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#### Abstract

In the moduli space $\mathcal{R}_{g}$ of double étale covers of curves of a fixed genus $g$, the locus of covers of curves with a semicanonical pencil decomposes as the union of two divisors $\mathcal{T}_{g}^{e}$ and $\mathcal{T}_{g}^{o}$. Adapting arguments of Teixidor for the divisor of curves having a semicanonical pencil, we prove that both divisors are irreducible and compute their divisor classes in the Deligne-Mumford compactification $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{g}$.


## 1. Introduction

Let $\pi: \widetilde{C} \rightarrow C$ be a double étale cover between smooth curves of genus $g=g(C)$ and $\widetilde{g}=$ $g(\widetilde{C})=2 g-1$, and denote by $(P, \Xi)$ its (principally polarized) Prym variety.

In his fundamental work [12], Mumford classified the singularities of the theta divisor $\Xi$. More precisely, he considered a translation $P^{+}$of the $\operatorname{Prym}$ variety to $\operatorname{Pic}^{2 g-2}(\widetilde{C})=\operatorname{Pic}^{\widetilde{g}-1}(\widetilde{C})$, together with a canonical theta divisor $\Xi^{+} \subset P^{+}$:

$$
\begin{gathered}
P^{+}=\left\{M \in \operatorname{Pic}^{2 g-2}(\widetilde{C}) \mid \operatorname{Nm}_{\pi}(M)=\omega_{C}, h^{0}(\widetilde{C}, M) \text { even }\right\} \\
\Xi^{+}=\left\{M \in P^{+} \mid h^{0}(\widetilde{C}, M) \geq 2\right\}
\end{gathered}
$$

Then every singular point of $\Xi^{+}$is stable ( $M \in \Xi^{+}$with $h^{0}(\widetilde{C}, M) \geq 4$ ) or exceptional ( $M=$ $\pi^{*} L \otimes A \in \Xi^{+}$such that $h^{0}(C, L) \geq 2$ and $\left.h^{0}(\widetilde{C}, A)>0\right)$.
Assume $C$ has a semicanonical pencil, that is, an even theta-characteristic $L$ with $h^{0}(C, L) \geq 2$ (in the literature, this is also frequently referred to as a vanishing theta-null). If $h^{0}\left(\widetilde{C}, \pi^{*} L\right)$ is furthermore even, then $M=\pi^{*} L \in \Xi^{+}$is an example of exceptional singularity. In that case, $L$ is called an even semicanonical pencil for the cover $\pi$, and the $\operatorname{Prym}$ variety $(P, \Xi)$ belongs to the divisor $\theta_{\text {null }} \subset \mathcal{A}_{g-1}$ of principally polarized abelian varieties whose theta divisor contains a singular 2 -torsion point.
In the paper [2], Beauville showed that the Andreotti-Mayer locus

$$
\mathcal{N}_{0}=\left\{(A, \Xi) \in \mathcal{A}_{4} \mid \operatorname{Sing}(\Xi) \text { is non-empty }\right\}
$$

in $\mathcal{A}_{4}$ is the union of two irreducible divisors: the (closure of the) Jacobian locus $\mathcal{J}_{4}$ and $\theta_{\text {null }}$. An essential tool for the proof is the extension of the Prym map $\mathcal{P}_{g}: \mathcal{R}_{g} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_{g-1}$ to a proper map $\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}_{g}: \widetilde{\mathcal{R}}_{g} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_{g-1}$, by considering admissible covers instead of only smooth covers. In the case $g=5$, this guarantees that every 4-dimensional principally polarized abelian variety is a Prym variety (i.e. the dominant map $\mathcal{P}_{5}$ is replaced by the surjective map $\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}_{5}$ ).

[^0]Then, one of the key points in Beauville's work is an identification of the coverings whose (generalized) Prym variety is contained in $\theta_{\text {null }}$. Indeed, the results in $[2$, Section 7] together with [2, Theorem 4.10] show that

$$
\mathcal{T}^{e}=\left(\text { closure in } \widetilde{\mathcal{R}}_{5} \text { of }\right)\left\{[\pi: \widetilde{C} \longrightarrow C] \in \mathcal{R}_{5} \mid \text { the cover } \pi \text { has an even semicanonical pencil }\right\}
$$

is irreducible and equals $\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}_{5}^{-1}\left(\theta_{\text {null }}\right)$. Therefore, the irreducibility of $\theta_{\text {null }} \subset \mathcal{A}_{4}$ is obtained from the irreducibility of $\mathcal{T}^{e}$; the proof of the latter starts by noticing that

$$
\mathcal{T}=\left\{[C] \in \mathcal{M}_{5} \mid C \text { has a semicanonical pencil }\right\}
$$

is an irreducible divisor of $\mathcal{M}_{5}$.
Now let us consider double étale covers of curves with a semicanonical pencil, in arbitrary genus. For a fixed $g \geq 3$, let $\mathcal{T}_{g} \subset \mathcal{M}_{g}$ denote the locus of (isomorphism classes of) curves with a semicanonical pencil (i.e. with an even, effective theta-characteristic). Note that $\mathcal{T}_{g}$ is the divisorial part of the locus of curves admitting a theta-characteristic of positive (projective) dimension ([16]).
The general element of $\mathcal{T}_{g}$ has a unique such theta-characteristic (which is a semicanonical pencil $L$ with $h^{0}(C, L)=2$ ), and the pullback of $\mathcal{T}_{g}$ to $\mathcal{R}_{g}$ decomposes as a union $\mathcal{T}_{g}^{e} \cup \mathcal{T}_{g}^{o}$ according to the parity of $h^{0}\left(\widetilde{C}, \pi^{*} L\right)$. In other words, the general element of $\mathcal{T}_{g}^{e}$ (resp. $\left.\mathcal{T}_{g}^{o}\right)$ is a cover with an even semicanonical pencil (resp. an odd semicanonical pencil).
In view of Beauville's work, it is natural to ask whether $\mathcal{T}_{g}^{e}$ and $\mathcal{T}_{g}^{o}$ are irreducible divisors, and to ask about the behaviour of the restricted Prym maps $\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}_{g} \mid \mathcal{T}_{g}$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}_{g} \mid \mathcal{T}_{g}$.
This paper exclusively deals with the first question, and studies the divisors $\mathcal{T}_{g}^{e}$ and $\mathcal{T}_{g}^{o}$ of even and odd semicanonical pencils. Aside from its independent interest, it provides tools for attacking the second question; a study of the restricted Prym maps $\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}_{g} \mid \mathcal{T}_{g}$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}_{g} \mid \mathcal{T}_{g}$ is carried out in the subsequent paper [9].
Coming back to the first question, the divisor $\mathcal{T}_{g} \subset \mathcal{M}_{g}$ was studied by Teixidor in [17]. Using the theory of limit linear series on curves of compact type developed by Eisenbud and Harris in [3], Teixidor proved the irreducibility of $\mathcal{T}_{g}$ and computed the class of its closure in the Deligne-Mumford compactification $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g}$.
In our case, we will work in the Deligne-Mumford compactification $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{g}$ of $\mathcal{R}_{g}$ (first considered in [2, Section 6], during the construction of the proper Prym map). Following closely Teixidor's approach, we obtain natural analogues of her results for the two divisors of Prym semicanonical pencils:

Theorem A. Let $\left[\mathcal{T}_{g}^{e}\right],\left[\mathcal{T}_{g}^{o}\right] \in \operatorname{Pic}\left(\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{g}\right){ }_{\mathbb{Q}}$ denote the classes of (the closures of) $\mathcal{T}_{g}^{e}, \mathcal{T}_{g}^{o}$ in the Deligne-Mumford compactification $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{g}$. Then, the following equalities hold:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& {\left[\mathcal{T}_{g}^{e}\right]=a \lambda-b_{0}^{\prime} \delta_{0}^{\prime}-b_{0}^{\prime \prime} \delta_{0}^{\prime \prime}-b_{0}^{r a m} \delta_{0}^{r a m}-\sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor g / 2\rfloor}\left(b_{i} \delta_{i}+b_{g-i} \delta_{g-i}+b_{i: g-i} \delta_{i: g-i}\right),} \\
& {\left[\mathcal{T}_{g}^{o}\right]=c \lambda-d_{0}^{\prime} \delta_{0}^{\prime}-d_{0}^{\prime \prime} \delta_{0}^{\prime \prime}-d_{0}^{r a m} \delta_{0}^{r a m}-\sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor g / 2\rfloor}\left(d_{i} \delta_{i}+d_{g-i} \delta_{g-i}+d_{i: g-i} \delta_{i: g-i}\right),}
\end{aligned}
$$

where

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
a=2^{g-3}\left(2^{g-1}+1\right), & c=2^{2 g-4} \\
b_{0}^{\prime}=2^{2 g-7}, & d_{0}^{\prime}=2^{2 g-7} \\
b_{0}^{\prime \prime}=0, & d_{0}^{\prime \prime}=2^{2 g-6} \\
b_{0}^{r a m}=2^{g-5}\left(2^{g-1}+1\right), & d_{0}^{r a m}=2^{g-5}\left(2^{g-1}-1\right), \\
b_{i}=2^{g-3}\left(2^{g-i}-1\right)\left(2^{i-1}-1\right), & d_{i}=2^{g+i-4}\left(2^{g-i}-1\right), \\
b_{g-i}=2^{g-3}\left(2^{g-i-1}-1\right)\left(2^{i}-1\right), & d_{g-i}=2^{2 g-i-4}\left(2^{i}-1\right), \\
b_{i: g-i}=2^{g-3}\left(2^{g-1}-2^{i-1}-2^{g-i-1}+1\right), & d_{i: g-i}=2^{g-3}\left(2^{g-1}-2^{g-i-1}-2^{i-1}\right)
\end{array}
$$

Theorem B. For every $g \neq 4$ the divisors $\mathcal{T}_{g}^{e}$ and $\mathcal{T}_{g}^{o}$ are irreducible.
A crucial role in the proofs is played by the intersection of $\mathcal{T}_{g}^{e}$ and $\mathcal{T}_{g}^{o}$ with the boundary divisors in $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{g}$ of covers of reducible curves. This is the content of Proposition 3.1. Then in section 3 we prove Theorem A by intersecting $\mathcal{T}_{g}^{e}$ and $\mathcal{T}_{g}^{o}$ with appropriate test curves in $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{g}$.
The proof of Theorem B for $g \geq 5$ is given in section 4 , and combines monodromy arguments with the intersection of $\mathcal{T}_{g}^{e}$ and $\mathcal{T}_{g}^{o}$ with the boundary divisor $\Delta_{1} \subset \overline{\mathcal{R}}_{g}$. We point out that the irreducibility for $g=3$ can be immediately checked in terms of hyperelliptic curves (Example 2.1), whereas the irreducibility of $\mathcal{T}_{4}^{e}$ and $\mathcal{T}_{4}^{o}$ is obtained in the paper [9] as a consequence of the study of the restricted Prym maps $\left.\mathcal{P}_{4}\right|_{\mathcal{T}_{4}^{e}}$ and $\mathcal{P}_{4} \mid \mathcal{T}_{4}^{o}$.
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## 2. Preliminaries

2.1. The moduli space $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{g}$. This part is a brief review of the Deligne-Mumford compactification $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{g}$ and its boundary divisors. We follow the presentation of [5, Section 1]; the reader is referred to it for further details.

Let $\mathcal{M}_{g}$ be the moduli space of smooth curves of genus $g$, and let $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g}$ be its Deligne-Mumford compactification by stable curves. Following the standard notations, we denote by $\Delta_{i}(i=$ $0, \ldots,\lfloor g / 2\rfloor)$ the irreducible divisors forming the boundary $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g} \backslash \mathcal{M}_{g}$. The general point of $\Delta_{0}$ is an irreducible curve with a single node, whereas the general point of $\Delta_{i}$ (for $i \geq 1$ ) is the union of two smooth curves of genus $i$ and $g-i$, intersecting transversely at a point.

The classes $\delta_{i}$ of the divisors $\Delta_{i}$, together with the Hodge class $\lambda$, are well known to form a basis of the rational Picard group $\operatorname{Pic}\left(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g}\right)_{\mathbb{Q}}$.

We denote by $\mathcal{R}_{g}$ the moduli space of connected double étale covers of smooth curves of genus $g$. In other words, $\mathcal{R}_{g}$ parametrizes isomorphism classes of pairs $(C, \eta)$, where $C$ is smooth of genus $g$ and $\eta \in J C_{2} \backslash\left\{\mathcal{O}_{C}\right\}$. It comes with a natural forgetful map $\pi: \mathcal{R}_{g} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{g}$ which
is étale of degree $2^{2 g}-1$. Then, the Deligne-Mumford compactification $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{g}$ is obtained as the normalization of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g}$ in the function field of $\mathcal{R}_{g}$. This gives a commutative diagram

where $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{g}$ is normal and the morphism $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{g} \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g}$ (that we will denote by $\pi$ as well) is finite.
Beauville's partial compactification $\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}_{g}$ by admissible covers admits a natural inclusion into $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{g}$. As proved in [1], the variety $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{g}$ parametrizes isomorphism classes of Prym curves of genus $g$, that is, isomorphism classes of triples $(X, \eta, \beta)$ where:

- $X$ is a quasi-stable curve of genus $g$, i.e. $X$ is semistable and any two of its exceptional components are disjoint ${ }^{1}$.
- $\eta \in \operatorname{Pic}^{0}(X)$ is a line bundle of total degree 0 , such that $\left.\eta\right|_{E}=\mathcal{O}_{E}(1)$ for every exceptional component $E \subset X$.
- $\beta: \eta^{\otimes 2} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{X}$ is generically nonzero over each non-exceptional component of $X$.

In case that $\beta$ is clear from the context, by abuse of notation the $\operatorname{Prym}$ curve $(X, \eta, \beta)$ will be often denoted simply by $(X, \eta)$.
Then the morphism $\pi: \overline{\mathcal{R}}_{g} \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g}$ sends (the class of) $(X, \eta, \beta)$ to (the class of) the stable model $\operatorname{st}(X)$, obtained by contraction of the exceptional components of $X$.
Using pullbacks of the boundary divisors of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g}$, the boundary $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{g} \backslash \mathcal{R}_{g}$ admits the following description (see [5, Examples 1.3 and 1.4]):
(1) Let $(X, \eta, \beta)$ be a Prym curve, such that $\operatorname{st}(X)$ is the union of two smooth curves $C_{i}$ and $C_{g-i}$ (of respective genus $i$ and $g-i$ ) intersecting transversely at a point $P$. In such a case $X=\operatorname{st}(X)$, and giving a 2-torsion line bundle $\eta \in \operatorname{Pic}^{0}(X)_{2}$ is the same as giving a nontrivial pair $\left(\eta_{i}, \eta_{g-i}\right) \in\left(J C_{i}\right)_{2} \times\left(J C_{g-i}\right)_{2}$.
Then the preimage $\pi^{-1}\left(\Delta_{i}\right)$ decomposes as the union of three irreducible divisors (denoted by $\Delta_{i}, \Delta_{g-i}$ and $\Delta_{i: g-i}$ ), which are distinguished by the behaviour of the 2-torsion bundle. More concretely, their general point is a Prym curve $(X, \eta)$, where $X=C_{i} \cup_{P} C_{g-i}$ is a reducible curve as above and the pair $\eta=\left(\eta_{i}, \eta_{g-i}\right)$ satisfies:

- $\eta_{g-i}=\mathcal{O}_{C_{g-i}}$, in the case of $\Delta_{i}$.
- $\eta_{i}=\mathcal{O}_{C_{i}}$, in the case of $\Delta_{g-i}$.
- $\eta_{i} \neq \mathcal{O}_{C_{i}}$ and $\eta_{g-i} \neq \mathcal{O}_{C_{g-i}}$, in the case of $\Delta_{i: g-i}$.
(2) Let $(X, \eta, \beta)$ be a Prym curve, such that $\operatorname{st}(X)$ is the irreducible nodal curve obtained by identification of two points $p, q$ on a smooth curve $C$ of genus $g-1$.
If $X=\operatorname{st}(X)$ and $\nu: C \rightarrow X$ denotes the normalization, then $\eta \in \operatorname{Pic}^{0}(X)_{2}$ is determined by the choice of $\eta_{C}=\nu^{*}(\eta) \in J C_{2}$ and an identification of the fibers $\eta_{C}(p)$ and $\eta_{C}(q)$.

[^1]- If $\eta_{C}=\mathcal{O}_{C}$, there is only one possible identification of $\mathcal{O}_{C}(p)$ and $\mathcal{O}_{C}(q)$ (namely identification by -1 ) giving a nontrivial $\eta \in \operatorname{Pic}^{0}(X)_{2}$. The corresponding element $(X, \eta)$ may be regarded as a Wirtinger cover of $X$.
- If $\eta_{C} \neq \mathcal{O}_{C}$, for each of the $2^{2 g-2}-1$ choices of $\eta_{C}$ there are two possible identifications of $\mathcal{O}_{C}(p)$ and $\mathcal{O}_{C}(q)$. The $2\left(2^{2 g-2}-1\right)$ corresponding Prym curves $(X, \eta)$ are non-admissible covers of $X$.
If $X \neq \operatorname{st}(X)$, then $X$ is the union of $C$ with an exceptional component $E$ through the points $p$ and $q$. The line bundle $\eta \in \operatorname{Pic}^{0}(X)$ must satisfy $\left.\eta\right|_{E}=\mathcal{O}_{E}(1)$ and $\left.\eta\right|_{C}{ }^{\otimes 2}=$ $\mathcal{O}_{C}(-p-q)$, which gives $2^{2 g-2}$ possibilities. The corresponding Prym curves $(X, \eta)$ give Beauville admissible covers of $\operatorname{st}(X)$.
It follows that $\pi^{-1}\left(\Delta_{0}\right)=\Delta_{0}^{\prime} \cup \Delta_{0}^{\prime \prime} \cup \Delta_{0}^{\text {ram }}$, where $\Delta_{0}^{\prime}$ (resp. $\Delta_{0}^{\prime \prime}$, resp. $\Delta_{0}^{\text {ram }}$ ) is an irreducible divisor whose general point is a non-admissible (resp. Wirtinger, resp. Beauville admissible) cover. Moreover, $\Delta_{0}^{r a m}$ is the ramification locus of $\pi$ (see [5, Page 763] or [1, Section 3]).

In terms of divisor classes, we have equalities

$$
\pi^{*}\left(\delta_{i}\right)=\delta_{i}+\delta_{g-i}+\delta_{i: g-i}, \quad \pi^{*}\left(\delta_{0}\right)=\delta_{0}^{\prime}+\delta_{0}^{\prime \prime}+2 \delta_{0}^{r a m}
$$

where of course $\delta_{i}, \delta_{g-i}, \delta_{i: g-i}(1 \leq i \leq\lfloor g / 2\rfloor)$ and $\delta_{0}^{\prime}, \delta_{0}^{\prime \prime}, \delta_{0}^{r a m}$ are the classes of the boundary divisors of $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{g}$. These boundary classes, together with the pullback (also denoted by $\lambda$ ) of the Hodge class of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g}$, form a basis of the rational Picard group $\operatorname{Pic}\left(\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{g}\right)_{\mathbb{Q}}$.
2.2. Divisors of Prym semicanonical pencils. If $C$ is a smooth curve of genus $g \geq 3$, by semicanonical pencil on $C$ we mean an even, effective theta-characteristic. By dimension of a theta-characteristic $L$ we mean the (projective) dimension $h^{0}(C, L)-1$ of the linear system $|L|$. The locus of smooth curves admitting a semicanonical pencil is a divisor in $\mathcal{M}_{g}$, whose irreducibility was proved in [17, Theorem 2.4]. In the same paper, the class of its closure $\mathcal{T}_{g}$ in $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g}$ was computed.

Since the parity of theta-characteristics remains constant in families ([13]), the pullback of $\mathcal{T}_{g}$ to $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{g}$ decomposes as $\pi^{-1}\left(\mathcal{T}_{g}\right)=\mathcal{T}_{g}^{e} \cup \mathcal{T}_{g}^{o}$, where $\mathcal{T}_{g}^{e}$ (resp. $\mathcal{T}_{g}^{o}$ ) is the closure in $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{g}$ of the set

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left\{(C, \eta) \in \mathcal{R}_{g} \mid C \text { has a semicanonical pencil } L \text { with } h^{0}(C, L \otimes \eta) \text { even }\right\} \\
\text { (resp. } & \left.\left\{(C, \eta) \in \mathcal{R}_{g} \mid C \text { has a semicanonical pencil } L \text { with } h^{0}(C, L \otimes \eta) \text { odd }\right\}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

Note that both $\mathcal{T}_{g}^{e}$ and $\mathcal{T}_{g}^{o}$ have pure codimension 1 in $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{g}$, since their union is the pullback by a finite map of an irreducible divisor. Furthermore, the restriction

$$
\left.\pi\right|_{\mathcal{T}_{g}^{e}}: \mathcal{T}_{g}^{e} \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}_{g} \quad\left(\text { resp. }\left.\pi\right|_{\mathcal{T}_{g}}: \mathcal{T}_{g}^{o} \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}_{g}\right)
$$

is surjective and generically finite of degree $2^{g-1}\left(2^{g}+1\right)-1$ (resp. of degree $2^{g-1}\left(2^{g}-1\right)$ ). This follows from the fact that a general element of $\mathcal{T}_{g}$ has a unique semicanonical pencil ([16, Theorem 2.16]), as well as from the number of even and odd theta-characteristics on a smooth curve.

Example 2.1. When $g=3$ a semicanonical pencil is the same as a $g_{2}^{1}$, and thus the divisor $\mathcal{T}_{3} \subset \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{3}$ equals the hyperelliptic locus $\mathcal{H}_{3}$. Of course, the semicanonical pencil on every
smooth curve $C \in \mathcal{T}_{3}$ is unique. The 63 non-trivial elements of $J C_{2}$ can be represented by linear combinations of the Weierstrass points $R_{1}, \ldots, R_{8}$ as follows:

- Those represented as a difference of two Weierstrass points, $\eta=\mathcal{O}_{C}\left(R_{i}-R_{j}\right)$, form a set of $\binom{8}{2}=28$ elements. Observe that in this case the theta-characteristic $g_{2}^{1} \otimes \eta=\mathcal{O}_{C}\left(2 R_{j}+R_{i}-\right.$ $\left.R_{j}\right)=\mathcal{O}_{C}\left(R_{i}+R_{j}\right)$ is odd.
- Those expressed as a linear combination of four distinct Weierstrass points, $\eta=\mathcal{O}_{C}\left(R_{i}+\right.$ $R_{j}-R_{k}-R_{l}$ ), form a set of $\frac{\binom{8}{4}}{2}=35$ elements $^{2}$. According to the number of odd and even theta-characteristics on a genus 3 curve, in this case $g_{2}^{1} \otimes \eta$ is even.

Hence we obtain

$$
\begin{gathered}
\mathcal{T}_{3}^{o}=(\text { closure of })\left\{(C, \eta) \in \mathcal{R}_{3} \mid C \text { hyperelliptic, } \eta=\mathcal{O}_{C}\left(R_{i}-R_{j}\right)\right\} \subset \overline{\mathcal{R}}_{3} \\
\mathcal{T}_{3}^{e}=(\text { closure of })\left\{(C, \eta) \in \mathcal{R}_{3} \mid C \text { hyperelliptic, } \eta=\mathcal{O}_{C}\left(R_{i}+R_{j}-R_{k}-R_{l}\right)\right\} \subset \overline{\mathcal{R}}_{3}
\end{gathered}
$$

and, since monodromy on hyperelliptic curves acts transitively on tuples of Weierstrass points, it turns out that both divisors $\mathcal{T}_{3}^{o}$ and $\mathcal{T}_{3}^{e}$ are irreducible.

## 3. Proof of Theorem A

We denote by $\left[\mathcal{T}_{g}^{e}\right],\left[\mathcal{T}_{g}^{o}\right] \in \operatorname{Pic}\left(\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{g}\right)_{\mathbb{Q}}$ the classes in $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{g}$ of the divisors $\mathcal{T}_{g}^{e}$ and $\mathcal{T}_{g}^{o}$. This section is entirely devoted to proving Theorem A.
First of all, observe that the pullback of the class $\left[\mathcal{T}_{g}\right] \in \operatorname{Pic}\left(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g}\right)_{\mathbb{Q}}$ (computed in [17, Proposition 3.1]) expresses $\left[\mathcal{T}_{g}^{e}\right]+\left[\mathcal{T}_{g}^{o}\right]$ as

$$
\pi^{*}\left[\mathcal{T}_{g}\right]=2^{g-3}\left(\left(2^{g}+1\right) \lambda-2^{g-3}\left(\delta_{0}^{\prime}+\delta_{0}^{\prime \prime}+2 \delta_{0}^{r a m}\right)-\sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor g / 2\rfloor}\left(2^{g-i}-1\right)\left(2^{i}-1\right)\left(\delta_{i}+\delta_{g-i}+\delta_{i: g-i}\right)\right) .
$$

This relation, together with the linear independence of the basic classes considered in $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{g}$, simplifies the computations: if we know a coefficient for one of the divisors, then we also know the coefficient corresponding to the same basic class for the other divisor. Keeping this in mind, the coefficients of Theorem A can be determined by essentially following three steps:
(1) The pushforward $\pi_{*}\left[\mathcal{T}_{g}^{e}\right]$ easily gives the coefficient $a$ (hence $c$ ), as well as a relation between $b_{0}^{\prime}, b_{0}^{\prime \prime}$ and $b_{0}^{r a m}$ (hence between $d_{0}^{\prime}, d_{0}^{\prime \prime}$ and $d_{0}^{r a m}$ ).
(2) We adapt an argument of Teixidor [17] to compute the coefficients $b_{i}, b_{g-i}$ and $b_{i: g-i}$ for every $i \geq 1$ : first we describe the intersection of $\mathcal{T}_{g}^{e}$ with the boundary divisors $\Delta_{i}, \Delta_{g-i}$ and $\Delta_{i: g-i}$, and then we intersect $\mathcal{T}_{g}^{e}$ with certain test curves.
(3) Finally, $d_{0}^{\prime}$ and $d_{0}^{\prime \prime}$ are obtained intersecting $\mathcal{T}_{g}^{o}$ with test curves contained inside $\Delta_{0}^{\prime}$ and $\Delta_{0}^{\prime \prime}$ respectively. The relation obtained in (1) determines $d_{0}^{\text {ram }}$ as well.

For step (1), note that on the one hand

$$
\pi_{*}\left[\mathcal{T}_{g}^{e}\right]=\operatorname{deg}\left(\mathcal{T}_{g}^{e} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_{g}\right) \cdot\left[\mathcal{T}_{g}\right]=\left(2^{g-1}\left(2^{g}+1\right)-1\right) 2^{g-3}\left(\left(2^{g}+1\right) \lambda-2^{g-3} \delta_{0}-\ldots\right)
$$

[^2]where $\ldots$ is a expression involving only the classes $\delta_{1}, \ldots, \delta_{\lfloor g / 2\rfloor}$. On the other hand
$$
\pi_{*}\left[\mathcal{T}_{g}^{e}\right]=a \pi_{*} \lambda-b_{0}^{\prime} \pi_{*} \delta_{0}^{\prime}-b_{0}^{\prime \prime} \pi_{*} \delta_{0}^{\prime \prime}-b_{0}^{r a m} \pi_{*} \delta_{0}^{r a m}-\sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor g / 2\rfloor}\left(b_{i} \pi_{*} \delta_{i}+b_{g-i} \pi_{*} \delta_{g-i}+b_{i: g-i} \pi_{*} \delta_{i: g-i}\right)
$$
and, since $\pi_{*} \lambda=\pi_{*}\left(\pi^{*} \lambda\right)=\operatorname{deg} \pi \cdot \lambda$ and the divisors $\Delta_{0}^{\prime}, \Delta_{0}^{\prime \prime}$ and $\Delta_{0}^{r a m}$ of $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{g}$ have respective degrees $2\left(2^{2 g-2}-1\right), 1$ and $2^{2 g-2}$ over $\Delta_{0} \subset \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g}$, we obtain
$$
\pi_{*}\left[\mathcal{T}_{g}^{e}\right]=a\left(2^{2 g}-1\right) \lambda-\left(2\left(2^{2 g-2}-1\right) b_{0}^{\prime}+b_{0}^{\prime \prime}+2^{2 g-2} b_{0}^{r a m}\right) \delta_{0}+\ldots
$$
where $\ldots$ again denotes a linear combination of $\delta_{1}, \ldots, \delta_{\lfloor g / 2\rfloor}$.
Using that $\lambda, \delta_{0}, \ldots \delta_{\lfloor g / 2\rfloor} \in \operatorname{Pic}\left(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g}\right)_{\mathbb{Q}}$ are linearly independent, we can compare the coefficients of $\lambda$ and $\delta_{0}$. Comparison for $\lambda$ yields
$$
a=\frac{\left(2^{g-1}\left(2^{g}+1\right)-1\right) 2^{g-3}\left(2^{g}+1\right)}{2^{2 g}-1}=2^{g-3}\left(2^{g-1}+1\right)
$$
therefore $c=2^{2 g-4}$ due to the relation $a+c=2^{g-3}\left(2^{g}+1\right)$.
Comparison for $\delta_{0}$ gives
$$
\left(2^{2 g-1}-2\right) b_{0}^{\prime}+b_{0}^{\prime \prime}+2^{2 g-2} b_{0}^{r a m}=2^{2 g-6}\left(2^{g-1}\left(2^{g}+1\right)-1\right)
$$
or equivalently
$$
\left(2^{2 g-1}-2\right) d_{0}^{\prime}+d_{0}^{\prime \prime}+2^{2 g-2} d_{0}^{r a m}=2^{3 g-7}\left(2^{g}-1\right)
$$

In step (2), the key point is the following description of the intersection of $\mathcal{T}_{g}^{e}$ and $\mathcal{T}_{g}^{o}$ with the preimages $\pi^{-1}\left(\Delta_{i}\right)$. It is nothing but an adaptation of [17, Proposition 1.2]:

Proposition 3.1. For $i \geq 1$, the general point of the intersection $\mathcal{T}_{g}^{e} \cap \pi^{-1}\left(\Delta_{i}\right)$ (resp. $\mathcal{T}_{g}^{o} \cap$ $\pi^{-1}\left(\Delta_{i}\right)$ ) is a pair $(C, \eta)$ where:
(i) The curve $C$ is the union at a point $P$ of two smooth curves $C_{i}$ and $C_{g-i}$ of respective genera $i$ and $g-i$, and satisfies one of these four conditions $(j=i, g-i)$ :
$\left.\alpha_{j}\right) C_{j}$ has a 1-dimensional (even) theta-characteristic $L_{j}$. In this case, the 1-dimensional limit theta-characteristics on $C$ are determined by the aspects $\left|L_{j}\right|+(g-j) P$ on $C_{j}$ and $\left|L_{g-j}+2 P\right|+(j-2) P$ on $C_{g-j}$, where $L_{g-j}$ is any even theta-characteristic on $C_{g-j}$.
$\left.\beta_{j}\right) P$ is in the support of an effective (0-dimensional) theta-characteristic $L_{j}$ on $C_{j}$. The aspects of the 1-dimensional limit theta-characteristics on $C$ are $\left|L_{j}+P\right|+(g-j-1) P$ on $C_{j}$ and $\left|L_{g-j}+2 P\right|+(j-2) P$ on $C_{g-j}$, where $L_{g-j}$ is any odd theta-characteristic on $C_{g-j}$.
(ii) $\eta=\left(\eta_{i}, \eta_{g-i}\right)$ is a non-trivial 2-torsion line bundle on $C$, such that the numbers $h^{0}\left(C_{i}, L_{i} \otimes\right.$ $\left.\eta_{i}\right)$ and $h^{0}\left(C_{g-i}, L_{g-i} \otimes \eta_{g-i}\right)$ have the same (resp. opposite) parity.

Proof. First of all, note that item (i) describes the general element of the intersection $\mathcal{T}_{g} \cap \Delta_{i}$ in $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g}$ : this is exactly [17, Proposition 1.2].
Moreover, if $(C, \eta) \in \mathcal{T}_{g}^{e} \cap \pi^{-1}\left(\Delta_{i}\right)$ (resp. $(C, \eta) \in \mathcal{T}_{g}^{o} \cap \pi^{-1}\left(\Delta_{i}\right)$ ), then there exists (a germ of) a 1-dimensional family $(\mathcal{C} \rightarrow S, H, \mathcal{L})$ of Prym curves $\left(\mathcal{C}_{s}, H_{s}\right)$ endowed with a 1-dimensional theta-characteristic $\mathcal{L}_{s}$, such that:
(1) For every $s \neq 0,\left(\mathcal{C}_{s}, H_{s}\right)$ is a smooth Prym curve such that $\mathcal{L}_{s} \otimes H_{s}$ is an even (resp. odd) theta-characteristic on $\mathcal{C}_{s}$.
(2) The family $(\mathcal{C} \rightarrow S, H)$ specializes to $(C, \eta)=\left(\mathcal{C}_{0}, H_{0}\right)$.

The possible aspects of the 1 -dimensional limit series of $\mathcal{L}$ on $C=\mathcal{C}_{0}$ are described by item (i). Now the result follows from the fact that, on the one hand, the aspects of the limit series of $\mathcal{L} \otimes H$ on $C=\mathcal{C}_{0}$ are the same aspects as the limit of $\mathcal{L}$, but twisted by $\eta=H_{0}$; and on the other hand, the parity of a theta-characteristic on the reducible curve $C$ is the product of the parities of the theta-characteristics induced on $C_{i}$ and $C_{g-i}$.

Remark 3.2. For a fixed general element $C$ of the intersection $\mathcal{T}_{g} \cap \Delta_{i}$ (i.e. a curve $C$ satisfying the condition (i) above), the number of $\eta=\left(\eta_{i}, \eta_{g-i}\right)$ such that $(C, \eta) \in \mathcal{T}_{g}^{e}$ can be easily computed. Indeed, the number of $\eta$ giving parities (even,even) is the product of the number of even theta-characteristics on $C_{i}$ and the number of even theta-characteristics on $C_{g-i}$ :

$$
2^{i-1}\left(2^{i}+1\right) 2^{g-i-1}\left(2^{g-i}+1\right)=2^{g-2}\left(2^{i}+1\right)\left(2^{g-i}+1\right)
$$

Similarly, the number of $\eta$ giving parities (odd,odd) is

$$
2^{i-1}\left(2^{i}-1\right) 2^{g-i-1}\left(2^{g-i}-1\right)=2^{g-2}\left(2^{i}-1\right)\left(2^{g-i}-1\right)
$$

From all these, we have to discard the trivial bundle $\left(\mathcal{O}_{C_{i}}, \mathcal{O}_{C_{g-i}}\right)$. Hence the total number of $\eta$ (both even and odd, counted together) is

$$
2^{g-2}\left(2^{i}+1\right)\left(2^{g-i}+1\right)+2^{g-2}\left(2^{i}-1\right)\left(2^{g-i}-1\right)-1=2^{g-1}\left(2^{g}+1\right)-1
$$

which indeed coincides with the degree of $\mathcal{T}_{g}^{e}$ over $\mathcal{T}_{g}$. Of course the configuration of the fiber $\left.\pi\right|_{\mathcal{T}_{g}^{e}}{ }^{-1}(C)$ along the divisors $\Delta_{i}, \Delta_{g-i}$ and $\Delta_{i: g-i}$ will depend on whether $C$ satisfies $\alpha_{j}$ ) or $\beta_{j}$ ).

Lemma 3.3. If $C$ is a smooth curve of genus $g$ and $\eta \in J C_{2}$ is a non-trivial 2-torsion line bundle, then there are exactly $2^{g-1}\left(2^{g-1}-1\right)$ odd theta-characteristics $L$ on $C$ such that $L \otimes \eta$ is also odd.

Proof. This can be checked, for example, by considering how the group $J C_{2}$ of 2 -torsion line bundles acts on the set $S_{g}(C)$ of theta characteristics. The associated difference map

$$
S_{g}(C) \times S_{g}(C) \longrightarrow J C_{2}, \quad(M, N) \longmapsto M \otimes N^{-1}
$$

can be restricted to the set of pairs of non-isomorphic odd theta-characteristics, that is,

$$
S_{g}^{-}(C) \times S_{g}^{-}(C)-\Delta \longrightarrow J C_{2}-\left\{\mathcal{O}_{C}\right\}
$$

Since $\# S_{g}^{-}(C)=2^{g-1}\left(2^{g}-1\right)$ and $\# J C_{2}=2^{2 g}$, the fibers of this restriction have order

$$
\# S_{g}^{-}(C) \cdot\left(\# S_{g}^{-}(C)-1\right) \cdot\left(\# J C_{2}-1\right)^{-1}=2^{g-1}\left(2^{g-1}-1\right)
$$

which reflects the number of odd theta-characteristics $L$ such that $L \otimes \eta$ is also odd.

Now, given an integer $i \geq 1$, we proceed to compute the coefficients $b_{i}, b_{g-i}$ and $b_{i: g-i}$ of the class $\left[\mathcal{T}_{g}{ }^{e}\right]$. We follow the argument in [17, Proposition 3.1].

Fix two smooth curves $C_{i}$ and $C_{g-i}$ of respective genera $i$ and $g-i$ having no theta-characteristic of positive dimension, as a well as a point $p \in C_{i}$ lying in the support of no effective thetacharacteristic. We denote by $F$ the curve (isomorphic to $C_{g-i}$ itself) in $\Delta_{i} \subset \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g}$, obtained by identifying $p$ with a variable point $q \in C_{g-i}$. This curve has the following intersection numbers with the basic divisor classes of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g}$ :

$$
F \cdot \lambda=0, F \cdot \delta_{j}=0 \text { for } j \neq i, F \cdot \delta_{i}=-2(g-i-1)
$$

(for a justification of these intersection numbers, see [8, page 81]).
Since the curve $F \subset \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g}$ does not intersect the branch locus of the morphism $\pi$, it follows that the preimage $\pi^{-1}(F)$ has $2^{2 g}-1$ connected components; each of them is isomorphic to $F$, and corresponds to the choice of a pair $\eta=\left(\eta_{i}, \eta_{g-i}\right)$ of 2-torsion line bundles on $C_{i}$ and $C_{g-i}$ being not simultaneously trivial.
Let $\widetilde{F}_{i}$ be one of the components of $\pi^{-1}(F)$ contained in the divisor $\Delta_{i}$ of $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{g}$; it is attached to an element $\eta=\left(\eta_{i}, \mathcal{O}_{C_{g-i}}\right)$, for a fixed non-trivial $\eta_{i} \in\left(J C_{i}\right)_{2}$.
On the one hand, clearly $\delta_{i}$ is the only basic divisor class of $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{g}$ that intersects $\widetilde{F}_{i}$. The projection formula then says that the number $\widetilde{F}_{i} \cdot \delta_{i}$ in $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{g}$ equals the intersection $F \cdot \delta_{i}=-2(g-i-1)$ in $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g}$. Therefore,

$$
\widetilde{F}_{i} \cdot\left[\mathcal{T}_{g}^{e}\right]=\widetilde{F}_{i} \cdot\left(a \lambda-b_{0}^{\prime} \delta_{0}^{\prime}-\ldots\right)=2(g-i-1) b_{i}
$$

On the other hand, according to Proposition 3.1 an element $(C, \eta) \in \widetilde{F}_{i}$ belongs to $\mathcal{T}_{g}^{e}$ if and only if the two following conditions are satisfied:
a) The point $q \in C_{g-i}$ that is identified with $p$ lies in the support of an effective thetacharacteristic $L_{g-i}$. That is, $C$ satisfies $\beta_{g-i}$ ).
b) The odd theta-characteristic $L_{i}$ of $C_{i}$, when twisted by $\eta_{i}$, remains odd.

This gives the intersection number

$$
\widetilde{F}_{i} \cdot\left[\mathcal{T}_{g}^{e}\right]=(g-i-1) 2^{g-i-1}\left(2^{g-i}-1\right) 2^{i-1}\left(2^{i-1}-1\right),
$$

where we use Lemma 3.3 to count the possible theta-characteristics $L_{i}$.
Comparing both expressions for $\widetilde{F}_{i} \cdot\left[\mathcal{T}_{g}^{e}\right]$, it follows that $b_{i}=2^{g-3}\left(2^{g-i}-1\right)\left(2^{i-1}-1\right)$.
With a similar argument (considering a connected component of $\pi^{-1}(F)$ contained in $\Delta_{g-i}$ or $\left.\Delta_{i: g-i}\right)$, one can find the numbers

$$
b_{g-i}=2^{g-3}\left(2^{g-i-1}-1\right)\left(2^{i}-1\right), \quad b_{i: g-i}=2^{g-3}\left(2^{g-1}-2^{i-1}-2^{g-i-1}+1\right)
$$

Remark 3.4. The transversality of these intersections can be shown by looking at the scheme $X^{e}$ parametrizing pairs $((C, \eta), L)$, where $(C, \eta)$ is a Prym curve and $L$ is a semicanonical pencil on $C$ such that $L \otimes \eta$ is even. If we restrict the forgetful map $X^{e} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_{g}^{e}$ to the component $\widetilde{F}_{i}$, we obtain a scheme $\left.\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_{g}^{e}\right|_{\widetilde{F}_{i}}$ which is, by the above discussion, isomorphic to the scheme $\mathfrak{J}_{g-1}^{1}\left(\widetilde{F}_{i}\right)$ of limit linear series of type $\mathfrak{g}_{g-1}^{1}$ on Prym curves $(C, \eta) \in \widetilde{F}_{i}$ satisfying conditions (a)
and (b). Following the description of this moduli space given in [3, Theorem 3.3], we see that the scheme $\mathfrak{J}_{g-1}^{1}\left(\widetilde{F}_{i}\right)$ splits as the product of two reduced 0 -dimensional schemes, namely

$$
\left\{\left(L_{g-i}, q\right) \text { as in (a) }\right\} \times\left\{L_{i} \text { as in (b) }\right\}
$$

Therefore $\left.\mathfrak{J}_{g-1}^{1}\left(\widetilde{F}_{i}\right) \cong \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_{g}^{e}\right|_{\widetilde{F}_{i}}$ is everywhere reduced and the intersection between $\widetilde{F}_{i}$ and $\mathcal{T}_{g}^{e}$ is transverse. A breakdown of this argument may be found in [4, Theorem 2.2].

Now we proceed with step (3). We will determine the constants $d_{0}^{\prime}, d_{0}^{\prime \prime}, d_{0}^{r a m}$ of the class $\left[\mathcal{T}_{g}^{o}\right]$ by using the test curve of [7, Example 3.137].

Fix a general smooth curve $D$ of genus $g-1$, with a fixed general point $p \in D$. Identifying $p$ with a moving point $q \in D$, we get a curve $G$ (isomorphic to $D$ ) which lies in $\Delta_{0} \subset \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g}$. As explained in [7], the following equalities hold:

$$
G \cdot \lambda=0, G \cdot \delta_{0}=2-2 g, G \cdot \delta_{1}=1, G \cdot \delta_{i}=0 \text { for } i \geq 2
$$

where the intersection of $G$ and $\Delta_{1}$ occurs when $q$ approaches $p$; in that case the curve becomes reducible, having $D$ and a rational nodal curve as components.
Combining this information with the known divisor class $\left[\mathcal{T}_{g}\right]$ in $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g}$, we have

$$
G \cdot\left[\mathcal{T}_{g}\right]=2^{g-3}\left((g-3) \cdot 2^{g-2}+1\right)
$$

In order to compute $d_{0}^{\prime \prime}$, let $\widetilde{G}^{\prime \prime}$ be the connected component of $\pi^{-1}(G)$ obtained by attaching to every curve $C=D_{p q}$ the 2-torsion line bundle $e=\left(\mathcal{O}_{D}\right)_{-1}$ (i.e. $\mathcal{O}_{D}$ glued by -1 at the points $p, q)$. Indeed $e$ is well defined along the family $G$, so $\widetilde{G}^{\prime \prime}$ makes sense and is isomorphic to $G$.

## Then:

- By the projection formula, $\widetilde{G}^{\prime \prime} \cdot \lambda=0$.
- Again by projection, $\widetilde{G}^{\prime \prime} \cdot\left(\pi^{*} \delta_{0}\right)=2-2 g$. Actually, since $\widetilde{G}^{\prime \prime} \subset \Delta_{0}^{\prime \prime}$ and $\widetilde{G}^{\prime \prime}$ intersects neither $\Delta_{0}^{\prime}$ nor $\Delta_{0}^{r a m}$, the following equalities hold:

$$
\widetilde{G}^{\prime \prime} \cdot \delta_{0}^{\prime \prime}=2-2 g, \quad \widetilde{G}^{\prime \prime} \cdot \delta_{0}^{\prime}=0=\widetilde{G}^{\prime \prime} \cdot \delta_{0}^{r a m}
$$

- We have $\widetilde{G}^{\prime \prime} \cdot\left(\pi^{*} \delta_{1}\right)=1$, with $\widetilde{G}^{\prime \prime} \cdot \delta_{1}=1$ and $\widetilde{G}^{\prime \prime} \cdot \delta_{g-1}=0=\widetilde{G}^{\prime \prime} \cdot \delta_{1: g-1}$.

Indeed, the intersection $G \cap \Delta_{1}$ occurs when $p=q$; for that curve, the 2-torsion that we consider is trivial on $D$ but not on the rational component. Hence the lift to $\widetilde{G}^{\prime \prime}$ of the intersection point $G \cap \Delta_{1}$ gives a point in $\widetilde{G}^{\prime \prime} \cap \Delta_{1}$.

- It is clear that $\widetilde{G}^{\prime \prime} \cdot \delta_{i}=\widetilde{G}^{\prime \prime} \cdot \delta_{g-i}=\widetilde{G}^{\prime \prime} \cdot \delta_{i: g-i}=0$ for $i \geq 2$.
- Since twisting by $e$ changes the parity of any theta-characteristic in any curve of the family $G$ by [6, Theorems 2.12 and 2.14], it follows that all the intersection points of $G$ and $\mathcal{T}_{g}$ lift to points of $\widetilde{G}^{\prime \prime} \cap \mathcal{T}_{g}^{o}$.

All in all, we have

$$
2^{g-3}\left((g-3) \cdot 2^{g-2}+1\right)=\widetilde{G}^{\prime \prime} \cdot\left[\mathcal{T}_{g}^{o}\right]=(2 g-2) d_{0}^{\prime \prime}-2^{g-3}\left(2^{g-1}-1\right)
$$

and solving the equation we obtain $d_{0}^{\prime \prime}=2^{2 g-6}$.

For the computation of $d_{0}^{\prime}$, we consider $\widetilde{G}^{\prime}=\pi^{-1}(G) \cap \Delta_{0}^{\prime}$ in $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{g}$. Note that for an element $\left(C=D_{p q}, \eta\right) \in \widetilde{G}^{\prime}, \eta$ is obtained by gluing a nontrivial 2 -torsion line bundle on $D$ at the points $p, q$. Then:

- $\widetilde{G}^{\prime} \cdot \lambda=0$ by the projection formula.
- Again by projection, $\widetilde{G}^{\prime} \cdot\left(\pi^{*} \delta_{0}\right)=\operatorname{deg}\left(\widetilde{G}^{\prime} \rightarrow G\right)\left(G \cdot \delta_{0}\right)=2(2-2 g)\left(2^{2 g-2}-1\right)$. Moreover, since $\widetilde{G}^{\prime} \subset \Delta_{0}^{\prime}$ intersects neither $\Delta_{0}^{\prime \prime}$ nor $\Delta_{0}^{\text {ram }}$ it follows that

$$
\widetilde{G}^{\prime} \cdot \delta_{0}^{\prime}=2(2-2 g)\left(2^{2 g-2}-1\right), \quad \widetilde{G}^{\prime} \cdot \delta_{0}^{\prime \prime}=0=\widetilde{G}^{\prime} \cdot \delta_{0}^{r a m}
$$

- $\widetilde{G}^{\prime} \cdot\left(\pi^{*} \delta_{1}\right)=\operatorname{deg}\left(\widetilde{G}^{\prime} \rightarrow G\right)\left(G \cdot \delta_{1}\right)=2\left(2^{2 g-2}-1\right)$. We claim that $\widetilde{G}^{\prime} \cdot \delta_{1}=0$ and $\widetilde{G}^{\prime} \cdot \delta_{g-1}=$ $2^{2 g-2}-1=\widetilde{G}^{\prime} \cdot \delta_{1: g-1}$.
Indeed, $G \cap \Delta_{1}$ occurs when $p=q$; when such a point is lifted to $\widetilde{G}^{\prime}$, the 2-torsion is nontrivial on $D$ (by construction). This gives $\widetilde{G}^{\prime} \cdot \delta_{1}=0$.
Moreover, triviality on the rational nodal component will depend on which of the two possible gluings of the 2-torsion on $D$ we are taking; in any case, since $\widetilde{G}^{\prime}=\pi^{-1}(G) \cap \Delta_{0}^{\prime}$ considers simultaneously all possible gluings of all possible non-trivial 2 -torsion line bundles on $D$, we have $\widetilde{G}^{\prime} \cdot \delta_{g-1}=\widetilde{G}^{\prime} \cdot \delta_{1: g-1}$. This proves the claim.
- Of course, $\widetilde{G}^{\prime} \cdot\left(\pi^{*} \delta_{i}\right)=\widetilde{G}^{\prime} \cdot \delta_{g-i}=\widetilde{G}^{\prime} \cdot \delta_{i: g-i}=0$ whenever $i \geq 2$.
- Finally, we use again that the parity of a theta-characteristic on a nodal curve of the family $G$ is changed when twisted by $e=\left(\mathcal{O}_{D}\right)_{-1}$. Since the two possible gluings of a non-trivial 2-torsion bundle on $D$ precisely differ by $e$, the intersection numbers $\widetilde{G}^{\prime} \cdot\left[\mathcal{T}_{g}^{e}\right]$ and $\widetilde{G}^{\prime} \cdot\left[\mathcal{T}_{g}^{o}\right]$ have to coincide, and at the same time add up to the total

$$
\widetilde{G}^{\prime} \cdot\left(\pi^{*}\left[\mathcal{T}_{g}\right]\right)=\operatorname{deg}\left(\widetilde{G}^{\prime} \rightarrow G\right)\left(G \cdot\left[\mathcal{T}_{g}\right]\right)=2\left(2^{2 g-2}-1\right) \cdot 2^{g-3}\left((g-3) \cdot 2^{g-2}+1\right)
$$

by the projection formula. That is,

$$
\widetilde{G}^{\prime} \cdot\left[\mathcal{T}_{g}^{e}\right]=\widetilde{G}^{\prime} \cdot\left[\mathcal{T}_{g}^{o}\right]=\left(2^{2 g-2}-1\right) \cdot 2^{g-3}\left((g-3) \cdot 2^{g-2}+1\right)
$$

Putting this together with the coefficients $d_{g-1}=2^{2 g-5}$ and $d_{1: g-1}=2^{g-3}\left(2^{g-2}-1\right)$ obtained in step (2), we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left(2^{2 g-2}-1\right) \cdot 2^{g-3}\left((g-3) \cdot 2^{g-2}+1\right)=\widetilde{G}^{\prime} \cdot\left[\mathcal{T}_{g}^{o}\right]= \\
& \quad=2(2 g-2)\left(2^{2 g-2}-1\right) d_{0}^{\prime}-2^{2 g-5}\left(2^{2 g-2}-1\right)-2^{g-3}\left(2^{g-2}-1\right)\left(2^{2 g-2}-1\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

and therefore $d_{0}^{\prime}=2^{2 g-7}$.
Finally, to compute $d_{0}^{\text {ram }}$ we simply combine the relation

$$
\left(2^{2 g-1}-2\right) d_{0}^{\prime}+d_{0}^{\prime \prime}+2^{2 g-2} d_{0}^{r a m}=2^{g-1}\left(2^{g}-1\right) 2^{2 g-6}
$$

obtained in step (1) with the coefficients $d_{0}^{\prime}$, $d_{0}^{\prime \prime}$ just found, to obtain $d_{0}^{r a m}=2^{g-5}\left(2^{g-1}-1\right)$. This concludes step (3) and hence the proof of Theorem A.

Remark 3.5. The divisor $\mathcal{T}_{g}$ has a more natural interpretation in the compactification of the moduli space $\mathcal{S}_{g}^{+}$of even spin curves (i.e. curves equipped with an even theta-characteristic). In the same way, it would be preferable to discuss the divisors $\mathcal{T}_{g}^{e}$ and $\mathcal{T}_{g}^{o}$ in a space of curves endowed with both a Prym and a spin structure. In particular, if a good compactification of
$\mathcal{R}_{g} \times \mathcal{M}_{g} \mathcal{S}_{g}^{+}$were constructed and studied, then the divisor classes of $\mathcal{T}_{g}^{e}$ and $\mathcal{T}_{g}{ }^{o}$ could also be derived from the diagram

$$
\mathcal{R}_{g} \longleftarrow \mathcal{R}_{g} \times \mathcal{M}_{g} \mathcal{S}_{g}^{+} \longrightarrow \mathcal{S}_{g}^{+}
$$

and the fact that the class of (the closure in $\overline{\mathcal{S}}_{g}^{+}$of) the divisor

$$
\left\{(C, L) \in \mathcal{S}_{g}^{+} \mid L \text { is a semicanonical pencil on } C\right\}
$$

was computed by Farkas in [4, Theorem 0.2]. Following the ideas of [15], a candidate space for such a compactification is proposed in [10, Section 2.4], although it remains to check that this space is indeed a smooth and proper Deligne-Mumford stack. Under the assumption that it is, a study of its boundary reveals the same expressions obtained in Theorem A. Further details can be found in [10].

## 4. Proof of Theorem B

In this section we study the irreducibility of the divisors $\mathcal{T}_{g}^{o}$ and $\mathcal{T}_{g}{ }^{e}$. Recall that for $g=3$, we already saw in Example 2.1 that the divisors $\mathcal{T}_{3}{ }^{o}$ and $\mathcal{T}_{3}{ }^{e}$ are irreducible. In the general case ( $g \geq 5$ ), our arguments are essentially an adaptation of those of Teixidor in [17, Section 2], used to prove the irreducibility of $\mathcal{T}_{g}$ in $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g}$.

The idea for proving the irreducibility of $\mathcal{T}_{g}^{o}$ is the following (the proof for $\mathcal{T}_{g}^{e}$ will be similar, but some simplifications will arise). By using Proposition 3.1, first we will fix a Prym curve $(C, \eta)$ (degeneration of smooth hyperelliptic ones) lying in all the irreducible components of the intersection $\mathcal{T}_{g}^{o} \cap \Delta_{1}$. This reduces the problem to the local irreducibility of $\mathcal{T}_{g}^{o}$ in a neighborhood of $(C, \eta)$ (after checking that every irreducible component of $\mathcal{T}_{g}^{o}$ intersects $\left.\Delta_{1}\right)$. For the proof of the local irreducibility of $\mathcal{T}_{g}^{o}$, we can take advantage of the scheme of pairs $((C, \eta), L)$ introduced in Remark 3.4 and use the following observation:

Remark 4.1. In a neighborhood of a given point, the local irreducibility of $\mathcal{T}_{g}{ }^{o}$ (resp. $\mathcal{T}_{g}^{e}$ ) is implied by the local irreducibility of the scheme $X^{o}$ (resp. $X^{e}$ ) parametrizing pairs $((C, \eta), L)$, where $(C, \eta)$ is a Prym curve and $L$ is a semicanonical pencil on $C$ such that $L \otimes \eta$ is odd (resp. even). This follows from the surjectivity of the forgetful map $X^{o} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_{g}^{o}$ (resp. $X^{e} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_{g}^{e}$ ).

Then the local irreducibility of $X^{o}$ (near our fixed $(C, \eta)$ ) will be argued by showing that monodromy interchanges the (limit) semicanonical pencils on $C$ that become odd when twisted by the 2 -torsion bundle $\eta$. Let us recall, for later use in this monodromy argument, some features of theta-characteristics on hyperelliptic curves:

Remark 4.2. Let $C$ be a smooth hyperelliptic curve of genus $g$, with Weierstrass points $R_{1}, \ldots, R_{2 g+2}$.
Then, it is well known (see e.g. [14, Proposition 6.1]) that the theta-characteristics on $C$ have the form $r \cdot g_{2}^{1}+S, r$ being its dimension (with $-1 \leq r \leq\left[\frac{g-1}{2}\right]$ ) and $S$ being the fixed part of the linear system (which consists of $g-1-2 r$ distinct Weierstrass points).

Moreover, given a 2-torsion line bundle of the form $\eta=\mathcal{O}_{C}\left(R_{i}-R_{j}\right)$, theta-characteristics changing their parity when twisted by $\eta$ are exactly those for which $R_{i}, R_{j} \in S$ (the dimension increases by 1 ) or $R_{i}, R_{j} \notin S$ (the dimension decreases by 1 ).

For the proof of Theorem B we also need the following result, which will guarantee that every irreducible component of $\mathcal{T}_{g}^{o}$ and $\mathcal{T}_{g}^{e}$ intersects the boundary divisor $\Delta_{1} \subset \overline{\mathcal{R}}_{g}$ :

Lemma 4.3. Let $\mathcal{D} \subset \mathcal{R}_{g}$ be any divisor, where $g \geq 5$. Then the closure $\overline{\mathcal{D}} \subset \overline{\mathcal{R}}_{g}$ intersects $\Delta_{1}$ and $\Delta_{g-1}$.

Proof. We borrow the construction from [11, Section 4], where (a stronger version of) the corresponding result for divisors in $\mathcal{M}_{g}$ is proved.

Fix a complete integral curve $B \subset \mathcal{M}_{g-2}$ (whose existence is guaranteed by the assumption $g \geq 5$ ), two elliptic curves $E_{1}, E_{2}$ and a certain 2-torsion element $\eta \in J E_{1} \backslash\{0\}$. If $\Gamma_{b}$ denotes the smooth curve of genus $g-2$ corresponding to $b \in B$, one defines a family of Prym curves parametrized by $\Gamma_{b}^{2}$ as follows.
If $\left(p_{1}, p_{2}\right) \in \Gamma_{b}^{2}$ is a pair of distinct points, glue to $\Gamma_{b}$ the curves $E_{1}$ and $E_{2}$ at the respective points $p_{1}$ and $p_{2}$ (this is independent of the chosen point on the elliptic curves). To this curve attach a 2 -torsion bundle being trivial on $\Gamma_{b}$ and $E_{2}$, and restricting to $\eta$ on $E_{1}$.

To an element $(p, p) \in \Delta_{\Gamma_{b}^{2}} \subset \Gamma_{b}^{2}$, we attach the curve obtained by gluing a $\mathbb{P}^{1}$ to $\Gamma_{b}$ at the point $p$, and then $E_{1}, E_{2}$ are glued to two other points in $\mathbb{P}^{1}$. Of course, the 2-torsion bundle restricts to $\eta$ on $E_{1}$, and is trivial on the remaining components.
Moving $b$ in $B$, this construction gives a complete threefold $T=\bigcup_{b \in B} \Gamma_{b}^{2}$ contained in $\Delta_{1} \cap \Delta_{g-1}$. Let also $S=\bigcup_{b \in B} \Delta_{\Gamma_{b}^{2}}$ be the surface in $T$ given by the union of all the diagonals; it is the intersection of $T$ with $\Delta_{2}$. Then, the following statements hold:
(1) $\left.\delta_{1}\right|_{S}=0$ and $\left.\delta_{g-1}\right|_{S}=0$ (the proof of [11, Lemma 4.2] is easily translated to our setting).
(2) $\left.\lambda\right|_{\Delta_{\Gamma_{b}^{2}}}=0$ for every $b \in B$, since all the curves in $\Delta_{\Gamma_{b}^{2}}$ have the same Hodge structure.
(3) If $a \in \mathbb{Q}$ is the coefficient of $\lambda$ for the class $[\overline{\mathcal{D}}] \in \operatorname{Pic}\left(\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{g}\right)_{\mathbb{Q}}$, then $a \neq 0$. Indeed, $2^{2 g-1} a \in \mathbb{Q}$ is the coefficient of $\lambda$ for the class $[\overline{\pi(\mathcal{D})}] \in \operatorname{Pic}\left(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g}\right)_{\mathbb{Q}}$; then [11, Remark 4.1] proves the claim.

These are the key ingredients in the original proof of [11, Proposition 4.5]. The same arguments there work verbatim in our case and yield the analogous result: $\left.[\overline{\mathcal{D}}]\right|_{T} \neq m \cdot S$ for every $m \in \mathbb{Q}$. In particular, the intersection $\overline{\mathcal{D}} \cap T$ is non-empty (and not entirely contained in $S$ ).

Proposition 4.4. For $g \geq 5$, the divisor $\mathcal{T}_{g}^{o}$ is irreducible.

Proof. According to Proposition 3.1, the intersection $\mathcal{T}_{g}^{o} \cap \Delta_{1}$ consists of two loci $\alpha$ and $\beta$. The general point of each of these loci is the union at a point $P$ of a Prym elliptic curve $(E, \eta)$ and a smooth curve $C_{g-1}$ (with trivial line bundle) of genus $g-1$, such that:

- In the case of $\alpha$, the curve $C_{g-1}$ has a 1-dimensional theta-characteristic, i.e, $C_{g-1} \in \mathcal{T}_{g-1}$ in $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g-1}$. Moreover, there is exactly one limit semicanonical pencil on $C_{g-1} \cup_{P} E$ changing parity when twisted by the 2-torsion bundle; it induces the theta-characteristic $\eta$ on $E$.
It follows that $\alpha$ is irreducible (by irreducibility of $\mathcal{T}_{g-1}$ ) and the intersection of $\mathcal{T}_{g}^{o}$ and $\Delta_{1}$ along $\alpha$ is reduced. In particular, there is a unique irreducible component of $\mathcal{T}_{g}^{o}$ (that we will denote by $\mathcal{T}_{g, \alpha}^{o}$ ) intersecting $\Delta_{1}$ along the whole locus $\alpha$.
- In the case of $\beta, P$ is in the support of a 0 -dimensional theta-characteristic on $C_{g-1}$. Again, there is a unique limit semicanonical pencil changing parity, with induced theta-characteristic $\mathcal{O}_{E}$ on $E$.

Now we consider a reducible Prym curve $(C, \eta) \in \Delta_{1}$ constructed as follows: $C$ is the join of an elliptic curve $E$ and a general smooth hyperelliptic curve $C^{\prime}$ of genus $g-1$ at a Weierstrass point $P \in C^{\prime}$, whereas the line bundle $\eta$ is trivial on $C^{\prime}$. Note that $(C, \eta)$ is the general point of the intersection $\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_{g} \cap \Delta_{1}$, where $\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_{g} \subset \mathcal{T}_{g}^{o}$ denotes the locus of hyperelliptic Prym curves whose 2-torsion bundle is a difference of two Weierstrass points.

Of course $(C, \eta)$ belongs to $\alpha$ and $\beta$; we claim that it actually belongs to any component of $\beta$. To prove this claim, consider any irreducible component of $\beta$, and fix a general element of it. This general element admits the description given above: let us denote by $X$ (written $C_{g-1}$ above) the irreducible component of genus $g-1$, and by $Q_{X} \in X$ the point connecting $X$ with the elliptic component. Recall that $Q_{X}$ lies in the support of a 0-dimensional theta-characteristic $L_{X}$ on $X$.
We deform the pair $\left(X, L_{X}\right)$ to a pair $\left(C^{\prime}, L\right)$ formed by our hyperelliptic curve $C^{\prime}$ and a 0dimensional theta-characteristic $L$ on it. According to the description of Remark 4.2, under this deformation the point $Q_{X} \in X$ specializes to a Weierstrass point $Q \in C^{\prime}$.

Therefore, our irreducible component of $\beta$ contains a Prym curve which is the union of $C^{\prime}$ (with trivial 2-torsion) and a Prym elliptic curve $\left(E^{\prime}, \eta^{\prime}\right)$ at the Weierstrass point $Q \in C^{\prime}$. Since the monodromy on hyperelliptic curves acts transitively on the set of Weierstrass points, we may replace $Q$ by our original Weierstrass point $P$ without changing the component of $\beta$. Using that $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{1}$ is connected we can also replace $\left(E^{\prime}, \eta^{\prime}\right)$ by $(E, \eta)$. This proves the claim.

Now, to prove the irreducibility of $\mathcal{T}_{g}^{o}$ we argue as follows: since $\mathcal{T}_{g}^{o}$ has pure codimension 1 , we know by Lemma 4.3 that each of its irreducible components intersects $\Delta_{1}$. As our point $(C, \eta)$ belongs to all the irreducible components of $\mathcal{T}_{g}^{o} \cap \Delta_{1}$, it suffices to check the local irreducibility of $\mathcal{T}_{g}^{o}$ in a neighborhood of $(C, \eta)$.
To achieve this, in view of Remark 4.1 we will check the local irreducibility of the scheme $X^{o}$. In other words, we need to study the limit semicanonical pencils on $C$ changing parity when twisted by $\eta$. We do this in the rest of the proof, by checking that monodromy on $\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_{g} \subset \mathcal{T}_{g}^{o}$ connects any limit semicanonical pencil changing parity on $(C, \eta)$ of type $\beta$ with one of type $\alpha$, and checking that limits of type $\alpha$ are also permuted by monodromy on $\mathcal{T}_{g, \alpha}^{o}$.
Let $R_{1}, R_{2}, R_{3}$ be the points on $E$ differing from $P$ by 2 -torsion, and let $R_{4}, \ldots, R_{2 g+2}$ be the Weierstrass points on $C^{\prime}$ that are different from $P$ : reordering if necessary, we assume $\left.\eta\right|_{E}=\mathcal{O}_{E}\left(R_{1}-R_{2}\right)$. Note that $R_{1}, \ldots, R_{2 g+2}$ are the limits on $C$ of Weierstrass points on nearby smooth hyperelliptic curves, since they are the ramification points of the limit $g_{2}^{1}$ on $C$.

With this notation, arguing as in the proof of Proposition 3.1, the possible aspects on $E$ of a limit semicanonical pencil changing parity on $(C, \eta)$ are:

- Those of type $\alpha$ have aspect on $E$ differing from the even theta-characteristic $\eta$ by $(g-1) P$, hence $\mathcal{O}_{E}\left(R_{3}+(g-2) P\right)=\mathcal{O}_{E}\left(R_{1}+R_{2}+(g-3) P\right)$.
- Those of type $\beta$ have aspect differing from the odd theta-characteristic $\mathcal{O}_{E}$ by $(g-1) P$, hence $\mathcal{O}_{E}((g-1) P)=\mathcal{O}_{E}\left(R_{1}+R_{2}+R_{3}+(g-4) P\right)$.

Given a family of semicanonical pencils changing parity on nearby smooth curves of $\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_{g}$, we can distinguish the type of its limit on $C$ by knowing how many of the $g-1-2 r$ fixed Weierstrass points in the moving theta-characteristic (recall Remark 4.2) specialize to $E$. If this number is 0 or 3 (resp. 1 or 2 ), then our limit is of type $\beta$ (resp. of type $\alpha$ ).

Hence, after using monodromy on smooth hyperelliptic curves to interchange the (limit) Weierstrass point $R_{3}$ with an appropriate (limit) Weierstrass point on $C^{\prime}$, we obtain that monodromy on $\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_{g} \subset \mathcal{T}_{g}$ interchanges any limit semicanonical pencil changing parity of type $\beta$ with one of type $\alpha$ (of the same dimension). The only possible exception is a limit of $\frac{g-1}{2} \cdot g_{2}^{1}$ when $g \equiv 3$ $(\bmod 4)$, since in that case there are no fixed points to interchange with $R_{3}$.
In addition, monodromy on $\mathcal{T}_{g, \alpha}^{o}$ (the unique irreducible component of $\mathcal{T}_{g}^{o}$ containing $\alpha$ ) acts transitively on the set of limit semicanonical pencils changing parity of type $\alpha$. Indeed, if $X_{\alpha}^{o}$ denotes the preimage of $\mathcal{T}_{g, \alpha}^{o}$ in $X^{o}$, then the forgetful map $X_{\alpha}^{o} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_{g, \alpha}^{o}$ is birational (by [16, Theorem 2.16]) and has finite fibers; consequently $X_{\alpha}^{o}$ is irreducible, which proves the assertion.
Therefore to conclude the proof of the local irreducibility of $X^{o}$ near $(C, \eta)$ it only remains to show that, if $g \equiv 3(\bmod 4)$, the monodromy on $\mathcal{T}_{g}^{o}$ interchanges the limit of $\frac{g-1}{2} \cdot g_{2}^{1}$ with a limit of theta-characteristics of lower dimension. This can be achieved exactly with the same family of limit theta-characteristics as in [17, Proposition 2.4] for certain reducible curves; let us include a few words about the geometry of this family.

First, one degenerates $C^{\prime}$ to a reducible hyperelliptic curve obtained by identifying a point $P^{\prime} \in E^{\prime}\left(E^{\prime}\right.$ elliptic curve) with a Weierstrass point $Q \in C^{\prime \prime}\left(C^{\prime \prime} \in \mathcal{M}_{g-2}\right.$ hyperelliptic $)$, such that the Weierstrass point $P \in C^{\prime}$ specializes to a point of $E^{\prime}$. This naturally induces a degeneration $C_{P^{\prime}}$ of our Prym curve $(C, \eta)$, in which the 2 -torsion bundle is non-trivial only along the component $E$. We will denote by $R_{4}, R_{5}$ the points of $E^{\prime}$ differing by 2 -torsion from $P$ and $P^{\prime}$ (limits of the corresponding Weierstrass points of $C^{\prime}$ ).

Consider the family of Prym curves $C_{X}$ obtained by glueing $E$ (the only component with nontrivial 2-torsion) and $E^{\prime}$ at $P$, and by identifying $Q \in C^{\prime \prime}$ with a variable point $X \in E^{\prime}$. Note that for $X=P^{\prime}$, we indeed recover our deformation $C_{P^{\prime}}$ of $(C, \eta)$. Every such Prym curve $C_{X}$ can be equipped with a limit semicanonical pencil changing parity of aspects $\mathcal{O}_{E}((g-1) P)$ on $E, \mathcal{O}_{E^{\prime}}(Q+(g-2) X)$ on $E^{\prime}$ and $\mathcal{O}_{C^{\prime \prime}}((g-1) Q)$ on $C^{\prime \prime}$.
On $C_{P^{\prime}}$, this corresponds to the limit of $\frac{g-1}{2} \cdot g_{2}^{1}$ on nearby smooth Prym curves of $\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_{g}$; on the other hand, $C_{R_{5}}$ is also hyperelliptic and we have a limit of theta-characteristics of the form $\frac{g-5}{2} \cdot g_{2}^{1}+R_{1}+R_{2}+R_{3}+R_{4}$.
Therefore, monodromy on $\mathcal{T}_{g}^{o}$ moves the limit of $\frac{g-1}{2} \cdot g_{2}^{1}$ to a limit theta-characteristic of type $\beta$ of lower dimension, which concludes the proof.

Proposition 4.5. For $g \geq 5$, the divisor $\mathcal{T}_{g}^{e}$ is irreducible.
Proof. The proof is similar to that of $\mathcal{T}_{g}^{o}$, but with some simplifications (due to the fact that the intersection $\mathcal{T}_{g}^{e} \cap \Delta_{1}$ consists only of a locus $\alpha$ ). Let us give an outline of the argument.

In virtue of Proposition 3.1, the general point of $\alpha$ is the union at a point $P$ of a Prym elliptic curve $(E, \eta)$ and a curve $C_{g-1} \in \mathcal{M}_{g-1}$ (with trivial 2-torsion bundle) having a 1-dimensional theta-characteristic. Let us denote by $R_{1}, R_{2}, R_{3}$ the points of $E$ differing from $P$ by 2-torsion, so that $\eta=\mathcal{O}_{E}\left(R_{1}-R_{2}\right)$.

Then there are exactly two limit semicanonical pencils on $E \cup_{P} C_{g-1}$ remaining even when twisted by $\left(\eta, \mathcal{O}_{C_{g-1}}\right)$. For these limit semicanonical pencils, $\mathcal{O}_{E}\left(R_{1}-R_{3}\right)$ and $\mathcal{O}_{E}\left(R_{2}-R_{3}\right)$ are the induced theta-characteristics on $E$ (and hence $\left|R_{2}+P\right|+(g-3) P$ and $\left|R_{1}+P\right|+(g-3) P$ are the corresponding aspects on $E$ ).

It follows that the intersection of $\mathcal{T}_{g}^{e}$ and $\Delta_{1}$ is irreducible (by irreducibility of $\mathcal{T}_{g-1}$ ) but not reduced. We also deduce that $\mathcal{T}_{g}^{e}$ will have at most two irreducible components, but we cannot directly derive the irreducibility of $\mathcal{T}_{g}^{e}$.

To circumvent this problem, we consider (as in the proof of Proposition 4.4) a Prym curve $(C, \eta) \in \mathcal{T}_{g}^{e} \cap \Delta_{1}$ obtained by taking $C_{g-1}=C^{\prime}\left(C^{\prime}\right.$ general smooth hyperelliptic curve) and $P \in C^{\prime}$ a Weierstrass point. Recall that $(C, \eta)$ is the general point of the intersection $\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_{g} \cap \Delta_{1}$ $\left(\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_{g} \subset \mathcal{T}_{g}^{e}\right.$ being the locus of hyperelliptic Prym curves whose 2 -torsion bundle is a difference of two Weierstrass points).

By using monodromy on smooth hyperelliptic curves to interchange the (limit) Weierstrass points $R_{1}$ and $R_{2}$, we obtain that monodromy on $\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_{g} \subset \mathcal{T}_{g}^{e}$ connects (locally around $(C, \eta)$ ) the two possible irreducible components of $\mathcal{T}_{g}^{e}$. This finishes the proof.

All in all, we have showed the irreducibility of $\mathcal{T}_{g}^{o}$ and $\mathcal{T}_{g}^{e}$ for every $g \neq 4$. As explained in the introduction, the irreducibility of $\mathcal{T}_{4}^{o}$ and $\mathcal{T}_{4}^{e}$ can be deduced from a study of the Prym map $\mathcal{P}_{4}$ restricted to these divisors, which is contained in [9].
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