

THE ACTION ON COHOMOLOGY BY COMPOSITIONS OF RATIONAL MAPS

ROLAND K. W. ROEDER

ABSTRACT. We use intuitive results from algebraic topology and intersection theory to clarify the pullback action on cohomology by compositions of rational maps. We use these techniques to prove a simple sufficient criterion for functoriality of a composition of two rational maps on all degrees of cohomology and we then reprove the criteria of Diller-Favre, Bedford-Kim, and Dinh-Sibony. We conclude with a cautionary example.

1. INTRODUCTION

Suppose that X and Y are projective algebraic manifolds, both of dimension k , and $f : X \dashrightarrow Y$ is a rational map. If I_f denotes the indeterminacy set of f , the graph of f is the irreducible variety

$$(1) \quad \Gamma_f := \overline{\{(x, y) \in X \times Y : x \notin I_f \text{ and } y = f(x)\}}.$$

One defines the action $f^* : H^*(Y) \rightarrow H^*(X)$ on the singular cohomology of X by considering f as the correspondence $\Gamma_f \subset X \times Y$. If $\pi_1 : X \times Y \rightarrow X$ and $\pi_2 : X \times Y \rightarrow Y$ are the canonical projections, then, for any $\alpha \in H^i(Y)$,

$$(2) \quad f^* \alpha := \pi_{1*}([\Gamma_f] \smile \pi_2^* \alpha).$$

Here, $[\Gamma_f]$ is the fundamental cohomology class of Γ_f , π_2^* is the classical pullback on cohomology as defined for regular maps, and π_{1*} is the pushforward on cohomology, defined by $\pi_{1*} = \text{PD}_X^{-1} \circ \pi_{1\#} \circ \text{PD}_{X \times Y}$, where $\pi_{1\#}$ denotes the push forward on homology and $\text{PD}_M : H^*(M) \rightarrow H_{k-*}(M)$ denotes the Poincaré duality isomorphism on a manifold M . If f is regular, $I_f = \emptyset$, then (2) coincides with the classical definition of pullback.

We will take the coefficients for our cohomology in \mathbb{C} , letting $H^i(X) \equiv H^i(X; \mathbb{C})$. Since our manifolds are Kähler, there is a natural isomorphism $\bigoplus_{p+q=i} H^{p,q}(X) \rightarrow H^i(X)$, where the former are the Dolbeault cohomology groups. This isomorphism induces a splitting of the singular cohomology of X into bi-degrees, which one can check is invariant under the pullback (2).

The most primitive dynamical invariants of any rational selfmap $h : X \dashrightarrow X$ are the dynamical degrees

$$\lambda_p(h) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |(h^n)^* : H^{p,p}(X) \rightarrow H^{p,p}(X)|^{1/n},$$

which are defined for $1 \leq p \leq k = \dim(X)$. They are tied to the expected ergodic properties of h ; see, for example, [20]. (These expected properties have been proved when $\lambda_k(h)$ is maximal [21, 12] or when $\dim(X) = 2$, $\lambda_1(h) > \lambda_2(h)$, and certain minor technical hypotheses are satisfied [11].) Dynamical degrees are typically hard to compute because (2) does not behave well under composition of maps. There are simple examples for which $(h^n)^* \neq (h^*)^n$. One says that h is p -stable if $(h^n)^* = (h^*)^n$ on $H^{p,p}(X)$ for every $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. A nice summary of techniques on how to compute dynamical degrees appears in [4]. Let us

note that there are very few explicit examples [1, 15, 24, 25] in which the p -th dynamical degrees have been computed for $1 < p < k$.

In order to study the problem of p -stability, one typically looks for criterion on $f : X \dashrightarrow Y$ and $g : Y \dashrightarrow Z$ under which $(g \circ f)^* = f^* \circ g^*$ (either on all cohomology or for certain degrees). Such criteria have been given by Fornaess-Sibony [16], Diller-Favre [10], Bedford-Kim [5, 6], and Dinh-Sibony [13]. The proofs of these criteria typically represent a cohomology class $\alpha \in H^*(Z)$ with a smooth form, pull it back under g^* as a closed current, and then pull back the resulting current under f^* . This approach is especially challenging when $p \geq 2$ since the pullback of such higher-codimension currents is very delicate.

The purpose of this note is to clarify these criteria using intuitive techniques from cohomology and intersection theory¹. Our approach is inspired by the techniques used by Amerik in [1].

Let us make the convention that all rational maps are *dominant*, meaning that the image is not contained within a proper subvariety of the codomain. To be concise, we will use the term *algebraic manifold* to mean projective algebraic manifold. Moreover, since we are primarily motivated by dynamics, all rational mappings will be between algebraic manifolds of the same dimension. For any $S \subset X$, we define $f(S) := \pi_2(\pi_1^{-1}(S) \cap \Gamma_f)$ and for any $S \subset Y$ we define $f^{-1}(S) := \pi_1(\pi_2^{-1}(S) \cap \Gamma_f)$.

For simplicity of exposition, we will ignore the decomposition of cohomology into bidegree wherever possible.

In order to study the composition $g \circ f$ we will need the following diagram:

$$(3) \quad \begin{array}{ccccc} & & \Gamma_{g \circ f} \subset X \times Z & & \\ & \nearrow \text{pr}_1 & \uparrow \rho_2 & \nwarrow \text{pr}_2 & \\ & X \times Y \times Z & & & \\ & \swarrow \rho_1 & & \searrow \rho_3 & \\ \Gamma_f \subset X \times Y & & & & \Gamma_g \subset Y \times Z \\ \swarrow \pi_1 & \searrow \pi_2 & & \swarrow \pi_3 & \searrow \pi_4 \\ X & \xrightarrow{\quad f \quad} & Y & \xrightarrow{\quad g \quad} & Z \end{array}$$

Central to the entire discussion is the following.

Proposition 1.1. *We have*

$$(4) \quad f^* g^* \alpha = \text{pr}_{1*} (\rho_{2*} (\rho_1^* [\Gamma_f] \smile \rho_3^* [\Gamma_g]) \smile \text{pr}_2^* \alpha).$$

In particular, $(g \circ f)^ = f^* \circ g^*$ on all cohomology groups if and only if*

$$[\Gamma_{g \circ f}] = \rho_{2*} (\rho_1^* [\Gamma_f] \smile \rho_3^* [\Gamma_g]) \in H^k(X \times Z).$$

This proposition is probably well-known within algebraic geometry, for example a variant of (4) is proved for the pull back on the Chow Ring in [18, Sec. 16.1] and [28, Prop. 9.7], but it seems to be less well-known in rational dynamics.

Our first application of Proposition 1.1 is to prove:

¹Note that the criteria listed above hold more generally for Kähler manifolds. However, in order to apply intersection theory, we need to restrict our focus to algebraic manifolds.

Proposition 1.2. *Let $f : X \dashrightarrow Y$ and $g : Y \dashrightarrow Z$ be rational maps. Suppose that there exists an algebraic manifold \tilde{X} and holomorphic maps pr and \tilde{f} making the following diagram commute (wherever $f \circ \text{pr}$ is defined)*

$$(5) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \tilde{X} & & \\ \downarrow \text{pr} \searrow \tilde{f} & & \\ X & \xrightarrow{f} & Y \end{array}$$

with the property that $\tilde{f}^{-1}(x)$ is a finite set for every $y \in Y$. Then, $(g \circ f)^ = f^* \circ g^*$ on all cohomology groups.*

Remark 1.3. In many cases, \tilde{X} will be a blow-up of X . However this is not a hypothesis of Proposition 1.2, which can also be useful in other situations. Notice also that the condition that $\tilde{f}^{-1}(x)$ is a finite set implies that $\dim(\tilde{X}) = k$.

After proving Proposition 1.2, we will use Proposition 1.1 to prove the criteria of Diller-Favre, Bedford-Kim, and Dinh-Sibony stated below.

Historically, the first criterion for functoriality of pullbacks under compositions was given by Fornaess and Sibony [16] who proved that if $f : \mathbb{CP}^k \dashrightarrow \mathbb{CP}^k$ and $g : \mathbb{CP}^k \dashrightarrow \mathbb{CP}^k$ are rational maps then $(g \circ f)^* = f^* \circ g^*$ on the second cohomology if and only if there is no hypersurface $H \subset \mathbb{P}^k$ with $f(H \setminus I_f) \subset I_g$. The proof consists of recognizing that the homogeneous expression obtained when composing f and g has a common factor of positive degree if and only if there is a hypersurface $H \subset \mathbb{P}^k$ with $f(H \setminus I_f) \subset I_g$. Since this common factor must be removed in order to define $g \circ f$, the resulting composition has lower degree. A further study of this phenomenon and a characterization of the sequences of degrees that may appear for the iterates of such a map f is given in [7].

Since I_g is of codimension at least two, in order that $f(H \setminus I_f) \subset I_g$, f must collapse H to a variety of lower dimension. The principle that non-functoriality is caused by collapse of a subvariety under f to something of lower dimension that is contained within I_g appears as a common theme in the following three criteria:

Proposition 1.4. (Diller-Favre [10, Prop. 1.13]) *Let X, Y , and Z be algebraic manifolds of dimension 2. Let $f : X \dashrightarrow Y$ and $g : Y \dashrightarrow Z$ be rational maps. Then $(g \circ f)^* = f^* \circ g^*$ if and only if there is no curve $C \subset X$ with $f(C \setminus I_f) \subset I_g$.*

Proposition 1.5. (Bedford-Kim [6, Thm. 1.1]) *Let X, Y , and Z be algebraic manifolds of dimension k . Let $f : X \dashrightarrow Y$ and $g : Y \dashrightarrow Z$ be rational maps. If there is no hypersurface H with $f(H \setminus I_f) \subset I_g$, then $f^* \circ g^* = (g \circ f)^*$ on $H^2(Z)$.*

We will prove a slightly stronger variant of the criterion of Dinh and Sibony. Let $\tilde{\Sigma}'_f \subset \Gamma_f$ is the set of points such that

- (i) π_2 restricted to Γ_f is not locally finite at x , and
- (ii) $\pi_2((x, y)) \in I_g$ for every $(x, y) \in \tilde{\Sigma}'_f$.

Let $\Sigma'_f := \pi_1(\tilde{\Sigma}'_f)$.

Proposition 1.6. (Variant of Dinh-Sibony [13, Prop. 5.3.5]) *Let X, Y , and Z be algebraic manifolds of dimension k . Let $f : X \dashrightarrow Y$ and $g : Y \dashrightarrow Z$ be rational maps. If $\dim \Sigma'_f < k - p$, then $(g \circ f)^* = f^* \circ g^*$ on $H^i(Z)$ for $1 \leq i \leq 2p$.*

Remark 1.7. The distinction between this criterion and the one from [13, Prop. 5.3.5] is that we impose the extra condition (ii) on Σ_f , allowing for higher dimensional varieties to be collapsed by f , so long as they don't map into I_g .

Remark 1.8. Proposition 1.2, the sufficiency condition in Proposition 1.4, and Proposition 1.5 can all be obtained as corollaries to Proposition 1.6. However, we'll present them separately since they're of independent interest and their direct proofs are simpler.

In §2 we provide a brief background with needed tools from cohomology and intersection theory. In §3 we discuss some further properties of the graph Γ_f and we show that definition (2) of f^* is equivalent with some of the other standard versions appearing in the literature. We prove Propositions 1.1 in §4. In §5 we prove Propositions 1.2-1.6. This paper is concluded with §6 in which we provide a cautionary example, presenting a rational map $f : X \dashrightarrow X$ of a three dimensional manifold X that is not 2-stable but has the property that $\left(f|_{X \setminus I_f}\right)^{-1}(x)$ is finite for every $x \in X$. This example illustrates that to study p stability for $1 < p < k$, one must consider collapsing behavior lying within the indeterminate set.

Acknowledgments: Much of this work is inspired by the techniques from [1] and by the results of the other authors mentioned above. We have also benefited from discussions with Eric Bedford, Olguta Buse, Jeffrey Diller, Sarah Koch, and Tuyen Truong. This work is supported in part by the NSF grant DMS-1102597 and startup funds from the Department of Mathematics at IUPUI.

2. BACKGROUND FROM COHOMOLOGY AND INTERSECTION THEORY

Suppose $f : M \rightarrow N$ is a continuous map between compact manifolds of dimensions m and n , respectively. Given $\alpha \in H^i(M)$, we define $f_* : H^i(M) \rightarrow H^{n-m+i}(N)$ by

$$(6) \quad f_*\alpha := \text{PD}_N^{-1}(f_{\#}(\text{PD}_M\alpha)),$$

where $f_{\#} : H_*(M) \rightarrow H_*(N)$ is the push forward on homology.

We will make extensive use of the following formula.

Lemma 2.1 (Push-Pull Formula). *Suppose M and N are manifolds and $f : M \rightarrow N$ is continuous. Then, for any $\alpha \in H^i(N)$ and any $\beta \in H^j(M)$ we have*

$$f_*(f^*(\alpha) \smile \beta) = \alpha \smile f_*(\beta) \in H^{n-m+i+j}(N).$$

Note that when f is holomorphic, this is sometimes also called the “projection formula”.

Proof. This is a simple consequence of the following three facts

- (i) Push-Pull formula on homology: If $f : M \rightarrow N$ is continuous, $\eta \in H^*(N)$, and $\gamma \in H_*(M)$, then

$$f_{\#}(f^*(\eta) \frown \gamma) = \eta \frown f_{\#}\gamma,$$

- (ii) $\text{PD}_M(\alpha)$ is defined by $\alpha \frown \{M\}$, where $\{M\}$ is the fundamental homology class of M , and

- (iii) for any $\eta, \phi \in H^*(M)$ and $\gamma \in H_*(M)$, then $(\eta \smile \phi) \frown \gamma = \eta \frown (\phi \frown \gamma)$.

See [8, Ch. VI, Thm. 5.1 and Cor. 9.3]. □

We will need a little bit of information about the Künneth formuli on cohomology and homology. Recall that our (co)homology is taken with coefficients in the field \mathbb{C} . Let

$$\kappa_i : \bigoplus_{a+b=i} H^a(M) \otimes H^b(N) \rightarrow H^i(M \times N)$$

and

$$K_i : \bigoplus_{a+b=i} H_a(M) \otimes H_b(N) \rightarrow H_i(M \times N)$$

be the Künneth isomorphisms. Recall that $\kappa_i(\gamma \otimes \eta) = \pi_1^* \gamma \smile \pi_2^* \eta$. Suppose M and N are manifolds.

Lemma 2.2. *The following diagram commutes:*

$$(7) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \bigoplus_{a+b=i} H^a(M) \otimes H^b(N) & \xrightarrow{(-1)^{mb} \text{PD}_M \otimes \text{PD}_N} & \bigoplus_{a+b=i} H_{m-a}(M) \otimes H_{n-b}(N) \\ \downarrow \kappa_i & & \downarrow K_{m+n-i} \\ H^i(M \times N) & \xrightarrow{\text{PD}_{M \times N}} & H_{m+n-i}(M \times N). \end{array}$$

Proof. According to [8, Ch. VI, Thm. 5.4], if $\alpha \in H^*(X)$, $\beta \in H^*(Y)$, $c \in H_*(X)$, and $d \in H_*(Y)$, then

$$\kappa(\alpha \otimes \beta) \smile K(c \otimes d) = (-1)^{\deg(\beta) \deg(c)} K((\alpha \smile c) \otimes (\beta \smile d)).$$

The result follows, since $\text{PD}_{M \times N}$ is obtained by taking the cap product with $\{M \times N\} = K(\{M\} \otimes \{N\})$. \square

Lemma 2.3. *Let M and N be connected manifolds of dimensions m and n , respectively and let $\pi : M \times N \rightarrow M$ be projection onto the first coordinate. Suppose $\nu \in H^i(M \times N)$ satisfies*

$$\kappa^{-1}(\nu) = \sum_{a=1}^i \sum_{l=1}^{l_j} \gamma_{i-a,l} \otimes \eta_{a,l}$$

with $\gamma_{i-a,l} \in H^{i-a}(M)$, $\eta_{a,l} \in H^a(N)$, and with the normalization that each $\eta_{n,l} \in H^n(N)$ is the fundamental class $[x]$ of a point $x \in N$. Then

$$\pi_* \nu = (-1)^{mn} \sum_{l=1}^{l_n} \gamma_{i-n,l}.$$

Proof. This follows from Lemma 2.2 and the fact that the push forward $\text{pr}_\#$ on homology satisfies that

$$\text{pr}_\# \left(K \left(\sum_{a=1}^i \sum_{l=1}^{l_a} g_{i-a,l} \otimes e_{a,l} \right) \right) = \sum_{l=1}^{l_0} g_{i,l},$$

if each $g_{i-a,l} \in H_{i-a}(M)$, each $e_{a,l} \in H_a(N)$, and each $e_{0,i} = \{x\}$ is the fundamental homology class of a point. This follows easily from the fact that the Künneth Isomorphism is natural with respect to induced maps. \square

Remark 2.4. In our applications, M and N will be complex manifolds. Since they have even real-dimension, the signs will disappear from Lemmas 2.2 and 2.3.

Let X be an algebraic manifold of (complex) dimension k and let $V \subset X$ be a subvariety of dimension $k - i$. It is well known that V generates a cohomology class $[V] \in H^{2i}(X)$; see, for example, [19, 27]. If $V' \subset X$ is another subvariety of dimension $k - j$, we will need information relating $[V] \smile [V']$ to $V \cap V'$. This is the subject of Intersection Theory [17, 18, 28]. One says that V and V' are *transverse at generic points* of $V \cap V'$ if there is a dense set of $V \cap V'$ on which V and V' are both smooth and intersect transversally. The information we need is encapsulated in:

Lemma 2.5. *Let V and V' be subvarieties of X of dimensions $k - i$ and $k - j$. Then, $[V] \smile [V']$ is represented as a linear combination of fundamental cohomology classes of $k - i - j$ -dimensional subvarieties of $V \cap V'$. More specifically:*

- (i) *If V and V' are transverse at generic points of $V \cap V'$, then $[V] \smile [V'] = [V \cap V']$.*
- (ii) *More generally, if each of the components W_1, \dots, W_{m_0} of $V \cap V'$ has the correct dimension of $k - i - j$, then*

$$[V] \smile [V'] = \sum_{m=1}^{m_0} a_m [W_m],$$

where each $a_m \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ is an intersection number satisfying that $a_m = 1$ if and only if V and V' are transverse at generic points of W_m .

- (iii) *Most generally, if some of the components W_1, \dots, W_{m_0} of $V \cap V'$ are of dimension $> k - i - j$, then,*

$$[V] \smile [V'] = \sum_{m=1}^{m_0} \sum_{n=1}^{n_m} a_{m,n} [W_{m,n}],$$

where each $W_{m,n} \subset W_m$ is a subvariety of W_m of dimension $k - i - j$ and each $a_{m,n} \in \mathbb{Z}$. For each W_m of the correct dimension $k - i - j$ the inner sum reduces to be $a_m [W_m]$, where a_m is given as in (ii).

Note that in case (iii), the coefficients $a_{m,n}$ can be negative, for example the self-intersection of the exceptional divisor resulting from a blow-up of \mathbb{CP}^2 is represented by a single point on the exceptional divisor with coefficient -1 .

Rather than presenting a proof of Lemma 2.5, we will mention how to obtain it from the corresponding properties in the Chow Ring $CH^*(X)$, which are proved in [17, 18, 28]. For each $0 \leq i \leq k$, the chow group $CH^i(X)$ is the collection of finite formal sums of $k - i$ -dimensional irreducible subvarieties taken with integer coefficients, up to an equivalence relation known as *rational equivalence*. We won't need the detailed definition of rational equivalence, however let us denote the rational equivalence class of an irreducible subvariety V by (V) .

One obtains the Chow Ring $CH^*(X) = \bigoplus_{i=0}^k CH^i(X)$ by defining an intersection product

$$\bullet : CH^i(X) \times CH^j(X) \rightarrow CH^{i+j}(X).$$

If V and V' intersect properly, with dimension $k - i - j$, then each component of the intersection is assigned an intersection multiplicity in a relatively simple way, see [18, Sec. 8.2]. (Note that using the uniqueness described in [18, Eg. 11.4.1], one can show that this intersection multiplicity is consistent with the more intuitive approach of [9, Sec. 12.3].)

This intersection multiplicity is a positive integer that equals 1 if and only if V and V' are generically transverse along the component.

If the intersection has a component whose dimension is larger than $k - i - j$, there are two approaches:

- (i) moving one of the subvarieties V to a rationally equivalent one \tilde{V} in such a way that $\tilde{V} \cap V'$ has the correct dimension, via Chow's moving lemma (see [28, Lem. 9.22] or [18, Sec. 11.4]), or
- (ii) or Fulton's *excess intersection formula*, which represents the intersection product as a linear combination of subvarieties lying within $V \cap V'$ (see [28, Sec. 9.2] or [18, Sec. 6.3]).

In order to guarantee the property that the cup product is represented by a sum of fundamental classes of subvarieties of $V \cap V'$, we appeal to the latter.

Lemma 2.5 then follows from the fact that there is a ring homomorphism $\text{cl} : CH^*(X) \rightarrow H^{2*}(X)$ with the property that for any irreducible $V \subset X$, $\text{cl}([V]) = [V]$. See, for example, [18, Ch. 19] or [28, Lem. 9.18 and Prop. 9.20].

Remark 2.6. In many of our applications, we will only need properties (i) and (ii) which are relatively simple. We will only use property (iii) to show that the cup product is given by subvarieties of the geometric intersection $V \cap V'$. We won't use any details of how the coefficients $a_{i,j}$ are actually computed.

Lemma 2.7. *Suppose that $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is a proper holomorphic map between algebraic manifolds. For any subvariety $V \subset X$ we have*

- (i) *if $\dim(f(V)) = \dim(V)$, then $f_*([V]) = \deg_{\text{top}}(f|_V)[f(V)]$, where $\deg_{\text{top}}(f|_V)$ is the number of preimages under $f|_V$ of a generic point from $f(V)$.*
- (ii) *Otherwise, $f_*([V]) = 0$.*

Proof. This is essentially [18, Lem. 19.1.2] combined the remark in Section 1.4 of [18] that $\deg(V/f(V))$ is equal to the topological degree $\deg_{\text{top}}(f|_V)$ of $f|_V : V \rightarrow f(V)$. \square

Lemma 2.8. *Let X and Z be k -dimensional algebraic manifolds and let W be a k -dimensional subvariety of $X \times Z$. We have*

$$\text{pr}_{1*}([W] \smile \text{pr}_2^* \alpha) = 0$$

if either

- (i) $\dim(\text{pr}_1(W)) \leq k - p$ and $\alpha \in H^i(Z)$ for some $i < 2p$, or
- (ii) $\dim(\text{pr}_2(W)) \leq p$ and $\alpha \in H^i(Z)$ for some $i > 2p$.

Proof. Suppose $\dim(\text{pr}_1(W)) \leq k - p$. The fundamental homology class $\{W\}$ is in the image of $\iota_{\#}$, where $\iota : \text{pr}_1(W) \times Z \hookrightarrow X \times Z$ is the inclusion. Therefore,

$$K^{-1}(\{W\}) = \sum_{a=1}^{2k-2p} \sum_{l=1}^{l_a} g_{a,l} \otimes e_{2k-a,l},$$

with each $g_{a,l} \in H_a(X)$ and each $e_{2k-a,l} \in H_{2k-a}(Z)$. Applying Lemma 2.2, we have

$$\kappa^{-1}([W]) = \sum_{a=1}^{2k-2p} \sum_{l=1}^{l_a} \text{PD}_X^{-1}(g_{a,l}) \otimes \text{PD}_Y^{-1}(e_{2k-a,l}) = \sum_{a=1}^{2k-2p} \sum_{l=1}^{l_a} \gamma_{2k-a,l} \otimes \eta_{a,l}.$$

where each $\gamma_{2k-a,l} \in H^{2k-a}(X)$ and $\eta_{a,l} \in H^a(Z)$. Thus for any $\alpha \in H^i(Z)$ we have,

$$[W] \smile \text{pr}_2^* \alpha = \sum_{a=1}^{2k-2p} \sum_{l=1}^{l_a} \text{pr}_1^*(\gamma_{2k-a,l}) \smile \text{pr}_2^*(\eta_{a,l} \smile \alpha) = \kappa^{-1} \left(\sum_{a=1}^{2k-2p} \sum_{l=1}^{l_a} \gamma_{2k-a,l} \otimes (\eta_{a,l} \smile \alpha) \right).$$

Since each term in the second factor has degree $2k - 2p + i < 2k$, Lemma 2.3 gives that

$$\text{pr}_{2*}([W] \smile \text{pr}_2^* \alpha) = 0.$$

The proof of (ii) is essentially the same. \square

3. SINGULAR POINTS ON Γ_f AND ALTERNATIVE DEFINITIONS FOR f^*

If $I_f \neq \emptyset$, then it is often the case that Γ_f has singularities.

Example 3.1. The quadratic Hénon map $h_{a,c} : \mathbb{C}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^2$ given by

$$(8) \quad h_{a,c}(x_1, x_2) = (x_1^2 + c - ax_2, x_1)$$

extends as a birational map of \mathbb{P}^2 , which is expressed in homogeneous coordinates as

$$(9) \quad h_{a,c}([X_1 : X_2 : X_3]) = [X_1^2 + cX_3^2 - aX_2X_3 : X_1X_3 : X_3^2].$$

The extension has indeterminacy $I_h = \{[0 : 1 : 0]\}$. Consider local coordinates $\xi = \frac{X_1}{X_2}, \lambda = \frac{X_3}{X_2}$ centered at $[0 : 1 : 0]$ in the domain and local coordinates $\eta = \frac{X_2}{X_1}, \tau = \frac{X_3}{X_1}$ centered at $[1 : 0 : 0]$ in the codomain. In the local coordinates ξ, λ, η, τ on $\mathbb{P}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^2$ the graph Γ_f is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \eta\xi^2 + c\eta\lambda^2 - a\eta\lambda - \xi\lambda &= 0 \text{ and} \\ \tau\xi^2 + c\tau\lambda^2 - a\tau\lambda - \lambda^2 &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

This is singular at $(0, 0, 0, 0)$ since the derivative of the defining equations vanishes at that point. Note that $(0, 0, 0, 0)$ corresponds to $([0 : 1 : 0], [1 : 0 : 0])$, the unique point of $\mathbb{P}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^2$ whose first coordinate is in I_h and whose second coordinate is in $I_{h^{-1}}$.

When Γ_f is singular, it can be difficult to use (2) to compute $f^*\alpha$. We'll now show that two common alternative definitions are consistent with (2):

Lemma 3.2. *Suppose \tilde{X} is a k -dimensional algebraic manifold and that $\text{pr} : \tilde{X} \rightarrow X$ and $\tilde{f} : \tilde{X} \rightarrow Y$ are holomorphic maps making the Diagram (5) commute. Then, $f^*\alpha = \text{pr}_*(\tilde{f}^*\alpha)$.*

Usually, $\text{pr} : \tilde{X} \rightarrow X$ will be a blow-up, but Lemma 3.2 holds in greater generality.

Proof. This follows from the fact that $(\text{pr} \times \text{id})_* [\Gamma_{\tilde{f}}] = [\Gamma_f]$ and the Push-Pull formula. \square

Lemma 3.3. *Suppose that $\tilde{\Gamma}_f$ is a resolution of the singularities in Γ_f and $\tilde{\pi}_1$ and $\tilde{\pi}_2$ are the lifts of $\pi_1|_{\Gamma_f}$ and $\pi_2|_{\Gamma_f}$ to $\tilde{\Gamma}_f$. Then, $f^*\alpha = \tilde{\pi}_{1*}(\tilde{\pi}_2^*\alpha)$.*

Proof. This is a restatement of Lemma 3.2. \square

Let us finish this section with two helpful remarks about the graph Γ_f .

Lemma 3.4. *Let X and Y be algebraic manifolds of dimension k and let $f : X \dashrightarrow Y$ be a rational map. If $V \subset X$ be a proper subvariety of X , then*

$$\Gamma_f = \overline{\{(x, y) \in X \times Y : x \notin V \cup I_f \text{ and } y = f(x)\}}.$$

Proof. Since Γ_f is defined by (1), it suffices to show that $\Gamma_f \setminus \pi_1^{-1}(V)$ is dense in Γ_f . This follows since $\pi_1 : \Gamma_f \rightarrow X$ is dominant, giving that $\pi_1^{-1}(V)$ is a proper subvariety of Γ_f . \square

Remark 3.5. Eric Bedford has pointed out to us that one should use some caution when constructing the graph Γ_f using homogeneous coordinates. The following is a variant of Example 1 from [3, §5]. In $\mathbb{C}^2 \times \mathbb{C}^2$, the graph of the Hénon map $h \equiv h_{a,c} : \mathbb{C}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^2$ is given by

$$y_1 = x_1^2 + c - ax_2 \quad \text{and} \quad y_2 = x_1.$$

It is natural to expect that the graph Γ_h of $h : \mathbb{P}^2 \dashrightarrow \mathbb{P}^2$ is obtained by substituting $x_1 = \frac{X_1}{X_3}, x_2 = \frac{X_2}{X_3}, y_1 = \frac{Y_1}{Y_3}$, and $y_2 = \frac{Y_2}{Y_3}$ and then clearing denominators. One obtains

$$(10) \quad \begin{aligned} Y_1 X_3^2 &= X_1^2 Y_3 + c X_3^2 Y_1 - a X_2 X_3 Y_3 & \text{and} \\ Y_2 X_3 &= X_1 Y_3, \end{aligned}$$

which describe some subset of $\mathbb{P}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^2$. One can check that $\{[0 : 1 : 0]\} \times \mathbb{P}^2$ satisfies these equations. Since Γ_h is irreducible and projects surjectively onto the first factor of \mathbb{P}^2 , we see that (10) describes a strictly bigger set than Γ_h . For this reason, when working with the graph of a rational map $f : X \dashrightarrow Y$, it is usually “safer” to work in local coordinates as we did in Example 3.1.

4. PROOF OF THE COMPOSITION FORMULA

The proof of (4) below is cribbed from Voisin’s textbook [28, Prop. 9.17].

Proof. Proof of Proposition 1.1: For any $\alpha \in H^*(Z)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{pr}_{1*}(\rho_{2*}(\rho_1^*[\Gamma_f] \smile \rho_3^*[\Gamma_g]) \smile \text{pr}_2^* \alpha) \stackrel{\text{PP}}{=} \text{pr}_{1*}(\rho_{2*}(\rho_1^*[\Gamma_f] \smile \rho_3^*[\Gamma_g] \smile \rho_2^* \text{pr}_2^* \alpha)) \\ &= \text{pr}_{1*}(\rho_{2*}(\rho_1^*[\Gamma_f] \smile \rho_3^*[\Gamma_g] \smile (\pi_4 \circ \rho_3)^* \alpha)) = \pi_{1*}(\rho_{1*}(\rho_1^*[\Gamma_f] \smile \rho_3^*[\Gamma_g] \smile (\pi_4 \circ \rho_3)^* \alpha)) \\ &\stackrel{\text{PP}}{=} \pi_{1*}([\Gamma_f] \smile \rho_{1*}(\rho_3^*[\Gamma_g] \smile (\pi_4 \circ \rho_3)^* \alpha)) = \pi_{1*}([\Gamma_f] \smile \rho_{1*}(\rho_3^*([\Gamma_g] \smile \pi_4^* \alpha))) \\ &\stackrel{\diamond}{=} \pi_{1*}([\Gamma_f] \smile \pi_2^*(\pi_{3*}([\Gamma_g] \smile \pi_4^* \alpha))) = f^* g^* \alpha. \end{aligned}$$

Here, all unlabeled equalities follow from commutativity of Diagram (3) and the equality labeled PP follows from the Push-Pull formula. To check \diamond , one must show for any $\beta \in H^*(Y \times Z)$ that

$$(11) \quad (\rho_{1*} \circ \rho_3^*)\beta = (\pi_2^* \circ \pi_{3*})\beta.$$

This follows easily by expanding β using the Künneth formula and applying Lemma 2.3.

We’ll now check that if $\rho_{2*}(\rho_1^*[\Gamma_f] \smile \rho_3^*[\Gamma_g]) \neq [\Gamma_{g \circ f}]$, then $f^* g^* \neq (g \circ f)^*$. Let

$$\rho_{2*}(\rho_1^*[\Gamma_f] \smile \rho_3^*[\Gamma_g]) = [\Gamma_{g \circ f}] + \mathcal{E}.$$

By linearity of (4), it suffices to find some $\alpha \in H^*(Z)$ with $\text{pr}_{1*}(\mathcal{E} \smile \text{pr}_2^* \alpha) \neq 0$. For each $i = 0, \dots, 2k$, let $\gamma_{i,1}, \dots, \gamma_{i,j_i}$ be a basis of $H^i(X)$ and let $\eta_{i,1}, \dots, \eta_{i,l_i}$ be a basis of $H^i(Z)$. Using the Künneth Isomorphism, we have

$$\kappa^{-1}(\mathcal{E}) = \sum_{i=0}^{2k} \sum_{j=1}^{j_i} \sum_{l=1}^{l_{2k-i}} a_{i,j,l} \gamma_{i,j} \otimes \eta_{2k-i,l}.$$

Since $\mathcal{E} \neq 0$, there is some $a_{i_0,j_0,l_0} \neq 0$. Since we are using field coefficients the cup product is a duality pairing; see [8, Ch. VI, Thm. 9.4]. We can therefore find some $\alpha \in H^{i_0}(Z)$ so

that $\eta_{2k-i_0, l_0} \smile \alpha = [z_\bullet]$ and $\eta_{2k-i_0, l} \smile \alpha = 0$ for every $l \neq l_0$. (Here, $[z_\bullet]$ is the fundamental cohomology class of a point $z_\bullet \in Z$ and a generator of $H^{2k}(Z)$.) This implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa^{-1}(\mathcal{E} \smile \text{pr}_2^* \alpha) &= \sum_{i=0}^{2k} \sum_{j=1}^{j_i} \sum_{l=1}^{l_{2k-i}} a_{i,j,l} \gamma_{i,j} \otimes (\eta_{2k-i,l} \smile \text{pr}_2^* \alpha) \\ &= a_{i_0, j_0, l_0} (\gamma_{i_0, j_0} \otimes [z_\bullet]) + \sum_{i=i_0+1}^{2k} \sum_{j=1}^{j_i} \sum_{l=1}^{l_{2k-i}} a_{i,j,l} \gamma_{i,j} \otimes (\eta_{2k-i,l} \smile \text{pr}_2^* \alpha). \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 2.3 implies

$$\text{pr}_{1*}(\mathcal{E} \smile \text{pr}_2^* \alpha) = a_{i_0, j_0, l_0} \gamma_{i_0, j_0} \neq 0.$$

we conclude that $f^* \circ g^*(\alpha) \neq (g \circ f)^*(\alpha)$. \square

5. CRITERIA FOR FUNCTORIALITY

We'll now start our study of the intersection $\rho_1^{-1}(\Gamma_f) \cap \rho_3^{-1}(\Gamma_g)$. Let

$$(12) \quad U := \{(x, y, z) \in X \times Y \times Z : (x, y) \in \Gamma_f, x \notin I_f, (y, z) \in \Gamma_g, \text{ and } y \notin I(g)\}.$$

Lemma 5.1. *We have*

- (i) $\rho_1^{-1}(\Gamma_f)$ and $\rho_3^{-1}(\Gamma_g)$ are smooth and intersect transversally at points of U and
- (ii) $V = \overline{U}$ is an irreducible component of $X \times Y \times Z$ that is mapped to $\Gamma_{g \circ f}$ by ρ_2 with topological degree 1.

Consequently, if U is dense in $\rho_1^{-1}(\Gamma_f) \cap \rho_3^{-1}(\Gamma_g)$ then $(g \circ f)^* = f^* \circ g^*$ on all cohomology.

We will call V the *principal component* of $\rho_1^{-1}(\Gamma_f) \cap \rho_3^{-1}(\Gamma_g)$.

Proof. Since $x \notin I_f$ and $y \notin I_g$, $\rho_1^*(\Gamma_f)$ and $\rho_3^*(\Gamma_g)$ are smooth at any $(x, y, z) \in U$. For any $(x, y, z) \in U$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} T_{(x,y,z)} \rho_1^{-1}(\Gamma_f) &= \{(u_1, Df_x u_1, w_1) : u_1 \in T_x X \text{ and } w_1 \in T_z Z\} \text{ and} \\ T_{(x,y,z)} \rho_3^{-1}(\Gamma_g) &= \{(u_2, v_2, Dg_y v_2) : v_2 \in T_y Y \text{ and } w_2 \in T_z Z\}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $T_{(x,y,z)} \rho_1^{-1}(\Gamma_f) + T_{(x,y,z)} \rho_3^{-1}(\Gamma_g) = T_{(x,y,z)} X \times Y \times Z$, so that $\rho_1^{-1}(\Gamma_f)$ and $\rho_3^{-1}(\Gamma_g)$ are transverse at (x, y, z) .

Notice that $\rho_2(U)$ is the graph of $(g \circ f)|_{X \setminus (I_f \cup f^{-1}(I(g)))}$, which is dense in $\Gamma_{g \circ f}$, by Lemma 3.4. Since ρ_2 is continuous and closed,

$$(13) \quad \rho_2(V) = \rho_2(\overline{U}) = \overline{\rho_2(U)} = \Gamma_{g \circ f}.$$

Finally, notice that $\rho_2 : U \rightarrow \rho_2(U)$ is one-to-one since for points of U , x completely determines y and z . In particular, since $\Gamma_{g \circ f}$ is irreducible, so is V .

If U is dense in $\rho_1^{-1}(\Gamma_f) \cap \rho_3^{-1}(\Gamma_g)$, then by Lemmas 2.5 and 2.7 we have

$$(14) \quad \rho_{2*}([\rho_1^{-1}(\Gamma_f)] \smile [\rho_3^{-1}(\Gamma_g)]) = \rho_{2*}([V]) = [\Gamma_{g \circ f}].$$

It follows from Proposition 1.1 that $(g \circ f)^* = f^* \circ g^*$ on all cohomology. \square

Let us also prove one more helpful lemma:

Lemma 5.2. *Let X, Y, Z be algebraic manifolds of dimension k and let $f : X \dashrightarrow Y$ and $g : Y \dashrightarrow Z$ be rational maps. If $\alpha \in H^i(Z)$ for $i \in \{0, 1, 2k-1, 2k\}$, then $(g \circ f)^* \alpha = (f^* \circ g^*) \alpha$.*

Proof. Since f is dominant, $f^{-1}(I_g) \cup I_f$ is a proper subvariety of X . Thus, any irreducible component of $\rho_1^{-1}(\Gamma_f) \cap \rho_3^{-1}(\Gamma_g)$ that projects under $\pi_1 \circ \rho_1$ onto all of X is equal to the principal component V . Similarly, since g is dominant $g(I_g \cup f(I_f))$ is a proper subvariety of Z , implying that any irreducible component of $\rho_1^{-1}(\Gamma_f) \cap \rho_3^{-1}(\Gamma_g)$ that projects under $\pi_4 \circ \rho_3$ onto all of Z is equal to the principal component V .

Thus, if $W \neq \Gamma_{g \circ f}$ is a k -dimensional subvariety of $\rho_2(\rho_1^{-1}(\Gamma_f) \cap \rho_3^{-1}(\Gamma_g))$ whose fundamental class appears in the expression for $\rho_{2*}(\rho_1^*[\Gamma_f] \cup \rho_3^*[\Gamma_g])$, one finds that $\dim(\text{pr}_1(W)) \leq k - 1$ and $\dim(\text{pr}_2(W)) \leq k - 1$. It then follows from Proposition 2.8 that if $i \in \{0, 1, 2k - 1, 2k\}$ and $\alpha \in H^i(Z)$ then $\text{pr}_{1*}([W] \smile \text{pr}_2^* \alpha) = 0$. Equation (4) then implies that $(g \circ f)^* \alpha = (f^* \circ g^*) \alpha$. \square

We are now ready to prove Propositions 1.2 – 1.6. For the reader's convenience we'll repeat the statements before each of the proofs.

Proposition 1.2. *Let $f : X \dashrightarrow Y$ and $g : Y \dashrightarrow Z$ be rational maps. Suppose that there exists an algebraic manifold \tilde{X} and holomorphic maps pr and \tilde{f} making the following diagram commute (wherever $f \circ \text{pr}$ is defined)*

$$(5) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \tilde{X} & & \\ \downarrow \text{pr} & \searrow \tilde{f} & \\ X & \xrightarrow{f} & Y \end{array}$$

with the property that $\tilde{f}^{-1}(y)$ is a finite set for every $y \in Y$. Then, $(g \circ f)^ = f^* \circ g^*$ on all cohomology groups.*

Proof. By Lemma 5.1, it suffices to show that U , given by (12), is dense in $\rho_1^{-1}(\Gamma_f) \cap \rho_3^{-1}(\Gamma_g)$.

Consider any $(x_\bullet, y_\bullet, z_\bullet) \in \rho_1^{-1}(\Gamma_f) \cap \rho_3^{-1}(\Gamma_g)$. We'll show that $(x_\bullet, y_\bullet, z_\bullet)$ is the limit of a sequence $\{(x_n, y_n, z_n)\} \subset U$. Since $f(I_f) := \pi_2(\pi_1^{-1}(I_f) \cap \Gamma_f)$ is a proper subvariety of Y , Lemma 3.4 gives that Γ_g is the closure of the graph of $g|_{Y \setminus (f(I_f) \cup I_g)}$. Therefore, we can choose a sequence $\{(y_n, z_n)\} \in \{Y \times Z : (y, z) \in \Gamma_g \text{ and } y \notin (f(I_f) \cup I_g)\}$ with $(y_n, z_n) \rightarrow (y_\bullet, z_\bullet)$.

Since $(x_\bullet, y_\bullet) \in \Gamma_f$, there exists $\tilde{x}_\bullet \in \tilde{X}$ with $\text{pr}(\tilde{x}_\bullet) = x_\bullet$ and $\tilde{f}(\tilde{x}_\bullet) = y_\bullet$. Since \tilde{f} is a finite map, it is open. Therefore we can choose a sequence of preimages \tilde{x}_n of y_n under \tilde{f} with $\tilde{x}_n \rightarrow \tilde{x}_\bullet$. If we let $x_n = \text{pr}(\tilde{x}_n)$, by continuity of pr we have $x_n \rightarrow x_\bullet$. Since $y_n \notin f(I_f)$ we have that each $x_n \notin I_f$. Therefore, we have found a sequence $(x_n, y_n, z_n) \in U$ with $(x_n, y_n, z_n) \rightarrow (x_\bullet, y_\bullet, z_\bullet)$. \square

Proposition 1.4. (Diller-Favre [10, Prop. 1.13]) *Let X, Y , and Z be algebraic manifolds of dimension 2. Then $(g \circ f)^* = f^* \circ g^*$ if and only if there is no curve $C \subset X$ with $f(C \setminus I_f) \subset I_g$.*

Remark 5.3. In the case that $(g \circ f)^* \neq f^* \circ g^*$, it follows from Lemma 5.2 that the discrepancy happens on $H^2(Z)$.

Proof. Suppose that there is no curve C with $f(C \setminus I_f) \subset I_g$. By Lemma 5.1, it suffices to show that the set U , given by (12), is dense in $\rho_1^{-1}(\Gamma_f) \cap \rho_3^{-1}(\Gamma_g)$.

Let $(x_\bullet, y_\bullet, z_\bullet) \in \rho_1^{-1}(\Gamma_f) \cap \rho_3^{-1}(\Gamma_g)$. If $y_\bullet \notin I_g$, then we can choose a sequence $\{(x_n, y_n)\} \subset \Gamma_f$ converging to (x_\bullet, y_\bullet) with each $x_n \notin I_f$. Since $y_\bullet \notin I_g$ and I_g is closed, $y_n \notin I_g$ for large

enough n . Letting $z_n = g(y_n)$, we obtain a sequence $\{(x_n, y_n, z_n)\} \subset U$ which converges to $(x_\bullet, y_\bullet, z_\bullet)$.

Now, suppose $y_\bullet \in I_g$. As in the proof of Proposition 1.2 we will use that Γ_g is the closure of the graph of $g|_{Y \setminus (f(I_f) \cup I_g)}$. Therefore, we can choose a sequence $\{(y_n, z_n)\} \subset \Gamma_g$ with $(y_n, z_n) \rightarrow (y_\bullet, z_\bullet)$ and each $y_n \notin f(I_f) \cup I_g$. We must show that there is a sequence $x_n \in X \setminus I_f$ with $f(x_n) = y_n$ and $x_n \rightarrow x_\bullet$.

Since X is a surface, we can make a resolution of indeterminacy of the form (5) where pr consists of a sequence of point blow-ups over I_f . Since $(x_\bullet, y_\bullet) \in \Gamma_f$, there exists $(\tilde{x}_\bullet, y_\bullet) \in \Gamma_{\tilde{f}}$ with $\text{pr}(\tilde{x}_\bullet) = x_\bullet$. Let D be the component of $\tilde{f}^{-1}(y_\bullet)$ containing \tilde{x}_\bullet . Since $y_\bullet \neq f(C \setminus I_g)$ for any curve $C \subset X$, $\text{pr}(D) = \{x_\bullet\}$.

Since $\tilde{f}(D) = y_\bullet$ and D is a component of $\tilde{f}^{-1}(y_\bullet)$, we can choose a sequence $\tilde{x}_n \in \tilde{X}$ with $\tilde{f}(\tilde{x}_n) = y_n$ such that $\tilde{x}_n \rightarrow D$. Since $\text{pr}(D) = x_\bullet$, the desired sequence $x_n \in X \setminus I_f$ is $x_n = \text{pr}(\tilde{x}_n)$.

Now, suppose that there are curves $C_1, \dots, C_m \subset X$ with $f(C_i \setminus I_f) \subset I_g$ for each i . For each i , $g(y_i) = D_i$ is a curve in Z . Then,

$$\rho_1^{-1}(\Gamma_f) \cap \rho_3^{-1}(\Gamma_g) = V \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^m C_i \times \{y_i\} \times D_i$$

with each term in the union being an independent irreducible component and $V = \overline{U}$ being the principal component.

Since each component has complex dimension 2, by Lemma 2.5

$$\rho_1^*[\Gamma_f] \smile \rho_3^*[\Gamma_g] = [V] + \sum_{i=1}^m a_i [C_i \times \{y_i\} \times D_i],$$

where each $a_i > 0$ is a suitable intersection number.

By Lemmas 5.1 and 2.7,

$$\rho_{2*} \left([V] + \sum_{i=1}^m a_i [C_i \times \{y_i\} \times D_i] \right) = [\Gamma_{g \circ f}] + \sum_{i=1}^m a_i [C_i \times D_i].$$

Since $\sum_{i=1}^m a_i [C_i \times D_i] \neq 0$, it follows from Proposition 1.1 that $(g \circ f)^* \neq f^* \circ g^*$. \square

Remark 5.4. Up to this point, we have only needed the simple cases (i) and (ii) of Lemma 2.5 in which the subvarieties intersect with the correct dimension. The proofs of the criteria of Bedford-Kim and Dinh-Sibony below rely upon case (iii) of Lemma 2.5, since one can easily have components of $\rho_1^{-1}(\Gamma_f) \cap \rho_3^{-1}(\Gamma_g)$ of dimension $> k$. For example, if $f : \mathbb{CP}^3 \dashrightarrow \mathbb{CP}^3$ and $g : \mathbb{CP}^3 \dashrightarrow \mathbb{CP}^3$ are both Cremona involutions

$$(15) \quad [x_1 : x_2 : x_3 : x_4] \mapsto [x_2 x_3 x_4 : x_1 x_3 x_4 : x_1 x_2 x_4 : x_1 x_2 x_3]$$

then $\rho_1^{-1}(\Gamma_1) \cap \rho_3^{-1}(\Gamma_g)$ contains a four-dimensional component

$$\{x_0 = 0\} \times \{[1 : 0 : 0 : 0]\} \times \{z_0 = 0\}.$$

Proposition 1.5. (Bedford-Kim [6, Thm. 1.1]) Let X, Y , and Z be algebraic manifolds of dimension k . Let $f : X \dashrightarrow Y$ and $g : Y \dashrightarrow Z$ be rational maps. If there is no hypersurface H with $f(H \setminus I_f) \subset I_g$, then $f^* \circ g^* = (g \circ f)^*$ on $H^2(Z)$.

Proof. By Lemmas 2.5 and 2.7,

$$(16) \quad \rho_{2*}(\rho_1^*[\Gamma_f] \smile \rho_3^*[\Gamma_g]) = [\Gamma_{g \circ f}] + \sum a_i[W_i],$$

where each W_i is a k -dimensional subvariety of $X \times Z$ and each $a_i \in \mathbb{Z}$. By Lemma 2.8, it suffices to show for every i that $\dim(\text{pr}_1(W_i)) < k - 1$.

Suppose for some $i = i_0$ that $\dim(\text{pr}_1(W_{i_0})) \geq k - 1$. Then, by commutativity of (3), $V_{i_0} := \text{pr}_2^{-1}(W_{i_0})$ satisfies that $\dim(\pi_1 \circ \rho_1(V_{i_0})) \geq k - 1$. The hypothesis that there is no hypersurface H with $f(H \setminus I_f) \subset I_g$ implies that $\dim(f^{-1}(I_g)) \leq k - 2$. Therefore $\dim(I_f \cup f^{-1}(I_g)) \leq k - 2$. Thus, there is a dense set of points $(x, y, z) \in V_{i_0}$ with $x \notin I_f \cup f^{-1}(I_g)$. All such points are in the principal component V ; therefore $V = V_{i_0}$. This contradicts that $\rho_2(V_{i_0}) = W_{i_0} \neq \Gamma_{g \circ f} = \rho_2(V)$. We conclude that, $\dim(\text{pr}_1(W_i)) \leq k - 2$ for every i . \square

Remark 5.5. Recently, Bayraktar [2, Thm. 5.3] has proved that the Bedford-Kim criterion is necessary, i.e. if there is a hypersurface $H \subset X$ with $f(H \setminus I_f) \subset I_g$, then $(g \circ f)^* \neq f^* \circ g^*$ on $H^2(Z)$.

This may be difficult to obtain with the approach used in this note, since, when $k = \dim(X) \geq 3$, $\rho_1^{-1}(\Gamma_f) \cap \rho^{-1}(\Gamma_g)$ may have components of dimension $> k$. (See Remark 5.4.) For this reason, the cup product $\rho_1^*[\Gamma_f] \smile \rho_3^*[\Gamma_g]$ may be represented by some k -dimensional subvarieties having negative coefficients. In particular, one must prove that the cohomology classes from all of the extra components of $\rho_1^{-1}(\Gamma_f) \cap \rho^{-1}(\Gamma_g)$ don't completely cancel.

Remark 5.6. There is an older criterion of Bedford and Kim [5, Prop. 1.2], which one can check is strictly weaker than the one stated in Proposition 1.5.

Recall that $\tilde{\Sigma}'_f \subset \Gamma_f$ is the set of points such that

- (i) π_2 restricted to Γ_f is not locally finite at x , and
- (ii) $\pi_2((x, y)) \in I_g$ for every $(x, y) \in \tilde{\Sigma}'_f$.

Let $\Sigma'_f := \pi_1(\tilde{\Sigma}'_f)$.

Proposition 1.6. (Variant of Dinh-Sibony [13, Prop. 5.3.5]) *Let X, Y , and Z be algebraic manifolds of dimension k . Let $f : X \dashrightarrow Y$ and $g : Y \dashrightarrow Z$ be rational maps. If $\dim \Sigma'_f < k - p$, then $(g \circ f)^* = f^* \circ g^*$ on $H^i(Z)$ for $1 \leq i \leq 2p$.*

Proof. As in the proof of Proposition 1.5, $\rho_{2*}(\rho_1^*[\Gamma_f] \smile \rho_3^*[\Gamma_g])$ can be expressed by (16). By Lemma 2.8 it suffices to show for every i that $\dim(\text{pr}_1(W_i)) < k - p$.

Suppose for some $i = i_0$ that $\dim(\text{pr}_1(W_{i_0})) \geq k - p$. Then, by commutativity of (3), $V_{i_0} := \text{pr}_2^{-1}(W_{i_0})$ satisfies that $\dim(\pi_1 \circ \rho_1(V_{i_0})) \geq k - p$. We'll show that the set U , given by (12), is dense in V_{i_0} , implying that $V_{i_0} = V$. This will contradict that $\rho_2(V_{i_0}) = W_{i_0} \neq \Gamma_{g \circ f} = \rho_2(V)$.

Since $\dim(\Sigma'_f) < k - p$, we have that $V_{i_0} \setminus (\pi_1 \circ \rho_1)^{-1}(\Sigma'_f)$ is dense in V_{i_0} . Therefore, it suffices to show that U is dense in $V_{i_0} \setminus (\pi_1 \circ \rho_1)^{-1}(\Sigma'_f)$. Let $(x_\bullet, y_\bullet, z_\bullet) \in V_{i_0} \setminus (\pi_1 \circ \rho_1)^{-1}(\Sigma'_f)$. First suppose that $y_\bullet \notin I_g$. Then, we can choose a sequence $(x_n, y_n) \in \Gamma_f$ with $x_n \notin I_f$ converging to (x_\bullet, y_\bullet) . Since $y_\bullet \notin I_g$ and I_g is closed, $y_n \notin I_g$ for large enough n . Thus, if we let $z_n = g(y_n)$, we obtain a sequence $(x_n, y_n, z_n) \in U$ that converges to $(x_\bullet, y_\bullet, z_\bullet)$.

Now suppose that $y_\bullet \in I_f$. By Lemma 3.4, Γ_g is the closure of the graph of $g|_{Y \setminus (I_g \cup f(I_f))}$. Thus, we can find a sequence (y_n, z_n) in the graph of $g|_{Y \setminus (I_g \cup f(I_f))}$ with $(y_n, z_n) \rightarrow (y_\bullet, z_\bullet)$. Meanwhile, since $x_\bullet \notin \Sigma'_f$ and $y_\bullet \in I_g$, $\pi_2|_{\Gamma_f}$ is a finite map in a neighborhood of (x_\bullet, y_\bullet) . It

follows from the Weierstrass Preparation Theorem that $\pi_2|_{\Gamma_f}$ is an open map in that neighborhood. Therefore, there is a sequence $x_n \in X$ with $(x_n, y_n) \in \Gamma_f$ and $(x_n, y_n) \rightarrow (x_\bullet, y_\bullet)$. Since $y_n \notin f(I_f)$, $x_n \notin I_f$. Thus, we have found a sequence $\{(x_n, y_n, z_n)\} \subset U$ with $(x_n, y_n, z_n) \rightarrow (x_\bullet, y_\bullet, z_\bullet)$. We conclude that U is dense in V_{i_0} . \square

Remark 5.7. The reader who is interested in proving Proposition 1.6 using currents should note that Truong [26] presents an approach to pulling back (p, p) -currents for $p > 1$ that is somewhat different from [13]. In particular, one can also use Theorem 7 from [26] to prove Proposition 1.6.

6. A CAUTIONARY EXAMPLE

In this section, we present a rational map $f : X \dashrightarrow X$ of a three-dimensional algebraic manifold X that is not 2-stable, but has the property that $(f|_{X \setminus I_f})^{-1}(x)$ is a finite set for every $x \in X$. This illustrates that in order to study p -stability for $p \geq 2$, it is necessary to consider collapsing behavior within the indeterminacy set.

Let $f_0 : \mathbb{P}^3 \dashrightarrow \mathbb{P}^3$ be the composition $f_0 = \alpha_0 \circ s_0$, where α_0 is the birational map

$$(17) \quad \begin{aligned} \alpha_0([x_1 : x_2 : x_3 : x_4]) \\ = [x_1(x_2 - x_4)(x_3 - x_4) : x_4(x_2 - x_4)(x_3 - x_4) : x_4(x_2 - x_1)(x_3 - x_4) : x_4(x_2 - x_4)(x_3 - x_1)] \end{aligned}$$

and s_0 is the squaring map

$$(18) \quad s_0([x_1 : x_2 : x_3 : x_4]) = [x_1^2 : x_2^2 : x_3^2 : x_4^2].$$

Let $\varrho : X \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^3$ be the blow-up of \mathbb{P}^3 at the five points $[1 : 0 : 0 : 0]$, $[0 : 1 : 0 : 0]$, $[0 : 0 : 1 : 0]$, $[0 : 0 : 0 : 1]$, and $[1 : 1 : 1 : 1]$ and let $\alpha : X \dashrightarrow X$, $s : X \dashrightarrow X$, and f be the lifts of α_0 , s_0 , and f_0 .

Proposition 6.1. *$f : X \dashrightarrow X$ satisfies for every $x \in X$ that $(f|_{X \setminus I_f})^{-1}(x)$ is a finite set, but f is not 2-stable.*

Proof. We will start by showing that $(f|_{X \setminus I_f})^{-1}(x)$ is a finite set for every $x \in X$. One can check that $\alpha_0 : \mathbb{P}^3 \dashrightarrow \mathbb{P}^3$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} I_{\alpha_0} = & \{x_1 = x_4 = 0\} \cup \{x_2 = x_4 = 0\} \cup \{x_3 = x_4 = 0\} \\ & \cup \{x_1 = x_2 = x_4\} \cup \{x_1 = x_3 = x_4\} \cup \{x_2 = x_3 = x_4\}. \end{aligned}$$

The four points $[1 : 0 : 0 : 0]$, $[0 : 1 : 0 : 0]$, $[0 : 0 : 1 : 0]$, $[1 : 1 : 1 : 1]$ where these six lines meet are each blown-up by α_0 to the following hyperplanes

$$\{x_2 = 0\}, \{x_2 = x_3\}, \{x_2 = x_4\}, \text{ and } \{x_1 = x_2\},$$

respectively. Once these four points are removed, the six lines in I_{α_0} map by flip indeterminacy (see, for example, [23]) to the lines

$$\begin{aligned} & \{x_2 = x_3 = x_4\} \cup \{x_2 = x_4 = 0\} \cup \{x_2 = x_3 = 0\} \\ & \cup \{x_1 = x_2 = x_4\} \cup \{x_1 = x_2 = x_3\} \cup \{x_1 = x_2 = x_4\}, \end{aligned}$$

respectively. A flip indeterminacy from a line L_1 to a line L_2 blows up any point $p \in L_1$ to all of L_2 , based on the direction that one approaches p within a transversal plane. Meanwhile, there is a *collapsing behavior*: if one approaches any two points of L_1 with the same transversal direction, one is sent by f to the same point of L_2 .

The critical set of α_0 consists of the hypersurfaces

$$\{x_4 = 0\} \cup \{x_1 = x_4\} \cup \{x_2 = x_4\} \cup \{x_3 = x_4\},$$

which are all collapsed by α_0 to the points $[1 : 0 : 0 : 0]$, $[1 : 1 : 1 : 1]$, $[0 : 0 : 1 : 0]$, and $[0 : 0 : 0 : 1]$, respectively, with the first three of these points in I_{α_0} .

When creating X , we have blown-up each of the images of the varieties that are collapsed by α_0 as well as $[0 : 0 : 0 : 1] = \alpha_0^{-1}([0 : 1 : 0 : 0])$. Using the universal property of blow-ups [14] (or direct calculations), one can check the indeterminacy set of $\alpha : X \dashrightarrow X$ is the proper transform of I_{α_0} and that α has no critical points (outside of I_α). In particular, α collapses no curves or hypersurfaces lying outside of I_α .

One can check that $s : X \dashrightarrow X$ is holomorphic in a neighborhood of each of the exceptional divisors, inducing the squaring map on each of the exceptional divisors $E_{[1:0:0:0]}$, $E_{[0:1:0:0]}$, $E_{[0:0:1:0]}$, $E_{[0:0:0:1]}$ and is the identity on the exceptional divisor $E_{[1:1:1:1]}$. As a result, the only indeterminacy points of s are the lifts under ϱ above the 7 points in $s_0^{-1}([1 : 1 : 1 : 1]) \setminus [1 : 1 : 1 : 1]$, each of which is blown-up to $E_{[1:1:1:1]}$. Since s_0 did not collapse any hypersurfaces or curves and s does not collapse anything in these exceptional divisors, we conclude that s also doesn't collapse any hypersurfaces or curves.

The indeterminacy of $f = \alpha \circ s$ is contained in $s^{-1}(I_\alpha) \cup I_s$. One can check that $I_s \subset I_f$ since α doesn't collapse $E_{[1:1:1:1]}$. Meanwhile, $s^{-1}(I_\alpha)$ is the proper transform of the 15 lines

$$\begin{aligned} s_0^{-1}(I_{\alpha_0}) = & \{x_1 = x_4 = 0\} \cup \{x_2 = x_4 = 0\} \cup \{x_3 = x_4 = 0\} \\ & \cup \{x_1 = \pm x_2 = \pm x_4\} \cup \{x_1 = \pm x_3 = \pm x_4\} \cup \{x_2 = \pm x_3 = \pm x_4\}. \end{aligned}$$

Taking any point from one of these 15 lines that is not on one of the exceptional divisors, one can use the homogeneous expression for f_0 to see that each such point is in I_f . Therefore, $I_f = s^{-1}(I_\alpha) \cup I_s$. Since neither α nor s collapse any variety outside of their indeterminate sets, we conclude that f doesn't collapse any variety outside of I_f .

The only non-trivial cohomology groups of X are $H^0(X) \cong \mathbb{C}$, $H^2(X) = H^{(1,1)}(X) \cong \mathbb{C}^6$, $H^4(X) = H^{(2,2)}(X) \cong \mathbb{C}^6$, and $H^6(X) \cong \mathbb{C}$. By Lemma 5.2, any rational map acts stably on $H^0(X)$ and $H^6(X)$. Since I_f is of codimension ≥ 2 and f collapses nothing outside of I_f , the Bedford-Kim criterion (Prop. 1.5) implies that f acts stably on $H^{(1,1)}(X)$. Therefore, in order to prove that f is not 2-stable, it suffices to show that $(f^2)^* \neq (f^*)^2$ on all of $H^*(X)$.

For notational convenience, we'll write the composition as $g \circ f$, where $X = Y = Z$ and $f : X \dashrightarrow Y$ and $g : Y \dashrightarrow Z$ are the same map. We will first show that every component of $\rho_1^{-1}(\Gamma_f) \cap \rho_3^{-1}(\Gamma_g)$ has the correct dimension ($= 3$), so that Lemma 2.5 implies that each component appears with positive multiplicity in the cup product $\rho_1^*([\Gamma_f]) \smile \rho_3^*([\Gamma_g])$. We will then show that there is at least one component V' of the intersection other than the principal component V (see Lemma 5.1 for the definition of the principal component) with the property that $\rho_{2*}([V']) \neq 0$. Non-functoriality $(f^2)^* \neq (f^*)^2$ will then follow from Proposition 1.1.

Consider a component $V' \neq V$ of $\rho_1^{-1}(\Gamma_f) \cap \rho_3^{-1}(\Gamma_g)$. Since $V' \neq V$ and f a finite map outside of I_f , $(\pi_1 \circ \rho_1)(V') \subset I_f$. Meanwhile, $(\pi_2 \circ \rho_1)(V') \subset I_g$. Let $\phi : V' \rightarrow \phi(V') \subset X \times Y$ be the restriction of the projection onto the first two coordinates. If $\dim(V') \geq 4$, then, since $\dim(\phi(V')) \leq 2$, the fibers over generic points satisfy $\dim(\phi^{-1}(x, y)) \geq 2$. However, there are finitely many points $y \in Y$ with $\dim(g(y)) \geq 2$, implying that $\dim(\pi_2 \circ \rho_1)(V') = 0$.

Therefore, the dimension of the projections of V' onto X , Y , and Z would be 1, 0, and 2, respectively, implying that $\dim(V') = 3$.

We will now find a component $V' \neq V \subset \rho_1^{-1}(\Gamma_f) \cap \rho_3^{-1}(\Gamma_g)$ so that $\rho_{2*}([V']) \neq 0$. Let $L_1 \subset X$ be the proper transform of $\{x_1 = x_3 = x_4\}$, let $L_2 \subset Y$ be the proper transform of $\{y_1 = y_2 = y_3\}$, let $p = \varrho^{-1}([1 : 1 : 1 : -1]) \in L_2$, and let $H \subset Z$ be the proper transform of $\{z_1 = z_2\}$. Since s maps a neighborhood of L_1 biholomorphically onto a neighborhood L_1 and α blows-up each point of L_1 to all of L_2 , we have that $L_1 \times \{p\} \subset \Gamma_f$. Meanwhile, since s blows up the indeterminate point p to $E_{[1:1:1:1]}$, which is mapped by α to the plane $z_1 = z_2$, we have that $\{p\} \times H \subset \Gamma_g$. We conclude that

$$V' := L_1 \times \{p\} \times H \subset \rho_1^{-1}(\Gamma_f) \cap \rho_3^{-1}(\Gamma_g).$$

Since V' is an irreducible 3-dimensional variety with $(\pi_1 \circ \rho_1)(V) = L_1 \subsetneq X$, it is not the principal component V . *It is the collapsing behavior of the flip indeterminacy along L_1 into the point of indeterminacy p that produces this extra component of $\rho_1^{-1}(\Gamma_f) \cap \rho_3^{-1}(\Gamma_g)$. This will lead to non-functoriality of the composition.*

Since ρ_2 maps V' biholomorphically to $L_1 \times H \subset X \times Z$, $\rho_{2*}([V']) \neq 0$. We conclude that $(g \circ f)^* \neq f^* \circ g^*$. \square

Remark 6.2. In a joint work with S. Koch [22], we check that f can be lifted to a further blow-up of X on which Proposition 1.2 can be applied. We then compute that the first and second dynamical degrees of this lift satisfy that $\lambda_1 \approx 2.3462$ is the largest root of

$$p_1(z) = z^4 - z^3 - 4z - 8,$$

$\lambda_2 \approx 4.8409$ is the largest root of

$$p_2(z) = z^9 - 4z^8 + 2z^7 - 16z^6 - 160z^5 + 448z^4 - 128z^3 + 6144z - 8192.$$

Since dynamical degrees are invariant under birational conjugacy (see, for example, [21]), these are the same as the dynamical degrees of $f : X \dashrightarrow X$. However, one can check that $\dim(H^4(X)) = 6$. Since p_2 is an irreducible polynomial of degree 9 > 6, this gives an alternate proof that $f : X \dashrightarrow X$ is not 2-stable.

Question 6.3. Does there exist a rational map $f : \mathbb{P}^3 \dashrightarrow \mathbb{P}^3$ such that $\left(f|_{\mathbb{P}^3 \setminus I_f}\right)^{-1}(x)$ is a finite set for every $x \in \mathbb{P}^3$, that is not 2-stable?

REFERENCES

- [1] Ekaterina Amerik. A computation of invariants of a rational self-map. *Ann. Fac. Sci. Toulouse Math.* (6), 18(3):445–457, 2009.
- [2] Turgay Bayraktar. Green currents for meromorphic maps of compact kähler manifolds. *Journal of Geometric Analysis*, pages 1–29, 2012.
- [3] Eric Bedford. On the dynamics of birational mappings of the plane. *J. Korean Math. Soc.*, 40(3):373–390, 2003.
- [4] Eric Bedford. The dynamical degrees of a mapping. In *Proceedings of the International Workshop Future Directions in Difference Equations*, pages 3–14. Publicacions da Universidade de Vigo, Vigo, Spain, 2011.
- [5] Eric Bedford and Kyounghee Kim. On the degree growth of birational mappings in higher dimension. *J. Geom. Anal.*, 14(4):567–596, 2004.
- [6] Eric Bedford and Kyounghee Kim. Degree growth of matrix inversion: Birational maps of symmetric, cyclic matrices. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.*, 21(4):977–1013, 2008.
- [7] Araceli Bonifant and John Erik Forneaess. Growth of degree for iterates of rational maps in several variables. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, 49(2):751–778, 2000.

- [8] Glen E. Bredon. *Topology and geometry*, volume 139 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1993.
- [9] E. M. Chirka. *Complex analytic sets*, volume 46 of *Mathematics and its Applications (Soviet Series)*. Kluwer Academic Publishers Group, Dordrecht, 1989. Translated from the Russian by R. A. M. Hoksbergen.
- [10] J. Diller and C. Favre. Dynamics of bimeromorphic maps of surfaces. *Amer. J. Math.*, 123(6):1135–1169, 2001.
- [11] Jeffrey Diller, Romain Dujardin, and Vincent Guedj. Dynamics of meromorphic maps with small topological degree I: from cohomology to currents. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, 59(2):521–561, 2010.
- [12] Tien-Cuong Dinh, Viet-Anh Nguyen, and Tuyen Trung Truong. Equidistribution for meromorphic maps with dominant topological degree. Preprint: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1303.5992>.
- [13] Tien-Cuong Dinh and Nessim Sibony. Super-potentials of positive closed currents, intersection theory and dynamics. *Acta Math.*, 203(1):1–82, 2009.
- [14] David Eisenbud and Joe Harris. *The geometry of schemes*, volume 197 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2000.
- [15] Charles Favre and Elizabeth Wulcan. Degree growth of monomial maps and mcmullen’s polytope algebra. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, 61:493–524, 2012.
- [16] John Erik Fornæss and Nessim Sibony. Complex dynamics in higher dimension. II. In *Modern methods in complex analysis (Princeton, NJ, 1992)*, volume 137 of *Ann. of Math. Stud.*, pages 135–182. Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, NJ, 1995.
- [17] William Fulton. *Introduction to intersection theory in algebraic geometry*, volume 54 of *CBMS Regional Conference Series in Mathematics*. Published for the Conference Board of the Mathematical Sciences, Washington, DC, 1984.
- [18] William Fulton. *Intersection theory*, volume 2 of *Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete. 3. Folge. A Series of Modern Surveys in Mathematics [Results in Mathematics and Related Areas. 3rd Series. A Series of Modern Surveys in Mathematics]*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, second edition, 1998.
- [19] Phillip Griffiths and Joseph Harris. *Principles of algebraic geometry*. Wiley Classics Library. John Wiley & Sons Inc., New York, 1994. Reprint of the 1978 original.
- [20] Vincent Guedj. Entropie topologique des applications méromorphes. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, 25(6):1847–1855, 2005.
- [21] Vincent Guedj. Ergodic properties of rational mappings with large topological degree. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 161(3):1589–1607, 2005.
- [22] Sarah Koch and Roland K.W. Roeder. Computing dynamical degrees for a family of maps of the Deligne-Mumford compactification of $\mathcal{M}_{0,n}$. in preparation.
- [23] János Kollár and Shigefumi Mori. *Birational geometry of algebraic varieties*, volume 134. Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- [24] Jan-Li Lin. Pulling back cohomology classes and dynamical degrees of monomial maps. To appear in Bulletin de la Société Mathématique de France; available at <http://arxiv.org/abs/1010.6285>.
- [25] Jan-Li Lin and Elizabeth Wulcan. Stabilization of monomial maps in higher codimension. To appear in Annales de l’Institut Fourier; available at <http://arxiv.org/abs/1206.4925>.
- [26] Tuyen Trung Truong. Pull-back of currents by meromorphic maps. To appear in Bulletin de la Société Mathématique de France; available at <http://arxiv.org/abs/1107.1743>.
- [27] Claire Voisin. *Hodge theory and complex algebraic geometry. I*, volume 76 of *Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, english edition, 2007. Translated from the French by Leila Schneps.
- [28] Claire Voisin. *Hodge theory and complex algebraic geometry. II*, volume 77 of *Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, english edition, 2007. Translated from the French by Leila Schneps.

E-mail address: rroeder@math.iupui.edu

IUPUI DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, LD BUILDING, ROOM 224Q, 402 NORTH BLACKFORD STREET, INDIANAPOLIS, INDIANA 46202-3267, UNITED STATES