

Paper ID: GMJ 231005-Subramaniam

Title: Seshadri Constants of Curve Configurations on Surfaces

Authors: Krishna Hanumanthu, Praveen Roy and Aditya Subramaniam

We thank the referee for carefully reading the manuscript and suggesting many useful changes including a valuable suggestion to remove the hypothesis that all the curves in \mathcal{C} are linearly equivalent to a fixed divisor. We were able to do this and our main theorem now (Theorem 2.2 in the new version) is a more general result without the old assumption.

We also thank the referee for pointing out an error in Assumption 2.4 (new version) which leads to ambiguities at several places. We fixed this error by assuming that the arrangement is connected.

We agree with the referee that Example 2.22 (in the new version) can be shortened and it is better to focus solely on the computation of Seshadri constants.

All these suggestions substantially improved the paper and we are grateful to the referee for them.

Below we describe in detail the changes made to the manuscript based on the referee's comments.

- As the referee mentioned correctly, the proof of the main theorem in the original version did not really need the assumption that all the curves are linearly equivalent to a fixed divisor. We removed this hypothesis and the hypothesis that \mathcal{C} is a star arrangement and re-wrote the proof in the more general setting. The earlier results were retained as corollaries.

We also modified some of the questions we asked to fit the more general setting of the new version.

- Following the referee's suggestion, we included the assumption that the arrangement \mathcal{C} is *connected* throughout. This assumption is added in Definition 1.2 itself where transversal arrangements are defined.
- We removed the unnecessary assumption that all the curves do not meet at any point. Referee correctly noted that this is not necessary for the main results.

We only needed this assumption while computing the configurational Seshadri constants in Theorems 2.18, 2.19 and 2.21 (in the new version). We therefore added the required assumption in the statements of Theorem 2.18 and Theorem 2.21. (In Theorem 2.19, the hypotheses of Theorem 2.18 are assumed.)

- We revised Example 2.22 (in the new version) considerably. We shortened it to focus solely on the computation of the Seshadri constant.