



Geometry & Topology

Volume 28 (2024)

**The nonabelian Brill–Noether divisor on $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{13}$
and the Kodaira dimension of $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{13}$**

GAVRIL FARKAS

DAVID JENSEN

SAM PAYNE

The nonabelian Brill–Noether divisor on $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{13}$ and the Kodaira dimension of $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{13}$

GAVRIL FARKAS

DAVID JENSEN

SAM PAYNE

We highlight several novel aspects of the moduli space of curves of genus 13, the first genus g where phenomena related to $K3$ surfaces no longer govern the birational geometry of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_g$. We compute the class of the nonabelian Brill–Noether divisor on $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{13}$ of curves that have a stable rank-two vector bundle with canonical determinant and many sections. This provides the first example of an effective divisor on $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_g$ with slope less than $6 + 10/g$. Earlier work on the slope conjecture suggested that such divisors may not exist. The main geometric application of our result is a proof that the Prym moduli space $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{13}$ is of general type. Among other things, we also prove the Bertram–Feinberg–Mukai and the strong maximal rank conjectures on $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{13}$.

14H10; 14T20

1. Introduction	803
2. The failure locus of the strong maximal rank conjecture on $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{13}$	809
3. The class of the virtual divisor $\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_{13}$	817
4. The strong maximal rank conjecture in genus 13	821
5. Effectivity of the virtual class	842
6. The Bertram–Feinberg–Mukai conjecture in genus 13	846
7. The nonabelian Brill–Noether divisor on $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{13}$	853
8. The Kodaira dimension of $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{13}$	859
References	863

1 Introduction

One of the defining achievements of modern moduli theory is the result due to Harris, Mumford and Eisenbud [27; 16] that $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_g$ is of general type for $g \geq 24$. An essential step in their proof is the calculation of the class of the *Brill–Noether divisor* $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,r}^d$ consisting of those curves X of genus g such that $G_d^r(X) \neq \emptyset$ in the case $\rho(g, r, d) := g - (r + 1)(g - d + r) = -1$. Recall that the *slope* of an effective divisor D on $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_g$ not containing any of the boundary divisors Δ_i in its support is defined as the quantity $s(D) := a / \min_i b_i$,

where $[D] = a\lambda - b_0\delta_0 - \cdots - b_{\lfloor g/2 \rfloor}\delta_{\lfloor g/2 \rfloor} \in CH^1(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_g)$. Eisenbud and Harris [16] showed that the slope of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,r}^d$ is $a/b_0 = 6 + 12/(g+1)$. After these seminal results from the 1980s, the fundamental question arose whether one can construct effective divisors D on $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_g$ of slope $s(D) < 6 + 12/(g+1)$ by using conditions defined in terms of *higher rank* vector bundles on curves.

Each effective divisor D on $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_g$ of slope $s(D) < 6 + 12/(g+1)$ must contain the locus $\mathcal{K}_g \subseteq \mathcal{M}_g$ of curves lying on a $K3$ surface; see Farkas and Popa [21]. Since curves on $K3$ surfaces possess stable rank-two vector bundles with canonical determinant and unexpectedly many sections (see Lazarsfeld [35], Mukai [38] and Voisin [48]), it is then natural to focus on conditions defined in terms of rank-two vector bundles with canonical determinant.

For a smooth curve X of genus g , let $\mathrm{SU}_X(2, \omega)$ be the moduli space of semistable rank-two vector bundles E on X with $\det E \cong \omega_X$. For $k \geq 0$, Bertram and Feinberg [7, Conjecture, page 2] and Mukai [38, Problem 4.8] conjectured that for a general curve X , the rank-two Brill–Noether locus

$$\mathrm{SU}_X(2, \omega, k) := \{E \in \mathrm{SU}_X(2, \omega_X) : h^0(X, E) \geq k\}$$

has dimension $\beta(2, g, k) := 3g - 3 - \binom{k+1}{2}$. For a general curve X the *Mukai–Petri map*

$$(1) \quad \mu_E : \mathrm{Sym}^2 H^0(X, E) \rightarrow H^0(X, \mathrm{Sym}^2(E))$$

is injective for each $E \in \mathrm{SU}_X(2, \omega)$; see Teixidor i Bigas [45]. As a consequence, $\mathrm{SU}_X(2, \omega, k)$ has the expected dimension $\beta(2, g, k)$, if it is nonempty. There are numerous partial results on the nonemptiness of $\mathrm{SU}_X(2, \omega, k)$ — see for instance Lange, Newstead and Park [34], Teixidor i Bigas [44] and Zhang [49] — although still no proof in full generality.

Assume now that $3g - 3 = \binom{k+1}{2}$. Then generically, $\mathrm{SU}_X(2, \omega, k)$ consists of finitely many vector bundles, if it is nonempty. We consider the *nonabelian* Brill–Noether divisor $\mathcal{MP}_g$ on $\mathcal{M}_g$ consisting of curves $[X]$ for which there exists $E \in \mathrm{SU}_X(2, \omega_X, k)$ such that the Mukai–Petri map μ_E is not an isomorphism. In this paper, we focus on the first genuinely interesting case,¹

$$g = 13 \quad \text{and} \quad k = 8.$$

Our first main result proves this case of the Bertram–Feinberg–Mukai conjecture and computes the class of the closure of the nonabelian Brill–Noether divisor.

Theorem 1.1 *A general curve X of genus 13 carries exactly three stable vector bundles $E \in \mathrm{SU}_X(2, \omega, 8)$. The closure in $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{13}$ of the nonabelian Brill–Noether divisor on $\mathcal{M}_{13}$*

$$\mathcal{MP}_{13} := \{[X] \in \mathcal{M}_{13} : \text{there exists an } E \in \mathrm{SU}_X(2, \omega, 8) \text{ with } \mu_E : \mathrm{Sym}^2 H^0(E) \xrightarrow{\neq} H^0(\mathrm{Sym}^2(E))\}$$

has slope equal to

$$s([\overline{\mathcal{MP}}_{13}]) = \frac{4109}{610} = 6.735 \dots < 6 + \frac{10}{13} = 6.769 \dots$$

¹It is left to the reader to show that in the previous cases $k = 5, 6$, the corresponding divisors $\mathcal{MP}_6$ and $\mathcal{MP}_8$ are supported on the loci, in $\mathcal{M}_6$ and $\mathcal{M}_8$ respectively, of curves failing the Petri theorem.

To explain the significance of this result, we recall that several infinite series of examples of divisors on $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_g$ for $g \geq 10$ with slope less than $6 + 12/(g + 1)$ have been constructed in Farkas [17], Farkas and Popa [21], Farkas, Jensen and Payne [19] and Khosla [32], using syzygies on curves. Quite remarkably, the slopes $s(D)$ of all these divisors D on $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_g$ satisfy

$$6 + \frac{10}{g} \leq s(D) < 6 + \frac{12}{g+1}.$$

The slope $6 + 12/(g + 1)$ appears as both the slope of the Brill–Noether divisors $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,r}^d$ and as the slope of a Lefschetz pencil of curves of genus g on a $K3$ surface. Similarly, $6 + 10/g$ is the slope of the family of curves $\{X'_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{P}^1}$ in $\Delta_0 \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{M}}_g$ obtained from a Lefschetz pencil $\{X_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{P}^1}$ of curves of genus $g - 1$ on a $K3$ surface S by identifying two sections corresponding to basepoints of the pencil. The natural question has been therefore raised in [10, page 2], whether a slight weakening of the Harris–Morrison slope conjecture [26] remains true and the inequality

$$(2) \quad s(D) \geq 6 + \frac{10}{g}$$

holds for every effective divisor D on $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_g$. Results from Farkas and Popa [21] and Tan [43] imply that inequality (2) holds for all $g \leq 12$. In particular, the divisor $\overline{\mathcal{K}}_{10}$ on $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{10}$ consisting of curves lying on $K3$ surfaces, which was shown in [21] to be the original counterexample to the slope conjecture, satisfies $s(\overline{\mathcal{K}}_{10}) = 7 = 6 + 10/g$. On $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{12}$, since a general curve of genus 11 lies on a $K3$ surface, it follows that the pencils $\{X'_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{P}^1}$ cover the boundary divisor $\Delta_0 \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{12}$, and consequently the inequality (2) holds. Therefore 13 is the smallest genus where inequality (2) can be tested, and Theorem 1.1 provides a negative answer to the question posed in Chen, Farkas and Morrison [10].

1.1 The Kodaira dimension of the Prym moduli space $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{13}$

One application of Theorem 1.1 concerns the birational geometry of the moduli space $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_g$ of Prym curves of genus g . The Prym moduli space $\mathcal{R}_g$ classifying pairs $[X, \eta]$, where X is a smooth curve of genus g and η is a 2-torsion point in $\text{Pic}^0(X)$, has been classically used to parametrize moduli of abelian varieties via the Prym map $\mathcal{R}_g \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_{g-1}$ [6]. The Deligne–Mumford compactification $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_g$ is uniruled for $g \leq 8$ (see Farkas and Verra [23]), and was previously known to be of general type for $g \geq 14$ and $g \neq 16$ (see Bruns [9] and Farkas and Ludwig [20]).²

Theorem 1.2 *The Prym moduli space $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{13}$ is of general type.*

In particular, 13 is the smallest genus g for which it is known that $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_g$ is of general type. The proof of Theorem 1.2 takes full advantage of Theorem 1.1. It also uses the *universal theta divisor* Θ_{13} , defined as

²The problem of determining the Kodaira dimension of $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{16}$ remains open. It was proven in Farkas and Ludwig [20] that the Prym–Green conjecture on $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{16}$ implies that $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{16}$ is of general type. However, as shown in Chiodo, Eisenbud, Farkas and Schreyer [11, Proposition 4.4], there is strong indication that the Prym–Green conjecture fails in genus 16.

the locus of Prym curves $[X, \eta] \in \mathcal{R}_{13}$ for which there exists a vector bundle $E \in \mathrm{SU}_X(2, \omega, 8)$ such that $H^0(X, E \otimes \eta) \neq 0$. In an indirect way (to be explained later), we calculate the class $[\bar{\Theta}_{13}]$ of the closure of Θ_{13} inside $\bar{\mathcal{R}}_{13}$ and show that

$$(3) \quad K_{\bar{\mathcal{R}}_{13}} \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0} \langle \lambda, [\bar{\Theta}_{13}], [\bar{D}_{13:2}], \text{boundary divisors} \rangle,$$

where $D_{13:2}$ is the effective divisor on $\mathcal{R}_{13}$ introduced in Farkas and Ludwig [20] consisting of Prym curves $[X, \eta]$ for which η can be written as the difference of two effective divisors of degree 6 on X . Since λ is big, it follows that $K_{\bar{\mathcal{R}}_{13}}$ is also big. Theorem 1.2 follows, since the singularities of $\bar{\mathcal{R}}_g$ do not impose adjunction conditions [20].

1.2 The strong maximal rank conjecture on $\bar{\mathcal{M}}_{13}$

The proofs of both Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 are indirect and proceed through a study of the failure locus of the strong maximal rank conjecture (see Aprodu and Farkas [3]) on $\bar{\mathcal{M}}_{13}$. For a general curve X of genus 13 the Brill–Noether locus $W_{16}^5(X)$ is one-dimensional, and $W_{16}^6(X) = \emptyset$. Counting dimensions shows that the multiplication map

$$\phi_L: \mathrm{Sym}^2 H^0(X, L) \rightarrow H^0(X, L^{\otimes 2})$$

has at least a one-dimensional kernel, since $h^0(X, L^{\otimes 2}) = 2 \deg(L) + 1 - g = 20$. The space of pairs $[X, L]$ such that $\mathrm{Ker}(\phi_L)$ is at least two-dimensional therefore has expected codimension 2 in the parameter space $\mathfrak{S}_{16}^5$ of all such pairs $[X, L]$. Since the fibers of the map $\sigma: \mathfrak{S}_{16}^5 \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{13}$ are in general one-dimensional, the pushforward of this locus is expected to be a divisor on $\mathcal{M}_{13}$.

Our next result verifies this case of the strong maximal rank conjecture and computes the class of the closure of the divisorial part of the failure locus. This is essential input for the calculation of the nonabelian Brill–Noether divisor class in Theorem 1.1 and hence for the proof of Theorem 1.2.

Theorem 1.3 *The locus of curves $[X] \in \mathcal{M}_{13}$ carrying a line bundle $L \in W_{16}^5(X)$ such that the multiplication map $\phi_L: \mathrm{Sym}^2 H^0(X, L) \rightarrow H^0(X, L^{\otimes 2})$ is not surjective is a proper subvariety of $\mathcal{M}_{13}$, having a divisorial part $\mathfrak{D}_{13}$, whose closure in $\bar{\mathcal{M}}_{13}$ has slope*

$$s(\bar{\mathfrak{D}}_{13}) = \frac{5059}{749} = 6.754 \dots < 6 + \frac{10}{13}.$$

The proof of Theorem 1.3 takes full advantage of the techniques we developed in [19] in the course of our work on $\bar{\mathcal{M}}_{22}$ and $\bar{\mathcal{M}}_{23}$. To that end, we split Theorem 1.3 in two parts.

Recall that a curve is *treelike* if its dual graph becomes a tree after deleting all loop edges [16, page 364]. We consider a proper moduli stack of generalized limit linear series $\sigma: \tilde{\mathfrak{S}}_{16}^5 \rightarrow \tilde{\mathfrak{M}}_{13}$, where $\tilde{\mathfrak{M}}_{13}$ is a suitable moduli stack of treelike curves of genus 13 equal to $\mathfrak{M}_{13} \cup \Delta_0 \cup \Delta_1$ in codimension one; see Section 2 for a precise definition. We then construct a morphism of vector bundles over $\tilde{\mathfrak{S}}_{16}^5$ globalizing

the multiplication maps ϕ_L considered before. The degeneracy locus $\mathfrak{U}$ of this morphism, due to its determinantal nature, carries a virtual class $[\mathfrak{U}]^{\text{virt}}$ of codimension 2 inside $\widetilde{\mathfrak{G}}_{16}^5$. Set

$$[\widetilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{13}]^{\text{virt}} := \sigma_*([\mathfrak{U}]^{\text{virt}}) \in CH^1(\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{13}).$$

Theorem 1.4 *The following relation for the virtual class $[\widetilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{13}]^{\text{virt}}$ holds:*

$$[\widetilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{13}]^{\text{virt}} = 3(5059\lambda - 749\delta_0 - 3929\delta_1) \in CH^1(\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{13}).$$

That the degeneracy locus $\mathfrak{U}$ does not map onto $\mathcal{M}_{13}$ is a particular case of the strong maximal rank conjecture of [3]. We prove this case, along with a stronger result that guarantees that the virtual class $[\widetilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{13}]^{\text{virt}}$ is effective, using tropical geometry. In particular, we use the method of tropical independence on chains of loops, as introduced in Jensen and Payne [30; 31]. Our construction of the required tropical independences is similar to the one used in our proof that $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{22}$ and $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{23}$ are of general type, with one important innovation. In [19], we were able to ignore certain loops called lingering loops. Here, this seems impossible; there are too few nonlingering loops. This difficulty shows up already in the simplest combinatorial case, which we call the vertex-avoiding case; for a discussion of how we resolve this difficulty, see Remarks 4.3 and 4.11.

Theorem 1.5 *For a general curve $[X] \in \mathcal{M}_{13}$ the map $\phi_L : \text{Sym}^2 H^0(X, L) \rightarrow H^0(X, L^{\otimes 2})$ is surjective for all $L \in W_{16}^5(X)$. Furthermore, there is no component of the degeneracy locus $\mathfrak{U}$ mapping with positive-dimensional fibers onto a divisor in $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{13}$.*

Theorem 1.5 implies that $\widetilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{13}$, defined as the divisorial part of $\sigma(\mathfrak{U})$, represents the class $[\widetilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{13}]^{\text{virt}}$. Together with **Theorem 1.4**, this completes the proof of **Theorem 1.3**.

The existence of effective divisors of exceptionally small slope on $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{13}$ has direct applications to the birational geometry of the moduli space $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{13,n}$ of n -pointed stable curves of genus 13.

Theorem 1.6 *The moduli space $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{13,n}$ is of general type for $n \geq 9$.*

This improves on Logan’s result [36] that $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{13,n}$ is of general type for $n \geq 11$. It is known that $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{13,n}$ is uniruled for $n \leq 4$; see Agostini and Barros [1].

1.3 The divisor $\mathfrak{D}_{13}$ and rank-two Brill–Noether loci

The link between Theorems 1.1 and 1.3 involves a reinterpretation of the divisor $\mathfrak{D}_{13}$ in terms of rank-two Brill–Noether theory. Let $SU_{13}(2, \omega, 8)$ denote the moduli space of pairs $[X, E]$, where $[X] \in \mathcal{M}_{13}$ and $E \in \text{SU}_X(2, \omega, 8)$. Consider the forgetful map

$$\vartheta : SU_{13}(2, \omega, 8) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{13}, \quad [X, E] \mapsto [X].$$

We will show that ϑ is a generically finite map of degree 3 (Theorem 6.5) and that $SU_{13}(2, \omega, 8)$ is unirational (Corollary 6.3). The fact that $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{13}$ possesses a modular cover ϑ of such small degree is surprising; we do not know of parallels for other moduli spaces $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_g$.

We now fix a pair $[X, E] \in SU_{13}(2, \omega, 8)$ and consider the determinant map

$$d: \wedge^2 H^0(X, E) \rightarrow H^0(X, \omega_X).$$

It turns out that for a general $[X, E]$ as above, E is globally generated and the map d is surjective. In particular, $\mathbb{P}(\text{Ker}(d)) \subseteq \mathbb{P}(\wedge^2 H^0(X, E)) \cong \mathbb{P}^{27}$ is a 14-dimensional linear space. Since $h^0(X, \omega_X) = 2h^0(X, E) - 3$, it follows that the set of pairs $[X, E]$ satisfying the condition

$$(4) \quad \mathbb{P}(\text{Ker}(d)) \cap G(2, H^0(X, E)) \neq \emptyset,$$

the intersection being taken inside $\mathbb{P}(\wedge^2 H^0(X, E))$, is expected to be a divisor on $SU_{13}(2, \omega, 8)$, and its image under projection by the generically finite map ϑ is expected to be also a divisor on $\mathcal{M}_{13}$. We refer to this locus as the *resonance divisor* $\mathfrak{Res}_{13}$, inspired by the algebraic definition of the *resonance variety*; see Aprodu, Farkas, Papadima, Raicu and Weyman [4, Definition 2.4].

Theorem 1.7 *The closure of the resonance divisor in $\mathcal{M}_{13}$*

$\mathfrak{Res}_{13} := \{[X] \in \mathcal{M}_{13} : \text{there exists an } E \in SU_X(2, \omega, 8) \text{ with } \mathbb{P}(\text{Ker}(d)) \cap G(2, H^0(X, E)) \neq \emptyset\}$
is an effective divisor in $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{13}$. One has the following equality of divisors on $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{13}$:

$$\overline{\mathfrak{Res}}_{13} = \overline{\mathcal{D}}_{13} + 3 \cdot \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{13,7}^1.$$

Here, we recall that $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{13,7}^1$ is the Hurwitz divisor of heptagonal curves on $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{13}$ whose class is computed in Harris and Mumford [27]. The set-theoretic inclusion $\mathcal{M}_{13,7}^1 \subseteq \mathfrak{Res}_{13}$ is relatively straightforward. The multiplicity 3 with which $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{13,7}^1$ appears in $\mathfrak{Res}_{13}$ is explained by an excess intersection calculation carried out in Section 7, and confirms once more that the degree of the map $\vartheta: SU_{13}(2, \omega, 8) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{13}$ is 3.

We conclude this introduction by explaining the connection between the resonance divisor $\mathfrak{Res}_{13}$ and Theorems 1.1 and 1.3. On the one hand, using Farkas and Rimányi [22] the class $[\widetilde{\mathfrak{Res}}_{13}]$ of the closure of $\mathfrak{Res}_{13}$ in $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{13}$ can be computed in terms of the generators of $CH^1(\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{13})$ and a tautological class $\vartheta_*(\gamma)$, where γ is the pushforward of the second Chern class of the (normalized) universal rank-two vector bundle on the universal curve over a suitable compactification of $SU_{13}(2, \omega, 8)$; see Definition 7.3 for details. On the other hand, Theorem 1.7 yields an explicit description of $\widetilde{\mathfrak{Res}}_{13}$. By combining this description with Theorem 1.3, we obtain a *second* calculation for the class $[\widetilde{\mathfrak{Res}}_{13}]$. In this way, we indirectly determine the tautological class $\vartheta_*(\gamma)$; see Proposition 7.7. Once the class of $[\widetilde{\mathfrak{Res}}_{13}]$ is known, the calculation of the class of the nonabelian Brill–Noether divisor $[\widetilde{\mathcal{MP}}_{13}]$ (Theorem 1.1) and that of the universal Theta divisor $[\widetilde{\Theta}_{13}]$ on $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{13}$ (Theorems 1.2 and 8.3) follow from Grothendieck–Riemann–Roch calculations, after checking suitable transversality assumptions.

Acknowledgements We had interesting discussions with P Newstead and A Verra related to this circle of ideas. Farkas was partially supported by the DFG Grant *Syzygien und Moduli* and by the ERC Advanced Grant SYZGY. Jensen was partially supported by NSF grant DMS–2054135. Payne was partially supported by NSF grants DMS–2001502 and DMS–2053261. This project has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union Horizon 2020 research and innovation program, grant agreement 834172.

2 The failure locus of the strong maximal rank conjecture on $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{13}$

We denote by $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_g$ the moduli stack of stable curves of genus $g \geq 2$ and by $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_g$ the associated coarse moduli space. We work throughout over an algebraically closed field K of characteristic 0 and the Chow groups that we consider are with rational coefficients. Via the isomorphism $CH^*(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_g) \cong CH^*(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_g)$, we routinely identify cycle classes on $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_g$ with their pushforward to $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_g$. Recall that for $g \geq 3$ the group $CH^1(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_g)$ is freely generated by the Hodge class λ and by the classes of the boundary divisors $\delta_i = [\Delta_i]$ for $i = 0, \dots, \lfloor \frac{1}{2}g \rfloor$.

In this section, we realize the virtual divisor class $[\widetilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{13}]^{\text{virt}}$ as the pushforward of the virtual class of a codimension 2 determinantal locus inside the moduli space $\widetilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{16}^5$ of limit linear series of type $\mathfrak{g}_{16}^5$ over an open substack $\widetilde{\mathfrak{M}}_{13}$ of $\overline{\mathfrak{M}}_{13}$, which agrees with $\mathfrak{M}_{13} \cup \Delta_0 \cup \Delta_1$ outside a subset of codimension 2. We will use standard terminology from the theory of limit linear series [15], and begin by recalling a few of the basics.

Definition 2.1 Let X be a smooth curve of genus g with $\ell = (L, V) \in G_d^r(X)$ a linear series. The *ramification sequence* of ℓ at a point $q \in X$ is denoted by

$$\alpha^\ell(q) : \alpha_0^\ell(q) \leq \dots \leq \alpha_r^\ell(q).$$

This is obtained from the *vanishing sequence* $a^\ell(q) : a_0^\ell(q) < \dots < a_r^\ell(q) \leq d$ of ℓ at q , by setting $\alpha_i^\ell(q) := a_i^\ell(q) - i$ for $i = 0, \dots, r$. The *ramification weight* of q with respect to ℓ is $\text{wt}^\ell(q) := \sum_{i=0}^r \alpha_i^\ell(q)$. We define $\rho(\ell, q) := \rho(g, r, d) - \text{wt}^\ell(q)$.

A *generalized limit linear series* on a treelike curve X of genus g consists of a collection

$$\ell = \{(L_C, V_C) : C \text{ is a component of } X\},$$

where L_C is a rank-one torsion-free sheaf of degree d on C and $V_C \subseteq H^0(C, L_C)$ is an $(r+1)$ -dimensional space of sections satisfying compatibility conditions on the vanishing sequences at the nodes of X ; see [16, page 364]. Let $\overline{G}_d^r(X)$ be the variety of generalized limit linear series of type $\mathfrak{g}_d^r$ on X .

In this section we set

$$(5) \quad g = 13, \quad r = 5, \quad d = 16.$$

Although we are mainly interested in the case $g = 13$, some of the constructions are set up for an arbitrary genus g , making it easier to refer to results from [19].

We denote by $\mathcal{M}_{13,15}^5$ the subvariety of $\mathcal{M}_{13}$ parametrizing curves X such that $W_{15}^5(X) \neq \emptyset$. As explained in [19, Section 3], we have $\text{codim}(\mathcal{M}_{13,5}^5, \mathcal{M}_{13}) \geq 2$.

Let $\Delta_1^\circ \subseteq \Delta_1 \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{M}}_g$ be the locus of curves $[X \cup_y E]$, where X is a smooth curve of genus $g - 1$ and $[E, y] \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{1,1}$ is an arbitrary elliptic curve. The point of attachment $y \in X$ is chosen arbitrarily. Furthermore, let $\Delta_0^\circ \subseteq \Delta_0 \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{M}}_g$ be the locus of curves $[X_{yq} := X/y \sim q] \in \Delta_0$, where $[X, q]$ is a smooth curve of genus $g - 1$ and $y \in X$ is an arbitrary point, together with their degenerations $[X \cup_q E_\infty]$, where E_∞ is a rational nodal curve (that is, E_∞ is a nodal elliptic curve and $j(E_\infty) = \infty$). Points of this form comprise the intersection $\Delta_0^\circ \cap \Delta_1^\circ$. We define the following open subset of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_g$:

$$\overline{\mathcal{M}}_g^\circ := \mathcal{M}_g \cup \Delta_0^\circ \cup \Delta_1^\circ.$$

Along the lines of [19, Section 3], we introduce an even smaller open subspace of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_g$, over which the calculation of $[\widetilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{13}]^{\text{virt}}$ can be completed. Let $\mathcal{T}_0 \subset \Delta_0^\circ$ be the locus of curves $[X_{yq} := X/y \sim q]$, where either $\overline{G}_d^{r+1}(X) \neq \emptyset$ or $\overline{G}_{d-2}^r(X) \neq \emptyset$. Similarly, let $\mathcal{T}_1 \subseteq \Delta_1^\circ$ be the locus of curves $[X \cup_y E]$, where X is a smooth curve of genus $g - 1$ such that $G_d^{r+1}(X) \neq \emptyset$ or $G_{d-2}^r(X) \neq \emptyset$. We set

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_g := \overline{\mathcal{M}}_g^\circ \setminus (\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,d-1}^r \cup \mathcal{T}_0 \cup \mathcal{T}_1).$$

We define $\widetilde{\Delta}_0 := \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_g \cap \Delta_0 \subseteq \Delta_0^\circ$ and $\widetilde{\Delta}_1 := \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_g \cap \Delta_1 \subseteq \Delta_1^\circ$. Note that $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_g$ and $\mathcal{M}_g \cup \Delta_0 \cup \Delta_1$ agree away from a set of codimension two in each. We identify $CH^1(\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_g) \cong \mathbb{Q}\langle \lambda, \delta_0, \delta_1 \rangle$, where λ is the Hodge class, $\delta_0 := [\widetilde{\Delta}_0]$ and $\delta_1 := [\widetilde{\Delta}_1]$.

2.1 Stacks of limit linear series

Let $\widetilde{\mathfrak{G}}_d^r$ be the stack of pairs $[X, \ell]$, where $[X] \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_g$ and ℓ is a (generalized) limit linear series of type g_d^r on the treelike curve X . We consider the proper projection

$$\sigma: \widetilde{\mathfrak{G}}_d^r \rightarrow \widetilde{\mathfrak{M}}_g.$$

Over a curve $[X \cup_y E] \in \widetilde{\Delta}_1$, we identify $\sigma^{-1}([X \cup_y E])$ with the variety of (generalized) limit linear series $\ell = (\ell_X, \ell_E) \in \overline{G}_d^r(X \cup_y E)$. The fiber $\sigma^{-1}([X_{yq}])$ over an irreducible curve $[X_{yq}] \in \widetilde{\Delta}_0 \setminus \widetilde{\Delta}_1$ is canonically identified with the variety $\overline{W}_d^r(X_{yq})$ of rank-one torsion-free sheaves L on X_{yq} having degree $d(L) = d$ and $h^0(X_{yq}, L) \geq r + 1$.

Let $\widetilde{\mathfrak{C}}_g \rightarrow \widetilde{\mathfrak{M}}_g$ be the universal curve, and let $p_2: \widetilde{\mathfrak{C}}_g \times_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{M}}_g} \widetilde{\mathfrak{G}}_d^r \rightarrow \widetilde{\mathfrak{G}}_d^r$ be the projection map. We denote by $\mathfrak{Z} \subseteq \widetilde{\mathfrak{C}}_g \times_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{M}}_g} \widetilde{\mathfrak{G}}_d^r$ the codimension-two substack consisting of pairs $[X_{yq}, L, z]$, where $[X_{yq}] \in \Delta_0^\circ$, the point z is the node of X_{yq} and $L \in \overline{W}_d^r(X_{yq}) \setminus W_d^r(X_{yq})$ is a *non-locally free* torsion-free sheaf. Let

$$\epsilon: \widehat{\mathfrak{C}}_g := \text{Bl}_{\mathfrak{Z}}(\widetilde{\mathfrak{C}}_g \times_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{M}}_g} \widetilde{\mathfrak{G}}_d^r) \rightarrow \widetilde{\mathfrak{C}}_g \times_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{M}}_g} \widetilde{\mathfrak{G}}_d^r$$

be the blowup of this locus, and we denote the induced universal curve by

$$\wp := p_2 \circ \epsilon : \widehat{\mathfrak{C}}_g \rightarrow \widetilde{\mathfrak{G}}_d^r.$$

The fiber of $\wp$ over a point $[X_{yq}, L] \in \widetilde{\Delta}_0$, where $L \in \overline{W}_d^r(X_{yq}) \setminus W_d^r(X_{yq})$, is the semistable curve $X \cup_{\{y,q\}} R$ of genus g , where R is a smooth rational curve meeting X transversally at y and q .

2.2 A degeneracy locus inside $\widetilde{\mathfrak{G}}_{16}^5$

In order to define the degeneracy locus on $\widetilde{\mathfrak{G}}_{16}^5$ whose pushforward produces $[\widetilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{13}]^{\text{virt}}$, we first choose a Poincaré line bundle $\mathcal{L}$ over the universal curve $\widehat{\mathfrak{C}}_g$ with the following properties:

- (i) If $[X \cup_y E] \in \widetilde{\Delta}_1$ and $\ell = (\ell_X, \ell_E) \in \overline{G}_d^r(X \cup E)$ is a limit linear series, then

$$\mathcal{L}|_{[X \cup_y E, \ell]} \in \text{Pic}^d(X) \times \text{Pic}^0(E).$$

- (ii) For a point $t = [X_{yq}, L]$, where $[X_{yq}] \in \widetilde{\Delta}_0$ and $L \in \overline{W}_d^r(X_{yq}) \setminus W_d^r(X_{yq})$, thus $L = v_*(A)$ for some $A \in W_{d-1}^r(X)$, we have $\mathcal{L}|_X \cong A$ and $\mathcal{L}|_R \cong \mathcal{O}_R(1)$. Here, $\wp^{-1}(t) = X \cup R$, whereas $v: X \rightarrow X_{yq}$ is the normalization map.

We now introduce two sheaves over $\widetilde{\mathfrak{G}}_d^r$,

$$\mathcal{E} := \wp_*(\mathcal{L}) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{F} := \wp_*(\mathcal{L}^{\otimes 2}).$$

Both $\mathcal{E}$ and $\mathcal{F}$ are locally free; the proof by local analysis in [19, Proposition 3.6] goes through essentially without change.

There is a sheaf morphism over $\widetilde{\mathfrak{G}}_{16}^5$ globalizing the multiplication of sections

$$(6) \quad \phi: \text{Sym}^2(\mathcal{E}) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}.$$

We denote by $\mathfrak{U} \subseteq \widetilde{\mathfrak{G}}_{16}^5$ the locus where ϕ is not surjective (equivalently, where $\phi^\vee$ is not injective). Due to its determinantal nature, $\mathfrak{U}$ carries a virtual class in the expected codimension 2.

Definition 2.2 We define the virtual divisor class $[\widetilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{13}]^{\text{virt}} := \sigma_*([\mathfrak{U}]^{\text{virt}})$ as

$$[\widetilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{13}]^{\text{virt}} := \sigma_*(c_2(\text{Sym}^2(\mathcal{E})^\vee - \mathcal{F}^\vee)) \in CH^1(\widetilde{\mathfrak{M}}_{13}).$$

If $\mathfrak{U}$ has pure codimension 2, then $\widetilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{13}$ is a divisor on $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{13}$ and $[\widetilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{13}]^{\text{virt}} = [\widetilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{13}]$. The following corollary provides a local description of the morphism ϕ .

Corollary 2.3 The morphism $\phi: \text{Sym}^2(\mathcal{E}) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$ has the following description on fibers:

- (i) For $[X, L] \in \widetilde{\mathfrak{G}}_d^r$, with $[X] \in \mathcal{M}_g \setminus \mathcal{M}_{g,d-1}^r$ smooth, the fibers are

$$\mathcal{E}_{(X,L)} = H^0(X, L) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{F}_{(X,L)} = H^0(X, L^{\otimes 2}),$$

and $\phi_{(X,L)}: \text{Sym}^2 H^0(X, L) \rightarrow H^0(X, L^{\otimes 2})$ is the usual multiplication map of global sections.

- (ii) Suppose $t = (X \cup_y E, \ell_X, \ell_E) \in \sigma^{-1}(\tilde{\Delta}_1)$, where X is a curve of genus $g - 1$, E is an elliptic curve and $\ell_X = |L_X|$ is the X -aspect of the corresponding limit linear series with $L_X \in W_d^r(X)$ such that $h^0(X, L_X(-2y)) \geq r$. If L_X has no basepoint at y , then

$$\mathcal{E}_t = H^0(X, L_X) \cong H^0(X, L_X(-2y)) \oplus K \cdot u \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{F}_t = H^0(X, L_X^{\otimes 2}(-2y)) \oplus K \cdot u^2,$$

where $u \in H^0(X, L_X)$ is any section such that $\text{ord}_y(u) = 0$.

If L_X has a basepoint at y , then

$$\mathcal{E}_t = H^0(X, L_X) \cong H^0(X, L_X(-y)),$$

and the image of $\mathcal{F}_t \rightarrow H^0(X, L_X^{\otimes 2})$ is the subspace $H^0(X, L_X^{\otimes 2}(-2y)) \subseteq H^0(X, L_X^{\otimes 2})$.

- (iii) Let $t = [X_{yq}, L] \in \sigma^{-1}(\tilde{\Delta}_0)$ be a point with $q, y \in X$ and let $L \in W_d^r(X_{yq})$ be a locally free sheaf of rank one, such that $h^0(X, v^*L(-y-q)) \geq r$, where $v: X \rightarrow X_{yq}$ is the normalization. Then the fibers are described as

$$\mathcal{E}_t = H^0(X, v^*L) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{F}_t = H^0(X, v^*L^{\otimes 2}(-y-q)) \oplus K \cdot u^2,$$

where $u \in H^0(X, v^*L)$ is any section not vanishing at both points y and q .

- (iv) Let $t = [X_{yq}, v_*(A)]$, where $A \in W_{d-1}^r(X)$, and again set $X \cup_{\{y,q\}} R$ to be the fiber $\wp^{-1}(t)$. Then $\mathcal{E}_t = H^0(X \cup R, \mathcal{L}_{X \cup R}) \cong H^0(X, A)$ and $\mathcal{F}_t = H^0(X \cup R, \mathcal{L}_{X \cup R}^{\otimes 2})$. Furthermore, $\phi(t)$ is the multiplication map on $X \cup R$.

Proof The proof is essentially identical to the proof of [19, Corollary 3.8]; we omit the details. $\square$

2.3 Test curves in $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_{13}$

As in [19], the calculation of $[\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_{13}]^{\text{virt}}$ is carried out by understanding the restriction of the morphism ϕ along the pullbacks of the three standard test curves F_0 , F_{ell} and F_1 inside $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_{13}$. Let $[X, q]$ be a general pointed curve of genus $g - 1$ and fix an elliptic curve $[E, y]$. We then define

$$F_0 := \{X_{yq} := X/y \sim q : y \in X\} \subseteq \Delta_0^\circ \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{M}}_g^\circ \quad \text{and} \quad F_1 := \{X \cup_y E : y \in X\} \subseteq \Delta_1^\circ \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{M}}_g^\circ.$$

Furthermore, we define the curve

$$(7) \quad F_{\text{ell}} := \{[X \cup_q E_t] : t \in \mathbb{P}^1\} \subseteq \Delta_1 \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{M}}_g,$$

where $\{[E_t, q]\}_{t \in \mathbb{P}^1}$ denotes a pencil of plane cubics and q is a fixed point of the pencil. We record the intersection of these test curves with the generators of $CH^1(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_g)$:

$$\begin{aligned} F_0 \cdot \lambda &= 0, & F_0 \cdot \delta_0 &= 2 - 2g, & F_0 \cdot \delta_1 &= 1, & F_0 \cdot \delta_j &= 0 \quad \text{for } j = 2, \dots, \lfloor \tfrac{1}{2}g \rfloor, \\ F_{\text{ell}} \cdot \lambda &= 1, & F_{\text{ell}} \cdot \delta_0 &= 12, & F_{\text{ell}} \cdot \delta_1 &= -1, & F_{\text{ell}} \cdot \delta_j &= 0 \quad \text{for } j = 2, \dots, \lfloor \tfrac{1}{2}g \rfloor. \end{aligned}$$

Note also that $F_1 \cdot \lambda = 0$, $F_1 \cdot \delta_i = 4 - 2g$ and $F_1 \cdot \delta_j = 0$ for $j \neq 1$.

We now describe the pullback $\sigma^*(F_0) \subseteq \widetilde{\mathfrak{G}}_{16}^5$. Having fixed a general pointed curve $[X, q] \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{12,1}$, we introduce the variety

$$(8) \quad Y := \{(y, L) \in X \times W_{16}^5(X) : h^0(X, L(-y - q)) \geq 5\},$$

together with the projection $\pi_1 : Y \rightarrow X$. Arguing in a way similar to [19, Proposition 3.10], we conclude that Y has pure dimension 2, that is, its actual dimension equals its expected dimension as a degeneracy locus. We consider two curves inside Y , namely

$$\Gamma_1 := \{(y, A(y)) : y \in X, A \in W_{15}^5(X)\} \quad \text{and} \quad \Gamma_2 := \{(y, A(q)) : y \in X, A \in W_{15}^5(X)\},$$

intersecting transversely along finitely many points. We then introduce the variety $\widetilde{Y}$ obtained from Y by identifying for each $(y, A) \in X \times W_{15}^5(X)$, the points $(y, A(y)) \in \Gamma_1$ and $(y, A(q)) \in \Gamma_2$. Let $\vartheta : Y \rightarrow \widetilde{Y}$ be the projection map.

Proposition 2.4 *With notation as above, there is a birational morphism*

$$f : \sigma^*(F_0) \rightarrow \widetilde{Y},$$

which is an isomorphism outside $\vartheta(\pi_1^{-1}(q))$. The restriction of f to $f^{-1}(\vartheta(\pi_1^{-1}(q)))$ forgets the aspect of each limit linear series on the elliptic curve E_∞ . Furthermore, both $\mathcal{E}_{|\sigma^*(F_0)}$ and $\mathcal{F}_{|\sigma^*(F_0)}$ are pullbacks under f of vector bundles on $\widetilde{Y}$.

Proof The proof is identical to that of [19, Proposition 3.11]. □

We now describe the pullback $\sigma^*(F_1) \subseteq \widetilde{\mathfrak{G}}_{16}^5$ and we define the determinantal variety

$$(9) \quad Z := \{(y, L) \in X \times W_{16}^5(X) : h^0(X, L(-2y)) \geq 5\}.$$

Because X is general, arguing precisely as in [19, Proposition 3.10], we find that Z is pure of dimension 2. Next we observe that in order to estimate the intersection of $[\widetilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{13}]^{\text{virt}}$ with the surface $\sigma^*(F_1)$, it suffices to restrict ourselves to Z :

Proposition 2.5 *The variety Z is an irreducible component of $\sigma^*(F_1)$, and*

$$c_2(\text{Sym}^2(\mathcal{E})^\vee - \mathcal{F}^\vee)_{|\sigma^*(F_1)} = c_2(\text{Sym}^2(\mathcal{E})^\vee - \mathcal{F}^\vee)|_Z.$$

Proof Let $(\ell_X, \ell_E) \in \sigma^{-1}([X \cup_y E])$ be a limit linear series. Observe that $\rho(13, 5, 16) = 1$, which is greater than or equal to the sum of the adjusted Brill–Noether numbers $\rho(\ell_X, y) + \rho(\ell_E, y)$; see Definition 2.1. Since $\rho(\ell_E, y) \geq 0$, it follows that $\rho(\ell_X, y) \in \{0, 1\}$. If $\rho(\ell_E, y) = 0$, then $\ell_E = 10y + |\mathcal{O}_E(6y)|$ and the aspect $\ell_X \in G_{16}^5(X)$ is a complete linear series with a cusp at the point $y \in X$. Therefore $(y, \ell_X) \in Z$, and in particular $Z \times \{\ell_E\} \cong Z$ is a union of irreducible components of $\sigma^*(F_1)$.

The remaining components of $\sigma^*(F_1)$ are indexed by Schubert indices

$$\alpha := (0 \leq \alpha_0 \leq \cdots \leq \alpha_5 \leq 11 = 16 - 5)$$

such that $\alpha \geq (0, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1)$ holds lexicographically and $\alpha_0 + \cdots + \alpha_5 \in \{6, 7\}$ when $\rho(\ell_X, y) \geq -1$ for any point $y \in X$; see also [18, Theorem 0.1]. For a Schubert index α satisfying these conditions, we let $\alpha^c := (11 - \alpha_5, \dots, 11 - \alpha_0)$ be the complementary Schubert index, and define

$$Z_\alpha := \{(y, \ell_X) \in X \times G_{16}^5(X) : \alpha^{\ell_X}(y) \geq \alpha\} \quad \text{and} \quad W_\alpha := \{\ell_E \in G_{16}^5(E) : \alpha^{\ell_E}(y) \geq \alpha^c\}.$$

Then the following relation holds for certain natural coefficients m_α :

$$\sigma^*(F_1) = Z + \sum_{\alpha \geq (0, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1)} m_\alpha (Z_\alpha \times W_\alpha).$$

We now finish the proof by invoking the pointed Brill–Noether theorem [16, Theorem 1.1], which gives $\dim Z_\alpha = 1 + \rho(12, 5, 16) - (\alpha_0 + \cdots + \alpha_5) \leq 1$. In the definition of the test curve F_1 , the point of attachment $y \in E$ is fixed, therefore the restrictions of both $\mathcal{E}$ and $\mathcal{F}$ are pulled-back from Z_α and one obtains $c_2(\text{Sym}^2(\mathcal{E})^\vee - \mathcal{F}^\vee)|_{Z_\alpha \times W_\alpha} = 0$ for dimension reasons. $\square$

2.4 Top Chern numbers on Jacobians

We use various facts about intersection theory on Jacobians, for which we refer to [5, Chapters VII–VIII]. We start with a general curve X of genus g , fix a Poincaré line bundle $\mathcal{P}$ on $X \times \text{Pic}^d(X)$ and denote by

$$\pi_1: X \times \text{Pic}^d(X) \rightarrow X \quad \text{and} \quad \pi_2: X \times \text{Pic}^d(X) \rightarrow \text{Pic}^d(X)$$

the two projections. Let $\eta = \pi_1^*([x_0]) \in H^2(X \times \text{Pic}^d(X), \mathbb{Z})$, where $x_0 \in X$ is a fixed point. We choose a symplectic basis $\delta_1, \dots, \delta_{2g} \in H^1(X, \mathbb{Z}) \cong H^1(\text{Pic}^d(X), \mathbb{Z})$, and then consider the class

$$\gamma := - \sum_{\alpha=1}^g (\pi_1^*(\delta_\alpha) \pi_2^*(\delta_{g+\alpha}) - \pi_1^*(\delta_{g+\alpha}) \pi_2^*(\delta_\alpha)) \in H^2(X \times \text{Pic}^d(X), \mathbb{Z}).$$

One has $c_1(\mathcal{P}) = d \cdot \eta + \gamma$, and the relations $\gamma^3 = 0$, $\gamma \eta = 0$, $\eta^2 = 0$ and $\gamma^2 = -2\eta \pi_2^*(\theta)$, for which we refer to [5, page 335]. Assuming $W_d^{r+1}(X) = \emptyset$ (which is what happens in the case of $g = 12$, $r = 5$ and $d = 16$ relevant to us), the smooth variety $W_d^r(X)$ admits a rank- $r+1$ vector bundle

$$\mathcal{M} := (\pi_2)_*(\mathcal{P}|_{X \times W_d^r(X)})$$

with fibers $\mathcal{M}_L \cong H^0(X, L)$, for $L \in W_d^r(X)$. The Chern numbers of $\mathcal{M}$ are computed via the Harris–Tu formula [28]. We write formally

$$\sum_{i=0}^r c_i(\mathcal{M}^\vee) = (1 + x_1) \cdots (1 + x_{r+1}).$$

For a class $\zeta \in H^*(\text{Pic}^d(X), \mathbb{Z})$, the Chern number $c_{j_1}(\mathcal{M}) \cdots c_{j_s}(\mathcal{M}) \cdot \zeta \in H^{\text{top}}(W_d^r(X), \mathbb{Z})$ can be computed by repeatedly using the following formal identities:³

$$(10) \quad x_1^{i_1} \cdots x_{r+1}^{i_{r+1}} \cdot \theta^{\rho(g,r,d)-i_1-\cdots-i_{r+1}} = g! \frac{\prod_{j>k} (i_k - i_j + j - k)}{\prod_{k=1}^{r+1} (g - d + 2r + i_k - k)!}.$$

We now specialize to the case when X is a general curve of genus 12, thus $W_{16}^5(X)$ is a smooth 6-fold. By Grauert's Theorem, $\mathcal{N} := (R^1\pi_2)_*(\mathcal{P}|_{X \times W_{16}^5(X)})$ is locally free of rank one. Set $y_1 := c_1(\mathcal{N})$. We now explain how y_1 determines the Chern numbers of $\mathcal{M}$.

Proposition 2.6 *For a general curve X of genus 12 set $c_i := c_i(\mathcal{M}^\vee)$ for $i = 1, \dots, 6$, and $y_1 := c_1(\mathcal{N})$. Then the following relations hold in $H^*(W_{16}^5(X), \mathbb{Z})$:*

$$c_i = \frac{\theta^i}{i!} - \frac{\theta^{i-1}}{(i-1)!} y_1 \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, 6.$$

Proof For an effective divisor D of sufficiently large degree on X , there is an exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{M} \rightarrow (\pi_2)_*(\mathcal{P} \otimes \mathcal{O}(\pi^*D)) \rightarrow (\pi_2)_*(\mathcal{P} \otimes \mathcal{O}(\pi_1^*D)|_{\pi_1^*D}) \rightarrow R^1\pi_{2*}(\mathcal{P}|_{X \times W_{16}^5(X)}) \rightarrow 0.$$

Recall that $\mathcal{N}$ is the vector bundle on the right in the exact sequence above. By [5, Chapter VII], we have $c_{\text{tot}}((\pi_2)_*(\mathcal{P} \otimes \mathcal{O}(\pi_1^*D))) = e^{-\theta}$, and the total Chern class of $(\pi_2)_*(\mathcal{P} \otimes \mathcal{O}(\pi_1^*D)|_{\pi_1^*D})$ is trivial. We therefore, as claimed, obtain the formula

$$(1 + y_1) \cdot e^{-\theta} = 1 - c_1 + c_2 - \cdots + c_6. \quad \square$$

Using Proposition 2.6, any Chern number on $W_{16}^5(X)$ can be expressed in terms of monomials in y_1 and θ . The following identity on $H^{12}(W_{16}^5(X), \mathbb{Z})$ follows from (10) using the canonical isomorphism $H^1(X, L) \cong H^0(X, \omega_X \otimes L^\vee)^\vee$:

$$(11) \quad (\theta^i \cdot y_1^{6-i})_{W_{16}^5(X)} = \frac{\theta^{12}}{(12-i)!} = i! \binom{12}{i}.$$

With this preparation in place, we now compute the classes of the loci Y and Z .

Proposition 2.7 *Let $[X, q]$ be a general pointed curve of genus 12, let $\mathcal{M}$ denote the tautological rank-six vector bundle over $W_{16}^5(X)$, and set $c_i = c_i(\mathcal{M}^\vee) \in H^{2i}(W_{16}^5(X), \mathbb{Z})$ as before. Then:*

- (i) $[Z] = \pi_2^*(c_5) - 6\eta\theta\pi_2^*(c_3) + (54\eta + 2\gamma)\pi_2^*(c_4) \in H^{10}(X \times W_{16}^5(X), \mathbb{Z})$.
- (ii) $[Y] = \pi_2^*(c_5) - 2\eta\theta\pi_2^*(c_3) + (15\eta + \gamma)\pi_2^*(c_4) \in H^{10}(X \times W_{16}^5(X), \mathbb{Z})$.

Proof The locus Z has been defined by (9) as the degeneracy locus of a vector bundle morphism over the 7-dimensional smooth variety $X \times W_{16}^5(X)$ (observe again that $W_{16}^6(X) = \emptyset$). For each $(y, L) \in X \times W_{16}^5(X)$, there is a natural map

$$H^0(X, L \otimes \mathcal{O}_{2y})^\vee \rightarrow H^0(X, L)^\vee.$$

³See [19, Section 4.1] for a detailed discussion of how to read and apply the Harris–Tu formula in this context.

These maps viewed together induce a morphism $\zeta: J_1(\mathcal{P})^\vee \rightarrow \pi_2^*(\mathcal{M})^\vee$ of vector bundles. Then Z is the first degeneracy locus of ζ and applying the Porteous formula,

$$[Z] = c_5(\pi_2^*(\mathcal{M})^\vee - J_1(\mathcal{P})^\vee).$$

The Chern classes of the jet bundle $J_1(\mathcal{P})$ are computed using the standard exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \pi_1^*(\omega_X) \otimes \mathcal{P} \rightarrow J_1(\mathcal{P}) \rightarrow \mathcal{P} \rightarrow 0.$$

We compute the total Chern class of the formal inverse of the jet bundle as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} c_{\text{tot}}(J_1(\mathcal{P})^\vee)^{-1} &= \left(\sum_{j \geq 0} (d(L)\eta + \gamma)^j \right) \cdot \left(\sum_{j \geq 0} ((2g(X) - 2 + d(L))\eta + \gamma)^j \right), \\ &= (1 + 16\eta + \gamma + \gamma^2 + \cdots) \cdot (1 + 38\eta + \gamma + \gamma^2 + \cdots), \\ &= 1 + 54\eta + 2\gamma - 6\eta\theta. \end{aligned}$$

Multiplying this with the total class of $\pi_2^*(\mathcal{M})^\vee$, one finds the claimed formula for $[Z]$.

To compute the class of Y defined in (8), we consider the projections

$$\mu, \nu: X \times X \times \text{Pic}^{16}(X) \rightarrow X \times \text{Pic}^{16}(X),$$

and let $\Delta \subseteq X \times X \times \text{Pic}^{16}(X)$ be the diagonal. Set $\Gamma_q := \{q\} \times \text{Pic}^{16}(X)$ and consider the vector bundle $\mathcal{B} := \mu_*(\nu^*(\mathcal{P}) \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\Delta + \nu^*(\Gamma_q)})$. There is a morphism $\chi: \mathcal{B}^\vee \rightarrow (\pi_2)^*(\mathcal{M})^\vee$ of vector bundles over $X \times W_{16}^5(X)$ obtained as the dual of the evaluation map, and the surface Y is realized as its degeneracy locus. Since we also have that

$$c_{\text{tot}}(\mathcal{B}^\vee)^{-1} = (1 + (d(L)\eta + \gamma) + (d(L)\eta + \gamma)^2 + \cdots) \cdot (1 - \eta) = 1 + 15\eta + \gamma - 2\eta\theta,$$

we find the stated expression for $[Y]$ and finish the proof. $\square$

We introduce two further vector bundles which appear in many of our calculations. Their Chern classes are computed via Grothendieck–Riemann–Roch.

Proposition 2.8 *Let $[X, q]$ be a general pointed curve of genus 12 and consider the vector bundles $\mathcal{A}_2$ and $\mathcal{B}_2$ on $X \times \text{Pic}^{16}(X)$ having fibers*

$$\mathcal{A}_{2,(y,L)} = H^0(X, L^{\otimes 2}(-2y)) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{B}_{2,(y,L)} = H^0(X, L^{\otimes 2}(-y - q)),$$

respectively. One then has the following formulas for their Chern classes:

$$\begin{aligned} c_1(\mathcal{A}_2) &= -4\theta - 4\gamma - 86\eta, & c_1(\mathcal{B}_2) &= -4\theta - 2\gamma - 31\eta, \\ c_2(\mathcal{A}_2) &= 8\theta^2 + 320\eta\theta + 16\gamma\theta, & c_2(\mathcal{B}_2) &= 8\theta^2 + 116\eta\theta + 8\theta\gamma. \end{aligned}$$

Proof We apply Grothendieck–Riemann–Roch to the projection map

$$\nu: X \times X \times \text{Pic}^{16}(X) \rightarrow X \times \text{Pic}^{16}(X).$$

Via Grauert’s theorem, $\mathcal{A}_2$ can be realized as a pushforward under the map ν , precisely

$$\mathcal{A}_2 = \nu_!(\mu^*(\mathcal{P}^{\otimes 2} \otimes \mathcal{O}_{X \times X \times \text{Pic}^{16}(X)}(-2\Delta))) = \nu_*(\mu^*(\mathcal{P}^{\otimes 2} \otimes \mathcal{O}_{X \times X \times \text{Pic}^{16}(X)}(-2\Delta))).$$

Applying Grothendieck–Riemann–Roch to ν , we find $\text{ch}_2(\mathcal{A}_2) = 8\eta\theta$, and $\nu_*(c_1(\mathcal{P})^2) = -2\theta$. One then obtains $c_1(\mathcal{A}_2) = -4\theta - 4\gamma - (4d(L) + 2g(C) - 2)\eta$, which yields the formula for $c_2(\mathcal{A}_2)$. To determine the Chern classes of $\mathcal{B}_2$, we observe $c_1(\mathcal{B}_2) = -4\theta - 2\gamma - (2d - 1)\eta$ and $\text{ch}_2(\mathcal{B}_2) = 4\eta\theta$. $\square$

3 The class of the virtual divisor $\widetilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{13}$

In this section we determine the virtual class $[\widetilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{13}]^{\text{virt}} := \sigma_*(c_2(\text{Sym}^2(\mathcal{E}))^\vee - \mathcal{F}^\vee)$ on $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{13}$. We begin by recording the following formulas for a vector bundle $\mathcal{V}$ of rank $r + 1$ on a stack $\mathcal{X}$:

$$c_1(\text{Sym}^2(\mathcal{V})) = (r + 2)c_1(\mathcal{V}) \quad \text{and} \quad c_2(\text{Sym}^2(\mathcal{V})) = \frac{1}{2}r(r + 3)c_1^2(\mathcal{V}) + (r + 3)c_2(\mathcal{V}).$$

We apply these formulas for the first degeneracy locus of $\phi^\vee: \mathcal{F}^\vee \rightarrow \text{Sym}^2(\mathcal{E})^\vee$. By [Definition 2.2](#), its class $[\mathfrak{U}]^{\text{virt}}$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} (12) \quad c_2(\text{Sym}^2(\mathcal{E})^\vee - \mathcal{F}^\vee) &= c_2(\text{Sym}^2(\mathcal{E})^\vee) - c_1(\text{Sym}^2(\mathcal{E})^\vee) \cdot c_1(\mathcal{F}^\vee) + c_1^2(\mathcal{F}^\vee) - c_2(\mathcal{F}^\vee) \\ &= 20c_1^2(\mathcal{E}) + 8c_2(\mathcal{E}) - 7c_1(\mathcal{E}) \cdot c_1(\mathcal{F}) + c_1^2(\mathcal{F}) - c_2(\mathcal{F}). \end{aligned}$$

In what follows we expand the virtual class in $CH^1(\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{13})$ as

$$(13) \quad [\widetilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{13}]^{\text{virt}} = a\lambda - b_0\delta_0 - b_1\delta_1.$$

We compute the coefficients a, b_0 and b_1 , by intersecting both sides of this expression with the test curves F_0, F_1 and F_{ell} . We start with the coefficient b_1 .

Theorem 3.1 *Let X be a general curve of genus 12. The coefficient b_1 in (13) is*

$$b_1 = \frac{1}{2g(X) - 2} \sigma^*(F_1) \cdot c_2(\text{Sym}^2(\mathcal{E})^\vee - \mathcal{F}^\vee) = 11787.$$

Proof We intersect the degeneracy locus of the map $\phi: \text{Sym}^2(\mathcal{E}) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$ with $\sigma^*(F_1)$. By [Proposition 2.5](#), it suffices to estimate the contribution coming from Z . We write

$$\sigma^*(F_1) \cdot c_2(\text{Sym}^2(\mathcal{E})^\vee - \mathcal{F}^\vee) = c_2(\text{Sym}^2(\mathcal{E})^\vee - \mathcal{F}^\vee)|_Z.$$

In [Proposition 2.7](#), we constructed a morphism $\zeta: J_1(\mathcal{P})^\vee \rightarrow \pi_2^*(\mathcal{M})^\vee$ of vector bundles on Z , whose fibers are the maps $H^0(\mathcal{O}_{2y})^\vee \rightarrow H^0(X, L)^\vee$. The kernel sheaf $\text{Ker}(\zeta)$ is locally free of rank one. If U is the line bundle on Z with fiber

$$U(y, L) = \frac{H^0(X, L)}{H^0(X, L(-2y))} \hookrightarrow H^0(X, L \otimes \mathcal{O}_{2y})$$

over a point $(y, L) \in Z$, then over Z one has the exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow U \rightarrow J_1(\mathcal{P}) \rightarrow (\text{Ker}(\zeta))^\vee \rightarrow 0.$$

In particular, by [Proposition 2.7](#), we find that

$$(14) \quad c_1(U) = 2\gamma + 54\eta + c_1(\text{Ker}(\zeta)).$$

The product of the Chern class of $\text{Ker}(\zeta)$ with any class $\xi \in H^2(X \times W_{16}^5(X), \mathbb{Z})$ is given by the Harris–Tu formula [\[28\]](#)

$$(15) \quad c_1(\text{Ker}(\zeta)) \cdot \xi|_Z = -c_6(\pi_2^*(\mathcal{M})^\vee - J_1(\mathcal{P})^\vee) \cdot \xi|_Z = -(\pi_2^*(c_6) - 6\eta\theta\pi_2^*(c_4) + (54\eta + 2\gamma)\pi_2^*(c_5)) \cdot \xi|_Z.$$

Similarly, one has the formula [\[28\]](#) for the self-intersection on the surface Z :

$$(16) \quad c_1^2(\text{Ker}(\zeta)) = (\pi_2^*(c_7) - 6\eta\theta\pi_2^*(c_5) + (54\eta + 2\gamma)\pi_2^*(c_6)) \in H^{14}(X \times W_{16}^5(X), \mathbb{Z}) \cong \mathbb{Z}.$$

We also observe that $c_7 = 0$, since the bundle $\mathcal{M}$ has rank 6.

Let $\mathcal{A}_3$ denote the vector bundle on Z having fibers

$$\mathcal{A}_{3,(y,L)} = H^0(X, L^{\otimes 2})$$

constructed as a pushforward of a line bundle on $X \times X \times \text{Pic}^{16}(X)$. Then the line bundle $U^{\otimes 2}$ can be embedded in $\mathcal{A}_3/\mathcal{A}_2$. We consider the quotient

$$\mathcal{G} := \frac{\mathcal{A}_3/\mathcal{A}_2}{U^{\otimes 2}}.$$

The morphism $U^{\otimes 2} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_3/\mathcal{A}_2$ vanishes along the locus of pairs (y, L) , where L has a basepoint. It follows that the sheaf $\mathcal{G}$ has torsion along the locus $\Gamma \subseteq Z$ consisting of pairs $(q, A(q))$, where $A \in W_{16}^5(X)$. Furthermore, $\mathcal{F}|_Z$, as a subsheaf of $\mathcal{A}_3$, can be identified with the kernel of the map $\mathcal{A}_3 \rightarrow \mathcal{G}$. Summarizing, there is an exact sequence of vector bundles on Z ,

$$(17) \quad 0 \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_{2|Z} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}|_Z \rightarrow U^{\otimes 2} \rightarrow 0.$$

Over a general point $(y, L) \in Z$, this sequence reflects the decomposition

$$\mathcal{F}(y, L) = H^0(X, L^{\otimes 2}(-2y)) \oplus K \cdot u^2,$$

where $u \in H^0(X, L)$ is a section such that $\text{ord}_y(u) = 1$.

Via the exact sequence [\(17\)](#), one computes the Chern classes of $\mathcal{F}|_Z$:

$$c_1(\mathcal{F}|_Z) = c_1(\mathcal{A}_{2|Z}) + 2c_1(U) \quad \text{and} \quad c_2(\mathcal{F}|_Z) = c_2(\mathcal{A}_{2|Z}) + 2c_1(\mathcal{A}_{2|Z})c_1(U).$$

Recalling that $\mathcal{E}|_Z = \pi_2^*(\mathcal{M})|_Z$ and using [\(12\)](#), we find that $\sigma^*(F_1) \cdot c_2((\text{Sym}^2 \mathcal{E})^\vee - \mathcal{F}^\vee)$ is equal to

$$\begin{aligned} & 20c_1^2(\pi_2^*\mathcal{M}|_Z^\vee) + 8c_2(\pi_2^*\mathcal{M}|_Z^\vee) + 7c_1(\pi_1^*\mathcal{M}|_Z^\vee) \cdot c_1(\mathcal{A}_{2|Z}) + 4c_1^2(U) \\ & \quad - c_2(\mathcal{A}_{2|Z}) + 14c_1(\pi_2^*\mathcal{M}|_Z^\vee) \cdot c_1(U) + c_1^2(\mathcal{A}_{2|Z}) + 2c_1^2(\mathcal{A}_{2|Z}) \cdot c_1(U). \end{aligned}$$

Here, $c_i(\pi_2^*\mathcal{M}|_Z^\vee) = \pi_2^*(c_i) \in H^{2i}(Z, \mathbb{Z})$. The Chern classes of $\mathcal{A}_{2|Z}$ were computed in [Proposition 2.8](#). Formula [\(14\)](#) expresses $c_1(U)$ in terms of $c_1(\text{Ker}(\zeta))$ and the classes η and γ . When expanding $\sigma^*(F_1) \cdot c_2((\text{Sym}^2 \mathcal{E})^\vee - \mathcal{F}^\vee)$, one distinguishes between terms that *do* and those that *do not* contain

the first Chern class of $\text{Ker}(\zeta)$. The coefficient of $c_1(\text{Ker}(\zeta))$, as well as the contribution coming from $c_1^2(\text{Ker}(\zeta))$ in the expression of $\sigma^*(F_1) \cdot c_2(\text{Sym}^2(\mathcal{E})^\vee - \mathcal{F}^\vee)$ is evaluated using the formulas (15) and (16) respectively. To carry this out, we first consider the part of this product that *does not* contain $c_1(\text{Ker}(\zeta))$, and we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 8\pi_2^*(c_2) + 20\pi_2^*(c_1^2) + c_1^2(\mathcal{A}_{2|Z}) + 7\pi_2^*(c_1) \cdot c_1(\mathcal{A}_{2|Z}) - c_2(\mathcal{A}_{2|Z}) + 4(2\gamma + 54\eta)^2 \\ + 2(2\gamma + 54\eta) \cdot c_1(\mathcal{A}_{2|Z}) + 14(2\gamma + 54\eta) \cdot \pi_2^*(c_1) \\ = 20\pi_2^*(c_1^2) + 154\pi_2^*(c_1) \cdot \eta - 28\pi_2^*(c_1) \cdot \theta - 96\eta\theta + 8\theta^2 + 8\pi_2^*(c_2) \end{aligned}$$

in $H^4(X \times W_{16}^5(X), \mathbb{Z})$. This polynomial gets multiplied by the class $[Z]$, which is expressed in Proposition 2.7 as a degree 5 polynomial in θ , η and $\pi_2^*(c_i)$. We obtain a homogeneous polynomial of degree 7 viewed as an element of $H^{14}(X \times W_{16}^5(X), \mathbb{Z})$.

Next we turn our attention to the contribution $\sigma^*(F_1) \cdot c_2(\text{Sym}^2(\mathcal{E})^\vee - \mathcal{F}^\vee)$ coming from terms that do contain $c_1(\text{Ker}(\zeta))$. This is given by the formula

$$4c_1^2(\text{Ker}(\zeta)) + c_1(\text{Ker}(\zeta)) \cdot (8(2\gamma + 54\eta) + 2c_1(\mathcal{A}_{2|Z}) + 14\pi_2^*(c_1)).$$

Using (15) and (16), one ends up with the following homogeneous polynomial of degree 7 in η , θ and $\pi_2^*(c_i)$ for $i = 1, \dots, 6$:

$$84\pi_2^*(c_1c_4)\theta\eta - 48\pi_2^*(c_4)\theta^2\eta - 756\pi_2^*(c_1c_5)\eta + 440\pi_2^*(c_5)\theta\eta - 44\pi_2^*(c_6)\eta.$$

Adding together the parts that do and those that do not contain $c_1(\text{Ker}(\zeta))$, and using the fact that the only monomials that need to be retained are those containing η , after manipulations carried out using *Maple*, one finds

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma^*(F_1) \cdot c_2(\text{Sym}^2(\mathcal{E})^\vee - \mathcal{F}^\vee) \\ = \eta\pi_2^*(-602c_1c_5 + 432c_2c_4 - 120c_1^2c_3\theta + 168c_1c_3\theta^2 - 48c_3\theta^3 + 1080c_1^2c_4 - 1428c_1c_4\theta \\ - 48c_2c_3\theta + 384c_4\theta^2 + 344c_5\theta - 44c_6). \end{aligned}$$

We suppress η and the remaining polynomial lives inside $H^{12}(W_{16}^5(X), \mathbb{Z}) \cong \mathbb{Z}$. Using Proposition 2.6 this expression is equal to

$$\sigma^*(F_1) \cdot c_2(\text{Sym}^2(\mathcal{E})^\vee - \mathcal{F}^\vee) = \frac{193}{45}\theta^6 - \frac{1271}{30}\theta^5y_1 + \frac{1607}{12}\theta^4y_1^2 - 120\theta_3y_1^3 = 259314,$$

where for the last step we used the formulas (11). We conclude

$$b_1 = \frac{1}{22}\sigma^*(F_1) \cdot c_2(\text{Sym}^2(\mathcal{E})^\vee - \mathcal{F}^\vee) = 11787,$$

as required. $\square$

Theorem 3.2 *Let $[X, q]$ be a general pointed curve of genus 12 and let $F_0 \subseteq \tilde{\Delta}_0 \subseteq \tilde{\mathcal{M}}_{13}$ be the associated test curve. Then the coefficient of δ_0 in the expression (13) of $[\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_{13}]^{\text{virt}}$ is equal to*

$$b_0 = \frac{1}{24}(\sigma^*(F_0) \cdot c_2(\text{Sym}^2(\mathcal{E})^\vee - \mathcal{F}^\vee) + b_1) = 2247.$$

Proof Using Proposition 2.4, we observe that

$$c_2(\mathrm{Sym}^2(\mathcal{E})^\vee - \mathcal{F}^\vee)_{|\sigma^*(F_0)} = c_2(\mathrm{Sym}^2(\mathcal{E})^\vee - \mathcal{F}^\vee)_{|Y}.$$

We shall evaluate the Chern classes of $\mathcal{F}_{|Y}$ via the line bundle V on Y with fiber

$$V(y, L) = \frac{H^0(X, L)}{H^0(X, L(-y - q))} \hookrightarrow H^0(X, L \otimes \mathcal{O}_{y+q})$$

over a point $(y, L) \in Y$. We write the exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow V \rightarrow \mathcal{B} \rightarrow (\mathrm{Ker}(\chi))^\vee \rightarrow 0$$

over Y , where the morphism $\chi: \mathcal{B}^\vee \rightarrow \pi_2^*(\mathcal{M})^\vee$ was defined in the final part of the proof of Proposition 2.7. In particular, we have

$$c_1(V) = 15\eta + \gamma + c_1(\mathrm{Ker}(\chi)).$$

The effect of multiplying $c_1(\mathrm{Ker}(\chi))$ against a class $\xi \in H^2(X \times W_{16}^5(X), \mathbb{Z})$ is described by applying once more the Harris–Tu formula [28]:

$$(18) \quad c_1(\mathrm{Ker}(\chi)) \cdot \xi_{|Y} = (-\pi_2^*(c_6) - 2\eta\theta\pi_2^*(c_4) + (15\eta + \gamma)\pi_2^*(c_5)) \cdot \xi_{|Y},$$

where we recall that $\pi_2: X \times W_{16}^5(X) \rightarrow W_{16}^5(X)$ and $c_i \in H^{2i}(W_{16}^5(X), \mathbb{Z})$. Similarly, for the self-intersection on Y the following formula holds:

$$(19) \quad c_1^2(\mathrm{Ker}(\chi)) = -2\eta\theta\pi_2^*(c_5) + (15\eta + \gamma)\pi_2^*(c_6) \in H^{14}(X \times W_{16}^5(X), \mathbb{Z}).$$

We have also introduced in Proposition 2.8 the vector bundle $\mathcal{B}_2$ on $X \times \mathrm{Pic}^{16}(X)$ with fibers $\mathcal{B}_{2,(y,L)} = H^0(X, L^{\otimes 2}(-y - q))$ over a point (y, L) . A local calculation along the lines of the one in the proof of Theorem 3.1 shows that one also has an exact sequence on Y , which can then be used to determine the Chern numbers of $\mathcal{F}_{|Y}$:

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_{2|Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_{|Y} \rightarrow V^{\otimes 2} \rightarrow 0.$$

This exact sequence reflects the fact for a general point $(y, L) \in Y$ one has a decomposition $\mathcal{F}(y, L) = H^0(X, L^{\otimes 2}(-y - q)) \oplus K \cdot u^2$, where $u \in H^0(X, L)$ is a section that does not vanish at y and q . We thus obtain the formulas

$$c_1(\mathcal{F}_{|Y}) = c_1(\mathcal{B}_{2|Y}) + 2c_1(V) \quad \text{and} \quad c_2(\mathcal{F}_{|Y}) = c_2(\mathcal{B}_{2|Y}) + 2c_1(\mathcal{B}_{2|Y})c_1(V).$$

To estimate $c_2(\mathrm{Sym}^2(\mathcal{E})^\vee - \mathcal{F}^\vee)_{|Y}$ we use (12) and write

$$\begin{aligned} & \sigma^*(F_0) \cdot c_2((\mathrm{Sym}^2 \mathcal{E})^\vee - \mathcal{F}^\vee) \\ &= 20c_1^2(\pi_1^* \mathcal{M}_{|Y}^\vee) + 8c_2(\pi_2^* \mathcal{M}_{|Y}^\vee) + 7c_1(\pi_1^* \mathcal{M}_{|Y}^\vee) \cdot c_1(\mathcal{B}_{2|Y}) + 4c_1^2(V) - c_2(\mathcal{B}_{2|Y}) \\ & \quad + 14c_1(\pi_2^* \mathcal{M}_{|Y}^\vee) \cdot c_1(V) + c_1^2(\mathcal{B}_{2|Y}) + 2c_1(\mathcal{B}_{2|Y}) \cdot c_1(V). \end{aligned}$$

We expand this expression, collect the terms that do not contain $c_1(\mathrm{Ker}(\chi))$, and obtain

$$20\pi_2^*(c_1^2) - 7\eta\pi_2^*(c_1) - 28\theta \cdot \pi_2^*(c_1) + 4\theta\eta + 8\theta^2 + 8\pi_2^*(c_2).$$

This quadratic polynomial gets multiplied with the class $[Y]$ computed in [Proposition 2.7](#). Next, we collect the terms in $\sigma^*(F_0) \cdot c_2(\text{Sym}^2 \mathcal{E}^\vee - \mathcal{F}^\vee)$ that do contain $c_1(\text{Ker}(\chi))$:

$$4c_1^2(\text{Ker}(\chi)) + c_1(\text{Ker}(\chi))(8(15\eta + \gamma) + 14\pi_2^*(c_1) + 2c_1(\mathcal{B}_{2|Y})).$$

This part of the contribution is evaluated using formulas [\(18\)](#) and [\(19\)](#).

Putting everything together, we obtain a polynomial in $H^{14}(X \times W_{16}^5(X), \mathbb{Z}) \cong \mathbb{Z}$, as in the proof of [Theorem 3.1](#):

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma^*(F_0) \cdot c_2(\text{Sym}^2(\mathcal{E})^\vee - \mathcal{F}^\vee) \\ = \eta\pi_2^*(-40c_1^2c_3\theta + 56c_1c_3\theta^2 - 16c_3\theta^3 + 300c_1^2c_4 - 392c_1c_4\theta - 16c_2c_3\theta + 104c_4\theta^2 - 217c_1c_5 \\ + 120c_2c_4 + 124c_5\theta + 2c_6). \end{aligned}$$

Applying [Proposition 2.6](#) and then [\(11\)](#), after eliminating η we obtain

$$\sigma^*(F_0) \cdot c_2(\text{Sym}^2(\mathcal{E})^\vee - \mathcal{F}^\vee) = \frac{161}{180}\theta^6 - \frac{28}{3}\theta^5y_1 + \frac{755}{24}\theta^4y_1^2 - 30\theta^3y_1^3 = 42141. \quad \square$$

We can now complete the calculation of $[\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_{13}]^{\text{virt}}$.

Proof of Theorem 1.4 We consider the curve $F_{\text{ell}} \subseteq \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_g$ defined in [\(7\)](#) obtained by attaching at the fixed point of a general curve X of genus 12 a pencil of plane cubics at one of the basepoints of the pencil. Then one has the relation

$$a - 12b_0 + b_1 = F_{\text{ell}} \cdot \sigma_*c_2(\text{Sym}^2(\mathcal{E})^\vee - \mathcal{F}^\vee) = 0.$$

Using [Theorems 3.1](#) and [3.2](#), we thus find $a = 15177$ for the λ -coefficient in the expansion [\(13\)](#). This completes the calculation of the virtual class $[\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_{13}]^{\text{virt}}$. $\square$

We finally explain how [Theorems 1.4](#) and [1.5](#) (proved in [Section 4](#)) together imply [Theorem 1.3](#).

Proof of Theorem 1.3 We write $[\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_{13}] = a\lambda - b_0\delta_0 - \dots - b_6\delta_6$, where a , b_0 and b_1 are determined by [Theorem 1.4](#). Applying [\[21, Theorem 1.1\]](#), we have the inequalities $b_i \geq (6i + 8)b_0 - (i + 1)a \geq b_0$ for $i = 2, \dots, 6$, which shows that $s(\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_{13}) = a/b_0 = \frac{5059}{749}$. $\square$

4 The strong maximal rank conjecture in genus 13

In this section and the next, we prove that $\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_{13}$ is not all of $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{13}$ and that its codimension-one part represents the virtual class $[\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_{13}]^{\text{virt}}$.

To show that $\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_{13}$ is not all of $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{13}$, it suffices to prove the existence of one Brill–Noether general smooth curve X of genus 13 such that, for every $L \in W_{16}^5(X)$, the multiplication map

$$\phi_L: \text{Sym}^2 H^0(X, L) \rightarrow H^0(X, L^{\otimes 2})$$

is surjective. This is one case of the strong maximal rank conjecture [3]. The locus of such curves is Zariski open; to prove that it is nonempty over every algebraically closed field of characteristic zero, it suffices to show this over one such field. Hence, we can and do assume that our ground field K is spherically complete with respect to a surjective valuation $v: K^\times \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, and that K has residue characteristic zero. This allows us to discuss the nonarchimedean analytifications of curves, the skeletons of those analytifications, and the tropicalizations of rational functions, viewed as sections of L and $L^{\otimes 2}$. In this framework, we apply the method of tropical independence to give a lower bound for the rank of the multiplication map ϕ_L for every $L \in W_{16}^5(X)$. The motivation and technical foundations for this approach are detailed in Sections 1.4–1.5, Sections 2.4–2.5 and Section 6 of [19], to which we refer the reader for details and further references.

After proving this case of the strong maximal rank conjecture, we will furthermore show that no component of the degeneracy locus $\mathfrak{U}$ in the parameter space $\tilde{\mathfrak{G}}_{16}^5$ over $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_{13}$ maps with generically positive-dimensional fibers onto a divisor in $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_{13}$. As in [19], this additional step is necessary to show that the pushforward of the virtual class is effective, and our proof involves analogous arguments on lower-genus curves for linear series with ramification. In particular, we will consider linear series with ramification on curves of genus 11 and 12 in Section 5, and so we set up our arguments here to work in this greater generality.

Let X be a smooth projective curve of genus $11 \leq g \leq 13$ over K whose Berkovich analytification X^{an} has a skeleton Γ which is a chain of g loops connected by bridges, as shown. In order to simplify notation later, the vertices of Γ are labeled $w_{13-g}, \dots, w_{13}$, and $v_{14-g}, \dots, v_{14}$, as shown in Figure 1.

For $14 - g \leq k \leq 13$ we write γ_k for the loop formed by the two edges of length ℓ_k and m_k between v_k and w_k . Similarly, for $14 - g \leq k \leq 14$ we write β_k for the bridge between w_{k-1} and v_k which has length n_k . Except where stated otherwise, we assume that these edge lengths satisfy

$$(20) \quad \ell_{k+1} \ll m_k \ll \ell_k \ll n_{k+1} \ll n_k \quad \text{for all } k.$$

These conditions on the edge lengths are precisely as in [19, Section 7.1]. Any curve X whose analytification has such a skeleton is Brill–Noether general [12].

Given a line bundle L on X we choose an identification $L = \mathcal{O}_X(D_X)$ so that any linear series $V \subseteq H^0(X, L)$ is identified with a finite-dimensional vector space of rational functions $V \subseteq K(X)$. The tropicalization of any nonzero rational function f on X is a piecewise linear function with integer slopes on Γ , and we write $\text{trop } V$ for the set of all tropicalizations of nonzero functions in V .




Figure 1: The chain of loops Γ .

Any sum of two functions in $\text{trop } V$ is the tropicalization of a function in the image of the multiplication map $\phi_V: \text{Sym}^2 V \rightarrow H^0(X, L^{\otimes 2})$. We say that a set of functions $\{\psi_0, \dots, \psi_n\}$ on Γ is *tropically independent* if there are real numbers $b_0, \dots, b_n$ such that

$$\min\{\psi_0 + b_0, \dots, \psi_n + b_n\} \neq \min\{\psi_0 + b_0, \dots, \widehat{\psi_j + b_j}, \dots, \psi_n + b_n\} \quad \text{for } 0 \leq j \leq n.$$

In other words, $\{\psi_0, \dots, \psi_n\}$ is tropically independent if there are real numbers $b_0, \dots, b_n$ such that each $\psi_j + b_j$ achieves the minimum uniquely in $\min_i\{\psi_i + b_i\}$ at some point $v \in \Gamma$. The function $\theta = \min_i\{\psi_i + b_i\}$ is then called an *independence*, since it verifies that $\{\psi_0, \dots, \psi_n\}$ is independent.

We recall that tropical independence is a sufficient condition for linear independence; if $f_0, \dots, f_n$ are nonzero rational functions on X such that $\{\text{trop}(f_0), \dots, \text{trop}(f_n)\}$ is tropically independent on Γ , then $\{f_0, \dots, f_n\}$ is linearly independent in $K(X)$. Therefore, the relevant case of the strong maximal rank conjecture, and hence the fact that $\widetilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{13}$ is a divisor, follows immediately from the following.

Theorem 4.1 *Let X be a curve of genus 13 with skeleton Γ . Let V be a linear series of degree 16 and dimension 5 on X , and let $\Sigma = \text{trop } V$. Then there is an independence θ among 20 pairwise sums of functions in Σ .*

We will use the following generalization of Theorem 4.1 in our proof that $\widetilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{13}$ represents the virtual class; the generalization involves analogous statements for linear series satisfying certain ramification conditions in genus 11 and 12. The situation is closely parallel to that in [19, Section 9.4]. Recall that $a_0^V(p) < \dots < a_r^V(p)$ denotes the vanishing sequence of a linear series V of rank r at a point p .

Theorem 4.2 *Let X be a curve of genus $g \in \{11, 12, 13\}$ whose skeleton is Γ , and let $p \in X$ be a point specializing to w_{13-g} . Let V be a linear series of degree 16 and dimension 5 on X , and let $\Sigma = \text{trop } V$. Assume that*

- (i) *if $g = 12$, then $a_1^V(p) \geq 2$, and*
- (ii) *if $g = 11$, then either $a_1^V(p) \geq 3$, or $a_0^V(p) \geq 1$ and $a_2^V(p) \geq 4$.*

Then there is an independence θ among 20 pairwise sums of functions in Σ .

The remainder of this section is devoted to the proof of Theorem 4.2. Our approach to constructing the independence is similar to that of [19], with a few important differences that we highlight when they arise. Throughout, we let D_X be a divisor class on X with $V \subseteq H^0(X, \mathcal{O}(D_X))$. We write $D = \text{Trop}(D_X)$, and we assume that D is a break divisor, meaning that it is the unique effective representative of its equivalence class with multiplicity $\deg D - g$ at w_0 and precisely one point of multiplicity 1 on each loop γ_k . (See for instance [2].) Let $R(D)$ denote the complete tropical linear series of D , as in [25]. In other words, $R(D) = \{\psi \in \text{PL}(\Gamma) : D + \text{div}(\psi) \geq 0\}$. Note, in particular, that $\text{Trop}(V)$ is a tropical submodule of $R(D)$.

Remark 4.3 The differences between the constructions of independences here and those in [19] are subtle but crucial. Even when $g = 13$, $[D]$ is vertex-avoiding, and Σ is unramified (the cases treated in Section 4.1), if we apply the algorithm of [19, Section 8.1] naively, we obtain an independence among only 19 functions in Σ . To overcome this difficulty, we divide the graph into blocks in such a way that the lingering loop is the last loop in its block and has exactly two permissible functions. This allows us to alter the algorithm slightly and assign a function to the lingering loop, raising the total number of functions in the independence to 20. See Remark 4.11.

4.1 The unramified vertex-avoiding case

We first consider the case where $g = 13$, D is vertex-avoiding, and $\Sigma = \text{trop } V$ is unramified. Unramified means that the ramification weights of $\text{trop } V$ at w_0 and v_{14} , in the sense of [19, Definition 9.7], are zero. Vertex-avoiding means that, for $0 \leq i \leq 5$, there is a unique divisor $D_i \sim D$ such that $D_i - i w_0 - (5-i) v_{14}$ is effective. A vertex-avoiding divisor is unramified if and only if the support of $D_i - i w_0 - (5-i) v_{14}$ contains neither w_0 nor v_{14} , for all i .

For $\psi \in \Sigma$, we write $s_k(\psi)$ and $s'_k(\psi)$ for the rightward slopes along the incoming and outgoing bridges of the k^{th} loop γ_k , at v_k and w_k , respectively. Since $\dim V = 6$, the functions in Σ have exactly 6 distinct slopes along each tangent vector in Γ .

Definition 4.4 Let $s_k[0] < \dots < s_k[5]$ and $s'_k[0] < \dots < s'_k[5]$ denote the 6 distinct rightward slopes that occur as $s_k(\psi)$ and $s'_k(\psi)$ for $\psi \in \Sigma$.

Since D is vertex-avoiding, there is a function $\varphi_i \in \Sigma$ such that

$$s_k(\varphi_i) = s_k[i] \quad \text{and} \quad s'_k(\varphi_i) = s'_k[i] \quad \text{for all } k,$$

and it is unique up to additive constants. Since Σ is also unramified, there is a unique *lingering loop* γ_ℓ , ie a unique loop γ_ℓ such that $s'_\ell[i] = s_\ell[i]$ for all i . Moreover, there is no function $\varphi \in \Sigma$ with the property that $s_\ell(\varphi) \leq s_\ell[i]$ and $s'_\ell(\varphi) \geq s'_\ell[i+1]$. This last condition means that γ_ℓ is not a *switching loop*, in the sense of [19, Section 9.6].

Our assumption that Σ is unramified implies that the break divisor D satisfies $\deg_{w_0} D = 3$, and the rightward slopes of the functions ψ_i at w_0 are

$$(s'_0[0], \dots, s'_0[5]) = (-2, -1, 0, 1, 2, 3).$$




Figure 2: The slopes s_k and s'_k .

Let us consider how the slope vector $(s'_k[0], \dots, s'_k[5])$ changes as we go from left to right across the graph. When crossing a loop other than the lingering loop γ_ℓ , one of these slopes increases by 1, and the other 5 remain the same. So, after the first nonlingering loop, the slopes are $(-2, -1, 0, 1, 2, 4)$, and after the second nonlingering loop, the slopes are either $(-2, -1, 0, 1, 2, 5)$ or $(-2, -1, 0, 1, 3, 4)$. The data of these slopes is recorded by a standard Young tableau on a rectangle with 2 rows and 6 columns, filled with the symbols 1 through 13, excluding ℓ . If the symbol k appears in column i , then it is the $(5-i)^{\text{th}}$ slope that increases on the loop γ_k , ie $s'_k[5-i] = s_k[5-i] + 1$. Note, in particular, that each slope increases exactly twice, so $s'_{13} = (0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)$ and no slope is ever greater than 5.

Let $\varphi_{ij} := \varphi_i + \varphi_j$. To prove [Theorem 4.2](#), we construct an independence θ among 20 of the 21 functions in

$$\mathcal{B} = \{\varphi_{ij} : 0 \leq i \leq j \leq 5\}.$$

In order to describe this construction, we divide the graph into three connected regions consisting of some number of loops and the bridges between them, which we call *blocks*. The construction ensures that, within each block, the slope of θ is nearly constant on each bridge, equal to 4 on bridges in the first block, 3 on bridges in the second block, and 2 on bridges in the third block. The slope decreases by 1 at the midpoint of the bridges between blocks.

The blocks are specified as follows. Recall that γ_ℓ is the lingering loop. Let

$$z_1 = \min\{6, \ell\} \quad \text{and} \quad z_2 = \max\{7, \ell\}.$$

Then γ_{z_1} and γ_{z_2} are the last loops of the first and second blocks, respectively. We construct our independence θ to satisfy

$$(21) \quad s_k(\theta) = \begin{cases} 4 & \text{if } k \leq z_1, \\ 3 & \text{if } z_1 < k \leq z_2, \\ 2 & \text{if } z_2 < k \leq 13. \end{cases}$$

Note that either z_1 or z_2 is equal to ℓ , so the lingering loop γ_ℓ is always the last loop in its block.

When we construct θ as a tropical linear combination of the functions in $\mathcal{B}$, we keep track of which functions achieve the minimum on which loops and bridges of Γ . The specified slopes of θ along the bridges within each block place natural constraints on which functions can achieve the minimum on a given loop, which we encode in the following definition of *permissibility*. In the vertex-avoiding case, we apply this condition only to functions $\varphi_{ij} \in \mathcal{B}$. However, we state the definition of permissibility more generally, for arbitrary functions ψ in the complete tropical linear series $R(D)$, for later use in [Sections 4.2–4.3](#).

Definition 4.5 Let $\psi \in R(D)$. We say that ψ is *permissible* on γ_k if

$$s_k(\psi) \leq s_k(\theta) \quad \text{and} \quad s'_k(\psi) \geq s'_k(\theta).$$

We say that ψ is *permissible* on a block if it is permissible on some loop in that block.

To understand this definition, suppose that θ has nearly constant slope along the bridges within each block and on each half of the bridges between blocks, and that it is written as the minimum of finitely many functions in $R(D)$, including ψ . If $s_k(\psi) \geq s_k(\theta) + 1$, then the value of ψ at v_k exceeds the value of θ at v_k by at least the length of the bridge β_k (or half this length, if β_k is the bridge between two blocks). Since this bridge is much longer than the loop γ_k , it follows that ψ cannot achieve the minimum at any point of γ_k . A similar argument shows that if $s'_k(\psi) \leq s_k(\theta) - 1$, then ψ cannot achieve the minimum at any point of γ_k .

We construct θ algorithmically, moving from left to right across the graph. At each step, we keep track of which functions in $\mathcal{B}$ are permissible on the given loop. The set of loops on which a given function ψ is permissible are indexed by the integers in an interval [19, page 44], so we pay special attention to the first and last loops in these intervals.

Suppose γ_k is the first loop on which $\varphi_{ij} \in \mathcal{B}$ is permissible and it is not the first loop in its block. Then γ_k is the unique loop on which φ_{ij} is permissible such that the first inequality in Definition 4.5 is strict. Similarly, suppose γ_k is the last loop on which φ_{ij} is permissible and it is not the last loop in its block. Then γ_k is the unique loop on which φ_{ij} is permissible such that the second inequality in Definition 4.5 is strict. This motivates the following definition.

Definition 4.6 A permissible function ψ is *new* if $s_k(\psi) \leq s_k(\theta) - 1$ and *departing* if $s'_k(\psi) \geq s_k(\theta) + 1$.

Our choice of z_1 and z_2 determines which loops have new permissible functions in $\mathcal{B}$.

Proposition 4.7 *There are no new permissible functions of the form φ_{ij} on γ_k if and only if $k = \ell$ or*

- (i) $\ell > 6$ and $k = 6$,
- (ii) $\ell > 7$ and $k = 7$,
- (iii) $\ell < 9$ and $k = 9$, or
- (iv) $\ell \leq 7$, $s'_7[5] = 4$ and $k = 8$.

Proof There is no new permissible function on the lingering loop γ_ℓ . Suppose $k \neq \ell$. Let j be the unique integer satisfying $s'_k[j] = s_k[j] + 1$. There is a new permissible function in $\mathcal{B}$ on γ_k if and only if either the function φ_{jj} is both new and departing, or there is an integer i such that $s'_k(\varphi_{ij}) = s_k(\theta)$. We now examine when such an i exists.

The values $s'_k[i]$ are six distinct integers between -2 and 5 . Let a and b be the two integers in this range that are not equal to $s'_k[i]$ for any i . On the h^{th} nonlingering loop, one has

$$h = \sum_{i=0}^5 (s'_k[i] + 2 - i) = 9 - (a + b).$$

Since $s'_k[j] = s_k[j] + 1$, we must have that $s'_k[j]$ is equal to either $a + 1$ or $b + 1$. Without loss of generality, assume that it is equal to $a + 1$. There does not exist i such that $s'_k[i] + s'_k[j] = s'_k(\theta)$ if and only if $s'_k(\theta) - (a + 1)$ is greater than 5 , smaller than -2 , or equal to either a or b . If it is equal to a , then

the function φ_{jj} is both new and departing. Since $s'_k(\theta) \leq 4$ and $a + 1 \geq -1$, we see that $s'_k(\theta) - (a + 1)$ cannot be greater than 5, and $s'_k(\theta) - (a + 1)$ is smaller than -2 if and only if $s'_k(\theta) = 2$ and $a = 4$. By the above calculation, $b = s'_k(\theta) - (a + 1)$ if and only if $h = 10 - s'_k(\theta)$.

The 6th nonlingering loop is contained in the first block if and only if $\ell > 6$. The 7th nonlingering loop is contained in the second block if and only if $\ell > 7$. The 8th nonlingering loop is contained in the third block if and only if $\ell < 9$. Finally, if $a = 4$, then γ_k is one of the first 7 nonlingering loops. If γ_k is in the third block, then since $z_2 \geq 7$, we have $\ell \leq 7$, and γ_k is the first loop in the third block. $\square$

Having determined which loops have new permissible functions in $\mathcal{B}$, we can now strategically choose the subset $\mathcal{B}' \subset \mathcal{B}$ from which we will construct the independence θ , so that the number of permissible functions in $\mathcal{B}'$ on each block is precisely one more than the number of loops in the block. Note that $|\mathcal{B}| = 21$, so $\mathcal{B}'$ is chosen by omitting a single function ψ from $\mathcal{B}$.

Definition 4.8 If $\ell \leq 7$, let $\psi \in \mathcal{B}$ be a function that is permissible on the second block. Otherwise, let $\psi \in \mathcal{B}$ be a function that is permissible on the third block. Let $\mathcal{B}' = \mathcal{B} \setminus \{\psi\}$.

Remark 4.9 There may be several functions that are permissible on the specified block; it does not matter which of these we omit from $\mathcal{B}'$.

Lemma 4.10 On each block, the number of permissible functions in $\mathcal{B}'$ is one more than the number of loops.

Proof This follows directly from [Proposition 4.7](#). Specifically, since $z_1 = \min\{6, \ell\}$, there is a new permissible function in $\mathcal{B}$ on each loop of the first block, except for the last one. Since there are precisely two pairs (i, j) such that $s_1(\varphi_{ij}) = 4$, we see that the number of permissible functions on the first block is one more than the number of loops. By symmetry, if $z_2 \leq 7$, then the number of permissible functions in $\mathcal{B}$ on the third block is one more than the number of loops, and if $z_2 > 7$, it is two more. But when $z_2 > 7$, one of these functions is not in $\mathcal{B}'$.

Finally, we consider the middle block. We count the number of pairs (i, j) such that $s'_{z_1}(\varphi_{ij}) = 3$. Since 3 is odd, if (i, j) is such a pair, then $i \neq j$. It follows that there are 3 such pairs if and only if $s'_{z_1}[i] + s'_{z_1}[5 - i] = 3$ for all i , which implies that there are precisely 6 nonlingering loops in the first block. It follows that, if $\ell < 7$, then there are precisely two such pairs, and if $\ell \geq 7$, there are three such pairs. By [Proposition 4.7](#), if $\ell < 7$, there is a new permissible function on every loop of the middle block. If $\ell = 7$, then the middle block contains only one loop, and since this loop is lingering, there are no new permissible functions on it. In both of these cases, the number of permissible functions in $\mathcal{B}$ on the middle block is therefore two more than the number of loops, but one of these functions is not in $\mathcal{B}'$. If $\ell > 7$, then there are no new permissible functions on γ_7 or γ_ℓ , so the number of permissible functions is one more than the number of loops. $\square$

We now describe the algorithm for constructing our independence

$$\theta = \min_{\varphi_{ij} \in \mathcal{B}'} \{\varphi_{ij} + c_{ij}\},$$

with slopes $s_k(\theta)$ as specified in (21), when $g = 13$, D is vertex-avoiding, and Σ is unramified. The algorithm is quite similar to that presented in [19, Section 8.1]. We include the details. See [Example 4.19](#) for an illustration of the output in one particular case.

In this algorithm, we move from left to right across each of the three blocks where $s_k(\theta)$ is constant, adjusting the coefficients of unassigned permissible functions and assigning one function $\varphi_{ij} \in \mathcal{B}'$ to each loop so that each function achieves the minimum uniquely on some part of the loop to which it is assigned. At the end of each block, there is one remaining unassigned permissible function that achieves the minimum uniquely on the bridge immediately after the block, which we assign to that bridge. Since there are 13 loops and three blocks, this gives us an independent configuration of 16 functions. The remaining 4 functions, with slopes too high or too low to be permissible on any block, achieve the minimum uniquely on the bridges to the left of the first loop or to the right of the last loop, respectively. [Example 4.19](#) illustrates the procedure for one randomly chosen tableau. We now list a few of the key properties of the algorithm:

- (i) Once a function has been assigned to a bridge or loop, it always achieves the minimum uniquely at some point on that bridge or loop.
- (ii) A function never achieves the minimum on any loop to the right of the bridge or loop to which it is assigned.
- (iii) The coefficient of each function is initialized to ∞ and then assigned a finite value when the function is assigned to a bridge or becomes permissible on a loop, whichever comes first.
- (iv) After the initial assignment of a finite coefficient, subsequent adjustments to this coefficient are smaller and smaller perturbations. This is related to the fact that the edges get shorter and shorter as we move from left to right across the graph.
- (v) Only the coefficients of unassigned functions are adjusted, and all adjustments are upward. This ensures that once a function is assigned and achieves the minimum uniquely on a loop, it always achieves the minimum uniquely on that loop.
- (vi) Exactly one function is assigned to each of the 13 loops, and the remaining seven functions are assigned to either the leftmost bridge, the rightmost bridge, or one of the three bridges after the blocks.

The algorithm terminates when we reach the rightmost bridge, at which point each of the 20 functions $\{\varphi_{ij} + c_{ij} : \varphi_{ij} \in \mathcal{B}'\}$ achieves the minimum uniquely at some point on the graph.

Remark 4.11 The one crucial difference, in comparison with the construction in [19, Section 8.1], is that we do *not* skip the lingering loop γ_ℓ . Instead, since γ_ℓ is the last loop in its block, there are precisely

two unassigned permissible functions on γ_ℓ . These two functions do not have identical restrictions to γ_ℓ . Thus, if we adjust their coefficients upward so that they agree at w_ℓ , one of them will obtain the minimum uniquely at some point of the loop γ_ℓ . We assign this function to γ_ℓ and adjust its coefficient upward by an amount small enough so that it still obtains the minimum uniquely at some point of γ_ℓ . The other achieves the minimum uniquely at w_ℓ , and we assign it to the bridge $\beta_{\ell+1}$.

The algorithm depends on the following basic properties of the permissible functions φ_{ij} .

Lemma 4.12 *There is at most one departing permissible function φ_{ij} on each loop γ_k . Furthermore, if γ_k is lingering then there are none.*

Proof The proof is identical to [19, Lemma 8.8]. □

Lemma 4.13 *For any loop γ_k , there are at most three nondeparting permissible functions in $\mathcal{B}$ on γ_k .*

Proof If φ_{ij} is a nondeparting permissible function on γ_k , then $s_{k+1}(\varphi_{ij}) = s_k(\theta)$. For each i , this equality holds for at most one j , and the lemma follows. □

Proposition 4.14 *Consider a set of at most three nondeparting permissible functions from $\mathcal{B}$ on a loop γ_k and assume that all of the functions take the same value at w_k . Then there is a point of γ_k at which one of these functions is strictly less than the others.*

Proof The proof is identical to [19, Lemma 8.19]. □

The algorithm is as follows:

- **Start at the first bridge** Start at β_1 and initialize $c_{55} = 0$. Initialize c_{45} so that $\varphi_{45} + c_{45}$ equals φ_{55} at a point one third of the way from w_0 to v_1 . Initialize c_{44} and c_{35} so that $\varphi_{44} + c_{44}$ and $\varphi_{35} + c_{35}$ agree with $\varphi_{45} + c_{45}$ at a point two thirds of the way from w_0 to v_1 . Initialize all other coefficients c_{ij} to ∞ . Note that φ_{55} and φ_{45} achieve the minimum uniquely on the first and second third of β_1 , respectively. Assign both of these functions to β_1 , and proceed to the first loop.
- **Loop subroutine** Each time we arrive at a loop γ_k , apply the following steps:
 - **Step 1: reinitialize unassigned coefficients** By Lemma 4.15 below, there are at least two unassigned permissible functions. Find the unassigned permissible function φ_{ij} that maximizes $\varphi_{ij}(w_k) + c_{ij}$. Initialize the coefficients of the new permissible functions (if any) and adjust the coefficients of the other unassigned permissible functions upward so that they all agree with φ_{ij} at w_k . (The unassigned permissible functions are strictly less than all other functions on γ_k , even after this upward adjustment; see Lemma 4.16.)
 - **Step 2: assign departing functions** If there is a departing function, assign it to the loop. (There is at most one, by Lemma 4.12.) Adjust the coefficients of the other permissible functions upward

so that all of the functions agree at a point on the following bridge a short distance to the right of w_k , but far enough so that the departing function achieves the minimum uniquely on the whole loop. This is possible because the bridge is much longer than the edges in the loop. Proceed to the next loop.

- **Step 3: otherwise, use Proposition 4.14** By Lemma 4.13, there are at most three nondeparting functions. By Proposition 4.14, there is one φ_{ij} that achieves the minimum uniquely at some point of γ_k . We adjust the coefficient of φ_{ij} upward by $\frac{1}{3}m_k$. This ensures that it will never achieve the minimum on any loops to the right, yet still achieves the minimum uniquely on this loop; see Lemma 4.16, below. Assign φ_{ij} to γ_k , and proceed to the next loop.
- **Proceeding to the next loop** If the next loop is contained in the same block, then move right to the next loop and apply the loop subroutine. Otherwise, the current loop is the last loop in its block. In this case, proceed to the next block.
- **Proceeding to the next block** After applying the loop subroutine to the last loop in a block, there is exactly one unassigned permissible function in $\mathcal{B}'$, by Lemma 4.10. The unassigned permissible function φ_{ij} achieves the minimum uniquely on the beginning of the outgoing bridge, without any further adjustment of coefficients. Assign φ_{ij} to this bridge.

If we are at the last loop γ_g , then proceed to the last bridge. Otherwise, there are several permissible functions on the first loop of the next block, as detailed in Lemma 4.13, above. Initialize the coefficient of each permissible function on the first loop of the next block so that it is equal to θ at the midpoint of the bridge between the blocks, and then apply the loop subroutine.

- **The last bridge** Initialize the coefficient c_{01} so that $\varphi_{01} + c_{01}$ equals θ at the midpoint of the last bridge β_{14} . Initialize c_{00} so that $\varphi_{00} + c_{00}$ equals θ halfway between the midpoint and the rightmost endpoint. Note that both of these functions now achieve the minimum uniquely at some point on the second half of β_{14} . Assign both of these functions to β_{14} , and output $\theta = \min\{\varphi_{ij} + c_{ij} : \varphi_{ij} \in \mathcal{B}'\}$.

To verify that this algorithm produces a tropical independence, we first show that there are at least two unassigned permissible functions on each loop.

Lemma 4.15 *There are at least two unassigned permissible functions on each loop γ_k .*

Proof By Lemma 4.10, the number of permissible functions in $\mathcal{B}'$ on the block containing γ_k is one more than the number of loops. Since there is at most one new function per loop, the number of functions in $\mathcal{B}'$ that are permissible on some loop between the first loop of the block and γ_k , inclusive, is at least one more than the number of loops. Finally, note that exactly one function is assigned to each loop, and moreover, if a function is departing, it is assigned. It follows by induction on k' that the number of functions in $\mathcal{B}'$ that are unassigned and permissible on some loop between $\gamma_{k'}$ and γ_k is at least $k - k' + 2$. Hence, the number of unassigned permissible functions on γ_k is at least two. $\square$

We now verify that this algorithm produces a tropical independence.

Lemma 4.16 Suppose that φ_{ij} is assigned to the loop γ_k or the bridge β_k . Then φ_{ij} does not achieve the minimum at any point to the right of v_{k+1} .

Proof If γ_k is a nonlingering loop, then the proof is the same as [19, Section 8.2]. On the other hand, if γ_k is the lingering loop, then it is the last loop in its block. Since v_{k+1} is the start of the next block, φ_{ij} cannot achieve the minimum at any point to the right of v_{k+1} . $\square$

This completes the proof of Theorem 4.2 in the vertex-avoiding case.

Remark 4.17 For future reference, we note that the proof of Lemma 4.16 does not depend on the relative lengths of the bridges. It only uses that the bridges are much longer than the loops. The assumption that each bridge is much longer than the next is only used later, when there are decreasing bridges, decreasing loops, or switching loops.

Remark 4.18 If Γ' is the subgraph of Γ to the right of w_1 , then Γ' is a chain of 12 loops whose edge lengths satisfy the required conditions, and if the first loop is nonlingering, then the restriction of Σ to Γ' satisfies the ramification condition of Theorem 4.2, with equality. Similarly, the subgraph to the right of w_2 is a chain of 11 loops whose edge lengths satisfy the required conditions, and the restriction of Σ to this subgraph satisfies the ramification condition of Theorem 4.2, with equality. To produce an independence in these cases, assign each function in $\mathcal{B}'$ with slope greater than 4 to the first bridge, and then proceed as above. There are precisely $15 - g$ such functions, and they have distinct slopes along the first bridge, as in [19, Lemma 10.40]. Because of this, we can choose coefficients so that each one obtains the minimum uniquely at some point of the first bridge. Thus the unramified vertex-avoiding cases of Theorem 4.2 for $g = 11$ and 12 (ie when Σ is unramified at v_{14} and there is no extra ramification at w_{13-g} beyond what is required by the inequalities on vanishing orders in the statement of the theorem) follow from essentially the same argument as for $g = 13$. Our choice to index the vertices starting at w_{13-g} reflects the idea that these linear series with ramification on a chain of $g = 11$ or 12 loops behave like linear series on a chain of 13 loops restricted to the subgraph to the right of w_{13-g} .

Example 4.19 We illustrate the construction with an example. Let $[D]$ be a vertex-avoiding class of degree 16 and rank 5 associated to the tableau in Figure 3.

The independence $\theta = \min_{ij} \{\varphi_{ij} + c_{ij}\}$ that we construct is depicted schematically in Figure 4. The graph should be read from left to right and top to bottom, so the first six loops appear in the first row, with

1	3	4	8	9	10
2	5	7	11	12	13

Figure 3: The tableau corresponding to the divisor D .




Figure 4: The divisor $D' = 2D + \text{div}(\theta)$. The function φ_{ij} achieves the minimum uniquely on the region labeled ij in $\Gamma \setminus \text{Supp}(D')$.

γ_1 on the left and γ_6 on the right, and γ_{13} is the last loop in the third row. The rows correspond to the three blocks. The 31 dots indicate the support of the divisor $D' = 2D + \text{div}(\theta)$. Note that $\deg(D') = 32$; the point on the bridge β_4 appears with multiplicity 2, as marked. Because $\ell = 6$, there is a function that is permissible on the second block in $\mathcal{B}$ but not $\mathcal{B}'$. The functions in $\mathcal{B}$ that are permissible on the second block are precisely φ_{05} , φ_{14} , and φ_{23} ; we have chosen (arbitrarily) to omit φ_{23} from $\mathcal{B}'$. Each of the 20 functions φ_{ij} in $\mathcal{B}'$ achieves the minimum uniquely on the connected component of the complement of $\text{Supp}(D')$ labeled ij .

4.2 No switching loops

Recall that a loop γ_ℓ is a *switching loop* for Σ if there is some $\varphi \in \Sigma$ and some h such that $s_\ell(\varphi) \leq s_\ell[h]$ and $s'_\ell(\varphi) \geq s'_\ell[h + 1]$. It is a *lingering loop* if it is not a switching loop and $s_\ell[i] = s'_\ell[i]$ for all i . Recall also that γ_ℓ is a *decreasing loop* if $s_\ell[h] > s'_\ell[h]$. Similarly β_ℓ is a *decreasing bridge* if $s'_{\ell-1}[h] > s_\ell[h]$.

Because we are only considering cases where the adjusted Brill–Noether number is at most one, by [19, Proposition 9.10], we know that there is at most one lingering loop, one positive ramification weight, one decreasing loop, one decreasing bridge, or one switching loop, and these possibilities are mutually exclusive. Moreover, for decreasing loops and bridges, the index h is unique and the decrease in slope is exactly one. In this subsection, we consider all cases where there is no switching loop. The cases with a switching loop are discussed in Section 4.3.

Assume Σ has no switching loops. Then for all i there is a function $\varphi_i \in \Sigma$ such that

$$s_k(\varphi_i) = s_k[i] \quad \text{and} \quad s'_k(\varphi_i) = s'_k[i] \quad \text{for all } k.$$

We keep the notation $\varphi_{ij} = \varphi_i + \varphi_j$ and $\mathcal{B} = \{\varphi_{ij} : 0 \leq i \leq j \leq 5\}$. As in the unramified vertex-avoiding case, we choose a subset $\mathcal{B}' \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ of 20 functions, and we choose integers z_1 and z_2 in order to divide the graph Γ into three blocks. We make our choices to satisfy the following conditions:

- (i) No two functions in $\mathcal{B}'$ that are permissible on γ_k differ by a constant on γ_k .

- (ii) The number of functions in $\mathcal{B}'$ that are permissible on each block is at most one more than the number of loops in that block.
- (iii) No function in $\mathcal{B}'$ is permissible on more than one block,
- (iv) if γ_k is a lingering loop, then it is the last loop in its block.
- (v) If γ_k is a decreasing loop and j is the unique value such that $s'_k[j] < s_k[j]$, then no function of the form $\varphi_{ij} \in \mathcal{B}'$ is permissible on γ_k .
- (vi) If β_k is a decreasing bridge and j is the unique value such that $s_k[j] < s'_{k-1}[j]$, then either β_k is a bridge between blocks, or no function of the form $\varphi_{ij} \in \mathcal{B}'$ is permissible on γ_{k-1} .

Proposition 4.20 *If $\mathcal{B}'$ satisfies conditions (i)–(vi), then the functions in $\mathcal{B}'$ are independent.*

Proof The algorithm for constructing the tropical independence is identical to the algorithm of [Section 4.1](#), with the following exceptions. First, as in [Remark 4.18](#), we assign every function with slope greater than four to the first bridge. Second, the procedure for proceeding to the next block must be altered slightly when the bridge between the blocks is a decreasing bridge.

When the bridge between the blocks is a decreasing bridge, there is a unique point v on the bridge where one of the functions φ_i is locally nonlinear. We initialize the coefficients of the new permissible functions on the next block so that they are equal to θ at a point to the right of v . If one of the blocks contains zero loops, we set the coefficient of the unique function with slope equal to that of θ so that it is equal to θ at a point to the right of v , and initialize the coefficients of the new permissible functions on the next block so that they are equal to θ at a point to the right of this.

We note that there are at most 3 nondeparting permissible functions in $\mathcal{B}'$ on each loop. This is because a nondeparting permissible function φ_{ij} on γ_k satisfies $s_{k+1}(\varphi_{ij}) = s_k(\theta)$, and for each i this equality can hold for at most one j .

To see that this algorithm produces an independence, suppose that φ_{ij} is assigned to the loop γ_k or the bridge β_k . We show that φ_{ij} does not achieve the minimum at any point to the right of v_{k+1} . If γ_k and β_k both have multiplicity zero, then the argument is the same as in [\[19, Section 8.2\]](#). On the other hand, if γ_k has positive multiplicity, then either γ_k is a decreasing loop, or by (iv) it is the last loop in its block. If γ_k is a decreasing loop, then by (v) there is no function in $\mathcal{B}'$ that is permissible on γ_k and contains the decreasing function as a summand, so the result holds again as in [\[19, Section 8.2\]](#). We may therefore assume that γ_k is the last loop in its block, in which case the argument is identical to the vertex-avoiding case above.

Similarly, if β_k has positive multiplicity, then by (vi) there are two possibilities. If φ_{ij} does not contain the decreasing function as a summand, then there is nothing to show. Otherwise, β_k is a bridge between blocks. By (iii) the function φ_{ij} is only permissible on one block. Since v_{k+1} is the start of the next block, φ_{ij} cannot achieve the minimum at any point to the right of v_{k+1} . $\square$

For the rest of this section, we explain how to choose z_1 , z_2 , and the set $\mathcal{B}'$ in order to satisfy conditions (i)–(vi). This is done by a careful case analysis, depending on combinatorial properties of the tropical linear series Σ .

Case 1: there are no loops or bridges of positive multiplicity This guarantees that either the linear series is ramified at v_{14} , or has “extra ramification” at w_{13-g} , meaning that $g = 13$ and the linear series is ramified at w_0 , or $g = 11$ or 12 and the linear series has more ramification than what is imposed by the inequalities on vanishing numbers in [Theorem 4.2s](#). In these cases, which are mutually exclusive, we choose z_1 and z_2 so that γ_{z_1} is the first loop in the first block with no new function, and γ_{z_2+1} is the last loop in the last block with no departing function. These loops exist by a counting argument, but we make the choice explicit.

If Σ is ramified at v_{14} , let k be the smallest positive integer such that $s'_k[5] = 6$, and define

$$(22) \quad z_1 = \begin{cases} 6 & \text{if } k \geq 7, \\ 7 & \text{if } k \leq 6, \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad z_2 = \max\{k-1, 7\}.$$

If Σ has extra ramification at w_{13-g} , let k be the largest positive integer such that $s_k[0] = -3$, and define

$$(23) \quad z_1 = \min\{k, 6\} \quad \text{and} \quad z_2 = \begin{cases} 6 & \text{if } k \geq 8, \\ 7 & \text{if } k \leq 7. \end{cases}$$

Let $\psi \in \mathcal{B}$ be a function that is permissible on the second block, and let $\mathcal{B}' = \mathcal{B} \setminus \{\psi\}$. (In the case where $z_1 = z_2$, let $\psi \in \mathcal{B}$ be a function with $s_{z_1+1}(\psi) = 3$.)

If there is a loop or bridge of positive multiplicity, then since $\rho = 1$, there is only one such loop or bridge, and it has multiplicity 1.

Case 2: there is a bridge β_ℓ of multiplicity 1 If $\ell \geq 8$ and $s'_{\ell-1}[5] = 6$, then define z_1 and z_2 as in (22). If $\ell \leq 7$ and $s_\ell[0] = -3$, then define z_1 and z_2 as in (23). Otherwise, define

$$z_1 = \min\{\ell-1, 6\} \quad \text{and} \quad z_2 = \ell-1.$$

If $\ell \geq 8$ and $s_{\ell-1}[5] = 6$, or $\ell \leq 7$ and $s_\ell[0] = -3$, then as above, we let $\psi \in \mathcal{B}$ be a function that is permissible on the second block, and let $\mathcal{B}' = \mathcal{B} \setminus \{\psi\}$. Otherwise, let h be the unique integer such that $s_\ell[h] < s'_{\ell-1}[h]$. If $\ell \neq 5, 6$, then we will see in [Lemma 4.21](#) that either there is a unique i such that $s'_{\ell-1}[h] + s'_{\ell-1}[i] = s_{\ell-1}(\theta)$, or $2s'_{\ell-1}[h] = s_{\ell-1}(\theta) + 1$, but not both. In the first case, we let $\mathcal{B}' = \mathcal{B} \setminus \{\varphi_{hi}\}$, and in the second case, we let $\mathcal{B}' = \mathcal{B} \setminus \{\varphi_{hh}\}$. (The function in $\mathcal{B} \setminus \mathcal{B}'$ is permissible on both blocks to either side of the bridge β_ℓ .) If $\ell = 5$ or 6 , then we will see in [Lemma 4.21](#) that there is a unique i such that $s'_{\ell-1}[h] + s'_{\ell-1}[i] = s_{\ell-1}(\theta) - 1$, and we again let $\mathcal{B}' = \mathcal{B} \setminus \{\varphi_{hi}\}$.

It remains to consider the cases where there is a loop of multiplicity one. The case of a switching loop is left to the next subsection. In the case of a lingering loop, we construct an independence exactly as in [Section 4.1](#). (See [Remark 4.18](#) for an explanation of how the algorithm for $g = 13$ is adapted to the cases where $g = 11$ or $g = 12$.) We now discuss the remaining case, where there is a decreasing loop.

Case 3: there is a decreasing loop γ_ℓ If $\ell \geq 8$ and $s_\ell[5] = 6$, then define z_1 and z_2 as in (22). If $\ell \leq 7$ and $s'_\ell[0] = -3$, then define z_1 and z_2 as in (23). Otherwise, define

$$z_1 = \begin{cases} \ell & \text{if } \ell < 6, \\ 5 & \text{if } \ell = 6, \\ 6 & \text{if } \ell > 6, \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad z_2 = \begin{cases} \ell - 1 & \text{if } \ell > 8, \\ 8 & \text{if } \ell = 8, \\ 7 & \text{if } \ell < 8. \end{cases}$$

If $\ell \geq 8$ and $s_\ell[5] = 6$ or $\ell \leq 7$ and $s_\ell[0] = -3$, then as above, we let $\psi \in \mathcal{B}$ be a function that is permissible on the second block, and let $\mathcal{B}' = \mathcal{B} \setminus \{\psi\}$. Otherwise, let h be the unique integer such that $s'_\ell[h] < s_\ell[h]$. If $\ell < 6$ or $\ell = 7, 8$ then γ_ℓ is the last loop in its block, and we will see in Lemma 4.21 that either there is a unique i such that $s_\ell[h] + s_\ell[i] = s_\ell(\theta)$, or $2s_\ell[h] = s_\ell(\theta) + 1$, but not both. In the first case, we let $\mathcal{B}' = \mathcal{B} \setminus \{\varphi_{hi}\}$, and in the second case, we let $\mathcal{B}' = \mathcal{B} \setminus \{\varphi_{hh}\}$. If $\ell > 8$ or $\ell = 6$, then we will see that either there is a unique i such that $s_\ell[h] + s_\ell[i] = s_{\ell-1}(\theta)$, or $2s_\ell[h] = s_{\ell-1}(\theta) + 1$. Again, in the first case, we let $\mathcal{B}' = \mathcal{B} \setminus \{\varphi_{hi}\}$, and in the second case, we let $\mathcal{B}' = \mathcal{B} \setminus \{\varphi_{hh}\}$.

In the cases above, we asserted several times that certain functions exist with specified slopes. To prove this, we need to generalize Proposition 4.7. We first define the function

$$\tau(k) = \sum_{i=0}^5 (s'_k[i] + 2 - i).$$

Note that, if there is a loop of positive multiplicity and γ_ℓ is the k^{th} loop of multiplicity zero, then $k = \tau(\ell)$. The following observation serves as the basis for our counting arguments.

Lemma 4.21 For a fixed k , suppose that $-2 \leq s'_k[i] \leq 5$ for all i . Let j be an integer such that $s'_k[j] - 1$ is not equal to -3 or $s'_k[i]$ for any i . For s in the range $2 \leq s \leq 5$, there does not exist i such that $s'_k[i] + s'_k[j] = s$ if and only if one of the following holds:

- (i) $\tau(k) = 10 - s$.
- (ii) $s = 5, j = 0$ and $s'_k[0] = -1$.
- (iii) $s = 2, j = 5$ and $s'_k[5] = 5$.
- (iv) $2s'_k[j] = s + 1$.

Proof The argument is identical to that of Proposition 4.7. □

There are additional relevant cases, when $s'_k[5] = 6$ or $s'_k[0] = -3$.

Lemma 4.22 If $s'_k[5] = 6$, then there does not exist i such that $s'_k[i] + 6 \leq 3$. Similarly, if $s_k[0] = -3$, then there does not exist i such that $s'_k[i] - 2 \geq 4$.

Proof Since $\rho = 1$, if $s'_k[5] = 6$, then $s'_k[0] \geq -2$. It follows that $s'_k[i] + 6 \geq 4$ for all i . Similarly, if $s_k[0] = -3$, then $s'_k[i] \leq 5$ for all i . It follows that $s'_k[i] - 2 \leq 3$ for all i . □

Lemma 4.23 *The set $\mathcal{B}'$ satisfies conditions (i)–(vi).*

Proof (i) If $s'_k[i] \geq s_k[i]$ for all i , then the result is immediate, so we may assume that γ_k is a decreasing loop. Let h be the unique integer such that $s'_k[h] = s_k[h] + 1$, and let h' be the unique integer such that $s'_k[h'] = s_k[h'] - 1$. If $\varphi_{hh'}$ is not permissible on γ_k , then again there is nothing to show. If $\varphi_{hh'}$ is permissible, then by Lemma 4.21, we must have $s_k(\theta) = 10 - k$. By construction, this occurs if and only if $k = 7$, in which case $\varphi_{hh'} \notin \mathcal{B}'$.

(ii) Consider the first block first. There are two functions $\psi \in \mathcal{B}$ with the property that $s'_{13-g}(\psi) = 4$. The result will therefore hold for the first block if and only if the first block contains a loop with no new permissible functions. Let γ_k be a loop of multiplicity zero that is contained in the first block. By Lemmas 4.21 and 4.22, there is no new permissible function on γ_k if and only if $\tau(k) = 6$ or $s'_k[0] = s_k[0] + 1 = -2$. Thus, the number of permissible functions in $\mathcal{B}$ on the first block is at most two more than the number of loops in Cases 2 or 3 when $\ell \leq 6$ and $s_\ell[0] \geq -2$, and one more than the number of loops in the remaining cases. In Cases 2 and 3 when $\ell \leq 6$ and $s_\ell[0] \geq -2$, the function in $\mathcal{B} \setminus \mathcal{B}'$ is permissible on the first block. Since this function is not in $\mathcal{B}'$, the number of functions in $\mathcal{B}'$ that are permissible on the first block is one less than the number in $\mathcal{B}$. The third block follows from a completely symmetric argument.

For the second block, note that if $\tau(z_1) = 6$, then there are 3 functions $\psi \in \mathcal{B}$ with the property that $s'_{z_1}(\psi) = 3$, and otherwise there are only two such functions. In every case, either $\tau(z_1) < 6$ or by Lemma 4.21, the second block contains a loop with no new permissible functions. Since the function in $\mathcal{B} \setminus \mathcal{B}'$ is permissible on the second block, we see that the number of permissible functions on the second block is one more than the number of loops. (Note that this holds even in the case where the second block contains zero loops, in which case there is exactly one permissible function on the second block.)

(iii) Suppose that $\varphi_{ij} \in \mathcal{B}$ is permissible on more than one block. First, consider the case where β_ℓ is a bridge of multiplicity one, and let h be the unique integer such that $s_\ell[h] = s_{\ell-1}[h] - 1$. If φ_{ij} is permissible on more than one block, then $j = h$ and either $s'_{\ell-1}[h] + s'_{\ell-1}[i] = s_{\ell-1}(\theta)$, or $i = h$ and $2s'_{\ell-1}[h] = s_{\ell-1}(\theta) + 1$. If $-2 \leq s_\ell[h] \leq 5$, then by Lemma 4.21, such an i exists if and only if $\ell \neq 5, 6$, and by construction, we have $\varphi_{hi} \notin \mathcal{B}'$. Similarly, if $s_\ell[h] = -3$, then by Lemma 4.22, such an i exists if and only if $\ell \geq 8$, and if $s_\ell[h] = 5$, then such an i exists if and only if $\ell \leq 7$. In both cases, we have $\varphi_{hi} \notin \mathcal{B}'$.

Next, consider the case where γ_ℓ is a decreasing loop. By construction, γ_ℓ is either the first or last loop in its block. Let h be the unique integer such that $s'_\ell[h] = s_\ell[h] - 1$. If γ_ℓ is the last loop in its block and φ_{ij} is permissible on both the block containing γ_ℓ and the next block, then $j = h$ and either $s_\ell[h] + s_\ell[i] = s_\ell(\theta)$, or $i = h$ and $2s_\ell[h] = s_\ell(\theta) + 1$. But then $\varphi_{ij} \notin \mathcal{B}'$. Similarly, if γ_ℓ is the first loop in its block, and φ_{ij} is permissible on both the block containing γ_ℓ and the preceding block, then $j = h$ and either $s_\ell[h] + s_\ell[i] = s_{\ell-1}(\theta)$, or $2s_\ell[h] = s_{\ell-1}(\theta) + 1$. If $\ell \neq 7$, then again $\varphi_{ij} \notin \mathcal{B}'$. Finally,

note that if γ_ℓ is *both* the first and last loop in its block, then $\ell = 7$, and the only functions φ_{ij} that are permissible on γ_7 satisfy $s'_\ell[i] + s'_\ell[j] = 3$. The result follows.

(iv) If γ_ℓ is a lingering loop, then we follow the construction of the vertex-avoiding case of the previous subsection, in which γ_ℓ is the last loop in its block.

(v) Let γ_k be a decreasing loop, let h be the unique integer such that $s'_k[h] = s_k[h] + 1$, and let h' be the unique integer such that $s'_k[h'] = s_k[h'] - 1$. If $\varphi_{hh'}$ is permissible, then $\varphi_{hh'} \notin \mathcal{B}'$, as shown in the proof of condition (i).

(vi) Let β_k be a decreasing bridge and let j is the unique value such that $s_k[j] < s'_{k-1}[j]$. If β_k is not a bridge between blocks, then by construction either $j = 0$, $k \leq 7$, and $s_k[0] = -3$, or $j = 5$, $k \geq 8$, and $s_k[5] = 5$. In both cases, by [Lemma 4.22](#), we see that there is no i such that $\varphi_{ij} \in \mathcal{B}'$ is permissible on γ_{k-1} . $\square$

This completes the proof of [Theorem 4.2](#) in all cases where there is no switching loop for Σ .

4.3 Switching loops

We now consider the case where there is a switching loop γ_ℓ that switches slope h . This means that $s_\ell[i] = s'_\ell[i]$ for all i , and there exists a function $\varphi \in R(D)$ satisfying

$$s_\ell(\varphi) = s_\ell[h] \quad \text{and} \quad s'_\ell(\varphi) = s'_\ell[h] + 1 = s'_\ell[h + 1].$$

In this case, we define z_1 and z_2 as follows:

$$z_1 = \begin{cases} \ell & \text{if } \ell < 6, \\ 5 & \text{if } \ell = 6, \\ 6 & \text{if } \ell > 6, \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad z_2 = \begin{cases} 7 & \text{if } \ell < 6, \\ \ell & \text{if } \ell \geq 6. \end{cases}$$

As in [Section 4.1](#), we will construct our independence θ to satisfy

$$s_k(\theta) = \begin{cases} 4 & \text{if } k \leq z_1, \\ 3 & \text{if } z_1 < k \leq z_2, \\ 2 & \text{if } z_2 < k \leq 13. \end{cases}$$

In the preceding cases, we identified functions $\varphi_i \in \Sigma$ with designated slope $s_k(\varphi_i) = s_k[i]$ along each bridge β_k . When there is a switching loop, this is possible for $i \neq h, h + 1$, but such a function does not necessarily exist for $i = h, h + 1$. Instead, we identify a collection of functions in Σ with designated slope along some of the bridges, and with slopes along the remaining bridges in a restricted range.

Proposition 4.24 *There is a pencil $W \subseteq V$ with φ_A , φ_B and φ_C in $\text{trop}(W)$ such that*

- (i) $s'_k(\varphi_A) = s'_k[h]$ for all $k < \ell$,
- (ii) $s_k(\varphi_B) = s_k[h + 1]$ for all $k > \ell$,
- (iii) $s_k(\varphi_C) = s_k[h + 1]$ for all $k \leq \ell$, and $s'_k(\varphi_C) = s_k[h]$ for all $k \geq \ell$,
- (iv) $s_k(\varphi_\bullet) \in \{s_k[h], s_k[h + 1]\}$ and $s'_k(\varphi_\bullet) \in \{s'_k[h], s'_k[h + 1]\}$ for all k .

Proof The proof is essentially the same as that of [19, Proposition 11.18]. We include the details for completeness. First, there exists $\varphi_A \in \Sigma$ such that $s'_{13-g}(\varphi_A) \leq s'_{13-g}[h]$ and $s_{14}(\varphi_A) \geq s_{14}[h]$. Since γ_ℓ is the only switching loop, we have $s'_k(\varphi_A) \leq s'_k[h]$ for $k < \ell$, and $s'_k(\varphi_A) \geq s'_k[h]$ for $k \geq \ell$. In particular, $s'_\ell(\varphi_A) \geq s'_\ell[h]$, so $s'_{\ell-1}(\varphi_A) \geq s'_{\ell-1}[h]$, and it follows that $s'_{\ell-1}(\varphi_A) = s'_{\ell-1}[h]$. This proves (i), because there are no switching loops to the left of γ_ℓ . The proof of (ii) is similar.

We now prove (iii). Given φ_A and φ_B in Σ satisfying (i) and (ii), choose f_A and $f_B \in V$ tropicalizing to φ_A and φ_B , respectively. Let W be the pencil spanned by f_A and f_B . Arguments similar to the proof of (i) above show that $s_k(\text{trop}(W)) = (s_k[h], s_k[h+1])$, for all k . Choose a function $f \in W$ such that $\varphi = \text{trop}(f)$ satisfies $s_\ell(\varphi) = s_\ell[h+1]$. Then $s_k(\varphi) = s_k[h+1]$ for $k < \ell$. Similarly, choose $\varphi' \in \text{trop}(W)$ such that $s'_\ell(\varphi') = s'_\ell[h]$, which implies that $s_k(\varphi') = s_k[h]$ for $k > \ell$. Finally, by adding a scalar to φ' , we may assume that φ and φ' agree on the loop γ_ℓ , and set $\varphi_C = \min\{\varphi, \varphi'\}$. $\square$

In three steps, we now construct a tropical independence among 20 pairwise sums of functions in

$$\mathcal{S} := \{\varphi_i : i \neq h, h+1\} \cup \{\varphi_A, \varphi_B, \varphi_C\}.$$

4.3.1 Step 1 First, we identify a collection of simpler functions in $R(D)$ that are not necessarily in Σ . Unlike φ_A and φ_B , these functions are completely explicit; they have fixed slopes at every point of the graph, rather than slopes in a restricted range. Moreover, these functions generate a tropical submodule containing φ_A , φ_B and φ_C .

Proposition 4.25 *There are functions φ_h^0 , φ_{h+1}^0 and φ_h^∞ in $R(D)$ such that:*

- (i) $s_k(\varphi_h^0) = s_k[h]$ and $s'_k(\varphi_h^0) = s'_k[h]$ for all k .
- (ii) $s_k(\varphi_{h+1}^0) = s_k[h+1]$ and $s'_k(\varphi_{h+1}^0) = s'_k[h+1]$ for all k .
- (iii) $s_k(\varphi_h^\infty) = s_k[h]$ and $s'_{k-1}(\varphi_h^\infty) = s'_{k-1}[h]$ for all $k \leq \ell$, and $s_k(\varphi_h^\infty) = s_k[h+1]$ and $s'_{k-1}(\varphi_h^\infty) = s'_{k-1}[h+1]$ for all $k > \ell$.
- (iv) The function φ_A is a tropical linear combination of the functions φ_h^0 and φ_h^∞ , where the two functions simultaneously achieve the minimum at a point to the right of γ_ℓ .
- (v) The function φ_B is a tropical linear combination of the functions φ_{h+1}^0 and φ_h^∞ , where the two functions simultaneously achieve the minimum at a point to the left of γ_ℓ .
- (vi) The function φ_C is a tropical linear combination of the functions φ_h^0 and φ_{h+1}^0 , where the two functions simultaneously achieve the minimum on the loop γ_ℓ where they agree.

Proof The construction of the functions is essentially the same as in [19, Lemmas 11.7 and 11.19], but we describe the essential argument here, for the reader's convenience. To construct φ_h^∞ , consider a function that agrees with φ_A to the left of γ_ℓ and with φ_B to the right. Because the two functions agree on γ_ℓ , they “glue” together to give a function in $R(D)$. The construction of the other two functions is similar. The verification that φ_A , φ_B and φ_C are tropical linear combinations as claimed is the same as in [19, Lemmas 11.8 and 11.19]. $\square$

4.3.2 Step 2 Next, we choose a set $\mathcal{B}''$ of 20 pairwise sums of functions in

$$\mathcal{A} := \{\varphi_i : i \neq h, h+1\} \cup \{\varphi_h^0, \varphi_{h+1}^0, \varphi_h^\infty\}$$

that satisfies conditions (i)–(vi) of [Section 4.2](#). We will choose this set so that, moreover, the independence θ produced by the algorithm from [Section 4.2](#) satisfies a technical condition involving the best approximations of θ by certain functions in $R(D)$ that are not in the set ([Lemma 4.30](#)).

Start with the set $\mathcal{B}$ of pairwise sums of elements in $\mathcal{A} \setminus \{\varphi_h^\infty\}$. Note that $|\mathcal{B}| = 21$. As a first step toward specifying $\mathcal{B}''$, we choose one function $\psi \in \mathcal{B}$, of the form $\varphi_i + \varphi_j$ for $i, j \neq h, h+1$, to exclude. If $\ell \leq 7$ and $\ell \neq 6$, let ψ be such a function that is permissible on the second block. If $\ell = 6$, let $\psi \in \mathcal{B}$ be a function that is permissible on the first block. Otherwise, if $\ell > 7$, let $\psi \in \mathcal{B}$ be a function that is permissible on the third block. This choice of ψ guarantees that the number of functions in $\mathcal{B}' := \mathcal{B} \setminus \{\psi\}$ that are permissible on each block is one more than the number of loops in that block. In order to ensure a certain technical condition in the next step ([Lemma 4.30](#)), in the cases where there is some j such that $s'_\ell[h+1] + s'_\ell[j] = s_\ell(\theta) + 1$, we adjust $\mathcal{B}'$ by removing one more function and replacing it with $\varphi_h^\infty + \varphi$ for some $\varphi \in \mathcal{A}$.

Suppose there is some $\varphi \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{\varphi_h^\infty\}$ such that $s'_\ell[h+1] + s'_\ell(\varphi) = s_\ell(\theta) + 1$. Then we define

$$\mathcal{B}'' := \mathcal{B} \cup \{\varphi_h^\infty + \varphi\} \setminus \{\varphi_h^0 + \varphi\}.$$

Otherwise, if there is no such φ , let $\mathcal{B}'' := \mathcal{B}'$.

Lemma 4.26 *The set $\mathcal{B}''$ satisfies conditions (i)–(vi) of [Section 4.2](#), and therefore the algorithm in [Section 4.2](#) produces an independence θ among the functions in $\mathcal{B}''$ with slopes $s_\ell(\theta)$ as specified above.*

Proof We first prove (i). First, note that, for any function $\varphi \in \mathcal{A}$, the functions $\varphi + \varphi_h^0, \varphi + \varphi_{h+1}^0$ have identical restrictions to the switching loop γ_ℓ . Because these two functions have different slopes along β_ℓ and $\beta_{\ell+1}$, however, we see that they cannot both be permissible on γ_ℓ . In the case where $\varphi_h^\infty + \varphi \in \mathcal{B}''$, we see that the restriction of this function to a loop γ_k with $k \geq \ell$ agrees with that of the function $\varphi_{h+1}^0 + \varphi$. We note, however, that since $s'_\ell[h+1] + s'_\ell(\varphi) = s_\ell(\theta) + 1$, the function $\varphi_{h+1}^0 + \varphi$ is not permissible on the loop γ_k if $k \geq \ell$.

If $\mathcal{B}'' = \mathcal{B}'$, then condition (ii) holds by the same argument as [Lemma 4.10](#). Otherwise, note that the function in $\mathcal{B}'' \setminus \mathcal{B}'$ is permissible on the same block as the function in $\mathcal{B}' \setminus \mathcal{B}''$, so condition (ii) still holds. Condition (iii) holds because the slopes functions in $\mathcal{A}$ do not decrease from one bridge to the next. Conditions (iv)–(vi) hold vacuously. By [Proposition 4.20](#), therefore, there is an independence ϑ among the functions in $\mathcal{B}''$. $\square$

4.3.3 Step 3 Finally, we choose a set $\mathcal{T}$ of 20 pairwise sums of functions in $\mathcal{S}$ and show that the best approximation of the θ by $\mathcal{T}$, defined as follows, is an independence.

Definition 4.27 Let $\mathcal{T}$ be a finite subset of $\text{PL}(\Gamma)$. The *best approximation* of $\theta \in \text{PL}(\Gamma)$ by $\mathcal{T}$ is

$$(24) \quad \vartheta_{\mathcal{T}} := \min\{\varphi - c(\varphi, \theta) : \varphi \in \mathcal{T}\},$$

where $c(\varphi, \theta) = \min\{\varphi(v) - \theta(v) : v \in \Gamma\}$.

Note that $\vartheta_{\mathcal{T}} \geq \theta$, and every function $\varphi \in \mathcal{T}$ achieves the minimum at some point.

Lemma 4.28 Let $\theta = \min_{\psi \in \mathcal{B}''} \{\psi + a_{\psi}\}$. Suppose $\varphi = \min_{\psi' \in \mathcal{C}} \{\psi' + b_{\psi'}\}$, where $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathcal{B}''$. Then the best approximation of θ by φ achieves equality on the entire region where some $\psi' \in \mathcal{C}$ achieves the minimum in θ .

Proof Let $c = \min_{\psi' \in \mathcal{C}} \{b_{\psi'} - a_{\psi'}\}$. Choose $\psi' \in \mathcal{C}$ such that $c = b_{\psi'} - a_{\psi'}$. Then $\varphi - c \geq \theta$, with equality at points where ψ' achieves the minimum in θ . $\square$

We now study the best approximation of θ by various pairwise sums of function in $\mathcal{S}$.

Lemma 4.29 Let $\varphi \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{\varphi_h^{\infty}\}$. The best approximation of θ by $\varphi_{\mathcal{C}} + \varphi$ achieves equality on the region where either $\varphi_h^0 + \varphi$ or $\varphi_{h+1}^0 + \varphi$ achieves the minimum.

Proof If $\mathcal{B}''$ contains both $\varphi_h^0 + \varphi$ and $\varphi_{h+1}^0 + \varphi$, then since $\varphi_{\mathcal{C}} + \varphi$ is a tropical linear combination of these two functions, the result follows from [Lemma 4.28](#). If not, then by construction $\mathcal{B}''$ does not contain $\varphi_h^0 + \varphi$, and $s'_{\ell}[h+1] + s'_{\ell}(\varphi) = s_{\ell}(\theta) + 1$. In this case, $\varphi_{\mathcal{C}} + \varphi$ has slope greater than $s_{\ell}(\theta)$ on β_{ℓ} , so it must achieve equality to the left of γ_{ℓ} , where it agrees with $\varphi_{h+1}^0 + \varphi$. $\square$

Lemma 4.30 Let $\varphi \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{\varphi_h^{\infty}\}$. If $\varphi_h^{\infty} + \varphi \notin \mathcal{B}''$, then the best approximation of θ by $\varphi_h^{\infty} + \varphi$ achieves equality on the region where either $\varphi_h^0 + \varphi$ or $\varphi_{h+1}^0 + \varphi$ achieves the minimum.

Proof If $\varphi_h^0 + \varphi$ is assigned to a loop γ_k with $k < \ell$, then since $\varphi_h^{\infty} \geq \varphi_h^0$ with equality to the left of γ_{ℓ} , we see that the best approximation of θ by $\varphi_h^{\infty} + \varphi$ achieves equality on the region where $\varphi_h^0 + \varphi$ achieves the minimum. Similarly, if $\varphi_{h+1}^0 + \varphi$ is assigned to a loop γ_k with $k \geq \ell$, then the best approximation of θ by $\varphi_h^{\infty} + \varphi$ achieves equality on the region where $\varphi_{h+1}^0 + \varphi$ achieves the minimum. It therefore suffices to consider the case where $\varphi_h^0 + \varphi$ is not assigned to a loop γ_k with $k < \ell$, but $\varphi_{h+1}^0 + \varphi$ is. By [Lemma 4.21](#), on every loop γ_k in the same block as γ_{ℓ} with $k < \ell$, there is a departing function. It follows that

$$s_{\ell}[h+1] + s_{\ell}(\varphi) \geq s_{\ell}(\theta) + 1.$$

Since $\varphi_h^0 + \varphi$ is not assigned to a loop γ_k with $k < \ell$, we must have equality in the expression above. By construction, in this case $\varphi_h^{\infty} + \varphi \in \mathcal{B}''$. $\square$

Remark 4.31 It is possible that the best approximation of θ by $\varphi_C + \varphi$ achieves equality on *both* the region where $\varphi_h^0 + \varphi$ achieves the minimum and the region where $\varphi_{h+1}^0 + \varphi$ achieves the minimum. However, the set of independences is open in the set of all tropical linear combinations. In other words, if the coefficients are varied in a sufficiently small neighborhood, the result is still an independence. One can therefore choose the independence θ to rule out this possibility.

We now describe our choice of the set $\mathcal{T}$. We will define sets $\mathcal{T}_j$ and $\mathcal{T}'$ below, and define

$$\mathcal{T} = \{\varphi_{ij} \in \mathcal{B}'' : i, j \neq h, h+1\} \cup \left(\bigcup_{j \neq h, h+1} \mathcal{T}_j \right) \cup \mathcal{T}'.$$

For $j \neq h, h+1$, if the best approximation of θ by $\varphi_C + \varphi_j$ achieves equality where $\varphi_h^0 + \varphi_j$ achieves the minimum, let $\mathcal{T}_j = \{\varphi_B + \varphi_j, \varphi_C + \varphi_j\}$. Otherwise, if the best approximation of θ by $\varphi_C + \varphi_j$ achieves equality where $\varphi_{h+1}^0 + \varphi_j$ achieves the minimum, then let $\mathcal{T}_j = \{\varphi_A + \varphi_j, \varphi_C + \varphi_j\}$.

Similarly, we define $\mathcal{T}'$ to be a set of three pairwise sums of elements of $\{\varphi_A, \varphi_B, \varphi_C\}$, with our choice depending on where certain functions achieve equality in the best approximation. In all cases, $\varphi_C + \varphi_C \in \mathcal{T}'$. The other functions in $\mathcal{T}'$ are determined by the following rules:

- If the best approximation of θ by $\varphi_C + \varphi_C$ achieves equality at a point to the left of γ_ℓ , then $\varphi_A + \varphi_C \in \mathcal{T}'$. Otherwise, $\varphi_B + \varphi_C \in \mathcal{T}'$.
- Suppose $\varphi_A + \varphi_C \in \mathcal{T}'$. If the best approximation of θ by $\varphi_A + \varphi_C$ achieves equality at a point to the left of γ_ℓ , then $\varphi_A + \varphi_A \in \mathcal{T}'$. Otherwise, $\varphi_A + \varphi_B \in \mathcal{T}'$.
- Suppose $\varphi_B + \varphi_C \in \mathcal{T}'$. If the best approximation of θ by $\varphi_B + \varphi_C$ achieves equality at a point to the left of γ_ℓ , then $\varphi_A + \varphi_B \in \mathcal{T}'$. Otherwise, $\varphi_B + \varphi_B \in \mathcal{T}'$.

Theorem 4.32 *The best approximation $\vartheta_{\mathcal{T}}$ is an independence, and $\vartheta_{\mathcal{T}} = \theta$ as functions.*

Proof We show that there is a bijection $F: \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}''$ with the property that each $\psi \in \mathcal{T}$ achieves the minimum in $\vartheta_{\mathcal{T}}$ on exactly the same region where $F(\psi)$ achieves the minimum in θ . From this it follows that $\vartheta_{\mathcal{T}}$ is an independence, and that $\vartheta_{\mathcal{T}} = \theta$.

For $i, j \neq h, h+1$, we set $F(\varphi_{ij}) = \varphi_{ij}$. Next, consider a value $j \neq h, h+1$. We describe the restriction of F to the subset $\mathcal{T}_j$. The restriction of F to $\mathcal{T}'$ admits a similar description. By [Lemma 4.29](#), the best approximation of θ by $\varphi_C + \varphi_j$ achieves equality on the region where either $\varphi_h^0 + \varphi_j$ or $\varphi_{h+1}^0 + \varphi_j$ achieves the minimum (but not both, see [Remark 4.31](#)). If it achieves equality on the region where $\varphi_h^0 + \varphi_j$ achieves the minimum, set $F(\varphi_C + \varphi_j) = \varphi_h^0 + \varphi_j$. Otherwise, set $F(\varphi_C + \varphi_j) = \varphi_{h+1}^0 + \varphi_j$.

Suppose that $F(\varphi_C + \varphi_j) = \varphi_{h+1}^0 + \varphi_j$. The case where $F(\varphi_C + \varphi_j) = \varphi_h^0 + \varphi_j$ follows from a similar (in fact, simpler) argument. Since φ_C agrees with φ_{h+1}^0 at points on or to the left of γ_ℓ , we have $\varphi_A + \varphi_j \in \mathcal{T}$. If $\varphi_h^\infty + \varphi_j \in \mathcal{B}''$, then we set $F(\varphi_A + \varphi_j) = \varphi_h^\infty + \varphi_j$. In this case, we have $s'_\ell[h] + s'_\ell[j] = s_\ell(\theta)$. Since

γ_ℓ is the last loop in its block, we see that the slope of $\varphi_A + \varphi_j$ is greater than that of θ on the right half of $\beta_{\ell+1}$. Thus, the best approximation of θ by $\varphi_A + \varphi_j$ must achieve equality to the left of $\beta_{\ell+1}$, where $\varphi_A + \varphi_j$ agrees with $\varphi_h^\infty + \varphi_j$.

If $\varphi_h^\infty + \varphi_j \notin B''$, then set $F(\varphi_A + \varphi_j) = \varphi_h^0 + \varphi_j$, and consider the best approximation θ' of θ by $B'' \cup \{\varphi_h^\infty + \varphi_j\}$. Note that the coefficient of $\varphi_A + \varphi_j$ is the same in the best approximation of θ' by $\varphi_A + \varphi_j$ and the best approximation of θ by $\varphi_A + \varphi_j$. By Lemma 4.30, $\varphi_h^\infty + \varphi_j$ achieves equality in θ' on the region where either $\varphi_h^0 + \varphi_j$ or $\varphi_{h+1}^0 + \varphi_j$ achieves the minimum in θ . Then, since φ_A is a linear combination of φ_h^0 and φ_h^∞ , by Lemma 4.28, it follows that the best approximation of θ by $\varphi_A + \varphi_j$ achieves equality on the region where either $\varphi_h^0 + \varphi_j$ or $\varphi_{h+1}^0 + \varphi_j$ achieves the minimum. But φ_A and φ_C do not agree at any point to the left of γ_ℓ , so the best approximation of θ by $\varphi_A + \varphi_j$ must achieve equality on the region where either $\varphi_h^0 + \varphi_j$ achieves the minimum. $\square$

5 Effectivity of the virtual class

Recall that $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{13}$ is an open substack of the moduli stack of stable curves, and $\widetilde{\mathfrak{G}}_d^r$ is a stack of generalized limit linear series of rank r and degree d over $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{13}$. There is a morphism of vector bundles $\phi: \text{Sym}^2(\mathcal{E}) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$ over $\widetilde{\mathfrak{G}}_d^r$, whose degeneracy locus is denoted by $\mathfrak{U}$.

The case of Theorem 4.2 where $g = 13$ shows that the pushforward $\sigma_*[\mathfrak{U}]^{\text{virt}}$ under the proper forgetful map $\sigma: \widetilde{\mathfrak{G}}_d^r \rightarrow \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_g$ is a divisor, not just a divisor class. In our proof that $\sigma_*[\mathfrak{U}]^{\text{virt}}$ is effective, we will use the additional cases where $g = 11$ or 12 . Theorem 4.2 implies the following result.

Theorem 5.1 *Let X be a general curve of genus $g \in \{11, 12, 13\}$, and let $p \in X$ be a general point. Let $V \subseteq H^0(X, L)$ be a linear series of degree 16 and rank 5. Assume that*

- (i) *if $g = 12$, then $a_1^V(p) \geq 2$, and*
- (ii) *if $g = 11$, then either $a_1^V(p) \geq 3$, or $a_0^V(p) + a_2^V(p) \geq 5$.*

Then the multiplication map $\phi_V: \text{Sym}^2 V \rightarrow H^0(X, L^{\otimes 2})$ is surjective.

We now prove that $\mathfrak{U}$ is generically finite over each component of $\sigma_*[\mathfrak{U}]^{\text{virt}}$, which implies that $\sigma_*[\mathfrak{U}]^{\text{virt}}$ is effective. Our argument follows closely that of [19, Section 12]. Indeed, several of the lemmas and propositions along the way are identical, and we omit those proofs. As in [19, Section 12], we suppose that $Z \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{13}$ is an irreducible divisor and that $\sigma|_{\mathfrak{U}}$ has positive-dimensional fibers over the generic point of Z . Let $j_2: \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{2,1} \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{13}$ be the map obtained by attaching an arbitrary pointed curve of genus 2 to a fixed general pointed curve (X, p) of genus 11. Since $g = 13$ is odd, by [19, Proposition 2.2], it suffices to show the following:

- (a) Z is the closure of a divisor in $\mathcal{M}_{13}$,
- (b) $j_2^*(Z) = 0$, and
- (c) Z does not contain any codimension 2 stratum $\Delta_{2,j}$.

The only irreducible boundary divisors in $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{13}$ are Δ_0° and Δ_1° . Therefore, item (a), that Z is the closure of a divisor in $\mathcal{M}_{13}$, is a consequence of the following.

Proposition 5.2 *The image of the degeneracy locus $\mathfrak{U}$ does not contain Δ_0° or Δ_1° .*

Proof The proof is identical to [19, Proposition 12.3]. □

The proofs of (b) and (c) use the following lemma.

Lemma 5.3 *If $[X] \in Z$ and $p \in X$, then there is a linear series $V \in G_{16}^5(X)$ that is ramified at p such that ϕ_V is not surjective.*

Proof The proof is identical to [19, Lemma 12.4]. □

5.1 Pulling back to $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{2,1}$

In order to verify (b), we consider the preimage of Z under the map j_2 .

Lemma 5.4 *The preimage $j_2^{-1}(Z)$ is contained in the Weierstrass divisor $\overline{\mathcal{W}}_2$ in $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{2,1}$.*

Proof The proof is identical to [19, Lemma 12.5]. □

To prove that $j_2^*(Z) = 0$, we consider the following construction. Let Γ be a chain of 13 loops with the following restrictions on edge lengths:

- (i) $m_2 = \ell_2$ (that is, the second loop has torsion index 2),
- (ii) $n_3 \gg n_2$, and
- (iii) $\ell_{k+1} \ll m_k \ll \ell_k \ll n_{k+1} \ll n_k$ for all $k \neq 2$.

The last condition says that, subject to the constraints of conditions (i) and (ii), the edge lengths otherwise satisfy (20). Let X be a smooth curve of genus 13 over K whose skeleton is Γ . We first note the following.

Lemma 5.5 *If $[X] \notin Z$, then $j_2^*(Z) = 0$.*

Proof This proof is identical to the first part of the proof of [19, Proposition 12.6]. □

Proposition 5.6 *We have $j_2^*(Z) = 0$.*

Proof By Lemma 5.5, it suffices to show that $[X] \notin Z$. We divide Γ into two subgraphs $\widetilde{\Gamma}'$ and $\widetilde{\Gamma}$, to the left and right, respectively, of the midpoint of the long bridge β_3 . Let $q \in X$ be a point specializing to v_{14} . If $[X] \in Z$, by Lemma 5.3 there is a linear series in the degeneracy locus over X that is ramified at q . We now show that this is impossible.

Let $\ell = (L, V) \in G_{16}^5(X)$ be a linear series ramified at q . We may assume that $L = \mathcal{O}(D_X)$, where $D = \text{Trop}(D_X)$ is a break divisor, and consider $\Sigma = \text{trop}(V)$. We will show that there are 20 tropically independent pairwise sums of functions in Σ using a variant of the arguments in [Section 4](#). It follows that the multiplication map ϕ_ℓ is surjective, and hence $[X]$ cannot be in Z .

To produce 20 tropically independent pairwise sums of functions in Σ , following the methods of [Section 4](#), we first consider the slope sequence along the long bridge β_3 . First, suppose that either $s_3[4] \leq 2$ or $s_3[3] + s_3[5] \leq 5$. In this case, even though the restriction of Σ to $\tilde{\Gamma}$ is not the tropicalization of a linear series on a pointed curve of genus 11 with prescribed ramification, it satisfies all of the combinatorial properties of the tropicalization of such a linear series. The proof of [Theorem 4.2](#) then goes through verbatim, yielding a tropical linear combination of 20 functions in Σ such that each function achieves the minimum uniquely at some point of $\tilde{\Gamma} \subseteq \Gamma$.

For the remainder of the proof, we therefore assume that $s_3[4] \geq 3$ and $s_3[3] + s_3[5] \geq 6$. Since $\deg D|_{\tilde{\Gamma}'} = 5$, we see that $s_3[5] \leq 5$. Moreover, since the divisor $D|_{\tilde{\Gamma}'} - s_3[4]w_2$ has positive rank on $\tilde{\Gamma}'$, and no divisor of degree one on $\tilde{\Gamma}'$ has positive rank, $s_3[4]$ must be exactly 3. Since the canonical class is the only divisor class of degree two and rank one on $\tilde{\Gamma}'$, we see that $D|_{\tilde{\Gamma}'} \sim K_{\tilde{\Gamma}'} + 3w_2$. This yields an upper bound on each of the slopes $s_3[i]$, and these bounds determine the slopes for $i \geq 2$:

$$s_3[5] = 5, \quad s_3[4] = 3, \quad s_3[3] = 1, \quad s_3[2] = 0.$$

Moreover, we must have $s'_2[i] = s_3[i]$ for $2 \leq i \leq 5$. Since ℓ is ramified at q , we also have $s_{14}[5] \geq 6$. These conditions together imply that the sum of the multiplicities of all loops and bridges on $\tilde{\Gamma}$ is at most one.

To construct an independence on Γ , we first construct an independence among 5 functions on $\tilde{\Gamma}'$. This is done exactly as in [\[19, Figure 39\]](#), and we omit the details.

Next, we construct an independence among 15 pairwise sums of functions in Σ restricted to $\tilde{\Gamma}$, with the property that any function ψ that obtains the minimum on $\tilde{\Gamma}$ satisfies $s'_2(\psi) \leq 4$. Note that each of the functions ψ that obtains the minimum on $\tilde{\Gamma}'$ satisfies $s_3(\psi) \geq 5$. Since the bridge β_3 is very long, it follows that no function that obtains the minimum on one of the two subgraphs can obtain the minimum on the other. Thus, we have constructed a tropical linear combination of 20 pairwise sums of functions in Σ in which 5 achieve the minimum uniquely at some point of $\tilde{\Gamma}'$ and 15 achieve the minimum uniquely at some point of $\tilde{\Gamma}$. In particular, this is an independence, as required.

It remains to construct an independence among 15 pairwise sums of functions in Σ restricted to $\tilde{\Gamma}$. To do this, we run the algorithm from [\[19\]](#), with one change. (Indeed, one could imagine that Γ is simply the first 13 loops in a chain of 23 loops; we construct the independence from [\[19, Section 12.3\]](#), and restrict it to Γ .) At the start, we skip the step named “start at the first bridge”. Instead, we do not assign any function ψ with $s_3(\psi) \geq 5$, and we start with the loop subroutine applied to γ_3 . Following this construction, there will only be two blocks, and there will be two functions with slope 2 along the last

bridge β_{14} . We eliminate one of these functions from $\mathcal{B}$, and assign the other to β_{14} . The rest of the argument is exactly the same as that of [19]. $\square$

5.2 Higher-codimension boundary strata

It remains to verify (c), that Z does not contain any of the codimension 2 boundary strata $\Delta_{2,j} \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{13}$.

Proposition 5.7 *The component Z does not contain any codimension 2 stratum $\Delta_{2,j}$.*

Proof The proof is again a variation on the independence constructions from the proof of Theorem 4.2. We fix $\ell = 11 - j$. Let Y_1 be a smooth curve of genus 2 over K whose skeleton Γ_1 is a chain of 2 loops with bridges, and let $p \in Y_1$ be a point specializing to the right endpoint of Γ_1 . Similarly, let Y_2 and Y_3 be smooth curves of genus ℓ and j , respectively, whose skeletons Γ_2 and Γ_3 , are chains of ℓ loops and j loops with edge lengths satisfying (20). Suppose further that the edges in the final loop of Γ_2 are much longer than those in the first loop of Γ_3 . Let $p, q \in Y_2$ be points specializing to the left and right endpoints of Γ_2 , respectively, and let $q \in Y_3$ be a point specializing to the left endpoint of Γ_3 . We show that $[Y'] = [Y_1 \cup_p Y_2 \cup_q Y_3] \in \Delta_{2,j}$ is not contained in Z .

As in the proof of [19, Proposition 12.6], if $[Y'] \in Z$, then Z contains points $[X]$ corresponding to smooth curves whose skeletons are arbitrarily close to the skeleton of Y' in the natural topology on $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{13}^{\text{trop}}$. In particular, there is an $X \in Z$ with skeleton a chain of loops Γ_X whose edge lengths satisfy all the conditions of (20), except that the bridges β_3 and β_ℓ are exceedingly long in comparison to the other edges. Let Γ be the subgraph of Γ_X to the right of the midpoint of the bridge β_3 . Note that Γ is a chain of 11 loops, labeled $\gamma_3, \dots, \gamma_{13}$, with bridges labeled $\beta_3, \dots, \beta_{14}$.

By Lemma 5.3, there is a linear series V of degree 16 and rank 5 on X that is ramified at a point x specializing to the right-hand endpoint v_{14} , and such that ϕ_V is not surjective. We will show that this is not possible, using the tropical independence construction from Section 4. Let $\Sigma = \text{trop}(V)$. We have that either $s'_2[4] \leq 2$ or $s'_2[3] + s'_2[4] \leq 5$. Also, since V is ramified at x , we have $s_{14}[5] \geq 6$. These conditions imply that the multiplicity of every loop and bridge is zero. In particular, for each i there is a function φ_i satisfying

$$s_k(\varphi_i) = s'_{k-1}(\varphi_i) = s_k[i] = s'_{k-1}[i] \quad \text{for all } k.$$

These functions have constant slope along bridges, and the slopes $s_k(\varphi_i)$ are nondecreasing in k . These properties guarantee that, even though the bridge β_ℓ is very long, a function φ_{ij} can only obtain the minimum on a loop or bridge where it is permissible.

Even though the restriction of Σ to Γ is not the tropicalization of a linear series on a curve of genus 11 with prescribed ramification at two specified points specializing to the left and right endpoints of Γ , it satisfies all of the combinatorial properties of the tropicalization of such a linear series, and we may apply the algorithm from Section 4. Because we are in a situation where the relative lengths of the bridges do not matter (Remark 4.17) the construction yields an independence among 20 pairwise sums of functions in Σ , and the proposition follows. $\square$

6 The Bertram–Feinberg–Mukai conjecture in genus 13

The aim of this section is to prove the existence part of the Bertram–Feinberg–Mukai conjecture on $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{13}$. For a smooth curve X of genus g , we denote by $\mathrm{SU}_X(2, \omega)$ the moduli space of S -equivalence classes of semistable rank-two vector bundles E on X with $\det(E) \cong \omega_X$. For an integer $k \geq 0$, the Brill–Noether locus

$$\mathrm{SU}_X(2, \omega, k) := \{E \in \mathrm{SU}_X(2, \omega) : h^0(X, E) \geq k\}$$

has the structure of a Lagrangian degeneracy locus and each component of $\mathrm{SU}_X(2, \omega, k)$ has dimension at least

$$\beta(2, g, k) = 3g - 3 - \binom{k+1}{2};$$

see [38]. Furthermore, $\mathrm{SU}_X(2, \omega, k)$ is smooth of dimension $\beta(2, g, k)$ at a point $[E]$ corresponding to a stable vector bundle if and only if the Mukai–Petri map (1) is injective. Of particular interest to us is the case

$$g = 13 \quad \text{and} \quad k = 8,$$

in which case $\beta(2, 13, 8) = 0$. First, using linkage methods, we show that a general curve of genus 13 carries a stable vector bundle $E \in \mathrm{SU}_X(2, \omega, 8)$. Then using a Hecke correspondence, we compute the fundamental class of $\mathrm{SU}_X(2, \omega, 8)$.

Theorem 6.1 *A general curve X of genus 13 carries a stable vector bundle E of rank two with $\det E \cong \omega_X$ and $h^0(X, E) = 8$.*

As a first step towards proving Theorem 6.1, we determine the extension type of the vector bundles in question.

Proposition 6.2 *For a general curve X of genus 13, every vector bundle $E \in \mathrm{SU}_X(2, \omega, 8)$ can be represented as an extension*

$$(25) \quad 0 \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X(D) \rightarrow E \rightarrow \omega_X(-D) \rightarrow 0,$$

where D is an effective divisor of degree 6 on X , such that $L := \omega_X(-D) \in W_{18}^6(X)$ is very ample and the map $\phi_L : \mathrm{Sym}^2 H^0(X, L) \rightarrow H^0(X, L^{\otimes 2})$ is not surjective. Conversely, a very ample $L \in W_{18}^6(X)$ with ϕ_L not surjective induces a stable vector bundle $E \in \mathrm{SU}_X(2, \omega, 8)$.

Proof Using a result of Segre — see [39] or [33, Proposition 3.1] for modern proofs — every semistable vector bundle E on X of rank two and canonical determinant carries a line subbundle $\mathcal{O}_X(D) \hookrightarrow E$ with $\deg D \geq \frac{1}{2}(g-2)$. Therefore, in our case $\deg D \geq 6$.

If $h^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(D)) \geq 2$, since $h^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(D)) + h^0(X, \omega_X(-D)) \geq h^0(X, E) = 8$ it follows from the Brill–Noether theorem and Riemann–Roch that $\deg D = 8$, hence $\omega_X(-D) \in W_{16}^5(X)$. It follows that the extension (25) lies in the kernel of the map

$$\mathrm{Ext}^1(\omega_X(-D), D) \rightarrow H^0(\omega_X(-D))^{\vee} \otimes H^1(D).$$

This implies that the multiplication map $\phi_{\omega_X(-D)}: \text{Sym}^2 H^0(X, \omega_X(-D)) \rightarrow H^0(X, \omega_X^{\otimes 2}(-2D))$ is not surjective, which contradicts [Theorem 1.5](#). Therefore $h^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(D)) = 1$, in which case necessarily $\deg D = 6$ and $h^0(X, E) = h^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(D)) + h^0(X, \omega_X(-D))$. Setting $L := \omega_X(-D) \in W_{18}^6(X)$, an extension E satisfies $h^0(X, E) = 8$ if and only if the extension class of E in $\text{Ext}^1(L, D)$ lies in the kernel of the linear map

$$\text{Ext}^1(L, D) \rightarrow H^0(L)^\vee \otimes H^1(D).$$

Thus, an extension [\(25\)](#) exists if and only if the multiplication map

$$\phi_L: \text{Sym}^2 H^0(L) \rightarrow H^0(X, L^{\otimes 2}) \cong \text{Ext}^1(L, D)^\vee$$

is not surjective. We claim that L is very ample. Otherwise, there exist points $x, y \in X$ such that $L' := L(-x - y) \in W_{16}^5(X)$. Since X is general, by [Theorem 1.5](#) the multiplication map

$$\phi_{L'}: \text{Sym}^2 H^0(X, L') \rightarrow H^0(X, (L')^{\otimes 2})$$

is surjective, implying the inclusion $H^0(X, (L')^{\otimes 2}(x + y)) \subseteq \text{Im}(\phi_{L'})$. We deduce that $[E]$ lies in the kernel of the map

$$\text{Ext}^1(L, D) \rightarrow \text{Ext}^1(L(-x - y), D).$$

That is, the vector bundle E can also be represented as an extension

$$0 \rightarrow L(-x - y) \rightarrow E \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X(D + x + y) \rightarrow 0,$$

thus contradicting the semistability of E . We conclude that L has to be very ample.

Conversely, each *very ample* linear system $L \in W_{18}^6(X)$, for which the map ϕ_L is not surjective induces a stable vector bundle E ; see also [\[14, 7.2\]](#). Indeed, let us assume E is not semistable. In view of the extension [\(25\)](#), a maximally destabilizing line subbundle of E is of the form $L(-M)$, where M is an effective divisor on X with $\deg M \leq 6$. Therefore, apart from [\(25\)](#), E can also be realized as an extension

$$0 \rightarrow L(-M) \rightarrow E \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X(D + M) \rightarrow 0.$$

By applying Riemann–Roch, one can then write

$$h^0(X, L(-M)) + h^1(X, L(-M)) = h^0(X, L) + h^1(X, L) - 2 \dim \frac{H^0(X, L)}{H^0(X, L(-M))} + \deg(M).$$

Since

$$h^0(X, L) + h^1(X, L) = h^0(X, E) \leq h^0(X, L(-M)) + h^1(X, L(-M)),$$

it follows that

$$\deg M \geq 2 \dim \frac{H^0(L)}{H^0(L(-M))}.$$

Since L is very ample, we find $\deg M \in \{4, 5, 6\}$. In each case, the Brill–Noether number of $L(-M)$ is negative, contradicting the generality of X . Therefore E is stable. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 6.1 By Proposition 6.2, it suffices to show that for a general curve X of genus 13, there exists a very ample linear system $L \in W_{18}^6(X)$ such that ϕ_L is not surjective. We use a method inspired by Verra's proof [47] of the unirationality of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{14}$. To illustrate the idea behind the proof, first suppose that there exists an embedding $\varphi_L: X \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}^6$ given by $L \in W_{18}^6(X)$, such that the map ϕ_L is not surjective. In particular, $X \subseteq \mathbb{P}^6$ lies on at least $5 = \binom{8}{2} - h^0(X, L^{\otimes 2}) - 1$ quadrics. We expect the base locus of this system of quadrics to be a reducible curve (of degree 32), containing X as a component and accordingly write

$$X + C = \text{Bs } |\mathcal{I}_{X/\mathbb{P}^6}(2)|.$$

Assuming that X and C intersect transversally, we obtain that $X + C$ is a complete intersection curve in $\mathbb{P}^6$. Therefore C is a curve of degree $14 = 2^5 - \deg(X)$ and applying the adjunction formula $2g(X) - 2g(C) = (10 - 7)(\deg(X) - \deg(C)) = 12$ (see for instance [47, page 1429]), we obtain $g(C) = 7$.

We now reverse this procedure and start with a general curve $C \subseteq \mathbb{P}^6$ of genus 7 embedded by a 7-dimensional linear system $V \subseteq H^0(C, L_C)$, where $L_C \in \text{Pic}^{14}(C)$ is a general line bundle, therefore $h^0(C, L_C) = 8$. Consider the multiplication map

$$\phi_V: \text{Sym}^2(V) \rightarrow H^0(C, L_C^{\otimes 2})$$

and observe that $\text{Ker}(\phi_V)$ has dimension at least $6 = \dim \text{Sym}^2(V) - h^0(L_C^{\otimes 2})$. Choose a general 5-dimensional system of quadrics $W \in G(5, H^0(\mathbb{P}^6, \mathcal{I}_{C/\mathbb{P}^6}(2)))$. We then expect

$$(26) \quad \text{Bs } |W| = C + X \subseteq \mathbb{P}^6$$

to be a nodal curve, and the curve X linked to C to be a smooth curve of degree 18 and genus 13. Setting $L := \mathcal{O}_X(1) \in W_{18}^6(X)$, by construction L is very ample and the embedded curve $X \subseteq \mathbb{P}^6$ lies on at least 5 quadrics, therefore ϕ_L is not surjective.

To carry this out, one needs to check some transversality statements. Let $\mathcal{P}ic_7^{14}$ be the universal Picard variety parametrizing pairs $[C, L_C]$, where C is a smooth curve of genus 7 and $L_C \in \text{Pic}^{14}(C)$. As pointed out in [47, Theorem 1.2], it follows from Mukai's work [37] that $\mathcal{P}ic_7^{14}$ is unirational. We introduce the variety

$$\mathcal{Y} := \{[C, L_C, V, W] : [C, L_C] \in \mathcal{P}ic_7^{14}, V \in G(6, H^0(C, L_C)), W \in G(5, \text{Ker}(\phi_V))\}$$

The forgetful map $\mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}ic_7^{14}$ has the structure of an iterated locally trivial projective bundle over $\mathcal{P}ic_7^{14}$, therefore $\mathcal{Y}$ is unirational as well. Moreover,

$$\dim \mathcal{Y} = \dim \mathcal{P}ic_7^{14} + \dim G(7, 8) + \dim G(5, 6) = 4 \cdot 7 - 3 + 7 + 5 = 37.$$

One has a rational *linkage map*

$$\chi: \mathcal{Y} \dashrightarrow \text{SU}_{13}(2, \omega, 8), \quad [C, L_C, V, W] \mapsto [X, L, E],$$

where X is defined by (26), $L := \mathcal{O}_X(1) \in W_{18}^6(X)$ and $E \in \mathrm{SU}_X(2, \omega, 8)$ is the rank-two vector bundle defined uniquely by the extension $0 \rightarrow \omega_X \otimes L^\vee \rightarrow E \rightarrow L \rightarrow 0$.

To show that χ is well defined it suffices to produce one example of a point in $\mathcal{Y}$ for which all these assumptions are realized. To that end, we consider 11 general points $p_1, \dots, p_5$ and $q_1, \dots, q_6$ respectively in $\mathbb{P}^2$ and the linear system

$$H \equiv 6h - 2(E_{p_1} + \dots + E_{p_5}) - (E_{q_1} + \dots + E_{q_6})$$

on the blowup $S = \mathrm{Bl}_{11}(\mathbb{P}^2)$ at these points. Here h denotes the pullback of the line class from $\mathbb{P}^2$. Via *Macaulay2* one checks that $S \xrightarrow{|H|} \mathbb{P}^6$ is an embedding and the graded Betti diagram of S is

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 1 & - & - & - & - & & \\ - & 5 & - & - & - & & \\ - & - & 15 & 16 & 15 & & \end{array}$$

Next we consider a general curve $C \subseteq S$ in the linear system

$$C \equiv 10h - 4(E_{p_1} + E_{p_2} + E_{p_3} + E_{p_4}) - 3E_{p_5} - 2(E_{q_1} + E_{q_2}) - (E_{q_3} + E_{q_4} + E_{q_5} + E_{q_6}).$$

Via *Macaulay2*, we verify that C is smooth, $g(C) = 7$ and $\deg(C) = 14$. Furthermore, using that $H^1(\mathbb{P}^6, \mathcal{I}_{S/\mathbb{P}^6}(2)) = 0$, we have an exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow H^0(\mathbb{P}^6, \mathcal{I}_{S/\mathbb{P}^6}(2)) \rightarrow H^0(\mathbb{P}^6, \mathcal{I}_{C/\mathbb{P}^6}(2)) \rightarrow H^0(S, \mathcal{O}_S(2H - C)) \rightarrow 0.$$

Since $\mathcal{O}_S(2H - C) = \mathcal{O}_S(2h - E_{p_5} - E_{q_3} - E_{q_4} - E_{q_5} - E_{q_6})$, clearly $h^0(S, \mathcal{O}_S(2H - C)) = 1$, therefore $h^0(\mathbb{P}^6, \mathcal{I}_{C/\mathbb{P}^6}(2)) = 6$. That is, $C \subseteq \mathbb{P}^6$ is a 2-normal curve.

One also verifies with *Macaulay2* that $C \subseteq \mathbb{P}^6$ is scheme-theoretically cut out by quadrics. Using [47, Proposition 2.2], C lies on a smooth surface $Y \subseteq \mathbb{P}^6$ which is a complete intersection of four quadrics containing C . Furthermore, the linear system $|\mathcal{O}_Y(2H - C)|$ is basepoint-free, so a general element $X \in |\mathcal{O}_Y(2H - C)|$ is a smooth curve of genus 13 meeting C transversally. Finally, a standard argument using the exact sequence $0 \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_Y(H - X) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_Y(H) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X(H) \rightarrow 0$ shows that since C is 2-normal, the residual curve X is 1-normal. That is, $h^1(X, \mathcal{O}_X(1)) = 1$. This implies that the map $\chi: \mathcal{Y} \dashrightarrow \mathrm{SU}_{13}(2, \omega, 8)$ is well defined and dominant. $\square$

Corollary 6.3 *The parameter space $\mathrm{SU}_{13}(2, \omega, 8)$ is unirational.*

Proof This follows from the proof of Theorem 6.1 and from the unirationality of $\mathcal{Y}$. $\square$

6.1 The fundamental class of $\mathrm{SU}_X(2, \omega, 8)$ for a general curve

It is essential for our calculations to determine the degree of the map

$$\vartheta: \mathrm{SU}_{13}(2, \omega, 8) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{13}, \quad \vartheta([X, E]) = [X].$$

We fix a general curve X of genus g and a point $p \in X$. Since the moduli space $\mathrm{SU}_X(2, \omega)$ is singular, in order to determine the fundamental class of the nonabelian Brill–Noether locus $\mathrm{SU}_X(2, \omega, k)$, following [40; 33; 38] one uses instead the Hecke correspondence relating $\mathrm{SU}_X(2, \omega)$ to the smooth moduli space $\mathrm{SU}_X(2, \omega(p))$ of stable rank-two vector bundles F on X with $\det(F) \cong \omega_X(p)$.

Recall that $\mathrm{SU}_X(2, \omega(p))$ is a fine moduli space. Hence there is a universal rank-two vector bundle $\mathcal{F}$ on $X \times \mathrm{SU}_X(2, \omega(p))$ and we consider the *Hecke correspondence*

$$\mathbf{P} := \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{F}_{\{p\} \times \mathrm{SU}_X(2, \omega(p))}),$$

endowed with the projection $\pi_1: \mathbf{P} \rightarrow \mathrm{SU}_X(2, \omega(p))$. The points of $\mathbf{P}$ are exact sequences

$$(27) \quad 0 \rightarrow E \rightarrow F \rightarrow K(p) \rightarrow 0,$$

where $F \in \mathrm{SU}_X(2, \omega(p))$, and therefore $\det(E) \cong \omega_X$. One has a diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \mathbf{P} & \\ \pi_1 \swarrow & & \searrow \rho \\ \mathrm{SU}_X(2, \omega(p)) & & \mathrm{SU}_X(2, \omega) \end{array}$$

where ρ assigns to a sequence (27) the semistable vector bundle E . Set

$$h := c_1(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{P}}(1)) = \rho^* c_1(\mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{ev}}),$$

where $\mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{ev}}$ is the determinant line bundle on $\mathrm{SU}_X(2, \omega)$, associated to the effective divisor

$$\Theta := \{E \in \mathrm{SU}_X(2, \omega) : H^0(X, E) \neq 0\}.$$

Set $\alpha := c_1(\mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{odd}}) \in H^2(\mathrm{SU}_X(2, \omega(p)), \mathbb{Z})$, where $\mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{odd}}$ is the ample generator of $\mathrm{Pic}(\mathrm{SU}_X(2, \omega(p)))$. Note that $\mathrm{Pic}(\mathbf{P})$ is generated by h and by $\pi_1^*(\alpha)$.

For each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, the nonabelian Brill–Noether locus

$$B_{\mathbf{P}}(k) := \{[0 \rightarrow E \rightarrow F \rightarrow K(p) \rightarrow 0] \in \mathbf{P} : h^0(X, E) \geq k\}$$

has the structure of a Lagrangian degeneracy locus of expected codimension $\beta(2, g, k) + 1 = 3g - 2 - \binom{k+1}{2}$; see [38, Section 5; 33, Section 2]. As such, its virtual class $[B_{\mathbf{P}}(k)]^{\mathrm{virt}} \in H^*(\mathbf{P}, \mathbb{Q})$ can be computed in terms of certain tautological classes, whose definition we recall now.

Following [40], we consider the Künneth decomposition of the Chern classes of $\mathcal{F}$, using that $\det(\mathcal{F}) \cong \omega_X(p) \boxtimes \mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{odd}}$, and write

$$c_1(\mathcal{F}) = \alpha + (2g - 1)\varphi \quad \text{and} \quad c_2(\mathcal{F}) = \chi + \psi + g\alpha \otimes \varphi,$$

where $\varphi \in H^2(X, \mathbb{Q})$ is the fundamental class of the curve, $\chi \in H^4(\mathrm{SU}_X(2, \omega(p)), \mathbb{Q})$ and ψ is in $H^3(\mathrm{SU}_X(2, \omega(p)), \mathbb{Q}) \otimes H^1(X, \mathbb{Q})$. Finally, we define the class

$$\gamma \in H^6(\mathrm{SU}_X(2, \omega(p)), \mathbb{Q})$$

by the formula $\psi^2 = \gamma \otimes \varphi$. One has the relation

$$h^2 = \alpha h - \frac{1}{4}(\alpha^2 - \beta) \in H^4(\mathbf{P}, \mathbb{Q}),$$

from which we can recursively determine all powers of h . We summarize as follows.

Proposition 6.4 *For each $n \geq 2$, the following relation holds in $H^*(\mathbf{P}, \mathbb{Q})$:*

$$h^n = \frac{h(-2\alpha + 2h)\sqrt{\beta} + \alpha^2 - 2\alpha h + \beta}{\sqrt{\beta}(\alpha^2 - \beta)} \left(\frac{\alpha + \sqrt{\beta}}{2} \right)^n + \frac{h(2\alpha - 2h)\sqrt{\beta} + \alpha^2 - 2\alpha h + \beta}{\sqrt{\beta}(\alpha^2 - \beta)} \left(\frac{\alpha - \sqrt{\beta}}{2} \right)^n.$$

In this formula $\sqrt{\beta}$ is a formal root of the class β . Applying [33, Section 3] or [38], one can endow $B_{\mathbf{P}}(k)$ with the structure of a Lagrangian degeneracy locus as follows. Let $\mathcal{E}$ be the vector bundle on $X \times \mathbf{P}$ defined by the exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{E} \rightarrow (\text{id} \times \pi_1)^*(\mathcal{F}) \rightarrow (p_2)_*(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{P}}(1)) \rightarrow 0,$$

where $p_2: X \times \mathbf{P} \rightarrow \mathbf{P}$ is the projection. Choose an effective divisor D of large degree on X and also denote by D its pullback under $X \times \mathbf{P} \rightarrow X$. Then $(p_2)_*(\mathcal{E}/\mathcal{E}(-D))$ and $(p_2)_*(\mathcal{E}(D))$ are Lagrangian subbundles of $(p_2)_*(\mathcal{E}(D)/\mathcal{E}(-D))$. For each point $t := [0 \rightarrow E \rightarrow F \rightarrow K(p) \rightarrow 0] \in \mathbf{P}$, one has

$$(p_2)_*(\mathcal{E}(D))(t) \cap (p_2)_*(\mathcal{E}/\mathcal{E}(-D))(t) \cong H^0(X, E).$$

Assume from now on $g = 13$ and $k = 8$, therefore we expect $B_{\mathbf{P}}(8)$ to be one-dimensional. Applying the formalism for Lagrangian degeneracy loci [38, Proposition 1.11], we find the following determinantal formula for its virtual fundamental class:

$$(28) \quad [B_{\mathbf{P}}(8)]^{\text{virt}} = \begin{vmatrix} c_8 & c_9 & c_{10} & c_{11} & c_{12} & c_{13} & c_{14} & c_{15} \\ c_6 & c_7 & c_8 & c_9 & c_{10} & c_{11} & c_{12} & c_{13} \\ c_4 & c_5 & c_6 & c_7 & c_8 & c_9 & c_{10} & c_{11} \\ c_2 & c_3 & c_4 & c_5 & c_6 & c_7 & c_8 & c_9 \\ c_0 & c_1 & c_2 & c_3 & c_4 & c_5 & c_6 & c_7 \\ 0 & 0 & c_0 & c_1 & c_2 & c_3 & c_4 & c_5 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & c_0 & c_1 & c_2 & c_3 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & c_0 & c_1 \end{vmatrix},$$

where the $c_i \in H^{2i}(\mathbf{P}, \mathbb{Q})$ are defined recursively by the following formulas, see [33, Corollary 4.2]:

$$(29) \quad c_0 = 2, \quad c_1 = h, \quad c_2 = \frac{1}{2}h^2, \quad c_3 = \frac{1}{3}\left(\frac{1}{2}h^3 + \frac{1}{4}\beta h - \frac{1}{2}\gamma\right), \quad c_4 = \frac{1}{4}\left(\frac{1}{6}h^4 + \frac{1}{3}\beta h^2 - \frac{1}{3}2\gamma h\right),$$

and for each $n \geq 1$,

$$(30) \quad (n+4)c_{n+4} - \frac{1}{2}(n+2)\beta c_{n+2} + \left(\frac{1}{4}\beta\right)^2 n c_n = h c_{n+3} - \left(\frac{1}{4}\beta h + \frac{1}{2}\gamma\right) c_{n+1}.$$

In order to evaluate the determinant giving $[B_{\mathbf{P}}(8)]^{\text{virt}}$, we shall use Proposition 6.4 coupled with the formula of Thaddeus [46] determining all top intersection numbers of tautological classes on $\text{SU}_X(2, \omega(p))$.

Precisely, for $m + 2n + 3p = 3g - 3$, one has

$$(31) \quad \int_{\mathrm{SU}_X(2, \omega(p))} \alpha^m \cdot \beta^n \cdot \gamma^p = (-1)^{g-p} \frac{g!m!}{(g-p)!q!} 2^{2g-2-p} (2^q - 2) B_q,$$

where $q = m + p + 1 - g$ and B_q denotes the Bernoulli number; those appearing in our calculation are

$$\begin{aligned} B_2 &= \frac{1}{6}, & B_4 &= -\frac{1}{30}, & B_6 &= \frac{1}{42}, & B_8 &= -\frac{1}{30}, & B_{10} &= \frac{5}{66}, & B_{12} &= -\frac{691}{2730}, \\ B_{14} &= \frac{7}{6}, & B_{16} &= -\frac{3617}{510}, & B_{18} &= \frac{43867}{798}, & B_{20} &= -\frac{174611}{330}, & B_{22} &= \frac{854513}{138}, & B_{24} &= -\frac{236364091}{2730}. \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 6.5 *For a general curve X of genus 13, the locus $\mathrm{SU}_X(2, \omega, 8)$ consists of three reduced points corresponding to stable vector bundles.*

Proof As explained, the Lagrangian degeneracy locus $B_{\mathbf{P}}(8)$ is expected to be a curve and we write

$$[B_{\mathbf{P}}(8)]^{\mathrm{virt}} = f(\alpha, \beta, \gamma) + h \cdot u(\alpha, \beta, \gamma),$$

where $f(\alpha, \beta, \gamma)$ and $u(\alpha, \beta, \gamma)$ are homogeneous polynomials of degrees $36 = 3g - 3$ and $35 = 3g - 4$, respectively.

Observe that if $E \in \mathrm{SU}_X(2, \omega, 8)$ then necessarily E is a stable bundle. Otherwise E is strictly semistable, in which case $E = B \oplus (\omega_X \otimes B^\vee)$, where $B \in W_{12}^3(X)$, which contradicts the Brill–Noether theorem on X . Since ρ is a $\mathbb{P}^1$ -fibration over the locus of stable vector bundles, it follows that $B_{\mathbf{P}}(8)$ is a $\mathbb{P}^1$ -fibration over $\mathrm{SU}_X(2, \omega, 8)$. Furthermore, applying [45], the Mukai–Petri map μ_E is an isomorphism for each vector bundle $E \in \mathrm{SU}_X(2, \omega, 8)$, therefore $\mathrm{SU}_X(2, \omega, 8)$ is a reduced zero-dimensional cycle. We denote by a its length, thus we can write

$$(32) \quad [B_{\mathbf{P}}(8)] = [B_{\mathbf{P}}(8)]^{\mathrm{virt}} = a\rho^*([E_0]) = f(\alpha, \beta, \gamma) + h \cdot u(\alpha, \beta, \gamma),$$

where $[E_0] \in \mathrm{SU}_X(2, \omega)$ is general. Intersecting both sides of (32) with h , we obtain

$$h \cdot f(\alpha, \beta, \gamma) = -h \cdot \alpha u(\alpha, \beta, \gamma).$$

Next observe that $\rho^*([E_0]) \cdot \alpha = 2$. Indeed, since ρ is a $\mathbb{P}^1$ -fibration over the open locus of stable bundles and $\omega_{\mathbf{P}} = \rho^*(\mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{ev}}) \otimes \pi^*(-\alpha)$, it follows that

$$-2 = \deg(\omega_{\mathbf{P}|_{\rho^*([E_0])}}) = \omega_{\mathbf{P}} \cdot \rho^*([E_0]) = -\alpha \cdot \rho^*([E_0]).$$

Intersecting both sides of (32) with α , we find $2a = h \cdot \alpha u(\alpha, \beta, \gamma) = -h \cdot f(\alpha, \beta, \gamma)$, so

$$a = |\mathrm{SU}_X(2, \omega, 8)| = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbf{P}} h f(\alpha, \beta, \gamma) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathrm{SU}_X(2, \omega(p))} f(\alpha, \beta, \gamma).$$

We are left with the task of computing the degree 36 polynomial $f(\alpha, \beta, \gamma)$, which is a long but elementary calculation. We consider the determinant (28) computing the class of $B_{\mathbf{P}}(8)$. First we substitute for each of the classes $c_1, \dots, c_{15}$ the expression in terms of α, β, γ and h given by the recursion (30), starting with the initial conditions (29). Evaluating this determinant, we obtain a polynomial of degree 36 in the classes

α , β , γ and h . We recursively express all the powers h^n with $n \geq 2$ and obtain a formula of the form $[B_{\mathbf{P}}(8)] = f(\alpha, \beta, \gamma) + h \cdot u(\alpha, \beta, \gamma)$. We set $h = 0$ in this formula and then we evaluate each monomial of degree 36 in α , β and γ using Thaddeus' formulas (31). At the end, we obtain $f(\alpha, \beta, \gamma) = -6$, which completes the proof of Theorem 6.5.⁴ $\square$

7 The nonabelian Brill–Noether divisor on $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{13}$

In this section we determine the class of the nonabelian Brill–Noether divisor $\overline{\mathcal{M}\mathcal{P}}_{13}$, and prove Theorem 1.1. The results in this section also lay the groundwork for the proof that $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{13}$ is of general type.

7.1 Tautological classes on the universal nonabelian Brill–Noether locus

Definition 7.1 Let $\mathfrak{M}_{13}^{\#}$ be the open substack of $\overline{\mathfrak{M}}_{13}$ consisting of

- (i) smooth curves X of genus 13 with $\mathrm{SU}_X(2, \omega, 9) = \emptyset$, or
- (ii) 1-nodal irreducible curves $[X/y \sim q]$, where X is a 7-gonal smooth genus 12 curve, $y, q \in X$, and the multiplication map $\phi_L: \mathrm{Sym}^2 H^0(X, L) \rightarrow H^0(X, L^{\otimes 2})$ is surjective for each $L \in W_{15}^5(X)$.

Let $\mathcal{M}_{13}^{\#}$ be the open subset of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{13}$ coarsely representing $\mathfrak{M}_{13}^{\#}$.

Note that $\mathcal{M}_{13}^{\#}$ and $\mathcal{M}_{13} \cup \Delta_0$ agree in codimension one, in particular we identify $CH^1(\mathcal{M}_{13}^{\#})$ with $\mathbb{Q}\langle \lambda, \delta_0 \rangle$. We let $\mathfrak{SU}_{13}^{\#}(2, \omega, 8)$ be the moduli stack of pairs $[X, E]$, where $[X] \in \mathcal{M}_{13}^{\#}$ and E is a semistable rank-two vector bundle on X with $\det(E) \cong \omega_X$ and $h^0(X, E) \geq 8$. Let $SU_{13}^{\#}(2, \omega, 8)$ be the coarse moduli space of $\mathfrak{SU}_{13}^{\#}(2, \omega, 8)$. We still denote by $\vartheta: \mathfrak{SU}_{13}^{\#}(2, \omega, 8) \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}_{13}^{\#}$ the forgetful map.

Proposition 7.2 The map $\vartheta: \mathfrak{SU}_{13}^{\#}(2, \omega, 8) \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}_{13}^{\#}$ is proper. Moreover, for each $[X, E] \in SU_{13}^{\#}(2, \omega, 8)$ the corresponding vector bundle E is globally generated.

Proof Suppose $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow T$ is a flat family of stable curves of genus 13, whose generic fiber X_{η} is smooth and the special fiber X_0 corresponds to a 1-nodal curve in $\mathcal{M}_{13}^{\#}$. The moduli space $\mathrm{SU}_{X_{\eta}}(2, \omega)$ specializes to a moduli space $\mathrm{SU}_{X_0}(2, \omega)$ that is a closed subvariety of the moduli space $U_{X_0}(2, 24)$ of S -equivalence classes of torsion-free sheaves of rank-two and degree 24 on X_0 . The points in $\mathrm{SU}_{X_0}(2, \omega)$ are described in [42].

We claim that if $E \in \mathrm{SU}_{X_0}(2, \omega)$ satisfies $h^0(X_0, E) \geq 8$, then necessarily E is locally free, in which case $\wedge^2 E \cong \omega_{X_0}$. Suppose $\nu: X \rightarrow X_0$ is the normalization map, let $y, q \in X$ denote the inverse images of the node p of X_0 and assume E is not locally free at p . Denoting by $\mathfrak{m}_p \subseteq \mathcal{O}_{X_0, p}$ the maximal ideal, either

- (i) $E_p \cong \mathfrak{m}_p \oplus \mathfrak{m}_p$, or
- (ii) $E_p \cong \mathcal{O}_{X_0, p} \oplus \mathfrak{m}_p$.

⁴The Maple file describing all calculations explained here is at <https://www.mathematik.hu-berlin.de/farkas/gen13bn.mw>.

In the first case, $E = v_*(F)$, where F is a vector bundle of rank two on X with $\det(F) \cong \omega_X$, that is, $\mathrm{SU}_X(2, \omega, 8) \neq \emptyset$. Note that

$$h^0(X, \det(F)) = 12 \leq 2h^0(X, F) - 4,$$

implying that F has a subpencil $A \hookrightarrow F$.⁵ Then $A \in W_7^1(X)$ and $L := \omega_X \otimes A^\vee \in W_{15}^5(X)$ is such that $\phi_L: \mathrm{Sym}^2 H^0(X, L) \rightarrow H^0(X, L^{\otimes 2})$ is not surjective. This is ruled out by the definition of $\mathcal{M}_{13}^\#$. In case (ii), when $E_p \cong \mathcal{O}_{X_0, p} \oplus \mathfrak{m}_p$, one has an exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow E \rightarrow v_*(\tilde{F}) \rightarrow K(p) \rightarrow 0,$$

where $\tilde{F} = v^*(E)/\mathrm{Torsion}$ is a vector bundle on the smooth curve X and satisfies $\det(F) = \omega_X(y)$, or $\det(F) \cong \omega_X(q)$; see also [42, 1.2]. Observe that also in this case F necessarily carries a subpencil, and we argue as before to rule out this possibility.

We now turn out to the last part of Proposition 7.2. Choose $[X, E] \in \mathcal{SU}_{13}^\#(2, \omega, 8)$ and assume for simplicity X is smooth (the case when X is 1-nodal being similar). Assume E is not globally generated at a point $q \in X$. Then there exists a vector bundle $F \in \mathrm{SU}_X(2, \omega(-q), 8)$, obtained from E by an elementary transformation at q . Note that $h^0(X, \det F) \leq 2h^0(X, F) - 4$, which forces F to have a subpencil $A \hookrightarrow F$. Necessarily, $\deg(A) = 7$. Since $h^0(F) = h^0(A) + h^0(\omega_X \otimes A^\vee(-q))$, setting $L := \omega_X \otimes A^\vee \in W_{17}^6(X)$, it follows that the multiplication map

$$H^0(X, L) \otimes H^0(X, L(-q)) \rightarrow H^0(X, L^{\otimes 2}(-q))$$

is not surjective, and in particular the map $\mathrm{Sym}^2 H^0(X, L) \rightarrow H^0(X, L^{\otimes 2})$ is not surjective either. Then X possesses a stable rank-two vector bundle with canonical determinant and $9 = h^0(X, A) + h^0(X, L)$ sections, which is not the case. $\square$

Let us consider the universal genus 13 curve

$$\wp: \mathcal{C}_{13}^\# \rightarrow \mathcal{SU}_{13}^\#(2, \omega, 8),$$

then let $\mathfrak{E}$ be the universal rank-two bundle over the stack $\mathcal{SU}_{13}^\#(2, \omega, 8)$. Note that we can normalize $\mathfrak{E}$ in such a way that $\det(\mathfrak{E}) \cong \omega_\wp$.

Definition 7.3 We define the tautological class $\gamma := \wp_*(c_2(\mathfrak{E})) \in CH^1(\mathcal{SU}_{13}^\#(2, \omega, 8))$.

We aim to determine the pushforward to $\mathcal{M}_{13}^\#$ of the class γ in terms of λ and δ_0 . To that end, we begin with the following:

Proposition 7.4 The pushforward $\wp_*(\mathfrak{E})$ is a locally free sheaf of rank 8 and

$$c_1(\wp_*(\mathfrak{E})) = \vartheta^*(\lambda) - \frac{1}{2}\gamma \in CH^1(\mathcal{SU}_{13}^\#(2, \omega, 8)).$$

⁵Use that for dimension reasons the determinant map $d: \bigwedge^2 H^0(X, F) \rightarrow H^0(X, \det(F))$ must necessarily vanish on a pure element $0 \neq s_1 \wedge s_2$, with $s_1, s_2 \in H^0(X, F)$. The subpencil in question is then generated by the sections s_1 and s_2 .

Proof The fact that $\wp_*(\mathfrak{E})$ is locally free follows from [29]. We apply Grothendieck–Riemann–Roch to the curve $\wp: \mathfrak{C}_{13}^\# \rightarrow \mathfrak{SU}_{13}^\#(2, \omega, 8)$ and to the vector bundle $\mathfrak{E}$ to obtain

$$\mathrm{ch}(\wp_!(\mathfrak{E})) = \wp_* \left[\left(2 + c_1(\mathfrak{E}) + \frac{1}{2}(c_1^2(\mathfrak{E}) - 2c_2(\mathfrak{E})) + \cdots \right) \cdot \left(1 - \frac{1}{2}c_1(\Omega_\wp^1) + \frac{1}{12}(c_1^2(\Omega_\wp^1) + c_2(\Omega_\wp^1)) + \cdots \right) \right].$$

We consider the degree-one terms in this equality. Using [27, page 49], observe that

$$c_1(\Omega_\wp^1) = c_1(\omega_\wp) \quad \text{and} \quad \wp_* \left(\frac{1}{12}(c_1^2(\Omega_\wp^1) + c_2(\Omega_\wp^1)) \right) = \vartheta^*(\lambda).$$

By Serre duality, observe that $R^1\wp_*(\mathfrak{E}) \cong \wp_*(\mathfrak{E})^\vee$, therefore one can write

$$2c_1(\wp_*(\mathfrak{E})) = c_1(\wp_*(\mathfrak{E})) - c_1(R^1\wp_*(\mathfrak{E})) = 2\vartheta^*(\lambda) - \frac{1}{2}\wp_*(c_1^2(\omega_\wp)) + \frac{1}{2}\wp_*(c_1^2(\omega_\wp)) - \gamma,$$

which leads to the claimed formula. $\square$

In view of our future applications to $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{13}$, we introduce the rank-six vector bundle

$$\mathcal{M}_{\mathfrak{E}} := \mathrm{Ker}\{\wp^*(\wp_*(\mathfrak{E})) \rightarrow \mathfrak{E}\}.$$

The fiber $M_E := \mathcal{M}_{\mathfrak{E}}[X, E]$ over a point $[X, E] \in \mathfrak{SU}_{13}^\#(2, \omega, 8)$ sits in an exact sequence

$$(33) \quad 0 \rightarrow M_E \rightarrow H^0(X, E) \otimes \mathcal{O}_X \xrightarrow{\mathrm{ev}} E \rightarrow 0,$$

where exactness on the right is a consequence of Proposition 7.2.

Proposition 7.5 *The following formulas hold:*

$$\begin{aligned} c_1(\mathcal{M}_{\mathfrak{E}}) &= \wp^*(\vartheta^*(\lambda) - \frac{1}{2}\gamma) - c_1(\omega_\wp), \\ c_2(\mathcal{M}_{\mathfrak{E}}) &= \wp^*c_2(\wp_*(\mathfrak{E})) - c_2(\mathfrak{E}) - c_1(\omega_\wp) \cdot \wp^*(\vartheta^*(\lambda) - \frac{1}{2}\gamma) + c_1^2(\omega_\wp). \end{aligned}$$

Proof This follows from the splitting principle applied to $\mathcal{M}_{\mathfrak{E}}$, coupled with Proposition 7.4. $\square$

7.2 The resonance divisor in genus 13

A general curve X of genus 13 has 3 stable vector bundles $E \in \mathrm{SU}_X(2, \omega, 8)$. In this case $h^0(X, \det(E)) = 2h^0(X, E) - 3$, which implies that requiring E to carry a subpencil defines a divisorial condition on the moduli space $\mathfrak{SU}_{13}(2, \omega, 8)$ and thus on $\mathcal{M}_{13}$. For a vector bundle $E \in \mathrm{SU}_X(2, \omega)$, we denote its determinant map by

$$d: \bigwedge^2 H^0(X, E) \rightarrow H^0(X, \omega_X).$$

Definition 7.6 The *resonance divisor* $\mathfrak{Res}_{13}^\#$ is the locus of curves $[X] \in \mathcal{M}_{13}^\#$ for which

$$G(2, H^0(X, E)) \cap \mathbb{P}(\mathrm{Ker}(d)) \neq \emptyset$$

for some vector bundle $E \in \mathrm{SU}_X(2, \omega, 8)$. In other words, $\mathfrak{Res}_{13}^\#$ is the locus of $[X]$ for which there exists an element $0 \neq s_1 \wedge s_2 \in \bigwedge^2 H^0(X, E)$ such that $d(s_1 \wedge s_2) = 0$.

We set $\mathfrak{Res}_{13} := \mathfrak{Res}_{13}^{\#} \cap \mathcal{M}_{13}$. Note that $\mathfrak{Res}_{13}^{\#}$ comes with an induced scheme structure under the proper map $\vartheta: \mathfrak{SU}_{13}^{\#}(2, \omega, 8) \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}_{13}^{\#}$. The points in $\mathfrak{Res}_{13}^{\#}$ correspond to those curves X for which a vector bundle $E \in \mathrm{SU}_X(2, \omega, 8)$ carries a subpencil (which is generated by the sections $s_1, s_2 \in H^0(X, E)$ with $d(s_1 \wedge s_2) = 0$). The class $[\mathfrak{Res}_{13}^{\#}]$ can be computed in terms of certain tautological classes over $\mathfrak{SU}_{13}^{\#}(2, \omega, 8)$. On the other hand, we have a geometric characterization of points in $\mathfrak{Res}_{13}$, and it turns out that the resonance divisor coincides with $\mathfrak{D}_{13}$ away from the heptagonal locus $\mathcal{M}_{13,7}^1$.

Proof of Theorem 1.7 We show that one has the following equality of effective divisors

$$\mathfrak{Res}_{13} = \mathfrak{D}_{13} + 3 \cdot \mathcal{M}_{13,7}^1$$

on $\mathcal{M}_{13}$. Indeed, let us assume that $[X] \in \mathfrak{Res}_{13} \setminus \mathcal{M}_{13,7}^1$, and let $E \in \mathrm{SU}_X(2, \omega, 8)$ be the vector bundle which can be written as an extension

$$(34) \quad 0 \rightarrow A \rightarrow E \rightarrow \omega_X \otimes A^{\vee} \rightarrow 0,$$

where $h^0(X, A) \geq 2$. Since $\mathrm{gon}(X) = 8$, and since $8 \leq h^0(X, E) \leq h^0(X, A) + h^0(X, \omega_X \otimes A^{\vee})$, it follows that $A \in W_8^1(X)$ and $L := \omega_X \otimes A^{\vee} \in W_{16}^5(X)$. If such an extension exists, then the map ϕ_L is not surjective, therefore $[X] \in \mathfrak{D}_{13}$.

Conversely, if $[X] \in \mathfrak{D}_{13}$, there is some $L \in W_{16}^5(X)$ such that the multiplication map ϕ_L is not surjective. For $[X]$ a general point of an irreducible component of $\mathfrak{D}_{13}$, we may assume that the multiplication map ϕ_L has corank one, for otherwise $\varphi_L: X \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}^5$ lies on a $(2, 2, 2)$ complete intersection in $\mathbb{P}^5$, which is a (possibly degenerate) $K3$ surface. But the locus of curves $[X] \in \mathcal{M}_{13}$ lying on a (possibly degenerate) $K3$ surface cannot exceed $g + 19 = 32 < 3g - 4$, a contradiction. We let

$$E \in \mathbb{P}(\mathrm{Ext}^1(L, \omega_X \otimes L^{\vee}))$$

be the *unique* vector bundle with $h^0(X, E) = h^0(X, L) + h^0(X, \omega_X \otimes L^{\vee}) = 8$. The argument of Proposition 6.2 shows that E is stable, otherwise there would exist an effective divisor M of degree 4 on X such that $L(-M) \in W_{12}^3(X)$. Since $\rho(13, 3, 12) = -3$, the locus of curves $[X] \in \mathcal{M}_{13}$ with $W_{12}^3(X) \neq \emptyset$ has codimension at least three in $\mathcal{M}_{13}$, hence this situation does not occur along a component of $\mathfrak{D}_{13}$. Summarizing, away from the divisor $\mathcal{M}_{13,7}^1$, the divisors $\mathfrak{Res}_{13}$ and $\mathfrak{D}_{13}$ coincide.

We now show that $\mathcal{M}_{13,7}^1$ appears with multiplicity 3 inside $\mathfrak{Res}_{13}$. Let X be a general 7-gonal curve of genus 13 and let $A \in W_7^1(X)$ denote its (unique) degree 7 pencil. Set $L := \omega_X \otimes A^{\vee} \in W_{17}^6(X)$. Each vector bundle $E \in \mathrm{SU}_X(2, \omega, 8)$ that has a subpencil appears as an extension

$$(35) \quad 0 \rightarrow A \rightarrow E \xrightarrow{j} L \rightarrow 0.$$

In this case $h^0(X, E) = h^0(X, A) + h^0(X, L) - 1$. That is, $V := \mathrm{Im}\{H^0(E) \xrightarrow{j} H^0(L)\}$ is 6-dimensional. Furthermore, the multiplication map

$$\mu_V: V \otimes H^0(X, L) \rightarrow H^0(X, L^{\otimes 2})$$

is not surjective. Conversely, each 6-dimensional subspace $V \subseteq H^0(X, L)$ such that μ_V is not surjective leads to a vector bundle $E \in \mathbb{P}(\text{Ext}^1(L, A))$ with $h^0(X, E) = 8$. The corresponding bundle E is stable unless V is of the form $H^0(X, L(-p))$ for a point $p \in X$, in which case E can also be realized as an extension

$$0 \rightarrow L(-p) \rightarrow E \rightarrow A(p) \rightarrow 0.$$

To determine the number of such subspaces $V \subseteq H^0(X, L)$, we consider the projective space $\mathbf{P}^6 := \mathbb{P}(H^0(X, L)^\vee)$ and consider the vector bundle $\mathcal{A}$ on $\mathbf{P}^6$ with fiber

$$\mathcal{A}(V) = \frac{V \otimes H^0(X, L)}{\wedge^2 V}$$

over a point $[V] \in \mathbf{P}^6$. There exists a bundle morphism $\mu: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow H^0(X, L^{\otimes 2}) \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{P}^6}$ given by multiplication and the subspaces $[V] \in \mathbf{P}^6$ for which μ_V is not surjective (or, equivalently, $\mu^\vee$ is not injective) are precisely those lying in the degeneracy locus of μ , that is, for which $\text{rk}(\mu(V)) = 21$. Applying the Porteous formula we find

$$[Z_{21}(\mu)] = c_6(H^0(X, L^{\otimes 2})^\vee \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{P}^6} - \mathcal{A}^\vee) = c_6(-\mathcal{A}).$$

To compute the Chern classes of $\mathcal{A}$, we recall that via the Euler sequence the rank-six vector bundle $M_{\mathbf{P}^6}$ on $\mathbf{P}^6$ with $M_{\mathbf{P}^6}(V) = V \subseteq H^0(X, L)$ can be identified with $\Omega_{\mathbf{P}^6}(1)$. Then $\mathcal{A}$ is isomorphic to $M_{\mathbf{P}^6} \otimes H^0(X, L)/\wedge^2 M_{\mathbf{P}^6}$. From the exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \wedge^2 M_{\mathbf{P}^6} \rightarrow \wedge^2 H^0(X, L) \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{P}^7} \rightarrow M_{\mathbf{P}^6}(1) \rightarrow 0,$$

recalling that $c_{\text{tot}}(M_{\mathbf{P}^6}) = 1/(1+h)$, where $h = c_1(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{P}^6}(1))$, we find $c_{\text{tot}}(\wedge^2 M_{\mathbf{P}^6}) = (1+2h)/(1+h)^7$, therefore

$$[Z_{21}(\mu)] = \left[\frac{1}{(1+h)^7} \cdot \frac{(1+h)^7}{1+2h} \right]_6 = \left[\frac{1}{1+2h} \right]_6 = 2^6 \cdot h^6 = 64.$$

From this, we subtract the excess contribution corresponding to the locus $X \xrightarrow{[L]} \mathbf{P}^6$, parametrizing the subspaces $V = H^0(X, L(-p))$ corresponding to unstable bundles. Via the excess Porteous formula [24, Example 14.4.7], this locus appears in the class $[Z_{21}(\mu)]$ with a contribution of

$$c_1(\text{Ker}(\mu^\vee) \otimes \text{Coker}(\mu^\vee) - N_{X/\mathbf{P}^6}) = -5c_1(\text{Ker}(\mu^\vee)) + c_1(\mathcal{A}_{|X}^\vee) - c_1(N_{X/\mathbf{P}^6}).$$

The restriction to $X \subseteq \mathbf{P}^6$ of the kernel bundle of $\mu^\vee$ can be identified with $L^\vee$, whereas $c_1(\mathcal{A}_{|X}^\vee) = -2c_1(M_{\mathbf{P}^6|X}) = 2 \deg(L)$. Furthermore $c_1(N_{X/\mathbf{P}^6}) = 7 \deg(L) + 2g(X) - 2$. All in all, the excess contribution to $[Z_{21}(\mu)]$ coming from X equals

$$10 \deg(L) + 2 \deg(L) - 7 \deg(L) - 2g(X) - 2 = 5 \cdot 17 - 24 = 61.$$

Therefore, for a general curve $[X] \in \mathcal{M}_{13,7}^1$, there are $3 = 64 - 61$ vector bundles $E \in \text{SU}_X(2, \omega, 8)$ having A as a subpencil, which finishes the proof. $\square$

We are now in a position to explain how Theorems 1.3 and 1.7 provide enough geometric information to determine the pushforward to $\mathfrak{M}_{13}^\#$ of the class γ .

Proposition 7.7 *One has $\vartheta_*(\gamma) = \frac{11288}{143}\lambda - \frac{1582}{143}\delta_0 \in CH^1(\mathcal{M}_{13}^\#)$.*

Proof The divisor $\mathfrak{Rcs}_{13}^\#$ is defined as the pushforward under $\vartheta: \mathfrak{SU}_{13}^\#(2, \omega, 8) \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}_{13}^\#$ of the locus where the fibers of the morphism of vector bundles

$$d: \wedge^2 \wp_*(\mathfrak{E}) \rightarrow \wp_*(\omega_\wp)$$

contain a rank-two tensor in their kernel. To compute the class of this locus, we use Proposition 7.4 in combination with [22, Theorem 1.1]:⁶

$$[\mathfrak{Rcs}_{13}^\#] = 132(c_1(\wp_*(\omega_\wp)) - \frac{13}{4}c_1(\wp_*(\mathfrak{E}))) = 132(-\frac{9}{4}\vartheta^*(\lambda) + \frac{13}{8}\gamma).$$

Using [27], we write $[\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{13,7}^\#] = 6 \cdot (48\lambda - 7\delta_0 - \dots)$ for the class of the heptagonal locus, while the class $[\widetilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{13}]$ is computed by Theorem 1.4. Since $\deg(\vartheta) = 3$, we then find

$$\vartheta_*(\gamma) = \frac{48}{13} \left(\frac{5059}{264}\lambda - \frac{749}{264}\delta_0 + \frac{9}{8}\lambda + \frac{3}{132}(48\lambda - 7\delta_0) \right) = \frac{1128}{143}\lambda - \frac{1582}{143}\delta_0. \quad \square$$

7.3 The class of the nonabelian Brill–Noether divisor on $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{13}$

In the introduction, we defined the nonabelian Brill–Noether divisor $\mathcal{MP}_{13}^\#$ as the locus of curves $[X] \in \mathcal{M}_{13}^\#$ for which there exists $E \in \mathrm{SU}_X(2, \omega, 8)$ such that the map

$$\mu_E: \mathrm{Sym}^2 H^0(X, E) \rightarrow H^0(X, \mathrm{Sym}^2 E)$$

is not an isomorphism, or equivalently, the scheme $\mathrm{SU}_X(2, \omega, 8)$ is not reduced. We now compute the class of this divisor.

Proof of Theorem 1.1 The locus $\mathcal{MP}_{13}^\#$ is the pushforward under the proper map ϑ of the degeneracy locus of the following map of vector bundles over $\mathfrak{SU}_{13}^\#(2, \omega, 8)$:

$$\mathrm{Sym}^2 \wp_*(\mathfrak{E}) \rightarrow \wp_*(\mathrm{Sym}^2 \mathfrak{E}).$$

Using Grothendieck–Riemann–Roch for $\wp: \mathfrak{C}_{13}^\# \rightarrow \mathfrak{SU}_{13}^\#(2, \omega, 8)$, we compute

$$c_1(p_*(\mathrm{Sym}^2 \mathfrak{E})) = \wp_* \left[\left(3 + 3c_1(\mathfrak{E}) + \frac{1}{2}(5c_1^2(\mathfrak{E}) - 8c_2(\mathfrak{E})) \right) \cdot \left(1 - \frac{1}{2}c_1(\Omega_\wp^1) + \frac{1}{12}(c_1^2(\Omega_\wp^1) + c_2(\Omega_\wp^1)) \right) \right]_2.$$

Using again that $12\wp_*(c_1^2(\Omega_\wp^1) + c_2(\Omega_\wp^1)) = \vartheta^*(\lambda)$, we conclude that

$$c_1(\wp_*(\mathrm{Sym}^2 \mathfrak{E})) = 3\vartheta^*(\lambda) + \wp_*(c_1^2(\omega_\wp)) - 4\gamma = \vartheta^*(15\lambda - \delta_0) - 4\gamma.$$

Via Proposition 7.4, we have $c_1(\mathrm{Sym}^2 \wp_*(\mathfrak{E})) = 9c_1(\wp_*(\mathfrak{E})) = 9(\vartheta^*(\lambda) - \frac{1}{2}\gamma)$, yielding

$$[\mathcal{MP}_{13}^\#] = \vartheta_*(c_1(\wp_*(\mathrm{Sym}^2 \mathfrak{E}) - \mathrm{Sym}^2 \wp_*(\mathfrak{E}))) = 3(6\lambda - \delta_0) + \frac{1}{2}\vartheta_*(\gamma).$$

Substituting via Proposition 7.7, we find $[\mathcal{MP}_{13}^\#] = \frac{1}{143}(8218\lambda - 1220\delta_0)$. □

⁶The result in [22] is stated for a morphism of vector bundles of the form $\mathrm{Sym}^2(\mathcal{E}) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$. An immediate inspection of the proof shows though that the *same formula* applies also in the setting of a morphism of the form $\wedge^2(\mathcal{E}) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$.

8 The Kodaira dimension of $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{13}$

We turn our attention to showing that the Prym moduli space $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{13}$ is a variety of general type. We begin by recalling basics on the geometry of the moduli of Prym variety, referring to [20] for details. We denote by $\overline{\mathfrak{R}}_g := \overline{\mathfrak{M}}_g(\mathcal{B}\mathbb{Z}_2)$ the Deligne–Mumford stack of *Prym curves* of genus g classifying triples $[Y, \eta, \beta]$, where Y is a nodal curve of genus g such that each of its rational components meets the rest of the curve in at least two points, $\eta \in \text{Pic}^0(Y)$ is a line bundle of total degree 0 such that $\eta|_R = \mathcal{O}_R(1)$ for every rational component $R \subseteq Y$ with $|R \cap \overline{Y \setminus R}| = 2$ (such a component is called *exceptional*), and $\beta: \eta^{\otimes 2} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_Y$ is a morphism which is generically nonzero along each nonexceptional component of Y . Let $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_g$ be the coarse moduli space of $\overline{\mathfrak{R}}_g$. One has a finite cover

$$\pi: \overline{\mathcal{R}}_g \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_g.$$

8.1 The boundary divisors of $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_g$

The geometry of the boundary of $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_g$ is described in [20]; we recall some facts. If $[X_{yq} = X/y \sim q]$ in $\Delta_0 \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{M}}_g$ is such that $[X, y, q] \in \mathcal{M}_{g-1,2}$, denoting by $\nu: X \rightarrow X_{yq}$ the normalization map, there are three types of Prym curves in the fiber $\pi^{-1}([X_{yq}])$. First, one can choose a nontrivial 2-torsion point $\eta \in \text{Pic}^0(X_{yq})$. If $\nu^*(\eta) \neq \mathcal{O}_X$, this amounts to choosing a 2-torsion point $\eta_X \in \text{Pic}^0(X)[2] \setminus \{\mathcal{O}_X\}$ together with an identification of the fibers $\eta_X(y)$ and $\eta_X(q)$ at the points y and q , respectively. As we vary $[X, y, q]$, points of this type fill up the boundary divisor Δ'_0 in $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_g$. The Prym curves corresponding to the situation $\nu^*(\eta) \cong \mathcal{O}_X$ fill up the boundary divisor Δ''_0 . Finally, choosing a line bundle η_X on X with $\eta_X^{\otimes 2} \cong \mathcal{O}_X(-y-q)$ leads to a Prym curve $[Y := X \cup_{y,q} R, \eta, \beta]$, where R is a smooth rational curve meeting X at y and q , and $\eta \in \text{Pic}^0(Y)$ is a line bundle such that $\eta|_X = \eta_X$ and $\eta|_R = \mathcal{O}_R(1)$. Points of this type fill up the boundary divisor Δ_0^{ram} of $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_g$, which is the ramification divisor of the morphism π .

Denoting by $\delta'_0 := [\Delta'_0]$, $\delta''_0 := [\Delta''_0]$ and $\delta_0^{\text{ram}} := [\Delta_0^{\text{ram}}]$ the corresponding divisor classes, one has the following relation in $CH^1(\overline{\mathcal{R}}_g) \cong CH^1(\overline{\mathfrak{R}}_g)$, see [20]:

$$\pi^*(\delta_0) = \delta'_0 + \delta''_0 + 2\delta_0^{\text{ram}}.$$

The finite morphism $\pi: \overline{\mathcal{R}}_g \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_g$ being ramified only along the divisor Δ_0^{ram} , one has

$$(36) \quad K_{\overline{\mathcal{R}}_g} = 13\lambda - 2(\delta'_0 + \delta''_0) - 3\delta_0^{\text{ram}} - 2 \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor g/2 \rfloor} (\delta_i + \delta_{g-i} + \delta_{i:g-i}) - (\delta_1 + \delta_{g-1} + \delta_{1:g-1}),$$

where $\pi^*(\delta_i) = \delta_i + \delta_{g-i} + \delta_{i:g-i}$; see [20, Theorem 1.5] for details.

8.2 The universal theta divisor on $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{13}$

For a semistable vector bundle $E \in \text{SU}_X(2, \omega)$ on a smooth curve X of genus g , its *Raynaud theta divisor* $\Theta_E := \{\xi \in \text{Pic}^0(X) : H^0(X, E \otimes \xi) \neq 0\}$ is a 2θ -divisor inside the Jacobian of X ; see [41].

Definition 8.1 The universal theta divisor Θ_{13} on $\mathcal{R}_{13}$ is defined as the locus of smooth Prym curves $[X, \eta] \in \mathcal{R}_{13}$ for which there exists a vector bundle $E \in \mathrm{SU}_X(2, \omega, 8)$ such that $H^0(X, E \otimes \eta) \neq 0$.

We first show that, as expected, this definition gives rise to a divisor on $\mathcal{R}_{13}$.

Proposition 8.2 For a general Prym curve $[X, \eta] \in \mathcal{R}_{13}$, one has $H^0(X, E \otimes \eta) = 0$ for all vector bundles $E \in \mathrm{SU}_X(2, \omega, 8)$. It follows that Θ_{13} is an effective divisor on $\mathcal{R}_{13}$.

Proof Consider the subvariety of $\mathcal{R}_{13} \times_{\mathcal{M}_{13}} \mathrm{SU}_{13}(2, \omega, 8)$ given by

$$\mathcal{Z} := \{[X, \eta, E] : H^0(X, E \otimes \eta) \neq 0\}.$$

Assume for contradiction that $\mathcal{Z}$ surjects onto $\mathcal{R}_{13}$. Then $\mathcal{Z}$ is a union of *irreducible* components of $\mathcal{R}_{13} \times_{\mathcal{M}_{13}} \mathrm{SU}_{13}(2, \omega, 8)$. In particular, $\mathcal{Z}$ surjects onto the irreducible variety $\mathrm{SU}_{13}(2, \omega, 8)$; see [Corollary 6.3](#). Therefore, for every pair $[X, E] \in \mathrm{SU}_{13}(2, \omega, 8)$, there exists a 2-torsion point η on X with $H^0(X, E \otimes \eta) \neq 0$.

We now specialize to the case when E is a strictly semistable vector bundle of the type

$$E = A^{\otimes 3} \oplus (\omega_X \otimes A^{\otimes (-3)}),$$

where $[X, A]$ is a general tetragonal curve of genus 13. Note that $h^0(X, A^{\otimes 3}) = 4$, by [\[13, Proposition 2.1\]](#). In particular, $h^0(X, E) = 8$. Using [\[8\]](#) the space $\mathcal{R}_{13} \times_{\mathcal{M}_{13}} \mathcal{M}_{13,4}^1$ parametrizing Prym curves over tetragonal curves of genus 13 is irreducible, therefore $H^0(X, A^{\otimes 3} \otimes \eta) \neq 0$ for every triple $[X, \eta, A] \in \mathcal{R}_{13} \times_{\mathcal{M}_{13}} \mathcal{M}_{13,4}^1$. We now further specialize the tetragonal curve X to a hyperelliptic curve and $A = A_0(x + y)$, where $A_0 \in W_2^1(X)$ and $x, y \in X$ are general points, whereas

$$\eta = \mathcal{O}_X(p_1 + p_2 + p_3 + p_4 - q_1 - q_2 - q_3 - q_4) \in \mathrm{Pic}^0(X)[2],$$

where $p_1, \dots, p_4, q_1, \dots, q_4$ are mutually distinct Weierstrass points of X . It immediately follows that for these choices $H^0(X, A^{\otimes 3} \otimes \eta) = 0$, which is a contradiction. $\square$

We consider the open substack $\mathfrak{R}_{13}^\# := \pi^{-1}(\mathfrak{M}_{13}^\#)$ of $\overline{\mathfrak{R}}_{13}$ and let $\mathcal{R}_{13}^\#$ be its associated coarse moduli space. We identify $CH^1(\mathcal{R}_{13}^\#)$ with the space $\mathbb{Q}\langle \lambda, \delta'_0, \delta''_0, \delta_0^{\mathrm{ram}} \rangle$. In what follows we extend the structure on the universal theta divisor Θ_{13} to $\mathcal{R}_{13}^\#$ and realize it as the pushforward of the degeneracy locus of a map of vector bundles of the same rank over the fiber product

$$\mathfrak{RSU}_{13}^\#(2, \omega, 8) := \mathfrak{R}_{13}^\# \times_{\mathfrak{M}_{13}^\#} \mathfrak{SU}_{13}^\#(2, \omega, 8).$$

We start with a triple $[X, \eta, E] \in \mathfrak{RSU}_{13}^\#(2, \omega, 8)$. Via [Proposition 7.2](#) the vector bundle E is globally generated and we let $M_E := \mathrm{Ker}\{H^0(X, E) \otimes \mathcal{O}_X \rightarrow E\}$. By tensoring with η and taking cohomology in the exact sequence [\(33\)](#), we observe that $H^0(X, E \otimes \eta) \neq 0$ if and only if the coboundary map

$$(37) \quad \nu: H^1(X, M_E \otimes \eta) \rightarrow H^0(X, E) \otimes H^0(X, \omega_X \otimes \eta)^\vee$$

is not injective. Since clearly $H^0(X, M_E \otimes \eta) = 0$, it follows that

$$h^1(X, M_E \otimes \eta) = -\deg(M_E) + 6(g-1) = 96 = 8 \cdot 12 = h^0(X, E) \cdot h^0(X, \omega_X \otimes \eta).$$

That is, ν is a map between vector space of the same dimension.

By slightly abusing notation, we still denote by

$$\wp: \mathfrak{RC}_{13}^{\#} \rightarrow \mathfrak{RSU}_{13}^{\#}(2, \omega, 8)$$

the universal curve of genus 13 over $\mathfrak{RSU}_{13}^{\#}(2, \omega, 8)$. It comes equipped with a universal rank-two vector bundle $\mathfrak{E}$ such that $\bigwedge^2 \mathfrak{E} \cong \omega_{\wp}$ and $\wp_*(\mathfrak{E})$ is locally free of rank 8 (cf [Proposition 7.4](#)), as well as with a universal Prym line bundle $\mathcal{L}$ with $\mathcal{L}|_{\wp^{-1}([X, \eta, E])} \cong \eta$ for any point $[X, \eta, E] \in \mathfrak{RSU}_{13}^{\#}(2, \omega, 8)$.

We consider the rank-six vector bundle $\mathcal{M}_{\mathfrak{E}}$ on $\mathcal{RC}_{13}^{\#}$ defined by the exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{\mathfrak{E}} \rightarrow \wp^*(\wp_* \mathfrak{E}) \rightarrow \mathfrak{E} \rightarrow 0,$$

then introduce the following sheaves over $\mathfrak{RSU}_{13}^{\#}(2, \omega, 8)$:

$$\mathcal{A} := R^1 \wp_*(\mathcal{M}_{\mathfrak{E}} \otimes \mathcal{L}) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{B} := \wp_*(\mathfrak{E}) \otimes \wp_*(\omega_{\wp} \otimes \mathcal{L})^{\vee}.$$

Using the fact that the map ν defined in (37) is a morphism between two vector spaces of the same dimension for every point $[X, \eta, E] \in \mathfrak{RSU}_{13}^{\#}(2, \omega, 8)$, via Grauert's theorem we conclude that both $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ are locally free of the same rank 96, and there exists a morphism

$$(38) \quad \nu: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$$

whose fiber restrictions are the maps (37). Recall that the forgetful map $\vartheta: \mathfrak{RSU}_{13}^{\#}(2, \omega, 8) \rightarrow \mathfrak{R}_{13}^{\#}$ is generically finite of degree 3. We denote by $\Theta_{13}^{\#}$ the pushforward to $\mathcal{R}_{13}^{\#}$ of the degeneracy locus of the morphism ν given by (38). Observe that $\Theta_{13}^{\#} \cap \mathcal{M}_{13} = \Theta_{13}$.

Theorem 8.3 *The class of the universal theta divisor $\Theta_{13}^{\#}$ on $\mathcal{R}_{13}$ is given by*

$$[\Theta_{13}^{\#}] = \frac{1}{143} (10430\lambda - 1582(\delta'_0 + \delta''_0) - \frac{5899}{2}\delta_0^{\text{ram}}) \in CH^1(\mathcal{R}_{13}^{\#}).$$

Proof From [Proposition 8.2](#) it follows that ν is generically nondegenerate, therefore

$$[\Theta_{13}^{\#}] = c_1(\mathcal{B} - \mathcal{A}).$$

Computing the class $c_1(\mathcal{B})$ is straightforward. We find that $c_1(\wp_*(\omega_{\wp} \otimes \mathcal{L})) = \vartheta^*(\lambda - \frac{1}{4}\delta_0^{\text{ram}})$, using [\[20, Proposition 1.7\]](#). Then via [Proposition 7.4](#), we compute

$$c_1(\mathcal{B}) = 12c_1(\wp_* \mathfrak{E}) - 8c_1(\wp_*(\omega_{\wp} \otimes \mathcal{L})) = 12(\vartheta^*(\lambda) - \frac{1}{2}\gamma) - 8(\vartheta^*(\lambda - \frac{1}{4}\delta_0^{\text{ram}})) = \vartheta^*(4\lambda + 2\delta_0^{\text{ram}}) - 6\gamma.$$

To determine $c_1(\mathcal{A})$ we apply Grothendieck–Riemann–Roch to the morphism $\wp$:

$$(39) \quad \text{ch}(\wp_!(\mathcal{M}_{\mathfrak{E}} \otimes \mathcal{L})) = \wp_* \left[\left(6 + c_1(\mathcal{M}_{\mathfrak{E}} \otimes \mathcal{L}) + \frac{1}{2}(c_1^2(\mathcal{M}_{\mathfrak{E}} \otimes \mathcal{L}) - 2c_2(\mathcal{M}_{\mathfrak{E}} \otimes \mathcal{L})) + \cdots \right) \cdot \left(1 - \frac{1}{2}c_1(\Omega_{\wp}^1) + \frac{1}{12}(c_1^2(\Omega_{\wp}^1) + c_2(\Omega_{\wp}^1)) + \cdots \right) \right].$$

Observe by direct calculation that the formulas

$$c_1(\mathcal{M}_{\mathfrak{E}} \otimes \mathcal{L}) = c_1(\mathcal{M}_{\mathfrak{E}}) + 6c_1(\mathcal{L}) \quad \text{and} \quad c_2(\mathcal{M}_{\mathfrak{E}} \otimes \mathcal{L}) = c_2(\mathcal{M}_{\mathfrak{E}}) + 5c_1(\mathcal{M}_{\mathfrak{E}}) \cdot c_1(\mathcal{L}) + 15c_1^2(\mathcal{L})$$

hold, therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \wp_*\left(\frac{1}{2}(c_1^2(\mathcal{M}_{\mathfrak{E}} \otimes \mathcal{L}) - 2c_2(\mathcal{M}_{\mathfrak{E}} \otimes \mathcal{L}))\right) &= \wp_*\left(\frac{1}{2}(c_1^2(\mathcal{M}_{\mathfrak{E}}) - 2c_2(\mathcal{M}_{\mathfrak{E}})) + c_1(\mathcal{M}_{\mathfrak{E}}) \cdot c_1(\mathcal{L}) + 3c_1^2(\mathcal{L})\right) \\ &= \gamma - \frac{1}{2}\wp_*(c_1^2(\omega_{\wp})) = \gamma - \frac{1}{2}(\wp^*(12\lambda - \delta'_0 - \delta''_0 - 2\delta_0^{\text{ram}})), \end{aligned}$$

where in the last formula we have used [Proposition 7.5](#), Mumford's formula [\[27\]](#) for the class $\wp_*(c_1^2(\omega_{\wp}))$, and $2\wp_*(c_1^2(\mathcal{L})) = -\wp^*(\delta_0^{\text{ram}})$; see [\[20, Proposition 1.6\]](#).

Substituting in the equation [\(39\)](#), coupled with [Proposition 7.5](#) and also using that via the push–pull formula one has $\wp_*(\wp^*(\wp^*(\lambda) - \frac{1}{2}\gamma) \cdot c_1(\omega_{\wp})) = (g-1) \cdot (\wp^*(\lambda) - \frac{1}{2}\gamma)$, we obtain

$$c_1(\mathcal{A}) = -7\gamma + \wp^*(6\lambda + \frac{3}{2}\delta_0^{\text{ram}}).$$

Putting everything together we find

$$[\Theta_{13}^{\#}] = \wp_*c_1(\mathcal{B} - \mathcal{A}) = \wp_*(\gamma - 2\lambda + \frac{1}{2}\delta_0^{\text{ram}}) = 2\wp_*(\gamma) - 6\lambda + \frac{3}{2}\delta_0^{\text{ram}}.$$

Finally, [Proposition 7.7](#) gives $143\wp_*(\gamma) = 11288\lambda - 1582(\delta'_0 + \delta''_0 + 2\delta_0^{\text{ram}})$ and the conclusion follows. $\square$

We can now complete the proof that $\bar{\mathcal{R}}_{13}$ is of general type.

Proof of Theorem 1.2 It is shown in [\[20, Theorem 6.1\]](#) that any g pluricanonical forms defined on $\bar{\mathcal{R}}_g$ automatically extend to any resolution of singularities, therefore $\bar{\mathcal{R}}_g$ is of general type if and only if the canonical class $K_{\bar{\mathcal{R}}_g}$ is big, that is, it can be expressed as a positive rational combination of an ample and an effective class on $\bar{\mathcal{R}}_g$. To that end we shall use, in addition to the closure $\bar{\Theta}_{13}$ in $\bar{\mathcal{R}}_{13}$ of the universal theta divisor Θ_{13} , the divisor $D_{13:2}$ on $\mathcal{R}_{13}$ consisting of pairs $[X, \eta]$ where the 2-torsion point η lies in the divisorial difference variety

$$X_6 - X_6 = \{\mathcal{O}_X(D - E) : D, E \in X_6\} \subseteq \text{Pic}^0(X).$$

It is shown in [\[20, Theorem 0.2\]](#) that up to a positive rational constant, the closure of $D_{13:2}$ inside $\bar{\mathcal{R}}_{13}$ is given by $[\bar{D}_{13:2}] = 19\lambda - 3(\delta'_0 + \delta''_0) - \frac{13}{4}\delta_0^{\text{ram}} - \dots \in CH^1(\bar{\mathcal{R}}_{13})$. Observe that by construction, $\Theta_{13}^{\#}$ differs from the restriction of $\bar{\Theta}_{13}$ to $\mathcal{M}_{13}^{\#}$ by a (possibly empty) effective combination of the divisors Δ'_0 , Δ''_0 and Δ_0^{ram} ; hence, using [Theorem 8.3](#) we can write

$$[\bar{\Theta}_{13}] = \frac{1}{143}(10430\lambda - b'_0\delta'_0 - b''_0\delta''_0 - b_0^{\text{ram}}\delta_0^{\text{ram}} - \dots) \in CH^1(\bar{\mathcal{R}}_{13}),$$

where $b'_0 \geq 1582$, $b''_0 \geq 1582$ and $b_0^{\text{ram}} \geq \frac{5899}{2}$. We consider the effective divisor, on $\bar{\mathcal{R}}_{13}$,

$$\mathcal{D} := \frac{65}{674}[\bar{\Theta}_{13}] + \frac{1153}{3707}[\bar{D}_{13:2}] = a\lambda - a'_0\delta'_0 - a''_0\delta''_0 - a_0^{\text{ram}}\delta_0^{\text{ram}} - \sum_{i=1}^{12} a_i\delta_i - \sum_{i=1}^6 a_{i,13-i}\delta_{i:13-i},$$

where $a = \frac{4362}{337}$, $a'_0 \geq 2$, $a''_0 \geq 2$ and $a_0^{\text{ram}} \geq 3$. By an argument using pencils on $K3$ surfaces, one can show that each of the coefficients $a_1, \dots, a_{12}$ or $a_{1,12}, \dots, a_{6,7}$ is at least equal to 3. Indeed, each boundary divisor Δ_i or $\Delta_{i:13-i}$ of $\bar{\mathcal{R}}_{13}$ is covered by pencils of reducible Prym curves consisting of two

components, of which one moves in a suitable Lefschetz pencil on a *fixed* $K3$ surface. The intersection numbers of these pencils with the generators of $CH^1(\overline{\mathcal{R}}_g)$ were computed in [20, Proposition 1.8]. Since $\mathcal{D}$ is the closure in $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{13}$ of an effective divisor on $\mathcal{R}_{13}$, the intersection number of each such pencil with $\mathcal{D}$ is nonnegative. For instance, for $1 \leq i \leq 6$ we obtain, in this way, the inequality

$$a_{13-i} \geq a'_0(6i + 18) - a(i + 1) \geq 2(6i + 18) - \frac{4362}{337}(i + 1) \geq 3.$$

The inequalities for the remaining coefficients of $\mathcal{D}$ can be handled similarly; see also [20, Proposition 1.9]. Since $a = 12.943 \dots < 13$, comparing the class of $\mathcal{D}$ to that of $K_{\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{13}}$ given in (36), we conclude that $K_{\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{13}}$ can be written as a positive combination of $[\mathcal{D}]$ and a multiple of λ , hence it is big. $\square$

8.3 The Kodaira dimension of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{13,n}$

We indicate how our results on divisors on $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{13}$ can be used to determine the Kodaira dimension of the moduli space $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{13,n}$.

Proof of Theorem 1.6 It suffices to show that $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{13,9}$ is of general type to conclude that the same holds for $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{13,n}$ when $n \geq 10$. We use the divisor $\mathcal{D}_{13:2^4,1^5}$ considered by Logan [36] and defined as the $\mathfrak{S}_9$ -orbit (under the action permuting the marked points) of the locus of pointed curves $[X, p_1, \dots, p_9] \in \mathcal{M}_{13,9}$ such that

$$h^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(2p_1 + \dots + 2p_4 + p_5 + \dots + p_9)) \geq 2.$$

Up to a positive constant the class of the closure in $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{13,9}$ of $\mathcal{D}_{13:2^4,1^5}$ equals

$$[\overline{\mathcal{D}}_{13:2^4,1^5}] = -\lambda + \frac{17}{9} \sum_{i=1}^9 \psi_i - \frac{25}{6} \delta_{0:2} - \dots \in CH^1(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{13,9}).$$

(See [17] or [36] for the standard notation on the generators of $CH^1(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,n})$.) If $\pi: \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{13,9} \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{13}$ is the map forgetting the marked points, a routine calculation shows that the canonical class $K_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{13,9}}$ can be expressed as a positive linear combination of $[\overline{\mathcal{D}}_{13:2^4,1^5}]$ and $\pi^*([D])$, where $D \in \text{Eff}(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{13})$ if and only if $2s(D) - \frac{9}{17} < 13$. Observe that the class of the nonabelian Brill–Noether divisor $[\overline{\mathcal{MP}}_{13}]$ verifies this inequality, and the result follows. $\square$

References

- [1] **D Agostini, I Barros**, *Pencils on surfaces with normal crossings and the Kodaira dimension of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,n}$* , Forum Math. Sigma 9 (2021) art. id. e31 [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [2] **Y An, M Baker, G Kuperberg, F Shokrieh**, *Canonical representatives for divisor classes on tropical curves and the matrix-tree theorem*, Forum Math. Sigma 2 (2014) art. id. e24 [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [3] **M Aprodu, G Farkas**, *Koszul cohomology and applications to moduli*, from “Grassmannians, moduli spaces and vector bundles” (D A Ellwood, E Previato, editors), Clay Math. Proc. 14, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI (2011) 25–50 [MR](#) [Zbl](#)

- [4] **M Aprodu, G Farkas, Ş Papadima, C Raicu, J Weyman**, *Topological invariants of groups and Koszul modules*, Duke Math. J. 171 (2022) 2013–2046 [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [5] **E Arbarello, M Cornalba, P A Griffiths, J Harris**, *Geometry of algebraic curves, I*, Grundle Math. Wissen. 267, Springer (1985) [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [6] **A Beauville**, *Prym varieties and the Schottky problem*, Invent. Math. 41 (1977) 149–196 [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [7] **A Bertram, B Feinberg**, *On stable rank two bundles with canonical determinant and many sections*, from “Algebraic geometry” (P E Newstead, editor), Lecture Notes in Pure and Appl. Math. 200, Dekker, New York (1998) 259–269 [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [8] **R Biggers, M Fried**, *Irreducibility of moduli spaces of cyclic unramified covers of genus g curves*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 295 (1986) 59–70 [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [9] **G Bruns**, *$\bar{\mathcal{R}}_{15}$ is of general type*, Algebra Number Theory 10 (2016) 1949–1964 [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [10] **D Chen, G Farkas, I Morrison**, *Effective divisors on moduli spaces of curves and abelian varieties*, from “A celebration of algebraic geometry” (B Hassett, J McKernan, J Starr, R Vakil, editors), Clay Math. Proc. 18, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI (2013) 131–169 [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [11] **A Chiodo, D Eisenbud, G Farkas, F-O Schreyer**, *Syzygies of torsion bundles and the geometry of the level ℓ modular variety over $\bar{\mathcal{M}}_g$* , Invent. Math. 194 (2013) 73–118 [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [12] **F Cools, J Draisma, S Payne, E Robeva**, *A tropical proof of the Brill–Noether theorem*, Adv. Math. 230 (2012) 759–776 [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [13] **M Coppens, G Martens**, *Linear series on a general k -gonal curve*, Abh. Math. Sem. Univ. Hamburg 69 (1999) 347–371 [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [14] **E Cotterill, A Alonso Gonzalo, N Zhang**, *The strong maximal rank conjecture and higher rank Brill–Noether theory*, J. Lond. Math. Soc. 104 (2021) 169–205 [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [15] **D Eisenbud, J Harris**, *Limit linear series: basic theory*, Invent. Math. 85 (1986) 337–371 [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [16] **D Eisenbud, J Harris**, *The Kodaira dimension of the moduli space of curves of genus ≥ 23* , Invent. Math. 90 (1987) 359–387 [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [17] **G Farkas**, *Koszul divisors on moduli spaces of curves*, Amer. J. Math. 131 (2009) 819–867 [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [18] **G Farkas**, *Brill–Noether with ramification at unassigned points*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra 217 (2013) 1838–1843 [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [19] **G Farkas, D Jensen, S Payne**, *The Kodaira dimensions of $\bar{\mathcal{M}}_{22}$ and $\bar{\mathcal{M}}_{23}$* , preprint (2020) [arXiv 2005.00622v2](#)
- [20] **G Farkas, K Ludwig**, *The Kodaira dimension of the moduli space of Prym varieties*, J. Eur. Math. Soc. 12 (2010) 755–795 [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [21] **G Farkas, M Popa**, *Effective divisors on $\bar{\mathcal{M}}_g$, curves on $K3$ surfaces, and the slope conjecture*, J. Algebraic Geom. 14 (2005) 241–267 [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [22] **G Farkas, R Rimányi**, *Quadric rank loci on moduli of curves and $K3$ surfaces*, Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Supér. 53 (2020) 945–992 [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [23] **G Farkas, A Verra**, *Prym varieties and moduli of polarized Nikulin surfaces*, Adv. Math. 290 (2016) 314–328 [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [24] **W Fulton**, *Intersection theory*, Ergebnisse der Math. (3) 2, Springer (1984) [MR](#) [Zbl](#)

- [25] **C Haase, G Musiker, J Yu**, *Linear systems on tropical curves*, Math. Z. 270 (2012) 1111–1140 [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [26] **J Harris, I Morrison**, *Slopes of effective divisors on the moduli space of stable curves*, Invent. Math. 99 (1990) 321–355 [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [27] **J Harris, D Mumford**, *On the Kodaira dimension of the moduli space of curves*, Invent. Math. 67 (1982) 23–88 [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [28] **J Harris, L Tu**, *Chern numbers of kernel and cokernel bundles*, Invent. Math. 75 (1984) 467–475 [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [29] **R Hartshorne**, *Stable reflexive sheaves*, Math. Ann. 254 (1980) 121–176 [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [30] **D Jensen, S Payne**, *Tropical independence, I: Shapes of divisors and a proof of the Gieseker–Petri theorem*, Algebra Number Theory 8 (2014) 2043–2066 [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [31] **D Jensen, S Payne**, *Tropical independence, II: The maximal rank conjecture for quadrics*, Algebra Number Theory 10 (2016) 1601–1640 [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [32] **D Khosla**, *Tautological classes on moduli spaces of curves with linear series and a push-forward formula when $\rho = 0$* , preprint (2007) [arXiv 0704.1340](#)
- [33] **H Lange, M S Narasimhan**, *Maximal subbundles of rank two vector bundles on curves*, Math. Ann. 266 (1983) 55–72 [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [34] **H Lange, P E Newstead, S S Park**, *Nonemptiness of Brill–Noether loci in $M(2, K)$* , Comm. Algebra 44 (2016) 746–767 [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [35] **R Lazarsfeld**, *Brill–Noether–Petri without degenerations*, J. Differential Geom. 23 (1986) 299–307 [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [36] **A Logan**, *The Kodaira dimension of moduli spaces of curves with marked points*, Amer. J. Math. 125 (2003) 105–138 [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [37] **S Mukai**, *Curves, K3 surfaces and Fano 3–folds of genus ≤ 10* , from “Algebraic geometry and commutative algebra, I” (H Hijikata, H Hironaka, M Maruyama, H Matsumura, M Miyanishi, T Oda, K Ueno, editors), Kinokuniya, Tokyo (1988) 357–377 [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [38] **S Mukai**, *Noncommutativizability of Brill–Noether theory and 3–dimensional Fano varieties*, Sūgaku 49 (1997) 1–24 [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [39] **M Nagata**, *On self-intersection number of a section on a ruled surface*, Nagoya Math. J. 37 (1970) 191–196 [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [40] **P E Newstead**, *Characteristic classes of stable bundles of rank 2 over an algebraic curve*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 169 (1972) 337–345 [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [41] **M Raynaud**, *Sections des fibrés vectoriels sur une courbe*, Bull. Soc. Math. France 110 (1982) 103–125 [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [42] **X Sun**, *Moduli spaces of $\mathrm{SL}(r)$ –bundles on singular irreducible curves*, Asian J. Math. 7 (2003) 609–625 [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [43] **S-L Tan**, *On the slopes of the moduli spaces of curves*, Internat. J. Math. 9 (1998) 119–127 [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [44] **M Teixidor i Bigas**, *Rank two vector bundles with canonical determinant*, Math. Nachr. 265 (2004) 100–106 [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [45] **M Teixidor i Bigas**, *Petri map for rank two bundles with canonical determinant*, Compos. Math. 144 (2008) 705–720 [MR](#) [Zbl](#)

- [46] **M Thaddeus**, *Conformal field theory and the cohomology of the moduli space of stable bundles*, J. Differential Geom. 35 (1992) 131–149 [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [47] **A Verra**, *The unirationality of the moduli spaces of curves of genus 14 or lower*, Compos. Math. 141 (2005) 1425–1444 [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [48] **C Voisin**, *Sur l'application de Wahl des courbes satisfaisant la condition de Brill–Noether–Petri*, Acta Math. 168 (1992) 249–272 [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [49] **N Zhang**, *Towards the Bertram–Feinberg–Mukai conjecture*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra 220 (2016) 1588–1654 [MR](#) [Zbl](#)

*Institut für Mathematik, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin
Berlin, Germany*

*Department of Mathematics, University of Kentucky
Lexington, KY, United States*

*Department of Mathematics, University of Texas at Austin
Austin, TX, United States*

farkas@math.hu-berlin.de, dave.jensen@uky.edu, sampayne@utexas.edu

Proposed: Dan Abramovich

Received: 31 October 2021

Seconded: Marc Levine, Mark Gross

Revised: 17 February 2022

GEOMETRY & TOPOLOGY

msp.org/gt

MANAGING EDITOR

András I Stipsicz Alfréd Rényi Institute of Mathematics
stipsicz@renyi.hu

BOARD OF EDITORS

Mohammed Abouzaid	Stanford University abouzaid@stanford.edu	Mark Gross	University of Cambridge mgross@dpms.cam.ac.uk
Dan Abramovich	Brown University dan_abramovich@brown.edu	Rob Kirby	University of California, Berkeley kirby@math.berkeley.edu
Ian Agol	University of California, Berkeley ianagol@math.berkeley.edu	Bruce Kleiner	NYU, Courant Institute bkleiner@cims.nyu.edu
Arend Bayer	University of Edinburgh arend.bayer@ed.ac.uk	Sándor Kovács	University of Washington skovacs@uw.edu
Mark Behrens	University of Notre Dame mbehren1@nd.edu	Urs Lang	ETH Zürich urs.lang@math.ethz.ch
Mladen Bestvina	University of Utah bestvina@math.utah.edu	Marc Levine	Universität Duisburg-Essen marc.levine@uni-due.de
Martin R Bridson	University of Oxford bridson@maths.ox.ac.uk	Ciprian Manolescu	University of California, Los Angeles cm@math.ucla.edu
Jim Bryan	University of British Columbia jbryan@math.ubc.ca	Haynes Miller	Massachusetts Institute of Technology hmr@math.mit.edu
Dmitri Burago	Pennsylvania State University burago@math.psu.edu	Tomasz Mrowka	Massachusetts Institute of Technology mrowka@math.mit.edu
Tobias H Colding	Massachusetts Institute of Technology colding@math.mit.edu	Aaron Naber	Northwestern University anaber@math.northwestern.edu
Simon Donaldson	Imperial College, London s.donaldson@ic.ac.uk	Peter Ozsváth	Princeton University petero@math.princeton.edu
Yasha Eliashberg	Stanford University eliash-gt@math.stanford.edu	Leonid Polterovich	Tel Aviv University polterov@post.tau.ac.il
Benson Farb	University of Chicago farb@math.uchicago.edu	Colin Rourke	University of Warwick gt@maths.warwick.ac.uk
David M Fisher	Rice University davidfisher@rice.edu	Roman Sauer	Karlsruhe Institute of Technology roman.sauer@kit.edu
Mike Freedman	Microsoft Research michaelf@microsoft.com	Stefan Schwede	Universität Bonn schwede@math.uni-bonn.de
David Gabai	Princeton University gabai@princeton.edu	Natasa Sesum	Rutgers University natasas@math.rutgers.edu
Stavros Garoufalidis	Southern U. of Sci. and Tech., China stavros@mpim-bonn.mpg.de	Gang Tian	Massachusetts Institute of Technology tian@math.mit.edu
Cameron Gordon	University of Texas gordon@math.utexas.edu	Ulrike Tillmann	Oxford University tillmann@maths.ox.ac.uk
Jesper Grodal	University of Copenhagen jg@math.ku.dk	Nathalie Wahl	University of Copenhagen wahl@math.ku.dk
Misha Gromov	IHÉS and NYU, Courant Institute gromov@ihes.fr	Anna Wienhard	Universität Heidelberg wienhard@mathi.uni-heidelberg.de

See inside back cover or msp.org/gt for submission instructions.

The subscription price for 2024 is US \$805/year for the electronic version, and \$1135/year (+\$70, if shipping outside the US) for print and electronic. Subscriptions, requests for back issues and changes of subscriber address should be sent to MSP. Geometry & Topology is indexed by Mathematical Reviews, Zentralblatt MATH, Current Mathematical Publications and the Science Citation Index.

Geometry & Topology (ISSN 1465-3060 printed, 1364-0380 electronic) is published 9 times per year and continuously online, by Mathematical Sciences Publishers, c/o Department of Mathematics, University of California, 798 Evans Hall #3840, Berkeley, CA 94720-3840. Periodical rate postage paid at Oakland, CA 94615-9651, and additional mailing offices. POSTMASTER: send address changes to Mathematical Sciences Publishers, c/o Department of Mathematics, University of California, 798 Evans Hall #3840, Berkeley, CA 94720-3840.

GT peer review and production are managed by EditFLOW® from MSP.

PUBLISHED BY

 **mathematical sciences publishers**
nonprofit scientific publishing
<http://msp.org/>

© 2024 Mathematical Sciences Publishers

GEOMETRY & TOPOLOGY

Volume 28

Issue 2 (pages 497–1003)

2024

On the top-weight rational cohomology of $\mathcal{A}_g$	497
MADELINE BRANDT, JULIETTE BRUCE, MELODY CHAN, MARGARIDA MELO, GWYNETH MORELAND and COREY WOLFE	
Algebraic uniqueness of Kähler–Ricci flow limits and optimal degenerations of Fano varieties	539
JIYUAN HAN and CHI LI	
Valuations on the character variety: Newton polytopes and residual Poisson bracket	593
JULIEN MARCHÉ and CHRISTOPHER-LLOYD SIMON	
The local (co)homology theorems for equivariant bordism	627
MARCO LA VECCHIA	
Configuration spaces of disks in a strip, twisted algebras, persistence, and other stories	641
HANNAH ALPERT and FEDOR MANIN	
Closed geodesics with prescribed intersection numbers	701
YANN CHAUBET	
On endomorphisms of the de Rham cohomology functor	759
SHIZHANG LI and SHUBHODIP MONDAL	
The nonabelian Brill–Noether divisor on $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{13}$ and the Kodaira dimension of $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{13}$	803
GAVRIL FARKAS, DAVID JENSEN and SAM PAYNE	
Orbit equivalences of $\mathbb{R}$ –covered Anosov flows and hyperbolic-like actions on the line	867
THOMAS BARTHELMÉ and KATHRYN MANN	
Microlocal theory of Legendrian links and cluster algebras	901
ROGER CASALS and DAPING WENG	
Correction to the article Bimodules in bordered Heegaard Floer homology	1001
ROBERT LIPSHITZ, PETER OZSVÁTH and DYLAN P THURSTON	