



A lower bound for $\chi(\mathcal{O}_S)$

Vincenzo Di Gennaro¹

Received: 17 February 2021 / Accepted: 11 May 2021 / Published online: 24 May 2021
© The Author(s) 2021

Abstract

Let (S, \mathcal{L}) be a smooth, irreducible, projective, complex surface, polarized by a very ample line bundle \mathcal{L} of degree $d > 25$. In this paper we prove that $\chi(\mathcal{O}_S) \geq -\frac{1}{8}d(d-6)$. The bound is sharp, and $\chi(\mathcal{O}_S) = -\frac{1}{8}d(d-6)$ if and only if d is even, the linear system $|H^0(S, \mathcal{L})|$ embeds S in a smooth rational normal scroll $T \subset \mathbb{P}^5$ of dimension 3, and here, as a divisor, S is linearly equivalent to $\frac{d}{2}Q$, where Q is a quadric on T . Moreover, this is equivalent to the fact that a general hyperplane section $H \in |H^0(S, \mathcal{L})|$ of S is the projection of a curve C contained in the Veronese surface $V \subseteq \mathbb{P}^5$, from a point $x \in V \setminus C$.

Keywords Projective surface · Castelnuovo–Halphen’s Theory · Rational normal scroll · Veronese surface

Mathematics Subject Classification Primary 14J99 · Secondary 14M20 · 14N15 · 51N35

1 Introduction

In [6] D. Franco and the author prove a sharp lower bound for the self-intersection K_S^2 of the canonical bundle of a smooth, projective, complex surface S , polarized by a very ample line bundle \mathcal{L} , in terms of its degree $d = \deg \mathcal{L}$, assuming $d > 35$. Refining the line of the proof in [6], in the present paper we deduce a similar result for the Euler characteristic $\chi(\mathcal{O}_S)$ of S [1, p. 2], in the range $d > 25$. More precisely, we prove the following:

Theorem 1.1 *Let (S, \mathcal{L}) be a smooth, irreducible, projective, complex surface, polarized by a very ample line bundle \mathcal{L} of degree $d > 25$. Then:*

$$\chi(\mathcal{O}_S) \geq -\frac{1}{8}d(d-6).$$

The bound is sharp, and the following properties are equivalent.

- (i) $\chi(\mathcal{O}_S) = -\frac{1}{8}d(d-6)$;

✉ Vincenzo Di Gennaro
digennar@axp.mat.uniroma2.it

¹ Dipartimento di Matematica, Università di Roma “Tor Vergata”, Via della Ricerca Scientifica, 00133 Rome, Italy

- (ii) $h^0(S, \mathcal{L}) = 6$, and the linear system $|H^0(S, \mathcal{L})|$ embeds S in \mathbb{P}^5 as a scroll with sectional genus $g = \frac{1}{8}d(d - 6) + 1$;
- (iii) $h^0(S, \mathcal{L}) = 6$, d is even, and the linear system $|H^0(S, \mathcal{L})|$ embeds S in a smooth rational normal scroll $T \subset \mathbb{P}^5$ of dimension 3, and here S is linearly equivalent to $\frac{d}{2}(H_T - W_T)$, where H_T is the hyperplane class of T , and W_T the ruling (i.e. S is linearly equivalent to an integer multiple of a smooth quadric $Q \subset T$).

By Enriques’ classification, one knows that if S is unruled or rational, then $\chi(\mathcal{O}_S) \geq 0$. Hence, Theorem 1.1 essentially concerns irrational ruled surfaces.

In the range $d > 35$, the family of extremal surfaces for $\chi(\mathcal{O}_S)$ is exactly the same for K_S^2 . We point out there is a relationship between this family and the Veronese surface. In fact one has the following:

Corollary 1.2 *Let $S \subseteq \mathbb{P}^r$ be a nondegenerate, smooth, irreducible, projective, complex surface, of degree $d > 25$. Let $L \subseteq \mathbb{P}^r$ be a general hyperplane. Then $\chi(\mathcal{O}_S) = -\frac{1}{8}d(d - 6)$ if and only if $r = 5$, and there is a curve C in the Veronese surface $V \subseteq \mathbb{P}^5$ and a point $x \in V \setminus C$ such that a general hyperplane section $S \cap L$ of S is the projection $p_x(C) \subseteq L$ of C in $L \cong \mathbb{P}^4$, from the point x .*

In particular, $S \cap L$ is not linearly normal, even if S is.

2 Proof of Theorem 1.1

Remark 2.1 (i) We say that $S \subset \mathbb{P}^r$ is a scroll if S is a \mathbb{P}^1 -bundle over a smooth curve, and the restriction of $\mathcal{O}_S(1)$ to a fibre is $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(1)$. In particular, S is a geometrically ruled surface, and therefore $\chi(\mathcal{O}_S) = \frac{1}{8}K_S^2$ [1, Proposition III.21].

(ii) By Enriques’ classification [1, Theorem X.4 and Proposition III.21], one knows that if S is unruled or rational, then $\chi(\mathcal{O}_S) \geq 0$, and if S is ruled with irregularity > 0 , then $\chi(\mathcal{O}_S) \geq \frac{1}{8}K_S^2$. Therefore, taking into account previous remark, when $d > 35$, Theorem 1.1 follows from [6, Theorem 1.1]. In order to examine the range $25 < d \leq 35$, we are going to refine the line of the argument in the proof of [6, Theorem 1.1].

(iii) When $d = 2\delta$ is even, then $\frac{1}{8}d(d - 6) + 1$ is the genus of a plane curve of degree δ , and the genus of a curve of degree d lying on the Veronese surface.

Put $r + 1 := h^0(S, \mathcal{L})$. Therefore, $|H^0(S, \mathcal{L})|$ embeds S in \mathbb{P}^r . Let $H \subseteq \mathbb{P}^{r-1}$ be a general hyperplane section of S , so that $\mathcal{L} \cong \mathcal{O}_S(H)$. We denote by g the genus of H . If $2 \leq r \leq 3$, then $\chi(\mathcal{O}_S) \geq 1$. Therefore, we may assume $r \geq 4$.

The case $r = 4$.

We first examine the case $r = 4$. In this case we only have to prove that, for $d > 25$, one has $\chi(\mathcal{O}_S) > -\frac{1}{8}d(d - 6)$. We may assume that S is an irrational ruled surface, so $K_S^2 \leq 8\chi(\mathcal{O}_S)$ (compare with previous Remark 2.1, (ii)). We argue by contradiction, and assume also that

$$\chi(\mathcal{O}_S) \leq -\frac{1}{8}d(d - 6). \tag{1}$$

We are going to prove that this assumption implies $d \leq 25$, in contrast with our hypothesis $d > 25$.

By the double point formula:

$$d(d - 5) - 10(g - 1) + 12\chi(\mathcal{O}_S) = 2K_S^2,$$

and $K_S^2 \leq 8\chi(\mathcal{O}_S)$, we get:

$$d(d - 5) - 10(g - 1) \leq 4\chi(\mathcal{O}_S).$$

And from $\chi(\mathcal{O}_S) \leq -\frac{1}{8}d(d - 6)$ we obtain

$$10g \geq \frac{3}{2}d^2 - 8d + 10. \tag{2}$$

Now we distinguish two cases, according that S is not contained in a hypersurface of degree < 5 or not.

First suppose that S is not contained in a hypersurface of \mathbb{P}^4 of degree < 5 . Since $d > 16$, by Roth’s Theorem ([12, p. 152], [8, p. 2, (C)]), H is not contained in a surface of \mathbb{P}^3 of degree < 5 . Using Halphen’s bound [9], we deduce that

$$g \leq \frac{d^2}{10} + \frac{d}{2} + 1 - \frac{2}{5}(\epsilon + 1)(4 - \epsilon),$$

where $d - 1 = 5m + \epsilon, 0 \leq \epsilon < 5$. It follows that

$$\frac{3}{2}d^2 - 8d + 10 \leq 10g \leq d^2 + 5d + 10\left(1 - \frac{2}{5}(\epsilon + 1)(4 - \epsilon)\right).$$

This implies that $d \leq 25$, in contrast with our hypothesis $d > 25$.

In the second case, assume that S is contained in an irreducible and reduced hypersurface of degree $s \leq 4$. When $s \in \{2, 3\}$, one knows that, for $d > 12$, S is of general type [2, p. 213]. Therefore, we only have to examine the case $s = 4$. In this case H is contained in a surface of \mathbb{P}^3 of degree 4. Since $d > 12$, by Bezout’s Theorem, H is not contained in a surface of \mathbb{P}^3 of degree < 4 . Using Halphen’s bound [9], and [8, Lemme 1], we get:

$$\frac{d^2}{8} - \frac{9d}{8} + 1 \leq g \leq \frac{d^2}{8} + 1.$$

Hence, there exists a rational number $0 \leq x \leq 9$ such that

$$g = \frac{d^2}{8} + d\left(\frac{x - 9}{8}\right) + 1.$$

If $0 \leq x \leq \frac{15}{2}$, then $g \leq \frac{d^2}{8} - \frac{3}{16}d + 1$, and from (2) we get

$$\frac{3}{20}d^2 - \frac{4}{5}d + 1 \leq g \leq \frac{d^2}{8} - \frac{3}{16}d + 1.$$

It follows $d \leq 24$, in contrast with our hypothesis $d > 25$.

Assume $\frac{15}{2} < x \leq 9$. Hence,

$$\left(\frac{d^2}{8} + 1\right) - g = -d\left(\frac{x - 9}{8}\right) < \frac{3}{16}d.$$

By [5, proof of Proposition 2, and formula (2.2)], we have

$$\begin{aligned} \chi(\mathcal{O}_S) &\geq 1 + \frac{d^3}{96} - \frac{d^2}{16} - \frac{5d}{3} - \frac{349}{16} - (d-3) \left[\left(\frac{d^2}{8} + 1 \right) - g \right] \\ &> 1 + \frac{d^3}{96} - \frac{d^2}{16} - \frac{5d}{3} - \frac{349}{16} - (d-3) \frac{3}{16} d = \frac{d^3}{96} - \frac{d^2}{4} - \frac{53}{48} d - \frac{333}{16}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining with (1), we get

$$\frac{d^3}{96} - \frac{d^2}{4} - \frac{53}{48} d - \frac{333}{16} + \frac{1}{8} d(d-6) < 0,$$

i.e.

$$d^3 - 12d^2 - 178d - 1998 < 0.$$

It follows $d \leq 23$, in contrast with our hypothesis $d > 25$.

This concludes the analysis of the case $r = 4$.

The case $r \geq 5$.

When $r \geq 5$, by [6, Remark 2.1], we know that, for $d > 5$, one has $K_S^2 > -d(d-6)$, except when $r = 5$, and the surface S is a scroll, $K_S^2 = 8\chi(\mathcal{O}_S) = 8(1-g)$, and

$$g = \frac{1}{8}d^2 - \frac{3}{4}d + \frac{(5-\epsilon)(\epsilon+1)}{8}, \tag{3}$$

with $d-1 = 4m + \epsilon$, $0 < \epsilon \leq 3$. In this case, by [6, pp. 73–76], we know that, for $d > 30$, S is contained in a smooth rational normal scroll of \mathbb{P}^5 of dimension 3. Taking into account that we may assume $K_S^2 \leq 8\chi(\mathcal{O}_S)$ (compare with Remark 2.1, (i) and (ii)), at this point Theorem 1.1 follows from [6, Proposition 2.2], when $d > 30$.

In order to examine the remaining cases $26 \leq d \leq 30$, we refine the analysis appearing in [6]. In fact assuming that $r = 5$ and S is a scroll, and assuming that (3) holds, then S is contained in a smooth rational normal scroll of \mathbb{P}^5 also in the range $26 \leq d \leq 30$. Then we may conclude as before, because [6, Proposition 2.2] holds true for $d \geq 18$.

First, observe that if S is contained in a threefold $T \subset \mathbb{P}^5$ of dimension 3 and minimal degree 3, then T is necessarily a smooth rational normal scroll [6, p. 76]. Moreover, observe that we may apply the same argument as in [6, pp. 75–76] in order to exclude the case S is contained in a threefold of degree 4. In fact the argument works for $d > 24$ [6, p. 76, first line after formula (13)].

In conclusion, assuming that $r = 5$ and S is a scroll, and assuming that (3) holds, it remains to exclude that S is not contained in a threefold of degree < 5 in the range $26 \leq d \leq 30$.

Assume S is not contained in a threefold of degree < 5 . Denote by $\Gamma \subset \mathbb{P}^3$ a general hyperplane section of H . Recall that $26 \leq d \leq 30$.

- **Case I** $h^0(\mathbb{P}^3, \mathcal{I}_\Gamma(2)) \geq 2$.

It is impossible. In fact, if $d > 4$, by monodromy [4, Proposition 2.1], Γ should be contained in a reduced and irreducible space curve of degree ≤ 4 , and so, for $d > 20$, S should be contained in a threefold of degree ≤ 4 [3, Theorem (0.2)].

- **Case II** $h^0(\mathbb{P}^3, \mathcal{I}_\Gamma(2)) = 1$ and $h^0(\mathbb{P}^3, \mathcal{I}_\Gamma(3)) > 4$.

As before, if $d > 6$, by monodromy, Γ is contained in a reduced and irreducible space curve X of degree $\deg(X) \leq 6$. Again as before, if $\deg(X) \leq 4$, then S is contained in a threefold of degree ≤ 4 . So we may assume $5 \leq \deg(X) \leq 6$.

Denote by h_Γ and h_X the Hilbert function of Γ and X . First notice that, since $\Gamma \subset \mathbb{P}^3$ is non degenerate, and $h^0(\mathbb{P}^3, \mathcal{I}_\Gamma(2)) = 1$, we have:

$$h_\Gamma(1) = 4, \quad \text{and} \quad h_\Gamma(2) = 9. \tag{4}$$

Moreover, since $d \geq 26$, by Bezout's Theorem we have

$$h_\Gamma(i) = h_X(i) \quad \text{for every} \quad i \leq 4. \tag{5}$$

Let $X' \subset \mathbb{P}^2$ be a general plane section of X , and $h_{X'}$ its Hilbert function. By [7, Lemma (3.1), p. 83] we know that $h_X(i) - h_X(i - 1) \geq h_{X'}(i)$ for every i . Therefore, for every i , we have:

$$h_X(i) \geq \sum_{j=0}^i h_{X'}(j). \tag{6}$$

On the other hand, by [7, Corollary (3.6), p. 87], we also know that

$$h_{X'}(j) \leq \min\{2j + 1, \deg(X)\}. \tag{7}$$

Therefore, by (5), (6), and (7) (recall that $5 \leq \deg(X) \leq 6$), we get:

$$h_\Gamma(3) \geq 14 \quad \text{and} \quad h_\Gamma(4) \geq 19. \tag{8}$$

By [7, Corollary (3.5), p. 86] we have:

$$h_\Gamma(i + j) \geq \min\{d, h_\Gamma(i) + h_\Gamma(j) - 1\} \quad \text{for every} \quad i \text{ and } j. \tag{9}$$

Combining (9) with (4) and (8), we get:

$$h_\Gamma(5) \geq 22, \quad h_\Gamma(6) \geq \min\{d, 27\}, \quad h_\Gamma(7) = d. \tag{10}$$

Since in general we have [7, Corollary (3.2) p. 84]

$$g \leq \sum_{i=1}^{+\infty} d - h_\Gamma(i), \tag{11}$$

from (4), (8), and (10), taking into account that $26 \leq d \leq 30$, it follows that:

$$g \leq (d - 4) + (d - 9) + (d - 14) + (d - 19) + (d - 22) + 3 = 5d - 65,$$

which is $< \frac{1}{8}d(d - 6) + 1$ for $d \geq 26$. This is in contrast with (3).

• **Case III** $h^0(\mathbb{P}^3, \mathcal{I}_\Gamma(2)) = 1$ and $h^0(\mathbb{P}^3, \mathcal{I}_\Gamma(3)) = 4$.

Using these assumptions, by (4) and (9), we have:

$$h_\Gamma(1) = 4, \quad h_\Gamma(2) = 9, \quad h_\Gamma(3) = 16, \quad h_\Gamma(4) \geq 19, \quad h_\Gamma(5) \geq 24, \quad h_\Gamma(6) = d.$$

By (11) it follows that:

$$g \leq (d - 4) + (d - 9) + (d - 16) + (d - 19) + (d - 24) = 5d - 72,$$

which is $< \frac{1}{8}d(d - 6) + 1$ for $d \geq 26$. This is in contrast with (3).

• **Case IV** $h^0(\mathbb{P}^3, \mathcal{I}_\Gamma(2)) = 0$.

Using this assumption, by (4) and (9), we have:

$$h_\Gamma(1) = 4, \quad h_\Gamma(2) = 10, \quad h_\Gamma(3) \geq 13, \quad h_\Gamma(4) \geq 19, \\ h_\Gamma(5) \geq 22, \quad h_\Gamma(6) \geq \min\{d, 28\}, \quad h_\Gamma(7) = d.$$

By (11) it follows that:

$$g \leq (d - 4) + (d - 10) + (d - 13) + (d - 19) + (d - 22) + 2 = 5d - 66,$$

which is $< \frac{1}{8}d(d - 6) + 1$ for $d \geq 26$. This is in contrast with (3).

This concludes the proof of Theorem 1.1.

Remark 2.2 (i) Let $Q \subseteq \mathbb{P}^3$ be a smooth quadric, and $H \in |\mathcal{O}_Q(1, d - 1)|$ be a smooth rational curve of degree d [11, p. 231, Exercise 5.6]. Let $S \subseteq \mathbb{P}^4$ be the projective cone over H . A computation, which we omit, proves that

$$\chi(\mathcal{O}_S) = 1 - \binom{d - 1}{3}.$$

Therefore, if S is singular, it may happen that $\chi(\mathcal{O}_S) < -\frac{1}{8}d(d - 6)$. One may ask whether $1 - \binom{d - 1}{3}$ is a lower bound for $\chi(\mathcal{O}_S)$ for every integral surface.

(ii) Let (S, \mathcal{L}) be a smooth surface, polarized by a very ample line bundle \mathcal{L} of degree d . By Harris' bound for the geometric genus $p_g(S)$ of S [10], we see that $p_g(S) \leq \binom{d - 1}{3}$. Taking into account that for a smooth surface one has $\chi(\mathcal{O}_S) = h^0(S, \mathcal{O}_S) - h^1(S, \mathcal{O}_S) + h^2(S, \mathcal{O}_S) \leq 1 + h^2(S, \mathcal{O}_S) = 1 + p_g(S)$, from Theorem 1.1 we deduce (the first inequality only when $d > 25$):

$$-\binom{\frac{d}{2} - 1}{2} \leq \chi(\mathcal{O}_S) \leq 1 + \binom{d - 1}{3}.$$

3 Proof of Corollary 1.2

• First, assume that $\chi(\mathcal{O}_S) = -\frac{1}{8}d(d - 6)$.

By Theorem 1.1, we know that $r = 5$. Moreover, S is contained in a nonsingular threefold $T \subseteq \mathbb{P}^5$ of minimal degree 3. Therefore, a general hyperplane section $H = S \cap L$ of S ($L \cong \mathbb{P}^4$ denotes a general hyperplane of \mathbb{P}^5) is contained in a smooth surface $\Sigma = T \cap L$ of $L \cong \mathbb{P}^4$, of minimal degree 3.

This surface Σ is isomorphic to the blowing-up of \mathbb{P}^2 at one point [1, p. 58]. Moreover, if V denotes the Veronese surface in \mathbb{P}^5 , for a suitable point $x \in V \setminus L$, the projection of $\mathbb{P}^5 \setminus \{x\}$ on $L \cong \mathbb{P}^4$ from x restricts to an isomorphism

$$p_x : V \setminus \{x\} \rightarrow \Sigma \setminus E,$$

where E denotes the exceptional line of Σ [1, loc. cit.].

Since S is linearly equivalent on T to $\frac{d}{2}(H_T - W_T)$ (H_T denotes the hyperplane section of T , and W_T the ruling), it follows that H is linearly equivalent on Σ to $\frac{d}{2}(H_\Sigma - W_\Sigma)$ (now H_Σ denotes the hyperplane section of Σ , and W_Σ the ruling of Σ). Therefore, H does not meet the exceptional line $E = H_\Sigma - 2W_\Sigma$. In fact, since $H_\Sigma^2 = 3$, $H_\Sigma \cdot W_\Sigma = 1$, and $W_\Sigma^2 = 0$, one has:

$$(H_\Sigma - W_\Sigma) \cdot (H_\Sigma - 2W_\Sigma) = H_\Sigma^2 - 3H_\Sigma \cdot W_\Sigma + 2W_\Sigma^2 = 0.$$

This implies that H is contained in $\Sigma \setminus E$, and the assertion of Corollary 1.2 follows.

• Conversely, assume there exists a curve C on the Veronese surface $V \subseteq \mathbb{P}^5$, and a point $x \in V \setminus C$, such that H is the projection $p_x(C)$ of C from the point x .

In particular, d is an even number, and H is contained in a smooth surface $\Sigma \subseteq L \cong \mathbb{P}^4$ of minimal degree, and is disjoint from the exceptional line $E \subseteq \Sigma$. By [3, Theorem (0.2)], S is contained in a threefold $T \subseteq \mathbb{P}^5$ of minimal degree. T is nonsingular. In fact, otherwise, H should be a Castelnuovo's curve in \mathbb{P}^4 [6, p. 76]. On the other hand, by our assumption, H is isomorphic to a plane curve of degree $\frac{d}{2}$. Hence, we should have:

$$g = \frac{d^2}{6} - \frac{2}{3}d + 1 = \frac{d^2}{8} - \frac{3}{4}d + 1$$

(the first equality because H is Castelnuovo's, the latter because H is isomorphic to a plane curve of degree $\frac{d}{2}$). This is impossible when $d > 0$.

Therefore, S is contained in a smooth threefold T of minimal degree in \mathbb{P}^5 .

Now observe that in Σ there are only two families of curves of degree even d and genus $g = \frac{d^2}{8} - \frac{3}{4}d + 1$. These are the curves linearly equivalent on Σ to $\frac{d}{2}(H_\Sigma - W_\Sigma)$, and the curves equivalent to $\frac{d+2}{6}H_\Sigma + \frac{d-2}{2}W_\Sigma$. But only in the first family the curves do not meet E . Hence, H is linearly equivalent on Σ to $\frac{d}{2}(H_\Sigma - W_\Sigma)$. Since the restriction $\text{Pic}(T) \rightarrow \text{Pic}(\Sigma)$ is bijective, it follows that S is linearly equivalent on T to $\frac{d}{2}(H_T - W_T)$. By Theorem 1.1, S is a fortiori linearly normal, and of minimal Euler characteristic $\chi(\mathcal{O}_S) = -\frac{1}{8}d(d-6)$.

Funding Open access funding provided by Università degli Studi di Roma Tor Vergata within the CRUI-CARE Agreement.

Open Access This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons licence, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons licence and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this licence, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>.

References

1. Beauville, A.: Surfaces algébriques complexes. *Astérisque* 54, société mathématique de France (1978)
2. Braun, R., Floystad, G.: A bound for the degree of smooth surfaces in \mathbb{P}_4 not of general type. *Compos. Math.* **93**(2), 211–229 (1994)
3. Chiantini, L., Ciliberto, C.: A few remarks on the lifting problem. *Astérisque* **218**, 95–109 (1993)
4. Chiantini, L., Ciliberto, C., Di Gennaro, V.: The genus of projective curves. *Duke Math. J.* **70**(2), 229–245 (1993)
5. Di Gennaro, V.: A note on smooth surfaces in \mathbb{P}^4 . *Geom. Dedicata* **71**, 91–96 (1998)
6. Di Gennaro, V., Franco, D.: A lower bound for K_S^2 . *Rendiconti del Circolo Matematico di Palermo II Ser.* **66**, 69–81 (2017)
7. Eisenbud, D., Harris, J.: Curves in Projective Space. *Sém. Math. Sup. 85 Les Presses de l'Université de Montréal* (1982)
8. Ellingsrud, G., Peskine, Ch.: Sur les surfaces lisses de \mathbb{P}_4 . *Invent. Math.* **95**, 1–11 (1989)
9. Gruson, L., Peskine, Ch.: Genre des courbes dans l'espace projectif. In: *Algebraic Geometry: Proceedings, Norway, 1977, Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, vol. 687, pp. 31–59. Springer, New York (1978)
10. Harris, J.: A bound on the geometric genus of projective varieties. *Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci.* **8**(4), 35–68 (1981)
11. Hartshorne, R.: *Algebraic Geometry, GTM*, vol. 52. Springer, New York (1983)
12. Roth, L.: On the projective classification of surfaces. *Proc. Lond. Math. Soc.* **42**, 142–170 (1937)

Publisher's Note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.