

# CURVES ON COMPLETE INTERSECTIONS AND MEASURES OF IRRATIONALITY

NATHAN CHEN, BENJAMIN CHURCH, AND JUNYAN ZHAO  
WITH AN APPENDIX BY MOHAN SWAMINATHAN

ABSTRACT. We study the minimal degrees and gonality of curves on complete intersections. We prove a classical conjecture which asserts that the degree of any curve on a general complete intersection  $X \subseteq \mathbb{P}^N$  cut out by polynomials of large degrees is bounded from below by the degree of  $X$ . As an application, we verify a conjecture of Bastianelli–De Poi–Ein–Lazarsfeld–Ullery on measures of irrationality for complete intersections.

## CONTENTS

1.	Introduction	1
2.	Covering families and degenerations of stable maps	5
3.	Covering degree of complete intersections	8
4.	Covering gonality and multiplier ideals	12
5.	Separation of points à la Angehrn–Siu	16
6.	Further questions	20
	Appendix A. Stable maps to SNC degenerations	20
	References	26

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Given a complex projective variety  $X \subseteq \mathbb{P}^N$ , it is always covered by curves obtained by taking the intersection with a linear subspace. Towards studying the geometry of  $X$ , it is fruitful to ask: what other curves lie on  $X$ ? More specifically, we consider the existence of curves with numerical invariants that are smaller than that of a linear slice.

The purpose of this paper is to resolve two open problems about curves on general complete intersections. Our first result establishes a folklore conjecture (cf. [Che, Conjecture 2.9]).

**Theorem A.** *Let  $X \subseteq \mathbb{P}^{n+r}$  be a general complete intersection variety of dimension  $n \geq 1$  cut out by polynomials of degrees  $d_1, \dots, d_r \geq 2n$ . Then any curve  $C \subseteq X$  satisfies*

$$\deg(C) \geq (d_1 - 2n + 1) \cdots (d_r - 2n + 1).$$

Moreover, there exists  $N := N(n, r)$  such that if  $d_1, \dots, d_r \geq N$ , then

$$\deg(C) \geq d_1 \cdots d_r.$$

By slicing with hyperplanes, note that the same degree bound appearing in Theorem A holds for any positive dimensional subvariety of  $X$ . As an application, Theorem A be used in concert with results of Clemens, Ein, Xu, Voisin, Pacienza, Clemens–Ran, and others to give an absolute lower bound on the geometric genus of any subvariety on a general complete intersection (cf. [Cle86, Ein88, Xu94, Voi98, Pac04, CR05]). For threefold hypersurfaces ( $n = 3$  and  $r = 1$ ), the statement of Theorem A follows from a theorem of X. Wu [Wu90].

The story begins with the classical theorem of Noether–Lefschetz [Lef24], which states that if  $d_1 + \cdots + d_r \geq r + 3$ , then a very general complete intersection surface  $X \subseteq \mathbb{P}^{r+2}$  of type  $(d_1, \dots, d_r)$  satisfies  $\text{Pic}(X) = \mathbb{Z}\langle \mathcal{O}_X(1) \rangle$ . In particular, this implies that for any curve  $C \subseteq X$ , its degree  $\deg(C)$  is an integer multiple of  $d_1 \cdots d_r$ . Motivated by Noether–Lefschetz, Griffiths–Harris later made a series of conjectures concerning curves on generic hypersurfaces in  $\mathbb{P}^4$  [GH85]. The strongest form of their conjecture was disproved by Voisin in [Voi89], but one notable case that remains open predicts that on a threefold hypersurface  $X \subseteq \mathbb{P}^4$  of degree  $d \geq 6$ , the degree of any curve  $C \subseteq X$  satisfies  $d \mid \deg C$ . Significant progress in this direction was initiated by Kollár [BCC92], who used degeneration methods to give counterexamples to the integral Hodge conjecture. More recently, Paulsen refined these degeneration methods to show that for a positive density set of integers, the conjecture of Griffiths–Harris (and its generalization to higher-dimensional hypersurfaces) is true [Pau22].

Another motivation for studying curves on varieties is as a measure of complexity. In recent years, measures of irrationality have emerged as interesting and subtle birational invariants for projective varieties, generalizing the notion of gonality for curves to higher dimensions. For a projective variety  $X$  of dimension  $n$ , the *degree of irrationality* and the *covering gonality* are defined as follows:

$$\text{irr}(X) := \min \{ \delta > 0 \mid \exists \text{ rational dominant map } X \dashrightarrow \mathbb{P}^n \text{ of degree } \delta \};$$

$$\text{cov. gon}(X) := \min \{ c > 0 \mid \exists \text{ a curve of gonality } c \text{ through a general point } x \in X \}.$$

From their descriptions, we see that the degree of irrationality is a measure of how far  $X$  is from being rational, while the covering gonality is a measure of how far  $X$  is from being uniruled. These two quantities are related by:  $\text{irr}(X) \geq \text{cov. gon}(X)$ . For an overview of the subject, we refer the reader to [BDPE<sup>+</sup>17] and the many references therein.

Given a smooth projective non-degenerate variety  $X \subseteq \mathbb{P}^{n+r}$  of dimension  $n > 0$  and degree  $d$ , an elementary observation is that by generic projection from points on  $X$ , we always have  $\text{irr}(X) \leq d - r$ . Much of the difficulty in studying  $\text{irr}(X)$  comes from producing sharp lower bounds. For very general hypersurfaces of large degree (i.e.  $r = 1$ ), we now have a fairly complete picture. In [BCFS19], the authors computed their covering gonality. Around the same time, [BCDP14, BDPE<sup>+</sup>17] proved that if  $X$  is a very general hypersurface of sufficiently large degree, then  $\text{irr}(X) = d - 1$ ; in fact, they also showed that any dominant map  $X \dashrightarrow \mathbb{P}^n$  of degree  $d - 1$  is given by projection from a point on  $X$ . The main idea that appears in these papers is to use the positivity of the canonical bundle  $K_X$ . Note that some of these results concerning the covering gonality have been extended to positive characteristic [Smi22].

For a (very) general complete intersection variety  $X \subseteq \mathbb{P}^{n+r}$  cut out by polynomials of degrees  $d_1, \dots, d_r$ , it is natural to ask how both invariants behave. The methods in [BDPE<sup>+</sup>17] only yield lower bounds that are additive in the  $d_i$ 's. However, the authors in *loc. cit.* conjectured that the degree of irrationality should behave *multiplicatively* in the degrees, namely there should be a

positive constant  $C(n, r)$  depending only on  $n$  and  $r$  such that

$$(1) \quad \text{irr}(X) \geq \text{cov. gon}(X) \geq C(n, r) d_1 \cdots d_r,$$

for sufficiently large degrees  $d_i$  (see [BDPE<sup>+</sup>17, Problem 4.1]). From the previous paragraph, it follows that  $\text{irr}(X) \leq d_1 \cdots d_r - r$  so we must always have  $C(n, r) < 1$ .

Our second result fully resolves this problem by exhibiting sharp bounds:

**Theorem B.** *Let  $X \subseteq \mathbb{P}^{n+r}$  be a general complete intersection variety of dimension  $n$  cut out by polynomials of degrees  $d_1, \dots, d_r$ . For any  $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$ , there exists an integer  $N_\epsilon = N(\epsilon, n, r) > 0$  such that if  $d_1, \dots, d_r \geq N_\epsilon$ , then*

$$\text{cov. gon}(X) \geq (1 - \epsilon) \cdot d_1 \cdots d_r.$$

Notably, Theorem B gives gonality bounds for *general* complete intersections and not just very general ones, as opposed to some of the results in [BDPE<sup>+</sup>17] and [BCFS19]. In particular, the gonality bounds hold for most complete intersections defined over  $\mathbb{Q}$ .

The first evidence for a bound of the form (1) came from a theorem of Lazarsfeld in the 90s, who used vector bundle techniques to establish sharp multiplicative bounds for complete intersection curves [Laz97, Exercise 4.12] (this was later revisited in [HLU20]). Unfortunately, these methods do not seem to generalize to higher dimensions. For  $n \geq 2$ , Stapleton derived superadditive bounds for the covering gonality of very general codimension two complete intersections [Sta17, Theorem 5.4]. Subsequently, Stapleton and Ullery computed the degree of irrationality for codimension two complete intersections of type  $(2, d)$  and  $(3, d)$  [SU20, Theorem A & B]. By relating the covering gonality of  $X$  to conjectures about the degrees and genera of curves on  $X$ , the first author produced multiplicative bounds for codimension two complete intersections ( $r = 2$ ) and complete intersection surfaces ( $n = 2$ ), but the constants were far from sharp. Most recently, the authors in [LSU23] establish sharp multiplicative bounds for the degree of irrationality of complete intersections whose degrees are sufficiently spread out (i.e.  $d_1 \gg d_2 \gg \cdots \gg d_r \gg 0$ ).

An important ingredient in the proof of Theorem B which may be of independent interest is an Angehrn–Siu type result (cf. [AS95]) about separation of points of certain adjoint line bundles:

**Theorem C** (Multi-point separation by adjoint line bundles). *Let  $(X, H)$  be a polarized normal Gorenstein variety. Suppose there exists an open subset  $U \subseteq X^{\text{reg}}$  of the regular locus and there exists a number  $\alpha > 0$  such that any positive dimensional subvariety  $W \subseteq X$  meeting  $U$  satisfies  $\deg_H W \geq \alpha$ . Then for any  $\epsilon > 0$ , there exists an integer  $d_0 := d_0(\dim(X), \alpha, \epsilon)$  such that for all  $d \geq d_0$ , the linear series  $|K_X + dH|$  separates at least  $(1 - \epsilon) \cdot d \cdot \alpha$  distinct points on  $U$ .*

This technical strengthening greatly improves the reduction step that appears in [Sta17, Che]. Our approach gives different bounds than those arising from the main result of [AS95] (see Remark 5.5), in that we optimize their techniques for separating asymptotically large numbers of points.

**Outline of the paper and sketch of proofs.** Both Theorem A and Theorem B follow from a sharp lower bound on the degree of a curve passing through a *general* point on a general complete intersection  $X$  of sufficiently large degrees given in Theorem 3.1. Moreover, our technique provides an explicit multiplicative bound for the covering degree and computes

$$\text{cov. deg}(X, \mathcal{O}_X(1)) = \text{deg } X$$

(see Definition 2.3) in the large degree regime. The proof of Theorem 3.1 proceeds by degenerating a complete intersection  $X$  into a union of two complete intersections  $X_1 \cup X_2$  of smaller degrees meeting transversally along a complete intersection of one lower dimension. Fixing a curve  $C$  on the generic such  $X$ , if we could show that the specialization of  $C$  has a component in each  $X_i$ , then we could apply induction to conclude. Unfortunately, this naive approach cannot work – consider the case of lines on a quadric hypersurface degenerating to a union of two hyperplanes. However, when the curve  $C$  belongs to a *covering family of curves* (see §2 for the precise definition), we show that either the curve breaks into components on each  $X_i$ , or some component must cover the intersection  $X_1 \cap X_2$ . This allows us to run a more subtle induction simultaneously on degrees, dimension, and codimension.

A crucial input in the argument above is a result on the structure of curves on a reducible central fiber that deform to nearby fibers. This follows from ideas of J. Li [Li01], and we give a self-contained exposition in Appendix A. The Grassmannian technique developed by Reidl and Yang [RY22] then allows one to pass between the degree of *any* curve on a general complete intersection and the covering degree of a general complete intersection of the same multi-degrees but twice the dimension (see Proof of Theorem A). Hence, Theorem B can be used to give similar bounds for the gonality of any curve on a general complete intersection.

In section §2, we set up the machinery for degenerating stable maps when the ambient space degenerates to the union of two irreducible components meeting transversally and we exhibit constraints on which curves can deform to the general fiber. In §3, we prove a lower bound on the covering degree of curves on a complete intersection  $X \subseteq \mathbb{P}^N$  with respect to  $\mathcal{O}_X(1)$ , and use this to prove Theorem A. In §4 we set up the relevant definitions of multiplier ideals, and we collect the necessary lemmas for modifying their log canonical centers. In §5, we then use these lemmas to prove Theorem C; at the end of the section, we also give the proof of Theorem B.

**Conventions.** In this paper, we work over  $\mathbb{C}$ . By *variety*, we mean an integral separated scheme of finite type over  $\mathbb{C}$ . A *polarized* variety  $(X, L)$  consists of a projective variety  $X$  together with an ample line bundle  $L$ . Recall that the *gonality* of a smooth projective irreducible curve  $C$ , denoted by  $\text{gon}(C)$ , is the smallest degree of a finite morphism  $C \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$ . For an integral curve, we define the gonality to be that of its normalization.

For a Cartier divisor  $D$ , we denote by  $|D|_{\mathbb{Q}}$  the  $\mathbb{Q}$ -linear series, which consists of effective  $\mathbb{Q}$ -divisors which are  $\mathbb{Q}$ -linearly equivalent to  $D$ . For additional properties about linear series and line bundles, we mainly follow [Laz04a]. By a collection of *general points*  $p_1, \dots, p_m$  in  $X$ , we mean that each  $p_i$  is chosen arbitrarily from some unspecified open subset of  $X$ . This should be distinguished from a collection of points  $p_1, \dots, p_m$  in *general position*, by which we mean  $(p_1, \dots, p_m)$  is chosen from an open subset of  $\text{Sym}^m(X)$ . The latter notion is more restrictive on how the points are allowed to vary.

When working with complete intersections  $X \subseteq \mathbb{P}^{n+r}$ , we will use  $n = \dim X$  to denote the dimension and  $r$  to denote the codimension. Sometimes we will write  $N = n + r$  and  $X \subseteq \mathbb{P}^N$ . We say that  $X$  is of *type*  $\underline{d} = (d_1, \dots, d_r)$  if it is a complete intersection defined by polynomials of degrees  $d_1, \dots, d_r$ .

**Acknowledgements.** We thank İzzet Coşkun, Mohammad Farajzadeh-Tehrani, François Greer, Melissa Liu, Rob Lazarsfeld, and David Stapleton for the many insightful discussions and encouragement. The second author would particularly like to thank his advisor, Ravi Vakil for invaluable

guidance and advice during this project. The third author would like to thank Lawrence Ein for suggesting Angehrn-Siu's approach for obtaining a stronger separation of points statement. During the preparation of this article, NC was partially supported by an NSF postdoctoral fellowship DMS-2103099 and BC was partially supported by an NSF GRFP fellowship under grant DGE-2146755.

## 2. COVERING FAMILIES AND DEGENERATIONS OF STABLE MAPS

For a projective variety  $X$  equipped with an embedding  $X \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}^N$ , we write  $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_g(X, b)$  for the Kontsevich moduli space of stable maps from genus  $g$  curves which have degree  $b$  with respect to the embedding. Likewise, if  $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow T$  is a flat projective morphism we write  $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_g(\mathcal{X}/T, b)$  for the relative moduli space of stable maps of degree  $b$  with respect to the fixed embedding. We sometimes omit the degree  $b$ . For details and conventions regarding stable maps, we refer to [FP97, Kon95].

**Definition 2.1.** Let  $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow S$  be a morphism of schemes,  $s_0 \in S$  a point, and  $\mu_{s_0} : C \rightarrow \mathcal{X}_{s_0}$  be a stable map. For any point  $s \in S$ , we say that  $\mu_{s_0}$  *deforms to*  $\mathcal{X}_s$  if there exists a family of stable maps

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{C}_T & \xrightarrow{\mu} & \mathcal{X} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ (T, t_0) & \longrightarrow & (S, s_0) \end{array}$$

such that  $T$  is connected and  $s$  is in the image of  $T \rightarrow S$  and  $(\mu_{s_0})_{\kappa(t_0)} \cong \mu_{t_0}$ .

Note that when  $s$  specializes to  $s_0$ , we can always take  $T$  to be the spectrum of a DVR.

**Definition 2.2.** A *covering family of curves* on a projective variety  $X$  consists of a smooth family

$$\pi : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow T$$

of projective curves parameterized by an irreducible quasi-projective variety  $T$ , together with a dominant morphism (meaning it hits the generic point of each component of  $X$ )

$$f : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow X,$$

such that for general  $t \in T$ , the map  $f_t : C_t \rightarrow X$  is birational onto its image.

**Definition 2.3.** Let  $(X, L)$  be a quasi-projective polarized variety. The *covering degree* of  $(X, L)$ , denoted by  $\text{cov. deg}(X, L)$ , is the minimal integer  $b$  such that there exists a covering family of curves  $\{\pi : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow T, f : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow X\}$  with

$$\deg f^*L|_{C_t} = b.$$

*Remark 2.4.* Alternatively, by standard compactification arguments (cf. [Vis89, Prop 2.6]) one can define the *covering degree*  $\text{cov. deg}(X, \mathcal{L})$  as the minimal  $d \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$  such that there exists a family of stable curves  $\mathcal{C} \rightarrow T$  over an irreducible base scheme  $T$  and a *surjective* stable map  $f : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow X$  such that  $\deg f^*L|_{C_t} = b$ . Since  $X$  is irreducible, one can reduce to checking the degrees of stable maps where the general curve  $C_t$  is smooth and irreducible.

By a Hilbert scheme argument, it is straightforward to show that covering degree is lower semi-continuous in flat polarized families. In particular, it is a constructible function and goes

down under specialization. It will be useful to set up notation to refer to the covering degree of a complete intersection of fixed degrees:

**Definition 2.5.** For  $n, r \in \mathbb{Z}_+$  and  $d_1, \dots, d_r \in \mathbb{Z}_+$  we define

$$\text{cd}_{n,r}(d_1, \dots, d_r) := \max_{X_{d_1}, \dots, X_{d_r}} \text{cov. deg}(X_{d_1} \cap \dots \cap X_{d_r}, \mathcal{O}(1))$$

where  $X_{d_1}, \dots, X_{d_r} \subseteq \mathbb{P}^{n+r}$  are taken over hypersurfaces such that the intersection is smooth of dimension  $n$ .

By the lower semi-continuity of covering degree, it is immediate that  $\text{cd}_{n,r}(d_1, \dots, d_r)$  can be computed as  $\text{cov. deg}(X_{d_1} \cap \dots \cap X_{d_r})$  for a (very) general complete intersection  $X_{d_1} \cap \dots \cap X_{d_r} \subseteq \mathbb{P}^{n+r}$ .

**2.1. The Breaking Lemma.** The input we need for the induction arises from constraints on which curves on the central fiber of an SNC degeneration of varieties deform to nearby fibers. These results rely on multiplicity matching conditions along the boundary that are well-known to experts in relative Gromov–Witten theory.

**Definition 2.6.** Let  $R$  be a DVR, and  $s, \eta \in \text{Spec } R$  be the closed point and generic point, respectively. An *SNC degeneration of varieties* over  $R$  is a flat proper family  $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \text{Spec } R$  such that  $\mathcal{X}_\eta$  is a smooth variety and  $\mathcal{X}_s$  is reduced with simple normal crossing (SNC) singularities.

To fix notation throughout this section, we will work in the following situation.

**Situation 2.7.** Let  $R$  be a DVR and  $s, \eta \in \text{Spec } R$  be the closed point and generic point, respectively. Let  $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \text{Spec } R$  be a SNC degeneration of varieties such that  $\mathcal{X}_s = X_1 \cup_Z X_2$  is the union of two smooth irreducible varieties along a smooth divisor  $Z$ .

It will be convenient to label certain types of components of a stable map.

**Definition 2.8.** Let  $\mu : C \rightarrow X_1 \cup_Z X_2$  be a stable map whose target has two smooth components glued along  $Z$  as in situation 2.7. A sub-curve  $C' \subseteq C$  is said to be of

- (1) *ghost type* if  $\mu(C')$  is a point in  $Z$ ;
- (2) *type  $Z$*  if it is not of ghost type and  $\mu(C') \subseteq Z$ ;
- (3) *type  $X_i$*  (for  $i = 1$  or  $2$ ) if it is neither of ghost type nor of type  $Z$ , and  $\mu(C') \subseteq X_i$ .

The following lemma is the critical input that allows us to force certain curves to break into reducible curves whose image lies on both components of the degeneration.

**Lemma 2.9.** *In situation 2.7, suppose there is a non-constant stable map  $\mu_s : C \rightarrow \mathcal{X}_s$  that deforms to  $\mathcal{X}_\eta$ . Let  $F \subseteq C$  be a connected component of  $\mu_s^{-1}(Z)$ , which is contracted to a point  $z \in \mathcal{X}^{\text{reg}}$  of the regular locus of the total space. For  $i = 1, 2$ , let  $C_i$  be the union of all components of  $C$  of type  $X_i$  meeting  $F$ . Then*

$$\sum_{p \in F \cap C_1} m_p(C_1; Z) = \sum_{p \in F \cap C_2} m_p(C_2; Z)$$

where  $m_p(C_i; Z)$  is the multiplicity at which  $C_i$  intersects  $Z$  in  $X_i$  at the point  $p$  for  $i = 1, 2$ .

*Remark 2.10.* In the case that  $F$  is a point, the only claim above is that  $F$  is a node lying on the intersection of two curves  $C_1, C_2$ , where  $C_i$  is of type  $X_i$  with multiplicity  $m_F(C_1; Z) = m_F(C_2; Z)$ .

The only consequence of Lemma 2.9 needed in the proof of Theorem 3.1 is that there exists at least one component of type  $X_1$  meeting  $F$ , and at least one component of type  $X_2$  meeting  $F$ . This result follows from Jun Li's relative stable maps formalism [Li01]. We refer to Appendix A for a self-contained proof and for a brief comparison with related statements in the literature. A consequence of this result is the following lemma.

**Lemma 2.11.** *In situation 2.7, let  $W \subseteq \mathcal{X}_s$  be the singular locus of the total space. Suppose  $\mu_s : C \rightarrow \mathcal{X}_s$  is a nonconstant stable map that deforms to  $\mathcal{X}_\eta$ , and  $z \in Z \setminus W$  is a point in the image of  $\mu$ . Then one of the following holds:*

- (a)  $z$  lies on the image of a component of type  $Z$ ; or
- (b)  $z$  lies on the image of a component of type  $X_1$  and also on the image of a component of type  $X_2$ .

*Proof.* Since  $\mu : C \rightarrow \mathcal{X}_s$  is non-constant, there must be a component  $C' \subseteq C$  meeting  $\mu^{-1}(z)$  that is either of type  $Z$  or (without loss of generality) of type  $X_1$ . In the former situation we arrive at case (a), so let us now assume that  $C'$  is of type  $X_1$ . Let  $p \in C'$  be a point mapping to  $z$ . If  $p$  lies on a component of type  $Z$ , then we are in case (a); otherwise  $p$  is contained in a connected component  $F$  of  $\mu_s^{-1}(Z)$  such that  $\mu(F) = z$ . Since  $z \in Z \setminus W$ , we can apply Lemma 2.9 to conclude that  $F$  meets a component  $C_1$  of type  $X_1$  and a component  $C_2$  of type  $X_2$ . Hence the images of  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  contain  $z$  (since they meet  $F$  and  $\mu(F) = z$ ) and satisfy the conditions of case (b).  $\square$

**Theorem 2.12.** *In situation 2.7, let  $\mathcal{L}$  be a line bundle on  $\mathcal{X}$ , which is relatively ample over  $\text{Spec } R$ . Suppose that  $\mathcal{X}^{\text{reg}} \cap Z$  is nonempty, and that  $\text{cov. deg}(\mathcal{X}_{\bar{\eta}}, \mathcal{L}_{\bar{\eta}}) \leq d$ . Then either*

- (a)  $\text{cov. deg}(X_1, \mathcal{L}|_{X_1}) + \text{cov. deg}(X_2, \mathcal{L}|_{X_2}) \leq d$ , or
- (b)  $\text{cov. deg}(Z, \mathcal{L}|_Z) \leq d$ .

*Proof.* The idea is that through a general point  $z \in Z$ , there is a curve in the specialization of the covering family passing through  $z$ . Then we apply Lemma 2.11 to conclude that either  $z$  lies on a component of type  $Z$  or it lies on two components, one of type  $X_1$  and one of type  $X_2$ . Since  $z$  is a general point, in the former case, the specialization of the covering family contains a covering family of curves of  $Z$  so we conclude (b), in the latter case, there is a component covering  $X_1$  and a component covering  $X_2$  so we conclude (a). We now fill in the details of this argument.

By assumption, there is a family of stable curves  $\pi : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow T$  over an integral base  $T$  and a stable dominant morphism  $\mu : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}_{\bar{\eta}}$  such that  $\deg_{\mu^* \mathcal{L}} \mathcal{C}_t \leq d$  fiberwise. By universality of the moduli stack, this gives a morphism  $T \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_g(\mathcal{X}_{\bar{\eta}})$ . Let  $W \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{M}}_g(\mathcal{X}/R)$  be the stack theoretic closure of the image of  $T$ . By [Vis89, Proposition 2.6], one can choose a finite cover  $W \rightarrow W$  by an integral scheme. Since  $W$  is integral and dominates  $\text{Spec } R$ , it is flat over  $\text{Spec } R$ . Therefore, pulling back to  $W$  we have the following diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{C} & \xrightarrow{\mu} & \mathcal{X} \\ \pi \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ W & \longrightarrow & \text{Spec } R, \end{array}$$

where  $\mu$  is surjective because it is surjective over  $\eta$ , the family  $\mathcal{C}$  is proper over  $R$ , and  $\mathcal{X}$  is irreducible. Specializing to the geometric special fiber, we get a stable map

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{C}_s & \xrightarrow{\mu_s} & \mathcal{X}_s \\ \pi_s \downarrow & & \\ W_s & & \end{array}$$

with  $\mu : \mathcal{C}_s \rightarrow \mathcal{X}_s$  surjective and  $\deg_{\mu^* \mathcal{L}} \mathcal{C}_s \leq d$  by flatness. Therefore, there is an irreducible component  $S \subseteq W_s$  such that  $Z \subseteq \mu(\mathcal{C}_S)$ . In fact, we can assume  $X_1 \subseteq \mu(\mathcal{C}_S)$  since the union of all images is  $X_1 \cup_Z X_2$  and the  $X_i$  are irreducible.

Let  $\eta_Z \in Z$  be the generic point. Since  $\mu$  is surjective, there is a point  $\delta \in \mathcal{C}_S$  mapping to  $\eta_Z$ . Let  $S' \subseteq S$  be the image under  $\pi$  of an irreducible component of  $\mu_s^{-1}(Z)$  containing  $\delta$ . By construction, every fiber of  $\mathcal{C}_{S'} \rightarrow S'$  has image meeting  $Z$  and  $\mu_s(\mathcal{C}_{S'})$  contains  $Z$ . Let  $\eta_{S'} \in S'$  be the generic point. By the flatness of  $\pi : \mathcal{C}_{S'} \rightarrow S'$ , the irreducible components of  $\mathcal{C}_{S'}$  are identified with those of  $\mathcal{C}_{\eta_{S'}}$ . Since  $\mu : \mathcal{C}_{\eta_{S'}} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}_s$  is a stable map that deforms to  $\mathcal{X}_\eta$  (there is a specialization from the generic point of  $W$  to  $\eta_{S'}$  since  $W$  is irreducible), we may apply Lemma 2.11 to the stable map  $\mu_s : \mathcal{C}_{\eta_{S'}} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}_s$ , where we take  $z = \eta_Z$ . Then either there is a component  $\mathcal{C}_Z \subseteq \mathcal{C}_{\eta_{S'}}$  with  $\mathcal{C}_Z$  of type  $Z$  and hitting  $\eta_Z$ , in which case  $\mathcal{C}_Z \rightarrow S'$  is a covering family of  $Z$  so we are in case (b); otherwise, there are two irreducible components  $\mathcal{C}_i \subseteq \mathcal{C}_{\eta_{S'}}$  such that  $(\mathcal{C}_i)_{\eta_{S'}}$  is of type  $X_i$  for  $i = 1, 2$ , and  $\eta_Z$  lies on both of their images. Since  $\mu(\mathcal{C}_i)$  and  $X_i$  are all irreducible and  $\mu(\mathcal{C}_i)$  properly contain  $Z$ , we must have that  $\mu(\mathcal{C}_i) = X_i$ . Therefore,  $\mathcal{C}_{S'} \rightarrow S'$  is a covering family of  $X_1 \cup_Z X_2$  over an irreducible base  $S'$ , and we have that

$$d \geq \deg_{\mathcal{L}} \mathcal{C} = \deg_{\mathcal{L}} \mathcal{C}_{S'} \geq \deg_{\mathcal{L}} \mathcal{C}_1 + \deg_{\mathcal{L}} \mathcal{C}_2 \geq \text{cov. deg}(X_1, \mathcal{L}|_{X_1}) + \text{cov. deg}(X_2, \mathcal{L}|_{X_2})$$

giving case (a). □

### 3. COVERING DEGREE OF COMPLETE INTERSECTIONS

In this section, we prove the following lower bound on the covering degree of complete intersections and show how it implies the bounds of Theorem A on the degree of *any* curve.

**Theorem 3.1.** *Let  $X \subseteq \mathbb{P}^{n+r}$  be a general complete intersection variety of dimension  $n$  cut out by polynomials of degrees  $d_1, \dots, d_r \geq n$ . Then*

$$\text{cov. deg}(X, \mathcal{O}(1)) \geq (d_1 - n + 1) \cdots (d_r - n + 1).$$

*Moreover, there exists  $N := N(n, r)$  such that if  $d_1, \dots, d_r \geq N$  then*

$$\text{cov. deg}(X, \mathcal{O}(1)) = d_1 \cdots d_r.$$

*Remark 3.2.* When  $X \subseteq \mathbb{P}^{n+1}$  is a hypersurface of degree  $d = n$ , then  $X$  is covered by lines so  $\text{cov. deg}(X) = 1$ . However, a basic dimension count shows that when  $d > n$ , the general such hypersurface is not covered by lines and hence  $\text{cov. deg}(X) \geq 2$ . This aligns with the constants in Theorem 3.1. Moreover, if  $d = 2n$  then every hypersurface contains a line but if  $d > 2n$  then the generic such hypersurface does not, aligning with the constants in Theorem A.



**3.1. The Main Induction.** To prove this result, we will degenerate our complete intersection to the union of complete intersections of lower degrees and track how stable maps deform using the results of the previous section. This leads to the recursion below, which enables a simultaneous induction on the dimension and codimension of  $X$ .

**Theorem 3.3.** *Let  $d_1 = a + b$  for  $a, b$  positive integers. Then for any  $d_2, \dots, d_r \in \mathbb{Z}_+$  we have*

$$\text{cd}_{n,r}(d_1, \dots, d_r) \geq \min \left\{ \text{cd}_{n,r}(a, d_2, \dots, d_r) + \text{cd}_{n,r}(b, d_2, \dots, d_r), \text{cd}_{n-1,r+1}(a, b, d_2, \dots, d_r) \right\}.$$

*Proof.* Given a very general hypersurface  $X_{d_1}$  in  $\mathbb{P}^n$ , there exists a degeneration to a union  $X_a \cup X_b$  of two very general hypersurfaces. More explicitly, we can find equations  $F, G, H$  of degrees  $d_1, a, b$  such that  $V(G)$  and  $V(H)$  are isomorphic to the geometric generic hypersurface of degree  $a$  and  $b$ , respectively, and  $V(F), V(G)$ , and  $V(H)$  all meet transversally. Choosing other fixed hypersurfaces  $X_{d_2}, \dots, X_{d_r}$  meeting each other and the aforementioned hypersurfaces all transversally, the family

$$\mathcal{X} := V(GH - tF) \cap X_{d_2} \cap \dots \cap X_{d_r} \subseteq \mathbb{P}^n \times \mathbb{A}^1$$

satisfies the hypotheses in Theorem 2.12, and the geometric generic fiber of  $\mathcal{X}$  is isomorphic to the geometric generic complete intersection of type  $\underline{d}$ . Let  $Z$  denote the intersection of the two components of the special fiber:

$$Z := V(G) \cap V(H) \cap X_{d_2} \cap \dots \cap X_{d_r}.$$

Note that the singular locus  $W \subseteq \mathcal{X}$  is the intersection

$$W := V(F) \cap V(G) \cap V(H) \cap X_{d_2} \cap \dots \cap X_{d_r},$$

which is a divisor in  $|\mathcal{O}_Z(d)|$ ; in particular,  $W$  does not contain  $Z$  as is required in Theorem 2.12. Let  $R = \mathbb{C}[t]_{(t)}$  and  $K = \mathbb{C}(t)$ . By the previous discussion,

- (1)  $\text{cd}_{n,r}(d_1, \dots, d_r) = \text{cov. deg}(\mathcal{X}_{\bar{\eta}})$ ;
- (2)  $\text{cd}_{n,r}(a, d_2, \dots, d_r) = \text{cov. deg}(X_1)$ ;
- (3)  $\text{cd}_{n,r}(b, d_2, \dots, d_r) = \text{cov. deg}(X_2)$ ;
- (4)  $\text{cd}_{n-1,r+1}(a, b, d_2, \dots, d_r) = \text{cov. deg}(Z)$ .

Therefore, we may apply Theorem 2.12 to conclude. □

The following base case will serve as the base case of an induction argument.

*Example 3.4.* Let  $X := X_{\underline{d}} \subseteq \mathbb{P}^{n+r}$  be a general Fano index 1 complete intersection, i.e.  $\sum d_i = n + r$ . It is well known that the Fano variety of lines on  $X$  has dimension equal to the expected dimension  $2(n + r) - \sum d_i - r - 2 = n - 2$ , so the locus of lines sweeps out at most a divisor on  $X$ . This implies that the covering degree of  $X$  is at least 2, and it turns out that conics do indeed cover  $X$ .

**Theorem 3.5.** *For any fixed  $n, r$ , and any  $\underline{d}$  with  $d_i \geq n$ , we have*

$$\text{cd}_{n,r}(d_1, \dots, d_r) \geq \prod_{i=1}^r (d_i - n + 1).$$

*Proof.* We apply induction on both  $n$  and  $r$  simultaneously. The case  $n = 1$  of curves is clear. The case  $r = 0$  is exactly the fact that  $\text{cov. deg}(\mathbb{P}^n) = 1$  which equals the empty product. Towards induction: assume the statement holds for  $(n, r - 1)$  and  $(n - 1, r)$ , and we need to prove it holds for  $(n, r)$ . Splitting  $d_1 = (d_1 - 1) + 1$  we obtain using Theorem 3.3

$$\begin{aligned} \text{cd}_{n,r}(d_1, \dots, d_r) &\geq \min \{ \text{cd}_{n,r}(d_1 - 1, d_2, \dots, d_r) + \text{cd}_{n,r}(1, d_2, \dots, d_r), \text{cd}_{n-1,r+1}(d_1 - 1, 1, d_2, \dots, d_r) \} \\ &= \min \{ \text{cd}_{n,r}(d_1 - 1, d_2, \dots, d_r) + \text{cd}_{n,r-1}(d_2, \dots, d_r), \text{cd}_{n-1,r}(d_1 - 1, d_2, \dots, d_r) \}. \end{aligned}$$

For the second term, we use the inductive hypothesis  $(n - 1, r)$  to conclude

$$\begin{aligned} \text{cd}_{n-1,r+1}(d_1 - 1, d_2, \dots, d_r) &= \text{cd}_{n-1,r}(d_1 - 1, d_2, \dots, d_r) \\ &\geq ((d_1 - 1) - (n - 1) + 1) \cdot \prod_{i=2}^r (d_i - (n - 1) + 1) \geq \prod_{i=1}^r (d_i - n + 1). \end{aligned}$$

Now we can apply induction on the degrees. We use the following base case  $d_1 = n$  for induction on  $d_1$ :

$$\text{cd}_{n,r}(n, d_2, \dots, d_r) \geq \text{cd}_{n,r}(1, d_2, \dots, d_r) = \text{cd}_{n,r-1}(d_2, \dots, d_r) \geq \prod_{i=2}^r (d_i - n + 1) = \prod_{i=1}^r (d_i - n + 1),$$

where the first inequality follows from generic projection or from specialization to a union of complete intersections of type  $(1, d_2, \dots, d_r)$ . Assuming the inequality for  $d_1 - 1$ , we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{cd}_{n,r}(d_1 - 1, d_2, \dots, d_r) + \text{cd}_{n,r-1}(d_2, \dots, d_r) &\geq ((d_1 - 1) - n + 1) \cdot \prod_{i=2}^r (d_i - n + 1) + \text{cd}_{n,r-1}(d_2, \dots, d_r) \\ &\geq (d_1 - n) \cdot \prod_{i=2}^r (d_i - n + 1) + \prod_{i=2}^r (d_i - n + 1) \\ &= (d_1 - n + 1) \cdot \prod_{i=2}^r (d_i - n + 1). \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

**3.2. Proof of Theorem 3.1.** In this section, we complete the proof of Theorem A using the following result of Paulsen, the asymptotics resulting from Theorem 3.1, and the main inductive bound.

**Theorem 3.6** ([Pau22, Proposition 7]). *Let  $n \geq 3$  be an integer. If  $d$  is an integer such that*

- (1)  $d$  is coprime to  $n!$
- (2) the largest prime power  $q$  dividing  $d$  satisfies

$$\left( \binom{n}{2} - 1 \right) \cdot q^n + \left( n! - \binom{n}{2} \right) \cdot q^{n-1} + (2^n + 1) \cdot n! \leq d,$$

*then every curve  $C$  on a very general hypersurface  $X_d \subseteq \mathbb{P}^{n+1}$  has  $d \mid \deg C$ .*

Using this result, we complete the proof as follows.

*Proof of Theorem 3.1.* We will show that for fixed  $(n, r)$ , there is an integer  $N := N(n, r)$  such that for all  $d_1, \dots, d_r \geq N$  we have  $\text{cd}_{n,r}(d_1, \dots, d_r) = d_1 \cdots d_r$ . To do this, we will check that the set  $S = S_n$  of positive integers  $d$  satisfying the hypothesis of Theorem 3.6 satisfies the following condition:

(\*) For any positive integers  $k$  and  $r$ , there exists an integer  $N := N(n, k, r)$  such that for any  $d_1, \dots, d_r \geq N$  there exists a finite array  $\{a_j^i\}_{i,j}$  of elements  $a_j^i \in S$  satisfying that

- (a)  $a_j^i \geq k$  for any  $i, j$ ;
- (b) any two elements  $a_j^i$  and  $a_{j'}^{i'}$  are coprime whenever  $j \neq j'$
- (c) for all  $1 \leq j \leq r$  we have

$$d_j = \sum_i a_j^i.$$

Granting that  $S_n$  satisfies (\*), let us prove the result. Fixing  $(n, r)$ , choose  $k > 5$  so that  $\text{cd}_{n-1,r+1}(d_1, \dots, d_{r+1}) \geq (1 - \frac{1}{2})d_1 \cdots d_{r+1}$  whenever  $d_1, \dots, d_{r+1} \geq \max\{k, n\}$  (we may do so because of Theorem 3.5). This condition implies that if we split  $d_1 = a + b$  for  $a, b \geq \max\{k, n\}$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} \text{cd}_{n,r}(d_1, \dots, d_r) &\geq \min\{\text{cd}_{n,r}(a, d_2, \dots, d_r) + \text{cd}_{n,r}(b, d_2, \dots, d_r), \text{cd}_{n-1,r+1}(a, b, d_2, \dots, d_r)\} \\ &\geq \text{cd}_{n,r}(a, d_2, \dots, d_r) + \text{cd}_{n,r}(b, d_2, \dots, d_r) \end{aligned}$$

since the second term is automatically larger than  $\frac{1}{2}abd_2 \cdots d_r \geq d_1 \cdots d_r$  since  $\frac{1}{2}ab \geq a + b$  for  $a, b > 5$ . Therefore, when all entries are at least  $\max\{k, n\}$  we see that  $\text{cd}_{n,r}(d_1, \dots, d_r)$  is multi-superadditive.

Using property (\*), for any  $d_1, \dots, d_r \geq N(n, k(n, r), r)$  we can find a matrix  $\{a_j^i\}$  satisfying (a) and (b) so that  $d_j = \sum_i a_j^i$ . Since all  $a_j^i \geq k$ , using the multi-superadditivity we get

$$\text{cd}_{n,r}(d_1, \dots, d_r) \geq \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_r} \text{cd}_{n,r}(a_1^{i_1}, \dots, a_r^{i_r}).$$

Since  $a_1^{i_1}, \dots, a_r^{i_r}$  are elements of  $S$ , any curve  $C$  on a very general complete intersection  $X \subseteq \mathbb{P}^{n+r}$  general of type  $(a_1^1, \dots, a_r^1)$  satisfies  $a_j^{i_j} \mid \deg C$ . Furthermore, because  $a_1^{i_1}, \dots, a_r^{i_r}$  are pairwise coprime,  $a_1^1 \cdots a_r^1 \mid \deg C$ . Therefore,

$$\text{cd}_{n,r}(d_1, \dots, d_r) \geq \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_r} a_1^{i_1} \cdots a_r^{i_r} = d_1 \cdots d_r.$$

Now we prove that  $S_n$  satisfies (\*). We first claim that  $S_n$  satisfies (\*) if it contains arbitrarily long sequences of pairwise coprime integers. Indeed, let  $g_1, \dots, g_r, g'_1, \dots, g'_r$  be such a sequence of length  $2r$  with all entries  $\geq k$ . Then we claim that the requisite matrices can be built so that  $a_j^i$  is either  $g_j$  or  $g'_j$  for each  $i$ . Clearly, such a matrix satisfies (a) and (b) so it suffices to show that all sufficiently large sequences  $(d_1, \dots, d_r)$  are representable. This uses nothing more than the claim that if  $g, g'$  are coprime then  $d > (g-1)(g'-1)$  can be written as  $gx + g'y$  for  $x, y > 0$  which is Sylvester's answer to the well-known "postage stamp" or "coin problem."

Finally, we show that  $S_n$  contains arbitrarily long sequences of coprime integers. Let  $p_1, \dots, p_s$  be an increasing sequence of primes with  $p_1 > 2^n$ . Then  $d = p_1 \cdots p_\ell \in S_n$  if

$$C_n p_\ell^n \leq p_1 \cdots p_\ell$$

where  $C_n$  is a constant depending only on  $n$  (given explicitly in Theorem 3.6). By Bertrand's postulate we can choose  $p_r \leq 2^r p_1$  thus if

$$2^{n\ell} C_n p_1^n \leq p_1^\ell$$

we win. Since  $p_1 > 2^n$ , the above bound holds as  $\ell \rightarrow \infty$ . Furthermore,  $\gcd(p_1, \dots, p_\ell, n!) = 1$  because  $p_1 > 2^n > n$  showing that  $d = p_1 \cdots p_\ell \in S_n$ . By starting at the next largest prime after  $p_\ell$  we can construct a new element of  $S_n$  sharing no primes in common. Repeating this, we win.  $\square$

For completeness, here we provide the details of how the Grassmanian technique of [RY22] applies to reduce Theorem A to Theorem 3.1.

*Proof of Theorem A.* We will apply [RY22, Theorem 2.3] to the locus of points on the universal complete intersection through which passes a curve of degree  $< b := \text{cd}_{2n,r}(d_1, \dots, d_r)$ .

Borrowing from the notation of [RY22], let  $\mathcal{X}_{N,\underline{d}}$  be the universal complete intersection in  $\mathbb{P}^N$  of type  $\underline{d} = (d_1, \dots, d_r)$ , and let  $\mathcal{Z}_{N,\underline{d}}^{<b}$  be the space of pairs  $(p, [X])$  consisting of a complete intersection  $X$  and a point  $p \in X$  through which there exists an integral curve  $C \subseteq X$  with  $\deg C < b$ . Since the arithmetic genus of an integral curve in  $\mathbb{P}^N$  of degree  $< d$  is bounded above by  $\frac{1}{2}(d-1)(d-2)$  (one can see this by projecting to a  $\mathbb{P}^2$ ), there are only finitely many Hilbert polynomials that may appear so the Hilbert scheme of such curves is finite type. Hence,  $\mathcal{Z}_{N,\underline{d}}^{<b}$  is constructible. By definition, when  $N = 2n + r$ , meaning the complete intersection has dimension  $2n$ , then  $\mathcal{Z}_{N,\underline{d}}^{<b}$  is a proper subset. Hence if  $m = 2n + r + 1$  then  $\mathcal{Z}_{m-1,\underline{d}}^{<b}$  has codimension at least 1 in  $\mathcal{X}_{m-1,\underline{d}}$ . Furthermore, if  $(p, [X]) \in \mathcal{Z}_{N,\underline{d}}^{<b}$  and  $X = \varphi^{-1}(X' \cap H)$  where  $\varphi : \mathbb{P}^N \xrightarrow{\sim} H$  is a parametrized hyperplane and  $X'$  is a complete intersection of type  $\underline{d}$  in  $\mathbb{P}^{N+1}$  then  $(\varphi(p), X') \in \mathcal{Z}_{N+1,\underline{d}}^{<b}$  because  $\varphi(C) \subseteq X'$  is a curve through  $\varphi(p)$  of degree  $< d$ . The hypotheses in [RY22, Theorem 2.3] are satisfied, so we conclude that for every integer  $c \geq 1$ ,

$$\text{codim}(\mathcal{Z}_{m-c,\underline{d}}^{<b} \subseteq \mathcal{X}_{m-c,\underline{d}}) \geq c.$$

Since  $\mathcal{X}_{n+r,\underline{d}}$  has relative dimension  $n$  over the moduli space of complete intersections, by setting  $c = n + 1$  we conclude that  $\mathcal{Z}_{n+r,\underline{d}}^{<b}$  cannot intersect the general fiber. This completes the proof.  $\square$

## 4. COVERING GONALITY AND MULTIPLIER IDEALS

**4.1. Covering Gonality and Separation of Points.** In this subsection, we recall how positivity can be used to give lower bounds for the covering gonality.

**Definition 4.1.** Let  $X$  be a normal projective variety. For a positive integer  $m$ , we say that a line bundle  $L$  on  $X$  *separates  $m$  distinct general points* if there exists a Zariski-open  $U \subseteq X$  such that for every set of  $m$  distinct points  $\xi := \{p_1, \dots, p_m\} \subseteq U$ , the restriction map

$$H^0(X, L) \rightarrow H^0(X, L \otimes \mathcal{O}_\xi)$$

is surjective. If the choice of  $U$  is made explicit we say that  $L$  separates  $m$  distinct points on  $U$ .

The relevant result we need is the following:

**Proposition 4.2** ([BDPE<sup>+</sup>17, Theorem 1.10] & [Sta17, Remark 5.14]). *Let  $X$  be a normal Gorenstein variety with at worst canonical singularities. If the canonical line bundle  $K_X$  separates  $m$  distinct general points, then*

$$\text{cov. gon}(X) \geq m + 1.$$

**4.2. Singularities, multiplier ideals and vanishing theorems.** In this subsection, we will introduce the relevant multiplier ideal machinery (for more details, see [Ein97, Laz04b]).

Although most of our results hold in a more general setting, for simplicity we will assume that  $X$  is  $\mathbb{Q}$ -Gorenstein.

**Definition 4.3.** Let  $(X, D)$  projective log pair such that  $D$  is an effective  $\mathbb{Q}$ -Cartier  $\mathbb{Q}$ -divisor, and fix a log resolution  $\mu : X' \rightarrow (X, D)$ . Then the *multiplier ideal sheaf*

$$\mathcal{J}(D) = \mathcal{J}(X, D) \subseteq \mathcal{O}_X$$

associated to  $D$  is defined to be

$$\mathcal{J}(D) = \mu_* \mathcal{O}_{X'}(K_{X'/X} - \lfloor \mu^* D \rfloor)$$

where  $\lfloor \mu^* D \rfloor$  denotes the round-down. Let  $Z(X, D)$  (or  $Z(D)$  if there is no confusion about the ambient space) denote the scheme defined by the multiplier ideal  $\mathcal{J}(D)$ .

**Definition 4.4.** Let  $(X, D)$  be a log canonical pair. A prime divisor  $E$  over  $X$  is called a *log canonical place* or *lc place* of  $(X, D)$  if there exists a birational model (or equivalently, a log resolution)  $\pi : X' \rightarrow X$  of  $(X, D)$  such that

$$\text{ord}_E(\pi^*(K_X + D) - K_{X'}) = 1.$$

The closed subset  $\pi(E)$  of  $X$  is called an *lc center* of  $(X, D)$ . The *non-klt locus* of  $(X, D)$ , denoted by  $\text{NKLT}(X, D)$ , is the union of all lc centers of  $(X, D)$ .

**Definition 4.5.** Let  $(X, D)$  be a pair such that  $D$  is  $\mathbb{Q}$ -Cartier. For an effective  $\mathbb{Q}$ -divisor  $D$  and a point  $x \in Y$ , the *LC-locus* of  $D$  locally at  $x$ , denoted by  $\text{LC}_x(X, D)$ , is the union of all irreducible components of  $Z(c \cdot D)$  that pass through  $x$ , with a reduced scheme structure, where

$$c = \text{lct}_x(X; D) := \inf\{c' > 0 \mid \mathcal{J}(c' \cdot D) \text{ is nontrivial at } x\}$$

is the local log canonical threshold at  $x$ .

*Remark 4.6.* In the above definition of LC-locus, the pair  $(X, D)$  does not have to be log canonical. While this may not be compatible with some other conventions in the literature, it is convenient for our proofs. If  $(X, D)$  is log canonical, we call it the non-klt locus (compare with Definition 4.4). In general, for any non-lc pair  $(X, D)$ , by definition we have that

$$\text{LC}(X, D) = \text{NKLT}(X, cD),$$

where  $c = \text{lct}(X, D)$ . The local version is also true: for any point  $p \in X$ , we have

$$\text{LC}_p(X, D) = \text{NKLT}_p(X, c_p D),$$

where  $c_p = \text{lct}_p(X, D)$ .

**Proposition 4.7.** (Semi-continuity of multiplier ideals, [Laz04b, Cor. 9.5.39]) *Let  $p : X \rightarrow T$  be a smooth morphism between smooth irreducible varieties. Let  $D$  be an effective  $\mathbb{Q}$ -divisor on  $X$  whose support does not contain any of the fibers  $X_t := p^{-1}(t)$ , so that for each  $t \in T$  the restriction  $D_t := D|_{X_t}$  is well-defined. Suppose moreover that there is a section  $q : T \rightarrow X$  of  $p$ , and write  $q_t := q(t) \in X_t$ . If  $q_t \in Z(X_t, D_t)$  for all  $0 \neq t \in T$ , then  $q_0 \in Z(X_0, D_0)$ .*

The following well-known lemmas will be used in the proof of the main theorems.

**Lemma 4.8.** ([Laz04b, Lemma 10.4.12]) *Let  $X$  be an  $n$ -dimensional irreducible projective variety, and  $p_1, \dots, p_m \in X$  be smooth points. Let  $H$  be an ample  $\mathbb{Q}$ -divisor on  $X$  such that  $(H^n) > m \cdot \gamma^n$  for some rational number  $\gamma > 0$ . Then there exists an effective  $\mathbb{Q}$ -divisor*

$$D \in |H|_{\mathbb{Q}} \quad \text{with} \quad \text{mult}_p(D) > \gamma.$$

*Proof.* This is the multi-point version of [Laz04a, Lemma 10.4.12], and the proof is almost identical to [Laz04a, Proposition 1.1.31]. Choosing  $\ell \gg 0$  sufficiently divisible we have

$$h^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(\ell H)) = \frac{\ell^n H^n}{n!} + O(\ell^{n-1}),$$

and we need to impose at most  $\frac{\gamma^n}{n!} + O(\gamma^{n-1})$  conditions to vanish to order  $\geq \gamma$  at each smooth point. Hence, for  $\ell \gg 0$  there exist sufficient sections as long as  $(H^n) > m \cdot \gamma^n$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 4.9** ([Laz04b, Proposition 9.3.2]). *Let  $X$  be a normal projective variety of dimension  $n$ , and  $p$  be a smooth point on  $X$ . If  $D$  is an effective  $\mathbb{Q}$ -divisor such that  $\text{mult}_p D \geq n$ , then  $p$  is contained in  $Z(D)$ .*

**4.3. Perturbation, cutting down, and lifting.** From now on, let  $(X, H)$  be a normal polarized variety of dimension  $n$  such that the canonical divisor  $K_X$  is Cartier.

Let  $p_1, \dots, p_m$  be  $m$  distinct points on  $X$ . Consider a rational number  $t_1 > 0$  such that  $(t_1 H)^n > mn^n$ . Then for sufficiently divisible and large  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , by Lemma 4.8 one can find a divisor  $D' \in |kt_1 H|$  such that

$$\text{mult}_{p_i}(D') > kn \quad \text{for all } i = 1, \dots, m.$$

As a consequence, setting  $D := \frac{1}{k} D'$ , by Lemma 4.9 we have that

$$\mathcal{G}(X, D)_{p_i} \subseteq \mathfrak{m}_{p_i} \quad \text{for all } i = 1, \dots, m.$$

**Proposition 4.10.** *Let  $X$  be a normal  $\mathbb{Q}$ -Gorenstein projective variety of dimension  $n$ ,  $p_1, \dots, p_m \in X$  be distinct smooth points, and  $D$  be an effective  $\mathbb{Q}$ -divisor such that  $Z(D)$  contains  $p_i$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, m$ . For any ample divisor  $H$  on  $Y$ , and any  $\epsilon > 0$ , there exists a rational number  $0 < c < \epsilon$  and an effective  $\mathbb{Q}$ -divisor  $E \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} c \cdot H$  such that*

- (1)  $\text{LC}_{p_i}(X, D + E)$  is irreducible at  $p_i$ , and
- (2)  $\dim \text{LC}_{p_i}(X, D + E) \leq \dim \text{LC}_{p_i}(X, D)$

for every  $i = 1, \dots, m$ .

*Proof.* Set  $Z_i := \text{LC}_{p_i}(X, D)$  and  $d_i(D) := \dim_{p_i} Z_i$  for each  $i = 1, \dots, m$ . Our proof will proceed by reducing the invariant

$$s := \max_i (\{0\} \cup \{d_i(D) \mid \text{LC}_{p_i}(X, D) \text{ is reducible}\}).$$

We may assume that  $s > 0$ , and  $d_1(D)$  attains the maximum  $s$ .

By assumption,  $Z_1$  is reducible and  $\dim_{p_1} Z_1 \geq 1$ . Choose an irreducible component  $Z'_1$  of  $Z_1$  of minimal dimension, and fix an integer  $\ell \gg 1$  such that the sheaf  $\mathcal{G}_{Z'_1}(\ell H)$  is globally generated. Take a general element  $f_1 \in \Gamma(Y, \mathcal{G}_{Z'_1}(\ell H))$ , and set  $E_1 := \text{div}(f_1)$ . Then for any rational number  $0 < \lambda_1 \ll 1$ , the support of  $\text{LC}(X, D + \lambda_1 E_1)$  locally near  $p_1$  satisfies one of the following conditions:

- (1) it is exactly  $Z'_1$ , or
- (2) it is contained in some proper algebraic subset of  $Z'_1$ ,

because  $E_1$  only contributes to the log canonical thresholds of the log canonical places whose centers are contained in  $Z'_1$ . Fix an index  $i \geq 2$ . If  $p_i \notin Z'_1$ , then  $\text{LC}_{p_i}(X, D + \lambda_1 E_1) = \text{LC}_{p_i}(X, D)$ . Now assume that  $p_i$  is contained in  $Z'_1$ . If  $\text{LC}_{p_i}(X, D)$  is irreducible, then by choosing  $\lambda_1$  sufficiently small, we can guarantee that  $\text{LC}_{p_i}(X, D + \lambda_1 E_1) = \text{LC}_{p_i}(X, D)$ . On the other hand, if  $\text{LC}_{p_i}(X, D)$  is reducible, then there are two further cases:

- (a)  $Z'_1$  is a component of  $\text{LC}_{p_i}(X, D)$ , in which case  $\text{LC}_{p_i}(X, D + \lambda_1 E_1)$  is contained in  $Z'_1$  (by the first sentence of the previous paragraph), or
- (b)  $Z'_1$  is not a component of  $\text{LC}_{p_i}(X, D)$ , in which case  $\text{LC}_{p_i}(X, D + \lambda_1 E_1)$  is contained in  $\text{LC}_{p_i}(X, D)$  for  $0 < \lambda_1 \ll 1$ .

In both cases, the  $d_i(D)$  does not increase.

Replacing  $D$  by  $D + \lambda_1 E_1$  for some fixed  $0 < \lambda_1 < \frac{\epsilon}{nm}$ , and repeating this reduction procedure, after at most  $mn$  steps, one will get a  $\mathbb{Q}$ -divisor

$$E := \sum \lambda_j E_j \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} c \cdot H$$

which satisfies the requisite properties. □

**Lemma 4.11** (Generic lifting). *Let  $(X, \mathcal{O}_X(1))$  be a normal polarized variety, and  $Z \subseteq X$  be a closed subvariety. Then for any  $\mathbb{Q}$ -divisor  $D_Z \in |\mathcal{O}_Z(d)|_{\mathbb{Q}}$  on  $Z$ , there exists an effective  $\mathbb{Q}$ -divisor  $D \in |\mathcal{O}_X(d)|_{\mathbb{Q}}$  on  $X$  such that  $D|_Z = D_Z$ .*

*Proof.* Pick a sufficiently large integer  $p \gg 0$  such that  $H^1(X, \mathcal{G}_Z(pd)) = 0$ . Then the restriction map

$$H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(pd)) \longrightarrow H^0(Z, \mathcal{O}_Z(pd))$$

is surjective. Hence there exists a divisor  $D' \in |\mathcal{O}_X(pd)|$  such that  $D'|_Z = pD_Z$ , and the  $\mathbb{Q}$ -divisor  $\frac{1}{p}D'$  is as desired. If  $p$  is sufficiently large and  $D'$  is a general divisor satisfying the restriction condition, then we call  $D$  a *generic lifting* of  $D_Z$ . □

**Proposition 4.12** (Cutting down LC-locus). *Let  $X$  be a normal  $\mathbb{Q}$ -Gorenstein projective variety and  $p \in X$  be a point. Let  $D$  be an effective  $\mathbb{Q}$ -divisor on  $X$  with  $\text{lct}_p(X, D) = 1$  satisfying that*

$$Z = \text{LC}_p(X, D)$$

is irreducible of dimension  $d$  at  $p$ . Fix  $m$  general smooth points  $p_1, \dots, p_m \in Z$ , and let  $B$  be any effective  $\mathbb{Q}$ -divisor on  $X$  with  $Z \not\subseteq \text{Supp } B$ . Assume that

$$\text{mult}_{p_i}(B|_Z) > d = \dim Z$$

for any  $i = 1, \dots, m$ , where the multiplicity is computed on  $Z$ . Then for any  $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$ , the multiplier ideal

$$\mathcal{G}(X, (1 - \epsilon)D + B)$$

is non-trivial at  $p_i$ . If moreover  $\mathcal{G}(X, D + B) = \mathcal{G}(X, D)$  away from  $Z$ , then  $Z((1 - \epsilon)D + B)$  locally near each  $p_i$  is a proper algebraic subset of  $Z$ .

*Proof.* Following the proof of [Laz04b, Proposition 10.4.10], we need to choose each  $p_i$  to avoid a closed subset of  $X$  (and we do so for every  $i$ ). Because there are finitely many such points, we can choose all of the  $p_i$  to avoid a fixed proper subscheme of  $X$ .  $\square$

## 5. SEPARATION OF POINTS À LA ANGEHRN–SIU

In this section, we will present the proof of Theorem C. The goal is to construct a  $\mathbb{Q}$ -divisor on  $X$  by cutting down the LC locus near a point and lifting the divisors, such that the Nadel vanishing theorem applies. This method is motivated by the proof of a weak version of Fujita’s conjecture by Angehrn–Siu [AS95].

*Proof of Theorem C.* For any choice of  $m$  distinct points  $p_1, \dots, p_m \in U$ , we will construct a  $\mathbb{Q}$ -divisor  $D$  which satisfies the following conditions:

- $D \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} c \cdot H$ , where  $0 < c < d$  is a rational number,
- the support of  $\mathcal{O}_X/\mathcal{G}(X, D)$  contains  $p_1, \dots, p_m$ , and
- some point  $p_j$  is an isolated point of  $\text{Supp } \mathcal{O}_X/\mathcal{G}(X, D)$ .

Supposing that the above holds, we claim that this implies the statement of the theorem. Nadel vanishing [Laz04b, Theorem 9.4.17] gives

$$H^1(X, \mathcal{O}_X(K_X + dH) \otimes \mathcal{G}(X, D)) = 0,$$

and hence the restriction map

$$H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(K_X + dH)) \longrightarrow H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(K_X + dH) \otimes \mathcal{O}_X/\mathcal{G}(X, D))$$

is surjective. Removing the point  $p_j$  from  $\{p_1, \dots, p_m\}$  and repeating the same construction for  $\{p_1, \dots, \hat{p}_j, \dots, p_m\}$ , one will end up with  $m$  divisors on  $X$  which are all linearly equivalent to  $K_X + dH$  and separate  $p_1, \dots, p_m$ .

Now let us start constructing the desired divisor. Choose a positive rational number

$$a_1 = \sqrt[n]{\frac{mn^n}{\alpha}} + \delta_1 = n \sqrt[n]{\frac{m}{\alpha}} + \delta_1,$$

where  $\delta_1 > 0$  is a sufficiently small real number. By Lemma 4.8, there exists an effective  $\mathbb{Q}$ -divisor  $D_1 \in |a_1 H|_{\mathbb{Q}}$  such that  $\text{mult}_{p_i}(D_1) > n$  for each  $i = 1, \dots, m$ . Recall that our assumption in



particular says that  $H^n = \deg_H X \geq \alpha$ . By Lemma 4.9, we see that every  $p_i$  is contained in  $Z(D_1)$ . Using Proposition 4.10, one can replace  $D_1$  with a small perturbation such that  $\text{LC}_{p_i}(X, D_1)$  is irreducible at  $p_i$  for each  $i$ . Set  $\lambda_i := \text{lct}_{p_i}(X, D_1)$ , and we may assume that

$$0 < \lambda_m \leq \lambda_{m-1} \leq \cdots \leq \lambda_1 \leq 1.$$

By replacing  $D_1$  by  $\lambda_1 D_1$ , one can assume that  $\lambda_1 = 1$ .

Notice that there could be more than one point at which the log canonical threshold of  $D_1$  is equal to 1. Let  $W_1, \dots, W_v$  be the distinct log canonical loci of  $(X, D_1)$  near the points  $p_i$  for which we have  $\text{lct}_{p_i}(X; D_1) = 1$ . Without loss of generality, let  $p_1, \dots, p_\ell$  be all the points with  $\lambda_i = 1$  and with  $W_1$  as the (local) log canonical center. By adding a small multiple of a general divisor in the linear series  $|\mathcal{G}_{W_j}(mH)|$  for  $j = 2, \dots, v$ , we may assume that

$$\lambda_1 = \cdots = \lambda_\ell = 1 > \lambda_{\ell+1}, \dots, \lambda_m,$$

and  $p_1, \dots, p_\ell$  have the same log canonical center  $W_1$ .

Let  $Z_1 := \text{NKLT}(X, D_1)$  be the non-klt locus of  $(X, D_1)$ , which contains  $p_1, \dots, p_m$  and contains  $W_1$  as a component. The dimension of  $Z_1$ , denoted by  $k$ , is at most  $n-1$ . If  $\dim_{p_i} Z_1 = 0$  for some  $i$  then we are done. Otherwise, by assumption we have  $\deg_H W_1 \geq \alpha$  since  $p_1 \in W_1 \cap U$ . First assume that  $p_1, \dots, p_m$  are all smooth points of  $Z_1$  that are sufficiently general so that Proposition 4.12 applies. To apply the proposition, choose a rational number

$$a_2 = \sqrt[k]{\frac{mk^k}{\alpha}} + \delta_2 = k \sqrt[k]{\frac{m}{\alpha}} + \delta_2$$

such that  $\delta_2 > 0$  is arbitrarily small. Then again by Lemma 4.8, one can choose an effective  $\mathbb{Q}$ -divisor  $D'_2$  on  $Z_1$ ,  $\mathbb{Q}$ -linearly equivalent to  $a_2 H|_{Z_1}$ , such that

$$\text{mult}_{p_i} D'_2 > k \quad \text{for any } i = 1, \dots, \ell.$$

Let  $D_2$  be a generic lifting of  $D'_2$  to  $X$ , as in Lemma 4.11. Then  $Z((1-t)D_1 + D_2)$  contains  $p_1, \dots, p_m$  for any sufficiently small  $t > 0$  and by Proposition 4.12.

If there is a point  $p_i$  in the singular locus of  $Z_1$ , then one can construct  $D_2$  using the same limiting process in the proof of Angehrn–Siu’s theorem [AS95] (also see [Laz04b, Section 10.4.C, Step 2]). More precisely, let  $(0 \in T)$  be a smooth pointed curve and let  $u_i : T \rightarrow Z_1$  be a morphism with  $u(0_i) = p_i$ , where  $i = 1, \dots, \ell$ . Writing  $p_{t,i} = u_i(t) \in Z_1$ , we can assume that  $p_{t,i}$  is a smooth point of  $Z_1$  for  $t \neq 0$ , and that it is sufficiently general to cut down the LC-locus. Let  $D'_{t,2}$  be the divisor that one constructs with respect to points  $u_1(t), \dots, u_\ell(t)$ . We can also assume that for  $t \neq 0_i$ , the divisors  $D'_t$  vary in a flat family parameterized by  $T - \{0\}$ . Then set  $D'_2 := \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} D'_{t,2}$ . Thus  $D'_2$  is an effective  $\mathbb{Q}$ -divisor on  $Z_1$  that lies in the desired linear series and passes through  $p_i$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, \ell$ . Take a generic lifting of  $D'_2$ , denoted by  $D_2$ , which does not contain  $Z_1$ , and we may assume moreover that

$$\mathcal{G}(X, D_1 + cD_2) = \mathcal{G}(X, D_1)$$

away from  $Z_1$  for every  $0 < c < 1$ . Now for  $t \in T$  near 0, we extend  $D_2$  to a family of  $\mathbb{Q}$ -divisors  $D_{t,2}$  lifting  $D'_{t,2}$ . It follows from Proposition 4.12 that

$$p_{t,i} \in Z((1-t_1)D_1 + D_{t,2})$$

for any  $0 \neq t \in T$  and  $0 < t_1 \ll 1$ . By the semi-continuity of multiplier ideals (see Proposition 4.7), the analogue holds at  $p_i = p_{0,i}$ :

$$p_i \in Z((1 - t_1)D_1 + D_2).$$

At this point, we have produced  $D_j \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} a_j H$  for  $j = 1, 2$  so for all  $0 < t_1 \ll 1$  the subscheme  $Z((1 - t_1)D_1 + D_2)$  contains  $p_1, \dots, p_m$  and near  $p_1, \dots, p_\ell$  is properly contained in  $W_1$ . Now we fix a rational number  $0 < t_1 \ll 1$  such that

$$\text{lct}_{p_i}(X, (1 - t_1)D_1) < 1 \quad \text{for any } i > \ell.$$

Then there exists a rational number  $0 < t_2 < 1$  such that

- $\text{lct}_{p_i}(X, (1 - t_1)D_1 + t_2D_2) \leq 1$  for any  $i = 1, \dots, \ell$ ;
- $\max_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} \text{lct}_{p_i}(X, (1 - t_1)D_1 + t_2D_2) = 1$ , and
- $\dim_{p_i} \text{LC}_{p_i}(X, (1 - t_1)D_1 + t_2D_2) < \dim_{p_i} \text{LC}_{p_i}(X, D_1)$ , for any  $i = 1, \dots, \ell$ .

Applying Lemma 4.10, we may assume that  $\text{LC}_{p_i}(X, (1 - t_1)D_1 + t_2D_2)$  is irreducible for any  $i = 1, \dots, m$ . Let  $i = 1, \dots, \ell'$ , where  $\ell' \leq \ell$ , be all the indices such that

$$\text{lct}_{p_i}(X, (1 - t_1)D_1 + t_2D_2) = 1.$$

Observe that for any  $i = 1, \dots, \ell'$ , the scheme  $Z((1 - t_1)D_1 + t_2D_2)$  near  $p_i$  is an irreducible proper closed subset of  $Z_1$ , and one has that

$$\mathcal{G}(X, (1 - t_1)D_1 + t_2D_2)_{p_i} \subsetneq \mathcal{O}_{X, p_i}.$$

Repeating this cutting down and perturbation procedure, we produce divisors  $D_j \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} a_j H$  and after at most  $n$  steps one achieves a  $\mathbb{Q}$ -divisor  $D := (1 - t_1)D_1 + t_2D_2 + \dots + t_kD_k$ , where  $k \leq n$  is the number of steps taken, satisfying:

- $0 < t_1, \dots, t_k < 1$ , and  $dH - (D_1 + D_2 + \dots + D_k)$  is ample (see Lemma 5.3);
- the multiplier ideal sheaf  $\mathcal{G}(X, D)$  is non-trivial at  $p_i$  for any  $i$ ; and
- there is an index  $i_0 \in \{1, \dots, m\}$  such that  $\text{lct}_{p_{i_0}}(X, D) = \max\{\text{lct}_{p_i}(X, D)\} = 1$ , and  $p_{i_0}$  is an isolated point of  $Z(D)$ .

Therefore, this divisor  $D$  satisfies the desired conditions as long as  $a_1 + \dots + a_k < d$ . For  $m = \lfloor (1 - \epsilon) \cdot \alpha \cdot d \rfloor$  this holds for  $d \geq d_0$  by the following lemma. Of course, we can also get  $m = \lceil (1 - \epsilon) \cdot \alpha \cdot d \rceil$  by running the argument on a sufficiently smaller  $\epsilon$ .  $\square$

*Remark 5.1.* In the statement of Theorem C, the subset  $U \subseteq X^{\text{reg}}$  does not have to be open. In fact,  $U$  can be chosen to be the complement of a countable union of proper closed subsets [Sta17, Proposition 5.17].

*Remark 5.2.* In the proof, we choose some perturbations  $\delta_i$ . Observe that the number of perturbations is bounded by an integer  $N$  depending only on  $n, r, \epsilon$ . Thus one can choose a uniform upper bound for all  $\delta_i$ . Furthermore, we include the perturbations arising from applications of Proposition 4.10 into  $c$ . Since the number of steps is bounded by  $n$  there is a uniform upper bound.

**Lemma 5.3.** *For any integer  $n > 1$ , any number  $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$ , and any function  $c := c(n, \epsilon) > 0$ , there is an integer  $d_0 := d_0(n, \epsilon) > 0$  such that the inequality*

$$\sum_{j=1}^n j \sqrt[j]{(1-\epsilon)d} + c < d$$

holds whenever  $d > d_0$ .

*Proof.* The desired inequality is equivalent to

$$\sum_{j=2}^n j \sqrt[j]{(1-\epsilon)d} + c < \epsilon \cdot d.$$

One can choose  $d_0$  satisfying

$$\left( \frac{(\epsilon^{j-1} - \epsilon^j) \cdot d_0}{j} \right)^j > (1-\epsilon)d_0$$

for all  $2 \leq j \leq n$  and  $\epsilon^n d_0 > c$ . Indeed, taking the following expression works

$$d_0 > \frac{1}{\epsilon^n} \max \left\{ c, \frac{n}{(1-\epsilon)} \right\}$$

When this holds, the sum telescopes to produce  $\epsilon d_0 - \epsilon^{n-1} d_0$ , satisfying the inequality. □

Combining Theorem C with Proposition 4.2 immediately gives:

**Theorem 5.4** (Covering gonality of divisors). *Let  $(X, H)$  be a polarized normal Gorenstein variety. Suppose  $\alpha > 0$  is a number and  $U \subseteq X^{\text{reg}}$  is a nonempty open set such that any positive dimensional subvariety  $W \subseteq X$  meeting  $U$  satisfies  $\deg_H W \geq \alpha$ . Then for any  $\epsilon > 0$ , there is an integer  $d_0 := d_0(\dim X, \alpha, \epsilon)$  such that for all  $d \geq d_0$  any integral divisor  $V \in |dH|$  with at worst canonical singularities that meets  $U$  satisfies*

$$\text{cov. gon}(V) \geq (1-\epsilon) \cdot d \cdot \alpha$$

Note that  $V$  is automatically Gorenstein in the set-up above so it makes sense to say that  $K_V$  separates many points when  $K_X + V$  does.

*Remark 5.5.* Note that we work with the hypothesis  $\deg_H W \geq \alpha$  which does not behave linearly under scaling  $H$ . In [AS95], they instead assume a bound  $\deg_H W \geq \alpha^{\dim W}$  which does scale  $\alpha$  linearly with  $H$ . The advantage of our bound is that: when  $H$  is very ample,  $\alpha$  may be computed by slicing down to curves which we require to obtain the optimal asymptotics in Theorem 3.1. From directly applying the main theorem of [AS95] we get a gonality bound of  $\text{cov. gon}(Y) \geq (d/n) \cdot \alpha^{1/n} - O(n)$ , which is insufficient to give a positive answer to [BDPE<sup>+</sup>17, Problem 4.1]. Note that in the theorem above, it suffices to bound the degree of a covering family of subvarieties, which is usually easier to estimate than a bound on any subvariety.

Finally, we will use Theorem 5.4 to give an application to measures of irrationality on complete intersections:

*Proof of Theorem B.* Let  $Y \subseteq \mathbb{P}^{n+r}$  be a general complete intersection of type  $(d_2, \dots, d_r)$ , and let  $X$  be a divisor on  $Y$  linearly equivalent to  $d_1 H$ , where  $H$  is the class of a hyperplane section on  $Y$ . By Proposition 4.2, it suffices to show that the linear series  $|K_X|$  separates  $m$  distinct general points for some integer  $m \geq (1 - \epsilon)d_1 \cdots d_r$ . In fact, we aim to prove a stronger statement: the linear series  $|K_Y + X|$  on  $Y$  separates  $m$  distinct general points. This follows immediately from Theorem 5.4 applied to the pair  $(Y, H)$ , setting  $d := d_1$ , and Theorem 3.1 to bound the degree of any subvariety of  $Y$  outside some proper Zariski closed subset.  $\square$

Note that in the statement of the theorem, only the first degree  $d_1$  is required to depend on  $\epsilon$  as long as  $d_2, \dots, d_r \gg_{n,r} 0$ .

## 6. FURTHER QUESTIONS

Several questions naturally arise from our work. Throughout this section, let  $X \subseteq \mathbb{P}^{n+r}$  denote a (very) general complete intersection variety cut out by polynomials of sufficiently large degrees  $d_1, \dots, d_r$ .

*Problem 6.1.* Find two constants  $d = d(n, r)$  and  $N = N(n, r)$  such that if  $d_1, \dots, d_r > d$ , then

$$\text{irr}(X) \geq d_1 \cdots d_r - N.$$

Note that for hypersurfaces (where  $r = 1$ ), by [BDPE<sup>+</sup>17, Theorem C] one can choose the constants  $N = 1$  and  $d = 2n + 1$ . The case  $n = 1$  of complete intersection curves would follow from [HLU20] and further analysis of secant varieties to a general complete intersection curve.

Following conjectures of Griffiths–Harris [GH85] on the divisibility of degrees of curves on generic threefold hypersurfaces, one can more ambitiously ask:

*Question 6.2.* Is there a constant  $d = d(n, r)$  such that for  $d_1, \dots, d_r > d$ , any curve  $C \subseteq X$  satisfies

$$d_1 \cdots d_r \mid \deg C?$$

Finally, in light of Theorem A it seems interesting to ask:

*Question 6.3.* Are the minimal degree curves  $C \subseteq X$  of the form  $C = X \cap \Lambda$  for some linear subspace  $\Lambda$  of dimension  $n + 1$ ?

One might even wonder if this is true as long as the general such  $X$  does not contain any lines. This would provide a generalization of a theorem of X. Wu [Wu90].

## APPENDIX A. STABLE MAPS TO SNC DEGENERATIONS

BY MOHAN SWAMINATHAN

In this appendix, we discuss a necessary condition for a stable map in the special fiber of a simple normal crossings (SNC) degeneration to deform to the generic fiber; see Proposition A.1 for the precise statement. Variants of this statement are well-known to experts in relative/logarithmic

Gromov–Witten theory. Our exposition is self-contained and does not assume any familiarity with relative GW theory or logarithmic geometry.

Proposition A.1 is an algebro-geometric version of [FT22a, Theorem 1.3] and its proof is similar to that of [Che14, Theorem 6.1.1]. The statement is reminiscent of Jun Li’s *predeformability* condition in relative GW theory [Li01, GV05], but we avoid the use of *expanded degenerations* of the target by following ideas from log GW theory [GS13, Che14, AC14, FT22b]. For an SNC degeneration whose total space is regular, the data whose existence is guaranteed by Proposition A.1 is very similar (if not identical) to what one needs in order to upgrade an ordinary stable map in the special fiber to a *stable log map over the standard log point*. In view of this, the result of this appendix might be implicitly contained in [ACGS20].

**A.1. Geometric setup.** Let  $R$  be a DVR which is given by the local ring of a smooth affine curve over  $\mathbb{C}$  at a closed point. Let  $\mathfrak{m}$  be its maximal ideal and  $K$  its fraction field. Let  $s$  and  $\eta$  be the closed point and generic point of  $\Delta := \text{Spec}(R)$  respectively.

Let  $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \Delta$  be an SNC degeneration (in the sense of Definition 2.6). Write the closed fiber  $\mathcal{X}_s = \bigcup_{i \in I} X_i$  of  $f$  as the union of finitely many smooth varieties. For any  $\emptyset \neq J \subseteq I$ , the intersection  $\bigcap_{i \in J} X_i$  is either empty or is smooth of codimension  $|J| - 1$  in  $X_i$  for each  $i \in J$ .

Let  $\mathcal{X}^{\text{reg}} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$  be the regular locus. For  $i \in I$ , define the line bundle  $\mathcal{L}_i := \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}^{\text{reg}}}(\mathcal{X}^{\text{reg}} \cap X_i)$  along with its tautological section  $\tau_i$  vanishing along  $\mathcal{X}^{\text{reg}} \cap X_i$ . Let  $\tau$  be the tautological section of  $\mathcal{O}_{\Delta}(s)$  vanishing at  $s$ . We have a canonical isomorphism of line bundles

$$(2) \quad \Psi : f^*(\mathcal{O}_{\Delta}(s))|_{\mathcal{X}^{\text{reg}}} \xrightarrow{\sim} \bigotimes_{i \in I} \mathcal{L}_i$$

characterized by mapping  $(f^*\tau)|_{\mathcal{X}^{\text{reg}}}$  to  $\bigotimes_{i \in I} \tau_i$ . Together with the natural  $\mathbb{C}$ -linear isomorphism  $T_{\Delta,s} = (\mathfrak{m}/\mathfrak{m}^2)^\vee \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{O}_{\Delta}(s)|_s$ , this restricts over  $s \in \Delta$  to the trivialization

$$\Psi_s : T_{\Delta,s} \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}_s^{\text{reg}}} \xrightarrow{\sim} \bigotimes_{i \in I} \mathcal{L}_i|_{\mathcal{X}_s^{\text{reg}}}.$$

Here  $\mathcal{X}_s^{\text{reg}}$  is the fiber over  $s$  of  $f|_{\mathcal{X}^{\text{reg}}} : \mathcal{X}^{\text{reg}} \rightarrow \Delta$ .

Let  $\mu_s : C \rightarrow \mathcal{X}_s$  be a stable map. Define the open subset  $U := \mu_s^{-1}(\mathcal{X}^{\text{reg}}) \subseteq C$  and let  $\Gamma = (V, E)$  be its dual graph, where each vertex  $v \in V$  (resp. edge  $e \in E$ ) of  $\Gamma$  corresponds to an irreducible component  $U_v$  (resp. node  $q_e$ ) of  $U$ . An edge  $e$  joins vertices  $v, v' \in V$  exactly when the irreducible components of  $U$  on which the node  $q_e$  lies are  $U_v$  and  $U_{v'}$  (note that  $e$  is allowed to be a loop, i.e.,  $v = v'$  is allowed). For  $v \in V$ , define  $\partial U_v = U_v \cap \bigcup_{v' \neq v} U_{v'}$ .

**A.2. Main result.** We describe some conditions that must be satisfied by  $\mu_s : C \rightarrow \mathcal{X}_s$  if it deforms to the generic fiber  $\mathcal{X}_\eta$  of  $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \Delta$  in the sense of Definition 2.1. The rough idea is to take a 1-parameter family that deforms  $\mu_s$  to the generic fibre and then to record, for each  $v \in V$  and  $i \in I$ , the “speed”  $n_i(v)$  and the “infinitesimal direction”  $\sigma_{v,i}$  at which the component  $U_v$  of  $U$  “sinks into” the component  $X_i$  of  $\mathcal{X}_s$ .

**Proposition A.1** (cf. [FT22a, Che14]). *If  $\mu_s : C \rightarrow \mathcal{X}_s$  deforms to  $\mathcal{X}_\eta$ , then we can find data of*

- (a) a  $\mathbb{C}$ -vector space  $M$ , an integer  $n \geq 1$ , and an isomorphism  $\Phi_\Delta : M^{\otimes n} \xrightarrow{\sim} T_{\Delta,s}$ ;
- (b) a function  $\delta : E \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$  and isomorphisms  $\Phi_e : M^{\otimes \delta(e)} \xrightarrow{\sim} T_{U_v, q_e} \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} T_{U_{v'}, q_e}$  for each edge  $e \in E$  joining distinct vertices  $v, v' \in V$ ; and

(c) functions  $n_i : V \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$  for  $i \in I$  and rational sections  $\sigma_{v,i}$  of the line bundle

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_{U_v}}(M^{\otimes n_i(v)} \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} \mathcal{O}_{U_v}, \mu_s^* \mathcal{L}_i|_{U_v})$$

for  $v \in V$  and  $i \in I$  which are regular and nowhere vanishing on  $U_v \setminus \partial U_v$

with the following properties.

- (i) For  $v \in V$  and  $i \in I$ ,  $n_i(v) = 0$  if and only if  $\mu_s(U_v) \not\subseteq X_i$  and, in this case,  $\sigma_{v,i} = (\mu_s^* \tau_i)|_{U_v}$ .
- (ii) For  $v \in V$ , we have  $\sum_{i \in I} n_i(v) = n$  and  $\bigotimes_{i \in I} \sigma_{v,i} = (\mu_s^* \Psi_s) \circ (\Phi_{\Delta} \otimes \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{O}_{U_v}})$ .
- (iii) Whenever  $q_e \in \partial U_v$ , define  $m_i(v, e) := \mathrm{ord}_{q_e}(\sigma_{v,i}) \in \mathbb{Z}$  and denote by

$$0 \neq \tilde{\sigma}_{v,i}(q_e) \in \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbb{C}}(T_{U_v, q_e}^{\otimes m_i(v, e)} \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} M^{\otimes n_i(v)}, (\mu_s^* \mathcal{L}_i)|_{q_e})$$

the lowest order term of  $\sigma_{v,i}$  at  $q_e$ .

For each edge  $e \in E$  joining distinct vertices  $v, v' \in V$  and  $i \in I$ , we have

$$n_i(v') = n_i(v) + m_i(v, e) \delta(e).$$

In particular,  $m_i(v, e) + m_i(v', e) = 0$ . Moreover, under the isomorphism

$$T_{U_v, q_e}^{\otimes m_i(v, e)} \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} M^{\otimes n_i(v)} \xrightarrow{\sim} T_{U_{v'}, q_e}^{\otimes m_i(v', e)} \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} M^{\otimes n_i(v')}$$

induced by  $\Phi_e$ , the lowest order terms  $\tilde{\sigma}_{v,i}(q_e)$  and  $\tilde{\sigma}_{v',i}(q_e)$  are identified.

*Remark A.2.* Property (ii) in Proposition A.1 implies that  $\bigotimes_{i \in I} \sigma_{v,i}$  is nowhere vanishing. This has a useful numerical consequence: for  $v \in V$  and  $q_e \in \partial U_v$ , we have  $\sum_{i \in I} m_i(v, e) = 0$ .

*Proof.* Since  $\mu_s : C \rightarrow \mathcal{X}_s$  deforms to  $\mathcal{X}_{\eta}$ , there is a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{C} & \xrightarrow{\mu} & \mathcal{X} \\ \downarrow g & & \downarrow f \\ B & \xrightarrow{\nu} & \Delta \end{array}$$

of schemes over  $\mathbb{C}$  where

- $B = \mathrm{Spec}(S)$ , where  $S$  is a DVR given by the local ring of a smooth affine curve over  $\mathbb{C}$  at a closed point, with  $t, \xi \in B$  being the closed and generic point respectively,
- the morphism  $\nu : B \rightarrow \Delta$  maps  $t \in B$  to  $s \in \Delta$  and  $\xi \in B$  to  $\eta \in \Delta$ ,
- $\mu : C \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$  is a family of stable maps over  $B$  whose closed fiber is  $\mu_s : C \rightarrow \mathcal{X}_s$ .

Let  $\pi$  be a uniformizer of  $S$ , let  $\mathfrak{n} = (\pi)$  be its maximal ideal and let  $L$  be its fraction field. After a base change of DVRs (inducing a finite extension of fraction fields), we ensure that the nodes of the generic fiber  $\mathcal{C}_{\xi}$  are defined over  $L$ . Each node  $\mathrm{Spec}(L) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_{\xi}$  can be uniquely completed to a section of  $C \rightarrow B$ , and this section specializes over  $t$  to a node of  $C$ . The nodes of  $C$  obtained in this manner from nodes of  $\mathcal{C}_{\xi}$  will be called *generic nodes* while the remaining nodes of  $C$  will be called *special nodes*.

Define the open subset  $\mathcal{U} := \mu^{-1}(\mathcal{X}^{\mathrm{reg}}) \subseteq C$  and note that  $\mathcal{U}_t = U$ . For convenience, we will denote the restrictions  $\mu|_{\mathcal{U}}$  and  $g|_{\mathcal{U}}$  simply by  $\mu$  and  $g$  respectively.

With these preparations, we define the desired data as follows.

(a) Define  $M := T_{B,t} = (\mathfrak{n}/\mathfrak{n}^2)^\vee$ . Let  $\Phi_\Delta : M^{\otimes n} \xrightarrow{\sim} T_{\Delta,s}$  be the isomorphism induced by the ring map  $R \rightarrow S$  corresponding to  $\nu : B \rightarrow \Delta$ , where  $n \geq 1$  is defined by  $\mathfrak{m}S = \mathfrak{n}^n$ .

(b) Let  $e \in E$  be an edge joining vertices  $v, v' \in V$ . The discussion is somewhat different depending on whether  $q_e$  is a special node or a generic node.

Suppose  $q_e \in U$  is a special node. Then, étale locally near  $q_e$ , the family  $\mathcal{C} \rightarrow B$  is given by

$$(3) \quad \text{Spec} \left( \frac{S[x, y]}{(xy - \pi^{\delta(e)})} \right) \longrightarrow \text{Spec}(S),$$

and this defines  $\delta(e) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ . We can phrase this intrinsically by saying  $\mathcal{C}$  has an  $A_{\delta(e)-1}$  singularity at  $q_e$ . If  $v \neq v'$ , then we have a canonical isomorphism  $\Phi_e : M^{\otimes \delta(e)} \xrightarrow{\sim} T_{U_v, q_e} \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} T_{U_{v'}, q_e}$ . In the étale local model (3), the map  $\Phi_e$  is given by  $(\partial\pi)^{\otimes \delta(e)} \mapsto \partial_x \otimes \partial_y$ .

Suppose  $q_e \in U$  is a generic node. Then, étale locally near  $q_e$ , the family  $\mathcal{C} \rightarrow B$  is given by

$$(4) \quad \text{Spec} \left( \frac{S[x, y]}{(xy)} \right) \longrightarrow \text{Spec}(S).$$

In this situation, we define the integer  $\delta(e) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$  arbitrarily. When  $v \neq v'$ , we also define the isomorphism  $\Phi_e : M^{\otimes \delta(e)} \xrightarrow{\sim} T_{U_v, q_e} \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} T_{U_{v'}, q_e}$  arbitrarily.

(c) Let  $i \in I$  and  $v \in V$ . Consider the section  $\sigma_i := \mu^* \tau_i$  of the line bundle  $\mu^* \mathcal{L}_i$  on  $\mathcal{U}$ . By assumption,  $\sigma_i$  is non-vanishing on the generic fiber  $\mathcal{U}_\xi$  of  $\mathcal{U} \rightarrow B$ .

Define  $n_i(v) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$  to be the generic order of vanishing of  $\sigma_i$  along  $U_v$ . To explain this in more detail, let  $\xi_v$  be the generic point of  $U_v$  and note that the local ring  $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{U}, \xi_v}$  is a DVR, with uniformizer being the image of  $\pi$  under the injective map  $S = \mathcal{O}_{B, \xi} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{U}, \xi_v}$  induced by  $g$ . We can then define  $n_i(v)$  to be the valuation of  $\sigma_i$  in  $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{U}, \xi_v}$ , where we use a local trivialization of  $\mu^* \mathcal{L}_i$  near  $\xi_v$  to regard  $\sigma_i$  as an element of  $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{U}, \xi_v}$ .

Define  $\sigma_{v,i}$  by first regarding  $\sigma_i$  as a rational section of the line bundle

$$\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{U}}(-n_i(v)U) \otimes \mu^* \mathcal{L}_i = g^*(\mathcal{O}_B(-t))^{\otimes n_i(v)} \otimes \mu^* \mathcal{L}_i$$

and then restricting it to  $U_v$  using the isomorphism  $M = T_{B,t} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{O}_B(t)|_t$ . Equivalently, we can define  $\sigma_{v,i}$  by the explicit formula

$$(5) \quad \sigma_{v,i} = (d\pi)^{\otimes n_i(v)} \otimes (\pi^{-n_i(v)} \sigma_i)|_{U_v}.$$

The ideal sheaf of  $U_v \setminus \partial U_v \subseteq \mathcal{U} \setminus \bigcup_{v' \neq v} U_{v'}$  is generated by  $\pi$  and the section  $\sigma_i$  has no zeros on  $\mathcal{U}_\xi$ . It follows that  $\sigma_{v,i}$  is regular and nowhere vanishing on  $U_v \setminus \partial U_v$ .

We now check that the above definitions have all the claimed properties.

(i) By definition, we have  $n_i(v) = 0$  if and only if  $\sigma_i$  is non-vanishing at the generic point  $\xi_v$  of  $U_v$ , i.e.,  $\mu_s(U_v) \not\subseteq X_i$ . In this case, (5) implies that  $\sigma_{v,i} = \sigma_i|_{U_v} = (\mu_s^* \tau_i)|_{U_v}$ .

(ii) The valuation of the section  $\bigotimes_{i \in I} \sigma_i$  in the DVR  $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{U}, \xi_v}$  is  $\sum_{i \in I} n_i(v)$ . Under the pullback of the isomorphism (2) under  $\mu$ , this section becomes  $\mu^*(f^* \tau) = g^*(\nu^* \tau)$ . Since  $\pi$  is simultaneously a uniformizer for both the DVRs  $S$  and  $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{U}, \xi_v}$ , we conclude that  $\sum_{i \in I} n_i(v)$  is the same as the valuation of  $\nu^* \tau$  in  $S$ , which is  $n$ .

Regard  $\nu^*\tau$  as a section of the line bundle

$$\mathcal{O}_B(-nt) \otimes \nu^*(\mathcal{O}_\Delta(s)).$$

Then, its image in  $(\mathcal{O}_B(-nt) \otimes \varphi^*(\mathcal{O}_\Delta(s)))|_t \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{Hom}_{\mathbb{C}}(T_{B,t}^{\otimes n}, T_{\Delta,s})$  coincides with  $\Phi_\Delta$ . The claimed formula for  $\bigotimes_{i \in I} \sigma_{v,i}$  now follows from the fact that the section  $(f^*\tau)|_{\mathcal{X}^{\text{reg}}}$  maps to the section  $\bigotimes_{i \in I} \tau_i$  under the isomorphism (2).

(iii) Fix  $i \in I$  and let  $e$  be an edge joining  $v \neq v'$ . Using a local trivialization of  $\mu^*\mathcal{L}_i$  near  $q_e$ , we regard  $\sigma_i = \mu^*\tau_i$  as a regular function defined on a neighborhood of  $q_e$  in  $\mathcal{U}$ . Since the assertions to be checked are étale local, we will work in one of the local models (3) and (4). In terms of these local models, assume that  $U_v$  is given by  $\pi = 0, x = 0$  and that  $U_{v'}$  is given by  $\pi = 0, y = 0$ .

Suppose  $q_e$  is a special node. Since  $\sigma_i$  has no zeros on  $\mathcal{U}_\xi$ , we can write  $\sigma_i = \pi^a x^b y^c h$  for some  $a, b, c \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$  and  $h \in \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{U}}^\times$ . Since  $y \in \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{U}, \xi_v}^\times$ , we can write  $x = \pi^{\delta(e)} y^{-1} \in \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{U}, \xi_v}$  which gives  $\sigma_i = \pi^{a+\delta(e)b} y^{c-b} h$ . From this, we deduce that  $n_i(v) = a + \delta(e)b$ ,

$$\sigma_{v,i} = (d\pi)^{\otimes(a+\delta(e)b)} \otimes (y^{c-b} h)|_{\pi=0, x=0},$$

and  $m_i(v, e) = c - b$ . Similarly, we get  $n_i(v') = a + \delta(e)c$  and  $m_i(v', e) = b - c$ , which shows that  $n_i(v') = n_i(v) + m_i(v, e)\delta(e)$ . Finally, note that the lowest order terms

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\sigma}_{v,i}(q_e) &= (d\pi)^{\otimes(a+\delta(e)b)} \otimes (dy)^{\otimes(c-b)} \otimes h(q_e), \\ \tilde{\sigma}_{v',i}(q_e) &= (d\pi)^{\otimes(a+\delta(e)c)} \otimes (dx)^{\otimes(b-c)} \otimes h(q_e) \end{aligned}$$

coincide under the isomorphism  $\Phi_e$ , which identifies  $\partial_x \otimes \partial_y$  with  $(\partial_\pi)^{\otimes \delta(e)}$ .

Suppose  $q_e$  is a generic node. Let  $\tilde{q}_e : B \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$  be the completion of the node  $\text{Spec}(L) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_\xi$  which specializes to  $q_e$  over  $t \in B$ . The section  $\tilde{q}_e$  corresponds to the section of (4) given by

$$\text{Spec}(S) \longrightarrow \text{Spec}\left(\frac{S[x, y]}{(xy)}\right), \quad x, y \mapsto 0.$$

Normalize an étale neighborhood of the section  $\tilde{q}_e$  in  $\mathcal{U}$  to break it into two components  $\mathcal{U}_v$  and  $\mathcal{U}_{v'}$  such that  $(\mathcal{U}_v)|_t = U_v$  and  $(\mathcal{U}_{v'})|_t = U_{v'}$ . The lifts of the section  $\tilde{q}_e$  to  $\mathcal{U}_v, \mathcal{U}_{v'}$  are given in the local model by

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Spec}(S) &\longrightarrow \text{Spec}\left(\frac{S[x, y]}{(x)}\right) = \text{Spec}(S[y]), \quad y \mapsto 0, \\ \text{Spec}(S) &\longrightarrow \text{Spec}\left(\frac{S[x, y]}{(y)}\right) = \text{Spec}(S[x]), \quad x \mapsto 0. \end{aligned}$$

respectively. Since  $\sigma_i$  has no zeros on  $\mathcal{U}_\xi$ , we can find  $h_v \in \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{U}_v}^\times$  and  $h_{v'} \in \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{U}_{v'}}^\times$  with

$$\sigma_i|_{\mathcal{U}_v} = \pi^{n_i(v)} h_v \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma_i|_{\mathcal{U}_{v'}} = \pi^{n_i(v')} h_{v'}.$$

Since these two expressions for  $\sigma_i$  must agree on the section  $\tilde{q}_e$ , we must have  $n_i(v) = n_i(v')$ ,  $h_v(q_e) = h_{v'}(q_e) \neq 0$  and  $m_i(v, e) = m_i(v', e) = 0$ . Thus,  $n_i(v') = n_i(v) + m_i(v, e)\delta(e)$  and

$$\tilde{\sigma}_{v,i}(q_e) = \sigma_{v,i}(q_e) = \sigma_{v',i}(q_e) = \tilde{\sigma}_{v',i}(q_e).$$



This concludes the proof.  $\square$

**A.3. Deducing Lemma 2.9 from Proposition A.1.** Restrict to the case where  $\mathcal{X}_s = X_1 \cup_Z X_2$  is the union of two smooth varieties  $X_1$  and  $X_2$  meeting along a smooth divisor  $Z = X_1 \cap X_2$ .

Recall from the statement of Lemma 2.9 that  $F \subseteq C$  is a connected component of  $\mu_s^{-1}(Z)$  which is contracted to a point  $z = \mu_s(F) \in \mathcal{X}^{\text{reg}}$ . Moreover, for  $i = 1, 2$ , we define  $C_i$  to be the union of the irreducible components of  $C$  which map under  $\mu_s$  to  $X_i$  (but not  $Z$ ) and meet  $F$ . Given that the non-constant stable map  $\mu_s : C \rightarrow \mathcal{X}_s$  deforms to  $\mathcal{X}_\eta$ , we need to show that

$$\sum_{p \in F \cap C_1} m_p(C_1; Z) = \sum_{p \in F \cap C_2} m_p(C_2; Z),$$

where  $m_p(C_i; Z)$  is the multiplicity at  $p$  of the divisor on  $C_i$  obtained by pulling back  $Z$  under the map  $\mu_s|_{C_i} : C_i \rightarrow X_i$  for  $i = 1, 2$ .

Apply Proposition A.1 to produce the data of (a), (b), (c) satisfying properties (i), (ii), (iii). As before, write  $\Gamma = (V, E)$  for the dual graph of  $U = \mu_s^{-1}(\mathcal{X}^{\text{reg}})$ , so that  $F \subseteq U$ . Fixing  $i = 1, 2$ , note that each irreducible component of  $C_i$  meets  $U$ . Let  $V_i \subseteq V$  be the set of vertices corresponding to the irreducible components of  $U \cap C_i$ . Since the irreducible components of  $C_i$  and  $U \cap C_i$  are in bijection, we will write  $C_{v,i}$  in place of  $U_v$  when  $v \in V_i$ .

**Lemma A.3.** *Let  $p \in F \cap C_{v,1}$  for some  $v \in V_1$ . Then, we have  $n_2(v) = 0$ ,  $\sigma_{v,2} = (\mu_s^* \tau_2)|_{C_{v,1}}$  and  $\text{ord}_p(\sigma_{v,2}) = m_p(C_1; Z)$ . Moreover, there exists  $v' \in V \setminus V_1$  such that  $p \in U_{v'}$ .*

*Proof.* Since  $\mu_s(C_{v,1}) \not\subseteq X_2$ , property (i) in Proposition A.1 gives  $n_2(v) = 0$  and  $\sigma_{v,2} = (\mu_s^* \tau_2)|_{C_{v,1}}$ . The restrictions of  $\mathcal{L}_2 = \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}^{\text{reg}}}(\mathcal{X}^{\text{reg}} \cap X_2)$  and  $\mathcal{O}_{X_1}(Z)$  to  $\mathcal{X}^{\text{reg}} \cap X_1$  are canonically isomorphic and their tautological sections get identified under this isomorphism. It follows that we have  $\text{ord}_p(\sigma_{v,2}) = m_p(C_1; Z)$ .

Since  $p \in F$ , the section  $\sigma_{v,2}$  vanishes at  $p$ . Since  $\sigma_{v,2}$  is non-vanishing away from  $\partial C_{v,1}$ , the point  $p$  must lie on  $U_{v'}$  for some  $v \neq v' \in V$ . If we had  $v' \in V_1$ , then the preceding paragraph shows that  $\sigma_{v',2}$  is regular (and vanishes) at  $p$ , contradicting property (iii) of Proposition A.1, which gives  $\text{ord}_p(\sigma_{v,2}) + \text{ord}_p(\sigma_{v',2}) = 0$ . Thus,  $v' \in V \setminus V_1$ .  $\square$

If  $F$  is 0-dimensional, then write  $F = \{p\}$ . Since  $p$  lies on at most two irreducible components of  $C$ , we must have  $|V_1| + |V_2| \leq 2$ . As  $\mu_s$  is non-constant, at least one of  $V_1$  and  $V_2$  is non-empty. Without loss of generality, assume  $V_1 \neq \emptyset$  and pick  $v \in V_1$ . By Lemma A.3, we get  $v' \in V \setminus V_1$  such that  $p \in U_{v'}$ . Since  $F = \{p\}$  is a connected component of  $\mu_s^{-1}(Z)$ , we must have  $v' \in V_2$ . This shows  $|V_1| = |V_2| = 1$ . By property (iii) of Proposition A.1, Remark A.2 and Lemma A.3, we get

$$0 = \text{ord}_p(\sigma_{v,2}) + \text{ord}_p(\sigma_{v',2}) = \text{ord}_p(\sigma_{v,2}) - \text{ord}_p(\sigma_{v',1}) = m_p(C_1; Z) - m_p(C_2; Z).$$

If  $F$  is 1-dimensional, let  $V_0 \subseteq V$  be set of the vertices corresponding to the irreducible components of  $U \cap F = F$ . For  $v \in V_0$ , we will write  $F_v$  in place of  $U_v$ . Since  $\mu_s(F)$  is a point in  $\mathcal{X}^{\text{reg}} \cap Z$ , the bundles  $\mu_s^* \mathcal{L}_i$  are trivial on  $F_v$  for all  $v \in V_0$  and  $i = 1, 2$ . Since  $F_v$  is a proper curve and  $\sigma_{v,i}$  is regular and non-vanishing at all nodes of  $F_v$ , we conclude that  $\sigma_{v,i}$  must have as many zeros as it has poles (counted with multiplicity) for all  $v \in V_0$  and  $i = 1, 2$ . Fixing  $i = 1$  and taking

the sum over all  $v \in V_0$ , we get the relation

$$\sum_{v \in V_0} \sum_{q_e \in \partial F_v} \text{ord}_{q_e}(\sigma_{v,1}) = 0.$$

For distinct  $v, v' \in V_0$  and  $q_e \in F_v \cap F_{v'}$ , we have  $\text{ord}_{q_e}(\sigma_{v,1}) + \text{ord}_{q_e}(\sigma_{v',1}) = 0$  by property (iii) of Proposition A.1. Such terms therefore cancel in pairs and the above relation reduces to

$$\sum_{v \in V_0} \sum_{p \in F_v \cap C_1} \text{ord}_p(\sigma_{v,1}) + \sum_{v \in V_0} \sum_{p \in F_v \cap C_2} \text{ord}_p(\sigma_{v,1}) = 0.$$

Using Remark A.2, we can rewrite this as

$$- \sum_{v \in V_0} \sum_{p \in F_v \cap C_1} \text{ord}_p(\sigma_{v,2}) + \sum_{v \in V_0} \sum_{p \in F_v \cap C_2} \text{ord}_p(\sigma_{v,1}) = 0.$$

Using property (iii) in Proposition A.1, this becomes

$$\sum_{v \in V_1} \sum_{p \in F \cap C_{v,1}} \text{ord}_p(\sigma_{v,2}) - \sum_{v \in V_2} \sum_{p \in F \cap C_{v,2}} \text{ord}_p(\sigma_{v,1}) = 0.$$

By Lemma A.3,  $\text{ord}_p(\sigma_{v,2}) = m_p(C_1; Z)$  for all  $v \in V_1$  and  $p \in F \cap C_{v,1}$ . Similarly, for all  $v \in V_2$  and  $p \in F \cap C_{v,2}$ , we have  $\text{ord}_p(\sigma_{v,1}) = m_p(C_2; Z)$ . This completes the proof of Lemma 2.9.

## REFERENCES

- [AC14] Dan Abramovich and Qile Chen. Stable logarithmic maps to Deligne–Faltings pairs II. *Asian J. Math.*, 18(3):465–488, 2014.
- [ACGS20] Dan Abramovich, Qile Chen, Mark Gross, and Bernd Siebert. Decomposition of degenerate Gromov–Witten invariants. *Compos. Math.*, 156(10):2020–2075, 2020.
- [AS95] Urban Anghern and Yum Tong Siu. Effective freeness and point separation for adjoint bundles. *Invent. Math.*, 122(2):291–308, 1995.
- [BCC92] Edoardo Ballico, Fabrizio Catanese, and Ciro Ciliberto, editors. *Trento examples. In: Classification of irregular varieties*, volume 1515 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1992.
- [BCDP14] Francesco Bastianelli, Renza Cortini, and Pietro De Poi. The gonality theorem of Noether for hypersurfaces. *J. Algebraic Geom.*, 23(2):313–339, 2014.
- [BCFS19] Francesco Bastianelli, Ciro Ciliberto, Flaminio Flamini, and Paola Supino. Gonality of curves on general hypersurfaces. *J. Math. Pures Appl. (9)*, 125:94–118, 2019.
- [BDPE<sup>+</sup>17] Francesco Bastianelli, Pietro De Poi, Lawrence Ein, Robert Lazarsfeld, and Brooke Ullery. Measures of irrationality for hypersurfaces of large degree. *Compos. Math.*, 153(11):2368–2393, 2017.
- [Che] Nathan Chen. Multiplicative bounds for measures of irrationality on complete intersections. *to appear in Alg. Geom.*
- [Che14] Qile Chen. Stable logarithmic maps to Deligne–Faltings pairs I. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 180(2):455–521, 2014.
- [Cle86] Herbert Clemens. Curves on generic hypersurfaces. *Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4)*, 19(4):629–636, 1986.
- [CR05] Herbert Clemens and Ziv Ran. Erratum to: “Twisted genus bounds for subvarieties of generic hypersurfaces” [*Amer. J. Math.* **126** (2004), no. 1, 89–120; mr2033565]. *Amer. J. Math.*, 127(1):241–242, 2005.
- [Ein88] Lawrence Ein. Subvarieties of generic complete intersections. *Invent. Math.*, 94(1):163–169, 1988.
- [Ein97] Lawrence Ein. Multiplier ideals, vanishing theorems and applications. In *Algebraic geometry—Santa Cruz 1995*, volume 62, Part 1 of *Proc. Sympos. Pure Math.*, pages 203–219. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1997.

- [FP97] W. Fulton and R. Pandharipande. Notes on stable maps and quantum cohomology. In *Algebraic geometry—Santa Cruz 1995*, volume 62, Part 2 of *Proc. Sympos. Pure Math.*, pages 45–96. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1997.
- [FT22a] Mohammad Farajzadeh-Tehrani. Limits of stable maps in a semi-stable degeneration. *Geom. Dedicata*, 216(6):Paper No. 66, 42, 2022.
- [FT22b] Mohammad Farajzadeh-Tehrani. Pseudoholomorphic curves relative to a normal crossings symplectic divisor: compactification. *Geom. Topol.*, 26(3):989–1075, 2022.
- [GH85] Phillip Griffiths and Joe Harris. On the Noether-Lefschetz theorem and some remarks on codimension-two cycles. *Math. Ann.*, 271(1):31–51, 1985.
- [GS13] Mark Gross and Bernd Siebert. Logarithmic Gromov-Witten invariants. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 26(2):451–510, 2013.
- [GV05] Tom Graber and Ravi Vakil. Relative virtual localization and vanishing of tautological classes on moduli spaces of curves. *Duke Math. J.*, 130(1):1–37, 2005.
- [HLU20] James Hotchkiss, Chung Ching Lau, and Brooke Ullery. The gonality of complete intersection curves. *J. Algebra*, 560:579–608, 2020.
- [Kon95] Maxim Kontsevich. Enumeration of rational curves via torus actions. In *The moduli space of curves (Texel Island, 1994)*, volume 129 of *Progr. Math.*, pages 335–368. Birkhäuser Boston, Boston, MA, 1995.
- [Laz97] Robert Lazarsfeld. Lectures on linear series. In *Complex algebraic geometry (Park City, UT, 1993)*, volume 3 of *IAS/Park City Math. Ser.*, pages 161–219. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1997. With the assistance of Guillermo Fernández del Busto.
- [Laz04a] Robert Lazarsfeld. *Positivity in algebraic geometry. I*, volume 48. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2004. Classical setting: line bundles and linear series.
- [Laz04b] Robert Lazarsfeld. *Positivity in algebraic geometry. II*, volume 49. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2004. Positivity for vector bundles, and multiplier ideals.
- [Lef24] S. Lefschetz. *L'analysis situs et la géométrie algébrique*. Gauthier-Villars, Paris, 1924.
- [Li01] Jun Li. Stable morphisms to singular schemes and relative stable morphisms. *J. Differential Geom.*, 57(3):509–578, 2001.
- [LSU23] Jake Levinson, David Stapleton, and Brooke Ullery. Minimal degree fibrations in curves and the asymptotic degree of irrationality of divisors. *arXiv:2304.09963*, 2023.
- [Pac04] Gianluca Pacienza. Subvarieties of general type on a general projective hypersurface. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 356(7):2649–2661, 2004.
- [Pau22] Matthias Paulsen. On the degree of algebraic cycles on hypersurfaces. *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, 790:137–148, 2022.
- [RY22] Eric Riedl and David Yang. Applications of a Grassmannian technique to hyperbolicity, Chow equivalence, and Seshadri constants. *J. Algebraic Geom.*, 31(1):1–12, 2022.
- [Smi22] Geoffrey Smith. Covering gonality of complete intersections in positive characteristic. *Algebra Number Theory*, 16(3):731–745, 2022.
- [Sta17] David Stapleton. *The degree of irrationality of very general hypersurfaces in some homogeneous spaces*. PhD thesis, State University of New York at Stony Brook, 2017.
- [SU20] David Stapleton and Brooke Ullery. The degree of irrationality of hypersurfaces in various Fano varieties. *Manuscripta Math.*, 161(3-4):377–408, 2020.
- [Vis89] Angelo Vistoli. Intersection theory on algebraic stacks and on their moduli spaces. *Invent. Math.*, 97(3):613–670, 1989.
- [Voi89] Claire Voisin. Sur une conjecture de Griffiths et Harris. In *Algebraic curves and projective geometry (Trento, 1988)*, volume 1389 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 270–275. Springer, Berlin, 1989.
- [Voi98] Claire Voisin. A correction: “On a conjecture of Clemens on rational curves on hypersurfaces” [J. Differential Geom. **44** (1996), no. 1, 200–213; MR1420353 (97j:14047)]. *J. Differential Geom.*, 49(3):601–611, 1998.
- [Wu90] Xian Wu. On a conjecture of Griffiths-Harris generalizing the Noether-Lefschetz theorem. *Duke Math. J.*, 60(2):465–472, 1990.

- [Xu94] Geng Xu. Subvarieties of general hypersurfaces in projective space. *J. Differential Geom.*, 39(1):139–172, 1994.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY, NEW YORK 10027  
*E-mail address:* nathanchen@math.columbia.edu

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, STANFORD UNIVERSITY, CALIFORNIA 94305  
*E-mail address:* bvchurch@stanford.edu

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND, COLLEGE PARK, MARYLAND 20742  
*E-mail address:* jzhao81@uic.edu

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, STANFORD UNIVERSITY, CALIFORNIA 94305  
*E-mail address:* mohans@stanford.edu