollary I.4.

Proof of Theorem I.3: The conclusion is true when n is a square, so we may assume n is a nonsquare. Cases $10 \leq n < 25$ (i.e., $3 \leq d \leq 4$) we treat ad hoc, briefly. When n is a nonsquare, we have $r/d < \sqrt{n}$, so for μ large enough $r/d < \sqrt{n - 1/\mu}$ holds, hence only finitely many μ can satisfy the hypothesis. When $d = 3$, it turns out that the only value of μ satisfying the hypothesis is $\mu = 1$. For $d = 4$, it turns out that μ is never more than 14. From Table II.10, we see that $\varepsilon(n) \geq (1/\sqrt{n})\sqrt{1 - 1/(\mu n)}$ thus holds for $n < 25$. So hereafter we may assume that $d \geq 5$.

Theorem I.1 will imply our conclusion. To apply Theorem I.1, it is enough to consider multiplicity sequences $\mathbf{m} = (m_1, \dots, m_n)$ in which either all multiplicities are equal to $m \leq \mu - 1$ or every multiplicity but one equals $m < \mu/(n - 1)$ (and so $m \leq (\mu - 1)/(n - 1)$ which implies $m < n$), and the remaining one is $m + k$ with $k^2 \leq (n/(n - 1))\min(m, m + k)$ (and as in the proof of Lemma II.4, $m < n$ implies $k^2 \leq m$). In either case, k zero or not, it suffices to show $\alpha(\mathbf{m}) \geq ((nm + k)/\sqrt{n})\sqrt{1 - 1/(\mu n)}$.

Since in the non-uniform case we have $k^2 \leq m < n$, we can apply Theorem III.2; in the uniform case we can apply Theorem I.3(c) of [HR]. What we want is to show that $((mn + k)/\sqrt{n})\sqrt{1 - 1/\mu n}$ is no bigger than the lower bound on $\alpha(\mathbf{m})$ given in each of these theorems.

Recall the quantities s , u and ρ defined in Theorem III.2. First we show that $s + ud + 1 \geq (mn + k)/\sqrt{n}$. The proof of Corollary IV.1 of [HR] handles the uniform case ($k = 0$), which we now adapt to handle also the case that $k \neq 0$. Since $r^2 \leq d^2 n$, we see that $(mn + k)/\sqrt{n} \leq (mn + k)d/r$, so it suffices to show that $(mn + k)d/r \leq s + ud + 1$. If $s = d - 1$, then $s + ud + 1 = (u + 1)d = \lceil (mn + k)/r \rceil d \geq (mn + k)d/r$ as required, so assume $(s + 1)(s + 2) \leq 2\rho < (s + 2)(s + 3)$ and $s + 2 \leq d$. Then $r(s + ud + 1) = r(s + 1) + (mn + k)d - d\rho$, so we need only check that $r(s + 1) + (mn + k)d - d\rho \geq (mn + k)d$, or $r(s + 1) \geq d\rho$. If $s = 0$, then $r(s + 1) = r \geq 3d = d(s + 2)(s + 3)/2 \geq d\rho$, since $\sqrt{n} \geq 3$. If $s > 0$, then $r(s + 1) \geq d(s + 3)(s + 2)/2 \geq d\rho$, since $r(s + 1)/d \geq d(s + 1) \geq (s + 2)(s + 1) \geq (s + 3)(s + 2)/2$.

In the uniform case, we still have to prove that $\lfloor (mr + g - 1)/d \rfloor + 1 \geq m\sqrt{n - 1/\mu}$. Observe that $\lfloor x/d \rfloor + 1 \geq x/d$, so it is enough to prove $(mr + g - 1)/d \geq m\sqrt{n - 1/\mu}$. But both sides of this inequality are linear in m , it obviously holds for $m = 0$, and it holds for $m = \mu - 1$ by hypothesis, so it clearly holds for all $0 < m < \mu$.

Finally, we need to verify $\lfloor (mr + k + g - 1)/d \rfloor + 1 \geq ((mn + k)/\sqrt{n})\sqrt{1 - 1/\mu n}$ when $k \neq 0$. As before, it is enough to prove $(mr + k + g - 1)/d \geq ((mn + k)/\sqrt{n})\sqrt{1 - 1/\mu n}$, which we can rewrite as $m(\sqrt{n - 1/\mu} - r/d) \leq (d - 3)/2 + k(1/d - (1/\sqrt{n})\sqrt{1 - 1/(\mu n)})$. But $k^2 \leq m < n$, so $k \geq -d$, hence it is enough to prove

$$m \left(\sqrt{n - \frac{1}{\mu}} - \frac{r}{d} \right) \leq \frac{d - 3}{2} - \left(1 - \frac{d}{\sqrt{n}} \sqrt{1 - \frac{1}{\mu n}} \right).$$

As $d \geq 5$, the term on the right is positive, it holds for $m = 0$ and so again by linearity it suffices to show it holds for $m = (\mu - 1)/(n - 1)$. By hypothesis we have $(d - 3)/(2(n -$

1)) $\geq ((\mu - 1)/(n - 1))(\sqrt{n - 1/\mu} - r/d)$, so the desired inequality will follow if we prove $(1 - 1/(n - 1))(d - 3)/2 \geq 1 - (d/\sqrt{n})\sqrt{1 - 1/(\mu n)}$, but $(1 - 1/(n - 1))(d - 3)/2 = ((n - 2)/(n - 1))(d - 3)/2$, so it suffices to show

$$\frac{d - 3}{2} \geq 1 + \frac{1}{n - 2} - \frac{d}{\sqrt{n}}\sqrt{1 - \frac{1}{\mu n}} > \frac{n - 1}{n - 2} - \frac{d(n - 1)}{(n - 2)\sqrt{n}}\sqrt{1 - \frac{1}{\mu n}},$$

the second inequality being obvious. But the first holds obviously if $d \geq 6$; since for every $25 < n < 36$ (so $d = 5$) it can be easily checked that $1/(n - 2) \leq (5/\sqrt{n})\sqrt{1 - 1/n}$, this finishes the proof. $\diamond$

The next Lemma is a technical result used to prove Corollary I.4.

Lemma III.3: *Let $n \geq 17$ be an integer, not a square, and define $d = \lfloor \sqrt{n} \rfloor$, $r = \lfloor d\sqrt{n} \rfloor$, $\Delta = n - d^2$ and $\delta = \lfloor \Delta/2 \rfloor$. Let*

$$\mu_n = \begin{cases} \left\lfloor d \left(d - 3 + \frac{d(d-3)-1}{(d-3)(d^2+\delta+1)} \right) \frac{d^2+\delta}{d^2-\delta^2} \right\rfloor + 1 & \text{if } \Delta = 2\delta + 1 \text{ is odd,} \\ \left\lfloor d \left(d - 3 + \frac{d(d-3)-1}{(d-3)(d^2+\delta)} \right) \frac{d^2+\delta-1}{2d^2-(\delta-1)^2} \right\rfloor + 1 & \text{if } \Delta = 2\delta \text{ is even;} \end{cases}$$

then $\mu = \mu_n$ satisfies the inequalities of Theorem I.3. Moreover, if $\Delta = 2\delta + 1$, $\delta \geq 2\sqrt{d}$, it follows that $\mu_n \geq n$.

Proof: We have to show first that $\mu_n \leq n(n - 1)$ ($\mu_n \geq 1$ is obvious). Consider the odd Δ case. Since μ_n is an increasing function of $\delta \leq d - 1$, we see $\mu_n \leq d(d - 3 + (d(d - 3) - 1)/((d - 3)(d^2 + d)))((d^2 + d - 1)/(2d - 1)) < d(d - 3 + 1/d)d$, and the desired inequality follows from $d^2 - 3d + 1 < n$, $d < n$. The even Δ case is similar.

For the second inequality, we use a refined version of the proof of Corollary IV.1 of [HR]. Consider the case in which Δ is odd, so $n = d^2 + 2\delta + 1$ and $r = d^2 + \delta$. We have to check that $(\mu_n - 1)(d^2 + \delta)/d + (d - 3)/2 \geq (\mu_n - 1)\sqrt{n - 1/\mu_n}$, or equivalently,

$$(\mu_n - 1) \left(\sqrt{n - \frac{1}{\mu_n}} - \frac{d^2 + \delta}{d} \right) \leq \frac{d - 3}{2}.$$

Now $\sqrt{n - 1/\mu_n} \leq \sqrt{n} - 1/(2\mu_n\sqrt{n})$, so it will be enough to prove that

$$(\mu_n - 1) \left(\sqrt{n} - \frac{d^2 + \delta}{d} \right) \leq \frac{d - 3}{2} + \frac{\mu_n - 1}{2\mu_n\sqrt{n}}.$$

This is the same as $\mu_n - 1 \leq ((d - 3)/2 + (1/(2\sqrt{n}))(1 - 1/\mu_n))(d^2/(d^2 - \delta^2))(\sqrt{n} + d + \delta/d)$. Taking into account that $d + (\delta + 1)/d = (r + 1)/d > \sqrt{n} > r/d = d + \delta/d$ and that $\mu_n \geq d(d - 3)$ (because $d \geq 4$) it is enough to have $\mu_n - 1 \leq (d - 3 + (d(d - 3) - 1)/((d^2 + \delta + 1)(d - 3)))d(d^2 + \delta)/(d^2 - \delta^2)$, which holds by hypothesis.

One handles the even case similarly, but now $n = d^2 + 2\delta$ and $r = d^2 + \delta - 1$, and $\delta > 0$ since n is not a square.

Finally, for the case that $\delta \geq 2\sqrt{d}$, use the fact that

$$d \left(d - 3 + \frac{d(d-3) - 1}{(d-3)(d^2 + \delta + 1)} \right) \frac{d^2 + \delta}{d^2 - \delta^2}$$

is an increasing function of δ . We want to show that it is bounded below by n when $\delta \geq 2\sqrt{d}$. Substitute x^2 for d and $2x$ for δ and simplify to get $(x-2)(x^7(x^2-3) + 12x^6 + 25x^5 + 14x^3 + 52x^2 + 51x) + 12x^5 + x^4 + 46x - 12 \geq 0$, which holds for $x \geq 2$, and hence the desired inequality holds if $\delta \geq 2\sqrt{d}$. (In addition to $\delta \geq 2\sqrt{d}$ we also have $\delta \leq d-1$, so in fact there are integers δ as above only if $d \geq 6$.) $\diamond$

Note that, whereas our results up to now, such as Theorem I.3, employ $r = \lfloor d\sqrt{n} \rfloor$, other choices of r can be useful. The case that $\Delta = 2$ of Corollary I.4 demonstrates this, since it follows from Corollary IV.1 of [HR], which in turn is based on using $r = \lceil d\sqrt{n} \rceil$.

Proof of Corollary I.4: First we will show we can take $f(n) = n(n - 3\sqrt{n} - 1)$ if $\Delta = n - d^2$ is odd, where $d = \lfloor \sqrt{n} \rfloor$. This follows from Lemma III.3 if we show $n\mu_n \geq n(n - 3\sqrt{n} - 1)$. But $d^2 - 3d + 2\delta - 1 \geq n - 3\sqrt{n} - 1$, so it is enough to verify $\mu_n \geq d^2 - 3d + 2\delta - 1$ and hence (since $d^2 - 3d + 2\delta - 2$ is an integer) to verify

$$\begin{aligned} d \left(d - 3 + \frac{d(d-3) - 1}{(d-3)(d^2 + \delta + 1)} \right) \frac{d^2 + \delta}{d^2 - \delta^2} &\geq \frac{d(d-3)(d^2 + \delta)}{d^2 - \delta^2} = \\ &= (d^2 - 3d) \left(1 + \frac{\delta^2 + \delta}{d^2 - \delta^2} \right) \geq d^2 - 3d + 2\delta - 2. \end{aligned}$$

For this it is enough to check $(d^2 - 3d)(\delta^2 + \delta) \geq (2\delta - 2)(d^2 - \delta^2)$ or $(\delta^2 - \delta + 2)d^2 - 3(\delta^2 + \delta)d + 2\delta^2(\delta - 1) \geq 0$. But $2\delta^2(\delta - 1) \geq 0$, and $(\delta^2 - \delta + 2)d^2 \geq 3(\delta^2 + \delta)d$ for $d \geq 5$. (To see this, note that $5(\delta^2 - \delta + 2) \geq 3(\delta^2 + \delta)$ simplifies to $(\delta - 2)^2 + 1 \geq 0$, and hence $d \geq 5 \geq 3(\delta^2 + \delta)/(\delta^2 - \delta + 2)$ for $d \geq 5$.) This leaves the cases $d = 4$ with $0 \leq \delta \leq 3$, which can be checked explicitly.

Now suppose that Δ is odd with $\Delta \geq 4\sqrt{n} + 1$. Then $\delta \geq 2\sqrt{d}$ so $\mu_n \geq n$ by Lemma III.3, hence we can take $f(n) = n^2$, as claimed.

Now consider the case that $\Delta = n - d^2$ is even and positive. The argument is similar, except now we want to show $n\mu_n \geq n(n - 3\sqrt{n} - 4)/2$, and hence

$$\begin{aligned} d \left(d - 3 + \frac{d(d-3) - 1}{(d-3)(d^2 + \delta)} \right) \frac{d^2 + \delta - 1}{2d^2 - (\delta - 1)^2} &\geq \frac{d(d-3)(d^2 + \delta - 1)}{2d^2 - (\delta - 1)^2} = \\ &= \left(\frac{d^2 - 3d}{2} \right) \left(1 + \frac{(\delta - 1)^2 + (\delta - 1)}{2d^2 - (\delta - 1)^2} \right) \geq \frac{d^2 - 3d + 2\delta - 6}{2}, \end{aligned}$$

for which it is enough to check $(d^2 - 3d)((\delta - 1)^2 + (\delta - 1)) \geq (2(\delta - 1) - 4)(2d^2 - (\delta - 1)^2)$ or $((\delta - 1)^2 - 3(\delta - 1) + 8)d^2 - 3((\delta - 1)^2 + (\delta - 1))d + 2((\delta - 1))^2((\delta - 1) - 2) \geq 0$. This clearly holds when $\delta = 1$, and it holds when $\delta = 2$ since $d \geq 4$. We check explicitly for $d = 4$ and $3 \leq \delta \leq 4$, so now we may assume $\delta \geq 3$ and $d \geq 5$, in which case $2((\delta - 1))^2((\delta - 1) - 2) \geq 0$, and $((\delta - 1)^2 - 3(\delta - 1) + 8)d^2 \geq 3((\delta - 1)^2 + (\delta - 1))d$ (this last because $d \geq 5 \geq 3((\delta - 1)^2 + (\delta - 1))/((\delta - 1)^2 - 3(\delta - 1) + 8)$.)

In the special case that $\Delta = 2$ we can do better, as we now show. It's enough to show we can take $\mu_n \geq n - 1$ in Theorem I.1(b), which follows by applying Corollary IV.1 of [HR]. Indeed, as noted in Remark I.2, we can restrict to the $k = 0$ case, and then Corollary IV.1(b) tells us that $\alpha(\mathbf{m}) \geq m\sqrt{n}$ if $m \leq d^2 = n - 2$. $\diamond$

IV. Application

As an application of our bound on $\varepsilon(n)$, we give a criterion for a divisor class $F = tL - m(E_1 + \cdots + E_n)$ (where $t > 0$ and m are integers and $F^2 > 0$) on a blow up X of $\mathbf{P}^2$ at $n \geq 10$ general points to be ample. When $m = 1$, it is known that F is ample; see [X3] (or see [B], which shows that this is already an immediate consequence of [N2]). This was extended to $m = 2$ by [B] and to $m = 3$ by [T]. Moreover, [H] shows F is nef when $m \leq \sqrt{n}$. However, it is not easy to use the approach of [H] to obtain a simple criterion for ampleness. So here we give an ampleness criterion.

Corollary IV.1: *Let $n \geq 10$, $t^2 > nm^2$, $m > 0$ and consider the divisor class $F = tL - m(E_1 + \cdots + E_n)$ on the blow up X of $\mathbf{P}^2$ at $n \geq 10$ points. Define $f(n)$ either as given in Corollary I.4 or in Table II.10. If $m < \sqrt{(f(n) - 1)/n}$, then F is ample. In particular, F is ample if $m \leq \sqrt{(n - 3\sqrt{n} - 5)/2}$.*

Proof: Note that $t^2 \geq m^2n + 1$, so $t/m \geq \sqrt{n + 1/m^2}$, hence $m/t \leq 1/\sqrt{n + 1/m^2} = (1/\sqrt{n})(\sqrt{1 - 1/(nm^2 + 1)})$. Thus $f(n) > nm^2 + 1$, or $m < \sqrt{(f(n) - 1)/n}$, suffices. This establishes the first claim. But $f(n)$ as given in Corollary I.4 is always at least as big as $n(n - 3\sqrt{n} - 4)/2$, hence $(f(n) - 1)/n > (n - 3\sqrt{n} - 5)/2$, and the second claim now follows. $\diamond$

Remark IV.2: It follows from Cor IV.1 that $F = tL - m(E_1 + \cdots + E_n)$ is ample for any positive integers $0 < t$, $0 < m \leq 4$ such that $F^2 > 0$. To see this for $10 \leq n \leq 99$ use the values of $f(n)$ in Table II.10 together with the criterion $m < \sqrt{(f(n) - 1)/n}$, and for $n \geq 61$ use the criterion $m \leq \sqrt{(n - 3\sqrt{n} - 5)/2}$. In fact, we obtain an upper bound on m of more than 4 in all cases except when n is 12, 13, 23, 29 or 41. $\diamond$

References

- [B] P. Biran. *Constructing new ample divisors out of old ones*, Duke Math. J. 98 (1999), no. 1, 113–135.
- [C] G. V. Chudnovsky. *Singular points on complex hypersurfaces and multidimensional Schwarz lemma*. Seminar on Number Theory, Paris 1979–80, pp. 29–69, Progr. Math., 12, Birkhäuser, Boston, Mass., 1981.
- [CCMO] C. Ciliberto, F. Cioffi, R. Miranda and F. Orecchia. *Bivariate Hermite interpolation via computer algebra and algebraic geometry techniques*, Preprint - Pubblicazioni del Dipartimento di Matematica e Applicazioni di Napoli n° 26 (2002).
- [D] J.P. Demailly. *Singular Hermitian metrics on positive line bundles*, Complex Algebraic Varieties (Bayreuth 1990) (K. Hulek et al., eds.), LNM, vol. 1507, Springer, 1992, pp. 87–104.

- [H] B. Harbourne. *Seshadri constants and very ample divisors on algebraic surfaces*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **559** (2003) 115–122.
- [HR] B. Harbourne and J. Roé. *Linear systems with multiple base points in $\mathbf{P}^2$* , to appear, Adv. Geom.
- [HH] M. Hochster and C. Huneke. *Comparison of symbolic and ordinary powers of ideals*, Invent. Math. **147** (2002), no. 2, 349–369.
- [N1] M. Nagata. *On rational surfaces, II*, Mem. Coll. Sci. Univ. Kyoto, Ser. A Math. 33 (1960), 271–293.
- [N2] M. Nagata. *On the fourteenth problem of Hilbert*, Amer. J. Math. 81 (1959), 766–772.
- [R1] J. Roé. *On submaximal plane curves*, preprint, 2003.
- [R2] J. Roé. *On Nagata’s Conjecture*, preprint, 2003.
- [S] T. Szemberg. *Global and local positivity of line bundles*, Habilitation, 2001.
- [ST] T. Szemberg and H. Tutaj-Gasińska. *General blow ups of the projective plane*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 130 (2002), no. 9, 2515–2524.
- [T] H. Tutaj-Gasińska, *A bound for Seshadri constant on $\mathbf{P}^2$* , preprint (2001).
- [X1] G. Xu. *Curves in $\mathbf{P}^2$ and symplectic packings*, Math. Ann. 299 (1994), 609–613.
- [X2] G. Xu. *Ample line bundles on smooth surfaces*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **469** (1995), 199–209.
- [X3] G. Xu. *Divisors on the blow up of the projective plane*, Man. Math. 86 (1995), 195–197.