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#### Abstract

We construct the first examples of what we call fake ES-irreducible components; Definition 2.8. In our way to do so, we classify the automorphism groups of smooth plane sextics that only have automorphisms of order $\leq 3$; Theorems 2.1, 2.4 and 2.5, Corollaries 2.9 and 2.11.


## 1. Introduction

Let $\mathcal{M}_{g}^{\mathrm{Pl}}$ be the set of $K$-isomorphism classes of smooth plane curves $C$ of a fixed degree $d \geq 4$. Here $K$ is an algebraically closed field of characterisitc $p=0$ or $p>2 g+1$, where $g=(d-1)(d-2) / 2 \geq 3$ is the geometric genus of $C$.

We can associate to any $[C] \in \mathcal{M}_{g}^{\mathrm{Pl}}$ infinitely many non-singular plane models, each of them is given by a homogeneous polynomial equation $C: F(X, Y, Z)=0$ of degree $d$ in $\mathbb{P}^{2}(K)$. Moreover, two such plane models for $C$ are $K$-isomorphic and their automorphism groups are $\mathrm{PGL}_{3}(K)$-conjugated via a projective change of variables $\phi \in \mathrm{PGL}_{3}(K)$.

Now, suppose that $G$ is a finite non-trivial group that can be embedded into $\mathrm{PGL}_{3}(K)$. We write $[C] \in \mathcal{M}_{g}^{\mathrm{Pl}}(G)$ when there exists an injective representation $\varrho: G \hookrightarrow \mathrm{PGL}_{3}(K)$ such that $\varrho(G)$ is a subgroup of $\operatorname{Aut}(C)$; the automorphism group of $C: F(X, Y, Z)=0$ inside $\mathrm{PGL}_{3}(K)$. Similarly, we write $[C] \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}_{g}^{\text {pl }}}(G)$ when $\varrho(G)=\operatorname{Aut}(C)$, moreover, in this situation, we say that $[C]$ belongs to the component $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}_{g}^{\mathrm{Pl}}}(\varrho(G))$ of $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}_{g}^{\mathrm{Pl}}}(G)$.

Clearly, if $\varrho_{i}: G \hookrightarrow \mathrm{PGL}_{3}(\bar{k})$, for $i=1,2$, are $\mathrm{PGL}_{3}(\bar{k})$-conjugated, then $\mathcal{M}_{g}^{\mathrm{Pl}}\left(\varrho_{1}(G)\right)=\mathcal{M}_{g}^{\mathrm{Pl}}\left(\varrho_{2}(G)\right)$ and $\left.\overline{\mathcal{M}_{g}^{\mathrm{Pl}}}\left(\varrho_{1}(G)\right)={\mathcal{\mathcal { M } _ { g } ^ { \mathrm { Pl } }}}_{\left(\varrho_{2}\right.}(G)\right)$. Accordingly,

$$
\mathcal{M}_{g}^{\mathrm{Pl}}(G)=\bigcup_{[\varrho] \in R_{G}} \mathcal{M}_{g}^{\mathrm{Pl}}(\varrho(G)) \text { and } \widetilde{\mathcal{M}_{g}^{\mathrm{Pl}}}(G)=\bigsqcup_{[\varrho] \in R_{G}} \widetilde{\mathcal{M}_{g}^{\mathrm{Pl}}}(\varrho(G))
$$

Here $R_{G}:=\left\{\varrho: G \hookrightarrow \operatorname{PGL}_{3}(K)\right\} / \sim$, where $\varrho_{1} \sim \varrho_{2}$ if and only if $\varrho_{1}(G)$ and $\varrho_{2}(G)$ are $\mathrm{PGL}_{3}(K)$-conjugated.
Definition 1.1 (ES-irreducibility [3]). Each $[\varrho] \in R_{G}$ such that $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}_{g}^{\text {Pl }}}(\varrho(G)) \neq \emptyset$ is called an ES-irreducible component for $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}_{g}^{\mathrm{Pl}}}(G)$. We call $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}_{g}^{\mathrm{Pl}}}(G)$ ES-irreducible if it has exactly one ES-irreducible component.

Clearly, if a non-empty $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}_{g}^{\mathrm{Pl}}}(G)$ is not ES-irreducible, then it is not irreducible and the number of its ES-irreducible components is a lower bound for the number of its irreducible components inside the coarse moduli space $\mathcal{M}_{g}$ of $K$-isomorphism classes of smooth curves of genus $g$.

[^0]Now, in the language of ES-irreducibility, one can interpret the results of Henn [9] and Komiya-Kuribayashi [10] for smooth plane quartic curves, which are genus $g=3$ curves, as follows: the strata $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}_{3}^{\text {Pl }}}(G)$ are either empty or ES-irreducible. Thus each non-empty $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}_{3}^{\text {Pl }}}(G)$ is described by a single normal form; a homogenous polynomial equation $F(X, Y, Z)=0$ in $\mathbb{P}^{2}(K)$ equipped with parameters as its coefficients such that any $[C] \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}_{3}^{\mathrm{Pl}}}(G)$ can be described by a smooth plane model through a specialization of those parameters.

Notations. Throughout the paper, $L_{i, B}$ denotes the generic homogeneous polynomial of degree $i$ in the variables $\{X, Y, Z\}-\{B\}$.

By $\zeta_{n}$ we mean a fixed primitive $n$th root of unity in $K$.
A projective linear transformation $A=\left(a_{i, j}\right) \in \mathrm{PGL}_{3}(K)$ is sometimes written as

$$
\left[a_{1,1} X+a_{1,2} Y+a_{1,3} Z: a_{2,1} X+a_{2,2} Y+a_{2,3} Z: a_{3,1} X+a_{3,2} Y+a_{3,3} Z\right]
$$

For example, $[X: Z: Y]$ represents the projective change of variables $X \mapsto X, Y \mapsto$ $Z, Z \mapsto Y$, and $\operatorname{diag}(1, a, b)$ represents $X \mapsto X, Y \mapsto a Y, Z \mapsto b Z$ with $a, b \in K^{*}$.

We use the formal GAP library notations " $\operatorname{GAP}(n, m)$ " to refer the finite group of order $n$ that appears in the $m$-th position of the atlas for small finite groups [7]. See also GroupNames.

Fix the following subgroups in $\mathrm{PGL}_{3}(K)$ :

- $\varrho_{1}(\mathbb{Z} / 2 \mathbb{Z}):=\langle\operatorname{diag}(1,1,-1)\rangle$ and $\varrho_{1}\left((\mathbb{Z} / 2 \mathbb{Z})^{2}\right):=\left\langle\varrho_{1}(\mathbb{Z} / 2 \mathbb{Z}), \operatorname{diag}(1,-1,1)\right\rangle$,
- $\varrho_{1}(\mathbb{Z} / 3 \mathbb{Z}):=\left\langle\operatorname{diag}\left(1,1, \zeta_{3}\right)\right\rangle$ and $\varrho_{1}\left((\mathbb{Z} / 3 \mathbb{Z})^{2}\right):=\left\langle\varrho_{1}(\mathbb{Z} / 3 \mathbb{Z}), \operatorname{diag}\left(1, \zeta_{3}, 1\right)\right\rangle$,
- $\varrho_{2}(\mathbb{Z} / 3 \mathbb{Z}):=\left\langle\operatorname{diag}\left(1, \zeta_{3}, \zeta_{3}^{-1}\right)\right\rangle$ and $\varrho_{2}\left((\mathbb{Z} / 3 \mathbb{Z})^{2}\right):=\left\langle\varrho_{2}(\mathbb{Z} / 3 \mathbb{Z}),[Y: Z:\right.$ $X]$,
- $\varrho_{1}\left(\mathrm{~S}_{3}\right):=\langle[Y: Z: X],[X: Z: Y]\rangle$ and $\varrho_{2}\left(\mathrm{~S}_{3}\right):=\left\langle\varrho_{2}(\mathbb{Z} / 3 \mathbb{Z}),[X: Z: Y]\right\rangle$,
- $\varrho_{1}\left(\mathbb{Z} / 3 \mathbb{Z} \rtimes \mathrm{~S}_{3}\right):=\left\langle\varrho_{1}\left(\mathrm{~S}_{3}\right), \varrho_{2}(\mathbb{Z} / 3 \mathbb{Z})\right\rangle$,
- $\varrho_{1}\left(\mathrm{~A}_{4}\right):=\left\langle\varrho_{1}\left((\mathbb{Z} / 2 \mathbb{Z})^{2}\right),[Y: Z: X]\right\rangle$ and $\varrho_{2}\left(\mathrm{~A}_{4}\right):=\left\langle\varrho_{1}\left((\mathbb{Z} / 2 \mathbb{Z})^{2}\right),\left[\zeta_{6}^{-1} Y:\right.\right.$ $Z: X]\rangle$.

Remark 1.2. P. Henn observed that $\mathcal{M}_{3}^{\mathrm{Pl}}(\mathbb{Z} / 3 \mathbb{Z})$ admits two ES-components. One component corresponds to $\varrho_{1}(\mathbb{Z} / 3 \mathbb{Z})$ where any $[C] \in \mathcal{M}_{3}^{\mathrm{Pl}}\left(\varrho_{1}(\mathbb{Z} / 3 \mathbb{Z})\right)$ is given by an equation of the form $Z^{3} Y+L_{4, Z}=0$. The second component corresponds to $\varrho_{2}(\mathbb{Z} / 3 \mathbb{Z})$ such that any $\left[C^{\prime}\right] \in \mathcal{M}_{3}^{\mathrm{Pl}}\left(\varrho_{2}(\mathbb{Z} / 3 \mathbb{Z})\right)$ is given by an equation of the form $X^{4}+X\left(Y^{3}+Z^{3}\right)+\alpha_{2,1} X^{2} Y Z+\alpha_{1,2} X(Y Z)^{2}=0$ for some $\alpha_{2,1}, \alpha_{1,2} \in K$. In particular, $C^{\prime}$ has $[X: Z: Y]$ as an extra involution, thus $C^{\prime}$ always has the symmetry group $\mathrm{S}_{3}$ as a subgroup of automorphisms. Therefore, $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}_{3}^{\text {Pl }}}\left(\varrho_{2}(\mathbb{Z} / 3 \mathbb{Z})\right)=$ $\emptyset$ and $\mathcal{M}_{3}^{\mathrm{Pl}}\left(\varrho_{2}(\mathbb{Z} / 3 \mathbb{Z})\right) \subseteq \mathcal{M}_{3}^{\mathrm{Pl}}\left(\mathrm{S}_{3}\right)$.

Concerning smooth plane quintic curves, which are genus $g=6$ curves, BadrBars [1] showed that all the strata $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}_{6}^{\text {Pl }}}(G)$ are either empty or ES-irreducible except when $G=\mathbb{Z} / 4 \mathbb{Z}$. In this case, $\widehat{\mathcal{M}_{6}^{\mathrm{Pl}}}(\mathbb{Z} / 4 \mathbb{Z})$ has exactly two ES-irreducible components. Moreover, we generalized this result in [3] for any odd degree $d \geq 5$. More precisely, we proved that $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}_{g}^{\mathrm{Pl}}}(\mathbb{Z} /(d-1) \mathbb{Z})$ has at least two ES-irreducible components for any $g=(d-1)(d-2) / 2$ with $d \geq 5$ odd. However, each of the strata $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}_{6}^{\mathrm{Pl}}}(\varrho(G))$ is described again by a single normal form.

Accordingly, we were wondering if this is the situation in general. That is to say, there always exists a single normal form describing the elements of $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}_{g}^{\text {P1 }}}(\varrho(G))$ for each $\varrho \in R_{G}$. In this article, we will show that this impression is not true at least for smooth plane sextic curves, which are genus $g=10$ curves. We establish two counter examples corresponding to $G=\mathbb{Z} / 3 \mathbb{Z}$ and $\mathrm{A}_{4}$ respectively.

On the other hand, classifying automorphism groups of smooth curves is a long standing problem that receives interest by many people. In the case of hyperelliptic curve, the structure of the automorphism group is quite explicit, see $[5,6,15,16]$. For non-hyperelliptic curves, we still have a lack of knowledge about the structure, except for some special cases. For example, the cases of low genus and also Hurwitz curves, see $[4,9,11,12,13]$. This lack motivates us to do more investigation in this direction, especially for the case of smooth plane curves of degree $d \geq 4$. In this paper, we classify the automorphism groups of smooth plane curves $C$ of degree 6 such that 2 and 3 are the only divisors of $|\operatorname{Aut}(C)|$.

## 2. Main Results

Theorem 2.1. Let $C$ be a smooth plane sextic curve that admit an automorphism of maximal order 2. Up to $K$-isomorphism, $C$ is defined by an equation of the form:

$$
C: Z^{6}+Z^{4} L_{2, Z}+Z^{2} L_{4, Z}+L_{6, Z}=0
$$

such that $L_{6, Z}$ is of degree $\geq 5$ in both $X$ and $Y$, and at least one of the binary forms $L_{2, Z}$ and $L_{4, Z}$ is non-zero. Moreover, $\operatorname{Aut}(C)=\varrho_{1}(\mathbb{Z} / 2 \mathbb{Z})$ unless $L_{2, Z}, L_{4, Z}$ and $L_{6, Z}$ belong to the ring $K\left[X^{2}, Y^{2}\right]$. In the latter case, $\operatorname{Aut}(C)=\varrho_{1}\left((\mathbb{Z} / 2 \mathbb{Z})^{2}\right)$.

Corollary 2.2. The strata $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}_{10}^{\mathrm{Pl}}}(\mathbb{Z} / 2 \mathbb{Z})$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}_{10}^{\mathrm{Pl}}}\left((\mathbb{Z} / 2 \mathbb{Z})^{2}\right)$ are ES-irreducible.
Definition 2.3 ([14]). An homology of period $n$ is a projective linear transformation of the plane $\mathbb{P}^{2}(K)$, which is $\mathrm{PGL}_{3}(K)$-conjugate to $\operatorname{diag}\left(1,1, \zeta_{n}\right)$. Such a transformation fixes pointwise a line $\mathcal{L}$ (its axis) and a point $P$ off this line (its center). In its canonical form, $\mathcal{L}: Z=0$ and center $P=(0: 0: 1)$.

Otherwise, it is called a non-homology.
Theorem 2.4. Let $C$ be a smooth plane sextic curve that admits an homology of period 3 as an automorphism of maximal order. Up to $K$-isomorphism, $C$ is defined by an equation of the form $Z^{6}+Z^{3} L_{3, Z}+L_{6, Z}=0$ where neither $L_{3, Z}$ nor $L_{6, Z}$ equals 0 . Moreover, $\operatorname{Aut}(C)$ is always $\left.\varrho_{1}(\mathbb{Z} / 3 \mathbb{Z})\right\rangle$ except when $C$ is $K$-isomorphic to $C^{\prime}$ of the form $C^{\prime}: X^{6}+Y^{6}+Z^{6}+Z^{3}\left(\alpha_{3,0} X^{3}+\alpha_{0,3} Y^{3}\right)+\alpha_{3,3} X^{3} Y^{3}=0$, such that $\alpha_{3,0}, \alpha_{0,3}, \alpha_{3,3}$ are pair-wise distinct modulo $\{ \pm 1\}$. In this case, $\operatorname{Aut}\left(C^{\prime}\right)=$ $\varrho_{1}\left((\mathbb{Z} / 3 \mathbb{Z})^{2}\right)$.
Theorem 2.5. Let $C$ be a smooth plane sextic curve that admits a non-homology of period 3 as an automorphism of maximal order. Up to $K$-isomorphism, $C$ is a member of one of the following families:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{C}_{1} & : X^{6}+Y^{6}+Z^{6}+X Y Z\left(\alpha_{4,1} X^{3}+\alpha_{1,4} Y^{3}+\alpha_{1,2} Z^{3}\right)+\alpha_{2,2} X^{2} Y^{2} Z^{2} \\
& +\alpha_{3,3} X^{3} Y^{3}+\alpha_{3,0} X^{3} Z^{3}+\alpha_{0,3} Y^{3} Z^{3}=0 \\
\mathcal{C}_{2} & : X^{5} Y+Y^{5} Z+X Z^{5}+X Y Z\left(\alpha_{3,2} X^{2} Y+\alpha_{1,3} Y^{2} Z+\alpha_{2,1} X Z^{2}\right) \\
& +\alpha_{2,4} X^{2} Y^{4}+\alpha_{0,2} Y^{2} Z^{4}+\alpha_{4,0} X^{4} Z^{2}=0
\end{aligned}
$$

In either way, $\sigma=\operatorname{diag}\left(1, \zeta_{3}, \zeta_{3}^{-1}\right)$ is an automorphism of maximal order 3.
(1) The automorphism group $\operatorname{Aut}\left(\mathcal{C}_{1}\right)=\varrho_{2}(\mathbb{Z} / 3 \mathbb{Z})$ except when one of the following conditions hold.
(i) If $\alpha_{4,1}=\alpha_{1,4}=\alpha_{1,2}=\alpha_{2,2}=0$, then $\mathcal{C}_{1}$ reduces to

$$
X^{6}+Y^{6}+Z^{6}+X^{3}\left(\alpha_{3,3} Y^{3}+\alpha_{3,0} Z^{3}\right)+\alpha_{0,3} Y^{3} Z^{3}=0
$$

where $\operatorname{Aut}\left(\mathcal{C}_{1}\right)=\varrho_{1}\left((\mathbb{Z} / 3 \mathbb{Z})^{2}\right)$.
(ii) If (a) $\alpha_{4,1}= \pm \alpha_{1,4}$ and $\alpha_{3,0}= \pm \alpha_{0,3}$, (b) $\alpha_{1,4}= \pm \alpha_{1,2}$ and $\alpha_{3,3}=$ $\pm \alpha_{3,0}$, or (c) $\alpha_{4,1}= \pm \alpha_{1,2}$ and $\alpha_{3,3}= \pm \alpha_{0,3}$, then $\mathcal{C}_{1}$ is $K$-isomorphic to
$\mathcal{C}_{1}^{\prime} \quad: \quad X^{6}+Y^{6}+Z^{6}+\alpha_{4,1}^{\prime} X^{4} Y Z+\alpha_{3,3}^{\prime} X^{3}\left(Y^{3}+Z^{3}\right)+\alpha_{2,2}^{\prime} X^{2} Y^{2} Z^{2}$
$+\alpha_{1,2}^{\prime} X Y Z\left(Y^{3}+Z^{3}\right)+\alpha_{0,3}^{\prime} Y^{3} Z^{3}=0$,
where $\operatorname{Aut}\left(\mathcal{C}_{1}^{\prime}\right)=\varrho_{2}\left(\mathrm{~S}_{3}\right)$ if $\alpha_{4,1}^{\prime} \neq \alpha_{1,2}^{\prime}$ or $\alpha_{3,3}^{\prime} \neq \alpha_{0,3}^{\prime}$, and $\operatorname{Aut}\left(C^{\prime}\right)=$ $\varrho_{1}\left(\mathbb{Z} / 3 \mathbb{Z} \rtimes \mathrm{~S}_{3}\right)$ otherwise.
Remark 2.6. $\left(\alpha_{3,3}^{\prime}, \alpha_{1,2}^{\prime}\right) \neq(0,0)$ or $\operatorname{diag}\left(1, \zeta_{6}, \zeta_{6}^{-1}\right)$ will be an automorphism of order $6>3$.
(iii) If (a) $\left(\alpha_{4,1}, \alpha_{1,2}, \alpha_{1,4}\right),\left(\alpha_{1,4}, \alpha_{4,1}, \alpha_{1,2}\right)$ or $\left(\alpha_{1,2}, \alpha_{1,4}, \alpha_{4,1}\right)$ equals

$$
\left(\frac{2\left(29-54 \lambda^{6}-54 \mu^{6}\right)}{27 \lambda \mu}, \frac{2\left(27 \mu^{6}-54 \lambda^{6}-52\right)}{27 \lambda \mu^{4}}, \frac{2\left(27 \lambda^{6}-54 \mu^{6}-52\right)}{27 \lambda^{4} \mu}\right),
$$

(b) $\left(\alpha_{3,0}, \alpha_{3,3}, \alpha_{0,3}\right),\left(\alpha_{3,3}, \alpha_{0,3}, \alpha_{3,0}\right)$ or $\left(\alpha_{0,3}, \alpha_{3,0}, \alpha_{3,3}\right)$ equals
$\left(\frac{2\left(81 \lambda^{6}-27 \mu^{6}-26\right)}{27 \mu^{3}}, \frac{2\left(81 \mu^{6}-27 \lambda^{6}-26\right)}{27 \lambda^{3}}, \frac{2\left(82-27 \lambda^{6}-27 \mu^{6}\right)}{27 \lambda^{3} \mu^{3}}\right)$,
and (c) $\alpha_{2,2}=\frac{9 \lambda^{6}+9 \mu^{6}+10}{3 \lambda^{2} \mu^{2}}$ for some $\lambda, \mu \in K^{*}$, then $\mathcal{C}_{1}$ is $K$ isomorphic to

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{C}_{1, \lambda, \mu}: X^{6}+Y^{6}+Z^{6} & +f_{1}(\lambda, \mu) X^{2} Y^{2} Z^{2}+f_{2}(\lambda, \mu)\left(X^{4} Y^{2}+X^{2} Z^{4}+Y^{4} Z^{2}\right) \\
& +f_{2}(\mu, \lambda)\left(X^{4} Z^{2}+X^{2} Y^{4}+Y^{2} Z^{4}\right)=0
\end{aligned}
$$

where

$$
\begin{aligned}
f_{1}(\lambda, \mu) & :=3\left(80+81 \lambda^{6}+81 \mu^{6}\right) \\
f_{2}(\lambda, \mu) & :=81\left(1+\zeta_{3} \lambda^{6}+\zeta_{3}^{-1} \mu^{6}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

In this case, $\operatorname{Aut}\left(\mathcal{C}_{1, \lambda, \mu}\right)=\varrho_{1}\left(\mathrm{~A}_{4}\right)$.
(2) The automorphism group $\operatorname{Aut}\left(\mathcal{C}_{2}\right)=\langle\sigma\rangle=\varrho_{2}(\mathbb{Z} / 3 \mathbb{Z})$ except when one of the following conditions hold.
(i) If $\alpha_{0,2}=\zeta_{21}^{-12 r} \alpha_{4,0}, \alpha_{2,4}=\zeta_{21}^{3 r} \alpha_{4,0}, \alpha_{1,3}=\zeta_{21}^{-6 r} \alpha_{3,2}, \alpha_{2,1}=\zeta_{21}^{3 r} \alpha_{3,2}$, then $\mathcal{C}_{2}$ is $K$-isomorphic to
$\mathcal{C}_{2}^{\prime} \quad: \quad X^{5} Y+Y^{5} Z+X Z^{5}+\alpha_{4,0} \zeta_{21}^{4 r}\left(X^{4} Z^{2}+X^{2} Y^{4}+Y^{2} Z^{4}\right)$ $+\alpha_{3,2} \zeta_{21}^{-r} X Y Z\left(X^{2} Y+X Z^{2}+Y^{2} Z\right)=0$,
where $\operatorname{Aut}\left(\mathcal{C}_{2}^{\prime}\right)=\varrho_{2}\left((\mathbb{Z} / 3 \mathbb{Z})^{2}\right)$.
Remark 2.7. $\left(\alpha_{2,4}, \alpha_{1,3}\right) \neq(0,0)$ or $\operatorname{diag}\left(1, \zeta_{21}, \zeta_{21}^{-4}\right)$ will be an automorphism of order $21>3$.
(ii) If (a) $\left(\alpha_{2,4}, \alpha_{4,0}, \alpha_{0,2}\right)$, $\left(\alpha_{0,2}, \alpha_{2,4}, \alpha_{4,0}\right)$ or $\left(\alpha_{4,0}, \alpha_{0,2}, \alpha_{2,4}\right)$ equals

$$
\left(\frac{\lambda^{5} \mu+4 \mu^{5}}{2 \lambda^{4}}, \frac{\lambda+4 \lambda^{5} \mu}{2 \mu^{2}}, \frac{4 \lambda+\mu^{5}}{2 \lambda^{2} \mu^{4}}\right)
$$

and (b) $\left(\alpha_{1,3}, \alpha_{3,2}, \alpha_{2,1}\right),\left(\alpha_{2,1}, \alpha_{1,3}, \alpha_{3,2}\right)$ or $\left(\alpha_{3,2}, \alpha_{2,1}, \alpha_{1,3}\right)$ equals

$$
\left(\frac{2\left(2 \lambda^{5} \mu+2 \lambda+\mu^{5}\right)}{\lambda^{3} \mu^{2}}, \frac{2 \lambda^{5} \mu+4 \lambda+4 \mu^{5}}{\lambda^{2} \mu}, \frac{2\left(2 \lambda^{5} \mu+\lambda+2 \mu^{5}\right)}{\lambda \mu^{3}}\right)
$$

then $\mathcal{C}_{2}$ is $K$-isomorphic to

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{C}_{2, \lambda, \mu}: X^{6}+Y^{6}+Z^{6} & +g_{1}(\lambda, \mu)\left(\zeta_{3}^{-1} X^{4} Y^{2}+X^{2} Z^{4}+Y^{4} Z^{2}\right) \\
& +g_{2}(\lambda, \mu)\left(X^{4} Z^{2}+\zeta_{3} X^{2} Y^{4}+Y^{2} Z^{4}\right)=0
\end{aligned}
$$

where

$$
\begin{aligned}
g_{1}(\lambda, \mu) & :=\frac{\sqrt{3} \zeta_{9}\left(\zeta_{4} \lambda^{5} \mu+\zeta_{12} \lambda+\zeta_{12}^{5} \mu^{5}\right)}{\lambda^{5} \mu+\lambda+\mu^{5}} \\
g_{2}(\lambda, \mu) & :=\frac{\sqrt{3} \zeta_{18}\left(\zeta_{12}^{5} \lambda^{5} \mu+\zeta_{12} \lambda+\zeta_{4} \mu^{5}\right)}{\lambda^{5} \mu+\lambda+\mu^{5}}
\end{aligned}
$$

In this case, $\operatorname{Aut}\left(\mathcal{C}_{2, \lambda, \mu}\right)=\varrho_{2}\left(\mathrm{~A}_{4}\right)$.
We now introduce the notion of fake ES-irreducible components.
Definition 2.8. An ES-irreducible component $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}_{g}^{\mathrm{Pl}}}(\varrho(G))$ is fake if it is not defined by a single normal form.

As a consequence of Theorems 2.4 and 2.5:
Corollary 2.9. The strata $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}_{10}^{\text {Pl }}}(\mathbb{Z} / 3 \mathbb{Z})$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}_{10}^{\text {Pl }}}\left((\mathbb{Z} / 3 \mathbb{Z})^{2}\right)$ are not ES-irreducible and each of them has exactly two ES-irreducible components namely, $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}_{10}^{\mathrm{Pl}}}\left(\varrho_{i}(\mathbb{Z} / 3 \mathbb{Z})\right)$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}_{10}^{\text {Pl }}}\left(\varrho_{i}\left((\mathbb{Z} / 3 \mathbb{Z})^{2}\right)\right)$ respectively with $i=1$ and 2 .

On the other hand, $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}_{10}^{\mathrm{Pl}}}\left(\varrho_{2}(\mathbb{Z} / 3 \mathbb{Z})\right)$ is the first example of fake ES-irreducible components. Any $[C] \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}_{10}^{\mathrm{Pl}}}\left(\varrho_{2}(\mathbb{Z} / 3 \mathbb{Z})\right)$ in the family $\mathcal{C}_{2}$ has the property that its automorphism group $\operatorname{Aut}(C)=\varrho_{2}(\mathbb{Z} / 3 \mathbb{Z})$ fixes point-wise the three reference points $P_{1}=(1: 0: 0), P_{2}=(0: 1: 0)$ and $P_{2}=(0: 0: 1)$ that all lie on $C$. This does not hold if $C$ is in the family $\mathcal{C}_{1}$ in the sense that $\operatorname{Aut}(C)=\varrho_{2}(\mathbb{Z} / 3 \mathbb{Z})$ does not fix any points on $C$.
Corollary 2.10. The strata $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}_{10}^{\mathrm{Pl}}}\left(\mathrm{S}_{3}\right)$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}_{10}^{\mathrm{Pl}}}\left(\mathbb{Z} / 3 \mathbb{Z} \rtimes \mathrm{~S}_{3}\right)$ are ES-irreducible. More precisely, $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}_{10}^{\mathrm{Pl}}}\left(\mathrm{S}_{3}\right)=\widetilde{\mathcal{M}_{10}^{\mathrm{Pl}}}\left(\varrho_{2}\left(\mathrm{~S}_{3}\right)\right)$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}_{10}^{\mathrm{Pl}}}\left(\mathbb{Z} / 3 \mathbb{Z} \rtimes \mathrm{~S}_{3}\right)=\widetilde{\mathcal{M}_{10}^{\mathrm{Pl}}}\left(\varrho_{1}(\mathbb{Z} / 3 \mathbb{Z} \rtimes\right.$ $\left.\mathrm{S}_{3}\right)$ ).
Corollary 2.11. The stratum $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}_{10}^{\mathrm{Pl}}}\left(\mathrm{A}_{4}\right)$ is ES-irreducible determined by $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}_{10}^{\mathrm{Pl}}}\left(\varrho_{1}\left(\mathrm{~A}_{4}\right)\right)$. It represents the second example of fake ES-irreducible components. Indeed, $\mathcal{C}_{2, \lambda, \mu}$ is $K$-isomorphic, via a change of variables $\phi=\operatorname{diag}(1, s, t)$ such that $s=t^{2}$ and $t^{3}=\zeta_{6}$, to ${ }^{\phi} \mathcal{C}_{2, \lambda, \mu}: X^{6}+\zeta_{3}^{-1} Y^{6}+\zeta_{3} Z^{6}+$ lower order terms, where $\operatorname{Aut}\left({ }^{\phi} \mathcal{C}_{2, \lambda, \mu}\right)=$ $\varrho_{1}\left(\mathrm{~A}_{4}\right)$. Moreover, any $[C] \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}_{10}^{\mathrm{P}}}\left(\varrho_{1}\left(\mathrm{~A}_{4}\right)\right)$ in the family $\mathcal{C}_{1, \lambda, \mu}$ is a descendant of the Fermat curve $\mathcal{F}_{6}$ in the sense of Theorem 3.1 via a change of variables in the normalizer of $\varrho_{1}\left(\mathrm{~A}_{4}\right)$ in $\mathrm{PGL}_{3}(K)$. This does not hold if $[C]$ is in the family ${ }^{\phi} \mathcal{C}_{2, \lambda, \mu}$.

## 3. Preliminaries about automorphism groups

Based entirely on geometrical methods, H. Mitchell [14, §1-10] proved that if $G$ is a finite subgroups of $\mathrm{PGL}_{3}(K)$, then it fixes a point, a line or a triangle unless it is primitive and conjugate to some group in a specific list. However, as a consequence of Maschke's theorem in group representation theory, the first two cases are equivalent, in the sense that if $G$ fixes a point (respectively a line), then it also fixes a line not passing through the point (respectively a point not lying the line).
Notations. For a non-zero monomial $c X^{i_{1}} Y^{i_{2}} Z^{i_{3}}$ with $c \in K^{*}$, its exponent is defined to be $\max \left\{i_{1}, i_{2}, i_{3}\right\}$. For a homogenous polynomial $F(X, Y, Z)$, the core of
it is defined to be the sum of all terms of $F$ with the greatest exponent. Now, let $C_{0}$ be a non-singular plane curve over $K$, a pair $(C, G)$ with $G \leq \operatorname{Aut}(C)$ is said to be a descendant of $C_{0}$ if $C$ is defined by a homogenous polynomial whose core is a defining polynomial of $C_{0}$ and $G$ acts on $C_{0}$ under a suitable change of the coordinates system, i.e. $G$ is $\mathrm{PGL}_{3}(K)$-conjugate to a subgroup of $\operatorname{Aut}\left(C_{0}\right)$.

An element of $\mathrm{PGL}_{3}(K)$ is called intransitive if it has the matrix shape

$$
\left(\begin{array}{lll}
1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & * & * \\
0 & * & *
\end{array}\right)
$$

The subgroup of $\mathrm{PGL}_{3}(K)$ of all intransitive elements is denoted by $\operatorname{PBD}(2,1)$. Obviously, there is a natural map $\Lambda: \operatorname{PBD}(2,1) \rightarrow \mathrm{PGL}_{2}(K)$ given by

$$
\left(\begin{array}{ccc}
1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & * & * \\
0 & * & *
\end{array}\right) \in \operatorname{PBD}(2,1) \mapsto\left(\begin{array}{cc}
* & * \\
* & *
\end{array}\right) \in \mathrm{PGL}_{2}(K)
$$

Theorem 3.1 below is very helpful for determining the full automorphism groups of smooth plane curves. For more details, we refer to the work of T. Harui [8, Theroem 2.1].
Theorem 3.1. Let $C$ be a non-singular plane curve of degree $d \geq 4$ defined over an algebraically closed field $K$ of characteristic 0 . Then, one of the following situations holds:

1. $\operatorname{Aut}(C)$ fixes a point on $C$ and then it is cyclic.
2. Aut $(C)$ fixes a point not lying on $C$ where we can think about $\operatorname{Aut}(C)$ in the following commutative diagram, with exact rows and vertical injective morphisms:


Here, $N$ is a cyclic group of order dividing the degree $d$ and $G^{\prime}$ is a subgroup of $\mathrm{PGL}_{2}(K)$, which is conjugate to a cyclic group $\mathbb{Z} / m \mathbb{Z}$ of order $m$ with $m \leq$ $d-1$, a Dihedral group $\mathrm{D}_{2 m}$ of order $2 m$ with $|N|=1$ or $m \mid(d-2)$, one of the alternating groups $\mathrm{A}_{4}, \mathrm{~A}_{5}$, or the symmetry group $\mathrm{S}_{4}$.

Remark 3.2. We note that $N$ is viewed as the part of $\operatorname{Aut}(C)$ acting on the variable $B \in\{X, Y, Z\}$ and fixing the other two variables, while $G^{\prime}$ is the part acting on $\{X, Y, Z\}-\{B\}$ and fixing $B$. For example, if $B=X$, then every automorphism in $N$ has the shape $\operatorname{diag}\left(\zeta_{n}, 1,1\right)$ for some $n$th root of unity $\zeta_{n}$.
3. Aut $(C)$ is conjugate to a subgroup $G$ of $\operatorname{Aut}\left(\mathcal{F}_{d}\right)$, where $\mathcal{F}_{d}$ is the Fermat curve $X^{d}+Y^{d}+Z^{d}=0$. In particular, $|G|$ divides $\left|\operatorname{Aut}\left(\mathcal{F}_{d}\right)\right|=6 d^{2}$, and $(C, G)$ is a descendant of $\mathcal{F}_{d}$.
4. Aut $(C)$ is conjugate to a subgroup $G$ of $\operatorname{Aut}\left(\mathcal{K}_{d}\right)$, where $\mathcal{K}_{d}$ is the Klein curve curve $X^{d-1} Y+Y^{d-1} Z+X Z^{d-1}=0$. In this case, $|\operatorname{Aut}(C)|$ divides $\left|\operatorname{Aut}\left(\mathcal{K}_{d}\right)\right|=$ $3\left(d^{2}-3 d+3\right)$, and $(C, G)$ is a descendant of $\mathcal{K}_{d}$.
5. Aut $(C)$ is conjugate to one of the finite primitive subgroup of $\mathrm{PGL}_{3}(K)$ namely, the Klein group $\operatorname{PSL}(2,7)$, the icosahedral group $\mathrm{A}_{5}$, the alternating group $\mathrm{A}_{6}$, or to one of the Hessian groups $\mathrm{Hess}_{*}$ with $* \in\{36,72,216\}$.

Finally, we have:

Proposition 3.3. The automorphism groups of the Fermat sextic curve $\mathcal{F}_{6}$ generated by $[X: Z: Y],[Y: Z: X], \operatorname{diag}\left(\zeta_{6}, 1,1\right)$ and $\operatorname{diag}\left(1, \zeta_{6}, 1\right)$ of orders $2,3,6$ and 6 respectively is isomorphic to $\operatorname{GAP}(216,92)=(\mathbb{Z} / 6 \mathbb{Z})^{2} \rtimes \mathrm{~S}_{3}$. On the other hand, the automorphism group of the Klein sextic curve $\mathcal{K}_{6}$ generated by $\operatorname{diag}\left(1, \zeta_{21}, \zeta_{21}^{-4}\right)$ and $[Y: Z: X]$ of orders 21 and 3 respectively is isomorphic to $\operatorname{GAP}(63,3)=\mathbb{Z} / 21 \mathbb{Z} \rtimes \mathbb{Z} / 3 \mathbb{Z}$.
Proof. Regarding the generators of $\operatorname{Aut}\left(\mathcal{F}_{6}\right)$ and $\operatorname{Aut}\left(\mathcal{K}_{6}\right)$, we refer the reader to [8, Propositions 3.3, 3.5]. Now, for the Fermat curve $\mathcal{F}_{6}$, take $a=[X: Z: Y], b=$ $[Y: Z: X], c=\operatorname{diag}\left(\zeta_{6}, 1,1\right)$ and $d=\operatorname{diag}\left(1, \zeta_{6}, 1\right)$. One verifies that

$$
(a b)^{2}=(a c)(c a)^{-1}=(c d)(d c)^{-1}=a d a(c d)^{-5}=b c b^{-1}(c d)^{-5}=1
$$

These relations give us the 4 th semidirect product of $(\mathbb{Z} / 6 \mathbb{Z})^{2}$ and $S_{3}$ acting faithfully, see semidirect products of $(\mathbb{Z} / 6 \mathbb{Z})^{2}$ and $S_{3}$ for more details.

For the Klein curve $\mathcal{K}_{6}$, the two generators $a=\operatorname{diag}\left(1, \zeta_{21}, \zeta_{21}^{-4}\right)$ and $b=[Y$ : $Z: X]$ of orders 21 and 3 respectively produce $\operatorname{GAP}(63,3)=\mathbb{Z} / 21 \mathbb{Z} \rtimes \mathbb{Z} / 3 \mathbb{Z}$ as $b a=(a b)^{-5}$.

## 4. Proof of Theorem 2.4

In this case, $C: F(X, Y, Z)=0$ has an homology $\sigma$ of period 3 in its automorphism group. The results in [2] allows us to assume that $\sigma$ acts as

$$
(X: Y: Z) \mapsto\left(X: Y: \zeta_{3} Z\right)
$$

up to $K$-isomorphism, where $\zeta_{3}$ is a fixed primitive 3 rd root of unity in $K$. In particular, $C$ is defined over $K$ by a non-singular plane equation of the form:

$$
C: Z^{6}+Z^{3} L_{3, Z}+L_{6, Z}=0
$$

where $\sigma=\operatorname{diag}\left(1,1, \zeta_{3}\right)$ is an automorphism of maximal order 3. By non-singularity, $L_{6, Z}$ should be of degree at least 5 in both variables $X$ and $Y$. Also, $L_{3, Z} \neq 0$ or $\operatorname{diag}\left(1,1, \zeta_{6}\right)$ would be an automorphism of order $6>3$.

In the sense of Theorem 3.1, we have the following:

- First, $\operatorname{Aut}(C)$ is not conjugate to any of the finite primitive subgroups of $\mathrm{PGL}_{3}(K)$ since each of them contains elements of order $>3$. Also, $C$ is not a descendant of the Klein sextic curve $\mathcal{K}_{6}$ because $\operatorname{Aut}\left(\mathcal{K}_{6}\right)$ by Proposition 3.3 equals $\mathbb{Z} / 21 \mathbb{Z} \rtimes \mathbb{Z} / 3 \mathbb{Z}$ and it does not contains homologies of order 3 similar to $\sigma$.
- Secondly, suppose that $C$ is a descendant of the Fermat curve $\mathcal{F}_{6}$. So there is a $\phi \in \mathrm{PGL}_{3}(K)$ such that $\phi^{-1} \operatorname{Aut}(C) \phi \leq \operatorname{Aut}\left(\mathcal{F}_{6}\right)$ and the transformed equation ${ }^{\phi} C$ is $X^{6}+Y^{6}+Z^{6}+$ lower order terms in $X, Y, Z=0$. There is no loss of generality to impose $\phi^{-1}\langle\sigma\rangle \phi=\langle\sigma\rangle$ since homologies of period 3 inside $\operatorname{Aut}\left(\mathcal{F}_{6}\right)$ form two conjugacy classes represented by $\sigma$ and $\sigma^{-1}$. Hence ${ }^{\phi} C$ reduces to

$$
{ }^{\phi} C: X^{6}+Y^{6}+Z^{6}+Z^{3} L_{3, Z}+\text { lower order terms in } X, Y=0
$$

Furthermore, by assumption, the automorphisms of $C$ have orders $\leq 3$, then the group structure of $\operatorname{Aut}\left(\mathcal{F}_{6}\right)=(\mathbb{Z} / 6 \mathbb{Z})^{2} \rtimes \mathrm{~S}_{3}$ assures that $\operatorname{Aut}\left({ }^{\phi} C\right)$ would be one of the following groups inside $\operatorname{Aut}\left(\mathcal{F}_{6}\right)$ :

$$
\mathbb{Z} / 3 \mathbb{Z},(\mathbb{Z} / 3 \mathbb{Z})^{2}, \mathrm{~S}_{3}, \mathrm{~A}_{4}, \mathbb{Z} / 3 \mathbb{Z} \rtimes \mathrm{~S}_{3}, \mathrm{He}_{3}
$$

For more details, check the subgroups lattice of $\operatorname{Aut}\left(\mathcal{F}_{6}\right)$.
Now we tackle each of the above situations.

- Any copy of $\mathrm{S}_{3}$ (respectively $\mathrm{A}_{4}$ ) inside $\operatorname{Aut}\left(\mathcal{F}_{6}\right)$ is $\operatorname{Aut}\left(\mathcal{F}_{6}\right)$-conjugate to either $\varrho_{i}\left(\mathrm{~S}_{3}\right)$ (respectively $\varrho_{i}\left(\mathrm{~A}_{4}\right)$ ) with $i=1$ or 2 . But non of these
subgroups has homologies of period 3 similar to $\sigma$. So $\operatorname{Aut}\left({ }^{\phi} C\right)$ can not be an $S_{3}$ or $\mathrm{A}_{4}$ inside $\operatorname{Aut}\left(\mathcal{F}_{6}\right)$.
- If $\operatorname{Aut}\left({ }^{\phi} C\right)$ equals a $(\mathbb{Z} / 3 \mathbb{Z})^{2}, \mathbb{Z} / 3 \mathbb{Z} \rtimes \mathrm{~S}_{3}$ or $\mathrm{He}_{3}$ in $\operatorname{Aut}\left(\mathcal{F}_{6}\right)$, then there must be $\sigma^{\prime} \in \operatorname{Aut}\left(\mathcal{F}_{6}\right) \cap \operatorname{Aut}\left({ }^{\phi} C\right)$ of order 3 that commutes with $\sigma$ as in any of these groups $\mathbb{Z} / 3 \mathbb{Z}$ is always contained in a $(\mathbb{Z} / 3 \mathbb{Z})^{2}$. By Proposition 3.3, the elements of order 3 in $\operatorname{Aut}\left(\mathcal{F}_{6}\right)$ are $\operatorname{diag}(1, s, t)$ with $s^{3}=t^{3}=1,[s Y: t Z: X]$ and $[t Z: X: s Y]$ with $s^{6}=t^{6}=1$. One easily verifies that only the diagonal shapes satisfies the description, equivalently, $\sigma^{\prime} \in\left\langle\sigma, \operatorname{diag}\left(1, \zeta_{3}, 1\right)\right\rangle$. In any case, we can reduce $C$ up to $K$-isomorphism to
${ }^{\phi} C: X^{6}+Y^{6}+Z^{6}+Z^{3}\left(\alpha_{3,0} X^{3}+\alpha_{0,3} Y^{3}\right)+\alpha_{3,3} X^{3} Y^{3}=0$,
where $\varrho_{1}\left((\mathbb{Z} / 3 \mathbb{Z})^{2}\right) \leq \operatorname{Aut}\left({ }^{\phi} C\right)$.
Remark 4.1. In this scenario, the parameters $\alpha_{3,0}, \alpha_{0,3}, \alpha_{3,3}$ must be pairwise distinct modulo $\{ \pm 1\}$ or ${ }^{\phi} C$ will admit automorphisms of order $>3$. For example, $\left[\zeta_{3} Y: X: Z\right] \in \operatorname{Aut}\left({ }^{\phi} C\right)$ has order 6 if $\alpha_{3,0}=\alpha_{0,3}$ and $\left[\zeta_{3} Y: X:-Z\right] \in \operatorname{Aut}\left({ }^{\phi} C\right)$ has order 6 if $\alpha_{3,0}=-\alpha_{0,3}$.

A similar discussion shows that any $\sigma^{\prime \prime} \in \operatorname{Aut}\left(\mathcal{F}_{6}\right)$ that commutes with $\sigma$ or $\sigma^{\prime}$ belongs to $\left\langle\sigma, \sigma^{\prime}\right\rangle$. Therefore, $\operatorname{Aut}\left({ }^{\phi} C\right)$ can not be the Heisenberg group $\mathrm{He}_{3}$ because this requires another automorphism $\sigma^{\prime \prime} \notin\left\langle\sigma, \sigma^{\prime}\right\rangle$ that commutes with either $\sigma$ or $\sigma^{\prime}$.

Finally, for $\operatorname{Aut}\left({ }^{\phi} C\right)$ to be $\mathbb{Z} / 3 \mathbb{Z} \rtimes \mathrm{~S}_{3}$, it is necessary that $\operatorname{Aut}\left(\mathcal{F}_{6}\right) \cap$ Aut $\left({ }^{\phi} C\right)$ has involutions in it. Proposition 3.3 tells us that the involutions of $\mathcal{F}_{6}$ are $\operatorname{diag}(-1,1,1), \operatorname{diag}(1,-1,1), \operatorname{diag}(1,1,-1),\left[X: s Z: s^{-1} Y\right]$, $\left[s^{-1} Y: s X: Z\right]$ and $\left[s Z: Y: s^{-1} X\right]$ with $s^{6}=1$. If any of these involutions lies in $\operatorname{Aut}\left({ }^{\phi} C\right)$, then two of the parameters are equal modulo $\{ \pm 1\}$, which is absurd by Remark 4.1. For example, $\operatorname{diag}(-1,1,1) \in \operatorname{Aut}\left({ }^{\phi} C\right)$ only if $\alpha_{3,0}=\alpha_{3,3}=0,\left[s Y: s^{-1} X: Z\right] \in \operatorname{Aut}\left({ }^{\phi} C\right)$ only if $\alpha_{3,0}= \pm \alpha_{0,3}$, and so on.

- Third, if $\operatorname{Aut}(C)$ fixes a line $\mathcal{L}$ and a point $P$ not lying on $\mathcal{L}$, then by Theorem 3.1 we can think about $\operatorname{Aut}(C)$ in a short exact sequence

$$
1 \rightarrow N=\langle\sigma\rangle \rightarrow \operatorname{Aut}(C) \rightarrow \Lambda(\operatorname{Aut}(C)) \rightarrow 1
$$

where $\Lambda(\operatorname{Aut}(C)) \simeq \mathbb{Z} / 3 \mathbb{Z}, \mathrm{D}_{4}$ or $\mathrm{A}_{4}$.

- Any group of order 36 (respectively 12) that has a normal subgroup isomorphic to $\mathbb{Z} / 3 \mathbb{Z}$ contains elements of order $6>3$, see Groups of order 12 and Groups of order 36 for more details. This allows us to exclude that $\Lambda(\operatorname{Aut}(C))$ equals $\mathrm{A}_{4}$ or $\mathrm{D}_{4}$.
- On the other hand, if $\Lambda($ Aut $)(C)$ equals $\mathbb{Z} / 3 \mathbb{Z}$ in $\mathrm{PGL}_{2}(K)$, then $\operatorname{Aut}(C)$ equals $(\mathbb{Z} / 3 \mathbb{Z})^{2}$ in $\operatorname{PBD}(2,1)$. In particular, $C: Z^{6}+Z^{3} L_{3, Z}+$ $L_{6, Z}=0$ admits an automorphism $\sigma^{\prime} \in \operatorname{PBD}(2,1)-\langle\sigma\rangle$ of order 3 that commutes with $\sigma$. Depending on whether $\sigma^{\prime}$ is an homology or a nonhomology, it is conjugate via a change of variables $\phi \in \operatorname{PBD}(2,1)$, the normalizer of $\langle\sigma\rangle$, to $\operatorname{diag}\left(1, \zeta_{3}, 1\right)$ or $\operatorname{diag}\left(1, \zeta_{3}, \zeta_{3}^{-1}\right)$ respectively. In either way, $\operatorname{Aut}\left({ }^{\phi} C\right)=\varrho_{1}\left((\mathbb{Z} / 3 \mathbb{Z})^{2}\right)$ which appeared earlier.
Summing up, we deduce that $\operatorname{Aut}(C)$ is always cyclic of order 3 generated by $\sigma$ except when $C$ is projectively equivalent to $C^{\prime}$ of the form

$$
C^{\prime}: X^{6}+Y^{6}+Z^{6}+Z^{3}\left(\alpha_{3,0} X^{3}+\alpha_{0,3} Y^{3}\right)+\alpha_{3,3} X^{3} Y^{3}=0
$$

such that $\alpha_{3,0}, \alpha_{0,3}, \alpha_{3,3}$ are pair-wise distinct modulo $\{ \pm 1\}$. In this case, $\operatorname{Aut}(C)$ is conjugate to $(\mathbb{Z} / 3 \mathbb{Z})^{2}$ generated by $\operatorname{diag}\left(1, \zeta_{3}, 1\right)$ and $\operatorname{diag}\left(1, \zeta_{3}, 1\right)$.

This proves Theorem 2.4.

## 5. Proof of Theorem 2.1

In this case, $C: F(X, Y, Z)=0$ has an homology $\sigma$ of period 2 in its automorphism group. By [2], there is no loss of generality to assume that $\sigma$ acts as

$$
(X: Y: Z) \mapsto(X: Y:-Z)
$$

up to $K$-isomorphism. In particular, $C$ is defined over $K$ by a non-singular plane equation of the form:

$$
C: Z^{6}+Z^{4} L_{2, Z}+Z^{2} L_{4, Z}+L_{6, Z}=0
$$

where $\sigma=\operatorname{diag}(1,1,-1)$ is an automorphism of maximal order 2. Again $L_{6, Z}$ is of degree $\geq 5$ in $X$ and $Y$ by non-singularity. Also, $L_{3, Z}$ or $L_{4, Z}$ does not vanish or $\operatorname{diag}\left(1,1, \zeta_{4}\right)$ will be an automorphism of order $4>3$ otherwise.

- Obviously, $\operatorname{Aut}(C)$ is not conjugate to any of the finite primitive subgroups of $\mathrm{PGL}_{3}(K)$ as each of them contains elements of order $>2$. Also, $C$ can not be a descendant of the Klein sextic curve $\mathcal{K}_{6}$ since $2 \nmid\left|\operatorname{Aut}\left(\mathcal{K}_{6}\right)\right|$, recall that $\left|\operatorname{Aut}\left(\mathcal{K}_{6}\right)\right|=63$ by Proposition 3.3.
- Secondly, if $\operatorname{Aut}(C)$ fixes a line $\mathcal{L}$ and a point $P$ off $\mathcal{L}$, then, by Theorem 3.1, $\operatorname{Aut}(C)$ is inside $\operatorname{PBD}(2,1)$ and satisfies a short exact sequence

$$
1 \rightarrow N=\langle\sigma\rangle \rightarrow \operatorname{Aut}(C) \rightarrow \Lambda(\operatorname{Aut}(C)) \rightarrow 1
$$

Our assumptions that any automorphism of $C$ has order $\leq 2$ implies that $\Lambda(\operatorname{Aut}(C))$ is either $\mathbb{Z} / 2 \mathbb{Z}$ or $\mathrm{D}_{4}$ inside $\mathrm{PGL}_{2}(K)$, so $\operatorname{Aut}(C)$ is conjugate to either $(\mathbb{Z} / 2 \mathbb{Z})^{2}$ or $(\mathbb{Z} / 2 \mathbb{Z})^{3}$. In both situations $\operatorname{Aut}(C)$ has another involution $\sigma^{\prime}$ that commutes with $\sigma$. Up to projective equivalence via a change of variables $\phi \in \operatorname{PBD}(2,1)$, the normalizer of $\langle\sigma\rangle$ in $\mathrm{PGL}_{3}(K)$, we can assume that $\sigma^{\prime}=\operatorname{diag}(1,-1,1)$. Consequently, $C$ is $K$-isomorphic to $C^{\prime}: Z^{6}+Z^{4} L_{2, Z}+Z^{2} L_{4, Z}+L_{6, Z}=0$ for some $L_{i, Z} \in K\left[X^{2}, Y^{2}\right]$. Moreover, $\operatorname{Aut}(C)$ equals $(\mathbb{Z} / 2 \mathbb{Z})^{3}$ only if there is an involution $\sigma^{\prime \prime} \notin \operatorname{PBD}(2,1)-\left\langle\sigma, \sigma^{\prime}\right\rangle$ that commutes with both $\sigma$ and $\sigma^{\prime}$. It is straightforward to check that such $\sigma^{\prime \prime}$ does not exist, hence $\operatorname{Aut}(C)$ is not $(\mathbb{Z} / 2 \mathbb{Z})^{3}$ in this case.

- If $C$ is a descendant of the Fermat curve $\mathcal{F}_{6}$ via a change of variables $\phi \in \mathrm{PGL}_{3}(K)$ with bigger automorphism group than $\langle\sigma\rangle$, then $\operatorname{Aut}\left({ }^{\phi} C\right)$ is a copy of $(\mathbb{Z} / 2 \mathbb{Z})^{2}$ inside $\operatorname{Aut}\left(\mathcal{F}_{6}\right)$. Indeed any other subgroup of $\operatorname{Aut}\left(\mathcal{F}_{6}\right)$ has elements of order $>2$, see subgroups lattice of $\operatorname{Aut}\left(\mathcal{F}_{6}\right)$.

Up to $\operatorname{Aut}\left(\mathcal{F}_{6}\right)$-conjugation, there are two copies of $(\mathbb{Z} / 2 \mathbb{Z})^{2}$ inside $\operatorname{Aut}\left(\mathcal{F}_{6}\right)$ namely, $\left\langle\sigma, \sigma^{\prime}\right\rangle$ and $\langle\sigma, \tau\rangle$ with $\sigma^{\prime}=\operatorname{diag}(1,-1,1)$ and $\tau=[Y:$ $X: Z]$. However, both groups are $\mathrm{PGL}_{3}(K)$-conjugated via a transformation in $\operatorname{PBD}(2,1)$, the normalizer of $\langle\sigma\rangle$ in $\mathrm{PGL}_{3}(K)$. Thus there is no loss of generality to assume that $\operatorname{Aut}(C)$ is conjugate to $\varrho_{1}\left((\mathbb{Z} / 2 \mathbb{Z})^{2}\right)$, which was treated earlier.
Summing up, we deduce that $\operatorname{Aut}(C)$ is always cyclic of order 2 generated by $\sigma$ except when $L_{i, Z} \in K\left[X^{2}, Y^{2}\right]$ for $i=2,4,6$. In the latter case, Aut $(C)$ equals $\varrho_{1}\left((\mathbb{Z} / 2 \mathbb{Z})^{2}\right)$, which shows Theorem 2.1.

## 6. Proof of Theorem 2.5

In this case, $C: F(X, Y, Z)=0$ has a non-homology $\sigma$ of period 3 in its automorphism group. By [2], one can assume that $\sigma$ acts as

$$
(X: Y: Z) \mapsto\left(X: \zeta_{3} Y: \zeta_{3}^{-1} Z\right)
$$

up to $K$-isomorphism, where $\zeta_{3}$ is a fixed primitive 3 rd root of unity in $K$. In particular, $C$ is a $K$-isomorphic to a non-singular plane modelin one of the following
families:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{C}_{1} & : X^{6}+Y^{6}+Z^{6}+X Y Z\left(\alpha_{4,1} X^{3}+\alpha_{1,4} Y^{3}+\alpha_{1,2} Z^{3}\right)+\alpha_{2,2} X^{2} Y^{2} Z^{2} \\
& +\alpha_{3,3} X^{3} Y^{3}+\alpha_{3,0} X^{3} Z^{3}+\alpha_{0,3} Y^{3} Z^{3}=0 \\
\mathcal{C}_{2} & : X^{5} Y+Y^{5} Z+X Z^{5}+X Y Z\left(\alpha_{3,2} X^{2} Y+\alpha_{1,3} Y^{2} Z+\alpha_{2,1} X Z^{2}\right) \\
& +\alpha_{2,4} X^{2} Y^{4}+\alpha_{0,2} Y^{2} Z^{4}+\alpha_{4,0} X^{4} Z^{2}=0
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\sigma:=\operatorname{diag}\left(1, \zeta_{3}, \zeta_{3}^{-1}\right)$ is an automorphism of maximal order 3 .

- Again $\operatorname{Aut}\left(\mathcal{C}_{i}\right)$ for $i=1$ and 2 is not conjugate to any of the finite primitive subgroups of $\mathrm{PGL}_{3}(K)$.
- Suppose that $\operatorname{Aut}\left(\mathcal{C}_{i}\right)$ fixes a line $\mathcal{L}$ and a point $P$ not lying on this line. Since $\sigma$ is a non-homology inside $\operatorname{Aut}\left(\mathcal{C}_{i}\right)$ in its canonical form, $\mathcal{L}$ must be one of the reference lines; $B=0$ with $B=X, Y$ or $Z$ and $P$ is the reference point $(1: 0: 0),(0: 1: 0)$ or $(0: 0: 1)$ respectively.
- For $\mathcal{C}_{2}$, the point $P$ belongs to $C: F(X, Y, Z)=0$. Hence $\operatorname{Aut}\left(\mathcal{C}_{2}\right)$ is cyclic, generated by $\langle\sigma\rangle$.
- For $\mathcal{C}_{1}$, we can further impose $\mathcal{L}: X=0$ and $P=(1: 0: 0)$ (in the worst case scenario, one just needs to permute two of the variables and to fix the third one, which preserves the property that $\sigma$ remains an automorphism). In particular, by Theorem 3.1, $\operatorname{Aut}\left(\mathcal{C}_{1}\right) \subseteq \operatorname{PBD}(2,1)$ and lives in a short exact sequence: $1 \rightarrow N \rightarrow \operatorname{Aut}\left(\mathcal{C}_{1}\right) \rightarrow \Lambda\left(\operatorname{Aut}\left(\mathcal{C}_{1}\right)\right) \rightarrow 1$, where $N=\langle\tau\rangle$ has order 1,2 or 3 and $\Lambda(\operatorname{Aut}(C))$ is either $\mathbb{Z} / 3 \mathbb{Z}, \mathrm{~S}_{3}$ with $|N|=1$ or $\mathrm{A}_{4}$ in $\mathrm{PGL}_{2}(K)$. First, we easily exclude the case when $\tau$ has order 2 because $\sigma \tau$ would be an automorphism of order $6>3$, a contradiction.

Secondly, we handle each of the remaining cases:
(i) If $\Lambda\left(\operatorname{Aut}\left(\mathcal{C}_{1}\right)\right)=\mathbb{Z} / 3 \mathbb{Z}$ and $N=1$, then $\operatorname{Aut}\left(\mathcal{C}_{1}\right)=\mathbb{Z} / 3 \mathbb{Z}$ generated by $\sigma$.
(ii) If $\Lambda\left(\operatorname{Aut}\left(\mathcal{C}_{1}\right)\right)=\mathbb{Z} / 3 \mathbb{Z}$ and $N=\mathbb{Z} / 3 \mathbb{Z}$, then $\operatorname{Aut}\left(\mathcal{C}_{1}\right)=\varrho_{1}\left((\mathbb{Z} / 3 \mathbb{Z})^{2}\right)$ generated by $\sigma$ and $\tau=\operatorname{diag}\left(\zeta_{3}, 1,1\right)$. In particular, $\alpha_{4,1}=\alpha_{2,2}=$ $\alpha_{1,2}=\alpha_{1,4}=0$, and $\mathcal{C}_{1}$ reduces to
$X^{6}+Y^{6}+Z^{6}+Z^{3}\left(\alpha_{3,0} X^{3}+\alpha_{0,3} Y^{3}\right)+\alpha_{3,3} X^{3} Y^{3}=0$,
which happened before in Theorem 2.4.
This shows Theorem 2.5, (1)-(i).
(iii) If $\Lambda\left(\operatorname{Aut}\left(\mathcal{C}_{1}\right)\right)=\mathrm{S}_{3}$ and $N=1$, then $C$ should have an involution $\tau$ such that $\tau \sigma \tau=\sigma^{-1}$. So $\tau=\left[X: s Z: s^{-1} Y\right],\left[s Y: s^{-1} X: Z\right]$ or $\left[s Z: Y: s^{-1} X\right]$ with $s^{6}=1$. This holds if we are in one of the situations: $\alpha_{3,3}= \pm \alpha_{3,0}$ and $\alpha_{1,2}= \pm \alpha_{1,4}, \alpha_{0,3}= \pm \alpha_{3,0}$ and $\alpha_{4,1}= \pm \alpha_{1,4}$, or $\alpha_{3,3}= \pm \alpha_{0,3}$ and $\alpha_{1,2}= \pm \alpha_{4,1}$. Moreover, in all scenarios we can reduce to $\tau=[X: Z: Y]$ via a change of variables $\phi$ in the normalizer of $\langle\sigma\rangle$, more precisely, via $\phi=\operatorname{diag}(1, \lambda, s \lambda)$ modulo $\langle[X: Z: Y],[Y: Z: X]\rangle$ with $\lambda^{6}=1$. That is, $\mathcal{C}_{1}$ is $K$-isomorphic to
$\mathcal{C}_{1}^{\prime} \quad: \quad X^{6}+Y^{6}+Z^{6}+\alpha_{4,1}^{\prime} X^{4} Y Z+\alpha_{3,3}^{\prime} X^{3}\left(Y^{3}+Z^{3}\right)+\alpha_{2,2}^{\prime} X^{2} Y^{2} Z^{2}$
$+\alpha_{1,2}^{\prime} X Y Z\left(Y^{3}+Z^{3}\right)+\alpha_{0,3}^{\prime} Y^{3} Z^{3}=0$.
Here $\operatorname{Aut}\left(\mathcal{C}_{1}^{\prime}\right)=\langle\sigma, \tau\rangle=\varrho_{1}\left(\mathrm{~S}_{3}\right)$. In particular, we should impose $\alpha_{4,1}^{\prime} \neq \alpha_{1,2}^{\prime}$ or $\alpha_{3,3}^{\prime} \neq \alpha_{0,3}^{\prime}$ to avoid having $[Y: Z: X]$ as an extra automorphism. Also, $\left(\alpha_{3,3}^{\prime}, \alpha_{1,2}^{\prime}\right) \neq(0,0)$ to avoid having $\operatorname{diag}\left(1, \zeta_{6}, \zeta_{6}^{-1}\right)$ as an extra automorphism of order $6>3$.
This shows part of Theorem 2.5, (1)-(ii).
(iv) If $\Lambda(\operatorname{Aut}(C))=\mathrm{A}_{4}$, then the Group Structure of $\mathrm{A}_{4}$ assures that $\Lambda(\operatorname{Aut}(C))$ contains $\Lambda(\tau)$ and $\Lambda\left(\tau^{\prime}\right)$ both of order 2 such that

$$
\Lambda(\sigma) \Lambda(\tau) \Lambda(\sigma)^{-1}=\Lambda\left(\tau^{\prime}\right), \Lambda(\sigma) \Lambda\left(\tau^{\prime}\right) \Lambda(\sigma)^{-1}=\Lambda\left(\tau^{\prime}\right) \Lambda(\tau)=\Lambda(\tau) \Lambda\left(\tau^{\prime}\right)
$$

We aim to show that such $\tau$ and $\tau^{\prime}$ do not exist. Write $\Lambda(\tau)=$ $\left(\begin{array}{ll}a & b \\ c & d\end{array}\right)$, then being of order 2 yields $(a+d) b=(a+d) c=0$ and $a= \pm d$. So $\Lambda(\tau)=\left(\begin{array}{ll}0 & b \\ c & 0\end{array}\right)$ or $\left(\begin{array}{cc}a & b \\ c & -a\end{array}\right)$. - If $\Lambda(\tau)=\left(\begin{array}{ll}0 & b \\ c & 0\end{array}\right)$, then
$\Lambda\left(\tau^{\prime}\right)=\Lambda(\sigma) \Lambda(\tau) \Lambda(\sigma)^{-1}=\left(\begin{array}{cc}0 & \zeta_{3}^{-1} b \\ \zeta_{3}^{-1} c & 0\end{array}\right)=\Lambda(\tau)$ in $\mathrm{PGL}_{2}(K)$,
a contradiction.

- If $\Lambda(\tau)=\left(\begin{array}{cc}a & b \\ c & -a\end{array}\right)$, then $\Lambda\left(\tau^{\prime}\right)=\Lambda(\sigma) \Lambda(\tau) \Lambda(\sigma)^{-1}=\left(\begin{array}{cc}a & \zeta_{3}^{-1} b \\ \zeta_{3}^{-1} c & -a\end{array}\right)$
such that $\Lambda(\tau) \Lambda\left(\tau^{\prime}\right)=\Lambda\left(\tau^{\prime}\right) \Lambda(\tau)$. That is,

$$
\left(\begin{array}{cc}
a^{2}+\zeta_{3} b c & \left(\zeta_{3}^{-1}-1\right) a b \\
\left(1-\zeta_{3}\right) a c & a^{2}+\zeta_{3}^{-1} b c
\end{array}\right)=\left(\begin{array}{cc}
a^{2}+\zeta_{3}^{-1} b c & -\left(\zeta_{3}^{-1}-1\right) a b \\
-\left(1-\zeta_{3}\right) a c & a^{2}+\zeta_{3} b c
\end{array}\right) \text { in } \mathrm{PGL}_{2}(K)
$$

For this to be true, either $a b=a c=0$ or $a^{2}+\zeta_{3} b c=-\left(a^{2}+\right.$ $\left.\zeta_{3}^{-1} b c\right)$. Assuming $a b=a c=0$ yields $\Lambda\left(\tau^{\prime}\right)=\left(\begin{array}{cc}0 & \zeta_{3}^{-1} b \\ \zeta_{3}^{-1} c & 0\end{array}\right)=$ $\Lambda(\tau)$ in $\mathrm{PGL}_{2}(K)$ or $\Lambda\left(\tau^{\prime}\right)=\left(\begin{array}{cc}a & 0 \\ 0 & -a\end{array}\right)=\Lambda(\tau)$ in $\mathrm{PGL}_{2}(K)$, which is again a contradiction. Assuming $a^{2}+\zeta_{3} b c=-\left(a^{2}+\zeta_{3}^{-1} b c\right)$ yields $c=2 a^{2} / b$ with $a b \neq 0$. Moreover, $\Lambda(\sigma) \Lambda\left(\tau^{\prime}\right) \Lambda(\sigma)^{-1}=\Lambda(\tau) \Lambda\left(\tau^{\prime}\right)$, hence

$$
\left(\begin{array}{cc}
a & \zeta_{3} b \\
2 a^{2} / b & -a
\end{array}\right)=\left(\begin{array}{cc}
a\left(\zeta_{3}-\zeta_{3}^{-1}\right) & \left(\zeta_{3}^{-1}-1\right) b \\
2 a^{2}\left(1-\zeta_{3}\right) / b & -a\left(\zeta_{3}-\zeta_{3}^{-1}\right)
\end{array}\right) \text { in } \mathrm{PGL}_{2}(K)
$$

This is valid only if $\left(\zeta_{3}-\zeta_{3}^{-1}\right) \zeta_{3}=\left(\zeta_{3}^{-1}-1\right)$ and $\left(\zeta_{3}-\zeta_{3}^{-1}\right)=$ $\left(1-\zeta_{3}\right)$, however, the second equation is never valid. This means that $\Lambda(\operatorname{Aut}(C)) \neq \mathrm{A}_{4}$.

- Thirdly, assume that $\mathcal{C}_{i}$ is a descendant of the Klein sextic curve $\mathcal{K}_{6}$.

Claim 1. $\operatorname{For} \mathcal{C}_{1}, \operatorname{Aut}\left(\mathcal{C}_{1}\right)=\varrho_{2}(\mathbb{Z} / 3 \mathbb{Z})$.
Proof. (of Claim 1) If $\mathcal{C}_{1}$ is a descendant of $\mathcal{K}_{6}$ with bigger automorphism group than $\langle\sigma\rangle$, then, from the Group Structure of $\mathbb{Z} / 21 \mathbb{Z} \rtimes \mathbb{Z} / 3 \mathbb{Z}$ and since the automorphisms of $C$ have orders $\leq 3$, $\operatorname{Aut}\left(\mathcal{C}_{1}\right)$ should be conjugate to a $(\mathbb{Z} / 3 \mathbb{Z})^{2}$ in $\operatorname{Aut}\left(\mathcal{K}_{6}\right)$. Thus $\mathcal{C}_{1}$ has another automorphism $\sigma^{\prime} \notin\langle\sigma\rangle$ of order 3 that commutes with $\sigma$. Direct calculations show that we can take $\sigma^{\prime}=\operatorname{diag}(1, s, t)$ with $s^{3}=t^{3}=1$ or $[s Y: t Z: X]$ with $s, t \in K^{*}$.

In the first case, $\sigma^{\prime}$ reduces to an homology as $\sigma^{\prime} \notin\langle\sigma\rangle$. This is absurd because $\operatorname{Aut}\left(\mathcal{K}_{6}\right)$ does not contain any homologies of period 3. Regarding the second case, any descendant $\mathcal{C}^{\prime}$ of the Klein curve $\mathcal{C}^{\prime}: X^{5} Y+Y^{5} Z+$ $Z^{5} X+$ lower terms in $X, Y, Z$ satisfies the property that its automorphism group fixes the triangle $\Delta$ whose vertices are the three reference points $(1: 0: 0),(0: 1: 0)$ and $(0: 0: 1)$, moreover, those points all lie on $\mathcal{C}^{\prime}$. Because $\Delta$ is the only triangle fixed by $\langle\sigma,[s Y: t Z: X]\rangle$ for any $s, t$ and
because non of its vertices lies on $\mathcal{C}_{1}$, we conclude that $\operatorname{Aut}\left(\mathcal{C}_{1}\right)$ can not equal $\langle\sigma,[s Y: t Z: X]\rangle$. This proves the claim for $\mathcal{C}_{1}$.
Claim 2. For $\mathcal{C}_{2}$, $\operatorname{Aut}\left(\mathcal{C}_{2}\right)$ is either conjugate to $\varrho_{2}(\mathbb{Z} / 3 \mathbb{Z})$ or $\varrho_{2}\left((\mathbb{Z} / 3 \mathbb{Z})^{2}\right)$.
Proof. (of Claim 2) Similarly if $\mathcal{C}_{2}$ is a descendant of $\mathcal{K}_{6}$ with bigger automorphism group than $\langle\sigma\rangle$, then $\operatorname{Aut}\left(\mathcal{C}_{2}\right)=\langle\sigma,[s Y: t Z: X]\rangle$ for some $s, t \in K^{*}$. For $\sigma^{\prime} \in \operatorname{Aut}\left(\mathcal{C}_{2}\right), s=\zeta_{21}^{r}, t=\zeta_{21}^{-4 r}, \alpha_{0,2}=\zeta_{21}^{-12 r} \alpha_{4,0}$, $\alpha_{2,4}=\zeta_{21}^{3 r} \alpha_{4,0}, \alpha_{1,3}=\zeta_{21}^{-6 r} \alpha_{3,2}, \alpha_{2,1}=\zeta_{21}^{3 r} \alpha_{3,2}$, and $\mathcal{C}_{2}$ reduces to

$$
\begin{aligned}
X^{5} Y & +Y^{5} Z+X Z^{5}+\alpha_{4,0}\left(X^{4} Z^{2}+\zeta_{21}^{3 r} X^{2} Y^{4}+\zeta_{21}^{-12 r} Y^{2} Z^{4}\right) \\
& +\alpha_{3,2} X Y Z\left(X^{2} Y+\zeta_{21}^{3 r} X Z^{2}+\zeta_{21}^{-6 r} Y^{2} Z\right)=0
\end{aligned}
$$

In any situation, there exists a change of variables $\phi=\operatorname{diag}\left(1, \zeta_{21}^{r^{\prime}}, \zeta_{21}^{17 r^{\prime}}\right) \in$ $\operatorname{Aut}\left(\mathcal{K}_{6}\right)$ such that $21 \mid 18 r^{\prime}+r, 12 r^{\prime}-4 r$ for some $r^{\prime} \in\{0,1, \ldots, 20\}$ that transforms $\mathcal{C}_{2}$ up to $K$-isomorphism to

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{C}_{2}^{\prime}: X^{5} Y & +Y^{5} Z+X Z^{5}+\alpha_{4,0} \zeta_{21}^{4 r}\left(X^{4} Z^{2}+X^{2} Y^{4}+Y^{2} Z^{4}\right) \\
& +\alpha_{3,2} \zeta_{21}^{-r} X Y Z\left(X^{2} Y+X Z^{2}+Y^{2} Z\right)=0
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\operatorname{Aut}\left(\mathcal{C}_{2}^{\prime}\right)=\varrho_{2}\left((\mathbb{Z} / 3 \mathbb{Z})^{2}\right)=\langle\sigma,[Y: Z: X]\rangle$. In particular, we must have $\left(\alpha_{2,4}, \alpha_{1,3}\right) \neq(0,0)$ or $\operatorname{diag}\left(1, \zeta_{21}, \zeta_{21}^{-4}\right) \in \operatorname{Aut}\left(\mathcal{C}_{2}^{\prime}\right)$ of order $21>3$.

This completes the proof, which in turns shows Theorem 2.5, (2)-(i).

- Now, assume that $\mathcal{C}_{i}$ is a descendant of the Fermat curve $\mathcal{F}_{6}$. From the Group structure of $\operatorname{Aut}\left(\mathcal{F}_{6}\right)$, one sees that if $\mathcal{C}_{i}$ is a descendant of $\mathcal{F}_{6}$ with bigger automorphism group than $\langle\sigma\rangle$, then $\operatorname{Aut}\left(\mathcal{C}_{i}\right)$ is conjugate to one of the following groups inside $\operatorname{Aut}\left(\mathcal{F}_{6}\right)$ :

$$
(\mathbb{Z} / 3 \mathbb{Z})^{2}, \mathrm{~S}_{3}, \mathrm{~A}_{4}, \mathbb{Z} / 3 \mathbb{Z} \rtimes \mathrm{~S}_{3}, \mathrm{He}_{3}
$$

In what follows, we treat each of these cases for $\mathcal{C}_{1}$ and $\mathcal{C}_{2}$ respectively, more precisely, Claim 3 and Claim 4 below.
Claim 3. For $\mathcal{C}_{1}, \operatorname{Aut}\left(\mathcal{C}_{1}\right)$ is conjugate to $\varrho_{2}(\mathbb{Z} / 3 \mathbb{Z}), \varrho_{2}\left(\mathrm{~S}_{3}\right), \varrho_{1}\left(\mathbb{Z} / 3 \mathbb{Z} \rtimes \mathrm{~S}_{3}\right)$, $\varrho_{1}\left((\mathbb{Z} / 3 \mathbb{Z})^{2}\right)$ or $\varrho_{1}\left(\mathrm{~A}_{4}\right)$.
Claim 4. For $\mathcal{C}_{2}, \operatorname{Aut}\left(\mathcal{C}_{2}\right)$ is conjugate to $\varrho_{2}(\mathbb{Z} / 3 \mathbb{Z}), \varrho_{2}\left((\mathbb{Z} / 3 \mathbb{Z})^{2}\right)$ or $\varrho_{2}\left(\mathrm{~A}_{4}\right)$.
Proof. (of Claim 3) - If $\operatorname{Aut}\left(\mathcal{C}_{1}\right)$ is conjugate to $\mathrm{S}_{3}$ or $\mathbb{Z} / 3 \mathbb{Z} \rtimes \mathrm{~S}_{3}$ inside $\operatorname{Aut}\left(\mathcal{F}_{6}\right)$, then $\mathcal{C}_{1}$ has an involution $\tau$ such that $\tau \sigma \tau=\sigma^{-1}$. Similarly as before, this holds only if $\alpha_{3,3}= \pm \alpha_{3,0}$ and $\alpha_{1,2}= \pm \alpha_{1,4}, \alpha_{0,3}= \pm \alpha_{3,0}$ and $\alpha_{4,1}= \pm \alpha_{1,4}$, or $\alpha_{3,3}= \pm \alpha_{0,3}$ and $\alpha_{1,2}= \pm \alpha_{4,1}$. In this scenario, $\mathcal{C}_{1}$ is $K$-isomorphic to

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{C}_{1}^{\prime} & : \quad X^{6}+Y^{6}+Z^{6}+\alpha_{4,1}^{\prime} X^{4} Y Z+\alpha_{3,3}^{\prime} X^{3}\left(Y^{3}+Z^{3}\right)+\alpha_{2,2}^{\prime} X^{2} Y^{2} Z^{2} \\
& +\alpha_{1,2}^{\prime} X Y Z\left(Y^{3}+Z^{3}\right)+\alpha_{0,3}^{\prime} Y^{3} Z^{3}=0,
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\varrho_{2}\left(\mathrm{~S}_{3}\right)$ generated by $\sigma=\operatorname{diag}\left(1, \zeta_{3}, \zeta_{3}^{-1}\right)$ and $\tau=[X: Z: Y]$ is a subgroup of $\operatorname{Aut}\left(\mathcal{C}_{1}^{\prime}\right)$. Furthermore, if $\operatorname{Aut}\left(\mathcal{C}_{1}^{\prime}\right)$ equals $\mathbb{Z} / 3 \mathbb{Z} \rtimes \mathrm{~S}_{3}$, then it must contain another automorphism $\sigma^{\prime} \notin\langle\sigma, \tau\rangle$ of order 3 that commutes with $\sigma$ and satisfies $\tau \sigma^{\prime} \tau=\sigma^{\prime-1}$. Thus $\sigma^{\prime}=\left[s^{\prime} Y: s^{\prime-1} Z: X\right]$ and the invariance of the defining equation for $\mathcal{C}_{1}^{\prime}$ under the action of $\sigma^{\prime}$ yields $s^{\prime 3}=1, \alpha_{4,1}^{\prime}=\alpha_{1,2}^{\prime}$ and $\alpha_{3,3}^{\prime}=\alpha_{0,3}^{\prime}$. Hence $\mathcal{C}_{1}^{\prime}$ becomes

$$
\begin{aligned}
X^{6} & +Y^{6}+Z^{6}+\alpha_{1,2}^{\prime} X Y Z\left(X^{3}+Y^{3}+Z^{3}\right)+\alpha_{3,3}^{\prime}\left(X^{3} Y^{3}+Y^{3} Z^{3}+Z^{3} X^{3}\right) \\
& +\alpha_{2,2}^{\prime} X^{2} Y^{2} Z^{2}=0
\end{aligned}
$$

with $\operatorname{Aut}\left(\mathcal{C}_{1}^{\prime}\right)=\varrho_{1}\left(\mathbb{Z} / 3 \mathbb{Z} \rtimes \mathrm{~S}_{3}\right)$. This shows the rest of Theorem 2.5, (1)-(ii).

- If $\operatorname{Aut}\left(\mathcal{C}_{1}\right)$ is conjugate to $(\mathbb{Z} / 3 \mathbb{Z})^{2}$ or $\mathrm{He}_{3}$ inside $\operatorname{Aut}\left(\mathcal{F}_{6}\right)$, then $\mathcal{C}_{1}$ would have an automorphism $\sigma^{\prime} \notin\langle\sigma\rangle$ of order 3 that commutes with $\sigma$ since every copy of
$\mathbb{Z} / 3 \mathbb{Z}$ in any of these groups is contained in a $(\mathbb{Z} / 3 \mathbb{Z})^{2}$. Moreover, we guarantee that $\alpha_{2,2} \neq 0$ or $\left[X: \zeta_{3} Z: \zeta_{3}^{-1} Y\right.$ ] would be an involution in $\operatorname{Aut}\left(\mathcal{C}_{1}\right)$, which is not accepted in this case.

Similarly as before, we can take $\sigma^{\prime}=\operatorname{diag}\left(1, s^{\prime}, t^{\prime}\right)$ with $s^{\prime 3}=t^{\prime 3}=1$ or $\left[s^{\prime} Y\right.$ : $\left.t^{\prime} Z: X\right]$ with $s^{\prime}, t^{\prime} \in K^{*}$.
(i) Suppose that $\sigma^{\prime}=\operatorname{diag}\left(1, s^{\prime}, t^{\prime}\right) \in \operatorname{Aut}\left(\mathcal{C}_{1}\right)$. Because $\sigma^{\prime} \notin\langle\sigma\rangle$, we have $\sigma^{\prime}=\operatorname{diag}\left(1,1, \zeta_{3}\right), \operatorname{diag}\left(\zeta_{3}, 1,1\right)$ or $\operatorname{diag}\left(1, \zeta_{3}, 1\right)$. Consequently, $\alpha_{4,1}=$ $\alpha_{2,2}=\alpha_{1,2}=\alpha_{1,4}=0$ and $\mathcal{C}_{1}$ reduces to

$$
X^{6}+Y^{6}+Z^{6}+\alpha_{3,3} X^{3} Y^{3}+\alpha_{3,0} X^{3} Z^{3}+\alpha_{0,3} Y^{3} Z^{3}=0
$$

with $\varrho_{1}\left((\mathbb{Z} / 3 \mathbb{Z})^{2}\right) \subseteq \operatorname{Aut}\left(\mathcal{C}_{1}\right)$. On the other hand, $\operatorname{Aut}\left(\mathcal{C}_{1}\right)$ equals $\mathrm{He}_{3}$ only if it contains an extra automorphism $\sigma^{\prime \prime} \notin\left\langle\sigma, \sigma^{\prime}\right\rangle$ of order 3 that commutes with $\sigma$ and satisfies $\sigma^{\prime \prime} \sigma^{\prime} \sigma^{\prime \prime-1}=\sigma^{\prime} \sigma^{-1}$. This gives us $\sigma^{\prime \prime}=\left[s^{\prime \prime} Y: t^{\prime \prime} Z: X\right]$ for some $s^{\prime \prime}, t^{\prime \prime} \in K^{*}$. Hence $s^{\prime \prime 6}=t^{\prime \prime 6}=1, \alpha_{3,3}=s^{\prime \prime 3} \alpha_{3,0}, \alpha_{0,3}=t^{\prime \prime 3} \alpha_{3,0}$, and $\mathcal{C}_{1}$ becomes of the form:

$$
X^{6}+Y^{6}+Z^{6}+\alpha_{3,0}\left( \pm X^{3} Y^{3}+X^{3} Z^{3}+t^{\prime \prime 3} Y^{3} Z^{3}\right)=0
$$

In particular, $\left[Y: X: t^{\prime \prime} Z\right]$ is an automorphism for $\mathcal{C}_{1}$ of order divisible by 2 . This is a contradiction as $2 \nmid\left|\mathrm{He}_{3}\right|(=27)$.
(ii) Suppose that $\sigma^{\prime}=\left[s^{\prime} Y: t^{\prime} Z: X\right] \in \operatorname{Aut}\left(\mathcal{C}_{1}\right)$. Thus $s^{\prime 3}=t^{\prime 6}=\left(s^{\prime} t^{\prime}\right)^{2}=1$, $\alpha_{1,4}= \pm \alpha_{4,1}, \alpha_{1,2}= \pm \alpha_{4,1}, \alpha_{3,0}=\alpha_{3,3}, \alpha_{0,3}= \pm \alpha_{3,3}$, and $\mathcal{C}_{1}$ is defined by

$$
\begin{aligned}
X^{6} & +Y^{6}+Z^{6}+\alpha_{4,1} X Y Z\left(X^{3} \pm Y^{3} \pm Z^{3}\right)+\alpha_{2,2} X^{2} Y^{2} Z^{2} \\
& +\alpha_{3,3}\left(X^{3} Y^{3}+X^{3} Z^{3} \pm Y^{3} Z^{3}\right)=0
\end{aligned}
$$

Hence $[X: Z: Y]$ is an involution for $\mathcal{C}_{1}$, which is not true if $\left|\operatorname{Aut}\left(\mathcal{C}_{1}\right)\right|=9$ or 27 .

- If $\operatorname{Aut}\left(\mathcal{C}_{1}\right)$ is conjugate to an $\mathrm{A}_{4}$ inside $\operatorname{Aut}\left(\mathcal{F}_{6}\right)$, then it should be $\varrho_{i}\left(\mathrm{~A}_{4}\right)$ with $i=1$ or 2 .
(i) First, suppose that $\phi^{-1} \operatorname{Aut}\left(\mathcal{C}_{1}\right) \phi=\varrho_{1}\left(\mathrm{~A}_{4}\right)$. As all subgroups of $\mathrm{A}_{4}$ of order 3 are $\mathrm{A}_{4}$-conjugated, there is no loss of generality to take $\phi^{-1} \sigma \phi=$ $[Y: Z: X]$ or $[Z: X: Y]$. In particular, $\phi$ has one of the following shapes:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\phi_{1}:=\left(\begin{array}{ccc}
1 & 1 & 1 \\
\lambda & \zeta_{3}^{-1} \lambda & \zeta_{3} \lambda \\
\mu & \zeta_{3} \mu & \zeta_{3}^{-1} \mu
\end{array}\right), \phi_{2}:=\left(\begin{array}{ccc}
\mu & \zeta_{3} \mu & \zeta_{3}^{-1} \mu \\
1 & 1 & 1 \\
\lambda & \zeta_{3}^{-1} \lambda & \zeta_{3} \lambda
\end{array}\right), \phi_{3}:=\left(\begin{array}{ccc}
\lambda & \zeta_{3}^{-1} \lambda & \zeta_{3} \lambda \\
\mu & \zeta_{3} \mu & \zeta_{3}^{-1} \mu \\
1 & 1 & 1
\end{array}\right), \\
\phi_{4}:=\left(\begin{array}{ccc}
1 & 1 & 1 \\
\lambda & \zeta_{3} \lambda & \zeta_{3}^{-1} \lambda \\
\mu & \zeta_{3}^{-1} \mu & \zeta_{3} \mu
\end{array}\right), \phi_{5}:=\left(\begin{array}{ccc}
\mu & \zeta_{3}^{-1} \mu & \zeta_{3} \mu \\
1 & 1 & 1 \\
\lambda & \zeta_{3} \lambda & \zeta_{3}^{-1} \lambda
\end{array}\right), \phi_{6}:=\left(\begin{array}{ccc}
\lambda & \zeta_{3} \lambda & \zeta_{3}^{-1} \lambda \\
\mu & \zeta_{3}^{-1} \mu & \zeta_{3} \mu \\
1 & 1 & 1
\end{array}\right),
\end{aligned}
$$

for some $\lambda, \mu \in K^{*}$.
Now, we handle each of these situations to determine the restrictions on the defining equation of $\mathcal{C}_{1}$ for which this holds.

- For $\phi_{1} \operatorname{diag}(1,1,-1) \phi_{1}^{-1}$ (respectively $\left.\phi_{4} \operatorname{diag}(1,1,-1) \phi_{4}^{-1}\right)$ to be in Aut $\left(\mathcal{C}_{1}\right)$, we must eliminate the coefficients of $X^{5} Z, X^{5} Y, Y^{5} Z, X Z^{5}$, $Y Z^{5}, X^{4} Y^{2}, X^{4} Z^{2}$ from the transformed equation ${ }^{\phi_{i} \operatorname{diag}(1,1,-1) \phi_{i}^{-1}} \mathcal{C}_{1}=$
$\mathcal{C}_{1}$ with $i=1$ and 4 respectively. In this way, we obtain:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\alpha_{4,1} & =\frac{2\left(29-54 \lambda^{6}-54 \mu^{6}\right)}{27 \lambda \mu}, \alpha_{3,3}=\frac{2\left(81 \mu^{6}-27 \lambda^{6}-26\right)}{27 \lambda^{3}} \\
\alpha_{3,0} & =\frac{2\left(81 \lambda^{6}-27 \mu^{6}-26\right)}{27 \mu^{3}}, \alpha_{1,4}=\frac{2\left(27 \lambda^{6}-54 \mu^{6}-52\right)}{27 \lambda^{4} \mu} \\
\alpha_{1,2} & =\frac{2\left(27 \mu^{6}-54 \lambda^{6}-52\right)}{27 \lambda \mu^{4}}, \alpha_{0,3}=\frac{2\left(82-27 \lambda^{6}-27 \mu^{6}\right)}{27 \lambda^{3} \mu^{3}} \\
\alpha_{2,2} & =\frac{9 \lambda^{6}+9 \mu^{6}+10}{3 \lambda^{2} \mu^{2}}
\end{aligned}
$$

In particular, $\mathcal{C}_{1}$ is $K$-isomorphic via $\phi_{1}$ (respectively $\phi_{4}$ followed by $Y \leftrightarrow Z)$ to $\mathcal{C}_{1, \lambda, \mu}$ described in Theorem 2.5, (1)-(iii).

- For $\phi_{2} \operatorname{diag}(1,1,-1) \phi_{2}^{-1}$ (respectively $\left.\phi_{5} \operatorname{diag}(1,1,-1) \phi_{5}^{-1}\right)$ to be in $\operatorname{Aut}\left(\mathcal{C}_{1}\right)$, one notices that $\phi_{2}=[Z: X: Y] \phi_{1}=\phi_{1} \circ[Z: X: Y]$ (respectively $\phi_{5}=[Z: X: Y] \phi_{4}=\phi_{4} \circ[Z: X: Y]$ ). This means that we get the same conclusion as above up to a permutation of the parameters, more precisely, after

$$
\begin{array}{rll}
\left(\alpha_{4,1}, \alpha_{1,2}, \alpha_{1,4}\right) & \mapsto & \left(\alpha_{1,2}, \alpha_{1,4}, \alpha_{4,1}\right) \\
\left(\alpha_{0,3}, \alpha_{3,3}, \alpha_{3,0}\right) & \mapsto & \left(\alpha_{3,3}, \alpha_{3,0}, \alpha_{0,3}\right)
\end{array}
$$

In other words, we have $\phi_{i} \operatorname{diag}(1,1,-1) \phi_{i}^{-1}$ with $i=2$ or 5 inside $\operatorname{Aut}\left(\mathcal{C}_{1}\right)$ only if
$\alpha_{1,4}=\frac{2\left(29-54 \lambda^{6}-54 \mu^{6}\right)}{27 \lambda \mu}, \alpha_{0,3}=\frac{2\left(81 \mu^{6}-27 \lambda^{6}-26\right)}{27 \lambda^{3}}$,
$\alpha_{3,3}=\frac{2\left(81 \lambda^{6}-27 \mu^{6}-26\right)}{27 \mu^{3}}, \alpha_{1,2}=\frac{2\left(27 \lambda^{6}-54 \mu^{6}-52\right)}{27 \lambda^{4} \mu}$,
$\alpha_{4,1}=\frac{2\left(27 \mu^{6}-54 \lambda^{6}-52\right)}{27 \lambda \mu^{4}}, \alpha_{3,0}=\frac{2\left(82-27 \lambda^{6}-27 \mu^{6}\right)}{27 \lambda^{3} \mu^{3}}$,
$\alpha_{2,2}=\frac{9 \lambda^{6}+9 \mu^{6}+10}{3 \lambda^{2} \mu^{2}}$.
Once more $\mathcal{C}_{1}$ reduces to $\mathcal{C}_{1, \lambda, \mu}$ described in Theorem 2.5, (1)-(iii).
Similarly, $\phi_{3}=\phi_{1} \circ[Y: Z: X]$ and $\phi_{6}=\phi_{4} \circ[Y: Z: X]$. So $\phi_{i} \operatorname{diag}(1,1,-1) \phi_{i}^{-1}$ with $i=3$ or 6 is an automorphism for $\mathcal{C}_{1}$ only if

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \alpha_{1,2}=\frac{2\left(29-54 \lambda^{6}-54 \mu^{6}\right)}{27 \lambda \mu}, \alpha_{3,0}=\frac{2\left(81 \mu^{6}-27 \lambda^{6}-26\right)}{27 \lambda^{3}}, \\
& \alpha_{0,3}=\frac{2\left(81 \lambda^{6}-27 \mu^{6}-26\right)}{27 \mu^{3}}, \alpha_{4,1}=\frac{2\left(27 \lambda^{6}-54 \mu^{6}-52\right)}{27 \lambda^{4} \mu} \\
& \alpha_{1,4}=\frac{2\left(27 \mu^{6}-54 \lambda^{6}-52\right)}{27 \lambda \mu^{4}}, \alpha_{3,3}=\frac{2\left(82-27 \lambda^{6}-27 \mu^{6}\right)}{27 \lambda^{3} \mu^{3}}, \\
& \alpha_{2,2}=\frac{9 \lambda^{6}+9 \mu^{6}+10}{3 \lambda^{2} \mu^{2}}
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\mathcal{C}_{1}$ becomes $K$-isomorphism to $C_{1, \lambda, \mu}$.
This shows Theorem 2.5, (1)-(iii).
(ii) Second, suppose that $\psi^{-1} \operatorname{Aut}\left(\mathcal{C}_{1}\right) \psi=\varrho_{2}\left(\mathrm{~A}_{4}\right)$. Again, we can impose $\psi^{-1} \sigma \psi=\left[\zeta_{6}^{-1} Y: Z: X\right]$ or $\left[Z: \zeta_{6} X: Y\right]$, in particular, $\psi$ has the shape
of $\psi_{i}$ below.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \psi_{1}:=\left(\begin{array}{ccc}
1 & \zeta_{18}^{-2} & \zeta_{18}^{-1} \\
\lambda & \zeta_{18}^{-8} \lambda & \zeta_{18}^{5} \lambda \\
\mu & \zeta_{18}^{4} \mu & \zeta_{18}^{-7} \mu
\end{array}\right), \psi_{2}:=\left(\begin{array}{ccc}
\mu & \zeta_{18}^{4} \mu & \zeta_{18}^{-7} \mu \\
1 & \zeta_{18}^{-2} & \zeta_{18}^{-1} \\
\lambda & \zeta_{18}^{8} \lambda & \zeta_{18}^{5} \lambda
\end{array}\right), \psi_{3}:=\left(\begin{array}{ccc}
\lambda & \zeta_{18}^{-8} \lambda & \zeta_{18}^{5} \lambda \\
\mu & \zeta_{18}^{4} \mu & \zeta_{18}^{-7} \mu \\
1 & \zeta_{18}^{-2} & \zeta_{18}^{-1}
\end{array}\right), \\
& \psi_{4}:=\left(\begin{array}{ccc}
1 & \zeta_{18}^{2} & \zeta_{18} \\
\lambda & \zeta_{18}^{-4} \lambda & \zeta_{18}^{7} \lambda \\
\mu & \zeta_{18}^{8} \mu & \zeta_{18}^{-5} \mu
\end{array}\right), \psi_{5}:=\left(\begin{array}{ccc}
\mu & \zeta_{18}^{8} \mu & \zeta_{18}^{-5} \mu \\
1 & \zeta_{18}^{2} & \zeta_{18} \\
\lambda & \zeta_{18}^{-4} \lambda & \zeta_{18}^{7} \lambda
\end{array}\right), \psi_{6}:=\left(\begin{array}{ccc}
\lambda & \zeta_{18}^{-4} \lambda & \zeta_{18}^{7} \lambda \\
\mu & \zeta_{18}^{8} \mu & \zeta_{18}^{-5} \mu \\
1 & \zeta_{18}^{2} & \zeta_{18}
\end{array}\right),
\end{aligned}
$$

for some $\lambda, \mu \in K^{*}$. However, it is straightforward to check that non of these transformation transforms $\mathcal{C}_{1}$ to $\mathcal{C}^{\prime}$ whose core is $X^{6}+Y^{6}+Z^{6}$. Consequently, $\mathcal{C}_{1}$ is never a descendant of the Fermat curve $\mathcal{F}_{6}$ with $\operatorname{Aut}\left(\mathcal{C}_{1}\right)$ conjugate to $\varrho_{2}\left(\mathrm{~A}_{4}\right)$.
This proves Claim 3.
It remains to prove Claim 4 for $\mathcal{C}_{2}$ that is a descendant of the Fermat curve $\mathcal{F}_{6}$.
Proof. (of Claim 4) - We easily discard the cases when $\operatorname{Aut}\left(\mathcal{C}_{2}\right)$ equals an $\mathrm{S}_{3}$ or $\mathbb{Z} / 3 \mathbb{Z} \rtimes \mathrm{~S}_{3}$ inside $\operatorname{Aut}\left(\mathcal{F}_{6}\right)$ as non of the involutions $\left[X: s Z: s^{-1} Y\right],\left[s Y: s^{-1} X: Z\right]$ and $\left[s Z: Y: s^{-1} X\right]$ preserves the core $X^{5} Y+Y^{5} Z+Z^{5} X$ of $\mathcal{C}_{2}$.

- On the other hand, if $\operatorname{Aut}\left(\mathcal{C}_{2}\right)$ equals $(\mathbb{Z} / 3 \mathbb{Z})^{2}$ or $\mathrm{He}_{3}$, then the discussion we had to show Claim 2 applies to conclude that $\mathcal{C}_{2}$ is $K$-isomorphic to

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{C}^{\prime}: X^{5} Y & +Y^{5} Z+X Z^{5}+\alpha_{4,0} \zeta_{21}^{4 r}\left(X^{4} Z^{2}+X^{2} Y^{4}+Y^{2} Z^{4}\right) \\
& +\alpha_{3,2} \zeta_{21}^{-r} X Y Z\left(X^{2} Y+X Z^{2}+Y^{2} Z\right)=0
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\varrho_{2}\left((\mathbb{Z} / 3 \mathbb{Z})^{2}\right) \subseteq \operatorname{Aut}\left(\mathcal{C}^{\prime}\right)$. Next, if $\operatorname{Aut}\left(\mathcal{C}^{\prime}\right)$ is $\mathrm{He}_{3}$, then there must be another automorphism $\sigma^{\prime} \notin \varrho_{2}\left((\mathbb{Z} / 3 \mathbb{Z})^{2}\right)$ of order 3 that commutes with $\sigma$ such that $\sigma^{\prime}[Y$ : $Z: X] \sigma^{\prime-1}=[Y: Z: X] \sigma^{-1}$. Straightforward calculations show that $\sigma^{\prime}=\left[s^{\prime} Y:\right.$ $\left.t^{\prime} Z: X\right]$ or $\left[s^{\prime} Z: t^{\prime} X: Y\right]$ with $s^{\prime} t^{\prime}=\zeta_{3}$ and $s^{\prime 2} t^{\prime-1}=\zeta_{3}^{-1}$. So $\sigma^{\prime}$ belongs to $\varrho_{1}\left((\mathbb{Z} / 3 \mathbb{Z})^{2}\right)$ modulo $\langle[Y: Z: X]\rangle$. Obviously, none of these transformations leaves invariant the core of $\mathcal{C}^{\prime}$. Therefore, $\operatorname{Aut}\left(\mathcal{C}_{2}\right)$ is never conjugate to $\mathrm{He}_{3}$ inside $\mathcal{F}_{6}$.

- Thirdly, following the notations of Claim 3, a change of variables of the form $\phi=\phi_{i}$ for $i=1,2, \ldots, 6$ does not transform $\mathcal{C}_{2}$ to $\mathcal{C}_{2}^{\prime}: X^{6}+Y^{6}+Z^{6}+$ lower order terms in $X, Y, Z$. Thus $\mathcal{C}_{2}$ is not a descendant of $\mathcal{F}_{6}$ such that $\phi^{-1} \operatorname{Aut}\left(\mathcal{C}_{2}\right) \phi=$ $\varrho_{1}\left(\mathrm{~A}_{4}\right)$. On the other hand, $\psi_{i} \operatorname{diag}(1,1,-1) \psi_{i}^{-1} \in \operatorname{Aut}\left(\mathcal{C}_{2}\right)$ with $i=1$ or 4 only if
$\alpha_{2,4}=\frac{\lambda^{5} \mu+4 \mu^{5}}{2 \lambda^{4}}, \alpha_{4,0}=\frac{\lambda+4 \lambda^{5} \mu}{2 \mu^{2}}, \alpha_{0,2}=\frac{4 \lambda+\mu^{5}}{2 \lambda^{2} \mu^{4}}$
$\alpha_{1,3}=\frac{2\left(2 \lambda^{5} \mu+2 \lambda+\mu^{5}\right)}{\lambda^{3} \mu^{2}}, \alpha_{3,2}=\frac{2 \lambda^{5} \mu+4 \lambda+4 \mu^{5}}{\lambda^{2} \mu}, \alpha_{2,1}=\frac{2\left(2 \lambda^{5} \mu+\lambda+2 \mu^{5}\right)}{\lambda \mu^{3}}$.
The above restrictions are consequences of eliminating the coefficients of $X^{6}, Y^{6}, Z^{6}$, $X^{5} Z, Y^{4} Z^{2}, X^{4} Y^{2}, X^{4} Z^{2}$ from the transformed equation $\psi_{i} \operatorname{diag}(1,1,-1) \psi_{i}^{-1} \mathcal{C}_{2}=\mathcal{C}_{2}$. Moreover, $\mathcal{C}_{2}$ is $K$-isomorphic via $\psi_{1}$ (respectively $\psi_{4}$ followed by $Y \leftrightarrow Z$ ) to $\mathcal{C}_{2, \lambda, \mu}$ described in Theorem 2.5, (2)-(ii). The rest is obvious by noticing that $\psi_{2}=\psi_{1} \circ[Z: X: Y], \psi_{5}=\phi_{4} \circ[Z: X: Y], \psi_{3}=\psi_{1} \circ[Y: Z: X]$ and $\psi_{6}=\psi_{4} \circ[Y: Z: X]$.

This proves Claim 4.

## References

[1] E. Badr and F. Bars, Automorphism groups of nonsingular plane curves of degree 5. Comm. Algebra 44 (2016), no. 10, 4327-4340. MR 3508302.
[2] E. Badr and F. Bars, Non-singular plane curves with an element of "large" order in its automorphism group. Internat. J. Algebra Comput. 26 (2016), no. 2, 399-433. MR 3475065.
[3] E. Badr and F. Bars, On the locus of smooth plane curves with a fixed automorphism group Mediterr. J. Math. 13 (2016), no. 5, 3605-3627. MR 3554328.
[4] T. Breuer, Characters and automorphism groups of compact Riemann surfaces. London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series, vol. 280, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000. MR 1796706.
[5] E. Bujalance, J. J. Etayo, and E. Martínez, Automorphism groups of hyperelliptic Riemann surfaces. Kodai Math. J. 10 (1987), no. 2, 174-181. MR 897252.
[6] E. Bujalance, J. M. Gamboa, and G. Gromadzki, The full automorphism groups of hyperelliptic Riemann surfaces. Manuscripta Math. 79 (1993), no. 3-4, 267-282. MR 1223022.
[7] GAP, The GAP Group: Groups, Algorithms, and Programming, a system for computational discrete algebra (2008), available at http://www.gap-system.org. Version 4.4.11.
[8] T. Harui, Automorphism groups of plane curves. Kodai Math. J. 42 (2), (2019), 308-331.
[9] P. Henn, Die Automorphismengruppen dar algebraischen Functionenkorper vom Geschlecht 3. Inagural-dissertation, Heidelberg, 1976.
[10] A. Kuribayashi and K. Komiya, On Weierstrass points and automorphisms of curves of genus three. Algebraic geometry (Proc. Summer Meeting, Univ. Copenhagen, Copenhagen, 1978), Lecture Notes in Math., vol. 732, Springer, Berlin, 1979, pp. 253-299. MR 555703.
[11] I. Kuribayashi and A. Kuribayashi, On automorphism groups of compact Riemann surfaces of genus 4. Proc. Japan Acad. Ser. A Math. Sci. 62 (1986), no. 2, 65-68. MR 839811.
[12] I. Kuribayashi and A. Kuribayashi, Automorphism groups of compact Riemann surfaces of genera three and four. J. Pure Appl. Algebra 65 (1990), no. 3, 277- 292. MR 1072285.
[13] A. Kuribayashi and H. Kimura, Automorphism groups of compact Riemann surfaces of genus five. J. Algebra 134 (1990), no. 1, 80-103. MR 1068416.
[14] H. Mitchell, Determination of the ordinary and modular ternary linear groups, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 12, no. 2 (1911), 207-242.
[15] D. Sevilla and T. Shaska, Hyperelliptic curves with reduced automorphism group A 5 . Appl. Algebra Engrg. Comm. Comput. 18 (2007), no. 1-2, 3-20. MR 2280308.
[16] T. Shaska, Determining the automorphism group of a hyperelliptic curve. Proceedings of the 2003 International Symposium on Symbolic and Algebraic Computation, ACM, New York, 2003, pp. 248-254. MR 2035219.

- E. Badr

Mathematics Department, Faculty of Science, Cairo University, Giza-Egypt Email address: eslam@sci.cu.edu.eg

Mathematics and Actuarial Science Department (MACT), American University in Cairo (AUC), New Cairo-Egypt

Email address: eslammath@aucegypt.edu

- F. Bars

Departament Matemìtiques, Edif. C, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, 08193 Bellaterra, Catalonia

Barcelona Graduate School of Mathematics, Catalonia
Email address: francesc@mat.uab.cat


[^0]:    2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. 14H37, 14H10, 14H45, 14H50.
    Key words and phrases. plane curves; automorphism groups, ES-irreducibility.
    The authors are supported by PID2020-116542GB-I00, Ministerio de Ciencia y Universidades of Spanish goverment. Also, E. Badr is partially supported by the School of Science and Engineering (SSE) of the American Univeristy in Cairo (AUC).

