

EXISTENCE OF FLIPS FOR GENERALIZED LC PAIRS

CHRISTOPHER D. HACON AND JIHAO LIU

ABSTRACT. We prove the existence of flips for \mathbb{Q} -factorial NQC generalized lc pairs, and the cone and contraction theorems for NQC generalized lc pairs. This answers a question of C. Birkar which was conjectured by J. Han and Z. Li. As an immediate application, we show that we can run the minimal model program for \mathbb{Q} -factorial NQC generalized lc pairs. In particular, we complete the minimal model program for \mathbb{Q} -factorial NQC generalized lc pairs in dimension ≤ 3 and pseudo-effective \mathbb{Q} -factorial NQC generalized lc pairs in dimension 4.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	2
2. Preliminaries	6
2.1. Divisors	6
2.2. Maps	7
2.3. Numerical dimensions	7
2.4. Iitaka dimension and invariant Iitaka dimension	9
2.5. \mathbf{b} -divisors	11
2.6. Generalized pairs	11
2.7. Some results on MMPs for generalized pairs	12
2.8. Rational polytopes for generalized pairs	18
3. Models	20
3.1. Definitions	20
3.2. Proper log smooth models	21
3.3. Models under some birational maps	21
3.4. Models under pullbacks	25
4. Generalized pairs with numerical dimension 0	29
4.1. MMP for generalized pairs with numerical dimension 0	30
4.2. Semi-stable reduction	32
5. A generalized canonical bundle formula and a special case of Theorem 1.1	33
6. Special termination	37
7. Fukuda-type base-point-free theorems	40
8. Proof of Theorem 1.1	46
8.1. Some useful lemmas	47
8.2. Proof of Theorem 1.1	50
9. Base-point-free, contraction, and cone theorems for generalized pairs	57
9.1. Preliminary results on non-lc pairs	58
9.2. Sub-adjunction	60
9.3. Proof of the cone theorem	60
9.4. Proof of the base-point-free theorem and the contraction theorem	64
9.5. Corollaries	65
10. Proof of Theorems 1.2, 1.4, and 1.5	66
References	68

Date: August 2, 2021.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. 14E30,14C20,14E05,14J17,14J30,14J35.

1. INTRODUCTION

We work over the field of complex numbers \mathbb{C} , however many of the results also hold over any algebraically closed field k of characteristic zero.

The main purpose of this paper is to prove the following theorem:

Theorem 1.1. *Let $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ be an NQC glc g-pair and $U^0 \subset U$ a non-empty open subset. Let $X^0 := X \times_U U^0$, $B^0 := B \times_U U^0$, and $\mathbf{M}^0 := \mathbf{M} \times_U U^0$ (see Definition 2.21 below). Assume that*

- (1) *the morphism $X \rightarrow U$ is a projective morphism between normal quasi-projective varieties,*
- (2) *$(X^0, B^0, \mathbf{M}^0)/U^0$ has a good minimal model,*
- (3) *all glc centers of (X, B, \mathbf{M}) intersect X^0 , and*
- (4) *\mathbf{M}^0 descends to X^0 and $\mathbf{M}_{X^0}^0 \sim_{\mathbb{R}, U^0} 0$.*

Then $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ has a good minimal model.

Here “glc g-pair” stands for “generalized lc pair” and “NQC” stands for “nef \mathbb{Q} -Cartier combination”. We remark that NQC generalized pairs in our paper exactly correspond to the original generalized pairs defined in [BZ16]. See Definition 2.23 for more details.

As an immediate application of Theorem 1.1, we show the existence of flips for \mathbb{Q} -factorial NQC generalized lc pairs:

Theorem 1.2 (Existence of generalized lc flips). *Let $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ be a \mathbb{Q} -factorial NQC glc g-pair and $f : X \rightarrow Z$ a $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)$ -flipping contraction over U . Then the flip $f^+ : X^+ \rightarrow Z$ of f exists.*

In fact, we will also show that X^+ is \mathbb{Q} -factorial and $\rho(X) = \rho(X^+)$, and hence the flip $X \dashrightarrow X^+$ is compatible with the minimal model program for generalized pairs. See Theorem 10.3 below.

As a complement to Theorem 1.2, we prove the cone and contraction theorems for NQC generalized lc pairs, thus completely answering Birkar’s question on the existence of contractions and flips [Bir20b, 6.1] which was originally conjectured by Han-Li [HL18, Conjectures 3.1, 3.3].

Theorem 1.3 (Cone and contraction theorems for generalized lc pairs). *Let $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ be an NQC glc g-pair and $\pi : X \rightarrow U$ the associated morphism. Let $\{R_j\}_{j \in \Lambda}$ be the set of $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)$ -negative extremal rays in $\overline{NE}(X/U)$ that are rational. Then:*

(1)

$$\overline{NE}(X/U) = \overline{NE}(X/U)_{K_X+B+\mathbf{M}_X \geq 0} + \sum_{j \in \Lambda} R_j.$$

In particular, any $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)$ -negative extremal ray in $\overline{NE}(X/U)$ is rational.

(2) *Each R_j is spanned by a rational curve C_j such that $\pi(C_j) = \{pt\}$ and*

$$0 < -(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X) \cdot C_j \leq 2 \dim X.$$

(3) *For any ample/ U \mathbb{R} -divisor A on X ,*

$$\Lambda_A := \{j \in \Lambda \mid R_j \subset \overline{NE}(X/U)_{K_X+B+\mathbf{M}_X+A < 0}\}$$

is a finite set. In particular, $\{R_j\}_{j \in \Lambda}$ is countable, and is a discrete subset in $\overline{NE}(X/U)_{K_X+B+\mathbf{M}_X+A < 0}$. Moreover, we may write

$$\overline{NE}(X/U) = \overline{NE}(X/U)_{K_X+B+\mathbf{M}_X+A \geq 0} + \sum_{j \in \Lambda_A} R_j.$$

(4) *Assume that \mathbf{M}_X is \mathbb{R} -Cartier. Let R be a $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)$ -negative extremal ray in $\overline{NE}(X/U)$. Then R is a rational extremal ray. In particular, there exists a projective morphism $\text{cont}_R : X \rightarrow Y$ over U satisfying the following.*

- (a) For any integral curve C such that $\pi(C)$ is a point, $\text{cont}_R(C)$ is a point if and only if $[C] \in R$.
- (b) $\mathcal{O}_Y \cong (\text{cont}_R)_* \mathcal{O}_X$. In other words, cont_R is a contraction.
- (c) Let L be a line bundle on X such that $L \cdot R = 0$. Then there exists a line bundle L_Y on Y such that $L \cong f^* L_Y$.

An immediate corollary of Theorems 1.2 and 1.3 is that we can run minimal model programs (MMPs) for \mathbb{Q} -factorial NQC glc g-pairs:

Theorem 1.4. *We can run the MMP for \mathbb{Q} -factorial NQC glc g-pairs. More precisely, for any \mathbb{Q} -factorial NQC glc g-pair $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$, there exists a sequence of $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)$ -flips and divisorial contractions over U . Moreover, any such sequence ends either with a Mori fiber space, or a minimal model, or an infinite sequence of flips over U .*

Therefore, as long as we know the termination of flips, we can completely establish the minimal model program for \mathbb{Q} -factorial NQC glc g-pairs. In particular, we have:

Theorem 1.5. *The MMP for \mathbb{Q} -factorial NQC glc g-pairs in dimension ≤ 3 holds, and the MMP for pseudo-effective \mathbb{Q} -factorial NQC glc g-pairs in dimension 4 holds. More precisely, for any \mathbb{Q} -factorial NQC glc g-pair $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ such that either $\dim X \leq 3$ or $\dim X = 4$ and $K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X$ is pseudo-effective/ U , there exists a sequence of $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)$ -flips and divisorial contractions over U . Moreover, any such sequence ends either with a Mori fiber space or a minimal model over U .*

The theory of *generalized pairs* (g-pairs for short) was introduced by C. Birkar and D.-Q. Zhang in [BZ16] to tackle the effective Iitaka fibration conjecture. Some embryonic forms of this theory can be found in [Bir12b, BH14], and can even be traced back to the early studies on the moduli part of the canonical bundle formula and sub-adjunctions [Kaw98, FM00]. Although, seemingly technical, in recent years, the theory of generalized pairs has proven to be a powerful tool in birational geometry. In particular, this theory has been essentially used in the proof of the Borisov-Alexeev-Borisov conjecture [Bir19, Bir21a]. For other results closely related to the theory of generalized pairs, we refer the reader to [HX15, Fil18a, Mor18, HL18, Fil18b, Bir18, HH19, HL19, LT19, HM20, HL20a, HL20b, HL20d, LP20a, LP20b, Li20, Hu20, FS20a, Fil20, Bir20a, HL20c, CX20, Bir20c, FS20b, FW20, BDCS20, CT20, Sho20, Has20, Li21, Liu21, LX21, Hu21, Jia21, Bir21b, FH21]. We also refer the reader to [Bir20b] for a more detailed introduction to the theory of generalized pairs.

It has recently become apparent that the minimal model program (MMP) for generalized pairs is closely related to the minimal model program for usual pairs and varieties. In particular, generalized pairs have been used to prove the termination of pseudo-effective fourfold flips [Mor18, HL18, HM20, CT20]. For this, and other reasons, it is important to study the minimal model program for generalized pairs. For gklt (generalized klt) g-pairs or \mathbb{Q} -factorial gdlt (generalized dlt) g-pairs, the corresponding theory is very similar to the case of the usual klt or \mathbb{Q} -factorial dlt pairs (cf. [BZ16, Lemma 4.4], [HL18, Lemma 3.5]). However, when studying the MMP for glc g-pairs, we encounter several non-trivial issues. Before discussing these, let us first recall the main features of the usual minimal model program.

Step 1. We start with a \mathbb{Q} -factorial projective pair (X, B) with at worst lc singularities.

Step 2. If $K_X + B$ is nef, i.e. (X, B) is a minimal model then we are done. Otherwise, by the cone and the contraction theorems, we contract a $(K_X + B)$ -negative extremal ray and get a contraction $f : X \rightarrow Z$.

Step 3. If f is a Mori fiber space, then we are done. If f is a divisorial contraction, then we replace X with Z and continue. If f is a flipping contraction and the flip $f^+ : X^+ \rightarrow Z$ of f exists, then we replace X with X^+ and continue. Note that the \mathbb{Q} -factorial condition, which usually follows from the cone and the contraction theorems, needs to be preserved.

Step 4. If there does not exist an infinite sequence of flips, then the MMP terminates with either a minimal model or a Mori fiber space, and we are done.

In summary, to complete a minimal model program, we need

- (1) the cone and the contraction theorems,
- (2) the existence of flips, and
- (3) the termination of flips.

For the usual lc pairs, (1) and (2) are completely known. In fact, the cone and contraction theorems for projective klt pairs appear in [Kaw84] and are completed in [Kol84], the relative versions are proven in [KMM87], the cone and contraction theorems for lc pairs are proven in [Amb03, Fuj11] by using the theory of quasi-log varieties, the existence of klt flips is proven in [BCHM10], and the existence of lc flips is proven in [Bir12a, HX13]. The difficult part for the minimal model program for usual pairs is (3): we only know the termination of flips in full generality, in dimension ≤ 3 [Kaw92, Sho96]. In dimension 4, some special cases have been proven: the terminal case in [KMM87], klt anti-effective case and some other special cases in [AHK07], canonical case with rational coefficients in [Fuj04, Fuj05], effective case in [Bir07, HMX14], and pseudo-effective case [Mor18, HL18, HM20, CT20] as we mentioned earlier.

For glc pairs that are neither gklt nor \mathbb{Q} -factorial gdlt, the situation is completely different. First of all, we usually need to add the NQC condition for technical reasons (cf. [HL18, Example 3.15]), however this is a natural assumption and is contained in the original definition of generalized pairs in [BZ16]. Under the NQC assumption, the known results on the termination of flips are similar to the usual pair case (in particular, in full generality in dimension ≤ 3 [CT20] and in the pseudo-effective case in dimension 4 [HM20, CT20]). However, the cone and contraction theorems and the existence of flips seem to be far more challenging even in dimension 3, and we only know some partial results when \mathbf{M} descends to X , i.e., \mathbf{M}_X is nef [LP20a, LP20b]. We remark that for curves and surfaces, there are no flips, and the cone and contraction theorems follow from the usual cone and contraction theorems as \mathbf{M}_X is always nef.

Very recently, there has been some progress towards the existence of flips for generalized pairs. K. Hashizume has shown the non-vanishing theorem for glc pairs with a polarization [Has20, Theorem 1.1], and also investigated the termination of a special MMP for glc pairs [Has20, Theorem 1.3], which has a close connection with the existence of glc flips. Recently, Z. Hu proved the finiteness of B-representations for some special glc pairs [Hu21, Theorem 1.5], a generalized pair version of [FG14, Theorem 1.1] and [HX16, Theorem 1.2]. This result induces the generalized pair version of [FG14, Theorem 1.4] and [HX16, Theorem 1.4] ([Hu21, Theorem 1.9]), and [Bir12a, Theorem 1.7] and [HX16, Corollary 1.5] ([Hu21, Theorem 1.10]), which are important theorems in the proof of the existence of lc flips. In this paper, we will prove the existence of flips for \mathbb{Q} -factorial NQC glc g-pairs, which solves (2). Although it turns out that we do not need K. Hashizume's result and Z. Hu's result to prove the existence of glc flips, their results motivated us. We also expect that the methods in [Hu21] can be applied to the termination of flips under the setting of [Has20, Theorem 1.3].

To guarantee that we can run the minimal model program for \mathbb{Q} -factorial glc g-pairs, we are only left to prove the corresponding cone and contraction theorems. We can prove the cone theorem by combining results of F. Ambro and O. Fujino on the cone and contraction theorems of non-lc pairs [Amb03, Fuj11] and recent results of J. Han and W. Liu on generalized sub-adjunction [HL19]. Although we cannot prove the base-point-free theorem in the same generality as in [Amb03, Fuj11], fortunately for us, we are able to prove the contraction theorem for extremal rays by using the special properties of extremal rays. Combining with the cone theorem, we solve (1). We remark that O. Fujino has a recent paper [Fuj21] on related topics, where he considers the cone and contraction theorems for quasi-log schemes. Note that any quasi-lc pair is a generalized lc pair (cf. [Fuj18, Remark 1.9]).

Sketch of the proof. We first sketch our proof on the existence of flips (Theorem 1.2).

Usually, proving the existence of flips is equivalent to proving the existence of a good minimal model for some special pairs. Therefore, the proof needs to contain two parts: the first part is to show the existence of a log minimal model, and the second part is to show that the log minimal model is actually good, or equivalently to prove a Fukuda-type base point free theorem.

We sketch the proof of the second part first. Notice that for a \mathbb{Q} -factorial generalized pair $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ equipped with a flipping contraction $f : X \rightarrow Z$ over U , we can always assume that $\mathbf{M}_X \cdot C < 0$ for any flipping curve, otherwise f is a $(K_X + B)$ -flipping contraction and the existence of the flip just follows from the existence of flips for lc pairs. Notice that on the complement of the flipping locus, we have $\mathbf{M}_X \sim_{\mathbb{R}} 0$ as a \mathbf{b} -divisor over Z . In other words, $\mathbf{M}_X|_{f^{-1}(Z^0)} \sim_{\mathbb{R}, Z^0} 0$ over some non-empty open subset Z^0 of Z . We can further shrink Z^0 and assume that \mathbf{M} descends to X over Z^0 . Then we will have a Fukuda-type base-point-free theorem similar to [Fuj12, Theorem 1.2] for such special generalized pairs (cf. Theorem 7.4). Using the property $\mathbf{M}_X|_{f^{-1}(Z^0)} \sim_{\mathbb{R}, Z^0} 0$ again, we can prove a base-point-free theorem similar to [HX13, Theorem 4.1] (cf. Theorem 7.5). This is enough for us to show that the log minimal models arising in this context are actually good.

Now we deal with the first part. With the condition $\mathbf{M}_X|_{f^{-1}(Z^0)} \sim_{\mathbb{R}, Z^0} 0$ in mind, we can easily transform this part of the question to a question on the existence of generalized lc closures (Theorem 1.1), which is similar to [HX13, Theorem 1.1] and [Has19, Theorem 1.2]. To show the existence of a log minimal model for generalized pairs satisfying the conditions as in Theorem 1.1, we would like to follow similar statements in the proofs of the existence of lc flips. However, two out of the three possible paths do not work for us: as we do not have the finite generation of the log canonical ring for gklt pairs, we cannot follow [Bir12a]; as we do not have a precise canonical bundle formula for Iitaka fibrations of generalized pairs, we cannot follow [HX13]. We also remark that the Kollár's conjecture (cf. [Kol14, Theorem 4], [Bir12a, Theorem 1.1], [HX13, Theorem 1.6], [Has19, Theorem 1.1]) has a negative answer for generalized pairs even in dimension 1 by considering the projective generalized pair $(X, 0, \mathbf{M})$ where X is an elliptic curve and $\mathbf{M}_X \equiv 0$ is a non-torsion divisor (cf. [Fil18a, 6.2]).

Fortunately for us, we are able to follow an alternative approach given in [Has19], where we combine the results of the generalized MMP with scaling from [HL18], the canonical bundle formula for glc-trivial fibrations [Fil18b, HL19, FS20b], the Shokurov-type polytope for generalized pairs [HL20d], and the special termination [HL18]. This allows us to prove Theorem 1.1, which immediately implies the existence of \mathbb{Q} -factorial NQC glc flips (Theorem 1.2).

Now we sketch a proof of the cone theorem. Possibly perturbing the generalized pair $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ with an ample divisor, we may assume that $K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X \sim_{\mathbb{R}, U} K_X + \Delta$ for some pair (X, Δ) . (X, Δ) is not necessarily lc; however, we may assume that the non-lc locus of (X, Δ) is exactly the non-gklt locus of (X, B, \mathbf{M}) . Now we want to apply the results of F. Ambro [Amb03] and O. Fujino [Fuj11]. Since we have a generalized pair structure, a key observation is that we can do sub-adjunction to any non-lc center of (X, B, \mathbf{M}) and still have a generalized lc pair structure after the sub-adjunction [HL19]. Applying induction on the dimension, we immediately get the cone theorem.

We can use the cone theorem to deduce the contraction theorem. Assume that \mathbf{M}_X is \mathbb{R} -Cartier. To prove the contraction theorem for any $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)$ -negative extremal ray R , we only need to prove some special base-point-freeness theorems for any supporting function L of a $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)$ -negative extremal ray. We can always assume that $\mathbf{M}_X \cdot R < 0$. In this case, possibly replacing \mathbf{M} with $(1 - \epsilon)\mathbf{M}$ for $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$, we may assume that $\text{Ngklt}(X, B, \mathbf{M}) = \text{Nklt}(X, B) = \text{Nlc}(X, \Delta)$ and $\text{Nlc}(X, \Delta)$ does not contain any curve C such that $[C] \in R$. By the cone theorem and Kleiman's Criterion, we know that $L|_{\text{Nlc}(X, \Delta)}$ is ample. Now we can apply the results of F. Ambro [Amb03] and O. Fujino [Fuj11] to prove the base-point-freeness theorem for L .

Finally, together with the existence of flips we just proved, we know that we can run MMP for any \mathbb{Q} -factorial NQC glc g-pair (Theorem 1.4). In other words, for \mathbb{Q} -factorial NQC glc g-pairs,

whenever we know the termination of flips, we will have the complete MMP, and Theorem 1.5 follows from [HM20, CT20].

Structure of the paper. In Section 2, we introduce some notation and tools for generalized pairs and MMPs which will be used in this paper. In Section 3, we study different models for generalized pairs. In Section 4, we recall the results on abundance for pairs with numerical dimension zero, and use them to prove a result on generalized pairs with numerical dimension 0. In Section 5, we prove a slight generalization of a canonical bundle formula for generalized pairs [Fil18b, HL19, FS20b] and use it to prove a special case of Theorem 1.1. In Section 6, we prove a special termination result for generalized pairs similar to [HL18, Theorem 4.5]. In Section 7, we prove a Fukuda-type base-point-free theorem for generalized pairs. In Section 8, we prove Theorem 1.1. In Section 9, we prove the base-point-free theorem, contraction theorem, and cone theorem for generalized lc pairs, which implies Theorem 1.3. In Section 10, we prove the rest of our main theorems, i.e. Theorems 1.2, 1.4, and 1.5.

Postscript. After the first version of our paper appeared, we were informed by Haidong Liu and Zhengyu Hu that there are some troubles with [Hu21, Theorem 1.9], a result we used in the proofs of Theorems 7.5 and 9.1 of the first version of the paper. Therefore some of the corresponding proofs in the first version of this paper are incomplete. Fortunately for us, we could avoid using [Hu21] and still prove all our main results except Theorem 1.3(4): without applying [Hu21], we could only contract $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)$ -negative extremal rays rather than faces, and we need to assume that \mathbf{M}_X is \mathbb{R} -Cartier. Nevertheless, this modification will not influence the other main theorems of the paper. Indeed, the current Theorem 1.3(4.c) is even comparably stronger than that of the first version from the perspective of running the minimal model program: for example, the current Theorem 1.3(4.c) will imply the \mathbb{Q} -factorial glc version of Lemma 2.41 while the first version did not. We were later informed by Nikolaos Tsakanikas that he and Vladimir Lazić have obtained some results on the minimal model program for generalized pairs [LT21] based on the main theorems of our paper, where they need the current Theorem 1.3(4.c).

We thank Zhengyu Hu, Haidong Liu, and Nikolaos Tsakanikas for these discussions.

Acknowledgement. The second author would like to thank Jingjun Han, Junpeng Jiao, and Yuchen Liu for useful discussions. The authors are partially supported by NSF research grants no: DMS-1801851, DMS-1952522 and by a grant from the Simons Foundation; Award Number: 256202.

2. PRELIMINARIES

We will freely use the notation and definitions from [KM98, BCHM10]. For generalized pairs, we will follow the definitions in [HL18] but follow the notation as in [FS20b, Has20] (see Remarks 2.26, 2.27, 2.28 below).

2.1. Divisors.

Definition 2.1. Let a be a real number, X a normal variety, and $D = \sum_i d_i D_i$ an \mathbb{R} -divisor on X , where D_i are the irreducible components of D . We define $D^{\leq a} := \sum_{i|d_i \leq a} d_i D_i$, $D^{=a} := \sum_{i|d_i=a} d_i D_i$, $D^{\geq a} := \sum_{i|d_i \leq a} d_i D_i$, $[D] := \sum_i [d_i] D_i$, and $\{D\} := \sum_i \{d_i\} D_i$.

Definition 2.2. Let $\phi : X \dashrightarrow Y$ be a birational map. We let $\text{Exc}(\phi)$ be the union of the exceptional divisors of ϕ , and usually identify $\text{Exc}(\phi)$ with the reduced exceptional divisor of ϕ .

The following lemma and its proof are taken verbatim from [BCHM10, Lemma 3.2.1].

Lemma 2.3 (cf. [BCHM10, Lemma 3.2.1]). *Let $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{Q}$ or \mathbb{R} . Let $\pi : X \rightarrow U$ be a projective morphism between normal quasi-projective varieties. Let D be a \mathbb{K} -Cartier \mathbb{K} -divisor on X and let D' be its restriction to the generic fiber of π .*

If $D' \sim_{\mathbb{K}} B' \geq 0$ for some \mathbb{K} -divisor B' on the generic fiber of π , then $D \sim_{\mathbb{K},U} B \geq 0$ for some \mathbb{K} -divisor B , such that B' is the restriction of B to the generic fiber of π .

Proof. Taking the closure of the generic points of B' , we may assume that there exists a \mathbb{K} -divisor $B_1 \geq 0$ such that B' is the restriction of B_1 to the generic fiber of π . Since $D' - B' \sim_{\mathbb{K}} 0$, $(D - B_1)|_{\pi^{-1}(U_1)} \sim_{\mathbb{K}} 0$ for some non-empty proper open subset U_1 of U . Then there exists a \mathbb{K} -divisor G on X such that $D - B_1 \sim_{\mathbb{K}} G$ and $Z := \pi(\text{Supp } G)$ is a proper closed subset of U . Since U is quasi-projective, there exists an ample \mathbb{K} -divisor $H \geq 0$ on U which contains Z , such that $F := \pi^*H \geq -G$. Thus $D \sim_{\mathbb{K},U} B_1 + F + G \geq 0$. By our construction, F and G are vertical over U , so B' is the restriction of $B := B_1 + F + G$ to the generic fiber of π . \square

2.2. Maps.

Definition 2.4 (Contraction and birational contraction). A *contraction* is a projective morphism $f : X \rightarrow Y$ such that $f_*\mathcal{O}_X = \mathcal{O}_Y$. In particular, f has connected fibers, and if $X \rightarrow Z \rightarrow Y$ is the Stein factorization of f , then $Z \rightarrow Y$ is an isomorphism. Moreover, if X is normal, then Y is normal.

Let $\phi : X \dashrightarrow Y$ be a birational map between normal varieties. Then ϕ is called a *birational contraction* if ϕ does not extract any divisors.

Definition 2.5. For any birational contraction $\phi : X \dashrightarrow Y$ and \mathbb{R} -Cartier \mathbb{R} -divisor D on X , let $p : W \rightarrow X$ and $q : W \rightarrow Y$ be a common resolution such that $q = \phi \circ p$, and let $D_Y := \phi_*D$. Then f is called

- (1) *D-trivial* if D_Y is \mathbb{R} -Cartier and $p^*D = q^*D_Y$,
- (2) *D-non-positive* if D_Y is \mathbb{R} -Cartier, and $p^*D = q^*D_Y + E$ for some $E \geq 0$ that is exceptional over Y , and
- (3) *D-negative* if D_Y is \mathbb{R} -Cartier, $p^*D = q^*D_Y + E$ for some $E \geq 0$ that is exceptional over Y , and $\text{Exc}(\phi) \subset \text{Supp}(p_*E)$.

Lemma 2.6. Let $\pi : X \rightarrow U$ be a projective morphism such that X is normal. Let D be an \mathbb{R} -Cartier \mathbb{R} -divisor on X , $\phi : X \dashrightarrow Y$ a birational contraction over U such that ϕ is *D-trivial*, and $D_Y := \phi_*D$. Then for any non-empty open subset $U^0 \subset U$, $D^0 := D \times_U U^0$ is semi-ample/ U^0 if and only if $D_Y^0 := D_Y \times_U U^0$ is semi-ample/ U^0 .

Proof. Let $p : W \rightarrow X$ and $q : W \rightarrow Y$ be a common resolution such that $q = \phi \circ p$. Since ϕ is *D-trivial*, $D_W := p^*D = q^*D_Y$. Let $D_W^0 := D_W \times_U U^0$ and $W^0 := W \times_U U^0$. Then

$$(p|_{W^0})^*D^0 = (p^*D)|_{W^0} = D_W^0 = (q^*D_Y)|_{W^0} = (q|_{W^0})^*D_Y^0,$$

and the lemma follows. \square

2.3. Numerical dimensions.

Definition 2.7 (Numerical dimension, cf. [HH20, Definition 2.7]). Let X be a normal projective variety and D an \mathbb{R} -Cartier \mathbb{R} -divisor on X . The *numerical dimension* $\kappa_\sigma(D) = \kappa_\sigma(X, D)$ of D is defined in the following way.

For any Cartier divisor A on X , we first define a $\sigma(D; A)$ as follows:

- (1) If $H^0(X, [mD] + A) \neq 0$ only for finitely many positive integers m , then

$$\sigma(D; A) := -\infty.$$

- (2) If $H^0(X, [mD] + A) \neq 0$ for infinitely many positive integers m , then

$$\sigma(D; A) := \max \left\{ k \in \mathbb{N} \mid \limsup_{m \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\dim H^0(X, [mD] + A)}{m^k} > 0 \right\}.$$

We define

$$\kappa_\sigma(D) = \kappa_\sigma(X, D) := \max\{\sigma(D; A) \mid A \text{ is a Cartier divisor on } X\}.$$

Definition 2.8 (Relative numerical dimensions, cf. [HH20, Definition 2.7]). Let $\pi : X \rightarrow U$ be a projective morphism from a normal variety to a variety, D an \mathbb{R} -Cartier \mathbb{R} -divisor on X , and F a very general fiber of the Stein factorization of π . The *relative numerical dimension* $\kappa_\sigma(X/U, D)$ is defined in the following way:

- (1) If $\dim F > 0$, then $\kappa_\sigma(X/U, D) := \kappa_\sigma(F, D|_F)$.
- (2) If $\dim F = 0$, then $\kappa_\sigma(X/U, D) := 0$.

Lemma 2.9 (cf. [Nak04, V. 2.6(5) Remark]). *Let X be a normal projective variety and D an \mathbb{R} -Cartier \mathbb{R} -divisor on X such that $\kappa_\sigma(D) \geq 0$. Then D is pseudo-effective.*

Proof. By definition, there exists a Cartier divisor A on X such that $\sigma(D; A) \geq 0$. In particular, there exists a sequence of strictly increasing positive integers m_i , such that $\dim H^0(X, [m_i D] + A) > 0$, hence $[m_i D] + A$ is effective for any i . Thus $m_i D + A$ is effective for any i , hence $D + \frac{1}{m_i} A$ is effective for any i . Thus D is the limit of the effective \mathbb{R} -divisors $D + \frac{1}{m_i} A$, hence D is pseudo-effective. \square

The following lemma is well-known. For the reader's convenience, we give a short proof here.

Lemma 2.10. *Let $\pi : X \rightarrow U$ be a projective morphism from a normal variety to a variety, and D an \mathbb{R} -Cartier \mathbb{R} -divisor on X . Then:*

- (1) D is big/ U if and only if $\kappa_\sigma(X/U, D) = \dim X - \dim U$.
- (2) Let D_1, D_2 be two \mathbb{R} -Cartier \mathbb{R} -divisors on X . Suppose that $D_1 \sim_{\mathbb{R}, U} E_1 \geq 0$ and $D_2 \sim_{\mathbb{R}, U} E_2 \geq 0$ for some \mathbb{R} -divisors E_1, E_2 such that $\text{Supp } E_1 = \text{Supp } E_2$. Then $\kappa_\sigma(X/U, D_1) = \kappa_\sigma(X/U, D_2)$.
- (3) Let $f : Y \rightarrow X$ be a surjective birational morphism and D_Y an \mathbb{R} -Cartier \mathbb{R} -divisor on Y such that $D_Y = f^* D + E$ for some f -exceptional \mathbb{R} -divisor $E \geq 0$. Then $\kappa_\sigma(Y/U, D_Y) = \kappa_\sigma(X/U, D)$.
- (4) Let $g : Z \rightarrow X$ be a surjective morphism from a normal variety such that Z is projective over U . Then $\kappa_\sigma(Z/U, f^* D) = \kappa_\sigma(X/U, D)$.
- (5) Let \bar{D} be an \mathbb{R} -Cartier \mathbb{R} -divisor on X such that $D \equiv_U \bar{D}$. Then $\kappa_\sigma(X/U, D) = \kappa_\sigma(X/U, \bar{D})$.
- (6) Let $\phi : X \dashrightarrow X'$ be a partial D -MMP/ U and let $D' := \phi_* D$. Then $\kappa_\sigma(X/U, D) = \kappa_\sigma(X'/U, D')$.

Proof. For (1)-(5), let F be a very general fiber of the Stein factorization of π . Possibly replacing X with F , U with $\{pt\}$, and D, D_1, D_2, \bar{D} with $D|_F, D_1|_F, D_2|_F, \bar{D}|_F$ respectively, we may assume that X is projective and $U = \{pt\}$. (2) follows from [HH20, Remark 2.8(1)] and (3)(4) follow from [HH20, Remark 2.8(2)].

To prove (1)(5), let $h : \tilde{X} \rightarrow X$ be a resolution of X . By (4), we may replace X with \tilde{X} , D with $h^* D$, and \bar{D} with $h^* \bar{D}$, and assume that X is smooth.

If D is big, then $\kappa_\sigma(D) = \dim X$ by definition. If $\kappa_\sigma(D) = \dim X$, then D is pseudo-effective by Lemma 2.9, hence D is big by [Nak04, V. 2.7(3) Proposition]. This gives (1).

To prove (5), notice that D is pseudo-effective if and only if \bar{D} is pseudo-effective. If D is not pseudo-effective, then $\kappa_\sigma(D) = \kappa_\sigma(\bar{D}) = -\infty$ by Lemma 2.9. If D is pseudo-effective, then (5) follows from [Nak04, V. 2.7(1) Proposition].

To prove (6), let $p : W \rightarrow X$ and $q : W \rightarrow X'$ be a common resolution such that $q = \phi \circ p$, then $p^* D = q^* D' + F$ for some $F \geq 0$ that is q -exceptional. By (3), we have

$$\kappa_\sigma(X/U, D) = \kappa_\sigma(W/U, p^* D) = \kappa_\sigma(W/U, q^* D' + F) = \kappa_\sigma(X'/U, D').$$

\square

Lemma 2.11. *Let $\pi : X \rightarrow U$ be a projective morphism from a normal variety to a variety, $D \equiv_U D' \geq A \geq 0$ for some \mathbb{R} -Cartier \mathbb{R} -divisors D, D', A on X . Then for any real numbers $t_1, t_2 \in [0, 1)$,*

$$\kappa_\sigma(X/U, D - t_1 A) = \kappa_\sigma(X/U, D - t_2 A).$$

Proof. By Lemma 2.10(5), we may assume that $D = D'$. We may write $D = A + B$ for some $B \geq 0$. Since

$\text{Supp}(D - t_1 A) = \text{Supp}((1 - t_1)A + B) = \text{Supp}(A + B) = \text{Supp}((1 - t_2)A + B) = \text{Supp}(D - t_2 B)$,
the lemma follows from Lemma 2.10(2). \square

2.4. Iitaka dimension and invariant Iitaka dimension.

Definition 2.12 (Iitaka dimension, cf. [Nak04, II 3.2 Definition]). Let X be a normal projective variety and D an \mathbb{R} -divisor on X . For any positive integer m such that $|\lfloor mD \rfloor| \neq \emptyset$, we define

$$\Phi_{mD} : X \dashrightarrow \mathbb{P}(H^0(X, \lfloor mD \rfloor)).$$

The *Iitaka dimension* $\kappa(D) = \kappa(X, D)$ of D is defined in the following way:

- (1) If $|\lfloor mD \rfloor| = \emptyset$ for every positive integer m , then

$$\kappa(D) = \kappa(X, D) := -\infty.$$

- (2) If $|\lfloor mD \rfloor| \neq \emptyset$ for some positive integer m , then

$$\kappa(D) = \kappa(X, D) := \max_{m \in \mathbb{N}^+, |\lfloor mD \rfloor| \neq \emptyset} \dim \Phi_{mD}(X).$$

Proposition 2.13 (cf. [Nak04, II 3.8 Corollary]). *Let X be a normal projective variety and D an \mathbb{R} -divisor on X . Then:*

- (1) *If $|\lfloor mD \rfloor| = \emptyset$ for every positive integer m , then $\kappa(D) = -\infty$.*
(2) *If $|\lfloor mD \rfloor| \neq \emptyset$ for some positive integer m , then*

$$\kappa(D) = \max \left\{ k \in \mathbb{N}^+ \mid \limsup_{m \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\dim H^0(X, \lfloor mD \rfloor)}{m^k} > 0 \right\}.$$

Definition 2.14 (Relative Iitaka dimensions, cf. [Cho08, Definition 2.1.1]). Let $\pi : X \rightarrow U$ be a projective morphism between normal, D an \mathbb{R} -divisor on X , and F a very general fiber of the Stein factorization of π . We define the *relative Iitaka dimension* $\kappa(X/U, D)$ of D over U in the following way:

- (1) $\kappa(X/U, D) := \kappa(F, D|_F)$ if $|\lfloor mD \rfloor/U| \neq \emptyset$ for some positive integer m and $\dim F > 0$.
(2) $\kappa(X/U, D) := -\infty$ if $|\lfloor mD \rfloor/U| = \emptyset$ for every positive integer m .
(3) $\kappa(X/U, D) := 0$ if $\dim F = 0$.

Definition 2.15 (Invariant Iitaka dimension, cf. [Cho08, Definition 2.2.1]). Let $\pi : X \rightarrow U$ be a projective morphism between normal varieties and D an \mathbb{R} -divisor on X . The *(relative) invariant Iitaka dimension* $\kappa_\iota(X/U, D)$ of D over U is defined in the following way:

- (1) If $|D/U|_{\mathbb{R}} = \emptyset$, then $\kappa_\iota(X/U, D) := -\infty$.
(2) If $|D/U|_{\mathbb{R}} \neq \emptyset$, then we define

$$\kappa_\iota(X/U, D) := \kappa(X/U, D')$$

for some \mathbb{R} -divisor $D' \geq 0$ on X such that $D \sim_{\mathbb{R}, U} D'$. $\kappa_\iota(X/U, D)$ is independent of the choice of D' by [Cho08, Corollary 2.1.4].

If $U = \{pt\}$, then we define $\kappa_\iota(D) = \kappa_\iota(X, D) := \kappa(X/U, D)$.

Definition 2.16. Let $\pi : X \rightarrow U$ be a projective morphism between normal quasi-projective varieties. An \mathbb{R} -divisor D on X is called *abundant over U* if $\kappa_\iota(X/U, D) = \kappa_\sigma(X/U, D)$. We also say that D is *π -abundant*. In addition, if $U = \{pt\}$, then we say that D is *abundant*.

Proposition 2.17 ([Cho08, Proposition 2.2.2(1)]). *Let $X \rightarrow U$ be a projective morphism between normal varieties, and D and D' be two \mathbb{R} -divisors on X . Then $\kappa(X/U, D) \leq \kappa_\iota(X/U, D)$, and $\kappa(X/U, D) < \kappa_\iota(X/U, D)$ if and only if $\kappa(X/U, D) = -\infty$ and $\kappa_\iota(X/U, D) \geq 0$.*

Lemma 2.18. *Let $X \rightarrow U$ be a projective morphism between normal quasi-projective varieties and D a \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X . Then $\kappa_\iota(X/U, D) = \kappa(X/U, D)$.*

Proof. We may assume that $\dim X > \dim U$, otherwise there is nothing to prove. Assume that $\kappa_\iota(X/U, D) \neq \kappa(X/U, D)$. By Proposition 2.17, $\kappa_\iota(X/U, D) \geq 0$ and $\kappa(X/U, D) = -\infty$. Since $\kappa_\iota(X/U, D) \geq 0$, $D \sim_{\mathbb{R}, U} D' \geq 0$ for some \mathbb{R} -divisor D' on X .

We may write $D' = D_0 + \sum_{i=1}^c r_i D_i$ for some non-negative integer c , \mathbb{Q} -divisors D_0, \dots, D_c , and real numbers r_1, \dots, r_c such that $1, r_1, \dots, r_c$ are linearly independent over \mathbb{Q} . Moreover, since $D' \geq 0$, we may pick rational numbers r'_1, \dots, r'_c that are sufficiently close to r_1, \dots, r_c respectively, such that

$$D'' := D_0 + \sum_{i=1}^c r'_i D_i \geq 0.$$

Since $D \sim_{\mathbb{R}, U} D'$,

$$(D_0 - D) + \sum_{i=1}^c r_i D_i \sim_{\mathbb{R}, U} 0.$$

Since D is a \mathbb{Q} -divisor, by [HLS19, Lemma 5.3], $D_0 - D \sim_{\mathbb{Q}, U} 0$ and $D_i \sim_{\mathbb{Q}, U} 0$ for every $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, c\}$. Thus $D \sim_{\mathbb{Q}, U} D'' \geq 0$, hence there exists a positive integer m such that mD, mD'' are Weil divisors and $mD \sim_U mD'' \geq 0$. In particular, $|[mD]/U| \neq \emptyset$, hence $\kappa(X/U, D) \geq 0$ by definition, a contradiction. \square

Lemma 2.19. *Let $\pi : X \rightarrow U$ be a projective morphism between normal quasi-projective varieties and F a very general fiber of the Stein factorization of π . Let D be an \mathbb{R} -Cartier \mathbb{R} -divisor on X . Then:*

- (1) *If $\dim F > 0$, then $\kappa_\iota(X/U, D) = \kappa_\iota(F, D|_F)$.*
- (2) *If $\dim F > 0$, then $\kappa(X/U, D) = \kappa(F, D|_F)$.*
- (3) *Let $f : Y \rightarrow X$ be a surjective birational morphism and D_Y an \mathbb{R} -Cartier \mathbb{R} -divisor on Y such that $D_Y = f^*D + E$ for some f -exceptional \mathbb{R} -divisor $E \geq 0$. Then $\kappa_\iota(Y/U, D_Y) = \kappa_\iota(X/U, D)$.*
- (4) *Let $\phi : X \dashrightarrow X'$ be a partial D -MMP/ U and let $D' := \phi_*D$. Then $\kappa_\iota(X/U, D) = \kappa_\iota(X'/U, D')$.*

Proof. First we prove (1). By definition, if $|D/U|_{\mathbb{R}} \neq \emptyset$, then (1) holds, so we may assume that $|D/U|_{\mathbb{R}} = \emptyset$. Then $\kappa_\iota(X/U, D) = -\infty$. By [HH20, Lemma 2.10], $\kappa_\iota(F, D|_F) = -\infty$, and we have (1).

We prove (2). Let $h : \tilde{X} \rightarrow X$ be a log resolution of X . By Proposition 2.13, we may replace X with \tilde{X} , D with h^*D , and π with $\pi \circ h$, and assume that X is smooth. If $|[mD]/U| \neq \emptyset$ for some positive integer m , then (2) holds, so we may assume that $|[mD]/U| = \emptyset$ for any positive integer m . Then $\kappa(X/U, D) = -\infty$. If $\kappa(F, D|_F) \geq 0$, then there exists a positive integer m_0 such that $|[m_0D|_F]| = |[m_0D]|_F \neq \emptyset$. Let $U_0 \subset U$ be a non-empty open subset such that $\mathcal{O}_{X_0}([mD])$ is flat over U_0 and $X_0 = \pi^{-1}(U_0)$. By semicontinuity, the set of points $u \in U_0$ such that $h^0(X_u, \mathcal{O}_{X_u}([mD])) = 0$ is an open subset. Since the fiber F corresponds to X_u where $u \in U$ is very general, we may assume that for some $m > 0$ as above, the open subset U_0 is non-empty. It follows that $\pi_*\mathcal{O}_X([mD]) \neq 0$ and hence $|[mD]/U| \neq \emptyset$. This is a contradiction and therefore, $\kappa(F, D|_F) = -\infty$. We get (2).

To prove (3), possibly replacing X with F , U with $\{pt\}$, and D with $D|_F$, we may assume that X is projective and $U = \{pt\}$. (3) follows from [HH20, Remark 2.8(2)].

To prove (4), let $p : W \rightarrow X$ and $q : W \rightarrow X'$ be a common resolution such that $q = \phi \circ p$, then $p^*D = q^*D' + F$ for some $F \geq 0$ that is q -exceptional. By (3), we have

$$\kappa_\iota(X/U, D) = \kappa_\iota(W/U, p^*D) = \kappa_\iota(W/U, q^*D' + F) = \kappa_\iota(X'/U, D').$$

\square

2.5. \mathbf{b} -divisors.

Definition 2.20 (\mathbf{b} -divisors). Let X be a normal quasi-projective variety. We call Y a *birational model* over X if there exists a projective birational morphism $Y \rightarrow X$.

Let $X \dashrightarrow X'$ be a birational map. For any valuation ν over X , we define $\nu_{X'}$ to be the center of ν on X' . A \mathbf{b} -divisor \mathbf{D} over X is a formal sum $\mathbf{D} = \sum_{\nu} r_{\nu} \nu$ where ν are valuations over X and $r_{\nu} \in \mathbb{R}$, such that ν_X is not a divisor except for finitely many ν . If in addition, $r_{\nu} \in \mathbb{Q}$ for every ν , then \mathbf{D} is called a \mathbb{Q} - \mathbf{b} -divisor. The *trace* of \mathbf{D} on X' is the \mathbb{R} -divisor

$$\mathbf{D}_{X'} := \sum_{\nu_{i,X'} \text{ is a divisor}} r_i \nu_{i,X'}.$$

If $\mathbf{D}_{X'}$ is \mathbb{R} -Cartier and \mathbf{D}_Y is the pullback of $\mathbf{D}_{X'}$ on Y for any birational model Y of X' , we say that \mathbf{D} *descends* to X' , and also say that \mathbf{D} is the *closure* of $\mathbf{D}_{X'}$, and write $\mathbf{D} = \overline{\mathbf{D}_{X'}}$.

Let $X \rightarrow U$ be a projective morphism and assume that \mathbf{D} is a \mathbf{b} -divisor over X such that \mathbf{D} descends to some birational model Y over X . If \mathbf{D}_Y is nef/ U , then we say that \mathbf{D} is nef/ U . If \mathbf{D}_Y is a Cartier divisor, then we say that \mathbf{D} is \mathbf{b} -Cartier. If \mathbf{D}_Y is a \mathbb{Q} -Cartier \mathbb{Q} -divisor, then we say that \mathbf{D} is \mathbb{Q} - \mathbf{b} -Cartier. If \mathbf{D} can be written as an $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ -linear combination of nef/ U \mathbf{b} -Cartier \mathbf{b} -divisors, then we say that \mathbf{D} is NQC/U .

We let $\mathbf{0}$ be the \mathbf{b} -divisor $\bar{0}$.

Definition 2.21. Let $X \rightarrow U$ be a projective morphism such that X is a normal quasi-projective varieties, and let U^0 be a non-empty open subset of U . Let \mathbf{D} be a \mathbf{b} -divisor over X . We define a \mathbf{b} -divisor $\mathbf{D}^0 := \mathbf{D} \times_U U^0$ in the following way. For any birational projective morphism $Y^0 \rightarrow X^0 = X \times_U U^0$, we may assume that $Y^0 = Y \times_U U^0$ where $Y \rightarrow X$ is a birational projective morphism. We let $\mathbf{D}_{Y^0}^0 = \mathbf{D}_Y|_{Y^0}$. It is easy to see that this definition is independent of the choice of Y and defines a \mathbf{b} -divisor.

It is easy to see that if $W \rightarrow X$ is a birational morphism such that \mathbf{D} descends to W , then \mathbf{D}^0 is the closure of $\mathbf{D}_W \times_U U^0$. Since base change is compatible with pullbacks, \mathbf{D}^0 is well-defined and independent of the choice of W . We also note that if \mathbf{D} is nef/ U , then \mathbf{D}^0 is nef/ U^0 , and if \mathbf{D} is NQC/U , then \mathbf{D}^0 is NQC/U^0 .

The following lemma is very useful in the proof of our main theorems:

Lemma 2.22. *Let $\pi : X \rightarrow U$ be a projective morphism such that X is a normal quasi-projective variety. Let $U^0 \subset U$ be an open subset and \mathbf{D} a \mathbf{b} -divisor over X , such that $\mathbf{D}^0 := \mathbf{D} \times_U U^0$ descends to X^0 and $\mathbf{D}_{X^0}^0 \sim_{\mathbb{R}, U^0} 0$. Then for any birational map $\phi : X \dashrightarrow Y$ over U , \mathbf{D}^0 descends to $Y^0 := Y \times_U U^0$ and $\mathbf{D}_{Y^0}^0 \sim_{\mathbb{R}, U^0} 0$.*

Proof. Let $p : W \rightarrow X$ and $q : W \rightarrow Y$ be a common resolution such that $q = \phi \circ p$. Then \mathbf{D}^0 descends to $W^0 := W \times_U U^0$ and $\mathbf{D}_{W^0}^0 \sim_{\mathbb{R}, U^0} 0$. Therefore, $\mathbf{D}_{Y^0}^0 = (q|_{W^0})_* \mathbf{D}_{W^0}^0 \sim_{\mathbb{R}, U^0} 0$. By the negativity lemma twice, \mathbf{D}^0 descends to Y^0 . \square

2.6. Generalized pairs.

Definition 2.23 (Generalized pairs). A *generalized sub-pair* (g -sub-pair for short) $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ consists of a normal quasi-projective variety X associated with a projective morphism $X \rightarrow U$, an \mathbb{R} -divisor B on X , and a nef/ U \mathbf{b} -divisor \mathbf{M} over X , such that $K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X$ is \mathbb{R} -Cartier. If \mathbf{M} is NQC/U , then we say that $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ is an NQC g -sub-pair. If B is a \mathbb{Q} -divisor and \mathbf{M} is a \mathbb{Q} - \mathbf{b} -divisor, then we say that $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ is a \mathbb{Q} - g -sub-pair.

If $\mathbf{M} = \mathbf{0}$, a g -sub-pair $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ is called a *sub-pair* and is denoted by (X, B) or $(X, B)/U$.

If $U = \{pt\}$, we usually drop U and say that (X, B, \mathbf{M}) is a *projective*.

A g -sub-pair (resp. NQC g -sub-pair, \mathbb{Q} - g -sub-pair) $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ is called a g -pair (resp. NQC g -pair, \mathbb{Q} - g -pair) if $B \geq 0$. A sub-pair (X, B) is called a *pair* if $B \geq 0$.

Notation 2.24. In the previous definition, if U is not important, we may also drop U . This usually happens when we emphasize the structures of (X, B, \mathbf{M}) that are independent of the choice of U , such as the singularities of (X, B, \mathbf{M}) . See Definition 2.25 below.

Definition 2.25 (Singularities of generalized pairs). Let $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ be a g-(sub-)pair. For any prime divisor E and \mathbb{R} -divisor D on X , we define $\text{mult}_E D$ to be the *multiplicity* of E along D . Let $h : W \rightarrow X$ be any log resolution of $(X, \text{Supp } B)$ such that \mathbf{M} descends to W , and let

$$K_W + B_W + \mathbf{M}_W := h^*(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X).$$

The *log discrepancy* of a prime divisor D on W with respect to (X, B, \mathbf{M}) is $1 - \text{mult}_D B_W$ and it is denoted by $a(D, X, B, \mathbf{M})$.

We say that (X, B, \mathbf{M}) is *(sub-)glc* (resp. *(sub-)gklt*) if $a(D, X, B, \mathbf{M}) \geq 0$ (resp. > 0) for every log resolution $h : W \rightarrow X$ as above and every prime divisor D on W .

We say that (X, B, \mathbf{M}) is *gdlt* if (X, B, \mathbf{M}) is glc, and there exists a closed subset $V \subset X$, such that

- (1) $X \setminus V$ is smooth and $B_{X \setminus V}$ is simple normal crossing, and
- (2) for any prime divisor E over X such that $a(E, X, B, \mathbf{M}) = 0$, $\text{center}_X E \not\subset V$ and $\text{center}_X E \setminus V$ is an lc center of $(X \setminus V, B|_{X \setminus V})$.

If $\mathbf{M} = \mathbf{0}$ and (X, B, \mathbf{M}) is (sub-)glc (resp. (sub-)gklt, gdlt), we say that (X, B) is (sub-)lc (resp. (sub-)klt, dlt).

Suppose that (X, B, \mathbf{M}) is sub-glc. A *glc place* of (X, B, \mathbf{M}) is a prime divisor E over X such that $a(E, X, B, \mathbf{M}) = 0$. A *glc center* of (X, B, \mathbf{M}) is the center of a glc place of (X, B, \mathbf{M}) on X . The *non-gklt locus* $\text{Ngklt}(X, B, \mathbf{M})$ of (X, B, \mathbf{M}) is the union of all glc centers of (X, B, \mathbf{M}) . If $\mathbf{M} = \mathbf{0}$, a glc place (resp. a glc center, the non-gklt locus) of (X, B, \mathbf{M}) will be called an lc place (resp. an lc center, the non-klt locus) of (X, B) , and we will denote $\text{Ngklt}(X, B, \mathbf{M})$ by $\text{Nklt}(X, B)$.

We note that the definitions above are independent of the choice of U .

Remark 2.26. The generalized pairs defined in [BZ16] correspond to the NQC generalized pairs defined in Definition 2.23.

Remark 2.27. The definition of gdlt in Definition 2.25 is the same as the definition in [HL18, Definition 2.2], and has slight difference with the definitions in [Bir19, Fil18b, FS20b]. This definition is preserved by adjunction (see Proposition 6.2 below). We remark that when X is \mathbb{Q} -factorial, our definition for gdlt coincides with the definitions in [Bir19, Fil18b, FS20b].

Because of these differences in definitions, for the reader's convenience, we will usually cite [HL18] for generalized pair related results although other references may have similar results.

Remark 2.28. For the notation related to generalized pairs as above, we generally adopt the same notation as in [FS20b] and [Has20]. These notation are more convenient and less confusing in practice. We also remark that for log discrepancies of generalized pairs, we use the notation $a(D, X, B, \mathbf{M})$ instead of $a(D, X, B + \mathbf{M}_X)$. This is because $(X, B + \mathbf{M}_X)$ is a sub-pair, and the log discrepancy of the sub-pair $(X, B + \mathbf{M}_X)$ may not be equal to the log discrepancy of the generalized pair (X, B, \mathbf{M}) . Our notation are also similar to the notation as in [HL19, HL20d] where they use $(X/U, B + \mathbf{M})$ for generalized pairs and $a_D(X/U, B + \mathbf{M})$ for log discrepancies. We do not use their notation as well because it is important to notice that log discrepancies of a generalized pair are independent of the base U .

2.7. Some results on MMPs for generalized pairs.

2.7.1. Set-up.

Definition 2.29. Let $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ be a glc g-pair. We say that a $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)$ -MMP/ U : $X \dashrightarrow X'$ ends with a *minimal model* if $K_{X'} + B' + \mathbf{M}_{X'}$ is nef/ U , where B' is the strict transform of B on X' . We say that We say that a $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)$ -MMP/ U : $X \dashrightarrow X'$ ends with a *Mori fiber space* if there exists a $(K_{X'} + B' + \mathbf{M}_{X'})$ -Mori fiber space structure $X' \rightarrow Z$ over U .

The following result tells us that we can always run the MMP for generalized lc pairs $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ when X is \mathbb{Q} -factorial klt.

Theorem 2.30 (cf. [HL18, Lemma 3.5]). *Let $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ be a \mathbb{Q} -factorial glc g-pair such that X is klt. Then we can always run a $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)$ -MMP/ U . More precisely, there exists a sequence of flips and divisorial contractions over U , which ends either with a Mori fiber space, or a minimal model, or an infinite sequence of flips over U .*

We also make the following remark on MMPs with scaling of relatively ample \mathbb{R} -divisors:

Remark 2.31. Let $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ be a \mathbb{Q} -factorial glc g-pair such that X is klt. When we say “we run a $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)$ -MMP/ U with scaling of an ample/ U \mathbb{R} -divisor”, we always assume that the choice of the ample/ U \mathbb{R} -divisor A on X satisfies that $A \geq 0$, $(X, B + A, \mathbf{M})$ is glc, and $K_X + B + A + \mathbf{M}_X$ is nef/ U . We remark that for any ample/ U \mathbb{R} -divisor A on X , one can always choose $A' \sim_{\mathbb{R}, U} A$ such that $(X, B + A', \mathbf{M})$ is glc.

2.7.2. MMP for very exceptional divisors.

Lemma 2.32 (MMP for very exceptional divisors, cf. [HL18, Proposition 3.8]). *Let $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ be a \mathbb{Q} -factorial glc g-pair such that X is klt and $K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X \equiv_U D_1 - D_2$ (resp. $\sim_{\mathbb{R}, U} D_1 - D_2$) where $D_1 \geq 0$, $D_2 \geq 0$ have no common components. Suppose that D_1 is very exceptional over U . Then any $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)$ -MMP/ U with scaling of an ample/ U \mathbb{R} -divisor either terminates with a Mori fiber space or contracts D_1 after finitely many steps. Moreover, if $D_2 = 0$, then this MMP terminates with a model Y such that $K_Y + B_Y + \mathbf{M}_Y \equiv_U 0$ (resp. $\sim_{\mathbb{R}, U} 0$), where B_Y is the strict transform of B on Y .*

Proof. The numerical equivalence part of the lemma is exactly [HL18, Proposition 3.8]. Thus we assume that $K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X \sim_{\mathbb{R}, U} D_1 - D_2$, $D_2 = 0$, and we only need to show that the MMP terminates with a model Y such that $K_Y + B_Y + \mathbf{M}_Y \sim_{\mathbb{R}, U} 0$, where B_Y is the strict transform of B on Y .

By the numerical equivalence part of the lemma, the MMP contracts D_1 after finitely many steps. We may let $\phi : X \dashrightarrow Y$ be the birational map corresponding to this partial MMP. Since $K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X \sim_{\mathbb{R}, U} D_1$ and ϕ contracts D_1 , we have $K_Y + B_Y + \mathbf{M}_Y \sim_{\mathbb{R}, U} 0$, where B_Y is the strict transform of B on Y , and the lemma is proved. \square

2.7.3. *MMP with scaling and log minimal models.* We refer the reader to [HL18, Lemma 3.19, Definition 3.20] for the definition MMP with scaling for generalized pairs.

We need the following definition for log minimal models. A detailed discussion of log minimal models and other models for g-pairs will be given in Section 3.

Definition 2.33 (Log minimal models, cf. Definition 3.2(3) and [HL18, Definition 2.9]). Let $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ be a glc g-pair, $\phi : X \dashrightarrow X'$ a birational map over U , and $E := \text{Exc}(\phi^{-1})$ the reduced ϕ^{-1} -exceptional divisor. A g-pair $(X', B', \mathbf{M})/U$ is called a *log minimal model* of $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ if

- (1) $B' = \phi_* B + E$,
- (2) $K_{X'} + B' + \mathbf{M}_{X'}$ is nef/ U ,
- (3) (X', B', \mathbf{M}) is \mathbb{Q} -factorial gdlt, and
- (4) for any prime divisor D on X which is exceptional over X' , $a(D, X, B, \mathbf{M}) < a(D, X', B', \mathbf{M})$.

We need the following theorem from [BZ16]:

Theorem 2.34 (cf. [BZ16, Theorem 4.4(2)]). *Let $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ be a \mathbb{Q} -factorial NQC gklt g-pair and $A \geq 0$ an ample/ U \mathbb{R} -divisor on X , such that*

- (1) $K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X$ is pseudo-effective/ U ,
- (2) $K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X + (1 + \alpha)B + (1 + \beta)\mathbf{M}_X$ is big/ U for some $\alpha, \beta \geq 0$,
- (3) $(X, B + A, \mathbf{M})$ is glc and $K_X + B + A + \mathbf{M}_X$ is nef/ U .

Then we can run a $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)$ -MMP/ U with scaling of A , which terminates with a log minimal model $(X', B', \mathbf{M})/U$ such that $K_{X'} + B' + \mathbf{M}_{X'}$ is semi-ample/ U .

Proof. We may pick a real number $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$ such that $(1 + \epsilon)(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X) \sim_{\mathbb{R}, U} K_X + \Delta$ for some klt pair (X, Δ) such that Δ is big/ U . Then any $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)$ -MMP/ U with scaling of A is also a $(K_X + \Delta)$ -MMP/ U with scaling of $A' \sim_{\mathbb{R}} (1 + \epsilon)A$ for some ample/ U \mathbb{R} -divisor $A' \geq 0$ such that $(X, \Delta + A')$ is klt. By [BCHM10, Corollary 1.4.2], this MMP terminates with a log minimal model X' such that $K_{X'} + \Delta'$ is semi-ample/ U , where Δ' is the strict transform of Δ on X' . Thus $(X', B', \mathbf{M})/U$ is a log minimal model of $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ such that $K_{X'} + B' + \mathbf{M}_{X'}$ is semi-ample/ U , where B' is the strict transform of B on X' . \square

Theorem 2.35 ([HL18, Remark 3.21, Theorem 4.1]). *Let $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ be a \mathbb{Q} -factorial NQC glc g -pair such that X is klt, $D \geq 0$ an \mathbb{R} -divisor on X , and \mathbf{N} an NQC/ U \mathbf{b} -divisor over X , such that $(X, B + D, \mathbf{M} + \mathbf{N})$ is glc and $K_X + B + D + \mathbf{M}_X + \mathbf{N}_X$ is nef/ U . Assume that there exists a $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)$ -MMP/ U with scaling of $D + \mathbf{N}_X$:*

$$(X, B, \mathbf{M}) := (X_1, B_1, \mathbf{M}) \dashrightarrow (X_2, B_2, \mathbf{M}) \dashrightarrow \cdots \dashrightarrow (X_i, B_i, \mathbf{M}) \dashrightarrow \cdots,$$

and let λ_i be the i -th scaling number of this MMP for each i , i.e.

$$\lambda_i := \inf\{t \mid t \geq 0, K_{X_i} + B_i + tD_i + \mathbf{M}_{X_i} + t\mathbf{N}_{X_i} \text{ is nef}/U\},$$

where D_i is the strict transform of D on X_i . Then $\lambda_i \geq \lambda_{i+1}$ for each i , and one of the following holds:

- (1) This MMP terminates after finitely many steps.
- (2) This MMP does not terminate and $\lambda_i = \lambda_{i+1}$ for any $i \gg 0$.
- (3) This MMP does not terminate, $\lambda := \lim_{i \rightarrow +\infty} \lambda_i \neq \lambda_j$ for any j , and $(X, B + \lambda D, \mathbf{M} + \lambda \mathbf{N})/U$ does not have a log minimal model.

Theorem 2.36. *Let $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ be a \mathbb{Q} -factorial NQC glc g -pair such that X is klt, and $A \geq 0$ an ample/ U \mathbb{R} -divisor on X such that $(X, B + A, \mathbf{M})$ is glc and $K_X + B + A + \mathbf{M}_X$ is nef/ U . Let*

$$(X, B, \mathbf{M}) := (X_1, B_1, \mathbf{M}) \dashrightarrow (X_2, B_2, \mathbf{M}) \dashrightarrow \cdots \dashrightarrow (X_i, B_i, \mathbf{M}) \dashrightarrow \cdots$$

be a $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)$ -MMP/ U with scaling of A , and let λ_i be the i -th scaling number of this MMP for each i , i.e.

$$\lambda_i := \inf\{t \mid t \geq 0, K_{X_i} + B_i + tA_i + \mathbf{M}_{X_i} \text{ is nef}/U\},$$

where A_i is the strict transform of A on X_i for each i . Then $\lambda_i \geq \lambda_{i+1}$ for each i , and one of the following holds:

- (1) This MMP terminates after finitely many steps.
- (2) $\lim_{i \rightarrow +\infty} \lambda_i = 0$, and (X, B, \mathbf{M}) does not have a log minimal model.

In particular, if $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ is gdlt and has a log minimal model, then this MMP terminates with log minimal model of $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$.

Proof. By Theorem 2.35, $\lambda_i \geq \lambda_{i+1}$ for each i , and we may assume that this MMP does not terminate and $\lambda_i = \lambda_{i+1} > 0$ for any $i \gg 0$. Let $\lambda := \lim_{i \rightarrow +\infty} \lambda_i$, then $\lambda > 0$. Since X is \mathbb{Q} -factorial klt, by [HL18, Lemma 3.5], we may pick

$$0 \leq \Delta \sim_{\mathbb{R}, U} B + \mathbf{M}_X + \frac{\lambda}{2}A$$

such that (X, Δ) is klt and Δ is big/ U . Now this MMP is also a $(K_X + \Delta)$ -MMP with scaling of $0 \leq A' \sim_{\mathbb{R}, U} (1 - \frac{\lambda}{2})A$ for some A' such that $(X, \Delta + A')$ is klt. This MMP terminates by [BCHM10, Corollary 1.4.2], a contradiction.

The in particular part follows from the fact that (X_i, B_i, \mathbf{M}) is \mathbb{Q} -factorial gdlt for each i if (X, B, \mathbf{M}) is gdlt, and $a(D, X, B, \mathbf{M}) < a(D, X_i, B_i, \mathbf{M})$ for any i and any prime divisor D on X that is exceptional over X_i . \square

Lemma 2.37. *Let $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ be a \mathbb{Q} -factorial NQC glc g -pair such that X is klt, and $A \geq 0$ an ample/ U \mathbb{R} -divisor on X such that $(X, B + A, \mathbf{M})$ is glc and $K_X + B + A + \mathbf{M}_X$ is nef/ U . Let*

$$(X, B, \mathbf{M}) := (X_1, B_1, \mathbf{M}) \dashrightarrow (X_2, B_2, \mathbf{M}) \dashrightarrow \cdots \dashrightarrow (X_i, B_i, \mathbf{M}) \dashrightarrow \cdots$$

be a $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)$ -MMP/ U with scaling of A , and A_i the strict transform of A on X_i for each i . Then there exists a positive integer n and a positive real number ϵ_0 , such that $K_{X_j} + B_j + \epsilon A_j + \mathbf{M}_{X_j}$ is movable/ U for any $\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_0)$ and $j \geq n$. In particular, $K_{X_j} + B_j + \mathbf{M}_{X_j}$ is a limit of movable/ U \mathbb{R} -divisors.

Proof. Let λ_i be the i -th scaling number of this MMP for each i , i.e.

$$\lambda_i := \inf\{t \mid t \geq 0, K_{X_i} + B_i + tA_i + \mathbf{M}_{X_i} \text{ is nef}/U\}.$$

We may assume that this MMP does not terminate. By Theorem 2.36, we have $\lim_{i \rightarrow +\infty} \lambda_i = 0$.

Let n be the minimal positive integer such that $X_i \dashrightarrow X_{i+1}$ is a flip for any $i \geq n$. For any i , $X \dashrightarrow X_i$ is a $(K_X + B + tA + \mathbf{M}_X)$ -MMP/ U with scaling of $(1-t)A$ for any $t \in [\lambda_i, \lambda_{i-1})$. Since X is \mathbb{Q} -factorial klt, there exists $\Delta_t \sim_{\mathbb{R}, U} B + tA + \mathbf{M}_X$ such that (X, Δ_t) is klt and Δ_t is big for any $t \in [0, 1]$. Thus $K_{X_i} + B_i + tA_i + \mathbf{M}_{X_i}$ is semi-ample/ U for any i and any $t \in [\lambda_i, \lambda_{i-1})$. Let $\epsilon_0 := \lambda_n$, then for any $\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_0)$, there exists $i \geq n$ such that $\epsilon \in [\lambda_i, \lambda_{i-1})$, and $K_{X_i} + B_i + \epsilon A_i + \mathbf{M}_{X_i}$ is semi-ample/ U . Since $X_i \dashrightarrow X_j$ is small for any $i, j \geq n$, $K_{X_j} + B_j + \epsilon A_j + \mathbf{M}_{X_j}$ is movable/ U for any $j \geq n$ and $\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_0)$, and $K_{X_j} + B_j + \mathbf{M}_{X_j}$ is a limit of movable/ U \mathbb{R} -divisors. \square

Lemma 2.38. *Let $X \rightarrow U$ be a projective morphism such that X is quasi-projective. Assume that D is an \mathbb{R} -Cartier \mathbb{R} -divisor on X such that D is a limit of movable/ U \mathbb{R} -divisors on X , and let $\phi : X \dashrightarrow X'$ be a partial D -MMP/ U . Then ϕ only contains flips.*

Proof. Since D is a limit of movable/ U \mathbb{R} -divisors, D is pseudo-effective/ U , so ϕ only contains flips and divisorial contractions.

If ϕ contains a divisorial contraction, let $\psi : X_1 \rightarrow X'_1$ be the first divisorial contraction in ϕ . Let D_1 be the strict transform of D on X_1 , then since $X \dashrightarrow X_1$ only contains flips, D_1 is a limit of movable/ U \mathbb{R} -divisors on X_1 . Let $D'_1 := \psi_* D_1$, then

$$D_1 = \psi^* D'_1 + F$$

for some $F \geq 0$ that is exceptional over X'_1 .

Since D_1 is a limit of movable/ U divisors, D_1 is also a limit of movable/ X'_1 divisors. Thus for any very general ψ -exceptional curve C , $D_1 \cdot C \geq 0$. By the general negativity lemma [Bir12a, Lemma 3.3], $-F \geq 0$. Thus $F = 0$, and ψ cannot be a D_1 -negative extremal contraction, a contradiction. Thus ϕ only contains flips. \square

The following two lemmas are similar.

Lemma 2.39. *Let $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ be a \mathbb{Q} -factorial NQC gdlt g -pair. Let $U^0 \subset U$ be a non-empty open subset such that $(X^0 := X \times_U U^0, B^0 := B \times_U U^0, \mathbf{M}^0 := \mathbf{M} \times_U U^0)/U^0$ has a log minimal model. Then any $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)$ -MMP/ U with scaling of an ample/ U \mathbb{R} -divisor terminates over U^0 with a log minimal model of $(X^0, B^0, \mathbf{M}^0)/U^0$.*

Proof. We run a $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)$ -MMP/ U with scaling of an ample/ U \mathbb{R} -divisor $A \geq 0$, such that $(X, B + A, \mathbf{M})$ is glc and $K_X + B + A + \mathbf{M}_X$ is nef/ U . If this MMP terminates then we are done. Otherwise, we may assume that this MMP does not terminate. Let

$$(X, B, \mathbf{M}) := (X_1, B_1, \mathbf{M}) \dashrightarrow (X_2, B_2, \mathbf{M}) \dashrightarrow \cdots \dashrightarrow (X_i, B_i, \mathbf{M}) \dashrightarrow \cdots$$

be this MMP. Let A_i be the strict transform of A on X_i for each i and let λ_i the i -th scaling number of this MMP for each i , i.e.

$$\lambda_i := \inf\{t \mid t \geq 0, K_{X_i} + B_i + tA_i + \mathbf{M}_{X_i} \text{ is nef}/U\}.$$

By Theorem 2.35, $\lambda_i \geq \lambda_{i+1}$ for each i , and $\lim_{i \rightarrow +\infty} \lambda_i = 0$. We let $X_i^0 := X_i \times_U U^0$, $B_i^0 := B_i \times_U U^0$, and $A_i^0 := A_i \times_U U^0$. Let

$$\mathcal{N} := \{i \in \mathbb{N}^+ \mid X_i^0 \dashrightarrow X_{i+1}^0 \text{ is not the identity map over } U^0\}.$$

There are two cases:

Case 1. \mathcal{N} is a finite set. In this case, let $n := \max\{j \mid j \in \mathcal{N}\} + 1$. Then $X_i^0 \dashrightarrow X_{i+1}^0$ is the identity map over U^0 for any $i \geq n$. In this case, $K_{X_i^0} + B_i^0 + \lambda_i A_i^0 + \mathbf{M}_{X_i^0}^0$ is nef/ U^0 for any $i \geq n$, hence $K_{X_n^0} + B_n^0 + \lambda_n A_n^0 + \mathbf{M}_{X_n^0}^0$ is nef/ U^0 for any $i \geq n$. Since $\lambda = 0$, $K_{X_n^0} + B_n^0 + \mathbf{M}_{X_n^0}^0$ is nef/ U^0 . Thus $(X_n^0, B_n^0, \mathbf{M}^0)/U^0$ is a log minimal model of $(X^0, B^0, \mathbf{M}^0)/U^0$.

Case 2. \mathcal{N} is not a finite set. We may write $\mathcal{N} = \{n_i\}_{i=1}^{+\infty}$ such that $n_i < n_{i+1}$ for each i , then we get a sequence of induced birational maps

$$(X^0, B^0, \mathbf{M}^0) = (X_{n_1}^0, B_{n_1}^0, \mathbf{M}^0) \dashrightarrow (X_{n_2}^0, B_{n_2}^0, \mathbf{M}^0) \dashrightarrow \cdots \dashrightarrow (X_{n_i}^0, B_{n_i}^0, \mathbf{M}^0) \dashrightarrow \cdots,$$

which is a sequence of the $(K_{X^0} + B^0 + \mathbf{M}_{X^0}^0)$ -MMP/ U^0 with scaling of $A^0 := A \times_U U^0$. Since $(X^0, B^0, \mathbf{M}^0)/U^0$ has a log minimal model, by Theorem 2.36, this MMP terminates, a contradiction. \square

Lemma 2.40. *Let $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ be a \mathbb{Q} -factorial NQC gdlit g -pair such that the induced morphism $\pi : X \rightarrow U$ is a contraction. Let F be a very general fiber of π , and (F, B_F, \mathbf{M}^F) the projective generalized pair given by the adjunction*

$$K_F + B_F + \mathbf{M}_F^F := (K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)|_F.$$

Assume that (F, B_F, \mathbf{M}^F) has a log minimal model. Then any $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)$ -MMP/ U with scaling of an ample/ U \mathbb{R} -divisor terminates along F with a log minimal model of (F, B_F, \mathbf{M}^F) .

Proof. We may assume that $F = \pi^{-1}(z)$ for some very general point $z \in U$. We run a $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)$ -MMP/ U with scaling of an ample/ U \mathbb{R} -divisor $A \geq 0$, such that $(X, B + A, \mathbf{M})$ is glc and $K_X + B + A + \mathbf{M}_X$ is nef/ U . If this MMP terminates then we are done. Otherwise, we may assume that this MMP does not terminate. Let

$$(X, B, \mathbf{M}) := (X_1, B_1, \mathbf{M}) \dashrightarrow (X_2, B_2, \mathbf{M}) \dashrightarrow \cdots \dashrightarrow (X_i, B_i, \mathbf{M}) \dashrightarrow \cdots$$

be this MMP. Let A_i be the strict transform of A on X_i for each i and let λ_i the i -th scaling number of this MMP for each i , i.e.

$$\lambda_i := \inf\{t \mid t \geq 0, K_{X_i} + B_i + tA_i + \mathbf{M}_{X_i} \text{ is nef}/U\}.$$

By Theorem 2.35, $\lambda_i \geq \lambda_{i+1}$ for each i , and $\lambda := \lim_{i \rightarrow +\infty} \lambda_i = 0$.

Let $\pi_i : X_i \rightarrow U$ be the induced morphism for each i . Since z is a very general point, we may let $F_i := \pi_i^{-1}(z)$, $(F_i, B_{F_i}, \mathbf{M}^F)$ the projective generalized pair given by the adjunction

$$K_{F_i} + B_{F_i} + \mathbf{M}_{F_i}^F := (K_{X_i} + B_i + \mathbf{M}_{X_i})|_{F_i},$$

and $A_{F_i} := A_i|_{F_i}$. Note that the nef part \mathbf{M}^F does not depend on i by the construction of generalized adjunction [BZ16, Definition 4.7]. Let

$$\mathcal{N} := \{i \in \mathbb{N}^+ \mid F_i \dashrightarrow F_{i+1} \text{ is not the identity map}\}.$$

There are two cases:

Case 1. \mathcal{N} is a finite set. In this case, let $n := \max\{j \mid j \in \mathcal{N}\} + 1$. Then $F_i \dashrightarrow F_{i+1}$ is the identity map for any $i \geq n$. In this case, $K_{F_i} + B_{F_i} + \lambda_i A_{F_i} + \mathbf{M}_{F_i}^F$ is nef for any $i \geq n$, hence $K_{F_n} + B_{F_n} + \lambda_n A_{F_n} + \mathbf{M}_{F_n}^F$ is nef for any $i \geq n$. Since $\lambda = 0$, $K_{F_n} + B_{F_n} + \mathbf{M}_{F_n}^F$ is nef. Thus $(F_n, B_{F_n}, \mathbf{M}^F)$ is a log minimal model of (F, B_F, \mathbf{M}^F) .

Case 2. \mathcal{N} is not a finite set. We may write $\mathcal{N} = \{n_i\}_{i=1}^{+\infty}$ such that $n_i < n_{i+1}$ for each i , then we get a sequence of induced birational maps

$$(F, B_F, \mathbf{M}^F) = (F_{n_1}, B_{F_{n_1}}, \mathbf{M}^F) \dashrightarrow (F_{n_2}, B_{F_{n_2}}, \mathbf{M}^F) \dashrightarrow \cdots \dashrightarrow (F_{n_i}, B_{F_{n_i}}, \mathbf{M}^F) \dashrightarrow \cdots,$$

which is a sequence of the $(K_F + B_F + \mathbf{M}_F^F)$ -MMP with scaling of $A_F := A|_F$. Since (F, B_F, \mathbf{M}^F) has a log minimal model, by Theorem 2.36, this MMP terminates, a contradiction. \square

2.7.4. Perturbation of MMPs.

Lemma 2.41. *Let $X \rightarrow U$ be a projective morphism such that X is normal quasi-projective. Let D, A be two \mathbb{R} -Cartier \mathbb{R} -divisors on X and let $\phi : X \dashrightarrow X'$ be a partial D -MMP/ U . Then there exists a positive real number t_0 , such that for any $t \in (0, t_0]$, ϕ is also a partial $(D + tA)$ -MMP/ U . Note that A is not necessarily effective.*

Proof. We let

$$X := X_1 \dashrightarrow X_2 \dashrightarrow \cdots \dashrightarrow X_n = X'$$

be this partial MMP, and D_i, A_i the strict transforms of D and A on X_i respectively. Let $X_i \rightarrow Z_i$ be the D_i -negative extremal contraction of a D_i -negative extremal ray R_i in this MMP for each i , then $D_i \cdot R_i < 0$ for each i . Thus there exists a positive real number t_0 , such that $(D_i + t_0 A_i) \cdot R_i < 0$ for each i . In particular, $(D_i + t A_i) \cdot R_i < 0$ for any i and any $t \in (0, t_0]$. Thus ϕ is a partial $(D + tA)$ -MMP/ U for any $t \in (0, t_0]$. \square

Lemma 2.42 ([HL18, Lemma 3.17]). *Let $(X, B + A, \mathbf{M})/U$ be a \mathbb{Q} -factorial NQC glc g -pair such that X is klt, (X, B, \mathbf{M}) is glc, and $K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X$ is nef/ U . Then there exists a positive real number t_0 , such that for any $t \in (0, t_0]$, any partial $(K_X + B + tA + \mathbf{M}_X)$ -MMP/ U is $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)$ -trivial. Note that A is not necessarily effective.*

Lemma 2.43. *Let $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ be a \mathbb{Q} -factorial NQC glc g -pair such that X is klt. Let $H \geq 0$ be an \mathbb{R} -divisor on X such that $(X, B + H, \mathbf{M})$ is glc and $K_X + B + H + \mathbf{M}_X$ is nef/ U . Assume that $(X, B + \mu H, \mathbf{M})/U$ has a log minimal model for any $\mu \in (0, 1]$. Then we can construct a $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)$ -MMP/ U with scaling of H :*

$$(X, B, \mathbf{M}) := (X_1, B_1, \mathbf{M}) \dashrightarrow (X_2, B_2, \mathbf{M}) \dashrightarrow \cdots \dashrightarrow (X_i, B_i, \mathbf{M}) \dashrightarrow \cdots$$

Let H_i be the strict transform of H on X_i for each i , and let

$$\lambda_i := \inf\{t \mid t \geq 0, K_{X_i} + B_i + tH_i + \mathbf{M}_{X_i} \text{ is nef}/U\}$$

be the i -th scaling number of this MMP for each i . Then this MMP

- (1) either terminates after finitely many steps, or
- (2) does not terminate and $\lim_{i \rightarrow +\infty} \lambda_i = 0$.

Proof. If $\lambda_1 = 0$ then there is nothing left to prove. So we may assume that $\lambda_1 > 0$. By Lemma 2.42 (applied with $A = -H$), we may pick $\lambda'_1 \in (0, \lambda_1)$ such that any sequence of the $(K_X + B + \lambda'_1 H + \mathbf{M}_X)$ -MMP/ U is $(K_X + B + \lambda_1 H + \mathbf{M}_X)$ -trivial.

By Theorem 2.36, we may run a $(K_X + B + \lambda'_1 H + \mathbf{M}_X)$ -MMP/ U with scaling of a general ample/ U divisor, which terminates with a log minimal model. We let

$$(X, B, \mathbf{M}) := (X_1, B_1, \mathbf{M}) \dashrightarrow (X_2, B_2, \mathbf{M}) \dashrightarrow \cdots \dashrightarrow (X_{k_1}, B_{k_1}, \mathbf{M})$$

be this sequence of the MMP/ U . Then this sequence consists of finitely many steps of a $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)$ -MMP/ U with scaling of H , with scaling numbers $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = \cdots = \lambda_{k_1-1}$. Since

$$K_{X_{k_1}} + B_{k_1} + \lambda'_1 H_{k_1} + \mathbf{M}_{X_{k_1}}$$

is nef/ U , we have $\lambda_{k_1} \leq \lambda'_1 < \lambda_1$.

We may replace $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ with $(X_{k_1}, B_{k_1}, \mathbf{M})/U$ and continue this process. If this MMP does not terminate, then we may let $\lambda := \lim_{i \rightarrow +\infty} \lambda_i$. By our construction, $\lambda \neq \lambda_i$ for any i , and the lemma follows from Theorem 2.35. \square

Lemma 2.44. *Let $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ be a \mathbb{Q} -factorial NQC glc g -pair such that X is klt. Let $U^0 \subset U$ be an non-empty open subset such that $K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X$ is semi-ample/ U^0 . Let B' be an \mathbb{R} -divisor*

on X such that $(X, B + B', \mathbf{M})$ is glc. Then there exists a positive real number t_0 , such that for any $t \in (0, t_0)$ and any partial $(K_X + B + tB' + \mathbf{M}_X)$ -MMP/ U :

$$(X = X_1, B + tB' = B_1 + tB'_1, \mathbf{M}) \dashrightarrow \cdots \dashrightarrow (X_i, B_i + tB'_i, \mathbf{M}) \dashrightarrow (X_n, B_n + tB'_n, \mathbf{M}),$$

$K_{X_n} + B_n + \mathbf{M}_{X_n}$ is semi-ample/ U^0 , where B_n is the strict transform of B on X_n .

Proof. By Lemma 2.42, we may pick such t such that any MMP/ U as above is $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)$ -trivial/ U^0 . The Lemma follows from Lemma 2.6. \square

2.8. Rational polytopes for generalized pairs. In some situations, we need to perturb the coefficients of NQC g-pairs in order to use the results for \mathbb{Q} -g-pairs. The key ideas are simple: First, we have a rational polytope (Shokurov-type polytope) for NQC glc pairs with nef generalized log canonical divisors ([HL18, 3.3]). Second, for usual pairs, Han-Liu-Shokurov had established a complete state-of-the-art theory on rational polytopes [HLS19, Section 5] with many important applications in birational geometry. Therefore, we will adopt the ideas in [HLS19] to prove Theorem 2.46, an analogous theorem of [HL18, 3.3] which also addresses some additional properties of the generalized pair. We remark that although there are many works and results in this direction ([HL18, HL19, HL20d, Che20]), directly applying these results is not sufficient for our purposes.

First we prove an easy lemma.

Lemma 2.45. *Let n, c be two non-negative integers, and let $\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{c+1} \in \mathbb{Q}^n$ be $c+1$ rational points. Let $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is a point which is contained in the interior of the convex hull of $\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{c+1}$. Then there exist real numbers $a_1, \dots, a_{c+1} \in (0, 1]$, such that $\sum_{i=1}^{c+1} a_i = 1$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{c+1} a_i \mathbf{v}_i = \mathbf{v}$.*

Proof. Let $\mathbf{v}'_i := \mathbf{v}_i - \mathbf{v}$ for each i . Then $\mathbf{0}$ is contained in the interior of the convex hull spanned by $\mathbf{v}'_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}'_{c+1}$. Thus there exist positive real numbers a'_1, \dots, a'_{c+1} such that $\sum_{i=1}^{c+1} a'_i \mathbf{v}'_i = \mathbf{0}$. We may let $a_i := \frac{a'_i}{\sum_{j=1}^{c+1} a'_j}$ for each i . \square

We refer some notation in the next theorem to [HLS19], which originated in [Nak16].

Theorem 2.46. *Let c, m, n, l be four non-negative integers, r_1, \dots, r_c real numbers such that $1, r_1, \dots, r_c$ are linearly independent over \mathbb{Q} , $\mathbf{r} := (r_1, \dots, r_c)$, and $s_1, \dots, s_{m+n} : \mathbb{R}^{c+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are \mathbb{Q} -linear functions, such that $s_j(1, \mathbf{r}) \geq 0$ for any j .*

Let $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ be an NQC glc g-pair, $B = \sum_{j=1}^m s_j(1, \mathbf{r})B_j$, and $\mathbf{M} = \sum_{j=1}^n s_{j+m}(1, \mathbf{r})\mathbf{M}_j$, where each $B_j \geq 0$ is a \mathbb{Q} -divisor and each \mathbf{M}_j is a nef/ U \mathbb{Q} -b-divisor. Let $B(\mathbf{x}) := \sum_{j=1}^m s_j(1, \mathbf{x})B_j$ and $\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{x}) := \sum_{j=1}^n s_{j+m}(1, \mathbf{x})\mathbf{M}_j$ for any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^c$. Let $U^0 \subset U$ be a non-empty open subset, $X^0 := X \times_U U^0$, and let S_1, \dots, S_l be the normalization of the irreducible components of $[B]$.

Then there exists an open set $V \ni \mathbf{r}$ of \mathbb{R}^c (which may depend on $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$, etc.) satisfying the following. For any $\mathbf{v} \in V$,

- (1) $s_j(1, \mathbf{v}) \geq 0$ for each j ,
- (2) $(X, B(\mathbf{v}), \mathbf{M}(\mathbf{v}))/U$ is an NQC glc g-pair,
- (3) $\text{Ngklt}(X, B(\mathbf{v}), \mathbf{M}(\mathbf{v})) = \text{Ngklt}(X, B, \mathbf{M})$,
- (4) if $X \rightarrow Z$ is a projective surjective morphism over U such that $K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X \sim_{\mathbb{R}, Z} 0$, then $K_X + B(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{M}(\mathbf{x})_X \sim_{\mathbb{R}, Z} 0$ for any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^c$,
- (5) if $\mathbf{M}_X|_{X^0} \sim_{\mathbb{R}, U^0} 0$, then $\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{x})_X|_{X^0} \sim_{\mathbb{R}, U^0} 0$ for any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^c$,
- (6) if $\mathbf{M} \times_U U^0$ descends to X^0 , then $\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{x}) \times_U U^0$ descends to X^0 for any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^c$,
- (7) if $K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X$ is nef/ U , then $K_X + B(\mathbf{v}) + \mathbf{M}(\mathbf{v})_X$ is nef/ U ,
- (8) if $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)|_{X^0}$ is semi-ample/ U^0 , then $(K_X + B(\mathbf{v}) + \mathbf{M}(\mathbf{v})_X)|_{X^0}$ is semi-ample/ U^0 ,
- (9) for any k , if $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)|_{S_k}$ is semi-ample/ U , then $(K_X + B(\mathbf{v}) + \mathbf{M}(\mathbf{v})_X)|_{S_k}$ is semi-ample/ U .

In particular, there exist positive real numbers $a_1, \dots, a_{c+1} \in (0, 1]$ and \mathbb{Q} -g-pairs $(X, B^i, \mathbf{M}^i)/U$, such that

- $\sum_{i=1}^{c+1} a_i = 1$, $B = \sum_{i=1}^{c+1} a_i B^i$, and $\mathbf{M} = \sum_{i=1}^{c+1} a_i \mathbf{M}^i$,
- $(X, B^i, \mathbf{M}^i)/U$ is glc for each i ,
- $\text{Ngklt}(X, B^i, \mathbf{M}^i) = \text{Ngklt}(X, B, \mathbf{M})$ for each i ,
- if $X \rightarrow Z$ is a projective surjective morphism over U such that $K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X \sim_{\mathbb{R}, Z} 0$, then $K_X + B^i + \mathbf{M}_X^i \sim_{\mathbb{Q}, Z} 0$ for each i ,
- if $\mathbf{M}_X|_{X^0} \sim_{\mathbb{R}, U^0} 0$, then $\mathbf{M}_X^i|_{X^0} \sim_{\mathbb{Q}, U^0} 0$ for each i ,
- if $\mathbf{M} \times_U U^0$ descends to X^0 , then $\mathbf{M}^i \times_U U^0$ descends to X^0 for each i ,
- if $K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X$ is nef/ U , then $K_X + B^i + \mathbf{M}_X^i$ is nef/ U for each i ,
- if $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)|_{X^0}$ is semi-ample/ U^0 , then $(K_X + B^i + \mathbf{M}_X^i)|_{X^0}$ is semi-ample/ U^0 for each i ,
- for any k , if $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)|_{S_k}$ is semi-ample/ U , then $(K_X + B^i + \mathbf{M}_X^i)|_{S_k}$ is semi-ample/ U for each i .

Proof. We only need to find open subsets V satisfying each individual condition and then take their common intersections. (1) is obvious. (2) and (3) follow from [Che20, Theorem 1.4] and the linearity of log discrepancies. (4) and (5) follow from the proof of [HLS19, Lemma 5.3].

To prove (6), let $\mathbf{M}^0 := \mathbf{M} \times_U U^0$ and $\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{x})^0 := \mathbf{M}(\mathbf{x}) \times_U U^0$ for any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^c$. Let $g : \tilde{X} \rightarrow X$ be a resolution such that \mathbf{M} and any \mathbf{M}_j descend to \tilde{X} , and let $\tilde{X}^0 := \tilde{X} \times_U U^0$. Since \mathbf{M}^0 descends to X^0 , $\mathbf{M}_{X^0}^0$ is \mathbb{R} -Cartier. By [HLS19, Lemma 5.3], $\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{x})_{X^0}^0$ is \mathbb{R} -Cartier for any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^c$. By the \mathbb{Q} -linearity of log discrepancies, there exists a \mathbb{Q} -affine function $F : \mathbb{R}^c \rightarrow \text{Div}_{\mathbb{R}}(\tilde{X}^0)$, such that for any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^c$,

$$\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{x})_{\tilde{X}^0}^0 = (g|_{\tilde{X}^0})^* \mathbf{M}(\mathbf{x})_{X^0}^0 + F(\mathbf{x}),$$

where $F(\mathbf{x})$ is exceptional over X^0 . Since \mathbf{M}^0 descends to X^0 , $F(\mathbf{r}) = 0$. Thus $F(\mathbf{x}) = 0$ for any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^c$, hence $\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{x})^0$ descends to X^0 for any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^c$.

We prove (7). Let $f : W \rightarrow X$ be a gdlt modification of (X, B, \mathbf{M}) (see Definition-Lemma 3.3 below) such that

$$K_W + f_*^{-1} B + E + \mathbf{M}_W = f^*(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)$$

where $E := \text{Exc}(f)$. Let $B_{j,W}$ be the strict transform of B_j on W for each j , and $B_W(\mathbf{x}) := \sum_{j=1}^m s_j(1, \mathbf{x}) B_{j,W} + E$ for any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^c$. By \mathbb{Q} -linearity of log discrepancies, we have

$$K_W + B_W(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{M}(\mathbf{x})_W = f^*(K_X + B(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{M}(\mathbf{x})_X)$$

for any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^c$. By [HL18, Proposition 3.16], there exists an open subset $V \ni \mathbf{r}$ such that $K_W + B_W(\mathbf{v}) + \mathbf{M}(\mathbf{v})_W$ is nef/ U for any $\mathbf{v} \in V$, and this V satisfies (7).

We prove (8). If $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)|_{X^0}$ is semi-ample/ U^0 , then we let $\phi : X^0 \rightarrow Y^0$ be the contraction defined by $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)|_{X^0}$ over U^0 . We have

$$(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)|_{X^0} \sim_{\mathbb{R}, U^0} \phi^* A$$

for some ample/ U^0 \mathbb{R} -divisor A on Y^0 . By (5), for any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^c$, we have $(K_X + B(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{M}(\mathbf{x})_X)|_{X^0} \sim_{\mathbb{R}, Y^0} 0$, so $(K_X + B(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{M}(\mathbf{x})_X)|_{X^0} \sim_{\mathbb{R}, U^0} \phi^* A(\mathbf{x})$ for some \mathbb{R} -divisor $A(\mathbf{x})$ on Y^0 . Possibly replacing $A(\mathbf{x})$, we may assume that $\mathbb{R}^c \rightarrow \text{Div}_{\mathbb{R}}(Y^0)$ given by $\mathbf{x} \rightarrow A(\mathbf{x})$ is an affine function and $A(\mathbf{r}) = A$. Since ampleness is an open condition, there exists an open set $V \ni \mathbf{r}$ such that $A(\mathbf{v})$ is ample/ U^0 for any $\mathbf{v} \in V$.

We prove (9), and finish the proof of the main part of the theorem. For any k , let $(S_k, B_{S_k}, \mathbf{M}^{S_k})$ be the NQC glc g-pair given by the adjunction

$$K_{S_k} + B_{S_k} + \mathbf{M}_{S_k}^{S_k} := (K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)|_{S_k},$$

then we may write $B_{S_k} = \sum_{j=1}^{m_k} s_j^k(1, \mathbf{r}) B_{j, S_k}$ and $\mathbf{M}^{S_k} = \sum_{j=1}^{n_k} s_{j+m_k}(1, \mathbf{r}) \mathbf{M}_j^{S_k}$, where $B_{j, S_k} \geq 0$ are \mathbb{Q} -divisors, $\mathbf{M}_j^{S_k}$ are nef/ U \mathbb{Q} -b-divisors, and $s_j^k(1, \mathbf{r}) \geq 0$ for any j, k . Let $B_{S_k}(\mathbf{x}) :=$

$\sum_{j=1}^{m_k} s_j^k(1, \mathbf{x})B_{j,S_k}$ and $\mathbf{M}^{S_k}(\mathbf{x}) := \sum_{j=1}^{n_k} s_{j+m_k}(1, \mathbf{x})\mathbf{M}_j^{S_k}$ for any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^c$, then

$$K_{S_k} + B_{S_k}(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{M}_{S_k}^{S_k}(\mathbf{x}) := (K_X + B(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{M}_X(\mathbf{x}))|_{S_k}$$

for any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^c$. Thus (9) follows from (8).

To prove the in particular part of the theorem, we let $\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{c+1} \in V \cap \mathbb{Q}^c$ be $c+1$ points such that \mathbf{r} is contained in the interior of the convex hull of $\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{c+1}$. By Lemma 2.45, we may let $B^i := B(\mathbf{v}_i)$ and $\mathbf{M}^i := \mathbf{M}(\mathbf{v}_i)$ for each i , and let $a_1, \dots, a_{c+1} \in (0, 1]$ be any real numbers such that $\sum_{i=1}^{c+1} a_i = 1$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{c+1} a_i \mathbf{v}_i = \mathbf{r}$. \square

3. MODELS

In this sections, we will study different types of models of generalized pairs. For the case of models of usual pairs, we refer the reader to [Bir12a, Section 2], [Has19, Section 2].

3.1. Definitions.

Definition 3.1 (Log smooth model). Let $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ be a glc g-pair and $h : W \rightarrow X$ a log resolution of $(X, \text{Supp } B)$ such that \mathbf{M} descends to W . Let $B_W \geq 0$ and $E \geq 0$ be two \mathbb{R} -divisors on W such that

- (1) $K_W + B_W + \mathbf{M}_W = h^*(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X) + E$,
- (2) (W, B_W) is log smooth dlt,
- (3) E is h -exceptional, and
- (4) for any h -exceptional prime divisor D such that $a(D, X, B, \mathbf{M}) > 0$, D is a component of E .

Then (W, B_W, \mathbf{M}) is called a *log smooth model* of (X, B, \mathbf{M}) . If we additionally assume that

- (5) for any h -exceptional prime divisor D such that $a(D, X, B, \mathbf{M}) > 0$, D is a component of $\{B_W\}$,

then (W, B_W, \mathbf{M}) is called a *proper log smooth model* of (X, B, \mathbf{M}) .

Definition 3.2 (Models). Let $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ be a glc g-pair, $\phi : X \dashrightarrow X'$ a birational map over U , and $E := \text{Exc}(\phi^{-1})$ the reduced ϕ^{-1} -exceptional divisor. Let $B' := \phi_*B + E$.

- (1) $(X', B', \mathbf{M})/U$ is called a *log birational model* of $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$.
- (2) $(X', B', \mathbf{M})/U$ is called a *weak glc model* of $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ if
 - (a) $(X', B', \mathbf{M})/U$ is a log birational model of $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$,
 - (b) $K_{X'} + B' + \mathbf{M}_{X'}$ is nef/ U , and
 - (c) for any prime divisor D on X which is exceptional over X' , $a(D, X, B, \mathbf{M}) \leq a(D, X', B', \mathbf{M})$.
- (3) $(X', B', \mathbf{M})/U$ is called a *log minimal model* of $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ if
 - (a) $(X', B', \mathbf{M})/U$ is a weak glc model of $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$,
 - (b) (X', B', \mathbf{M}) is \mathbb{Q} -factorial gdlt, and
 - (c) for any prime divisor D on X which is exceptional over X' , $a(D, X, B, \mathbf{M}) < a(D, X', B', \mathbf{M})$.
- (4) $(X', B', \mathbf{M})/U$ is called a *good minimal model* of $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ if
 - (a) $(X', B', \mathbf{M})/U$ is a log minimal model of $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$, and
 - (b) $K_{X'} + B' + \mathbf{M}_{X'}$ is semi-ample/ U .

Definition-Lemma 3.3 (Gdlt modification, [HL18, Proposition 3.9]). Let $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ be a glc g-pair. Then there exists a birational morphism $f : Y \rightarrow X$ and a glc g-pair $(Y, B_Y, \mathbf{M})/U$, such that

- (1) (Y, B_Y, \mathbf{M}) is \mathbb{Q} -factorial gdlt,
- (2) $K_Y + B_Y + \mathbf{M}_Y = f^*(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)$, and
- (3) any f -exceptional divisor is a component of $[B_Y]$.

For any birational morphism f and (Y, B_Y, \mathbf{M}) which satisfies (1-3), f will be called a *gdlt modification* of (X, B, \mathbf{M}) , and (Y, B_Y, \mathbf{M}) will be called a *gdlt model* of (X, B, \mathbf{M}) .

Remark 3.4. As the definition of gdlt follows from [HL18] and is different from [Bir20a] and [FS20b], we do not define the gdlt modifications for g-pairs that are not glc here.

Remark 3.5. Log birational models, weak glc models, log minimal models, and good minimal models depend on the base U , so in the definitions, we have the notation “/U”. On the other hand, log smooth models and gdlt models do not depend on the base U , so in the definitions, we do not have the notation “/U”.

3.2. Proper log smooth models.

Lemma 3.6. *Let $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ be a glc g-pair and $h : W \rightarrow X$ a log resolution of $(X, \text{Supp } B)$ such that \mathbf{M} descends to W . Then (X, B, \mathbf{M}) has a proper log smooth model (W, B_W, \mathbf{M}) for some \mathbb{R} -divisor B_W on W .*

Proof. Assume that

$$K_W + h_*^{-1}B + \Gamma + \mathbf{M}_W = h^*(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X),$$

then Γ is h -exceptional. Let $E = \text{Exc}(h)$ be the reduced h -exceptional divisor. Then there exists a real number $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$, such that for any component D of E , if $\text{mult}_D \Gamma < 1$, then $\text{mult}_D \Gamma < 1 - \epsilon$. We let

$$B_W := h_*^{-1}B + \epsilon\Gamma^{=1} + (1 - \epsilon)E,$$

then (W, B_W, \mathbf{M}) is a proper log smooth model of (X, B, \mathbf{M}) . \square

Lemma 3.7. *Let $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ be a glc g-pair and (W, B_W, \mathbf{M}) a proper log smooth model of (X, B, \mathbf{M}) with induced morphism $h : W \rightarrow X$. Assume that*

$$K_W + B_W + \mathbf{M}_W = h^*(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X) + E,$$

then:

- (1) $\text{Supp } B_W = \text{Supp } h_*^{-1}B \cup \text{Exc}(h)$.
- (2) For any prime divisor D on W that is exceptional over X , D is a component E if and only if $a(D, X, B, \mathbf{M}) > 0$.
- (3) Any glc place of (W, B_W, \mathbf{M}) is a glc place of (X, B, \mathbf{M}) . In particular, the image of any glc center of (W, B_W, \mathbf{M}) on X is a glc center of (X, B, \mathbf{M}) .

Proof. First we prove (1). By construction, $\text{Supp } B_W \subset \text{Supp } h_*^{-1}B \cup \text{Exc}(h)$ and $\text{Supp } h_*^{-1}B \subset \text{Supp } B_W$. Let D be a component of $\text{Exc}(h)$. If $a(D, X, B, \mathbf{M}) = 0$, then since $E \geq 0$, D is a component of B_W . If $a(D, X, B, \mathbf{M}) > 0$, by Definition 3.1(5), E is a component of $\{B_W\}$, hence a component of B_W . Thus $\text{Exc}(h) \subset \text{Supp } B_W$, and we have (1).

We prove (2). Let D be a prime divisor on W . If $a(D, X, B, \mathbf{M}) > 0$, then D is a component of E by Definition 3.1(4). If $a(D, X, B, \mathbf{M}) = 0$, then

$$0 = a(D, X, B, \mathbf{M}) = a(D, W, B_W - E, \mathbf{M}) \geq a(D, W, B_W, \mathbf{M}) \geq 0,$$

which implies that $a(D, W, B_W - E, \mathbf{M}) = a(D, W, B_W, \mathbf{M})$, hence $\text{mult}_D E = 0$. Thus we have (2).

We prove (3). Let D be a glc place of (W, B_W, \mathbf{M}) . Then the center of D on W is a stratum of $\lfloor B_W \rfloor$. If $\text{center}_W D \subset \text{Supp } E$, then since $B_W + E$ is simple normal crossing, there exists a prime divisor F that is a component of $\lfloor B_W \rfloor$ such that $\text{center}_W D \subset F$ and F is a component of E . By (2), $a(F, X, B, \mathbf{M}) > 0$. By Definition 3.1(5), F is a component of $\{B_W\}$, so F cannot be a component of $\lfloor B_W \rfloor$, a contradiction. Thus $\text{center}_W D \not\subset \text{Supp } E$. Therefore, any glc place of (W, B_W, \mathbf{M}) is a glc place of $(W, B_W - E, \mathbf{M})$, hence a glc place of (X, B, \mathbf{M}) , and we have (3). \square

3.3. Models under some birational maps.

3.3.1. *Models under resolutions.*

Lemma 3.8. *Let $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ be a glc g-pair, $(X', B', \mathbf{M})/U$ a weak glc model of $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ with birational map $\phi : X \dashrightarrow X'$, and $p : W \rightarrow X$ and $q : W \rightarrow X'$ a common resolution of (X, B, \mathbf{M}) and (X', B', \mathbf{M}) such that $q = \phi \circ p$. Assume that*

$$p^*(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X) = q^*(K_{X'} + B' + \mathbf{M}_{X'}) + E,$$

then

- (1) $E \geq 0$, and
- (2) E is exceptional over X' .

Proof. For any prime divisor D that is an irreducible component of E ,

$$\text{mult}_D E = a(D, X', B', \mathbf{M}) - a(D, X, B, \mathbf{M}).$$

Thus if D is not exceptional over X , then

- if D is not exceptional over X' , then $\text{mult}_D E = 0$, and
- if D is exceptional over X' , then $\text{mult}_D E \geq 0$ by Definition 3.2(2.c).

Therefore, $p_*E \geq 0$. Since $K_{X'} + B' + \mathbf{M}_{X'}$ is nef/ U , $q^*(K_{X'} + B' + \mathbf{M}_{X'})$ is nef/ X , hence E is anti-nef/ X . By the negativity lemma, $E \geq 0$, which is (1).

We show (2). If E is not exceptional over X' , then there exists a component D of E that is not exceptional over X' . If D is not exceptional over X , then $\text{mult}_D E = 0$, a contradiction. Thus D is exceptional over X . By the definition of weak glc models, $a(D, X', B', \mathbf{M}) = 0$. Since $E \geq 0$, $a(D, X, B, \mathbf{M}) \leq a(D, X, B', \mathbf{M}) = 0$. Since $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ is a glc g-pair, $a(D, X, B, \mathbf{M}) \geq 0$. Thus $a(D, X, B, \mathbf{M}) = 0$, which implies that $\text{mult}_D E = 0$, a contradiction. \square

Lemma 3.9. *Let $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ be a glc g-pair, $(X_1, B_1, \mathbf{M})/U$ and $(X_2, B_2, \mathbf{M})/U$ two weak glc models of $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ with induced birational map $\phi : X_1 \dashrightarrow X_2$, and $g_1 : W \rightarrow X_1$ and $g_2 : W \rightarrow X_2$ a common resolution such that $\phi \circ g_1 = g_2$. Then:*

(1)

$$g_1^*(K_{X_1} + B_1 + \mathbf{M}_{X_1}) = g_2^*(K_{X_2} + B_2 + \mathbf{M}_{X_2}).$$

In particular, if $K_{X_2} + B_2 + \mathbf{M}_{X_2}$ is ample/ U , then ϕ is a morphism.

(2) *If $K_{X_1} + B_1 + \mathbf{M}_{X_1}$ is semi-ample/ U , then for any weak glc model $(X', B', \mathbf{M})/U$ of $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$, $K_{X'} + B' + \mathbf{M}_{X'}$ is semi-ample/ U .*

Proof. Let $\phi_1 : X \dashrightarrow X_1$ and $\phi_2 : X \dashrightarrow X_2$ be the induced birational maps. Possibly replacing W , we may assume that the induced birational map $h : W \rightarrow X$ is a morphism. Let

$$E_i := h^*(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X) - g_i^*(K_{X_i} + B_i + \mathbf{M}_{X_i})$$

for $i \in \{1, 2\}$. By Lemma 3.8, $E_i \geq 0$ and is exceptional over X_i for $i \in \{1, 2\}$. Thus $g_{1,*}(E_2 - E_1) \geq 0$ and $E_1 - E_2$ is nef/ X_1 , and $g_{2,*}(E_1 - E_2) \geq 0$ and $E_2 - E_1$ is nef/ X_2 . By the negativity lemma, $E_2 - E_1 \geq 0$ and $E_1 - E_2 \geq 0$. Thus $E_1 = E_2$, which implies (1). (2) immediately follows from (1). \square

Lemma 3.10. *Let $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ be a glc g-pair, $h : W \rightarrow X$ a log resolution of $(X, \text{Supp } B)$ such that \mathbf{M} descends to W , and (W, B_W, \mathbf{M}) a log smooth model of (X, B, \mathbf{M}) . Then any weak glc model (resp. log minimal model, good minimal model) of $(W, B_W, \mathbf{M})/U$ is a weak glc model (resp. log minimal model, good minimal model) of $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$.*

Proof. Since (W, B_W, \mathbf{M}) is a log smooth model of (X, B, \mathbf{M}) , we may write

$$K_W + B_W + \mathbf{M}_W = h^*(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X) + E$$

for some $E \geq 0$ that is h -exceptional.

Claim 3.11. *Let $(X', B', \mathbf{M})/U$ be a weak glc model of $(W, B_W, \mathbf{M})/U$. Then $a(D, X, B, \mathbf{M}) \leq a(D, X', B', \mathbf{M})$ for any prime divisor D over X .*

Proof. Let $\phi_W : W \dashrightarrow X'$ be the induced birational map, and let $p : V \rightarrow W$ and $q : V \rightarrow X'$ be a common resolution such that $q = \phi_W \circ p$. By Lemma 3.8,

$$p^*(K_W + B_W + \mathbf{M}_W) = q^*(K_{X'} + B' + \mathbf{M}_{X'}) + F$$

for some $F \geq 0$ that is exceptional over X' . Then we have

$$p^*h^*(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X) = q^*(K_{X'} + B' + \mathbf{M}_{X'}) + F - p^*E,$$

thus

$$p^*E - F \sim_{\mathbb{R}, X} q^*(K_{X'} + B' + \mathbf{M}_{X'})$$

is nef/ X . Since $h_*p_*(F - p^*E) = h_*p_*F \geq 0$, by the negativity lemma, $F \geq p^*E$. Thus $a(D, X, B, \mathbf{M}) \leq a(D, X', B', \mathbf{M})$ for any prime divisor D over X or X' . \square

Proof of Lemma 3.10 continued. First we prove the weak glc model case. Let $(X', B', \mathbf{M})/U$ be a weak glc model of $(W, B_W, \mathbf{M})/U$ with induced birational map $\phi_W : W \dashrightarrow X'$. We check Definition 3.2(2) for $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ and $(X', B', \mathbf{M})/U$. Definition 3.2(2.b) holds by construction. For any prime divisor D on X which is exceptional over X' , $h_*^{-1}D$ is a prime divisor on W which is exceptional over X' . Thus

$$a(D, X, B, \mathbf{M}) = a(D, W, B_W, \mathbf{M}) \leq a(D, X', B', \mathbf{M}),$$

and we have Definition 3.2(2.c). Thus we only need to show that $(X', B', \mathbf{M})/U$ is a log birational model of $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$. Let $\phi : X \dashrightarrow X'$ be the induced morphism and $B'' := \phi_*B + \text{Exc}(\phi^{-1})$, then we only need to show that $B' = B''$. By construction, $B' = (\phi_W)_*B_W + \text{Exc}(\phi_W^{-1})$. Let D be a prime divisor on X' . There are three cases:

Case 1. D is not exceptional over X . In this case,

$$\begin{aligned} 1 - \text{mult}_D B'' &= a(D, X', B'', \mathbf{M}) = a(D, X, B, \mathbf{M}) \\ &= a(D, W, B_W, \mathbf{M}) = a(D, X', B', \mathbf{M}) = 1 - \text{mult}_D B', \end{aligned}$$

so $\text{mult}_D B' = \text{mult}_D B''$.

Case 2. D is exceptional over W . In this case, D is a component of $\text{Exc}(\phi_W^{-1})$ and a component of $\text{Exc}(\phi^{-1})$, hence

$$\text{mult}_D B' = 1 = \text{mult}_D B''.$$

Case 3. D is exceptional over X but not exceptional over W . In this case,

$$1 - \text{mult}_D B' = a(D, X', B', \mathbf{M}) = a(D, W, B_W, \mathbf{M}).$$

Since $E \geq 0$, $a(D, W, B_W, \mathbf{M}) \leq a(D, X, B, \mathbf{M})$. By Claim 3.11, $a(D, X, B, \mathbf{M}) \leq a(D, X', B', \mathbf{M})$. Thus

$$a(D, X, B, \mathbf{M}) = a(D, X', B', \mathbf{M}) = a(D, W, B_W, \mathbf{M}).$$

By Definition 3.1(4),

$$a(D, X, B, \mathbf{M}) = a(D, X', B', \mathbf{M}) = a(D, W, B_W, \mathbf{M}) = 0,$$

which implies that

$$\text{mult}_D B' = 1 = \text{mult}_D \text{Exc}(\phi^{-1}) = \text{mult}_D B''.$$

Thus $B' = B''$, so $(X', B', \mathbf{M})/U$ is a log birational model of $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$, and we have proved the weak glc model case.

Next we prove the log minimal model case. Let $(X', B', \mathbf{M})/U$ be a log minimal model of $(W, B_W, \mathbf{M})/U$. We check Definition 3.2(3) for $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ and $(X', B', \mathbf{M})/U$. Definition 3.2(3.a) follows from (1). Definition 3.2(3.b) is immediate from the construction. For any prime divisor D on X which is exceptional over X' , $f_*^{-1}D$ is a prime divisor on W which is exceptional over X' . Thus

$$a(D, X, B, \mathbf{M}) = a(D, W, B_W, \mathbf{M}) < a(D, X', B', \mathbf{M}).$$

so we get Definition 3.2(3.c), and we have the log minimal model case.

The good minimal model case follows immediately from the log minimal model case. \square

3.3.2. Models under the MMP.

Lemma 3.12. *Let $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ be a glc g -pair and $X \dashrightarrow Y$ a partial $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)$ -MMP/ U . Let B_Y be the strict transform of B on Y . Then any weak glc model (resp. log minimal model, good minimal model) of $(Y, B_Y, \mathbf{M})/U$ is a weak glc model (resp. log minimal model, good minimal model) of $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$.*

Proof. Since $X \dashrightarrow Y$ is a partial $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)$ -MMP/ U , $X \dashrightarrow Y$ does not extract any divisor, $a(D, X, B, \mathbf{M}) \leq a(D, Y, B_Y, \mathbf{M})$ for any prime divisor D over X or Y , and $a(D, X, B, \mathbf{M}) < a(D, Y, B_Y, \mathbf{M})$ for any prime divisor D on X that is exceptional over Y .

Assume that $(X', B', \mathbf{M})/U$ is a weak glc model of $(Y, B_Y, \mathbf{M})/U$, and $\phi : X \dashrightarrow X'$ and $\phi_Y : Y \dashrightarrow X'$ are the induced birational maps. Then $B' = (\phi_Y)_* B_Y + \text{Exc}(\phi_Y^{-1})$. Let $B'' := \phi_* B + \text{Exc}(\phi^{-1})$ and let D be a prime divisor on X' . There are three possibilities:

Case 1. D is not exceptional over X and Y . In this case,

$$\begin{aligned} 1 - \text{mult}_D B' &= a(D, X', B', \mathbf{M}) = a(D, Y, B_Y, \mathbf{M}) \\ &= a(D, X, B, \mathbf{M}) = a(D, X', B'', \mathbf{M}) = 1 - \text{mult}_D B'', \end{aligned}$$

so $\text{mult}_D B' = \text{mult}_D B''$.

Case 2. D is exceptional over X and Y . In this case, D is a component of $\text{Exc}(\phi_Y^{-1})$ and a component of $\text{Exc}(\phi^{-1})$, hence

$$\text{mult}_D B' = 1 = \text{mult}_D B''.$$

Case 3. D is exceptional over Y but not exceptional over X . In this case, D is a component of B' and $a(D, X', B', \mathbf{M}) = 0$. By Lemma 3.8,

$$a(D, X, B, \mathbf{M}) \leq a(D, Y, B_Y, \mathbf{M}) \leq a(D, X', B', \mathbf{M}) = 0,$$

so $a(D, X, B, \mathbf{M}) = 0$, hence

$$\text{mult}_D B'' = 1 - a(D, X', B'', \mathbf{M}) = 1 - a(D, X, B, \mathbf{M}) = 1 = \text{mult}_D B'.$$

Thus $B' = B''$, hence (X', B', \mathbf{M}) is a log birational model of (X, B, \mathbf{M}) . By Lemma 3.8(1),

$$a(D, X, B, \mathbf{M}) \leq a(D, Y, B_Y, \mathbf{M}) \leq a(D, X', B', \mathbf{M})$$

for any prime divisor D over X . Since $K_{X'} + B' + \mathbf{M}_{X'}$ is nef over U , by Definition 3.2(2), $(X', B', \mathbf{M})/U$ is a weak glc model of $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$, and we have proven the weak glc model case of the lemma.

Now assume that $(X', B', \mathbf{M})/U$ is a log minimal model of $(Y, B_Y, \mathbf{M})/U$. By the weak glc model case of the lemma, $(X', B', \mathbf{M})/U$ is a weak glc model of $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$. For any prime divisor D on X which is exceptional over X' , if D is exceptional over Y , then

$$a(D, X, B, \mathbf{M}) < a(D, Y, B_Y, \mathbf{M}) \leq a(D, X', B', \mathbf{M}),$$

and if D is not exceptional over Y , then

$$a(D, X, B, \mathbf{M}) = a(D, Y, B_Y, \mathbf{M}) < a(D, X', B', \mathbf{M}).$$

Thus $(X', B', \mathbf{M})/U$ is a log minimal model of $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ by Definition 3.2(3), and we have proven the log minimal model case of the lemma. The good minimal model case of the lemma follows from the log minimal case. \square

3.3.3. Models under gdlt modifications.

Lemma 3.13. *Let $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ be a glc g -pair and (Y, B_Y, \mathbf{M}) a gdlt model of (X, B, \mathbf{M}) . Then any log birational model (resp. weak glc model, log minimal model, good minimal model) of $(Y, B_Y, \mathbf{M})/U$ is a log birational model (resp. weak glc model, log minimal model, good minimal model) of $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$.*

Proof. We begin by proving the log birational model case. Let $(X', B', \mathbf{M})/U$ be a log birational model of $(Y, B_Y, \mathbf{M})/U$ with induced birational maps $\phi_Y : Y \dashrightarrow X'$ and $\phi : X \dashrightarrow X'$. Let $B'' := \phi_* B + \text{Exc}(\phi^{-1})$, then for any prime divisor D on X' , there are three cases:

Case 1. D is not exceptional over X . In this case,

$$\begin{aligned} 1 - \text{mult}_D B'' &= a(D, X', B'', \mathbf{M}) = a(D, X, B, \mathbf{M}) \\ &= a(D, Y, B_Y, \mathbf{M}) = a(D, X', B', \mathbf{M}) = 1 - \text{mult}_D B', \end{aligned}$$

so $\text{mult}_D B' = \text{mult}_D B''$.

Case 2. D is exceptional over Y . In this case, D is a component of $\text{Exc}(\phi_Y^{-1})$ and a component of $\text{Exc}(\phi^{-1})$, hence

$$\text{mult}_D B' = 1 = \text{mult}_D B''.$$

Case 3. D is exceptional over X but not exceptional over Y . In this case, $a(D, X, B, \mathbf{M}) = a(D, Y, B_Y, \mathbf{M}) = 0$. Thus

$$\text{mult}_D B' = 1 - a(D, X', B', \mathbf{M}) = 1 - a(D, Y, B_Y, \mathbf{M}) = 1 = \text{mult}_D \text{Exc}(\phi^{-1}) = \text{mult}_D B''.$$

Thus $B' = B''$, so $(X', B', \mathbf{M})/U$ is a log birational model of $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$.

The remainder of the lemma now follows easily. In particular, notice that as $a(D, X, B, \mathbf{M}) = a(D, Y, B_Y, \mathbf{M})$ for any prime divisor D over X and $X \dashrightarrow Y$ does not contract any divisor, properties (2.c) and (3.c) of Definition 3.2 follow immediately. \square

3.4. Models under pullbacks. The goal of this subsection is the following theorem, which will be proven at the end of this subsection.

Theorem 3.14. *Let $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ and $(Y, B_Y, \mathbf{M})/U$ be two NQC glc g -pairs and let $f : Y \rightarrow X$ be a projective birational morphism such that*

$$K_Y + B_Y + \mathbf{M}_Y = f^*(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X) + E$$

for some $E \geq 0$ that is exceptional over X . Then $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ has a weak glc model (resp. log minimal model, good minimal model) if and only if $(Y, B_Y, \mathbf{M})/U$ has a weak glc model (resp. log minimal model, good minimal model).

We prove several lemmas before proving Theorem 3.14.

Lemma 3.15. *Let $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ be a glc g -pair. If $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ has a weak glc model, then $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ has a log minimal model.*

Proof. Let $(X', B', \mathbf{M})/U$ be a weak glc model of $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$. Let $h : W \rightarrow X$ be a log resolution of $(X, \text{Supp } B)$ such that the induced map $\phi_W : W \rightarrow X'$ is a morphism, and \mathbf{M} descends to W . We may write

$$K_W + B_W + \mathbf{M}_W = h^*(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X) + E$$

for some log smooth pair (W, B_W) , such that $B_W := h_*^{-1} B + \text{Exc}(h)$ and $E \geq 0$ is exceptional over X . Then (W, B_W, \mathbf{M}) is a log smooth model of (X, B, \mathbf{M}) . By Lemma 3.8, we have

$$h^*(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X) = \phi_W^*(K_{X'} + B' + \mathbf{M}_{X'}) + G$$

where $G \geq 0$ is exceptional over X' . Thus

$$K_W + B_W + \mathbf{M}_W \sim_{\mathbb{R}, X'} G + E.$$

Claim 3.16. E is exceptional over X' .

Proof. Let D be a component of E . By construction, $a(D, X, B, \mathbf{M}) > 0$ and D is exceptional over X .

Assume that D is not exceptional over X' . Since $(X', B', \mathbf{M})/U$ is a log birational model of $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$, $a(D, X', B', \mathbf{M}) = 0$. Since $G \geq 0$, $a(D, X, B, \mathbf{M}) \leq a(D, X', B', \mathbf{M})$. Thus $a(D, X, B, \mathbf{M}) = 0$, hence D is not a component of E , a contradiction. \square


Proof of Lemma 3.15 continued. By Claim 3.16, $G + E$ is exceptional over X' . By Lemma 2.32, we may run a $(K_W + B_W + \mathbf{M}_W)$ -MMP/ X' with scaling of a general ample/ X' divisor, which terminates with a model Y such that $K_Y + B_Y + \mathbf{M}_Y \sim_{\mathbb{R}, X'} 0$, where B_Y is the strict transform of B on Y . Applying the negativity lemma twice, we have that $K_Y + B_Y + \mathbf{M}_Y$ is the pullback of $K_{X'} + B' + \mathbf{M}_{X'}$. Thus $K_Y + B_Y + \mathbf{M}_Y$ is nef/ U . Since (W, B_W, \mathbf{M}) is \mathbb{Q} -factorial gdl and $W \dashrightarrow Y$ is a $(K_W + B_W + \mathbf{M}_W)$ -MMP/ X' , (Y, B_Y, \mathbf{M}) is \mathbb{Q} -factorial gdl. Thus $(Y, B_Y, \mathbf{M})/U$ is a log minimal model of $(W, B_W, \mathbf{M})/U$. The lemma follows from Lemma 3.10. \square

Lemma 3.17. Let $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ and $(Y, B_Y, \mathbf{M})/U$ be two glc g -pairs, and $f : Y \rightarrow X$ a projective birational morphism such that

$$K_Y + B_Y + \mathbf{M}_Y = f^*(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X) + E$$

for some $E \geq 0$ that is exceptional over X . Then any weak glc model of $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ is a weak glc model of $(Y, B_Y, \mathbf{M})/U$.

Proof. Let $(X', B', \mathbf{M})/U$ be a weak glc model of $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$, $\phi : X \dashrightarrow X'$ the induced birational map, and $\phi_Y := \phi \circ f$. Let $p : W \rightarrow Y$ and $q : W \rightarrow X'$ be a common resolution and let $h := f \circ p$.



By Lemma 3.8,

$$h^*(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X) = q^*(K_{X'} + B' + \mathbf{M}_{X'}) + F$$

for some $F \geq 0$ that is exceptional over X' . Thus

$$p^*(K_Y + B_Y + \mathbf{M}_Y) = q^*(K_{X'} + B' + \mathbf{M}_{X'}) + p^*E + F.$$

Thus $a(D, Y, B_Y, \mathbf{M}) \leq a(D, X', B', \mathbf{M})$ for any prime divisor D over X' . In particular, if $a(D, X', B', \mathbf{M}) = 0$, then $a(D, Y, B_Y, \mathbf{M}) = 0$.

Since $(X', B', \mathbf{M})/U$ is a log birational model of $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$, $B' = \phi_*B + \text{Exc}(\phi^{-1})$. Let $B'' := (\phi_Y)_*B_Y + \text{Exc}(\phi_Y^{-1})$. For any prime divisor D on X' , there are two cases:

Case 1. D is not exceptional over X . In this case,

$$\begin{aligned} 1 - \text{mult}_D B' &= a(D, X', B', \mathbf{M}) = a(D, X, B, \mathbf{M}) \\ &= a(D, Y, B_Y, \mathbf{M}) = a(D, X', B'', \mathbf{M}) = 1 - \text{mult}_D B'', \end{aligned}$$

so $\text{mult}_D B' = \text{mult}_D B''$.

Case 2. D is exceptional over X . In this case,

$$a(D, X', B', \mathbf{M}) = 1 - \text{mult}_D B' = 0.$$

Since $a(D, Y, B_Y, \mathbf{M}) \leq a(D, X', B', \mathbf{M})$, $a(D, Y, B_Y, \mathbf{M}) = 0$. Thus if D is not exceptional over Y , then

$$\text{mult}_D B'' = \text{mult}_D B_Y = 1 - a(D, Y, B_Y, \mathbf{M}) = 1 = \text{mult}_D B',$$

and if D is exceptional over Y , then

$$\text{mult}_D B'' = \text{mult}_D \text{Exc}(\phi_Y^{-1}) = 1 = \text{mult}_D B'.$$

Thus $B' = B''$, hence $(X', B', \mathbf{M})/U$ is a log birational model of $(Y, B_Y, \mathbf{M})/U$. Since $K_{X'} + B' + \mathbf{M}_{X'}$ is nef/ U , and $a(D, Y, B_Y, \mathbf{M}) \leq a(D, X', B', \mathbf{M})$ for any prime divisor D over X' , $(X', B', \mathbf{M})/U$ is a weak glc model of $(Y, B_Y, \mathbf{M})/U$. \square

Lemma 3.18. *Let $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ and $(Y, B_Y, \mathbf{M})/U$ be two glc g -pairs, and $f : Y \rightarrow X$ a projective birational morphism such that*

$$K_Y + B_Y + \mathbf{M}_Y = f^*(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X) + E$$

for some $E \geq 0$ that is exceptional over X . If $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ has a weak glc model (resp. log minimal model, good minimal model), then $(Y, B_Y, \mathbf{M})/U$ has a weak glc model (resp. log minimal model, good minimal model).

Proof. Let $(X', B', \mathbf{M})/U$ be a weak glc model (resp. log minimal model, good minimal model) of $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$. By Lemma 3.17, $(X', B', \mathbf{M})/U$ is a weak glc model of $(Y, B_Y, \mathbf{M})/U$. By Lemma 3.15, $(Y, B_Y, \mathbf{M})/U$ has a log minimal model $(Y', B_{Y'}, \mathbf{M})/U$. By Lemma 3.9, if $K_{X'} + B' + \mathbf{M}_{X'}$ is semi-ample/ U , then $K_{Y'} + B_{Y'} + \mathbf{M}_{Y'}$ is semi-ample/ U , and we finish the proof. \square

Lemma 3.19. *Let $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ and $(Y, B_Y, \mathbf{M})/U$ be two \mathbb{Q} -factorial NQC gdlt g -pairs, and $f : Y \rightarrow X$ a projective birational morphism such that*

$$K_Y + B_Y + \mathbf{M}_Y = f^*(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X) + E$$

for some $E \geq 0$ that is exceptional over X . Assume that

- (1) \mathbf{M} descends to Y ,
- (2) $(Y, B_Y + \text{Exc}(f))$ is log smooth, and
- (3) $(Y, B_Y, \mathbf{M})/U$ has a weak glc model.

Then $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ has a weak glc model.

Proof. By our assumption, $K_Y + B_Y + \mathbf{M}_Y$ and $K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X$ are pseudo-effective/ U . Since (X, B, \mathbf{M}) is gdlt, we may pick an ample/ U \mathbb{R} -divisor $A \geq 0$ on X such that $(X, B + A, \mathbf{M})$ is glc, and $K_X + B + A + \mathbf{M}_X$ and $A + \lfloor B \rfloor$ are ample. Since (X, B, \mathbf{M}) is gdlt, $(X, \{B\}, \mathbf{M})$ is gklt, so we may pick an ample/ U \mathbb{R} -divisor $0 \leq A' \sim_{\mathbb{R}, U} A + \lfloor B \rfloor$ such that $(X, \Delta := \{B\} + A', \mathbf{M})$ is gklt and f is a log resolution of $(X, B + A)$. Since $\Delta \sim_{\mathbb{R}, U} B + A$, $K_X + \Delta + \mathbf{M}_X$ is big/ U . We may write

$$K_Y + \Gamma + \mathbf{M}_Y = f^*(K_X + \Delta + \mathbf{M}_X) + F$$

for some $\Gamma \geq 0$, $F \geq 0$ such that $\Gamma \wedge F = 0$. By our construction, \mathbf{M} descends to Y , $(Y, B_Y + \text{Exc}(f))$ is log smooth, (Y, Γ) is log smooth, (Y, Γ, \mathbf{M}) is gklt, and $K_Y + \Gamma + \mathbf{M}_Y$ is big/ U . We let

$$\Delta_t := t\Delta + (1-t)B \sim_{\mathbb{R}, U} B + tA$$

and

$$\Gamma_t := t\Gamma + (1-t)B_Y$$

for any real number t . Then $(X, \Delta_t, \mathbf{M})$ and $(Y, \Gamma_t, \mathbf{M})$ are gklt for any $t \in (0, 1]$, and $K_X + \Delta_t + \mathbf{M}_X$ and $K_Y + \Gamma_t + \mathbf{M}_Y$ are big/ U for any $t \in (0, 1]$.

Since $(Y, B_Y, \mathbf{M})/U$ has a weak glc model, by Lemma 3.15, $(Y, B_Y, \mathbf{M})/U$ has a log minimal model. Since Y is klt, by Theorem 2.36, we may run a $(K_Y + B_Y + \mathbf{M}_Y)$ -MMP/ U with scaling of a general ample/ U divisor H , which terminates with a log minimal model $(Y', B_{Y'}, \mathbf{M})/U$ with induced birational map $\phi : Y \dashrightarrow Y'$.

We let Γ'_t be the strict transform of Γ_t on Y' for any t . By Lemmas 2.41 and 2.42, there exists $t_0 \in (0, 1)$, such that

- ϕ is also a $(K_Y + \Gamma_{t_0} + \mathbf{M}_Y)$ -MMP/ U , and
- for any $t \in (0, t_0]$, any partial $(K_{Y'} + \Gamma'_t + \mathbf{M}_{Y'})$ -MMP/ U is $(K_{Y'} + B_{Y'} + \mathbf{M}_{Y'})$ -trivial.

Thus $(Y', \Gamma'_{t_0}, \mathbf{M})$ is gklt and $K_{Y'} + \Gamma'_{t_0} + \mathbf{M}_{Y'}$ is big/ U . By Theorem 2.34, we may run a $(K_{Y'} + \Gamma'_{t_0} + \mathbf{M}_{Y'})$ -MMP/ U , which terminates with a log minimal model $(Y'', \Gamma''_{t_0}, \mathbf{M})/U$ of $(Y', \Gamma'_{t_0}, \mathbf{M})/U$. We let Γ''_t be the strict transform of Γ_t on Y'' for any t and $B_{Y''}$ the strict transform of B_Y on Y'' . Since the induced birational map $\phi' : Y' \dashrightarrow Y''$ is $(K_{Y'} + B_{Y'} + \mathbf{M}_{Y'})$ -trivial, $K_{Y''} + B_{Y''} + \mathbf{M}_{Y''}$ is nef/ U . Moreover, the induced map $\phi' \circ \phi : Y \dashrightarrow Y''$ does not extract any divisor, and is both $(K_Y + B_Y + \mathbf{M}_Y)$ -non-positive and $(K_Y + \Gamma_{t_0} + \mathbf{M}_Y)$ -non-positive. Thus $(Y'', B_{Y''}, \mathbf{M})/U$ is a weak glc model of $(Y, B_Y, \mathbf{M})/U$ and $(Y'', \Gamma''_{t_0}, \mathbf{M})/U$ is a weak glc model of $(Y, \Gamma_{t_0}, \mathbf{M})/U$, hence $(Y'', \Gamma''_t, \mathbf{M})/U$ is a weak glc model of $(Y, \Gamma_t, \mathbf{M})/U$ for any $t \in [0, t_0]$.

By Theorem 2.30, we can run a $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)$ -MMP/ U with scaling of A :

$$(X, B, \mathbf{M}) := (X_1, B_1, \mathbf{M}) \dashrightarrow (X_2, B_2, \mathbf{M}) \dashrightarrow \cdots \dashrightarrow (X_i, B_i, \mathbf{M}) \dashrightarrow \cdots$$

Let $A_i, \Delta_i, \Delta_{t,i}$ be the strict transforms of A, Δ, Δ_t on X_i for any t, i respectively, and let

$$\lambda_i := \inf\{t \mid t \geq 0, K_{X_i} + B_i + tA_i + \mathbf{M}_{X_i} \text{ is nef}/U\}$$

be the scaling numbers. If this MMP terminates, then there is nothing left to prove as we already get a log minimal model for $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$. Thus we may assume that this MMP does not terminate. By Theorem 2.36, $\lim_{i \rightarrow +\infty} \lambda_i = 0$.

In particular, there exists a positive integer n such that $\lambda_n < \lambda_{n-1} \leq t_0$. Since $\Delta_{t,i} \sim_{\mathbb{R}, U} B_i + tA_i$ for any t , $(X_n, \Delta_{\lambda_{n-1}, n}, \mathbf{M})/U$ is a weak glc model of $(X, \Delta_{\lambda_{n-1}}, \mathbf{M})/U$ and $(X_n, \Delta_{\lambda_n, n}, \mathbf{M})/U$ is a weak glc model of $(X, \Delta_{\lambda_n}, \mathbf{M})/U$. Since

$$K_Y + \Gamma_t + \mathbf{M}_Y = f^*(K_X + \Delta_t + \mathbf{M}_X) + tF + (1-t)E$$

for any t , by Lemma 3.17, $(X_n, \Delta_{\lambda_{n-1}, n}, \mathbf{M})/U$ is a weak glc model of $(Y, \Gamma_{\lambda_{n-1}}, \mathbf{M})/U$ and $(X_n, \Delta_{\lambda_n, n}, \mathbf{M})/U$ is a weak glc model of $(Y, \Gamma_{\lambda_n}, \mathbf{M})/U$. By our construction, $(Y'', \Gamma''_{\lambda_{n-1}}, \mathbf{M})/U$ is a weak glc model of $(Y, \Gamma_{\lambda_{n-1}}, \mathbf{M})/U$ and $(Y'', \Gamma''_{\lambda_n}, \mathbf{M})/U$ is a weak glc model of $(Y, \Gamma_{\lambda_n}, \mathbf{M})/U$.

We let $p : W \rightarrow X_n$ and $q : W \rightarrow Y''$ be a resolution of indeterminacy.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} Y \xrightarrow{\phi} Y' \xrightarrow{\phi'} Y'' \xleftarrow{q} W & & \\ f \downarrow & & \downarrow p \\ X \dashrightarrow X_2 \dashrightarrow \cdots \dashrightarrow X_n & & \end{array}$$

By Lemma 3.9(1),

$$p^*(K_{X_n} + \Delta_{\lambda_{n-1}, n} + \mathbf{M}_{X_n}) = q^*(K_{Y''} + \Gamma''_{\lambda_{n-1}} + \mathbf{M}_{Y''}).$$

and

$$p^*(K_{X_n} + \Delta_{\lambda_n, n} + \mathbf{M}_{X_n}) = q^*(K_{Y''} + \Gamma''_{\lambda_n} + \mathbf{M}_{Y''}).$$

Thus

$$p^*(K_{X_n} + t\Delta_i + (1-t)B_i + \mathbf{M}_{X_n}) = q^*(K_{Y''} + t\Gamma''_1 + (1-t)B_{Y''} + \mathbf{M}_{Y''})$$

when $t \in \{\lambda_{n-1}, \lambda_n\}$. Since $\lambda_{n-1} \neq \lambda_n$, we have

$$p^*(K_{X_n} + t\Delta_i + (1-t)B_i + \mathbf{M}_{X_n}) = q^*(K_{Y''} + t\Gamma''_1 + (1-t)B_{Y''} + \mathbf{M}_{Y''})$$

for any t . In particular,

$$p^*(K_{X_n} + B_n + \mathbf{M}_{X_n}) = q^*(K_{Y''} + B_{Y''} + \mathbf{M}_{Y''})$$

is nef/ U , hence $K_{X_n} + B_n + \mathbf{M}_{X_n}$ is nef/ U , and $\lambda_n = 0$, a contradiction. \square

Proof of Theorem 3.14. First we prove the weak glc model case. By Lemma 3.17, we only need to prove that if $(Y, B_Y, \mathbf{M})/U$ has a weak glc model, then $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ has a weak glc model. Let $g : \bar{X} \rightarrow X$ be a gdl modification of (X, B, \mathbf{M}) such that

$$K_{\bar{X}} + \bar{B} + \mathbf{M}_{\bar{X}} = g^*(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X),$$

and let $p : W \rightarrow Y$ and $q : W \rightarrow \bar{X}$ be a resolution of indeterminacy, such that \mathbf{M} descends to W , p is a log resolution of $(Y, \text{Supp}(B_Y + E))$, and q is a log resolution of $(\bar{X}, \text{Supp}\bar{B})$. By Lemma 3.6, we may find a proper log smooth model (W, B_W, \mathbf{M}) of (Y, B_Y, \mathbf{M}) . We have

$$K_W + B_W + \mathbf{M}_W = p^*(K_Y + B_Y + \mathbf{M}_Y) + F = (p \circ f)^*(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X) + p^*E + F$$

for some p -exceptional \mathbb{R} -divisor $F \geq 0$.

Let D be a component of $p^*E + F$. Then $a(D, W, B_W, \mathbf{M}) < a(D, X, B, \mathbf{M})$ and D is exceptional over X . If D is not exceptional over \bar{X} , then $a(D, W, B_W, \mathbf{M}) < a(D, X, B, \mathbf{M}) = 0$, which is not possible. Thus $p^*E + F$ is exceptional over \bar{X} .

By Lemma 3.17, $(W, B_W, \mathbf{M})/U$ has a weak glc model. Since $p^*E + F$ is exceptional over \bar{X} , \mathbf{M} descends to W , $(W, B_W + p^*E + F)$ is log smooth, by Lemma 3.19, we have that $(\bar{X}, \bar{B}, \bar{\mathbf{M}})/U$ has a weak glc model. By Lemma 3.13, $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ has a weak glc model, and we have proven the weak glc model case.

Now we prove the general case. By Lemma 3.18, we only need to prove that if $(Y, B_Y, \mathbf{M})/U$ has a weak glc (resp. log minimal model, good minimal model), then $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ has a weak glc (resp. log minimal model, good minimal model). The weak glc case has just been proven, and the log minimal model case follows from the weak glc model case and Lemma 3.15. Assume that $(Y, B_Y, \mathbf{M})/U$ has a good minimal model. By the log minimal model case, we may assume that $(X', B', \mathbf{M})/U$ is a log minimal model of $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$. By Lemma 3.17, $(X', B', \mathbf{M})/U$ is also a weak glc model of $(Y, B_Y, \mathbf{M})/U$. By Lemma 3.9(2), $K_{X'} + B' + \mathbf{M}_{X'}$ is semi-ample/ U , hence $(X', B', \mathbf{M})/U$ is a good minimal model of $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$, and the proof is concluded. \square

Corollary 3.20. *Let $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ be an NQC glc g -pair and $X \dashrightarrow X'$ a partial $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)$ -MMP/ U . Let B' be the strict transform of B on X' . Then $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ has a weak glc model (resp. log minimal model, good minimal model) if and only if $(X', B', \mathbf{M})/U$ has a weak glc model (resp. log minimal model, good minimal model).*

Proof. Let $p : W \rightarrow X$ and $q : W \rightarrow X'$ be a resolution of indeterminacy of $X \dashrightarrow X'$ such that \mathbf{M} descends to W . Let (W, B_W, \mathbf{M}) be a log smooth model of (X, B, \mathbf{M}) , then (W, B_W, \mathbf{M}) is also a log smooth model of (X', B', \mathbf{M}) . By Theorem 3.14, $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ has a weak glc model (resp. log minimal model, good minimal model) if and only if $(W, B_W, \mathbf{M})/U$ has a weak glc model (resp. log minimal model, good minimal model) if and only if $(X', B', \mathbf{M})/U$ has a weak glc model (resp. log minimal model, good minimal model). \square

4. GENERALIZED PAIRS WITH NUMERICAL DIMENSION 0

The goal of this section is to prove the following theorem, which will be proven at the end of this section. This theorem is similar to [Has19, Lemma 3.2] for the pair case.

Theorem 4.1. *Let $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ be an NQC glc g -pair, $U^0 \subset U$ a non-empty open subset, and $\pi : X \rightarrow V$ a contraction over U such that V is quasi-projective. Let $X^0 := X \times_U U^0$, $B^0 := B \times_U U^0$, and $\mathbf{M}^0 := \mathbf{M} \times_U U^0$. Assume that $\kappa_\sigma(X/V, K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X) = 0$, \mathbf{M}^0 descends to X^0 , and $\mathbf{M}_{X^0}^0 \sim_{\mathbb{R}, U^0} 0$. Then there exists a \mathbb{Q} -factorial NQC gdlc g -pair $(X', B', \mathbf{M})/U$, a contraction $\pi' : X' \rightarrow V'$ over U , and a birational projective morphism $\varphi : V' \rightarrow V$ over U satisfying the following:*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X' & \dashrightarrow & X \\ \pi' \downarrow & & \downarrow \pi \\ V' & \xrightarrow{\varphi} & V \\ & \searrow & \swarrow \\ & & U \end{array}$$

- (1) X' is birational to X and V' is smooth,
- (2) $K_{X'} + B' + \mathbf{M}_{X'} \sim_{\mathbb{R}, V'} 0$.

- (3) $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ has a good minimal model if and only if $(X', B', \mathbf{M})/U$ has a good minimal model, and $(X^0, B^0, \mathbf{M}^0)/U^0$ has a good minimal model if and only if $(X'^0 := X' \times_U U^0, B'^0 := B' \times_U U^0, \mathbf{M}^0)/U^0$ has a good minimal model.
- (4) Any weak glc model of $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ is a weak glc model of $(X', B', \mathbf{M})/U$, and any weak glc model of $(X', B', \mathbf{M})/U$ is a weak glc model of $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$.
- (5) If all glc centers of (X, B, \mathbf{M}) intersect X^0 , then all glc centers of (X', B', \mathbf{M}) intersect X'^0 .
- (6) If all glc centers of (X, B, \mathbf{M}) dominate V , then all glc centers of (X', B', \mathbf{M}) dominate V' .
- (7) $\kappa_\sigma(X/U, K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X) = \kappa_\sigma(X'/U, K_{X'} + B' + \mathbf{M}_{X'})$.

Generally speaking, Theorem 4.1 shows that for any g-pair $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ in Theorem 1.1 equipped with an Iitaka fibration structure $X \rightarrow V$, then we can replace this g-pair and additionally assume that $K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X \sim_{\mathbb{R}, V} 0$.

We introduce some auxiliary results before proving Theorem 4.1.

4.1. MMP for generalized pairs with numerical dimension 0.

Lemma 4.2 (cf. [Gon11, Lemma 2.6(3)]). *Let X be a normal projective variety and D a nef \mathbb{R} -Cartier \mathbb{R} -divisor on X . Then*

$$\kappa_\sigma(D) = \max\{k \mid k \in \mathbb{N}, D^k \neq 0\}.$$

Proof. Let $f : W \rightarrow X$ be a resolution of X . Possibly replacing X with W and D with f^*D , we may assume that X is smooth, and the lemma follows from [Nak04, V. 2.7(6) Proposition]. \square

Theorem 4.3 (cf. [Gon11, Theorem 1.2]). *Let (X, B) be a projective \mathbb{Q} -factorial dlt pair such that $\kappa_\sigma(K_X + B) = 0$. Then (X, B) has a log minimal model.*

Theorem 4.4 (cf. [Gon11, Theorem 6.2]). *Let (X, B) be a projective lc pair such that $K_X + B \equiv 0$. Then $K_X + B \sim_{\mathbb{R}} 0$.*

Corollary 4.5. *Let (X, B) be a projective lc pair such that $\kappa_\sigma(K_X + B) = 0$. Then (X, B) has a good minimal model (X', B') such that $K_{X'} + B' \sim_{\mathbb{R}} 0$.*

Proof. By Theorem 4.3, (X, B) has a log minimal model (X', B') . By Lemma 3.8, there exists a common resolution $p : W \rightarrow X$ and $q : W \rightarrow X'$ such that $p^*(K_X + B) = q^*(K_{X'} + B') + E$ for some \mathbb{R} -divisor $E \geq 0$ that is exceptional over X' . By Lemma 2.10(3), $\kappa_\sigma(K_{X'} + B') = 0$. Since $K_{X'} + B'$ is nef, by Lemma 4.2, $K_{X'} + B' \equiv 0$. By Theorem 4.4, $K_{X'} + B' \sim_{\mathbb{R}} 0$. In particular, (X', B') is a good minimal model of (X, B) . \square

Theorem 4.6. *Let (X, B, \mathbf{M}) be a projective glc g-pair such that $\kappa_\sigma(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X) = 0$, \mathbf{M} descends to X , and $\mathbf{M}_X \sim_{\mathbb{R}} 0$. Then (X, B, \mathbf{M}) has a good minimal model (X', B', \mathbf{M}) such that $K_{X'} + B' + \mathbf{M}_{X'} \sim_{\mathbb{R}} 0$.*

Proof. By Corollary 4.5, (X, B) has a good minimal model (X', B') such that $K_{X'} + B' \sim_{\mathbb{R}} 0$. Since \mathbf{M} descends to X and $\mathbf{M}_X \sim_{\mathbb{R}} 0$, by Lemma 2.22, \mathbf{M} descends to X' and $\mathbf{M}_{X'} \sim_{\mathbb{R}} 0$. Thus (X', B', \mathbf{M}) is a good minimal model of (X, B, \mathbf{M}) such that $K_{X'} + B' + \mathbf{M}_{X'} \sim_{\mathbb{R}} 0$. \square

Corollary 4.7. *Let (X, B, \mathbf{M}) be a projective glc g-pair such that $\kappa_\sigma(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X) = 0$, \mathbf{M} descends to X , and $\mathbf{M}_X \sim_{\mathbb{R}} 0$. Then $\kappa_\iota(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X) = 0$.*

Proof. By Theorem 4.6, (X, B, \mathbf{M}) has a good minimal model (X', B', \mathbf{M}) such that $K_{X'} + B' + \mathbf{M}_{X'} \sim_{\mathbb{R}} 0$. By Lemma 3.8, there exists a common resolution $p : W \rightarrow X$ and $q : W \rightarrow X'$ such that $p^*(K_X + B) = q^*(K_{X'} + B') + E$ for some \mathbb{R} -divisor $E \geq 0$ that is exceptional over X' . By Lemma 2.19(3), $\kappa_\iota(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X) = \kappa_\iota(K_{X'} + B' + \mathbf{M}_{X'}) = 0$. \square

Lemma 4.8. *Let $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ be a glc g-pair such that $X \rightarrow U$ is a contraction, $\kappa_\sigma(X/U, K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X) = 0$, and U is quasi-projective. Assume that $U^0 \subset U$ is a non-empty open subset such that $\mathbf{M}^0 := \mathbf{M} \times_U U^0$ descends to $X^0 := X \times_U U^0$ and $\mathbf{M}_{X^0}^0 \sim_{\mathbb{R}, U^0} 0$. Then $\kappa_\iota(X/U, K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X) = 0$. In particular, $K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X \sim_{\mathbb{R}} D \geq 0$ for some \mathbb{R} -divisor D on X .*

Proof. If $\dim X = \dim U$ then there is nothing left to prove, so we may assume that $\dim X > \dim U$. Let F be a very general fiber of $X \rightarrow U$ and (F, B_F, \mathbf{M}^F) the projective glc g-pair given by the adjunction

$$K_F + B_F + \mathbf{M}_F^F := (K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)|_F.$$

Then $\kappa_\sigma(K_F + B_F + \mathbf{M}_F^F) = 0$, (F, B, \mathbf{M}^F) is glc, \mathbf{M}^F descends to F , and $\mathbf{M}_F^F \sim_{\mathbb{R}} 0$. By Corollary 4.7, $\kappa_\iota(K_F + B_F + \mathbf{M}_F^F) = 0$. By Lemma 2.19(1), $\kappa_\iota(X/U, K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X) = 0$, and the lemma follows by the definition of invariant Iitaka dimensions. \square

Lemma 4.9. *Let $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ be a \mathbb{Q} -factorial NQC gdlit g-pair and $\pi : X \rightarrow U$ the induced morphism, such that*

- (1) π is an equidimensional contraction,
- (2) U is quasi-projective and \mathbb{Q} -factorial,
- (3) $\kappa_\sigma(X/U, K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X) = 0$, and
- (4) there exists a non-empty open subset $U^0 \subset U$, such that $\mathbf{M}^0 := \mathbf{M} \times_U U^0$ descends to $X^0 := X \times_U U^0$ and $\mathbf{M}_{X^0}^0 \sim_{\mathbb{R}, U^0} 0$.

Let $A \geq 0$ be an ample/ U \mathbb{R} -divisor on X such that $(X, B + A, \mathbf{M})$ is glc and $K_X + B + A + \mathbf{M}_X$ is nef/ U , and run a $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)$ -MMP/ U with scaling of A . Then this MMP terminates with a good minimal model $(X', B', \mathbf{M})/U$ of $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$. Moreover, $K_{X'} + B' + \mathbf{M}_{X'} \sim_{\mathbb{R}, U} 0$.

Proof. If $\dim X = \dim U$, then since π is an equidimensional contraction, π is the identity map, and there is nothing left to prove. In the following, we assume that $\dim X > \dim U$.

By Lemma 4.8, $K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X \sim_{\mathbb{R}, U} E \geq 0$ for some \mathbb{R} -divisor E on X . We may write $E = E^h + E^v$, such that $E^h \geq 0, E^v \geq 0$, each component of E^h is horizontal over U , and E^v is vertical over U . Since π is equidimensional, the image of any component of E^v on U is a divisor. Since U is \mathbb{Q} -factorial, for any prime divisor P on U , we may define

$$\nu_P := \sup\{\nu \mid \nu \geq 0, E^v - \nu\pi^*P \geq 0\}.$$

Then $\nu_P > 0$ for only finitely many prime divisors P on U . Possibly replacing E^v with $E^v - \pi^*(\sum_P \nu_P P)$, we may assume that E^v is very exceptional over U .

Let F be a very general fiber of π , and (F, B_F, \mathbf{M}^F) the projective g-pair induced by the adjunction to the fiber

$$K_F + B_F + \mathbf{M}_F^F := (K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)|_F.$$

Then $\kappa_\sigma(K_F + B_F + \mathbf{M}_F^F) = 0$, \mathbf{M}^F descends to F , and $\mathbf{M}_F^F \sim_{\mathbb{R}} 0$. By Theorem 4.6, (F, B_F, \mathbf{M}^F) has a good minimal model $(F', B_{F'}, \mathbf{M}^F)$ such that $K_{F'} + B_{F'} + \mathbf{M}_{F'}^F \sim_{\mathbb{R}} 0$. By Lemma 2.40, any $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)$ -MMP/ U with scaling of A terminates along F with a log minimal model of (F, B_F, \mathbf{M}^F) . In particular, let

$$(X, B, \mathbf{M}) := (X_1, B_1, \mathbf{M}) \dashrightarrow (X_2, B_2, \mathbf{M}) \dashrightarrow \cdots \dashrightarrow (X_i, B_i, \mathbf{M}) \dashrightarrow \cdots$$

be our $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)$ -MMP/ U with scaling of A , and let A_i, E_i^h, E_i^v, F_i be the strict transforms of A, E^h, E^v, F on X_i respectively, then there exists a positive integer n such that

$$E_n^h|_{F_n} = (E_n^h + E_n^v)|_{F_n} \sim_{\mathbb{R}} (K_{X_n} + B_n + \mathbf{M}_{X_n})|_{F_n},$$

and the projective generalized pair $(F_n, B_{F_n}, \mathbf{M}^F)$ given by the adjunction

$$K_{F_n} + B_{F_n} + \mathbf{M}_{F_n}^F := (K_{X_n} + B_n + \mathbf{M}_{X_n})|_{F_n}$$

is a log minimal model of (F, B_F, \mathbf{M}^F) .

By Lemma 3.9(1), $K_{F_n} + B_{F_n} + \mathbf{M}_{F_n}^F \sim_{\mathbb{R}} 0$. Thus $E_n^h|_{F_n} \sim_{\mathbb{R}} 0$. Since $E_n^h \geq 0$ is horizontal over U , $E_n^h = 0$, and $K_{X_n} + B_n + \mathbf{M}_{X_n} \sim_{\mathbb{R}, U} E_n^v$. Since this MMP/ U is also a $(E^h + E^v)$ -MMP/ U and E_n^v is very exceptional over U , by Lemma 2.32, this MMP terminates with a log minimal model $(X', B', \mathbf{M})/U = (X_m, B_m, \mathbf{M})/U$ of $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ for some positive integer m , such that $K_{X'} + B' + \mathbf{M}_{X'} \sim_{\mathbb{R}, U} 0$. In particular, $(X', B', \mathbf{M})/U$ is a good minimal model of $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$. \square

4.2. Semi-stable reduction.

Definition 4.10. A pair (X, B) is called *quasi-smooth* if X is \mathbb{Q} -factorial and (X, B) is toroidal.

Theorem 4.11. *Let (X, B) be a dlt pair and $\pi : X \rightarrow U$ a projective surjective morphism over a normal variety U . Then there exists a commutative diagram of projective morphisms*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} Y & \xrightarrow{f} & X \\ \pi' \downarrow & & \downarrow \pi \\ V & \xrightarrow{\varphi} & U \end{array}$$

such that

- (1) f, φ are birational morphisms, π' is an equidimensional contraction, Y only has \mathbb{Q} -factorial toroidal singularities, and V is smooth, and
- (2) there exist two \mathbb{R} -divisors B_Y and E on Y , such that
 - (a) $K_Y + B_Y = f^*(K_X + B) + E$,
 - (b) $B_Y \geq 0$, $E \geq 0$, and $B_Y \wedge E = 0$,
 - (c) (Y, B_Y) is lc quasi-smooth, and any lc center of (Y, B_Y) on X is an lc center of (X, B) .

Proof. This result follows from [AK00], see also [Hu20, Theorem B.6], [Kaw15, Theorem 2] and [Has19, Step 2 of Proof of Lemma 3.2]. \square

Proof of Theorem 4.1. Let $h : W \rightarrow X$ be a log resolution of $(X, \text{Supp } B)$ such that \mathbf{M} descends to W . By Lemma 3.6, (X, B, \mathbf{M}) has a proper log smooth model (W, B_W, \mathbf{M}) for some \mathbb{R} -divisor B_W on W . By Lemma 2.10(3), Lemma 2.22, Theorem 3.14, Lemmas 3.10 and 3.17, and Lemma 3.7(3), we may replace (X, B, \mathbf{M}) with (W, B_W, \mathbf{M}) , and assume that (X, B) is log smooth dlt and \mathbf{M} descends to X .

By Theorem 4.11, there exists a commutative diagram of projective morphisms

$$\begin{array}{ccc} Y & \xrightarrow{f} & X \\ \pi_Y \downarrow & & \downarrow \pi \\ V' & \xrightarrow{\varphi} & V \end{array}$$

such that

- f, φ are birational morphisms, π_Y is an equidimensional contraction, Y only has \mathbb{Q} -factorial toroidal singularities, and V' is smooth, and
- there exist two \mathbb{R} -divisors B_Y and E on Y , such that
 - $K_Y + B_Y + \mathbf{M}_Y = f^*(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X) + E$,
 - $B_Y \geq 0$, $E \geq 0$, and $B_Y \wedge E = 0$,
 - (Y, B_Y) is lc quasi-smooth, and any glc center of (Y, B_Y, \mathbf{M}) on X is a glc center of (X, B, \mathbf{M}) .

In particular, (Y, B_Y, \mathbf{M}) is \mathbb{Q} -factorial NQC gdlt. Since φ is birational, by Lemma 2.10(3),

$$\kappa_\sigma(Y/V', K_Y + B_Y + \mathbf{M}_Y) = \kappa_\sigma(Y/V, K_Y + B_Y + \mathbf{M}_Y) = \kappa_\sigma(X/V, K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X) = 0.$$

By Lemma 4.9, we may run a $(K_Y + B_Y + \mathbf{M}_Y)$ -MMP/ V' with scaling of a general ample/ V' divisor A on Y , which terminates with a good minimal model $(X', B', \mathbf{M})/V'$ of $(Y, B_Y, \mathbf{M})/V'$ such that $K_{X'} + B' + \mathbf{M}_{X'} \sim_{\mathbb{R}, V'} 0$. Let $\pi' : X' \rightarrow V'$ be the induced contraction.

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} X' & \leftarrow & Y & \xrightarrow{f} & X \\ & \searrow \pi' & \downarrow \pi_Y & & \downarrow \pi \\ & & V' & \xrightarrow{\varphi} & V \end{array}$$

We show that $(X', B', \mathbf{M})/U, \pi', \varphi$ satisfy our requirements. (1)(2) follow from our construction.

Let $p : W' \rightarrow Y$ and $q : W' \rightarrow X'$ be a resolution of indeterminacy of the induce map $Y \dashrightarrow X'$ such that p is a log resolution of (Y, B_Y) . Then we have

$$p^*(K_Y + B_Y + \mathbf{M}_Y) = q^*(K_{X'} + B' + \mathbf{M}_{X'}) + F$$

for some $F \geq 0$ that is exceptional over X' . Let $B_{W'} := p_*^{-1}B_Y + \text{Exc}(p)$, then $(W', B_{W'}, \mathbf{M})$ is a log smooth model of (Y, B_Y, \mathbf{M}) and (X', B', \mathbf{M}) .

Since $K_Y + B_Y + \mathbf{M}_Y = f^*(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X) + E$, by Theorem 3.14, $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ has a good minimal model if and only if $(Y, B_Y, \mathbf{M})/U$ has a good minimal model, if and only if $(W', B_{W'}, \mathbf{M})/U$ has a good minimal model, if and only if $(X', B', \mathbf{M})/U$ has a good minimal model. Moreover, let $Y^0 := Y \times_U U^0, B_Y^0 := B_Y \times_U U^0, W'^0 := W' \times_U U^0$, and $B_{W'}^0 := B_{W'} \times_U U^0$, then by Theorem 3.14 again, $(X^0, B^0, \mathbf{M}^0)/U^0$ has a good minimal model if and only if $(Y^0 := Y \times_U U^0, B_Y^0 := B_Y \times_U U^0, \mathbf{M}^0)/U^0$ has a good minimal model, if and only if $(W'^0 := W' \times_U U^0, B_{W'}^0 := B_{W'} \times_U U^0, \mathbf{M}^0)/U^0$ has a good minimal model, if and only if $(X'^0, B'^0, \mathbf{M}^0)/U^0$ has a good minimal model, hence (3).

By Lemmas 3.10 and 3.17, a g-pair $(X'', B'', \mathbf{M})/U$ is a weak glc model of $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ if and only if $(X'', B'', \mathbf{M})/U$ is a weak glc model of $(W', B_{W'}, \mathbf{M})/U$, if and only if $(X'', B'', \mathbf{M})/U$ is a weak glc model of $(X', B', \mathbf{M})/U$, hence (4).

Let D be a glc place of (X', B', \mathbf{M}) . Since $Y \dashrightarrow X'$ is a $(K_Y + B_Y + \mathbf{M}_Y)$ -MMP/ V' , D is a glc place of (Y, B_Y, \mathbf{M}) , hence a glc place of (X, B, \mathbf{M}) . Thus if all glc centers of (X, B, \mathbf{M}) intersect X^0 , then the image of any glc place of (X, B, \mathbf{M}) on U intersects U^0 , hence the image of any glc place of (X', B', \mathbf{M}) on U intersects U^0 , hence all glc centers of (X', B', \mathbf{M}) intersect X'^0 , and we have (5). Moreover, if all glc centers of (X, B, \mathbf{M}) dominate V , then all glc centers of (X', B', \mathbf{M}) dominate V , hence all glc centers of (X', B', \mathbf{M}) dominate V' as φ is birational, and we have (6).

Finally, by Lemma 2.10(3),

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa_\sigma(X/U, K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X) &= \kappa_\sigma(Y/U, K_Y + B_Y + \mathbf{M}_Y) = \kappa_\sigma(W'/U, p^*(K_Y + B_Y + \mathbf{M}_Y)) \\ &= \kappa_\sigma(W'/U, q^*(K_{X'} + B' + \mathbf{M}_{X'})) = \kappa_\sigma(X'/U, K_{X'} + B' + \mathbf{M}_{X'}), \end{aligned}$$

and we get (7). \square

5. A GENERALIZED CANONICAL BUNDLE FORMULA AND A SPECIAL CASE OF THEOREM 1.1

In this section, we prove a generalized canonical bundle formula (Theorem 5.1) that is a small modification of [Fil18b, Theorem 1.4], [FS20b, Theorem 2.20], and [HL19, Theorem 1.2]. We then use this generalized canonical bundle formula to prove a special case of the main theorem (Proposition 5.3).

Theorem 5.1. *Let $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ be an NQC glc g-pair such that U is quasi-projective, and let $\pi : X \rightarrow V$ be a surjective morphism over U . Assume that $K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X \sim_{\mathbb{R}, V} 0$, then there exists an NQC glc g-pair $(V, B_V, \mathbf{M}^V)/U$, such that*

- (1) $K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X \sim_{\mathbb{R}} \pi^*(K_V + B_V + \mathbf{M}_V^V)$,
- (2) any glc center of (V, B_V, \mathbf{M}^V) is the image of a glc center of (X, B, \mathbf{M}) in V , and
- (3) if all glc centers of (X, B, \mathbf{M}) dominate V , then (V, B_V, \mathbf{M}^V) is gklt.

Proof. By Theorem 2.46 we may assume that $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ is a \mathbb{Q} -g-pair.

Step 1. In this step, we prove the case when $X \rightarrow V$ is a generically finite morphism. Within this step, we assume that $X \rightarrow V$ is a generically finite morphism.

By [HL20d, Theorem 4.5, (4.3),(4.4)], there exists a glc \mathbb{Q} -g-pair $(V, B_V, \mathbf{M}^V)/U$, such that $K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} \pi^*(K_V + B_V + \mathbf{M}_V^V)$, and B_V and \mathbf{M}^V are defined in the following way:

Let V^0 be the smooth locus of V , $X^0 := X \times_V V^0$, and $\pi|_{X^0} : X^0 \rightarrow V^0$ the restriction of π . Then we have the Hurwitz formula

$$K_{X^0} = (\pi|_{X^0})^*K_{V^0} + R^0$$

where R^0 is the effective ramification divisor of $f|_{X^0}$. Let R be the closure of R^0 in X , and let $B_V := \frac{1}{\deg \pi} \pi_*(R + B)$. For any proper birational morphism $\mu : V' \rightarrow V$, let X' be the main component of $X \times_V V'$ with induced birational map $\pi' : X' \rightarrow V'$. We let $\mathbf{M}_{V'}^V = \frac{1}{\deg \pi} \pi'_* \mathbf{M}_{X'}$.

(1) follows immediately.

Since $(V, B, \mathbf{M}^V)/U$ is a g-pair, for any prime divisor E over V , there exists a birational morphism $h_V : \tilde{V} \rightarrow V$ such that \mathbf{M}^V descends to \tilde{V} and E is on \tilde{V} . We let $h : \tilde{X} \rightarrow X$ be a birational morphism such that h descends to \tilde{X} , \mathbf{M} descends to \tilde{X} , and the induced map $\tilde{\pi} : \tilde{X} \rightarrow \tilde{V}$ is a morphism.

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} X' & \longrightarrow & X & \xleftarrow{h} & \tilde{X} \\ \pi' \downarrow & & \pi \downarrow & & \downarrow \tilde{\pi} \\ V' & \xrightarrow{\mu} & V & \xleftarrow{h_V} & \tilde{V} \end{array}$$

There are two cases:

Case 1. E is exceptional over V . In this case, we let $F \subset \tilde{\pi}^{-1}(E)$ be a prime divisor, and let $r \leq \deg f$ be the ramification index of $\tilde{\pi}$ along F . Near the generic point of F , we have

$$K_{\tilde{X}} = h^*(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X) + (a(F, X, B, \mathbf{M}) - 1)F \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} h^* \pi^*(K_V + B_V + \mathbf{M}_V) + (a(F, X, B, \mathbf{M}) - 1)F$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} K_{\tilde{X}} &= \tilde{\pi}^* K_{\tilde{Z}} + (r - 1)F = \tilde{\pi}^* h_V^*(K_V + B_V + \mathbf{M}_V) + r(a(E, V, B_V, \mathbf{M}^V) - 1)F + (r - 1)F \\ &= h^* \pi^*(K_V + B_V + \mathbf{M}_V) + (ra(E, V, B_V, \mathbf{M}^V) - 1)F. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\tilde{X} \rightarrow \tilde{X} \rightarrow V$ be the Stein factorization of $\pi \circ h = h_V \circ \tilde{\pi}$. Since E is exceptional over V , F is exceptional over \tilde{X} . By the negativity lemma, we have

$$a(F, X, B, \mathbf{M}) - 1 = ra(E, V, B_V, \mathbf{M}^V) - 1,$$

hence $a(F, X, B, \mathbf{M}) \geq 0$ if and only if $a(E, V, B_V, \mathbf{M}^V) \geq 0$ and $a(F, X, B, \mathbf{M}) > 0$ if and only if $a(E, V, B_V, \mathbf{M}^V) > 0$. Moreover, since $F \subset \tilde{\pi}^{-1}(E)$, if E is a glc place of (V, B_V, \mathbf{M}^V) , then F is a glc place of (X, B, \mathbf{M}) and $\text{center}_V E$ is contained in the image of $\text{center}_X F$ in V .

Case 2. E is not exceptional over V . In this case, if E is not a component of B_V , then $a(E, V, B_V, \mathbf{M}^V) = 1 > 0$. If E is a component of B_V , then we may let $B_1, \dots, B_m \subset \pi^{-1}(E)$ be the prime divisors on X lying over V and let d_i be the degree of the induced morphism $\pi|_{B_i} : B_i \rightarrow E$. By our construction of B_V ,

$$a(E, V, B_V, \mathbf{M}^V) = 1 - \text{mult}_E B_V = 1 - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^m d_i \text{mult}_{B_i} B}{\deg \pi}.$$

Since $\sum_{i=1}^m d_i \leq \deg \pi$, $a(E, V, B_V, \mathbf{M}^V) \geq 0$ if $\text{mult}_{B_i} B \leq 1$ for each i , and $a(E, V, B_V, \mathbf{M}^V) > 0$ if $\text{mult}_{B_i} B < 1$ for each i . Moreover, since $B_i \subset \pi^{-1}(E)$ for each i , if E is a glc place of (V, B_V, \mathbf{M}^V) , then B_i is a glc place of (X, B, \mathbf{M}) for some i and E is contained in the image of B_i in V .

By our discussions above, we finish the proof in the case when $X \rightarrow V$ is a generically finite morphism.

Step 2. In this step, we prove the case when $X \rightarrow V$ is a contraction. Within this step, we assume that $X \rightarrow V$ is a contraction.

By [FS20b, Theorem 2.20], there exists a glc \mathbb{Q} -g-pair $(V, B_V, \mathbf{M}^V)/U$, such that $K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} \pi^*(K_V + B_V + \mathbf{M}_V^V)$. Moreover, for any birational morphism $h_V : \tilde{V} \rightarrow V$, we have an \mathbb{R} -divisor $B_{\tilde{V}}$ satisfies that $K_{\tilde{V}} + B_{\tilde{V}} + \mathbf{M}_{\tilde{V}}^V = h_V^*(K_V + B_V + \mathbf{M}_V^V)$ and defined in the following way: let \tilde{X} be the main component of $X \times_V \tilde{V}$, and $h : \tilde{X} \rightarrow X$ and $\tilde{\pi} : \tilde{X} \rightarrow \tilde{V}$ the

induced morphisms. Let $K_{\tilde{X}} + \tilde{B} + \mathbf{M}_{\tilde{X}} := h^*(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)$. For any prime divisor E on \tilde{V} , $\text{mult}_E B_{\tilde{V}} = 1 - t_E$, where

$$t_E := \sup\{s \mid (\tilde{X}, \tilde{B} + s\tilde{\pi}^*E, \mathbf{M}) \text{ is glc over the generic point of } E\}.$$

Note that E may not be \mathbb{Q} -Cartier but $\tilde{\pi}^*E$ is always defined over the generic point of E .

(1) follows immediately.

If E is a glc place of (V, B_V, \mathbf{M}^V) on \tilde{V} , then $t_E = 0$, hence $\tilde{\pi}^*E$ contains a glc center F of $(\tilde{X}, \tilde{B}, \mathbf{M})$ over the generic point of E . We have $F \subset \text{Supp } \tilde{\pi}^*E$ and $\tilde{\pi}(F) \subset E$, hence $\tilde{\pi}(F) = E$. Thus E is the image of a glc center of $(\tilde{X}, \tilde{B}, \mathbf{M})$ on \tilde{V} , hence $\text{center}_V E$ is the image of a glc center of (X, B, \mathbf{M}) in V .

By our discussions above, we finish the proof in the case when $X \rightarrow V$ is a contraction.

Step 3. In this step we prove the general case.

We let $X \xrightarrow{f} Y \xrightarrow{g} V$ be the Stein factorization of π . Then $K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X \sim_{\mathbb{Q}, Y} 0$, $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is a contraction and $g : Y \rightarrow V$ is a finite morphism. By Step 2, $K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} f^*(K_Y + B_Y + \mathbf{M}_Y^V)$ for some glc \mathbb{Q} -g-pair $(Y, B_Y, \mathbf{M}^Y)/U$ such that any glc center of (Y, B_Y, \mathbf{M}^Y) is the image of a glc center of (X, B, \mathbf{M}) in Y . Moreover, $K_Y + B_Y + \mathbf{M}_Y^V \sim_{\mathbb{Q}, V} 0$. By Step 1, $K_Y + B_Y + \mathbf{M}_Y^V \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} g^*(K_V + B_V + \mathbf{M}_V^V)$ for some glc g-pair $(V, B_V, \mathbf{M}^V)/U$ such that any glc center of (V, B_V, \mathbf{M}^V) is the image of a glc center of (Y, B_Y, \mathbf{M}^Y) in V , hence the image of a glc center of (X, B, \mathbf{M}) in V . We immediately get (1)(2) and (3) follows from (2). \square

Remark 5.2. We remark that in the previous theorem, we cannot apply the generalized canonical bundle formula as in [Fil18b] because [Fil18b] requires that X is projective. On the other hand, different from the generalized canonical bundle formula for contractions where the log discrepancies are computed as lc thresholds, [HL20d] uses an alternative construction for generically finite morphisms, so we need to check their construction in order to prove (2)(3). [Hu20] also proves some results on the generalized canonical bundle formula, but only for generically finite morphisms.

We also remark that we only need Theorem 5.1 when π is a contraction in our paper, but we prove it in full generality for potential further applications.

The following proposition is similar to [Has19, Proposition 3.4] for the usual pair case, and can be viewed as a special case of Theorem 1.1.

Proposition 5.3. *Let $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ be an NQC glc g-pair and $\pi : X \rightarrow V$ a contraction over U , such that*

- V is normal quasi-projective,
- $\kappa_\sigma(X/V, K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X) = 0$ and $\kappa_\sigma(X/U, K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X) = \dim V - \dim U$,
- all glc centers of (X, B, \mathbf{M}) dominate V , and
- there exists a non-empty open subset $U^0 \subset U$, such that $\mathbf{M}^0 := \mathbf{M} \times_U U^0$ descends to $X^0 := X \times_U U^0$, and $\mathbf{M}_{X^0}^0 \sim_{\mathbb{R}, U^0} 0$.

Then:

- (1) $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ has a good minimal model, and
- (2) Let $(\tilde{X}, \tilde{B}, \mathbf{M})/U$ be a good minimal model of $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ and $\tilde{X} \rightarrow \tilde{V}$ is the contraction over U induced by $K_{\tilde{X}} + \tilde{B} + \mathbf{M}_{\tilde{X}}$. Then all glc centers of $(\tilde{X}, \tilde{B}, \mathbf{M})$ dominate \tilde{V} .

Proof. By Theorem 4.1, there exists a \mathbb{Q} -factorial NQC gdlt g-pair $(X', B', \mathbf{M})/U$, a contraction $\pi' : X' \rightarrow V'$ over U , and a birational projective morphism $\varphi : V' \rightarrow V$ over U , such that

- X' is birational to X and V' is smooth,
- $K_{X'} + B' + \mathbf{M}_{X'} \sim_{\mathbb{R}, V'} 0$. In particular, $\kappa_\sigma(X'/V', K_{X'} + B' + \mathbf{M}_{X'}) = 0$ by Lemma 2.10(5),
- $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ has a good minimal model if and only if $(X', B', \mathbf{M})/U$ has a good minimal model,

- any weak glc model of $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ is a weak glc model of $(X', B', \mathbf{M})/U$, and any weak glc model of $(X', B', \mathbf{M})/U$ is a weak glc model of $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$,
- all glc centers of (X', B', \mathbf{M}) dominate V' , and
- $\kappa_\sigma(X'/U, K_{X'} + B' + \mathbf{M}_{X'}) = \kappa_\sigma(X/U, K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X) = \dim V - \dim U = \dim V' - \dim U$.

By Lemma 2.22, we also have that

- \mathbf{M}^0 descends to $X'^0 := X' \times_U U^0$ and $\mathbf{M}_{X'^0}^0 \sim_{\mathbb{R}, U^0} 0$.

Claim 5.4. *Assume that $(X', B', \mathbf{M})/U$ has a good minimal model $(\bar{X}', \bar{B}', \mathbf{M})/U$, $\bar{X}' \rightarrow \bar{V}'$ is the contraction over U induced by $K_{\bar{X}'} + \bar{B}' + \mathbf{M}_{\bar{X}'}$, and all glc centers of $(\bar{X}', \bar{B}', \mathbf{M})$ dominate \bar{V}' . Then Proposition 5.3(2) holds for $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$.*

Proof. Let $(\bar{X}, \bar{B}, \mathbf{M})/U$ be a good minimal model of $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$. Then $(\bar{X}, \bar{B}, \mathbf{M})/U$ is a weak glc model of $(X', B', \mathbf{M})/U$. Since $(\bar{X}', \bar{B}', \mathbf{M})/U$ is also a weak glc model of $(X', B', \mathbf{M})/U$, by Lemma 3.9(1), we may take a resolution of indeterminacy $p : W \rightarrow \bar{X}$ and $q : W \rightarrow \bar{X}'$ of the induced birational map $\bar{X} \dashrightarrow \bar{X}'$, such that

$$p^*(K_{\bar{X}} + \bar{B} + \mathbf{M}_{\bar{X}}) = q^*(K_{\bar{X}'} + \bar{B}' + \mathbf{M}_{\bar{X}'}).$$

Then $K_{\bar{X}} + \bar{B} + \mathbf{M}_{\bar{X}}$ is semi-ample/ U , and if we let $\bar{X} \rightarrow \bar{V}$ be the contraction over U induced by $K_{\bar{X}} + \bar{B} + \mathbf{M}_{\bar{X}}$, then $\bar{V} = \bar{V}'$. Since all glc centers of $(\bar{X}', \bar{B}', \mathbf{M})$ dominate $\bar{V}' = \bar{V}$, all glc centers of $(\bar{X}, \bar{B}, \mathbf{M})$ dominate \bar{V} , and the claim is proved. \square

Proof of Proposition 5.3 continued. By Claim 5.4, we may replace $(X, B, \mathbf{M}), V$ and π with $(X', B', \mathbf{M}), V'$ and π' respectively, and assume that V is smooth and $K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X \sim_{\mathbb{R}, V} 0$. By Theorem 5.1, there exists an NQC gklt g-pair $(V, B_V, \mathbf{M}^V)/U$ such that

$$K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X \sim_{\mathbb{R}} \pi^*(K_V + B_V + \mathbf{M}_V^V).$$

By Lemma 2.10(4)(5), we have

$$\kappa_\sigma(V/U, K_V + B_V + \mathbf{M}_V^V) = \kappa_\sigma(X/U, K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X) = \dim V - \dim U.$$

By Lemma 2.10(1), $K_V + B_V + \mathbf{M}_V^V$ is big/ U . By Theorem 2.34, we may run a $(K_V + B_V + \mathbf{M}_V^V)$ -MMP/ U with scaling of some general ample/ U divisor A , which terminates with a good minimal model $(\hat{V}, B_{\hat{V}}, \mathbf{M}^V)/U$ of $(V, B_V, \mathbf{M}^V)/U$. Let $\phi : V \dashrightarrow \hat{V}$ be the induced morphism, and let $g : \tilde{V} \rightarrow V$ and $\hat{g} : \tilde{V} \rightarrow \hat{V}$ be a common resolution such that $\hat{g} = \phi \circ g$. Let $h : W \rightarrow X$ be a log resolution of $(X, \text{Supp } B)$ such that \mathbf{M} descends to W and the induced map $\pi_W : W \rightarrow \tilde{V}$ is a morphism. By Lemma 3.6, there exists a proper log smooth model (W, B_W, \mathbf{M}) of (X, B, \mathbf{M}) . In particular,

$$K_W + B_W + \mathbf{M}_W = h^*(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X) + E$$

for some h -exceptional \mathbb{R} -divisor $E \geq 0$. Assume that

$$g^*(K_V + B_V + \mathbf{M}_V^V) = \hat{g}^*(K_{\hat{V}} + B_{\hat{V}} + \mathbf{M}_{\hat{V}}^V) + F.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} K_W + B_W + \mathbf{M}_W &= h^*(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X) + E \sim_{\mathbb{R}} (\pi \circ h)^*(K_V + B_V + \mathbf{M}_V^V) + E \\ &= \pi_W^* g^*(K_V + B_V + \mathbf{M}_V^V) + E = \pi_W^* \hat{g}^*(K_{\hat{V}} + B_{\hat{V}} + \mathbf{M}_{\hat{V}}^V) + \pi_W^* F + E. \end{aligned}$$

Since E is exceptional over X , E is very exceptional over V . Since ϕ is a birational contraction, E is very exceptional over \hat{V} . Since F is exceptional over \hat{V} , $\pi_W^* F$ is very exceptional over \hat{V} . Thus $\pi_W^* F + E$ is very exceptional over \hat{V} . In particular,

$$K_W + B_W + \mathbf{M}_W \sim_{\mathbb{R}, \hat{V}} \pi_W^* F + E$$

is very exceptional over \hat{V} . By Lemma 2.32, we may run a $(K_W + B_W + \mathbf{M}_W)$ -MMP/ \hat{V} with scaling of a general ample/ \hat{V} divisor which terminates with a good minimal model $(\hat{W}, B_{\hat{W}}, \mathbf{M})/\hat{V}$ such that $K_{\hat{W}} + B_{\hat{W}} + \mathbf{M}_{\hat{W}} \sim_{\mathbb{R}, \hat{V}} 0$ and the induced birational map $W \dashrightarrow \hat{W}$

exactly contracts $\text{Supp}(\pi_W^*F + E)$. In particular, let $\pi_{\widehat{W}} : \widehat{W} \rightarrow \widehat{V}$ be the induced morphism, then


$$K_{\widehat{W}} + B_{\widehat{W}} + \mathbf{M}_{\widehat{W}} \sim_{\mathbb{R}} \pi_{\widehat{W}}^*(K_{\widehat{V}} + B_{\widehat{V}} + \mathbf{M}_{\widehat{V}}^V).$$

Since $(\widehat{V}, B_{\widehat{V}}, \mathbf{M}^V)/U$ is a good minimal model of $(V, B_V, \mathbf{M}^V)/U$, $K_{\widehat{V}} + B_{\widehat{V}} + \mathbf{M}_{\widehat{V}}^V$ is semi-ample/ U , hence $K_{\widehat{W}} + B_{\widehat{W}} + \mathbf{M}_{\widehat{W}}$ is semi-ample/ U . Thus $(\widehat{W}, B_{\widehat{W}}, \mathbf{M})/U$ is a good minimal model of $(W, B_W, \mathbf{M})/U$. By Lemma 3.10, $(\widehat{W}, B_{\widehat{W}}, \mathbf{M})/U$ is a good minimal model of $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$, which implies (1).

Let $(\bar{X}, \bar{B}, \mathbf{M})/U$ be a good minimal model of $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$. By Lemma 3.9(1), there exists a resolution $f : Z \rightarrow \bar{X}$ and $\hat{f} : Z \rightarrow \widehat{W}$ of indeterminacy of the induced birational map $\bar{X} \dashrightarrow \widehat{W}$, such that

$$f^*(K_{\bar{X}} + \bar{B} + \mathbf{M}_{\bar{X}}) = \hat{f}^*(K_{\widehat{W}} + B_{\widehat{W}} + \mathbf{M}_{\widehat{W}}).$$

In particular, any glc place of $(\bar{X}, \bar{B}, \mathbf{M})$ is a glc place of $(\widehat{W}, B_{\widehat{W}}, \mathbf{M})$, hence a glc place of (W, B_W, \mathbf{M}) , and hence a glc place of (X, B, \mathbf{M}) by Lemma 3.7 as (W, B_W, \mathbf{M}) is a proper log smooth model of (X, B, \mathbf{M}) . In particular, any glc place of $(\bar{X}, \bar{B}, \mathbf{M})$ dominates V . Moreover, the contraction $\bar{X} \rightarrow \bar{V}$ induced by $K_{\bar{X}} + \bar{B} + \mathbf{M}_{\bar{X}}$ factors through \widehat{V} , and the induced morphism $\widehat{V} \rightarrow \bar{V}$ is birational as $K_{\widehat{V}} + B_{\widehat{V}} + \mathbf{M}_{\widehat{V}}^V$ is big/ U . In particular, the induced map $V \dashrightarrow \bar{V}$ is birational. Thus all glc places of $(\bar{X}, \bar{B}, \mathbf{M})$ dominate \bar{V} , hence all glc centers of $(\bar{X}, \bar{B}, \mathbf{M})$ dominate \bar{V} , which implies (2).



□

6. SPECIAL TERMINATION

In this section, we prove a special case of special termination for generalized pairs (Theorem 6.4) which will be used later in the proof of our main theorem. The proof is very similar to [HL18, Theorem 4.5]. We are informed by Nikolaos Tsakanikas that some similar results are obtained in [LMT20]. We recall the definitions related to the concept of *difficulty* for g-pairs as in [HL18, Theorem 4.5]:

Definition 6.1. Let $\mathcal{I} \subset [0, 1]$ and $\mathcal{I}' \subset [0, +\infty)$ be two sets. We define

$$\mathbb{S}(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{I}') := \left\{ 1 - \frac{1}{m} + \sum_j \frac{r_j b_j}{m} + \sum_i \frac{s_i \mu_i}{m} \mid m \in \mathbb{N}^+, r_i, s_i \in \mathbb{N}, b_j \in \mathcal{I}, \mu_j \in \mathcal{I}' \right\} \cap (0, 1].$$

Proposition 6.2 ([HL18, Proposition 2.8]). *Let $\mathcal{I} \subset [0, 1]$ and $\mathcal{I}' \subset [0, +\infty)$ be two sets. Let $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ be a \mathbb{Q} -factorial NQC gdlc g-pair such that $B \in \mathcal{I}$ and $\mathbf{M} = \sum \mu_i \mathbf{M}_i$, where $\mu_i \in \mathcal{I}'$ for each i and each \mathbf{M}_i is nef/ U \mathbf{b} -Cartier. Then for any glc center S of (X, B, \mathbf{M}) , the g-pair $(S, B_S, \mathbf{M}^S)/U$ given by the adjunction*

$$K_S + B_S + \mathbf{M}_S^S := (K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)|_S$$

is gdlc, and $B_S \in \mathbb{S}(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{I}')$.

Definition 6.3 (Difficulty, [HL18, Definition 4.3]). Let \mathcal{I} and \mathcal{I}' be two finite sets of non-negative real numbers. Let $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ be a \mathbb{Q} -factorial NQC gdltd g-pair such that $B \in \mathcal{I}$ and $\mathbf{M} = \sum \mu_i \mathbf{M}_i$, where $\mu_i \in \mathcal{I}'$ for each i and each \mathbf{M}_i is nef/ U \mathbf{b} -Cartier. For any glc center S of (X, B, \mathbf{M}) of dimension ≥ 1 , let (S, B_S, \mathbf{M}^S) be the g-pair given by the generalized adjunction

$$K_S + B_S + \mathbf{M}_S^S := (K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)|_S,$$

then we define

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{I}'}(S, B_S, \mathbf{M}^S) &:= \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{S}(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{I}')} \#\{E \mid a(E, B_S, \mathbf{M}^S) < 1 - \alpha, \text{center}_S E \not\subset [B_S]\} \\ &+ \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{S}(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{I}')} \#\{E \mid a(E, B_S, \mathbf{M}^S) \leq 1 - \alpha, \text{center}_S E \not\subset [B_S]\}. \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 6.4. *Let $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ be a \mathbb{Q} -factorial NQC gdltd g-pair and $A \geq 0$ an \mathbb{R} -divisor on X , such that $(X, B + A, \mathbf{M})$ is glc and $K_X + B + A + \mathbf{M}_X$ is nef/ U . Let*

$$(X, B, \mathbf{M}) := (X_1, B_1, \mathbf{M}) \dashrightarrow (X_2, B_2, \mathbf{M}) \dashrightarrow \cdots \dashrightarrow (X_i, B_i, \mathbf{M}) \dashrightarrow \cdots$$

be a $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)$ -MMP/ U with scaling of A , such that the scaling numbers

$$\lambda_i := \inf\{t \mid t \geq 0, K_{X_i} + B_i + tA_i + \mathbf{M}_{X_i} \text{ is nef}/U\}$$

satisfies that $\lim_{i \rightarrow +\infty} \lambda_i = 0$. Here A_i is the strict transform of A on X_i for each i .

For any glc center S_i of (X_i, B_i, \mathbf{M}) of dimension ≥ 1 , let $(S_i, B_{S_i}, \mathbf{M}^{S_i})/U$ be the generalized pair given by the adjunction

$$K_{S_i} + B_{S_i} + \mathbf{M}_{S_i}^{S_i} := (K_{X_i} + B_i + \mathbf{M}_{X_i})|_{S_i}.$$

Assume that for any i and any glc center S_i of (X_i, B_i, \mathbf{M}) of dimension ≥ 1 , $(S_i, B_{S_i}, \mathbf{M}^{S_i})/U$ has either a log minimal model or a Mori fiber space. Then the MMP terminates near the strict transform of $[B]$.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{I} \subset [0, 1]$ be a finite set such that $B \in \mathcal{I}$, and let $\mathcal{I}' \subset [0, +\infty)$ be a finite set such that $\mathbf{M} = \sum \mu_i \mathbf{M}_i$, where each \mathbf{M}_i is nef/ U \mathbf{b} -Cartier and each $\mu_i \in \mathcal{I}'$. Let $\phi_i : X_i \dashrightarrow X_{i+1}$ be the induced birational maps.

We may assume that the MMP does not terminate, otherwise there is nothing left to prove. Possibly replacing X with X_i for $i \gg 0$, we may assume that each ϕ_i is a flip. We let $X_i \rightarrow Z_i \leftarrow X_{i+1}$ be the flip given by ϕ_i , where $X_i \rightarrow Z_i$ is the flipping contraction. Since the number of glc centers of (X, B, \mathbf{M}) is finite, possibly replacing X with X_i for $i \gg 0$, we may assume that the flipping locus of ϕ_i does not contain any glc centers. In particular, ϕ_i is an isomorphism of 0-dimensional glc places for each i .

We show that ϕ_i induces an isomorphism of every glc center by induction on dimension d of glc centers, and the theorem will follow from the $d = \dim X - 1$ case. Pick an integer $1 \leq k \leq \dim X - 1$, and suppose that ϕ_i induces an isomorphism for every d -dimensional glc centers for each $d \leq k - 1$ and $i \gg 0$. Possibly replacing X with X_i for $i \gg 0$, we may assume that ϕ_i induces an isomorphism for every d -dimensional glc center for each $d \leq k - 1$ and each i .

Let S be a k -dimensional glc center of (X, B, \mathbf{M}) . Since the flipping locus of ϕ_i does not contain any glc centers, we may let S_i be the birational transform of S on X_i . By Proposition 6.2, the g-pair $(S_i, B_{S_i}, \mathbf{M}^{S_i})$ given by the adjunction

$$K_{S_i} + B_{S_i} + \mathbf{M}_{S_i}^{S_i} := (K_{X_i} + B_i + \mathbf{M}_{X_i})|_{S_i}$$

is gdltd, and $B_{S_i} \in \mathbb{S}(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{I}')$. By our construction, $\mathbf{M}^{S_i} = \mathbf{M}^S$ for each i . To check this, since (X, B, \mathbf{M}) is gdltd, we may assume that S is an irreducible component of $[B]$. Let $p : W \rightarrow X$ and $q : W \rightarrow X_i$ be a resolution of indeterminacy such that p is a log resolution of (X, B) and q is a log resolution of (X_i, B_i) and \mathbf{M} descends to W . Let S_W be the strict transform of S (and of S_i) on W . We then have that $\mathbf{M}_{S_W}^S = \mathbf{M}_W|_{S_W} = \mathbf{M}_{S_W}^{S_i}$ as claimed above.

By the induction hypothesis, ϕ_i induces an isomorphism on $[B_{S_i}]$ for each i . Thus for any i and any prime divisor E over S_i , $\text{center}_{S_i} E \subset [B_{S_i}]$ if and only if $\text{center}_{S_{i+1}} E \subset [B_{S_{i+1}}]$. By the negativity lemma, $a(E, S_i, B_{S_i}, \mathbf{M}^S) \leq a(E, S_{i+1}, B_{S_{i+1}}, \mathbf{M}^S)$ for each i and any prime divisor E over S_i . Thus

$$d_{\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{I}'}(S_i, B_{S_i}, \mathbf{M}^S) \geq d_{\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{I}'}(S_{i+1}, B_{S_{i+1}}, \mathbf{M}^S)$$

for each i . Moreover, for any i such that S_i and S_{i+1} are not isomorphic in codimension 1, if there exists a prime divisor E on S_{i+1} that is exceptional over S_i , then

$$1 - \alpha = a(E, S_{i+1}, B_{S_{i+1}}, \mathbf{M}^S) > a(E, S_i, B_{S_i}, \mathbf{M}^S)$$

for some $\alpha \in \mathbb{S}(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{I}')$, and hence

$$d_{\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{I}'}(S_i, B_{S_i}, \mathbf{M}^S) > d_{\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{I}'}(S_{i+1}, B_{S_{i+1}}, \mathbf{M}^S).$$

By [HL18, Remark 4.4], $d_{\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{I}'}(S_i, B_{S_i}, \mathbf{M}^S) < +\infty$. Thus possibly replacing X with X_i for some $i \gg 0$, we may assume that $S_i \dashrightarrow S_{i+1}$ does not extract any divisor for any i . In particular, $\rho(S_{i+1}) \leq \rho(S_i)$, and $\rho(S_{i+1}) < \rho(S_i)$ if $S_i \dashrightarrow S_{i+1}$ contracts a divisor. Thus possibly replacing X with X_i for some $i \gg 0$, we may assume that S_i and S_{i+1} are isomorphic in codimension 1 for each i .

In particular, let $\phi_{i,j} : S_i \dashrightarrow S_j$ be the induced birational map for each i, j , then

$$K_{S_i} + B_{S_i} + \mathbf{M}_{S_i}^S = \lim_{j \rightarrow +\infty} (\phi_{i,j}^{-1})_* ((K_{X_j} + B_j + \lambda_j A_j + \mathbf{M}_{X_j})|_{S_j})$$

for each i . Since $K_{X_j} + B_j + \lambda_j A_j + \mathbf{M}_{X_j}$ is nef/ U , $K_{S_i} + B_{S_i} + \mathbf{M}_{S_i}^S$ is pseudo-effective/ U for each i . By our assumption, $(S_1, B_{S_1}, \mathbf{M}^S)/U$ has a log minimal model.

Let T_i be the normalization of the image of S_i in Z_i for each i , and let T be the image of S on U . Then we have an induced birational map $S_i \dashrightarrow S_{i+1}$ over T_i for each i . Let $(S'_1, B_{S'_1}, \mathbf{M}^S)$ be a gdlm model of $(S_1, B_{S_1}, \mathbf{M}^S)$, and let $A_{S'_1}$ be the pullback of A on S'_1 . We prove the following claim:

Claim 6.5. (1) *The $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)$ -MMP/ U with scaling of A induces a $(K_{S'_1} + B_{S'_1} + \mathbf{M}_{S'_1}^S)$ -MMP/ T with scaling of $A_{S'_1}$.*
(2) *The induced $(K_{S'_1} + B_{S'_1} + \mathbf{M}_{S'_1}^S)$ -MMP/ T with scaling of $A_{S'_1}$ terminates.*

Proof. Since $(S_1, B_{S_1}, \mathbf{M}^S)/U$ has a log minimal model, $(S_1, B_{S_1}, \mathbf{M}^S)/T$ has a log minimal model. By Lemma 3.13, $(S'_1, B_{S'_1}, \mathbf{M}^S)/T$ has a log minimal model. By Lemma 3.12, for any partial $(K_{S'_1} + B_{S'_1} + \mathbf{M}_{S'_1}^S)$ -MMP/ T $(S'_1, B_{S'_1}, \mathbf{M}^S) \dashrightarrow (S''_1, B_{S''_1}, \mathbf{M}^S)$, $(S''_1, B_{S''_1}, \mathbf{M}^S)/T$ has a log minimal model.

We run a $(K_{S'_1} + B_{S'_1} + \mathbf{M}_{S'_1}^S)$ -MMP/ T_1 with scaling of a general ample/ T divisor. Since

$$K_{S'_1} + B_{S'_1} + \lambda_1 A_{S'_1} + \mathbf{M}_{S'_1}^S \equiv_{T_1} 0,$$

this MMP is also a $(K_{S'_1} + B_{S'_1} + \mathbf{M}_{S'_1}^S)$ -MMP/ T_1 with scaling of $\lambda_1 A_{S'_1}$.

Since $(S'_1, B_{S'_1}, \mathbf{M}^S)/T$ has a log minimal model, by Theorem 2.36, this MMP terminates with a log minimal model $(S'_2, B_{S'_2}, \mathbf{M}^S)/T_1$. Since $S_1 \dashrightarrow S_2$ is an isomorphism in codimension 1, $K_{S_2} + B_{S_2} + \mathbf{M}_{S_2}^S$ is ample/ T_1 , and $S'_2 \dashrightarrow S_2$ does not extract any divisor, $(S_2, B_{S_2}, \mathbf{M}^S)/T_1$ is a weak glc model of $(S'_2, B_{S'_2}, \mathbf{M}^S)/T_1$. By Lemma 3.9, the birational map $S'_2 \rightarrow S_2$ is a morphism, and $(S'_2, B_{S'_2}, \mathbf{M}^S)$ is a gdlm model of $(S_2, B_{S_2}, \mathbf{M}^S)$.

We may replace $(S_1, B_{S_1}, \mathbf{M}^S)/T$ with $(S_2, B_{S_2}, \mathbf{M}^S)/T$ and continue this process. This gives us the desired $(K_{S'_1} + B_{S'_1} + \mathbf{M}_{S'_1}^S)$ -MMP/ T with scaling of $A_{S'_1}$.

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
(S'_1, B_{S'_1}, \mathbf{M}^S) & \dashrightarrow & (S'_2, B_{S'_2}, \mathbf{M}^S) & \dashrightarrow & \dots & \dashrightarrow & (S'_i, B_{S'_i}, \mathbf{M}^S) & \dashrightarrow & (S_{i+1}, B_{S_{i+1}}, \mathbf{M}^S) & \dashrightarrow & \dots \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow & & & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
(S_1, B_{S_1}, \mathbf{M}^S) & \dashrightarrow & (S_2, B_{S_2}, \mathbf{M}^S) & \dashrightarrow & \dots & \dashrightarrow & (S_i, B_{S_i}, \mathbf{M}^S) & \dashrightarrow & (S_{i+1}, B_{S_{i+1}}, \mathbf{M}^S) & \dashrightarrow & \dots \\
& & \searrow & \swarrow & & & \searrow & \swarrow & & & \\
& & T_1 & & & & T_i & & & &
\end{array}$$

Let $(S'_i, B_{S'_i}, \mathbf{M}^S)/T$ be the generalized pair constructed in the MMP that is a gdlt model of $(S_i, B_{S_i}, \mathbf{M}^S)/T$ for each i . Then the scaling numbers of any step of the MMP after $(S'_i, B_{S'_i}, \mathbf{M}^S)/T$ are $\leq \lambda_i$. In particular, let μ_i be the scaling numbers of the $(K_{S'_i} + B_{S'_i} + \mathbf{M}_{S'_i}^S)$ -MMP/ T with scaling of $A_{S'_i}$ we constructed, then $\lim_{i \rightarrow +\infty} \mu_i = 0$. By Theorem 2.35, this MMP terminates. \square

Proof of Theorem 6.4 continued. By Claim 6.5, $S_i \dashrightarrow S_{i+1}$ is the identity map for $i \gg 0$. Thus the original $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)$ -MMP/ U with scaling of an ample/ U \mathbb{R} -divisor A on X terminates near S_i . We apply this for every k -dimensional glc center, and the theorem follows by induction on k . \square

7. FUKUDA-TYPE BASE-POINT-FREE THEOREMS

Definition 7.1 (Special \mathbf{b} -divisors, [Fuj12, Definitions 3.7, 3.9, 3.21]). Let (X, B) be a sub-pair such that B is a \mathbb{Q} -divisor.

- (1) The *discrepancy \mathbf{b} -divisor* of (X, B) is the \mathbf{b} -divisor $\mathbf{A}(X, B)$ defined in the following way: for any birational morphism $f : Y \rightarrow X$, we define

$$\mathbf{A}(X, B)_Y := K_Y - f^*(K_X + B).$$

- (2) The *non-klt \mathbf{b} -divisor* of (X, B) is the \mathbf{b} -divisor $\mathbf{N}(X, B)$ defined in the following way: for any birational morphism $f : Y \rightarrow X$ such that

$$K_Y = f^*(K_X + B) + E_Y,$$

we define $\mathbf{N}(X, B)_Y := E_Y^{\leq -1}$.

- (3) We define

$$\mathbf{A}^*(X, B) := \mathbf{A}(X, B) - \mathbf{N}(X, B).$$

- (4) We define $[\mathbf{A}^*(X, B)]$ to be the \mathbf{b} -divisor such that $[\mathbf{A}^*(X, B)]_Y = [\mathbf{A}^*(X, B)_Y]$ for any birational morphism $Y \rightarrow X$.

- (5) For any \mathbf{b} -divisor \mathbf{D} , we define $\mathcal{O}_X(\mathbf{D})$ to be the \mathcal{O}_X -module whose sections on an open subset $U \subset X$ are given by

$$H^0(U, \mathcal{O}_X(\mathbf{D})) := \{a \in k(X)^\times \mid ((\overline{a}) + \mathbf{D})|_U \geq 0\} \cup \{0\}.$$

In particular, $\mathcal{O}_X([\mathbf{A}^*(X, B)])$ is a coherent \mathcal{O}_X -module by [Fuj12, Lemma 3.22].

The following theorem is a slight generalization of [Fuj12, Theorem 6.1].

Theorem 7.2. *Let X be a smooth variety and let B be a \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X such that (X, B) is sublc and $\text{Supp } B$ is a simple normal crossing divisor. Let $\pi : X \rightarrow U$ be a proper morphism onto a variety U , and let M and H be two π -nef \mathbb{Q} -divisors on X . Assume the following conditions:*

- (1) $H - (K_X + B + M)$ is nef and big over U ,
- (2) (Saturation condition) there exist positive integers b and j_0 such that $\pi_* \mathcal{O}_X([\mathbf{A}^*(X, B)] + jb\overline{H}) \subset \pi_* \mathcal{O}_X(jbH)$ for every integer $j \geq j_0$, and
- (3) there is a positive integer c such that cH is Cartier and that $\mathcal{O}_T(cH) := \mathcal{O}_X(cH)|_T$ is π -generated, where $T = -\mathbf{N}(X, B)_X$.

Then mH is π -generated for all $m \gg 0$ sufficiently divisible and in particular H is π -semi-ample.

Proof. Suppose that (X, B) is sub-plt, then note that $H - (K_X + B + M) \sim_{\mathbb{Q}, U} A + E$ where A is ample/ U and $E \geq 0$. Let $\mu : Y \rightarrow X$ be a log resolution of $(X, B + E)$ and assume that

$$K_Y = \mu^*(K_X + B) + \sum a_j F_j.$$

Then, for any rational number $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$,

$$K_X + B + M + \epsilon(A + E) \sim_{\mathbb{Q}, U} K_X + B'$$

for some sub-plt pair (X, B') , such that if we write

$$K_Y = \mu^*(K_X + B') + \sum a'_j F_j,$$

then $\lceil a'_j \rceil = \lceil a_j \rceil$ for each j . Then

$$H - (K_X + B') \sim_{\mathbb{Q}, U} (1 - \epsilon)(H - (K_X + B + M))$$

is nef and big over U , and by [Fuj12, Lemma 3.11],

$$\pi_* \mathcal{O}_X(\lceil \mathbf{A}^*(X, B') \rceil + jb\bar{H}) = \pi_* \mathcal{O}_X(\lceil \mathbf{A}^*(X, B) \rceil + jb\bar{H}) \subset \pi_* \mathcal{O}_X(jbH)$$

for every integer $j \geq j_0$. Thus the claim follows from [Fuj12, Theorem 2.1].

Now we assume that (X, B) is not sub-plt. Then $T \neq \emptyset$. Replacing H by a multiple, we may assume that $j_0 = b = c = 1$. Since

$$lH + \lceil \mathbf{A}^*(X, B)_X \rceil - T - (K_X + \{B\}) = lH - (K_X + B + M) + M$$

is nef and big over U for any positive integer l , by applying relative Kawamata-Viehweg vanishing to $lH + \lceil \mathbf{A}^*(X, B)_X \rceil - T$, we have a surjection

$$\pi_* \mathcal{O}_X(lH + \lceil \mathbf{A}^*(X, B)_X \rceil) \twoheadrightarrow \pi_* \mathcal{O}_T(lH + \lceil \mathbf{A}^*(X, B)_X \rceil).$$

By assumption (2) and [Fuj12, Lemma 3.11], the left hand side is isomorphic to $\pi_* \mathcal{O}_X(lH)$ and the map factors through $\pi_* \mathcal{O}_T(lH)$ and so we have an isomorphism $\pi_* \mathcal{O}_T(lH) \cong \pi_* \mathcal{O}_T(lH + \lceil \mathbf{A}^*(X, B)_X \rceil)$. Since $\mathcal{O}_T(lH)$ is π -generated, from the surjection $\pi_* \mathcal{O}_X(lH) \rightarrow \pi_* \mathcal{O}_T(lH)$, it follows that the base locus of lH over U does not intersect T .

We can now deduce the theorem along the lines of the proof of [Fuk96, Theorem 3]. Fix p a prime number, it suffices to show that $|p^m H|$ is generated over U for $m \gg 0$. Suppose that this is not the case and pick $m_0 > 0$ such that the base locus of $|p^{m_0} H|$ over U coincides with the base locus of $|p^m H|$ over U for any $m \geq m_0$. As we have seen above, this base locus does not intersect T . Let $\mu : Y \rightarrow X$ be a log resolution such that

- (I) $K_Y = \mu^*(K_X + B) + \sum a_j F_j$,
- (II) $\mu^*|p^{m_0} H| = |P| + \sum r_j F_j$ where $|P|$ is free over U and $r_j \geq 0$, and
- (III) $\mu^*(H - (K_X + B)) - \sum \delta_j F_j$ is ample/ U for some $0 \leq \delta_j \ll 1$.

Let $c = \min_{r_j \neq 0} \{\frac{a_j + 1 - \delta_j}{r_j}\}$. Note that as the base locus does not intersect T , if $r_j \neq 0$, then $a_j > -1$ and so $c > 0$. Possibly perturbing the δ_j , we may assume that the above minimum is achieved for a unique $j = j_0$ and that $\mu(F_{j_0}) \cap T = \emptyset$. Define $A := \sum (-cr_j + a_j - \delta_j) F_j$ and $A' = (\lceil A \rceil)^{\geq 0} = \lceil A \rceil + F_{j_0} + \Gamma$ where $\mu(\Gamma) = T$. Note that $0 \leq A' \leq \lceil \mathbf{A}^*(X, B)_X \rceil$. Define

$$N := \mu^*(p^m H) + A - K_Y \equiv cP + \mu^*((p^m - cp^{m_0})H - (K_X + B)) - \sum \delta_j F_j.$$

If $p^m - cp^{m_0} \geq 1$, then N is ample/ U and so $R^i \phi_* \mathcal{O}_Y(\mu^*(p^m H) + \lceil A \rceil) = 0$ for $i > 0$ where $\phi : Y \rightarrow U$ is the induced morphism. Since $F_{j_0} \cap \text{Supp}(\Gamma) = \emptyset$, it follows that the short exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_Y(\mu^*(p^m H) + \lceil A \rceil) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_Y(\mu^*(p^m H) + A') \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{F_{j_0} + \Gamma}(\mu^*(p^m H) + A') \rightarrow 0$$

induces a surjection $\phi_* \mathcal{O}_Y(\mu^*(p^m H) + A') \rightarrow \phi_* \mathcal{O}_{F_{j_0}}(\mu^*(p^m H) + A')$. Since

$$(p^m \mu^* H + A + F_{j_0} + \Gamma)|_{F_{j_0}} - K_{F_{j_0}} = (p^m \mu^* H + A - K_Y)|_{F_{j_0}} = N|_{F_{j_0}}$$

is ample/ U , then $\phi_*\mathcal{O}_{F_{j_0}}(\mu^*(p^m H) + A') \neq 0$ for all $m \gg 0$ by Shokurov's non-vanishing. But then F_{j_0} is not contained in the base locus of $\mu^*p^m H + A'$ over U . Since $0 \leq A' \leq \lceil \mathbf{A}^*(X, B)_X \rceil$, by [Fuj12, Lemma 3.11] $\phi_*\mathcal{O}_{F_{j_0}}(\mu^*(p^m H) + A') = \phi_*\mathcal{O}_{F_{j_0}}(\mu^*(p^m H))$ and so F_{j_0} is not contained in the base locus of $\mu^*p^m H$ over U , so that $\mu(F_{j_0})$ is not contained in the base locus of $p^m H$ over U . This is a contradiction as this base locus coincides with the base locus of $p^{m_0} H$ over U and by property (II) above, $\mu(F_{j_0})$ is contained in the base locus of $p^{m_0} H$ over U . Thus $p^m H$ is generated over U for some $m > 0$. Let q be another prime, then by the same argument $q^n H$ is generated over U for some $n > 0$. Since p^m and q^n are coprime, we may write any integer $r \gg 0$ as a linear combination $r = ap^m + bq^n$ where a, b are positive integers. But then $|rH| \supset |p^m H|^{\times a} \times |q^n H|^{\times b}$ is generated over U . In particular the stable base locus of H over U is empty as required. \square

We will now prove the following variant of [Fuj12, Theorem 6.2].

Theorem 7.3. *Let X be a smooth variety and let B be a \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X such that (X, B) is sub-lc and $\text{Supp } B$ is a simple normal crossing divisor. Let $\pi : X \rightarrow U$ be a projective morphism to a normal variety U and η the generic point of U , such that*

- (1) \mathbf{M} is a nef/ U \mathbb{Q} -b-Cartier \mathbb{Q} -b-divisor over X such that \mathbf{M} descends to X and $\mathbf{M}_X|_{X_\eta} \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0$, where X_η is the generic fiber of π ,
- (2) H is a π -nef \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X and $H - (K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)$ is π -nef and π -abundant,
- (3) $\kappa(aH_\eta - (K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)_\eta) \geq 0$ and $\kappa_\sigma(aH_\eta - (K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)_\eta) = \kappa_\sigma(H_\eta - (K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)_\eta)$ for some rational number $a > 1$, where $(\cdot)_\eta$ denotes restriction to X_η ,
- (4) (Rank condition) if $g : X \dashrightarrow Z$ is the Itaka fibration for $H - (K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)$ over U , then we assume that replacing Z by a higher model, for a log resolution $\mu : Y \rightarrow X$ such that the induced map $f : Y \rightarrow Z$ is a morphism, then $\text{rk} f_* \mathcal{O}_Y(\lceil \mathbf{A}^*(Y, B_Y) \rceil) = 1$ where $\mu^*(K_X + B) = K_Y + B_Y$,
- (5) (Saturation condition) there exist positive integers b and j_0 such that $\pi_* \mathcal{O}_X(\lceil \mathbf{A}^*(X, B) \rceil + jb\bar{H}) \subset \pi_* \mathcal{O}_X(jbH)$ for every integer $j \geq j_0$, and
- (6) there is a positive integer c such that cH is Cartier and $\mathcal{O}_X(cH)|_T$ is π -generated where $T := -\mathbf{N}(X, B)_X$.

Then H is π -semi-ample.

Proof. If $H - (K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)$ is nef and big over U , then this follows from Theorem 7.2.

By [KMM87, Proposition 6-1-3, Remark 6-1-4] (see also [Nak86, Lemma 6]), we may let $\mu : Y \rightarrow X$ be a log resolution with morphisms $f : Y \rightarrow Z$ and $\varphi : Z \rightarrow U$, such that

- (I) $p := \pi \circ \mu = \varphi \circ f : Y \rightarrow U$ where Y and Z are smooth, f and φ are projective, μ is birational, and f has connected fibers,
- (II) there is a φ -nef and φ -big \mathbb{Q} -divisor P_0 on Z such that

$$\mu^*(H - (K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)) \sim_{\mathbb{Q}, U} f^* P_0,$$

- (III) there is a φ -nef \mathbb{Q} -divisor D on Z such that $\mu^* H \sim_{\mathbb{Q}, U} f^* D$, and
- (IV) since properties (II) and (III) are preserved under further base change, we can further assume that $f : Y \rightarrow Z$ has equidimensional fibers.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} Y & \xrightarrow{f} & Z \\ \mu \downarrow & \searrow p & \downarrow \varphi \\ X & \xrightarrow{\pi} & U \end{array}$$

We write $K_Y + B_Y + \mathbf{M}_Y = \mu^*(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)$ and $H_Y = \mu^* H$. By construction, (Y, B_Y) is sub-lc, $\mathbf{M}_Y = \mu^* \mathbf{M}_X$ is nef, and f is birational to the Itaka fibration of $H - (K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)$ over U .

We show that $\mathbf{M}_Y \sim_{\mathbb{Q}, Z} 0$. By our construction, $\mathbf{M}_Y|_{Y_\eta} \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0$ where Y_η is the generic fiber of p . Thus $\mathbf{M}_Y \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0$ over the generic point η_Z of Z . By Lemma 2.3, $\mathbf{M}_Y \sim_{\mathbb{Q}, Z} E$ where $E \geq 0$ is vertical over Z . Since f is equidimensional, $f(E)$ is a \mathbb{Q} -divisor on Z . Since Z is smooth, for any prime divisor P on Z , we may define

$$\nu_P := \sup\{\nu \mid \nu \geq 0, E - \nu f^*P \geq 0\},$$

then $\nu_P > 0$ for only finitely many prime divisors P on Z . Let $F := E - f^*(\sum_P \nu_P P)$, then $\mathbf{M}_Y \sim_{\mathbb{Q}, Z} F \geq 0$ and F is very exceptional over Z . By the general negativity lemma [Bir12a, Lemma 3.3], $\mathbf{M}_Y \sim_{\mathbb{Q}, Z} 0$. In particular, since \mathbf{M}_Y is nef/ U , $\mathbf{M}_Y \sim_{\mathbb{Q}, U} f^*P_Z$ for some \mathbb{Q} -divisor P_Z that is nef/ U .

We now let $T' = -\mathbf{N}(Y, B_Y)_Y$ and observe that $\mu(T') = T$ and so $\mathcal{O}_Y(cH_Y)|_{T'}$ is p -generated. If T' dominates Z , then there exists an irreducible component T'_0 of T' such that $f(T'_0) = Z$. Thus $(H_Y)|_{T'_0} \sim_{\mathbb{Q}, U} (f^*D)|_{T'_0}$ is p -semi-ample, hence $H_Y \sim_{\mathbb{Q}, U} f^*D$ is p -semi-ample and H is p -semi-ample and we are done. Thus we may assume that T' does not dominate Z and therefore that (Y, B_Y) is sub-plt over η_Z .

Since $\mathbf{M}_Y \sim_{\mathbb{Q}, Z} 0$, $K_Y + B_Y \sim_{\mathbb{Q}, Z} 0$. By the usual canonical bundle formula (cf. [Kol07, Theorem 8.5.1]; note that the second condition of this theorem follows from assumption (4)), we have $K_Y + B_Y \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} f^*(K_Z + B_Z + \mathbf{M}_Z^Z)$ for some sub-glc g-sub-pair $(Z, B_Z, \mathbf{M}_Z^Z)/U$. We show that we can assume the following:

- (i) $K_Y + B_Y + \mathbf{M}_Y \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} f^*(K_Z + B_Z + \mathbf{M}_Z^Z + P_Z)$,
- (ii) $(Z, B_Z, \mathbf{M}_Z^Z + \bar{P}_Z)$ is sub-glc,
- (iii) $\mathbf{M}_Z^Z + \bar{P}_Z$ is a nef/ U , \mathbb{Q} -b-divisor on Z ,
- (iv) $\varphi_*\mathcal{O}_Z([\mathbf{A}^*(Z, B_Z)] + j\bar{D}) \subset \varphi_*\mathcal{O}_Z(jD)$,
- (v) $D - (K_Z + B_Z + \mathbf{M}_Z^Z + P_Z)$ is φ -nef and φ -big,
- (vi) Y and Z are smooth, $\text{Supp}(B_Y)$ and $\text{Supp}(B_Z)$ have simple normal crossings, and
- (vii) $\mathcal{O}_{T''}(D) = \mathcal{O}_Z(D)|_{T''}$ is φ -semi-ample, where $T'' = -\mathbf{N}(Z, B_Z)_Z$.

Note that properties (i-iii) follow from the usual canonical bundle formula and the fact that P_Z is nef/ U . Replacing Z (and Y) by a higher model, we may assume that \mathbf{M}_Z^Z descends to the nef divisor \mathbf{M}_Z^Z and (Z, B_Z) and (Y, B_Y) are log smooth sub-lc. Thus we may assume that (vi) is satisfied by an appropriate choice of models of Y and Z .

Since $f^*P_0 \sim_{\mathbb{Q}, U} \mu^*(H - (K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)) \sim_{\mathbb{Q}, U} f^*(D - (K_Z + B_Z + \mathbf{M}_Z^Z + P_Z))$ is p -nef and P_0 is φ -big, (v) follows.

(iv) holds, since by [Fuj12, Lemma 6.5] applied to the lc-trivial fibration $f : (Y, B_Y) \rightarrow Z$, we have

$$\mathcal{O}_Z([\mathbf{A}^*(Z, B_Z)] + j\bar{D}) \subset f_*\mathcal{O}_Y([\mathbf{A}^*(Y, B_Y)] + j\bar{H}_Y).$$

By assumption (5),

$$\varphi_*\mathcal{O}_Z([\mathbf{A}^*(Z, B_Z)] + j\bar{D}) \subset p_*\mathcal{O}_Y([\mathbf{A}^*(Y, B_Y)] + j\bar{H}_Y) \subset p_*\mathcal{O}_Y(jH_Y) = \varphi_*\mathcal{O}_Z(jD),$$

and so (iv) holds.

Finally we check (vii). We have

$$lH_Y + [\mathbf{A}^*(Y, B_Y)_Y] - T' - (K_Y + \{B_Y\}) \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} f^*((l-1)D + P_0 + P_Z)$$

where P_0 is φ -nef and φ -big and so $(l-1)D + P_0 + P_Z$ is φ -nef and φ -big for $l \geq 1$. It follows that $R^1 f_*\mathcal{O}_Y(lH_Y + [\mathbf{A}^*(Y, B_Y)_Y] - T')$ is a torsion free sheaf on Z . Since $f_*\mathcal{O}_T(lH_Y + [\mathbf{A}^*(Y, B_Y)_Y])$ is supported on $T'' = f(T')$ and hence a torsion sheaf on Z , then

$$0 \rightarrow f_*\mathcal{O}_Y(lH_Y + [\mathbf{A}^*(Y, B_Y)_Y] - T') \rightarrow f_*\mathcal{O}_Y(lH_Y + [\mathbf{A}^*(Y, B_Y)_Y]) \rightarrow f_*\mathcal{O}_T(lH_Y + [\mathbf{A}^*(Y, B_Y)_Y]) \rightarrow 0$$

is exact. By [Fuj13, Corollary 1.5], $R^1 \varphi_* f_*\mathcal{O}_Y(lH_Y + [\mathbf{A}^*(Y, B_Y)_Y] - T') = 0$. Thus we have a surjection

$$p_*\mathcal{O}_Y(lH_Y) \cong p_*\mathcal{O}_Y(lH_Y + [\mathbf{A}^*(Y, B_Y)_Y]) \rightarrow p_*\mathcal{O}_{T'}(lH_Y + [\mathbf{A}^*(Y, B_Y)_Y])$$

which factors through $p_*\mathcal{O}_{T'}(lH_Y)$. Therefore the natural inclusion $p_*\mathcal{O}_{T'}(lH_Y) \hookrightarrow p_*\mathcal{O}_{T'}(lH_Y + [\mathbf{A}^*(Y, B_Y)_Y])$ is an isomorphism and $p_*\mathcal{O}_Y(lH_Y) \rightarrow p_*\mathcal{O}_{T'}(lH_Y)$ is surjective. Since, as observed above, the latter is p -generated, it follows that the relative base locus of $\mathcal{O}_Y(lH_Y)$ is disjoint from T' . Since $H_Y \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} f^*D$ and $T'' = f(T')$, it follows that $\mathcal{O}_Z(lD)$ is generated along T'' so that $\mathcal{O}_{T''}(D)$ is φ -semi-ample and thus (vii) holds.

The theorem now follows. In fact by Theorem 7.2 applied to (Z, B_Z) , D and \mathbf{M}_Z^Z , one sees that $\mathcal{O}_Z(D)$ is φ -semi-ample. Since $\mu^*H = f^*D$, $\mathcal{O}_X(H)$ is π -semi-ample. \square

The following theorem is similar to [Fuj12, Theorem 1.2].

Theorem 7.4. *Let $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ be a glc \mathbb{Q} -g-pair. Let η be the generic point of U , X_η the generic fiber of $\pi : X \rightarrow U$, and D_η the restriction of D to X_η for any \mathbb{Q} -divisor D on X . Assume that*

- (1) \mathbf{M} descends to X near X_η and $\mathbf{M}_X|_{X_\eta} \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0$,
- (2) H is a π -nef \mathbb{Q} -Cartier \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X such that $H - (K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)$ is π -nef and π -abundant,
- (3) for some rational number $a > 1$, $\kappa(X_\eta, (aH_\eta - (K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)_\eta)) \geq 0$ and $\kappa_\sigma(X_\eta, (aH_\eta - (K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)_\eta)) = \kappa_\sigma(X_\eta, (H_\eta - (K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)_\eta))$, and
- (4) there is a positive integer c such that cH is Cartier and $\mathcal{O}_X(cH)|_T$ is π -generated where $T := \text{Ngklt}(X, B, \mathbf{M})$.

Then H is π -semi-ample.

Proof. Let $h : W \rightarrow X$ be a log resolution of $(X, \text{Supp } B)$ such that \mathbf{M} descends to W . Let $K_W + B_W + \mathbf{M}_W := h^*(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)$. Let $H_W := h^*H$, $\pi' := \pi \circ h$, W_η the generic fiber of π' , and D_η the restriction of D to W_η for any \mathbb{Q} -divisor D on W . Then

- W is smooth, (W, B_W) is sub-lc and $\text{Supp } B_W$ is a simple normal crossing divisor,
- By Lemma 2.22, \mathbf{M} is a nef/ U \mathbb{Q} - \mathbf{b} -Cartier \mathbb{Q} - \mathbf{b} -divisor over W such that \mathbf{M} descends to W and $\mathbf{M}_W|_{W_\eta} \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0$,
- H_W is a π' -nef \mathbb{Q} -Cartier \mathbb{Q} -divisor and $H_W - (K_W + B_W + \mathbf{M}_W) = h^*(H - (K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X))$ is π' -nef and π' -abundant,
- $\kappa((aH_W - (K_W + B_W + \mathbf{M}_W))_\eta) = \kappa(aH_\eta - (K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)_\eta) \geq 0$, and

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa_\sigma((aH_W - (K_W + B_W + \mathbf{M}_W))_\eta) &= \kappa_\sigma(aH_\eta - (K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)_\eta) \\ &= \kappa_\sigma(H_\eta - (K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)_\eta) \\ &= \kappa_\sigma((H_W - (K_W + B_W + \mathbf{M}_W))_\eta) \end{aligned}$$

for some rational number $a > 1$.

- (Rank condition) This follows along the lines of [Fuj10, Lemma 2.3]. We include the proof for the reader's convenience. Since (X, B, \mathbf{M}) is glc, then $[\mathbf{A}^*(Y, B_Y)_Y]$ is h -effective and exceptional. Let $f : Y \rightarrow Z$ be an appropriate model of the Iitaka fibration of $H - (K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)$ over U . In particular $\mathcal{O}_Z = f_*\mathcal{O}_Y \subset f_*\mathcal{O}_Y([\mathbf{A}^*(Y, B_Y)_Y])$ so that $\text{rk } f_*\mathcal{O}_Y([\mathbf{A}^*(Y, B_Y)_Y]) \geq 1$. Let \mathcal{C} be the cokernel of the above inclusion. We may shrink U and assume that it is affine. Pick A sufficiently ample on Z so that $f_*\mathcal{O}_Y([\mathbf{A}^*(Y, B_Y)_Y]) \otimes \mathcal{O}_Z(A)$ is generated and $H^1(\mathcal{O}_Z(A)) = 0$. In particular $H^0(f_*\mathcal{O}_Y([\mathbf{A}^*(Y, B_Y)_Y]) \otimes \mathcal{O}_Z(A)) \rightarrow H^0(\mathcal{C} \otimes \mathcal{O}_Z(A))$ is surjective and $\mathcal{C} \otimes \mathcal{O}_Z(A)$ is generated. Recall that

$$f^*P_0 \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} H_Y - (K_Y + B_Y + \mathbf{M}_Y) = h^*(H - (K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X))$$

where P_0 is big and so we have an inclusion $\mathcal{O}_Z(A) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_Z(mP_0)$ for some $m > 0$. We also see that

$$H^0(\mathcal{O}_Y([\mathbf{A}^*(Y, B_Y)_Y] + k(H_Y - (K_Y + B_Y + \mathbf{M}_Y)))) \cong H^0(\mathcal{O}_Y(k(H_Y - (K_Y + B_Y + \mathbf{M}_Y))))$$

for any $k \geq 0$ such that $k(H_Y - (K_Y + B_Y + \mathbf{M}_Y))$ is Cartier. Thus we have an isomorphism $H^0(f_*\mathcal{O}_Y([\mathbf{A}^*(Y, B_Y)_Y]) \otimes \mathcal{O}_Z(kP_0)) \cong H^0(\mathcal{O}_Z(kP_0))$ for all $k > 0$ sufficiently divisible. Consider the corresponding diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} H^0(\mathcal{O}_Z(A)) & \longrightarrow & H^0(f_*\mathcal{O}_Y([\mathbf{A}^*(Y, B_Y)_Y]) \otimes \mathcal{O}_Z(A)) & \longrightarrow & H^0(\mathcal{C} \otimes \mathcal{O}_Z(A)) & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\ H^0(\mathcal{O}_Z(kP_0)) & \longrightarrow & H^0(f_*\mathcal{O}_Y([\mathbf{A}^*(Y, B_Y)_Y]) \otimes \mathcal{O}_Z(kP_0)) & \longrightarrow & H^0(\mathcal{C} \otimes \mathcal{O}_Z(kP_0)) & & \end{array}$$

where both rows are exact and the first homomorphism on the bottom row is an isomorphism. If the rank of $f_*\mathcal{O}_Y([\mathbf{A}^*(Y, B_Y)_Y])$ is bigger than 1, then \mathcal{C} is not torsion and so the map $\mathcal{C} \otimes \mathcal{O}_Z(A) \rightarrow \mathcal{C} \otimes \mathcal{O}_Z(kP_0)$ is non-zero. Since $\mathcal{C} \otimes \mathcal{O}_Z(A)$ is generated, the corresponding map of global sections $H^0(\mathcal{C} \otimes \mathcal{O}_Z(A)) \rightarrow H^0(\mathcal{C} \otimes \mathcal{O}_Z(kP_0))$ is non-zero. An easy diagram chase now gives a contradiction.

- (Saturation condition) Since $B \geq 0$, $[\mathbf{A}^*(W, B_W)]$ is effective and exceptional over X , i.e. for any birational morphism $W' \rightarrow W$, $[\mathbf{A}^*(W, B_W)_{W'}] \geq 0$ and is exceptional over X . Thus

$$\pi'_*\mathcal{O}_W([\mathbf{A}^*(W, B_W)] + j\overline{bH_W}) \subset \pi'_*\mathcal{O}_W(jbH_W)$$

for any positive integers j and b such that bH is Cartier.

- Let $T_W := -\mathbf{N}(W, B_W)_W$, then since $h(-\mathbf{N}(W, B_W)_W) = T$, $\mathcal{O}_W(cH_W)|_{T_W}$ is π' -generated.

By Theorem 7.3, h^*H is π' -generated and by the projection formula h is π -generated. \square

Theorem 7.5. *Let $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ be a \mathbb{Q} -factorial NQC gdlc g -pair. Assume that there exists an open subset $U^0 \subset U$, such that*

- (1) $\mathbf{M}^0 := \mathbf{M} \times_U U^0$ descends to $X^0 := X \times_U U^0$ and $\mathbf{M}_{X^0}^0 \sim_{\mathbb{R}, U^0} 0$,
- (2) the image of any strata of $S := \lfloor B \rfloor$ in U intersects U^0 ,
- (3) $K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X$ is nef/ U and $K_{X^0} + B^0 + \mathbf{M}_{X^0}^0$ is semi-ample/ U^0 , where $B^0 := B \times_U U^0$, and
- (4) for any component S_i of S , $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)|_{S_i}$ is semi-ample/ U .

Then $K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X$ is semi-ample/ U .

Proof. By Theorem 2.46, we may assume that (X, B, \mathbf{M}) is a \mathbb{Q} -g-pair. We will give 2 proofs. The first one follows immediately from the, as yet unpublished [Hu21] and the second one follows with more work from a reduction to the traditional slc pair result of [FG14].

Since X is \mathbb{Q} -factorial klt, by [Hu21, Lemma 2.16(3)], the generalized pair $(S, B_S, \mathbf{M}^S)/U$ given by the adjunction

$$K_S + B_S + \mathbf{M}_S^S := (K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)|_S$$

is gslc in the sense of [Hu21, Definition 1.6]. By [Hu21, Theorem 1.9], $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)|_S$ is semi-ample/ U . Applying Theorem 7.4 for $H := 2(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)$, we have that $K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X$ is semi-ample/ U , hence $K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X$ is semi-ample/ U . This concludes the first proof.

For the second proof, we will need the following.

Claim 7.6. *There exists a \mathbb{Q} -divisor $G \sim_{\mathbb{Q}, U} \mathbf{M}_X$ such that $(X, B + G)$ is log canonical and its log canonical places coincide with the glc places of (X, B, \mathbf{M}) .*

Grant this for the time being. Note that $(K_X + B + G)|_{S_i} = (K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)|_{S_i}$ is semi-ample/ U and $(S, B_S + G_S)/U$ is slc where $K_S + B_S + G_S := (K_X + B + G)|_S$ is given by adjunction. By [FG14, Theorem 1.5], $K_S + B_S + G_S$ is semi-ample/ U and hence so is $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)|_S$. Applying Theorem 7.4 for $H := 2(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)$, we have that $K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X$ is semi-ample/ U which concludes the proof. We will now verify the above claim.

Proof of Claim 7.6. By [KMM87, Proposition 6-1-3, Remark 6-1-4] (see also [Nak86, Lemma 6]) and Theorem 4.11, we may let $f : X' \rightarrow X$ be a resolution with morphisms $\pi' : X' \rightarrow U'$ and $\varphi : U' \rightarrow U$, such that

- \mathbf{M} descends to X' ,
- We may write

$$K_{X'} + B_{X'} + \mathbf{M}_{X'} = f^*(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X) + E_{X'},$$

where $B_{X'}, E_{X'} \geq 0$, $B_{X'} \wedge E_{X'} = 0$, $(X', \text{Supp}(B_{X'} + E_{X'}))$ is quasi-smooth, and

- $p := \pi \circ f = \varphi \circ \pi' : X' \rightarrow U$ where X' and U' are smooth, π' and φ are projective, f is birational, and π' has connected equidimensional connected fibers.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X' & \xrightarrow{\pi'} & U' \\ f \downarrow & \searrow p & \downarrow \varphi \\ X & \xrightarrow{\pi} & U \end{array}$$

We show that there is a φ -nef \mathbb{Q} -divisor $M_{U'}$ on U' such that $\mathbf{M}_{X'} \sim_{\mathbb{Q},U} \pi'^* M_{U'}$. By our construction, $\mathbf{M}_{X'}|_{X'_\eta} \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0$ where X'_η is the generic fiber of p . Thus $\mathbf{M}_{X'} \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0$ over the generic point $\eta_{U'}$ of U' . By Lemma 2.3, $\mathbf{M}_{X'} \sim_{\mathbb{Q},U'} D$ where $D \geq 0$ is vertical over U' . Since π' is equidimensional, $\pi'(D)$ is a \mathbb{Q} -divisor on U' . Since U' is smooth, for any prime divisor P on U' , we may define

$$\nu_P := \sup\{\nu \mid \nu \geq 0, D - \nu\pi'^*P \geq 0\},$$

then $\nu_P > 0$ for only finitely many prime divisors P on U' . Let $D' := D - \pi'^*(\sum_P \nu_P P)$, then $\mathbf{M}_{X'} \sim_{\mathbb{Q},U'} D' \geq 0$ and D' is very exceptional over U . By the general negativity lemma [Bir12a, Lemma 3.3], $\mathbf{M}_{X'} \sim_{\mathbb{Q},U'} 0$. In particular, since $\mathbf{M}_{X'}$ is nef/ U , $\mathbf{M}_{X'} \sim_{\mathbb{Q},U} \pi'^* M_{U'}$ for some \mathbb{Q} -divisor $M_{U'}$ that is nef/ U .

Let $X^0 := X' \times_U U^0$ and $U^0 := U' \times_U U^0$. Since $\mathbf{M}_{X'}|_{X^0} \sim_{\mathbb{Q},U^0} 0$, we have that $M_{U^0} := M_{U'}|_{U^0} \sim_{\mathbb{Q},U^0} 0$.

To prove the claim it suffices to show that for a general element $G' \in |\mathbf{M}_{X'}/U|_{\mathbb{Q}}$, the pair $(X', B_{X'} + G')$ is lc and its lc centers coincide with the lc centers of $(X', B_{X'})$, i.e. the strata of $[B_{X'}]$. If this is the case, then $(X', B_{X'} - E_{X'} + G')$ is sub-lc and $K_{X'} + B_{X'} - E_{X'} + G' \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} f^*(K_X + B + G)$ where $G = f_* G' \in |\mathbf{M}_X/U|_{\mathbb{Q}}$ and $(X, B + G)$ is log canonical and its log canonical places coincide with the glc places of (X, B, \mathbf{M}) .

Let $E \geq 0$ be an effective divisor on U' such that $-E$ is ample over U (note that E is not necessarily exceptional, but its support can be chosen to avoid any point not in the exceptional locus). It follows that $|\mathbf{M}_{X'}/U|_{\mathbb{Q}} \supset |\mathbf{M}_{X'} - \epsilon E/U|_{\mathbb{Q}} + \epsilon E$. Since $\mathbf{M}_{X'} - \epsilon E$ is ample over U , for a general element $G' \in |\mathbf{M}_{X'}/U|_{\mathbb{Q}}$ we have that the set of nktl places of $(X', B_{X'} + G')$ are contained in the set of nktl places of $(X', B_{X'} + \epsilon\pi'^*E)$. Thus, the only non-klt centers of $(X', B_{X'} + G')$ are strata of $[B_{X'}]$.

To prove the claim, it suffices to show that the support of a general element $G' \in |\mathbf{M}_{X'}/U|_{\mathbb{Q}}$ does not contain any stratum S' of $[B_{X'}]$ or equivalently that there exist one element $G' \in |\mathbf{M}_{X'}/U|_{\mathbb{Q}}$ whose support does not contain any given stratum S' of $[B_{X'}]$. Note that $f(S')$ is a glc center of (X, B, \mathbf{M}) . As (X, B, \mathbf{M}) is gdlt, its glc centers are the strata of $[B]$ which intersect X^0 by assumption. Pick a point $x \in f(S') \cap X^0$ and let $u = \pi(x) \in U^0$. Since $M_{U^0} \sim_{\mathbb{Q},U^0} 0$, we may assume that $M_{U'} \sim_{\mathbb{Q},U} F$ where $F \geq 0$ is a \mathbb{Q} -divisor whose support does not intersect the fiber $\varphi^{-1}(u)$. Then $\pi'^*F \in |\mathbf{M}_{X'}/U|_{\mathbb{Q}}$ and its support does not contain S' . \square

\square

8. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1

The proof of Theorem 1.1 is similar to [Has19, Proof of Theorem 1.2] for the usual pair case. For the reader's convenience, we provide all details of the proof, and also divide a part of the proof into several different lemmas.

8.1. Some useful lemmas.

Lemma 8.1. *Let $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ and $(X, B', \mathbf{M}')/U$ be two NQC glc g -pairs, $f : Y \rightarrow X$ a birational morphism, $K_Y + B_Y + \mathbf{M}_Y := f^*(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)$ and $K_Y + B'_Y + \mathbf{M}'_Y := f^*(K_X + B' + \mathbf{M}'_X)$, such that Y is \mathbb{Q} -factorial klt and $(Y, B_Y, \mathbf{M})/U$ and $(Y, B'_Y, \mathbf{M}')/U$ are glc g -pairs.*

Assume that there exists a positive real number r such that $K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X \sim_{\mathbb{R}, U} r(K_X + B' + \mathbf{M}'_X)$. Then $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ has a good minimal model if and only if $(X, B', \mathbf{M}')/U$ has a good minimal model.

Proof. Let A_Y be a general ample/ U divisor on Y such that $(Y, B_Y + A_Y, \mathbf{M})/U$ and $(Y, B'_Y + A_Y, \mathbf{M}')/U$ are glc, and $K_Y + B_Y + A_Y + \mathbf{M}_Y$ and $K_Y + B'_Y + rA_Y + \mathbf{M}'_Y$ are nef/ U .

Without loss of generality, we may assume that $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ has a good minimal model and only need to show that $(X, B', \mathbf{M}')/U$ has a good minimal model. By Theorem 3.14, $(Y, B_Y, \mathbf{M})/U$ has a good minimal model. By Theorem 2.36 and Lemma 3.9(2), we may let $\phi : Y \dashrightarrow Z$ be a $(K_Y + B_Y + \mathbf{M}_Y)$ -MMP/ U with scaling of A_Y , such that $(Z, B_Z, \mathbf{M})/U$ is a weak glc model of $(Y, B_Y, \mathbf{M})/U$ and $K_Z + B_Z + \mathbf{M}_Z$ is semi-ample/ U , where B_Z is the strict transform of B_Y on Z . Then ϕ is also a $(K_Y + B'_Y + \mathbf{M}'_Y)$ -MMP/ U with scaling of rA_Y . We let B'_Z be the strict transform of B'_Y on Z , then $K_Z + B_Z + \mathbf{M}_Z \sim_{\mathbb{R}, U} r(K_Z + B'_Z + \mathbf{M}'_Z)$. Thus $(Z, B'_Z, \mathbf{M}')/U$ is a weak glc model of $(Y, B'_Y, \mathbf{M}')/U$ and $K_Z + B'_Z + \mathbf{M}'_Z$ is semi-ample/ U . By Lemmas 3.15 and 3.9(2), (Y, B'_Y, \mathbf{M}') has a good minimal model. By Theorem 3.14, $(X, B', \mathbf{M}')/U$ has a good minimal model. \square

Lemma 8.2. *Let $f : X \rightarrow Y$ and $g : Y \rightarrow Z$ be two contractions between normal quasi-projective varieties such that general fibers of $Y \rightarrow Z$ are smooth and Y is \mathbb{Q} -Gorenstein. Let (X, B) be a pair that is lc over a non-empty open subset of Y . Let D be an \mathbb{R} -Cartier \mathbb{R} -divisor on X such that $D - (K_{X/Y} + B)$ is nef/ Z . Then for any \mathbb{R} -Cartier \mathbb{R} -divisor Q on Y ,*

$$\kappa_\sigma(X/Z, D + f^*Q) \geq \kappa_\sigma(X/Y, D) + \kappa(Y/Z, Q).$$

Proof. Let $z \in Z$ be a very general point and let $X_z := (g \circ f)^{-1}(z)$, $Y_z := g^{-1}(z)$ be the fibers of X and Y over z respectively. We have an induced contraction $f_z : X_z \rightarrow Y_z$. Let F be a very general fiber of f_z , then F is also a very general fiber of f .

First assume that $\dim Y > \dim Z$. By our assumption, Y_z is smooth, $(X_z, B|_{X_z})$ is lc over a non-empty open subset of Y_z , and

$$D|_{X_z} - (K_{X_z/Y_z} + B|_{X_z}) = (D - (K_{X/Y} + B))|_{X_z}$$

is nef. By Lemma 2.19(2) and [Fuj19, (3.3)],

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa_\sigma(X/Z, D + f^*Q) &= \kappa_\sigma(X_z, D|_{X_z} + f_z^*Q|_{Y_z}) \geq \kappa_\sigma(X_z/Y_z, D|_{X_z}) + \kappa(Y_z, Q|_{Y_z}) \\ &= \kappa_\sigma(F, D|_F) + \kappa(Y/Z, Q) = \kappa_\sigma(X/Y, D) + \kappa(Y/Z, Q). \end{aligned}$$

Now assume that $\dim Y = \dim Z$. If $\dim X = \dim Y$ then there is nothing left to prove, so we may assume that $\dim X > \dim Y$. In this case, $f^*Q|_{X_z} = 0$, so we have

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa_\sigma(X/Z, D + f^*Q) &= \kappa_\sigma(X_z, D|_{X_z} + f^*Q|_{X_z}) = \kappa_\sigma(X_z, D|_{X_z}) = \kappa_\sigma(X/Z, D) \\ &\geq \kappa_\sigma(X/Y, D) = \kappa_\sigma(X/Y, D) + \kappa(Y/Z, Q). \end{aligned}$$

\square

Lemma 8.3. *Let $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ be a glc g -pair such that $K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X \equiv_U G$ for some \mathbb{R} -divisor $G \geq 0$, such that U is quasi-projective and G is abundant over U . Let $X \dashrightarrow V$ be the Iitaka fibration over U associated to G , and (W, B_W, \mathbf{M}) a log smooth model of (X, B, \mathbf{M}) such that the induced map $\psi : W \rightarrow V$ is a morphism over U . Then*

- (1) $\kappa_\sigma(W/U, K_W + B_W + \mathbf{M}_W) = \dim V - \dim U$, and
- (2) $\kappa_\sigma(W/V, K_W + B_W + \mathbf{M}_W) = 0$.

Proof. Let $h_V : \bar{V} \rightarrow V$ be a resolution of V . By Lemmas 2.10(3) and 3.6 possibly replacing $(W, B_W, \mathbf{M})/U$ with a higher model, we may assume that the induced map $\bar{\psi} : W \rightarrow \bar{V}$ is a morphism. Since (W, B_W, \mathbf{M}) a log smooth model of (X, B, \mathbf{M}) , we have

$$K_W + B_W + \mathbf{M}_W = h^*(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X) + E$$

where $h : W \rightarrow X$ is the induced morphism, \mathbf{M} descends to W , and $E \geq 0$.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} W & \xrightarrow{h} & X \\ \bar{\psi} \downarrow & \searrow \psi & \downarrow \\ \bar{V} & \xrightarrow{h_V} & V \\ & \searrow & \downarrow \\ & & U \end{array}$$

Since $G \geq 0$ is abundant over U , by Proposition 2.17,

$$\dim V - \dim U = \kappa(X/U, G) = \kappa_\iota(X/U, G) = \kappa_\sigma(X/U, G) \geq 0.$$

Since $X \dashrightarrow V$ is the Iitaka fibration associated to G over U , there exists an ample/ U \mathbb{R} -divisor A on V and an \mathbb{R} -divisor $F \geq 0$ on W such that $h^*G = \psi^*A + F$ for some h -exceptional \mathbb{R} -divisor $F \geq 0$ on W . Then for any real number k , we have

$$K_W + B_W + \mathbf{M}_W + k\psi^*A \equiv_U (1+k)\psi^*A + E + F.$$

By Lemma 2.10(2)(3)(5), for any $k \geq 0$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa_\sigma(W/U, K_W + B_W + \mathbf{M}_W + k\psi^*A) &= \kappa_\sigma(W/U, (1+k)\psi^*A + E + F) = \kappa_\sigma(W/U, \psi^*A + E + F) \\ &= \kappa_\sigma(W/U, K_W + B_W + \mathbf{M}_W) = \kappa_\sigma(X/U, K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X) \\ &= \kappa_\sigma(X/U, G) = \kappa(X/U, G) = \dim V - \dim U \end{aligned}$$

for any non-negative real number k . In particular, we get (1). Since A is ample/ U , h_V^*A is big/ U , and we may pick a sufficiently large positive integer k such that $K_{\bar{V}} + kh_V^*A$ is big/ U .

Since (W, B_W, \mathbf{M}) is a log smooth model of (X, B, \mathbf{M}) , (W, B_W) is lc. Since \bar{V} is smooth, any very general fiber of the induced morphism $\bar{V} \rightarrow U$ is smooth. Let $D := K_W + B_W + \mathbf{M}_W - \bar{\psi}^*K_{\bar{V}}$ and $Q := K_{\bar{V}} + kh_V^*A$, then $D - (K_{W/\bar{V}} + B_W) = \mathbf{M}_W$ is nef/ U . By Lemma 8.2,

$$\begin{aligned} \dim V - \dim U &= \kappa_\sigma(W/U, K_W + B_W + \mathbf{M}_W + k\psi^*A) = \kappa_\sigma(W/U, K_W + B_W + \mathbf{M}_W + k\bar{\psi}^*h_V^*A) \\ &= \kappa_\sigma(W/U, D + \bar{\psi}^*Q) \geq \kappa_\sigma(W/\bar{V}, D) + \kappa(\bar{V}/U, Q) \\ &= \kappa_\sigma(W/\bar{V}, K_W + B_W + \mathbf{M}_W - \bar{\psi}^*K_{\bar{V}}) + \kappa(\bar{V}/U, K_{\bar{V}} + kh_V^*A) \\ &= \kappa_\sigma(W/\bar{V}, K_W + B_W + \mathbf{M}_W) + (\dim V - \dim U). \end{aligned}$$

Thus $\kappa_\sigma(W/\bar{V}, K_W + B_W + \mathbf{M}_W) \leq 0$, hence $\kappa_\sigma(W/V, K_W + B_W + \mathbf{M}_W) \leq 0$. Since $K_W + B_W + \mathbf{M}_W \equiv_U h^*G + E \geq 0$, $\kappa_\sigma(W/V, K_W + B_W + \mathbf{M}_W) \geq 0$. Thus $\kappa_\sigma(W/V, K_W + B_W + \mathbf{M}_W) = 0$, and we get (2). \square

Lemma 8.4. *Let $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ be a glc g -pair. Then there exists a proper log smooth model $(W, B_W = B_W^h + B_W^\nu, \mathbf{M})$ of (X, B, \mathbf{M}) , such that*

- (1) $B_W^h \geq 0$ and B_W^ν is reduced,
- (2) B_W^ν is vertical over U , and
- (3) for any real number $t \in (0, 1]$, all glc centers of $(W, B_W - tB_W^\nu, \mathbf{M})$ dominate U .

Proof. By Lemma 3.6, possibly replacing (X, B, \mathbf{M}) with a proper log smooth model, we may assume that $(X, \text{Supp } B)$ is log smooth and \mathbf{M} descends to X . By [Has18, Lemma 2.10], there exists a proper log smooth model $(W, B_W = B_W^h + B_W^\nu)$ of (X, B) , such that

- $B_W^h \geq 0$ and B_W^ν is reduced,
- B_W^ν is vertical over U , and

- for any real number $t \in (0, 1]$, all lc centers of $(W, B_W - tB_W^\nu)$ dominate U .

Since \mathbf{M} descends to X , (W, B_W, \mathbf{M}) is a proper log smooth model of (X, B, \mathbf{M}) , and for any real number $t \in (0, 1]$, any glc center of $(W, B_W - tB_W^\nu, \mathbf{M})$ is an lc center of $(W, B_W - tB_W^\nu)$ and dominates U . Thus $(W, B_W = B_W^h + B_W^\nu, \mathbf{M})$ satisfies our requirements. \square

Lemma 8.5. *Let $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ be a glc g -pair. Then there exists a gdlt model $(Y, B_Y = B_Y^h + B_Y^\nu, \mathbf{M})$ of (X, B, \mathbf{M}) , such that*

- (1) $B_Y^h \geq 0$ and B_Y^ν is reduced,
- (2) B_Y^ν is vertical over U , and
- (3) for any real number $t \in (0, 1]$, all glc centers of $(Y, B_Y - tB_Y^\nu, \mathbf{M})$ dominate U .

Proof. By Lemma 8.4, there exists a proper log smooth model $(W, B_W = B_W^h + B_W^\nu, \mathbf{M})$ of (X, B, \mathbf{M}) , such that

- $B_W^h \geq 0$ and B_W^ν is reduced,
- B_W^ν is vertical over U , and
- for any real number $t \in (0, 1]$, all glc centers of $(W, B_W - tB_W^\nu, \mathbf{M})$ dominate U .

By Lemma 2.32, we may run a $(K_W + B_W + \mathbf{M}_W)$ -MMP/ X with scaling of a general ample/ X divisor, which terminates with a good minimal model $(Y, B_Y, \mathbf{M})/X$ such that $K_Y + B_Y + \mathbf{M}_Y \sim_{\mathbb{R}, X} 0$. Let $\phi : W \dashrightarrow Y$ be the induced birational map over X and let $f : Y \rightarrow X$ be the induced morphism. By applying the negativity lemma twice, we have that $K_Y + B_Y + \mathbf{M}_Y = f^*(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)$. By Lemma 3.10, $(Y, B_Y, \mathbf{M})/X$ is a log minimal model of $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/X$, hence (Y, B_Y, \mathbf{M}) is a gdlt model of (X, B, \mathbf{M}) . Let $B_Y^h := \phi_* B_W^h$ and let $B_Y^\nu := \phi_* B_W^\nu$.

We show that $(Y, B_Y = B_Y^h + B_Y^\nu, \mathbf{M})/U$ satisfies our requirements. (1) and (2) clearly hold. By Lemma 2.41, we may pick $t_0 \in (0, 1]$ such that for any $t \in (0, t_0]$, ϕ is also a partial $(K_W + B_W - tB_W^\nu + \mathbf{M}_W)$ -MMP/ X . Then for any $t \in (0, t_0]$, $a(D, W, B_W - tB_W^\nu, \mathbf{M}) \leq a(D, Y, B_Y - tB_Y^\nu, \mathbf{M})$ for any prime divisor D over X . Thus for any $t \in (0, 1]$, any glc place of $(Y, B_Y - tB_Y^\nu, \mathbf{M})$ is a glc place of $(Y, B_Y - \min\{t, t_0\}B_Y^\nu, \mathbf{M})$, hence a glc place of $(W, B_W - \min\{t, t_0\}B_W^\nu, \mathbf{M})$, which dominates U by our construction, and we get (3). \square

Lemma 8.6. *Let $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ be a glc g -pair and $\pi : X \rightarrow V$ a contraction over U , such that $K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X \sim_{\mathbb{R}, V} 0$ and $\kappa_\sigma(X/U, K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X) = \dim V - \dim U$. Then there exists a gdlt model $(Y, B_Y = B_Y^h + B_Y^\nu, \mathbf{M})$ of (X, B, \mathbf{M}) , two \mathbb{R} -divisors $E_Y^h, E_Y^\nu \geq 0$ on Y , and a positive real number ϵ_0 , such that*

- (1) $B_Y^h \geq 0$ and B_Y^ν is reduced,
- (2) B_Y^ν is vertical over V ,
- (3) all glc centers of (Y, B_Y^h, \mathbf{M}) dominate V ,
- (4) $K_Y + B_Y + \mathbf{M}_Y \sim_{\mathbb{R}, U} E_Y^h + E_Y^\nu$, such that
 - (a) $E_Y^h \geq 0, E_Y^\nu \geq 0$, and $E_Y^h \wedge E_Y^\nu = 0$,
 - (b) $\text{Supp } E_Y^\nu = \text{Supp } B_Y^\nu$,
 - (c) for any $\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_0)$,
 - (i) $(Y, B_Y + \epsilon E_Y^h, \mathbf{M})$ is gdlt, and
 - (ii) for any prime divisor D over Y , and $a(D, Y, B_Y + \epsilon E_Y^h, \mathbf{M}) = 0$ if and only if $a(D, Y, B_Y, \mathbf{M}) = 0$.

Proof. By Lemma 8.5, there exists a gdlt model $(Y_1, B_{Y_1} = B_{Y_1}^h + B_{Y_1}^\nu, \mathbf{M})$ of (X, B, \mathbf{M}) , such that

- $B_{Y_1}^h \geq 0$ and $B_{Y_1}^\nu$ is reduced,
- $B_{Y_1}^\nu$ is vertical over V , and
- all glc centers of $(Y_1, B_{Y_1}^h, \mathbf{M})$ dominate V .

By Lemma 2.10(3), we may replace $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ with $(Y_1, B_{Y_1}, \mathbf{M})/U$, and assume that $B = B^h + B^\nu$, such that

- $B^h \geq 0$ and B^ν is reduced,

- B^ν is vertical over V , and
- all glc centers of (X, B^h, \mathbf{M}) dominate V .

Moreover, we may assume that (X, B, \mathbf{M}) is \mathbb{Q} -factorial gdl. Since $K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X \sim_{\mathbb{R}, V} 0$, there exists an \mathbb{R} -divisor G_V on V such that $K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X \sim_{\mathbb{R}, U} \pi^* G_V$. By Lemma 2.10(4)(5),

$$\kappa_\sigma(V/U, G_V) = \kappa_\sigma(X/U, \pi^* G_V) = \kappa_\sigma(X/U, K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X) = \dim V - \dim U,$$

hence G_V is big/ U by Lemma 2.10(1). Since B^ν is vertical over V , we may pick $0 \leq G'_V \sim_{\mathbb{R}, U} G_V$ such that $\text{Supp}(\pi^* B^\nu) \subset \text{Supp} G'_V$. Let $G := \pi^* G'_V$, then $G \geq 0$ is vertical over V , $\text{Supp} B^\nu \subset \text{Supp} G$, and $K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X \sim_{\mathbb{R}, U} G$.

Let $g : W \rightarrow X$ be a log resolution of $(X, \text{Supp}(B + G))$ such that \mathbf{M} descends to W . By Lemma 3.6, we may find a proper log smooth model (W, B_W, \mathbf{M}) of (X, B, \mathbf{M}) . We let

$$B_W^\nu := \lfloor B_W \wedge \text{Supp}(g^* B^\nu) \rfloor, \text{ and } B_W^h := B_W - B_W^\nu.$$

We may assume that $g^* G = E_W^h + E_W^\nu$, such that $E_W^h \geq 0, E_W^\nu \geq 0, E_W^h \wedge E_W^\nu = 0$, and $\text{Supp} E_W^\nu = \text{Supp} B_W^\nu$.

Since g is a log resolution of $(X, \text{Supp}(B + G))$, $(W, \text{Supp}(B_W + E_W^h))$ is log smooth. We show that E_W^h and $\lfloor B_W \rfloor$ do not have any common component. In fact, if there exists a component D of $\text{Supp} E_W^h \cap \text{Supp} \lfloor B_W \rfloor$, then since $g(D) \subset \text{Supp} g(E_W^h) \subset \text{Supp} g(g^* G) = \text{Supp} G$, D is vertical over V . Since D is a component of $\lfloor B_W \rfloor$, D is a glc place of (W, B_W, \mathbf{M}) , hence a glc place of (X, B, \mathbf{M}) by Lemma 3.7(3). Since all glc centers of (X, B^h, \mathbf{M}) dominate V , $g(D) \subset B^\nu$. Thus $D \subset \text{Supp}(g^* B^\nu)$. Since $B_W^\nu = \lfloor B_W \wedge \text{Supp}(g^* B^\nu) \rfloor$, $D \subset \text{Supp} B_W^\nu = \text{Supp} E_W^\nu$, which contradicts $E_W^h \wedge E_W^\nu = 0$.

By Lemma 2.32, we may run a $(K_W + B_W + \mathbf{M}_W)$ -MMP/ X with scaling of a general ample/ X divisor, which terminates with a good minimal model $(Y, B_Y, \mathbf{M})/X$ such that $K_Y + B_Y + \mathbf{M}_Y \sim_{\mathbb{R}, X} 0$. Let $\phi : W \dashrightarrow Y$ be the induced map and let $f : Y \rightarrow X$ be the induced morphism. By applying the negativity lemma twice, we have that $K_Y + B_Y + \mathbf{M}_Y = f^*(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)$. By Lemma 3.10, $(Y, B_Y, \mathbf{M})/X$ is a log minimal model of $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/X$, hence (Y, B_Y, \mathbf{M}) is a gdl modification of (X, B, \mathbf{M}) . Since E_W^h and $\lfloor B_W \rfloor$ do not have common components, by Lemma 2.41, there exists a positive real number ϵ_0 , such that for any $\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_0]$,

- $(W, B_W + \epsilon E_W^h, \mathbf{M})$ is gdl, and
- ϕ is also a $(K_W + B_W + \epsilon E_W^h + \mathbf{M}_W)$ -MMP/ X .

Let $B_Y^h := \phi_* B_W^h$, $B_Y^\nu := \phi_* B_W^\nu$, $E_Y^h := \phi_* E_W^h$, and $E_Y^\nu := \phi_* E_W^\nu$. We show that $(Y, B_Y = B_Y^h + B_Y^\nu, \mathbf{M})/U$, E_Y^h, E_Y^ν , and ϵ_0 satisfy our requirements. (1) follows from our construction immediately.

Since $\text{Supp}(g_* B_W^\nu) \subset \text{Supp} B^\nu$ is vertical over V , B_W^ν is vertical over V . Thus B_Y^ν is vertical over V , hence (2).

For any glc place F of (Y, B_Y^h, \mathbf{M}) , F is a glc place of (Y, B_Y, \mathbf{M}) such that $\text{center}_Y F$ is not contained in B_Y^ν . Thus F is a glc place of (X, B, \mathbf{M}) and $\text{center}_X F$ is not contained in B^ν . Thus F is a glc place of (X, B^h, \mathbf{M}) , hence F dominates V . Thus all glc centers of (Y, B_Y^h, \mathbf{M}) dominate V , hence (3).

Since $K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X \sim_{\mathbb{R}, U} G$ and $g^* G = E_W^h + E_W^\nu$, we have $K_Y + B_Y + \mathbf{M}_Y \sim_{\mathbb{R}, U} E_Y^h + E_Y^\nu$. Since $E_W^h \geq 0, E_W^\nu \geq 0$, and $E_W^h \wedge E_W^\nu = 0$, we have (4.a). Since $\text{Supp} E_W^\nu = \text{Supp} B_W^\nu$, we have (4.b). Since ϕ is also a $(K_W + B_W + \epsilon_0 E_W^h + \mathbf{M}_W)$ -MMP/ X and $(W, B_W + \epsilon_0 E_W^h, \mathbf{M})$ is gdl, $(Y, B_Y + \epsilon_0 E_Y^h, \mathbf{M})$ is gdl, and we have (4.c). \square

8.2. Proof of Theorem 1.1. Now we are ready to prove our main theorem.

Theorem 8.7 (=Theorem 1.1). *Let $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ be an NQC glc g -pair, $U^0 \subset U$ a non-empty open subset, $X^0 := X \times_U U^0$, $B^0 := B \times_U U^0$, and $\mathbf{M}^0 := \mathbf{M} \times_U U^0$. Assume that*

- (1) *the morphism $X \rightarrow U$ is a projective morphism between normal quasi-projective varieties,*
- (2) *$(X^0, B^0, \mathbf{M}^0)/U^0$ has a good minimal model,*
- (3) *all glc centers of (X, B, \mathbf{M}) intersect X^0 , and*

(4) \mathbf{M}^0 descends to X^0 and $\mathbf{M}_{X^0}^0 \sim_{\mathbb{R}, U^0} 0$.

Then $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ has a good minimal model.

Proof. We prove Theorem 8.7 in several steps. We sketch the proof here.

From Step 1 to Step 3, we show that we may additionally assume that (X, B, \mathbf{M}) satisfies certain properties, and construct auxiliary varieties and divisors. More precisely, in Step 1, we introduce an auxiliary variety V equipped with a morphism $\pi : X \rightarrow V$ over U , and add assumptions (5)-(7). In Step 2, we introduce auxiliary \mathbb{R} -divisors B^h, B^ν, E^h, E^ν and a real number $\epsilon_0 \in (0, 1)$, and additionally add assumptions (8)-(11). In Step 3, we introduce an auxiliary real number $t_0 \in (0, 1)$, add assumptions (12)-(14) while losing the morphism $X \rightarrow V$ and the assumptions (6)(9)(10), and we also modify assumption (11.c). In Step 4, we construct some partial MMPs over U with induced birational maps $\phi_i : X \dashrightarrow \bar{X}_i$ satisfying properties (I)-(IX). In Step 5, we show that possibly passing to a subsequence, $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ has a good minimal model if $(Z, B_Z, \mathbf{M})/U := (\bar{X}_1, \bar{B}_1, \mathbf{M})/U$ has a good minimal model. Finally, in Step 6, we construct a good minimal model for $(Z, B_Z, \mathbf{M})/U$, and conclude our proof.

Step 1. We show that we may additionally assume that

- (5) (X, B, \mathbf{M}) is \mathbb{Q} -factorial gdlt,
- (6) there exists a contraction $\pi : X \rightarrow V$ over U , such that $K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X \sim_{\mathbb{R}, V} 0$, and
- (7) $\kappa_\sigma(X/U, K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X) = \dim V - \dim U$.

By Lemmas 3.13 and 2.22, possibly replacing (X, B, \mathbf{M}) with a \mathbb{Q} -factorial gdlt model, we may assume that (X, B, \mathbf{M}) is \mathbb{Q} -factorial gdlt. Since $(X^0, B^0, \mathbf{M}^0)/U^0$ has a good minimal model, we have $K_{X^0} + B^0 + \mathbf{M}_{X^0}^0 \sim_{\mathbb{R}, U^0} E^0$ for some \mathbb{R} -divisor $E^0 \geq 0$ such that E^0 is abundant over U^0 . By Lemma 2.3, $K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X \sim_{\mathbb{R}, U} E^1$ for some \mathbb{R} -divisor $E^1 \geq 0$ on X such that $E^1|_{X_\eta} = E^0|_{X_\eta}$, where X_η is the generic fiber of $X \rightarrow U$. In particular, E^1 is abundant over U . Let $\varphi : X \dashrightarrow V^1$ be the Iitaka fibration over U associated to E^1 , and let $h : W \rightarrow X$ be a log resolution of $(X, \text{Supp } B)$, such that \mathbf{M} descends to W and the induced birational map $\varphi_W : W \rightarrow V^1$ is a morphism. By Lemma 3.6, there exists a proper log smooth model (W, B_W, \mathbf{M}) of (X, B, \mathbf{M}) .

By Lemma 8.3, we have $\kappa_\sigma(W/U, K_W + B_W + \mathbf{M}_W) = \dim V^1 - \dim U$ and $\kappa_\sigma(W/V^1, K_W + B_W + \mathbf{M}_W) = 0$. By Lemma 2.22, \mathbf{M}^0 descends to $W^0 := W \times_U U^0$ and $\mathbf{M}_{W^0}^0 \sim_{\mathbb{R}, U^0} 0$. By Theorem 3.14, $(W^0, B_W^0 := B_W \times_U U^0, \mathbf{M}^0)$ has a good minimal model, and $(W, B_W, \mathbf{M})/U$ has a good minimal model if and only if $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ has a good minimal model. By Lemma 3.7(3), all glc centers of (W, B_W, \mathbf{M}) intersect W^0 . Therefore, by Theorem 4.1, there exists a birational map $X' \dashrightarrow W$, a \mathbb{Q} -factorial NQC gdlt g-pair $(X', B', \mathbf{M})/U$, a contraction $\pi : X' \rightarrow V$ over U , and a birational projective morphism $V \rightarrow V^1$ over U satisfying the following:

- $K_{X'} + B' + \mathbf{M}_{X'} \sim_{\mathbb{R}, V} 0$.
- $\kappa_\sigma(X'/U, K_{X'} + B' + \mathbf{M}_{X'}) = \kappa_\sigma(W/U, K_W + B_W + \mathbf{M}_W) = \dim(V^1/U) = \dim(V/U)$.
- $(X'^0 := X' \times_U U^0, B'^0 := B' \times_U U^0, \mathbf{M}^0)/U^0$ has a good minimal model,
- all glc centers of (X', B', \mathbf{M}) intersect X'^0 , and
- $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ has a good minimal model if and only if $(X', B', \mathbf{M})/U$ has a good minimal model.

Since \mathbf{M}^0 descends to X^0 and $\mathbf{M}_{X^0}^0 \sim_{\mathbb{R}, U^0} 0$, by Lemma 2.22,

- \mathbf{M}^0 descends to X'^0 and $\mathbf{M}_{X'^0}^0 \sim_{\mathbb{R}, U^0} 0$.

Thus we may replace $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ with $(X', B', \mathbf{M})/U$ and let $\pi : X \rightarrow V$ be the contraction $X' \rightarrow V$, and (5)-(7) follow from our construction.

Step 2. We show that we may additionally assume that there exist \mathbb{R} -divisors B^h, B^ν, E^h, E^ν on X and a positive real number $\epsilon_0 \in (0, 1)$, such that

- (8) $B = B^h + B^\nu$, $B^h \geq 0$, and B^ν is reduced,
- (9) B^ν is vertical over V ,

- (10) all glc centers of (X, B^h, \mathbf{M}) dominate V ,
- (11) $K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X \sim_{\mathbb{R}, U} E^h + E^\nu$, such that
- (a) $E^h \geq 0, E^\nu \geq 0$, and $E^h \wedge E^\nu = 0$,
 - (b) $\text{Supp } E^\nu = \text{Supp } B^\nu$,
 - (c) for any $\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_0)$,
 - (i) $(X, B + \epsilon E^h, \mathbf{M})$ is gdlt, and
 - (ii) for any prime divisor D over X such that $a(D, X, B + \epsilon E^h, \mathbf{M}) = 0$, the image of D on U intersects U^0 .

By Lemma 8.6, there exists a gdlt model $(Y, B_Y = B_Y^h + B_Y^\nu, \mathbf{M})/U$ of $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$, two \mathbb{R} -divisors $E_Y^h, E_Y^\nu \geq 0$ on Y , and a positive real number $\epsilon_0 \in (0, 1)$, such that

- $B_Y^h \geq 0$ and B_Y^ν is reduced,
- B_Y^ν is vertical over V ,
- all glc centers of (Y, B_Y^h, \mathbf{M}) dominate V ,
- $K_Y + B_Y + \mathbf{M}_Y \sim_{\mathbb{R}, U} E_Y^h + E_Y^\nu$, such that
 - $E_Y^h \geq 0, E_Y^\nu \geq 0$, and $E_Y^h \wedge E_Y^\nu = 0$,
 - $\text{Supp } E_Y^\nu = \text{Supp } B_Y^\nu$,
 - for any $\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_0)$,
 - * $(Y, B_Y + \epsilon E_Y^h, \mathbf{M})$ is gdlt, and
 - * for any prime divisor D over Y , and $a(D, Y, B_Y + \epsilon E_Y^h, \mathbf{M}) = 0$ if and only if $a(D, Y, B_Y, \mathbf{M}) = 0$.

By Lemma 3.13, $(Y^0 := Y \times_U U^0, B_Y^0 := B_Y \times_U U^0, \mathbf{M}^0)/U^0$ has a good minimal model. Since (Y, B_Y, \mathbf{M}) is a gdlt model of (X, B, \mathbf{M}) ,

- all glc centers of (Y, B_Y, \mathbf{M}) intersect Y^0 ,
- \mathbf{M}^0 descends to Y^0 over U^0 and $\mathbf{M}_{Y^0}^0 \sim_{\mathbb{R}, U^0} 0$, and
- (Y, B_Y, \mathbf{M}) is \mathbb{Q} -factorial gdlt and $K_Y + B_Y + \mathbf{M}_Y \sim_{\mathbb{R}, V} 0$ by (5).

By Lemma 3.13, $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ has a good minimal model if and only if $(Y, B_Y, \mathbf{M})/U$ has a good minimal model. By Lemma 2.10(3), $\kappa_\sigma(Y/U, K_Y + B_Y + \mathbf{M}_Y) = \kappa(X/U, K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X) = \dim V - \dim U$. Thus we may replace $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ with $(Y, B_Y, \mathbf{M})/U$, and let $B^h := B_Y^h, B^\nu := B_Y^\nu, E^h := E_Y^h$, and $E^\nu := E_Y^\nu$. (1)-(11.c.i) are immediately satisfied by our construction. For any $\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_0)$ and any prime divisor D over X such that $a(D, B + \epsilon E^h, \mathbf{M}) = 0$, by our construction, $a(D, B, X, \mathbf{M}) = 0$. By (3), the image of D on U intersects U^0 , and we get (11.c.ii).

Step 3. We show that we may additionally assume that there exists a positive real number $t_0 \in (0, 1)$, such that

- (12) $(X^0, B^0, \mathbf{M}^0)/U^0$ is a good minimal model of itself and $K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X$ is a limit of movable/ U \mathbb{R} -divisors,
- (13) $B^\nu \geq t_0 E^\nu$,
- (14) for any $t \in (0, t_0)$,
- (a) $\kappa_\sigma(X/U, K_X + B - tE^\nu + \mathbf{M}_X) = \dim V - \dim U$,
 - (b) $(X, B - tE^\nu, \mathbf{M})/U$ has a good minimal model, and
 - (c) for any good minimal model $(\bar{X}, \bar{B} - t\bar{E}^\nu, \mathbf{M})/U$ of $(X, B - tE^\nu, \mathbf{M})/U$ with contraction $\bar{X} \rightarrow \bar{V}$ induced by $K_{\bar{X}} + \bar{B} - t\bar{E}^\nu + \mathbf{M}_{\bar{X}}$ over U , all glc centers of $(\bar{X}, \bar{B} - t\bar{E}^\nu, \mathbf{M})$ dominate \bar{V} ,
- and
- (6') we may lose assumption (6),
 - (9') we may lose assumption (9),
 - (10') we may lose assumption (10), and
 - (11.c') we may lose assumption (11.c), but for any $t \in (0, t_0)$,
 - (i) $(X, B + tE^h, \mathbf{M})$ is gdlt, and

- (ii) for any prime divisor D over X such that $a(D, X, B + tE^h, \mathbf{M}) = 0$, the image of D on U intersects U^0 .

By (5), (X, B, \mathbf{M}) is \mathbb{Q} -factorial gdl, so we may run a $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)$ -MMP/ U with scaling of a general ample/ U divisor A on X , and let

$$(X, B, \mathbf{M}) := (X_1, B_1, \mathbf{M}) \dashrightarrow (X_2, B_2, \mathbf{M}) \dashrightarrow \cdots \dashrightarrow (X_i, B_i, \mathbf{M}) \dashrightarrow$$

be this MMP. By (3), $(X^0, B^0, \mathbf{M}^0)/U^0$ has a good minimal model. By Lemmas 2.39 and 2.37, there exists a positive integer n such that $(X_n^0 := X_n \times_U U^0, B_n^0 := B^n \times_U U^0, \mathbf{M}^0)/U^0$ is a log minimal model of $(X^0, B^0, \mathbf{M}^0)/U^0$ and $K_{X_n} + B_n + \mathbf{M}_{X_n}$ is a limit of movable/ U \mathbb{R} -divisors. By Lemmas 3.9(2), $(X_n^0, B_n^0, \mathbf{M}^0)/U^0$ is a good minimal model of $(X^0, B^0, \mathbf{M}^0)/U^0$.

By (11.b) and (11.c.i), $\text{Supp } E^\nu = \text{Supp } B^\nu$ and $(X, B + tE^h, \mathbf{M})$ is gdl for any $t \in (0, \epsilon_0)$. By Lemma 2.41, there exists a positive real number $t_0 \in (0, \epsilon_0)$, such that

- $B^\nu \geq t_0 E^\nu$, and
- for any real number $t \in (0, t_0)$, the induced birational map $X \dashrightarrow X_n$ is also a partial $(K_X + B + tE^h + \mathbf{M}_X)$ -MMP/ U and a partial $(K_X + B - tE^\nu + \mathbf{M}_X)$ -MMP/ U .

Claim 8.8. For any $t \in (0, t_0)$,

- 1) $\kappa_\sigma(X/U, K_X + B - tE^\nu + \mathbf{M}_X) = \dim V - \dim U$,
- 2) $\kappa_\sigma(X/V, K_X + B - tE^\nu + \mathbf{M}_X) = 0$, and
- 3) all glc centers of $(X, B - tE^\nu, \mathbf{M})$ dominate V .

Proof. 1) follows from (7)(11) and Lemma 2.11.

By (9) and (11.b), $\text{Supp } E^\nu = \text{Supp } B^\nu$ and B^ν is vertical over V , hence E^ν is vertical over V . By (6), for any real number $t \in (0, t_0)$,

$$\kappa_\sigma(X/V, K_X + B - tE^\nu + \mathbf{M}_X) = \kappa_\sigma(X/V, K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X) = 0,$$

hence 2).

Since $\text{Supp } E^\nu = \text{Supp } B^\nu$, for any real number $t \in (0, t_0)$, there exists a real number $\lambda_t \in (0, 1)$ such that $\lambda_t B^h + (1 - \lambda_t)B \geq B - tE^\nu \geq B^h$. By (10), all glc centers of (X, B^h, \mathbf{M}) dominate V , hence all glc centers of $(X, B - tE^\nu, \mathbf{M})$ dominate V for any $t \in (0, t_0)$, which implies 3). \square

Proof of Theorem 8.7 continued. By Lemma 2.10(6) and Claim 8.8 1), for any $t \in (0, t_0)$,

$$\kappa_\sigma(X_n/U, K_{X_n} + B_n - tE_n^\nu + \mathbf{M}_{X_n}) = \kappa_\sigma(X/U, K_X + B - tE^\nu + \mathbf{M}_X) = \dim V - \dim U.$$

By Claim 8.8 and Proposition 5.3, for any $t \in (0, t_0)$,

- $(X, B - tE^\nu, \mathbf{M})/U$ has a good minimal model, and
- for any good minimal model $(\bar{X}, \bar{B} - t\bar{E}^\nu, \mathbf{M})/U$ of $(X, B - tE^\nu, \mathbf{M})/U$, let $\bar{X} \rightarrow \bar{V}$ be the contraction over U induced by $K_{\bar{X}} + \bar{B} - t\bar{E}^\nu + \mathbf{M}_{\bar{X}}$. Then all glc centers of $(\bar{X}, \bar{B} - t\bar{E}^\nu, \mathbf{M})$ dominate \bar{V} .

Since $X \dashrightarrow X_n$ is a partial $(K_X + B - tE^\nu + \mathbf{M}_X)$ -MMP/ U for any $t \in (0, t_0)$, by Lemma 3.12 and Corollary 3.20,

- $(X_n, B_n - tE_n^\nu, \mathbf{M})/U$ has a good minimal model, and
- for any good minimal model $(\bar{X}, \bar{B} - t\bar{E}^\nu, \mathbf{M})/U$ of $(X_n, B_n - tE_n^\nu, \mathbf{M})/U$, $(\bar{X}, \bar{B} - t\bar{E}^\nu, \mathbf{M})/U$ is a good minimal model $(X, B - tE^\nu, \mathbf{M})/U$. Therefore, if we let $\bar{X} \rightarrow \bar{V}$ be the contraction over U induced by $K_{\bar{X}} + \bar{B} - t\bar{E}^\nu + \mathbf{M}_{\bar{X}}$, then all glc centers of $(\bar{X}, \bar{B} - t\bar{E}^\nu, \mathbf{M})$ dominate \bar{V} .

We let B_n^ν, B_n^h, E_n^ν and E_n^h be the strict transforms of B^ν, B^h, E^ν and E^h on X_n respectively. We show that we may replace $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U, B^\nu, B^h, E^\nu, E^h$ with $(X_n, B_n, \mathbf{M})/U, B_n^\nu, B_n^h, E_n^\nu, E_n^h$ respectively. (1)(5)(8)(11.a)(11.b)(12)(13)(14) follow immediately from our construction. (2) follows from (12). (4) follows from Lemma 2.22. (7) follows from Lemma 2.10(6). Since $X \dashrightarrow X_n$ is a $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)$ -MMP/ U , for any glc place D of (X_n, B_n, \mathbf{M}) , D is a glc place of (X, B, \mathbf{M}) , hence the image of D on U intersects U^0 , and hence the image of D on X_n intersects X_n^0 . This implies (3).

For any $t \in (0, t_0)$, since $t_0 < \epsilon_0$, by (11.c.i), $(X, B + tE^h, \mathbf{M})$ is gdl. By our construction, $X \dashrightarrow X_n$ is also a $(K_X + B + tE^h + \mathbf{M}_X)$ -MMP/ U , so $(X_n, B_n + tE_n^h, \mathbf{M})$ is gdl, and we get (11'.c.i). For any $t \in (0, t_0)$ and any prime divisor D over X_n such that $a(D, X_n, B_n + tE_n^h, \mathbf{M}) = 0$, since $X \dashrightarrow X_n$ is a $(K_X + B + tE^h + \mathbf{M}_X)$ -MMP/ U , $a(D, X, B + tE^h, \mathbf{M}) = 0$, so the image of D on U intersects U^0 by (11.c.ii), and we get (11'.c.ii).

By Corollary 3.12, $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ has a good minimal model if and only if $(X_n, B_n, \mathbf{M})/U$ has a good minimal model. Thus we may replace $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U, B^\nu, B^h, E^\nu, E^h$ with $(X_n, B_n, \mathbf{M})/U, B_n^\nu, B_n^h, E_n^\nu, E_n^h$ respectively, and assume that $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U, B^\nu, B^h, E^\nu, E^h$ satisfy (1)-(5), (7)-(8), (11.a)-(11.b), (12)-(14), and (11'.c). Note that although (6) no longer holds, we still have a rational map $X \dashrightarrow V$.

Step 4. In this step, we construct

- two sequences of strictly decreasing positive real numbers $\{s_i\}_{i=1}^{+\infty}, \{t_i\}_{i=1}^{+\infty}$, and
- for every positive integer i , a birational map $\phi_i : X \dashrightarrow \bar{X}_i$ over U ,

satisfying the following:

- (I) $\lim_{i \rightarrow +\infty} t_i = 0$, $t_1 < \frac{1}{2}t_0 < \frac{1}{2}$, and $s_i < t_i$ for each i .
- (II) For each i , ϕ_i is a $(K_X + B - t_i E^\nu + \mathbf{M}_X)$ -MMP/ U and $(\bar{X}_i, \bar{B}_i - t_i \bar{E}_i^\nu, \mathbf{M})/U$ is a good minimal model of $(X, B - t_i E^\nu, \mathbf{M})/U$, where \bar{B}_i and \bar{E}_i^ν are the strict transforms of B and E^ν on \bar{X}_i respectively.
- (III) For each i , $K_{\bar{X}_i} + \bar{B}_i - t \bar{E}_i^\nu + \mathbf{M}_{\bar{X}_i}$ is semi-ample/ U for any $t \in [s_i, t_i]$.
- (IV) For each i , $(\bar{X}_i, \bar{B}_i, \mathbf{M})$ is \mathbb{Q} -factorial gdl.
- (V) For each i , $(\bar{X}_i, \bar{B}_i - t \bar{E}_i^\nu, \mathbf{M})/U$ has a good minimal model for any $t \in (0, t_i]$.
- (VI) Possibly passing to a subsequence, for any i, j , \bar{X}_i and \bar{X}_j are isomorphic in codimension 1.
- (VII) For each i , $(\bar{X}_i^0 := \bar{X}_i \times_U U^0, \bar{B}_i^0 := \bar{B}_i \times_U U^0, \mathbf{M}^0)/U^0$ is a good minimal model of itself.
- (VIII) For each i , all glc centers of $(\bar{X}_i, \bar{B}_i, \mathbf{M})$ intersect \bar{X}_i^0 .
- (IX) For each i , \mathbf{M}^0 descends to \bar{X}_i^0 and $\mathbf{M}_{\bar{X}_i^0}^0 \sim_{\mathbb{R}, U^0} 0$.

By (12), $(X^0, B^0, \mathbf{M}^0)/U^0$ is a good minimal model of itself. By Lemma 2.44, there exists a positive real number $t'_0 \in (0, \frac{1}{2}t_0)$, such that for any $t \in (0, t'_0)$, and any partial $(K_X + B - tE^\nu + \mathbf{M}_X)$ -MMP/ U $X \dashrightarrow \bar{X}$, $(\bar{X} \times_U U^0, \bar{B} \times_U U^0, \mathbf{M}^0)/U^0$ is a good minimal model of itself, where \bar{B} is the strict transform of B on \bar{X} .

Let $\{s_i\}_{i=1}^{+\infty}$ be a strictly decreasing sequence of positive real numbers such that $\lim_{i \rightarrow +\infty} s_i = 0$ and $s_1 < t'_0$. By (14.b), $(X, B - s_i E^\nu, \mathbf{M})/U$ has a good minimal model for each i . By Theorem 2.36 and Lemma 3.9(2), we may run a $(K_X + B - s_i E^\nu + \mathbf{M}_X)$ -MMP/ U with scaling of a general ample/ U divisor A , which terminates with a good minimal model $(\hat{X}_i, \hat{B}_i - s_i \hat{E}_i^\nu, \mathbf{M})/U$ of $(X, B - s_i E^\nu, \mathbf{M})/U$, where \hat{B}_i and \hat{E}_i^ν are the strict transforms of B and E^ν on \hat{X}_i respectively.

Let $\psi_i : X \dashrightarrow \hat{X}_i$ be the induced birational map for each i , and let $s_0 := t'_0$. By Lemmas 2.41 and 2.42, for each i , there exists a real number $t_i \in (s_i, s_{i-1})$, such that

- ψ_i is also a partial $(K_X + B - t_i E^\nu + \mathbf{M}_X)$ -MMP/ U , and
- any partial $(K_{\hat{X}_i} + B_{\hat{X}_i} - t_i \hat{E}_i^\nu + \mathbf{M}_{\hat{X}_i})$ -MMP/ U is $(K_{\hat{X}_i} + B_{\hat{X}_i} - s_i \hat{E}_i^\nu + \mathbf{M}_{\hat{X}_i})$ -trivial.

By (14.b) and Corollary 3.20, $(\hat{X}_i, \hat{B}_i - t_i \hat{E}_i^\nu, \mathbf{M})/U$ has a good minimal model over U . By Theorem 2.36 and Lemma 3.9(2), we may run a $(K_{\hat{X}_i} + \hat{B}_i - t_i \hat{E}_i^\nu + \mathbf{M}_{\hat{X}_i})$ -MMP/ U with scaling of a general ample/ U divisor A_i on \hat{X}_i , which terminates with a good minimal model $(\bar{X}_i, \bar{B}_i - t_i \bar{E}_i^\nu, \mathbf{M})/U$ of $(\hat{X}_i, \hat{B}_i - t_i \hat{E}_i^\nu, \mathbf{M})/U$, where \bar{B}_i and \bar{E}_i^ν are the strict transforms of \hat{B}_i and \hat{E}_i^ν on \bar{X}_i respectively. For each i , we let $\varphi_i : \hat{X}_i \dashrightarrow \bar{X}_i$ and $\phi_i := \varphi_i \circ \psi_i$ be the induced birational maps over U .

In the following, we show that $\{s_i\}_{i=1}^{+\infty}, \{t_i\}_{i=1}^{+\infty}$ and $\phi_i : X \dashrightarrow \bar{X}_i$ satisfy our requirements.

(I)(VII) follows immediately from our construction, and (IX) follows from Lemma 2.22.

Since ψ_i is a partial $(K_X + B - t_i E^\nu + \mathbf{M}_X)$ -MMP/ U and φ_i is a $(K_{\widehat{X}_i} + \widehat{B}_i - t_i \widehat{E}_i^\nu + \mathbf{M}_{\widehat{X}_i})$ -MMP/ U which terminates with a good minimal model $(\bar{X}_i, \bar{B}_i - t_i \bar{E}_i^\nu, \mathbf{M})/U$ of $(\widehat{X}_i, \widehat{B}_i - t_i \widehat{E}_i^\nu, \mathbf{M})/U$, $(\bar{X}_i, \bar{B}_i - t_i \bar{E}_i^\nu, \mathbf{M})/U$ is a good minimal model of $(X, B - t_i E^\nu, \mathbf{M})/U$ by Lemma 3.12, and we have (II).

By our construction, φ_i is $(K_{\widehat{X}_i} + B_{\widehat{X}_i} - s_i \widehat{E}_i^\nu + \mathbf{M}_{\widehat{X}_i})$ -trivial, so $K_{\bar{X}_i} + \bar{B}_i - s_i \bar{E}_i^\nu + \mathbf{M}_{\bar{X}_i}$ is semi-ample/ U . By (II), $(\bar{X}_i, \bar{B}_i - t_i \bar{E}_i^\nu, \mathbf{M})/U$ is a good minimal model of $(X, B - t_i E^\nu, \mathbf{M})/U$, so $K_{\bar{X}_i} + \bar{B}_i - t_i \bar{E}_i^\nu + \mathbf{M}_{\bar{X}_i}$ is semi-ample/ U . Thus $K_{\bar{X}_i} + \bar{B}_i - t \bar{E}_i^\nu + \mathbf{M}_{\bar{X}_i}$ is semi-ample/ U for any $t \in [s_i, t_i]$, and we have (III).

For each i , Let \bar{E}_i^h be the strict transform of E^h on \bar{X}_i . By (11), $K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X \sim_{\mathbb{R}, U} E^h + E^\nu$, so

$$K_X + B - t_i E^\nu + \mathbf{M}_X \sim_{\mathbb{R}, U} (1 - t_i)(K_X + B + \frac{t_i}{1 - t_i} E^h + \mathbf{M}_X)$$

for each i . By (I), for each i , $\frac{t_i}{1 - t_i} < 2t_i \leq 2t_1 < t_0$, so by (5) and (11.c'.i), $(X, B + \frac{t_i}{1 - t_i} E^h, \mathbf{M})$ is \mathbb{Q} -factorial gdl. By (II), for each i , ϕ_i is a $(K_X + B - t_i E^\nu + \mathbf{M}_X)$ -MMP/ U , so ϕ_i is a $(K_X + B + \frac{t_i}{1 - t_i} E^h + \mathbf{M}_X)$ -MMP/ U . Thus $(\bar{X}_i, \bar{B}_i + \frac{t_i}{1 - t_i} \bar{E}_i^h, \mathbf{M})$ is \mathbb{Q} -factorial gdl, hence $(\bar{X}_i, \bar{B}_i, \mathbf{M})$ is \mathbb{Q} -factorial gdl, which is (IV). Moreover, for any glc place D of $(\bar{X}_i, \bar{B}_i, \mathbf{M})$, since $a(D, \bar{X}_i, \bar{B}_i, \mathbf{M}) = 0$, $a(D, \bar{X}_i, \bar{B}_i + \frac{t_i}{1 - t_i} \bar{E}_i^h, \mathbf{M}) = 0$, hence $a(D, X, B + \frac{t_i}{1 - t_i} E^h, \mathbf{M}) = 0$. By (I) and (11.c'.ii), the image of D on U intersects U^0 , hence the image of D on \bar{X}_i intersects \bar{X}_i^0 . This implies (VIII).

Since $K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X \sim_{\mathbb{R}, U} E^h + E^\nu$, ϕ_i only contracts components of $\text{Supp}(E^h + E^\nu)$. Thus possibly passing to a subsequence, we may assume that ϕ_i contracts the same components of $\text{Supp}(E^h + E^\nu)$ for all i , and we have (VI).

We are left to prove (V). By (II), $K_{\bar{X}_i} + \bar{B}_i - t_i \bar{E}_i^\nu + \mathbf{M}_{\bar{X}_i}$ is semi-ample/ U , so we may let $\pi_i : \bar{X}_i \rightarrow \bar{V}_i$ be the contraction induced by $K_{\bar{X}_i} + \bar{B}_i - t_i \bar{E}_i^\nu + \mathbf{M}_{\bar{X}_i}$ over U . By (14.c), all glc centers of $(\bar{X}_i, \bar{B}_i - t_i \bar{E}_i^\nu, \mathbf{M})$ dominate \bar{V}_i . By (IV), $(\bar{X}_i, \bar{B}_i, \mathbf{M})$ is \mathbb{Q} -factorial gdl, so for any $t \in (0, t_i]$, all glc centers of $(\bar{X}_i, \bar{B}_i - t \bar{E}_i^\nu, \mathbf{M})$ dominate \bar{V}_i .

By (II), (11), (14.a), Lemma 2.10(2), and Lemma 2.11,

$$\begin{aligned} \dim V - \dim U &= \kappa_\sigma(X/U, K_X + B - t_i E^\nu + \mathbf{M}_X) = \kappa_\sigma(\bar{X}_i/U, K_{\bar{X}_i} + \bar{B}_i - t_i \bar{E}_i^\nu + \mathbf{M}_{\bar{X}_i}) \\ &= \kappa_\sigma(\bar{X}_i/U, K_{\bar{X}_i} + \bar{B}_i - t \bar{E}_i^\nu + \mathbf{M}_{\bar{X}_i}) \end{aligned}$$

for any $t \in (0, t_i]$. Since $\bar{X}_i \rightarrow \bar{V}_i$ is the contraction induced by $K_{\bar{X}_i} + \bar{B}_i - t_i \bar{E}_i^\nu + \mathbf{M}_{\bar{X}_i}$ over U , by (11) and Lemma 2.11,

$$0 = \kappa_\sigma(\bar{X}_i/\bar{V}_i, K_{\bar{X}_i} + \bar{B}_i - t_i \bar{E}_i^\nu + \mathbf{M}_{\bar{X}_i}) = \kappa_\sigma(\bar{X}_i/\bar{V}_i, K_{\bar{X}_i} + \bar{B}_i - t \bar{E}_i^\nu + \mathbf{M}_{\bar{X}_i})$$

for any $t \in (0, t_i]$. (V) follows from (VIII)(IX) and Proposition 5.3.

Step 5. By (VI), possibly passing to a subsequence, we may assume that \bar{X}_i and \bar{X}_j are isomorphic in codimension 1 for any i, j . We let $Z := \bar{X}_1, B_Z := \bar{B}_1$ and $E_Z^\nu := \bar{E}_1^\nu$. In this step, we prove the following claim:

Claim 8.9. *Assume that $(Z, B_Z, \mathbf{M})/U$ has a good minimal model. Then $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ has a good minimal model.*

Proof. Assume that $(Z, B_Z, \mathbf{M})/U$ has a good minimal model. By (IV), Theorem 2.36 and Lemma 3.9(2), we may run a $(K_Z + B_Z + \mathbf{M}_Z)$ -MMP/ U which terminates with a good minimal model $(\widehat{Z}, B_{\widehat{Z}}, \mathbf{M})/U$ of $(Z, B_Z, \mathbf{M})/U$. Let $\psi_Z : Z \dashrightarrow \widehat{Z}$ be the induced birational map over U and let $E_{\widehat{Z}}^\nu$ be the strict transform of E_Z^ν on \widehat{Z} . By Lemmas 2.41 and 2.42, there exists a real number $t'_1 \in (0, t_1)$, such that

- ψ_Z is also a partial $(K_Z + B_Z - t'_1 E_Z^\nu + \mathbf{M}_Z)$ -MMP/ U , and
- any partial $(K_{\widehat{Z}} + B_{\widehat{Z}} - t'_1 E_{\widehat{Z}}^\nu + \mathbf{M}_{\widehat{Z}})$ -MMP/ U is $(K_{\widehat{Z}} + B_{\widehat{Z}} + \mathbf{M}_{\widehat{Z}})$ -trivial.

By (V) and Corollary 3.20, $(\widehat{Z}, B_{\widehat{Z}} - t'_1 E_{\widehat{Z}}^\nu, \mathbf{M})/U$ has a good minimal model. By Theorem 2.36 and Lemma 3.9(2), we may run a $(K_{\widehat{Z}} + B_{\widehat{Z}} - t'_1 E_{\widehat{Z}}^\nu + \mathbf{M}_{\widehat{Z}})$ -MMP/ U , which terminates with a good minimal model $(\bar{Z}, B_{\bar{Z}} - t'_1 E_{\bar{Z}}^\nu, \mathbf{M})/U$ of $(\widehat{Z}, B_{\widehat{Z}} - t'_1 E_{\widehat{Z}}^\nu, \mathbf{M})/U$, where $B_{\bar{Z}}$ and $E_{\bar{Z}}^\nu$ are the strict transforms of $B_{\widehat{Z}}$ and $E_{\widehat{Z}}^\nu$ on \bar{Z} respectively. We let $\varphi_Z : \widehat{Z} \dashrightarrow \bar{Z}$ be the induced birational map. Since φ_Z is $(K_{\widehat{Z}} + B_{\widehat{Z}} + \mathbf{M}_{\widehat{Z}})$ -trivial, $(K_{\bar{Z}} + B_{\bar{Z}} + \mathbf{M}_{\bar{Z}})$ is semi-ample/ U , hence $K_{\bar{Z}} + B_{\bar{Z}} - t E_{\bar{Z}}^\nu + \mathbf{M}_{\bar{Z}}$ is semi-ample/ U for any $t \in [0, t'_1]$.

By (12), $K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X$ is a limit of movable/ U \mathbb{R} -divisors, hence $K_Z + B_Z + \mathbf{M}_Z$ is a limit of movable/ U \mathbb{R} -divisors. By (III), $K_Z + B_Z - t_1 E_Z^\nu + \mathbf{M}_Z$ is semi-ample/ U , hence for any $t \in [0, t_1]$,

$$K_Z + B_Z - t E_Z^\nu + \mathbf{M}_Z = \frac{t}{t_1}(K_Z + B_Z - t_1 E_Z^\nu + \mathbf{M}_Z) + (1 - \frac{t}{t_1})(K_Z + B_Z + \mathbf{M}_Z)$$

is a limit of movable/ U \mathbb{R} -divisors. Since φ_Z is a $(K_{\widehat{Z}} + B_{\widehat{Z}} - t'_1 E_{\widehat{Z}}^\nu + \mathbf{M}_{\widehat{Z}})$ -MMP/ U and ψ_Z is a partial $(K_Z + B_Z - t'_1 E_Z^\nu + \mathbf{M}_Z)$ -MMP/ U , $\phi_Z := \varphi_Z \circ \psi_Z$ is a $(K_Z + B_Z - t'_1 E_Z^\nu + \mathbf{M}_Z)$ -MMP/ U . By Lemma 2.38, ϕ_Z only contains flips, hence Z and \bar{Z} are isomorphic in codimension 1. Thus \bar{X}_i and \bar{Z} are isomorphic in codimension 1 for any i .

In particular, let n be a positive integer such that $t_i \in (0, t'_1)$ for any $i \geq n$. Let $g_i : \bar{X}_i \dashrightarrow \bar{Z}$ be the induced birational map, and let $p_i : W_i \rightarrow \bar{X}_i$ and $q_i : W_i \rightarrow \bar{Z}$ be a common resolution such that $q_i = g_i \circ p_i$. Since \bar{X}_i and \bar{Z} are isomorphic in codimension 1, we have

$$p_i^*(K_{\bar{X}_i} + \bar{B}_i - t_i \bar{E}_i^\nu + \mathbf{M}_{\bar{X}_i}) = q_i^*(K_{\bar{Z}} + B_{\bar{Z}} - t_i E_{\bar{Z}}^\nu + \mathbf{M}_{\bar{Z}}) + F_i$$

for some F_i that is exceptional over \bar{X}_i and \bar{Z} . Since $t_i \in (0, t'_1)$, $K_{\bar{Z}} + B_{\bar{Z}} - t_i E_{\bar{Z}}^\nu + \mathbf{M}_{\bar{Z}}$ is semi-ample/ U . By (III), $K_{\bar{X}_i} + \bar{B}_i - t_i \bar{E}_i^\nu + \mathbf{M}_{\bar{X}_i}$ is semi-ample/ U . Applying the negativity lemma twice, and we see that $F_i = 0$ for each i . Since $(\bar{X}_i, \bar{B}_i - t_i \bar{E}_i^\nu, \mathbf{M})/U$ is a good minimal model of $(X, B - t_i E^\nu, \mathbf{M})/U$, $(\bar{Z}, B_{\bar{Z}} - t_i E_{\bar{Z}}^\nu, \mathbf{M})/U$ is a weak glc model of $(X, B - t_i E^\nu, \mathbf{M})/U$. Let $p : \bar{W} \rightarrow X$ and $q : \bar{W} \rightarrow \bar{Z}$ be a resolution of indeterminacy of the induced birational map $X \dashrightarrow \bar{Z}$. By Lemma 3.8,

$$p^*(K_X + B - t_i E^\nu + \mathbf{M}_X) = q^*(K_{\bar{Z}} + B_{\bar{Z}} - t_i E_{\bar{Z}}^\nu + \mathbf{M}_{\bar{Z}}) + \bar{F}_i$$

for some $\bar{F}_i \geq 0$ that is exceptional over \bar{Z} for each $i \geq n$. By (I), $\lim_{i \rightarrow +\infty} t_i = 0$, hence

$$p^*(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X) = q^*(K_{\bar{Z}} + B_{\bar{Z}} + \mathbf{M}_{\bar{Z}}) + \bar{F}$$

for some $\bar{F} \geq 0$ that is exceptional over \bar{Z} . Since $K_{\bar{Z}} + B_{\bar{Z}} + \mathbf{M}_{\bar{Z}}$ is semi-ample/ U , $(\bar{Z}, B_{\bar{Z}}, \mathbf{M})/U$ is a weak glc model of $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$, and by Lemmas 3.9(2) and 3.15, $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ has a good minimal model. \square

Proof of Theorem 8.7 continued.

Step 6. In this step we construct a good minimal model for $(Z, B_Z, \mathbf{M})/U$, hence completing the proof.

Let $m > \frac{s_1}{t_1 - s_1}$ be a positive integer. By (IV), Z is \mathbb{Q} -factorial klt. By (III), there exists $0 \leq H_Z \sim_{\mathbb{R}, U} m(K_Z + B_Z - t_1 E_Z^\nu + \mathbf{M}_Z)$ such that $(Z, B_Z + H_Z, \mathbf{M})/U$ is glc. Since

$$K_Z + B_Z + H_Z + \mathbf{M}_Z \sim_{\mathbb{R}, U} (m+1)(K_Z + B_Z - \frac{mt_1}{m+1} E_Z^\nu + \mathbf{M}_Z)$$

and $s_1 < \frac{mt_1}{m+1} < t_1$, by (III), $K_Z + B_Z + H_Z + \mathbf{M}_Z$ is semi-ample/ U . For any positive real number μ , since

$$K_Z + B_Z + \mu H_Z + \mathbf{M}_Z \sim_{\mathbb{R}, U} (\mu m + 1)(K_Z + B_Z - \frac{\mu m t_1}{\mu m + 1} E_Z^\nu + \mathbf{M}_Z)$$

and $\frac{\mu m t_1}{\mu m + 1} \in (0, t_1)$, by (IV)(V) and Lemma 8.1, $(Z, B_Z + \mu H_Z, \mathbf{M})/U$ has a good minimal model for any $\mu \in (0, 1]$. By Lemma 2.43, we may run a $(K_Z + B_Z + \mathbf{M}_Z)$ -MMP/ U with scaling of H_Z

$$(Z, B_Z, \mathbf{M}) := (Z_1, B_{Z_1}, \mathbf{M}) \dashrightarrow (Z_2, B_{Z_2}, \mathbf{M}) \dashrightarrow \cdots \dashrightarrow (Z_i, B_{Z_i}, \mathbf{M}) \dashrightarrow \cdots,$$

such that either this MMP terminates, or the scaling numbers

$$\lambda_i := \inf\{t \mid t \geq 0, K_{Z_i} + B_{Z_i} + tH_{Z_i} + \mathbf{M}_{Z_i} \text{ is nef}/U\}$$

satisfy $\lim_{i \rightarrow +\infty} \lambda_i = 0$, where H_{Z_i} is the strict transform of H_Z on Z_i for each i .

Claim 8.10. *This $(K_Z + B_Z + \mathbf{M}_Z)$ -MMP/ U with scaling of H_Z terminates with a log minimal model $(\bar{Z}, B_{\bar{Z}}, \mathbf{M})/U$ of $(Z, B_Z, \mathbf{M})/U$.*

Proof. Assume that this MMP does not terminate. Then $\lim_{i \rightarrow +\infty} \lambda_i = 0$.

For any i , by (VII)(VIII)(IX), we have the following:

- $(Z_i^0 := Z_i \times_U U^0, B_{Z_i}^0 := B_{Z_i} \times_U U^0, \mathbf{M}^0)/U^0$ is a good minimal model of itself.
- Since any glc place of $(Z_i, B_{Z_i}, \mathbf{M})$ is a glc place of (Z, B_Z, \mathbf{M}) , all glc centers of $(Z_i, B_{Z_i}, \mathbf{M})$ intersect Z_i^0 .
- For each i , by Lemma 2.22, \mathbf{M}^0 descends to \bar{X}_i^0 and $\mathbf{M}_{\bar{X}_i^0}^0 \sim_{\mathbb{R}, U^0} 0$.

In particular, by Theorem 8.7 in lower dimensions, for any glc center S_i of $(Z_i, B_{Z_i}, \mathbf{M})$ of dimension ≥ 1 , $(S_i, B_{S_i}, \mathbf{M}^{S_i})/U$ has a good minimal model, where $(S_i, B_{S_i}, \mathbf{M}^{S_i})/U$ is the generalized pair given by the adjunction

$$K_{S_i} + B_{S_i} + \mathbf{M}_{S_i}^{S_i} := (K_{Z_i} + B_{Z_i} + \mathbf{M}_{Z_i})|_{S_i}.$$

By Theorem 6.4, the $(K_Z + B_Z + \mathbf{M}_Z)$ -MMP/ U with scaling of H_Z terminates near $\lfloor B_Z \rfloor$.

For each i , let $E_{Z_i}^\nu$ be the strict transform of E_Z^ν on Z_i . For any curve C_i contracted by $Z_i \dashrightarrow Z_{i+1}$, we have that $(K_{Z_i} + B_{Z_i} + \lambda_i H_{Z_i} + \mathbf{M}_{Z_i}) \cdot C_i = 0$ and $(K_{Z_i} + B_{Z_i} + \mathbf{M}_{Z_i}) \cdot C_i < 0$. Since $H_Z \sim_{\mathbb{R}, U} m(K_Z + B_Z - t_1 E_Z^\nu + \mathbf{M}_Z)$, $H_{Z_i} \sim_{\mathbb{R}, U} m(K_{Z_i} + B_{Z_i} - t_1 E_{Z_i}^\nu + \mathbf{M}_{Z_i})$. Thus $E_{Z_i}^\nu \cdot C_i < 0$, hence $C_i \subset E_{Z_i}^\nu$. Therefore, the MMP we have constructed only contract curves in E_Z^ν . By (11.b) and (8), the MMP only appears in $\lfloor B_Z \rfloor$, hence the MMP terminates, a contradiction. \square

Proof of Theorem 8.7 continued. By (IV)(VII)(VIII)(IX),

- $(\bar{Z}, B_{\bar{Z}}, \mathbf{M})$ is \mathbb{Q} -factorial gdlc,
- $(\bar{Z}^0 := \bar{Z} \times_U U^0, B_{\bar{Z}}^0 := B_{\bar{Z}} \times_U U^0, \mathbf{M}^0)/U^0$ is a good minimal model of itself,
- all glc centers of $(\bar{Z}, B_{\bar{Z}}, \mathbf{M}_{\bar{Z}})$ intersect \bar{Z}^0 , and
- \mathbf{M}^0 descends to \bar{Z}^0 and $\mathbf{M}_{\bar{Z}^0}^0 \sim_{\mathbb{R}, U^0} 0$.

By Theorem 8.7 in lower dimensions, for any glc center S of $(\bar{Z}, B_{\bar{Z}}, \mathbf{M})$, $(K_{\bar{Z}} + B_{\bar{Z}} + \mathbf{M}_{\bar{Z}})|_S$ is semi-ample/ U . Therefore, $(\bar{Z}, B_{\bar{Z}}, \mathbf{M})/U$ is a good minimal model of $(Z, B_Z, \mathbf{M})/U$ by Theorem 7.5. Theorem 8.7 follows from Claim 8.9. \square

9. BASE-POINT-FREE, CONTRACTION, AND CONE THEOREMS FOR GENERALIZED PAIRS

In this section, we prove Theorem 1.3. For the reader's convenience, we will prove Theorem 1.3(1)(2)(3) (the cone theorem) and Theorem 1.3(4) (the contraction theorem) separately, and we will also prove a base-point-free theorem. More precisely, we will prove the following three theorems:

Theorem 9.1 (Cone theorem for glc g-pairs). *Let $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ be an NQC glc g-pair and $\pi : X \rightarrow U$ the associated projective morphism. Let $\{R_j\}_{j \in \Lambda}$ be the set of $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)$ -negative extremal rays in $\overline{NE}(X/U)$ that are rational. Then:*

(1)

$$\overline{NE}(X/U) = \overline{NE}(X/U)_{K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X \geq 0} + \sum_{j \in \Lambda} R_j.$$

In particular, any $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)$ -negative extremal ray in $\overline{NE}(X/U)$ is rational.

(2) Each R_j is spanned by a rational curve C_j such that $\pi(C_j) = \{pt\}$ and

$$0 < -(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X) \cdot C_j \leq 2 \dim X.$$

(3) For any ample/ U \mathbb{R} -divisor A on X ,

$$\Lambda_A := \{j \in \Lambda \mid R_j \subset \overline{NE}(X/U)_{K_X+B+\mathbf{M}_X+A<0}\}$$

is a finite set. In particular, $\{R_j\}_{j \in \Lambda}$ is countable, and is a discrete subset in $\overline{NE}(X/U)_{K_X+B+\mathbf{M}_X+A<0}$. Moreover, we may write

$$\overline{NE}(X/U) = \overline{NE}(X/U)_{K_X+B+\mathbf{M}_X+A \geq 0} + \sum_{j \in \Lambda_A} R_j.$$

(4) Let F be a $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)$ -negative extremal face in $\overline{NE}(X/U)$. Then F is a rational extremal face.

Theorem 9.2 (Base-point-free theorem for glc g-pairs). *Let $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ be an NQC glc g-pair and $\pi : X \rightarrow U$ the associated projective morphism. Assume that \mathbf{M}_X is \mathbb{R} -Cartier. Let L be a π -nef Cartier divisor on X that is the supporting function of a $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)$ -negative extremal ray. Then mL is π -generated for any integer $m \gg 0$.*

Theorem 9.3 (Contraction theorem for glc g-pairs). *Let $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ be an NQC glc g-pair and $\pi : X \rightarrow U$ the associated projective morphism. Assume that \mathbf{M}_X is \mathbb{R} -Cartier. Let R be a $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)$ -negative extremal ray. Then there exists a projective morphism $\text{cont}_R : X \rightarrow Y$ over U satisfying the following:*

- (1) Let C be an integral curve such that $\pi(C)$ is a point. Then $\text{cont}_R(C)$ is a point if and only if $[C] \in R$.
- (2) $\mathcal{O}_Y \cong (\text{cont}_R)_* \mathcal{O}_X$. In other words, cont_R is a contraction.
- (3) Let L be a line bundle on X such that $L \cdot C = 0$ for every curve C such that $[C] \in R$. Then there exists a line bundle L_Y on Y such that $L \cong f^* L_Y$.

9.1. Preliminary results on non-lc pairs. Before we give the proof, let us first recall some results on non-lc pairs.

Definition 9.4. Let (X, Δ) be a sub-pair. A *non-lc place* of (X, Δ) is a prime divisor D over X such that $a(D, X, \Delta) < 0$. A *non-lc center* of (X, Δ) is the center of a non-lc place of (X, Δ) on X . The *non-lc locus* $\text{Nlc}(X, \Delta)$ of (X, Δ) is the union of all non-lc centers of (X, Δ) .

Some of the notation and results below are adopted from the theory of *quasi-log varieties*. Although there are many papers in this direction, we will only use the results in [Amb03, Fuj11], and we will always translate them into the language of (not necessarily lc) pairs. To make these translations valid, we only need to recall the following result:

Lemma 9.5 (cf. [Amb03, Example 4.3.1]). *Let (X, Δ) be a pair. Then (X, Δ) can be considered as a quasi-log variety $[X, K_X + \Delta]$, such that $\text{Nlc}(X, \Delta)$ is exactly the non-qlc locus of $[X, K_X + \Delta]$.*

Definition 9.6 (cf. [Amb03, Definition 5.2], [Fuj11, Theorem 4.5.2(1), Definition 6.7.1]). Let (X, Δ) be a (not necessarily lc) pair. We define

$$\overline{NE}(X/U)_{\text{Nlc}(X, \Delta)} := \text{Im}(\overline{NE}(\text{Nlc}(X, \Delta)/U) \rightarrow \overline{NE}(X/U)).$$

Definition 9.7 (cf. [Amb03, Definition 5.3], [Fuj11, Definition 6.7.2]). Let (X, Δ) be a (not necessarily lc) pair and $\pi : X \rightarrow U$ a projective morphism. Let F be an extremal face of $\overline{NE}(X/U)$.

- (1) A *supporting function* of F is a π -nef \mathbb{R} -divisor H such that $F = \overline{NE}(X/U) \cap H^\perp$. If H is a \mathbb{Q} -divisor, we say that H is a *rational supporting function*. Since F is an extremal face of $\overline{NE}(X/U)$, F always has a supporting function.
- (2) For any \mathbb{R} -Cartier \mathbb{R} -divisor D on X , we say that F is *D -negative* if

$$F \cap \overline{NE}(X/U)_{D \geq 0} = \{0\}.$$

- (3) We say that F is *rational* if F has a rational supporting function.
(4) We say that F is *relatively ample at infinity with respect to* (X, Δ) if

$$F \cap \overline{NE}(X/U)_{\text{Nlc}(X, \Delta)} = \{0\}.$$

Equivalently, $H|_{\text{Nlc}(X, \Delta)}$ is $\pi|_{\text{Nlc}(X, \Delta)}$ -ample for any supporting function H of F .

- (5) We say that F is *contractible at infinity with respect to* (X, Δ) if F has a rational supporting function H and $H|_{\text{Nlc}(X, \Delta)}$ is $\pi|_{\text{Nlc}(X, \Delta)}$ -semi-ample.

Theorem 9.8 (Cone theorem for not necessarily lc pairs, cf. [Amb03, Theorem 5.10], [Fuj11, Theorems 4.5.2, 6.7.4]). *Let (X, Δ) be a (not necessarily lc) pair and $\pi : X \rightarrow U$ a projective morphism. Let $\{R_j\}_{j \in \Lambda}$ be the set of $(K_X + \Delta)$ -negative extremal rays in $\overline{NE}(X/U)$ that are rational and relatively ample at infinity with respect to (X, Δ) . Then:*

(1)

$$\overline{NE}(X/U) = \overline{NE}(X/U)_{K_X + \Delta \geq 0} + \overline{NE}(X/U)_{\text{Nlc}(X, \Delta)} + \sum_{j \in \Lambda} R_j.$$

(2) *Each R_j is spanned by a rational curve C_j such that $\pi(C_j) = \{pt\}$ and*

$$0 < -(K_X + \Delta) \cdot C_j \leq 2 \dim X.$$

(3) *For any π -ample \mathbb{R} -divisor A on X ,*

$$\Lambda_A := \{j \in \Lambda \mid R_j \subset \overline{NE}(X/U)_{K_X + \Delta + A < 0}\}$$

is a finite set. In particular, $\{R_j\}_{j \in \Lambda}$ is a discrete subset in $\overline{NE}(X/U)_{K_X + \Delta < 0}$, and we may write

$$\overline{NE}(X/U) = \overline{NE}(X/U)_{K_X + \Delta + A \geq 0} + \overline{NE}(X/U)_{\text{Nlc}(X, \Delta)} + \sum_{j \in \Lambda_A} R_j.$$

(4) *Let F be a $(K_X + \Delta)$ -negative extremal face in $\overline{NE}(X/U)$ that is relatively ample at infinity with respect to (X, Δ) . Then F is a rational extremal face, and is contractible at infinity with respect to (X, Δ) .*

Theorem 9.9 (Base-point-free theorem for not necessarily lc pairs, cf. [Amb03, Theorem 5.3], [Fuj11, Theorems 4.5.5, 6.5.1]). *Let (X, Δ) be a (not necessarily lc) pair and $\pi : X \rightarrow U$ a projective morphism. Let L be a π -nef Cartier divisor on X . Assume that*

- (1) $qL - (K_X + \Delta)$ is π -ample for some real number $q > 0$, and
(2) $mL|_{\text{Nlc}(X, \Delta)}$ is $\pi|_{\text{Nlc}(X, \Delta)}$ -generated for any $m \gg 0$,

then mL is π -generated for any $m \gg 0$. In particular, L is π -semi-ample.

We also include the following contraction theorem for the sake of completeness.

Theorem 9.10 (Contraction theorem for not necessarily lc pairs, cf. [Amb03, Theorem 5.6, Lemma 6.3], [Fuj11, Theorems 4.5.2(4), 6.7.3]). *Let (X, Δ) be a (not necessarily lc) pair and $\pi : X \rightarrow U$ a projective morphism. Let H be a π -nef Cartier divisor on X , $F := \overline{NE}(X/U) \cap H^\perp$ an extremal face of $\overline{NE}(X/U)$, such that F is $(K_X + \Delta)$ -negative and contractible at infinity with respect to (X, Δ) . Then there exists a projective morphism $\text{cont}_F : X \rightarrow Y$ over U satisfying the following:*

- (1) *Let C be an integral curve such that $\pi(C)$ is a point. Then $\text{cont}_F(C)$ is a point if and only if $[C] \in F$.*
(2) $\mathcal{O}_Y \cong (\text{cont}_F)_* \mathcal{O}_X$. *In other words, cont_F is a contraction.*
(3) *Let L be a line bundle on X such that $L \cdot C = 0$ for every curve C such that $[C] \in F$. Assume that $L^{\otimes m}|_{\text{Nlc}(X, \Delta)}$ is $\text{cont}_F|_{\text{Nlc}(X, \Delta)}$ -generated for every $m \gg 0$. Then there exists a line bundle L_Y on Y such that $L \cong (\text{cont}_F)^* L_Y$.*

9.2. Sub-adjunction. We need the following sub-adjunction result for NQC glc g-pairs:

Theorem 9.11 (Generalized sub-adjunction, cf. [HL19, Theorem 5.1]). *Let $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ be an NQC glc g-pair, \tilde{W} a glc center of (X, B, \mathbf{M}) , and W the normalization of \tilde{W} . Let $\iota : W \rightarrow X$ be the induced morphism. Then there exists an NQC glc g-pair $(W, B_W, \mathbf{M}^W)/U$ on W , such that*

$$K_W + B_W + \mathbf{M}_W^W \sim_{\mathbb{R}} \iota^*(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X).$$

Remark 9.12. Note that the fact that $(W, B_W, \mathbf{M}_W)/U$ is NQC is not written down in the statement of [HL19, Theorem 5.1], but it is stated on line -3 of Page 25 of [HL19].

9.3. Proof of the cone theorem. In this subsection, we prove the cone theorem (Theorem 9.1). We first prove a useful lemma which allows us to associate a generalized lc pair with a (not necessarily lc) pair.

Lemma 9.13. *Let $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ be a glc g-pair and A a nef and big/ U \mathbb{R} -divisor on X . Then there exists a pair (X, Δ) , such that*

- (1) $\Delta \sim_{\mathbb{R}, U} B + \mathbf{M}_X + A$, and
- (2) $\text{Nlc}(X, \Delta) = \text{Ngklt}(X, B, \mathbf{M})$.

Proof. Let $h : W \rightarrow X$ be a log resolution of $(X, \text{Supp } B)$ such that \mathbf{M} descends to W , and suppose that

$$K_W + B_W + \mathbf{M}_W = h^*(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)$$

for some sub-glc g-sub-pair $(W, B_W, \mathbf{M})/U$. Since \mathbf{M}_W is nef/ U , $\mathbf{M}_W + h^*A$ is nef and big/ U . Thus there exists an \mathbb{R} -divisor $E \geq 0$ such that

$$\mathbf{M}_W + h^*A = H_n + \frac{1}{n}E$$

for any positive integer n and some ample/ U \mathbb{R} -divisors H_n on W . Since $h : W \rightarrow X$ is a log resolution of $(X, \text{Supp } B)$, we may pick $n \gg 0$ such that $\text{Nlc}(W, B_W + \frac{1}{n}E) \subset \text{Supp } B_W^{-1}$. In particular, for any positive real number ϵ , $\text{Nlc}(W, B_W + \epsilon B_W^{-1} + \frac{1}{n}E) = \text{Supp } B_W^{-1}$.

Now we may pick a real number $0 < \epsilon_0 \ll 1$ such that $H_n - \epsilon_0 B_W^{-1}$ is ample/ U . Then we may pick $0 \leq A_W \sim_{\mathbb{R}, U} H_n - \epsilon_0 B_W^{-1}$ such that $(W, \Delta_W := B_W + \epsilon_0 B_W^{-1} + \frac{1}{n}E + A_W)$ is a sub-pair and $\text{Nlc}(W, \Delta_W) = \text{Supp } B_W^{-1}$.

$(X, \Delta := h_*\Delta_W)$ satisfies our requirements. \square

Lemma 9.14. *Let $d \geq 2$ be an integer. Assume Theorem 9.1 in dimension $\leq d - 1$.*

Let $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ be an NQC glc g-pair of dimension d and $\pi : X \rightarrow U$ the associated projective morphism. Let A be an ample/ U \mathbb{R} -divisor on X and $\{R_j\}_{j \in \Lambda'_A}$ the set of $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X + A)$ -negative extremal rays (that are not necessarily rational) in $\overline{NE}(X/U)$. Then:

- (1) Λ'_A is a finite set. In particular,

$$\overline{NE}(X/U) = \overline{NE}(X/U)_{K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X + A \geq 0} + \sum_{j \in \Lambda'_A} R_j.$$

- (2) For any $j \in \Lambda'_A$, R_j is spanned by a rational curve C_j such that $\pi(C_j) = \{pt\}$ and

$$0 < -(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X + A) \cdot C_j \leq 2 \dim X.$$

Proof. By Lemma 9.13, we may pick $0 \leq \Delta \sim_{\mathbb{R}, U} B + \mathbf{M}_X + A$ such that $\text{Nlc}(X, \Delta) = \text{Ngklt}(X, B, \mathbf{M})$.

For any glc center \tilde{W} of (X, B, \mathbf{M}) with normalization W , we let $(W, B_W, \mathbf{M}^W)/U$ be the NQC glc g-pair given by the sub-adjunction

$$K_W + B_W + \mathbf{M}_W^W \sim_{\mathbb{R}} (K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)|_W$$

as in Theorem 9.11, and let $A_W := A|_W$. By Theorem 9.1 in dimension $\leq d-1$, we have

$$\overline{NE}(W/U) = \overline{NE}(W/U)_{K_W+B_W+\mathbf{M}_W^W+A_W \geq 0} + \sum_{j \in \Lambda_{A_W}} R_{j,W},$$

where $\{R_{j,W}\}_{j \in \Lambda_{A_W}}$ is the set of $(K_W + B_W + \mathbf{M}_W^W + A_W)$ -negative extremal rays in $\overline{NE}(W/U)$ that are rational, where Λ_{A_W} is a finite set. For any $j \in \Lambda_{A_W}$, we let R_j be the image of $R_{j,W}$ in X under the map

$$\cup_W \overline{NE}(W/U) \rightarrow \overline{NE}(\mathrm{Nlc}(X, \Delta)/U) \rightarrow \overline{NE}(X/U)$$

and let $\Lambda_A^0 := \cup_W \Lambda_{A_W}$. Then Λ_A^0 is a finite set. Finally, we let $\{R_j\}_{j \in \Lambda_A^1}$ be the set of $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X + A)$ -negative extremal rays in $\overline{NE}(X/U)$ that are relatively ample at infinity with respect to (X, Δ) . By Theorem 9.8(3), Λ_A^1 is a finite set.

Claim 9.15.

$$\overline{NE}(X/U) = \overline{NE}(X/U)_{K_X+B+\mathbf{M}_X+A \geq 0} + \sum_{j \in \Lambda_A^0} R_j + \sum_{j \in \Lambda_A^1} R_j.$$

Proof. For simplicity, we let

$$V := \overline{NE}(X/U)_{K_X+B+\mathbf{M}_X+A \geq 0} + \sum_{j \in \Lambda_A^0} R_j + \sum_{j \in \Lambda_A^1} R_j.$$

For any curve C on X , we will write $[C]$ for its class in $\overline{NE}(X/U)$, and for any glc center \tilde{W} of (X, B, \mathbf{M}) with normalization W , if $C \subset W$, then we will write $[C]_W$ for its class in $\overline{NE}(W/U)$.

Suppose that $\overline{NE}(X/U) \neq V$. By Theorem 9.8(1), we have

$$\overline{NE}(X/U) = \overline{NE}(X/U)_{K_X+B+\mathbf{M}_X+A \geq 0} + \overline{NE}(X/U)_{\mathrm{Nlc}(X, \Delta)} + \sum_{j \in \Lambda_A^1} R_j.$$

Thus there exists an integral curve $C \subset \mathrm{Nlc}(X, \Delta) = \mathrm{Ngklt}(X, B, \mathbf{M})$, such that $[C]$ is not contained in V . We may write

$$C = \sum_{W|W \text{ is a glc center of } (X, B, \mathbf{M})} C_W,$$

where each C_W is an integral curve in W . For any C_W , we have

$$[C_W]_W = c_W^0 R_W^0 + \sum_{j \in \Lambda_{A_W}} c_{j,W} R_{j,W}$$

where c_W^0 and each $c_{j,W}$ are non-negative real numbers, and $R_W^0 \in \overline{NE}(W/U)_{K_W+B_W+\mathbf{M}_W^W+A_W \geq 0}$. Since the image of R_W^0 in X is contained in $\overline{NE}(X/U)_{K_X+B+\mathbf{M}_X+A \geq 0}$, $[C_W]$ is contained in $\overline{NE}(X/U)_{K_X+B+\mathbf{M}_X+A \geq 0} + \sum_{j \in \Lambda_A^0} R_j$. Thus $[C_W]$ is contained in V , hence $[C]$ is contained in V , a contradiction. \square

Proof of Lemma 9.14 continued. By Claim 9.15, any $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X + A)$ -negative extremal ray in $\overline{NE}(X/U)$ must be contained in $\{R_j\}_{j \in \Lambda_A^0 \cup \Lambda_A^1}$, so $\Lambda'_A \subset \Lambda_A^0 \cup \Lambda_A^1$. Since $\Lambda_A^0 \cup \Lambda_A^1$ is a finite set, Λ'_A is a finite set, and we get (1).

By Theorem 9.1 in dimension $\leq d-1$, for any $j \in \Lambda_{A_W}$, $R_{j,W}$ is spanned by a rational curve C_j such that the image of C_j in U is a point, and

$$0 < -(K_W + B_W + \mathbf{M}_W^W + A_W) \cdot C_j \leq 2 \dim W < 2 \dim X.$$

Therefore, for any $j \in \Lambda_A^0 = \cup_W \Lambda_{A_W}$, R_j is spanned by the curve C_j such that $\pi(C_j) = \{pt\}$ and

$$0 < -(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X + A) \cdot C_j \leq 2 \dim X.$$

By Theorem 9.8(2), for any $j \in \Lambda_A^1$, R_j is spanned by a rational curve C_j such that $\pi(C_j) = \{pt\}$ and

$$0 < -(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X + A) \cdot C_j \leq 2 \dim X.$$

Thus (2) holds and the proof is complete. \square

Lemma 9.16. *Let $d \geq 2$ be an integer. Assume Theorem 9.1 in dimension $\leq d - 1$.*

Let $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ be an NQC glc \mathbb{Q} -g-pair of dimension d and $\pi : X \rightarrow U$ the associated projective morphism. Let A be an ample/ U \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X and $\{R_j\}_{j \in \Lambda_A}$ the set of $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X + A)$ -negative extremal rays in $\overline{NE}(X/U)$ that are rational. Then Λ_A is a finite set, and

$$\overline{NE}(X/U) = \overline{NE}(X/U)_{K_X+B+\mathbf{M}_X+A \geq 0} + \sum_{j \in \Lambda_A} R_j.$$

Proof. We may assume that $\dim_{\mathbb{R}} N^1(X/U) \geq 2$, otherwise there is nothing to prove.

By Lemma 9.14, the number of $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X + A)$ -negative extremal rays in $\overline{NE}(X/U)$ is a finite set, so $\Lambda_A \subset \Lambda'_A$ is a finite set.

For simplicity, we let $V := \overline{NE}(X/U)_{K_X+B+\mathbf{M}_X+A \geq 0} + \sum_{j \in \Lambda_A} R_j$. Suppose that $V \neq \overline{NE}(X/U)$. Since $\dim_{\mathbb{R}} N^1(X/U) \geq 2$, there exists a Cartier divisor N on X satisfying the following:

- N is not numerically equivalent to a multiple of $K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X + A$ over U ,
- N is positive on $V \setminus \{0\}$, and
- $N \cdot z_0 < 0$ for some $z_0 \in \overline{NE}(X/U)$.

Let Q be the dual cone of $\overline{NE}(X/U)_{K_X+B+\mathbf{M}_X+A \geq 0}$, i.e.,

$$Q = \{D \in N^1(X/U) \mid D \cdot z \geq 0 \text{ for any } z \in \overline{NE}(X/U)_{K_X+B+\mathbf{M}_X+A \geq 0}\},$$

then Q is generated by π -nef divisors and $K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X + A$. Since N is positive on $\overline{NE}(X/U)_{K_X+B+\mathbf{M}_X+A \geq 0} \setminus \{0\}$, N is in the interior of Q . By Kleiman's Criterion, there exists an ample/ U \mathbb{Q} -divisor H on X and a positive real number p , such that

$$N = H + p(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X + A).$$

Since $N \cdot z_0 < 0$ and H is ample/ U , we may let

$$t := \sup\{s \mid H + s(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X + A) \text{ is nef}/U\}.$$

Then $0 < t < p$. Since $(H + t(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X + A)) \cdot z \geq 0$ for any $z \in \overline{NE}(X/U)_{K_X+B+\mathbf{M}_X+A \geq 0}$, by Lemma 9.14,

$$t = \max\{s \mid (H + s(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X + A)) \cdot R_j \geq 0, \forall j \in \Lambda'_A\}$$

where $\{R_j\}_{j \in \Lambda'_A}$ the set of $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X + A)$ -negative extremal rays in $\overline{NE}(X/U)$ and is a finite set. Thus t is a rational number. Since N is not a multiple of $K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X + A$, $H + t(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X + A)$ is a rational supporting function of a $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X + A)$ -negative extremal face F_N , which is spanned by $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X + A)$ -negative extremal rays. By Lemma 9.14, F_N is spanned by finitely many $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X + A)$ -negative extremal rays R^1, \dots, R^n in $\overline{NE}(X/U)$ for some positive integer n . In particular, we may pick a Cartier divisor L on X such that $L \cdot R^1 > 0$ and $L \cdot R^i < 0$ for any $i \geq 2$. Since H is ample/ U and N is not numerically equivalent to a multiple of $K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X + A$ over U , we may pick a rational number $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ such that

- $N_\epsilon := (H - \epsilon L) + p(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X + A)$ is not numerically equivalent to a multiple of $K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X + A$ over U for any $\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_0)$,
- $H - \epsilon_0 L$ is ample/ U , and
- $N_{\epsilon_0} \cdot z_0 < 0$.

Thus N_ϵ is positive on $\overline{NE}(X/U)_{K_X+B+\mathbf{M}_X+A \geq 0}$. Since Λ_A is a finite set and $N \cdot R_j > 0$ for any $j \in \Lambda_A$, we may pick a rational number $\epsilon_1 \in (0, \epsilon_0)$ such that $N_{\epsilon_1} \cdot R_j > 0$ for any $j \in \Lambda_A$. In particular, N_{ϵ_1} is positive on $V \setminus \{0\}$. Now we let

$$t_1 := \sup\{s \mid H - \epsilon_1 L + s(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X + A) \text{ is nef}/U\}.$$

By our construction,

$$t_1 = \frac{(H - \epsilon_1 L) \cdot R^1}{-(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X + A) \cdot R^1}$$

is a rational number, $0 < t_1 < t < p$, and $H - \epsilon_1 L + t_1(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X + A)$ is a rational supporting function of R^1 . Thus $R^1 \in \Lambda_A$, and so $N_{\epsilon_1} \cdot R^1 > 0$. Therefore, $p < t_1$, a contradiction. \square

Lemma 9.17. *Let $d \geq 2$ be an integer. Assume Theorem 9.1 in dimension $\leq d - 1$.*

Let $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ be an NQC glc g -pair of dimension d and $\pi : X \rightarrow U$ the associated projective morphism. Let A be an ample/ U \mathbb{R} -divisor on X and $\{R_j\}_{j \in \Lambda_A}$ the set of $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X + A)$ -negative extremal rays in $\overline{NE}(X/U)$ that are rational. Then Λ_A is a finite set, and

$$\overline{NE}(X/U) = \overline{NE}(X/U)_{K_X+B+\mathbf{M}_X+A \geq 0} + \sum_{j \in \Lambda_A} R_j.$$

In particular, any $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X + A)$ -negative extremal ray in $\overline{NE}(X/U)$ is rational.

Proof. Let $\{R_j\}_{j \in \Lambda'_A}$ be the set of $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X + A)$ -negative extremal rays (that are not necessarily rational) in $\overline{NE}(X/U)$. By Lemma 9.14, Λ'_A is a finite set, and we have

$$\overline{NE}(X/U) = \overline{NE}(X/U)_{K_X+B+\mathbf{M}_X+A \geq 0} + \sum_{j \in \Lambda'_A} R_j.$$

By Theorem 2.46, there exist real numbers $a_1, \dots, a_k \in (0, 1]$, such that

- $\sum_{i=1}^k a_i = 1$,
- $K_X + B = \sum_{i=1}^k a_i(K_X + B^i)$ and $\mathbf{M} = \sum_{i=1}^k a_i \mathbf{M}^i$, and
- $(X, B^i, \mathbf{M}^i)/U$ is a glc \mathbb{Q} - g -pair for each i .

Let $A = \sum_{i=1}^c r_i A_i$, where $r_1, \dots, r_c > 0$ are real numbers such that r_1, \dots, r_c are linearly independent over \mathbb{Q} , and A_1, \dots, A_c are ample/ U \mathbb{Q} -divisors.

Since Λ'_A is a finite set, we may pick rational numbers $\bar{a}_1, \dots, \bar{a}_k \in (0, 1]$ and $\bar{r}_1, \dots, \bar{r}_c > 0$, such that $\sum_{i=1}^k \bar{a}_i = 1$, each \bar{a}_i is sufficiently close to a_i and each \bar{r}_i is sufficiently close to r_i , such that

- $(X, \bar{B} := \sum_{i=1}^k \bar{a}_i B_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}} := \sum_{i=1}^k \bar{a}_i \mathbf{M}^i)$ is glc,
- $\bar{A} := \sum_{i=1}^c \bar{r}_i A_i$ is ample, and
- $(K_X + \bar{B} + \bar{\mathbf{M}}_X + \bar{A}) \cdot R_j < 0$ for any $j \in \Lambda'_A$.

By Lemma 9.16, we have

$$\overline{NE}(X/U) = \overline{NE}(X/U)_{K_X+\bar{B}+\bar{\mathbf{M}}_X+\bar{A}} + \sum_{j \in \Phi} R_j,$$

where $\{R_j\}_{j \in \Phi}$ is the set of $(K_X + \bar{B} + \bar{\mathbf{M}}_X + \bar{A})$ -negative extremal rays in $\overline{NE}(X/U)$. Moreover, R_j is rational for any $j \in \Phi$. By our construction, $\Lambda'_A \subset \Phi$. Thus R_j is rational for any $j \in \Lambda'_A$, hence $\Lambda_A = \Lambda'_A$ and we are done. \square

Proof of Theorem 9.1. We apply induction on dimension of X . The $\dim X = 1$ case is obviously true. So we may assume that $\dim X = d$ where $d \geq 2$ is an integer and Theorem 9.1 holds in dimension $\leq d - 1$.

For any $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)$ -negative extremal ray R in $\overline{NE}(X/U)$, R is also a $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X + A)$ -negative extremal ray for some ample/ U \mathbb{R} -divisor A on X . By Lemma 9.17, R is rational. By Lemma 9.14(2), R is generated by a rational curve C such that $\pi(C) = \{pt\}$ and

$$0 < -(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X + A) \cdot C \leq 2 \dim X.$$

Since R is also a $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X + \epsilon A)$ -negative extremal ray for any $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$, by Lemma 9.14(2) again, we have

$$0 < -(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X + \epsilon A) \cdot C \leq 2 \dim X$$

for any $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$. Thus

$$0 < -(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X) \cdot C \leq 2 \dim X,$$

and we get (2). (3) follows from Lemma 9.17 and the fact that

$$\{R_j\}_{j \in \Lambda} \subset \cup_{n=1}^{+\infty} \{R_j\}_{j \in \Lambda_{\frac{1}{n}A}}$$

for any ample/ U \mathbb{R} -divisor A on X . (1) follows from (3).

We now prove (4). For any $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)$ -negative extremal face F in $\overline{NE}(X/U)$, F is also a $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X + A)$ -negative extremal face for some ample/ U \mathbb{R} -divisor A on X . Let $V := F^\perp \subset N^1(X/U)$. Then since F is spanned by a subset of $\{R_j\}_{j \in \Lambda_A}$, V is defined over \mathbb{Q} . We let

$$W_F := \overline{NE}(X/U)_{K_X+B+\mathbf{M}_X+A \geq 0} + \sum_{j|j \in \Lambda_A, R_j \not\subset F} R_j.$$

Then W_F is a closed cone, $\overline{NE}(X/U) = W_F + F$, and $W_F \cap F = \{0\}$. The supporting functions of F are the elements in V that are positive on $W_F \setminus \{0\}$, which is a non-empty open subset of V , and hence contains a rational element H . In particular, $F = H^\perp \cap \overline{NE}(X/U)$, hence F is rational, and we get (4). \square

9.4. Proof of the base-point-free theorem and the contraction theorem. Now we prove the base-point-free theorem (Theorem 9.2) for glc g-pairs.

Proof of Theorem 9.2. Let R be the $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)$ -negative extremal ray such that L is the supporting function of R . Then R is also a $(K_X + B + (1 - \epsilon)\mathbf{M}_X)$ -negative extremal ray for some $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$. Possibly replacing \mathbf{M} with $(1 - \epsilon)\mathbf{M}$, we may assume that $\text{Ngklt}(X, B, \mathbf{M}) = \text{Nklt}(X, B)$. Let A be an ample/ U \mathbb{R} -divisor on X such that R is also $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X + A)$ -negative extremal ray.

If $\mathbf{M}_X \cdot R \geq 0$, then $(K_X + B) \cdot R < 0$, and the theorem immediately follows from Theorem 9.9. Therefore, we may assume that $\mathbf{M}_X \cdot R < 0$.

Let $f : Y \rightarrow X$ be a birational morphism such that \mathbf{M} descends to Y . By the negativity lemma, we may assume that $\mathbf{M}_Y = f^*\mathbf{M}_X - E$ for some $E \geq 0$ that is exceptional over X . Note that if $x \notin f(E)$ then over a neighborhood of $x \in X$, we may assume that \mathbf{M} descends to X and hence we may assume that f is an isomorphism here. By the negativity lemma, we may then assume that $\text{Exc}(f) = \text{Supp } E$.

Let $K_Y + B_Y := f^*(K_X + B)$. By our construction, $\text{Exc}(f) = \text{Supp } E$ does not contain any lc place of (X, B) . Thus we may pick $E' \geq 0$ on Y such that $-E'$ is ample/ X and E' does not contain any lc place of (X, B) . Since $\text{Ngklt}(X, B, \mathbf{M}) = \text{Nklt}(X, B)$, we may find $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$ such that $f^*A - \epsilon E'$ is ample/ U and $(Y, B_Y + \epsilon E')$ is sub-lc. In particular, we may find an ample/ U \mathbb{R} -divisor $0 \leq H_Y \sim_{\mathbb{R}, U} \mathbf{M}_Y + f^*A - \epsilon E'$ on Y such that $(Y, B_Y + H_Y + \epsilon E')$ is sub-lc. Let $\Delta := B + f_*H_Y$, then (X, Δ) is lc and $\Delta \sim_{\mathbb{R}, U} B + \mathbf{M}_X + A$. In particular, R is a $(K_X + \Delta)$ -negative extremal ray, and the theorem follows from Theorem 9.9. \square

The contraction theorem (Theorem 9.3) immediately follows from the base-point-free theorem:

Proof of Theorem 9.3. By Theorem 9.1, R has a supporting function H that is a π -nef Cartier divisor. By Theorem 9.2, H is semi-ample/ U , hence defines a contraction $\text{cont}_R : X \rightarrow Y$ over U . (1) and (2) immediately follow.

Since $-(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)$ is ample/ Y , for any line bundle L on X such that $L \cdot R = 0$, $L - (K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)$ is ample/ Y . By Theorem 9.2, mL is cont_R -generated and $mL \equiv_Y 0$ for any $m \gg 0$. Therefore, cont_R is defined by $|mL|$ and $|(m+1)L|$ over Y for any $m \gg 0$, which

implies that $mL \cong f^*L_{Y,m}$ and $(m+1)L \cong f^*L_{Y,m+1}$ for some line bundles $L_{Y,m}$ and $L_{Y,m+1}$ on Y . We may let $L_Y := L_{Y,m+1} - L_{Y,m}$, and we obtain (3). \square

Proof of Theorem 1.3. It immediately follows from Theorems 9.3 and 9.1. \square

9.5. Corollaries. With the cone and contraction theorems proven, we can prove the following three corollaries, which guarantee that negative extremal contractions associated with NQC glc g -pairs behave similarly to negative extremal contractions associated with usual pairs. The statements and proofs are similar to [KM98, Corollaries 3.17, 3.18]. These corollaries are necessary for us to run the minimal model program.

Corollary 9.18. *Let $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ be a \mathbb{Q} -factorial NQC glc g -pair and $f : X \rightarrow Z$ a contraction of a $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)$ -negative extremal ray R over U . Then $\rho(X) = \rho(Z) + 1$.*

Proof. R is generated by a curve C by Theorem 9.1(2). We consider the maps

$$0 \rightarrow \text{Pic}(Z) \xrightarrow{D \rightarrow f^*D} \text{Pic}(X) \xrightarrow{L \rightarrow (L \cdot C)} \mathbb{Z}.$$

We show that the sequence above is an exact sequence.

By Theorem 9.3(2), f is a contraction, so $f_*f^*D = D$ for any $D \in \text{Pic}(Z)$, hence $\text{Pic}(Z) \xrightarrow{D \rightarrow f^*D} \text{Pic}(X)$ is an injection. By Theorem 9.3(3), for any $L \in \text{Pic}(X)$, if $L \cdot C = 0$, then $L \cong f^*L_Y$ for some line bundle L_Y in Y . In particular, L and f^*L_Y corresponds to the same element in $\text{Pic}(X)$. Thus the sequence above is exact, and we have $\rho(X) = \rho(Z) + 1$. \square

Corollary 9.19. *Let $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ be a \mathbb{Q} -factorial NQC glc g -pair and $f : X \rightarrow Z$ a contraction of a $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)$ -negative extremal ray R over U . Assume that f is a divisorial contraction, i.e. $\dim X = \dim Z$ and the exceptional locus of f is an irreducible divisor. Then Z is \mathbb{Q} -factorial.*

Proof. Let D_Z be an \mathbb{R} -divisor on Z and E the exceptional divisor of f . Let D be the strict transform of D_Z on X . Then there exists a real number t such that $(E + tD) \cdot R = 0$. By Theorem 9.3(3), $E + tD \sim_{\mathbb{R}} f^*H$ for some \mathbb{R} -Cartier \mathbb{R} -divisor H on Z . Thus $D_Z \sim_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{t}H$ is \mathbb{R} -Cartier. Therefore, Z is \mathbb{Q} -factorial. \square

Corollary 9.20. *Let $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ be a \mathbb{Q} -factorial NQC glc g -pair and $f : X \rightarrow Z$ a contraction of a $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)$ -negative extremal ray R over U . Assume that f is a Fano contraction, i.e. $\dim X > \dim Z$. Then Z is \mathbb{Q} -factorial.*

Proof. Let D_Z be a divisor on Z and Z^0 the smooth locus of Z . Let D be the closure of $f^{-1}(D_Z|_{Z^0})$. Then D does not intersect any general fiber of f , hence $D \cdot R = 0$. By Theorem 9.3(3), $D \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} f^*H$ for some \mathbb{Q} -Cartier \mathbb{Q} -divisor H on Z . Thus $D_Z \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} H$ is \mathbb{Q} -Cartier. Therefore, Z is \mathbb{Q} -factorial. \square

The following corollary will allow us to run \mathbb{Q} -factorial generalized MMP with scaling (once the existence of flips is proven in the next section). It is similar to [HL18, Lemma 3.19].

Corollary 9.21. *Let $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ be a \mathbb{Q} -factorial NQC glc g -pair, $D \geq 0$ an \mathbb{R} -divisor on X , and \mathbf{N} an NQC/ U \mathbf{b} -divisor over X , such that $(X, B + D, \mathbf{M} + \mathbf{N})$ is glc and $K_X + B + D + \mathbf{M}_X + \mathbf{N}_X$ is nef/ U . Then either $K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X$ is nef/ U , or there exists an extremal ray R of $\overline{NE}(X/U)$, such that $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X) \cdot R < 0$ and $(K_X + B + tD + \mathbf{M}_X + t\mathbf{N}_X) \cdot R = 0$, where*

$$t := \sup\{s \geq 0 \mid K_X + B + sD + \mathbf{M}_X + s\mathbf{N}_X \text{ is nef}/U\}.$$

In particular, $K_X + B + tD + \mathbf{M}_X + t\mathbf{N}_X$ is nef/ U .

Proof. Let $\Delta := B + D$ and $\mathbf{P} := \mathbf{M} + \mathbf{N}$. By Theorem 2.46, we may write $K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X = \sum_{i=1}^k a_i(K_X + B^i + \mathbf{M}_X^i)$ and $K_X + \Delta + \mathbf{P}_X = \sum_{i=1}^l c_i(K_X + \Delta^i + \mathbf{P}_X^i)$, such that

- each $a_i, c_i \in (0, 1]$ and $\sum_{i=1}^k a_i = 1$, $\sum_{i=1}^l c_i = 1$,
- $\mathbf{M} = \sum_{i=1}^k a_i \mathbf{M}^i$ and $\mathbf{P} = \sum_{i=1}^l c_i \mathbf{P}^i$,

- each (X, B^i, \mathbf{M}^i) is glc, each $(X, \Delta^i, \mathbf{P}^i)$ is glc, and
- each $K_X + \Delta^i + \mathbf{P}_X^i$ is nef/ U .

Let m be a positive integer such that $m(K_X + B^i + \mathbf{M}_X^i)$ and $m(K_X + \Delta^i + \mathbf{P}_X^i)$ are Cartier for any i .

If $K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X$ is nef then there is nothing left to prove. Therefore, we may assume that $K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X$ is not nef. By Theorem 1.3, we may let $\{R_j\}_{j \in \Lambda}$ be the set of $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)$ -negative extremal rays in $\overline{NE}(X/U)$, and C_j a curve which generates R_j such that

$$-2 \dim X \leq (K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X) \cdot C_j < 0$$

for each j . Then for each j , we have

$$-2 \dim X \leq (K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X) \cdot C_j = \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{a_i n_{i,j}}{m} < 0$$

and

$$(K_X + \Delta + \mathbf{P}_X) \cdot C_j = \sum_{i=1}^l \frac{c_i n'_{i,j}}{m} \geq 0,$$

where $n_{i,j}, n'_{i,j}$ are integers, each $n_{i,j} \geq -2m \dim X$, and each $n'_{i,j} \geq 0$. Therefore, $\mathcal{I} := \{(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X) \cdot C_j \mid j \in \Lambda\}$ and $\mathcal{I}' := \{(K_X + \Delta + \mathbf{P}_X) \cdot C_j \mid j \in \Lambda\}$ are DCC sets.

For any $j \in \Lambda$, let t_j be the real number such that $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X + t_j(D + \mathbf{N}_X)) \cdot C_j = 0$. Let $\alpha_j := (K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X) \cdot C_j$ and $\beta_j := (K_X + \Delta + \mathbf{P}_X) \cdot C_j$, then $\alpha_j \in \mathcal{I}$, $\beta_j \in \mathcal{I}'$, $\alpha_j < 0$, $\beta_j \geq 0$, and

$$t_j = \frac{-\alpha_j}{\beta_j - \alpha_j} = \frac{1}{1 + \frac{\beta_j}{-\alpha_j}}.$$

Thus $\{t_j\}_{j \in \Lambda}$ is an ACC set, hence

$$t = \sup\{s \geq 0 \mid K_X + B + sD + \mathbf{M}_X + s\mathbf{N}_X \text{ is nef}/U\} = \sup_{j \in \Lambda} \{t_j\} = \max_{j \in \Lambda} \{t_j\} = t_{j_0}$$

for some $j_0 \in \Lambda$. We may pick $R = R_{j_0}$. □

10. PROOF OF THEOREMS 1.2, 1.4, AND 1.5

Now we are ready to prove the rest of our main theorems. We start with Theorem 1.2. In fact, we can prove a slightly stronger result only assuming that \mathbf{M}_X is \mathbb{R} -Cartier. Before we state the proof, let us recall the definitions of flipping contractions and flips.

Definition 10.1 (Flipping contraction). Let $X \rightarrow U$ be a projective morphism such that X is normal quasi-projective and D an \mathbb{R} -Cartier \mathbb{R} -divisor on X . A D -flipping contraction over U is a contraction $f : X \rightarrow Z$ over U satisfying the following:

- (1) f is the contraction of a D -negative extremal ray R in $\overline{NE}(X/U)$. In particular, $\rho(X/Z) = 1$.
- (2) f is small, i.e. $\dim X = \dim Z$ and the exceptional locus of f is of codimension ≥ 2 in X .

Definition 10.2 (Flip). Let X be a normal quasi-projective variety, D an \mathbb{R} -Cartier \mathbb{R} -divisor on X , and $f : X \rightarrow Z$ a D -flipping contraction. A D -flip is a birational contraction $f^+ : X^+ \rightarrow Z$ satisfying the following.

- (1) D^+ is \mathbb{R} -Cartier and ample/ Z , where D^+ is the strict transform of D on X^+ .
- (2) f^+ is small.

Theorem 10.3. *Let $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ be an NQC glc g -pair and $f : X \rightarrow Z$ a $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)$ -flipping contraction over U . Assume that \mathbf{M}_X is \mathbb{R} -Cartier. Then the flip $f^+ : X^+ \rightarrow Z$ of f exists.*

In particular, \mathbf{M}_{X^+} is \mathbb{R} -Cartier, and if X is \mathbb{Q} -factorial, then X^+ is \mathbb{Q} -factorial and $\rho(X) = \rho(X^+)$.

Proof. We prove the theorem in three steps. In Step 1, we construct the morphism $f^+ : X^+ \rightarrow Z$. In Step 2, we show that the morphism f^+ constructed in Step 1 is a $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)$ -flip. In Step 3, we prove the in particular part of the theorem.

Step 1. In this step, we construct the morphism $f^+ : X^+ \rightarrow Z$.

Let $h : \tilde{X} \rightarrow X$ be a birational morphism such that \mathbf{M} descends to \tilde{X} . Since \mathbf{M}_X is \mathbb{R} -Cartier and $\mathbf{M}_{\tilde{X}}$ is nef/ X , we have

$$\mathbf{M}_{\tilde{X}} + E = h^* \mathbf{M}_X$$

for some $E \geq 0$ that is exceptional over X . Let $T \subset X$ be the flipping locus and let C be any flipping curve contracted by f . There are two cases:

Case 1. $\mathbf{M}_X \cdot C \geq 0$. Then $(K_X + B) \cdot C < 0$, and f is also a $(K_X + B)$ -flipping contraction. Thus there exists an ample/ Z \mathbb{R} -divisor $A \geq 0$ on X such that $K_X + B + A \sim_{\mathbb{R}, Z} 0$ and $(X, B + A)$ is lc. By [Has19, Theorem 1.1], $(X, B)/U$ has a good minimal model. By Theorem 9.3(3), we have $K_X + B \sim_{\mathbb{R}, Z} r(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)$ for some positive real number r . We let $g : Y \rightarrow X$ be a dlt modification of (X, B) and let $K_Y + B_Y = g^*(K_X + B)$, then $K_Y + B_Y + \mathbf{M}_Y = g^*(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)$, and $(Y, B_Y, \mathbf{M})/U$ and $(Y, B_Y, \mathbf{0})/U$ are glc g-pairs such that Y is \mathbb{Q} -factorial klt. By Lemma 8.1, $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/Z$ has a good minimal model $(X', B', \mathbf{M})/Z$, and we may let $X' \rightarrow X^+$ be the contraction induced by $K_{X'} + B' + \mathbf{M}_{X'}$ over Z and let $f^+ : X^+ \rightarrow Z$ be the induced morphism.

Case 2. $\mathbf{M}_X \cdot C < 0$. In this case, $C \subset h(E)$, hence $T \subset h(E)$. Let $Z^0 := Z \setminus \{f(h(E))\}$, $X^0 := X \times_Z Z^0$, $B^0 := B \times_Z Z^0$, and $\mathbf{M}^0 := \mathbf{M} \times_Z Z^0$. Since center $_X E$ does not contain any glc center of $(X, B, (1 - \epsilon)\mathbf{M})$, for any $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$,

- all glc centers of $(X, B, (1 - \epsilon)\mathbf{M})$ intersect X^0 ,
- $(X^0, B^0, (1 - \epsilon)\mathbf{M}^0)/Z^0$ is a good minimal model of itself (this is because $X^0 \cong Z^0$), and
- \mathbf{M}^0 descends to X^0 and $\mathbf{M}_{X^0}^0 \sim_{\mathbb{R}, Z^0} 0$.

Let $\epsilon_0 \in (0, 1)$ be a real number such that f is also a $(K_X + B + (1 - \epsilon_0)\mathbf{M}_X)$ -flipping contraction. By Theorem 1.1, $(X, B, (1 - \epsilon_0)\mathbf{M})/Z$ has a good minimal model. Since $\rho(X/Z) = 1$, there exists a positive real number r such that $K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X \equiv_Z r(K_X + B + (1 - \epsilon_0)\mathbf{M}_X)$. By Theorem 9.3(3), $K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X \sim_{\mathbb{R}, Z} r(K_X + B + (1 - \epsilon_0)\mathbf{M}_X)$. Let $g : Y \rightarrow X$ be a dlt modification of (X, B) and let $K_Y + B_Y := g^*(K_X + B)$, then $K_Y + B_Y + (1 - \epsilon_0)\mathbf{M}_Y = g^*(K_X + B + (1 - \epsilon_0)\mathbf{M}_X)$ and $K_Y + B_Y + \mathbf{M}_Y = g^*(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)$, and $(Y, B_Y, (1 - \epsilon_0)\mathbf{M})/U$ and $(Y, B_Y, \mathbf{M})/U$ are glc g-pairs such that Y is \mathbb{Q} -factorial klt. By Lemma 8.1, $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/Z$ has a good minimal model $(X', B', \mathbf{M})/Z$, and we may let $X' \rightarrow X^+$ be the contraction induced by $K_{X'} + B' + \mathbf{M}_{X'}$ over Z and let $f^+ : X^+ \rightarrow Z$ be the induced morphism.

Step 2. In this step, we show that the f^+ we constructed in Step 1 is a $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)$ -flip. Let B^+ be the strict transform of B on X^+ . We only need to check the following two conditions by the definition of a flip:

- (I) $K_{X^+} + B^+ + \mathbf{M}_{X^+}$ is \mathbb{R} -Cartier and ample/ Z .
- (II) f^+ is small.

(I) is immediate from our construction. Since f is small, to prove (II), we only need to show that the rational map $X \dashrightarrow X^+$ does not extract any divisor.

Let $p : W \rightarrow X$ and $q : W \rightarrow X'$ be a resolution of indeterminacy of $X \dashrightarrow X'$. By Lemma 3.8, $p^*(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X) = q^*(K_{X'} + B' + \mathbf{M}_{X'}) + F$ where $F \geq 0$ is exceptional over X' . Let D be a prime divisor on X' that is exceptional over X and D_W its strict transform on W . Then D_W is covered by a family of p -vertical curves Σ_t such that $\Sigma_t \cdot p^*(K_X + B_X + \mathbf{M}_X) = 0$. Since $F \cdot \Sigma_t \geq 0$, then $\Sigma_t \cdot q^*(K_{X'} + B' + \mathbf{M}_{X'}) \leq 0$. Let $\Sigma'_t = q_* \Sigma_t$, then $\Sigma'_t \cdot (K_{X'} + B' + \mathbf{M}_{X'}) \leq 0$ so that Σ'_t are contracted by $X' \rightarrow X^+$ and hence D is also contracted. Thus $X \dashrightarrow X^+$ does not extract any divisor, which implies (II). Thus f^+ is a $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)$ -flip.

Step 3. Now we prove the in particular part of the theorem. Pick any \mathbb{R} -divisor D^+ on X^+ , and let D be the strict transform of D^+ on X .

Assume that D is \mathbb{R} -Cartier. Since $\rho(X/Z) = 1$, there exists a real number t such that $D + t(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X) \equiv_Z 0$. By Theorem 9.3(3), $D + t(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X) \sim_{\mathbb{R},Z} 0$. Thus $D + t(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X) \sim_{\mathbb{R}} f^*D_Z$ for some \mathbb{R} -Cartier \mathbb{R} -divisor D_Z on Z . Therefore, $D^+ + t(K_{X^+} + B^+ + \mathbf{M}_{X^+}) \sim_{\mathbb{R}} (f^+)^*D_Z$. Since $K_{X^+} + B^+ + \mathbf{M}_{X^+}$ is \mathbb{R} -Cartier, D^+ is \mathbb{R} -Cartier. Therefore, if \mathbf{M}_X is \mathbb{R} -Cartier, then \mathbf{M}_{X^+} is \mathbb{R} -Cartier, and if X is \mathbb{Q} -factorial, then X^+ is \mathbb{Q} -factorial.

Since $X \dashrightarrow X^+$ is an isomorphism in codimension 1, there is a natural isomorphism between the groups of Weil divisors on X and X^+ . When X and X^+ are both \mathbb{Q} -factorial, we have $\rho(X) = \rho(X^+)$, and the proof is concluded. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.2. It immediately follows from Theorem 10.3. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.4. It immediately follows from Theorems 10.3, 9.3, 9.1, and Corollaries 9.18 and 9.19. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.5. It immediately follows from Theorem 1.4 and [HM20, Corollary 1], [CT20, Theorems 1.2,1.3]. \square

REFERENCES

- [AK00] D. Abramovich and K. Karu, *Weak semistable reduction in characteristic 0*, Invent. Math. **139** (2000), no. 2, 241–273.
- [AHK07] V. Alexeev, C. D. Hacon, and Y. Kawamata, *Termination of (many) 4-dimensional log flips*, Invent. Math. **168** (2007), no. 2, 433–448.
- [Amb03] F. Ambro, *Quasi-log varieties*, Tr. Mat. Inst. Steklova **240** (2003), Biratsion. Geom. Linein. Sist. Konechno Porozhdennye Algebr, 220–239; translation in Proc. Steklov Inst. Math. 2003, no. 1 (240), 214–233.
- [Bir07] C. Birkar, *Ascending chain condition for log canonical thresholds and termination of log flips*, Duke Math. J. **136** (2007), no. 1, 173–180.
- [Bir12a] C. Birkar, *Existence of log canonical flips and a special LMMP*, Pub. Math. IHES., **115** (2012), 325–368.
- [Bir12b] C. Birkar, *On existence of log minimal models and weak Zariski decompositions*, Math. Ann. **354** (2012), no. 2, 787–799.
- [Bir18] C. Birkar, *Log Calabi-Yau fibrations*, arXiv: 1811.10709v2.
- [Bir19] C. Birkar, *Anti-pluricanonical systems on Fano varieties*. Ann. of Math. (2), **190** (2019), 345–463.
- [Bir20a] C. Birkar, *Geometry and moduli of polarised varieties*, arXiv: 2006.11238v1.
- [Bir20b] C. Birkar, *Generalised pairs in birational geometry*, arXiv: 2008.01008v2.
- [Bir20c] C. Birkar, *On connectedness of non-klt loci of singularities of pairs*, arXiv: 2010.08226v1.
- [Bir21a] C. Birkar, *Singularities of linear systems and boundedness of Fano varieties*, Ann. of Math. **193** (2021), no. 2, 347–405.
- [Bir21b] C. Birkar, *Boundedness and volume of generalised pairs*, arXiv: 2103.14935v2.
- [BCHM10] C. Birkar, P. Cascini, C. D. Hacon and J. McKernan, *Existence of minimal models for varieties of log general type*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **23** (2010), no. 2, 405–468.
- [BDCS20] C. Birkar, G. Di Cerbo, and R. Svaldi, *Boundedness of elliptic Calabi-Yau varieties with a rational section*, arXiv: 2010.09769v1.
- [BH14] C. Birkar and Z. Hu, *Polarized pairs, log minimal models, and Zariski decompositions*, Nagoya Math. J. **215** (2014), 203–224.
- [BZ16] C. Birkar and D.-Q. Zhang, *Effectivity of Itaka fibrations and pluricanonical systems of polarized pairs*, Pub. Math. IHES., **123** (2016), 283–331.
- [Che20] G. Chen, *Boundedness of n -complements for generalized pairs*, arXiv: 2003.04237v2.
- [CT20] G. Chen and N. Tsakanikas, *On the termination of flips for log canonical generalized pairs*, arXiv: 2011.02236v1.
- [CX20] G. Chen and Q. Xue, *Boundedness of (ϵ, n) -Complements for projective generalized pairs of Fano type*, arXiv: 2008.07121v1.
- [Cho08] R. Choi, *The geography of log models and its applications*, PhD Thesis, Johns Hopkins University (2008).
- [Fil18a] S. Filipazzi, *Boundedness of Log Canonical Surface Generalized Polarized Pairs*, Taiwanese J. Math. **22** (2018), no.4, 813–850.
- [Fil18b] S. Filipazzi, *On a generalized canonical bundle formula and generalized adjunction*, arXiv: 1807.04847v3.
- [Fil20] S. Filipazzi, *On the boundedness of n -folds with $\kappa(X) = n - 1$* , arXiv: 2005.05508v2.

- [FS20a] S. Filipazzi and R. Svaldi, *Invariance of Plurigenera and boundedness for Generalized Pairs*, arXiv: 2005.04254v2.
- [FS20b] S. Filipazzi and R. Svaldi, *On the connectedness principle and dual complexes for generalized pairs*, arXiv: 2010.08018v2.
- [FW20] S. Filipazzi and J. Waldron, *Connectedness principle in characteristic $p > 5$* , arXiv: 2010.08414v2.
- [Fuj04] O. Fujino, *Termination of 4-fold canonical flips*, Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci, **40** (2004), no. 1, 231–237.
- [Fuj05] O. Fujino, *Addendum to “Termination of 4-fold canonical flips”*, Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci. **41** (2005), no. 1, 252–257.
- [Fuj10] O. Fujino, *On Kawamata’s theorem*, Classification of Algebraic Varieties, EMS Ser. of Congr. Rep., Eur. Math. Soc., Zürich (2010), 305–315.
- [Fuj11] O. Fujino, *Foundations of the minimal model program*, MSJ Memoirs, **35**. Mathematical Society of Japan, Tokyo (2017).
- [Fuj12] O. Fujino, *Base point free theorems: saturation, B -divisors, and canonical bundle formula*, Algebra Number Theory **6** (2012), no. 4, 797–823.
- [Fuj13] O. Fujino, *A transcendental approach to Kollár’s injectivity theorem II*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **681** (2013), 149–174.
- [Fuj18] O. Fujino, *Fundamental properties of basic slc -trivial fibrations I*, to appear in Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci., arXiv: 1804.11134v3.
- [Fuj19] O. Fujino, *Corrigendum: On subadditivity of the logarithmic Kodaira dimension*, arXiv: 1904.11639v3.
- [Fuj21] O. Fujino, *Cone theorem and Mori hyperbolicity*, arXiv:2102.11986v1.
- [FG14] O. Fujino and Y. Gongyo, *Log pluricanonical representations and abundance conjecture*, Compos. Math. **150** (2014), no. 4, 593–620.
- [FH21] O. Fujino and K. Hashizume, *Existence of log canonical modifications and its applications*, arXiv: 2103.01417.
- [FM00] O. Fujino and S. Mori, *A canonical bundle formula*, J. Differential Geom. **56** (2000), no. 1, 167–188.
- [Fuk96] S. Fukuda, *On base point free theorem*, Kodai Math. J.19 (1996), no. 2,191–199.
- [Gon11] Y. Gongyo, *On the minimal model theory for dlt pairs of numerical kodaira dimension zero*, Math. Res. Lett. **18** (2011), no. 5, 991–1000.
- [HH19] C. D. Hacon and J. Han, *On a connectedness principle of Shokurov-Kollár type*, Sci. China Math. **62** (2019), no. 3, 411–416.
- [HMX14] C. D. Hacon, J. McKernan, and C. Xu, *ACC for log canonical thresholds*, Ann. of Math. **180** (2014), no. 2, 523–571.
- [HM20] C. D. Hacon and J. Moraga, *On weak Zariski decompositions and termination of flips*, Math. Res. Lett. **27** (2020), no. 5, 1393–1421.
- [HX13] C. D. Hacon and C. Xu, *Existence of log canonical closures*, Invent. Math. **192** (2013), no. 1, 161–195.
- [HX15] C. D. Hacon and C. Xu, *Boundedness of log Calabi-Yau pairs of Fano type*, Math. Res. Lett. **22** (2015), no. 6, 1699–1716.
- [HX16] C. D. Hacon and C. Xu, *On finiteness of B -representations and semi-log canonical abundance in Minimal Models and Extremal Rays (Kyoto, 2011)*, Adv. Stud. Pure Math. **70** (2016), Math. Soc. Japan, Tokyo, 361–378.
- [HL18] J. Han and Z. Li, *Weak Zariski decompositions and log terminal models for generalized polarized pairs*, arXiv: 1806.01234v2.
- [HL20a] J. Han and Z. Li, *On Fujita’s conjecture for pseudo-effective thresholds*, Math. Res. Lett. **27** (2020), no. 2, 377–396.
- [HL20b] J. Han and Z. Li, *On accumulation points of pseudo-effective thresholds*, Manuscripta math (2020).
- [HL20c] J. Han and J. Liu, *Effective birationality for sub-pairs with real coefficients*, arXiv: 2007.01849v1.
- [HLS19] J. Han, J. Liu, and V. V. Shokurov, *ACC for minimal log discrepancies of exceptional singularities*, arXiv: 1903.04338v2.
- [HL19] J. Han and W. Liu, *On a generalized canonical bundle formula for generically finite morphisms*, arXiv: 1905.12542v3, to appear in Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble).
- [HL20d] J. Han and W. Liu, *On numerical nonvanishing for generalized log canonical pairs*, Doc. Math. **25** (2020), 93–123.
- [Has18] K. Hashizume, *Minimal model theory for relatively trivial log canonical pairs*, Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) **68** (2018), no. 5, 2069–2107.
- [Has19] K. Hashizume, *Remarks on special kinds of the relative log minimal model program*, Manuscripta Math. **160** (2019), no. 3, 285–314.
- [Has20] K. Hashizume, *Non-vanishing theorem for generalized log canonical pairs with a polarization*, arXiv: 2012.15038v1.
- [HH20] K. Hashizume and Z. Hu, *On minimal model theory for log abundant lc pairs*, J. Reine Angew. Math., **767** (2020), 109–159.
- [Hu20] Z. Hu, *Log abundance of the moduli b -divisors for lc -trivial fibrations*, arXiv: 2003.14379v3.

- [Hu21] Z. Hu, *An abundance theorem for generalised pairs*, arXiv: 2103.11813v1.
- [Jia21] J. Jiao, *On the Boundedness of Canonical Models*, arXiv: 2103.13609v1.
- [Kaw84] Y. Kawamata, *The cone of curves of algebraic varieties*, Ann. of Math. **119** (1984), 603–633.
- [Kaw92] Y. Kawamata, *Termination of log flips for algebraic 3-folds*, Internat. J. Math. **3** (1992), no. 5, 653–659.
- [Kaw98] Y. Kawamata, *Subadjunction of log canonical divisors, II*, Amer. J. Math. **120** (1998), 893–899.
- [Kaw15] Y. Kawamata, *Variation of mixed Hodge structures and the positivity for algebraic fiber spaces*, Advanced Studies in Pure Mathematics, **65** (2015), 27–57.
- [KMM87] Y. Kawamata, K. Matsuda, and K. Matsuki, *Introduction to the minimal model problem*, Algebraic geometry, Sendai, 1985, 283–360, Adv. Stud. Pure Math., **10**, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1987.
- [Kol84] J. Kollár, *The cone theorem*, Ann. of Math., **120** (1984), 1–5.
- [Kol07] J. Kollár, *“Kodaira’s canonical bundle formula and adjunction*. In: *Flips for 3-folds and 4-folds*. Ed. by A. Corti. Vol. 35. Oxford Lecture Series in Mathematics and its Applications. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007. Chap. 8, 134–162.
- [Kol14] J. Kollár, *Semi-Normal Log Centres and Deformations of Pairs*, Proc. Edinburgh Math. Soc., **57** (2014), no. 1, 191–199.
- [KM98] J. Kollár and S. Mori, *Birational geometry of algebraic varieties*, Cambridge Tracts in Math. **134** (1998), Cambridge Univ. Press.
- [LP20a] V. Lazic and T. Peternell, *On generalised abundance, I*, Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci. **56** (2020), no. 2, 353–389.
- [LP20b] V. Lazic and T. Peternell, *On generalised abundance, II*, Peking Mathematical Journal **3** (2020), 1–46.
- [LMT20] V. Lazic, J. Moraga, and N. Tsakanikas, *Special termination for log canonical pairs*, arXiv: 2007.06458v1.
- [LT19] V. Lazic and N. Tsakanikas, *On the existence of minimal models for log canonical pairs*, to appear in Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci., arXiv: 1905.05576v3.
- [LT21] V. Lazic and N. Tsakanikas, *Special MMP for log canonical generalised pairs*, personal communication.
- [Li20] Z. Li, *Boundedness of the base varieties of certain fibrations*, arXiv: 2002.06565v2.
- [Li21] Z. Li, *Fujita’s conjecture on iterated accumulation points of pseudo-effective thresholds*, Selecta Mathematica **27** (2021), no. 9.
- [Liu21] J. Liu, *Sarkisov program for generalized pairs*, Osaka J. Math., **58** (2021), no. 4.
- [LX21] J. Liu and L. Xie, *Number of singular points on projective surfaces*, arXiv: 2103.04522v1.
- [Mor18] J. Moraga, *Termination of pseudo-effective 4-fold flips*, arXiv: 1802.10202v3.
- [Nak86] N. Nakayama, *Invariance of the plurigenera of algebraic varieties under minimal model conjectures*, Topology **25** (1986), no. 2, 237–251.
- [Nak16] Y. Nakamura, *On minimal log discrepancies on varieties with fixed Gorenstein index*. Michigan Math. J., **65** (1), 165–187, 2016.
- [Nak04] N. Nakayama, *Zariski-decomposition and abundance*, MSJ Memoirs, vol. 14, Mathematical Society of Japan, Tokyo, 2004.
- [Sho96] V.V. Shokurov, *3-fold log models*, J. Math. Sci. **81** (1996), no. 3, 2667–2699.
- [Sho20] V.V. Shokurov, *Existence and boundedness of n-complements*, arXiv: 2012.06495v1.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, THE UNIVERSITY OF UTAH, SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84112, USA
 Email address: hacon@math.utah.edu

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, THE UNIVERSITY OF UTAH, SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84112, USA
 Email address: jliu@math.utah.edu