

$\mathcal{F}$  : sheaf on  $X$

$$\check{H}^q(X, \mathcal{F}) = \lim_{\underline{U}} \check{H}^q(\underline{U}, \mathcal{F}) = \lim_{\underline{U}} \frac{\ker(s: C^q \rightarrow C^{q+1})}{\operatorname{Im}(s: C^{q-1} \rightarrow C^q)}$$

Ex:  $A^{p,q}$  are fine sheaves.

- $\mathcal{F}$  is called a fine sheaf if for any open covering  $\underline{U} = \{U_i\}$ , there exist morphisms  $\eta_i: \mathcal{F}(U_i) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(U)$  s.t.  $\operatorname{supp}(\eta_i) \subset U_i$  and  $\sum \eta_i = \operatorname{Id}$

Prop: If  $\mathcal{F}$  is a fine sheaf, then  $\check{H}^k(X, \mathcal{F}) = 0$  for  $k > 0$ . (i.e.  $\sum \eta_i \circ r_{U_i} = \operatorname{Id}$  for any open  $U \subset X$ )

Pf: let  $\sigma = \{\sigma_{i_0 \dots i_q}\}$  be a cocycle.

$$\text{Set } \tau_{i_0 \dots i_q} = \sum_i \eta_i \sigma_{i i_0 \dots i_q}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Then } (\delta\tau)_{i_0 \dots i_q} &= \sum_{j=0}^q (-1)^j \tau_{i_0 \dots \hat{j} \dots i_q} \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^q (-1)^j \sum_i \eta_i \sigma_{i i_0 \dots \hat{j} \dots i_q} \\ &= \sum_i \eta_i \sum_{j=0}^q (-1)^j \sigma_{i i_0 \dots \hat{j} \dots i_q} \stackrel{\delta\sigma=0}{=} \sum_i \eta_i \sigma_{i i_0 \dots i_q} = \sigma_{i_0 \dots i_q} \end{aligned}$$

$$\Rightarrow \delta\tau = \sigma \Rightarrow [\sigma] = 0.$$

- Dolbeault Theorem:  $\check{H}^q(X, \Omega^p) = H_{\bar{\partial}}^{p,q}(X)$   
 $\uparrow$  sheaf of holomorphic  $p$ -forms.

Pf: Consider the resolution

$$0 \rightarrow \Omega^p \rightarrow A^{p,0} \xrightarrow{\bar{\partial}} A^{p,1} \xrightarrow{\bar{\partial}} \dots \xrightarrow{\bar{\partial}} A^{p,k} \xrightarrow{\bar{\partial}} A^{p,k+1} \rightarrow \dots$$

$\uparrow$   
sheaf of smooth  $(p,k)$ -forms

$$\text{set: } Z^k = \ker(\bar{\partial}: A^{p,k} \rightarrow A^{p,k+1}) = \operatorname{Im}(\bar{\partial}: A^{p,k-1} \rightarrow A^{p,k}).$$

Then we get short exact sequences:

$$0 \rightarrow \overset{z^0}{\Omega^p} \rightarrow A^{p,0} \rightarrow Z^1 \rightarrow 0 \rightsquigarrow H^{q-1}(A^{p,0}) \rightarrow H^{q-1}(Z^1) \rightarrow H^q(\Omega^p)$$

$$0 \rightarrow Z^1 \rightarrow A^{p,1} \rightarrow Z^2 \rightarrow 0 \quad \begin{matrix} H^q(A^{p,0}) \\ \downarrow \\ 0 \quad \forall q \geq 1 \end{matrix}$$

$$0 \rightarrow Z^{q-2} \rightarrow A^{p,q-2} \rightarrow Z^{q-1} \rightarrow 0$$

$$0 \rightarrow Z^{q-1} \rightarrow A^{p,q} \rightarrow Z^q \rightarrow 0$$

$$\text{Last one gives: } H^0(A^{p,q}) \xrightarrow{\bar{\partial}} H^0(Z^q) \rightarrow H^1(Z^{q-1}) \xrightarrow{\cong} 0^{p,q}$$

$$\Rightarrow H^1(Z^q) \cong \frac{H^0(Z^q)}{\bar{\partial}(H^0(A^{p,q}))} = \frac{\{\bar{\partial}\text{-closed } (p,q)\text{-forms}\}}{\{\bar{\partial}\text{-exact } (p,q)\text{-forms}\}} = H_{\bar{\partial}}^{p,q}(X)$$

$$\text{Going upward: } H^1(Z^q) = H^2(Z^{q-2}) = \dots = H^{q-1}(Z^1) \underset{q \geq 2}{=} H^q(\Omega^p)$$

$$\left( q=1: \quad H^0(A^{p,0}) \rightarrow H^0(Z^1) \rightarrow H^1(\Omega^p) \rightarrow 0 \right.$$

$$\Rightarrow H^1(\Omega^p) = \frac{\{\bar{\partial}\text{-closed } (p,1)\text{-forms}\}}{\{\bar{\partial}\text{-exact } (p,1)\text{-forms}\}} = H_{\bar{\partial}}^{p,1}(X) \left. \right)$$

- Leray's Thm: If  $\underline{U} = \{U_i\}$  is acyclic for  $\Omega^p$  (i.e.  $H^q(U_i, \Omega^p) = 0$ , for all  $q \geq 1$  and any  $i$ )  
(for  $\Omega^p$ ) Then  $\check{H}^q(\underline{U}, \Omega^p) = \check{H}^q(X, \Omega^p)$ .

Pf: Because of Dolbeault's Thm ( $\check{H}^q(X, \Omega^p) \cong H_{\bar{\partial}}^{p,q}(X)$ )  
We just need to prove  $\check{H}^q(\underline{U}, \Omega^p) \cong H_{\bar{\partial}}^{p,q}(X)$ .

Consider the double complex

$$D = \{ D^{r,s} = C^r(\underline{U}, A^{p,s}) : \begin{matrix} \delta: D^{r,s} \rightarrow D^{r+1,s} \\ \bar{\partial}: D^{r,s} \rightarrow D^{r,s+1} \end{matrix} \quad r, s \geq 0 \}$$

and the associated single complex:

$$K^q = \bigoplus_{r+s=q} D^{r,s} \text{ with } d = \bar{\partial} + (-1)^k \delta : K^q \rightarrow K^{q+1}$$

$$\pm d^2 = (\bar{\partial} + \delta)(\bar{\partial} - \delta) = \bar{\partial}^2 - \bar{\partial}\delta + \delta\bar{\partial} - \delta^2 = 0.$$

Claim I:  $H^k(K^\bullet) := \frac{\ker(d: K^k \rightarrow K^{k+1})}{\operatorname{Im}(d: K^{k-1} \rightarrow K^k)}$  is always isomorphic to  $H_{\bar{\partial}}^{p,q}(X)$

To see this, we construct a map from  $H^k(K^\bullet) \xrightarrow{\cong} H_{\bar{\partial}}^{p,q}(X)$  as follows:

Pick any  $[\sigma] \in H^k(K^\bullet)$  with  $\sigma_{r,s} \in C^r(U, A^{p,s})$

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \sigma_{0,q} & \xrightarrow{\delta\sigma_{0,q} - \bar{\partial}\sigma_{1,q} = 0} & \\ \uparrow & & \\ \sigma_{1,q-1} & & \\ & \ddots & \\ & & \sigma_{q-1,1} \xrightarrow{\delta\sigma_{q-1,1} - \bar{\partial}\sigma_{q,0} = 0} \\ & & \uparrow \\ & & \sigma_{q,0} \xrightarrow{\delta} \delta\sigma_{q,0} = 0 \end{array}$$

Because  $\check{H}^r(A^{p,s}) = 0$ , for any  $r > 0$ , we can inductively solve:

$$\begin{array}{lcl} \sigma_{q,0} = \delta \tau_{q-1,0} & & \tilde{\sigma}_{0,q} \\ \pm \bar{\partial} \tau_{q-1,0} + \sigma_{q-1,1} = \delta \tau_{q-2,1} & \rightsquigarrow & \sigma - d \cdot \{ \tau_{r,s} \} = \sigma_{0,q} - \bar{\partial} \tau_{0,q-1} \\ & & \uparrow \\ \pm \bar{\partial} \tau_{q-2,1} + \sigma_{q-2,2} = \delta \tau_{q-3,2} & & \text{Global } D^{0,q} \end{array}$$

Then  $d\sigma = 0 \Rightarrow d\tilde{\sigma}_{0,q} = 0 \Rightarrow \tilde{\sigma}_{0,q}$  is a  $\bar{\partial}$ -closed  $(p,q)$ -form

$$\begin{cases} \delta \tilde{\sigma}_{0,q} = 0 \\ \bar{\partial} \tilde{\sigma}_{0,q} = 0 \end{cases}$$

Define  $[\sigma] \xrightarrow{\alpha} [\tilde{\sigma}_0, q]$

(Ex) prove  $\alpha: H^q(K^\bullet) \rightarrow H_{\bar{\partial}}^{p,q}(X)$  is an isomorphism

Claim II: If  $U$  is acyclic for  $\Omega^p$ , then there is an isomorphism  $\beta: H^q(K^\bullet) \rightarrow H^q(\Omega^p)$ .

similar construction: Look at:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 & & \vdots & & \vdots & & \\
 & & \uparrow & & \uparrow & & \\
 \cdots & \longrightarrow & C^r(U, A^{p,s+1}) & \longrightarrow & C^{r+1}(U, A^{p,s+1}) & \longrightarrow & \cdots \\
 & & \uparrow & & \uparrow & & \\
 \cdots & \longrightarrow & C^r(U, A^{p,s}) & \longrightarrow & C^{r+1}(U, A^{p,s}) & \longrightarrow & \cdots \\
 & & \uparrow \bar{\partial} & & \uparrow \bar{\partial} & & \\
 \cdots & \longrightarrow & C^r(U, A^{p,s-1}) & \longrightarrow & C^{r+1}(U, A^{p,s-1}) & \longrightarrow & \cdots \\
 & & \uparrow & & \uparrow & & \\
 & & \vdots & & \vdots & & 
 \end{array}$$

The vertical cohomology is  $\bigoplus_{|I|=r} H_{\bar{\partial}}^{p,s}(U_I) = \bigoplus_{|I|=r} H^s(U_I, \Omega^p)$

(The horizontal cohomology is  $H^r(A^{p,s})$ )

$\uparrow$   
acyclic hypothesis

$\Rightarrow$  We can solve inductively

$$\begin{array}{c}
 0 \\
 \uparrow \\
 \sigma_{0,q} \\
 \uparrow \bar{\partial} \\
 \tau'_{0,q-1} \rightarrow \sigma_{1,q-1} \\
 \uparrow \quad \quad \quad \vdots \\
 \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \sigma_{q-1,1} \\
 \uparrow \quad \quad \quad \rightarrow \quad \sigma_{q,0}
 \end{array}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 \sigma_{0,q} &= \bar{\partial} \tau'_{0,q-1} \\
 \pm \delta \tau'_{0,q-1} + \sigma_{0,q-1} &= \bar{\partial} \tau'_{0,q-2} \\
 &\vdots \\
 \pm \delta \tau'_{q-2,1} + \sigma_{q-1,1} &= \bar{\partial} \tau'_{q-1,0}
 \end{aligned}
 \rightsquigarrow \sigma - d \{ \tau'_{r,s} \} = \tilde{\sigma}'_{1,0} \pm \delta \tau'_{q,0}$$

$$d \tilde{\sigma}' = 0 \Rightarrow \tilde{\sigma}' \text{ is a cocycle in } C^q(A^{p,0}) \text{ satisfying } \bar{\partial} \tilde{\sigma}' = 0$$

$$\Rightarrow \tilde{\sigma}' \text{ represents a cohomology class in } \check{H}^q(\underline{U}, \Omega^p).$$

$$\textcircled{\text{Ex}} \quad [\sigma] \longmapsto [\tilde{\sigma}'] \quad \text{is an isomorphism.}$$

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 & \uparrow & \\
 H^q_p(K') & & \check{H}^q(\underline{U}, \Omega^p)
 \end{array}$$

so we conclude 
$$H_{\bar{\partial}}^{p,q}(X) \cong H^q(K^\bullet) \cong \check{H}^q(\underline{U}, \Omega^p).$$

$\cong$

$H^q(X, \mathcal{F})$ .

More details about such type of construction can be found in the book: Bott-Tu: Diff. Forms in Alg Topology, GTM 82.

- A more conceptual proof (following Griffiths-Harris)

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 & & \uparrow & & \uparrow & & \\
 \cdots & \longrightarrow & C^r(\underline{U}, A^{p,s+1}) & \longrightarrow & C^{r+1}(\underline{U}, A^{p,s+1}) & \longrightarrow & \cdots \\
 & & \uparrow & & \uparrow & & \\
 \cdots & \longrightarrow & C^r(\underline{U}, A^{p,s}) & \longrightarrow & C^{r+1}(\underline{U}, A^{p,s}) & \longrightarrow & \cdots \\
 & & \uparrow \bar{\partial} & & \uparrow \bar{\partial} & & \\
 \cdots & \longrightarrow & C^r(\underline{U}, A^{p,s-1}) & \longrightarrow & C^{r+1}(\underline{U}, A^{p,s-1}) & \longrightarrow & \cdots \\
 & & \uparrow & & \uparrow & & \\
 & & \vdots & & \vdots & & 
 \end{array}$$

Set

$$C^r(\underline{U}, \mathcal{Z}^s) = \ker(\bar{\partial}: C^r(\underline{U}, A^{p,s}) \rightarrow C^{r+1}(\underline{U}, A^{p,s+1})).$$

Then we have the exact sequences of complexes:

$$0 \rightarrow C^\bullet(\underline{U}, \mathcal{Z}^s) \rightarrow C^\bullet(\underline{U}, A^{p,s}) \xrightarrow{\bar{\partial}} C^\bullet(\underline{U}, \mathcal{Z}^{s+1}) \rightarrow 0$$

argue as in the proof of Dolbeault thm that:

$$\begin{aligned} \check{H}^q(\underline{U}, \Omega^p) &\cong \check{H}^{q-1}(\underline{U}, \mathbb{Z}^1) \cong \dots \cong \check{H}^1(\underline{U}, \mathbb{Z}^{q-1}) \\ &\cong \frac{\check{H}^0(\underline{U}, \mathbb{Z}^q)}{\partial \check{H}^0(\underline{U}, A^{0, q-1})} = \frac{H^0(X, \mathbb{Z}^q)}{\partial H^0(X, A^{0, q-1})} = H_{\partial}^{p, q}(X). \end{aligned}$$