

COHERENT SYSTEMS AND BGN EXTENSIONS ON NODAL REDUCIBLE CURVES

SONIA BRIVIO AND FILIPPO F. FAVALE

ABSTRACT. Let (C, \underline{w}) be a polarized nodal reducible curve. In this paper we consider coherent systems of type (r, d, k) on C with $k < r$. We prove that the moduli spaces of (\underline{w}, α) -stable coherent systems stabilize for large α and we generalize several results known for the irreducible case when we chose a good polarization. Then, we study in details the components of moduli spaces containing coherent systems arising from locally free sheaves.

INTRODUCTION

In this paper we deal with coherent systems on nodal reducible curves. Coherent systems, on a smooth curve, are pairs (E, V) where E is a locally free sheaf and V is a subspace of global sections of E . Hence they can be seen as a generalisation of linear systems and they are closely related to higher rank Brill-Noether theory. They were introduced for a smooth curve in [BD91, Ber94, LP97] under different names and have been studied extensively by several authors (see [BGPMN03, BPGN97, New11] for relevant results and [Bra09] for a survey). For any real parameter α , the notion of α -stability has been introduced and it gives a family of coarse moduli spaces parametrizing coherent systems (E, V) of type (r, d, k) , i.e. with $\text{rk}(E) = r$, $\text{deg}(E) = d$ and $\dim V = k$. For comparison of different notions of stability in moduli theory see for instance [BB12].

Actually, for any type, there are only a finite number of distinct moduli spaces and the “terminal” one (which corresponds to the biggest possible choice for α for which the moduli space is not empty) can be described by using different approaches according to whether $k \geq r$ or $k < r$. In the first case, the description is related to Quot scheme of quotients of the trivial bundle of rank k (see [BGPMN03]) while in the second case the moduli space parametrizes extensions of a sheaf by the trivial bundle of rank k (see [BPGN97]). These extensions are said BGN extensions.

Coherent systems can be defined even on a singular reduced curve but in this case, in order to have compact moduli spaces, one needs to consider not only locally free sheaves but also torsion free sheaves. In particular, when C is a nodal curve, a coherent system is a pair (E, V) , where E is a depth one sheaf and $V \subseteq H^0(E)$. A notion of \underline{w} -rank and \underline{w} -degree can be defined on nodal curves once we fix a polarization \underline{w} on C . Hence, for any coherent system one can define the type and the notion of (\underline{w}, α) -stability, as well the \underline{w} -stability for any depth one sheaf. In [KN95], for any $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, it has been proved the existence of coarse moduli spaces $\mathcal{G}_{(C, \underline{w}), \alpha}(r, d, k)$ parametrizing families of (\underline{w}, α) -stable coherent systems of type (r, d, k) . For details, the reader can see Section 1.

Date: April 15, 2021.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification: Primary: 14H60; Secondary: 14F06, 14D20

Keywords: Coherent Systems, Nodal curves, Polarizations, Stability, Moduli spaces, Extensions

Both authors are partially supported by INdAM - GNSAGA.

Many results which hold in the smooth case (concerning, for example, dimension, irreducibility, values of the parameters for which these moduli spaces are empty and smoothness), have been extended to the case of irreducible nodal curves in [Bho09, Bho07]. The authors have begun studying coherent systems on reducible nodal curves of compact type in [BF20b], considering coherent systems (E, V) with $k \geq r$ and assuming that the rank of the restriction of E to each component of the curve is the same. In this paper we consider also curves which are not of compact type and we deal with the case $k < r$.

Let (C, \underline{w}) be a polarized nodal curve with smooth irreducible components of genus at least 2. As in the case of smooth or irreducible nodal curves, we prove that for any type (r, d, k) with $k < r$ there are only finitely many distinct moduli spaces (see Lemma 3.1 and Proposition 3.2) so there is a “terminal” moduli space which we denote by $\mathcal{G}_{(C, \underline{w}), L}(r, d, k)$. In order to describe this moduli space we generalize the notion of BGN extensions to nodal reducible curves (see Section 2). Proceeding as in the smooth case, more technicalities are involved as the curve is reducible, depending also on the chosen polarization and the behaviour of these moduli spaces seems very wild. The situation became a little bit better if one chooses a polarization which is *good*. This class of polarizations was introduced by the authors in [BF20c] by observing that depth one sheaves on nodal curves equipped with good polarizations reflect a lot of properties that hold for vector bundles on smooth curves. For curves of compact type, good polarizations are exactly those for which \mathcal{O}_C is \underline{w} -stable (in general, \mathcal{O}_C is not even \underline{w} -semistable!). The definition of good polarization on a nodal curve is rather technical so we refer to the preliminaries in Section 1.

In Section 3, by fixing a good polarization \underline{w} on a nodal curve C we are able to describe (in analogy to the smooth case) coherent systems of the moduli space $\mathcal{G}_{(C, \underline{w}), L}(r, d, k)$ as BGN extensions of depth one sheaves which are \underline{w} -semistable (see Theorem 3.10 and Theorem 3.11).

In the last section (i.e. Section 4) we analyze in details the moduli space $\mathcal{G}_{(C, \underline{w}), L}(r \cdot \underline{1}, d, k)$ parametrizing coherent systems (E, V) where the restriction of E to any component has rank r . We are interested in these moduli spaces as they contain coherent systems arising from locally free sheaves. For any good polarization \underline{w} on a nodal curve, we give a necessary and sufficient condition for emptiness of $\mathcal{G}_{(C, \underline{w}), L}(r \cdot \underline{1}, d, k)$. Moreover, we give a description of all irreducible components containing coherent systems (E, V) with E locally free, generalizing the picture of the situation in the case of smooth curves. Such components are birational to Grassmannian fibrations over irreducible components of the moduli space of \underline{w} -semistable depth one sheaves whose \underline{w} -rank and \underline{w} -degree are $(r - k)$ and d respectively (see Theorem 4.1). Finally, we investigate how coherent systems restrict to irreducible components of the curve C (see Corollary 4.5).

1. TECHNICAL RESULTS AND PRELIMINARIES

In this section we recall some definitions and we state relevant technical results about nodal curves, depth one sheaves on them and coherent systems.

1.1. Nodal curves. Let C be a connected reduced nodal curve over the complex field (i.e. having only ordinary double points as singularities). We will denote by γ the number of irreducible components and δ the number of nodes of C . We will assume that each irreducible component C_i is a smooth curve of genus $g_i \geq 2$. For the theory of nodal curves see [ACG11, Ch X]. We will denote by

$$\nu: C^\nu = \bigsqcup_{i=1}^{\gamma} C_i \rightarrow C$$

the normalization map. From the exact sequence:

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_C \rightarrow \nu_* \nu^*(\mathcal{O}_C) \rightarrow \bigoplus_{p \in \text{Sing}(C)} \mathbb{C}_p \rightarrow 0,$$

we deduce that $\chi(\mathcal{O}_C) = \sum_{i=1}^{\gamma} \chi(\mathcal{O}_{C_i}) - \delta$, and we obtain the *arithmetic genus* of C :

$$(1.1) \quad p_a(C) = \sum_{i=1}^{\gamma} g_i + \delta - \gamma + 1.$$

For any irreducible component C_i let C_i^c be the closure of $C \setminus C_i$. We set $\Delta_i = C_i \cdot C_i^c$, and we denote by δ_i its degree, i.e. the number of nodes of C on C_i . We recall that C can be embedded in a smooth projective surface S (see [AK79]) and this yields the exact sequence

$$(1.2) \quad 0 \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{C_i^c}(-\Delta_i) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_C \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{C_i} \rightarrow 0.$$

For more details on this sequence see [BF19]. Since C is a local complete intersection, Serre duality Theorem holds. There exists on C a dualizing sheaf ω_C , it is an invertible sheaf as C is Gorenstein. We recall that, for any $i = 1 \dots \gamma$, we have $\omega_C|_{C_i} = \omega_{C_i}(\Delta_i)$.

Finally, we recall some technical results. Let p be a node and denote by C_{i_1} and C_{i_2} the two components such that $p \in C_{i_1} \cap C_{i_2}$. Following the notations of [Ses82], chap. 8, we set:

$$\mathcal{O}_{x_{i_k}} = \mathcal{O}_{C_{i_k}, p}, \quad m_{x_{i_k}} = m_{C_{i_k}, p}, \quad \mathcal{O}_p = \mathcal{O}_{C, p} \quad m_p = m_{C, p}.$$

Then:

$$\mathcal{O}_p = \{(f, g) \in \mathcal{O}_{x_{i_1}} \oplus \mathcal{O}_{x_{i_2}} \mid f(p) = g(p)\}, \quad m_p = m_{x_{i_1}} \oplus m_{x_{i_2}}.$$

The isomorphisms $\mathcal{O}_{x_{i_k}} \simeq m_{x_{i_k}}$ obtained by sending $f \mapsto ft_{i_k}$, where t_{i_k} is a local coordinate on C_{i_k} at p , induce an isomorphism $\mathcal{O}_{x_{i_1}} \oplus \mathcal{O}_{x_{i_2}} \simeq m_p$. We have the following exact sequences of \mathcal{O}_p -moduli:

$$(1.3) \quad 0 \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_p \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{x_{i_1}} \oplus \mathcal{O}_{x_{i_2}} \rightarrow \mathbb{C} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{and} \quad 0 \rightarrow m_p \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_p \rightarrow \mathbb{C} \rightarrow 0.$$

Lemma 1.1. *In the above hypothesis we have:*

- (a) $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_p}(\mathcal{O}_{x_{i_k}}, \mathcal{O}_{x_{i_j}}) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } k \neq j \\ \mathcal{O}_{x_{i_j}} & \text{if } k = j \end{cases}$, $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_p}(\mathcal{O}_{x_{i_k}}, \mathcal{O}_p) \simeq t_{i_k} \cdot \mathcal{O}_{x_{i_k}} \simeq m_{x_{i_k}}$;
- (b) $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_p}(\mathbb{C}, \mathcal{O}_p) = \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_p}(\mathbb{C}, m_p) = \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_p}(\mathbb{C}, \mathcal{O}_{x_{i_k}}) = 0$;
- (c) $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{O}_p}^1(\mathbb{C}, \mathcal{O}_p) \simeq \mathbb{C}$, $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{O}_p}^1(m_p, \mathcal{O}_p) = \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{O}_p}^1(\mathcal{O}_{x_{i_k}}, \mathcal{O}_p) = 0$.

Proof. For (a) see [Ses82, Lemma 6, pag. 171]. (b) and (c) are obtained by applying $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_p}(-, \mathcal{O}_p)$ to the exact sequence 1.3. \square

Definition 1.2. *Let C be a nodal curve with γ irreducible components. A **polarization** on C is a vector $\underline{w} = (w_1, \dots, w_\gamma) \in \mathbb{Q}^\gamma$ such that*

$$(1.4) \quad 0 < w_i < 1 \quad \sum_{i=1}^{\gamma} w_i = 1.$$

*We will say that the pair (C, \underline{w}) is a **polarized curve**.*

1.2. Depth one sheaves on nodal curves. We recall the notion of depth one sheaves on nodal curves (see [Ses82] for details).

A coherent sheaf E on a reduced curve is said to be of *depth one* if for any $x \in \text{Supp}(E)$ the stalk E_x is an \mathcal{O}_x -module of depth one. For a nodal curve this is equivalent to say that E is *pure of dimension 1*, i.e. $\dim F = \dim \text{Supp}(F) = 1$ for every subsheaf F of E . Let C be a nodal curve with smooth irreducible components C_i . Using the notations introduced above, a coherent sheaf E on C is of depth one if the stalk of E at the node $p \in C_{i_1} \cap C_{i_2}$ is isomorphic to $\mathcal{O}_p^s \oplus \mathcal{O}_{x_{i_1}}^{a_1} \oplus \mathcal{O}_{x_{i_2}}^{a_2}$. In particular, any vector bundle on C is a sheaf of depth one and any subsheaf of a depth one sheaf is of depth one too.

Let E be a depth one sheaf on C . Its dual sheaf $E^* = \mathcal{H}om_{\mathcal{O}_C}(E, \mathcal{O}_C)$ is of depth one too and E is reflexive, i.e. $\mathcal{H}om_{\mathcal{O}_C}(E^*, \mathcal{O}_C) \simeq E$. In particular, Serre duality yields for any $q \geq 0$ the isomorphism $H^q(E)^* \simeq H^{1-q}(E^* \otimes \omega_C)$.

Lemma 1.3. *Let E be a depth one sheaf on C , then $\mathcal{E}xt^1(E, \mathcal{O}_C) = 0$.*

Proof. If $p \in C$ is a smooth point, then $E_p \simeq \mathcal{O}_p^r$ so we have $\text{Ext}^1(E_p, \mathcal{O}_p) = 0$. If $p \in C_{i_1} \cap C_{i_2}$, then $E_p \simeq \mathcal{O}_p^s \oplus \mathcal{O}_{x_{i_1}}^{a_1} \oplus \mathcal{O}_{x_{i_2}}^{a_2}$. By Lemma 1.1(c) we have $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{O}_p}^1(\mathcal{O}_{x_{i_k}}, \mathcal{O}_p) = \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{O}_p}^1(\mathcal{O}_p, \mathcal{O}_p) = 0$ so $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{O}_p}^1(E_p, \mathcal{O}_p) = 0$. \square

Let (C, \underline{w}) be a polarized nodal curve with γ smooth irreducible components C_i . Let E be a sheaf of depth one on C , we define the *restriction of E modulo torsion* on the component C_i as $E_i = E \otimes \mathcal{O}_{C_i} / \text{Torsion}$. We set $r_i = \text{rank}(E_i)$. We define the *multirank* of E , the *\underline{w} -rank* of E and the *\underline{w} -degree* of E respectively as

$$(1.5) \quad \underline{\text{rk}}(E) = (r_1, \dots, r_\gamma) \quad \text{rk}_{\underline{w}}(E) = \sum_{i=1}^{\gamma} w_i r_i \quad \text{deg}_{\underline{w}} E = \chi(E) - \text{rk}_{\underline{w}}(E) \chi(\mathcal{O}_C).$$

For brevity, we will denote by $\underline{1}$ the vector $(1, \dots, 1) \in \mathbb{Z}^\gamma$. Note that \underline{w} -rank and \underline{w} -degree are not necessary integers. When E is a vector bundle on C , i.e. it is locally isomorphic to \mathcal{O}_C^r , then $\text{rank}(E_i) = r \forall i$, the \underline{w} -rank of E is actually r and its multirank is $r \cdot \underline{1}$. Moreover the \underline{w} -degree of E is the sum of the degrees of E_i and, in particular, it is an integer too. In general, this is not the case. In [BF20c] the authors have introduced and studied the function $\Delta_{\underline{w}}(E) = \text{deg}_{\underline{w}}(E) - \sum_{i=1}^{\gamma} \text{deg}(E_i)$.

Lemma 1.4. *Let (C, \underline{w}) be a polarized nodal curve. Let E be a depth one sheaf on C , let E_i its restriction modulo torsion to C_i with $\text{rank}(E_i) = r_i$ and $\text{deg}(E_i) = d_i$. Then the following hold:*

- (a) $\Delta_{\underline{w}}(E) = \sum_{i=1}^{\gamma} r_i(1 - g_i - w_i \chi(\mathcal{O}_C)) - \sum_{j=1}^{\delta} s_{p_j}$, where s_{p_j} is the rank of the free part of the stalk of E at p_j ;
- (b) $\Delta_{\underline{w}}(E \otimes L) = \Delta_{\underline{w}}(E)$ for any L line bundle on C ;
- (c) if $r_i = r$ for any i , then $\Delta_{\underline{w}}(E) \geq 0$ and equality holds if and only if E is locally free;
- (d) let $w_m = \min\{w_i : i = 1, \dots, \gamma\}$ and $r_M = \max\{r_i : i = 1, \dots, \gamma\}$, we have

$$\Delta_{\underline{w}}(E) \geq -(r_M - \text{rk}_{\underline{w}}(E))(p_a(C) - 1) \geq -\left(\frac{1}{w_m} - 1\right) \text{rk}_{\underline{w}}(E)(p_a(C) - 1).$$

Proof. Statements (a), (b) and (c) have been proved in [BF20c, Lemma 2.4]. From (a) we get

$$\Delta_{\underline{w}}(E) = -\sum_{i=1}^{\gamma} r_i(g_i - 1) + \sum_{i=1}^{\gamma} w_i r_i (p_a(C) - 1) - \sum_{j=1}^{\delta} s_{p_j},$$

since $s_{p_j} \leq r_M$, $r_i \leq r_M$ and $g_i \geq 2$, we obtain

$$\Delta_{\underline{w}}(E) \geq -r_M \sum_{i=1}^{\gamma} (g_i - 1) + \operatorname{rk}_{\underline{w}}(E)(p_a(C) - 1) - \delta r_M \geq (\operatorname{rk}_{\underline{w}}(E) - r_M)(p_a(C) - 1).$$

For all j we have $r_j \leq \operatorname{rk}_{\underline{w}}(E)/w_m$, so $r_M \leq \operatorname{rk}_{\underline{w}}(E)/w_m$ and this proves (d). \square

We recall the definition of good polarization (see [BF20c]).

Definition 1.5. *A polarization \underline{w} on C is said **good** if $\Delta_{\underline{w}}(E) \geq 0$ for all depth one sheaves E on C and equality holds if and only if E is locally free.*

In [BF20c] the authors proved that good polarizations exist on any stable nodal curve C with $p_a(C) \geq 2$. If \underline{w} is good, then \mathcal{O}_C is \underline{w} -stable and the converse holds when C is a nodal curve of compact type (see [BF20c, Theorem 3.9]). It is also conjectured that this should hold for any nodal curve. The above lemma justifies the following definition:

Definition 1.6. *Let (C, \underline{w}) be a polarized nodal curve. We set*

$$\lambda_{\underline{w}} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \underline{w} \text{ is good} \\ \left(\frac{1}{w_m} - 1\right)(p_a(C) - 1) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Notice that $\lambda_{\underline{w}} \geq 0$ for all \underline{w} and, by Lemma 1.4, if E is a depth one sheaf on C we have $\Delta_{\underline{w}}(E) \geq -\lambda_{\underline{w}} \operatorname{rk}_{\underline{w}}(E)$.

We recall the notion of \underline{w} -semistability for depth one sheaves on a polarized nodal curve.

Definition 1.7. *A depth one sheaf E is said \underline{w} -(semi)stable if for any proper subsheaf F of E we have $\mu_{\underline{w}}(F) < \mu_{\underline{w}}(E)$ (resp. \leq), where $\mu_{\underline{w}}(E) = \deg_{\underline{w}}(E)/\operatorname{rk}_{\underline{w}}(E)$ is said \underline{w} -slope of E .*

For any $d \in \mathbb{Q}$ and $r \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0}$, there exists a coarse moduli space $\mathcal{U}_{(C, \underline{w})}(r, d)$ for families of \underline{w} -semistable depth one sheaves on C with prescribed \underline{w} -rank and \underline{w} -degree. It is a projective variety. Moreover, when we fix $(r_1, \dots, r_{\gamma}) \in \mathbb{N}^{\gamma}$, we obtain the moduli space $\mathcal{U}_{(C, \underline{w})}((r_1, \dots, r_{\gamma}), d)$ of classes of \underline{w} -semistable depth one sheaves with prescribed multirank. When we will consider the subscheme parametrizing \underline{w} -stable classes we will use the notation $\mathcal{U}_{(C, \underline{w})}^s(r, d)$ and $\mathcal{U}_{(C, \underline{w})}^s((r_1, \dots, r_{\gamma}), d)$. For details one can see [Ses82]. We will denote by $[F]$ the S -equivalence class of a \underline{w} -semistable sheaf in its moduli space. When F is \underline{w} -stable, $[F]$ is the isomorphism class of F . In this case, we will denote it simply by F .

When \underline{w} is a good polarization, we generalize to \underline{w} -semistable depth one sheaves a well known result which holds for semistable vector bundles on a smooth curve.

Lemma 1.8. *Let (C, \underline{w}) be a polarized nodal curve with \underline{w} good. Assume that E is a \underline{w} -semistable depth-one sheaf with $\deg_{\underline{w}}(E) = d > 0$. Then $h^0(E^*) = 0$.*

Proof. Assume that $h^0(E^*) \neq 0$. As $E^* = \operatorname{Hom}(E, \mathcal{O}_C)$, we have $\operatorname{Hom}(E, \mathcal{O}_C) \neq 0$ so there exists a non zero homomorphism $\varphi: E \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_C$. Denote by G the image of φ , so we have

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & & \varphi & & \\ & \curvearrowright & & \curvearrowleft & \\ E & \xrightarrow{\psi} & G & \hookrightarrow & \mathcal{O}_C. \end{array}$$

We will show that this implies $d \leq 0$ which contradicts our hypothesis. If $G = \mathcal{O}_C$ or ψ is an isomorphism, we conclude respectively by \underline{w} -semistability of E and by \underline{w} -stability of \mathcal{O}_C (which

holds since \underline{w} is good). Otherwise, we have that G is a depth one sheaf which is a proper subsheaf of \mathcal{O}_C and a proper quotient of E . Then we have

$$d/\mathrm{rk}_{\underline{w}}(E) = \mu_{\underline{w}}(E) \leq \mu_{\underline{w}}(G) < \mu_{\underline{w}}(\mathcal{O}_C) = 0$$

by \underline{w} -semistability of E and \underline{w} -stability of \mathcal{O}_C respectively. \square

We stress that the above result does not hold when \underline{w} is not good.

1.3. Coherent systems on nodal curves. Let (C, \underline{w}) be a polarized nodal curve. We will recall the notion of coherent systems on the curve C (see [KN95] for details).

Definition 1.9. *A coherent system on the curve C is given by a pair (E, V) , where E is a depth one sheaf on C and V is a subspace of $H^0(E)$.*

A *coherent subsystem* (F, U) of (E, V) is a coherent system which consists of a subsheaf $F \subseteq E$ and a subspace $U \subseteq V \cap H^0(F)$. We say that (F, U) is a *proper subsystem* if $(F, U) \neq (0, 0)$ and $(F, U) \neq (E, V)$. A coherent system (E, V) is said to be of *type* (r, d, k) if $\mathrm{rk}_{\underline{w}}(E) = r$, $\deg_{\underline{w}} E = d$ and $\dim V = k$; if the multirank of E is $\underline{\mathrm{rk}}(E) = (r_1, \dots, r_\gamma)$ then it is said to be of *multitype* $((r_1, \dots, r_\gamma), d, k)$.

Let (E, V) be a coherent system on C . Let C_i be a component of C , from the exact sequence (1.2), we obtain that the restriction map $E \rightarrow E \otimes \mathcal{O}_{C_i}$ is surjective. Then, the map $E \rightarrow E_i$ is also surjective and induces the map of global sections

$$\rho_i: H^0(E) \rightarrow H^0(E_i).$$

We define V_i as the image of V by the map ρ_i . We will call (E_i, V_i) the *restriction of (E, V) to the curve C_i* . A coherent system (E, V) is called *generated* if the evaluation map $ev_V: V \otimes \mathcal{O}_C \rightarrow E$ is surjective.

Lemma 1.10. *Let (E, V) be a generated coherent system on (C, \underline{w}) of type (r, d, k) . Then,*

- (a) $r \leq k$, (E_i, V_i) is generated and $\deg(E_i) \geq 0$;
- (b) if either \underline{w} is good or $\mathrm{rk}(E_i) = r$ for all $i = 1, \dots, \gamma$, then $d \geq 0$.

Proof. Since (E, V) is generated, the evaluation map $ev_V: V \otimes \mathcal{O}_C \rightarrow E$ is surjective. This implies $k \geq r$. By [BF20b, Lemma 3.3], each restriction (E_i, V_i) is generated too so $\deg(E_i) \geq 0$. (b) follows easily from Lemma 1.4 or the definition of good polarization as $\deg(E_i) \geq 0$ for all i . \square

Definition 1.11. *Let (E, V) be a coherent system on the curve C . Fix $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ and a polarization \underline{w} on C . We say that (E, V) is (\underline{w}, α) -(semi)stable if for any proper coherent subsystem (F, U) we have*

$$\mu_{\underline{w}, \alpha}(F, U) < \mu_{\underline{w}, \alpha}(E, V) \quad (\text{resp. } \leq)$$

where $\mu_{(\underline{w}, \alpha)}$ is the (\underline{w}, α) -slope, which is defined as

$$\mu_{\underline{w}, \alpha}(E, V) = \frac{\deg_{\underline{w}}(E)}{\mathrm{rk}_{\underline{w}}(E)} + \alpha \frac{k}{\mathrm{rk}_{\underline{w}}(E)} = \mu_{\underline{w}}(E) + \alpha \frac{k}{\mathrm{rk}_{\underline{w}}(E)}.$$

Fix (r, d, k) with $r, d \in \mathbb{R}$, $r > 0$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ positive. In [KN95] it is proved that there exists a projective scheme $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_{(C, \underline{w}), \alpha}(r, d, k)$ which is a coarse moduli space for families of (\underline{w}, α) -semistable coherent systems of type (r, d, k) on the polarized curve (C, \underline{w}) . Moreover, the open subscheme $\mathcal{G}_{(C, \underline{w}), \alpha}(r, d, k) \subset \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_{(C, \underline{w}), \alpha}(r, d, k)$, parametrizing (\underline{w}, α) -stable pairs, is a coarse moduli space for (\underline{w}, α) -stable coherent systems of type (r, d, k) . Finally, when we fix

$(r_1, \dots, r_\gamma) \in \mathbb{N}^\gamma$ we obtain the moduli space $\mathcal{G}_{(C, \underline{w}), \alpha}((r_1, \dots, r_\gamma), d, k)$ parametrizing (\underline{w}, α) -stable coherent systems (E, V) of multitype $((r_1, \dots, r_\gamma), d, k)$. For brevity, if (E, V) is a (\underline{w}, α) -stable coherent system, we denote by (E, V) also its isomorphism class in its moduli space.

In the last section we will focus on the moduli spaces $\mathcal{G}_{(C, \underline{w}), \alpha}(r \cdot \underline{1}, d, k)$. In particular, we will consider coherent systems (E, V) where E is locally free. For these points, we can extend a local smoothness condition, which holds when C is smooth or nodal irreducible (see [BGPMN03] and [Bho09]). We can define the Brill-Noether number

$$\beta_C(r, d, k) = r^2(p_a(C) - 1) + 1 - k(k - d + r(p_a(C) - 1)).$$

For any $(E, V) \in \mathcal{G}_{(C, \underline{w}), \alpha}(r \cdot \underline{1}, d, k)$ with E locally free, we can define the Petri map

$$\mu_{(E, V)} : V \otimes H^0(\omega_C \otimes E^*) \rightarrow H^0(\omega_C \otimes E \otimes E^*),$$

which is given by multiplication by global sections.

Proposition 1.12. *Let $(E, V) \in \mathcal{G}_{(C, \underline{w}), \alpha}(r \cdot \underline{1}, d, k)$, assume that E is locally free and that the evaluation map ev_V is injective. Then the Petri map $\mu_{(E, V)}$ is injective too and the moduli space $\mathcal{G}_{(C, \underline{w}), \alpha}(r \cdot \underline{1}, d, k)$ is a smooth at (E, V) with dimension $\beta_C(r, d, k)$.*

Proof. The result follows from [BF20b, Prop 2.7] once we prove that the Petri map $\mu_{(E, V)}$ is injective. As ev_V is injective and $E^* \otimes \omega_C$ is locally free, we have an exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow V \otimes E^* \otimes \omega_C \rightarrow E \otimes E^* \otimes \omega_C.$$

The induced map in cohomology is injective and it is $\mu_{(E, V)}$. \square

2. BGN EXTENSIONS ON NODAL REDUCIBLE CURVES

Let (C, \underline{w}) be a polarized nodal curve with γ irreducible smooth components C_i of genus $g_i \geq 2$ and δ nodes. In this section we generalize the notion of BGN extension defined in [BPGN97] to nodal reducible curves.

Definition 2.1. *Let r and d two positive rational numbers and k an integer such that $0 < k < r$. A BGN extension on C of type (r, d, k) is an extension*

$$0 \rightarrow V \otimes \mathcal{O}_C \rightarrow E \rightarrow F \rightarrow 0$$

such that

- V is a vector space of dimension k ;
- F is a depth one sheaf with $\mathrm{rk}_{\underline{w}}(F) = r - k$, $\mathrm{deg}_{\underline{w}}(F) = d$;
- let $\underline{e} = (\underline{e}_1, \dots, \underline{e}_k) \in \mathrm{Ext}^1(F, V \otimes \mathcal{O}_C) = V \otimes \mathrm{Ext}^1(F, \mathcal{O}_C) \simeq \mathrm{Ext}^1(F, \mathcal{O}_C)^{\oplus k}$ be the corresponding extension class, $\{\underline{e}_1, \dots, \underline{e}_k\}$ are linearly independent in $\mathrm{Ext}^1(F, \mathcal{O}_C)$.

Two BGN extensions are said to be *equivalent* if they are equivalent as extensions. A BGN extension does not depend on the choice of F in its isomorphism class.

In the sequel, we will be interested in BGN extensions arising from depth one sheaves F which are \underline{w} -semistable. Note that, when C is smooth, and F is semistable with $\mathrm{deg}(F) > 0$, then $h^0(F^*) = 0$. So this condition was required in the definition of BGN extensions given in [BPGN97]. This property does not always occur if C is reducible. Nevertheless, by Lemma 1.8, this holds when \underline{w} is a good polarization.

Proposition 2.2. *Consider a BGN extension*

$$\underline{e}: \quad 0 \rightarrow V \otimes \mathcal{O}_C \rightarrow E \rightarrow F \rightarrow 0$$

of a depth one sheaf F and denote by (r, d, k) its type. Then we have:

- (a) E is a depth one sheaf on C with $\text{rk}_{\underline{w}}(E) = r$ and $\text{deg}_{\underline{w}}(E) = d$. Moreover, E is locally free if and only if F is locally free.
- (b) The following sequence is also exact

$$\underline{e}^* : \quad 0 \rightarrow F^* \rightarrow E^* \rightarrow V^* \otimes \mathcal{O}_C \rightarrow 0.$$

- (c) All BGN extensions on C of F of type (r, d, k) are classified by $\text{Gr}(k, H^1(F^*)) \simeq \text{Gr}(k, H^0(F \otimes \omega_C)^*)$.

Proof. (a) It is enough to describe the stalk of E at nodes. If $p \in C_{i_1} \cap C_{i_2}$, the stalk F_p can be written as $\mathcal{O}_p^s \oplus \mathcal{O}_{x_{i_1}}^{a_1} \oplus \mathcal{O}_{x_{i_2}}^{a_2}$, with $s + a_j = r_{i_j}$. We have the exact sequence of \mathcal{O}_p -moduli

$$(2.1) \quad 0 \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_p^k \rightarrow E_p \rightarrow F_p \rightarrow 0.$$

By Lemma 1.3 we have $\text{Ext}^1(F_p, \mathcal{O}_p)^{\otimes k} = 0$ so $E_p \simeq F_p \oplus \mathcal{O}_p^k \simeq \mathcal{O}_p^{s+k} \oplus \mathcal{O}_{x_{i_1}}^{a_1} \oplus \mathcal{O}_{x_{i_2}}^{a_2}$, which proves (a).

(b) This follows from Lemma 1.3 by applying $\mathcal{H}om_{\mathcal{O}_C}(-, \mathcal{O}_C)$ to the exact sequence defining the BGN extension.

(c) All BGN extensions on C of F of type (r, d, k) are classified by linearly independent k -tuples of elements of $\text{Ext}^1(F, \mathcal{O}_C)$ modulo to the action of $\text{GL}(k)$. Hence, they are parametrized by the variety $\text{Gr}(k, \text{Ext}^1(F, \mathcal{O}_C))$. By Serre duality we have $\text{Ext}^1(F, \mathcal{O}_C) \simeq \text{Ext}^1(F \otimes \omega_C, \omega_C) \simeq H^0(F \otimes \omega_C)^* \simeq H^1(F^*)$. \square

Proposition 2.3. *Let (C, \underline{w}) be a polarized nodal curve. Let F be a locally free sheaf on C of rank $r - k$ and degree d . Let F_i be the restriction to the component C_i and $d_i = \text{deg}(F_i)$. If F_i is semistable, $d_i > 0$ and $0 < k \leq d_i + (r - k)(g_i - 1)$, there exists a non empty open subset $U \subset \text{Gr}(k, H^1(F^*))$ such that any $u \in U$ defines a BGN extension of F whose restriction to the curve C_i is a BGN extension on C_i of F_i of type (r, d_i, k) .*

Proof. Consider a BGN extension corresponding to $\underline{e} \in \text{Ext}^1(F, V \otimes \mathcal{O}_C) = V \otimes H^1(F^*)$:

$$\underline{e} : \quad 0 \rightarrow V \otimes \mathcal{O}_C \rightarrow E \rightarrow F \rightarrow 0.$$

Since F is locally free, $\text{Tor}_{\mathcal{O}_C}^1(\mathcal{O}_{C_i}, F) = 0$, so by tensoring with \mathcal{O}_{C_i} we get the exact sequence on C_i :

$$0 \rightarrow V \otimes \mathcal{O}_{C_i} \rightarrow E_i \rightarrow F_i \rightarrow 0.$$

Its corresponding extension class is an element $\underline{e}^i \in \text{Ext}^1(F_i, V \otimes \mathcal{O}_{C_i}) = V \otimes H^1(F_i^*)$, where $F_i^* = \mathcal{H}om_{\mathcal{O}_{C_i}}(F_i, \mathcal{O}_{C_i})$. This gives us a natural map $\alpha_i : V \otimes H^1(F^*) \rightarrow V \otimes H^1(F_i^*)$, sending $\underline{e} \rightarrow \underline{e}^i$. As F is locally free, we have $F_i^* \simeq F^* \otimes \mathcal{O}_{C_i}$. Hence we have a restriction map $\rho_i : F^* \rightarrow F_i^*$ on the component C_i . We claim that $\alpha_i = \text{id}_V \otimes H^1(\rho_i)$, where $H^1(\rho_i) : H^1(F^*) \rightarrow H^1(F_i^*)$ is the map induced by ρ_i . In fact, consider the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} \text{Hom}(F, V \otimes \mathcal{O}_C) & \hookrightarrow & \text{Hom}(F, E) & \longrightarrow & \text{Hom}(F, F) & \xrightarrow{\delta} & V \otimes H^1(F^*) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \text{Hom}(F_i, V \otimes \mathcal{O}_{C_i}) & \hookrightarrow & \text{Hom}(F_i, E_i) & \longrightarrow & \text{Hom}(F_i, F_i) & \xrightarrow{\delta_i} & V \otimes H^1(F_i^*) \end{array}$$

where the vertical arrows are induced by the restriction to C_i . As the extension class \underline{e} is the image by δ of id_F and \underline{e}^i is the image by δ_i of id_{F_i} , the claim follows.

Since $h^0(F_i^*) = 0$, to prove that \underline{e}^i defines a BGN extension on C_i it is enough to verify that $\{\underline{e}_1^i, \dots, \underline{e}_k^i\}$ are linearly independent vectors in $H^1(F_i^*)$. $\text{Gr}(k, H^1(F_i^*)) \neq \emptyset$ since we assume $k \leq d_i + (r - k)(g_i - 1)$. Note that the restriction map $H^1(\rho_i) : H^1(F^*) \rightarrow H^1(F_i^*)$ is a linear

surjective map. The image of a k -dimensional subspace W of $H^1(F^*)$ has dimension k if and only if it has trivial intersection with the kernel of $H^1(\rho_i)$. This happens for W in an open subset U of $\text{Gr}(k, H^1(F^*))$ since we are assuming $k \leq h^1(F_i^*)$. Hence $H^1(\rho_i)$ induces a rational surjective map between Grassmannian varieties

$$\text{Gr}(k, H^1(F^*)) \xrightarrow{-A_i} \text{Gr}(k, H^1(F_i^*))$$

which is defined on U . Each extension class in U gives, by restriction to the curve C_i , a BGN extension class on C_i of F_i of type (r, d_i, k) . \square

3. COHERENT SYSTEMS AND BGN EXTENSIONS

Let (C, \underline{w}) be a polarized nodal curve with γ irreducible smooth components of genus $g_i \geq 2$ and δ nodes. In this section we will study moduli spaces $\mathcal{G}_{(C, \underline{w}), \alpha}(r, d, k)$ with $k < r$ by using BGN extensions. Recall that $\alpha > 0$ is a *critical value* for coherent systems of type (r, d, k) if it is numerically possible to have a proper coherent subsystem (F, W) of (E, V) with

$$\mu_{(\underline{w}, \alpha)}(F, W) = \mu_{(\underline{w}, \alpha)}(E, V), \quad \mu_{\underline{w}}(F) \neq \mu_{\underline{w}}(E).$$

In our first result we prove that, as in the smooth case, on a polarized curve (C, \underline{w}) there are only finitely many spaces $\mathcal{G}_{(C, \underline{w}), \alpha}(r, d, k)$ for fixed (r, d, k) .

Lemma 3.1. *Let (C, \underline{w}) be a polarized nodal curve. Fix $M > 0$, there are up to finitely many critical value in $(0, M)$ for coherent systems of type (r, d, k) with $k < r$:*

$$0 < \alpha_1 < \cdots < \alpha_{i_M} < M.$$

Moreover, within the intervals $(0, \alpha_1)$, (α_i, α_{i+1}) and (α_{i_M}, M) the property of (\underline{w}, α) -stability is independent of α .

Proof. Denote by $w_m = \min\{w_i \mid i = 1, \dots, \gamma\}$. The critical value of α for coherent systems of type (r, d, k) can be written as

$$\alpha = \frac{rd' - r'd}{r'k - rk'} \quad \text{with} \quad rk' \neq r'k$$

where

- (1) $k' \in \mathbb{N}$, $0 \leq k' \leq k$;
- (2) $r' = \sum_{i=1}^{\gamma} w_i r'_i$, with $r'_i \in \mathbb{N}$, $0 \leq r'_i \leq r_i \leq r/w_m$;
- (3) $d' + r'\chi(\mathcal{O}_C) \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Note that, by (1) and (2), there are only finite possibilities for k' and r' . Moreover, by (3), once we fix r' , d' varies in a discrete set. Since $\alpha \in (0, M)$, this gives finitely values for d' .

In order to prove the last assertion, let $\alpha, \beta \in (0, M)$ with α, β not critical. Assume that there exists (E, V) which is (\underline{w}, α) -stable but it is not (\underline{w}, β) -stable. It is enough to prove that between α and β there is a critical value. Let (F, W) be a coherent subsystem of (E, V) such that $\mu_{(\underline{w}, \beta)}(F, W) \geq \mu_{(\underline{w}, \beta)}(E, V)$. If $\mu_{(\underline{w}, \beta)}(F, W) = \mu_{(\underline{w}, \beta)}(E, V)$, as β is not a critical value, we have $\mu_{\underline{w}}(F) = \mu_{\underline{w}}(E)$ and so $\frac{\dim W}{\text{rk}_{\underline{w}}(F)} = \frac{\dim V}{\text{rk}_{\underline{w}}(E)}$. This implies that $\mu_{(\underline{w}, \alpha)}(F, W) = \mu_{(\underline{w}, \alpha)}(E, V)$, which contradicts the (\underline{w}, α) -stability of (E, V) . So we can assume

$$\mu_{(\underline{w}, \beta)}(F, W) - \mu_{(\underline{w}, \beta)}(E, V) > 0 \quad \mu_{(\underline{w}, \alpha)}(F, W) - \mu_{(\underline{w}, \alpha)}(E, V) < 0.$$

We claim that there exists $t \in (0, 1)$ such that $t\alpha + (1-t)\beta$ is a critical value. Let $t \in (0, 1)$, then we have:

$$\begin{aligned} & \mu_{(\underline{w}, t\alpha + (1-t)\beta)}(F, W) - \mu_{(\underline{w}, t\alpha + (1-t)\beta)}(E, V) = \\ & t[\mu_{(\underline{w}, \alpha)}(F, W) - \mu_{(\underline{w}, \alpha)}(E, V)] + (1-t)[\mu_{(\underline{w}, \beta)}(F, W) - \mu_{(\underline{w}, \beta)}(E, V)]. \end{aligned}$$

So there exists $t_0 \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$\mu_{(\underline{w}, t_0\alpha + (1-t_0)\beta)}(F, W) - \mu_{(\underline{w}, t_0\alpha + (1-t_0)\beta)}(E, V) = 0.$$

If $\mu_{\underline{w}}(F) = \mu_{\underline{w}}(E)$ we get a contradiction as before, whereas if $\mu_{\underline{w}}(F) \neq \mu_{\underline{w}}(E)$, then $t_0\alpha + (1-t_0)\beta \in (0, M)$ is a critical value. \square

Proposition 3.2. *Let (C, \underline{w}) be a polarized nodal curve. Let $r > 0$ and d be rational numbers and k be an integer such that $0 < k < r$. Then the moduli space $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_{(C, \underline{w}), \alpha}(r, d, k)$ is empty for any $\alpha > \frac{d+r\lambda_{\underline{w}}}{r-k}$ and $\mathcal{G}_{(C, \underline{w}), \alpha}(r, d, k)$ is empty for any $\alpha \geq \frac{d+r\lambda_{\underline{w}}}{r-k}$. Moreover, if $\mathcal{G}_{(C, \underline{w}), \alpha}(r, d, k) \neq \emptyset$, then $d > -r\lambda_{\underline{w}}$.*

Proof. Let (E, V) be a coherent system of type (r, d, k) which is (\underline{w}, α) -semistable. We have $\text{rk}_{\underline{w}}(E) = r$ and $\text{deg}_{\underline{w}}(E) = \chi(E) - \text{rk}_{\underline{w}}(E)\chi(\mathcal{O}_C) = d$. Since $k < r$ the evaluation map $ev_V: V \otimes \mathcal{O}_C \rightarrow E$ is not surjective, let F be its image. It is a non zero sheaf and it is of depth one so (F, V) is a generated coherent system, which is a proper coherent subsystem of (E, V) . Let $s = \text{rk}_{\underline{w}}(F)$, by Lemma 1.10, we have $0 < s \leq k$. By (\underline{w}, α) -semistability of (E, V) we have $\mu_{(\underline{w}, \alpha)}(F, V) \leq \mu_{(\underline{w}, \alpha)}(E, V)$, i.e.

$$(3.1) \quad \frac{\text{deg}_{\underline{w}}(F)}{s} + \alpha \frac{k}{s} \leq \frac{d}{r} + \alpha \frac{k}{r}.$$

This is equivalent to the following inequality:

$$k\alpha \left(\frac{1}{s} - \frac{1}{r} \right) \leq \frac{d}{r} - \frac{\text{deg}_{\underline{w}}(F)}{s}.$$

As $0 < s \leq k < r$, by Lemma 1.4 and Definition 1.6 we can write

$$\alpha \leq \frac{sd}{k(r-s)} - \frac{r \text{deg}_{\underline{w}}(F)}{k(r-s)} \leq \frac{sd}{k(r-s)} - \frac{r \sum_{i=1}^{\gamma} \text{deg}(F_i)}{k(r-s)} + \frac{rs\lambda_{\underline{w}}}{k(r-s)}.$$

Since (F, V) is generated, by Lemma 1.10, we have $\text{deg}(F_i) \geq 0$ so we obtain

$$(3.2) \quad 0 \leq \alpha \leq \frac{s}{k(r-s)}(d + r\lambda_{\underline{w}})$$

This implies that $d + r\lambda_{\underline{w}} \geq 0$. Hence, since $r - s \geq r - k$ we obtain

$$(3.3) \quad \alpha \leq \frac{d + r\lambda_{\underline{w}}}{r - k}.$$

If we assume the existence of (E, V) which is (\underline{w}, α) -stable then we would get

$$(3.4) \quad \alpha < \frac{d + r\lambda_{\underline{w}}}{r - k},$$

and $d > -r\lambda_{\underline{w}}$. \square

Corollary 3.3. *Let (C, \underline{w}) be a polarized nodal curve with \underline{w} good. If $\mathcal{G}_{(C, \underline{w}), \alpha}(r, d, k) \neq \emptyset$, then $d > 0$ and $\alpha \in (0, d/(r-k))$.*

We point out that these bounds are exactly the same which hold for a smooth curve (see [BDGPW95]) and an irreducible nodal curve (see [Bho09]).

When C is a smooth or a nodal irreducible curve, moduli spaces of α -stable coherent systems with $k < r$ are closely related to BGN extensions. We would like to show that this connection holds also on nodal reducible curve. Note that, given a BGN extension

$$\underline{e}: 0 \rightarrow V \otimes \mathcal{O}_C \rightarrow E \rightarrow F \rightarrow 0$$

of type (r, d, k) we have a coherent system (E, V) of type (r, d, k) , such that ev_V is injective. We will call (E, V) the coherent system defined by \underline{e} .

Lemma 3.4. *Let (C, \underline{w}) be a polarized nodal curve. Let r and d be rational numbers and k be an integer such that $0 < k < r$. Let (E, V) be a (\underline{w}, α) -semistable coherent system of type (r, d, k) . If the evaluation map $ev_V: V \otimes \mathcal{O}_C \rightarrow E$ is injective, then either $d > 0$ and $\alpha \leq d/(r - k)$ or $\alpha = d = 0$.*

Proof. Since ev_V is injective and $k < r$, $V \otimes \mathcal{O}_C$ is a proper subsheaf of E . The pair $(V \otimes \mathcal{O}_C, V)$ is a proper coherent subsystem of (E, V) . Since it is (\underline{w}, α) -semistable we have:

$$\mu_{(\underline{w}, \alpha)}(V \otimes \mathcal{O}_C, V) \leq \mu_{(\underline{w}, \alpha)}(E, V),$$

that is

$$\alpha \leq \frac{d}{r} + \alpha \frac{k}{r},$$

since $0 < k < r$ this implies $\alpha \leq d/(r - k)$ and hence $d > 0$ unless $\alpha = 0$ (which implies $d = 0$). \square

In light of these facts and the discussion made above, it is natural to fix a good polarization \underline{w} on C . Hence, from now on, \underline{w} will be a good polarization. Then, by Proposition 3.2, all critical values for coherent systems of type (r, d, k) are in the interval $(0, \frac{d}{r-k})$. We will denote by α_L the biggest among the critical values. We will denote by $\mathcal{G}_{(C, \underline{w}), L}(r, d, k)$ the "limit" moduli space of coherent systems of type (r, d, k) which are (\underline{w}, α) -stable for $\alpha \in (\alpha_L, \frac{d}{r-k})$.

Lemma 3.5. *Let C be a nodal curve and \underline{w} be a good polarization. Let $r > 0$ and $d > 0$ be rational numbers and let k be an integer with $0 < k < r$. There exists $0 < \alpha_I < \frac{d}{r-k}$ such that if $\alpha \in (\alpha_I, \frac{d}{r-k})$ for any (\underline{w}, α) -semistable coherent system (E, V) the evaluation map $ev_V: V \otimes \mathcal{O}_C \rightarrow E$ is injective.*

Proof. Let $0 < \alpha < \frac{d}{r-k}$ and let (E, V) be a coherent system which is (\underline{w}, α) -semistable. Assume that the evaluation map ev_V is not injective, so we have an exact sequence of sheaves:

$$0 \rightarrow N \rightarrow V \otimes \mathcal{O}_C \rightarrow F \rightarrow 0,$$

where N and F are non zero sheaves satisfying the following properties:

- N is a proper subsheaf of $V \otimes \mathcal{O}_C$, so it is a depth one sheaf too; let $\text{rk}_{\underline{w}}(N) = \eta$, then we have $\eta \geq w_m$, where $w_m = \min(w_1, \dots, w_\gamma)$.
- F is proper subsheaf of E , so F is a depth one sheaf too; let $\text{rk}_{\underline{w}}(F) = s$, then we have

$$s = k - \eta, \quad w_m \leq s \leq k - w_m.$$

The pair (F, V) is a generated coherent system, which is a proper subsystem of (E, V) . As this is (\underline{w}, α) -semistable, we have $\mu_{(\underline{w}, \alpha)}(F, V) \leq \mu_{(\underline{w}, \alpha)}(E, V)$, which implies

$$(3.5) \quad \frac{\deg_{\underline{w}}(F)}{s} + \alpha \frac{k}{s} \leq \frac{d}{r} + \alpha \frac{k}{r}.$$

As $s < k < r$, we can proceed as in the proof of Proposition 3.2 and we obtain:

$$\alpha \leq \frac{sd}{k(r-s)} - \frac{r \deg_{\underline{w}}(F)}{k(r-s)} \leq \frac{sd}{k(r-s)} - \frac{r \sum_{i=1}^{\gamma} \deg(F_i)}{k(r-s)} + \frac{rs\lambda_{\underline{w}}}{k(r-s)}$$

Since (F, V) is generated, then $\deg(F_i) \geq 0$. Then, as \underline{w} is good, we have $\lambda_{\underline{w}} = 0$. Hence we obtain

$$\alpha \leq \frac{sd}{k(r-s)}.$$

Finally as $s \leq k - w_m$ we get:

$$(3.6) \quad \alpha \leq \frac{(k - w_m)d}{k(r - k + w_m)} = \alpha_I.$$

Note that $0 < \alpha_I < \frac{d}{r-k}$. We can conclude that if $\alpha \in (\alpha_I, \frac{d}{r-k})$ the evaluation map is injective for any (\underline{w}, α) -semistable (E, V) . \square

Remark 3.6. Notice that, without assuming \underline{w} good, the proof of Lemma 3.5 still works and yields the bound

$$\alpha \leq (d + r\lambda_{\underline{w}}) \frac{(k - w_m)}{k(r - k + w_m)} = \alpha'_I.$$

Hence, if $\alpha > \alpha'_I$, every (\underline{w}, α) -semistable coherent system has ev_V injective. Nevertheless, by Lemma 3.4, for such coherent systems one has necessarily $\alpha < d/(r - k)$. Unfortunately, for a general polarization, it can happens that $\alpha'_I > d/(r - k)$.

Lemma 3.7. Let C be a nodal curve and \underline{w} be a good polarization on it. Let $r > 0$ and $d > 0$ be rational numbers and let k be an integer with $0 < k < r$. There exists $0 < \alpha_T < \frac{d}{r-k}$ such that if $\alpha \in (\alpha_T, \frac{d}{r-k})$ for any (\underline{w}, α) -semistable coherent system (E, V) we have an exact sequence:

$$(3.7) \quad 0 \rightarrow V \otimes \mathcal{O}_C \rightarrow E \rightarrow F \rightarrow 0,$$

where F is a sheaf of depth one.

Proof. Let $\alpha \in (\alpha_I, \frac{d}{r-k})$. Let (E, V) be a coherent system which is (\underline{w}, α) -semistable. By Lemma 3.5 the evaluation map $V \otimes \mathcal{O}_C \rightarrow E$ is injective. So we have an exact sequence of sheaves:

$$0 \rightarrow V \otimes \mathcal{O}_C \rightarrow E \rightarrow F \rightarrow 0.$$

Assume that F is not of depth one. Let T be the maximal torsion subsheaf of F . Then $\dim T = 0$, $\text{rk}_{\underline{w}}(T) = 0$ and $\deg_{\underline{w}}(T) = \chi(T) = \tau \geq 1$. The quotient $F_0 = F/T$ is a depth one sheaf on C . We have the following commutative diagram:

$$(3.8) \quad \begin{array}{ccccc} V \otimes \mathcal{O}_C & \hookrightarrow & E_0 & \twoheadrightarrow & T \\ \parallel & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ V \otimes \mathcal{O}_C & \hookrightarrow & E & \twoheadrightarrow & F \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ & & F_0 & \xlongequal{\quad} & F_0 \end{array}$$

The pair (E_0, V) is a proper coherent subsystem of (E, V) of type (k, τ, k) . By (\underline{w}, α) -semistability of (E, V) we have:

$$\mu_{(\underline{w}, \alpha)}(E_0, V) \leq \mu_{(\underline{w}, \alpha)}(E, V),$$

that is:

$$\frac{\tau}{k} + \alpha \leq \frac{d}{r} + \alpha \frac{k}{r}.$$

This implies:

$$\alpha \left(1 - \frac{k}{r}\right) \leq \frac{d}{r} - \frac{\tau}{k}.$$

Since $k < r$ and $\tau \geq 1$, we have:

$$\alpha \leq \frac{d}{r-k} - \frac{r\tau}{k(r-k)} \leq \frac{d}{r-k} - \frac{r}{k(r-k)} = \tilde{\alpha}_T.$$

Note that $\tilde{\alpha}_T < \frac{d}{r-k}$. Hence we can conclude by defining α_T to be the maximum between α_I and $\tilde{\alpha}_T$. \square

Let (E, V) be a coherent system of type (r, d, k) with $d > 0$ and $0 < k < r$ defining an exact sequence as follows

$$0 \rightarrow V \otimes \mathcal{O}_C \rightarrow E \rightarrow F \rightarrow 0,$$

where F is a sheaf of depth one. Let $\underline{e} \in \text{Ext}^1(F, V \otimes \mathcal{O}_C)$ be the corresponding extension class. We have $\text{Ext}^1(F, V \otimes \mathcal{O}_C) \simeq V \otimes \text{Ext}^1(F, \mathcal{O}_C)$, so $\underline{e} = (\underline{e}_1, \dots, \underline{e}_k)$, $\underline{e}_i \in \text{Ext}^1(F, \mathcal{O}_C)$.

Lemma 3.8. *With the above notations, let (E, V) be (\underline{w}, α) -semistable, with $\alpha \leq \frac{d}{r-k}$, then we have:*

- (1) if $\underline{e} = \underline{0}$ then $\alpha = \frac{d}{r-k}$;
- (2) if $\alpha < \frac{d}{r-k}$, then $\underline{e}_1, \dots, \underline{e}_k$ are linearly independent in $\text{Ext}^1(F, \mathcal{O}_C)$. In particular, $k \leq h^1(F^*)$.

Proof. (1) Assume that $\underline{e} = \underline{0}$, then we have $(E, V) \simeq (V \otimes \mathcal{O}_C, V) \oplus (F, 0)$. In particular, as (E, V) is (\underline{w}, α) -semistable, we must have:

$$\frac{\deg_{\underline{w}}(F)}{\text{rk}_{\underline{w}}(F)} \leq \frac{d}{r} + \alpha \frac{k}{r},$$

that is

$$\frac{d}{r-k} \leq \frac{d}{r} + \alpha \frac{k}{r},$$

which implies: $\alpha \geq \frac{d}{r-k}$. Since we assumed $\alpha \leq \frac{d}{r-k}$, we get the equality.

(2) Assume that $\underline{e}_1, \dots, \underline{e}_k$ are linearly dependent. After a base change, we can assume that $\underline{e} = (\underline{e}_1, \dots, \underline{e}_l, \underline{0}, \dots, \underline{0})$, with $1 \leq l < k$ and $\underline{e}_1, \dots, \underline{e}_l$ linearly independent. This implies that

$$(E, V) \simeq (E_1, V_1) \oplus (V_2 \otimes \mathcal{O}_C, V_2),$$

with $\dim V_1 = l$ and $\dim V_2 = k - l$. We have the following relation between (\underline{w}, α) -slopes:

$$\mu_{(\underline{w}, \alpha)}(E, V) = \frac{r - (k - l)}{r} \mu_{(\underline{w}, \alpha)}(E_1, V_1) + \frac{k - l}{r} \mu_{(\underline{w}, \alpha)}(V_2 \otimes \mathcal{O}_C, V_2).$$

So we have the following cases:

- (1) $\mu_{(\underline{w}, \alpha)}(E, V) = \mu_{(\underline{w}, \alpha)}(E_1, V_1) = \mu_{(\underline{w}, \alpha)}(V_2 \otimes \mathcal{O}_C, V_2)$,
- (2) either (E_1, V_1) or $(V_2 \otimes \mathcal{O}_C, V_2)$ destabilizes (E, V) .

In the first case we obtain $\alpha = \frac{d}{r-k}$, the second one cannot occur since (E, V) is (\underline{w}, α) -semistable. \square

Lemma 3.9. *Let C be a nodal curve and let \underline{w} be a good polarization. Let $r, d > 0$ rational and k an integer with $0 < k < r$. Then, there exists $\alpha_S > \alpha_T$ and $\alpha_S < \frac{d}{r-k}$ such that if $\alpha \in (\alpha_S, \frac{d}{r-k})$, any (\underline{w}, α) -semistable coherent system (E, V) defines a BGN extension*

$$(3.9) \quad 0 \rightarrow V \otimes \mathcal{O}_C \rightarrow E \rightarrow F \rightarrow 0,$$

of type (r, d, k) with F \underline{w} -semistable and $h^0(F^*) = 0$.

Proof. Let (E, V) be (\underline{w}, α) -semistable with $\alpha > \alpha_T$. Then, by Lemma 3.7 and Lemma 3.8, it defines a BGN extension with F of depth one. We have to prove that F is \underline{w} -semistable for α big enough. Let $F' \subset F$ be a proper subsheaf of F such that the quotient $Q = F/F'$ is a sheaf of depth one. We denote by $s' = \text{rk}_{\underline{w}}(F')$ and $d' = \deg_{\underline{w}}(F')$. Then we have $w_m \leq s' < r - k$,

where $w_m = \min\{w_1, \dots, w_\gamma\}$. From the commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
V \otimes \mathcal{O}_C & \hookrightarrow & E' & \twoheadrightarrow & F' \\
\parallel & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
V \otimes \mathcal{O}_C & \hookrightarrow & E & \twoheadrightarrow & F \\
& & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
& & Q & \equiv & Q
\end{array}$$

we obtain a coherent system (E', V) of type $(s' + k, d', k)$ which is a proper subsystem of (E, V) . Since this is (\underline{w}, α) -semistable we have:

$$\mu_{(\underline{w}, \alpha)}(E', V) \leq \mu_{(\underline{w}, \alpha)}(E, V),$$

that is

$$\frac{d'}{k + s'} + \alpha \frac{k}{k + s'} \leq \frac{d}{r} + \alpha \frac{k}{r}.$$

We can write the above inequality as follows

$$\frac{s'}{k + s'} \mu_{\underline{w}}(F') + \alpha \frac{k}{k + s'} \leq \frac{s'}{k + s'} \mu_{\underline{w}}(F) + \left(\frac{r - k}{r} - \frac{s'}{k + s'} \right) \mu_{\underline{w}}(F) + \alpha \frac{k}{r},$$

equivalently

$$\frac{s'}{k + s'} (\mu_{\underline{w}}(F') - \mu_{\underline{w}}(F)) \leq \alpha \left(\frac{k}{r} - \frac{k}{k + s'} \right) + \frac{k(r - k - s')}{r(k + s')} \mu_{\underline{w}}(F),$$

as $s' > 0$ and $k + s' > 0$, we get

$$(\mu_{\underline{w}}(F') - \mu_{\underline{w}}(F)) \leq \frac{k(r - k - s')}{rs'} (\mu_{\underline{w}}(F) - \alpha).$$

Note that $\mu_{\underline{w}}(F) = \frac{d}{r - k}$ and $s' \geq w_m > 0$, so we obtain:

$$\mu_{\underline{w}}(F') - \mu_{\underline{w}}(F) \leq \frac{k(r - k - w_m)}{rw_m} \left(\frac{d}{r - k} - \alpha \right).$$

Let $s' = \sum_{i=1}^{\gamma} w_i s'_i$, as $s' < r - k$, then we have $0 \leq s'_i \leq (r - k)/w_m$. In particular, for a fixed polarization \underline{w} , there are finitely many values for s' . As $d' = \chi(F') - s' \chi(\mathcal{O}_C)$, the possible value of d' lies in a discrete set whose intersection with any bounded subset is finite. In particular, the possible values which the difference $\mu_{\underline{w}}(F') - \mu_{\underline{w}}(F)$ can assume in $[0, 1]$ are finite. So there exists $q > 0$ such that $\mu_{\underline{w}}(F') - \mu_{\underline{w}}(F) \leq q$ implies $\mu_{\underline{w}}(F') - \mu_{\underline{w}}(F) \leq 0$. If we choose

$$\alpha > \frac{d}{r - k} - q \frac{rw_m}{k(r - k - w_m)},$$

then we have

$$\mu_{\underline{w}}(F') - \mu_{\underline{w}}(F) \leq q$$

and so $\mu_{\underline{w}}(F') \leq \mu_{\underline{w}}(F)$. We set $\alpha_S = \frac{d}{r - k} - q \frac{rw_m}{k(r - k - w_m)}$. It is easy to see that $\alpha_S > \alpha_T$.

Finally, as F is \underline{w} -semistable with $\deg_{\underline{w}}(F) = d > 0$ and \underline{w} is good, by Lemma 1.8 we have that $h^0(F^*) = 0$. \square

The consequence of all previous technical result is the following Theorem.

Theorem 3.10. *Let C be a nodal curve and \underline{w} a good polarization on it. Let $r > 0$ and $d > 0$ be rational numbers and let k be an integer with $0 < k < r$. If $\mathcal{G}_{(C,\underline{w}),L}(r,d,k)$ is not empty, we have a morphism*

$$\eta : \mathcal{G}_{(C,\underline{w}),L}(r,d,k) \rightarrow \mathcal{U}_{(C,\underline{w})}(r-k,d)$$

sending a coherent system (E, V) to $[\text{coker}(ev_V)]$.

Proof. First of all we point out that $\text{coker}(ev_V)$ does not depend on the isomorphism class of (E, V) . By Lemma 3.8 and Lemma 3.9 if $\alpha \in \left(\alpha_S, \frac{d}{r-k}\right)$ any (\underline{w}, α) -stable coherent system (E, V) defines a BGN extension of type (r, d, k) , where $F = \text{coker } ev_V$ is a depth one sheaf which is \underline{w} -semistable, with $\text{rk}_{\underline{w}}(F) = r - k$ and $\text{deg}_{\underline{w}}(F) = d$. If $\alpha_S < \alpha_L$, then this holds for any $(E, V) \in \mathcal{G}_{(C,\underline{w}),L}(r,d,k)$. Let $\alpha_S > \alpha_L$, then for any $(E, V) \in \mathcal{G}_{(C,\underline{w}),L}(r,d,k)$, (\underline{w}, α) -stability does not change if α varies in $(\alpha_L, \frac{d}{r-k})$ by Lemma 3.1. As Hence, we obtain that η is well defined.

To prove that η is a morphism we consider a family of (\underline{w}, α) -stable coherent systems of type (r, d, k) parametrized by a variety S . In particular, in our hypothesis, we have a coherent sheaf \mathcal{E} on $S \times C$, which is flat on S such that $E_s = \mathcal{E} \otimes \mathcal{O}_{s \times C}$ is a depth one sheaf, a vector bundle \mathcal{V} on S of rank k and a map of sheaves $\xi : \pi_S^* \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$, where $\pi_S : S \times C \rightarrow S$ is the projection. Moreover, for any s the map $\xi|_{s \times C} : V_s \otimes \mathcal{O}_{s \times C} \rightarrow E_s$ is injective and its cokernel F_s is a \underline{w} -semistable depth one sheaf with $\text{rk}_{\underline{w}}(F_s) = r - k$ and $\text{deg}_{\underline{w}}(F_s) = d$. If we assume that S is irreducible and reduced, we can prove that ξ is an injective map of sheaves on $S \times C$.

This implies that its cokernel \mathcal{F} is a coherent sheaf on $S \times C$, which is flat on S too and $\mathcal{F}_s = F_s$ defined as above. So \mathcal{F} defines a family of \underline{w} -semistable sheaves of depth one of \underline{w} -rank $(r - k)$ and \underline{w} -degree d , parametrized by S . Hence we have a natural morphism $S \rightarrow \mathcal{U}_{(C,\underline{w})}(r - k, d)$, sending $s \mapsto [F_s]$. This proves that η is a morphism. \square

Theorem 3.11. *Assume that we are in the same hypothesis of Theorem 3.10. Then the image of η contains the subscheme $\mathcal{U}_{(C,\underline{w})}^s(r - k, d)$ parametrizing \underline{w} -stable sheaves and the fiber of η over $F \in \mathcal{U}_{(C,\underline{w})}^s(r - k, d)$ is $\text{Gr}(k, H^1(F^*))$.*

Proof. Let F be a \underline{w} -stable sheaf of depth one on C with $\text{rk}_{\underline{w}}(F) = r - k$ and $\text{deg}_{\underline{w}}(F) = d$. Let $\underline{e} \in \text{Ext}^1(F, V \otimes \mathcal{O}_C)$ be the class of a BGN extension of type (r, d, k) :

$$(3.10) \quad 0 \rightarrow V \otimes \mathcal{O}_C \rightarrow E \xrightarrow{\beta} F \rightarrow 0.$$

Let (E, V) be the coherent system on C defined by \underline{e} . We will prove that (E, V) is (\underline{w}, α) -stable for $\alpha \in (\alpha_L, d/(r - k))$. At this end, let (E', V') be a proper coherent subsystem of (E, V) with $V' = V \cap H^0(E')$, it is enough to see that

$$\mu_{(\underline{w}, \alpha)}(E', V') < \mu_{(\underline{w}, \alpha)}(E, V),$$

for α sufficiently close to $\frac{d}{r-k}$. For this reason, we set $\alpha = \frac{d-\epsilon}{r-k}$, with $\epsilon > 0$.

We consider the restriction of β of (3.10) to E' : $\beta|_{E'} : E' \rightarrow F$. We will distinguish two cases depending on the fact the $\beta|_{E'}$ is the zero map.

Case (a): $\beta|_{E'} = 0$. Then E' is a nonzero subsheaf of $V \otimes \mathcal{O}_C$ with $\text{rk}_{\underline{w}}(E') = r' \leq k < r$. As \underline{w} is good we have that $V \otimes \mathcal{O}_C$ is \underline{w} -semistable (see [BF20c]), then we have:

$$\mu_{\underline{w}}(E') \leq \mu_{\underline{w}}(V \otimes \mathcal{O}_C) = 0,$$

which implies $\text{deg}_{\underline{w}}(E') = d' \leq 0$. Let $k' = \dim V'$, then $0 \leq k' \leq k$. If $k' > 0$, since $V' \subseteq V$, then we have an injective map $V' \otimes \mathcal{O}_C \rightarrow E'$ which implies $k' \leq r' \leq k < r$. So we have:

$$\mu_{(\underline{w}, \alpha)}(E', V') = \frac{d'}{r'} + \alpha \frac{k'}{r'} \leq \alpha.$$

As we have chosen $\alpha = \frac{d-\epsilon}{r-k}$, it follows that

$$\mu_{(\underline{w},\alpha)}(E, V) = \frac{d}{r} + \alpha \frac{k}{r} = \alpha + \frac{\epsilon}{r} > \alpha.$$

These two inequalities allow us to conclude:

$$\mu_{(\underline{w},\alpha)}(E', V') \leq \alpha < \mu_{(\underline{w},\alpha)}(E, V).$$

Case (b): $\beta_{|E'} \neq 0$. Then we set $G' = \text{Ker}(\beta_{|E'})$ and $F' = \text{Im}(\beta_{|E'})$. They are depth one sheaves on C , G' is a subsheaf of $V \otimes \mathcal{O}_C$ and F' is a non zero subsheaf of F , they fit into the following exact sequence:

$$0 \rightarrow G' \rightarrow E' \xrightarrow{\beta'_{|E'}} F' \rightarrow 0.$$

We distinguish two cases depending on the fact that F' coincide with F or not.

(b1): F' is a proper subsheaf of F . Let $S_F = \{\mu_{\underline{w}}(F'') \mid F'' \text{ proper subsheaf of } F\}$. Since F is \underline{w} -stable, the intersection $S_F \cap (0, \mu_{\underline{w}}(F))$ is finite. So we can choose $\delta > 0$ such that for any proper subsheaf F' of F we have:

$$\mu_{\underline{w}}(F') \leq \mu_{\underline{w}}(F) - \frac{\delta}{r-k}.$$

We set

$$\text{rk}_{\underline{w}}(G') = l' \quad \text{rk}_{\underline{w}}(E') = r' \quad \text{rk}_{\underline{w}}(F') = r' - l',$$

with $0 \leq l' < r'$, and

$$\text{deg}_{\underline{w}}(E') = d' = \text{deg}_{\underline{w}}(G') + \text{deg}_{\underline{w}}(F').$$

As $G' \subseteq V \otimes \mathcal{O}_C$ and \underline{w} is good, by \underline{w} -semistability of $V \otimes \mathcal{O}_C$ we have $\text{deg}_{\underline{w}}(G') \leq 0$, hence $\text{deg}_{\underline{w}}(E') \leq \text{deg}_{\underline{w}}(F')$. So we have:

$$(3.11) \quad \mu_{\underline{w}}(E') = \frac{\text{deg}_{\underline{w}}(E')}{r'} \leq \frac{\text{deg}_{\underline{w}}(F')}{r'} \leq \frac{r' - l'}{r'} \mu_{\underline{w}}(F') \leq \frac{r' - l'}{r'} \left[\mu_{\underline{w}}(F) - \frac{\delta}{r-k} \right].$$

We set $k' = \dim V'$, as $V' \subseteq V$, then we have an injective map $V' \otimes \mathcal{O}_C \rightarrow G'$, so $k' \leq l' < r'$. Finally, (E', V') is a proper coherent subsystem of (E, V) of type (r', d', k') . By using Equation (3.11) we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_{(\underline{w},\alpha)}(E', V') - \mu_{(\underline{w},\alpha)}(E, V) &= \mu_{\underline{w}}(E') - \mu_{\underline{w}}(E) + \alpha \left(\frac{k'}{r'} - \frac{k}{r} \right) \leq \\ &\leq \frac{r' - l'}{r'} \left[\mu_{\underline{w}}(F) - \frac{\delta}{r-k} \right] - \mu_{\underline{w}}(F) \frac{r-k}{r} + \alpha \left(\frac{k'}{r'} - \frac{k}{r} \right) \leq \\ &\leq \mu_{\underline{w}}(F) \frac{k' - l'}{r'} - \frac{\delta}{r-k} \left(1 - \frac{l'}{r'} \right) + \frac{\epsilon}{r-k} \left(\frac{k}{r} - \frac{k'}{r'} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Since $k' \leq l'$ and $\mu_{\underline{w}}(F) \geq 0$ by assumption, we have $\mu_{\underline{w}}(F) \frac{k' - l'}{r'} \leq 0$; as $l' < r'$, then $-\frac{\delta}{r-k} \left(1 - \frac{l'}{r'} \right) < 0$. Note that if $\frac{k}{r} - \frac{k'}{r'} \leq 0$, then $\frac{\epsilon}{r-k} \left(\frac{k}{r} - \frac{k'}{r'} \right) \leq 0$ for any $\epsilon > 0$. If $\frac{k}{r} - \frac{k'}{r'} > 0$, then $\frac{k'}{r'}$ can assume finitely many values, hence we can find $\epsilon > 0$ small enough in order to obtain

$$\mu_{(\underline{w},\alpha)}(E', V') < \mu_{(\underline{w},\alpha)}(E, V).$$

(b2): $F' = F$. Let $\text{rk}_{\underline{w}}(G') = l' \leq k$ and $\text{deg}_{\underline{w}}(G') = m'$. Then $\text{rk}_{\underline{w}}(E') = r - k + l'$. As in case (b1) we have $\text{deg}_{\underline{w}}(G') \leq 0$, so we we have:

$$\text{deg}_{\underline{w}}(E') = \text{deg}_{\underline{w}}(G') + \text{deg}_{\underline{w}}(F) = \text{deg}_{\underline{w}}(F) + m',$$

which implies

$$(3.12) \quad \mu_{\underline{w}}(E') = \mu_{\underline{w}}(F) \frac{r-k}{r-k+l'} + \frac{m'}{r-k+l'}.$$

Let $k' = \dim V'$. As in case (b1) we have $k' \leq l'$. So we have a proper coherent subsystem of (E, V) . By using Equation (3.12) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_{(\underline{w}, \alpha)}(E', V') - \mu_{(\underline{w}, \alpha)}(E, V) &= \mu_{\underline{w}}(E') - \mu_{\underline{w}}(E) + \alpha \left(\frac{k'}{r-k+l'} - \frac{k}{r} \right) \leq \\ &\leq \mu_{\underline{w}}(F) \frac{r-k}{r-k+l'} - \mu_{\underline{w}}(F) \frac{r-k}{r} + \frac{d-\epsilon}{r-k} \left(\frac{k'}{r-k+l'} - \frac{k}{r} \right) + \frac{m'}{r-k+l'} \leq \\ &\leq \mu_{\underline{w}}(F) \frac{k'-l'}{r-k+l'} + \frac{\epsilon}{r-k} \left(\frac{k}{r} - \frac{k'}{r-k-l'} \right) + \frac{m'}{r-k+l'}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $\mu_{\underline{w}}(F) \frac{k'-l'}{r-k+l'} + \frac{m'}{r-k+l'} \leq 0$ and it is zero if and only if $k' = l'$ and $m' = 0$. Assume that we are in this case. Then, the injection $V' \otimes \mathcal{O}_C \rightarrow G'$ is an isomorphism $G' \simeq V' \otimes \mathcal{O}_C$. Let $V = V' \oplus V''$, then the quotient $\frac{E}{E'} \simeq V'' \otimes \mathcal{O}_C$, hence $E \simeq E' \oplus (V'' \otimes \mathcal{O}_C)$ and then Extension (3.10) would split. But this is impossible since the vectors $\underline{e}_1, \dots, \underline{e}_k$ are linearly independent in $\text{Ext}^1(F, \mathcal{O}_C)$.

We can conclude, as in the case (b1), that $\mu_{\underline{w}}(F) \frac{k'-l'}{r-k+l'} + \frac{m'}{r-k+l'} < 0$, so for ϵ small enough we have:

$$\mu_{(\underline{w}, \alpha)}(E', V') < \mu_{(\underline{w}, \alpha)}(E, V)$$

so (E, V) is (\underline{w}, α) -stable as claimed.

The claim about the fiber over points of $\mathcal{U}_{(C, \underline{w})}^s(r-k, d)$ follows by Proposition 2.2(c). \square

4. ON THE MODULI SPACE $\mathcal{G}_{(C, \underline{w}), L}(r \cdot \underline{1}, d, k)$

Let C be a nodal curve with γ smooth irreducible components C_i of genus $g_i \geq 2$ and δ nodes. Let \underline{w} be a good polarization on C . In this section we will consider coherent systems (E, V) of type (r, d, k) with multirank $r \cdot \underline{1}$, $k < r$ and $d > 0$. This case is interesting as it includes coherent systems with E locally free. Coherent systems with such features which are (\underline{w}, α) -stable are parametrized by the subscheme $\mathcal{G}_{(C, \underline{w}), \alpha}(r \cdot \underline{1}, d, k)$ of the moduli space $\mathcal{G}_{(C, \underline{w}), \alpha}(r, d, k)$. Hence, we can consider the map η defined in Theorem 3.10 and restrict it to the subscheme $\mathcal{G}_{(C, \underline{w}), L}(r \cdot \underline{1}, d, k)$, we obtain a morphism

$$(4.1) \quad \psi : \mathcal{G}_{(C, \underline{w}), L}(r \cdot \underline{1}, d, k) \rightarrow \mathcal{U}_{(C, \underline{w})}((r-k) \cdot \underline{1}, d).$$

The moduli spaces $\mathcal{U}_{(C, \underline{w})}(s \cdot \underline{1}, d)$ have been described by Teixidor i Bigas (see [TiB91] and [TiB95]). We briefly recall the most relevant results. First of all, for any integers $s \geq 1$ and d , the moduli space $\mathcal{U}_{(C, \underline{w})}(s \cdot \underline{1}, d)$ is never irreducible but it is connected and each irreducible component has dimension $1 + s^2(p_a(C) - 1)$. The generic element of each irreducible component is the isomorphism class of a locally free sheaf F , which is \underline{w} -stable and whose restrictions to C_i are stable too. Each component is identified by a γ -uple (d_1, \dots, d_γ) , where d_i is the degree of the restriction to C_i of the generic element and $\sum_{i=1}^{\gamma} d_i = d$. We will denote by X_{d_1, \dots, d_γ} the component of $\mathcal{U}_{(C, \underline{w})}(s \cdot \underline{1}, d)$ corresponding to (d_1, \dots, d_γ) . The intersection of two such components consists of sheaves which are not locally free. Finally, for \underline{w} general, the number of irreducible components is $h \cdot s^{\gamma-1}$ where h is the number of spanning tree in the dual graph of C .

The main result of this section is the following:

Theorem 4.1. *Let (C, \underline{w}) be a polarized nodal curve with \underline{w} good. Let $0 < k < r$ and $d > 0$ integers. Then the following hold:*

- (a) the moduli space $\mathcal{G}_{(C,\underline{w}),L}(r \cdot \underline{1}, d, k)$ is non empty if and only if $k \leq \frac{d+r(p_a(C)-1)}{p_a(C)}$;
- (b) for any irreducible component $X_{d_1, \dots, d_\gamma} \subset \mathcal{U}_{(C,\underline{w})}((r-k) \cdot \underline{1}, d)$ we have an irreducible component $Y_{d_1, \dots, d_\gamma} \subset \mathcal{G}_{(C,\underline{w}),L}(r \cdot \underline{1}, d, k)$ which is birational to a Grassmanian fibration over X_{d_1, \dots, d_γ} ;
- (c) any component Y_{d_1, \dots, d_γ} has dimension $\beta(r, d, k)$ and the generic element is a coherent system (E, V) with E locally free;
- (d) the above components are the only ones which contains coherent systems (E, V) with E locally free.

Proof. For simplicity, we set $\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{U}_{(C,\underline{w})}((r-k) \cdot \underline{1}, d)$ and $\mathcal{U}^s = \mathcal{U}_{(C,\underline{w})}^s((r-k) \cdot \underline{1}, d)$. Let $F \in \mathcal{U}^s$, by Theorem 3.11, we have that $\psi^{-1}(F) \simeq \text{Gr}(k, H^0(F \otimes \omega_C)^*)$. Hence

$$\dim \psi^{-1}(F) = k(h^0(F \otimes \omega_C) - k).$$

By Serre duality and Lemma 1.8 we have $h^1(F \otimes \omega_C) = h^0(F^*) = 0$. So

$$h^0(F \otimes \omega_C) = \chi(F \otimes \omega_C) = \deg_{\underline{w}}(F \otimes \omega_C) + (r-k)(1-p_a(C)).$$

Since $\omega_C \otimes \mathcal{O}_{C_i} = \omega_{C_i}(\Delta_i)$, then by Lemma 1.4 we obtain

$$\deg_{\underline{w}}(F \otimes \omega_C) = \Delta_{\underline{w}}(F) + \sum_{i=1}^{\gamma} [d_i + (r-k)(2g_i - 2 + \delta_i)] = d + 2(r-k)(p_a(C) - 1)$$

so $h^0(F \otimes \omega_C) = d + (r-k)(p_a(C) - 1)$ and

$$\dim \psi^{-1}(F) = k[d + (r-k)(p_a(C) - 1) - k].$$

In particular, this proves (a): the moduli space $\mathcal{G}_{(C,\underline{w}),L}(r \cdot \underline{1}, d, k)$ is non empty if and only if

$$k \leq \frac{d + r(p_a(C) - 1)}{p_a(C)}.$$

In this case, since \mathcal{U}^s is an open dense subset of \mathcal{U} , we can conclude that ψ is dominant.

Let $X_{d_1, \dots, d_\gamma} \subset \mathcal{U}$ be the irreducible component corresponding to (d_1, \dots, d_γ) . We denote by $X_{d_1, \dots, d_\gamma}^s$ its open subset corresponding to \underline{w} -stable sheaves. Then $\psi^{-1}(X_{d_1, \dots, d_\gamma}^s)$ is an irreducible quasi-projective variety: in fact it is a Grassmannian fibration over $X_{d_1, \dots, d_\gamma}^s$, with fibers $\text{Gr}(k, N)$ with $N = d + (r-k)(p_a(C) - 1)$. Hence we have

$$\dim(\psi^{-1}(X_{d_1, \dots, d_\gamma}^s)) = 1 + (r-k)^2(p_a(C) - 1) + k(N - k).$$

Let (E, V) be a generic element of $\psi^{-1}(X_{d_1, \dots, d_\gamma}^s)$. Then E is locally free and the evaluation map ev_V is injective. By Proposition 1.12, it follows that the moduli space $\mathcal{G}_{(C,\underline{w}),L}(r \cdot \underline{1}, d, k)$ is smooth at the point (E, V) with dimension $\beta_C(r, d, k)$. Actually, it is immediate to check that

$$\beta_C(r, d, k) = \dim(\psi^{-1}(X_{d_1, \dots, d_\gamma}^s)).$$

This allow us to conclude that the closure of $\psi^{-1}(X_{d_1, \dots, d_\gamma}^s)$ in $\mathcal{G}_{(C,\underline{w}),L}(r \cdot \underline{1}, d, k)$ is an irreducible component of $\mathcal{G}_{(C,\underline{w}),L}(r \cdot \underline{1}, d, k)$: we denote it by Y_{d_1, \dots, d_γ} .

We claim now that the above components are the only ones containing coherent systems (E, V) with E locally free. By contradiction, assume that there exists an irreducible component $Y \subset \mathcal{G}_{(C,\underline{w}),L}(r \cdot \underline{1}, d, k)$, such that $Y \neq Y_{d_1, \dots, d_\gamma}$ and Y contains (E_0, V_0) with E_0 locally free. Note that by Proposition 1.12, (E_0, V_0) is a smooth point of the moduli space (and then of Y). This implies $\dim(Y) = \beta(r, d, k)$.

Consider the irreducible bounded set $\mathcal{W} = \{\text{coker}(ev_V) \mid (E, V) \in Y\}$. By assumption, for the general $(E, V) \in Y$ we have that $\text{coker}(ev_V)$ is \underline{w} -semistable but not \underline{w} -stable. As \underline{w} -stability is an open property, we have that all $F \in \mathcal{W}$ are \underline{w} -semistable but not \underline{w} -stable. We recall that

BGN extensions of $F \in \mathcal{W}$ are parametrized by the Grassmannian variety $\text{Gr}(k, H^0(F \otimes \mathcal{O}_C)^*)$. By Lemma 1.8 we have $h^1(F \otimes \omega_C) = 0$ for all $F \in \mathcal{W}$, so $\dim \text{Gr}(k, H^0(F \otimes \mathcal{O}_C)^*) = k(N - k)$ with N as above.

Moreover, since (\underline{w}, α) -stability is an open condition, for any $F \in \mathcal{W}$ there is an open subset of $\text{Gr}(k, H^0(F \otimes \mathcal{O}_C)^*)$ parametrizing (\underline{w}, α) -stable coherent systems of Y with $\text{coker}(ev_V) = F$. This implies that \mathcal{W} depends on $1 + (r - k)^2(p_a(C) - 1)$ parameters. We claim that this is not possible. Any $F \in \mathcal{W}$ fits into an exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow F \rightarrow \bigoplus_{i=1}^{\gamma} F_i \rightarrow T \rightarrow 0,$$

where F_i is the restriction of F modulo torsion to C_i and T is a torsion sheaf whose support is contained in the set of nodes (see [Ses82]). A general element of \mathcal{W} is locally free and its restriction F_i is a locally free sheaf of rank $r - k$ and degree d_i on C_i . Let

$$\mathcal{W}_i = \{F_i \mid F \in \mathcal{W}, F \text{ locally free}\}, \quad i = 1, \dots, \gamma.$$

As $h^1(F \otimes \omega_C) = 0$, we have $h^1(F_i \otimes \omega_{C_i}(\Delta_i)) = 0$ for any i . This implies that the set \mathcal{W}_i is a bounded set, as, up to tensoring with a fixed ample line bundle, all the elements of \mathcal{W}_i can be seen as quotient of a fixed trivial bundle. In particular, \mathcal{W}_i depends on at most $1 + (r - k)^2(g_i - 1)$ parameters, by [BPGN97, Remark 4.2].

A general element of \mathcal{W} is obtained by glueing its restrictions at the nodes by choosing an isomorphism between the fibers. By a dimensional count it turns out that \mathcal{W}_i depends actually on $1 + (r - k)^2(g_i - 1)$ parameters, hence it contains all stable vector bundles of rank $r - k$ and degree d_i . By [TiB95], a general F obtained in this way is actually \underline{w} -stable. This is impossible as we have seen that elements of \mathcal{W} are never \underline{w} -stable. \square

Remark 4.2. *It is easy to see that if $d \geq r$, then $\mathcal{G}_{(C, \underline{w}), L}(r \cdot \underline{1}, d, k)$ is not empty whenever $0 < k < r$.*

Remark 4.3. *We stress that, a priori, there could be other components of the moduli space $\mathcal{G}_{(C, \underline{w}), L}(r \cdot \underline{1}, d, k)$ besides the components Y_{d_1, \dots, d_γ} defined in Theorem 4.1. These should contain coherent systems (E, V) consisting of depth one sheaves E which are not locally free such that $\text{coker}(ev_V)$ are not \underline{w} -stable.*

Let $(E, V) \in Y_{d_1, \dots, d_\gamma}$, we can consider its restriction (E_i, V_i) to the component C_i . We wonder if (E_i, V_i) is α -semistable for some α . This does never happen when $\deg(E_i) < 0$ by [BDGPW95, Cor 3.2].

Remark 4.4. *Notice that, in general, taking restriction does not preserve stability properties. For example, \underline{w} -stable locally free sheaves can have restrictions which are not even semistable (see [BF20]).*

We denote by $\mathcal{G}_{C_i, L}(r, d_i, k)$ the terminal moduli space for α -stable coherent systems of type (r, d_i, k) on the curve C_i . Then we have the following:

Corollary 4.5. *Let Y_{d_1, \dots, d_γ} be an irreducible component of $\mathcal{G}_{(C, \underline{w}), L}(r \cdot \underline{1}, d, k)$ defined in Theorem 4.1. Assume moreover that $d_i > 0$ and $k \leq d_i + (r - k)(g_i - 1)$. Then for a general coherent system $(E, V) \in Y_{d_1, \dots, d_\gamma}$ the restriction (E_i, V_i) is an element of $\mathcal{G}_{C_i, L}(r, d_i, k)$.*

Proof. Let $F \in X_{d_1, \dots, d_\gamma}^s$ be a general element, it is locally free and F_i is stable with $\deg(F_i) = d_i > 0$ by assumption. Then, by Proposition 2.3 it follows that a general element $(E, V) \in \psi^{-1}(F)$ is a BGN extension of type (r, d, k) whose restriction (E_i, V_i) to C_i is a BGN extension

of type (r, d_i, k) . By [BGP02], the coherent system (E_i, V_i) is α -stable for any α big enough. Hence $(E_i, V_i) \in \mathcal{G}_{C_i, L}(r, d_i, k)$. \square

REFERENCES

- [AK79] A.S. Altman and S.L. Kleiman, *Bertini theorems for hypersurface sections containing a subscheme*, Comm.Algebra **8** (1979), 775–790. $\uparrow 3$
- [ACG11] E. Arbarello, M. Cornalba, and P. A. Griffiths, *Geometry of algebraic curves. Volume II*, Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences], vol. 268, Springer, Heidelberg, 2011. With a contribution by Joseph Daniel Harris. $\uparrow 2$
- [Ber94] A. Bertram, *Stable pairs and stable parabolic pairs*, J. Algebraic Geom. **3** (1994), no. 4, 703–724. $\uparrow 1$
- [Bho07] U. N. Bhosle, *Brill-Noether theory on nodal curves*, Internat. J. Math. **18** (2007), no. 10, 1133–1150, DOI 10.1142/S0129167X07004461. $\uparrow 2$
- [Bho09] ———, *Coherent systems on a nodal curve*, Moduli spaces and vector bundles, London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser., vol. 359, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2009, pp. 437–455. $\uparrow 2, 7, 10$
- [Bra09] S. B. Bradlow, *Coherent systems: a brief survey*, Moduli spaces and vector bundles, London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser., vol. 359, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2009, pp. 229–264. With an appendix by H. Lange. $\uparrow 1$
- [BD91] S. B. Bradlow and G. D. Daskalopoulos, *Moduli of stable pairs for holomorphic bundles over Riemann surfaces*, Internat. J. Math. **2** (1991), no. 5, 477–513, DOI 10.1142/S0129167X91000272. MR1124279 $\uparrow 1$
- [BDGPW95] Steven Bradlow, Georgios D. Daskalopoulos, Oscar García-Prada, and Richard Wentworth, *Stable augmented bundles over Riemann surfaces*, Vector bundles in algebraic geometry (Durham, 1993), London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser., vol. 208, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1995, pp. 15–67. $\uparrow 10, 19$
- [BGPMN03] S. B. Bradlow, O. García-Prada, V. Muñoz, and P. E. Newstead, *Coherent systems and Brill-Noether theory*, Internat. J. Math. **14** (2003), no. 7, 683–733, DOI 10.1142/S0129167X03002009. $\uparrow 1, 7$
- [BGP02] S. B. Bradlow and O. García-Prada, *An application of coherent systems to a Brill-Noether problem*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **551** (2002), 123–143, DOI 10.1515/crll.2002.079. $\uparrow 20$
- [BPGN97] L. Brambila-Paz, I. Grzegorzcyk, and P. E. Newstead, *Geography of Brill-Noether loci for small slopes*, J. Algebraic Geom. **6** (1997), no. 4, 645–669. $\uparrow 1, 7, 19$
- [BB12] M. Bolognesi and S. Brivio, *Coherent systems and modular subvarieties of $SU_C(r)$* , Internat. J. Math. **23** (2012), no. 4, 1250037, 23, DOI 10.1142/S0129167X12500371. $\uparrow 1$
- [BF19] S. Brivio and F. F. Favale, *On vector bundle over reducible curves with a node*, posted on 2019, DOI 10.1515/advgeom-2020-0010. To appear in *Advances in Geometry*. $\uparrow 3$
- [BF20a] ———, *On Kernel Bundle over reducible curves with a node*, *International Journal of Mathematics* **31** (2020), no. 7, DOI 10.1142/S0129167X20500548. $\uparrow 19$
- [BF20b] ———, *Coherent systems on curves of compact type*, *Journal of Geometry and Physics* **158** (2020), DOI 10.1016/j.geomphys.2020.103850. $\uparrow 2, 6, 7$
- [BF20c] ———, *Nodal curves and polarization with good properties*, *Preprint arXiv:2008.00753v1* (2020). $\uparrow 2, 4, 5, 15$
- [KN95] A. D. King and P. E. Newstead, *Moduli of Brill-Noether pairs on algebraic curves*, Internat. J. Math. **6** (1995), no. 5, 733–748, DOI 10.1142/S0129167X95000316. $\uparrow 1, 6$
- [LP97] J. Le Potier, *Lectures on vector bundles*, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, vol. 54, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1997. Translated by A. Maciocia. $\uparrow 1$
- [New11] P. E. Newstead, *Existence of α -stable coherent systems on algebraic curves*, Grassmannians, moduli spaces and vector bundles, Clay Math. Proc., vol. 14, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2011, pp. 121–139. $\uparrow 1$
- [Ses82] C. S. Seshadri, *Fibrés vectoriels sur les courbes algébriques*, Astérisque, vol. 96, Société Mathématique de France, Paris, 1982 (French). Notes written by J.-M. Drezet from a course at the École Normale Supérieure, June 1980. $\uparrow 3, 4, 5, 19$
- [TiB91] M. Teixidor i Bigas, *Moduli spaces of (semi)stable vector bundles on tree-like curves*, Math. Ann. **290** (1991), no. 2, 341–348, DOI 10.1007/BF01459249. $\uparrow 17$
- [TiB95] M. Teixidor i Bigas, *Moduli spaces of vector bundles on reducible curves*, Amer. J. Math. **117** (1995), no. 1, 125–139, DOI 10.2307/2375038. $\uparrow 17, 19$

DIPARTIMENTO DI MATEMATICA E APPLICAZIONI, UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI MILANO-BICOCCA, VIA ROBERTO COZZI, 55, I-20125 MILANO, ITALY

Email address: `sonia.brivio@unimib.it`

DIPARTIMENTO DI MATEMATICA E APPLICAZIONI, UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI MILANO-BICOCCA, VIA ROBERTO COZZI, 55, I-20125 MILANO, ITALY

Email address: `filippo.favale@unimib.it`