AN EXCEPTIONAL LOCUS IN THE PERFECT COMPACTIFICATION OF $A_g$
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1 Introduction

This paper is a sequel to [SB]. The main result of that was a description of the cone $\overline{NE}(A_g^P)$ of curves on the perfect compactification of the coarse moduli space $A_g$ (the notation will be explained below). In particular, the $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor class $L_g = 12H_g - D_g$ is nef but not ample. Here we make this result more explicit in two ways: we identify the exceptional locus $\text{Exc}(L_g)$ as the locus $A_{g-1}^{P,g}$ inside $A_g^P$ that is the closure of the locus in $A_g$ that parametrizes abelian varieties with an elliptic factor, and we show that $L_g$ is semi-ample in positive characteristic. We do not know whether $L_g$ is semi-ample in characteristic zero.

Recall that $A_g$ is known to be of general type if $g \geq 7$ and the characteristic is zero, and that the canonical class is given by $K_{A_g^P} \sim (g+1)H_g - D_g$. It follows (Corollary 4.8) that, if $7 \leq g \leq 10$, then $K_{A_g^P}$ is not nef and therefore the first step in running the characteristic zero Minimal Model Program on $A_g^P$ is a flipping contraction that, in particular, crushes the locus that parametrizes products of $g$ elliptic curves to a point. In particular, each non-trivial fibre of this contraction penetrates $A_g$, which we regard as the interior of $A_g^P$. Therefore to run the MMP on $A_g^P$ (which has terminal singularities if $g \geq 6$; see [AS] for a proof of this that completes the argument in [SB]) while maintaining a modular interpretation would necessitate changing the definition of “principally polarized abelian variety” in the presence of elliptic factors. In contrast, there is a prospect that the MMP for the coarse moduli space $\overline{M}_g$ of stable curves of genus $g$ will run in a way that does not touch the interior of $\overline{M}_g$, where in this context “interior” refers to the locus $M_g$ of smooth curves [HH].

Here is some of the notation used in this paper. We let $A_g$ denote the stack, and $A_g = [A_g]$ the coarse moduli space, of principally polarized abelian $g$-folds and $A_g^P$, $A_g^F$ their perfect compactifications. These are particular toroidal compactifications, and dominate the Satake compactification $A_g^{Sat}$ of $A_g$. Stacks that classify abelian varieties with level $n$ structures will be denoted by $A_{g,n}$, etc. In general the geometric quotient of an algebraic stack $\mathcal{X}$ will, when it exists, be denoted by $[\mathcal{X}]$.

We let $H_g$ denote the line bundle of weight 1 modular forms on $A_g^P$. It gives a $\mathbb{Q}$-line bundle on $A_g^P$ that can, in turn, be identified with the pullback of a $\mathbb{Q}$-line bundle on $A_g^{Sat}$. The boundary $D_g = A_g^P \setminus A_g$ is a geometrically...
irreducible Q-Cartier divisor, but is not Cartier; even at the stack level there are denominators.

The objects $A_g^P$ and $A_g^P$ exist over $\text{Spec} \mathbb{Z}$ and there is a contraction $\pi : A_g^P \to A_g^S$ that factors through $A_g^P$; see $[FC]$ for this. As mentioned above, the main result of $[SB]$ is a description of the cone of curves $\overline{NE}$ (in Mori’s sense) of $A_g^P$ over any field: $\overline{NE}(A_g^P)$ is the rational cone spanned by certain curves $C_1$ and $C_2$. Here $C_1$ is the closure of the locus of products $E \times B$, where $E$ is a varying elliptic curve and $B \in A_{g-1}$ is fixed (so that $C_1$ is a copy of $A_1^P$, the compactified j-line) and $C_2$ is any curve in the boundary divisor $D_g = A_g^P \setminus A_g$ such that $\pi(C_2)$ is a point.

In consequence $[SB]$, $aH_g - D_g$ is ample on $A_g^P$ (or on $A_g^P$) if and only if $a > 12$, and is nef if and only if $a \geq 12$. (I am grateful to Alexeev for pointing out that the notion of an ample invertible sheaf makes sense on any proper stack $\mathcal{X}$ with finite inertia and geometric quotient $X = [\mathcal{X}]$: the invertible sheaf $\mathcal{L}$ on $\mathcal{X}$ is ample if and only if, for all coherent sheaves $\mathcal{F}$ on $\mathcal{X}$, $H^i(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}^\otimes n \otimes \mathcal{F}) = 0$ for all $i > 0$ and for all $n \gg 0$. If $\mathcal{L}$ corresponds to the Q-line bundle $L$ on $X$, then $\mathcal{L}$ is ample if and only if $L$ is so. Note also that, even more obviously, the notions of nef and semi-ample are insensitive to the distinction between $\mathcal{X}$ and $X$, and $\text{Exc}(\mathcal{L})$ is exactly the inverse image in $\mathcal{X}$ of $\text{Exc}(L)$.)

Recall $[Ke]$ that if $L$ is a nef divisor class on a projective variety $X$, then the exceptional locus $\text{Exc}(L)$ of $L$ is the union of all the subvarieties $Z$ of $X$ with $L^\dim Z, Z = 0$, and that $L$ is semi-ample on $X$ provided that it is semi-ample on $\text{Exc}(L)$ and the ground field $k$ has char $k > 0$. Notice that Keel’s result holds without change when $X$ is allowed to be any proper stack over a field whose inertia stack is finite (so that a geometric quotient of $X$ exists as a proper algebraic space, by $[KM]$) and whose geometric quotient is projective.

Here is the main result of this paper; I am very grateful to Stefan Schröer, who asked whether $12H_g - D_g$ is semi-ample in positive characteristic.

**Theorem 1.1** (= Theorem 3.3) Suppose that the base is a field $k$ and set $L_g = 12H_g - D_g$.

1. $\text{Exc}(L_g)$ is the subvariety $A_{1,g-1}^P$ that is the image of the stack $A_{1,g-1}^P$ defined in Corollary 3.2.3.

2. Suppose either that char $k = 0$ and that $g \leq 11$ or that char $k > 0$ and that $g$ is arbitrary. Then $L_g$ is semi-ample. For a sufficiently divisible integer $n$ the linear system $|mL_g|$ defines a birational morphism $\phi_{[mL_g]} : A_g^P \to V_g$ onto a normal projective $k$-variety $V_g$ that contracts the ray $R_1$ generated by the curve $C_1$.

3. The normalization of the image $\phi_{[mL_g]}(\text{Exc}(L_g))$ is isomorphic to $V_{g-1}$.

Observe that $V_g$ can be regarded as being obtained from $A_g^P$ by “crushing elliptic factors to points”. From this point of view it is not clear a priori that $V_g$ exists as an algebraic variety; indeed, we are unable to prove such a statement when $g \geq 12$ and the characteristic is zero.
2 A remark and an example

Given a principally polarized abelian variety \((A, \lambda)\) there is not usually a theta divisor \(\theta\) on \(A\), although there is a natural line bundle \(L_{2\lambda}\) associated to \(2\lambda\). However, the stack \(A_g\) is naturally isomorphic to the stack \(X_g\) of pairs \((X, \theta)\) where \(X\) is a symmetric torsor under \(A\) and \(\theta\) is an ample divisor on \(X\) that defines \(\lambda\) on \(A = \text{Aut}^0_X\). Moreover, \((X, \theta)\) has a 1-dimensional factor if and only if \((A, \lambda)\) has an elliptic factor.

It is sometimes convenient to identify \(X_g\) with \(A_g\) and to consider pairs \((X, \theta)\) instead of ppavs \((A, \lambda)\).

Now we recall [H, DO] some of the classical geometry of the moduli space \(A_2\) over \(\mathbb{C}\).

A level 2 structure on a principally polarized abelian surface \((A, \lambda)\) is a symplectic isomorphism \(\psi: A[2] \to G := (\mathbb{Z}/2)^2 \times \mu_2^2\), where \(G\) has its standard symplectic pairing and \(A[2]\) has the Weil pairing defined by the principal polarization \(\lambda\). There is a standard projective action of \(G\) on \(\mathbb{P}^3\); the linear system \(|2\theta|\) on \(X\) then gives a \(G\)-equivariant morphism \(X \to \mathbb{P}^3\) that factors through the Kummer surface \(\text{Km}(X) = X/(-1)\). The image of \(\text{Km}(X)\) lies in a unique \(G\)-invariant quartic; taking the coefficients of this quartic then determines a point on \(\Sigma\), the Segre cubic threefold [H]; this is the unique cubic threefold with 10 nodes and lies in \(\mathbb{P}^5\) with equations \(e_1 = e_3 = 0\), where \(e_i\) is the \(i\)th elementary symmetric function in 6 variables. If \((X, \theta)\) is irreducible then \(|2\theta|\) is very ample on \(\text{Km}(X)\), so \((X, \theta)\) is determined by the point on \(\Sigma\), while if \(X = E_1 \times E_2\), where \(E_1, E_2\) are curves of genus 1, then the image of \(\text{Km}(X)\) is \(\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1\), which does not determine \(X\).

There are also 15 planes on \(\Sigma\). Let \(\overline{\Sigma} \to \Sigma\) be the blow-up of the nodes, \(\Pi = \sum \Pi_i\) the exceptional divisor of the blow-up and \(D = \sum D_i\) the strict transform of the sum of the planes.

If \(G\) is a finite group acting on a variety \(V\) then we let \(V/G\) denote the geometric quotient.

Theorem 2.1 (1) \(\overline{\Sigma} = A_{2,2}^P\), the perfect compactification of the level 2 moduli space \(A_{2,2}\). \(D\) is the toroidal boundary and \(\Pi\) the locus of products \(E_1 \times E_2\) of elliptic curves.

(2) \(A_{2,2}^P\) has two distinct birational contractions: one is the standard contraction \(\pi: A_{2,2}^P \to \Sigma\) and the other is a birational contraction \(\rho: A_{2,2}^P \to \Sigma/\mathfrak{S}_6\), where \(\mathfrak{S}_6\) is the symmetric group on 6 letters and is isomorphic to \(S_{P_4}(\mathbb{F}_2)\).

(3) \(\Sigma/\mathfrak{S}_6\) is isomorphic to a weighted projective space \(\mathbb{P}(2, 4, 5, 6)\); \(A_{2,2}^{Sat}\) is isomorphic to the Igusa quartic \(e_1 = e_4 - e_2^2 = 0\) in \(\mathbb{P}^5\) (this is also the projective dual of \(\Sigma\)); and \(A_{2,2}^{Sat}\) is isomorphic to \(\mathbb{P}(2, 3, 5, 6)\).

From one point of view, the point of Theorem [1.1] is to extend this picture, albeit in a more abstract way, to all values of \(g\).
3 The structure of the perfect boundary

For any \( g \) let \( \Lambda_g \) be a fixed copy of \( \mathbb{Z}^g \) and \( B(\Lambda_g) \) the \( \mathbb{Z} \)-module of symmetric bilinear \( \mathbb{Z} \)-valued bilinear forms on \( \Lambda_g \). Let \( C_g \) denote the cone of real positive definite symmetric bilinear forms in \( g \) variables and \( \overline{C}_g \) the cone of real positive semi-definite symmetric bilinear forms in \( g \) variables. We identify both of these as subsets of \( B(\Lambda_g) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{R} \). Identify \( C_g \) with the interior of \( \overline{C}_g^0 \) of \( \overline{C}_g \). A toroidal compactification of \( \Lambda_g \) or \( A_g \) corresponds to a choice of \( GL_g(\mathbb{Z}) \)-admissible decomposition of \( \overline{C}_g \), as defined in \([AMRT]\). We consider here a particular admissible decomposition \( \Sigma_g^P \) of \( \overline{C}_g \), namely, that defined by the perfect quadratic forms. It is called the perfect decomposition and the cones appearing in it (that is, the facets) are the perfect cones. It is described in Theorem 3.1 below. Since our results are particular to this specific toroidal compactification, the arguments of this paper depend upon knowing something about perfect forms and the combinatorics of the decomposition of \( \overline{C}_g \) that they define. The cones of maximal dimension \( g(g+1)/2 \) correspond to perfect quadratic forms (this can be taken as the definition of a perfect quadratic form).

**Theorem 3.1**  (1) (Voronoi) \([AMRT]\) The convex hull of the positive semi-definite integral forms in \( \overline{C}_g \) defines a \( GL_g(\mathbb{Z}) \)-admissible decomposition \( \Sigma_g^P \) of \( \overline{C}_g \).

(2) (Barnes-Cohn) \([BC]\) This convex hull coincides with the convex hull of the primitive rank 1 forms. Moreover, a form of rank at least 2 lies in the interior of the hull.

(3) If \( p = p(x_1, ..., x_m) \) and \( q = q(y_1, ..., y_n) \) are perfect forms of equal minimal norm, then \( p + q = r = r(x_1, ..., x_m, y_1, ..., y_n) \) is a form that defines a perfect cone in \( \overline{C}_{m+n} \).

(4) Suppose that \( \tau \) is a perfect cone in \( \overline{C}_r \) that meets \( C_r \). Then its closure contains perfect cones in some copy of \( \overline{C}_{r-1} \). In particular, if \( \tau \) is a minimal perfect cone in \( \overline{C}_r \) that meets \( C_r \), then \( \tau \cap \overline{C}_{r-1} \) is a union of minimal perfect cones in \( \overline{C}_{r-1} \) that meet \( C_{r-1} \).

(5) Suppose that \( \sigma \) is a maximal perfect cone in \( \overline{C}_r \), so that \( \sigma \) is defined by a perfect form \( q \) in \( r \) variables. Suppose also that \( \tau_1, \tau_2 \) are closed cones in \( \overline{C}_{r+1} \) such that both contain \( \sigma \) in their boundary and \( \dim \tau_i = \dim \sigma + 1 \). That is, both cones \( \tau_i \) are minimal with respect to containing \( \sigma \) in their boundary. Then each \( \tau_i \) can be defined by a quadratic form \( \lambda q + l_i^2 \), where \( l_i \) is a primitive linear form and \( \lambda \in \mathbb{Q} \) is the inverse of the minimal norm of \( q \). In particular, \( \tau_1 \) and \( \tau_2 \) are conjugate under the parabolic subgroup of \( GL_{r+1}(\mathbb{Z}) \) that preserves each of the first \( r \) variables.

**PROOF:** For (1) and (2) see the references. (3) is trivial. For (4), we can suppose that \( \sigma \) is minimal with respect to meeting \( C_r \). Suppose that \( l_1, ..., l_n \) are primitive elements of \( \Lambda_g' \) such that \( l_1^2, ..., l_n^2 \in B(\Lambda_g) \) span the 1-dimensional faces of \( \sigma \). So there are \( \lambda_1, ..., \lambda_n > 0 \) such that \( \sum \lambda_i l_i^2 \in C_r \). Then, for some \( t \), \( \sum \lambda_i t l_i^2 \) is of...
rank at most \( r - 1 \) for every \( \lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_t > 0 \), while \( \sum_{i=1}^{t+1} \lambda_i l_i^2 \) is of rank \( r \) for some \( \lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_{t+1} > 0 \). Take \( t \) to be maximal subject to this; then the cone \( \tau \) generated by \( l_1^2, \ldots, l_t^2 \) is a face of \( \sigma \) with the stated properties.

(5) is even easier.

We denote by \( A^P_g \) the toroidal compactification of \( A_g \) that corresponds, as in [FC], to the perfect decomposition of \( \overline{C}_g \). The boundary \( D = A^P_g \setminus A_g \) is a divisor, and is the inverse image \( \pi^{-1}(A^\text{Sat}_{g-1}) \), where \( A^\text{Sat}_{g-1} \) is identified with the boundary \( A^\text{Sat}_g \setminus A_g \). We also have the partial compactification \( A^\text{part}_g \), which is open in \( A^\text{tor}_g \) and is, by definition, the inverse image \( \pi^{-1}(A_g \coprod A_{g-1}) \). The universal abelian scheme \( U_{g-r} \to A_{g-r} \) has an extension to a semi-abelian scheme \( U^\text{part}_{g-r} \to A^\text{part}_{g-r} \) whose degenerate fibres have torus rank 1. Taking \( r \)-fold fibre products gives a semi-abelian scheme \( \delta : U^\text{part}_{g-r} \to A^\text{part}_{g-r} \).

In higher codimension the boundary is described as follows. There is a stratified scheme \( F = F_r \), locally of finite type over the base, the closures of whose strata are projective toric varieties, with an action of \( GL_r(\mathbb{Z}) \) on \( F_r \), and an \( F_r \)-bundle \( \overline{F}_r \to U^\text{part}_{g-r} \), with an equivariant action of \( GL_r(\mathbb{Z}) \), such that \( \pi^{-1}(A_{g-r}) = \overline{F}_r/GL_r(\mathbb{Z}) \), the stack quotient. The closures \( F_{r,\tau} \) of the various strata of \( F_r \) correspond to the perfect cones \( \tau \) in the perfect decomposition of \( \overline{C}_r \) that meet the interior \( C_r \). In particular, the irreducible components of \( F_r \) correspond to the minimal such cones.

Here is a more precise description of \( F_r \): put \( \Lambda_r = \mathbb{Z}^{2r} \), let \( B_r \) be the lattice of symmetric bilinear forms on \( \Lambda_r \) and denote by \( T_r \) the torus with character group \( \mathbb{Z}^*(T_r) = B_r \). Then there is a locally finite \( GL_r(\mathbb{Z}) \)-equivariant torus embedding \( T_r \hookrightarrow Y_r \) such that \( F_r \) is a \( T_r \rtimes GL_r(\mathbb{Z}) \)-equivariant closed subscheme of the boundary \( Y_r \setminus T_r \). The closure \( F_{r,\tau} \) of a stratum in \( F_r \) is then a torus embedding under a quotient \( T \) of \( T_r \) and gives rise to the closure \( F_{r,\tau} \) of a stratum in \( F_r \); this closure is a proper \( F_{r,\tau} \)-bundle \( F_{r,\tau} \to U^\text{part}_{g-r} \) that is a relative \( T \)-equivariant compactification of a \( T \)-bundle \( T \to U^\text{part}_{g-r} \).

In turn, the image of \( F_{r,\tau} \) in \( A^P_g \) is an irreducible closed substack \( \mathcal{X}_{r,\tau} \) of \( \pi^{-1}(A_{g-r}) \). If \( n \geq 3 \) and is invertible in the base, then in the stack \( A^P_{g:n} \) the image \( \mathcal{X}_{r,\tau} \) can be identified with \( F_{r,\tau} \). In this case (that is, at level \( n \)) \( T_r \) acts on \( \mathcal{X}_{r,\tau} \), via the quotient \( T_r \to T \), and this action extends to an action on the closure \( \overline{\mathcal{X}}_{r,\tau} \) of \( \mathcal{X}_{r,\tau} \) in \( A^P_{g:n} \).

Each such \( \tau \) lies in the closure of finitely many maximal perfect cones \( \sigma \) in \( \overline{C}_r \). Such a cone \( \sigma \) corresponds to the choice, up to scalars, of a perfect form \( q \) in \( r \) variables. The closure \( \overline{U}_{g-r,\sigma} \) of \( U_{g-r} \) is just \( \overline{\mathcal{X}}_{r,\sigma} \). We let \( \overline{U}^\text{norm}_{g-r,\sigma} \) denote the normalization of \( \overline{U}_{g-r,\sigma} \).

Translating Theorem 3.1 into algebraic geometry yields the following statement.

**Corollary 3.2** (1) (Corollary of 3.1.1) There exist toroidal compactifications \( A^P_g \) and \( A^P_{g:r} \) corresponding to this decomposition.
(2) (Corollary of [3.1 2]) As a Deligne-Mumford stack, \( A_g^P \) has terminal singularities and the boundary \( D \) is absolutely irreducible.

(3) (Corollary of [3.1 3]) The product morphism \( A_g \times A_h \to A_{g+h} \) extends to a morphism \( A_g^P \times A_h^P \to A_{g+h}^P \) whose image is denoted by \( A_{g,h}^P \).

(4) (Corollary of [3.1 4]) \( \pi^{-1}(A_{g-r+1}^{Sat}) \) lies in the closure of \( \pi^{-1}(A_{g-r+1}) \) and \( \pi^{-1}(A_{g-r+1}) \) is the closure of \( \pi^{-1}(A_{g-r+1}) \).

(5) (Corollary of [3.1 5]) A maximal perfect cone \( \sigma \) in \( C_r \) corresponds to an irreducible closed substack \( \overline{U}_{g-r,\sigma} \) of \( \pi^{-1}(A_{g-r}^{Sat}) \) that contains an open substack isomorphic to \( U_{g-r}^{part} \). The complement \( \overline{U}_{g-r,\sigma} \setminus U_{g-r}^{part} \) has codimension at least 2 in \( \overline{U}_{g-r,\sigma} \).

**Proof:** (1), (2) and (3) are immediate.

For (4), we use the fact that the irreducible components \( Z \) of \( \pi^{-1}(A_{g-r}) \) correspond to the (equivalence classes of the) minimal perfect cones \( \tau \) in \( C_r \) that meet \( C_r \). Since, by [3.1 4], \( \tau \cap \partial \overline{C}_r \) is a union of minimal perfect cones in \( \overline{C}_{r-1} \) that meet \( C_{r-1} \), the closure \( \overline{Z} \) of \( Z \) lies in the closure of an irreducible component of \( \pi^{-1}(A_{g-r+1}) \). So \( \pi^{-1}(A_{g-r}) \subseteq \pi^{-1}(A_{g-r+1}) \). Then, by induction, \( \pi^{-1}(A_{g-r-m}) \subseteq \pi^{-1}(A_{g-r+1}) \), so that \( \pi^{-1}(A_{g-r}^{Sat}) \subseteq \pi^{-1}(A_{g-r+1}) \). Therefore \( \pi^{-1}(A_{g-r+1}) = \pi^{-1}(A_{g-r+1}) \).

For (5), note that the irreducible components of \( \overline{U}_{g-r,\sigma} \setminus U_{g-r}^{part} \) correspond to the minimal perfect cones \( \tau \) in \( \overline{C}_{r+1} \) that contain \( \sigma \). These are equivalent, and we are done.

**Definition 3.3** An open substack \( \mathcal{U} \) of an algebraic stack \( \mathcal{X} \) is nearly equal (abbreviated to n.e.) to \( \mathcal{X} \) if its complement has codimension at least 2 everywhere. A near equality is an open embedding \( \mathcal{U} \to \mathcal{X} \) of stacks whose image is nearly equal to its target.

In particular, \( A_g^{part} \) is nearly equal to \( A_g^P \).

4 The exceptional locus of \( 12 H_g - D_g \)

Set \( L_g = 12 H_g - D_g \).

**Proposition 4.1** For sufficiently divisible \( m \), the linear system \( |mL_g| \) has no base points in \( A_g^{part} \) and contracts all curves (that is, complete 1-dimensional substacks) of the form \( A_g^P \times \{ B \} \) where \( B \) is a point in \( A_{g-1} \). This morphism separates points except along \( A_{1,g-1} \cap A_g^{part} \).

**Proof:** First, work over \( \mathbb{Z}[1/2] \) and impose a level 2 structure. We then consider the morphism defined by the 2\( \theta \) linear system: there is a universal family \( f : V \to A_g^{part} \) of projective schemes with level 2 structure, and the 2\( \theta \) linear system defines, by taking the cycle-theoretic image of each fibre of \( f \), a morphism \( \Phi \) from \( A_g^{part} \) to the Chow scheme of \( \mathbb{P}^{2g-1} \). After dividing by the finite group \( Sp_{2g}(\mathbb{Z}/2) \)
we then get a morphism \( \phi \) from \( \mathcal{A}_{g}^{\text{part}} \) to some scheme, and \( \phi \) contracts every curve of the form \( \mathcal{A}_{g}^{p} \times \{ B \} \), since the Kummer variety of an elliptic curve \( E \) is independent of \( E \), so the \( j \)-line collapses to a point. It follows that \( \phi \) is defined by some linear system \([mL_{g}]\), since when \( g = 1 \) the bundle \( H_{g} \) has degree 1/12 and \( D_{g} \) has degree 1.

Over \( \mathbb{Z}[1/3] \) we work at level 3. There is a normalized projective space \( \mathbb{P}^{3g-1} \) such that, given \((X, \theta)\), \( X \) is embedded in \( \mathbb{P}^{3g-1} \) via \([3\theta] \). Let \( Gr \) denote the Grassmannian of quadrics in \( \mathbb{P}^{3g-1} \). Then to \((X, \theta)\) associate the point \( P_{\langle X, \theta \rangle} \) in \( Gr \) that corresponds to the space of quadrics that pass through the image of \( X \) in \( \mathbb{P}^{3g-1} \). Since curve of genus 1 and degree 3 cannot be recovered from the quadrics that contain it (there are no such quadrics), this association defines a morphism \( \mathcal{A}_{g}^{\text{part}} \) that performs a similar function of “losing elliptic factors”.

So pick \( r \geq 2 \) and consider \( L_{g} \) on the inverse image \( \pi^{-1}(A_{g-r}) \), where \( A_{g-r} \) is regarded as a stratification in \( A_{g}^{\text{Sat}} \). The closure \( Z_{r} \) of \( \pi^{-1}(A_{g-r}) \) in \( A_{g}^{P} \) is a finite union of irreducible components \( \mathcal{X}_{r, \tau} \) as above. Note that \( Z_{r} = \pi^{-1}(A_{g-r}^{\text{Sat}}) \), as already pointed out.

Fix a maximal perfect cone \( \sigma \) in \( C_{r} \) and a face \( \tau \) of \( \sigma \) that meets \( C_{r} \). There is, up to scalars, a unique perfect quadratic form \( q \) which defines \( \sigma \) and can be written, in many ways, as a linear combination \( q = \sum_{i}^{r} \lambda_{i} x_{i}^{2} \) where \( x_{i} \) is a primitive integral linear form and \( \lambda_{i} \in \mathbb{Q}_{+} \). Each rank 1 form \( x_{i}^{2} \) corresponds, in \( \text{End}(U_{g-r}^{\text{ur}}) \otimes \mathbb{Q} \), to a projection \( \xi_{i}: U_{g-r}^{\text{ur}} \rightarrow U_{g-r} \) over \( A_{g-r} \). So (since homomorphisms of abelian schemes extend uniquely to homomorphisms of semi-abelian schemes) there is a commutative diagram

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\mathcal{X}_{r, \tau} & \xrightarrow{\text{cl.}} & U_{g-r, \sigma}^{\text{ur}} \\
\downarrow \scriptstyle{\text{cl.}} & & \downarrow \scriptstyle{\text{cl.}} \\
A_{g}^{P} & \xrightarrow{\alpha_{g, r}} & A_{g-r}^{\text{part}} \\
& \downarrow \scriptstyle{\delta} & \downarrow \scriptstyle{\gamma} \\
& \text{n.e.} D_{g-r+1} & \xrightarrow{\text{cl.}} A_{g-r+1}^{P} \\
& \text{n.e.} U_{g-r}^{\text{part}} & \xrightarrow{\xi_{i}} \\
\end{array}
\]

(Here the labels cl. and n.e. refer, respectively, to closed embeddings and near equalities.)

**Proposition 4.2**  Let \( s \) denote the 0-section of \( \delta \). Then the restrictions \( \alpha_{g, r}^{*} D_{g-r}|_{s} \) and \( \delta^{*} D_{g-r}|_{s} \) are linearly equivalent.

**PROOF:**  Recall that the multiplication \( A_{g-r} \times A_{r} \rightarrow A_{g} \) extends to \( A_{g-r}^{P} \times A_{r}^{P} \rightarrow A_{g}^{P} \). The perfect form \( q \) corresponds to a maximally degenerate boundary point \( x \in A_{r}^{P} \), and then the image of \( \{ x \} \times A_{g-r}^{P} \) in \( A_{g}^{P} \) is exactly the closure in \( A_{g}^{P} \) of the zero section of \( U_{g-r}^{\text{ur}} \rightarrow A_{g-r} \).

Identify \( s \) with \( \{ x \} \times A_{g-r}^{\text{part}} \) as above. Then there is a chain of rational curves in \( A_{g}^{P} \) leading from \( x \) to an interior point \( y = E^{r} \), for any elliptic curve \( E \) (let \( E \) degenerate, and then take a chain of rational curves leading from this maximally degenerate boundary point to \( y \)).
So \( D_g \) is rationally equivalent to \( D_g \upharpoonright \{y\} \times \mathcal{A}_{g-r}^{\text{part}} \), and now the result is obvious.

Set \( \Lambda = -\alpha_{g,r}^* D_g + \delta^* D_{g-r} \), a divisor class on \( \mathcal{U}_{g-r}^{\text{part}} \). Since \( \mathcal{U}_{g-r}^{\text{part}} \to \mathcal{A}_{g-r}^{\text{part}} \) is semi-abelian and \( \Lambda \) is trivial on the zero section, \( \Lambda \) is determined by the polarization that it defines on the generic fibre \( \mathcal{U}_{g-r}^{\text{part}} \to \mathcal{A}_{g-r}^{\text{part}} \) that are trivial on the zero section and determined by the polarization that they define on the generic fibre. This is because the only global point of the self-dual abelian scheme \( \mathcal{U}_{g-r}^{\text{part}} \to \mathcal{A}_{g-r}^{\text{part}} \) is zero.

Corollary 4.3

\[
\Lambda \sim \sum_{i=1}^{r} \lambda_i \xi_i^* \left( -D_{g-r+1} \upharpoonright \mathcal{U}_{g-r}^{\text{part}} + \gamma^* D_{g-r} \right).
\]

PROOF: From its definition, and knowledge of the polarization defined by \( -D_g \) on \( \mathcal{U}_{g-r}^{\text{part},q} \), the polarization defined by \( \Lambda \) on \( \mathcal{U}_{g-r}^{\text{part},q} \) is the quadratic form \( q \). The polarization defined by \( -D_{g-r+1} \) on the generic fibre of \( \mathcal{U}_{g-r}^{\text{part}} \) is that given by the primitive rank one form \( x_i^2 \), and we are done.

For \( i = 1, \ldots, r \), choose a large positive integer \( n_i \) and set \( \tilde{\xi}_i = [n_i] \circ \xi_i : \mathcal{U}_{g-r}^{\text{part}} \to \mathcal{U}_{g-r}^{\text{part}} \) and \( \rho_i = \alpha_{g-r+1,1} \circ \tilde{\xi}_i : \mathcal{U}_{g-r}^{\text{part}} \to \mathcal{A}_{g-r+1}^{\text{part}} \). Then

\[
\alpha_{g,r}^* \Lambda \sim \sum_{i=1}^{r} \frac{\lambda_i}{n_i^2} \tilde{\xi}_i^* \left( -D_{g-r+1} \upharpoonright \mathcal{U}_{g-r}^{\text{part}} + \gamma^* D_{g-r} \right),
\]

which can be re-written as

\[
L_g \upharpoonright \mathcal{U}_{g-r}^{\text{part}} \sim \left( 1 - \sum_{i} \frac{\lambda_i}{n_i^2} \right) \delta^* L_{g-r} + \sum_{i} \frac{\lambda_i}{n_i^2} \rho_i^* L_{g-r+1}.
\]

We abbreviate this to

\[
L_g \upharpoonright \mathcal{U}_{g-r}^{\text{part}} \sim a \delta^* L_{g-r} + \sum b_i \rho_i^* L_{g-r+1}.
\]

Note that \( a, b_i > 0 \).

Theorem 4.5

(1) \( L_g \) is nef.

(2) \( \text{Exc}(L_g) = \mathcal{A}_{1,g-1}^{\text{part}} \).

Now suppose also that either that the characteristic is zero and that \( g \leq 11 \) or that the characteristic is positive.

(3) Then \( L_g \) is semi-ample and there is a normal projective \( k \)-variety \( V_g \) and a birational contraction \( \mathcal{A}_g^P \to V_g \) of the ray \( R_1 \) whose exceptional locus is \( \mathcal{A}_{1,g-1}^P \).
(4) The normalization of the image of $A_{1,g-1}^P$ is isomorphic to $V_{g-1}$.

PROOF: (1) was proved in [SB]. However, in order to prove (2) it is simplest to give here another proof of (1) whose techniques can be extended to prove (2) also.

Assume that $L_g$ is not nef, and that $C$ is a complete curve in $A_g^P$ with $L_g.C < 0$. By Proposition 4.4 and since $-D_g$ is $\pi$-ample, there is some minimal $r \geq 2$ such that $C$ maps to a curve in $A_{g-r}^{Sat}$ that does not lie in $A_{g-r}^{Sat}$.

Fix an integer $n \geq 3$ that is prime to $\text{char } k$ and consider the perfect compactification $A_{g,n}^P$ of the level $n$ stack $A_{g,n}$.

Consider $L_g$ on the inverse image $\pi^{-1}(A_{g-r})$, where $A_{g-r}$ is regarded as a locally closed subvariety of $A_{g-r}^{Sat}$. The closure $Z^r$ of $\pi^{-1}(A_{g-r})$ in $A_g^P$ is a finite union of irreducible components $\mathcal{X}_{r,r}$, each of which is the image of an equivariant closure $\mathcal{X}_{r,r,n}$ in $A_{g,n}^P$ of a $T$-bundle over the universal level $n$ abelian scheme $\mathcal{U}_{g-r,n}$, where $T$ is a quotient of the torus $T_r$ whose cocharacter group is $B_r$.

We can use the $T$-action at level $n$ to construct a specialization (that is, a rational equivalence) $C \sim C_0 + \mathcal{F}$, where $C_0$ is contained in a minimal stratum of $Z_r$ and $\mathcal{F}$ is the image in $A_g^P$ of a closed subvariety $\mathcal{F}_n$ in $A_{g,n}^P$ such that $\mathcal{F}_n$ is preserved by $T$ but no component of $\mathcal{F}_n$ consists of $T$-fixed points. So then $\mathcal{F}$ is $\pi$-vertical, so that $(-D_g).\mathcal{F} > 0$ and $H_g.\mathcal{F} = 0$, and then $C_0$ is $L_g$-negative. So we can assume that $C$ lies in a minimal stratum of $Z_r$. Recall that each such stratum is one of the closed substacks $\mathcal{U}_{g-r,\sigma}$ considered previously, and so $C \subseteq \mathcal{U}_{g-r,\sigma}$, say.

Note that, for any sufficiently divisible integer $m$, there are equalities

$$H^0(\mathcal{U}^{\text{norm}}_{g-r,\sigma}, \mathcal{O}_mL_g)|_{\mathcal{U}^{\text{norm}}_{g-r,\sigma}} = H^0(\mathcal{U}^{\text{part}}_{g-r,\sigma}, \mathcal{O}_mL_g)|_{\mathcal{U}^{\text{part}}_{g-r,\sigma}} = H^0(\mathcal{U}^{\text{part}}_{g-r,\sigma}, \mathcal{O}(m\delta^r L_{g-r}) \otimes H^0(\mathcal{U}^{\text{part}}_{g-r,\sigma}, \mathcal{O}(\sum mb_i \rho_i^r L_{g-r+1})).$$

The first equality follows from the facts that $\mathcal{U}^{\text{part}}_{g-r,\sigma}$ is nearly equal to $\mathcal{U}^{\text{norm}}_{g-r,\sigma}$ and that $\mathcal{U}^{\text{norm}}_{g-r,\sigma}$ is normal. The second follows from the linear equivalence 4.3 and the fact that, by Proposition 4.1, $L_h$ has (stably) no base points on $A^{\text{part}}_h$ for all values of $h$, and in particular for $h = g - r$ and $h = g - r + 1$.

Therefore, the stable base locus $\mathbb{B}(L_g)|_{\mathcal{U}^{\text{norm}}_{g-r,\sigma}}$ is contained in the boundary $\mathcal{U}^{\text{norm}}_{g-r,\sigma} \setminus \mathcal{U}^{\text{part}}_{g-r}$ of $\mathcal{U}^{\text{norm}}_{g-r,\sigma}$.

The next lemma is well known but we include a proof for lack of a convenient reference.

**Lemma 4.6** If $\nu : X \to Y$ is a finite dominant morphism of integral proper algebraic spaces and $L \in \text{Pic}_Y$, then $\nu^{-1}\mathbb{B}(L) = \mathbb{B}(\nu^*L)$.

**PROOF:** The homomorphism

$$R(Y, L) = \oplus H^0(Y, L^\otimes n) \to R(X, \nu^*L) = \oplus H^0(X, \nu^*L^\otimes n)$$
is injective and finite.

Suppose that \( x \in \mathbb{B}(\nu^*L) \), so that \( s(x) = 0 \) for all \( s \in R(X, \nu^*L) \). In particular, \( t(x) = 0 \) for all \( t \in R(Y, L) \) and so \( x \in \nu^{-1}\mathbb{B}(L) \). That is, \( \mathbb{B}(\nu^*L) \subseteq \nu^{-1}\mathbb{B}(L) \).

Now suppose that \( x \in \nu^{-1}\mathbb{B}(L) \). Choose \( s \in H^0(X, \nu^*L^{\otimes n}) \) with \( s(x) \neq 0 \). There is an equation

\[
s^N + a_{N-1}s^{N-1} + \cdots + a_0 = 0
\]

for some \( a_i \in H^0(Y, L^{\otimes n(N-i)}) \). Then \( a_i(x) = 0 \) for all \( i \), which is absurd. \( \square \)

It follows that \( \mathbb{B}(L_{g,g-r,\sigma}) \) is contained in the boundary \( \overline{U}_{g-r,\sigma} \setminus U_{g-r}^\text{part} \) of \( \overline{U}_{g-r,\sigma} \). Therefore \( C \) is disjoint from the open substack \( U_{g-r}^\text{part} \). However, this contradicts the assumption that \( \pi(C) \) does not lie in \( A_{g-r,\sigma-1}^\text{Sat} \), and (1) is proved.

For (2), assume first that we are in positive characteristic so that Keel’s theorem \( [K\ell] \) is available. Assume also, as an induction hypothesis, that \( m \) is semi-ample on \( A_h^P \) for all \( h < g \).

Suppose that \( Z \) is an irreducible closed substack of \( A_h^P \) with \( Z.L_{g}^{\dim Z} = 0 \), so that \( Z \) lies in \( \text{Exc}(L_g) \). If \( Z \cap A_g^\text{part} \) is not empty, then \( Z \) lies in \( A_{1,g-1}^P \), as desired. So we can suppose that \( Z \) lies over \( A_g^\text{Sat} \), but not over \( A_g^\text{Sat} \), where \( r \geq 2 \). Then \( Z \) lies in some \( \overline{X}_r \).

Note first that \( r < g \), since \( L_g \) is ample on the fibre \( \pi^{-1}(A_g^\text{Sat}) \) of \( \pi \). (This is the statement that \( -D_g \) is \( \pi \)-ample, which holds because, as a toroidal compactification, \( A_h^P \) is defined by taking a convex hull.)

Once again we can use a torus action to construct a rational equivalence \( Z \sim Z_0 = Y + W \) where \( Y \) lies in \( \overline{U}_{g-r,\sigma} \) and the fibres of \( W \to A_g^\text{Sat} \) are of strictly positive dimension.

Suppose first that \( Z = Y \), i.e., that \( Z \) lies in some \( \overline{U}_{g-r,\sigma} \). Since \( L_g \) is nef, we have \( Z.L_{g}^{\dim Z} = 0 \). Put \( Z^0 = Z \cap U_{g-r}^\text{part} \); this is open and dense in \( Z \).

As in the proof of (1), it follows from the linear equivalence \( [1,3] \) that the stable base locus of the restriction \( L_g|_{\overline{U}_{g-r,\sigma}^\text{part}} \) lies in the boundary \( \overline{U}_{g-r,\sigma} \setminus U_{g-r}^\text{part} \). Therefore, by Kodaira’s lemma \( ([K\ell] \text{VI.2.15, VI.2.16}) \), the restriction \( L' \) of \( L_g \) to \( U_{g-r}^\text{part} \) is semi-ample but not big, so that \( Z^0 \) is covered by open curves \( C^0 \) on which the morphism defined by the linear system \( |mL'| \), for some suitable integer \( m \), is constant.

Then, for each \( i \), the linear system \( |mL_{g-r+1}| \) defines a constant morphism on each curve \( C^0 \). By induction, \( |mL_{g-r+1}| \) has no base points on \( A_{g-r+1}^{1,\text{part}} \), so the closure of \( C^0 \) lies in \( \text{Exc}(L_{g-r+1}) \).

By the induction hypothesis, \( \text{Exc}(L_{g-r+1}) = A_{g-r+1}^{1,\text{part}} \). Moreover, if \( U_{g-r}^\text{part} \) is identified with an open substack of the boundary \( D_{g-r+1} \) of \( A_{g-r+1}^{1,\text{part}} \), then taking the \( j \)-invariant of the elliptic factor to be \( \infty \) shows that \( \text{Exc}(L_{g-r+1}) \cap U_{g-r}^\text{part} \) contains the closure of the zero-section of the semi-abelian scheme \( U_{g-r}^\text{part} \to A_{g-r}^{\text{part}} \).

Consider the intersection \( \mathcal{I} = A_{1,g-r}^{1,\text{part}} \cap U_{g-r}^\text{part} \), taken inside \( D_{g-r+1} \).
Lemma 4.7 \( \mathcal{I} \) has just two irreducible components. One is the locus of points of the form

\[(\infty, B, 0_b),\]

where \( B \in \mathcal{A}_{g-r} \) and \( \infty \) is the point at infinity on \( \mathcal{A}_1^P \); this is a copy of \( \mathcal{A}_{g-r} \). The other is the locus of points of the form

\[(E \times V, (0_E, v)),\]

where \( E \in \mathcal{A}_1, V \in \mathcal{A}_{g-r-1} \) and \( v \in V \) is arbitrary; this is a copy of \( \mathcal{A}_1^P \times \mathcal{U}_{g-r-1} \).

PROOF: The only thing to notice is that on \( \mathcal{A}_{g-r+1}^{part} \), the exceptional locus \( \text{Exc}(L_{g-r+1}) \) includes the image of \( \mathcal{A}_1 \times \mathcal{A}_{g-r}^{part} \), the locus where the cycle-theoretic image of the Kummer variety under the \( 2\theta \) linear system does not determine the abelian variety. The pair \((V, v)\) corresponds to a compactification \( \tilde{V} \) of some \( \mathbb{G}_m \)-bundle over \( V \), and then taking the Kummer variety of \( E \times \tilde{V} \) has the effect of “losing the isomorphism class of \( E \)”.  

That is, for every \( \tilde{\xi}_i : \mathcal{U}_{g-r}^{part} \to \mathcal{U}_{g-r}^{part} \), the image \( \tilde{\xi}_i(\mathcal{Z}) \) is contained in the union of these two loci. Now consider the summand \( a\delta L_{g-r} \) that appears as a contribution to \( L_g |_{\mathcal{U}_{g-r}^{part}} \) in \( \mathfrak{H} \); since, by induction, \( L_{g-r} \) is semi-ample and \( \text{Exc}(L_{g-r}) = \mathcal{A}_{1,g-r-1}^P \), this consideration shows that

\[\mathcal{Z}^0 \cap \mathcal{U}_{g-r}^c \subset \mathcal{A}_1 \times \mathcal{U}_{g-r-1}^c.\]

Now \( \mathcal{Z} \) lies in the closure of \( \mathcal{Z}^0 \cap \mathcal{U}_{g-r}^c \) in \( \mathcal{U}_{g-r,\sigma} \), so that \( \mathcal{Z} \) is in (the image of) \( \mathcal{A}_1^P \times \mathcal{U}_{g-r-1,\sigma} \) in \( \mathcal{A}_{1,g-1}^P \). In particular, \( \mathcal{Z} \) lies in \( \mathcal{A}_{1,g-1}^P \).

Now drop the assumption that \( \mathcal{Z} \) lies in some \( \mathcal{U}_{g-r,\sigma} \). Then \( \mathcal{Z} \) specializes as above to \( \mathcal{Z}_0 = \mathcal{W} + \mathcal{Y} \) where \( \mathcal{Y} \) lies in some \( \mathcal{U}_{g-r,\sigma} \). Since \( L_g \) is nef, both \( \mathcal{W} \) and \( \mathcal{Y} \) lie in \( \text{Exc}(L_g) \), so that, by what we have already proved, \( \mathcal{Y} \) lies in \( \mathcal{A}_{1,g-1}^P \).

Recall that \( \mathcal{Z} \) lies in \( \mathcal{X}_{r,\tau} \), the image of the closure of a \( T \)-bundle \( \mathcal{T} \to \mathcal{U}_{g-r}^c \). The specialization \( \mathcal{Z} \sim \mathcal{Z}_0 \) and the fact that \( \mathcal{Y} \) lies in \( \mathcal{A}_{1,g-1}^P \) show that \( \mathcal{Z} \) lies in the image of the closure of the restriction of \( \mathcal{T} \) to the closed substack \( \mathcal{A}_1 \times \mathcal{U}_{g-r-1}^c \) of \( \mathcal{U}_{g-r}^c \). But this restriction is of the form \( \mathcal{A}_1 \times \mathcal{T}_1 \), where \( \mathcal{T}_1 \) is a \( T \)-bundle over \( \mathcal{U}_{g-r-1}^c \). So \( \mathcal{Z} \) lies in \( \mathcal{A}_1^P \times \mathcal{X}_{r,\tau} \), where \( \mathcal{X}_{r,\tau} \) is the image of the closure of \( \mathcal{T}_1 \). However, \( \mathcal{X}_{r,\tau} \) lies in \( \mathcal{A}_{g-1}^P \), so that \( \mathcal{Z} \) lies in \( \mathcal{A}_{1,g-1}^P \), as required.

That is, we have shown that in characteristic \( p > 0 \), \( \text{Exc}(L_g) \subset \mathcal{A}_{1,g-1}^P \); the other inclusion is an immediate consequence of the fact that \( L_1 \) is trivial. From Keel’s theorem we deduce that \( L_g \) is semi-ample. It follows at once that \( \text{Exc}(L_g) = \mathcal{A}_{1,g-1}^P \) in characteristic zero, and now (2) is proved.

(3) We know now that \( L_g \) is semi-ample, and it remains to show that the varieties \( V_g \) behave as stated.

The multiplication morphism \( \phi : \mathcal{A}_{g-h}^P \times \mathcal{A}_h^P \to \mathcal{A}_g^P \) has the property that \( \phi^* \mathcal{O}(H_g) \cong \mathcal{O}(H_{g-h}) \boxtimes \mathcal{O}(H_h) \) and \( \phi^* \mathcal{O}(D_g) \cong \mathcal{O}(D_{g-h}) \boxtimes \mathcal{O}(D_h) \). So \( \phi^* \mathcal{O}(L_g) \cong \mathcal{O}(L_{g-h}) \boxtimes \mathcal{O}(L_h) \).
Let $\psi_g : A^P_g \to V_g$ be the morphism defined by the linear system $|mL_g|$ for sufficiently divisible $m$ and take $h = 1$; since $L_1$ is trivial, the composite

$$A^P_{g-1} \times A^P_1 \to A^P_{g-1,1} \to A^P_g \to V_g$$

factors through $pr_1 : A^P_{g-1} \times A_1 \to A^P_{g-1,1}$, say $A^P_{g-1,1} \to V_g$. Let $A^P_{g-1} \to W_{g-1}$ denote the Stein factorization of this. Since $A_{g-1} \to V_g$ is defined by some system $|mL_{g-1}|$, it follows that $W_{g-1}$ is identified with $V_{g-1}$.

**Corollary 4.8** Suppose that $7 \leq g \leq 10$ and that $\text{char } k = 0$. Then the first step in running the MMP on $A^P_g$ is the contraction $A^P_g \to V_g$. Its fibres are the fibres of $A^P_{g-1,1} \to V_{g-1}$ and they meet the interior $A_g$ of $A^P_g$.

**Proof:** This follows at once from the results above when it is recalled that $A^P_g$ has only terminal singularities in this range [AS].
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