Prym varieties provide a correspondence between the moduli spaces of curves and abelian varieties \( M_g \) and \( A_{g-1} \), via the Prym map \( P_g : R_g \to A_{g-1} \) from the moduli space \( R_g \) parameterizing pairs \([C, \eta]\), where \([C] \in M_g\) is a smooth curve and \( \eta \in \text{Pic}^0(C)[2] \) is a torsion point of order 2. When \( g \leq 6 \) the Prym map is dominant and \( R_g \) can be used directly to determine the birational type of \( A_{g-1} \). It is known that \( R_g \) is rational for \( g = 2, 3, 4 \) (see [Dol] and references therein and [Ca] for the case of genus 4) and unirational for \( g = 5 \) (cf. [IGS] and [V2]). The situation in genus 6 is strikingly beautiful because \( P_6 : R_6 \to A_5 \) is equidimensional (precisely \( \dim(R_6) = \dim(A_5) = 15 \)). Donagi and Smith showed that \( P_6 \) is generically finite of degree 27 (cf. [DS]) and the monodromy group equals the Weyl group \( W_E_6 \) describing the incidence correspondence of the 27 lines on a cubic surface (cf. [D1]). There are three different proofs that \( R_6 \) is unirational (cf. [D1], [MM], [V]). Verra has very recently announced a proof of the unirationality of \( R_7 \) (see also Theorem 0.8 for a weaker result). The Prym map \( P_g \) is generically injective for \( g \geq 7 \) (cf. [FS]), although never injective. In this range, we may regard \( R_g \) as a partial desingularization of the moduli space \( P_g(R_g) \subset \mathcal{A}_{g-1} \) of Prym varieties of dimension \( g - 1 \).

The scheme \( R_g \) admits a suitable modular compactification \( \overline{R}_g \), which is isomorphic to (1) the coarse moduli space of the stack \( \overline{R}_g = \overline{M}_g(B\mathbb{Z}_2) \) of Beauville admissible double covers (cf. [B], [ACV]) and (2) the coarse moduli space of the stack of Prym curves (cf. [BCF]). The forgetful map \( \pi : R_g \to M_g \) extends to a finite map \( \pi : \overline{R}_g \to \overline{M}_g \). The aim of this paper is to initiate a study of the enumerative and global geometry of \( \overline{R}_g \), in particular to determine its Kodaira dimension. The main result of the paper is the following:

**Theorem 0.1.** The moduli space of Prym varieties \( \overline{R}_g \) is of general type for \( g > 13 \) and \( g \neq 15 \).

The Kodaira dimension of \( \overline{R}_{15} \) is at least 1.

We point out in Remark 2.9 that the existence of an effective divisor \( D \in \text{Eff}(\overline{M}_{15}) \) of slope \( s(D) < 6 + 12/(g + 1) = 27/4 \) (that is, violating the Harris-Morrison Slope Conjecture on \( \overline{M}_{15} \)), would imply that \( \overline{R}_{15} \) is of general type. There are known examples of divisors \( D \in \text{Eff}(\overline{M}_g) \) satisfying \( s(D) < 6 + \frac{12}{g+1} \) for every genus of the form \( g = s(2s + si + i + 1) \) with \( s \geq 2 \) and \( i \geq 0 \) (cf. [PT], [P2]). No such examples have been found yet on \( \overline{M}_{15} \), though they are certainly expected to exist.

The normal variety \( \overline{R}_g \) has finite quotient singularities and an important part of the proof is concerned with showing that pluricanonical forms defined on the smooth
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part \( \mathcal{R}_{reg}^g \subset \mathcal{R}_g \) can be lifted to any resolution of singularities \( \widehat{\mathcal{R}}_g \to \mathcal{R}_g \), that is, we have isomorphisms

\[
H^0(\mathcal{R}_{reg}^g, K_{\mathcal{R}_g}^{\otimes l}) \cong H^0(\widehat{\mathcal{R}}_g, K_{\widehat{\mathcal{R}}_g}^{\otimes l})
\]

for \( l \geq 0 \). This is achieved in the last section of the paper. The locus of non-canonical singularities in \( \mathcal{R}_g \) is also explicitly described: A Prym curve \([X, \eta, \beta] \in \mathcal{R}_g \) is a non-canonical singularity if and only if \( X \) has an elliptic tail with \( \text{Aut}(C) = \mathbb{Z}_6 \), such that the line bundle \( \eta_C \in \text{Pic}^0(C)[2] \) is trivial (cf. Theorem 6.7).

We outline the strategy to prove that \( \mathcal{R}_g \) is of general type for given \( g \). If \( \lambda = \pi^*(\lambda) \in \text{Pic}(\mathcal{R}_g) \) is the pull-back of the Hodge class and \( \delta^r_0, \delta^r_0, \delta^\text{ram} \in \text{Pic}(\mathcal{R}_g) \) and \( \delta_i, \delta_{g-i}, \delta_{i,g-i} \in \text{Pic}(\mathcal{R}_g) \) for \( 1 \leq i \leq [g/2] \) are boundary divisor classes such that

\[
\pi^*(\delta_0) = \delta^r_0 + 2\delta^\text{ram} \quad \text{and} \quad \pi^*(\delta_i) = \delta_i + \delta_{g-i} + \delta_{i,g-i} \quad \text{for} \quad 1 \leq i \leq [g/2]
\]

(see Section 2 for a precise definition of these classes), then one has the formula

\[
K_{\mathcal{R}_g} \equiv 13\lambda - 2(\delta^r_0 + \delta^r_0) - 3\delta^\text{ram} - 2 \sum_{i=1}^{[g/2]} (\delta_i + \delta_{g-i} + \delta_{i,g-i}) - (\delta_1 + \delta_{g-1} + \delta_{1,g-1}).
\]

We show that this class is big by explicitly constructing effective divisors \( D \) on \( \widehat{\mathcal{R}}_g \) such that one can write \( K_{\mathcal{R}_g} \equiv \alpha \cdot \lambda + \beta \cdot D + \text{effective combination of boundary classes} \), for certain \( \alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0} \) (see [2] for the inequalities the coefficients of such \( D \) must satisfy).

We carry out an enumerative study of divisors on \( \mathcal{R}_g \) defined in terms of pairs \([C, \eta]\) such that the 2-torsion point \( \eta \in \text{Pic}^0(C) \) is transversal with respect to the theta divisors associated to certain stable vector bundles on \( C \). We fix integers \( k \geq 2 \) and \( b \geq 0 \) and then define the integers

\[
i := kb + k - b - 2, \quad r := kb + k - 2, \quad g := ik + 1 \quad \text{and} \quad d := rk.
\]

The Brill-Noether number \( \rho(g, r, d) \equiv g - (r + 1)(g - d + r) = 0 \) and a general \([C] \in \mathcal{M}_g \) carries a finite number of line bundles \( L \in W^0_d(C) \). For each such line bundle \( L \), if \( Q_L \) denotes the dual of the Lazarsfeld bundle defined by the exact sequence (see [L])

\[
0 \to Q^\perp_L \to H^0(C, L) \otimes O_C \to L \to 0,
\]

we compute that \( \mu(Q_L) = d/r = k \) and then \( \mu(L^\perp Q_L) = ik = g - 1 \). In these circumstances we define the Raynaud divisor (degeneration locus of virtual codimension 1)

\[
\Theta_{L^\perp Q_L} := \{ \eta \in \text{Pic}^0(C) : H^0(C, L^\perp Q_L \otimes \eta) \neq 0 \}.
\]

This is a virtual divisor inside \( \text{Pic}^0(C) \), in the sense that either \( \Theta_{L^\perp Q_L} = \text{Pic}^0(C) \) or else \( \Theta_{L^\perp Q_L} \) is a divisor on \( \text{Pic}^0(C) \) belonging to the linear system \( |L^\perp|_{\theta} \), cf. [R]. We study the relative position of \( \eta \) with respect to \( \Theta_{L^\perp Q_L} \) and introduce the following locus on \( \mathcal{R}_g \):

\[
D_{g;k} := \{ [C, \eta] \in \mathcal{R}_g : \exists L \in W^0_d(C) \text{ such that } \eta \in \Theta_{L^\perp Q_L} \}.
\]

When \( k = 2, i = b, \) then \( g = 2i + 1, d = 2g - 2 \) and \( D_{2i+1:2} \) has a new incarnation using the proof of the Minimal Resolution Conjecture [FMP]. In this case, \( L = K_C \) (a genus \( g \) curve has only one \( g_{2g-2}^{-1} \)) and [FMP] gives an identification of cycles

\[
\Theta_{L^\perp Q_{K_C}} = C_i - C_i \subset \text{Pic}^0(C),
\]
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where the right-hand-side stands for the $i$-th difference variety of $C$.

We prove in Section 2 that $D_{g,k}$ is an effective divisor on $R_g$. By specialization to the $k$-gonal locus $M^1_{g,k} \subset M_g$, we show that for a generic $[C, \eta] \in R_g$ the vanishing $H^0(C, \wedge^i Q_L \otimes \eta) = 0$ holds for every $L \in W^r_d(C)$ (Theorem 0.3). Then we extend the determinantal structure of $D_{g,k}$ to a partial compactification of $R_g$ which enables us to compute the class of the compactification $\overline{D}_{g,k}$. Precisely we construct two vector bundles $E$ and $F$ over a stack $\overline{R}_g$ which is a partial compactification of $R_g$, such that rank$(E) = \text{rank}(F)$, together with a vector bundle homomorphism $\phi : \mathcal{E} \to \mathcal{F}$ such that $Z_1(\phi) \cap R_g = D_{g,k}$. Then we explicitly determine the class $c_1(\mathcal{F} - \mathcal{E}) \in A^1(\overline{R}_g)$ (Theorem 2.3). The cases of interest for determining the Kodaira dimension of $\overline{R}_g$ are when $k = 2, 3$ when we obtain the following results:

**Theorem 0.2.** The closure of the divisor $D_{2i+1,2} = \{[C, \eta] \in R_{2i+1} : h^0(C, \wedge^i Q_{K_C} \otimes \eta) \geq 1\}$ inside $\overline{R}_{2i+1}$ has class given by the following formula in $\text{Pic}(\overline{R}_{2i+1})$:

$$\overline{D}_{2i+1,2} \equiv \frac{1}{2i-1} \binom{2i}{i} \left( (3i+1)\lambda - \frac{i}{2} \left( \delta_0'' + \delta_0'^{-1} \right) - \frac{2i+1}{4} \delta_0^\text{ram} - (3i-1)\delta_0 - i(\delta_1 g - 1 + \delta_1) - \cdots \right).$$

To illustrate Theorem 0.2 in the simplest case, $i = 1$ hence $g = 3$, we write $D_{3,2} = \{[C, \eta] \in R_3 : \eta = \mathcal{O}_C(x - y), x, y \in C\}$. The analysis carried out in Section 5 shows that the vector bundle morphism $\phi : \mathcal{E} \to \mathcal{F}$ is generically non-degenerate along the boundary divisors $\Delta_0^\text{ram} \subset \overline{R}_3$ and degenerate (with multiplicity 1) along the divisor $\Delta_0^\text{ram} \subset \overline{R}_3$ of Wirtinger covers. Theorem 0.2 reads like

$$\overline{D}_{3,2} \equiv c_1(\mathcal{F} - \mathcal{E}) - \delta_0'' \equiv 8\lambda - \delta_0' - 2\delta_0'' - \frac{3}{2} \delta_0^\text{ram} - 6\delta_1 - 4\delta_2 - 2\delta_{1,2} \in \text{Pic}(\overline{R}_3),$$

and then $\pi_+(\overline{D}_{3,2}) \equiv 56(9\lambda - \delta_0' - 3\delta_1) \equiv 56\cdot \overline{M}_{3,2}^1 \in \text{Pic}(\overline{M}_3)$ (see Theorem 5.1). Theorem 0.2 is consistent with the following elementary fact, see e.g. [HI]: If $[\overline{C} \to C] \in \mathcal{R}_3$ is an étale double cover, then $[\overline{C}] \in M_3$ is hyperelliptic if and only if $[C] \in M_3$ is hyperelliptic and $\eta = \mathcal{O}_C(x - y)$, with $x, y \in C$ being Weierstrass points.

**Theorem 0.3.** For $b \geq 1$ and $r = 3b + 1$ the class of the divisor $\overline{D}_{6b+4,3}$ on $\overline{R}_{6b+4}$ is given by:

$$\overline{D}_{g;3} \equiv \frac{4}{r} \left( \frac{6b + 3}{b, 2b, 3b + 3} \right) \left( (3b+2)(b+2)\lambda - \frac{3b^2 + 7b + 3}{6} (\delta_0' + \delta_0'') - \frac{24b^2 + 47b + 21}{24} \delta_0^\text{ram} - \cdots \right).$$

Theorems 2.8, 0.2 and 0.3 specify precisely the $\lambda, \delta_0', \delta_0''$ and $\delta_0^\text{ram}$ coefficients in the expansion of $[\overline{D}_{g,k}]$. Good lower bounds for the remaining boundary coefficients of $[\overline{D}_{g,k}]$ can be obtained using Proposition 1.9. The information contained in Theorems 0.2 and 0.3 is sufficient to finish the proof of Theorem 0.1 for odd genus $g = 2i + 1 \geq 15$.

When $b = 0$, hence $i = r = k - 2$, Theorem 2.8 has the following interpretation:

**Theorem 0.4.** We fix integers $k \geq 3, r = k - 2$ and $g = (k - 1)^2$. The following locus

$$D_{g;k} := \{[C, \eta] \in R_g : \exists L \in W^r_{k(k-2)}(C) \text{ such that } H^0(C, L \otimes \eta) \neq 0\}$$

is a divisor on $R_g$. The class of its compactification inside $\overline{R}_g$ is given by the formula

$$\overline{D}_{g;k} \equiv \frac{g!}{(k-1)!} \frac{1! 2! \cdots (k-2)!}{(2k-3)!} \left( \frac{1}{2} (k^4 - 4k^3 + 11k^2 - 14k + 2) \lambda - \cdots \right).$$
When $k = 3$ and $g = 4$, the divisor $\mathcal{D}_{4:3}$ consists of Prym curves $[C, \eta] \in \mathcal{R}_4$ for which the plane Prym-canonical model $\iota : C \to [K_C \otimes \eta] \mathbb{P}^2$ has a triple point. Note that for a general $[C, \eta] \in \mathcal{R}_4$, $\iota(C)$ is a 6-nodal sextic. We can then verify the formula
\[ \pi_*(\mathcal{D}_{4:3}) = 60(34\lambda - 4\delta_0 - 14\delta_1 - 18\delta_2) = 60 \cdot \mathcal{G}^1_{4,3} \in \text{Pic}(\mathcal{M}_4), \]
where $\mathcal{G}^1_{4,3} \subset \mathcal{M}_4$ is the divisor of curves with a vanishing theta-null. This is consistent with the set-theoretic equality $\pi(\mathcal{D}_{4:3}) = \mathcal{G}^1_{4,3}$ which can be easily established (see Theorem 5.4).

Another case which has a simple interpretation is when $b = 1$, $i = r - 1$, and then $g = (2k - 1)(k - 1), d = 2k(k - 1)$. Since rank$(Q_L) = r$ and det$(Q_L) = L$, by duality we have that $\wedge^i Q_L = M_L \otimes L$, hence points $[C, \eta] \in \mathcal{D}(2(k-1)(k-1):k)$ can be described purely in terms of multiplication maps of sections of line bundles on $C$:

**Theorem 0.5.** We fix integers $k \geq 2$ and $g = (2k - 1)(k - 1)$. The following locus
\[ \mathcal{D}_{g:k} = \{ [C, \eta] \in \mathcal{R}_g : \forall L \in W^{2k-2}_{2k-1}(C) \text{ with } H^0(L) \otimes H^0(L \otimes \eta) \to H^0(L^\otimes \otimes \eta) \text{ not bijective} \} \]
is a divisor on $\mathcal{R}_g$. The class of its compactification inside $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_g$ equals
\[ \mathcal{D}_{g:k} \equiv g! \cdot 3(2k^2 - 3k - 1)(2k - 1)! (2k)! \cdots (3k - 3)! (3k - 2)! \left( 6(k^5 - 36k^4 + 78k^3 - 95k^2 + 49k - 6) \lambda - (8k^5 - 36k^4 + 70k^3 - 71k^2 + 29k - 2)(\delta'_0 + \delta''_0) - \frac{1}{2} (32k^5 - 144k^4 + 262k^3 - 245k^2 + 107k - 14) \delta_{ram} + \cdots \right). \]

The second class of (virtual) divisors is provided by Koszul divisors on $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_g$. For a pair $(C, L)$ consisting of a curve $[C] \in \mathcal{M}_g$, and a line bundle $L \in \text{Pic}(C)$, we denote by $K_{i,j}(C, L)$ its $(i, j)$-th Koszul cohomology group, cf. [1]. For a point $[C, \eta] \in \mathcal{R}_g$, we set $L := K_C \otimes \eta$ and we stratify $\mathcal{R}_g$ using the syzygies of the Prym-canonical curve $C \to \mathbb{P}^{g-2}$. We define the stratum
\[ \mathcal{U}_{g,i} := \{ [C, \eta] \in \mathcal{R}_g : K_{i,2}(C, K_C \otimes \eta) \neq \emptyset \}, \]
that is, $\mathcal{U}_{g,i}$ consists of those Prym curves $[C, \eta] \in \mathcal{R}_g$ for which the Prym-canonical model $C \to \mathbb{P}^{g-2}$ fails to satisfy the Green-Lazarsfeld property $(N_i)$ in the sense of [GL, 1].

**Theorem 0.6.** There exist two vector bundles $\mathcal{G}_{i,2}$ and $\mathcal{H}_{i,2}$ of the same rank defined over a partial compactification $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{2i+6}$ of the stack $\mathcal{R}_{2i+6}$, together with a morphism $\phi : \mathcal{H}_{i,2} \to \mathcal{G}_{i,2}$ such that
\[ \mathcal{U}_{2i+6,i} := \{ [C, \eta] \in \overline{\mathcal{R}}_{2i+6} : K_{i,2}(C, K_C \otimes \eta) \neq \emptyset \} \]
is the degeneracy locus of the map $\phi$. The virtual class of $\overline{\mathcal{U}}_{2i+6,i}$ is given by the formula:
\[ \overline{\mathcal{U}}_{2i+6,i}^{\text{virt}} = c_1(\mathcal{G}_{i,2} - \mathcal{H}_{i,2}) = \left( \frac{2i + 2}{i} \right) \left( \frac{3(2i + 7)}{i + 3} \lambda - \frac{3}{2} \delta_{ram} + (\delta'_0 + \alpha \delta''_0) \right). \]
where the constant \( \alpha \) satisfies \( \alpha \geq 1 \).

The compactification \( \tilde{R}_g \) has the property that if \( \tilde{R}_g \subset \bar{R}_g \) denotes its coarse moduli space, then \( \text{codim}(\pi^{-1}(\mathcal{M}_g \cup \Delta_0) - \tilde{R}_g) \geq 2 \). In particular Theorem 0.6 precisely determines the coefficient of \( \lambda, \delta_0', \delta_0'' \) and \( \delta_0^{\text{sm}} \) in the expansion of \( \bar{U}_{2i+6,i}^{\text{virt}} \). We also show that when \( g < 2i+6 \) then \( K_{i,2}(C, K_C \otimes \eta) \neq \emptyset \) for any \( [C, \eta] \in \tilde{R}_g \). By analogy with the case of canonical curves and the classical M. Green Conjecture on syzygies of canonical curves (see [Vo]), we conjecture that the morphism of vector bundles \( \phi : \mathcal{G}_{i,2} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{i,2} \) over \( \tilde{R}_{2i+6} \) is generically non-degenerate:

**Conjecture 0.7.** (Prym-Green Conjecture) For a generic point \( [C, \eta] \in \tilde{R}_g \) and \( g \geq 2i+6 \), we have that \( K_{i,2}(C, K_C \otimes \eta) = 0 \). Equivalently, the Prym-canonical curve \( C \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^{g-2} \) satisfies the Green-Lazarsfeld property \( (N_i) \) whenever \( g \geq 2i+6 \). For \( g = 2i+6 \), the locus \( U_{2i+6,i} \) is an effective divisor on \( \tilde{R}_{2i+6} \).

Proposition [3.1] shows that, if true, Conjecture 0.7 is sharp. In [F4] we verify the Prym-Green Conjecture for \( g = 2i+6 \) with \( 0 \leq i \leq 4 \), \( i \neq 1 \). In particular, this together with Theorem 0.6 proves that \( \tilde{R}_g \) is of general type for \( g = 14 \).

The strata \( U_{g,i} \) have been considered before for \( i = 0, 1 \), in connection with the Prym-Torelli problem. Unlike the classical Torelli problem, the Prym-Torelli problem is a subtle question: Donagi’s tetragonal construction shows that \( P_g \) fails to be injective over points \( [C, \eta] \in \pi^{-1}(\mathcal{M}_{g,4}) \) where the curve \( C \) is tetragonal (cf. [D2]). The locus \( U_{g,0} \) consists of those points \( [C, \eta] \in \tilde{R}_g \) where the differential

\[
(dP_g)_{[C, \eta]} : \mathcal{H}^0(C, C^{\otimes 2})^* \rightarrow (\text{Sym}^2 \mathcal{H}^0(C, K_C \otimes \eta))^*
\]

is not injective and thus the infinitesimal Prym-Torelli theorem fails. It is known that \( (dP_g)_{[C, \eta]} \) is generically injective for \( g \geq 6 \) (cf. [B], or [De] Corollaire 2.3), that is, \( U_{g,0} \) is a proper subvariety of \( \tilde{R}_g \). In particular, for \( g = 6 \) the locus \( U_{6,0} \) is a divisor of \( \tilde{R}_6 \), which gives another proof of Conjecture 0.7 for \( i = 0 \).

Debarre proved that \( U_{g,1} \) is a proper subvariety of \( \tilde{R}_g \) for \( g \geq 9 \) (cf. [De] Théorème 2.2). This immediately implies that for \( g \geq 9 \) the Prym map \( P_g \) is generically injective, hence the Prym-Torelli theorem holds generically. Debarre’s proof unfortunately does not cover the interesting case \( g = 8 \).

The proof of Theorem 0.1 is finished in Section 4, using in an essential way results from [F3]: We set \( g' := 1 + \frac{2g - 1}{g} \) and then we consider the rational map which associates to a curve one of its Brill-Noether loci

\[
\phi : \mathcal{M}_{2g-1} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{1+\frac{2g-1}{g}}(g-1), \quad \phi[Y] := W_{g+1}^1(Y),
\]

where \( W_{g+1}^1(Y) := \{ L \in \text{Pic}^{g+1}(Y) : h^0(Y, L) \geq 2 \} \). If \( \chi : \tilde{R}_g \rightarrow \tilde{M}_{2g-1} \) is the map given by \( \chi([C, \eta]) := [\tilde{C}] \), where \( f : \tilde{C} \rightarrow C \) is the étale double cover with the property that \( f_*\mathcal{O}_{\tilde{C}} = \mathcal{O}_C \oplus \eta \), then using [F3] we compute the slope of myriads of effective divisors of type \( \chi^*\phi^*(A) \), where \( A \in \text{Ample}(\mathcal{M}_{g'}) \). This proves Theorem 0.1 for even genus \( g = 2i+6 \geq 18 \).
We mention in passing as an immediate application of Proposition 1.9, a different proof of the statement that $\mathcal{R}_g$ has good rationality properties for low $g$ (see again the Introduction for the history of this problem). Our proof is quite simple and uses only numerical properties of Lefschetz pencils of curves on $K3$ surfaces:

**Theorem 0.8.** For all $g \leq 7$, the Kodaira dimension of $\mathcal{R}_g$ is $-\infty$.

We close by summarizing the structure of the paper. In Section 1 we introduce the stack $\mathcal{R}_g$ of Prym curves and determine the Chern classes of certain tautological vector bundles. In Section 2 we carry out the enumerative study of the divisors $\mathcal{D}_{g,k}$ while in Section 3 we study Koszul divisors on $\mathcal{R}_g$ in connection with the Prym-Green Conjecture. The proof of Theorem 0.1 is completed in Section 4 while Section 5 is concerned with the enumerative geometry of $\mathcal{R}_g$ for $g \leq 5$. In Section 6 we describe the behaviour of singularities of pluricanonical forms of $\mathcal{R}_g$. There is a significant overlap between some of the results of this paper and those of [Be]. Among the things we use from [Be] we mention the description of the branch locus of $\pi$ and the fact that $\mathcal{R}_g$ is isomorphic to the coarse moduli space of $\mathcal{M}_g(B\mathbb{Z}_2)$ (see Section 1). However, some of the results in [Be] are not correct, in particular the statement in [Be] Chapter 3 on singularities of $\mathcal{R}_g$. Hence we carried out a detailed study of singularities of $\mathcal{R}_g$ in Section 6 of our paper.

1. **The stack of Prym curves**

In this section we review a few facts about compactifications of $\mathcal{R}_g$. As a matter of terminology, if $\mathcal{M}$ is a Deligne-Mumford stack, we denote by $\mathcal{M}$ its coarse moduli space (This is contrary to the convention set in [ACV] but it makes sense, at least from a historical point of view). All the Picard groups of stacks or schemes we are going to consider are with rational coefficients.

We recall that $\pi : \mathcal{R}_g \to \mathcal{M}_g$ is the $(2g-1)$-sheeted cover which forgets the point of order 2 and we denote by $\mathcal{R}_g$ the normalization of $\mathcal{M}_g$ in the function field of $\mathcal{R}_g$. By definition, $\mathcal{R}_g$ is a normal variety and $\pi$ extends to a finite ramified covering $\pi : \mathcal{R}_g \to \mathcal{M}_g$. The local behaviour of this branched cover has been studied in the thesis of M. Bernstein [Be] as well as in the paper [BCF]. In particular, the scheme $\mathcal{R}_g$ has two distinct modular incarnations which we now recall. If $X$ is a nodal curve, a smooth rational component $E \subset X$ is said to be exceptional if $\#(E \cap X - E) = 2$. The curve $X$ is said to be quasi-stable if any two exceptional components of $X$ are disjoint. Thus a quasi-stable curve is obtained from a stable curve by blowing-up each node at most once. We denote by $[\text{st}(X)] \in \mathcal{M}_g$ the stable model of $X$. We have the following definition (cf. [BCF]):

**Definition 1.1.** A **Prym curve** of genus $g$ consists of a triple $(X, \eta, \beta)$, where $X$ is a genus $g$ quasi-stable curve, $\eta \in \text{Pic}^0(X)$ is a line bundle of degree 0 such that $\eta|_E = \mathcal{O}_E(1)$ for every exceptional component $E \subset X$, and $\beta : \eta^{\otimes 2} \to \mathcal{O}_X$ is a sheaf homomorphism which is generically non-zero along each non-exceptional component of $X$.

A **family of Prym curves** over a base scheme $S$ consists of a triple $(X \xrightarrow{f} S, \eta, \beta)$, where $f : X \to S$ is a flat family of quasi-stable curves, $\eta \in \text{Pic}(X)$ is a line bundle and
\[ \beta : \eta^{\otimes 2} \to \mathcal{O}_X \] is a sheaf homomorphism, such that for every point \( s \in S \) the restriction \((X_s, \eta_{X_s}, \beta_{X_s} : \eta_{X_s}^{\otimes 2} \to \mathcal{O}_{X_s})\) is a Prym curve.

We denote by \( \overline{\mathcal{R}}_g \) the non-singular Deligne-Mumford stack of Prym curves of genus \( g \). The main result of \cite{BCP} is that the coarse moduli space of \( \overline{\mathcal{R}}_g \) is isomorphic to the normalization of \( \overline{\mathcal{M}}_g \) in the function field of \( \mathcal{R}_g \). On the other hand, it is proved in \cite{Be} that \( \overline{\mathcal{R}}_g \) is also isomorphic to the coarse moduli space of the Deligne-Mumford stack \( \overline{\mathcal{M}}_g(B\mathbb{Z}_2) \) of \( \mathbb{Z}_2 \)-admissible double covers introduced in \cite{B} and later in \cite{ACV}. For intersection theory calculations the language of Prym curves is better suited than that of admissible covers. In particular, the existence of a degree 0 line bundle \( \eta \) over the universal Prym curve will be often used to compute the Chern classes of various tautological vector bundles defined over \( \overline{\mathcal{R}}_g \). Throughout this paper we use the isomorphism between rational Picard groups \( \epsilon^* : \text{Pic} (\overline{\mathcal{R}}_g) \to \text{Pic}(\overline{\mathcal{R}}_g) \) induced by the map \( \epsilon : \overline{\mathcal{R}}_g \to \overline{\mathcal{R}}_g \) from the stack to its coarse moduli space.

**Remark 1.2.** If \((X, \eta, \beta)\) is a Prym curve with exceptional components \( E_1, \ldots , E_r \) and \( \{p_i, q_i\} = E_i \cap X - E_i \) for \( i = 1, \ldots , r \), then obviously \( \beta_{E_i} = 0 \). Moreover, if \( \tilde{X} := X - \bigcup_{i=1}^r E_i \) (viewed as a subcurve of \( X \)), then we have an isomorphism of sheaves

\[ (1) \quad \eta_{\tilde{X}}^{\otimes 2} \cong \mathcal{O}_{\tilde{X}}(-p_1 - q_1 - \cdots - p_r - q_r). \]

It is straightforward to describe all Prym curves \([X, \eta, \beta] \in \overline{\mathcal{R}}_g\) whose stable model has a prescribed topological type. We do this when \( st(X) \) is a 1-nodal curve and we determine in the process the boundary components of \( \overline{\mathcal{R}}_g - \overline{\mathcal{R}}_g \).

**Example 1.3.** (Curves of compact type) If \( st(X) = C \cup D \) is a union of two smooth curves \( C \) and \( D \) of genus \( i \) and \( g-i \) respectively meeting transversally at a point, we use \( (1) \) to note that \( X = C \cup D \) (that is, \( X \) has no exceptional components). The line bundle \( \eta \) on \( X \) is determined by the choice of two line bundles \( \eta_C \in \text{Pic}^0(C) \) and \( \eta_D \in \text{Pic}^0(D) \) satisfying \( \eta_C^{\otimes 2} = \mathcal{O}_C \) and \( \eta_D^{\otimes 2} = \mathcal{O}_D \) respectively. This shows that for \( 1 \leq i \leq [g/2] \) the pull-back under \( \pi \) of the boundary divisor \( \Delta_i \subset \overline{\mathcal{M}}_g \) splits into three irreducible components

\[ \pi^* (\Delta_i) = \Delta_i + \Delta_{g-i} + \Delta_{i;g-i}, \]

where the generic point of \( \Delta_i \subset \overline{\mathcal{R}}_g \) is of the form \([C \cup D, \eta_C \neq \mathcal{O}_C, \eta_D = \mathcal{O}_D]\), the generic point of \( \Delta_{g-i} \) is of the form \([C \cup D, \eta_C = \mathcal{O}_C, \eta_D \neq \mathcal{O}_D]\), and finally \( \Delta_{i;g-i} \) is the closure of the locus of points \([C \cup D, \eta_C \neq \mathcal{O}_C, \eta_D \neq \mathcal{O}_D]\) (see also \cite{Be} pg. 9).

**Example 1.4.** (Irreducible one-nodal curves) If \( st(X) = C_{qq} := C/y \sim q \), where \([C, y, q] \in \mathcal{M}_{g-1,2}\), then there are two possibilities, depending on whether \( X \) has an exceptional component or not. Suppose first that \( X = C' \) and \( \eta \in \text{Pic}^0(X) \). If \( \nu : C \to X \) is the normalization map, then there is an exact sequence

\[ 1 \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}^* \longrightarrow \text{Pic}^0(X) \xrightarrow{\nu^*} \text{Pic}^0(C) \longrightarrow 0. \]

Thus \( \eta \) is determined by a (non-trivial) line bundle \( \eta_C := \nu^*(\eta) \in \text{Pic}^0(C) \) satisfying \( \eta_C^{\otimes 2} = \mathcal{O}_C \) together with an identification of the fibres \( \eta_C(y) \) and \( \eta_C(q) \). If \( \eta_C = \mathcal{O}_C \), then there is a unique way to identify the fibres \( \eta_C(y) \) and \( \eta_C(q) \) such that \( \eta \neq \mathcal{O}_X \), and this corresponds to the classical Wirtinger cover of \( X \). We denote by \( \Delta_0'' = \Delta_0^{\text{Wir}} \) the
We denote by $\eta$ the closure of the locus of Prym curves in $\mathcal{M}_g$. Then $\eta$ covers. We explain how to do this in codimension 1. We use that $\eta$ is a general point in $\mathcal{M}_g$. One has the following formula in $\mathcal{M}_g$: $K = K + \sum_{i} \delta_i$, where $K$ is a canonical class corresponding to the boundary divisors of $\mathcal{M}_g$. As usual, one denotes by $\delta_i$ the canonical class $K$ of $\mathcal{M}_g$. The Beauville cover is obtained by taking $\mathcal{M}_g \ni \tilde{C} \rightarrow C \sim y \sim q \rightarrow C \sim y \sim q \in \mathcal{M}_g$. If $\tilde{C} \rightarrow C$ is a general point in $\mathcal{M}_g$, then $\eta$ is a admissible double cover, defined up to a sign. This ambiguity is then resolved in the choice of an element in $\text{Ker} \{ u^* : \text{Pic}^0(C_{yq}) \rightarrow \text{Pic}^0(C)[2]\}$.

If $[C/y \sim q, \eta, \beta]$ is a general point of $\Delta''_0$, then we take identical copies $[C_1, y_1, q_1]$ and $[C_2, y_2, q_2]$ of $[C, y, q] \in \mathcal{M}_{g-1}$. The Wirtinger cover is obtained by taking $\mathcal{M}_{2g-1} \ni \mathcal{M}_g \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_g$. If $[C \cup \{y, q\}, \eta, \beta] \in \Delta''_0$, then $\eta \in \sqrt{\mathcal{O}_C(-y - q)}$ induces a 2 : 1 cover $\tilde{C} \rightarrow C$ branched over $y$ and $q$. We set $\{\tilde{y}\} := f^{-1}(y)$, $\{\tilde{q}\} := f^{-1}(q)$. The Beauville cover is $\mathcal{M}_{2g-1} \ni \mathcal{M}_g \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_g$.

As usual, one denotes by $\delta_0, \delta_0', \delta_0'' \in \text{Pic}(\mathcal{R}_g)$ the stacky divisor classes corresponding to the boundary divisors of $\mathcal{R}_g$. We also set $\lambda := \pi^*(\lambda) \in \text{Pic}(\mathcal{R}_g)$. Next we determine the canonical class $K_{\mathcal{R}_g}$:

**Theorem 1.5.** One has the following formula in $\text{Pic}(\mathcal{R}_g)$:

$$K_{\mathcal{R}_g} = 13\lambda - 2(\delta_0' + \delta_0'') - 3\delta_{0}^{\text{ram}} - 2\sum_{i=1}^{[g/2]} (\delta_i + \delta_{g-i} + \delta_{1: g-i}) - (\delta_1 + \delta_{g-1} + \delta_{1: g-1})$$

**Proof.** We use that $K_{\mathcal{R}_g} \equiv 13\lambda - 2\delta_0 - 3\delta_1 - 2\delta_2 - \cdots - 2\delta_{[g/2]}$ (cf. [HM]), together with the Hurwitz formula for the cover $\pi : \mathcal{R}_g \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_g$. We find that $K_{\mathcal{R}_g} = \pi^*(K_{\mathcal{M}_g}) + \delta_{0}^{\text{ram}}$. $\square$
Using this formula as well as the Appendix, we conclude that in order to prove that \( \overline{\mathcal{M}}_g \) is of general type for a certain \( g \), it suffices to exhibit a single effective divisor
\[
D \equiv a \lambda - b'_0 \nu' - b''_0 \nu'' - b''_{0} \delta_{0} - \sum_{i=1}^{[g/2]} (b_i \delta_i + b_{g-i} \delta_{g-i}) \in \text{Eff}(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_g),
\]
satisfying the following inequalities:
\[
\max \left\{ \frac{a}{b'_0}, \frac{a}{b''_0} \right\} < \frac{13}{2}, \quad \max \left\{ \frac{a}{b'_0}, \frac{a}{b''_0}, \frac{a}{b_{g-1}}, \frac{a}{b_{1:g-1}} \right\} < \frac{13}{3}
\]
and
\[
\max_{i \geq 1} \left\{ \frac{a}{b_i}, \frac{a}{b_{g-i}}, \frac{a}{b_{1:g-i}} \right\} < \frac{13}{2}.
\]

1.1. The universal Prym curve. We start by introducing the partial compactification \( \overline{\mathcal{M}}_g := \mathcal{M}_g \cup \Delta_0 \) of \( \mathcal{M}_g \), obtaining by adding to \( \mathcal{M}_g \) the locus \( \Delta_0 \subset \overline{\mathcal{M}}_g \) of one-nodal irreducible curves \([C_{yq} \coloneqq C/y \sim \eta] \), where \([C, y, \eta] \in M_{g-1,2} \). Let \( p : \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,1} \to \mathcal{M}_g \) denote the universal curve. We denote \( \overline{\mathcal{R}}_g := \pi^{-1}(\mathcal{M}_g) \subset \overline{\mathcal{R}}_g \) and note that the boundary divisors \( \Delta_0 := \Delta_0 \cap \overline{\mathcal{R}}_g, \Delta''_0 := \Delta''_0 \cap \overline{\mathcal{R}}_g \) and \( \Delta_{0}^{\text{ram}} := \Delta_{0}^{\text{ram}} \cap \overline{\mathcal{R}}_g \) become disjoint inside \( \overline{\mathcal{R}}_g \). Finally, we set \( \mathcal{Z} := \overline{\mathcal{R}}_g \times \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,1} \) and denote by \( p_1 : \mathcal{Z} \to \overline{\mathcal{R}}_g \) the projection.

To obtain the universal family of Prym curves over \( \overline{\mathcal{R}}_g \), we blow-up the codimension 2 locus \( V \subset \mathcal{Z} \) corresponding to points
\[
v = ([C \cup \{y, q\}] E, \eta_C \in \sqrt{\mathcal{O}_C(-y - q)}, \eta_E = \mathcal{O}_E(1), \nu(y) = \nu(q)) \in \Delta_{0}^{\text{ram}} \times \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,1}
\]
(recall that \( \nu : C \to C_{yq} \) denotes the normalization map). Suppose that \((t_1, \ldots, t_{3g-3})\) are local coordinates in an étale neighbourhood of \([C \cup \{y, q\}] E, \eta_C, \eta_E] \in \overline{\mathcal{R}}_g \) such that the local equation of \( \Delta_{0}^{\text{ram}} \) is \((t_1 = 0)\). Then \( \mathcal{Z} \) around \( v \) admits local coordinates \((x, y, t_1, \ldots, t_{3g-3})\) satisfying the equation \( xy = t_1^2 \). In particular, \( \mathcal{Z} \) is singular along \( V \). We denote by \( \mathcal{X} := \text{Bl}_V(\mathcal{Z}) \) and by \( f : \mathcal{X} \to \overline{\mathcal{R}}_g \) the induced family of Prym curves. Then for every \([X, \eta, \beta] \in \overline{\mathcal{R}}_g \) we have that \( f^{-1}([X, \eta, \beta]) = X \).

On \( \mathcal{X} \) there exists a Prym line bundle \( \mathcal{P} \in \text{Pic}(\mathcal{X}) \) as well as a morphism of \( \mathcal{O}_X \)-modules \( B : \mathcal{P}^{\otimes 2} \to \mathcal{O}_X \) with the property that \( B_{f^{-1}([X, \eta, \beta])} = \beta \) and \( B_{f^{-1}([X, \eta, \beta])} = \eta^{\otimes 2} \to \mathcal{O}_X \), for all points \([X, \eta, \beta] \in \overline{\mathcal{R}}_g \) (see e.g. [C], the same argument carries over from the spin to the Prym moduli space).

We set \( \mathcal{E}_0', \mathcal{E}_0'' \) and \( \mathcal{E}_0^{\text{ram}} \subset \mathcal{X} \) to be the proper transforms of the boundary divisors \( p_1^{-1}(\Delta_0'), p_1^{-1}(\Delta_0'') \) and \( p_1^{-1}(\Delta_{0}^{\text{ram}}) \) respectively. Finally, we define \( \mathcal{E}_0 \) to be the exceptional divisor of the blow-up map \( \mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{Z} \).

We recall that \( g : \mathcal{Y} \to S \) is a family of nodal curves and \( L, M \) are line bundles on \( \mathcal{Y} \), then \((L, M) \in \text{Pic}(S) \) denotes the bilinear Deligne pairing of \( L \) and \( M \).

**Proposition 1.6.** If \( f : \mathcal{X} \to \overline{\mathcal{R}}_g \) is the universal Prym curve and \( \mathcal{P} \in \text{Pic}(\mathcal{X}) \) is the corresponding Prym bundle, then one has the following relations in \( \text{Pic}(\overline{\mathcal{R}}_g) \):

(i) \( \langle \omega_f, \mathcal{P} \rangle = 0 \).
(ii) $\langle O_X(\mathcal{E}_0) , O_X(\mathcal{E}_0) \rangle = -2\delta_0^\text{ram}$.
(iii) $\langle O_X(\mathcal{P}) , O_X(\mathcal{P}) \rangle = -\delta_0^\text{ram}/2$.

Proof. The sheaf homomorphism $B : \mathcal{P}^\otimes 2 \to O_X$ vanishes (with order 1) precisely along the exceptional divisor $\mathcal{E}_0$, hence $[\mathcal{E}_0] = -2c_1(\mathcal{P})$. Furthermore, we have the relations $f^*([\Delta_0^\text{ram}]) = \mathcal{E}_0^\text{ram} + \mathcal{E}_0$ and $f^*([\mathcal{E}_0^\text{ram}] \cdot [\mathcal{E}_0]) = 2\delta_0^\text{ram}$ (In the fibre $f^{-1}([C \cup \{y,q\} \ E, \eta_C])$ the divisors $\mathcal{E}_0$ and $\mathcal{E}_0^\text{ram}$ meet over two points, corresponding to whether the marked points equals $y$ or $q$. Now (ii) and (iii) follow simply from the push-pull formula. For (i), it is enough to show that $\omega_f|_{\mathcal{E}_0}$ is the trivial bundle. This follows because for any point $[X, \eta, \beta] \in \tilde{R}_g$ we have that $\omega_X \otimes O_E = 0$, for any exceptional component $E \subset X$. \hfill \Box

We now fix $i \geq 1$ and set $\mathcal{N}_i := f_*(\omega_f^i \otimes \mathcal{P}^\otimes i)$. Since $R^1 f_*(\omega_f^i \otimes \mathcal{P}^\otimes i) = 0$, Grauert's theorem implies that $\mathcal{N}_i$ is a vector bundle over $\tilde{R}_g$ of rank $(g-1)(2i-1)$.

**Proposition 1.7.** For each integer $i \geq 1$ the following formula in $\text{Pic}(\tilde{R}_g)$ holds:

$$c_1(\mathcal{N}_i) = \left(\frac{i}{2}\right)(12\lambda - \delta_0' - \delta_0'' - 2\delta_0^\text{ram}) + \lambda - i^2\frac{\delta_0^\text{ram}}{4}.$$

**Proof.** We apply Grothendieck-Riemann-Roch to the universal Prym curve $f : X \to \tilde{R}_g$:

$$c_1(\mathcal{N}_i) = f_*\left[\left(1 + ic_1(\omega_f \otimes \mathcal{P}) + \frac{i^2c_1^2(\omega_f \otimes \mathcal{P})}{2}\right)\left(1 - c_1(\omega_f) + \frac{c_1^2(\omega_f) + [\text{Sing}(f)]}{12}\right)\right],$$

and then use Proposition 1.6 and Mumford's formula $(\kappa_1)\tilde{R}_g = 12\lambda - \delta_0' - \delta_0'' - 2\delta_0^\text{ram}$. \hfill \Box

1.2. **Inequalities between coefficients of divisors on $\tilde{R}_g$.** We use pencils of curves on $K3$ surfaces to establish certain inequalities between the coefficients of effective divisors on $\tilde{R}_g$. Using $K3$ surfaces we construct pencils that fill up the boundary divisors $\Delta_i \Delta_{g-i}$ and $\Delta_{i;g-i}$ for $1 \leq i \leq [g/2]$ when $g \leq 23$. The use of such pencils in the context of $\mathcal{M}_g$ has already been demonstrated in [FP].

We start with a Lefschetz pencil $B \subset \overline{\mathcal{M}}_i$ of curves of genus $i$ lying on a fixed $K3$ surface $S$. The pencil $B$ is induced by a family $f : \text{Bl}_{i}(S) \to \mathbb{P}^1$ which has $i^2$ sections corresponding to the base points and we choose one such section $\sigma$. Using $B$, for each $g \geq i + 1$ we create a genus $g$ pencil $B_i \subset \overline{\mathcal{M}}_g$ of stable curves, by gluing a fixed curve $[C_2, p] \in \mathcal{M}_{g-i,1}$ along the section $\sigma$ to each member of the pencil $B$. Then we have the following formulas on $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_g$ (cf. [FP] Lemma 2.4):

$$B_i \cdot \lambda = i + 1, \quad B_i \cdot \delta_0 = 6i + 18, \quad B_i \cdot \delta_i = -1 \quad \text{and} \quad B_i \cdot \delta_j = 0 \quad \text{for} \ j \neq i.$$

We fix $1 \leq i \leq [g/2]$ and lift $B_i$ in three different ways to pencils in $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_g$. First we choose a non-trivial line bundle $\eta_2 \in \text{Pic}^0(C_2)[2]$. Let us denote by $A_{g-i} \subset \Delta_{g-i} \subset \overline{\mathcal{R}}_g$ the pencil of Prym curves $[C_2 \cup_{\sigma(\lambda)} f^{-1}(\lambda), \eta_{C_2} = \eta_2, \eta_{f^{-1}(\lambda)} = O_{f^{-1}(\lambda)}]$, with $\lambda \in \mathbb{P}^1$.

Next, we denote by $A_i \subset \Delta_i \subset \overline{\mathcal{R}}_g$ the pencil consisting of Prym curves

$$[C_2 \cup_{\sigma(\lambda)} f^{-1}(\lambda), \eta_{C_2} = O_{C_2}, \eta_{f^{-1}(\lambda)} \in \overline{\text{Pic}}^1(f^{-1}(\lambda))[2]], \quad \text{where} \ \lambda \in \mathbb{P}^1.$$
Clearly $\pi(A_i) = B_i$ and $\deg(A_i/B_i) = (2^{2i} - 1)$. Finally, $A_{i:g-i} \subset \Delta_{i:g-i} \subset \overline{\K}_g$ denotes the pencil of Prym curves $[C_2 \cup f^{-1}(\lambda), \eta_{C_2} = \eta_2, \eta_{f^{-1}(\lambda)} \in \text{Pic}^0(f^{-1}(\lambda))[2]]$. Again, we have that $\deg(A_{i:g-i}/B_i) = 2^{2i} - 1$.

**Lemma 1.8.** If $A_i, A_{g-i}$ and $A_{i:g-i}$ are pencils defined above, we have the following relations:

- $A_{g-i} \cdot \lambda = i+1, A_{g-i} \cdot \delta_0' = 6i+18, A_{g-i} \cdot \delta_i = A_{g-i} \cdot \delta_0^\text{ram} = 0$, and $A_{g-i} \cdot \delta_i = -1$.
- $A_i \cdot \lambda = (i+1)(2^{2i} - 1), A_i \cdot \delta_0' = (2^{2i-1} - 2)(6i - 18), A_i \cdot \delta_i = 6i + 18, A_i \cdot \delta_0^\text{ram} = 2^{2i-2}(6i + 18)$ and $A_i \cdot \delta_i = -(2^{2i} - 1)$.
- $A_{i:g-i} \cdot \lambda = (i+1)(2^{2i} - 1), A_{i:g-i} \cdot \delta_0' = (2^{2i-1} - 1)(6i - 18)$,
  $A_{i:g-i} \cdot \delta_0^\text{ram} = 2^{2i-2}(6i + 18), A_{i:g-i} \cdot \delta_i = 0$ and $A_{i:g-i} \cdot \delta_{i:g-i} = -(2^{2i} - 1)$.

Note that all these intersections are computed on $\overline{\K}_g$. The intersection numbers of $A_i, A_{g-i}$ and $A_{i:g-i}$ with the generators of $\text{Pic}^0(\overline{\K}_g)$ not explicitly mentioned in Lemma 1.8 are all equal to 0.

**Proof.** We treat in detail only the case of $A_i$ the other cases being similar. Using $[FP]$ we find that $(A_i \cdot \lambda)_{\overline{\K}_g} = (\pi_*(A_i) \cdot \lambda)_{\overline{\K}_g} = (2^{2i} - 1)(B_i \cdot \lambda)_{\overline{\K}_g}$. Furthermore, since $A_i \cap \Delta_{g-i} = A_i \cap \Delta_{i:g-i} = \emptyset$, we can write the formulas

$$(A_i \cdot \delta_i)_{\overline{\K}_g} = (A_i \cdot \pi^*(\delta_i))_{\overline{\K}_g} = (2^{2i} - 1)(B_i \cdot \delta_i)_{\overline{\K}_g}.$$  

Clearly $(A_i \cdot \delta_0')_{\overline{\K}_g} = (B_i \cdot \delta_0)_{\overline{\K}_g} = 6i + 18$, whereas the intersection $A_i \cdot \delta_0'$ corresponds to choosing an element in $\text{Pic}^0(f^{-1}(\lambda))[2]$, where $f^{-1}(\lambda)$ is a singular member of $B$. There are $2(2^{2i-2} - 1)(6i + 18)$ such choices.

**Proposition 1.9.** Let $D \equiv a\lambda - b_0\delta_0' - b_0''\delta_0^\text{ram} - \sum_{i=1}^{[g/2]} (b_i \delta_i + b_{g-i} \delta_{g-i} + b_{i:g-i} \delta_{i:g-i}) \in \text{Pic}(\overline{\K}_g)$ be the closure in $\overline{\K}_g$ of an effective divisor in $\K_g$. Then if $1 \leq i \leq \min\{[g/2], 11\}$, we have the following inequalities:

1. $a(i+1) - b_0'(6i + 18) + b_{g-i} \geq 0$.
2. $a(i+1) - b_0'(6i + 18)^{2^{2i-2} - 2} - b_0'(6i + 18)^{2^{2i-1} - 1} + b_{i:g-i} \geq 0$.
3. $a(i+1) - b_0'(6i + 18)^{2^{2i-2} - 2} - b_0'(6i + 18)^{2^{2i-1} - 2} - b_0'(6i + 18)^{1 - 2} + b_i \geq 0$.

**Proof.** We use that that in this range the pencils $A_i, A_{g-i}$ and $A_{i:g-i}$ fill-up the boundary divisors $\Delta_i, \Delta_{g-i}$ and $\Delta_{i:g-i}$ respectively, hence $A_i \cdot D, A_{g-i} \cdot D, A_{i:g-i} \cdot D \geq 0$.

**Proof of Theorem 1.8.** We lift the Lefschetz pencil $B \subset \overline{\M}_g$ corresponding to a fixed $K3$ surface, to a pencil $\tilde{B} \subset \overline{\K}_g$ of Prym curves by taking Prym curves $\tilde{B} := \{ [C_\lambda, \eta_{C_\lambda}] \in \overline{\K}_g : [C_\lambda] \in B, \eta_{C_\lambda} \in \text{Pic}^0(C_\lambda)[2]\}$. We have the following formulas

$\tilde{B} \cdot \lambda = (2^{2g-1})(g+1), \tilde{B} \cdot \delta_0' = (2^{2g-1} - 2)(6g + 18), \tilde{B} \cdot \delta_0'' = 6g + 18, \tilde{B} \cdot \delta_0^\text{ram} = 2^{2g-2}(6g + 18)$.  

Furthermore, $\tilde{B}$ is disjoint from all the remaining boundary classes of $\overline{\K}_g$. One now verifies that $\tilde{B} \cdot K_{\overline{\K}_g} < 0$ precisely when $g \leq 7$. Since $\tilde{B}$ is a covering curve for $\overline{\K}_g$ in the range $g \leq 11, g \neq 10$, we find that $\kappa(\overline{\K}_g) = -\infty$.
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2. Theta divisors for vector bundles and geometric loci in $\mathcal{R}_g$

We present a general method of constructing geometric divisors on $\mathcal{R}_g$. For a fixed point $[C, \eta] \in \mathcal{R}_g$ we shall study the relative position of $\eta \in \text{Pic}^0(C)[2]$ with respect to certain pluri-theta divisors on $\text{Pic}^0(C)$.

We start by fixing a smooth curve $C$. If $E \in U_C(r, d)$ is a semistable vector bundle on $C$ of integer slope $\mu(E) := d/r \in \mathbb{Z}$, then following Raynaud [R], we introduce the determinantal cycle

$$\Theta_E := \{ \eta \in \text{Pic}^{g-\mu-1}(C) : H^0(C, E \otimes \eta) \neq 0 \}.$$  

Either $\Theta_E = \text{Pic}^{g-\mu-1}(C)$, or else, $\Theta_E$ is a divisor on $\text{Pic}^{g-\mu-1}(C)$ and then $\Theta_E \equiv r \cdot \theta$. In the latter case we say that $\Theta_E$ is the theta divisor of the vector bundle $E$. Clearly, $\Theta_E$ is a divisor if and only if $H^0(C, E \otimes \eta) = 0$, for a general bundle $\eta \in \text{Pic}^{g-\mu-1}(C)$.

Let us now fix a globally generated line bundle $L \in \text{Pic}^d(C)$ such that $h^0(C, L) = r + 1$. The Lazarsfeld vector bundle $M_L$ of $L$ is defined using the exact sequence on $C$

$$0 \to M_L \to H^0(C, L) \otimes \mathcal{O}_C \to L \to 0$$

(see also [GL], [L], [Vo], [F1], [FMP] for many applications of these bundles). It is customary to denote $Q_L := M_L^\vee$, hence $\mu(Q_L) = d/r$. When $L = K_C$, one writes $Q_C := Q_{K_C}$. The vector bundles $Q_L$ (and all its exterior powers) are semistable under mild genericity assumptions on $C$ (see [L] or [F1] Proposition 2.1). In the case $\mu(\wedge^i Q_L) = g - 1$, when we expect $\Theta_{\wedge^i Q_L}$ to be a divisor on $\text{Pic}^0(C)$, we may ask whether for a given point $[C, \eta] \in \mathcal{R}_g$ the condition $\eta \in \Theta_{\wedge^i Q_L}$ is satisfied or not. Throughout this section we denote by $\mathfrak{G}_d^r \to \mathcal{M}_g$ the Deligne-Mumford stack parameterizing pairs $[C, l]$, where $[C] \in \mathcal{M}_g$ and $l = (L, V) \in G^r_d(C)$ is a linear series of type $g^r_d$.

We fix integers $k \geq 2$ and $b \geq 0$. We set integers $i := kb + k - b - 2,$

$$r := kb + k - 2, \quad g := k(kb + k - b - 2) + 1 = ik + 1 \quad \text{and} \quad d := k(kb + k - 2).$$

Since $\rho(g, r, d) = 0$, a general curve $[C] \in \mathcal{M}_g$ carries a finite number of (obviously complete) linear series $l \in G^r_d(C)$. We denote this number by

$$N := g! \frac{1! 2! \cdots r!}{(k - 1)! \cdots (k - 1 + r)!} = \deg(\mathfrak{G}_d^r/\mathcal{M}_g).$$

We also note that we can write $g = (r + 1)(k - 1)$ and $d = rk$, and moreover, each line bundle $L \in W^r_d(C)$ satisfies $h^1(C, L) = k - 1$. Furthermore, we compute $\mu(\wedge^i Q_L) = ik = g - 1$ and then we introduce the following virtual divisor on $\mathcal{R}_g$:

$$D_{g,k} := \{ [C, \eta] \in \mathcal{R}_g : \exists L \in W^r_d(C) \text{ such that } h^0(C, \wedge^i Q_L \otimes \eta) \geq 1 \}.$$  

From the definition it follows that $D_{g,k}$ is either pure of codimension 1 in $\mathcal{R}_g$, or else $D_{g,k} = \mathcal{R}_g$. We shall prove that the second possibility does not occur.

For $[C, \eta] \in \mathcal{R}_g$ and $L \in W^r_d(C)$ one has the following exact sequence on $C$

$$0 \to \wedge^i M_L \otimes K_C \otimes \eta \to \wedge^i H^0(C, L) \otimes K_C \otimes \eta \to \wedge^{i-1} M_L \otimes L \otimes K_C \otimes \eta \to 0,$$

from which, using Serre duality, one derives the following equivalences:

$$[C, \eta] \in D_{g,k} \iff h^1(C, \wedge^i M_L \otimes K_C \otimes \eta) \geq 1 \iff$$
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(3) $\wedge^i H^0(C, L) \otimes H^0(C, K_C \otimes \eta) \rightarrow H^0(C, \wedge^{i-1} M_L \otimes L \otimes K_C \otimes \eta)$ is not an isomorphism.

Note that obviously $\text{rank}(\wedge^i H^0(C, L) \otimes H^0(C, K_C \otimes \eta)) = \binom{i+1}{i}(g-1)$, while

$$h^0(C, \wedge^{i-1} M_L \otimes L \otimes K_C \otimes \eta) = \chi(C, \wedge^{i-1} M_L \otimes L \otimes K_C \otimes \eta) =$$

$$= \left(\begin{array}{c} r \\ i-1 \end{array}\right)(-k(i-1) + d + g - 1) = \left(\begin{array}{c} r + 1 \\ i \end{array}\right)(g-1)$$

(use that $M_L$ is a semistable vector bundle and that $\mu(\wedge^{i-1} M_L \otimes L \otimes K_C \otimes \eta) > 2g - 1$).

**Remark 2.1.** As pointed out in the Introduction, an important particular case is $k = 2$, when $i = b, g = 2i + 1, r = 2i, d = 4i = 2g - 2$. Since $W_{2g-2}^i(C) = \{K_C\}$, it follows that $[C, \eta] \in D_{2i+1, 2} \iff \eta \in \Theta_{\wedge^i Q_C}$. The main result from [FMP] states that for any $[C] \in M_g$ the Raynaud locus $\Theta_{\wedge^i Q_C}$ is a divisor in $\text{Pic}^0(C)$ (that is, $\wedge^i Q_C$ has a theta divisor) and we have an equality of cycles

$$\Theta_{\wedge^i Q_C} = C_i - C_i \subset \text{Pic}^0(C),$$

where the right-hand-side denotes the $i$-th difference variety of $C$, that is, the image of the difference map

$$\phi : C_i \times C_i \rightarrow \text{Pic}^0(C), \quad \phi(D, E) := \mathcal{O}_C(D - E).$$

Using Lazarsfeld’s filtration argument [L] Lemma 1.4.1, one finds that for a generic choice of distinct points $x_1, \ldots, x_{g-2} \in C$, there is an exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \oplus_{i=1}^{g-2} \mathcal{O}_C(x_i) \rightarrow Q_C \rightarrow K_C \otimes \mathcal{O}_C(-x_1 - \cdots - x_{g-2}) \rightarrow 0,$$

which implies the inclusion $C_i - C_i \subset \Theta_{\wedge^i Q_C}$. The importance of (3) is that it shows that $\Theta_{\wedge^i Q_C}$ is a divisor on $\text{Pic}^0(C)$, that is, $H^0(C, \wedge^i Q_C \otimes \eta) = 0$ for a generic $\eta \in \text{Pic}^0(C)$.

**Theorem 2.2.** For every genus $g = 2i + 1$ we have the following identification of cycles on $R_g$:

$$D_{2i+1, 2} := \{[C, \eta] \in R_g : \eta \in C_i - C_i\}.$$  

Next we prove that $D_{g, k}$ is an actual divisor on $R_g$ for any $k \geq 2$ and we achieve this by specialization to the $k$-gonal locus $M_{4, k}^1 \subset M_g$.

**Theorem 2.3.** Fix $k \geq 2, b \geq 1$ and $g, r, d, i$ defined as above. Then $D_{g, k}$ is a divisor on $R_g$.

Precisely, for a generic $[C, \eta] \in R_g$ we have that $H^0(C, \wedge^i Q_L \otimes \eta) = 0$, for every $L \in W_d^i(C)$.

**Proof.** Since there is a unique irreducible component of $\mathcal{G}_d^r$ mapping dominantly onto $M_g$, to prove that $D_{g, k}$ is a divisor it suffices to exhibit a single element $[C, L, \eta] \in \mathcal{G}_d^r$ such that (1) the Petri map

$$\mu_0(C, L) : H^0(C, L) \otimes H^0(C, K_C \otimes L^r) \rightarrow H^0(C, K_C)$$

is an isomorphism, and (2) for each point $\eta \in \text{Pic}^0(C)[2]$, we have that $\eta \notin \Theta_{\wedge^i Q_L}$.

Proposition 2.1.1 from [CM] ensures that for a generic $k$-gonal curve $[C, A] \in \mathcal{G}_d^r$ of genus $g = (r + 1)(k - 1)$ one has that $h^0(C, A^{\otimes j}) = j + 1$ for $1 \leq j \leq r + 1$. In particular there is an isomorphism $\text{Sym}^{i} H^0(C, A) \cong H^0(C, A^{\otimes j})$. Using this and Riemann-Roch, we obtain that $h^0(C, K_C \otimes A^{\otimes (j-1)}) = (k - 1)(r + 1 - j)$ for $0 \leq j \leq r + 1$. Thus there is a generically injective rational map $\mathcal{G}_d^r \rightarrow \mathcal{G}_d^r$ given by $[C, A] \mapsto [C, A^{\otimes}]$ (The use of such a map has been first pointed out to me in a different context by S. Keel). We claim
that $\mathfrak{S}_k$ maps into the "main component" of $\mathfrak{S}_d$ which maps dominantly onto $\overline{M}_g$. To prove this it suffices to check that the Petri map

$$\mu_0(C, A^\otimes r) : H^0(C, A^\otimes r) \otimes H^0(C, K_C \otimes A^\otimes(-r)) \to H^0(C, K_C)$$

is an isomorphism (Remember that $H^0(C, A^\otimes r) \cong \text{Sym}^r H^0(C, A)$). We use the base point free pencil trick to write down the exact sequence

$$0 \to H^0(K_C \otimes A^\otimes(-(j+1))) \to H^0(A) \otimes H^0(K_C \otimes A^\otimes(-j)) \xrightarrow{\mu_j(A)} H^0(K_C \otimes A^\otimes(-(j-1))).$$

One can now easily check that $\mu_j(A)$ is surjective for $1 \leq j \leq r$ by using the formulas $h^0(C, K_C \otimes A^\otimes(-j)) = (k-1)(r+1-j)$ valid for $0 \leq j \leq r+1$. This in turn implies that $\mu_0(C, A^\otimes r)$ is surjective, hence an isomorphism.

We now check condition (2) and note that for $[C, L = A^\otimes r] \in \mathfrak{S}_d^r$, the Lazarsfeld bundle splits as $Q_L \cong A^\otimes r$. In particular, $\Lambda^i Q_L \cong \oplus (\cdot)^{\otimes i}$, hence the condition $H^0(C, \Lambda^i \otimes \eta) \neq 0$ is equivalent to $H^0(C, A^\otimes i \otimes \eta) \neq 0$, that is, the translate of the theta divisor $W_{g-1}(C) - A^\otimes 1 \subset \text{Pic}^0(C)$ cannot contain any point of order 2 on $\text{Pic}^0(C)$. Using that the moduli space of triples $[C, A, \eta]$, where $[C, A] \in \mathfrak{S}_k^1$ and $\eta \in \text{Pic}^0(C)[2]$ is irreducible for each $k \geq 3$, it suffices to prove the statement for a single such triple.

We assume by contradiction that for any $[C, A] \in \mathfrak{S}_k^1$ and any $\eta \in \text{Pic}^0(C)[2]$, we have that $H^0(C, A^\otimes \otimes \eta) \geq 1$. We specialize $C$ to a hyperelliptic curve and choose $A = g_1^d \otimes \mathcal{O}_C(x_1 + \cdots + x_{d-2})$, with $x_1, \ldots, x_{d-2} \in C$ being general points. Finally we take $\eta := \mathcal{O}_C(p_1 + \cdots + p_{d-1} - q_1 - \cdots - q_{d-1}) \in \text{Pic}^0(C)[2]$, with $p_1, \ldots, p_{d-1}, q_1, \ldots, q_{d-1}$ being distinct ramification points of the hyperelliptic $g_1^d$. It is now straightforward to check that $H^0(C, A^\otimes \otimes \eta) = 0$.

In order to compute the class $[\overline{D}_{g,k}] \in \text{Pic}(\overline{M}_g)$ we extend the determinantal description of $\mathcal{D}_{g,k}$ to the boundary of $\overline{M}_g$. We start by setting some notation. We denote by $\mathfrak{M}_g^0 \subset \mathfrak{M}_g$ the open substack classifying curves $[C] \in \mathfrak{M}_g$ such that $W_{d-1}^r(C) = \emptyset$ and $W_{d+1}^r(C) = \emptyset$. We know that $\text{codim}(\mathfrak{M}_g - \mathfrak{M}_g^0, \mathfrak{M}_g) \geq 2$. We further denote by $\Delta^0 \subset \Delta_0 \subset \overline{M}_g$ the locus of curves $[C/y \sim q]$ where $[C] \in \mathfrak{M}_{g-1}$ is a curve that satisfies the Brill-Noether theorem and where $y, q \in C$ are arbitrary points. Note that every Brill-Noether general curve $[C] \in \mathfrak{M}_{g-1}$ satisfies

$$W_{d-1}^r(C) = \emptyset, \ W_{d+1}^r(C) = \emptyset \text{ and } \dim W_d^r(C) = \rho(g-1, r, d) = r.$$ 

We set $\overline{M}_g^0 := \mathfrak{M}_g^0 \cup \Delta^0 \subset \overline{M}_g$. Then we consider the Deligne-Mumford stack

$$\sigma_0 : \mathfrak{S}_d^r \to \overline{M}_g^0$$

classifying pairs $[C, L]$ with $[C] \in \overline{M}_g^0$ and $L \in G^r_d(C)$ (cf. [EH], [FP], [Kh] -note that it is essential that $\rho(g, r, d) = 0$. At the moment there is no known extension of this stack over the entire $\overline{M}_g$). We remark that for any curve $[C] \in \overline{M}_g^0$ and $L \in W_d^r(C)$ we have that $h^0(C, L) = r+1$, that is, $\mathfrak{S}_d^r$ parameterizes only complete linear series. Indeed, for a smooth curve $[C] \in \mathfrak{M}_g^0$ we have that $W_{d-1}^r(C) = \emptyset$, so necessarily $W_d^r(C) = G^r_d(C)$. For a point $[C_{yq} := C/y \sim q] \in \Delta^0$ we have the identification

$$\sigma_0^{-1}[C_{yq}] = \{ L \in W_d^r(C) : h^0(C, L \otimes \mathcal{O}_C(-y - q)) = r \},$$

where $\mathfrak{S}_d^r$ parameterizes only complete linear series. Indeed, for a smooth curve $[C] \in \mathfrak{M}_g^0$ we have that $W_{d-1}^r(C) = \emptyset$, so necessarily $W_d^r(C) = G^r_d(C)$.
where we note that since the normalization \([\mathcal{C}] \in \mathcal{M}_{g-1}\) is assumed to be Brill-Noether general, any sheaf \(L \in \sigma_{0}^{-1}[\mathcal{C}]\) satisfies \(h^{0}(C, L \otimes \mathcal{O}_{C}(-y)) = h^{0}(C, L \otimes \mathcal{O}_{C}(-q)) = r\) and \(h^{0}(C, L) = r + 1\). Furthermore, \(\sigma_{0} : \mathfrak{S}_{g}^{r} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{g}\) is proper, which is to say that \(\overline{W}_{d}^{r}(\mathcal{C}) = \mathcal{W}_{d}^{r}(\mathcal{C})\), where the left-hand-side denotes the closure of \(\mathcal{W}_{d}^{r}(\mathcal{C})\) in the variety \(\overline{\operatorname{Pic}}_{d}(\mathcal{C})\) of torsion-free sheaves on \(\mathcal{C}\). This follows because a non-locally free torsion-free sheaf in \(\overline{W}_{d}^{r}(\mathcal{C}) - \mathcal{W}_{d}^{r}(\mathcal{C})\) is of the form \(\nu(A)\), where \(A \in W_{d-1}^{r}(\mathcal{C})\) and \(\nu : C \rightarrow \mathcal{C}\) is the normalization map. But we know that \(W_{d-1}^{r}(\mathcal{C}) = \emptyset\), because \([\mathcal{C}] \in \mathcal{M}_{g-1}\) satisfies the Brill-Noether theorem. Since \(\rho(g, r, d) = 0\), by general Brill-Noether theory, there exists a unique irreducible component of \(\mathfrak{S}_{d}^{r}\) which maps onto \(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g}^{1}\). It is certainly not the case that \(\mathfrak{S}_{d}^{r}\) is irreducible, unless \(k \leq 3\), when either \(\mathfrak{S}_{d}^{r} = \mathcal{M}_{g}\) \((k = 2)\), or \(\mathfrak{S}_{d}^{r}\) is isomorphic to a Hurwitz stack \((k = 3)\). We denote by \(f_{d}^{r} : \mathfrak{S}_{g,d}^{r} := \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,1}^{1} \times \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g}^{1} \mathfrak{S}_{d}^{r} \rightarrow \mathfrak{S}_{d}^{r}\) the pull-back of the universal curve \(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,1}^{1} \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g}^{1}\) to \(\mathfrak{S}_{d}^{r}\). Once we have chosen a Poincaré bundle \(\mathcal{L}\) on \(\mathfrak{S}_{g,d}^{r}\) we can form the three codimension 1 tautological classes in \(A^{1}(\mathfrak{S}_{d}^{r})\):

\[
\begin{align*}
a &:= (f_{d}^{r})_{*}(c_{1}(\mathcal{L})^{2}), \quad b := (f_{d}^{r})_{*}(c_{1}(\mathcal{L}) \cdot c_{1}(\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{L}}^{r})), \quad c := (f_{d}^{r})_{*}(c_{1}(\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{L}}^{r})^{2}) = (\sigma_{0})^{*}((\kappa_{1})_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g}^{1}}).
\end{align*}
\]

These classes depend on the choice of \(\mathcal{L}\) and behave functorially with respect to base change, see also Remark 2.7 on the precise statement regarding the choice of \(\mathcal{L}\). We set \(\overline{R}_{g}^{0} := \pi^{-1}(\mathcal{M}_{g}^{0}) \subset \overline{R}_{g}\) and introduce the stack of \(g_{d}^{r}\)’s on Prym curves

\[
\overline{\sigma} : \mathfrak{S}_{d}^{r}(\overline{R}_{g}/\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g}^{1}) := \overline{R}_{g} \times \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g}^{1} \mathfrak{S}_{d}^{r} \rightarrow \overline{R}_{g}.
\]

By a slight abuse of notation we denote the boundary divisors by the same symbols, that is, \(\Delta_{0}^{0} := \overline{\sigma}^{*}(\Delta_{0}^{0})\), \(\Delta_{0}^{0} := \sigma^{*}(\Delta_{0}^{0})\) and \(\Delta_{0}^{0}^{\operatorname{ram}} := \sigma^{*}(\Delta_{0}^{0})^{\operatorname{ram}}\). Finally, we introduce the universal curve over the stack of \(g_{d}^{r}\)’s on Prym curves:

\[
f^{r} : \mathcal{X}_{d}^{r} := \mathcal{X} \times \overline{R}_{g} \mathfrak{S}_{d}^{r}(\overline{R}_{g}/\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g}^{1}) \rightarrow \mathfrak{S}_{d}^{r}(\overline{R}_{g}/\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g}^{1}).
\]

On \(\mathcal{X}_{d}^{r}\) there are two tautological line bundles, the universal Prym bundle \(\mathcal{P}_{d}^{r}\) which is the pull-back of \(\mathcal{P} \in \operatorname{Pic}(\mathcal{X})\) under the projection \(\mathcal{X}_{d}^{r} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}\), and a Poincaré bundle \(\mathcal{L} \in \operatorname{Pic}(\mathcal{X}_{d}^{r})\) characterized by the property \(L|_{\mathcal{X}_{d}^{r} \times [X, \eta, \beta, L]} = L \in W_{d}^{r}(C)\), for each point \([X, \eta, \beta, L] \in \mathfrak{S}_{d}^{r}(\overline{R}_{g}/\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g}^{1})\). Note that we also have the codimension 1 classes \(a, b, c \in A^{1}(\mathfrak{S}_{d}^{r}(\overline{R}_{g}/\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g}^{1}))\) defined by the formulas \((5)\).

**Proposition 2.4.** Let \(C\) be a curve of genus \(g\) and let \(L \in W_{d}^{r}(C)\) be a globally generated complete linear series. Then for any integer \(0 \leq j \leq r\) and for any line bundle \(A \in \operatorname{Pic}^{0}(C)\) such that \(a \geq 2g + d - r + j - 1\), we have that \(H^{1}(C, \wedge^{i}M_{L} \otimes A) = 0\).

**Proof.** We use a filtration argument due to Lazarsfeld [L]. Having fixed \(L\) and \(A\), we choose general points \(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{r-1} \in C\) such that \(h^{0}(C, L \otimes \mathcal{O}_{C}(-x_{1} - \cdots - x_{r-1})) = 2\) and then there is an exact sequence on \(C\)

\[
0 \longrightarrow L^{\vee}(x_{1} + \cdots + x_{r-1}) \longrightarrow M_{L} \longrightarrow \oplus_{i=1}^{r-1} \mathcal{O}_{C}(-x_{i}) \longrightarrow 0.
\]

Taking the \(j\)-th exterior powers and tensoring the resulting exact sequence with \(A\), we find that in order to conclude that \(H^{1}(C, \wedge^{i}M_{L} \otimes A) = 0\) for \(i \leq r\), it suffices to show that for \(1 \leq i \leq r\) the following hold:
(1) $H^1(C, A \otimes \mathcal{O}_C(-D_j)) = 0$ for each effective divisor $D_j \in C_j$ with support in the set \{x_1, \ldots, x_{r-1}\}, and

(2) $H^1(C, A \otimes L^\vee \otimes \mathcal{O}_C(D_{r-j})) = 0$, for any effective divisor $D_{r-j} \in C_{r-j}$ with support contained in \{x_1, \ldots, x_{r-1}\}.

Both (1) and (2) hold for degree reasons since $\text{deg}(C, A \otimes \mathcal{O}_C(-D_j)) \geq 2g - 1$ and $\text{deg}(C, A \otimes L^\vee \otimes \mathcal{O}_C(D_{r-j})) \geq 2g - 1$ and the points $x_1, \ldots, x_{r-1} \in C$ are general. □

Next we use Proposition 2.4 to prove a vanishing result for Prym curves.

**Proposition 2.5.** For each point $[X, \eta, \beta, L] \in \mathcal{G}_a^r(\mathcal{R}_g/\mathcal{M}_g)$ and $0 \leq a \leq i - 1$, we have that

$$H^1(X, \wedge^a M_L \otimes L^{\otimes(i-a)} \otimes \omega_X \otimes \eta) = 0.$$  

**Proof.** If $X$ is smooth, then the vanishing follows directly from Proposition 2.4. Assume now that $[X, \eta, \beta] \in \Delta_0 \cup \Delta''_0$, that is, $\text{st}(X) = X$ and $\eta \in \text{Pic}^0(X)[2]$. As usual, we denote by $\nu : C \to X$ the normalization map, and $L_C := \nu^*(L) \in \mathcal{W}_g(C)$ satisfies $h^0(C, L_C \otimes \mathcal{O}_C(-y-q)) = r$, hence $H^0(X, L) \cong H^0(C, L_C)$, which implies that $\nu^*(M_L) = M_{LC}$. Tensoring the usual exact sequence on $X$

$$0 \to \mathcal{O}_X \to \nu_* \mathcal{O}_C \to \nu_* \mathcal{O}_C/\mathcal{O}_X \to 0,$$

by the line bundle $\wedge^a M_L \otimes L^{\otimes(i-a)} \otimes \omega_X \otimes \eta$, we find that a sufficient condition for the vanishing $H^1(X, \wedge^a M_L \otimes L^{\otimes(i-a)} \otimes \omega_X \otimes \eta) = 0$ to hold, is to show that

$$H^1(C, \wedge^a M_{LC} \otimes L_C^{\otimes(i-a)} \otimes K_C \otimes \eta_C) = H^1(C, \wedge^a M_{LC} \otimes L_C^{\otimes(i-a)} \otimes K_C(y+q) \otimes \eta_C) = 0.$$  

Since $i < r$, this follows directly from Proposition 2.4.

We are left with the case when $[X, \eta, \beta] \in \Delta^\text{ram}_r$, when $X := C \cup \{q, y\} \cup \eta$, with $E$ being a smooth rational curve, $L_C \in \mathcal{W}_g^c(C), L_E = \mathcal{O}_E$ and $\eta_C \otimes \mathcal{O}_C(-y-q)$. We also have that $M_{LC} = M_{LC}$ and $M_{LC} = H^0(C, L_C \otimes \mathcal{O}_C(-y-q)) \otimes \mathcal{O}_E$. A standard argument involving the Mayer-Vietoris sequence on $X$ shows that the vanishing of the group $H^1(X, \wedge^a M_L \otimes L^{\otimes(i-a)} \otimes \omega_X \otimes \eta)$ is implied by the following vanishing conditions

$$H^1(C, \wedge^a M_{LC} \otimes L_C^{\otimes(i-a)} \otimes K_C(y+q) \otimes \eta_C) = H^1(C, \wedge^a M_{LC} \otimes L_C^{\otimes(i-a)} \otimes K_C \otimes \eta_C) = 0.$$  

The conditions of Proposition 2.4 being satisfied ($i \leq r - 1$), we finish the proof. □

Proposition 2.5 enables us to define a sequence of tautological vector bundles on $\mathcal{G}_a^r(\mathcal{R}_g/\mathcal{M}_g)$: First, we set $\mathcal{H} := f^r_*(\mathcal{L})$. By Grauert’s theorem, it follows that $\mathcal{H}$ is a vector bundle of rank $r + 1$ with fibre $H[X, \eta, \beta, L] = H^0(X, L)$. For $j \geq 0$ we set

$$A_{0,j} := f^r_*(\mathcal{L}^{\otimes j} \otimes \omega_{f^r} \otimes \mathcal{P}_a^r).$$

Since $R^i f^r_*(\mathcal{L}^{\otimes j} \otimes \omega_{f^r} \otimes \mathcal{P}_a^r) = 0$ we find that $A_{0,j}$ is a vector bundle over $\mathcal{G}_a^r(\mathcal{R}_g/\mathcal{M}_g)$ of rank equal to $h^0(X, L^{\otimes j} \otimes \omega_X \otimes \eta) = jd + g - 1$. Next we introduce the global Lazarsfeld vector bundle $\mathcal{M}$ over $\Lambda^2_a$ by the exact sequence

$$0 \to \mathcal{M} \to f^r_*(\mathcal{H}) \to \mathcal{L} \to 0,$$
hence $M_{f'-1[X, \eta, \beta, L]} = M_L$ for each $[X, \eta, \beta, L] \in \mathcal{B}_d(\mathbb{R}_g^0/\mathbb{M}_g^0)$. Then for integers $a, j \geq 1$ we define the sheaf

$$A_{a,j} := f_!(\wedge^a M \otimes \mathcal{L}^\otimes j \otimes \omega_f \otimes \mathcal{P}_d^r).$$

For each $1 \leq a \leq i - 1$, we have proved that $R^1f_*\left(\wedge^a M \otimes \mathcal{L}^\otimes (i-a) \otimes \omega_f \otimes \mathcal{P}_d^r\right) = 0$ (cf. Proposition 2.5), therefore $A_{a,i-a}$ is a vector bundle over $\mathcal{B}_d(\mathbb{R}_g^0/\mathbb{M}_g^0)$ having rank

$$\text{rk}(A_{a,i-a}) = \chi(X, \wedge^a M_L \otimes L^\otimes (i-a) \otimes \omega_X \otimes \eta) = \binom{r}{a}k(i-a)(r+1).$$

Proposition 2.5 also shows that for all integers $1 \leq a \leq i - 1$, the vector bundles $A_{a,i-a}$ sit in exact sequences

$$0 \rightarrow A_{a,i-a} \rightarrow \wedge^a \mathcal{H} \otimes A_{0,i-a} \rightarrow A_{a-1,i-a+1} \rightarrow 0.$$

We shall need the expression for the Chern numbers of $A_{a,i-a}$. Using (6) it will be sufficient to compute $c_1(A_{0,j})$ for all $j \geq 0$.

**Proposition 2.6.** For all $j \geq 0$ one has the following formula in $A^1(\mathcal{B}_d(\mathbb{R}_g^0/\mathbb{M}_g^0))$:

$$c_1(A_{0,j}) = \lambda + \frac{j}{2}B + \frac{j^2}{2}A - \frac{1}{4}\delta_0^\text{ram}.$$

**Proof.** We apply Grothendieck-Riemann-Roch to the morphism $f' : \mathcal{X}_d^r \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_d(\mathbb{R}_g^0/\mathbb{M}_g^0)$:

$$c_1(A_{0,j}) = c_1\left(f'_!(\omega_f \otimes \mathcal{L}^\otimes j \otimes \mathcal{P}_d^r)\right) = f'_*\left[\left(1 + c_1(\omega_f \otimes \mathcal{L}^\otimes j \otimes \mathcal{P}_d^r) + \frac{c_2(\omega_f \otimes \mathcal{L}^\otimes j \otimes \mathcal{P}_d^r)}{2} + \frac{c_1^2(\omega_f \otimes \mathcal{L}^\otimes j \otimes \mathcal{P}_d^r) + \text{Sing}(f')} + \frac{c_1(\omega_f \otimes \mathcal{L}^\otimes j \otimes \mathcal{P}_d^r)}{2} + \frac{c_2(\omega_f \otimes \mathcal{L}^\otimes j \otimes \mathcal{P}_d^r)}{12}\right]\right].$$

where $\text{Sing}(f') \subset X^r_d$ denotes the codimension 2 singular locus of the morphism $f'$, therefore $f'_*[\text{Sing}(f')] = \Delta_0 + \Delta_0'' + 2\Delta_0^\text{ram}$. We finish the proof using Mumford’s formula $\kappa_1 = f'_*(c_2^2(\omega_f)) = 12\lambda - (\delta_0 + \delta_0 + 2\delta_0^\text{ram})$ and noting that $f'_*(c_1(\mathcal{L}) \cdot c_1(\mathcal{P}_d^r)) = 0$ (the restriction of $\mathcal{L}$ to the exceptional divisor of $f' : \mathcal{X}_d^r \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_d(\mathbb{R}_g^0/\mathbb{M}_g^0)$ is trivial) and $f'_*(c_1(\omega_f) \cdot c_1(\mathcal{P}_d^r)) = 0$. Finally, according to Proposition 1.6 we have that $f'_*(c_1^2(\mathcal{P}_d^r)) = -\delta_0^\text{ram}/2$. \(\square\)

**Remark 2.7.** While the construction of the vector bundles $A_{a,j}$ depends on the choice of the Poincaré bundle $\mathcal{L}$ and that of the Prym bundle $\mathcal{P}_d^r$, it is easy to check that if we set the vector bundles $A := \wedge^1 \mathcal{H} \otimes A_{0,j}$ and $B := A_{i-1,i}$, then the vector bundle $\text{Hom}(A, B)$ on $\mathcal{B}_d(\mathbb{R}_g^0/\mathbb{M}_g^0)$, as well as the morphism

$$\phi \in H^0(\mathcal{B}_d(\mathbb{R}_g^0/\mathbb{M}_g^0), \text{Hom}(A, B))$$

whose degeneracy locus is the virtual divisor $\overline{\Sigma}_{g,k}$, are independent of such choices. More precisely, let us denote by $\Xi$ the collection of triples $\alpha := (\pi_\alpha, \mathcal{L}_\alpha, (\mathcal{P}_d^r)_\alpha)$, where $\pi_\alpha : \Sigma_\alpha \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_d(\mathbb{R}_g^0/\mathbb{M}_g^0)$ is an étale surjective morphism from a scheme $\Sigma_\alpha$, $(\mathcal{P}_d^r)_\alpha$ is a Prym bundle and $\mathcal{L}_\alpha$ is a Poincaré bundle on $p_{2,\alpha} : \mathcal{X}_d^r \times \mathcal{B}_d(\mathbb{R}_g^0/\mathbb{M}_g^0) \text{~} \Sigma_\alpha \rightarrow \Sigma_\alpha$. Recall that if $\Sigma \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_d(\mathbb{R}_g^0/\mathbb{M}_g^0)$ is an étale surjection from a scheme and $\mathcal{L}$ and $\mathcal{L}'$ are two Poincaré bundles on $p_2 : \mathcal{X}_d^r \times \mathcal{B}_d(\mathbb{R}_g^0/\mathbb{M}_g^0) \rightarrow \Sigma$, then the sheaf $\mathcal{N} := p_2^{\ast}\text{Hom}(\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{L}')$ is invertible and there is a canonical isomorphism $\mathcal{L} \otimes p_2^{\ast}\mathcal{N} \cong \mathcal{L}'$. For every $\alpha \in \Xi$ we construct the
proof. To compute the class of the degeneracy locus of $\phi$ as above, then there exists a morphism $\text{Hom}(A, B)$ on $E_d(R_0/M_0)$ together with a section $\phi \in H^0(E_d(R_0/M_0), \text{Hom}(A, B))$ such that for every $\alpha = (\pi_\alpha, \mathcal{L}_\alpha, (\mathcal{P}_d)_\alpha) \in \Xi$ we have that

$$\pi^*_\alpha(\text{Hom}(A, B)) = \text{Hom}(A_\alpha, B_\alpha)$$

We are finally in a position to compute the class of the divisor $\mathcal{D}_{g,k}$.

**Theorem 2.8.** We fix integers $k \geq 2, b \geq 0$ and set

$$i := kb - b + k - 2, \quad r := kb + k - 2, \quad g := ik + 1, \quad d := rk$$
as above. Then there exists a morphism $\phi : \wedge^i \mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{A}_{0,0} \to \mathcal{A}_{i-1,1}$ between vector bundles of the same rank over $E_d(R_0/M_0)$, such that the push-forward under $\sigma$ of the restriction to $E_d(R_0/M_0)$ of the degeneration locus of $\phi$ is precisely the effective divisor $\mathcal{D}_{g,k}$. Moreover, we have the following expression for its class in $A^1(R_0)$:

$$\sigma_*(c_1(\mathcal{A}_{i-1,1} - \wedge^i \mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{A}_{0,0})) \equiv \left( \frac{N}{b} \right) \frac{g}{(r + k)(kr + k - r - 3)} \left( \mathcal{A} - \frac{\mathcal{B}_0}{6}(\delta'_0 + \delta'_g) - \frac{\mathcal{B}'_0}{12} \delta'_{\text{ram}} \right),$$

where

$$\mathcal{A} = (k^5 - 4k^4 + 5k^3 - 2k^2)b^3 + (3k^5 - 13k^4 + 24k^3 - 23k^2 + 9k)b^2 + (3k^5 - 14k^4 + 34k^3 - 45k^2 + 24k - 4)b + k^5 - 5k^4 + 15k^3 - 25k^2 + 16k - 2,$$

$$\mathcal{B}_0 = (k^5 - 4k^4 + 5k^3 - 2k^2)b^3 + (3k^5 - 13k^4 + 22k^3 - 17k^2 + 5k)b^2 + (3k^5 - 14k^4 + 30k^3 - 33k^2 + 14k - 2)b + k^5 - 5k^4 + 13k^3 - 19k^2 + 10k$$

and

$$\mathcal{B}'_0 = (4k^5 - 16k^4 + 20k^3 - 8k^2)b^3 + (12k^5 - 52k^4 + 85k^3 - 65k^2 + 20k)b^2 + (12k^5 - 56k^4 + 111k^3 - 114k^2 + 53k - 8)b + 4k^5 - 20k^4 + 46k^3 - 58k^2 + 34k - 6.$$
\( L' := L \otimes f^*(M) \) is another Poincaré bundle with \( M \in \text{Pic} (\mathcal{G}^r_d(\overline{R}_g/\overline{M}_g)) \) and if \( a', b', \mathcal{H}' \) denote the classes defined in terms of \( L' \) using (5), then we have formulas:

\[
a' = a + 2dc_1(M), \quad b' = b + (2g - 2)c_1(M) \quad \text{and} \quad c_1(\mathcal{H}') = c_1(\mathcal{H}) + (r + 1)c_1(M).
\]

A straightforward calculation shows that the class

\[
(7) \quad \Xi := \frac{-kb}{r-1} c_1(\mathcal{H}) + \frac{r - 2b - 1}{2(r-1)} a \in A^1(\mathcal{G}^r_d(\overline{R}_g/\overline{M}_g))
\]

is independent of the choice of \( L \) and \( \sigma_*(\Xi) = \pi^*((\sigma_0)_*(\Xi_0)) \), where the \( \Xi_0 \in A^1(\mathcal{G}^r_d) \) is defined by the same formula (7) but inside \( \text{Pic}(\mathcal{G}^r_d) \). We outline below the computation of \( \pi^*((\sigma_0)_*(\Xi_0)) \) which uses [F2] Lemmas 2.6 and 2.13 and Proposition 2.12. Together with the description of its fibres:

- \( \mathcal{G}_{0,n}(C, L) = H^0(C, L^\otimes n) \), for each \([C] \in \mathcal{M}_g\) and \( L \in W^r_d(C) \).
- \( \mathcal{G}_{0,n}(t) = H^0(C, L^\otimes n(-y - q)) \oplus \mathbb{C} \cdot u^n \subset H^0(C, L^\otimes n) \), where the point \( t = (C_y, \ L \in W^r_d(C)) \in \sigma_0^{-1}([C_y]) \), with \( u \in H^0(C, L) \) being a section such that \( H^0(C, L) = H^0(C, L(-y - q)) \oplus \mathbb{C} \cdot u \).
- \( \mathcal{G}_{0,n}(t) = H^0(C, L^\otimes n(-2y)) \oplus \mathbb{C} \cdot u^n \subset H^0(C, L^\otimes n) \), where \( t = (C \cup y, E, t_C, t_E) \in \sigma_0^{-1}([C \cup y]) \) and \( (t_C, t_E) \in G^r_d(C) \times G^r_d(E) \) being a limit linear series \( g^r_d \) with \( t_C = (L, H^0(C, L)) \) and \( u \in H^0(C, L) \) a section such that \( H^0(C, L) = H^0(C, L(-2y)) \oplus \mathbb{C} \cdot u \).

We extend the classes \( a, b \in A^1(\mathcal{G}^r_d) \) over the stack \( \mathcal{G}^r_d \) by choosing a Poincaré bundle over \( \mathcal{M}_{g,1} \times \mathcal{G}^r_d \) which restricts to line bundles of bidegree \((d,0)\) on curves \([C \cup y] \in \Delta^1_0\). Grothendieck-Riemann-Roch applied to the universal curve over \( \mathcal{G}^r_d \) gives that

\[
(8) \quad c_1(\mathcal{G}_{0,n}) = \lambda - \frac{n}{2} b + \frac{n^2}{2} a \in A^1(\mathcal{G}^r_d), \quad \text{for all} \ n \geq 2
\]

while obviously \( \sigma^* (\mathcal{G}_{0,1}) = \mathcal{H} \). We now fix a general pointed curve \([C, q] \in \mathcal{M}_{g-1}\) and an elliptic curve \([E, y] \in \mathcal{M}_{1,1}\) and consider the test curves (see also [F2] p. 7)

\[
C^0 := \{ C/y \sim q \}_{y \in C} \subset \Delta^0_0 \subset \overline{M}_g \quad \text{and} \quad C^1 := \{ C \cup y \}_{y \in C} \subset \Delta^1_0 \subset \overline{M}_g.
\]

For \( n \geq 1 \), the intersection numbers \( C^0 \cdot (\sigma_0)_*(c_1(\mathcal{G}_{0,n})) \) and \( C^1 \cdot (\sigma_0)_*(c_1(\mathcal{G}_{0,n})) \) can be computed using [F2] Lemmas 2.6 and 2.13 and Proposition 2.12. Together with the relation (cf. [F2] p. 15 for details)

\[
(\sigma_0)_*(c_1(\mathcal{G}_{0,n}))_{\chi} = 12(\sigma_0)_*(c_1(\mathcal{G}_{0,n}))_{\delta_0} + (\sigma_0)_*(c_1(\mathcal{G}_{0,n}))_{\delta_1} = 0,
\]
this completely determine the classes \((\sigma_0)_*(c_1(\mathcal{G}_{0,n}))\). Then using \((9)\) we find
\[
(\sigma_0)_*(a) \equiv N \left( -\frac{rk(r^2k^2 - 3r^2k + 3rk^2 + 2r^2 + 2k^2 + 4k - 7rk - 4r - 10)}{(rk - r + k - 3)(rk - r + k - 2)} \lambda + \frac{rk(r^2k^2 - 3r^2k + 3rk^2 - 8rk + 2r^2 + 2k^2 + r - k - 3)}{6(rk - r + k - 3)(rk - r + k - 2)} \delta_0 + \cdots \right),
\]
\[
(\sigma_0)_*(b) \equiv N \left( -\frac{6rk}{rk - r + k - 2} \lambda - \frac{rk}{2(rk - r + k - 2)} \delta_0 + \cdots \right),
\]
and this completes the computation of the class \((\sigma_0)_*(\Xi)\) and finishes the proof. \(\square\)

The rather unwieldy expressions from Theorem 2.8 simplify nicely when \(k = 2, 3\) when we obtain Theorems 0.2 and 0.3.

**Proof of Theorem 0.1 when \(g = 2i + 1\).** We construct an effective divisor on \(\mathcal{K}_g\) satisfying the inequalities (2) as follows: The pull-back to \(\mathcal{K}_g\) of the Harris-Mumford divisor \(\mathcal{M}_{g,i+1}^1\) of curves of genus \(2i + 1\) with a \(g_{i+1}^1\) is given by the formula: \(\pi^*(\mathcal{M}_{g,i+1}^1) \equiv \mathfrak{c}((\mathcal{M}_{g,i+1}^1), \mathfrak{c} \equiv \mathfrak{c}(\mathcal{M}_{g,i+1}^1) \equiv \frac{(2i - 2)!}{(i + 1)!(i - 1)!} \left( 6(i + 2) \lambda - i + 1 \right) \delta_0 + \frac{3j(g - j)}{(2i - 1)(i + 1)} \delta_0 + \cdots \right).$

We split \(\overline{\mathcal{D}}_{2i+1,2}\) into boundary components of compact type and their complement
\[
\overline{\mathcal{D}}_{2i+1,2} = E + \sum_{j=1}^{i} (a_j \delta_j + \alpha_{g-j} \delta_{g-j} + \alpha_{j,g-j} \delta_{j,g-j}),
\]
where \(a_j, \alpha_{g-j}, \alpha_{j,g-j} \geq 0\) and \(\Delta_j, \Delta_{g-j}, \Delta_{j,g-j} \subseteq \text{supp}(E)\) for \(1 \leq j \leq i\), we consider the following positive linear combination on \(\mathcal{K}_g\):
\[
A := \frac{i! (i - 1)!}{(2i - 1)(2i - 3)} \pi^*(\mathcal{M}_{2i+1,i+1}^1) + \frac{4(i!)^2}{(2i)!} \cdot \frac{4(3i + 5)}{i + 1} \lambda - 2(\delta_0 + \delta_0') - 3\delta_0^{\text{ram}} - \cdots,
\]
where each of the coefficients of \(\delta_j, \delta_{g-j}\) and \(\delta_{j,g-j}\) in the expansion of \(A\) are at least
\[
\frac{6(i - 1)j(2i - 1 + j)}{(2i - 1)(i + 1)} \geq 2.
\]
Since \(\frac{4(3i + 5)}{i + 1} < 13\) for \(i \geq 8\), the conclusion now follows using (2). For \(i = 7\) we find that
\[
A \equiv 13\lambda - 2(\delta_0 + \delta_0') - 3\delta_0^{\text{ram}} - \cdots,\]
hence \(\kappa(\mathcal{K}_{15}) \geq 0\). To obtain that \(\kappa(\mathcal{K}_{15}) \geq 1\), we use the fact that on \(\mathcal{M}_{15}^1\) there exists a Brill-Noether divisor other than \(\mathcal{M}_{15,8}^1\), namely the divisor \(\mathcal{M}_{15,14}^3\) of curves \([C] \in \mathcal{M}_{15}\) with a \(g_{14}^3\). This divisor has the same slope \(s(\mathcal{M}_{15,14}^3) = s(\mathcal{M}_{15,8}^1) = 27/4\), but \(\text{supp}(\mathcal{M}_{15,14}^3) \neq \text{supp}(\mathcal{M}_{15,8}^1)\). It follows that there exist constants \(\alpha, \beta, \gamma, m \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0}\) such that
\[
\alpha \cdot E + \beta \cdot \pi^*(\mathcal{M}_{15,8}^1) \equiv \alpha \cdot E + \gamma \cdot \pi^*(\mathcal{M}_{15,14}^3) \in |mK_{\mathcal{K}_{15}}|.
\]
Thus we have found distinct multicanonical divisors on \(\mathcal{M}_{15}\), that is, \(\kappa(\mathcal{M}_{15}) \geq 1\). \(\square\)

**Remark 2.9.** The same numerical argument shows that if one replaces \(\mathcal{M}_{15,8}^1\) with any divisor \(D \in \text{Eff}(\mathcal{M}_{15})\) with \(s(D) < s(\mathcal{M}_{15,8}^1) = 27/4\), then \(\mathcal{K}_{15}\) is of general type. Any counterexample to the Slope Conjecture on \(\mathcal{M}_{15}\) makes \(\mathcal{K}_{15}\) of general type.
3. Koszul cohomology of Prym canonical curves

We recall that for a curve $C$, a line bundle $L \in \text{Pic}^d(C)$ and integers $i, j \geq 0$, the Koszul cohomology group $K_{i,j}(C, L)$ is obtained from the complex

$$\wedge^{i+1} H^0(L) \otimes H^0(L^{(j-1)}) \overset{d_{i+1}}{\longrightarrow} \wedge^i H^0(L) \otimes H^0(L^{(j)}) \overset{d_i}{\longrightarrow} \wedge^{i-1} H^0(L) \otimes H^0(L^{(j+1)}),$$

where the maps are the Koszul differentials (cf. [CL]). There is a well-known connection between Koszul cohomology groups and Lazarsfeld bundles. Assuming that $L$ is globally generated, a diagram chasing argument involving exact sequences of the type

$$0 \longrightarrow \wedge^a M_L \otimes L^\otimes b \rightarrow \wedge^a H^0(L) \otimes L^\otimes b \longrightarrow \wedge^{a-1} M_L \otimes L^\otimes (b+1) \longrightarrow 0$$

for various $a, b \geq 0$, yields the following identification (see also [GL] Lemma 1.10)

$$K_{i,j}(C, L) = \frac{H^0(C, \wedge^i M_L \otimes L^\otimes j)}{\text{Image}\{\wedge^{i+1} H^0(C, L) \otimes H^0(C, L^{(j-1)})\}}.$$

We fix $[C, \eta] \in \mathcal{R}_g$, set $L := K_C \otimes \eta \in W_{g-2}^2(C)$ and consider the Prym-canonical map $C \overset{[L]}{\rightarrow} \mathbb{P}^{g-2}$. We denote by $\mathcal{I}_C \subset \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^{g-2}}$ the ideal sheaf of the Prym-canonical curve.

By analogy with [F2] we study the Koszul stratification of $\mathcal{R}_g$ and define the strata

$$\mathcal{U}_{g,i} := \{[C, \eta] \in \mathcal{R}_g : K_{i,2}(C, K_C \otimes \eta) \neq \emptyset\}.$$

Using (9) we write the series of equivalences

$$[C, \eta] \in \mathcal{U}_{g,i} \Leftrightarrow H^1(C, \wedge^{i+1} M_L \otimes L) \neq 0 \Leftrightarrow h^0(C, \wedge^{i+1} M_L \otimes L) > \left(\frac{g-2}{i+1}\right)\left(\frac{(i+1)(g-2)}{g-2} + (g-1)\right).$$

Next we write down the exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow H^0(\wedge^{i+1} M_{\mathbb{P}^{g-2}}(1)) \overset{\alpha}{\longrightarrow} H^0(C, \wedge^{i+1} M_L \otimes L) \longrightarrow H^1(\wedge^{i+1} M_{\mathbb{P}^{g-2}} \otimes \mathcal{I}_C(1)) \longrightarrow 0,$$

and then also

$$\text{Coker}(\alpha) = H^1(\mathbb{P}^{g-2}, \wedge^{i+1} M_{\mathbb{P}^{g-2}} \otimes \mathcal{I}_C(1)) = H^0(\mathbb{P}^{g-2}, \wedge^i M_{\mathbb{P}^{g-2}} \otimes \mathcal{I}_C(2)).$$

Using the well-known fact that $h^0(\mathbb{P}^{g-2}, \wedge^{i+1} M_{\mathbb{P}^{g-2}}(2)) = \binom{g-1}{i+2}$ (use for instance the Bott vanishing theorem), we end-up with the following equivalence:

$$\text{(10)} \quad [C, \eta] \in \mathcal{U}_{g,i} \Leftrightarrow h^0(\mathbb{P}^{g-2}, \wedge^i M_{\mathbb{P}^{g-2}} \otimes \mathcal{I}_C(2)) > \left(\frac{g-3}{i}\right)\frac{(g-1)(g-2i-6)}{i+2}.$$

**Proposition 3.1.** (1) For $g < 2i + 6$, we have that $K_{i,2}(C, K_C \otimes \eta) \neq \emptyset$ for any $[C, \eta] \in \mathcal{R}_g$, that is, the Prym-canonical curve $C \overset{[K_C + \eta]}{\rightarrow} \mathbb{P}^{g-2}$ does not satisfy property $(N_1)$.

(2) For $g = 2i + 6$, the locus $\mathcal{U}_{g,i}$ is a virtual divisor on $\mathcal{R}_g$, that is, there exist vector bundles $\mathcal{G}_{i,2}$ and $\mathcal{H}_{i,2}$ over $\mathcal{R}_g$ such that $\text{rank}(\mathcal{G}_{i,2}) = \text{rank}(\mathcal{H}_{i,2})$, together with a bundle morphism $\phi : \mathcal{H}_{i,2} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}_{i,2}$ such that $\mathcal{U}_{g,i}$ is the degeneracy locus of $\phi$. 
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Proof. Part (1) is an immediate consequence of (10), since we have the equivalence
\[ K_{i,2}(C, K_C) \otimes \eta = 0 \iff h^0(P^{g-2}, \wedge^i M_{p-2} \otimes \mathcal{I}_C(2)) = \left( \frac{g-3}{i} \right) (g-1)(g-2i-6). \]
For part (2) one constructs two vector bundles \( G_{i,2} \) and \( H_{i,2} \) over \( R_g \) having fibres
\[ G_{i,2}(C, \eta) = H^0(C, \wedge^i M_{K_C \otimes \eta}(2)) \quad \text{and} \quad H_{i,2}(C, \eta) = H^0(P^{g-2}, \wedge^i M_{p-2}(2)). \]
There is a natural morphism \( \phi : H_{i,2} \to G_{i,2} \) given by restriction. We have that
\[ \text{rank}(G_{i,2}) = \left( \frac{g-2}{i} \right) \left( -i \frac{2g-2}{g-2} + 3(g-1) \right) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{rank}(H_{i,2}) = (i+1) \left( \frac{g}{i} + 2 \right) \]
and the condition that \( \text{rank}(G_{i,2}) = \text{rank}(H_{i,2}) \) is equivalent to \( g = 2i+6 \).
\[ \square \]
We describe a set-up that will be used to define certain tautological sheaves over \( \widetilde{R}_g \) and compute the class \([\mathcal{N}_{g,1}]_{\text{virt}}\). We use the notation from Subsection 1.1, in particular from Proposition 1.7 and recall that \( f : X \to \widetilde{R}_g \) is the universal Prym curve, \( P \in \text{Pic}(X) \) denotes the universal Prym line bundle and \( \mathcal{N}_f = f_* (\omega_f^\otimes \otimes \mathcal{P}^\otimes \mathcal{O}_T) \). We denote by \( T := \mathcal{E}^{\text{vir}} \cap \text{Sing}(f) \) the codimension 2 subvariety corresponding to Wirtinger covers \([C_{yq}, \eta \in \text{Pic}(C_{yq})[2], \nu(y) = \nu(q)] \in X \) (where \( \nu^*(\eta) = \mathcal{O}_C \)), with the marked point being the node of the underlying curve \( C_{yq} \). Let us fix a point \([X := C_{yq}, \eta, \beta] \in \Delta_{g,0}' \cup \Delta''_{g,0} \)
where as usual \( \nu : C \to X \) is the normalization map. Then we have an identification
\[ (11) \quad \mathcal{N}_1[X, \eta, \beta] = \ker \{ H^0(C, \omega_{C}(y + q) \otimes \eta_C) \to (\nu_* \mathcal{O}_C/\mathcal{O}_X) \otimes \omega_X \otimes \eta \cong C_{y \cdot q} \}, \]
where the map is given by taking the difference of residues at \( y \) and \( q \). Note that when \( \eta_C = \mathcal{O}_C \), that is when \( [X, \eta, \beta] \in \Delta''_{g,0} \), we have that \( \mathcal{N}_1[X, \eta, \beta] = H^0(C, \omega_C) \). For a point
\[ [X = C \cup_{\{y,q\}} E, \eta_C \in \sqrt{\mathcal{O}_C(-y - q)}, \eta_E] \in \Delta^\text{ram}_{g,0} \]
we have an identification
\[ (12) \quad \mathcal{N}_1[X, \eta, \beta] = \ker \{ H^0(C, \omega_C(y + q) \otimes \eta_C) \oplus H^0(E, \mathcal{O}_E(1)) \to (\omega_X \otimes \eta)_{y \cdot q} \cong C_{y \cdot q}^2 \}. \]
We set
\[ \mathcal{M} := \ker \{ f^*(\mathcal{N}_1) \to \omega_f \otimes \mathcal{P} \}. \]
\( \mathcal{M} \) is smooth of codimension 2 if it follows that \( \mathcal{M} \) is locally free. For \( a, b \geq 0 \), we define the sheaf \( \mathcal{E}_{a,b} := f_*(\wedge^a \mathcal{M} \otimes \omega_f^\otimes \otimes \mathcal{P}^\otimes \mathcal{O}_T) \) over \( \widetilde{R}_g \). Clearly \( \mathcal{E}_{a,b} \) is locally free. We have that \( \mathcal{E}_{0,b} = \mathcal{N}_b \) for \( b \geq 0 \), and we always have left-exact sequences
\[ (13) \quad 0 \to \mathcal{E}_{a,b} \to \wedge^a \mathcal{E}_{0,1} \otimes \mathcal{E}_{0,b} \to \mathcal{E}_{a-1,b+1}, \]
which are right-exact off the divisor \( \Delta''_{g,0} \) (to be proved later). We then define inductively a sequence of vector bundles \( \{ \mathcal{H}_{a,b} \}_{a,b \geq 0} \) over \( \widetilde{R}_g \) in the following way: We set \( \mathcal{H}_{0,b} := \text{Sym}^b \mathcal{N}_1 \) for each \( b \geq 0 \). Then having defined \( \mathcal{H}_{a-1,b} \) for all \( b \geq 0 \), we define the vector bundle \( \mathcal{H}_{a,b} \) by the exact sequence
\[ (14) \quad 0 \to \mathcal{H}_{a,b} \to \wedge^a \mathcal{H}_{0,1} \otimes \text{Sym}^b \mathcal{H}_{0,1} \to \mathcal{H}_{a-1,b+1} \to 0. \]
For a point \([X, \eta, \beta] \in \widetilde{R}_g\), if we use the identification \( H^0(X, \omega_X \otimes \eta) = H^0(P^{g-2}, \mathcal{O}_{p^{g-2}}(1)) \), we have a natural identification of the fibre
\[ \mathcal{H}_{a,b}[X, \eta, \beta] = H^0(P^{g-2}, \wedge^a M_{p^{g-2}}(b)). \]
By induction on $a \geq 0$, there exist vector bundle morphisms $\phi_{a,b} : \mathcal{H}_{a,b} \to \mathcal{E}_{a,b}$.

**Proposition 3.2.** For $b \geq 2$ and $a \geq 0$ we have the vanishing of the higher direct images

$$R^1 f_*(\wedge^a M \otimes \omega_\mathcal{F}^{\otimes b} \otimes \mathcal{P}^{\otimes b})|_{\mathcal{R}_g \cup \Delta'_0}' \Delta'_0' \alpha = 0.$$

It follows that the sequences (13) are right-exact off the divisor $\Delta'_0$ of $\mathcal{R}_g$.

**Proof.** Over the locus $\mathcal{R}_g$ the vanishing is a consequence of Proposition 2.4. For simplicity we prove that $R^1 f_*(\wedge^a M \otimes \omega_\mathcal{F}^{\otimes b} \otimes \mathcal{P}^{\otimes b}) \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\Delta'_0}' \alpha = 0$, the vanishing over $\Delta'_0$ being similar. We fix a point $[X = C \cup_{(y,q)} E, \eta_C, \eta_E] \in \Delta'_{\alpha}$, with $\eta_C^{\otimes 2} = \mathcal{O}_C(-y - q)$, $\eta_E = \mathcal{O}_E(1)$ and set $L := \omega_\mathcal{F} \otimes \eta \in \text{Pic}^{2g-2}(X)$. We show that $H^1(X, \wedge^a M_L \otimes L^{\otimes b}) = 0$ for all $a \geq 0$ and $b \geq 2$. A Mayer-Vietoris argument shows that it suffices to prove that

$$(15) \quad H^1(C, \wedge^a M_L \otimes L^{\otimes b} \otimes \mathcal{O}_C) = 0, \quad H^1(C, \wedge^a M_L \otimes L^{\otimes b} \otimes \mathcal{O}_E) = 0, \quad \text{and}$$

$$(16) \quad H^1(C, \wedge^a M_L \otimes L^{\otimes b} \otimes \mathcal{O}_C(-y - q)) = 0.$$

For $L_C := L \otimes \mathcal{O}_C = K_C(y + q) \otimes \eta_C$ and $L_E := L_E \otimes \mathcal{O}_E$, we write the exact sequences

$$0 \to H^0(C, L_C(-y - q)) \otimes \mathcal{O}_E \to M_L \otimes \mathcal{O}_E \to M_{L_E} \to 0, \quad \text{and}$$

$$0 \to H^0(E, L_E(-y - q)) \otimes \mathcal{O}_C \to M_L \otimes \mathcal{O}_C \to M_{L_C} \to 0,$$

and we find that $M_L \otimes \mathcal{O}_C = M_{L_C}$ while obviously $M_{L_E} = \mathcal{O}_E(-1)$. We conclude that the statements (15) and (16) for all $a \geq 0$ and $b \geq 2$ can be reduced to showing that

$$H^1(C, \wedge^a M_{L_C} \otimes L_{C}^{\otimes b}) = H^1(C, \wedge^a M_{L_C} \otimes L_{C}^{\otimes b} \otimes \mathcal{O}_C(-y - q)) = 0, \quad \text{for all} \ a \geq 0, b \geq 2.$$

This is now a direct application of Proposition 2.4.

**Proof of Theorem 2.6** We have constructed the vector bundle morphism $\phi_{i,2} : \mathcal{H}_{i,2} \to \mathcal{E}_{i,2}$ over $\mathcal{R}_g$. For $g = 2i + 6$ we have that $\text{rank}(\mathcal{H}_{i,2}) = \text{rank}(\mathcal{E}_{i,2})$ and the virtual Koszul class $[\mathcal{H}_{g,i}^{\text{vir}}]$ is given by $c_1(\mathcal{E}_{i,2} - \mathcal{H}_{i,2})$. We recall that for a rank $e$ vector bundle $\mathcal{E}$ over a variety $X$ and for $i \geq 1$, we have the formulas $c_1(\wedge^i \mathcal{E}) = \binom{e - 1}{i - 1} c_1(\mathcal{E})$ and $c_1(\text{Sym}^i(\mathcal{E})) = \binom{e + i - 1}{e} c_1(\mathcal{E})$. Using (13) we find that there exists a constant $\alpha \geq 0$ such that

$$c_1(\mathcal{E}_{i,2}) - \alpha \cdot \delta''_0 = \sum_{l=0}^{i} (-1)^l c_1(\wedge^{i-l} \mathcal{E}_{0,1} \otimes \mathcal{E}_{0,l+2}) = \sum_{l=0}^{i} (-1)^l \binom{g - 1}{i - l} c_1(\mathcal{E}_{0,l+2}) +$$

$$+ \sum_{l=0}^{i} (-1)^l \binom{(g - 1)(2l + 3)}{i - l - 1} c_1(\mathcal{E}_{0,1}),$$

while a repeated application of the exact sequence (14) gives that

$$c_1(\mathcal{H}_{i,2}) = \sum_{l=0}^{i} (-1)^l \binom{g - 1}{i - l} c_1(\text{Sym}^{l+2}(\mathcal{H}_{0,1})) +$$

$$\binom{g + l}{l + 2} c_1(\wedge^{i-l}(\mathcal{H}_{0,1})).$$
\[= \sum_{l=0}^{i} (-1)^l \left( \binom{g-1}{i-l} \left( \binom{g+l}{g} + \binom{g+l}{g-2} \right) + \binom{g+l}{l+2} \right) c_1(H_{0,1}),\]

with \(E_{0,1} = H_{0,1} = N_1\) and \(E_{0,t+2} = N_{t+2}\) for \(t \geq 0\). Proposition \[\text{[2]}\] finishes the proof. \(\Box\)

Comparing these formulas to the canonical class of \(\overline{\mathcal{R}}_g\), one obtains that \(\overline{\mathcal{R}}_g\) is of general type for \(g > 12\).

4. Effective divisors on \(\overline{\mathcal{R}}_g\)

We now use in an essential way results from \([F3]\) to produce myriads of effective divisors on \(\overline{\mathcal{R}}_g\). This construction, though less explicit than that of \(\overline{\mathcal{U}}_{2i+6}\) and \(\overline{\mathcal{B}}_{g:k}\), is still very effective and we use it to show \(\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{18}, \overline{\mathcal{R}}_{20}\) and \(\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{22}\) are of general type.

We consider the morphism \(\chi : \overline{\mathcal{R}}_g \to \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{2g-1}\) given by \(\chi([C, \eta]) := [\tilde{C}]\), where \(f : \tilde{C} \to C\) is the étale double cover determined by \(\eta\). Thus one has

\[f_* O_{\tilde{C}} = O_C \oplus \eta\]

and \(H^1(\tilde{C}, f^* L) = H^1(C, L) \oplus H^1(C, L \otimes \eta)\) for any \(L \in \text{Pic}(C)\), \(i = 0, 1\).

The pullback map \(\chi^*\) at the level of Picard groups has been determined by M. Bernstein in \([Be]\) Lemma 3.1.3. We record her results:

**Proposition 4.1.** The pullback map \(\chi^* : \text{Pic}(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{2g-1}) \to \text{Pic}(\overline{\mathcal{R}}_g)\) is given as follows:

\[
\chi^*(\lambda) = 2\lambda - \frac{1}{4} \delta_{0}^{\text{ram}}, \quad \chi^*(\delta_0) = \delta_{0}^{\text{ram}} + 2(\delta_{0}^{\text{ram}} + \delta_{0}^{\prime} + \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor g/2 \rfloor} \delta_{1:i-g-i}), \quad \chi^*(\delta_i) = 2\delta_{g-i} \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq g-1.
\]

**Proof.** The formula for \(\chi^*(\delta_i)\) when \(1 \leq i \leq g-1\) is immediate. To determine \(\chi^*(\lambda)\) one notices that \(\chi^*(\kappa_1)_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{2g-1}} = 2(\kappa_1)_{\overline{\mathcal{R}}_g}\) and the rest follows from Mumford’s formulas \((\kappa_1)_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{2g-1}} = 12\lambda - \delta \in \text{Pic}(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{2g-1})\) and \((\kappa_1)_{\overline{\mathcal{R}}_g} = 12\lambda - \pi^*(\delta) \in \text{Pic}(\overline{\mathcal{R}}_g)\). \(\Box\)

We set the integer \(g' := 1 + \frac{g-1}{2}(\frac{2g}{g-1})\). In \([F3]\) we have studied the rational map

\[
\phi : \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{2g-1} \dashrightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{1+\frac{g-1}{2}(\frac{2g}{g-1})}, \quad \phi[Y] := W_{g+1}^1(Y),
\]

and determined the pullback map at the level of divisors \(\phi^* : \text{Pic}(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g'}) \to \text{Pic}(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{2g-1})\). In particular, we proved that if \(A \in \text{Pic}(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g'})\) is a divisor of slope \(s(A) = s\), then the slope of the pullback \(\phi^*(A)\) is equal to (cf. \([F3]\) Theorem 0.2)

\[
s(\phi^*(A)) = 6 + \frac{8g^3s - 32g^3 - 19g^2s + 66g^2 + 6g - 16g + 3s + 6}{(g-1)(g+1)(g^2s - 2gs - 4g^2 + 7g + 3)}.
\]

To obtain effective divisors of small slope on \(\overline{\mathcal{R}}_g\) we shall consider pullbacks \((\phi \chi)^*(A)\), where \(A \in \text{Ample}(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g'})\). (Of course, one can consider the cone \(\chi^*(\text{Ample}(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{2g-1}))\), but a quick look at Proposition \([4,1]\) shows that it is impossible to obtain in this way divisors on \(\overline{\mathcal{R}}_g\) satisfying the inequalities \([2]\). Pulling back merely effective divisors \(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{2g-1}\) rather than ample ones, is problematic since \(\chi(\overline{\mathcal{R}}_g)\) tends to be contained in many geometric divisors on \(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{2g-1}\).) In order for the pullbacks \(\chi^* \phi^*(A)\) to be well-defined as effective divisors on \(\overline{\mathcal{R}}_g\) we prove the following result:
Proposition 4.2. If $\text{dom}(\phi) \subset \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{2g-1}$ is the domain of definition of the rational morphism $\phi: \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{2g-1} \to \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g'}$, then $\chi(\overline{\mathcal{R}}_g) \cap \text{dom}(\phi) \neq \emptyset$. It follows that for any ample divisor $A \in \text{Ample}(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g'})$, the pullback $\chi^*\phi^*(A) \in \text{Eff}(\overline{\mathcal{R}}_g)$ is well-defined.

Proof. We take a general point $[C \cup y, E, \eta_C = \mathcal{O}_C, \eta_E] \in \Delta_1 \subset \overline{\mathcal{R}}_g$. The corresponding admissible double cover is then $f: C_1 \cup y_1 \stackrel{\overline{E}}{\to} C_2 \cup y_2$, where $[C_1, y_1]$ and $[C_2, y_2]$ are copies of $[C, y]$ mapping isomorphically to $[C, y]$, and $f: \overline{E} \to \overline{E}$ is the étale double cover induced by the torsion point $\eta_E \in \text{Pic}^0(\overline{E})[2]$. We have that $C_1 \cap \overline{E} = \{y_1\}$, where $f_\overline{E}(y_1) = f_\overline{E}(y_2) = y$. Thus $\chi([C \cup y, E, \mathcal{O}_C, \eta_E]) := [C_1 \cup y_1, \overline{E} \cup y_2, C_2]$, where $y_1, y_2 \in \overline{E}$ are such that $\mathcal{O}_\overline{E}(y_1 - y_2)$ is a 2-torsion point in $\text{Pic}^0(\overline{E})$.

Suppose now that $X := C_1 \cup y_1 \cup y_2 \cup C_2$ is a curve of compact type such that $[C_i, y_i] \in \mathcal{M}_{g-1,1} (i = 1, 2)$ and $[E, y_1, y_2] \in \mathcal{M}_{1,2}$ are all Brill-Noether general. In particular, the class $y_1 - y_2 \in \text{Pic}^0(\overline{E})$ is not torsion. Then $\phi([X]) := [\overline{W}^1_{g+1}(X)]$ is the variety of limit linear series $g^1_{g+1}$ on $X$. The general point of each irreducible component of $\overline{W}^1_{g+1}(X)$ corresponds to a refined linear series $l$ on $X$ satisfying the following compatibility conditions in terms of Brill-Noether numbers (see also [EH], [E3]):

\[
1 = \rho(l_{c_1}, y_1) + \rho(l_{c_2}, y_2) + \rho(l_E, y_1, y_2) = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \rho(l_{c_1}, y_1), \rho(l_{c_2}, y_2), \rho(l_E, y_1, y_2) \geq 0.
\]

If $\rho(l_{c_2}, y_2) = 1$, we find two types of components of $\overline{W}^1_{g+1}(X)$ which we describe: Since $\rho(l_{c_1}, y_1) = 0$, there exists an integer $0 \leq a \leq g/2$ such that $a^{l_{c_1}}(y_1) = (a, g + 2 - a)$. On $E$ there are two choices for $l_E \in G^1_{g+1}(E)$ such that $a^{l_E}(y_1) = (a - 1, g + 1 - a)$. Either $a^{l_E}(y_2) = (a, g + 1 - a)$ (there is a unique such $l_E$), and then $l_{c_2}$ belongs to the connected curve $T_a := \{(c_2 \in G^1_{g+1}(C_2) : a^{l_{c_2}}(y_2) \geq (a + g + 1 - a))\}$, or else, $a^{l_E}(y_2) = (a - 1, g + 2 - a)$ (again, there is a unique such $l_E$), and then the $C_2$-aspect of $l$ belongs to the curve $T_a' := \{(c_2 \in G^1_{g+1}(C_2) : a^{l_{c_2}}(y_2) \geq (a - 1, g + 2 - a))\}$. Thus $\{l_{c_1}\} \times T_a$ and $\{l_{c_1}\} \times T_a'$ are irreducible components of $\overline{W}^1_{g+1}(X)$. When $\rho(l_E, y_1, y_2) = 1$, then there are three types of irreducible components of $\overline{W}^1_{g+1}(X)$ corresponding to the cases

\[
a^{l_E}(y_1) = (a - 1, g + 1 - a), \quad a^{l_E}(y_2) = (a - 1, g + 1 - a) \quad \text{for} \ 0 \leq a \leq g/2,
\]

\[
a^{l_E}(y_1) = (a - 1, g + 1 - a), \quad a^{l_E}(y_2) = (a, g - a) \quad \text{for} \ 1 \leq a \leq (g - 1)/2,
\]

\[
a^{l_E}(y_1) = (a - 1, g + 1 - a), \quad a^{l_E}(y_2) = (a - 2, g + 2 - a) \quad \text{for} \ 2 \leq a \leq (g - 1)/2.
\]

Finally, the case $\rho(l_{c_1}, y_1) = 1$ is identical to the case $\rho(l_{c_2}, y_2) = 1$ by reversing the role of the curves $C_1$ and $C_2$. The singular points of $\overline{W}^1_{g+1}(X)$ correspond to (necessarily) crude limit $g^1_{g+1}$'s satisfying $\rho(l_{c_1}, y_1) = \rho(l_{c_2}, y_2) = \rho(l_E, y_1, y_2) = 0$. For such $l$, there must exist two irreducible components of $X$, say $Y$ and $Z$, for which $Y \cap Z = \{x\}$ and such that $a^{l_Y}(x) + a^{l_Z}(x) = g + 2$ and $a^{l_Y}(x) + a^{l_Z}(x) = g + 1$. The point $l$ lies precisely on the two irreducible components of $\overline{W}^1_{g+1}(X)$: The one corresponding to refined limit $g^1_{g+1}$ with vanishing sequence on $Y$ equal to $(a^{l_Y}(x) - 1, a^{l_Y}(x))$, and the one with vanishing $(a^{l_Z}(x), a^{l_Z}(x) - 1)$ on $Z$. Thus $\overline{W}^1_{g+1}(X)$ is a stable curve of compact type, so $[X] \in \text{dom}(\phi)$. Using [E3], this set-theoretic description applies to the image
under \( \phi \) of any point \([C_1 \cup y_1 E \cup y_2 C_2]\), in particular to \([C_1 \cup y_1 \tilde{E} \cup y_2 C_2] = \chi([C \cup y E])\). We have showed that \( \chi(\Delta_1) \cap \text{dom}(\phi) \neq \emptyset \).

Proof of Theorem 0.1 for genus \( g = 18, 20, 22 \). We construct an effective divisor on \( \mathcal{K}_g \) which satisfies the inequalities (2) and which is of the form

\[
\mu \pi^*(D) + \epsilon \chi^*(A) = \alpha \lambda - 2(\delta' + \delta'') - 3\delta_{\text{ram}} - \sum_{i=1}^{[g/2]} (b_i \delta_i + b_{g-i} \delta_{g-i}) + b_{i;g-i} \delta_{i;g-i},
\]

where \( A \equiv s \lambda - \delta \in \text{Pic}(\mathcal{M}_g) \) is an ample class (which happens precisely when \( s > 11 \), cf. [CH], \( D \in \text{Eff}(\mathcal{M}_g) \) and \( \mu, \epsilon > 0 \) and \( \alpha < 13 \). We solve this linear system using Proposition 4.1 and find that we must have

\[
\epsilon = \frac{8}{12 - s(\phi^*(A))} \quad \text{and} \quad \mu = \frac{16 - 2s(\phi^*(A))}{12 - s(\phi^*(A))}.
\]

To conclude that \( \mathcal{K}_g \) is of general type, it suffices to check that the inequality

\[
\alpha = \frac{8s(\phi^*(A))}{12 - s(\phi^*(A))} + \left( 6 + \frac{12}{g+1} \right) \frac{16 - 2s(\phi^*(A))}{12 - s(\phi^*(A))} < 13
\]

has a solution \( s = s(A) \geq 11 \). Using (17), we find that this is the case for \( g \geq 18 \). \( \Box \)

5. The enumerative geometry of \( \mathcal{K}_g \) in small genus

In this Section we describe the divisors \( D_{g,i} \) and \( U_{g,i} \) for small \( g \). We start with the case \( g = 3 \). This result has been first obtained by M. Bernstein [Be] Theorem 3.2.3 using test curves inside \( \mathcal{K}_3 \). Our method is more direct and uses the identification of cycles \( C - C = \Theta_{QC} \subset \text{Pic}^0(C) \), valid for all curves \( [C] \in \mathcal{M}_3 \).

Theorem 5.1. The divisor \( D_{3,2} = \{ [C, \eta] \in \mathcal{R}_3 : \eta \in C - C \} \) is equal to the locus of étale double covers \([\tilde{C} \to C] \subset \mathcal{R}_3 \) such that \([\tilde{C}] \in \mathcal{M}_5 \) is hyperelliptic. We have the equality of cycles \( \tilde{D}_{3,2} \equiv 8\lambda - \delta' - \delta'' - \frac{3}{2}\delta_{\text{ram}} - 6\delta_1 - 4\delta_2 - 2\delta_{1,2} \in \text{Pic}(\mathcal{R}_3) \). Moreover,

\[
\pi_*(\tilde{D}_{3,2}) \equiv 56 \cdot \mathcal{M}_{3,2} = 56 \cdot (9\lambda - \delta_1 - 3\delta_1) \in \text{Pic}(\mathcal{M}_3).
\]

This equality corresponds to the fact that for an étale double cover \( f : \tilde{C} \to C \), the source \( \tilde{C} \) is hyperelliptic if and only if \( C \) is hyperelliptic and \( \eta \in C - C \subset \text{Pic}^0(C) \).

Proof. We use the setup from Theorem 2.8 and recall that there exists a vector bundle morphism \( \phi : \mathcal{H} \otimes A_{0,0} \to A_{0,1} \) over \( \mathcal{R}_3 \) such that \( Z_1(\phi) \cap \mathcal{R}_3 = D_{3,2} \). Here \( \mathcal{H} = \pi^*(\mathcal{E}) \), \( A_{0,0}[X, \eta] = H^0(X, \omega_X \otimes \beta) \) and \( A_{0,1}[X, \eta] = H^0(X, \omega_X^{\otimes 2} \otimes \beta) \), for each point \([X, \eta] \in \mathcal{R}_3 \). Using (11) and (12) we check that both \( \phi|_{\Delta_0'} \) and \( \phi|_{\Delta_{\text{ram}}} \) are generically non-degenerate. Over a point \( t = [C_{yq}, \eta, \beta] \in \Delta_0'' \) corresponding to a Wirtinger covering (i.e. \( \nu : C \to C_{yq} \), with \([C] \in \mathcal{M}_2 \) and \( \nu^*(\eta) = \mathcal{O}_C \)), we have that

\[
\phi(t) : H^0(C, K_C) \otimes H^0(C, K_C \otimes \mathcal{O}_C(y + q)) \to A_{0,1}(t) \subset H^0(C, \omega_{C}^{\otimes 2} \otimes \mathcal{O}_C(2y + 2q)).
\]

From the base point free pencil trick we find that \( \text{Ker}(\phi(t)) = H^0(C, \mathcal{O}_C(y + q)) \), that is, \( \phi|_{\Delta_0''} \) is everywhere degenerate and the class \( c_1(A_{0,1} - \mathcal{H} \otimes A_{0,0}) - \delta_0 \in \text{Pic}(\mathcal{R}_3) \) is
Theorem 5.4. The divisor
\[ \gamma \in \mathbb{M}_{4,3} \] can be identified with the locus of Prym curves
\[ \mathcal{C} \in \mathcal{M}_{4,3} \] that is,
\[ s(\pi_*(c_1(A_{0,1} - H \otimes A_{0,0}) - \delta_0')) = 9. \]
The hyperelliptic locus \( \mathcal{M}_{3,2} \) is the only divisor on \( D \in \text{Eff}(\mathcal{M}_3) \) with \( \Delta_c \subseteq \text{supp}(D) \) for
\[ i = 0, 1 \] and \( s(D) \leq 9 \), which leads to the formula
\[ \pi_*(\mathcal{M}_{3,2}) = 56 \cdot \mathcal{M}_{3,2}. \]

Theorem 5.2. The divisor
\[ \mathcal{D}_{5,2} := \{ (C, \eta) \in \mathcal{R}_5 : \eta \in C_2 - C_2 \} \] equals the locus of étale double covers
\[ \mathcal{C} \rightarrow C \in \mathcal{R}_5 \] such that the genus 9 curve \( \mathcal{C} \) is tetragonal. We have the formula
\[ \mathcal{D}_{5,2} = 14\lambda - 2(\delta_0' + \delta_0'') - \frac{5}{2}\delta_{\text{ram}} - 10\delta_4 - 4\delta_{1,4} - \cdots \in \text{Pic}(\mathcal{R}_5). \]

Proof. We start with an étale cover \( f : \hat{C} \rightarrow C \) corresponding to the torsion point \( \eta = \mathcal{O}_C(D - E) \), with \( D, E \in C_2 \). Then
\[ H^0(\hat{C}, \mathcal{O}_C(f^*D)) = H^0(C, \mathcal{O}_C(D)) \oplus H^0(C, \mathcal{O}_C(E)), \]
that is, \( |f^*D| \in G^1_4(\hat{C}) \) and \( \hat{C} \in \mathcal{M}_{9,4} \). Conversely, if \( l \in G^1_4(\hat{C}) \), then \( l \) must be invariant under the involution of \( \hat{C} \) and then \( f_*l \in G^1_4(C) \) contains two divisors of the type \( 2x + 2y \equiv 2p + 2q \). Then we take \( \eta = \mathcal{O}_C(x + y - p - q) \), that is, \( (C, \eta) \in \mathcal{D}_{5,2} \).

Remark 5.3. Since \( \text{codim}(\mathcal{M}_{9,4}, \mathcal{M}_9) = 3 \) while \( \mathcal{D}_{5,2} \) is a divisor in \( \mathcal{R}_3 \), there seems to be a dimensional discrepancy in Theorem 5.2. This is explained by noting that for an étale double covering \( f : \hat{C} \rightarrow C \) over a general curve \( [C] \in \mathcal{M}_5 \), the codimension 1 condition \( \text{gon}(\hat{C}) \leq 5 \) is equivalent to the seemingly stronger condition \( \text{gon}(\hat{C}) \leq 4 \). Indeed, if \( l \in G^1_4(\hat{C}) \) is base point free, then \( l \) is not invariant under the involution of \( \hat{C} \) and \( \text{dim} |f_*l| \geq 2 \) so \( G^1_3(C) \neq 0 \), a contradiction with the genericity assumption on \( C \).

Theorem 5.4. The divisor \( \mathcal{D}_{4,3} = \{ (C, \eta) \in \mathcal{R}_4 : \exists A \in W^1_3(C) \text{ with } H^0(C, A \otimes \eta) \neq 0 \} \) can be identified with the locus of Prym curves \( [C, \eta] \in \mathcal{R}_4 \) such that the Prym-canonical model
\[ C \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^2 \] is a plane sextic curve with a triple point. We also have the class formula
\[ \mathcal{D}_{4,3} \equiv 8\lambda - \delta_0' - 2\delta_0'' - \frac{7}{4}\delta_{\text{ram}} - 4\delta_3 - 7\delta_1 - 3\delta_{1,3} - \cdots \in \text{Pic}(\mathcal{R}_4), \]
hence \( \pi_*(\mathcal{D}_{4,3}) = 60 \cdot \mathcal{G} \mathcal{P}^1_{4,3} = 60(34\lambda - 4\delta_0 - 14\delta_1 - 18\delta_2) \in \text{Pic}(\mathcal{M}_4) \), where
\[ \mathcal{G} \mathcal{P}^1_{4,3} \subseteq \mathcal{M}_4 := \{ C \in \mathcal{M}_4 : \exists A \in W^1_3(C), A^{\otimes 2} = K_C \} \]
is the Gieseker-Petri divisor of curves \( [C] \in \mathcal{M}_4 \) with a vanishing theta-null.

Proof. We start with a Prym curve \( [C, \eta] \in \mathcal{R}_4 \) such that there exists a pencil \( A \in W^1_3(C) \) with \( H^0(C, A \otimes \eta) \neq 0 \). We claim that \( A^{\otimes 2} = K_C \), that is, \( [C] \in \mathcal{G} \mathcal{P}^1_{4,3} \).

Indeed, assuming the opposite, we find disjoint divisors \( D_1, D_2 \in C_2 \) such that
\[ D_1 \in |A \otimes \eta| \] and \( D_2 \in |K_C \otimes A^\vee \otimes \eta| \). In particular, the subspaces
\[ H^0(C, K_C \otimes \eta(-D_i)) \subseteq H^0(C, K_C \otimes \eta) \]
are both of dimension 2 and intersect non-trivially, that is \( H^0(C, K_C \otimes \eta(-D_1-D_2)) \neq 0 \). Since \( D_1 + D_2 \equiv K_C \), this implies \( \eta = 0 \), a contradiction.
The proof that the vector bundle morphism $\phi : H \otimes A_{0,0} \to A_{0,1}$ constructed in the proof of Theorem 2.3 is degenerate with order 1 along the divisor $\Delta^\prime_{0} \subset \overline{R}_{4}$ follows from [11]. Thus $c_{1}(A_{0,1} - H \otimes A_{0,0} - \delta_{0}) \in \text{Pic}(\overline{R}_{4})$ is an effective class and its push-forward to $\overline{M}_{4}$ has slope $17/2$. The only divisor $D \in \text{Eff}(\overline{M}_{4})$ with $\Delta_{i} \subseteq \text{supp}(D)$ for $i = 0, 1, 2$ and $s(D) \leq 17/2$, is the theta-null divisor $\overline{g_{2,3}}$ (cf. [F3] Theorem 5.1).

Remark 5.5. For a general point $[C, \eta] \in R_{4}$, the Prym-canonical curve $\iota : C \to \mathbb{P}^{2}$ is a plane sextic with 6 nodes which correspond to the preimages in $\phi^{-1}(\eta)$ under the second difference map

$$C_{2} \times C_{2} \to \text{Pic}^{0}(C), \quad (D_{1}, D_{2}) \mapsto O_{C}(D_{1} - D_{2}).$$

Note that $W_{2}(C) \cdot (W_{2}(C) + \eta) = 6$. For a general $[C, \eta] \in D_{4;3}$, the model $\iota(C) \subset \mathbb{P}^{2}$ has a triple point. For a hyperelliptic curve $[C] \in M_{4,2}$, out of the $255 = 2^{2g} - 1$ étale double covers of $C$, there exist 210 for which $C \to \mathbb{P}^{2}$ has an ordinary 4-fold point and no other singularity. The remaining $45 = \binom{2^{g} + 2}{2}$ coverings correspond to the case $\eta = O_{C}(x - y)$, with $x, y \in C$ being Weierstrass points, when $|K_{C} \otimes \eta|$ has 2 base points and $\iota$ is a degree 2 map onto a conic.

6. The singularities of the moduli space of Prym curves

The moduli space $\overline{R}_{g}$ is a normal variety with finite quotient singularities. To determine its Kodaira dimension we consider a smooth model $\overline{R}_{g}$ of $\overline{R}_{g}$ and then analyze the growth of the dimension of the spaces $H^{0}(\overline{R}_{g}, K_{\overline{R}_{g}}^{\otimes l})$ of pluricanonical forms for all $l \geq 0$. In this section we show that in doing so one only needs to consider forms defined on $\overline{R}_{g}$ itself.

Theorem 6.1. We fix $g \geq 4$ and let $\overline{R}_{g} \to \overline{R}_{g}$ be any desingularisation. Then every pluricanonical form defined on the smooth locus $\overline{R}_{g}^{\text{reg}}$ of $\overline{R}_{g}$ extends holomorphically to $\overline{R}_{g}$, that is, for all integers $l \geq 0$ we have isomorphisms

$$H^{0}(\overline{R}_{g}^{\text{reg}}, K_{\overline{R}_{g}}^{\otimes l}) \cong H^{0}(\overline{R}_{g}, K_{\overline{R}_{g}}^{\otimes l}).$$

A similar statement has been proved for the moduli space $\overline{M}_{g}$ of curves cf. [HM] Theorem 1, and for the moduli space $\overline{S}_{g}$ of spin curves, cf. [Lud] Theorem 4.1. We start by explicitly describing the locus of non-canonical singularities in $\overline{R}_{g}$, which has codimension 2. At a non-canonical singularity there exist local pluricanonical forms that do acquire poles on a desingularisation. We show that this situation does not occur for forms defined on the smooth locus $\overline{R}_{g}^{\text{reg}}$, and they extend holomorphically to $\overline{R}_{g}$.

Definition 6.2. An automorphism of a Prym curve $(X, \eta, \beta)$ is an automorphism $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(X)$ such that there exists an isomorphism of sheaves $\gamma : \sigma^{*}\eta \to \eta$ making the
every fibre over $\gamma$ extends to an isomorphism $\gamma$. Lemma 2.3.2 and [Lud] Proposition 2.7). Given $\gamma$ is the set of connected components of the non-exceptional subcurve $\gamma$. The subgroup $\Delta := \gamma$ is called the subgroup of inessential automorphisms $\gamma$. Proposition isomorphism $\gamma$ to $\gamma$.\bigstar$

Definition 6.4. For a quasi-stable curve $X$, an irreducible component $C_j$ is called an elliptic tail if $p_3(C_j) = 1$ and $C_j \cap (X - C_j) = \{p\}$. The node $p$ is then an elliptic tail node. A non-trivial automorphism $\sigma$ of $X$ is called an elliptic tail automorphism (with respect to $C_j$) if $\sigma|_{X - C_j}$ is the identity.\bigstar$

Theorem 6.5. Let $(X, \eta, \beta)$ be a Prym curve of genus $g \geq 4$. The point $[X, \eta, \beta] \in \mathcal{R}_g$ is smooth if and only if $\text{Aut}(X, \eta, \beta)$ is generated by elliptic tail involutions.\bigstar$

Throughout this Appendix, $X$ denotes a quasi-stable curve of genus $g \geq 2$ and $C := st(X)$ is its stable model. We denote by $N \subset \text{Sing}(C)$ the set of exceptional nodes and $\Delta := \text{Sing}(C) - N$. Then $X$ is the support of a Prym curve if and only if $N$ considered as a subgraph of the dual graph $\Gamma(C)$ is eulerian, that is, every vertex of $\Gamma(C)$ is incident to an even number of edges in $N$ (cf. [BCF] Proposition 0.4).\bigstar$

Locally at a point $[X, \eta, \beta]$, the moduli space $\mathcal{R}_g$ is isomorphic to the quotient of the versal deformation space $\mathbb{C}^{3g-3}$ of $(X, \eta, \beta)$ modulo the action of the automorphism group $\text{Aut}(X, \eta, \beta)$. If $\mathbb{C}^{3g-3} = \text{Ext}^1(\Omega^1_{\mathcal{O}_X}, \mathcal{O}_X)$ denotes the versal deformation space of $C$, then the map $\mathbb{C}^{3g-3} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{3g-3}$ is given by $t_i = \tau_i^2$ if $t_i = 0 \subset \mathbb{C}^{3g-3}$ is the locus where the exceptional node $p_i \in N$ persists and $t_i = \tau_i$ otherwise. The morphism $\pi : \mathcal{R}_g \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_g$ is given locally by the map $\mathbb{C}^{3g-3}/\text{Aut}(X, \eta, \beta) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{3g-3}/\text{Aut}(C)$. One has the following decomposition of the versal deformation space of $(X, \eta, \beta)$

$$\mathbb{C}^{3g-3} = \bigoplus_{p_i \in N} \mathbb{C}_{\tau_i} \oplus \bigoplus_{p_i \in \Delta} \mathbb{C}_{\tau_i} \oplus \bigoplus_{C_j \subset C} H^1(C_j^\nu, T_{C_j^\nu}(-D_j)),$$

where for a node $p_i \in N$ we denote by $(\tau_i = 0) \subset \mathbb{C}^{3g-3}$ the locus where the corresponding exceptional component $E_i$ persists, while for a node $p_i \in \Delta$ we denote by $(\tau_i = 0) \subset \mathbb{C}^{3g-3}$ the locus of those deformations in which $p_i$ persists. Finally, for a component $C_j \subset C$ with normalization $C_j^\nu$, if $D_j$ consists of the inverse images of the
nodes of $C$ under the normalization map $C'_j \to C_j$, the group $H^1(C'_j, T_{C'_j}(-D_j))$ parameterizes deformations of the pair $(C'_j, D_j)$. This decomposition is compatible with the decomposition

$$C_i^{3g-3} = \bigoplus_{p_i \in \text{Sing}(C)} C_{t_i} \oplus \bigoplus_{C_j} H^1(C'_j, T_{C'_j}(-D_j))$$

as well as with the actions of the automorphism groups on $C_i^{3g-3}$ and $C_i^{3g-3}$, see also [Lud] pg. 5. The point $[X, \eta, \beta] \in \overline{\mathcal{R}}_g$ is smooth if and only if the action of $\text{Aut}(X, \eta, \beta)$ on $C_i^{3g-3}$ is generated by quasi-reflections, that is, elements $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(X, \eta, \beta)$ having 1 as an eigenvalue of multiplicity precisely $3g - 4$. Theorem 6.5 follows from the following proposition.

**Proposition 6.6.** Let $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(X, \eta, \beta)$ be an automorphism of a Prym curve $(X, \eta, \beta)$ of genus $g \geq 4$. Then $\sigma$ acts on $C_i^{3g-3}$ as a quasi-reflection if and only if $X$ has an elliptic tail $C_j$ such that $\sigma$ is the elliptic tail involution with respect to $C_j$.

**Proof.** Let $\sigma$ be an elliptic tail involution with respect to $C_j$. The induced automorphism $\sigma_C$ is an elliptic tail involution of $C$ and acts on the versal deformation space $C_i^{3g-3}$ of $C$ as $t_i \mapsto -t_i$ and $t_i \mapsto t_i$, $i \neq 1$. Here $t_i$ is the coordinate corresponding to the node $p_i \in C_j \cap (C - C_j)$. The node $p_i$ being non-exceptional, we have that $t_i = \tau_i$. Then $\sigma = \tau_i$, $i \neq 1$. If $t_i = \tau_i$, then $\sigma \cdot \tau_i = \tau_i$. For coordinates $t_i = \tau_i$, $\sigma$ is the identity in a neighbourhood of the corresponding exceptional component $E_i$, thus $\sigma \cdot \tau_i = \tau_i$.

Now let $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(X, \eta, \beta)$ act as a quasi-reflection with eigenvalues $\zeta$ and 1. As in the proof of [Lud] Proposition 2.15, there exists a node $p_1 \in C$ such that the action of $\sigma$ is given by $\sigma \cdot \tau_1 = \zeta \tau_1$ and $\sigma \cdot \tau_j = \tau_j$ for $j \neq 1$. When $p_1 \in N$, the induced automorphism $\sigma_C$ acts via $t_1 \mapsto \zeta^2 t_1$ and $\sigma_C \cdot t_j = t_j$ for $j \neq 1$. If $\zeta^2 \neq 1$, then $\sigma_C$ acts as a quasi-reflection and $p_1$ is an elliptic tail node, which contradicts the assumption $p_1 \in N$. Therefore $\sigma_C = \text{Id}_C$ and the exceptional component $E_1$ over $p_1$ is the only component on which $\sigma$ acts non-trivially. The graph $N \subset \Gamma(C)$ is eulerian and there exists a circuit of edges in $N$ containing $p_1$.

By Remark 6.3, $\sigma$ corresponds to an element $\pm (\gamma_j) \in \{\pm 1\}^{CC(X)} / \pm 1$. Since $\sigma$ acts non-trivially on $E_1$ we find that $\gamma_1 = -\gamma_2$. In particular, there exists $i \neq 1$ such that $\sigma$ acts non-trivially on $E_i$. This is a contradiction which shows that the node $p_1$ is non-exceptional, $\tau_1 = t_1$ and $\sigma_C \cdot t_1 = \zeta t_1$ and $\sigma_C \cdot t_i = t_i$ for $i \neq 1$. Thus $\sigma_C$ is an elliptic tail involution of $C$ with respect to an elliptic tail through the node $p_1$ and $\xi = -1$. Since $\sigma$ fixes every coordinate corresponding to an exceptional component of $X$, it follows that $\sigma$ is an elliptic tail involution of $X$. $\square$

**Theorem 6.7.** We fix $g \geq 4$. A point $[X, \eta, \beta] \in \overline{\mathcal{R}}_g$ is a non-canonical singularity if and only if $X$ has an elliptic tail $C_j$ with $j$-invariant 0 and $\eta$ is trivial on $C_j$. 30
The proof is similar to that of the analogous statement for $\mathcal{S}_g$ and we refer to [Lud].

Theorem 3.1 for a detailed outline of the proof and background on quotient singularities. Locally at $[X, \eta, \beta]$, the space $\mathcal{R}_g$ is isomorphic to a neighbourhood of the origin in $\mathbb{C}^{3g-3}/\text{Aut}(X, \eta, \beta)$. We consider the normal subgroup $H$ of $\text{Aut}(X, \eta, \beta)$ generated by automorphisms acting as quasi-reflections on $\mathbb{C}^{3g-3}$. The map $\mathbb{C}^{3g-3} \to \mathbb{C}^{3g-3}/H = C_{\eta}$ is given by $v_i = \tau_i^g$ if $p_i$ is an elliptic tail node and $v_i = \tau_i$ otherwise. The automorphism group $\text{Aut}(X, \eta, \beta)$ acts on $\mathbb{C}^{3g-3}$ and the quotient $\mathbb{C}^{3g-3}/\text{Aut}(X, \eta, \beta)$ is isomorphic to $C_{\eta}$.

Similarly, an elliptic tail automorphism of order $n$ on $X$ deforming the curve $C$ by automorphisms acting as quasi-reflections on $C_{\eta}$ (cf. [Re], [T], [Re2]).

The Reid–Shepherd-Barron–Tai criterion states that $\text{Aut}(X, \eta, \beta)$ acts on $\mathbb{C}^{3g-3}$ and the quotient $\mathbb{C}^{3g-3}/\text{Aut}(X, \eta, \beta)$ is isomorphic to $C_{\eta}$.

We fix an automorphism $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(X, \eta, \beta)$ of order $n$ and a primitive $n$-th root of unity $\zeta_n$. If the action of $\sigma$ on $\mathbb{C}^{3g-3}$ has eigenvalues $\zeta_n^a, \ldots, \zeta_n^{3g-3}$, then following [Re, [T], [Re2]] we define the age of $\sigma$ by

$$\text{age}(\sigma, \zeta_n) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i.$$ 

We say that $\sigma$ satisfies the Reid–Shepherd-Barron–Tai inequality if $\text{age}(\sigma, \zeta_n) \geq 1$. The Reid–Shepherd-Barron–Tai criterion states that $\mathbb{C}^{3g-3}/\text{Aut}(X, \eta, \beta)$ has canonical singularities if and only if every $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(X, \eta, \beta)$ satisfies the Reid–Shepherd-Barron–Tai inequality (cf. [Re], [T], [Re2]).

**Proof of the if-part of Theorem 6.7** Let $(X, \eta, \beta)$ be a Prym curve, $C = st(X)$ and $C_j \subset X$ an elliptic tail with $\text{Aut}(C_j) = \mathbb{Z}_6$ and we assume $\eta_{C_j} = \mathcal{O}_{C_j}$. We fix an elliptic tail automorphism $\sigma_C$ with respect to $C_j$ such that $\text{ord}(\sigma_C) = 6$. Then $\sigma_C$ acts on $\mathbb{C}^{3g-3}$ by $t_1 \mapsto \zeta_6 t_1$, $t_2 \mapsto \zeta_6^2 t_2$ for an appropriate sixth root of unity $\zeta_6$ and $\sigma \cdot t_i = t_i$ for $i \neq 1, 2$.

Here $t_1, t_2 \in \text{Ext}^1(\mathcal{O}_{C_j}, \mathcal{O}_C)$ correspond to smoothing the node $p_1 \in C_j \cap (C - C_j)$ and deforming the curve $[C_j, p_1] \in \mathcal{R}_{1,1}$ respectively. Since $\eta_{C_j} = \mathcal{O}_{C_j}$, the automorphism $\sigma_C$ lifts to an automorphism $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(X, \eta, \beta)$ such that $\sigma_{|C_j}$ is the identity. Then $\sigma$ acts on $\mathbb{C}^{3g-3}$ as $\sigma \cdot t_1 = \zeta_6 t_1$, $\sigma \cdot t_2 = \zeta_6^2 t_2$ and $\sigma \cdot t_i = t_i$ for $i \neq 1, 2$. Since $v_1 = \tau_1^g$ and $v_2 = \tau_2$, the action of $\sigma$ on $\mathbb{C}^{3g-3}$ is $v_1 \mapsto \zeta_6^2 v_1$, $v_2 \mapsto \zeta_6^2 v_2$ and $v_i \mapsto v_i$, $i \neq 1, 2$. We compute $\text{age}(\sigma, \zeta_6^2) = \frac{1}{3} + \frac{2}{3} + 0 + \cdots + 0 = \frac{2}{3} < 1$, that is, $[X, \eta, \beta] \in \mathcal{R}_g$ is a non-canonical singularity. Similarly, an elliptic tail automorphism of order 3 with respect to $C_j$ acts via $t_1 \mapsto \zeta_3^2 t_1$, $t_2 \mapsto \zeta_3 t_2$ and $t_i \mapsto t_i$, $i \neq 1, 2$, and then for the action on $\mathbb{C}^{3g-3}$ as $v_1 \mapsto \zeta_3 v_1$, $v_2 \mapsto \zeta_3 v_2$ and $v_i \mapsto v_i$ for $i \neq 1, 2$. This gives a value of $\frac{2}{3}$ for the age.

Suppose that $[X, \eta, \beta] \in \mathcal{R}_g$ is a non-canonical singularity. Then there exists an automorphism $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(X, \eta, \beta)$ of order $n$ which acts on $\mathbb{C}^{3g-3}$ such that $\text{age}(\sigma, \zeta_n) < 1$. Let $p_0, p_1 = \sigma_C(p_0), \ldots, p_{n-1} = \sigma_C^{n-1}(p_0)$ be distinct nodes of $C$ which are cyclically permuted by the induced automorphism $\sigma_C$ and $p_i$ is not an elliptic tail node. The
The possibility of contribution of \( \sigma \) is given by the matrix
\[
B = \begin{pmatrix}
0 & c_1 \\
\vdots & \ddots \\
c_m & 0 & \cdots & 0
\end{pmatrix}
\]
for appropriate scalars \( c_j \neq 0 \). The pair \((X, \eta, \beta, \sigma)\) is said to be singularity reduced if for every such cycle we have that \( \prod_{j=1}^m c_j \neq 1 \).

**Proposition 6.8.** ([HM], [Lud] Proposition 3.6) There exists a deformation \((X', \eta', \beta')\) of \((X, \eta, \beta)\) such that \( \sigma \) deforms to an automorphism \( \sigma' \in \text{Aut}(X', \eta', \beta') \) and the nodes of every cycle of nodes as above with \( \prod_{j=1}^m c_j = 1 \) are smoothed. The pair \((X', \eta', \beta'), \sigma'\) is then singularity reduced and the action of \( \sigma \) on \( \mathbb{C}^{3g-3} \) and that of \( \sigma' \) on \( \mathbb{C}^{3g-3} \) have the same eigenvalues and hence the same age.

We fix a singularity reduced pair \((X, \eta, \beta, \sigma)\) with \( n := \text{ord}(\sigma) \geq 2 \) and assume that \( \text{age}(\sigma, \zeta_n) < 1 \). We denote this assumption by \( (*) \). Using [Lud] Proposition 3.7 we obtain that if \( (*) \) holds, the induced automorphism \( \sigma_C \) of \( C = \text{st}(X) \) fixes every node with the possible exception of two nodes which are interchanged.

**Proposition 6.9.** If \( (*) \) holds, then \( \sigma_C \) fixes all components of the stable model \( C \) of \( X \).

**Proof.** Let \( C_{i_0}, C_{i_1}, \ldots, C_{i_{m-1}} = \sigma_C^{-1}(C_{i_0}) \) be distinct components of \( C \), \( \sigma_C^{m-1}(C_{i_0}) = C_{i_0} \) and assume that \( m \geq 2 \). Most of the proof of Proposition 3.8 in [Lud] applies to the case of Prym curves and implies that the normalization \( C'_{i_0} \) is rational and there are exactly three preimages of nodes \( p_1', p_2', p_3' \in C'_{i_0} \) mapping to different nodes of \( C \). By [Lud] Proposition 3.7 at least one of \( p_1', p_2', p_3' \) is fixed by \( \sigma_C \). If either one or all three nodes are fixed, then \( g(C) = 2 \), impossible. Thus two nodes, say \( p_1 \) and \( p_2 \), are fixed by \( \sigma_C \) while \( p_3 \) is interchanged with a fourth node \( p_4 \). Interchanging \( p_3 \) and \( p_4 \) gives a contribution of \( \frac{1}{2} \) to \( \text{age}(\sigma, \zeta_n) \). Now consider the action of \( \sigma_C \) near \( p_1 \) and let \( xy = 0 \) be a local equation of \( C \) at \( p_1 \). We have that \( t_1 = xy \mapsto x \) and \( t_1 \mapsto \pm t_1 \), where the minus sign is only possible if \( p_1 \in N \). Since \( p_1 \) is not an elliptic tail node and \((X, \eta, \beta, \sigma)\) is singularity reduced, we have \( t_1 \mapsto -t_1 \), which gives an additional contribution of \( \frac{1}{2} \) to the age, that is, \( \text{age}(\sigma, \zeta_n) \geq \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} = 1 \), contradicting \( (*) \). \( \square \)

**Proposition 6.10** ([HM] p. 28, 36, [Lud] Proposition 3.9). We assume that \( (*) \) holds and denote by \( \varphi_j = \sigma_C^{-1} \) the induced automorphism of the normalization \( C_j' \) of the irreducible component \( C_j \) of \( C \). Then the pair \((C_j', \varphi_j)\) is one of the following types:

(i) \( \varphi_j = \text{Id}_{C_j'} \) and \( C_j' \) arbitrary.

(ii) \( C_j' \) is rational and \( \text{ord}(\varphi_j) = 2, 4 \).

(iii) \( C_j' \) is elliptic and \( \text{ord}(\varphi_j) = 2, 4, 3, 6 \).

(iv) \( C_j' \) is hyperelliptic of genus 2 and \( \varphi_j \) is the hyperelliptic involution.

(v) \( C_j' \) is hyperelliptic of genus 3 and \( \varphi_j \) is the hyperelliptic involution.

(vi) \( C_j' \) is bielliptic of genus 2 and \( \varphi_j \) is the associated involution.

The possibility of \( \sigma_C \) interchanging two nodes does not appear, cf. [Lud] Prop. 3.10:
Proposition 6.11. Under the assumption (\(*\)), the automorphism \(\sigma_C\) fixes all the nodes of \(C\).

Proposition 6.12. Assume (\(*\)) holds. Let \(C_j\) be a component of \(C\) with normalization \(C_j'\), \(D_j\) the divisor of the marked points on \(C_j'\) and \(\varphi_j = \sigma_{C_j'}\). Then \((C_j', D_j, \varphi_j)\) is of one of the following types and the contribution to \(\text{age}(\sigma, \zeta\eta)\) coming from \(H^1(\mathcal{C}_j'(\mathcal{T}_{C_j'}(-D_j))) \subset \mathbb{C}^{3g-3}\) is at least the following quantity \(w_j\):

(i) Identity component: \(\varphi_j = 1d_{C_j'},\) arbitrary pair \((C_j', D_j)\) and \(w_j = 0\)
(ii) Elliptic tail: \(C_j'\) is elliptic, \(D_j = p_1^+ + p_1^-\) is fixed by \(\varphi_j\).
   order 2: \(\text{ord}(\varphi_j) = 2\) and \(w_j = 0\)
   order 4: \(C_j'\) has \(j\)-invariant 1728, \(\text{ord}(\varphi_j) = 4\) and \(w_j = \frac{1}{2}\)
   order 3, 6: \(C_j'\) has \(j\)-invariant 0, \(\text{ord}(\varphi_j) = 3\) or \(6\) and \(w_j = \frac{3}{2}\)
(iii) Elliptic ladder: \(C_j'\) is elliptic, \(D_j = p_1^+ + p_2^\pm\), with \(p_1^+\) and \(p_2^\pm\) both fixed by \(\varphi_j\).
   order 2: \(\text{ord}(\varphi_j) = 2\) and \(w_j = \frac{1}{2}\)
   order 4: \(C_j'\) has \(j\)-invariant 1728, \(\text{ord}(\varphi_j) = 4\) and \(w_j = \frac{3}{2}\)
   order 3: \(C_j'\) has \(j\)-invariant 0, \(\text{ord}(\varphi_j) = 3\) and \(w_j = \frac{2}{3}\)
(iv) Hyperelliptic tail: \(C_j'\) has genus 2, \(\varphi_j\) is the hyperelliptic involution, \(D_j\) is of the form 
   \(\eta_j = p_1^+\) with \(p_1^+\) fixed by \(\varphi_j\) and \(w_j = \frac{1}{2}\).

Proof. The proof is along the lines of the proof of Proposition 3.11 in [Luc]. The only difference occurs in the case of a singular elliptic tail on which \(\sigma\) acts with order 2. Assume that \(C_j'\) is rational, \(D_j = p_1^+ + p_1^- + p_2^\pm\), with \(\text{ord}(\varphi_j) = 2\) which fixes \(p_2^\pm\) and interchanges \(p_1^+\) and \(p_1^-\). If \(xy = 0\) is an equation for \(C\) at \(p_1\), then \(\sigma_C\) acts via \(t_1 = xy \mapsto yx = t_1\). Since \(p_1\) is not an elliptic tail node and \(((X, \eta, \beta), \sigma)\) is singularity reduced, the node \(p_1\) must be exceptional and \(\sigma \cdot \tau_1 = -\tau_1\).

A deformation of \((X, \eta, \beta)\) over the locus \((\tau_i = 0)_{i \neq 1} \subset \mathbb{C}^{3g-3}\) smooths \(p_1\). Furthermore, \(\sigma\) deforms to an automorphism \(\sigma'\) of a general Prym curve \((X', \eta', \beta')\) over this locus, \(\varphi_j\) deforms to the involution \(\varphi'_j\) on the smooth elliptic tail \(C_j'\) such that it fixes the line bundle \(\eta'_{C_j}\), and the restrictions of \(\sigma\) and \(\sigma'\) to the complement of \(C_j\) resp. \(C_j'\) coincide. Over the non-exceptional subcurve \(\tilde{X} \subset X\) we have \((\varphi'_j)'^* \eta'_j \cong \eta'_j\). Thus \(\sigma \cdot \tau_1 = \tau_1\) which is a contradiction. The case of a singular elliptic tail is thus excluded. \(\square\)

Proposition 6.13. Under the hypothesis (\(*\)), the hyperelliptic tail case does not occur.

Proof. Let \(C_j\) be a genus 2 tail of \(C\) and \(C_j'\) the second component through \(p_1\). The action of \(\sigma\) on \(H^1(C_j', \mathcal{T}_{C_j'}(-D_j))\) contributes \(\frac{1}{2}\) to the age of \(\sigma\) and \(C_j'\) has to be one of the cases of Proposition 6.12. If \(C_j'\) is elliptic, then \(g(C) = 3\). If \(C_j'\) is a hyperelliptic tail or an elliptic ladder, the action on \(H^1(C_j', \mathcal{T}_{C_j'}(-D_j'))\) contributes at least \(\frac{1}{2}\). Therefore \(\sigma_C\) is an identity component. If \(xy = 0\) is an equation for \(C\) at \(p_1\), then \(\sigma_C\) acts via \(t_1 = xy \mapsto -yx = -t_1\). The node \(p_1\) is disconnecting, hence non-exceptional, and it is not an elliptic tail node. Therefore, \(\nu_1 = \tau_1 = t_1\) and \(\sigma\) acts as \(\sigma \cdot \nu_1 = -\nu_1\). This gives an additional contribution of \(\frac{1}{2}\) to the age of \(\sigma\) finishing the proof. \(\square\)

Proof. Let $C_j$ be an elliptic ladder of $C$ of order $n_j = \text{ord}(\varphi_j)$ and denote by $C_{j'}$ resp. $C_{j''}$ the second component through the node $p_1$ resp. $p_2$. Since every elliptic ladder contributes at least $\frac{1}{2}$ to the age, $C_{j'}$ and $C_{j''}$ can only be elliptic tails or identity components. If both are elliptic tails, then $g(C) = 3$, hence we may assume that $C_{j'}$ is an identity component. If $xy = 0$ is an equation for $C$ at $p_1$, then $\sigma_C$ acts as $x \mapsto x$, $y \mapsto \alpha y$ and $t_1 \mapsto \alpha t_1$, where $\alpha$ is a primitive $n_j$-th root of 1. If $p_1$ is non-exceptional then $v_1 = \tau_1 = t_1$ and the space $H^1(C_{j'}, T_{C_{j'}}(-D_j)) \oplus \mathbb{C} \cdot v_1$ contributes to the age at least
\[
1 = \begin{cases} 
\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{4} & \text{if } n_j = 2 \\
\frac{1}{3} + \frac{1}{4} & \text{if } n_j = 4 \\
\frac{2}{3} + \frac{1}{3} & \text{if } n_j = 3 
\end{cases}
\]
Therefore $p_1 \in N$. Since $N \subset \Gamma(C)$ is an eulerian subgraph, the node $p_2$ is also exceptional, both $p_1$ and $p_2$ are non-disconnecting and $C_{j''}$ is an identity component as well. Moreover $\sigma_C \cdot t_i = \alpha t_i$, $i = 1, 2$. Since $v_1 = \tau_1$ and $\tau_2^2 = t_2$ for $i = 1, 2$, we find that $\sigma \cdot v_i = \alpha_i v_i$, $i = 1, 2$, where $\alpha_i$ is a square root of $\alpha$. Therefore, the contribution to the age of $\sigma$ coming from $H^1(C_{j'}, T_{C_{j'}}(-D_j)) \oplus \mathbb{C} \cdot v_1 \oplus \mathbb{C} \cdot v_2$ is at least
\[
1 = \begin{cases} 
\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{2} & \text{if } n_j = 2 \\
\frac{1}{3} + \frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{3} & \text{if } n_j = 4 \\
\frac{2}{3} + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{6} & \text{if } n_j = 3 
\end{cases}
\]
and the case of elliptic ladders is excluded. \hfill \Box

Proposition 6.15. Under hypothesis $(\ast)$, the case of an elliptic tail of order 4 does not occur.

Proof. Let $C_j$ be an elliptic tail of order 4 and $C_{j'}$ another component of $C$ through $p_1$. Then $\sigma_C \mid C_{j'} = \text{Id}_{C_{j'}}$ and $\sigma_C$ acts as $t_1 = xy \mapsto \zeta_4 xy = \zeta_4 t_1$ for a suitable fourth root $\zeta_4$ of 1. Since $p_1$ is an elliptic tail node, we have $v_1 = t_1^2$ and $\sigma \cdot v_1 = -v_1$. The action of $\sigma$ on $H^1(C_{j'}, T_{C_{j'}}(-D_j)) \oplus \mathbb{C} \cdot v_1$ contributes $\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} = 1$ to age($\sigma, \zeta_4$) excluding this case. \hfill \Box

Proposition 6.16. In situation $(\ast)$ there has to be at least one elliptic tail of order 3 or 6.

Proof. Assume to the contrary that every component of $C$ is either an identity component or an elliptic tail of order 2. The action of $\sigma$ on every space $H^1(C_{j'}, T_{C_{j'}}(-D_j))$ is trivial. If $p_1$ is the node of an elliptic tail of order 2, then $\sigma_C \cdot t_1 = -t_1$ and we have $v_1 = \tau_1^2 = t_1^2$ and $\sigma \cdot v_1 = v_1$. In case $p_1$ is non-exceptional but not an elliptic tail node, $\sigma_C \cdot t_1 = t_1$. Since $v_1 = \tau_1 = t_1$, we find that $\sigma$ fixes $v_1$. If $p_1 \in N$, then $\sigma_C \cdot t_1 = t_1$ and $v_1^2 = \tau_1^2 = t_1$ and $\sigma$ acts as $v_1 \mapsto \pm v_1$. Since age($\sigma, \zeta_n$) $< 1$, there is exactly one node $p_1$ such that $\sigma \cdot v_1 = -v_1$, that is, $\sigma$ acts as quasi-reflection on $\mathbb{C} \overline{\rho}^{-3}$, a contradiction. \hfill \Box

Proof of the only-if-part of Theorem 6.7. We proved, that if $((X, \eta, \beta), \sigma)$ is a singularity reduced pair and age($\sigma, \zeta_n$) $< 1$, where $n = \text{ord}(\sigma)$, there exists an elliptic tail $C_j \subset C$ with $\text{Aut}(C_j) = \mathbb{Z}_n$ such that $\text{ord}(\text{ord}(\sigma) C_j) \in \{3, 6\}$. Since $\sigma_{C_j}^* (\eta_{C_j}) \cong \eta_{C_j}$, we find that $\eta_{C_j} = \mathcal{O}_{C_j}$. Let $((X, \eta, \beta), \sigma)$ be a pair consisting of a Prym curve and an automorphism such that the age($\sigma, \zeta_n$) $< 1$. By Proposition 6.8 we may deform $((X, \eta, \beta), \sigma)$ to a singularity reduced pair $((X', \eta', \beta'), \sigma')$ such that the actions of $\sigma$ on $\mathbb{C} \overline{\rho}^{-3}$ and $\sigma'$ on $\mathbb{C} \overline{\rho}^{-3}$ have the same ages. Therefore $X'$ has an elliptic tail $C_j'$ with $\text{Aut}(C_j') = \mathbb{Z}_n$ such that $\eta_{C_j}'$
is trivial and $\sigma'$ acts on $C'_j$ of order 3 or 6. In the deformation of $(X, \eta, \beta)$ to $(X', \eta', \beta')$ elliptic tails are preserved hence $((X, \eta, \beta), \sigma)$ enjoys the same properties. \hfill \Box

Remark 6.17. If $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(X, \eta, \beta)$ satisfies the inequality $\text{age}(\eta, \sigma) < 1$ (with respect to the action on $\mathbb{C}^{g-3}$), then $\sigma$ is an elliptic tail automorphism and $\text{ord}(\sigma) \in \{3, 6\}$. Indeed, we already know that $\sigma_C \in \text{Aut}(C)$ acts with order 3 or 6 on an elliptic tail $C_j$. The action of $\sigma$ on $H^1(C', T_{C'}(-D'))$ and the $\nu$-coordinate corresponding to the elliptic tail node on $C_j$ contributes at least $\frac{2}{3}$ to $\text{age}(\eta, \sigma)$. Thus there is exactly one elliptic tail of order 3 or 6 and $\sigma_C$ is an elliptic tail automorphism of the same order. If $\sigma$ is not an elliptic tail automorphism of $X$, then there exists an exceptional component $E_1 \subset X$ on which $\sigma$ acts non-trivially. Since $E_1$ connects two non-exceptional components of $X$ on which $\sigma$ acts trivially, $\sigma \cdot v_1 = -v_1$, giving a contribution of $\frac{1}{2}$ and an age $\geq \frac{2}{3} + \frac{1}{2} \geq 1$.  

Proof of Theorem 6.1. We start with a pluricanonical form $\omega$ on $\overline{\mathbb{R}}_g^{\text{reg}}$ and show that $\omega$ lifts to a desingularization of a neighbourhood of every point $[X, \eta, \beta] \in \mathbb{R}_g$. We may assume that $[X, \eta, \beta]$ is a general non-canonical singularity of $\mathbb{R}_g$, hence $X = C_1 \cup_p C_2$, where $[C_1, p] \in M_{g-1,1}$ is general and $[C_2, p] \in M_{1,1}$ has $j$-invariant 0. Furthermore $\eta_{C_2} = \mathcal{O}_{C_2}$ and $\eta_1 := \eta_{C_1} \in \text{Pic}(C_1)$[2]. We consider the pencil $\phi : \mathcal{M}_{1,1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_g$ given by $\phi(C', p) = [C' \cup_p C_1, \eta_{C'} = \mathcal{O}_{C'}, \eta_{C_1} = \eta_1]$. Since $\phi(M_{1,1}) \cap \Delta_0^{\text{reg}} = \emptyset$, we imitate [HIM] pg. 41-44 and construct an explicit open neighbourhood $\overline{\mathbb{R}}_g \supset S \supset \phi(M_{1,1})$ such that the restriction to $S$ of $\pi : \mathbb{R}_g \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{1,1}$ is an isomorphism and every form $\omega \in H^0(\mathbb{R}_g^{\text{reg}}, \mathcal{K}_{\mathbb{R}_g}^{\text{reg}})$ extends to a resolution $\tilde{S}$ of $S$. For an arbitrary non-canonical singularity we show that $\omega$ extends locally to a desingularization along the lines of [Lud] Theorem 4.1. \hfill \Box
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