

Algebra & Number Theory

Volume 11

2017

No. 10

**Effective nonvanishing for Fano
weighted complete intersections**

Marco Pizzato, Taro Sano and Luca Tasin



Effective nonvanishing for Fano weighted complete intersections

Marco Pizzato, Taro Sano and Luca Tasin

We show that the Ambro–Kawamata nonvanishing conjecture holds true for a quasismooth WCI X which is Fano or Calabi–Yau, i.e., we prove that, if H is an ample Cartier divisor on X , then $|H|$ is not empty. If X is smooth, we further show that the general element of $|H|$ is smooth. We then verify the Ambro–Kawamata conjecture for any quasismooth weighted hypersurface. We also verify Fujita’s freeness conjecture for a Gorenstein quasismooth weighted hypersurface.

For the proofs, we introduce the arithmetic notion of regular pairs and highlight some interesting connections with the Frobenius coin problem.

1. Introduction

Complete intersections in weighted projective spaces (WCIs for short) form a natural class of varieties which are particularly interesting from the point of view of higher dimensional algebraic geometry. We refer to [Dolgachev 1982], [Mori 1975] and [Dimca 1986] for a general treatment of these varieties.

Reid [1980; 1987] and Iano-Fletcher [2000] systematically investigated notable examples of WCIs and started their classification. Several results have since been obtained concerning boundedness and classification; see for example [Johnson and Kollár 2001; Chen et al. 2011; Ballico et al. 2013; Chen 2015; Przyjalkowski and Shramov 2016].

The main motivation of this paper is to study the following conjecture in the realm of WCIs, in particular for what concerns the case of Fano and Calabi–Yau varieties.

Conjecture 1.1 (Ambro–Kawamata). *Let (X, Δ) be a klt pair and H be an ample Cartier divisor on X such that $H - K_X - \Delta$ is ample. Then $|H| \neq \emptyset$.*

For an introduction to this conjecture, see [Ambro 1999] and in particular [Kawamata 2000] where the 2-dimensional case is proven. In the smooth setting, Ionescu [Lanteri et al. 1993, p. 321] and Beltrametti and Sommese [1995] proposed related conjectures.

MSC2010: primary 14M10; secondary 11D04, 14J45.

Keywords: weighted complete intersections, nonvanishing, Ambro–Kawamata conjecture.

The Ambro–Kawamata conjecture is known to be true in full generality only in dimensions 1 and 2. Several cases have been studied, especially in dimension 3; see for instance [Xie 2009; Broustet and Höring 2010; Höring 2012; Cao and Jiang 2016].

A *fundamental divisor* on a Fano variety X is an ample Cartier divisor H which is primitive and proportional to $-K_X$. In the classification of Fano varieties, it is important to investigate the properties of the general member of the linear system given by H ; see for instance [Ambro 1999]. The second purpose of this note is to study this problem in the case of Fano and Calabi–Yau smooth WCIs.

The main result of this paper is the following.

Theorem 1.2. *Let $X = X_{d_1, \dots, d_c} \subset \mathbb{P}(a_0, \dots, a_n)$ be a well-formed quasismooth weighted complete intersection which is not a linear cone and H be an ample Cartier divisor on X . Assume that X is Fano or Calabi–Yau. Then $|H| \neq \emptyset$.*

Moreover, if X is smooth, then the number of $a_i = 1$ is at least c and the general element of $|\mathcal{O}_X(1)|$ is smooth.

For a smooth Fano WCI, it was already proved in [Przyjalkowski and Shramov 2016, Lemma 3.3] that at least two weights are 1, which implies the nonvanishing for a smooth Fano WCI. In addition, it is easy to prove Conjecture 1.1 for any smooth WCI of codimension 1 and 2, see Remark 4.9.

It is particularly interesting that, in the smooth case, we can prove the smoothness of the general member of the fundamental linear system (Corollary 5.3(ii)).

Theorem 1.2 is a direct consequence of Corollaries 5.3 and 5.13. In particular, in Corollary 5.3, we show that if $X = X_{d_1, \dots, d_c} \subset \mathbb{P}(a_0, \dots, a_n)$ is a smooth well-formed Fano WCI which is not a linear cone, then the number of i for which $a_i = 1$ is at least $c + 1$. By using this, we can then show that the general element of $|\mathcal{O}_X(1)|$ is quasismooth (from which smoothness follows easily). One can not expect a similar statement for a general member of the fundamental linear system of a singular quasismooth WCI, as Example 5.8 shows. We also give a description of the base locus of $|\mathcal{O}_X(1)|$ in Remark 5.5 and an example whose base locus $\text{Bs } |\mathcal{O}_X(1)|$ is singular and not quasismooth in Example 5.6.

In [Przyjalkowski and Shramov 2017, Corollary 4.2], the authors show that for a smooth well-formed Fano WCI X the number of a_i equal to 1 is at least $I(X) = \sum a_i - \sum d_j$ when $c \leq 2$ and write that they expect this to hold for any codimension. As a consequence of Proposition 5.2, we can confirm this expectation; see Corollary 5.11.

In the case of hypersurfaces, we can prove the following stronger result, which is the combination of Propositions 6.2 and 6.3:

Theorem 1.3. *Let $X = X_d \subset \mathbb{P} = \mathbb{P}(a_0, \dots, a_n)$ be a well-formed quasismooth hypersurface of degree d which is not a linear cone.*

- (1) If H is an ample Cartier divisor on X such that $H - K_X$ is ample, then $|H|$ is not empty.
- (2) If X is Gorenstein and H is an ample Cartier divisor, then $K_X + mH$ is globally generated for any $m \geq n$.

The second part of the statement is known as Fujita’s freeness conjecture and it has been proven in the smooth setting up to dimension 5; see [Reider 1988; Ein and Lazarsfeld 1993; Kawamata 1997; Ye and Zhu 2015].

The methods. The above theorems are obtained by studying the arithmetic properties of quasismooth WCIs. More precisely, in Section 3, we prove a criterion (Proposition 3.1) for a WCI to be quasismooth, which generalizes Iano-Fletcher’s criterion in codimension 1 and 2 (see [Iano-Fletcher 2000, Section 8]). We then exploit some arithmetic consequences of quasismoothness. In particular, Proposition 3.6 motivates the introduction of an h -regular pair (see Definition 4.1) which turns out to be a key tool in our treatment.

Given a positive integer h , a pair $(d; a) = (d_1, \dots, d_c; a_0, \dots, a_n) \in \mathbb{N}^c \times \mathbb{N}^{n+1}$ is said to be h -regular if for any $I = \{i_1, \dots, i_k\} \subset \{0, \dots, n\}$ such that $a_I := \gcd(a_{i_1}, \dots, a_{i_k}) > 1$, either $a_I \mid h$ or there are distinct integers p_1, \dots, p_k such that

$$a_I \mid d_{p_1}, \dots, d_{p_k}.$$

Set $\delta(d; a) := \sum_{j=1}^c d_j - \sum_{i=0}^n a_i$. By Proposition 3.6, any quasismooth (well-formed) WCI $X = X_{d_1, \dots, d_c} \subset \mathbb{P}(a_0, \dots, a_n)$ gives rise to an h -regular pair $(d; a) = (d_1, \dots, d_c; a_0, \dots, a_n)$, where h is the smallest positive integer for which $\mathcal{O}_X(h)$ is Cartier. Remembering that $K_X = \mathcal{O}_X(\delta)$, the nonvanishing for a Fano or Calabi–Yau WCI follows from Proposition 5.12, which says that, if $(d; a)$ is h -regular such that $a_i \neq d_j$ and $a_i \nmid h$ for any i, j , then $\delta(d; a) > 0$. A more accurate statement (Corollary 5.3) is needed to prove that, if X is smooth, then the general element of $|\mathcal{O}_X(1)|$ is also smooth.

We now spend some words for the case $h = 1$. In this case, the pair $(d; a)$ is simply called *regular*. A smooth WCI X gives rise to a regular pair $(d; a)$. The nonvanishing is then equivalent to prove that

$$\delta(d; a) \geq G(a_0, \dots, a_n),$$

where $G(a_0, \dots, a_n)$ is the Frobenius number of a_0, \dots, a_n , i.e., the greatest integer which is not a nonnegative integral combination of a_0, \dots, a_n . In Conjecture 4.8, we speculate that $\delta(d; a) \geq G(a_0, \dots, a_n)$ for a regular pair $(d; a)$, under some natural assumptions. This would imply the Ambro–Kawamata conjecture for any smooth WCI.

We believe that this conjecture is interesting also from the arithmetic point of view, since it would give new bounds for the Frobenius number (see page 2382 for details).

2. Preliminaries and notation

In this section, we recall some basic facts about weighted complete intersections and fix our notation. See [Dolgachev 1982] or [Iano-Fletcher 2000] for further details.

Let \mathbb{N} (resp. \mathbb{N}_+) be the set of nonnegative (resp. positive) integers. Let $a_0, \dots, a_n \in \mathbb{N}_+$. We define $\mathbb{P} := \mathbb{P}(a_0, \dots, a_n)$ to be the weighted projective space with weights a_0, \dots, a_n , i.e., $\mathbb{P} = \text{Proj } \mathbb{C}[x_0, \dots, x_n]$, where x_i has weight a_i . We denote

$$\mathbb{P}(\underbrace{b_1, \dots, b_1}_{k_1}, \dots, \underbrace{b_l, \dots, b_l}_{k_l})$$

by $\mathbb{P}(b_1^{(k_1)}, \dots, b_l^{(k_l)})$ for short.

Note that if we start with x_0, \dots, x_n to be affine coordinates on \mathbb{A}^{n+1} and \mathbb{C}^* acting on \mathbb{A}^{n+1} via

$$\lambda \cdot (x_0, \dots, x_n) = (\lambda^{a_0} x_0, \dots, \lambda^{a_n} x_n)$$

for any $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}^*$, then \mathbb{P} is just the quotient $(\mathbb{A}^{n+1} \setminus \{0\})/\mathbb{C}^*$.

We always assume that \mathbb{P} is *well-formed*, i.e., the greatest common divisor of any n weights is 1. For any $I = \{i_1, \dots, i_k\} \subset \{0, \dots, n\}$, the stratum Π_I is defined as

$$\Pi_I := \{x_i = 0 : i \notin I\}.$$

The singular locus of \mathbb{P} is the union of all strata Π_I for which $a_I := \gcd(a_i)_{i \in I} > 1$. Any point of the interior Π_I^0 of a stratum Π_I is locally isomorphic to a quotient singularity of type

$$\frac{1}{a_I}(a_0, \dots, \hat{a}_{i_1}, \dots, \hat{a}_{i_k}, \dots, a_n) \times \mathbb{C}^{k-1}.$$

Here, for $r \in \mathbb{N}_+$ and $a_1, \dots, a_n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\gcd(r, a_1, \dots, a_n) = 1$, a *quotient singularity* of type $1/r(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ means a quotient $\mathbb{C}^n/\mathbb{Z}_r$ by the action of a cyclic group \mathbb{Z}_r of order r as $g \cdot z_i = \zeta_r^{a_i} z_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$, where $g \in \mathbb{Z}_r$ is a generator and ζ_r is an r -th primitive root of unity. We also denote by $\mathbb{C}^n/\mathbb{Z}_r(a_1, \dots, a_r)$ this quotient affine variety. Let $\pi : \mathbb{C}^n \rightarrow U := \mathbb{C}^n/\mathbb{Z}_r(a_1, \dots, a_r)$ be the quotient morphism. We have an eigendecomposition

$$\pi_* \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}^n} = \bigoplus_{i=0}^{r-1} \mathcal{F}_i,$$

where $\mathcal{F}_i := \{f \in \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}^n} \mid g \cdot f = \zeta_r^i f\}$ is the \mathcal{O}_U -submodule of $\pi_*\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}^n}$ consisting of \mathbb{Z}_r -eigenfunctions of eigenvalue ζ_r^i . Note that $\mathcal{F}_i \simeq \mathcal{O}_U(D_f)$, where a divisor $D_f := (f = 0)/\mathbb{Z}_r$ on U is defined by a function $f \in \mathcal{F}_i$.

Proposition 2.1. *The divisor class group of $U := \mathbb{C}^n/\mathbb{Z}_r(a_1, \dots, a_r)$ is*

$$\text{Cl } U \simeq \mathbb{Z}_r \cdot \mathcal{F}_1. \tag{1}$$

Proof. We have an inclusion $\iota : \mathbb{Z}_r \cdot \mathcal{F}_1 \hookrightarrow \text{Cl } U$. It is enough to show that this is surjective. Let $D \subset U$ be a prime divisor. Then $\pi^{-1}(D)$ is a divisor on \mathbb{C}^n defined by some \mathbb{Z}_r -eigenfunction $f_D \in \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}^n}$. Let $i(D) \in \mathbb{Z}_r$ be an element such that $g \cdot f_D = \zeta_r^{i(D)} f$. Then we can check that $\mathcal{O}_U(D) \simeq \mathcal{F}_{i(D)}$. Since $g^i \cdot \mathcal{F}_1 \simeq \mathcal{F}_i$ for $i \in \mathbb{Z}_r$, we see that ι is surjective.

We can also check the isomorphism by toric computation. Since $\mathbb{C}^n/\mathbb{Z}_r(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ is a toric variety, we can compute its class group by using the information of the cone and lattice. (cf., [Fulton 1993, p. 63, Proposition]) More precisely, it is the quotient \mathbb{Z}^n/M , where $M := \{(m_1, \dots, m_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^n \mid \sum_{i=1}^n m_i a_i \equiv 0 \pmod r\}$. □

Definition 2.2. Let X be a (closed) subvariety of codimension c in \mathbb{P} . Then X is *well-formed* if

$$\text{codim}_X(X \cap \text{Sing}(\mathbb{P})) \geq 2.$$

Let $\pi : \mathbb{A}^{n+1} \setminus \{0\} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}$ be the natural projection. Then X is *quasismooth* if $\pi^{-1}(X)$ is smooth.

The variety X is said to be a *weighted complete intersection* (WCI for short) of multidegree (d_1, \dots, d_c) if its weighted homogenous ideal in $\mathbb{C}[x_0, \dots, x_n]$ is generated by a regular sequence of homogenous polynomials $\{f_j\}$ such that $\deg f_j = d_j$ for $j = 1, \dots, c$. We denote by X_{d_1, \dots, d_c} a general element of the family of WCIs of multidegree (d_1, \dots, d_c) .

Finally, $X_{d_1, \dots, d_c} \subset \mathbb{P}$ is said to be a *linear cone* if $d_j = a_i$ for some i and j .

Note that by [Dimca 1986, Proposition 8], if X is a well-formed quasismooth WCI, then

$$\text{Sing}(X) = X \cap \text{Sing}(\mathbb{P}).$$

Proposition 2.3. *If X is a quasismooth WCI of dimension ≥ 3 , then its divisor class group is a free \mathbb{Z} -module generated by $\mathcal{O}_X(1)$, where $\mathcal{O}_X(1) := \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(1)|_X$. (We freely mix the divisorial and the sheaf notation.)*

Proof. The proof is the same as [Corti et al. 2000, Lemma 3.5]. This follows from the parafactoriality of an l.c.i. local ring [Call and Lyubeznik 1994]. □

If $X \subset \mathbb{P}$ is a well-formed quasismooth WCI, then

$$\omega_X = K_X = \mathcal{O}_X \left(\sum_{j=1}^c d_j - \sum_{i=0}^n a_i \right),$$

see [Dolgachev 1982, Theorem 3.3.4]. We usually write $\delta := \sum_{j=1}^c d_j - \sum_{i=0}^n a_i$.

The following result shows that the dimension of the linear system $|\mathcal{O}_X(n)|$ can be computed by the weights of the coordinates.

Lemma 2.4 [Iano-Fletcher 2000, Lemma 7.1]. *Let $X \subset \mathbb{P}(a_0, \dots, a_n)$ be a well-formed quasismooth WCI. Let $A := k[x_0, \dots, x_n]/(f_1, \dots, f_c)$ be the homogeneous coordinate ring of X and A_k be the k -th graded part for $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then*

$$H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(k)) \simeq A_k.$$

Proof. See also [Dolgachev 1982, 3.4.3]. This follows since the homogeneous coordinate ring A is Cohen–Macaulay and $H_{\mathfrak{m}}^1(A) = 0$, where $\mathfrak{m} := (x_0, \dots, x_n)$ is the maximal ideal. □

3. Properties of quasismooth WCIs

In the following proposition, we give a necessary and sufficient condition for quasismoothness of a WCI.

Proposition 3.1. *Let $X = X_{d_1, \dots, d_c} \subset \mathbb{P}(a_0, \dots, a_n) =: \mathbb{P}$ be a quasismooth WCI which is not a linear cone. Let x_0, \dots, x_n be the coordinates of $\mathbb{P}(a_0, \dots, a_n)$. Fix $I := \{i_1, \dots, i_k\} \subset \{0, \dots, n\}$ and let $\rho_I := \min\{c, k\}$. For $m = (m_1, \dots, m_k)$, let $x_I^m := \prod_{j=1}^k x_{i_j}^{m_j}$. For a finite set A , let $|A|$ be the number of its elements. Then one of the following holds.*

- (Q1) *There exist distinct integers $p_1, \dots, p_{\rho_I} \in \{1, \dots, c\}$ and $M_1, \dots, M_{\rho_I} \in \mathbb{N}^k$ such that the monomial $x_I^{M_j}$ has the degree d_{p_j} for $j = 1, \dots, \rho_I$.*
- (Q2) *There exist a permutation p_1, \dots, p_c of $\{1, \dots, c\}$, an integer $l < \rho_I$, and integers $e_{\mu, j} \in \{0, \dots, n\} \setminus I$ for $\mu = 1, \dots, k - l$ and $j = l + 1, \dots, c$ such that there are monomials $x_I^{M_j}$ of degree d_{p_j} for $j = 1, \dots, l$ and distinct $k - l$ monomials $\{x_{e_{\mu, j}} x_I^{M_{\mu, j}} : \mu = 1, \dots, k - l\}$ of degree d_{p_j} for each $j = l + 1, \dots, c$ which satisfy the following: for any subset $J \subset \{l + 1, \dots, c\}$, we have $|\{e_{\mu, j} : j \in J, \mu = 1, \dots, k - l\}| \geq k - l + |J| - 1$.*

Conversely, if we have (Q1) or (Q2) for all I , then a general WCI $X_{d_1, \dots, d_c} \subset \mathbb{P}(a_0, \dots, a_n)$ is quasismooth.

Remark 3.2. This generalizes [Iano-Fletcher 2000, Theorem 8.7] in codimension 2 case. A weaker necessary condition for the quasismoothness is written in [Chen 2015, Proposition 2.3]. Although we shall not use the new part of Proposition 3.1 in the main part of this paper, we believe it is an interesting result on its own.

Proof. The framework of the proof is similar to that of [Iano-Fletcher 2000, Theorem 8.7].

Let $F_j := |\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(d_j)|$ be the linear system of weighted homogeneous polynomials of degree d_j . For $j = 1, \dots, c$, let f_j be a general homogeneous polynomial of degree d_j such that $X = (f_1 = \dots = f_c = 0) \subset \mathbb{P}(a_0, \dots, a_n)$. Let $C_X^* \subset \mathbb{A}^{n+1} \setminus \{0\}$ be the cone over X defined by the polynomials f_1, \dots, f_c with the following diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} C_X^* & \longrightarrow & \mathbb{A}^{n+1} \setminus \{0\} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ X & \longrightarrow & \mathbb{P} \end{array}$$

Without loss of generality, we may assume $I = \{0, \dots, k-1\}$ in the statement. Let $\Pi := (x_k = \dots = x_n = 0) \subset \mathbb{A}^{n+1}$ be the stratum corresponding to I and $\Pi^0 \subset \Pi$ be the open toric stratum. By expanding f_λ for $\lambda = 1, \dots, c$ in terms of x_k, \dots, x_n , we can write

$$f_\lambda = h_\lambda(x_0, \dots, x_{k-1}) + \sum_{i=k}^n x_i g_\lambda^i(x_0, \dots, x_{k-1}) + R_\lambda(x_0, \dots, x_n),$$

where $h_\lambda, g_\lambda^i \in \mathbb{C}[x_0, \dots, x_{k-1}]$ and $R_\lambda \in \mathbb{C}[x_0, \dots, x_n]$ satisfies $\deg_{x_k, \dots, x_n} R_\lambda \geq 2$.

Note that X is quasismooth if and only if C_X^* is smooth along all the coordinate strata. We shall show that C_X^* is smooth along Π^0 when either (Q1) or (Q2) holds for I . Let $\rho := \rho_I$ for short.

Suppose that (Q1) holds. Then $h_{p_1}, \dots, h_{p_\rho}$ are nonzero on Π^0 . If some of h_{p_j} involves only one monomial, then we have $\Pi^0 \cap C_X^* = \emptyset$. So we may assume that each of $h_{p_1}, \dots, h_{p_\rho}$ involves at least 2 monomials. Thus we see that the linear systems $F_{d_{p_1}}, \dots, F_{d_{p_\rho}}$ do not have base locus on Π^0 . By Bertini's theorem, we see that $(f_{p_1} = \dots = f_{p_\rho} = 0) \subset \mathbb{A}^{n+1}$ is smooth along Π^0 when $k \geq c$. When $k < c$, we have $(f_{p_1} = \dots = f_{p_\rho} = 0) \cap \Pi^0 = \emptyset$. Therefore C_X^* is nonsingular along Π^0 .

Next suppose that (Q2) holds. By permutation, we may assume that $p_i = i$. Then h_1, \dots, h_l are nonzero on Π^0 . Hence the base locus of F_{d_λ} is disjoint with Π^0 for $\lambda = 1, \dots, l$. By Bertini's theorem, we see that $(f_1 = \dots = f_l = 0)$ is nonsingular along Π^0 . We may assume that the Jacobian of $(f_1 = \dots = f_c = 0) \subset \mathbb{A}^{n+1}$ at $P \in \Pi^0$ is of the form

$$\begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial f_1}{\partial x_0} & \dots & \frac{\partial f_1}{\partial x_{k-1}} & & & \\ \vdots & & \vdots & & * & \\ \frac{\partial f_l}{\partial x_0} & \dots & \frac{\partial f_l}{\partial x_{k-1}} & & & \\ \mathbf{0} & & & g_{l+1}^k & \dots & g_{l+1}^n \\ & & & \vdots & & \vdots \\ & & & g_c^k & \dots & g_c^n \end{pmatrix} (P),$$

since we have $h_\lambda = 0$ for $\lambda = l+1, \dots, c$. Note that the block matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial f_1}{\partial x_0} & \dots & \frac{\partial f_1}{\partial x_{k-1}} \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ \frac{\partial f_l}{\partial x_0} & \dots & \frac{\partial f_l}{\partial x_{k-1}} \end{pmatrix} (P)$$

has maximal rank l at $P \in \Pi^0$ since $(f_1 = \dots = f_l = 0)$ is nonsingular along Π^0 . Hence it is enough to show that the matrix

$$M_P := \begin{pmatrix} g_{l+1}^k \cdots g_{l+1}^n \\ \vdots \\ g_c^k \cdots g_c^n \end{pmatrix} (P) \tag{2}$$

has maximal rank $c - l$.

Note that there are at least $k - l$ elements of $K_\lambda := \{i \in \{k, \dots, n\} : g_\lambda^i \neq 0\}$ for each $\lambda = l + 1, \dots, c$. By $|K_\lambda| \geq k - l$, we see that each row vector of M_P is nonzero for $P \in \Pi^0$. Indeed, for each $\lambda' = l + 1, \dots, c$, the intersection

$$\bigcap_{\lambda=1}^l (h_\lambda = 0) \cap \bigcap_{i=k}^n (g_{\lambda'}^i = 0) \cap \Pi^0$$

is contained in at least $k = l + (k - l)$ free linear systems on k -dimensional Π^0 , and it is empty. Thus we may assume that $g_{l+1}^k(P) \neq 0$. We shall make elementary matrix operations on M_P to calculate the rank of M_P .

For $\lambda = l + 2, \dots, c$, let

$$Z_\lambda(P) := \{Q \in (f_1 = \dots = f_l = 0) \cap \Pi^0 : g_{l+1}^k(P)g_\lambda^i(Q) - g_\lambda^k(P)g_{l+1}^i(Q) = 0 \ (i = k + 1, \dots, n)\}.$$

Note that the first row M_P^1 and the $(\lambda - l)$ -th row $M_P^{\lambda-l}$ of M_P are linearly dependent if and only if $P \in Z_\lambda(P)$. By condition (Q2) for J with $|J| = 2$, there are at least $k - l$ nonzero elements of $G_\lambda(P) := \{g_{l+1}^k(P)g_\lambda^i - g_\lambda^k(P)g_{l+1}^i : i = k + 1, \dots, n\}$ and they define $k - l$ free linear systems on Π^0 . Hence we obtain $Z_\lambda(P) = \emptyset$ and the two rows M_P^1 and $M_P^{\lambda-l}$ are linearly independent. Thus, by elementary operations on M_P , we obtain a matrix of the following form;

$$\begin{pmatrix} g_{l+1}^k \cdots g_{l+1}^n \\ 0 \ h_{l+2}^{k+1} \cdots h_{l+2}^n \\ \vdots \\ 0 \ h_c^{k+1} \cdots h_c^n \end{pmatrix} (P).$$

By column exchange operations, we may assume that $h_{l+2}^{k+1}(P) \neq 0$ and repeat the process to

$$M'_P := \begin{pmatrix} h_{l+2}^{k+1} \cdots h_{l+2}^n \\ \vdots \\ h_c^{k+1} \cdots h_c^n \end{pmatrix} (P).$$

Let $G'_\lambda(P) := \{h_{l+2}^{k+1}(P)h_\lambda^i - h_\lambda^{k+1}(P)h_{l+2}^i : i = k + 2, \dots, n\}$. By condition (Q2) for J with $|J| = 3$, there are at least $k - l$ nonzero elements of $G'_\lambda(P)$ and they

define free linear systems on Π^0 . By this, we again see that the first row and another row of M'_P are linearly independent.

After repeating these elementary operations, we obtain a matrix of the form

$$\begin{pmatrix} \alpha_{l+1} & & & \\ & \ddots & * & * \\ \mathbf{0} & & \alpha_c & \end{pmatrix}$$

for some $\alpha_{l+1}, \dots, \alpha_c \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ and see that the rank of M_P is $c - l$. Thus C_X^* is nonsingular at $P \in \Pi^0$.

Suppose that conditions (Q1) and (Q2) do not hold for some I . We shall show that X is not quasismooth. We may again assume that $I = \{0, \dots, k - 1\}$ and $\Pi = (x_k = \dots = x_n = 0)$. Moreover, since (Q1) and (Q2) do not hold, we may assume that, for some $l < \rho_I$, we have $\Pi \not\subset (f_\lambda = 0)$ for $\lambda = 1, \dots, l$ and $\Pi \subset (f_\lambda = 0)$ for $\lambda = l + 1, \dots, c$. Then the singular locus of C_X^* on Π^0 can be described as

$$Z := \{P \in (f_1 = \dots = f_l = 0) \cap \Pi^0 : \text{rk } M_P < c - l\},$$

where M_P is the matrix defined in (2). By the hypothesis, we may also assume that there exists $J \subset \{l + 1, \dots, c\}$ such that there are at most $k - l + |J| - 2$ nonzero elements among $\{g_\lambda^i : \lambda \in J, i = k, \dots, n\}$. This implies that there are at most $k - l + |J| - 2$ nonzero columns of the matrix $M_P^J := (g_\lambda^i(P))_{\lambda \in J}^{k \leq i \leq n}$. We can choose J so that the number $|J|$ is minimal among such subsets of $\{l + 1, \dots, c\}$. Then, by elementary operations as in the first part of the proof, we can transfer M_P^J to the form

$$\begin{pmatrix} h_{l+1}^k & \dots & \dots & h_{l+1}^{k+|J|} & \dots & h_{l+1}^n \\ & \ddots & & \vdots & & \vdots \\ \mathbf{0} & & h_{l+|J|}^{k+|J|-1} & h_{l+|J|}^{k+|J|} & \dots & h_{l+|J|}^n \end{pmatrix} (P).$$

Note that on the bottom row we have at most $k - l - 1$ nonzero entries. Hence we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \dim(f_1 = \dots = f_l = 0) \cap (h_{l+|J|}^{k+|J|-1} = \dots = h_{l+|J|}^n = 0) \cap \Pi^0 \\ \geq k - l - (k - l - 1) = 1. \end{aligned}$$

Since the rank of M_P^J is not maximal on the subset $(h_{l+|J|}^{k+|J|-1} = \dots = h_{l+|J|}^n = 0)$, we see that C_X^* is singular along the above positive dimensional subset. Hence X is not quasismooth in this case. This concludes the proof of Proposition 3.1. \square

In the following example, we use Proposition 3.1 to check quasismoothness of a given WCI.

Example 3.3. Let $X_{8,8,8} \subset \mathbb{P}(2^{(4)}, 3^{(5)}, 5^{(3)})$ be a general WCI of codimension 3. We can check the quasismoothness of $X_{8,8,8}$ by Proposition 3.1 as follows. Consider

$I = \{4, 5, 6, 7, 8\}$, that is, $a_4 = \dots = a_8 = 3$. Then (Q1) does not hold for this I and we have $k = 5, l = 0$ in (Q2). We can choose $\{e_{\mu,j} : j = 1, 2, 3, \mu = 1, \dots, 5\} \subset \{0, 1, 2, 3, 9, 10, 11\}$ so that (Q2) is satisfied for this I . We can similarly check that (Q2) holds for $I = \{9, 10, 11\}$. For other I , we have (Q1), thus we see the quasismoothness of $X_{8,8,8}$.

On the other hand, we see that $X'_{8,8,8} \subset \mathbb{P}(2^{(3)}, 3^{(4)}, 5^{(3)})$ is not quasismooth. Indeed, for $I = \{7, 8, 9\}$, that is, $a_7 = a_8 = a_9 = 5$, neither (Q1) nor (Q2) hold.

The following proposition treats the special situation where some weight of \mathbb{P} divides none of the degrees of a WCI.

Proposition 3.4. *Let $X = X_{d_1, \dots, d_c} \subset \mathbb{P}(a_0, \dots, a_n)$ be a (well-formed) quasismooth WCI which is not a linear cone. Assume that there exists i_0 such that a_{i_0} does not divide d_j for all j . Let $H = \mathcal{O}_X(h)$ be the fundamental divisor on X , that is, an ample Cartier divisor on X which generates $\text{Pic } X$. Then*

- (i) X has a quotient singularity of type $1/a_{i_0}(c_1, \dots, c_{n-c})$ for some $c_1, \dots, c_{n-c} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ such that $\text{gcd}(a_{i_0}, c_1, \dots, c_{n-c}) = 1$;
- (ii) $a_{i_0} \mid h$. As a consequence, we have $|H| \neq \emptyset$.

Proof. Let $f_1, \dots, f_c \in \mathbb{C}[x_0, \dots, x_n]$ be the defining equations of X such that $\text{deg } f_j = d_j$ for $1 \leq j \leq c$ and $X = (f_1 = \dots = f_c = 0) \subset \mathbb{P}(a_0, \dots, a_n)$, where $\text{deg } x_i = a_i$ for $0 \leq i \leq n$. By applying Proposition 3.1 to $I = \{i_0\}$, we see that there exist distinct integers $e_1, \dots, e_c \in \{0, \dots, \hat{i}_0, \dots, n\}$ and positive integers k_1, \dots, k_c such that $d_j = k_j a_{i_0} + a_{e_j}$ for $1 \leq j \leq c$, i.e., we can write

$$f_j = x_{i_0}^{k_j} x_{e_j} + g_j$$

for $1 \leq j \leq c$, where g_j is a weighted homogeneous polynomial of degree d_j .

By the inverse function theorem, we see that X has a quotient singularity of type $1/a_{i_0}(a_0, \dots, \hat{a}_{i_0}, \dots, \hat{a}_{e_1}, \dots, \hat{a}_{e_c}, \dots, a_n)$ at $P_{i_0} := [0 : \dots : 1 : \dots : 0]$. We shall show that $g := \text{gcd}(a_0, \dots, \hat{a}_{e_1}, \dots, \hat{a}_{e_c}, \dots, a_n) = 1$. Suppose that $g > 1$.

Claim 3.5. *Up to a permutation on $\{1, \dots, c\}$, we may choose $0 \leq c' \leq c$ with the following properties:*

- (*) For $j = 1, \dots, c'$, some monomial in g_j does not contain any element of $\{x_{e_j}, \dots, x_{e_c}\}$.
- (**) For $j = c' + 1, \dots, c$, every monomial in g_j contain some of $\{x_{e_{c'+1}}, \dots, x_{e_c}\}$.

Proof of the claim. If (**) holds for all $j = 1, \dots, c$ and $\{x_{e_1}, \dots, x_{e_c}\}$, then we put $c' := 0$. Otherwise there is some j such that $1 \leq j \leq c$ and (*) holds for $\{x_{e_1}, \dots, x_{e_c}\}$. We then exchange (f_1, e_1) and (f_j, e_j) and repeat the same process starting from $j = 2$ till we obtain the claim, that is, check whether (**) holds for new $\{f_2, \dots, f_c\}$ and $\{e_2, \dots, e_c\}$ and so on. □

Hence, for $1 \leq j \leq c'$, there exists a monomial in g_j of the form $h_j = \prod_{i \neq e_j, \dots, e_c} x_i^{b_i}$. Then we have $a_{e_j} \equiv \sum_{i \neq e_j, \dots, e_c} b_i a_i \pmod{a_{i_0}}$. Thus we can check one by one that

$$g \mid a_{e_j} \quad \text{for } 1 \leq j \leq c'. \tag{3}$$

Now let $\Pi := (x_{e_{c'+1}} = \dots = x_{e_c} = 0) \subset \mathbb{P}$. We have $\Pi \subset \text{Sing } \mathbb{P}$, in particular $\Pi \neq \mathbb{P}$.

We also have $f_j|_{\Pi} \equiv 0$ for $c' + 1 \leq j \leq c$ by the property (**) of c' . Thus we obtain

$$\dim \Pi \cap X \geq \dim \Pi - c' = \dim \mathbb{P} - c.$$

This contradicts the fact that $X \not\subset \Pi$ since X is not a linear cone. Hence we obtain $g = 1$, concluding the proof of Proposition 3.4. □

The following proposition is useful for calculating the fundamental divisor of a WCI and is the motivation of the definition of *h-regular pair* (see Definition 4.1).

Proposition 3.6. *Let $X = X_{d_1, \dots, d_c} \subset \mathbb{P}(a_0, \dots, a_n)$ be a quasismooth well-formed WCI which is not a linear cone. Let $H = \mathcal{O}_X(h)$ be the fundamental divisor of X . Assume that there exists $I = \{i_1, \dots, i_k\}$ such that $a_I := \gcd(a_{i_1}, \dots, a_{i_k}) > 1$.*

Then one of the following holds:

- (i) *There exist distinct integers p_1, \dots, p_k such that $a_I \mid d_{p_1}, \dots, d_{p_k}$;*
- (ii) *$a_I \mid h$.*

Proof. We apply Proposition 3.1 to $I = \{i_1, \dots, i_k\}$. Let

$$P_I := (x_0 = \dots = \hat{x}_{i_1} = \dots = \hat{x}_{i_k} = \dots = x_n = 0) \subset \mathbb{P}$$

be the $(k - 1)$ -dimensional stratum corresponding to I and $P_I^0 \subset P_I$ be the open toric stratum.

Suppose that condition (Q1) in Proposition 3.1 holds, that is, there exist distinct integers p_1, \dots, p_k and nonnegative integers $k_{j,i}$ for $j = 1, \dots, k$ and $i \in I$ such that $d_{p_j} = \sum_{i \in I} k_{j,i} a_i$. Then we have (i) in this case.

Suppose that (Q2) holds. Then there exist a permutation p_1, \dots, p_c of $\{1, \dots, c\}$, an integer $l < \rho := \min\{c, k\}$, nonnegative integers $k_{j,i}$ for $j = 1, \dots, c$ and $i \in I$, and distinct integers e_{l+1}, \dots, e_c , which satisfy the following:

- for $j = 1, \dots, l$, we have $\sum_{i \in I} k_{j,i} a_i = d_{p_j}$,
- for $j = l + 1, \dots, c$, we have $a_{e_j} + \sum_{i \in I} k_{j,i} a_i = d_{p_j}$.

We may assume that $(f_{p_j} = 0) \cap P_I^0 \neq \emptyset$ since X is irreducible and the linear system $|\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(d_{p_j})|$ does not have a fixed component. Hence, on $p \in X \cap P_I^0$, the variety X is analytic locally isomorphic to a quotient singularity of type

$$\frac{1}{a_I}(a_0, \dots, \hat{a}_{i_1}, \dots, \hat{a}_{i_k}, \dots, \hat{a}_{e_{l+1}}, \dots, \hat{a}_{e_c}, \dots, a_n) \times \mathbb{C}^{k-l}.$$

Now the proof is reduced to the following claim:

Claim 3.7. *We have $g := \gcd(a_0, \dots, \hat{a}_{e_{l+1}}, \dots, \hat{a}_{e_c}, \dots, a_n) = 1$.*

Proof of Claim. Suppose that $g > 1$. We shall have a similar contradiction as in the proof of Proposition 3.4. As in Claim 3.5, up to a permutation of $\{1, \dots, c\}$, we may choose c' with $l + 1 \leq c' \leq c$ with the following properties:

- (*) For $j = l + 1, \dots, c'$, some monomial in g_j does not contain any element of $\{x_{e_j}, \dots, x_{e_c}\}$.
- (**) For $j = c' + 1, \dots, c$, every monomial in g_j contain some of $\{x_{e_{c'+1}}, \dots, x_{e_c}\}$.

Let $\Pi := (x_{e_{c'+1}} = \dots = x_{e_c} = 0) \subset \mathbb{P}$. Then, as in Proposition 3.6, we see that $f_j|_{\Pi} \equiv 0$ for $j = c' + 1, \dots, c$ and $\Pi \subset \text{Sing } \mathbb{P}(a_0, \dots, a_n)$ since $g \mid a_i$ for $i \notin \{e_{c'+1}, \dots, e_c\}$. Thus we have $\dim \Pi \cap X \geq \dim \mathbb{P} - c$ as before and it contradicts that $X \not\subset \Pi$ since X is not a linear cone. Thus we obtain the claim. \square

The sheaf $\mathcal{O}_X(1)$ induces a generator of the class group of a quotient singularity of the above type. Since the class group is a cyclic group of order a_I as in (1), we see that $a_I \mid h$. Thus we have finished the proof of Proposition 3.6. \square

The following corollary restricts Proposition 3.6 to the smooth case.

Corollary 3.8 [Przyjalkowski and Shramov 2016, Lemma 2.15]. *Let $X = X_{d_1, \dots, d_c} \subset \mathbb{P}(a_0, \dots, a_n)$ be a smooth WCI. Assume that there exists $I = \{i_1, \dots, i_k\}$ such that $a_I := \gcd(a_{i_1}, \dots, a_{i_k}) > 1$.*

Then there exist distinct integers p_1, \dots, p_k such that $a_I \mid d_{p_1}, \dots, d_{p_k}$.

Proof. Since X is smooth, the fundamental divisor of X is $\mathcal{O}_X(1)$, that is $h = 1$ in the notation of Proposition 3.6. Thus the statement follows from Proposition 3.6. \square

4. Regular pairs and Frobenius coin problem

The following definition is motivated by Proposition 3.6 and Corollary 3.8.

Definition 4.1. Let $c \in \mathbb{N}$ and $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq -1}$ be integers and $(d; a)$ be a pair, where $d = (d_1, \dots, d_c) \in \mathbb{N}_+^c$ and $a = (a_0, \dots, a_n) \in \mathbb{N}_+^{n+1}$. Let $\bar{c}^+ := \{1, \dots, c\}$ and $\bar{n} := \{0, \dots, n\}$.

We say that $(d; a)$ is h -regular for a positive integer h if, for any subset $I = \{i_1, \dots, i_k\} \subset \bar{n}$ such that $a_I := \gcd(a_{i_1}, \dots, a_{i_k}) > 1$, one of the following holds:

- (i) There exist distinct integers $p_1, \dots, p_k \in \bar{c}^+$ such that $a_I \mid d_{p_1}, \dots, d_{p_k}$;
- (ii) $a_I \mid h$.

If a pair is h -regular for $h = 1$, we simply call it *regular*.

Remark 4.2. For technical reasons, in Definition 4.1 we admit the cases $c = 0$ or $n = -1$, i.e., pairs of the form $(d; \emptyset)$, $(\emptyset; a)$ and (\emptyset, \emptyset) .

We need to fix some notation. If $(d; a)$ is a pair with $d = (d_1, \dots, d_c) \in \mathbb{N}_+^c$ and $a = (a_0, \dots, a_n) \in \mathbb{N}_+^{n+1}$, then we define

$$\delta(d; a) := \sum_{j=1}^c d_j - \sum_{i=0}^n a_i.$$

In the case where the pair $(d; a)$ comes from a well-formed quasismooth WCI $X = X_{d_1, \dots, d_c} \subset \mathbb{P}(a_0, \dots, a_n)$, we have $\omega_X \cong \mathcal{O}_X(\delta(d; a))$.

Let q be a prime number. Set $I_q := \{i \in \bar{n} : q \mid a_i\}$ and $J_q := \{j \in \bar{c}^+ : q \mid d_j\}$. We consider two new pairs obtained from $(d; a)$. The pair $(d^q; a^q)$ is given by

$$d^q := ((d_j/q)_{j \in J_q}, (d_j)_{j \in \bar{c}^+ \setminus J_q}), \quad a^q := ((a_i/q)_{i \in I_q}, (a_i)_{i \in \bar{n} \setminus I_q})$$

in which we divided by q all the divisible d_j and a_i and the pair $(d(q), a(q))$ is given by

$$d(q) := (d_j)_{j \in J_q}, \quad a(q) := (a_i)_{i \in I_q}$$

in which only the divisible d_j and a_i appear. Note that

$$\delta(d; a) = \delta(d^q; a^q) + \frac{q-1}{q} \delta(d(q); a(q)).$$

Definition 4.3. For a pair $(d; a)$, we may choose subsets $J_{(d;a)} = \{j_1, \dots, j_l\} \subset \bar{c}^+$ and $I_{(d;a)} = \{i_1, \dots, i_l\} \subset \bar{n}$ uniquely for some $l \in \mathbb{N}$ so that $d_{j_k} = a_{i_k}$ for $k = 1, \dots, l$ and $d_j \neq a_i$ for all $j \in \bar{c}^+ \setminus J_{(d;a)}$ and $i \in \bar{n} \setminus I_{(d;a)}$. We define a pair $(\tilde{d}; \tilde{a})$ by

$$(\tilde{d}; \tilde{a}) := ((d_j)_{j \in \bar{c}^+ \setminus J_{(d;a)}}; (a_i)_{i \in \bar{n} \setminus I_{(d;a)}}), \tag{4}$$

that is, we cancel the doubles (d_j, a_i) with $d_j = a_i$.

Lemma 4.4. *The pair $(\tilde{d}; \tilde{a})$ is h -regular if $(d; a)$ is h -regular.*

Proof. Let $I := \{i_1, \dots, i_k\} \subset \bar{n} \setminus I_{(d;a)}$ be a subset with $a_I > 1$. Since $(d; a)$ is h -regular, either (i) holds for some $\{p_1, \dots, p_k\} \subset \bar{c}^+$ or (ii) holds. In the latter case, there is nothing to check. Thus we consider the former case and need to find $p'_1, \dots, p'_k \in \bar{c}^+ \setminus J_{(d;a)}$ such that $a_I \mid d_{p'_j}$ for $j = 1, \dots, k$. Let

$$J' := \{j \in J_{(d;a)} : a_I \mid d_j\}, \quad I' := \{i \in I_{(d;a)} : a_I \mid a_i\}.$$

Then we have $|I'| = |J'| = l'$. Let $I'' := I \cup I'$. By $a_I = a_{I''}$, there exist distinct integers $p_1, \dots, p_{k+l'} \in \bar{c}^+$ such that $a_I \mid d_{p_j}$ for $j = 1, \dots, k+l'$. Then the set $\{p_1, \dots, p_{k+l'}\} \setminus J'$ contains k elements $p'_1, \dots, p'_k \in \bar{c}^+ \setminus J_{(d;a)}$ such that $a_I \mid d_{p'_j}$ for $j = 1, \dots, k$. Thus (i) holds for $(\tilde{d}; \tilde{a})$ and I . Hence we see that $(\tilde{d}; \tilde{a})$ is h -regular. □

The following straightforward lemmas show how h -regular pairs are very suitable for inductive arguments.

Lemma 4.5. *Let $(d; a)$ be an h -regular pair and q be a prime not dividing h . Then the pairs $(d^q; a^q)$ and $(d(q); a(q))$ are h -regular. Hence $(d(q)/q; a(q)/q)$ is also h -regular.*

Proof. We write the details for the pair $(d^q; a^q)$. The proof for $(d(q); a(q))$ is easier.

Let $I = \{i_1, \dots, i_k\} \subset \bar{n}$ such that $a_I := \gcd(a_{i_1}, \dots, a_{i_k}) > 1$. By the h -regularity of $(d; a)$, we have either condition (i) of Definition 4.1, i.e., there exist distinct integers p_1, \dots, p_k such that

$$a_I \mid d_{p_1}, \dots, d_{p_k}$$

or (ii), i.e., $a_I \mid h$.

If $q \mid a_I$, then we have $q \mid a_{i_\ell}$ for all $i_\ell \in I$ and $a_I \nmid h$. Thus we have (i) and

$$\gcd\left(\frac{a_{i_1}}{q}, \dots, \frac{a_{i_k}}{q}\right) = \frac{a_I}{q} \mid \frac{d_{p_1}}{q}, \dots, \frac{d_{p_k}}{q}$$

as we wanted.

If $q \nmid a_I$, then

$$\gcd((a_i/q)_{i \in I'_q}, (a_i)_{i \in (I \setminus I'_q)}) = a_I$$

where $I'_q := \{i \in I : q \mid a_i\}$. If $a_I \mid h$, then there is nothing to prove, so we can assume that $a_I \nmid h$ and that (i) holds. Since $q \nmid a_I$, we get that a_I divides $(d^q)_{p_j}$ for $j = 1, \dots, k$. This concludes the proof. \square

Lemma 4.6. *Let $(d; a)$ be an h -regular pair and q be a prime dividing h . Then $(d^q; a^q)$ is h/q -regular and $(d(q); a(q))$ is h -regular, hence $(d(q)/q; a(q)/q)$ is h/q -regular.*

Proof. We give the proof for the pair $(d^q; a^q)$. Consider a set $I = \{i_1, \dots, i_k\} \subset \bar{n}$ such that $a_I := \gcd(a_{i_1}, \dots, a_{i_k}) > 1$ and let $a_I^q := \gcd(a_i^q)_{i \in I}$ be the gcd of the a_i in $(d^q; a^q)$.

Assume first that $\gcd(a_I, q) = 1$, so that $a_I^q = a_I$. If $a_I \mid h$, we obtain that $a_I^q \mid h/q$ and we are done. If $a_I \nmid h$, then there exist distinct integers p_1, \dots, p_k such that $a_I \mid d_{p_1}, \dots, d_{p_k}$. We have $a_I^q \nmid h/q$ and the $d_{p_j}^q$ work.

If $a_I = qt$ for some positive integer t , then $a_I^q = t$. If $qt \mid h$, we have $t \mid h/q$. If $qt \nmid h$, then there exist distinct integers p_1, \dots, p_k such that $a_I \mid d_{p_1}, \dots, d_{p_k}$. For the same integers, we have $a_I^q \mid d_{p_1}/q, \dots, d_{p_k}/q$ so the first condition of h/q -regularity is satisfied and we are done. \square

The Frobenius coin problem. In this subsection we want to enlighten some interesting connections among the Ambro–Kawamata conjecture, regular pairs and the Frobenius coin problem.

Question 4.7 (Frobenius coin problem). Given positive integers a_0, \dots, a_n such that $\gcd(a_0, \dots, a_n) = 1$, find the largest integer $G = G(a_0, \dots, a_n)$ so that there do not exist nonnegative integers x_0, \dots, x_n satisfying

$$G = a_0x_0 + \dots + a_nx_n.$$

Such G is called the Frobenius number of a_0, \dots, a_n .

For $n = 1$, it is classically known that

$$G(a_0, a_1) = a_0a_1 - a_0 - a_1.$$

For $n \geq 2$, the problem is considerably harder: precise methods have been developed to compute $G(a_0, a_1, a_2)$ and some algorithms and (lower and upper) bounds are known for the general case (see for instance [Johnson 1960] and [Brauer and Shockley 1962]).

By Lemma 2.4, the Ambro–Kawamata conjecture for smooth WCI would follow from the following purely arithmetic statement, which we believe to be of independent interest.

Conjecture 4.8. *Let $(d; a) = (d_1, \dots, d_c; a_0, \dots, a_n) \in \mathbb{N}^c \times \mathbb{N}^{n+1}$ be a regular pair such that $a_i \neq 1$ and $d_j \neq a_i$ for any i, j . Assume $c \leq n$ and $\gcd(a_0, \dots, a_n) = 1$. Then*

$$\delta(d; a) \geq G(a_0, \dots, a_n).$$

One of the best known lower bounds for G is given in [Brauer 1942]. Let a_0, \dots, a_n be positive coprime integers, set $g_j := \gcd(a_0, \dots, a_j)$ for $j = 0, \dots, n$ and consider

$$Br(a_0, \dots, a_n) := \sum_{j=1}^n a_j \frac{g_{j-1}}{g_j} - \sum_{i=0}^n a_i.$$

Brauer proved that $Br(a_0, \dots, a_n) \geq G(a_0, \dots, a_n)$. Set $d_j := a_j g_{j-1} / g_j$ for $j = 1, \dots, n$. Then it is easy to check that $(d; a) := (d_1, \dots, d_n; a_0, \dots, a_n)$ is actually a regular pair.

On the other hand, it is not difficult to see that, considering big prime numbers p and q , the pair $(pq, 6p, 6q; 2p, 3p, 2q, 3q)$ is regular, $\delta(d; a) \geq G(a_0, \dots, a_n)$, but $\delta(d; a) < Br(a_0, \dots, a_n)$.

This shows that regular pairs can give better bounds for the Frobenius number with respect to the known ones. For this reason, it seems to be a challenge and interesting problem to study Conjecture 4.8.

Remark 4.9. It is not difficult to check that Conjecture 4.8 is true for $c = 1, 2$, which implies that the nonvanishing holds for a smooth WCI of codimension 1 or 2. For simplicity, we omit the detail in the codimension 2 case.

For $c = 1$, a stronger and more general result is given in Lemma 6.1, which is the key step to prove Theorem 1.3.

5. Proof of Theorem 1.2

Theorem 1.2 is the combination of Corollary 5.3 and Corollary 5.13 below.

Smooth case. The pair $(d; a)$ in the following lemma does not come from a nonempty WCI. Nevertheless this lemma is important in the proof of Proposition 5.2.

Lemma 5.1. *Let $(d; a) \in \mathbb{N}_+^c \times \mathbb{N}_+^{n+1}$ be a regular pair such that $a_i \neq d_j$ for any i, j . Let q be a prime number such that $q \mid a_i$ and $q \mid d_j$ for any i, j . Then*

$$\delta(d; a) \geq cq.$$

Moreover, if the equality holds, then $c = n + 1$.

Proof. Note that $c \geq n + 1$ which does not occur for a nonempty WCI.

Assume first that q is the only prime dividing the a_i , that is for any $i = 0, \dots, n$, we have $a_i = q^{\alpha_i}$ for some $\alpha_i \geq 1$. We can assume that $a_0 \geq a_1 \geq \dots \geq a_n$. We can also order the d_j in such a way that $v_q(d_s) \geq v_q(d_t)$ for any $s \leq t$, where $v_q(d_j) = \max\{e \in \mathbb{N} : q^e \mid d_j\}$. Then we have $a_i \mid d_{i+1}$ for any $i = 0, \dots, n$ and so

$$\sum_{j=1}^c d_j - \sum_{i=0}^n a_i = \sum_{k=1}^{c-n-1} d_{n+1+k} + \sum_{i=0}^n (d_{i+1} - a_i) \geq cq$$

and the equality is possible only if $c = n + 1$, $d_j = 2q$ and $a_i = q$ for any i, j .

Assume now that $q \neq 2$ and that q and 2 are the only primes dividing the a_i , that is for any $i = 0, \dots, n$ we have $a_i = 2^{\alpha_i} q^{\beta_i}$ for some $\alpha_i \geq 0$ and $\beta_i \geq 1$ such that $\alpha_i > 0$ for at least one i . We proceed by induction on $t = \max_{0 \leq i \leq n} \{\beta_i\}$, the greatest power of q dividing at least one a_i .

Suppose $t = 1$. We can assume that $v_2(a_i) \geq v_2(a_j)$ and $v_2(d_i) \geq v_2(d_j)$ for any $i \leq j$. Then again $a_i \mid d_{i+1}$ for any $i = 0, \dots, n$ and we conclude as before.

Suppose $t \geq 2$. Let $I_{q^t} := \{i \in \bar{n} : q^t \mid a_i\}$ and $J_{q^t} := \{j \in \bar{c}^+ : q^t \mid d_j\}$. We consider the following pairs: $(d'; a')$, where $d' = ((d_j/q)_{j \in J_{q^t}}, (d_j)_{j \in \bar{c}^+ \setminus J_{q^t}})$ and $a' = ((a_i/q)_{i \in I_{q^t}}, (a_i)_{i \in \bar{n} \setminus I_{q^t}})$ and $(d''; a'')$, where $d'' = (d_j/q)_{j \in J_{q^t}}$ and $a'' = (a_i/q)_{i \in I_{q^t}}$. It is straightforward to check as in Lemma 4.5 that $(d'; a')$ and $(d''; a'')$ are regular. Consider the regular pair $(\tilde{d}'; \tilde{a}')$ constructed in (4) which satisfies $\tilde{d}'_j \neq \tilde{a}'_i$ for any $i \in \bar{n} \setminus I_{(d'; a')}$, $j \in \bar{c}^+ \setminus J_{(d'; a')}$, where $I_{(d'; a')} \subset \bar{n}$ and $J_{(d'; a')} \subset \bar{c}^+$ are the subsets defined in Definition 4.3.

Let

$$m := |\{j \in J_{q^t} : d_j/q = a_i \text{ for some } i \in \bar{n} \setminus I_{q^t}\}|,$$

$$\bar{m} := |\{i \in I_{q^t} : d_j = a_i/q \text{ for some } j \in \bar{c}^+ \setminus J_{q^t}\}|.$$

Note that $|I_{(d', a')}| = |J_{(d', a')}| \leq m + \bar{m}$. Let $k := |J_{q^t}|$. By induction on t , we may assume that we have $\delta(d'; a') = \delta(\tilde{d}'; \tilde{a}') \geq (c - m - \bar{m})q$ and $\delta(d''; a'') \geq kq$. We have that $|I_{q^t}| \leq |J_{q^t}|$ since $(d; a)$ is regular. Since $m \leq k$ and $\bar{m} \leq |I_{q^t}| \leq k$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \delta(d; a) &= \delta(d'; a') + (q - 1)\delta(d''; a'') \geq (c - 2k)q + (q - 1)kq \\ &= cq - 2kq + kq^2 - kq \\ &= cq + kq(q - 3) \geq cq \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

because $q \geq 3$. The equality is possible only if we have it for both $(\tilde{d}'; \tilde{a}')$ and $(d''; a'')$. This implies by induction on t that $c = n + 1$ in this case.

We now pass to the general case. For any prime p , different from q and 2, let $e_p := \max\{e \in \mathbb{N} : p^e \mid a_i \text{ for some } i\}$. The proof is by induction on $D = \sum_p e_p$, where the index varies over all prime numbers different from q and 2. The case $D = 0$ has already been treated in the first part of the proof. So assume $D \geq 1$ and that the inequality holds up to $D - 1$. Consider $(d^p; a^p)$ and let

$$\begin{aligned} m_p &:= |\{j \in \bar{c}^+ : d_j/p = a_i \text{ for some } i \in \bar{n} \setminus I_p\}|, \\ \bar{m}_p &:= |\{i \in \bar{n} : d_j = a_i/p \text{ for some } j \in \bar{c}^+ \setminus J_p\}|. \end{aligned}$$

Let us again consider the pair $(\tilde{d}^p; \tilde{a}^p)$ as in Definition 4.3 by removing subsets $J_{(d^p, a^p)} \subset \bar{c}^+$ and $I_{(d^p, a^p)} \subset \bar{n}$. Then this satisfies the hypothesis $(\tilde{d}^p)_j \neq (\tilde{a}^p)_i$ for any i and j . We again have that $|J_{(d^p, a^p)}| \leq m_p + \bar{m}_p$. By induction on D , we obtain $\delta(d^p; a^p) = \delta(\tilde{d}^p; \tilde{a}^p) \geq (c - m_p - \bar{m}_p)q$. Now consider the pair $(d(p)/p; a(p)/p)$. Again by induction on D , we obtain $\delta(d(p)/p; a(p)/p) \geq sq$, where $s := |\{j \in \bar{c}^+ : p \mid d_j\}|$. We see that $m_p \leq s$ by the definition of m_p . Let $s' := |\{i \in \bar{n} : p \mid a_i\}|$. We see that $s' \leq s$ by the regularity of $(d; a)$ and that $\bar{m}_p \leq s'$ by the definition of \bar{m}_p . Thus we have $\bar{m}_p \leq s$. By these inequalities and $p \geq 3$, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \delta(d; a) &= \delta(d^p; a^p) + (p - 1)\delta(d(p)/p; a(p)/p) \\ &\geq (c - m_p - \bar{m}_p)q + (p - 1)sq \\ &= cq + psq - m_pq - \bar{m}_p q - sq \geq cq + psq - 3sq \geq cq \end{aligned}$$

as we wanted. Again, the equality is possible only if $c = n + 1$. □

By using Lemma 5.1, we prove the following key proposition.

Proposition 5.2. *Let $(d; a) \in \mathbb{N}_+^c \times \mathbb{N}_+^{n+1}$ be a regular pair such that $a_i > 1$ and $a_i \neq d_j$ for any i, j . Then the following holds.*

(i) *We have*

$$\delta(d; a) \geq c. \tag{6}$$

(ii) *If $\gcd(a_0, \dots, a_n) = 1$, then the equality holds only if $(d; a)$ is of the form $(6^{(s)}, 1^{(c-s)}; 2^{(s)}, 3^{(s)})$ for some integer s .*

Proof. (i) The proof is by induction on n , the case $n = 0$ being obvious. We can assume that no prime divides every a_i , otherwise we are in the case of Lemma 5.1. In particular, we may assume that there is a prime $q \neq 2$ which divides some a_i . Let

$$\begin{aligned} m &:= |\{j \in \bar{c}^+ : d_j/q = a_i \text{ for some } i \in \bar{n} \setminus I_q\}|, \\ \bar{m} &:= |\{i \in \bar{n} : d_j = a_i/q \text{ for some } j \in \bar{c}^+ \setminus J_q, d_j \neq 1\}|, \\ \ell &:= |\{i \in \bar{n} : a_i = q\}|, \quad s := |\{j \in \bar{c}^+ : q|d_j\}| = |J_q|. \end{aligned}$$

We note that $m \leq s$ by definition and $\ell + \bar{m} \leq s$ by the regularity.

Case 1: Suppose that $\ell + m + \bar{m} \geq 1$. Then the pair $(d^q; a^q)$ has some redundant a_i , in the sense that $a_i/q = 1$, $d_j/q = a_i$ or $d_j = a_i/q$ for some i, j . That is, we consider a regular pair $(\tilde{d}^q, \tilde{a}^q)$ and, by removing all $\tilde{a}_i^q = 1$, we obtain a new regular pair $(\hat{d}^q; \hat{a}^q) \in \mathbb{N}_+^{\hat{c}} \times \mathbb{N}_+^{\hat{n}+1}$ for some $\hat{c} \leq c$ and $\hat{n} \leq n$. Note that $\hat{n} < n$ by the hypothesis $\ell + m + \bar{m} \geq 1$. Let $\ell_1 := |\{j \in \bar{c}^+ : d_j = 1\}|$ and $\ell' := \min\{\ell, \ell_1\}$. Then we see that $\hat{c} \geq c - m - \bar{m} - \ell'$ by the construction of $(\tilde{d}^q; \tilde{a}^q)$. Since we have $|\{i \in \bar{n} \setminus I_{(d^q; a^q)} : \tilde{a}_i^q = 1\}| = \ell - \ell'$, we obtain, by induction on n , that

$$\delta(d^q; a^q) = \delta(\hat{d}^q; \hat{a}^q) - (\ell - \ell') \geq \hat{c} - (\ell - \ell') \geq c - \ell - m - \bar{m}.$$

By applying Lemma 5.1 to $(d(q), a(q))$, we obtain

$$\delta(d(q); a(q)) \geq sq.$$

By these and $\ell + m + \bar{m} \leq 2s$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \delta(d; a) &= \delta(d^q; a^q) + \frac{q-1}{q} \delta(d(q); a(q)) \geq c - \ell - m - \bar{m} + (q-1)s \\ &\geq c + qs - 3s \geq c \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

since $q \geq 3$.

Case 2: Suppose now that $\ell + m + \bar{m} = 0$. Then the pair $(d^q; a^q)$ satisfies the assumptions of the proposition. We note that

$$\delta(d; a) = \delta(d^q; a^q) + \frac{q-1}{q} \delta(d(q); a(q)) > \delta(d^q; a^q)$$

since we have $\delta(d(q); a(q)) > 0$ by Lemma 5.1. So we can replace the pair $(d; a)$ with $(d^q; a^q)$ without changing the number c of the j and we can repeat the argument from the beginning of the proof (possibly changing the prime q) till either we end up in **Case 1** or we reach the situation of Lemma 5.1. In both cases, we are done and obtain (6).

(ii) We now study when the identity holds in the case $\gcd(a_0, \dots, a_n) = 1$.

Note that the case $n = 1$ is clear, being equivalent to asking $a_0 a_1 - a_0 - a_1 = 1$.

Assume $n \geq 2$ and let $q \neq 2$ be a prime number such that $q \mid a_i$ for some i . We shall follow the proof of the inequality. In particular, we look at

$$\delta(d; a) = \delta(d^q; a^q) + \frac{q-1}{q} \delta(d(q); a(q)).$$

With the same notation as above, we note that the equality can hold only if we are in **Case 1** and, by Lemma 5.1, the number $|\{i \in \bar{n} : q \mid a_i\}|$ must be equal to $s = |J_q|$. Moreover we obtain $q = 3$ by (7). This implies that the only possible prime numbers that divide at least one a_i are 2 and 3.

We must also have $m = s$ and $\ell + \bar{m} = s$. By $m = s$, we see that any $d_j/3 \in \mathbb{N}$ must be equal to some a_i which is not divisible by 3. Hence we can write

$$(d; a) = (3 \cdot 2^{\beta_1}, \dots, 3 \cdot 2^{\beta_s}, 2^{\beta_{s+1}}, \dots, 2^{\beta_c}; 2^{\beta_1}, \dots, 2^{\beta_s}, 3 \cdot 2^{\alpha_{s+1}}, \dots, 3 \cdot 2^{\alpha_{n+1}})$$

for some nonnegative integers α_i and β_i . Then

$$\delta(d; a) = \delta(2^{\beta_{s+1}}, \dots, 2^{\beta_c}; 2^{\alpha_{s+1}}, \dots, 2^{\alpha_{n+1}}) + \frac{2}{3} \delta(3 \cdot 2^{\beta_1}, \dots, 3 \cdot 2^{\beta_s}; 3 \cdot 2^{\alpha_{s+1}}, \dots, 3 \cdot 2^{\alpha_{n+1}}).$$

Also note that $\ell + \bar{m} = s$ implies that $n + 1 - s = |\{i \in \bar{n} : 3 \mid a_i\}| = \ell + \bar{m} = s$, thus $n + 1 = 2s$. By the regularity of $(d(3); a(3))$ and the assumption $d_j \neq a_i$ for any i, j , to have the equality $\delta(d(3); a(3)) = 3s$ we need $\beta_j = 1$ for $j = 1, \dots, s$ and $\alpha_i = 0$ for $i = s + 1, \dots, n + 1$, which implies

$$\delta(d; a) = \delta(2^{\beta_{s+1}}, \dots, 2^{\beta_c}; 1, \dots, 1) + 2s = \sum_{i=1}^{c-s} 2^{\beta_{s+i}} - (n + 1 - s) + 2s,$$

i.e., $c = \delta(d; a) = \sum_{i=1}^{c-s} 2^{\beta_{s+i}} + s$.

Hence, we must have $\beta_j = 0$ for $j = s + 1, \dots, c$, which finishes the proof. \square

As a corollary of Proposition 5.2, we obtain the nonemptiness of $|\mathcal{O}(1)|$ and the smoothness of its general member on a smooth Fano or Calabi–Yau WCI.

Corollary 5.3. *Let $X := X_{d_1, \dots, d_c} \subset \mathbb{P}(a_0, \dots, a_n)$ be a well-formed smooth Fano or Calabi–Yau WCI which is not a linear cone. Let $c_1 := |\{i \in \bar{n} : a_i = 1\}|$. Then the following hold.*

- (i) *We have $c_1 \geq c$. Moreover the equality is possible only if X is Calabi–Yau of type $X_{6, \dots, 6} \subset \mathbb{P}(1^{(c)}, 2^{(c)}, 3^{(c)})$.*
- (ii) *The linear system $|\mathcal{O}_X(1)|$ is nonempty and its general member H is smooth.*

Proof. (i) We may assume that $a_0 \leq \dots \leq a_n$. Thus we have $a_0 = \dots = a_{c_1-1} = 1$. Since X is smooth, we see that $(d_1, \dots, d_c; a_{c_1}, \dots, a_n)$ is regular. By this and Proposition 5.2(i), we obtain

$$\delta(d_1, \dots, d_c; a_{c_1}, \dots, a_n) \geq c.$$

By the assumptions, $0 \geq \delta(d; a) \geq c - c_1$, and this implies the former statement.

Let $(d; a)$ be a regular pair which satisfies $c_1 = c$. Let $(\hat{d}; \hat{a})$ be the regular pair obtained by removing all $a_i = 1$. Then $(\hat{d}; \hat{a})$ satisfies the hypothesis of Proposition 5.2(ii) since $(d; a)$ defines a smooth WCI. Hence, by Proposition 5.2(ii), we see that $(\hat{d}; \hat{a}) = (6^{(c)}; 2^{(c)}, 3^{(c)})$ and $(d; a) = (6^{(c)}; 2^{(c)}, 3^{(c)}, 1^{(c)})$.

(ii) By the latter part of Proposition 5.2, we can assume that X is not of the form $X_{6, \dots, 6} \subset \mathbb{P}(2^{(c)}, 3^{(c)}, 1^{(c)})$; otherwise the conclusion is immediate. In particular, we may assume $c_1 \geq c + 1$.

By (i), we see that $|\mathcal{O}_X(1)| \neq \emptyset$. Since X is smooth and well-formed, we have $\text{Sing } \mathbb{P}(a_0, \dots, a_n) \cap X = \emptyset$. Thus $H \cap \text{Sing } \mathbb{P}(a_0, \dots, a_n) = \emptyset$. Hence it is enough to check H is quasismooth at $P := \Pi(p)$, where $p \in \Pi^{-1}((x_0 = \dots = x_{c_1-1} = 0) \cap X)$ and $\Pi : \mathbb{A}^{n+1} \setminus \{0\} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}(a_0, \dots, a_n)$ is the quotient map.

Set $H_i := X \cap (x_i = 0)$ for $i = 0, \dots, c_1 - 1$. We shall look at the Jacobi matrices of X and $H_i \subset \mathbb{P}(a_0, \dots, a_{i-1}, a_{i+1}, \dots, a_n)$. Let f_1, \dots, f_c be the defining equations of X such that $\deg f_j = d_j$. For $i = 0, \dots, n$, set

$$v_i(p) := \begin{pmatrix} \partial f_1 / \partial x_i \\ \vdots \\ \partial f_c / \partial x_i \end{pmatrix} (p).$$

The Jacobi matrix $J_X(p)$ and $J_{H_i}(p)$ of X and H_i can be written as

$$J_X(p) = (v_0(p), \dots, v_n(p)), \quad J_{H_i}(p) = (v_0(p), \dots, v_{i-1}(p), v_{i+1}(p), \dots, v_n(p)).$$

Since X is quasismooth, there exist linearly independent vectors

$$v_{i_1}(p), \dots, v_{i_c}(p).$$

Since $c_1 \geq c + 1$, we can choose i so that $i \notin \{i_1, \dots, i_c\}$. Then we see that H_i is quasismooth at $P := \Pi(p)$. Thus a general member H is also quasismooth at P . \square

Remark 5.4. Let $X \subset \mathbb{P}(a_0, \dots, a_n)$ be a smooth WCI as in Corollary 5.3. For $I \subset \bar{n}$ such that $a_I = 1$, it may a priori happen that (Q1) does not hold, but (Q2) holds. That is why we make an argument as in Corollary 5.3 (ii).

Remark 5.5. Let X_{d_1, \dots, d_c} be a smooth WCI as in Corollary 5.3. Motivated by a question by Andreas H\"oring, we consider the description of the base locus $\text{Bs } |\mathcal{O}_X(1)|$.

Up to reordering d_1, \dots, d_c , we can assume that there is an integer $c' \leq c$ with the following properties: for $1 \leq j \leq c'$, there are weighted homogeneous polynomials $f_j(x_{c_1}, \dots, x_n)$ of degree d_j and, for $c' + 1 \leq j \leq c$, all monomials of degree d_j contain one of the variables x_0, \dots, x_{c_1-1} of weights 1. Since the base locus $\text{Bs } |\mathcal{O}_X(1)|$ is $(x_0 = \dots = x_{c_1-1} = 0) \cap X_{d_1, \dots, d_c}$, it is isomorphic to a general WCI $Y_{d_1, \dots, d_{c'}} \subset \mathbb{P}(a_{c_1}, \dots, a_n)$.

Thus the base locus is again a WCI. However this is not necessarily (quasi)smooth in general. We shall see this in Example 5.6.

Example 5.6. Let $X := X_{231,231,26} \subset \mathbb{P} := \mathbb{P}(3, 3, 7, 7, 11, 11, 1^{(447)})$ be a general WCI. We can check that this is a smooth Fano WCI as follows: for $I = \{0, 1\}, \{2, 3\}$ or $\{4, 5\}$, (that is, two variables of weights 3, 7 or 11), we have (Q1) for $d_1 = 231, d_2 = 231$. Also, for $I = \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$ or $\{0, 1, 4, 5\}$, we have (Q1) for $d_1 = 231, d_2 = 231, d_3 = 26$ since $26 = 7 \cdot 2 + 3 \cdot 4 = 11 + 3 \cdot 5$. For $I = \{2, 3, 4, 5\}$, we have (Q2) for $d_1 = 231, d_2 = 231, d_3 = 26 = 7 \cdot 2 + 11 + 1$. By Proposition 3.1, we see that X is quasismooth, and smooth since $X \cap \text{Sing } \mathbb{P} = \emptyset$.

The base locus $\text{Bs } |\mathcal{O}_X(1)|$ is a WCI $Y := Y_{231,231,26} \subset \mathbb{P}' := \mathbb{P}(3, 3, 7, 7, 11, 11)$. This is not quasismooth. Indeed, for $I = \{2, 3, 4, 5\}$, neither (Q1) nor (Q2) holds because of the lack of suitable degree 26 polynomials. In fact, Y is a nonnormal surface singular along a curve $(x_0 = x_1 = f_1 = f_2 = 0) \subset \mathbb{P}'$, where f_1, f_2 are part of defining polynomials of degrees 231 and x_0, x_1 are the variables of weights 3.

Hence we can not expect smoothness of the base locus of the fundamental linear system even if it contains a smooth member.

Remark 5.7. Let $W = W_{d_1, \dots, d_c} \subset \mathbb{P}(a_0, \dots, a_n)$ be a smooth WCI which is not a linear cone, where $a_i > 1$ for any $i = 0, \dots, n$. By Corollary 5.3 we know that W is not Fano. Then we can consider a WCI

$$X = X_{d_1, \dots, d_c} \subset \mathbb{P}(a_0, \dots, a_n, 1^{(\ell)})$$

where $\ell = \delta(W) + 1$. In this way X is a smooth Fano with $-K_X = \mathcal{O}_X(1)$ and $\text{Bs } |\mathcal{O}_X(1)|$ is exactly W .

In Corollary 5.3 we showed that for a smooth Fano WCI, the general member of the fundamental divisor is quasismooth. This is not true in general for a quasismooth Fano WCI as the following example shows.

Example 5.8. Let $X = X_{35} \subset \mathbb{P}(5, 7, 2^{(k)}, 3^{(k)})$ where $k \geq 5$. Then X is a quasismooth Fano WCI with fundamental divisor $\mathcal{O}_X(6)$, but $X_{35,6} \subset \mathbb{P}(5, 7, 2^{(k)}, 3^{(k)})$ is not quasismooth. However, we see that a general member of $|\mathcal{O}_X(6)|$ has only terminal singularities. Indeed it has an isolated singularity at $[* : * : 0 : \dots : 0]$ which is locally isomorphic to $0 \in (x_1^3 + \dots + x_k^3 + x_{k+1}^2 + \dots + x_{2k}^2 = 0) \subset \mathbb{C}^{2k}$.

It is also natural to look at the general element of $|-K_X|$ in the case of a Fano variety X . For instance, Shokurov [1979] and Reid [1983] proved that a Fano 3-fold with only canonical Gorenstein singularities admits an anticanonical member with only Du Val singularities. Here we give an example of a smooth Fano WCI whose anticanonical members are singular (and not quasismooth). See also [Höring and Voisin 2011, 2.12] for an example of a Fano 4-fold with singular fundamental divisor.

Example 5.9. (cf., [Sano 2014, Example 2.9]) For $m \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, let X be a weighted hypersurface $X = X_{(2m+1)(2m+2)} \subset \mathbb{P}(1^{(1+2m(2m+1))}, 2m+1, 2m+2)$ of degree $(2m+1)(2m+2)$. Then we see that $-K_X = \mathcal{O}_X(2)$ and the linear system $|-iK_X|$ does not contain a smooth member for $i = 1, \dots, m$. Thus we can not expect a smooth element of the plurianticanonical system on a Fano manifold. However, in the above example, we can find a member with only terminal singularities. Moreover, the base locus of $|H|$ consists of a point.

Remark 5.10. It is well known that following the arguments in [Ambro 1999, Section 5] or [Kawamata 2000, Section 5] and assuming Conjecture 1.1, it is possible to show that the general element of $|-mK_X|$ has always only klt singularities for $m > 0$ such that $-mK_X$ is Cartier (we thank Chen Jiang for pointing this fact out to us).

Finally, we also get the following corollary, which generalizes [Przyjalkowski and Shramov 2017, Corollary 4.2] to any codimension.

Corollary 5.11. *Let $X := X_{d_1, \dots, d_c} \subset \mathbb{P}(a_0, \dots, a_n)$ be a well-formed smooth Fano or Calabi–Yau WCI which is not a linear cone. Let $c_1 := |\{i \in \bar{n} : a_i = 1\}|$. Then $c_1 > I(X) := -\delta(d; a) = \sum_{i=0}^n a_i - \sum_{j=1}^c d_j$.*

Proof. Consider the regular pair $(d; a)$ associated with X . We may assume that $a_0 \leq \dots \leq a_n$, so that $a_0 = \dots = a_{c_1-1} = 1$. Let $(d'; a')$ be the pair $(d; a_{c_1}, \dots, a_n)$, where we took away every 1 from $(d; a)$. This pair is regular with no $a_i = 1$ and so by Proposition 5.2 we get

$$\delta(d'; a') \geq c > 0,$$

which implies

$$\delta(d; a) = \delta(d'; a') - c_1 > -c_1,$$

i.e., $I(X) < c_1$, as we wanted. □

General case. The following is a key proposition to deduce the nonvanishing in the quasismooth Fano case.

Proposition 5.12. *Let $h \in \mathbb{N}_+$ and $(d; a) \in \mathbb{N}_+^c \times \mathbb{N}_+^{n+1}$ be an h -regular pair with $c \geq 1$. If $a_i \nmid h$ for any $i = 0, \dots, n$ and $a_i \neq d_j$ for any i, j , then*

$$\delta(d; a) > 0.$$

Proof. Let us write $h = p_1^{\alpha_1} \dots p_k^{\alpha_k}$, where the p_i are distinct prime numbers. The proof is by induction on $\alpha = \sum_{i=1}^k \alpha_i \geq 0$. If $\alpha = 0$, then the pair $(d; a)$ is regular and the statement follows from Proposition 5.2, so we assume $\alpha \geq 1$.

Let p be a prime number dividing h and consider $(d^p; a^p)$. As usual,

$$\delta(d; a) = \delta(d^p; a^p) + \frac{p-1}{p} \delta(d(p); a(p)).$$

By Lemma 4.6, $(d^p; a^p)$ and $(d(p)/p; a(p)/p)$ are h/p -regular. Note that there does not exist i such that $a_i/p = 1$ by the hypothesis $a_i \nmid h$. Thus, after cancellation on $(d^p; a^p)$ (see Definition 4.3), we see that $(\tilde{d}^p; \tilde{a}^p)$ and $(d(p)/p; a(p)/p)$ are h/p -regular and satisfy the hypothesis of the proposition.

If $p \mid a_i$ or $p \mid d_j$ for some i or j , then we obtain $\delta(d(p)/p; a(p)/p) > 0$ by the induction hypothesis and conclude $\delta(d; a) > 0$ by induction since we have either $\delta(d^p; a^p) = \delta(\tilde{d}^p; \tilde{a}^p) > 0$ or $(\tilde{d}^p; \tilde{a}^p)$ is empty.

If $p \nmid a_i$ and $p \nmid d_j$ for any i, j , then $\delta(d^p; a^p) > 0$ by the induction hypothesis since $(d^p; a^p) = (d; a)$ is h/p -regular. Moreover $(d(p); a(p))$ is empty. Hence we can again conclude that $\delta(d; a) > 0$. □

Corollary 5.13. *Let $X = X_{d_1, \dots, d_c} \subset \mathbb{P}(a_0, \dots, a_n)$ be a well-formed quasismooth WCI which is Fano or Calabi–Yau and which is not a linear cone. Then $|H| \neq \emptyset$ for any ample Cartier divisor H on X .*

Proof. Write $H = \mathcal{O}_X(h)$. If there exists $i \in \bar{n}$ such that $a_i \mid h$, then we are done. Otherwise, we are in the situation of Proposition 5.12, and so the variety can not be Fano or Calabi–Yau since $(d; a)$ is h -regular by Proposition 3.6. □

6. Weighted hypersurfaces

The following lemma gives a proof of a generalized version of Conjecture 4.8 in the case $c = 1$.

Lemma 6.1. *Let a_0, \dots, a_n be positive integers, $n \geq 1$ and set*

$$h := \text{lcm}_{i \neq j}(\text{gcd}(a_i, a_j)).$$

Assume that $a_i \nmid h$ for any i and set $f := \text{lcm}(a_0, \dots, a_n)$. Then

$$f - \sum_{i=0}^n a_i \geq \text{lcm}(a_s, a_t) - a_s - a_t$$

for any s and t .

Proof. We first note that, for any proper subset I of $\bar{n} := \{0, \dots, n\}$, we have $f \neq \text{lcm}_{i \in I}(a_i)$. In fact, suppose that the equality holds and let $k \in \bar{n} \setminus I$. For any prime power p^e such that $e \geq 1$ and $p^e \mid a_k$, we have $p^e \mid f$. In particular, we have $p^e \mid a_\ell$ for some $\ell \in I$. This implies that $p^e \mid \text{gcd}(a_k, a_\ell)$ and so $a_k \mid h$, which is a contradiction. In particular, $f \geq 2 \text{lcm}_{i \in I}(a_i)$.

The proof of the lemma is by induction on n and the case $n = 1$ is trivial, so assume $n \geq 2$. Let $s, t \in \bar{n}$ be such that $s \neq t$. Then

$$f - \sum_{i=0}^n a_i = \frac{f}{2} - a_s - a_t + \frac{f}{2} - \sum_{i \neq s, t} a_i \geq \text{lcm}(a_s, a_t) - a_s - a_t + \text{lcm}_{i \neq s, t}(a_i) - \sum_{i \neq s, t} a_i.$$

If $n = 2$, then we have

$$\text{lcm}_{i \neq s,t}(a_i) - \sum_{i \neq s,t} a_i = 0$$

and we are done.

If $n \geq 3$, then we have

$$\text{lcm}_{i \neq s,t}(a_i) - \sum_{i \neq s,t} a_i \geq \text{lcm}(a_{s'}, a_{t'}) - a_{s'} - a_{t'}$$

for $s', t' \in \bar{n} \setminus \{s, t\}$ such that $s' \neq t'$ by induction on n and $\text{lcm}(a_{s'}, a_{t'}) - a_{s'} - a_{t'} \geq 0$ because we are assuming that $a_i \nmid h$ for any i . □

Proposition 6.2. *Let $X = X_d \subset \mathbb{P} = \mathbb{P}(a_0, \dots, a_n)$ be a well-formed, quasismooth hypersurface of degree d which is not a linear cone. Let H be an ample Cartier divisor on X such that $H - K_X$ is ample.*

Then $|H|$ is not empty.

Proof. Write $\mathcal{O}_X(H) = \mathcal{O}_X(h)$ for a positive integer h .

By Proposition 3.4, we can assume that $a_i \mid d$ for any i . Then X is a Cartier divisor which intersects any stratum $P_{\{i,j\}}$ in some interior point. The condition of H to be Cartier is then equivalent to

$$\text{lcm}_{i \neq j}(\text{gcd}(a_i, a_j)) \mid h.$$

If there exists a_i such that $a_i \mid h$, then we are done. So assume that $a_i \nmid h$ for any i and let $f := \text{lcm}(a_0, \dots, a_n)$. By Lemma 6.1, we get

$$f - \sum_{i=0}^n a_i \geq \text{lcm}(a_s, a_t) - a_s - a_t$$

for any s and t . Since $h > f - \sum_{i=0}^n a_i$ (because $H - K_X$ is ample and $f \mid d$) and $g := \text{gcd}(a_s, a_t) \mid h$ for any $s \neq t$, we can use the Frobenius number $G(a_s/g, a_t/g) = (1/g)(\text{lcm}(a_s, a_t) - a_s - a_t)$ as on page 2382 to conclude that there are nonnegative integers λ_s, λ_t such that

$$\lambda_s a_s + \lambda_t a_t = h,$$

which implies that $|H|$ is not empty by Lemma 2.4. □

In the following, we prove the basepoint freeness on a Gorenstein weighted hypersurface.

Proposition 6.3. *Let $X = X_d \subset \mathbb{P} = \mathbb{P}(a_0, \dots, a_n)$ be a well-formed, quasismooth hypersurface of degree d which is not a linear cone such that K_X is Cartier. Let H be the fundamental divisor of X and h be the positive integer such that $H = \mathcal{O}_X(h)$.*

Then $L = K_X + mH$ is globally generated for any $m \geq n$.

Proof. Suppose by contradiction that there is a point $p = [p_0 : \cdots : p_n] \in \text{Bs } |L|$ and take ℓ such that $L = \mathcal{O}_X(\ell)$.

Note that if $p_s \neq 0$ for some s , then $a_s \nmid h$, otherwise $x_s^e \in |L|$ for some positive integer e and so $p \notin \text{Bs } |L|$. Also note that, for all $i \in \bar{n}$ such that $a_i \nmid h$, we have $a_i \mid d$ by Proposition 3.4.

Assume first that there exists a unique $s \in \bar{n}$ such that $p_s \neq 0$. Since $p \in X$ and $a_s \nmid h$, we get that $a_s \mid d$. Let f_d be the defining polynomial of X_d . If f_d contains a monomial x_s^{d/a_s} , then we obtain $p \notin X_d$ and this is a contradiction. If f_d does not contain such a monomial, then it should contain a monomial of the form $x_s^k x_i$ for some $k > 0$ and $i \neq s$ by the quasismoothness of X_d . Then we see that $a_s \mid a_i$ by $a_s \mid d$, and X_d has a quotient singularity of index a_s . Thus we obtain $a_s \mid h$ and this is a contradiction.

Hence we can assume that there exist s and t such that $s \neq t$, $p_s \neq 0$ and $p_t \neq 0$, thus $a_s, a_t \nmid h$. We have

$$\ell = d - \sum_{i=0}^n a_i + mh = d - \sum_{a_i \nmid h} a_i - \sum_{a_i \mid h} a_i + mh.$$

Assume that $-\sum_{a_i \mid h} a_i + mh \geq 1$. Since $a_i \mid d$ for all i such that $a_i \nmid h$, we can apply Lemma 6.1 to conclude that

$$\ell > \text{lcm}(a_s, a_t) - a_s - a_t,$$

which implies that $x_s^{e_s} x_t^{e_t} \in |L|$ for some nonnegative integers e_s and e_t . So we again have $p \notin \text{Bs } |L|$.

Assume now that $-\sum_{a_i \mid h} a_i + mh \leq 0$. Then we can check that $|\{i : a_i = h\}| \geq n - 1$, because $m \geq n$. Moreover, since \mathbb{P} is well-formed, the greatest common factor of any n weights is 1. By these, when $|\{i : a_i = h\}| = n$, we have $h = 1$ and $\mathbb{P} = \mathbb{P}(a_0, 1, \dots, 1)$ for some $a_0 > 1$. When $|\{i : a_i = h\}| = n - 1$, we have $h = 2$ and $\mathbb{P} = \mathbb{P}(1, 1, 2, \dots, 2)$. In both cases, we can check that L is basepoint free, and we have derived a contradiction. □

Acknowledgment

We thank D. Turchetti for many helpful conversations, C. Shramov for letting us know of the recent preprint [Przyjalkowski and Shramov 2017], and A. H\"oring for asking us a question on the base locus of the fundamental linear system. Part of this project was realized while the Sano and Tasin were visiting the Max Planck Institute for Mathematics and the Institute for Mathematical Science, NUS in Singapore. We are happy to thank them for their support during our stays. Sano was also partially supported by JST Tenure Track Program, JSPS KAKENHI Grant Numbers JP15J03158, JP16K17573, JP24224001.

References

- [Ambro 1999] F. Ambro, “Ladders on Fano varieties”, *J. Math. Sci. (New York)* **94**:1 (1999), 1126–1135. MR Zbl
- [Ballico et al. 2013] E. Ballico, R. Pignatelli, and L. Tasin, “Weighted Hypersurfaces with Either Assigned Volume or Many Vanishing Plurigenera”, *Communications in Algebra* **41**:10 (2013), 3745–3752.
- [Beltrametti and Sommese 1995] M. C. Beltrametti and A. J. Sommese, *The adjunction theory of complex projective varieties*, de Gruyter Expositions in Mathematics **16**, de Gruyter, Berlin, 1995. MR Zbl
- [Brauer 1942] A. Brauer, “On a problem of partitions”, *Amer. J. Math.* **64** (1942), 299–312. MR Zbl
- [Brauer and Shockley 1962] A. Brauer and J. E. Shockley, “On a problem of Frobenius”, *J. Reine Angew. Math.* **211** (1962), 215–220. MR Zbl
- [Broustet and Höring 2010] A. Broustet and A. Höring, “Effective non-vanishing conjectures for projective threefolds”, *Adv. Geom.* **10**:4 (2010), 737–746. MR Zbl
- [Call and Lyubeznik 1994] F. Call and G. Lyubeznik, “A simple proof of Grothendieck’s theorem on the parafactoriality of local rings”, pp. 15–18 in *Commutative algebra: syzygies, multiplicities, and birational algebra* (South Hadley, MA, 1992), edited by W. J. Heinzer et al., Contemp. Math. **159**, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1994. MR Zbl
- [Cao and Jiang 2016] Y. Cao and C. Jiang, “Remarks on Kawamata’s effective non-vanishing conjecture for manifolds with trivial first Chern classes”, preprint, 2016. arXiv
- [Chen 2015] J.-J. Chen, “Finiteness of Calabi–Yau quasismooth weighted complete intersections”, *Int. Math. Res. Not.* **2015**:12 (2015), 3793–3809. MR Zbl
- [Chen et al. 2011] J.-J. Chen, J. A. Chen, and M. Chen, “On quasismooth weighted complete intersections”, *J. Algebraic Geom.* **20**:2 (2011), 239–262. MR Zbl
- [Corti et al. 2000] A. Corti, A. Pukhlikov, and M. Reid, “Fano 3-fold hypersurfaces”, pp. 175–258 in *Explicit birational geometry of 3-folds*, edited by A. Corti and M. Reid, London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser. **281**, Cambridge Univ. Press, 2000. MR Zbl
- [Dimca 1986] A. Dimca, “Singularities and coverings of weighted complete intersections”, *J. Reine Angew. Math.* **366** (1986), 184–193. MR Zbl
- [Dolgachev 1982] I. Dolgachev, “Weighted projective varieties”, pp. 34–71 in *Group actions and vector fields* (Vancouver, 1981), edited by J. B. Carrell, Lecture Notes in Math. **956**, Springer, 1982. MR Zbl
- [Ein and Lazarsfeld 1993] L. Ein and R. Lazarsfeld, “Global generation of pluricanonical and adjoint linear series on smooth projective threefolds”, *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* **6**:4 (1993), 875–903. MR Zbl
- [Fulton 1993] W. Fulton, *Introduction to toric varieties*, Annals of Mathematics Studies **131**, Princeton Univ. Press, 1993. MR Zbl
- [Höring 2012] A. Höring, “On a conjecture of Beltrametti and Sommese”, *J. Algebraic Geom.* **21**:4 (2012), 721–751. MR Zbl
- [Höring and Voisin 2011] A. Höring and C. Voisin, “Anticanonical divisors and curve classes on Fano manifolds”, *Pure Appl. Math. Q.* **7**:4 (2011), 1371–1393. MR Zbl
- [Iano-Fletcher 2000] A. R. Iano-Fletcher, “Working with weighted complete intersections”, pp. 101–173 in *Explicit birational geometry of 3-folds*, edited by A. Corti and M. Reid, London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser. **281**, Cambridge Univ. Press, 2000. MR Zbl
- [Johnson 1960] S. M. Johnson, “A linear diophantine problem”, *Canad. J. Math.* **12** (1960), 390–398. MR Zbl

- [Johnson and Kollár 2001] J. M. Johnson and J. Kollár, “Fano hypersurfaces in weighted projective 4-spaces”, *Experiment. Math.* **10**:1 (2001), 151–158. MR Zbl
- [Kawamata 1997] Y. Kawamata, “On Fujita’s freeness conjecture for 3-folds and 4-folds”, *Math. Ann.* **308**:3 (1997), 491–505. MR Zbl
- [Kawamata 2000] Y. Kawamata, “On effective non-vanishing and base-point-freeness”, *Asian J. Math.* **4**:1 (2000), 173–181. MR Zbl
- [Lanteri et al. 1993] Lanteri et al., “Open problems”, pp. 321–325 in *Geometry of complex projective varieties* (Cetraro, Italy, 1990), edited by A. Lanteri et al., *Seminars and Conferences* **9**, Mediterranean Press, Rende, Italy, 1993. MR
- [Mori 1975] S. Mori, “On a generalization of complete intersections”, *J. Math. Kyoto Univ.* **15**:3 (1975), 619–646. MR Zbl
- [Przyjalkowski and Shramov 2016] V. Przyjalkowski and C. Shramov, “Bounds for smooth Fano weighted complete intersections”, preprint, 2016. arXiv
- [Przyjalkowski and Shramov 2017] V. Przyjalkowski and C. Shramov, “Nef partitions for codimension 2 weighted complete intersections”, preprint, 2017. arXiv
- [Reid 1980] M. Reid, “Canonical 3-folds”, pp. 273–310 in *Journées de Géométrie Algébrique* (Angers, 1979), edited by A. Beauville, Sijthoff & Noordhoff, Germantown, MD, 1980. MR Zbl
- [Reid 1983] M. Reid, “Projective morphisms according to Kawamata”, preprint, 1983, Available at <http://homepages.warwick.ac.uk/~masda/3folds/Ka.pdf>.
- [Reid 1987] M. Reid, “Young person’s guide to canonical singularities”, pp. 345–414 in *Algebraic geometry, I* (Brunswick, ME, 1985), edited by S. J. Bloch, *Proc. Sympos. Pure Math.* **46**, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1987. MR Zbl
- [Reider 1988] I. Reider, “Vector bundles of rank 2 and linear systems on algebraic surfaces”, *Ann. of Math. (2)* **127**:2 (1988), 309–316. MR Zbl
- [Sano 2014] T. Sano, “Unobstructedness of deformations of weak Fano manifolds”, *Int. Math. Res. Not.* **2014**:18 (2014), 5124–5133. MR Zbl
- [Shokurov 1979] V. V. Shokurov, “Smoothness of a general anticanonical divisor on a Fano variety”, *Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR Ser. Mat.* **43**:2 (1979), 430–441. In Russian; translation in *Math. USSR-Izv.* **14**:2 (1980), 395–405. MR Zbl
- [Xie 2009] Q. Xie, “A note on the effective non-vanishing conjecture”, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **137**:1 (2009), 61–63. MR Zbl
- [Ye and Zhu 2015] F. Ye and Z. Zhu, “On Fujita’s freeness conjecture in dimension 5”, preprint, 2015. arXiv

Communicated by Shigefumi Mori

Received 2017-03-29 Revised 2017-07-28 Accepted 2017-09-01

marco.pizzato1@gmail.com *I-39100 Bolzano, Italy*

tarosano@math.kobe-u.ac.jp *Department of Mathematics, Graduate School of Science,
Kobe University, Kobe, Japan*

ltasin@mat.uniroma3.it *Dipartimento di Matematica e Fisica, Roma Tre University,
Rome, Italy*

Algebra & Number Theory

msp.org/ant

EDITORS

MANAGING EDITOR

Bjorn Poonen
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Cambridge, USA

EDITORIAL BOARD CHAIR

David Eisenbud
University of California
Berkeley, USA

BOARD OF EDITORS

Richard E. Borcherds	University of California, Berkeley, USA	Martin Olsson	University of California, Berkeley, USA
J-L. Colliot-Thélène	CNRS, Université Paris-Sud, France	Raman Parimala	Emory University, USA
Brian D. Conrad	Stanford University, USA	Jonathan Pila	University of Oxford, UK
Samit Dasgupta	University of California, Santa Cruz, USA	Anand Pillay	University of Notre Dame, USA
Hélène Esnault	Freie Universität Berlin, Germany	Michael Rapoport	Universität Bonn, Germany
Gavril Farkas	Humboldt Universität zu Berlin, Germany	Victor Reiner	University of Minnesota, USA
Hubert Flenner	Ruhr-Universität, Germany	Peter Sarnak	Princeton University, USA
Sergey Fomin	University of Michigan, USA	Joseph H. Silverman	Brown University, USA
Edward Frenkel	University of California, Berkeley, USA	Michael Singer	North Carolina State University, USA
Andrew Granville	Université de Montréal, Canada	Christopher Skinner	Princeton University, USA
Joseph Gubeladze	San Francisco State University, USA	Vasudevan Srinivas	Tata Inst. of Fund. Research, India
Roger Heath-Brown	Oxford University, UK	J. Toby Stafford	University of Michigan, USA
Craig Huneke	University of Virginia, USA	Pham Huu Tiep	University of Arizona, USA
Kiran S. Kedlaya	Univ. of California, San Diego, USA	Ravi Vakil	Stanford University, USA
János Kollár	Princeton University, USA	Michel van den Bergh	Hasselt University, Belgium
Yuri Manin	Northwestern University, USA	Marie-France Vignéras	Université Paris VII, France
Philippe Michel	École Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne	Kei-Ichi Watanabe	Nihon University, Japan
Susan Montgomery	University of Southern California, USA	Shou-Wu Zhang	Princeton University, USA
Shigefumi Mori	RIMS, Kyoto University, Japan		

PRODUCTION

production@msp.org
Silvio Levy, Scientific Editor


See inside back cover or msp.org/ant for submission instructions.

The subscription price for 2017 is US \$325/year for the electronic version, and \$520/year (+\$55, if shipping outside the US) for print and electronic. Subscriptions, requests for back issues and changes of subscriber address should be sent to MSP.

Algebra & Number Theory (ISSN 1944-7833 electronic, 1937-0652 printed) at Mathematical Sciences Publishers, 798 Evans Hall #3840, c/o University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720-3840 is published continuously online. Periodical rate postage paid at Berkeley, CA 94704, and additional mailing offices.

ANT peer review and production are managed by EditFLOW[®] from MSP.

PUBLISHED BY

 **mathematical sciences publishers**
nonprofit scientific publishing

<http://msp.org/>

© 2017 Mathematical Sciences Publishers

Algebra & Number Theory

Volume 11 No. 10 2017

Tate cycles on some unitary Shimura varieties mod p DAVID HELM, YICHAO TIAN and LIANG XIAO	2213
Complex conjugation and Shimura varieties DON BLASIUS and LUCIO GUERBEROFF	2289
A subspace theorem for subvarieties MIN RU and JULIE TZU-YUEH WANG	2323
Variation of anticyclotomic Iwasawa invariants in Hida families FRANCESC CASTELLA, CHAN-HO KIM and MATTEO LONGO	2339
Effective nonvanishing for Fano weighted complete intersections MARCO PIZZATO, TARO SANO and LUCA TASIN	2369
Generalized Kuga–Satake theory and good reduction properties of Galois representations STEFAN PATRIKIS	2397
Remarks on the arithmetic fundamental lemma CHAO LI and YIHANG ZHU	2425



1937-0652(2017)11:10;1-7