MODULAR COMPACTIFICATIONS OF $\mathcal{M}_{2,n}$ I

LUCA BATTISTELLA

ABSTRACT.

CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION

One of the most beautiful and influential results of modern algebraic geometry is the construction of a modular compactification of the stack of smooth pointed curves $\mathcal{M}_{g,n}$, due to P. Deligne and D. Mumford [DM69], through the introduction of *stable* pointed curves.

Definition 1.1. Assume $2g - 2 + n > 0$. A connected, reduced, complete curve C with distinct markings $(p_1, \ldots, p_n)$ is *stable* if:

   (1) C has only nodes as singularities, and p_i are smooth points of C;
   (2) every rational component of C has at least three special points (markings or nodes).

Theorem 1.2. *Assume $2g - 2 + n > 0$. The moduli stack of stable pointed curves $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,n}$ is a smooth and proper connected DM stack over $\mathrm{Spec}(\mathbb{Z})$, with projective coarse moduli space $\overline{\mathbf{M}}_{g,n}$. The boundary $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,n} \setminus \mathcal{M}_{g,n}$, representing nodal curves, is a normal crossing divisor.*

On one hand, the Deligne-Mumford compactification has every desirable property one can hope for; on the other, it is not unique, and it is an interesting deep question to classify all possible modular compactifications of $\mathcal{M}_{g,n}$ - a natural partial answer has been given by D.I. Smyth [Smy13].

Even though the existence of $\overline{\mathbf{M}}_{g,n}$ can be deduced from nowadays standard general theory on stacks [KM97], this space was first constructed by means of GIT [Gie82, MFK94, BS08]. The study of alternative compactifications of $\mathcal{M}_{g,n}$ is motivated as well by an interest in the birational geometry of $\overline{\mathbf{M}}_{g,n}$, and it is not by chance that the first steps in this direction were moved from a GIT perspective - by changing the invariant theory problem or the stability condition, and realising that the resulting quotient still enjoys a modular interpretation [Sch91, Has05]. The consequent program that goes under the name of B. Hassett and S. Keel aims to describe all the different possible quotients, and to understand whether every step of a minimal model program for $\overline{\mathbf{M}}_{g,n}$ can be given a modular interpretation in terms of curves with worse than nodal singularities. Since the early stages of this study, it has developed into a fascinating playground for testing implementations of ideas originating from GIT into a general structural theory for Artin stacks [AFSvdW17, AFS17a, AFS17b, CTV18].

Only few steps of the Hassett-Keel program have been carried out in full generality. On the other hand, the program has been completed to a larger extent in low genus: with the introduction of weighted pointed curves [Has03] in genus zero, and with Smyth's pioneering work in genus one [Smy11a, Smy11b, Smy18].

Smyth extended earlier work of Schubert by following the philosophy that an alternative compactification can be defined by allowing a reasonably larger class of singularities (*local condition*), studying their stable models, and disallowing the latter by imposing a stronger stability condition (*global condition*); this ensures that the resulting moduli problem be again separated and universally closed, by the valuative criterion.

A useful notion in this respect is that of the *genus* of an isolated curve singularity: let (C, x) be (the germ of) a reduced curve over an algebraically closed field $\mathbf{k}$ at its unique singular point x, with normalisation $\nu \colon \widetilde{C} \to C$.

Definition 1.3. Let C have m branches at x, and δ the $\mathbf{k}$-dimension of $\nu_* \mathscr{O}_{\widetilde{C}} / \mathscr{O}_C$, which is a skyscraper sheaf supported at x. The genus of (C, x) is then

$$g = \delta - m + 1.$$

It can be thought of as the number of conditions that a function must satisfy in order to descend from the seminormalisation to C. It is a notion adapted to work in families, in the sense that a complete, reduced curve C with only one singular point at x and normalisation a disjoint union of m copies of $\mathbb{P}^1$ will appear in a family of curves of arithmetic genus g.

Smyth found that, for every fixed number of branches m, there is a unique germ of Gorenstein singularity of genus one up to isomorphism, namely:

$m = 1$: the cusp, $V(y^2 - x^3) \subseteq \mathbb{A}^2_{x,y}$;
$m = 2$: the tacnode, $V(y^2 - yx^2) \subseteq \mathbb{A}^2_{x,y}$;
$m \geq 3$: the union of m general lines in $\mathbb{A}^{m-1}$.

Singularities of this kind, with up to m branches, together with nodes, form a deformation-open class of singularities. Furthermore, the elliptic m-fold point can be obtained by contracting a smooth elliptic curve with m rational tails in a one-parameter smoothing, and, roughly speaking, all stable models look like this.

Definition 1.4. [Smy11a] For $m < n$, a connected, reduced, complete curve C of arithmetic genus one with smooth distinct markings $(p_1, \ldots, p_n)$ is m-stable if:

(1) it has only nodes and elliptic l-fold points, $l \leq m$, as singularities;
(2) for every connected subcurve $E \subseteq C$ of arithmetic genus one, its *level* $|E \cap \overline{C \setminus E}| + |\{i \colon p_i \in E\}|$ is strictly bigger than m;
(3) $H^0(C, \Omega_C^\vee(-\sum_i p_i)) = 0$.

The latter can be thought of as a decency condition on the moduli stack. The second one is instead essential in guaranteeing the uniqueness of m-stable limits, seen the discussion above. Smyth's main result is the following.

Theorem 1.5. [Smy11a, Smy11b] *The moduli stack of m-stable curves $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{1,n}(m)$ is a proper irreducible DM stack over $\operatorname{Spec} \mathbb{Z}[1/6]$. It is not smooth for $m \geq 6$.*

1.1. **Outline of results.** Here are the main novelties of our construction. It is not a semistable compactification (see [Smy13, Definition 1.2]), in that we allow dangling singularities of type II (see ??? below for a definition), whose normalisation has a one-pointed rational component. The necessity to do so was prefigured in [AFS16] already.

The dualising line bundle of a minimal (with no separating nodes) Gorenstein curve of genus one is trivial [Smy11a, Lemma 3.3]. This plays a fundamental role in the study of semistable tails, as well as in the boundedness of the moduli functor. On the other hand the dualising line bundle of a minimal Gorenstein curve of genus two Z has degree two. For this reason we had to desymmetrise the problem and use the first marking as a reference point, in order to write $\omega_Z = \mathscr{O}_Z(q_1 + \bar{q}_1)$ whenever needed, where q_1 is the point of Z closest to p_1, and $\bar{q}_1$ is conjugate to q_1 (it is not always defined uniquely).

1.2. **Future directions.**

(1) Resolve the indeterminacy of the rational map $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{2,n}(m_1) \dashrightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{2,n}(m_2)$; we expect the construction to rely on a semistable compactification of the crimping spaces of the genus two singularities, as in [vdW10, §1.10] and [Smy18]. It would be interesting to put this work in the context of the Hassett-Keel program, as in [Smy11b]. More generally, a question outstanding to our knowledge is whether the whole program fits in the theoretical framework developed in [Hal14].
(2) Our main motivation to start this project arose from Gromov-Witten theory. In genus one, the link between reduced Gromov-Witten invariants (see for example [VZ08, Zin09, LZ09]) and maps from singular curves (see [Vis12]) was partially uncovered in [BCM18], and brought in plain light

in [RSW17a, RSW17b]. With F. Carocci we are investigating whether similar techniques may serve to desingularise the main component of the space of genus two maps to projective space. If this is the case, they will provide a clear definition of reduced invariants, and hopefully ease the access to comparison (standard vs. reduced) results. We expect there will be a(n iso)morphism to the modular blow-up constructed in [HLN12]. This might lead to a mathematical definition of all-genera Gopakumar-Vafa invariants, one day.

2. GORENSTEIN CURVE SINGULARITIES OF GENUS TWO

In this and the next sections we work over an algebraically closed field of characteristic different from $2, 3, 5$. We provide an algebraic classification of the completed local rings of Gorenstein curve singularities of genus two.

Let (C, x) be as above, and let $(R, \mathfrak{m})$ denote $\hat{\mathscr{O}}_{C,x}$, with normalisation:

$$(\widetilde{R}, \widetilde{\mathfrak{m}}) \simeq (\mathbf{k}[[t_1]] \oplus \ldots \oplus \mathbf{k}[[t_m]], \langle t_1, \ldots, t_m \rangle).$$

Here m is the number of branches. Recall from Definition 1.3 that the genus is:

$$g = \delta - m + 1,$$

so $\delta = m + 1$ in our case. Smyth considers $\widetilde{R}/R$ as a $\mathbb{Z}$-graded module with:

$$(\widetilde{R}/R)_i := \widetilde{\mathfrak{m}}^i / (\widetilde{\mathfrak{m}}^i \cap R) + \widetilde{\mathfrak{m}}^{i+1};$$

furthermore he notices in [Smy11a, Appendix A] that:

(1) $m + 1 = \delta(p) = \sum_{i \geq 0} \dim_{\mathbf{k}}(\widetilde{R}/R)_i$;
(2) $2 = g = \sum_{i \geq 1} \dim_{\mathbf{k}}(\widetilde{R}/R)_i$;
(3) if $(\widetilde{R}/R)_i = (\widetilde{R}/R)_j = 0$ then $(\widetilde{R}/R)_{i+j} = 0$.

The following observations will also be useful:

(4) $\sum_{i \geq k}(\widetilde{R}/R)_i$ is a grading of $\widetilde{\mathfrak{m}}^k / (\widetilde{\mathfrak{m}}^k \cap R)$;
(5) there is an exact sequence of $R/\mathfrak{m} = \mathbf{k}$-modules:

$$0 \to A_k := \frac{\widetilde{\mathfrak{m}}^k \cap R}{\widetilde{\mathfrak{m}}^{k+1} \cap R} \to \frac{\widetilde{\mathfrak{m}}^k}{\widetilde{\mathfrak{m}}^{k+1}} \to \left(\widetilde{R}/R\right)_k \to 0$$

Lemma 2.1. *There are two unibranch curve singularities of genus two; only one of them is Gorenstein, the A_4-singularity or ramphoid cusp: $V(y^2 - x^5) \subseteq \mathbb{A}^2_{x,y}$.*

Proof. In the unibranch case $\dim_{\mathbf{k}}(\widetilde{R}/R)_1 \leq 1$, hence equality must hold (by observation (3) above). We are left with two cases:

- either $\dim_{\mathbf{k}}(\widetilde{R}/R)_2 = 1$ and $\dim_{\mathbf{k}}(\widetilde{R}/R)_i = 0$ for all $i \geq 3$: in this case $\widetilde{\mathfrak{m}}^3 \subseteq \mathfrak{m}$ by observation (4). In facts by (5) we see that $\widetilde{\mathfrak{m}}^3 = \mathfrak{m}$, hence $R \simeq \mathbf{k}[[t^3, t^4, t^5]]$, a spatial non-Gorenstein singularity.

- Or $\dim_{\mathbf{k}}(\widetilde{R}/R)_3 = 1$ and $\dim_{\mathbf{k}}(\widetilde{R}/R)_i = 0$ for $i = 2$ and for all $i \geq 4$: in this case $\widetilde{\mathfrak{m}}^4 \subseteq \mathfrak{m}$ by observation (4). On the other hand from $\dim_{\mathbf{k}}(\widetilde{\mathfrak{m}}^2 \cap R/\widetilde{\mathfrak{m}}^3 \cap R) = 1$ we deduce that there is a generator of degree 2, and from $\dim_{\mathbf{k}}(\widetilde{\mathfrak{m}}^3 \cap R/\widetilde{\mathfrak{m}}^4 \cap R) = 0$ there is none of degree 3; so we see that

$$\mathfrak{m}/\mathfrak{m}^2 = \langle t^2, t^5 \rangle,$$

  i.e. $R \simeq \mathbf{k}[[x, y]]/(x^5 - y^2)$, as anticipated.

$\square$

Let $I = (R : \tilde{R}) = \operatorname{Ann}_R(\tilde{R}/R)$ be the conductor ideal. Recall (see e.g. [Hun99, Theorem 6.4]) that (C, x) is Gorenstein iff :

$$\dim_{\mathbf{k}}(R/I) = \dim_{\mathbf{k}}(\widetilde{R}/R)(= \delta).$$

Proposition 2.2. *For every fixed integer $m \geq 2$, there are exactly two Gorenstein curve singularities of genus two with m branches.*

Proof. We wish to find a basis for $\mathfrak{m}/\mathfrak{m}^2$, because a map of complete local rings that is surjective on cotangent spaces is surjective. We use the filtrations above.

Case I: $(2, 0, 0)$. We see that $\widetilde{\mathfrak{m}}^2 \subseteq I$, so (by the Gorenstein assumption) $m + 1 = \delta = \dim_{\mathbf{k}}(R/I) \leq \dim_{\mathbf{k}}(R/\widetilde{\mathfrak{m}}^2) = \dim_{\mathbf{k}} A_0 + \dim_{\mathbf{k}} A_1 = m - 1$, contradiction. (In this case the singularity is decomposable, see [AFS16, Proposition 2.1].)

Case II: $(1, 1, 0)$. We have $\widetilde{\mathfrak{m}}^3 \subseteq I$. We are going to write down the $m - 1$ generators of $A_1 \pmod{\widetilde{\mathfrak{m}}^3}$. The first one, call it, x_1, has a non-trivial linear term in at least one of the variables, wlog t_1. We can therefore change coordinates in t_1 and make it into the form: $x_1 = t_1 \oplus p_{1,2}(t_2) \oplus \ldots \oplus p_{1,m}(t_m) \mod \widetilde{\mathfrak{m}}^3$. Now we can use x_1 and x_1^2 to make the second generator start with a 0. It will still have a linear term independent of t_1, say non-trivial in t_2. Now by changing coordinates in the latter, we can write $x_2 = 0 \oplus t_2 \oplus \ldots \oplus p_{1,m}(t_m) \mod \widetilde{\mathfrak{m}}^3$. Also notice that, by taking a linear combination with x_2 and x_2^2, we may assume that $x_1 = t_1 \oplus 0 \oplus p_{1,3}(t_3) \oplus \ldots \oplus p_{1,m}(t_m) \mod \widetilde{\mathfrak{m}}^3$. Therefore, by Gaussian elimination and coordinate change, we may write

$$\begin{aligned} x_1 &= t_1 \oplus 0 \oplus \ldots \oplus \alpha_{1,m} t_m + \beta_{1,m} t_m^2 \\ x_2 &= 0 \oplus t_2 \oplus \ldots \oplus \alpha_{2,m} t_m + \beta_{2,m} t_m^2 \\ &\ldots \\ x_{m-1} &= 0 \oplus \ldots \oplus t_{m-1} \oplus \alpha_{m-1,m} t_m + \beta_{m-1,m} t_m^2 \end{aligned}$$

$\pmod{\widetilde{\mathfrak{m}}^3}$. We must have $R/I = \langle 1, x_1, \ldots, x_{m-1}, y \rangle$ by the Gorenstein condition (if $x_i \in I$, then $t_i \in R$, and it is then easy to see that the singularity is decomposable). Now $x_i^2 \in I$ for all but at most one i, say $i = 1$. Then $t_i^2 \in R$ for $i = 2, \ldots, m - 1$. If $\alpha_{i,m} \neq 0$ for some i in this range, then $t_m^2 \in R$ as well, so $t_{m-1}^2 = x_{m-1}^2 - O(t_m^2) \in R$, contradicting $\dim_{\mathbf{k}}(\widetilde{R}/R)_2 = 1$. Therefore $\alpha_{i,m} = 0$ for $i \in \{2, \ldots, m - 1\}$. If $\alpha_{1,m} = 0$, then we need a further generator of $\mathfrak{m}/\mathfrak{m}^2$,

namely $z = 0 \oplus \ldots \oplus t_m^3$. In this case, though, both x_{m-1}^2 and z belong to I, so $\dim_k(R/I) = m$, and the singularity cannot be Gorenstein. Finally, if $\alpha_{1,m} \neq 0$, by changing coordinates in t_m and scaling each generator, we find:

$$
\begin{aligned}
x_1 =&\, t_1 \oplus 0 \oplus \ldots \oplus t_m \\
x_2 =&\, 0 \oplus t_2 \oplus \ldots \oplus t_m^2 \\
&\ldots \\
x_{m-1} =&\, 0 \oplus \ldots \oplus t_{m-1} \oplus t_m^2.
\end{aligned}
$$
(1)

We may check that $R/I = \langle 1, x_1, \ldots, x_{m-1}, x_1^2 \rangle$ and $\widetilde{R}/R$ is of type $(1, 1, 0)$. In the case $m = 2$, we need an extra generator $y = t_2^3$. Equations are given by

- $y(y - x_1^3)$ if $m = 2$ (A_5-singularity);
- $x_1 x_2 (x_2 - x_1^2)$ if $m = 3$ (D_6-singularity);
- $\langle x_3(x_1^2 - x_2), x_i(x_j - x_k) \rangle_{1 \leq i < j < k \leq m-1 \text{ or } 1 < j < k < i \leq m-1}$ if $m \geq 4$.

Case III: $(1, 0, 1)$. We have $\widetilde{\mathfrak{m}}^4 \subseteq I$. By an argument similar to the above, we write generators for A_1 as $x_i = \ldots \oplus t_i \oplus \ldots \oplus \alpha_{i,m} t_m + \beta_{i,m} t_m^2 + \gamma_{i,m} t_m^3$, for $i = 1, \ldots, m-1$. Then $R/I = \langle 1, x_1, \ldots, x_{m-1}, y \rangle$. For all but at most one i, say $i = 1$, $x_i^2 \in I$. On the other hand $t_m^3 \notin R$, because otherwise $t_i^3 = x_i^3 - \alpha_{i,m}^3 t_m^3 + O(t_m^4)$ belongs to R as well, contradicting $\dim_{\mathbf{k}}(\widetilde{R}/R)_3 = 1$. We deduce that $\alpha_{i,m} = 0$ for $i = 2, \ldots, m-1$. If $\alpha_{1,m} \neq 0$, by changing coordinates in t_m, we could write $x_1 = t_1 \oplus \ldots \oplus t_m$. But $x_1^3 \in I$ implies $t_m^3 \in R$. Therefore $\alpha_{1,m} = 0$ and, up to a coordinate change, we may write $x_1 = t_1 \oplus \ldots \oplus t_m^2$. By $\dim_{\mathbf{k}}(\widetilde{R}/R)_2 = 0$ we find another generator $z = t_m^2 + \gamma_z t_m^3$ of $\mathfrak{m}/\mathfrak{m}^2$. We can use z to remove all the t_m^2 pieces from $x_1, \ldots, x_{m-1}$. Finally, we change coordinates in t_m so that $z = t_m^2$, and we scale all the previously found generators so that

$$
\begin{aligned}
x_1 =&\, t_1 \oplus 0 \oplus \ldots \oplus t_m^3 \\
x_2 =&\, 0 \oplus t_2 \oplus \ldots \oplus t_m^3 \\
&\ldots \\
x_{m-1} =&\, 0 \oplus \ldots \oplus t_{m-1} \oplus t_m^3 \\
x_m =&\, 0 \oplus \ldots \oplus t_m^2.
\end{aligned}
$$
(2)

We may check that $R/I = \langle 1, x_1, \ldots, x_{m-1}, x_m \rangle$ and $\widetilde{R}/R$ is of type $(1, 0, 1)$. The case $m = 1$ is given by the subalgebra $\mathbf{k}[t^2, t^5] \subseteq \mathbf{k}[t]$. Equations are given by

- $x^5 - y^2$ if $m = 1$ (A_4-singularity or *ramphoid cusp*);
- $y(y^3 - x^2)$ if $m = 2$ (D_5-singularity);
- $\langle x_3(x_1 - x_2), x_3^3 - x_1 x_2 \rangle$ if $m = 3$;
- $\langle x_i(x_j - x_k), x_m(x_i - x_j), x_m^3 - x_1 x_2 \rangle_{i,j,k \in \{1, \ldots, m-1\} \text{ all different}}$ if $m \geq 4$.

$\square$

Remark 2.3. Not-necessarily Gorenstein singularities can be obtained by gluing various Gorenstein singularities of genus ≤ 2 along subschemes of length ≤ 3. Classifying all of them would not necessarily be easy.

Remark 2.4. Singularities of type II do appear in the miniversal family of singularities of type III, and viceversa. For low values of m, this can be seen neatly from a beautiful result of Grothendieck that I have learnt from [CML13] (see also [Arn72, Dem75]):

Theorem 2.5. *Let (C, p) be a singularity of ADE type. Singularities that appear in the miniversal deformation of (C, p) are all and only those ADE, whose Dynkin diagram can be obtained as a full subgraph of the diagram of (C, p).*

Definition 2.6. In case II, we shall call the branches parametrised by t_1 and t_m *twin*; in case III, the branch parametrised by t_m is called the *singular* branch. We shall refer to them as *special* or *distinguished* branches; all other branches are referred to as *axes*. *Branch* remains a generic name, indicating any of the previous ones.

3. Tangent sheaf and automorphisms

Proposition 3.1. *Describes the tangent sheaf of a genus two singularity in local coordinates.*

Proof. Let $\nu \colon \tilde{C} \to C$ be the normalisation map, and $K(\tilde{C})$ the constant sheaf of rational functions on $\tilde{C}$. A section of $\Omega^\vee_{\tilde{C}} \otimes K(\tilde{C})$ is contained in $\Omega^\vee_C$ if and only if its image under the push-forward map

$$\nu_* \colon \nu_* \mathscr{H}om(\Omega_{\tilde{C}}, K(\tilde{C})) \to \mathscr{H}om(\Omega_C, K(\tilde{C}))$$

lies in the subspace $\mathscr{H}om(\Omega_C, \mathscr{O}_C)$. We may work formally around the singular point in the coordinates given above.

A_4: In the coordinates $x = t^2, y = t^5$, the section $f(t)\frac{d}{dt} \in \nu_* \Omega^\vee_{\tilde{C}} \otimes K(\tilde{C})$ pushes forward to

$$\nu_* \left(f(t)\frac{d}{dt} \right) = 2tf(t)\frac{d}{dx} + 5t^4 f(t)\frac{d}{dy},$$

from which, writing $f(t) = f_0 + f_1 t + f_2 t^2 + O(t^3)$, we see that

$$2tf(t), 5t^4 f(t) \in \hat{\mathscr{O}}_{C,p} \Leftrightarrow f_0 = f_2 = 0.$$

A_5: In the coordinates $x = t_1 \oplus t_2, y = t_1^3$, the section $f_1(t_1)\frac{d}{dt_1} \oplus f_2(t_2)\frac{d}{dt_2}$ pushes forward to

$$\nu_* \left(f_1(t_1)\frac{d}{dt_1} \oplus f_2(t_2)\frac{d}{dt_2} \right) = (f_1(t_1) \oplus f_2(t_2))\frac{d}{dx} + 3t_1^2 f_1(t_1)\frac{d}{dy},$$

from which, writing $f_i(t_i) = f_{i0} + f_{i1}t_i + f_{i2}t_i^2 + O(t_i^3)$, $i = 1, 2$, we see that

$$f_1(t_1) \oplus f_2(t_2), 3t_1^2 f_1(t_1) \in \hat{\mathcal{O}}_{C,p} \Leftrightarrow \begin{cases} f_{10} = f_{20} = 0, \\ f_{11} = f_{21}, \\ f_{12} = f_{22}. \end{cases}$$

$II_{m \geq 3}$: In the coordinates of (1),

$$\nu_* \left(\sum_{i=1}^m f_i(t_i) \frac{d}{dt_i} \right) = (f_1(t_1) \oplus f_m(t_m)) \frac{d}{dx_1} + \sum_{i=2}^m (f_i(t_i) \oplus 2t_m f_m(t_m)) \frac{d}{dx_i},$$

hence we deduce that

$$\nu_* \left(\sum_{i=1}^m f_i(t_i) \frac{d}{dt_i} \right) \in \Omega_C^\vee \otimes \hat{\mathcal{O}}_{C,p} \Leftrightarrow \begin{cases} f_{i0} = 0 & \text{for } i = 1, \ldots, m, \\ 2f_{11} = f_{i1} = 2f_{m1}, & \text{for } i = 2, \ldots, m-1, \\ f_{12} = f_{m2}. \end{cases}$$

$III_{m \geq 2}$: In the coordinates of (2),

$$\nu_* \left(\sum_{i=1}^m f_i(t_i) \frac{d}{dt_i} \right) = \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \left(f_i(t_i) \oplus 3t_m^2 f_m(t_m) \right) \frac{d}{dx_i} + 2t_m f_m(t_m) \frac{d}{dx_m},$$

hence we deduce that

$$\nu_* \left(\sum_{i=1}^m f_i(t_i) \frac{d}{dt_i} \right) \in \Omega_C^\vee \otimes \hat{\mathcal{O}}_{C,p} \Leftrightarrow \begin{cases} f_{i0} = 0 & \text{for } i = 1, \ldots, m, \\ f_{i1} = 3f_{m1}, & \text{for } i = 1, \ldots, m-1, \\ f_{m2} = 0. \end{cases}$$

$\square$

Recall Smyth's description of Gorenstein curves of genus one with no automorphisms [Smy11a, Proposition 2.3, Corollary 2.4].

Definition 3.2. Let $(C, p_1, \ldots, p_n)$ be a pointed Gorenstein curve. A connected subcurve $D \subseteq C$ is said to be *nodally attached* if $D \cap \overline{C \setminus D}$ consists of nodes only. Let us call a point *special* if it is either a marking or a node. For a nodal and nodally attached subcurve D with normalisation $\nu \colon \tilde{D} \to D$, pointed by $\nu^{-1}(\{p_1, \ldots, p_n\} \cap D) \cup (D \cap \overline{C \setminus D}) \cup \{q \in D | q \text{ node of } D\}$, we shall say that *DM stability holds* if every rational component has at least three special points, and every elliptic component has at least one. We say that C is *rDM* if DM stability holds for every nodal and nodally attached subcurve of C.

Corollary 3.3. *Let $(C, p_1 \ldots, p_n)$ be a pointed Gorenstein curve of arithmetic genus two. The condition $H^0(C, \Omega_C^\vee(-\sum_{i=1}^n p_i)) = 0$ is equivalent to either of the following:*

(1) C has an A_4 singularity with at least one special point, and is rDM.

(2) C has a singularity of type $II_{m \geq 2}$: at least one of its twin branches contains a special point, each of its axes contains at least one special point, and at least one branch has at least two. Furthermore C is rDM.

(3) C has a singularity of type $III_{m \geq 2}$: each of its axes contains at least one special point, and at least one branch has at least two. Furthermore C is rDM.

(4) C has two elliptic m-fold points: each of their branches contains at least one special point, and either they share a branch, or at least one branch of each singular point contains at least two special points. Furthermore C is rDM.

(5) C has one elliptic m-fold point: if one of its branches is a genus one curve, then all the other ones contain at least a special point; if two of its branches coincide, then all branches contain at least one special point; otherwise, all branches contain at least one special point, and at least one branch has at least two. Furthermore C is rDM.

(6) C has only nodes and is rDM.

4. Dualising line bundle and semistable tails

This is the most delicate and combinatorially delicate section of the paper. We classify the nodal subcurves that can be contracted in a one-parameter smoothing in order to obtain a Gorenstein singularity of genus two. The upshot is that the shape of the curve depends on one parameter only, namely the distance of the distinguished (i.e. twin or singular) branches from the core (minimal subcurve of genus two), no matter what the latter is. This is going to play a key role in the proof that our moduli spaces are proper.

Remark 4.1. Smyth's contraction lemma [Smy11a, Lemma 2.13] carries over essentially unchanged.

Lemma 4.2 (Contraction lemma)**.**

Lemma 4.3. Let $\nu \colon \tilde{C} \to C$ be the normalisation of a Gorenstein singularity of genus two, with $\nu^{-1}(p) = \{p_1, \ldots, p_m\}$. Then $\nu^* \omega_C = \omega_{\tilde{C}}(3p_1 + 2p_2 + \ldots + 2p_{m-1} + 3p_m)$ (case II) or $\nu^* \omega_C = \omega_{\tilde{C}}(2p_1 + \ldots + 2p_{m-1} + 4p_m)$ (case III).

Proof. Recall the explicit description of the dualising sheaf for curves:

$$\omega_C(U) = \{\eta \in \Omega_{\tilde{C}} \otimes K(\nu^{-1}(U)) | \sum_{p_i \in \nu^{-1}(p), p \in U} \mathrm{Res}_{p_i}((\nu^* f)\eta) = 0, \ \forall f \in \mathscr{O}_C(U)\}.$$

In case II, we know that $\widetilde{\mathfrak{m}}^3 \subseteq R$, therefore we have poles of third order at most. It is enough to study the possible polar tails. Let

$$\eta = c_1 \frac{\mathrm{d}\, t_1}{t_1^3} + b_1 \frac{\mathrm{d}\, t_1}{t_1^2} + a_1 \frac{\mathrm{d}\, t_1}{t_1} \oplus \ldots \oplus c_m \frac{\mathrm{d}\, t_m}{t_m^3} + b_m \frac{\mathrm{d}\, t_m}{t_m^2} + a_m \frac{\mathrm{d}\, t_m}{t_m}.$$

From looking at $1 \cdot \eta$ we deduce $\sum_{i=1}^m a_i = 0$; from $x_i \cdot \eta$ we see $b_1 + b_m = 0$ (if $i = 1$), and $b_i + c_m = 0$ (if $i = 2, \ldots, m-1$); finally from $x_i^2 \cdot \eta$ we have $c_1 + c_m = 0$

(if $i = 1$), and $c_i = 0$ (if $i = 2, \ldots, m-1$). Therefore $\omega_C / \nu_* \omega_{\tilde{C}}$ is spanned by

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\, t_1}{t_1} - \frac{\mathrm{d}\, t_m}{t_m}, \ldots, \frac{\mathrm{d}\, t_{m-1}}{t_{m-1}} - \frac{\mathrm{d}\, t_m}{t_m}, \frac{\mathrm{d}\, t_1}{t_1^2} - \frac{\mathrm{d}\, t_m}{t_m^2},$$

$$\bar{\eta} = \frac{\mathrm{d}\, t_1}{t_1^3} + \frac{\mathrm{d}\, t_2}{t_2^2} + \ldots + \frac{\mathrm{d}\, t_{m-1}}{t_{m-1}^2} - \frac{\mathrm{d}\, t_m}{t_m^3}.$$

In particular ω_C is generated by $\bar{\eta}$ as an $\mathscr{O}_C$-module. Hence the first claim.

In case III, we know that $\widetilde{\mathfrak{m}}^4 \subseteq R$, therefore we have poles of fourth order at most. On the other hand $t_i^2 \in R$ for all i implies the part of order three is trivial. So let

$$\eta = c_1 \frac{\mathrm{d}\, t_1}{t_1^4} + b_1 \frac{\mathrm{d}\, t_1}{t_1^2} + a_1 \frac{\mathrm{d}\, t_1}{t_1} \oplus \ldots \oplus c_m \frac{\mathrm{d}\, t_m}{t_m^4} + b_m \frac{\mathrm{d}\, t_m}{t_m^2} + a_m \frac{\mathrm{d}\, t_m}{t_m}.$$

From looking at $1 \cdot \eta$ we deduce $\sum_{i=1}^m a_i = 0$; from $x_i \cdot \eta$ we see $b_i + c_m = 0$ for all i, and from $x_i^3 \cdot \eta$ we have $c_i = 0$ for all i. (The statement about third order poles can be evinced from $x_i^2 \cdot \eta$ or from $z \cdot \eta$ indifferently.) Therefore $\omega_C / \nu_* \omega_{\tilde{C}}$ is spanned by

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\, t_1}{t_1} - \frac{\mathrm{d}\, t_m}{t_m}, \ldots, \frac{\mathrm{d}\, t_{m-1}}{t_{m-1}} - \frac{\mathrm{d}\, t_m}{t_m}, \frac{\mathrm{d}\, t_m}{t_m^2}$$

$$\bar{\eta} = \frac{\mathrm{d}\, t_1}{t_1^2} + \ldots + \frac{\mathrm{d}\, t_{m-1}}{t_{m-1}^2} - \frac{\mathrm{d}\, t_m}{t_m^4}.$$

In particular ω_C is generated by $\bar{\eta}$ as an $\mathscr{O}_C$-module. Hence the second claim. $\quad\square$

Corollary 4.4. *The dualising sheaf has multi-degree $(1, 0, \ldots, 0, 1)$ (case II) and $(0, \ldots, 0, 2)$ (case III) respectively.*

Remark 4.5. $H^0(C, \Omega_C^\vee(-\sum_{i=1}^n p_i)) = 0$ implies the ampleness of $\omega_C(\sum_{i=1}^n p_i)$.

Remark 4.6. Recall Smyth's *balancing* condition [Smy11a, Definition 2.11], generalised by the interior of a circle around the core in [RSW17a].

Proposition 4.7 (Semistable tails). *Let (C, p) be a Gorenstein singularity of genus two, with pointed normalisation $\bigsqcup_{i=1}^m (\mathbb{P}^1, p_i)$. Let $\mathscr{C} \to \Delta$ be a one-parameter smoothing of C, and $\phi \colon \mathscr{C}^{ps} \to \mathscr{C}$ a birational contraction from a prestable curve. Let $(Z, p_1, \ldots, p_m)$ be $\phi^{-1}(p)$ marked with the intersection points with the rest of $\mathscr{C}_0^{ps}$.*

- *Case II: p_1 and p_m are either on the same rational tail, attached to a Weierstrass point, or on two different tails, attached to conjugate points. In any case they are equidistant from the core. All other p_i are further away from it.*
- *Case III: p_m is on a tail attached to a Weierstrass point, all other p_i are further away from the core.*

Proof. By Smyth's contraction lemma [Smy11a, Lemma 2.13], a semistable curve of genus two $(Z, p_1, \ldots, p_m)$ is a semistable tail iff there exists a smoothing $\mathscr{C}^s \to \Delta$ of a compactification obtained by adjoining an m-marked tail to $p_1, \ldots, p_m$,

and a line bundle $\mathscr{L}$ on $\mathscr{C}^s$ of the form $\omega_{\mathscr{C}^s/\Delta}(D)$, with D an effective divisor supported on Z, such that $\mathscr{L}$ is ample everywhere except on Z, where it restricts to the structure sheaf.

We may split Z into a core K (minimal subcurve of genus two) and a number (possibly zero) of rational trees. *We start by analysing the latter ones.* Observe that, by the previous lemma, in case II p_1 and p_m are attached to a component that appears with multiplicity 2 in D (resp. in case III p_m is attached to a component along which D has multiplicity 3), while all other markings lie on multiplicity 1 components.

First, we claim that no component can appear with multiplicity 0 in D. Assume that this occurred along one of the rational trees. Call S such a component, R the one that precedes it, and $T_1, \ldots, T_h$ the ones that follow it (when sweeping the tree from the core), and let d_A denote the multiplicity of the divisor D along the component A. Then

$$\deg(\mathscr{L}_{|S}) = -2 + (h+1) + d_R + \sum d_{T_i} = 0,$$

which implies that all the d_A involved are 0, since $h \geq 1$ by semistability. Also, $h = 1$, hence we are looking at a bead of a rational chain. Since this consideration propagates, in the long run we will span the whole of Z, hence showing that Z is itself a rational chain, which is absurd.

Second, let's study the case $d_S = 1$. We stick to the notation above; furthermore, there can be a number of p_i, $i \in \{2, \ldots, m-2\}$, lying on S, which we think of as extra tails $T_1', \ldots, T_k'$ attached to S, but lying outside the support of D. Then

$$\deg(\mathscr{L}_{|S}) = -2 + (h+k+1) - (h+k+1) + d_R + \sum d_{T_i} = 0.$$

Either $d_R = 2$, $h = 0$ and $k \geq 1$; or $d_R = 1$, $h = 1$, and $d_{T_1} = 1$ (with k arbitrary). In the latter case, though, we may repeat the argument on T_1, and we find an infinite chain in Z, which can be excluded. More generally, an analogous computation shows that, when balancing a component A of multiplicity d_A, all neighbouring components of multiplicity $d_A - 1$ can be safely ignored (at the same time, the number of such components is only bounded by the semistability of Z and the quantity of markings).[1]

We now prove that $d_R > d_S$ in general. The previous two paragraphs deal with the case $d_S = 0, 1$; we may therefore assume $d_S > 1$ (which in particular implies $0 \leq k \leq 2$). We have

$$\deg(\mathscr{L}_{|S}) = -2 + (h+k+1) + d_R - d_S(h+k+1) + \sum d_{T_i} = 0.$$

By proceeding from leaves to root, we can assume that $d_S > d_{T_i}$, $i = 1, \ldots, h$. We may therefore rewrite

$$d_R = (d_S - 1)(h+k+1) - \sum d_{T_i} + 2 \geq (d_S - 1)(k+1) + 2 = d_S + 1 + k(d_S - 1) > d_S.$$

---

[1] define the trend along a rational chain and show it is unaltered by $\alpha - (\alpha - 1)$-interactions

In fact, we can prove as on [Smy11a, p.893] that $d_R = d_S + 1$, unless $d_S = 2$ and either p_1 or p_m (or both) are attached to S (type II), or $d_S = 3$ and $p_m \in S$ (type III). We single out the former case within the following

Definition 4.8. A 1-tree is a rooted rational tree with weighted vertices, such that its leaves are all at the same distance l from the root $\circ$, and the weight of a vertex v is determined by $d_v = l - \text{dist}(v, \circ) + 1$. Legs are attached to leaves only, and every leaf has at least a leg.

Let us look at a component S with $d_S = 2$ and at least one of p_1 and p_m attached to it. The balancing equation is

$$\deg(\mathscr{L}_{|S}) = -2 - (h + k + 1) + d_R + \sum d_{T_i} = 0,$$

with $k \in \{1, 2\}$. The preceding discussion implies that $d_{T_i} = 1$ for all $i = 1, \ldots, h$, so $d_R = 3 + k$. If $k = 2$, both p_1 and p_m are on S (therefore they are equidistant from the core). In this case $d_R = 5$, and it can be shown inductively that the multiplicity of D along a component increases by 3 for every step we make towards the core. A similar computation shows that the same property holds in case III, when starting from a component S with $d_S = 3$ and p_m attached to it. Let us give the following

Definition 4.9. A 3-chain of weight w is a rooted rational chain of length l such that its leaf has weight w and either one or two distinguished legs. The weight of each vertex v is determined by $w + 3(l - \text{dist}(v, \circ))$. A 3-trunk is obtained by adjoining a finite number of 1-trees of length l_i to a leg adjacent to a bead of weight $l_i + 1$ in a 3-chain.

Finally, say $d_S = 2$ and only $p_1 \in S$. Then $d_R = 4$. It can again be shown that the growth rate along the chain that connects S to the core is usually 2.

Definition 4.10. A 2-chain is a rooted rational chain of length l such that its leaf has weight 2 and one distinguished leg. The weight of each vertex v is determined by $2 + 2(l - \text{dist}(v, \circ))$. A 2-tree is obtained by adjoining a finite number of 1-trees of length l_i to a leg adjacent to a bead of weight $l_i + 1$ in a 2-chain. The length of a 2-tree is the length of its 2-chain.

It is important to notice that this trend can break only when two 2-trees meet; at that point the growth rate becomes 3. Hence the following

Definition 4.11. A 3-tree of type II is obtained by adjoining two 2 trees of the same length l to the two legs of a 3-trunk of weight $4 + l$. A 3-tree of type III is a 3-trunk with one leg and weight 3.

It should be clear from the preceding discussion that Z contains a number of 1-trees (bounded by m), and either (a) one 3-tree or (b) two 2-trees.

Finally, let us look at the core K. Consider it as a one-pointed (case (a)), resp. two-pointed (case (b)) curve of genus two, by ignoring all the attachment points of the 1-trees, and let $\bar{K} \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{2,1}$ (resp. $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{2,2}$) be its stable model. Recall that $\bar{K}$

is called Weierstrass if the marking is a fixed-point of the hyperelliptic involution σ (case (a)), resp. conjugate if the two markings are swapped by σ (case (b)). This is well defined by the existence and uniqueness of a $\mathfrak{g}_2^1$. More generally, K admits a non-degenerate $2:1$ morphism to $\mathbb{P}^1$ such that p_1 is a ramification point (resp. $\{p_1, p_2\}$ is a fiber) if and only if $\bar{K}$ does.

(1) K is a smooth genus two curve. In case (a), the balancing equation admits a solution if and only if K is Weierstrass, while case (b) admits a solution if and only if K is conjugate.

(2) K contains two nodally attached irreducible subcurves of genus one E_1 and E_2. It is convenient to solve the balancing equation on one of them first, say $E = E_1$. If all the neighbouring components have multiplicity $d_E - 1$, it's fine. If all but one of the neighbouring components have multiplicity $d_E - 1$, then the last one is forced to have multiplicity $d_E - 1$ as well. The case that all but two neighbouring components have multiplicity $d_E - 1$ occurs when either a 2-tree or a 3-tree is attached to E at q, and let F be the component going towards E_2, with $E \cap F = \{r\}$. The case of a 2-tree forces $d_F = d_E$ by degree reason, but then we are left to solve $q \sim r$ in $\mathrm{Pic}(E)$, which is impossible; on the other hand, the case of a 3-tree imposes $d_F = d_E + 1$ and $2q \sim 2r$ in $\mathrm{Pic}(E)$, which says that K is Weierstrass. The above considerations imply that, if there are two 2-trees, they must both be connected to the same E in nodes q_1, q_2 such that $q_1 + q_2 \sim 2r$, and $d_F = d_E + 1$. Finally, assume that E_1 and E_2 are connected by a chain of rational curves R_i in K. Then it is easy to see that, if there are two 2-trees and one of them is connected to an R_i, the other must be as well. Furthermore, the incoming growth rate at E_1 and E_2 must be 1 in both cases. Hence it can be showed that the rational chain $\{R_i\}$ is symmetric, namely: in case (a) the marking is equidistant from E_1 and E_2, and in case (b) the distance between a marking and its closest (resp. furthest) E_i are the same for the two markings.

PICTURE

(3) $\bar{K} \in \Delta_{irr}$, or K contains only one nodally attached irreducible subcurve of genus one E. E contains two distinguished nodes r_1 and r_2 joined in K by a (possibly empty) rational chain. We see as above that either a 3-tree is attached to a point $q \in E$ satisfying $2q \sim r_1 + r_2$ in $\mathrm{Pic}(E)$, or two 2-trees are attached to nodes $q_1, q_2 \in E$ satisfying $q_1 + q_2 \sim r_1 + r_2$ in $\mathrm{Pic}(E)$, or the rational chain is not empty and the distinguished trees are attached to it. In this case, solve the balancing equation on E: let $d = d_E$, d_1 and d_2 be the multiplicities of the rational components attached to r_1 and r_2 respectively; then either $d_1 = d_2 = d - 1$, or $d_1 = d - 1 + k$, $d_2 = d - 1 - k$ and $r_1 - r_2$ is k-torsion in $\mathrm{Pic}(E)$. But, by chasing the balancing equation along the rational chain, we see that, if $d_1 \geq d$, this non-decreasing trend propagates, and in fact increases when passing a distinguished bead, so that we should have $d_2 > d$, which is absurd. So again the only possibility

is to have a rational chain symmetric with respect to the distinguished beads.

PICTURE

(4) Finally, the case that the normalisation of K is a union of $\mathbb{P}^1$. The only really new case is when a distinguished component contains two nodes such that removing them preserves connectedness.

l_1
l_2
l_3

Denoting by l_i the length of a rational chain and by t_i the trend along it, balancing reduces to the following system in case (a) and (b).2:[2]

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ l_1 + 1 & -l_2 - 1 & 0 \\ l_1 + 1 & 0 & -l_3 - 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} t_1 \\ t_2 \\ t_3 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

$\square$

5. The new moduli functors

Definition 5.1. Let $(C, p_1, \ldots, p_n)$ be a reduced curve, marked by smooth points. For a ~~nodally attached~~ subcurve $D \subseteq C$, no matter what the singularities at the intersection with the rest of C, we define the *level* of D to be the number

$$\mathrm{lev}(D) = |D \cap \overline{C \setminus D}| + |\{p_1, \ldots, p_n\} \cap D|.$$

Definition 5.2. Fix positive integers $m < n$. Let $(C, p_1, \ldots, p_n)$ be a connected, reduced, complete curve of arithmetic genus two, marked by smooth points. We say that C is m-stable if:

(1) C has only nodes; elliptic l-fold points, $l \leq m+1$; type $II_{\leq m+1}$, and type $III_{\leq m}$ genus two singularities as singular points.
(2) If Z is a connected subcurve of arithmetic genus two, then $\mathrm{lev}(Z) > m$.
(3) If E is a ~~nodally attached~~ subcurve of arithmetic genus one, then $\mathrm{lev}(E) > m+1$.
(4) $H^0(C, \Omega_C^\vee(-\sum_{i=1}^n p_i)) = 0$.
(5) If C contains a singularity of genus two, p_1 is connected (through a rational chain) to one of the distinguished branches.

Remark 5.3. The definition is not $\mathfrak{S}_n$-symmetric. In the contraction arguments below, we use the asymmetry to write down the dualising line bundle of a genus two (sub)curve Z as $\omega_Z \simeq \mathscr{O}_Z(q_1 + \bar{q}_1)$, where q_1 is the point on Z which is closest to p_1. Compare this with the genus one situation, where the dualising line bundle of a Gorenstein curve is trivial.

---

[2] I am not sure when this admits integral solutions, e.g. not if all l_i are equal

Remark 5.4. If there is a subcurve of genus one, condition (3) and condition (4) jointly imply condition (2). Indeed, $\mathrm{lev}(Z) \geq \mathrm{lev}(E) - 1$, and the only cases in which the level drops by one are: when $Z = (E, p_1, \ldots, p_{l-2}, q_1, q_2) \sqcup_{\{q_1, q_2\}} (\mathbb{P}^1, q_1, q_2, p_{l-1})$; and when $Z = (E, p_1, \ldots, p_{l-1}, q) \sqcup_q (E', q)$, where (E', q) is a one-pointed curve of genus one.

Lemma 5.5 (boundedness)**.** *If $(C, p_1, \ldots, p_n)$ is an m-stable curve of genus two, the N-th power of $A = \omega_C(\sum_{i=1}^n p_i)$ is very ample for every $N > 2 + 8(m+1)$.*

Proof. We need to show that, for every point $p, q \in C$ (possibly equal)
  (1) *basepoint-freeness*: $H^1(C, A^{\otimes N} \otimes I_p) = 0$;
  (2) *separating points and tangent vectors*: $H^1(C, A^{\otimes N} \otimes I_p I_q) = 0$.
By Serre duality we may equivalently show that $H^0(C, \omega_C \otimes A^{-N} \otimes (I_p I_q)^\vee) = 0$. Let $\nu \colon \tilde{C} \to C$ be the normalisation, and let $\nu^{-1}(p) = \{p_1, \ldots, p_h\}$, $\nu^{-1}(q) = \{q_1, \ldots, q_k\}$, with $h, k \leq m+1$. It follows from Proposition 2.2 (and the analogous result of Smyth) that $\nu_* \mathscr{O}_{\tilde{C}}(-D) \subseteq I_p I_q$ for $D = 4 \sum_{i=1}^h p_i + \sum_{j=1}^k q_j$ (note that $\deg(D) \leq 8(m+1)$); furthermore, the quotient is torsion, therefore, by applying $\mathscr{H}om(-, \mathscr{O}_C)$ and adjunction, we find $(I_p I_q)^\vee \subseteq \nu_* \mathscr{O}_{\tilde{C}}(D)$. It is thus enough to show that $H^0(\tilde{C}, \mathscr{O}_{\tilde{C}}(D) \otimes \nu^*(\omega_C \otimes A^{-N})) = 0$. Finally, $\nu^* \omega_C$ has degree at most two, and $\nu^* A$ has degree at least one on any branch of $\tilde{C}$, hence it is enough to take $N > 2 + 8(m+1)$. $\qquad\qquad\square$

Lemma 5.6 (deformation openness)**.** *Let $(\mathscr{C}, \sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_n) \to S$ be a family of curves over a Noetherian base scheme with n sections. The locus*

$$\{s \in S | (\mathscr{C}_{\bar{s}}, \sigma_1(\bar{s}), \ldots, \sigma_n(\bar{s})) \text{ is } m\text{-stable}\}$$

is Zariski-open in S.

Proof. Being Gorenstein is an open condition, as much as having connected fibers of arithmetic genus two. This bounds the genus of the singularities that may occur. The case $m = 1$ deserves special attention. In this case, that condition (1) is open follows from acknowledging that $II_2 = A_5$, $III_1 = A_4$, while tacnode, cusp, and node are A_3, A_2, and A_1 respectively, and from a beautiful result of Grothendieck concerning the deformation theory of ADE singularities [Arn72, Dem75]. The case $m \geq 2$ simply follows from upper semicontinuity of embedded dimension and the fact that we have exhausted all possible Gorenstein singularities of genus ≤ 2, and embedding dimension $\leq m + 1$.

Condition (4) translates to: the locus where the automorphism group is unramified is open in the base.

The other conditions are topological, hence constructible. With Noetherian assumptions, it is enough to check their openness over a dvr scheme. Assume that the geometric generic fiber $C_{\bar{\eta}}$ contains two genus one subcurve $E_{1,\bar{\eta}}$ and $E_{2,\bar{\eta}}$; their closures E_1 and E_2 in $\mathscr{C}$ are then flat families of genus one curves over Δ. If $E_{1,\bar{\eta}}$ and $E_{2,\bar{\eta}}$ are disconnected, then so are E_1 and E_2, by local constancy of the number of connected components of fibers of a flat proper morphism with

geometrically normal fibers. If $E_{1,\bar{\eta}}$ and $E_{2,\bar{\eta}}$ are joined by a (disconnecting) node $q_{\bar{\eta}}$, then so are $E_{1,0}$ and $E_{2,0}$; indeed, the unique limit of $q_{\bar{\eta}}$ must be a singular point of the projection, but cannot be any worse than a node by local constancy of the arithmetic genus. Finally, if $E_{1,\bar{\eta}}$ and $E_{2,\bar{\eta}}$ share a branch, then so do $E_{1,0}$ and $E_{2,0}$; on the other hand, if $E_{i,\bar{\eta}}$ has more than one branch, then so does E_i. Similarly, if $C_{\bar{\eta}}$ contains only one subcurve of genus one, with two nodes joined by a rational chain, so does C_0. The upshot of this discussion is that

$$|E_{i,\bar{\eta}} \cap \overline{C_{\bar{\eta}} \setminus E_{i,\bar{\eta}}}| = |E_{i,0} \cap \overline{C_0 \setminus E_{i,0}}|.$$

The number of markings on E_i is also constant. Hence we can deduce condition (3) for $C_{\bar{\eta}}$ from the same condition on C_0. Condition (2) follows as in Remark 5.4. Condition (2) can be proved analogously when there is no subcurve of genus one.

Finally, suppose that $C_{\bar{\eta}}$ has a genus two singularity, then so does C_0. The (union of the) distinguished branch(es) $E_{\bar{\eta}}$ of $C_{\bar{\eta}}$ is a genus one singularity, and so is its limit E_0 in C_0. It has to contain the distinguished branch(es) of C_0, because any subcurve contained in the union of the axes of C_0 has genus zero; therefore, by assumption, E_0 contains $p_{1,0}$. Then also $E_{\bar{\eta}}$ contains $p_{1,\bar{\eta}}$.   □

Recall the following result of Smyth [Smy11a, Lemma 3.3].

Lemma 5.7. *A Gorenstein curve of arithmetic genus one with no disconnecting nodes Z is either: a smooth elliptic curve; a ring of $r \geq 1$ $\mathbb{P}^1$; or an elliptic m-fold point whose normalisation is the disjoint union of m copies of $\mathbb{P}^1$. In all these cases $\omega_Z \simeq \mathcal{O}_Z$.*

We may provide an analogous description of minimal subcurves of genus two.

Lemma 5.8. *A Gorenstein curve of genus two with no disconnecting nodes Z is either:*
  (1) a smooth curve of genus two;
  (2) the union of E, a Gorenstein curve of genus one with no disconnecting nodes, and R, a (possibly empty) rational chain, along two distinct nodes;
  (3) the union of two copies of $(\mathbb{P}^1, 0, 1, \infty)$ with three (possibly empty) rational chains R_0, R_1, R_∞ joining the homonymous points;
  (4) an elliptic m-fold point whose normalisation is the disjoint union of either $m - 1$ $\mathbb{P}^1$ (two branches coincide), or $m - 1$ $\mathbb{P}^1$ and a Gorenstein curve of genus one with no disconnecting node (i.e. there are two genus one subcurves sharing one branch);
  (5) or a singularity of genus two with m-branches, whose normalisation is the disjoint union of m copies of $\mathbb{P}^1$.

In all cases there exists a unique $\mathfrak{g}_2^1$. In cases (4) and (5), given a smooth point p lying on a special branch, there exists a unique point $\bar{p}$ (possibly equal to p), such that $\omega_Z \simeq \mathcal{O}(p + \bar{p})$.

Proposition 5.9 (Valuative criterion of properness)**.**

Proof. Existence of limits. We start with a smooth n-pointed curve of genus two over a discrete valuation field. By the semistable reduction theorem [DM69, Corollary 2.7], we may find a finite base-change $\Delta' \to \Delta$ and a semistable curve $\mathscr{C}' \to \Delta'$ with regular total space, such that its generic fiber is isomorphic to the pullback of the curve we started with. By Castelnuovo's criterion, we may further assume that the central fiber contains no rational tails.

Now check whether p_1 afferes to a Weierstrass point or not: in the former case, change base with $\pi'' \mapsto (\pi')^3$, in the latter with $\pi'' \mapsto (\pi')^2$; then resolve. This has the effect of replacing every node with a chain of two (resp. one) -2-curve. It is a technical expedient we find useful in the construction. We drop the primes from notation.

Next we identify a (not necessarily connected) subcurve that needs be contracted in order to find the m-stable limit. The process can be thought of as drawing expanding circles on the dual graph (except, they are not always expanding). We may at any point blow-up the curve at a marking on the central fiber, and consider the strict transform of the corresponding section; thus markings can effectively be considered as legs going to infinity in the dual graph.

We start from the case that the core Z is irreducible. Suppose that the level of Z is $l \leq m$; then we may contract (a subcurve containing) Z as follows. Let q_1 the point of Z closest to p_1.

(1) If (Z, q_1) is Weierstrass, call S_h the -2-curves closest to $\tilde{Z}$, and R_h the second closest. Consider the line bundle

$$\mathscr{L}_{j+1} = \omega_{\mathscr{B}_{j+1}/\Delta}(3\tilde{Z} + 2\sum_{h=1}^{l_j-1} S_h + \sum_{h=1}^{l_j-1} R_h + \tilde{\sigma}_{1,j} + \ldots + \tilde{\sigma}_{n,j}).$$

By the contraction lemma 4.2... By the classification of semistable tails, $\mathscr{C}_{j+1,0}$ acquires a singularity of type III_l (which works out by our initial choice of base-change), and p_1 is connected to the singular branch.

(2) If (Z, q_1) is not Weierstrass, call R_h the -2-curves closest to $\tilde{Z}$. In case there is no rational tail attached to $\bar{q}_1$, blow up the latter point. Consider then the line bundle

$$\mathscr{L}_{j+1} = \omega_{\mathscr{B}_{j+1}/\Delta}(2\tilde{Z} + \sum_{h=1}^{l_j-1} R_h + \tilde{\sigma}_{1,j} + \ldots + \tilde{\sigma}_{n,j});$$

By the contraction lemma 4.2... By the classification of semistable tails, $\mathscr{C}_{j+1,0}$ acquires a singularity of type II_l or II_{l+1} (in which case one of the twin branches is dangling), and p_1 is connected to one of the twin branches.

More generally, in case 1 we may draw circles around Z that at each step expand by 1 along the tail containing p_1 and by 3 along all other tails. Note that at each step the number of branches is the same as the level one step before that thanks to our base-change choice. If l denotes the radius of the circle along T_1, the line

bundle

$$\omega_{\mathscr{C}}\left(3lZ + \sum_{R_i \in T_1} 3(l - \mathrm{dist}(R_i, Z))R_i + \sum_{R_i \notin T_1}(l - \mathrm{dist}(R_i, Z))R_i + \sigma_1 + \ldots + \sigma_n\right)$$

performs the desired contraction.

Suppose the minimal subcurve of genus two Z contains two subcurves of genus one; call E_1 and E_2 the minimal such, and assume that p_1 afferes to E_1. Start drawing circles around E_2. If E_2 already has level bigger than $m + 1$, stop with the circle of radius 0. Otherwise grow the radius by 1 at a time. The curve to be contracted is the inner disk, so the number of branches is measured by the vertices lying on the circle, and the level by the number of exciding edges. Both are non-decreasing with the radius. We exmine the Weierstrass case; the conjugate is entirely analogous. Note that at this stage we perform one meaningful step every three, due to our choice of base-change.

(1) If level $\geq m + 2$ is reached before the circle touches E_1, take the next possible $\equiv 2 \mod 3$ radius, then contract the inner circle by the line bundle

$$\omega_{\mathscr{C}}((l_2 + 1)E_2 + \sum_i \max(l_2 + 1 - \mathrm{dist}(E_2, R_i), 0)R_i \oplus \sigma_1 \oplus \ldots \oplus \sigma_n)$$

where l_2 is the radius of the circle around E_2. Consider now E_1: if $\mathrm{lev}(E_1) \leq m + 1$ start expanding the circle around it. Again, either level $\geq m+2$ can be reached before touching E_2, or, by contracting the maximal balanced subcurve of genus one containing E_1, we produce a curve having two genus one singularities that share a branch. Notice that in this case p_1 afferes to the only genus one subcurve that may have level $\leq m + 1$.

(2) Otherwise, one step before reaching E_1, we may contract to produce a genus one singularity with a genus one branch. If the level is $\leq m$ at this point, consider the genus two subcurve Z as a whole. Observe that the line bundle we would like to consider at this point starts with weight 3 instead of 1 along the tail connecting p_1 to E_1. This means that it will be supported two steps further along each rational tail departing from Z except the tail containing p_1. Note also that getting to include E_2 happens at a step $\equiv 0 \mod 3$, therefore including two more components on each rational tail will not make the number of branches grow above m. We may now continue as before, at every step expanding the circle by 1 along T_1 and by 3 along all other rational tails.

In case p_1 is equidistant from E_1 and E_2 (it must then affere to the rational chain joining them), start by expanding a circle around the one with lower level; if they have the same level, expand them simultaneously. If at a later stage p_1 becomes closer to one of the two circles, proceed as above.

Uniqueness of limits. By the theorem of semistable reduction [DM69], we may find a diagram

$$
\begin{array}{ccc}
 & \mathscr{C}^{ss} & \\
\phi \swarrow & & \searrow \phi' \\
\mathscr{C} & & \mathscr{C}' \\
\searrow & & \swarrow \\
 & \Delta &
\end{array}
$$

that extends the isomorphism between the generic fibers, with $\mathscr{C}^{ss}$ regular.

Claim: If $\mathscr{C}_0'$ has only singularities of genus $\leq i$ $(i = 0, 1)$, then so does $\mathscr{C}_0$.

First assume that $\mathscr{C}_0'$ has only nodes. If $\mathscr{C}_0$ has a singular point x of genus one, $E := \phi^{-1}(x)$ is an unmarked subcurve of arithmetic genus one and level $\leq m+1$ of $\mathscr{C}_0^{ss}$; then so is $\phi'(E)$ (recall that ϕ' is a contraction, therefore it has connected fibers, which excludes the possibility that ϕ' lowers the genus of E by realising a finite cover of a line), contradicting the m-stability of $\mathscr{C}'$. Argue similarly if x is a genus two singularity with $\leq m$ branches. Finally, if x is dangling II_{m+1}, there is a -1-curve R adjacent to $\phi^{-1}(x)$; ϕ' must contract R by DM stability of $\mathscr{C}'$, hence $\phi'(\phi^{-1}(x))$ is a genus two curve of level $\leq m$, which is again absurd.

The case $i = 1$ is more delicate; suppose $\mathscr{C}_0$ has a singularity x of genus two; the case of a dangling II_{m+1} can be excluded as above. Then $\mathscr{C}_0^{ss} = Z \cup R_1 \cup \ldots \cup R_l$, with $Z = \phi^{-1}(x)$ and $l \leq m$. If Z has geometric genus two, or is irreducible of geometric genus one, $\phi'(Z)$ violates m-stability of $\mathscr{C}'$. If Z contains a unique subcurve E of genus one, with a rational chain R connecting E to itself, then p_1 must affere to R by the analysis of semistable tails of genus two. Therefore $\mathrm{lev}(E) \leq (l-1) + 2 \leq m+1$. Similarly, if Z contains two subcurves of genus one E_1 and E_2, then $(\mathrm{lev}(E_1) - 1) + (\mathrm{lev}(E_2) - 1) \leq l$, hence at least one of the two has level $\leq m+1$ (the level of the other one has to be positive anyway). In all cases, $\phi'(E)$ contradicts m-stability of $\mathscr{C}'$.

Claim: We may assume that $\mathscr{C}^{ss}$ contains either no -1-curve, or only one, which is contracted by neither ϕ nor ϕ'.

If there is a -1-curve contracted by both, ϕ and ϕ' factor through a smaller regular model. Assume there is a -1-curve not contracted by ϕ. Then, by stability, its image is one of the special branches of a dangling singularity of type II_{l+1}, $l \leq m$; call x the singular point, and $Z = \phi^{-1}(x)$. We may then write $\mathscr{C}_0 = Z \cup R_0 \cup \ldots \cup R_l$, with $R_0 = R$, and R_1 (the tail including) the preimage of the other special branch, which contains p_1. Is it possible that ϕ' contracts a different subcurve than Z? By the previous claim, ϕ' has to contract a subcurve of genus two Z'. If Z' contains R and is of shape II, then it is strictly larger than Z, therefore its contraction will not be dangling and it will have at least $m+1$ branches, by the condition on the level of the minimal genus two subcurve of $\mathscr{C}_0$. Otherwise Z' can be of shape III; this forces R_0 and R_1 to meet on a trunk T, that is attached to a Weierstrass point of the core of $\mathscr{C}_0^{ss}$. If Z' starts from the top

of T or further away from the core along R_1, then Z' contains Z strictly, therefore $\mathscr{C}_0'$ will have a singularity of type $III_{\geq m+1}$, by the assumption on the level of the minimal subcurve of genus two of $\mathscr{C}_0$. On the other hand, if Z' starts closer to the core than the top of T, then the level of the minimal subcurve of genus two of $\mathscr{C}'$ will be at most m. In fact this argument proves more, namely that if $\mathscr{C}_0$ has a dangling II singularity, then the exceptional loci of ϕ and ϕ' coincide, therefore $\mathscr{C} \cong \mathscr{C}'$ (see below).

Claim: The exceptional loci of ϕ and ϕ' coincide.

If $\mathscr{C}_0$ has only nodes, then so does $\mathscr{C}_0'$, and we can conclude by the uniqueness part of the stable reduction theorem [DM69]. The meat is in the higher genus components of the exceptional loci.

If $\mathscr{C}_0$ has a genus one singularity x, then it cannot have a genus two singularity, so neither can $\mathscr{C}_0'$. If $\mathscr{C}_0$ has a second genus one singularity y, let $E_1 = \phi^{-1}(x)$ and $E_2 = \phi^{-1}(y)$; they are disjoint balanced subcurves of genus one and level $\leq m+1$ in $\mathscr{C}_0^{ss}$, therefore ϕ' must contract them. Enlarging the contraction radius of any one of them would produce a singularity with at least $m+2$ branches, unless by enlarging we make them touch, in which case we should contract to a genus two singularity, which is also not allowed. The case of a single genus one singularity with a genus one branch, or with a disjoint subcurve of genus one, is entirely similar. In the case of a genus one singularity with two branches joined by a (possibly empty) rational chain R, notice that the argument that expanding the contraction radius increases the number of branches of $\phi'(E')$ above $m+1$ may fail in the case that the contraction circle includes the entire R, but in this case we would find a genus two singularity in $\mathscr{C}_0'$.

Finally, if $\mathscr{C}_0$ has a genus two singularity x - the case of a dangling II_{m+1} was dealt with above -, write $\mathscr{C}_0^{ss} = Z \cup R_1 \cup \ldots \cup R_l$, with $Z = \phi^{-1}(x)$ and $l \leq m$. Now $\phi'(Z)$ must be a point x', by stability considerations. If p_1 afferes to a non-Weierstrass point of Z, x' must be of type II; therefore $Z' = (\phi')^{-1}(x')$ has shape II, which is determined by one parameter. Since $Z \subsetneq Z'$ implies x' has at least $m+1$ branches by level considerations, we conclude $Z = Z'$. If instead p_1 afferes to a Weierstrass point, there are multiple possibilities. If x is type III, and x' as well, the argument is as before; if instead x' is of type II, notice that Z' must start further away from the core than Z (otherwise $Z' \subsetneq Z$, hence the level of $\mathscr{C}_0'$ is not enough), but then $Z \subsetneq Z\prime$, and the singularity of $\mathscr{C}_0'$ is too bad. The other cases are symmetric.

The claim now follows from the observation that the exceptional loci of ϕ and ϕ' are the fibers over higher genus singularity (call them Z) union those rational curves with only two special points that are disjoint from Z.

Claim: The generic isomorphism between $\mathscr{C}$ and $\mathscr{C}'$ extends over Δ.

Follows from [Deb01, Lemma 1.13]. □

Definition 5.10. Fix positive integers $m < n$. Let $(C, p_1, \ldots, p_n)$ be a connected, reduced, complete curve of arithmetic genus two, marked by smooth points. We say that C is m-stable if:

(1) C has only nodes; elliptic l-fold points, $l \leq m+1$; type $II_{\leq m}$, dangling II_{m+1}, and type $III_{\leq m}$ genus two singularities as singular points.

(2) If Z is a connected subcurve of arithmetic genus two, then $\operatorname{lev}(Z) > m$.

(3) If E is a nodally attached subcurve of arithmetic genus one, then $\operatorname{lev}(E) > m+1$.

(4) $H^0(C, \Omega_C^\vee(-\sum_{i=1}^n p_i)) = 0$.

(5) If C contains a singularity of genus two, p_1 is connected (through a rational chain) to one of the distinguished branches.

(6) If there is a Gorenstein subcurve of genus one and level less than $m+2$, then it is not nodally attached and p_1 afferes to it.

Remark 5.11. Non-Gorenstein subcurves appear by taking the union of some - but not all - the branches of a Gorenstein singularity of genus one or two.

References

[AFS16]   Jarod Alper, Maksym Fedorchuk, and David Ishii Smyth. Singularities with $\mathbb{G}_m$-action and the log minimal model program for $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_g$. *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, 721:1–41, 2016.

[AFS17a]   Jarod Alper, Maksym Fedorchuk, and David Ishii Smyth. Second flip in the Hassett-Keel program: existence of good moduli spaces. *Compos. Math.*, 153(8):1584–1609, 2017.

[AFS17b]   Jarod Alper, Maksym Fedorchuk, and David Ishii Smyth. Second flip in the Hassett-Keel program: projectivity. *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN*, (24):7375–7419, 2017.

[AFSvdW17]   Jarod Alper, Maksym Fedorchuk, David Ishii Smyth, and Frederick van der Wyck. Second flip in the Hassett-Keel program: a local description. *Compos. Math.*, 153(8):1547–1583, 2017.

[Arn72]   V. I. Arnol'd. Normal forms of functions near degenerate critical points, the Weyl groups A_k, D_k, E_k and Lagrangian singularities. *Funkcional. Anal. i Priložen.*, 6(4):3–25, 1972.

[BCM18]   Luca Battistella, Francesca Carocci, and Cristina Manolache. Reduced invariants from cuspidal maps. *arXiv e-prints*, page arXiv:1801.07739, Jan 2018.

[BS08]   Elizabeth Baldwin and David Swinarski. A geometric invariant theory construction of moduli spaces of stable maps. *Int. Math. Res. Pap. IMRP*, (1):Art. ID rp. 004, 104, 2008.

[CML13]   Sebastian Casalaina-Martin and Radu Laza. Simultaneous semi-stable reduction for curves with ADE singularities. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 365(5):2271–2295, 2013.

[CTV18]   Giulio Codogni, Luca Tasin, and Filippo Viviani. On the first steps of the minimal model program for the moduli space of stable pointed curves. *arXiv e-prints*, page arXiv:1808.00231, Aug 2018.

[Deb01]   Olivier Debarre. *Higher-dimensional algebraic geometry*. Universitext. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2001.

[Dem75]   Michel Demazure. Classification des germes à point critique isolé et à nombres de modules 0 ou 1 (d'après V. I. Arnol'd). pages 124–142. Lecture Notes in Math., Vol. 431, 1975.

[DM69]   P. Deligne and D. Mumford. The irreducibility of the space of curves of given genus. *Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math.*, (36):75–109, 1969.

[Gie82]   D. Gieseker. *Lectures on moduli of curves*, volume 69 of *Tata Institute of Fundamental Research Lectures on Mathematics and Physics*. Published for the Tata Institute of Fundamental Research, Bombay; Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1982.

[Hal14]   Daniel Halpern-Leistner. On the structure of instability in moduli theory. *arXiv e-prints*, page arXiv:1411.0627, Nov 2014.

[Has03]   Brendan Hassett. Moduli spaces of weighted pointed stable curves. *Adv. Math.*, 173(2):316–352, 2003.

[Has05]   Brendan Hassett. Classical and minimal models of the moduli space of curves of genus two. In *Geometric methods in algebra and number theory*, volume 235 of *Progr. Math.*, pages 169–192. Birkhäuser Boston, Boston, MA, 2005.

[HLN12]   Yi Hu, Jun Li, and Jingchen Niu. Genus Two Stable Maps, Local Equations and Modular Resolutions. *arXiv e-prints*, page arXiv:1201.2427, Jan 2012.

[Hun99]   Craig Huneke. Hyman Bass and ubiquity: Gorenstein rings. In *Algebra, K-theory, groups, and education (New York, 1997)*, volume 243 of *Contemp. Math.*, pages 55–78. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1999.

[KM97]   Seán Keel and Shigefumi Mori. Quotients by groupoids. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 145(1):193–213, 1997.

[LZ09]   Jun Li and Aleksey Zinger. On the genus-one Gromov-Witten invariants of complete intersections. *J. Differential Geom.*, 82(3):641–690, 2009.

[MFK94]   D. Mumford, J. Fogarty, and F. Kirwan. *Geometric invariant theory*, volume 34 of *Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete (2) [Results in Mathematics and Related Areas (2)]*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, third edition, 1994.

[RSW17a]   Dhruv Ranganathan, Keli Santos-Parker, and Jonathan Wise. Moduli of stable maps in genus one and logarithmic geometry I. *arXiv e-prints*, page arXiv:1708.02359, August 2017.

[RSW17b]   Dhruv Ranganathan, Keli Santos-Parker, and Jonathan Wise. Moduli of stable maps in genus one and logarithmic geometry II. *arXiv e-prints*, page arXiv:1709.00490, September 2017.

[Sch91]   David Schubert. A new compactification of the moduli space of curves. *Compositio Math.*, 78(3):297–313, 1991.

[Smy11a]   David Ishii Smyth. Modular compactifications of the space of pointed elliptic curves I. *Compos. Math.*, 147(3):877–913, 2011.

[Smy11b]   David Ishii Smyth. Modular compactifications of the space of pointed elliptic curves II. *Compos. Math.*, 147(6):1843–1884, 2011.

[Smy13]   David Ishii Smyth. Towards a classification of modular compactifications of $\mathcal{M}_{g,n}$. *Invent. Math.*, 192(2):459–503, 2013.

[Smy18]   David Ishii Smyth. Intersections of psi-classes on moduli spaces of m-stable curves. *arXiv e-prints*, page arXiv:1808.03214, Aug 2018.

[vdW10]   Frederick DW van der Wyck. *Moduli of singular curves and crimping*. PhD thesis, Harvard University, 2010.

[Vis12]   Michael Viscardi. Alternate compactifications of the moduli space of genus one maps. *Manuscripta Math.*, 139(1-2):201–236, 2012.

[VZ08]   Ravi Vakil and Aleksey Zinger. A desingularization of the main component of the moduli space of genus-one stable maps into $\mathbb{P}^n$. *Geom. Topol.*, 12(1):1–95, 2008.

[Zin09]   Aleksey Zinger. Reduced genus-one Gromov-Witten invariants. *J. Differential Geom.*, 83(2):407–460, 2009.

Luca Battistella

Max Planck Institut für Mathematik - Bonn

battistella@mpim-bonn.mpg.de