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Let $S$ be a complex nonsingular projective surface of general type with a fibration of genus 2, and let $G \subset \text{Aut } S$ be a nontrivial subgroup of automorphisms of $S$, inducing trivial actions on $H^2(S, \mathbb{Q})$. We give a classification for pairs $(S, G)$ from the point of view of moduli. Consequently, we show that there exist surfaces $S$ of general type (with $p_g$ arbitrary large) with an involution acting trivially on $H^i(S, \mathbb{Z})$ for all $i$.

1. Introduction

Let $S$ be a complex minimal nonsingular projective surface of general type, and let $G \subset \text{Aut } S$ be a nontrivial subgroup of automorphisms of $S$ inducing trivial actions on $H^2(S, \mathbb{Q})$. Peters [1979] proved that, if the canonical linear system $|K_S|$ is basepoint free, then either $K_S^2 = 8\chi(C_S)$ or $K_S^2 = 9\chi(C_S)$. Recently, we showed that $|G| \leq 4$ if $\chi(C_S) > 188$ [Cai 2004]. When $S$ has a fibration of genus 2, we have a numerical classification for pairs $(S, G)$:

**Theorem 1.1** [Cai 2006a; 2006b]. Let $S, G$ be as above. Assume that $S$ has a relatively minimal fibration of genus 2 and $\chi(C_S) \geq 5$. Then $|G| = 2$, and either

(i) $K_S^2 = 4\chi(C_S) - 4a$ ($a = 0, 1$), or
(ii) $K_S^2 = 8\chi(C_S) - 6b$ ($b = 0, 1, 2$).

There are some examples in [Cai 2006a; 2006b] to show that such pairs $(S, G)$ exist, besides the well known ones (products of two hyperelliptic curves). An interesting question is whether it could be possible to classify all possible pairs $(S, G)$ in Theorem 1.1.

In this note we give a classification for pairs $(S, G)$ in Theorem 1.1 from the more general point of view of moduli. Roughly speaking, our main result is this (see Theorems 2.5 and 4.7 for precise statements):

**Theorem 1.2.** Let $S, G$ be as in Theorem 1.1.
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(i) If $S$ is as in Theorem 1.1(i), then $S$ is birationally equivalent to a double cover of certain elliptic fiber bundle. The configuration of the ramification divisor of this covering is determined.

(ii) If $S$ is as in Theorem 1.1(ii) with $b = 0$, then $S \simeq (F \times \tilde{C})/\tilde{G}$, where $F$ and $\tilde{C}$ are curves of genus $g(F) = 2$, $g(\tilde{C}) \geq 2$, and $\tilde{G}$ is one of the following groups: $\mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z}$ ($m \leq 10$, $m \neq 7, 9$), $(\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})^2$, $\mathbb{Z}/6\mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$, $D_8$ (the dihedral group of order 8); a complete description for the action of $\tilde{G}$ on $F \times \tilde{C}$ is given.

We note that, for K3 and Enriques surfaces $S$, $\text{Aut} S$ acts faithfully on $H^2(S, \mathbb{Z})$ (see [Burns and Rapoport 1975; Ueno 1976]). As an interesting consequence of Theorem 2.5, we show that the analogous question for surfaces of general type has a negative answer:

**Theorem 1.3** (Corollary 2.11). Let $n \geq 3$ be an integer. There exist an infinite series of surfaces $S_n$ of general type with $K^2_{S_n} = 4n$, $p_g(S_n) = n$, $q(S_n) = 1$ admitting an involution acting trivially on $H^i(S_n, \mathbb{Z})$ for all $i$.

We work over the complex number field and use standard notation as exemplified by [Barth et al. 1984]. We also use freely the notation from [Cai 2006a; 2006b].

2. Surfaces whose canonical map being composite with a pencil

2.1. Let $S$ be a complex nonsingular projective surface of general type with $p_g(S)$ at least 3 and let $f : S \rightarrow C$ be a relatively minimal fibration of genus 2. Consider a nontrivial subgroup $G \subset \text{Aut} S$ of automorphisms of $S$ inducing trivial actions on $H^2(S, \mathbb{Q})$. In this section, we assume that the canonical map $\Phi_S$ of $S$ is composite with a pencil. By [Cai 2006a, Theorem 3.2], we have $|G| = 2$, the generator $\sigma$ of $G$ is a bielliptic involution of $f$ (that is, $f \circ \sigma = f$, and for a general fiber $F$ of $f$, $\sigma|_F$ is a bielliptic involution of $F$), and $S$ has numerical invariants

(2.1.1) $K^2_S = 4\chi(\mathcal{O}_S)$ and $g(S) = g(C) = 1$, or

(2.1.2) $K^2_S = 4\chi(\mathcal{O}_S) - 4$, $q(S) = 1$ and $g(C) = 0$.

The hyperelliptic involutions of smooth fibers of $f$ glue together to give a birational $C$-involution $\tau$ of $S$, which is everywhere defined by the uniqueness of the minimal model of $f$. We call $\tau$ the hyperelliptic involution of $f : S \rightarrow C$. Let $\lambda = \sigma \circ \tau$. Clearly $\lambda$ is a bielliptic involution of $f$. We have a commutative diagram
where \( \rho \) is the blowup of all isolated fixed points of \( \lambda \), \( \tilde{\lambda} \) is the induced involution on \( \tilde{S} \), \( \alpha \) is the blowdown of all \(-1\)-curves contained in fibers of \( \tilde{S}/\tilde{\lambda} \to C \), and \( p \) is the induced relatively minimal elliptic fibration.

We can describe \( p : T \to C \) explicitly:

**Proposition 2.2.** Let \( E_2 \) be an elliptic curve, and set \( E_A = \mathbb{C}/(\mathbb{Z} + i\mathbb{Z}) \) and \( E_5 = \mathbb{C}/(\mathbb{Z} + \xi\mathbb{Z}) \), for \( \xi \) a primitive third root of unit.

(i) If \( S \) is as in (2.1.1), then \( C \) is an elliptic curve, and

\[
(p : T \to C) \simeq (T_d := (C' \times E_d)/\mathbb{Z}_d \to C'/\mathbb{Z}_d)
\]

for some \( d \in \{2, 3, 4, 6\} \), where \( C' \) is an elliptic curve and \( \mathbb{Z}_d \) acts on \( C' \times E_d \) via a product action: \( \mathbb{Z}_d \) acts on \( C' \) as a translation of order \( d \) such that \( C'/\mathbb{Z}_d \simeq C \), and \( \mathbb{Z}_d \) acts on \( E_d \) by (1) \( e \mapsto -e \) if \( d = 2 \); (2) \( e \mapsto \xi e \) if \( d = 3 \); (3) \( e \mapsto ie \) if \( d = 4 \); (4) \( e \mapsto \xi e \) if \( d = 6 \).

Moreover, \( K_T = p^*\eta \), where \( \eta \in \text{Pic}^0 C \), which determines the étale cover \( C' \to C \).

(ii) If \( S \) is as in (2.1.2), then \( C = \mathbb{P}^1 \), \( T = C \times E \) and \( p \) is the projection to the first factor, where \( E \) is an elliptic curve.

**Proof.** By [Cai 2006a, Proposition 4.12] and its proof, \( p : T \to C \) is an elliptic fiber bundle with a section. By the proof of Theorem 3.2 of the same reference, we have \( q(T) = g(C) = 1 \) if \( S \) is as in (2.1.1), and \( q(T) = 1, g(C) = 0 \) if \( S \) is as in (2.1.2). Note that \( p_g(T) = 0 \). Now the proposition follows from the well-known result of Bagnera and de Franchis on the classification of bielliptic surfaces (see [Beauville 1983, VI, 20], for example). \qed

**Proposition 2.3.** Let \( T_d \) be as in Proposition 2.2. Then \( H_1(T_d, \mathbb{Z})_{\text{tor}} \simeq \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2 \), \( \mathbb{Z}_3 \), \( \mathbb{Z}_2 \), 0 if \( d = 2, 3, 4, 6 \), respectively.


**Notation 2.4.** Let \( p : T \to C \) be a fiber surface and \( \Delta \subset T \) a bisection of \( T \), that is, an irreducible curve with \( \Delta P = 2 \), where \( P \) is a fiber of \( p \). We say that a point \( t \in \Delta \) is a ramification point of \( p|_{\Delta} : \Delta \to C \) if \( t \) is in the image of the set of ramification points of \( p|_{\Delta} \circ \phi : \Delta \to \Delta \to C \) under \( \phi \), where \( \phi : \Delta \to \Delta \) is the normalization of \( \Delta \).

For any point \( t \in \Delta \), let \( I(t; \Delta) \) be the number of times we must blow up \( t \in T \) and its infinitely near points to get the strict transform of \( \Delta \) being nonsingular at the inverse image of \( t \).

For any two curves \( D, D' \) and \( t \in D \cap D' \), we denote by \( I(D, D'; t) \) the intersection number of \( D \) and \( D' \) at the point \( t \).
Theorem 2.5. Let \( f : S \to C, \ p : T \to C, \ \tilde{\pi}, \) and \( \alpha \) be as in 2.1. Let \( \pi : S' \to T \) be the Stein factorization of \( \alpha \circ \tilde{\pi} \), and let \( (B, \theta) \) be the singular double cover data corresponding to \( \pi \). Then \( (B, \theta) \) has the following properties:

(i) \( \theta = C_1 + p^*D \), where \( C_1 \) is a section of \( p \) and \( D \) is a divisor on \( C \) of degree \( n := p_\pi(S) \geq 3 \),

(ii) \( B = \Delta + \sum_{i=1}^m p^*c_i \), where \( \Delta \in |2C_1 + p^*(2D - \sum_{i=1}^m c_i)| \) is a bisection of \( p \) and \( c_i \ (i = 1, \ldots, m) \) are different points of \( C \),

(iii) \( \Delta \cap C_1 \) is contained in the set of ramification points of \( p|_\Delta \). As a set, \( \Delta \cap C_1 = \{t_1, \cdots, t_m\} \), where \( t_i = p^*c_i \cap C_1 \). For any \( i \), \( I(\Delta, C_1; t_i) = 2l(t_i; \Delta) + 1 \). So \( \sum_{i=1}^m l(t_i; \Delta) = n - m \).

Conversely, let \( p : T \to C \) be as in Proposition 2.2, and let \( (B, \theta) \) be the singular double covers data satisfying conditions (i)-(iii) above. Let \( \pi : S' \to T \) be the double cover corresponding to \( (B, \theta) \). Let \( S'' \) be the desingularization of \( S' \), and \( f' : S'' \to C \) the induced fibration. Let \( f : S \to C \) be the relatively minimal fibration of \( f' \). Denote by \( \tau \) the hyperelliptic involution of \( f \), and \( \lambda \) the involution corresponding to the double cover \( \pi \). Let \( \sigma = \tau \circ \lambda \). Then \( S \) is as in (2.1.1) (resp. (2.1.2)) with \( p_\pi(S) = n \) if \( T \) is as in (i) (resp. (ii)) of Proposition 2.2 and \( \sigma \) acts trivially on \( H^2(S, \mathbb{Q}) \).

Proof. We assume that \( T \) is as in Proposition 2.2(i). The proof of the other case is similar and is left to the reader. Since \( B \) has no essential singularities, by the formula for double covers, we have \( h^0(K_T \otimes \theta) = n \). Note that \( p : T \to C \) is a fiber bundle, and \( (K_T \otimes \theta) P = 1 \) for a fiber \( P \) of \( p \). We have \( K_T \otimes \theta \equiv C_1 + p^*D' \), where \( C_1 \) is a section of \( p \) and \( D' \) is an effective divisor on \( C \). Clearly \( C_1 \) is the fixed part of \( |C_1 + p^*D'| \). So deg \( D' = h^0(D') = h^0(C_1 + p^*D') = n \). Note that \( K_T = p^*\eta \), where \( \eta \) is as in Proposition 2.2. So \( \theta = C_1 + p^*D \), where \( D = D' \otimes \eta \) is a divisor on \( C \) of degree \( n \).

Since \( B \) is a reduced divisor, we may write \( B = \Delta + \sum_{i=1}^m p^*c_i \), where \( \Delta \) is a reduced horizontal divisor with respect to \( p \), \( m \geq 0 \), and \( c_i \ (i = 1, \ldots, m) \) are different points of \( C \).

2.6. We show that \( \Delta \) is irreducible. Otherwise, \( \Delta = \Delta_1 + \Delta_2 \), where \( \Delta_i \) are sections of \( p \). Clearly \( \Delta_1 \Delta_2 = 0 \). So \( m > 0 \). Then locally around \( p^*c_1 \) the branch locus \( B \) of \( \pi \) has the configuration

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\Delta_1 \\
\hline
\Delta_2 \\
\hline
p^*a_1
\end{array}
\]

So \( (p \circ \pi)^*c_1 \) is a multiple fiber and \( S' \) has two rational double points on it, and hence \( f^*c_1 \) is a fiber of type \( (b_0) \). This contradicts [Cai 2006a, Lemma 4.7(ii)].
Lemma 2.7. If \( t \in \Delta \cap C_1 \), then \( t \) is a ramification point of \( p|_{\Delta} \), and
\[
I(\Delta, C_1; t) = 2l(t; \Delta) + 1,
\]
where \( l(t; \Delta) \) is as in Notation 2.4.

Proof. let \( c = p(t) \) and \( l = l(t; \Delta) \). First we assume that \( t \) is a smooth point of \( \Delta \). If \( t \) is not a ramification point of \( p|_{\Delta} \), then \( p^*c \cap \Delta \) consists of two different points, \( t \) and \( t' \). We have \( t + t' - 2t \equiv \Delta|_{p^*c} - 2C_1|_{p^*c} \equiv p^*(2D - \sum_{i=1}^{m} c_i)|_{p^*c} \equiv 0 \). This implies \( t \equiv t' \) on \( p^*c \), which is a contradiction since \( p^*c \) is not rational.

Now we may assume that \( t \) is a singular point of \( \Delta \). If \( c \neq c_i \) for any \( i \), then \( \text{mult}_B = 2 \). Let \( \hat{\rho} : \hat{T} \to T \) be the blowing up at \( t \), and \( E \) the exceptional curve. For any irreducible curve \( Z \) in \( T \), we denote \( \hat{Z} \) the strict transform of \( Z \) in \( \hat{T} \). Set
\[
\hat{B} = \hat{\rho}^*B - 2E, \quad \hat{\theta} = \hat{\rho}^*\theta - E = \hat{C}_1 + \hat{\rho}^*p^*D.
\]
Let \( \hat{\pi} : \hat{S} \to \hat{T} \) be the double cover corresponding to \( (\hat{B}, \hat{\theta}) \). Clearly \( \alpha \circ \hat{\pi} \) (notation as in 2.1) factors through \( \hat{\pi} \). Since \( C_1 \) and \( p^*c \) meet transversally only in one point \( t \), we have \( \hat{C}_1 \cap p^*c = \emptyset \). This implies \( \hat{\theta}_\rho^*p^*c \) is trivial. So \( \hat{\pi}^*p^*c \) has two disconnected components, and hence \( f^*c \) is of type \((a_6)\). This contradicts [Cai 2006a, Lemma 4.6].

So we can assume \( c = c_i \) for some \( i \). If \( t \in \Delta \) is not a ramification point of \( p|_{\Delta} \), then \( (p \circ \alpha)^*c \) has the following configuration:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\tilde{\Delta} \\
\begin{array}{c}
D_{t+2}^{(-1)} \\
E_{t+2}^{(-4)} \\
D_{t+1}^{(-1)} \\
E_{t+1}^{(-4)} \\
\cdot \cdot \cdot \\
D_2^{(-1)} \\
E_2^{(-4)} \\
D_1^{(-1)} \\
E_1^{(-4)} \\
p^*c_i
\end{array}
\end{array}
\]

where \( \tilde{\Delta} \) and \( \tilde{p^*c_i} \) are the strict transforms of \( \Delta \) and \( p^*c_i \), thick lines mean branch locus of \( \tilde{\pi} \), and superscript numbers without brackets are multiplicities and superscript numbers within brackets denote self-intersections. This implies \( f^*c_i \) is of type \((b_2)\), which is a contradiction by [Cai 2006a, Lemma 4.7(ii)].

Now \( t \in \Delta \) is a ramification point of \( p|_{\Delta} \). Let \( H = (\alpha \circ \hat{\pi})^*C_1 \). By [Cai 2006a, 4.8, 4.11 and 4.12], we have \( (f \circ \rho)|_H : H \to C \) is étale. So the strict transform \( \tilde{C}_1 \) of \( C_1 \) in \( \tilde{S} / \tilde{\lambda} \) does not meet the branch locus of \( \tilde{\pi} \). This implies \( I(\Delta, C_1; t) = 2l + 1 \) by a standard calculation; see, for instance, [Hartshorne 1977, Chapter V, Propositions 3.2 and 3.6].

By the proof of Lemma 2.7, the image of \( \Delta \cap C_1 \) under \( p \) is contained in the set \( \{c_1, \ldots, c_m\} \). Now suppose there is a point \( c_i \in \{c_1, \ldots, c_m\} \setminus p(\Delta \cap C_1) \). If \( p^*c_i \cap \Delta \) consists of two points, then \( p|_{\Delta} \) is étale at \( c_i \) and we get a contradiction as in 2.6. Hence \( p^*c_i \cap \Delta \) is a single point. By the choice of \( c_i \), \( p^*c_i \cap \Delta \notin C_1 \).
So $p^*c_i \cap C_1 \neq p^*c_i \cap \Delta$, and hence $p^*c_i \cap C_1$ must be a smooth point of $B$. This implies the strict transform $\tilde{C}_1$ of $C_1$ does meet the branch locus of $\tilde{\pi}$. This is impossible since $H \to C$ is étale.

Now we prove the converse of the theorem. Let $T$ be as in (i) of Proposition 2.2, and let $(B, \theta)$ be the singular double cover data satisfying conditions (i)–(iii) in Theorem 2.5. Let $\pi : S' \to T$ be the double cover corresponding to $(B, \theta)$. Then $S'$ has only canonical singularities. Let $\epsilon : S \to S'$ be the minimal desingularization. We have

$$K_S = (\pi \circ \epsilon)^*(p^*(\eta + D) + C_1).$$

So $S$ has the following numerical invariants:

$$K_S^2 = 4n, \quad p_g(S) = n, \quad q(S) = 1.$$ 

Now $f := p \circ \pi \circ \epsilon : S \to C$ is a fibration of genus 2. Denote by $\tau$ the hyperelliptic involution of $f$, and by $\lambda$ the involution of $S$ corresponding to $\pi$. Then $\langle \lambda, \tau \rangle \cong \mathbb{Z}_2 \oplus \mathbb{Z}_2$. Take $\sigma = \tau \circ \lambda$. Now the result follows by the following lemma. \hfill $\Box$

**Lemma 2.8.** The involution $\sigma$ acts trivially on $H^i(S, \mathbb{Q})$ for all $i$.

The idea of the proof of Lemma 2.8 is to analyze the action of $\sigma$ around the singular fibers of $f$, and to apply the topological Lefschetz formula to $\sigma$. The proof is longer and is postponed until the next section; see also [Cai 2006a, 3.3] for the special case when the bisection $\Delta < B$ is smooth.

**Remark 2.9.** Let $\Delta$ be as in Theorem 2.5. If $\Delta$ is smooth, then $l(t_i; \Delta) = 0$ for all $i$ and hence $m = n$. In this case, by the proof of Lemma 2.7, the points in $\Delta \cap C_1$ are necessarily ramification points of $p|_{\Delta}$. So the only condition for $(S, \sigma)$ being as in 2.1 is that the $n$ fibers $p^*c_i$ contained in $B$ pass through the $n$ points of $\Delta \cap C_1$.

**Corollary 2.10.** (i) The moduli space $\mathcal{M}$ of surfaces $(S, \sigma)$ as in (2.1.1) with $p_g(S) = n$ has four irreducible connected components. Among them one has dimension $2n + 1$ and the others have dimensions $2n$.

(ii) The moduli space $\mathcal{M}'$ of surfaces $(S, \sigma)$ as in (2.1.2) with $p_g(S) = n$ is irreducible and of dimension $2n - 1$.

**Proof.** We prove (i); the proof of (ii) is similar and is left to the reader. By Theorem 2.5, $\mathcal{M}$ is a disjoint union $\mathcal{M}_2 \cup \mathcal{M}_3 \cup \mathcal{M}_4 \cup \mathcal{M}_6$, where $\mathcal{M}_d = \{ S \in \mathcal{M} \mid T \simeq T_d \}$, for $T_d$ is as in Proposition 2.2. Let $\mathcal{B}_z \in [2\theta]$ be a flat family of curves such that $\mathcal{B}_0$ is the branch locus $B$ of $\pi : S' \to T$ and $\mathcal{B}_1$ is smooth. Let $\mathcal{F}_z$ be the flat family of surfaces corresponding to the double cover data $(\mathcal{B}_z, \theta)$. Since the branch locus $\mathcal{B}_1$ of $\mathcal{F}_1 \to T$ is ample, we have $\pi_1(\mathcal{F}_1) \simeq \pi_1(T)$ by [Cornalba 1981]. Since $\mathcal{B}_0 = B$ has no essential singularities, $S' = \mathcal{F}_0$ has only rational double points. By [Atiyah 1958], the minimal desingularization $S$ of $\mathcal{F}_0$ is diffeomorphic to $\mathcal{F}_1$. Hence we have $\pi_1(S) \simeq \pi_1(T)$. By Proposition 2.3, the sets $\mathcal{M}_d$ are open. Given
$T_d$, for generic $[S] \in \mathcal{M}_d$, $S$ is determined by $(B, \theta)$, where $\theta = C_1 + p^*D$, $D$ is a divisor of degree $n$ on $C$, $B = \Delta + \sum_{i=1}^{n} p^*c_i$, $\Delta \in |2C_1 + p^*D|$ (cf. Remark 2.9). Up to automorphisms of $T_d$, $C_1$ is uniquely determined. Given a smooth curve $\Delta \in |2C_1 + p^*D|$, the choice of $\theta$ is unique up to a torsion element of order 2 of $\text{Pic}^0 T_d$. Clearly $\Delta$ depends on $h^0(2C_1 + p^*D) - 1 = 2n - 1$ (by Riemann–Roch) parameters. Note that $T_d$ depends on two parameters if $d = 2$, and on one if $d = 3, 4, 6$. So the dimension of $\mathcal{M}_d$ is $2n + 1$ if $d = 2$, and $2n$ if $d = 3, 4, 6$. □

**Corollary 2.11.** Let $(S, \sigma)$ be as in (2.1.1). If $S \in \mathcal{M}_6$, where $\mathcal{M}_6$ is as in the proof of Corollary 2.10, then the involution $\sigma$ acts trivially on $H^i(S, \mathbb{Z})$ for all $i$.

**Proof.** If $S \in \mathcal{M}_6$ we have $\pi_1(S) \simeq \pi_1(T)$ by the proof of Corollary 2.10, and hence $H_1(S, \mathbb{Z})_{\text{tor}} = 0$ by Proposition 2.3. By the Poincaré duality for the torsion part of homology, we have $H^2(S, \mathbb{Z})_{\text{tor}} = 0$. Hence $H^*(S, \mathbb{Z})$ is torsion-free, and the result follows from Lemma 2.8. □

### 3. Proof of Lemma 2.8

We keep the notation of Theorem 2.5. Since $q(S) = g(C)$, by Hodge theory, $\sigma$ acts trivially on $H^1(S, \mathbb{Q})$. To check that the involution $\sigma$ acts trivially on $H^2(S, \mathbb{Q})$, we analyze the action of $\sigma$ around the singular fibers of $f$. Let $t_j$ $(j = 1, \ldots, u)$ be the ramification points of $p_{|\Delta}$. After suitable reindexing, we may assume that $\{t_1, \ldots, t_m\} = \Delta \cap C_1$ as a set. Let $t_{u+k}$ $(k = 1, \ldots, \nu)$ be the singular points of $\Delta \setminus \{t_j\}$ $(1 \leq j \leq u)$. Set $l_j = l(t_j; \Delta)$, where $l(t_j; \Delta)$ is as in Notation 2.4. We have $l_j \geq 0$ for $j = 1, \ldots, u$, and $l_j \geq 1$ for $j = u + 1, \ldots, u + \nu$. By the definition of $l_j$, we have

$$p_{\Delta}(\Delta) = g(\tilde{\Delta}) + \sum_{j=1}^{u+\nu} l_j,$$

where $\phi : \tilde{\Delta} \to \Delta$ is the normalization of $\Delta$. Applying the Hurwitz formula to $p_{|\Delta} \circ \phi$, we get

$$2g(\tilde{\Delta}) - 2 = u.$$

By the adjunction formula,

$$2p_{\Delta}(\Delta) - 2 = \left(2C_1 + p^*(2D - \sum_{j=1}^{m} c_j)\right)^2 = 4(2n - m).$$

Combining these three equalities, we have

$$4m + u + 2\sum_{j=1}^{u+\nu} l_j = 8n. \quad (3.0.1)$$

Let $g : T' \to T$ be the morphism composed of $l_j$ times blow-ups of $t_j$ and its infinitely near points $(j = 1, \ldots, u + \nu)$. The exceptional divisor $g^*(t_j)$ equals
\( \sum_{j=1}^{l_j} E_j' \), where \( E_j' \) is the exceptional curve corresponding to the \((l - 1)\)-th near points of \( t_j \). Then the strict transform \( \Delta' \) of \( \Delta \) is smooth, and for \( j = 1, \ldots, u \), \( \Delta' \) meets \( E_j' \) in one point \( t'_j \) and is tangent to it there. Let \( \varrho' : T'' \to T' \) be the blow-up of \( t'_j \) (\( j = 1, \ldots, u \)) and \( s_{jl} := E_j' \cap E_j' (j = 1, \ldots, m, l = 1, \ldots, l_j) \) (for convenience, here we set \( E'_j|_0 = (p^*c_j)' \)). Let \( E''_{j,l+1} = \varrho''(t'_j) \) and \( D''_{jl} = \varrho''(s_{jl}) \) be the exceptional curves. Then \( E''_{j,l+1} \) and the strict transform \( \Delta'' \) of \( \Delta' \) meet transversely at point \( t'_j \). Let

\[ \mu : \tilde{T} \to T'' \]

be the blow-up of \( t''_j \) (\( j = 1, \ldots, u \)). Let \( \tilde{E}_{j,l+2} = \mu^*(t''_j) \) (\( j = 1, \ldots, u \)) be the exceptional curves. For any irreducible curve \( Y \) in \( T \), we denote by \( Y', Y'' \), and \( \tilde{Y} \) the strict transform of \( Y \) in \( T', T'' \), and \( \tilde{T} \), respectively. Set

\[ \tilde{B} := \mu^*\left( \varrho''(\varrho^*B - 2 \sum_{j=1}^{l_j} l_j E_j') - 2 \sum_{j=1}^{m} E''_{j,l+1} - 2 \sum_{j=1}^{m} D''_{jl} \right) - 2 \sum_{j=1}^{m} \tilde{E}_{j,l+2} \]

\[ = \tilde{\Delta} + \sum_{j=1}^{m} p^*c_j + \sum_{j=1}^{l_j} l_j \tilde{E}_{jl} + \sum_{j=m+1}^{u} \tilde{E}_{j,l+1} \]

\[ \tilde{\theta} := \mu^*\left( \varrho''(\varrho^*\vartheta - \sum_{j=1}^{l_j} l_j E_j') - \sum_{j=1}^{m} E''_{j,l+1} - \sum_{j=1}^{m} l_j D''_{jl} \right) - \sum_{j=1}^{m} \tilde{E}_{j,l+2} \]

\[ = (\varrho \circ \varrho' \circ \mu)^*D + \tilde{C}_1 - \sum_{j=m+1}^{u+v} l_j \tilde{E}_{jl} - \sum_{j=1}^{l_j} l_j \tilde{D}_{jl} \]

\[ - \sum_{j=m+1}^{u} l_j \tilde{E}_{j,l+2} - \sum_{j=m+1}^{u} (2l_j + 1) \tilde{E}_{j,l+2}. \]

We have \( \tilde{B} \) is a smooth divisor on \( \tilde{T} \), and \( \tilde{B} \equiv 2\tilde{\delta} \). Let \( \tilde{\pi} : \tilde{S} \to \tilde{T} \) be the morphism associated with the double cover data \((\tilde{B}, \tilde{\delta})\). By the canonical resolution [Persson 1978], we have a commutative diagram

\[ \begin{array}{ccc}
\tilde{S} & \xrightarrow{\varrho} & \tilde{T} \\
\tilde{\pi} \downarrow & \quad & \downarrow \gamma := \varrho \circ \varrho' \circ \mu \\
S & \xrightarrow{\varrho} & T,
\end{array} \]

where \( \beta \) is a desingularization of \( S' \), and \( \varepsilon \) is the contraction of \(-1\)-curves on \( \tilde{S} \).

Clearly \( f \) has only \( u + v \) singular fibers \( f^*c_j \) (\( j = 1, \ldots, u + v \)). For \( j = 1, \ldots, m \), locally around a singular fiber, \( \tilde{\pi} : (f \circ \varepsilon)^*c_j \to (p \circ \gamma)^*c_j \) has the
following configurations:

\[ f^*c_j = \Theta_j'_{j,l_j+1} + \Theta_j''_{j,l_j+1} + 2\Theta_j'_{j,l_j+2} + 2\sum_{l=1}^{l_j} \Theta_{jl} + 2\sum_{l=1}^{l_j} \Theta_j'_{jl} + 2\Gamma_j \]

is as in \((b_{2l_j+1})\) of [Cai 2006a, 2.6]. \(\Theta_{jl} (l = 1, \ldots, l_j)\) are \(\lambda\)-fixed \(-2\)-curves and \(\Gamma_j\) is an \(\lambda\)-fixed elliptic curve.

For \(j = m + 1, \ldots, u, \tilde{\pi} : (f \circ \varphi)^* c_j \to (p \circ \gamma)^* c_j\) has the configurations

\[ f^*c_j = \sum_{l=1}^{l_j} \Theta_{jl} + \sum_{l=1}^{l_j} \Theta_j'_{jl} + \Gamma_j \]

(here we also denote by \(\Theta_{jl}\) and \(\Theta_j'_{jl}\), the image of \(\Theta_{jl}\) and \(\Theta_j'_{jl}\) in \(S\) is as in (v) of [Cai 2006a, Lemma 4.9]. The chain of \(-2\)-curves in \(f^*c_j\) is of type \(A_{2l_j}\) and \(\Theta_{jl} \cap \Theta_j'_{jl}\) is a nonisolated \(\lambda\)-fixed point. (When \(l_j = 0\) \(f^*c_j\) is an irreducible curve
with exactly one node $p_j$, which is a nonisolated $\lambda$-fixed point. The normalization of $f^*a_j$ is an elliptic curve.) For $j = u + 1, \ldots, u + v$, $\tilde{\pi} : (f \circ \varepsilon)^*c_j \to (p \circ \gamma)^*c_j$ has the configurations

\begin{align*}
\Theta_j & \to \Theta_{j_1} \to \Theta_{j_2} \to \cdots \to \Theta_{j_l} \to \cdots \\
\tilde{\Delta} & \to \tilde{\Delta}_1 \to \tilde{\Delta}_2 \to \cdots \to \tilde{\Delta}_l \to \cdots \\
\tilde{\pi} & \to \tilde{\pi}_1 \to \tilde{\pi}_2 \to \cdots \to \tilde{\pi}_l \to \cdots \\
\tilde{\pi}^*c_j & \to \tilde{\pi}_1^*c_j \to \tilde{\pi}_2^*c_j \to \cdots \to \tilde{\pi}_l^*c_j \to \cdots
\end{align*}

Since $\delta|_{\tilde{\pi}^*c_j} = \tilde{C}_1|_{\tilde{\pi}^*c_j} - E_{j_1}|_{\tilde{\pi}^*c_j}$ is nontrivial, the inverse image $\Gamma_j$ of $\tilde{\pi}^*c_j$ is connected. Hence

$$f^*c_j = \sum_{l=1}^{l_j} \Theta_j l + \sum_{l=1}^{l_j-1} \Theta_{j_l} + \Gamma_j$$

is as in (v) of [Cai 2006a, Lemma 4.9]. The chain of $-2$-curves in $f^*c_j$ is of type $A_{2l_j-1}$.

For $j = 1, \ldots, m$, $\lambda|_{\Theta_j'}$ is an involution with fixed points

$$q_j = \Theta_j l_j \cap \Theta_j' l_j + 2, \quad q'_j = \tilde{\Delta} \cap \Theta_j l_j + 2$$

(the former equals $\Gamma_j \cap \Theta_j' l_j + 2$ when $l_j = 0$). See the picture above. Since $\tilde{\Delta}$ is $\tau$-invariant, $q'_j$ is $\tau$-fixed. From

(3.0.2) $$e^*K_S = (\gamma \circ \tilde{\pi})^*(p^*(\eta + D)) + C_1,$$

we see that

$$(l_j + 1)(\Theta_j' l_j + 1 + \Theta_j'' l_j + 1) + (2l_j + 1)\Theta_j' l_j + 2 + \sum_{l=1}^{l_j} 2l(\Theta_j l_l) + \sum_{l=1}^{l_j} (2l - 1)\Theta_j' l_l$$

is contained in the fixed part of $|K_S|$. By [Cai 2006a, 2.9], $f^*c_j$ is not of type $V$ in the sense of Horikawa. So by [Cai 2006a, 2.8], $q_j, q'_j$ are isolated $\tau$-fixed points and there are three nonisolated $\tau$-fixed points $r_{l_j}, r_{l_j}, r_{l_j}$ on $\Gamma_j$. So $\Theta_j' l_j + 2$ is $\sigma$-fixed (otherwise, $\langle \lambda, \tau \rangle \leftarrow \text{Aut} \Theta_j l_j + 2$, which is a contradiction since $\langle \lambda, \tau \rangle$ is not cyclic) and $r_{l_j}, r_{l_j}, r_{l_j}$ are $\sigma$-fixed points. Similarly we see easily that $\Theta_j'^l_j$ ($l = 1, \ldots, l_j$) are $\sigma$-fixed. Hence

$$e((f^*c_j')^*) = 2(l_j + 1) + 3 = 2l_j + 5 \quad \text{for } j = 1, \ldots, m.$$
For \( j = m + 1, \ldots, u + v \), since \( f^*c_j \) is reduced, by [Cai 2006a, 2.4], \( \sigma \) has no fixed curves on \( f^*c_j \). Since each component of \( f^*c_j \) is \( \sigma \)-invariant, each node point of \( f^*c_j \) is \( \sigma \)-fixed. We show that they are isolated \( \sigma \)-fixed points. If there is a \( \sigma \)-fixed point \( x \in f^*c_j \) which is not isolated, then there is a \( \sigma \)-fixed curve \( D \) (necessarily being horizontal with respective to \( f \)) passing through \( x \). Since \( D \) is contained in the fixed part of \( |K_S| \), \( Df^*c_j = 2 \). This implies there are three \( \sigma \)-invariant curves meeting in \( x \) with distinct tangent directions, and hence the induced linear action of \( \sigma \) on the tangent space at \( x \) must be \( \mathbb{C} \) for some \( \zeta \in \mathbb{C} \), a contradiction. (When \( m + 1 \leq j \leq u \) and \( l_j = 0 \), then \( p_j \) is a nonisolated \( \tau \)-fixed point by [Cai 2001, Lemma 2.4], both \( \tau \) and \( \lambda \) exchange the local branches at \( p_j \). So \( \sigma \) fixes the local branches at \( p_j \), implying that \( p_j \) is an isolated fixed point of \( \sigma \).) Hence

\[
e((f^*c_j)^\sigma) = \begin{cases} 2l_j + 1, & j = m+1, \ldots, u; \\ 2l_j, & j = u+1, \ldots, u+v. \end{cases}
\]

Let \( H \subset S \) be the inverse image of \( C_1 \). Both \( \tau|_H \) and \( \lambda|_H \) are involution of \( H \). (Clearly by (3.0.2), \( H \) is contained in the fixed part of \( |K_S| \). So \( H \) is \( \tau \)-invariant and \( H|_F \) is a \( g_2^1 \) on \( F \), where \( F \) is a general fiber of \( f \). If \( \tau|_H = \text{id} \), let \( H \cap F = \{ s, s' \} \), then \( s + s' = H|_F \equiv 2s \), which implies \( s' \equiv s \) on \( F \), a contradiction.) So \( H \) is a \( \sigma \)-fixed curve. Clearly \( H \) is the only \( \sigma \)-fixed curve which is horizontal with respective to \( f \). we show that \( f|_H : H \to C \) is étale. In particular, this implies \( r_{1j}, r_{2j}, r_{3j} \) are isolated \( \sigma \)-fixed points. Suppose \( x \in H \) is a ramification point of \( f|_H \). Let \( F' = f^*(f(x)) \). Since \( HF' = 2 \), we have \( H \cap F' = \{ x \} \). Since \( H \) is \( \lambda \)-invariant, we have \( x \in (\tau, \lambda) \)-fixed. Since \( \langle \tau, \lambda \rangle \) is not cyclic, \( x \) is a singular point of \( F' \). If \( F' = f^*c_j \) for some \( j \), \( m + 1 \leq j \leq u + v \), then \( x \) is one of the node points of \( f^*c_j \), which is a contradiction since these points are isolated fixed points of \( \sigma \). Now we suppose \( F' = f^*c_j \) for some \( j \), \( 1 \leq j \leq m \). Since \( \Theta'_{j,l_j+2} \) is \( \sigma \)-fixed, \( \Theta'_{j,l_j+1} \) is not \( \sigma \)-fixed. So there is a \( \sigma \)-fixed point \( o_j \) on \( \Theta'_{j,l_j+1} \setminus \Theta'_{j,l_j+1} \cup \Theta'_{j,l_j+2} \), By [Cai 2001, Lemma 2.4], \( H \) passes through \( o_j \), which is a contradiction. Since \( H \) is étale over \( C \), \( e(H) = 0 \). Summing-up, we have

\[
e(S^\sigma) = \sum_{j=1}^{u+v} e((f^*c_j)^\sigma) + e(H) = \sum_{j=m+1}^{u} (2l_j + 5) + \sum_{j=m+1}^{u+v} (2l_j + 1) + \sum_{j=u+1}^{u+v} 2l_j
\]

\[
= 2 \sum_{j=1}^{u+v} l_j + 4m + u.
\]

By the Noether formula, \( e(S) = 8n \). Applying the topological Lefschetz formula to \( \sigma \) [Atiyah and Singer 1968, p. 566], namely

\[
e(S) + 8(q(S) - \dim H^0(S, \Omega^1_S)^\sigma) - 2(\dim H^2(S, \mathbb{Q}) - \dim H^2(S, \mathbb{Q})^\sigma) = e(S^\sigma),
\]
we get

\[
2(\dim H^2(S, \mathbb{Q}) - \dim H^2(S, \mathbb{Q})^\sigma) = 8n - \left(2 \sum_{j=1}^{u+v} l_j + 4m + u\right) = 0
\]

by (3.0.1). Thus \(\sigma\) acts trivially on \(H^2(S, \mathbb{Q})\), and Lemma 2.8 is proved. \(\square\)

**Remark 3.1.** Here is a sketch of an alternative proof of Lemma 2.8 suggested by the referee if \(T\) is as in Proposition 2.2(i). In this case \(q(S) = g(C)\), and we can use Theorem 3 of [Shioda 1999] to compute the rank of the Néron–Severi group \(\text{NS}(S)_\mathbb{Q} = \text{NS}(S) \otimes \mathbb{Q}\) of \(S\). Consequently, \(\text{NS}(S)_\mathbb{Q}\) is generated by \(H, F\) and all irreducible components of singular fibers of \(f\). By the construction of \(S\), we can check that \(H, F\) and each such component are \(\sigma\)-invariant. Hence \(\sigma\) acts trivially on \(\text{NS}(S)_\mathbb{Q}\). Let \(T(S)\) be the orthogonal complement of \(\text{NS}(S)_\mathbb{Q}\) in \(H^2(S, \mathbb{Q})\). Note that \(T(S)\) is the smallest rational subspace of \(H^2(S, \mathbb{Q})\) such that the complexification of \(T(S)\) contains \(H^{2,0}(S)\). Since the involution \(\sigma\) acts trivially on \(H^0(\omega_S)\), we have \(T(S)^\sigma = T(S)\). Hence \(\sigma\) acts trivially on \(H^2(S, \mathbb{Q})\).

4. **Surfaces with \(K_S^2 = 8\chi(C_S)\)**

In this section, we describe explicitly families of pairs \((S, \sigma)\), where \(S\) is a fiber surface of genus 2 with \(K_S^2 = 8\chi(C_S)\), and \(\sigma\) is an involution of \(S\) inducing trivial action on \(H^2(S, \mathbb{Q})\).

Throughout the section, we denote by \(\tau_D\) the hyperelliptic involution of a hyperelliptic curve \(D\); for a point \(e\) in an elliptic curve \(E\), we denote by \(t_e\) the translation by \(e\).

**Example 4.1.** Let \((S, \sigma) = (F \times C, \tau_F \times \tau_C)\), where \(F\) and \(C\) are hyperelliptic curves with \(g(F) = 2\) and \(g(C) \geq 2\). This example is well known.

**Example 4.2.** Let \(F\) be a curve of genus 2 with a bielliptic involution \(\lambda_F\). Let \(\tilde{B} = \mathbb{P}^1\) and \(\gamma_{\tilde{B}}\) an involution of \(\tilde{B}\). Let \(\pi : C \to B := \tilde{B}/(\gamma_{\tilde{B}})\) be a double cover with \(g(C) \geq 2\), such that the branch points of \(\tilde{B} \to \tilde{B}/(\gamma_{\tilde{B}}) = B\) are contained in that of \(\pi\). Let \(\tilde{C}\) be the normalization of \(C \times_B \tilde{B}\) and \(\gamma_{\tilde{C}} \in \text{Aut}\tilde{C}\) the lift of \(\gamma_{\tilde{B}}\). (Note that \(\tilde{C}\) is hyperelliptic since the involution corresponding to \(\tilde{C} \to \tilde{B}\) is the hyperelliptic one.)

Let \((S, \sigma) = ((F \times \tilde{C})/(\lambda_F \times \gamma_{\tilde{C}}), \overline{\tau_F \times \tau_{\tilde{C}}} )\), where \(\overline{\tau_F \times \tau_{\tilde{C}}}\) is the involution of \((F \times \tilde{C})/(\lambda_F \times \gamma_{\tilde{C}})\) induced by \(\tau_F \times \tau_{\tilde{C}}\).

**Example 4.3.** Let \(G\) be one of the groups \(\mathbb{Z}_a\) \((a = 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 10)\) or \(\mathbb{Z}_b \oplus \mathbb{Z}_2\) \((b = 2, 6)\). Let \(F\) be a curve of genus 2 on which \(G\) acts faithfully and \(g(F/G) = 0\). Let \(\tilde{B}\) be an elliptic curve and \(G\) a subgroup of translations of \(\tilde{B}\). Let \(C \to B := \tilde{B}/G\) be a double cover with \(g(C) \geq 2\). Let \(\tilde{C} = C \times_B \tilde{B}\). Then \(G\) induces a
Let \( S \) be a complex nonsingular projective surface of general type.

The first part of this theorem follows from [Cai 2006b, Theorem 1.1]. Now let \( S \) be as in (4.7.1). Let \( \tau : C \to \tilde{C} \) be a double cover such that the branch locus of \( \tilde{C} \) is contained in that of \( \pi \). Let \( \tilde{C} \) be the normalization of \( C \times_B \tilde{B} \), and \( \tilde{e}_1, \tilde{e}_2 \in \text{Aut} \tilde{C} \) the lifts of \( -1, e \in \text{Aut} \tilde{B} \) respectively. Let \( \lambda_{\tilde{C}} \) be the involution of \( \tilde{C} \) corresponding to the double cover \( \tilde{C} \to \tilde{B} \).

Let \( (S, \sigma) = ((F \times \tilde{C})/(\tau_F \times \lambda_{\tilde{C}}), \), where \( G \) acts on \( F \times \tilde{C} \) via a product action.

**Example 4.4.** Let \( F \) be a curve of genus 2 with a bielliptic involution \( \lambda_F \). Let \( \tilde{B} \) be an elliptic curve, and \( e \in \tilde{B} \) a nontrivial 2-torsion point. Let \( \pi : C \to B := \tilde{B}/\langle t_e, -1 \rangle \) be a double cover such that the branch locus of \( \tilde{B} \to B \) is contained in that of \( \pi \). Let \( \tilde{C} \) be the normalization of \( C \times_B \tilde{B} \), and \( \tilde{e}_1, \tilde{e}_2 \in \text{Aut} \tilde{C} \) the lifts of \( -1, e \in \text{Aut} \tilde{B} \) respectively. Let \( \lambda_{\tilde{C}} \) be the involution of \( \tilde{C} \) corresponding to the double cover \( \tilde{C} \to \tilde{B} \).

Let \( (S, \sigma) = ((F \times \tilde{C})/(\tau_F \times \tilde{e}_1, \lambda_F \times (-\tilde{1}_B), \tau_F \times \lambda_{\tilde{C}}) \).

**Example 4.5.** Let \( \tilde{B} \) be an elliptic curve, and \( e \in \tilde{B} \) a nontrivial 4-torsion point. Let \( \tilde{G} := \langle t_e, -1 \rangle \cong D_8 \) (the dihedral group of order 8). Let \( F \) be a curve of genus 2 on which \( G \) acts faithfully. Let \( \pi : C \to B := \tilde{B}/G \) be a double cover such that the branch locus of \( \tilde{B} \to B \) is contained in that of \( \pi \). Let \( \tilde{C} \) be the normalization of \( C \times_B \tilde{B} \). Then \( \tilde{G} \) induces a faithful action on \( \tilde{C} \). Let \( \lambda_{\tilde{C}} \) be the involution of \( \tilde{C} \) corresponding to the double cover \( \tilde{C} \to \tilde{B} \).

Let \( (S, \sigma) = ((F \times \tilde{C})/(\tau_F \times \tilde{e}_e, \lambda_F \times (-\tilde{1}_B), \tau_F \times \lambda_{\tilde{C}}) \).

**Remark 4.6.** Let \( (S, \sigma) \) be as in one of Examples 4.1–4.5. Clearly \( S \) has a fibration of genus 2 with \( K_S^2 = 8\chi(C) \). Applying the topological and holomorphic Lefschetz formula to \( \sigma \) (see [Atiyah and Singer 1968, p. 566]) or by [Cai 2006b, 3.1], we can check easily that \( \sigma \) induces trivial actions on \( H^2(S, \mathbb{Q}) \).

**Theorem 4.7.** Let \( S \) be a complex nonsingular projective surface of general type with \( \chi(C) \geq 5 \), and \( f : S \to C \) be a relatively minimal fibration of genus 2. Let \( G \subset \text{Aut} \to S \) be a nontrivial subgroup of automorphisms of \( S \), inducing trivial actions on \( H^2(S, \mathbb{Q}) \). Assume that the canonical map \( \phi_S \) of \( S \) is generically finite. Then \( |G| = 2 \), \( g(C) \geq 2 \), the generator \( \sigma \) of \( G \) induces a hyperelliptic involution or a bielliptic involution \( \tilde{\sigma} \) of \( C \) such that \( \tilde{\sigma} \circ f = f \circ \sigma \), and either

\[
(4.7.1) K_S^2 = 8\chi(C) \quad \text{and} \quad g(C) \leq q(S) \leq g(C) + 2,
\]
\[
(4.7.2) K_S^2 = 8\chi(C) - 6 \quad \text{and} \quad g(C) \leq q(S) \leq g(C) + 1, \quad \text{or}
\]
\[
(4.7.3) K_S^2 = 8\chi(C) - 12 \quad \text{and} \quad q(S) = g(C).
\]

Moreover, if \( S \) is as in (4.7.1), then \( (S, \sigma) \) belongs to one of Examples 4.1–4.5.

**Proof.** The first part of this theorem follows from [Cai 2006b, Theorem 1.1]. Now let \( f : S \to C, \sigma \) be as in (4.7.1). Let \( \tau \) be the hyperelliptic involution of
$f: S \to C$, and $\lambda = \sigma \circ \tau$. We have a commutative diagram

$$
\begin{array}{ccccccc}
S & \xrightarrow{\rho} & \tilde{S} & \xrightarrow{\tilde{\pi}} & \tilde{S}/\tilde{\lambda} & \xrightarrow{\eta} & T \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
C & \xrightarrow{\pi} & B := C/\tilde{\sigma} & & & & \\
\end{array}
$$

where $\rho$ is the blowup of all isolated fixed points of $\lambda$, $\tilde{\lambda}$ the induced involution on $\tilde{S}$, and $\eta$ is the blowdown of all $-1$-curves contained in fibers of $\tilde{S}/\tilde{\lambda} \to B$. Then $p_g(T) = 0$, and $h: T \to B$ is a relatively minimal fibration of genus 2. The configurations of reducible fibers of $h$ is as in Table 1 (see [Cai 2006b, 2.9]), where $q_f = q(S) - g(C)$, and $4(b_0)$, etc (column 5) means $h$ having 4 reducible fibers of type $(b_0)$ and no other reducible fibers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$q_f$</th>
<th>$g(B)$</th>
<th>$q(T)$</th>
<th>$K_T^2$</th>
<th>configurations of reducible singular fibers of $h$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 4(b_0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0 -4 2(b_0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-8 4(b_0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-8 a trivial fiber bundle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1

Since $f$ is a fiber bundle by [Xiao 1985, p. 18], $h$ has constant moduli. Let $F$ be a general fiber of $h$. There exists a finite group $G$ acting on $F$ and on some smooth curve $\tilde{B}$ such that $h$ is birationally isomorphic to $(F \times \tilde{B})/G \to \tilde{B}/G$.

If $h$ is as in line 4 of Table 1, then clearly $(S, \sigma)$ is as in Example 4.1.

Case 1: $h$ is as in line 3 of Table 1. In this case $g(F/G) = q(T) - g(\tilde{B}/G) = 1$. So $|G| = 2$ by the Hurwitz formula. Since $p_g(T) = 0$, we have $\tilde{B} \simeq \mathbb{P}^1$. So $T$ is birationally isomorphic to $(F \times \tilde{B})/(\lambda_F \times \gamma_\tilde{B})$, where $\lambda_F$ is a bielliptic involution of $F$, and $\gamma_\tilde{B}$ is an involution of $\tilde{B}$. We have a commutative diagram

$$
\begin{array}{ccccccc}
\tilde{C} & \xrightarrow{\mu} & C \times_B \tilde{B} & \xrightarrow{\pi} & \tilde{B} \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
C & \xrightarrow{\pi} & B & & & & \\
\end{array}
$$

where $\pi$ is as in the beginning of the proof and $\mu$ is the normalization. Let $\lambda_\tilde{C}$ be the involution of $\tilde{C}$ corresponding to the double cover $\tilde{C} \to \tilde{B}$, and $\gamma_\tilde{C} \in \text{Aut } \tilde{C}$ is the lift of $\gamma_\tilde{B}$. Since the image of reducible fibers of $h$ is contained in the set of branch points of $\pi$, the branch points of $\tilde{B} \to B$ are contained in that of $\pi$. This
implies $\tilde{C} \to C \simeq C/\langle \gamma_C \rangle$ is étale. We have a commutative diagram

$$
F \times (C \times_B \tilde{B}) \simeq C \times_B (F \times \tilde{B}) \quad \Rightarrow \quad F \times \tilde{B}
$$

$$
\downarrow \quad \downarrow
$$

$$
C \times_B (F \times \tilde{B})/\langle \lambda_F \times \gamma \rangle \quad \Rightarrow \quad (F \times \tilde{B})/\langle \lambda_F \times \gamma \rangle
$$

Hence $S = (F \times \tilde{C})/\langle \lambda_F \times \gamma_C \rangle$ and $\sigma = (\tau_F \times \text{id}_{\tilde{C}})(\text{id}_F \times \tau_C) = \tau_F \times \tau_{\tilde{C}}$. So $(S, \sigma)$ is as in Example 4.2.

Case 2: $h$ is as in line 2 of Table 1. In this case, $T \simeq (F \times \tilde{B})/G$, where $F$, $\tilde{B}$ and $G$ are as in Example 4.3. (Since $G$ is an abelian subgroup of $\text{Aut} F$, we have $|G| \leq 4g(F) + 4 = 12 \leq 4g(F) + 2 = 10$ if $G$ is cyclic). Moreover, when $\tau_F \notin G$, since $\langle \tau_F, G \rangle$ is also abelian, we have $|G| = \frac{1}{2} \langle \tau_F, G \rangle | \leq 2g(F) + 2 = 6$. Finally $G \not\simeq \mathbb{Z}_2 \oplus \mathbb{Z}_4$ by the Riemann’s existence theorem (see, for instance, [Broughton 1991, Proposition 2.1 or Theorem 4.1]). By the same argument as in Case 1, we get $(S, \sigma)$ is as in Example 4.3.

Case 3: $h$ is as in line 1 of Table 1. Let $B' \to B$ be the double cover branched at four points, which are the image of four singular fibers of type $(b_0)$ of $h$. Let $T'' \to T \times_B B'$ be the normalization, and $h': T' \to B'$ the relatively minimal fibration induced by contracting $-1$-curves contained in the fibers of $T'' \to B'$. Since $h$ has only 4 reducible fibers of type $(b_0(I_0))$, $(b_0(I_1))$ or $(b_0(I I))$ (see [Cai 2006b, Table 1]) and no other reducible fibers, by the construction, each singular fiber (if any) of $h'$ is irreducible and reduced. Since $h'$ has constant moduli, this implies $h'$ is a fiber bundle. By [Cai 2006b, Lemma 2.5], $q(T') = 1$. So $(h': T' \to B') \simeq ((F \times \tilde{B})/G \to \tilde{B}/G)$, where $F$, $\tilde{B}$ and $G$ are as in Example 4.3. This implies $h$ has only 4 reducible fibers of type $(b_0(I_0))$ and no other singular fibers. Hence, for any $z \in \tilde{B}$, the order of the stabilizer $G_z$ of $z$ in $G$ is at most 2 and if $G_z$ is not trivial for some $z \in \tilde{B}$, then $|G|/|G_z| \leq 4$ and the generator of $G_z$ acts on $F$ as a bielliptic involution. So $|G| = 4$ or 8. If $|G| = 4$, then $\tilde{G} \simeq \mathbb{Z}_2^2$ and $T$ is birationally isomorphic to $(F \times \tilde{B})/\langle \tau_F \times t_e, \lambda_F \times (-1)_{\tilde{B}} \rangle$, where $e \in \tilde{B}$ is a nontrivial 2-torsion point, and $\lambda_F$ is the involution of $F$ corresponding to the generator of $G_z$. If $|G| = 8$, then $G \simeq \mathbb{Z}_8$, $Q_8$ or $D_8$ by [Broughton 1991, Theorem 4.1]. Since $G \hookrightarrow \text{Aut} \tilde{B}$, $G \simeq G_1 \rtimes G_2$ (a semidirect product), where $G_1$ is a group of translations and $G_2 \subset \text{Aut} \tilde{B}$ is a subgroup preserving the group structure. Since $B/G = \mathbb{P}^1$, $G_2 \neq 0$, thus $G_2 \simeq \mathbb{Z}_m$ ($m = 2$ or 4). This implies $G \not\simeq \mathbb{Z}_8$ or $Q_8$. Hence $G \simeq \langle t_e, -1 \rangle \simeq D_8$, where $e \in \tilde{B}$ is a nontrivial 4-torsion point. Now by the similar argument as in Case 1, we get $(S, \sigma)$ is as in Examples 4.4 and 4.5. □

Remark 4.8. Let $S$ be a surface isogenous to a product of curves of genus at least 2 (see [Catanese 2000; 2003] for properties of these surfaces), and $G \subset \text{Aut} S$ be a nontrivial subgroup of automorphisms of $S$, inducing trivial actions on $H^2(S, \mathbb{Q})$. 

It is interesting to classify pairs \((S, G)\). Note that fiber surfaces of genus 2 with \(K_S^2 = 8\chi(C_S)\) are isogenous to products of curves. Theorem 4.7 gives a classification for such pairs under the condition that one curve of the products has genus 2.
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