

THE TAME NORI FUNDAMENTAL GROUP

INDRANIL BISWAS, MANISH KUMAR, AND A. J. PARAMESWARAN

ABSTRACT. We introduce three notion of tameness of the Nori fundamental group scheme for a normal quasiprojective variety X over an algebraically closed field. It is proved that these three notions agree if X admits a smooth completion with strict normal crossing divisor as the complement. We also prove a Lefschetz type restriction theorem for the tame Nori fundamental group scheme for such an X .

1. INTRODUCTION

Let X be a variety defined over an algebraically closed field k , and fix a closed point x of X . Let $\pi^N(X, x)(k)$ denote the k -rational points of the Nori fundamental group scheme defined by Nori using the finite group scheme torsors over X [No]. There is a natural surjective map $\pi^N(X, x)(k) \longrightarrow \pi_1^{et}(X, x)$ to the étale fundamental group, because $\pi_1^{et}(X, x)$ corresponds to the torsors on X for (reduced) finite groups. On the étale side, when X is quasi-projective normal curve one defines $\pi_1^{et,t}(X, x)$ as the quotient of $\pi_1^{et}(X, x)$ which represents étale covers of X which are tamely ramified at the boundary points. The notion of tameness becomes a little more subtle for covers of higher dimensional normal varieties (see [KS]).

In this article we provide three different definitions of the tame Nori fundamental group scheme (see Proposition 2.10 and Proposition 2.12) and discuss relationship between them. When X is projective then $\pi^N(X, x)$ has a Tannakian description. In [BKP1] we defined Nori fundamental group of projective formal orbifolds as Tannaka dual of a Tannakian category of certain equivariant bundles. Using this description we defined a group scheme $\pi^n(X^o, x)$ when X^o is a quasi-projective normal variety. It was shown in [BKP1] that there is a surjection $\pi^N(X^o, x) \longrightarrow \pi^n(X^o, x)$; however, it is not clear if this is an isomorphism.

Two of the three versions of the tame Nori fundamental group schemes are quotients of $\pi^n(X^o, x)$ and all the versions agree if X^o admits a smooth completion X with $D = X \setminus X^o$ a strict normal crossing divisor (Proposition 3.1 and Theorem 3.2).

In the above set-up, Lefschetz theorem holds for the tame fundamental group [EK]. We partially extend it to the tame Nori fundamental group scheme. More precisely, in Theorem 4.4 we show that if Z is a general hyperplane section of X high enough degree, then the natural homomorphism $\pi^{N,t}(Z \setminus Z \cap D) \longrightarrow \pi^{N,t}(X^o)$ is surjective if the dimension of Z is at least one.

2. VARIOUS NOTIONS OF TAME NORI FUNDAMENTAL GROUP

Let X^o be a regular quasiprojective variety over a perfect field k of characteristic p . Let X be a normal projective variety containing X^o as an open subset. Recall the following

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 14H30, 14J60.

Key words and phrases. Parabolic bundle, orbifold bundle, Tannakian category, essentially finite bundle.

definitions of tameness from [KS]. An étale covering $Y^\circ \rightarrow X^\circ$ is said to have *curve tame* ramification at the boundary if the normalization of the pullback $C^\circ \times_X^\circ Y^\circ \rightarrow C^\circ$ is tamely ramified outside C° for every morphism $C^\circ \rightarrow X^\circ$ with C° regular. Note that an étale covering $D^\circ \rightarrow C^\circ$ of quasi-projective regular curves is said to be tamely ramified outside C° if the induced morphism $D \rightarrow C$ is tamely ramified at points over $C \setminus C^\circ$ where C and D are the regular projective compactification of C° and D° respectively. Let $f : Y \rightarrow X$ be the normalization of X in the function field $k(Y)$ of Y . The covering is said to be *numerically tame* if for all $y \in Y \setminus Y^\circ$, the inertia group I_y is of order prime to p .

There are multiple ways to think about the tame Nori fundamental group scheme of X° .

2.1. Two definitions using formal orbifolds. Let (X, P) be a normal projective formal orbifold over k such that X° is an open subset of X and the branch locus of P lies outside X° . In [BKP1] Nori fundamental group of such a pair (X, P) was defined using the essentially finite Galois equivariant bundles of an appropriate cover of (X, P) . Recall from [Ku, Definition 9.5] that the branch data P is said to be *numerically tame* if for every point $x \in X$ of codimension at least one the extension $P(x)/\mathcal{K}_{X,x}$ is tamely ramified. Also, P is called *curve-tame* at a closed point $x \in X$ if the following holds:

For any codimension one prime ideal \mathfrak{p} in $\widehat{\mathcal{O}_{X,x}}$ not in $\text{BL}(P)$, and for any codimension one prime ideal \mathfrak{q} in the integral closure $\mathcal{O}_{P(x)}$ of $\widehat{\mathcal{O}_{X,x}}$ in $P(x)$ lying above \mathfrak{p} , let R and S be the normalizations of $\widehat{\mathcal{O}_{X,x}}/\mathfrak{p}$ and $\mathcal{O}_{P(x)}/\mathfrak{q}$ respectively. Then P is called *curve-tame* at $x \in X$ if S/R is at most a tamely ramified extension.

The branch data P is called *curve-tame* if it is curve-tame for all closed points $x \in X$. A branch data P on X is called *geometric* if $P = B_f$ for some finite ramified Galois cover $f : Y \rightarrow X$.

A branch data which is both geometric and curve tame will be called a geometric and curve tame branch data. Recall the following result of [Ku] which characterizes geometric curve-tame branch data.

Proposition 2.1 ([Ku, Proposition 9.6]). *Let X be a proper normal variety over k and $f : Y \rightarrow X$ a Galois covering which is étale over a nonempty open subset X° of the regular locus of X . The branch data B_f is curve-tame if and only if f is curve-tame.*

Let $x \in X^\circ$ be a generic geometric point of X° , so it is given by a morphism

$$\text{Spec}(K) \rightarrow X^\circ,$$

where K is the separable closure of $k(X^\circ)$. We define

$$\pi_1^{et,nt}(X^\circ) := \pi_1^{et,nt}(X^\circ, x)$$

which turns out to be the inverse limit of the Galois groups of the Galois coverings of X which are numerically tame along D . Similarly $\pi_1^{et,ct}(X^\circ)$ denotes the quotient of $\pi_1^{et}(X^\circ)$ which corresponds to curve tame covers of X° . Note that $\pi_1^{et,nt}(X^\circ)$ depends on the compactification X as well.

Proposition 2.2. *The group $\pi_1^{et,nt}(X^\circ)$ is the inverse limit of $\pi_1^{et}(X, P)$, where the limit is over all the branch data P on X whose branch locus is outside X° and P is numerically tame. Similarly, $\pi_1^{et,ct}(X^\circ)$ is the limit over the branch data P which are curve tame.*

Proof. Note that $f : Y \rightarrow X$ is numerically-tame covering if and only if B_f is curve-tame branch data. The same holds for curve-tame [Ku, Proposition 9.6]. Rest of the argument is similar to the proof of [Ku, Theorem 5.4]. \square

We recall from [BKP1] the definition of vector bundles on geometric formal orbifolds (X, P) (also see [KP] for the curve case). Let $(Y, O) \rightarrow (X, P)$ be an étale Γ -Galois covering of formal orbifolds. The category $\text{Vect}(X, P)$ of vector bundles on (X, P) are the Γ -equivariant vector bundles on Y , while morphisms between two vector bundles on (X, P) are defined to be the Γ -equivariant homomorphisms between the corresponding Γ -bundles on Y . Note that the category $\text{Vect}(X, P)$ does not depend on the choice of the covering $(Y, O) \rightarrow (X, P)$. Let $\text{Vect}^s(X, P)$ (respectively, $\text{Vect}^f(X, P)$) denote the full subcategory of $\text{Vect}(X, P)$ consisting of strongly semistable (respectively, essentially finite) equivariant vector bundles. The category $\text{Vect}^f(X, P)$ is equipped with the usual operations of direct sum, tensor product and dual. With these $\text{Vect}^f(X, P)$ is a Tannakian category. For a closed point $x \in X$ outside the support of P , there is an associated fiber functor from $\text{Vect}^f(X, P)$ to the category of k -vector spaces. The automorphism group scheme of this fiber functor is the Nori fundamental group scheme $\pi^N((X, P), x)$ of (X, P) . We will often drop the base point from the notation.

We say that a cover $f : Y \rightarrow X$ is genuinely ramified if there is no nontrivial étale cover of X dominated by f .

Lemma 2.3. *Let $f : Y \rightarrow X$ be a genuinely ramified map, and let E_1, E_2 be semistable bundles on X with $\mu(E_1) = \mu(E_2)$. Then $\text{Hom}(f^*E_1, f^*E_2) \cong \text{Hom}(E_1, E_2)$.*

Proof. See [BP, p. 12844, Lemma 4.3] and the proof of Theorem 2.5 of [BDP]. \square

Lemma 2.4. *Let $f : Y \rightarrow X$ be a G -Galois cover, and let E be a vector bundle on X . Let V be a G -equivariant subbundle of the G -equivariant vector bundle f^*E . Then there is a natural isomorphism $V \cong f^*((f_*V)^G)$ of G -equivariant bundles.*

Proof. We have $(f_*\mathcal{O}_Y)^G = \mathcal{O}_X$. Consequently, using the projection formula,

$$(f_*f^*E)^G = ((f_*\mathcal{O}_Y) \otimes E)^G = E.$$

Therefore,

$$f^*((f_*V)^G) \subset f^*((f_*f^*E)^G) = f^*E,$$

and $f^*((f_*V)^G)$ is a subbundle of f^*E . Now, the two subbundles V and $f^*((f_*V)^G)$ of f^*E coincide over the open subset $f^{-1}(U) \subset Y$, where $U \subset X$ is the open subset over which the map f is étale. This implies that the two subbundles V and $f^*((f_*V)^G)$ of f^*E coincide over entire Y . \square

Proposition 2.5. *Let X be a normal projective variety. Let $P_1 \geq P_2$ be two geometric branch data on X . Then there is a fully faithful functor*

$$i^* : \text{Vect}^s(X, P_2) \rightarrow \text{Vect}^s(X, P_1).$$

Moreover, for any object \mathcal{E} in $\text{Vect}^s(X, P_2)$ and a subobject \mathcal{V} of $i^\mathcal{E}$, there exist an object \mathcal{E}' in $\text{Vect}^s(X, P_2)$ such that $i^*\mathcal{E}' \cong \mathcal{V}$.*

Proof. For $i = 1, 2$, let $f_i : (Y_i, O) \rightarrow (X, P_i)$ be an étale G_i -Galois cover. Replacing f_1 by the fiber product of f_1 and f_2 we may assume f_1 dominates f_2 .

As f_1 dominates f_2 , there is a unique morphism

$$f : Y_1 \longrightarrow Y_2$$

such that $f_2 \circ f = f_1$. Let H be the Galois group of the extension $k(Y_1)/k(Y_2)$, so $G_1/H = G_2$. Take G_2 -equivariant vector bundles E_1 and E_2 on Y_2 . We need to show that

$$\mathrm{Hom}(E_1, E_2)^{G_2} \cong \mathrm{Hom}(f^*E_1, f^*E_2)^{G_1}.$$

For that it suffices to show that

$$\mathrm{Hom}(E_1, E_2) \cong \mathrm{Hom}(f^*E_1, f^*E_2)^H.$$

We may express f as $f = h \circ g$, where $g : Y_1 \longrightarrow Z$ is genuinely ramified and $h : Z \longrightarrow Y_2$ is an étale H' -Galois cover. By Lemma 2.3 we have

$$\mathrm{Hom}(f^*E_1, f^*E_2) \cong \mathrm{Hom}(h^*E_1, h^*E_2).$$

By étale Galois descent,

$$\mathrm{Hom}(h^*E_1, h^*E_2)^{H'} \cong \mathrm{Hom}(E_1, E_2).$$

Combining these we obtain that $\mathrm{Hom}(E_1, E_2) \cong \mathrm{Hom}(f^*E_1, f^*E_2)^H$.

For the second part of the proposition, let E be a G_2 -equivariant vector bundle on Y_2 so that $\mathcal{E} = (f_2 : (Y_2, \mathcal{O}) \longrightarrow (X, P_2), E)$, and let V be a G_1 -equivariant subbundle of f^*E representing \mathcal{V} . Then V is also an H -equivariant bundle. Hence by Lemma 2.4,

$$V \cong f^*[(f_*V)^H].$$

But $(f_*V)^H$ is a G_2 -equivariant subbundle of E . □

In view of Proposition 2.5 and [DM, Proposition 2.21] we obtain the following.

Corollary 2.6. *Let $P_1 \geq P_2$ be two geometric branch data on a normal projective variety X . Then the natural morphism $\pi^N(X, P_1) \longrightarrow \pi^N(X, P_2)$ is surjective.*

Definition 2.7. The *numerically tame Nori fundamental group* $\pi^{N,nt}(X^o)$ of X^o is defined to be the projective limit of $\pi^N(X, P)$, where the limit is over all the branch data P on X whose branch locus is outside X^o and P is numerically tame. Similarly, *curve tame Nori fundamental group* $\pi^{N,ct}(X^o)$ of X^o is the limit over the geometric branch data P which are curve tame.

Remark 2.8. Note that in [BKP1, Definition 3.3] $\pi^n(X^o)$ was defined to be the projective limit of $\pi^N(X, P)$, where the limit is over all the branch data P on X whose branch locus is outside X^o . Hence $\pi^{N,nt}(X^o)$ and $\pi^{N,ct}(X^o)$ are quotients of $\pi^n(X^o)$.

Definition 2.9. Let X be a smooth projective variety and D a divisor on X . Let

$$\mathrm{Vect}^{f,nt}(X, D)$$

be the category defined as follows:

- The objects are pairs $(f : Y \longrightarrow X, E)$, where f is a numerically tamely ramified Galois cover étale outside D , and E is an $\mathrm{Aut}(Y/X)$ -equivariant vector bundle on Y , which is essentially finite.

- Let $\mathcal{E}_1 = (f_1 : Y_1 \rightarrow X, E_1)$ and $\mathcal{E}_2 = (f_2 : Y_2 \rightarrow X, E_2)$ be two objects, and let $f : Y \rightarrow X$ be a tamely ramified Galois cover of X which is étale outside D while dominating both f_1 and f_2 . Let $g_i : Y \rightarrow Y_i$ be such that $f_i \circ g_i = f$ for $i = 1, 2$. Then $g_1^*E_1$ and $g_2^*E_2$ are $\text{Aut}(Y/X)$ -equivariant vector bundles over Y .
- Denote by $\text{Hom}(\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2)$ the space of $\text{Aut}(Y/X)$ -equivariant homomorphisms from $g_1^*E_1$ to $g_2^*E_2$. Note that by Proposition 2.5, $\text{Hom}(\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2)$ does not depend on the choice of Y .
- The tensor product is

$$\mathcal{E}_1 \otimes \mathcal{E}_2 := (f : Y \rightarrow X, g_1^*E_1 \otimes g_2^*E_2)$$

while the dual is $\mathcal{E}_1^* = (f_1, E_1^*)$.

Proposition 2.10. *The category $\text{Vect}^{f,nt}(X, D)$ in Definition 2.9 is Tannakian. Its Tannaka dual is $\pi^{N,nt}(X \setminus D)$.*

Proof. Note that for geometric branch data P and P' on X , with $P \leq P'$, we have a fully faithful functor from $\text{Vect}^f(X, P)$ to $\text{Vect}^f(X, P')$. Now the direct limit of $\text{Vect}^f(X, P)$, where P varies over numerically tame geometric branch data with branch locus $\text{BL}(P) \subset D$, is precisely $\text{Vect}^{f,nt}(X, D)$. Hence its Tannaka dual is the inverse limit of the Tannaka duals of $\text{Vect}^f(X, P)$, where P varies over numerically tame geometric branch data with branch locus $\text{BL}(P) \subset D$, which is $\pi^{N,nt}(X \setminus D)$. \square

Recall that a vector bundle E on a variety Y is called Frobenius trivial or F -trivial if $F^{n*}E$ is trivial for some n where $F : Y \rightarrow Y$ is the Frobenius morphism.

Proposition 2.11. *The full subcategory of $\text{Vect}^{f,nt}(X, D)$ consisting of objects (f, E) , where E is a F -trivial bundle, is equivalent to the entire category $\text{Vect}^{f,nt}(X, D)$.*

Proof. Let $(f : Y \rightarrow X, E)$ be an object of $\text{Vect}^{f,nt}(X, D)$. Since E is an essentially finite bundle on Y , there exist a finite étale cover $g : Y' \rightarrow Y$ such that g^*E is F -trivial. Passing to the Galois closure of $f \circ g$ we may assume g is Galois and hence g^*E is $\text{Aut}(Y'/X)$ -equivariant bundle. By definition $(f \circ g : Y' \rightarrow X, g^*E)$ is isomorphic to (f, E) in $\text{Vect}^{f,nt}(X, D)$. \square

In the same way we can define $\text{Vect}^{f,ct}(X, D)$ and deduce that its Tannaka dual is $\pi^{N,ct}(X \setminus D)$. Moreover Proposition 2.11 holds with $\text{Vect}^{f,nt}(X, D)$ replaced $\text{Vect}^{f,ct}(X, D)$.

2.2. A definition using tame parabolic bundles. Here we assume that X is smooth, k is an algebraically closed field of characteristic zero and $D = X \setminus X^o$ is a reduced effective divisor. In [MY] parabolic bundles on curves X relative to D were defined. For higher dimensions this was extended in [MY]. In [Bi1] it was shown that when $k = \mathbb{C}$, and D is a simple normal crossing divisor, the category of parabolic bundles is equivalent to the category of orbifold bundles (see also [Bo1], [Bo2]).

When k is of positive characteristic, and X is a curve, the orbifold bundles were studied in [KP]. In that case, parabolic bundles were defined in [KM] and it was shown that the two categories are equivalent. Though the structure of parabolic bundles is complicated due to the wild ramifications, the objects in the subcategory of tame parabolic bundles which correspond to the tame orbifold bundles are considerably simpler. In fact, the tame parabolic

bundles are same as the parabolic bundles whose all the parabolic weights have denominators prime to the characteristic p .

Let X be a smooth projective variety and

$$D \subset X$$

a reduced effective divisor. Let

$$D = \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} D_i$$

be the decomposition of D into its irreducible components.

Take a vector bundle E on X . A quasiparabolic structure on E is a filtration of subbundles

$$E|_{D_i} = F_1^i \supset F_2^i \supset \cdots \supset F_{n_i-1}^i \supset F_{n_i}^i \supset F_{n_i+1}^i = 0 \quad (2.1)$$

for every $1 \leq i \leq \ell$. A system of parabolic weights for such a quasiparabolic structure consists of rational numbers

$$0 \leq \alpha_1^i < \alpha_2^i < \cdots < \alpha_{n_i-1}^i < \alpha_{n_i}^i < 1 \quad (2.2)$$

for every $1 \leq i \leq \ell$ satisfying the condition that there is an integer $N \geq 1$ prime to p for which $N\alpha_j^i \in \mathbb{Z}$ for all i, j .

A parabolic structure on E is a quasiparabolic structure as above together with a system of parabolic weights. Take a parabolic structure on E . Let $\{E_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ be the corresponding filtration of sheaves (see [MY]). We impose the following condition on the parabolic structure:

Each sheaf E_t , $t \in \mathbb{R}$, is locally free.

A tame parabolic structure on E is a parabolic structure on E satisfying the above condition.

Tensor product and dual of parabolic bundles are defined in standard way (see, for example, [Bi2], [Yo]). Let E_* and F_* be parabolic bundles. Then all the parabolic weights of the parabolic tensor product $E_* \otimes F_*$ at a parabolic divisor D are of the form $\alpha + \beta - [\alpha + \beta]$, where α (respectively, β) is a parabolic weight of E_* (respectively, F_*) at D ; the notation $[t] \in \mathbb{Z}$ stands for the integral part of $t \in \mathbb{R}$, so $0 \leq t - [t] < 1$. From this it follows immediately that the parabolic tensor product of two tame parabolic bundles is again a tame parabolic bundle. Next note that all the parabolic weights of the parabolic dual E_*^* at a parabolic divisor D are of the form $-\alpha - [-\alpha]$, where α is a parabolic weight of E_* at D . This implies that the parabolic dual of a tame parabolic bundle is again a tame parabolic bundle.

For any polynomial $f = \sum_{i=0}^n a_i x^i \in \mathbb{Z}[X]$ with $a_i \geq 0$, and any tame parabolic bundle E_* , define

$$f(E_*) := \bigoplus_{i=0}^n (E_*^{\otimes i})^{\oplus a_i},$$

where $E_*^{\otimes 0}$ is the trivial parabolic line bundle (trivial line bundle with no nonzero parabolic weight).

A tame parabolic bundle E_* is called *finite* if there are two distinct polynomials f_1 and f_2 as above such that the two parabolic bundles $f_1(E_*)$ and $f_2(E_*)$ are isomorphic. If E_* and F_* are finite tame parabolic bundles, then $E_* \otimes F_*$, $E_* \oplus F_*$ and E_*^* are also finite tame parabolic bundles.

Consider the abelian category generated by the finite tame parabolic bundles. Note that any parabolic bundle in this category is tame, because any parabolic subbundle of a tame parabolic bundle is tame. An *essentially finite* tame parabolic bundle is a parabolic bundle lying in this abelian category.

Proposition 2.12. *The category of essentially finite tame parabolic bundles with respect to D form a Tannakian category.*

Proof. The proof in [No] that the essentially finite vector bundles form a Tannakian category goes through without any change. \square

Let $\pi^{N,pt}(X^o)$ denote the Tannakian dual of this category of essentially finite tame parabolic bundles with respect to D . This $\pi^{N,pt}(X^o)$ is the third candidate for the Nori fundamental group scheme.

A tame orbifold bundle on X relative to D is a vector bundle on a formal orbifold (X, P) for some tame branch data P with $\text{BL}(P)$ contained in D . When D is a strict normal crossing divisor, extending the result of [Bi1] we will show that the category of tame orbifold bundles on X relative to D is equivalent to the category of tame parabolic bundles on X relative to D .

2.3. A definition using linearly reductive group scheme torsors. One definition which is attributed to Borne and Vistoli (Definition 10.4 of [BV]) is the maximal pro linearly reductive quotient of $\pi^N(X^o)$ using the tame Nori fundamental gerbe (also see Definition 3.9 and Remark 3.10 of [Ota]). Let us denote this group scheme by $\pi^{tame}(X^o)$. It behaves well with respect to the extension of base field. It surjects onto the prime-to- p part of the étale fundamental group of X^o .

It is natural to pose the following question.

Question 2.13. *What is the relation between $\pi^{tame}(X^o)$ and $\pi^{N,nt}(X^o)$.*

3. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN $\pi^{N,nt}(X^o)$, $\pi^{N,ct}(X^o)$ AND $\pi^{N,pt}(X^o)$

Let us first assume X^o is a curve. Denote by X its smooth compactification, and set $D = X \setminus X^o$. In this case $\pi^{N,nt}(X^o)$ and $\pi^{N,ct}(X^o)$ are evidently the same. There is an equivalence of categories between the category of tame orbifold bundles on X with orbifold structure along D and the category of tame parabolic bundles on X with filtration along D (see [KM, Proposition 5.15]). This induces an equivalence between the category $\text{Vect}^f(X, D)$ of essentially finite tame orbifold bundles on X with orbifold structure along D and the category $\text{PVect}^f(X, D)$ of tame parabolic bundles on X with filtration along D . Consequently, this equivalence of categories gives an isomorphism between $\pi^{N,nt}(X^o)$ and $\pi^{N,pt}(X^o)$, because the former is the Tannaka dual of $\text{Vect}^f(X, D)$ and the latter is the Tannaka dual of $\text{PVect}^f(X, D)$.

Proposition 3.1. *Let X be a smooth projective variety over k and $D \subset X$ a reduced divisor on X . Let $X^o := X \setminus D$ be the complement of it. Then there is an epimorphism $\pi^{N,ct}(X^o) \rightarrow \pi^{N,nt}(X^o)$.*

Proof. Note that if $Y \rightarrow X$ is a covering, étale over X^o , such that the ramification along the divisor $D = X \setminus X^o$ is numerically tame, then the pull-back of this covering via a

nonconstant morphism $C \rightarrow X$, where C is smooth connected projective curve, is tamely ramified [KS, Theorem 5.3 and Theorem 5.4]. This implies that if P is geometric numerically tame branch data, then it is curve tame as well [Ku, Proposition 9.7]. Hence there is a surjection $\pi^{N,ct}(X^o) \rightarrow \pi^{N,nt}(X^o)$. \square

In higher dimensions when D is a strict normal crossing divisor, we first note that $\pi^{N,ct}(X^o) \rightarrow \pi^{N,nt}(X^o)$ is an isomorphism. This is because a curve tame cover branched along a strict normal crossing divisor is numerically tame ([KS, Theorem 1.1 and 1.2]). Note that in the appendix of [KS] it is also shown that curve tame covers need not be numerically tame in general. Hence the map $\pi^{N,ct}(X^o) \rightarrow \pi^{N,nt}(X^o)$ is not necessarily an isomorphism if D is not a strict normal crossing divisor.

We will show that $\pi^{N,nt}(X^o)$ and $\pi^{N,pt}(X^o)$ are isomorphic. It actually follows from Theorem 3.2.

Theorem 3.2. *Assume that D is a strict normal crossing divisor. The category of tame parabolic bundles on X relative to D corresponds to the category of tame orbifold bundles on X relative to D .*

Proof. In [Bi1], [Bo1], [Bo2] this is proved under the assumption that the characteristic of the base field k is zero. However, then the characteristic of k is positive, the same proofs works if we restrict to the tame parabolic bundles. \square

Question 3.3. *In general when D may not be normal crossing divisor, is $\pi^{N,ct}(X^o)$ isomorphic to $\pi^{N,pt}(X^o)$?*

4. LEFSCHETZ THEOREM FOR TAME NORI FUNDAMENTAL GROUP

Lemma 4.1. *Let X be a smooth projective variety of dimension n and $H \subset X$ a general hyperplane. Let D be a reduced divisor on X , and $f : Y \rightarrow X$ is a cover étale away from D and tamely ramified along D . Set $C = H^{n-1}$, and let $i : C \rightarrow X$ be the inclusion map. Let $\tilde{i} : \tilde{C} \rightarrow Y$ be the pullback of i by f . Then $\tilde{i}^*\Omega_{Y/X}^1$ is isomorphic to $\Omega_{\tilde{C}/C}^1$.*

Proof. Let \tilde{f} be the projection map from $\tilde{C} \rightarrow C$. The Cartesian square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \tilde{C} & \xrightarrow{\tilde{i}} & Y \\ \tilde{f} \downarrow & & f \downarrow \\ C & \xrightarrow{i} & X \end{array}$$

induces the following commutative diagram of sheaves on \tilde{C} :

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & K_1 & \longrightarrow & \tilde{i}^* f^* \Omega_X^1 & \longrightarrow & \tilde{f}^* \Omega_C^1 \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & K_2 & \longrightarrow & \tilde{i}^* \Omega_Y^1 & \longrightarrow & \Omega_{\tilde{C}}^1 \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & K_3 & \longrightarrow & \tilde{i}^* \Omega_{Y/X}^1 & \longrightarrow & \Omega_{\tilde{C}/C}^1 \longrightarrow 0 \end{array} \quad (4.1)$$

Since H is general, C intersects D transversally. We will use this and separability of f to show that $K_3 = 0$ or equivalently the map $K_1 \rightarrow K_2$ is an isomorphism, which actually will complete the proof of the lemma.

Let $R = f^{-1}(D)$ and $y \in \tilde{C}$. If $y \notin R$, then f and \tilde{f} are étale at y , and hence the maps between the stalks of sheaves in the first two rows of (4.1) are in fact isomorphisms.

Since C intersects D transversally, and f is tamely ramified, \tilde{C} is regular and it intersects R transversally. Let $y \in \tilde{C} \cap R$ and $x = f(y)$. The transversality condition ensures there exists a regular sequence z_1, \dots, z_n in $\mathcal{O}_{Y,y}$ such that R — locally in a neighbourhood of y — is given by $z_n = 0$ and C is locally given by $z_1 = \dots = z_{n-1} = 0$. Hence z_n is a local coordinate on C , and z_1, \dots, z_{n-1} are local coordinates on R . Moreover, since the map f is tamely ramified by Abhyankar's lemma, we can assume that the covering in the neighbourhood of y is given by

$$\mathcal{O}_{Y,y} = \mathcal{O}_{X,f(y)}[z_n]/(z_n^e - u_n),$$

where e is the ramification index and $u_n \in \mathcal{O}_{X,f(y)}$ is such that z_1, \dots, z_{n-1}, u_n is a regular sequence of $\mathcal{O}_{X,x}$, while u_n is a local coordinate of C with $u_n = 0$ defining D in a neighbourhood of x . This description of f shows that both $(K_1)_y$ and $(K_2)_y$, as submodule of $(\tilde{i}^* f^* \Omega_X^1)_y$ and $(\tilde{i}^* \Omega_Y^1)_y$ respectively, are the free submodule generated by dz_1, \dots, dz_{n-1} . Hence the map $K_1 \rightarrow K_2$ induces an isomorphism of stalks at all points of \tilde{C} . \square

Corollary 4.2. *Let X be a smooth projective variety of dimension n and $H \subset X$ a general hyperplane. Let D be a reduced divisor on X and $f : Y \rightarrow X$ a tamely ramified cover which is étale away from D . Then*

$$\frac{\mu_{\max}(\Omega_Y^1)}{\deg(f)} \leq \mu_{\max}(\Omega_X^1) + (D.H^{n-1}).$$

Proof. Since f is separable, we have the following short exact sequence of sheaves

$$0 \rightarrow f^* \Omega_X^1 \rightarrow \Omega_Y^1 \rightarrow \Omega_{Y/X}^1 \rightarrow 0.$$

Note that the degree of $f^* \Omega_X^1$ with respect to $f^{-1}(H)$ is $\deg(f) \deg(\Omega_X^1)$. The same holds for any subbundle of Ω_X^1 . The functoriality of Harder-Narasimhan filtration implies that

$$\mu_{\max}(\Omega_Y^1) \leq \mu_{\max}(f^* \Omega_X^1) + \deg(\Omega_{Y/X}^1).$$

Hence in view of Lemma 4.1 it is enough to show the following:

$$\deg(\Omega_{\tilde{C}/C}^1) \leq \deg(f)(D.H^{n-1}),$$

where $C = H^{n-1}$ and \tilde{C} are as in Lemma 4.1.

Now $D.H^{n-1} = D.C$ is the number of points at which $\tilde{f} : \tilde{C} \rightarrow C$ is branched. Since \tilde{f} is tamely ramified,

$$\deg(\Omega_{\tilde{C}/C}^1) = \sum_{x \text{ branch points}} (\deg(f) - |\tilde{f}^{-1}(x)|) \leq \deg(f)(D.H^{n-1})$$

which completes the proof. \square

Let X be a smooth projective variety with a fixed polarization and $D \subset X$ a normal crossing divisor. Let $i : Z \rightarrow X$ be a general hypersurface of degree d in X . We define the functor

$$i^* : \text{Vect}^{f,nt}(X, D) \rightarrow \text{Vect}^{f,nt}(Z, Z \cap D)$$

by sending an object $(f : Y \rightarrow X, E)$ in $\text{Vect}^{f,nt}(X, D)$ to $(\tilde{f} : \tilde{Z} \rightarrow Z, \tilde{i}^*E)$; the morphisms are defined similarly; here \tilde{Z} , \tilde{i} and \tilde{f} are defined by the following fiber product:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \tilde{Z} & \xrightarrow{\tilde{i}} & Y \\ \tilde{f} \downarrow & & \downarrow f \\ Z & \xrightarrow{i} & X \end{array}$$

Proposition 4.3. *The functor i^* is fully faithful if degree of Z is greater than*

$$\frac{\mu_{\max}(\Omega_X^1) + (D \cdot H^{n-1})}{p},$$

where H is a polarization of X .

Proof. We proceed in a similar way as done in the proof of [BKP2, Theorem 3.1]. The argument needs to be carried out for equivariant bundles over tamely ramified Galois covers. Let $\mathcal{E}_1 = (f_1 : Y_1 \rightarrow X, E_1)$ and $\mathcal{E}_2 = (f_2 : Y_2 \rightarrow X, E_2)$ be two objects in $\text{Vect}^{f,nt}(X, D)$. Pulling back E_1 and E_2 to Y , where $Y \rightarrow X$ is a tamely ramified G -Galois cover of X étale outside D and dominating f_1 and f_2 , we may assume that $f_1 = f_2$. Note that

$$\text{Hom}(\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2) \subset \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_Y}(E_1, E_2) = H^0(Y, E_1^* \otimes E_2)$$

consist of G -equivariant maps. Also observe that the natural map

$$\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_Y}(E_1, E_2) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_{\tilde{Z}}}(\tilde{i}^*E_1, \tilde{i}^*E_2)$$

sends G -equivariant maps between E_1 and E_2 to G -equivariant maps between \tilde{i}^*E_1 and \tilde{i}^*E_2 . Hence to prove that i^* is fully faithful it is enough to show that the map

$$\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_Y}(E_1, E_2) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_{\tilde{Z}}}(\tilde{i}^*E_1, \tilde{i}^*E_2)$$

is a bijection. Equivalently, $H^0(Y, E) \rightarrow H^0(\tilde{Z}, \tilde{i}^*E)$ is an isomorphism for all G -equivariant sheaves E on Y . Following the proof of [BKP2, Theorem 3.1] we see that this is indeed the case if

$$p \deg(\tilde{Z}) \geq \mu_{\max}(\Omega_Y^1).$$

The latter inequality is equivalent to $p \deg(Z) \geq \frac{\mu_{\max}(\Omega_Y^1)}{\deg(f)}$. By Corollary 4.2 this holds if $\deg(Z) \geq \frac{\mu_{\max}(\Omega_X^1) + (D \cdot H^{n-1})}{p}$, where H is a polarization of X . \square

Theorem 4.4. *Under the hypothesis of Proposition 4.3, the natural map*

$$\pi^{N,nt}(Z \setminus Z \cap D) \rightarrow \pi^{N,nt}(X \setminus D)$$

is surjective (faithfully flat) if the dimension of Z is at least one.

Proof. In view of [DM, Proposition 2.21], it is enough to show the following:

- (1) The functor i^* is fully faithful if dimension Z is at least one.

- (2) For $(f, E) \in \text{Vect}^{f,nt}(X, D)$ every subobject (\tilde{f}, E_1) of $i^*(f, E)$ in $\text{Vect}^{f,nt}(Z, Z \cap D)$ is isomorphic to $i^*(f, E_2)$ for some $(f, E_2) \in \text{Vect}^{f,nt}(X, D)$.

Proposition 4.3 implies (1). The argument for (3) is exactly same as in the proof of [BKP2, Theorem 3.1]. \square

REFERENCES

- [Bi1] I. Biswas, Parabolic bundles as orbifold bundles, *Duke Math. Jour.* **88** (1997), 305–325.
- [Bi2] I. Biswas, Parabolic ample bundles, *Math. Ann.* **307** (1997), 511–529.
- [BKP1] I. Biswas, M. Kumar and A. J. Parameswaran, Higher dimensional formal orbifolds and orbifold bundles in positive characteristic, *Comm. Algebra* **50** (2022), 300–307.
- [BKP2] I. Biswas, M. Kumar and A. J. Parameswaran, Bertini results and Lefschetz, preprint, arXiv:2002.01623.
- [BP] I. Biswas and A. J. Parameswaran, Ramified covering maps and stability of pulled back bundles, *Int. Math. Res. Not.*, Vol. 2022, Issue 17, 12821–12851.
- [BDP] I. Biswas, S. Das and A. J. Parameswaran, Genuinely ramified maps and stable vector bundles, *Internat. J. Math.* **33** (2022), no. 5, Paper No. 2250039.
- [Bo1] N. Borne, Fibrés paraboliques et champ des racines, *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN*, **16**, Art. ID rnm049, 38, (2007).
- [Bo2] N. Borne, Sur les représentations du groupe fondamental d’une variété privée d’un diviseur à croisements normaux simples, *Indiana Univ. Math. Jour.* **58** (2009), 137–180.
- [BV] N. Borne and A. Vistoli, The Nori fundamental gerbe of a fibered category, *J. Algebraic Geom.* **24** (2015), 311–353.
- [DM] P. Deligne and J. S. Milne, Tannakian Categories, *Hodge cycles, motives, and Shimura varieties*, by P. Deligne, J. S. Milne, A. Ogus and K.-Y. Shih, pp. 101–228, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, 900, Springer-Verlag, Berlin-Heidelberg-New York, 1982.
- [EK] Hélène Esnault and L. Kindler, Lefschetz theorems for tamely ramified coverings, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **144** (2016), 5071–5080. 14E20 (14E22 14F35)
- [KS] Moritz Kerz and A. Schmidt, On different notions of tameness in arithmetic geometry, *Math. Annalen* **346**, Issue 3 (2010), 641–668
- [Ku] M. Kumar, Ramification theory and formal orbifolds in arbitrary dimension, *Proc. Indian Acad. Sci. (Math. Sci.)* **129** (2019), no. 3, Art. 38, 34 pp.
- [KM] M. Kumar and S. Majumder, Parabolic bundles in positive characteristic, *J. Ramanujan Math. Soc.* **33** (2018), 1–36.
- [KP] M. Kumar and A. J. Parameswaran, Formal Orbifolds and Orbifold Bundles in Positive Characteristic, *Internat. J. Math.* **30** (2019), no. 12, 1950067, 20 pp.
- [MY] M. Maruyama and K. Yokogawa, Moduli of parabolic stable sheaves, *Math. Ann.* **293** (1992), 77–99.
- [MS] V. B. Mehta and C. S. Seshadri, Moduli of vector bundles on curves with parabolic structures, *Math. Ann.* **248** (1980), 205–239.
- [No] M. V. Nori, The Fundamental Group-Scheme, *Proc. Ind. Acad. Sc. (Math. Sci.)* **91** (1982), 73–122.
- [Ota] Shusuke Otabe, The tame fundamental group schemes of curves in positive characteristic, <https://arxiv.org/abs/1802.01111>
- [Yo] K. Yokogawa, Infinitesimal deformations of parabolic Higgs sheaves, *Internet. J. Math.* **6** (1995), 125–148.

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, TATA INSTITUTE OF FUNDAMENTAL RESEARCH, HOMI BHABHA ROAD,
BOMBAY 400005, INDIA

Email address: `indranil@math.tifr.res.in`

STATISTICS AND MATHEMATICS UNIT, INDIAN STATISTICAL INSTITUTE, BANGALORE 560059, INDIA

Email address: `manish@isibang.ac.in`

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, TATA INSTITUTE OF FUNDAMENTAL RESEARCH, HOMI BHABHA ROAD,
BOMBAY 400005, INDIA

Email address: `param@math.tifr.res.in`