

EXAMPLES RELATING TO GREEN’S CONJECTURE IN LOW CHARACTERISTICS AND GENERA

TOPIK TEGUH ESTU, MEE SEONG IM, BENJAMIN MANNING, ZACHARY MICHAELS, JOSEPH PASKO,
WILLIAM RULLA, AND NISHAN WIJESINGHE

ABSTRACT. We exhibit approximately fifty Betti diagrams of free resolutions of rings of smooth, connected canonical curves of genera 9-14 in prime characteristics between 2 and 11. Generic Green’s conjecture is verified for genera 9 and 10 for characteristics 2, 5, 7, and 11.

1. INTRODUCTION

This paper is the product of a four week VIGRE REU participated by the authors¹ and conducted by the sixth author during the Summer of 2002, together with further participation supported by UGA’s Summer Undergraduate Research Program. The research collaboration was an examination of Gröbner bases and their use in calculating free resolutions, with applications to an experimental study of a conjecture of Mark Green (cf. [8]). It was inspired by [4, 6, 2, 3, 5].

The conjecture concerns Riemann surfaces, but carries over to algebraic curves. Throughout this manuscript, the terms “curve” and “algebraic curve” will mean smooth, proper, non-hyperelliptic algebraic curve. Each curve of genus g is associated a sequence of non-negative integers of length $\lfloor \frac{g-3}{2} \rfloor$; the sequence can be thought of as a refinement of the invariant g . The conjecture relates the number of zero entries of the sequence to geometric characteristics of the curve. This paper is an empirical examination of the kinds of sequences which can occur. It is divided as follows.

1.1. Summary of the sections. In §2, we provide some background on free resolutions and canonical embeddings of curves, establish notation, and present the motivating question of our investigation. In §3, we present Green’s conjecture and generic Green’s conjecture. We describe in §4 a synopsis of our summer research. Algorithms used to examine the nonsingularity and connectedness of our examples are described in §§5 and 6. An overview on how we generated our examples, what we expected to find, and our results is given in §7. We give the verification of generic Green’s conjecture in several small characteristics and genera $g \leq 10$ in §8, and we present examples of Betti diagrams corresponding to singular and reducible curves in §9. In §10, we pose questions and give suggestions for further projects.

Acknowledgment. We thank Maurice D. Hendon and D. Wayne Tarrant for their assistance during our preparation of this manuscript, and to Clint McCrory for providing us this collaboration opportunity. We also thank Robert Varley for extensive encouragement and helpful feedback throughout the duration of our research, and during the preparation of this paper. All authors also thank William (Bill) Rulla for teaching the research group computational algebraic geometry and homology algebra when we were undergraduate students. He spoke about 120 words per minute, but nonetheless, he is an exceptional and admirable researcher. All authors, with the exception

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 14Q05, 13P10. Secondary: 13D02, 68W01.

Key words and phrases. computational algebraic geometry, experimental mathematics, Green’s conjecture, free resolution, Betti diagram, canonical curve.

¹The addresses provided are the authors’ affiliations at the time of when drafting this manuscript. The primary point of contact and her current affiliation are also provided at the end of this paper.

of M.S.I., were partially supported by University of Georgia's NSF VIGRE grant DMS #0089927. M.S.I was partially supported by SURP, sponsored by the University of Georgia Graduate School.

2. BACKGROUND ON CANONICAL CURVES AND FREE RESOLUTIONS

The following is a synopsis of background found in [1, 4, 5, 9]. Let k be any algebraically closed field.

Any (nonhyperelliptic) curve C has an associated canonical embedding in the projectivization $\mathbb{P}(H^0(C, K_C)) \cong \mathbb{P}^{g-1}$ of its g -dimensional k -vector space of global regular differential forms, obtained by identifying a choice of homogeneous coordinates of \mathbb{P}^{g-1} with a basis. The image of the embedding corresponds to a homogeneous ideal $I = I_C$ of the coordinate ring $R := k[X_0, \dots, X_{g-1}]$ of \mathbb{P}^{g-1} . The ring R is graded by degree:

$$R = \bigoplus_{d \geq 0} R_d,$$

where R_d is the k -vector space of monomials of degree d in X_0, \dots, X_{g-1} . The ideal I correspondingly decomposes into a direct sum

$$I = \bigoplus_{d \geq 0} I_d$$

of vector spaces, where I_d is the subset of homogeneous polynomials of degree d in R vanishing identically on C . The dimensions of the I_d 's are determined by the common Hilbert function for all canonical curves of genus g , so they provide no distinguishing information between curves of the same genus.

More precisely, the Hilbert polynomial

$$p(t) = (2t - 1)(g - 1)$$

of such a curve gives us the dimensions of the I_d 's. This polynomial gives $h^0(C, K_C^{\otimes d})$ for all integers $d \geq 2$, while $h^0(C, K_C) = g$. For each degree, there is a sub-exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow I_d \rightarrow R_d \rightarrow (R/I)_d \rightarrow 0,$$

so $\dim I_d = \dim R_d - \dim(R/I)_d$. Furthermore,

$$\dim R_d = \binom{d + g - 1}{g - 1}.$$

We see that for fixed g , the dimension of I_d is independent of C . The graded ring R can be realized as follows:

$$R = \bigoplus_{d \geq 0} H^0(C, K_C^{\otimes d}),$$

where each summand is just the space of homogeneous polynomials in the coordinates of \mathbb{P}^{g-1} . Bases of the $H^0(C, K_C^{\otimes d})$ were determined by Petri (cf. [1, pages 127–130]). Hence we see that bases depend only on the genus of C .

More interesting is a theorem of Petri [1, page 131], which states that any canonical ideal is generated by homogeneous elements of degree two, unless C is trigonal, i.e., it admits a 3:1 map to \mathbb{P}^1 , or is isomorphic to a plane quintic. In these cases some generators must be of degree three. Thus any canonical curve is the (scheme-theoretic) intersection of degree two and (possibly) degree three hypersurfaces, i.e., there is an exact sequence

$$\begin{array}{ccc} R(-3)^{\oplus b_1} & & \\ \oplus & \xrightarrow{f} & I \rightarrow 0. \\ R(-2)^{\oplus a_1} & & \end{array} \tag{2.1}$$

Note that no differential form $\omega \neq 0$ vanishes identically on C , so I contains nothing of degree 1. Here, e.g., the “ (-2) ” indicates that each of the a_1 generators of the free module $R^{\oplus a_1}$ is mapped

to a homogeneous polynomial of degree 2 in $I \subseteq R$. By Petri, the exponent b_1 is nonzero if and only if C is trigonal or isomorphic to a plane quintic.

The proof of Petri’s theorem involves an examination of the syzygies (relations) on the generators of I , i.e., a calculation of generators of the kernel of the map f in the sequence (2.1) (see [1, pages 131–135]). A natural extension of this idea is to then examine the kernel of a surjection

$$R^{\oplus m} \rightarrow \ker f,$$

where m is the (minimal) number of generators of $\ker f$ over R . Iterating leads to an examination of a free resolution of I . It is a fact that a (finite) minimal free resolution

$$0 \rightarrow R^{\oplus n_r} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow R^{\oplus n_2} \rightarrow R^{\oplus a_1 + b_1} \xrightarrow{f} I \rightarrow 0$$

exists, and is unique up to isomorphism of exact sequences.

Next, we discuss the structure of minimal resolutions of ideals of canonical curves. To simplify the discussion, given an ideal I we consider instead the deleted resolution of the canonical ring R/I ,

$$0 \rightarrow R^{\oplus n_r} \xrightarrow{\varphi_r} \dots \rightarrow R^{\oplus n_2} \rightarrow R^{\oplus a_1 + b_1} \rightarrow R, \quad (2.2)$$

where the cokernel of the rightmost map is R/I . Rings of canonical curves are Cohen–Macaulay, so the number r determining the length of the resolution is known by the formula of Auslander–Buchsbaum to be $g - 2$.

As outlined above, the second term of the sequence (2.2) decomposes as a sum of $R(-2)$ ’s and $R(-3)$ ’s; we can similarly be more specific with the others. Since the resolution is minimal, there is never a “degree zero” relation on the elements of any kernel, so the twisting must increase at each step. Thus for example there are no $R(-d)$ terms in the $R^{\oplus n_2}$ term of (2.2) for $d = 0, 1, 2$.

Let $i : C \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^{g-1}$ be the canonical morphism. By considering what happens when the contravariant functor

$$\mathrm{Hom}_R(\cdot, \mathcal{O}_{P^{g-1}}(-g-1))$$

is applied to the sheafification of (2.2), using

$$\mathrm{Ext}_{P^{g-1}}^i(i_*\mathcal{O}_C, \mathcal{O}_{P^{g-1}}(-g-1)) \cong \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } 0 < i < g-2 \\ i_*\mathcal{O}_C & \text{if } i = g-2, \end{cases}$$

and the fact that C is projectively normal, one finds that by reversing the arrows of (2.2) one gets another deleted resolution of R/I . This “dual” sequence is therefore also a deleted resolution for R/I , must be minimal, and by uniqueness is isomorphic to the original (this is the “Gorenstein” property of R/I). The symmetry puts a serious restriction on the form of the resolution; in fact, any such must be of the form

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \rightarrow R(-g-1) \rightarrow & \begin{array}{ccc} R(-g+1)^{\oplus a_1} & & R(-g+2)^{\oplus a_2} \\ \oplus & \rightarrow & \oplus \\ R(-g+2)^{\oplus a_{g-3}} & & R(-g+3)^{\oplus a_{g-4}} \end{array} \rightarrow \dots \\ & \dots \rightarrow \begin{array}{ccc} R(-4)^{\oplus a_{g-4}} & & R(-3)^{\oplus a_{g-3}} \\ \oplus & \rightarrow & \oplus \\ R(-3)^{\oplus a_2} & & R(-2)^{\oplus a_1} \end{array} \rightarrow R \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned} \quad (2.3)$$

The resolution is encoded in a *Betti diagram*, which specifies the occurring exponents:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 1 & \cdot & \cdot & \dots & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & a_1 & a_2 & \dots & a_{g-4} & a_{g-3} & \cdot \\ \cdot & a_{g-3} & a_{g-4} & \dots & a_2 & a_1 & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \dots & \cdot & \cdot & 1. \end{array}$$

Here the \cdot ’s indicate zeros, and going either back a column or up a row corresponds to twisting by (-1) .

Hilbert functions impose a further constraint. Because Hilbert functions are additive on exact sequences, and because the Hilbert function of the I_C 's and $R(-k)^{\oplus j}$'s is known, it is straightforward to derive a relation on the a_i 's:

$$a_i - a_{g-i-1} = i \binom{g-2}{i+1} - (g-i-1) \binom{g-2}{i-2}.$$

Thus, in the notation of [4], the Betti diagram is determined by the sequence

$$\mathbf{a} := \left(a_{\lfloor \frac{g}{2} \rfloor}, \dots, a_{g-3} \right). \quad (2.4)$$

The principal question motivating us is from [4]:

Question 2.1 (Eisenbud). What sequences \mathbf{a} can occur?

In [9], all possible diagrams are determined through $g = 8$. The primary goal of our research was to explore the possibilities for $g \geq 9$.

3. GREEN'S CONJECTURE

We give some definitions from [4].

Definition 3.1. The *2-linear strand* of a resolution as in (2.3) is the subcomplex

$$R(-g+2)^{\oplus a_{g-3}} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow R(-3)^{\oplus a_2} \rightarrow R(-2)^{\oplus a_1},$$

which we specify by the sequence

$$(a_1, \dots, a_{g-3}).$$

Because the resolution is minimal, if ever $a_i = 0$ then $a_j = 0$ for all $j \geq i$. The *2-linear projective dimension 2LP* of a minimal resolution is the length of its 2-linear strand, i.e., it is the number of nonzero entries.

The (nonhyperelliptic) curves for which $a_{g-3} \neq 0$ are exactly the trigonal curves together with curves (of genus 6) which are isomorphic to plane quintics. Green's conjecture may be viewed as an extension of this observation.

Conjecture 3.2 (Green). For any (smooth) curve C , we have

$$2LP = g - 2 - c,$$

where c is the Clifford index of C , i.e., it is the minimum over all maps to \mathbb{P}^r of degree d admitted by C of the numbers

$$d - 2r.$$

One direction of the conjecture is a theorem (for a more extensive explanation, see [4]): if a curve admits a $d : 1$ map to \mathbb{P}^1 corresponding to a line bundle L , then the 2×2 minors of the matrix corresponding to the multiplication map

$$V \otimes H^0(K_C \otimes L^{-1}) \rightarrow H^0(C, K_C)$$

cut out a rational normal scroll S inside $\mathbb{P}^{g-1} \cong \mathbb{P}(H^0(C, K_C))$ which contains C . The 2-linear strand of the scroll is a subcomplex of the 2-linear strand for C , and has $2LP \geq g - d$. Thus the $2LP$ of the curve is $\geq g - d$, with d minimal for C - i.e. with d the so-called "gonality" of C . Green's conjecture (modulo the replacement of gonality with the refinement $c + 2$) is that the length is always exactly this. Said otherwise, the number of nonzero entries of the sequence \mathbf{a} is conjectured to be $\lfloor \frac{g+1}{2} \rfloor - c - 1$.

Generic Green's conjecture is a highly studied subconjecture, asserting that there exists a curve of every genus $g \geq 3$ giving the zero sequence $\mathbf{a} = (0, \dots, 0)$ (note the generic Clifford index $c_{\text{gener}} = \lfloor \frac{g+1}{2} \rfloor - 1$). The condition of having extra syzygies is closed, so if an example exists, "almost all" curves of that genus and characteristic must generate the zero sequence.

Remark 3.3. Because of this, to verify generic Green’s conjecture, it suffices to produce a sequence $\mathbf{a} = (0, \dots, 0)$ coming from a singular curve, as long as it is smoothable, i.e., it occurs in a flat family of smooth genus g curves.

4. THE REU

The objective of our research was to explore the notions of free resolutions and canonically embedded curves thru explicit computation, and ultimately to illuminate Green’s conjecture through experimental evidence. However, to even state the conjecture is complicated, so we started more basically.

The calculation of free resolutions is essentially elementary, being based on Gröbner bases, which themselves are calculated via polynomial long division. During the first days of the program, we spent writing code in the language of Macaulay2 [7] (henceforth abbreviated M2) to carry out polynomial long division. We briefly studied the theory of Gröbner bases and syzygies for ideals using [2, Chapter 2] and then extended these notions to submodules of free modules [3, Chapter 5], writing algorithms designed to calculate generators of kernels of maps of free modules. We briefly discussed some characteristics (e.g. minimality) of graded free modules [3, Chapter 6] and then focused on the use of M2’s built-in functions.

The next goal was to generate rings of canonical curves. For this we used as example [6], which demonstrates the use of M2 in calculating the canonical series of the normalization C of a singular plane curve Γ , given only a homogeneous polynomial for Γ . The result is a subring of the ring of the ambient \mathbb{P}^2 , identifiable with the space of global regular differential forms on C . As this is the main idea behind the generation of our examples, we explain it more fully (see also [1, Appendix A]).

Suppose a smooth, abstract curve C of genus g maps onto a (possibly singular) plane curve Γ of degree d . Then the entire space of global regular differential forms on C can be identified with a g -dimensional subspace of differential forms on \mathbb{P}^2 , which are regular except possibly (simply) along Γ itself. The forms with simple poles along Γ are identified with homogeneous polynomials of degree $d - 3$ in the coordinates of \mathbb{P}^2 . The subspace in question is determined by the types of singularities of Γ . For instance, a simple node or cusp at a point $P \in \mathbb{P}^2$ requires limitation to the subspace of forms vanishing at P . Tacnodes and other more general singularities require further conditions [1, #32, page 60]. If the subspace under consideration has as basis a set of homogeneous polynomials $\{F_0, \dots, F_{g-1}\}$, then the subring $k[F_1, \dots, F_{g-1}] \subseteq k[X_0, \dots, X_{g-1}]$ is identifiable with the canonical ring of C .

The rest of our time in collaboration was spent generating canonical rings in order to build a collection of diagrams. Details are given in the following sections.

5. SINGULARITIES AND ADJUNCTION

We begin by giving an example.

Example 5.1. The following Betti diagram came from a genus 8 curve in characteristic 7:

$$\begin{array}{cccccccc}
 1 & . & . & . & . & . & . & . \\
 . & 15 & 36 & 33 & 12 & 1 & . & . \\
 . & 1 & 12 & 33 & 36 & 15 & . & . \\
 . & . & . & . & . & . & 1 & .
 \end{array}$$

It has a two linear strand of length $g - 3$, so should be trigonal, but this diagram is not the unique diagram for trigonal genus 8 curves (cf. [9]). This would be a counterexample to Green’s conjecture (and [9]), except for the fact that the conjecture was made for nonsingular curves. The plane curve from which we produced the diagram had singularities not defined over $k = \mathbb{Z}/7\mathbb{Z}$, and one of its singularities over k was of a type requiring stronger adjunction conditions than were performed. Thus the canonical model we produced by doing partial adjunction was singular.

To signal such situations, we developed an M2 code to indicate when a canonical curve was not smooth. The code can be obtained by contacting Mee Seong Im. It also contains supporting algorithms, e.g., resultants, as well as subroutines for generating and analyzing lists of canonical rings. The following is a summary of the code: a homogeneous polynomial F of degree d is entered (we will discuss more on how we generated these later). The partials $\partial F/\partial X_i$ are calculated, and two cases can occur:

- (1) every partial of F passes through every point of \mathbb{P}_k^2 .
- (2) some partial does not pass through some point of \mathbb{P}_k^2 .

In either case, we can locate the k -singularities of $V(F)$ by finding the points at which F and all its partials vanish. In the first case, our code was not set up to say anything about the possibility of there being other singularities of $V(F)$ not defined over k . We flag this by saying “`check1 = 4.`”

In the second case, we proceed as follows: a point P over k is selected such that some derivative $\partial F/\partial X_i(P) \neq 0$. Label the three partials P_i , $i = 0, 1, 2$, where P_0 is this distinguished one. Coordinates are changed to make $P = (1, 0, 0)$. The three resultants $R0i := \text{Res}_{X_0}(P_0, P_i)$ ($i = 1, 2$) and $R0F := \text{Res}_{X_0}(P_0, F)$ are calculated, and all linear factors defined over k , which they have in common, are put into a list. The resultant $\text{Res}_{X_1}(\text{rem}_{01}, \text{rem}_{02})$ of the remainders of $R01$ and $R02$ on dividing out all k -linear factors is then calculated. If it is identically zero and if $\text{char } k \nmid \deg F$, then $V(F)$ has singularities not defined over k ; we say “`check1 = 2.`” If $\text{char } k \mid \deg F$, we can conclude nothing (this ambiguity could be resolved, e.g., by using multipolynomial resultants on $R0F$ and the $R0i$), and say “`check1 = 1.`” If $\text{Res}_{X_1}(\text{rem}_{01}, \text{rem}_{02})$ is not identically zero, then all singularities of $V(F)$ lie on lines thru $(1 : 0 : 0)$ which are defined over k , and we say “`check1 = 0.`”

Next we set `check2 = 0`, and the (transformed) polynomial F and the P_i are restricted to the lines determined by $(1 : 0 : 0)$ and the list of linear factors gathered above. Common k -linear factors are again gathered; these correspond to the subset of singular points defined over k . If the resultant of any pair of elements of $\{\text{rem}_{\overline{F}}, \text{rem}_{\overline{P}_0}, \text{rem}_{\overline{P}_1}, \text{rem}_{\overline{P}_2}\}$ (of remainders of restrictions on dividing out all k -linear factors) is not identically zero, then all singularities of $V(F)$ along this line are defined over k , and we leave `check2 = 0`. Otherwise, we cannot conclude anything, and set `check2 = 1`.

Thus if “`check`” is the minimum of the two checks, then we have four cases:

- (1) `check = 0` implies all singularities of $V(F)$ are defined over k .
- (2) `check = 1` implies there may be singularities of $V(F)$ not defined over k , but calculations are inconclusive.
- (3) `check = 2` implies there are definitely singularities of $V(F)$ not defined over k .
- (4) `check = 4` implies the algorithm failed, either due to lack of a point of \mathbb{P}_k^2 not on some partial, or some other reason (most commonly monomial overflow in the resultant calculations).

Once the singularities have been located, they are classified according to the following definition.

Definition 5.2. Let P be a singularity over k of the curve C , and let $f(x, y)$ be a local equation for C such that P corresponds to $(0, 0)$. Then f decomposes into a sum of homogeneous parts $f = \sum_i f_{(i)}$. In this paper, a plane curve singularity will be called *admissible* if it is of one of the two following types:

- (1) a regular m -fold point for any $m \geq 2$. These points are such that $f_{(i)} \equiv 0$ for $0 \leq i \leq m - 1$ and f_m decomposes into m distinct linear factors over the algebraic closure \overline{k} of k . These are characterized by $f_{(m)}$ and its derivative (with respect to either x or y) having nonzero resultant. Such a point will be symbolized by R_m .
- (2) an m -th order node/cusp, i.e., $f_0 = f_1 = 0$, $f_2 = L^2$ for some linear homogeneous L defined over k , $L^2 \mid f_{(i)}$ for $2 \leq i \leq m - 1$, and $L \nmid f_m$. Such a singularity will be called a *double point of index m* , and symbolized by D_m .

These singularities were admitted for two reasons:

- (1) we knew how to perform adjunction on them [1, page 60]: an R_n singularity P requires restriction to homogeneous forms H of degree $\deg F - 3$ which vanish to order $n - 1$ at P such that H is in the $(n - 1)$ -st power of the ideal I_P of P . A D_{2n} or D_{2n+1} singularity P with tangent line L requires restriction to the forms in the ideal $(L) + I_P^n$.
- (2) both were necessary in generating our list of diagrams (see §7 for a further discussion).

When a singularity was not admissible, we did adjunction as though it were a regular singularity of order $\text{ord}_P(f)$. In that case, adjunction produced only a partial normalization. We flagged this situation with a subscript b . For example, we would juxtapose the symbol 2_{b1} with the sequence $\mathbf{a} = (5, 0, 0)$ if that sequence were found in characteristic 2, but the k -singularities of $V(F)$ were not all admissible, and calculations were inconclusive as to whether all singularities were defined over k .

6. CONNECTEDNESS

Next, we discuss a criterion for connectedness for our canonical models.

Observation 6.1. If $P \in \mathbb{P}_k^2$ is chosen so that the partial $F_{X_i}(P)$ of F with respect to some i is nonzero, then $\text{Res}_{X_0}(F, F_{X_i})$ is defined, and is identically zero if and only if F is not reduced.

Our code was written to abandon non-reduced curves.

Definition 6.2. Let F be a reduced homogeneous polynomial of degree f over some field k . The sub-intersection order $\text{subOrd}_P(C)$ of a point P on $C := V(F)$ is the maximum over all intersection numbers $I_P(V(H), V(K))$, where H and K are homogeneous of degrees h and k , respectively, where $h + k = f$, and where the singularity $P \in V(HK)$ has the same analytic type over \bar{k} as that of $P \in V(F)$.

Example 6.3. We have

$$\text{subOrd}_P(C) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } P \text{ of type } D_m \text{ and } m \text{ is odd,} \\ \frac{m}{2} & \text{if } P \text{ of type } D_m \text{ and } m \text{ is even,} \\ \lfloor \frac{\text{ord}_P(C)^2}{4} \rfloor & \text{if } P \text{ of type } R_m. \end{cases}$$

If F is reduced of degree f , then for F to factor over \bar{k} as HK , Bézout requires

$$hk \leq \sum_{P \in \text{sing}(V(F))} \text{subOrd}_P(V(F)). \quad (6.1)$$

Definition 6.4. For $P \in V(F)$, let $\delta(P)$ be the amount by which the point P drops the genus of $V(F)$. More precisely, $\delta(P)$ is the dimension of the conditions on polynomials of degree $f - 3$ imposed by the singularity in order to do adjunction.

Example 6.5. For $m \geq 2$,

$$\delta(P) = \begin{cases} \lfloor \frac{m}{2} \rfloor & \text{if } P \text{ of type } D_m, \\ \binom{m}{2} & \text{if } P \text{ of type } R_m. \end{cases}$$

Let $\delta := \sum_P \delta(P)$. Then if C has only admissible singularities,

$$\sum_P \text{subOrd}_P(C) \leq \delta, \quad (6.2)$$

with equality only if C has no cusps or regular R_m -fold points with $m > 2$. We label

$$g := \binom{f-1}{2} - \delta$$

the geometric genus of the normalization of $V(F)$. We thus have the following:

Proposition 6.6. Suppose a plane curve $V(F)$ whose normalization has geometric genus g is specified by a homogeneous polynomial F of degree f , and F factors as $F = HK$, where $h := \deg H \leq k := \deg K$. Then

$$h(f - h) \leq \frac{1}{2}(f - 1)(f - 2) - g.$$

Corollary 6.7. If $V(F)$ is a plane curve with only admissible singularities, and if $F = HK$ with $h \leq k$, then h can be no larger than the numbers indicated in the following table:

	$g = 4$	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
$f = 5$	-	-	-	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
6	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	*	*	*	*
7	2	2	1	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-
8	4	4	3	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	1
9	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	2	2	2	2
10	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	3	3

Happily, our “cases of interest” coincide with the cases in the above table having entries ≤ 2 . That is, all computations fell under one of the following sets of constraints:

$$\begin{aligned} f \leq 7 \quad \text{and} \quad g \geq 4, \\ f = 8 \quad \text{and} \quad g \geq 7, \\ f = 9 \quad \text{and} \quad g \geq 11. \end{aligned} \tag{6.3}$$

In these cases, we have the following result:

Corollary 6.8. In our cases of interest (6.3), a plane curve with only admissible singularities can be reducible only if it contains a line or conic defined over k .

Proof. As a singular conic must be a union of lines, we need only consider the cases of a line and an irreducible (nonsingular) conic. Our cases of interest exclude the possibility of $V(F)$ being a union of lines.

Suppose first that $\deg H = 1$, so that $V(H)$ must have intersection number $f - 1$ with $V(K)$. $V(H)$ cannot be part of a singularity of type D_k ; its intersection number with $V(K)$ at an R_n singularity is $n - 1$. Since $V(F)$ is not a union of lines, $n < f$, so $V(H)$ must pass through two distinct points over k , and so is definable over k .

Similarly, suppose $\deg H = 2$, so the intersection number of $V(H)$ with $V(K)$ is $2(f - 2)$, and suppose $V(H)$ is a smooth conic. We will show that the singularities of $V(F)$ contained in $V(H)$ impose five independent conditions over k so that $V(H)$ is definable over k . Note first that any regular n -fold point over k imposes one condition over k , and causes $V(H)$ to have intersection number $n - 1$ with $V(K)$. If $V(H)$ forms part of a singularity of type D_k , then $k = 4$, and two conditions (the point and a tangency condition) are imposed. In this case $V(H)$ has intersection number 2 with $V(K)$. For the following purposes we can think of a D_4 as being equivalent to two R_2 's.

So suppose there are four or fewer singularities of $V(F)$ through which $V(H)$ is passing, say of type R_{n_i} , $i = 1, \dots, 4$. Then we must have

$$\sum_{i=1}^4 (n_i - 1) \geq 2(f - 2), \quad \text{i.e.,} \quad \sum_{i=1}^4 n_i \geq 2f. \tag{6.4}$$

Let $\delta_0 := \sum_{i=1}^4 \binom{n_i}{2}$. Then our cases of interest (6.3) impose the added conditions

$f =$	4	5	6	7	8	9
$\delta_0 \leq$	0	2	6	11	14	17

which together with (6.4) deny any possibility. \square

Corollary 6.9. In our cases of interest (6.3), if F has only admissible singularities and is irreducible over k , then its normalization is connected. Even if $V(F)$ has singularities not defined over k (but its k -singularities are admissible), the partial normalization at k -singularities is connected.

Remark 6.10. To check whether the normalization of a plane curve satisfying the hypotheses of Proposition 6.6 is connected, it thus suffices to check for factorizability of F over k . M2's `isPrime` command does this.

7. COMPUTATIONS, EXPECTATIONS, AND RESULTS

Other than the data of the characteristic of k , two pieces of information were necessary to generate our plane curves:

- (1) which points of $\mathbb{P}^2(k)$ should we single out?
- (2) what condition at each of these points should we impose?

Once these decisions were made, we had M2 generate a “random” polynomial satisfying the prescribed constraints.² This polynomial was a choice of element of the linear system of all suitable curves. Most of the time we expected to get a “generic” such element by randomness, but (especially in characteristics 2 and 3, when there was a dearth of choices for the coefficients) sometimes running repeated assays with the same constraints gave varying diagrams or (more often) allowed us to find a nonsingular model for a diagram discovered using a singular curve.

Differences in diagrams most often were due to differences in the number and type of singularities, so we concentrated on categorizing these combinations. To denote the possibilities, we use products of R_m 's and D_n 's, e.g., the string $R_2^3 R_4 D_4$ implies the curve had three regular nodes, a regular quadruple point, and a regular tacnode (a double point of index 4 in the terminology of §5). The degree of the plane curve is recoverable from the genus of the canonical curve and the singularity combination. In this notation we found that every possible diagram for curves of genera $4 \leq g \leq 8$ for all prime characteristics 2 – 11 came from one of the configurations

$$R_2^i \text{ for } 0 \leq i \leq 8, \quad R_3, \quad R_2^4 R_3, \quad \text{or} \quad R_2 R_4$$

(the generic diagram in genus 7 for characteristic 2 was an exception, which we will discuss more later). All possible diagrams in all possible characteristics were classified in [9] for $g \leq 8$. Table 1 summarizes the sequences **a**, together with some of the combinations which worked to produce them.

g	seq. a	Sings	g	seq. a	Sings
4	()	R_2^2, D_4, R_2^6	7	(3,0)	$R_2^8, R_2^{14}, R_2^5 R_3$
5	(0)	$R_2^5, R_2^3 D_4, R_4 D_4^5$	7	(9,0)	$R_2^3, R_2 D_4, R_2^2 R_4^2$
5	(2)	R_2	7	(15,4)	R_3
6	(0)	R_2^4	8	(0,0)	$R_2^7, R_2 D_6^2, R_2^{11} D_3^2$
6	(3)	{ }	8	(4,0)	$R_2^4 R_3, R_2 D_6^2, D_4, R_2^{13}$
7	(0,0)	$R_2^8, R_2^{11} R_3, R_2^2 R_3^3 D_6$	8	(14,0)	$R_2^2, D_4, R_2 R_3^2$
7	*(1,0)	$R_2 D_4^2 D_6$ (characteristic 2)	8	(24,5)	$R_2 R_4, R_3 R_5, R_2 D_6^4$

TABLE 1. Genus $g \leq 8$

Emboldened, we began a categorization of configurations of regular points for $9 \leq g \leq 11$ given $\deg F \leq 8$. We determined that there are 34 allowable combinations:

²It is important to set a new random seed before each calculation (or M2 will generate the same results repeatedly). Our code uses the date/time as random seed.

Deg 6: $\{\}, R_2,$

Deg 7: $R_4, R_3^2, R_3R_2^3, R_2^6, R_3R_2^2, R_2^5, R_3R_2, R_2^4,$

Deg 8: $R_5R_2^2, R_4^2, R_4R_3^2, R_4R_3R_2^3, R_4R_2^6, R_3^4, R_3^3R_2^3, R_3^2R_2^6, R_3R_2^9, R_2^{12}, R_5R_2, R_4R_3R_2^2, R_4R_2^5, R_3^3R_2^2, R_3^2R_2^5, R_3R_2^8, R_2^{11}, R_5, R_4R_3R_2, R_4R_2^4, R_3^3R_2, R_3^2R_2^4, R_3R_2^7, R_2^{10}.$

Of these, 17 involve four or fewer points. In these cases there are at most three distinct configurations modulo $\text{PGL}_3(k)$ (given the constraints on the degree of F). In fact we can always assign the $n \leq 4$ points to the first n of $\{(1,0,0), (0,1,0), (0,0,1), (1,1,1)\}$ except in the presence of collinearity. In the following, we describe the exceptional configurations in analogy to the following examples:

$$\begin{array}{cc} 2 & 2 \\ 3 & 2 \end{array}$$

denotes the placement of a triple point at $(1,0,0)$ and nodes at the points $(0,1,0), (0,0,1)$ and $(1,1,1)$. Next,

$$\begin{array}{ccc} 2 & & \\ 3 & 2 & 2 \end{array}$$

denotes the same configuration up to the last node, which is not placed at $(1,1,1)$, but along the line generated by $(1,0,0)$ and $(0,1,0)$ (without loss of generality, this can be taken to be $(1,1,0)$ up to projective transformation). The list of exceptional configurations (beyond the default choice) is:

$$\begin{array}{cccccccccccc} 2 & & 3 & & 3 & & 4 & & 3 & & 3 & 2 & 2, & 2 \\ 3 & 2 & 2' & 2 & 2 & 2' & 4 & 2 & 2' & 3 & 3 & 2' & 3 & 2 & 2, & 2 & 2 & 2. \end{array}$$

Via this list, we generated examples for every possible configuration up to PGL for allowable regular singularity combinations of four or fewer points.

Four of the singularity combinations above involve exactly five points: $R_2^5, R_4R_3R_2^3, R_3^3R_2^2$ and $R_4R_2^4$. To deal with the possible configurations, note that in any case degree restrictions deny any four to be collinear, so there are two kinds of cases up to PGL equivalence:

- (1) four points including all non-ordinary nodes can be situated at $\{(1,0,0), (0,1,0), (0,0,1), (1,1,1)\}$, and the fifth can be any other point of $\mathbb{P}^2(k)$ (all possibilities must be considered),
- (2) all points lie on two intersecting lines, with one of the points at the point of intersection.

Diagrammatically, the exceptional cases are one of the following:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} 2 & & 2 & & 2 & & 2 & & 2 \\ 2 & & 4 & & 3 & & 2 & & 2 \\ 2 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 3 & 2 & 3 & 3 & 2 & 2 & 4 & 2 & 4 & 2 & 2 \end{array}$$

There are four singularity combinations involving six points: $R_2^6, R_3^3R_2^3, R_4R_2^5,$ and $R_3^2R_2^4$. Degree considerations require at least three points (including all higher order regular points) to be non-collinear, so without loss of generality, they can be taken to be $\{(1,0,0), (0,1,0), (0,0,1)\}$. Then, either there exists a fourth point which is not collinear with any of these, or else we are in the situation of one of the following exceptional configurations:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} 2 & & 3 & & 2 & & 2 & & 2 \\ \boxed{2} & 2 & \boxed{2} & 2 & \boxed{2} & 2 & \boxed{2} & 2 & \boxed{2} \\ 2 & 2 & 2 & 3 & 2 & 3 & 3 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 4 \end{array}$$

Here the boxed number is allowed to vary along the indicated line. Without loss of generality, the non-varying points can be taken to be $(1,0,0), (1,1,0), (0,1,0), (1,0,1), (0,1,1),$ and $(0,0,1)$.

Remark 7.1. Any diagram coming from an exceptional configuration also came from a “generic” one, when one existed. Thus the exceptional configurations contributed nothing new.

The remaining singularity combinations are of one of the forms: $R_4R_2^6$, $R_3R_2^i$ ($i = 5, 6$), $R_3R_2^j$ ($j = 7, 8, 9$), or R_2^k ($k = 10, 11, 12$). During continuing work after our summer research (in lieu of an exhaustion of all equivalence classes of configurations for these combinations), we generated lists of randomly chosen points and automated M2 to search on its own. We were able to examine on the order of 10,000 curves in this way. The results of these calculations are given as the sequences in Tables 2–5 which are not preceded by asterisks.

We found it necessary in characteristic 2, genus 7 to use non-regular singularities to get the generic diagram, which is different than the generic diagram for characteristic $p \neq 2$. The generic diagrams for the other characteristics in this genus were all found using at least 8 points at which to specify regular singularities. Unfortunately the number of points of \mathbb{P}_k^2 for $k = \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$ is only 7 (we could circumvent this issue by allowing coefficients in extensions of k ; we were not able to get our code to accommodate these, but this seems like good material for a sequel).

Exotic double points are particularly useful in such situations: a singularity with local equation analytically equivalent to $y^2 = x^N$ reduces the genus by $\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor$, but affects gonality in the same way as a regular double point. Describing an algorithm to categorize configurations and types of singularities including exotic double points might thus make an interesting project. Due to time constraints, we however did little in this direction.

Tables 2–5 list our results (the meanings of the subscripts on the characteristics are discussed in §5). All entries in these tables came from curves which were irreducible over k according to M2’s `isPrime` command. By Proposition 6.9, the curves in the tables indicated by characteristics without the subscript b are connected. Sequences preceded by asterisks were not obtained using only regular singularities. The existence of sequences with no nonzero entries verifies Generic Green for the corresponding genus and characteristics (see §8 for more discussion).

sequence a	char	sings
(0, 0, 0)	2 ₁ , 5, 7, 11	$R_2^{12}, D_6^4, R_2R_3, D_4D_6^2, R_2^3D_6^3, D_4^3D_6^2$
(4, 0, 0)	2, 5, 7, 11	$R_2^{12}, R_2R_3D_4^4, R_2R_3D_4D_6^2$
*(6, 0, 0)	3	$D_6^4, R_2^{10}D_3^2$
(8, 0, 0)	2, 3, 5, 7, 11	$R_2^{12}, R_2^6R_3^2, D_6^4, R_2^2R_3^2D_4^2, D_3D_4^4D_6, R_3^2D_6D_7$
*(10, 0, 0)	3	$R_2^6D_4^3, R_2^4R_3^2D_5$
(12, 0, 0)	2, 3, 5, 7, 11	$R_2^6R_3, R_2^6R_3^2, R_2R_3D_4^4, R_3D_6^3, R_2R_3D_4D_6D_7$
(24, 0, 0)	2, 3, 5, 7, 11	R_2, R_2^6, D_6^2
(24, 5, 0)	2, 3, 5, 7, 11	$R_2^6R_4, R_2^{12}, R_2^2D_4^2D_6^2, R_4D_6^2$
*(28, 5, 0)	3 ₂ , 3 _b , 7 _b	$R_2^9D_3^3, R_2^2D_4^2D_6^2, R_2^3D_6^3$
(44, 5, 0)	2, 3, 5, 7, 11	$R_3^4, R_2^3R_3R_4, R_2R_3D_4, R_3D_6$
(64, 20, 0)	2, 3, 5, 7, 11	R_2, R_4^2, D_8^3
(84, 35, 6)	2, 3, 5, 7, 11	$R_4, R_2^2R_5$

TABLE 2. Genus 9

8. GENERIC GREEN

A side goal was to verify generic Green’s conjecture for our acceptable genera and characteristics. The conjecture is false in prime characteristic (in particular in characteristic 2, genus 7), and most of the literature (with the notable exception of [9]) is concerned with the genus zero case.

Remark 8.1. A computational strategy for characteristic 0 involves the use of g -cuspidal rational normal curves in \mathbb{P}^g . It fails completely for characteristic 2 (the resulting rings are evidently not even Gorenstein) and fails to give the generic diagrams for characteristics 3 and 5 for the genera of our study (Table 6; for background on this strategy, see [5, Project 7, pages 379–81] or [4, pages 61–70]).

sequence a	char	sings
(0, 0, 0)	2, 5, 7, 11	$R_2^{11}, R_2^9 D_3^2, R_2^2 D_6^3, D_4^2 D_6 D_8$
*(1, 0, 0)	3	$R_2 D_4^5, R_2 D_3^{10}, R_2^2 D_3 D_6^2$
(5, 0, 0)	2, 3, 5, 7, 11	$R_2^8 R_3, R_3 D_4^4$
*(6, 0, 0)	3_{b2}	$R_2^3 R_3 D_4 D_6$
(10, 0, 0)	2, 3, 5, 7, 11	$R_2^{11}, R_2^5 R_3^2, R_2^4 R_3^2 D_4, R_3^2 D_5 D_7$
*(12, 0, 0)	$3_b, 7_{b2}$	$R_2^9 D_4, R_2^3 D_3 D_4^2 D_6, R_2^3 R_3^2 D_3, R_2^2 D_4^3 D_6$
*(20, 0, 0)	$2_1, 3, 5, 7, 11$	$R_2 D_4^2 D_6^2, R_2^4 D_3 D_4^3, R_2^8 D_3^3, R_2^{10} D_3, R_2 D_3 D_4^2 D_6$
(35, 0, 0)	2, 3, 5, 7, 11	$R_2^5, R_2^2 R_3^3, D_4 D_6, R_2^4 R_4$
(35, 6, 0)	$2_1, 2_b, 3, 5, 7, 11$	$R_2^5 R_4, R_2^3 R_4 D_4$
(70, 6, 0)	2, 3, 5, 7, 11	$R_2^2 R_3, R_2^2 R_3 R_4$
(105, 27, 0)	$2_1, 3_1, 5, 7, 11$	{ }
(140, 48, 7)	2, 3, 5, 7, 11	$R_2 R_5, R_3 R_6$

TABLE 3. Genus 10

sequence a	char	sings
(50, 0, 0, 0)	5, 7, 11	$R_2^{10}, R_2^7 D_3^3, R_2^8 D_3^2, R_2^4 D_4^3$
*(56, 0, 0, 0)	3	$R_2^5 D_3^5$
(60, 0, 0, 0)	2, 5, 7, 11	$R_2^{10}, R_2^4 D_4^3, R_2^8 D_3^2, D_3 D_6^2 D_7$
*(64, 0, 0, 0)	2, 3	$R_2^9 D_3, R_2^8 D_3^2, D_3 D_6^3, R_2 D_6^3$
(65, 0, 0, 0)	5, 7	$R_2^{10}, R_2^6 D_3^4$
*(68, 0, 0, 0)	2, 3	$R_2^5 D_3^5, R_2^6 D_3^4, R_2^2 D_4 D_6^2$
*(72, 0, 0, 0)	2_{b1}	$R_2^7 D_4 D_6^2$
*(74, 0, 0, 0)	3_2	$R_2^9 D_2$
*(100, 0, 0, 0)	2, 3, 5, 7, 11	$R_2^7 D_3^3, R_2^5 D_3^3, R_2^4 D_4^4, R_2^9 D_3, R_2^6 D_3^4, D_7^2 D_8$
(75, 6, 0, 0)	5, 7, 11	$R_2^7 R_3$
(76, 6, 0, 0)	3	$R_2^7 R_3, R_2^3 R_3 D_4^2$
*(78, 6, 0, 0)	2	$R_2 R_3 D_6 D_7, R_2 R_3 D_6^2$
*(80, 6, 0, 0)	2, 3, 5, 7, 11	$R_2^6 R_3 D_3, R_2^3 R_3 D_3^4, R_3 D_6 D_8$
(140, 12, 0, 0)	2, 3, 5, 7, 11	$R_2^4 R_3^2$
(210, 48, 0, 0)	2, 3, 5, 7, 11	$R_2^4, R_2 R_3^3, D_4^2, R_2 D_6$
(210, 48, 7, 0)	$2_1, 2_b, 3, 5, 7, 11$	$R_2^4 R_4, R_2 R_4 D_3 D_4$
(280, 104, 7, 0)	2, 3, 5, 7, 11	$R_2 R_3 R_4$
(420, 216, 63, 8)	2, 3, 5, 7, 11	$R_5, R_2 R_6 D_3$

TABLE 4. Genus 11

We were able to get generic diagrams for characteristics 2, 5, 7 and 11 (and other small $p \neq 3$) in genera 9 and 10, as well as the known diagrams for $g \leq 8$. Interestingly, the closest to the generic diagram for characteristic 3 in genus 10 was the sequence (1, 0, 0), found in characteristic 3 only, reminiscent of the case for characteristic 2 in genus 7. Something similar happens in genus 9 (see Table 2). We naively posit the following:

Conjecture 8.2. Generic Green fails for characteristic 3 in genera 9 and 10.

There was no hope of verifying generic Green for genera $g \geq 11$ given our calculational constraints. For example, any curve coming from a degree 8 plane curve with one ordinary node has gonality ≤ 6 , and the general curve of genus 11 has gonality 7. We were not able to get M2 to handle the resolution of normalizations of curves of degree $f \geq 9$ with many singularities of small order.

genus	sequence \mathbf{a}	char	sings
12	*(69, 0, 0, 0)	2, 3, 7	$R_2^3 D_6^2, D_6^3$
12	*(75, 0, 0, 0)	$2_1, 3, 5$	$R_2^3 D_6^2, D_6^3$
12	*(105, 7, 0, 0)	$2_1, 2_b, 3, 5, 7$	$R_3 D_6^2, R_2^4 R_3 D_4, R_2 R_3 D_4 D_6$
12	*(216, 14, 0, 0)	$2_1, 2_b, 3, 5, 7, 11$	$R_3^2 D_7$
12	(342, 63, 0, 0)	2, 3, 5, 7, 11	$R_2^3, R_3^3, R_2 D_4, D_6$
12	(342, 63, 8, 0)	$2_1, 3, 5, 7, 11$	$R_2^3 R_4$
12	(468, 147, 8, 0)	2, 3, 5, 7, 11	$R_3, R_3 R_4$
12	(720, 315, 80, 9)	2, $3_1, 5, 7, 11$	$R_2 R_6$
13	(972, 315, 16, 0, 0)	$3_b, 5_b$	$R_2 R_3^2 D_3, R_2^2 R_3^2$
13	(1224, 525, 80, 0, 0)	2, 3, 5, $7_1, 11$	R_2^2, D_4
13	(1224, 525, 80, 9, 0)	$2_1, 3, 5, 7, 11$	$R_2^2 R_4$
13	(1980, 1155, 440, 99, 10)	2, $3_1, 5, 7, 11$	R_6
14	(1617, 440, 18, 0, 0)	2_{b1}	$R_2 R_3^2$
14	(2079, 770, 99, 0, 0)	2, 3, 5, $7_1, 11$	R_2, D_3
14	(2079, 770, 99, 10, 0)	$2_1, 3, 5, 7$	$R_2 R_4$
14	(3465, 1760, 594, 120, 11)	$2_4, 3_4, 5_4, 7_4, 11_4$	$R_2 R_7$

TABLE 5. Genus $g \geq 12$

g	char = 3	5	7
9	(84, 35, 6)	(4, 0, 0)	(0, 0, 0)
10	(140, 48, 7)	(5, 0, 0)	(0, 0, 0)
11	(420, 216, 63, 8)	(35, 6, 0, 0)	(0, 0, 0, 0)
12	(720, 315, 80, 9)	(48, 7, 0, 0)	(0, 0, 0, 0)
13	(1980, 1155, 440, 99, 10)	(274, 63, 8, 0, 0)	(6, 0, 0, 0, 0)
14	(3465, 1760, 594, 120, 11)	(315, 80, 9, 0, 0)	(7, 0, 0, 0, 0)

TABLE 6. Sequences \mathbf{a} from g -cuspidal rational normal curves

9. DEGENERATE EXAMPLES

A natural question is whether every sequence coming from a Gorenstein, two-dimensional ring S of degree $2g - 2$ comes from a normal canonical curve, i.e., whether nonsingularity or connectedness impose significant conditions. As indicated by the Example of §5, some sequences do not.

A few 2-linear strands coming from reducible curves are exhibited in Table 7; each came from a 2-dimensional Gorenstein ring of degree $2g - 2$ for the indicated genus g .

10. FURTHER QUESTIONS AND PROJECTS

In this section, we provide a list of possible future research projects.

- (1) Can a Macaulay2 code be written to make effective use of coefficients in finite fields \mathbb{F}_{p^n} ?
- (2) To what extent can quadratic transformations be used to improve bad singularities? Is it computationally feasible to use them to improve our adjunction algorithm?
- (3) Can a Macaulay2 code be written to do adjunction on an arbitrary plane curve, e.g., using the `integralClosure` and `ICmap` operations? Using these functions, can hyperelliptic curves be included in the analysis?
- (4) Can a meaningful analysis be done for curves embedded in spaces other than \mathbb{P}^2 ? We, for instance, considered the intersection of a general quadric and general quartic in \mathbb{P}^3 , and the intersection of two general cubic surfaces in \mathbb{P}^3 . These gave the sequences (64, 20, 0)

genus	2-linear strand	char
6	(6, 6, 1)	3_b
7	(10, 18, 11, 2)	3_{b_2}
8	(15, 35, 22, 1, 0)	3_b
9	(21, 64, 71, 24, 1, 0)	$3_2, 5$
9	(21, 64, 75, 32, 5, 0)	2_4
9	(21, 65, 76, 36, 6, 1)	$7_b, 11_2$
10	(28, 105, 162, 90, 6, 0, 0)	5_{b_2}
10	(28, 105, 162, 101, 17, 0, 0)	2_4
10	(28, 105, 163, 104, 20, 1, 0)	7_2

TABLE 7. 2-linear strands from reducible canonical curves

(genus 9) and $(20, 0, 0)$ (genus 10), respectively. We did not try looking at (normalizations of) singular curves produced in a way similar to this.

- (5) Can the non-generic diagrams calculated for the cuspidal rational normal curve example in Table 6 be realized by genus g canonical curves? If so, what is the connection? For example, in characteristic 3, the sequences are those of trigonal curves. More generally, what diagrams can be realized as degenerations of others?
- (6) We generated our curves $V(F)$ by selecting an element of the linear system of all curves of degree d satisfying some imposed constraints. How are the diagrams of all elements of such a linear system related? For example, what happens when we perturb coefficients? Is there a canonical choice always giving the “generic” element (for instance the sum of all generators of the system as calculated by M2)?
- (7) Is there an effectively computable way to determine the gonality (or Clifford index) of a plane curve given by a degree d homogeneous polynomial? Carefully check whether Green’s conjecture is verified or denied by the examples herein (or others).
- (8) For a general curve C of genus g , what is the minimum degree d of a plane curve Γ onto which C surjects? How many nodes or other singularities are required?
- (9) What effect does assigning nonsingular points to plane curves have? For example, can new diagrams be obtained by requiring curves only to pass through certain configurations of points (in addition to having prescribed singularities at certain points)?
- (10) Do a study on reducible or non-reduced curves. Is there a criterion for determining whether a given Betti diagram comes from a reducible curve?
- (11) In each of the genera $g \in \{9, \dots, 14\}$, there were pairs of sequences of the form

$$\begin{aligned} &(\dots, (g-5)(g-3), \quad 0 \quad, 0) \\ &(\dots, (g-5)(g-3), (g-4), 0). \end{aligned}$$

The first was obtainable with R_2^k and the second with $R_2^k R_4$, where $k = 15 - g$. What are geometric descriptions of the corresponding curves, and what is their relationship? What other patterns can be found in the data?

- (12) More generally, what does the locus with given sequence \mathbf{a} look like in the moduli space of curves?

REFERENCES

- [1] Enrico Arbarello, Maurizio Cornalba, Phillip A. Griffiths, and Joe Harris. *Geometry of algebraic curves. Vol. I*, volume 267 of *Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1985.

- [2] David Cox, John Little, and Donal O'Shea. *Ideals, varieties, and algorithms*. Undergraduate Texts in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, New York, second edition, 1997. An introduction to computational algebraic geometry and commutative algebra.
- [3] David Cox, John Little, and Donal O'Shea. *Using algebraic geometry*, volume 185 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1998.
- [4] David Eisenbud. Green's conjecture: an orientation for algebraists. In *Free resolutions in commutative algebra and algebraic geometry (Sundance, UT, 1990)*, volume 2 of *Res. Notes Math.*, pages 51–78. Jones and Bartlett, Boston, MA, 1992.
- [5] David Eisenbud. *Commutative algebra*, volume 150 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1995. With a view toward algebraic geometry.
- [6] David Eisenbud. Canonical Embeddings of Plane Curves and Gonality, A Mathematical Vignette. Available at <https://stanford.edu/~mluciano/M2-help/1634.html>, 2002.
- [7] Daniel R. Grayson and Michael E. Stillman. Macaulay2, a software system for research in algebraic geometry. Available at <https://faculty.math.illinois.edu/Macaulay2>, 1993-2002.
- [8] Mark L. Green. Koszul cohomology and the geometry of projective varieties. *J. Differential Geom.*, 19(1):125–171, 1984.
- [9] Frank-Olaf Schreyer. Syzygies of canonical curves and special linear series. *Math. Ann.*, 275(1):105–137, 1986.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA, ATHENS, GA 30602 (ESTU, IM, MANNING, MICHAELS, RULLA)

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, EMMANUEL COLLEGE, FRANKLIN SPRINGS, GA 30639 (PASKO)

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, AUGUSTA STATE UNIVERSITY, AUGUSTA, GA 30904 (WIJESINGHE)

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY, WEST POINT, NY 10996 (IM: POINT OF CONTACT)

E-mail address: `meeseongim@gmail.com`