

QUASI- F^e -SPLITTINGS AND QUASI- F -REGULARITY

HIROMU TANAKA, JAKUB WITASZEK, AND FUETARO YOBUKO

ABSTRACT. We develop the theory of quasi- F^e -splittings, quasi- F -regularity, and quasi-+-regularity.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	2
1.1. Future directions	6
2. Preliminaries	6
2.1. Notation	6
2.2. S_2 sheaves	8
2.3. Generalities on restrictions	10
2.4. Matlis duality	10
2.5. Witt dualising sheaves and $W_n\omega_X(-K_X)$	12
3. Iterative quasi- F -splitting	16
3.1. Definition of quasi- F^e -splitting	16
3.2. Alternative definitions via splittings	21
3.3. Finite covers	25
3.4. Quasi- F^e -splitting criterion via Cartier operator	28
3.5. Definition of pure quasi- F^e -splitting	30
3.6. Quasi- F^e -stable sections $q^e S_n^0(X, \Delta; L)$ and $q^e S_{\text{adj},n}^0(X, \Delta; L)$	32
3.7. Quasi- F^∞ -splittings	35
3.8. Stabilisation for quasi- F^e -stable sections	38
4. Quasi- F -regularity and quasi-+-regularity	42
4.1. Quasi- F -regularity	42
4.2. Quasi-+-regularity	44
4.3. Quasi-+-stable sections and stabilisation	48
5. Inversion of adjunction	55
5.1. The restriction map for $q^e S^0$	55
5.2. Inversion of adjunction in the log Calabi-Yau case	58
5.3. Inversion of adjunction for anti-semi-ample divisors	60
6. Inversion of adjunction for uniform quasi- F^∞ -splitting	66
6.1. Uniformly quasi- F^∞ -split case	68
6.2. Quasi-+-regular case	71
7. Examples	73

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 14E30, 13A35.

Key words and phrases. quasi- F -split, quasi- F -regular, quasi-+-regular.

7.1.	Calabi-Yau varieties	73
7.2.	Log Fano curves	77
7.3.	Log Calabi-Yau curves	79
7.4.	Two-dimensional klt singularities	82
8.	Appendix: stabilisation for S^0 and B^0 in characteristic $p > 0$	84
8.1.	Stabilisation for S^0	84
8.2.	Stabilisation for B^0	86
	References	89

1. INTRODUCTION

A key tool in positive characteristic birational geometry and commutative algebra is the F -splitting of an \mathbb{F}_p -scheme X , which is a splitting of the Frobenius homomorphism $\mathcal{O}_X \rightarrow F_*\mathcal{O}_X$, or equivalently that of $\mathcal{O}_X \rightarrow F_*^e\mathcal{O}_X$ for every integer $e > 0$. One considers also a more restrictive notion of strong F -regularity requiring that for every effective divisor D , there exists $e > 0$ such that the composition $\mathcal{O}_X \rightarrow F_*^e\mathcal{O}_X \hookrightarrow F_*^e(\mathcal{O}_X(D))$ splits.

Recently, the third author introduced in [Yob19] a new notion, called quasi- F -splitting, which shares many properties with F -splittings but is satisfied by a broader class of schemes. We say that an \mathbb{F}_p -scheme X is n -quasi- F -split for an integer $n > 0$ if there exists a dashed arrow making the following diagram

$$(1.0.1) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} W_n\mathcal{O}_X & \xrightarrow{F} & F_*W_n\mathcal{O}_X \\ R^{n-1}\downarrow & \swarrow \exists & \\ \mathcal{O}_X & & \end{array}$$

commutative. We say that X is *quasi- F -split* if it is n -quasi- F -split for some integer $n > 0$. For a more comprehensive introduction to the theory of quasi- F -splittings, we refer to the introductions of [Yob19] and [KTT⁺a].

One of the key limitation of the above definition is that it involves only one power of Frobenius. If one naively replaces F with F^e in (1.0.1), the notion becomes redundant, being equivalent to the standard F -splitting (Proposition 3.8). The main goal of our article is to introduce proper definitions of quasi- F^e -splittings and quasi- F -regularity and to verify that they satisfy the comprehensive set of properties one would expect from such notions, especially in the context of birational geometry. This effort builds upon [KTT⁺a], where such properties were established for standard quasi- F -splittings.

Let $Q_{X,n}$ be the pushout of (1.0.1), which one can check to be an \mathcal{O}_X -module. Then X is n -quasi- F -split, if the induced map $\mathcal{O}_X \rightarrow Q_{X,n}$ splits, or, equivalently, that the dual map $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_X}(Q_{X,n}, \mathcal{O}_X) \rightarrow H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X)$ is surjective. Similarly, for every integer

$e > 0$, we can consider the pushout diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} W_n \mathcal{O}_X & \xrightarrow{F^e} & F_*^e W_n \mathcal{O}_X \\ R^{n-1} \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathcal{O}_X & \longrightarrow & Q_{X,n}^e. \end{array}$$

Definition 1.1. We say that X is n -quasi- F^e -split if and only if the following map

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{W_n \mathcal{O}_X}(Q_{X,n}^e, W_n \omega_X(-K_X)) \rightarrow H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X),$$

obtained by applying $\mathrm{Hom}_{W_n \mathcal{O}_X}(-, W_n \omega_X(-K_X))$ to $\mathcal{O}_X \rightarrow Q_{X,n}^e$, is surjective.

Here, $W_n \omega_X$ is the dualising sheaf of the scheme $W_n X$, and $W_n \omega_X(-K_X)$ is the S_2 -hull of $W_n \omega_X \otimes_{W_n \mathcal{O}_X} W_n \mathcal{O}_X(-K_X)$, where $W_n \mathcal{O}_X(-K_X)$ is the Teichmüller lift of $\mathcal{O}_X(-K_X)$.

We emphasise that $W_n \omega_X(-K_X)$ is not equal to $W_n \mathcal{O}_X$ unless $n = 1$. The reader should feel free to skip the next two remarks.

Remark 1.2. What is special about the case of $e > 1$ is that $Q_{X,n}^e$ is not an \mathcal{O}_X -module any more: it is only a $W_{\min(e,n)} \mathcal{O}_X$ -module (Proposition 3.12). In particular, the above definition is not equivalent to the splitting of $\mathcal{O}_X \rightarrow Q_{X,n}^e$; as mentioned before asking for such a splitting would give a redundant notion again, equivalent to the standard F -splitting (Proposition 3.8). One can however reformulate Definition 1.1 as the existence of a dashed arrow rendering the following diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} W_n \mathcal{O}_X & \xrightarrow{F^e} & F_*^e W_n \mathcal{O}_X \\ R^{n-1} \downarrow & & \swarrow \\ \mathcal{O}_X & \xrightarrow{\exists} & \\ \downarrow & & \\ W_n \omega_X(-K_X). & & \end{array}$$

commutative (Proposition 3.19), where $\mathcal{O}_X \rightarrow W_n \omega_X(-K_X)$ is obtained from the restriction $R^{n-1}: W_n \mathcal{O}_X \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X$ by applying $\mathcal{H}om_{W_n \mathcal{O}_X}(-, W_n \omega_X(-K_X))$. In the above, one can equivalently replace $W_n \omega(-K_X)$ by $W_e \omega_X(-K_X)$.

Remark 1.3. Definition 1.1 can be also reformulated in terms of local cohomology (Lemma 3.10). For example, if $X = \mathrm{Spec} R$ for a Gorenstein local ring (R, \mathfrak{m}) of dimension d , then X is n -quasi- F^e -split if and only if the following map is injective

$$H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(\mathcal{O}_X) \rightarrow H_{W_n \mathfrak{m}}^d(Q_{X,n}^e).$$

In contrast to the case of F -splittings, the higher the e is, the more restrictive the condition of being quasi- F^e -split becomes. For example, a supersingular elliptic curve X is n -quasi- F^e -split if and only if $e \leq n - 1$.

Theorem 1.4 (Corollary 7.2). *Let k be an algebraically closed field of characteristic $p > 0$. Let X be a d -dimensional smooth proper variety over k such that $d \geq 2$, $\omega_X \simeq \mathcal{O}_X$, and $H^{d-1}(X, \mathcal{O}_X) = 0$. Let h be the quasi- F -split height of X ¹.*

Then X is n -quasi- F^e -split if and only if $n \geq eh - e + 1$.

See also Corollary 7.3 for the case of abelian varieties. It is an intriguing problem to find all pairs of integers (n, e) for which an explicit variety X is n -quasi- F^e -split.

In view of the above, we say that:

- X is *quasi- F^∞ -split* if $\forall_{e>0} \exists_{n>0} X$ is n -quasi- F^e -split.
- X is *uniformly quasi- F^∞ -split* if $\exists_{n>0} \forall_{e>0} X$ is n -quasi- F^e -split.

We emphasise that by the above result, Calabi-Yau varieties are never uniformly quasi- F^∞ -split except when they are F -split.

We now move to the definition of quasi- F -regularity. Since working with small coefficients often causes problems in the setting of quasi- F -splittings², we also define the notion of quasi-+-regularity which is often easier to work with.

Definition 1.5. We say that X is *globally n -quasi- F -regular* if for every effective divisor D , there exists a rational number $0 < \epsilon < 1$ such that $(X, \epsilon D)$ is n -quasi- F^∞ -split. We say that X is *globally quasi- F -regular* if it is globally n -quasi- F -regular for some $n > 0$.

Definition 1.6. We say that X is *globally n -quasi-+-regular* if for every finite surjective morphism $f: Y \rightarrow X$ from a normal integral scheme Y , the following $W_n \mathcal{O}_X$ -module homomorphism is surjective:

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{W_n \mathcal{O}_X}(Q_{X,n}^f, W_n \omega_X(-K_X)) \rightarrow H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X).$$

Here this map is obtained by applying $\mathrm{Hom}_{W_n \mathcal{O}_X}(-, W_n \omega_X(-K_X))$ to the following pushout diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} W_n \mathcal{O}_X & \xrightarrow{f^*} & f_* W_n \mathcal{O}_Y \\ \downarrow R^{n-1} & & \downarrow \\ \mathcal{O}_X & \xrightarrow{\Phi_{X,n}^f} & Q_{X,n}^f. \end{array}$$

We say that X is *globally quasi-+-regular* if it is globally n -quasi-+-regular for some $n > 0$.

Proposition 1.7 (Proposition 4.9). *If X is globally quasi- F -regular, then it is globally quasi-+-regular.*

In the forthcoming paper [KTT⁺c], we will show that the converse is true for \mathbb{Q} -Gorenstein affine schemes X by building up the theory of quasi-test ideals³.

¹this means that X is n -quasi- F -split if and only if $n \geq h$

²in many of our theorems for pairs (X, Δ) , we need to assume that $\Delta \geq \{p^i \Delta\}$ for every $i > 0$; this assumption is satisfied for example when Δ has standard coefficients, but not in general


³the equivalence of global F -regularity and global +-regularity, for example for non- \mathbb{Q} -Gorenstein affine schemes or even smooth projective varieties, is a long-standing open problem.

As source of examples, we verify that all one-dimensional log Fano pairs (\mathbb{P}^1, Δ) are globally quasi- F -regular (Theorem 7.7). Moreover, we show the following result generalising [KTT⁺a, Theorem C].

Theorem 1.8 (Theorem 7.14). *Let X be an affine klt surface over a perfect field of characteristic $p > 0$. Then X is globally quasi-+-regular.*

However, generalising the main result of [KTT⁺b] to the quasi-+-regular case (specifically that three-dimensional \mathbb{Q} -factorial klt singularities in characteristic $p \geq 42$ are quasi-+-regular) is a bit more subtle. This will be done in the forthcoming paper [KTT⁺c] with help of quasi-test ideals.

The following diagram summarises the connection between some of the notions defined above:



By changing the order of quantifiers in the above definitions, we also define weaker notions of *feeble quasi- F -regularity* and *feeble quasi-+-regularity* (cf. Definition 4.7).

The key advantage of using quasi-+-regularity or quasi- F^e -splittings is that one can significantly weaken the assumptions of theorems proven in [KTT⁺a] for quasi- F -splittings. This is most apparent in the following version of inversion of adjunction⁴.

Theorem 1.9 (Corollary 6.11). *Let X be a normal variety admitting a projective morphism $\pi : X \rightarrow Z$ to an affine normal variety Z over a perfect field of characteristic $p > 0$. Let S be a normal prime divisor on X . Suppose that $\mathcal{O}_X(D)$ is Cohen-Macaulay for every Weil divisor D on X . Further assume that*

- (1) S is globally quasi-+-regular,
- (2) $A := -(K_X + S)$ and $-S$ are ample, and
- (3) X is locally quasi-+-regular.

Then X is globally quasi-+-regular over an open neighbourhood of $\pi(S)$.

We also prove an analogous result for uniform and non-uniform quasi- F^∞ -splittings (Corollary 5.20, Corollary 6.7). In the above theorem we can drop the assumption that $\mathcal{O}_X(D)$ is Cohen-Macaulay for every Weil divisor D on X , but given the length of our article, we refrained from doing that.

⁴Let us remind the reader that, in general, the inversion of adjunction is false for quasi- F -splittings (see [KTY22, Example 7.7]), but we could establish it in the relatively projective case when restricting to an anti-ample divisor D ([KTT⁺a, Corollary 4.12]). Such a case is essential in the study of singularities via plt blow-ups (extractions of Kollár's components).

The above result provides two significant advancements in comparison to [KTT⁺a, Corollary 4.12]. First, we do not need to assume that X satisfies relative Kawamata-Viehweg vanishing over Z (briefly speaking, Kawamata-Viehweg vanishing is replaced by Serre's vanishing by taking $e \gg 0$ in the definition of quasi- F^e -splitting). Second, the statement is now intrinsic to the category of quasi- F -singularities; specifically, in Assumption (3) we only need to assume that X is locally quasi-+-regular (or locally quasi- F^∞ -split), as opposed to locally F -split as in [KTT⁺a, Corollary 4.12]. Assumption (3) can often be verified by performing another plt blow-up.

We conclude the introduction by listing some other results of this paper:

- (1) invariance of quasi- F^e -splittings under finite covers (Subsection 3.3);
- (2) criterion for quasi- F^e -splittings via Cartier operator (Theorem 3.27);
- (3) introduction of quasi- F^e -stable sections $q^e S^0(X, L)$ and quasi-+-stable sections $qB^0(X, L)$ for a line bundle L (Subsection 3.6 and Definition 4.11);
- (4) introduction of adjoint variants of the above results and definitions for pairs (X, S) (Subsection 3.5, 3.6, etc.).

A technical difficulty in our paper is establishing that quasi- F^∞ -stable sections and quasi-+-regular stable sections can be calculated for a single $e > 0$ or by a single finite cover, respectively (Corollary 3.52 and Theorem 4.15). This is well known for F -splittings and +-regularity in positive characteristic in the local case (see, e.g., [BST15]), but as we could not find a reference which covers all the cases needed for our paper, we derived such results from scratch in the appendix.

1.1. Future directions. In the forthcoming paper [KTT⁺c] joint with Kawakami, Takamatsu, and Yoshikawa, we establish the following results, amongst other things.

- (1) quasi-+-regularity and quasi- F -regularity agree for \mathbb{Q} -Gorenstein singularities;
- (2) quasi-+-regular singularities are klt;
- (3) quasi-+-regular singularities of dimension $d \leq 3$ are Cohen-Macaulay.
- (4) three-dimensional \mathbb{Q} -factorial klt singularities are quasi-+-regular in characteristic $p \geq 42$.

We do not know whether (3) holds in dimension ≥ 4 .

2. PRELIMINARIES

2.1. Notation. In this subsection, we summarise notation and basic definitions used in this article.

- (1) Throughout the paper, p denotes a prime number and $\mathbb{F}_p := \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$. Given an \mathbb{F}_p -scheme, we denote by $F: X \rightarrow X$ the absolute Frobenius morphism.
- (2) For an integral scheme X , we define the *function field* $K(X)$ of X as the stalk $\mathcal{O}_{X,\xi}$ at the generic point ξ of X .
- (3) An effective Cartier divisor $D \subseteq X$ on a Noetherian scheme X is called *simple normal crossing* if for every $x \in D$, the local ring $\mathcal{O}_{X,x}$ is regular and there exists a regular system of parameters x_1, \dots, x_d in the maximal ideal \mathfrak{m} of $\mathcal{O}_{X,x}$ and $1 \leq r \leq d$ such that D is defined by $x_1 \cdots x_r$ in $\mathcal{O}_{X,x}$ (cf. [Sta14, Tag 0BI9 and Tag 0BIA]).

- (4) Given an integral normal Noetherian scheme X and a \mathbb{Q} -divisor Δ , a projective birational morphism $\pi: Y \rightarrow X$ is called a *log resolution of (X, Δ)* if Y is regular and the closed subscheme $\text{Exc}(f) \cup \text{Supp } f^{-1}\Delta$, equipped with the reduced scheme structure, is a simple normal crossing divisor.
- (5) We say that X is a *variety* (over a field k) if X is an integral scheme which is separated and of finite type over k . We say that X is a *curve* if X is a variety of dimension one, and that X is a *surface* if X is a variety of dimension two.
- (6) We say that a scheme X is *excellent* if it is Noetherian and all the stalks $\mathcal{O}_{X,x}$ are excellent. We note that the regular locus of an integral normal excellent scheme X is an open dense subset of X which contains all the points of codimension one (see [Sta14, Tag 07P7 and 0BX2]).
- (7) We say that an \mathbb{F}_p -scheme X is *F-finite* if $F: X \rightarrow X$ is a finite morphism, and we say that an \mathbb{F}_p -algebra R is *F-finite* if $\text{Spec } R$ is *F-finite*. Such schemes admit many good properties.
- (a) If R is an *F-finite* Noetherian \mathbb{F}_p -algebra, then it is a homomorphic image of a regular ring of finite Krull dimension [Gab04, Remark 13.6]; in particular, R is excellent, it admits a dualising complex, and $\dim R < \infty$.
 - (b) Being *F-finite* is stable under localisation and ideal-adic completions [Has15, Example 9].
 - (c) If a scheme X is of finite type over an *F-finite* Noetherian \mathbb{F}_p -scheme Y , then it is also *F-finite*.
- (8) We say that a ring A is *essentially of finite type over* a ring R if A is isomorphic to $S^{-1}(R[x_1, \dots, x_n]/I)$ as an R -algebra, where $R[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ is the polynomial ring over R with variables x_1, \dots, x_n , I is an ideal of $R[x_1, \dots, x_n]$, and S is a multiplicatively closed subset of $R[x_1, \dots, x_n]/I$.
- (9) Given an integral normal Noetherian scheme X and a \mathbb{Q} -divisor D , we define the subsheaf $\mathcal{O}_X(D)$ of the constant sheaf $K(X)$ on X by the following formula

$$\Gamma(U, \mathcal{O}_X(D)) = \{\varphi \in K(X) \mid (\text{div}(\varphi) + D)|_U \geq 0\}$$

for every open subset U of X . In particular, $\mathcal{O}_X(\lfloor D \rfloor) = \mathcal{O}_X(D)$.

- (10) Take $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. Given an *F-finite* Noetherian \mathbb{F}_p -algebra R and an ideal I of R , we set

$$W_n I := \{(a_0, a_1, \dots, a_{n-1}) \in W_n R \mid a_0, a_1, \dots, a_{n-1} \in I\}.$$

It is well known that $W_n I$ is an ideal of $W_n R$. Moreover, if (R, \mathfrak{m}) is a local ring, then $(W_n R, \sqrt{W_n \mathfrak{m}})$ is a local ring. In particular, it holds that

$$H_{W_n \mathfrak{m}}^i(M) = H_{\sqrt{W_n \mathfrak{m}}}^i(M)$$

for a $W_n R$ -module M .

- (11) Given $b \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, the equality $a := b \bmod n$ means that a is the integer satisfying $a - b \in n\mathbb{Z}$ and $0 \leq a < n$. For example, $a := 13 \bmod 5$ means that $a \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $a = 3$; in particular, a is not defined as an element of $\mathbb{Z}/5\mathbb{Z}$.

Last, we emphasise the following non-standard definition used in the article.

Definition 2.1. We say that an integral normal Noetherian scheme X is *divisorially Cohen-Macaulay* if $\mathcal{O}_X(D)$ is Cohen-Macaulay for every Weil divisor D on X .

In particular, divisorially Cohen-Macaulay schemes are Cohen-Macaulay.

2.1.1. *Dualising complexes and canonical divisors.* For basic properties of dualising complexes, we refer to [Sta14, Tag 0A85] and [Har66].

Throughout the article, whenever we consider a dualising complex, we implicitly work over a fixed excellent base scheme, which is denoted by B in this subsection. We assume that B admits a dualising complex and we implicitly make a choice of one, say ω_B^\bullet . It automatically holds that $\dim B < \infty$ [Har66, Corollary V.7.2].

Given an irreducible S_2 excellent scheme X and a separated morphism $\pi: X \rightarrow B$ of finite type, we set $\omega_X^\bullet := \pi^! \omega_B^\bullet$. Then ω_X^\bullet is a dualising complex of X (cf. [Sta14, Tag 0AU5]). In what follows, if a base scheme is not specified, then we implicitly take $X = B$ and $\pi = \text{id}$. There exists a unique $e \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $\mathcal{H}^{-e}(\omega_X^\bullet) \neq 0$ and $\mathcal{H}^i(\omega_X^\bullet) = 0$ for $i < -e$. We say that ω_X^\bullet is *normalised* if $e = \dim X$. We set $\omega_X := \mathcal{H}^{-e}(\omega_X^\bullet)$. The sheaf ω_X is called a *dualising sheaf* of X , and it is known that it is S_2 [Sta14, Tag 0AWE].

Throughout the article, we always assume that the dualising complex ω_B^\bullet on the base scheme B is normalised. In this case, given a proper morphism $\pi: X \rightarrow B$ of irreducible excellent schemes such that π is surjective or $\dim B = \dim \mathcal{O}_{B,b}$ for every closed point $b \in B$, the dualizing complex $\omega_X^\bullet = \pi^! \omega_B^\bullet$ is also normalised [KTT⁺a, Subsubsection 2.1.1].

Assume that X is integral and normal. Then the dualising sheaf ω_X is invertible on the regular locus of X [Sta14, Tag 0AWX]. We fix a Weil divisor K_X such that $\mathcal{O}_X(K_X) \simeq \omega_X$. Any such Weil divisor is called a *canonical divisor* on X . If K_X and K'_X are canonical divisors on X , then there exists an invertible sheaf L on B such that $\mathcal{O}_X(K_X) \simeq \mathcal{O}_X(K'_X) \otimes \pi^* L$ [Har66, Theorem V.3.1].

2.1.2. *Singularities of minimal model program.* We will freely use the standard notation in birational geometry, for which we refer to [Kol13] and [KM98]. In particular, we will use the abbreviated names for singularities such as klt or plt. We say that (X, Δ) is a *log pair* if X is an integral normal excellent scheme admitting a dualising complex and Δ is an effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor such that $K_X + \Delta$ is \mathbb{Q} -Cartier. In contrast to [Kol13, Definition 2.8], we always require that Δ is effective, and so a klt pair (X, Δ) is always a log pair.

Remark 2.2. In [Kol13], it is assumed that all schemes X are of finite type over a regular base scheme B . This assumption was only introduced so that B , and so X , admit a dualising complex, but the results of [Kol13] go through for general excellent schemes admitting dualising complexes. We point out that the discrepancy $a(E, X, \Delta)$ for a log pair (X, Δ) and a prime divisor E over X does not depend on the choice of the dualising complex ω_X^\bullet .

2.2. **S_2 sheaves.** Let Y be an irreducible excellent S_2 scheme admitting a dualising complex ω_Y^\bullet . Let \mathcal{F} be a coherent sheaf with $\text{Supp } \mathcal{F} = Y$. We say that \mathcal{F} is S_r if

depth $\mathcal{F}_y \geq \min\{r, \dim \mathcal{O}_{Y,y}\}$ (note that we have $\dim \mathcal{F}_y = \dim \mathcal{O}_{Y,y}$ by $\text{Supp } \mathcal{F} = Y$). It is well known that (1-a) and (1-b) below are equivalent.

(1-a) \mathcal{F} is S_1 .

(1-b) If U and V are non-empty open subsets satisfying $U \supseteq V$, then the restriction map $\mathcal{F}(U) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(V)$ is injective.

Moreover, (2-a) and (2-b) below are equivalent.

(2-a) \mathcal{F} is S_2 .

(2-b) If U and V are non-empty open subsets satisfying $U \supseteq V$ and $\text{codim}_U(U \setminus V) \geq 2$, then the restriction map $\mathcal{F}(U) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(V)$ is bijective.

For the dualising sheaf ω_Y on Y and an arbitrary coherent sheaf \mathcal{F} with $\text{Supp } \mathcal{F} = Y$, we set

$$\mathcal{F}^{**} := \mathcal{H}om_{\mathcal{O}_Y}(\mathcal{H}om_{\mathcal{O}_Y}(\mathcal{F}, \omega_Y), \omega_Y)$$

which is called the S_2 -hull (or S_2 -fication) of \mathcal{F} [Kol22, Theorem 2].

Remark 2.3. In the case of Noetherian integral normal schemes, we could have written

$$\mathcal{F}^{**} := \mathcal{H}om_{\mathcal{O}_Y}(\mathcal{H}om_{\mathcal{O}_Y}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{O}_Y), \mathcal{O}_Y).$$

The reason we stated the above definition in this way, is that often for us we will set $Y := W_n X$ for an integral normal excellent \mathbb{F}_p -scheme X . In this case, it is more natural to define duality by mapping to $\omega_Y = W_n \omega_X$, or, as will be the case in this paper, to $W_n \omega_X(-K_X)$.

For a coherent sheaf \mathcal{F} with $\text{Supp } \mathcal{F} = Y$, the following properties hold for its S_2 -hull \mathcal{F}^{**} (cf. [Kol22, Definition 13]).

- (1) \mathcal{F}^{**} is S_2 (Lemma 2.4).
- (2) We have the natural \mathcal{O}_Y -module homomorphism $\theta : \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}^{**}$.
- (3) \mathcal{F} is S_1 if and only if $\theta : \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}^{**}$ is injective.
- (4) $\text{codim}_Y(\mathcal{F}^{**}/\theta(\mathcal{F})) \geq 2$.

Lemma 2.4. *Let Y be an irreducible excellent S_2 scheme. Take a coherent sheaf \mathcal{F} and an S_2 coherent sheaf \mathcal{G} satisfying $\text{Supp } \mathcal{F} = \text{Supp } \mathcal{G} = Y$. Then $\mathcal{H}om_{\mathcal{O}_Y}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ is S_2 .*

Proof. Since \mathcal{G} is S_1 , it is easy to see that $\mathcal{H}om_{\mathcal{O}_Y}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ is S_1 as well. Thus it is enough to show that $\mathcal{H}om_{\mathcal{O}_Y}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})(U) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}om_{\mathcal{O}_Y}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})(V)$ is surjective for every non-empty open subsets $V \subseteq U \subseteq Y$ such that the complement of the inclusion $i : V \hookrightarrow U$ is of codimension ≥ 2 .

To this end, take $\varphi_V \in \mathcal{H}om_{\mathcal{O}_Y}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})(V)$. Then the composition

$$\varphi_U : \mathcal{F}|_U \rightarrow i_*(\mathcal{F}|_V) \xrightarrow{i_*\varphi_V} i_*(\mathcal{G}|_V) \xleftarrow{\cong} \mathcal{G}|_U$$

gives an element lifting φ_V under $\mathcal{H}om_{\mathcal{O}_Y}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})(U) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}om_{\mathcal{O}_Y}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})(V)$, proving its surjectivity. Here, the isomorphism $i_*(\mathcal{G}|_V) \xleftarrow{\cong} \mathcal{G}|_U$ follows from \mathcal{G} being S_2 . \square

2.3. Generalities on restrictions.

Definition 2.5. Let X be an integral normal Noetherian scheme, let S be a prime divisor, and let D be a \mathbb{Q} -Cartier \mathbb{Q} -divisor such that $S \not\subseteq \text{Supp } D$. For a positive integer m such that mD is Cartier, we define

$$D|_S := \frac{1}{m}((mD)|_S),$$

which is a \mathbb{Q} -Cartier \mathbb{Q} -divisor on S . Note that $D|_S$ is independent of the choice of m .

Proposition 2.6. *Let X be an integral normal divisorially Cohen-Macaulay excellent scheme admitting a dualising complex and let S be a normal prime divisor. Let D be a \mathbb{Q} -Cartier \mathbb{Q} -divisor such that $S \not\subseteq \text{Supp } D$ and $(X, S + \{D\})$ is plt. Then there exists a unique \mathcal{O}_X -module homomorphism*

$$\text{res}: \mathcal{O}_X([D]) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_S([D|_S])$$

such that $\text{res}|_{X \setminus \text{Supp } D}$ coincides with the restriction homomorphism $\rho: \mathcal{O}_{X \setminus \text{Supp } D} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{S \setminus \text{Supp } D}$. Moreover, res is surjective.

Proof. See [KTT⁺a, Proposition 2.28]. □

2.4. Matlis duality. In this subsection, we recall the foundations of Matlis duality and refer to [Sta14, Tag 08XG] for details.

Let (R, \mathfrak{m}) be a local Noetherian ring admitting a normalised dualising complex ω_R^\bullet . Let E be the injective hull of the residue field R/\mathfrak{m} over R (the reader should be aware that E is an injective Artinian R -module). The operation $(-)^{\vee} := \text{Hom}_R(-, E)$ is called *Matlis duality*. Note that $(-)^{\vee}$ is exact, and so this operation extends canonically to the corresponding derived categories; we will denote such an extension by the same symbol $(-)^{\vee}$. If (R, \mathfrak{m}) is complete, then it is an anti-equivalence between the category of Noetherian R -modules and the category of Artinian R -modules.

A key property of Matlis duality is that it turns the local cohomology of a complex into its Grothendieck dual as indicated by the following result. This is a generalisation of Serre duality to the relative setting. In what follows, $(-)^{\wedge}$ denotes the derived \mathfrak{m} -adic completion (see [Sta14, Tag 0922] for the definition in the Noetherian case, cf. [Sta14, Tag 091V]).

Proposition 2.7 (cf. [Sta14, Tag 0A84 and 0AAK]). *Let (R, \mathfrak{m}) be a local Noetherian ring and let $K \in D_{\text{coh}}^b(R)$. Then*

$$R \text{Hom}_R(K, \omega_R^\bullet)^{\wedge} \simeq R\Gamma_{\mathfrak{m}}(K)^{\vee}.$$

In particular, if K is a finitely generated R -module, then

$$\text{Ext}_R^{-i}(K, \omega_R^\bullet)^{\wedge} \simeq H_{\mathfrak{m}}^i(K)^{\vee}.$$

In the second isomorphism, $(-)^{\wedge}$ denotes the usual \mathfrak{m} -adic completion, but there is no ambiguity here as the derived \mathfrak{m} -adic completion agrees with the usual \mathfrak{m} -adic completion for finitely generated modules over Noetherian rings by [Sta14, Tag 0EEU(2)].

In order to make proofs easier to read, we introduce the following notation used throughout the article.

Notation 2.8. Given $i \in \mathbb{Z}$, a Noetherian local ring (R, \mathfrak{m}) , a proper morphism of schemes $g: Y \rightarrow \text{Spec } R$, and a coherent sheaf \mathcal{F} on Y , we define

$$H_{\mathfrak{m}}^i(Y, \mathcal{F}) := H^i R\Gamma_{\mathfrak{m}} R\Gamma(Y, \mathcal{F}),$$

which is an Artinian R -module. Here, $R\Gamma(Y, \mathcal{F})$ may be identified with $Rg_*\mathcal{F}$.

Given a short exact sequence of coherent sheaves on Y , the functors $H_{\mathfrak{m}}^i(Y, -)$ induce a long exact sequence of cohomologies. Note that if $Y = \text{Spec } R$ and $g = \text{id}$, then $H_{\mathfrak{m}}^i(Y, \mathcal{F})$ agrees with the usual local cohomology, and if $R = k$ is a field and $\mathfrak{m} = (0)$, then $H_{\mathfrak{m}}^i(Y, \mathcal{F}) = H^i(Y, \mathcal{F})$ is the coherent cohomology.

The following lemma will be useful in translating problems concerning global sections into problems concerning local cohomology.

Lemma 2.9. *Let (R, \mathfrak{m}) be a Noetherian local ring admitting a dualising complex such that $\text{Spec } R$ is irreducible. Let X be a d -dimensional irreducible scheme which is proper over $\text{Spec } R$ and let \mathcal{F} be a coherent sheaf on X . Then*

$$H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(X, \mathcal{F})^{\vee} \simeq \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_X}(\mathcal{F}, \omega_X)^{\wedge}.$$

Moreover, if X is Cohen-Macaulay, then

$$H_{\mathfrak{m}}^i(X, \mathcal{F})^{\vee} \simeq \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{O}_X}^{d-i}(\mathcal{F}, \omega_X)^{\wedge}.$$

Proof. Consider the following isomorphisms

$$\begin{aligned} (H^i R\Gamma_{\mathfrak{m}} R\Gamma(X, \mathcal{F}))^{\vee} &\simeq (H^{-i} R\text{Hom}_R(R\Gamma(X, \mathcal{F}), \omega_R^{\bullet}))^{\wedge} \\ &\simeq (H^{-i} R\Gamma \circ R\mathcal{H}om_{\mathcal{O}_X}(\mathcal{F}, \omega_X^{\bullet}))^{\wedge} \simeq (H^{-i} R\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_X}(\mathcal{F}, \omega_X^{\bullet}))^{\wedge}, \end{aligned}$$

where the first one holds by Matlis duality (Proposition 2.7) and [Sta14, Tag 0A06], whilst the second one is Grothendieck duality.

If X is Cohen-Macaulay, then $\omega_X^{\bullet} = \omega_X[d]$, and so

$$H_{\mathfrak{m}}^i(X, \mathcal{F})^{\vee} \simeq \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{O}_X}^{d-i}(\mathcal{F}, \omega_X)^{\wedge}.$$

For $i = d$, but without assuming Cohen-Macauliness, the higher cohomologies of ω_X^{\bullet} do not interfere, and so the same conclusion holds (see [KTT⁺a, Lemma 2.24] or the proof of [BMP⁺20, Lemma 2.2]). \square

Lemma 2.10. *Let (R, \mathfrak{m}) be a Noetherian local ring admitting a dualising complex such that $\text{Spec } R$ is irreducible. Let X be a d -dimensional irreducible scheme which is proper over $\text{Spec } R$, let \mathcal{F} be a coherent sheaf on X , and let A be an ample Cartier divisor.*

Suppose that X and \mathcal{F} are Cohen-Macaulay. Then there exists $s_0 \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ such that

$$H_{\mathfrak{m}}^i(X, \mathcal{F}(-sA)) = 0$$

for all integers i and s satisfying $i < d$ and $s \geq s_0$, where $\mathcal{F}(-sA) := \mathcal{F} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \mathcal{O}_X(-sA)$.

Proof. Let $s \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ and $i < d$. By Lemma 2.9,

$$H_m^i(X, \mathcal{F}(-sA)) \simeq \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{O}_X}^{d-i}(\mathcal{F}(-sA), \omega_X)^\wedge.$$

Moreover,

$$\mathcal{E}xt_{\mathcal{O}_X}^{d-i}(\mathcal{F}(-sA), \omega_X)^\wedge = 0$$

for $i < d$, as $\mathcal{F}(-sA)$ is Cohen-Macaulay (see, e.g. Proposition 2.7). Therefore, by the Lerray spectral sequence for $R\text{Hom} = R\Gamma \circ R\mathcal{H}om$, we get that

$$\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{O}_X}^{d-i}(\mathcal{F}(-sA), \omega_X)^\wedge \simeq H^{d-i}(X, \mathcal{H}om_{\mathcal{O}_X}(\mathcal{F}(-sA), \omega_X)^\wedge),$$

which is zero for $s \gg 0$ by the Serre vanishing theorem. \square

2.5. Witt dualising sheaves and $W_n\omega_X(-K_X)$. Let X be an integral normal Noetherian F -finite \mathbb{F}_p -scheme. Fix $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. Recall that the ringed space $W_nX := (X, W_n\mathcal{O}_X)$ is a Noetherian scheme over $\mathbb{Z}/p^n\mathbb{Z}$. Then $W_n\omega_X^\bullet$ denotes the dualising complex (if it exists) and $W_n\omega_X$ denotes the dualising sheaf, which is an S_2 coherent $W_n\mathcal{O}_X$ -module (cf. Subsection 2.1.1). Throughout this paper, we shall basically work under the following setting.

Setting 2.11 (general case). Let X be a d -dimensional integral normal Noetherian F -finite \mathbb{F}_p -scheme such that W_nX is an excellent scheme admitting a dualising complex $W_n\omega_X^\bullet$ for every $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$.

In some cases, we might need to assume that our scheme is projective over a fixed affine base as described by Setting 2.12 to which we will refer whenever necessary.

Setting 2.12 (projective case). Let R be an F -finite Noetherian domain of characteristic $p > 0$ such that W_nR is an excellent ring admitting a dualising complex for every $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. Let X be a d -dimensional integral normal scheme which is projective over $\text{Spec } R$.

Remark 2.13. In the situation of Setting 2.11, it automatically holds that $d = \dim W_nX = \dim X < \infty$ ([Har66, Ch. V, Corollary 7.2]). In the situation of Setting 2.12, we have that $\dim W_nR = \dim R < \infty$.

Remark 2.14. If S is a complete F -finite Noetherian local \mathbb{F}_p -algebra and R is a ring essentially of finite type over S , then W_nR is an excellent ring admitting a dualising complex for every $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. Indeed, W_nS is a complete Noetherian local ring and W_nR is a ring essentially of finite type over W_nS (cf. [Gro65, Scholie 7.8.3(iii)], [Har66, Chapter V, §10]).

Remark 2.15. (1) In the situation of Setting 2.11, whenever we fix n , we always assume that the dualising complexes on W_mX and W_nX are compatible for every $m < n$, i.e., we define $W_m\omega_X^\bullet := i^!W_n\omega_X^\bullet$ for the induced closed immersion $i : W_mX \hookrightarrow W_nX$. The authors do not know whether we can assume this compatibility condition without fixing n .

- (2) In the situation of Setting 2.12, we consider $\mathrm{Spec} W_n R (= W_n(\mathrm{Spec} R))$ as the base scheme of $W_n X$. As in (1), when we fix $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, we always assume that the dualising complexes on $\mathrm{Spec} W_m R$ and $\mathrm{Spec} W_n R$ are compatible for every $m < n$. In this case, $W_m \omega_X^\bullet$ and $W_n \omega_X^\bullet$ are also compatible by $W_m \omega_X^\bullet = \pi_m^!(W_m \omega_{\mathrm{Spec} W_m R}^\bullet)$ and $W_n \omega_X^\bullet = \pi_n^!(W_n \omega_{\mathrm{Spec} W_n R}^\bullet)$ (cf. Subsubsection 2.1.1), where $\pi_m : W_m X \rightarrow \mathrm{Spec} W_m R$ and $\pi_n : W_n X \rightarrow \mathrm{Spec} W_n R$ denote the induced morphisms.

In the situation of Setting 2.11, the S_2 -hull \mathcal{F}^{**} of a coherent $W_n \mathcal{O}_X$ -module \mathcal{F} is given as follows (Subsection 2.2):

$$\mathcal{F}^{**} := \mathcal{H}om_{W_n \mathcal{O}_X}(\mathcal{H}om_{W_n \mathcal{O}_X}(\mathcal{F}, W_n \omega_X), W_n \omega_X).$$

For a Weil divisor D on X , we define $W_n \omega_X(D)$ as the S_2 -hull of $W_n \omega_X \otimes_{W_n \mathcal{O}_X} W_n \mathcal{O}_X(D)$, where $W_n \mathcal{O}_X(D)$ denotes the Witt divisorial sheaf introduced in [Tan22, Subsection 3.1]. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} W_n \omega_X(D) &= \mathcal{H}om_{W_n \mathcal{O}_X}(\mathcal{H}om_{W_n \mathcal{O}_X}(W_n \omega_X(D), W_n \omega_X), W_n \omega_X) \\ &\simeq j_*(W_n \omega_{X_{\mathrm{reg}}} \otimes_{W_n \mathcal{O}_{X_{\mathrm{reg}}}} W_n \mathcal{O}_{X_{\mathrm{reg}}}(D|_{X_{\mathrm{reg}}}), \end{aligned}$$

where $j : X_{\mathrm{reg}} \hookrightarrow X$ denotes the open immersion from the regular locus X_{reg} of X . By construction, $W_n \omega_X(D)$ is S_2 . We shall frequently use the case when $D = -K_X$, i.e., $W_n \omega_X(-K_X)$. For a coherent $W_n \mathcal{O}_X$ -module \mathcal{F} , we set $\mathcal{F}^* := \mathcal{H}om_{W_n \mathcal{O}_X}(\mathcal{F}, W_n \omega_X(-K_X))$, which is an S_2 coherent $W_n \mathcal{O}_X$ -module (Lemma 2.4). This notation \mathcal{F}^* is compatible with the notation \mathcal{F}^{**} introduced earlier up to isomorphism, because $\mathcal{F}^{**} \simeq (\mathcal{F}^*)^*$ holds as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}^{**} &= \mathcal{H}om_{W_n \mathcal{O}_X}(\mathcal{H}om_{W_n \mathcal{O}_X}(\mathcal{F}, W_n \omega_X), W_n \omega_X) \\ &\simeq \mathcal{H}om_{W_n \mathcal{O}_X}(\mathcal{H}om_{W_n \mathcal{O}_X}(\mathcal{F}, W_n \omega_X(-K_X)), W_n \omega_X(-K_X)) \\ &= (\mathcal{F}^*)^*, \end{aligned}$$

where the isomorphism can be checked by restricting to the regular locus X_{reg} of X .

Remark 2.16. Take a coherent $W_n \mathcal{O}_X$ -module \mathcal{F} with $\mathrm{Supp} \mathcal{F} = X$. For $n \leq m$ and the induced closed immersion $i : W_n X \hookrightarrow W_m X$, we have that \mathcal{F} is an S_2 coherent $W_n \mathcal{O}_X$ -module if and only if $i_* \mathcal{F}$ is an S_2 coherent $W_m \mathcal{O}_X$ -module.

In the situation of Setting 2.11, we now recall the definition of $\underline{p} : W_{n-1} \omega_X \rightarrow W_n \omega_X$. Since the kernel of the multiplication map $p : W_n \mathcal{O}_X \rightarrow W_n \mathcal{O}_X$ is equal to $V(F_* W_{n-1} \mathcal{O}_X)$, we obtain the following decomposition

$$(2.16.1) \quad p : W_n \mathcal{O}_X \xrightarrow{R} W_{n-1} \mathcal{O}_X \xrightarrow{\underline{p}} W_n \mathcal{O}_X,$$

where $R : W_n \mathcal{O}_X \rightarrow W_{n-1} \mathcal{O}_X$ is surjective and $\underline{p} : W_{n-1} \mathcal{O}_X \rightarrow W_n \mathcal{O}_X$ is injective.

We now apply $\mathcal{H}om_{W_n\mathcal{O}_X}(-, W_n\omega_X)$ to (2.16.1). We have $\mathcal{H}om_{W_n\mathcal{O}_X}(W_n\mathcal{O}_X, W_n\omega_X) \simeq W_n\omega_X$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}om_{W_n\mathcal{O}_X}(W_{n-1}\mathcal{O}_X, W_n\omega_X) &\simeq j_*\mathcal{H}om_{W_n\mathcal{O}_{X_{\text{reg}}}}(W_{n-1}\mathcal{O}_{X_{\text{reg}}}, W_n\omega_{X_{\text{reg}}}) \\ &\simeq j_*\mathcal{H}om_{W_{n-1}\mathcal{O}_{X_{\text{reg}}}}(W_{n-1}\mathcal{O}_{X_{\text{reg}}}, W_{n-1}\omega_{X_{\text{reg}}}) \\ &\simeq \mathcal{H}om_{W_{n-1}\mathcal{O}_X}(W_{n-1}\mathcal{O}_X, W_{n-1}\omega_X) \\ &\simeq W_{n-1}\omega_X, \end{aligned}$$

where $j : X_{\text{reg}} \hookrightarrow X$ denotes the open immersion from the regular locus X_{reg} of X and the second isomorphism follows from the Grothendieck duality (cf. Remark 2.15). Thus we obtain a composition of $W_n\mathcal{O}_X$ -module homomorphisms:

$$(2.16.2) \quad p : W_n\omega_X \xrightarrow{R := \underline{p}^*} W_{n-1}\omega_X \xrightarrow{\underline{p} := R^*} W_n\omega_X,$$

where $\underline{p}^* := \mathcal{H}om_{W_n\mathcal{O}_X}(\underline{p}, W_n\omega_X)$ and $R^* := \mathcal{H}om_{W_n\mathcal{O}_X}(R, W_n\omega_X)$.

Fix a Weil divisor D on X . We naturally get the following logarithmic version of (2.16.2):

$$(2.16.3) \quad p : W_n\omega_X(D) \xrightarrow{R} W_{n-1}\omega_X(D) \xrightarrow{\underline{p}} W_n\omega_X(D).$$

More specifically, if X is regular, then we obtain (2.16.3) from (2.16.2) by taking the tensor product with the invertible $W_n\mathcal{O}_X$ -module $W_n\mathcal{O}_X(D)$ [Tan22, Proposition 3.12]. The general case is reduced to this case, because (2.16.3) is obtained by applying j_* to $p : W_n\omega_{X_{\text{reg}}}(D|_{X_{\text{reg}}}) \xrightarrow{R} W_{n-1}\omega_{X_{\text{reg}}}(D|_{X_{\text{reg}}}) \xrightarrow{\underline{p}} W_n\omega_{X_{\text{reg}}}(D|_{X_{\text{reg}}})$, where $j : X_{\text{reg}} \hookrightarrow X$ is the open immersion from the regular locus X_{reg} . Note that $\underline{p} : W_{n-1}\omega_X(D) \rightarrow W_n\omega_X(D)$ is injective by definition.

Remark 2.17. Assume that X is a smooth variety over a perfect field k of characteristic $p > 0$. In this case, we have $W_n\omega_X \simeq W_n\Omega_X^N$ for $N := \dim X$ [Eke84, Theorem 4.1 in page 197]. Via this isomorphism, (2.16.1) coincides with the sequence given in [Ill79, Ch. I, Proposition 3.4]

$$p : W_n\Omega_X^N \xrightarrow{R} W_{n-1}\Omega_X^N \xrightarrow{\underline{p}} W_n\Omega_X^N,$$

because each of them coincides with the unique decomposition of the p -multiplication map into a surjection followed by an injection (cf. Proposition 2.19(1)).

Remark 2.18. As pointed out in Remark 2.17, $R : W_n\omega_X \rightarrow W_{n-1}\omega_X$ is surjective when X is a smooth variety over a perfect field of characteristic $p > 0$. On the other hand, $R : W_n\omega_X \rightarrow W_{n-1}\omega_X$ is not necessarily surjective in general, whilst $\underline{p} : W_{n-1}\omega_X \rightarrow W_n\omega_X$ is always injective. Indeed, if X is a Gorenstein affine normal surface which is not F -split but n -quasi- F -split for some integer $n \geq 2$, then $R : W_n\omega_X \rightarrow W_{n-1}\omega_X$ is not surjective (Proposition 2.19).

Proposition 2.19. *In the situation of Setting 2.11, assume that X is affine, Gorenstein, and n -quasi- F -split for an integer $n \geq 2$. Consider the following conditions*

- (a) X is F -split.
- (b) $R : W_n\omega_X \rightarrow W_{n-1}\omega_X$ is surjective.

Then the following hold.

- (1) If (a) holds, then (b) holds.
- (2) If (b) holds and $\dim X = 2$, then (a) holds.

Proof. Since the problem is local, we may assume that $X = \text{Spec } R$ for a local ring (R, \mathfrak{m}) . In what follows, we set $H_{\mathfrak{m}}^i(\mathcal{F}) := H_{\mathfrak{m}}^i(\Gamma(X, \mathcal{F}))$ for a coherent $W_n \mathcal{O}_X$ -module \mathcal{F} . Set $d := \dim X = \dim R$. The problem is reduced to the case when $d \geq 2$, as otherwise the assertions are clear.

For $Q_{X,n} := Q_{X,0,n} = W_n \mathcal{O}_X / p W_n \mathcal{O}_X$ and $B_{X,n} := B_{X,0,n} = \text{Coker}(F : W_n \mathcal{O}_X \rightarrow F_* W_n \mathcal{O}_X)$, we have the following exact sequences [KTT⁺a, Remark 3.4]:

$$(2.19.1) \quad 0 \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X \xrightarrow{\Phi_{X,n}} Q_{X,n} \rightarrow B_{X,n} \rightarrow 0,$$

$$(2.19.2) \quad 0 \rightarrow W_{n-1} \mathcal{O}_X \xrightarrow{p} W_n \mathcal{O}_X \rightarrow Q_{X,n} \rightarrow 0.$$

Since X is Cohen-Macaulay, we have $H_{\mathfrak{m}}^{d-1}(\mathcal{O}_X) = 0$. As X is n -quasi- F -split, $H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(\Phi_{X,n}) : H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(\mathcal{O}_X) \rightarrow H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(Q_{X,n})$ is injective [KTT⁺a, Lemma 3.13]. Then these, together with (2.19.1), imply

$$(2.19.3) \quad H_{\mathfrak{m}}^{d-1}(Q_{X,n}) \simeq H_{\mathfrak{m}}^{d-1}(B_{X,n}).$$

By applying $\mathcal{H}om_{W_n \mathcal{O}_X}(-, W_n \omega_X)$ to (2.19.2), we obtain another exact sequence

$$W_n \omega_X \xrightarrow{p^*=R} W_{n-1} \omega_X \rightarrow \mathcal{E}xt_{W_n \mathcal{O}_X}^1(Q_{X,n}, W_n \omega_X) \rightarrow \mathcal{E}xt_{W_n \mathcal{O}_X}^1(W_n \mathcal{O}_X, W_n \omega_X) = 0.$$

Since $Q_{X,n}$ is naturally a coherent \mathcal{O}_X -module [KTT⁺a, Proposition 3.6], Grothendieck duality yields $\mathcal{E}xt_{W_n \mathcal{O}_X}^1(Q_{X,n}, W_n \omega_X) \simeq \mathcal{E}xt_{\mathcal{O}_X}^1(Q_{X,n}, \omega_X)$. Therefore, we obtain the equivalence (b) \Leftrightarrow (b') for the condition (b') below:

$$(b') \quad \mathcal{E}xt_{\mathcal{O}_X}^1(Q_{X,n}, \omega_X) = 0.$$

Moreover, we get (b) \Leftrightarrow (b') \Leftrightarrow (b'') by applying Matlis duality (Proposition 2.7):

$$(b'') \quad H_{\mathfrak{m}}^{d-1}(Q_{X,n}) = 0.$$

Since X is Gorenstein, (a) is equivalent to the following condition (a') by the exact sequence $0 \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X \rightarrow F_* \mathcal{O}_X \rightarrow B_{X,1} \rightarrow 0$.

$$(a') \quad H_{\mathfrak{m}}^{d-1}(B_{X,1}) = 0.$$

Let us show (1). Assume (a). Since (a') holds, we obtain $H_{\mathfrak{m}}^{d-1}(B_{X,n}) = 0$ by the exact sequence [KTT⁺a, (3.8.2)]:

$$(2.19.4) \quad 0 \rightarrow F_* B_{X,n-1} \rightarrow B_{X,n} \rightarrow B_{X,1} \rightarrow 0.$$

Then (2.19.3) implies (b''). This completes the proof of (1).

Let us show (2). Assume $d = \dim X = 2$ and (b). It follows from (b'') and (2.19.3) that $H_{\mathfrak{m}}^1(B_{X,n}) = 0$. Observe that $H_{\mathfrak{m}}^0(B_{X,1}) = 0$ as $H_{\mathfrak{m}}^0(F_* \mathcal{O}_X) = 0$ and $H_{\mathfrak{m}}^1(\mathcal{O}_X) = 0$. Thus, by (2.19.4), we obtain $H_{\mathfrak{m}}^1(B_{X,n-1}) = 0$. Applying this argument repeatedly, we obtain $H_{\mathfrak{m}}^1(B_{X,i}) = 0$ for every $1 \leq i \leq n$ by descending induction on i . Thus (a') holds. This completes the proof of (2). \square

3. ITERATIVE QUASI-F-SPLITTING

3.1. Definition of quasi- F^e -splitting. Let X be as in Setting 2.11. Take $e \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ and let Δ be a (non-necessarily effective) \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X . We define a $W_n\mathcal{O}_X$ -module $Q_{X,\Delta,n}^e$ and a $W_n\mathcal{O}_X$ -module homomorphism $\Phi_{X,\Delta,n}^e$ by the following pushout diagram of $W_n\mathcal{O}_X$ -module homomorphisms:

$$(3.0.1) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} W_n\mathcal{O}_X(\Delta) & \xrightarrow{F^e} & F_*^e W_n\mathcal{O}_X(p^e\Delta) \\ \downarrow R^{n-1} & & \downarrow \\ \mathcal{O}_X(\Delta) & \xrightarrow{\Phi_{X,\Delta,n}^e} & Q_{X,\Delta,n}^e \end{array}$$

For the definition of the Witt divisorial sheaf $W_n\mathcal{O}_X(\Delta)$, we refer to [Tan22, Subsection 3.1]. We remind the reader that $\mathcal{O}_X(\Delta) = \mathcal{O}_X(\lfloor \Delta \rfloor)$, but it is *not* true in general that $W_n\mathcal{O}_X(\Delta) = W_n\mathcal{O}_X(\lfloor \Delta \rfloor)$.

We define a $W_n\mathcal{O}_X$ -module $B_{X,\Delta,n}^e$ by

$$(3.0.2) \quad \begin{aligned} B_{X,\Delta,n}^e &:= \text{Coker}(W_n\mathcal{O}_X(\Delta) \xrightarrow{F^e} F_*^e W_n\mathcal{O}_X(p^e\Delta)) \\ &= F_*^e W_n\mathcal{O}_X(p^e\Delta) / F^e(W_n\mathcal{O}_X(\Delta)). \end{aligned}$$

Remark 3.1. The key properties of the construction of $Q_{X,\Delta,n}^e$, $B_{X,\Delta,n}^e$, and $\Phi_{X,\Delta,n}^e$ may be encapsulated by the following diagram

$$(3.1.1) \quad \begin{array}{ccccccc} & & 0 & & 0 & & \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\ & & F_* W_{n-1}\mathcal{O}_X(p\Delta) & = & F_* W_{n-1}\mathcal{O}_X(p\Delta) & & \\ & & \downarrow V & & \downarrow F^e V = V F^e & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & W_n\mathcal{O}_X(\Delta) & \xrightarrow{F^e} & F_*^e W_n\mathcal{O}_X(p^e\Delta) & \longrightarrow & B_{X,\Delta,n}^e \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow R^{n-1} & & \downarrow & & \parallel \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O}_X(\Delta) & \xrightarrow{\Phi_{X,\Delta,n}^e} & Q_{X,\Delta,n}^e & \longrightarrow & B_{X,\Delta,n}^e \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\ & & 0 & & 0 & & \end{array}$$

All the horizontal and vertical sequences are exact, as $F^e: W_n\mathcal{O}_X(\Delta) \rightarrow F_*^e W_n\mathcal{O}_X(p^e\Delta)$ is injective, $R^{n-1}: W_n\mathcal{O}_X(\Delta) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X(\Delta)$ is surjective, and (3.0.1) is a pushout diagram.

One can now check that

$$(3.1.2) \quad Q_{X,\Delta+D,n}^e \simeq Q_{X,\Delta,n}^e \otimes_{W_n\mathcal{O}_X} W_n\mathcal{O}_X(D)$$

for any Cartier divisor D . Indeed, $W_n\mathcal{O}_X(D)$ is an invertible $W_n\mathcal{O}_X$ -module, and hence both sides of (3.1.2) are isomorphic to the pushout of

$$F_*^e W_n\mathcal{O}_X(p^e\Delta + p^e D) \xleftarrow{F^e} W_n\mathcal{O}_X(\Delta + D) \xrightarrow{R^{n-1}} \mathcal{O}_X(\Delta + D).$$

In what follows, we shall often assume that $[\Delta] = 0$, which is equivalent to the condition that the coefficients of Δ are contained in $[0, 1)$. In this case, $\mathcal{O}_X(\Delta) = \mathcal{O}_X$.

Definition 3.2. In the situation of Setting 2.11, let Δ be a \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X . We define a $W_n\mathcal{O}_X$ -module homomorphism

$$(\Phi_{X,\Delta,n}^e)^* : (Q_{X,\Delta,n}^e)^* \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X(\Delta)^*$$

by applying $(-)^* := \mathcal{H}om_{W_n\mathcal{O}_X}(-, W_n\omega_X(-K_X))$ to the $W_n\mathcal{O}_X$ -module homomorphism $\Phi_{X,\Delta,n}^e : \mathcal{O}_X(\Delta) \rightarrow Q_{X,\Delta,n}^e$.

More explicitly, $(\Phi_{X,\Delta,n}^e)^*$ can be written as follows:

$$(\Phi_{X,\Delta,n}^e)^* : \mathcal{H}om_{W_n\mathcal{O}_X}(Q_{X,\Delta,n}^e, W_n\omega_X(-K_X)) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}om_{W_n\mathcal{O}_X}(\mathcal{O}_X(\Delta), W_n\omega_X(-K_X)).$$

Note that $\mathcal{O}_X(\Delta)^* = \mathcal{H}om_{W_n\mathcal{O}_X}(\mathcal{O}_X(\Delta), W_n\omega_X(-K_X)) \simeq \mathcal{O}_X(-[\Delta])$.

For the case when $[\Delta] = 0$, the following are equivalent.

- (A) $\Phi_{X,\Delta,n}^e : \mathcal{O}_X \rightarrow Q_{X,\Delta,n}^e$ splits as a $W_n\mathcal{O}_X$ -module homomorphism.
- (B) $H^0(X, (\Phi_{X,\Delta,n}^e)^*) : \mathcal{H}om_{W_n\mathcal{O}_X}(Q_{X,\Delta,n}^e, \mathcal{O}_X) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}om_{W_n\mathcal{O}_X}(\mathcal{O}_X, \mathcal{O}_X)$ is surjective.

On the other hand, their iterative versions are not equivalent in general.

- (A') $\Phi_{X,\Delta,n}^e : \mathcal{O}_X \rightarrow Q_{X,\Delta,n}^e$ splits as a $W_n\mathcal{O}_X$ -module homomorphism.
- (B') $H^0(X, (\Phi_{X,\Delta,n}^e)^*) : \mathcal{H}om_{W_n\mathcal{O}_X}(Q_{X,\Delta,n}^e, W_n\omega_X(-K_X)) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}om_{W_n\mathcal{O}_X}(\mathcal{O}_X, W_n\omega_X(-K_X))$ is surjective.

As Yobuko's original definition is given by (A), it is tempting to adopt (A') as the definition of quasi- F^e -splitting. However, condition (A') is too restrictive (e.g., if (A') holds for $\Delta = 0$ and $e \geq 2$, then X is F -split (Proposition 3.8)), and so our definition is (B'), which is weaker than (A').

Definition 3.3. In the situation of Setting 2.11, let Δ be a \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X . Take $n, e \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. We say that (X, Δ) is n -quasi- F^e -split if $[\Delta] = 0$ and the induced map

$$(\Phi_{X,\Delta,n}^e)^* : H^0(X, (Q_{X,\Delta,n}^e)^*) \rightarrow H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X^*)$$

is surjective, where $\mathcal{O}_X^* \simeq \mathcal{O}_X$.

We call (X, Δ) *quasi- F^e -split* if it is n -quasi- F^e -split for some $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. We call (X, Δ) *n -quasi- F^e -pure* (resp. *quasi- F^e -pure*) if there exists an open cover $X = \bigcup_{i \in I} X_i$ such that $(X_i, \Delta|_{X_i})$ is n -quasi- F^e -split (resp. quasi- F^e -split) for all $i \in I$.

Remark 3.4. By definition, we have $Q_{X,\Delta,n} = Q_{X,\Delta,n}^1$ (compare Definition 3.3 and [KTT⁺a, (3.3.1)]). In particular, (X, Δ) is quasi- F -split if and only if (X, Δ) is quasi- F^1 -split.

Definition 3.5. In the situation of Setting 2.11, let Δ be a \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X . For $e \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, we define

$$h^e(X, \Delta) \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0} \cup \{\infty\}$$

as follows.

- If (X, Δ) is not quasi- F^e -split, then we set $h^e(X, \Delta) := \infty$.

- If (X, Δ) is quasi- F^e -split, then $h^e(X, \Delta)$ is defined as the smallest positive integer n such that (X, Δ) is n -quasi- F^e -split. In this case, we say that X is *quasi- F^e -split of height n* .

When $1 < h^e(X, \Delta) < \infty$, X is quasi- F^e -split of height n if and only if X is not $(n-1)$ -quasi- F^e -split but n -quasi- F^e -split.

Remark 3.6. In the situation of Setting 2.11, let Δ be a \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X with $[\Delta] = 0$. Fix $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ and $e \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. We have the following factorisations of $W_n\mathcal{O}_X$ -module homomorphisms:

$$\Phi_{X,\Delta,n}^{e+1} : \mathcal{O}_X \xrightarrow{\Phi_{X,\Delta,n}^e} Q_{X,\Delta,n}^e \rightarrow Q_{X,\Delta,n}^{e+1}$$

$$(\Phi_{X,\Delta,n}^{e+1})^* : (Q_{X,\Delta,n}^{e+1})^* \rightarrow (Q_{X,\Delta,n}^e)^* \xrightarrow{(\Phi_{X,\Delta,n}^e)^*} (\mathcal{O}_X)^*,$$

where $\mathcal{F}^* := \mathcal{H}om_{W_n\mathcal{O}_X}(\mathcal{F}, W_n\omega_X(-K_X))$. In particular, if (X, Δ) is n -quasi- F^{e+1} -split, then (X, Δ) is n -quasi- F^e -split. In other words, $h^e(X, \Delta) \leq h^{e+1}(X, \Delta)$.

Remark 3.7. In the situation of Setting 2.11, let Δ be an effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X with $[\Delta] = 0$, and let X' be an open subset of X such that $\text{codim}_X(X \setminus X') \geq 2$. By Definition 3.3, (X, Δ) is n -quasi- F^e -split if and only if $(X', \Delta|_{X'})$ is n -quasi- F^e -split.

In what follows, we set $Q_{X,n}^e := Q_{X,0,n}^e$ and $\Phi_{X,n}^e := \Phi_{X,0,n}^e$. The following result shows that asking for the splitting of $\Phi_{X,n}^e : \mathcal{O}_X \rightarrow Q_{X,n}^e$ for $e \geq 2$ gives a redundant definition.

Proposition 3.8. *In the situation of Setting 2.11, take integers $e \geq 2$ and $n \geq 1$. Then the following are equivalent.*

- (1) X is F -split, i.e., $F : \mathcal{O}_X \rightarrow F_*\mathcal{O}_X$ splits as an \mathcal{O}_X -module homomorphism.
- (2) $\Phi_{X,n}^e : \mathcal{O}_X \rightarrow Q_{X,n}^e$ splits as a $W_n\mathcal{O}_X$ -module homomorphism.

Proof. By Remark 3.1, (1) implies (2). Let us show (2) \Rightarrow (1). Assume (2). We then get $W_n\mathcal{O}_X$ -module homomorphisms:

$$\text{id} : \mathcal{O}_X \xrightarrow{\Phi_{X,n}^e} Q_{X,n}^e \xrightarrow{\exists\theta} \mathcal{O}_X.$$

By $p\mathcal{O}_X = 0$, the $W_n\mathcal{O}_X$ -module homomorphism $\theta : Q_{X,n}^e \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X$ factors through

$$\frac{Q_{X,n}^e}{pQ_{X,n}^e} = \frac{F_*W_n\mathcal{O}_X}{pF_*W_n\mathcal{O}_X} = F_*^* \frac{W_n\mathcal{O}_X}{pW_n\mathcal{O}_X}.$$

Therefore, we obtain the following $W_n\mathcal{O}_X$ -module homomorphisms:

$$\text{id} : \mathcal{O}_X \xrightarrow{\Phi'} F_*^*(W_n\mathcal{O}_X/pW_n\mathcal{O}_X) \xrightarrow{\theta'} \mathcal{O}_X.$$

It is enough to prove that $\Phi' : \mathcal{O}_X \rightarrow F_*^e(W_n\mathcal{O}_X/pW_n\mathcal{O}_X)$ factors through $F : \mathcal{O}_X \rightarrow F_*\mathcal{O}_X$, which holds by the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
W_n\mathcal{O}_X & \xrightarrow{F} & F_*W_n\mathcal{O}_X & \xrightarrow{F^{e-1}} & F_*^eW_n\mathcal{O}_X \\
\downarrow R^{n-1} & & \downarrow F_*R^{n-1}=: \rho & & \downarrow \pi \\
\mathcal{O}_X & \xrightarrow{F} & F_*\mathcal{O}_X & \dashrightarrow & F_*^e(W_n\mathcal{O}_X/pW_n\mathcal{O}_X), \\
& & \searrow & \nearrow & \\
& & & \Phi' &
\end{array}$$

where the above dashed arrow exists, because the assumption $e \geq 2$ implies that

$$F^{e-1}(\text{Ker}(\rho)) = F^{e-1}(V(F_*^2W_{n-1}\mathcal{O}_X)) \subseteq pF_*^eW_n\mathcal{O}_X \subseteq \text{Ker}(\pi).$$

□

As the definition of quasi- F^e -splitting (Definition 3.3) shows, we are mainly interested in the case when $[\Delta] = 0$. However, we shall work under a more general setting, as it will be necessary in our applications. We have the following cohomological criterion for whether a pair is quasi- F^e -split.

Remark 3.9. In the situation of Setting 2.12, assume that (R, \mathfrak{m}) is a local ring. Recall that $(W_nR, \sqrt{W_n\mathfrak{m}})$ is a local ring for every $n > 0$. For $i \in \mathbb{Z}$, integers $n' \geq n > 0$, and a coherent $W_n\mathcal{O}_X$ -module \mathcal{F} , we have that \mathcal{F} is naturally a $W_{n'}\mathcal{O}_X$ -module and

$$H_{W_{n'}\mathfrak{m}}^i(X, \mathcal{F}) = H_{W_n\mathfrak{m}}^i(X, \mathcal{F}).$$

Lemma 3.10. *In the situation of Setting 2.12, assume that (R, \mathfrak{m}) is a local ring and let Δ be a \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X . Fix $e, n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. Then the following are equivalent, where $(-)^* := \mathcal{H}om_{W_n\mathcal{O}_X}(-, W_n\omega_X(-K_X))$.*

- (1) $H^0(X, (\Phi_{X,\Delta,n}^e)^*) : H^0(X, (Q_{X,\Delta,n}^e)^*) \rightarrow H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(\Delta)^*)$ is surjective.
- (2) $H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(X, \Phi_{X,K_X+\Delta,n}^e) : H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(X, \mathcal{O}_X(K_X + \Delta)) \rightarrow H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(X, Q_{X,K_X+\Delta,n}^e)$ is injective.

As a consequence, when $[\Delta] = 0$, (X, Δ) is n -quasi- F^e -split if and only if

$$H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(X, \Phi_{X,K_X+\Delta,n}^e) : H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(X, \mathcal{O}_X(K_X + \Delta)) \rightarrow H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(X, Q_{X,K_X+\Delta,n}^e)$$

is injective (cf. Definition 3.3). For the definition of $H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(X, -)$, see Notation 2.8.

Proof. Consider the following exact sequence of W_nR -modules:

$$(3.10.1) \quad 0 \rightarrow K \rightarrow H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(X, \mathcal{O}_X(K_X + \Delta)) \xrightarrow{H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(X, \Phi_{X,K_X+\Delta,n}^e)} H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(X, Q_{X,K_X+\Delta,n}^e),$$

where K is the kernel of $H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(X, \Phi_{X,K_X+\Delta,n}^e)$. By applying Matlis duality $\text{Hom}_{W_nR}(-, E)$ (which is exact), Lemma 2.9 yields an exact sequence

$$(3.10.2) \quad 0 \leftarrow K^\vee \leftarrow H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(\Delta)^*)^\wedge \xleftarrow{H^0(X, (\Phi_{X,\Delta,n}^e)^*)^\wedge} H^0(X, (Q_{X,\Delta,n}^e)^*)^\wedge$$

where $K^\vee = \text{Hom}_{W_nR}(K, E)$ and we used the following (Lemma 2.4):

$$\mathcal{H}om_{W_n\mathcal{O}_X}(Q_{X,K_X+\Delta,n}^e, W_n\omega_X) \simeq \mathcal{H}om_{W_n\mathcal{O}_X}(Q_{X,\Delta,n}^e, W_n\omega_X(-K_X)) = (Q_{X,\Delta,n}^e)^*.$$

Then the following is true:

$$\begin{aligned} H^0(X, (\Phi_{X,\Delta,n}^e)^*) \text{ is surjective} &\iff H^0(X, (\Phi_{X,\Delta,n}^e)^*)^\wedge \text{ is surjective} \\ &\iff H_m^d(X, \Phi_{X,K_X+\Delta,n}^e) \text{ is injective.} \end{aligned}$$

Here the first equivalence holds by the fact that $(-)^{\wedge} \simeq (-) \otimes_{W(R)} \widehat{W_n R}$ and the completion $W_n R \rightarrow \widehat{W_n R}$ is faithfully flat (cf. [Sta14, Tag 00MA(3)], [Sta14, Tag 00MC]), and the second one follows from (3.10.1) and (3.10.2). In the last assertion, we used that $K = 0$ if and only if $K^\vee = 0$, which is true because $K^{\vee\vee} \simeq K$ (cf. [Sta14, Tag 08Z9]). \square

Lemma 3.11. *In the situation of Setting 2.11, let Δ be a \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X . Take $e, n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. Then we have the following exact sequence of coherent $W_n \mathcal{O}_X$ -modules:*

$$(3.11.1) \quad 0 \rightarrow F_* B_{X,p\Delta,n}^e \rightarrow Q_{X,\Delta,n+1}^e \rightarrow F_*^e \mathcal{O}_X(p^e \Delta) \rightarrow 0.$$

Proof. The exact sequence (3.11.1) is obtained by applying the snake lemma to the following commutative diagram in which the horizontal sequence is exact

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} F_* W_n \mathcal{O}_X(p\Delta) & \xlongequal{\quad} & F_* W_n \mathcal{O}_X(p\Delta) & & & & \\ \downarrow F^e & & \downarrow VF^e & & & & \\ 0 \longrightarrow & F_*^{e+1} W_n \mathcal{O}_X(p^{e+1}\Delta) & \xrightarrow{V} & F_*^e W_{n+1} \mathcal{O}_X(p^e \Delta) & \xrightarrow{R^n} & F_*^e \mathcal{O}_X(p^e \Delta) & \longrightarrow 0. \end{array}$$

\square

Proposition 3.12. *In the situation of Setting 2.11, let Δ be a \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X . Then $B_{X,\Delta,n}^e$ and $Q_{X,\Delta,n}^e$ are naturally coherent $W_e \mathcal{O}_X$ -modules.*

Proof. Since $B_{X,\Delta,n}^e$ and $Q_{X,\Delta,n}^e$ are coherent $W_n \mathcal{O}_X$ -modules, there is nothing to show when $n \leq e$. In what follows, we assume $n > e$. By the following exact sequence (3.1.1):

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X(\Delta) \xrightarrow{\Phi_{X,\Delta,n}^e} Q_{X,\Delta,n}^e \rightarrow B_{X,\Delta,n}^e \rightarrow 0,$$

it suffices to prove that $Q_{X,\Delta,n}^e$ is a $W_e \mathcal{O}_X$ -module. By (3.1.1), we have

$$W_e \mathcal{O}_X = \frac{W_n \mathcal{O}_X}{V^e(F_*^e W_{n-e} \mathcal{O}_X)} \quad \text{and} \quad Q_{X,\Delta,n}^e = \frac{F_*^e W_n \mathcal{O}_X(p^e \Delta)}{VF^e(F_* W_{n-1} \mathcal{O}_X(p\Delta))}.$$

Hence it is enough to show that

$$(V^e F_*^e \zeta) \cdot (F_*^e \xi) \in VF^e(F_* W_{n-1} \mathcal{O}_X(p\Delta)(U))$$

for $F_*^e \zeta \in F_*^e W_{n-e} \mathcal{O}_X(U)$ and $F_*^e \xi \in F_*^e W_n \mathcal{O}_X(p^e \Delta)(U)$, where U is an affine open subset of X . For $\zeta = (\zeta_0, \zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_{n-e-1}) \in W_{n-e} \mathcal{O}_X(U)$, we set

$$\tilde{\zeta} := (\zeta_0, \zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_{n-e-1}, 0, \dots, 0) \in W_n \mathcal{O}_X(U).$$

For $F^e : W_n \mathcal{O}_X(U) \rightarrow F_*^e W_n \mathcal{O}_X(U)$, we obtain $F^e V^e(F_*^e \zeta) = p^e F_*^e \tilde{\zeta}$. It holds that

$$(V^e F_*^e \zeta) \cdot (F_*^e \xi) = F_*^e((p^e \tilde{\zeta}) \cdot \xi) = p^e F_*^e(\tilde{\zeta} \cdot \xi)$$

$$\in p^e F_*^e(\tilde{\zeta} \cdot W_n \mathcal{O}_X(p^e \Delta)(U)) \subset p^e F_*^e W_n \mathcal{O}_X(p^e \Delta)(U) \subset VF^e(F_* W_{n-1} \mathcal{O}_X(p \Delta)).$$

Therefore, $Q_{X,n}^e$ is a $W_e \mathcal{O}_X$ -module. \square

Remark 3.13. We use the same notation as in Proposition 3.12. We then get

$$H_{W_n m}^i(X, Q_{X,\Delta,n}^e) = H_{W_\ell m}^i(X, Q_{X,\Delta,n}^e) = H_{W_e m}^i(X, Q_{X,\Delta,n}^e)$$

for $i \in \mathbb{Z}$, $e \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, and $\ell := \min\{e, n\}$ (Remark 3.9).

Lemma 3.14. *In the situation of Setting 2.11, let Δ be a \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X . Then we have the following exact sequences*

$$(3.14.1) \quad 0 \rightarrow B_{X,\Delta,n}^e \rightarrow B_{X,\Delta,n}^{e+r} \rightarrow F_*^e B_{X,p^e \Delta,n}^r \rightarrow 0$$

$$(3.14.2) \quad 0 \rightarrow F_*^n B_{X,p^s \Delta,s}^e \rightarrow B_{X,\Delta,n+s}^e \rightarrow B_{X,\Delta,n}^e \rightarrow 0$$

for all $e, n, r, s \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$.

Proof. The exact sequences (3.14.1) and (3.14.2) are obtained by applying the snake lemma to the following commutative diagrams in which each horizontal sequence is exact and all the vertical arrows are injective:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} W_n \mathcal{O}_X(\Delta) & \xlongequal{\quad} & W_n \mathcal{O}_X(\Delta) & & & & \\ \downarrow F^e & & \downarrow F^{e+r} & & & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & F_*^e W_n(p^e \Delta) & \xrightarrow{F^r} & F_*^{e+r} W_n \mathcal{O}_X(p^{e+r} \Delta) & \longrightarrow & F_*^e B_{X,p^e \Delta,n}^r \longrightarrow 0, \\ \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & F_*^n W_s \mathcal{O}_X(p^s \Delta) & \xrightarrow{V^n} & W_{n+s} \mathcal{O}_X(\Delta) & \xrightarrow{R^s} & W_n \mathcal{O}_X(\Delta) \longrightarrow 0 \\ \downarrow F^e & & \downarrow F^e & & \downarrow F^e & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & F_*^{n+e} W_s \mathcal{O}_X(p^{s+e} \Delta) & \xrightarrow{V^n} & F_*^e W_{n+s} \mathcal{O}_X(p^e \Delta) & \xrightarrow{R^s} & F_*^e W_n \mathcal{O}_X(p^e \Delta) \longrightarrow 0 \end{array}$$

\square

3.2. Alternative definitions via splittings. Throughout this subsection, we fix an isomorphism $\iota : \mathcal{O}_X \xrightarrow{\cong} \omega_X(-K_X)$ and identify \mathcal{O}_X with $\omega_X(-K_X)$ via this fixed isomorphism. For a Weil divisor D , the equality $\mathcal{O}_X(D) = \omega_X(D - K_X)$ means the fixed isomorphism $\mathcal{O}_X(D) \xrightarrow{\cong, \iota} \omega_X(D - K_X)$.

Definition 3.15. In the situation of Setting 2.11, let Δ be a \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X . Fix $e, n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. We define a $W_n \mathcal{O}_X$ -module $Q_{X,n}^e$ and a $W_n \mathcal{O}_X$ -module homomorphism

$$\Phi_{X,\Delta,n}^e : W_n \omega_X(-K_X) \rightarrow Q_{X,\Delta,n}^e$$

by the following diagram, where each square is a pushout diagram of $W_n\mathcal{O}_X$ -modules:

$$(3.15.1) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} W_n\mathcal{O}_X(\Delta) & \xrightarrow{F^e} & F_*^e W_n\mathcal{O}_X(p^e\Delta) \\ \downarrow R^{n-1} & & \downarrow \\ \mathcal{O}_X([\Delta]) = \omega_X([\Delta] - K_X) & \xrightarrow{\Phi_{X,\Delta,n}^e} & Q_{X,\Delta,n}^e \\ \downarrow \underline{p}^{n-1} & & \downarrow \\ W_n\omega_X([\Delta] - K_X) & \xrightarrow{\Phi'_{X,\Delta,n}{}^e} & Q'_{X,\Delta,n}{}^e. \end{array}$$

Recall that \underline{p}^{n-1} is the dual of the restriction R^{n-1} . Moreover, $\omega_X([\Delta] - K_X) = (\omega_X \otimes \mathcal{O}_X([\Delta] - K_X))^{**}$ and $W_e\omega_X([\Delta] - K_X) = (W_e\omega_X \otimes W_e\mathcal{O}_X([\Delta] - K_X))^{**}$.

Explicitly, $Q'_{X,\Delta,n}{}^e$ is defined via the short exact sequence

$$(3.15.2) \quad 0 \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X([\Delta]) \rightarrow W_n\omega_X([\Delta] - K_X) \oplus Q_{X,\Delta,n}^e \rightarrow Q'_{X,\Delta,n}{}^e \rightarrow 0.$$

Remark 3.16. As explained above, the equality $\mathcal{O}_X([\Delta]) = \omega_X([\Delta] - K_X)$ means the isomorphism $\iota : \mathcal{O}_X([\Delta]) \xrightarrow{\cong} \omega_X([\Delta] - K_X)$ induced by the fixed isomorphism $\iota : \mathcal{O}_X \xrightarrow{\cong} \omega_X(-K_X)$. Then the diagram (3.15.1) is a shortened version of the following diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} W_n\mathcal{O}_X(\Delta) & \xrightarrow{F^e} & F_*^e W_n\mathcal{O}_X(p^e\Delta) \\ \downarrow R^{n-1} & & \downarrow \\ \mathcal{O}_X([\Delta]) & \xrightarrow{\Phi_{X,\Delta,n}^e} & Q_{X,\Delta,n}^e \\ \simeq \downarrow \iota & & \downarrow \\ \omega_X([\Delta] - K_X) & & \\ \downarrow \underline{p}^{n-1} & & \downarrow \\ W_n\omega_X([\Delta] - K_X) & \xrightarrow{\Phi'_{X,\Delta,n}{}^e} & Q'_{X,\Delta,n}{}^e. \end{array}$$

It is easy to see that $Q'_{X,\Delta,n}{}^e$ and $\Phi'_{X,\Delta,n}{}^e$ are unique up to isomorphisms.

Remark 3.17. We use the same notations as in Definition 3.15. Since F^e is injective, $\Phi_{X,\Delta,n}^e$ is injective and we have the following exact sequences of coherent $W_n\mathcal{O}_X$ -modules,

$$0 \rightarrow W_n\omega_X([\Delta] - K_X) \xrightarrow{\Phi'_{X,\Delta,n}{}^e} Q'_{X,\Delta,n}{}^e \rightarrow B_{X,\Delta,n}^e \rightarrow 0,$$

because we have similar diagrams to (3.1.1) for $Q'_{X,\Delta,n}{}^e$ (cf. (3.15.2)).

Definition 3.18. In the situation of Setting 2.11, let Δ be a \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X . We define a $W_n\mathcal{O}_X$ -module homomorphism

$$(\Phi'_{X,\Delta,n}{}^e)^* : (Q'_{X,\Delta,n}{}^e)^* \rightarrow (W_n\omega_X([\Delta] - K_X))^*$$

by applying $(-)^* := \mathcal{H}om_{W_n\mathcal{O}_X}(-, W_n\omega_X(-K_X))$ to the $W_n\mathcal{O}_X$ -module homomorphism

$$\Phi'_{X,\Delta,n}{}^e : W_n\omega_X([\Delta] - K_X) \rightarrow Q_{X,\Delta,n}^e.$$

More explicitly, $(\Phi'_{X,\Delta,n}{}^e)^*$ can be written as follows:

$$\mathcal{H}om_{W_n\mathcal{O}_X}(Q_{X,\Delta,n}^e, W_n\omega_X(-K_X)) \xrightarrow{(\Phi'_{X,\Delta,n}{}^e)^*} \underbrace{\mathcal{H}om_{W_n\mathcal{O}_X}(W_n\omega_X([\Delta] - K_X), W_n\omega_X(-K_X))}_{\simeq W_n\mathcal{O}_X(-[\Delta])}.$$

Proposition 3.19. *In the situation of Setting 2.11, let Δ be a \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X satisfying $[\Delta] = 0$. Fix $e, n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. Then the following are equivalent.*

- (1) (X, Δ) is n -quasi- F^e -split.
- (2) There exists a $W_n\mathcal{O}_X$ -module homomorphism $\alpha : F_*^e W_n\mathcal{O}_X(p^e\Delta) \rightarrow W_n\omega_X(-K_X)$ that commutes with the following diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} W_n\mathcal{O}_X(\Delta) & \xrightarrow{F^e} & F_*^e W_n\mathcal{O}_X(p^e\Delta) \\ R^{n-1} \downarrow & & \swarrow \text{---} \alpha \text{---} \\ \mathcal{O}_X = \omega_X(-K_X) & & \\ p^{n-1} \downarrow & \swarrow \text{---} & \\ W_n\omega_X(-K_X) & & \end{array}$$

- (3) There exists a $W_n\mathcal{O}_X$ -module homomorphism $\beta : Q_{X,\Delta,n}^e \rightarrow W_n\omega_X(-K_X)$ that commutes with the following diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{O}_X = \omega_X(-K_X) & \xrightarrow{\Phi_{X,\Delta,n}^e} & Q_{X,\Delta,n}^e \\ p^{n-1} \downarrow & & \swarrow \text{---} \beta \text{---} \\ W_n\omega_X(-K_X) & & \end{array}$$

- (4) $\Phi'_{X,\Delta,n}{}^e : W_n\omega_X(-K_X) \rightarrow Q_{X,\Delta,n}^e$ splits as a $W_n\mathcal{O}_X$ -module homomorphism.
- (5) The map

$$H^0(X, (\Phi'_{X,\Delta,n}{}^e)^*) : H^0(X, (Q_{X,\Delta,n}^e)^*) \rightarrow H^0(X, (W_n\omega_X(-K_X))^*)$$

is surjective, where $(-)^* := \mathcal{H}om_{W_n\mathcal{O}_X}(-, W_n\omega_X(-K_X))$.

Note that we have $(W_n\omega_X(-K_X))^* = \mathcal{H}om_{W_n\mathcal{O}_X}(W_n\omega_X(-K_X), W_n\omega_X(-K_X)) \simeq \mathcal{H}om_{W_n\mathcal{O}_X}(W_n\omega_X, W_n\omega_X) \simeq W_n\mathcal{O}_X$.

Proof. First of all, we prove that (2) \Leftrightarrow (3) \Leftrightarrow (4) \Leftrightarrow (5). Since $Q_{X,\Delta,n}^e$ and $Q'_{X,\Delta,n}{}^e$ are the pushouts (cf. (3.15.1)), we get (2) \Leftrightarrow (3) \Leftrightarrow (4). It is clear that (4) \Rightarrow (5). It is also easy to see the opposite implication (5) \Rightarrow (4), because the surjectivity in (5) assures the existence of $\theta \in \text{Hom}_{W_n\mathcal{O}_X}(Q'_{X,\Delta,n}{}^e, W_n\omega_X(-K_X))$ satisfying $(\Phi'_{X,\Delta,n}{}^e)^*(\theta) = \text{id}$, i.e., $\theta \circ \Phi'_{X,\Delta,n}{}^e = \text{id}$. This completes the proof of (2) \Leftrightarrow (3) \Leftrightarrow (4) \Leftrightarrow (5).

It is obvious that (1) \Rightarrow (3). Let us show (3) \Rightarrow (1). Assume (3). Let $j : X \hookrightarrow W_nX$ be the induced closed immersion. Recall that the equality $\mathcal{O}_X = \omega_X(-K_X)$

in (3) means a fixed isomorphism $\iota : \mathcal{O}_X \xrightarrow{\cong} \omega_X(-K_X)$. We have the following isomorphisms:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Hom}_{W_n \mathcal{O}_X}(j_* \mathcal{O}_X, W_n \omega_X(-K_X)) &= H^0(X, \mathcal{H}om_{W_n \mathcal{O}_X}(j_* \mathcal{O}_X, W_n \omega_X(-K_X))) \\ &\stackrel{(i)}{\cong} H^0(X, \mathcal{H}om_{\mathcal{O}_X}(\mathcal{O}_X, \omega_X(-K_X))) \\ &= \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_X}(\mathcal{O}_X, \omega_X(-K_X)) \\ &\stackrel{(ii)}{\cong} H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X), \end{aligned}$$

where (i) follows from the Grothendieck duality (as both hand sides are S_2) and (ii) is given by our fixed isomorphism $\iota : \mathcal{O}_X \xrightarrow{\cong} \omega_X(-K_X)$. It follows from

$$H^0(X, W_n \mathcal{O}_X) = W_n(H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X))$$

that $\mathrm{Hom}_{W_n \mathcal{O}_X}(j_* \mathcal{O}_X, W_n \omega_X(-K_X))$ has the generator as a $H^0(X, W_n \mathcal{O}_X)$ -module which is corresponding to $1 \in H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X)$. For the trace map $\underline{p}^{n-1} : j_* \omega_X(-K_X) \rightarrow W_n \omega_X(-K_X)$ (obtained as the dual of $R^{n-1} : W_n \mathcal{O}_X \rightarrow j_* \mathcal{O}_X$), the first isomorphism (i) is given as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Hom}_{W_n \mathcal{O}_X}(j_* \mathcal{O}_X, W_n \omega_X(-K_X)) &\stackrel{\cong}{\leftarrow (i)} \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_X}(\mathcal{O}_X, \omega_X(-K_X)) \\ (j_* \mathcal{O}_X \xrightarrow{j_* \varphi} j_* \omega_X(-K_X) \xrightarrow{\underline{p}^{n-1}} W_n \omega_X(-K_X)) &\longleftarrow (\varphi : \mathcal{O}_X \rightarrow \omega_X(-K_X)). \end{aligned}$$

To summarise, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Hom}_{W_n \mathcal{O}_X}(j_* \mathcal{O}_X, W_n \omega_X(-K_X)) &\stackrel{(i)}{\cong} \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_X}(\mathcal{O}_X, \omega_X(-K_X)) \stackrel{(ii)}{\cong} H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X) \\ j_* \mathcal{O}_X \xrightarrow{\underline{p}^{n-1} \circ j_* \iota} W_n \omega_X(-K_X) &\leftrightarrow \iota : \mathcal{O}_X \xrightarrow{\cong} \omega_X(-K_X) \leftrightarrow 1. \end{aligned}$$

Pick $\beta : Q_{X, \Delta, n}^e \rightarrow W_n \omega_X(-K_X)$ as in (3). The commutativity of the diagram in (3) means that $\underline{p}^{n-1} \circ (j_* \iota) = \beta \circ \Phi_{X, \Delta, n}^e$. By

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathrm{Hom}_{W_n \mathcal{O}_X}(Q_{X, \Delta, n}^e, W_n \omega_X(-K_X)) & \xrightarrow{H^0(X, (\Phi_{X, \Delta, n}^e)^*)} & \mathrm{Hom}_{W_n \mathcal{O}_X}(j_* \mathcal{O}_X, W_n \omega_X(-K_X)) \\ \beta & \longmapsto & \beta \circ \Phi_{X, \Delta, n}^e \end{array}$$

the image of $H^0(X, (\Phi_{X, \Delta, n}^e)^*)$ contains $\underline{p}^{n-1} \circ (j_* \iota) = \beta \circ \Phi_{X, \Delta, n}^e$, which is a generator of $\mathrm{Hom}_{W_n \mathcal{O}_X}(j_* \mathcal{O}_X, W_n \omega_X(-K_X))$ as an $H^0(X, W_n \mathcal{O}_X)$ -module. Since $H^0(X, (\Phi_{X, \Delta, n}^e)^*)$ is a $H^0(X, W_n \mathcal{O}_X)$ -module homomorphism, $H^0(X, (\Phi_{X, \Delta, n}^e)^*)$ is surjective. \square

One of the advantages of the splitting definition above is that it allows for showing that sections of all line bundles are quasi- F^e -stable when X is quasi- F^e -split (Proposition 3.40). This will be a consequence of the following proposition.

Proposition 3.20. *In the situation of Setting 2.11, let Δ be an effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor with $\lfloor \Delta \rfloor = 0$. Take $e, n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ and suppose that (X, Δ) is n -quasi- F^e -split. Let D be a Weil divisor on X . Then the following induced maps are surjective:*

$$H^0(X, (\Phi_{X, \Delta+D, n}^e)^*) : H^0(X, (Q_{X, \Delta+D, n}^e)^*) \rightarrow H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(D)^*)$$

$$H^0(X, (\Phi'_{X,\Delta+D,n})^e)^* : H^0(X, (Q'_{X,\Delta+D,n})^e)^* \rightarrow H^0(X, (W_n\omega_X(-K_X+D))^e)^*,$$

where $(-)^* := \mathcal{H}om_{W_n\mathcal{O}_X}(-, W_n\omega_X(-K_X))$ and $W_n\mathcal{O}_X(D)$ denotes the Witt divisorial sheaf.

Note that $\mathcal{O}_X(D)^* \simeq \mathcal{O}_X(-D)$ and $W_n\omega_X(-K_X+D)^* \simeq W_n\mathcal{O}_X(-D)$.

Proof. We have the following pushout diagram (Definition 3.15):

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \omega_X(-K_X) & \xrightarrow{\Phi_{X,\Delta,n}^e} & Q_{X,\Delta,n}^e \\ \downarrow \underline{p}^{n-1} & & \downarrow \\ W_n\omega_X(-K_X) & \xrightarrow{\Phi'_{X,\Delta,n}^e} & Q_{X,\Delta,n}^m \end{array}$$

By applying $(-)\otimes_{W_n\mathcal{O}_X} W_n\mathcal{O}_X(D)$ and $(-)^* = \mathcal{H}om_{W_n\mathcal{O}_X}(-, W_n\omega_X(-K_X))$, we obtain the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{O}_X(-D) & \xleftarrow{(\Phi_{X,\Delta+D,n}^e)^*} & (Q_{X,\Delta+D,n}^e)^* \\ \uparrow R^{n-1} & & \uparrow \\ W_n\mathcal{O}_X(-D) & \xleftarrow{(\Phi'_{X,\Delta+D,n}^e)^*} & (Q_{X,\Delta+D,n}^m)^* \end{array}$$

Since $\Phi'_{X,\Delta,n}$ is a split injection (Proposition 3.19), $(\Phi'_{X,\Delta+D,n})^e$ is a split surjection. Therefore,

$$H^0(X, (\Phi'_{X,\Delta+D,n})^e)^* : H^0(X, (Q'_{X,\Delta+D,n})^e)^* \rightarrow H^0(X, W_n\mathcal{O}_X(-D))$$

is surjective. Note that

$$R^{n-1} : H^0(X, W_n\mathcal{O}_X(-D)) \rightarrow H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(-D))$$

is surjective, because an arbitrary element $s \in H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(-D))$ has its Teichmüller lift $\underline{s} \in H^0(X, W_n\mathcal{O}_X(-D))$, which satisfies $R^{n-1}(\underline{s}) = s$. By diagram chase, the induced map

$$H^0(X, (\Phi_{X,\Delta+D,n}^e)^* : H^0(X, (Q_{X,\Delta+D,n}^e)^* \rightarrow H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(-D))$$

is surjective. □

3.3. Finite covers.

Proposition 3.21. *In the situation of Setting 2.11, let $f : Y \rightarrow X$ be a finite surjective morphism from an integral normal excellent scheme Y such that $K(Y)/K(X)$ is a Galois extension and its extension degree $[K(Y) : K(X)]$ is not divisible by p . Let D be a \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X and set $D_Y := f^*D$. Then the induced $W_n\mathcal{O}_X$ -module homomorphism*

$$f^* : Q_{X,D,n}^e \rightarrow f_*Q_{Y,D_Y,n}^e$$

splits.

Proof. Set $G := \text{Gal}(K(Y)/K(X)) = \{\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n\}$. For every \mathbb{Q} -divisor E on X , we have a $W_n\mathcal{O}_X$ -module homomorphism

$$\pi_E : f_*W_n\mathcal{O}_Y(f^*E) \rightarrow W_n\mathcal{O}_X(E), \quad \alpha \mapsto \frac{1}{|G|} \sum_{\sigma \in G} \sigma^* \alpha.$$

We then obtain the following diagram in which each horizontal sequence is exact:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & f_*F_*W_{n-1}\mathcal{O}_Y(pD_Y) & \xrightarrow{VF^e} & f_*F_*^eW_n\mathcal{O}_Y(p^eD_Y) & \longrightarrow & f_*Q_{Y,D_Y,n}^e \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow \pi_D & & \downarrow F_*^e\pi_{p^eD} & & \downarrow \bar{\pi} \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & F_*W_{n-1}\mathcal{O}_X(pD) & \xrightarrow{VF^e} & F_*^eW_n\mathcal{O}_X(p^eD) & \longrightarrow & Q_{X,D,n}^e \longrightarrow 0 \end{array}$$

Indeed, the left square in the above diagram is commutative by the following commutative diagram, and $\bar{\pi}$ is induced from the other vertical arrows

$$\begin{array}{ccc} F_*W_{n-1}\mathcal{O}_Y(pD_Y) & \xrightarrow{VF^e} & F_*^eW_n\mathcal{O}_Y(p^eD_Y) \\ \downarrow \sigma^* & & \downarrow \sigma^* \\ F_*W_{n-1}\mathcal{O}_X(pD) & \xrightarrow{VF^e} & F_*^eW_n\mathcal{O}_X(p^eD). \end{array}$$

Note that we have $F_*^e\pi_{p^eD} \circ f^* = \text{id}$. By diagram chase, we have that $\bar{\pi} \circ f^* = \text{id}$, and hence $f^* : Q_{X,D,n}^e \rightarrow f_*Q_{Y,D_Y,n}^e$ splits. \square

Proposition 3.22. *In the situation of Setting 2.12, let $f : Y \rightarrow X$ be a finite surjective morphism from an integral normal excellent scheme Y . Let Δ_X and Δ_Y be effective \mathbb{Q} -divisors on X and Y such that $\lfloor \Delta_X \rfloor = 0, \lfloor \Delta_Y \rfloor = 0$, and $K_Y + \Delta_Y \sim f^*(K_X + \Delta_X)$.*

- (1) *Assume that $f^* : H_m^d(X, \mathcal{O}_X(K_X + \Delta_X)) \rightarrow H_m^d(Y, \mathcal{O}_Y(K_Y + \Delta_Y))$ is injective. If (Y, Δ_Y) is n -quasi- F^e -split, then so is (X, Δ_X) . In particular, $h^e(X, \Delta_X) \leq h^e(Y, \Delta_Y)$.*
- (2) *Assume that $K(Y)/K(X)$ is a Galois extension, its extension degree $[K(Y) : K(X)]$ is not divisible by p , and $f^* : H_m^d(X, \mathcal{O}_X(K_X + \Delta_X)) \rightarrow H_m^d(Y, \mathcal{O}_Y(K_Y + \Delta_Y))$ is bijective. Then (X, Δ_X) is n -quasi- F^e -split if and only if so is (Y, Δ_Y) . In particular, $h^e(X, \Delta_X) = h^e(Y, \Delta_Y)$.*

Proof. We have the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} f_*W_n\mathcal{O}_Y(K_Y + \Delta_Y) & \xrightarrow{F^e} & f_*F_*^eW_n\mathcal{O}_X(p^e(K_Y + \Delta_Y)) \\ \uparrow f^* & & \uparrow f^* \\ W_n\mathcal{O}_X(K_X + \Delta_X) & \xrightarrow{F^e} & F_*^eW_n\mathcal{O}_X(p^e(K_X + \Delta_X)). \end{array}$$

Taking the pushouts and $H_m^d(Y, -)$, we obtain the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} H_m^d(Y, \mathcal{O}_Y(K_Y + \Delta_Y)) & \xrightarrow{H_m^d(Y, \Phi_{Y, K_Y + \Delta_Y, n}^e)} & H_m^d(Y, Q_{Y, K_Y + \Delta_Y, n}^e) \\ \uparrow f^* =: \alpha & & \uparrow f^* =: \beta \\ H_m^d(X, \mathcal{O}_X(K_X + \Delta_X)) & \xrightarrow{H_m^d(X, \Phi_{X, K_X + \Delta_X, n}^e)} & H_m^d(X, Q_{X, K_X + \Delta_X, n}^e). \end{array}$$

Let us show (1). Assume that (Y, Δ_Y) is n -quasi- F^e -split, i.e., $H_m^d(Y, \Phi_{Y, K_Y + \Delta_Y, n}^e)$ is injective (Lemma 3.10). Since α is injective, so is $H_m^d(X, \Phi_{X, K_X + \Delta_X, n}^e)$ by diagram chase. Then (X, Δ_X) is n -quasi- F^e -split (Lemma 3.10). Thus (1) holds.

The assertion (2) follows from a similar argument by using the fact that β is an injection (Proposition 3.21). \square

Corollary 3.23. *Let k be an algebraically closed field of characteristic $p > 0$ and let $f : Y \rightarrow X$ be a finite surjective morphism of projective normal varieties over k . Let Δ_X and Δ_Y be effective \mathbb{Q} -divisors on X and Y such that $\lfloor \Delta_X \rfloor = 0$, $\lfloor \Delta_Y \rfloor = 0$, and $K_Y + \Delta_Y \sim f^*(K_X + \Delta_X)$. Assume that $K(Y)/K(X)$ is a Galois extension and its extension degree $[K(Y) : K(X)]$ is not divisible by p . Then (X, Δ_X) is n -quasi- F^e -split if and only if so is (Y, Δ_Y) . In particular, $h^e(X, \Delta_X) = h^e(Y, \Delta_Y)$.*

Proof. Set $d := \dim X = \dim Y$. Since $H^d(X, \mathcal{O}_X(K_X + \Delta_X)) \rightarrow H^d(Y, \mathcal{O}_Y(K_Y + \Delta_Y))$ is an isomorphism, the assertion follows from Proposition 3.22(2). \square

Proposition 3.24. *Let $f : Y \rightarrow X$ be an étale morphism of normal varieties over a perfect field of characteristic $p > 0$. Take an effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor Δ_X on X such that $\lfloor \Delta_X \rfloor = 0$ and set $\Delta_Y := f^*\Delta_X$. If (X, Δ_X) is n -quasi- F^e -split, then so is (Y, Δ_Y) . In particular, $h^e(Y, \Delta_Y) \leq h^e(X, \Delta_X)$.*

Proof. By removing the singular locus of X , we may assume that X and Y are smooth (Remark 3.7). Since (X, Δ_X) is n -quasi- F^e -split, there exists a $W_n\mathcal{O}_X$ -module homomorphism α which completes the following commutative diagram (Proposition 3.19(2)):

$$\begin{array}{ccc} W_n\mathcal{O}_X(\Delta) & \xrightarrow{F^e} & F_*^e W_n\mathcal{O}_X(p^e\Delta) \\ \downarrow R^{n-1} & & \swarrow \exists \alpha \\ \mathcal{O}_X = \omega_X(-K_X) & & \\ \downarrow \underline{p}^{n-1} & & \swarrow \\ W_n\omega_X(-K_X) & & \end{array}$$

Recall that we have the induced étale morphism $W_n f : W_n Y \rightarrow W_n X$ [Ill79, Ch. 0, Proposition 1.5.8]. By applying $(W_n f)^*$ to the above diagram, we see that (Y, Δ_Y) is n -quasi- F^e -split. Indeed, for every $d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, we have

$$(W_n f)^*(F_*^d W_n\mathcal{O}_X(p^d\Delta)) \stackrel{(i)}{\simeq} F_*^d (W_n f)^*(W_n\mathcal{O}_X(p^d\Delta)) \stackrel{(ii)}{\simeq} F_*^d W_n\mathcal{O}_Y(p^d f^*\Delta)$$

and

$$(W_n f)^*(W_n \omega_X(-K_X)) = (W_n f)^*(W_n \omega_X \otimes W_n \mathcal{O}_X(-K_X)) \stackrel{(iii)}{\simeq} W_n \omega_Y \otimes W_n \mathcal{O}_Y(-K_Y),$$

where

- (i) holds by [Ill79, Ch. 0, Proposition 1.5.8],
- (ii) follows from [Tan22, Lemma 4.6], and
- (iii) is obtained by $(W_n f)^*(W_n \Omega_Y^N) \simeq W_n \Omega_X^N$ [Ill79, Ch. I, Proposition 1.14] and $(W_n f)^*(W_n \mathcal{O}_X(-K_X)) = W_n \mathcal{O}_Y(-K_Y)$ [Tan22, Lemma 4.6]. \square

Proposition 3.25. *Let $k \subset k'$ be an algebraic separable field extension between perfect fields of characteristic $p > 0$. Take a normal variety X over k such that $X \times_k k'$ is integral. Let Δ be an effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X with $[\Delta] = 0$. Assume that X is projective over an affine variety V over k . Then (X, Δ) is n -quasi- F^e -split if and only if $(X \times_k k', \Delta \times_k k')$ is n -quasi- F^e -split, where $\Delta \times_k k'$ denotes the pullback of Δ to $X \times_k k'$. In particular, $h^e(X, \Delta) = h^e(X \times_k k', \Delta \times_k k')$.*

Proof. Set $R := \Gamma(V, \mathcal{O}_V)$. Then all the conditions in Setting 2.12 hold (Remark 2.14). Since $k \subset k'$ can be written as a direct limit of finite separable extension, the problem is reduced to the case when $k \subset k'$ is a finite separable extension. In particular, $X \times_k k' \rightarrow X$ is étale. If (X, Δ) is n -quasi- F^e -split, then so is $(X \times_k k', \Delta \times_k k')$ by Proposition 3.24. In order to prove the opposite implication, it is enough to show that

$$f^* : H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(X, \mathcal{O}_X(K_X)) \rightarrow H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(X \times_k k', \mathcal{O}_{X \times_k k'}(K_{X \times_k k'}))$$

is injective (Proposition 3.22(1)), where we used that $\mathcal{O}_X(K_X + \Delta) = \mathcal{O}_X(K_X)$ and $\mathcal{O}_{X \times_k k'}(K_{X \times_k k'} + \Delta \times_k k') = \mathcal{O}_{X \times_k k'}(K_{X \times_k k'})$. Since $k \hookrightarrow k'$ is a split injection, so are $f^* : \mathcal{O}_X \rightarrow f_* \mathcal{O}_{X \times_k k'}$ and $f^* : \mathcal{O}_X(K_X) \rightarrow f_* \mathcal{O}_{X \times_k k'}(K_{X \times_k k'})$. \square

3.4. Quasi- F^e -splitting criterion via Cartier operator. We refer to [KTT⁺a, Subsection 5.2] for the discussion on the Cartier operator for projective schemes over domains essentially of finite type.

Lemma 3.26. *Let (R, \mathfrak{m}) be a local domain essentially of finite type over a perfect field of characteristic $p > 0$. Let (X, Δ) be a d -dimensional log pair which is projective over R , where $[\Delta] = 0$. Let $f : Y \rightarrow X$ be a log resolution of (X, Δ) and let B_Y be a \mathbb{Q} -divisor such that $[B_Y] \leq 0$, $-(K_Y + B_Y)$ is ample, and $f_* B_Y = \Delta$. Set $E := \text{Supp}(B_Y)$. Take $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ and suppose that (*) holds.*

$$(*) \quad H_{\mathfrak{m}}^{d-1}(Y, B_{Y, p^c(K_Y + B_Y), n}) = 0 \text{ for every } 0 \leq c \leq e - 1.$$

Then (X, Δ) is n -quasi- F^e -split.

Proof. Write $K_Y + \Delta_Y = f^*(K_X + \Delta)$. Since $-(K_Y + B_Y)$ is ample and $f_* B_Y = \Delta$, the negativity lemma implies that $K_Y + B_Y \geq K_Y + \Delta_Y$, and so $f_* \mathcal{O}_Y(K_Y + B_Y) = \mathcal{O}_X(K_X + \Delta)$. Moreover, we obtain a natural map $f^* : Q_{X, K_X + \Delta, n}^e \rightarrow f_* Q_{Y, K_Y + B_Y, n}^e$

featured inside the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} H_m^d(X, \mathcal{O}_X(K_X + \Delta)) & \xrightarrow{H_m^d(\Phi_{X, K_X + \Delta, n}^e)} & H_m^d(X, Q_{X, K_X + \Delta, n}^e) \\ \parallel & & \downarrow f^* \\ H_m^d(Y, \mathcal{O}_Y(K_Y + B_Y)) & \xrightarrow{H_m^d(\Phi_{Y, K_Y + B_Y, n}^e)} & H_m^d(Y, Q_{Y, K_Y + B_Y, n}^e). \end{array}$$

Note that the injectivity of the upper horizontal arrow is equivalent to (X, Δ) being n -quasi- F -split by Lemma 3.10. Thus, to prove the theorem, it is enough to show that the lower horizontal arrow

$$(3.26.1) \quad H_m^d(\Phi_{Y, K_Y + B_Y, n}^e) : H_m^d(Y, \mathcal{O}_Y(K_Y + B_Y)) \rightarrow H_m^d(Q_{Y, K_Y + B_Y, n}^e) \text{ is injective.}$$

By the exact sequence $0 \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_Y(K_Y + B_Y) \rightarrow Q_{Y, K_Y + B_Y, n}^e \rightarrow B_{Y, K_Y + B_Y, n}^e \rightarrow 0$ (3.1.1), it suffices to prove that $H_m^{d-1}(Y, B_{Y, K_Y + B_Y, n}^e) = 0$. By the following exact sequence (3.14.1):

$$0 \rightarrow B_{Y, K_Y + B_Y, n}^{e-1} \rightarrow B_{Y, K_Y + B_Y, n}^e \rightarrow F_*^{e-1} B_{Y, p^{e-1}(K_Y + B_Y), n} \rightarrow 0,$$

$H_m^{d-1}(B_{Y, K_Y + B_Y, n}^e) = 0$ holds by (*). \square

Theorem 3.27. *Let (R, \mathfrak{m}) be a local domain essentially of finite type over a perfect field of characteristic $p > 0$. Let (X, Δ) be a d -dimensional log pair which is projective over R , where $[\Delta] = 0$. Let $f: Y \rightarrow X$ be a log resolution of (X, Δ) and let B_Y be a \mathbb{Q} -divisor such that $\lfloor B_Y \rfloor \leq 0$, $-(K_Y + B_Y)$ is ample, and $f_* B_Y = \Delta$. Set $E := \text{Supp } B_Y$. Take $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ and suppose that*

- (1) $H_m^{d-2}(Y, \Omega_Y^1(\log E)(p^c(K_Y + B_Y))) = 0$ for every $0 \leq c \leq e - 1$,
- (2) $H_m^{d-2}(Y, B_1 \Omega_Y^2(\log E)(p^k(K_Y + B_Y))) = 0$ for every $k \geq 1$, and
- (3) $H^1(Y, \Omega_Y^1(\log E)^* \otimes \mathcal{O}_Y(K_Y - p^{n+c}(K_Y + B_Y))) = 0$ for every $0 \leq c \leq e - 1$, where $\Omega_Y^1(\log E)^* := \mathcal{H}om_{\mathcal{O}_Y}(\Omega_Y^1(\log E), \mathcal{O}_Y)$.

Then (X, Δ) is n -quasi- F^e -split.

We refer to Notation 2.8 for the definition of $H_m^i(Y, -)$. Also, to avoid confusion, we emphasise that

$$B_1 \Omega_Y^2(\log E)(p^k(K_Y + B_Y)) \simeq B_1(\Omega_Y^2(\log E)(p^k B_Y)) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_Y} \mathcal{O}_Y(p^{k-1} K_Y).$$

Last, we point out that assumption (3) is valid by Serre duality as long as $n \gg 0$.

Proof. By Lemma 3.26, it is enough to show that the condition (*) holds.

$$(*) \quad H_m^{d-1}(Y, B_{Y, p^c(K_Y + B_Y), n}) = 0 \text{ for every } 0 \leq c \leq e - 1.$$

Fix an integer c satisfying $0 \leq c \leq e - 1$. Recall that ([KTT⁺a, Lemma 5.9]):

$$B_{Y, p^c(K_Y + B_Y), n} \simeq B_{Y, p^c B_Y, n} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_Y} \mathcal{O}_Y(p^c K_Y) \simeq B_n \Omega_Y^1(\log E)(p^{n+c} B_Y) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_Y} \mathcal{O}_Y(p^c K_Y).$$

Now we use the following exact sequence [KTT⁺a, (5.7.1)]:

$$0 \rightarrow B_n \Omega_Y^1(\log E)(p^{n+c} B_Y) \rightarrow Z_n \Omega_Y^1(\log E)(p^{n+c} B_Y) \xrightarrow{C_{p^c B_Y}^n} \Omega_Y^1(\log E)(p^c B_Y) \rightarrow 0,$$

By tensoring by $\mathcal{O}_Y(p^c K_Y)$, the problem is reduced to showing that

- $H_{\mathfrak{m}}^{d-1}(Y, Z_n \Omega_Y^1(\log E)(p^{n+c} B_Y) \otimes \mathcal{O}_Y(p^c K_Y)) = 0$, and
- $H_{\mathfrak{m}}^{d-2}(Y, \Omega_Y^1(\log E)(p^c B_Y) \otimes \mathcal{O}_Y(p^c K_Y)) = 0$.

The latter assertion is nothing but our Assumption (1). Thus it is sufficient to prove the former assertion.

Now we use the short exact sequence [KTT⁺a, Lemma 5.8]:

$$0 \rightarrow F_*^k Z_{n-k} \Omega_Y^1(\log E)(p^{n+c} B_Y) \rightarrow F_*^{k+1} Z_{n-k-1} \Omega_Y^1(\log E)(p^{n+c} B_Y) \rightarrow F_*^k B_1 \Omega_Y^2(\log E)(p^{k+1+c} B_Y) \rightarrow 0$$

By tensoring by $\mathcal{O}_Y(p^c K_Y)$ and repeatedly applying Assumption (2), we get the following injections

$$\begin{aligned} H_{\mathfrak{m}}^{d-1}(Y, Z_n \Omega_Y^1(\log E)(p^{n+c} B_Y) \otimes \mathcal{O}_Y(p^c K_Y)) &\hookrightarrow H_{\mathfrak{m}}^{d-1}(Y, F_* Z_{n-1} \Omega_Y^1(\log E)(p^{n+c} B_Y) \otimes \mathcal{O}_Y(p^c K_Y)) \\ &\hookrightarrow \dots \\ &\hookrightarrow H_{\mathfrak{m}}^{d-1}(Y, F_*^n \Omega_Y^1(\log E)(p^{n+c} B_Y) \otimes \mathcal{O}_Y(p^c K_Y)). \end{aligned}$$

Hence it suffices to show that

$$H_{\mathfrak{m}}^{d-1}(Y, F_*^n \Omega_Y^1(\log E)(p^{n+c} B_Y) \otimes \mathcal{O}_Y(p^c K_Y)) = H_{\mathfrak{m}}^{d-1}(Y, \Omega_Y^1(\log E)(p^{n+c}(K_Y + B_Y)))$$

is zero. By Matlis duality (Proposition 2.7) and exactness of the derived \mathfrak{m} -completion in our setting ([Sta14, Tag 0A06]), it is enough to verify that

$$\begin{aligned} &H^{-d+1} R \operatorname{Hom}(R \pi_* \Omega_Y^1(\log E)(p^{n+c}(K_Y + B_Y)), \omega_R^\bullet) \\ &= H^1 R \operatorname{Hom}(\Omega_Y^1(\log E)(p^{n+c}(K_Y + B_Y)), \omega_Y) \\ &= H^1(Y, \Omega_Y^1(\log E)^* \otimes \mathcal{O}_Y(K_Y - p^{n+c}(K_Y + B_Y))) \end{aligned}$$

is equal to zero, where $\pi: Y \rightarrow \operatorname{Spec} R$ is the natural projection. This is nothing but Assumption (3). \square

3.5. Definition of pure quasi- F^e -splitting. Throughout this subsection, we work under the assumptions of Setting 3.28.

Setting 3.28 (general case, with boundary). Let X be a d -dimensional integral normal Noetherian F -finite \mathbb{F}_p -scheme such that $W_n X$ is an excellent scheme admitting a dualising complex $W_n \omega_X^\bullet$ for every $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. We fix a Weil divisor S on X which either is a prime divisor or is equal to zero.

Setting 3.29 (projective case, with boundary). Let R be an F -finite Noetherian domain of characteristic $p > 0$ such that $W_n R$ is an excellent ring admitting a dualising complex for every $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. Let X be a d -dimensional integral normal scheme which is projective over $\operatorname{Spec} R$. We fix a Weil divisor S on X which is either a prime divisor or is equal to zero.

We denote the ideal sheaf of S by \mathcal{I}_S . We remind the reader that $W_n \mathcal{I}_S$ and $W_n \mathcal{O}_X(-S)$ are *not* equal in general. Let Δ be a (non-necessarily effective) \mathbb{Q} -divisor

on X . We define a coherent $W_n\mathcal{O}_X$ -module $Q_{X,\Delta,n}^S$ and a $W_n\mathcal{O}_X$ -module homomorphism $\Phi_{X,\Delta,n}^S$ by the following pushout diagram of $W_n\mathcal{O}_X$ -modules:

$$(3.29.1) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} W_n\mathcal{I}_S(\Delta) & \xrightarrow{F^e} & F_*^e W_n\mathcal{I}_S(p^e\Delta) \\ \downarrow R^{n-1} & & \downarrow \\ \mathcal{I}_S(\Delta) & \xrightarrow{\Phi_{X,\Delta,n}^{S,e}} & Q_{X,\Delta,n}^{S,e} \end{array} \quad \lrcorner$$

We remind the reader that $\mathcal{I}_S(\Delta) = \mathcal{O}_X(\Delta - S)$.

Remark 3.30. In our applications, we are mainly interested in the case when $\Delta = S+B$ for a prime divisor S and a \mathbb{Q} -divisor B such that $S \not\subseteq \text{Supp } B$ and $\lfloor B \rfloor = 0$. Under these assumptions, $B \geq 0$ and $\mathcal{I}_S(\Delta) = \mathcal{O}_X$.

We define a coherent $W_n\mathcal{O}_X$ -module $B_{X,\Delta,n}^{S,e}$ by

$$\begin{aligned} B_{X,\Delta,n}^{S,e} &:= \text{Coker}(W_n\mathcal{I}_S(\Delta) \xrightarrow{F^e} F_*^e W_n\mathcal{I}_S(p^e\Delta)) \\ &= F_*^e W_n\mathcal{I}_S(p^e\Delta) / F^e(W_n\mathcal{I}_S(\Delta)). \end{aligned}$$

Remark 3.31. The key properties of the construction of $Q_{X,\Delta,n}^{S,e}$, $B_{X,\Delta,n}^{S,e}$, and $\Phi_{X,\Delta,n}^{S,e}$ may be encapsulated by the following diagram

$$(3.31.1) \quad \begin{array}{ccccccc} & & 0 & & 0 & & \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\ & & F_* W_{n-1}\mathcal{I}_S(p\Delta) & = & F_* W_{n-1}\mathcal{I}_S(p\Delta) & & \\ & & \downarrow V & & \downarrow F^e V = V F^e & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & W_n\mathcal{I}_S(\Delta) & \xrightarrow{F^e} & F_*^e W_n\mathcal{I}_S(p^e\Delta) & \longrightarrow & B_{X,\Delta,n}^{S,e} \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow R^{n-1} & & \downarrow & & \parallel \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{I}_S(\Delta) & \xrightarrow{\Phi_{X,\Delta,n}^{S,e}} & Q_{X,\Delta,n}^{S,e} & \longrightarrow & B_{X,\Delta,n}^{S,e} \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\ & & 0 & & 0 & & \end{array}$$

All the horizontal and vertical sequences are exact, as $F^e: W_n\mathcal{I}_S(\Delta) \rightarrow F_*^e W_n\mathcal{I}_S(p^e\Delta)$ is injective, $R^{n-1}: W_n\mathcal{I}_S(\Delta) \rightarrow \mathcal{I}_S(\Delta)$ is surjective, and (3.29.1) is a pushout diagram.

In what follows, we apply exactly the same arguments as in Subsection 3.1 and Subsection 3.2, and hence we omit proofs.

Lemma 3.32. *In the situation of Setting 3.28, let Δ be a \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X . Then we have the following exact sequences*

$$(3.32.1) \quad 0 \rightarrow B_{X,\Delta,n}^{S,e} \rightarrow B_{X,\Delta,n}^{S,e+r} \rightarrow F_*^e B_{X,p^e\Delta,n}^{S,r} \rightarrow 0$$

$$(3.32.2) \quad 0 \rightarrow F_*^n B_{X,p^s\Delta,s}^{S,e} \rightarrow B_{X,\Delta,n+s}^{S,e} \rightarrow B_{X,\Delta,n}^{S,e} \rightarrow 0$$

for all $e, n, r, s \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$.

For a Cartier divisor D , the following holds:

$$(3.32.3) \quad Q_{X,\Delta+D,n}^{S,e} \simeq Q_{X,\Delta,n}^{S,e} \otimes_{W_n \mathcal{O}_X} W_n \mathcal{O}_X(D).$$

Definition 3.33. In the situation of Setting 3.28, let Δ be a \mathbb{Q} -divisor. We define $(\Phi_{X,\Delta,n}^{S,e})^* : (Q_{X,\Delta,n}^{S,e})^* \rightarrow \mathcal{I}_S(\Delta)^*$ by applying $(-)^* := \mathcal{H}om_{W_n \mathcal{O}_X}(-, W_n \omega_X(-K_X))$ to the $W_n \mathcal{O}_X$ -module homomorphism $\Phi_{X,\Delta,n}^{S,e} : \mathcal{I}_S(\Delta) \rightarrow Q_{X,\Delta,n}^{S,e}$:

$$(\Phi_{X,\Delta,n}^{S,e})^* : \mathcal{H}om_{W_n \mathcal{O}_X}(Q_{X,\Delta,n}^{S,e}, W_n \omega_X(-K_X)) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}om_{W_n \mathcal{O}_X}(\mathcal{I}_S(\Delta), W_n \omega_X(-K_X)).$$

Note that $\mathcal{I}_S(\Delta) = \mathcal{O}_X(-S + \Delta)$ and $\mathcal{I}_S(\Delta)^* = \mathcal{H}om_{W_n \mathcal{O}_X}(\mathcal{I}_S(\Delta), W_n \omega_X(-K_X)) \simeq \mathcal{O}_X([S - \Delta])$.

Definition 3.34. In the situation of Setting 3.28, let B be a \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X such that $S \not\subseteq \text{Supp } B$ and $[B] = 0$. Set $\Delta := S + B$ and take $n, e \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. We say that $(X, S + B)$ is *purely n -quasi- F^e -split (along S)* if the induced map

$$(\Phi_{X,\Delta,n}^{S,e})^* : H^0(X, (Q_{X,\Delta,n}^{S,e})^*) \rightarrow H^0(X, \mathcal{I}_S(\Delta)^*) = H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X)$$

is surjective. Note that we have

$$\mathcal{I}_S(\Delta)^* = \mathcal{H}om_{W_n \mathcal{O}_X}(\mathcal{I}_S(S+B), W_n \omega_X(-K_X)) = \mathcal{H}om_{W_n \mathcal{O}_X}(\mathcal{O}_X, W_n \omega_X(-K_X)) \simeq \mathcal{O}_X.$$

We call (X, Δ) *purely quasi- F^e -split* if it is purely n -quasi- F^e -split for some $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. We say that (X, Δ) is *purely n -quasi- F^e -pure* (resp. *purely quasi- F^e -pure*) if there exists an open cover $X = \bigcup_{i \in I} X_i$ such that $(X_i, \Delta|_{X_i})$ is n -quasi- F^e -split (resp. quasi- F^e -split) for every $i \in I$.

Lemma 3.35. *In the situation of Setting 3.29, let B be a \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X such that $S \not\subseteq \text{Supp } B$ and $[B] = 0$. Assume that R is a local ring with maximal ideal \mathfrak{m} . Fix $e, n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. Then $(X, S + B)$ is purely n -quasi- F^e -split if and only if the following map is injective:*

$$H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(X, \Phi_{X, K_X + S + B, n}^{S,e}) : H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(X, \mathcal{I}_S(K_X + S + B)) \rightarrow H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(X, Q_{X, K_X + S + B, n}^{S,e}).$$

Lemma 3.36. *In the situation of Setting 3.28, let Δ be a \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X . Take $e, n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. Then we have the following exact sequences of coherent \mathcal{O}_X -modules:*

$$(3.36.1) \quad 0 \rightarrow F_* B_{X,p\Delta,n}^{S,e} \rightarrow Q_{X,\Delta,n+1}^{S,e} \rightarrow F_* \mathcal{I}_S(p^e \Delta) \rightarrow 0.$$

Proposition 3.37. *In the situation of Setting 3.28, let Δ be a \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X . Then $B_{X,\Delta,n}^{S,e}$ and $Q_{X,\Delta,n}^{S,e}$ are naturally coherent $W_e \mathcal{O}_X$ -modules.*

3.6. Quasi- F^e -stable sections $q^e S_n^0(X, \Delta; L)$ and $q^e S_{\text{adj},n}^0(X, \Delta; L)$.

In this subsection, we introduce a submodule (subspace)

$$q^e S_n^0(X, \Delta; L) \subseteq H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X([L - \Delta])), \text{ and its adjoint variant} \\ q^e S_{n,\text{adj}}^0(X, \Delta; L) \subseteq H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X([L - \Delta])).$$

Definition 3.38. In the situation of Setting 2.11, let L and Δ be \mathbb{Q} -divisors on X . Recall that we have $W_e\mathcal{O}_X$ -module homomorphisms

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi_{X,\Delta-L,n}^e &: \mathcal{O}_X(\Delta - L) \longrightarrow Q_{X,\Delta-L,n}^e \\ (\Phi_{X,\Delta-L,n}^e)^* &: (Q_{X,\Delta-L,n}^e)^* \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_X(\Delta - L)^* = \mathcal{O}_X(\lceil L - \Delta \rceil),\end{aligned}$$

where the lower one $(\Phi_{X,\Delta-L,n}^e)^*$ is obtained by applying $(-)^* = \mathcal{H}om_{W_n\mathcal{O}_X}(-, W_n\omega_X(-K_X))$ to the upper one $\Phi_{X,\Delta-L,n}^e$. We define $q^e S_n^0(X, \Delta; L)$ by

$$q^e S_n^0(X, \Delta; L) := \text{Im} \left(H^0(X, (Q_{X,\Delta-L,n}^e)^*) \xrightarrow{H^0(X, (\Phi_{X,\Delta-L,n}^e)^*)} H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(\lceil L - \Delta \rceil)) \right).$$

When $\lfloor \Delta \rfloor = 0$ and L is a Weil divisor, we have

$$q^e S_n^0(X, \Delta; L) \subseteq H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(\lceil L - \Delta \rceil)) = H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(L)).$$

However, we do need to consider the most general case of the above definition as non-integral L and non-effective Δ come up naturally in the context of pullbacks and restrictions of Weil divisors.

Lemma 3.39. *Under the same notation as in Definition 3.38, suppose that $(W, X + B_W)$ is a plt pair, $K_X + \Delta = (K_W + X + B_W)|_X$, and $L = L_W|_X$ for a Weil divisor L_W on W . Then $\lfloor \Delta \rfloor = 0$ and $\Delta \geq \{L\}$. In particular, $\lceil L - \Delta \rceil = \lfloor L \rfloor$ and*

$$q^e S_n^0(X, \Delta; L) = q^e S_n^0(X, \Delta - \{L\}; \lfloor L \rfloor) \subseteq H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(\lfloor L \rfloor)).$$

Proof. See [KTT⁺a, Lemma 3.35]. □

Proposition 3.40. *In the situation of Setting 2.11, let L and Δ be \mathbb{Q} -divisors on X . Suppose that $(X, \{\Delta - L\})$ is n -quasi- F^e -split. Then*

$$q^e S_n^0(X, \Delta; L) = H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(\lceil L - \Delta \rceil)).$$

Proof. Since $(X, \{\Delta - L\})$ is n -quasi- F -split, the following map is surjective by Proposition 3.20:

$$H^0(X, (Q_{X,\Delta-L,n}^e)^*) \xrightarrow{H^0(X, (\Phi_{X,\Delta-L,n}^e)^*)} H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(\lfloor \Delta - L \rfloor)^*) = H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(\lceil L - \Delta \rceil)).$$

Then the required equality follows from Definition 3.38. □

Analogously, we make an adjoint definition.

Definition 3.41. In the situation of Setting 3.28, let L and B be \mathbb{Q} -divisors on X . Recall that we have $W_n\mathcal{O}_X$ -module homomorphisms

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi_{X,S+B-L,n}^{S,e} &: \mathcal{I}_S(S + B - L) \rightarrow Q_{X,S+B-L,n}^{S,e} \\ (\Phi_{X,S+B-L,n}^{S,e})^* &: (Q_{X,S+B-L,n}^{S,e})^* \rightarrow \mathcal{I}_S(S + B - L)^* = \mathcal{O}_X(\lceil L - B \rceil),\end{aligned}$$

where the lower one $(\Phi_{X,S+B-L,n}^{S,e})^*$ is obtained by applying $(-)^* = \mathcal{H}om_{W_n\mathcal{O}_X}(-, W_n\omega_X(-K_X))$ to the upper one $\Phi_{X,S+B-L,n}^{S,e}$. We define $q^e S_{n,\text{adj}}^0(X, S + B; L)$ by

$$q^e S_{n,\text{adj}}^0(X, S + B; L) := \text{Im} \left(H^0(X, (Q_{X,S+B-L,n}^{S,e})^*) \xrightarrow{H^0(X, (\Phi_{X,S+B-L,n}^{S,e})^*)} H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(\lceil L - B \rceil)) \right).$$

Lemma 3.42. *In the situation of Setting 3.28, let B be a \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X such that $S \not\subseteq \text{Supp } B$ and $[B] = 0$. Let L be a Weil divisor on X . Then the following inclusions hold for every rational number $0 \leq t < 1$:*

$$q^e S_{n,\text{adj}}^0(X, S+B; L) \subseteq q^e S_n^0(X, tS+B; L) \subseteq H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(L)).$$

Proof. We have the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} W_n \mathcal{O}_X(tS+B-L) & \xrightarrow{F_1^e} & F_*^e W_n \mathcal{O}_X(p^e(tS+B-L)) \\ \downarrow i & & \downarrow j \\ W_n \mathcal{I}_S(S+B-L) & \xrightarrow{F_2^e} & F_*^e W_n \mathcal{I}_S(p^e(S+B-L)) \\ \downarrow R^{n-1} & & \\ \mathcal{O}_X(tS+B-L) & = & \mathcal{I}_S(S+B-L), \end{array}$$

where i and j are the natural inclusions, and F_1^e and F_2^e denote the e -th iterated Frobenii. Since $Q_{X,tS+B-L,n}^e$ and $Q_{X,S+B-L,n}^{S,e}$ are the pushouts of $(F_1^e, R^{n-1} \circ i)$ and (F_2^e, R^{n-1}) respectively, we get a map $Q_{X,tS+B-L,n}^e \rightarrow Q_{X,S+B-L,n}^{S,e}$ sitting inside the following diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \mathcal{O}_X(-L) & \xrightarrow{\Phi_{X,tS+B-L,n}^e} & Q_{X,tS+B-L,n}^e & \longrightarrow & Q_{X,S+B-L,n}^{S,e} \\ & \searrow & & \nearrow & \\ & & \Phi_{X,S+B-L,n}^{S,e} & & \end{array}$$

Now, by applying $H^0(X, (-)^*) = \text{Hom}_{W_n \mathcal{O}_X}(-, W_n \omega_X(-K_X))$, we get a factorisation of $H^0(X, (\Phi_{X,S+B-L,n}^{S,e})^*)$ as follows:

$$H^0(X, (Q_{X,S+B-L,n}^{S,e})^*) \rightarrow H^0(X, (Q_{X,tS+B-L,n}^e)^*) \xrightarrow{H^0(X, (\Phi_{X,tS+B-L,n}^e)^*)} H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(L)),$$

which immediately implies the statement of the lemma. \square

Finally, we state a reformulation of quasi- F -stable sections via local cohomology.

Proposition 3.43. *Fix $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ and $e \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. In the situation of Setting 2.12, assume that (R, \mathfrak{m}) is a local ring. Take \mathbb{Q} -divisors L and Δ on X . Then*

$$q^e S_n^0(X, \Delta; L)^\wedge \simeq \text{Im} \left(H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(X, \mathcal{O}_X(\lfloor K_X + \Delta - L \rfloor)) \rightarrow H_{W_n \mathfrak{m}}^d(X, Q_{X, K_X + \Delta - L, n}^e) \right)^\vee,$$

where $(-)^\wedge$ denotes \mathfrak{m} -completion, and $(-)^\vee$ denotes Matlis duality.

Similarly, in the situation of Setting 3.29, assume that (R, \mathfrak{m}) is a local ring. Take \mathbb{Q} -divisors L and Δ on X . Then

$$q^e S_{n,\text{adj}}^0(X, S+B; L)^\wedge \simeq \text{Im} \left(H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(X, \mathcal{O}_X(\lfloor K_X + S + B - L \rfloor)) \rightarrow H_{W_n \mathfrak{m}}^d(X, Q_{X, K_X + S + B - L, n}^{S,e}) \right)^\vee.$$

Proof. This is immediate by Matlis duality (Lemma 2.9) and definitions of quasi- F -stable sections (Definition 3.38 and Definition 3.41). \square

3.7. Quasi- F^∞ -splittings.

Definition 3.44. In the situation of Setting 2.11, let Δ be a \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X satisfying $[\Delta] = 0$. We say that (X, Δ) is

$$\begin{aligned} n\text{-quasi-}F^\infty\text{-split} & \text{ if } \forall_{e>0} \text{ the pair } (X, \Delta) \text{ is } n\text{-quasi-}F^e\text{-split} \\ \text{quasi-}F^\infty\text{-split} & \text{ if } \forall_{e>0} \exists_{n>0} \text{ s.t. the pair } (X, \Delta) \text{ is } n\text{-quasi-}F^e\text{-split} \\ \text{uniformly quasi-}F^\infty\text{-split} & \text{ if } \exists_{n>0} \forall_{e>0} \text{ the pair } (X, \Delta) \text{ is } n\text{-quasi-}F^e\text{-split.} \end{aligned}$$

We define local variants (i.e., n -quasi- F^∞ -pure, quasi- F^∞ -pure, uniformly quasi- F^∞ -pure) analogously to Definition 3.3.

As we will see later, Calabi-Yau varieties (e.g., elliptic curves) are never uniformly quasi- F^∞ -split unless they are F -split (Proposition 7.4).

Definition 3.45. In the situation of Setting 2.11, let Δ and L be \mathbb{Q} -divisors on X . We define the following subspaces of $H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X([\Delta - L]))$:

$$\begin{aligned} q^e S^0(X, \Delta; L) & := \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} q^e S_n^0(X, \Delta; L) \\ q^\infty S_n^0(X, \Delta; L) & := \bigcap_{e>0} q^e S_n^0(X, \Delta; L) \\ q^\infty S^0(X, \Delta; L) & := \bigcap_{e>0} \bigcup_{n>0} q^e S_n^0(X, \Delta; L) = \bigcap_{e>0} q^e S^0(X, \Delta; L) \\ q_{\text{uni}}^\infty S^0(X, \Delta; L) & := \bigcup_{n>0} \bigcap_{e>0} q^e S_n^0(X, \Delta; L) = \bigcup_{n>0} q^\infty S_n^0(X, \Delta; L). \end{aligned}$$

Note that for $n \leq m$:

$$\begin{aligned} q^e S_n^0(X, \Delta; L) & \subseteq q^e S_m^0(X, \Delta; L), \quad \text{and} \\ q^\infty S_n^0(X, \Delta; L) & \subseteq q^\infty S_m^0(X, \Delta; L). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, if X is projective over a Noetherian ring R , then $H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X([\Delta - L]))$ is a finitely generated R -module, and so we get the stabilisation:

$$\begin{aligned} q^e S^0(X, \Delta; L) & = q^e S_n^0(X, \Delta; L), \quad \text{and} \\ q_{\text{uni}}^\infty S^0(X, \Delta; L) & = q^\infty S_n^0(X, \Delta; L). \end{aligned}$$

for $n \gg 0$. The stabilisation with respect to e will be discussed in the next subsection.

Remark 3.46. By definition and the above stabilisation, we immediately see that:

$$\begin{aligned} X \text{ is } n\text{-quasi-}F^e\text{-split} & \iff q^e S_n^0(X, \Delta; \mathcal{O}_X) = H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X); \\ X \text{ is quasi-}F^e\text{-split} & \iff q^e S^0(X, \Delta; \mathcal{O}_X) = H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X); \\ X \text{ is } n\text{-quasi-}F^\infty\text{-split} & \iff q^\infty S_n^0(X, \Delta; \mathcal{O}_X) = H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X); \\ X \text{ is quasi-}F^\infty\text{-split} & \iff q^\infty S^0(X, \Delta; \mathcal{O}_X) = H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X); \\ X \text{ is uniformly quasi-}F^\infty\text{-split} & \iff q_{\text{uni}}^\infty S^0(X, \Delta; \mathcal{O}_X) = H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X). \end{aligned}$$

Remark 3.47. As in Subsection 3.5 and Definition 3.41, we define pure and adjoint variants of Definition 3.44 and Definition 3.45. For sake of brevity, we do not spell these definitions out.

Remark 3.48. In this remark, we sketch an interpretation of quasi- F^∞ -splittings using perfection. Define $Q_{X,\Delta,n}^{\text{perf}}$ as the pushout sitting in the following diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} W_n \mathcal{O}_X(\Delta) & \xrightarrow{\pi^*} & \pi_* W_n \mathcal{O}_X^{\text{perf}}(\pi^* \Delta) \\ \downarrow R^{n-1} & & \downarrow \\ \mathcal{O}_X(\Delta) & \xrightarrow{\Phi_{X,\Delta,n}^{\text{perf}}} & Q_{X,\Delta,n}^{\text{perf}} \end{array} \quad \lrcorner$$

where X^{perf} denotes the perfection of X and $\pi: X^{\text{perf}} \rightarrow X$ is the induced projection. Recall that the perfection X^{perf} is defined as the scheme $(X, \mathcal{O}_X^{\text{perf}})$, where

$$\mathcal{O}_X^{\text{perf}} := \varinjlim_F \mathcal{O}_X := \varinjlim_F (\mathcal{O}_X \xrightarrow{F} F_* \mathcal{O}_X \xrightarrow{F} F_*^2 \mathcal{O}_X \xrightarrow{F} \cdots).$$

It holds that $Q_{X,\Delta,n}^{\text{perf}} \simeq \varinjlim_e Q_{X,\Delta,n}^e$. We define $Q_{X,\Delta}^{\text{perf}} := \varprojlim_n Q_{X,\Delta,n}^{\text{perf}}$. One can check that $Q_{X,\Delta}^{\text{perf}}$ is the pushout of $\mathcal{O}_X(\Delta) \leftarrow W \mathcal{O}_X(\Delta) \rightarrow \pi_* W \mathcal{O}_{X^{\text{perf}}}(\pi^* \Delta)$, but we shall not need this in our paper.

In the situation of Setting 2.12, we assume that (R, \mathfrak{m}) is a local ring. Given $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, we have that (X, Δ) is n -quasi- F^∞ -split if and only if the natural map

$$H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(\mathcal{O}_X(K_X + \Delta)) \rightarrow H_{W_n \mathfrak{m}}^d(Q_{X,K_X+\Delta,n}^{\text{perf}})$$

is injective. Using Artiniaty of local cohomology, one can easily deduce from this that (X, Δ) is uniformly quasi- F^∞ -split if and only if the natural map

$$H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(\mathcal{O}_X(K_X + \Delta)) \rightarrow H_{W \mathfrak{m}}^d(Q_{X,K_X+\Delta}^{\text{perf}})$$

is injective.

Finally, we state a reformulation of quasi- F -stable sections via local cohomology.

Proposition 3.49. *Fix $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ and $e \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. In the situation of Setting 2.12, assume that (R, \mathfrak{m}) is a local ring. Take \mathbb{Q} -divisors L and Δ on X . Then*

$$H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(X, Q_{X,K_X+\Delta-L,n}^{\text{perf}})^\vee \simeq \varprojlim_e (H^0(X, (Q_{X,\Delta-L,n}^e)^*)^\wedge) \quad \text{and}$$

$$q^\infty S_n^0(X, \Delta; L)^\wedge \simeq \text{Im} \left(H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(X, \mathcal{O}_X(\lfloor K_X + \Delta - L \rfloor)) \rightarrow H_{W_n \mathfrak{m}}^d(X, Q_{X,K_X+\Delta-L,n}^{\text{perf}}) \right)^\vee,$$

where $(-)^^\wedge$ denotes \mathfrak{m} -completion, and $(-)^^\vee := \text{Hom}_{W_n R}(-, E)$ denotes Matlis duality.

The proof is analogous to that of [BMP⁺20, Lemma 4.8].

Proof. The first assertion holds by the following argument:

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.49.1) \quad H_m^d(X, Q_{X, K_X + \Delta - L, n}^{\text{perf}})^\vee &= \text{Hom}_{W_n R}(H_m^d(X, \varinjlim_e Q_{X, K_X + \Delta - L, n}^e), E) \\
&\simeq \text{Hom}_{W_n R}(\varinjlim_e H_m^d(X, Q_{X, K_X + \Delta - L, n}^e), E) \\
&\simeq \varprojlim_e \text{Hom}_{W_n R}(H_m^d(X, Q_{X, K_X + \Delta - L, n}^e), E) \\
&\simeq \varprojlim_e (\text{Hom}_{W_n R}(Q_{X, K_X + \Delta - L, n}^e, W_n \omega_X)^\wedge) \\
&\simeq \varprojlim_e (H^0(X, (Q_{X, \Delta - L, n}^e)^*)^\wedge).
\end{aligned}$$

Let us show the second assertion. Take the image:

$$(3.49.2) \quad H_m^d(X, \mathcal{O}_X(K_X + \Delta - L)) \twoheadrightarrow I_n \hookrightarrow H_{W_n m}^d(X, Q_{X, K_X + \Delta - L, n}^{\text{perf}}).$$

It suffices to show that $I_n^\vee \simeq q^\infty S_n^0(X, \Delta; L)^\wedge$. Since Matlis duality turns colimits into limits, we get that

$$I_n^\vee = (\varinjlim_e I_n^e)^\vee = \varprojlim_e (I_n^e)^\vee,$$

where I_n^e is defined as the image in

$$(3.49.3) \quad H_m^d(X, \mathcal{O}_X(K_X + \Delta - L)) \twoheadrightarrow I_n^e \hookrightarrow H_{W_n m}^d(X, Q_{X, K_X + \Delta - L, n}^e).$$

By Lemma 2.9, the Matlis duality functor $(-)^\vee = \text{Hom}_{W_n R}(-, E)$ yields

$$\begin{aligned}
H_m^d(X, \mathcal{O}_X(K_X + \Delta - L))^\vee &\simeq H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(L))^\wedge \text{ and} \\
H_m^d(X, Q_{X, K_X + \Delta - L, n}^e)^\vee &= \text{Hom}_{W_n R}(H_m^d(X, Q_{X, K_X + \Delta - L, n}^e), E) \\
&\simeq \text{Hom}_{W_n \mathcal{O}_X}(Q_{X, K_X + \Delta - L, n}^e, W_n \omega_X)^\wedge \\
&\simeq H^0(X, (Q_{X, \Delta - L, n}^e)^*)^\wedge,
\end{aligned}$$

where $(-)^* := \mathcal{H}om_{W_n \mathcal{O}_X}(-, W_n \omega_X(-K_X))$. By applying $(-)^\vee = \text{Hom}_{W_n R}(-, E)$ to (3.49.3), we get

$$H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(L))^\wedge \hookleftarrow (I_n^e)^\vee \hookleftarrow H^0(X, (Q_{X, \Delta - L, n}^e)^*)^\wedge.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\varprojlim_e (I_n^e)^\vee &= \bigcap_{e>0} (I_n^e)^\vee \\
&= \bigcap_{e>0} \text{Im}(H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(L))^\wedge \hookleftarrow H^0(X, (Q_{X, \Delta - L, n}^e)^*)^\wedge) \\
&= q^\infty S_n^0(X, \Delta; L)^\wedge,
\end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from the fact that intersections commute with a flat base change $(-) \otimes_{W_n R} \widehat{W_n R}$ (cf. the proof of [Mat89, Theorem 7.4]). \square

When dealing with non-noetherian objects, one needs to be extra careful about distinguishing theorems stated for local rings and arbitrary rings, as taking infinite intersection may not commute with localisation. This will stop to be an issue after we show stabilisation for quasi- F^e -stable sections in the next subsection (Corollary 3.52).

3.8. Stabilisation for quasi- F^e -stable sections. In this subsection, we prove the stabilisation of quasi- F^e -stable sections (Corollary 3.52). For ease of notation, we will work in the framework of local cohomology, but the proofs can be restated in terms of usual trace maps. As we often twist our divisors by other nef divisors, we shall consider all divisors of the form $rA + kN$ and establish necessary bounds to be independent of the choice of $r > 0$ and $k \geq 0$.

We start with the following lemma generalising Lemma 8.2 to the Witt case.

Lemma 3.50. *In the situation of Setting 2.12, fix $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, let \mathfrak{m} be a maximal ideal of R , let A be an ample \mathbb{Q} -Cartier \mathbb{Q} -divisor, and let N be a nef \mathbb{Q} -Cartier \mathbb{Q} -divisor. Assume that X is divisorially Cohen-Macaulay. Then there exists $e_0 > 0$ such that for every integer $r \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ and every integer $k \geq 0$, the kernel of*

$$F^e : H_{W_n \mathfrak{m}}^d(X, W_n \mathcal{O}_X(-(rA + kN))) \rightarrow H_{W_n \mathfrak{m}}^d(X, F_*^e W_n \mathcal{O}_X(-p^e(rA + kN)))$$

is independent of the choice of $e \geq e_0$.

Proof. By abuse of notation, we replace $rA + kN$ by A in the following proof. All the bounds we shall pick are clearly independent of r and k , as they come from Lemma 8.2 and the Fujita vanishing theorem.

Let $e_0^\dagger > 0$ be the bound coming from Lemma 8.2. By Matlis duality (Lemma 2.9), we can assume that the kernel of

$$(3.50.1) \quad H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(X, \mathcal{O}_X(-A)) \rightarrow H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(X, F_*^e \mathcal{O}_X(-p^e A))$$

is independent of the choice of $e \geq e_0^\dagger$. By increasing e_0^\dagger further, we may also assume that

$$(3.50.2) \quad H_{\mathfrak{m}}^{d-1}(X, F_*^e \mathcal{O}_X(-p^e A)) = 0$$

for all $e \geq e_0^\dagger$. This is possible, because X is divisorially Cohen-Macaulay, and so by Matlis duality we need the vanishing of $H^1(X, \mathcal{O}_X(K_X + p^e A)) = 0$ which follows by the Fujita vanishing theorem (cf. Lemma 2.10).

Fix $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. By induction on n , we may assume that the statement of the lemma is valid after replacing n by $n - 1$. Specifically, there exists an integer $e_0^{\dagger\dagger} > 0$ such that the kernel of

$$(3.50.3) \quad F^e : H_{W_{n-1} \mathfrak{m}}^d(X, W_{n-1} \mathcal{O}_X(-A)) \rightarrow H_{W_{n-1} \mathfrak{m}}^d(X, F_*^e W_{n-1} \mathcal{O}_X(-p^e A))$$

stabilises for all $e \geq e_0^{\dagger\dagger}$. Note that the same holds by A replaced by any $rA + kN$ for integers $r > 0$ and $k \geq 0$ with the same bound $e_0^{\dagger\dagger}$.

We will prove the statement of the lemma for $e_0 := e_0^\dagger + e_0^{\dagger\dagger}$. Take e', e such that $e' \geq e \geq e_0$. It is enough to show the following claim.

Claim. *Suppose that*

$$\zeta \in \text{Ker}(H_{W_n, m}^d(X, W_n \mathcal{O}_X(-A)) \rightarrow H_{W_n, m}^d(X, F_*^{e'} W_n \mathcal{O}_X(-p^{e'} A))).$$

Then

$$(3.50.4) \quad \zeta \in \text{Ker}(H_{W_n, m}^d(X, W_n \mathcal{O}_X(-A)) \rightarrow H_{W_n, m}^d(X, F_*^e W_n \mathcal{O}_X(-p^e A))).$$

In what follows, we prove the above claim. We set $H_m^d(-) := H_{W_n, m}^d(X, -)$ by abuse of notation. The exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow F_* W_{n-1} \mathcal{O}_X(pD) \xrightarrow{V} W_n \mathcal{O}_X(D) \xrightarrow{R^{n-1}} \mathcal{O}_X(D) \rightarrow 0$$

induces the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \rightarrow & H_m^d(F_*^{e'+1} W_{n-1} \mathcal{O}_X(-p^{e'+1} A)) & \rightarrow & H_m^d(F_*^{e'} W_n \mathcal{O}_X(-p^{e'} A)) & \rightarrow & H_m^d(F_*^{e'} \mathcal{O}_X(-p^{e'} A)) \rightarrow 0 \\ & & \uparrow & & \uparrow & & \uparrow \\ 0 & \rightarrow & H_m^d(F_*^{e+1} W_{n-1} \mathcal{O}_X(-p^{e+1} A)) & \rightarrow & H_m^d(F_*^e W_n \mathcal{O}_X(-p^e A)) & \rightarrow & H_m^d(F_*^e \mathcal{O}_X(-p^e A)) \rightarrow 0 \\ & & (\dagger\dagger) \uparrow & & \uparrow & & \uparrow \\ 0 & \rightarrow & H_m^d(F_*^{e_0^\dagger+1} W_{n-1} \mathcal{O}_X(-p^{e_0^\dagger+1} A)) & \xrightarrow{\psi} & H_m^d(F_*^{e_0^\dagger} W_n \mathcal{O}_X(-p^{e_0^\dagger} A)) & \rightarrow & H_m^d(F_*^{e_0^\dagger} \mathcal{O}_X(-p^{e_0^\dagger} A)) \rightarrow 0 \\ & & \uparrow & & \theta \uparrow & & (\dagger) \uparrow \\ & & H_m^d(F_* W_{n-1} \mathcal{O}_X(-pA)) & \longrightarrow & H_m^d(W_n \mathcal{O}_X(-A)) & \xrightarrow{\varphi} & H_m^d(\mathcal{O}_X(-A)) \longrightarrow 0. \end{array}$$

Note that each horizontal sequence is exact by (3.50.2) the above claim now follows immediately by diagram chase. Specifically, by (3.50.1), $\varphi(\zeta)$ lies in the kernel of (\dagger) . Therefore, $\theta(\zeta) = \psi(\zeta')$ for some

$$\zeta' \in H_m^d(F_*^{e_0^\dagger+1} W_{n-1} \mathcal{O}_X(-p^{e_0^\dagger+1} A)).$$

Then, by (3.50.3) and $(e+1) - (e_0^\dagger+1) = e - e_0^\dagger \geq e_0^\dagger$, ζ' lies in the kernel of $(\dagger\dagger)$. Therefore, (3.50.4) holds, which concludes the proofs of the above claim and Lemma 3.50. \square

Proposition 3.51. *In the situation of Setting 2.12, fix $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, let A be an ample \mathbb{Q} -Cartier \mathbb{Q} -divisor, and let N be a nef \mathbb{Q} -Cartier \mathbb{Q} -divisor. Assume that X is divisorially Cohen-Macaulay. Then there exist $e_0 \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ such that for*

- all integers r, k, e satisfying $r \geq 1, k \geq 0$, and $e \geq e_0$, and
- every \mathbb{Q} -divisor Δ such that $K_X + \Delta$ is \mathbb{Q} -Cartier,

the following equality holds:

$$q^e S_n^0(X, \Delta; L) = q^{e_0} S_n^0(X, \Delta; L),$$

where $L := K_X + \Delta + rA + kN$.

In other words, $q^\infty S_n^0(X, \Delta; L) = q^e S_n^0(X, \Delta; L)$ for $e \geq e_0$.

Proof. By abuse of notation, we replace $rA+kN$ by A . In particular, $L = K_X + \Delta + A$. All the bounds in this proof are clearly independent of the choice of integers $r \geq 1$ and $k \geq 0$.

Let \mathfrak{m} be a maximal ideal of R . We shall prove the following statement: there exists $e_0 > 0$ such that the kernel of

$$(3.51.1) \quad H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(X, \mathcal{O}_X(-A)) \rightarrow H_{W_n, \mathfrak{m}}^d(X, Q_{X, -A, n}^e).$$

is independent of the choice of $e \geq e_0$. By Matlis duality (Proposition 3.43) and Definition 3.38, this implies the statement of the proposition: $q^e S_n^0(X, \Delta; L) = q^{e_0} S_n^0(X, \Delta; L)$ for the case when (R, \mathfrak{m}) is a local ring. The general case is reduced to this case by Noetherian induction.

We pick $e_0 > 0$ as in Lemma 3.50 and fix $e \geq e_0$. Consider the following commutative diagram in which each horizontal sequence is exact (Remark 3.1):

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & F_* W_{n-1} \mathcal{O}_X(-pA) & \xrightarrow{V} & W_n \mathcal{O}_X(-A) & \xrightarrow{R^{n-1}} & \mathcal{O}_X(-A) & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \downarrow = & & \downarrow F^e & & \downarrow & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & F_* W_{n-1} \mathcal{O}_X(-pA) & \xrightarrow{VF^e} & F_*^e W_n \mathcal{O}_X(-p^e A) & \longrightarrow & Q_{X, -A, n}^e & \longrightarrow & 0. \end{array}$$

By applying cohomology $H_{W_n, \mathfrak{m}}^i(-) := H_{W_n, \mathfrak{m}}^i(X, -)$, we get

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \rightarrow & H_{W_{n-1}, \mathfrak{m}}^d(F_* W_{n-1} \mathcal{O}_X(-pA))/M & \longrightarrow & H_{W_n, \mathfrak{m}}^d(W_n \mathcal{O}_X(-A)) & \longrightarrow & H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(\mathcal{O}_X(-A)) \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow \Downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ 0 & \rightarrow & H_{W_{n-1}, \mathfrak{m}}^d(F_* W_{n-1} \mathcal{O}_X(-pA))/N & \rightarrow & H_{W_n, \mathfrak{m}}^d(F_*^e W_n \mathcal{O}_X(-p^e A)) & \rightarrow & H_{W_n, \mathfrak{m}}^d(Q_{X, -A, n}^e) \rightarrow 0. \end{array}$$

Here M and N are the images of $H_{\mathfrak{m}}^{d-1}(\mathcal{O}_X(-A))$ and $H_{W_n, \mathfrak{m}}^{d-1}(Q_{X, -A, n}^e)$, respectively. By the snake lemma,

$$K^e := \text{Ker}(H_{W_n, \mathfrak{m}}^d(W_n \mathcal{O}_X(-A)) \rightarrow H_{W_n, \mathfrak{m}}^d(F_*^e W_n \mathcal{O}_X(-p^e A)))$$

maps surjectively onto the kernel of (3.51.1). Since K^e stabilises for $e \geq e_0$ by Lemma 3.50, the kernel of (3.51.1) stabilises as well for $e \geq e_0$. \square

In particular, we obtain the following stabilisation result. We use quantifiers to emphasise the subtlety of how various indices depend on one another. We do not know a similar statement for $q^\infty S^0(X, \Delta; L)$.

Corollary 3.52. *In the situation of Setting 2.12, let Δ and L be \mathbb{Q} -divisors on X such that $L - (K_X + \Delta)$ is an ample \mathbb{Q} -Cartier \mathbb{Q} -divisor. Assume that X is divisorially Cohen-Macaulay. Then the following hold.*

- (1) $\forall_{n>0} \exists_{e_0>0} \forall_{e \geq e_0} \quad q^\infty S_n^0(X, \Delta; L) = q^e S_n^0(X, \Delta; L).$
- (2) $\exists_{n_0>0} \forall_{n \geq n_0} \exists_{e_0>0} \forall_{e \geq e_0} \quad q_{\text{uni}}^\infty S^0(X, \Delta; L) = q^e S_n^0(X, \Delta; L).$

Proof. Statement (1) is clear by Definition 3.45 and Proposition 3.51.

Let us show (2). By Definition 3.45, we have an ascending chain

$$q^\infty S_1^0(X, \Delta; L) \subseteq q^\infty S_2^0(X, \Delta; L) \subseteq \cdots \subseteq H^0(X, L)$$

of R -submodules of $H^0(X, L)$. Since X is projective over an Noetherian ring R , there exists $n_0 > 0$ such that for all $n \geq n_0$,

$$q_{\text{uni}}^\infty S^0(X, \Delta; L) = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} q^\infty S_n^0(X, \Delta; L) = q^\infty S_n^0(X, \Delta; L).$$

Fix $n \geq n_0$. Then there exists e_0 (dependent on n) such that for all $e \geq e_0$,

$$q^\infty S_n^0(X, \Delta; L) = q^e S_n^0(X, \Delta; L)$$

by (1). □

Proposition 3.53. *In the situation of Setting 2.12, fix $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, let A be an ample \mathbb{Q} -Cartier \mathbb{Q} -divisor, and let N be a nef \mathbb{Q} -Cartier \mathbb{Q} -divisor. Assume that X is divisorially Cohen-Macaulay. Then there exists $r_0 \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ such that for*

- all integers r, k, e satisfying $r \geq r_0$, $k \geq 0$, and $e > 0$, and
- every \mathbb{Q} -divisor Δ such that $K_X + \Delta$ is \mathbb{Q} -Cartier, (X, Δ) is n -quasi- F^∞ -pure, and $L := K_X + \Delta + rA + kN$ is a Weil divisor,

the following equality holds:

$$q^e S_n^0(X, \Delta; L) = H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(L)).$$

Since we are assuming that (X, Δ) is n -quasi- F^∞ -pure, this implicitly requires that $[\Delta] = 0$, and so $\Delta = \{-(rA + kN)\}$. Moreover, $L = K_X + [rA + kN]$.

Proof. By Proposition 3.51, we may pick e_0 such that

$$q^e S_n^0(X, \Delta; L) = q^{e_0} S_n^0(X, \Delta; L)$$

for all integers $e \geq e_0$, $r \geq 1$, and $k \geq 0$. On the other hand, we have $q^e S_n^0(X, \Delta; L) \supseteq q^{e_0} S_n^0(X, \Delta; L)$ when $e \leq e_0$. Hence it is enough to prove the statement of the proposition for $e = e_0$.

By Definition 3.38,

$$\begin{aligned} & q^{e_0} S_n^0(X, \Delta; L) \\ & := \text{Im} \left(\text{Hom}_{W_n \mathcal{O}_X} (Q_{X, -(K_X + rA + kN), n}^{e_0}, W_n \omega_X(-K_X)) \rightarrow H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(K_X + [rA + kN])) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Define

$$\mathcal{G}_{r,k} := \text{Ker} \left(\mathcal{H}om_{W_n \mathcal{O}_X} (Q_{X, -(K_X + rA + kN), n}^{e_0}, W_n \omega_X(-K_X)) \xrightarrow{(\dagger)} \mathcal{O}_X(K_X + [rA + kN]) \right).$$

Claim 3.54. *There exists an integer $r_0 > 0$ such that $H^1(X, \mathcal{G}_{r,k}) = 0$ for all $r \geq r_0$ and $k \geq 0$.*

Assuming this claim, we now finish the proof of Proposition 3.53. Note that (\dagger) is surjective as (X, Δ) is n -quasi- F^{e_0} -pure (see Proposition 3.20 for $D = -(K_X + [rA + kN])$ and $\Delta + D = -(K_X + rA + kN)$). Therefore, the claim immediately implies that $q^{e_0} S_n^0(X, \Delta; K_X + [rA + kN]) = H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(K_X + [rA + kN]))$ for $r \geq r_0$, so it is enough to prove the above claim.

To this end, take $m_0 \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ such that $m_0 A$ and $m_0 N$ are Cartier. Take the integers r' and k' defined by $r' := r \bmod m_0$ and $k' := k \bmod m_0$ (cf. Subsection 2.1(11)). Since

$(r - r')A$ and $(k - k')N$ are Cartier, we get $\mathcal{G}_{r,k} = \mathcal{G}_{r',k'} \otimes \mathcal{O}_X((r - r')A + (k - k')N)$. Thus there exists r_0 (independent of (r, k)) such that

$$H^1(X, \mathcal{G}_{r',k'} \otimes \mathcal{O}_X((r - r')A + (k - k')N)) = 0$$

for every $r \geq r_0$ and every $k \geq 0$ by the Fujita vanishing theorem ([Kee03, Theorem 1.5]), because there are only finitely many possibilities for $\mathcal{G}_{r',k'}$. \square

4. QUASI- F -REGULARITY AND QUASI-+-REGULARITY

4.1. Quasi- F -regularity.

Definition 4.1. In the situation of Setting 2.11, let Δ be a \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X . Take $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$.

- (1) We say that (X, Δ) is *globally n -quasi- F -regular* if
 - (a) $\lfloor \Delta \rfloor = 0$, and
 - (b) given an effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor E on X , there exist $\epsilon \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0}$ such that $(X, \Delta + \epsilon E)$ is n -quasi- F^e -split for every $e \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$.
- (2) We say that (X, Δ) is *globally quasi- F -regular* if (X, Δ) is globally m -quasi- F -regular for some $m \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$.
- (3) We say that (X, Δ) is *locally n -quasi- F -regular* if there exists an open cover $X = \bigcup_{i \in I} X_i$ such that $(X_i, \Delta|_{X_i})$ is globally n -quasi- F -regular for every $i \in I$.
- (4) We say that (X, Δ) is *locally quasi- F -regular* if (X, Δ) is locally m -quasi- F -regular for some $m \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. This condition is equivalent to the following: there exists an open cover $X = \bigcup_{i \in I} X_i$ such that $(X_i, \Delta|_{X_i})$ is globally quasi- F -regular for every $i \in I$.

Definition 4.2. In the situation of Setting 2.11, let Δ be a \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X . We say that (X, Δ) is *feebly globally quasi- F -regular* if

- (1) $\lfloor \Delta \rfloor = 0$, and
- (2) given an effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor E on X , there exist $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ and $\epsilon \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0}$ such that $(X, \Delta + \epsilon E)$ is n -quasi- F^e -split for every $e \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$.

We say that (X, Δ) is *feebly locally quasi- F -regular* if there exists an open cover $X = \bigcup_{i \in I} X_i$ such that $(X_i, \Delta|_{X_i})$ is globally quasi- F -regular for every $i \in I$.

Remark 4.3. If $(X, \Delta + \epsilon E)$ is n -quasi- F^{e+1} -split, then $(X, \Delta + \epsilon E)$ is n -quasi- F^e -split (Remark 3.6). Therefore, $(X, \Delta + \epsilon E)$ is n -quasi- F^e -split for every $e \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ if and only if $(X, \Delta + \epsilon E)$ is n -quasi- F^e -split for infinitely many $e \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$.

In order to compare our definition of global quasi- F -regularity (Definition 4.1) with the global F -regularity, let us recall its definition.

Definition 4.4. Let X be an integral normal F -finite Noetherian scheme and let Δ be an effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor. We say that (X, Δ) is *globally F -regular* if given an effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor E , there exists $e \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ such that

$$F^e : \mathcal{O}_X \rightarrow F_*^e \mathcal{O}_X((p^e - 1)\Delta + E)$$

splits.

Note that some authors use the splitting of

$$F^e : \mathcal{O}_X \rightarrow F^e \mathcal{O}_X(\lceil (p^e - 1)\Delta + E \rceil)$$

for the definition of the global F -regularity (cf. [SS10, Definition 3.1]). It is easy to see that two definitions are equivalent. The following result shows that our definition of global quasi- F -regularity (Definition 4.1) can be considered as an analogue of the global F -regularity.

Proposition 4.5. *In the situation of Setting 2.11, let Δ be a \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X such that $\lfloor \Delta \rfloor = 0$. Then the following are equivalent.*

- (1) (X, Δ) is globally F -regular, i.e., given an effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor E , there exists $e \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ such that

$$F^e : \mathcal{O}_X \rightarrow F_*^e \mathcal{O}_X((p^e - 1)\Delta + E)$$

splits.

- (2) (X, Δ) is globally 1-quasi- F -regular. In other words, given an effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor E , there exists $\epsilon \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0}$ such that $(X, \Delta + \epsilon E)$ is 1-quasi- F^e -split for every $e \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, i.e.,

$$(4.5.1) \quad \Phi_{X, \Delta, 1}^e : \mathcal{O}_X \rightarrow F_*^e \mathcal{O}_X(p^e(\Delta + \epsilon E))$$

splits for every $e \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$.

Proof. Let us show (2) \Rightarrow (1). Assume (2). Fix an effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor E . Take $\epsilon \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0}$ as in (2). Then we can find $e \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ satisfying $1 \leq p^e \epsilon$, which implies

$$(p^e - 1)\Delta + E \leq p^e(\Delta + \epsilon E).$$

Hence the composite \mathcal{O}_X -module homomorphism

$$\Phi_{X, \Delta, 1}^e : \mathcal{O}_X \xrightarrow{F^e =: \alpha} F_*^e \mathcal{O}_X((p^e - 1)\Delta + E) \hookrightarrow F_*^e \mathcal{O}_X(p^e(\Delta + \epsilon E))$$

splits, and hence also α splits. Thus (1) holds.

Let us show (1) \Rightarrow (2). Assume (1). Fix E an effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor. Then

$$(X, (1 + \delta)(\Delta + \epsilon E))$$

is globally F -regular for some $\epsilon, \delta \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0}$ [SS10, Corollary 6.1]. In particular, $(X, (1 + \delta)(\Delta + \epsilon E))$ is globally sharply F -split in the sense of [SS10, Definition 3.1]. Then there exists $d_1 \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ such that

$$F^{dd_1} : \mathcal{O}_X \rightarrow F_*^{dd_1} \mathcal{O}_X(\lceil (p^{dd_1} - 1)(1 + \delta)(\Delta + \epsilon E) \rceil)$$

splits for every $d \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ [SS10, Proposition 3.8(b)]. Since we have $(p^{dd_1} - 1)(1 + \delta) \geq p^{dd_1}$ and $(p^{dd_1} - 1)(1 + \delta)\epsilon \geq 1$ for $d \gg 0$, we can find infinitely many $e \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ such that (4.5.1) splits. Therefore, (4.5.1) splits for every $e \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ (Remark 4.3). \square

4.2. Quasi-+-regularity.

Definition 4.6. In the situation of Setting 2.11, let Δ be a \mathbb{Q} -divisor. Let $f : Y \rightarrow X$ be a finite surjective morphism from an integral normal scheme Y . Recall that $f^*\Delta$ can be naturally defined as in [KM98, the proof of Proposition 5.20]. We define a $W_n\mathcal{O}_X$ -module homomorphism $\Phi_{X,\Delta,n}^f$ and a coherent $W_n\mathcal{O}_X$ -module $Q_{X,\Delta,n}^f$ on X by the following pushout diagram:

$$(4.6.1) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} W_n\mathcal{O}_X(\Delta) & \xrightarrow{f^*} & f_*W_n\mathcal{O}_Y(f^*\Delta) \\ R^{n-1}\downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathcal{O}_X(\Delta) & \xrightarrow{\Phi_{X,\Delta,n}^f} & Q_{X,\Delta,n}^f. \end{array}$$

We define $(\Phi_{X,\Delta,n}^f)^*$ by applying $(-)^* := \mathcal{H}om_{W_n\mathcal{O}_X}(-, W_n\omega_X(-K_X))$ to $\Phi_{X,\Delta,n}^f$:

$$(\Phi_{X,\Delta,n}^f)^* : (Q_{X,\Delta,n}^f)^* \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X(\Delta)^*$$

Note that $\mathcal{O}_X(\Delta)^* = \mathcal{H}om_{W_n\mathcal{O}_X}(\mathcal{O}_X(\Delta), W_n\omega_X(-K_X)) \simeq \mathcal{H}om_{\mathcal{O}_X}(\mathcal{O}_X(\Delta), \omega_X(-K_X)) \simeq \mathcal{O}_X([- \Delta])$.

Definition 4.7. In the situation of Setting 2.11, let Δ be a \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X .

- (1) Take $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ and a finite surjective morphism $f : Y \rightarrow X$ from an integral normal excellent scheme Y . We say that (X, Δ) is *globally n -quasi- f -regular* if $[-\Delta] = 0$ and the induced map

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{W_n\mathcal{O}_X}(Q_{X,\Delta,n}^f, W_n\omega_X(-K_X)) \xrightarrow{H^0(X, (\Phi_{X,\Delta,n}^f)^*)} \mathrm{Hom}_{W_n\mathcal{O}_X}(\mathcal{O}_X, W_n\omega_X(-K_X))$$

is surjective.

- (2) Given $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, we say that (X, Δ) is *globally n -quasi-+-regular* if $[-\Delta] = 0$ and it is globally n -quasi- f -regular for every finite surjective morphism $f : Y \rightarrow X$ from an integral normal excellent scheme Y . We say that (X, Δ) is *globally quasi-+-regular* if (X, Δ) is globally n -quasi-+-regular for some $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$.
- (3) We say that (X, Δ) is *feebly globally quasi-+-regular* if $[-\Delta] = 0$ and, for every finite surjective morphism $f : Y \rightarrow X$ from an integral normal excellent scheme Y , there exists $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ such that (X, Δ) is n -quasi- F -regular.

We say that (X, Δ) is *(feebly) locally quasi-+-regular* (resp. *(feebly) locally n -quasi-+-regular*) if there exists an open cover $X = \bigcup_{i \in I} X_i$ such that $(X_i, \Delta|_{X_i})$ is (feebly) quasi-+-regular (resp. (feebly) n -quasi-+-regular) for every $i \in I$.

Lemma 4.8. *Let $g : Y \rightarrow Z$ be a finite surjective morphism of integral normal Noetherian F -finite \mathbb{F}_p -schemes. Assume that the induced field extension $j : K(Z) \hookrightarrow K(Y)$ is separable. Fix $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. Then the following hold.*

- (1) $W_n(K(Z))$ is a local Artinian ring.
- (2) The induced map $W_n j : W_n(K(Z)) \rightarrow W_n(K(Y))$ splits as a $W_n(K(Z))$ -module homomorphism, i.e., there exists a $W_n(K(Z))$ -module homomorphism

$\varphi : W_n(K(Y)) \rightarrow W_n(K(Z))$ such that the composition

$$W_n(K(Z)) \xrightarrow{W_{n,j}} W_n(K(Y)) \xrightarrow{\varphi} W_n(K(Z))$$

is the identity map id .

- (3) Let $\varphi : W_n(K(Y)) \rightarrow W_n(K(Z))$ be as in (2), i.e., a $W_n(K(Z))$ -module homomorphism such that $\varphi \circ W_{n,j} = \text{id}$. Take a \mathbb{Q} -divisor Δ_Z . Then there exists an effective Weil divisor D_Z on Z which induces the following commutative diagram consisting of $W_n\mathcal{O}_Z$ -module homomorphisms for every $m \in \mathbb{Z}$

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & & \text{id} & & \\ & \searrow & \text{---} & \swarrow & \\ & & & & \\ W_n(K(Z)) & \xrightarrow{W_{n,j}} & W_n(K(Y)) & \xrightarrow{\varphi} & W_n(K(Z)) \\ \uparrow & & \uparrow & & \uparrow \\ W_n\mathcal{O}_Z(m\Delta_Z) & \xrightarrow{g^*} & g_*W_n\mathcal{O}_Y(mg^*\Delta_Z) & \xrightarrow{\psi_m} & W_n\mathcal{O}_Z(m\Delta_Z + D_Z), \end{array}$$

where $W_n(K(Y))$ and $W_n(K(Z))$ denote the corresponding constant sheaves on Z , and $\psi_m : g_*W_n\mathcal{O}_Y(mg^*\Delta_Z) \rightarrow W_n\mathcal{O}_Z(m\Delta_Z + D_Z)$ is a $W_n\mathcal{O}_Z$ -module homomorphism.

Proof. Let us show (1). Since $K(Z)$ is an F -finite Noetherian \mathbb{F}_p -algebra, $W_n(K(Z))$ is a Noetherian ring. As $\text{Spec } W_n(K(Z)) \simeq \text{Spec } K(Z)$ consists of one point, $W_n(K(Z))$ is a local artinian ring. Thus (1) holds.

Let us show (3) assuming (2). By removing the non-regular locus of Z , we may assume that Z is regular. In particular, there exists $m_0 \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ such that $m_0\Delta_Z$ is Cartier. Since $g_*W_n\mathcal{O}_Y(mg^*\Delta_Z)$ is a coherent $W_n\mathcal{O}_Z$ -submodule of $W_n(K(Z))$, it is easy to find an effective Weil divisor $D_{Z,m}$, depending on m , satisfying

$$\varphi(g_*W_n\mathcal{O}_Y(mg^*\Delta_Z)) \subseteq W_n\mathcal{O}_Z(m\Delta_Z + D_{Z,m}).$$

Then the assertion holds for an effective Weil divisor D_Z satisfying $D_{Z,m} \leq D_Z$ for every $0 \leq m \leq m_0 - 1$, because $\psi_m : g_*W_n\mathcal{O}_Y(mg^*\Delta_Z) \rightarrow W_n\mathcal{O}_Z(m\Delta_Z + D_Z)$ induces $\psi_{m \pm m_0} : g_*W_n\mathcal{O}_Y((m \pm m_0)g^*\Delta_Z) \rightarrow W_n\mathcal{O}_Z((m \pm m_0)\Delta_Z + D_Z)$ by applying $(-)\otimes_{W_n\mathcal{O}_Z} W_n\mathcal{O}_Z(\pm m_0\Delta_Z)$.

Therefore, it is now enough to show (2). Set

$$K := K(Z) \quad \text{and} \quad L := K(Y).$$

Fix a K -linear basis $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_d$ of L with $\alpha_1 = 1$, so that $L = \bigoplus_{i=1}^d K\alpha_i$. It suffices to show that $W_n(L) = \bigoplus_{i=1}^d W_n(K)\underline{\alpha}_i$, where each $\underline{\alpha}_i \in W_n(L)$ denotes the Teichmüller lift $(\alpha_i, 0, \dots, 0)$ of α_i .

First, we prove that

$$(4.8.1) \quad W_n(L) = \sum_{i=1}^d W_n(K)\underline{\alpha}_i.$$

To this end, it follows from (1) that $(W_n(K), V(W_{n-1}K))$ is a Noetherian complete local ring. By [Mat89, Theorem 8.4], it is enough to show that

$$W_n(L)/(V(W_{n-1}K) \cdot W_n(L))$$

is generated by the images of $\underline{\alpha}_1, \dots, \underline{\alpha}_d$. This follows from

$$\begin{aligned} W_n(L)/(V(W_{n-1}K) \cdot W_n(L)) &\simeq W_n(L) \otimes_{W_n(K)} (W_n(K)/V(W_{n-1}(K))) \\ &\simeq W_n(L) \otimes_{W_n(K)} W_1(K) \simeq W_1(L) = L \end{aligned}$$

where the last isomorphism follows from the fact that $K \rightarrow L$ is étale [Ill79, Ch. 0, Proposition 1.5.8]. This completes the proof of (4.8.1).

Fix $e \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ and set $q := p^e$. It suffices to show that $\alpha_1^q, \dots, \alpha_d^q$ are linearly independent over K . Consider the following commutative diagram consisting of field extensions:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} K & \hookrightarrow & L & & \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\ K^{1/q} & \hookrightarrow & K^{1/q} \otimes_K L & \xrightarrow{\theta} & L^{1/q} \end{array}$$

where $K^{1/q} \otimes_K L$ is a field, because Spec of the horizontal arrows are étale and Spec of the vertical arrows are universal homeomorphisms. Since $1 \otimes \alpha_1, \dots, 1 \otimes \alpha_d \in K^{1/q} \otimes_K L$ is a $K^{1/q}$ -linear basis of $K^{1/q} \otimes_K L$, it follows from $\theta(1 \otimes \alpha_i) = \alpha_i$ that $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_d \in L^{1/q}$ are linearly independent over $K^{1/q}$. Take an equation

$$c_1 \alpha_1^q + \dots + c_d \alpha_d^q = 0$$

with $c_i \in K$. Apply $(-)^{1/q}$ inside $L^{1/q}$:

$$c_1^{1/q} \alpha_1 + \dots + c_d^{1/q} \alpha_d = 0.$$

Note that $c_i^{1/q} \in K^{1/q}$. Since $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_d \in L^{1/q}$ is linearly independent over $K^{1/q}$, we obtain $c_1^{1/q} = \dots = c_d^{1/q} = 0$, which implies $c_1 = \dots = c_d = 0$. Thus (2) holds. \square

Proposition 4.9. *In the situation of Setting 2.11, let Δ be a \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X . If (X, Δ) is globally quasi- F -regular, then (X, Δ) is globally quasi-+-regular.*

Proof. Assume that (X, Δ) is globally quasi- F -regular. In particular, $[\Delta] = 0$. Fix $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ such that (X, Δ) is globally n -quasi- F -regular. It suffices to show the following:

- (\star) Let $f : Y \rightarrow X$ be a finite surjective morphism from an integral normal excellent scheme Y . Then

$$H^0(X, (\Phi_{X, \Delta, n}^f)^*) : H^0(X, \mathcal{H}om(Q_{X, \Delta, n}^f, W_n \omega_X(-K_X))) \rightarrow H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X)$$

is surjective.

In order to prove (\star), we may take the normal closure L of $K(Y)/K(X)$ and replace Y by its normalisation in L . Then there exists an intermediate field $K(X) \subseteq M \subseteq K(Y)$ such that $M/K(X)$ is purely inseparable and $K(Y)/M$ is separable [Lan02, Proposition 6.11].

In particular, there is a factorisation of finite surjective morphisms of integral normal excellent schemes

$$f : Y \xrightarrow{g} Z \xrightarrow{h} X,$$

where $h : Z \rightarrow X$ is purely inseparable and $g : Y \rightarrow Z$ is separable. We have the induced homomorphisms:

$$W_n \mathcal{O}_X(\Delta) \xrightarrow{h^*} h_* W_n \mathcal{O}_Z(h^* \Delta) \xrightarrow{g^*} h_* g_* W_n \mathcal{O}_Y(g^* h^* \Delta) = f_* W_n \mathcal{O}_Y(f^* \Delta).$$

By Lemma 4.8, there exist an effective Weil divisor D_Z on Z and a $W_n(K(Z))$ -module homomorphism $\varphi : W_n(K(Y)) \rightarrow W_n(K(Z))$ which induces, for every $e \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, a $W_n \mathcal{O}_Z$ -module homomorphism $\varphi : g_* W_n \mathcal{O}_Y(p^e f^* \Delta) \rightarrow W_n \mathcal{O}_Z(p^e h^* \Delta + D_Z)$ such that $\varphi \circ g^*(1) = 1$:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} W_n \mathcal{O}_Z(p^e h^* \Delta) & \xrightarrow{g^*} & g_* W_n \mathcal{O}_Y(p^e f^* \Delta) & \xrightarrow{\varphi} & W_n \mathcal{O}_Z(p^e h^* \Delta + D_Z), \\ 1 & \mapsto & g^*(1) & \mapsto & \varphi \circ g^*(1) = 1. \end{array}$$

Pick an effective Weil divisor D_X on X such that $h^* D_X \geq D_Z$. By enlarging D_Z , we may assume that $D_Z = h^* D_X$. Since $h : Z \rightarrow X$ is a finite purely inseparable surjective morphism, we can find $e_1 \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ such that the e_1 -th iterated absolute Frobenius morphism $F^{e_1} : X \rightarrow X$ factors through h :

$$F^{e_1} : X \xrightarrow{\alpha} Z \xrightarrow{h} X.$$

In particular, we get the induced $W_n \mathcal{O}_X$ -module homomorphism:

$$\alpha^* : h_* W_n \mathcal{O}_Z(h^*(\Delta + D_X)) \rightarrow F_*^{e_1} W_n \mathcal{O}_X((F^{e_1})^*(\Delta + D_X)) = F_*^{e_1} W_n \mathcal{O}_X(p^{e_1}(\Delta + D_X)).$$

Since (X, Δ) is globally n -quasi- F -regular, there exists $\epsilon \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0}$ such that $(X, \Delta + \epsilon D_X)$ is n -quasi- F^e -split for every $e \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ (Definition 4.1). Fix $e_2 \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ such that $p^{e_1+e_2}\epsilon \geq p^{e_1}$, i.e., $p^{e_2}\epsilon \geq 1$. By $h_* g_* W_n \mathcal{O}_Y = f_* W_n \mathcal{O}_Y$, the morphism $f^* : W_n \mathcal{O}_X(\Delta) \rightarrow f_* W_n \mathcal{O}_Y(f^* \Delta)$ factors through the following composition:

$$\begin{aligned} W_n \mathcal{O}_X(\Delta) &\xrightarrow{F^{e_2}} F_*^{e_2} W_n \mathcal{O}_X(p^{e_2} \Delta) \xrightarrow{h^*} F_*^{e_2} h_* W_n \mathcal{O}_Z(p^{e_2} h^* \Delta) \xrightarrow{g^*} F_*^{e_2} h_* g_* W_n \mathcal{O}_Y(p^{e_2} f^* \Delta) \\ &\xrightarrow{\varphi} F_*^{e_2} h_* W_n \mathcal{O}_Z(p^{e_2} h^* \Delta + h^* D_X) \xrightarrow{\alpha^*} F_*^{e_1+e_2} W_n \mathcal{O}_X(p^{e_1+e_2} \Delta + p^{e_1} D_X) \\ &\hookrightarrow F_*^{e_1+e_2} W_n \mathcal{O}_X(p^{e_1+e_2}(\Delta + \epsilon D_X)). \end{aligned}$$

By $\varphi \circ g^*(1) = 1$ and $F^{e_1} = h \circ \alpha$, this composition coincides with the following canonical one:

$$W_n \mathcal{O}_X(\Delta) \xrightarrow{F^{e_1+e_2}} F_*^{e_1+e_2} W_n \mathcal{O}_X(p^{e_1+e_2} \Delta) \hookrightarrow F_*^{e_1+e_2} W_n \mathcal{O}_X(p^{e_1+e_2}(\Delta + \epsilon D_X)).$$

Taking the pushouts, we obtain the following factorisation:

$$\Phi_{X, \Delta + \epsilon D_X, n}^{e_1+e_2} : \mathcal{O}_X \xrightarrow{\Phi_{X, \Delta, n}^f} Q_{X, \Delta, n}^f \rightarrow Q_{X, \Delta + \epsilon D_X, n}^{e_1+e_2}.$$

Since $(X, \Delta + \epsilon D_X)$ is n -quasi- $F^{e_1+e_2}$ -split,

$$H^0(X, (\Phi_{X, \Delta + \epsilon D_X, n}^{e_1+e_2})^*) : \text{Hom}(Q_{X, \Delta + \epsilon D_X, n}^{e_1+e_2}, W_n \omega_X(-K_X)) \rightarrow \text{Hom}(\mathcal{O}_X, W_n \omega_X(-K_X))$$

is surjective. Therefore, also

$$H^0(X, (\Phi_{X,\Delta,n}^f)^*) : \text{Hom}(Q_{X,\Delta,n}^f, W_n\omega_X(-K_X)) \rightarrow \text{Hom}(\mathcal{O}_X(\Delta), W_n\omega_X(-K_X))$$

is surjective. \square

Remark 4.10. In [KTT⁺c], it will be shown that in the \mathbb{Q} -Gorenstein case X is locally quasi- F -regular if and only if X is locally quasi-+-regular.

4.3. Quasi-+-stable sections and stabilisation.

Definition 4.11. In the situation of Setting 2.11, let Δ and L be \mathbb{Q} -divisors on X . Given $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ and a finite cover $f : Y \rightarrow X$ (i.e., a finite surjective morphism from an excellent integral normal scheme Y), we set

$$q^f B_n^0(X, \Delta; L) := \text{Im}((\Phi_{X,\Delta-L,n}^f)^* : H^0(X, (Q_{X,\Delta-L,n}^f)^*) \rightarrow H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(\Delta - L)^*)),$$

where $(-)^* := \mathcal{H}om_{W_n\mathcal{O}_X}(-, W_n\mathcal{O}_X(-K_X))$ and $\mathcal{O}_X(\Delta - L)^* \simeq \mathcal{O}_X([\Delta - L])$. We define

$$\begin{aligned} qB_n^0(X, \Delta; L) &:= \bigcap_{f:Y \rightarrow X} q^f B_n^0(X, \Delta; L), \\ qB^0(X, \Delta; L) &:= \bigcup_{n \geq 1} q^f B_n^0(X, \Delta; L) = q^f B_N^0(X, \Delta; L), \end{aligned}$$

where $f : Y \rightarrow X$ runs over all finite covers and N is a sufficiently large integer (note that we have $qB_n^0(-) \subseteq qB_{n+1}^0(-)$). Moreover, we set

$$Q_{X,\Delta,n}^+ := \varinjlim_{f:Y \rightarrow X} Q_{X,\Delta,n}^f \quad \text{and} \quad B_{X,\Delta,n}^+ := \varinjlim_{f:Y \rightarrow X} B_{X,\Delta,n}^f,$$

where $f : Y \rightarrow X$ runs over all finite covers.

Proposition 4.12. Fix $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ and $e \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. In the situation of Setting 2.12, assume that (R, \mathfrak{m}) is a local ring. Take \mathbb{Q} -divisors L and Δ on X . Then

$$qB_n^0(X, \Delta; L)^\wedge \simeq \text{Im}\left(H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(X, \mathcal{O}_X([\Delta - L] + K_X)) \rightarrow H_{W_n\mathfrak{m}}^d(X, Q_{X,K_X+\Delta-L,n}^+)\right)^\vee,$$

where $(-)^\wedge$ denotes \mathfrak{m} -completion, and $(-)^\vee$ denotes Matlis duality.

Proof. The proof is the same as that of Proposition 3.49. \square

Proposition 4.13. In the situation of Setting 2.12, fix $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, let A be an ample \mathbb{Q} -Cartier \mathbb{Q} -divisor, and let N be a nef \mathbb{Q} -Cartier \mathbb{Q} -divisor. Assume that X is divisorially Cohen-Macaulay. Then there exists a finite surjective morphism $f : Y \rightarrow X$ from a normal integral scheme Y such that for

- all integers r, k satisfying $r \geq 1$ and $k \geq 0$, and
- every \mathbb{Q} -divisor Δ such that $K_X + \Delta$ is \mathbb{Q} -Cartier,

the following equality holds:

$$qB_n^0(X, \Delta; L) = \text{Im}((\Phi_{X,\Delta-L,n}^f)^* : H^0(X, (Q_{X,\Delta-L,n}^f)^*) \rightarrow H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(\Delta - L)^*)),$$

where $L := K_X + \Delta + rA + kN$.

Proof. In view of Proposition 8.4, the proof is analogous to that of Lemma 3.50 and Proposition 3.51. Therefore, we only sketch the key ideas and leave the verification of the details to the reader. Let $\pi: X^+ \rightarrow X$ denotes the natural projection. By abuse of notation, we replace $rA + kN$ by A , but all the finite surjective morphisms we shall construct in the proof are clearly independent of r and k .

First, take any finite surjective morphism $f: Y \rightarrow X$ from a normal integral scheme Y . By the same argument as in the proof of Proposition 3.51, looking at the commutative diagram in which each horizontal sequence is exact

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} H_{W_{n-1}\mathfrak{m}}^d(F_*W_{n-1}\mathcal{O}_X(-pA)) & \longrightarrow & H_{W_n\mathfrak{m}}^d(W_n\mathcal{O}_X(-A)) & \longrightarrow & H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(\mathcal{O}_X(-A)) & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \parallel & & \downarrow & & \\ H_{W_{n-1}\mathfrak{m}}^d(F_*W_{n-1}\mathcal{O}_X(-pA)) & \longrightarrow & H_{W_n\mathfrak{m}}^d(f_*W_n\mathcal{O}_X(-f^*A)) & \longrightarrow & H_{W_n\mathfrak{m}}^d(Q_{X,-A,n}^f) & \longrightarrow & 0, \end{array}$$

we get that

$$\text{Ker} \left(H_{W_n\mathfrak{m}}^d(X, W_n\mathcal{O}_X(-A)) \rightarrow H_{W_n\mathfrak{m}}^d(X, f_*W_n\mathcal{O}_Y(-f^*A)) \right)$$

surjects onto

$$\text{Ker} \left(H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(X, \mathcal{O}_X(-A)) \rightarrow H_{W_n\mathfrak{m}}^d(X, Q_{X,-A,n}^f) \right)$$

for every finite surjective morphism $f: Y \rightarrow X$ from a normal integral scheme Y . In particular, it is enough to show that

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Ker} \left(H_{W_n\mathfrak{m}}^d(X, W_n\mathcal{O}_X(-A)) \rightarrow H_{W_n\mathfrak{m}}^d(X^+, W_n\mathcal{O}_{X^+}(-\pi^*A)) \right) \\ & = \text{Ker} \left(H_{W_n\mathfrak{m}}^d(X, W_n\mathcal{O}_X(-A)) \rightarrow H_{W_n\mathfrak{m}}^d(Y, W_n\mathcal{O}_Y(-f^*A)) \right) \end{aligned}$$

for some fixed finite surjective morphism f .

To this end, by Proposition 8.4, we pick $f: Y \rightarrow X$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Ker} \left(H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(X, \mathcal{O}_X(-A)) \rightarrow H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(X^+, \mathcal{O}_{X^+}(-\pi^*A)) \right) \\ & = \text{Ker} \left(H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(X, \mathcal{O}_X(-A)) \rightarrow H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(Y, \mathcal{O}_Y(-f^*A)) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Now by induction on n applied to Y , we can find $f': Z \rightarrow Y$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Ker} \left(H_{W_{n-1}\mathfrak{m}}^d(Y, W_{n-1}\mathcal{O}_Y(-f^*A)) \rightarrow H_{W_{n-1}\mathfrak{m}}^d(Y^+, W_{n-1}\mathcal{O}_{Y^+}(-\pi^*A)) \right) \\ & = \text{Ker} \left(H_{W_{n-1}\mathfrak{m}}^d(Y, W_{n-1}\mathcal{O}_Y(-f^*A)) \rightarrow H_{W_{n-1}\mathfrak{m}}^d(Z, W_{n-1}\mathcal{O}_Z(-g^*A)) \right), \end{aligned}$$

where $g := f \circ f'$.

Note that $Z^+ = Y^+ = X^+$. We claim that the statement of the proposition holds true for f replaced by g . To this end, consider the following diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
H_m^d(F_*\pi_*W_{n-1}\mathcal{O}_{X^+}(-p\pi^*A)) & \xrightarrow{(\dagger)} & H_m^d(\pi_*W_n\mathcal{O}_{X^+}(-\pi^*A)) & \longrightarrow & H_m^d(\pi_*\mathcal{O}_{X^+}(-\pi^*A)) & \longrightarrow & 0 \\
\uparrow & & \uparrow & & \uparrow & & \\
H_m^d(F_*g_*W_{n-1}\mathcal{O}_Z(-pg^*A)) & \longrightarrow & H_m^d(g_*W_n\mathcal{O}_Z(-g^*A)) & \longrightarrow & H_m^d(g_*\mathcal{O}_Z(-g^*A)) & \longrightarrow & 0 \\
\uparrow & & \uparrow & & \uparrow & & \\
H_m^d(F_*f_*W_{n-1}\mathcal{O}_Y(-pf^*A)) & \longrightarrow & H_m^d(f_*W_n\mathcal{O}_Y(-f^*A)) & \longrightarrow & H_m^d(f_*\mathcal{O}_Y(-f^*A)) & \longrightarrow & 0 \\
\uparrow & & \uparrow & & \uparrow & & \\
H_m^d(F_*W_{n-1}\mathcal{O}_X(-pA)) & \longrightarrow & H_m^d(W_n\mathcal{O}_X(-A)) & \longrightarrow & H_m^d(\mathcal{O}_X(-A)) & \longrightarrow & 0.
\end{array}$$

Note that $H_m^{d-1}(X, \pi_*\mathcal{O}_{X^+}(-\pi^*A)) = 0$ by [BMP⁺20, Corollary 3.7], and so the map (\dagger) is injective. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{Ker} \left(H_m^d(W_n\mathcal{O}_X(-A)) \rightarrow H_m^d(\pi_*W_n\mathcal{O}_{X^+}(-\pi^*A)) \right) \\
& \quad = \text{Ker} \left(H_m^d(W_n\mathcal{O}_X(-A)) \rightarrow H_m^d(g_*W_n\mathcal{O}_Z(-g^*A)) \right)
\end{aligned}$$

by a diagram chase similar to that in the proof of Proposition 3.51. \square

Proposition 4.14. *In the situation of Setting 2.12, fix $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, let A be an ample \mathbb{Q} -Cartier \mathbb{Q} -divisor, and let N be a nef \mathbb{Q} -Cartier \mathbb{Q} -divisor. Assume that X is divisorially Cohen-Macaulay. Then there exist $r_0 \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ such that for*

- all integers r, k satisfying $r \geq r_0$ and $k \geq 0$, and
- every \mathbb{Q} -divisor Δ such that (X, Δ) is \mathbb{Q} -Gorenstein, locally n -quasi-+-regular, and $L := K_X + \Delta + rA + kN$ is a Weil divisor,

the following equality holds:

$$qB_n^0(X, \Delta; L) = H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(L)).$$

Proof. In view of Proposition 4.13, the proof is analogous to that of Proposition 3.53. We leave the verification of the details to the reader. \square

In order to be as explicit as possible in the proof of the proposition below, we introduce two more non-standard definitions. Let $\varphi: \{A_n\}_{n>0} \rightarrow \{B_n\}_{n>0}$ be a homomorphism of projective systems induced by $\varphi_n: A_n \rightarrow B_n$. We denote the projections in the first projective system by $\pi_{m,n}: A_m \rightarrow A_n$ for $m \geq n$. For an integer $n_0 > 0$, we say that φ is *2-injective at n_0* if $\pi_{2n_0, n_0}(\text{Ker}(\varphi_{2n_0}: A_{2n_0} \rightarrow B_{2n_0})) = 0$. We say that $\{A_n\}_{n>0}$ is *2-zero at n_0* if $\pi_{2n_0, n_0} = 0$.

In what follows, we show that quasi-+-stable sections $qB^0(-)$ agree with uniformly quasi- F^∞ -stable sections $q_{\text{uni}}^\infty S^0(-)$ when the singularities are locally quasi-+-regular.

Theorem 4.15. *In the situation of Setting 2.12, let Δ be an effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X such that (X, Δ) is locally quasi-+-regular. Let L be a Weil divisor such that*

$L - (K_X + \Delta)$ is ample. Assume that X is divisorially Cohen-Macaulay. Then

$$qB^0(X, \Delta; L) = q_{\text{uni}}^\infty S^0(X, \Delta; L).$$

Proof. Set $A := L - (K_X + \Delta)$. Since X is projective over a Noetherian ring R , we can find $n_0 > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} qB^0(X, \Delta; L) &= qB_n^0(X, \Delta; L) \quad \text{and} \\ q_{\text{uni}}^\infty S^0(X, \Delta; L) &= q^\infty S_n^0(X, \Delta; L) \end{aligned}$$

for all $n \geq n_0$. By increasing n_0 , we may assume that (X, Δ) is locally n -quasi-+-regular for all $n \geq n_0$. In view of Proposition 3.51 and Proposition 4.13, the question is stable under localisation, and so we may assume that R is local. Let \mathfrak{m} be the maximal ideal of R .

Step 1. Reduction to (4.15.1).

By Proposition 3.49 and Proposition 4.12, it is enough to prove that the natural map

$$H_{W_n \mathfrak{m}}^d(X, Q_{X, -A, n}^{\text{perf}}) \rightarrow H_{W_n \mathfrak{m}}^d(X, Q_{X, -A, n}^+)$$

is an injection. Unfortunately, this is too much to hope for, but we will show the following weaker (but sufficient) statement: the homomorphism of projective systems

$$\{H_{W_n \mathfrak{m}}^d(X, Q_{X, -A, n}^{\text{perf}})\}_{n>0} \rightarrow \{H_{W_n \mathfrak{m}}^d(X, Q_{X, -A, n}^+)\}_{n>0} \text{ is injective.}$$

Specifically, we will show that this homomorphism is 2-injective at n_0 , which immediately implies the statement of the proposition by chasing the following diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(X, \mathcal{O}_X(-A)) & \longrightarrow & H_{W_{2n} \mathfrak{m}}^d(X, Q_{X, -A, 2n}^{\text{perf}}) & \longrightarrow & H_{W_{2n} \mathfrak{m}}^d(X, Q_{X, -A, 2n}^+) \\ \downarrow = & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(X, \mathcal{O}_X(-A)) & \longrightarrow & H_{W_n \mathfrak{m}}^d(X, Q_{X, -A, n}^{\text{perf}}) & \longrightarrow & H_{W_n \mathfrak{m}}^d(X, Q_{X, -A, n}^+) \end{array}$$

for $n = n_0$. Since $Q_{X, -A, n}^{\text{perf}} = \varinjlim_e Q_{X, -A, n}^e$, it is enough to prove that

$$(4.15.1) \quad \{H_{W_n \mathfrak{m}}^d(X, Q_{X, -A, n}^e)\}_{n>0} \rightarrow \{H_{W_n \mathfrak{m}}^d(X, Q_{X, -A, n}^+)\}_{n>0} \text{ is 2-injective at } n_0 \text{ for } e \gg 0.$$

Step 2. The proof of (4.15.1).

To prove (4.15.1), consider the natural projection $\pi: X^+ \rightarrow X$ and the factorisation $\pi: X^+ \xrightarrow{\pi'} X \xrightarrow{F^e} X$. Although π and π' are isomorphic to each other via $F^e: X^+ \xrightarrow{\sim} X$, we shall distinguish them in what follows. We have the following commutative

diagram with horizontal and vertical sequences exact:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
& F_*W_{n-1}\mathcal{O}_X(-pA) & \xrightarrow{=} & F_*W_{n-1}\mathcal{O}_X(-pA) & & & \\
& \downarrow F^e \circ V & & \downarrow \pi^* \circ V & & & \\
0 & \longrightarrow & F_*^e W_n \mathcal{O}_X(-p^e A) & \xrightarrow{\pi'^*} & \pi_* W_n \mathcal{O}_{X^+}(-\pi^* A) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F}_n \longrightarrow 0. \\
& & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow = \\
0 & \longrightarrow & Q_{X,-A,n}^e & \longrightarrow & Q_{X,-A,n}^+ & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F}_n \longrightarrow 0.
\end{array}$$

It is enough to show that $\{H_{W_{n\mathfrak{m}}}^{d-1}(X, \mathcal{F}_n)\}_{n>0}$ is 2-zero at n_0 . We also see that \mathcal{F}_n features in the following commutative diagram with horizontal and vertical sequences exact:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
& F_*^{e+1}W_{n-1}\mathcal{O}_X(-p^{e+1}A) & \xrightarrow{=} & F_*^{e+1}W_{n-1}\mathcal{O}_X(-p^{e+1}A) & & & \\
& \downarrow V & & \downarrow \pi'^* \circ V & & & \\
0 & \longrightarrow & F_*^e W_n \mathcal{O}_X(-p^e A) & \xrightarrow{\pi'^*} & \pi_* W_n \mathcal{O}_{X^+}(-\pi^* A) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F}_n \longrightarrow 0. \\
& & \downarrow R^{n-1} & & \downarrow & & \downarrow = \\
0 & \longrightarrow & F_*^e \mathcal{O}_X(-p^e A) & \longrightarrow & (\star_n) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F}_n \longrightarrow 0.
\end{array}$$

Since $F^e \circ \pi' = \pi: X^+ \rightarrow X$, we get that

$$\pi_* W_n \mathcal{O}_{X^+}(-\pi^* A) \simeq F_*^e \pi'_* W_n \mathcal{O}_{X^+}(-\pi'^* p^e A).$$

Then (\star_n) is isomorphic to $F_*^e Q_{X,-p^e A,n}^+$, as π and π' are isomorphic. Thus to show that $\{H_{W_{n\mathfrak{m}}}^{d-1}(X, \mathcal{F}_n)\}_{n>0}$ is 2-zero at n_0 , it is sufficient to prove that for $e \gg 0$,

- (1) $\{H_{W_{n\mathfrak{m}}}^{d-1}(X, Q_{X,-p^e A,n}^+)\}_{n>0}$ is 2-zero at n_0 , and
- (2) $H_{W_{n\mathfrak{m}}}^d(X, \mathcal{O}_X(-p^e A)) \rightarrow H_{W_{n\mathfrak{m}}}^d(X, Q_{X,-p^e A,n}^+)$ is injective for $n = 2n_0$.

Now (1) follows from Lemma 4.17 below in view of Propostion 4.14, whilst (2) holds by Proposition 4.14 thanks to Matlis duality (Proposition 4.12). This concludes the proof of the theorem. \square

Lemma 4.16. *In the situation of Setting 2.11, fix $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ and let Δ be a \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X .*

- (1) *For a finite surjective morphism $f: Y \rightarrow X$, there is a canonical exact sequence*

$$0 \rightarrow F_* B_{X,p\Delta,n}^f \rightarrow Q_{X,\Delta,n}^f \rightarrow f_* \mathcal{O}_Y(f^* \Delta) \rightarrow 0.$$

- (2) *For the induced morphism $\pi: X^+ \rightarrow X$, there is a canonical exact sequence*

$$0 \rightarrow F_* B_{X,p\Delta,n}^+ \rightarrow Q_{X,\Delta,n}^+ \rightarrow \pi_* \mathcal{O}_{X^+}(\pi^* \Delta) \rightarrow 0.$$

- (3) *There is a canonical exact sequence*

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X(\Delta) \rightarrow Q_{X,\Delta,n}^+ \rightarrow B_{X,\Delta,n}^+ \rightarrow 0.$$

Proof. The assertion (1) holds by applying the snake lemma to the following commutative diagram in which the horizontal sequence is exact:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} F_*W_n\mathcal{O}_X(p\Delta) & \xlongequal{\quad} & F_*W_n\mathcal{O}_X(p\Delta) & & & & \\ \downarrow f^* & & \downarrow V \circ f^* & & & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & F_*f_*W_n\mathcal{O}_Y(pf^*\Delta) & \xrightarrow{V} & f_*W_{n+1}\mathcal{O}_Y(f^*\Delta) & \xrightarrow{R^n} & f_*\mathcal{O}_Y(f^*\Delta) \longrightarrow 0. \end{array}$$

Then (1) implies (2) by applying \varinjlim_f , where f runs over the finite surjective morphisms $f: Y \rightarrow X$ from normal integral schemes Y . Similarly, (3) is obtained by applying \varinjlim_f to $0 \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X(\Delta) \rightarrow Q_{X,\Delta,n}^f \rightarrow B_{X,\Delta,n}^f \rightarrow 0$. \square

Lemma 4.17. *In the situation of Setting 2.12, fix $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ and suppose that (R, \mathfrak{m}) is a local ring. Let A be an ample \mathbb{Q} -Cartier \mathbb{Q} -divisor such that*

$$(4.17.1) \quad qB_{2n-i}^0(X, \{p^i A\}, K_X + [p^i A]) = H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(K_X + [p^i A]))$$

for all $0 \leq i \leq n$. Then

$$H_{W_n\mathfrak{m}}^{d-1}(X, Q_{X,-A,2n}^+) \rightarrow H_{W_n\mathfrak{m}}^{d-1}(X, Q_{X,-A,n}^+)$$

is a zero map.

Proof. More generally, we will show by descending induction on $0 \leq i \leq n-1$ that

$$(4.17.2) \quad H_{W_n\mathfrak{m}}^{d-1}(X, Q_{X,-p^i A, 2n-i}^+) \rightarrow H_{W_n\mathfrak{m}}^{d-1}(X, Q_{X,-p^i A, n-i}^+) \text{ is zero.}$$

The base case $i = n-1$ of this induction follows from

$$H_{W_n\mathfrak{m}}^{d-1}(X, Q_{X,-p^{n-1}A, 1}^+) = H_{\mathfrak{m}}^{d-1}(X^+, \mathcal{O}_{X^+}(-p^{n-1}\pi^*A)) = 0,$$

where the latter equality is a consequence of [BMP⁺20, Corollary 3.7]. Thus we may assume that (4.17.2) holds for some $0 < i \leq n-1$ and aim for showing that:

$$(4.17.3) \quad H_{W_n\mathfrak{m}}^{d-1}(X, Q_{X,-p^{i-1}A, 2n-i+1}^+) \rightarrow H_{W_n\mathfrak{m}}^{d-1}(X, Q_{X,-p^{i-1}A, n-i+1}^+) \text{ is zero.}$$

First, consider the following map of short exact sequences (Lemma 4.16(2)):

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & F_*(B_{X,-p^i A, 2n-i}^+) & \longrightarrow & Q_{X,-p^{i-1}A, 2n-i+1}^+ & \longrightarrow & \pi_*\mathcal{O}_{X^+}(-p^{i-1}\pi^*A) \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow = \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & F_*(B_{X,-p^i A, n-i}^+) & \longrightarrow & Q_{X,-p^{i-1}A, n-i+1}^+ & \longrightarrow & \pi_*\mathcal{O}_{X^+}(-p^{i-1}\pi^*A) \longrightarrow 0. \end{array}$$

Note that $H_{\mathfrak{m}}^j(X, \pi_*\mathcal{O}_{X^+}(-p^{i-1}\pi^*A)) = 0$ for $j < d$ by [BMP⁺20, Corollary 3.7]. Thus, it is enough to show that

$$(4.17.4) \quad H_{\mathfrak{m}}^{d-1}(X, B_{X,-p^i A, 2n-i}^+) \rightarrow H_{\mathfrak{m}}^{d-1}(X, B_{X,-p^i A, n-i}^+)$$

is zero.

Consider the following diagram (Lemma 4.16(3))

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O}_X(-p^i A) & \longrightarrow & Q_{X,-p^i A,2n-i}^+ & \longrightarrow & B_{X,-p^i A,2n-i}^+ \longrightarrow 0 \\
& & \downarrow = & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O}_X(-p^i A) & \longrightarrow & Q_{X,-p^i A,n-i}^+ & \longrightarrow & B_{X,-p^i A,n-i}^+ \longrightarrow 0.
\end{array}$$

By our assumption (4.17.1), Proposition 4.12 gives us that

$$H_m^d(X, \mathcal{O}_X(-p^i A)) \rightarrow H_m^d(X, Q_{X,-p^i A,2n-i}^+)$$

is injective. Moreover,

$$H_m^{d-1}(X, Q_{X,-p^i A,2n-i}^+) \rightarrow H_m^{d-1}(X, Q_{X,-p^i A,n-i}^+)$$

is a zero map by the induction hypothesis. Therefore, a diagram chase shows that (4.17.4) is a zero map as well. \square

Remark 4.18. Note that the key assumption (4.17.1) of Lemma 4.17 is satisfied when $n \gg 0$ if

- $(X, \{p^i A\})$ is locally quasi-+-regular and A is sufficiently ample, or
- $(X, \{p^i A\})$ is globally quasi-+-regular,

for $0 \leq i \leq n$.

Corollary 4.19. *In the situation of Setting 2.12, let Δ be an effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X . Assume that X is divisorially Cohen-Macaulay, (X, Δ) is locally quasi-+-regular, and $-(K_X + \Delta)$ is ample. Then (X, Δ) is globally quasi-+-regular if and only if (X, Δ) is uniformly quasi- F^∞ -split.*

Proof. The assertion holds by applying Theorem 4.15 for $L := 0$. \square

Finally, we give definitions in the adjoint setting.

Definition 4.20. We work in the situation of Setting 3.28. We say that $f : (Y, S_Y) \rightarrow (X, S)$ is a *finite cover* (of (X, S)) if $f : Y \rightarrow X$ is a finite surjective morphism from an integral normal scheme Y and S_Y is a prime divisor on Y satisfying $f(S_Y) = S$. By abuse of notation, the induced morphism $S_Y \rightarrow S$ is also denoted by f .

Suppose that $S \not\subseteq \text{Supp } L$. For a finite cover $f : (Y, S_Y) \rightarrow (X, S)$, we set

$$q^f B_{n,\text{adj}}^0(X, S + B; L) := \text{Im} \left(H^0(X, (Q_{X,S+B-L,n}^{S,f})^*) \rightarrow H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(L)) \right),$$

We define

$$\begin{aligned}
qB_{n,\text{adj}}^0(X, S + B; L) &:= \bigcap_{f:(Y,T) \rightarrow (X,S)} q^f B_{n,\text{adj}}^0(X, S + B; L), \\
qB_{\text{adj}}^0(X, S + B; L) &:= \bigcup_{n \geq 1} qB_{n,\text{adj}}^0(X, S + B; L) = qB_{N,\text{adj}}^0(X, S + B; L),
\end{aligned}$$

where $f : (Y, T) \rightarrow (X, S)$ runs over all finite covers and N is a sufficiently large integer (note that $qB_n^0(-) \subseteq qB_{n+1}^0(-)$).

5. INVERSION OF ADJUNCTION

5.1. **The restriction map for $q^e S^0$.** We start by showing that the restriction of $Q_{X,\Delta,n}^e$ to S is equal to $Q_{S,\Delta|_S,n}^e$.

Proposition 5.1. *In the situation of Setting 2.11, suppose that X is divisorially Cohen-Macaulay. Let S be a normal prime divisor on X and let Δ be a \mathbb{Q} -Cartier \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X such that $S \not\subseteq \text{Supp } \Delta$ and $(X, S + \{p^i \Delta\})$ is plt for every $i \geq 0$. Then restricting $Q_{X,\Delta,n}^e$ to S yields the following short exact sequence:*

$$0 \rightarrow Q_{X,\Delta,n}^{S,e} \rightarrow Q_{X,\Delta,n}^e \rightarrow Q_{S,\Delta_S,n}^e \rightarrow 0,$$

where $\Delta_S := \Delta|_S$ (cf. Definition 2.5).

Proof. By [KTT⁺a, the first paragraph of the proof of Proposition 4.1] we have the following exact sequence

$$(5.1.1) \quad 0 \rightarrow W_n \mathcal{I}_S(\Delta) \rightarrow W_n \mathcal{O}_X(\Delta) \xrightarrow{\text{res}} W_n \mathcal{O}_S(\Delta_S) \rightarrow 0.$$

Note that the $W_n \mathcal{O}_X$ -module homomorphism $\text{res}: W_n \mathcal{O}_X(\Delta) \rightarrow W_n \mathcal{O}_S(\Delta_S)$ is defined by the formula

$$(a_0, \dots, a_{n-1}) \mapsto (a_0|_S, \dots, a_{n-1}|_S),$$

where $a_i \in F_*^i \mathcal{O}_X(p^i \Delta)(U)$ for some open subset $U \subseteq X$, and $a_i|_S := \text{res}(a_i)$ for the surjective homomorphism $\text{res}: F_*^i \mathcal{O}_X(p^i \Delta) \rightarrow F_*^i \mathcal{O}_S(p^i \Delta_S)$ induced from Proposition 2.6. By (5.1.1), we get the following commutative diagram in which each horizontal sequence is exact

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & F_* W_{n-1} \mathcal{I}_S(p\Delta) & \longrightarrow & F_* W_{n-1} \mathcal{O}_X(p\Delta) & \xrightarrow{\text{res}} & F_* W_{n-1} \mathcal{O}_S(p\Delta_S) & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \downarrow F^e V & & \downarrow F^e V & & \downarrow F^e V & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & F_*^e W_n \mathcal{I}_S(p^e \Delta) & \longrightarrow & F_*^e W_n \mathcal{O}_X(p^e \Delta) & \xrightarrow{\text{res}} & F_*^e W_n \mathcal{O}_S(p^e \Delta_S) & \longrightarrow & 0. \end{array}$$

Since all the vertical arrows are injective, the snake lemma yields the required exact sequence (cf. (3.31.1)). \square

We now construct a restriction map for $q^e S^0$, which will be a key tool for inversion of adjunction. With exactly the same assumptions as in Proposition 5.1, consider the following commutative diagram in which each horizontal sequence is exact:

$$(5.1.2) \quad \begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & Q_{X,\Delta,n}^{S,e} & \longrightarrow & Q_{X,\Delta,n}^e & \longrightarrow & Q_{S,\Delta_S,n}^e & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \Phi_{X,\Delta,n}^{S,e} \uparrow & & \Phi_{X,\Delta,n}^e \uparrow & & \Phi_{S,\Delta_S,n}^e \uparrow & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O}_X(\Delta - S) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O}_X(\Delta) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O}_S(\Delta_S) & \longrightarrow & 0. \end{array}$$

Applying $\text{Hom}_{W_n \mathcal{O}_X}(-, W_n \omega_X) = (- \otimes_{W_n \mathcal{O}_X} W_n \mathcal{O}_X(-K_X))^*$ (recall that $(-)^* := \text{Hom}_{W_n \mathcal{O}_X}(-, W_n \omega_X(-K_X))$), we get the following commutative diagram in which

each horizontal sequence is exact:

$$(5.1.3) \quad \begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & (Q_{X,\Delta-K_X,n}^e)^* & \longrightarrow & (Q_{X,\Delta-K_X,n}^{S,e})^* & \longrightarrow & (Q_{S,\Delta_S-K_S,n})^* \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O}_X(K_X - \lfloor \Delta \rfloor) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O}_X(K_X + S - \lfloor \Delta \rfloor) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O}_S(K_S - \lfloor \Delta_S \rfloor) \longrightarrow 0. \end{array}$$

The existence of this diagram follows by the same argument as in [KTT⁺a, p.47]. Note that the lower sequence is exact, because the cokernel of $\mathcal{O}_X(K_X - \lfloor \Delta \rfloor) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X(K_X + S - \lfloor \Delta \rfloor)$ is reflexive, due to X being divisorially Cohen-Macaulay. We are ready to define the restriction map for $q^e S^0$.

Definition 5.2. In the situation of Setting 2.11, let $(X, S + B)$ be a divisorially Cohen-Macaulay plt pair, where S is a normal prime divisor and B is a \mathbb{Q} -divisor such that $\lfloor B \rfloor = 0$. Suppose that $(X, S + \{p^i B\})$ is plt for every $i \geq 0$ and write $K_S + B_S = (K_X + S + B)|_S$.

Let L be a \mathbb{Q} -Cartier Weil divisor such that $S \not\subseteq \text{Supp } L$. Recall that

$$\begin{aligned} q^e S_{n,\text{adj}}^0(X, S + B; L) &= \text{Im} \left(H^0(X, (Q_{X,S+B-L,n}^{S,e})^*) \rightarrow H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(L)) \right), \text{ and} \\ q^e S_n^0(S, B_S; L|_S) &= \text{Im} \left(H^0(S, (Q_{S,B_S-L|_S,n}^e)^*) \rightarrow H^0(S, \mathcal{O}_S(\lceil L|_S - B_S \rceil)) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Then we obtain a map

$$q^e S_{n,\text{adj}}^0(X, S + B; L) \rightarrow q^e S_n^0(S, B_S; L|_S)$$

induced by plugging $\Delta = K_X + S + B - L$ into the above diagram (5.1.3) to get

$$(5.2.1) \quad \begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & (Q_{X,S+B-L,n}^e)^* & \longrightarrow & (Q_{X,S+B-L,n}^{S,e})^* & \longrightarrow & (Q_{S,B_S-L|_S,n}^e)^* \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O}_X(L - S) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O}_X(L) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O}_S(\lceil L|_S - B_S \rceil) \longrightarrow 0. \end{array}$$

By taking the union $\bigcup_{n \geq 1}$, we obtain a map

$$q^e S_{\text{adj}}^0(X, S + B; L) \rightarrow q^e S^0(S, B_S; L|_S)$$

Under our assumptions, $\lceil L|_S - B_S \rceil = \lfloor L|_S \rfloor$ (see Lemma 3.39), and so the lower horizontal row in Diagram (5.2.1) does not contradict Proposition 2.6.

Remark 5.3. In the above definition, in order to make $(K_X + S + B)|_S$ well-defined, we always, implicitly, pick a canonical divisor K_X so that $S \not\subseteq \text{Supp}(K_X + S + B)$. Specifically, this is achieved by using prime avoidance to pick $K_X = -S + D$ for a Weil divisor D such that $S \not\subseteq \text{Supp } D$.

More importantly, we will apply Definition 5.2 even when $S \subseteq \text{Supp } L$. In that case, we implicitly find $L' \sim L$ such that $S \not\subseteq \text{Supp } L'$ and then replace L by L' . As making such replacements in the body of the text would make the proofs and notation impenetrable, we elected *not* to do it.

Lemma 5.4. *In the situation of Setting 2.12, assume that (R, \mathfrak{m}) is a local ring. Let $(X, S + B)$ be a divisorially Cohen-Macaulay plt pair, where S is a normal prime divisor and B is a \mathbb{Q} -divisor such that $[B] = 0$. Suppose that $(X, S + \{p^i B\})$ is plt for every $i \geq 0$ and write $K_S + B_S = (K_X + S + B)|_S$. Let L be a \mathbb{Q} -Cartier Weil divisor on X . Fix an integer $e > 0$. Then the following hold.*

(1) *If $H_{\mathfrak{m}}^{d-1}(X, Q_{X, K_X + S + B - L, n}^e) = 0$, then*

$$q^e S_{n, \text{adj}}^0(X, S + B; L) \rightarrow q^e S_n^0(S, B_S; L|_S)$$

is surjective.

(2) *Assume that for every n_0 , there exist integers m and n such that $m > n \geq n_0$ and*

$$H_{\mathfrak{m}}^{d-1}(X, Q_{X, K_X + S + B - L, m}^e) \rightarrow H_{\mathfrak{m}}^{d-1}(X, Q_{X, K_X + S + B - L, n}^e)$$

is zero. Then

$$q^e S_{\text{adj}}^0(X, S + B; L) \rightarrow q^e S^0(S, B_S; L|_S)$$

is surjective.

Proof. By definition, we obtain the following commutative diagram:

$$(5.4.1) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} H^0(X, (Q_{X, S+B-L, n}^{S, e})^*) & \xrightarrow{\alpha_n} & H^0(S, (Q_{S, B_S-L|_S, n}^e)^*) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ q^e S_{n, \text{adj}}^0(X, S + B; L) & \xrightarrow{\beta_n} & q^e S_n^0(S, B_S; L|_S) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(L)) & \xrightarrow{\gamma_n} & H^0(S, \mathcal{O}_S([L|_S - B_S])). \end{array}$$

By applying Matlis duality $(-)^{\vee} := \text{Hom}_{W_n R}(-, E)$, we obtain

$$(5.4.2) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(X, Q_{X, K_X + S + B - L, n}^{S, e}) & \xleftarrow{\alpha_n^{\vee}} & H_{\mathfrak{m}}^{d-1}(S, Q_{S, K_S + B_S - L|_S, n}^e) \\ \uparrow & & \uparrow j_n \\ q^e S_{n, \text{adj}}^0(X, S + B; L)^{\vee} & \xleftarrow{\beta_n^{\vee}} & q^e S_n^0(S, B_S; L|_S)^{\vee} \\ \uparrow & & \uparrow \\ H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(X, \mathcal{O}_X(K_X - L)) & \xleftarrow{\gamma_n^{\vee}} & H_{\mathfrak{m}}^{d-1}(S, \mathcal{O}_S((K_X - L)|_S)), \end{array}$$

where we used $H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(X, \mathcal{F}) \simeq H^0(X, \mathcal{H}om_{W_n \mathcal{O}_X}(\mathcal{F}, W_n \omega_X))^{\vee}$ for a coherent sheaf \mathcal{F} on $W_n X$ (see Lemma 2.9 applied to $W_n X$). Note that the diagram (5.4.1) coincides with the one obtained from (5.1.2).

Let us show (1). By $H_{\mathfrak{m}}^{d-1}(X, Q_{X, K_X + S + B - L, n}^e) = 0$, α_n^{\vee} is injective. By chasing the diagram (5.4.2), β_n^{\vee} is injective, and hence β_n is surjective. Thus (1) holds.

Let us show (2). Pick $n_0 \gg 0$ and take integers m and n as in the statement of (2). In particular, $m > n \geq n_0 \gg 0$. Recall that we have

$$\begin{aligned} q^e S_1^0(S, B_S; L|_S) &\subseteq \cdots \subseteq q^e S_n^0(S, B_S; L|_S) \\ &= q^e S_{n+1}^0(S, B_S; L|_S) = \cdots = q^e S^0(S, B_S; L|_S). \end{aligned}$$

Applying $(-)^{\vee} (= \text{Hom}_{W_e R}(-, E))$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} q^e S_1^0(S, B_S; L|_S)^{\vee} &\leftarrow \cdots \leftarrow q^e S_n^0(S, B_S; L|_S)^{\vee} \\ &\xleftarrow{\cong} q^e S_{n+1}^0(S, B_S; L|_S)^{\vee} \xleftarrow{\cong} \cdots \xleftarrow{\cong} q^e S^0(S, B_S; L|_S)^{\vee}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we may assume that $q^e S_{n,\text{adj}}^0(X, S+B; L)^{\vee} \xleftarrow{\cong} q^e S_{m,\text{adj}}^0(X, S+B; L)^{\vee}$. It is enough to show that β_n^{\vee} is injective.

To this end, pick $\zeta_n \in q^e S_n^0(S, B_S; L|_S)^{\vee}$ such that $\beta_n^{\vee}(\zeta_n) = 0$. Via the induced isomorphism

$$q^e S_n^0(S, B_S; L|_S) \xleftarrow{\cong} q^e S_m^0(S, B_S; L|_S),$$

there is an element $\zeta_m \in q^e S_m^0(S, B_S; L|_S)^{\vee}$ corresponding to $\zeta_n \in q^e S_n^0(S, B_S; L|_S)^{\vee}$. Therefore, $\beta_m^{\vee}(\zeta_m) = 0$. Then $j_m(\zeta_m)$ is the image of some element

$$\xi_m \in H_m^{d-1}(X, Q_{X, K_X+S+B-L, m}^e).$$

By our assumption, the image of ξ_m in $H_m^{d-1}(X, Q_{X, K_X+S+B-L, n}^e)$ is zero. Then $j_n(\zeta_n) = 0$, and hence $\zeta_n = 0$. Thus (2) holds. \square

Remark 5.5. Assertion (2) can be replaced by a more precise statement. Specifically, pick an integer $n > 0$ such that

$$q^e S_n^0(S, B_S; L|_S) = q^e S_{n+1}^0(S, B_S; L|_S) = \cdots = q^e S^0(S, B_S; L|_S),$$

and assume that $H_m^{d-1}(X, Q_{X, K_X+S+B-L, m}^e) \rightarrow H_m^{d-1}(X, Q_{X, K_X+S+B-L, n}^e)$ is zero for some $m > n$. Then

$$q^e S_{n,\text{adj}}^0(X, S+B; L) \rightarrow q^e S_n^0(S, B_S; L|_S)$$

is surjective. We emphasise that the choice of n depends on e !

Remark 5.6. With some work involving the Mittag-Leffler condition, one can check that the assumption in (2) is equivalent to the vanishing $H_m^{d-1}(Q_{X, K_X+S+B-L}^e) = 0$, where $Q_{X, K_X+S+B-L}^e := \varprojlim_n Q_{X, K_X+S+B-L, n}^e$, which one can use to give a unified proof of both (1) and (2).

5.2. Inversion of adjunction in the log Calabi-Yau case.

Theorem 5.7. *Fix $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ and $e \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. Let k be an F -finite field of characteristic $p > 0$ and let $(X, S+B)$ be a divisorially Cohen-Macaulay plt pair, where X is projective over k , S is a normal prime divisor, and B is a \mathbb{Q} -divisor such that $[B] = 0$. Set $d := \dim X$ and define the effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor B_S on S by adjunction $K_S + B_S = (K_X + S + B)|_S$. Suppose that the following hold.*

- (1) $(X, S + \{p^i B\})$ is plt for every $i \geq 0$.

- (2) (S, B_S) is n -quasi- F^e -split.
(3) $H^{d-1}(X, \mathcal{O}_X(p^f(K_X + S + B))) = 0$ for every $f \in \{1, 2, \dots, e+1\}$.
(4) $H^d(X, \mathcal{O}_X(p^f(K_X + S + B))) = 0$ for every $f \in \{1, 2, \dots, e\}$.

Then $(X, S + B)$ is purely n -quasi- F^e -split.

Proof. After replacing k by $H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X)$, we may assume that $H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X) = k$. By (2), we have $q^e S_n^0(S, B_S; 0) = H^0(S, \mathcal{O}_S)$, and hence $q^e S^0(S, B_S; 0) \neq 0$. It suffices to show

$$(5.7.1) \quad H^{d-1}(X, Q_{X, K_X + S + B, m}^e) = 0 \quad \text{for every } m \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\},$$

because the equality $H^{d-1}(X, Q_{X, K_X + S + B, n}^e) = 0$, together with Lemma 5.4, implies $q^e S_{n, \text{adj}}^0(X, S + B; 0) \neq 0$, which in turn yields $q^e S_{n, \text{adj}}^0(X, S + B; 0) = H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X)$, i.e., $(X, S + B)$ is purely n -quasi- F^e -split.

Let us prove (5.7.1) by induction on m . The base case $m = 1$ is settled by

$$H^{d-1}(X, Q_{X, K_X + S + B, 1}^e) = H^{d-1}(X, F_*^e \mathcal{O}_X(p^e(K_X + S + B))) = 0,$$

where the latter equality follows from Assumption (3). We have the following exact sequence (3.14.2):

$$0 \rightarrow F_*^{m-1} B_{X, p(K_X + S + B), 1}^e \rightarrow Q_{X, K_X + S + B, m}^e \rightarrow Q_{X, K_X + S + B, m-1}^e \rightarrow 0,$$

and hence the problem is reduced to $H^{d-1}(X, B_{X, p(K_X + S + B), 1}^e) = 0$.

As a more generalised statement, it suffices to show

$$(5.7.2) \quad H^{d-1}(X, B_{X, p(K_X + S + B), 1}^f) = 0 \quad \text{for every } f \in \{0, 1, \dots, e\}.$$

We prove (5.7.2) by induction on f . The base case $f = 0$ follows from $B_{X, p(K_X + S + B), 1}^0 = \text{Coker}(F^0 : \mathcal{O}_X \rightarrow F_*^0 \mathcal{O}_X) = \text{Coker}(\text{id} : \mathcal{O}_X \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X) = 0$. By the following exact sequence (3.14.1):

$$0 \rightarrow B_{X, p(K_X + S + B), 1}^{f-1} \rightarrow B_{X, p(K_X + S + B), 1}^f \rightarrow F_*^{f-1} B_{X, p^f(K_X + S + B), 1}^1 \rightarrow 0,$$

it is enough to prove

$$(5.7.3) \quad H^{d-1}(X, B_{X, p^f(K_X + S + B), 1}^1) = 0 \quad \text{for every } f \in \{1, 2, \dots, e\}.$$

By the definition of $B_{X, p^f(K_X + S + B), 1}^1$ (3.0.2), we have an exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X(p^f(K_X + S + B)) \rightarrow F_* \mathcal{O}_X(p^{f+1}(K_X + S + B)) \rightarrow B_{X, p^f(K_X + S + B), 1}^1 \rightarrow 0.$$

Then (5.7.3) follows from Assumption (3) and Assumption (4). \square

Remark 5.8. We use the same notation as in the statement of Theorem 5.7.

- Assumption (1) holds if X is \mathbb{Q} -factorial and B has standard coefficients. Indeed, as we are assuming that (X, B) is plt, also $(X, \{p^i B\})$ is plt for every $i \geq 0$, because $K_X + S + \{p^i B\}$ is \mathbb{Q} -Cartier and $\{p^i B\} \leq B$.

- Assumption (4) holds when $K_X + S + B \equiv 0$ and B has standard coefficients, because we have

$$h^d(X, \mathcal{O}_X(p^f(K_X + S + B))) = h^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(K_X - \lfloor p^f(K_X + S + B) \rfloor))$$

and

$$K_X - \lfloor p^f(K_X + S + B) \rfloor \equiv K_X + \{p^f B\} \leq K_X + B \equiv -S.$$

Corollary 5.9. *Fix $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ and $e \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. Let k be an F -finite field of characteristic $p > 0$ and let X be a d -dimensional regular projective variety over k . Take a regular prime divisor S on X . Assume that*

- (i) $H^{d-1}(X, \mathcal{O}_X) = 0$,
- (ii) $K_X + S \sim 0$, and
- (iii) S is n -quasi- F^e -split.

Then (X, S) is purely n -quasi- F^e -split. In particular, X is n -quasi- F^e -split.

Proof. We apply Theorem 5.7 by setting $B := 0$. It is enough to verify its assumptions. By Remark 5.8, Assumption (1) and Assumption (4) of Theorem 5.7 hold. Assumption (2) of Theorem 5.7 follows from (iii). Finally, Assumption (3) of Theorem 5.7 holds by (i) and (ii). \square

5.3. Inversion of adjunction for anti-semi-ample divisors.

Setting 5.10. Let R be an F -finite Noetherian local domain of characteristic $p > 0$ such that $W_n R$ is an excellent ring admitting a dualising complex for every $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. Set \mathfrak{m} to be the maximal ideal of R . Let X be a d -dimensional integral normal scheme such that X admits a projective morphism $\pi: X \rightarrow \text{Spec } R$ and $H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X) = R$. Let $(X, S + B)$ be a divisorially Cohen-Macaulay \mathbb{Q} -factorial plt pair, where S is a normal prime divisor and B is a \mathbb{Q} -divisor such that $\lfloor B \rfloor = 0$ and $(X, S + \{p^i B\})$ is plt for every integer $i \geq 0$. We define an effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor B_S on S by $K_S + B_S = (K_X + S + B)|_S$. Let L be a Weil divisor on X such that $A := L - (K_X + S + B)$ is ample. For $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ and a coherent $W_n \mathcal{O}_X$ -module \mathcal{F} , we set $H_{\mathfrak{m}}^i(X, \mathcal{F}) := H_{W_n \mathfrak{m}}^i(X, \mathcal{F})$ by abuse of notation.

We also introduce two conditions on an integer $e_0 > 0$:

$$(\star) \quad H_{\mathfrak{m}}^j(X, \mathcal{O}_X(-sA)) = 0 \quad \text{for all } j < d \text{ and } s \geq p^{e_0},$$

and in the case when $-S$ is semiample over $\text{Spec } R$:

$$(\star\star) \quad H_{\mathfrak{m}}^j(X, \mathcal{O}_X(-sA - kS)) = 0 \quad \text{for all } j < d, k \geq 0, \text{ and } s \geq p^{e_0}.$$

Such e_0 may be chosen by Lemma 2.10 (more precisely, its variant using the Fujita vanishing theorem).

The goal of this section is to establish that quasi- F^e -stable sections of L lift from S , when $-S$ is semiample.

Remark 5.11. The main difficulty with working with iterative quasi- F -splittings is that one needs to be very careful about the order of quantifiers between the power of

Frobenius e , and the height n . In this subsection we deal with non-uniform version of quasi- F -splittings, and so the choice of e cannot depend on n .

Assume that $-S$ is semiample and fix an integer e_0 satisfying Condition $(\star\star)$. We will establish the following surjectivity as long as $e \geq e_0$ (see Theorem 5.18):

$$q^e S_{n,\text{adj}}^0(X, S + B; L) \rightarrow q^e S_n^0(S, B_S; L|_S)$$

assuming that n is large enough. We emphasise that the choice of large enough n depends on e itself, and not just e_0 . For example, we need n large enough so that:

$$q^e S_{n,\text{adj}}^0(X, S + B; L) = q^e S_{n+1,\text{adj}}^0(X, S + B; L) = \dots = q^e S_{\text{adj}}^0(X, S + B; L),$$

and similarly for $q^e S_n^0(S, B_S; L|_S)$. In fact, what we need is that n is large enough so that the above equalities hold for L replaced by $K_X + [p^i A] - kS$ and B replaced by $\{p^i B\}$ for all $i, k \geq 0$ ⁵. The existence of such n follows by Noetherianity and the stabilisation of quasi- F^e -stable sections for every $i \gg 0$ and $k \geq 0$ (see the lemma below).

Last we point out that there are only finitely many possibilities for $\{p^i B\}$ when i is an integer, and so the choice of i will not affect the order of quantifiers.

Lemma 5.12. *In the situation of Setting 5.10, fix an integer $e > 0$ and a π -nef Weil divisor N . Let n be a positive integer such that $(X, \{p^i B\})$ is n -quasi- F^e -pure for every integer $i \geq 0$. Then there exists $i_1 \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ such that*

$$(5.12.1) \quad q^e S_n^0(X, \{p^i B\}; K_X + [p^i A] + kN) = H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(K_X + [p^i A] + kN))$$

for all integers $i \geq i_1$ and $k \geq 0$.

We immediately get that

$$q^e S_{n'}^0(X, \{p^i B\}; K_X + [p^i A] + kN) = H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(K_X + [p^i A] + kN))$$

for all $n' \geq n$, $i \geq i_1$, and $k \geq 0$. The following proof is the same as that of Proposition 3.53. For the reader's convenience, we repeat it below.

Proof. By Definition 3.38, $q^e S_n^0(X, \{p^i B\}; K_X + [p^i A] + kN)$ is equal to

$$\text{Im} \left(H^0(X, (Q_{X, -(K_X + p^i A + kN), n}^e)^* \rightarrow H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(K_X + [p^i A] + kN))) \right),$$

where $(-)^* := \mathcal{H}om_{W_n \mathcal{O}_X}(-, W_n \omega(-K_X))$. Define

$$\mathcal{G}_{r,k} := \text{Ker} \left((Q_{X, -(K_X + rA + kN), n}^e)^* \xrightarrow{(\dagger)} \mathcal{O}_X(K_X + [rA] + kN) \right).$$

Claim 5.13. *There exists an integer $r_0 > 0$ such that $H^1(X, \mathcal{G}_{r,k}) = 0$ for all $r \geq r_0$ and $k \geq 0$.*

Assuming this claim, we now finish the proof of Lemma 5.12. Pick an integer i_0 such that $p^{i_0} \geq r_0$ and set $r = p^i$. Note that (\dagger) is surjective as $(X, \{p^i B\})$ is n -quasi- F^e -pure (see Proposition 3.20 for $D = -(K_X + [p^i A] + kN)$ and $\Delta + D = -(K_X + p^i A + kN)$). Therefore, the claim immediately implies that $q^e S_n^0(X, \Delta; K_X +$

⁵or to be more precise, for all $0 \leq k \leq k_0$ where k_0 is bounded in terms of i (see Remark 5.17)

$[p^i A + kN]) = H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(K_X + [p^i A + kN]))$ for all $i \geq i_0$, so it is enough to prove the above claim.

To this end, take $m_0 \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ such that $m_0 A$ and $m_0 N$ are Cartier. Take integers r' and k' defined by $r' := r \bmod m_0$ and $k' := k \bmod m_0$ (cf. Subsection 2.1(11)). Since $(r - r')A$ and $(k - k')N$ are Cartier, we get $\mathcal{G}_{r,k} = \mathcal{G}_{r',k'} \otimes \mathcal{O}_X((r - r')A + (k - k')N)$. Thus there exists r_0 (independent of (r, k)) such that

$$H^1(X, \mathcal{G}_{r',k'} \otimes \mathcal{O}_X((r - r')A + (k - k')N)) = 0$$

for every $r \geq r_0$ and every $k \geq 0$ by the Fujita vanishing theorem ([Kee03, Theorem 1.5]), because there are only finitely many possibilities for $\mathcal{G}_{r',k'}$. \square

The following proposition allows one to run an inductive proof that quasi- F^e -stable sections lift.

Proposition 5.14. *In the situation of Setting 5.10, take integers e and e_0 satisfying $e \geq e_0 > 0$ and Condition (\star) . Suppose that the following hold.*

- (1) $(X, \{p^i B\})$ is quasi- F^e -pure for every integer $i \geq 0$.
- (2) $q^e S^0(X, \{p^i B\}; K_X + [p^i A]) = H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(K_X + [p^i A]))$ for every integer $i \geq 1$.

Then the map

$$q^e S_{\text{adj}}^0(X, S + B; L) \rightarrow q^e S^0(S, B_S; L|_S)$$

from Definition 5.2 is surjective (cf. Remark 5.3).

Note that $K_X + [p^i A] = K_X + \{p^i B\} + p^i A$.

Proof. Pick an integer $\ell > 0$ such that $(X, \{p^i B\})$ is ℓ -quasi- F^e -pure for every $i \geq 0$ and pick $i_1 \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ as in Lemma 5.12. Then we have

$$q^e S_\ell^0(X, \{p^i B\}; K_X + [p^i A]) = H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(K_X + [p^i A]))$$

for every $i > i_1$. For every $1 \leq i \leq i_1$, (2) enables us to find $n_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ such that

$$q^e S_{n_i}^0(X, \{p^i B\}; K_X + [p^i A]) = H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(K_X + [p^i A])).$$

Fix integers n and m satisfying $n \geq \max\{\ell, n_1, \dots, n_{i_1}\}$ and $m \geq 2n$. In particular,

$$(5.14.1) \quad q^e S_{n'}^0(X, \{p^i B\}; K_X + [p^i A]) = H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(K_X + [p^i A])) \\ \text{if } n' \geq n, \quad i \geq 1.$$

By Lemma 5.4(2), it is enough to show that the map

$$H_{\mathfrak{m}}^{d-1}(X, Q_{X,-A,m}^e) \rightarrow H_{\mathfrak{m}}^{d-1}(X, Q_{X,-A,n}^e)$$

is zero. We shall prove a more general statement that

$$H_{\mathfrak{m}}^{d-1}(X, Q_{X,-p^{i-1}A,m-i+1}^e) \rightarrow H_{\mathfrak{m}}^{d-1}(X, Q_{X,-p^{i-1}A,n-i+1}^e)$$

is zero by descending induction on $1 \leq i \leq n$. This holds when $i = n$, because Condition (\star) implies

$$H_{\mathfrak{m}}^{d-1}(X, Q_{X,-p^{n-1}A,1}^e) \simeq H_{\mathfrak{m}}^{d-1}(X, F_*^e \mathcal{O}_X(-p^{e+n-1}A)) = 0.$$

Now consider the following commutative diagram in which each horizontal sequence is exact (Lemma 3.11):

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & F_*(B_{X,-p^i A, m-i}^e) & \longrightarrow & Q_{X,-p^{i-1} A, m-i+1}^e & \longrightarrow & F_*^e \mathcal{O}_X(-p^{e+i-1} A) \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow \alpha_{i,m,n}^e & & \downarrow \beta_{i-1,m,n}^e & & \parallel \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & F_*(B_{X,-p^i A, n-i}^e) & \longrightarrow & Q_{X,-p^{i-1} A, n-i+1}^e & \longrightarrow & F_*^e \mathcal{O}_X(-p^{e+i-1} A) \longrightarrow 0. \end{array}$$

It suffices to show the implication $H_m^{d-1}(X, \beta_{i,m,n}^e) = 0 \Rightarrow H_m^{d-1}(X, \beta_{i-1,m,n}^e) = 0$, where

$$H_m^{d-1}(X, \beta_{i,m,n}^e) : H_m^{d-1}(X, Q_{X,-p^i A, m-i}^e) \rightarrow H_m^{d-1}(X, Q_{X,-p^i A, n-i}^e).$$

By $H_m^{d-2}(X, \mathcal{O}_X(-p^{e+i-1} A)) = H_m^{d-1}(X, \mathcal{O}_X(-p^{e+i-1} A)) = 0$ (\star), the above diagram implies that $H_m^{d-1}(X, \beta_{i-1,m,n}^e) = 0 \Leftrightarrow H_m^{d-1}(X, \alpha_{i,m,n}^e) = 0$. Consider the following commutative diagram in which each horizontal sequence is exact (Remark 3.1):

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O}_X(-p^i A) & \xrightarrow{\Phi_{X,-p^i A, m-i}^e} & Q_{X,-p^i A, m-i}^e & \xrightarrow{\rho} & B_{X,-p^i A, m-i}^e \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \parallel & & \downarrow \beta_{i,m,n}^e & & \downarrow \alpha_{i,m,n}^e \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O}_X(-p^i A) & \xrightarrow{\Phi_{X,-p^i A, n-i}^e} & Q_{X,-p^i A, n-i}^e & \longrightarrow & B_{X,-p^i A, n-i}^e \longrightarrow 0. \end{array}$$

By $m - i \geq 2n - n = n$, (5.14.1) implies that $q^e S_{m-i}^0(X, \{p^i B\}; K_X + [p^i A]) = H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(K_X + [p^i A]))$, i.e.,

$$H^0(X, (Q_{X,-K_X-p^i A, m-i}^e)^*) \xrightarrow{H^0(X, (\Phi_{X,-K_X-p^i A, m-i}^e)^*)} H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(K_X + [p^i A]))$$

is surjective. We get that

$$H_m^d(X, \Phi_{X,-p^i A, m-i}^e) : H_m^d(X, \mathcal{O}_X(-p^i A)) \rightarrow H_m^d(X, Q_{X,-p^i A, m-i}^e)$$

is injective by Proposition 3.10. Since $H_m^{d-1}(\rho)$ is surjective, we obtain $H_m^{d-1}(X, \beta_{i,m,n}^e) = 0 \Rightarrow H_m^{d-1}(X, \alpha_{i,m,n}^e) = 0$. To summarise,

$$H_m^{d-1}(X, \beta_{i,m,n}^e) = 0 \Rightarrow H_m^{d-1}(X, \alpha_{i,m,n}^e) = 0 \Leftrightarrow H_m^{d-1}(X, \beta_{i-1,m,n}^e) = 0,$$

as required. \square

Remark 5.15. Under the same assumptions as in Proposition 5.14, we can show in fact that $q^e S_{n,\text{adj}}^0(X, S + B; L) \rightarrow q^e S_n^0(S, B_S; L|_S)$ is surjective, provided we replace Assumption (2) by the condition that there exists an integer $n > 0$ satisfying (5.14.1).

Proposition 5.16. *Fix $e \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. In the situation of Setting 5.10, suppose that the following hold.*

- (1) $-S$ is semiample.
- (2) (S, B_S) is quasi- F^e -split.
- (3) $q^e S_{\text{adj}}^0(X, S + B; L - kS) \rightarrow q^e S^0(S, B_S; (L - kS)|_S)$ is surjective for all $k \geq 0$.

Then

$$(5.16.1) \quad q^e S_{\text{adj}}^0(X, S + B; L) = H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(L)).$$

In particular, $q^e S^0(X, B; L) = H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(L))$ (cf. Lemma 3.42).

We omit some details of the following proof, as it is identical to that of [KTT⁺a, Lemma 4.9].

Proof. Let \mathfrak{m} be the maximal ideal of R . We have $\mathfrak{m} \in \pi(S)$. First of all, we reduce the problem to showing that

$$(5.16.2) \quad H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(L - kS)) + q^e S_{\text{adj}}^0(X, S + B; L) = H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(L))$$

for every integer $k \geq 0$. To this end, we first observe that in order to prove (5.16.1), it suffices to show

$$\mathfrak{m}H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(L)) + q^e S_{\text{adj}}^0(X, S + B; L) = H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(L))$$

by Nakayama's lemma. One can show that $\mathfrak{m}H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(L)) \supseteq H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(L - kS))$ for a large integer $k \gg 0$, and hence (5.16.1) holds if (5.16.2) holds for every $k \geq 0$. For more details, see [KTT⁺a, Reduction to (4.9.1) and Reduction to (4.9.3) in the proof of Lemma 4.9].

We shall prove (5.16.2) for every integer $k \geq 0$ by increasing induction on k . Since the base case of the induction $k = 0$ is trivial, we assume that (5.16.2) is true for some $k \geq 0$ and aim for showing that

$$(5.16.3) \quad H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(L - (k + 1)S)) + q^e S_{\text{adj}}^0(X, S + B; L) = H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(L)).$$

We start by making two observations. First, note that

$$(5.16.4) \quad q^e S_{\text{adj}}^0(X, S + B; L) \supseteq q^e S_{\text{adj}}^0(X, S + B; L - kS).$$

Second, observe that Proposition 3.40 yields

$$(5.16.5) \quad q^e S^0(S, B_S; (L - kS)|_S) = H^0(S, \mathcal{O}_S([(L - kS)|_S - B_S])).$$

Here we used that $(S, \{B_S - (L - kS)|_S\})$ is quasi- F^e -split, which is true by Assumption (2) and $\{B_S - (L - kS)|_S\} \leq B_S$ [KTT⁺a, Claim 4.10 in the proof of Lemma 4.9].

Now pick a section $\gamma \in H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(L))$. By the induction hypothesis (5.16.2), we have $\gamma = \gamma_1 + \gamma_2$ for some $\gamma_1 \in H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(L - kS))$ and $\gamma_2 \in q^e S_{\text{adj}}^0(X, S + B; L)$. Then

$$\gamma_1|_S \in H^0(S, \mathcal{O}_S([(L - kS)|_S - B_S]))$$

(cf. the lower horizontal sequence in the diagram (5.2.1)). By (5.16.5) and Assumption (3), there exists a section

$$\sigma \in q^e S_{\text{adj}}^0(X, S + B; L - kS) \subseteq H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(L - kS))$$

such that $\sigma|_S = \gamma_1|_S$. Hence

$$\gamma_1 = (\gamma_1 - \sigma) + \sigma,$$

where $\gamma_1 - \sigma \in H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(L - (k + 1)S))$ and $\sigma \in q^e S_{\text{adj}}^0(X, S + B; L)$ by (5.16.4). This concludes the proof of the claim (5.16.3). \square

Remark 5.17. The above proposition looks very subtle in that for different choices of k we may be forced to pick a different height in assumption (3). Thus, at first glance, it may seem that one cannot work with a fixed height depending on e . However, this is not really the case as we only need to check this condition for $k \leq k_0$, where k_0 is chosen so that

$$\mathfrak{m}H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(L)) \supseteq H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(L - k_0S)).$$

Theorem 5.18. *In the situation of Setting 5.10, take integers e and e_0 satisfying $e \geq e_0 > 0$ and Condition $(\star\star)$. Suppose that the following hold.*

- (1) (X, B) is quasi- F^e -pure.
- (2) $B \geq \{p^i B\}$ for every $i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$.
- (3) $-S$ is semiample.
- (4) (S, B_S) is quasi- F^e -split.

Then $q^e S_{\text{adj}}^0(X, S + B; L) \rightarrow q^e S^0(S, B_S; L|_S)$ is surjective.

Proof. For $i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ and $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, we set

- $B_i := \{p^i B\}$,
- $K_S + B_{S,i} := (K_X + S + B_i)|_S$,
- $A_{i,k} := p^i A - kS$, and
- $L_{i,k} := \lceil K_X + S + p^i A - kS \rceil = \lceil K_X + S + A_{i,k} \rceil = K_X + S + B_i + A_{i,k}$.

Note that $B = B_0$, $B_{S,0} = B_S$, $A = A_{0,0}$, and $L = K_X + S + B + A = \lceil K_X + S + A \rceil = L_{0,0}$. All the conditions assumed in Setting 5.10 hold after replacing (B, B_S, A, L) by $(B_i, B_{S,i}, A_{i,k}, L_{i,k})$. After such replacement, Condition (\star) is guaranteed by Condition $(\star\star)$, too. However, note that it is not necessarily true that $B_i \geq \{p^j B_i\}$.

By (1), (2), and (4), the following hold.

- (1') (X, B_i) is quasi- F^e -pure.
- (4') $(S, B_{S,i})$ is quasi- F^e -split.

For $i \geq 0$, consider the following two assertions.

- (a _{i}) The following map is surjective for every $k \geq 0$:

$$q^e S_{\text{adj}}^0(X, S + B_i; L_{i,k}) \rightarrow q^e S^0(S, B_{S,i}; L_{i,k}|_S).$$

- (b _{i}) $q^e S^0(X, B_i; L_{i,k}) = H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(L_{i,k}))$ for all $k \geq 0$.

We prove (a _{i}) and (b _{i}) by descending induction on i . We can find $i_1 \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ such that (b _{i}) holds for every $i \geq i_1$ (Lemma 5.12). Fix an integer $i \geq 0$. It suffices to show (α) and (β) below.

- (α) If (a _{i}) holds, then (b _{i}) holds.
- (β) If (b _{i'}) holds for every $i' \geq i + 1$, then (a _{i}) holds.

Let us show (α) . Assume (a _{i}). Fix $k \geq 0$. We now apply Proposition 5.16 for $m \gg 0$ after replacing (B, B_S, A, L) by $(B_i, B_{S,i}, A_{i,k}, L_{i,k})$. The assumptions (1), (2), and (3) of Proposition 5.16 follow from (3), (4'), and (a _{i}), respectively. We then obtain $q^e S^0(X, B_i; L_{i,k}) = H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(L_{i,k}))$, i.e., (b _{i}) holds. Thus (α) holds.

Let us show (β) . Assume that (b _{i'}) holds for every $i' \geq i + 1$. Fix $k \geq 0$. In order to apply Proposition 5.14 after replacing (B, B_S, A, L) by $(B_i, B_{S,i}, A_{i,k}, L_{i,k})$, we now

verify its assumptions. First, Condition (\star) is satisfied as mentioned earlier. Further, for every $j \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, it holds that $\{p^j B_i\} = \{p^j \{p^i B\}\} = \{p^{i+j} B\} = B_{i+j}$ and

$$p^j A_{i,k} = p^j (p^i A - kS) = p^{i+j} A - kp^j S = A_{i+j, kp^j}.$$

Thus Assumption (1) in Proposition 5.14 holds by (1'). As for Assumption (2) in Proposition 5.14, it is enough to check the following.

(†) $q^e S^0(X, \{p^j B_i\}; K_X + [p^j A_{i,k}]) = H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(K_X + [p^j A_{i,k}]))$ for every $j \geq 1$. We have $K_X + [p^j A_{i,k}] = K_X + [A_{i+j, kp^j}] = L_{i+j, kp^j} - S = L_{i+j, kp^j+1}$. Therefore, (†) is equivalent to (‡) below.

(‡) $q^e S^0(X, B_{i+j}; L_{i+j, kp^j+1}) = H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(L_{i+j, kp^j+1}))$ for every $j > 0$.

Then (‡) holds, because we are assuming that (b_{i+j}) holds for every $j \geq 1$. This completes the proof of (β) . \square

Corollary 5.19. *With the same assumptions as in Theorem 5.18, we have that $q^e S_{\text{adj}}^0(X, S + B; L) = H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(L))$.*

Proof. By applying Theorem 5.18 with L replaced by $L - kS$, we get that

$$q^e S_{\text{adj}}^0(X, S + B; L - kS) \rightarrow q^e S^0(S, B_S; (L - kS)|_S)$$

is surjective for every $k \geq 0$. Then we can conclude by Proposition 5.16. \square

Corollary 5.20. *In the situation of Setting 2.12, suppose that R is a local ring and $H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X) = R$. Let $(X, S + B)$ be a divisorially Cohen-Macaulay \mathbb{Q} -factorial plt pair, where S is a normal prime divisor and B is a \mathbb{Q} -divisor such that $[B] = 0$. Suppose that $-(K_X + S + B)$ is ample and the following hold.*

- (1) (X, B) is quasi- F^e -pure for every $e \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$.
- (2) $B \geq \{p^i B\}$ for every $i \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$.
- (3) $-S$ is semiample.
- (4) (S, B_S) is quasi- F^e -split for every $e \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, where $K_S + B_S = (K_X + S + B)|_S$.

Then $(X, S + B)$ is purely quasi- F^e -split for every $e \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$.

Proof. Set $A := -(K_X + S + B)$. Take $e_0 \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ such that

$$H_m^j(X, \mathcal{O}_X(-sA - kS)) = 0 \quad \text{for all integers } j < d, k \geq 0, \text{ and } s \geq p^{e_0},$$

whose existence is guaranteed by a variant of Lemma 2.10 using the Fujita vanishing theorem. Fix an integer $e \geq e_0$. Then it follows from Corollary 5.19 that

$$q^e S_{\text{adj}}^0(X, S + B; 0) = H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X),$$

and so $(X, S + B)$ is purely quasi- F^e -split (see Definition 3.34). \square

6. INVERSION OF ADJUNCTION FOR UNIFORM QUASI- F^∞ -SPLITTING

Lemma 6.1. *In the situation of Setting 5.10, the following hold.*

- (1) *If $H_m^{d-1}(X, Q_{X, K_X + S + B - L, n}^{\text{perf}}) = 0$ for some integer $n > 0$, then*

$$q^\infty S_{n, \text{adj}}^0(X, S + B; L) \rightarrow q^\infty S_n^0(S, B_S; L|_S)$$

is surjective.

(2) Suppose that for every n_0 , there exist integers m and n such that $m > n \geq n_0$ and

$$H_m^{d-1}(X, Q_{X, K_X+S+B-L, n}^{\text{perf}}) \rightarrow H_m^{d-1}(X, Q_{X, K_X+S+B-L, n}^{\text{perf}})$$

is zero. Then

$$q_{\text{uni}}^\infty S_{\text{adj}}^0(X, S+B; L) \rightarrow q_{\text{uni}}^\infty S^0(S, B_S; L|_S)$$

is surjective.

Proof. As in the proof of Lemma 5.4, we have the following commutative diagram:

$$(6.1.1) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} H_m^d(X, Q_{X, K_X+S+B-L, n}^{S, \text{perf}}) & \xleftarrow{\alpha_n} & H_m^{d-1}(S, Q_{S, K_S+B_S-L|_S, n}^{\text{perf}}) \\ \uparrow & & \uparrow j_n \\ I_n & \xleftarrow{\beta_n} & J_n \\ \uparrow & & \uparrow \\ H_m^d(X, \mathcal{O}_X(K_X - L)) & \xleftarrow{\gamma_n} & H_m^{d-1}(S, \mathcal{O}_S((K_X - L)|_S)), \end{array}$$

where I_n and J_n are defined as the images of the vertical arrows. Note that by Proposition 3.49 and an analogous statement in the adjoint case, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} I_n^\vee &\simeq q^\infty S_{n, \text{adj}}^0(X, S+B; L)^\wedge, \quad \text{and} \\ J_n^\vee &\simeq q^\infty S_n^0(S, B_S; L|_S)^\wedge. \end{aligned}$$

Let us show (1). By $H_m^{d-1}(X, Q_{X, K_X+S+B-L, n}^{\text{perf}}) = 0$, we have that α_n is injective. By chasing the diagram (6.1.1), β_n is injective. Thus $\beta_n^\vee: q^\infty S_{n, \text{adj}}^0(X, S+B; L) \rightarrow q^\infty S_n^0(S, B_S; L|_S)$ is surjective and hence (1) holds.

Let us show (2). Pick $n_0 \gg 0$ and take integers m and n as in the statement of (2). In particular, $m > n \geq n_0 \gg 0$. Recall that we have

$$\begin{aligned} q^\infty S_1^0(S, B_S; L|_S) &\subseteq \cdots \subseteq q^\infty S_n^0(S, B_S; L|_S) \\ &= q^\infty S_{n+1}^0(S, B_S; L|_S) = \cdots = q_{\text{uni}}^\infty S^0(S, B_S; L|_S). \end{aligned}$$

Applying $(-)^\vee (= \text{Hom}_{W_e R}(-, E))$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} q^\infty S_1^0(S, B_S; L|_S)^\vee &\leftarrow \cdots \leftarrow q^\infty S_n^0(S, B_S; L|_S)^\vee \\ &\xleftarrow{\simeq} q^\infty S_{n+1}^0(S, B_S; L|_S)^\vee \xleftarrow{\simeq} \cdots \xleftarrow{\simeq} q_{\text{uni}}^\infty S^0(S, B_S; L|_S)^\vee. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we may assume that $q^\infty S_{n, \text{adj}}^0(X, S+B; L)^\vee \xleftarrow{\simeq} q^\infty S_{m, \text{adj}}^0(X, S+B; L)^\vee$. It is enough to show that β_n is injective.

To this end, pick $\zeta_n \in q^\infty S_n^0(S, B_S; L|_S)^\vee$ such that $\beta_n(\zeta_n) = 0$. Via the induced isomorphism

$$q^\infty S_n^0(S, B_S; L|_S) \xleftarrow{\simeq} q^\infty S_m^0(S, B_S; L|_S),$$

there is an element $\zeta_m \in q^\infty S_m^0(S, B_S; L|_S)^\vee$ corresponding to $\zeta_n \in q^\infty S_n^0(S, B_S; L|_S)^\vee$. Therefore, $\beta_m(\zeta_m) = 0$. Then $j_m(\zeta_m)$ is the image of some element

$$\xi_m \in H_m^{d-1}(X, Q_{X, K_X+S+B-L, m}^{\text{perf}}).$$

By our assumption, the image of ξ_m in $H_m^{d-1}(X, Q_{X, K_X+S+B-L, n}^{\text{perf}})$ is zero. Then $j_n(\zeta_n) = 0$, and hence $\zeta_n = 0$. Thus (2) holds. \square

6.1. Uniformly quasi- F^∞ -split case.

Lemma 6.2. *In the situation of Setting 5.10, fix an integer $e > 0$ and a π -nef Weil divisor N . Let n be a positive integer such that $(X, \{p^i B\})$ is n -quasi- F^∞ -pure for every integer $i \geq 0$. Then there exists $i_1 \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ such that*

$$(6.2.1) \quad q^\infty S_n^0(X, \{p^i B\}; K_X + [p^i A] + kN) = H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(K_X + [p^i A] + kN))$$

for all integers $i \geq i_1$ and $k \geq 0$.

Proof. This follows immediately from Proposition 3.53. \square

Proposition 6.3. *In the situation of Setting 5.10, suppose that the following hold.*

- (1) $(X, \{p^i B\})$ is uniformly quasi- F^∞ -pure for every integer $i \geq 0$.
- (2) $q_{\text{uni}}^\infty S^0(X, \{p^i B\}; K_X + [p^i A]) = H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(K_X + [p^i A]))$ for all integers $i \geq 1$.

Then the map

$$q_{\text{uni}}^\infty S_{\text{adj}}^0(X, S + B; L) \rightarrow q_{\text{uni}}^\infty S^0(S, B_S; L|_S)$$

induced from Definition 5.2 is surjective (cf. Remark 5.3).

Note that $K_X + [p^i A] = K_X + \{p^i B\} + p^i A$.

Proof. Pick an integer $\ell > 0$ such that $(X, \{p^i B\})$ is ℓ -quasi- F^∞ -pure for every $i \geq 0$ and pick $i_1 \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ as in Lemma 6.2. Then we have

$$q^\infty S_\ell^0(X, \{p^i B\}; K_X + [p^i A]) = H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(K_X + [p^i A]))$$

for every $i > i_1$. For every $1 \leq i \leq i_1$, (2) enables us to find $n_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ such that

$$q^\infty S_{n_i}^0(X, \{p^i B\}; K_X + [p^i A]) = H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(K_X + [p^i A])).$$

Fix integers n and m satisfying $n \geq \max\{\ell, n_1, \dots, n_{i_1}\}$ and $m \geq 2n$. In particular,

$$(6.3.1) \quad q^\infty S_{n'}^0(X, \{p^i B\}; K_X + [p^i A]) = H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(K_X + [p^i A]))$$

if $n' \geq n, \quad i \geq 1$.

By Lemma 6.1(2), it is enough to show that the map

$$H_m^{d-1}(X, Q_{X, -A, m}^{\text{perf}}) \rightarrow H_m^{d-1}(X, Q_{X, -A, n}^{\text{perf}})$$

is zero. We shall prove a more general statement that

$$H_m^{d-1}(X, Q_{X, -p^{i-1}A, m-i+1}^{\text{perf}}) \rightarrow H_m^{d-1}(X, Q_{X, -p^{i-1}A, n-i+1}^{\text{perf}})$$

is zero by descending induction on $1 \leq i \leq n$. This holds when $i = n$, because

$$H_m^{d-1}(X, Q_{X, -p^{n-1}A, 1}^{\text{perf}}) \simeq H_m^{d-1}(X, \theta_* \mathcal{O}_{X^{\text{perf}}}(-p^{n-1}A)) = 0$$

by Lemma 2.10 and the fact that colimits commute with local cohomology, where $\theta: X^{\text{perf}} \rightarrow X$ denotes the canonical projection.

Now consider the following commutative diagram in which each horizontal sequence is exact (built from Lemma 3.11 by taking the colimit \varinjlim_e):

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & F_*(B_{X,-p^i A, m-i}^{\text{perf}}) & \longrightarrow & Q_{X,-p^{i-1} A, m-i+1}^{\text{perf}} & \longrightarrow & \theta_* \mathcal{O}_{X^{\text{perf}}}(-p^{i-1} A) \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow \alpha_{i,m,n} & & \downarrow \beta_{i-1,m,n} & & \parallel \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & F_*(B_{X,-p^i A, n-i}^{\text{perf}}) & \longrightarrow & Q_{X,-p^{i-1} A, n-i+1}^{\text{perf}} & \longrightarrow & \theta_* \mathcal{O}_{X^{\text{perf}}}(-p^{i-1} A) \longrightarrow 0. \end{array}$$

It suffices to show the implication $H_{\mathfrak{m}}^{d-1}(X, \beta_{i,m,n}) = 0 \Rightarrow H_{\mathfrak{m}}^{d-1}(X, \beta_{i-1,m,n}) = 0$, where

$$H_{\mathfrak{m}}^{d-1}(X, \beta_{i,m,n}) : H_{\mathfrak{m}}^{d-1}(X, Q_{X,-p^i A, m-i}^{\text{perf}}) \rightarrow H_{\mathfrak{m}}^{d-1}(X, Q_{X,-p^i A, n-i}^{\text{perf}}).$$

By $H_{\mathfrak{m}}^{d-2}(X, \theta_* \mathcal{O}_{X^{\text{perf}}}(-p^{i-1} A)) = H_{\mathfrak{m}}^{d-1}(X, \theta_* \mathcal{O}_{X^{\text{perf}}}(-p^{i-1} A)) = 0$ (Lemma 2.10), the above diagram implies that $H_{\mathfrak{m}}^{d-1}(X, \beta_{i-1,m,n}) = 0 \Leftrightarrow H_{\mathfrak{m}}^{d-1}(X, \alpha_{i,m,n}) = 0$. Consider the following commutative diagram in which each horizontal sequence is exact (built from Remark 3.1 by taking the colimit \varinjlim_e):

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O}_X(-p^i A) & \xrightarrow{\Phi_{X,-p^i A, m-i}^{\text{perf}}} & Q_{X,-p^i A, m-i}^{\text{perf}} & \xrightarrow{\rho} & B_{X,-p^i A, m-i}^{\text{perf}} \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \parallel & & \downarrow \beta_{i,m,n} & & \downarrow \alpha_{i,m,n} \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O}_X(-p^i A) & \xrightarrow{\Phi_{X,-p^i A, n-i}^{\text{perf}}} & Q_{X,-p^i A, n-i}^{\text{perf}} & \longrightarrow & B_{X,-p^i A, n-i}^{\text{perf}} \longrightarrow 0. \end{array}$$

By $m-i \geq 2n-n = n$, (6.3.1) implies that $q^\infty S_{m-i}^0(X, \{p^i B\}; K_X + [p^i A]) = H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(K_X + [p^i A]))$. By Proposition 3.49, we get that

$$H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(X, \Phi_{X,-p^i A, m-i}^{\text{perf}}) : H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(X, \mathcal{O}_X(-p^i A)) \rightarrow H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(X, Q_{X,-p^i A, m-i}^{\text{perf}})$$

is injective. Since $H_{\mathfrak{m}}^{d-1}(\rho)$ is surjective, we obtain $H_{\mathfrak{m}}^{d-1}(X, \beta_{i,m,n}) = 0 \Rightarrow H_{\mathfrak{m}}^{d-1}(X, \alpha_{i,m,n}) = 0$. To summarise,

$$H_{\mathfrak{m}}^{d-1}(X, \beta_{i,m,n}) = 0 \Rightarrow H_{\mathfrak{m}}^{d-1}(X, \alpha_{i,m,n}) = 0 \Leftrightarrow H_{\mathfrak{m}}^{d-1}(X, \beta_{i-1,m,n}) = 0,$$

as required. \square

Proposition 6.4. *In the situation of Setting 5.10, suppose that the following hold.*

- (1) $-S$ is semiample.
- (2) (S, B_S) is uniformly quasi- F^∞ -split.
- (3) $q_{\text{uni}}^\infty S_{\text{adj}}^0(X, S + B; L - kS) \rightarrow q_{\text{uni}}^\infty S^0(S, B_S; (L - kS)|_S)$ is surjective for all $k \geq 0$.

Then

$$(6.4.1) \quad q_{\text{uni}}^\infty S_{\text{adj}}^0(X, S + B; L) = H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(L)).$$

In particular, $q_{\text{uni}}^\infty S^0(X, B; L) = H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(L))$ (cf. Lemma 3.42, Definition 3.45).

Proof. The same argument as in Proposition 5.16 works after replacing $q^e S^0(-)$ by $q_{\text{uni}}^\infty S^0(-)$. \square

Theorem 6.5. *In the situation of Setting 5.10, suppose that the following hold.*

- (1) (X, B) is uniformly quasi- F^∞ -pure.
- (2) $B \geq \{p^i B\}$ for every $i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$.
- (3) $-S$ is semiample.
- (4) (S, B_S) is uniformly quasi- F^∞ -split.

Then $q_{\text{uni}}^\infty S_{\text{adj}}^0(X, S + B; L) \rightarrow q_{\text{uni}}^\infty S^0(S, B_S; L|_S)$ is surjective.

Proof. For $i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ and $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, we set

- $B_i := \{p^i B\}$,
- $K_S + B_{S,i} := (K_X + S + B_i)|_S$,
- $A_{i,k} := p^i A - kS$, and
- $L_{i,k} := \lceil K_X + S + p^i A - kS \rceil = \lceil K_X + S + A_{i,k} \rceil = K_X + S + B_i + A_{i,k}$.

Note that $B = B_0$, $B_{S,0} = B_S$, $A = A_{0,0}$, and $L = K_X + S + B + A = \lceil K_X + S + A \rceil = L_{0,0}$. All the conditions assumed in Setting 5.10 hold after replacing (B, B_S, A, L) by $(B_i, B_{S,i}, A_{i,k}, L_{i,k})$. However, note that it is not necessarily true that $B_i \geq \{p^j B_i\}$.

By (1), (2), and (4), the following hold.

- (1') (X, B_i) is uniformly quasi- F^∞ -pure.
- (4') $(S, B_{S,i})$ is uniformly quasi- F^∞ -split.

For $i \geq 0$, consider the following two assertions.

- (a_i) The following map is surjective for every $k \geq 0$:

$$q_{\text{uni}}^\infty S_{\text{adj}}^0(X, S + B_i; L_{i,k}) \rightarrow q_{\text{uni}}^\infty S^0(S, B_{S,i}; L_{i,k}|_S).$$

- (b_i) $q_{\text{uni}}^\infty S^0(X, B_i; L_{i,k}) = H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(L_{i,k}))$ for all $k \geq 0$.

We prove (a_i) and (b_i) by descending induction on i . We can find $i_1 \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ such that (b_i) holds for every $i \geq i_1$ (Lemma 6.2). Fix an integer $i \geq 0$. It suffices to show (α) and (β) below.

- (α) If (a_i) holds, then (b_i) holds.
- (β) If (b_{i'}) holds for every $i' \geq i + 1$, then (a_i) holds.

Let us show (α). Assume (a_i). Fix $k \geq 0$. We now apply Proposition 6.4 for $m \gg 0$ after replacing (B, B_S, A, L) by $(B_i, B_{S,i}, A_{i,k}, L_{i,k})$. The assumptions (1), (2), and (3) of Proposition 6.4 follow from (3), (4'), and (a_i), respectively. We then obtain $q_{\text{uni}}^\infty S^0(X, B_i; L_{i,k}) = H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(L_{i,k}))$, i.e., (b_i) holds. Thus (α) holds.

Let us show (β). Assume that (b_{i'}) holds for every $i' \geq i + 1$. Fix $k \geq 0$. In order to apply Proposition 6.3 after replacing (B, B_S, A, L) by $(B_i, B_{S,i}, A_{i,k}, L_{i,k})$, we now verify its assumptions. Further, for every $j \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, it holds that $\{p^j B_i\} = \{p^j \{p^i B\}\} = \{p^{i+j} B\} = B_{i+j}$ and

$$p^j A_{i,k} = p^j (p^i A - kS) = p^{i+j} A - kp^j S = A_{i+j, kp^j}.$$

Thus Assumption (1) in Proposition 6.3 holds by (1'). As for Assumption (2) in Proposition 6.3, it is enough to check the following.

$$(\dagger) \quad q_{\text{uni}}^\infty S^0(X, \{p^j B_i\}; K_X + [p^j A_{i,k}]) = H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(K_X + [p^j A_{i,k}])) \text{ for every } j \geq 1.$$

We have $K_X + [p^j A_{i,k}] = K_X + [A_{i+j, kp^j}] = L_{i+j, kp^j} - S = L_{i+j, kp^j+1}$. Therefore, (\dagger) is equivalent to (\ddagger) below.

$$(\ddagger) \quad q_{\text{uni}}^\infty S^0(X, B_{i+j}; L_{i+j, kp^j+1}) = H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(L_{i+j, kp^j+1})) \text{ for every } j > 0.$$

Then (\ddagger) holds, because we are assuming that (b_{i+j}) holds for every $j \geq 1$. This completes the proof of (β) . \square

Corollary 6.6. *With the same assumptions as in Theorem 6.5, we have that*

$$q_{\text{uni}}^\infty S_{\text{adj}}^0(X, S + B; L) = H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(L)).$$

Proof. By applying Theorem 6.5 with L replaced by $L - kS$, we get that

$$q_{\text{uni}}^\infty S_{\text{adj}}^0(X, S + B; L - kS) \rightarrow q_{\text{uni}}^\infty S^0(S, B_S; (L - kS)|_S)$$

is surjective for every $k \geq 0$. Then we can conclude by Proposition 6.4. \square

Corollary 6.7. *In the situation of Setting 2.12, suppose that R is a local ring and $H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X) = R$. Let $(X, S + B)$ be a divisorially Cohen-Macaulay \mathbb{Q} -factorial plt pair, where S is a normal prime divisor and B is a \mathbb{Q} -divisor such that $[B] = 0$. Suppose that $-(K_X + S + B)$ is ample and the following hold.*

- (1) (X, B) is uniformly quasi- F^∞ -pure.
- (2) $\{p^i B\} \leq B$ for every $i \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$.
- (3) $-S$ is semiample.
- (4) (S, B_S) is uniformly quasi- F^∞ -split, where $K_S + B_S = (K_X + S + B)|_S$.

Then $(X, S + B)$ is purely uniformly quasi- F^∞ -split.

Proof. By the same argument as in Corollary 5.20, this follows immediately from Corollary 6.6. \square

6.2. Quasi-+-regular case. In what follows, we shall work in the situation of Setting 5.10 until the end of this subsection. We say that $f : (Y, S_Y) \rightarrow (X, S)$ is a *finite cover* (of (X, S)) if $f : Y \rightarrow X$ is a finite surjective morphism from an integral normal scheme Y and S_Y is a prime divisor on Y satisfying $f(S_Y) = S$. By abuse of notation, the induced morphism $S_Y \rightarrow S$ is also denoted by f .

By the same argument as in Proposition 5.1, we get the following commutative diagram in which each horizontal sequence is exact:

$$(6.7.1) \quad \begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & Q_{X, \Delta, n}^{S, f} & \longrightarrow & Q_{X, \Delta, n}^f & \longrightarrow & Q_{S, \Delta_S, n}^f & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \Phi_{X, \Delta, n}^{S, f} \uparrow & & \Phi_{X, \Delta, n}^f \uparrow & & \Phi_{S, \Delta_S, n}^f \uparrow & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O}_X(\Delta - S) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O}_X(\Delta) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O}_S(\Delta_S) & \longrightarrow & 0. \end{array}$$

Applying $\mathcal{H}om_{W_n \mathcal{O}_X}(-, W_n \omega_X) = (- \otimes_{W_n \mathcal{O}_X} W_n \mathcal{O}_X(-K_X))^*$, we get the following commutative diagram in which each horizontal sequence is exact:

$$(6.7.2) \quad \begin{array}{ccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & (Q_{X, \Delta - K_X, n}^f)^* & \longrightarrow & (Q_{X, \Delta - K_X, n}^{S, f})^* & \longrightarrow & (Q_{S, \Delta_S - K_S, n}^f)^* \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O}_X(K_X - [\Delta]) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O}_X(K_X + S - [\Delta]) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O}_S(K_S - [\Delta_S]) \longrightarrow 0. \end{array}$$

We are ready to define the restriction map for qB^0 .

Definition 6.8. In the situation of Setting 5.10, suppose that $S \not\subseteq \text{Supp } L$. For a finite cover $f : (Y, S_Y) \rightarrow (X, S)$, we obtain a map

$$(6.8.1) \quad q^f B_{n, \text{adj}}^0(X, S + B; L) \rightarrow q^f B_n^0(S, B_S; L|_S)$$

induced by plugging $\Delta = K_X + S + B - L$ into the above diagram (6.7.2) to get

$$(6.8.2) \quad \begin{array}{ccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & (Q_{X, S+B-L, n}^f)^* & \longrightarrow & (Q_{X, S+B-L, n}^{S, f})^* & \longrightarrow & (Q_{S, B_S - L|_S, n}^f)^* \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O}_X(L - S) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O}_X(L) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O}_S([L|_S - B_S]) \longrightarrow 0. \end{array}$$

Recall that

$$\begin{aligned} qB_{n, \text{adj}}^0(X, S + B; L) &:= \bigcap_{f: (Y, T) \rightarrow (X, S)} q^f B_{n, \text{adj}}^0(X, S + B; L), \\ qB_{\text{adj}}^0(X, S + B; L) &:= \bigcup_{n \geq 1} qB_{n, \text{adj}}^0(X, S + B; L) = qB_{N, \text{adj}}^0(X, S + B; L), \end{aligned}$$

where $f : (Y, T) \rightarrow (X, S)$ runs over all finite covers and N is a sufficiently large integer (note that $qB_n^0(-) \subseteq qB_{n+1}^0(-)$). By (6.8.1), we obtain the following induced maps:

$$qB_{n, \text{adj}}^0(X, S + B; L) \rightarrow qB_n^0(S, B_S; L|_S), \quad qB_{\text{adj}}^0(X, S + B; L) \rightarrow qB^0(S, B_S; L|_S).$$

As before, we shall apply the above definition even when $S \subseteq \text{Supp } L$ (cf. Remark 5.3).

Recall that $(X, S+B)$ is purely globally n -quasi-+-regular if and only if $qB_{n, \text{adj}}^0(X, S+B; 0) = H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X)$. Similarly, (S, B_S) is globally n -quasi-+-regular if and only if $qB_n^0(S, B_S; 0) = H^0(S, \mathcal{O}_S)$. Recall

$$Q_{X, S+B, n}^{S, +} = \varinjlim_{f: (Y, S_Y) \rightarrow (X, S)} Q_{X, S+B, n}^{S, f}.$$

Remark 6.9. One can drop the assumption that X is divisorially Cohen-Macaulay in the following theorem. As our article is already quite long, we refrain from doing that here.

Theorem 6.10. *In the situation of Setting 5.10, suppose that the following hold.*

- (1) (X, B) is locally quasi-+-regular.
- (2) $B \geq \{p^i B\}$ for every $i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$.
- (3) $-S$ is semiample.
- (4) (S, B_S) is globally quasi-+-regular.

Then

$$qB_{\text{adj}}^0(X, S + B; L) \rightarrow qB^0(S, B_S; L|_S)$$

is surjective. Moreover,

$$q_{\text{uni}}^\infty S_{\text{adj}}^0(X, S + B; L) = H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(L)).$$

Proof. It follows from Theorem 4.15 and its adjoint version that

$$q_{\text{uni}}^\infty S^0(S, B_S; L|_S) = qB^0(S, B_S; L|_S) \quad \text{and} \quad q_{\text{uni}}^\infty S_{\text{adj}}^0(X, S + B; L) = qB_{\text{adj}}^0(X, S + B; L).$$

Then the assertion holds by Theorem 6.5 and Corollary 5.19. \square

Corollary 6.11. *In the situation of Setting 2.12, suppose that R is a local ring and $H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X) = R$. Let $(X, S + B)$ be a divisorially Cohen-Macaulay \mathbb{Q} -factorial plt pair, where S is a normal prime divisor and B is a \mathbb{Q} -divisor such that $\lfloor B \rfloor = 0$. Suppose that $-(K_X + S + B)$ is ample and the following hold.*

- (1) (X, B) is locally quasi-+-regular.
- (2) $\{p^i B\} \leq B$ for every $i \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$.
- (3) $-S$ is semiample.
- (4) (S, B_S) is globally quasi-+-regular, where $K_S + B_S = (K_X + S + B)|_S$.

Then $(X, S + B)$ is purely globally quasi-+-regular.

Proof. By the same argument as in Corollary 5.20, this is immediate from Theorem 6.10. \square

7. EXAMPLES

7.1. Calabi-Yau varieties. In this paragraph, we recall our constructions and results for the case when k is an algebraically closed field of characteristic $p > 0$ and X is a smooth proper variety over k . Set $d := \dim X$. We have the induced morphism $\pi_n: W_n X \rightarrow \text{Spec } W_n(k)$ and $W_n \omega_X^\bullet := \pi_n^!(W_n(k)) \simeq W_n \omega_X[d]$. Note that $W_n(k)$ itself is the injective hull of the residue field k and hence the dualising module of the Artin local ring $W_n(k)$. Let \mathcal{F} be a coherent $W_n \mathcal{O}_X$ -module. By the Grothendieck duality for $\pi_n: W_n X \rightarrow \text{Spec } W_n(k)$, we have a canonical isomorphism

$$H^i(X, R\mathcal{H}om_{W_n \mathcal{O}_X}(\mathcal{F}, W_n \omega_X)) \simeq \text{Hom}_{W_n(k)}(H^{d-i}(X, \mathcal{F}), W_n(k)).$$

In particular, we have

$$\text{Hom}_{W_n \mathcal{O}_X}(\mathcal{F}, W_n \omega_X) \simeq \text{Hom}_{W_n(k)}(H^d(X, \mathcal{F}), W_n(k)).$$

We now apply this functorial isomorphism for $\Phi_{X,n}^e: \mathcal{O}_X \rightarrow Q_{X,n}^e := Q_{X,0,n}^e$. Then

$$\text{Hom}_{W_n \mathcal{O}_X}(Q_{X,n}^e, W_n \omega_X(-K_X)) \xrightarrow{H^0(X, (\Phi_{X,n}^e)^*)} \text{Hom}_{W_n \mathcal{O}_X}(\mathcal{O}_X, W_n \omega_X(-K_X))$$

is surjective if and only if its $W_n(k)$ -dual

$$H^d(X, \Phi_{X, K_X, n}^e) : H^d(X, \mathcal{O}_X(K_X)) \rightarrow H^d(X, Q_{X, \Delta, n}^e(K_X))$$

is injective.

Now assume $K_X = 0$. Then the above morphism fits into the following diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} H^d(X, W_n \mathcal{O}_X) & \xrightarrow{F^e} & H^d(X, W_n \mathcal{O}_X) \\ \downarrow R^{n-1} & & \downarrow \\ H^d(X, \mathcal{O}_X) & \xrightarrow{H^d(X, \Phi_{X, n}^e)} & H^d(X, Q_{X, n}^e). \end{array}$$

By definition, we have

$$Q_{X, n}^e \simeq W \mathcal{O}_X / (V^n W \mathcal{O}_X + V F^e W \mathcal{O}_X).$$

Set $H := H^d(X, W \mathcal{O}_X)$. Note that H is not necessarily finitely generated as a $W(k)$ -module but equipped with induced operators F and V . Since $H^d(X, -)$ is right exact, we have

$$H^d(X, Q_{X, n}^e) \simeq H / (V^n H + V F^e H).$$

Further assume that $H = H^d(X, W \mathcal{O}_X)$ is a finitely generated free $W(k)$ -module of rank $h \geq 1$. By the structure theorem of one-dimensional p -divisible group over an algebraically closed field, there is a $W(k)$ -basis v_1, \dots, v_h of H such that

$$\begin{aligned} V v_1 &= v_2, \quad V v_2 = v_3, \quad \dots, \quad V v_{h-1} = v_h, \quad V v_h = p v_1, \\ F v_1 &= v_h, \quad F v_2 = p v_1, \quad \dots, \quad F v_{h-1} = p v_{h-2}, \quad F v_h = p v_{h-1}. \end{aligned}$$

When $h = 1$, these equations mean $V v_1 = p v_1, F v_1 = v_1$.

Observe that $F v_i = V^{h-1} v_i$ for each $i = 1, \dots, h$. Then it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} V^n H + V F^e H &= V^n H + V^{eh-e+1} H \\ &= \begin{cases} V^n H & \text{if } eh - e + 1 > n, \\ V^{eh-e+1} H & \text{if } eh - e + 1 \leq n. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 7.1. *Let k be an algebraically closed field of characteristic $p > 0$. Let X be a d -dimensional smooth proper variety over k with $\omega_X \simeq \mathcal{O}_X$. Assume that $H^d(X, W \mathcal{O}_X)$ is a finitely generated free $W(k)$ -module of rank $h \geq 1$. Take $e \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. Then X is quasi- F^e -split of height $eh - e + 1$.*

Proof. We use the same notation as above. The image of v_1 under the natural surjection $H \twoheadrightarrow H^d(X, \mathcal{O}_X)$ is a basis of the k -vector space $H^d(X, \mathcal{O}_X)$. Therefore, X is n -quasi- F^e -split (i.e., $h^e(X) \leq n$) if and only if $F^e v_1 \notin V^n H + V F^e H$. Since $F v_1 = V^{h-1} v_1$, we have

$$F^e v_1 = V^{eh-e} v_1.$$

First assume that $n \leq eh - e$. Then

$$F^e v_1 = V^{eh-e} v_1 \in V^{eh-e} H \subseteq V^n H \subseteq V^n H + V F^e H = V^n H.$$

Hence the image of $F^e v_1$ in $H/(V^n H + VF^e H)$ is zero. Then it holds that $h^e(X) > eh - e$.

Next assume $n = eh - e + 1$. In this case, we have $V^n H + F^e V H = V^{eh-e+1} H$. Since $V : H \rightarrow H$ is injective and $v_1 \notin V H$, the element $F^e v_1 = V^{eh-e} v_1$ is not contained in $V^{eh-e+1} H$. Thus $h^e(X) \leq eh - e + 1$. \square

Corollary 7.2. *Let k be an algebraically closed field of characteristic $p > 0$. Let X be a d -dimensional smooth proper variety over k with $\omega_X \simeq \mathcal{O}_X$. Assume that $H^{d-1}(X, \mathcal{O}_X) = 0$ when $d \geq 2$. Take $e \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. Then $h^e(X) = eh(X) - e + 1$.*

Proof. If $h(X) = \infty$, then we have $h^e(X) = \infty$ by definition, and hence $h^e(X) = eh(X) - e + 1$ holds. In what follows, we assume $h(X) < \infty$. By our assumption, X has the associated Artin-Mazur formal group, which is a one-dimensional formal group [AM77, II. Proposition 1.8]. Note that we have $h(X) = \dim_K H^d(X, W\mathcal{O}_X) \otimes_{W(k)} K$ for $K := \text{Frac } W(k)$ [Yob19, Theorem 4.5]. Moreover, $h(X) < \infty$ implies that $H^d(X, W\mathcal{O}_X)$ is a finitely generated free $W(k)$ -module. Then the assertion follows from Theorem 7.1. \square

Corollary 7.3. *Let k be a perfect field of characteristic $p > 0$. Let X be a g -dimensional abelian variety over k . Set $f(X)$ to be its p -rank.*

- (1) *If $f(X) = g$, then $h^e(X) = 1$.*
- (2) *If $f(X) = g - 1$, then $h^e(X) = e + 1$*
- (3) *If $f(X) \leq g - 2$, then $h^e(X) = \infty$.*

Recall that $f(X)$ is equal to the \mathbb{F}_p -dimension of the p -torsion subgroup $X(\bar{k})[p]$.

Proof. When $f(X) = g$ (resp. $f(X) = g - 1$), $H^g(X, W\mathcal{O}_X)$ is a free $W(k)$ -module of rank one (resp. two) [Yob, Theorem 3.2 and its proof]. Hence (1) and (2) follow from Theorem 7.1. If $f(X) \leq g - 2$, then $h(X) = \infty$ [Yob, Theorem 3.2], and hence $h^e(X) = \infty$. Thus (3) holds. \square

Proposition 7.4. *Let X be a smooth projective variety over a perfect field k of characteristic $p > 0$. Assume that K_X is pseudo-effective (e.g., $\kappa(X) \geq 0$). Then X is F -split if and only if X is uniformly quasi- F^∞ -split.*

Proof. By Proposition 3.25, we may assume that k is an algebraically closed field. As the “only-if” part is clear, let us prove the “if” part. In what follows, we assume that X is uniformly quasi- F^∞ -split. The proof consists of the following two steps.

- (A) Reduction to the case when $K_X \sim 0$.
- (B) The proof for the case when $K_X \sim 0$.

(A) Let us reduce the proof to the case when $K_X \sim 0$. Since X is quasi- F -split, there exists an integer $n > 0$ such that $H^0(X, -(p^n - 1)K_X) \neq 0$ [KTT⁺a, the proof of Proposition 3.14]. Since K_X is pseudo-effective, we get $(p^n - 1)K_X \sim 0$. Let $\pi : Y \rightarrow X$ be the associated cyclic étale cover from a smooth projective variety Y with $K_Y \sim 0$. It follows from Corollary 3.23 that $h^e(X) = h^e(Y)$, and hence the problem is reduced to the case when $K_X \sim 0$.

(B) Assume $K_X \sim 0$. Since X is uniformly quasi- F^∞ -split, there exists $e_0 \geq 1$ such that

$$h^1(X) \leq h^2(X) \leq \cdots \leq h^{e_0}(X) = h^{e_0+1}(X) = \cdots =: n < \infty.$$

Fix an integer $e \geq e_0 + 1$. By assumption, there exists a nonzero $W_n \mathcal{O}_X$ -module homomorphism $\alpha: F_*^e W_n \mathcal{O}_X \rightarrow W_n \omega_X(-K_X)$ such that $\alpha \circ F^e = \underline{p}^{n-1} \circ R^{n-1}$:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} W_n \mathcal{O}_X & \xrightarrow{F^e} & F_*^e W_n \mathcal{O}_X \\ R^{n-1} \downarrow & & \swarrow \exists \alpha \\ \mathcal{O}_X = \omega_X(-K_X) & & \\ \underline{p}^{n-1} \downarrow & & \\ W_n \omega_X(-K_X) & & \end{array}$$

Consider the composition

$$\beta := \alpha \circ V^{n-1}: F_*^{e+n-1} \mathcal{O}_X \rightarrow F_*^e W_n \mathcal{O}_X \rightarrow W_n \omega_X(-K_X).$$

Then β is nonzero by $n = h^e(X)$ and the exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow F_*^{e+n-1} \mathcal{O}_X \xrightarrow{V^{n-1}} F_*^e W_n \mathcal{O}_X \xrightarrow{R^{n-1}} F_*^e W_{n-1} \mathcal{O}_X \rightarrow 0.$$

Also consider the composition

$$\alpha' := \alpha \circ F: F_*^{e-1} W_n \mathcal{O}_X \xrightarrow{F} F_*^e W_n \mathcal{O}_X \xrightarrow{\alpha} W_n \omega_X(-K_X),$$

which is nonzero, because $\alpha' \circ F^{e-1} = \alpha \circ F^e = \underline{p} \circ R^{n-1} \neq 0$. By $n = h^{e-1}(X)$, $\beta' := \alpha' \circ V^{n-1}$ is nonzero. By definition, under the induced $W_n \mathcal{O}_X$ -module homomorphism

$$F^*: \text{Hom}(F_*^{e+n-1} \mathcal{O}_X, W_n \omega_X(-K_X)) \rightarrow \text{Hom}(F_*^{e+n-2} \mathcal{O}_X, W_n \omega_X(-K_X)),$$

we have

$$F^*(\beta) = \beta \circ F = \alpha \circ V^{n-1} \circ F = \alpha \circ F \circ V^{n-1} = \alpha' \circ V^{n-1} = \beta'.$$

Via Grothendieck duality, the above morphism is isomorphic to H^0 of

$$\Psi: F_*^{e+n-1} \mathcal{O}_X((1 - p^{e+n-1})K_X) \rightarrow F_*^{e+n-2} \mathcal{O}_X((1 - p^{e+n-2})K_X),$$

which we know to be nonzero on global sections. By tensoring Ψ with $\mathcal{O}_X(K_X)$, we get

$$F_*^{e+n-1} \mathcal{O}_X(K_X) \rightarrow F_*^{e+n-2} \mathcal{O}_X(K_X)$$

which is the pushforward F_*^{e+n-2} of the Cartier operator $C: F_* \mathcal{O}_X(K_X) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X(K_X)$. Now assume that K_X is trivial. Then Ψ and C are isomorphic to each other. So we see that the Cartier operator C on $H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(K_X))$ is nonzero, which implies that X is F -split. \square

7.2. Log Fano curves.

Theorem 7.5. *Let κ be a field which is finitely generated over a perfect field k of characteristic $p > 0$. Let X be a regular projective curve over κ and let Δ be an effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X such that $[\Delta] = 0$ and $-(K_X + \Delta)$ is ample. Then the following hold.*

- (1) (X, Δ) is feebly globally quasi- F -regular.
- (2) (X, Δ) is globally quasi-+-regular.

Proof. Let us show (1). Fix an effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor E on X . We can find a sufficiently small $\epsilon \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0}$ such that $-(K_X + \Delta + \epsilon E)$ is ample. It suffices to find $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ such that $(X, \Delta + \epsilon E)$ is n -quasi- F^e -split for every $e > 0$. This follows from Theorem 3.27, which can be applied for $\text{id}: Y = X \rightarrow X$, because κ is essentially of finite type over k . Thus (1) holds. By Definition 3.44 and Definition 4.2, (1) implies that (X, Δ) is uniformly quasi- F^∞ -split, and hence (2) holds (Corollary 4.19). \square

At first, one could think that the above proof shows global quasi- F -regularity of log Fano curves in the strong sense thanks to the Fujita vanishing theorem. Unfortunately, as one imposes no bounds on the support of E , it is not easy to control the fractional parts of divisors that come up in the above proof. Thus, to prove global quasi- F -regularity of curves in the strong sense, one needs a more careful argument, which is explained below. We start with the following lemma.

Lemma 7.6. *Let X be a normal projective variety over an F -finite field of characteristic $p > 0$. Take an effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor Δ on X satisfying $[\Delta] = 0$. Fix $e \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ and $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. Assume that*

- (1) (X, Δ) is n -quasi- F^e -split.
- (2) $H^{\dim X - 1}(X, \mathcal{O}_X(p^f(K_X + \Delta))) = 0$ for every integer $f \geq e$.
- (3) $F : \mathcal{O}_X \rightarrow F_*\mathcal{O}_X(p\{p^f\Delta\})$ splits as an \mathcal{O}_X -module homomorphism for every integer $f \geq e$.

Then (X, Δ) is n -quasi- F^{e+1} -split.

Proof. Set $d := \dim X$ and $D := K_X + \Delta$. By construction, we have the induced $W_n\mathcal{O}_X$ -module homomorphisms

$$(7.6.1) \quad \Phi_{X,D,n}^{e+1} : \mathcal{O}_X(D) \xrightarrow{\Phi_{X,D,n}^e} Q_{X,D,n}^e \xrightarrow{\psi} Q_{X,D,n}^{e+1}.$$

Recall that the exact sequence

$$(7.6.2) \quad 0 \rightarrow F_*^e W_n \mathcal{O}_X(p^e D) \xrightarrow{F} F_*^{e+1} W_n \mathcal{O}_X(p^{e+1} D) \rightarrow F_*^e B_{X,p^e D,n}^1 \rightarrow 0$$

induces another exact sequence by taking pushouts:

$$(7.6.3) \quad 0 \rightarrow Q_{X,D,n}^e \xrightarrow{\psi} Q_{X,D,n}^{e+1} \rightarrow F_*^e B_{X,p^e D,n}^1 \rightarrow 0.$$

By (1), (7.6.1), and Lemma 3.10, it suffices to show that

$$H^d(X, \psi) : H^d(X, Q_{X,D,n}^e) \rightarrow H^d(X, Q_{X,D,n}^{e+1})$$

is injective. It follows from (7.6.3) that the problem is reduced to $H^{d-1}(X, B_{X,p^e D,n}^1) = 0$. Then, by (7.6.2), it is enough to prove that

- (i) $H^{d-1}(X, F_*^{e+1}W_n\mathcal{O}_X(p^{e+1}D)) = 0$, and
- (ii) $F : H^d(X, W_n\mathcal{O}_X(p^e D)) \rightarrow H^d(X, F_*W_n\mathcal{O}_X(p^{e+1}D))$ is injective.

The assertion (i) follows from (2) and an exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow F_*^{n-1}\mathcal{O}_X(p^{e+n}D) \xrightarrow{V^{n-1}} W_n\mathcal{O}_X(p^{e+1}D) \xrightarrow{R} W_{n-1}\mathcal{O}_X(p^{e+1}D) \rightarrow 0.$$

It suffices to show (ii). Consider the following commutative diagram in which each horizontal sequence is exact:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \rightarrow & H^d(F_*^{n-1}\mathcal{O}_X(p^{e+n-1}D)) & \xrightarrow{V^{n-1}} & H^d(W_n\mathcal{O}_X(p^e D)) & \xrightarrow{R} & H^d(W_{n-1}\mathcal{O}_X(p^e D)) \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow F & & \downarrow F & & \downarrow F \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & H^d(F_*^n\mathcal{O}_X(p^{e+n}D)) & \xrightarrow{V^{n-1}} & H^d(F_*W_n\mathcal{O}_X(p^{e+1}D)) & \xrightarrow{R^{n-1}} & H^d(F_*W_{n-1}\mathcal{O}_X(p^{e+1}D)) \rightarrow 0, \end{array}$$

where $H^d(-) := H^d(X, -)$. By induction on n , it is enough to show that

$$F : H^d(X, \mathcal{O}_X(p^f D)) \rightarrow H^d(X, F_*\mathcal{O}_X(p^{f+1}D))$$

is injective for every $f \geq e$. This holds, because (3) implies that $\mathcal{O}_X(p^f D) \rightarrow F_*\mathcal{O}_X(p^{f+1}D)$ splits for every $f \geq e$. This completes the proof of (ii). \square

Theorem 7.7. *Let k be an algebraically closed field of characteristic $p > 0$. Let X be a smooth projective curve over k and let Δ be an effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X such that $\lfloor \Delta \rfloor = 0$ and $-(K_X + \Delta)$ is ample. Then (X, Δ) is globally quasi- F -regular.*

Proof. By enlarging the coefficients of Δ , the problem is reduced to the case when

$$\Delta = \sum_{i=1}^r \frac{\alpha_i}{p^\nu} P_i, \quad \text{where } \nu, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}.$$

Replacing ν by a larger integer, we may assume that $\lfloor \Delta' \rfloor = 0$ and $-(K_X + \Delta')$ is ample for

$$\Delta' := \sum_{i=1}^r \frac{\alpha_i + 1}{p^\nu} P_i.$$

Then there is $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ such that (X, Δ') is n -quasi- F^e -split for every $e > 0$ (Theorem 7.5(2)).

Fix an effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor E on X . Take the decomposition $E = E_1 + E_2$ into the effective \mathbb{Q} -divisors E_1 and E_2 such that $\text{Supp } E_1 \subseteq \text{Supp } \Delta$ and $\text{Supp } E_2 \cap \text{Supp } \Delta = \emptyset$. Fix $\epsilon_1 \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0}$ satisfying

$$\Delta + \epsilon_1 E_1 \leq \Delta'.$$

Since n and ν are fixed, we have $Q_{X, \Delta' + \epsilon_2 E_2, n}^\nu = Q_{X, \Delta', n}^\nu$ for some $0 < \epsilon_2 \ll 1$, which implies that

$$H^1(X, \Phi_{X, K_X + \Delta' + \epsilon_2 E, n}^\nu) : H^1(X, \mathcal{O}_X(K_X + \Delta' + \epsilon_2 E)) \rightarrow H^1(X, Q_{X, K_X + \Delta' + \epsilon_2 E, n}^\nu)$$

is injective, i.e., $(X, \Delta' + \epsilon_2 E)$ is n -quasi- F^ν -split. Let $E_2 = b_1 Q_1 + \dots + b_s Q_s$ be the irreducible decomposition of E_2 . Pick positive integers μ_1, \dots, μ_s satisfying

- $\nu < \mu_1 < \mu_2 < \cdots < \mu_s$, and
- $\overline{E}_2 \leq \epsilon_2 E_2$ for

$$\overline{E}_2 := \frac{1}{p^{\mu_1}} Q_1 + \cdots + \frac{1}{p^{\mu_s}} Q_s.$$

By $\Delta' + \overline{E}_2 \leq \Delta' + \epsilon_2 E_2$, $(X, \Delta' + \overline{E}_2)$ is n -quasi- F^ν -split. We may assume that $-(K_X + \Delta' + \overline{E}_2)$ is ample and $[\Delta' + \overline{E}_2] = 0$.

We can find $\epsilon \in \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}$ such that $\epsilon \leq \epsilon_1$ and $\Delta + \epsilon E \leq \Delta' + \overline{E}_2$. Then it suffices to show that $(X, \Delta' + \overline{E}_2)$ is n -quasi- F^e -split for every integer $e \geq \nu$. Let us prove this by induction on e . The base case (i.e., the case when $e = \nu$) has been settled already. Since $H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(p^f(K_X + \Delta' + \overline{E}_2))) = 0$ for every $f \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, it is enough, by Lemma 7.6, to show that

$$F : \mathcal{O}_X \rightarrow F_* \mathcal{O}_X(p\{p^f(\Delta' + \overline{E}_2)\})$$

splits for every $f \geq \nu$. If $f \geq \nu$, then we have that

$$\{p^f(\Delta' + \overline{E}_2)\} \stackrel{(a)}{=} \{p^f \overline{E}_2\} = \left\{ \frac{p^f}{p^{\mu_1}} Q_1 + \cdots + \frac{p^f}{p^{\mu_s}} Q_s \right\} \stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \frac{1}{p} Q_j + \frac{1}{p^2} (Q_{j+1} + \cdots + Q_s)$$

for some j , where (a) holds by $p^f \cdot \frac{\alpha_i + 1}{p^\nu} = p^{f-\nu}(\alpha_i + 1) \in \mathbb{Z}$ and (b) follows from $\mu_1 < \cdots < \mu_s$. Hence the problem is reduced to the splitting of

$$F : \mathcal{O}_X \rightarrow F_* \mathcal{O}_X(p \cdot (\frac{1}{p} Q_j + \frac{1}{p^2} (Q_{j+1} + \cdots + Q_s))) = F_* \mathcal{O}_X(Q_j),$$

which is well known. \square

7.3. Log Calabi-Yau curves.

Definition 7.8. We work over an algebraically closed field k of characteristic $p > 0$. We say that $(X = \mathbb{P}^1, \Delta)$ is a log Calabi-Yau pair (over k) with standard coefficients if Δ is an effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor whose coefficients are contained in $\{1\} \cup \{1 - 1/n \mid n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}\}$, and $\deg \Delta = 2$.

It is easy to see that the classification of log Calabi-Yau curves $(X = \mathbb{P}^1, \Delta)$ with standard coefficients (except for elliptic curves) is given as follows, where P_1, P_2, P_3, P_4 are distinct points:

- (i) $\Delta = \frac{2}{3}P_1 + \frac{2}{3}P_2 + \frac{2}{3}P_3$.
- (ii) $\Delta = \frac{1}{2}P_1 + \frac{3}{4}P_2 + \frac{3}{4}P_3$.
- (iii) $\Delta = \frac{1}{2}P_1 + \frac{2}{3}P_2 + \frac{5}{6}P_3$.
- (iv) $\Delta = \frac{1}{2}P_1 + \frac{1}{2}P_2 + \frac{1}{2}P_3 + \frac{1}{2}P_4$.
- (v) $\Delta = P_1 + \frac{1}{2}P_2 + \frac{1}{2}P_3$.
- (vi) $\Delta = P_1 + P_2$.

Since we are interested in the case when $[\Delta] = 0$, we shall treat (i)-(iv).

Proposition 7.9. *Let $(X = \mathbb{P}^1, \Delta)$ be a log Calabi-Yau pair with standard coefficients. Assume that $[\Delta] = 0$ and $(p^s - 1)\Delta$ is Cartier for some $s \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. Then (X, Δ) is quasi- F^e -split for every $e > 0$. Moreover:*

- (1) if (X, Δ) is quasi- F -split of height 1, then (X, Δ) is quasi- F^e -split of height 1 for every $e > 0$;
- (2) if (X, Δ) is not quasi- F -split of height 1, then (X, Δ) is quasi- F^e -split of height $e + 1$ for every $e > 0$.

Recall that (X, Δ) is quasi- F -split of height 1 if and only if $\mathcal{O}_X \rightarrow F_*\mathcal{O}_X(p\Delta)$ splits as an \mathcal{O}_X -module homomorphism. This condition is called *naively keenly F -split* in [KTT⁺a, Definition 2.19].

The assumption that $(p^s - 1)\Delta$ is Cartier is equivalent to: $p \neq 3$ in Case (i), $p \neq 2$ in Cases (ii) and (iv), and $p \neq 2, 3$ in Case (iii).

Proof. By the proof of [KTT⁺a, Proposition 3.21] there is a finite Galois cover $f : Y \rightarrow X$ from an elliptic curve Y such that $\deg f$ is not divisible by p and $K_Y \sim f^*(K_X + \Delta)$ (note that the resulting field extension $K(Y)/K(X)$ is a Kummer extension, because $K(X)$ contains an algebraically closed subfield). We point out that the proof therein works even in the case of $p = 2$ and 3 , as we are assuming that $(p^s - 1)\Delta$ is Cartier. By Corollary 3.23, we have that $h^e(X, \Delta) = h^e(Y)$.

- (1) Assume that (X, Δ) is quasi- F -split of height 1. Then $h^1(Y) = h^1(X, \Delta) = 1$, i.e., Y is an ordinary elliptic curve. Therefore, $h^e(X, \Delta) = h^e(Y) = 1$ (Corollary 7.3).
- (2) Assume that (X, Δ) is not quasi- F -split of height 1. Then $h^1(Y) = h^1(X, \Delta) \neq 1$, i.e., Y is a supersingular elliptic curve. Therefore, $h^e(X, \Delta) = h^e(Y) = e + 1$ (Corollary 7.3). \square

Proposition 7.10. *Let $(X = \mathbb{P}^1, \Delta)$ be a log Calabi-Yau pair with standard coefficients such that $\lfloor \Delta \rfloor = 0$.*

- (1) *Assume that $H^1(X, \mathcal{O}_X(p^r(K_X + \Delta))) = 0$ for every $r \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. Then (X, Δ) is not quasi- F -split.*
- (2) *Assume that p and (X, Δ) satisfy one of the following.*
 - (a) $p = 2, \Delta = \frac{1}{2}P_1 + \frac{1}{2}P_2 + \frac{1}{2}P_3 + \frac{1}{2}P_4$.
 - (b) $p = 2, \Delta = \frac{1}{2}P_1 + \frac{3}{4}P_2 + \frac{3}{4}P_3$.
 - (c) $p = 2, \Delta = \frac{1}{2}P_1 + \frac{2}{3}P_2 + \frac{5}{6}P_3$.
 - (d) $p = 3, \Delta = \frac{2}{3}P_1 + \frac{2}{3}P_2 + \frac{2}{3}P_3$.
 - (e) $p = 3, \Delta = \frac{1}{2}P_1 + \frac{2}{3}P_2 + \frac{5}{6}P_3$.

Then $H^1(X, \mathcal{O}_X(p^r(K_X + \Delta))) = 0$ holds for every $r \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ and (X, Δ) is not quasi- F -split.

Proof. Let us show (1). Fix $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. It is enough to prove that the map $H^1(X, \Phi_{X, K_X + \Delta, n})$, appearing below, is zero for every $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ (Lemma 3.10):

$$\begin{array}{ccc} H^1(X, W_n \mathcal{O}_X(K_X + \Delta)) & \xrightarrow{F} & H^1(X, F_* W_n \mathcal{O}_X(p(K_X + \Delta))) \\ \downarrow R^{n-1} & & \downarrow \\ H^1(X, \mathcal{O}_X(K_X + \Delta)) & \longrightarrow & H^1(X, \mathcal{Q}_{X, K_X + \Delta, n}) \end{array}$$

By an exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow F_* W_{n-1} \mathcal{O}_X(p^{r+1}(K_X + \Delta)) \xrightarrow{V} W_n \mathcal{O}_X(p^r(K_X + \Delta)) \xrightarrow{R^{n-1}} \mathcal{O}_X(p^r(K_X + \Delta)) \rightarrow 0,$$

our assumption $H^1(X, \mathcal{O}_X(p^r(K_X + \Delta))) = 0$ ($r > 0$) implies that

$$H^1(X, F_*W_n\mathcal{O}_X(p^r(K_X + \Delta))) = 0$$

for every $r \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ and every $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. Hence the composite map $H^1(X, \Phi_{X, K_X + \Delta, n}) \circ R^{n-1}$ is zero. Since the left vertical arrow R^{n-1} is surjective, $H^1(X, \Phi_{X, K_X + \Delta, n})$ is also zero. Thus (1) holds.

Let us show (2). If $p^r(K_X + \Delta) \sim 0$, then $H^1(X, \mathcal{O}_X(p^r(K_X + \Delta))) \simeq H^1(X, \mathcal{O}_X) = 0$. Thus the cases (a) and (d) are settled by (1).

Case (b). Assume that $p = 2$ and $\Delta = \frac{1}{2}P_1 + \frac{3}{4}P_2 + \frac{3}{4}P_3$. Then it suffices to show

$$H^1(X, \mathcal{O}_X(p^r(K_X + \Delta))) = 0$$

for every integer $r \geq 1$. If $r \geq 2$, then we have $p^r(K_X + \Delta) \sim 0$. We may assume $r = 1$. In this case, we have

$$(7.10.1) \quad h^1(X, 2(K_X + \Delta)) = h^0(X, K_X - \lrcorner 2(K_X + \Delta) \lrcorner) = h^0(X, -K_X - \lrcorner 2\Delta \lrcorner) = 0.$$

Case (c). Assume that $p = 2$ and $\Delta = \frac{1}{2}P_1 + \frac{2}{3}P_2 + \frac{5}{6}P_3$. Since we have

$$(2^{s+2} - 2^s)(K_X + \Delta) = 2^{s-1} \cdot 6(K_X + \Delta) \sim 0$$

for every $s \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, $2^r(K_X + \Delta)$ is linearly equivalent to either $2(K_X + \Delta)$ or $4(K_X + \Delta)$. It suffices to show that $H^1(X, \mathcal{O}_X(2(K_X + \Delta))) = H^1(X, \mathcal{O}_X(4(K_X + \Delta))) = 0$. The former one follows from the same computation as in (7.10.1). The latter one holds by

$$h^1(X, 4(K_X + \Delta)) = h^0(X, -3K_X - \lrcorner 4\Delta \lrcorner) = 0$$

where the last equality follows from $\deg \lrcorner 4\Delta \lrcorner = [4 \cdot \frac{1}{2}] + [4 \cdot \frac{2}{3}] + [4 \cdot \frac{5}{6}] = 2 + 2 + 3 = 7$.

Case (e). Assume that $p = 3$ and $\Delta = \frac{1}{2}P_1 + \frac{2}{3}P_2 + \frac{5}{6}P_3$. Since we have

$$(3^{s+1} - 3^s)(K_X + \Delta) \sim 3^{s-1} \cdot 6(K_X + \Delta) \sim 0$$

for $s \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, it holds that $3^r(K_X + \Delta) \sim 3(K_X + \Delta)$. Thus it suffices to show that $H^1(X, \mathcal{O}_X(3(K_X + \Delta))) = 0$. This follows from

$$h^1(X, 3(K_X + \Delta)) = h^0(X, -2K_X - \lrcorner 3\Delta \lrcorner) = 0$$

where the last equality holds by $\deg \lrcorner 3\Delta \lrcorner = [3 \cdot \frac{1}{2}] + [3 \cdot \frac{2}{3}] + [3 \cdot \frac{5}{6}] = 1 + 2 + 2 = 5$. \square

Theorem 7.11. *Let $(X = \mathbb{P}^1, \Delta)$ be a log Calabi-Yau pair with standard coefficients. Assume $\lrcorner \Delta \lrcorner = 0$. Fix $e \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. Then the following hold.*

- (1) (X, Δ) is quasi-F-split if and only if there exists $s \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ such that $(p^s - 1)\Delta$ is Cartier.
- (2) If $h(X, \Delta) = 1$, then $h^e(X, \Delta) = 1$.
- (3) If $1 < h(X, \Delta) < \infty$, then $h^e(X, \Delta) = e + 1$.

Proof. The assertion follows from Proposition 7.9 and Proposition 7.10. \square

The following theorem is an explicit version of the above theorem.

Theorem 7.12. *Let $(X = \mathbb{P}^1, \Delta)$ be a log Calabi-Yau pair with standard coefficients. Fix $e \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ and take distinct closed points $P_1, P_2, P_3, P_4 \in \mathbb{P}^1$. Then the following hold.*

- (1) Assume $\Delta = \frac{2}{3}P_1 + \frac{2}{3}P_2 + \frac{2}{3}P_3$.
 - (a) If $p = 3$, then (X, Δ) is not quasi- F^e -split.
 - (b) If $p \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$, then (X, Δ) is quasi- F^e -split of height 1.
 - (c) If $p \equiv 2 \pmod{3}$, then (X, Δ) is quasi- F^e -split of height $e + 1$.
- (2) Assume $\Delta = \frac{1}{2}P_1 + \frac{3}{4}P_2 + \frac{3}{4}P_3$.
 - (a) If $p = 2$, then (X, Δ) is not quasi- F^e -split.
 - (b) If $p \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$, then (X, Δ) is quasi- F^e -split of height 1.
 - (c) If $p \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$, then (X, Δ) is quasi- F^e -split of height $e + 1$.
- (3) Assume $\Delta = \frac{1}{2}P_1 + \frac{2}{3}P_2 + \frac{5}{6}P_3$.
 - (a) If $p \in \{2, 3\}$, then (X, Δ) is not quasi- F^e -split.
 - (b) If $p \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$, then (X, Δ) is quasi- F^e -split of height 1.
 - (c) If $p \neq 2$ and $p \equiv 2 \pmod{3}$, then (X, Δ) is quasi- F^e -split of height $e + 1$.
- (4) Assume $\Delta = \frac{1}{2}P_1 + \frac{1}{2}P_2 + \frac{1}{2}P_3 + \frac{1}{2}P_4$.
 - (a) If $p = 2$, then (X, Δ) is not quasi- F -split.
 - (b) Assume $p \neq 2$. Then (X, Δ) is quasi- F^e -split of height 1 or $e + 1$ (in this case, $h^e(X, \Delta)$ depends on $\text{Supp } \Delta$).

Proof. The assertion follows from Theorem 7.11 and [Wat91, Theorem 4.2(2)]. Recall that the following are equivalent.

- (i) (X, Δ) is quasi- F -split of height 1.
- (ii) $F : \mathcal{O}_X \rightarrow F_*\mathcal{O}_X(p\Delta)$ splits as an \mathcal{O}_X -module homomorphism.
- (iii) $F : H^{\dim X}(X, \mathcal{O}_X(K_X + \Delta)) \rightarrow H^{\dim X}(X, \mathcal{O}_X(p(K_X + \Delta)))$.

Then, for R as in the statement of [Wat91, Theorem 4.2], (X, Δ) is quasi- F -split of height 1 if and only if R is F -pure [Wat91, Theorem 3.3(i)]. \square

7.4. Two-dimensional klt singularities.

Theorem 7.13. *Let R be a ring essentially of finite type over a perfect field of characteristic $p > 0$. Let X be a two-dimensional integral normal scheme and let $\pi : X \rightarrow \text{Spec } R$ be a projective morphism with $\dim \pi(X) \geq 1$. Let Δ be an effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X such that (X, Δ) is klt and $-(K_X + \Delta)$ is ample. Then (X, Δ) is feebly globally quasi- F -regular.*

In particular, if X is a Noetherian scheme essentially of finite type over a perfect field k of characteristic $p > 0$ (i.e., there is a finite open affine cover $X = \bigcup_{i=1}^r \text{Spec } R_i$ such that each R_i is a ring essentially of finite type over k) and (X, Δ) is a two-dimensional klt pair, then (X, Δ) is feebly locally quasi- F -regular.

Proof. By taking the Stein factorisation of $\pi : X \rightarrow \text{Spec } R$ and a localisation of R , we may assume that $H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X) = R$ and R is a local domain. Take an effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor E on X . Fix $\epsilon \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0}$ such that $(X, \Delta' := \Delta + \epsilon E)$ is klt and $-(K_X + \Delta')$ is ample. Let $f : Y \rightarrow X$ be a log resolution of (X, Δ') . We have the induced morphisms:

$$g : Y \xrightarrow{f} X \xrightarrow{\pi} \text{Spec } R.$$

Set $K_Y + \Delta'_Y = f^*(K_X + \Delta')$. As X is \mathbb{Q} -factorial, there exists an f -exceptional effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor F such that $-F$ is f -ample. Set $B_Y := \Delta'_Y + \delta F$ for some $0 < \delta \ll 1$. We may assume that $\lfloor B_Y \rfloor \leq 0$, $-(K_Y + B_Y)$ is ample, and $f_*B_Y = \Delta'$.

It is enough to find $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ such that (X, Δ') is n -quasi- F^e -split for every $e \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ (Definition 4.1). To this end, it suffices to find $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ such that (1)-(3) of Theorem 3.27 hold for every $e \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. Recall that

$$H^0 R\Gamma_{\mathfrak{m}} Rg_* \mathcal{F} = H^0_{\mathfrak{m}}(g_* \mathcal{F}) = 0$$

for a torsion-free coherent \mathcal{O}_Y -module \mathcal{F} , where the first equality holds by $R\Gamma_{\mathfrak{m}} Rg_* = R(\Gamma_{\mathfrak{m}} \circ g_*)$ and the second one follows from the fact that $g_* \mathcal{F}$ is also torsion-free. Hence (1) and (2) of Theorem 3.27 hold automatically for all $n, e \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. By the Serre vanishing theorem, we can find $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ such that

$$H^1(Y, \Omega_Y^1(\log E)^* \otimes \mathcal{O}_Y(K_Y - p^{n+c}(K_Y + B_Y))) = 0$$

holds for every $c \geq 0$, i.e., (3) of Theorem 3.27 holds for every $e > 0$. \square

When the boundary has standard coefficients, we can prove a stronger result.

Theorem 7.14. *Let R be a ring essentially of finite type over a perfect field of characteristic $p > 0$. Let X be a two-dimensional integral normal scheme and let $\pi: X \rightarrow \text{Spec } R$ be a projective morphism with $\dim \pi(X) \geq 1$. Let B be an effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X such that (X, B) is klt, $-(K_X + B)$ is ample, and B has standard coefficients. Then (X, B) is globally quasi-+-regular.*

Proof. By Theorem 7.13, (X, B) is feebly globally F -regular, and hence uniformly quasi- F^∞ -split (Definition 3.44, Definition 4.2). Then it is enough to show that (X, B) is locally quasi-+-regular (Corollary 4.19). In other words, the problem is reduced to the case when $X = \text{Spec } R$.

For a log resolution $\mu: W \rightarrow X$ of (X, B) , we run a $(K_W + \mu_*^{-1}B + \text{Exc}(\mu))$ -MMP over X [Tan18, Theorem 1.1]. Let

$$f: Y \rightarrow X$$

be the last step of this MMP. By construction,

- $E := \text{Exc}(f)$ is a prime divisor,
- $(Y, E + B_Y)$ is plt for $B_Y := f_*^{-1}B$, and
- $-E$ and $-(K_Y + E + B_Y)$ are ample.

We define the effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor B_E on E by adjunction: $(K_Y + E + B_Y)|_E = K_E + B_E$. We now finish the proof assuming that

- (1) (E, B_E) is globally quasi-+-regular, and
- (2) (Y, B_Y) is locally quasi-+-regular.

By (1) and (2), we may apply inversion of adjunction (Corollary 6.11), and hence $(Y, E + B_Y)$ is purely globally quasi-+-regular. Then its pushforward $(X, f_*(E + B_Y)) = (X, B)$ is globally quasi-+-regular.

It is enough to show (1) and (2). The assertion (1) follows from Theorem 7.5. Since (E, B_E) is strongly F -regular, so is $(Y, (1 - \epsilon)E + B_Y)$ for every $0 < \epsilon \leq 1$ by [Das15, Theorem 4.1] (although this reference works over an algebraically closed

field of characteristic $p > 0$, the same argument works under our setting). Hence (2) holds. \square

8. APPENDIX: STABILISATION FOR S^0 AND B^0 IN CHARACTERISTIC $p > 0$

In this appendix, we study the stabilisation for F -splittings. The results in this section are well known to the experts (cf. [BST15]), but, as far as we know, they have not been written with the exact assumptions we need.

8.1. Stabilisation for S^0 .

Lemma 8.1. *In the situation of Setting 2.11 let D be a \mathbb{Q} -Cartier \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X . Then the image of the trace map*

$$\mathrm{tr}^e: F_*^e \mathcal{O}_X(K_X + \lceil p^e D \rceil) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X(K_X + \lceil D \rceil)$$

stabilises for $e \gg 0$, i.e., there exists $e_0 > 0$ such that $\mathrm{Im} \mathrm{tr}^e = \mathrm{Im} \mathrm{tr}^{e_0}$ for all $e \geq e_0$. We denote this image by $\sigma_{\mathrm{keen}}(K_X + \lceil D \rceil)$.

Proof. Fix $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ such that nD is Cartier.

We now reduce the problem to the case when $n \notin p\mathbb{Z}$. Otherwise, we can write $n = p^d n'$ for some $d \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ and $n' \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0} \setminus p\mathbb{Z}$. For $e \geq d$, we get the following factorisation:

$$\mathrm{tr}^e: F_*^e \mathcal{O}_X(K_X + \lceil p^e D \rceil) \xrightarrow{F_*^d \mathrm{tr}^{e-d}} F_*^d \mathcal{O}_X(K_X + \lceil p^d D \rceil) \xrightarrow{\mathrm{tr}^d} \mathcal{O}_X(K_X + \lceil D \rceil).$$

As we are assuming that the statement holds for $p^d D$, the image of

$$F_*^d \mathrm{tr}^{e-d}: F_*^e \mathcal{O}_X(K_X + \lceil p^e D \rceil) \rightarrow F_*^d \mathcal{O}_X(K_X + \lceil p^d D \rceil)$$

stabilises for $e \gg 0$, and hence so is the image of tr^e .

In what follows, we assume $n \notin p\mathbb{Z}$. By taking an open cover $X = \bigcup_{i \in I} X_i$ which trivialises $\mathcal{O}_X(nD)$, the problem is reduced to the case when there exists an \mathcal{O}_X -module isomorphism $\theta: \mathcal{O}_X(nD) \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathcal{O}_X$. For a positive integer m satisfying $p^m \equiv 1 \pmod{n\mathbb{Z}}$, we have that θ induces an \mathcal{O}_X -module isomorphism

$$\Theta: \mathcal{O}_X(K_X + \lceil D \rceil) \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathcal{O}_X(K_X + \lceil p^m D \rceil).$$

Then the statement follows from [Gab04, Lemma 13.1] (stating that the image of a high enough power of a p^{-1} -endomorphism $\lambda: M \rightarrow M$ of a coherent \mathcal{O}_X -module M stabilises) applied to

$$M = \bigoplus_{i=0}^{m-1} \underbrace{\mathcal{O}_X(K_X + \lceil p^i D \rceil)}_{M_i}.$$

Here the \mathcal{O}_X -module homomorphism $\lambda: F_* M \rightarrow M$ is defined componentwisely for direct summands $F_* M_i$ as the compositions

- (for $0 < i \leq m-1$): $F_* M_i \rightarrow M_{i-1} \hookrightarrow M$, where the first homomorphism is the trace map $\mathrm{tr}: F_* M_i = F_* \mathcal{O}_X(K_X + \lceil p^i D \rceil) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X(K_X + \lceil p^{i-1} D \rceil) = M_{i-1}$, and the second homomorphism is the natural inclusion;

- (for $i = 0$): $F_*M_0 \xrightarrow{F_*\Theta, \simeq} F_*\mathcal{O}_X(K_X + [p^m D]) \xrightarrow{\text{tr}} F_*\mathcal{O}_X(K_X + [p^{m-1} D]) = M_{m-1} \hookrightarrow M$, where the first isomorphism is given by $F_*M_0 = F_*\mathcal{O}_X(K_X + [D]) \xrightarrow{F_*\Theta, \simeq} F_*\mathcal{O}_X(K_X + [p^m D])$, the second homomorphism tr is the trace map, and the last homomorphism is the natural inclusion. \square

With the notation of the above lemma, we get the following sequence of surjective \mathcal{O}_X -module homomorphisms induced by the trace map $\text{tr}: F_*^{e+1}\mathcal{O}_X(K_X + [p^{e+1}D]) \rightarrow F_*^e\mathcal{O}_X(K_X + [p^e D])$:

$$\cdots \xrightarrow{\text{tr}} F_*^e\sigma_{\text{keen}}(K_X + [p^e D]) \xrightarrow{\text{tr}} \cdots \xrightarrow{\text{tr}} \sigma_{\text{keen}}(K_X + [D]).$$

The key property of $\sigma_{\text{keen}}(K_X + [D])$ is that for a Cartier divisor E , we have that

$$(8.1.1) \quad \sigma_{\text{keen}}(K_X + [D + E]) = \sigma_{\text{keen}}(K_X + [D]) \otimes \mathcal{O}_X(E).$$

Lemma 8.2. *In the situation of Setting 2.12, let A be an ample \mathbb{Q} -Cartier \mathbb{Q} -divisor and let N be a nef \mathbb{Q} -Cartier \mathbb{Q} -divisor. Then there exists $e_0 > 0$ such that for every integer $r \geq 1$ and every integer $k \geq 0$, the image of*

$$(8.2.1) \quad \text{Tr}^e: H^0(X, F_*^e\mathcal{O}_X(K_X + [p^e(rA + kN)])) \rightarrow H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(K_X + [rA + kN]))$$

is independent of the choice of $e \geq e_0$, i.e., $\text{Im Tr}^e = \text{Im Tr}^{e_0}$ for every $e \geq e_0$.

Proof. Set $A_{r,k} := rA + kN$ and

$$M_{r,k}^e := H^0(X, F_*^e\sigma_{\text{keen}}(K_X + [p^e A_{r,k}])).$$

As mentioned earlier, the trace map $F_*^{e+1}\mathcal{O}_X(K_X + [p^{e+1}A_{r,k}]) \xrightarrow{\text{tr}} F_*^e\mathcal{O}_X(K_X + [p^e A_{r,k}])$ induces the following commutative diagram for every integer $e \geq 0$:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} H^0(X, F_*^{e+1}\mathcal{O}_X(K_X + [p^{e+1}A_{r,k}])) & \xrightarrow{\text{Tr}} & H^0(X, F_*^e\mathcal{O}_X(K_X + [p^e A_{r,k}])) \\ \uparrow & & \uparrow \\ M_{r,k}^{e+1} & \xrightarrow{\widetilde{\text{Tr}}} & M_{r,k}^e \end{array}$$

where the vertical arrows are the induced inclusions.

Claim 8.3. *There exists $e_1 > 0$ such that for every $r \geq 1$ and $k \geq 0$, the image $\text{Im}(\widetilde{\text{Tr}}^e: M_{r,k}^e \rightarrow M_{r,k}^0)$ is independent of the choice of $e \geq e_1$.*

Proof of Claim 8.3. We set

$$K_{r,k}^e := \text{Ker}(F_*^{e+1}\sigma_{\text{keen}}(K_X + [p^{e+1}A_{r,k}]) \rightarrow F_*^e\sigma_{\text{keen}}(K_X + [p^e A_{r,k}])).$$

By the long exact sequence in cohomology, it is enough to find $e_1 \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ such that

$$(8.3.1) \quad H^1(X, K_{r,k}^e) = 0$$

for all $e \geq e_1$, $r \geq 1$, and $k \geq 0$. Fix $m_0 \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ such that m_0A and m_0N are Cartier. Pick $e \geq 0$. Take the integers r' and k' defined by $r' := p^e r \bmod m_0$ and

$k' := p^e k \bmod m_0$ (cf. Notation 2.1(11)). As $(p^e r - r')A$ and $(p^e k - k')N$ are Cartier, it holds that

$$K_{r,k}^e = F_*^e K_{p^e r, p^e k}^0 = F_*^e (K_{r',k'}^0 \otimes \mathcal{O}_X((p^e r - r')A + (p^e k - k')N)).$$

Since there are only finitely many possibilities for r' and k' , the Fujita vanishing theorem enables us to find $e_1 > 0$, independent of r' and k' , such that the vanishing (8.3.1) holds for all $e \geq e_1$, $r \geq 1$, and $k \geq 0$. This concludes the proof of Claim 8.3. \square

We now observe that by Lemma 8.1 applied to $D = p^e A_{r,k}$, it holds that for every $e > 0$, $r > 0$ and $k \geq 0$, there exists $e_2 > 0$ (possibly dependent on (e, r, k)) such that the image of

$$\mathrm{tr}^{e'-e}: F_*^{e'} \mathcal{O}_X(K_X + \lceil p^{e'} A_{r,k} \rceil) \rightarrow F_*^e \mathcal{O}_X(K_X + \lceil p^e A_{r,k} \rceil)$$

is equal to $F_*^e \sigma_{\mathrm{keen}}(K_X + \lceil p^e A_{r,k} \rceil)$ for all $e' - e \geq e_2$. Moreover, we may pick e_2 to be independent of (e, r, k) . Indeed, by replacing r and k by $p^e r$ and $p^e k$, respectively, we may assume that $e = 0$. Then, by (8.1.1), it is enough to consider finitely many possibilities for (r, k) ; more explicitly, if $m_0 A$ and $m_0 N$ are Cartier for some $m_0 \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, then we may assume that $0 \leq r < m_0$ and $0 \leq k < m_0$. Hence a uniform e_2 exists.

In particular, we get the inclusions of images:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Im}(M_{r,k}^e \xrightarrow{\widetilde{\mathrm{Tr}}^e} M_{r,k}^0) \\ \subseteq \mathrm{Im}\left(H^0(X, F_*^e \mathcal{O}_X(K_X + \lceil p^e A_{r,k} \rceil)) \xrightarrow{\mathrm{Tr}^e} H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(K_X + \lceil A_{r,k} \rceil))\right) \\ \subseteq \mathrm{Im}(M_{r,k}^{e-e_2} \xrightarrow{\widetilde{\mathrm{Tr}}^{e-e_2}} M_{r,k}^0) \end{aligned}$$

for every $e \geq e_2$. By Claim 8.3, if we take $e - e_2 \geq e_1$, then the left hand side is equal to the right hand side, and hence all these inclusions are equalities. In particular, the images of (8.2.1) stabilise for all $e \geq e_0 := e_1 + e_2$. This completes the proof of Lemma 8.2. \square

8.2. Stabilisation for B^0 . We fix the assumptions and notation as in Setting 2.12. For a finite surjective morphism $f: Y \rightarrow X$ from a normal integral scheme Y and a \mathbb{Q} -divisor D on X , we consider the trace map:

$$\mathrm{Tr}_D^f: H^0(Y, \mathcal{O}_Y(K_Y + \lceil f^* D \rceil)) \rightarrow H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(K_X + \lceil D \rceil)).$$

For \mathbb{Q} -divisors Δ and L on X , we define

$$B^0(X, \Delta; L) := \bigcap_{f: Y \rightarrow X} \mathrm{Im}(\mathrm{Tr}_{L-(K_X+\Delta)}^f),$$

where the intersection is taken over all finite surjective morphisms $f: Y \rightarrow X$ from normal integral schemes Y . Recall that the pullback $f^* D$ is naturally defined even if D is not \mathbb{Q} -Cartier. The following result immediately implies that the above intersection stabilises.

Proposition 8.4. *In the situation of Setting 2.12, let A be an ample \mathbb{Q} -Cartier \mathbb{Q} -divisor and let N be a nef \mathbb{Q} -Cartier \mathbb{Q} -divisor.*

Then there exists a finite surjective morphism $f: Y \rightarrow X$ from a normal integral scheme Y such that

- *for every integer $r \geq 1$, every integer $k \geq 0$, and*
- *every \mathbb{Q} -divisor Δ such that $K_X + \Delta$ is \mathbb{Q} -Cartier,*

the following equality holds:

$$B^0(X, \Delta; L) = \text{Im}(\text{Tr}_{L-(K_X+\Delta)}^f),$$

where $L := K_X + \Delta + rA + kN$.

Proof. By definition,

$$B^0(X, \Delta; L) = \bigcap_{g: Z \rightarrow X} \text{Im}(\text{Tr}_{rA+kN}^g),$$

where $g: Z \rightarrow X$ runs over all finite surjective morphisms from normal integral schemes Z . Now, pick a finite surjective morphism $f: Y \rightarrow X$ as in Lemma 8.5 below. Then

$$B^0(X, \Delta; L) = \bigcap_{g: Z \rightarrow X} \text{Im}(\text{Tr}_{rA+kN}^g) \supseteq \bigcap_{e>0} \text{Im}(\text{Tr}_{rA+kN}^{F^{e_0} \circ f}) = \text{Im}(\text{Tr}_{rA+kN}^{F^{e_0} \circ f})$$

for some $e_0 > 0$, where the last equality follows immediately from Lemma 8.2 applied to Y . Clearly,

$$B^0(X, \Delta; L) \subseteq \text{Im}(\text{Tr}_{rA+kN}^{F^{e_0} \circ f}),$$

and so the conclusion of the proposition holds after replacing $F^{e_0} \circ f$ by f . \square

Lemma 8.5. *In the situation of Setting 2.12, let A be an ample \mathbb{Q} -Cartier \mathbb{Q} -divisor and let N be a nef \mathbb{Q} -Cartier \mathbb{Q} -divisor.*

Then there exists a finite surjective morphism $f: Y \rightarrow X$ from a normal integral scheme Y such that the following holds: for every finite surjective morphism $g: Z \rightarrow X$ from a normal integral scheme Z , there exists $e_0 > 0$ such that

$$(8.5.1) \quad \text{Im}(\text{Tr}_{rA+kN}^g) \supseteq \text{Im}(\text{Tr}_{rA+kN}^{F^{e_0} \circ f}).$$

for every $e \geq e_0$, $r > 0$, and $k \geq 0$.

Proof. For a \mathbb{Q} -divisor D on X , define

$$\tau_+(D) := \bigcap_{g: Z \rightarrow X} \text{Im}(\text{tr}_D^g),$$

where $g: Z \rightarrow X$ are finite surjective morphisms from normal integral schemes Z , and tr_D^g is the trace map:

$$\text{tr}_D^g: g_*\mathcal{O}_Z(K_Z + [g^*D]) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X(K_X + [D]).$$

Claim 8.6. $\tau_+(A_{r,k}) = \text{Im}(\text{tr}_{A_{r,k}}^f)$ for some fixed finite surjective morphism $f: Y \rightarrow X$ from a normal integral scheme Y , which is independent of $r > 0$ and $k \geq 0$.

Proof of Claim 8.6. Fix $m_0 \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ such that m_0A and m_0N are Cartier. Take the integers r' and k' defined by $r' := r \bmod m_0$ and $k' := k \bmod m_0$ (cf. Notation 2.1(11)). In particular, $(r - r')A$ and $(k - k')N$ are Cartier. Then

$$\tau_+(A_{r,k}) = \tau_+(A_{r',k'}) \otimes \mathcal{O}_X((r - r')A + (k - k')N).$$

Moreover, if r' and k' are fixed, then we get

$$\tau_+(A_{r',k'}) = \text{Im}(\text{tr}_{A_{r',k'}}^f)$$

for some finite surjective morphism $f: Y \rightarrow X$ (dependent on r' and k') from a normal integral scheme Y by [BST15, Corollary 4.8(a)]. Since there are only finitely many possibilities for r' and k' , we can pick such f uniformly for all the choices. This completes the proof of Claim 8.6. \square

We fix f as in Claim 8.6. Define $\overline{\text{Tr}}_{A_{r,k}}^f$ as the induced map as follows:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} H^0(Y, \tau_+(f^*A_{r,k})) & \xrightarrow{\overline{\text{Tr}}_{A_{r,k}}^f} & H^0(X, \tau_+(A_{r,k})) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ H^0(Y, \mathcal{O}_Y(K_Y + [f^*A_{r,k}])) & \xrightarrow{\text{Tr}_{A_{r,k}}^f} & H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(K_X + [A_{r,k}])). \end{array}$$

Claim 8.7. *For every other finite surjective morphism $g: Z \rightarrow X$ from a normal integral scheme Z , there exists $e_0 > 0$ such that*

$$\text{Im}(\overline{\text{Tr}}_{rA+kN}^g) \supseteq \text{Im}(\overline{\text{Tr}}_{rA+kN}^{F^e \circ f})$$

for all $e \geq e_0$, $r > 0$, and $k \geq 0$.

Proof of Claim 8.7. Pick a finite surjective morphism $g: Z \rightarrow X$ as in the statement of Claim 8.7. After replacing $g: Z \rightarrow X$ by a higher one $g': Z' \rightarrow X$, we may assume that g factors through f , that is, we have a diagram:

$$g: Z \xrightarrow{h} Y \xrightarrow{f} X.$$

Set $A_{r,k} := rA + kN$ and consider the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} H^0(Z, \tau_+(p^e g^* A_{r,k})) & \xrightarrow{\overline{\text{Tr}}_{p^e f^* A_{r,k}}^h} & H^0(Y, \tau_+(p^e f^* A_{r,k})) \\ \downarrow \overline{\text{Tr}}^{F^e} & & \downarrow \overline{\text{Tr}}^{F^e} \\ H^0(Z, \tau_+(g^* A_{r,k})) & \xrightarrow{\overline{\text{Tr}}_{f^* A_{r,k}}^h} & H^0(Y, \tau_+(f^* A_{r,k})) \\ & \searrow \overline{\text{Tr}}_{A_{r,k}}^g & \downarrow \overline{\text{Tr}}_{A_{r,k}}^f \\ & & H^0(X, \tau_+(A_{r,k})). \end{array} \quad \left. \begin{array}{l} \downarrow \\ \downarrow \\ \downarrow \end{array} \right) \overline{\text{Tr}}_{A_{r,k}}^{f \circ F^e}$$

For $e \gg 0$, we have that

$$\text{Im}(\overline{\text{Tr}}_{A_{r,k}}^g) \supseteq \text{Im}(\overline{\text{Tr}}_{A_{r,k}}^{g \circ F^e}) = \text{Im}(\overline{\text{Tr}}_{A_{r,k}}^{f \circ F^e}),$$

where the last equality follows from the fact that $\mathrm{Tr}_{p^e f^* A_{r,k}}^h$ is surjective. The surjectivity of $\mathrm{Tr}_{p^e f^* A_{r,k}}^h$ holds, because the Fujita vanishing theorem assures

$$H^1(Y, K_{r,k}^e) = 0,$$

where

$$K_{r,k}^e := \mathrm{Ker} \left(\tau_+(p^e g^* A_{r,k}) \xrightarrow{\mathrm{tr}_{f^* A_{p^e r, p^e k}}^h} \tau_+(p^e f^* A_{r,k}) \right).$$

This is analogous to the proof of Claim 8.3, and so we leave the details to the reader. This completes the proof of Claim 8.7. \square

By Claim 8.6 applied to Y , there is a finite surjective morphism $h: \tilde{Y} \rightarrow Y$ from a normal integral scheme \tilde{Y} such that

$$\tau_+(f^* A_{r,k}) = \mathrm{Im}(\mathrm{tr}_{f^* A_{r,k}}^h),$$

which implies

$$H^0(Y, \tau_+(f^* A_{r,k})) = H^0(Y, \mathrm{Im}(\mathrm{tr}_{f^* A_{r,k}}^h)) \supseteq \mathrm{Im}(H^0(\mathrm{tr}_{f^* A_{r,k}}^h)) = \mathrm{Im}(\mathrm{Tr}_{f^* A_{r,k}}^h).$$

Taking the images by $\mathrm{Tr}_{A_{r,k}}^{F^e \circ f}$, we get

$$(8.7.1) \quad \mathrm{Im}(\overline{\mathrm{Tr}}_{rA+kN}^{F^e \circ f}) \supseteq \mathrm{Im}(\mathrm{Tr}_{rA+kN}^{F^e \circ f \circ h})$$

for every $e \geq 0$.

Now pick a finite surjective morphism $g: Z \rightarrow X$ from a normal integral scheme Z . Then

$$\mathrm{Im}(\mathrm{Tr}_{rA+kN}^g) \supseteq \mathrm{Im}(\overline{\mathrm{Tr}}_{rA+kN}^g) \stackrel{(i)}{\supseteq} \mathrm{Im}(\overline{\mathrm{Tr}}_{rA+kN}^{F^e \circ f}) \stackrel{(ii)}{\supseteq} \mathrm{Im}(\mathrm{Tr}_{rA+kN}^{F^e \circ f \circ h}).$$

for $e \geq e_0$, where (i) follows from Claim 8.7 and (ii) holds by (8.7.1). Thus the statement of the lemma (that is, (8.5.1)) follows after replacing $f \circ h$ by f . \square

REFERENCES

- [AM77] M. Artin and B. Mazur, *Formal groups arising from algebraic varieties*, Annales scientifiques de l'école normale supérieure, 1977, pp. 87–131.
- [BMP⁺20] B. Bhatt, L. Ma, Z. Patakfalvi, K. Schwede, K. Tucker, J. Waldron, and J. Witaszek, *Globally $+$ -regular varieties and the minimal model program for threefolds in mixed characteristic*, arXiv:2012.15801 (2020).
- [BST15] M. Blickle, K. Schwede, and K. Tucker, *F-singularities via alterations*, Amer. J. Math. **137** (2015), no. 1, 61–109.
- [Das15] O. Das, *On strongly F-regular inversion of adjunction*, J. Algebra **434** (2015), 207–226.
- [Eke84] T. Ekedahl, *On the multiplicative properties of the de Rham-Witt complex. I*, Ark. Mat. **22** (1984), no. 2, 185–239. MR765411
- [Gab04] O. Gabber, *Notes on some t-structures*, Geometric aspects of Dwork theory. Vol. I, II, 2004, pp. 711–734. MR2099084
- [Gro65] A. Grothendieck, *Éléments de géométrie algébrique. IV. Étude locale des schémas et des morphismes de schémas. II*, Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math. **24** (1965), 231. MR199181
- [Har66] R. Hartshorne, *Residues and duality*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, No. 20, Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1966. Lecture notes of a seminar on the work of A. Grothendieck, given at Harvard 1963/64, With an appendix by P. Deligne. MR0222093

- [Has15] M. Hashimoto, *F-finiteness of homomorphisms and its descent*, Osaka J. Math. **52** (2015), no. 1, 205–213. MR3326608
- [Ill79] L. Illusie, *Complexe de de Rham-Witt et cohomologie cristalline*, Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4) **12** (1979), no. 4, 501–661.
- [Kee03] D. S. Keeler, *Ample filters of invertible sheaves*, J. Algebra **259** (2003), no. 1, 243–283.
- [KM98] J. Kollár and S. Mori, *Birational Geometry of Algebraic Varieties*, Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics, vol. 134, Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- [Kol13] J. Kollár, *Singularities of the minimal model program*, Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics, vol. 200, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2013.
- [Kol22] J. Kollár, *Duality and normalization, variations on a theme of Serre and Reid*, Recent developments in algebraic geometry—to Miles Reid for his 70th birthday, 2022, pp. 216–252. With an appendix by Hailong Dao. MR4480570
- [KTT⁺a] T. Kawakami, T. Takamatsu, H. Tanaka, J. Witaszek, F. Yobuko, and S. Yoshikawa, *Quasi-F-splittings in birational geometry*, preprint.
- [KTT⁺b] ———, *Quasi-F-splittings in birational geometry II*, preprint.
- [KTT⁺c] ———, *Quasi-F-splittings in birational geometry III*, preprint.
- [KTY22] T. Kawakami, T. Takamatsu, and S. Yoshikawa, *Fedder type criteria for quasi-F-splitting*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.10076 (2022).
- [Lan02] S. Lang, *Algebra*, third, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. 211, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2002. MR1878556
- [Mat89] H. Matsumura, *Commutative ring theory*, Second, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, vol. 8, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1989. Translated from the Japanese by M. Reid. MR1011461
- [SS10] K. Schwede and K. E. Smith, *Globally F-regular and log Fano varieties*, Adv. Math. **224** (2010), no. 3, 863–894.
- [Sta14] T. Stacks Project Authors, *Stacks Project*, 2014.
- [Tan18] H. Tanaka, *Minimal model program for excellent surfaces*, Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) **68** (2018), no. 1, 345–376.
- [Tan22] ———, *Vanishing theorems of Kodaira type for Witt canonical sheaves*, Selecta Math. (N.S.) **28** (2022), no. 1, Paper No. 12, 50.
- [Wat91] K. Watanabe, *F-regular and F-pure normal graded rings*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra **71** (1991), no. 2-3, 341–350.
- [Yob19] F. Yobuko, *Quasi-Frobenius splitting and lifting of Calabi-Yau varieties in characteristic p*, Math. Z. **292** (2019), no. 1-2, 307–316.
- [Yob] ———, *Quasi-F-split and Hodge-Witt*, preprint.

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, THE UNIVERSITY OF TOKYO, 3-8-1 KOMABA, MEGURO-KU, TOKYO 153-8914, JAPAN

Email address: tanaka@ms.u-tokyo.ac.jp

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, FINE HALL, WASHINGTON ROAD, PRINCETON UNIVERSITY, PRINCETON NJ 08544-1000, USA

Email address: jwitaszek@princeton.edu

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, FACULTY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY, TOKYO UNIVERSITY OF SCIENCE, 2641 YAMAZAKI, NODA, CHIBA, 278-8510, JAPAN

Email address: soratobumusabidesu@gmail.com