Torelli problem for arrangements of hypersurfaces

Joint International Meeting American Mathematical Society & Romanian Mathematical Society.

Special session Geometry and Topology of Arrangements of Hypersurfaces

Daniele Faenzi

Université de Pau E. Angelini (Firenze) + D.F. (Pau) & G. Ottaviani (Firenze) arXiv:1304.5709

Alba Iulia, June 29, 2013

200

イロト イポト イヨト イヨト



< 口 > < 同

- 1 Divisors in projective space
- 2 Logarithmic derivations and 1-forms

Ξ

4 ∃ > < ∃ >

< 口 > < 同

990

- 1 Divisors in projective space
- 2 Logarithmic derivations and 1-forms
- 3 Torelli problem

3

∃ ► < ∃ ►</p>

< 口 > < 同

590

- 1 Divisors in projective space
- 2 Logarithmic derivations and 1-forms
- 3 Torelli problem
- Torelli theorem 4

3

990

 $\exists \rightarrow$

- 1 Divisors in projective space
- 2 Logarithmic derivations and 1-forms
- 3 Torelli problem
- Torelli theorem 4
- Fibres of Torelli map 5

-

3

Arrangements of hypersurfaces

Arrangement D of hypersurfaces in \mathbb{P}^n .

• D is a collection $D = (D_1, \dots, D_m)$ of hypersurfaces D_i of \mathbb{P}^n . Each D_i is *irreducible and reduced*.

Jac.

イロト イポト イヨト イヨト 二日

Arrangements of hypersurfaces

Arrangement D of hypersurfaces in \mathbb{P}^n .

D is a collection D = (D₁,..., D_m) of hypersurfaces D_i of Pⁿ. Each D_i is *irreducible and reduced*.
Notation. S = C[x₀,...,x_n]. f_i equation of D_i. f = ∏ f_i. d_i = deg(f_i). d = ∑d_i. Ď_i = [f_i] ∈ P(S_i).

Arrangements of hypersurfaces

Arrangement D of hypersurfaces in \mathbb{P}^n .

- D is a collection D = (D₁,..., D_m) of hypersurfaces D_i of ℙⁿ. Each D_i is *irreducible and reduced*.
 Notation. S = ℂ[x₀,..., x_n]. f_i equation of D_i. f = ∏ f_i.
 - $d_i = \deg(f_i). \quad d = \sum d_i. \quad \check{D}_i = [f_i] \in \mathbb{P}(S_i).$
- D can have normal crossings (NC) or not.



▲ロ ▶ ▲帰 ▶ ▲ 国 ▶ ▲ 国 ▶ ● ● ● ● ● ●

Logarithmic vector fields

Bundle (or sheaf) $\mathcal{T}(-\log D)$.

• $\mathcal{T}(-\log D) =$ vector fields with logarithmic poles along D. Sheaf associated with *S*-module of logarithmic derivations of D:

$$Der(D) = \{\theta = \sum p_i \partial_i \mid \theta(f) \in (f)\}.$$

イロト 不得 トイヨト イヨト 二日

Logarithmic vector fields

Bundle (or sheaf) $\mathcal{T}(-\log D)$.

• $\mathcal{T}(-\log D) =$ vector fields with logarithmic poles along D. Sheaf associated with S-module of logarithmic derivations of D:

$$Der(D) = \{\theta = \sum p_i \partial_i \mid \theta(f) \in (f)\}.$$

 $\mathcal{T}(-\log D)$ sheafification of $\operatorname{Der}(D)/\sum x_i\partial_i$.

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲三▶ ▲三▶ 三三 ろの⊙

Logarithmic vector fields

Bundle (or sheaf) $\mathcal{T}(-\log D)$.

• $\mathcal{T}(-\log D) =$ vector fields with logarithmic poles along D. Sheaf associated with S-module of logarithmic derivations of D:

$$Der(D) = \{\theta = \sum p_i \partial_i \mid \theta(f) \in (f)\}.$$

 $\mathcal{T}(-\log D)$ sheafification of $\operatorname{Der}(D)/\sum x_i\partial_i$.

• Syzygy of Jacobian ideal J_D .

$$0 \to \mathcal{T}(-\log D) \to \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n}^{n+1} \xrightarrow{(\partial_0 f, \dots, \partial_n f)} J_D(d-1) \to 0.$$

Daniele Faenzi (Université de Pau)

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲三▶ ▲三▶ 三三 ろの⊙

Logarithmic 1-forms

Meromorphic 1-forms with logarithmic poles along D is:

 $\Omega(\log D) = \mathcal{T}(-\log D)^*(-1).$

For NC arrangements: residue exact sequence

$$0 \to \Omega \to \Omega(\log D) \to \bigoplus \mathcal{O}_{D_i} \to 0.$$

500

<ロト < 団ト < 団ト < 団ト < 団ト = 三</p>

Logarithmic 1-forms

Meromorphic 1-forms with logarithmic poles along D is:

 $\Omega(\log D) = \mathcal{T}(-\log D)^*(-1).$

For NC arrangements: residue exact sequence

$$0 \to \Omega \to \Omega(\log D) \to \bigoplus \mathcal{O}_{D_i} \to 0.$$

For general arrangements: Dolgachev's sheaf $\hat{\Omega}(\log D)$. Non-reflexive sheaf $\tilde{\Omega}(\log D)$. $\mathcal{T}(-\log D) \simeq \tilde{\Omega}(\log D)^*(-1)$.

Logarithmic 1-forms

Meromorphic 1-forms with logarithmic poles along D is:

 $\Omega(\log D) = \mathcal{T}(-\log D)^*(-1).$

For NC arrangements: residue exact sequence

$$0 \to \Omega \to \Omega(\log D) \to \bigoplus \mathcal{O}_{D_i} \to 0.$$

For general arrangements: Dolgachev's sheaf $\hat{\Omega}(\log D)$. Non-reflexive sheaf $\tilde{\Omega}(\log D)$. $\mathcal{T}(-\log D) \simeq \tilde{\Omega}(\log D)^*(-1)$. $\nu : \tilde{\mathbb{P}}^n \to \mathbb{P}^n$ log-resolution of D. Smooth $\tilde{D} \to D$. $0 \to \Omega \to \tilde{\Omega}(\log D) \to \nu_* \mathcal{O}_{\tilde{D}} \to 0$.

Resolution of
$$\mathcal{T}(-\log D)$$

If D is NC, then we have a (perhaps non-minimal) resolution:

$$0 \to \mathcal{T}(-\log D) \to \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n}^{n+1} \oplus \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n}(-1)^{m-1} \to \oplus_i \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n}(d_i - 1) \to 0.$$

3

Sar

イロト イポト イヨト イヨト

Resolution of
$$\mathcal{T}(-\log D)$$

If D is NC, then we have a (perhaps non-minimal) resolution:

$$0 \to \mathcal{T}(-\log D) \to \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n}^{n+1} \oplus \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n}(-1)^{m-1} \to \oplus_i \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n}(d_i - 1) \to 0.$$

Consequences

• In terms of $\Omega(\log D)$: $0 \to \bigoplus_i \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n}(-d_i) \to \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n}^{n+1}(-1) \oplus \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n}^{m-1} \to \Omega(\log D) \to 0.$

Resolution of
$$\mathcal{T}(-\log D)$$

If D is NC, then we have a (perhaps non-minimal) resolution:

$$0 \to \mathcal{T}(-\log D) \to \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n}^{n+1} \oplus \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n}(-1)^{m-1} \to \oplus_i \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n}(d_i - 1) \to 0.$$

Consequences

- In terms of $\Omega(\log D)$: $0 \to \bigoplus_i \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n}(-d_i) \to \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n}^{n+1}(-1) \oplus \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n}^{m-1} \to \Omega(\log D) \to 0.$
- Bonhost-Spindler. $\mathcal{T}(-\log D)$ is stable if d > n + 1. This means any sub-bundle of smaller rank has smaller slope c_1/rk .

Resolution of
$$\mathcal{T}(-\log D)$$

If D is NC, then we have a (perhaps non-minimal) resolution:

 $0 \to \mathcal{T}(-\log D) \to \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n}^{n+1} \oplus \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n}(-1)^{m-1} \to \oplus_i \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n}(d_i - 1) \to 0.$

Consequences

- In terms of $\Omega(\log D)$: $0 \to \bigoplus_i \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n}(-d_i) \to \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n}^{n+1}(-1) \oplus \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n}^{m-1} \to \Omega(\log D) \to 0.$
- Bonhost-Spindler. $\mathcal{T}(-\log D)$ is stable if d > n + 1. This means any sub-bundle of smaller rank has smaller slope c_1/rk .
- Moduli space of semistable bundle with fixed Chern polynomial c is a projective variety ${\cal M}(c).$

Resolution of
$$\mathcal{T}(-\log D)$$

If D is NC, then we have a (perhaps non-minimal) resolution:

 $0 \to \mathcal{T}(-\log D) \to \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n}^{n+1} \oplus \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n}(-1)^{m-1} \to \oplus_i \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n}(d_i - 1) \to 0.$

Consequences

- In terms of $\Omega(\log D)$: $0 \to \bigoplus_i \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n}(-d_i) \to \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n}^{n+1}(-1) \oplus \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n}^{m-1} \to \Omega(\log D) \to 0.$
- Bonhost-Spindler. $\mathcal{T}(-\log D)$ is stable if d > n + 1. This means any sub-bundle of smaller rank has smaller slope c_1/rk .
- Moduli space of semistable bundle with fixed Chern polynomial c is a projective variety M(c). $\check{D}_i \in \mathbb{P}(S_i)$. Rational map:

$$\omega: \prod \mathbb{P}(S_i) \dashrightarrow M(c). \qquad (\check{D}) \mapsto \Omega(\log D).$$

Torelli problem in general

Is D Torelli, i.e. Does $\tilde{\Omega}(\log D)$ determine D? Is ω injective?

200

<ロト < 団ト < 団ト < 団ト < 団ト = 三</p>

Torelli problem in general

Is D Torelli, i.e. Does $\tilde{\Omega}(\log D)$ determine D? Is ω injective?

Torelli theorems

2 Smooth *D* is Torelli iff *D* not Thom-Sebastiani (Ueda-Yoshinaga), $f = f_1(x_0, \ldots, x_k) + f_2(x_{k+1}, \ldots, x_n).$

Torelli problem in general

Is D Torelli, i.e. Does $\tilde{\Omega}(\log D)$ determine D? Is ω injective?

Torelli theorems

- (1) Smooth D is Torelli iff D not Thom-Sebastiani (Ueda-Yoshinaga), $f = f_1(x_0, \ldots, x_k) + f_2(x_{k+1}, \ldots, x_n).$
- 2 NC hyperplane arrangement is Torelli iff D_i don't osculate RNC (Dolgachev-Kapranov, Vallès).

Torelli problem in general

Is D Torelli, i.e. Does $\tilde{\Omega}(\log D)$ determine D? Is ω injective?

Torelli theorems

- (1) Smooth D is Torelli iff D not Thom-Sebastiani (Ueda-Yoshinaga), $f = f_1(x_0, \ldots, x_k) + f_2(x_{k+1}, \ldots, x_n).$
- ② NC hyperplane arrangement is Torelli iff D_i don't osculate RNC (Dolgachev-Kapranov, Vallès). Dually, the points \check{D}_i of $\mathbb{P}(S_1) = \check{\mathbb{P}}^n$ do not lie in a RNC $\mathbb{P}^1 \to \mathbb{P}^n$ by $[s^n : s^{n-1}t : \ldots : t^n]$.

Torelli problem in general

Is D Torelli, i.e. Does $\tilde{\Omega}(\log D)$ determine D? Is ω injective?

Torelli theorems

- (1) Smooth D is Torelli iff D not Thom-Sebastiani (Ueda-Yoshinaga), $f = f_1(x_0, \ldots, x_k) + f_2(x_{k+1}, \ldots, x_n).$
- ② NC hyperplane arrangement is Torelli iff D_i don't osculate RNC (Dolgachev-Kapranov, Vallès). Dually, the points \check{D}_i of $\mathbb{P}(S_1) = \check{\mathbb{P}}^n$ do not lie in a RNC $\mathbb{P}^1 \to \mathbb{P}^n$ by $[s^n : s^{n-1}t : \ldots : t^n]$.
- ③ hyperplane arrangement is Torelli iff Ď_i not on a KW variety: minors of Oⁿ(-1) → O² (D.F.-Matei-Vallès).



Torelli fails for $\Omega(\log D)$ more often than $\tilde{\Omega}(\log D)$.

Free divisors

 $9\ {\rm flexes}$ of a smooth plane cubic.



Torelli fails for $\Omega(\log D)$ more often than $\tilde{\Omega}(\log D)$.

Free divisors

9 flexes of a smooth plane cubic.



• $0 \to \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(-1)^6 \to \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}^8 \to \tilde{\Omega}(\log D) \to 0$, so $c_2 = 21$;

Torelli fails for $\Omega(\log D)$ more often than $\tilde{\Omega}(\log D)$.

Free divisors

9 flexes of a smooth plane cubic.



• $0 \to \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(-1)^6 \to \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}^8 \to \tilde{\Omega}(\log D) \to 0$, so $c_2 = 21$; • $\Omega(\log D) \cong \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(3)^2$ (free!);

Torelli fails for $\Omega(\log D)$ more often than $\tilde{\Omega}(\log D)$.

Free divisors

9 flexes of a smooth plane cubic.



- $0 \to \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(-1)^6 \to \mathcal{O}^8_{\mathbb{P}^2} \to \tilde{\Omega}(\log D) \to 0$, so $c_2 = 21$;
- $\Omega(\log D) \cong \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(3)^2$ (free!);
- Difference of 12 between $c_2(\Omega(\log D))$ and $c_2(\tilde{\Omega}(\log D))$.



Too small divisors

• One smooth quadric D, then $\mathcal{T}(-\log D) \simeq \Omega(1)$ (polar).

三

Sac

イロト イポト イヨト イヨト

Too small divisors

• One smooth quadric D, then $\mathcal{T}(-\log D) \simeq \Omega(1)$ (polar).

Too small moduli

Too small divisors

• One smooth quadric D, then $\mathcal{T}(-\log D) \simeq \Omega(1)$ (polar).

Too small moduli

• Example: one conic and $1 \le m \le 3$ lines then $\prod \mathbb{P}(S_i) > \dim M(c)$.

イロト イポト イヨト イヨト 二日

Too small divisors

• One smooth quadric D, then $\mathcal{T}(-\log D) \simeq \Omega(1)$ (polar).

Too small moduli

• Example: one conic and $1 \le m \le 3$ lines then $\prod \mathbb{P}(S_i) > \dim M(c)$. For instance 1 conic 3 lines: 11 parameters, $\dim(M(c)) = 9$.

・ロト ・ 同ト ・ ヨト ・ ヨト

Too small divisors

• One smooth quadric D, then $\mathcal{T}(-\log D) \simeq \Omega(1)$ (polar).

Too small moduli

• Example: one conic and $1 \le m \le 3$ lines then $\prod \mathbb{P}(S_i) > \dim M(c)$. For instance 1 conic 3 lines: 11 parameters, $\dim(M(c)) = 9$.

• Look at fibre of ω to see "periods".

イロト イポト イヨト イヨト 二日

Too small divisors

• One smooth quadric D, then $\mathcal{T}(-\log D) \simeq \Omega(1)$ (polar).

Too small moduli

- Example: one conic and $1 \le m \le 3$ lines then $\prod \mathbb{P}(S_i) > \dim M(c)$. For instance 1 conic 3 lines: 11 parameters, $\dim(M(c)) = 9$.
- Look at fibre of ω to see "periods".

Rational normal curves

イロト イポト イヨト イヨト 二日

Too small divisors

• One smooth quadric D, then $\mathcal{T}(-\log D) \simeq \Omega(1)$ (polar).

Too small moduli

- Example: one conic and $1 \le m \le 3$ lines then $\prod \mathbb{P}(S_i) > \dim M(c)$. For instance 1 conic 3 lines: 11 parameters, $\dim(M(c)) = 9$.
- Look at fibre of ω to see "periods".

Rational normal curves

• Take C RNC in $\mathbb{P}(S_1) = \check{\mathbb{P}}^n$: any set \check{D} of m points on C gives same $\Omega(\log D)$.

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲三▶ ▲三▶ 三三 ろの⊙

Too small divisors

• One smooth quadric D, then $\mathcal{T}(-\log D) \simeq \Omega(1)$ (polar).

Too small moduli

- Example: one conic and $1 \le m \le 3$ lines then $\prod \mathbb{P}(S_i) > \dim M(c)$. For instance 1 conic 3 lines: 11 parameters, $\dim(M(c)) = 9$.
- Look at fibre of ω to see "periods".

Rational normal curves

- Take C RNC in $\mathbb{P}(S_1) = \check{\mathbb{P}}^n$: any set \check{D} of m points on C gives same $\Omega(\log D)$.
- Totally non-Torelli non-NC arrangements iff \check{D} contained in a tree of rational curves.

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲三▶ ▲三▶ 三三 ろの⊙

Theorem (D.F.-Angelini)

Assume $m_d \gg n$ for all d and each D_i general enough. Then D is Torelli.

Sac

イロト イポト イヨト イヨト 二日

Theorem (D.F.-Angelini)

Assume $m_d \gg n$ for all d and each D_i general enough. Then D is Torelli.

Theorem (D.F.-Angelini)

Assume $m_d \gg n$ for all d and each D_i general enough. Then D is Torelli.

Proof for a single m_d .

1) Set $m_d = m$. Take $V_d^n \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}^N$ d-th Veronese of \mathbb{P}^n .

Theorem (D.F.-Angelini)

Assume $m_d \gg n$ for all d and each D_i general enough. Then D is Torelli.

- 1 Set $m_d = m$. Take $V_d^n \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}^N$ d-th Veronese of \mathbb{P}^n .
- 2 Each D_i is $H_i \subset \mathbb{P}^N$. Take $\mathcal{D} = (H_1, \dots, H_m)$. $\mathcal{D} \cap V_{n,d} = D$.

Theorem (D.F.-Angelini)

Assume $m_d \gg n$ for all d and each D_i general enough. Then D is Torelli.

- **1** Set $m_d = m$. Take $V_d^n \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}^N d$ -th Veronese of \mathbb{P}^n .
- ② Each D_i is $H_i \subset \mathbb{P}^N$. Take $\mathcal{D} = (H_1, \dots, H_m)$. $\mathcal{D} \cap V_{n,d} = D$.
- 3 *H* hyperplane in \mathbb{P}^N unstable for \mathcal{D} if $H^0(\Omega(\log \mathcal{D})^*|_H) \neq 0$.

Theorem (D.F.-Angelini)

Assume $m_d \gg n$ for all d and each D_i general enough. Then D is Torelli.

- **1** Set $m_d = m$. Take $V_d^n \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}^N$ d-th Veronese of \mathbb{P}^n .
- ② Each D_i is $H_i \subset \mathbb{P}^N$. Take $\mathcal{D} = (H_1, \dots, H_m)$. $\mathcal{D} \cap V_{n,d} = D$.
- 3 *H* hyperplane in \mathbb{P}^N unstable for \mathcal{D} if $H^0(\Omega(\log \mathcal{D})^*|_H) \neq 0$.
- ④ $W_{\mathcal{D}}$ =unstable hyps of \mathcal{D} . So D Torelli if $D = W_{\mathcal{D}}$. Always $D \subseteq W_{\mathcal{D}}$.

Theorem (D.F.-Angelini)

Assume $m_d \gg n$ for all d and each D_i general enough. Then D is Torelli.

- (1) Set $m_d = m$. Take $V_d^n \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}^N$ d-th Veronese of \mathbb{P}^n .
- ② Each D_i is $H_i \subset \mathbb{P}^N$. Take $\mathcal{D} = (H_1, \dots, H_m)$. $\mathcal{D} \cap V_{n,d} = D$.
- 3 *H* hyperplane in \mathbb{P}^N unstable for \mathcal{D} if $H^0(\Omega(\log \mathcal{D})^*|_H) \neq 0$.
- ④ $W_{\mathcal{D}}$ =unstable hyps of \mathcal{D} . So D Torelli if $D = W_{\mathcal{D}}$. Always $D \subseteq W_{\mathcal{D}}$.
- S Normal bundle sequence:

$$0 \to \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^n}(\log D)^* \to \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^N}(\log \mathcal{D})^*|_{V_d^n} \to \mathcal{N}_{V_d^n} \to 0$$

Proof for a single $m = m_d$ (continued).

Proof for a single $m = m_d$ (continued).

 $\ \, {\it O} \ \, C \ \, {\rm unstable \ \, hypersurface \ \, for \ \, } \Omega(\log D)$

 \Rightarrow unstable hyperplane H of \mathcal{D} . Lift global section:

 $\Omega_{\mathbb{P}^n}(\log D)^*|_C$

Proof for a single $m = m_d$ (continued).

 $\begin{tabular}{ll} \hline 0 & C \mbox{ unstable hypersurface for } \Omega(\log D) \end{tabular} \end{tabular}$

 \Rightarrow unstable hyperplane H of \mathcal{D} . Lift global section:

 $\Omega_{\mathbb{P}^n}(\log D)^*|_C \Rightarrow \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^N}(\log \mathcal{D})^*|_{V^n_d \cap H}$

Proof for a single $m = m_d$ (continued).

• C unstable hypersurface for $\Omega(\log D)$

 \Rightarrow unstable hyperplane *H* of *D*. *Lift global section*:

 $\Omega_{\mathbb{P}^n}(\log D)^*|_C \Rightarrow \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^N}(\log \mathcal{D})^*|_{V^n_d \cap H} \Rightarrow \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^N}(\log \mathcal{D})^*|_H.$

Proof for a single $m = m_d$ (continued).

• C unstable hypersurface for $\Omega(\log D)$ \Rightarrow unstable hyperplane H of D. Lift global section:

 $\Omega_{\mathbb{P}^n}(\log D)^*|_C \Rightarrow \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^N}(\log \mathcal{D})^*|_{V^n_d \cap H} \Rightarrow \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^N}(\log \mathcal{D})^*|_H.$

7 It's ok if $H^1(\Omega_{\mathbb{P}^n}(\log D)^*|_H \otimes \mathcal{I}_{V_d^n}) = 0$. Tensor product of $\Omega_{\mathbb{P}^n}(\log D)^*|_H$ and ideal sequence:

$$0 \to \mathcal{I}_{V_d^n} \to \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^N} \to \mathcal{O}_{V_d^n} \to 0.$$

Proof for a single $m = m_d$ (continued).

• C unstable hypersurface for $\Omega(\log D)$ \Rightarrow unstable hyperplane H of D. Lift global section:

 $\Omega_{\mathbb{P}^n}(\log D)^*|_C \Rightarrow \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^N}(\log \mathcal{D})^*|_{V^n_d \cap H} \Rightarrow \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^N}(\log \mathcal{D})^*|_H.$

7 It's ok if $H^1(\Omega_{\mathbb{P}^n}(\log D)^*|_H \otimes \mathcal{I}_{V_d^n}) = 0$. Tensor product of $\Omega_{\mathbb{P}^n}(\log D)^*|_H$ and ideal sequence:

$$0 \to \mathcal{I}_{V_d^n} \to \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^N} \to \mathcal{O}_{V_d^n} \to 0.$$

⁽³⁾ Tensor product of $\mathcal{O}_H \otimes \mathcal{I}_{V_d^n}$ and of *Steiner resolution*:

$$0 \to \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^n}(\log D)^* \to \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^N}^{m-1} \to \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^N}^{m-N-1}(1) \to 0.$$

For more m_d 's

(9) Work in the product $\prod_d \mathbb{P}^{N_d}$ and embed by Segre-Veronese.

$$\Omega_{\mathbb{P}^n}(\log D)^* \subset \bigoplus_d \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^{N_d}}(\log \mathcal{D}_d)^*|_{V_d^n}$$

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □

For more m_d 's

(9) Work in the product $\prod_d \mathbb{P}^{N_d}$ and embed by Segre-Veronese.

$$\Omega_{\mathbb{P}^n}(\log D)^* \subset \bigoplus_d \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^{N_d}}(\log \mathcal{D}_d)^*|_{V_d^n}$$

10 Reduce by divisor $D' \subset D$ of highest degree d and iterate.

$$D' = \bigcup_{\deg(D_i)=d} D_i,$$

$$0 \to \Omega(\log(D \setminus D')) \to \Omega(\log D) \to \bigoplus_{\deg(D_i)=d} \mathcal{O}_{D_i} \to 0.$$

Daniele Faenzi (Université de Pau)

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

Logarithmic derivations for two conics

Two conics, three points, 4 lines

2 smooth transverse conics C, D in \mathbb{P}^2 give 4 bitangents H_1, \ldots, H_4 .

イモトイモト

Logarithmic derivations for two conics

Two conics, three points, 4 lines

2 smooth transverse conics C, D in \mathbb{P}^2 give 4 bitangents H_1, \ldots, H_4 .



Logarithmic derivations for two conics

Two conics, three points, 4 lines

2 smooth transverse conics C, D in \mathbb{P}^2 give 4 bitangents H_1, \ldots, H_4 .



Theorem (Angelini) D' gives $\mathcal{T}(-\log D') \simeq \mathcal{T}(-\log D)$ iff 4 bitangents to D' are H_1, \ldots, H_4 . Sac イロト イポト イヨト イヨト Alba Iulia, June 29, 2013 13 / 13

Daniele Faenzi (Université de Pau)

On Torelli problem

• Find optimal bounds on the number m_d of general hypersurfaces for Torelli to hold.

3

∃ ≥ < ∃</p>

On Torelli problem

• Find optimal bounds on the number m_d of general hypersurfaces for Torelli to hold. First open cases: 3 conics should be Torelli (almost proved); 4 lines and a conic, etc.

A E + A E +

On Torelli problem

- Find optimal bounds on the number m_d of general hypersurfaces for Torelli to hold. First open cases: 3 conics should be Torelli (almost proved); 4 lines and a conic, etc.
- Describe fibres of ω below these bounds.

* E > < E >

On Torelli problem

- Find optimal bounds on the number m_d of general hypersurfaces for Torelli to hold. First open cases: 3 conics should be Torelli (almost proved); 4 lines and a conic, etc.
- Describe fibres of ω below these bounds.
- Give conditions for Torelli failure above the bounds.

- < E > < E >

On Torelli problem

- Find optimal bounds on the number m_d of general hypersurfaces for Torelli to hold. First open cases: 3 conics should be Torelli (almost proved); 4 lines and a conic, etc.
- ${\ }$ Describe fibres of ω below these bounds.
- Give conditions for Torelli failure above the bounds.

On resolutions

• Study arrangements having J_D of low projective dimension (e.g. free arrangements pd = 1 and so on).

イロト イロト イヨト イヨト 二日

On Torelli problem

- Find optimal bounds on the number m_d of general hypersurfaces for Torelli to hold. First open cases: 3 conics should be Torelli (almost proved); 4 lines and a conic, etc.
- $\bullet\,$ Describe fibres of ω below these bounds.
- Give conditions for Torelli failure above the bounds.

On resolutions

- Study arrangements having J_D of low projective dimension (e.g. free arrangements pd = 1 and so on).
- What is $\Omega(\log D)$ when D is an invariant hypersurface? Example: discriminant of binary forms, determinant of $n \times n$ matrices, etc.

イロト イポト イヨト イヨト 二日