## Maximal Quasiprojective Subsets and the Kleiman-Chevalley Quasiprojectivity Criterion

By Jarosław Włodarczyk\*

**Abstract.** We prove that any complete Q-factorial variety contains only finitely many maximal open quasiprojective subsets.

Let X be a normal variety defined over an algebraically closed field of any characteristic. By Div(X), respectively Car(X) denote the group of Weil (resp. Cartier) divisors on X. We prove the following theorem

THEOREM A. Let X be a complete normal variety such that  $(Div(X)/Car(X)) \otimes \mathbf{Q}$  is finite dimensional (in particular X can be Q-factorial or rational). Then X contains only finitely many maximal (in the sense of inclusion) open quasiprojective subsets.

REMARK. The conclusion of the above theorem holds for any open subset  $X' \subset X$ . However it is not clear that any normal variety X' such that  $(Div(X')/Car(X')) \otimes \mathbf{Q}$  is finite dimensional admits an open embedding into a complete normal variety with the above mentioned property. This is clearly true for smooth varieties defined over a field of characteristic 0. In this case we can complete our variety by the Nagata theorem (see [6]) and then apply the Hironaka resolution theorem (see [4]).

As a simple corollary of Theorem A we get

THEOREM B. Let X' be a normal variety for which there exists an open embedding  $X' \subset X$  into a complete normal variety X such that  $(Div(X)/Car(X)) \otimes \mathbf{Q}$  is finite dimensional. Then X' is quasiprojective iff any finite subset of X' is contained in some open affine subset of X'.

<sup>1991</sup> Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary 14C20; Secondary 14C22, 14C10. \*The author is in part supported by Polish KBN Grant.

This generalizes the Kleiman-Chevalley criterion stated for smooth and complete varieties. (See [5] Chapter IV, Section 2, Theorem 3 or [3] Chapter I, Section 9, Theorem 9.1.)

PROOF OF THEOREM B. Suppose X' is not quasiprojective. Then it contains finitely many maximal open quasiprojective sets  $U_1, ..., U_k$ . Let  $x_i \in X' \setminus U_i$ . Then  $\{x_1, ..., x_k\}$  is contained in some open affine subset and hence in some maximal open quasiprojective set  $U_i$ , a contradiction to the choice of  $x_1, ..., x_k$ . The converse is evident.  $\Box$ 

Theorem B can also be stated in a relative form:

THEOREM C. Let X' be as above and  $Z \subset X'$  be any subset of X'. Then Z is contained in some open quasiprojective subset  $U \subset X'$  iff any finite subset of Z is contained in some open affine subset of X'.

PROOF OF THEOREM C. Choose  $x_i \in Z \setminus X_i$  and follow the proof of Theorem B.  $\Box$ 

A consequence of Theorem B is the following

THEOREM D. Let X' be as in Theorem B and let G be a connected algebraic group acting on X'. Let  $U \subset X'$  be any open quasiprojective subset. Then  $G \cdot U$  is also quasiprojective.

REMARK. This is analogous to the Theorem of Sumihiro which says that on a normal variety with an action of a linear group G, each point has a G-invariant open quasiprojective neighbourhood (see [9]).

PROOF OF THEOREM D. Let  $\{x_1, ..., x_k\}$  be any finite subset of  $G \cdot V = \bigcup_{g \in G} g \cdot V$ . For any  $x_i$  the set  $G_i := \{g \in G : x_i \in g \cdot V\}$  is non-empty and open. Since G is connected we have  $\bigcap_{i=1}^k G_i \neq \emptyset$ . Then for any  $g \in \bigcap_{i=1}^k G_i$  we have  $\{x_1, ..., x_k\} \subset g \cdot V$ . The set  $g \cdot V$  is open quasiprojective, hence it contains an open affine set  $U \subset g \cdot V$  containing all  $x_i$ . We are done by Theorem B.  $\Box$ 

## **Proof of the Main Theorem**

PROOF OF THEOREM A. Let D be a Weil divisor on a normal variety X. We say that D is very ample on an open subset  $U \subset X$  iff there exists an open embedding of U into a projective variety Y and a very ample divisor  $D_0$  on Y such that  $D_{0|U} = D_{|U}$ . We say that D is ample on U iff a positive multiple of D is very ample on U.

For any two Weil divisors  $D_1$  and  $D_2$  on a complete normal variety X we write  $D_1 \equiv D_2$  iff  $D_1 - D_2$  is a Cartier divisor numerically equivalent to 0.

LEMMA 1. Let X be a complete normal variety,  $D_1$  and  $D_2$  be Weil divisors such that  $D_1 \equiv D_2$ . Then, for any open  $U \subset X$  the divisor  $D_1$  is ample on U iff  $D_2$  is ample on U.

PROOF. By assumption there is an ample divisor  $D_0$  on a projective variety  $X_0 \supset U$  such that the restrictions of  $D_0$  and  $D_1$  to U are equal. By a theorem of Nagata ([7] Theorem 3.2) we can find  $X^0$  containing U, dominating X and obtained from  $X_0$  by a join of finitely many blow-ups  $X_i$  with centers  $C_i$  disjoint from U. Let  $p_i : X_i \to X$  be the blow-up with center  $C_i$ . Then  $X^0 = X_1 * \ldots * X_k$ . Let  $s_i : X^0 \to X_i$  and  $p : X^0 \to X$  be the standard projections. For any  $p_i$ , let  $E_i := p_i^{-1}(C_i)$  be the exceptional divisor. Then  $-E_i$  is relatively very ample, and by [2], II, 4.6.13 (ii)  $D_i :=$  $n_i \cdot p_i^*(D_0) - E_i$  is very ample for  $n_i >> 0$ . Finally,  $D := \sum_{i=1}^k s_i^*(D_i)$  is ample on  $X^0$ . Note that  $D_{|U} = mD_{1|U}$  for  $m = n_1 + \ldots + n_k$ . The Cartier divisor  $D' := D + m \cdot p^*(D_2 - D_1)$  is numerically equivalent to D, hence it is ample by the Seshadri criterion ([8]). But  $D'_{|U} = mD_{2|U}$ .  $\Box$ 

LEMMA 2. Let X be a normal variety. Assume that D is ample on both  $U_1$  and  $U_2$ . If  $(U_1 \setminus U_2) \cup (U_2 \setminus U_1)$  is of codimension at least 2 in  $U_1 \cup U_2$ , then D is ample on  $U_1 \cup U_2$ .

PROOF. We can choose n >> 0 such that nD has no base points on  $U_1 \cup U_2$ , and sections of nD intersect properly each curve meeting  $U_1 \cup U_2$ . Thus nD defines a quasifinite morphism  $p: U_1 \cup U_2 \to \mathbf{P}(nD)$ . By the Zariski Theorem we can factor p as  $U_1 \cup U_2 \xrightarrow{i} Z \xrightarrow{\pi} \mathbf{P}(nD)$  where i is an open immersion and  $\pi$  is finite. Then  $nD = \pi^*(O(1))_{|U_1 \cup U_2}$  is ample because  $\pi$  preserves ampleness (see [3], Chapter 1, Proposition 4.4).  $\Box$  LEMMA 3 (Z.Jelonek). Let X be any normal variety and  $U \subseteq X$  be maximal open quasiprojective. Then  $X \setminus U$  is of codimension at least 2.

PROOF. We may assume X to be complete. By the Nagata theorem there is a projective  $X^0$  containing U and dominating X. Let  $p: X^0 \to X$ be the standard projection. Then  $p^{-1}$  defines an open embedding into the projective variety  $X^0$  outside the exceptional locus S, which by normality and the Zariski theorem, is of codimension  $\geq 2$  in X ([10]). Hence  $X \setminus S$  is quasiprojective and contains U. By maximality,  $U = X \setminus S$ .  $\Box$ 

From now on, let X be a complete normal variety with  $\dim_{\mathbf{Q}}((Div(X)/Car(X)) \otimes \mathbf{Q}) < \infty$ . For a complete variety X let  $r = r(X) := \dim((Div(X)/\equiv) \otimes \mathbf{Q})$  where  $\equiv$  has been defined before. This is a finite number by finiteness of  $\dim_{\mathbf{Q}}((Div(X)/Car(X)) \otimes \mathbf{Q})$  and  $\dim_{\mathbf{Q}}((Car(X)/\equiv) \otimes \mathbf{Q})$  (see [5]).

LEMMA 4. Let  $X' \subset X$  be an open subset and let  $U_1, ..., U_s$  with s > rbe open quasiprojective subsets of X'. Assume  $X' \setminus U_i$  is of codimension at least 2 in X'. Then for some pairwise distinct indices  $i_1, ..., i_k, i_{k+1}, ..., i_{s'} \in$  $\{1, ..., s\}$  where  $1 \leq k < s'$  the set  $U := (U_{i_1} \cap ... \cap U_{i_k}) \cup (U_{i_{k+1}} \cap ... \cap U_{i_s})$ is quasiprojective.

PROOF. Let  $D_i$  be a divisor on X such that  $D_i$  is ample on  $U_i$ . Then we can find  $i_1, ..., i_k, i_{k+1}, ..., i_{s'}$  such that  $\sum_{j=1}^k n_{i_j} D_{i_j} \equiv \sum_{j=k+1}^s n_{i_j} D_{i_j}$  with all  $n_{i_j}$  positive. Note that by Lemmas 1 and 2,  $\sum_{j=1}^k n_{i_j} D_{i_j}$  is ample on U.  $\Box$ 

LEMMA 5. Let  $U_1, ..., U_s$  be open quasiprojective sets of X' as above. Assume  $X' \setminus U_i$  are of dimension  $\leq l \leq \dim(X) - 2$  and have no common components. Let U be as in the statement of Lemma 4. Then  $\dim(X' \setminus U) \leq l-1$ .

**PROOF.** Follows directly from the definition of U.  $\Box$ 

Now we prove Theorem A along the following lines. Given a variety X (not necessarily complete) satisfying the condition

(\*) X contains infinitely many maximal open quasiprojective subsets.

Let l(X) be the maximal dimension of their complements. We will construct an open subset  $X' \subset X$  such that X' satisfies (\*) and that l(X') < l(X).

Set  $n = \dim(X)$ . We say that an open subset U of X has property P(k) for  $-1 \le k \le n-1$  iff

1. dim $X \setminus U \leq k$ 

2. Each component of dimension k of  $X \setminus U$  is contained in the complements of only finitely many maximal open quasiprojective sets.

(We mean here that  $\dim(\emptyset) = -1$ .)

Let  $U_1^{n-2}$  be a maximal open quasiprojective subset of X. By Lemma 3 we see that  $\dim X \setminus U_1^{n-2} \leq n-2$ . Remove from X, one by one, all components of  $X \setminus U_1^{n-2}$  which are of dimension n-2 and contained in the complement of infinitely many maximal open quasiprojective sets. As a result we get X' such that  $U_1^{n-2} \subset X' \subset X$  and X' satisfies (\*). Observe that  $U_1^{n-2}$  has property P(n-2) on X'. By abuse of notation write X for X'. Because of (\*) and by the fact that  $U_1^{n-2}$  has property P(n-2) on the new X, we can find open quasiprojective  $U_2^{n-2}$  in the new X for which  $X \setminus U_1^{n-2}$  and  $X \setminus U_2^{n-2}$  have no common component of dimension n-2. By an analogous procedure of removing components we can assume that  $U_2^{n-2}$  has property P(n-2) on some new X' satisfying (\*). Again we rename X' as X.

Continuing this process we find  $U_1^{n-2}, U_2^{n-2}, ..., U_{r+1}^{n-2}$  such that all sets satisfy condition P(n-2) on the varying X, and  $X \setminus U_i^{n-2}$  for i = 1, ..., r+1 have no common component.

Note that by shrinking X we are also shrinking its open subsets  $U_1^{n-2}$ ,  $U_2^{n-2}$ , ...,  $U_{r+1}^{n-2}$ . However all these subsets are still quasiprojective and have property P(n-2) on shrinked X, and X still satisfies condition (\*).

Apply Lemma 4 to the sets  $U_1^{n-2}, ..., U_{r+1}^{n-2}$  and call the resulting set  $U_1^{n-3}$ . By Lemma 5 dim $X \setminus U_1^{n-3} \leq n-3$ . As before by removing "bad" components of dimension n-3 we can assume that  $U_1^{n-3}$  has property P(n-3). Now we construct  $U_{r+1}^{n-2}, ..., U_{2r+2}^{n-2}$  which satisfy condition P(n-2) on X and such that the  $X \setminus U_i^{n-2}$  have no common components and do not contain any components of dimension n-3 of  $X \setminus U_1^{n-3}$ . The last condition can be maintained since  $U_1^{n-3}$  has property P(n-3). Then we find  $U_2^{n-3} = U$  for  $U_{r+1}^{n-2}, ..., U_{2r+2}^{n-3}$  as in Lemma 4. Again by continuing this process we construct  $U_1^{n-3}, U_2^{n-3}, ..., U_{r+1}^{n-3}$  and then find  $U_1^{n-4}$  and so on. Finally we get quasiprojective  $X = U_1^{-1}$  containing infinitely many maximal quasipro-

jective sets.  $\Box$ 

REMARK. As was noted by Z.Jelonek one can easily prove Theorem A for smooth normal surfaces.

PROOF. Let X be a normal surface. Then X contains finitely many singular points  $\{x_1, ..., x_n\}$ . Let  $U \subset X$  be a maximal open quasiprojective subset. Resolve all singular points which are not in U. We get a variety  $\tilde{X}$ which is projective by a Zariski theorem ([11]). Let  $V := X \setminus \{x_1, ..., x_n\} \setminus U$ . Then  $U \subseteq V \subseteq X$  and by the above  $V \subseteq \tilde{X}$  is quasiprojective. Finally U = V by the maximality of U.  $\Box$ 

Acknowledgements. Theorem A was conjectured by Professor Andrzej Białynicki-Birula (in the case when X is smooth or normal) (see [1]). I thank Zbigniew Jelonek from Uniwersytet Jagielloński (Kraków) for numerous discussions which were very stimulating for me. He has independently obtained Theorem A under the condition that the vector space  $Cl(X) \otimes \mathbf{Q}$ is finite dimensional and in the above mentioned case of normal surface. On the other hand by slight modification of the proof one can prove Theorem A in the case when X is normal and contains only isolated singularities. I would also like to thank Michel Brion, Gottfried Barthel, Michał Szurek and Jarosław Wiśniewski for advice and help.

## References

- [1] Białynicki-Birula, A., Finiteness of the number of maximal open subsets with good quotients, preprint.
- [2] Grothendieck, A., EGA Eléments de géométrie algébrique, Publ. Math. IHES.
- [3] Hartshorne, R., Ample subvarieties of algebraic varieties, Lecture Notes in Mathematics 156, Springer-Verlag Berlin-Heidelberg, (1970).
- [4] Hironaka, H., Resolution of singularities of an algebraic variety over a field of characteristic zero, I, II Annals of Math. 79 (1964), 109–203, 205–326, MR 33:7333.
- [5] Kleiman, S. L., Towards a numerical theory of ampleness, Ann. of Math. 84 (1966), 293–344.
- [6] Nagata, M., Imbeddings of an abstract variety in a complete variety, J. Math. Kyoto Univ. (1962), 1–10.

- [7] Nagata, M., On rational surfaces I, Mem. Coll. Sci. Kyoto A32 (1960), 351– 370.
- [8] Seshadri, C. S., L'opération de Cartier. Applications. Exposé 6 Séminaire C. Chevalley, Variétés de Picard, 3 (1958–1959).
- [9] Sumihiro, H., Equivariant completion, J. Math. Kyoto Univ. 13 (1974), 1–28.
- [10] Zariski, O., Complete linear systems on normal varieties and a generalization of a Lemma of Enriques-Severi, Ann. of Math. **55** (1952), 552–592.
- [11] Zariski, O., Introduction to the problem of minimal model in the theory of algebraic surfaces, Publ. Math. Soc. Jap. 4 (1958).

(Received September 4, 1998)

Instytut Matematyki UW Banacha 2 02-097 Warszawa, Poland E-mail: jwlodar@mimuw.edu.pl