

MODULI OF BOUNDARY POLARIZED CALABI–YAU PAIRS

KENNETH ASCHER, DORI BEJLERI, HAROLD BLUM, KRISTIN DEVLEMING, GIOVANNI INCHIOSTRO,
YUCHEN LIU, AND XIAOWEI WANG

ABSTRACT. We develop the moduli theory of boundary polarized CY pairs, which are slc Calabi–Yau pairs (X, D) such that D is ample. The motivation for studying this moduli problem is to construct a moduli space at the Calabi–Yau wall interpolating between certain K-moduli and KSBA moduli spaces. We prove that the moduli stack of boundary polarized CY pairs is S-complete, Θ -reductive, and satisfies the existence part of the valuative criterion for properness, which are steps towards constructing a proper moduli space. A key obstacle in this theory is that the irreducible components of the moduli stack are not in general of finite type. Despite this issue, in the case of pairs (X, D) where X is a degeneration of \mathbb{P}^2 , we construct a projective moduli space on which the Hodge line bundle is ample. As a consequence, we complete the proof of a conjecture of Prokhorov and Shokurov in relative dimension two.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	2
2. Preliminaries	8
3. Moduli stack	17
4. Test configurations	21
5. S-completeness	29
6. Theta-reductivity	35
7. Properness	40
8. Sources and regularity	43
9. Moduli stacks of plane curves	51
10. Explicit S-equivalence classes	54
11. Twisted varieties	64
12. Existence of good moduli spaces	69
13. Asymptotically good moduli spaces	74
14. Ampleness of the Hodge line bundle	76
15. Proofs of main theorems	88
16. Examples	89
Appendix A. Special degenerations of \mathbb{P}^2	96
Appendix B. Coregularity 0 pairs	97
References	100

1. INTRODUCTION

Recently, there has been tremendous progress in constructing compact moduli spaces of higher dimensional varieties. The main classes of varieties to consider are canonically polarized varieties, Calabi–Yau varieties, and Fano varieties, which, from the viewpoint of birational geometry, are the three building blocks of algebraic varieties. For canonically polarized varieties, the Kollár, Shepherd-Barron, and Alexeev (KSBA) approach produces a projective moduli space parametrizing canonically polarized varieties with slc singularities [KSB88, Ale94, Kol08, BCHM10, AH11, HX13, KP17, HMX18, Fuj18, Kol19]. For Fano varieties, an approach using K-stability produces a projective moduli space parametrizing K-polystable Fano varieties [Jia20, CP21, LWX21, BX19, ABHLX20, Xu20, BLX22, XZ20, XZ21, BHLLX21, LXZ22]. See [Kol23, Xu21, Xu23] for surveys on these topics.

In the remaining case, the problem is to construct compact moduli spaces of Calabi–Yau varieties polarized by an ample line bundle. While there is no unified solution to this problem, techniques including Hodge theory, KSBA moduli, Fano K-moduli, mirror symmetry, geometric invariant theory, and differential geometry provide various approaches to the problem and are successful in specific examples. In this paper, we introduce a new approach that bridges the KSBA and Fano K-moduli theories and apply it to certain examples.

The main objects we consider are *boundary polarized CY pairs*, which are semi-log-canonical (slc) pairs (X, D) such that X is projective, D is an ample \mathbb{Q} -Cartier \mathbb{Q} -divisor, and $K_X + D \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0$.¹ Note that $-K_X$ is ample and so X is an slc Fano variety. Many important classes of Calabi–Yau varieties are naturally associated to such pairs.

- (1) A smooth hypersurface $H \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ of degree $n + 1$ gives such a pair (\mathbb{P}^n, H) .
- (2) A general K3 surface of degree two is the double cover of such a pair $(\mathbb{P}^2, \frac{1}{2}C_6)$, where C_6 is a sextic plane curve. More generally, a hyperelliptic K3 surface is a double cover of a pair of the form $(X, \frac{1}{2}C)$, where X is a del Pezzo surface.
- (3) The projective cone $X := C_p(Y, L)$ over a Calabi–Yau variety Y with respect to an ample line bundle L with divisor $Y \cong D \subset X$ at infinity is such a pair.

Via the construction in (3), the moduli theory of Calabi–Yau varieties polarized by an ample line bundle is contained in the moduli theory of boundary polarized CY pairs. This relationship will be studied in detail in future work.

In certain situations, both KSBA and K-moduli theories can be used to construct compactifications of the moduli of boundary polarized CY pairs. Indeed, if (X, D) is a boundary polarized CY pair that is klt (for example, the klt condition occurs in (2)), then

- $(X, (1 - \varepsilon)D)$ is a K-semistable log Fano pair,
- (X, D) is a klt CY pair, and
- $(X, (1 + \varepsilon)D)$ is a KSBA stable canonically polarized pair,

for $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$. Therefore, Fano K-moduli and KSBA machinery combined with boundedness results (needed to deal with an ε in the coefficient) produce projective moduli spaces of such pairs and we denote them by M^K and M^{KSBA} . Such moduli spaces were constructed in [ADL19, Zho23] and [KX20, Bir23, Bir22], respectively.

In the special case when $X := \mathbb{P}^2$ and $D := \frac{3}{d}C$, where $C \subset \mathbb{P}^2$ is a smooth degree d curve, the above K-moduli and KSBA compactifications were studied by Ascher, DeVleming, and Liu in [ADL19] and by Hacking in [Hac04], respectively. Furthermore, in this case, the first three authors conjectured that at $\varepsilon = 0$ there exists a moduli space of CY pairs that is the common ample model of the Hodge line bundles on M^K and M^{KSBA} .

One reason to believe the existence of this moduli space of CY pairs comes from K-stability for polarized varieties. For Fano varieties, K-stability produces the K-moduli space of Fano varieties.

¹More generally, we will also consider pairs of the form $(X, \Delta + D)$; see Definition 2.2.

For canonically polarized varieties, KSBA stability agrees with K-stability by [Oda12, Oda13b]. Hence, the moduli spaces M^K and M^{KSBA} are both K-moduli spaces and there ideally would be a K-moduli space M^{CY} at $\varepsilon = 0$ parametrizing certain CY pairs. Such a space would interpolate between two very different geometries: log general type and Fano.

To determine what the Calabi–Yau moduli space should parametrize, note that the Fano K-moduli space M^K is a good moduli space as defined in [Alp13] and parametrizes S-equivalence classes of K-semistable log Fano pairs. Here, two K-semistable log Fano pairs are S-equivalent if they degenerate to a common K-semistable log Fano pair via test configurations. By [Oda13a, Oda13b], a polarized K-trivial variety is K-semistable if and only if it is slc. Thus, when the Calabi–Yau moduli space exists, it should parametrize S-equivalence classes of (slc) boundary polarized CY pairs.

The moduli theory of boundary polarized CY pairs differs from both the KSBA and Fano K-moduli theories:

- Boundary polarized CY pairs can have non-discrete automorphism groups and can admit isotrivial degenerations to other such pairs. In particular, the moduli stack will be algebraic, but not in general Deligne–Mumford.
- The irreducible components of the moduli stack are often not quasi-compact and hence not of finite type. See Example 9.4 for simple examples.

While the first issue does not occur for KSBA stable varieties, it appears for K-semistable Fano varieties and requires technical machinery to understand and construct a good moduli space in the sense of [Alp13]. The second issue differs significantly from both the KSBA and Fano K-moduli theories and will be a crucial obstacle moving forward.

1.1. Higher dimensional results. Before constructing the moduli space of CY pairs in specific examples, we will need to build up considerable theory. As a first step, we construct a moduli stack parametrizing boundary polarized CY pairs with fixed invariants (see Definition 3.6). This is carried out in Section 3 and uses many of the same techniques in the construction of the moduli stack of KSBA stable pairs in [Kol23]. As mentioned above, the irreducible components of the stack are not in general of finite type.

In hopes of constructing a good moduli space for the stack, we recall the foundational result of [AHLH18], which states that a finite type algebraic stack with affine diagonal admits a separated good moduli space if and only if it is S-complete and Θ -reductive [AHLH18]. The latter two notions are defined in Sections 5.1 and 6.1 and may be thought of as valuative criteria over two-dimensional bases and require extensions of families over punctured surfaces. The first main theorem of this paper shows that almost all of these conditions are satisfied for the moduli stack of boundary polarized CY pairs.

Theorem 1.1. *The moduli stack of boundary polarized CY pairs is algebraic, locally of finite type, and has affine diagonal. Moreover, the stack is*

- (1) *S-complete,*
- (2) *Θ -reductive, and*
- (3) *satisfies the existence part of the valuative criterion for properness*

all with respect to DVRs essentially of finite type over the base field.

In a future work we will prove an analogue of this result for the moduli stack of Calabi–Yau varieties polarized by an ample \mathbb{Q} -line bundle.

While Theorem 1.1 may seem abstract, it implies the following concrete results regarding degenerations of boundary polarized CY pairs over the germ of a smooth curve $0 \in C$.

- **PROPERNESS:** If $(X^\circ, D^\circ) \rightarrow C^\circ$ is a family of boundary polarized CY pairs over $C^\circ := C \setminus 0$, then it admits an extension to a family over C , possibly after a finite ramified base change.

- Θ -REDUCTIVITY: If $(X, D) \rightarrow C$ is a family of boundary polarized CY pairs, then any weakly special test configuration of the generic fiber extends to the special fiber.
- S-COMPLETENESS: S-completeness implies the next corollary, which is a Calabi–Yau analogue of the main theorem of [BX19].

Corollary 1.2. *Let $(X, D) \rightarrow C$ and $(X', D') \rightarrow C$ be families of boundary polarized CY pairs over the germ of a smooth pointed curve $0 \in C$. If there is an isomorphism*

$$(X, D)|_{C^\circ} \cong (X', D')|_{C^\circ},$$

over $C^\circ := C \setminus 0$, then (X_0, D_0) and (X'_0, D'_0) are S-equivalent.

In the above corollary, *S-equivalence* means that (X_0, D_0) and (X'_0, D'_0) admit degenerations via test configurations to a common boundary polarized CY pair; see Definition 6.7. Roughly, the corollary states that any moduli space parametrizing S-equivalence classes of boundary polarized CY pairs is separated.

The proofs of Theorem 1.1.1 and 1.1.2 are inspired by the proofs of S-completeness and Θ -reductivity for the moduli stack of K-semistable Fano varieties in [ABHLX20], which builds on [BX19, LWX21]. Additional subtleties arise in the proof in the boundary polarized CY case due to the presence of slc, rather than klt, singularities. To deal with this obstacle, the proof uses the MMP for lc pairs [HX13] and Kollár’s gluing theory [Kol13]. Theorem 1.1.3 is related to, but different from, extension results for CY pairs in the literature [Fuj11, KLSV18, KX20]. Its proof combines [KX20] with a perturbation argument. In particular, we obtain a stronger version of the existence part of the valuative criterion than one expects for general Artin stacks (see Remark 7.2).

Note that Theorem 1.1 may not be immediately applied to construct a moduli space of boundary polarized CY pairs, since the irreducible components of the moduli stack will not always be of finite type. Significant additional work is needed to construct a moduli space in specific examples.

1.2. Moduli of plane curve pairs. Let \mathcal{P}_d denote the stack parametrizing families of pairs $(\mathbb{P}^2, \frac{3}{d}C)$, where $C \subset \mathbb{P}^2$ is a smooth degree $d \geq 3$ curve. We consider the following three compactifications of the stack.

- (i) CALABI–YAU: $\mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY}}$ denotes the stack theoretic closure of \mathcal{P}_d in the moduli stack of boundary polarized CY pairs.
- (ii) K-MODULI: $\mathcal{P}_d^K \subset \mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY}}$ denotes the open locus consisting of pairs (X, D) such that $(X, (1 - \varepsilon)D)$ is K-semistable for $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$.
- (iii) KSBA: $\mathcal{P}_d^{\text{H}} \subset \mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY}}$ denotes the open locus consisting of pairs (X, D) such that $(X, (1 + \varepsilon)D)$ is KSBA stable (i.e. slc) for $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$. The notation is a reference to Hacking [Hac04].

Concretely, the points of $\mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY}}$ correspond to boundary polarized CY pairs that are degenerations of families of pairs $(\mathbb{P}^2, \frac{3}{d}C)$, where C is a smooth degree d plane curve. By [ADL19] and [Hac04], the K-moduli and KSBA stacks have associated good moduli spaces $\phi_K : \mathcal{P}_d^K \rightarrow P_d^K$ and $\phi_H : \mathcal{P}_d^{\text{H}} \rightarrow P_d^{\text{H}}$. The following theorem produces a moduli space of Calabi–Yau pairs as conjectured in [ADL19, Conj. 1.8].

Theorem 1.3. *For any $d \geq 3$, there exists a seminormal projective variety P_d^{CY} and a surjective morphism*

$$\phi : (\mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY}})^{\text{sn}} \rightarrow P_d^{\text{CY}},$$

where sn denotes seminormalization, such that the following hold:

- (1) *The map ϕ is universal among maps from $(\mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY}})^{\text{sn}}$ to algebraic spaces.*
- (2) *The moduli space P_d^{CY} parametrizes S-equivalence classes of pairs in $\mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY}}$.*

(3) *There exists a wall crossing diagram*

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 \mathcal{P}_d^K & \hookrightarrow & (\mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY}})^{\text{sn}} & \longleftarrow & (\mathcal{P}_d^{\text{H}})^{\text{sn}} \\
 \phi_K \downarrow & & \downarrow \phi & & \downarrow \phi_H^{\text{sn}} \\
 P_d^K & \longrightarrow & P_d^{\text{CY}} & \longleftarrow & (P_d^{\text{H}})^{\text{sn}}
 \end{array}$$

where the arrows in the first row are open immersions and in the second are projective birational morphisms for $d > 3$.²

(4) *The Hodge line bundle on P_d^{CY} is ample.*

The geometry of ϕ is governed by the divisibility of the degree. Indeed, when $3 \nmid d$, the geometry is well behaved: $\mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY}}$ is a smooth algebraic stack of finite type, P_d^{CY} is normal, and ϕ is a good moduli space morphism. When $3 \mid d$, the moduli problem is unbounded: $\mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY}}$ is not finite type and ϕ fails to be a good moduli space morphism by Remark 13.9. To remedy this failure, we introduce the notion of an *asymptotically good moduli space* (Definition 13.1), which allows for unboundedness.

The moduli space P_d^{CY} has similarities to the Baily–Borel (BB) compactification of the moduli space of polarized K3 surfaces. Indeed the Hodge line bundle is ample on P_d^{CY} , the boundary parametrizes lower dimensional CY pairs, and the compactification is minimal in that both P_d^K and P_d^{H} map down to it. In fact, when $d = 4, 6$, this heuristic can be made precise: P_4^{CY} is isomorphic to the BB compactification of the moduli space of ADE K3 surfaces of degree 4 with a $\mathbb{Z}/4\mathbb{Z}$ symmetry constructed by Kondō [Kon00], and P_6^{CY} is isomorphic to the BB compactification of the moduli space of primitively polarized K3 surfaces of degree two; see Section 16. Thus Theorem 1.3 gives a moduli interpretation to the previous two BB compactifications. It would be interesting to find explicit descriptions of P_d^{CY} for additional degrees and relate them to other moduli spaces of polarized Calabi–Yau varieties.

1.2.1. *Sketch of proof.* The proof of Theorem 1.3 combines the abstract theory developed in Theorem 1.1 and an in depth analysis of degenerations of plane curve pairs.

To construct the moduli space, we first analyze the case when $3 \nmid d$. In this case, $\mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY}}$ is of finite type and we can use Theorem 1.1 to construct P_d^{CY} . The case when $3 \mid d$ is significantly more involved since $\mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY}}$ will not be of finite type. In this case, we write $\mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY}}$ as a union of an ascending chain of finite type open substacks

$$\mathcal{P}_{d,1}^{\text{CY}} \subset \mathcal{P}_{d,2}^{\text{CY}} \subset \mathcal{P}_{d,3}^{\text{CY}} \subset \cdots,$$

where $\mathcal{P}_{d,m}^{\text{CY}} \subset \mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY}}$ is the open substack consisting of pairs (X, D) such that the Cartier index of K_X at each point is at most m . Next, we prove that $\mathcal{P}_{d,m}^{\text{CY}}$ is S-complete and Θ -reductive by an involved argument using Theorem 1.1, a reduction argument to the case when $d = 3$, and the geometry of twisted stacky curves. Thus $\mathcal{P}_{d,m}^{\text{CY}}$ admits a separated good moduli space $P_{d,m}^{\text{CY}}$. The latter result is somewhat miraculous, since an arbitrary finite type open substack of $\mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY}}$ will not admit a good moduli space!

Next, the inclusions of the stacks induce a sequence of morphisms

$$P_{d,1}^{\text{CY}} \rightarrow P_{d,2}^{\text{CY}} \rightarrow P_{d,3}^{\text{CY}} \rightarrow \cdots.$$

We prove that the morphisms are eventually isomorphisms after seminormalization and deduce that Theorem 1.3.1–3 holds with $P_d^{\text{CY}} := (P_{d,m}^{\text{CY}})^{\text{sn}}$ for m sufficiently large.

The remaining step is to prove the ampleness of the Hodge line bundle on P_d^{CY} . Results that rely on Hodge theory [Amb05, Kol07, FG14b] imply the Hodge line bundle is nef and, additionally, big on the locus of P_d^{CY} where the sources of the pairs (see Definition 8.1) have maximal variation.

²When $d = 3$, \mathcal{P}_3^{H} and P_3^{H} are empty and the bottom left arrow is an isomorphism.

We perform a detailed analysis of the S-equivalence classes of pairs in $\mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY}}$ to prove that the sources have maximal variation on all of $\mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY}}$. With this done, the proof of Theorem 1.3 is complete.

As part of the proof of the ampleness result, we prove a result of independent interest on the existence of generically finite covers of certain stacks by schemes (Theorem 14.11). This generalizes a well-known result about Deligne-Mumford stacks [LMB00, Thm. 6.6] to a larger class of stacks.

1.3. Application to the b-semiampleness conjecture. The canonical bundle formula is a technical, but powerful, tool that has many applications in the MMP. The formula, which was developed in the work of [Kod63, Kaw98, FM00, Amb04], associates to an lc-trivial fibration $(X, D) \rightarrow Y$ a \mathbb{Q} -linear equivalence

$$K_X + D \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} f^*(K_Y + D_Y + M_Y),$$

where D_Y is the discriminant divisor, which measures the singularities of the fibers, and M_Y is the moduli divisor, which measures the variation of the fibers. Furthermore, the moduli divisor gives rise to a b-divisor \mathbf{M} ; see Section 14.1 for details.

The main open problem on this topic is a conjecture of Prokhorov and Shokurov stating that the moduli divisor is b-semiample [PS09, Conj. 7.13]. The conjecture is known in only a few cases, which include when the base is a curve [Amb04, Amb05, Flo14] and when the geometric generic fiber is a curve [PS09] or a surface not isomorphic to \mathbb{P}^2 [Fuj03, Fil20].

Shokurov has suggested the following strategy to prove the conjecture: construct a compact moduli space parametrizing certain equivalence classes of CY pairs such that the Hodge line bundle is ample on the moduli space and verify that the moduli b-divisor is the pullback of this line bundle. In the case when the geometric generic fiber of $X \rightarrow Y$ is \mathbb{P}^2 , the moduli space $\mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY}}$ with its ample Hodge line bundle realizes this vision. Combining the \mathbb{P}^2 case with [PS09, Fuj03, Fil20] leads to the following result.

Theorem 1.4. *If $(X, D) \rightarrow Y$ is an lc-trivial fibration such that the generic fiber (X_η, D_η) is a projective lc pair of dimension ≤ 2 , then \mathbf{M} is b-semiample.*

If additionally $D_\eta \neq 0$, then there exists an integer $I > 0$ depending only on the coefficient set of D_η such that $I\mathbf{M}$ is b-free.

1.4. Additional examples. It is natural to ask whether or not Theorem 1.3 generalizes to other moduli problems, not just the case of degenerations of pairs $(\mathbb{P}^2, \frac{3}{d}C)$, where C is a smooth degree d plane curve. In Section 16, we give a few examples where boundedness holds (as in the case of $\mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY}}$ with $3 \nmid d$) and use Theorem 1.1 to construct the moduli space of boundary polarized CY pairs. These examples are degenerations of pairs $(\mathbb{P}^1, \frac{2}{d} \sum_{i=1}^d p_i)$, where the p_i are distinct points, $(\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1, \frac{2}{d}C)$, where $d \geq 3$ is an odd integer and C is a smooth bidegree (d, d) curve, and $(\mathbb{P}^3, \frac{4}{5}S)$, where S is a smooth quintic surface. We expect that Theorem 1.3 likely extends to compactifying boundary polarized CY pairs (X, D) , where X is a smooth del Pezzo surface.

In higher dimensions, such a moduli space will not always exist. Indeed, in a future paper, we will explain that there does not exist a moduli space parametrizing S-equivalence classes of boundary polarized CY pairs that are degenerations of $(C_p(A), H)$, where $C_p(A)$ is a projective cone over a principally polarized abelian surface and H is the divisor at infinity. It would be interesting to find geometric conditions that guarantee the existence of such a moduli space.

1.5. Appendices. In two appendices to the paper, we prove additional results that are independent of the main theorems stated above.

In Appendix A, we characterize all special degenerations of \mathbb{P}^2 . This gives a complete answer to a problem in the Fano K-stability literature [AIM20, Prob. 3.4]. The proof relies on a technical result from Section 12.1 to show that all special degenerations of \mathbb{P}^2 are induced by lc places of a 1-complement. This reduces the classification to [LXZ22, §6] and an additional computation.

Appendix B concerns the index of CY pairs and the boundedness of complements. A celebrated result of Birkar states that a klt Fano variety X of dimension n admits an $N(n)$ -complement, i.e. a \mathbb{Q} -divisor D on X such that (X, D) is lc and $N(n)(K_X + D) \sim 0$ [Bir19]. Here, $N(n)$ is a positive integer depending only on n .

In [FFMP22], the authors prove that if X additionally admits a complement of coregularity 0, then $N(n)$ can be replaced with 2. Here, the coregularity of a Fano variety with complement is the dimension of the minimal lc center on a dlt modification; see Definition 8.5. Their argument uses ideas from [Bir19] with significant upgrades to utilize the coregularity assumption. Using a degeneration argument, we give a new proof of their result, which also holds for lc Fano varieties.

Using a similar degeneration argument, we also give a new proof of a result on the index of coregularity 0 CY pairs [FMM22, Thm. 1].

1.6. Relation to other work. In constructing compact moduli spaces of Calabi–Yau varieties, a fundamental issue is that a family of polarized smooth Calabi–Yau varieties over a punctured curve can admit infinitely many slc Calabi–Yau degenerations after finite base changes. In order to construct canonical limits of Calabi–Yau varieties, an effective technique is to use K-moduli or KSBA theory. As mentioned above, if (X, D) is a klt boundary polarized CY pair, then $(X, (1-\varepsilon)D)$ is a K-semistable log Fano pair, and K-stability machinery can be applied to construct a projective moduli space [ADL19, Zho23]. In the KSBA setting, if (X, D) is a klt CY pair, then the standard technique is to consider the pair $(X, D + \varepsilon H)$, where H is an ample divisor, possibly equal to D . Since the perturbed pair is KSBA stable, KSBA theory gives an approach to compactifying the moduli space of such pairs. In [KX20], Kollár and Xu construct the irreducible components of the moduli space and prove that the components are projective schemes. In [Bir23, Bir22], Birkar proves a powerful boundedness result for such pairs and uses the boundedness to give a more direct construction of the moduli space using KSBA theory. This type of moduli space was notably constructed and described for abelian varieties in [Ale02] and K3 surfaces in [AE21]. See [Hac04, Laz16, AB19a, AET19, Inc20, AE21, DH21, GKS21, Gol21, MS21, DeV22, AB22, ABE22, Sch23] and [GMGS21, ADL23a, ADL23b, Zha22, Pap22, PSW23] for a partial list of additional explicit examples of these KSBA and K-moduli spaces. The approach of this paper is different in that we do not use KSBA or K-moduli theory to construct the moduli space.

In this paper, we do not aim to choose a canonical limit of a family of boundary polarized CY pairs over a punctured disc, but instead parametrize S-equivalence classes of all (slc) boundary polarized CY pairs. The approach is philosophically similar to the notion of a *galaxy* in [Oda22a], which takes a family of Calabi–Yau varieties over a punctured disc $X^\circ \rightarrow \mathbb{D}^\circ$ and outputs the projective limit of all extensions $X \rightarrow \mathbb{D}$ to a flat family of slc Calabi–Yau varieties after finite base change. Since the aim of this paper is to construct moduli spaces, we consider S-equivalence classes rather than galaxies.

As mentioned earlier, the Hodge line bundle on P_d^{CY} is ample and, hence, the compactification is an analogue of the BB compactification of the moduli space of K3 surfaces. A number of authors, including Shokurov, Odaka [Oda22a], and Laza [Laz23], have conjectured that there exists a compactification of the moduli space of smooth Calabi–Yau varieties on which the Hodge line bundle is ample and the boundary parametrizes lower dimensional Calabi–Yau varieties. This conjecture is closely related to the b-semiampleness conjecture of Prokhorov and Shokurov [PS09]. There are also various approaches in the literature for constructing the ample model of the (augmented) Hodge line bundle, see e.g. [BBT23, GGLR20].

Finally, note that P_d^{CY} sits between P_d^{K} and P_d^{H} , which are given by perturbing the coefficient of the boundary divisor, and gives a “wall crossing” between the two moduli spaces. Constructing this wall crossing is one motivation for the conjectural description of $\mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY}}$ present in [ADL19]. The idea of wall-crossing for moduli spaces of pairs originated in the case of weighted stable pointed

curves [Has03] and has been generalized to higher dimensions for both the moduli of K-stable and KSBA stable varieties in [ADL19, Zho23] and [ABIP23], respectively.

1.7. Structure of the paper. The first half of the paper builds general theory on the moduli of boundary polarized CY pairs. In Section 2, we introduce necessary preliminaries and the definition of boundary polarized CY pairs. In Section 3, we construct the moduli stack of boundary polarized CY pairs. Section 4 discusses relevant results on test configurations of such pairs. In Sections 5, 6, and 7, we prove that the moduli stack of boundary polarized CY pairs is S-complete, Θ -reductive, and satisfies the existence part of the valuative criterion of properness, respectively. Section 8 discusses the source and regularity of a CY pair and constructs a good moduli space for pairs of regularity at most 0.

The second half of the paper studies compactifications of the moduli of plane curve pairs. After introducing the relevant stacks in Section 9, we explicitly describe the S-equivalence classes of pairs in $\mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY}}$ in Section 10. In Section 11, we apply the theory of twisted varieties to study local properties of the moduli stack. We construct the good moduli spaces $P_{d,m}^{\text{CY}}$ in Section 12 and the asymptotically good moduli space P_d^{CY} in Section 13. In Section 14, we prove the ampleness of the Hodge line bundle on P_d^{CY} and deduce the b-semiampleness conjecture in relative dimension 2. In Section 15, we combine the previous results to obtain the theorems stated in the introduction. In Section 16, we give explicit descriptions of P_d^{CY} when $3 \leq d \leq 6$.

The paper has two appendices. In Appendix A, we characterize special degenerations of \mathbb{P}^2 . In Appendix B, we prove results on coregularity 0 pairs.

Acknowledgments. We thank the American Institute of Mathematics (AIM) for hosting the 2021 workshop *Moduli problems beyond geometric invariant theory* at which this project began and Jarod Alper, Daniel Halpern-Leistner, and Filippo Viviani for organizing the workshop. We are grateful to Valery Alexeev, Jarod Alper, Elden Elmanto, Philip Engel, Stefano Filipazzi, Samuel Grushevsky, Daniel Halpern-Leistner, Mattias Jonsson, János Kollár, Sándor Kovács, Aaron Landesman, Radu Laza, Jihao Liu, Siddharth Mathur, Joaquín Moraga, Yuji Odaka, Vyacheslav Shokurov, Chenyang Xu, Chuyu Zhou, and Ziquan Zhuang for helpful conversations and comments.

KA was partially supported by NSF grant DMS-2140781 (formerly DMS-2001408). DB was partially supported by NSF Grant DMS-1803124. HB is partially supported by NSF Grant DMS-2200690. KD is partially supported by NSF Grant DMS-2302163. YL is partially supported by NSF Grant DMS-2148266 (formerly DMS-2001317), NSF CAREER Grant DMS-2237139, and an Alfred P. Sloan research fellowship. XW is partially supported by NSF Grant DMS-1609335 and a Collaboration Grants for Mathematicians from Simons Foundation: award 631318. KA, KD, YL, and XW were partially supported by AIM as part of the AIM SQuaREs program.

2. PRELIMINARIES

2.1. Conventions. Throughout, all schemes are defined over an algebraically closed field \mathbb{k} of characteristic 0, which is our ground field. A scheme X is *demi-normal* if it is S_2 and its codimension 1 points are either regular or nodes [Kol13, Def. 5.1]. We denote by \mathbb{N} the set of all non-negative integers.

2.2. Pairs. A *pair* (X, Δ) consists of a demi-normal scheme X that is essentially of finite type over a field \mathbb{K} containing \mathbb{k} and an effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor Δ on X such that $\text{Supp}(\Delta)$ does not contain a codimension 1 singular point of X and $K_X + \Delta$ is \mathbb{Q} -Cartier. The pair (X, Δ) is *projective* if X is projective over \mathbb{K} . For the notions of singularities of pairs that assume X is normal, including *lc*, *klt*, *pkt*, and *dlt*, see [Kol13, Def. 2.8]. Unless stated otherwise, we assume that X is geometrically connected.

The *normalization* of a pair (X, Δ) is the possibly disconnected pair $(\overline{X}, \overline{\Delta} + \overline{G})$, where $\pi : \overline{X} \rightarrow X$ is the normalization morphism, $\overline{G} \subset \overline{X}$ the conductor divisor on \overline{X} , and $\overline{\Delta}$ the divisorial part of

$\pi^{-1}(\Delta)$, and satisfies $K_{\overline{X}} + \overline{G} + \overline{\Delta} = \pi^*(K_X + \Delta)$ [Kol13, 5.7]. This construction induces a generically fixed point free involution $\tau : \overline{G}^n \rightarrow \overline{G}^n$ that fixes $\text{Diff}_{\overline{G}^n}(\overline{\Delta})$; see [Kol13, 5.2 & 5.11] for details. A pair (X, Δ) is *slc* if its normalization $(\overline{X}, \overline{\Delta} + \overline{G})$ is *lc* [Kol13, Def. 5.10].

Definition 2.1. A projective *slc*³ pair (X, Δ) is called

- (1) *log Fano* if $-K_X - \Delta$ is ample,
- (2) *CY* if $K_X + \Delta \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0$, and
- (3) *canonically polarized* if $K_X + \Delta$ is ample.

The *index* of a CY pair (X, Δ) is the smallest positive integer N such that $N(K_X + \Delta) \sim 0$.

Throughout this paper, we focus on the following special class of CY pairs.

Definition 2.2. A *boundary polarized CY pair* is a projective *slc* pair $(X, \Delta + D)$ such that

- (1) Δ and D are effective \mathbb{Q} -divisors,
- (2) $K_X + \Delta + D \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0$, and
- (3) D is \mathbb{Q} -Cartier and ample.

Note that (3) is equivalent to the condition that (X, Δ) is log Fano. Hence we call Δ the *log Fano boundary* and D the *polarizing boundary* and write them in this order to avoid confusion.

Remark 2.3. The above definition can be alternatively phrased using the language of *complements*. Let (X, Δ) be a log Fano pair. A *complement* D of (X, Δ) is an effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor such that $(X, \Delta + D)$ is a CY pair or equivalently, a boundary polarized CY pair. A complement is an *N-complement* if $N(K_X + \Delta + D) \sim 0$ or, equivalently, the index of $(X, \Delta + D)$ divides N .

While we are primarily interested in the case when $\Delta = 0$, the general case arises when normalizing. Indeed, if $(X, \Delta + D)$ is a boundary polarized CY pair, then $(\overline{X}, \overline{G} + \overline{\Delta} + \overline{D})$ is a possible disconnected lc boundary polarized CY pair, where $\overline{G} + \overline{\Delta}$ is the log Fano boundary. The latter holds, since π is finite, and

$$K_{\overline{X}} + \overline{G} + \overline{\Delta} = \pi^*(K_X + \Delta) \quad \text{and} \quad K_{\overline{X}} + \overline{G} + \overline{\Delta} + \overline{D} = \pi^*(K_X + \Delta + D).$$

2.3. Families of pairs. To define a family of pairs, we first need the following notion of a family of divisors [Kol23, Def. 4.68].

Definition 2.4 (Relative Mumford divisor). Let $f : X \rightarrow B$ be a flat finite type morphism with S_2 fibers of pure dimension n . A subscheme $D \subset X$ is a *relative Mumford divisor* if there is an open set $U \subset X$ such that

- (1) $\text{codim}_{X_b}(X_b \setminus U_b) \geq 2$ for each $s \in S$,
- (2) $D|_U$ is a relative Cartier divisor,
- (3) D is the closure of $D|_U$, and
- (4) X_b is smooth at the generic points of D_b for every $b \in B$.

If $D \subset X$ is a relative Mumford divisor for $f : X \rightarrow B$ and $B' \rightarrow B$ is a morphism, then the *divisorial pullback* $D_{B'}$ on $X_{B'} := X \times_B B'$ is the relative Mumford divisor defined to be the closure of the pullback of $D|_U$ to $U_{B'}$. Note that D_b as in (4) always denotes the divisorial pullback.

Definition 2.5. A *family of slc (resp., lc, klt) pairs* $(X, \Delta) \rightarrow B$ over a reduced Noetherian scheme B is a flat finite type morphism $X \rightarrow B$ with S_2 fibers and a \mathbb{Q} -divisor Δ on X satisfying

- (1) each prime component of Δ is a relative Mumford divisor,
- (2) $K_{X/B} + \Delta$ is \mathbb{Q} -Cartier, and
- (3) (X_b, Δ_b) is an *slc* (resp. *lc*, *klt*) pair for all points $b \in B$.

³Note that this definition differs from common conventions, which assume a log Fano pair is klt and a CY pair is lc.

Using this definition, we can define a family of the classes of pairs appearing in Definition 2.1.

Definition 2.6. A family of slc pairs $(X, \Delta) \rightarrow B$ over a reduced Noetherian scheme B with $X \rightarrow B$ projective is called

- (1) a family of KSBA stable pairs if $K_{X/B} + \Delta$ is relatively ample,
- (2) a family of CY pairs if $K_{X/B} + \Delta \sim_{\mathbb{Q}, B} 0$, and
- (3) a family of log Fano pairs if $-(K_{X/B} + \Delta)$ is relatively ample.

The following characterization of a family of slc pairs follows from [Kol23, Proof of Thm. 4.54].

Lemma 2.7. Let $f : X \rightarrow B$ be a finite type morphism to a regular, local, essentially of finite type scheme $0 \in B$. Fix a \mathbb{Q} -divisor Δ on X and a snc divisor $D_1 + \cdots + D_r$ on B so that $D_1 \cap \cdots \cap D_r = \{0\}$. The following are equivalent:

- (1) $(X, \Delta) \rightarrow B$ is a family of (possibly disconnected) slc pairs.
- (2) $(X, \Delta + f^*D_1 + \cdots + f^*D_r)$ is a (possibly disconnected) slc pair.

The previous lemma implies that the normalization and restriction of a family of slc pairs over a regular scheme is a family of slc pairs.

Lemma 2.8. Let $(X, \Delta) \rightarrow B$ be a family of slc pairs over a regular, essentially of finite type, Noetherian scheme B .

- (1) If $f : (\overline{X}, \overline{G} + \overline{\Delta})$ is the normalization of (X, Δ) , then $\overline{f} : (\overline{X}, \overline{G} + \overline{\Delta}) \rightarrow B$ is a family of (possibly disconnected) slc pairs.
- (2) If $\Delta := \Delta' + \Delta''$, where Δ' is a reduced divisor and $\Delta'' \geq 0$, then $(\Delta', \text{Diff}_{\Delta'}(\Delta'')) \rightarrow B$ is a family of (possibly disconnected) slc pairs.

Proof. Since both statements are local on B , we may assume B is a regular local scheme. Fix an snc divisor $D := D_1 + \cdots + D_r$ on B so that $D_1 \cap \cdots \cap D_r$ is the unique closed point. Since $(X, \Delta) \rightarrow B$ is a family of slc pairs, Lemma 2.7 implies $(X, \Delta + f^*D)$ is slc. Hence $(\overline{X}, \overline{G} + \overline{\Delta} + \overline{f^*D})$ is lc. Thus Lemma 2.7 implies (1) holds.

For (2), note that $(\Delta', \text{Diff}_{\Delta'}(\Delta'' + f^*D))$ is slc by adjunction [Kol23, Thm. 11.17] and $\text{Diff}_{\Delta'}(\Delta'' + f^*D) = \text{Diff}_{\Delta'}(\Delta'') + f^*D|_{\Delta''}$. Thus (2) holds by Lemma 2.7. \square

2.3.1. *Families of boundary polarized CY pairs.* We now define a family of boundary polarized CY pairs over a reduced Noetherian scheme. A generalization of this definition to arbitrary base schemes will be given in Section 3.

Definition 2.9. A family of boundary polarized CY pairs $f : (X, \Delta + D) \rightarrow B$ over a reduced Noetherian scheme B is a family of slc pairs $f : (X, \Delta + D) \rightarrow B$ such that

- (1) $f : X \rightarrow B$ is projective,
- (2) $K_{X/B} + \Delta + D \sim_{\mathbb{Q}, B} 0$, and
- (3) D is \mathbb{Q} -Cartier and ample over B .

We now prove the following uniqueness results for extensions. See [Bou14] and [Oda13c, Cor. 4.3] for similar statements already in the literature.

Lemma 2.10. Fix two families of boundary polarized CY pairs

$$(X^1, \Delta^1 + D^1) \rightarrow B \quad \text{and} \quad (X^2, \Delta^2 + D^2) \rightarrow B$$

over a regular local Noetherian scheme $0 \in B$ with an isomorphism $\phi : (X^1, \Delta^1 + D^1)|_{B \setminus 0} \cong (X^2, \Delta^2 + D^2)|_{B \setminus 0}$ over $B \setminus 0$.

- (1) If $\dim B = 1$ and both X^i are normal, then $(X^1, \Delta^1 + D^1 + X_0^1)$ and $(X^2, \Delta^2 + D^2 + X_0^2)$ are crepant birational.
- (2) If $\dim B = 1$ and $(X_0^1, \Delta_0^1 + D_0^1)$ is klt, then ϕ extends to an isomorphism over B .

(3) If $\dim B = 2$, then ϕ extends to an isomorphism over B .

Recall, two birational pairs (Z, Δ_Z) and (Z', Δ'_Z) are *crepant birational* if the discrepancies $a(E, Z, \Delta_Z) = a(E, Z', \Delta'_Z)$ for every prime divisor E over Z [Kol13, Def. 2.23.2].

Proof. Let Y denote the main component of the normalization of the graph of $X^1 \dashrightarrow X^2$. Write $g_i : Y \rightarrow X^i$ for the natural map. We define \mathbb{Q} -divisors F^1 and F^2 on Y by the

$$K_Y + g_{i*}^{-1}(\Delta^i + D^i) + Y_0^{\text{red}} + F^i = g_i^*(K_{X^i} + \Delta^i + D^i + X_0^i)$$

Note that F^i is anti-effective, since $(X^i, \Delta^i + D^i + X_0^i)$ is lc. Therefore both $(X^i, \Delta^i + D^i + X_0^i)$ are weak minimal models of $(Y, (g_i)_*^{-1}(\Delta^i + D^i) + Y_0^{\text{red}})$ [Kol13, Def. 1.19]. Hence the pairs are crepant birational by [Kol13, Prop. 1.21].

The proof of (2) reduces to the separatedness of the KSBA-moduli space. Indeed, since D^2 is relatively ample, there exists a \mathbb{Q} -divisor $0 \leq H^2 \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} D^2$ such that $(X_0^2, \Delta_0^2 + D_0^2 + H_0^2)$ is slc. Let H^1 denote the birational transform of G^2 on X^1 . Since $H^1_{B \setminus 0} \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} D^1_{B \setminus 0}$, $H^1 \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} D^1 + E^1$ for some \mathbb{Q} -divisor E^1 with $\text{Supp}(E^1) \subset X_0^1$. Using that X_0^1 is irreducible by the klt assumption and $X_0^1 \sim 0$, we see $H^1 \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} D^1$ as well. By our assumption in (2), there exists $\varepsilon > 0$, such that $(X_0^1, \Delta^1 + D_0^1 + \varepsilon H_0^1)$ is klt. Hence

$$(X^1, \Delta^1 + D^2 + \varepsilon H^1) \rightarrow B \quad \text{and} \quad (X^2, \Delta^2 + D^2 + \varepsilon H^2) \rightarrow B$$

are families of slc pairs and are isomorphic over $B \setminus 0$. Since

$$K_{X^i/B} + \Delta^i + D^i + \varepsilon H^i \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} \varepsilon D^i,$$

which is ample, [Kol23, Prop. 2.50] implies ϕ extends to an isomorphism.

Finally, to verify (3), fix a sufficiently divisible integer r such that $L^i := -r(K_{X^i/B} + \Delta^i)$ is a relative ample Cartier divisor over B for $i = 1, 2$. Since $(X^1, L^1) \rightarrow B$ and $(X^2, L^2) \rightarrow B$ are isomorphic over $B \setminus 0$, [ABHLX20, Lem. 2.16] implies (3) holds. \square

Lemma 2.11. *Let $(X, \Delta + D) \rightarrow B$ be a family of boundary polarized CY pairs over a regular local scheme $0 \in B$ with generic point $\eta \in B$.*

If $N(K_{X_\eta} + \Delta_\eta + D_\eta) \sim 0$ for some integer N , then $N(K_{X/B} + \Delta + D) \sim 0$.

Proof. First, assume B is the spectrum of a DVR. Let $X_{0,1}, \dots, X_{0,m}$ denote the irreducible components of X_0 . Since $(K_{X/B} + \Delta + D)|_{X_\eta} \sim 0$, $K_{X/B} + \Delta + D \sim \sum a_i X_{0,i}$ for some $a_i \in \mathbb{Z}$. After twisting by the principal divisor $X_0 = \sum_i X_{0,i}$, we may assume

$$0 = a_1 = \dots = a_r < a_{r+1} \leq \dots \leq a_m.$$

We seek to show $r = m$. If not, then, using that X_0 is connected, we can choose a curve $C \subset X_0$ such that $C \not\subset X_{i,0}$ for all $r < i \leq m$ and $C \cap X_{0,j} \neq \emptyset$ for some $r < j \leq m$. Hence,

$$C \cdot N(K_{X/B} + \Delta + D) = C \cdot \sum_{i=r+1}^m a_i D_{0,i} \geq a_j X_{0,j} \cdot C_j > 0.$$

The latter is not possible, since $K_{X/B} + \Delta + D \sim_{\mathbb{Q},S} 0$ by assumption. Therefore, $r = m$, which implies $N(K_{X/B} + \Delta + D) \sim 0$ when B is the spectrum of a DVR.

We now deduce the full result from the above special case. By [Kol23, Prop. 9.42], there is locally closed subscheme $B' \hookrightarrow B$ such that for any $T \rightarrow B$, $N(K_{X_T/T} + \Delta_T + D_T) \sim_B 0$ if and only if $T \rightarrow B$ factors through B' . By the above case, every spectrum of a DVR T with a dominant map $T \rightarrow B$ must factor through B' . Thus [Kol23, Lem. 4.31] implies $B' = B$ and so $N(K_{X/B} + \Delta + D) \sim_B 0$. \square

Next, we prove a result, which is a consequence of Kollár's gluing theory for slc pairs.

Proposition 2.12. *Let B be a regular scheme essentially of finite type over \mathbb{k} and B° a dense open subset. Let $(X^\circ, \Delta^\circ + D^\circ) \rightarrow B^\circ$ be a family of boundary polarized CY pairs and write $(\overline{X}^\circ, \overline{G}^\circ + \overline{\Delta}^\circ + \overline{D}^\circ)$ for the normalization of $(X^\circ, \Delta^\circ + D^\circ)$.*

If $\overline{f}^\circ : (\overline{X}^\circ, \overline{G}^\circ + \overline{\Delta}^\circ + \overline{D}^\circ) \rightarrow B^\circ$ extends to a family of boundary polarized CY pairs $\overline{f} : (\overline{X}, \overline{G} + \overline{\Delta} + \overline{D}) \rightarrow B$ and the involution τ° of $(\overline{G}^\circ)^n$ extends to an involution τ of \overline{G}^n , then f° extends to a family of boundary polarized CY pairs $f : (X, \Delta + D) \rightarrow B$ such that there is a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} (\overline{X}^\circ, \overline{G}^\circ + \overline{\Delta}^\circ + \overline{D}^\circ) & \hookrightarrow & (\overline{X}, \overline{G} + \overline{\Delta} + \overline{D}) \\ \downarrow \pi^\circ & & \downarrow \pi \\ (X^\circ, \Delta^\circ + D^\circ) & \hookrightarrow & (X, \Delta + D) \end{array},$$

where the horizontal maps are open embeddings and the vertical maps normalizations.

Proof. To begin, note that $(X^\circ, \Delta^\circ + D^\circ)$ and $(\overline{X}, \overline{G} + \overline{\Delta} + \overline{D})$ are slc pairs by Lemma 2.8.1 Since τ° fixes $\text{Diff}_{(\overline{G}^\circ)^n}(\overline{\Delta}^\circ + \overline{D}^\circ)$ by [Kol13, Prop. 5.12] and $\text{Diff}_{\overline{G}^n}(\overline{\Delta} + \overline{D})$ has no components supported over $B \setminus B^\circ$ by Lemma 2.8.2, τ fixes $\text{Diff}_{\overline{G}^n}(\overline{\Delta} + \overline{D})$.

We will now construct X as a geometric quotient [Kol13, Def. 9.4] by the gluing relation $(n, n \circ \tau) : \overline{G}^n \rightrightarrows \overline{X}$ [Kol13, §5.31]. Note that $(\overline{X}, \overline{G} + \overline{\Delta} + \overline{D})$ is lc and has no lc centers contained in $\overline{X} \setminus \overline{X}^\circ$ by Lemma 2.7. Additionally, over \overline{X}° , the equivalence relation is finite and has quotient X° . Therefore [Kol13, Lem. 9.55] implies $(n, n \circ \tau)$ generates a finite equivalence relation. Thus, by [Kol13, Cor. 5.33], there exist a deminormal pair $(X, \Delta + D)$ and a diagram as above. Since τ fixes $\text{Diff}_{\overline{G}^n}(\Delta + D)$, [Kol13, Thm. 5.38] implies $(X, \Delta + D)$ is slc. By the universal property of categorical quotients [Kol13, Def. 9.4], there exists a map $f : X \rightarrow B$ such that $\overline{f} = f \circ \pi$. By [Kol13, 9.31], f is finite type. Using that \overline{f} is proper and π is proper and surjective, f is proper.

It remains to show that $(X, \Delta + D) \rightarrow B$ is a family of boundary polarized CY pairs. First, fix any $b \in B$ and regular system of parameters $x_1, \dots, x_r \in \mathcal{O}_{B,0}$. Since $(\overline{X}, \overline{G} + \overline{\Delta} + \overline{D} + \overline{f}^* \{x_1 \cdots x_r = 0\})$ is slc over a neighborhood of b by Lemma 2.7, $(X, G + \Delta + D + f^* \{x_1 \cdots x_r = 0\})$ is slc over a neighborhood of b . Thus $(X, \Delta + D) \rightarrow B$ is a family of slc pairs in a neighborhood of $b \in B$ by Lemma 2.7. Since the Definition 2.5 is local on the base, it follows that $(X, \Delta + D) \rightarrow B$ is a family of slc pairs. Next, note that

$$K_{\overline{X}} + \overline{G} + \overline{\Delta} + \overline{D} = \pi^*(K_X + \Delta + D) \quad \text{and} \quad K_{\overline{X}} + \overline{G} + \overline{\Delta} = \pi^*(K_X + \Delta)$$

Since π is finite, $-K_X - \Delta$ is ample over B and $K_X + \Delta + D \equiv_B 0$. The latter implies $K_X + \Delta + D \sim_{B, \mathbb{Q}} 0$ by [HX16, Cor. 1.6]. Therefore $(X, \Delta + D) \rightarrow B$ is a family of boundary polarized CY pairs. \square

2.4. Valuations. Let X be a normal scheme. If $\mu : Y \rightarrow X$ is a proper birational morphism with Y normal and $E \subset Y$ is a prime divisor (called a *divisor over X*), then E defines a valuation $\text{ord}_E : K(X)^\times \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$. A valuation $v : K(X)^\times \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ of the form $v := c \text{ord}_E$, where $c \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ and E a divisor over X , is called *divisorial* and we write DivVal_X for the set of divisorial valuations on X .

Let (X, Δ) be a pair. The *log discrepancy* of a divisorial valuation $v = \text{ord}_E$ on X is

$$A_{X, \Delta}(v) := c(1 + \text{coeff}_E(K_Y - \mu^*(K_X + \Delta))).$$

If $v = \text{ord}_E$ for a divisor E over X , we will often write $A_{X, \Delta}(E)$ for $A_{X, \Delta}(v)$. Note that (X, Δ) is lc if and only if $A_{X, \Delta}(v) \geq 0$ for all divisorial valuations v on X .

2.5. Kollár components.

Definition 2.13 ([LX20]). Let (X, Δ) be a klt pair of finite type over \mathbb{k} . Let $x \in X$ be a closed point. A proper birational morphism $\mu : Y \rightarrow X$ is said to provide a *Kollár component* E over $x \in (X, \Delta)$ if the following statements hold.

- (1) μ is an isomorphism over $X \setminus \{x\}$;
- (2) $\mu^{-1}(x) = E$ is a prime divisor on Y ;
- (3) $-E$ is \mathbb{Q} -Cartier and μ -ample;
- (4) $(Y, E + \mu_*^{-1}\Delta)$ is plt.

Sometimes we also say that (E, Δ_E) is a Kollár component over $x \in (X, \Delta)$ where Δ_E is the different of $(Y, E + \mu_*^{-1}\Delta)$ on E .

Lemma 2.14. *Let $x \in X$ be a cyclic quotient surface singularity. Let (E, Δ_E) be a Kollár component over $x \in X$. Then (E, Δ_E) is toric.*

Proof. As we will explain, the result follows from [LX23, Proof of Theorem 4.5]. Let $f : Z \rightarrow X$ be the minimal resolution of the singularity $x \in X$. By [Kol13]*§3.40.1, we know that the dual graph of $\text{Exc}(f)$ is a chain, i.e. $x \in X$ is an A -type singularity in terms of [LX23]. Since $-(K_Y + E) \sim_{\mathbb{Q}, \mu} A_X(E)E$ is \mathbb{Q} -Cartier and μ -ample, there exists an integer $m > 1$ such that $-m(K_Y + E)$ is Cartier and μ -very ample. By Bertini’s theorem [KM98]*Lem. 5.17, there exists an effective Cartier divisor $\Gamma \sim_f -m(K_Y + E)$ on Y such that $(Y, E + \frac{1}{m}\Gamma)$ is plt. Since $K_Y + E + \frac{1}{m}\Gamma \sim_{\mathbb{Q}, \mu} 0$, we know that $K_Y + E + \frac{1}{m}\Gamma = \mu^*(K_X + \frac{1}{m}\mu_*\Gamma)$. Thus $(X, \frac{1}{m}\mu_*\Gamma)$ is log canonical with only one lc place E . Hence, for $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$, we have that $x \in (X, \frac{1-\varepsilon}{m}\mu_*\Gamma)$ is a klt surface germ whose mld is computed by E . Thus the assumptions of [LX23, Thm. 4.5] are satisfied. By [LX23, Proof of Theorem 4.5], there exists a sequence of smooth blowups $h : W \rightarrow Y$ such the dual graph of $\text{Exc}(g)$ is a chain where $g = f \circ h : W \rightarrow X$, and E is a g -exceptional prime divisor on W . Therefore, we have a birational morphism $p : W \rightarrow Y$ such that $g = \mu \circ p$, and the dual complex of $\text{Exc}(g)$ being a chain implies that $p(\text{Exc}(p))$ is a subset of E containing at most two points. Since Δ_E is supported in $p(\text{Exc}(p))$, we know that (E, Δ_E) is toric. \square

2.6. Seifert \mathbb{G}_m -bundles and orbifold cones.

2.6.1. Seifert \mathbb{G}_m -bundles.

Definition 2.15 ([Kol04]). Let X be a normal variety over \mathbb{k} . A *Seifert \mathbb{G}_m -bundle* Y over X is a normal variety Y equipped with a \mathbb{G}_m -action together with a morphism $\pi : Y \rightarrow X$ such that the following hold.

- (1) π is affine and \mathbb{G}_m -equivariant with respect to the trivial \mathbb{G}_m -action on X .
- (2) For every $x \in X$, the \mathbb{G}_m -action on the reduced fiber $Y_x^{\text{red}} := \text{red } f^{-1}(x)$ is \mathbb{G}_m -equivariantly isomorphic to the natural left action of \mathbb{G}_m on $\mathbb{G}_m/\mu_{m(x)}$ for some $m(x) \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$.
- (3) $m(x) = 1$ for x in a dense open subset of X .

Definition 2.16 (cf. [Kol04]). Let X be a normal variety. Let L be a \mathbb{Q} -Cartier \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X . We define a normal variety Y_L together with an affine morphism $\pi_L : Y_L \rightarrow X$ as

$$Y_L := \text{Spec}_X \bigoplus_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{O}_X([iL]).$$

There is a natural \mathbb{G}_m -action on Y_L where $\mathcal{O}_X([iL])$ has weight i . We define another normal variety \overline{Y}_L together with a projective morphism $\overline{\pi}_L : \overline{Y}_L \rightarrow X$ as

$$\overline{Y}_L := \text{Proj}_X \bigoplus_{i=0}^{\infty} \bigoplus_{j=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{O}_X([iL]) \cdot t^j,$$

where $\mathcal{O}_X([iL])$ and t have degree i and 1 respectively. Then \overline{Y}_L admits a \mathbb{G}_m -action where $\mathcal{O}_X([iL])$ and t have weight i and 0 respectively. There are natural \mathbb{G}_m -equivariant open immersions $Y_L \hookrightarrow Y_L^a \hookrightarrow \overline{Y}_L$, where

$$Y_L^a := \text{Spec}_X \bigoplus_{i=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{O}_X([iL]).$$

In fact, Y_L^a is \mathbb{G}_m -equivariantly isomorphic to the open subset ($t \neq 0$) of \overline{Y}_L . We call \overline{Y}_L a *compactified Seifert \mathbb{G}_m -bundle over X* . From [Kol04, §14] we know that $\overline{Y}_L \setminus Y_L$ is the disjoint union of two sections X_0 and X_∞ , where $X_0 = Y_L^a \setminus Y_L$ and $X_\infty = \overline{Y}_L \setminus Y_L^a$.

Theorem 2.17 ([Kol04]*Thm. 7). *Let X be a normal variety. Then the following hold.*

- (1) *Let L be a \mathbb{Q} -Cartier \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X . Then Y_L is a Seifert \mathbb{G}_m -bundle over X .*
- (2) *Every Seifert \mathbb{G}_m -bundle Y over X is \mathbb{G}_m -equivariantly isomorphic to Y_L for some \mathbb{Q} -Cartier \mathbb{Q} -divisor L on X . Moreover, such L is uniquely determined by Y up to \mathbb{Z} -linear equivalence.*

2.6.2. Orbifold cones.

Definition 2.18 (cf. [Kol04]). Let X be a normal projective variety. Let L be an ample \mathbb{Q} -Cartier \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X .

- (1) The *affine orbifold cone* $C_a(X, L)$ is defined as

$$C_a(X, L) := \text{Spec} \bigoplus_{i=0}^{\infty} H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(\lfloor iL \rfloor)).$$

It admits a \mathbb{G}_m -action where $H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(\lfloor iL \rfloor))$ has weight i .

- (2) The *projective orbifold cone* $C_p(X, L)$ is defined as

$$C_p(X, L) := \text{Proj} \bigoplus_{i=0}^{\infty} \bigoplus_{j=0}^{\infty} H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(\lfloor iL \rfloor)) \cdot t^j,$$

where $H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(\lfloor iL \rfloor))$ and t have degree i and 1 respectively. It admits a \mathbb{G}_m -action where $H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(\lfloor iL \rfloor))$ and t have weight i and 0 respectively.

Note that $C_a(X, L)$ is \mathbb{G}_m -equivariantly isomorphic to the open subset ($t \neq 0$) of $C_p(X, L)$. Moreover, both $C_a(X, L)$ and $C_p(X, L)$ can be obtained by contracting the zero section X_0 in Y_L^a and \overline{Y}_L to a point respectively, see [Kol04, §14].

Definition 2.19. Let X be a normal projective variety. Let L be an ample \mathbb{Q} -Cartier \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X . Assume $\{L\} := L - \lfloor L \rfloor = \sum_{i=1}^l \frac{a_i}{b_i} L_i$ where a_i and b_i are coprime positive integers, and the L_i are distinct prime divisors. We define the *orbifold divisor* L_{orb} of L as the effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X given by

$$L_{\text{orb}} := \sum_{i=1}^l \frac{b_i - 1}{b_i} L_i.$$

We often say that L_{orb} is the *orbifold divisor* of the projective orbifold cone $C_p(X, L)$.

Let D be an effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X such that $D \geq L_{\text{orb}}$. Let $\overline{\pi}_L : \overline{Y}_L \rightarrow X$ be the compactified Seifert \mathbb{G}_m -bundle. Suppose $D = \sum_i \frac{b_i - 1 + c_i}{b_i} L_i + \sum_j c'_j D_j$ where the D_j 's are irreducible components of D not contained in $\text{Supp}(L_{\text{orb}})$. We define

$$\overline{D}_L := \sum_i c_i \text{red}(\overline{\pi}_L^{-1}(L_i)) + \sum_j c'_j \text{red}(\overline{\pi}_L^{-1}(D_j)). \quad (2.1)$$

From (2.1) we see that if $D = L_{\text{orb}}$ then $\overline{D}_L = 0$. Define the \mathbb{Q} -divisor $D_{L,p}$ on $C_p(X, L)$ to be the pushforward of \overline{D}_L under the contraction $\mu_L : \overline{Y}_L \rightarrow C_p(X, L)$. As an abuse of notation, we denote the section at infinity of $C_p(X, L)$ by X_∞ which is just $(\mu_L)_* X_\infty$. It is clear that $X_\infty = (t = 0)$ is \mathbb{Q} -Cartier ample on $C_p(X, L)$.

Proposition 2.20 (cf. [Kol04]). *Let X be a normal projective variety. Let L be an ample \mathbb{Q} -Cartier \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X . Let D be an effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X such that $D \geq L_{\text{orb}}$ and $K_X + D$ is \mathbb{Q} -Cartier.*

- (1) If (X, D) is lc (resp. klt), then $(\overline{Y}_L, \overline{D}_L + X_0 + X_\infty)$ is an lc (resp. plt) pair whose different divisors on X_0 and X_∞ are the pullbacks of D under the isomorphisms $\overline{\pi}_L|_{X_0}$ and $\overline{\pi}_L|_{X_\infty}$.
- (2) If (X, L_{orb}) is an lc (resp. klt) log Fano pair satisfying $rL \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} -(K_X + L_{\text{orb}})$ for some $r \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0}$, then $(C_p(X, L), X_\infty)$ is an lc (resp. plt) log Fano pair whose different divisor on X_∞ is the pullback of L_{orb} .
- (3) If (X, D) is an lc CY pair, then $(C_p(X, L), D_{L,p} + X_\infty)$ is a boundary polarized CY pair whose different divisor on the polarizing boundary X_∞ is the pullback of D .

Proof. (1) Since $\overline{\pi}_L : \overline{Y}_L \rightarrow X$ is a pure relative dimension 1 morphism between normal varieties, the pullback map $\overline{\pi}_L^* : \text{WDiv}(X) \rightarrow \text{WDiv}(Y)$ is well-defined, where $\text{WDiv}(\cdot)$ denotes the free abelian group of Weil divisors. The following equalities on (\mathbb{Q}) -Weil divisors are often obtained by first restricting to the smooth locus X_{sm} of X and its preimage $\overline{Y}_L \times_X X_{\text{sm}}$, and then taking Zariski closure. By [Kol04, §40 and §41], we have

$$K_{Y_L} = \pi_L^*(K_X + L_{\text{orb}}).$$

By similar arguments to [LL19, Proof of Lemma 3.11], we can extend the above equality to

$$K_{\overline{Y}_L} + X_0 + X_\infty = \overline{\pi}_L^*(K_X + L_{\text{orb}}). \quad (2.2)$$

By [Kol04, Proof of Prop. 16], we know that

$$\overline{\pi}_L^* L_i = b_i \text{red}(\overline{\pi}_L^{-1}(L_i)) \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{\pi}_L^* D_j = \text{red}(\overline{\pi}_L^{-1}(D_j)). \quad (2.3)$$

Combining (2.2) and (2.3) together with the definition of \overline{D}_L from (2.1), we have

$$K_{\overline{Y}_L} + \overline{D}_L + X_0 + X_\infty = \overline{\pi}_L^*(K_X + D). \quad (2.4)$$

Since $K_X + D$ is \mathbb{Q} -Cartier, (2.4) implies that the different divisors of $(\overline{Y}_L, \overline{D}_L + X_0 + X_\infty)$ along X_0 and X_∞ are pullbacks of D . By inversion of adjunction, if (X, D) is lc (resp. klt), then $(\overline{Y}_L, \overline{D}_L + X_0 + X_\infty)$ is lc (resp. plt) in a neighborhood of $X_0 \cup X_\infty$. This implies that $(\overline{Y}_L, \overline{D}_L + X_0 + X_\infty)$ is lc (resp. plt) as the closure of every \mathbb{G}_m -orbit of \overline{Y}_L intersects either X_0 or X_∞ . Thus (1) is proved.

(2) For simplicity, denote by $\pi_0 := \overline{\pi}_L|_{X_0}$ (resp. $\pi_\infty := \overline{\pi}_L|_{X_\infty}$) the isomorphism between X_0 (resp. X_∞) and X . Thus $X_0|_{X_0} \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} \pi_0^*(-L)$. Hence by (1) we have

$$(K_{\overline{Y}_L} + (1-r)X_0 + X_\infty)|_{X_0} = K_{X_0} + L_{\text{orb}} - rX_0|_{X_0} \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} \pi_0^*(-rL) - \pi_0^*(-rL) = 0.$$

As a result, we have that

$$K_{\overline{Y}_L} + (1-r)X_0 + X_\infty \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} \mu_L^*(K_{C_p(X,L)} + X_\infty).$$

If (X, L_{orb}) is lc (resp. klt), then by (1) we know that $(\overline{Y}_L, X_0 + X_\infty)$ is lc (resp. plt), which implies that $(C_p(X, L), X_\infty)$ is lc (resp. plt) as $A_{C_p(X,L), X_\infty}(X_0) = r > 0$.

Next, we show that $K_{C_p(X,L)} + X_\infty \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} -rX_\infty$. By (2.1) and (2.4), we have

$$K_{\overline{Y}_L} + X_0 + X_\infty = \overline{\pi}_L^*(K_X + L_{\text{orb}}) \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} -r\overline{\pi}_L^* L. \quad (2.5)$$

Since $X_\infty = (t=0)$, we know that $X_\infty \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} (\mu_L)_* \overline{\pi}_L^* L$. Thus taking pushforward of (2.5) under μ_L yields the desired \mathbb{Q} -linear equivalence. As a result, $-K_{C_p(X,L)} - X_\infty \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} rX_\infty$ is ample, which implies that $(C_p(X, L), X_\infty)$ is a log Fano pair. The statement on the different divisor follows from (1).

(3) By (1) and (2.4) we know that $(\overline{Y}_L, \overline{D}_L + X_0 + X_\infty)$ is an lc CY pair. Thus $(C_p(X, L), D_{L,p} + X_\infty)$ is also an lc CY pair. Clearly X_∞ is ample on $C_p(X, L)$. The statement on the different divisor follows from (1). \square

Proposition 2.21. *Under the assumptions of Proposition 2.20(2) with $n = \dim X$, we have*

$$(-K_{C_p(X,L)})^{n+1} = (1+r)^{n+1}(L^n) \quad \text{and} \quad (-K_{C_p(X,L)} - X_\infty)^{n+1} = r^{n+1}(L^n).$$

Proof. By the proof of Proposition 2.20(2), we have $-K_{C_p(X,L)} \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} (1+r)X_{\infty}$ and $-K_{C_p(X,L)} - X_{\infty} \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} rX_{\infty}$. Thus it suffices to show $(X_{\infty}^{n+1}) = (L^n)$. Since $X_{\infty} = (t=0)$, we know that $X_{\infty} \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} (\mu_L)_* \bar{\pi}_L^* L$ which implies that $X_{\infty}|_{X_{\infty}} \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} \pi_{\infty}^* L$. Thus we have $(X_{\infty}^{n+1}) = (L^n)$. \square

2.6.3. Surfaces with \mathbb{G}_m -actions.

Definition 2.22. Let Y be a normal surface with an effective \mathbb{G}_m -action. Let E be a \mathbb{G}_m -invariant prime divisor on Y . We say E is *vertical* if it is the closure of a \mathbb{G}_m -orbit. We say E is *horizontal* if every point in E is a \mathbb{G}_m -fixed point.

Proposition 2.23. *Under the assumption of Definition 2.22, there exist at most two horizontal divisors on Y .*

Proof. This follows from [PS11, Cor. 3.17] as the divisorial fan of Y with the \mathbb{G}_m -action is 1-dimensional, hence there are at most two rays in the tail fan. Note that a horizontal divisor is called a prime divisor of type 2 in loc. cit. \square

Definition 2.24 ([Kol13]*Def. 4.36). A *standard \mathbb{P}^1 -link* is a pair $(Y, \Delta + D_1 + D_2)$ where Y is a normal variety, D_1 and D_2 are prime divisors on Y , together with a proper morphism $\pi : Y \rightarrow X$ to a normal variety X such that the following hold.

- (1) $K_Y + \Delta + D_1 + D_2 \sim_{\mathbb{Q}, \pi} 0$;
- (2) $(Y, \Delta + D_1 + D_2)$ is plt (in particular, D_1 and D_2 are disjoint);
- (3) $\pi|_{D_i} : D_i \rightarrow X$ is an isomorphism for every $i \in \{1, 2\}$;
- (4) every reduced fiber $Y_x^{\text{red}} = \text{red } \pi^{-1}(x)$ is isomorphic to \mathbb{P}^1 .

Proposition 2.25. *Let $\pi : (Y, D_1 + D_2) \rightarrow B$ be a standard \mathbb{P}^1 -link over a smooth projective curve B . Assume that $(Y, D_1 + D_2)$ admits an effective \mathbb{G}_m -action such that every fiber of π is \mathbb{G}_m -invariant. Then Y is \mathbb{G}_m -equivariantly isomorphic to a compactified Seifert \mathbb{G}_m -bundle over B .*

Proof. Denote by $Y^{\circ} := Y \setminus (D_1 \cup D_2)$ and $\pi^{\circ} := \pi|_{Y^{\circ}}$. Since the reduced structure of every fiber of π is isomorphic to \mathbb{P}^1 and D_1 and D_2 are two disjoint sections of π , we know that the reduced structure of $(\pi^{\circ})^{-1}(b)$ is isomorphic to $\mathbb{A}^1 \setminus \{0\}$ for every $b \in B$. Since D_1 and D_2 are two horizontal divisors on Y , we know that every fiber of π is vertical by Proposition 2.23. In particular, $(\pi^{\circ})^{-1}(b)$ consists of a single \mathbb{G}_m -orbit for every $b \in B$. This implies that Y° is a Seifert \mathbb{G}_m -bundle by Definition 2.15. By Theorem 2.17, there exists a \mathbb{Q} -divisor L on B such that Y° is \mathbb{G}_m -equivariantly isomorphic to Y_L in terms of Definition 2.16. Denote by $Y' := \bar{Y}_L$ the compactified Seifert \mathbb{G}_m -bundle over B from Definition 2.16. Denote by Y'° the open subset of Y' that is isomorphic to Y_L .

Denote by D'_1 and D'_2 the two horizontal divisors (which are exactly the two sections) of Y' such that $D'_1 \cup D'_2 = Y' \setminus Y'^{\circ}$. Thus we get a \mathbb{G}_m -equivariant birational map $Y \dashrightarrow Y'$ that is isomorphic between Y° and Y'° . Since D_1 and D_2 both dominate B , they are not exceptional over Y' ; similarly, D'_1 and D'_2 are not exceptional over Y . This implies that $Y \dashrightarrow Y'$ is an isomorphism in codimension 1, which implies that it is an isomorphism as both Y and Y' are normal projective surfaces. \square

2.7. Good moduli spaces. The definition of a good moduli space was introduced by Alper to generalize a good quotient in GIT to arbitrary algebraic stacks [Alp13]. Below, we recall its definition and some results that will be used later on. Throughout, we use conventions for algebraic stacks in [Alp13, §2].

Definition 2.26 ([Alp13]). A quasi-compact morphism $\phi : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow M$ from an algebraic stack to an algebraic space is a *good moduli space* if

- (1) The push-forward functor on quasi-coherent sheaves is exact.

(2) The induced morphism $\mathcal{O}_M \rightarrow \phi_*\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{M}}$ is an isomorphism.

Good moduli space morphisms satisfy a number of natural properties.

Proposition 2.27 ([Alp13, Main Prop.]). *If $\phi : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow M$ is a good moduli space, then:*

- (1) *The morphism ϕ is surjective and universally closed.*
- (2) *Two geometric points $x, x' \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{K})$ are identified in M if and only if their closures $\overline{\{x\}}$ and $\overline{\{x'\}}$ in $\mathcal{X} \times_{\mathbb{K}} \mathbb{K}$ intersect.*
- (3) *Assuming \mathcal{M} is locally Noetherian, ϕ is universal for maps from \mathcal{M} to algebraic spaces.*

Proposition 2.28 ([Alp13, Rem. 6.2]). *Let $\phi : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow M$ be a good moduli space and $\mathcal{U} \subset \mathcal{M}$ be an open substack. If \mathcal{U} is saturated (which means $\phi^{-1}(\phi(\mathcal{U})) = \mathcal{U}$), then*

- (1) *$\phi(\mathcal{U}) \subset M$ is an open subspace and*
- (2) *$\mathcal{U} \rightarrow \phi(\mathcal{U})$ is a good moduli space morphism.*

In order to construct good moduli spaces, we will use the following existence result due to Alper, Halpern-Leistner, and Heinloth. The terms S-completeness and Θ -reductivity, which appear in the result, will be defined in Sections 5.1 and 6.1.

Theorem 2.29 ([AHLH18, Thm. A]). *Let \mathcal{M} be a finite type algebraic stack with affine diagonal. The following are equivalent:*

- (1) *There exists a good moduli space morphism $\mathcal{M} \rightarrow M$ with M separated.*
- (2) *\mathcal{M} is S-complete and Θ -reductive.*

Moreover, when (1) holds, M is proper if \mathcal{M} satisfies the existence part of the valuative criterion for properness.

Remark 2.30. In the above theorem, it suffices to check S-completeness, Θ -reductivity, and the existence part of the valuative criterion with respect to DVRs that are essentially of finite type over \mathbb{k} [AHLH18, Thm. 5.4 & Lem. A.11].

3. MODULI STACK

In this section, we define a family of boundary polarized CY pairs over an arbitrary base scheme. Using the definition, we introduce a moduli stack parametrizing families of boundary polarized CY pairs and prove it is a locally finite type algebraic stack with affine diagonal.

Throughout this section, we fix the following numerical invariants: an index $N \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, a coefficient set $\mathbf{r} = (r, s) \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0}$ satisfying that $N\mathbf{r} \in \mathbb{Z}^2$, and a function $\chi : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$.

3.1. Families of boundary polarized CY pairs. We first define a family of boundary polarized CY pairs over an arbitrary Noetherian scheme.

Definition 3.1. A family of boundary polarized CY pairs $(X, \Delta + D) \rightarrow B$ over a Noetherian scheme B and with coefficients \mathbf{r} and index dividing N consists of

- (1) a flat projective morphism $X \rightarrow B$, and
- (2) relative K-flat Mumford divisors Δ^{Div} and D^{Div} , where $\Delta := r\Delta^{\text{Div}}$ and $D := sD^{\text{Div}}$

satisfying the following conditions

- (3) $(X_b, \Delta_b + D_b)$ is a boundary polarized CY pair for each $b \in B$,
- (4) $\omega_{X/B}^{[N]}(N(\Delta + D)) \cong_B \mathcal{O}_X$,
- (5) $\omega_{X/B}^{[m]}(m\Delta + nD^{\text{Div}})$ commutes with base change for all $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}$ with mr integral.

Remark 3.2. We now explain some of the terminology in the above definition.

- (i) By writing Δ and D as rational multiples of relative Mumford divisors in (2), we are viewing $(X, \Delta + D) \rightarrow B$ as a family of *marked* pairs. See [Kol23, Sec. 8.1] for a discussion on markings and why they are necessary when defining a moduli functor.
- (ii) The term K-flatness is defined in [Kol23, Sec. 7.1] and is needed to have a moduli theory for divisors over non-reduced schemes.
- (iii) The notation \cong_B means $\omega_{X/B}^{[N]}(N(\Delta + D)) \cong \mathcal{O}_X \otimes L_B$ for some line bundle L_B pulled back from B .
- (iv) The sheaves in (4) and (5) are defined as follows. Let $U \subset X$ be the largest open subset where the fibers of $U \rightarrow B$ are either smooth or nodal and D_U^{Div} and Δ_U^{Div} are relative Cartier divisors. Note that $\text{codim}_{X_b}(X_b \setminus U_b) \geq 2$ for each $b \in B$. We set

$$\omega_{X/B}^{[m]}(m\Delta + nD^{\text{Div}}) := i_*(\omega_{U/B}^{\otimes m}(m\Delta_U + nD_U^{\text{Div}})),$$

where $i : U \hookrightarrow X$ is the inclusion. The sheaves are reflexive by [HK04, Cor. 3.7].

- (v) Condition (5) means that for any morphism of schemes $g : B' \rightarrow B$, the natural map

$$g^* \omega_{X/B}^{[m]}(m\Delta + nD^{\text{Div}}) \rightarrow \omega_{X'/B'}^{[m]}(m\Delta_{B'} + nD_{B'}^{\text{Div}})$$

is an isomorphism, where $X' := X \times_B B'$ and $g' : X' \rightarrow X$ the first projection. This is often referred to as *Kollár's condition* in the literature; see [Kol23, Ch. 9].

- (vi) Conditions (3) and (5) imply $\omega_{X/B}^{[-m]}(-m\Delta)$ and $\mathcal{O}_X(mD)$ are relatively ample line bundles for any sufficiently divisible positive integer m .
- (vii) Condition (5) with $m = 0$ and $n = 1$ implies that D^{Div} is flat with pure dimensional scheme theoretic fibers by [Kol23, 4.19 and 4.33].

It is clear that, over a reduced Noetherian scheme, Definition 3.1 implies Definition 2.9. The following proposition shows the notions are in fact equivalent in this setting.

Lemma 3.3. *If $(X, \Delta + D) \rightarrow B$ is a family of boundary polarized CY pairs over a reduced base scheme B as defined in Definition 2.9 such that*

- (1) $N(K_{X/B} + \Delta + D) \sim 0$ and
- (2) $\Delta := r\Delta^{\text{Div}}$ and $D := sD^{\text{Div}}$, where Δ^{Div} and D^{Div} are relative Mumford divisors,

then the family satisfies Definition 3.1.

Proof. It suffices to show that Δ^{Div} and D^{Div} are K-flat and Definition 3.1.5 is satisfied. Since B is reduced and the divisors $K_{X/B} + \Delta$ and D^{div} are \mathbb{Q} -Cartier, the statements follow from [Kol23, 7.4.2] and [Kol23, 4.19, 4.33, 9.17], respectively. \square

In Definition 3.1, we assumed B is a Noetherian scheme, since the definition of K-flatness and its properties are only developed in [Kol13] for families over Noetherian schemes. To define a family over an arbitrary scheme, we bootstrap from the Noetherian case.

Definition 3.4. A family of boundary polarized CY pairs $(X, \Delta + D) \rightarrow B$ over a scheme B and with coefficients \mathbf{r} and index dividing N consists of

- (1) a flat projective morphism of schemes $X \rightarrow B$, and
- (2) relative Mumford divisors Δ^{Div} and D^{Div} , where $\Delta := r\Delta^{\text{Div}}$ and $D := sD^{\text{Div}}$

satisfying the condition

- (3) for each affine open set $U \subset X$, there exists a Noetherian subring $A^N \subset A := \mathcal{O}_X(U)$ such that $(X, \Delta + D)_U \rightarrow U$ is the pullback of a family $(X^N, \Delta^N + D^N) \rightarrow U^N := \text{Spec}(A^N)$ satisfying Definition 3.1.

We now collect a number of results about the behavior of various invariants of boundary polarized CY pairs in families.

Proposition 3.5. *Let $(X, \Delta + D) \rightarrow B$ be a family of boundary polarized CY pairs with coefficients \mathbf{r} and index dividing N . Fix $m \in \mathbb{N}$ with $mr \in \mathbb{Z}$. The following hold.*

- (1) $H^i(X_b, \omega_{X_b}^{[-m]}(-m\Delta)) = 0$ for all $b \in B$, and $i \geq 1$.
- (2) The sheaf $f_*\omega_{X/B}^{[-m]}(-m\Delta)$ is locally free and commutes with base change.
- (3) The functions $B \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ sending

$$b \mapsto H^0(X, \omega_{X_b}^{[-m]}(-m\Delta_b)), \quad b \mapsto \deg(\Delta_b^{\text{Div}}), \quad \text{and} \quad b \mapsto \deg(D_b^{\text{Div}})$$

are locally constant, where $\deg(G_b) := G_b \cdot (-K_{X_b} - \Delta_b)^{d-1}$ for a divisor G_b on X_b .

- (4) The subset of B is open

$$U := \{b \in B \mid \omega_{X_b}^{[-m]}(-m\Delta) \text{ is a very ample line bundle}\}.$$

Proof. By Definition 3.1.5,

$$\omega_{X/B}^{[-m]}(-mr\Delta)|_{X_b} \cong \omega_{X_b}^{[-m]}(-m\Delta),$$

which will be used throughout. Statement (1) follows from [Kol23, Thm. 11.34]. Statement (2) follows from (1) and the extension of [Har77, Thm. 12.11] to finitely presented morphisms using standard Noetherian approximation arguments. Statement (3) follows from (2) and [Kol23, Thm. 4.3.5]. Next note that $V := \{b \in B \mid \omega_{X/B}^{[-m]}(-m\Delta)|_{X_b} \text{ is a line bundle}\}$ is open by Nakayama’s Lemma. Since (2) holds, U consists of $b \in V$ such that the restriction of

$$X_V \dashrightarrow \mathbb{P}_V(f_*\omega_{X/B}^{[-m]}(-m\Delta)^*|_V)$$

is a closed embedding. Since the latter set is open, (4) holds. \square

3.2. Moduli stack. We now define a moduli stack of boundary polarized CY pairs.

Definition 3.6. Let $\mathcal{M}(\chi, N, \mathbf{r})$ denote the category fibered in groupoids over $\text{Sch}_{\mathbb{k}}$ where:

- The objects are families of boundary polarized CY pairs

$$(X, \Delta + D) \rightarrow B$$

with coefficients \mathbf{r} , index dividing N , and $\chi(X_b, \omega_{X_b}^{[-m]}(-m\Delta)) = \chi(m)$ for each $b \in B$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $mr \in \mathbb{N}$.

- the morphisms $[(X', \Delta' + D') \rightarrow B'] \rightarrow [(X, \Delta + D) \rightarrow B]$ consist of morphisms of schemes $X' \rightarrow X$ and $B' \rightarrow B$ such that the natural map $X' \rightarrow X \times_B B'$ is an isomorphism and Δ'^{Div} and D'^{Div} are the divisorial pullbacks of Δ^{Div} and D^{Div} .

The main result of this section is the following statement.

Theorem 3.7. $\mathcal{M}(\chi, N, \mathbf{r})$ is a locally finite type algebraic stack with affine diagonal.

Remark 3.8. In explicit examples, we will be primarily interested in the substack of $\mathcal{M}(\chi, N, \mathbf{r})$ consisting of families $[(X, \Delta + D) \rightarrow B]$ such that $\Delta^{\text{Div}} = \emptyset$. This is an open and closed substack by Proposition 3.5.3.

To prove the theorem, we will show the stack has an open cover by finite type quotient stacks. Fix $\mathbf{c} = (c, c') \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0}^2$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $kr \in \mathbb{N}$. Let

$$\mathcal{M}(\chi, N, \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{c}, k) \subset \mathcal{M}(\chi, N, \mathbf{r})$$

denote the full subcategory consisting of families $[(X, \Delta + D) \rightarrow B]$ such that $-k(K_{X_b} + \Delta_b)$ is a very ample Cartier divisor and $\mathbf{c} = (\deg(\Delta_b^{\text{Div}}), \deg(D_b^{\text{Div}}))$.

Proposition 3.9. $\mathcal{M}(\chi, N, \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{c}, k)$ is a finite type algebraic stack with affine diagonal.

Proof. If $[f : (X, \Delta + D) \rightarrow B]$ is an object of $\mathcal{M}(\chi, N, \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{c}, k)$, then $\omega_{X/B}^{[-k]}(-k\Delta)$ is a f -very ample line bundle of rank $\chi(k)$ and there is an induced embedding

$$X \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}_B(f_*\omega_{X/B}^{[-k]}(-k\Delta)).$$

We proceed to parametrize such embeddings.

Let $M := \chi(k) - 1$, and consider the Hilbert scheme $H := \text{Hilb}_{\chi(k)}(\mathbb{P}^M)$ parametrizing subschemes $X \subset \mathbb{P}^M$ with $\chi(X, \mathcal{O}_X(m)) = \chi(mk)$ for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Write $X_H \subset \mathbb{P}_H^M$ for the corresponding universal family. Note that the PGL_{M+1} action on \mathbb{P}^M induces a PGL_{M+1} action on H .

We claim that the locus $h \in H$ such that

- (a) X_h is geometrically connected and reduced, equidimensional, and deminormal,
- (b) $H^i(X_h, \mathcal{O}_{X_h}(1)) = 0$ for all $i > 0$, and
- (c) the embedding $X_h \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}_{\kappa(h)}^M$ is by the complete linear series $|\mathcal{O}_{X_h}(1)|$,

is an open subscheme $H_1 \subset H$. Indeed, (a) is open by [Gro66, 12.2.1(ii) and 12.2.4(vi)] and [Kol23, Cor. 10.42], while (b) is open by [Har77, Thm. III.12.8]. Since condition (b) implies

$$\dim H^0(X_h, \mathcal{O}_{X_h}(1)) = \chi(k) = \dim H^0(\mathbb{P}_{\kappa(h)}^M, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_{\kappa(h)}^M}(1)),$$

and $H^i(\mathbb{P}_{\kappa(h)}^M, \mathcal{I}_{X_h}(1)) = 0$ for $i \geq 2$, condition (c) holds if and only if $H^1(\mathbb{P}_{\kappa(h)}^M, \mathcal{I}_{X_h}(1)) = 0$, which is again an open condition. Hence $H_1 \subset H$ is open.

Next, we parametrize the boundary divisors in the moduli problem. Let

$$H_2 := \text{KDiv}_{k^{n-1}c}(X_{H_1}/H_1) \times_{H_1} \text{KDiv}_{k^{n-1}c'}(X_{H_1}/H_1),$$

where $n := \dim(X_{H_1}) - \dim H_1$ and $\text{KDiv}_{k^{n-1}c}(\cdot)$ denotes the parameter space of K-flat, relative Mumford divisors of degree $k^{n-1}c$ with respect to $\mathcal{O}_{X_{H_1}}(1)$ as constructed in [Kol23, Thm. 7.3]. Write $\Delta_{H_2} := r\Delta_{H_2}^{\text{Div}}$ and $D_{H_2} := sD_{H_2}^{\text{Div}}$, where $\Delta_{H_2}^{\text{Div}}$ and $D_{H_2}^{\text{Div}}$ are the universal families of relative Mumford divisors on X_{H_2} of degree c and c' , respectively. Again, the PGL_{M+1} -action on \mathbb{P}^M induces a natural PGL_{M+1} -action on H_2 .

Now, we shrink H_2 to the locus where Definition 3.1.3–5 is satisfied. By [Kol23, Prop. 9.42 & Thm. 3.29], there is a locally closed partial decomposition $H_3 \hookrightarrow H_2$ such that $B \rightarrow H_2$ factors through H_3 if and only if

$$\omega_{X_B/B}^{[-k]}(-k\Delta_B) \cong_B \mathcal{O}_{X_B}(1) \quad \text{and} \quad \omega_{X_B/B}^{[N]}(N(\Delta_B + D_B)) \cong_B \mathcal{O}_{X_B}.$$

By our choice of H_3 , $\omega_{X_{H_2}/H_2}^{[m]}(m\Delta_{H_2})$ and $\mathcal{O}_{X_{H_3}}(mD_{H_3})$ are line bundles for $m > 0$ sufficiently divisible. Hence [Kol23, Prop. 3.31] implies there is a locally closed partial decomposition $H_4 \hookrightarrow H_3$ such that $B \rightarrow H_3$ factors through H_4 if and only if the formation of $\omega_{X_B/B}^{[m]}(m\Delta_B + nD_B^{\text{Div}})$ commutes with base change for all $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $mr \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Finally, by [Kol23, Cor. 4.45], the locus

$$H_5 := \{h \in H_4 \mid (X_h, \Delta_h + D_h) \text{ is slc}\} \subset H_4$$

is open. Now, note that $(X_{H_5} \subset \mathbb{P}_{H_5}^M, r\Delta_{H_5} + sD_{H_5}) \rightarrow H_5$ is an object in $\mathcal{M}(\chi, N, \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{c}, k)$. Furthermore, by our construction, H_5 represents the category fibered over $\text{Sch}_{\mathbb{k}}$ whose objects consist of a family $[f : (X, \Delta + D) \rightarrow B]$ in $\mathcal{M}(\chi, N, \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{c}, k)$ with an isomorphism $\mathbb{P}(f_*\omega_{X/B}^{[-k]}(-k\Delta)) \cong \mathbb{P}_B^M$.

We claim $\mathcal{M}(\chi, N, \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{c}, k) \cong [H_5/\text{PGL}_{M+1}]$. Indeed, the universal family

$$(X_{H_5} \subset \mathbb{P}_{H_5}^M, \Delta_{H_5} + D_{H_5}) \rightarrow H_5,$$

which is PGL_{M+1} -equivariant, induces a morphism $H_5 \rightarrow \mathcal{M}(\chi, N, \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{c}, k)$. The latter induces a morphism $[H_5/\text{PGL}_{M+1}]^{\text{pre}} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}(\chi, N, \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{c}, k)$, which by Lemma 3.10, induces a morphism

$[H_5/\mathrm{PGL}_{M+1}] \rightarrow \mathcal{M}(\chi, N, \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{c}, k)$. To construct the inverse, consider $[f : (X, \Delta + D) \rightarrow B]$ in $\mathcal{M}(\chi, N, \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{c}, k)$. Since $f_*\omega_{X/B}^{[-k]}(-k\Delta)$ is locally free, there exists an open cover $B = \cup_i B_i$ over which its restriction is free. Choosing trivializations induce embeddings $X_{B_i} \subset \mathbb{P}_{B_i}^M$ and, hence, morphisms $\phi_i : B_i \rightarrow H_5$. Over the intersections $B_i \cap B_j$, the trivializations differ by a section $s_{ij} \in H^0(B_i \cap B_j, \mathrm{PGL}_{M+1})$. Therefore the ϕ_i glue to a morphism $\phi : B \rightarrow [H_5/\mathrm{PGL}_{M+1}]$, which induces a morphism $\mathcal{M}(\chi, N, \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{c}, k) \rightarrow [H_5/\mathrm{PGL}_{M+1}]$ that is the inverse.

To finish the proof, note that H_5 is a finite type scheme. Thus $[H_5/\mathrm{PGL}_{M+1}]$, which is isomorphic to $\mathcal{M}(\chi, N, \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{c}, k)$, is a finite type algebraic stack with affine diagonal. \square

The following lemma was used in the above proof.

Lemma 3.10. *The fibered category $\mathcal{M}(\chi, N, \mathbf{r})$ satisfies étale descent.*

Proof. For an étale cover of a Noetherian scheme, standard arguments show $\mathcal{M}(\chi, N, \mathbf{r})$ satisfies descent (see for example [FI21, Proof of Prop. 4.2]). Using [Sta23, Tag 049N] and [Sta23, Tag 00QN], the general case can be deduced from the Noetherian case. We leave the details to the reader. \square

Proof of Theorem 3.7. For each $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0}^2$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$, the natural morphism

$$\mathcal{M}(\chi, N, \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{c}, k) \longrightarrow \mathcal{M}(\chi, N, \mathbf{r})$$

is representable and an open immersion by Proposition 3.5. Additionally, the morphism

$$\bigsqcup_{\mathbf{c}, k} \mathcal{M}(\chi, N, \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{c}, k) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}(\chi, N, \mathbf{r})$$

is surjective by construction. Since each $\mathcal{M}(\chi, N, \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{c}, k)$ is a finite type algebraic stack with affine diagonal by Proposition 3.9, $\mathcal{M}(\chi, N, \mathbf{r})$ is a locally finite type algebraic stack with affine diagonal. \square

3.3. Boundedness. In this section, we state an elementary criterion for when a set of boundary polarized CY pairs is bounded.

Definition 3.11. A subset $\mathfrak{F} \subset \mathcal{M}(\chi, N, \mathbf{r})(\mathbb{k})$ is *bounded* if there exists a family of boundary polarized CY pairs $(X, \Delta + D) \rightarrow B$ over a finite type scheme B such that every element of \mathfrak{F} appears as a fiber of the family.

In the definition we may assume B is smooth. Indeed, if B is not smooth, we can choose a finite collection of smooth locally closed subschemes $B_i \subset B$ such that $B = \cup_{i=1} B_i$ and replace $(X, \Delta + D) \rightarrow B$ by the base change by $\sqcup_i B_i \rightarrow B$.

Proposition 3.12. *A subset $\mathfrak{F} \subset \mathcal{M}(\chi, N, \mathbf{r})(\mathbb{k})$ is bounded if and only if there positive integers k and c such that $-k(K_X + \Delta)$ is very ample Cartier divisor and $\deg(\Delta^{\mathrm{Div}}) := (-K_X - \Delta)^{\dim X - 1} \cdot \Delta^{\mathrm{Div}} \leq c$ for every $(X, \Delta + D) \in \mathfrak{F}$.*

Proof. The forward implication follows immediately from Proposition 3.5. To prove the reverse implication, assume the existence of k and c . Note that $(\deg(\Delta^{\mathrm{Div}}), \deg(D^{\mathrm{Div}}))$ takes finitely many values for $(X, \Delta + D) \in \mathfrak{F}$, since

$$\deg(D^{\mathrm{Div}}) = s^{-1}(-K_X - \Delta)^{\dim X - 1} \cdot D = s^{-1}(-K_X - \Delta)^{\dim X},$$

which is determined by \mathbf{r} and χ , and $\deg(\Delta^{\mathrm{Div}}) \in k^{-\dim X + 1}\mathbb{Z} \cap [0, c]$. Thus the proof of Proposition 3.9 shows that \mathfrak{F} is bounded. \square

4. TEST CONFIGURATIONS

In this section, we discuss properties of test configurations of boundary polarized CY pairs. These degenerations will play a key role in the moduli theory of such pairs.

4.1. Test configurations of polarized schemes. We recall content from [BHJ17] on test configurations. Throughout, X is a projective scheme, and L is an ample line bundle on X .

Definition 4.1. A *test configuration* $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ of (X, L) is the data of

- a \mathbb{G}_m -equivariant flat proper morphism $\pi : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{A}^1$,
- a relatively ample \mathbb{G}_m -linearized line bundle \mathcal{L} on \mathcal{X} , and
- a \mathbb{G}_m -equivariant isomorphism

$$(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})|_{\mathbb{A}^1 \setminus 0} \cong (X, L) \times (\mathbb{A}^1 \setminus 0),$$

where \mathbb{G}_m acts on the right side as the product of the trivial and standard actions.

A test configuration induces a multiplicative \mathbb{Z} -filtration \mathcal{F}^\bullet of $H^0(X, mL)$ defined by

$$\mathcal{F}^\lambda H^0(X, mL) = \{s \in H^0(X, mL) \mid t^{-\lambda} \bar{s} \in H^0(\mathcal{X}, m\mathcal{L})\}$$

for each $\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$, where $\bar{s} \in H^0(\mathcal{X} \setminus \mathcal{X}_0, m\mathcal{L}|_{\mathcal{X} \setminus \mathcal{X}_0})$ is the \mathbb{G}_m -invariant section such that $\bar{s}|_{X_1} = s$. By the Rees construction, there are \mathbb{G}_m -equivariant isomorphisms of graded rings

$$\bigoplus_{m \in \mathbb{N}} H^0(\mathcal{X}, m\mathcal{L}) \cong \bigoplus_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{F}^\lambda H^0(X, mL) t^{-\lambda} \quad (4.1)$$

and

$$\bigoplus_{m \in \mathbb{N}} H^0(\mathcal{X}_0, m\mathcal{L}_0) \cong \bigoplus_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}} F^\lambda H^0(X, mL) / F^{\lambda+1} H^0(X, mL), \quad (4.2)$$

where the \mathbb{G}_m -actions on the right sides are induced by the \mathbb{Z} -grading [BHJ17, Section 2.5].

When X is a normal variety and \mathcal{X} is normal, \mathcal{F}^\bullet has an interpretation in terms of valuations [BHJ17, Section 4]. Each irreducible component $E \subset \mathcal{X}_0$ induces a \mathbb{G}_m -equivariant valuation ord_E of $K(\mathcal{X})$. Set

$$b_E := \text{ord}_E(\mathcal{X}_0) = \text{ord}_E(t) \quad \text{and} \quad v_E := b_E^{-1} r(\text{ord}_E),$$

where $r(\text{ord}_E)$ is the restriction of ord_E to $K(X) \subset K(X)(t) \cong K(\mathcal{X})$. By [BHJ17, Lem. 4.1], $r(\text{ord}_E) = c \text{ord}_F$, where $c \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ and F is a prime divisor over X . Let \mathcal{Y} denote the normalization of the graph of $\mathcal{X} \dashrightarrow X_{\mathbb{A}^1} := X \times \mathbb{A}^1$ with natural morphisms

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \mathcal{Y} & \\ f \swarrow & & \searrow g \\ \mathcal{X} & \dashrightarrow & X_{\mathbb{A}^1} \end{array} .$$

Let $L_{\mathbb{A}^1} := p_1^* L$ where $p_1 : X_{\mathbb{A}^1} \rightarrow X$ is the projection to the first factor. Since $f^* \mathcal{L}$ and $g^* L_{\mathbb{A}^1}$ are canonically isomorphic over $\mathcal{Y} \setminus \mathcal{Y}_0$, there exists a divisor G supported on \mathcal{Y}_0 such that $f^* \mathcal{L} = g^* L_{\mathbb{A}^1}(G)$. By the proof of [BHJ17, Lem. 5.17],

$$\mathcal{F}^\lambda H^0(X, mL) = \bigcap_{E \subset \mathcal{X}_0} \{s \in H^0(X, mL) \mid v_E(s) + mb_E^{-1} \text{ord}_E(G) \geq \lambda\}. \quad (4.3)$$

The following lemma says that the valuations v_E for $E \subset \mathcal{X}_0$ are the minimal set of valuations that defining the filtration.

Lemma 4.2. *Let $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ be a test configuration of (X, L) with \mathcal{X} normal and irreducible. If $v_1, \dots, v_\ell \in \text{DivVal}_X$ and $c_1, \dots, c_\ell \in \mathbb{Z}$ satisfy*

$$\mathcal{F}^\lambda H^0(X, mL) = \bigcap_{i=1, \dots, \ell} \{s \in H^0(X, mL) \mid v_i(s) + mc_i \geq \lambda\}$$

for each $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}$, then for each irreducible component $E \subset \mathcal{X}_0$ there exists $i \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}$ such that $v_i = v_E$ and $c_i = b_E^{-1} \text{ord}_E(G)$.

Proof. Let $S := \bigoplus_{m \in \mathbb{N}} S_m := \bigoplus_{m \in \mathbb{N}} H^0(X, mL)$ and $I_\lambda := \mathcal{F}^\lambda S := \bigoplus_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{F}^\lambda S_m$ for each $\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}$. Note that replacing \mathcal{L} with $\mathcal{L}(d\mathcal{X}_0)$ results in replacing G with $G + d\mathcal{X}_0$, $\mathcal{F}^\lambda H^0(X, mL)$ with $\mathcal{F}^{\lambda-md} H^0(X, mL)$, and c_i with $c_i + d$. Thus, after performing such a replacement with $d \gg 0$, we may assume G is effective, $\mathcal{F}^0 S = S$, and $c_i \geq 0$ for all i . Using that

$$S \cdot \mathcal{F}^\lambda S = \mathcal{F}^0 S \cdot \mathcal{F}^\lambda S \subset \mathcal{F}^\lambda S,$$

we see $I_\lambda := \mathcal{F}^\lambda S$ is an ideal of S . Since the algebra in (4.1) is finitely generated, $\bigoplus_{\lambda \in \mathbb{N}} I_\lambda$ is a finitely generated \mathbb{k} -algebra. Thus there exists $\mu > 0$ such that $I_\mu^\lambda = I_{\mu\lambda}$ for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{N}$.

We now interpret the ideals I_λ valuatively. Consider the valuation w_i of S defined by

$$w_i(f) = \min\{v_i(f_m) + mc_i \mid f_m \neq 0\},$$

where $f = \sum_{m \geq 0} f_m \in \bigoplus_{m \in \mathbb{N}} S_m$. Similarly, for each irreducible component $E \subset \mathcal{X}_0$, define

$$w_E(f) := \min\{r(\text{ord}_E)(f_m) + mb_E^{-1} \text{ord}_E(G) \mid f_m \neq 0\},$$

which is also a valuation of S . Note that

$$I_\lambda = \mathcal{F}^\lambda S = \bigcap_{i=1, \dots, \ell} \{f \in S \mid w_i(f) \geq \lambda\} = \bigcap_{E \subset \mathcal{X}_0} \{f \in S \mid w_E(f) \geq \lambda\}$$

for each $\lambda \in \mathbb{N}$. Since I_λ is the intersection of valuation ideals, I_λ is integrally closed by [HS06, Rem. 1.1.3.6 & Ex. 6.10.7].

By [BHJ17, Thm. 1.10], there exists a finite set of Rees valuations $\{u_j \mid j \in J\}$ of I_μ . This is the unique minimal finite set of valuations of S with the property that

$$\overline{I_\mu^\lambda} = \bigcap_{j \in J} \{f \in S \mid u_j(f) \geq \lambda\mu\}$$

for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{N}$. Since $\overline{I_\mu^\lambda} = I_\mu^\lambda = I_{\lambda\mu}$, $\{u_j \mid j \in J\}$ is a subset of both $\{w_i \mid 1 \leq i \leq \ell\}$ and $\{w_E \mid E \subset \mathcal{X}_0\}$.

To compare $\{u_j \mid j \in J\}$ and $\{v_E \mid E \subset \mathcal{X}_0\}$, consider the map

$$Z := \text{Proj}\left(\bigoplus_{\lambda \in \mathbb{N}} I_\lambda\right) \rightarrow \text{Spec}(S) =: Y.$$

Note that $\text{Proj}\left(\bigoplus_{\lambda \in \mathbb{N}} I_\lambda\right) = \text{Proj}\left(\bigoplus_{\lambda \in \mathbb{N}} I_{\mu\lambda}\right) = \text{Proj}\left(\bigoplus_{\lambda \in \mathbb{N}} I_\mu^\lambda\right)$, which is the blowup of Y along I_λ . Since $I_\mu^\lambda = I_{\mu\lambda}$, which is integrally closed, Z is normal. By [BHJ17, Thm 1.10], the Rees valuations of I_μ are in bijection with the irreducible components of $V(I_\mu \cdot \mathcal{O}_Z)$. Observe that

$$V(I_\mu \cdot \mathcal{O}_Z) = \text{Proj}\left(\bigoplus_{\lambda \in \mathbb{N}} I_\lambda / I_{\lambda+\mu}\right)$$

On the other hand, the effective Cartier divisor $\mu\mathcal{X}_0 \subset \mathcal{X}$ is the Proj of

$$\bigoplus_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{F}^\lambda S_m / \mathcal{F}^{\lambda+\mu} S_m \cong \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}} I_\lambda / I_{\lambda+\mu},$$

where the Proj is taken with respect to the m -grading. Therefore, $V(I_\mu \cdot \mathcal{O}_Z)$ and $\mu\mathcal{X}_0$ are Proj's of the same ring with respect to different gradings and, hence, have the same number of irreducible components. Therefore $\{u_j \mid j \in J\}$ and $\{w_E \mid E \subset \mathcal{X}_0\}$ have the same cardinality and and so $\{w_E \mid E \subset \mathcal{X}_0\} = \{u_j \mid j \in J\} \subset \{w_i \mid 1 \leq i \leq \ell\}$. Thus, for each $E \subset \mathcal{X}_0$, there exists i such that $w_E = w_i$, which gives $v_E = v_i$ and $b_E^{-1} \text{ord}_E(G) = c_i$. \square

4.2. Test configurations of boundary polarized CY pairs.

Definition 4.3. A *weakly special test configuration* $(\mathcal{X}, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}} + \mathcal{D})$ of a boundary polarized CY pair $(X, \Delta + D)$ is the data of

- a \mathbb{G}_m -equivariant family of boundary polarized CY pairs $\pi : (\mathcal{X}, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}} + \mathcal{D}) \rightarrow \mathbb{A}^1$ and
- a \mathbb{G}_m -equivariant isomorphism

$$(\mathcal{X}, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}} + \mathcal{D})_{\mathbb{A}^1 \setminus 0} \cong (X, \Delta + D) \times (\mathbb{A}^1 \setminus 0),$$

where \mathbb{G}_m acts on the right side as the product of the trivial and standard actions.

A test configuration is a *product* if there exists a \mathbb{G}_m -equivariant isomorphism

$$(\mathcal{X}, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}} + \mathcal{D}) \cong (X, \Delta + D) \times \mathbb{A}^1,$$

where \mathbb{G}_m -acts on the right side as a product of a \mathbb{G}_m -action on $(X, \Delta + D)$ and the standard action on \mathbb{A}^1 . It is *trivial* if the isomorphism above can be chosen so that the \mathbb{G}_m -action on $(X, \Delta + D)$ is trivial.

Definition 4.4. We say that there is a *weakly special degeneration*

$$(X, \Delta + D) \rightsquigarrow (X_0, \Delta_0 + D_0)$$

if there exists a weakly special test configuration $(\mathcal{X}, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}} + \mathcal{D})$ of $(X, \Delta + D)$ such that $(X_0, \Delta_0 + D_0) \cong (\mathcal{X}_0, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}_0} + \mathcal{D}_0)$.

Remark 4.5 (Terminology). The term *weakly special* is a reference to [LWX21, Def. 2.16] and highlights the assumptions that the special fiber of the test configuration is slc. While one could allow test configurations of boundary polarized CY pairs with worse singularities, these will not appear in the paper. Hence, we will often refer to a *weakly special test configuration* as simply a *test configuration*.

Remark 4.6 (Stacky interpretation). Test configurations can be understood in terms of maps into the moduli stack of boundary polarized CY pairs. Indeed, a test configuration $(\mathcal{X}, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}} + \mathcal{D}) \rightarrow \mathbb{A}^1$ of a pair $(X, \Delta + D)$ in $\mathcal{M}(\chi, N, \mathbf{r})(\mathbb{k})$ is equivalent to a map $f : [\mathbb{A}_{\mathbb{k}}^1 / \mathbb{G}_m] \rightarrow \mathcal{M}(\chi, N, \mathbf{r})$ with an isomorphism $f(1) \cong [(X, \Delta + D)]$.

Let $(\mathcal{X}, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}} + \mathcal{D})$ be a weakly special test configuration of $(X, \Delta + D)$. If we set

$$L := \omega_X^{[-r]}(-r\Delta) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{L} := \omega_{\mathcal{X}/\mathbb{A}^1}^{[-r]}(-r\Delta_{\mathcal{X}}),$$

where $r \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ is sufficiently divisible, and endow \mathcal{L} with the canonical \mathbb{G}_m -linearization, then $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ is a test configuration of (X, L) in the sense of Definition 4.1. The following lemma describes the filtration \mathcal{F}^\bullet of $H^0(X, mL)$.

Lemma 4.7. *Let $(\mathcal{X}, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}} + \mathcal{D})$ be a weakly special test configuration of a boundary polarized CY pair $(X, \Delta + D)$. If \mathcal{X} is normal, then*

- (1) $\mathcal{F}^\lambda H^0(X, mL) = \bigcap_{E \subset \mathcal{X}_0} \{s \in H^0(X, mL) \mid v_E(s) - mr A_{X, \Delta}(v_E) \geq \lambda\}$ and
- (2) $A_{X, \Delta + D}(v_E) = 0$ for each irreducible component $E \subset \mathcal{X}_0$.

Proof. Fix an irreducible component $E \subset \mathcal{X}_0$. Since $(\mathcal{X}, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}} + \mathcal{D} + \mathcal{X}_0)$ is lc,

$$A_{\mathcal{X}, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}} + \mathcal{D} + \mathcal{X}_0}(E) = 0 = A_{\mathcal{X}, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}} + \mathcal{X}_0}(E)$$

and $\text{ord}_E(\mathcal{X}_0) = 1$. Now, set $G := -rf^*(K_{\mathcal{X}/\mathbb{A}^1} + \Delta_{\mathcal{X}}) + rg^*p_1^*(K_X + \Delta)$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} G &= -rf^*(K_{\mathcal{X}} + \Delta_{\mathcal{X}}) + rg^*(K_{X \times \mathbb{A}^1} + \Delta \times \mathbb{A}^1) \\ &= r(K_Y - f^*(K_{\mathcal{X}} + \Delta_{\mathcal{X}} + \mathcal{X}_0)) - r(K_Y - g^*(K_{X \times \mathbb{A}^1} + \Delta - X \times 0)), \end{aligned}$$

where the first equality uses $K_{\mathcal{X}/\mathbb{A}^1} = K_{\mathcal{X}} - \pi^*K_{\mathbb{A}^1}$ and $K_{X \times \mathbb{A}^1} = p_1^*K_X + p_2^*K_{\mathbb{A}^1}$. Thus

$$r^{-1}\text{ord}_E(G) = A_{\mathcal{X}, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}} + \mathcal{X}_0}(E) - A_{X \times \mathbb{A}^1, \Delta \times \mathbb{A}^1 + X \times 0}(E) = -A_{X \times \mathbb{A}^1, \Delta \times \mathbb{A}^1 + X \times 0}(E) = -A_{X, \Delta}(v_E),$$

where the third equality is [BHJ17, Prop. 4.11]. Thus (1) follows from (4.3). For (2),

$$A_{X,\Delta+D}(v_E) = A_{X \times \mathbb{A}^1, \Delta \times \mathbb{A}^1 + D \times \mathbb{A}^1 + X \times 0}(E) = A_{\mathcal{X}, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}} + \mathcal{D} + \mathcal{X}_0}(E) = 0,$$

where the first equality is [BHJ17, Prop. 4.11] and the second is by Lemma 2.10.1. \square

4.3. Lc places and test configurations. Now, we discuss the relation between lc places of complements and test configurations of slc log Fano pairs proven in [BLX22, CZ22b].

Recall, the *lc places* of an lc pair (X, Δ) is

$$\text{LC}(X, \Delta) := \{v \in \text{DivVal}_X \mid A_{X, \Delta}(v) = 0\}.$$

If (X, Δ) is an slc pair, we write $\text{LC}(X, \Delta) := \sqcup_{i=1}^r \text{LC}(\overline{G}_i + \overline{X}_i, \overline{\Delta}_i)$, which is the disjoint union of the lc places of the irreducible components of the normalization.

Theorem 4.8 ([CZ22b]). *If $(X, \Delta + D)$ is an lc boundary polarized CY pair, then there is a bijection between the sets of:*

- (1) *Weakly special test configurations $(\mathcal{X}, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}} + \mathcal{D})$ of $(X, \Delta + D)$ with \mathcal{X}_0 integral.*
- (2) *\mathbb{Z} -valued divisorial valuations $v \in \text{LC}(X, \Delta + D)$.*

The map is given by sending $(\mathcal{X}, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}} + \mathcal{D})$ to the valuation $v_{\mathcal{X}_0}$.

While the theorem follows from [CZ22b], we will instead deduce it from the following more general result, which produces a weakly special test configuration from the data of a collection of lc places.

Proposition 4.9. *Let $(X, \Delta + D)$ be an lc boundary polarized CY pair and $v_1, \dots, v_\ell \in \text{LC}(X, \Delta + D)$.*

- (1) *Then the $\mathbb{k}[t]$ -algebra $\text{Rees}(\mathcal{F}^\bullet) := \bigoplus_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{F}^\lambda H^0(X, mL) t^{-\lambda}$ is finitely generated, where*

$$\mathcal{F}^\lambda H^0(X, mL) := \{s \in \mathcal{F}^\lambda H^0(X, mL) \mid v_i(s) - mr A_{X, \Delta}(v_i) \geq \lambda\}$$

- (2) *If we set $\mathcal{X} := \text{Proj}(\text{Rees}(\mathcal{F}^\bullet))$, then $(\mathcal{X}, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}} + \mathcal{D})$ is a weakly special test configuration of $(X, \Delta + D)$ and each irreducible component $E \subset \mathcal{X}_0$ satisfies $v_E = v_i$ for some i .*

In statement (2), $(\mathcal{X}, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}} + \mathcal{D})$ is defined as follows. The \mathbb{Z} -grading on $\text{Rees}(\mathcal{F}^\bullet)$ induces a \mathbb{G}_m -action on \mathcal{X} and the isomorphism

$$\text{Rees}(\mathcal{F}^\bullet) \bigotimes_{\mathbb{k}[t]} \mathbb{k}[t^\pm] \cong \bigoplus_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}} H^0(X, mL) t^{-\lambda}$$

induces a \mathbb{G}_m -equivariant isomorphism $\mathcal{X}|_{\mathbb{A}^1 \setminus 0} \cong X \times (\mathbb{A}^1 \setminus 0)$. The \mathbb{Q} -divisors $\Delta_{\mathcal{X}}$ and \mathcal{D} then denote the closures of $\Delta \times (\mathbb{A}^1 \setminus 0)$ and $D \times (\mathbb{A}^1 \setminus 0)$ in \mathcal{X} .

Proof. Statement (1) holds by Theorem 5.6, which appears in a later section, or by [CZ22a, pg. 14]. Next, set $\mathcal{X} := \text{Proj}(\text{Rees}(\mathcal{F}^\bullet))$ and $\mathcal{L} := \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}(1)$. After replacing $r > 0$ with a positive multiple, we may assume $\text{Rees}(\mathcal{F}^\bullet)$ is generated in degree 1 and, hence, \mathcal{L} is a line bundle. By [BHJ17, §2.5], $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ is a test configuration of (X, L) . Using the valuative definition of \mathcal{F}^\bullet and the fact that X is integral, we see \mathcal{X}_0 is reduced. Since X is normal and \mathcal{X}_0 is reduced, \mathcal{X} is normal by [BHJ17, Prop. 2.6.iv].

Let \mathcal{Y} denote the normalization of the graph of $\mathcal{X} \dashrightarrow X_{\mathbb{A}^1}$ with maps $f : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ and $g : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow X_{\mathbb{A}^1}$. Let G be the divisor supported on \mathcal{Y}_0 such that $f^* \mathcal{L} = g^* L_{\mathbb{A}^1}(G)$. By Lemma 4.2 and the definition of \mathcal{F}^\bullet , each irreducible component $E \subset \mathcal{X}_0$ satisfies

$$A_{X, \Delta + D}(v_E) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \text{coeff}_E(G) = -r A_{X, \Delta}(r(\text{ord}_E)).$$

In addition, $v_E = v_i$ for some i .

To prove $(\mathcal{X}, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}} + \mathcal{D})$ is a weakly special test configuration of $(X, \Delta + D)$, it remains to show $(\mathcal{X}, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}} + \mathcal{D}) \rightarrow \mathbb{A}^1$ is a family of boundary polarized CY pairs. Using Lemma 2.7, it suffices to

prove (i) $(\mathcal{X}, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}} + \mathcal{D} + \mathcal{X}_0)$ is lc, (ii) $K_{\mathcal{X}} + \Delta_{\mathcal{X}} + \mathcal{D} + \mathcal{X}_0 \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0$, and (iii) $-K_{\mathcal{X}} - \Delta_{\mathcal{X}}$ is ample over \mathbb{A}^1 . To verify (i) and (ii), note that

$$A_{X_{\mathbb{A}^1}, \Delta_{\mathbb{A}^1} + D_{\mathbb{A}^1} + X \times 0}(E) = A_{X, \Delta + D}(v_E) = 0,$$

where the first equality is [BHJ17, Prop. 4.11]. Thus, if we define $\Gamma_{\mathcal{Y}}$ by the formula

$$K_{\mathcal{Y}} + \Gamma_{\mathcal{Y}} = g^*(K_{X_{\mathbb{A}^1}} + \Delta_{\mathbb{A}^1} + D_{\mathbb{A}^1} + X \times 0),$$

then $f_*\Gamma_{\mathcal{Y}} = \Delta_{\mathcal{X}} + \mathcal{D} + \mathcal{X}_0$. Since $(X_{\mathbb{A}^1}, \Delta_{\mathbb{A}^1} + D_{\mathbb{A}^1} + X \times 0)$ is lc and $K_{X_{\mathbb{A}^1}} + \Delta_{\mathbb{A}^1} + D_{\mathbb{A}^1} + X \times 0 \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0$, it follows that (i) and (ii) hold. For (iii), note that

$$\text{coeff}_E(G) = -rA_{X, \Delta}(v_E) = -rA_{X_{\mathbb{A}^1}, \Delta_{\mathbb{A}^1} + X \times 0}(E) = -r\text{coeff}_E(K_{\mathcal{Y}/X \times \mathbb{A}^1} - g^*\Delta_{\mathbb{A}^1}),$$

where the second equality is [BHJ17, Prop. 4.11]. Next, fix a divisor \mathcal{H} on \mathcal{X} such that $\mathcal{L} \cong \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{H})$. Since \mathcal{H} is ample over \mathbb{A}^1 and

$$\mathcal{H} \sim -rg_*f^*(K_{X_{\mathbb{A}^1}} + \Delta_{\mathbb{A}^1}) + g_*G \sim -rg_*(K_{\mathcal{Y}} + f_*^{-1}\Delta_{\mathbb{A}^1}) = -r(K_{\mathcal{X}} + \Delta_{\mathcal{X}}),$$

(iii) holds. Therefore $(\mathcal{X}, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}} + \mathcal{D})$ is a weakly special test configuration. \square

Proof of Theorem 4.8. The map is well defined by Lemma 4.7.2. The map is injective, since a weakly special test configuration $(\mathcal{X}, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}} + \mathcal{D})$ of $(X, \Delta + D)$ is uniquely determined by its induced filtration of the section ring [BHJ17, Prop. 2.15] and the filtration is uniquely determined by $v_{\mathcal{X}_0}$ (Lemma 4.7.1). The map is surjective by Proposition 4.9. \square

We now prove two additional statements concerning test configurations of boundary polarized CY pairs and modifying the complement.

Lemma 4.10. *Let $(X, \Delta + D)$ be an lc boundary polarized CY pair. If $(\mathcal{X}, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}})$ is a weakly special test configuration of (X, Δ) and $v_E \in \text{LC}(X, \Delta + D)$ for each irreducible component $E \subset \mathcal{X}_0$, then $(\mathcal{X}, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}} + \mathcal{D})$ is a weakly special test configuration of $(X, \Delta + D)$.*

By a *weakly special test configuration* of an lc log Fano pair as above, we mean that $(\mathcal{X}, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}}) \rightarrow \mathbb{A}^1$ is a \mathbb{G}_m -equivariant family of log Fano pairs, and there is a \mathbb{G}_m -equivariant isomorphism

$$(\mathcal{X}, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}})|_{\mathbb{A}^1 \setminus 0} \cong (X, \Delta) \times (\mathbb{A}^1 \setminus 0),$$

where \mathbb{G}_m -acts on the right as the product of the trivial action and the standard action.

Proof. Let \mathcal{Y} denote the normalization of the graph of $\mathcal{X} \dashrightarrow X_{\mathbb{A}^1}$ with maps $f : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ and $g : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow X_{\mathbb{A}^1}$. Define a \mathbb{Q} -divisor on Γ by

$$K_{\mathcal{Y}} + \Gamma = g^*(K_{X_{\mathbb{A}^1}} + \Delta_{\mathbb{A}^1} + D_{\mathbb{A}^1} + X \times 0).$$

For each irreducible component $E \subset \mathcal{X}_0$,

$$\text{coeff}_E(f_*\Gamma) = 1 - A_{X_{\mathbb{A}^1}, \Delta_{\mathbb{A}^1} + D_{\mathbb{A}^1} + X \times 0}(\text{ord}_E) = 1 - A_{X, \Delta + D}(v_E) = 1,$$

where the second equality is [BHJ17, Prop. 4.11]. Thus $f_*\Gamma = K_{\mathcal{X}} + \Delta_{\mathcal{X}} + \mathcal{D} + \mathcal{X}_0$. Since $(X_{\mathbb{A}^1}, \Delta_{\mathbb{A}^1} + D_{\mathbb{A}^1} + X \times 0)$ is lc and $K_{X_{\mathbb{A}^1}} + \Delta_{\mathbb{A}^1} + D_{\mathbb{A}^1} + X \times 0 \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0$, $(\mathcal{X}, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}} + \mathcal{D} + \mathcal{X}_0)$ is lc and $K_{\mathcal{X}} + \Delta_{\mathcal{X}} + \mathcal{D} + \mathcal{X}_0 \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0$. Thus $(\mathcal{X}, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}} + \mathcal{D})$ is a weakly special test configuration. \square

Lemma 4.11. *Let $(\mathcal{X}, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}} + \mathcal{D})$ be a weakly special test configuration of a boundary polarized CY pair $(X, \Delta + D)$.*

If B is a complement of (X, Δ) satisfying $\text{LC}(X, \Delta + D) \subset \text{LC}(X, \Delta + B)$, then

- (1) $(\mathcal{X}, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}} + \mathcal{B})$ is a weakly special test configuration of $(X, \Delta + B)$, where \mathcal{B} is the closure of $B \times (\mathbb{A}^1 \setminus 0)$ in \mathcal{X} and
- (2) $\text{LC}(\mathcal{X}_0, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}_0} + \mathcal{D}_0) \subset \text{LC}(\mathcal{X}_0, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}_0} + \mathcal{B}_0)$.

Proof. We first prove the result when X is normal. By Lemma 4.7 and our assumption, $v_E \in \text{LC}(X, \Delta + B)$ for each $E \subset \mathcal{X}_0$. Thus Lemma 4.10 implies (1) holds.

To prove (2) when X is normal, fix a log resolution $f : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ of both $(\mathcal{X}, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}} + \mathcal{D} + \mathcal{X}_0)$ and $(\mathcal{X}, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}} + \mathcal{B} + \mathcal{X}_0)$. Define \mathbb{Q} -divisors Γ_B and Γ_D by

$$K_{\mathcal{Y}} + \Gamma_D = f^*(K_{\mathcal{X}} + \Delta_{\mathcal{X}} + \mathcal{D} + \mathcal{X}_0) \quad \text{and} \quad K_{\mathcal{Y}} + \Gamma_B = f^*(K_{\mathcal{X}} + \Delta_{\mathcal{X}} + \mathcal{B} + \mathcal{X}_0).$$

Since $\text{LC}(X, \Delta + D) \subset \text{LC}(X, \Delta + B)$, it follows that

$$\text{LC}(X_{\mathbb{A}^1}, \Delta_{\mathbb{A}^1} + D_{\mathbb{A}^1} + X \times 0) \subset \text{LC}(X_{\mathbb{A}^1}, \Delta_{\mathbb{A}^1} + B_{\mathbb{A}^1} + X \times 0).$$

Thus Lemma 2.10.1 implies $\Gamma_D^{-1} \leq \Gamma_B^{-1}$. Now, fix an irreducible component $E \subset \mathcal{X}_0$. Write \bar{E} for its normalization and \tilde{E} for its birational transform on \mathcal{Y} . By [Kol13, Prop 4.6],

$$(\tilde{E}, (\Gamma_D - \tilde{E})|_{\tilde{E}}) \rightarrow (\bar{E}, \text{Diff}_{\bar{E}}(\Delta_{\mathcal{X}} + \mathcal{D} + \mathcal{X}_0))$$

is crepant birational. Also, the same holds with the D and \mathcal{D} replaced by B and \mathcal{B} . Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \text{LC}(\bar{E}, \text{Diff}_{\bar{E}}(\Delta_{\mathcal{X}} + \mathcal{D} + \mathcal{X}_0)) &= \text{LC}(\tilde{E}, (\Gamma_D^{-1} - \tilde{E})|_{\tilde{E}}) \\ &\subset \text{LC}(\tilde{E}, (\Gamma_B^{-1} - \tilde{E})|_{\tilde{E}}) = \text{LC}(\bar{E}, \text{Diff}_{\bar{E}}(\Delta_{\mathcal{X}} + \mathcal{B} + \mathcal{X}_0)). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore (2) holds when X is normal.

If X is not normal, then the normalization $(\bar{\mathcal{X}}, \bar{\mathcal{G}} + \Delta_{\bar{\mathcal{X}}} + \bar{\mathcal{D}})$ of $(\mathcal{X}, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}} + \mathcal{D})$ is a test configuration of $(\bar{X}, \bar{G} + \bar{\Delta} + \bar{D})$. By (1) in the normal case, $(\bar{\mathcal{X}}, \bar{\mathcal{G}} + \Delta_{\bar{\mathcal{X}}} + \bar{\mathcal{B}} + \bar{\mathcal{X}}_0)$ is a possibly disconnected lc CY pair. Hence $(\mathcal{X}, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}} + \mathcal{B} + \mathcal{X}_0)$ is an slc CY pair, which implies (1) holds. For (2), note that $(\bar{\mathcal{X}}_0, \bar{\mathcal{G}}_0 + \bar{\Delta}_{\mathcal{X}_0} + \bar{\mathcal{D}}_0) \rightarrow (\mathcal{X}_0, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}_0} + \mathcal{D}_0)$ is crepant and the same holds with each \mathcal{D} replaced by \mathcal{B} . Thus the case when X is normal implies the result. \square

4.4. Families of test configurations.

Definition 4.12. A family of test configurations of a family of boundary polarized CY pairs $(X, \Delta + D) \rightarrow S$ is the data of a

- (1) \mathbb{G}_m -equivariant family of boundary polarized CY pairs

$$(\mathcal{X}, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}} \times \mathcal{D}) \rightarrow \mathbb{A}_S^1,$$

where \mathbb{G}_m -acts on $\mathbb{A}_S^1 := \mathbb{A}^1 \times S$ by the product of the standard action on \mathbb{A}^1 and the trivial action on S and

- (2) an isomorphism $(\mathcal{X}, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}} \times \mathcal{D})|_{\{1\} \times S} \cong (X, \Delta + D)$ over S .

Note that the restriction to any $s \in S$ is naturally a test configuration of $(X, \Delta + D)$.

Lemma 4.13. Let $(X, \Delta + D) \rightarrow S$ be a family of boundary polarized CY pairs over a variety S , and let $K := k(S)$ denote the function field of S .

If $(\mathcal{X}_K, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}_K} + \mathcal{D}_K) \rightarrow \mathbb{A}_K^1$ is a test configuration of $(X_K, \Delta_K + D_K)$, then there exists an open set $U \subset S$ and a family of test configurations

$$(\mathcal{X}_U, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}_U} + \mathcal{D}_U) \rightarrow \mathbb{A}_U^1$$

of $(X_U, \Delta_U + D_U) \rightarrow U$ that extends $(\mathcal{X}_K, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}_K} + \mathcal{D}_K) \rightarrow \mathbb{A}_K^1$. Additionally, if $(\mathcal{X}_K, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}_K} + \mathcal{D}_K) \rightarrow \mathbb{A}_K^1$ is non-trivial, then so is $(\mathcal{X}_s, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}_s} + \mathcal{D}_s) \rightarrow \mathbb{A}_{k(s)}^1$ for each $s \in U$.

Proof. Over a non-empty open set $U \subset X$, $(\mathcal{X}_K, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}_K} + \mathcal{D}_K) \rightarrow \mathbb{A}_K^1$ extends to a projective \mathbb{G}_m -equivariant family of pairs $(\mathcal{X}_U, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}_U} + \mathcal{D}_U) \rightarrow \mathbb{A}_U^1$. Since the slc condition is constructible [Kol23, Lem. 4.44], after shrinking U , we may assume $(\mathcal{X}_U, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}_U} + \mathcal{D}_U) \rightarrow \mathbb{A}_U^1$ is a family of slc pairs. Further shrinking U , we may assume $-K_{\mathcal{X}_U/\mathbb{A}_U^1} - \Delta_{\mathcal{X}_U}$ is relatively ample and $K_{\mathcal{X}_U/\mathbb{A}_U^1} + \Delta_{\mathcal{D}_U} + \mathcal{D}_U \sim_{\mathbb{A}_U^1, \mathbb{Q}} 0$.

Hence $(\mathcal{X}_U, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}_U} + \mathcal{D}_U) \rightarrow \mathbb{A}^1_U$ is a \mathbb{G}_m -equivariant family of boundary polarized CY pairs. Further shrinking U , the \mathbb{G}_m -equivariant isomorphism

$$(\mathcal{X}_K, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}_K} + \mathcal{D}_K) \cong (X_K, \Delta_K + D_K) \times (\mathbb{A}^1 \setminus 0)$$

extends to a \mathbb{G}_m -equivariant isomorphism

$$(\mathcal{X}_U, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}_U} + \mathcal{D}_U) \cong (X_U, \Delta_U + D_U) \times (\mathbb{A}^1 \setminus 0).$$

Hence, $(\mathcal{X}_U, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}_U} + \mathcal{D}_U) \rightarrow \mathbb{A}^1_U$ is a family of test configurations of $(X_U, \Delta_U + D_U)$. Additionally, if $(\mathcal{X}_K, \Delta_K + \mathcal{D}_K) \rightarrow \mathbb{A}^1_K$ is non-trivial, then the \mathbb{G}_m -action on the fiber over $0 \in \mathbb{A}^1_K$ is non-trivial. Hence, after shrinking U , the \mathbb{G}_m -action on the fiber of $(\mathcal{X}_s, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}_s} + \mathcal{D}_s) \rightarrow \mathbb{A}^1_{k(s)}$ over $0 \in \mathbb{A}^1_{k(s)}$ will also be non-trivial. \square

4.5. Torus equivariant test configurations. The following proposition shows that all test configurations of boundary polarized CY pairs with torus action are equivariant. See [Oda22b, Lem. 2.18 & 2.20] for related results.

Proposition 4.14. *Let $(X, \Delta + D)$ be a boundary polarized CY pair admitting an action by a torus $\mathbb{T} := \mathbb{G}_m^r$ for some $r \geq 0$.*

If $(\mathcal{X}, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}} + \mathcal{D})$ is a test configuration of $(X, \Delta + D)$, then it is \mathbb{T} -equivariant.

In the above proposition, the term \mathbb{T} -equivariant test configuration means that the $\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{G}_m$ -action on $\mathcal{X}_{\mathbb{A}^1 \setminus 0} \cong X \times (\mathbb{A}^1 \setminus 0)$, which is given by the product of the \mathbb{T} -action on X and the standard \mathbb{G}_m -action on $\mathbb{A}^1 \setminus 0$, extends to a $\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{G}_m$ -action on \mathcal{X} .

Proof. We first prove the result when X is normal. Fix an integer $r > 0$ such that $L := -r(K_X + \Delta)$ is a Cartier divisor. Note that the \mathbb{T} -action on \mathcal{X} induces a \mathbb{T} -action on $H^0(X, mL)$. We claim that the filtration \mathcal{F}^\bullet of $H^0(X, mL)$ induced by $(\mathcal{X}, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}} + \mathcal{D})$ is \mathbb{T} -invariant. By the formula for \mathcal{F}^\bullet in Lemma 4.7.1, it suffices to show that v_E is \mathbb{T} -invariant for each irreducible component $E \subset \mathcal{X}_0$. To verify the latter, fix a \mathbb{T} -equivariant log resolution $f : Y \rightarrow X$ of $(X, \Delta + D)$ and define a \mathbb{Q} -divisor B by

$$K_Y + B = f^*(K_X + \Delta + D).$$

Since $A_{Y,B}(v_E) = A_{X,\Delta+D}(v_E) = 0$, where the second equality is Lemma 4.7.2, [BLX22, Lem. 2.3] implies v_E is quasimonomial with respect to $(Y, \text{Supp}(B))$. Since $\text{Supp}(B)$ is a \mathbb{T} -invariant divisor on Y , v_E is a \mathbb{T} -invariant valuation. Thus the claim holds.

Since \mathcal{F}^\bullet is \mathbb{T} -invariant, there is a decomposition $\mathcal{F}^\lambda H^0(X, mL) = \bigoplus_{\mu \in \mathbb{Z}^r} \mathcal{F}^\lambda H^0(X, mL)_\mu$, into weight spaces. Using that

$$\mathcal{X} \cong \text{Proj}_{\mathbb{A}^1} \left(\bigoplus_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \bigoplus_{(\mu, \lambda) \in \mathbb{Z}^r \times \mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{F}^\lambda H^0(X, mL)_\mu t^{-\lambda} \right),$$

the $\mathbb{Z}^r \times \mathbb{Z}$ -grading inside the Proj induces a $\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{G}_m$ -action on \mathcal{X} extending the $\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{G}_m$ -action on $\mathcal{X}_{\mathbb{A}^1 \setminus 0}$. Therefore the proposition holds when X is normal.

To deduce the full result from the normal case, note that the \mathbb{T} -action on $(X, \Delta + D)$ induces a \mathbb{T} -action on $(\overline{X}, \overline{\mathcal{G}} + \overline{\Delta} + \overline{D})$. Additionally, the normalization $(\overline{\mathcal{X}}, \overline{\mathcal{G}} + \overline{\Delta}_{\overline{\mathcal{X}}} + \overline{D})$ of $(\mathcal{X}, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}} + \mathcal{D})$ is naturally a test configuration of $(\overline{X}, \overline{\mathcal{G}} + \overline{\Delta} + \overline{D})$. By the result in the normal case, the $\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{G}_m$ -action on $\overline{\mathcal{X}}|_{\mathbb{A}^1 \setminus 0}$ extends to a $\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{G}_m$ -action on $\overline{\mathcal{X}}$. Hence, the $\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{G}_m$ -action on $\mathcal{X}|_{\mathbb{A}^1 \setminus 0}$ extends to a $\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{G}_m$ -action on $\mathcal{U} := \mathcal{X} \setminus (\mathcal{X}_0 \cap \mathcal{G})$, where \mathcal{G} is the conductor divisor on \mathcal{X} . Since $\text{codim}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{X} \setminus \mathcal{U}) \geq 2$, the natural map

$$\text{Proj} \left(\bigoplus_{m \in \mathbb{N}} H^0(\mathcal{U}, \omega_{\mathcal{X}/\mathbb{A}^1}^{[-m]}(-m\Delta_{\mathcal{X}})|_{\mathcal{U}}) \right) \rightarrow \text{Proj} \left(\bigoplus_{m \in \mathbb{N}} H^0(\mathcal{X}, \omega_{\mathcal{X}/\mathbb{A}^1}^{[-m]}(-m\Delta_{\mathcal{X}})) \right) = \mathcal{X}$$

is an isomorphism. Since the $\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{G}_m$ -action on \mathcal{U} induces a $\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{G}_m$ -action on the left hand side, \mathcal{X} admits a $\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{G}_m$ -action extending the $\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{G}_m$ -action on $\mathcal{X}_{\mathbb{A}^1 \setminus 0}$. \square

5. S-COMPLETENESS

The notion of S-completeness for an algebraic stack was introduced in [AHLH18] and is closely related to the separatedness of the stacks good moduli space when it exists. The goal of this section is to prove that the moduli stack of boundary polarized CY pairs is S-complete.

Throughout, R denotes a DVR with uniformizer π , fraction field K , and residue field κ .

5.1. **Definition.** S-completeness is defined in terms of the stacky surface

$$\overline{\text{ST}}_R := [\text{Spec}(R[s, t]/(st - \pi)) / \mathbb{G}_m],$$

where \mathbb{G}_m acts on $\text{Spec}(R[s, t]/(st - \pi))$ with weights 1 and -1 on s and t . We write $0 \in \overline{\text{ST}}_R$ for the closed point defined by $s = t = 0$.

To understand the geometry of $\overline{\text{ST}}_R$, observe that

$$\overline{\text{ST}}_R|_{s \neq 0} \cong [\text{Spec}(R[s^{\pm 1}]) / \mathbb{G}_m] \cong \text{Spec}(R) \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{\text{ST}}_R|_{t \neq 0} \cong [\text{Spec}(R[t^{\pm 1}]) / \mathbb{G}_m] \cong \text{Spec}(R).$$

Therefore

$$\overline{\text{ST}}_R \setminus 0 \cong \text{Spec}(R) \bigcup_{\text{Spec}(K)} \text{Spec}(R). \quad (5.1)$$

Hence a morphism $\overline{\text{ST}}_R \setminus 0 \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ to a stack \mathcal{M} is equivalent to the data of two morphisms $\text{Spec}(R) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ and $\text{Spec}(R) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ that agree over $\text{Spec}(K)$.

The loci where s and t vanish have the description:

$$\overline{\text{ST}}_R|_{s=0} \cong [\text{Spec}(\kappa[t]) / \mathbb{G}_m] \cong [\mathbb{A}_\kappa^1 / \mathbb{G}_m] \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{\text{ST}}_R|_{t=0} \cong [\text{Spec}(\kappa[s]) / \mathbb{G}_m] \cong [\mathbb{A}_\kappa^1 / \mathbb{G}_m].$$

Thus the closed points of $\overline{\text{ST}}_R|_{s \neq 0}$ and $\overline{\text{ST}}_R|_{t \neq 0}$ specialize to 0.

Definition 5.1 ([AHLH18, Def. 3.7]). A stack \mathcal{M} is *S-complete* if for any DVR R and morphism $\overline{\text{ST}}_R \setminus 0 \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$, there exists a unique extension $\overline{\text{ST}}_R \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$.

To reduce notation throughout this section, we write

$$S := \text{Spec}(R[s, t]/(st - \pi)) \quad \text{and} \quad S^\circ := S \setminus 0.$$

If $\mathcal{M} := \mathcal{M}(\chi, N, \mathbf{r})$ is the moduli stack defined in Section 3, then a map $\overline{\text{ST}}_R \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$, is equivalent to a \mathbb{G}_m -equivariant family in $\mathcal{M}(S)$. Hence proving that \mathcal{M} is S-complete is equivalent to showing that any \mathbb{G}_m -equivariant family of boundary polarized CY pairs

$$g^\circ : (\mathcal{X}^\circ, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}^\circ} + \mathcal{D}^\circ) \rightarrow S^\circ$$

extends uniquely to a \mathbb{G}_m -equivariant family of boundary polarized CY pairs

$$g : (\mathcal{X}, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}} + \mathcal{D}) \rightarrow S.$$

5.2. **Polarized schemes.** Following [ABHLX20, §3.2], we describe the problem of extending a \mathbb{G}_m -equivariant family of polarized schemes over S° to a family over S .

Fix a \mathbb{G}_m -equivariant family of polarized schemes

$$g^\circ : (\mathcal{X}^\circ, \mathcal{L}^\circ) \rightarrow S^\circ.$$

By (5.1), such a family is equivalent to the data of two families of polarized schemes

$$(X, L) \rightarrow \text{Spec}(R) \quad \text{and} \quad (X', L') \rightarrow \text{Spec}(R)$$

with an isomorphism $(X_K, L_K) \cong (X'_K, L'_K)$.⁴ To describe when g° extends to a family over S , we consider the filtration of $H^0(X, mL)$ by R -modules defined by

$$\mathcal{F}^\lambda H^0(X, mL) = H^0(X, mL) \cap \pi^\lambda H^0(X', mL') \quad (5.2)$$

⁴The family $(\mathcal{X}^\circ, \mathcal{L}^\circ) \rightarrow S^\circ$ can be recovered from the previous data by gluing $(X, L) \times \mathbb{G}_m \rightarrow \text{Spec}(R) \times \mathbb{G}_m$ and $(X', L') \times \mathbb{G}_m \rightarrow \text{Spec}(R) \times \mathbb{G}_m$ along $\text{Spec}(K) \times \mathbb{G}_m$.

for each $\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$. In the previous intersection, we use the isomorphism $H^0(X_K, mL_K) \cong H^0(X'_K, mL'_K)$ to view $H^0(X', mL')$ as an R -submodule of $H^0(X_K, mL_K)$. By [ABHLX20, §3.2], there is a \mathbb{G}_m -equivariant isomorphism of $R[s, t]/(st - \pi)$ -modules

$$H^0(\mathcal{X}^\circ, m\mathcal{L}^\circ) \cong \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{F}^\lambda H^0(X, mL)t^{-\lambda},$$

where the \mathbb{G}_m -action on the right hand side is induced by the \mathbb{Z} -grading and the $R[s, t]/(st - \pi)$ -module structure is induced by having s and t act on $ft^{-\lambda} \in \mathcal{G}^\lambda H^0(X, mL)t^{-\lambda}$ by

$$s \cdot ft^{-\lambda} = (\pi f)t^{-\lambda-1} \quad \text{and} \quad t \cdot ft^{-\lambda} = ft^{-\lambda+1}.$$

The module isomorphism induces a \mathbb{G}_m -equivariant isomorphism of $R[s, t]/(st - \pi)$ -algebras

$$\bigoplus_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}} H^0(\mathcal{X}^\circ, m\mathcal{L}^\circ) \cong \bigoplus_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{F}^\lambda H^0(X, mL)t^{-\lambda} \quad (5.3)$$

If the algebras are finitely generated, we set $\mathcal{X} := \text{Proj}(\bigoplus_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{F}^\lambda H^0(X, mL)t^{-\lambda})$.

Proposition 5.2. [ABHLX20, §3.2] *If the algebra in (5.3) is finitely generated, then*

$$g : (\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}(m)) \rightarrow S$$

is the unique extension of $(\mathcal{X}^\circ, m\mathcal{L}^\circ) \rightarrow S^\circ$ to a \mathbb{G}_m -equivariant family of polarized schemes for all $m > 0$ sufficiently divisible.

In the case when \mathcal{X}° is normal, the filtration \mathcal{F}^\bullet has a valuative interpretation. Let Y denote the normalization of the graph of $X \dashrightarrow X'$ with induced maps

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & Y & \\ h \swarrow & & \searrow h' \\ X & \dashrightarrow & X' \end{array} .$$

Since (X, L) and (X', L') are isomorphic over $\text{Spec}(K)$, we may write $h'^*L' = h^*L(G)$, where G is a divisor supported on the special fiber Y_κ .

Lemma 5.3. *The filtration \mathcal{F}^\bullet satisfies*

$$\mathcal{F}^\lambda H^0(X, mL) = \bigcap_E \{f \in H^0(X, mL) \mid \text{ord}_E(f) + m \cdot \text{ord}_E(G) \geq \text{ord}_E(\pi)\lambda\},$$

where E runs through all irreducible components Y_κ such that $h'(E)$ is a divisor.

Proof. By definition, $f \in \mathcal{G}^\lambda H^0(X, mL)$ if and only if $f\pi^{-\lambda} \in H^0(X', mL')$. Since X' is normal and $\text{codim}_X(h'(\text{Exc}(h'))) \geq 2$, the latter holds if and only if $f\pi^{-\lambda} \in H^0(U, L'|_U)$, where $U' := Y \setminus \text{Exc}(h')$. Using that $h'^*L' = h^*L(G)$, the latter is equivalent to

$$\text{ord}_E(f\pi^{-\lambda}) + m \cdot \text{ord}_E(G) \geq 0$$

for each irreducible component $E \subset Y_\kappa$ such that $h'(E)$ is a divisor. Since $\text{ord}_E(f\pi^{-\lambda}) = \text{ord}_E(f) - \lambda \text{ord}_E(\pi)$, the result follows. \square

5.3. Boundary polarized CY pairs. Fix a \mathbb{G}_m -equivariant family of boundary polarized CY pairs

$$g^\circ : (\mathcal{X}^\circ, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}^\circ} + \mathcal{D}^\circ) \rightarrow S^\circ.$$

By (5.1), g° is equivalent to the data of two families of boundary polarized CY pairs

$$(X, \Delta + D) \rightarrow \text{Spec}(R) \quad \text{and} \quad (X', \Delta' + D') \rightarrow \text{Spec}(R)$$

with an isomorphism $(X_K, \Delta_K + D_K) \cong (X'_K, \Delta'_K + D'_K)$.

Theorem 5.4. *If R is essentially of finite type over \mathbb{k} , then g° extends uniquely to a \mathbb{G}_m -equivariant family of boundary polarized CY pairs $g : (\mathcal{X}, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}} + \mathcal{D}) \rightarrow S$.*

The essentially of finite type assumption is needed to apply Theorem 5.6, which relies on results from the MMP. To prove the theorem, we first verify the case when both X and X' are normal by showing that the filtration in Section 5.2 is finitely generated. We then use Kollár's gluing theory for slc pairs to prove the full result.

To proceed, fix a positive integer r such that $L := -r(K_X + \Delta)$ and $L' := -r(K_{X'} + \Delta')$ are Cartier divisors. Let $\mathcal{L}^\circ := -r(K_{\mathcal{X}^\circ/S^\circ} + \Delta_{\mathcal{X}^\circ})$. Write \mathcal{F}^\bullet for the filtration of $H^0(X, mL)$ defined in (5.2).

Proposition 5.5. *If X and X' are normal, then $\bigoplus_{(m,\lambda) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{F}^\lambda H^0(X, mL)t^{-\lambda}$ is a finitely generated $R[s, t]/(st - \pi)$ -algebra.*

Proof. Let Y denote the normalization of the graph of $X \dashrightarrow X'$, and consider the induced morphisms $h : Y \rightarrow X$ and $h' : Y \rightarrow X'$. Let E_1, \dots, E_ℓ denote the birational transforms on Y of the irreducible components of X'_κ . We claim that

- (i) $\mathcal{F}^\lambda H^0(X, mL) = \bigcap_{i=1}^\ell \{s \in H^0(X, mL) \mid \text{ord}_{E_i}(s) \geq \lambda + mr A_{X, \Delta + X_\kappa}(E_i)\}$
- (ii) $A_{X, \Delta + D + X_\kappa}(E_i) = 0$ for $i = 1, \dots, \ell$.

Assuming the claim holds, then Theorem 5.6, which is proven in the next section, immediately implies the relevant algebra is finitely generated.

To verify the claim, note that $(X', \Delta' + D' + X'_\kappa)$ is lc. Thus

$$A_{X', \Delta' + D' + X'_\kappa}(E_i) = 0 = A_{X', \Delta' + X'_\kappa}(E_i)$$

and $\text{ord}_{E_i}(\pi) = \text{ord}_{E_i}(X'_\kappa) = 1$. Set $G := h'^*L' - h^*L$. Since

$$\text{ord}_{E_i}(G) = r A_{X', \Delta' + X'_\kappa}(E_i) - r A_{X, \Delta + X_\kappa}(E_i) = 0 - r A_{X, \Delta + X_\kappa}(E_i),$$

Lemma 5.3 implies (i) holds. For (ii), observe that

$$A_{X, \Delta + D + X_\kappa}(E_i) = A_{X', \Delta' + D' + X'_\kappa}(E_i) = 0$$

where the first equality holds by Lemma 2.10.1. □

Proof of Theorem 5.4 when \mathcal{X}° is normal. Consider the morphism

$$g : \mathcal{X} := \text{Proj} \left(\bigoplus_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{G}^\lambda H^0(X, mL)t^{-\lambda} \right) \rightarrow S.$$

By Propositions 5.2 and 5.5, $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}(m)) \rightarrow S$ is the unique extension of $(\mathcal{X}^\circ, m\mathcal{L}^\circ) \rightarrow S^\circ$ to a flat family of polarized schemes for $m > 0$ sufficiently divisible. Let $\Delta_{\mathcal{X}}$ and \mathcal{D} denote the closures of $\Delta_{\mathcal{X}^\circ}$ and \mathcal{D}° under the embedding $j : \mathcal{X}^\circ \hookrightarrow \mathcal{X}$.

We will now show $(\mathcal{X}, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}} + \mathcal{D}) \rightarrow S$ is a family of boundary polarized CY pairs. First, we verify that \mathcal{X} is normal. For $m > 0$ sufficiently divisible, the natural map $H^0(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}(m)) \rightarrow H^0(\mathcal{X}, j_*j^*\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}(m))$ is an isomorphism, since

$$H^0(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}(m)) = \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{G}^\lambda H^0(X, mL)t^{-\lambda} \cong H^0(\mathcal{X}^\circ, m\mathcal{L}^\circ) \cong H^0(\mathcal{X}, j_*j^*\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}(m)),$$

where the second isomorphism is (5.3). Therefore the natural map $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}} \rightarrow j_*j^*\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}$ is an isomorphism as well. Since $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}} \cong j_*j^*\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}$ and \mathcal{X}° is normal, \mathcal{X} is normal. Next, recall that

$$\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}^\circ}(-mr(K_{\mathcal{X}^\circ/S^\circ} + \Delta_{\mathcal{X}^\circ})) \cong \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}^\circ}(m) \quad \text{and} \quad K_{\mathcal{X}^\circ} + \Delta_{\mathcal{X}^\circ} + \mathcal{D}^\circ \sim_{S^\circ, \mathbb{Q}} 0.$$

Since \mathcal{X} is normal and $\text{codim}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{X}_0) = 2$,

$$\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}(-mr(K_{\mathcal{X}/S} + \Delta_{\mathcal{X}})) \cong \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}(m) \quad \text{and} \quad K_{\mathcal{X}} + \Delta_{\mathcal{X}} + \mathcal{D} \sim_{S, \mathbb{Q}} 0.$$

Finally, we show $(\mathcal{X}, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}} + \mathcal{D}) \rightarrow S$ is a family of slc pairs. Consider the family

$$(\tilde{\mathcal{X}}, \Delta_{\tilde{\mathcal{X}}} + \tilde{\mathcal{D}}) := (X, \Delta + D) \times_{\text{Spec}(R)} S$$

The isomorphisms $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_{t \neq 0} \cong X \times \mathbb{G}_m \cong \mathcal{X}_{t \neq 0}$ induce a birational map $\tilde{\mathcal{X}} \dashrightarrow \mathcal{X}$. Over $t = 0$ there may be indeterminacy, since

$$\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_{s \neq 0} \cong X \times \mathbb{G}_m \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{X}_{s \neq 0} \cong X' \times \mathbb{G}_m. \quad (5.4)$$

Let \mathcal{Y} denote the normalization of the graph of $\tilde{\mathcal{X}} \dashrightarrow \mathcal{X}$ and write $\tilde{f} : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{X}}$ and $f : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ for the induced morphisms. Set

$$\Gamma := \tilde{f}^*(K_{\tilde{\mathcal{X}}} + \Delta_{\tilde{\mathcal{X}}} + \tilde{\mathcal{D}} + \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_{st=0}) - f^*(K_{\mathcal{X}} + \Delta_{\mathcal{X}} + \mathcal{D} + \mathcal{X}_{st=0}).$$

We claim (i) $f_*\Gamma = 0$ and (ii) $\Gamma \equiv_f 0$. Assuming the claim holds, the Negativity Lemma implies $\Gamma = 0$. For (i), note that $\text{Supp}(\Gamma) \subset \mathcal{Y}_{t=0}$, since $\tilde{\mathcal{X}} \dashrightarrow \mathcal{X}$ is an isomorphism over $t \neq 0$. Additionally $\text{Supp}(\Gamma) \subset \mathcal{Y}_{s=0}$ by (5.4) and Lemma 2.10. Therefore $\text{Supp}(f_*\Gamma) \subset \mathcal{X}_0$. Since $\text{codim}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{X}_0) = 2$, (i) holds. Since $K_{\tilde{\mathcal{X}}} + \Delta_{\tilde{\mathcal{X}}} + \tilde{\mathcal{D}} \sim_{\mathbb{Q}, S} 0$, (ii) also holds. Using that $(\tilde{\mathcal{X}}, \Delta_{\tilde{\mathcal{X}}} + \tilde{\mathcal{D}} + \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_{st=0})$ is lc and $\Gamma = 0$, the pair $(\mathcal{X}, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}} + \mathcal{D} + \mathcal{X}_{st=0})$ is lc. Therefore $(\mathcal{X}, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}} + \mathcal{D}) \rightarrow S$ is a family of boundary polarized CY pairs by Lemma 2.7. The family is \mathbb{G}_m -equivariant by [ABHLX20, Lem. 2.16] and the unique extension by Lemma 2.10.3. \square

We will now deduce Theorem 5.4 from the case when \mathcal{X}° is normal.

Proof of Theorem 5.4. Let $(\overline{\mathcal{X}^\circ}, \overline{\mathcal{G}^\circ} + \Delta_{\overline{\mathcal{X}^\circ}} + \overline{\mathcal{D}^\circ})$ denote the normalization of $(\mathcal{X}^\circ, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}^\circ} + \mathcal{D}^\circ)$ and $\tau^\circ : \overline{\mathcal{G}^{\circ n}} \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{G}^{\circ n}}$ the induced involution. We claim that

- (1) $\overline{g}^\circ : (\overline{\mathcal{X}^\circ}, \overline{\mathcal{G}^\circ} + \Delta_{\overline{\mathcal{X}^\circ}} + \overline{\mathcal{D}^\circ}) \rightarrow S^\circ$ extends to a \mathbb{G}_m -equivariant family of boundary polarized CY pairs $\overline{g} : (\overline{\mathcal{X}}, \overline{\mathcal{G}} + \Delta_{\overline{\mathcal{X}}} + \overline{\mathcal{D}}) \rightarrow S$, and
- (2) τ° extends to an involution $\tau : \overline{\mathcal{G}^n} \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{G}^n}$.

Since each connected component of $\overline{g}^\circ : (\overline{\mathcal{X}^\circ}, \overline{\mathcal{G}^\circ} + \Delta_{\overline{\mathcal{X}^\circ}} + \overline{\mathcal{D}^\circ}) \rightarrow S$ is a \mathbb{G}_m -equivariant family of boundary polarized CY pairs by Lemma 2.8.1, the normal case of Theorem 5.4 implies (1). Next observe that Lemma 2.8.2 and adjunction imply $(\overline{\mathcal{G}^n}, \text{Diff}_{\overline{\mathcal{G}^n}}(\Delta_{\overline{\mathcal{X}}} + \overline{\mathcal{D}})) \rightarrow S$ is a family of boundary polarized CY pairs. Thus (2) holds by Lemma 2.10.2.

Since (1) and (2) hold, Proposition 2.12 implies that $g^\circ : (\mathcal{X}^\circ, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}^\circ} + \mathcal{D}^\circ) \rightarrow S^\circ$ extends to a family of boundary polarized CY pairs $(\mathcal{X}, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}} + \mathcal{D}) \rightarrow S$. The extension is \mathbb{G}_m -equivariant by [ABHLX20, Lem. 2.16] and unique by Lemma 2.10.3. \square

5.4. Finite generation. In this section, we prove the finite generation of certain bigraded algebras that appear when verifying the moduli stack of boundary polarized CY pairs is S-complete and Θ -reductive.

To state the result, we fix the data of a family of boundary polarized CY pairs

$$(X, \Delta + D) \rightarrow \text{Spec}(R)$$

such that X is normal, valuations v_1, \dots, v_ℓ , where $v_i := b_i \text{ord}_{E_i}$, $b_i \in \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}$, and E_i is a divisor over X , and a positive integer $r > 0$ such that $L := -r(K_X + \Delta)$ is a Cartier divisor.

The above data induces a filtration \mathcal{F}^\bullet of $H^0(X, mL)$ by R -submodules defined by

$$\mathcal{F}^\lambda H^0(X, mL) := \bigcap_{i=1, \dots, \ell} \{s \in H^0(X, mL) \mid v_i(s) \geq \lambda + mr A_{X, \Delta + X_\kappa}(v_i)\}$$

for each $\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$. The Rees algebra of \mathcal{F}^\bullet is

$$\text{Rees}(\mathcal{F}) := \bigoplus_{(m, \lambda) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{F}^\lambda H^0(X, mL) \subset \bigoplus_{(m, \lambda) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{Z}} H^0(X, mL),$$

which has the structure of a graded R -algebra. The following theorem gives a criterion for when the algebra is finitely generated.

Theorem 5.6. *For \mathcal{F}^\bullet as above, if R is essentially of finite type over \mathbb{k} and $A_{X,\Delta+D+X_\kappa}(E_i) = 0$ for all $i = 1, \dots, \ell$, then $\text{Rees}(\mathcal{F})$ is a finitely generated R -algebra.*

A less general finite generation result was shown in [BX19, Section 5] to prove the uniqueness of K -polystable degenerations and the S -completeness of the moduli stack of K -semistable Fano varieties [ABHLX20]. Theorem 5.6 is different in that the special fiber is lc, but not necessarily klt, and we allow multiple divisorial valuations. To prove Theorem 5.6, we first relate the finite generation of $\text{Rees}(\mathcal{F})$ to a local finite generation result over the relative cone over $(X, \Delta + D)$ with respect to the polarization L and then apply results on the Minimal Model Program for lc pairs.

5.4.1. *Cone construction.* Let $(Y, \Gamma + G) \rightarrow \text{Spec}(R)$ denote the relative cone over $(X, \Delta + D)$ with respect to the polarization L . By this we mean, $Y := \text{Spec}(V)$, where

$$V := \bigoplus_{m \in \mathbb{N}} V_m := \bigoplus_{m \in \mathbb{N}} H^0(X, mL).$$

There is a natural morphism $Y \rightarrow \text{Spec}(R)$ induced by the R -algebra structure on V and it admits a section $\sigma : \text{Spec}(R) \rightarrow Y$ given by the cone points. The \mathbb{Q} -divisor $\Gamma + G$ is defined as the closure of the pullback of $\Delta + D$ under the morphism

$$Y \setminus \sigma(\text{Spec}(R)) \cong X \times (\mathbb{A}^1 \setminus 0) \xrightarrow{\text{pr}_1} X.$$

Since $(X, \Delta + D + X_\kappa)$ is lc and $K_X + \Delta + D + X_\kappa \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0$, a relative version of [Kol13, Lem. 3.1] implies $(Y, \Gamma + G + Y_\kappa)$ is lc. Next, fix an integer $N > rA_{X,\Delta+X_\kappa}(v_i)$ for each $i = 1, \dots, \ell$.

Lemma 5.7. *For each $i = 1, \dots, \ell$, there is a valuation w_i on Y such that*

$$w_i(f) := \min \{v_i(f_m) + (N - rA_{X,\Delta+X_\kappa}(v_i))m \mid f_m \neq 0\},$$

for all $f \in V$, where $f = \sum_{m \geq 0} f_m$ and $f_m \in V_m$. Furthermore,

- (1) $w_i = c_i \text{ord}_{F_i}$ for some $c_i \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0}$ and prime divisor F_i over Y , and
- (2) $A_{Y,\Gamma+G+Y_\kappa}(w_i) = 0$.

Proof. This result follows from arguments similar to [BX19, Section 2.5.1]. Let $\mu : W \rightarrow X$ be a log resolution of $(X, \Delta + D + X_\kappa)$ such that each E_i appears as a divisor on W . Consider the natural birational morphisms

$$W_L \rightarrow X_L \rightarrow Y,$$

where $W_L := \text{Spec}_W(\bigoplus_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{O}_W(m\mu^*L))$ and $X_L := \text{Spec}_X(\bigoplus_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{O}_X(mL))$, which are the total spaces of the line bundles corresponding to the invertible sheaves $\mathcal{O}_W(-\mu^*L)$ and $\mathcal{O}_X(-L)$. Let \widehat{E}_i denote the preimage of E_i under the morphism $W_L \rightarrow W$ and $\widehat{W} \subset W_L$ denote the zero section. By a computation similar to [BX19, §2.5.1], w_i is the quasi-monomial valuation with weights 1 and $N - rA_{X,\Delta+X_\kappa}(v_i)$ along \widehat{E}_i and \widehat{W} . Thus $w_i = c_i \text{ord}_{F_i}$, where $c_i \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0}$ and F_i is a prime divisor on a weighted blowup of Y_L along \widehat{E}_i and \widehat{Y} . For (2), note that

$$A_{Y,\Gamma+G+Y_\kappa}(\widehat{E}_i) = A_{(X,\Delta+D+X_\kappa) \times \mathbb{A}^1}(E \times \mathbb{A}^1) = A_{X,\Delta+D+X_\kappa}(E_i) = 0.$$

Additionally, if we let $\widehat{X} \subset X_L$ denote the zero section, then

$$A_{Y,\Gamma+G+Y_\kappa}(\widehat{Y}) = A_{Y,\Gamma+G+Y_\kappa}(\widehat{X}) = 0,$$

where the final equality can be computed by restricting to the fiber over $\text{Spec}(K)$ and applying the computation in the proof of [Kol13, Lem. 3.1]. Since w_i is a quasi-monomial combination of \widehat{E}_i and \widehat{X} , we conclude (2) holds. \square

5.4.2. Finite generation.

Proof of Theorem 5.6. We use the notation of Lemma 5.7. Since $A_{Y, \Gamma+G+Y_\kappa}(F_i) = 0$ for each i , [Koll13, Cor. 1.38] implies that there exists a proper birational morphism $g : Z \rightarrow Y$ such that Z is \mathbb{Q} -factorial, F_1, \dots, F_ℓ appear as prime divisors on Z , (Z, B) is dlt where $B := g_*^{-1}(\Gamma + G + Y_\kappa) + \sum_{E \in \text{Exc}(g)} E$, and $K_Z + B = g^*(K_Y + \Gamma + G + Y_\kappa)$. Now, set $F := \sum_{c_i \neq 0} c_i^{-1} F_i$.

Claim 1: The \mathcal{O}_Y -algebra $\bigoplus_{p \in \mathbb{N}} g_* \mathcal{O}_Z(\lfloor -pF \rfloor)$ is finitely generated.

Proof: Since $A_{Y, \Gamma+G+Y_\kappa}(F_i) = 0$, $\text{coeff}_{F_i}(B) = 1$ for $i = 1, \dots, \ell$. Therefore we may find an integer $d > 0$ such that $B - \frac{1}{d}F$ is effective. Since (Z, B) is \mathbb{Q} -factorial dlt and $K_Z + B \sim_{\mathbb{Q}, g} 0$, [HX13, Cor. 1.6] implies that $(Z, B - \frac{1}{d}F)$ admits a good minimal model. Therefore

$$\bigoplus_{p \in \mathbb{N}} g_* \mathcal{O}_Z(\lfloor pd(K_Z + B - \frac{1}{d}F) \rfloor)$$

is a finitely generated \mathcal{O}_Y -algebra. Since $d(K_Z + B - \frac{1}{d}F) \sim_{\mathbb{Q}, g} -F$, we have the \mathcal{O}_Y -algebra $\bigoplus_{p \in \mathbb{N}} g_* \mathcal{O}_Z(\lfloor -pF \rfloor)$ is finitely generated as well. \square

Claim 2: For each $p \in \mathbb{N}$, $g_* \mathcal{O}_Z(\lfloor -pF \rfloor)(Y) \cong \bigoplus_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{F}^{p-Nm} H^0(X, mL)$.

Proof: First, observe that $g_* \mathcal{O}_Z(\lfloor -pF \rfloor)(Y) \subset \mathcal{O}_Y(Y)$, since F is effective and Y is normal, and $\mathcal{O}_Y(Y) = \bigoplus_{m \in \mathbb{N}} H^0(X, mL)$. Now, for $f = \sum_{m \geq 0} f_m \in V$, $f \in g_* \mathcal{O}_Z(\lfloor -pF \rfloor)(Y)$ if and only if $\text{div}_Y(g^*f) + \lfloor -pF \rfloor$ is effective. The latter is equivalent to the condition that $c_i \text{ord}_{F_i}(f) \geq p$ for each $i = 1, \dots, \ell$, which holds if and only if

$$v_i(f_m) + mr A_{X, \Delta+D+X_\kappa}(v_i) \geq p - Nm$$

for each $i = 1, \dots, \ell$. The result now follows. \square

The theorem follows easily from the previous two claims. Indeed, consider the monoids

$$S_1 := \{(m, \lambda) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{Z} \mid \lambda \leq -Nm\} \quad \text{and} \quad S_2 := \{(m, \lambda) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{Z} \mid \lambda \geq -Nm\}.$$

Since $\text{Rees}(\mathcal{F}) = S_1 \cup S_2$, it suffices to show $\bigoplus_{(m, \lambda) \in S_i} \mathcal{F}^\lambda H^0(X, mL)$ is finitely generated for $i = 1, 2$. To verify the latter statement, first note that

$$\bigoplus_{(m, \lambda) \in S_2} \mathcal{F}^\lambda H^0(X, mL) \cong \bigoplus_{(m, \lambda) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{F}^{\lambda - Nm} H^0(X, mL)$$

and the latter R -algebra is finitely generated by Claims 1 and 2. Next, note that

$$\bigoplus_{(m, \lambda) \in S_1} \mathcal{F}^\lambda H^0(X, mL) \cong \bigoplus_{(m, \lambda) \in S_1} H^0(X, mL).$$

Since $\bigoplus_{(\lambda, m) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{Z}} H^0(X, mL)$ is a finitely generated R -algebra by the assumption that L is ample over $\text{Spec}(R)$, and $S_1 \subset \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{Z}$ is a finitely generated sub-monoid, [ELM⁺06, Lem. 4.8] implies $\bigoplus_{(m, \lambda) \in S_1} H^0(X, mL)$ is finitely generated. Therefore $\text{Rees}(\mathcal{F})$ is finitely generated. \square

5.4.3. *Additional result.* The above argument also implies the following finite generation result for boundary polarized CY pairs, rather than families of such pairs over $\text{Spec}(R)$.

Theorem 5.8. *Let $(X, \Delta + D)$ be an lc boundary polarized CY pair and r a positive integer such that $L := -r(K_X + \Delta)$ is a Cartier divisor. Fix $v_1, \dots, v_\ell \in \text{DivVal}_X$ and set*

$$\mathcal{G}^\lambda H^0(X, mL) := \{s \in H^0(X, mL) \mid v_i(s) - mr A_{X, \Delta}(v_i) \geq \lambda\}$$

If $A_{X, \Delta+D}(v_i) = 0$ for $i = 1, \dots, \ell$, then the $\mathbb{k}[t]$ -algebra $\bigoplus_{(m, \lambda) \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{G}^\lambda H^0(X, mL) t^{-\lambda}$ is finitely generated.

Proof. The proof is essentially the same as the proof of Theorem 5.6, but simpler since we work on the cone over X with respect to L , rather than the relative cone over $\text{Spec}(R)$. \square

6. THETA-REDUCTIVITY

The notion of Θ -reductivity for an algebraic stack was introduced in [HL13] and is a necessary condition for the existence of a good moduli space [AHLH18]. The goal of this section is to prove that the moduli stack of boundary polarized CY pairs is Θ -reductive. After proving the result, we discuss S-equivalence classes and stability.

Throughout, R denotes a DVR with uniformizer π , fraction field K , and residue field κ .

6.1. Definition. The definition of Θ -reductivity involves the stacky surface

$$\Theta_R = \Theta \times \text{Spec } R \cong [\text{Spec}(R[t])/\mathbb{G}_m],$$

where $\Theta := [\mathbb{A}^1/\mathbb{G}_m]$. We write $0_\kappa \in \Theta_R$ for the unique closed point, which is defined by the vanishing of t and a uniformizing parameter $\pi \in R$. Note that

$$\{t \neq 0\} \cong [\text{Spec}(R[t^{\pm 1}])/\mathbb{G}_m] \cong \text{Spec}(R) \quad \text{and} \quad \{\pi \neq 0\} \cong [\text{Spec}(K[t])/\mathbb{G}_m] \cong \Theta_K.$$

Therefore a map $\Theta_R \setminus 0_\kappa \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$, where \mathcal{M} is a stack, is equivalent to the data of maps $\text{Spec}(R) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ and $\Theta_K \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ with an isomorphism of their restrictions to $\text{Spec}(K)$.

Definition 6.1. An algebraic stack \mathcal{M} is Θ -reductive if for any DVR R and map $\Theta_R \setminus 0_\kappa \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$, there is a unique extension $\Theta_R \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$.

If $\mathcal{M} := \mathcal{M}(\chi, N, \mathbf{r})$ is the moduli stack in Section 3, then a map $\Theta_R \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ is equivalent to a \mathbb{G}_m -equivariant family in $\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{A}_R^1)$. Hence, proving that \mathcal{M} is Θ -reductive is equivalent to showing that any \mathbb{G}_m -equivariant family of boundary polarized CY pairs

$$g^\circ : (\mathcal{X}^\circ, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}^\circ} + \mathcal{D}^\circ) \rightarrow \mathbb{A}_R^1 \setminus 0_\kappa$$

extends uniquely to a \mathbb{G}_m -equivariant family of boundary polarized CY pairs

$$g : (\mathcal{X}, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}} + \mathcal{D}) \rightarrow \mathbb{A}_R^1.$$

6.2. Polarized schemes. Following [ABHLX20, §5.2], we describe a criterion for when a \mathbb{G}_m -equivariant family of polarized schemes over $\mathbb{A}_R^1 \setminus 0_\kappa$ extends to a family over \mathbb{A}_R^1 . Fix a family of \mathbb{G}_m -equivariant family of polarized schemes

$$g^\circ : (\mathcal{X}^\circ, \mathcal{L}^\circ) \rightarrow \mathbb{A}_R^1 \setminus 0_\kappa.$$

By restricting over $1 \times \text{Spec}(R)$ and \mathbb{A}_K^1 , we get

- (1) a family of polarized schemes $(X, L) \rightarrow \text{Spec}(R)$ and
- (2) a test configuration $(\mathcal{X}_K, \mathcal{L}_K) \rightarrow \mathbb{A}_K^1$ of (X_K, L_K) .

Let \mathcal{F}_K^\bullet denote the filtration of $H^0(X_K, mL_K)$ induced by the test configuration $(\mathcal{X}_K, \mathcal{L}_K)$. We define a filtration \mathcal{F}^\bullet of $H^0(X, mL)$ by R -submodules by

$$\mathcal{F}^\lambda H^0(X, mL) := H^0(X, mL) \cap \mathcal{F}_K^\lambda H^0(X_K, mL_K)$$

for each $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}$. As explained in [ABHLX20, §5.2], there is a natural \mathbb{G}_m -equivariant isomorphism of graded $R[t]$ -algebras

$$\bigoplus_{m \in \mathbb{N}} H^0(\mathcal{X}^\circ, m\mathcal{L}^\circ) \cong \bigoplus_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{F}^\lambda H^0(X, mL) t^{-\lambda}, \quad (6.1)$$

where the \mathbb{G}_m -action on the right is induced by the \mathbb{Z} -grading. If the algebra is finitely generated, we set $\mathcal{X} := \text{Proj}(\bigoplus_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{F}^\lambda H^0(X, mL) t^{-\lambda})$.

Proposition 6.2. *If the R -algebra in (6.1) is finitely generated, then*

$$g : (\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}(m)) \rightarrow \mathbb{A}_R^1$$

is the unique extension of $(\mathcal{X}^\circ, m\mathcal{L}^\circ) \rightarrow \mathbb{A}_R^1 \setminus 0_\kappa$ to a \mathbb{G}_m -equivariant family of polarized schemes over \mathbb{A}_R^1 for all $m > 0$ sufficiently divisible.

6.3. Boundary polarized CY pairs. Fix a \mathbb{G}_m -equivariant family of boundary polarized CY pairs

$$g^\circ : (\mathcal{X}^\circ, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}^\circ} + \mathcal{D}^\circ) \rightarrow \mathbb{A}_R^1 \setminus 0_\kappa.$$

By restricting over $1 \times \text{Spec}(R)$ and $\mathbb{A}^1 \times \text{Spec}(K)$, we get

- a family of boundary polarized CY pairs $(X, \Delta + D) \rightarrow \text{Spec}(R)$ and
- a test configuration $(\mathcal{X}_K, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}_K} + \mathcal{D}_K)$ of $(X_X, \Delta_K + D_K)$.

The following theorem is the main result of this section.

Theorem 6.3. *If R is essentially of finite type over \mathbb{k} , then g° admits a unique extension*

$$g : (\mathcal{X}, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}} + \mathcal{D}) \rightarrow \mathbb{A}_R^1$$

to a \mathbb{G}_m -equivariant family of boundary polarized CY pairs over \mathbb{A}_R^1 .

The strategy to prove the Theorem 6.3 is similar to that of Theorem 5.4. We first prove the theorem when \mathcal{X}° is normal by using Theorem 5.6 to prove the filtration in Section 6.2 is finitely generated. We then use Kollár's gluing theory for slc pairs to deduce the full result.

To proceed, fix a positive integer r such that

$$L := -r(K_X + \Delta) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{L}_K := -r(K_{\mathcal{X}_K} + \Delta_{\mathcal{X}_K}),$$

are Cartier divisors. The test configuration $(\mathcal{X}_K, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}_K} + \mathcal{D}_K)$ induces a filtration \mathcal{F}_K^\bullet of $H^0(X_K, mL_K)$. Following Section 6.2, we define a filtration \mathcal{F}^\bullet of $H^0(X, mL)$ by

$$\mathcal{F}^\lambda H^0(X, mL) := H^0(X, mL) \cap \mathcal{F}_K^\lambda H^0(X_K, mL_K).$$

Proposition 6.4. *If R is essentially of finite type over \mathbb{k} and \mathcal{X}° is normal, then the $R[t]$ -algebra $\bigoplus_{(m,\lambda) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{F}^\lambda H^0(X, mL)$ is finitely generated.*

Proof. Observe that X is normal, since $\mathcal{X}^\circ|_{t \neq 0} \cong X \times (\mathbb{A}^1 \setminus 0)$ and \mathcal{X}° is normal by assumption. Let $E_{1,K}, \dots, E_{q,K}$ denote the irreducible components of the fiber of $\mathcal{X}_K \rightarrow \mathbb{A}_K^1$ over 0_K . Note that

$$v_{E_{i,K}} := r(\text{ord}_{E_{i,K}}) = c_i \text{ord}_{F_{i,K}}$$

for some $c_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ and divisor $F_{i,K}$ over X_K . For each i , there exists a divisor F_i over X such that its restriction to X_K is $F_{i,K}$. With this notation, we claim

- $\mathcal{F}^\lambda H^0(X, mL) = \bigcap_{i=1}^q \{s \in H^0(X, mL) \mid c_i \text{ord}_{F_i}(s) \geq \lambda + A_{X, \Delta + D + X_\kappa}(c_i \text{ord}_{F_i})\}$
- $A_{X, \Delta + D + X_\kappa}(c_i \text{ord}_{F_i}) = 0$.

Assuming the claim holds, then Theorem 5.6 implies $\bigoplus_{(m,\lambda) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{F}^\lambda H^0(X, mL)$ is finitely generated. To verify the claim note that each F_i dominates $\text{Spec}(R)$. Therefore

$$A_{X, \Delta + X_\kappa}(F_i) = A_{X_K, \Delta_K}(F_{i,K}), \quad A_{X, \Delta + D + X_\kappa}(F_i) = A_{X_K, \Delta_K + D_K}(F_{i,K}),$$

and $\text{ord}_{F_{i,K}}(s|_K)$ for all $s \in H^0(X, mL)$. Thus the claim holds by Lemma 4.7 and the definition of \mathcal{F}^\bullet . \square

We are now ready to prove Theorem 6.3 in the case when \mathcal{X}° is normal.

Proof of Theorem 6.3 when \mathcal{X}° is normal. Consider the morphism

$$g : \mathcal{X} := \text{Proj} \left(\bigoplus_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{G}^\lambda H^0(X, mL) t^{-\lambda} \right) \rightarrow \mathbb{A}_R^1.$$

By Propositions 6.2 and 6.4, $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}(m)) \rightarrow \mathbb{A}_R^1$ is a flat family of polarized schemes and is the unique extension of $(\mathcal{X}^\circ, m\mathcal{L}^\circ) \rightarrow \mathbb{A}_R^1$ for all $m > 0$ sufficiently divisible. Let $\Delta_{\mathcal{X}}$ and \mathcal{D} be the closures of $\Delta_{\mathcal{X}^\circ}$ and \mathcal{D}° in \mathcal{X} .

To show $(\mathcal{X}, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}} + \mathcal{D}) \rightarrow \mathbb{A}_R^1$ is a family of boundary polarized CY pairs, we follow the proof of Theorem 5.4. First, arguing as in the proof of Theorem 5.4 shows \mathcal{X} is normal,

$$\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}(-mr(K_{\mathcal{X}/\mathbb{A}^1} + \Delta_{\mathcal{X}} + \mathcal{D})) \cong \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}(m) \quad \text{and} \quad K_{\mathcal{X}/\mathbb{A}^1} + \Delta_{\mathcal{X}} + \mathcal{D} \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0$$

for $m > 0$ sufficiently divisible. Hence, it remains to show $(\mathcal{X}, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}} + \mathcal{D}) \rightarrow \mathbb{A}^1$ is a family of slc pairs. To proceed, consider the family of boundary polarized CY pairs

$$(X_{\mathbb{A}^1}, \Delta_{\mathbb{A}^1} + D_{\mathbb{A}^1}) := (X, \Delta + D) \times \mathbb{A}^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{A}_R^1.$$

The isomorphism $\mathcal{X}|_{t \neq 0} \cong (X, \Delta + D) \times (\mathbb{A}^1 \setminus 0)$ induces a birational map $\mathcal{X} \dashrightarrow X_{\mathbb{A}^1}$. Let \mathcal{Y} denote the normalization of the graph with maps $f : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ and $f' : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow X_{\mathbb{A}^1}$. Set

$$\Gamma := f'^*(K_{X_{\mathbb{A}^1}} + \Delta_{\mathbb{A}^1} + D_{\mathbb{A}^1} + X \times 0 + (X_{\mathbb{A}^1})_{\pi t=0}) - f^*(K_{\mathcal{X}} + \Delta_{\mathcal{X}} + \mathcal{D} + \mathcal{X}_{\pi t=0}).$$

Since $(X_{\mathbb{A}^1}, \Delta_{\mathbb{A}^1} + D_{\mathbb{A}^1} + (X_{\mathbb{A}^1})_{\pi t=0})$ is lc by Lemma 2.7 and $\Gamma = 0$ by arguing as in the proof of Theorem 5.4, $(\mathcal{X}, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}} + \mathcal{D} + \mathcal{X}_{\pi t=0})$ is lc. Thus $(\mathcal{X}, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}} + \mathcal{D}) \rightarrow \mathbb{A}_R^1$ is a family of slc pairs by Lemma 2.7 and so a family of boundary polarized CY pairs. The extension is \mathbb{G}_m -equivariant by [ABHLX20, Lem. 2.16] and unique by Lemma 2.10.3. \square

We will now deduce Theorem 6.3 from the case when \mathcal{X}° is normal.

Proof of Theorem 6.3. Let $(\overline{\mathcal{X}}^\circ, \overline{\mathcal{G}}^\circ + \Delta_{\overline{\mathcal{X}}^\circ} + \overline{\mathcal{D}}^\circ)$ denote the normalization of $(\mathcal{X}^\circ, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}^\circ} + \mathcal{D}^\circ)$ and $\tau^\circ : \overline{\mathcal{G}}^{\circ n} \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{G}}^{\circ n}$ denote the involution. By arguing as in the proof of Theorem 5.4,

- (1) $\overline{g}^\circ : (\overline{\mathcal{X}}^\circ, \overline{\mathcal{G}}^\circ + \Delta_{\overline{\mathcal{X}}^\circ} + \overline{\mathcal{D}}^\circ) \rightarrow \mathbb{A}_R^1 \setminus 0_\kappa$ extends to a \mathbb{G}_m -equivariant family of boundary polarized CY pairs $\overline{g} : (\overline{\mathcal{X}}, \overline{\mathcal{G}} + \Delta_{\overline{\mathcal{X}}} + \overline{\mathcal{D}}) \rightarrow \mathbb{A}_R^1 \setminus 0_\kappa$, and
- (2) τ° extends to an involution $\tau : \overline{\mathcal{G}}^n \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{G}}^n$.

By Proposition 2.12, g° extends to a family of boundary polarized CY pairs $g : (\mathcal{X}, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}} + \mathcal{D}) \rightarrow \mathbb{A}_R^1$. The extension is \mathbb{G}_m -equivariant by [ABHLX20, Lem. 2.16] and unique by Lemma 2.10.3. \square

6.4. Automorphism groups. For a boundary polarized CY pair $(X, \Delta + D)$, set

$$\text{Aut}(X, \Delta + D) := \{g \in \text{Aut}(X) \mid g^*D = D \text{ and } g^*\Delta = \Delta\}.$$

Note that $\text{Aut}(X, \Delta + D)$ has the structure of a linear algebraic group. To see this, fix an integer $r > 0$ sufficiently divisible such that $L := \omega_X^{[r]}(-r\Delta)$ is a very ample line bundle. Since $g^*L \cong L$ for any $g \in \text{Aut}(X, \Delta + D)$, we can identify $\text{Aut}(X, \Delta + D)$ with the closed subgroup of $\text{PGL}(H^0(X, L))$ composed of elements fixing Δ and D . We let $\text{Aut}^0(X, \Delta + D)$ denote the connected component of $\text{Aut}(X, \Delta + D)$ containing the identity.

Theorem 6.5. *If $(X, \Delta + D)$ is a boundary polarized CY pair, then $\text{Aut}^0(X, \Delta + D)$ is isomorphic to an algebraic torus (i.e. \mathbb{G}_m^r for some $r \geq 0$).*

The statement is known to experts and follows easily from [Hu18, Lem. 2.1], which more generally implies that any connected algebraic subgroup of the automorphism group of an slc CY pair is a torus. We thank Joaquín Moraga for providing us with the reference.

Proof. It suffices to prove the result when X is normal. Indeed, there is an embedding

$$\text{Aut}^0(X, \Delta + D) \hookrightarrow \text{Aut}^0(\overline{X}, \overline{\Delta} + \overline{\mathcal{G}} + \overline{\mathcal{D}}) = \times_{i=1}^r \text{Aut}^0(\overline{X}_i, \overline{\mathcal{G}}_i + \overline{\Delta}_i + \overline{\mathcal{D}}_i),$$

where $(\overline{X}, \overline{\mathcal{G}} + \overline{\Delta} + \overline{\mathcal{D}}) := \sqcup_{i=1}^r (\overline{X}_i, \overline{\mathcal{G}}_i + \overline{\Delta}_i + \overline{\mathcal{D}}_i)$ is the normalization of $(X, \Delta + D)$. Since the connected algebraic subgroups of a torus are tori, the normal case implies the full result.

Now, assume X is normal. Fix an $\text{Aut}(X, \Delta + D)$ -equivariant log resolution $\mu : Y \rightarrow X$ of $(X, \Delta + D)$ and set $B := \text{Supp}(\mu_*^{-1}(\Delta + D)) + \text{Exc}(\mu)$. Since $K_X + \Delta + D \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0$ and

$$K_Y + B = f^*(K_X + \Delta + D) + \sum_E A_{X, \Delta + D}(E)E,$$

where E runs through prime divisors in $\text{Supp}(\mu_*^{-1}(\Delta + D)) + \text{Exc}(\mu)$, $K_Y + B$ is psuedoeffective. Thus [Hu18, Lem. 2.1] states that any connected affine algebraic subgroup of $\text{Aut}^0(Y, B)$ is a torus. Since there is an embedding $\text{Aut}^0(X, \Delta + D) \hookrightarrow \text{Aut}(Y, B)$, $\text{Aut}^0(X, \Delta + D)$ is a torus. \square

The next proposition shows that the dimension of the automorphism group increases under weakly special degeneration. While the statement is well known, we include a proof for the lack of a suitable reference.

Proposition 6.6. *If $(X, \Delta + D) \rightsquigarrow (X_0, \Delta_0 + D_0)$ is a weakly special degeneration of boundary polarized CY pair and $(X, \Delta + D) \not\cong (X_0, \Delta_0 + D_0)$, then*

$$\dim(\text{Aut}(X, \Delta + D)) < \dim(\text{Aut}(X_0, \Delta_0 + D_0)).$$

Proof. We may assume $x = [(X, \Delta + D)]$ and $x_0 = [(X_0, \Delta_0 + D_0)]$ are \mathbb{k} -points of the stack $\mathcal{M}(\chi, N, \mathbf{r})$ for some choice of χ, N , and \mathbf{r} . By the proof of Theorem 3.7, there is an open substack $\mathcal{U} \subset \mathcal{M}(\chi, N, \mathbf{r})$ such that $x, x_0 \in \mathcal{U}$ and $\mathcal{U} \cong [Z/G]$, where Z is a finite type \mathbb{k} -scheme with an action by an affine algebraic group G . Choose $z, z_0 \in Z$ that map to $x, x_0 \in \mathcal{U}$, respectively. Observe that

$$\dim \text{Stab}(z) = \dim G - \dim(G \cdot z) < \dim G - \dim(G \cdot z_0) = \dim \text{Stab}(z_0),$$

where the inequality uses that $G \cdot z_0 \in \overline{G \cdot z}$. Since $\text{Aut}(X, \Delta + D) \cong \text{Stab}(z)$ and $\text{Aut}(X_0, \Delta_0 + D_0) \cong \text{Stab}(z_0)$, the result follows. \square

6.5. S-equivalence. We now discuss S-equivalence classes of boundary polarized CY pairs.

Definition 6.7 (S-equivalence). Two boundary polarized CY pairs $(X, \Delta + D)$ and $(X', \Delta' + D')$ are *S-equivalent* if there exist weakly special test configurations degenerating

$$(X, \Delta + D) \rightsquigarrow (X_0, \Delta_0 + D_0) \leftarrow (X', \Delta' + D')$$

to a common boundary polarized CY pair $(X_0, \Delta_0 + D_0)$. To denote S-equivalence, we write $(X, \Delta + D) \sim_S (X', \Delta' + D')$.

Remark 6.8 (Terminology). The term S-equivalence is a reference to work of Seshadri on vector bundles. Recall, two semistable vector bundles E and E' on a smooth curve C to be *S-equivalent* if the graded bundles associated to the Jordan-Holder filtrations satisfy

$$\text{gr}_{\text{JH}} E \cong \text{gr}_{\text{JH}} E',$$

The latter is related to the above definition by using the Rees construction to give a degeneration $E \rightsquigarrow \text{gr}_{\text{JH}} E$ via an equivariant family over \mathbb{A}^1 .

Proposition 6.9. *S-equivalence for boundary polarized CY pairs is an equivalence relation.*

The proposition is a consequence of the following lemma that interprets S-equivalence stack theoretically. Statement (2) of the lemma relies on Theorem 6.3.

Lemma 6.10. *Let $x = [(X, \Delta + D)]$ and $x' = [(X', \Delta' + D')]$ be \mathbb{k} -points of $\mathcal{M}(\chi, N, \mathbf{r})$.*

- (1) $(X, \Delta + D) \sim_S (X', \Delta' + D')$ if and only if $\overline{\{x\}} \cap \overline{\{x'\}} \neq \emptyset$.
- (2) if $x_1, x_2 \in \overline{\{x\}}$ are \mathbb{k} -points, then $\overline{\{x_1\}} \cap \overline{\{x_2\}} \neq \emptyset$.

Proof. The forward implication of (1) is clear since a common degeneration will be contained in $\overline{\{x\}} \cap \overline{\{x'\}}$. For the converse, assume $\overline{\{x\}} \cap \overline{\{x'\}} \neq \emptyset$. Thus there is a \mathbb{k} -point $x_0 \in \overline{\{x\}} \cap \overline{\{x'\}}$. Since x_0 has linearly reductive stabilizer group by Theorem 6.5, [AHLH18, Proof of Lem. 3.24] implies that the specializations $x \rightsquigarrow x_0$ and $x' \rightsquigarrow x_0$ are realized by maps $\Theta \rightarrow \mathcal{M}(\chi, N, \mathbf{r})$. Thus the reverse implication of (1) holds.

For (2), note that the specializations $x \rightsquigarrow x_1$ and $x \rightsquigarrow x_2$ are given by maps $f_1, f_2 : \Theta \rightarrow \mathcal{M}(\chi, N, \mathbf{r})$ as in the above paragraph. Following [AHLH18, Proof of Lem. 3.25], the maps f_1 and

f_2 glue to give a map $[\mathbb{A}^2 \setminus \{(0, 0)\} / (\mathbb{G}_m)^2] \rightarrow \mathcal{M}(\chi, N, \mathbf{r})$. By choosing one of the two \mathbb{G}_m factors, Θ -reductivity (Theorem 6.3) implies that there exists an extension $g : [\mathbb{A}^2 / \mathbb{G}_m] \rightarrow \mathcal{M}(\chi, N, \mathbf{r})$. Since $\gamma(0, 0)$ is a specialization of both x_1 and x_2 , (2) holds. \square

Proof of Proposition 6.9. The proposition follows immediately from Lemma 6.10. \square

The next proposition shows that klt pairs are only S-equivalent to themselves.

Proposition 6.11. *If $(X, \Delta + D)$ is a klt boundary polarized CY pair and $(X, \Delta + D) \sim_S (X', \Delta' + D')$, then $(X, \Delta + D) \cong (X', \Delta' + D')$.*

Proof. The proposition is a consequence of the following claim: If $(\mathcal{X}, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}} + \mathcal{D})$ is a test configuration of a boundary polarized CY pair such that the fiber over $0 \in \mathbb{A}^1$ or $1 \in \mathbb{A}^1$ is klt, then the test configuration is trivial.

To verify the claim, note that if the fiber over 0 is klt, then so is the fiber over 1 by the openness of klt singularities. If the fiber over 1 is klt, then Lemma 2.10.3 applied to $(\mathcal{X}, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}} + \mathcal{D}) \dashrightarrow (\mathcal{X}_1, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}_1} + \mathcal{D}_1) \times \mathbb{A}^1$ implies the test configuration is trivial. \square

We now prove Corollary 1.2, which states that any two degenerations of a family of boundary polarized CY pairs over a punctured curve are S-equivalent.

Proof of Corollary 1.2. Let $R := \mathcal{O}_{C,0}$ and consider the \mathbb{G}_m -equivariant family of boundary polarized CY pairs $(\mathcal{X}^\circ, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}^\circ} + \mathcal{D}^\circ) \rightarrow \text{Spec}(R[s, t]/(st - \pi)) \setminus 0$ constructed by gluing

$$(X, \Delta + D) \times \mathbb{G}_m \rightarrow \text{Spec}(R) \times \mathbb{G}_m \quad \text{and} \quad (X', \Delta' + D') \times \mathbb{G}_m \rightarrow \text{Spec}(R) \times \mathbb{G}_m$$

along $\text{Spec}(K) \times \mathbb{G}_m$. By Theorem 5.4, the family extends to a \mathbb{G}_m -equivariant family of boundary polarized CY pairs $(\mathcal{X}, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}} + \mathcal{D}) \rightarrow \text{Spec}(R[s, t]/(st - \pi))$. The restrictions of the extension to $\{s = 0\}$ and $\{t = 0\}$ are test configurations degenerating

$$(X_0, \Delta_0 + D_0) \rightsquigarrow (\mathcal{X}, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}} + \mathcal{D})_{s=t=0} \leftarrow (X', \Delta'_0 + D'_0)$$

Thus the pairs are S-equivalent. \square

6.6. Stability. Motivated by the definition of K-stability, it is natural to introduce the following definition.

Definition 6.12. A boundary polarized CY pair $(X, \Delta + D)$ is called

- (1) *polystable* if every weakly special test configuration $(\mathcal{X}, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}} + \mathcal{D})$ of $(X, \Delta + D)$ is a product, i.e. it satisfies $(\mathcal{X}_0, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}_0} + \mathcal{D}_0) \cong (X, \Delta + D)$, and
- (2) *stable* if every weakly special test configuration $(\mathcal{X}, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}} + \mathcal{D})$ of $(X, \Delta + D)$ is trivial.

Semistability is not defined above, since it is natural to call every boundary polarized CY pair *semistable*. The above two notions have the following stacky interpretation.

Proposition 6.13. *A pair $x = [(X, \Delta + D)]$ in $\mathcal{M}(\chi, N, \mathbf{r})(\mathbb{k})$ is*

- (1) *polystable if and only if the point x is closed, and*
- (2) *stable if and only if the point x is closed and has finite stabilizer group.*

Proof. Since the stabilizers of points in $\mathcal{M}(\chi, N, \mathbf{r})(\mathbb{k})$ are reductive by Theorem 6.5, [AHLH18, Lem. 3.24] implies that any specialization $x \rightsquigarrow x_0$ of \mathbb{k} -points is given by a morphism $\Theta \rightarrow \mathcal{M}(\chi, N, \mathbf{r})$. Therefore (1) holds.

Statement (2) follows from (1) and the following observation. By Theorem 6.5, the group $\text{Aut}^0(X, \Delta + D)$ is trivial if and only if there are no non-trivial maps to $\mathbb{G}_m \rightarrow \text{Aut}(X, \Delta + D)$. In addition, the latter holds if and only if there are no non-trivial weakly special test configurations $(\mathcal{X}, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}} + \mathcal{D})$ of $(X, \Delta + D)$ with $(X_0, \Delta_0 + D_0) \cong (X, \Delta + D)$. \square

Remark 6.14. An unusual feature of our moduli problem is that there can be S-equivalence classes that are unbounded (see Example 9.4 and Theorem 10.2). Such S-equivalence classes will not admit polystable representatives.

Theorem 6.15. *A boundary polarized CY pair $(X, \Delta + D)$ is stable if and only if it is klt.*

Proof. If X is normal, then the statement follows immediately from Theorem 4.8. It remains to show that a non-normal boundary polarized CY pair is not stable.

Let $(\overline{X}, \overline{G} + \overline{\Delta} + \overline{D})$ denote the normalization of a non-normal boundary polarized CY pair $(X, \Delta + D)$. Fix an integer $r > 0$ such that $\overline{L} := -r(K_{\overline{X}} + \overline{G} + \overline{\Delta})$ is a Cartier divisor. Consider the filtration \mathcal{F}^\bullet of $S := \bigoplus_{m \in \mathbb{N}} S_m := \bigoplus_{m \in \mathbb{N}} H^0(\overline{X}, m\overline{L})$ defined by

$$\mathcal{F}^\lambda S_m := \{s \in S_m \mid \operatorname{div}_{\overline{X}}(s) \geq \lambda \overline{G}\}.$$

By Proposition 4.9, there exists a test configuration $(\overline{\mathcal{X}}, \overline{\mathcal{G}} + \overline{\Delta}_{\overline{\mathcal{X}}} + \overline{\mathcal{D}})$ of $(\overline{X}, \overline{G} + \overline{\Delta} + \overline{D})$ such that $\mathcal{X} := \operatorname{Proj}(\bigoplus_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{F}^\lambda S_m)$ and the isomorphism $\mathcal{X}|_{\mathbb{A}^1 \setminus 0} \cong X \times (\mathbb{A}^1 \setminus 0)$ is induced by the isomorphism of graded rings $(\bigoplus_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{F}^\lambda S_m) \otimes_{k[t]} k[t^{\pm 1}] \cong \bigoplus_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}} S_m t^{-m}$.

We claim that the \mathbb{G}_m -equivariant birational map $\overline{G} \times \mathbb{A}^1 \dashrightarrow \overline{\mathcal{G}}$ is an isomorphism. To verify the claim, note that the closed subscheme $\overline{\mathcal{G}} \subset \overline{\mathcal{X}}$ is defined by the homogeneous ideal

$$\bigoplus_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}} (\mathcal{F}^\lambda S_m \cap I_m) t^{-\lambda} \subset \bigoplus_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{F}^\lambda S_m t^{-\lambda},$$

where $I_m := H^0(\overline{X}, m\overline{L} \otimes \mathcal{I}_{\overline{G}}) \subset S_m$; see [BX19, 2.3.1]. Using that $I_m = \mathcal{F}^1 S_m$, we see

$$\overline{\mathcal{G}} \cong \operatorname{Proj} \left(\bigoplus_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \bigoplus_{\lambda \leq 0} (S_m / I_m) t^{-\lambda} \right) \cong \overline{G} \times \mathbb{A}^1,$$

where the isomorphisms are \mathbb{G}_m -equivariant. Thus the claim holds.

We will now construct a non-trivial test configuration of $(X, \Delta + D)$ by gluing. Consider the involution $\tau : \overline{G}^n \rightarrow \overline{G}^n$. By the previous claim, the involution $\tau \times \operatorname{id} : \overline{G}^n \times (\mathbb{A}^1 \setminus 0) \rightarrow \overline{G}^n \times (\mathbb{A}^1 \setminus 0)$ extends to an involution $\tau : \overline{\mathcal{G}}^n \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{G}}^n$. Thus Proposition 2.12 implies that $(X, \Delta + D) \times (\mathbb{A}^1 \setminus 0)$ extends to a family of boundary polarized CY pairs $(\mathcal{X}, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}} + \mathcal{D})$ whose normalization is the extension $(\overline{\mathcal{X}}, \overline{\mathcal{G}} + \overline{\Delta}_{\overline{\mathcal{X}}} + \overline{\mathcal{D}})$. Arguing as in the proof of Proposition 4.14, the \mathbb{G}_m -action on $X \times (\mathbb{A}^1 \setminus 0)$ extends to a \mathbb{G}_m -action on \mathcal{X} . Thus $(\mathcal{X}, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}} + \mathcal{D})$ is a test configuration of $(X, \Delta + D)$. Since $(\overline{\mathcal{X}}, \overline{\mathcal{G}} + \overline{\Delta}_{\overline{\mathcal{X}}} + \overline{\mathcal{D}})$ is non-trivial, $(\mathcal{X}, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}} + \mathcal{D})$ is non-trivial and so $(X, \Delta + D)$ is not stable. \square

Remark 6.16. One can also consider the K-(poly/semi)stability of a boundary polarized CY pair $(X, \Delta + D)$ with respect to the polarization $L := -K_X - \Delta$.

- By [Oda13a, OS15], the above pair $(X, \Delta + D)$ is always K-semistable with respect to L , since the singularities are slc and $K_X + \Delta + D \equiv 0$.
- The notion of K-polystability differs from polystability as defined above, since the definition of K-(poly/semi)stability takes into account test where where the degeneration of $(X, \Delta + D)$ is no long a boundary polarized CY pair. For example, the pairs in Theorem 16.6 are polystable, but not klt and so not K-polystable by [Oda22b, Thm. 1.3].

7. PROPERNESS

In this section, we show that the moduli stack of boundary polarized CY pairs satisfies the existence part of the valuative criterion for properness.

Throughout, let R be a DVR essentially of finite type over \mathbb{k} with fraction field K and residue field κ .

Theorem 7.1 (Properness). *If $(X_K, \Delta_K + D_K)$ is a boundary polarized CY pair over K , then there is a finite extension of DVRs R'/R such that the base change by $K' = \text{Frac}(R')$*

$$(X_K, \Delta_K + D_K) \times_K K',$$

extends to a family of boundary polarized CY pairs $(X', \Delta' + D') \rightarrow \text{Spec}(R')$.

Remark 7.2. In fact the proof shows we can take $R' = R[\sqrt[d]{\pi}]$, where π is a uniformizer of R . Phrased another way, $(X_K, \Delta_K + D_K)$ extends to a family over a root stack of $\text{Spec } R$. This stronger version of the existence part of the valuative criterion of properness holds in particular for proper Deligne–Mumford stacks and has had several applications in the literature [AB19b, BV22].

To prove the theorem, we use a perturbation argument to reduce to a result of Kollár and Xu, which states that the moduli stack of slc pairs $(X, \Delta + \varepsilon H)$, where (X, Δ) is a CY pair and H is an ample Weil divisor, is proper [KX20]. More precisely, we use the following technical statement shown in the proof of [KX20, Lem. 4].

Proposition 7.3. *Let (X_K, Γ_K) be an lc CY pair over K and H_K an ample \mathbb{Q} -Cartier \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X_K . Assume the following hold:*

- (1) $(X_K, \Gamma_K + \delta H_K)$ is lc for $0 < \delta \ll 1$.
- (2) *There exists a log resolution $f : Y_K \rightarrow X_K$ of $(X_K, \Gamma_K + H_K)$ and an extension of Y_K to a flat projective family $Y \rightarrow \text{Spec}(R)$ such that $(Y, B + Y_\kappa)$ is dlt, where B is the closure of $\text{Supp}(f_*^{-1}(\Gamma_K + H_K)) + \text{Exc}(f)$ in Y .*

Then (X_K, Γ_K) extends to a family of CY pairs $(X, \Gamma) \rightarrow \text{Spec}(R)$ such that

- (3) $(X, \Gamma + \delta H) \rightarrow \text{Spec}(R)$ is a family of KSBA stable pairs for $0 < \delta \ll 1$.
- (4) $Y \dashrightarrow X$ is a birational contraction.

Before proving Theorem 7.1, we prove the following auxiliary statement, which we will deduce from Proposition 7.3.

Proposition 7.4. *Let $(X_K, \Delta_K + D_K)$ be an lc boundary polarized CY pair over K and $0 \leq H_K \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} -K_{X_K} - \Delta_K$.*

If conditions (1) and (2) of Proposition 7.3 are satisfied with $\Gamma_K := \Delta_K + D_K$, then

$$(X_K, \Delta_K + D_K)$$

extends to a family of boundary polarized CY pairs $(X, \Delta + D) \rightarrow \text{Spec}(R)$ such that $(X, \Delta + (1 - \varepsilon)D + (\varepsilon + \delta)H) \rightarrow \text{Spec}(R)$ is a family of KSBA stable pairs for $0 < \varepsilon, \delta \ll 1$.

Proof. For $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$, we consider the pair

$$(X_K, \Delta_K + (1 - \varepsilon)D_K + \varepsilon H_K). \tag{7.1}$$

Since $H_K \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} -K_{X_K} - \Delta_K$ and condition (1) holds, (7.1) is an lc CY pair. Therefore, we may apply Proposition 7.3 to produce an extension of (7.1) to a family of slc CY pairs

$$(X^\varepsilon, \Delta^\varepsilon + (1 - \varepsilon)D^\varepsilon + \varepsilon H^\varepsilon) \rightarrow \text{Spec}(R)$$

such that $(X^\varepsilon, \Delta^\varepsilon + (1 - \varepsilon)D^\varepsilon + (\varepsilon + \delta)H^\varepsilon) \rightarrow \text{Spec}(R)$ is a family of KSBA stable pairs for $0 < \delta \ll 1$ and $Y \dashrightarrow X^\varepsilon$ is a birational contraction. Note that the previous conditions imply H^ε is \mathbb{Q} -Cartier and ample.

Claim: There exists a sequence of positive rational numbers $(\varepsilon_i)_i$ such that $\lim \varepsilon_i = 0$ and the birational map $X^{\varepsilon_i} \dashrightarrow X^{\varepsilon_j}$ is an isomorphism for all $i, j \geq 1$.

Proof of Claim: Since Y_κ is a union of finitely many prime divisors, there are finitely many combinations of prime divisors contained in Y_κ that can get contracted by $g^\varepsilon : Y \dashrightarrow X^\varepsilon$ for some ε . Therefore we may find a sequence $(\varepsilon_i)_i$ such that $\lim \varepsilon_i = 0$ and the set of components of Y_κ that get contracted by g^{ε_i} is independent of i .

Now note that $X^{\varepsilon_i} \dashrightarrow X^{\varepsilon_j}$ is an isomorphism over $\text{Spec}(K)$, since both varieties are extensions of X_K . Using that g^{ε_i} and g^{ε_j} contract the same components of Y_κ , we see $X^{\varepsilon_i} \dashrightarrow X^{\varepsilon_j}$ is an isomorphism in codimension one. We now observe

$$X^{\varepsilon_i} \cong \text{Proj}\left(\bigoplus_{m \in \mathbb{N}} H^0(X^{\varepsilon_i}, \mathcal{O}_{X^{\varepsilon_i}}(\lfloor mH^{\varepsilon_i} \rfloor))\right) \cong \text{Proj}\left(\bigoplus_{m \in \mathbb{N}} H^0(X^{\varepsilon_j}, \mathcal{O}_{X^{\varepsilon_j}}(\lfloor mH^{\varepsilon_j} \rfloor))\right) \cong X^{\varepsilon_j},$$

where the first and third isomorphisms use that H^{ε_i} and H^{ε_j} are ample and the second uses Hartog's Lemma. \square

Let $(X, \Delta + D + H) := (X^{\varepsilon_i}, \Delta^{\varepsilon_i} + D^{\varepsilon_i} + H^{\varepsilon_i})$, which is independent of the choice of i by the previous claim. Note that

- (a) $(X, \Delta + (1 - \varepsilon_i)D + \varepsilon_i H) \rightarrow \text{Spec}(R)$ is a family of projective CY pairs and
- (b) $(X, \Delta + (1 - \varepsilon_i)D + (\varepsilon_i + \delta)H) \rightarrow \text{Spec}(R)$ is a family of KSBA pairs for $0 < \delta \ll 1$

for each $i \geq 1$. Using (a), we see that

$$0 \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} (K_X + \Delta + (1 - \varepsilon_i)D + \varepsilon_i H) - (K_X + \Delta + (1 - \varepsilon_j)D + \varepsilon_j H) \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} (\varepsilon_i - \varepsilon_j)(D - H),$$

for $i, j \geq 1$, which implies $D \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} H$. Thus D is ample, \mathbb{Q} -Cartier, and satisfies

$$K_X + \Delta + D \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} K_X + \Delta + (1 - \varepsilon_i)D + \varepsilon_i H \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0.$$

Using (a) and that $\lim \varepsilon_i = 0$, we see $(X, \Delta + D) \rightarrow \text{Spec}(R)$ is a family of slc pairs. Therefore $(X, \Delta + D) \rightarrow \text{Spec}(R)$ is a family of boundary polarized CY pairs. Furthermore, (b) implies the last statement of the proposition holds. \square

We will now deduce Theorem 7.1 from Proposition 7.4.

Proof of Theorem 7.1. Let $\nu : \overline{X}_K \rightarrow X_K$ denote the normalization morphism and $\overline{G}_K \subset \overline{X}_K$ the conductor divisor. We seek to apply Proposition 7.4 to the connected components of $(\overline{X}_K, \overline{\Delta}_K + \overline{G}_K + \overline{D}_K)$. Since the linear system $\nu^*| - m(K_{X_K} + \Delta_K)|$ is basepoint free for $m > 0$ sufficiently divisible, there exists $H_K \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} -K_{X_K} - \Delta_K$ such that

$$(\overline{X}_K, \overline{\Delta}_K + \overline{G}_K + \overline{D}_K + \overline{H}_K)$$

is lc. Fix a log resolution $f : Y_K \rightarrow \overline{X}_K$. By [KKMSD73, Sec. IV.3, pg 198-199], there exists a finite extension $R' = R[\sqrt[d]{\pi}]$, where π is the uniformizer of R , and an extension of the pullback $Y_{K'}$ to a flat projective morphism $g : Y \rightarrow \text{Spec}(R')$ such that $(Y, B + Y_\kappa)$ is dlt, where B denotes the closure of $(f_{K'})_*^{-1}(\overline{G}_{K'} + \overline{\Delta}_{K'} + \overline{D}_{K'}) + \text{Exc}(f_{K'})$. By Proposition 7.4, there exists an extension of $(\overline{X}_{K'}, \overline{G}_{K'} + \overline{\Delta}_{K'} + \overline{D}_{K'})$ to a family of boundary polarized CY pairs

$$(\overline{X}', \overline{G}' + \overline{\Delta}' + \overline{D}') \rightarrow \text{Spec}(R') \tag{7.2}$$

such that

$$(\overline{X}', \overline{G}' + \overline{\Delta}' + (1 - \varepsilon)\overline{D}' + (\varepsilon + \delta)\overline{H}') \rightarrow \text{Spec}(R') \tag{7.3}$$

is a family of KSBA-stable pairs for $0 < \varepsilon, \delta \ll 1$. By [Kol23, Thm. 11.38] $(X_{K'}, \Delta_{K'} + (1 - \varepsilon)D_{K'} + (\varepsilon + \delta)H_{K'})$ extends to a family of KSBA-stable pairs

$$(X', \Delta' + (1 - \varepsilon)D' + (\varepsilon + \delta)H') \rightarrow \text{Spec}(R')$$

with normalization (7.3). Since the normalization of $(X', \Delta' + D')$ is (7.2), which is a family of boundary polarized CY pairs, $(X', \Delta' + D') \rightarrow \text{Spec}(R')$ is a proper family of slc pairs, D' is relatively ample, and $K_{X'} + \Delta' + D' \equiv 0$. By abundance for numerically trivially slc pairs [HX16, Cor. 1.4], $K_{X'} + \Delta' + D' \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0$. Thus $(X', \Delta' + D') \rightarrow \text{Spec}(R')$ is a family of boundary polarized CY pairs.

By choosing f to be a $\text{Gal}(K'/K) = \mu_d$ -equivariant resolution, the resulting family $(X', \Delta' + D') \rightarrow \text{Spec} R'$ is μ_d -equivariant. Indeed the stack of KSBA-stable pairs has finite, and in particular proper and representable, inertia. Thus by the valuative criterion of properness for representable morphisms, the K' -point of the inertia stack corresponding to the generator of the μ_d action extends

uniquely to an order d automorphism of the KSBA-stable extension over R' . Thus the resulting family descends to a family of boundary polarized CY pairs over the d -th root stack $[\mathrm{Spec} R'/\mu_d]$ of $\mathrm{Spec} R$. \square

8. SOURCES AND REGULARITY

In this section, we discuss the source and regularity of CY pairs. After recalling their definitions, we study their behavior in families and then we construct a good moduli space parametrizing regularity at most 0 boundary polarized CY pairs.

8.1. Definition. The source [Kol16] and regularity [Sho00] of a CY pair are defined in terms of minimal lc centers on a dlt modification.

8.1.1. Dlt modification. A *dlt modification* of an lc pair (X, Δ) is the data of a pair (Y, Δ_Y) and a proper birational morphism $f : Y \rightarrow X$ such that

- (i) (Y, Δ_Y) is dlt,
- (ii) $\Delta_Y = E + f_*^{-1}\Delta$, where E is the sum of the exceptional divisors of f , and
- (iii) $K_Y + \Delta_Y = f^*(K_X + \Delta)$.

Every lc pair (X, Δ) admits a dlt modification by [Kol13, Thm. 1.34].

If (Y, Δ_Y) is a dlt pair and $S \subset Y$ an lc center, then (S, Δ_S) is a dlt pair, where $\Delta_S := \mathrm{Diff}_S^*(\Delta)$ is defined via adjunction, and $K_S + \Delta_S \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} (K_Y + \Delta_Y)|_S$; see [Kol13, Sec 4.2].

8.1.2. Sources. The source was introduced in [Kol16] for crepant log structures, which are roughly CY fibrations. We are primarily interested in sources of CY pairs, defined below. See also [Sho13, Defn. 2] for a related notion.

Definition 8.1 (Source). Let (X, Δ) be a CY pair.

- (1) If (X, Δ) is klt, we set $\mathrm{Src}(X, \Delta) := (X, \Delta)$.
- (2) If (X, Δ) is not klt, then let $(\overline{X}, \overline{G} + \overline{\Delta}) := \sqcup_{i=1}^r (\overline{X}_i, \overline{G}_i + \overline{\Delta}_i)$ denote its normalization and fix a dlt modification

$$(Y, \Delta_Y) \rightarrow (\overline{X}_i, \overline{G}_i + \overline{\Delta}_i)$$

for some i . We set $\mathrm{Src}(X, \Delta)$ equal to the crepant birational equivalence class of (S, Δ_S) , where $S \subset Y$ is a minimal lc center of (Y, Δ_Y) .

Note that a boundary polarized CY pair $(X, \Delta + D)$ is also a CY pair and so $\mathrm{Src}(X, \Delta + D)$ is defined.

Lemma 8.2. *Definition 8.1.2 is independent of the choice of dlt modification, minimal lc center S , and index i .*

Proof. The result follows from [Kol16]. Indeed, if (X, Δ) is lc, then $\mathrm{Src}(X, \Delta)$ is independent of the choice of dlt modification and minimal lc center by [Kol16, Thm. 1]. If (X, Δ) is slc, but not lc, it remains to show independence of the choice of i . To proceed, note that X is connected. Thus, it suffices to show that if $\pi(\overline{X}_i)$ and $\pi(\overline{X}_j)$ intersect, then

$$\mathrm{Src}(\overline{X}_i, \overline{G}_i + \overline{\Delta}_i) \stackrel{\text{cbir}}{\sim} \mathrm{Src}(\overline{X}_j, \overline{G}_j + \overline{\Delta}_j). \quad (8.1)$$

Now, if the images intersect, then there exist prime divisors $\overline{F}_i \subset \overline{G}_i$ and $\overline{F}_j \subset \overline{G}_j$ such that the involution $\tau : \overline{G}^n \rightarrow \overline{G}^n$ interchanges \overline{F}_i^n and \overline{F}_j^n . By [Kol16, Thm. 1.6],

$$\mathrm{Src}(\overline{X}_i, \overline{G}_i + \overline{\Delta}_i) \cong \mathrm{Src}(\overline{F}_i^n, \mathrm{Diff}_{\overline{F}_i^n}(\overline{G}_i + \overline{\Delta}_i - \overline{F}_i))$$

and the same holds for i replaced by j . Since

$$(\overline{F}_i^n, \mathrm{Diff}_{\overline{F}_i^n}(\overline{G}_i + \overline{\Delta}_i - \overline{F}_i)) \cong (\overline{F}_j^n, \mathrm{Diff}_{\overline{F}_j^n}(\overline{G}_j + \overline{\Delta}_j - \overline{F}_j))$$

by [Kol13, Prop. 5.12], we conclude that (8.1) holds. \square

Remark 8.3 (Structure). The source of a CY pair is either a klt CY pair or an equivalence class containing such a pair. Indeed, if (X, Δ) is klt, this is clear. If not, then the assumption that S is minimal and $K_S + \Delta_S \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} f^*(K_X + \Delta)|_S$ implies (S, Δ_S) is a klt CY pair.

Remark 8.4 (Surfaces). If (X, Δ) is a CY surface pair, then the source is either a point, the crepant birational equivalence class of a klt CY curve pair, or (X, Δ) . In each case, the source is a single log pair.

Definition 8.5 (Regularity). The *regularity* and *coregularity* of an slc CY pair is

$$\begin{aligned} \text{reg}(X, D) &:= \dim X - \dim \text{Src}(X, D) - 1 \\ \text{coreg}(X, D) &:= \dim \text{Src}(X, D) \end{aligned}$$

For notational purposes, it will be convenient to have both definitions.

When (X, Δ) is an lc CY pair that is not klt, the above definition of coregularity agrees with Shokurov's original definition, which is the dimension of the dual complex of the dlt modification [Sho00]. When (X, Δ) is klt, $\text{reg}(X, \Delta) = -1$, while it is $-\infty$ in *loc. cit.* The term *coregularity* arose in the work of Moraga and his coauthors [Mor22].

8.2. Behavior in families. We now analyze the behavior of the source and regularity in families. We begin with the following helpful lemma.

Lemma 8.6. *Let $(X, \Delta + D) \rightarrow C$ be a family of boundary polarized CY pairs over the germ of a smooth pointed curve $0 \in C$. If X is normal, then*

$$\text{Src}(0, X, \Delta + D + X_0) \stackrel{\text{cbir}}{\sim} \text{Src}(X_0, \Delta_0 + D_0).$$

In the above statement, $\text{Src}(0, X, \Delta + D_0 + X_0)$ denotes the source of $(X, \Delta + D_0 + X_0) \rightarrow C$ over 0, which is defined in [Kol16, Thm. 1] as the crepant birational equivalence class of a pair (S, Γ_S) , where $(Y, \Gamma_Y) \rightarrow (X, \Delta + D + X_0)$ is a dlt modification, $S \subset Y$ a minimal lc center dominating 0, and $\Gamma_S := \text{Diff}_S^*(\Gamma_Y)$. By [Kol16], it is well defined.

Proof. Fix an irreducible component $F \subset X_0$. Let $f : (Y, \Gamma_Y) \rightarrow (X, \Delta + D + X_0)$ be a dlt modification and $S \subset Y$ be a minimal lc center of (Y, Γ_Y) contained in $F_Y := f_*^{-1}(F)$. By definition, $(S, \Gamma_S) \in \text{Src}(0, X, \Delta + D)$. Note that

$$(F_Y, \text{Diff}_{F_Y}(\Gamma_Y - F_Y)) \rightarrow (F^n, \text{Diff}_{F^n}(\Delta + D + X_0 - F)) \quad (8.2)$$

is a dlt modification, since the morphism is crepant by [Kol13, Prop. 4.6] and adjunction [Kol13, Thm. 4.19] implies $(F_Y, \text{Diff}_{F_Y}(\Gamma_Y - F_Y))$ is dlt. Since $(F^n, \text{Diff}_{F^n}(\Delta + D + X_0 - F))$ is a component of the normalization of $(X_0, \Delta_0 + D_0)$, (S, Γ_S) is a source of $(X_0, \Delta_0 + D_0)$. \square

Proposition 8.7. *If $(X, \Delta + D)$ and $(X', \Delta' + D')$ are S -equivalent boundary polarized CY pairs, then $\text{Src}(X, \Delta + D) \stackrel{\text{cbir}}{\sim} \text{Src}(X', \Delta' + D')$.*

Proof. It suffices to show that if $(\mathcal{X}, \Delta + \mathcal{D}) \rightarrow \mathbb{A}^1$ is a test configuration of $(X, \Delta + D)$, then $\text{Src}(X, \Delta + D) \stackrel{\text{cbir}}{\sim} \text{Src}(\mathcal{X}_0, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}_0} + \mathcal{D}_0)$. If X is normal, then

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Src}(X, \Delta + D) \stackrel{\text{cbir}}{\sim} \text{Src}(0, X_{\mathbb{A}^1}, \Delta_{\mathbb{A}^1} + D_{\mathbb{A}^1} + X \times 0) \\ \stackrel{\text{cbir}}{\sim} \text{Src}(0, \mathcal{X}, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}} + \mathcal{D} + \mathcal{X}_0) \stackrel{\text{cbir}}{\sim} \text{Src}(\mathcal{X}_0, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}_0} + \mathcal{D}_0), \end{aligned}$$

Indeed, the first and third equivalence hold by Lemma 8.6. For the second, note that $(X_{\mathbb{A}^1}, \Delta_{\mathbb{A}^1} + D_{\mathbb{A}^1} + X \times 0)$ and $(\mathcal{X}, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}} + \mathcal{D} + \mathcal{X}_0)$ are crepant birational by Lemma 2.10. Thus [Kol13, Thm. 4.45.7] implies their sources over 0 are equal.

If X is not normal, then the normalization $(\overline{\mathcal{X}}, \overline{\mathcal{G}} + \Delta_{\overline{\mathcal{X}}} + \overline{\mathcal{D}})$ of $(\mathcal{X}, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}} + \mathcal{D})$ is a test configuration of $(\overline{X}, \overline{G} + \overline{\Delta} + \overline{D})$. Note that

$$\mathrm{Src}(X, \Delta + D) \stackrel{\mathrm{cbir}}{\sim} \mathrm{Src}(\overline{X}, \overline{G} + \overline{\Delta} + \overline{D}) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathrm{Src}(\mathcal{X}_0, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}_0} + \mathcal{D}_0) \stackrel{\mathrm{cbir}}{\sim} \mathrm{Src}(\overline{\mathcal{X}}_0, \overline{\mathcal{G}}_0 + \Delta_{\overline{\mathcal{X}}_0} + \overline{\mathcal{D}}_0).$$

Indeed, the first relation follows from the definition of source, and the second from the fact that $(\mathcal{X}_0, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}_0} + \mathcal{D}_0)$ and $(\overline{\mathcal{X}}_0, \overline{\mathcal{G}}_0 + \Delta_{\overline{\mathcal{X}}_0} + \overline{\mathcal{D}}_0)$ have the same normalization. Hence, the case when X is normal implies the non-normal case. \square

Proposition 8.8. *If $(X, \Delta + D) \rightarrow B$ is a family of boundary polarized CY pairs over a reduced finite type scheme B , then the function*

$$B \ni b \mapsto \mathrm{reg}(X_b, \Delta_b + D_b) \in \mathbb{Z}$$

is constructible and upper semi-continuous.

Proof. To prove the proposition, it suffices to verify the following statements.

- (1) There exists a non-empty open set $B^\circ \subset B$ such that $\mathrm{reg}(X_b, \Delta_b + D_b)$ is independent of $b \in B^\circ$.
- (2) If B is a curve and $b \in B$, then $\mathrm{reg}(X_b, \Delta_b + D_b) \geq \mathrm{reg}(X_{K(B)}, \Delta_{K(B)})$.

Indeed, (1) implies constructibility and (2) then implies upper-semicontinuity.

We first verify (1) in the case when X is normal. By replacing B with a non-empty open subset, we may assume B is smooth. The latter implies $(X, \Delta + D)$ is an lc pair by Lemma 2.7. Thus there exists a dlt modification $(Y, \Gamma_Y) \rightarrow (X, \Delta + D)$. Now fix an lc center $S \subset Y$ of (Y, Γ_Y) , which is minimal among those dominating B . There exists an open set $B^\circ \subset B$, such that $(Y_b, \Gamma_{Y_b} := \Gamma_Y|_{Y_b}) \rightarrow (X_b, \Delta_b + D_b)$ is a dlt modification for each $b \in B^\circ$. Furthermore, after shrinking B° , S_b is a union of minimal lc centers of (Y_b, Δ_b) of dimension $\dim(S) - \dim(B)$. Hence $\mathrm{reg}(X_b) = \dim(X) - \dim(S) - 1$ for $b \in B^\circ$, which proves (1) when X is normal.

If X is not normal, let $(\overline{X}, \overline{G} + \overline{\Delta} + \overline{D})$ denote the normalization of $(X, \Delta + D)$. There exists an open set $U \subset B$ such $(\overline{X}_U, \overline{G}_U + \overline{\Delta}_U + \overline{D}_U) \rightarrow U$ is a family of boundary polarized CY pairs and $(\overline{X}_b, \overline{G}_b + \overline{\Delta}_b + \overline{D}_b)$ is the normalization of $(X_b, \Delta_b + D_b)$ for each $b \in U$. Hence applying the normal case to the family of over U completes the proof of (1).

For (2), it suffices to prove the result when X is normal. Indeed, the reduction step to the normal case is similar to the last paragraph of the proof of Proposition 8.7.

Assume X is normal. If $(X_\eta, \Delta_\eta + D_\eta)$ is klt, then there is nothing to prove, since $\mathrm{reg}(X_0, \Delta_0 + D_0) = -1$. If not, then choose a dlt modification $(Y, \Gamma_Y) \rightarrow (X, \Delta + D + X_0)$ and a minimal lc center $S \subset Y$ of (Y, Γ_Y) dominating C . Since $S \cap Y_0 \neq \emptyset$, there exists an irreducible component $F \subset Y_0$ with $S \cap F \neq \emptyset$. Since F is an lc center of (Y, Γ_Y) , $S \cap F$ is an lc center of (Y, Γ_Y) as well, and, hence, there is a minimal lc center T of (Y, Δ_Y) with $T \subset S \cap F$. Now observe

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{coreg}(X_0, \Delta_0 + D_0) &= \dim(\mathrm{Src}(X_0, \Delta_0 + D_0)) = \dim(\mathrm{Src}(0, X, \Delta + D + X_0)) \\ &= \dim T \leq \dim S - 1 = \dim S_\eta = \mathrm{coreg}(X_\eta, \Delta_\eta + D_\eta), \end{aligned}$$

where the second equality holds by Lemma 8.6. \square

8.3. Regularity 0 pairs. In this section, we study regularity 0 pairs. Under mild hypotheses, we prove that they are parametrized by a good moduli space (Theorem 8.15).

8.3.1. *Properties.*

Lemma 8.9. *If $(X, \Delta + D)$ is an lc regularity 0 boundary polarized CY pair, then*

- (1) $(X, \Delta + D)$ has at most two lc places and
- (2) (X, Δ) has at most one lc place.

If $(X, \Delta + (1 + \varepsilon)D)$ is lc for $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$ as well, then $(X, \Delta + D)$ has exactly one lc place.

Proof. Let $(Y, \Gamma_Y) \rightarrow (X, \Delta + D)$ be a dlt modification and $\Delta_Y \leq \Gamma_Y$ the \mathbb{Q} -divisor on Y such that $(Y, \Delta_Y) \rightarrow (X, \Delta)$ is also a dlt modification. Note that $\Gamma_Y^{\neq 1}$ is a union of non-intersecting prime divisors, since $\text{reg}(X, \Delta + D) = 0$.

Since $K_Y + \Gamma_Y \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0$, [Kol13, Prop. 4.37] implies $\Gamma_Y^{\neq 1}$ has at most two connected components and so (1) holds. Next, note that $-K_Y - \Delta_Y$ is big and nef, since it is the pullback $-K_X - \Delta$, which is ample. Thus $\Delta_Y^{\neq 1}$ is connected by [K⁺92, Thm. 17.4] and so (2) holds. If $(X, \Delta + (1 + \varepsilon)D)$ is lc for $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$, then the lc places of $(X, \Delta + D)$ are the same as those of (X, Δ) . Thus (2) implies the last statement. \square

Proposition 8.10. *If $(X, \Delta + D)$ is a regularity 0 boundary polarized CY pair, then*

- (1) X is normal or
- (2) X is non-normal, has at most two irreducible components, and the normalization $(\overline{X}, \overline{\Delta} + \overline{G})$ of (X, Δ) is plt.

Proof. If X is non-normal, then the normalization $(\overline{X}, \overline{G} + \overline{\Delta} + \overline{D}) = \sqcup_{i=1}^r (\overline{X}_i, \overline{G}_i + \overline{\Delta}_i + \overline{D}_i)$ is a union of regularity 0 boundary polarized CY pairs. By Lemma 8.9.2, each pair $(\overline{X}_i, \overline{G}_i + \overline{\Delta}_i)$ is plt and \overline{G}_i is prime. Since X is the gluing of the \overline{X}_i via an involution $\tau : \overline{G} \rightarrow \overline{G}$, the normalization \overline{X} has at most two components. \square

Proposition 8.11. *If $(X, \Delta + D)$ is a regularity 0 boundary polarized CY pair, then*

$$\text{Aut}^0(X, \Delta + D) \cong \mathbb{G}_m^r$$

for some $0 \leq r \leq 2$. Furthermore, when $r = 2$, $(X, \Delta + D)$ is polystable.

Proof. First, assume X is normal. By Theorem 6.5, $\text{Aut}^0(X, \Delta + D) \cong \mathbb{G}_m^r$ for some $r \geq 0$. Now, each $\rho \in N := \text{Hom}(\mathbb{G}_m, \text{Aut}^0(X, \Delta + D))$ induces a distinct product test configuration

$$(\mathcal{X}_\rho, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}_\rho} + \mathcal{D}_\rho) := (X, \Delta + D) \times \mathbb{A}^1,$$

and, hence, a \mathbb{Z} -valued divisorial valuation v_ρ satisfying $A_{X, \Delta + D}(v_\rho) = 0$ by Lemma 4.10. Thus $v_\rho = b_\rho \cdot \text{ord}_{E_\rho}$ for some $b_\rho \in \mathbb{N}$ and a divisor E_ρ over X that is an lc place of $(X, \Delta + D)$. Since the correspondence respects the scaling of test configurations and valuations,

$$\text{ord}_{E_\rho} = \text{ord}_{E_{\rho'}} \iff m\rho = m'\rho' \text{ for some } m, m' \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}.$$

Therefore, if $r \geq 2$, then there are infinitely many divisors E over X with $A_{X, \Delta + D}(E) = 0$. Since the latter cannot occur by Lemma 8.9.2, $r \leq 1$ when X is normal.

Next, assume X is not normal. By the normal case and Proposition 8.10, $\text{Aut}(\overline{X}, \overline{G} + \overline{\Delta} + \overline{D})$ is a torus of rank at most two. Since there is an injection

$$\text{Aut}^0(X, \Delta + D) \hookrightarrow \text{Aut}^0(\overline{X}, \overline{G} + \overline{\Delta} + \overline{D}),$$

$\text{Aut}^0(X, \Delta + D)$ is also a torus of rank at most two.

Finally, we analyze the case when $\text{Aut}^0(X, \Delta + D) \cong \mathbb{G}_m^2$. If $(X, \Delta + D) \rightsquigarrow (X_0, \Delta_0 + D_0)$ is a weakly special degeneration, then $\text{reg}(X_0, \Delta_0 + D_0) = 0$ by Proposition 8.7 and, hence, $\text{Aut}^0(X_0, \Delta_0 + D_0)$ is a torus of rank at most two. Thus Proposition 6.6 implies $(X, \Delta + D) \cong (X_0, \Delta_0 + D_0)$. Therefore $(X, \Delta + D)$ is polystable as in Definition 6.12. \square

Proposition 8.12. *If $(X, \Delta + D)$ is a regularity 0 boundary polarized CY pair such that $(X, \Delta + (1 + \varepsilon)D)$ is lc for $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$, then the test configurations of $(X, \Delta + D)$ are*

- (1) the trivial test configuration and
- (2) $(\mathcal{X}_F, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}_F} + \mathcal{D}_F)$, where \mathcal{X}_F denotes the test configuration induced by the unique lc place F of (X, Δ) , as well as its base changes by $\mathbb{A}^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{A}^1$ sending $t \mapsto t^c$.

Proof. Fix a test configuration $(\mathcal{X}, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}} + D)$ of $(X, \Delta + D)$ and $r > 0$ such that $L := -r(K_X + \Delta)$ is a Cartier divisor. By Lemma 4.7, the induced \mathbb{Z} -filtration \mathcal{F}^\bullet of $H^0(X, mL)$ satisfies

$$\mathcal{F}^\lambda H^0(X, mL) := \bigcap_{E \subset \mathcal{X}_0} \{s \in H^0(X, mL) \mid v_E(s) \geq \lambda + A_{X, \Delta}(v_E)\},$$

and $A_{X, \Delta + D}(v_E) = 0$ for each $E \subset \mathcal{X}_0$. Thus $v_E = c_E \cdot \text{ord}_F$ for some integer $c_E \geq 0$ by Lemma 8.9. Hence, if we set $c := \max\{c_E \mid E \subset \mathcal{X}_0\}$, then

$$\mathcal{F}^\lambda H^0(X, mL) = \{s \in H^0(X, mL) \mid c \cdot \text{ord}_F(s) \geq \lambda\}$$

If $c = 0$, then (1) holds. If $c > 0$, then (2) holds using the bijection in Theorem 4.8. \square

8.3.2. Boundedness of degenerations.

Proposition 8.13. *Let \mathfrak{F} be a set of regularity 0 boundary polarized CY pairs $(X, \Delta + D)$ satisfying $(X, \Delta + (1 + \varepsilon)D)$ is slc for $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$. Consider the set of weakly special degenerations of elements in \mathfrak{F} :*

$$\overline{\mathfrak{F}} := \{(X_0, \Delta_0 + D_0) \mid \exists (X, \Delta + D) \in \mathfrak{F} \text{ and w.s. degeneration } (X, \Delta + D) \rightsquigarrow (X_0, \Delta_0 + D_0)\}$$

If \mathfrak{F} is bounded, then $\overline{\mathfrak{F}}$ is bounded.

Before proving the statement, we verify the following lemma, which allows us to reduce to the case when the pairs are normal.

Lemma 8.14. *Let \mathfrak{F} be a set of regularity 0 boundary polarized CY pairs and set*

$$\mathfrak{F}^\nu := \{(\overline{X}, \overline{\Delta} + \overline{G} + \overline{D}) \mid (X, \Delta + D) \in \mathfrak{F}\}.$$

If \mathfrak{F}^ν is bounded, then \mathfrak{F} is bounded.

Proof. The subset of \mathfrak{F} consisting of the lc pairs is bounded since it is contained in \mathfrak{F}^ν . Thus we may assume each pair in \mathfrak{F} is not lc.

For any pair $(X, \Delta + D) \in \mathfrak{F}$, the normalization $(\overline{X}, \overline{G} + \overline{\Delta} + \overline{D})$ is a union of at most two lc boundary polarized CY pairs and the pair $(\overline{X}, \overline{G} + \overline{\Delta})$ is plt by Proposition 8.10. Thus G is normal by [KM98, Prop. 5.51]. Let $\tau : \overline{G} \rightarrow \overline{G}$ denote the induced generically fixed point free involution fixing $\text{Diff}_{\overline{G}}(\overline{\Delta})$ and $\text{Diff}_{\overline{G}}(\overline{\Delta} + \overline{D})$. By [Kol13, Prop. 5.3], $(\overline{X}, \overline{G} + \overline{\Delta} + \overline{D}, \tau)$ uniquely determines $(X, \Delta + D)$. We will now parametrize such triples.

Claim: There exists a triple $(Y, P + \Gamma + B, \Phi) \rightarrow S$ such that

- (i) $(Y, P + \Gamma + B) \rightarrow S$ is a family of not necessarily connected lc boundary polarized CY pairs over a smooth finite type scheme S ,
- (ii) P is a \mathbb{Z} -divisor and is normal,
- (iii) $\Phi : P \rightarrow P$ is an involution over S that is generically fixed point free and fixes $\text{Diff}_P(\Gamma)$ and $\text{Diff}_P(\Gamma + B)$, and
- (iv) if $(X, \Delta + D) \in \mathfrak{F}$, then there is $s \in S$ such that $(Y_s, P_s + \Gamma_s + B_s, \Phi_s) \cong (\overline{X}, \overline{G} + \overline{\Delta} + \overline{D}, \tau)$.

Proof of Claim. Since \mathfrak{F}^ν is bounded, there exists a family of boundary polarized CY pairs $(Y, P + \Gamma + B) \rightarrow S$ over a smooth finite type scheme S such that if $(\overline{X}, \overline{G} + \overline{\Delta} + \overline{D}) \in \mathfrak{F}^\nu$, then there is $s \in S$ such that $(Y_s, P_s + \Gamma_s + B_s) \cong (\overline{X}, \overline{G} + \overline{\Delta} + \overline{D})$. By replacing S with a disjoint union of locally closed subsets, we may assume $(Y, \Gamma + P + B) \rightarrow S$ is a family of possibly disconnected regularity 0 lc boundary polarized CY pairs and P is a \mathbb{Z} -divisor.

Next, consider the scheme $\text{Isom}_S(P, P)$, which is a countable union of quasi-projective schemes. Since $-K_{P/S} - \text{Diff}_P(\Gamma) \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} -(K_{Y/S} + P + \Gamma)|_P$ is ample over S , the subscheme of $\text{Isom}_S(P, P)$ fixing $\text{Diff}_P(\Gamma)$ is quasi-projective over S . Thus the locus parametrizing generically fixed point free involutions that fix $\text{Diff}_P(\Gamma)$ and $\text{Diff}_P(\Gamma + B)$ is a quasi-projective scheme $S_1 \subset \text{Isom}_S(P, P)$. Replacing S with S_1 and $(Y, P + \Gamma + B) \rightarrow S$ with its base change by S_1 produces a triple satisfying (i), (iii), and (iv), except the smoothness of S . By replacing S with a disjoint union of locally closed

subschemes, which are smooth varieties, we may assume S is smooth. Since $(Y_s, P_s + \Gamma_s + B_s)$ has regularity 0 for each $s \in S$, the pair $(Y_s, P_s + \Gamma_s)$ is plt by Proposition 8.10. Hence P_s is normal for each $s \in S$. Thus, after replacing S with a disjoint union of locally closed subsets, we may assume (ii) holds, which completes the proof of the claim.

Consider a triple $(Y, P + \Gamma + B, \Phi) \rightarrow S$ satisfying the claim. Since S is smooth, $(Y, \Gamma + P + B)$ is an lc pair by Lemma 2.7. Let $R(\phi) \subset X \times_S X$ denote the equivalence relation on X induced by Φ . The involution $\Phi : P \rightarrow P$ induces a finite equivalence relation on Y . By [Kol13, Cor. 5.51], there is a demi-normal pair $(\tilde{Y}, \tilde{\Gamma} + \tilde{B})$ over S with normalization $(Y, P + \Gamma + B)$ and \tilde{Y} is the geometric quotient of Y by the equivalence relation. Now, if $(X, \Delta + D) \in \mathfrak{F}$, then (iv) implies $(Y_s, P_s + \Gamma_s + B_s, \Phi_s) \cong (\overline{X}, \overline{G} + \overline{\Delta} + \overline{D}, \tau)$. Hence $(\tilde{Y}_s, \tilde{\Gamma}_s + \tilde{B}_s) \cong (X, \Delta + D)$. In conclusion, \mathfrak{F} is bounded. \square

Proof of Proposition 8.13. We first prove the proposition when each pair $(X, \Delta + D) \in \mathfrak{F}$ is normal. Since \mathfrak{F} is bounded, there exists a family of boundary polarized CY pairs $(Y, \Gamma + B) \rightarrow S$ over a smooth finite type scheme S such that if $(X, \Delta + D) \in \mathfrak{F}$, then there is $s \in S$ such that $(Y_s, \Gamma_s + B_s) \cong (X, \Delta + D)$. After replacing S with a disjoint union of locally closed subsets, we may assume $(Y, \Gamma + B) \rightarrow S$ is a family of regularity 0 lc boundary polarized CY pairs that satisfy $(Y_s, \Gamma_s + (1 + \varepsilon)B_s)$ is lc for $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$ and $s \in S$.

We claim that after replacing S with a disjoint union of locally closed sets, there exists a family of non-trivial test configurations $(\mathcal{Y}, \Gamma_{\mathcal{Y}} + \mathcal{B}) \rightarrow \mathbb{A}_S^1$ of $(Y, \Gamma + B) \rightarrow S$. By Noetherian induction, it suffices to show that there exists a non-empty open set $U \subset S$ and a family of non-trivial test configurations $(\mathcal{Y}_U, \Gamma_{\mathcal{Y}_U} + \mathcal{B}_U) \rightarrow \mathbb{A}_U^1$ of $(Y_U, \Gamma_U + B_U)$. To verify the latter, fix a generic point $g \in S$. By Proposition 8.12, $(Y_g, \Gamma_g + B_g)$ admits a non-trivial test configuration $(\mathcal{Y}_g, \Gamma_{\mathcal{Y}_g} + \mathcal{B}_g)$. Lemma 4.13 implies the test configuration extends to a family of non-trivial test configurations $(\mathcal{Y}_U, \Gamma_{\mathcal{Y}_U} + \mathcal{B}_U) \rightarrow \mathbb{A}_U^1$ of $(Y_U, \Gamma_U + B_U)$ over an open set $g \in U \subset S$. Therefore the claim holds.

To finish the proof in the normal case, it suffices to show that every element of \mathfrak{F} is a fiber of $(\mathcal{Y}, \Gamma_{\mathcal{Y}} + \mathcal{B}) \rightarrow \mathbb{A}_S^1$. This is clear, since if $(X, \Delta + D) \in \mathfrak{F}$, then there exists $s \in S$ such that $(X, \Delta + D) \cong (Y_s, \Gamma_s + B_s)$ and a non-trivial test configuration $(\mathcal{Y}_s, \Gamma_{\mathcal{Y}_s} + \mathcal{B}_s)$ of the latter pair. If $(X, \Delta + D) \rightsquigarrow (X_0, \Delta_0 + D_0)$ is a weakly special degeneration, then Proposition 8.12 implies $(X_0, \Delta_0 + D_0)$ must be isomorphic to a fiber of $(\mathcal{Y}_s, \Gamma_{\mathcal{Y}_s} + \mathcal{B}_s) \rightarrow \mathbb{A}^1$.

We will now deduce the full result from the normal case. By the normal case, we may assume the elements of \mathfrak{F} are non-normal pairs. Consider the set of pairs defined by normalization

$$\mathfrak{F}^n := \{(\overline{X}, \overline{\Delta} + \overline{G} + \overline{D}) \mid (X, \Delta + D) \in \mathfrak{F}\} \quad (\overline{\mathfrak{F}})^n := \{(\overline{X}, \overline{\Delta} + \overline{G} + \overline{D}) \mid (X, \Delta + D) \in \overline{\mathfrak{F}}\}.$$

Since \mathfrak{F} is bounded, \mathfrak{F}^n is bounded. By the normal case, the set $\widetilde{\mathfrak{F}}^n$ consisting of weakly special degenerations of pairs in \mathfrak{F}^n , as well as their normalizations, is bounded. Since $(\overline{\mathfrak{F}})^n \subset \widetilde{\mathfrak{F}}^n$, it follows that $(\overline{\mathfrak{F}})^n$ is bounded. Hence $\overline{\mathfrak{F}}$ is bounded by Lemma 8.14. \square

8.3.3. Moduli of regularity 0 pairs. In this section, we study the substack

$$\mathcal{M}(\chi, N, \mathbf{r})^{\text{reg} \leq 0} \subset \mathcal{M}(\chi, N, \mathbf{r})$$

consisting of families $(X, \Delta + D) \rightarrow B$ such that $\text{reg}(X_b, \Delta_b + D_b) \leq 0$ for all $b \in B$. Note that the substack is open by Proposition 8.8. The following theorem shows that regularity ≤ 0 pairs admit a good moduli theory.

Theorem 8.15. *If $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathcal{M}(\chi, N, \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{c})$ is an open, finite type substack, then*

$$\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\text{reg} \leq 0} := \overline{\mathcal{M}} \cap \mathcal{M}(\chi, N, \mathbf{r})^{\text{reg} \leq 0}$$

- (1) *is a finite type algebraic stack with affine diagonal and*
- (2) *admits a separated good moduli space.*

Here $\overline{\mathcal{M}}$ denotes the stack theoretic closure of \mathcal{M} and we moreover denote $\mathcal{M}^{\text{reg}\leq 0} := \mathcal{M} \cap \mathcal{M}(\chi, N, \mathbf{r})^{\text{reg}\leq 0}$. To prove Theorem 8.15.1, we first verify the following boundedness result, which relies on Proposition 8.13 and [KX20].

Proposition 8.16. *With the notation and assumptions in Theorem 8.15, the set of pairs $\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\text{reg}\leq 0}(\mathbb{k})$ is bounded.*

Proof. The proof uses the substack $\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\text{KSBA}} \subset \overline{\mathcal{M}}$ consisting of $(X, \Delta + D) \rightarrow B$ in $\overline{\mathcal{M}}$ such that, for each $b \in B$, $(X_b, \Delta_b + (1 + \varepsilon)D_b) \rightarrow B$ is slc for $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$. Note that the substack

- (i) is open by the openness of slc singularities [Kol23, Cor. 4.45],
- (ii) satisfies the the valuative criterion of properness [KX20, Lem. 7], and
- (iii) and is finite type by [KX20, Thm. 2].

Note that (iii) follows from [KX20], since $\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\text{KSBA}}$ has finitely many irreducible components by the assumption that \mathcal{M} is finite type. (This statements also follows from the stronger boundedness result in [Bir22, Cor. 1.8]).

We will first prove the proposition under the assumption that $\mathcal{M} \subset \overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\text{KSBA}}$. Since $\mathfrak{F} := \mathcal{M}^{\text{reg}\leq 0}(\mathbb{k})$ and the above assumption holds, Proposition 8.13 implies

$$\overline{\mathfrak{F}} := \{(X_0, \Delta_0 + D_0) \mid \exists (X, \Delta + D) \in \mathfrak{F} \text{ and a w.s. degeneration } (X, \Delta + D) \rightsquigarrow (X_0, \Delta_0 + D_0)\},$$

is bounded. Thus, by Lemma 3.12, there exist positive integers k and c such that

$$(\dagger) \quad -k(K_X + \Delta) \text{ is very ample Cartier divisor and } \deg(\Delta) \leq c$$

for every if $(X, \Delta + D)$ in $\overline{\mathfrak{F}}$.

We will show every pair in $\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\text{reg}\leq 0}(\mathbb{k})$ satisfies (\dagger) . Fix a pair $(X, \Delta + D)$ in $\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\text{reg}\leq 0}(\mathbb{k})$. Since the pair is in the closure of \mathcal{M} , there exists a family

$$(Y, \Gamma + G) \rightarrow C$$

in $\overline{\mathcal{M}}$ over a pointed curve $0 \in C$ such that the generic fiber $(Y_\eta, \Gamma_\eta + G_\eta)$ is in \mathcal{M} , and $(Y_0, \Gamma_0 + G_0) \cong (X, \Delta + D)$. Using that $\mathcal{M} \subset \overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\text{KSBA}}$ and (iii), after possibly replacing $0 \in C$ by a finite cover, there exists a family

$$(Y', \Gamma' + G') \rightarrow C$$

in $\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\text{KSBA}}$ such that $(Y_\eta, \Gamma_\eta + G_\eta) \cong (Y'_\eta, \Gamma'_\eta + G'_\eta)$. Thus Corollary 1.2 implies that there exist weakly special degenerations to a boundary polarized CY pair:

$$(X, \Delta + D) \rightsquigarrow (X_0, \Delta_0 + D_0) \leftarrow (Y'_\kappa, \Gamma'_\kappa + G'_\kappa).$$

Since $(X_0, \Delta_0 + D_0)$ is in $\overline{\mathfrak{F}}$, $(X_0, \Delta_0 + D_0)$ satisfies (\dagger) and so $(X, \Delta + D)$ satisfies (\dagger) by Proposition 3.5. Therefore $\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\text{reg}\leq 0}(\mathbb{k})$ is bounded by Lemma 3.12.

We will now deduce the full result from the above special case. Since $\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{k})$ is bounded, Proposition 3.12 implies that there exist integers $k', c' > 0$ such that

$$(\dagger') \quad -k'(K_X + \Delta) \text{ is a very ample Cartier divisor and } \deg(\Delta) \leq c'.$$

holds for every $(X, \Delta + D)$ in $\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{k})$. Consider the morphism of stacks

$$j : \mathcal{M}(\chi, N, \mathbf{r}) \longrightarrow \mathcal{M}(\chi, Nk', (r, s/k'))$$

defined by modifying the markings of the boundary divisors by sending

$$[(X, r\Delta^{\text{div}}, sD^{\text{div}}) \rightarrow B] \longmapsto [(X, r\Delta^{\text{div}}, \frac{s}{k'}(k'D^{\text{div}})) \rightarrow B].$$

Let $\mathcal{M}' \subset \mathcal{M}(\chi, Nk', (r, s/k'))$ denote the finite type open substack consisting of families $(X, \Delta + D) \rightarrow B$ such that, for each $b \in B$, $(X_b, \Delta_b + D_b)$ satisfies (\dagger') and $(X_b, \Delta_b + (1 + \varepsilon)D_b)$ is slc for $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$. Since $\mathcal{M}' \subset \overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\text{KSBA}}$, the previous case implies $\overline{\mathcal{M}}'^{\text{reg}\leq 0}(\mathbb{k})$ is bounded.

To finish the proof, note that: if $(X, \Delta + D)$ is in $\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{k})$, then

- $D \in \frac{1}{Nm} | - Nm(K_X + \Delta) |$ and
- $(X, \Delta + H)$ is in $\mathcal{M}'(\mathbb{k})$ for general $H \in \frac{1}{Nm} | - Nm(K_X + \Delta) |$.

Thus $j(\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{k})) \subset \overline{\mathcal{M}}'(\mathbb{k})$ and so $j(\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\text{reg} \leq 0}(\mathbb{k})) \subset \overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\text{reg} \leq 0}(\mathbb{k})$. Therefore $\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\text{reg} \leq 0}(\mathbb{k})$ is bounded. \square

Proof of Theorem 8.15. Since $\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\text{reg} \leq 0}$ is a locally closed substack of $\mathcal{M}(\chi, N, \mathbf{r})$, $\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\text{reg} \leq 0}$ is a locally finite type algebraic stack with affine diagonal by Theorem 3.7. Using Proposition 8.16, we see $\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\text{reg} \leq 0}$ is of finite type and so (1) holds.

To verify (2) and (3), let R be a DVR essentially of finite type over \mathbb{k} . Set

$$S := \text{Spec}(R[s, t]/(st - \pi)) \quad \text{or} \quad S := \text{Spec}(R[t]),$$

where \mathbb{G}_m -acts on S with weights 1 and -1 on s and t , respectively. Let $0 \in S$ denote the unique closed point fixed by \mathbb{G}_m and $S^\circ := S \setminus 0$. Given a \mathbb{G}_m -equivariant family $(X^\circ, \Delta^\circ + D^\circ) \rightarrow S^\circ$ in $\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\text{reg} \leq 0}$, Theorem 5.4 implies the existence of a unique \mathbb{G}_m -equivariant extension $(X, \Delta + D) \rightarrow S$ in $\overline{\mathcal{M}}$. Since the restriction of the family to $\{s = 0\} \hookrightarrow S$ is a test configuration and the fiber over $1 \in \mathbb{A}_\kappa^1$ has regularity at most 0, Proposition 8.7 implies the fiber over $0 \in \mathbb{A}_\kappa^1$ has regularity at most 0. Thus the extension is in $\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\text{reg} \leq 0}$ and so $\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\text{reg} \leq 0}$ is S -complete and Θ -reductive with respect to essentially finite type DVRs. Theorem 2.29 now implies (2) holds. \square

8.4. Coregularity 0 pairs. We now prove a degeneration result for coregularity 0 pairs. The result will play an important role in Section 10 and Appendix B.

Proposition 8.17. *If $(X, \Delta + D)$ is an lc boundary polarized CY pair of coregularity 0, then there exists a weakly special degeneration $(X, \Delta + D) \rightsquigarrow (X_0, \Delta_0 + D_0)$ such that*

$$(\overline{X}_0, \overline{G}_0 + \overline{\Delta}_0 + \overline{D}_0) \overset{\text{cbir}}{\sim} (\mathbb{P}_{x_i}^n, \{x_0 \cdots x_n = 0\}).$$

In particular, $K_{\overline{X}_0} + \overline{G}_0 + \overline{\Delta}_0 + \overline{D}_0 \sim 0$ and $\Delta_0 + D_0$ is a \mathbb{Z} -divisor.

Proof. Fix a dlt modification $f : (Y, \Gamma_Y) \rightarrow (X, \Delta + D)$ and minimal lc center $Z \subset Y$ of (Y, Γ_Y) . Since $\text{coreg}(X, \Delta + D) = 0$, Z is a point. Let $F \subset B_Z Y \rightarrow Z$ denote the blowup of Y along Z with exceptional divisor F . Since F is an lc place of $(X, \Delta + D)$, there exists a test configuration $(\mathcal{X}, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}} + \mathcal{D}) \rightarrow \mathbb{A}^1$ of $(X, \Delta + D)$ such that $v_{\mathcal{X}_0} = \text{ord}_F$ by Theorem 4.8. Now consider the sequence of birational maps

$$\mathcal{Y} := B_{Z \times 0}(Y \times \mathbb{A}^1) \xrightarrow{g} Y \times \mathbb{A}^1 \xrightarrow{f_{\mathbb{A}^1}} X \times \mathbb{A}^1 \dashrightarrow \mathcal{X}.$$

Let $\mathcal{E} \subset \mathcal{Y}$ denote the exceptional divisor of g . By Section 4.1, \mathcal{X}_0 is the birational transform of \mathcal{E} on \mathcal{X} and $\Gamma_{\mathcal{Y}} := g_*^{-1}(\Gamma_Y \times \mathbb{A}^1 + Y \times 0)$. Since $Z \times 0$ is a 0-dimensional lc place of the dlt pair $(Y \times \mathbb{A}^1, \Gamma_Y \times \mathbb{A}^1 + Y \times 0)$,

$$K_{\mathcal{Y}} + \Gamma_{\mathcal{Y}} + \mathcal{E} = g^*(K_{Y \times \mathbb{A}^1} + \Gamma_Y \times \mathbb{A}^1 + Y \times 0)$$

and $(\mathcal{E}, \Gamma_{\mathcal{Y}}|_{\mathcal{E}}) \cong (\mathbb{P}^n, \{x_0 \cdots x_n = 0\})$. Thus the two maps

$$(\mathcal{Y}, \Gamma_{\mathcal{Y}} + \mathcal{E}) \rightarrow (X \times \mathbb{A}^1, \Delta \times \mathbb{A}^1 + D \times \mathbb{A}^1 + X \times 0) \dashrightarrow (\mathcal{X}, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}} + \mathcal{D} + \mathcal{X}_0)$$

are crepant birational; for the second map see Lemma 2.10.1. Thus [Kol13, Prop. 4.6] implies $(\mathcal{E}, \Gamma_{\mathcal{Y}}|_{\mathcal{E}}) \dashrightarrow (\overline{X}_0, \overline{G}_0 + \overline{\Delta}_0 + \overline{D}_0)$ is crepant birational, which proves the first statement. The second statement follows from the first. \square

As a consequence of the proposition, we deduce the following sufficient condition for a boundary polarized pair to have positive coregularity.

Proposition 8.18. *Let $(X, \Delta + D)$ be a boundary polarized CY pair with Δ a \mathbb{Z} -divisor.*

If there exists a rational number $r > 0$ such that $D = rD'$ for some \mathbb{Z} -divisor D' and $1 \notin r\mathbb{Z}$, then $\text{coreg}(X, \Delta + D) > 0$.

Proof. By taking the normalization, we may assume $(X, \Delta + D)$ is lc. If $\text{coreg}(X, \Delta + D) = 0$, then Proposition 8.17 implies that there exists a weakly special degeneration

$$(X, \Delta + D) \rightsquigarrow (X_0, \Delta_0 + D_0)$$

such that $\Delta_0 + D_0$ has coefficient 1 on each prime divisor in its support. Since Δ_0 is a \mathbb{Z} -divisor and $(X_0, \Delta_0 + D_0)$ is slc, D_0 must also be a reduced \mathbb{Z} -divisor. Since $D_0 = rD'_0$ for some \mathbb{Z} -divisor D'_0 , $1 \in r\mathbb{Z}$, which is a contradiction. \square

9. MODULI STACKS OF PLANE CURVES

In this section, we define the moduli stack $\mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY}}$, as well as its various open substacks defined using KSBA stability, K-stability, regularity, and index of the canonical divisor. When $3 \nmid d$, we show $\mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY}}$ admits a proper good moduli space in Theorem 9.17.

9.1. Moduli stack. To a smooth plane curve $C \subset \mathbb{P}^2$ of degree $d \geq 3$, we associate a boundary polarized CY pair $(\mathbb{P}^2, \Delta + D)$, where $\Delta = 1 \cdot \emptyset$ and $D := \frac{3}{d}C$. Note that

$$N_d(K_{\mathbb{P}^2} + \frac{3}{d}C) \sim 0, \quad \text{where } N_d := \begin{cases} \frac{d}{3} & \text{if } 3 \mid d \\ d & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

We will proceed to define a stack parametrizing such pairs and their slc degenerations.

Definition 9.1 (Stack of smooth plane curves). Let $\chi(m) := \chi(\mathbb{P}^2, \omega_{\mathbb{P}^2}^{[-m]}) = \binom{3+m}{m}$. For each integer $d \geq 3$, let

$$\mathcal{P}_d \subset \mathcal{M}(\chi, N_d, (1, \frac{3}{d}))$$

denote the open substack consisting of families $(X, \Delta + D) \rightarrow B$ in $\mathcal{M}(\chi, N_d, (1, \frac{3}{d}))$ with $\Delta := 1 \cdot \emptyset$ and $D := \frac{3}{d}C$ such that X_b and C_b are smooth for all $b \in B$.

Since \mathbb{P}^2 is the only smooth del Pezzo surface with Hilbert function χ , if $(X, D) \rightarrow B$ is a family in \mathcal{P}_d and $b \in B$, then $X_{\bar{b}} \cong \mathbb{P}_{k(\bar{b})}^2$ and $C_{\bar{b}}$ is a smooth plane curve of degree d .

Definition 9.2 (Moduli of slc CY degenerations). Let $\mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY}} := \overline{\mathcal{P}_d}$, which denotes the stack theoretic closure of \mathcal{P}_d in $\mathcal{M}(\chi, d, (1, \frac{3}{d}))$.

For any $(X, \Delta + D) \rightarrow B$ in $\mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY}}$, the boundary $\Delta := 1 \cdot \emptyset$. Hence, we will from now on simply write $(X, D) \rightarrow B$ for the family.

Remark 9.3 (Points of the stack). A pair (X, D) is in $\mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY}}(\mathbb{k})$ if there exists a family of boundary polarized CY pairs $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{D}) \rightarrow T$ over the germ of a pointed curve $0 \in T$ such that the restriction to $T^\circ := T \setminus 0$ is a family in \mathcal{P}_d and $(\mathcal{X}_0, \mathcal{D}_0) \cong (X_0, D_0)$.

Example 9.4 (Boundedness fails). When $3 \mid d$, the stack $\mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY}}$ is not of finite type. This follows from either of the two examples, which shows $\mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY}}(\mathbb{k})$ is not bounded.

- (1) For positive integers a, b, c satisfying Markov's inequality, i.e. $a^2 + b^2 + c^2 = 3abc$, we claim that the toric pair with reduced toric boundary

$$(\mathbb{P}_{x,y,z}(a^2, b^2, c^2), \frac{3}{d}\{(xyz)^{d/3} = 0\})$$

is a \mathbb{k} -point of $\mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY}}$. Since the canonical divisor of $\mathbb{P}(a^2, b^2, c^2)$ has Cartier index abc , which is unbounded, $\mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY}}(\mathbb{k})$ is unbounded by [Bir19, Lem. 2.25].

The claim is a consequence of [Hac04, Thm. 8.3], which states that there is a projective family of klt pairs $X \rightarrow T$, over the germ of a smooth curve $0 \in T$, such that $X_0 \cong \mathbb{P}(a^2, b^2, c^2)$ and $X_t \cong \mathbb{P}^2$ for $t \neq 0$. Since

$$(X_0, \frac{3}{d}C_0) := (\mathbb{P}(a^2, b^2, c^2), \frac{3}{d}\{(xyz)^{d/3} = 0\}),$$

is a boundary polarized CY pair of index 1, Lemma 12.2 (proven in a later section) implies that C_0 extends to a divisor $C \subset X$ such that $(X, D := \frac{3}{d}C) \rightarrow T$ is a family of boundary polarized CY pairs with $K_{X/T} + D \sim 0$. Since $(X_{K(T)}, D_{K(T)})$ is in $\mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY}}$, so is (X_0, D_0) .

(2) When $3 \mid d$, methods from toric geometry produce weakly special degenerations

$$(\mathbb{P}^2, \frac{3}{d}\{(xyz)^{d/3} = 0\}) \rightsquigarrow (X_0, D_0)$$

such that X_0 is not irreducible and can have arbitrarily many irreducible components.

Related moduli stacks of plane curves have been studied in the canonically polarized KSBA setting by Hacking [Hac04] and in the log Fano K-moduli setting in [ADL19].

Definition 9.5. The *Hacking substack* $\mathcal{P}_d^{\text{H}} \subset \mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY}}$ is the substack consisting of $(X, D) \rightarrow B$ in $\mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY}}$ such that, for each $b \in B$, $(X_b, (1 + \varepsilon)D_b)$ is slc for $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$.

Theorem 9.6 ([Hac04]). *For each integer $d \geq 4$,*

- (1) \mathcal{P}_d^{H} is an open substack of $\mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY}}$ containing \mathcal{P}_d , and
- (2) \mathcal{P}_d^{H} is a finite type, proper Deligne–Mumford stack, and admits a projective coarse moduli space P_d^{H} .

Proof. Statement (1) follows from the openness of slc singularities [Kol23, Cor. 4.45] and the definition of slc. Statement (2) follows from [Hac04] and [KP17] for the projectivity. \square

In addition, Hacking [Hac04, Thm. 7.1] proved that if $3 \nmid d$, then the stack \mathcal{P}_d^{H} is smooth and the underlying surfaces X are either Manetti surfaces, i.e. a klt surface that admits a \mathbb{Q} -Gorenstein smoothing to \mathbb{P}^2 (see [Hac04, Def. 8.1] or [HP10, Cor. 1.2]), or unions of two normal surfaces glued along a smooth rational curve.

Definition 9.7. The *K-moduli substack* $\mathcal{P}_d^{\text{K}} \subset \mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY}}$ is the substack consisting of $(X, D) \rightarrow B$ in $\mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY}}$ such that, for each $b \in B$, $(X_b, (1 - \varepsilon)D_b)$ is a K-semistable log Fano pair for $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$.

We will explain in Remark 11.8 that the K-moduli substack \mathcal{P}_d^{K} agrees with the stack defined in [ADL19]. See [ADL19] for the definition of K-semistability. While the exact definition will play no role in this paper, we will frequently use that K-semistable log Fano pairs are klt by [Oda13b].

Theorem 9.8 ([ADL19]). *For each integer $d \geq 3$,*

- (1) \mathcal{P}_d^{K} is an open substack of $\mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY}}$ containing \mathcal{P}_d , and
- (2) \mathcal{P}_d^{K} is finite type and admits a projective good moduli space P_d^{K} .

Proof. Statement (1) follows from the openness of K-semistability in families of smoothable log Fano pairs in [ADL19, Cor. 3.17 & Prop. 4.6.3] (see also [BLX22, Xu20]). Statement (2) follows from [ADL19, Thm. 1.1 & 1.2] and [XZ20] for the projectivity party. \square

Remark 9.9. For a parameter $0 < c < \frac{3}{d}$, [ADL19] also constructs compactifications $\mathcal{P}_d \subset \mathcal{P}_{d,c}^{\text{K}}$ by viewing a smooth degree d plane curve $C \subset \mathbb{P}^2$ as a K-polystable log Fano pair (\mathbb{P}^2, cC) and using K-moduli theory to compactify the stack. The authors show $\mathcal{P}_{d,c}^{\text{K}}$ satisfies a wall-crossing framework as c varies and $\mathcal{P}_{d,c}^{\text{K}}$ parametrizes GIT semistable plane curves when $0 < c \ll \frac{3}{d}$.

Lemma 9.10. *If (X, D) is in $\mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY}}(\mathbb{k})$, then it is S-equivalent to a pair in $\mathcal{P}_d^{\text{K}}(\mathbb{k})$.*

Proof. Fix a family $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{D}) \rightarrow T$ in $\mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY}}$ over the germ of a curve $0 \in T$ such that $(X, D) \cong (\mathcal{X}_0, \mathcal{D}_0)$ and $(\mathcal{X}_K, \mathcal{D}_K) \in \mathcal{P}_d(K)$, where $K := K(T)$. By [ADL19, Thm. 3.19], after possibly replacing $0 \in T$ by a finite cover, there exists a family $(\mathcal{X}', \mathcal{D}') \rightarrow C$ in \mathcal{P}_d^{K} such that $(\mathcal{X}'_K, \mathcal{D}'_K) \cong (\mathcal{X}_K, \mathcal{D}_K)$. Thus Corollary 1.2 implies $(X, D) \sim_S (\mathcal{X}'_0, \mathcal{D}'_0)$. \square

9.2. Stratification via type.

Definition 9.11 (Type). A pair (X, D) in $\mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY}}(\mathbb{k})$ is called

- (1) *Type I* if (X, D) is klt,
- (2) *Type II* if $\text{Src}(X, D)$ is a curve, and
- (3) *Type III* if $\text{Src}(X, D)$ is a point.

Remark 9.12. A pair in $\mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY}}(\mathbb{k})$ is Type I, II, or III if and only if the regularity is -1 , 0 , or 1 , respectively. When discussing degenerations of surface pairs, we use type, rather than regularity, to mirror terms used for degenerations of K3 surfaces [Kul77].

Remark 9.13. By Proposition 8.7, S-equivalent pairs in $\mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY}}(\mathbb{k})$ are of the same type.

Using Theorem 8.15, we will show that the union of the Type I and II loci of the stack admits a good moduli space. The Type III locus of the stack is related to the failure of boundedness in Example 9.4 and will be analyzed in later sections.

Definition 9.14 (Type I and II substack). Let $\mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY}, \text{I+II}} \subset \mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY}}$ be the substack consisting of families $(X, D) \rightarrow B$ in $\mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY}, \text{I+II}}$ such that (X_b, D_b) is Type I or II for all $b \in B$.

Proposition 9.15. *The following hold:*

- (1) $\mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY}, \text{I+II}} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY}}$ is an open embedding,
- (2) $\mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY}, \text{I+II}}$ is a finite type algebraic stack with affine diagonal, and
- (3) there exists a morphism $\mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY}, \text{I+II}} \rightarrow P_d^{\text{CY}, \text{I+II}}$ to a separated good moduli space.

Proof. Statement (1) follows from Proposition 8.8, while (2) and (3) from Theorem 8.15. \square

In the case when the degree is not divisible by 3, we will show that Type III degenerations do not occur and deduce the existence of a good moduli space in that case.

Proposition 9.16. *If (X, D) is in $\mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY}}(\mathbb{k})$ and $3 \nmid d$, then the pair is Type I or II and the normalization $(\overline{X}, \overline{G})$ of $(X, 0)$ is plt.*

Proof. Since $1 \notin \frac{3}{d}\mathbb{Z}$, Proposition 8.18 implies (X, D) must be Type I or II. If $(\overline{X}, \overline{G})$ is not plt, then Proposition 8.10 implies X is lc and not klt. Thus X must be the cone over an elliptic curve by [Hac04, Thm. 8.5]. This case cannot occur when $3 \nmid d$ by either the proof of [Hac04, Proof of Thm. 7.1] or Theorem 10.1, which is proven in a later section. \square

Theorem 9.17. *If $3 \nmid d$, then $\mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY}, \text{I+II}} = \mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY}}$. Additionally,*

- (1) $\mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY}}$ is a finite type algebraic stack with affine diagonal, and
- (2) there exists a good morphism $\mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY}} \rightarrow P_d^{\text{CY}}$ to a proper good moduli space.

Proof. Propositions 9.15 and 9.16 imply statement (1) and the existence of a separated good moduli space P_d^{CY} . Since $\mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY}}$ satisfies the existence part of the valuative criterion of properness by Theorem 7.1, P_d^{CY} is proper by Theorem 2.29. \square

9.3. Stratification via index.

Definition 9.18. For a boundary polarized CY pair (X, D) , the *index* at $x \in X$ is

$$\text{ind}_x(K_X) := \min\{m \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0} \mid mK_X \text{ is Cartier in a neighborhood of } x\}.$$

For each $m \geq 1$, we define the substack $\mathcal{P}_{d,m}^{\text{CY}} \subset \mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY}}$ consisting of families $(X, D) \rightarrow B$ in $\mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY}}$ such that $\text{ind}_x(K_{X_b}) \leq m$ at each $b \in B$ and $x \in X_b$.

Observe that there is a chain of inclusions

$$\mathcal{P}_d \subset \mathcal{P}_{d,1}^{\text{CY}} \subset \mathcal{P}_{d,2}^{\text{CY}} \subset \cdots \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY}} = \cup_{m \geq 1} \mathcal{P}_{d,m}^{\text{CY}}.$$

The advantage to working with $\mathcal{P}_{d,m}^{\text{CY}}$ is that the stack is finite type by the following lemma.

Proposition 9.19. *The following hold:*

- (1) $\mathcal{P}_{d,m}^{\text{CY}} \subset \mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY}}$ is an open substack,
- (2) $\mathcal{P}_{d,m}^{\text{CY}}$ is a finite type algebraic stack with affine diagonal.

Proof. To prove (1), it suffices to show that if $f : (X, D) \rightarrow B$ is a family in $\mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY}}$, then

$$B^\circ := \{b \in B \mid \text{ind}_x(X_b) \leq m \text{ at each } x \in X_b\}$$

is open in B . By Definition 3.4, we may assume B is Noetherian. Now, for $1 \leq j \leq m$, let $U_j \subset X$ denote the open locus where $\omega_{X/B}^{[j]}$ is an invertible sheaf and $Z_j := X \setminus U_j$. For $b \in B$ and $x \in X_b$, jK_{X_b} is Cartier at x if and only if $\omega_{X_b}^{[j]}$ is invertible at x . Since $\omega_{X/B}^{[j]}|_{X_b} \cong \omega_{X_b}^{[j]}$, jK_{X_b} is invertible at x if and only if $x \in U_j$. Thus $B^\circ = B \setminus f(\cap_{j=1}^m Z_j)$, which is open.

Since (1) holds and $\mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY}}$ is a locally finite type algebraic stack with affine diagonal, $\mathcal{P}_{d,m}^{\text{CY}}$ satisfies the same properties. To show the stack is of finite type, it suffices to verify $\mathcal{P}_{d,m}^{\text{CY}}(\mathbb{k})$ is bounded. Now, if $(X, D := \frac{3}{d}C)$ is in $\mathcal{P}_{d,m}^{\text{CY}}(\mathbb{k})$, then $-m!K_X$ is Cartier divisor with Hilbert polynomial $\chi(m! \cdot)$. Thus [Kol85, Thm. 2.1.2] implies that there exists a fixed integer k such that $-kK_X$ is a very ample Cartier divisor for every (X, D) in $\mathcal{P}_{d,m}^{\text{CY}}(\mathbb{k})$. Thus $\mathcal{P}_{d,m}^{\text{CY}}$ is finite type by Proposition 3.12. \square

10. EXPLICIT S-EQUIVALENCE CLASSES

In this section, we prove the following two theorems characterizing S-equivalence classes of Type II and III pairs in $\mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY}}$. Theorem 10.1 describes a representative element in each Type II S-equivalence class. Theorem 10.2 shows that all Type III pairs are S-equivalent.

Theorem 10.1. *Let $(X, D) \in \mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY}}(\mathbb{k})$ be a Type II pair. Then (X, D) is S-equivalent to one of the following pairs $(X_0, D_0) \in \mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY}}(\mathbb{k})$.*

- (i) X_0 is a projective cone over a smooth elliptic curve polarized with a degree 9 line bundle, and D_0 is the section at infinity;
- (ii) X_0 is a projective orbifold cone over \mathbb{P}^1 whose orbifold divisor (see Definition 2.19) is toric, and D_0 is the section at infinity plus a \mathbb{Q} -linear combination of rulings;
- (iii) X_0 is a toric Manetti surface with a specific \mathbb{G}_m -action, and D_0 is \mathbb{Q} -linear combination of the closure of \mathbb{G}_m -orbits, such that the broken \mathbb{G}_m -orbit (see Definition 10.7) on X_0 is non-reduced.
- (iv) X_0 is the gluing of two orbifold cones over \mathbb{P}^1 with the same toric orbifold divisor, and D_0 is a \mathbb{Q} -linear combination of rulings on each irreducible component of X_0 .

Moreover, for a fixed source (E, D_E) , which is either a smooth elliptic curve or a CY pair on \mathbb{P}^1 , and a fixed integer $d \geq 3$, there exist at most finitely many $(X_0, D_0) \in \mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY}}(\mathbb{k})$ up to isomorphism from the above list with $\text{Src}(X_0, D_0) \cong (E, D_E)$.

Since the proof of Theorem 10.1 relies on a lengthy and in depth analysis of the geometry of certain Type II pairs, we briefly outline the argument. First, by Proposition 9.10, we may assume X is klt. Next, if there is a non-exceptional lc place of (X, D) , we show in Section 10.2.1 that the lc place induces a weakly special degeneration of (X, D) to a pair satisfying (i) or (ii). If all lc places of (X, D) are exceptional, then we show that each lc place induces a degeneration $(X, D) \rightsquigarrow (X_0, D_0)$ such that X_0 is klt and the pair admits an effective \mathbb{G}_m -action. By an in depth analysis of such pairs in Section 10.1, we show in Section 10.2.2 that (X_0, D_0) satisfies (ii) or (iii) or degenerates to (iv).

Theorem 10.2. *If $(X, D) \in \mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY}}(\mathbb{k})$ is Type III, then $(X, D) \sim_S (\mathbb{P}^2, \frac{3}{d}\{(xyz)^{d/3} = 0\})$*

The proof of Theorem 10.2 is relatively brief, in comparison to the proof of Theorem 10.1. The argument relies on degenerating (X, D) to an index 1 pair.

The above two theorems play key roles in the proof of Theorem 1.3. In particular, the theorems will be used to prove Proposition 12.3 on the existence of 1-complements on Type II and III pairs. The latter is a key ingredient in the construction of $\mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY}}$. In addition, the theorems will be used in the proof of Theorem 1.3.4 to show the Hodge line bundle is big on subvarieties contained in the Type II and III loci of the moduli space.

10.1. Manetti surfaces with \mathbb{G}_m -actions. Throughout this subsection, we assume the following condition on (X, D) .

$(X, D) \in \mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY}}(\mathbb{k})$ is a Type II pair such that X is klt, (X, D) admits an effective \mathbb{G}_m -action, and that every lc place of (X, D) is exceptional over X . (†)

There are precisely two lc places of (X, D) denoted by E_1 and E_2 . This follows because (X, D) admits two test configurations of product type induced by the \mathbb{G}_m -action λ and its inverse λ^{-1} which gives us at least two lc places by Lemma 4.7.2. On the other hand, a Type II boundary polarized CY surface pair can have at most two log canonical places by Lemma 8.9.1.

Next, let $\mu : \tilde{X} \rightarrow X$ be the dlt modification of (X, D) . Then both E_1 and E_2 are μ -exceptional prime divisors on \tilde{X} . Let \tilde{D} be the strict transform of D in \tilde{X} . Then $(\tilde{X}, E_1 + E_2 + \tilde{D})$ is a plt CY pair with a \mathbb{G}_m -action. Denote by D_{E_i} the different of $(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D} + E_1 + E_2)$ on E_i . Denote by Δ_{E_i} the different of $(\tilde{X}, E_1 + E_2)$ on E_i .

The main result of this section is the following theorem.

Theorem 10.3. *Notation as above. Assume that (X, D) satisfies (†). Denote by $\mu_i : \tilde{X}_i \rightarrow X$ the extraction of E_i . Then one of the following is true.*

- (i) $-K_{\tilde{X}_i} - E_i$ is ample for some $i \in \{1, 2\}$, and \tilde{X} , \tilde{X}_i , and X are all toric.
- (ii) $-K_{\tilde{X}_i} - E_i$ is big and nef for all $i \in \{1, 2\}$, and $((-K_{\tilde{X}_i} - E_i) \cdot C_i) = 0$ for a \mathbb{G}_m -invariant curve C_i on \tilde{X}_i .

We denote by $\phi_i : \tilde{X} \rightarrow \tilde{X}_i$ the birational morphism contracting E_{3-i} . Then we have the following diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \tilde{X} & \xrightarrow{\phi_1} & \tilde{X}_1 \\ \phi_2 \downarrow & \searrow \mu & \downarrow \mu_1 \\ \tilde{X}_2 & \xrightarrow{\mu_2} & X \end{array}$$

By abuse of notation, we denote $\phi_{i,*}E_i$ by E_i as the unique μ_i -exceptional divisor on \tilde{X}_i .

Lemma 10.4. *Notation as above. Then E_i is a Kollár component over $\mu_i(E_i) \in X$ extracted by $\mu_i : \tilde{X}_i \rightarrow X$ for $i = 1, 2$.*

Proof. Since $(\tilde{X}, E_1 + E_2 + \tilde{D})$ is plt, so is (\tilde{X}, E_i) for each $i = 1, 2$. Thus (\tilde{X}_i, E_i) is plt near E_i and klt elsewhere as μ_i is isomorphic away from E_i . This implies that (\tilde{X}_i, E_i) is plt. Since X has only quotient singularities, it is \mathbb{Q} -factorial. By [KM98, Lem. 2.62] we have that $-E_i$ is μ_i -ample as it is the only μ_i -exceptional divisor. \square

Lemma 10.5. *Notation as above. Then, \tilde{X} is of Fano type and $\rho(\tilde{X}) = 3$.*

Recall, \tilde{X} of Fano type means that there exists a \mathbb{Q} -divisor \tilde{B} on \tilde{X} such that (\tilde{X}, \tilde{B}) is klt and $-K_{\tilde{X}} - \tilde{B}$ is big and nef.

Proof. For $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$, we have that $(X, (1 - \varepsilon)D)$ is a klt log Fano pair, and

$$A_{X, (1-\varepsilon)D}(E_i) = A_{X, D}(E_i) + \varepsilon \text{ord}_{E_i}(D) = \varepsilon \text{ord}_{E_i}(D) < 1.$$

Denote by $a_i := \varepsilon \text{ord}_{E_i}(D)$. Then $(\tilde{X}, (1 - \varepsilon)\tilde{D} + (1 - a_1)E_1 + (1 - a_2)E_2)$ is a klt weak log Fano pair as it is crepant birational to $(X, (1 - \varepsilon)D)$. Thus \tilde{X} is of Fano type.

By [Hac04, Prop. 6.3], we know that $\rho(X) = 1$. Since $\tilde{X} \rightarrow X$ extracts two exceptional curves E_1 and E_2 , we have $\rho(\tilde{X}) = \rho(X) + 2 = 3$. \square

The following result is useful for understanding the geometry of \tilde{X} .

Proposition 10.6. *Notation as above. Then, there exists a \mathbb{G}_m -equivariant contraction $\pi : \tilde{X} \rightarrow B$ to a smooth rational curve B with connected fibers such that the following hold.*

- (1) E_1 and E_2 are disjoint sections of π ;
- (2) every fiber of π is \mathbb{G}_m -invariant.

Proof. By [K⁺92, Proof of Proposition 12.3.2], running the $(K_{\tilde{X}} + \tilde{D} + (1 - \varepsilon)(E_1 + E_2))$ -MMP terminates with $\tilde{X} \rightarrow Z \rightarrow B$ such that $\tilde{X} \rightarrow Z$ is birational, and $Z \rightarrow B$ is a Mori fiber space over a smooth curve with connected fibers. Since \mathbb{G}_m is a connected algebraic group, this MMP is automatically \mathbb{G}_m -equivariant. Moreover, since X is a rational surface, so is \tilde{X} . Thus B is a smooth rational curve. Therefore (1) follows directly from [K⁺92, Prop. 12.3.2].

For (2), notice that (E_i, D_{E_i}) is \mathbb{G}_m -invariant. By adjunction, we know that $K_{E_i} + D_{E_i} \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0$ and (E_i, D_{E_i}) is klt. Thus $\text{Supp}(D_{E_i})$ contains at least three points on $E_i \cong \mathbb{P}^1$, which implies that the \mathbb{G}_m -action on E_i has to be trivial. Since $\pi|_{E_i} : E_i \rightarrow B$ is a \mathbb{G}_m -equivariant isomorphism, we know that the \mathbb{G}_m -action on B is also trivial. Thus every fiber of π is \mathbb{G}_m -invariant. \square

Definition 10.7. Notation as above. Assume that (X, D) satisfies (\dagger) . A *broken \mathbb{G}_m -orbit* on X is a divisor of the form $\mu_*\pi^*[b]$ for a point $b \in B$ such that $\pi^*[b]$ is reducible.

Proposition 10.8. *Notation as above. Then there is precisely one broken \mathbb{G}_m -orbit $\mu_*\pi^*[b]$ on X . Moreover, $\pi^*[b]$ has precisely two irreducible components \tilde{C}_1 and \tilde{C}_2 .*

Proof. Since μ only contracts E_1 and E_2 , it suffices to show that there is precisely one reducible fiber $\pi^*[b]$, and such a fiber has two irreducible components. We first show that there is at most one reducible fiber. Assume to the contrary that fibers over two distinct points $b, b' \in B$ are reducible. Let \tilde{C}_1 (resp. \tilde{C}'_1) be an irreducible component of $\pi^*[b]$ (resp. $\pi^*[b']$). Let $m_1 := \text{ord}_{\tilde{C}_1} \pi^*[b] > 0$. Since π has connected fibers, we have that $(\tilde{C}_1 \cdot (F - m_1\tilde{C}_1)) > 0$ and $(\tilde{C}_1 \cdot F) = 0$ for a general fiber F of π . Thus, $(\tilde{C}_1^2) < 0$, and similarly $(\tilde{C}'_1{}^2) < 0$. Running the $(\tilde{C}_1 + \tilde{C}'_1)$ -MMP over B yields a birational morphism $\tilde{X} \rightarrow Z'$ that contracts both \tilde{C}_1 and \tilde{C}'_1 . Note that we can run any MMP on \tilde{X} since it is of Fano type by Lemma 10.5. Thus we have $\rho(\tilde{X}) = \rho(Z') + 2 \geq \rho(B) + 3 = 4$, which is a contradiction to Lemma 10.5.

Next, we show that there is at least one reducible fiber. Assume to the contrary that every fiber is irreducible. Then all fibers define the same ray in $\overline{NE}(\tilde{X})$, which implies that $\rho(\tilde{X}/B) = 1$. Thus $\rho(\tilde{X}) = \rho(B) + 1 = 2$, a contradiction to Lemma 10.5. Thus (3) is proved.

For the last statement, similar arguments to those above show that if the reducible fiber $\pi^*[b]$ has at least three irreducible components, then we would have $\rho(\tilde{X}) \geq 4$ which contradicts Lemma 10.5. Thus $\pi^*[b]$ has exactly two irreducible components \tilde{C}_1 and \tilde{C}_2 . \square

Proposition 10.9. *Notation as above. There exists a \mathbb{G}_m -equivariant birational morphism $\psi_i : \tilde{X} \rightarrow Z_i$ that contracts the curve \tilde{C}_{3-i} . Denote by $E_{i,j}$ (resp. D_{Z_i}) the pushforward of E_j (resp. of \tilde{D}) to Z_i . Then $(Z_i, D_{Z_i} + E_{i,1} + E_{i,2})$ is a standard \mathbb{P}^1 -link over B . Moreover, after switching \tilde{C}_1 and \tilde{C}_2 if necessary, we have $(\tilde{C}_i \cdot E_i) > 0$ and $(\tilde{C}_i \cdot E_j) = 0$ for $j \neq i$.*

Proof. From the proof of Proposition 10.8, we have $(\tilde{C}_{3-i})^2 < 0$. Hence, we may run a \tilde{C}_{3-i} -MMP on \tilde{X} over B which yields a birational morphism $\psi_i : \tilde{X} \rightarrow Z_i$ that only contracts \tilde{C}_{3-i} . Since the MMP is automatically \mathbb{G}_m -equivariant, λ induces an effective \mathbb{G}_m -action on Z_i . Since $(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D} + E_1 + E_2)$ is a plt CY pair, so is $(Z_i, D_{Z_i} + E_{i,1} + E_{i,2})$. By Proposition 10.8, we know that every fiber of $Z_i \rightarrow B$ is irreducible. Thus $(Z_i, D_{Z_i}) \rightarrow B$ is a log Mori fiber space. By [Kol13, Proof of Proposition 4.37], we know that $(Z_i, D_{Z_i} + E_{i,1} + E_{i,2})$ is a standard \mathbb{P}^1 -link over B .

To prove the last statement, we notice that each E_i intersects at least one of \tilde{C}_1 and \tilde{C}_2 , since the fiber $\pi^*[b]$ has support $\tilde{C}_1 \cup \tilde{C}_2$ by Proposition 10.8 and E_i is a section by Proposition 10.6. If some \tilde{C}_i intersects both E_1 and E_2 , then after contracting \tilde{C}_i we have that $E_{j,1}$ and $E_{j,2}$ intersect each other in Z_j for $j \neq i$, which contradicts that $(Z_j, D_{Z_j} + E_{j,1} + E_{j,2})$ is a standard \mathbb{P}^1 -link. Thus the proof is finished. \square

Proposition 10.10. *Notation as above. Let $m_i := \text{ord}_{\tilde{C}_i}(\pi^*[b])$ and $a_i := \text{ord}_{\tilde{C}_i}(\tilde{D})$. Then the following hold.*

$$(1) \frac{1-a_1}{m_1} = \frac{1-a_2}{m_2}.$$

(2) *If the broken \mathbb{G}_m -orbit on X is non-reduced, then \tilde{X} is toric.*

Proof. (1) Let p_i be the point in E_i such that $\pi(p_i) = b$. By contracting \tilde{C}_j from \tilde{X} where $j \neq i$, we see that the fiber of $Z_i \rightarrow B$ over b is $m_i(\psi_{i,*}\tilde{C}_i)$. Thus by Propositions 2.20, 2.25, and 10.9, and (2.3), we get that $\text{ord}_{p_i}\Delta_{E_i} = 1 - \frac{1}{m_i}$ and $\text{ord}_{p_i}\tilde{D}|_{E_i} = \frac{a_i}{m_i}$. Thus

$$\text{ord}_{p_i}D_{E_i} = \text{ord}_{p_i}\Delta_{E_i} + \text{ord}_{p_i}\tilde{D}|_{E_i} = 1 - \frac{1-a_i}{m_i}.$$

Since $(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D} + E_1 + E_2)$ is a \mathbb{P}^1 -link over B , by [Kol13, Prop. 4.37] we know that $\text{ord}_{p_1}D_{E_1} = \text{ord}_{p_2}D_{E_2}$. This implies (1).

(2) The non-reducedness of the broken \mathbb{G}_m -orbit is equivalent to $m_1 > 1$ or $m_2 > 1$ by Proposition 10.8. Let us assume $m_1 > 1$ without loss of generality. Consider the birational morphism $\psi_1 : \tilde{X} \rightarrow Z_1$ by contracting \tilde{C}_2 . Denote by $C_{1,1} := \psi_{1,*}\tilde{C}_1$. We know that $\pi_1 : Z_1 \rightarrow B$ is a compactified Seifert \mathbb{G}_m -bundle by Proposition 2.25. Then we know that $\pi_1^{-1}(b) = \psi_{1,*}\pi^*[b] = \psi_{1,*}(m_1\tilde{C}_1 + m_2\tilde{C}_2) = m_1C_{1,1}$ which is a non-reduced fiber.

We claim that the standard \mathbb{P}^1 -link $\pi_1 : Z_1 \rightarrow B$ has at most one non-reduced fiber other than $\pi_1^{-1}(b)$. Denote by $\Delta_{E_{1,1}}$ the different of $(Z_1, E_{1,1})$ on $E_{1,1}$. Then by Proposition 2.25, we know that $\text{Supp}(\Delta_{E_{1,1}})$ equals the intersection of $E_{1,1}$ with the union of all non-reduced fibers of π_1 . Thus it suffices to show that $\text{Supp}(\Delta_{E_{1,1}})$ has at most two points. Since $\psi_1 : \tilde{X} \rightarrow Z_1$ is isomorphic over a neighborhood of $E_{1,1}$, we know that $(E_{1,1}, \Delta_{E_{1,1}}) \cong (E_1, \Delta_{E_1})$ which is toric by Lemma 2.14. Thus $\text{Supp}(\Delta_{E_{1,1}})$ has at most two points.

Next, we show that Z_1 is toric. Assume that π_1 is induced by the \mathbb{Q} -divisor L_1 on B . Then $\text{Supp}(\{L_1\}) = \text{Supp}(\pi_{1,*}\Delta_{E_{1,1}})$, which contains at most two points. Thus $(B, \{L_1\})$ is toric. Since the Seifert \mathbb{G}_m -bundle only depends on the \mathbb{Z} -linear equivalence class of L_1 , we may assume that L_1 is toric as well. This shows that Z_1 is toric.

Finally, we show that \tilde{X} is toric. From the paragraph above, we know that $C_{1,1}$, $E_{1,1}$ and $E_{1,2}$ are all torus invariant divisors on Z_1 . Thus $(Z_1, C_{1,1} + E_{1,1} + E_{1,2})$ is a toric log canonical pair. It suffices to show \tilde{C}_2 is an lc place of $(Z_1, C_{1,1} + E_{1,1} + E_{1,2})$ which would imply that $\pi_1 : \tilde{X} \rightarrow Z_1$ is toric. Since $(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D} + E_1 + E_2)$ and $(Z_1, D_{Z_1} + E_{1,1} + E_{1,2})$ are crepant birational, we have

$$1 - a_2 = A_{\tilde{X}, \tilde{D} + E_1 + E_2}(\tilde{C}_2) = A_{Z_1, D_{Z_1} + E_{1,1} + E_{1,2}}(\tilde{C}_2).$$

By construction, we know that $D_{Z_1} - a_1 C_{1,1}$ is a \mathbb{Q} -linear combination of fibers of π_1 other than $\pi_1^{-1}(b)$. Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned} A_{Z_1, C_{1,1} + E_{1,1} + E_{1,2}}(\tilde{C}_2) &= A_{Z_1, D_{Z_1} + E_{1,1} + E_{1,2}}(\tilde{C}_2) - (1 - a_1) \text{ord}_{\tilde{C}_2}(C_{1,1}) \\ &= (1 - a_2) - (1 - a_1) \text{ord}_{\tilde{C}_2} \left(\frac{\pi_1^{-1}(b)}{m_1} \right) \\ &= (1 - a_2) - (1 - a_1) \frac{m_2}{m_1} = 0, \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from (1). Thus the proof is finished. \square

Lemma 10.11. *Notation as above. Then $\overline{NE}(\tilde{X}_i)$ is spanned by E_i and $C_i := \phi_{i,*}\tilde{C}_i$.*

Proof. Since ϕ_i is an isomorphism in a neighborhood of $E_i \cup \tilde{C}_i$, we know that $(E_i)_{\tilde{X}_i}^2 = (E_i)_{\tilde{X}}^2 < 0$ and $(C_i^2) = (\tilde{C}_i^2) < 0$. Thus $[E_i]$ and $[C_i]$ are two extremal curve classes in $\overline{NE}(\tilde{X}_i)$. By Lemma 10.5, we know that $\rho(\tilde{X}_i) = \rho(\tilde{X}) - 1 = 2$. Thus the result follows. \square

Proof of Theorem 10.3. We know that $\tilde{X}_i \rightarrow X$ extracts the Kollár component E_i . Thus we have $((-K_{\tilde{X}_i} - E_i) \cdot E_i) > 0$. By Lemma 10.11, the ampleness of $-K_{\tilde{X}_i} - E_i$ is equivalent to the positivity of its intersection with C_i . Since ϕ_i is isomorphic in a neighborhood of $E_i \cup \tilde{C}_i$, we have

$$((-K_{\tilde{X}_i} - E_i) \cdot C_i) = ((-K_{\tilde{X}} - E_1 - E_2) \cdot \tilde{C}_i) = (\tilde{D} \cdot \tilde{C}_i).$$

Since \tilde{D} is supported in finitely many fibers of π , we know that $(\tilde{D} \cdot (m_1 \tilde{C}_1 + m_2 \tilde{C}_2)) = (\tilde{D} \cdot F) = 0$.

If $(\tilde{D} \cdot \tilde{C}_i) > 0$ for some i , we claim that either m_1 or m_2 is larger than 1. Assume to the contrary that $m_1 = m_2 = 1$. Then Proposition 10.10.1 implies that $a_1 = a_2$. Thus \tilde{D} is a \mathbb{Q} -linear combination of fibers of π , which implies that $(\tilde{D} \cdot \tilde{C}_1) = (\tilde{D} \cdot \tilde{C}_2) = 0$, a contradiction. Thus by Proposition 10.10.2, we know that \tilde{X} is toric. Since \tilde{C}_j is torus invariant for $j \neq i$, we have that \tilde{X}_i is also toric. This falls into case (i).

If $(\tilde{D} \cdot \tilde{C}_1) = (\tilde{D} \cdot \tilde{C}_2) = 0$, then the above discussion implies that $-K_{\tilde{X}_i} - E_i$ is nef for any i . To show its bigness, consider the birational morphism $g_i : \tilde{X}_i \rightarrow \tilde{X}'_i$ by contracting C_i . Such a contraction exists as $(C_i)^2 = (\tilde{C}_i^2) < 0$ and \tilde{X} is of Fano type by Proposition 10.5. Thus $-K_{\tilde{X}_i} - E_i = g_i^* L'_i$ for some \mathbb{Q} -line bundle L'_i on \tilde{X}'_i . Since $((-K_{\tilde{X}_i} - E_i) \cdot E_i) > 0$, we know that $(L'_i \cdot g_{i,*} E_i) > 0$. Since $\rho(\tilde{X}'_i) = \rho(\tilde{X}_i) - 1 = 1$, this implies that L'_i is ample on \tilde{X}'_i . This shows the bigness of $-K_{\tilde{X}_i} - E_i$. The proof is finished. \square

10.2. Type II pairs. The goal of this subsection is to prove Theorem 10.1.

By Lemma 9.10, it suffices to show that every Type II pair $(X, D) \in \mathcal{P}_d^K(\mathbb{k})$ satisfies the statement. Because X is a Manetti surface, X has cyclic quotient singularities and $\rho(X) = 1$ by [Hac04, Thm. 8.3 & Prop. 6.3]. Let E be an lc place of (X, D) . Then either E is a curve on X or E is an exceptional divisor over X .

10.2.1. Non-exceptional lc place. If E is a curve on X , we may degenerate (X, D) to the normal cone over (E, Δ_E) , where Δ_E is the different divisor of (X, D) on E . This gives an S-equivalence between (X, D) and a projective orbifold cone over (E, Δ_E) :

Lemma 10.12. *Let (X, D) be an lc boundary polarized CY pair and $E = [D]$ a prime divisor on X such that $-K_X \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} rE$ for some rational number $r \geq 1$. If (X, E) is plt, then E induces a weakly special degeneration $(X, D) \rightsquigarrow (X_0, D_0)$, where X_0 is a projective orbifold cone over E , and E degenerates to the section at infinity. Moreover, X_0 is klt if $r > 1$.*

Proof. The proof is similar to [LZ22, Proof of Lemma 2.12]. Let $R = \bigoplus_{m=0}^{\infty} R_m$ where $R_m = H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(mE))$ so $\text{Proj } R \cong X$. The divisor E induces an \mathbb{N} -filtration \mathcal{F} of R as

$$\mathcal{F}^\lambda R_m := \{s \in R_m \mid \text{ord}_E(s) \geq \lambda\} \cong H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(m - \lambda)E) \quad \text{for } \lambda \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}.$$

Let $L_E := E|_E$ be the \mathbb{Q} -divisor on E as defined in [HLS19, Appendix A], which is well-defined up to \mathbb{Z} -linear equivalence. By similar arguments to [LZ22, Proof of Proposition 2.10], we have the short exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X((m - \lambda - 1)E) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X((m - \lambda)E) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_E(\lfloor (m - \lambda)L_E \rfloor) \rightarrow 0.$$

For $\lambda \in [0, m - 1]$, we have $(m - \lambda - 1)E - K_X$ is ample, hence Kawamata-Viehweg vanishing implies $H^1(X, \mathcal{O}_X((m - \lambda - 1)E)) = 0$. For $\lambda = m$, we know that $H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X) \cong \mathbb{k} \cong H^0(E, \mathcal{O}_E)$. As a result, we have that

$$\text{gr}_{\mathcal{F}}^\lambda R_m \cong H^0(E, \mathcal{O}_E(\lfloor (m - \lambda)L_E \rfloor)) \quad \text{for every } \lambda \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}.$$

Thus, by Theorem 4.8, we know that E induces a weakly special degeneration $(X, D) \rightsquigarrow (X_0, D_0)$ such that the central fiber

$$X_0 \cong \text{Proj} \bigoplus_{m=0}^{+\infty} \bigoplus_{\lambda=0}^{+\infty} H^0(E, \mathcal{O}_E(\lfloor (m - \lambda)L_E \rfloor)).$$

This is precisely $X_0 \cong C_p(E, L_E)$. Denote by Δ_E the different of $(X, 0)$ on E . If $r > 1$, then by adjunction we know that $-K_E - \Delta_E = (-K_X - E)|_E \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} (r - 1)L_E$ is ample. Thus (E, Δ_E) is a klt log Fano pair, which implies that X_0 is klt. The statement on the degeneration of E follows from the same argument as [LZ22, Proof of Lemma 2.12]. \square

Proposition 10.13. *Let $(X, D) \in \mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY}}(\mathbb{k})$ be a Type II pair such that X is klt. Assume that there exists an lc place E of (X, D) as a prime divisor on X . Then (X, D) admits a weakly special degeneration to (X_0, D_0) , which is one of the following:*

- (1) X_0 is a projective cone over an elliptic curve polarized with a degree 9 line bundle, and D_0 is the section at infinity;
- (2) X_0 is a projective orbifold cone over \mathbb{P}^1 , whose orbifold divisor is toric, and D_0 is the section of infinity plus a \mathbb{Q} -linear combination of rulings.

Proof. By Lemma 10.12, (X, D) admits a weakly special degeneration to (X_0, D_0) where X_0 is a projective orbifold cone over E .

If $r = 1$, then $E = D \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} -K_X$. By adjunction, we know that (E, Δ_E) is klt and $K_E + \Delta_E \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0$. Then, we know that X_0 has a strictly log canonical singularity at the cone point. By [Hac04, Thm. 8.5], we get that X_0 is an elliptic cone of degree 9, i.e. E is an elliptic curve, $\Delta_E = 0$, and $\deg(L_E) = 9$. By Lemma 10.12, the degeneration of $E = D$ to X_0 is precisely the section at infinity. Thus we get degeneration (1).

If $r > 1$, then (E, Δ_E) is a klt log Fano pair which implies that $E \cong \mathbb{P}^1$. By Lemma 10.12 X_0 is a Manetti surface. If $\text{Supp}(\Delta_E)$ has at least 3 points, then the section at infinity E_0 in X_0 also satisfies $|\text{Supp}(\Delta_{E_0})| \geq 3$. This implies that X_0 has at least 3 singular points along E_0 . Meanwhile, the cone point of X_0 cannot be smooth as every Kollár component over a smooth point is toric by Lemma 2.14 (see also [FJ04, Lem. 2.11] or [Kaw17]). Thus X_0 has at least 4 singular points, which is a contradiction as every Manetti surface has at most 3 singular points by [Hac04, Thm. 8.3]. As a result, $\text{Supp}(\Delta_E)$ has at most 2 points which implies that (E, Δ_E) is toric. Since E is an irreducible component of D , by Lemma 10.12 we know that the degeneration D_0 of D on X_0 is \mathbb{G}_m -invariant which contains the section at infinity as an irreducible component. Thus we get degeneration (2), and the proof is finished. \square

10.2.2. *Exceptional lc places.* Next, we study the case where E is exceptional over X .

Lemma 10.14. *Let $(X, D) \in \mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY}}(\mathbb{k})$ be a Type II pair such that X is a Manetti surface. Assume that (X, D) has an lc place E as an exceptional divisor over X . Then E induces a non-trivial weakly special degeneration (X_0, D_0) of (X, D) such that X_0 is a Manetti surface equipped with an effective \mathbb{G}_m -action and D_0 is \mathbb{G}_m -invariant.*

Proof. Since X has klt singularities, the exceptional divisor E is a rational curve. By Theorem 4.8, we have that E induces a non-trivial weakly special degeneration $(X, D) \rightsquigarrow (X_0, D_0)$ with X_0 integral. If X_0 is not normal, then by [Hac04, Thm. 5.5 & 6.5] we know that (X_0, D_0) is of Type III, which is a contradiction. Hence, X_0 is normal. If X_0 is an elliptic cone, then its source is a smooth elliptic curve, which is a contradiction as E is rational and the source is preserved under weakly special degenerations by Proposition 8.7. Thus, by [Hac04, Thm. 8.5], we know that X_0 is a Manetti surface. \square

From now on, we may assume that (X, D) satisfies (\dagger) . We will also use the notation from Section 10.1.

Proposition 10.15. *For a fixed source $(E \cong \mathbb{P}^1, D_E)$ and a fixed degree d there exist at most finitely many pairs (X, D) up to isomorphism satisfying (\dagger) such that the broken \mathbb{G}_m -orbit on X is non-reduced, and $\text{Src}(X, D) \cong (E, D_E)$.*

Proof. First of all, we will show that, given a fixed source (E, D_E) , there exist finitely many \tilde{X} , which are necessarily toric varieties by Theorem 10.3. By the boundedness of Type II pairs (Theorem 8.15), we know that such X are bounded. Since X is toric and boundedness implies that such X are ϵ -log terminal, this implies that X has finitely many choices up to isomorphism by [BB92]. Next, we show that $A_X(E_1)$ and $A_X(E_2)$ are bounded from above. For simplicity let us assume $i = 1$. Let $L_1 := -E_1|_{E_1}$ be the ample \mathbb{Q} -divisor from [HLS19]*Appx. A. Recall that Δ_{E_1} is the different divisor of (\tilde{X}, E_1) . Then we have that $\Delta_{E_1} \leq D_E$ under the identification $E_1 \cong E$. Write $\{L_1\} = \sum_{j=1}^l \frac{a_j}{b_j} p_j$, where p_j are distinct points on E_1 , both $a_j, b_j \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, and $\gcd(a_j, b_j) = 1$. Then we have that $\Delta_{E_1} = (L_1)_{\text{orb}} = \sum_{j=1}^l \frac{b_j-1}{b_j} p_j$ by [HLS19, Appendix A]. Hence there are only finitely many choices of l and (b_1, \dots, b_l) , which implies that there are only finitely many choices of $\{L_1\}$ and Δ_{E_1} . We have

$$\begin{aligned} A_X(E_1) \cdot \deg L_1 &= A_X(E_1) \cdot (-E_1^2) = (-K_{\tilde{X}_1} - E_1) \cdot E_1 \\ &= \deg(-K_{E_1} - \Delta_{E_1}) = 2 - \deg \Delta_{E_1}. \end{aligned}$$

Since X is bounded, its Gorenstein index is bounded from above, which implies that $A_X(E_1)$ has bounded denominators. On the other hand, since $\{L_1\}$ has finitely many choices, we know that $\deg L_1$ has bounded denominators as well. Thus their product having finitely many choices implies that both $A_X(E_1)$ and $\deg L_1$ have finitely many choices. Since E_1 and E_2 are toric divisors over X with bounded log discrepancy, we know that \tilde{X} has finitely many choices.

Let m_1 and m_2 be the multiplicities of the broken \mathbb{G}_m -orbit on X along its irreducible components as defined in Proposition 10.10. Without loss of generality, we may assume $m_1 > 1$ as the broken \mathbb{G}_m -orbit is non-reduced. Recall that $\psi_1 : \tilde{X} \rightarrow Z_1$ is the contraction of the curve \tilde{C}_2 such that $\pi_1 : Z_1 \rightarrow E$ is a compactified Seifert \mathbb{G}_m -bundle. Since \tilde{X} has finitely many choices and ψ_1 is toric, we know that Z_1 has finitely many choices. From the construction, we know that $(Z_1, D_{Z_1} + E_{1,1} + E_{1,2})$ is the compactified Seifert \mathbb{G}_m -bundle over (E, D_E) . Thus $(Z_1, D_{Z_1} + E_{1,1} + E_{1,2})$ has finitely many choices. It suffices to show that the birational map $\psi_1 : \tilde{X} \rightarrow Z_1$ has finitely many choices up to isomorphism. Since $C_{1,1} = (\psi_1)_* \tilde{C}_1$ has multiplicity $m_1 > 1$, we know that $p_j := \pi_1(C_{1,1})$ lies in the support of D_E . Thus there are finitely many choices of $(Z_1, C_{1,1} + E_{1,1} + E_{1,2})$. From the proof of Proposition 10.10, we know that \tilde{C}_2 is an lc place of $(Z_1, C_{1,1} + E_{1,1} + E_{1,2})$. Moreover,

finiteness of \tilde{X} and Z_1 implies that $A_{Z_1}(\tilde{C}_2)$ is bounded from above. Thus there are only finitely many extractions $\psi_1 : \tilde{X} \rightarrow (Z_1, C_{1,1} + E_{1,1} + E_{1,2})$ of \tilde{C}_2 . This shows that $(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D} + E_1 + E_2)$ has finitely many choices up to isomorphism, which implies that (X, D) has finitely many choices up to isomorphism. \square

Proposition 10.16. *Let $(X, D) \in \mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY}}(\mathbb{k})$ be a Type II pair satisfying (\dagger) . If the broken \mathbb{G}_m -orbit on X is reduced, then (X, D) admits a weakly special degeneration to (X_0, D_0) , where X_0 is the gluing of two orbifold cones over \mathbb{P}^1 along sections at infinity and D_0 is a \mathbb{Q} -linear combination of rulings on each irreducible component of X_0 . Moreover, the conductor of X_0 with its different divisor is toric.*

Proof. Let $x_1 \in X$ be the center of E_1 on X . From Section 10.1, we know that there exists a proper birational morphism $\mu_1 : \tilde{X}_1 \rightarrow X$ from a normal projective variety \tilde{X}_1 that extracts E_1 . Since (X, D) is of Type II, we know that $(\tilde{X}_1, (\mu_1)_*^{-1}D + E_1)$ is plt along E_1 . By Lemma 10.4 we know that μ_1 extracts E_1 as a Kollár component over $x_1 \in X$. Denote by Δ_{E_1} the different of \tilde{X}_1 on E_1 . Denote by $L_1 := -E_1|_{E_1}$ as an ample \mathbb{Q} -Cartier \mathbb{Q} -divisor from [HLS19, Appendix A].

Next, we perform the blowup on the trivial test configuration $(X_{\mathbb{A}^1}, D_{\mathbb{A}^1}) := (X, D) \times \mathbb{A}^1$ to extract a divisor \mathcal{E} induced by E_1 . Let \mathcal{E} be the prime divisor over $X_{\mathbb{A}^1}$ as the $(1, 1)$ quasi-monomial combination of $(E_1)_{\mathbb{A}^1}$ and $X \times \{0\}$. As a divisorial valuation, we know that $\text{ord}_{\mathcal{E}}$ is the \mathbb{G}_m -equivariant extension of ord_{E_1} on $K(X_{\mathbb{A}^1}) = K(X)(t)$ such that $\text{ord}_{\mathcal{E}}(t) = 1$, see e.g. [Liu18, (3.2)]. By the same argument as [Liu18, Proof of Lemma 33], we know that $\bigoplus_{m=0}^{\infty} \mathfrak{a}_m(\text{ord}_{\mathcal{E}})$ is finitely generated since E_1 is a Kollár component over $x_1 \in X$. Denote by

$$\mathcal{Y} := \text{Proj}_{X_{\mathbb{A}^1}} \bigoplus_{m=0}^{\infty} \mathfrak{a}_m(\text{ord}_{\mathcal{E}})$$

Let $\sigma : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow X_{\mathbb{A}^1}$ be the projection map. By the same argument as [Liu18, Proof of Lemma 33], we know that σ extracts \mathcal{E} as a Kollár component over $(x_1, 0) \in X_{\mathbb{A}^1}$, and

$$\mathcal{E} \cong \text{Proj}(\text{gr}_{\text{ord}_{E_1}} \mathcal{O}_{X, x_1}[s]),$$

where s is a free variable of degree 1. Moreover, the central fiber $\mathcal{Y}_0 = \tilde{X}_1 + \mathcal{E}$ where $\tilde{X}_1 \cap \mathcal{E} = E_1$. By [LZ22, Prop. 2.10], we know that $\text{gr}_{\text{ord}_{E_1}} \mathcal{O}_{X, x_1} \cong \bigoplus_{m=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{O}_{E_1}(\lfloor mL_1 \rfloor)$ which implies that \mathcal{E} is isomorphic to the projective orbifold cone $C_p(E_1, L_1)$ over (E_1, Δ_{E_1}) .

Claim. \mathcal{Y} is \mathbb{Q} -factorial and of Fano type over \mathbb{A}^1 .

Proof of claim. Since X has only quotient singularities, it is \mathbb{Q} -factorial, hence so is $X_{\mathbb{A}^1}$. Since $\sigma : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow X_{\mathbb{A}^1}$ extracts a unique exceptional divisor \mathcal{E} which is \mathbb{Q} -Cartier, we know that \mathcal{Y} is \mathbb{Q} -factorial. Denote by $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{Y}} := \sigma_*^{-1}D_{\mathbb{A}^1}$. Since \mathcal{E} is an lc place of $(X_{\mathbb{A}^1}, X \times \{0\} + D_{\mathbb{A}^1})$, we know that $(X_{\mathbb{A}^1}, (1 - \varepsilon)(X \times \{0\} + D_{\mathbb{A}^1}))$ is klt log Fano over \mathbb{A}^1 , and $a := A_{X_{\mathbb{A}^1}, (1 - \varepsilon)(X \times \{0\} + D_{\mathbb{A}^1})}(\mathcal{E}) \in (0, 1)$ for $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$. Thus $(\mathcal{Y}, (1 - \varepsilon)(\tilde{X}_1 + \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{Y}}) + (1 - a)\mathcal{E})$ is klt weak log Fano over \mathbb{A}^1 , which implies that \mathcal{Y} is of Fano type over \mathbb{A}^1 . The claim is proven. \square

From the claim, by [BCHM10, Cor. 1.3.2] we may run the \mathbb{G}_m -equivariant \tilde{X}_1 -MMP on \mathcal{Y} over \mathbb{A}^1 . Since $\tilde{X}_1|_{\tilde{X}_1} = -\mathcal{E}|_{\tilde{X}_1} = -E_1$ is not nef while $\tilde{X}_1|_{\mathcal{E}} = E_1$ is ample, the first step of the \tilde{X}_1 -MMP yields a contraction $\phi_{\mathcal{Y}} : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ where an E_1 -negative extremal ray in $\overline{NE}(\tilde{X}_1)$ gets contracted. By Proposition 10.9 and Lemma 10.11 we know that $\overline{NE}(\tilde{X}_1)$ is spanned by E_1 and C_1 with $(C_1 \cdot E_1) > 0$ and $(C_1^2) < 0$. Thus the contraction $\phi_{\mathcal{Y}}$ is a small flipping contraction that only contracts C_1 to a point.

Denote by \mathcal{E}' , X' , and \mathcal{D} the push-forward of \mathcal{E} , \tilde{X}_1 , $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{Y}}$ under $\phi_{\mathcal{Y}}$ respectively, so that $\mathcal{X}_0 = X' + \mathcal{E}'$. Denote by $E' := \mathcal{E}' \cap X'$. Since $(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{Y}} + \mathcal{Y}_0)$ is log canonical CY over \mathbb{A}^1 , so is $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{D} + \mathcal{X}_0)$.

Next, we show that $-K_{\mathcal{X}} - \mathcal{X}_0$ is \mathbb{Q} -Cartier and ample over \mathbb{A}^1 . By Theorem 10.3, we know that $((K_{\tilde{X}_1} + E_1) \cdot C_1) = 0$. By adjunction we have $(K_{\mathcal{Y}} + \mathcal{Y}_0)|_{\tilde{X}_1} = K_{\tilde{X}_1} + E_1$, which implies that $((K_{\mathcal{Y}} + \mathcal{Y}_0) \cdot C_1) = 0$. Thus by [KM98, Cor. 3.17] we know that $K_{\mathcal{X}} + \mathcal{X}_0 = (\phi_{\mathcal{Y}})_*(K_{\mathcal{Y}} + \mathcal{Y}_0)$ is \mathbb{Q} -Cartier. Moreover, Theorem 10.3 implies that $-K_{\tilde{X}_1} - E_1$ is big and nef on \tilde{X}_1 , which implies that $-K_{X'} - E'$ is big and nef on X' . Since $\rho(X') = \rho(\tilde{X}_1) - 1 = 1$, we have that $-K_{X'} - E'$ is ample on X' . Similarly, we know that $(\mathcal{E}', E') \cong (\mathcal{E}, E_1)$ is a plt log Fano pair as (E_1, Δ_{E_1}) is klt log Fano and $\rho(\mathcal{E}) = 1$. Thus by adjunction we know that $-K_{\mathcal{X}} - \mathcal{X}_0$ is ample over \mathbb{A}^1 . This implies that $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{D}) \rightarrow \mathbb{A}^1$ is a weakly special test configuration of boundary polarized CY pairs.

Finally, we show that $(\mathcal{X}_0, \mathcal{D}_0)$ is the gluing of two orbifold cones over \mathbb{P}^1 along sections at infinity, and the conductor with its different divisor is toric. It is clear that $(\mathcal{E}', E' + \mathcal{D}_0|_{\mathcal{E}'}) \cong (\mathcal{E}, E_1 + \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{Y},0}|_{\mathcal{E}})$ is an orbifold cone over (E_1, D_{E_1}) . On the other hand, we know that X' is obtained by contracting both E_2 and \tilde{C}_1 from \tilde{X} . Thus X' is also obtained by contracting $E_{2,2}$ on Z_2 . By Proposition 10.9 we know that Z_2 is a standard \mathbb{P}^1 -link with a negative section $E_{2,2}$. Hence from Section 2.6 we know that X' is isomorphic to an orbifold cone over \mathbb{P}^1 where E' is the section at infinity and $\mathcal{D}_0|_{X'}$ is a \mathbb{Q} -linear combination of rulings. Denote by $\Delta_{E'}$ the different divisor of the conductor E' of \mathcal{X}_0 . Since $(\mathcal{E}', E') \cong (\mathcal{E}, E_1)$, we have that $(E', \Delta_{E'}) \cong (E_1, \Delta_{E_1})$ which is toric by Lemma 2.14. Thus the proof is finished. \square

Proof of Theorem 10.1. By Lemma 9.10 and Remark 9.13, we may assume that $(X, D) \in \mathcal{P}_d^K(\mathbb{k})$. If there exists an lc place E of (X, D) as a prime divisor on X , then (X, D) is S-equivalent to pairs in (i) or (ii) by Proposition 10.13. If an lc place E of (X, D) is exceptional over X , then by replacing (X, D) with its degeneration induced by E (see Lemma 10.14) we may assume that (X, D) is a Type II pair satisfying (\dagger) . If the broken \mathbb{G}_m -orbit on X is non-reduced, then we set $(X_0, D_0) = (X, D)$ which gives us case (iii). If the broken \mathbb{G}_m -orbit on X is reduced, then by Proposition 10.16 we have a weakly special degeneration $(X, D) \rightsquigarrow (X_0, D_0)$ as in case (iv). The statement on S-equivalence is proved.

Next we prove the finiteness of (X_0, D_0) once its source (E, D_E) is fixed in each case.

(i) For a fixed elliptic curve E , the pair (X_0, D_0) is uniquely determined by the polarization L which is a degree 9 line bundle. Since any two degree 9 line bundles are isomorphic up to an automorphism of E , (X_0, D_0) is uniquely determined by E up to isomorphism.

(ii) Let L be the ample \mathbb{Q} -divisor on E such that $X_0 = C_p(E, L)$. Since (X_0, D_0) is a projective orbifold cone over (E, D_E) with \mathbb{Q} -polarization L , it suffices to show that there are at most finitely many L up to \mathbb{Z} -linear equivalence. First of all, we know that $L_{\text{orb}} \leq D_E$ as $[D_E] = 0$, which implies that there are at most finitely many choices of L_{orb} hence also $\{L\}$. Choose $r \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0}$ such that $-K_E - L_{\text{orb}} \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} rL$ which implies $2 - \deg(L_{\text{orb}}) = r \deg(L)$. Then by Proposition 2.21 we have

$$9 = (-K_{X_0})^2 = (1 + r)^2 \deg(L) = \frac{(1 + r)^2}{r} (2 - \deg(L_{\text{orb}})).$$

Since there are finitely many choices of L_{orb} , we know that r and hence $\deg(L)$ have finitely many choices. This implies that L has at most finitely many choices up to \mathbb{Z} -linear equivalence.

(iii) This follows directly from Proposition 10.15.

(iv) Let $(\overline{X}_0, \overline{G}_0 + \overline{D}_0)$ be the normalization of (X_0, D_0) where \overline{G}_0 is the conductor. Then we know that \overline{X}_0 has two connected components $\overline{X}_{0,1}$ and $\overline{X}_{0,2}$. Denote by $\overline{G}_{0,i}$ and $\overline{D}_{0,i}$ the restriction of \overline{G}_0 and \overline{D}_0 to $\overline{X}_{0,i}$. Then we know that $(\overline{X}_{0,i}, \overline{G}_{0,i} + \overline{D}_{0,i})$ is a projective orbifold cone over (E, D_E) with \mathbb{Q} -polarization L_i on E . Moreover, since X_0 is an slc Fano variety, we know that the different divisors of $(\overline{X}_{0,i}, \overline{G}_{0,i})$ on $\overline{G}_{0,i}$ are the same. By Proposition 2.20.2, this implies that $(L_i)_{\text{orb}} = \Delta_E$ is independent of the choice of i . Choose $r_i \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0}$ such that $-K_E - \Delta_E \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} r_i L_i$ which implies

$r_i \deg(L_i) = 2 - \deg \Delta_E$. Hence by Proposition 2.21 we have

$$\begin{aligned} 9 &= (-K_{X_0})^2 = (-K_{\overline{X}_0} - \overline{G}_0)^2 \\ &= r_1^2 \deg(L_1) + r_2^2 \deg(L_2) = \left(\frac{1}{\deg(L_1)} + \frac{1}{\deg(L_2)} \right) (2 - \deg \Delta_E)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\Delta_E \leq D_E$ and $[D_E] = 0$, we know that Δ_E and hence $\{L_i\}$ have finitely many choices. In particular, this shows that the possible values of $\frac{1}{\deg(L_i)}$ form an ACC set. Since $\frac{1}{\deg(L_1)} + \frac{1}{\deg(L_2)}$ has finitely many choices from the equation above, we know that both $\deg(L_1)$ and $\deg(L_2)$ have at most finitely many choices. This implies that both L_1 and L_2 have at most finitely many choices and so does the normalization $(\overline{X}_0, \overline{G}_0 + \overline{D}_0)$. Moreover, since (E, D_E) is a klt CY pair where $E \cong \mathbb{P}^1$, we know that $\text{Supp}(D_E)$ has at least three points which implies that $\text{Aut}(E, D_E)$ is a finite group. Thus for each $(\overline{X}_0, \overline{G}_0 + \overline{D}_0)$ there are at most finitely many ways to glue the two components of the conductor \overline{G}_0 . This implies that (X_0, D_0) has at most finitely many choices up to isomorphism. The proof is finished. \square

10.3. Type III pairs. We will now begin the proof of Theorem 10.2, which states that all Type III pairs are S-equivalent. The main step is the following proposition.

Proposition 10.17. *If (X, D) is a Type III lc pair in $\mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY}}(\mathbb{k})$, then it is S-equivalent to a pair (X_0, D_0) with $K_{X_0} + D_0 \sim 0$.*

Proof. By Proposition 8.17, there exists a weakly special degeneration $(X, D) \rightsquigarrow (X_0, D_0)$ such that the normalization $(\overline{X}_0, \overline{G}_0 + \overline{D}_0)$ is crepant birational to $(\mathbb{P}^2, \{xyz = 0\})$ and $K_{\overline{X}_0} + \overline{G}_0 + \overline{D}_0 \sim 0$. If X_0 is normal, then the proof is complete. Hence, we will now assume X_0 is not normal.

Claim 1: The \mathbb{Z} -divisor $\overline{\Gamma}_0 := \overline{G}_0 + \overline{D}_0$ is a cycle of \mathbb{P}^1 's glued along nodes and $\text{Diff}_{\overline{\Gamma}_0}(0) = 0$.

Proof of claim: Fix a dlt modification $f : (Y, \Gamma_Y) \rightarrow (\overline{X}_0, \overline{\Gamma}_0)$. Since $\{xyz = 0\}$ is a cycle of smooth curves glued along nodes and

$$(Y, \Gamma_Y) \sim_{\text{cbir}} (\overline{X}_0, \overline{D}_0 + \overline{G}_0) \sim_{\text{cbir}} (\mathbb{P}^2, \{xyz = 0\}),$$

[dFKX17, Prop. 11] implies Γ_Y a cycle of smooth curves glued along nodes. Using that $\text{Exc}(f) \subset \Gamma_Y$ and f have connected fibers, we see $\overline{\Gamma}_0$ is a cycle of curves as well. Since $(\overline{\Gamma}_0, \text{Diff}_{\overline{\Gamma}_0}(0))$ is an slc CY curve by adjunction, we can conclude $\overline{\Gamma}_0$ is a cycle of \mathbb{P}^1 's and $\text{Diff}_{\overline{\Gamma}_0}(0) = 0$. \square

Claim 2: $\overline{G}_0 \cong \mathbb{P}^1 \cup \mathbb{P}^1$, where the components meet at a single node p .

Proof of claim: Since $(\overline{X}_0, \overline{G}_0)$ is an lc log Fano pair with reduced boundary, [Hac04, Thm. 5.3 & 6.5] implies one of the following hold:

- (i) $\overline{G}_0 \cong \mathbb{P}^1 \cup \mathbb{P}^1$, where the components meet at a single node $p \in \overline{G}_0$.
- (ii) $\overline{G}_0 \cong \mathbb{P}^1$ and Y has a dihedral singularity [Kol13, 3.35.3] at a point $q \in \overline{G}_0$.

Case (ii) cannot hold, since then $\text{Diff}_{\overline{\Gamma}_0}(0)$ has coefficient 1 at q by [Kol13, Cor. 3.45], which would contradict Claim 1. Thus (i) holds. \square

Combining Claim 2 and Lemma 10.18 proven below, we conclude $K_{X_0} + D_0 \sim 0$. \square

Lemma 10.18. *Let (X, D) be an slc CY surface with normalization $(\overline{X}, \overline{G} + \overline{D})$. If $\overline{G} = \mathbb{P}^1 \cup \mathbb{P}^1$, where the curves meet at a single node p , and $K_{\overline{X}} + \overline{G} + \overline{D} \sim 0$, then $K_X + D \sim 0$.*

Proof. Since $K_{\overline{X}} + \overline{G} + \overline{D} \sim 0$, there exists a non-vanishing section $\overline{s} \in H^0(\overline{X}, \omega_{\overline{X}}(\overline{G} + \overline{D}))$. We aim to show \overline{s} descends to a section $s \in H^0(X, \omega_X(D))$.

Let $\overline{G}^n = C_1 \cup C_2$ and $p_i \in C_i$ denote the preimages of p . Since $(\overline{G}^n, \text{Diff}_{\overline{G}^n}(\overline{D}))$ is lc and $K_{\overline{G}^n} + \text{Diff}_{\overline{G}^n}(\overline{D}) \sim 0$ by adjunction, there exists a point $q_i \in C_i$ such that $\text{Diff}_{\overline{G}^n}(\overline{D})|_{C_i} = p_i + q_i$. Note that the involution $\tau : \overline{G}^n \rightarrow \overline{G}^n$ acts by $\tau(p_1) = p_2$ and $\tau(q_1) = q_2$.

Now consider the canonically defined Poincaré residue maps:

$$H^0(X, \omega_{\overline{X}}(\overline{G} + \overline{D})) \xrightarrow{R} H^0(C_1, \omega_{C_1}(p_1 + q_1)) \oplus H^0(C_2, \omega_{C_2}(p_2 + q_2)) \xrightarrow{R'} H^0(p_1, \omega_{p_1}) \oplus H^0(p_2, \omega_{p_2}).$$

Note that R' is an isomorphism, since

$$H^0(C_i, \omega_{C_i}(p_i + q_i)) \rightarrow H^0(p_i, \omega_{p_i})$$

is a nonzero linear map between 1-dimensional vector spaces. By [Kol13, Prop. 5.8], \overline{s} descends to X if and only if $\tau^*(R(\overline{s})) = -R(\overline{s})$.

To verify the equality holds, observe that $R(\overline{s})$ descends to a section on \overline{G} , since R factors through $H^0(\overline{G}, \omega_{\overline{G}}(\text{Diff}_{\overline{G}}(\overline{D})))$. Thus [Kol13, Prop. 5.8] applied to $R(\overline{s})$ implies

$$\tau^*(R'(R(\overline{s}))) = -R'(R(\overline{s})).$$

Since τ^* and R' commute (using that τ interchanges p_1 and p_2), it follows

$$R'(\tau^*(R(\overline{s}))) = \tau^*(R'(R(\overline{s}))) = -R'(R(\overline{s}))$$

Since R' is an isomorphism, we further see $\tau^*(R(\overline{s})) = -R(\overline{s})$. Thus \overline{s} descends to a non-zero section $s \in H^0(X, \omega_X(D))$, which induces an effective divisor B on X such that $K_X + D \sim B$. Since $K_X + D \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0$, $B = 0$. Therefore $K_X + D \sim 0$. \square

We will now deduce Theorem 10.2 from Proposition 10.17.

Proof of Theorem 10.2. By Lemma 9.10, we may assume X is normal. By Proposition 10.17, we may further assume $K_X + D \sim 0$. Thus we can write

$$D := \frac{3}{d}(\frac{d}{3}C),$$

where we are viewing both C and $\frac{d}{3}C$ as relative Mumford divisors and $\frac{3}{d}$ as the marking.

We claim that the marked pair $(X, 1C)$ is in $\mathcal{P}_3^{\text{CY}}$. Indeed, since (X, D) is in $\mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY}}$, there is a family $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{D}) \rightarrow T$ in $\mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY}}$ over the germ of a pointed curve $0 \in T$ such that

$$(\mathcal{X}_0, \mathcal{D}_0) \cong (X, D) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{X}_{K(T)} \cong \mathbb{P}_{K(T)}^2$$

Since $K_X + C \sim 0$, Lemma 12.2 (proven in a later section) implies that there exists a relative Mumford divisor \mathcal{C} on \mathcal{X} such that $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{C}) \rightarrow T$ is a family of boundary polarized CY pairs with $K_{\mathcal{X}/T} + \mathcal{C} \sim 0$ and $(\mathcal{X}_0, \mathcal{C}_0) \cong (X, C)$. Thus the marked pair $(X, 1C)$ is in $\mathcal{P}_3^{\text{CY}}$.

To finish the proof, we use the K-moduli space of cubic curves. By Lemma 9.10, $(X, 1C)$ is S-equivalent to a Type III pair in \mathcal{P}_3^{K} . Note that the type III pairs in \mathcal{P}_3^{K} are of the form $(\mathbb{P}^2, \{f_3(x, y, z) = 0\})$ where $f_3(x, y, z) = 0$ is a nodal cubic by [ADL19, Ex. 4.5] and any nodal cubic degenerates to three lines in \mathbb{P}^2 via a map $\mathbb{G}_m \rightarrow \text{Aut}(\mathbb{P}^2)$. Therefore $(X, 1C) \sim_S (\mathbb{P}^2, 1\{xyz = 0\})$, which implies $(X, D) \sim_S (\mathbb{P}^2, \frac{3}{d}\{(xyz)^{d/3} = 0\})$. \square

11. TWISTED VARIETIES

In this section, we associate to a pair in $\mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY}}$ its canonical covering stack, which is a Gorenstein Deligne–Mumford stack. This construction has previously been used to study moduli of certain classes of slc varieties and pairs [Hac04, AH11, BI21]. We will use the construction to understand the local structure of $\mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY}}$ and prove a result that will be used to show $\mathcal{P}_{3,m}^{\text{CY}}$ admits a good moduli space.

11.1. Canonical covering stack.

Definition 11.1. The *covering stack* of a family $(X, D) \rightarrow B$ in $\mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY}}$, where $D := \frac{3}{d}C$ and B is a Noetherian scheme, is the quotient stack

$$\mathcal{X} := \left[\text{Spec}_X \left(\bigoplus_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} \omega_{X/B}^{[m]} \right) / \mathbb{G}_m \right].$$

Note that the natural map $\pi : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow X$ is an isomorphism on the open set $U \subset X$ where $\omega_{X/B}$ is a line bundle. We set \mathcal{C} equal to the closure of $C|_U$ in \mathcal{X} and call $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{D}) \rightarrow B$, where $\mathcal{D} := \frac{3}{d}\mathcal{C}$, the *canonical covering family* of $(X, D) \rightarrow B$.

Proposition 11.2. *The following hold:*

- (1) \mathcal{X} is a Deligne–Mumford stack with coarse moduli space $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow X$.
- (2) $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow B$ is a proper flat morphism with S_2 fibers.
- (3) The canonical sheaf $\omega_{\mathcal{X}/B}$ is a line bundle.
- (4) \mathcal{C} is a Cartier divisor on \mathcal{X} that is flat over B .
- (5) The pair $(\mathcal{X}_b, \mathcal{D}_b)$ is slc (see [BI21, Def. 2.5]) for all $b \in B$.

In the above proposition, $\omega_{\mathcal{X}/B} := j_*\omega_{\mathcal{U}/B}$, where j denotes the open immersion $\mathcal{U} := \pi^{-1}(U) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{X}$. The sheaf is reflexive by [LN18, Prop. 5.6].

Proof. Since $\omega_{X/B}^{[m]}$ commutes with arbitrary base change for all $m \in \mathbb{Z}$, [AH11, Prop. 5.3.2] implies (1) and (2) hold and that there is a line bundle \mathcal{L} on \mathcal{X} that agrees with $\omega_{\mathcal{X}/B}$ on the open locus \mathcal{U} . Since $\text{codim}_{\mathcal{X}_b}(\mathcal{X}_b \setminus \mathcal{U}_b) \geq 2$ for all $b \in B$, [HK04, Prop. 3.6.2] implies $\mathcal{L} \cong \omega_{\mathcal{X}/B}$ and so (3) holds.

To prove (4), fix any $x \in X$. We claim that there exists an integer k and an open set $x \in V \subset X$ such that $\omega_{X/B}^{[k]}(C)|_V$ is a line bundle. Indeed, if $3 \mid d$, then $\omega_{X/B}^{[d/3]}(C) \cong_B \mathcal{O}_X$ by definition and, hence, $\omega_{X/B}^{[d/3]}(C)$ is a line bundle. If $3 \nmid d$, let b denote the image of x in B . Proposition 9.16 and [Hac04, Proof of Lem. 3.13] imply C_b is locally a multiple of K_{X_b} at x . Hence, for some integer k , $\omega_{X_b}^{[k]}(C_b)$ is a line bundle at $x \in X$. Since $\omega_{X/B}^{[k]}(C)$ commutes with base change, $\omega_{X/B}^{[k]}(C)|_{C_b}$ is also a line bundle at x . This implies that there exists a neighborhood V containing x such that $\omega_{X/B}^{[k]}(C)|_V$ is a line bundle.

We now show that the claim implies (4). Let $\mathcal{V} := \pi^{-1}(V) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{X}$. Since $\omega_{\mathcal{X}/B}^{[k]}(C)|_{\mathcal{V}}$ and $\pi^*\omega_{X/B}^{[k]}(C)|_{\mathcal{V}}$ are isomorphic over $\mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{V}$, [HK04, Prop. 3.6.2] implies the sheaves are isomorphic. Thus $\omega_{\mathcal{X}/B}^{[k]}(C)|_{\mathcal{V}}$ is a line bundle. Using that $\omega_{\mathcal{X}/B}$ is a line bundle, we see $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}(C)|_{\mathcal{V}}$ is a line bundle. Thus \mathcal{C} is a Cartier divisor.

Since \mathcal{C} does not contain a fiber of $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow B$ (as C does not contain a fiber $X \rightarrow B$), [Kol23, Lem. 4.20] implies $\mathcal{C} \rightarrow B$ is flat. Finally, (5) follows from [BI21, Obs. 2.6] as $\pi : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow X$ is an isomorphism in codimension one. \square

Remark 11.3. In [Hac04, Sec. 3], a different construction, which locally is a stack quotient of the index one cover of $\omega_{X/S}$, is used to construct a Deligne–Mumford stack with similar properties. These two constructions agree by [BI21, Sec. 4.1].

11.2. Local structure. In the section, we relate deformations of a family in $\mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY}}$ to deformations of the canonical covering stack. Using this correspondence and results of [Hac04], we show the stack is smooth when $3 \nmid d$.

11.2.1. Deformations.

Proposition 11.4. *Let A' be a local artinian ring with residue field \mathbb{k} , (X, D) in $\mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY}}(\mathbb{k})$, and $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{D})$ the canonical covering pair. Then there exists a bijection between:*

- (1) isomorphism classes of deformations $(X', D') \rightarrow \mathrm{Spec}(A')$ of (X, D) and
(2) isomorphism classes of deformations $(\mathcal{X}', \mathcal{D}') \rightarrow \mathrm{Spec}(A')$ of $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{D})$.

In the above proposition, a deformation means the following:

- A *deformation* of (X, D) is a family $(X', D') \rightarrow \mathrm{Spec}(A')$ in $\mathcal{M}(\chi, N_d, (1, \frac{3}{d}))$ with an isomorphism $(X', D')_{\mathrm{Spec}(\mathbb{k})} \cong (X, D)$.
- A *deformation* of $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{D})$, where $\mathcal{D} := \frac{3}{d}\mathcal{C}$, is the data of $(\mathcal{X}', \mathcal{D}')$, where \mathcal{X}' is a Deligne–Mumford stack with a flat proper morphism $\mathcal{X}' \rightarrow \mathrm{Spec}(A')$ and $\mathcal{D}' := \frac{3}{d}\mathcal{C}'$, where $\mathcal{C}' \subset \mathcal{X}'$ is a flat Cartier divisor with an isomorphism $(\mathcal{X}', \mathcal{C}')|_{\mathrm{Spec}(\mathbb{k})} \cong (\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{C})$.

Proof. The construction in Section 11.1 produces a map from (1) to (2) given by taking the canonical covering family $(\mathcal{X}', \mathcal{D}') \rightarrow \mathrm{Spec}(A')$ of $(X', D') \rightarrow \mathrm{Spec}(A')$. To construct its inverse, fix a deformation $(\mathcal{X}', \mathcal{D}') \rightarrow \mathrm{Spec}(A')$ of $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{D})$ and let X' denote the coarse moduli space of \mathcal{X}' . By [Alp13, Prop. 4.6.i & 4.14.x], there is a cartesian diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{X} & \hookrightarrow & \mathcal{X}' \\ \downarrow \pi & & \downarrow \pi', \\ X & \hookrightarrow & X' \end{array}$$

where the vertical arrows are the coarse moduli space maps, and the horizontal arrows are closed embeddings, and the map $X' \rightarrow \mathrm{Spec}(A')$ is flat. Let $\mathcal{U} \subset \mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{U}' \subset \mathcal{X}'$ denote the loci where π and π' are isomorphisms. Since $\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{U}'|_{\mathcal{X}}$, $\mathrm{codim}_{\mathcal{X}'}(\mathcal{X}' \setminus \mathcal{U}') \geq 2$. Hence we may set $D' := \frac{3}{d}\mathcal{C}'$, where \mathcal{C}' is the closure of the (isomorphic) image of $\mathcal{C}'|_{\mathcal{U}'}$ in X' .

We now prove $(X', D') \rightarrow \mathrm{Spec}(A')$ is a family in $\mathcal{M}(\chi, N_d, (1, \frac{3}{d}))$. Since $(X', D')_{\mathrm{Spec}(\mathbb{k})} \cong (X, D)$, which is an slc pair in $\mathcal{P}_d^{\mathrm{CY}}$, it suffices to show (i) $\omega_{X'/A'}^{[m]}(k\mathcal{C})$ commutes with base change for all $m, k \in \mathbb{Z}$ and (ii) $\omega_{X'/A'}^{[N_d]}(N_d D') \cong \mathcal{O}_{X'}$. For (i), note that $\pi'_* \omega_{\mathcal{X}'/A'}^{[m]}(k\mathcal{C}')$ is flat over B with pure S_2 fibers and taking reflexive powers commutes with base change by the proof of [AH11, Thm. 5.3.6]. Since $\pi'_* \omega_{\mathcal{X}'/A'}^{[m]}(k\mathcal{C}')$ and $\omega_{X'/A'}^{[m]}(k\mathcal{C}')$ agree over U , [HK04, Prop. 3.6.2] implies the sheaves are isomorphic. Thus (i) holds.

To show (ii) holds, note that $\omega_{X'/A'}^{[N_d]}(N_d D')|_X \cong \omega_X^{[N_d]}(N_d D) \cong \mathcal{O}_X$, where the first isomorphism is by (i). Hence $\omega_{X'/A'}^{[N_d]}(N_d D')$ is a deformation of \mathcal{O}_X . To show \mathcal{O}_X does not admit trivial deformations, factor $A' \rightarrow \mathbb{k}$ by a sequence of maps of Artinian rings

$$A' = A_0 \rightarrow A_1 \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow A_r = \mathbb{k}$$

such that $J_i := \ker(A_i \rightarrow A_{i+1})$ is a principal ideal annihilated by the maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}_i \subset A_i$. Set $X_i := X \times_{\mathrm{Spec}(A)} \mathrm{Spec}(A_i)$. Since

$$H^1(X_{i+1}, J_i \otimes \mathcal{O}_{X_{i+1}}) = H^1(X, \mathcal{O}_X) = 0,$$

where the first isomorphism uses that $J_i \cong A_i/\mathfrak{m}_i \cong \mathbb{k}$ and the second is by [Kol23, Thm. 11.34], [Har10, Thm. 6.4] implies that there is at most one deformation of \mathcal{O}_{X_i} to X_{i+1} . Hence the only deformation of \mathcal{O}_X to X' is $\mathcal{O}_{X'}$, and we can conclude that (ii) holds.

By the above discussion, $(X', D') \rightarrow \mathrm{Spec}(A')$ is a deformation of (X, D) . Thus taking the coarse moduli space gives a map from (2) to (1). To see that these constructions are inverses, note that the canonical covering stack of the coarse moduli space $X' \rightarrow \mathrm{Spec}(A')$ is isomorphic to $\mathcal{X}' \rightarrow \mathrm{Spec}(A')$ by [Hac04, Prop. 3.7]. Thus we get the desired bijection. \square

11.2.2. Smoothness and normality results.

Proposition 11.5. *If (X_0, D_0) is in $\mathcal{P}_d^{\mathrm{CY}}(\mathbb{k})$ and the normalization $(\overline{X}_0, \overline{G}_0)$ of $(X_0, 0)$ is plt, then $\mathcal{P}_d^{\mathrm{CY}}$ is smooth at (X_0, D_0) .*

Proof. Since $\mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY}}$ is defined as the closure of the open substack \mathcal{P}_d in $\mathcal{M}(\chi, N_d, (1, \frac{3}{d}))$, it suffices to prove $\mathcal{M}(\chi, N_d, (1, \frac{3}{d}))$ is smooth at (X_0, D_0) . By the infinitesimal lifting criterion for smoothness [Sta23, Tag 02HY and Tag 0DP0], the latter holds if and only if for every

- surjective morphism of Artinian local rings $A' \rightarrow A$ with residue field \mathbb{k} and
- deformation $(X, D) \rightarrow \text{Spec}(A)$ of (X_0, D_0) ,

there exists a deformation $(X', D') \rightarrow \text{Spec}(A')$ of (X_0, D_0) extending $(X, D) \rightarrow \text{Spec}(A)$.

To verify the existence of such a deformation, we will first deform the canonical covering family $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{D}) \rightarrow \text{Spec}(A)$ of $(X, D) \rightarrow \text{Spec}(A)$. Since $(\overline{X}_0, \overline{G}_0)$ is plt by assumption, [Hac04, Thm. 8.2 & 9.1] implies the existence of a flat proper morphism from a Deligne–Mumford stack $\mathcal{X}' \rightarrow \text{Spec}(A')$ and an isomorphism $\mathcal{X}' \times_{\text{Spec}(A')} \text{Spec}(A) \cong \mathcal{X}$. Since $H^i(X_0, \mathcal{O}_{X_0}(C_0)) = 0 = H^i(X_0, \mathcal{O}_{X_0})$ for all $i \geq 1$ by [Kol23, Thm. 11.34] and \mathcal{C} is a Cartier divisor by Proposition 11.2, the proof of [Hac04, Thm. 3.12] implies $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathcal{X}$ deforms to a closed subscheme $\mathcal{C}' \subset \mathcal{X}'$. Thus $(\mathcal{X}', \mathcal{D}' := \frac{3}{d}\mathcal{C}') \rightarrow \text{Spec}(A')$ is a deformation of $(\mathcal{X}_0, \mathcal{D}_0)$. By Proposition 11.4, the coarse moduli space $(X', D') \rightarrow \text{Spec}(A')$ is a deformation of (X_0, D_0) extending $(X, D) \rightarrow \text{Spec}(A)$. Therefore $\mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY}}$ is smooth at (X_0, D_0) . \square

Using the previous proposition, we deduce the following statements.

Proposition 11.6. *If $3 \nmid d$, then $\mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY}}$ is smooth and P_d^{CY} is normal.*

Proof. By Propositions 9.16 and 11.5, $\mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY}}$ is smooth. Thus P_d^{CY} is normal by [Alp13, Thm. 4.16.viii]. \square

Proposition 11.7. *For each $d \geq 1$, \mathcal{P}_d^{K} is smooth and P_d^{K} is normal.*

Proof. Since K-semistable log Fano pairs are klt, Proposition 11.5 implies \mathcal{P}_d^{K} is smooth. Thus P_d^{K} is normal by [Alp13, Thm. 4.16.viii]. \square

Remark 11.8. The definition of \mathcal{P}_d^{K} in [ADL19] differs from the definition in this paper. While it is straightforward to see the definitions agree over reduced bases using Lemma 3.3 and [ADL19, Rem. 3.25], it is not immediately obvious that the two definitions agree over all base schemes. However, since \mathcal{P}_d^{K} is reduced by Proposition 11.7 and so is the stack in [ADL19] by definition, the two stacks agree.

11.3. Twisted curves. We now discuss *twisted curves*, which arise naturally from families in $\mathcal{P}_3^{\text{CY}}$ and study some properties of their degenerations.

Definition 11.9 ([AV02]). A *twisted curve* over a scheme B is a proper flat Deligne–Mumford stack $\mathcal{C} \rightarrow B$ such that for each geometric point $\overline{b} \rightarrow B$,

- (1) $\mathcal{C}_{\overline{b}}$ is purely one-dimensional with at worst nodal singularities,
- (2) the coarse moduli map $\mathcal{C}_{\overline{b}} \rightarrow C_{\overline{b}}$ is an isomorphism away from the nodes of $\mathcal{C}_{\overline{b}}$, and
- (3) each node of $\mathcal{C}_{\overline{b}}$ admits an étale neighborhood which is étale locally isomorphic to

$$[(\text{Spec } k(\overline{b})[z, w]/(zw))/\mu_r],$$

where the action of μ_r is $\zeta \cdot z = \zeta z$ and $\zeta \cdot w = \zeta^{-1}w$ for $\zeta \in \mu_r$.

The following proposition produces a twisted curve from a family in $\mathcal{P}_3^{\text{CY}}$.

Proposition 11.10. *If $(X, D := \frac{3}{3}C) \rightarrow B$ is a family in $\mathcal{P}_3^{\text{CY}}$ over a Noetherian scheme B and $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{D} := \frac{3}{3}\mathcal{C})$ is the canonical covering family, then $\mathcal{C} \rightarrow B$ is a twisted curve.*

Proof. By Proposition 11.2.4, $\mathcal{C} \rightarrow B$ is flat and its formation commutes with base change. Thus we need to check the geometric fibers are twisted curves. Since every geometric point of $\mathcal{P}_3^{\text{CY}}$ is in the closure of \mathcal{P}_3 , it suffices to prove that, when $B = \text{Spec } R$ is the spectrum of a DVR with algebraically closed residue field and $(X, D) \rightarrow B$ has generic fiber in \mathcal{P}_3 , then the fiber over the closed point $0 \in B$ is a twisted curve.

We will now show \mathcal{C}_0 satisfies (1)–(3) of Definition 11.9 when $(X, D) \rightarrow B$ is as above. Part (1) holds, since \mathcal{C}_0 is pure 1-dimensional by definition and is at worst nodal by Proposition 11.2.4 and adjunction. For (2), we will first show $\text{Diff}_{\mathcal{C}_0}(0) = 0$. Since $\text{Supp}(\text{Diff}_C(0))$ is flat over B by Lemma 2.8.2 and $\text{Diff}_C(0)$ is trivial over the generic fiber, $\text{Diff}_C(0) = 0$. Now we compute by adjunction that

$$K_{\mathcal{C}_0} + \text{Diff}_{\mathcal{C}_0}(0) \sim 0 \quad \text{and} \quad K_{\mathcal{C}_0} \sim K_C|_{\mathcal{C}_0} \sim (K_C + \text{Diff}_C(0))|_{\mathcal{C}_0} \sim 0.$$

Thus $\text{Diff}_{\mathcal{C}_0}(0) \sim 0$, which implies $\text{Diff}_{\mathcal{C}_0}(0) = 0$. Therefore X_0 is smooth at the smooth points of \mathcal{C}_0 by [Kol13, Prop. 2.35]. Thus the canonical covering stack $\pi : \mathcal{X}_0 \rightarrow X_0$ is an isomorphism over smooth points of \mathcal{C}_0 and so (2) holds.

Finally, we check (3). Let $p \in \mathcal{C}_0$ be a nodal geometric point lying over the geometric point $q \rightarrow C_0$. By the previous argument, $\pi^{-1}(C_0^{sm}) = \mathcal{C}_0^{sm}$ so q is a node and by [Ols07, Prop. 2.2] and [Sta23, Tag 04GH] the pullback of \mathcal{C}_0 to the strict Henselization of C_0 at q is computed as

$$\mathcal{C}_0 \times_C \text{Spec } \mathcal{O}_{C,q}^{sh} \cong [\text{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_{B,0}[z, w]/(zw - t))^{sh}/\mu_r]$$

where $t \in \mathfrak{m} \subset R$ and a generator of μ_r acts via $(z, w) \mapsto (\zeta_1 z, \zeta_2 w)$ for ζ_i primitive r^{th} roots of unity. Since $C \rightarrow B$ is a smoothing of \mathcal{C}_0 , $t \neq 0$. On the other hand, μ_r acts trivially on t and $(zw - t)$ must be a μ_r -invariant ideal so $\zeta_1 \zeta_2 = 1$, concluding the proof of (3). \square

Proposition 11.11. *If $(X, D := \frac{3}{3}C)$ is a pair in $\mathcal{P}_3^{\text{CY}}(\mathbb{k})$ with canonical cover $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{D} := \frac{3}{3}\mathcal{C})$ and $\pi : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow X$ is the coarse moduli space morphism, then*

$$\text{ind}_{\pi(p)}(K_X) = |\text{Aut}_{\mathcal{C}}(p)| \quad \text{for all } p \in \mathcal{C}.$$

Proof. Since $\mathcal{C} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{X}$ is a closed embedding, $\text{Aut}_{\mathcal{C}}(p) = \text{Aut}_{\mathcal{X}}(p)$. By the last paragraph of [Kol13, Proof of Thm. 9.51], the reduced fiber of $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow X$ over $\pi(p)$ equals $[(\mathbb{A}^1 \setminus 0)/\mathbb{G}_m]$, where \mathbb{G}_m -acts on $\mathbb{A}^1 \setminus 0$ by $t \cdot x = t^m x$ and m is the index of K_X at $\pi(p)$ so $|\text{Aut}_{\mathcal{X}}(p)| = m$. \square

Proposition 11.12. *Let $\mathcal{C} \rightarrow S$ be a family of twisted curves over a pure two dimensional scheme S . Let $0 \in S$ be a closed point and $1 \in I \subset \mathbb{N}$ a finite subset. If $|\text{Aut}_{\mathcal{C}}(p)| \in I$ for all $p \in \mathcal{C} \setminus \mathcal{C}_0$, then $|\text{Aut}_{\mathcal{C}}(p)| \in I$ for all $p \in \mathcal{C}_0$.*

The result shows that, for a family of twisted curves, the stabilizer does not jump up in codimension two. An application to families in $\mathcal{P}_3^{\text{CY}}$ will be given in Proposition 11.13.

Proof. First note that the order of $\text{Aut}_{\mathcal{C}}(p)$ can be computed locally and after passing to the strict Henselization of the coarse space C at $q = \pi(p)$. Indeed let $f : (\text{Spec } A, q') \rightarrow (C, q)$ be any pointed étale map and consider the cartesian diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{C}_A & \xrightarrow{f'} & \mathcal{C} \\ \pi' \downarrow & & \downarrow \pi \\ \text{Spec } A & \xrightarrow{f} & C \end{array} .$$

Then π' is the coarse moduli map and $f'(p') = p$ where $p' \in \mathcal{C}_A$ lies over $q' \in \text{Spec } A$. Moreover, f is stabilizer preserving so f' is also stabilizer preserving. That is,

$$\text{Aut}_{\mathcal{C}_A}(p') \rightarrow \text{Aut}_{\mathcal{C}}(p)$$

is an isomorphism.

Thus we may assume that $(S, 0)$ is a strictly Henselian local ring and replace (C, q) with $\text{Spec } \mathcal{O}_{C,q}^{sh}$. We may also assume that p is a node of \mathcal{C}_0 otherwise the statement is clear. Now the statement is a consequence of the description of the local structure of twisted curves [Ols07, Prop. 2.2]. Indeed by *loc. cit.*,

$$\mathcal{C} \times_C \text{Spec } \mathcal{O}_{C,q}^{sh} \cong [\text{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_{S,0}[z, w]/(zw - t))^{sh}/\mu_r],$$

where $t \in \mathfrak{m} \subset \mathcal{O}_{S,0}$ and $\zeta \in \mu_r$ acts by $(z, w) \mapsto (\zeta z, \zeta^{-1}w)$. This stack has stabilizer μ_r along the nodal locus $\{t = 0\} \subset \mathcal{C}$ and trivial stabilizer elsewhere. On the other hand, $V(t) \subset S$ has codimension at most 1. Thus $\{t = 0\}$ intersects $\mathcal{C} \setminus \mathcal{C}_0$ nontrivially and so $r \in I$ as required. \square

Proposition 11.13. *Let S be a Noetherian pure two dimensional scheme, $0 \in S$ a closed point, and $S^\circ := S \setminus 0$. If $(X, D) \rightarrow S$ is in $\mathcal{P}_3^{\text{CY}}$ and its restriction $(X^\circ, D^\circ) \rightarrow S^\circ$ is in $\mathcal{P}_{3,m}^{\text{CY}}$, then $(X, D) \rightarrow S$ is in $\mathcal{P}_{3,m}^{\text{CY}}$.*

Proof. By Propositions 11.10, 11.11, and 11.12, $\text{ind}_p(K_{X_0}) \leq m$ at all $p \in D_0$. Since $K_{X_0} + D_0 \sim 0$, $\text{ind}_p(K_{X_0}) = 1$ at all $p \in X_0 \setminus D_0$. Therefore, $(X, D) \rightarrow S$ is in $\mathcal{P}_{3,m}^{\text{CY}}$. \square

12. EXISTENCE OF GOOD MODULI SPACES

In this section, we prove that $\mathcal{P}_{d,m}^{\text{CY}}$ admits a good moduli space and study properties of the moduli space.

12.1. Index 1 CY pairs. We now prove technical results that will allow us to reduce to the case when $d = 3$ when proving that $\mathcal{P}_{d,m}^{\text{CY}}$ is S -complete and Θ -reductive.

Proposition 12.1. *Let (X, D) be a pair in $\mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY}}$ with an action by $\mathbb{T} := \mathbb{G}_m^r$ for some $r \geq 0$.*

If (X, D) is Type II or III, then there exists a \mathbb{T} -invariant divisor B on X such that (X, B) is a boundary polarized CY pair of index 1.

In the language of complements, the divisor B is a \mathbb{T} -invariant 1-complement of X . To construct the divisor B , we first use results from Section 10 to degenerate (X, D) to a pair (X_0, D_0) admitting such a divisor B_0 . The following lemma will allow us to deform B_0 to the desired divisor B on X .

Lemma 12.2. *Let $\mathbb{T} := \mathbb{G}_m^r$ and $(X, \Delta + D) \rightarrow S$ be a family of boundary polarized CY pairs over a reduced Noetherian affine scheme S such that $(X, \Delta) \rightarrow S$ is \mathbb{T} -equivariant.*

If $0 \in S$ is a \mathbb{T} -invariant closed point and B_0 a \mathbb{T} -invariant \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X_0 satisfying

- (1) $0 \in \overline{\mathbb{T} \cdot s}$ for any $s \in S$,
- (2) $(X_0, \Delta_0 + B_0)$ is slc, and
- (3) $0 \sim N(K_{X_0} + \Delta_0 + B_0)$,

then B_0 extends to a \mathbb{T} -equivariant \mathbb{Q} -divisor B on X such that $(X, \Delta + B) \rightarrow S$ is a family of boundary polarized CY pairs with $N(K_{X/S} + \Delta + B) \sim 0$.

Proof. Consider the restriction map

$$\phi : H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(-N(K_{X/S} - \Delta))) \rightarrow H^0(X_0, f_* \mathcal{O}_{X_0}(-N(K_{X_0} - \Delta_0))),$$

which is surjective by Proposition 3.5 and the assumption that S is affine. The \mathbb{T} -action on $(X, \Delta) \rightarrow S$ induces \mathbb{T} -actions on the source and target of ϕ . Thus the \mathbb{k} -vector spaces admit decompositions into weight spaces indexed by \mathbb{Z}^r that respects ϕ :

$$\phi : \bigoplus_{\vec{\lambda} \in \mathbb{Z}^r} H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(-N(K_{X/S} + \Delta)))_{\vec{\lambda}} \rightarrow \bigoplus_{\vec{\lambda} \in \mathbb{Z}^r} H^0(X_0, f_* \mathcal{O}_{X_0}(-N(K_{X_0} + \Delta_0)))_{\vec{\lambda}}$$

Since $NB_0 \sim -N(K_{X_0} - \Delta_0)$ is \mathbb{T} -equivariant, there exists $\vec{\lambda}' \in \mathbb{Z}^r$ and

$$g_0 \in H^0(X_0, \mathcal{O}_{X_0}(-N(K_{X_0} - \Delta_0)))_{\vec{\lambda}'}$$

such that $B_0 = \frac{1}{N}\{g_0 = 0\}$. Since ϕ is surjective, there exists

$$g \in H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(-N(K_{X/S} - \Delta)))_{\vec{\lambda}'}$$

such that $\phi(g) = g_0$. Thus $B := \frac{1}{N}\{g = 0\}$ is a \mathbb{T} -equivariant extension of B_0 . Note that

$$0 \in S_{\text{slc}} := \{s \in S \mid (X_s, \Delta_s + B_s) \text{ is slc}\}$$

and $S_{\text{slc}} \subset S$ is a \mathbb{T} -equivariant open set by the openness of slc singularities [Kol23, Cor. 4.52]. Therefore assumptions (1) and (2) imply $S_{\text{slc}} = S$ and so $(X, \Delta + B) \rightarrow S$ is a \mathbb{T} -equivariant family of boundary polarized CY pairs with $N(K_{X/S} + \Delta + B) \sim 0$. \square

Proof of Proposition 12.1. By Theorems 10.1 and 10.2, (X, D) is S-equivalent to a pair (X', D') , which is either (i)-(iv) listed in Theorem 10.1 or (v) $X' = \mathbb{P}^2$ and $D' := \frac{3}{d}\{(xyz)^{d/3} = 0\}$. Hence, the pairs admit weakly special degenerations

$$(X, D) \rightsquigarrow (X_0, D_0) \leftarrow (X', D')$$

via test configurations, which we denote by $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{D}) \rightarrow \mathbb{A}^1$ and $(\mathcal{X}', \mathcal{D}') \rightarrow \mathbb{A}^1$. Since $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{D})$ is \mathbb{T} -equivariant by Proposition 4.14, the \mathbb{T} -action on (X, D) induces a $\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{G}_m$ -action on $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{D})$ fixing \mathcal{X}_0 .

Claim: There is a $\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{G}_m$ -invariant divisor B_0 on X_0 such that (X_0, B_0) is a CY pair of index 1.

Proof of claim: In each case, there exists a divisor B' on X' such that (X', B') is a CY pair of index 1 and $\text{LC}(X', D') \subset \text{LC}(X', B')$. Indeed, in cases (i) and (v), set $B' := D'$. In the remaining cases,

- (ii) X' is a projective orbifold cone over \mathbb{P}^1 whose orbifold divisor is toric. Let B' be the reduced toric boundary divisor of X' .
- (iii) X' is a klt toric surface. Let B' to be the reduced toric boundary divisor of X' .
- (iv) X' is the gluing of two projective orbifold cones X'_1 and X'_2 over \mathbb{P}^1 with the same toric orbifold divisor. Denote the conductor divisor on X'_i by G_i . Let $B'|_{X'_i}$ be the reduced toric boundary divisor on X'_i minus G_i .

By Lemma 4.11, there exists a divisor B_0^0 on X_0 and weakly special degeneration $(X', B') \rightsquigarrow (X_0, B_0^0)$ such that $\text{LC}(X_0, D_0) \subset \text{LC}(X_0, B_0^0)$.

While B_0^0 is not necessarily $\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{G}_m$ -invariant, we can use a degeneration argument to remedy this. Consider the inclusion of $\lambda : \mathbb{G}_m \cong \mathbb{G}_m \times 1^{\times r} \hookrightarrow \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{G}_m$ and set

$$B_0^1 := \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \lambda(t) \cdot B_0^0.$$

By Lemma 4.11 applied to the product test configuration of (X_0, D_0) induced by λ , there is a weakly special degeneration $(X_0, B_0) \rightsquigarrow (X_0, B_0^1)$ such that $\text{LC}(X_0, D_0) \subset \text{LC}(X_0, B_0^1)$. Degenerating r -additional times using the remaining summands of $\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{G}_m = \mathbb{G}_m^{r+1}$ produces a sequence of weakly special degenerations

$$(X', D') \rightsquigarrow (X_0^0, B_0^0) \rightsquigarrow \dots \rightsquigarrow (X_0^{r+1}, B_0^{r+1})$$

such that $B_0 := B_0^{r+1}$ is $\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{G}_m$ -invariant. Since (X', B') has index 1, Lemma 2.11 implies (X_0, B_0) has index 1. \square

By Lemma 12.2 applied to B_0 , there is a $\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{G}_m$ -invariant divisor \mathcal{B} on \mathcal{X} such that $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{B}) \rightarrow \mathbb{A}^1$ is a family of boundary polarized CY pairs with $K_{\mathcal{X}/\mathbb{A}^1} + \mathcal{B} \sim 0$. Thus $(X, B) := (\mathcal{X}_1, \mathcal{B}_1)$ is a \mathbb{T} -equivariant boundary polarized CY pair of index 1. \square

We now prove an analogue of Proposition 12.1 for families over the the surfaces appearing in the definition of S-completeness and Θ -reductivity.

Proposition 12.3. *Let R be a DVR with uniformizer π . Let S be the affine scheme*

$$\text{Spec}(R[s, t]/(st - \pi)) \quad \text{or} \quad \text{Spec}(R[t]),$$

where \mathbb{G}_m -acts on S with weights 1 and -1 on s and t , respectively, and write $0 \in S$ for the unique \mathbb{G}_m -invariant closed point.

If $(X, D) \rightarrow S$ is a \mathbb{G}_m -equivariant family in $\mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY}}$ and (X_0, D_0) is Type II or III, then there exists a divisor B on X such that $(X, B) \rightarrow S$ is a \mathbb{G}_m -equivariant family in $\mathcal{P}_3^{\text{CY}}$.

Proof. By Proposition 12.1, there exists a \mathbb{G}_m -invariant divisor B_0 such that (X_0, B_0) is a boundary polarized CY pair with index 1. By Lemma 12.2, B_0 extends to a divisor B on X such that $(X, B) \rightarrow S$ is a \mathbb{G}_m -equivariant family of boundary polarized CY pairs with $K_{X/S} + B \sim 0$. Since each fiber of $X \rightarrow S$ is a degeneration of \mathbb{P}^2 and $K_{X/S} + B \sim 0$, $(X, B) \rightarrow S$ is in $\mathcal{P}_3^{\text{CY}}$. \square

12.2. Existence of the moduli space.

Theorem 12.4. *For each $d \geq 3$ and $m \geq 1$, there is a good moduli space $\phi_m : \mathcal{P}_{d,m}^{\text{CY}} \rightarrow P_{d,m}^{\text{CY}}$ and $P_{d,m}^{\text{CY}}$ is a separated algebraic space.*

The key step to proving the theorem is to verify the following statement.

Proposition 12.5. *For each $d \geq 3$ and $m \geq 1$, $\mathcal{P}_{d,m}^{\text{CY}}$ is S -complete and Θ -reductive.*

The proof of the proposition relies on reducing to the case when $d = 3$ and the theory of twisted curves to analyze the case when $d = 3$.

Proof. Let R be a DVR essentially of finite over \mathbb{k} and $\pi \in R$ a uniformizer. Set

$$S := \text{Spec}(R[s, t]/(st - \pi)) \quad \text{or} \quad S := \text{Spec}(R[t]),$$

where \mathbb{G}_m -acts on S with weights 1 and -1 on s and t , respectively. Let $0 \in S$ denote the unique closed point fixed by \mathbb{G}_m and $S^\circ := S \setminus 0$. Fix a \mathbb{G}_m -equivariant family $(X^\circ, D^\circ) \rightarrow S^\circ$ in $\mathcal{P}_{d,m}^{\text{CY}}$. By Theorems 5.4 and 6.3, the family extends uniquely to a \mathbb{G}_m -equivariant family $(X, D) \rightarrow S$ in $\mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY}}$. We claim that $(X, D) \rightarrow S$ is in $\mathcal{P}_{d,m}^{\text{CY}}$.

Case 1: (X_0, D_0) is Type I. Let $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{D}) \rightarrow \mathbb{A}_\kappa^1$ denote the test configuration given by

$$(X, D)_{\{s=0\}} \rightarrow \{s=0\} \quad \text{or} \quad (X, D)_{\pi=0} \rightarrow \{\pi=0\},$$

depending on which scheme S denotes. Note that $(\mathcal{X}_1, \mathcal{D}_1)$ is in $\mathcal{P}_{d,m}^{\text{CY}}$, since it is a fiber of $(X^\circ, D^\circ) \rightarrow S^\circ$. Since the special fiber of the test configuration is (X_0, D_0) , which is klt, Proposition 2.10.2 implies $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{D}) \rightarrow \mathbb{A}_\kappa^1$ is a trivial test configuration. Therefore $(X_0, D_0) \cong (\mathcal{X}_1, \mathcal{D}_1)$ and so $(X, D) \rightarrow S$ is in $\mathcal{P}_{d,m}^{\text{CY}}$.

Case 2: (X_0, D_0) is Type II or III. This is the difficult case. By Proposition 12.3, there exists a divisor B on X such that $(X, B) \rightarrow S$ is a \mathbb{G}_m -equivariant family in $\mathcal{P}_3^{\text{CY}}$. Since $(X^\circ, D^\circ) \rightarrow S^\circ$ is in $\mathcal{P}_{d,m}^{\text{CY}}$, $(X^\circ, B^\circ) \rightarrow S^\circ$ is in $\mathcal{P}_{3,m}^{\text{CY}}$. Now $(X, B) \rightarrow S$ is in $\mathcal{P}_{3,m}^{\text{CY}}$ by Proposition 11.13 and so $(X, D) \rightarrow S$ is in $\mathcal{P}_{d,m}^{\text{CY}}$.

The previous two cases verify the claim. Therefore $\mathcal{P}_{d,m}^{\text{CY}}$ is S -complete and Θ -reductive with respect to essentially of finite type DVRs. Using that $\mathcal{P}_{d,m}^{\text{CY}}$ is a finite type algebraic stack with affine diagonal by Proposition 9.19, Theorem 2.29 (with the sentence directly after) implies $\mathcal{P}_{d,m}^{\text{CY}}$ is S -complete and Θ -reductive with respect to all DVRs. \square

Proof of Theorem 12.4. By Propositions 9.19 and 12.5, we may apply Theorem 2.29 to deduce the theorem. \square

12.3. Properties of the moduli space. We now prove various properties of $P_{d,m}^{\text{CY}}$ including the existence of wall crossing morphisms, properness, and stabilization.

Proposition 12.6. *(Local structure) Fix $d \geq 3$ and $m \geq 1$.*

- (1) *The moduli space $P_{d,m}^{\text{CY}}$ is reduced and irreducible.*
- (2) *If $p \in P_{d,m}^{\text{CY}}$ is a point where the source is not a point or an elliptic curve, then $P_{d,m}^{\text{CY}}$ is normal at p .*

Proof. Note that \mathcal{P}_d is smooth by Proposition 11.5 and clearly irreducible. Using that $\mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY}}$ is the stack theoretic closure of \mathcal{P}_d , it follows that $\mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY}}$, as well as $\mathcal{P}_{d,m}^{\text{CY}}$, is reduced and irreducible as well. Thus [Alp13, Thm. 4.16.viii] implies (1) holds.

For (2), let $\mathcal{Z} \subset \mathcal{P}_{d,m}^{\text{CY}}$ denote the non-smooth locus of the stack and

$$U := P_{d,m}^{\text{CY}} \setminus \phi_m(\mathcal{Z}) \subset P_{d,m}^{\text{CY}},$$

which is an open subset. Since $\phi^{-1}(U) \rightarrow U$ is a good moduli space morphism by Proposition 2.28 and $\phi^{-1}(U)$ is smooth, [Alp13, Thm. 4.16.viii] implies U is normal. By our assumption on p , [Hac04, Thm. 5.5 & 6.5] implies: if (X, D) is a pair in $\mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY}}$ that maps to p , then the normalization of $(\overline{X}, \overline{G})$ of $(X, 0)$ is plt. Thus $p \in U$ by Proposition 11.5 and so $P_{d,m}^{\text{CY}}$ is normal at p . \square

Proposition 12.7 (Wall crossing). *Fix $d \geq 3$. If m is sufficiently large, then $\mathcal{P}_d^{\text{K}} \subset \mathcal{P}_{d,m}^{\text{CY}}$, $\mathcal{P}_d^{\text{H}} \subset \mathcal{P}_{d,m}^{\text{CY}}$, and there is a commutative diagram*

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \mathcal{P}_d^{\text{K}} & \hookrightarrow & \mathcal{P}_{d,m}^{\text{CY}} & \longleftarrow & \mathcal{P}_d^{\text{H}} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ P_d^{\text{K}} & \xrightarrow{\psi_{\text{K},m}} & P_{d,m}^{\text{CY}} & \xleftarrow{\psi_{\text{H},m}} & P_d^{\text{H}} \end{array},$$

where the top arrows are open immersions and the vertical arrows are good moduli space morphisms. In addition, $\psi_{\text{K},m}$ and $\psi_{\text{H},m}$ are proper surjective morphisms when $d \geq 3$ and $d \geq 4$, respectively.

Note that third column of the diagram is trivial when $d = 3$, since $\mathcal{P}_3^{\text{H}} = \emptyset = P_3^{\text{H}}$.

Proof. Since \mathcal{P}_d^{K} and \mathcal{P}_d^{H} are finite type, Proposition 3.12 implies

$$\mathcal{P}_d^{\text{K}} \subset \mathcal{P}_{d,m}^{\text{CY}} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{P}_d^{\text{H}} \subset \mathcal{P}_{d,m}^{\text{CY}}$$

for m sufficiently large. By Proposition 2.27, there are unique morphisms $\psi_{\text{K},m}$ and $\psi_{\text{H},m}$ that make the diagram commute. Since P_d^{K} and P_d^{H} are proper (Theorem 9.8 and 9.6) and $P_{d,m}^{\text{CY}}$ is separated (Theorem 12.4), $\psi_{\text{K},m}$ and $\psi_{\text{H},m}$ are proper.

To verify that $\psi_{\text{K},m}$ is surjective for $d \geq 3$, note that $\mathcal{P}_d \subset \mathcal{P}_d^{\text{K}}$ by Theorem 9.8. Thus \mathcal{P}_d^{K} is dense in $\mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY}}$ and so $\psi_{\text{K},m}(P_d^{\text{K}})$ is dense in $P_{d,m}^{\text{CY}}$. Since $\psi_{\text{K},m}$ is proper, it follows that $\psi_{\text{K},m}(P_d^{\text{K}}) = P_{d,m}^{\text{CY}}$ as desired. Similar argument shows that $\psi_{\text{H},m}$ is surjective when $d \geq 4$. \square

Proposition 12.8 (Properness). *Fix $d \geq 3$. If m is sufficiently large, then $P_{d,m}^{\text{CY}}$ is proper.*

Proof. Since P_d^{K} is proper by Theorem 9.8 and there is a proper surjective morphism $P_d^{\text{K}} \rightarrow P_{d,m}^{\text{CY}}$ for m sufficiently large by Proposition 12.7, $P_{d,m}^{\text{CY}}$ is proper for m sufficiently large. \square

Proposition 12.9 (Compactification). *If $d \geq 4$ and $m \geq 1$, then the natural map*

$$\mathcal{P}_d \rightarrow P_d := \phi_m(\mathcal{P}_d)$$

is a coarse moduli space morphism and $P_d \subset P_{d,m}^{\text{CY}}$ is a dense open subset.

Proof. If $d \geq 4$, then each pair (X, D) in $\mathcal{P}_d(\mathbb{k})$ is klt and is not S-equivalent to non-isomorphic pairs by Proposition 6.11. Thus Proposition 2.27.3 and Lemma 6.10 imply

$$\mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY}}(\mathbb{k}) \rightarrow P_{d,m}^{\text{CY}}(\mathbb{k})$$

is a bijection over $P_d(\mathbb{k})$ and so \mathcal{P}_d is saturated with respect to ϕ_m . Therefore Proposition 2.28 implies $P_d \subset P_{d,m}^{\text{CY}}$ is an open subset and $\mathcal{P}_d \rightarrow P_d$ is a good moduli space. Since $\mathcal{P}_d \rightarrow P_d$ is a bijection on \mathbb{k} -points, it is a coarse moduli space. \square

Next, we prove a stabilization result for $P_{d,m}^{\text{CY}}$. If $m' \geq m$, then there is a diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{P}_{d,m}^{\text{CY}} & \hookrightarrow & \mathcal{P}_{d,m'}^{\text{CY}} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ P_{d,m}^{\text{CY}} & \xrightarrow{\psi_{m,m'}} & P_{d,m'}^{\text{CY}} \end{array} \quad (12.1)$$

where the existence of a morphism $\phi_{m,m'}$, which makes the diagram commute, follows from Proposition 2.27.2.

Proposition 12.10. *Fix $d \geq 3$. If m is sufficiently large and $m' \geq m$, then the map*

$$\psi_{m,m'} : P_{d,m}^{\text{CY}} \rightarrow P_{d,m'}^{\text{CY}}$$

is a bijection on \mathbb{k} -points.

To prove the above proposition, we first analyze the stratification via type.

Lemma 12.11. *Fix $d \geq 3$. If m is sufficiently large, then $\mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY,I+II}} \subset \mathcal{P}_{d,m}^{\text{CY}}$ and the induced map $P_d^{\text{CY,I+II}} \rightarrow P_{d,m}^{\text{CY}}$ is an open immersion. Furthermore,*

- (1) *if $3 \nmid d$, then $P_d^{\text{CY,I+II}} \rightarrow P_{d,m}^{\text{CY}}$ is an isomorphism;*
- (2) *if $3 \mid d$, then $P_{d,m}^{\text{CY}} \setminus P_d^{\text{CY,I+II}}$ is the \mathbb{k} -point corresponding to the S -equivalence class of the pair $(\mathbb{P}^2, \frac{3}{d}\{(xyz)^{d/3} = 0\})$.*

Proof. Since $\mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY,I+II}}$ is finite type by Theorem 8.15, Proposition 3.12 implies $\mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY,I+II}} \subset \mathcal{P}_{d,m}^{\text{CY}}$ for m sufficiently large. To check $P_d^{\text{CY,I+II}} \rightarrow P_{d,m}^{\text{CY}}$ is an open immersion, observe that if $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{D}) \rightarrow \mathbb{A}^1$ a test configuration of a pair (X, D) in $\mathcal{P}_{d,m}^{\text{CY,I+II}}(\mathbb{k})$, then $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{D}) \rightarrow \mathbb{A}^1$ is a family in $\mathcal{P}_{d,m}^{\text{CY,I+II}}$ by Lemma 8.7. Therefore [AHLH18, Lem. 3.32] implies $\mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY,I+II}} \subset \mathcal{P}_{d,m}^{\text{CY}}$ is saturated with respect to ϕ_m . Thus $P_d^{\text{CY,I+II}} \rightarrow P_{d,m}^{\text{CY}}$ is an open immersion by Proposition 2.28.

If $3 \nmid d$, then Theorem 9.17 implies (1) holds. We now assume $3 \mid d$. We claim that if $m' \geq m \gg 1$, then

$$\psi_{m,m'}(P_{d,m}^{\text{CY}} \setminus P_d^{\text{CY,I+II}}) = P_{d,m'}^{\text{CY}} \setminus P_d^{\text{CY,I+II}}.$$

To verify the claim, note that $\mathcal{P}_{d,m}^{\text{CY}}$ is dense in $\mathcal{P}_{d,m'}^{\text{CY}}$ and so $\psi_{m,m'}(P_{d,m}^{\text{CY}})$ is dense in $P_{d,m'}^{\text{CY}}$. Since both $P_{d,m}^{\text{CY}}$ and $P_{d,m'}^{\text{CY}}$ are proper by Proposition 12.8, $\psi_{m,m'}$ is proper and so $\psi_{m,m'}$ is surjective. Since $\psi_{m,m'}$ is surjective and an isomorphism over the Type I and II loci, the claim follows.

Now, to prove (2) it suffices to show that $\psi_{m,m'}(P_d^{\text{CY}} \setminus P_d^{\text{CY,I+II}})$ is the \mathbb{k} -point

$$p_{m'} := \phi_{m'}([\mathbb{P}^2, \frac{3}{d}\{(xyz)^{d/3} = 0\}]) \in P_{d,m'}^{\text{CY}}$$

for $m' \geq m \gg 0$. To verify the previous statement, fix an irreducible component $Z \subset P_{d,m}^{\text{CY}} \setminus P_d^{\text{CY,I+II}}$ and set $\mathbb{K} := \overline{K(Z)}$. Since $\mathcal{P}_d^{\text{K}}(\mathbb{K}) \rightarrow P_d^{\text{K}}(\mathbb{K})$ is surjective by Proposition 2.27, there exists a Type III pair (X, D) in $\mathcal{P}_{d,m}^{\text{CY}}(\mathbb{K})$ mapping to the geometric generic point of Z . By Theorem 10.2, there exist weakly special degenerations

$$(X, D) \rightsquigarrow (X_0, D_0) \leftarrow (\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}^2, \frac{3}{d}\{(xyz)^{d/3} = 0\}). \quad (12.2)$$

to a pair (X_0, D_0) in $\mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY}}(\mathbb{K})$. If m' is sufficiently large so that (X_0, D_0) is in $\mathcal{P}_{d,m'}^{\text{CY}}(\mathbb{K})$, then the map $\mathcal{P}_{d,m'}^{\text{CY}}(\mathbb{K}) \rightarrow P_{d,m'}^{\text{CY}}(\mathbb{K})$ identifies the pairs in (12.2) and, hence, $\psi_{m,m'}(Z) = p_{m'}$. Therefore $\psi_{m,m'}(P_d^{\text{CY}} \setminus P_d^{\text{CY,I+II}}) = p_{m'}$ for $m' \geq m \gg 0$ as desired. \square

Proof of Proposition 12.10. The statement follows immediately from Lemma 12.11. \square

Proposition 12.12. *Fix $d \geq 3$ and m sufficiently large. Two points $x := [(X, D)]$ and $x' := [(X', D')]$ in $\mathcal{P}_{d,m}^{\text{CY}}(\mathbb{k})$ are identified in $P_{d,m}^{\text{CY}}$ if and only if $(X, D) \sim_S (X', D')$.*

Proof. To begin, fix $m \gg 1$ so that the conclusion of Lemma 12.11 holds. By Proposition 2.27.3, x and x' are identified in $P_{d,m}^{\text{CY}}$ if and only if $\overline{\{x\}} \cap \overline{\{x'\}} = \emptyset$ in $\mathcal{P}_{d,m}^{\text{CY}}$. Thus, if x and x' are identified in $P_{d,m}^{\text{CY}}$, then $(X, D) \sim_S (X', D')$ by Lemma 6.10.

Conversely, assume $(X, D) \sim_S (X', D')$. Then there exist weakly special degenerations

$$(X, D) \rightsquigarrow (X_0, D_0) \leftarrow (X', D')$$

to a pair $(X_0, D_0) \in \mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY}}(\mathbb{k})$. If (X, D) is Type I or II, then (X_0, D_0) is also Type I or II by Proposition 8.7 and so (X_0, D_0) is in $\mathcal{P}_{d,m}^{\text{CY}}$ by Lemma 12.11. Thus x and x' are identified in $P_{d,m}^{\text{CY}}(\mathbb{k})$. If (X, D) is Type III, then (X', D') is also Type III by Proposition 8.7 and, hence, x and x' are identified in $P_{d,m}^{\text{CY}}$ by Lemma 12.11.2. \square

13. ASYMPTOTICALLY GOOD MODULI SPACES

In this section, we prove Theorem 1.3.1-3, which produces a moduli space for the seminormalization of $\mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY}}$. The moduli space will be an asymptotically good moduli space as defined below.

13.1. Asymptotically good moduli spaces. We first introduce the notion of an asymptotically good moduli space and describe its properties. The term is motivated by *asymptotic GIT* in which one views a polarized variety (X, L) as a point

$$[(X, L^m)] \in \text{Chow}(\mathbb{P}^{N_m})$$

in the appropriate Chow scheme and analyzes the stability as $m \rightarrow \infty$.

Definition 13.1. A morphism $\phi : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow M$ from an algebraic stack to an algebraic space is an *asymptotically good moduli space* if there exists an ascending chain

$$\mathcal{U}_1 \subset \mathcal{U}_2 \subset \mathcal{U}_3 \subset \cdots$$

of open substacks of \mathcal{M} such that $\mathcal{M} = \bigcup_{i \geq 1} \mathcal{U}_i$ and the composition $\mathcal{U}_i \hookrightarrow \mathcal{M} \rightarrow M$ is a good moduli space for all $i \geq 1$.

Remark 13.2 (Construction). In practice, one might construct an asymptotically good moduli space as follows. Fix a locally noetherian algebraic stack \mathcal{M} with an ascending chain

$$\mathcal{U}_1 \subset \mathcal{U}_2 \subset \mathcal{U}_3 \subset \cdots$$

of open substacks of \mathcal{M} such that $\mathcal{M} = \bigcup_{i \geq 1} \mathcal{U}_i$. Assume the following hold:

- (i) There exists a good moduli space $\mathcal{U}_i \rightarrow U_i$ for each $i \geq 1$.
- (ii) In the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} \mathcal{U}_1 & \hookrightarrow & \mathcal{U}_2 & \hookrightarrow & \mathcal{U}_3 & \hookrightarrow & \cdots \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\ U_1 & \xrightarrow{\psi_1} & U_2 & \xrightarrow{\psi_2} & U_3 & \xrightarrow{\psi_3} & \cdots \end{array},$$

which exists by Proposition 2.27.2, there exists k such that ψ_i is an isomorphism for all $i \geq k$.

Since the above diagram commutes and $\mathcal{M} = \bigcup_{i \geq 1} \mathcal{U}_i$, the morphisms $(\mathcal{U}_i \rightarrow U_i)_{i \geq k}$ glue to give a morphism $\phi : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow M$ with $M = U_k$ such that $\phi|_{\mathcal{U}_i} = \phi_i$ for all $i \geq k$. Thus $\mathcal{M} \rightarrow M$ is an asymptotically good moduli space.

Asymptotically good moduli spaces inherit many of the properties that good moduli spaces satisfy. We prove a few of these properties in the following proposition.

Proposition 13.3. *If $\phi : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow M$ is an asymptotically good moduli space, then:*

- (1) *The morphism ϕ is surjective.*
- (2) *If \mathcal{M} is locally Noetherian, then ϕ is universal for maps from \mathcal{M} to algebraic spaces.*
- (3) *Two points $x, x' \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{k})$ are identified in M if and only if $\overline{\{x\}} \cap \overline{\{x'\}} \neq \emptyset$.*

Statement (2) implies that an asymptotically good moduli space, if it exists, is unique up to unique isomorphism.

Proof. Since $\phi_i : \mathcal{U}_i \rightarrow M$ is a good moduli space morphism, ϕ_i is surjective by Proposition 2.27.1. Therefore ϕ is surjective.

To prove (2), fix a morphism to an algebraic space $\rho : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow Z$. Let $\rho_i : \mathcal{U}_i \rightarrow Z$ denote its restriction to Z . Since ϕ_i is a good moduli space, Proposition 2.27.2 implies that there exists a unique map $\pi_i : M \rightarrow Z$ such that the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \rho_i & \\ & \curvearrowright & \\ \mathcal{U}_i & \xrightarrow{\phi_i} & M \xrightarrow{\pi_i} Z \end{array}$$

commutes. Since π_i is unique and satisfies

$$\rho_i = \rho_{i+1}|_{\mathcal{U}_i} = (\pi_{i+1} \circ \phi_{i+1})|_{\mathcal{U}_i} = \pi_{i+1} \circ \phi_i,$$

π_i is independent of i and we can denote it without confusion by π . Using that $\mathcal{M} = \bigcup_{i \geq 1} \mathcal{U}_i$, we conclude $\rho = \pi \circ \phi$. Thus (2) holds.

For (3), note that the closure of $\{x\}$ and $\{x'\}$ in \mathcal{M} intersect if and only if the closure of $\{x\}$ and $\{x'\}$ in \mathcal{U}_i intersect for all $i \gg 1$. Thus (3) follows from Proposition 2.27.2. \square

Proposition 13.4. *Let \mathcal{M} be a locally finite type algebraic stack with affine diagonal. If there exists an asymptotically good moduli space $\mathcal{M} \rightarrow M$ such that M is finite type and separated, then $\mathcal{M} \rightarrow M$ is Θ -reductive and S -complete.*

The converse to this statement is false. In a future paper, we will give an example of a moduli stack of certain polarized CY pairs that is S -complete and Θ -reductive, but does not admit an asymptotically good moduli space.

Proof. Note that \mathcal{U}_i is quasi-compact, since $\mathcal{U}_i \rightarrow M$ and M are quasi-compact. Since \mathcal{U}_i is locally of finite type as well, it follows that \mathcal{U}_i is finite type. Therefore we can apply Theorem 2.29 to deduce that \mathcal{U}_i is S -complete and Θ -reductive. Since $\mathcal{M} = \bigcup_{i \geq 1} \mathcal{U}_i$, \mathcal{M} is S -complete and Θ -reductive. \square

Remark 13.5. In general, an asymptotically good moduli space $\phi : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow M$ need not be universally closed and ϕ_* need not preserve quasi-coherence.

13.2. Seminormalization of a stack. In this section, we discuss the seminormalization of a stack and its relation to good moduli spaces.

For the definition of a *seminormal* scheme and the *seminormalization* of a scheme, see [Kol23, §10.8]. The definitions of these terms for stacks are built from the definitions for schemes.

Definition 13.6. An algebraic stack \mathcal{M} is *seminormal* if there is a smooth morphism from a seminormal scheme $U \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$. A *seminormalization* of an algebraic stack \mathcal{M} is a representable morphism $\mathcal{M}^{\text{sn}} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ such that $\mathcal{M}^{\text{sn}} \times_{\mathcal{M}} U \rightarrow U$ is a seminormalization for every smooth morphism from a scheme $U \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$.

The seminormalization of a locally Noetherian algebraic stack exists and is unique up to isomorphism. The proofs of these statements are similar to the corresponding proofs for the normalization in [AB21, App. A], though the case of seminormalization is actually simpler, since the seminormalization of a scheme is functorial, while the normalization is not.

Lemma 13.7. *Let \mathcal{M} be a finite type algebraic stack with affine diagonal. If there exists a good moduli space $\mathcal{M} \rightarrow M$, then the induced morphism of seminormalizations $\mathcal{M}^{\text{sn}} \rightarrow M^{\text{sn}}$ is a good moduli space.*

Proof. Since \mathcal{M} admits a good moduli space and $\mathcal{M}^{\text{sn}} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ is finite, [Alp13, Lem. 4.14 & Thm. 4.16.x] implies that there exists a good moduli space $\mathcal{M}^{\text{sn}} \rightarrow P$ and, in the commutative diagram, which exists by Proposition 2.27.2,

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{M}^{\text{sn}} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{M} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ P & \longrightarrow & M \end{array}$$

the bottom row is finite. Note that $P \rightarrow M$ is a bijection on \mathbb{k} -points, since good moduli spaces are bijections on closed \mathbb{k} -points and seminormalizations are bijections on \mathbb{k} -points. Thus $P \rightarrow M$ is a partial seminormalization.

Next, observe that P is seminormal. Indeed, since \mathcal{M}^{sn} is seminormal, $\mathcal{M}^{\text{sn}} \rightarrow P$ factors through $P^{\text{sn}} \rightarrow P$ and so $P^{\text{sn}} \rightarrow P$ is an isomorphism by Proposition 2.27.2. Therefore $P \rightarrow M$ is a seminormalization and the result follows. \square

13.3. Existence of the asymptotically good moduli space. We now prove that the seminormalization of $\mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY}}$ admits an asymptotically good moduli space.

Proposition 13.8. *There exists an asymptotically good moduli space*

$$\phi : (\mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY}})^{\text{sn}} \rightarrow P_d^{\text{CY}}$$

where P_d^{CY} is the seminormalization of $P_{d,m}^{\text{CY}}$ for m sufficiently large.

Proof. The existence of the asymptotically good moduli space follows from taking seminormalizations of the construction in Section 12. Indeed, consider the commutative diagram which arises from taking the seminormalization of the diagram in (12.1).

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} (\mathcal{P}_{d,1}^{\text{CY}})^{\text{sn}} & \hookrightarrow & (\mathcal{P}_{d,2}^{\text{CY}})^{\text{sn}} & \hookrightarrow & (\mathcal{P}_{d,3}^{\text{CY}})^{\text{sn}} & \hookrightarrow & \dots \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \cdot \\ (\mathcal{P}_{d,1}^{\text{CY}})^{\text{sn}} & \xrightarrow{\phi_1} & (\mathcal{P}_{d,2}^{\text{CY}})^{\text{sn}} & \xrightarrow{\phi_2} & (\mathcal{P}_{d,3}^{\text{CY}})^{\text{sn}} & \xrightarrow{\phi_3} & \dots \end{array}$$

By Proposition 12.10, there exists $k \gg 1$ such that ϕ_m is a bijection on \mathbb{k} -points for $m \geq k$. Using that $(\mathcal{P}_{d,m+1}^{\text{CY}})^{\text{sn}}$ is seminormal and proper by Proposition 12.8, we see ϕ_m is an isomorphism for $m \geq k$. Thus Remark 13.2 implies that there exists an asymptotically good moduli space $\phi : (\mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY}})^{\text{sn}} \rightarrow P_d^{\text{CY}}$ such that the restriction of ϕ to $(\mathcal{P}_{d,m}^{\text{CY}})^{\text{sn}}$ is the morphism $(\mathcal{P}_{d,m}^{\text{CY}})^{\text{sn}} \rightarrow (P_{d,m}^{\text{CY}})^{\text{sn}}$. \square

Remark 13.9. The morphism $\phi : (\mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY}})^{\text{sn}} \rightarrow P_d^{\text{CY}}$ is not a good moduli space when $3 \mid d$. Indeed, since $(\mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY}})^{\text{sn}}$ is locally of finite type, but not of finite type by Example 9.4, $(\mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY}})^{\text{sn}}$ is not quasi-compact. On the other hand, P_d^{CY} is quasi-compact since it is proper. Therefore ϕ cannot be quasi-compact, which violates Definition 2.26.

14. AMPLENESS OF THE HODGE LINE BUNDLE

In this section, we prove that the Hodge line bundle is ample on $P_{d,m}^{\text{CY}}$ for $m \gg 0$ (Theorem 14.14). As a consequence of the result, we prove the b-semiampleness conjecture in relative dimension 2 (Theorem 14.17).

14.1. Canonical bundle formula. We first recall the canonical bundle formula of an lc-trivial fibration and relevant positivity results. See [Amb05, Kol07, FG14b] for further details on the topic.

Definition 14.1. An *lc-trivial fibration* $f : (X, D) \rightarrow Y$ is a surjective morphism $f : X \rightarrow Y$ between normal proper varieties with connected fibers and a \mathbb{Q} -divisor D on X satisfying

- (1) (X, D) is sub-lc over the generic point of Y ,
- (2) $\text{rank}(f \circ g)_* \mathcal{O}_Z(\lceil A_Z^*(X, D) \rceil) = 1$, where $g : Z \rightarrow X$ is a log resolution of (X, D) , $A_Z(X, D) := K_Z - f^*(K_X + D) = \sum_i a_i D_i$, and $A_Z^*(X, D) := \sum_{a_i > -1} a_i D_i$, and
- (3) there exists a \mathbb{Q} -Cartier \mathbb{Q} -divisor B on Y such that $K_X + D \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} f^* B$.

Note that (2) is automatically satisfied if D is effective on the general fiber, since then $\lceil A_Z^*(X, D) \rceil$ is effective and g -exceptional.

Given an lc-trivial fibration $(X, D) \rightarrow Y$ and $Y' \rightarrow Y$ a generically finite morphism with Y' normal, there is an induced lc-trivial fibration $(X', D') \rightarrow Y'$. Here, $\varphi' : X' \rightarrow X$ is the main component of the normalization of $X \times_Y Y'$ and D' is defined by $K_{X'} + D' = \varphi'^*(K_X + D)$.

Definition 14.2 (Canonical bundle formula). Let $f : (X, D) \rightarrow Y$ be an lc-trivial fibration. There is a \mathbb{Q} -linear equivalence

$$K_X + D \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} f^*(K_Y + D_Y + M_Y),$$

where D_Y and M_Y are \mathbb{Q} -divisors on Y defined as follows:

- (1) D_Y is the *discriminant divisor*, which is defined by $D_Y := \sum_P (1 - b_P) P$, where the sum runs through prime divisors $P \subset Y$ and

$$b_P := \max\{\lambda \in \mathbb{Q} \mid (X, D + \lambda f^* P) \text{ is sub-lc over the generic point of } P\}.$$

- (2) $M_Y := G - K_Y - D_Y$ is the *moduli divisor*, where G is a \mathbb{Q} -Cartier \mathbb{Q} -divisor on Y such that $K_X + D \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} f^* B$. Note that M_Y is only defined up to \mathbb{Q} -linear equivalence, since it depends on the choice of B .⁵

Remark 14.3. If $\varphi : Y' \rightarrow Y$ is a proper birational morphism with Y normal and $(X', D') \rightarrow Y'$ is the induced lc-trivial fibration, then the divisors in Definition 14.2 satisfy $\varphi_* M_{Y'} = M_Y$ and $\varphi_* D_{Y'} = D_Y$. Hence there exist b - \mathbb{Q} -divisors \mathbf{M} and \mathbf{D} on Y such that $\mathbf{M}_{Y'} := M_{Y'}$ and $\mathbf{D}_{Y'} := D_{Y'}$ for each proper birational morphism $Y' \rightarrow Y$ with Y' normal.

The following positivity statements for the moduli divisor, which follow from [Amb05, Kol07, FG14b], will be used to prove the ampleness of the Hodge line bundle on $P_{d,m}^{\text{CY}}$.

Theorem 14.4. *If $(X, D) \rightarrow Y$ is an lc-trivial fibration, then*

- (1) \mathbf{M} is b - \mathbb{Q} -Cartier and b -nef;
- (2) if the generic fiber (X_η, D_η) is a projective klt pair and there is a non-empty open set $U \subset Y$ satisfying that for every $y \in U(\mathbb{k})$

$$\#\{z \in U(\mathbb{k}) \mid (X_y, D_y) \cong (X_z, D_z)\} < +\infty,$$

then \mathbf{M} is b -big.

The statement that \mathbf{M} is b - \mathbb{Q} -Cartier means that there exists a proper birational morphism $Y' \rightarrow Y$ such that $\mathbf{M}_{Y'}$ is \mathbb{Q} -Cartier and $\mathbf{M} = \overline{\mathbf{M}_{Y'}}$ (i.e. $\mathbf{M}_{Y''} = \psi^* \mathbf{M}_{Y'}$ for any proper birational morphism of normal varieties $\psi : Y'' \rightarrow Y'$). The terms *b -nef* (resp., *b -big*, *b -semiample*, *b -free*) mean we can additionally choose Y' such that $\mathbf{M}_{Y'}$ is nef (resp., big, semiample, basepoint free).

⁵If $N(K_{X_\eta} + D_\eta) \sim 0$ for some integer $N > 0$, then we can choose B such that $N(K_X + D - f^* B) \sim 0$ and, hence, $N M_Y$ will be defined up to \mathbb{Z} -linear equivalence; see [PS09, §7.5].

Proof. Statement (1) is [Kol07, Thm. 8.3.7] and [FG14b, Thm. 3.6] (see also [Amb05]). Under the assumptions of (2), [Amb05, Thm. 3.3] states that there exists a diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} (X, D) & & (X^!, D^!) \\ \downarrow f & & \downarrow f^! \\ Y \xleftarrow{\tau} \bar{Y} & \xrightarrow{\rho} & Y^! \end{array}$$

such that (i) $(X^!, D^!) \rightarrow Y^!$ is an lc-trivial fibration, (ii) \bar{Y} a smooth projective variety, (iii) τ is generically finite and surjective, and ρ is surjective, (iv) there exists a non-empty open set $V \subset \bar{Y}$ such that $(X, D) \times_Y V \cong (X^!, D^!) \times_{Y^!} V$ over V , and (v) $\mathbf{M}^!$ is b-nef and big with $\tau^*\mathbf{M} = \rho^*\mathbf{M}^!$, where \mathbf{M} and $\mathbf{M}^!$ denote the moduli b- \mathbf{Q} -divisors of f and $f^!$.

We aim to show that ρ is generically finite. By shrinking V , we may assume $\tau(V) \subset U$ and $\tau|_V$ has finite fibers. For a closed point $y \in V$, observe

$$\begin{aligned} \rho^{-1}(\rho(y)) \cap V &\subset \{z \in V \mid (X^!_{\rho(y)}, D^!_{\rho(y)}) \cong (X^!_{\rho(z)}, D^!_{\rho(z)})\} \\ &= \{z \in V \mid (X_{\tau(y)}, D_{\tau(y)}) \cong (X_{\tau(z)}, D_{\tau(z)})\}. \end{aligned}$$

where the equality is by (iv). The last set is finite since $\tau(V) \subset U$ and $\tau|_V$ has finite fibers. Therefore, $\rho^{-1}(\rho(y)) \cap V$ is finite for each $y \in V$, which implies ρ is generically finite. Since ρ and τ are both generically finite, (v) implies \mathbf{M} is b-big. \square

14.2. Hodge line bundle.

Definition 14.5 (Hodge line bundle). If $f : (X, \Delta + D) \rightarrow S$ is a family of boundary polarized CY pairs with index dividing N , we set

$$\lambda_{\text{Hodge}, f, N} := f_*\omega_{X/S}^{[N]}(N(\Delta + D)).$$

Remark 14.6. There is also a natural line bundle on the base of a family of boundary polarized CY pairs called the CM line bundle, which has relations to K-stability. The CM line bundle of $(X, \Delta + D) \rightarrow S$ with respect to the polarization $L := -K_X - \Delta$ agrees with the Hodge line bundle up to a positive constant; see e.g. [ADL19, pg. 14].

We state a few basic properties of the Hodge line bundle.

Proposition 14.7. *Let $f : (X, \Delta + D) \rightarrow S$ be a family of boundary polarized CY pairs with index dividing N over an arbitrary scheme S . The following hold:*

- (1) $\lambda_{\text{Hodge}, f, N}$ is the unique line bundle (up to isomorphism) satisfying

$$\omega_{X/S}^{[N]}(N(\Delta + D)) \cong f^*\lambda_{\text{Hodge}, f, N}.$$

- (2) If $\varphi : S' \rightarrow S$ is a morphism and $f' : (X', \Delta' + D') \rightarrow S'$ denotes the pullback of $(X, \Delta + D) \rightarrow S$ by φ , then there is a canonical isomorphism

$$\varphi^*\lambda_{\text{Hodge}, f, N} \xrightarrow{\sim} \lambda_{\text{Hodge}, f', N}.$$

- (3) If S is smooth and the generic fiber of $X \rightarrow S$ is normal, then $(X, \Delta + D) \rightarrow S$ is an lc-trivial fibration with $\mathcal{O}_S(NM_S) \cong \lambda_{\text{Hodge}, f, N}$ and $\mathbf{M} := \overline{M}_S$.

Proof. First note that $\pi_*\mathcal{O}_X \cong \mathcal{O}_S$. Indeed, since $H^0(X_s, \mathcal{O}_{X_s})$ for all $s \in S$, Proposition 3.5 implies $f_*\mathcal{O}_X$ is a line bundle and the natural map $f_*\mathcal{O}_X \otimes k(s) \rightarrow H^0(X_s, \mathcal{O}_{X_s})$ is an isomorphism for all $s \in S$. Thus the natural map $\mathcal{O}_S \rightarrow f_*\mathcal{O}_X$ restricts to an isomorphism $\mathcal{O}_S \otimes k(s) \rightarrow f_*\mathcal{O}_X \otimes k(s)$ for all $s \in S$ and so $\mathcal{O}_S \rightarrow f_*\mathcal{O}_X$ is an isomorphism.

To prove (1), note that $\omega_{X/S}^{[N]}(N(\Delta + D))$ and \mathcal{O}_X are locally isomorphic over S . Since $f_*\mathcal{O}_X$ is a line bundle and the natural map $f^*f_*\mathcal{O}_X \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X$ is an isomorphism, $\lambda_{\text{Hodge}, f, N}$ is a line bundle

and the natural map $f^* \lambda_{\text{Hodge}, f, N} \rightarrow \omega_{X/S}^{[N]}(N(\Delta + D))$ is an isomorphism. If \mathcal{L}_S is a line bundle satisfying $\omega_{X/S}^{[N]}(N(\Delta + D)) \cong f^* \mathcal{L}_S$, then

$$\lambda_{\text{Hodge}, f, N} \cong f_* f^* \mathcal{L}_S \cong f_* \mathcal{O}_X \otimes \mathcal{L}_S \cong \mathcal{L}_S,$$

which completes (1). Next, observe that there are natural morphisms

$$\varphi^* f_* \omega_{X/S}^{[N]}(m(\Delta + D)) \longrightarrow f'_* \varphi'^* \omega_{X/S}^{[N]}(N(\Delta + D)) \xrightarrow{\cong} f'_* \omega_{X'/S'}^{[N]}(N(\Delta' + D')).$$

Since the first map is locally of the form $\varphi^* f_* \mathcal{O}_X \rightarrow f'_* \varphi'^* \mathcal{O}_X$, it is an isomorphism. Thus (2) holds.

Finally, we prove (3). Lemma 2.7 implies $(X, \Delta + D)$ is an slc pair and the conductor divisor does not contain any fibers. Since the generic fiber of $X \rightarrow S$ is normal, the conductor divisor on X must be 0 and, hence, $(X, \Delta + D)$ is lc. Next, observe that

$$0 \sim_{\mathbb{Q}, S} K_{X/S} + \Delta + D \sim_{\mathbb{Q}, S} K_X + \Delta + D,$$

where the second equivalence uses that K_S is Cartier. Therefore $(X, \Delta + D) \rightarrow S$ is an lc-trivial fibration.

We claim that the discriminant b-divisor equal to 0. To see this, fix a proper birational morphism $\varphi : S' \rightarrow S$ with S' smooth. Since the pullback $f' : (X', \Delta' + D') \rightarrow S'$ is a family of boundary polarized CY pairs, f' is an lc-trivial fibration. By Lemma 2.7, $(X', \Delta' + D' + f'^* P')$ is lc for any prime divisor P' on X' . Therefore the discriminant b-divisor is 0, which implies $N(K_{X/S} + \Delta + D) \sim N f^* M_S$ and so $\mathcal{O}_S(NM_S) \cong \lambda_{\text{Hodge}, f, N}$. Using (2), we additionally see $\mathbf{M} = \overline{\mathbf{M}}_S$ \square

The following statement is a well-known consequence of [FG14a] and can also be deduced from the K-semistability of polarized slc CY pairs proved in [Oda13b] and Theorem 6.5.

Proposition 14.8. *If $(X, \Delta + D)$ is a boundary polarized CY pair, then the identity component of $\text{Aut}(X, \Delta + D)$ acts trivially on $H^0(X, \omega_X^{[N]}(N(\Delta + D)))$.*

Proof. The action of $\text{Aut}^0(X, \Delta + D)$ on $(X, \Delta + D)$ induces an action on $(\overline{X}, \overline{G} + \overline{\Delta} + \overline{D}) := \sqcup_{i=1}^r (\overline{X}_i, \overline{G}_i + \overline{\Delta}_i + \overline{D}_i)$ and there is an $\text{Aut}^0(X, \Delta + D)$ equivariant isomorphism

$$H^0(X, \omega_X^{[N]}(N(\Delta + D))) \cong H^0(\overline{X}_i, \omega_{\overline{X}_i}^{[N]}(N(\overline{G}_i + \overline{\Delta}_i + \overline{D}_i)))$$

induced by pulling back forms. Hence it suffices to prove the result in the case when X is normal. If $(X, \Delta + D)$ is normal, then the finiteness of B-representations [FG14a, Thm. 3.15] implies that the image of the natural map

$$\text{Aut}^0(X, \Delta + D) \rightarrow \text{GL}(H^0(X, \omega_X^{[N]}(N(\Delta + D))))$$

is finite. Since $\text{Aut}^0(X, \Delta + D)$ is connected, the image is trivial. \square

Let $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathcal{M}(\chi, N, \mathbf{r})$ be a locally closed substack and k be a positive multiple of N . Since any family $f : (X, \Delta + D) \rightarrow S$ in $\mathcal{M}(\chi, N, \mathbf{r})$ has index dividing k , Proposition 14.7 implies the collection of line bundles $\lambda_{\text{Hodge}, f, k}$ induces a line bundle on \mathcal{M} and we denote it by $\lambda_{\text{Hodge}, k}$. Note that $\lambda_{\text{Hodge}, k}^{\otimes l} = \lambda_{\text{Hodge}, kl}$ by 14.7.1.

Proposition 14.9. *Let $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathcal{M}(\chi, N, \mathbf{r})$ be a finite type locally closed substack that admits a good moduli space $\mathcal{M} \rightarrow M$. If k is a sufficiently divisible positive integer, then $\lambda_{\text{Hodge}, k}$ descends to a unique line bundle $L_{\text{Hodge}, k}$ on M .*

Proof. By [Alp13, Thm. 10.3], $\lambda_{\text{Hodge}, k}$ descends uniquely to a line bundle on M if and only if, for each closed point $z \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{k})$, the stabilizer of z acts trivially on $\lambda_{\text{Hodge}, k}|_z$. The latter is equivalent to the condition that $\text{Aut}(X, \Delta + D)$ acts trivially on $H^0(X, \omega_X^{[k]}(k(\Delta + D)))$ for each closed point $[(X, \Delta + D)]$ in $\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{k})$. Using Proposition 14.8 and the fact that \mathcal{M} is finite type with affine

diagonal, the previous condition holds for $k \gg 0$; see [LWX18, Thm. 5.2] or [CP21, Lem. 10.2] for a similar argument. \square

Definition 14.10. We define the *Hodge \mathbb{Q} -line bundle* on various moduli spaces as follows.

- (1) In the setup of Proposition 14.9, we define $L_{\text{Hodge}} := L_{\text{Hodge},k}^{1/k}$. Using the uniqueness statement of the proposition and that $\lambda_{\text{Hodge},kl} = \lambda_{\text{Hodge},k}^{\otimes l}$ for a positive integer l , we see $L_{\text{Hodge},kl} = L_{\text{Hodge},k}^{\otimes l}$. Thus L_{Hodge} is independent of the choice of k when viewed as a \mathbb{Q} -line bundle.
- (2) In the case when $\mathcal{M} := \mathcal{P}_{d,m}^{\text{CY}}$ and $M := P_{d,m}^{\text{CY}}$, we define the Hodge \mathbb{Q} -line bundle L_{Hodge} as in (1). Using the commutative diagram (12.1) and the uniqueness part of Proposition 14.9, it follows that the Hodge \mathbb{Q} -line bundle pulls back to the Hodge \mathbb{Q} -line bundle via the map $P_{d,m}^{\text{CY}} \rightarrow P_{d,m+1}^{\text{CY}}$.
- (3) Let P_d^{CY} be the asymptotically good moduli space in Proposition 13.8. By construction, the natural map $P_d^{\text{CY}} \rightarrow P_{d,m}^{\text{CY}}$ is a seminormalization for $m \gg 0$. We define the Hodge \mathbb{Q} -line bundle on P_d^{CY} as the pullback of the Hodge \mathbb{Q} -line bundle on $P_{d,m}^{\text{CY}}$ when $m \gg 0$. This \mathbb{Q} -line bundle is independent of the choice of $m \gg 0$ by (2).

14.3. Existence of covers by schemes. We now prove a stack theoretic result on the existence of generically finite covers of certain stacks by schemes. The result will be used in the proof of the ampleness of the Hodge line bundle on $P_{d,m}^{\text{CY}}$ in order to cook up a generically finite cover of a closed subspace $Z \subset P_{d,m}^{\text{CY}}$ such that the cover supports a universal family of boundary polarized CY pairs.

Theorem 14.11. *Suppose that \mathcal{X} is a finite type algebraic stack with a separated good moduli space $\pi : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow X$ and let $Z \subseteq X$ be an irreducible closed subspace. Suppose that the connected component of the identity of the automorphism group $\text{Aut}_{\mathcal{X}}^0(x) \subset \text{Aut}_{\mathcal{X}}(x)$ is an algebraic torus for each $x \in \mathcal{X}$. Then there exists a commutative diagram*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} S & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{X} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ Z & \hookrightarrow & X \end{array}$$

where S is a smooth quasi-projective variety and $S \rightarrow Z$ is proper, surjective, and generically finite. Moreover, there exists a dense open subset $U \subset S$ such that closed points of U map to closed points of \mathcal{X} .

The proof relies on [ER21] to reduce to the case when \mathcal{X} is a gerbe over a Deligne–Mumford stack and then rigidification to further reduce to when \mathcal{X} is a Deligne–Mumford stack.

Proof. Since the property of being a good moduli space is preserved under base change, it suffices to prove the statement when $Z = X$. Moreover, by [Alp13, Thm. 4.16.viii], we may assume \mathcal{X} and X are reduced. We use throughout that for any closed substack $\mathcal{Z} \subset \mathcal{X}$, $\pi(\mathcal{Z}) \subset X$ is closed and $\mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \pi(\mathcal{Z})$ is a good moduli space. Let \mathcal{X}^{ps} be the locus of closed points in \mathcal{X} .

First we claim that \mathcal{X}^{ps} is the set of closed points of a constructible subset, which we also denote by \mathcal{X}^{ps} . Indeed by the Luna étale slice theorem [AHR20, Thm. 4.12] and condition I in the proof of [AHR20, Thm. 5.3], for any $x \in \mathcal{X}^{\text{ps}}$, there exists an affine scheme $\text{Spec } A$ with an $\text{Aut}_{\mathcal{X}}(x)$ action, an $\text{Aut}_{\mathcal{X}}(x)$ fixed closed point $w \in \text{Spec } A$, and a Cartesian diagram of pointed stacks

$$\begin{array}{ccc} (\mathcal{W}, w) & \xrightarrow{f} & (\mathcal{X}, x) \\ \pi' \downarrow & & \downarrow \pi \\ (W, \pi'(w)) & \longrightarrow & (X, \pi(x)) \end{array}$$

where $\mathcal{W} = [\mathrm{Spec} A / \mathrm{Aut}_{\mathcal{X}}(x)]$, π' is a good moduli space map, the horizontal maps are étale, and for every closed point $w' \in \mathcal{W}$, f is stabilizer preserving at w' , and $f(w')$ is closed in \mathcal{X} . Then $f^{-1}(\mathcal{X}^{\mathrm{ps}}) = \mathcal{W}^{\mathrm{ps}}$. Since the property of being constructible is étale local, it suffices to show that $\mathcal{W}^{\mathrm{ps}}$ is constructible in \mathcal{W} . As $\mathrm{Aut}_{\mathcal{X}}(x)$ is reductive and $\mathcal{W}^{\mathrm{ps}}$ is the polystable locus of an affine GIT quotient, the claim now follows as in the proof of [ABHLX20, Thm. 4.5].

For each closed point $y \in X$, there exists a unique closed point $x \in \mathcal{X}^{\mathrm{ps}}$ lying over it so π induces a bijection between $\mathcal{X}^{\mathrm{ps}}$ and closed points of X . Let $\mathcal{Z} \subset \mathcal{X}$ be the closure of $\mathcal{X}^{\mathrm{ps}}$. Then $\pi(\mathcal{Z}) = X$, $\pi|_{\mathcal{Z}} : \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow X$ is a good moduli space, and $\mathcal{X}^{\mathrm{ps}} = \mathcal{Z}^{\mathrm{ps}}$. Thus it suffices to replace \mathcal{X} with \mathcal{Z} and prove the statement when $\mathcal{X}^{\mathrm{ps}}$ is dense in \mathcal{X} . Moreover, \mathcal{X} has finitely many irreducible components $\mathcal{X}_1, \dots, \mathcal{X}_n$ so $\pi(\mathcal{X}_i) = X$ for some i . Then $\mathcal{X}_i \rightarrow X$ is a good moduli space and up to replacing \mathcal{X} with \mathcal{X}_i we may assume that \mathcal{X} is irreducible.

Following [ER21, Def. 2.5], we let \mathcal{X}^{s} denote the set of $x \in \mathcal{X}$ such that $\pi^{-1}(\pi(x)) = \{x\}$. By [ER21, Prop. 2.6 & 2.7], \mathcal{X}^{s} is the largest saturated open substack of \mathcal{X} such that π induces a homeomorphism $|\mathcal{X}^{\mathrm{s}}| \rightarrow \pi(\mathcal{X}^{\mathrm{s}})$. Now $\mathcal{X}^{\mathrm{ps}}$ is constructible and dense so there exists an open $\mathcal{U} \subset \mathcal{X}$ contained in $\mathcal{X}^{\mathrm{ps}}$. The restriction of π to $\mathcal{X}^{\mathrm{ps}}$ is a bijection onto X so the restriction to \mathcal{U} is a bijection onto its image. Thus up to shrinking \mathcal{U} , $\pi|_{\mathcal{U}}$ is a homeomorphism onto its image. In particular, $\mathcal{U} \subset \mathcal{X}^{\mathrm{s}}$ so $\mathcal{X}^{\mathrm{s}} \neq \emptyset$. Since \mathcal{X} is irreducible, it follows that $\mathcal{X}^{\mathrm{s}} \subset \mathcal{X}$ is dense.

Now we may apply [ER21, Thm. 2.11] to obtain a stack \mathcal{Y} and a morphism $f : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ satisfying the following properties:

- (1) \mathcal{Y} admits a good moduli space Y ,
- (2) $f : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ factors as a sequence of saturated blowups,
- (3) the induced map $g : Y \rightarrow X$ factors as a sequence of blowups,
- (4) f is an isomorphism over \mathcal{X}^{s} , and
- (5) $\mathcal{Y} \rightarrow Y$ factors as a gerbe over a Deligne–Mumford stack $\mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}_{DM}$ and a coarse moduli space $\mathcal{Y}_{DM} \rightarrow Y$.

Since \mathcal{X} is reduced and irreducible, so are \mathcal{Y} and \mathcal{Y}_{DM} . By [LMB00, Thm. 6.6], there exists a quasi-projective scheme Y' and a proper, surjective and generically étale morphism $Y' \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}_{DM}$. Up to resolving singularities, Y' is smooth and irreducible.

Consider the pullback

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{Y}' & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{Y} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ Y' & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{Y}_{DM} \end{array} .$$

Then $\mathcal{Y}' \rightarrow Y'$ is a gerbe by [Sta23, Tag 06QE]. Moreover, $\mathcal{Y}' \rightarrow Y'$ is a good moduli space since it is a finite type gerbe with affine diagonal and reductive stabilizer groups.

Consider the inertia stack $I\mathcal{Y}' \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}'$ which is flat by [Sta23, Tag 06QJ] and affine. In particular, the connected component of the identity $A^0 \subset \mathcal{Y}'$ is an open and closed subgroup flat over \mathcal{Y}' . Thus we can take the rigidification $\rho : \mathcal{Y}' \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}' \!/\!/\! A^0$. By [AOV08, Thm. A.1]. ρ is a gerbe and for all $x \in \mathcal{Y}'$, $\mathrm{Aut}_{\mathcal{Y}' \!/\!/\! A^0}(\rho(x)) = \mathrm{Aut}_{\mathcal{Y}'}(x) / \mathrm{Aut}_{\mathcal{Y}'}^0(x)$. In particular, $\mathcal{Y}' \!/\!/\! A^0$ is Deligne–Mumford so we can apply [LMB00, Thm. 6.6] again to find a smooth Y'' with a proper, surjective, generically étale morphism $Y'' \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}' \!/\!/\! A^0$ and consider the pullback

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{Y}'' & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{Y}' \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ Y'' & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{Y}' \!/\!/\! A^0 \end{array} .$$

Then $\mathcal{Y}'' \rightarrow Y''$ is a gerbe such that for all $x \in \mathcal{Y}''$, $\mathrm{Aut}_{\mathcal{Y}''}(x) = \mathrm{Aut}_{\mathcal{Y}'}^0(x)$ is connected. Moreover, the composition $\tau : \mathcal{Y}'' \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ is representable as saturated blowups and pullbacks of representable

morphisms are representable. Thus $\text{Aut}_{\mathcal{Y}''}(x) \subset \text{Aut}_{\mathcal{X}}^0(\tau(x))$ is a torus for each $x \in \mathcal{Y}''$. By Proposition 14.12 below, there exists a proper, surjective and generically finite map $S \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}''$ with S smooth and quasi-projective which trivializes the gerbe, that is, which admits a section $s : S \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}''$. The composition $S \rightarrow X$ is then proper, surjective and generically finite and admits a map to \mathcal{X} via the composition $\tau \circ s$. \square

Proposition 14.12. *Let $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow X$ be an fppf gerbe with affine diagonal over an algebraic space. Suppose that X is separated and finite type and that $\text{Aut}_{\mathcal{X}}(x)$ is an algebraic torus for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$. Then there exists a proper, surjective, and generically finite morphism $S \rightarrow X$ with S smooth and quasi-projective and a section $S \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$.*

Proof. By Chow's lemma for algebraic spaces [Sta23, Tag 088U], we may assume that X is quasi-projective. Moreover, we may normalize and work one connected component at time and assume X is normal and irreducible. Since $\pi : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow X$ is an abelian gerbe, by [Sta23, Tag 0CJY] there exists a band, that is, an fppf abelian group scheme $G \rightarrow X$, such that for all points $x \in \mathcal{X}$, we have $G_{\pi(x)} \cong \text{Aut}_{\mathcal{X}}(x)$.

By assumption, G_x is a torus for all $x \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ so $G \rightarrow X$ is a torus by [Con14, Cor. 3.1.8]. There exists some finite extension $F/k(X)$ such that $G_F \cong \mathbb{G}_{m,F}^r$. Up to replacing X with the normalization $X' \rightarrow X$ of X in F , we may assume that $G_{k(X)} \cong \mathbb{G}_{m,k(X)}^r$. Since $\text{Isom}_{X\text{-Grp}}(\mathbb{G}_{m,X}^r, G)$ is representable by a smooth and separated scheme over X , by [ABD⁺66, XI 4.1], the $k(X)$ point of $\text{Isom}_{X\text{-Grp}}(\mathbb{G}_{m,X}^r, G)$ spreads out to a section over some dense open set $U \subset X$. By [Con14, Cor. B.3.6], algebraic tori over X are classified by $\pi_1^{\text{ét}}(X, \bar{x})$ representations on a lattice. By [Sta23, Tag 0BN6], the map $\pi_1^{\text{ét}}(U, \bar{x}) \rightarrow \pi_1^{\text{ét}}(X, \bar{x})$ is surjective for any base point $\bar{x} \rightarrow U \subset X$. Thus, the triviality of $G|_U$ implies that $G \cong \mathbb{G}_{m,X}^r$ and we are reduced to trivializing the class of the gerbe $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow X$ in

$$H_{\text{ét}}^2(X, \mathbb{G}_m^r) = \bigoplus_{i=1}^r H_{\text{ét}}^2(X, \mathbb{G}_m) = \bigoplus_{i=1}^r \text{Br}(X).$$

Without loss of generality, we may assume that $r = 1$. Thus we need to show that a cohomological Brauer class $\alpha \in \text{Br}(X)$ can be trivialized after a proper, surjective and generically finite morphism $S \rightarrow X$ with S smooth. Up to resolving singularities and pulling back α , we may assume X is smooth. By [CTS21, Thm. 3.5.5 & 4.2.1], α is the class of an Azumaya algebra so by [EHKV01, Thm. 3.6], there exists a flat projective surjection $\rho : Y \rightarrow X$ such that $\rho^*\alpha = 0$. Slicing by ρ -ample divisors, we can find $S_0 \subset Y \rightarrow X$ such that the composition is projective, surjective and generically finite. Let $S \rightarrow S_0$ be a resolution of singularities. Then the composition $S \rightarrow X$ trivializes α , thus completing the proof. \square

14.4. Ampleness of the Hodge line bundle. In this section, we prove the Hodge line bundle is ample on $P_{d,m}^{\text{CY}}$ for $m \gg 0$. We will deduce the result from the following more general theorem and the description of the S-equivalence classes of the pairs at the boundary in Section 10.

Theorem 14.13. *Let $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{X}, N, \mathbf{r})$ be a finite type locally closed substack that admits a good moduli space $\mathcal{M} \rightarrow M$. If $Z \subset M$ is an irreducible closed subspace which is proper, then $(L_{\text{Hodge}}|_Z)^{\dim Z} \geq 0$. Furthermore, the inequality is strict if one of the following holds:*

- (1) *The fiber of $\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{k}) \rightarrow M(\mathbb{k})$ over a general point of Z contains only klt pairs.*
- (2) *There exists an open set $U \subset Z$ such that for every $y \in U(\mathbb{k})$,*

$$\#\{z \in U(\mathbb{k}) \mid \text{Src}(z) = \text{Src}(y)\} < +\infty.$$

In condition (2), $\text{Src}(z)$ denotes the source of an element in the S-equivalence class of a pair in the preimage of $\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{k}) \rightarrow M(\mathbb{k})$ over z and is independent of the choice of pair in the preimage by Lemma 6.10 and Proposition 8.7.

Proof. Let k be a positive integer multiple of N such that $\lambda_{\text{Hodge},k}$ on \mathcal{M} descends to a line bundle $L_{\text{Hodge},k}$ on M . By Theorem 14.11 and Theorem 6.5, there is a diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} S & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{M} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ Z & \hookrightarrow & M \end{array},$$

where S is a smooth projective variety and $S \rightarrow Z$ is proper, surjective, and a generically finite morphism. Let $f : (X, \Delta + D) \rightarrow S$ be the family of boundary polarized CY pairs induced by the morphism $S \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$. Since

$$(L_{\text{Hodge}|_Z})^{\dim Z} = k^{-\dim Z} (L_{\text{Hodge},k}|_Z)^{\dim Z} = (\deg(S/Z)k)^{-\dim Z} (\lambda_{\text{Hodge},f,k})^{\dim Z}$$

it suffices to show that $\lambda_{\text{Hodge},f,k}$ is nef and, when (1) or (2) holds, big.

To verify these statements, first assume the generic fiber of $(X, \Delta + D) \rightarrow S$ is klt. Fix a dense open set $U \subset S$ such that the fibers of $(X_U, \Delta_U + D_U) \rightarrow U$ are klt and $U \rightarrow M$ has finite fibers. By Proposition 14.7, $(X, \Delta + D) \rightarrow S$ is an lc-trivial fibration $\mathcal{O}_S(k\mathbf{M}_S) \cong \lambda_{\text{Hodge},f,k}$ and $\mathbf{M} = \overline{\mathbf{M}}_S$. Thus Theorem 14.4 implies $\lambda_{\text{Hodge},f,k}$ is big and nef.

Now assume the generic fiber of $(X, \Delta + D) \rightarrow S$ is not klt. In a number of steps, we will proceed to construct a new family where a general fiber is replaced by its source.

First, let $(\overline{X}, \overline{G} + \overline{\Delta} + \overline{D})$ be a connected component of the normalization of $(X, \Delta + D)$ and \overline{f} denote the composition $\overline{X} \xrightarrow{\pi} X \xrightarrow{f} S$. Note that

$$\overline{f} : (\overline{X}, \overline{G} + \overline{\Delta} + \overline{D}) \rightarrow S$$

is a family of possibly disconnected boundary polarized CY pairs by Lemma 2.8.1 and adjunction.

Second, fix a dlt modification $(Y, \Gamma) \rightarrow (\overline{X}, \overline{G} + \overline{\Delta} + \overline{D})$. Let g denote the composition $Y \rightarrow \overline{X} \rightarrow S$ and μ the composition $Y \rightarrow \overline{X} \rightarrow X$. We claim that $g : (Y, \Gamma) \rightarrow S$ is a projective family of slc pairs. Indeed, since $(\overline{X}, \overline{G} + \overline{\Delta} + \overline{D}) \rightarrow S$ is a projective family of slc pairs, for each point $s \in S$ and regular system of parameters $x_1, \dots, x_r \in \mathcal{O}_{S,s}$, the pair $(\overline{X}, \overline{G} + \overline{\Delta} + \overline{D} + \overline{f}^*\{x_1 \cdots x_r = 0\})$ is slc over a neighborhood of s . Thus its crepant pullback $(Y, \Gamma + g^*\{x_1 \cdots x_r = 0\})$ is slc over a neighborhood of s . Therefore the claim holds by Lemma 2.7.

Third, fix a minimal lc center $T \subset (Y, \Gamma)$, and write $h : T \rightarrow S$ for the induced morphism. Since $(Y, \Gamma) \rightarrow S$ is a family of slc pairs, T must dominate the base S as a consequence of Lemma 2.7.

After replacing S by a generically finite cover by a smooth projective variety, we may assume that the geometric generic fiber of h is connected. Note that

$$h : (T, \Gamma_T := \text{Diff}_T^*(\Gamma)) \rightarrow S$$

is a family of projective slc pairs by Lemma 2.8.2 applied multiple times. Additionally, there exists a dense open subset $V \subset S$ such that $\overline{X}_s \rightarrow X_s$ is a normalization and $(Y_s, \Gamma_s) \rightarrow (\overline{X}_s, \overline{G}_s + \overline{\Delta}_s + \overline{D}_s)$ is a dlt modification. Therefore, after possibly shrinking V , $(T_s, (\Gamma_T)_s)$ is a source of $(X_s, \Delta_s + D_s)$ for all $s \in V$.

Since $(T, \Gamma) \rightarrow S$ is a projective family of slc pairs with klt generic fiber and

$$N(K_{T/S} + \Gamma) \sim N(K_{Y/S} + \Gamma)|_T \sim N(K_{X/S} + \Delta + D)|_T \sim_S 0,$$

the proof of Proposition 14.7.4 shows $(T, \Gamma) \rightarrow S$ is an lc-trivial fibration with moduli divisor satisfying $\mathbf{M} = \overline{\mathbf{M}}_S$ and discriminant b -divisor equal to zero. By Theorem 14.4.1, \mathbf{M}_S is nef. Additionally, if (2) holds, then, by shrinking V further, we may assume $V \rightarrow Z$ has finite fibers and factors through U . Thus Theorem 14.4.2 implies \mathbf{M}_S is also big. Since

$$h^* \mathcal{O}_S(k\mathbf{M}_S) \cong \omega_{T/S}^{[k]}(k\Gamma) \cong (\mu^* \omega_{X/S}^{[k]}(k(\Delta + D)))|_T \cong (\mu^* f^* \lambda_{\text{Hodge},f,k})|_T \cong h^* \lambda_{\text{Hodge},f,k},$$

it follows that $\mathcal{O}_S(k\mathbf{M}_S) \cong \lambda_{\text{Hodge},f,k}$. Thus $\lambda_{\text{Hodge},f,k}$ is nef and when (2) holds is big. \square

Theorem 14.14. *Fix $d \geq 3$. If $m \gg 0$, then the Hodge \mathbb{Q} -line bundle L_{Hodge} on $P_{d,m}^{\text{CY}}$ is ample. As a consequence, the Hodge \mathbb{Q} -line bundle is ample on P_d^{CY} .*

Proof of Theorem 14.14. Fix $m \gg 0$ so that the conclusions of Propositions 12.7 and 12.8 and Lemma 12.11 hold. By the Nakai–Moishezon criterion for ampleness on proper algebraic spaces [Kol90, Thm. 3.11], it suffices to show $(L_{\text{Hodge}}|_Z)^{\dim Z} > 0$ for each irreducible closed subspace $Z \subset P_{d,m}^{\text{CY}}$ of positive dimension. Note that for a general element $z \in Z(\mathbb{k})$, $\text{Src}(z)$ is either (i) a surface pair, (ii) a curve pair or (iii) a point. We analyze each case separately.

- (i) In this case, the preimage of a general point in $Z(\mathbb{k})$ under $\mathcal{P}_{d,m}^{\text{CY}}(\mathbb{k}) \rightarrow P_{d,m}^{\text{CY}}(\mathbb{k})$ contains only klt pairs. Thus Theorem 14.13.1 implies $(L_{\text{Hodge}}|_Z)^{\dim Z} > 0$.
- (ii) In this case, there exists a nonempty open set $U \subset Z$ such that $\text{Src}(z)$ is a curve pair for all $z \in U$. Since $\mathcal{P}_{d,m}^{\text{CY}}(\mathbb{k}) \rightarrow P_{d,m}^{\text{CY}}(\mathbb{k})$ identifies S-equivalent pairs by Theorem 12.12 and each curve pair is the source of finitely many different S-equivalence classes by Theorem 10.1,

$$\#\{z \in U \mid \text{Src}(z) \cong \text{Src}(y)\} < \infty$$

for each $y \in Z$. Thus Proposition 14.13.2 implies $(L_{\text{Hodge}}|_Z)^{\dim Z} > 0$.

- (iii) This case does not occur, since the Type III locus of $P_{d,m}^{\text{CY}}$ is a point by Lemma 12.11 and $\dim(Z) > 0$ by assumption.

By the above three cases, $(L_{\text{Hodge}}|_Z)^{\dim Z} > 0$ as desired. Therefore L_{Hodge} is ample on $P_{d,m}^{\text{CY}}$. Since $P_d^{\text{CY}} \rightarrow P_{d,m}^{\text{CY}}$ is a seminormalization and in particular finite, L_{Hodge} pulls back to an ample \mathbb{Q} -line bundle on P_d^{CY} . \square

14.5. B-semiampleness. We now use Theorem 14.14 to prove cases of the b-semiampleness conjecture and its effective variant due to Prokhorov and Shokurov [PS09, Conj. 7.13].

Proposition 14.15. *If $d \geq 4$, then there exists an integer $I := I(d)$ satisfying the following:*

If $(X, D) \rightarrow Y$ is an lc-trivial fibration such that the geometric generic fiber $(X_{\bar{\eta}}, D_{\bar{\eta}})$ is a klt pair with $X_{\bar{\eta}} \cong \mathbb{P}_{k(\bar{\eta})}^2$ and $\frac{d}{3}D_{\bar{\eta}}$ is a Weil divisor, then IM is b-free.

The result follows from the ampleness of the Hodge line bundle on $P_{d,m}^{\text{CY}}$ and the next lemma.

Lemma 14.16. *For each $d \geq 4$, there exists a constant $c := c(d)$ satisfying the following:*

If $(X_U, D_U) \rightarrow U$ is a family in \mathcal{P}_d^{H} and there is a compactification $U \subset Y$ with Y a normal projective variety, then there is a diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} (X_U, D_U) & & (X', D') \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ U & \xrightarrow{\quad} & Y \xleftarrow{\tau} Y' \end{array}$$

such that (i) Y' is a smooth projective variety, (ii) τ is generically finite with $\deg(\tau) \leq c$, and (iii) $(X', D') \rightarrow Y'$ is a family in \mathcal{P}_d^{H} with $(X', D') \times_Y U \cong (X_U, D_U)$ over U .

Proof. Since \mathcal{P}_d^{H} is a finite type Deligne–Mumford stack by Theorem 9.6, [LMB00, Thm. 16.6] implies that there exists a scheme S with a finite surjective morphism $f : S \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_d^{\text{H}}$. Let \tilde{U} denote a component of the normalization of $U \times_{\mathcal{P}_d^{\text{H}}} S$ dominating U . Since $S \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_d^{\text{H}}$ is representable and finite, $U \times_{\mathcal{P}_d^{\text{H}}} S$ is a scheme and finite over U . Thus \tilde{U} is a scheme and finite over U . Choose a compactification $\tilde{U} \subset \tilde{Y}$ such that \tilde{Y} is a proper normal variety and the morphisms $\tilde{U} \rightarrow U$ and

$\tilde{U} \rightarrow Y$ extend to morphisms $\tilde{Y} \rightarrow Y$ and $\tilde{Y} \rightarrow S$. Thus we have a diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \tilde{U} & \hookrightarrow & \tilde{Y} & \longrightarrow & S \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ U & \hookrightarrow & Y & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{P}_d^H. \end{array}$$

Let $Y' \rightarrow \tilde{Y}$ denote a projective resolution of singularities. Let $(X', D') \rightarrow Y'$ denote the family induced by the morphism $Y' \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_d^H$. Thus (i) and (iii) are satisfied.

For (ii), note that

$$c := \max\{\deg(S_z) \mid z \in \mathcal{P}_d^H(\mathbb{k})\}$$

is finite, since $S \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_d^H$ is finite and $\deg(S_z)$ is constructible. Now $\deg(\tau) = \deg(\tilde{Y}/Y) \leq c$ as desired. \square

Proof of Proposition 14.15. By Proposition 14.9 and Theorem 14.14, there exist $m, N > 0$ such that the line bundle $\lambda_{\text{Hodge}, N}$ on $\mathcal{P}_{d,m}^{\text{CY}}$ descends to an ample line bundle $L_{\text{Hodge}, N}$ on $\mathcal{P}_{d,m}^{\text{CY}}$. Fix a positive integer b such that $bL_{\text{Hodge}, N}$ is very ample. Fix $c > 0$ satisfying the conclusion of Lemma 14.16. Now set $I := N \cdot b \cdot c!$.

By replacing $(X, D) \rightarrow Y$ by a pullback via a proper birational morphism, we may assume $\mathbf{M} := \overline{\mathbf{M}}_Y$. Since $(X_{\bar{\eta}}, D_{\bar{\eta}})$ is a projective klt pair with $X_{\bar{\eta}} \cong \mathbb{P}_{k(\bar{\eta})}^2$ and $\frac{d}{3}D_{\bar{\eta}}$ a Weil divisor, there exists a non-empty open set $U \subset S$ such that $(X_U, D_U) \rightarrow U$ is a family of klt boundary polarized CY pairs and $\frac{d}{3}D_U$ is Weil divisor. Hence $(X_U, D_U) \rightarrow U$ is a family in \mathcal{P}_d^H and we can find a diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} (X_U, D_U) & & (X', D') \\ \downarrow f & & \downarrow f' \\ U & \hookrightarrow & Y \xleftarrow{\tau} Y' \end{array}$$

satisfying the conclusion of Lemma 14.16. Let $(X'', D'') \rightarrow Y'$ denote the lc-trivial fibration induced via base changing $(X, D) \rightarrow Y$ by $Y' \rightarrow Y$. Since $(X', D') \rightarrow Y'$ and $(X'', D'') \rightarrow Y'$ have isomorphic generic fiber, their moduli divisors on Y' are equal by [Kol07, Prop. 8.4.9]. Therefore we may write $\mathbf{M}_{Y'}$ without confusion. By Propositions 14.7.3 and 14.9,

$$\mathcal{O}_{Y'}(N\mathbf{M}_{Y'}) \cong \lambda_{\text{Hodge}, f', N} = \rho^* L_{\text{Hodge}, N},$$

where $\rho : Y' \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_{d,m}^{\text{CY}}$ is the moduli map. Since $bL_{\text{Hodge}, N}$ is very ample, $N \cdot b\mathbf{M}$ is b-free. Since $\mathbf{M} = \tau^*\mathbf{M}$ by [Amb05, Prop. 3.1], [FL19, Proof of Lem. 2.1] implies $N \cdot b \cdot \deg(\tau)\mathbf{M}$ is b-free. Using that $N \cdot b \cdot \deg(\tau)$ divides I , we conclude $I\mathbf{M}$ is b-free. \square

Theorem 14.17. *If $(X, D) \rightarrow Y$ is an lc-trivial fibration such that the generic fiber (X_{η}, D_{η}) is a projective lc pair and $\dim(X) - \dim(Y) \leq 2$, then \mathbf{M} is b-semiample.*

Proof. If (X_{η}, D_{η}) is not klt, then the statement holds by [FG14b, Rem. 4.1], which reduces the problem to the case when $\dim(X) - \dim(Y) \leq 1$ and then applies [PS09, Thm. 8.1]. If (X_{η}, D_{η}) is klt, then the statements holds when $X_{\bar{\eta}} \not\cong \mathbb{P}_{k(\bar{\eta})}^2$ by [Fil20, Thm. 1.7], which reduces to cases proven in [Fuj03, PS09], and when $X_{\bar{\eta}} \cong \mathbb{P}_{k(\bar{\eta})}^2$ by Proposition 14.15. \square

Proposition 14.15 and arguments similar to [Fil20] also imply an effective version of Theorem 14.17 stated in the introduction (Theorem 1.4).

Before proving the statement, we verify the following two lemmas.

Lemma 14.18. *For each positive integer r , there exists an integer $I_r > 0$ satisfying:*

If $(X, D) \rightarrow Y$ is an lc-trivial fibration such that the generic fiber (X_η, D_η) is an lc pair, $r(K_{X_\eta} + D_\eta) \sim 0$, and either (i) $\dim(X) - \dim(Y) = 1$, (ii) $X_\eta \cong \mathbb{P}_{k(\bar{\eta})}^2$, or (iii) there exists a proper normal variety Z and commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X & \xrightarrow{g} & Z \\ & \searrow f & \downarrow h \\ & & Y, \end{array}$$

of surjective morphisms with connected fibers such that g and h are of relative dimension 1 and the general fiber of g is a genus 0 curve, then $I_r \mathbf{M}$ is b-free.

Proof. Case (i) holds by [PS09, Thm. 8.1]. If additionally (X_η, D_η) is klt, then case (ii) holds by Proposition 14.15 and case (iii) holds by [Fil20, Proofs of Thm. 1.7 and 1.8], which reduces the problem to [Fil20, Cor. 7.4].

It remains to consider the case when (X_η, D_η) is lc, but not klt. In this case, the problem can be reduced to (i) by using [FL19, Thm. 5.2] as follows. By replacing $(X, D) \rightarrow Y$ with a pullback, we may assume $\mathbf{M} := \overline{\mathbf{M}}_Y$. Fix a sequence of crepant proper birational morphisms

$$(X^{\text{res}}, D^{\text{res}}) \xrightarrow{\pi} (X^{\text{dlt}}, D^{\text{dlt}}) \xrightarrow{\rho} (X, D)$$

such that ρ restricts to a dlt modification over the generic point of Y and π is a log resolution. By [Kol13, Thm. 10.45], we may additionally choose π to be an isomorphism over the snc locus. Now fix a minimal lc center T of the geometric generic fiber $(X_\eta^{\text{dlt}}, D_\eta^{\text{dlt}})$. Write S for the closure of the image of T on X^{dlt} . Let S' be the birational transform of S on X^{res} and $S' \rightarrow Y^1 \xrightarrow{\tau} Y$ the Stein factorization. By the proof of [FL19, Thm. 5.2], there exists an lc-trivial fibration $(S^1, D^1) \rightarrow Y^1$ such that

- $\dim(Y_1) - \dim(S_1) \leq 1$
- $\mathbf{M}^1 = \tau^* \mathbf{M}$, where \mathbf{M} and \mathbf{M}^1 are the moduli b- \mathbb{Q} -divisors of $(X, D) \rightarrow Y$ and $(S^1, D^1) \rightarrow Y^1$, respectively, and
- $r(K_{S^1} + D^1)$ is linearly equivalent to 0 over the generic fiber.

Thus case (i) implies there exists an integer $I'_r > 0$ depending only on r such that $I'_r \mathbf{M}^1$ is b-free. Since $\mathbf{M}^1 = \tau^* \mathbf{M}$, [FL19, Proof of Lem. 2.1] implies $\deg(\tau) I'_r \mathbf{M}$ is b-free. Hence it suffices to show that T can be chosen such that $\deg(\tau)$ is bounded. One approach is to reduce to the case when T is a curve and then apply [Bir22, Thm. 1.15]. We give a more explicit approach below.

Note that $\deg(\tau)$ equals the number of connected components of S'_η , which equals the number of connected components of S_η . Since S_η is the image of T under the map $X_\eta \rightarrow X_\eta$, [Sta23, Lem. 04KZ] implies S_η is the orbit of T under the Galois group of $k(\bar{\eta})/k(\eta)$. Hence, to complete the proof, it suffices to choose T such that its Galois orbit has a bounded number of components.

Case 1: (X_η, D_η) has regularity 0.

Since $D_\eta^{\text{dlt},=1}$ has at most two connected components by [Kol13, Prop. 4.37.3], $D_\eta^{\text{dlt},=1}$ is either a prime divisor or a union of two disjoint divisors. Hence the Galois orbit of any choice of minimal lc center T of $(X_\eta^{\text{dlt}}, D_\eta^{\text{dlt}})$ has at most two components.

Case 2: (X_η, D_η) has regularity 1 and (ii) holds.

First assume D_η has a coefficient 1 along a curve $C \subset X_\eta$. Since $D_\eta \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} -K_{X_\eta}$ and (ii) holds, there are at most 3 such curves. Let T be a minimal lc center of X_η^{dlt} that is contained in the strict transform of \tilde{C} of C . Since the restriction of $(X_\eta^{\text{dlt}}, D_\eta^{\text{dlt}})$ to \tilde{C} is an lc CY curve pair, there are at most two such lc centers. Thus the Galois orbit of T has at most six components.

Next, assume D_η does not have coefficient 1 along a curve. By [Kol13, Prop. 4.37], $D_\eta^{\text{dlt},=1}$ is connected. Denote by $x \in X_\eta$ the image of $D_\eta^{\text{dlt},=1}$. Since the exceptional divisor of every log

resolution of the smooth point $x \in X_{\bar{\eta}}$ is a tree of rational curves, $D_{\bar{\eta}}^{\text{dlt},=1}$ is a chain of rational curves. Hence, if we let T be a minimal lc center of $(X_{\bar{\eta}}^{\text{dlt}}, D_{\bar{\eta}}^{\text{dlt},=1})$, which is furthest to an endpoint of the chain, then the Galois orbit of T has at most two components.

Case 3: $(X_{\bar{\eta}}, D_{\bar{\eta}})$ has regularity 1 and (iii) holds.

First assume there is an lc center T' of $(X_{\bar{\eta}}^{\text{dlt}}, D_{\bar{\eta}}^{\text{dlt}})$ dominating $Z_{\bar{\eta}}$. Since the general fiber of $X_{\bar{\eta}}^{\text{dlt}} \rightarrow Z_{\bar{\eta}}$ is an lc CY curve pair, there are at most two such lc centers. Since $(T', D_{T'}^{\text{dlt}})$ is again an lc CY curve, there are at most 2 lc centers contained in $T \subset T'$. Hence, the Galois orbit of such a T has at most four components.

Next, assume no lc center of $(X_{\bar{\eta}}^{\text{dlt}}, D_{\bar{\eta}}^{\text{dlt}})$ dominates $Z_{\bar{\eta}}$. By [Kol13, Prop. 4.37], $D_{\bar{\eta}}^{\text{dlt},=1}$ is connected, and, hence, is contained in a fiber of $X_{\bar{\eta}}^{\text{dlt}} \rightarrow Z_{\bar{\eta}}$. Since $X'_{\bar{\eta}} \rightarrow Z_{\bar{\eta}}$ is birational to a smooth ruled surface, we know that every fiber is a tree of rational curves. Thus $D_{\bar{\eta}}^{\text{dlt},=1}$ is a chain of rational curves. Hence, if T is a minimal lc center chosen furthest along the chain, the Galois orbit has at most two components.

By the previous cases, T can be chosen so that the Galois orbit has at most 6 components and, hence, $\deg(\tau) \leq 6$. Therefore $60I_r\mathbf{M}$ is b-free. \square

Lemma 14.19. *There exists a constant $d > 0$ such that the following holds:*

If X is a smooth del Pezzo surface over a field K of characteristic zero and $X \times_K \bar{K} \not\cong \mathbb{P}_{\bar{K}}^2$, then there exists a field extension K'/K of degree $\leq d$ such that $X_{K'}$ is either isomorphic to a blowup of $\mathbb{P}_{K'}^2$ at distinct K' -rational points or isomorphic to $\mathbb{P}_{K'}^1 \times \mathbb{P}_{K'}^1$.

Proof. Let $\bar{X} := X \times_K \bar{K}$ and $\Lambda := [K_X]^\perp \subset \text{Pic}(\bar{X})$. Then (Λ, \cdot) is a negative definite lattice by the Hodge index theorem. Hence the action of Galois group $\text{Gal}(\bar{K}/K)$ on $\text{Pic}(\bar{X})$ factors through the finite group W , which is the automorphism group of the lattice (Λ, \cdot) . Thus there exists a finite extension of fields K_1/K with $[K_1 : K] \leq |W|$ such that $\text{Gal}(\bar{K}/K_1)$ acts trivially on $\text{Pic}(\bar{X})$.

If \bar{X} contains (-1) -curves, we set $K' = K_1$. Then every (-1) -curve is fixed by the $\text{Gal}(\bar{K}/K')$ -action. We know that \bar{X} is isomorphic to the blowup of $\mathbb{P}_{\bar{K}}^2$ at $m = 9 - (K_X^2)$ distinct points $\{p_i\}_{i=1}^m$. Denote by \bar{E}_i the (-1) -curve on \bar{X} as the exceptional divisor over p_i . Since each \bar{E}_i is fixed by the $\text{Gal}(\bar{K}/K')$ -action, we know that it is defined over K' as a (-1) -curve $E'_i \subset X_{K'}$. Thus, the birational morphism $\bar{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_{\bar{K}}^2$ is also defined over K' , which implies that we have a birational morphism $\phi : X_{K'} \rightarrow S$ over K' where S is a Severi–Brauer surface over K' . Since $\phi(E'_i)$ is a K' -rational point of S , we know that $S \cong \mathbb{P}_{K'}^2$.

If $\bar{X} \cong \mathbb{P}_{\bar{K}}^1 \times \mathbb{P}_{\bar{K}}^1$, then both classes of curves $[\bar{F}_1]$ and $[\bar{F}_2]$ of bidegree $(1, 0)$ and $(0, 1)$ respectively are invariant under the $\text{Gal}(\bar{K}/K_1)$ -action. Since each projection map $\text{pr}_j : \bar{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_{\bar{K}}^1$ for $j = 1, 2$ is an extremal contraction of $[\bar{F}_{3-j}]$, it is defined over K_1 as $\pi_j : X_{K_1} \rightarrow Q_j$ where Q_j is a smooth conic curve over K_1 . Thus we get an isomorphism $(\pi_1, \pi_2) : X_{K_1} \xrightarrow{\cong} Q_1 \times Q_2$. Then we let K'/K_1 be a finite field extension such that both Q_1 and Q_2 admit K' -rational points, which can be chosen such that $[K' : K_1] \leq 4$. This implies that $X_{K'} \cong \mathbb{P}_{K'}^1 \times \mathbb{P}_{K'}^1$. In the previous two cases, $\deg(K'/K)$ is bounded by a constant d depending only on the lattice Λ of \bar{X} , which only depends on the deformation family of \bar{X} . Since there are only 9 deformation families of \bar{X} , the proof is complete. \square

Theorem 14.20. *For each finite subset $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{Q} \cap [0, 1]$, there exists an integer $I := I(\Lambda)$ satisfying:*

If $(X, D) \rightarrow Y$ is an lc-trivial fibration such that $\dim(X) - \dim(Y) \leq 2$, the generic fiber (X_η, D_η) is an lc pair, and D_η is a nonzero divisor with coefficients in Λ , then $I\mathbf{M}$ is b-free.

Proof. By [PS09, Cor. 1.11], there exists a positive integer r that depends only on the coefficient set Λ such that $r(K_{X_\eta} + D_\eta) \sim 0$. Thus $r\mathbf{M}$ is a \mathbf{b} -divisor and the coefficients of D_η are contained

in $r^{-1}\mathbb{Z} \cap [0, 1]$. We will proceed to show that the theorem holds with $I := d!I_r$, where I_r and d are the constants in Lemmas 14.18 and 14.19.

We first reduce to the case when X_η is a smooth del Pezzo surface. By replacing $(X, D) \rightarrow Y$ with a base change, we may assume Y is projective. By [HX13, Cor. 1.2], we may assume X is projective. Fix a minimal resolution $\tilde{X}_\eta \rightarrow X_\eta$, which exists by [Kol13, Thm. 2.25], and a resolution $f : \tilde{X} \rightarrow X$ that restricts to the minimal resolution on the general fiber. Write \tilde{D} for the divisor such that $K_{\tilde{X}} + \tilde{D} = f^*(K_X + D)$. Note that $\tilde{D}_\eta > 0$ and the coefficients of \tilde{D}_η are in $r^{-1}\mathbb{Z}$, since $D_\eta > 0$, $K_{\tilde{X}_\eta/X_\eta} \leq 0$, and $r(K_{X_\eta} + D_\eta) \sim 0$. Using that $K_{\tilde{X}} + \tilde{D} \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0$, we see $K_{\tilde{X}}$ is not pseudo-effective over Y . Thus [BCHM10, Cor. 1.3.3] implies that a $K_{\tilde{X}}$ -MMP over Y terminates with a Mori fibre space:

$$\tilde{X} \dashrightarrow \cdots \dashrightarrow X^m \rightarrow Z^m.$$

Since \tilde{X} is terminal, X^m is terminal and, hence, X_η^m is smooth. Let D^m denote the pushforward of \tilde{D} to X^m . Since $K_{\tilde{X}} + \tilde{D} \sim_{\mathbb{Q}, Y} 0$, $K_{X^m} + D^m \sim_{Y, \mathbb{Q}} 0$ and the pairs are crepant birational over Y . Thus the moduli b-divisors of $(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D}) \rightarrow Y$ and $(X^m, D^m) \rightarrow Y$ are equal by [FL19, Rem. 3.5]. If $\dim Z^m > \dim Y$, then we are in the setting of Lemma 14.18.iii and, hence, $I_r \mathbf{M}$ is b-free. If not, then X_η^m is a smooth del Pezzo surface. Thus, by replacing (X, D) with (X^m, D^m) , we may assume X_η is a smooth del Pezzo surface.

If $X_{\bar{\eta}} \cong \mathbb{P}_{k(\bar{\eta})}^2$, then $I_r \mathbf{M}$ is b-free by Lemma 14.18.ii. If not, then Lemma 14.19 implies there exists a field extension K' of $K(\eta)$ of degree $\leq d$ such that $X_{K'}$ is isomorphic to $\mathbb{P}_{K'}^1 \times \mathbb{P}_{K'}^1$, or $\mathbb{P}_{K'}^2$, blown up at K' -points. In both cases, there is a surjective morphism $X_{K'} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_{K'}^1$. Thus there exists of finite morphism of normal varieties $\rho : Y' \rightarrow Y$ such that $\deg(Y'/Y) \leq d$ and the generic fiber of $X \times_Y Y' \rightarrow Y'$ admits a surjective morphism to $\mathbb{P}_{K'}^1$. Now let $(X', D') \rightarrow Y'$ denote the lc-trivial fibration induced by pullback. The moduli divisors of the two lc-trivial fibrations are related by that $\mathbf{M}' = \rho^* \mathbf{M}$ by [Amb05, Prop. 3.1]. There exists a proper normal variety Z' and a commutative diagram of dominant maps

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X' & \overset{g'}{\dashrightarrow} & Z' \\ & \searrow f' & \downarrow h' \\ & & Y' \end{array}$$

such that the generic fiber of h' is $\mathbb{P}_{K'}^1$. By taking birational modifications of X' and Z' that are isomorphisms over the generic point of Y' , we may assume that g' and h' are morphisms. This does not change the moduli divisor by [Kol07, Prop. 8.4.9.1]. Since f' has connected fibers, so does g' and h' . Now Lemma 14.18 implies $I_r \mathbf{M}'$ is b-free. Therefore $\deg(Y'/Y)I_r \mathbf{M}$ is b-free by [FL19, Proof of Lem. 2.1] and so $I \mathbf{M}$ is b-free. \square

15. PROOFS OF MAIN THEOREMS

In this section, we prove Theorems 1.1, 1.3, and 1.4, which were stated in the introduction. Note that Corollary 1.2 was previously proven in Section 6.5.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. The first part of the theorem follows from Theorem 3.7. Theorems 5.4, 6.3, and 7.1 combined with Lemma 2.11 imply (1)-(3) hold. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.3. Consider the asymptotically good moduli space

$$\phi : (\mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY}})^{\text{sn}} \rightarrow P_d^{\text{CY}}$$

in Proposition 13.8. Note that P_d^{CY} is the seminormalization of $P_{d,m}^{\text{CY}}$ for m sufficiently large. The morphism ϕ is surjective by Proposition 13.3. The algebraic space $P_{d,m}^{\text{CY}}$ is reduced, irreducible, and proper by Propositions 12.6 and 12.8. We now verify (1)-(4) of Theorem 1.3 hold.

- (1) Proposition 13.3.2 implies ϕ is universal among maps to algebraic spaces.
 (2) Lemma 6.10 and Proposition 13.3 imply the map

$$(\mathcal{P}_d^{\text{CY}})^{\text{sn}}(\mathbb{k}) \rightarrow (P_d^{\text{CY}})^{\text{sn}}(\mathbb{k})$$

- is surjective and identifies two pairs (X, D) and (X', D') if and only if they are S-equivalent.
 (3) Note that \mathcal{P}_d^{K} and P_d^{K} are seminormal by Proposition 11.7. Thus there exists a commutative diagram as in (3) by Proposition 13.3.2. Since P_d^{K} and $(P_d^{\text{H}})^{\text{sn}}$ are projective by Theorems 9.8 and 9.6 and P_d^{CY} is separated, the maps in the bottom row are projective morphisms. When $d \geq 4$, $\mathcal{P}_d \subset \mathcal{P}_d^{\text{K}}$ and $\mathcal{P}_d \subset \mathcal{P}_d^{\text{H}}$. Using Proposition 12.9, we see the maps in the bottom row are bijections on \mathbb{k} -points over $\phi(\mathcal{P}_d^{\text{sn}})$. Thus the maps are birational.
 (4) Theorem 14.14 implies the Hodge line bundle on $P_{d,m}^{\text{CY}}$ is ample. Thus the pullback of the line bundle by $P_d^{\text{CY}} \rightarrow P_{d,m}^{\text{CY}}$ is also ample.

We have now shown that P_d^{CY} is a proper algebraic space that is reduced, irreducible, and admits an ample line bundle. Thus P_d^{CY} is a projective variety. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.4. The results follows from Theorems 14.17 and 14.20. \square

16. EXAMPLES

In this section we give concrete examples of the moduli space P_d^{CY} and apply Theorem 1.1 to additional moduli problems.

16.1. Low degree plane curves. We now describe the moduli space P_d^{CY} when $3 \leq d \leq 6$. When $d = 4$ and $d = 6$, we assume the base field $\mathbb{k} = \mathbb{C}$ in order to relate P_d^{CY} to certain Baily-Borel compactifications of moduli of K3 surfaces that are defined over the complex numbers.

16.1.1. Degree 3. By [ADL19, Ex. 4.5.3], \mathcal{P}_3^{K} parametrizes GIT semistable cubics and P_3^{K} is isomorphic to the GIT compactification of plane cubics P_3^{GIT} . Thus, a pair (X, D) is in $\mathcal{P}_3^{\text{K}}(\mathbb{k})$ if and only if $(X, D) \cong (\mathbb{P}^2, C)$, where either

- (a) C is a smooth cubic curve, or
- (b) C is a nodal cubic curve.

Additionally, in case (a), each pair is a closed point of \mathcal{P}_d^{K} with finite stabilizer. In case (b), all pairs are S-equivalent, and $(\mathbb{P}^2, \{xyz = 0\})$ is the unique closed point in \mathcal{P}_d^{K} from this S-equivalence class.

Proposition 16.1. *The natural map $P_3^{\text{K}} \rightarrow P_3^{\text{CY}}$ is an isomorphism.*

Proof. Since P_3^{K} and P_3^{CY} are projective seminormal varieties, it suffices to show that $P_3^{\text{K}} \rightarrow P_3^{\text{CY}}$ is a bijection on \mathbb{k} -points. Proposition 12.7 states that the map is surjective. Additionally, if (X, D) and (X', D') are pairs in $\mathcal{P}_3^{\text{K}}(\mathbb{k})$ that are identified in $P_3^{\text{CY}}(\mathbb{k})$, then (X, D) and (X', D') are S-equivalent by Theorem 1.3 and, hence, have isomorphic source by Proposition 6.9. The above classification of pairs in \mathcal{P}_3^{K} implies (X, D) and (X', D') are identified in P_3^{K} . Therefore $P_3^{\text{K}} \rightarrow P_3^{\text{CY}}$ is bijective on \mathbb{k} -points as desired. \square

The inclusion $\mathcal{P}_3^{\text{K}} \subset \mathcal{P}_3^{\text{CY}}$ is not an equality. Indeed, a pair (X, D) in case (a) admits a degeneration to $(X, D) \rightsquigarrow (X_0, D_0)$, where X_0 is the cone over D and D_0 is the divisor at infinity. In addition, the S-equivalence class of Type III pairs in $\mathcal{P}_3^{\text{CY}}$ is unbounded by Example 9.4.

16.1.2. *Degree 4.* In [Kon00], Kondō uses the observation that a degree 4 cyclic cover of \mathbb{P}^2 along a smooth quartic curve is a degree K3 surface to construct a compactification $P_4 \subset P_4^*$, which is the Baily-Borel compactification of a period domain parametrizing degree 4 K3 surfaces with a $\mathbb{Z}/4\mathbb{Z}$ symmetry.

Proposition 16.2. *The birational map $P_4^{\text{CY}} \dashrightarrow P_4^*$ is an isomorphism.*

Proof. Note that P_4^{CY} and P_4^{K} are both normal by Propositions 11.6. By [ADL19, Thm. 6.5], P_4^* the ample model of the Hodge line bundle $L_{\text{Hodge}}^{\text{K}}$ on P_4^{K} , which means

$$P_4^* \cong \text{Proj} \left(\bigoplus_{m \in \mathbb{N}} H^0 \left(P_4^{\text{K}}, mL_{\text{Hodge}}^{\text{K}} \right) \right).$$

Since L_{Hodge} is ample on P_d^{CY} by Theorem 1.3.4 and $L_{\text{Hodge}}^{\text{K}}$ is the pullback of L_{Hodge} , P_4^{CY} is also the ample model of $L_{\text{Hodge}}^{\text{K}}$. Thus $P_4^{\text{CY}} \dashrightarrow P_4^*$ extends to an isomorphism. \square

Theorem 16.3. *The polystable pairs parametrized by $P_4^{\text{CY}}(\mathbb{k})$ are the following:*

- (1) $(\mathbb{P}^2, \frac{3}{4}C)$ where C is a plane quartic curve with at worst cuspidal singularities;
- (2) $(\mathbb{P}(1, 1, 4), \frac{3}{4}C)$ where C is a degree 8 curve not passing through the cone point with at worst cuspidal singularities;
- (3) $(\mathbb{P}(1, 1, 2) \cup \mathbb{P}(1, 1, 2), \frac{3}{4}C)$ where C is of degree 4 on each component, and has a tacnodal singularity on each component, illustrated in Figure 1.

Proof. By [ADL19, Section 6.2.1] and the isomorphism $P_4^{\text{CY}} \cong P_4^*$ from Proposition 16.2, we know that the birational morphism $P_4^{\text{K}} \rightarrow P_4^{\text{CY}}$ contracts an irreducible curve Σ_{A_3} to a point p , and is an isomorphism elsewhere. Here Σ_{A_3} is the closed locus of P_4^{K} parametrizing curves with tacnodal singularities. Moreover, $P_4^{\text{K}} \setminus \Sigma_{A_3}$ precisely parametrizes klt boundary polarized CY pairs (X, D) which are the pairs from (1) or (2). On the other hand, Σ_{A_3} parametrizes pairs $(\mathbb{P}^2, \frac{3}{4}C)$ where C is a cat-eye or an ox, together with $(\mathbb{P}(1, 1, 4)_{[y_0:y_1:y_2]}, \frac{3}{4}\{y_2^2 = y_0^4 y_1^4\})$. Thus it suffices to show that the point $p \in P_4^{\text{CY}}$ is precisely the pair from (3). Indeed, consider the test configuration $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{D}) \rightarrow \mathbb{A}^1$ where

$$\mathcal{X} = \{x_0 x_2 = t x_1^2\} \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 1, 1, 2)_{[x_0:x_1:x_2:x_3]} \times \mathbb{A}_t^1, \quad \mathcal{D} = \frac{3}{4}\{x_3^2 = x_1^4\}|_{\mathcal{X}},$$

and the \mathbb{G}_m -action is given by $s \cdot ([x_0 : x_1 : x_2 : x_3], t) = ([s x_0 : x_1 : x_2 : x_3], st)$. Then the fiber over $t = 1$ is isomorphic to $(\mathbb{P}(1, 1, 4), \frac{3}{4}\{y_2^2 = y_0 y_1^4\})$ via the embedding $\mathbb{P}(1, 1, 4) \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}(1, 1, 1, 2)$ given by $[y_0 : y_1 : y_2] \mapsto [y_0^2 : y_0 y_1 : y_1^2 : y_2]$. It is clear that the central fiber over $t = 0$ is isomorphic to the pair in (3). Since the central fiber is of Type II and admits an effective \mathbb{G}_m^2 -action by $(s_1, s_2) \cdot [x_0 : x_1 : x_2 : x_3] = [s_1 x_0 : x_1 : s_2 x_2 : x_3]$, we know that it is polystable by Proposition 8.11. Thus the central fiber gives the polystable point p . \square

16.1.3. *Degree 5.* As in the degree 4 case above, we can describe the polystable representatives in P_5^{CY} .


Theorem 16.4. *The polystable pairs (X, D) parametrized by $P_5^{\text{CY}}(\mathbb{k})$ satisfy that either (X, D) is klt, or it is isomorphic to one of the following two pairs, illustrated in Figure 2:*

- (1) $(\mathbb{P}(1, 1, 5) \cup \mathbb{P}(1, 4, 5) = (\{z_2 z_0 = 0\} \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 1, 4, 5)_{[z_0:z_1:z_2:z_3]}, \frac{3}{5}\{z_3^2 = z_1^{10}\})$;
- (2) $(\mathbb{P}(1, 1, 2) \cup \mathbb{P}(1, 1, 2) = (\{x_0 x_2 = 0\} \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 1, 1, 2)_{[x_0:x_1:x_2:x_3]}, \frac{3}{5}\{x_1(x_3^2 - x_1^4) = 0\})$.

Moreover, the birational map $P_5^{\text{K}} \rightarrow P_5^{\text{CY}}$ contracts the A_9 -locus and D_6 -locus to (1) and (2) respectively, and is isomorphic elsewhere.


Proof. By [ADL19, Section 9.4], we know that there are two disjoint irreducible closed subvarieties Σ_{A_9} and Σ_{D_6} of P_5^{K} parametrizing curves with A_9 or D_6 singularities respectively. Moreover, $P_5^{\text{K}} \setminus (\Sigma_{A_9} \cup \Sigma_{D_6})$ is precisely the locus parametrizing klt boundary polarized CY pairs. By [ADL19, Prop. 9.21 and 9.22], we know that every boundary polarized CY pair in Σ_{A_9} (resp. in Σ_{D_6}) admits

FIGURE 1. The common polystable degeneration of the cat-eye and ox.



a weakly special degeneration to the pair from (1) (resp. from (2)). Since the pair in (1) or (2) is of Type II and admits an effective \mathbb{G}_m^2 -action, we know that it is polystable by Proposition 8.11. Thus the birational map $P_5^K \rightarrow P_5^{CY}$ contracts Σ_{A_9} and Σ_{D_6} to (1) and (2) respectively, and is an isomorphism on $P_5^K \setminus (\Sigma_{A_9} \cup \Sigma_{D_6})$. \square

FIGURE 2. The polystable degenerations of the A_9 and D_6 quintic curves.



16.1.4. *Degree 6.* The double cover of \mathbb{P}^2 branched along a smooth sextic plane curve is a degree 2 K3 surface and this construction induces a birational map

$$P_6 \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_2,$$

where \mathcal{F}_2 is the coarse moduli space of primitively polarized degree 2 K3 surfaces with ADE singularities. Using that \mathcal{F}_2 can be endowed with the structure of a Hermitian symmetric domain by the global Torelli theorem, \mathcal{F}_2 admits a Baily-Borel compactification \mathcal{F}_2^{BB} , which is a normal projective variety. The compactifications P_6^K and P_6^H and their relation to \mathcal{F}_2^{BB} are well-understood.

- The moduli space P_6^H was studied in detail by Alexeev, Engel, and Thompson [AET19]. In particular, the authors analyzed the boundary strata and proved that the normalization of P_6^H is a semitoroidal compactification of \mathcal{F}_2 .
- By [ADL19, §6.2.2], the moduli space P_6^K agrees with a compactification of Shah [Sha80] that was constructed as a partial Kirwan desingularization of the moduli space P_6^{GIT} of GIT semistable plane sextics. In addition, Shah constructed a set theoretic map $P_6^K \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_2^{BB}$ extending the map $P_6 \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_2$. The map was later shown to be algebraic by work of Looijenga [Loo03] (see [Laz16, Thm. 1.9]).

Using that the Hodge line bundle is ample on P_6^{CY} , we deduce the following.

Proposition 16.5. *The map $P_6 \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_2$ extends to an isomorphism $P_6^{CY} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_2^{BB}$.*

Proof. Note that P_6^K is normal by Proposition 11.7 and P_6^{CY} is seminormal by Proposition 13.8. By [ADL19, Thm. 6.6], $\mathcal{F}_2^{\text{BB}}$ is the ample normal model of L_{Hodge}^K on P_6^K . Since L_{Hodge} is ample on P_6^{CY} by Theorem 1.3.4 and L_{Hodge}^K is the pullback of L_{Hodge} to P_6^K , the normalization of P_6^{CY} is the ample normal model of L_{Hodge}^K as well. Thus $P_6^K \rightarrow P_6^{\text{CY}}$ factors as

$$P_6^K \longrightarrow \mathcal{F}_2^{\text{BB}} \xrightarrow{\nu} P_6^{\text{CY}},$$

where ν is the normalization of P_6^{CY} .

We claim that ν is a bijection on \mathbb{k} -points. Since ν is a normalization, surjectivity holds. To show injectivity, it suffices to show: if (X, D) and (X', D') are pairs in $P_6^K(\mathbb{k})$ that are identified in P_6^{CY} , then (X, D) and (X', D') are identified in $\mathcal{F}_2^{\text{BB}}$. Note that as (X, D) and (X', D') are identified in P_6^{CY} , $\text{Src}(X, D) = \text{Src}(X', D')$ by Proposition 8.7. We consider three cases:

Case 1: The source is not a smooth elliptic curve or a point. By Proposition 12.6, P_6^{CY} is normal at the image of (X, D) and (X', D') . Therefore, ν is a bijection at those points and the pairs are identified in $\mathcal{F}_2^{\text{BB}}$.

Case 2: The source is a smooth elliptic curve. The classification of the boundary of P_6^K in [Laz16, pg. 233] implies $(X, D) \cong (\mathbb{P}^2, C)$ and $(X', D') \cong (\mathbb{P}^2, C')$ for some smooth cubic curves C and C' in \mathbb{P}^2 . Since the sources are isomorphic, we must have $(X, D) \cong (X', D')$.

Case 3: The source is a point. Since the map $P_6^K \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_2^{\text{BB}}$ contracts the Type III locus to a single point [Laz16, pg. 234], (X, D) and (X', D') are identified in $\mathcal{F}_2^{\text{BB}}$.

By the above cases, ν is a bijection on \mathbb{k} -points. Using that P_6^{CY} is seminormal and $\mathcal{F}_2^{\text{BB}}$ is reduced, we conclude that ν is an isomorphism. \square


Theorem 16.6. *The polystable pairs of Type II in $P_6^{\text{CY}}(\mathbb{k})$, as illustrated in Figure 3, are the following:*

- (1) $(C_p(E, L), E_\infty)$ where E is a smooth elliptic curve, L is a degree 9 line bundle on E , and E_∞ is the section at infinity;
- (2) $(\mathbb{P}(1, 1, 2) \cup \mathbb{P}(1, 1, 2), \frac{1}{2}C)$ where on each component of the surface, C is the sum of three sections tangent at a common point away from the non-normal locus;
- (3) $(\mathbb{P}^2 \cup \mathbb{F}_1, \frac{1}{2}C)$ where the surface is glued along a line l in \mathbb{P}^2 and the negative section in \mathbb{F}_1 , $C|_{\mathbb{P}^2}$ is the sum of four distinct lines passing through a common point away from l , and $C|_{\mathbb{F}_1}$ is the sum of four distinct fibers together with a doubled positive section;
- (4) $(\mathbb{P}(1, 1, 4) \cup \mathbb{F}_4, \frac{1}{2}C)$ where the surface is glued along the section at infinity of $\mathbb{P}(1, 1, 4)$ and the negative section of \mathbb{F}_4 , $C|_{\mathbb{P}(1, 1, 4)}$ is the sum of four distinct rulings, and $C|_{\mathbb{F}_4}$ is the sum of four distinct fibers together with a doubled positive section.

Proof. The polystability of these pairs in (2), (3), and (4) follows from Proposition 8.11. Let (X, D) be a pair from (1) whose polystable degeneration is (X_0, D_0) . Assume to the contrary that (X, D) is not polystable so by Propositions 6.6 and 8.11 we know that $\text{Aut}^0(X_0, D_0) \cong \mathbb{G}_m^2$. By [Hac04, Thm. 5.5 & 6.5] we know that X_0 is either normal or obtained by gluing two normal surfaces along a smooth rational curve. The latter is not possible as $\text{Src}(X_0, D_0) \cong \text{Src}(X, D)$ is a smooth elliptic curve. Thus X_0 is normal, and $\text{Aut}^0(X_0, D_0) \cong \mathbb{G}_m^2$ implies that X_0 is toric and D_0 is torus invariant. Let D'_0 denote the reduced toric boundary of X_0 . Then we have $K_{X_0} + D'_0 \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0$ and $D_0 \leq D'_0$, which implies that $D_0 = D'_0$. Thus the source of (X_0, D_0) is a point which cannot be a smooth elliptic curve, a contradiction. Thus we conclude that pairs from (1) are polystable.

One can work out the polystable degenerations from the Type II pairs in P_6^K (see e.g. [Laz16, pg. 233]) to these four cases. For (1), one simply take the degeneration to normal cone. For (2), the construction is similar to cases from degree 4 and 5 where the degeneration of the underlying surface is also $\mathbb{P}(1, 1, 2) \cup \mathbb{P}(1, 1, 2)$. For (3) and (4), one takes the blowup of the trivial test configuration along the double curve in the central fiber. \square

FIGURE 3. The polystable degenerations of Type II sextic curves.



16.2. **Points on \mathbb{P}^1 .** We now use the machinery of the paper to compactify the moduli space of unordered points on \mathbb{P}^1 . For other approaches using KSBA or K-stability, see e.g. [Has03, Fuj21].

Definition 16.7. Fix an integer $d \geq 2$. Let $\chi(m) := \chi(\mathbb{P}^1, \omega_{\mathbb{P}^1}^{[-m]})$ and

$$\mathcal{C}_d^{\text{CY}} \subset \mathcal{M}(\chi, d, (1, \frac{2}{d}))$$

denote the open and closed substack of $\mathcal{M}(\chi, d, (1, \frac{2}{d}))$ consisting of families $[(X, \Delta + D) \rightarrow B]$ with $\Delta = 1 \cdot \emptyset$ (see 3.8). Let

$$\mathcal{C}_d \subset \mathcal{C}_d^{\text{GIT}} \subset \mathcal{C}_d^{\text{CY}}$$

denote open substacks such that $\mathcal{C}_d^{\text{GIT}}(\mathbb{k})$ parametrizes pairs (X, D) , where $X \cong \mathbb{P}^1$, and $\mathcal{C}_d(\mathbb{k})$ parametrizes pairs $(X, D = \frac{2}{d}D^{\text{Div}})$, where $X \cong \mathbb{P}^1$ and D^{Div} is reduced on X .

Lemma 16.8. *Let $d \geq 2$ be an integer. The following properties of $\mathcal{C}_d^{\text{CY}}$ hold.*

- (1) *If (X, D) is a pair in $\mathcal{C}_d^{\text{CY}}(\mathbb{k})$, then $X \cong \mathbb{P}^1$ or $X \cong \mathbb{P}^1 \vee \mathbb{P}^1$, where $\mathbb{P}^1 \vee \mathbb{P}^1$ denotes the nodal curve obtained by gluing two copies of \mathbb{P}^1 at a point.*
- (2) *$\mathcal{C}_d^{\text{CY}}$ is smooth.*
- (3) *$\mathcal{C}_d^{\text{GIT}}$ is dense in $\mathcal{C}_d^{\text{CY}}$.*

Proof. (1) Since (X, D) is a boundary polarized CY pair of dimension 1, we know that X is a nodal curve with $-K_X$ ample. If X is normal, then it is isomorphic to \mathbb{P}^1 . If X is non-normal, then its normalization $(\overline{X}, \overline{G})$ is a log Fano pair. Thus every component of \overline{X} is \mathbb{P}^1 containing a unique point in the conductor divisor. Thus $X \cong \mathbb{P}^1 \vee \mathbb{P}^1$.

(2) To show the stack is smooth, it suffices to verify the infinitesimal lifting criterion for smoothness as in the proof of Proposition 11.5. Here the situation is much simpler as every pair (X, D) in $\mathcal{C}_d^{\text{CY}}(\mathbb{k})$ satisfies that X is a reduced Gorenstein curve with at worst nodal singularities, and D^{Div} is a Cartier divisor not passing through the singular locus of X . By [Sta23, Tag 0DZX] we know that X has unobstructed deformations. By [Har10, Thm. 6.2.b] we know that the Cartier divisor D^{Div} has unobstructed deformations as $H^1(D^{\text{Div}}, \mathcal{O}_X(D^{\text{Div}})|_{D^{\text{Div}}}) = 0$. Thus the statement follows by combining the unobstructedness of deformations of both X and D^{Div} .

(3) We know that $\mathbb{P}^1 \vee \mathbb{P}^1$ is an isotrivial degeneration of \mathbb{P}^1 , as one can just take the blowup of $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{A}^1$ at a point in the central fiber. Thus by the unobstructedness of deformations of D from (2) we know that every pair (X, D) in $\mathcal{C}_d^{\text{CY}}(\mathbb{k})$ with $X \cong \mathbb{P}^1 \vee \mathbb{P}^1$ deforms to a family in $\mathcal{C}_d^{\text{GIT}}$. \square

Theorem 16.9. *For any $d \geq 2$, the stack $\mathcal{C}_d^{\text{CY}}$ is of finite type and admits a projective good moduli space C_d^{CY} . Moreover,*

- (1) *The stack $\mathcal{C}_d^{\text{GIT}}$ is isomorphic to the GIT quotient stack $[\mathbb{P}(H^0(\mathbb{P}^1, \mathcal{O}(d)))^{\text{ss}}/\text{PGL}_2]$ and hence admits a projective good moduli space C_d^{GIT} isomorphic to the GIT quotient space $\mathbb{P}(H^0(\mathbb{P}^1, \mathcal{O}(d)))^{\text{ss}} // \text{PGL}_2$.*
- (2) *There is a commutative diagram*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{C}_d^{\text{GIT}} & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \mathcal{C}_d^{\text{CY}} \\ \phi_{\text{GIT}} \downarrow & & \downarrow \phi \\ C_d^{\text{GIT}} & \xrightarrow{\cong} & C_d^{\text{CY}} \end{array}$$

where the bottom row is an isomorphism.

- (3) *The Hodge line bundle on C_d^{CY} is ample.*

A version of the moduli space C_d^{GIT} for marked points on \mathbb{P}^1 notably appears in the work of Deligne and Mostow [DM86].

Proof. Every pair (X, D) in $\mathcal{C}_d^{\text{CY}}(\mathbb{k})$ has regularity at most 0 as $\dim X = 1$. Therefore, Theorem 8.15 implies that $\mathcal{C}_d^{\text{CY}}$ is of finite type and admits a separated good moduli space C_d^{CY} . Since $\mathcal{C}_d^{\text{CY}}$ satisfies the existence part of the valuative criterion for properness by Theorem 7.1, we conclude that C_d^{CY} is a proper algebraic space by Theorem 2.29. The projectivity will be verified in (3) by proving the ampleness of the Hodge line bundle.

(1) By definition we know that (X, D) is in $\mathcal{C}_d^{\text{GIT}}(\mathbb{k})$ if and only if $X \cong \mathbb{P}^1$ and $\text{mult}_p D^{\text{Div}} \leq \frac{d}{2}$ for every $p \in X$. By [MFK94, §4.1] this is equivalent to D^{Div} being GIT semistable as a binary form in $H^0(\mathbb{P}^1, \mathcal{O}(d))$. To show that there is an isomorphism between these two stacks, we look at the forgetful map $\psi : \mathcal{C}_d^{\text{GIT}} \rightarrow B\text{PGL}_2$ sending $[(X, D) \rightarrow S]$ to $[X \rightarrow S]$ where $B\text{PGL}_2$ is the classifying stack of \mathbb{P}^1 -bundles. Clearly the fiber of ψ is the scheme $\mathbb{P}(H^0(\mathbb{P}^1, \mathcal{O}(d)))^{\text{ss}}$ equipped with the natural PGL_2 -action. Thus we obtain the isomorphism between stacks.

The isomorphism of good moduli spaces follows from Proposition 2.27.3.

(2) The commutative diagram exists by the universality of good moduli spaces from Proposition 2.27.3. Therefore it remains to show that $\sigma : \mathcal{C}_d^{\text{GIT}} \rightarrow C_d^{\text{CY}}$ is an isomorphism. By Lemma 16.8, we know that σ is dominant and C_d^{CY} is normal. If $d = 2$ then C_d^{GIT} is a point which implies the isomorphism. Assume $d \geq 3$ from now on. Then, there is a dense saturated open substack $\mathcal{C}_d^{\text{s}} \subset \mathcal{C}_d^{\text{GIT}}$ parametrizing (X, D) where $X \cong \mathbb{P}^1$ and D^{Div} is GIT stable. Moreover, \mathcal{C}_d^{s} admits a coarse moduli space C_d^{s} as an open subscheme of C_d^{GIT} . Since every pair (X, D) in $\mathcal{C}_d^{\text{s}}(\mathbb{k})$ is klt by [MFK94, §4.1], by Proposition 6.11 we know that the map $\sigma|_{\mathcal{C}_d^{\text{s}}} : \mathcal{C}_d^{\text{s}} \rightarrow C_d^{\text{CY}}$ is injective. If d is odd, then by [MFK94, §4.1] we know that $C_d^{\text{s}} = C_d^{\text{GIT}}$ and hence σ is dominant and injective between normal proper varieties, which implies that σ is an isomorphism by Zariski's main theorem. If d is even, then by [MFK94, §4.1] we know that $C_d^{\text{GIT}} \setminus C_d^{\text{s}}$ is a single point. Thus σ is dominant, birational and quasi-finite between normal proper varieties, which implies that σ is an isomorphism by Zariski's main theorem.

(3) As $\mathcal{C}_d^{\text{CY}}$ is finite type, Proposition 14.9 gives the existence of the Hodge line bundle on C_d^{CY} . If $d = 2$, C_d^{CY} is a point, so the result follows. Assume then $d \geq 3$. By the Nakai–Moishezon criterion for ampleness [Kol90, Thm. 3.11], it suffices to show $L_{\text{Hodge}}|_Z^{\dim Z} > 0$ for each irreducible closed subspace $Z \subset C_d^{\text{CY}}$ of positive dimension. Since $\dim Z > 0$ and the non-klt locus is at most a single point of C_d^{CY} by [MFK94, §4.1], the fiber of $\mathcal{C}_d^{\text{CY}} \rightarrow C_d^{\text{CY}}$ over a general point of Z contains only klt pairs. Therefore, Theorem 14.13.1 implies $L_{\text{Hodge}}|_Z^{\dim Z} > 0$ and we conclude that the Hodge line bundle is ample. \square

In fact, we can say more: if d is odd, then by Proposition 8.18, for any $(X, D) \in \mathcal{C}_d^{\text{CY}}(\mathbb{k})$, $\text{coreg}(X, D) > 0$ so $\text{reg}(X, D) < 0$, i.e. (X, D) is klt. Thus $X \cong \mathbb{P}^1$ which shows that $\mathcal{C}_d^{\text{CY}} = \mathcal{C}_d^{\text{GIT}} = \mathcal{C}_d^{\text{s}}$ and hence the good moduli space $\mathcal{C}_d^{\text{CY}} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_d^{\text{CY}}$ is a coarse moduli space. If d is even, we can have lc pairs (X, D) of coregularity 0 and hence regularity 0. Since $\mathcal{C}_d^{\text{GIT}} \setminus \mathcal{C}_d^{\text{s}}$ consists of a single point $(\mathbb{P}^1, \frac{2}{d}(\frac{d}{2}[0] + \frac{d}{2}[\infty]))$ by [MFK94, §4.1], we know that all non-klt pairs in $\mathcal{C}_d^{\text{CY}}$ are S-equivalent to each other. By blowing up the point $([0], 0)$ in the family $(\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{A}^1, \frac{2}{d}(\frac{d}{2}[0] \times \mathbb{A}^1 + \frac{d}{2}[\infty] \times \mathbb{A}^1)) \rightarrow \mathbb{A}^1$, we obtain a test configuration of $(\mathbb{P}^1, \frac{2}{d}(\frac{d}{2}[0] + \frac{d}{2}[\infty]))$ whose central fiber is isomorphic to $(\mathbb{P}^1 \vee \mathbb{P}^1, \frac{2}{d}(\frac{d}{2}p_1 + \frac{d}{2}p_2))$ where p_1 is a point on the first copy of \mathbb{P}^1 and p_2 is a point on the second copy. Since the identity component of the automorphism group of $(\mathbb{P}^1 \vee \mathbb{P}^1, \frac{2}{d}(\frac{d}{2}p_1 + \frac{d}{2}p_2))$ is \mathbb{G}_m^2 , this pair is the unique non-klt polystable point in $\mathcal{C}_d^{\text{CY}}$ by Proposition 8.11.

16.3. Curves of odd degree in $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$. We now study the moduli stack $\mathcal{K}_d^{\text{CY}}$ of boundary polarized CY pairs $(\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1, \frac{2}{d}C)$ and their degenerations where $d \geq 3$ is odd and $C \in |\mathcal{O}(d, d)|$.

Definition 16.10. Fix an integer $d \geq 2$. Let $\chi'(m) := \chi(\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1, \omega_{\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1}^{[-m]}) = (2m + 1)^2$ and

$$\mathcal{K}_d \subset \mathcal{M}(\chi', d, (1, \frac{2}{d}))$$

denote the open substack whose \mathbb{k} -points are pairs $(X, \Delta + D)$ such that $X \cong \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$, $\Delta := 1 \cdot \emptyset$, and $D := \frac{2}{d}C$, where C is a smooth curve of bidegree (d, d) .

Let $\mathcal{K}_d^{\text{CY}} := \overline{\mathcal{K}_d}$ be the stack theoretic closure of \mathcal{K}_d in $\mathcal{M}(\chi', d, (1, \frac{2}{d}))$.

Theorem 16.11. *Assume that $d \geq 3$ is an odd integer. Then the stack $\mathcal{K}_d^{\text{CY}}$ is of finite type and admits a proper good moduli space $\mathcal{K}_d^{\text{CY}}$.*

Proof. Since d is odd, we know that $1 \notin \frac{2}{d}\mathbb{Z}$. By Proposition 8.18, every pair (X, D) in $\mathcal{K}_d^{\text{CY}}(\mathbb{k})$ has $\text{coreg}(X, D) > 0$, and so

$$\text{reg}(X, D) = \dim X - 1 - \text{coreg}(X, D) = 1 - \text{coreg}(X, D) \leq 0.$$

Thus Theorem 8.15 implies that $\mathcal{K}_d^{\text{CY}}$ is of finite type and admits a separated good moduli space $\mathcal{K}_d^{\text{CY}}$. Since $\mathcal{K}_d^{\text{CY}}$ satisfies the existence part of valuative criterion for properness by Theorem 7.1, $\mathcal{K}_d^{\text{CY}}$ is proper by Theorem 2.29. \square

As a consequence, we obtain a wall crossing diagram including birational morphisms to $\mathcal{K}_3^{\text{CY}}$ from both the K-moduli space studied in [ADL23a] and the KSBA moduli space studied in [DH21] for $d = 3$.

16.4. Quintic surfaces in \mathbb{P}^3 . Let $d \geq 4$ be an integer, $\chi''(m) := \chi(\mathbb{P}^3, \omega_{\mathbb{P}^3}^{[-m]})$, and

$$\mathcal{S}_d \subset \mathcal{M}(\chi'', d, (1, 4/d))$$

denote the open substack whose \mathbb{k} -points are the pairs $(X, \Delta + D)$ such that $X \cong \mathbb{P}^3$, $\Delta = 1 \cdot \emptyset$, and $D := \frac{4}{d}D^{\text{Div}}$, where $D^{\text{Div}} \subset \mathbb{P}^3$ is a smooth surface of degree d . Let $\mathcal{S}_d^{\text{CY}} := \overline{\mathcal{S}_d}$ denote the stack theoretic closure of \mathcal{S}_d in $\mathcal{M}(\chi'', d, (1, 4/d))$.

Theorem 16.12. *The stack $\mathcal{S}_5^{\text{CY}}$ is a finite type algebraic stack and admits a proper good moduli space $\mathcal{S}_5^{\text{CY}}$.*

The proof relies on [DeV22, Thm. 5.3], which will be used to show that all pairs in the moduli space have regularity at most 0.

Proof. We will first show that every pair (X, D) in $\mathcal{S}_5^{\text{CY}}(\mathbb{k})$ has $\text{reg}(X, D) \leq 0$. To proceed, fix a family $(Y, G) \rightarrow C$ in $\mathcal{S}_5^{\text{CY}}$ over the germ of a curve $0 \in C$ such that $(X, D) \cong (Y_0, G_0)$ and (Y_K, D_K) is in \mathcal{S}_5 , where $K := K(C)$. Since $(Y_K, (1 + \varepsilon)D_K)$ is slc for $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$, [DeV22, Thm. 3.15] implies

that, after possibly replacing $0 \in C$ by a finite cover, there exists a family $(Y', G') \rightarrow C$ in $\mathcal{S}_5^{\text{CY}}$ such that $(Y'_0, (1 + \varepsilon)G'_0)$ is slc. Now,

$$\text{reg}(X, D) = \text{reg}(Y'_0, G'_0) \leq 0,$$

where the first equality is by Propositions 6.9 and 8.7 and the second is [DeV22, Thm. 5.3].

Since all pairs in $\mathcal{S}_5^{\text{CY}}$ have regularity at most 0, Theorem 8.15 implies $\mathcal{S}_5^{\text{CY}}$ admits a separated good moduli space $\mathcal{S}_5^{\text{CY}}$. Since $\mathcal{S}_5^{\text{CY}}$ satisfies the existence part of the valuative criterion for properness by Theorem 7.1, $\mathcal{S}_5^{\text{CY}}$ is proper by Theorem 2.29. \square

The above proof does not generalize to the case when degree $d \neq 5$, since there exist pairs appearing with higher regularity [DeV22, Rem. 5.4].

APPENDIX A. SPECIAL DEGENERATIONS OF \mathbb{P}^2

In this section, we use a technical result from Section 12.1 to characterize all special degenerations of \mathbb{P}^2 . This gives a complete answer to [AIM20, Prob. 3.4]. To begin, we recall the following definition.

Definition A.1. A *special test configuration* \mathcal{X} of a klt Fano variety X is the data of

- (1) a \mathbb{G}_m -equivariant proper flat family of klt varieties $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{A}^1$ such that $-K_{\mathcal{X}}$ is relatively ample, and
- (2) a \mathbb{G}_m -equivariant isomorphism

$$\mathcal{X} \times_{\mathbb{A}^1} (\mathbb{A}^1 \setminus 0) \cong X \times (\mathbb{A}^1 \setminus 0),$$

where \mathbb{G}_m acts on the right side as the product of the trivial and standard actions.

We say X_0 is a *special degeneration* of X if there exists a special test configuration \mathcal{X} of X with $\mathcal{X}_0 \cong X_0$.

Theorem A.2. *Any non-trivial special test configuration \mathcal{X} of \mathbb{P}^2 satisfies that $r(\text{ord}_{\mathcal{X}_0})$ is an lc place of a 1-complement of \mathbb{P}^2 .*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{A}^1$ be a special test configuration of \mathbb{P}^2 . By [BLX22, Thm. A.2], there exists an N -complement D on \mathbb{P}^2 and an lc place E of (\mathbb{P}^2, D) such that $r(\text{ord}_{\mathcal{X}_0}) = b \cdot \text{ord}_E$ for some $b \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. Let \mathcal{D} be the closure of $D \times (\mathbb{A}^1 \setminus \{0\})$ in \mathcal{X} . By Lemma 4.10, we know that $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{D})$ is a weakly special test configuration of (\mathbb{P}^2, D) . Thus $(\mathcal{X}_0, \mathcal{D}_0) \in \mathcal{P}_{3N}^{\text{CY}}(\mathbb{k})$. By Proposition 12.1, there exists a \mathbb{G}_m -equivariant 1-complement B_0 on X_0 . By Lemma 12.2, B_0 extends to a \mathbb{G}_m -equivariant divisor \mathcal{B} on \mathcal{X} such that $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{B}) \rightarrow \mathbb{A}^1$ is a \mathbb{G}_m -equivariant family of boundary polarized CY pairs of index 1. Thus there is a 1-complement B of \mathbb{P}^2 such that $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{B}) \rightarrow \mathbb{A}^1$ is a weakly special test configuration of (\mathbb{P}^2, B) . By Lemma 4.7.2, we know that E is also an lc place of (\mathbb{P}^2, B) . The proof is finished. \square

It is clear that a 1-complement of \mathbb{P}^2 is one of the following: a smooth cubic curve, an irreducible nodal cubic curve, a smooth conic union a transversal line, or a triangle of lines. With the help of [LXZ22, Section 6], we can completely classify all special degenerations of \mathbb{P}^2 .

Theorem A.3. *Let X_0 be a special degeneration of \mathbb{P}^2 . Then X_0 is one of the following: \mathbb{P}^2 , $\mathbb{P}(1, 1, 4)$, $\mathbb{P}(1, d_n^2, d_{n+1}^2)$, or the weighted hypersurfaces $\{x_0x_3 = x_1^{d_{n+1}} + x_2^{d_{n-1}}\} \subset \mathbb{P}(1, d_{n-1}, d_{n+1}, d_n^2)$. Here $(d_n)_{n \geq 0}$ is the sequence of integers such that $d_0 = d_1 = 1$ and $d_{n+1} = 3d_n - d_{n-1}$.*

Proof. Let B be the 1-complement on \mathbb{P}^2 from Theorem A.2. If B is a smooth cubic curve, then $E = B$ which implies that X_0 is the projective cone over B by Lemma 10.12, which is not klt. If B is an irreducible nodal cubic curve, then the special degenerations were classified in [LXZ22, Thm. 6.1 & Rem. 6.6] which gives the list from the statement. If B is a triangle, then (\mathbb{P}^2, B) is toric which implies that any special degeneration is of product type, hence $X_0 \cong \mathbb{P}^2$.

If B is a smooth conic Q union a transversal line L , then we claim that X_0 is isomorphic to either \mathbb{P}^2 or $\mathbb{P}(1, 1, 4)$. If E is a divisor on \mathbb{P}^2 , then X_0 is isomorphic to either \mathbb{P}^2 (when $E = L$) or $\mathbb{P}(1, 1, 4)$ (when $E = Q$) by Lemma 10.12. Thus we may assume that the center of E on \mathbb{P}^2 is a point $p \in Q \cap L$. In particular, ord_E is proportional to the monomial valuation v_t at p of weight $(1, t)$ in the analytic coordinate defined by (Q, L) for some $t \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0}$. If $t \geq \frac{1}{2}$, then Proposition A.4 implies that v_t and hence E are toric, which indicates $X_0 \cong \mathbb{P}^2$. We may assume that $t \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$. Since $S_{\mathbb{P}^2}(v_t)$ is affine for $t \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$ by Proposition A.4, [LXZ22, Proof of Lemma 4.6] implies that $X_0 \cong \text{Proj gr}_{v_t} R \cong \text{Proj gr}_{v_0}(\text{gr}_{v_{\frac{1}{2}}} R)$ where R is the anti-canonical ring of \mathbb{P}^2 . Since $v_{\frac{1}{2}}$ is toric whose induced \mathbb{G}_m -action preserves Q , we know that $\text{gr}_{v_{\frac{1}{2}}} R \cong R$, and the induced filtration of v_0 on $\text{gr}_{v_{\frac{1}{2}}} R$ is the same as that on R . Thus we have $X_0 \cong \text{Proj gr}_{v_0} R \cong \mathbb{P}(1, 1, 4)$. The proof is finished. \square

Proposition A.4. *Let Q and L be a smooth conic and a transversal line in \mathbb{P}^2 . Let $p \in Q \cap L$ be an intersection point. Denote by v_t the monomial valuation at p of weights $(1, t)$ in the analytic coordinates defined by (Q, L) . Then v_t is a toric valuation for $t \geq \frac{1}{2}$. Moreover,*

$$S_{\mathbb{P}^2}(v_t) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} + 2t & \text{if } t \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]; \\ 1 + t & \text{if } t \in [\frac{1}{2}, +\infty). \end{cases}$$

Here we follow the notation from [BJ20] on the S -invariant of valuations.

Proof. We may pick affine coordinates (x, y) at p such that $Q = \{x' = 0\}$ and $L = \{y = 0\}$ where $x' = x - y^2$. Then we know that $v_t(x) = \min\{1, 2t\}$. By similar arguments as [LXZ22, Proof of Proposition 6.4], we have that v_t is a toric monomial valuation in the coordinates (x, y) of weight $(1, t)$ whenever $t \geq \frac{1}{2}$. Thus a standard toric computation shows that $S_{\mathbb{P}^2}(v_t) = 1 + t$ for $t \geq \frac{1}{2}$. Meanwhile, $S_{\mathbb{P}^2}(v_0) = S_{\mathbb{P}^2}(Q) = \frac{1}{2}$ by a standard volume computation. We know that $S_{\mathbb{P}^2}(v_t)$ is a concave function by [LXZ22, Lem. 4.6.1]. Thus it suffices to show that $S_{\mathbb{P}^2}(v_{\frac{1}{4}}) = \frac{1}{2}(S_{\mathbb{P}^2}(v_0) + S_{\mathbb{P}^2}(v_{\frac{1}{2}})) = 1$.

Let $\mu : \tilde{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^2$ be the $(4, 1)$ -weighted blowup at p in the analytic coordinates (x', y) with exceptional divisor E . Denote by $\tilde{Q} := \mu_*^{-1}Q$. Then we have

$$(\tilde{Q}^2) = (\mu^*Q - 4E)^2 = (Q^2) + 16(E^2) = 4 - 16 \cdot \frac{1}{4} = 0.$$

Thus by [KM98, Lem. 1.22] we know that $[\tilde{Q}]$ is at the boundary of $\overline{NE}(\tilde{X})$. Thus we have $T_{\mathbb{P}^2}(\text{ord}_E) = \text{ord}_E(\frac{3}{2}Q) = 6$. By [LXZ22, Lem. 6.2] we know that

$$S_{\mathbb{P}^2}(\text{ord}_E) = \frac{T_{\mathbb{P}^2}(\text{ord}_E)}{3} + \frac{12}{T_{\mathbb{P}^2}(\text{ord}_E)} = 4.$$

Since $v_{\frac{1}{4}} = \frac{1}{4}\text{ord}_E$, we have that $S_{\mathbb{P}^2}(v_{\frac{1}{4}}) = \frac{1}{4}S_{\mathbb{P}^2}(\text{ord}_E) = 1$. The proof is finished. \square

APPENDIX B. COREGULARITY 0 PAIRS

In this appendix, we prove two results concerning coregularity 0 CY pairs.

Theorem B.1. *If (X, Δ) is a projective slc CY pair of coregularity 0 with Weil index⁶ λ , then $\lambda'(K_X + \Delta) \sim 0$, where $\lambda' = \text{lcm}(\lambda, 2)$.*

Theorem B.2. *Let X be an lc Fano variety. If X admits a complement of coregularity 0, then X admits a 2-complement of coregularity 0.*

⁶The Weil index of Δ is the smallest positive integer λ such that $\lambda\Delta$ is an integral Weil divisor.

Recall, a *complement* of an lc Fano variety X is a \mathbb{Q} -divisor D such that (X, D) is an lc CY pair. A complement has *coregularity 0* if $\text{coreg}(X, D) = 0$ and is a *2-complement* if $2(K_X + D) \sim 0$.

The above theorems were previously proven in [FMM22, Cor. 9] and [FFMP22, Thm. 4] using different techniques from the proofs given below. For example, the proof of Theorem B.2 in [FFMP22] uses the strategy of Birkar's proof of the boundedness of complements [Bir19] with significant upgrades to utilize the coregularity assumption. Note that [FMM22, FFMP22] also prove versions of these theorems for generalized pairs. We thank Stefano Filipazzi and Joaquín Moraga for explaining their results in [FFMP22, FMM22], which led us to the following arguments.

We prove Theorems B.1 and B.2 using a degeneration argument. The proof of Theorem B.2 takes the following strategy.

- (1) Using that X admits a complement D of coregularity 0, we can construct a test configuration degenerating $(X, D) \rightsquigarrow (X_0, D_0)$, where the normalization $(\overline{X}_0, \overline{G}_0 + \overline{D}_0)$ is an lc CY pair with $K_{\overline{X}_0} + \overline{G}_0 + \overline{D}_0 \sim 0$.
- (2) By descending a non-vanishing section of $\omega_{X_0}^{[2]}(2(\overline{G}_0 + \overline{D}_0))$ to X_0 , we show \overline{D}_0 is a 2-complement. This step uses higher Poincaré maps [Kol13, 4.18] and is similar to [FMM22, Sec. 5.3]
- (3) Finally, we extend D_0 to a 2-complement on X .

The proof of Theorem B.1 takes a similar approach.

B.1. Poincaré residue map. Let (Y, Δ_Y) be a dlt sub-pair and $p \in Y$ a minimal lc center of dimension 0. If m is an even integer such that $m(K_Y + \Delta_Y)$ is Cartier, then there is a Poincaré residue map

$$\mathcal{R}_{(Y, \Delta_Y) \rightarrow p}^m : H^0(Y, \omega_Y^{[m]}(m\Delta_Y)) \rightarrow \mathbb{k},$$

which is defined by writing an element $s \in H^0(Y, \omega_Y^{[m]}(m\Delta_Y))$ in the form

$$s =_{\text{loc}} f \cdot \left(\frac{dx_1}{x_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge \frac{dx_n}{x_n} \right)^{\otimes m},$$

where $x_1, \dots, x_n \in \mathcal{O}_{Y,p}$ is a regular system of parameters such that $\text{Supp}(\Delta_Y) =_{\text{loc}} \{x_1 \cdots x_n = 0\}$ and $f \in \mathcal{O}_{Y,p}$, and setting $\mathcal{R}_{(Y, \Delta_Y) \rightarrow p}^m(s) := f(p)$. Note that the map is independent of the choice of parameters, as well as their ordering, which uses the assumption that m is even. See [Kol13, §4.18] for a detailed study of such residue maps and their generalizations.

Next let (X, Δ) be a projective lc CY pair of coregularity 0. Fix a dlt modification $g : (Y, \Delta_Y) \rightarrow (X, \Delta)$ and a minimal lc center $p \in Y$. For each even integer m such that $m(K_X + \Delta) \sim 0$, we define a map

$$R_{(X, \Delta)}^m : H^0(X, \omega_X^{[m]}(m\Delta)) \rightarrow \mathbb{k}$$

by the composition of the pullback map

$$g^* : H^0(X, \omega_X^{[m]}(m\Delta)) \rightarrow H^0(Y, \omega_Y^{[m]}(m\Delta_Y))$$

followed by the Poincaré residue map $\mathcal{R}_{(Y, \Delta_Y) \rightarrow p}^m$. Note that $R_{(X, \Delta)}^m$ is an isomorphism since it is a nonzero linear map between 1-dimensional vector spaces.

Proposition B.3. *The map $R_{(X, \Delta)}^m$ is independent of the choice of dlt modification Y and minimal lc center p .*

Proof. The independence of the choice of minimal lc center $p \in Y$ was shown in [Kol16, Prop. 14]. To see the independence of the choice of dlt modification, we follow similar arguments in [Kol16]. Fix two dlt modifications (Y, Δ_Y) and $(Y', \Delta_{Y'})$ of (X, Δ) . By [Kol13, Thm. 10.45], there exist log resolutions $(Z, \Delta_Z) \rightarrow (Y, \Delta_Y)$ and $(Z', \Delta_{Z'}) \rightarrow (Y', \Delta_{Y'})$, which are isomorphisms at all minimal

lc centers. By the weak factorization theorem [AKMW02], there is a sequence of smooth blowups and blowdowns

$$Z := Z_1 \xrightarrow{\pi_1} Z_2 \dashrightarrow \cdots \dashrightarrow Z_{r-1} \xrightarrow{\pi_{r-1}} Z_r =: Z'$$

and an integer $1 \leq s < r$ such that the composition $\pi_i^{-1} \circ \cdots \circ \pi_1^{-1} : Z_i \dashrightarrow Z_1$ for $i \leq s$ and $\pi_{r-1} \circ \cdots \circ \pi_i : Z_i \dashrightarrow Z_r$ for $i \geq s$ are morphisms. We define Δ_{Z_i} to be the crepant pullback of Δ_{Z_1} for $i \leq s$ and the crepant pullback of Δ_{Z_r} for $i \geq s$ via the above morphisms. Additionally, we may assume each π_i is a blowup or blowdown of a smooth subvariety that has simple normal crossing with $\text{Supp}(\Delta_{Z_{i+1}})$ or $\text{Supp}(\Delta_{Z_i})$, respectively.

By the above discussion, the proposition reduces to understanding the residue map under a single blowup. In particular, it suffices to verify: if $g : (W, \Delta_W) \rightarrow (Z, \Delta_Z)$ is the blowup along a subvariety that has simple normal crossing with $\text{Supp}(\Delta_Z)$, then

$$\mathcal{R}_{(W, \Delta_W) \rightarrow w}^m \circ g^* = \mathcal{R}_{(Z, \Delta_Z) \rightarrow z}^m,$$

where $z \in Z$ and $w \in W$ are minimal lc centers satisfying $g(w) = z$. This follows from a local computation. \square

B.2. Descending complements.

Proposition B.4. *Let (X, Δ) be an slc CY pair of coregularity 0 and m an even integer. If the normalization $(\overline{X}, \overline{G} + \overline{\Delta})$ satisfies $m(K_{\overline{X}} + \overline{G} + \overline{\Delta}) \sim 0$, then $m(K_X + \Delta) \sim 0$.*

The proposition is proven in [FFMP22, Thm. 4.10] using the theory of admissible sections. We give a different proof using residue maps and [Kol13, Prop. 5.8].

Proof of Proposition B.4. Let $(\overline{X}, \overline{G} + \overline{\Delta}) := \sqcup_{i=1}^r (\overline{X}_i, \overline{G}_i + \overline{\Delta}_i)$ denote the normalization of (X, Δ) and $\overline{G}_i^n = \sqcup_j \overline{G}_{i,j}$ the conductor divisor. By assumption, there is a generically non-vanishing section $\overline{s} \in H^0(\overline{X}, \omega_{\overline{X}}^{[m]}(m(\overline{\Delta} + \overline{G})))$. By rescaling each $\overline{s}|_{\overline{X}_i}$, we may assume $R_{(\overline{X}_i, \overline{\Delta}_i + \overline{G}_i)}^m(\overline{s}|_{\overline{X}_i}) = 1$. Let \overline{t} denote the image of \overline{s} under the residue map

$$H^0(\overline{X}, \omega_{\overline{X}}^{[m]}(m(\overline{G} + \overline{\Delta}))) \rightarrow H^0(\overline{G}^n, \omega_{\overline{G}^n}^{[m]}(m\text{Diff}_{\overline{G}^n}(\overline{\Delta}))).$$

Since m is even, \overline{s} descends to a section $s \in H^0(X, \omega_X^{[m]}(m\Delta))$ if and only if $\overline{t} = \tau^* \overline{t}$, where $\tau : \overline{G}^n \rightarrow \overline{G}^n$ is the induced involution; see [Kol13, Prop. 5.8].

To verify the previous condition, note that $R_{(\overline{X}_i, \overline{\Delta}_i + \overline{G}_i)}^m$ equals the composition

$$H^0(\overline{X}_i, \omega_{\overline{X}_i}^{[m]}(m(\overline{G}_i + \overline{\Delta}_i))) \longrightarrow H^0(\overline{G}_{i,j}, \omega_{\overline{G}_{i,j}}^{[m]}(m\text{Diff}_{\overline{G}_{i,j}}(\Delta))) \xrightarrow{R_{i,j}} \mathbb{k},$$

where $\overline{G}_{i,j}$ is an irreducible component of \overline{G}_i and $R_{i,j} := R_{(\overline{G}_{i,j}, \text{Diff}_{\overline{G}_{i,j}} \overline{\Delta})}^m$ by [Kol16, Thm. 17].

Thus $R_{i,j}(\overline{t}|_{\overline{G}_{i,j}}) = 1$ for all i and j and so $R_{i,j}((\tau^* \overline{t})|_{\overline{G}_{i,j}}) = 1$ as well. Using that $R_{i,j}$ is an isomorphism, it follows that $(\tau^* \overline{t})|_{\overline{G}_{i,j}} = \overline{t}|_{\overline{G}_{i,j}}$, and hence $\overline{t} = \tau^* \overline{t}$. Therefore \overline{s} descends to a section of $s \in H^0(X, \omega_X^{[m]}(m\Delta))$, which is generically non-zero. Thus there is an effective divisor D with $D \sim m(K_X + \Delta)$. Since $K_X + \Delta \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0$, we conclude $0 = D \sim m(K_X + \Delta)$. \square

B.3. Proof of theorems.

Proof of Theorem B.1. We may assume X is normal by Proposition B.4. Now choose an ample Cartier divisor L on X and consider the pair $(Y, \Gamma + D)$, where $Y = C_p(X, L)$ is the projective cone over X with respect to L , $\Gamma := \Delta_{L,p}$ and $D := X_\infty$ in the notation of Definition 2.19. By Proposition 2.20.3, $(Y, \Gamma + D)$ is an lc boundary polarized CY pair and $(D, \text{Diff}_\Gamma(D)) \cong (X, \Delta)$. Note that $(Y, \Gamma + D)$ has coregularity 0. By Propositions 8.17 and B.4, there exists a test configuration $(\mathcal{Y}, \Gamma_{\mathcal{Y}} + \mathcal{D}) \rightarrow \mathbb{A}^1$ of $(Y, \Gamma + D)$ such that $2(K_{\mathcal{Y}_0} + \Gamma_{\mathcal{Y}_0} + \mathcal{D}_0) \sim 0$.

To construct a degeneration of (X, Δ) , set

$$\mathcal{X} := \mathcal{D} \quad \text{and} \quad \Delta_{\mathcal{X}} := \text{Diff}_{\mathcal{D}}(\Gamma y).$$

Note that $(\mathcal{X}, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}}) \rightarrow \mathbb{A}^1$ is a projective family of slc pairs by Lemma 2.7 and $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{D})|_{\mathbb{A}^1 \setminus 0} \cong (X, D) \times (\mathbb{A}^1 \setminus 0)$. By adjunction, $K_{\mathcal{X}/\mathbb{A}^1} + \Delta_{\mathcal{X}} \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0$ and $2(K_{\mathcal{X}_0} + \Delta_{\mathcal{X}_0}) \sim 0$. Now set $\mathcal{L} := \omega_{\mathcal{X}/\mathbb{A}^1}^{[\lambda']}(\lambda' \Delta_{\mathcal{X}})$. Since $\lambda'(K_{\mathcal{X}/\mathbb{A}^1} + \Delta_{\mathcal{X}})$ is a \mathbb{Q} -Cartier \mathbb{Z} -divisor, $\mathcal{L}_t \cong \omega_{\mathcal{X}_t}^{[\lambda']}(\lambda' \Delta_{\mathcal{X}_t})$ for all $t \in \mathbb{A}^1$ by [Kol23, Prop. 2.79]. Thus \mathcal{L}_0 is a line bundle and $h^0(\mathcal{X}_0, \mathcal{L}_0) \neq 0$. Thus \mathcal{L} is a line bundle in a neighborhood of \mathcal{X}_0 and hence a line bundle on \mathcal{X} . Since \mathcal{L} is a line bundle and $K_{\mathcal{X}/\mathbb{A}^1} + \Delta_{\mathcal{X}} \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0$, $h^0(\mathcal{X}_t, \mathcal{L}_t)$ is independent of $t \in U$ by [Kol23, Prop. 2.65]. Therefore

$$h^0(X, \omega_X^{[\lambda']}(\lambda' \Delta)) = h^0(\mathcal{X}_1, \mathcal{L}_1) = h^0(\mathcal{X}_0, \mathcal{L}_0) > 0.$$

Thus there is a divisor $0 \leq B \sim \lambda'(K_X + \Delta)$. Since $K_X + \Delta \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0$, $B = 0$ as desired. \square

Proof of Theorem B.2. Fix a complement D of X such that (X, D) has coregularity 0. By Propositions 8.17 and B.4, there exists a test configuration $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{D}) \rightarrow \mathbb{A}^1$ of (X, D) such that $2(K_{\mathcal{X}_0} + \mathcal{D}_0) \sim 0$. By Lemma 12.2, there exists a \mathbb{Q} -divisor \mathcal{B} on \mathcal{X} such that $\mathcal{B}_0 = \mathcal{D}_0$ and $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{B}) \rightarrow \mathbb{A}^1$ is a \mathbb{G}_m -equivariant family of boundary polarized CY pairs with $2(K_{\mathcal{X}/\mathbb{A}^1} + \mathcal{B}) \sim 0$. Therefore $B = \mathcal{B}_1$ is a 2-complement of X and

$$\text{coreg}(X, B) = \text{coreg}(\mathcal{X}_0, \mathcal{B}_0) = \text{coreg}(X, D) = 0,$$

where the first two equalities hold by Proposition 8.7. \square

REFERENCES

- [AB19a] Kenneth Ascher and Dori Bejleri. Compact moduli of elliptic K3 surfaces. *Geom. Topol.*, to appear, 2019. [arXiv:1902.10686](#). 7
- [AB19b] Kenneth Ascher and Dori Bejleri. Moduli of fibered surface pairs from twisted stable maps. *Math. Ann.*, 374(1-2):1007–1032, 2019. 41
- [AB21] Kenneth Ascher and Dori Bejleri. Moduli of weighted stable elliptic surfaces and invariance of log plurigenera. *Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. (3)*, 122(5):617–677, 2021. With an appendix by Giovanni Inchiostro. 75
- [AB22] Kenneth Ascher and Dori Bejleri. Compact moduli of degree one del Pezzo surfaces. *Math. Ann.*, 384(1-2):881–911, 2022. 7
- [ABD⁺66] Michael Artin, Jean-Etienne Bertin, Michel Demazure, Alexander Grothendieck, Pierre Gabriel, Michel Raynaud, and Jean-Pierre Serre. *Schémas en groupes*. Séminaire de Géométrie Algébrique de l’Institut des Hautes Études Scientifiques. Institut des Hautes Études Scientifiques, 1963/1966. 82
- [ABE22] Valery Alexeev, Adrian Brunyate, and Philip Engel. Compactifications of moduli of elliptic K3 surfaces: stable pair and toroidal. *Geom. Topol.*, 26(8):3525–3588, 2022. 7
- [ABHLX20] Jarod Alper, Harold Blum, Daniel Halpern-Leistner, and Chenyang Xu. Reductivity of the automorphism group of K -polystable Fano varieties. *Invent. Math.*, 222(3):995–1032, 2020. 2, 4, 11, 29, 30, 32, 33, 35, 37, 81
- [ABIP23] Kenneth Ascher, Dori Bejleri, Giovanni Inchiostro, and Zsolt Patakfalvi. Wall crossing for moduli of stable log pairs. *Ann. of Math.*, to appear, 2023. [arXiv:2108.07402](#). 8
- [ADL19] Kenneth Ascher, Kristin DeVleming, and Yuchen Liu. Wall crossing for K-moduli spaces of plane curves, 2019. [arXiv:1909.04576](#). 2, 4, 7, 8, 52, 64, 67, 78, 89, 90, 91, 92
- [ADL23a] Kenneth Ascher, Kristin DeVleming, and Yuchen Liu. K-moduli of curves on a quadric surface and K3 surfaces. *J. Inst. Math. Jussieu*, 22(3):1251–1291, 2023. 7, 95
- [ADL23b] Kenneth Ascher, Kristin DeVleming, and Yuchen Liu. K-stability and birational models of moduli of quartic K3 surfaces. *Invent. Math.*, 232(2):471–552, 2023. 7
- [AE21] Valery Alexeev and Philip Engel. Compact moduli of K3 surfaces. *Ann. of Math.*, to appear, 2021. [arXiv:2101.12186](#). 7
- [AET19] Valery Alexeev, Philip Engel, and Alan Thompson. Stable pair compactification of moduli of K3 surfaces of degree 2. *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, to appear, 2019. [arXiv:1903.09742](#). 7, 91
- [AH11] Dan Abramovich and Brendan Hassett. Stable varieties with a twist. In *Classification of algebraic varieties*, EMS Ser. Congr. Rep., pages 1–38. Eur. Math. Soc., Zürich, 2011. 2, 64, 65, 66

- [AHLH18] Jarod Alper, Daniel Halpern-Leistner, and Jochen Heinloth. Existence of moduli spaces for algebraic stacks, 2018. [arXiv:1812.01128](https://arxiv.org/abs/1812.01128). 3, 17, 29, 35, 38, 39, 73
- [AHR20] Jarod Alper, Jack Hall, and David Rydh. A Luna étale slice theorem for algebraic stacks. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 191(3):675–738, 2020. 80
- [AIM20] AIM. AIM problem list: K-stability and related topics, 2020. Available at <http://aimpl.org/kstability>. 6, 96
- [AKMW02] Dan Abramovich, Kalle Karu, Kenji Matsuki, and Jarosław Włodarczyk. Torification and factorization of birational maps. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 15(3):531–572, 2002. 99
- [Ale94] Valery Alexeev. Boundedness and K^2 for log surfaces. *Internat. J. Math.*, 5(6):779–810, 1994. 2
- [Ale02] Valery Alexeev. Complete moduli in the presence of semiabelian group action. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 155(3):611–708, 2002. 7
- [Alp13] Jarod Alper. Good moduli spaces for Artin stacks. *Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble)*, 63(6):2349–2402, 2013. 3, 16, 17, 66, 67, 72, 76, 79, 80
- [Amb04] Florin Ambro. Shokurov’s boundary property. *J. Differential Geom.*, 67(2):229–255, 2004. 6
- [Amb05] Florin Ambro. The moduli b -divisor of an lc-trivial fibration. *Compos. Math.*, 141(2):385–403, 2005. 5, 6, 77, 78, 85, 88
- [AOV08] Dan Abramovich, Martin Olsson, and Angelo Vistoli. Tame stacks in positive characteristic. *Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble)*, 58(4):1057–1091, 2008. 81
- [AV02] Dan Abramovich and Angelo Vistoli. Compactifying the space of stable maps. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 15(1):27–75, 2002. 67
- [BB92] Alexander Borisov and Lev Borisov. Singular toric Fano three-folds. *Mat. Sb.*, 183(2):134–141, 1992. 60
- [BBT23] Benjamin Bakker, Yohan Brunebarbe, and Jacob Tsimerman. o-minimal GAGA and a conjecture of Griffiths. *Invent. Math.*, 232(1):163–228, 2023. 7
- [BCHM10] Caucher Birkar, Paolo Cascini, Christopher D. Hacon, and James M^cKernan. Existence of minimal models for varieties of log general type. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 23(2):405–468, 2010. 2, 61, 88
- [BHJ17] Sébastien Boucksom, Tomoyuki Hisamoto, and Mattias Jonsson. Uniform K-stability, Duistermaat-Heckman measures and singularities of pairs. *Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble)*, 67(2):743–841, 2017. 22, 23, 25, 26
- [BHLLX21] Harold Blum, Daniel Halpern-Leistner, Yuchen Liu, and Chenyang Xu. On properness of K-moduli spaces and optimal degenerations of Fano varieties. *Selecta Math. (N.S.)*, 27(4):Paper No. 73, 39, 2021. 2
- [BI21] Dori Bejleri and Giovanni Inchiostro. Stable pairs with a twist and gluing morphisms for moduli of surfaces. *Selecta Math. (N.S.)*, 27(3):Paper No. 40, 44, 2021. 64, 65
- [Bir19] Caucher Birkar. Anti-pluricanonical systems on Fano varieties. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 190(2):345–463, 2019. 7, 51, 98
- [Bir22] Caucher Birkar. Moduli of polarised varieties, 2022. [arXiv:2211.11237](https://arxiv.org/abs/2211.11237). 2, 7, 49, 86
- [Bir23] Caucher Birkar. Geometry of polarised varieties. *Publ. Math. Inst. Hautes Études Sci.*, 137:47–105, 2023. 2, 7
- [BJ20] Harold Blum and Mattias Jonsson. Thresholds, valuations, and K-stability. *Adv. Math.*, 365:107062, 57, 2020. 97
- [BLX22] Harold Blum, Yuchen Liu, and Chenyang Xu. Openness of K-semistability for Fano varieties. *Duke Math. J.*, 171(13):2753–2797, 2022. 2, 25, 28, 52, 96
- [Bou14] Sébastien Boucksom. Remarks on minimal models of degenerations, 2014. Available at http://sebastien.boucksom.perso.math.cnrs.fr/notes/Remarks_minimal_models.pdf. 10
- [BV22] Giulio Bresciani and Angelo Vistoli. An arithmetic valuative criterion for proper maps of tame algebraic stacks, 2022. [arXiv:2210.03406](https://arxiv.org/abs/2210.03406). 41
- [BX19] Harold Blum and Chenyang Xu. Uniqueness of K-polystable degenerations of Fano varieties. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 190(2):609–656, 2019. 2, 4, 33, 40
- [Con14] Brian Conrad. Reductive group schemes. In *Autour des schémas en groupes. Vol. I*, volume 42/43 of *Panor. Synthèses*, pages 93–444. Soc. Math. France, Paris, 2014. 82
- [CP21] Giulio Codogni and Zsolt Patakfalvi. Positivity of the CM line bundle for families of K -stable klt Fano varieties. *Invent. Math.*, 223(3):811–894, 2021. 2, 80
- [CTS21] Jean-Louis Colliot-Thélène and Alexei N. Skorobogatov. *The Brauer-Grothendieck group*, volume 71 of *Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete. 3. Folge. A Series of Modern Surveys in Mathematics*. Springer, Cham, 2021. 82
- [CZ22a] Guodu Chen and Chuyu Zhou. Degeneration of log Calabi–Yau pairs via log canonical places. *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN*, to appear, 2022. [arXiv:2201.03223](https://arxiv.org/abs/2201.03223). 25
- [CZ22b] Guodu Chen and Chuyu Zhou. Weakly special test configurations of log canonical Fano varieties. *Algebra Number Theory*, 16(10):2415–2432, 2022. 25

- [DeV22] Kristin DeVleming. Moduli of surfaces in \mathbb{P}^3 . *Compos. Math.*, 158(6):1329–1374, 2022. 7, 95, 96
- [dFKX17] Tommaso de Fernex, János Kollár, and Chenyang Xu. The dual complex of singularities. In *Higher dimensional algebraic geometry—in honour of Professor Yujiro Kawamata’s sixtieth birthday*, volume 74 of *Adv. Stud. Pure Math.*, pages 103–129. Math. Soc. Japan, Tokyo, 2017. 63
- [DH21] Anand Deopurkar and Changho Han. Stable log surfaces, admissible covers, and canonical curves of genus 4. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 374(1):589–641, 2021. 7, 95
- [DM86] Pierre Deligne and George D. Mostow. Monodromy of hypergeometric functions and nonlattice integral monodromy. *Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math.*, (63):5–89, 1986. 94
- [EHKV01] Dan Edidin, Brendan Hassett, Andrew Kresch, and Angelo Vistoli. Brauer groups and quotient stacks. *Amer. J. Math.*, 123(4):761–777, 2001. 82
- [ELM⁺06] Lawrence Ein, Robert Lazarsfeld, Mircea Mustață, Michael Nakamaye, and Mihnea Popa. Asymptotic invariants of base loci. *Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble)*, 56(6):1701–1734, 2006. 34
- [ER21] Dan Edidin and David Rydh. Canonical reduction of stabilizers for Artin stacks with good moduli spaces. *Duke Math. J.*, 170(5):827–880, 2021. 80, 81
- [FFMP22] Fernando Figueroa, Stefano Filipazzi, Joaquín Moraga, and Junyao Peng. Complements and coregularity of fano varieties, 2022. [arXiv:2211.09187](https://arxiv.org/abs/2211.09187). 7, 98, 99
- [FG14a] Osamu Fujino and Yoshinori Gongyo. Log pluricanonical representations and the abundance conjecture. *Compos. Math.*, 150(4):593–620, 2014. 79
- [FG14b] Osamu Fujino and Yoshinori Gongyo. On the moduli b-divisors of lc-trivial fibrations. *Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble)*, 64(4):1721–1735, 2014. 5, 77, 78, 85
- [FI21] Stefano Filipazzi and Giovanni Inchiostro. Moduli of \mathbb{Q} -Gorenstein pairs and applications, 2021. [arXiv:2108.07988](https://arxiv.org/abs/2108.07988) To appear in *J. Algebraic Geom.* 21
- [Fil20] Stefano Filipazzi. On a generalized canonical bundle formula and generalized adjunction. *Ann. Sc. Norm. Super. Pisa Cl. Sci. (5)*, 21:1187–1221, 2020. 6, 85, 86
- [FJ04] Charles Favre and Mattias Jonsson. *The valuative tree*, volume 1853 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2004. 59
- [FL19] Enrica Floris and Vladimir Lazić. On the B-semiampleness conjecture. *Épjournal Géom. Algébrique*, 3:Art. 12, 26, 2019. 85, 86, 88
- [Flo14] Enrica Floris. Inductive approach to effective b-semiampleness. *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN*, (6):1465–1492, 2014. 6
- [FM00] Osamu Fujino and Shigefumi Mori. A canonical bundle formula. *J. Differential Geom.*, 56(1):167–188, 2000. 6
- [FMM22] Stefano Filipazzi, Mirko Mauri, and Joaquín Moraga. Index of coregularity zero log Calabi–Yau pairs, 2022. [arXiv:2209.02925](https://arxiv.org/abs/2209.02925). 7, 98
- [Fuj03] Osamu Fujino. A canonical bundle formula for certain algebraic fiber spaces and its applications. *Nagoya Math. J.*, 172:129–171, 2003. 6, 85
- [Fuj11] Osamu Fujino. Semi-stable minimal model program for varieties with trivial canonical divisor. *Proc. Japan Acad. Ser. A Math. Sci.*, 87(3):25–30, 2011. 4
- [Fuj18] Osamu Fujino. Semipositivity theorems for moduli problems. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 187(3):639–665, 2018. 2
- [Fuj21] Kento Fujita. K-stability of log Fano hyperplane arrangements. *J. Algebraic Geom.*, 30(4):603–630, 2021. 93
- [GGLR20] Mark Green, Phillip Griffiths, Radu Laza, and Colleen Robles. Period mappings and ampleness of the Hodge line bundle, 2020. [arXiv:1708.09523](https://arxiv.org/abs/1708.09523). 7
- [GKS21] Patricio Gallardo, Matt Kerr, and Luca Schaffler. Geometric interpretation of toroidal compactifications of moduli of points in the line and cubic surfaces. *Adv. Math.*, 381:Paper No. 107632, 48, 2021. 7
- [GMGS21] Patricio Gallardo, Jesus Martinez-Garcia, and Cristiano Spotti. Applications of the moduli continuity method to log K-stable pairs. *J. Lond. Math. Soc. (2)*, 103(2):729–759, 2021. 7
- [Gol21] J. Ross Goluboff. Genus six curves, K3 surfaces, and stable pairs. *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN*, (13):9908–9936, 2021. 7
- [Gro66] Alexander Grothendieck. Éléments de géométrie algébrique. IV. Étude locale des schémas et des morphismes de schémas. III. *Institut des Hautes Études Scientifiques. Publications Mathématiques*, (28):255, 1966. 20
- [Hac04] Paul Hacking. Compact moduli of plane curves. *Duke Math. J.*, 124(2):213–257, 2004. 2, 4, 7, 51, 52, 53, 56, 58, 59, 60, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 72, 92
- [Har77] Robin Hartshorne. *Algebraic geometry*. Graduate Texts in Mathematics, No. 52. Springer-Verlag, New York-Heidelberg, 1977. 19, 20
- [Har10] Robin Hartshorne. *Deformation theory*, volume 257 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer, New York, 2010. 66, 93

- [Has03] Brendan Hassett. Moduli spaces of weighted pointed stable curves. *Adv. Math.*, 173(2):316–352, 2003. [8](#), [93](#)
- [HK04] Brendan Hassett and Sándor J. Kovács. Reflexive pull-backs and base extension. *J. Algebraic Geom.*, 13(2):233–247, 2004. [18](#), [65](#), [66](#)
- [HL13] Daniel Halpern-Leistner. *Geometric invariant theory and derived categories of coherent sheaves*. ProQuest LLC, Ann Arbor, MI, 2013. Thesis (Ph.D.)—University of California, Berkeley. [35](#)
- [HLS19] Jingjun Han, Jihao Liu, and V. V. Shokurov. ACC for minimal log discrepancies of exceptional singularities, 2019. [59](#), [60](#), [61](#)
- [HMX18] Christopher D. Hacon, James M^cKernan, and Chenyang Xu. Boundedness of moduli of varieties of general type. *J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)*, 20(4):865–901, 2018. [2](#)
- [HP10] Paul Hacking and Yuri Prokhorov. Smoothable del Pezzo surfaces with quotient singularities. *Compos. Math.*, 146(1):169–192, 2010. [52](#)
- [HS06] Craig Huneke and Irena Swanson. *Integral closure of ideals, rings, and modules*, volume 336 of *London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2006. [23](#)
- [Hu18] Fei Hu. The dimension of automorphism groups of algebraic varieties with pseudo-effective log canonical divisors. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 146(5):1879–1893, 2018. [37](#), [38](#)
- [HX13] Christopher D. Hacon and Chenyang Xu. Existence of log canonical closures. *Invent. Math.*, 192(1):161–195, 2013. [2](#), [4](#), [34](#), [88](#)
- [HX16] Christopher D. Hacon and Chenyang Xu. On finiteness of B-representations and semi-log canonical abundance. In *Minimal models and extremal rays (Kyoto, 2011)*, volume 70 of *Adv. Stud. Pure Math.*, pages 361–377. Math. Soc. Japan, [Tokyo], 2016. [12](#), [42](#)
- [Inc20] Giovanni Inchiostro. Moduli of Weierstrass fibrations with marked section. *Adv. Math.*, 375:107374, 57, 2020. [7](#)
- [Jia20] Chen Jiang. Boundedness of \mathbb{Q} -Fano varieties with degrees and alpha-invariants bounded from below. *Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Supér. (4)*, 53(5):1235–1248, 2020. [2](#)
- [K⁺92] János Kollár et al. *Flips and abundance for algebraic threefolds*. Société Mathématique de France, Paris, 1992. Papers from the Second Summer Seminar on Algebraic Geometry held at the University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah, August 1991, Astérisque No. 211 (1992). [46](#), [56](#)
- [Kaw98] Yujiro Kawamata. Subadjunction of log canonical divisors. II. *Amer. J. Math.*, 120(5):893–899, 1998. [6](#)
- [Kaw17] Masayuki Kawakita. Divisors computing the minimal log discrepancy on a smooth surface. *Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.*, 163(1):187–192, 2017. [59](#)
- [KKMSD73] George Kempf, Finn Faye Knudsen, David Mumford, and Bernard Saint-Donat. *Toroidal embeddings. I*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York,, 1973. [42](#)
- [KLSV18] János Kollár, Radu Laza, Giulia Saccà, and Claire Voisin. Remarks on degenerations of hyper-Kähler manifolds. *Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble)*, 68(7):2837–2882, 2018. [4](#)
- [KM98] János Kollár and Shigefumi Mori. *Birational geometry of algebraic varieties*, volume 134 of *Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1998. [13](#), [47](#), [55](#), [62](#), [97](#)
- [Kod63] Kunihiko Kodaira. On the structure of compact complex analytic surfaces. I, II. *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.*, 50:218–221, 1963. [6](#)
- [Kol85] János Kollár. Toward moduli of singular varieties. *Compositio Math.*, 56(3):369–398, 1985. [54](#)
- [Kol90] János Kollár. Projectivity of complete moduli. *J. Differential Geom.*, 32(1):235–268, 1990. [84](#), [94](#)
- [Kol04] János Kollár. Seifert G_m -bundles, 2004. [arXiv:0404386](#). [13](#), [14](#), [15](#)
- [Kol07] János Kollár. Kodaira’s canonical bundle formula and adjunction. In *Flips for 3-folds and 4-folds*, volume 35 of *Oxford Lecture Ser. Math. Appl.*, pages 134–162. Oxford Univ. Press, Oxford, 2007. [5](#), [77](#), [78](#), [85](#), [88](#)
- [Kol08] János Kollár. Hulls and Husks, 2008. [arXiv:0805.0576](#). [2](#)
- [Kol13] János Kollár. *Singularities of the minimal model program*, volume 200 of *Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2013. With a collaboration of Sándor Kovács. [4](#), [8](#), [9](#), [11](#), [12](#), [13](#), [16](#), [18](#), [27](#), [33](#), [34](#), [43](#), [44](#), [46](#), [47](#), [48](#), [50](#), [57](#), [63](#), [64](#), [68](#), [86](#), [87](#), [88](#), [98](#), [99](#)
- [Kol16] János Kollár. Sources of log canonical centers. In *Minimal models and extremal rays (Kyoto, 2011)*, volume 70 of *Adv. Stud. Pure Math.*, pages 29–48. Math. Soc. Japan, [Tokyo], 2016. [43](#), [44](#), [98](#), [99](#)
- [Kol19] János Kollár. Families of divisors, 2019. [arXiv:1910.00937](#). [2](#)
- [Kol23] János Kollár. *Families of varieties of general type*, volume 231 of *Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2023. With the collaboration of Klaus Altmann and Sándor J. Kovács. [2](#), [3](#), [9](#), [10](#), [11](#), [18](#), [19](#), [20](#), [27](#), [42](#), [49](#), [52](#), [65](#), [66](#), [67](#), [70](#), [75](#), [100](#)
- [Kon00] Shigeyuki Kondō. A complex hyperbolic structure for the moduli space of curves of genus three. *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, 525:219–232, 2000. [5](#), [90](#)
- [KP17] Sándor J. Kovács and Zsolt Patakfalvi. Projectivity of the moduli space of stable log-varieties and subadditivity of log-Kodaira dimension. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 30(4):959–1021, 2017. [2](#), [52](#)

- [KSB88] János Kollár and Nicholas Shepherd-Barron. Threefolds and deformations of surface singularities. *Invent. Math.*, 91(2):299–338, 1988. [2](#)
- [Kul77] Viktor Kulikov. Degenerations of $K3$ surfaces and Enriques surfaces. *Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR Ser. Mat.*, 32:167–168, 1977. [53](#)
- [KX20] János Kollár and Chenyang Xu. Moduli of polarized Calabi–Yau pairs. *Acta Math. Sin. (Engl. Ser.)*, 36(6):631–637, 2020. [2](#), [4](#), [7](#), [41](#), [49](#)
- [Laz16] Radu Laza. The KSBA compactification for the moduli space of degree two $K3$ pairs. *J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)*, 18(2):225–279, 2016. [7](#), [91](#), [92](#)
- [Laz23] Radu Laza. Personal communication, 2023. [7](#)
- [Liu18] Yuchen Liu. The volume of singular Kähler-Einstein Fano varieties. *Compos. Math.*, 154(6):1131–1158, 2018. [61](#)
- [LL19] Chi Li and Yuchen Liu. Kähler-Einstein metrics and volume minimization. *Adv. Math.*, 341:440–492, 2019. [15](#)
- [LMB00] Gérard Laumon and Laurent Moret-Bailly. *Champs algébriques*, volume 39 of *Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete. 3. Folge. A Series of Modern Surveys in Mathematics [Results in Mathematics and Related Areas. 3rd Series. A Series of Modern Surveys in Mathematics]*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2000. [6](#), [81](#), [84](#)
- [LN18] Yongnam Lee and Noboru Nakayama. Grothendieck duality and \mathbb{Q} -Gorenstein morphisms. *Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci.*, 54(3):517–648, 2018. [65](#)
- [Loo03] Eduard Looijenga. Compactifications defined by arrangements. II. Locally symmetric varieties of type IV. *Duke Math. J.*, 119(3):527–588, 2003. [91](#)
- [LWX18] Chi Li, Xiaowei Wang, and Chenyang Xu. Quasi-projectivity of the moduli space of smooth Kähler-Einstein Fano manifolds. *Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Supér. (4)*, 51(3):739–772, 2018. [80](#)
- [LWX21] Chi Li, Xiaowei Wang, and Chenyang Xu. Algebraicity of the metric tangent cones and equivariant K -stability. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 34(4):1175–1214, 2021. [2](#), [4](#), [24](#)
- [LX20] Chi Li and Chenyang Xu. Stability of valuations and Kollár components. *J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)*, 22(8):2573–2627, 2020. [12](#)
- [LX23] Jihao Liu and Lingyao Xie. Divisors computing minimal log discrepancies on lc surfaces. *Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.*, 175(1):107–128, 2023. [13](#)
- [LXZ22] Yuchen Liu, Chenyang Xu, and Ziquan Zhuang. Finite generation for valuations computing stability thresholds and applications to K -stability. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 196(2):507–566, 2022. [2](#), [6](#), [96](#), [97](#)
- [LZ22] Yuchen Liu and Ziquan Zhuang. On the sharpness of Tian’s criterion for K -stability. *Nagoya Math. J.*, 245:41–73, 2022. [59](#), [61](#)
- [MFK94] David Mumford, John Fogarty, and Frances Kirwan. *Geometric invariant theory*, volume 34 of *Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete (2) [Results in Mathematics and Related Areas (2)]*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, third edition, 1994. [94](#), [95](#)
- [Mor22] Joaquín Moraga. Coregularity of Fano varieties, 2022. [arXiv:2206.10834](#). [44](#)
- [MS21] Han-Bom Moon and Luca Schaffler. KSBA compactification of the moduli space of $K3$ surfaces with a purely non-symplectic automorphism of order four. *Proc. Edinb. Math. Soc. (2)*, 64(1):99–127, 2021. [7](#)
- [Oda12] Yuji Odaka. The Calabi conjecture and K -stability. *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN*, (10):2272–2288, 2012. [3](#)
- [Oda13a] Yuji Odaka. A generalization of the Ross-Thomas slope theory. *Osaka J. Math.*, 50(1):171–185, 2013. [3](#), [40](#)
- [Oda13b] Yuji Odaka. The GIT stability of polarized varieties via discrepancy. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 177(2):645–661, 2013. [3](#), [52](#), [79](#)
- [Oda13c] Yuji Odaka. On the moduli of Kähler-Einstein Fano manifolds. *Proceeding of Kinoshita algebraic geometry symposium*, 2013. [arXiv:1211.4833](#). [10](#)
- [Oda22a] Yuji Odaka. Degenerated Calabi-Yau varieties with infinite components, moduli compactifications, and limit toroidal structures. *Eur. J. Math.*, 8(3):1105–1157, 2022. [7](#)
- [Oda22b] Yuji Odaka. Polystable log Calabi-Yau varieties and gravitational instantons. *J. Math. Sci. Univ. Tokyo*, 29(1):1–50, 2022. [28](#), [40](#)
- [Ols07] Martin C. Olsson. (Log) twisted curves. *Compos. Math.*, 143(2):476–494, 2007. [68](#)
- [OS15] Yuji Odaka and Song Sun. Testing log K -stability by blowing up formalism. *Ann. Fac. Sci. Toulouse Math. (6)*, 24(3):505–522, 2015. [40](#)
- [Pap22] Theodoros Stylianos Papazachariou. K -moduli of log Fano complete intersections, 2022. [arXiv:2212.09332](#). [7](#)
- [PS09] Yuri Prokhorov and V. V. Shokurov. Towards the second main theorem on complements. *J. Algebraic Geom.*, 18(1):151–199, 2009. [6](#), [7](#), [77](#), [84](#), [85](#), [86](#), [87](#)
- [PS11] Lars Petersen and Hendrik Süß. Torus invariant divisors. *Israel J. Math.*, 182:481–504, 2011. [16](#)

- [PSW23] Long Pan, Fei Si, and Haoyu Wu. K moduli of log del Pezzo pairs, 2023. [arXiv:2303.05651](#). 7
- [Sch23] Nolan Schock. Moduli of weighted stable marked del Pezzo surfaces, 2023. [arXiv:2305.06922](#). 7
- [Sha80] Jayant Shah. A complete moduli space for $K3$ surfaces of degree 2. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 112(3):485–510, 1980. 91
- [Sho00] V. V. Shokurov. Complements on surfaces. In *Journal of Mathematical Sciences (New York)*, volume 102, pages 3876–3932. Springer, New York, 2000. Algebraic geometry, 10. 43, 44
- [Sho13] V. V. Shokurov. Log adjunction: effectiveness and positivity, 2013. [arXiv:1308.5160](#). 43
- [Sta23] The Stacks Project Authors. *Stacks Project*, 2023. <https://stacks.math.columbia.edu>. 21, 67, 68, 81, 82, 86, 93
- [Xu20] Chenyang Xu. A minimizing valuation is quasi-monomial. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 191(3):1003–1030, 2020. 2, 52
- [Xu21] Chenyang Xu. K-stability of Fano varieties: an algebro-geometric approach. *EMS Surv. Math. Sci.*, 8(1-2):265–354, 2021. 2
- [Xu23] Chenyang Xu. K-stability of Fano varieties, 2023. Available at <https://web.math.princeton.edu/~chenyang/Kstabilitybook.pdf>. 2
- [XZ20] Chenyang Xu and Ziquan Zhuang. On positivity of the CM line bundle on K-moduli spaces. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 192(3):1005–1068, 2020. 2, 52
- [XZ21] Chenyang Xu and Ziquan Zhuang. Uniqueness of the minimizer of the normalized volume function. *Camb. J. Math.*, 9(1):149–176, 2021. 2
- [Zha22] Junyan Zhao. K-moduli of quintic del Pezzo pairs and moduli of genus six curves, 2022. [arXiv:2212.06992](#). 7
- [Zho23] Chuyu Zhou. On wall-crossing for K-stability. *Adv. Math.*, 413:Paper No. 108857, 26, 2023. 2, 7, 8

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, IRVINE, CA, 92697, USA
Email address: kascher@uci.edu

HARVARD UNIVERSITY, ONE OXFORD STREET, CAMBRIDGE, MA 02138, USA
Email address: bejleri@math.harvard.edu

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF UTAH, SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84112, USA
Email address: blum@math.utah.edu

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS, AMHERST, MA 01003, USA
Email address: kdevleming@umass.edu

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, BOX 354350, SEATTLE, WA 98195, USA
Email address: ginchios@uw.edu

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY, EVANSTON, IL 60208, USA
Email address: yuchenl@northwestern.edu

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND COMPUTER SCIENCE, RUTGERS UNIVERSITY, NEWARK, NJ 07102, USA
Email address: xiaowwan@rutgers.edu