

## Sections of $K3$ surfaces with Picard number two and Mercat’s conjecture

by  
MARIAN APRODU<sup>(1)</sup>, LAURA FILIMON<sup>(2)</sup>

*Dedicated to the memory of Lucian Bădescu*

### Abstract

In [6, Theorem 1.1], the authors present counterexamples to Mercat’s conjecture by restricting to a hyperplane section  $C$  some suitable rank-two vector bundles on a  $K3$  surface whose Picard group is generated by  $C$  and another very ample divisor. We prove that the same bundles produce other counterexamples by restriction to hypersurface sections  $C_n \in |nC|$  for all  $n \geq 2$ . In the process, we compute the Clifford indices of the corresponding hypersurface sections  $C_n$ , noting their non-generic nature for  $n \geq 2$  (refer to Theorem 1). A key ingredient to prove the (semi)stability of the restricted bundles, Theorem 2, is Green’s Explicit  $H^0$  Lemma (see [10, Corollary (4.e.4)]). In what concerns the (semi)stability, although general restriction theorems such as [9, Theorem 1.2] or [7, Theorem 1.1] are applicable for sufficiently large, explicit values of  $n$ , our approach works for all  $n \geq 2$ . It is also worth noting that our proof deviates slightly from the one presented in [6, Proposition 3.2]. Employing the same strategy leads to an enhancement of the main result of [21]; refer to Theorem 3 for counterexamples to the conjecture on curves in  $|nC|$ , where  $C$  now acts as a generator of the Picard group.

**Key Words:** Higher-rank Brill-Noether theory, curves on  $K3$  surfaces.

**2010 Mathematics Subject Classification:** Primary 14H60; Secondary 14H51, 14J60, 14J28.

## 1 Introduction

Mercat’s conjecture aims to establish a connection between higher-rank Brill–Noether theory and classical Brill–Noether theory concerning curves. Let  $C$  be a smooth curve of genus  $g \geq 3$ , and consider  $\mathcal{E}$  a semistable rank vector bundle on  $C$  satisfying  $h^1(C, \mathcal{E}) \geq h^0(C, \mathcal{E}) \geq 2r$ . The *Clifford index* of  $\mathcal{E}$  is defined as

$$\gamma(\mathcal{E}) := \mu(\mathcal{E}) - \frac{2h^0(C, \mathcal{E})}{\text{rk}(\mathcal{E})} + 2 \geq 0$$

and  $\text{Cliff}_r(C)$ , the *r*th *Clifford index* of  $C$  is the minimum of the Clifford indices of bundles of rank  $r$  that can contribute, i.e.

$$\text{Cliff}_r(C) := \min\{\gamma(\mathcal{E}) : \mathcal{E} \in \mathcal{U}_C(r, d), d \leq r(g-1), h^0(C, \mathcal{E}) \geq 2r\}.$$

In this context, Mercat [18] conjectured that for any  $r \geq 1$ , we have  $\text{Cliff}_r(C) = \text{Cliff}(C)$ . It is worth noting that the inequality  $\text{Cliff}_r(C) \leq \text{Cliff}(C)$  is readily obtained taking direct

sums of line bundles  $A^{\oplus r}$ . Originally, the conjecture was formulated as an explicit upper bound in terms of  $\text{Cliff}(C)$  for the number of sections of semistable bundles, [18, p. 786]. Precisely, the conjectured bound is given by:

$$h^0(C, \mathcal{E}) \leq \frac{d}{2} - r \left( \frac{\text{Cliff}(C)}{2} - 1 \right)$$

for all  $\mathcal{E} \in \mathcal{U}_C(r, d)$ , with  $d \leq r(g-1)$  and  $h^0(C, \mathcal{E}) \geq 2r$ . In rank two, this inequality simplifies to  $h^0(C, \mathcal{E}) \leq \frac{d}{2} - \text{Cliff}(C) + 2$  for all  $\mathcal{E} \in \mathcal{U}_C(2, d)$ , with  $d \leq 2g-2$  and  $\mathcal{E}$  having at least 4 independent sections. Note that the number of independent sections is always bounded, [19, Proposition 3, Proposition 4], [18, Theorem 2.1] etc, but the known general bounds are weaker than those predicted by the conjecture.

While the conjecture has been confirmed in various cases, e.g. in rank two, it holds for arbitrary  $k$ -gonal curves of genus  $g > 2(k-1)(k-2)$ , for general curves [2], for general  $k$ -gonal curves of genus  $g > 4k-4$ , for plane curves [12], [15] etc, it fails for large values  $k$  of the gonality. Specifically, several counterexamples have been provided by curves on  $K3$  surfaces, as seen, for instance in [5], [13], [14], [6], [21] (see also [1], [7] for higher ranks). A current challenge is to discover additional examples of pairs  $(g, k)$  where Mercat's conjecture fails in rank two or to determine whether the existing list of counterexamples is exhaustive. In view of [15, Section 4], the problem needs to be addressed for curves of Clifford dimension one.

In this short Note, we present a new infinite set of counter-examples for the conjecture. Our methodology also revolves around the utilization of curves on  $K3$  surfaces, specifically drawing upon the counterexamples identified in [6], i.e. curves on  $K3$  surfaces of Picard number two. A distinctive aspect of our investigation is the transition from hyperplane sections to hypersurface sections, aligning with the exploration of  $K3$  surfaces with Picard number one, as discussed in [21]. The two main technical difficulties that we have to overcome are: the computation of Clifford indices, and the semistability of the restricted bundles. These issues are addressed in Theorem 1 and Theorem 2, respectively. For the computation of the Clifford indices, we use the Main Theorem of [11], and the verification of semistability relies on Green's explicit  $H^0$  Lemma, see [10, Corollary (4.e.4)]. Employing the same strategy leads to an enhancement of the main result of [21]; see Theorem 3 for counterexamples to the conjecture on curves in  $|nC|$ , where  $C$  now acts as a generator of the Picard group.

## 2 Basic properties of Lazarsfeld–Mukai bundles

We follow closely the presentation of [16]. Let  $S$  be a  $K3$  surface,  $C$  be a smooth connected curve of genus  $g$  in  $S$ , and  $A$  be a base-point-free complete  $g_d^r$  on  $C$ . Denote by  $M_A$  the kernel of the evaluation map

$$\text{ev}_A : H^0(A) \otimes \mathcal{O}_C \rightarrow A.$$

The map  $\text{ev}_A$  induces a surjective morphism  $H^0(A) \otimes \mathcal{O}_S \rightarrow A$  of sheaves on  $S$  whose kernel  $\mathcal{F}_{C,A}$  is a vector bundle of rank  $(r+1)$ . Its dual  $\mathcal{E}_{C,A} = \mathcal{F}_{C,A}^\vee$  is called a *Lazarsfeld–Mukai bundle*. The defining sequences of  $\mathcal{F}_{C,A}$  and  $\mathcal{E}_{C,A}$  are

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_{C,A} \rightarrow H^0(A) \otimes \mathcal{O}_S \rightarrow A \rightarrow 0. \quad (2.1)$$

and, respectively

$$0 \rightarrow H^0(A)^\vee \otimes \mathcal{O}_S \rightarrow \mathcal{E}_{C,A} \rightarrow K_C(-A) \rightarrow 0. \quad (2.2)$$

The bundles  $\mathcal{E}_{C,A}$  and  $\mathcal{F}_{C,A}$  have the following properties:

1.  $\det(\mathcal{E}_{C,A}) = \mathcal{O}_S(C)$ ,
2.  $c_2(\mathcal{E}_{C,A}) = d$ ,
3.  $h^0(S, \mathcal{F}_{C,A}) = h^1(S, \mathcal{F}_{C,A}) = 0$ ,
4.  $\chi(S, \mathcal{F}_{C,A}) = h^2(S, \mathcal{F}_{C,A}) = 2(r+1) + g - d - 1$ ,
5.  $h^0(S, E_{C,A}) = r + 1 + h^0(C, K_C(-A))$ ,
6.  $\mathcal{E}_{C,A}$  is generated off the base locus of  $|K_C(-A)|$  inside  $C$ .

Restricting the sequence (2.1) to the curve  $C$ , we obtain a short exact sequence:

$$0 \rightarrow K_C^\vee(A) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_{C,A}|_C \rightarrow M_A \rightarrow 0 \quad (2.3)$$

which implies, twisting by  $K_C(-A)$  and using the adjunction formula,

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_C \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_{C,A} \otimes K_C(-A) \rightarrow M_A \otimes K_C(-A) \rightarrow 0. \quad (2.4)$$

Note that  $H^0(M_A \otimes K_C(-A)) = \ker(\mu_{0,A})$ , where  $\mu_{0,A} : H^0(A) \otimes H^0(K_C(-A)) \rightarrow H^0(K_C)$  is the Petri map.

### 3 Clifford indices of hypersurface sections of a $K3$ surface with Picard number two

Given integers  $p \geq 3$  and  $a \geq 2p+3$ , let  $S$  be a  $K3$  surface whose Picard group is generated by two very ample smooth divisors,  $\text{Pic}(S) = \langle C, D \rangle$ , where  $C^2 = 4a$ ,  $D \cdot C = 2a + 2p + 1$ ,  $D^2 = 4p + 2$ . The existence of such surfaces is established through the surjectivity of the period map, as noted in [6]. We focus on the embedding  $S \subset \mathbb{P}^{2a+1}$  defined by the complete linear system  $|C|$ . It is worth noting that in [6], the authors consider the surface  $S$  as being embedded via the other linear system  $|D|$ , denoted by  $|H|$  in that context.

For the convenience of the reader, we highlight the following simple fact that was implicitly used in [6].

**Lemma 1.** *Put  $E = C - D$ . Then  $E^2 = 0$ ,  $h^0(S, \mathcal{O}_S(E)) = 2$  and  $h^1(S, \mathcal{O}_S(E)) = 0$ .*

*Proof.* The numerical data makes it evident that  $E^2 = 0$ . Notably, as  $(-E) \cdot D = -2a + 2p + 1 < 0$  and  $D$  is ample, it implies that  $-E$  cannot be effective, and it cannot be zero either. By the Riemann-Roch Theorem, we derive  $h^0(S, \mathcal{O}_S(E)) \geq 2$ .

Suppose the linear system  $|E|$  is base-point-free; in this case, according to [20, Proposition 2.6], it follows that  $E$  is a multiple of a smooth elliptic curve. Since  $E$  is a generator of the Picard group, it must be a smooth elliptic curve. Consequently, we have  $h^0(S, \mathcal{O}_S(E)) = 2$  and  $h^1(S, \mathcal{O}_S(E)) = 0$ .

Now, assume the linear system  $|E|$  has base points. According to [20, Proposition 2.6] the linear system  $|E|$  has a fixed component  $\Delta$ . Write  $E = \Delta + E'$  where  $E'$  is an effective divisor with  $h^0(S, \mathcal{O}_S(E)) = h^0(S, \mathcal{O}_S(E'))$ . From [4, Proposition 2.2], we deduce that  $(E')^2 \geq 0$  and  $\Delta^2 \geq 0$ . Since  $|E'|$  is the moving part of the linear system  $|E|$ , we must also have  $E' \cdot \Delta > 0$ . On the other hand  $E^2 = 0$ , which is a contradiction.  $\square$

We aim to prove that the Clifford index of any curve in the linear system  $|nC|$ , for  $n \geq 2$ , is computed by  $\mathcal{O}(E)$ .

**Theorem 1.** *For any  $n \geq 2$ , and any smooth curve  $C_n \in |nC|$ , we have  $\text{Cliff}(C_n) = n(2a - 2p - 1) - 2$ .*

*Proof.* We remark that the genus of  $C_n$  is  $g(C_n) = 2an^2 + 1$ , and the bundle  $\mathcal{O}_{C_n}(E)$  contributes to the Clifford index of  $C_n$ , with its Clifford index strictly smaller than the generic Clifford index  $(an^2 - 1)$ . Applying the Main Theorem of [11], and [17, Lemma 2.2] the Clifford index of  $C_n$  is computed by the restriction of a line bundle  $\mathcal{O}_S(F) \in \text{Pic}(S)$  by the formula

$$\text{Cliff}(C_n) = \text{Cliff}(\mathcal{O}_{C_n}(F)) = F \cdot C_n - F^2 - 2.$$

To simplify calculations, we work with the basis  $\{C, E\}$  of  $\text{Pic}(S)$  instead of the original  $\{C, D\}$ , considering  $E^2 = 0$ . Note that  $C \cdot E = 2a - 2p - 1 > 0$ . Therefore, expressing  $F = sC + tE$  with  $s, t \in \mathbb{Z}$ , we compute:

$$f(s, t) := \text{Cliff}(\mathcal{O}_{C_n}(sC + tE)) = (n - 2s)(2a - 2p - 1)t - 4as^2 + 4ans - 2. \quad (3.1)$$

The condition  $f(s, t) \geq 0$  must be satisfied due to the definition of the Clifford index.

Following the proof of [4, Theorem 3] and the proof of [6, Proposition 3.3], we observe that  $F$  is subject to the following restrictions:

- (i)  $F^2 \geq 0$ ,
- (ii)  $F \cdot D > 2$ ,
- (iii)  $F \cdot C_n \leq g(C_n) - 1$ ,

Taking into account that  $g(C_n) = 2an^2 + 1$ , these constraints are translated into the following conditions:

- (i)  $s(2as + (2a - 2p - 1)t) \geq 0$ ,
- (ii)  $4as + (2a - 2p - 1)(t - s) > 2$ ,
- (iii)  $4as + (2a - 2p - 1)t \leq 2an$ .

The objective is to prove that the minimum of  $f$ , when  $s$  and  $t$  are integers satisfying conditions (i), (ii), and (iii) is attained at  $(0, 1)$ . Since  $E \cdot C_n - E^2 - 2 = n(2a - 2p - 1) - 2$  that would conclude the proof of the theorem.

We note that  $s \geq 0$ . Indeed, if  $s < 0$ , then (i) implies that  $2as + (2a - 2p - 1)t \leq 0$  and hence we obtain from (ii) that  $(2p + 1)s > 0$  which is a contradiction with the assumption  $s < 0$ . Consequently, condition (i) is reformulated as:

(i)  $2as + (2a - 2p - 1)t \geq 0$ .

Additionally, we have  $s \leq n$ , due to (i) and (iii) leading to  $2an - 2as \geq 0$ .

If  $s = 0$ , then  $f(0, t) = n(2a - 2p - 1)t - 2$  and the minimal positive value is  $f(0, 1) = n(2a - 2p - 1) - 2$  which we wanted to prove.

We analyze next the case  $s \geq 1$ . The inequalities (i) and (iii) give the following bounds for  $t$ :

$$t_{min} := -\frac{2as}{2a - 2p - 1} \leq t \leq t_{max} := \frac{2a(n - 2s)}{2a - 2p - 1}.$$

If  $n$  is even and  $s = \frac{n}{2}$ , we observe that  $f(\frac{n}{2}, t) = an^2 - 2 > n(2a - 2p - 1) - 2$  for  $n \geq 2$ .

If  $n > 2s$ , since the coefficient of  $t$  in the expression of  $f$  is positive and  $s \geq 1$ , it follows that

$$f(s, t) \geq f(s, t_{min}) = 2ans - 2 > n(2a - 2p - 1) - 2.$$

If  $n < 2s$ , since the coefficient of  $t$  in the expression of  $f$  is negative, it holds that

$$f(s, t) \geq f(s, t_{max}) = 4as^2 - 4ans + 2an^2 - 2.$$

On the interval  $[\frac{n}{2}, n]$  the degree-two function  $g(s) := f(s, t_{max})$  is increasing and hence

$$f(s, t) \geq f(s, t_{max}) \geq f\left(\frac{n}{2}, t_{max}\right) = an^2 - 2 > n(2a - 2p - 1) - 2$$

for  $n \geq 2$ . This completes the proof. □

**Remark 1.** For any integer  $n \geq 2$ , any K3 surface  $S$ , and any very ample line bundle  $\mathcal{O}_S(C)$ , consider a smooth curve  $C_n$  in the linear system  $|nC|$ . In this context, the Clifford index of  $C_n$  is smaller than the generic value  $\left[\frac{g(C_n)-1}{2}\right]$ . Specifically, the restriction of the bundle  $\mathcal{O}_S(C)$  to  $C_n$  contributes to the Clifford index, and upon direct computation, its Clifford index is found to be smaller than the generic value. If  $\mathcal{O}_S(C)$  generates the Picard group of  $S$ , then  $\text{Cliff}(C_n)$  is computed by the restriction of  $\mathcal{O}_S(C)$ . In contrast to the very generic case, the explicit situation presented here yields  $\text{Cliff}(\mathcal{O}_{C_n}(C)) = 4(n - 1)a - 2 > n(2a - 2p - 2) - 2 = \text{Cliff}(C_n)$ .

## 4 New counterexamples to Mercat’s conjecture

We adopt the notation from in the previous sections. Consider a  $g_{p+2}^1$  denoted as  $A$  on  $D$ , and let  $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}_{C,A}$  be the associated Lazarsfeld–Mukai bundle. As affirmed by [6, Theorem 1.1], it follows that  $\text{Cliff}(C) = a$ , and additionally,  $\gamma(\mathcal{E}|_C) < \text{Cliff}(C)$ . Notably,  $\mathcal{E}|_C$  is semistable ([6, Proposition 3.2]), consequently providing a counterexample to Mercat’s conjecture.

In the subsequent discussion, we establish the following result.

**Theorem 2.** Notation as above. Assume  $a \geq 3p + 2$ . For any  $n \geq 2$ , the bundle  $\mathcal{E}|_{C_n}$  is stable and it is a counter-example to Mercat’s conjecture.

*Proof.* We prove first the semistability of  $\mathcal{E}|_{C_n}$ . Suppose, for a contradiction, that  $\mathcal{E}|_{C_n}$  is not stable and consider

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{C_n}(B) \rightarrow \mathcal{E}|_{C_n} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{C_n}(D-B) \rightarrow 0$$

a destabilizing sequence. In particular,

$$\deg(B) \geq \mu(\mathcal{E}|_{C_n}) = \frac{n(2a+2p+1)}{2}. \quad (4.1)$$

Since  $\mathcal{E}$  is globally generated, it follows that  $\mathcal{O}_{C_n}(D-B)$ , along with any other quotient of  $\mathcal{E}$ , is also globally generated.

If  $\mathcal{O}_{C_n}(D-B) \neq \mathcal{O}_{C_n}$ , then  $h^0(C_n, \mathcal{O}_{C_n}(D-B)) \geq 2$ . Furthermore, since

$$h^0(C_n, \mathcal{O}_{C_n}(C_n - D + B)) \geq h^0(C_n, \mathcal{O}_{C_n}(C_n - D)) \geq h^0(S, \mathcal{O}_S(C_n - D)) \geq 2,$$

it follows that  $\mathcal{O}_{C_n}(D-B)$  contributes to the Clifford index of  $C_n$ . Using the inequality (4.1) we evaluate

$$\text{Cliff}(\mathcal{O}_{C_n}(D-B)) \leq n(2a+2p+1) - \deg(B) - 2 \leq \frac{n(2a+2p+1)}{2} - 2$$

and the latter value is smaller than  $n(2a-2p-1) - 2 = \text{Cliff}(C_n)$ , by the assumption  $a \geq 3p+2$ , leading to a contradiction.

In conclusion, we have  $\mathcal{O}_{C_n}(D-B) = \mathcal{O}_{C_n}$ . This implies the existence of a short exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{C_n}(D) \rightarrow \mathcal{E}|_{C_n} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{C_n} \rightarrow 0$$

and, as a consequence, we have:

$$h^0(C_n, \mathcal{E}|_{C_n}) \geq h^0(C_n, \mathcal{O}_{C_n}(D)). \quad (4.2)$$

Since  $h^0(S, \mathcal{O}_S(D-nC)) = 0$  for all  $n \geq 1$ , it follows that

$$h^0(C_n, \mathcal{O}_{C_n}(D)) \geq h^0(S, \mathcal{O}_S(D)) = 2p+1.$$

Moreover, the two dimensions are equal, as shown below.

*Claim 1.*  $h^1(S, \mathcal{O}_S(D-nC)) = 0$  for all  $n \geq 1$ .

We proceed by induction on  $n$ . For the base case  $n = 1$ , we apply Lemma 1. For the induction step, for  $n \geq 2$ , consider the long cohomology sequence of the short exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_S((n-1)C-D) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_S(nC-D) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_C(nC-D) \rightarrow 0$$

and observe that  $h^1(C, K_C^{\otimes n}(-D)) = 0$  by degree reasons.

*Claim 2.*  $h^1(S, \mathcal{E}(-nC)) = 0$ .

To establish Claim 2, we begin with the defining exact sequence (2.1) of the dual of the Lazarsfeld-Mukai bundle:

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{E}^\vee \rightarrow H^0(A) \otimes \mathcal{O}_S \rightarrow A \rightarrow 0$$

(where  $A$  was a  $g_{p+2}^1$  on  $D$ ) twist it with  $\mathcal{O}_S(nC)$  and take the long cohomology sequence:

$$0 \rightarrow H^0(\mathcal{E}^\vee(nC)) \rightarrow H^0(A) \otimes H^0(\mathcal{O}_S(nC)) \rightarrow H^0(D, A(nC)) \rightarrow H^1(\mathcal{E}^\vee(nC)) \rightarrow 0.$$

Claim 1 implies that the restriction map  $H^0(S, \mathcal{O}_S(nC)) \rightarrow H^0(D, \mathcal{O}_D(nC))$  is surjective. Hence, Claim 2 would follow from the surjectivity of the multiplication map

$$H^0(D, A) \otimes H^0(D, \mathcal{O}_D(nC)) \rightarrow H^0(D, A(nC))$$

To this end, we apply [10, Corollary (4.e.4)]; the hypothesis

$$\deg(A) + \deg(\mathcal{O}_D(C_n)) \geq 4g(D) + 2$$

is verified for  $n \geq 2$ , as the genus of  $D$  is  $g(D) = 2p + 2$ , and  $\deg(A) + \deg(\mathcal{O}_D(C_n)) = (p + 2) + n(2a + 2p + 1) \geq 13p + 16$ . Claim 2 is proved.

We consider the short exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{E}(-nC) \rightarrow \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}|_{C_n} \rightarrow 0.$$

Since  $h^0(S, \mathcal{E}(-nC)) = h^1(S, \mathcal{E}(-nC)) = 0$ , (the vanishing of  $h^0$  follows from the defining sequence (2.2)), we infer that  $h^0(S, \mathcal{E}) = p + 3$ . This leads to a contradiction with (4.2).

Finally, we note that  $\mathcal{E}|_{C_n}$  contributes to  $\text{Cliff}(C_n)$ . We compute  $\gamma(\mathcal{E}|_{C_n}) = \mu(\mathcal{E}|_{C_n}) - h^0(C_n, \mathcal{E}|_{C_n}) + 2$ . We have proved that  $H^1(S, \mathcal{E}(-nC)) = 0$ , and hence  $h^0(C_n, \mathcal{E}|_{C_n}) = h^0(S, \mathcal{E}) = p + 3$ , implying

$$\gamma(\mathcal{E}|_{C_n}) = \frac{n(2a + 2p + 1)}{2} - p - 1 < n(2a - 2p - 1) - 2$$

by the assumption  $a \geq 3p + 2$ , which concludes the proof. □

**Remark 2.** *As mentioned in the preamble of [6, Section 4], Mercat’s conjecture holds for any curve of genus  $g$  and gonality  $k$  if  $g > 2(k - 1)(k - 2)$ . In our case, note that, as  $S$  contains no  $(-2)$ -curve, the results of [3] imply that  $\text{gon}(C_n) = n(2a - 2p - 1)$ . Since  $g(C_n) = 2an^2 + 1$ , the above inequality fails, even though both expressions are quadratic in  $n$ . The gonality of  $C_n$  is small compared to the genus, and yet not sufficiently small to satisfy the conditions for Mercat’s conjecture.*

The same strategy yields the following improvement of the main result of [21].

**Theorem 3.** *Let  $S$  be a K3 surface with  $\text{Pic}(S) = \langle C \rangle$ , where  $C$  is a smooth curve of genus  $g \geq 2$ . Denote by  $k = \lfloor \frac{g+3}{2} \rfloor$  and by  $\mathcal{E}$  the Lazarsfeld-Mukai bundle associated to a  $g_k^1$ ,  $A$  on  $C$ . Let  $n \geq 2$  and  $C_n \in |nC|$  be a smooth curve. If either  $n \geq 3$ , or  $n = 2$  and  $g \geq 9$ , then  $\mathcal{E}|_{C_n}$  is semistable with  $\gamma(\mathcal{E}|_{C_n}) < \text{Cliff}(C_n)$  and thus it is a counterexample to Mercat’s conjecture. Furthermore, if  $n \geq 3$ , then  $\mathcal{E}|_{C_n}$  is stable.*

*Proof.* We proceed along the lines of the proof of Theorem 2. Note that  $g(C_n) = n^2(g-1)+1$  and  $\text{Cliff}(C_n) = 2(n-1)(g-1) - 2$ .

We first establish that  $\mathcal{E}|_{C_n}$  is semistable, and it is stable if  $n \geq 3$ . Suppose  $\mathcal{E}|_{C_n}$  is unstable and consider

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{C_n}(B) \rightarrow \mathcal{E}|_{C_n} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{C_n}(C-B) \rightarrow 0$$

a destabilizing sequence. If  $\mathcal{O}_{C_n}(C-B) \neq \mathcal{O}_{C_n}$ , then it contributes to the Clifford index of  $C_n$ , and

$$\text{Cliff}(\mathcal{O}_{C_n}(C-B)) < \mu(\mathcal{E}|_{C_n}) - 2 = n(g-1) - 2 \leq \text{Cliff}(C_n)$$

which leads to a contradiction. Note that, if  $n \geq 3$ , we have the stronger inequality  $\mu(\mathcal{E}|_{C_n}) - 2 < \text{Cliff}(C_n)$ .

Therefore, the destabilizing sequence is, in fact,

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{C_n}(C) \rightarrow \mathcal{E}|_{C_n} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{C_n} \rightarrow 0$$

and it follows that  $h^0(C_n, \mathcal{E}|_{C_n}) \geq h^0(C_n, \mathcal{O}_{C_n}(C)) = h^0(S, \mathcal{O}_S(C)) = g+1$ .

We prove that the restriction map  $H^0(S, \mathcal{E}) \rightarrow H^0(C_n, \mathcal{E}|_{C_n})$  is an isomorphism. Since  $h^0(S, \mathcal{E}) = g-k+3$ , this will be in contradiction with the inequality above. The vanishing of  $H^0(S, \mathcal{E}(-nC))$  follows immediately from the sequence (2.2), twisted with  $\mathcal{O}_S(-nC)$ . The surjectivity of the restriction map reduces to  $H^1(S, \mathcal{E}(-nC)) = 0$  which is equivalent to the vanishing of  $H^1(S, \mathcal{E}^\vee(nC))$ . Consider the defining sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{E}^\vee \rightarrow H^0(A) \otimes \mathcal{O}_S \rightarrow A \rightarrow 0,$$

twist it by  $\mathcal{O}_S(nC)$  and take the long cohomology sequence. This reduces the problem to proving the surjectivity of the multiplication map

$$H^0(C, A) \otimes H^0(S, \mathcal{O}_S(nC)) \rightarrow H^0(C, A(nC)).$$

Since the restriction map  $H^0(S, \mathcal{O}_S(nC)) \rightarrow H^0(C, \mathcal{O}_C(nC))$  is surjective, it suffices to prove that the multiplication map

$$H^0(C, A) \otimes H^0(C, \mathcal{O}_C(nC)) \rightarrow H^0(C, A(nC))$$

is surjective. To verify this, we apply once again Green's explicit  $H^0$  Lemma, [10, Corollary (4.e.4)], as in the proof of Theorem 2. We observe that the condition

$$\deg(A) + \deg(\mathcal{O}_C(nC)) \geq 4g+2$$

is verified for any  $n \geq 2$ , by the hypothesis.

To finish the proof, we compute  $\gamma(\mathcal{E}|_{C_n}) = \mu(\mathcal{E}|_{C_n}) - h^0(\mathcal{E}|_{C_n}) + 2 = (n-1)(g-1) + k - 2 < 2(n-1)(g-1) - 2$ .  $\square$

**Acknowledgement** *Marian Aprodu was supported in part by the PNR grant CF 44 / 14.11.2022 "Cohomological Hall algebras of smooth surfaces and applications".*



## References

- [1] M. APRODU, G. FARKAS, A. ORTEGA, Restricted Lazarsfeld–Mukai bundles and canonical curves, in *Development of Moduli Theory - Kyoto 2013*, Advanced Studies in Pure Mathematics **69**, Mathematical Society Japan (2016), 303–322.
- [2] B. BAKKER, G. FARKAS, Mercat’s Conjecture for stable rank 2 vector bundles on generic curves, *American Journal of Math.* **140** (2018), 1277–1295.
- [3] C. CILIBERTO, G. PARESCHI, Pencils of minimal degree on curves on a K3 surface, *J. Reine Angew. Math.* **460** (1995), 15–36.
- [4] G. FARKAS, Brill–Noether loci and the gonality stratification of  $\mathcal{M}_g$ , *J. Reine Angew. Math.* **539** (2001), 185–200.
- [5] G. FARKAS, A. ORTEGA, The maximal rank conjecture and rank two Brill–Noether theory, *Pure Appl. Math. Quart.* **7** (2011), 1265–1296.
- [6] G. FARKAS, A. ORTEGA, Higher rank Brill–Noether theory on sections of K3 surfaces, *Internat. J. Math.* **23** (7) (2012), 1250075.
- [7] S. FEYZBAKHS, An effective restriction theorem via wall-crossing and Mercat’s conjecture, *Math. Zeit.* **301** (2022), 4175–4199.
- [8] S. FEYZBAKHS, C. LI, Higher rank Clifford indices of curves on a K3 surface, *Selecta Math. New Ser.* **27** (2021), 48.
- [9] H. FLENNER, Restrictions of semistable bundles on projective varieties, *Commentarii Math. Helvetici* **59** (1984), 635–650.
- [10] M. GREEN, Koszul cohomology and the cohomology of projective varieties, *J. Differential Geom.* **19** (1984), 125–167.
- [11] M. GREEN, R. LAZARFELD, Special divisors on curves on a K3 surface, *Inventiones Math.* **89** (1987), 357–370.
- [12] H. LANGE, P. E. NEWSTEAD, Clifford indices for vector bundles on curves, in A. H. W. Schmitt, editor, *Affine Flag Manifolds and Principal Bundles*, Trends in Mathematics, Birkhäuser (2010), 165–202.
- [13] H. LANGE, P. E. NEWSTEAD, Further Examples of Stable Bundles of Rank 2 with 4 Sections, *Pure and Applied Mathematics Quarterly* **7** (4) (2011), 1517–1528.
- [14] H. LANGE, P. E. NEWSTEAD, Bundles of rank 2 with small Clifford index on algebraic curves, in R. de Jong, C. Faber, G. Farkas, editors, *Geometry and Arithmetic*, EMS Series of Congress Reports (2012), 267–281.
- [15] H. LANGE, P. E. NEWSTEAD, Vector bundles of rank 2 computing Clifford indices, *Communications in Alg.* **41** (2013), 2317–2345.

- [16] R. LAZARSELD, A sampling of vector bundle techniques in the study of linear series, in M. Cornalba et al., editors, *Proceedings of the first college on Riemann surfaces held in Trieste, Italy, November 1987*, World Scientific, Singapore (1989), 500-559.
- [17] G. MARTENS, On curves on K3 surfaces, in *Algebraic Curves and Projective Geometry*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics **1389**, Springer (1989), 174-182.
- [18] V. MERCAT, Clifford's theorem and higher rank vector bundles, *Internat. J. Math.* **13** (2002), 785-796.
- [19] R. RE, Multiplication of sections and Clifford bounds for stable vector bundles on curves, *Communications in Alg.* **26** (1998), 1931-1944.
- [20] B. SAINT-DONAT, Projective Models of K-3 Surfaces, *American Journal of Math.* **96** (4) (1974), 602-639.
- [21] A. K. SENGUPTA, Counterexamples to Mercat's conjecture, *Arch. Math.* **106** (2016), 439-444.

Received: 11.12.2023

Accepted: 12.01.2024

<sup>(1)</sup> Simion Stoilow Institute of Mathematics, P. O. Box 1-764, 014700 Bucharest, Romania  
and

Faculty of Mathematics and Computer Science, University of Bucharest, Bucharest, Romania

E-mail: [marian.aprodu@imar.ro](mailto:marian.aprodu@imar.ro) & [marian.aprodu@fmi.unibuc.ro](mailto:marian.aprodu@fmi.unibuc.ro)

<sup>(2)</sup> Faculty of Mathematics and Computer Science, University of Bucharest, Bucharest, Romania

E-mail: [laura.filimon@my.fmi.unibuc.ro](mailto:laura.filimon@my.fmi.unibuc.ro)