

Fine compactified moduli of enriched structures on stable curves

Owen Biesel and David Holmes

September 18, 2019

Abstract

Enriched structures on stable curves over fields were defined by Mainò in the late 1990s, and have played an important role in the study of limit linear series and degenerating jacobians. In this paper we solve three main problems: we give a definition of enriched structures on stable curves over arbitrary base schemes, and show that the resulting fine moduli problem is representable; we show that the resulting object has a universal property in terms of Néron models; and we construct a compactification of our stack of enriched structures.

Contents

1	Introduction	3
1.1	Future work on the closure of the double ramification cycle	5
1.2	Special case of 2-gons	6
1.3	Some of the complications arising in the general case	7
1.3.1	Graphs make no sense	8
1.3.2	What if the graph is not circuit-connected?	8
1.3.3	How to pull back as the graph changes?	8
1.4	Why do we bother with non-compactified enriched structures? . . .	9
1.5	Acknowledgements	9
1.6	Table of Notation	9
1.7	Notation for pullbacks	11
I	Fine moduli of enriched structures	12

2	Defining enriched structures	12
2.1	Graphs	12
2.2	Fitting ideals	13
2.3	Prestable curves and their moduli	14
2.4	Boundaries and labelled graphs of curves	15
2.5	Controlled curves and charts	17
2.5.1	Definitions	17
2.5.2	Basic properties of simple charts	18
2.5.3	Immediate neighbourhoods of controlled curves	19
2.6	Enriched structures on controlled curves	20
2.6.1	Enriched structures	22
2.7	Pulling back enriched structures	23
2.8	Enriched structures for general C/S	27
3	Representability of the functor of enriched structures	30
3.1	Example	31
3.2	Glueing	31
4	Enriched structures over separably closed fields	35
4.1	The structure of pullbacks of certain ideal sheaves to fibres	37
4.2	Comparing the two notions of enriched structure	40
5	The stack of enriched structures and universal Néron models	41
5.1	Geometric regularity of the stack of enriched structures	43
5.2	\mathbb{E} is an isomorphism	46
6	Relation to the constructions of Mainò	48
6.1	Over reduced base schemes	49
6.1.1	Our modification of Mainò's definition	49
6.1.2	Mainò's original definition	51
6.2	Blowing up the moduli space of curves	53
II	Compactifying the stack of enriched structures	55
7	Defining compactified enriched structures	55
7.1	From relative components to hemispheres	56
7.2	Enrichment data	57
7.3	Local structure of pullbacks of ideal sheaves again	58
7.4	Compatibility of enrichment data	62
7.5	Pulling back compactified enriched structures	65
7.6	Compactified enriched structures for general C/S , and properties	67

8	Properness of the stack of compactified enriched structures	69
9	Comparison to enriched structures	74
9.1	When all the labels vanish	75
9.2	Integral base schemes	83
9.3	Deducing the general case	84
A	Defining sheaves on a base for a Grothendieck topology	85

1 Introduction

If C/k is a stable curve over an algebraically closed field with irreducible components C_1, \dots, C_n , and $\mathcal{C}/k[[t]]$ is a regular smoothing of C , then the C_i can be thought of as divisors on \mathcal{C} , and one defines line bundles \mathcal{L}_i on \mathcal{C} by the formula $\mathcal{L}_i = \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{C}}(C_i)|_{\mathcal{C}}$. In [Mai98b], Mainò defined an *enriched structure* on C/k to be a collection of line bundles $\mathcal{L}_1, \dots, \mathcal{L}_n$ which arise in the above fashion from some regular smoothing of C/k . She gave a more intrinsic characterisation of these enriched structures, and also constructed a coarse moduli space (which we will discuss more later on). Mainò’s work has played an important role in a number of works on stable curves, such as in Osserman’s construction of limit linear series on stable curves [Oss14b], [Oss14a], and work of Esteves, Nivaldo, Salehyan and others on related problems [EM02], [ES07]. In [AP14], Abreu and Pacini study a tropical counterpart of enriched structures, with the explicit hope that it might lead to a modular compactification of the moduli of enriched structures. At the conclusion of her talk at the Summer Research Institute on Algebraic Geometry in Salt Lake City, Caporaso also asked for a compactification of the moduli of enriched structures. The construction of such a compactification is the third of the three main results of this article; we call its points *compactified enriched structures*.

The definition of enriched structure given above only applies to a stable curve over an algebraically closed field, and so the notion of ‘moduli of enriched structures’ is rather awkward. Writing \overline{M}_g for the coarse moduli space of stable curves of genus g , Mainò constructs a scheme $En_g \rightarrow \overline{M}_g$ and for each k -point p of \overline{M}_g (corresponding to a curve C/k) gives a bijection of sets between the set of enriched structures on C/k and the k -points of En_g lying over p . Noting that every stable curve over k admits at least one enriched structure, it is clear that this En_g/\overline{M}_g is highly non-unique - for example, the disjoint union of the fibres of $En_g \rightarrow \overline{M}_g$ has the same property. Now Mainò’s construction is much more reasonable than this — it is connected and quasi-compact, given as an open subscheme of a certain blowup of \overline{M}_g — but with her definition of enriched structure it was hard to justify why this is a ‘good’ moduli space.

Our first main result is a definition of an enriched structure on a stable curve over an arbitrary base scheme (allowing marked points and more, see section 2.3). Unfortunately our definition is too involved to spell out in the introduction, though in section 1.2 we will describe the special case of the universal deformation of a 2-pointed 2-gon. We show that our definition reduces to Mainò's when the base is a point. We also show that the resulting stack \mathcal{E} over the fine moduli stack $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,n}$ is algebraic; better, that \mathcal{E} is relatively representable by an algebraic space over $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,n}$. In section 6.2 we will adapt Mainó's construction of her space En_g slightly to work over the fine moduli stack $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_g$, and then show that it *does* coincide naturally with our \mathcal{E} .

Mainò also proposes a definition of an enriched structure for a stable curve over an arbitrary reduced base scheme (in a way quite different from us), and conjectures that the resulting functor is coarsely represented by En_g . However, in example 6.6 we show that her functor is not representable, disproving the conjecture. In section 6.1.1 we will construct a variant on her definition, which is representable by En_g , but the result is somewhat clumsy. In this way, all of Mainó's conjectures are resolved.

Our second main result is to give a universal property for the stack $\mathcal{E} \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,n}$ in terms of Néron models of jacobians. We show that the pullback to \mathcal{E} of the universal stable curve $\overline{\mathcal{C}}_{g,n}$ is regular. We show that the jacobian of the universal smooth curve $\mathcal{C}_{g,n} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{g,n}$ admits a Néron model N over \mathcal{E} (in the sense of [Hol14]), and further that \mathcal{E} is universal with respect to this property; more precisely we show that if $t: T \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,n}$ is a morphism such that $t^*\overline{\mathcal{C}}_{g,n}$ is regular and the jacobian of $t^*\mathcal{C}_{g,n}$ admits a Néron model over T , then $T \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,n}$ factors uniquely via $\mathcal{E} \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,n}$.

This relates \mathcal{E} to the 'universal Néron model admitting morphism' constructed in [Hol14] (more precisely, it shows that \mathcal{E} is the 'first level' in the tower of universal Néron model admitting morphisms, see section 5). From this we can deduce for free some nice properties of \mathcal{E} :

- \mathcal{E} is regular (non-singular);
- $\mathcal{E} \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,n}$ is separated;
- The pullback of Caporaso's balanced Picard stack (cf. [Cap08]) $\mathcal{P}_{d,g}/\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,n}$ to \mathcal{E} admits a canonical group/torsor structure (here we need conditions on (d, g) for $\mathcal{P}_{d,g}$ to be defined);
- Let $d = (d_1, \dots, d_n)$ be a vector of integers with sum zero. Writing $J_{g,n} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{g,n}$ for the universal jacobian, the d th Abel-Jacobi map is a section $\alpha: \mathcal{M}_{g,n} \rightarrow J_{g,n}$. Then α extends uniquely to a section $\mathcal{E} \rightarrow N$ (recall N/\mathcal{E} is the Néron model of J over \mathcal{E}). In section 1.1 we will briefly discuss an application of this to the double ramification cycle.

Alternatively, if one is initially more interested in the Néron models side, then we can view this result as giving an explicit description of the functor of points of \mathcal{E} , the first level in the tower of universal Néron model admitting morphisms.

The second part of the paper is devoted to constructing a compactification of \mathcal{E} over $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,n}$. More precisely, we construct a proper relative algebraic space $\overline{\mathcal{E}} \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,n}$ and an open immersion $\mathcal{E} \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{E}}$ over $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,n}$. In view of the ‘extension of the Abel-Jacobi map’ property discussed just above, we plan to use such a compactification to define Gromov-Witten invariants of $B\mathbb{G}_m$ (cf. [FTT16], where ‘admissibility’ is required). Such a construction will need further work, for example showing that $\overline{\mathcal{E}}$ is regular, so that the intersection theory is well-behaved, and we postpone this to a future paper.

The definition of $\overline{\mathcal{E}}$ is again too involved to describe in this introduction, but we can nonetheless outline the main differences from \mathcal{E} . As in Mainò’s original construction, our definition of an enriched structure includes certain invertible sheaves. When moving to $\overline{\mathcal{E}}$, these are unsurprisingly replaced by torsion free rank 1 sheaves (see definition 7.1). However, there is a substantial complication. Mainò’s definition (spelled out in definition 4.2) gives an invertible sheaf for each irreducible component of C/k satisfying certain combinatorial conditions, and requires that the tensor product of all these invertible sheaves together be trivial. In our more general definition of an enriched structure a similar condition remains; at some point the tensor product of certain invertible sheaves is required to be trivial. When replacing the invertible sheaves by torsion free rank 1 sheaves this no longer makes much sense, since if a tensor product of sheaves is trivial then they were by definition invertible! We thus replace the ‘tensor product is trivial’ condition by a rather more involved condition in terms of certain auxiliary data (see definition 7.13). We must then work quite hard to verify that, in the case of invertible sheaves, this reduces to the original definition.

1.1 Future work on the closure of the double ramification cycle

Given the connection between moduli of enriched structures and Néron models, it is perhaps unsurprising that the moduli of enriched structures is relevant in the study of the closure of the double ramification cycle. Given a tuple of n integers summing to zero, one constructs a section α to the universal jacobian over $\mathcal{M}_{g,n}$ by taking the formal linear combination of the tautological sections with the given integers as coefficients, and viewing this as a divisor on the universal curve. The double ramification cycle on $\mathcal{M}_{g,n}$ is constructed by pulling back the unit section in the universal jacobian along the section α described above. One then wishes to extend this cycle to $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,n}$ in a natural way, and to compute its class in the

tautological ring. On the locus of curves with at most one non-separating node the above definition extends in a natural way, and the class was computed by Gruschevsky and Zakharov [GZ14], extending work of Hain [Hai13] who treated the compact-type case. A different approach using virtual fundamental classes on a space of stable maps to a ‘rubber \mathbb{P}^1 ’ allows for the construction of an extension of the double ramification cycle to the whole of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,n}$, and its class was computed in [JPPZ16]. Cavalieri, Marcus and Wise verified ([CMW12], [MW13]) that on the locus of curves of compact type this definition in terms of stable maps to rubber \mathbb{P}^1 coincides with the original definition in terms of sections to the universal jacobian. In future work, we plan to extend this result to the whole of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,n}$ using a (slightly modified) moduli stack of enriched structures to provide a space where the section α will always extend. It was suggested in [CMW12, §1.5] that such a construction should be carried out, but to our knowledge this has not yet happened.

1.2 Special case of 2-gons

In this section we gently introduce the definition of enriched structure (and compactified enriched structure) by considering the case of a curve with two irreducible components, meeting in two points, whose dual graph is thus a 2-gon.

We work over a separably closed field k — no subtleties are missed by taking $k = \mathbb{C}$. Let C_0 be the curve over k constructed by taking two copies of \mathbb{P}^1 , glueing the points $(0 : 1)$ together, and the points $(1 : 0)$ together, and finally marking both points $(1 : 1)$. We have a stable 2-pointed curve of genus 1. Let \mathcal{C}/\mathcal{M} be its universal deformation as a pointed curve, and choose an isomorphism $\mathcal{M} \cong \text{Spec } k[[x, y]]$ such that the locus in \mathcal{M} where $\mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ is not smooth is given by $xy = 0$.

The curve C_0 is the fibre over the closed point of $\mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$, and so its two irreducible components give closed subschemes of \mathcal{C} . If Γ is the dual graph of C_0/k (a 2-gon), let u and v be its vertices, corresponding to the two irreducible components of C_0 . Let $Z(u)$ (resp. $Z(v)$) be the corresponding closed subschemes of \mathcal{C} , and write \mathcal{I}_u (resp. \mathcal{I}_v) for their ideal sheaves on \mathcal{C} .

Now let $s : S \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ be any scheme over \mathcal{M} . If \mathcal{C}_S is the pullback of \mathcal{C} to a stable curve over S , then $s^*\mathcal{I}_u$ and $s^*\mathcal{I}_v$ are coherent sheaves on \mathcal{C}_S . We define an *enriched structure on \mathcal{C}_S/S* to be a pair

$$(q_u : s^*\mathcal{I}_u \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{L}_u, q_v : s^*\mathcal{I}_v \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{L}_v)$$

of invertible quotients of the $s^*\mathcal{I}_-$, satisfying the condition that $\mathcal{L}_u \otimes \mathcal{L}_v$ is S -locally isomorphic to the trivial bundle on \mathcal{C}_S .

For example, suppose $S \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ factors via the complement of the closed point. Then clearly $s^*\mathcal{I}_u$ and $s^*\mathcal{I}_v$ are both trivial, hence so are \mathcal{L}_u and \mathcal{L}_v , so there is

exactly one enriched structure on \mathcal{C}_S/S . On the other hand, if $S \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ factors via the inclusion of the closed point, then there is a bijection between enriched structures on \mathcal{C}_S/S and $\mathbb{G}_m(S)$. The reader will then not be surprised to know that the moduli space \mathcal{E}/\mathcal{M} of enriched structures can be obtained by blowing up \mathcal{M} at the closed point, then deleting the two points where the strict transforms of the coordinate axes meet the exceptional fibre.

If the moduli space of enriched structures is open in the blowup of \mathcal{M} at the closed point, one might hope that the moduli of compactified enriched structures is simply the blowup of \mathcal{M} at the origin, and indeed this is the case. To define the functor of compactified enriched structures, one takes pairs

$$(q_u: s^*\mathcal{I}_u \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{F}_u, q_v: s^*\mathcal{I}_v \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{F}_v)$$

of torsion free rank 1 (see definition 7.1) quotients of the $s^*\mathcal{I}_-$, and imposes a compatibility condition. To define the latter, denote by σ_u (resp. σ_v) the tautological section of \mathcal{C}/\mathcal{M} through $Z(u)$ (resp. $Z(v)$). We write \mathbb{K}_u for the kernel of the map $\sigma_u^*s^*\mathcal{I}_u \rightarrow \sigma_u^*\mathcal{F}_u$ induced by pulling back q_u along σ_u , and define \mathbb{K}_v similarly. Note that $\sigma_u^*s^*\mathcal{I}_u = s^*(x, y) = \sigma_v^*s^*\mathcal{I}_v$ where (x, y) is the defining ideal of the closed point in \mathcal{M} . We then say that the pair $(q_u: s^*\mathcal{I}_u \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{F}_u, q_v: s^*\mathcal{I}_v \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{F}_v)$ is compatible (i.e. form a compactified enriched structure) if the canonical closed immersion

$$\mathrm{Supp}_{\mathrm{Fitt}} \frac{s^*(x, y)}{\mathbb{K}_u + \mathbb{K}_v} \rightarrow S$$

is an isomorphism (here $\mathrm{Supp}_{\mathrm{Fitt}}$ denote the Fitting-support of a coherent sheaf — this is a slight variation on the usual support designed to behave better with respect to non-flat base-change, see definition 2.9). Note that the formation of \mathbb{K}_u and \mathbb{K}_v is stable under base-change by the S -flatness of \mathcal{F}_u and \mathcal{F}_v .

Again, if $S \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ factors via the complement of the closed point then the $s^*\mathcal{I}_-$ are both trivial, so $\mathbb{K}_u = \mathbb{K}_v = 0$ and the pair is automatically compatible, so there is exactly one compactified enriched structure. If $S \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ is the inclusion of the closed point then $s^*(x, y)$ is a free k -module of rank 2, \mathbb{K}_u and \mathbb{K}_v are both submodules of rank 1, so that pair is compatible if and only if $\mathbb{K}_u = \mathbb{K}_v$ as submodules of $s^*(x, y)$. More generally we find that the moduli space of compactified enriched structures is naturally isomorphic to the blowup of \mathcal{M} at the closed point.

1.3 Some of the complications arising in the general case

The story told above for the 2-gon was hopefully straightforward (aided by the omission of all the proofs). In this section we outline some of the complications which arise in treating the general case, and how we handle them.

1.3.1 Graphs make no sense

The crucial ideal sheaves \mathcal{I}_u and \mathcal{I}_v were defined in terms of dual graphs and irreducible components, but for arbitrary stable curves neither of these are defined. We begin by defining enriched structures on stable curves C/S such that the tautological map $S \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,n}$ factors via an étale chart $U \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,n}$ such that the tautological curve C_U/U is ‘controlled’, i.e. some fibre has a dual graph which dominates the dual graph of all the other fibres. We show the definition is independent of the choice of U . We show that such $S \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,n}$ form a base for the big étale site on $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,n}$ and that the resulting notion of enriched structure forms a sheaf on that base, and hence extends uniquely to a sheaf on the whole of the big étale site. We define this latter sheaf to be the sheaf of enriched structures. In fact, we carry out this procedure over the stack of all prestable curves for maximal generality.

1.3.2 What if the graph is not circuit-connected?

Having one \mathcal{I}_v for each vertex v does not work well if the graph is not circuit-connected (definition 2.3). We work instead with ‘relative components’ of the graph, namely pairs (v, G) where v is a vertex and G is a connected component of the complement of v . For example, if the graph has only a single vertex then the set of relative components is empty, so there is exactly one enriched structure (the empty tuple), as one would expect for a smooth curve.

When defining compactified enriched structures this setup is not quite general enough, essentially because of how graphs can change under specialisation (see below). We thus replace relative components with ‘hemispheres’ of the graph, namely connected subgraphs whose complements are also connected. If (v, G) is a relative component then G is a hemisphere, but not vice-versa in general.

1.3.3 How to pull back as the graph changes?

To define a functor of enriched structures we need a good notion of pullback. However, the dual graph can change dramatically under pullback, as contracting edges may delete loops or break circuit-connectedness. In the case of enriched structures we work around these problems by showing that the set of enriched structures is empty unless the only pullbacks are of a very simple combinatorial shape. In the case of compactified enriched structures our notion of hemispheres allows us to work around this.

1.4 Why do we bother with non-compactified enriched structures?

We will prove that the open substack of compactified enriched structures where the torsion free rank 1 quotients are invertible is canonically isomorphic to the stack of enriched structures. One might reasonably then ask why we bother with a separate definition of enriched structures with its own notion of compatibility. There are several possible answers:

1. The definition of enriched structures is rather simpler and easier to work/compute with than that of compactified enriched structures;
2. The definition of enriched structures is much closer to Mainò's original definition;
3. To show that invertible compactified enriched structures over fields are the same as those arising from Mainò's definition we would have to do much of the same work as we do in any case comparing enriched structures and invertible compactified enriched structures;
4. For the universal property concerning Néron models, it is much easier to work with enriched structures.

1.5 Acknowledgements

OB would like to thank Raoul Wols for pointing out a valuable reference for the appendix. DH would like to thank Martin Bright for his help in coming up with the definition of compatibility for compactified enriched structures, David Rydh for suggestions on proving representability, and the organisers of the AMS Summer Institute in Algebraic Geometry in Utah for an inspiring conference which provided a lot of motivation and context for this work. Both authors would like to thank Bas Edixhoven for a number of helpful comments and corrections.

1.6 Table of Notation

For the convenience of the reader, we list here some of the notation most frequently used in the paper.

Graph theory notation:

Γ		A graph.
Vert Γ , Edge Γ		The sets of vertices and edges of a graph Γ .
G, G^c		G is a set of vertices of a graph Γ , and G^c the set of vertices of Γ which are not in G .

$e : v - v'$	An edge e between vertices v and v' of a graph.
γ	A circuit of a graph (see definition 2.1).
$E(V)$	The set of edges of a graph with exactly one endpoint in a subset V of the vertices.
$\pi_0(\Gamma)$	The set of connected components of graph Γ .
Υ	A circuit-connected component of a graph (see lemma 2.5).

Commutative algebra and algebraic geometry notation:

R	A ring, assumed to be commutative with unity.
\widehat{R}	The completion of a local ring R at its maximal ideal.
$\text{Spec } R$	The spectrum of a ring R .
$\bar{s} \rightarrow S$	A geometric point of a scheme (or more generally algebraic stack) S .
\mathcal{O}_S	The structure sheaf on S .
M	A module over a ring, or a quasicoherent sheaf of modules.
I	An ideal of a ring, or a quasicoherent sheaf of ideals.
$V(I)$	The closed subscheme cut out by an ideal (sheaf) I .
$\text{Fitt}_k(M)$	The k th Fitting ideal of module (sheaf) M (see section 2.2).
$\text{Supp}(M)$	The set-theoretic support of sheaf of modules M .
$\text{Supp}_{\text{Fitt}}(M)$	The closed subscheme cut out by the 0th Fitting ideal of M (see section 2.2).
$Z, Z(\cdot)$	A closed subscheme (possibly one determined by some data “.”).
$\mathcal{O}_{S, \bar{s}}^{et}$	The étale stalk of the structure sheaf of scheme S at a geometric point \bar{s} .
$\text{Irr}(C)$	The set of irreducible components of a reduced scheme C (often a prestable curve).

Prestable curve notation:

C/S	A prestable curve C over scheme (or algebraic stack) S (see section 2.3).
\mathfrak{M}	The algebraic stack of all prestable curves (see section 2.3).
$\mathfrak{C}/\mathfrak{M}$	The universal prestable curve (see section 2.3).
$\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,n}$ or $\mathcal{M}_{g,n}^{stab}$	The Deligne-Mumford stack of stable curves of genus g with n marked points.
Γ_x	The dual graph of a prestable curve C/S over a point $x \in S$.
$\Omega_{C/S}$	The sheaf of relative differentials of a prestable curve C/S .
$\text{Sing}(C/S)$	A canonical closed subscheme of curve C/S where $C \rightarrow S$ is not smooth.
\mathfrak{s}	A controlling point of S for a prestable curve C/S .
$\mathfrak{U} \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}, C/\mathfrak{U}$	A simple chart (see definition 2.19).

\mathfrak{U}_S	The immediate neighbourhood of stack S in chart U , see definition 2.26
$Z(D)$	The closed subscheme of a simple chart U cut out by labels of edges in D (see definition 2.31).
\mathcal{I}_W	A sheaf of ideals on \mathfrak{U} , see definition 2.31.
\mathcal{I}_V	A sheaf of ideals on $C_{\mathfrak{U}}$ (see definition 2.31).

Miscellaneous notation:

$\mathcal{E}(S)$	The set of enriched structures on S .
Set	The category of sets.
Sch$_S$	The category of schemes over algebraic stack S .
$\#F$	the cardinality of a (finite) set F .
\mapsto	a closed immersion.
\hookrightarrow	an open immersion.

We use lowercase letters both for points of schemes and for morphisms of schemes, adopting the view that a point $x \in X$ is a type of morphism to X , part of the “functor of points” view that every morphism of schemes $T \rightarrow X$ is a “ T -point” of X . We often use η for a point of a scheme that is meant to be “generic” in some way, either specifically as the generic point of a given irreducible subscheme of X , or more generally as any point of X that specializes to a given $x \in X$.

1.7 Notation for pullbacks

Suppose we are given a pullback diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 X \times_S T & \longrightarrow & X \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow \pi \\
 T & \xrightarrow{t} & S,
 \end{array}$$

and a quasicoherent sheaf \mathcal{F} on X , which we can pull back to $X \times_S T$. Often one would write X_T for $X \times_S T$, and \mathcal{F}_T for the pullback of \mathcal{F} to X_T . However, it is really the map t which is important, not just the data of the scheme T — it will often happen that $T = \text{Spec } k$ for some field k , and there are many possibilities for t , so we want to emphasise our choice. Because of this, we write $t^*X := X \times_S T$, $t^*\pi$ for the natural map $t^*X \rightarrow T$, and symmetrically π^*t for the natural map $X \times_S T \rightarrow X$. With this arranged, the pullback of \mathcal{F} to t^*X should correctly be

denoted $(\pi^*t)^*\mathcal{F}$, but this is clumsy; we denote it simply $t^*\mathcal{F}$, which is shorter and unambiguous.

This notation makes it important to remember where various sheaves live. To aid in this, we make the following conventions: if C/S is a curve, we use \mathcal{I} for ideal sheaves on C , and \mathcal{J} for ideal sheaves on S . Similarly, we use K for kernels of maps on C , and \mathbb{K} for kernels of maps on S .

Part I

Fine moduli of enriched structures

2 Defining enriched structures

We start by briefly recalling some standard definitions, and fixing notation.

2.1 Graphs

Definition 2.1. By a *graph* Γ we shall mean an *undirected multigraph*, that is, Γ has a set of vertices $\text{Vert}(\Gamma)$ and a set of edges $\text{Edge}(\Gamma)$, and to each edge is associated an unordered pair of vertices called its *endpoints*. A *loop* is an edge whose endpoints are the same (in particular, we allow loops), and a *circuit* is a path of positive length which starts and ends at the same vertex, and which does not repeat any edges or any other vertices.

We will also use the notion of a *contraction* of graphs $\Gamma \rightarrow \Gamma'$, which means that Γ' has been obtained from Γ by removing a subset E of the edges of Γ and identifying the endpoints of each edge in E .

We now introduce two notions of connectedness for a graph: ordinary path-connectedness as well as circuit-connectedness.

Definition 2.2. The *connected components* of a graph Γ are the equivalence classes of $\text{Vert}(\Gamma)$ under the equivalence relation generated by the edges of the graph. A graph is *connected* if it has exactly one connected component, i.e. if it is non-empty and if every two vertices can be connected by a path.

Definition 2.3. Let Γ be a graph. To any subset $E \subseteq \text{Edge}(\Gamma)$ we associate the unique subgraph of Γ with edges E and with no isolated vertices — we will often fail to distinguish between the set E of edges and the subgraph of Γ obtained in

this way. We say E is *circuit-connected* if it is non-empty and, for every pair e, e' of distinct edges in E , there is at least one circuit $\gamma \subseteq E$ such that $e \in \gamma$ and $e' \in \gamma$.

Remark 2.4. Note that circuit-connectedness is not equivalent to the notion of 2-vertex-connectivity found in the literature, for example a graph with one vertex and one edge (a loop) is circuit-connected, but not 2-vertex-connected.

Lemma 2.5 ([Hol14, lemma 7.2]). *For each graph Γ , the maximal circuit-connected subsets (circuit-connected components) of $\text{Edge}(\Gamma)$ form a partition of $\text{Edge}(\Gamma)$.*

This partition can be thought of as breaking the graph into loops and 2-vertex-connected components, cf. [Hol14, §7.1].

2.2 Fitting ideals

Here we recall the definition and key properties of Fitting ideals for finite modules over schemes, which among other uses provide a well-behaved notion of scheme-theoretic support for a finite quasicohherent sheaf of modules.

Definition 2.6. Let R be a ring (commutative, with unity) and M a finitely generated R -module. Choose a presentation of M with a finite list of generators m_1, \dots, m_n and a (possibly infinite) family of relations $\{a_{1j}m_1 + \dots + a_{nj}m_n : j \in J\}$. The k th Fitting ideal of M is the ideal $\text{Fitt}_k(M) \subseteq R$ generated by the $(n-k) \times (n-k)$ minors of the $n \times J$ matrix with entries a_{ij} . It is independent of choice of presentation; see [Sta13, Tag 07Z8].

We note the following elementary results about Fitting ideals:

Lemma 2.7. *Let R be a ring and M, M' finite R -modules.*

1. $\text{Fitt}_0 M \subseteq \text{Ann}_R M$ as ideals of R .
2. $V(\text{Fitt}_0) = \text{Supp}(M)$ as subsets of $\text{Spec}(R)$.
3. Given an R -algebra R' , if I is the k th Fitting ideal of M then $R'I$ is the k th Fitting ideal of $M' = R' \otimes_R M$.
4. If $M \rightarrow M'$ is a surjection, then $\text{Fitt}_k(M) \subseteq \text{Fitt}_k(M')$.

Proof. [Sta13, Tag 07ZA] □

From here, it is a straightforward matter to generalize Fitting ideals to quasicohherent modules over a scheme:

Lemma 2.8. *Let S be a scheme and M a finite type quasicoherent \mathcal{O}_S -module. For each natural number k , there is a unique quasicoherent \mathcal{O}_S -ideal sheaf that assigns to each affine subscheme $X \subseteq S$ the ideal $\text{Fitt}_k(M(X))$. We denote this sheaf of ideals by $\text{Fitt}_k(M)$ as well and call it the k th Fitting ideal sheaf of M .*

Proof. [Sta13, Tag 0CZ3] □

Definition 2.9. For S a scheme and M a finite quasicoherent \mathcal{O}_S -module, we define the *Fitting support* $\text{Supp}_{\text{Fitt}} M$ to be the closed subscheme of S cut out by the ideal sheaf $\text{Fitt}_0(M)$.

Remark 2.10. From the above, we see that the Fitting support coincides set-theoretically with the usual support, and its formation commutes with arbitrary base-change.

2.3 Prestable curves and their moduli

Definition 2.11. Let S be an algebraic stack (in the sense of [Sta13, Tag 026O]). A *prestable curve* over S is a proper, flat, finitely presented morphism to S which is relatively representable by algebraic spaces and whose geometric fibres are reduced, connected, have all irreducible components of dimension 1, and which have at worst nodal singularities.

By *curve*, we will always mean ‘prestable curve’. We denote by \mathfrak{M} the stack of all prestable curves. In other words, \mathfrak{M} is a stack in groupoids over the category $\mathbf{Sch}_{\mathbb{Z}}$ of schemes over \mathbb{Z} , whose objects are pairs $(S, C/S)$ with S a scheme and C/S a prestable curve. This is an algebraic stack, smooth over \mathbb{Z} , and is the disjoint union of open substacks of prestable curves of genus g , see [Sta13, Section 0E6S].

We write $\mathfrak{C}/\mathfrak{M}$ for the universal prestable curve. By definition, to give a morphism from a scheme $S \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}$ is the same as to give a prestable curve C/S . On the other hand, we can view S as a stack (namely, as the category of schemes over S together with the forgetful functor to $\mathbf{Sch}_{\mathbb{Z}}$), and then the functor $\mathbf{Sch}_S \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}$ sends $T \rightarrow S$ to the pair $(T, C \times_S T/T) \in \text{ob } \mathfrak{M}$. Now, the universal curve $\mathfrak{C}/\mathfrak{M}$ is a stack whose objects are triples $(T, C/T, f)$ of a scheme, a prestable curve, and a section $f \in C(T)$. If C/S is a prestable curve, then we can view C as a stack (namely, as \mathbf{Sch}_C), and define a functor $\mathbf{Sch}_C \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}$ by sending a scheme $T \rightarrow C$ to the triple $(T, C \times_S T, f)$ where $f: T \rightarrow C \times_S T$ is the section induced by the map $T \rightarrow C$.

Given a morphism from a scheme S to \mathfrak{M} , we write C_S/S for the tautological prestable curve over S (the pullback of \mathfrak{C} from \mathfrak{M} to S). If we start with a prestable curve C/S , this induces a morphism $S \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}$, and thus a prestable curve C_S/S ; reassuringly, by the above discussion we have $C_S = C$; these curves are

canonically identified as schemes over S . For example, given a prestable curve C/S and a geometric point $\bar{s} \rightarrow S$ we may compose $s \rightarrow S \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}$ and obtain the fiber $C_{\bar{s}}$ of C over \bar{s} ; more generally, we can apply this process to any map $T \rightarrow S$ and obtain the pullback $C_T/T = C \times_S T/T$.

The stack \mathfrak{M} is not quasi-compact or Deligne-Mumford, but does come with a very pleasant smooth cover by a Deligne-Mumford stack:

$$\bigsqcup_{(g,n):2g-2+n>0} \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,n} \rightarrow \mathfrak{M} \quad (2.3.1)$$

where we simply forget the markings. This map is smooth since the map $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,n} \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}$ is relatively representable by an open substack of the n -fold fibre product of smooth locus the universal curve over \mathfrak{M} , and it is surjective since every prestable curve admits many sections étale-locally on the base.

For many applications, it seems more interesting to work with the universal stable curve over $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,n}$ for some g, n in place of the stack \mathfrak{M} of prestable curves. The formation of the stack of enriched structures (and its compactification) are largely carried out smooth-locally on the target, and their formation commutes with base-change. Because of this, the reader who is only interested in the case of stable curves will lose nothing by taking \mathfrak{M} to be $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,n}$ (over \mathbb{Z} , or their favourite ground field).

2.4 Boundaries and labelled graphs of curves

Given a prestable curve C/S over a scheme, and a geometric point $\bar{s} \rightarrow S$, the *graph* $\Gamma_{\bar{s}}$ of C/S at \bar{s} is defined as in [Liu02, definition 10.3.17] (who writes ‘semistable’ where we write ‘prestale’); there is one vertex for each irreducible component of $C_{\bar{s}}$ and for every nodal point an edge connecting the vertices corresponding to the components it lies on. If e is an edge of $\Gamma_{\bar{s}}$, i.e. a nodal point of $C_{\bar{s}}$, then we label e by the principal ideal $(a) \subseteq \mathcal{O}_{S,\bar{s}}^{et}$ such that

$$\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{C,e}^{et} \cong \frac{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{S,\bar{s}}^{et}[[x,y]]}{(xy - a)} \quad (2.4.1)$$

as $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{S,\bar{s}}^{et}$ -algebras — see [Hol16a, proposition 2.5].

Definition 2.12. Let C/S be a prestable curve over a scheme, and $\bar{s} \rightarrow S$ a geometric point. We say C/S has *normal crossings singularities at \bar{s}* if for every subset $E \subseteq \text{Edge } \Gamma_{\bar{s}}$, the closed subscheme of $\text{Spec } \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{S,\bar{s}}^{et}$ cut out by the labels of the edges in E is regular as a scheme, and has codimension equal to the cardinality of E .

We say C/S has *normal crossings singularities* if it has them at all geometric points of S . The notion of having normal crossings singularities is local on S in the smooth topology, so the definition naturally extends to prestable curves C/S where S is an algebraic stack.

Definition 2.13. Let C/S be a prestable curve over a scheme, with relative differentials $\Omega_{C/S}$. The first Fitting ideal (see [Eis95, Chapter 20] or definition 2.6) of $\Omega_{C/S}$ is a sheaf of ideals on C , hence cuts out a closed subscheme $\text{Sing}(C/S)$ of C , whose complement is exactly the locus where the map $C \rightarrow S$ is smooth. The *boundary* of C/S is defined as the closed subscheme of S cut out by the 0th Fitting ideal of the structure sheaf of $\text{Sing}(C/S)$.

Remark 2.14. Set-theoretically the boundary consists of those points of S over which C is not smooth. The boundary is locally cut out by a single equation. Suppose S is strictly henselian local (in particular the graph over the closed point makes sense), and that C/S has node e of the graph of the closed fibre labelled by $(\alpha(e)) \subseteq \mathcal{O}_S(S)$. Then a simple computation from eq. (2.4.1) and the definition of the 1st Fitting ideal yields

$$\text{Sing}(C/S) = \text{Spec} \left(\prod_{e \in \text{nodes}} \mathcal{O}_S(S)/(\alpha(e)) \right).$$

The 0th fitting ideal of this module is then simply $(\prod_{e \in \text{nodes}} \alpha(e))$.

To specialise further, assume $S = \text{Spec } k[[t]]$ and C/S is regular, with n nodes on the special fibre. Then the boundary is cut out by (t^n) . This is of course *not* in general equal to the schematic image of $\text{Sing}(C/S)$ in S (the latter being cut out by (t)). However, we will mostly use this concept in the case where C/S has normal crossings singularities, in which case the boundary is easily seen to coincide with the schematic image in S of $\text{Sing}(C/S)$. The advantage of the definition of the boundary given here is that its formation commutes with arbitrary base-change.

Definition 2.15. A prestable curve C/S is *quasisplit* if every irreducible component of every fibre is geometrically irreducible, and if the structure morphism $\text{Sing}(C/S) \rightarrow S$ of the non-smooth locus is an immersion Zariski-locally on the source.

A prestable curve over a strictly Henselian local scheme is always quasi-split, and by a limiting argument we find that every prestable curve becomes quasi-split after some étale cover. If C/S is quasisplit and $s \in S$ is a point then the graph of C/S at s makes sense without making a choice of algebraic closure of the residue field, and its labels naturally lie in the Zariski local ring $\mathcal{O}_{S,s}$ (see [Hol14] for more details).

Let C/S be a quasisplit prestable curve. If s, η are two points in S with $s \in \overline{\{\eta\}}$ then we have a natural ‘specialisation map’ $\Gamma_s \rightarrow \Gamma_\eta$ which contracts those edges whose labels become units at η , and replaces the labels on the other edges by their images in the local ring at η , see [Hol14].

2.5 Controlled curves and charts

2.5.1 Definitions

Definition 2.16. Let C/S be a quasi-split curve. If s, x are two points in S we say x is controlled by s if there exists a point $\eta_x \in S$ such that x and s both lie in $\overline{\{\eta_x\}}$ and such that the specialisation map $\Gamma_x \rightarrow \Gamma_{\eta_x}$ is an isomorphism. We say s is a controlling point for S if every $x \in S$ is controlled by s .

Roughly, this says that every graph of C/S is canonically a contraction of Γ_s . In the case of the universal deformation \mathcal{C}/\mathcal{M} of the 2-gon considered in section 1.2, the unique controlling point is the closed point of \mathcal{M} . We usually denote controlling points by fraktur letters.

Suppose C/S has a controlling point $\mathfrak{s} \in S$. Let \mathfrak{s}' be any other controlling point. Then the graphs $\Gamma_{\mathfrak{s}}$ and $\Gamma_{\mathfrak{s}'}$ are canonically identified, so we have a graph for the whole C/S , without reference to a specific controlling point, motivating

Definition 2.17. If C/S has a controlling point we call it *weakly controlled*, and we call the graph a *controlling graph*.

Every C/S is weakly controlled S -étale locally, and if C/S is weakly controlled then in particular S is connected.

Definition 2.18. We say a closed immersion to an affine scheme $Z \hookrightarrow X$ is *SNC* if there exists a finite set $F \subseteq \mathcal{O}_X(X)$, such that

1. the ideal sheaf of Z is the ideal generated by the product of all the elements of F ;
2. For every subset $F_0 \subseteq F$, the closed subscheme cut out by the ideal generated by F_0 is smooth over \mathbb{Z} , is connected, and is of codimension $\#F_0$ in X .

This concept is referred to in the literature both as (relative) *strict normal crossings* and as *simple normal crossings*, but the acronym is happily the same.

By taking F_0 empty we see that X itself must be smooth and connected, in particular it is non-empty, jacobson and equidimensional. The prototypical example of $Z \hookrightarrow X$ is the inclusion of the union of the coordinate hyperplanes into affine space; and every other example is étale-locally isomorphic to this one. How unique is this F ? If F' is another set of elements satisfying the same conditions,

then there is a unique bijection $\varphi: F \rightarrow F'$ such that f differs from $\varphi(f)$ by multiplication by a unit in $\mathcal{O}_X(X)$.

An SNC closed immersion $Z \hookrightarrow X$ induces a partition of X into smooth connected locally-closed subschemes (a *stratification*), by taking intersections and complements of subschemes defined by the vanishing of the elements of F . By our connectedness assumptions, there is exactly one closed and one open stratum. We order the strata of X by ‘inclusion in the closure’, i.e. we set

$$\sigma \leq \sigma' \iff \sigma \subseteq \overline{\sigma'},$$

so the closed stratum is the minimal element, and the open stratum is the maximal element. More generally, the union of a downward-closed set of strata is closed, and the union of an upward-closed set of strata is open.

Definition 2.19. A *simple chart* is a smooth morphism from an affine scheme $\mathfrak{U} \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}$ such that the boundary of $C_{\mathfrak{U}}/\mathfrak{U}$ is SNC, and such that $C_{\mathfrak{U}}/\mathfrak{U}$ is quasi-split.

The symbol \mathfrak{U} will be reserved for simple charts. We will soon prove that simple charts are weakly controlled.

Definition 2.20. We say a curve C/S is *controlled* if

1. C/S is weakly controlled;
2. there exists a factorisation $S \rightarrow \mathfrak{U} \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}$ where $\mathfrak{U} \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}$ is a simple chart (we call this a *controlled neighbourhood*).

We will soon prove that simple charts are controlled in the sense of definition 2.20, making the terminology reasonable.

2.5.2 Basic properties of simple charts

Lemma 2.21. *Let C/\mathfrak{U} be a simple chart, and $u \in \mathfrak{U}$ be a point with graph Γ . Let F be as in definition 2.18, and let $F_u \subseteq F$ be the set of those elements vanishing at u . Then the graph over u has exactly $\#F_u$ edges, and the labels of these edges are generated by the images of the elements of F_u in $\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{U},u}$.*

Proof. We can check these claims after passing to the strict henselisation of \mathfrak{U} at u , whereupon they follow from remark 2.14. \square

Since no edges are contracted when we move within a stratum, we have

Lemma 2.22. *Let C/\mathfrak{U} be a simple chart, and $u, u' \in \mathfrak{U}$ points in the same stratum, with $u \in \overline{\{u'\}}$. Then the contraction $\Gamma_{u'} \rightarrow \Gamma_u$ is an isomorphism.*

Since each stratum has a unique generic point, the graphs at all points within the same stratum are *canonically* identified. In this way, each stratum σ has an associated graph Γ_σ , and the edges can be seen as having labels taken from the elements of F . If a stratum σ is contained in the closure of another σ' (i.e. $\sigma \leq \sigma'$), then we have a contraction $\Gamma_\sigma \rightarrow \Gamma_{\sigma'}$, contracting exactly those edges whose labels are units on the stratum σ' . Since the closed stratum lies in the closure of the generic point of every other stratum, we in particular obtain

Lemma 2.23. *Let C/\mathfrak{U} be a simple chart, and $u \in \mathfrak{U}$ a point lying in the closed stratum. Then u is a controlling point for C/\mathfrak{U} .*

A simple chart $\mathfrak{U} \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}$ is therefore itself controlled (as a simple chart for \mathfrak{U} , just take $\mathfrak{U} \xrightarrow{id} \mathfrak{U}$).

Lemma 2.24. *Let $S \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}$ be any curve, with S a scheme. There exists an étale cover $\bigsqcup_{i \in I} S_i \rightarrow S$ such that each $S_i \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}$ is controlled.*

Proof. Firstly, from (2.3.1) it is clear that we can find a smooth cover of \mathfrak{M} by simple charts. Moreover, any family of curves has an étale cover by controlled families. The result follows by combining these statements. \square

2.5.3 Immediate neighbourhoods of controlled curves

Let C/S be a controlled curve with controlled neighbourhood $S \rightarrow \mathfrak{U} \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}$. Since any two controlling points of C/S lie in the closure of a third, and the graphs over these points are canonically identified via specialisation, we see

Lemma 2.25. *There exists a stratum σ_S of \mathfrak{U} such that every controlling point of S lands in σ_S .*

Definition 2.26. Let $\mathfrak{U}_S \subseteq \mathfrak{U}$ be the union of those strata $\sigma \geq \sigma_S$. Then \mathfrak{U}_S is affine open in \mathfrak{U} , and the morphism $S \rightarrow \mathfrak{U}$ factors via $\mathfrak{U}_S \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{U}$; we call \mathfrak{U}_S the *immediate neighbourhood of S in \mathfrak{U}* .

If $F \subseteq \mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{U}}(\mathfrak{U})$ is as in definition 2.18, we see that \mathfrak{U}_S is obtained from \mathfrak{U} by inverting those $f \in F$ which pull back to units on S ; in particular, \mathfrak{U}_S is itself a simple chart for S .

If $S \rightarrow \mathfrak{U}$ is a controlled neighbourhood and $S \rightarrow \mathfrak{U}_S \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{U}$ is the immediate neighbourhood of S in \mathfrak{U} , then \mathfrak{U}_S is also the immediate neighbourhood of S in \mathfrak{U}_S .

Example 2.27. If $\mathfrak{U} \subseteq \text{Spec } k[x, y]$ is a deformation of a 2-gon with boundary $xy = 0$, then

- If u is the generic point of \mathfrak{U} then $\mathfrak{U}_u = \mathfrak{U} \setminus (xy = 0)$;

- If u is the generic point of the divisor $(x = 0)$ then $\mathfrak{U}_u = \mathfrak{U} \setminus (y = 0)$;
- If u is the closed point of \mathfrak{U} then $\mathfrak{U}_u = \mathfrak{U}$.

2.6 Enriched structures on controlled curves

Let \mathfrak{U} be a simple chart with controlling point \mathfrak{u} , with graph Γ . Let e be an edge in Γ , and let $\ell(e) \in \mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{u}}(\mathfrak{U})$ be the label of e , defined up to multiplication by a unit. Let $Z = Z(\ell(e))$ be the closed subscheme of \mathfrak{U} cut out by $\ell(e)$.

Lemma 2.28. *There exists a unique \mathfrak{U} -map $Z \rightarrow C_{\mathfrak{U}}$ landing in the non-smooth locus and which, on restriction to the fibre over \mathfrak{u} , is the inclusion of the node corresponding to the edge e .*

Proof. Writing $C_Z = C_{\mathfrak{U}} \times_{\mathfrak{U}} Z$, we must construct an appropriate section of the projection $C_Z \rightarrow Z$. The node in $C_{\mathfrak{u}}$ corresponding to the edge e lies in $\text{Sing}(C_Z/Z)$; we write T for the connected component of $\text{Sing}(C_Z/Z)$ containing it. It suffices to show that the map $T \rightarrow Z$ is an isomorphism. Now $T \rightarrow Z$ is finite unramified, and by looking étale-locally at the equations we can see that it is even étale. Thus $T \rightarrow Z$ is a finite étale morphism of connected schemes smooth over \mathbb{Z} (in particular, geometrically unibranch), and by our quasi-splitness assumption it admits a section on some Zariski neighbourhood of u , thus by [Sta13, Tag 0BQI] $T \rightarrow Z$ is an isomorphism. \square

Let D be a subset of the edges of Γ , and write $Z(D)$ for the subscheme of \mathfrak{U} cut out by the labels of edges in D . Write $C_{Z(D)} = C_{\mathfrak{U}} \times_{\mathfrak{U}} Z(D)$, a prestable curve over $Z(D)$. Write $\Gamma \setminus D$ for the graph obtained from Γ by deleting those edges in D , and write $\pi_0(\Gamma \setminus D)$ for its set of connected components. Write $\text{Irr}(C_{Z(D)})$ for the set of irreducible components of the (reduced) scheme $C_{Z(D)}$.

Lemma 2.29. *There is a unique bijection*

$$\varphi: \pi_0(\Gamma \setminus D) \rightarrow \text{Irr}(C_{Z(D)}) \tag{2.6.1}$$

such that, on the fibre over the controlling point \mathfrak{u} , vertices of a connected component G correspond to irreducible components of $C_{\mathfrak{u}}$ which lie in $\varphi(G)$.

Proof. Write η for the generic point of the integral scheme $Z(D)$. Then the graph Γ_{η} over η is obtained from Γ by contracting exactly those edges *not* in D . Thus the vertices of Γ_{η} are in natural bijection with $\pi_0(\Gamma \setminus D)$. On the other hand, the vertices of Γ_{η} are also in natural bijection with the irreducible components of C_{η} . It thus suffices to construct a suitable bijection $\text{Irr}(C_{\eta}) \rightarrow \text{Irr}(C_{Z(D)})$.

Applying lemma 2.28 yields for every edge in D a section of $C_{Z(D)} \rightarrow Z(D)$ landing in the non-smooth locus. Write $\tilde{C}_{Z(D)}$ for the blowup of $C_{Z(D)}$ at the

union of these sections (this is the same as the normalisation of $C_{Z(D)}$, as can be checked by an étale-local computation). Each connected component of $\tilde{C}_{Z(D)}$ is a generically-smooth prestable curve over $Z(D)$, and so is irreducible, hence the connected components of $\tilde{C}_{Z(D)}$ are naturally in bijection with the irreducible components of $C_{Z(D)}$. These connected components also correspond bijectively to the irreducible components of C_η (since blowups commute with flat base-change, and the claim is true for a curve over a field). \square

Now let W be a subset of the vertices of Γ , and write $E(W)$ for the set of edges with exactly one endpoint in W . Then $Z(E(W))$ is the closed subscheme of \mathfrak{U} cut out by the labels of edges in $E(W)$, and we have a bijection

$$\varphi: \pi_0(\Gamma \setminus E(W)) \rightarrow \text{Irr}(C_{Z(E(W))}). \quad (2.6.2)$$

Let T_W be the disjoint union of the $\varphi(G)$ as G runs over connected components of $\Gamma \setminus E(W)$ which contain a vertex in W ; symbolically,

$$T_W = \bigsqcup \{\varphi(G) : G \in \pi_0(\Gamma \setminus E(W)), G \cap W \neq \emptyset\}.$$

Equipping T_W with its reduced induced scheme structure, we have a natural map $T_W \rightarrow C_{\mathfrak{U}}$.

Lemma 2.30. *The natural map $T_W \rightarrow C_{\mathfrak{U}}$ is a closed immersion.*

Proof. It suffices to show that the natural map $T_W \rightarrow C_{Z(E(W))}$ is a closed immersion. Since the latter map is the inclusion of a disjoint union of irreducible components, it suffices to check that these irreducible components have no intersection. But this is clear from the definition of $E(W)$, since no two connected components of $\Gamma \setminus E(W)$ can be connected by an edge. \square

Definition 2.31. Given W as above, we define \mathcal{J}_W to be the sheaf of ideals on \mathfrak{U} cutting out $Z(E(W))$, and \mathcal{I}_W to be the sheaf of ideals on $C_{\mathfrak{U}}$ cutting out T_W .

The sheaf \mathcal{I}_W will play a central role in everything that follows; \mathcal{J}_W will only become important in part II.

Example 2.32 (The 2-gon). With a deformation of the 2-gon as discussed in section 1.2, the graph is a 2-gon with labels (u) and (v) . We consider several possible sets W :

1. If W consists of a single vertex then $Z(E(W))$ is the closed point, and T_W will be the corresponding irreducible component of the special fibre;
2. If W consists of both vertices then $Z(E(W))$ is the whole of \mathfrak{U} and T_W is the whole of C ;
3. If W is empty then $Z(E(W))$ is again the whole of \mathfrak{U} , but T_W is empty.

2.6.1 Enriched structures

If Γ is a graph with vertex set V and $W \subseteq V$, we write $\Gamma - W$ for the subgraph of Γ induced by $V \setminus W$. If $W = \{v\}$ is a singleton, we denote this simply $\Gamma - v$.

Definition 2.33. Let Γ be a connected graph. A *relative component* of Γ is a pair (v, G) where v is a vertex of Γ and G is a connected component of $\Gamma - v$. An edge from v to G is called a *separating edge* of the relative component. We write G^c (the ‘complement of G ’) for the set of vertices of Γ that are not in G .

Note that the set of relative components is empty if and only if Γ has exactly one vertex. Note also that G determines v uniquely, but not vice-versa in general (though v does determine G if Γ is circuit-connected).

Definition 2.34 (The set of enriched structures). Let C/S be a controlled curve with controlling point \mathfrak{s} and $S \xrightarrow{\mathfrak{s}} \mathfrak{U} \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}$ a controlled neighbourhood. Write $u = s(\mathfrak{s})$, and let $\Gamma := \Gamma_{\mathfrak{s}}$ be the graph of \mathfrak{s} , and \mathfrak{U}_S be the immediate neighborhood of S in \mathfrak{U} . For each relative component (v, G) of Γ we have an ideal sheaf \mathcal{I}_{G^c} on $C_{\mathfrak{U}_S}$, which we can pull back along s to C (c.f. section 1.7).

An *enriched structure* on C/S with respect to \mathfrak{U} consists of, for each relative component (v, G) of Γ , an invertible quotient

$$q_{v,G}: s^*\mathcal{I}_{G^c} \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{L}_{(v,G)}, \quad (2.6.3)$$

(i.e. a surjective map of sheaves on C where $\mathcal{L}_{(v,G)}$ is invertible), such that S -locally there exists an isomorphism

$$\bigotimes_{\substack{v \in \text{Vert } \Gamma \\ G \in \pi_0(\Gamma - v)}} \mathcal{L}_{(v,G)} \cong \mathcal{O}_C. \quad (2.6.4)$$

We say two enriched structures $(q_{v,G}: s^*\mathcal{I}_{G^c} \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{L}_{(v,G)})_{v,G}$ and $(q'_{v,G}: s^*\mathcal{I}_{G^c} \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{L}'_{(v,G)})_{v,G}$ (with respect to \mathfrak{U}) are *equivalent* if for every vertex v and every $G \in \pi_0(\Gamma - v)$ there exists an isomorphism $\psi_{v,G}: \mathcal{L}_{(v,G)} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}'_{(v,G)}$ making the obvious triangle commute. We write $\mathcal{E}(C/S)$ for the set of equivalence classes of enriched structures on C/S .

Later, we will extend the construction of \mathcal{E} to a functor, and extend it to all curves (not just controlled ones).

Note that the set $\mathcal{E}(C/S)$ can be empty. Indeed, in section 6.2 we will see that the moduli of enriched structures on C/S is sub-functor of a blowup of S , so we should not expect it to have S -points in general.

Remark 2.35 (Changing the neighbourhood).

1. If $S \rightarrow \mathfrak{U}' \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}$ is another controlled neighbourhood of $S \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}$, then $\mathfrak{U} \times_{\mathfrak{M}} \mathfrak{U}'$ is also a controlled neighbourhood.
2. Let $S \rightarrow \mathfrak{U}' \rightarrow \mathfrak{U} \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}$ be a refinement of controlled neighbourhoods. Then (see section 2.5.3) the map $\mathfrak{U}'_S \rightarrow \mathfrak{U}$ factors via \mathfrak{U}_S . Write Γ for the graph of \mathfrak{s} (equivalently the graph of u or u') and let (v, G) be a relative component. Write \mathcal{I}_{G^c} for the ideal sheaf over \mathfrak{U}_S and \mathcal{I}'_{G^c} for that over \mathfrak{U}'_S . Then it is clear that the pullback of \mathcal{I}_{G^c} to the curve over \mathfrak{U}'_S is exactly \mathcal{I}'_{G^c} . As such, we see that enriched structures on C/S with respect to \mathfrak{U} are canonically the same as those taken with respect to \mathfrak{U}' .
3. Combining the above two points, we see that the definition of an enriched structure does not depend on the choice of controlled neighbourhood \mathfrak{U} .

Example 2.36 (Compact type). Suppose that C/S is of compact type, so that the graph Γ is a tree. Then $C_{\mathfrak{U}_S}/\mathfrak{U}_S$ is also of compact type. If (v, G) is a relative component, then there is exactly one edge between G and G^c , from which it follows that T_G^c is a Cartier divisor, so the ideal sheaf \mathcal{I}_{G^c} on $C_{\mathfrak{U}_S}$ is invertible. The pullback to C (denoted $s^*\mathcal{I}_{G^c}$ is therefore also invertible, so that it has a unique invertible quotient (namely, itself). This immediately implies that there is at most one enriched structure on a curve of compact type, and with a little more work one can check that the compatibility eq. (2.6.4) holds, so that there is exactly one enriched structure.

2.7 Pulling back enriched structures

In this section we will define the pullback of enriched structures. This will define the functor of enriched structures; it then makes sense to ask whether it is representable (indeed it is; see corollary 3.9). The definition is rather involved; we begin by introducing a condition ‘1-alignment’ on curves. We show that any family of curves which is not 1-aligned does not admit any enriched structures. We then define the pullback when the target is 1-aligned, which suffices by the previous result.

Definition 2.37. Let C/S be a curve and $\bar{s} \rightarrow S$ a geometric point. We say C/S is *1-aligned at \bar{s}* if for every circuit γ in the graph over \bar{s} , all the labels of edges in γ are equal. We say C/S is *1-aligned* if it is so at every geometric point of S .

Lemma 2.38. *Let C/S be a controlled curve, and suppose the set of enriched structures on C/S is non-empty. Then C/S is 1-aligned.*

Proof. Let $\bar{s} \rightarrow S$ be a geometric point of S with Γ the graph of $C_{\bar{s}}/\bar{s}$. Write $R = \widehat{\mathcal{O}_{S, \bar{s}}}$. Suppose the set of enriched structures is non-empty. Given a vertex

$v \in \Gamma$ and G a connected component of $\Gamma - v$, we will show that all the edges from v to G have the same label. This is vacuously true if there are no such edges; otherwise, write $p = p_0, p_1, \dots, p_n$ for the singular points of $C_{\bar{s}}$ corresponding to these edges, and $(a) = (a_0), (a_1), \dots, (a_n)$ for their labels. We will show that in fact every (a_i) is equal to (a) . We identify the completed local ring $\widehat{\mathcal{O}_{C, p_i}}$ at the singular point p_i corresponding to the edge labelled (a_i) with $R[[x, y]]/(xy - a_i)$.

Write $s: S \rightarrow \mathfrak{U}_S \subseteq \mathfrak{U}$ for an immediate neighbourhood. Using that \mathcal{M} has normal crossings singularities it is easy to write down a presentation of the ideal sheaf \mathcal{I}_{G^c} restricted to the completed local ring in the tautological curve $C_{\mathfrak{U}_S}$ at the image of p . Pulling back this presentation to C_R/R we find that the restriction of $s^*\mathcal{I}_{G^c}$ to $R[[x, y]]/(xy - a)$ is isomorphic to

$$\frac{R[[x, y]] \langle A, A_1, \dots, A_n, X \rangle}{(xy - a) J}$$

where the submodule of relations J is generated by the 2×2 minors of the matrix

$$\begin{bmatrix} A & A_1 & \cdots & A_n & X \\ a & a_1 & \cdots & a_n & x \end{bmatrix} \quad (2.7.1)$$

together with the element $yX - A$. Thus our assumption that an enriched structure exists implies (after restriction) that there exists a surjective map of $R[[x, y]]/(xy - a)$ -modules

$$\frac{R[[x, y]] \langle A, A_1, \dots, A_n, X \rangle}{(xy - a) J} \twoheadrightarrow R[[x, y]]/(xy - a).$$

From this we will deduce that $a_i \in (a)$ for every $1 \leq i \leq n$, and by symmetry this proves the lemma. First, identifying A , the A_i and X with their images in $\frac{R[[x, y]]}{(xy - a)}$ we obtain elements A , A_i and X in $\frac{R[[x, y]]}{(xy - a)}$ satisfying the following conditions:

1. at least one of A , A_i , X is a unit (this uses that the target is local);
2. the minors of the matrix in (2.7.1) vanish;
3. $yX = A$.

Now (3) implies that A is not a unit, so at least one of A_1, \dots, A_n, X is a unit.

Case 1: A_i a unit for some $1 \leq i \leq n$. Then $x \in (a_i)$ in $\frac{R[[x, y]]}{(xy - a)}$. Thus there exists $g \in R[[x, y]]$ such that $x - ga_i \in (xy - a)$ in $R[[x, y]]$. So let $f \in R[[x, y]]$ be such that $x - ga_i = f \cdot (xy - a)$. Then $x - ga_i = fxy - fa$ in $R[[x, y]]$, so equating coefficients of x (and writing f_x for the coefficient of x in f , similarly for g) we find that $1 - g_x a_i = 0 - f_x a$. But then $1 = (a, a_i)$, which contradicts that fact that a and a_i must be contained in the maximal ideal of R .

Case 2: X a unit. Then for every $1 \leq i \leq n$ we have that $a_i \in (x)$ in $\frac{R[[x,y]]}{(xy-a)}$, in other words a_i lies in the kernel of $R \rightarrow \frac{R[[x,y]]}{(xy-a,x)}$. But this kernel is exactly (a) , so we deduce $a_i \in (a)$ as required. \square

We will now define the pullback of enriched structures for a map of controlled curves. Let C_S/S be a controlled curve, and $f: T \rightarrow S$ a morphism such that $C_T = C_S \times_S T$ is also controlled. By definition there exists a factorisation $S \xrightarrow{s} \mathfrak{U} \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}$ with \mathfrak{U} a controlled neighbourhood; clearly this \mathfrak{U} is also a controlled neighbourhood of T . Without loss of generality (see remark 2.35) we can replace \mathfrak{U} with \mathfrak{U}_S , the immediate neighbourhood of S in \mathfrak{U} , and let $T \xrightarrow{t} \mathfrak{U}_T \subset \mathfrak{U}_S$ then be the immediate neighbourhood of T in \mathfrak{U}_S .

Write $\mathcal{E}(C_S/S)$ for the set of enriched structures on S with respect to \mathfrak{U}_S , and $\mathcal{E}(C_T/T)$ the same for T . We will construct a map $\mathcal{E}(C_S/S) \rightarrow \mathcal{E}(C_T/T)$ (we leave the verification that the construction of the map does not depend on the choice of \mathfrak{U} to the reader). Note that by lemma 2.38 it is enough to treat the case where C_S/S is 1-aligned—otherwise $\mathcal{E}(C_S/S)$ is empty and there is a unique map to $\mathcal{E}(C_T/T)$!

Before constructing the map we need some preliminary lemmas. Write Γ_S for the graph of S and Γ_T for the graph of T , so we get a specialisation map $\text{sp}: \Gamma_S \rightarrow \Gamma_T$ which contracts exactly those edges whose labels become units on T (equivalently, on \mathfrak{U}_T). Let w be a vertex of Γ_T , and write $W = \text{sp}^{-1}(w)$ for the set of vertices of Γ_S which map to w . So between any two vertices in W we can find a path all of whose edges have labels which become units on T .

Lemma 2.39. *The specialisation map induces a bijection $\pi_0(\Gamma_S - W) \rightarrow \pi_0(\Gamma_T - w)$.*

Proof. Given $G \in \pi_0(\Gamma_S - W)$ and an element $g \in G$, we see that $\text{sp}(g)$ is not equal to w and is thus contained in some $H \in \pi_0(\Gamma_T - w)$. This H does not depend on the choice of $g \in G$, and so we define the map to send G to H . We leave the verification of the bijectivity to the reader. \square

Lemma 2.40. *Assume that the prestable curve C/S is 1-aligned. Then for every $G \in \pi_0(\Gamma_S - W)$ there exists a unique $v \in W$ such that $G \in \pi_0(\Gamma_S - v)$.*

Proof. First we show that there exists $v \in W$ such that every edge between G and W has one endpoint equal to v . Indeed, suppose that this is not the case, and let $e: v - g$ and $e': v' - g'$ be two edges with $v, v' \in W$ distinct and $g, g' \in G$. Then we may combine e and e' with a path from v to v' consisting of edges that are contracted by sp , and with a path from g to g' within G , making a circuit. The 1-alignment then implies that every edge in this path has the same label, a

label that becomes a unit on T , so the specialisation map contracts them all, a contradiction.

It is clear that G is then a connected component of $\Gamma_S - v$. Furthermore, since Γ_S is connected there is at least one edge from G to v , and thus G is not a connected component of $\Gamma_S - v'$ for any other $v' \in W$. \square

Lemma 2.41. *Assume that C/S is 1-aligned. Given $H \in \pi_0(\Gamma_T - w)$ there exists a unique vertex $v \in W$ and $G \in \pi_0(\Gamma_S - v)$ such that $\text{sp}(G) = H$.*

Proof. Immediate from the previous two lemmas. \square

Thus each relative component of Γ_T is the image of exactly one relative component of Γ_S .

Lemma 2.42. *Let $G \in \pi_0(\Gamma_S - v)$ for some $v \in W$. Then exactly one of the following occurs:*

1. $G \cap W$ is non-empty, i.e. $w \in \text{sp}(G)$;
2. $\text{sp}(G) \in \pi_0(\Gamma_T - w)$.

Proof. It is clear that (1) and (2) cannot both happen; we will show that if (1) does not hold then (2) does. Now suppose that G does not meet W ; then $\text{sp}(G) \subseteq \Gamma_T - w$ and is connected. Let y be a vertex of Γ_T with a path to $\text{sp}(G)$ that does not pass through w ; we will show that $y \in \text{sp}(G)$ and thus that $\text{sp}(G)$ is a connected component of $\Gamma_T - w$. By adding back in contracted edges where necessary, we may lift this path to a path in $\Gamma_S - W \subseteq \Gamma_S - v$ between a vertex x and G . But since G is a connected component of $\Gamma_S - v$, this path must belong entirely to G . Hence $x \in G$ and $y = \text{sp}(x) \in \text{sp}(G)$ as desired. \square

Thus for 1-aligned curves, we have a bijection

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi: \{ \text{Relative components } (v, G) \text{ of } \Gamma_S : \text{sp}(v) \notin \text{sp}(G) \} \\ \rightarrow \{ \text{Relative components } (w, H) \text{ of } \Gamma_T \} \\ (v, G) \mapsto (\text{sp}(v), \text{sp}(G)). \end{aligned} \tag{2.7.2}$$

Recall that we write $f: T \rightarrow S$.

Lemma 2.43. *Given $v \in W$ and $G \in \pi_0(\Gamma_S - v)$ with $G \cap W \neq \emptyset$, the coherent sheaf $f^*\mathcal{I}_{G^c}$ on C_T is canonically isomorphic to \mathcal{O}_{C_T} , and thus its only invertible quotient is itself.*

Proof. The closed subscheme of $C_{\mathfrak{U}_S}$ corresponding to \mathcal{I}_{G^c} lies over the closed subscheme of \mathfrak{U}_S cut out by labels on edges on edges between G and G^c (which are all contracted by sp , i.e. become units on \mathfrak{U}_T), so $\mathfrak{U}_T \rightarrow \mathfrak{U}_S$ does not meet this closed subscheme. Therefore the pullback of \mathcal{I}_{G^c} to \mathfrak{U}_T is the unit ideal sheaf $\mathcal{O}_{C_{\mathfrak{U}_T}}$, the pullback to C_T of which is \mathcal{O}_{C_T} . \square

We are now in a position to define the pullback of enriched structures $\mathcal{E}(S) \rightarrow \mathcal{E}(T)$ when $t: T \rightarrow S$ is a morphism of weakly controlled curves and S has a controlled neighbourhood $s: S \rightarrow \mathfrak{U}$. Suppose we are given an enriched structure in $\mathcal{E}(S)$; this consists of a line bundle $\mathcal{L}_{(v,G)}$ for every relative component of Γ_S , together with a surjective map

$$s^* \mathcal{I}_{G^c} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_{(v,G)},$$

and such that $\bigotimes_{v,G} \mathcal{L}_{(v,G)} \cong \mathcal{O}_{C_S}$. We need to construct the similar data of an invertible quotient $f^* s^* \mathcal{I}_{H^c} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}'_{(w,H)}$ for each relative component (w, H) of Γ_T .

By lemma 2.38, we know that C_S/S is 1-aligned, and therefore each such pair (w, H) corresponds to a pair $(v, G) = \Psi^{-1}(w, H)$ for some $v \in \text{sp}^{-1}(w)$ and component $G \in \pi_0(\Gamma_S - v)$ such that $G \cap \text{sp}^{-1}(w) = \emptyset$, and we define $\mathcal{L}'_{(w,H)}$ by

$$\mathcal{L}'_{(w,H)} := f^* \mathcal{L}_{(v,G)}.$$

Each of these is naturally an invertible quotient of $t^* \mathcal{I}_{H^c} = f^* s^* \mathcal{I}_{G^c}$. We want to define $(t^* \mathcal{I}_{H^c} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}'_{(w,H)})_{(w,H)}$ to be the pullback, but we need to check that

$$\bigotimes_{w,H} \mathcal{L}'_{(w,H)} \cong \mathcal{O}_{C_T}$$

locally on T . First the tensor product of all of these $\mathcal{L}'_{(w,H)}$ is

$$\begin{aligned} \bigotimes_{w,H} \mathcal{L}'_{(w,H)} &= \bigotimes_{w,H} f^* \mathcal{L}_{\Psi^{-1}(w,H)} \\ &= \bigotimes_{\substack{v,G \\ \text{sp}(v) \notin \text{sp}(G)}} f^* \mathcal{L}_{(v,G)}. \end{aligned}$$

Now by lemma 2.43, the invertible quotient $f^* \mathcal{L}_{(v,G)}$ of $f^* \mathcal{I}_{G^c}$ is trivial if $\text{sp}(v) \in \text{sp}(G)$, so we may include them in the tensor product at no cost, so that locally on S we have:

$$\bigotimes_{w,H} \mathcal{L}'_{(w,H)} \cong \bigotimes_{v,G} f^* \mathcal{L}_{(v,G)} \cong f^* \mathcal{O}_{C_S} = \mathcal{O}_{C_T}.$$

2.8 Enriched structures for general C/S

We want to apply lemma A.4 to define enriched structures on arbitrary families of curves. In order to do this we need to check two things:

1. The full subcategory of controlled curves is a base for the étale topology on schemes over \mathfrak{M} ;

2. The functor of enriched structures is a sheaf on the full subcategory of curves over S consisting of controlled curves.

Condition (1) is immediate from lemma 2.24, so our task is to check (2). More precisely, we need to show that if $S \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}$ is a controlled curve, $\{T_i\}_I \rightarrow S$ is an étale cover by controlled curves, and for each $i, j \in I$ we have a cover $\{T_{i,j,k}\}_{K_{i,j}}$ of $T_i \times_S T_j$ by controlled curves, then the following diagram is an equaliser:

$$\mathcal{E}(S) \rightarrow \prod_i \mathcal{E}(T_i) \rightrightarrows \prod_{i,j,k} \mathcal{E}(T_{i,j,k}) \quad (2.8.1)$$

(here we write $\mathcal{E}(S)$ in place of $\mathcal{E}(C/S)$, since we are working with schemes over \mathfrak{M} , so each comes with a tautological curve). First consider the case where C/S is *not* 1-aligned. Then $\mathcal{E}(S)$ is empty by lemma 2.38. Moreover, there exists $i_0 \in I$ such that T_{i_0} hits a controlling point of S , and so (using that $T_{i_0} \rightarrow S$ is étale) we deduce that T_{i_0} is not 1-aligned, so $\mathcal{E}(T_{i_0})$ is empty. Similarly some $T_{i,j,k}$ hits a controlling point of S and thus admits no enriched structures. This we see all the three terms of (2.8.1) are empty, so the diagram is certainly an equaliser! It thus remains to treat the case where S is 1-aligned.

The key tool for this is a slight generalisation of the definition of enriched structure given in definition 2.34 (which will also be very useful in section 3).

Definition 2.44. Let S be a controlled curve with graph Γ_S , and let $s: S \rightarrow \mathfrak{U}$ be an immediate neighbourhood. Let $\Gamma_S \rightarrow \Gamma'$ be any contraction of Γ . Define $S' \hookrightarrow S$ to be the locus in S where the labels of the contracted edges are units, and similarly define $\mathfrak{U}' \subseteq \mathfrak{U}$ (using that Γ_S is also the controlling graph of \mathfrak{U}). Then $S' \rightarrow \mathfrak{U}$ factors via \mathfrak{U}' ; write $s': S' \rightarrow \mathfrak{U}'$.

Suppose we are given a vertex v of Γ' and a connected component $G' \in \pi_0(\Gamma' - v)$. Write G for the set of vertices of Γ_S which map to G' . Slightly abusing notation, define the ideal sheaf \mathcal{I}_{G^c} on $C_{\mathfrak{U}'}/\mathfrak{U}'$ to be the restriction to $C_{\mathfrak{U}'}$ of the ideal sheaf \mathcal{I}_{G^c} on $C_{\mathfrak{U}}/\mathfrak{U}$.

Given any morphism $f: T \rightarrow S'$ we define a Γ_S/Γ' -enriched structure on T to be the data of, for each vertex v of Γ' and connected component $G' \in \pi_0(\Gamma' - v)$, an invertible quotient

$$f^*(s')^* \mathcal{I}_{G^c} \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{L}_{(v,G')}$$

of sheaves on C_T , such that the tensor product of all the line bundles $\mathcal{L}_{(v,G')}$ is T -locally trivial on C_T , and such that each $\mathcal{L}_{(v,G')}$ has total degree zero on every fibre of C_T/T . The set of Γ_S/Γ' -enriched structures on T is denoted $\mathcal{E}_{\Gamma_S/\Gamma'}(T)$. Pulling back Γ_S/Γ' -enriched structures is defined in the evident way (just pull back the invertible quotients — the combinatorial data is unchanged), yielding a presheaf

$$\mathcal{E}_{\Gamma_S/\Gamma'}: \mathbf{Sch}_{S'}^{op} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}.$$

We are more interested in computing $\mathcal{E}(T)$ than $\mathcal{E}_{\Gamma_S/\Gamma'}(T)$, but whereas the latter has the elementary description above, the former will require lemma A.4 in order to extend the definition to general T . In the special case that $\Gamma' = \Gamma_S$ (so $S' = S$ as well), then the two definitions agree at S : $\mathcal{E}_{\Gamma_S/\Gamma_S}(S) = \mathcal{E}(S)$. The following lemma shows that the same holds for any weakly controlled T over S :

Lemma 2.45. *In the setting of definition 2.44, with $\Gamma' = \Gamma_S$, suppose S is 1-aligned and T is weakly controlled. Then $\mathcal{E}_{\Gamma_S/\Gamma_S}(T) = \mathcal{E}(T)$.*

Proof. Write Γ_T for the graph of T , so we get a specialisation map $\text{sp}: \Gamma_S \rightarrow \Gamma_T$. Since C_S/S is 1-aligned, this map sp has the property that, if H is a circuit-connected component of Γ_S , then sp contracts at least one edge in H if and only if it contracts every edge in H .

Moreover, if v is a vertex of Γ_S and $G \in \pi_0(\Gamma_S - v)$ then either

1. Every edge from v to G is contracted by sp , in which case $f^*s^*\mathcal{I}_{G^c}$ is canonically trivial on C_T , or
2. No edge from v to G is contracted by sp , in which case $H := \text{sp}(G)$ is a connected component of $\Gamma_T - \text{sp}(v)$, and $f^*s^*\mathcal{I}_{G^c}$ is canonically isomorphic to $t^*\mathcal{I}_{H^c}$, where $t: T \rightarrow \mathfrak{U}_T$ is the immediate neighbourhood of T in \mathfrak{U} (noting $\mathfrak{U}_T \subseteq \mathfrak{U}$). Furthermore, every relative component of Γ_T arises in this way.

Thus the data of a Γ_S/Γ_S -enriched structure on T is equivalent to the data of a Γ_T/Γ_T -enriched structure on T , but this is equivalent to the data of an ordinary enriched structure because Γ_T is the graph for T . The degree condition is satisfied for elements of $\mathcal{E}(T)$ by lemma 4.5 (this lemma is not proven until section 4, but this is only for expository reasons — it is entirely independent of the present section). \square

To prove that diagram (2.8.1) is an equaliser, we have already seen that we can reduce to the case where S is 1-aligned. In that situation, it is equivalent by lemma 2.45 to show that the diagram

$$\mathcal{E}_{\Gamma_S/\Gamma_S}(S) \rightarrow \prod_i \mathcal{E}_{\Gamma_S/\Gamma_S}(T_i) \rightrightarrows \prod_{i,j,k} \mathcal{E}_{\Gamma_S/\Gamma_S}(T_{i,j,k}). \quad (2.8.2)$$

is an equaliser, where as before we write Γ_S for the graph of S . We are done by the following lemma:

Lemma 2.46. *In the setting of definition 2.44, the functor $\mathcal{E}_{\Gamma_S/\Gamma'}$ from schemes over S' to sets is representable; in particular it is a sheaf for every subcanonical topology.*

All we need right now is the sheaf property of $\mathcal{E}_{\Gamma_S/\Gamma_S}$, which is slightly quicker to prove, but we will need the general representability of $\mathcal{E}_{\Gamma_S/\Gamma'}$ very soon anyway.

Proof. This is immediate by combining four standard ingredients:

1. The representability of Quot schemes;
2. The inclusion of invertible sheaves into finitely presented quasi-coherent sheaves is relatively representable;
3. The unit section of the relative Picard scheme is relatively representable.
4. The subfunctor of the relative Picard space consisting of line bundles of total degree zero is representable.

Combining (1) and (2) we see that the functor of invertible quotients of each $\mathcal{I}_{G'^c}$ is representable. We take the fibre product over S' of these functors for each relative component (v, G') of Γ' , and then (3) and (4) show that the additional conditions that the tensor product of all the $\mathcal{L}_{(v, G')}$ be trivial and that they all have degree 0 do not break representability. \square

Therefore \mathcal{E} , as we have defined it, is an étale sheaf on the full subcategory of controlled curves, and since every curve is étale-locally controlled, the comparison lemma A.4 tells us that \mathcal{E} extends uniquely (up to unique isomorphism) to an étale sheaf on all of $\mathbf{Sch}_{\mathfrak{M}}$.

Definition 2.47. In the following, we will use \mathcal{E} to refer to this unique extension, and for any curve $S \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}$ we will call elements of $\mathcal{E}(S)$ *enriched structures on the tautological curve C/S* .

3 Representability of the functor of enriched structures

The aim of this section is to prove that \mathcal{E} is relatively representable by an algebraic space over \mathfrak{M} . We will prove representability of \mathcal{E} by reducing to lemma 2.46, the representability of the various $\mathcal{E}_{\Gamma_S/\Gamma'}$. Note that \mathcal{E} is by definition a sheaf for the étale topology, as it was defined by extending a sheaf on the subcategory of controlled curves, so it is enough to show representability locally. Let $\mathfrak{U} \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}$ be a simple chart; we will show representability of the restricted functor $\mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{U}}: \mathbf{Sch}_{\mathfrak{U}}^{op} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$. Write $\Gamma_{\mathfrak{U}}$ for the graph over \mathfrak{U} . Then $\mathcal{E}_{\Gamma_{\mathfrak{U}}/\Gamma_{\mathfrak{U}}}$ is certainly representable, but does *not* in general coincide with $\mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{U}}$ because \mathfrak{U} is not in general 1-aligned. This will be remedied by glueing together various suitable $\mathcal{E}_{\Gamma_{\mathfrak{U}}/\Gamma'}$, but before getting into the details we give an example where $\mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{U}} \neq \mathcal{E}_{\Gamma_{\mathfrak{U}}/\Gamma_{\mathfrak{U}}}$.

3.1 Example

Let k be an algebraically closed field, and take three copies of \mathbb{P}^1 over k . Glue the point $(0 : 1)$ on each curve to the point $(1 : 0)$ on the next so as to form a triangle. Let $\mathfrak{U} \hookrightarrow k[a, b, c]$ be a controlled chart for this curve, with boundary abc , and graph $\Gamma_{\mathfrak{U}}$ a triangle with labels a, b, c . We consider some examples:

1. Let p be a point of \mathfrak{U} where at least two of a, b and c are units (so C_p is irreducible). Then $\mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{U}}(p)$ is the set containing the empty enriched structure, and $\mathcal{E}_{\Gamma_{\mathfrak{U}}/\Gamma_{\mathfrak{U}}}(p)$ is a singleton consisting of the trivial enriched structure (since all the pullbacks of ideal sheaves are trivial). In particular, the two sets are naturally in bijection!
2. Let p be a point where exactly one of a, b and c is a unit; say a is a unit for simplicity of notation. Then Γ_p is obtained from $\Gamma_{\mathfrak{U}}$ by contracting the edge labelled a . We find that $\mathcal{E}_{\Gamma_{\mathfrak{U}}/\Gamma_{\mathfrak{U}}}(p)$ is empty but $\mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{U}}(p)$ is non-empty, in fact it is isomorphic to k^* ;
3. If p is a point where none of a, b or c is a unit (so p is the closed point) then $\mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{U}/\mathfrak{U}}(p) = \mathcal{E}_{\Gamma_{\mathfrak{U}}}(p)$ directly from the definitions.

Summarising, in cases (1) and (3) the functor $\mathcal{E}_{\Gamma_{\mathfrak{U}}/\Gamma_{\mathfrak{U}}}$ gives the ‘correct’ answer (i.e. the same as $\mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{U}}$), but in case (2) it does not; instead it yields the empty set. We will fix this by glueing in $\mathcal{E}_{\Gamma_{\mathfrak{U}}/\Gamma'}$ for various contractions $\Gamma_{\mathfrak{U}} \rightarrow \Gamma'$.

3.2 Glueing

Recall that we are assuming $C_{\mathfrak{U}}/\mathfrak{U}$ to be controlled, with graph $\Gamma_{\mathfrak{U}}$. Given a contraction of graphs $\Gamma_{\mathfrak{U}} \rightarrow \Gamma'$, let $U_{\Gamma'} \subseteq \mathfrak{U}$ be the open subscheme obtained by deleting the loci where the labels of contracted edges vanish. Then we apply definition 2.44 with $S = \mathfrak{U}$ to define a functor $\mathcal{E}_{\Gamma_{\mathfrak{U}}/\Gamma'} : \mathbf{Sch}_{U_{\Gamma'}}^{op} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$.

We have schemes $\mathcal{E}_{\Gamma_{\mathfrak{U}}/\Gamma'}$ as Γ' runs over various contractions of $\Gamma_{\mathfrak{U}}$, from which we will build a representing object for $\mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{U}}$. We will carefully specify certain loci along which to glue the various $\mathcal{E}_{\Gamma_{\mathfrak{U}}/\Gamma'}$ in order to obtain a representing object for $\mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{U}}$. First we need a few preliminaries.

Definition 3.1. Let $f : \Gamma \rightarrow \Gamma'$ be a contraction of graphs. We say $f : \Gamma \rightarrow \Gamma'$ is *aligned* if for every circuit-connected component G of Γ , either


1. every vertex of G maps to the same vertex of Γ' , or
2. the map f is injective on the vertices of G (equivalently, no edge in G is contracted).

Note that case (1) is *not* the same as saying that all edges in G are contracted — rather, it says there exists a connected spanning subgraph of G all of whose edges are contracted.

Lemma 3.2. *Let $\Gamma_{\mathcal{U}} \rightarrow \Gamma'$ be a contraction which is not aligned. Let $p \in U_{\Gamma'}$. Then $\mathcal{E}_{\Gamma_{\mathcal{U}}/\Gamma'}(p) = \emptyset$.*

Proof. Since $\Gamma_{\mathcal{U}} \rightarrow \Gamma'$ is not aligned, there exists some circuit-connected component G of $\Gamma_{\mathcal{U}}$ such that at least one non-loop edge of G is contracted, but the vertices of G do not all have the same image in Γ' . Let e be such a contracted edge, let v be the vertex of Γ' to which it is contracted, and let V be the set of vertices of $\Gamma_{\mathcal{U}}$ whose image in Γ' is the vertex v .

Now not all the vertices of G are in V by assumption; let e' be an edge of G connecting such a vertex to V , and let γ be a circuit of G containing both e and e' . Thus γ has at least one edge e between two vertices in V and another edge e' between V and V^c .



We will prove the lemma by a careful analysis of the partial degrees which would appear in an enriched structure (more precisely, an element of $\mathcal{E}_{\Gamma_{\mathcal{U}}/\Gamma'}(p)$) if one were to exist, and then deriving a numerical contradiction. First we have three claims.

Claim 3.2.1.

$$\# \text{edges } V \text{ to } V^c > \sum_{w \in V} \sum_{\substack{H \in \pi_0(\Gamma_{\mathcal{U}} - w) \\ H \cap V = \emptyset}} \# \text{edges } w \text{ to } H \quad (3.2.1)$$

where the condition $H \cap V = \emptyset$ should be read as saying that H and V have no vertex in common.

The point of the claim is to get a strict inequality; a non-strict inequality here is essentially obvious.

Proof of claim: There is an obvious injective map from edges on the RHS of (3.2.1) to edges on the LHS: every edge between such w and H is in particular an edge between V and V^c . To show the strictness of the inequality we need to construct an edge from V to V^c which does not appear on the RHS. The key will be the circuit γ defined above.

Recall that e' is an edge of γ which has exactly one endpoint in V . Write w for the end of e' which is in V , and u for the other end of e' . If e' appears in the RHS of (3.2.1) then it must go from w to the connected component H of $\Gamma_{\mathfrak{U}} - w$ that contains u . But this H has a vertex w' in common with V , namely the next point where γ re-enters V (note that $w \neq w'$ since γ also contains e , an edge whose endpoints are both in V). Therefore e' is not on the RHS of (3.2.1), which means that the inequality is strict.

This concludes the proof of the first claim. Now let $(p^* \mathcal{I}_{H^c} \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{L}_H)_H$ be an element of $\mathcal{E}_{\Gamma_{\mathfrak{U}}/\Gamma'}(p)$. We first compute the sums of partial degrees of \mathcal{L}_H for H corresponding to vertices in V .

Claim 3.2.2.

$$\sum_{w \in V} \sum_{H \in \pi_0(\Gamma_{\mathfrak{U}} - w)} \deg \mathcal{L}_H|_v = \sum_{w \in V} \sum_{\substack{H \in \pi_0(\Gamma_{\mathfrak{U}} - w) \\ H \cap V = \emptyset}} \# \text{edges } w \text{ to } H.$$

where the condition $H \cap V = \emptyset$ should again be read as saying that H and V have no vertex in common.

Proof of claim: Fix $w \in V$ and $H \in \pi_0(\Gamma_{\mathfrak{U}} - w)$. Note that if H and V have a vertex in common, then that vertex can be taken to be an endpoint of an edge to w that contracts to v . For if $w' \in H \cap V$, we can find a path from w' to w using only edges contracted to v , and thus H contains all the vertices of this path except for w itself. Now if an edge from H to w is contracted in Γ' then \mathcal{L}_H is trivial, so has degree 0.

On the other hand, if H and V are disjoint then by lemma 4.5 (this lemma is not proven until the next section, but this is only for expository reasons - it is entirely independent of the present section) we have that

$$\deg \mathcal{L}_H|_v = \# \text{ edges from } w \text{ to } H.$$

This concludes the proof of the claim. We now compute the sums of partial degree of \mathcal{L}_H for H corresponding to vertices in V .

Claim 3.2.3.

$$\sum_{w \notin V} \sum_{H \in \pi_0(\Gamma_{\mathfrak{U}} - w)} \deg \mathcal{L}_H|_v = -\# \text{edges } V \text{ to } V^c.$$

Proof of claim: Let $w \notin V$. Then for each $H \in \pi_0(\Gamma_{\mathfrak{U}} - w)$, we have

$$\deg \mathcal{L}_H|_v = -\# \text{ edges from } w \text{ to } V \cap H.$$

Therefore, since every edge from w to V ends in exactly one connected component of $\Gamma_{\mathfrak{U}} - w$, we have

$$\sum_{H \in \pi_0(\Gamma_{\mathfrak{U}} - w)} \deg \mathcal{L}_H|_v = -\# \text{ edges from } w \text{ to } V.$$

Summing over all $w \in V^c$ concludes the proof of the claim.

We can now finish off the proof of the lemma by observing that (from the condition that the tensor product of all the line bundles appearing in an enriched structure must be trivial) we have

$$\sum_{w \in \text{Vert } \Gamma_{\mathfrak{U}}} \sum_{H \in \pi_0(\Gamma_{\mathfrak{U}} - w)} \deg \mathcal{L}_H|_v = 0$$

which is incompatible with the above claims, thus yielding a contradiction to the assumption that $\mathcal{E}_{\Gamma_{\mathfrak{U}}/\Gamma'}(p)$ is non-empty. \square

Lemma 3.3. *Let $f: \Gamma \rightarrow \Gamma'$ be a contraction between two contractions of $\Gamma_{\mathfrak{U}}$ such that f is aligned. Let $T \rightarrow U_{\Gamma'}$ be any morphism. Then there is a canonical identification*

$$\mathcal{E}_{\Gamma_{\mathfrak{U}}/\Gamma}(T) = \mathcal{E}_{\Gamma_{\mathfrak{U}}/\Gamma'}(T).$$

Proof. Let v be a vertex of Γ' and write V for the set of vertices of Γ mapping to v . Since f is aligned it induces a bijection

$$\varphi: \bigsqcup_{w \in V} \{H \in \pi_0(\Gamma - w) : H \cap V = \emptyset\} \rightarrow \pi_0(\Gamma' - v).$$

Then for each $G \in \pi_0(\Gamma' - v)$ we note that $\mathcal{I}_{G^c}|_T = \mathcal{I}_{\varphi^{-1}(G)^c}|_T$ and define $\mathcal{L}_G = \mathcal{L}_{\varphi^{-1}(G)}$ with the obvious map from $\mathcal{I}_{G^c}|_T$. To check that we have an enriched structure with respect to Γ' it suffices to verify that the tensor product of all these bundles is trivial. But this is immediate from the same property of the original enriched structure with respect to Γ , using that $\mathcal{I}_{H^c}|_T$ is canonically trivial whenever an edge between H and H^c is contracted by f . \square

Definition 3.4. Let $\Gamma_{\mathfrak{U}} \rightarrow \Gamma_1$ and $\Gamma_{\mathfrak{U}} \rightarrow \Gamma_2$ be two contractions. To shorten notation, we write $U_i := U_{\Gamma_i} \subseteq \mathfrak{U}$ (the open subscheme of \mathfrak{U} obtained by inverting the labels of those edges contracted in passing from $\Gamma_{\mathfrak{U}}$ to Γ_i), and $\mathcal{E}_i := \mathcal{E}_{\Gamma_{\mathfrak{U}}/\Gamma_i}$. Define the open subscheme $U_{1,2} \subseteq U_1 \times_{\mathfrak{U}} U_2$ by

$$U_{1,2} = \left\{ p \in U_1 \times_{\mathfrak{U}} U_2 : \exists \text{ a diagram } \begin{array}{ccc} \Gamma_1 & \searrow & \tilde{\Gamma} \\ & & \longrightarrow \Gamma_p \\ \Gamma_2 & \nearrow & \end{array} \text{ such that } \begin{array}{ccc} \Gamma_1 & \searrow & \tilde{\Gamma} \\ & & \longrightarrow \tilde{\Gamma} \\ \Gamma_2 & \nearrow & \end{array} \text{ are both aligned} \right\}.$$

It is clear that $U_{1,2}$ is constructible in \mathfrak{U} , and it is closed under generalisation essentially by construction, hence $U_{1,2}$ is open in \mathfrak{U} .

Lemma 3.5. *We carry over the notation from definition 3.4. Suppose $T \rightarrow U_1 \cap U_2$ does not factor via $U_{1,2}$. Then at least one of $\mathcal{E}_1(T)$ and $\mathcal{E}_2(T)$ is empty.*

Proof. Since enriched structures admit pullbacks it is enough to treat the case where T is a point. The result is then clear from lemma 3.2. \square

Lemma 3.6. *We carry over the notation from definition 3.4. Let $T \rightarrow U_{1,2}$ be any morphism. Then the maps in lemma 3.3 induce canonical isomorphisms*

$$\mathcal{E}_1(T) = \mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{U}}(T) = \mathcal{E}_2(T).$$

Proof. Immediate from lemma 3.3. \square

Definition 3.7. We define a scheme $\mathcal{E}_{\text{glue}}/\mathfrak{U}$ by glueing all the \mathcal{E}_i as Γ_i runs over contractions of $\Gamma_{\mathfrak{U}}$, where we glue \mathcal{E}_i to \mathcal{E}_j over $U_{i,j}$ along the isomorphisms given in lemma 3.6.

Theorem 3.8. *The isomorphisms given in lemma 3.6 induce an isomorphism of functors from $\mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{U}}$ to $\mathcal{E}_{\text{glue}}$.*

Proof. It is enough to verify that the functors coincide on controlled curves. Let $T \rightarrow \mathfrak{U}$ be such a morphism, with graph Γ_T . We have a contraction $f: \Gamma_{\mathfrak{U}} \rightarrow \Gamma_T$. If $\Gamma_{\mathfrak{U}} \rightarrow \Gamma$ is any other contraction, then $T \rightarrow \mathfrak{U}$ factors via U_{Γ} if and only if f factors via $\Gamma_{\mathfrak{U}} \rightarrow \Gamma$ (and if not then $\mathcal{E}_{\Gamma_{\mathfrak{U}}/\Gamma}(T)$ is clearly empty). It thus suffices to consider intermediate contractions $\Gamma_{\mathfrak{U}} \rightarrow \Gamma \rightarrow \Gamma_T$. Moreover, if $\Gamma \rightarrow \Gamma_T$ is not aligned then $\mathcal{E}_{\Gamma_{\mathfrak{U}}/\Gamma}(T)$ is empty, so again it can be ignored.

Given two aligned intermediate contractions $\Gamma_{\mathfrak{U}} \rightarrow \Gamma_1 \rightarrow \Gamma_2 \rightarrow \Gamma_T$, it is immediate that $T \rightarrow \mathfrak{U}$ factors via $U_{1,2}$, and so $\mathcal{E}_1(T) = \mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{U}}(T) = \mathcal{E}_2(T)$ are identified by the glueing as required. \square

Corollary 3.9. *The functor \mathcal{E} of enriched structures is representable.*

4 Enriched structures over separably closed fields

Mainò defined enriched structures on curves over fields in a way which looks rather different from what we write. We will show that our definition is in fact equivalent in this case. We begin by recalling her definition, which we call a *Mainò-enriched* structure to distinguish the terminology from what we use.

Definition 4.1. Let k be a separably closed field, and C/k be a curve. Write Γ for the graph of C/k . For v a vertex of Γ , write C_v^c for the union of the irreducible components of C corresponding to the other vertices. A *Mainò-enriched structure* on C is an collection $(\mathcal{F}_v)_{v \in \text{vert}(\Gamma)}$ of line bundles on C such that

$$\bigotimes_{v \in \text{vert}(\Gamma)} \mathcal{F}_v \cong \mathcal{O}_C \quad (4.0.1)$$

and for every $v \in \text{vert}(\Gamma)$, we have

$$\mathcal{F}_v|_{C_v} \cong \mathcal{O}_{C_v}(-C_v \cap C_v^c) \quad (4.0.2)$$

and

$$\mathcal{F}_v|_{C_v^c} \cong \mathcal{O}_{C_v^c}(C_v \cap C_v^c). \quad (4.0.3)$$

Note that the symbol \cong means ‘is isomorphic to’ — we do not specify the isomorphisms.

Before showing equivalence to our rather more involved definition, we give a slightly modified (but equivalent) version of the above definition, since it will make the comparison rather more direct:

Definition 4.2. Let k be a separably closed field, and C/k be a curve. Write Γ for the graph of C/k . An *M-enriched structure* on C/k consists of, for each relative component (v, G) of Γ a line bundle \mathcal{F}_G on C such that

$$\bigotimes_{v, G \in \pi_0(\Gamma-v)} \mathcal{F}_G \cong \mathcal{O}_C \quad (4.0.4)$$

and for every (v, G) we have

$$\mathcal{F}_G|_{C_G} \cong \mathcal{O}_{C_G}(-C_G \cap C_G^c) \quad (4.0.5)$$

(where C_G denotes the union of the components of C corresponding to vertices in G) and

$$\mathcal{F}_G|_{C_G^c} \cong \mathcal{O}_{C_G^c}(C_G \cap C_G^c). \quad (4.0.6)$$

Given an M-enriched structure $(\mathcal{F}_G)_G$ it is easy to see that we can obtain a Mainò-enriched structure by defining $\mathcal{F}_v = \bigotimes_{G \in \pi_0(\Gamma-v)} \mathcal{F}_G^\vee$ (use that conditions (4.0.1) and (4.0.3) together imply (4.0.2)).

Lemma 4.3. *The above construction induces a bijection between Mainò-enriched structures and M-enriched structures.*

Proof. If V is a set of vertices of Γ then we are writing C_V for the union of the corresponding components of C . If (v, G) is a relative component then C_{G^c} is a closed subscheme of C , and we can also define $C \setminus C_G$ to be the open subscheme of C obtained by deleting C_G . Then C_{G^c} is the closure of $C \setminus C_G$.

With the notation out of the way, we can build an M -enriched structure from a Mainò-enriched structure (\mathcal{F}_v) as follows. Given a vertex v and component $G \in \pi_0(\Gamma \setminus v)$, write

$$X := C \setminus \bigcup_{\substack{G' \in \pi_0(\Gamma - v) \\ G' \neq G}} C_{G'}.$$

Let

$$g: \mathcal{F}_v|_{C_v} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{O}_{C_v}(-C_v \cap C_{v^c})$$

be an isomorphism. Then on $X \setminus C_G$, the isomorphism g restricts to a trivialisation of \mathcal{F}_v . Then we define a line bundle \mathcal{F}_G by taking the restriction of the line bundle \mathcal{F}_v^\vee to X , and the trivial bundle on $C \setminus C_G$, and glueing them on $X \setminus C_G$ along the trivialisation g .

We leave it to the reader to check that this is well-defined and an inverse to the construction above. \square

4.1 The structure of pullbacks of certain ideal sheaves to fibres

For the remainder of this section, take a controlled curve C/S where $S = \text{Spec } k$, with immediate neighbourhood $s: S \rightarrow \mathfrak{U}$. We will exhibit an isomorphism between the enriched structures on C/S and the M -enriched structures on C/S . In particular, this shows that (when the test object is a separably closed point) the data of the surjections from the ideal sheaves is redundant, and the line bundles themselves actually determine the enriched structure. We do not know if this is the case in general. Write Γ for the graph of C/S .

Lemma 4.4. *Let (v, G) be a relative component of Γ . Write B_G for the union of the sections corresponding to separating edges of (v, G) , which we think of as a set of smooth points on C_G or C_{G^c} , or as a divisor (on either) where each point has multiplicity 1.*

Let T_G be the torsion module on C_G given by

$$T_G = \bigoplus_{p \in B_G} k_p^{\oplus(B_G - p)}$$

where k_p denotes the skyscraper sheaf k at p . Then there exist isomorphisms

$$f_G: s^* \mathcal{I}_{G^c}|_{C_G} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{O}_{C_G}(-B_G) \oplus T_G, \quad (4.1.1)$$

$$f_{G^c}: s^*\mathcal{I}_{G^c}|_{C_{G^c}} \xrightarrow{\sim} \bigoplus_{p \in B_G} \mathcal{O}_{C_{G^c}}(p) \quad (4.1.2)$$

and for each $b \in B_G$ an isomorphism

$$g_b: b^*(\mathcal{O}_{C_G}(-B_G) \oplus T_G) \rightarrow b^*\left(\bigoplus_{p \in B_G} \mathcal{O}_{C_{G^c}}(p)\right)$$

such that for each $b \in B_G$ the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} b^*(\mathcal{O}_{C_G}(-B_G) \oplus T_G) & \xrightarrow{g_b} & b^*\left(\bigoplus_{p \in B_G} \mathcal{O}_{C_{G^c}}(p)\right) \\ \downarrow b^*f_G & & \downarrow b^*f_{G^c} \\ b^*s^*\mathcal{I}_{G^c}|_{C_G} & \xlongequal{\quad} & (s \circ b)^*\mathcal{I}_{G^c} \xlongequal{\quad} b^*s^*\mathcal{I}_{G^c}|_{C_{G^c}}. \end{array}$$

Moreover, if we view the isomorphism g_b as being a morphism

$$b^*\mathcal{O}_{C_G}(-b) \oplus \bigoplus_{B_G-b} k \xrightarrow{\sim} b^*\mathcal{O}_{C_{G^c}}(b) \oplus \bigoplus_{B_G-b} k,$$

then g_b is the identity on the $\bigoplus_{B_G-b} k$ parts, and induces an isomorphism $b^*\mathcal{O}_{C_G}(-b) \xrightarrow{\sim} b^*\mathcal{O}_{C_{G^c}}(b)$ (in particular g_b respects the evident direct sum decomposition).

Proof. We may assume the immediate neighbourhood \mathfrak{U} is affine; write $R := \mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{U}}(\mathfrak{U})$. In the notation of definition 2.31, let $\mathcal{J} = (e_p : p \in B_G)$ be the ideal of R generated by the labels of singular points in B_G . Write $\pi_u: C_{\mathfrak{U}} \rightarrow \mathfrak{U}$ and $\pi_s: C \rightarrow S$ for the structure maps, $\iota_{G^c}: C_{G^c} \rightarrow C$ and $\iota_G: C_G \rightarrow C$ for the inclusions (closed immersions).

First we analyse $s^*\mathcal{I}_{G^c}|_{C_{G^c}}$ outside points in B_G . On the open subscheme $C_{\mathfrak{U}} \setminus C_G$ we find that $\pi_u^*\mathcal{J} = \mathcal{I}_{G^c}$, so we find that outside B_G we have $s^*\mathcal{I}_{G^c}|_{C_{G^c}} = \iota_{G^c}^*\pi_u^*\mathcal{J}$. Hence away from B_B we find that $s^*\mathcal{I}_{G^c}|_{C_{G^c}}$ is just the pullback along π_s of $s^*\mathcal{J}$, and the latter is a free k -module generated by symbols e_p as p runs over B_G .

Next we analyse $s^*\mathcal{I}_{G^c}|_{C_G}$ outside points in B_G . On the open subscheme $C \setminus C_{G^c}$ we find that \mathcal{I}_{G^c} is the trivial bundle, so it follows that $s^*\mathcal{I}_{G^c}|_{C_G}$ is canonically trivial outside points in B_G .

It remains to analyse in detail what happens locally at a point in B_G . By fpcq descent we may work with completed local rings at such a point, taking care that the morphisms we construct glue suitably. We fix now some $b \in B_G$, and for the remainder of this proof the letter p will be an index running over $B_G - b$. After choosing an isomorphism we may write

$$A = \frac{\widehat{R}_s[[x, y]]}{(xy - e_b)}$$

for the completed local ring of $C_{\mathfrak{U}}$ at b . If \mathfrak{m} is the maximal ideal of \widehat{R}_s then locally

$$C_{G^c} = \text{Spec} \frac{A}{\mathfrak{m} + (x)} = k[[y]] \quad \text{and} \quad C_G = \text{Spec} \frac{A}{\mathfrak{m} + (y)} = k[[x]].$$

Next we will compute the sheaves $\iota_G^* s^* \mathcal{I}_{G^c} = s^* \mathcal{I}_{G^c}|_{C_G}$, $b^* \iota_G^* s^* \mathcal{I}_{G^c} = b^* \iota_{G^c}^* s^* \mathcal{I}_{G^c}$ and $\iota_{G^c}^* s^* \mathcal{I}_{G^c} = s^* \mathcal{I}_{G^c}|_{C_{G^c}}$ explicitly as A -modules (here we will slightly abuse notation by conflating A -modules and quasi coherent sheaves on $\text{Spec} A$). First we have

$$\begin{aligned} \iota_G^* s^* \mathcal{I}_{G^c} &= (\mathcal{J}, x) \otimes_A \frac{A}{(\mathfrak{m}, y)} \xrightarrow{\sim} \left(\bigoplus_p k \right) \oplus xk[[x]] \\ e_b = 0 &\mapsto 0 \\ x &\mapsto (0, x) \\ e_p &\mapsto (\delta_p, 0) \end{aligned}$$

where δ_p indicates the element of $\bigoplus_p k$ taking value 1 in the p -th position and zero elsewhere. Next we find

$$\begin{aligned} \iota_{G^c}^* s^* \mathcal{I}_{G^c} &= (\mathcal{J}, x) \otimes_A \frac{A}{(\mathfrak{m}, x)} \xrightarrow{\sim} \left(\bigoplus_p k[[y]] \right) \oplus k[[y]] \\ e_b &\mapsto (0, y) \\ x &\mapsto (0, 1) \\ e_p &\mapsto (\delta_p, 0), \end{aligned}$$

where δ_p is as above but taking values in $\bigoplus_p k[[y]]$. Finally we compute

$$\begin{aligned} b^* \iota_G^* s^* \mathcal{I}_{G^c} &= b^* \iota_{G^c}^* s^* \mathcal{I}_{G^c} = (\mathcal{J}, x) \otimes_A \frac{A}{(\mathfrak{m}, x, y)} \xrightarrow{\sim} \left(\bigoplus_p k \right) \oplus k \\ e_b = 0 &\mapsto 0 \\ x &\mapsto (0, 1) \\ e_b &\mapsto (\delta_p, 0). \end{aligned}$$

The module $b^* \iota_G^* s^* \mathcal{I}_{G^c} = b^* \iota_{G^c}^* s^* \mathcal{I}_{G^c}$ is naturally a quotient of $\iota_G^* s^* \mathcal{I}_{G^c}$ and of $\iota_{G^c}^* s^* \mathcal{I}_{G^c}$, and the maps are given by

$$\begin{aligned} xk[[x]] &\rightarrow k \leftarrow k[[y]] \\ x &\mapsto 1 \leftarrow 1 \\ x^2 &\mapsto 0 \leftarrow y. \end{aligned}$$

We leave it to the reader to check that with the natural gluing maps the local descriptions we have given here combine to yield the lemma. \square

Lemma 4.5. *We continue in the notation of the previous lemma. Let \mathcal{L} be an invertible quotient of $s^*\mathcal{I}_{G^c}$.*

1. *There exists an isomorphism $\mathcal{L}|_{C_G} \cong \mathcal{O}_{C_G}(-B_G)$.*
2. *There exists an isomorphism $\mathcal{L}|_{C_{G^c}} \cong \mathcal{O}_{C_{G^c}}(B_G + D)$ where D is some effective divisor on C_{G^c} ;*
3. *If moreover we assume \mathcal{L} to have total degree 0, then the divisor D above is zero.*

Proof. Part (3) follows from parts (1) and (2) by a degree calculation. Part (1) is clear since we know $s^*\mathcal{I}_{C_G} \cong \mathcal{O}_{C_G}(-B_G) \oplus T_G$ and T_G is torsion so is killed by any map to an invertible sheaf. The content is in (2).

To give a map $\bigoplus_{b \in B_G} \mathcal{O}_{C_{G^c}}(b) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}|_{C_{G^c}}$ is to give a section of $\mathcal{L}(-b)|_{C_{G^c}}$ for each $b \in B_G$. The glueing conditions at the singular points imply that each such section lands in $\mathcal{L}(-B_G)|_{C_{G^c}}$ and takes a non-zero value at b . Hence $\mathcal{L}(-B_G)|_{C_{G^c}}$ admits a non-zero global section, and the result is clear (noting that C_{G^c} is connected). \square

4.2 Comparing the two notions of enriched structure

We continue in the notation of the previous section, so C/k is a prestable curve over a separably closed field, with graph Γ .

Lemma 4.6. *Let*

$$(\varphi_G: s^*I_{G^c} \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{L}_G)_{(v,G)}$$

(where (v, G) runs over relative components of Γ) be an enriched structure on C . Then $(\mathcal{L}_G)_G$ is an M -enriched structure on C .

Proof. From the definition of an enriched structure we have that $\bigotimes_{(v,G)} \mathcal{L}_G$ is trivial, so formula (4.0.4) is satisfied. We must verify that formulae (4.0.5) and (4.0.6) hold, which is done by lemma 4.5. \square

Lemma 4.7. *Let v be a vertex of Γ , and $G \in \pi_0(\Gamma - v)$. Let \mathcal{L} be a line bundle on C such that*

$$\mathcal{L}|_{C_{G^c}} \cong \mathcal{O}_{C_{G^c}}(G \cap G^c)$$

and

$$\mathcal{L}|_{C_G} \cong \mathcal{O}_{C_G}(-G \cap G^c).$$

*Let $\varphi: s^*I_{G^c}|_{C_G} \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{L}|_{C_G}$ be any surjection. Then there exists a unique surjection $\Phi: s^*I_{G^c} \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{L}$ such that $\Phi|_{C_G} = \varphi$.*

Proof. We adopt the notation of lemma 4.4 (so $B_G = G \cap G^c$), and choose a compatible system of isomorphisms as in the lemma. By [Fer03] and lemma 4.4, it is equivalent to show that there is a unique surjection

$$\bigoplus_{p \in B_G} \mathcal{O}_{C_{G^c}}(p) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{C_{G^c}}(B_G)$$

such that suitable compatibilities hold at each of the point $p \in B_G$. Fix one $b \in B_G$. To give a map $\mathcal{O}_{C_{G^c}}(b) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{C_{G^c}}(B_G)$ is the same as to give a global section of $\mathcal{O}_{C_{G^c}}(B_G - b)$. Since the sheaf T is torsion we know that it is killed by $\varphi \circ f_G^{-1}$, which implies that the section of $\mathcal{O}_{C_{G^c}}(B_G - b)$ must vanish at every point in the support of $B_G - p$. Since C_{G^c} is connected, this further implies that the section is actually constant. To pin the section down completely it is enough to determine its value at a single point. Indeed, its value at b is determined by the restriction of the isomorphism g_b to the first factor, and we are done. \square

Lemma 4.8. *Let $(\mathcal{L}_G)_G$ be an M -enriched structure on C . Then there exists an enriched structure $(\varphi_G: s^*I_{G^c} \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{L}_G)_G$. Moreover, if $(\varphi'_G: s^*I_{G^c} \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{L}_G)_G$ is another enriched structure with the same quotients, then it is equivalent to $(\varphi_G: s^*I_{G^c} \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{L}_G)_G$.*

Proof. To construct the enriched structure, we first choose surjections $s^*I_{G^c}|_{C_G} \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{L}_G|_{C_G}$, which is certainly possible since the $s^*I_{G^c}|_{C_G}$ is isomorphic to the direct sum of $\mathcal{L}_G|_{C_G}$ with a torsion module (lemma 4.4). Lemma 4.7 then allows us to extend these surjections to an enriched structure. For the uniqueness, notice that any two enriched structure structures $(\varphi_G: s^*I_{G^c} \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{L}_G)_G$ differ by multiplications by elements of k^* since (up to torsion) they are just isomorphisms of line bundles on *connected* curves over a separably closed field. The uniqueness part of lemma 4.7 then shows that the two enriched structure structures are equivalent. \square

Combining lemma 4.6 and lemma 4.8 we immediately deduce

Theorem 4.9. *The map from enriched structures to M -enriched structures which sends $(\varphi_G: s^*I_G \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{L}_G)_G$ to $(\mathcal{L}_G)_G$ induces a bijection between equivalence classes of enriched structures and M -enriched structures.*

5 The stack of enriched structures and universal Néron models

Suppose that S is a scheme, $U \subseteq S$ a dense open subscheme, and $A \rightarrow U$ an abelian scheme. A *Néron model* of A over S is a proper smooth group algebraic space N/S together with an isomorphism $N_U \rightarrow A$, satisfying the *Néron mapping property*:

for every smooth morphism $T \rightarrow S$, and for every U -morphism $f: T_U \rightarrow N_A$, there exists a unique S -morphism $F: T \rightarrow N$ such that $F|_{T_U} = f$. In [Hol16a] the second author investigated Néron models in the case of jacobians of prestable curves, giving necessary and sufficient criteria for their existence.

We write \mathfrak{M} for the locus of smooth curves in \mathfrak{M} , and J/\mathfrak{M} for the jacobian of the universal smooth curve.

In [Hol14] the second author constructed a *universal Néron-model-admitting morphism* $\widetilde{\mathfrak{M}} \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}$, a terminal object in the category of *Néron model admitting morphisms*. A Néron model admitting morphism is a morphism $t: T \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}$ such that

- T is regular;
- $t^{-1}\mathfrak{M}$ is dense in T ;
- t^*J admits a Néron model over T

(a morphism satisfying the first two conditions we call ‘non-degenerate’). In particular, J admits a Néron model $N/\widetilde{\mathfrak{M}}$. In other words, the universal property says that any Néron model admitting morphism factors uniquely via $\widetilde{\mathfrak{M}} \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}$.

This $\widetilde{\mathfrak{M}}$ is not quasi-compact over \mathfrak{M} , but it can be written as a union of a ‘tower’ of quasi-compact pieces. The general construction is more involved, but the first step of the tower is easy to describe; we define $\mathfrak{M}^1 \hookrightarrow \widetilde{\mathfrak{M}}$ to be the largest open substack such that the pullback of \mathfrak{C} to \mathfrak{M}^1 is regular (equivalently, $\mathfrak{M}^1 \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}$ is a terminal object in the category of 1-aligned morphisms to \mathfrak{M}). The aim of this section is to construct an isomorphism between \mathfrak{M}^1 and \mathcal{E} .

First we will define a map $\mathbb{E}: \mathfrak{M}^1 \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$. In fact we will do something equivalent but a bit slicker; we will construct an enriched structure on the tautological curve over every controlled non-degenerate 1-aligned morphism $t: T \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}$. Since both \mathfrak{M}^1 and \mathcal{E} are separated and birational over \mathfrak{M} (and \mathfrak{M}^1 is reduced), maps between (open subsets of) these stacks are unique if they exist. Hence if we construct maps locally, they will automatically glue to globally defined maps.

Definition 5.1. Let $t: T \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}$ be a non-degenerate morphism from a scheme to \mathfrak{M} which is 1-aligned. Assume T is controlled with graph Γ . Let v be a vertex of Γ and $G \in \pi_0(\Gamma - v)$. Let $T \rightarrow \mathfrak{U} \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}$ be an immediate neighbourhood, and let \mathcal{I}_{G^c} be the ideal sheaf on $C_{\mathfrak{U}}$ as in definition 2.31. The same recipe defines an ideal sheaf \mathcal{L}_{G^c} on C_T , and we have a canonical surjection $t^*\mathcal{I}_{G^c} \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{L}_{G^c}$. Moreover, alignment of $T \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}$ means that all the edges between v and G have the same label (which is non-zero by non-degeneracy), and so \mathcal{L}_{G^c} cuts out a locally-principal closed subscheme, which has codimension 1 since $t^*\mathfrak{M}$ is dense, and hence this closed subscheme is a Cartier divisor on C_T . Hence \mathcal{L}_{G^c} is actually a line bundle. The

map $t^*\mathcal{I}_{G^c} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_{G^c}$ from above is then the quotient map required in the definition of an enriched structure. One easily checks that the conditions are satisfied.

Remark 5.2. This enriched structure can alternatively be defined by looking at the closure of the unit section in the relative Picard space of C/T , and imposing degree conditions to cut out the right sections. Note that the closure of the unit section is (étale locally on T) a union of sections by our alignment assumption, see [Hol16a].

The remainder of this section will be taken up with proving that $\mathbb{E}: \mathfrak{M}^1 \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ is an isomorphism, and observing a few consequences. First a quick lemma, then we do quite some work to prove that, if Λ is a point, then \mathcal{E}_Λ is regular. From this it is a small step to show that \mathbb{E} is an isomorphism.

Lemma 5.3. *The map $\mathbb{E}: \mathfrak{M}^1 \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ is surjective.*

Proof. Let k be a separably closed field, C_0/k a curve and E an enriched structure on C_0 . We wish to show the existence of a regular curve $C/k[[t]]$ with C_0 isomorphic to the special fibre, and such that E is the enriched structure induced by C as in definition 5.1. Marking some points on C_0 we can assume it to be stable, whereupon this is proven in [EM02, Corollary 6.6], or [Mai98b] (who assumes characteristic zero). This C is a regular curve over a dedekind scheme and thus 1-aligned, so the tautological map $\text{Spec } k[[t]] \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}$ lifts canonically to \mathfrak{M}^1 . It is then immediate from the construction of \mathbb{E} that the image of the closed point of $\text{Spec } k[[t]]$ maps to the point corresponding to E . \square

5.1 Geometric regularity of the stack of enriched structures

Let k be a separably closed field. In this section, we will show that the base-change \mathcal{E}_k is regular.

Note that \mathfrak{M}_k is locally of finite type over k , and hence so are \mathfrak{M}_k^1 and \mathcal{E}_k . We will show that \mathcal{E}_k is regular by computing the dimension of its tangent space.

By our finite-type assumption it is enough to check that \mathcal{E}_k is regular at all k points. We fix p a k -point of \mathcal{E}_k . Write d for the dimension of \mathfrak{M}_k at p .

Lemma 5.4. $\dim_p \mathcal{E}_k \geq d$

We will see later that this is an equality.

Proof. Since our schemes are of finite type over a field, this follows from the existence of an irreducible open neighbourhood of p in \mathcal{E}_k , and the dominance of $\mathcal{E}_k \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}_k$ (which follows from the same property for $\mathfrak{M}_k^1 \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}_k$). \square

Write $\pi: \mathcal{E}_k \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}_k$ for the structure map. Write $\pi_*: T_p \mathcal{E}_k \rightarrow T_{\pi(p)} \mathfrak{M}_k$ for the map on tangent spaces induced by π .

Lemma 5.5. *Write Γ for the graph of the curve over p . Then*

$$\dim \text{Ker } \pi_* \leq \#\{\text{non-loop edges of } \Gamma\} + \#\text{Vert } \Gamma - \sum_{v \in \text{Vert } \Gamma} \#\pi_0(\Gamma - v) - 1.$$

We will see later that this is an equality.

Proof. In this proof we write $k[\epsilon] := k[\epsilon]/\epsilon^2$. We think of the tangent space to \mathcal{E} at p as the space of pointed maps from $T := \text{Spec } k[\epsilon]$ to \mathcal{E} through p . The kernel of π_* corresponds exactly to those maps which factor via the inclusion of the fibre over $\pi(p)$; in other words, where the curve does not deform, only the enriched structure on it deforms.

Let C_0/k be the curve corresponding to p , and let $C = C_0 \times_k k[\epsilon]$, a constant deformation. Let E be the enriched structure on C_0 corresponding to p . We need to show that the dimension of the space of enriched structures on C which restrict to E on C_0 is at most

$$N := \#\{\text{non-loop edges of } \Gamma\} + \#\text{Vert } \Gamma - \sum_{v \in \text{Vert } \Gamma} \#\pi_0(\Gamma - v) - 1.$$

Let (v, G) be a relative component of Γ . Write $t: T \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}_k$ for the tautological morphism. Write B_G for the set of sections in $C(T)$ corresponding to the edges between G and G^c . We find by lemma 4.4 (and using that t factors via a point) that

$$t^* \mathcal{I}_{G^c}|_{C_G} \cong \mathcal{O}_{C_G}(-B_G) \oplus \text{torsion}$$

and so has a unique invertible quotient $\mathcal{O}_{C_G}(-B_G)$ up to isomorphism. By the condition that the tensor product of all the line bundles be trivial we find (lemma 4.5) that if \mathcal{L}_G is part of an enriched structure on C then $\mathcal{L}_G|_{C_{G^c}} \cong \mathcal{O}_{C_{G^c}}(B_G)$. Applying lemma 4.4 again we obtain

$$t^* \mathcal{I}_{G^c}|_{C_{G^c}} \cong \bigoplus_{b \in B_G} \mathcal{O}_{C_{G^c}}(b),$$

so as in lemma 4.5, surjective maps to \mathcal{L}_G correspond to elements of

$$\bigoplus_{b \in B_G} H^0(C_{G^c}, \mathcal{O}(B_G - b))$$

and the glueing conditions imply that the section under consideration lands in

$$H^0(C_{G^c}, \mathcal{O}) \subseteq H^0(C_{G^c}, \mathcal{O}(B_G - b)).$$

Since $C_{G^c} \rightarrow T$ is proper, flat and has reduced connected geometric fibres we deduce that $H^0(C_{G^c}, \mathcal{O}) = k[\epsilon]$. To specify the surjection to \mathcal{L}_G is to specify the elements of $k[\epsilon]$ at points in B_G which glue these maps together. The surjections are already specified over the closed point k (since we are looking at the tangent space to a fixed enriched structure), so we get a k -worth of choices at each element of B_G . We do not claim (at this point) that all of these enriched structures actually exist, we only say that any enriched structure must satisfy these conditions (hence the inequality in the statement of the lemma).

At this point we can simply count the dimension, imitating the proof of [Mai98b, proposition 2.12]. Let v_1, \dots, v_r be the vertices of Γ , and define

$$n_i = \#\{\text{edges } v - v^c\} - \#\pi_0(\Gamma - v_i).$$

The dimension of the space of choices for \mathcal{L}_G (for $G \in \pi_0(\Gamma - v_1)$) is the number of edges from v_1 to G , minus 1 to allow for adjusting the isomorphism on G . Summing over $G \in \pi_0(\Gamma - v_1)$ we find that the dimension of the space of choices for the $\mathcal{L}_G : G \in \pi_0(\Gamma - v_1)$ is n_1 .

A similar argument for v_2 yields that the dimension of the space of choices for the $\mathcal{L}_G : G \in \pi_0(\Gamma - v_2)$ is n_2 , except that $\#\{\text{edges } v_1 - v_2\} - 1$ choices were already determined by our choices for v_1 and the condition that the tensor product of all the bundles together be trivial. Thus the dimension of the space of choices for connected components in the complements of v_1 or v_2 is $n_1 + n_2 - \#\{\text{edges } v_1 - v_2\} + 1$. Continuing in this fashion yields that the total dimension is N as required. \square

Lemma 5.6. *Write Part Γ for the decomposition of Γ into circuit-connected components as in lemma 2.5. Then*

$$\dim \text{coker } \pi_* \geq \sum_{G \in \text{Part } \Gamma} (\#\text{ edges } G - 1)$$

We will see later that this is an equality.

Proof. This follows easily from the fact that enriched structures can only exist when the curve is 1-aligned (lemma 2.38). If $G \in \text{Part } \Gamma$ then let T_G be the $(\#\text{ edges } G)$ -dimensional subspace of $T_{\pi(p)}\mathfrak{M}_k$ spanned by deforming those nodes which are edges in G . Then the intersection of $\pi_*T_P\mathcal{E}_k$ with T_G cannot meet any of the coordinate hyperplanes except at the origin, from which we deduce that the image is contained in¹ a 1-dimensional subspace of T_G . Applying this condition for each G , the lemma follows. \square

¹Later we will deduce that this containment is an equality. It should be possible to give an intrinsic characterisation of this 1-dimensional subspace but we have not yet done so.

Lemma 5.7.

$$\sum_{G \in \text{Part } \Gamma} (\# \text{ edges } G - 1) = \#\{\text{non-loop edges of } \Gamma\} + \#\text{Vert } \Gamma - \sum_{v \in \text{Vert } \Gamma} \#\pi_0(\Gamma - v) - 1.$$

Proof. We may assume Γ has no loops since they make no contribution to either side. Further, elements of $\text{Part } \Gamma$ which are bridges make no contribution to either side, and both sides of the equality are additive in disjoint unions of graphs, so we may assume Γ is circuit-connected (so $\#\text{Part } \Gamma = 1$). Then we compute both sides; the LHS is just the number of edges in Γ minus 1. The circuit-connectivity implies that each $\pi_0(\Gamma - v)$ has exactly 1 element, and the result follows. \square

Proposition 5.8. \mathcal{E}_k is regular at p .

Proof. From the definition of the kernel and cokernel we have that

$$\dim T_p \mathcal{E}_k - \dim T_{\pi(p)} \mathfrak{M}_k = \dim \ker \pi_* - \dim \text{coker } \pi_*.$$

Combining with lemmas 5.5 and 5.6 we deduce that

$$\dim T_p \mathcal{E}_k \leq \dim T_{\pi(p)} \mathfrak{M}_k = d.$$

But by lemma 5.4 we know that $\dim_p \mathcal{E}_k \geq d$, so in fact all these inequalities are equalities and \mathcal{E}_k is regular at p . \square

5.2 \mathbb{E} is an isomorphism

Returning now to working over \mathbb{Z} , we prove that \mathbb{E} is an isomorphism. This mostly consists of mild gymnastics with properties of morphisms — the main work was carried out in section 5.1. In fact, it would have been enough to show that \mathcal{E}_k was reduced, as regularity would follow from what we prove in this section, but in any case it was nice to play with computing tangent spaces, since this is something which our definition of enriched structure over arbitrary base schemes has made possible. Anyway, on with the main result:

Theorem 5.9. $\mathbb{E}: \mathfrak{M}^1 \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ is an isomorphism.

Proof. Being an isomorphism is local on \mathfrak{M} , so base-changing we may replace \mathfrak{M} by a scheme. Note that \mathfrak{M}^1 and \mathcal{E} are both of finite presentation over \mathfrak{M} . Let $\text{Spec } k \rightarrow \text{Spec } \mathbb{Z}$ be any geometric point (so k is some algebraically closed field). Now \mathfrak{M}_k is dense in \mathfrak{M}_k^1 , so it is dense in \mathcal{E}_k by surjectivity of \mathbb{E}_k . Moreover, \mathcal{E}_k is regular by section 5.1, in particular it is reduced. The map $\mathcal{E}_k \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}_k$ is 1-aligned by lemma 2.38. By the universal property of \mathfrak{M}_k^1 (see [Hol14, definitions 3.1 and

12.1] — note that the normal-crossings assumption is superfluous) we obtain a map $\mathbb{F}_k: \mathcal{E}_k \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}_k^1$ (over \mathfrak{M}_k):

$$\mathfrak{M}_k^1 \xrightarrow{\mathbb{E}_k} \mathcal{E}_k \xrightarrow{\mathbb{F}_k} \mathfrak{M}_k^1.$$

The composite $\mathbb{F}_k \circ \mathbb{E}_k$ is the identity over the schematically dense open $\mathring{\mathfrak{M}}_k$, and $\mathfrak{M}^1 \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}$ is separated, so in fact $\mathbb{F}_k \circ \mathbb{E}_k$ is the identity. We also know that \mathbb{E}_k is surjective, and thus is bijective, in particular quasi-finite. Since \mathfrak{M}_k^1 is separated we can apply Zariski's Main Theorem to deduce that \mathbb{E}_k is the composite of an open immersion and a finite map. The open immersion is clearly an isomorphism, so \mathbb{E}_k is finite. It is also a bijection, hence is radicial. It is locally of finite presentation, and the fact that $\mathbb{F}_k \circ \mathbb{E}_k$ is the identity allows one to easily deduce that \mathbb{E}_k is formally étale, but a radicial étale morphism is an isomorphism.

Readers who are only interested in working over an algebraically closed field can stop here, but it is only a little more work to deduce the general case: we apply a fibrewise criterion, then repeat the above arguments. Firstly, the above result and the fibrewise criterion for flatness implies that \mathbb{E} is flat. It is also an isomorphism on every geometric fibre, and hence is smooth. This implies (since smoothness is local on the source for the smooth topology, and $\mathfrak{M}^1 \rightarrow \text{Spec } \mathbb{Z}$ is smooth) that $\mathcal{E} \rightarrow \text{Spec } \mathbb{Z}$ is smooth. In particular it is reduced, and $\mathring{\mathfrak{M}}$ is dense in \mathcal{E} , so $\mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}$ is 1-aligned, and we obtain a map $\mathbb{F}: \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}^1$ as before. Separatedness of \mathfrak{M}^1 implies that $\mathbb{F} \circ \mathbb{E}$ is the identity (since it is over $\mathring{\mathfrak{M}}$). Applying Zariski's Main Theorem and formal étaleness just as above we deduce that \mathbb{E} is an isomorphism as required. \square

We can now reap the tasty fruits of our labour, as many nice properties of \mathcal{E} follow from the same for \mathfrak{M}^1 .

Corollary 5.10.

1. \mathcal{E} is smooth over $\text{Spec } \mathbb{Z}$;
2. \mathcal{E} is separated over \mathfrak{M} ;
3. If $\mathring{\mathcal{J}} \rightarrow \mathring{\mathfrak{M}}$ is the jacobian of the tautological smooth curve, then $\mathring{\mathcal{J}}$ admits a finite-type Néron model \mathcal{N} over \mathcal{E} (which is unique up to unique isomorphism);
4. If $t: T \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}$ is any morphism from a regular scheme such that
 - $t^*\mathcal{E}$ is smooth over a dense open of T ;
 - $t^*\mathcal{E}$ is 1-aligned;

then $t^*\mathcal{N}$ is the Néron model of $t^*\mathring{\mathcal{J}}$ (in particular, the Néron model exists).

5. $\mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}$ is in fact uniquely characterised by the above property - more precisely, it is the terminal object in the category of such morphism to \mathfrak{M} .
6. Over the stack of stable curves, the pullback of Caporaso's balanced Picard stack $\mathcal{P}_{d,g}$ to \mathcal{E} acquires a natural group/torsor structure (see [Hol14, §13] for a precise statement).

Proof. See [Hol14], and [Hol16b] for the quasi-compactness of the Néron model. \square

6 Relation to the constructions of Mainò

In this section, we begin by recalling some definitions due to Mainò. These can be found both in her thesis [Mai98b] and in her unpublished preprint [Mai98a]; we will give precise references to the latter, as it seems to have been more widely circulated. We will then relate her constructions to the definitions made in the present work, and use this to prove certain of her conjectures.

Mainò worked over an algebraically closed field of characteristic zero, but this restriction is not necessary, so we will work over arbitrary base schemes \mathbb{Z} as usual (the interested reader can easily check that her proofs carry over in this setting). Mainò worked exclusively with stable curves, over the coarse Deligne-Mumford moduli space \overline{M}_g , but find it clearer to work over the fine moduli stack. The restriction to stable curves does seem necessary for some of her results explicitly describing chains of blowups to construct moduli spaces. Because of this, we will work over the stack $\overline{\mathcal{M}}/\mathbb{Z}$ of stable (unmarked) curves. To avoid clashes with the notation for compactified enriched structures in later sections, we will in this section use the notation \mathcal{M}^{stab} for the Deligne-Mumford stack of stable curves. The natural map $\overline{\mathcal{M}} = \mathcal{M}^{stab} \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}$ is an open immersion, and we denote by \mathcal{E}^{stab} the pullback of our fine moduli stack of enriched structures from \mathfrak{M} to \mathcal{M}^{stab} .

Mainò makes the following preliminary definition:

Definition 6.1. ([Mai98a, definition 2.1]) Let k be a separably closed field and C/k a stable curve with irreducible components C_1, \dots, C_r . An *enriched structure* on C is a collection of isomorphism classes of line bundles $\mathcal{F}_1, \dots, \mathcal{F}_r$ such that there exists a regular smoothing C' of C with $\mathcal{F}_i = \mathcal{O}_{C'}(C_i)|_C$.

She then shows ([Mai98a, proposition 2.14]) that this definition is equivalent to the more intrinsic one given in definition 4.1. In particular, by theorem 4.9 we know that our definition coincides with hers over separably closed fields.

In particular, Mainò's above definition gives a way to associate an enriched structure on C/k to any regular smoothing of C/k . Writing $\text{Def}(C/k)$ for the $3g-3$ -dimensional k -vector space of first-order infinitesimal deformations, we have a linear subspace $\text{Def}^{lt}(C/k) \subseteq \text{Def}(C/k)$ of locally trivial deformations — these

are also known as ‘equisingular’ deformations, as they are exactly the deformations which do not smooth any nodes. If $C'/k[[t]]$ is a regular smoothing of C/k , Mainò shows in [Mai98a, theorem 2.6] that the resulting enriched structure on C/k depends only on the image of this smoothing in the quotient

$$N := \frac{\text{Def}(C/k)}{\text{Def}^{lt}(C/k)}.$$

6.1 Over reduced base schemes

Mainò’s next goal is to generalise her definition from curves over fields to curves over reduced base schemes (this is the subject of section 3 of [Mai98a]). The restriction to the reduced case seems unavoidable with her approach, because her definition depends heavily on specifying the restriction of line bundles to geometric fibres, and so cannot ‘see’ non-reduced structure on the base.

Unfortunately, the definition Mainò gives ([Mai98a, definition 3.3]) does not behave as intended. In section 6.1.2, we will recall her original definition, and give an example to show why the resulting functor of enriched structures is not representable. In particular, this disproves her conjectures 5.5 and 5.6, relating moduli of enriched structures to blowups of the moduli space of stable curves (see section 6.2 for a detailed description of these conjectures).

This problem arises because Mainò indexes the line bundles in her enriched structures by vertices rather than by relative components. In section 6.1.1, we will present a slightly modified version of her definition, and show that it is equivalent to ours. We will prove later (section 6.2, in particular corollary 6.8) that her conjectures 5.5 and 5.6 *do* hold with this slightly-modified definition.

6.1.1 Our modification of Mainò’s definition

We choose first to present our modified version of Mainò’s definition. In this way, the reader who is not familiar with Mainò’s work and wishes simply to take the shortest path to the proofs of conjectures 5.5 and 5.6 can do so, skipping section 6.1.2.

We begin with a family of curves over a reduced strictly henselian local base S (in particular, note that such a family is controlled)², and we have an immediate neighbourhood $s: S \rightarrow \mathfrak{U}_S$. Write Γ for the graph over the closed point. Let (v, G) be a relative component of Γ . We define the open subset $U_{(v,G)} \subseteq S$ to be the complement of the closed subscheme $Z(\mathcal{J}_G)$ in S (see definition 2.31).

²In fact, Mainò writes that she works over a reduced local ring with algebraically closed residue field. However, a family of curves over such a base need not admit any sections, which she needs for some intermediate constructions. We assume that she intended a strictly henselian local base, so that sections exist through the smooth locus of every component of every fibre.

With these notions in hand, we define an M-enriched structure on C/S (the ‘M’ stands for ‘Mainò’):

Definition 6.2. (c.f. [Mai98a, definition 3.3]) If C/S is not 1-aligned, the set of M-enriched structures on C/S is defined to be empty. Otherwise, an *M-enriched structure* on $\pi: C \rightarrow S$ is a collection of total-degree-zero line bundles $\mathcal{F}_{(G,v)}$ for (v, G) relative components of Γ , such that

1. For every $s \in S$: given a relative component (v, G) of Γ_s , let (v', G') be the unique relative component of Γ specialising to (v, G) as in eq. (2.7.2). Let $\mathcal{F}_{(v,G)} = \mathcal{F}_{(v',G')}$. Then the $\mathcal{F}_{(v,G)}$ form an enriched structure on C_s/s .
2. For every relative component (v, G) of Γ , we have

$$\mathcal{F}_{(v,G)}|_{\pi^{-1}(U_{(v,G)})} \cong \mathcal{O}_{\pi^{-1}(U_{(v,G)})}.$$

The first condition requires that these sheaves give us an enriched structure on every fibre of C/S .

Suppose we have an enriched structure on C/S (in the sense of definition 2.34). This immediately gives the data of an M-enriched structure, and it follows from theorem 4.9 that this collection of line bundles satisfies Mainò’s first, fibrewise condition. To check her second condition, it is enough to observe that the ideal sheaves $s^*\mathcal{I}_{G^c}$ are themselves trivial over the relevant $\pi^{-1}U_{(v,G)}$, so the same certainly holds for their invertible quotients. In this way, we see that any enriched structure gives rise to an M-enriched structure.

Conversely, every M-enriched structure arises in this way, but we must work a little more to prove it. Suppose we are given an M-enriched structure $(\mathcal{F}_{(v,G)})_{(v,G)}$, and let (v, G) be relative component of Γ . We will construct an invertible quotient $\mathcal{L}_{(v,G)}$ of the pulled-back ideal sheaf $s^*\mathcal{I}_G$ which functions as the line bundle of the M-enriched structure.

There are two quite different cases to consider. The first is where the open subset $U_{(v,G)} \subseteq S$ is non-empty. In this case the ideal sheaves $\mathcal{I}_{(G,v)}$ are in fact already invertible, by our alignment assumption (c.f. ([Mai98a, corollary 3.12])).

The second case is where $U_{(v,G)}$ is empty; here the reducedness of S and 1-alignedness of C/S implies that the labels of all edges from v to G are zero. The structure of the restriction of $\mathcal{F}_{(v,G)}$ to C_G and C_{G^c} is thus as given in lemma 4.5. By lemma 4.7, any line bundle satisfying these conditions arises as an invertible quotient of $s^*\mathcal{I}_G$ in a unique way. The last two lemmas were stated and proven when the base is a field, but the same proofs carry over to the case where the labels vanish; c.f. part II. Finally, the compatibility is clear, since we impose it fibrewise over a reduced base. Putting this together, we obtain

Theorem 6.3. *For S any reduced strictly hensellian local scheme, and C/S a stable curve, there is a natural bijection between enriched structures on C/S and M -enriched structures on C/S .*

Mainò then defines an enriched structure on an arbitrary reduced scheme S as the limit of a diagram of M -enriched structures on all strictly hensellian local rings mapping to S . Since the strictly hensellian local rings are precisely the local rings in the étale topology, we see that M -enriched structures coincide with enriched structures over arbitrary reduced base schemes.

6.1.2 Mainò's original definition

Mainò's original definition over reduced bases does not work as intended. We will describe it briefly here, and give an example to show that the resulting functor is not representable.

Recall the partition $\text{Part}(\Gamma)$ of the edges of Γ into maximal circuit-connected subsets as in lemma 2.5. Given $H \in \text{Part}(\Gamma)$, we write \bar{H} for the unique connected subgraph of Γ with those edges — following Mainò, we will refer to such a \bar{H} as a *link* of Γ , though the reader should be warned that this is non-standard terminology. We say a vertex is *disconnecting* if it is contained in at least two distinct links.

If u and v are two vertices, Mainò defines an open subscheme $U_{uv} \subseteq S$ to be the locus of $s \in S$ such that the specialisations of u and v to the graph Γ_s coincide; this is equivalent to requiring that, for at least one path p from u to v in Γ , all the edges along p have labels which are units in U_{uv} .

Given a vertex v of Γ , we write L_v for the union of the vertices of all links containing v . So if v is non-disconnecting this consists of exactly the vertices of the unique link containing v . Mainò then defines open subsets $U_v \subseteq S$ by the formulae

$$U_v = \bigcup_{u \in L_v} U_{uv} \text{ if } v \text{ is non-disconnecting, and}$$

$$U_v = \bigcap_{u \in L_v} U_{uv} \text{ if } v \text{ is disconnecting.}$$

Remark 6.4. For a relative component (v, G) of Γ , we see

$$U_{(v,G)} = \bigcup_{u \in G} U_{uv},$$

relating our construction above to that of Mainò.

With these notions in hand, Mainò makes the following definition:

Definition 6.5. ([Mai98a, definition 3.3]) A *Mainò-enriched structure* on $\pi: C \rightarrow S$ is a collection of line bundles \mathcal{F}_v for $v \in \text{Vert}(\Gamma)$ such that

1. For every $s \in S$, write $\text{sp}_s: \Gamma \rightarrow \Gamma_s$ for the contraction map. For each vertex v of Γ_s , let $\mathcal{F}_v = \bigotimes_{u: \text{sp}_s(u)=v} \mathcal{F}_u$. Then the \mathcal{F}_v form a Mainò-enriched structure on C_s/s (as in definition 4.1).
2. For every vertex v of Γ , we have

$$\mathcal{F}_v|_{\pi^{-1}(U_v)} \cong \mathcal{O}_{\pi^{-1}(U_v)}.$$

Example 6.6. We now present an example to show that the resulting functor of Mainò-enriched structures is not representable. We work over a base scheme $S = k[[t]]$ with k a field. We define a labelled graph Γ with 4 vertices and 3 edges:

$$\Gamma : \quad v_1 \xrightarrow{0} v_2 \xrightarrow{t} v_3 \xrightarrow{0} v_4.$$

We choose a stable compact-type curve C/S with labelled graph Γ .

Since C/S is of compact-type it admits a unique enriched structure $(\mathcal{F}_{(v,G)})_{(v,G)}$ indexed by relative components. For each vertex v_i , define \mathcal{F}_i by tensoring together the (one or two) $\mathcal{F}_{(v,G)}$ for G running over the connected components of $\Gamma - v$. This is easily checked to satisfy the first condition of Mainò's definition, and since the open sets U_{v_1}, \dots, U_{v_4} are all empty, the second condition in Mainò's definition is vacuous.

Now choose p and q two sections through the smooth locus of C/S , with the same reduction modulo t ; we see these as Cartier divisors on C . We define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}'_1 &= \mathcal{F}_1 \\ \mathcal{F}'_2 &= \mathcal{F}_2(p - q) \\ \mathcal{F}'_3 &= \mathcal{F}_3(q - p) \\ \mathcal{F}'_4 &= \mathcal{F}_4. \end{aligned}$$

On the special fibre we have $\mathcal{F}'_i = \mathcal{F}_i$, because of the assumption that p and q coincide modulo t . On the other hand, on the generic fibre we have $\mathcal{F}'_2 \otimes \mathcal{F}'_3 = \mathcal{F}_2 \otimes \mathcal{F}_3$, so these again give a Mainò-enriched structure on the generic fibre. Hence, Mainò's first condition is satisfied. The second condition is still vacuous, as the U_{v_i} are empty. Thus $\mathcal{F}'_1, \dots, \mathcal{F}'_4$ also define a Mainò-enriched structure.

In this way, we have built two non-isomorphic Mainò-enriched structures, which coincide over the closed point and also over the generic point of S . This contradicts representability of the functor of Mainò-enriched structures, as we have two $k[[t]]$ points which agree at the generic and closed points, but are not equal.

The problem lies in the fact that Mainò attaches her line bundles \mathcal{F}_v to vertices, not to relative components. Because of this, her second condition cannot be made strong enough to force the line bundles to be of the required shape.

6.2 Blowing up the moduli space of curves

Mainò's other main contribution is the construction of an explicit chain of blowups of \mathcal{M}^{stab} , and an explicit open subscheme of this blowup, which she conjectures coincides with the moduli space of enriched structures. As we have seen in section 6.1.2, her notion of enriched structures did not define a representable functor, and so this conjecture was not true as stated. In this section, we will describe her blowups and open subscheme, and then show that the resulting space *can* be naturally identified with the moduli space of enriched structures as we define them, thus proving a 'corrected' version of her conjectures.

From now on, we work in \mathcal{M}_g^{stab} , the moduli stack of stable curves of fixed genus g . For $1 \leq i \leq 3g-3$, we define the locally closed subscheme $\mathcal{R}_i \subseteq \mathcal{M}_g^{stab}$ to be the locus of curves whose graphs have i nodes, are not trees, and are circuit-connected.

We set $B_{3g-3} = \mathcal{M}_g^{stab}$. Inductively on $2 \leq i \leq 3g-3$, starting with $i = 3g-3$, we define B_{i-1} to be the blowup of B_i at the closure of the preimage of \mathcal{R}_i . In other words, we first blow up \mathcal{R}_{3g-3} , then we blow up the strict transform of the closure of \mathcal{R}_{3g-4} , then the strict transform of the closure of \mathcal{R}_{3g-5} , etc. The final step in the tower is B_1 , which we also simply denote by B . Mainò proves ([Mai98a, proposition 6.2]) that B is regular, so the strict transform of \mathcal{R}_1 is a Cartier divisor, hence we would obtain the same result if we had run our induction all the way to $i = 1$.

Writing $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_i$ for the closure of the pullback of \mathcal{R}_i to B , Mainò defines a closed subset $Z \hookrightarrow B$ by the formula

$$Z = \bigcup_{i=1}^{3g-3} \overline{\left(\left(\bigcup_{1 \leq j < i} \tilde{\mathcal{R}}_j \right) \cap \pi^{-1} \mathcal{R}_i \right)},$$

and then defines En to be the open substack of B obtained by deleting Z .

Mainò then constructs ([Mai98a, theorem 4.3]), for every field-valued point of \mathcal{M}_g^{stab} , a natural bijection between the enriched structures on the corresponding stable curve C/k , and the k -points of the fibre of En . She then conjectures ([Mai98a, conjecture 5.6]) that this natural bijection can be extended from field-valued points to points taking values in arbitrary reduced local rings (in the statement she omits the 'reduced' assumption, but as she does not give a definition of enriched structures over non-reduced rings, we assume this to be an oversight). Her conjecture 5.5 is the same statement, but restricted to discrete valuation rings.

As we have seen in section 6.1.2, these conjectures are both false as stated, since her definition of enriched structures over reduced local rings does not yield a representable functor. In what follows (in particular in corollary 6.8), we will show that her conjectures *do* hold when one uses our definition of enriched structure, and the requirements that the base be reduced or local are superfluous. More

precisely, we will construct an isomorphism of stacks over \mathcal{M}_g^{stab} between En and \mathcal{E}^{stab} . Such an isomorphism is necessarily unique if it exists, as both stacks are separated and birational to \mathcal{M}_g^{stab} .

We know that both stacks En and \mathcal{E}^{stab} are regular, and Mainò has already provided us with a bijection on the field-valued points. Hence it is enough to construct a map between these stacks, which is compatible with Mainò's bijection on each field-valued fibre. Since \mathcal{E}^{stab} has a universal property, it is most reasonable to construct a map from En to \mathcal{E}^{stab} . Perhaps the most satisfying way to do this would be to write down a universal enriched structure over En , but the details of this become somewhat painful. Instead, recall from section 5 the isomorphism $\mathcal{E}^{stab} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}^{1,stab}$, from the stack of enriched structures to the universal 1-aligned stack pulled back to the moduli stack of stable curves.

Lemma 6.7. *En is 1-aligned.*

Proof. Let \bar{x} be a geometric point of En , with local ring $\mathcal{O}_{En, \bar{x}}^{et}$. Write Γ for the labeled graph over x , whose labels are principal ideals in $\mathcal{O}_{En, \bar{x}}^{et}$. If γ is a circuit in Γ , we need to show that all edges in γ have the same label.

We treat first the case where \bar{x} maps to some \mathcal{R}_i , so the graph is circuit-connected. Mainò checks that the fibre of En over this point is obtained by blowing up the closure of \mathcal{R}_i , then deleting the ‘coordinate hyperplanes’, i.e. the parts of the exceptional locus where some label becomes a non-trivial power of another label. The universal property of the blowup (principalising ideal sheaves), and the fact that there are no higher-power relations between labels, together imply that En is 1-aligned at \bar{x} .

The general case is similar, but more involved. Mainò shows that the fibre is isomorphic to a product of projective spaces, one for each link of the graph, and again with the coordinate hyperplanes removed. In other words, for each link we principalise the ideal sheaf generated by its labels, then delete the loci where some label is a non-trivial power of another. As before, this implies that En is 1-aligned at \bar{x} . \square

This lemma furnishes us with a map $En \rightarrow \mathcal{M}^{1,stab}$, and hence $En \rightarrow \mathcal{E}^{stab}$. Using test curves it is straightforward to check that this is compatible with Mainò's bijection on field valued points — we omit the details, as it would require reproducing large parts of her proofs; we leave the interested reader to check the original source. Putting things together, we have

Corollary 6.8. *There is a unique isomorphism $En \rightarrow \mathcal{E}^{stab}$ of stacks over \mathcal{M}_g^{stab} . This isomorphism is compatible with Mainò's bijection on each geometric fibre over \mathcal{M}_g^{stab} .*

This proves the ‘corrected’ versions of her conjectures 5.5 and 5.6. Since En is clearly a scheme over \mathcal{M}_g^{stab} , we obtain

Corollary 6.9. *The stack \mathcal{E}^{stab} is relatively representable by a scheme over \mathcal{M}_g^{stab} .*

It seems natural to ask whether Mainò’s blowup B coincides with our compactified stack of enriched structures, defined in part II. We do not know if this is the case. It is certainly true that there are many different ways of blowing up \mathcal{M}_g^{stab} which also contain open subschemes isomorphic to \mathcal{E}^{stab} (for a trivial example, just blow up B at a point in Z).

Part II

Compactifying the stack of enriched structures

7 Defining compactified enriched structures

The problem of compactifying the moduli stack of enriched structures has been open since the work of Mainò [Mai98b]. Since enriched structures were only defined over fields prior to this work, this was always going to be a rather awkward problem. Mainò considered building a compactification using ‘bubbling’, but this did not work as the boundary components were too large; looking back, we realise that Mainò was seeing higher parts of the universal Néron-Model admitting stack \mathfrak{M} (see [Hol14]). While \mathfrak{M} could be viewed as a compactification of the moduli stack of enriched structures for some purposes (for example, it satisfies a restricted version of the valuative criterion for properness), it is a very unsatisfactory compactification in other ways — since it is not proper over \mathfrak{M} it is not ideal for doing intersection theory etc. We will use the other common approach to compactifying moduli of line bundles: we will use torsion free sheaves of rank 1.

There are two main parts to our definition of an enriched structure. The first is to consider invertible quotients of pullback of certain carefully chosen ideal sheaves. This part is rather easily adapted to torsion free sheaves; we simply replace the requirement that the quotients be invertible by stipulating that they be torsion free of rank 1 (see definition 7.1 for a precise definition). The second part of the definition is to require that the tensor product of all these bundles be isomorphic (locally on S) to the trivial bundle. This does not work well with torsion free rank 1 sheaves; by definition, if a tensor product of sheaves is trivial then they are all invertible! To get around this, we show that the condition that the tensor

product of the sheaves be trivial can be replaced by a condition on the shapes of the kernels of the quotient maps, see definition 7.13. We show that for line bundles this recovers our original definition (section 9), that for torsion-free rank 1 sheaves it defines a representable functor, and that the representing object is proper over \mathfrak{M} (section 8).

Definition 7.1. Let C/k be a curve over a separably closed field, and let $j: C^{sm} \hookrightarrow C$ be the inclusion of the smooth locus. We say a coherent sheaf \mathcal{F} on C is *torsion free of rank 1* if

1. $j^*\mathcal{F}$ is locally free of rank 1 on C^{sm} ;
2. The canonical map $\mathcal{F} \rightarrow j_*j^*\mathcal{F}$ is injective.

Now let C/S be a curve over any base, and \mathcal{F} a finitely presented quasi-coherent sheaf on C . We say \mathcal{F} is *torsion free of rank 1* if \mathcal{F} is S -flat and if for every geometric point $\bar{s} \rightarrow S$, the pullback $\mathcal{F}_{\bar{s}}$ on $C_{\bar{s}}$ is torsion free of rank 1 in the above sense.

This is one of many possible equivalent definitions. Such sheaves are very commonly used in compactifying moduli of invertible sheaves, see for example [MM64], [D'S79], [AK80], [Est01], [Cap08].

7.1 From relative components to hemispheres

If V is a subset of the vertices of a graph Γ , we say V is *connected* if the subgraph induced by V is connected. Recall that for us being connected means having exactly one connected component, in particular being non-empty.

Definition 7.2. Let Γ be a connected graph. A *hemisphere* of Γ is a connected subset G of the vertices of Γ such that the complement of G is also connected. We call the edges of Γ with exactly one end in G the *separating edges* of G .

In the first part of this paper we worked with invertible sheaves indexed by relative components (v, G) of Γ . We worked quite hard to prove that the set of enriched structures was empty if the family of curves was not 1-aligned, which was key in allowing us to define pullbacks of enriched structures since it essentially said that, whenever it was unclear how to define the pullback, the set of enriched structures was empty anyway, so there was no problem! With compactified enriched structures this strategy no longer works, since it is possible to have compactified enriched structures on families which are not 1-aligned (indeed, otherwise the valuative criterion for properness could not hold). To fix this we need to generalise the notion of relative component to allow V to be a connected set of vertices of

Γ rather than just a single vertex. We could thus work with relative components (V, G) where V was simply a connected subgraph, but there would be a fair amount of redundancy since G would no longer determine V , so we could end up with two torsion free rank 1 quotients of the same ideal sheaf. The compatibility conditions we will impose in definition 7.13 can be phrased so as to require these quotients to be isomorphic, but this gets a little messy. Thus when defining compactified enriched structures we will work instead with hemispheres; the hemispheres of Γ are exactly those G that appear in these generalized relative components (V, G) . Then setting the data of a compactified enriched structure to be a tuple of torsion free rank 1 quotients of $s^*\mathcal{I}_{G^c}$ for each hemisphere G avoids the redundancy having the same G appear with multiple V .

7.2 Enrichment data

In this section we define an enrichment datum on a σ -controlled curve (to be defined in a moment). After this we will define what it means for such a datum to be *compatible*, and we will define a *compactified enriched structure* to be a compatible enrichment datum.

Definition 7.3. Let $S \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}$ be a controlled curve. Let $\mathfrak{s} \in S$ be a controlling point with graph Γ , and let $S \rightarrow \mathfrak{U} \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}$ be a controlled neighbourhood. Let \mathfrak{U}_S be the immediate neighbourhood of S in \mathfrak{U} .

We say $S \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}$ is *σ -controlled* if for every irreducible component v of $C_{\mathfrak{s}}$ there exists a section $\sigma_v: \mathfrak{U}_S \rightarrow C_{\mathfrak{U}_S}$ passing through the smooth locus of v .

Note that we do *not* fix the section σ_v , so one cannot glue these to make sections over the whole of \mathfrak{M} .

Lemma 7.4. *σ -controlled curves form a base for the big étale site over \mathfrak{M} .*

Proof. We know this for controlled curves by lemma 2.24, and it is standard that smooth morphisms admit sections étale-locally. \square

This base for the étale site is where we will initially define compactified enriched structures - as before, we will use appendix A to then extend to the general case.

Situation 7.5. Let $S \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}$ be a σ -controlled curve. Let $\mathfrak{s} \in S$ be a controlling point with graph Γ , and let $S \xrightarrow{s} \mathfrak{U} \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}$ be a controlled neighbourhood. Let \mathfrak{U}_S be the immediate neighbourhood of S in \mathfrak{U} , so $S \rightarrow \mathfrak{U}$ factors via $\mathfrak{U}_S \rightarrow \mathfrak{U}$. Choose sections σ_v for each vertex v .

Definition 7.6. Suppose we are in situation 7.5. Let G be a hemisphere of Γ . An *enrichment datum* for G is a torsion free rank 1 quotient

$$q_G: s^*\mathcal{I}_{G^c} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_G$$

such that on every fibre of C/S , the Euler characteristic of \mathcal{F}_G is equal to the Euler characteristic of the structure sheaf \mathcal{O}_C . We say two enrichment data $q_G: s^*\mathcal{I}_{G^c} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_G$ and $q'_G: s^*\mathcal{I}_{G^c} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}'_G$ are *equivalent* if there exists an isomorphism $\psi_G: \mathcal{F}_G \rightarrow \mathcal{F}'_G$ making the obvious triangle commute.

An *enrichment datum* for Γ consists of an enrichment datum for every hemisphere of Γ , with a corresponding notion of isomorphism.

Remark 7.7.

1. We could perfectly well take quotients of \mathcal{I}_G instead of \mathcal{I}_{G^c} , but we choose the latter convention to be consistent with the first part of this paper (on the non-compactified case).
2. We have not used the sections σ_v yet; these will be needed for defining compatibility, and can be ignored in this section.
3. As in the case of enriched structures (see remark 2.35), one checks easily that these notions are independent of the choice of controlled neighbourhood.

7.3 Local structure of pullbacks of ideal sheaves again

In this section we prove a generalisation of lemma 4.4, and some related results, which will be useful in what follows. Some of these results will make earlier results (such as lemma 4.4) redundant, but we have separated them out to reduce the technicalities encountered by the reader only interested in the non-compactified case. We start by recalling a result of Faltings on the local structure of torsion free rank 1 sheaves.

Lemma 7.8. *Let R be a local ring, C/R a controlled curve, and \mathcal{F} a torsion free rank 1 sheaf on C/R . Let e be an edge of the graph of C/R whose label is zero in R , and choose an isomorphism f from the R -algebra $A := R[[x, y]]/(xy)$ to the completion of C along the section corresponding to e . Then there exist elements $a, b \in R$ with $ab = 0$ and an isomorphism of A -modules*

$$f^*\mathcal{F} \xrightarrow{\sim} \frac{A\langle U, V \rangle}{yU + aV, xV + bU}.$$

The elements a, b are clearly not unique — for example, if $f^*\mathcal{F}$ is invertible then we can take $a = 0$ and b to be any unit in R or vice versa.

Proof. This is a special case of theorem 3.5 of [Fal96], which treats also the case of non-constant degeneration and higher-rank torsion free sheaves. The authors are grateful to Emre Can Sertöz for pointing out this reference. \square

We now give a slight generalisation of lemma 4.4.

Lemma 7.9. *Let C/S be a controlled curve with graph Γ and $S \xrightarrow{s} \mathfrak{U}_S$ an immediate neighbourhood, and assume that S is local. Let G be a hemisphere of Γ , and assume that for every separating edge e of G , the label of e is 0 on S .*

Write C_G for the union of the irreducible components of C corresponding to vertices in G , and define C_{G^c} similarly, so that C is a fibred coproduct over S of C_G with C_{G^c} along the union of the sections of C/S corresponding to separating edges of G . Write B_G for this union of sections, which we will also view as Cartier divisors on C_G or C_{G^c} interchangeably.

Let T_G be the torsion module on C_G given by

$$T = \bigoplus_{p \in B_G} \mathcal{O}_p^{\oplus(B_G - p)}$$

where \mathcal{O}_p denotes the push forward to C_G along p of the structure sheaf of S . Then there exist isomorphisms

$$f_G: s^* \mathcal{I}_{G^c}|_{C_G} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{O}_{C_G}(-B_G) \oplus T_G, \quad (7.3.1)$$

$$f_{G^c}: s^* \mathcal{I}_{G^c}|_{C_{G^c}} \xrightarrow{\sim} \bigoplus_{p \in B_G} \mathcal{O}_{C_{G^c}}(p) \quad (7.3.2)$$

and for each $b \in B_G$

$$g_b: b^* (\mathcal{O}_{C_G}(-B_G) \oplus T_G) \rightarrow b^* \left(\bigoplus_{p \in B_G} \mathcal{O}_{C_{G^c}}(p) \right)$$

such that for each $b \in B_G$ the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} b^* (\mathcal{O}_{C_G}(-B_G) \oplus T_G) & \xrightarrow{g_b} & b^* \left(\bigoplus_{p \in B_G} \mathcal{O}_{C_{G^c}}(p) \right) \\ \downarrow b^* f_G & & \downarrow b^* f_{G^c} \\ b^* s^* \mathcal{I}_{G^c}|_{C_G} & \xlongequal{\quad} & (s \circ b)^* \mathcal{I}_{G^c} \xlongequal{\quad} b^* s^* \mathcal{I}_{G^c}|_{C_{G^c}} \end{array}$$

Moreover, if we view the isomorphism g_b as being a morphism

$$b^* \mathcal{O}_{C_G}(-b) \oplus \bigoplus_{B_G - b} \mathcal{O}_p \xrightarrow{\sim} b^* \mathcal{O}_{C_{G^c}}(b) \oplus \bigoplus_{B_G - b} \mathcal{O}_p,$$

then g_b is the identity on the $\bigoplus_{B_G - b} \mathcal{O}_p$ parts, and induces an isomorphism $b^ \mathcal{O}_{C_G}(-b) \xrightarrow{\sim} b^* \mathcal{O}_{C_{G^c}}(b)$ (in particular g_b respects the evident direct sum decomposition).*

Proof. The proof of lemma 4.4 carries over with little change. The notation is a little different since now G is a hemisphere instead of being part of a relative component, but this is unimportant for the proof. ‘Points’ becomes sections, but this again makes no real difference. Completions should be taken with respect to the defining ideal of the image of the section, which is no longer a maximal ideal, but this again does not make any difference. \square

We now combine lemmas 7.8 and 7.9 to obtain more detailed information on the structure of enrichment data. This is the point in our story where the restriction on the Euler characteristic in the definition of enrichment data plays a key role.

Lemma 7.10. *In the notation of lemma 7.9, suppose $q: s^*\mathcal{I}_{G^c} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$ is an enrichment datum for G . Write K for the kernel of q , and fix an isomorphism*

$$s^*\mathcal{I}_{G^c}|_{C_{G^c}} \xrightarrow{\sim} \bigoplus_{b \in B_G} \mathcal{O}_{C_{G^c}}(b)$$

as in lemma 7.9.

1. *The coherent sheaf K is supported on C_{G^c} , and the restricted inclusion $K \rightarrow s^*\mathcal{I}_{G^c}|_{C_{G^c}}$ factors via the natural inclusion*

$$\bigoplus_{b \in B_G} \mathcal{O}_{C_{G^c}} \rightarrow \bigoplus_{b \in B_G} \mathcal{O}_{C_{G^c}}(b)$$

2. *There exists an isomorphism $K|_{C_{G^c}} \cong \bigoplus_{\#e(G, G^c)-1} \mathcal{O}_{C_{G^c}}$.*
3. *Choose an isomorphism as in (2). The induced map*

$$\bigoplus_{\#e(G, G^c)-1} \mathcal{O}_{C_{G^c}} \rightarrow \bigoplus_{b \in B_G} \mathcal{O}_{C_{G^c}}$$

is given by a matrix with entries in \mathcal{O}_S .

4. *The quotient \mathcal{F} is invertible at the point $b \in B_G$ if and only if the image of the b th standard basis vector of $\bigoplus_{b \in B_G} \mathcal{O}_{C_{G^c}}$ in \mathcal{F} is non-zero.*

Proof.

1. We check this locally at a singular section $p \in B_G$. We choose an isomorphism f from $A := R[[x, y]]/(xy)$ to the completion of C along p as in lemma 7.8, assuming that x vanishes on the component corresponding to G^c . We also choose an isomorphism $f^*\mathcal{F}$ to $A \langle U, V \rangle / (yU + aV, xV + bU)$. We write

$$A \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_C} \bigoplus_{b \in B_G} \mathcal{O}_{C_{G^c}}(b) \xrightarrow{\sim} \frac{A}{x} \langle L_1, \dots, L_n, X \rangle,$$

where the L_i correspond to elements of $B_G \setminus p$ and X corresponds to the generator for $\mathcal{O}_{C_{G^c}}(p)$. The glueing conditions of lemma 7.9 then imply that X maps to a unit multiple of V , and each of the L_i maps to a unit multiple of yV . Thus if $\sum_i t_i L_i + sX$ maps to 0 under q , we must have that $y \mid s$. This proves the first claim.

2. Given $p \in B_G$, write \mathbf{v}_p for the p th standard basis vector in $\bigoplus_{b \in B_G} \mathcal{O}_{C_{G^c}}$. The submodule \mathcal{V} of $\mathcal{F}|_{C_{G^c}}$ spanned by the images of the \mathbf{v}_p is clearly invertible (by the computations in the proof of the first part); we claim that \mathcal{V} has degree 0. This we can check on field-valued points of S , so we reduce to the case where S is a point. The structure of torsion free rank 1 sheaves is then very well understood, and the restriction that \mathcal{F} have Euler characteristic equal to that of \mathcal{O}_C implies that \mathcal{V} has degree 0 as required.

Knowing that \mathcal{V} has degree 0 the result is very easy; the kernel K consists of relations between the \mathbf{v}_p , and such relations must then have coefficients in $\mathcal{O}_{C_{G^c}}$, proving the claim.

3. This is immediate from (2) since C_{G^c} has connected fibres.
4. A torsion free rank 1 sheaf is invertible if and only if it is so on every fibre over S , so we reduce to the case where S is a geometric point. This is then an easy calculation since the structure of torsion free rank 1 sheaves on curves over fields is very well understood. \square

Lemma 7.11. *Assume we are in situation 7.5, and let G be a hemisphere of Γ , and v a vertex not in G . Let $q_G: s^*\mathcal{I}_{G^c} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_G$ be an enrichment datum with kernel K_G . Let σ_v be the section through the smooth locus chosen in situation 7.5. Then the annihilator of $\sigma_v^*K_G$ contains the labels of all the separating edges of G .*

Recall that σ_v goes through the smooth locus of an irreducible of C_s component corresponding to a vertex in G^c ; if the section went through the smooth locus of an irreducible component corresponding to a vertex in G then $\sigma_v^*K_G = 0$ so the lemma would hold trivially.

Proof. This result is very clear set-theoretically, but we must do a little work for the scheme-theoretic version. We may assume S and \mathfrak{U}_S are affine, say $S = \text{Spec } B \rightarrow \mathfrak{U} = \text{Spec } A$. Let $a_1, \dots, a_n \in A$ be the labels of the separating edges of G , and say a_i maps to $b_i \in B$. Then we find that $\sigma_v^*\mathcal{I}_{G^c} = s^*(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ (since σ_v goes through G^c), so pulling back along σ_v yields a sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \sigma_v^*K_G \rightarrow \sigma_v^*(a_1, \dots, a_n) \rightarrow \sigma_v^*\mathcal{F}_G \rightarrow 0,$$

which is exact since \mathcal{F}_G is flat over C in a neighbourhood of σ_v . This $\sigma_v^*\mathcal{F}_G$ is invertible (since \mathcal{F}_G can only be non-invertible at non-smooth points of the fibres). Moreover, using that \mathfrak{M} has normal crossings singularities we see that

$$\sigma_v^*(a_1, \dots, a_n) = \frac{B\langle A_1, \dots, A_n \rangle}{(b_i A_j - b_j A_i : 1 \leq i, j \leq n)}.$$

To simplify notation write $\psi = \sigma_v^*q_G$. Since \mathcal{F}_G is S -flat by assumption, we see that $\sigma_v^*K_G$ is still the kernel of ψ . Hence we have an exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \sigma_v^*K_G \rightarrow \frac{B\langle A_1, \dots, A_n \rangle}{(b_i A_j - b_j A_i : 1 \leq i, j \leq n)} \xrightarrow{\psi} \sigma_v^*\mathcal{F}_G \rightarrow 0$$

where $\sigma_v^*\mathcal{F}_G$ is invertible, and we want to show $\sigma_v^*K_G$ is killed by every b_i .

Well, let $\sum_i c_i A_i \in \text{Ker } \psi$. Note that $b_j \sum_i c_i A_i = (\sum_i b_i c_i) A_j$. Then

$$0 = b_j 0 = b_j \psi \left(\sum_i c_i A_i \right) = \left(\sum_i b_i c_i \right) \psi(A_j),$$

and since the $\psi(A_j)$ generate an invertible module this implies that $\sum_i b_i c_i = 0$. Then we see that

$$b_j \sum_i c_i A_i = \left(\sum_i b_i c_i \right) A_j = 0 A_j = 0$$

as required. □

7.4 Compatibility of enrichment data

Suppose we are in situation 7.5 and have an enrichment datum for Γ . We need some analogue of the condition in the definition of an enriched structure that the tensor product of the invertible sheaves is trivial. There are two problems with applying that condition directly in our situation:

1. If a tensor product of sheaves is trivial then by definition they were all invertible, so we are not going to see very interesting torsion-free rank 1 sheaves!
2. Because we are working with hemispheres instead of relative components it is not completely clear which combinations of quotients we should require to be trivial.

In this section we construct a different condition, which satisfies two important properties (the proofs of which will take up much of the remainder of this paper):

1. If one restricts to invertible quotients, then the resulting notion of compactified enriched structure is naturally equivalent to our previous definition of enriched structure, and this makes the stack of enriched structures into an open substack of the stack of compactified enriched structures;
2. The resulting functor of compactified enriched structures is relatively representably by an algebraic space over \mathfrak{M} , and moreover is proper over \mathfrak{M} , making it a good notion of ‘compactification’.

In future work we plan to show that the stack of compactified enriched structures is smooth over \mathbb{Z} , give a stratification of the boundary into smooth pieces, and show that the stack of enriched structures is dense in every fibre over \mathcal{M} , making it a very good compactification! Note that the boundary is *not* a normal crossings divisor for dimension reasons, cf. section 1.2 where we removed 2 points from the blowup of the completed affine plane.

We now begin the definition of compatibility. Suppose again that we are in situation 7.5 and have an enrichment datum for Γ , so we have a torsion free rank 1 quotient $q_G: s^*\mathcal{I}_{G^c} \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{F}_G$ for every hemisphere G (a surjection of sheaves on the tautological curve C/S). Write K_G for the kernel of q_G , so we have a short exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow K_G \rightarrow s^*\mathcal{I}_{G^c} \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{F}_G \rightarrow 0$$

of coherent sheaves on C (for later use, note that the formation of the kernel commutes with base change by the S -flatness of \mathcal{F}_G). Write \mathcal{J}_G for the ideal sheaf on \mathfrak{U}_S generated by the labels of separating edges of G . If $v \in G^c$ is any vertex then we have a canonical inclusion

$$\sigma_v^*K_G \hookrightarrow \sigma_v^*s^*\mathcal{I}_{G^c} = \mathcal{J}_G$$

of sheaves on S (using that \mathcal{F}_G is C -flat in a neighbourhood of σ_v). We write $\mathbb{K}_G := \sigma_v^*K_G$ for this submodule of \mathcal{J}_G ; the notation is justified by

Lemma 7.12. *The submodule $\mathbb{K}_G = \sigma_v^*K_G \subseteq \mathcal{J}_G$ is independent of the choice of component $v \in G^c$ and of the choice of section σ_v through the smooth locus of v .*

Proof. Write $i: Z_S(\mathcal{J}_G) \rightarrow S$ for the closed immersion. By lemma 7.11 we see that $i_*i^*\sigma_v^*K_G = \sigma_v^*K_G$, hence we may reduce to the case where i is an isomorphism, i.e. where all the labels vanish on the whole of S . The result is then clear from part 3 of lemma 7.10, since the inclusion of K_G in $s^*\mathcal{I}_{G^c}$ is isomorphic to a linear map of free $\mathcal{O}_{C_{G^c}}$ -modules with matrix entries in \mathcal{O}_S (note that the Euler characteristic restriction is key in that lemma). \square

Let E be a non-empty subset of the edges of Γ . Let \mathcal{J}_E be the ideal sheaf on \mathfrak{U}_S cut out by the labels of edges in E . If G is a hemisphere of Γ such that the

separating edges of G all lie in E then the ideal sheaf \mathcal{I}_{G^c} is contained in $\pi^* \mathcal{J}_E$ on $C_{\mathfrak{U}_S}$, where $\pi: C_{\mathfrak{U}_S} \rightarrow \mathfrak{U}_S$ is the structure morphism. Pulling back along $\sigma_v \circ s$ for any $v \in G^c$ we obtain a map of coherent sheaves on S

$$f_{E,G}: \mathcal{J}_G = \sigma_v^* s^* \mathcal{I}_{G^c} \rightarrow \sigma_v^* s^* \pi^* \mathcal{J}_E = s^* \mathcal{J}_E.$$

Recall from section 1.6 that we use \mathcal{J} for the ideal on the base \mathfrak{U} , and \mathcal{I} for the ideal upstairs on the curve. We use K for kernels of maps upstairs on the curve, and \mathbb{K} for (corresponding) kernels of maps downstairs on \mathfrak{U} .

Definition 7.13. We say the enrichment datum is *compatible* (or *Fitting-compatible* for emphasis) if for every non-empty set E as above the closed immersion

$$\mathrm{Supp}_{\mathrm{Fitt}} \frac{s^* \mathcal{J}_E}{\sum_G f_{E,G}(\mathbb{K}_G)} \rightarrow S \quad (7.4.1)$$

is an isomorphism. Here the sum runs over hemispheres G such that every separating edge of G is contained in E , and $\mathrm{Supp}_{\mathrm{Fitt}}$ denotes the Fitting support of a coherent sheaf, see definition 2.9.

Definition 7.14. If C/S is σ -controlled, a *compactified enriched structure* on C/S is a compatible enrichment datum on C/S .

Remark 7.15. This definition is independent of the choice of controlled neighbourhood, and also that of the sections σ_v . For the former, see remark 7.7. The latter follows from lemma 7.12.

The definition of compatibility risks being somewhat cryptic, so we conclude this section with two detailed examples.

Example 7.16 (Compact type). Suppose that C/S is of compact type, so hemispheres of Γ are in natural bijection with edges of Γ . Then each of the ideal sheaves \mathcal{I}_{G^c} is itself invertible, so every enrichment datum consists of isomorphisms $q_G: s^* \mathcal{I}_{G^c} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{F}_G$. The kernels K_G are thus the zero module, and the same holds for their images under $f_{E,G}$. Thus, the enrichment datum being compatible is equivalent to the map

$$\mathrm{Supp}_{\mathrm{Fitt}} s^* \mathcal{J}_E \rightarrow S$$

being an isomorphism. Since the formation of the Fitting support commutes with arbitrary base-change, it suffices to check that the natural map

$$\mathrm{Supp}_{\mathrm{Fitt}} \mathcal{J}_E \rightarrow \mathfrak{U}_S$$

is an isomorphism. Now we have $\mathrm{Fitt}_0 \mathcal{J}_E \subseteq \mathrm{Ann} \mathcal{J}_E = (0)$, the first equality by lemma 2.7, and the second since all labels are non-zero and \mathfrak{U} is integral. So we see that this map is always an isomorphism in the compact type case. To summarise, for curves of compact type, enrichment data always consist only of isomorphisms, and compatibility is automatic.

Example 7.17 (Neighbourhood of the 2-gon). Let C/k be the 2-gon, and \mathfrak{U} be an immediate neighbourhood, so $\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{U}}(\mathfrak{U})$ has elements x and y corresponding to the labels of the two edges. Let $s: \text{Spec } k \rightarrow \mathfrak{U}$ be the inclusion of the central fibre $x = y = 0$. Note that the graph has exactly two hemispheres, each consisting of a single vertex. If the vertices are denoted v_1 and v_2 , then an enrichment datum thus consists of a pair

$$(q_1: s^*\mathcal{I}_{v_1} \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{F}_{v_1}, q_2: s^*\mathcal{I}_{v_2} \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{F}_{v_2})$$

of torsion free rank 1 (see definition 7.1) quotients of the $s^*\mathcal{I}_-$.

When considering compatibility, we have to run over all non-empty subsets E of the edges of the graph. There are exactly three such subsets. Denoting the edges e and e' , we treat first the case where E has cardinality 1, say $E = \{e\}$. Then there are no hemispheres with separating edges contained in E , so the sum in the expression (9.1.1) is over the empty set, hence is the zero sub-module. We argue as in the compact-type case above to see that the map in (9.1.1) is thus an isomorphism.

It remains to treat the case where $E = \{e, e'\}$. Here \mathcal{J}_E is the ideal generated by x and y , so its pullback $s^*\mathcal{J}_E$ is a free module of rank 2, with natural basis elements which we denote X, Y . Supposing we have sections σ_{v_i} of $C_{\mathfrak{U}}/\mathfrak{U}$ passing through the smooth loci of the components C_{v_i} of the central fibre. Then we have to consider the images of the $\sigma_{v_i}^*(\ker q_i)$ in $s^*\mathcal{J}_E$. By lemma 7.9, $\sigma_{v_i}^*(\ker q_i)$ is a k -module of rank 1, so its image is a 1-dimensional subspace of the module $s^*\mathcal{J}_E = k\langle X, Y \rangle$. In fact, the quotient is uniquely determined by such a submodule, so that the space of enrichment data is given by the space of pairs of lines in $k\langle X, Y \rangle$, hence is naturally isomorphic to $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1(k)$.

The map (9.1.1) is an isomorphism if and only if the k -module

$$\frac{s^*\mathcal{J}_E}{\sum_G f_{E,G}(\mathbb{K}_G)} = \frac{k\langle X, Y \rangle}{\sigma_{v_1}^*(\ker q_1) + \sigma_{v_2}^*(\ker q_2)}$$

is non-zero, if and only if the two 1-dimensional subspaces $\sigma_{v_i}^*(\ker q_i)$ are equal. Hence, the space of compatible enrichment data is given by the diagonal in $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1(k)$.

From (4) of lemma 7.10 we see that the quotient \mathcal{F}_{v_i} is invertible if and only if the submodule $\sigma_{v_i}^*(\ker q_i)$ in $s^*\mathcal{I}_E$ is not given by $X = 0$ or $Y = 0$; in other words, the invertible enrichment data are parametrised by a $\mathbb{G}_m(k) \subseteq \mathbb{P}^1(k)$. We see then that the compatibility condition in particular imposes that either both \mathcal{F}_{v_1} and \mathcal{F}_{v_2} are invertible, or neither is.

7.5 Pulling back compactified enriched structures

Suppose we are in situation 7.5. Let $\varphi: T \rightarrow S$ be another σ -controlled curve, and let $T \xrightarrow{t} \mathfrak{U}_T \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{U}_S$ be the immediate neighbourhood of T in \mathfrak{U}_S . We may take the

sections on $C_{\mathcal{U}_T}/\mathcal{U}_T$ to be induced by those from $C_{\mathcal{U}_S}/\mathcal{U}_S$. We have a contraction map $\varphi_\Gamma: \Gamma_S \rightarrow \Gamma_T$.

Lemma 7.18. *If H is a hemisphere of Γ_T then $\varphi_\Gamma^{-1}H$ is a hemisphere of Γ_S .*

Proof. Since φ_Γ^{-1} preserves intersections and emptiness it is enough to show that the pullback of a connected set is connected, but this is clear since φ_Γ just contracts edges. \square

If H is a hemisphere of Γ_T , let $G = \varphi_\Gamma^{-1}H$. Suppose we are given an enrichment datum

$$q_G: s^*\mathcal{I}_G \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_G$$

for G . Note that $\varphi^*s^*\mathcal{I}_G = t^*\mathcal{I}_H$, and the pullback of a torsion free rank 1 sheaf is torsion free rank 1, and surjectivity is stable under pullback. We thus obtain an enrichment datum

$$q_H := \varphi^*q_G: t^*\mathcal{I}_H \rightarrow \varphi^*\mathcal{F}_G.$$

In this way, we build an enrichment datum for C_T/T from one for C_S/S .

Lemma 7.19. *Let*

$$(q_G: s^*\mathcal{I}_G \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_G)_G$$

be a compatible enrichment datum for C/S . Then the pullback to T (as constructed above) is also compatible.

Proof. Formation of pullbacks, quotients and the Fitting support are compatible with base-change. Formation of kernels of surjections to *flat* targets are also compatible with base change. Thus the problems are essentially combinatorial.

Let E'_T be a non-empty subset of the edges of Γ_T . Let E'_S be the set of edges of Γ_S which map to edges in E'_T (so in particular $\#E'_T = \#E'_S$). Let H be a hemisphere of Γ_T with all separating edges of H contained in E'_T . Then every separating edge of $\varphi_\Gamma^{-1}H$ is contained in E'_S , since it maps to a separating edge of H . Conversely, if G is a hemisphere of Γ_S with every separating edge of G contained in E'_S then G is the pullback of a hemisphere from Γ_T ; indeed, any vertex v of $\varphi_\Gamma^{-1}\varphi_\Gamma(G)$ which is not contained in G must be connected to some vertex of G by a chain of edges which are all contracted by φ_Γ , but then none of these edges are in E'_S , contradicting the existence of such a v .

In this way we see that φ_Γ^{-1} induces a bijection between hemispheres of Γ_T with all separating edges in E'_T and hemispheres of Γ_S with all separating edges in E'_S . Thus in the notation of definition 7.13 we see that

$$\varphi^* \frac{s^* \mathcal{J}_{E'_S}}{\sum_G f_{E'_S, G}(\mathbb{K}_G)} = \frac{t^* \mathcal{J}_{E'_T}}{\sum_H f_{E'_T, H}(\mathbb{K}_H)}$$

where the sums run over the relevant sets of hemispheres discussed above. The result is clear since the formation of the Fitting support of a coherent module commutes with pullback, see lemma 2.7. \square

Definition 7.20. Write $\sigma\text{-Sch}_{\mathfrak{M}}$ for the full subcategory of schemes over \mathfrak{M} whose objects are σ -controlled curves. Then by lemma 7.4 this is a base for the étale topology on $\text{Sch}_{\mathfrak{M}}$.

Let $\overline{\mathcal{E}}: \sigma\text{-Sch}_{\mathfrak{M}}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ be the functor sending a curve to the set of compactified enriched structures on it, with the pullback defined just above. This is the *functor of compactified enriched structures* on the subcategory of σ -controlled curves.

7.6 Compactified enriched structures for general C/S , and properties

To define compactified enriched structures for general (not necessarily σ -controlled) C/S we need to show the functor of compactified enriched structures defined in definition 7.20 is a sheaf for the étale topology (c.f. section 2.6). As in the non-compactified case we will make use of a representability result for a related functor, so we begin by defining some functors related to $\overline{\mathcal{E}}$.

Let C/S be a σ -controlled curve, with graph Γ , controlled neighbourhood $S \rightarrow \mathfrak{U}$ and immediate neighbourhood $S \xrightarrow{s} \mathfrak{U}_S \subseteq \mathfrak{U}$. If G is a hemisphere of Γ , let

$$\mathcal{ED}_{S,G}: \text{Sch}_S^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$$

be the functor sending an S -scheme $T \xrightarrow{f} S$ to the set of isomorphism classes of torsion free rank 1 quotients of $f^*s^*\mathcal{I}_{G^c}$, with the evident notion of pullback. Let

$$\mathcal{ED}_S: \text{Sch}_S^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$$

be the fibre product over S of the functors $\mathcal{ED}_{S,G}$ as G runs over hemispheres of Γ . Note that $\mathcal{ED}_S(S)$ is exactly the set of enrichment data on S . Finally, let

$$\overline{\mathcal{E}}_S: \text{Sch}_S^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$$

be the subfunctor of \mathcal{ED}_S obtained by requiring that the enrichment data are compatible. More precisely, we choose sections σ_v of C_S/S through the smooth locus of each irreducible component v of any controlling fibre, and define \mathbb{K}_G to be the pullback to T along $f^*\sigma_v$ (any $v \in G^c$) of the kernel of $q_G: f^*s^*\mathcal{I}_{G^c} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_G$. We then require that for each non-empty set E of edges of Γ , the inclusion of the Fitting support of the coherent \mathcal{O}_T -module

$$\frac{f^*s^*\mathcal{J}_E}{\sum_G \mathbb{K}_G} \tag{7.6.1}$$

to T is an isomorphism (the sum running over those G all of whose separating edges are contained in E). Again, if $S = T$ we immediately see that $\overline{\mathcal{E}}_S(S) = \overline{\mathcal{E}}(S)$.

We made similar definitions in the non-compactified case, but here things are actually much simpler; we do not have to worry about 1-alignment, instead we have a very general lemma:

Lemma 7.21. *For all σ -controlled T/\mathfrak{M} and \mathfrak{M} -maps $T \rightarrow S$, we have that $\overline{\mathcal{E}}_S(T) = \overline{\mathcal{E}}(T)$.*

More precisely, the discussion in the proof of lemma 7.19 gives an obvious map $\overline{\mathcal{E}}_S(T) \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{E}}(T)$, and we will prove that this is an isomorphism.

Proof. This almost comes from looking at the proof of lemma 7.19. The only extra thing we need to observe is that if E is a nonempty set of edges of $\Gamma = \Gamma_S$ which does not come by pullback from the graph Γ_T of C_T/T (equivalently, at least one edge in E is contracted under the map to Γ_T) then $f^*s^*\mathcal{J}_E$ is canonically trivial, and all the images of relevant \mathbb{K}_G in it are zero, so the quotient in (7.6.1) clearly has Fitting support equal to T . \square

Lemma 7.22.

1. *For each hemisphere G of Γ , the functor $\mathcal{ED}_{S,G}: \mathbf{Sch}_S^{op} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ is representable by a separated S -scheme.*
2. *The functor $\mathcal{ED}_S: \mathbf{Sch}_S^{op} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ is representable by a separated S -scheme.*
3. *The functor $\overline{\mathcal{E}}_S: \mathbf{Sch}_S^{op} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ is representable by a separated S -scheme.*

Proof. For (1), we note that $\mathcal{ED}_{S,G}$ is naturally a subfunctor of a quot scheme. The inclusion of this subfunctor is moreover relatively representable, since the inclusion of torsion free rank 1 sheaves in the stack of all finitely presented sheaves is relatively representable, and fixing the Euler characteristic is an open and closed condition. We thus see that $\mathcal{ED}_{S,G}$ is representable, and we need to check separatedness. All the torsion free rank 1 quotients appearing as G -enrichment data have the same Hilbert polynomial (because they are required to have the same Euler characteristic), and thus $\mathcal{ED}_{S,G}$ is a subfunctor of a quot functor for a fixed Hilbert polynomial. Such a functor satisfies the valuative criterion for properness with respect to discrete valuation rings by [FGI⁺05, §5.5.7]. Moreover, since C/S and the various ideal sheaves we consider are of finite presentation we can reduce to the case where S is noetherian, so $\mathcal{ED}_{S,G}$ is a subfunctor of a separated functor.

Part (2) holds since a product of separated schemes is a separated scheme. The third functor is represented by the intersection of Fitting supports of suitably chosen coherent sheaves on the second, namely, the universal versions of the sheaves

in definition 7.13. The Fitting support is closed and its formation commutes with arbitrary base-change (lemma 2.7), so the third functor is also represented by a separated S -scheme. \square

Corollary 7.23. *The functor $\bar{\mathcal{E}}$ is a sheaf for the étale topology.*

Proof. We need to show that if C/S is a σ -controlled curve, $\{T_i\}_I \rightarrow S$ is an étale cover by σ -controlled curves, and for each $i, j \in I$ we have a cover $\{T_{i,j,k}\}_{K_{i,j}}$ of $T_i \times_S T_j$ by σ -controlled curves, then the following diagram is an equaliser:

$$\bar{\mathcal{E}}(S) \rightarrow \prod_i \bar{\mathcal{E}}(T_i) \rightrightarrows \prod_{i,j,k} \bar{\mathcal{E}}(T_{i,j,k}). \quad (7.6.2)$$

However, for such T we know that $\bar{\mathcal{E}}(T) = \bar{\mathcal{E}}_S(T)$ and that the functor $\bar{\mathcal{E}}_S$ is representable, and hence a sheaf for any subcanonical topology. \square

Definition 7.24. By lemma A.4 the sheaf $\bar{\mathcal{E}}$ extends uniquely to a sheaf on the big étale site over \mathfrak{M} . We denote this extension also by $\bar{\mathcal{E}}$, and call it the functor of compactified enriched structures.

Corollary 7.25. *The functor $\bar{\mathcal{E}}$ is representable by a separated algebraic space over \mathfrak{M} .*

Proof. By definition $\bar{\mathcal{E}}$ is a sheaf, so we can check representability locally on \mathfrak{M} , say on σ -controlled patches. The result is then immediate by combining lemma 7.21 and part (3) of lemma 7.22. The separatedness follows by again applying part (3) of lemma 7.22, using that separatedness is local on the target (see [Sta13, Section 02YJ]). \square

8 Properness of the stack of compactified enriched structures

Properness is fpqc-(hence smooth-)local on the target, so it can be checked on any smooth cover. From now until the end of the present section 8 we will thus replace \mathfrak{M} by a scheme mapping smoothly to \mathfrak{M} (we continue to denote it \mathfrak{M} to avoid cluttering the notation). Moreover we can now assume that $\mathfrak{C}/\mathfrak{M}$ is σ -controlled with graph Γ . Since the compatibility condition is defined by the vanishing of a certain Fitting ideal, we see that $\bar{\mathcal{E}}$ is a closed subscheme of the fibre product over \mathfrak{M} of functors $\mathcal{E}\mathcal{D}_{\mathfrak{M},H}$ as H runs over hemispheres of Γ . Hence it is enough to show that each $\mathcal{E}\mathcal{D}_{\mathfrak{M},H}$ is proper over \mathfrak{M} . Fixing a hemisphere H , we will construct an isomorphism between $\mathcal{E}\mathcal{D}_{\mathfrak{M},H}$ and the blowup of \mathfrak{M} at the ideal sheaf \mathcal{J}_H (generated by labels of separating edges of H), which is clearly proper over \mathfrak{M} .

Let σ be a section through the smooth locus of $\mathfrak{C}/\mathfrak{M}$ passing through a component in H^c . If $s: S \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}$ is any scheme then an object of $\mathcal{E}\mathcal{D}_{\mathfrak{M},H}$ is a torsion-free rank 1 quotient

$$s^*\mathcal{I}_{H^c} \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{F}_H,$$

and pulling back along σ we obtain an invertible quotient

$$s^*\mathcal{J}_H \rightarrow \sigma^*\mathcal{F}_H$$

(here (and elsewhere) we abuse notation — the section σ is over \mathfrak{M} , but we pull it back to make a section of C_S/S , and use the same notation for this new section). We thus obtain a natural transformation from torsion-free rank 1 quotients of $s^*\mathcal{I}_{H^c}$ on \mathfrak{C}_S to invertible quotients of $s^*\mathcal{J}_H$ on S .

Lemma 8.1. *The above natural transformation is an isomorphism of functors $\mathbf{Sch}_{\mathfrak{M}}^{op} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$.*

Proof. For each \mathfrak{M} -scheme S we must prove that the map from torsion-free rank 1 quotients of $s^*\mathcal{I}_{H^c}$ to invertible quotients of $s^*\mathcal{J}_H$ above is a bijection. Since both sides are representable functors it is enough to check this in the case where S is the spectrum of a strictly henselian complete local ring. Write $R = \mathcal{O}_S(S)$.

Let $Z \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{M}$ be the closed subscheme where the labels of the separating edges of H vanish (so Z is cut out by \mathcal{J}_H). Suppose we are given an invertible quotient $q: s^*\mathcal{J}_H \twoheadrightarrow R$. Write \mathbb{K} for the kernel. Our first task will be to construct a corresponding submodule K of $s^*\mathcal{I}_{H^c}$, and then to show that the cokernel of $K \rightarrow s^*\mathcal{I}_{H^c}$ is torsion free of rank 1. In this way we will construct an inverse to the ‘pullback along σ ’ map above, showing that the map of functors is an isomorphism (we will leave it to the reader to check that the map we define is actually an inverse).

Step 1: Constructing K

Let $\iota: V(H^c) \hookrightarrow C_S$ be the closed subscheme corresponding to H^c as in definition 2.31. Then $\pi_{H^c}: V(H^c) \rightarrow Z$ is proper and flat, and we define $K = \iota_*\pi_{H^c}^*\mathbb{K}$ (noting that \mathbb{K} is supported on Z by a simpler analogue of lemma 7.11).

Step 2: Constructing a map from K to $s^*\mathcal{I}_{H^c}$

Let $U_H = C_S \setminus V(H^c)$. Then K is zero on U_H , so the map to $s^*\mathcal{I}_{H^c}$ on U_H is clear. Write $\pi: C_S \rightarrow S$ for the structure map. If we let $V(H)$ be as defined in definition 2.31 (so $C_Z = V(H) \cup V(H^c)$) and set $U_{H^c} = C_S \setminus V(H)$, then on U_{H^c} we find that $s^*\mathcal{I}_{H^c}|_{U_{H^c}} = \pi^*s^*\mathcal{J}_H|_{U_{H^c}}$ and $\pi^*\mathbb{K}|_{U_{H^c}} = K|_{U_{H^c}}$, so again the map is clear. Moreover, these two maps agree on the intersection of U_H and U_{H^c} .

However, we are not done yet, since we also need to define a (compatible) map in a neighbourhood of the sections corresponding to separating edges of H . Fix such an edge e . In order to write down our map (and for later calculations) we need to give presentations of the various modules involved. We may assume \mathfrak{M} is affine and that the labels of separating edges of H are principal ideals on \mathfrak{M} .

Number the separating edges e_0, \dots, e_n . Choose a generator ℓ_i for each separating edge i . From now on we will work locally at the completion of C_S at a point in the singular subscheme corresponding to e_0 . We see that

$$s^* \mathcal{J}_H = \frac{R\langle L_0, \dots, L_n \rangle}{\ell_i L_j - \ell_j L_i : 0 \leq i, j \leq n}.$$

Writing A for the completion of C_S along e_0 , we choose an isomorphism $A \cong R[[x, y]]/(xy - \ell_0)$, and let us assume that x vanishes on the component lying in H . Then we find

$$s^* \mathcal{I}_{H^c} = \frac{A\langle X, L_0, \dots, L_n \rangle}{yX - L_0, \ell_i X - xL_i, \ell_i L_j - \ell_j L_i : 0 \leq i, j \leq n}.$$

Recalling that $q: s^* \mathcal{J}_H \rightarrow R$ is the invertible quotient we started with, we set $q_i := q(L_i)$. We see that

$$\mathbb{K} = \left\{ \sum_{i \geq 0} \alpha_i L_i : \sum_{i \geq 0} \alpha_i q_i = 0 \right\} \subseteq s^* \mathcal{J}_H.$$

Then

$$K = \left\{ \sum_{i \geq 0} \alpha_i L_i : \sum_{i \geq 0} \alpha_i q_i = 0 \right\} \subseteq \frac{R[[y]]\langle L_0, \dots, L_n \rangle}{\ell_i L_j - \ell_j L_i : 0 \leq i, j \leq n}.$$

It is then clear how to define the map $K \rightarrow s^* \mathcal{I}_{H^c}$; simply send $(\sum_{j \geq 0} r_j y^j) L_i$ to the same symbol considered as an element of $A\langle L_0, \dots, L_n \rangle$. The compatibility with the maps defined above on U_H and U_{H^c} is also clear.

Step 3: Verifying that the cokernel is torsion free rank 1

We have built a map $K \rightarrow s^* \mathcal{I}_{H^c}$, and need to check that the cokernel is torsion free of rank 1 and of the correct Euler characteristic. The fibrewise part of this is a straightforward calculation, and is omitted. The hard part is checking that this cokernel is flat over R . Writing M for the cokernel, we have a presentation

$$M = \frac{A\langle X, L_0, \dots, L_n \rangle}{yX - L_0, \ell_i X - xL_i, \ell_i L_j - \ell_j L_i (0 \leq i, j \leq n), K}.$$

We want to show M is R -flat. From the constructions this is clear away from points in the closed subscheme corresponding to the section e_0 . This subscheme is contained in the subscheme cut out by the equation $x - y = 0$. We wish to apply lemma 8.2 with $a = x - y$ to check flatness. The lemma does not apply directly because the finite presentation assumptions fail, so we apply the lemma *before* completing along e_0 , and then observe that the properties we need to check can be verified *after* completion. Hence by lemma 8.2 it is enough to check the following:

1. $M/(x - y)M$ is flat over R ;
2. $(x - y): M \rightarrow M$ is injective.

Step 4: Flatness of $M/(x - y)M$

This is rather easy from the presentation; as R -modules we find that

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{M}{(x - y)M} &= \frac{R[[x]] \langle X, L_0, \dots, L_n \rangle}{(x^2 - \ell_0) xX - L_0, \ell_i X - xL_i, \ell_i L_j - \ell_j L_i (0 \leq i, j \leq n), K} \\
&= \frac{R\langle X, L_0, L_1, \dots, L_n, xX, xL_0, xL_1, \dots, xL_n \rangle}{xX - L_0, \ell_i X - xL_i, \ell_i L_j - \ell_j L_i (0 \leq i, j \leq n), K} \\
&\cong \frac{R\langle X, L_0, \dots, L_n \rangle}{\ell_i L_j - \ell_j L_i (0 \leq i, j \leq n), K} \\
&\text{(via } q) = R\langle X \rangle
\end{aligned}$$

which is evidently R -flat!

Step 5: Injectivity of $(x - y): M \rightarrow M$

Let \mathbb{L} be the sub- A -module of M generated by the L_i . By a small diagram chase, it is enough to show

- 2.1. $(x - y): \mathbb{L} \rightarrow \mathbb{L}$ is injective;
- 2.2. $(x - y): M/\mathbb{L} \rightarrow M/\mathbb{L}$ is injective

For (2.1), we observe first that we have a presentation

$$\mathbb{L} = \frac{A\langle L_0, \dots, L_n \rangle}{\ell_i L_j - \ell_j L_i (0 \leq i, j \leq n), \mathbb{K}},$$

so $\mathbb{L} \cong A$ as an A -module (via the map q), and so multiplication by $(x - y)$ is easily seen to be injective. For (2.2), it is clear from the presentations that M/\mathbb{L} is again isomorphic as an A -module to A , and so injectivity again follows.

In conclusion, we have shown how to build a torsion free rank 1 quotient of $s^*\mathcal{I}_{H^c}$ starting from an invertible quotient of $s^*\mathcal{J}_H$. To show bijectivity, it remains to check that this is actually an inverse of the ‘pull back along σ ’ map, but this is not hard and we omit it. \square

The key technical result we used above was the following beautiful lemma whose statement and proof are adapted from [Ore14, lemma 1.2.2].

Lemma 8.2. *Let R be a ring, A a finitely presented R -algebra, and M a finitely presented A module. Let $a \in A$. Suppose*

1. M/aM is flat over R ;

2. $a: M \rightarrow M$ is injective.

Then for every point $q \in Z(a) \subseteq \text{Spec } A$, the localisation M_q is flat over R .

Proof. Step 1: There is an obvious exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \frac{aM}{a^2M} \rightarrow \frac{M}{a^2M} \rightarrow \frac{M}{aM} \rightarrow 0.$$

Now $a: M \rightarrow aM$ is a bijection by (2), hence $\frac{aM}{a^2M} \cong \frac{M}{aM}$ as A -modules, so by (1) the module $\frac{aM}{a^2M}$ is R -flat, hence $\frac{M}{a^2M}$ is R -flat. Repeating this argument, we deduce that $\frac{M}{a^nM}$ is R -flat for all $n \geq 1$.

Step 2: Fix a point $q \in Z(a) \subseteq \text{Spec } A$, and let $p \in \text{Spec } R$ be its pullback. Write A_q for the localisation of A at q , R_p for the localisation of R at p , and $M_q = M \otimes_A A_q$. We need to show M_q is flat over R_p . By [Sta13, Tag 00HD] this is equivalent to checking that for all finitely generated ideals $I \triangleleft R_p$, the canonical map $I \otimes_{R_p} M_q \rightarrow M_q$ is injective. For each integer $n \geq 1$ consider the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} I \otimes_{R_p} M_q & \longrightarrow & M_q \\ \downarrow \varphi_n & & \downarrow \\ I \otimes_{R_p} \left(\frac{M_q}{a^n M_q} \right) & \hookrightarrow & \frac{M_q}{a^n M_q}, \end{array}$$

where the bottom arrow is injective by the R -flatness of $\frac{M}{a^n M}$ established above. We need to show the top horizontal arrow is injective; for this we will show that $\bigcap_{n \geq 1} \text{Ker } \varphi_n = 0$. Note that

$$I \otimes_{R_p} \left(\frac{M_q}{a^n M_q} \right) = \frac{I \otimes_{R_p} M_q}{a^n (I \otimes_{R_p} M_q)},$$

and so $\text{Ker } \varphi_n = a^n (I \otimes_{R_p} M_q)$. Hence we want to show that $N = 0$ where

$$N := \bigcap_{n \geq 1} a^n (I \otimes_{R_p} M_q).$$

If R (and hence A) is Noetherian we can use the Artin-Rees lemma; let $P := I \otimes_{R_p} M_q$, then Artin-Rees tells us that there exists an $m \geq 0$ such that

$$(a^{m+1}P) \cap N = a((a^m P) \cap N),$$

in other words that $N = aN$, so by Nakayama's lemma (using that $a \in q$) we have that $N = 0$ as required.

To extend to the general (non-Noetherian) case one uses [Sta13, Tag 00R1 and Tag 00R6]; more details are in [Ore14, lemma 1.2.2]. \square

We have established an isomorphism of functors between $\mathcal{ED}_{\mathfrak{M},H}$ and the functor of invertible quotients of \mathcal{J}_H , the latter being defined entirely in terms of \mathfrak{M} with no reference to the curve living over it. We still need to show that this latter functor is proper.

Lemma 8.3. *Let $Q: \mathbf{Sch}_{\mathfrak{M}}^{op} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ be the functor sending a scheme $s: S \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}$ to the set of invertible quotients of $s^*\mathcal{J}_H$. This functor is naturally equivalent to the functor of points of the blowup of \mathfrak{M} along \mathcal{J}_H ; in particular it is proper.*

Proof. The blowup $B \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}$ is by definition the Proj of the blowup algebra, whose functor of points is spelled out in [Sta13, Section 01NS] (note that the blowup algebra is generated in degree 1). In our situation, for a scheme $s: S \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}$, we see that $B(S)$ is the set of equivalence classes of invertible quotients of $s^*\mathcal{J}_H \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{L}$ such that for every integer $d > 0$, the induced surjection $s^*\mathrm{Sym}^d(\mathcal{J}_H) \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{L}^{\otimes d}$ factors via $s^*(\mathcal{J}_H^{\otimes d})$. However, recall that \mathcal{J}_H is assumed to correspond to a normal crossings divisor in \mathfrak{M} , and so this latter condition is vacuous, so the blowup is simply the functor of invertible quotients of \mathcal{J}_H . \square

9 Comparison to enriched structures

There are three key differences between enriched structures and compactified enriched structures:

1. Enriched structures are built from invertible sheaves, whereas compactified enriched structures are built from torsion free rank 1 sheaves;
2. For an enriched structures we specify one quotient for each relative component of Γ , whereas for compactified enriched structures we specify one quotient for each hemisphere of Γ .
3. For enriched structures we require that the tensor product of the invertible sheaves be trivial, whereas for compactified enriched structures we have a rather complicated compatibility condition in terms of the Fitting supports of certain modules.

Suppose we have a compactified enriched structure where all the torsion free rank 1 quotients are in fact invertible. By throwing out the \mathcal{F}_G where G is not a connected component of the complement of a single vertex (i.e. coming from a relative component) we obtain a collection of data which is a reasonable candidate to be an enriched structure - we just need to check that the tensor product of the invertible sheaves is trivial, which we will do in the next sections. In this way we have a map from the ‘invertible locus’ of compacted enriched structures to enriched

structures, which clearly behaves well with pullbacks, giving a map of functors. We will verify that this map is an isomorphism, and hence that the invertible locus of the stack of compactified enriched structures is canonically identified with the stack of enriched structures.

Definition 9.1. Let C/S be σ -controlled. We say an enrichment datum on C/S is *invertible* if each of the torsion free rank 1 quotients is in fact an invertible sheaf. Similarly, we say a compactified enriched structure is *invertible* if the underlying enrichment datum is invertible.

A *vertex-enrichment datum* is the same data as an enrichment datum, except that we restrict to hemispheres G which are connected components of the complements of single vertices (in other words, which come from relative components). There is an obvious parallel notion of an invertible vertex-enrichment datum. We say an invertible vertex-enrichment datum is \otimes -*compatible* if the tensor product of all the invertible sheaves is S -locally trivial. We say it is *Fitting-compatible* if it satisfies the analogue of definition 7.13 (summing only over G coming from relative components).

Thus a ‘ \otimes -compatible invertible vertex-enrichment datum’ is exactly the same thing as an enriched structure as defined in definition 2.34!

A vertex enrichment datum is easily obtained from an enrichment datum by forgetting some of the data. This clearly preserves invertibility, and sends a Fitting-compatible enrichment datum to a Fitting-compatible vertex enrichment datum. We need to show two things:

1. Every Fitting-compatible invertible vertex enrichment datum is \otimes -compatible.
2. The resulting functor from invertible compactified enriched structures to enriched structures is an equivalence.

We will actually prove these in a somewhat roundabout way. This is essentially because the case of non-integral base schemes is rather hard to handle, so instead we side-step it by using that the stack of invertible compactified enriched structures is reduced (since it is regular). We first prove the result in the case where all labels vanish, then deduce the result for integral base schemes, and then finally deduce the general case.

9.1 When all the labels vanish

Suppose we are in situation 7.5. Suppose moreover that all the labels on all edges in Γ are zero, and that S is local; let $R := \mathcal{O}_S(S)$. Recall that \mathfrak{U} is affine, and the labels of edges in Γ are principal ideals of $\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{U}}(\mathfrak{U})$. We choose once and for all a generator of each principal ideal; say the edge e has as label the principal ideal

generated by l_e (so all the l_e vanish on the image of S in \mathfrak{U}_S). For each vertex v of Γ , let C_v be the corresponding irreducible component of C_S (c.f. lemma 2.29).

We begin by fixing an invertible enrichment datum

$$\mathfrak{E} := (q_G: s^*I_{G^c} \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{F}_G)_G$$

on C/S . It is easy to check with (4) of lemma 2.7 that if \mathfrak{E} is Fitting-compatible (i.e. it is an invertible compactified enriched structure) then the corresponding vertex enrichment datum \mathfrak{E}_{vert} is Fitting-compatible. The main goal of this section is to prove the following theorem, whose proof will occupy the remainder of section 9.1.

Theorem 9.2. *In the above setting:*

1. *If we start with a Fitting-compatible invertible enrichment datum \mathfrak{E} then the invertible Fitting-compatible vertex-enriched structure \mathfrak{E}_{vert} obtained by forgetting extra quotients is also \otimes -compatible;*
2. *The resulting functor from invertible compactified enriched structures to enriched structures is an equivalence.*

First, suppose that \mathfrak{E}_{vert} is Fitting-compatible. We need to show that the invertible vertex-enriched structure \mathfrak{E}_{vert} is \otimes -compatible. It is enough to check this compatibility on each non-loop circuit-connected component of Γ separately, so we fix such a component Υ of Γ and let $E(\Upsilon)$ be the set of its edges and $V(\Upsilon)$ the set of its vertices. For a relative component (v, G) we write $e(v, G)$ for the set of edges from v to G , and we write $\pi(\Upsilon)$ for the set of those relative components (v, G) such that $e(v, G) \subseteq E(\Upsilon)$. Observe that $e(v, G)$ is contained in a unique circuit-connected component (we will prove a more general version of this in lemma 9.9), and for each v there is at most one $G \in \pi^0(C - v)$ with $(v, G) \in \pi(\Upsilon)$. Note that the elements of $e(v, G)$ correspond to nodes lying on the irreducible component C_v ; abusing notation, we will also denote by $e(v, G)$ the corresponding Cartier divisor on C_v .

Lemma 9.3. *Let (v, G) and $(u, H) \in \pi(\Upsilon)$ with $u \neq v$. Then*

1. *$v \notin H^c$ (i.e. $v \in H$), and*
2. *If $e \in e(u, H)$ and e has an end at v , then $e \in e(v, G)$.*

Proof. 1. We need to show that $H^c \cap V(\Upsilon) = \{u\}$. If not then Υ contains an edge from u to a different relative component at u , which contradicts circuit-connectivity of Υ .

2. Similarly; if not then Υ contains an edge from v to a different relative component at v , which contradicts circuit-connectivity of Υ .

□

Combined, these two conditions imply that for every vertex $u \neq v$, the coherent sheaf $s^*\mathcal{I}_{H^c}|_{C_v \setminus e(v,G)}$ is canonically trivial (it corresponds to an ideal sheaf whose closed subscheme does not meet this locus).

A *local trivialisation* of this invertible vertex-enriched structure consists of, for each $(v, G) \in \pi(\Upsilon)$, a choice of isomorphism $f_G: \mathcal{F}_G|_{C_v} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{O}_{C_v}(e(v, G))$ (here we are thinking of $e(v, G)$ as a horizontal Cartier divisor on C_v). Because of the canonical triviality of the $s^*\mathcal{I}_{H^c}|_{C_v \setminus e(v,G)}$, our choice of f_G induces a map

$$F_G: s^*\mathcal{I}_{G^c} \otimes \bigotimes_{(v', G') \in \pi(\Upsilon), G' \neq G} s^*\mathcal{I}_{G'^c} \Big|_{C_v \setminus e(v,G)} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{C_v \setminus e(v,G)}.$$

Let $\pi_C: C \rightarrow S$ be the structure map. For each $e \in e(v, G)$ we note that $F_G(e) := F_G(l_e \otimes 1 \cdots \otimes 1)$ lies in $\pi_C^{-1}\mathcal{O}_S \subseteq \mathcal{O}_{C_v \setminus e(v,G)}(C_v \setminus e(v, G))$ (cf. lemma 7.10), and is a unit since \mathcal{F}_G is invertible (again by lemma 7.10). If $(u, H) \in \pi(\Upsilon)$ is another relative component, we say F_G and F_H *match up* if for every edge e from u to v , we have that $F_G(e) = F_H(e)$. Note that the expression $F_H(e)$ makes sense, defining it by the analogue of the formula $F_G(e)$ (since the edge e has an end at H).

Lemma 9.4. *Suppose we have chosen a local trivialisation. The following are equivalent:*

1. *For all $(v, G), (u, H) \in \pi(\Upsilon)$, the maps F_G and F_H match up.*
2. *There exists an isomorphism $\Phi: \bigotimes_{(v,G) \in \pi(\Upsilon)} \mathcal{F}_G \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{O}_C$ such that for each $(u, H) \in \pi(\Upsilon)$, the restriction to the component $C_u \setminus e(u, H)$ of the composite*

$$\bigotimes_{(v,G) \in \pi(\Upsilon)} s^*\mathcal{I}_{G^c} \xrightarrow{\otimes q_G} \bigotimes_{(v,G) \in \pi(\Upsilon)} \mathcal{F}_G \xrightarrow{\Phi} \mathcal{O}_C$$

is equal to F_H .

Proof. Let $e: u - v$ be an edge in Υ , with (v, G) and $(u, H) \in \pi(\Upsilon)$. Recall that $R = \mathcal{O}_S(S)$, define $A := R[[x, y]]/(xy)$, and fix an isomorphism between A and the completion of the local ring of C_S along the section corresponding to e , such that x vanishes on the component corresponding to v . Then we have natural isomorphisms of A -modules

$$s^*\mathcal{I}_{G^c}|_A = \frac{A\langle X, L_e, B_1, \dots, B_n \rangle}{yX - L_e, xB_1, \dots, xB_n},$$

where L_e is a generator corresponding to the label generator l_e , and B_1, \dots, B_n correspond to the labels of the other edges from v to G . Similarly we have

$$s^*\mathcal{I}_{H^c}|_A = \frac{A\langle Y, L_e, C_1, \dots, C_m \rangle}{xY - L_e, yC_1, \dots, yC_m}.$$

Tensoring the above presentations together over A we obtain a presentation for the A -module

$$M := s^*\mathcal{I}_{G^c}|_A \otimes_A s^*\mathcal{I}_{H^c}|_A.$$

Note that the restrictions of the $s^*\mathcal{I}_{F^c}$ for $F \notin \{G, H\}$ are canonically trivial on this locus, so we can ignore them.

Considering the condition (2), note that the map Φ is uniquely determined on the smooth locus by the condition on the restriction to the $C_u \setminus e(u, H)$. So the only question is whether these maps on the smooth locus can be patched together over the nodes. The condition (2) is thus equivalent to the existence of an A -module map $\Psi: M \rightarrow A$ satisfying the following two conditions:

- after inverting x , the map Ψ sends $\frac{X}{x} \otimes L_e$ to $F_H(e)$ *i.e. it gives the correct map on the u -component*;
- after inverting y , the map Ψ sends $L_e \otimes \frac{Y}{y}$ to $F_G(e)$ *i.e. it gives the correct map on the v -component*.

We now move to proving the lemma. Suppose first that (1) holds. Then we construct a map Ψ as above by sending

- $X \otimes Y$ to $F_G(e) = F_H(e)$;
- $L_e \otimes Y$ to $yF_G(e)$;
- $X \otimes L_e$ to $xF_H(e)$;
- $B_i \otimes Y$ to $yF_G(1 \otimes \cdots \otimes l_i \otimes \cdots \otimes 1)$;
- $X \otimes C_j$ to $xF_H(1 \otimes \cdots \otimes l_j \otimes \cdots \otimes 1)$;
- $B_i \otimes C_j$ to 0.

It is straightforward to verify that this map is well-defined.

Conversely, suppose (2) holds. Then we have a map Ψ as above. After inverting y we find that

$$\Psi_y(X \otimes Y) = \Psi_y(yX \otimes \frac{Y}{y}) = \Psi_y(L_e \otimes \frac{Y}{y}) = F_G(e),$$

and after inverting x we find

$$\Psi_x(X \otimes Y) = \Psi_x(\frac{X}{x} \otimes xY) = \Psi_x(\frac{X}{x} \otimes L_e) = F_H(e)$$

which implies that $F_H(e) = F_G(e)$. □

Lemma 9.5. *With Υ as above, the following are equivalent:*

1. *There exists $(t_G)_{(v,G) \in \pi(\Upsilon)} \in (\mathcal{O}_S^\times)^{\pi(\Upsilon)}$ such that for all pairs of relative components $(u, H), (v, G)$ we have that $t_G F_G$ matches up with $t_H F_H$ (where the multiplication is just composition with the obvious scaling);*
2. *There exists an isomorphism $\bigotimes_{(v,G) \in \pi(\Upsilon)} \mathcal{F}_G \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{O}_C$.*

Proof. Suppose (1) holds. Then (2) follows immediately from (1 \implies 2) of lemma 9.4.

Conversely, suppose (2) holds. Then define F'_G for $(v, G) \in \pi(\Upsilon)$ by composing $\otimes q_G$ with the given isomorphism — these match up by (2 \implies 1) of lemma 9.4. Then for each (v, G) , the maps F_G and F'_G are related by an automorphism of \mathcal{O}_S acting on $\mathcal{O}_{C_v \setminus e(v,G)}$, and we define t_G such that multiplication by it is that automorphism. \square

Let $(v, G) \in \pi(\Upsilon)$ be a relative component, and define $F_G(e)$ for $e \in e(v, G)$ as above - this depends on the choice of trivialisation f_G . If we had chosen a different trivialisation (say f'_G) then this would differ from f_G by multiplication by a unit in $R = \mathcal{O}_S(S)$, and so the resulting $F_G(e)$ would differ by the same scalar. As such, the free rank 1 R -submodule of $\bigoplus_{e \in e(v,G)} R$ spanned by $(F_G(e))_{e \in e(v,G)}$ is independent of the choice of f_G , and we denote it by L_G .

Since we have chosen generators for the labels of edges in \mathfrak{U}_S , we obtain a canonical identification of R -modules $s^* \mathcal{J}_G \xrightarrow{\sim} \bigoplus_{e \in e(v,G)} R$. The later module has a canonical basis and is thus naturally isomorphic to its dual. In this way we obtain an identification between $\bigoplus_{e \in e(v,G)} R$ and the dual of $s^* \mathcal{J}_G$ (here by ‘dual’ of an R -module N we mean $\text{Hom}(N, R)$ as an R -module, and we write it N^\vee). This construction feels very ad-hoc, but really it was the choice of the generators l_e that was ad-hoc. The construction is justified by the next lemma.

Lemma 9.6. *Let u be a vertex in G^c . Applying $- \mapsto \text{Hom}_{R\text{-mod}}(-, R)$ to the exact sequence*

$$0 \rightarrow \mathbb{K}_G \rightarrow s^* J_G \rightarrow \sigma_u^* \mathcal{F}_G \rightarrow 0$$

yields an exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow (\sigma_u^* \mathcal{F}_G)^\vee \rightarrow \bigoplus_{e \in e(v,G)} R \rightarrow \mathbb{K}_G^\vee \rightarrow 0,$$

and the submodule $(\sigma_u^ \mathcal{F}_G)^\vee \rightarrow \bigoplus_{e \in e(v,G)} R$ is exactly the submodule L_G defined above.*

Proof. Each term in the first sequence is free as an R -module, and so dualising preserves exactness. The second assertion is a straightforward computation. \square

We temporarily need a slightly more relaxed notion of Fitting compatibility than that provided by definition 7.13; later we will use it to recover the full form of Fitting compatibility.

Definition 9.7. Suppose we are given a subset of a vertex-enrichment datum which contains all relative components in $\pi(\Upsilon)$. We say this collection of data is Υ -Fitting-compatible if the closed immersion

$$\mathrm{Supp}_{\mathrm{Fitt}} \frac{s^* \mathcal{J}_\Upsilon}{\sum_{(v,G) \in \pi(\Upsilon)} \mathbb{K}_G} \rightarrow S \quad (9.1.1)$$

be an isomorphism.

Lemma 9.8. *With Υ as above, the following are equivalent:*

1. *There exists $(t_G)_{(v,G) \in \pi(\Upsilon)} \in (\mathcal{O}_S^\times)^{\pi(\Upsilon)}$ such that for all pairs of relative components $(u, H), (v, G)$ we have that $t_G F_G$ matches up with $t_H F_H$ (where the multiplication is just composition with the obvious scaling).*
2. *The collection of quotients $(q_G: s^* \mathcal{I}_{G^c} \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{F}_G)_{(v,G)}$ is Υ -Fitting-compatible.*

Proof. In this proof, when we write $\sum \mathbb{K}_G$ the sum runs over $(v, G) \in \pi(\Upsilon)$, and we write $F_v = F_G$ if $(v, G) \in \pi(\Upsilon)$ (note v determines G and vice versa by circuit connectivity of Υ). Using lemma 9.6 we can construct a presentation for $\frac{s^* \mathcal{J}_\Upsilon}{\sum \mathbb{K}_G}$ using the $F_G(e)$; we find

$$\frac{s^* \mathcal{J}_\Upsilon}{\sum \mathbb{K}_G} = \frac{\bigoplus_{v \in V(\Upsilon)} R\langle V \rangle}{\langle F_u(e)V - F_v(e)U \text{ for } e: u - v \text{ in } \Upsilon \rangle}.$$

Now pick any $v_0 \in V(\Upsilon)$ as a basepoint. If γ is a directed path in Υ from v_0 back to v_0 , then when we write

$$\prod_{\gamma} \frac{F_u(e)}{F_v(e)}$$

we mean the product over all edges $u \xrightarrow{e} v$ in γ . Then we see that

$$\frac{s^* \mathcal{J}_\Upsilon}{\sum \mathbb{K}_G} = \frac{R\langle V_0 \rangle}{\langle V_0 \left(1 - \prod_{\gamma} \frac{F_u(e)}{F_v(e)} \right) : \gamma \text{ from } v_0 \text{ to } v_0 \rangle}$$

(in particular we see that $\frac{s^* \mathcal{J}_\Upsilon}{\sum \mathbb{K}_G}$ is cyclic as an R -module). Then, from the definition of the Fitting ideal (definition 2.6), the canonical closed immersion $\mathrm{Supp}_{\mathrm{Fitt}} \frac{s^* \mathcal{J}_\Upsilon}{\sum \mathbb{K}_G} \rightarrow S$ is an isomorphism if and only if for every path γ as above we have $1 - \prod_{\gamma} \frac{F_u(e)}{F_v(e)} = 0$, which (by a simple combinatorial argument) is equivalent to the ‘matching up condition’ (1). \square

Proof of (1) of theorem 9.2. By lemma 9.8, there exists a scaling of the trivialisations which matches up (in the notation of the following two paragraphs), and then by lemma 9.5 the invertible vertex-enrichment datum is \otimes -compatible. \square

Finally, we show how to reconstruct a compactified enriched structure from a Fitting-compatible vertex enrichment datum.

Lemma 9.9. *If H is a hemisphere and E_H the set of separating edges for H , then there is a unique circuit-connected component Υ containing E_H .*

Proof. Given two separating edges e, e' with endpoints $u, u' \in H$ and $v, v' \in H^c$, choose a minimal path from u to u' in H and from v to v' in H^c , then the union of these paths with e and e' is a circuit $\gamma_{e,e'}$. If two circuit-connected subgraphs have an edge in common then their union is also circuit connected (by lemma 2.5), hence the union of all the $\gamma_{e,e'}$ as e and e' vary over separating edges is itself circuit-connected. Again by lemma 2.5, it is therefore contained in a (unique) circuit-connected component. \square

If we have a Fitting-compatible vertex enrichment datum, we need a way to extend it so an enrichment datum, i.e. to construct an (invertible) quotient for every hemisphere, while preserving compatibility. The next lemma shows that we can do this in a unique way, by constructing the kernel of the quotient map.

Lemma 9.10. *Suppose $(q_G: s^*\mathcal{I}_{G^c} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_G)_{(v,G)}$ is a Fitting-compatible invertible vertex enrichment datum. Let H be a hemisphere of Γ . Let Υ be the unique circuit-connected component of Γ which contains all separating edges of H . Then there exists a unique short exact sequence*

$$0 \rightarrow \mathbb{K}_H \rightarrow s^*\mathcal{J}_H \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_S(S) \rightarrow 0$$

so that the natural map

$$\frac{s^*\mathcal{J}_\Upsilon}{\sum_{(v,G) \in \pi(\Upsilon)} \mathbb{K}_G} \rightarrow \frac{s^*\mathcal{J}_\Upsilon}{(\sum_{(v,G) \in \pi(\Upsilon)} \mathbb{K}_G) + \mathbb{K}_H}$$

is an isomorphism. Moreover the corresponding quotient of $s^*\mathcal{I}_{H^c}$ is invertible (under the correspondance of lemma 8.1).

Note that in this argument it only matters that the labels of edges in Υ vanish on S - this will be important in lemma 9.13.

Proof. Noting above that $s^* \mathcal{J}_\Upsilon / \sum_{(v,G) \in \pi(\Upsilon)} \mathbb{K}_G$ is cyclic, the Υ -Fitting-compatibility condition implies that $s^* \mathcal{J}_\Upsilon / \sum_{(v,G) \in \pi(\Upsilon)} \mathbb{K}_G \cong \mathcal{O}_S(S) =: R$. Then we have a natural map

$$\varphi: s^* \mathcal{J}_H \rightarrow \frac{s^* \mathcal{J}_\Upsilon}{\sum_{(v,G) \in \pi(\Upsilon)} \mathbb{K}_G} \cong R,$$

and we see from the presentations in the proof of lemma 9.8 that it is a surjection, hence the kernel \mathbb{K}_φ is free of rank $\#e(H, H^c) - 1$ as an R -module.

In order for the compatibility to hold we must choose \mathbb{K}_H to be contained in \mathbb{K}_φ , and we must have that \mathbb{K}_H is free of rank $\#e(H, H^c) - 1$ as an R -module. Since also the cokernel of $\mathbb{K}_H \rightarrow s^* \mathcal{J}_H$ is free of rank 1 we see that the only option is to have $\mathbb{K}_H = \mathbb{K}_\varphi$.

It remains to check the invertibility of the corresponding quotient of $s^* \mathcal{I}_{H^c}$. If we construct $F_H(e) \in R$ for $e \in \Upsilon$ in an analogous fashion to the construction of the $F_G(e)$ for (v, G) relative components as above, then invertibility is equivalent to all the $F_H(e)$ being units in R . Perhaps the nicest way to see that they are indeed units is to give a direct recipe to build $F_H(e)$ out of the $F_G(e)$. First, scale the $F_G(e)$ so that they match up (cf. (2) of lemma 9.5). Then if $e: u - v$ is an edge in Υ with $v \in H$ and $u \in H^c$, then we define $F_H(e) = F_v(e) = F_u(e)$. That the $F_H(e)$ so defined are in R^\times is immediate. A small calculation is then required to check that (under the duality as in lemma 9.6) these $F_H(e)$ really correspond to the \mathbb{K}_H defined above, yielding the invertibility. \square

Lemma 9.11. *Let \mathfrak{E} be an invertible enrichment datum which is Υ -Fitting-compatible for every circuit-connected component Υ . Then \mathfrak{E} is Fitting-compatible.*

Proof. This is immediate by combining the following two claims with part (4) of lemma 2.7.

Claim 1: Let Υ be a circuit-connected component, and $\Upsilon_0 \subseteq \Upsilon$ a non-empty subset. Then natural map $s^* \mathcal{J}_{\Upsilon_0} \rightarrow s^* \mathcal{J}_\Upsilon$ induces a surjection

$$\frac{s^* \mathcal{J}_{\Upsilon_0}}{\sum_{e(H, H^c) \subseteq \Upsilon_0} \mathbb{K}_H} \rightarrow \frac{s^* \mathcal{J}_\Upsilon}{\sum_{e(H, H^c) \subseteq \Upsilon} \mathbb{K}_H}.$$

Proof of claim 1: That there is an induced map is clear since the \mathbb{K}_H we consider for Υ_0 are a subset of the ones we consider for Υ . The surjectivity follows from the presentation of $\frac{s^* \mathcal{J}_\Upsilon}{\sum_H \mathbb{K}_H}$ given in the proof of lemma 9.8. This concludes the proof of claim 1.

Claim 2: Let Υ, Υ' be two distinct (hence having no common edges) circuit-connected components. Let $\Upsilon_0 \subseteq \Upsilon$ and $\Upsilon'_0 \subseteq \Upsilon'$. Then the natural isomorphism $s^* \mathcal{J}_{\Upsilon_0} \oplus s^* \mathcal{J}_{\Upsilon'_0} \rightarrow s^* \mathcal{J}_{\Upsilon_0 \cup \Upsilon'_0}$ induces an isomorphism

$$\frac{s^* \mathcal{J}_{\Upsilon_0}}{\sum_{e(H, H^c) \subseteq \Upsilon_0} \mathbb{K}_H} \oplus \frac{s^* \mathcal{J}_{\Upsilon'_0}}{\sum_{e(H, H^c) \subseteq \Upsilon'_0} \mathbb{K}_H} \xrightarrow{\sim} \frac{s^* \mathcal{J}_{\Upsilon_0 \cup \Upsilon'_0}}{\sum_{e(H, H^c) \subseteq \Upsilon_0 \cup \Upsilon'_0} \mathbb{K}_H}.$$

Proof of claim 2: Because Υ_0 and Υ'_0 are contained in distinct circuit-connected components, the \mathbb{K}_H appearing for $\Upsilon_0 \cup \Upsilon'_0$ are exactly the union of those appearing for Υ_0 and those appearing for Υ'_0 . This concludes the proof of the second claim, and thus the lemma. \square

Proof of (2) of theorem 9.2. If we start with an enriched structure, we immediately have an invertible vertex enrichment datum (they consist of the same data). By lemma 9.5 and lemma 9.8 the invertible vertex enrichment datum is Υ -Fitting-compatible for every circuit-connected component Υ . Then by lemma 9.10 there is a unique way to extend it to an invertible enrichment datum which is Υ -Fitting-compatible for every circuit-connected component Υ . Finally by lemma 9.11 this invertible enrichment datum is actually compatible. \square

9.2 Integral base schemes

We adopt situation 7.5. In this section we will prove the analogue of theorem 9.2 in the case where S is integral. First, two lemmas which hold without restriction on S :

Lemma 9.12. *Assume that there exists an invertible enrichment datum on C/S . Then C/S is 1-aligned.*

Proof. This needs only a trivial modification of the proof of lemma 2.38 — the proof of the latter never used the condition that the tensor product of the invertible sheaves be trivial, only the existence of an invertible quotient of $s^*\mathcal{I}_{H^c}$. \square

Lemma 9.13. *Suppose we are given a subset of an enrichment datum which contains a vertex enrichment datum. Fix a hemisphere H , and suppose all labels of all separating edges of H vanish on S . All separating edges of H are contained in some circuit-connected-component, say Υ . Suppose that our given subset of an enrichment datum is Υ -Fitting-compatible. Then there is a unique invertible quotient of $s^*\mathcal{I}_{H^c}$ which is Υ -Fitting-compatible with all the other given quotients.*

Proof. This is a slight generalisation of lemma 9.10, and the same proof works. The main difference is that here we only assume the labels of edges in Υ vanish on S (rather than all edges as in lemma 9.10), but this is not important for the proof. \square

Corollary 9.14 (c.f. theorem 9.2). *Suppose we are in situation 7.5. Suppose moreover that S is reduced. Then*

1. *If we start with a compatible invertible enrichment datum \mathfrak{E} (i.e. an invertible compactified enriched structure) then the invertible Fitting-compatible vertex-enriched structure $\mathfrak{E}_{\text{vert}}$ obtained by forgetting extra quotients is \otimes -compatible;*

2. Suppose also that every connected component of S is irreducible. Then the resulting functor from invertible compactified enriched structures to enriched structures is an equivalence.

Proof. (1): Suppose that C/S is as in the statement and that we are given a compatible invertible enrichment datum. We extract a vertex-enrichment datum $(q_{v,G}: s^*\mathcal{I}_{G^c} \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{F}_{v,G})_{v,G}$, and consider the line bundle $\bigotimes \mathcal{F}_{v,G}$. The locus in S where this bundle is trivial on the fibres is a closed subscheme of S and contains all points of S by theorem 9.2 (applied in the case when the base is a point), hence is equal to S since S is reduced.

(2): Unlike for (1) we cannot quite deduce this formally from the case over a field. Note that both sets are empty if C/S is not 1-aligned by lemma 9.12, so we may assume that C/S is 1-aligned. Fix a hemisphere H of Γ . Let $z: Z_H \rightarrow S$ be the closed subscheme where all the labels of separating edges of H vanish. We consider two cases:

Case 1: The map z is a surjection. Then we are essentially in the case we considered before (all relevant labels vanishing on S), and we are done by lemma 9.13.

Case 2: The map z is not a surjection. By alignment, Z_H is cut out by monogenic ideal, and since z is not a surjection we see that Z_H is a Cartier divisor in S (i.e. cut out by a regular element). Then $s^*\mathcal{I}_{H^c}$ is invertible, so we take $K_H = 0$ and compatibility is clear. \square

9.3 Deducing the general case

Recall that \mathcal{E}/\mathfrak{M} is the stack of enriched structures, and write $\overline{\mathcal{E}}^{inv}/\mathfrak{M}$ for the stack of invertible compactified enriched structures - this is evidently an open substack of the stack $\overline{\mathcal{E}}$ of compactified enriched structures. Since \mathcal{E} is regular (corollary 5.10) we know by corollary 9.14 that $\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{E}) = \overline{\mathcal{E}}^{inv}(\mathcal{E})$, and the former contains the identity, so we obtain a map $\Psi: \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{E}}^{inv}$.

Theorem 9.15. *The map $\Psi: \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{E}}^{inv}$ is an isomorphism.*

Proof. If $m \in \mathfrak{M}$ is a point then the map $\Psi_m: \mathcal{E}_m \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{E}}_m^{inv}$ is an isomorphism by theorem 9.2. In particular, Ψ is a bijection on points.

We may check the theorem after base-change to a regular irreducible scheme $M \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}$, with the property that the pullback of the locus of smooth curves is dense in M . Then \mathcal{E}_M is irreducible, so the same holds for $\overline{\mathcal{E}}_M^{inv}$.

If $M^0 \subseteq M$ denotes the (dense open) locus of smooth curves, then $\mathcal{E}_M \rightarrow M$ is an isomorphism over M^0 , and the same is true for $\overline{\mathcal{E}}_M^{inv} \rightarrow M$. Moreover the pullback of M^0 to \mathcal{E}_M is dense in \mathcal{E}_M , so its image in $\overline{\mathcal{E}}_M^{inv}$ is dense there also. Thus

we see that the map Ψ_M is a birational map of integral schemes, and that \mathcal{E}_M and $\overline{\mathcal{E}}_M^{inv}$ have the same dimension.

If p is a point of \mathcal{E} lying over a point $m \in M$, then by theorem 9.2 we have an isomorphism of tangent spaces

$$T_p \mathcal{E}_m \xrightarrow{\sim} T_{\Psi(p)} \overline{\mathcal{E}}_m^{inv}.$$

The dimension of the former (and hence the latter) tangent space is computed in proposition 5.8. Moreover, the image in $T_m M$ of $T_{\Psi(p)} \overline{\mathcal{E}}_m^{inv}$ satisfies the same upper bound as that obtained for $T_p \mathcal{E}$ in lemma 5.5, since $\overline{\mathcal{E}}^{inv} \rightarrow M$ is 1-aligned by lemma 9.12. Thus repeating the elementary dimension computation of proposition 5.8 (and using that \mathcal{E}_M and $\overline{\mathcal{E}}_M^{inv}$ are irreducible schemes of the same dimension) we see that $\overline{\mathcal{E}}_M^{inv}$ is regular.

Thus we see that Ψ_M is a birational bijection between regular schemes, so by [Sta13, Lemma 0AB1] it is an isomorphism. \square

A Defining sheaves on a base for a Grothendieck topology

This appendix contains the abstract results which allow us to define a sheaf by specifying its values on a full subcategory.

Definition A.1 (Sheaf with respect to a coverage). Let \mathcal{C} be a category. A *coverage* K on \mathcal{C} is an assignment $A \mapsto K(A)$ for each object A of \mathcal{C} , where $K(A)$ is a collection of families of morphisms to A , such that if $\{f_i: A_i \rightarrow A\} \in K(A)$ and $g: A' \rightarrow A$ is any morphism in \mathcal{C} , then there is a family $\{f'_j: A'_j \rightarrow A'\} \in K(A')$ such that each $g \circ f'_j: A'_j \rightarrow A$ factors via some f_i .

The families $\{f_i: A_i \rightarrow A\} \in K(A)$ are called *covering families* and the pair (\mathcal{C}, K) is called a *site*. A *sheaf* on (\mathcal{C}, K) is a presheaf $\mathcal{F}: \mathcal{C}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ such that for each covering family $\{A_i \rightarrow A\}$ in K , the restriction map $\mathcal{F}(A) \rightarrow \prod_i \mathcal{F}(A_i)$ is injective with image the set of those tuples $(a_i)_i$ such that, for every commutative square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} B & \longrightarrow & A_i \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ A_j & \longrightarrow & A, \end{array}$$

the common restrictions of a_i and a_j to B agree. The category of presheaves on \mathcal{C} will be denoted below as $\mathbf{PSh}(\mathcal{C})$, and given a coverage K on \mathcal{C} , we denote by $\mathbf{Sh}(\mathcal{C}, K)$ the full subcategory of $\mathbf{PSh}(\mathcal{C})$ consisting of sheaves on (\mathcal{C}, K) .

Definition A.2 (Grothendieck pretopology). If \mathcal{C} has pullbacks, we say that a coverage on \mathcal{C} is a *Grothendieck pretopology* if it satisfies the following three extra conditions:

1. (Compatibility with pullback.) For each covering family $\{A_i \rightarrow A\}$ and each morphism $A' \rightarrow A$ in \mathcal{C} , the pullback family $\{A' \times_A A_i \rightarrow A'\}$ is also a covering family.
2. (Reflexivity.) For each object A of \mathcal{C} , the singleton family $\{\text{id}_A: A \rightarrow A\}$ is a covering family.
3. (Transitivity.) If $\{A_i \rightarrow A\}$ is a covering family, and for each i we have another covering family $\{A_{ij} \rightarrow A_i\}$, then the family of all composites $\{A_{ij} \rightarrow A_i \rightarrow A\}$ is also a covering family.

If K is a Grothendieck pretopology on \mathcal{C} , then a presheaf $\mathcal{F}: \mathcal{C}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ is in $\mathbf{Sh}(\mathcal{C}, K)$ if and only if for each covering family $\{A_i \rightarrow A\}$ in K , the usual diagram

$$\mathcal{F}(A) \rightarrow \prod_i \mathcal{F}(A_i) \rightrightarrows \prod_{i,j} \mathcal{F}(A_i \times_A A_j)$$

is an equalizer.

Definition A.3 (Base for a coverage). Let \mathcal{C} be a category equipped with a coverage, and let \mathcal{B} be a full subcategory of \mathcal{C} . We say \mathcal{B} is a *base for \mathcal{C}* if every object in \mathcal{C} admits a cover by objects in \mathcal{B} .

Lemma A.4 (Comparison Lemma). *Let \mathcal{C} be a category with pullbacks, and let K be a Grothendieck pretopology on \mathcal{C} making every representable presheaf a sheaf (i.e. the topology is subcanonical). Let \mathcal{B} be a base for (\mathcal{C}, K) . Then*

1. *The assignment $K|_{\mathcal{B}}: A \mapsto K(A) \cap \mathcal{B}$, sending an object of \mathcal{B} to the collection of covers of it by more objects of \mathcal{B} , is a coverage on \mathcal{B} .*
2. *Let \mathcal{F} be a presheaf on \mathcal{B} . Then \mathcal{F} is a sheaf on $(\mathcal{B}, K|_{\mathcal{B}})$ if and only if for every cover $\{A_i \rightarrow A\}_{i \in I}$ in $K|_{\mathcal{B}}$, and for every family of covers $\{A_{ijk} \rightarrow A_i \times_A A_j\}_{k \in I_{ij}}$ of the fibered products $A_i \times_A A_j \in \mathcal{C}$ by objects in \mathcal{B} , the diagram*

$$\mathcal{F}(A) \rightarrow \prod_{i \in I} \mathcal{F}(A_i) \rightrightarrows \prod_{\substack{i,j \in I \\ k \in I_{ij}}} \mathcal{F}(A_{ijk}) \quad (\text{A.0.1})$$

is an equalizer.

3. *The restriction functor $\mathcal{F} \mapsto \mathcal{F}|_{\mathcal{B}}$ is an equivalence $\mathbf{Sh}(\mathcal{C}, K) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbf{Sh}(\mathcal{B}, K|_{\mathcal{B}})$.*

Thus a presheaf on \mathcal{B} extends (uniquely) to a sheaf on (\mathcal{C}, K) if and only if diagram (A.0.1) is an equalizer for all such A , A_i , and A_{ijk} .

Proof.

1. Let $\{A_i \rightarrow A\}_{i \in I}$ be a family in $K|_{\mathcal{B}}(A)$ and $g: A' \rightarrow A$ any morphism in \mathcal{B} . We must exhibit a covering of A' in $K|_{\mathcal{B}}$ such that each composite morphism to A factors via some $A_i \rightarrow A$.

First form the pullback family $\{A' \times_A A_i \rightarrow A'\}_{i \in I}$ in \mathcal{C} , and for each i choose a cover of $A' \times_A A_i$ by objects $\{A'_{ij}\}_{j \in I_i}$ of \mathcal{B} . Then because K is a Grothendieck pretopology, the family of all composites $\{A'_{ij} \rightarrow A' \otimes_A A_i \rightarrow A'\}_{i \in I, j \in I_i}$ is also in K , and in fact in $K|_{\mathcal{B}}$. Furthermore, each composite $A'_{ij} \rightarrow A' \rightarrow A$ factors canonically via $A_i \rightarrow A$, as desired. Thus $K|_{\mathcal{B}}$ is a coverage.

2. Let $\{A_i \rightarrow A\}_{i \in I}$ be a cover in $K|_{\mathcal{B}}$, and for each $i, j \in I$, let $\{A_{ijk} \rightarrow A_i \times_A A_j\}_{k \in I_{ij}}$ be a cover by objects in \mathcal{B} ; we must show that a tuple $(a_i)_i \in \prod_i \mathcal{F}(A_i)$ has the same two images in $\prod_{i,j,k} \mathcal{F}(A_{ijk})$ if and only if for every commutative square formed by an object $B \in \mathcal{B}$ with morphisms to some A_i and A_j , the two restrictions $a_i|_B$ and $a_j|_B$ agree. Then the sheaf condition for \mathcal{F} is exactly the same as diagram (A.0.1) being an equalizer.

The “if” direction is easy, since composing the map $A_{ijk} \rightarrow A_i \times_A A_j$ with the projections to A_i and A_j make the square with A commute. For the “only if” direction, let $(a_i)_i$ be a tuple such that for all $i, j \in I$ and $k \in I_{ij}$, we have $a_i|_{A_{ijk}} = a_j|_{A_{ijk}}$, and let $A_i \leftarrow B \rightarrow A_j$ be a span of objects in \mathcal{B} over A . We will show that $a_i|_B = a_j|_B$.

In \mathcal{C} , the maps $B \rightarrow A_i$ and $B \rightarrow A_j$ give a single morphism $B \rightarrow A_i \times_A A_j$, and we can therefore form the pullback covering family $\{B \times_{(A_i \times_A A_j)} A_{ijk} \rightarrow B\}_{k \in I_{ij}}$ in \mathcal{C} . For each $k \in I_{ij}$, let $\{B_{ijkl} \rightarrow B \times_{(A_i \times_A A_j)} A_{ijk}\}_{\ell \in I_{ijk}}$ be a cover of the fibered product in \mathcal{C} by objects of \mathcal{B} . Then by transitivity, $\{B_{ijkl} \rightarrow B\}_{k \in I_{ij}, \ell \in I_{ijk}}$ is a covering family in $K|_{\mathcal{B}}$. Thus $\mathcal{F}(B) \rightarrow \prod_{i,j,k,\ell} \mathcal{F}(B_{ijkl})$ is injective, so it suffices to show that the restrictions of a_i and a_j to each B_{ijkl} agree. But this is true, because the morphisms from B_{ijkl} to A_i and A_j factor through A_{ijk} , where we are assuming a_i and a_j agree.

3. For this part, we appeal to a similar result, Corollary A.4.3 in [MLM94]; this is why we have the subcanonicity hypothesis. All we need to do is translate their result in the sieve language into our covering family language; this amounts to checking that if S is a sieve on $B \in \mathcal{B}$ —i.e. a collection of morphisms to B closed under precomposition by any composable morphism in \mathcal{B} —then S contains a covering family in $K|_{\mathcal{B}}$ if and only if the collection

(S) of all morphisms to $B \in \mathcal{C}$ factoring via some morphism in S contains a covering family in K .

The “only if” direction is trivial: such a covering family in $K|_{\mathcal{B}}$ is also the desired covering family in K . Now suppose that (S) contains a K -covering family $\{A_i \rightarrow B\}_{i \in I} \subset \mathcal{C}$. This means that each $A_i \rightarrow B$ factors via some $B_i \rightarrow B$ in S . Now choose for each A_i a cover $\{B_{ij} \rightarrow A_i\}_{j \in I_i}$ by objects in \mathcal{B} . Then by transitivity and the sieve condition on S , the composite family $\{B_{ij} \rightarrow B\}_{i \in I, j \in I_i}$ is a covering family in $K|_{\mathcal{B}}$ contained in S , as desired. \square

Remark A.5. Lemma A.4(3) only says that a sheaf on \mathcal{B} extends uniquely (up to unique natural isomorphism) to a sheaf on \mathcal{C} , but in fact we can compute $\mathcal{F}(A)$ from $\mathcal{F}|_{\mathcal{B}}$ for any object $A \in \mathcal{C}$. First, choose covering families $\{A_i \rightarrow A\}_{i \in I}$ and $\{A_{ijk} \rightarrow A_i \times_A A_j\}_{k \in I_{ij}}$ with all A_i and A_{ijk} in \mathcal{B} . Then lemma A.4(2) tells us (by applying the case $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{C}$) that diagram (A.0.1) is an equalizer, and if $\mathcal{F}|_{\mathcal{B}}$ is known then this gives a way to calculate $\mathcal{F}(A)$.

Example A.6. As a simple example, we obtain the well-known fact that a presheaf on the category of schemes is a sheaf in the étale topology if and only if it is a Zariski sheaf and satisfies descent for each étale cover of one affine scheme by another. For if we apply lemma A.4 to the full subcategory \mathbf{Aff} of affine schemes, we find that sheaves on the big Zariski site correspond to presheaves on \mathbf{Aff} that satisfy the sheaf condition with respect to open covers. Sheaves on the big étale site correspond to those presheaves on \mathbf{Aff} that satisfy the sheaf condition with respect to open covers and étale surjections. Thus to check that a presheaf on the big étale site is a sheaf, it suffices to check that it is a Zariski sheaf (thus corresponding to a Zariski sheaf on \mathbf{Aff}) and satisfies descent for affine étale surjections (so that it corresponds to an étale sheaf on \mathbf{Aff}).

References

- [AK80] Allen Altman and Steven Kleiman. Compactifying the Picard scheme. *Adv. in Math.*, 35(1):50–112, 1980.
- [AP14] Alex Abreu and Marco Pacini. Enriched curves and their tropical counterpart. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.5308*, to appear in *Ann. Inst. Fourier*, 2014.
- [Cap08] Lucia Caporaso. Néron models and compactified Picard schemes over the moduli stack of stable curves. *Amer. J. Math.*, 130(1):1–47, 2008.
- [CMW12] Renzo Cavalieri, Steffen Marcus, and Jonathan Wise. Polynomial families of tautological classes on. *Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra*, 216(4):950–981, 2012.

- [DM69] Pierre Deligne and David Mumford. The irreducibility of the space of curves of given genus. *Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math.*, (36):75–109, 1969.
- [D’S79] Cyril D’Souza. Compactification of generalised Jacobians. *Proc. Indian Acad. Sci. Sect. A Math. Sci.*, 88(5):419–457, 1979.
- [Eis95] David Eisenbud. *Commutative algebra*, volume 150 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1995. With a view toward algebraic geometry.
- [EM02] Eduardo Esteves and Nivaldo Medeiros. Limit canonical systems on curves with two components. *Invent. Math.*, 149(2):267–338, 2002.
- [ES07] Eduardo Esteves and Parham Salehyan. Limit Weierstrass points on nodal reducible curves. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 359(10):5035–5056, 2007.
- [Est01] Eduardo Esteves. Compactifying the relative Jacobian over families of reduced curves. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 353(8):3045–3095 (electronic), 2001.
- [Fal96] Gerd Faltings. Moduli-stacks for bundles on semistable curves. *Math. Ann.*, 304(3):489–515, 1996.
- [Fer03] Daniel Ferrand. Conducteur, descente et pincement. *Bull. Soc. Math. France*, 131(4):553–585, 2003.
- [FGI⁺05] B. Fantechi, L. Göttsche, L. Illusie, S. L. Kleiman, N. Nitsure, and A. Vistoli. *Fundamental algebraic geometry*, volume 123 of *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2005. Grothendieck’s FGA explained.
- [FTT16] Edward Frenkel, Constantin Teleman, and A. J. Tolland. Gromov-Witten gauge theory. *Adv. Math.*, 288:201–239, 2016.
- [GZ14] Samuel Grushevsky and Dmitry Zakharov. The zero section of the universal semiabelian variety, and the double ramification cycle. *Duke Math J.*, 163(5):889–1070, 2014.
- [Hai13] Richard Hain. Normal functions and the geometry of moduli spaces of curves. In G. Farkas and I. Morrison, editors, *Handbook of Moduli, Volume I. Advanced Lectures in Mathematics, Volume XXIV*. International Press, Boston, 2013.

- [Hol14] David Holmes. A Néron model of the universal jacobian. <http://arxiv.org/abs/1412.2243>, 2014.
- [Hol16a] David Holmes. Néron models of jacobians over base schemes of dimension greater than 1. *To appear in J. Reine Angew. Math.*, <http://www.degruyter.com/view/j/crll.ahead-of-print/crelle-2016-0014>, 2016.
- [Hol16b] David Holmes. Quasi-compactness of Néron models, and an application to torsion points. *To appear in Manuscripta Math.*, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1604.01155>, 2016.
- [JPPZ16] F Janda, R Pandharipande, A Pixton, and D Zvonkine. Double ramification cycles on the moduli spaces of curves. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1602.04705*, 2016.
- [Liu02] Qing Liu. *Algebraic geometry and arithmetic curves*, volume 6 of *Oxford Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2002. Translated from the French by Reinie Ern e, Oxford Science Publications.
- [Mai98a] Laila Main . Moduli of enriched stable curves. *preprint*, 1998.
- [Mai98b] Laila Maino. *Moduli space of enriched stable curves*. PhD thesis, Harvard University, 1998.
- [MLM94] Saunders Mac Lane and Ieke Moerdijk. *Sheaves in geometry and logic*. Universitext. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1994. A first introduction to topos theory, Corrected reprint of the 1992 edition.
- [MM64] David Mumford and A. Mayer. Further comments on boundary points. *Unpublished lecture notes distributed at the Amer. Math. Soc. Cummmer Institute, Woods Hole*, 1964.
- [MW13] Steffen Marcus and Jonathan Wise. Stable maps to rational curves and the relative jacobian. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1310.5981*, 2013.
- [Ore14] Giulio Orecchia. Torsion free rank 1 sheaves on a semi-stable curve. *Master's thesis*, <https://www.math.leidenuniv.nl/scripties/MasterOrecchia.pdf>, 2014.
- [Oss14a] Brian Osserman. Dimension counts for limit linear series on curves not of compact type. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1410.5450*, 2014.

- [Oss14b] Brian Osserman. Limit linear series for curves not of compact type. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1406.6699*, 2014.
- [Sta13] The Stacks Project Authors. Stacks project. <http://stacks.math.columbia.edu>, 2013.