

METRICS WITH MINIMAL SINGULARITIES AND THE ABUNDANCE CONJECTURE

VLADIMIR LAZIĆ

To Thomas Peternell on the occasion of his 70th birthday, with admiration

ABSTRACT. The Abundance conjecture predicts that on a minimal projective klt pair (X, Δ) , the adjoint divisor $K_X + \Delta$ is semiample. When $\chi(X, \mathcal{O}_X) \neq 0$, we give a necessary and sufficient condition for the conjecture to hold in terms of the asymptotic behaviour of multiplier ideals of currents with minimal singularities of small twists of $K_X + \Delta$. Furthermore, we prove fundamental structural properties as well as regularity and weak convergence behaviour of an important class of currents with minimal singularities: the supercanonical currents. The results of the paper indicate strongly that supercanonical currents are central to the completion of the proof of the Abundance conjecture for minimal klt pairs (X, Δ) with $\chi(X, \mathcal{O}_X) \neq 0$.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	3
Part I. Preliminaries	9
2. Preliminaries: pluripotential theory	9
2.1. Bott-Chern cohomology	9
2.2. Almost positive currents	9
2.3. Plurisubharmonic functions	10
2.4. Quasi-psh functions	11
2.5. Upper semicontinuous regularisation	12
2.6. Positivity of classes	14
2.7. Lelong numbers	14
2.8. Divisorial valuations	15
2.9. Siu decomposition	16
2.10. Singular metrics	16
2.11. Multiplier ideals	18
2.12. Currents with analytic singularities	20
2.13. Currents with generalised analytic singularities	21
2.14. Scalar products and norms	21

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification*: 14E30, 32U40, 32J25.

Keywords: Minimal Model Program, Abundance conjecture, singular metrics, currents with minimal singularities, supercanonical currents.

2.15.	Hörmander's estimates	22
3.	Preliminaries: birational geometry	22
3.1.	Models	23
3.2.	Nakayama–Zariski and Boucksom–Zariski functions	23
3.3.	Stable, diminished and augmented base loci	25
3.4.	Finite generation	26
4.	Auxiliary results	27
4.1.	(Pluri)subharmonic functions	27
4.2.	Estimates of sections of line bundles	29
4.3.	Special quasi-psh functions	31
Part II.	Currents with minimal singularities	33
5.	Singularities of currents	33
5.1.	Comparison of singularities	33
5.2.	Minimal singularities	33
5.3.	Minimal singularities under pullbacks and sums	34
5.4.	Siu decomposition of currents with minimal singularities	36
6.	Supercanonical currents	37
Part III.	Asymptotically equisingular approximations	41
7.	Asymptotically equisingular approximations	41
8.	Good approximations	43
9.	Excellent approximations	47
10.	Excellent approximations and the MMP	49
11.	Proof of Theorem A	50
12.	Local behaviour	53
Part IV.	Approximations by supercanonical currents	58
13.	A uniform bound theorem	58
14.	Supercanonical currents on big line bundles	61
15.	Proof of Theorem B	69
	References	77

1. INTRODUCTION

The Abundance conjecture is one of the most important open problems in algebraic geometry. It predicts that on a projective klt pair (X, Δ) , if the adjoint divisor $K_X + \Delta$ is nef, then it is semiample; in other words, there exist a fibration $f: X \rightarrow Z$ and an ample \mathbb{R} -divisor A on Z such that $K_X + \Delta \sim_{\mathbb{R}} f^*A$. The conjecture is classically known for curves and surfaces, whereas for threefolds it was a fantastic achievement obtained in [Miy87, Miy88b, Miy88a, Kaw92, KMM94]. In arbitrary dimension, the conjecture holds for pairs of log general type [Sho85, Kaw85], for pairs of numerical dimension 0 [Nak04], and for varieties satisfying Miyaoka's equality [IMM24].

In dimensions at least 4, up to now there has only been one general result due to Lazić and Peternell [LP18, LP20b], and to Gongyo and Matsumura [GM17]: assuming the Minimal Model Program in lower dimensions, the divisor $K_X + \Delta$ is semiample if $\chi(X, \mathcal{O}_X) \neq 0$ and if the pullback of $K_X + \Delta$ to a resolution of X is hermitian semipositive. Very little seems to be known about the Abundance conjecture in higher dimensions when $\chi(X, \mathcal{O}_X) = 0$, unless X is uniruled [LM21].

The papers [LP18, LP20b] show, more generally, that half of the Abundance conjecture – the Nonvanishing conjecture – holds when $\chi(X, \mathcal{O}_X) \neq 0$, if the pullback of $K_X + \Delta$ to a resolution of X has a *singular metric with generalised algebraic singularities*. This class of metrics, discussed in detail in §2.13, is a singular generalisation of hermitian semipositive metrics and is a natural class of metrics from the point of view of the Minimal Model Program. Op. cit. indicated strongly that understanding this class of metrics is crucial for progress on the Abundance conjecture.

The quest for metrics with generalised algebraic singularities on adjoint divisors $K_X + \Delta$ is the main motivation for this paper.

The best candidates for such metrics are *metrics with minimal singularities*. Singular metrics with minimal singularities on an \mathbb{R} -divisor L on a compact Kähler manifold induce the smallest norms among all possible positively curved singular metrics on L , modulo certain compatibility conditions for singularities of metrics. Such metrics are notoriously difficult to work with as they are usually very transcendental and can be only implicitly described. However, they have some very good properties which we recall in Section 5, which distinguish them from other singular metrics on L .

In this paper we investigate how metrics with minimal singularities on divisors $K_X + \Delta + \varepsilon A$ behave when $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$, where A is an ample divisor on X . We prove two main results:

- (a) the Abundance conjecture can be reinterpreted as a statement about good asymptotic behaviour of multiplier ideals of currents with minimal singularities, and
- (b) supercanonical currents are excellent candidates to prove such good behaviour of multiplier ideals, and thus complete the proof of the Abundance conjecture when $\chi(X, \mathcal{O}_X) \neq 0$.

Notation. If T is a closed positive current on a compact Kähler manifold X , we use the notation $\mathcal{I}(T)_{\min}$ for the multiplier ideal of any closed positive current with minimal singularities in the cohomology class of T , see §2.11 and §5.1.

THE FIRST MAIN RESULT

Our first main result is that on a minimal klt pair (X, Δ) with $\chi(X, \mathcal{O}_X) \neq 0$, the Abundance conjecture is equivalent to an approximation property of multiplier ideals of currents with minimal singularities associated to divisors $K_X + \Delta$ and $K_X + \Delta + \frac{1}{m}A$ for $m \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$, where A is an ample divisor on X .¹ Roughly speaking, this approximation property says that the multiplier ideals of currents with minimal singularities associated to large multiples of $K_X + \Delta$ and $K_X + \Delta + \frac{1}{m}A$ are almost the same when $m \rightarrow \infty$.

This statement has two parts, given in Proposition 1.1 and Theorem A. The first observation is that this approximation statement of multiplier ideals is a consequence of the Abundance conjecture: this is the content of the following proposition, whose proof is given in Section 8.

Proposition 1.1. *Let (X, Δ) be a projective klt pair such that $K_X + \Delta$ is semiample. Let $\pi: Y \rightarrow X$ be a log resolution of (X, Δ) and write*

$$K_Y + \Delta_Y \sim_{\mathbb{R}} \pi^*(K_X + \Delta) + E,$$

where Δ_Y and E are effective \mathbb{R} -divisors without common components. Let A be an ample \mathbb{R} -divisor on Y . Then there exist an effective divisor D on Y and a sequence of positive integers $\{m_\ell\}_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}}$ such that $m_\ell \rightarrow \infty$ and

$$\mathcal{I}(\ell(K_Y + \Delta_Y + \frac{1}{m_\ell}A))_{\min} \subseteq \mathcal{I}(\ell(K_Y + \Delta_Y))_{\min} \otimes \mathcal{O}_Y(D) \quad \text{for all } \ell.$$

To explain the conclusion of this proposition, note that, in its notation, we always have

$$\mathcal{I}(\ell(K_Y + \Delta_Y))_{\min} \subseteq \mathcal{I}(\ell(K_Y + \Delta_Y + \frac{1}{m_\ell}A))_{\min} \quad \text{for all } \ell$$

by Lemma 5.2. Therefore, Proposition 1.1 says that the multiplier ideals $\mathcal{I}(\ell(K_Y + \Delta_Y))_{\min}$ and $\mathcal{I}(\ell(K_Y + \Delta_Y + \frac{1}{m_\ell}A))_{\min}$ are almost equal.

The first main result of the paper is that for pairs (X, Δ) with $\chi(X, \mathcal{O}_X) \neq 0$ we have the converse to Proposition 1.1.

Theorem A. *Assume the existence of good minimal models for projective klt pairs in dimensions at most $n - 1$.*

Let (X, Δ) be a projective klt pair of dimension n such that $K_X + \Delta$ is nef and Δ is a \mathbb{Q} -divisor. Let $\pi: Y \rightarrow X$ be a log resolution of (X, Δ) and write

$$K_Y + \Delta_Y \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} \pi^*(K_X + \Delta) + E,$$

¹We prove this assuming the Minimal Model Program in lower dimensions. This is a natural and necessary condition in all current work on the Abundance conjecture, considering that we aim to prove it by induction on the dimension.

where Δ_Y and E are effective \mathbb{Q} -divisors without common components. Let A be an ample \mathbb{R} -divisor on Y , and assume that there exist an effective divisor D on Y and a sequence of positive integers $\{m_\ell\}_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}}$ such that $m_\ell \rightarrow \infty$ and

$$\mathcal{I}(\ell(K_Y + \Delta_Y + \frac{1}{m_\ell}A))_{\min} \subseteq \mathcal{I}(\ell(K_Y + \Delta_Y))_{\min} \otimes \mathcal{O}_Y(D) \quad \text{for all } \ell.$$

If $\kappa(X, K_X + \Delta) \geq 0$ or $\chi(X, \mathcal{O}_X) \neq 0$, then $K_X + \Delta$ is semiample.

Part III of the paper is dedicated to the proof of this theorem. It follows immediately from Theorem 11.1, which proves a much more precise statement.

Theorem A and Proposition 1.1 together show that, when $\chi(X, \mathcal{O}_X) \neq 0$, the Abundance conjecture is a statement about the behaviour of multiplier ideals of currents with minimal singularities. (We stress that this does not depend on any particular *choice* of currents with minimal singularities: this gives significant flexibility that we will exploit several times in the paper). This is the first main contribution of this work.

We explain briefly the strategy of the proof of Theorem A. First we introduce and study in detail *asymptotically equisingular approximations*: a sequence of closed almost positive $(1,1)$ -currents $\{T_m\}_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ on a compact Kähler manifold X is an asymptotically equisingular approximation of a closed almost positive $(1,1)$ -current T on X if there exist an effective divisor D on X and a sequence of positive integers $\{m_\ell\}_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}}$ such that $m_\ell \rightarrow \infty$ and we have the inclusions of multiplier ideals

$$\mathcal{I}(\ell T_{m_\ell}) \otimes \mathcal{O}_X(-D) \subseteq \mathcal{I}(\ell T) \subseteq \mathcal{I}(\ell T_{m_\ell}) \otimes \mathcal{O}_X(D) \quad \text{for all } \ell.$$

Note that we do not require that the currents T_m converge weakly to T , hence asymptotically equisingular approximations would seem to be too weak for successful applications in practice. We will see, however, that they are perfectly suited to the context of the Minimal Model Program. Stronger forms of approximations appeared in connection to the regularisation techniques of Demailly [Dem92a, DPS01, Cao14], but equisingular approximations considered there do not seem suitable for applications within the Minimal Model Program; they did, however, motivate the definition of asymptotically equisingular approximations, as will be apparent in Sections 7 and 8.

In order to make asymptotically equisingular approximations useful within the context of the Minimal Model Program, we introduce in Section 9 a much stronger version of approximations of currents: *excellent approximations*. We show in Theorem 9.2 that the existence of excellent approximations of a current with minimal singularities T is equivalent to T having generalised analytic singularities. We combine this information in Section 10 with the techniques from [LP18, LP20b] to deduce certain strong cohomological properties of the sheaves of differential forms. Finally, in Theorem 11.1 we show that in the context of the Minimal Model Program, asymptotically equisingular approximations are always excellent: this allows to prove the

Nonvanishing by further application of the methods from [LP18, LP20b], and then semiample follows from the main result of [GM17].

For completeness we remark here that when X is uniruled in Theorem A, then we know that $\kappa(X, K_X + \Delta) \geq 0$ by [LM21, Theorem 1.1]. Therefore, when it comes to the Nonvanishing conjecture, the main remaining case is the case of non-uniruled varieties.

THE SECOND MAIN RESULT

Theorem A implies that understanding multiplier ideals of currents with minimal singularities, and especially their behaviour under perturbations, is fundamental for the proof of the Abundance conjecture. This is where supercanonical currents enter the picture.

The second goal of the paper is to study in detail a very specific choice of currents with minimal singularities: the *supercanonical currents* introduced by Tsuji in [Tsu07, Tsu11] and investigated in much greater generality and detail by Berman and Demailly [BD12]. The origins of supercanonical currents can be traced back to the work of Narasimhan and Simha [NS68], where they were examined in the case of ample line bundles. We study supercanonical currents in detail in Section 6.

We explain first the main idea behind supercanonical currents. Usually, the existence of at least one current with minimal singularities in a pseudoeffective cohomology class is shown by using a suitable L^∞ -condition; this is explained in Section 5. This seems, however, not to be suited for use in birational geometry. In contrast, supercanonical currents are defined by an exponential L^1 -condition, see Section 6. On a technical level, this makes them adapted to proofs involving estimates in which one uses Hölder's inequality. Crucially for us, this allows to use techniques of Berman, Demailly and others to show that supercanonical currents can actually be calculated by using only algebraic data: concretely, a supercanonical current of a big line bundle L depends only on the global holomorphic sections of powers of L , see Theorem 14.3. A large portion of Part IV is dedicated to showing this fundamental fact. We will then be able to prove much better regularity properties of such currents compared to other currents with minimal singularities. This is especially useful in the context of the Minimal Model Program, as we will see in Theorem B.

The paper [BD12] studies supercanonical currents on a projective klt pair (X, Δ) such that $K_X + \Delta$ is big and proves several of its properties. In this paper we define supercanonical currents on any pseudoeffective line bundle, inspired by the definition in op. cit. The definition in Section 6 is somewhat more transparent than that in [BD12], and we simplify the construction by viewing it from a slightly different standpoint. This allows to give a streamlined and precise proof of the behaviour of supercanonical currents on big line bundles in Section 14: one of the main new ingredients is a result on uniform bounds of norms of sections of adjoint line bundles given

in Theorem 13.1. Further explanations will be given at the beginning of Section 14.

After the case of big line bundles is settled, the main problem is to analyse what happens when the line bundle L is only pseudoeffective, and how supercanonical currents associated to divisors $L + \varepsilon A$ behave when $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$, where A is an ample divisor on X . Following a suggestion from [BD12, Generalization 5.24], we show that the corresponding supercanonical currents of $L + \varepsilon A$ converge weakly to a supercanonical current of L , and deduce additional strong regularity properties.

Specialising to the context of the Minimal Model Program, the following is our second main result. (We use the following notation introduced in Section 6: if θ is a smooth closed real $(1, 1)$ -form on a compact complex manifold X whose cohomology class is pseudoeffective, then $T_{\theta, \text{can}}$ denotes the supercanonical current associated to θ .)

Theorem B. *Let (X, Δ) be a projective klt pair such that Δ is a \mathbb{Q} -divisor and $K_X + \Delta$ is pseudoeffective. Let $\pi: Y \rightarrow X$ be a log resolution of (X, Δ) and write*

$$K_Y + \Delta_Y \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} \pi^*(K_X + \Delta) + E,$$

where Δ_Y and E are effective \mathbb{Q} -divisors without common components. Let A be an ample \mathbb{Q} -divisor on Y , and let α and ω be fixed smooth $(1, 1)$ -forms in the cohomology classes of $K_Y + \Delta_Y$ and A , respectively. Then:

- (a) for each $\varepsilon > 0$ the supercanonical current $T_{\alpha + \varepsilon\omega, \text{can}}$ depends only on the holomorphic global sections of multiples of $K_Y + \Delta_Y + \varepsilon A$,
- (b) the supercanonical currents $T_{\alpha + \varepsilon\omega, \text{can}}$ converge weakly to the supercanonical current $T_{\alpha, \text{can}}$ as $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$.

If additionally $K_X + \Delta$ is nef, then there exists a positive rational number δ such that:

- (c) the non-nef loci $\mathbf{B}_-(K_Y + \Delta_Y + \varepsilon A)$ do not depend on $0 \leq \varepsilon \leq \delta$, and they are equal to the non-ample loci $\mathbf{B}_+(K_Y + \Delta_Y + \varepsilon A)$ for $0 < \varepsilon \leq \delta$,
- (d) for each $0 < \varepsilon \leq \delta$ the supercanonical current $T_{\alpha + \varepsilon\omega, \text{can}}$ has continuous local potentials away from the non-nef locus $\mathbf{B}_-(K_Y + \Delta_Y)$,
- (e) for any two rational numbers $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2 \in (0, \delta]$ and for any $t \in [0, 1]$ the supercanonical current

$$tT_{\alpha + \varepsilon_1\omega, \text{can}} + (1 - t)T_{\alpha + \varepsilon_2\omega, \text{can}}$$

is the current with minimal singularities in the cohomology class of the divisor $K_Y + \Delta_Y + (t\varepsilon_1 + (1 - t)\varepsilon_2)A$.

Parts (a) and (b) of the theorem are very delicate and they hold more generally for pseudoeffective divisors which are not necessarily adjoint, see Theorem 15.2 for a much more precise statement. Part (d) holds also in that more general context, albeit with a weaker estimate of the size of the regularity locus. The other statements rely crucially on the fact that we are working with adjoint divisors, and they depend on the Minimal Model Program, see Theorem 12.1.

The main aim of Theorem **B** is to gain precise information on the behaviour of multiplier ideals associated to supercanonical currents under perturbations by an ample divisor, in order to combine it with Theorem **A** to obtain the proof of the Abundance conjecture for minimal projective klt pairs (X, Δ) with $\chi(X, \mathcal{O}_X) \neq 0$. The more detailed results from Sections **14** and **15** indicate how this might be achieved, see Theorem **14.3(ix)** and Theorem **15.2(v)**.

The algebraicity statements (a) and (b) as well as the regularity statement (d) of Theorem **B** are very strong and, combined with Theorem **A**, we expect them to be crucial for the completion of the proof of the Abundance conjecture for minimal projective klt pairs (X, Δ) with $\chi(X, \mathcal{O}_X) \neq 0$.

On the organisation of the paper. This work contains as many ingredients from complex birational geometry as it does from pluripotential theory. I have attempted to make it accessible to both birational and complex geometers. This possibly resulted in the inclusion of proofs of some results which might be considered standard or classical by some readers.

Acknowledgements. It is my great pleasure to dedicate this paper to Thomas Peternell. This present work builds on our joint quest towards abundance-related problems that we started almost a decade ago. He has provided constant support and has been a source of wonderful mathematical ideas. This paper would not have been possible without him.

I had several conversations online about a very preliminary version of the ideas presented here with Jean-Pierre Demailly in the summer of 2021, partly together with Thomas Peternell. Jean-Pierre clarified several things about his Bergman kernel techniques and the paper [BD12]. These conversations have had a very big impact on this paper.

I am very grateful to Nikolaos Tsakanikas for discussions about the content of Section **12** and for extensive comments which improved the presentation of the paper. I am grateful to Vincent Guedj and Zhixin Xie for useful comments and suggestions.

I gratefully acknowledge support by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) – Project-ID 286237555 – TRR 195 and Project-ID 530132094.

Part I. Preliminaries

2. PRELIMINARIES: PLURIPOTENTIAL THEORY

Much of the material discussed here can be found in [Dem12, Kli91, GZ17] or in the introductory sections of [Bou02, Bou04]. The notes [BT06, Vu21] present many of the foundational results with more details or clarity. The presentation in [GZ05] is exceptionally clear.

We collect some definitions and results for the benefit of the reader and to settle the notation and terminology. In this paper we use the convention that $d^c = \frac{1}{2\pi i}(\partial - \bar{\partial})$, so that $dd^c = \frac{i}{\pi}\partial\bar{\partial}$. We denote by

$$B(x, r) = \{x \in \mathbb{C}^n \mid \|x\| < r\} \quad \text{and} \quad S(x, r) = \{x \in \mathbb{C}^n \mid \|x\| = r\}$$

the open ball and the sphere of radius r and with centre x in \mathbb{C}^n . All manifolds in the paper are connected. The notation \int is used for the averaged integral, i.e. for the integral divided by the volume of the set over which the integration is made.

2.1. Bott-Chern cohomology. If X is a complex manifold, we define the Bott-Chern $(1, 1)$ -cohomology space $H_{\text{BC}}^{1,1}(X, \mathbb{C})$ as the quotient of the space of d -closed smooth $(1, 1)$ -forms modulo the dd^c -exact smooth $(1, 1)$ -forms, and we denote by $H_{\text{BC}}^{1,1}(X, \mathbb{R})$ the space of its real points. It can be shown by a partition of unity argument that $H_{\text{BC}}^{1,1}(X, \mathbb{C})$ is isomorphic to the quotient of the space of d -closed $(1, 1)$ -currents modulo the dd^c -exact $(1, 1)$ -currents. If additionally X is compact and Kähler, then $H_{\text{BC}}^{1,1}(X, \mathbb{C})$ is isomorphic to the Dolbeault cohomology group $H^{1,1}(X, \mathbb{C})$.

If T is a closed $(1, 1)$ -current on a complex manifold X , we denote by $\{T\}$ its class in $H_{\text{BC}}^{1,1}(X, \mathbb{C})$. If T is a real closed $(1, 1)$ -current, then $\{T\} \in H_{\text{BC}}^{1,1}(X, \mathbb{R})$, and the representatives of $\{T\}$ are the closed currents of the form $T + dd^c\varphi$, where φ is a real current of degree 0. If T is a representative of a class $\alpha \in H_{\text{BC}}^{1,1}(X, \mathbb{C})$, we write $T \in \alpha$; if $T' \in \alpha$ is another representative, we also write $T \equiv T'$.

2.2. Almost positive currents. Let X be a complex manifold of dimension n . A continuous $(n-1, n-1)$ -form φ on X is *positive* if it can be written locally as a finite non-negative linear combination of forms of type

$$(i\alpha_1 \wedge \bar{\alpha}_1) \wedge \dots \wedge (i\alpha_{n-1} \wedge \bar{\alpha}_{n-1}),$$

where α_i are $(1, 0)$ -forms. Positivity of forms is a pointwise property which does not depend on local coordinates.

A $(1, 1)$ -current T on X is *positive* if $T(\varphi)$ is a positive measure for every smooth positive $(n-1, n-1)$ -form φ , and we write $T \geq 0$. A positive $(1, 1)$ -current is always real. If T and T' are two $(1, 1)$ -currents on X , we write $T \geq T'$ if $T - T' \geq 0$. If $\varphi = i \sum h_{jk} dz_j \wedge d\bar{z}_k$ is a real continuous $(1, 1)$ -form, then φ is positive if and only if $(h_{jk}(x))$ is a positive semidefinite hermitian matrix for all $x \in X$.

If now D is an irreducible analytic subset of pure codimension 1 in X , then we denote by $[D]$ the *current of integration* on the regular part of D : this is a closed positive $(1, 1)$ -current. If we have an effective \mathbb{R} -divisor $G = \delta_1 G_1 + \cdots + \delta_r G_r$ on X , then we call the closed positive $(1, 1)$ -current $[G] := \delta_1 [G_1] + \cdots + \delta_r [G_r]$ the *current of integration on G* . If there is no danger of confusion, we drop the brackets and write simply G for the current of integration on G .

A real $(1, 1)$ -current T on X is *almost positive* if $T \geq \gamma$ for some real continuous $(1, 1)$ -form γ on X .

If $f: Y \rightarrow X$ is a surjective holomorphic map between complex manifolds and if T is a closed almost positive $(1, 1)$ -current on X , then one can easily define its *pullback* f^*T to Y such that $\{f^*T\} = f^*\{T\}$, see [Bou04, 2.2.3].

We will need the following easy result.

Lemma 2.1. *Let X be a compact complex manifold of dimension n and let ω be a smooth positive definite $(1, 1)$ -form on X . Let $\{\theta_j\}_{j \in J}$ be a collection of real $(1, 1)$ -forms on X whose coefficients are locally uniformly bounded on X . Then there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that $\theta_j + C\omega \geq 0$ for all j .*

Proof. Fix a point $x \in X$ and a coordinate neighbourhood U_x centred at x such that the coefficients of all θ_j are uniformly bounded on U_x . Then we may find finitely many real smooth $(1, 1)$ -forms $\tilde{\theta}_1, \dots, \tilde{\theta}_r$ on U_x such that each θ_j is a convex linear combination of the forms $\tilde{\theta}_k$. By the spectral theorem for hermitian operators, for each k there exists a linear change of local coordinates $f_{k,x}: U_x \rightarrow U_x$ such that

$$f_{k,x}^* \tilde{\theta}_k = \frac{i}{2} \sum_{\ell=1}^n \lambda_{k,\ell,x} dz_\ell \wedge d\bar{z}_\ell \quad \text{and} \quad f_{k,x}^* \omega = \frac{i}{2} \sum_{\ell=1}^n dz_\ell \wedge d\bar{z}_\ell \quad \text{at } x.$$

Then it is clear that, by possibly shrinking U_x , there exists a constant C_x on U_x such that $f_{k,x}^* \tilde{\theta}_k + C_x f_{k,x}^* \omega \geq 0$ on U_x for all $1 \leq k \leq r$. Therefore, $\tilde{\theta}_k + C_x \omega \geq 0$ on U_x for all $1 \leq k \leq r$ by [Dem12, Proposition III.1.17], hence $\theta_j + C_x \omega \geq 0$ on U_x for all $j \in J$. We conclude by the compactness of X . \square

2.3. Plurisubharmonic functions. In this subsection X is a complex manifold of dimension n . A function $\varphi: X \rightarrow [-\infty, +\infty)$ is *plurisubharmonic* or *psh* if it is upper semicontinuous, locally integrable, and satisfies the mean value inequality

$$f^* \varphi(0) \leq \int_{\Delta} f^* \varphi dV_{\Delta}$$

for any holomorphic mapping $f: \Delta \rightarrow X$ from the open unit disk $\Delta \subseteq \mathbb{C}$. Every plurisubharmonic function is *subharmonic*, i.e. it satisfies the mean value inequality

$$f^* \varphi(0) \leq \int_B f^* \varphi dV_B$$

for any open embedding $f: B \rightarrow X$ of the open unit ball $B \subseteq \mathbb{C}^n$.

Psh functions on X are locally bounded from above and belong to $L^p_{\text{loc}}(X)$ for any $1 \leq p < \infty$. If additionally X is compact, then any psh function on X is constant.

A subset A of X is *locally pluripolar* if it is locally contained in the pole set $\{u = -\infty\}$ of a psh function u . Since each psh function is locally integrable, the set A is of Lebesgue measure zero and the complement $X \setminus A$ is dense in X .

A closed $(1,1)$ -current T on X is positive if and only if for each $x \in X$ there exists an open subset $U \subseteq X$ such that T can be locally written as $T = dd^c\varphi$ for a psh function φ on U . The function φ is a *local potential* of T on U .

We will often need the following well-known properties of subharmonic functions.

Lemma 2.2. *Let $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{C}^n$ be a domain.*

(a) *Let φ be a subharmonic function on Ω and let $A \subseteq \Omega$ be a set of Lebesgue measure zero. Then*

$$\limsup_{z' \rightarrow z, z' \in \Omega \setminus A} \varphi(z') = \varphi(z) \quad \text{for every } z \in \Omega.$$

(b) *Let φ be a subharmonic function on Ω . Then*

$$\varphi(z) = \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \int_{B(z,r)} \varphi(z) dV \quad \text{for every } z \in \Omega.$$

(c) *Let φ and ψ be subharmonic functions on Ω and assume that $\varphi \leq \psi$ almost everywhere. Then $\varphi \leq \psi$.*

Proof. Part (c) follows immediately from (a). We will show (a) and (b) simultaneously. For a fixed $z \in \Omega$, the mean value inequality on balls $B(z,r) \subseteq \Omega$ and the upper semicontinuity of φ give

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(z) &\leq \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \int_{B(z,r)} \varphi(z) dV = \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \int_{B(z,r) \setminus A} \varphi(z) dV \\ &\leq \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \sup_{B(z,r) \setminus A} \varphi(z') = \limsup_{z' \rightarrow z, z' \in \Omega \setminus A} \varphi(z') \leq \varphi(z). \end{aligned}$$

This finishes the proof. \square

2.4. Quasi-psh functions. As mentioned above, a psh function on a compact complex manifold is always constant. A more suitable notion on compact complex manifolds is that of *quasi-plurisubharmonic* or *quasi-psh* functions: a function $\varphi: X \rightarrow [-\infty, +\infty)$ on a complex manifold X is quasi-psh if it is locally equal to the sum of a psh function and a smooth function. Equivalently, φ is quasi-psh if it is locally integrable and upper semicontinuous, and there exists a smooth closed real $(1,1)$ -form θ on X such that $\theta + dd^c\varphi \geq 0$ in the sense of currents. A good introduction to quasi-psh functions is in [GZ05].

Now, if θ is a real continuous $(1, 1)$ -form on X and if φ is a quasi-psh function on X such that $\theta + dd^c\varphi \geq 0$ in the sense of currents, then we say that φ is θ -psh and we denote the set of all θ -psh functions by $\text{PSH}(X, \theta)$. The weak topology on the set $\{\theta + dd^c\varphi \mid \varphi \in \text{PSH}(X, \theta)\}$ corresponds to the $L^1_{\text{loc}}(X)$ -topology on $\text{PSH}(X, \theta)$. The set

$$\{\varphi \in \text{PSH}(X, \theta) \mid \sup_X \varphi = 0\}$$

is compact in this topology, as we will see in Theorem 2.4.

If X is additionally compact, if θ is a smooth closed real $(1, 1)$ -form on X and if T is a closed almost positive $(1, 1)$ -current in $\{\theta\}$, then there exists a closed real smooth $(1, 1)$ -form γ such that $\gamma + T \geq 0$, and clearly $\gamma + T \in \{\gamma + \theta\}$. By the dd^c -lemma there exists $\varphi \in \text{PSH}(X, \gamma + \theta)$, which is unique up to an additive constant, such that $\gamma + T = (\gamma + \theta) + dd^c\varphi$, hence

$$T = \theta + dd^c\varphi.$$

By adopting the terminology from [BEGZ10], such a function φ is called a *global potential* of T ; global potentials depend, up to an additive constant, on the choice of θ , but not of γ .

A subset of X is *pluripolar* if it is contained in the pole set $\{\varphi = -\infty\}$ of a quasi-psh function φ on X .

We will need the following easy consequence of Lemma 2.2(c).

Corollary 2.3. *Let X be a complex manifold and let φ and ψ be quasi-psh functions on X . If $\varphi \leq \psi$ holds almost everywhere, then $\varphi \leq \psi$.*

Proof. Let θ_1 and θ_2 be real smooth $(1, 1)$ -forms on X such that $\varphi_1 \in \text{PSH}(X, \theta_1)$ and $\varphi_2 \in \text{PSH}(X, \theta_2)$. Fix a point $x \in X$. As in the proof of Theorem 2.4(a) below, there exist an open neighbourhood U of x and a smooth closed form ω on U such that $\omega \geq \theta_1$ and $\omega \geq \theta_2$ on U . Hence, φ_1 and φ_2 are ω -psh on U . If ξ is a local potential of ω on U , then $\xi + \varphi_1$ and $\xi + \varphi_2$ are psh and $\xi + \varphi_1 \leq \xi + \varphi_2$ almost everywhere on U . We conclude by Lemma 2.2(c). \square

2.5. Upper semicontinuous regularisation. Let $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{C}^n$ be an open subset and let u be a function on Ω . We define its *upper semicontinuous regularisation* as

$$u^*(z) = \limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \sup_{B(z, \varepsilon)} u \quad \text{for } z \in \Omega.$$

Then u^* is the smallest upper semicontinuous function which is $\geq u$. This notion extends easily to quasi-psh functions on a complex manifold.

Consider a family $\{u_\alpha\}$ of psh functions on Ω which is locally uniformly bounded from above, and set $u := \sup_\alpha u_\alpha$. Then the function u^* is psh and we have $u^* = u$ almost everywhere, see [Dem12, Theorem I.5.7]. We will need very often the following extension of this and other important compactness results to quasi-psh functions.

Theorem 2.4. *Let X be a complex manifold and let θ be a continuous real $(1, 1)$ -form on X .*

- (a) Consider a family $\{\varphi_\alpha\}$ of θ -psh functions on X which is locally uniformly bounded from above, and set $\varphi := \sup_\alpha \varphi_\alpha$. Then $\varphi^* \in \text{PSH}(X, \theta)$ and $\varphi^* = \varphi$ almost everywhere.
- (b) Assume additionally that X is compact. Let $\{\varphi_j\}$ be a sequence of θ -psh functions on X which are uniformly bounded from above. Then either the sequence $\{\varphi_j\}$ converges uniformly to $-\infty$ or it has a subsequence which converges in $L^1_{\text{loc}}(X)$ and almost everywhere to a function in $\text{PSH}(X, \theta)$.
- (c) Let $\{\varphi_j\}$ be a sequence of θ -psh functions on X which are locally uniformly bounded from above. Then the function $\left(\limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} \varphi_j\right)^*$ is θ -psh.
- (d) Let $\{\varphi_j\}$ be a sequence of θ -psh functions on X which are locally uniformly bounded from above. If the sequence is decreasing, then either it converges uniformly to $-\infty$ or it converges in $L^1_{\text{loc}}(X)$ to the θ -psh function $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \varphi_j$. If the sequence is increasing, then it converges in $L^1_{\text{loc}}(X)$ and almost everywhere to the θ -psh function $\left(\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \varphi_j\right)^*$.
- (e) Assume additionally that X is compact. Let θ' be a positive continuous $(1,1)$ -form on X , and consider a sequence of real numbers $\varepsilon_j \downarrow 0$. For each positive integer j , let $\varphi_j \in \text{PSH}(X, \theta + \varepsilon_j \theta')$ and assume that all φ_j are uniformly bounded from above. Then either the sequence $\{\varphi_j\}$ converges uniformly to $-\infty$ or it has a subsequence which converges in $L^1_{\text{loc}}(X)$ and almost everywhere to a function in $\text{PSH}(X, \theta)$.

Proof. For (a) we extract the proof from [Bou02, Proposition 2.1.3]. Fix a point $x \in X$. By the spectral theorem for hermitian operators and by the continuity of θ , for each $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists real numbers λ_j and a neighbourhood U_ε of x with local coordinates $z = (z_1, \dots, z_n)$ such that, if we set $q(z) := \sum \lambda_j |z_j|^2$, we have

$$dd^c(q(z) - \varepsilon|z|^2) \leq \theta \leq dd^c(q(z) + \varepsilon|z|^2).$$

Then on U_ε each function $q(z) + \varepsilon|z|^2 + \varphi_\alpha(z)$ is psh, hence so is the function

$$\left(\sup_\alpha \{q + \varepsilon|z|^2 + \varphi_\alpha\}\right)^* = q + \varepsilon|z|^2 + \varphi^*$$

by the paragraph before the theorem. Therefore,

$$dd^c \varphi^* + \theta + 2\varepsilon dd^c |z|^2 \geq dd^c \varphi^* + dd^c q(z) + \varepsilon dd^c |z|^2 \geq 0$$

on U_ε . Letting $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ we obtain $dd^c \varphi^* + \theta \geq 0$ at x . Since x was arbitrary, this shows that φ is θ -psh.

The proof of (b) is similar, using the local result for psh functions [Dem12, Proposition I.5.9]; see [Vu21, Proposition 2.5.7] for details.

Part (c) follows similarly as (a) from the local result for psh functions [Kli91, Proposition 2.9.17].

Part (d) follows from (b) and (c).

Now we prove (e). Assume that the sequence $\{\varphi_j\}$ does not converge uniformly to $-\infty$. For positive integers $k \geq k'$ we have $\theta + \varepsilon_{k'} \theta' \geq \theta + \varepsilon_k \theta'$,

and hence

$$\varphi_k \in \text{PSH}(X, \theta + \varepsilon_k \theta').$$

Therefore, by (b) there exists a subsequence $\{\varphi_{j_1}\}$ of $\{\varphi_j\}$ which converges in $L^1_{\text{loc}}(X)$ and almost everywhere to a function

$$\varphi \in \text{PSH}(X, \theta + \varepsilon_1 \theta').$$

We will be done if we show that $\varphi \in \text{PSH}(X, \theta)$, and for this it suffices to prove that $\varphi \in \text{PSH}(X, \theta + \varepsilon_i \theta')$ for all i , since θ is the weak limit of the sequence $\{\theta + \varepsilon_i \theta'\}$. To this end, by (b) we inductively have that, for all $i \geq 2$, there exists a subsequence $\{\varphi_{j_i}\}$ of $\{\varphi_{j_{i-1}}\}$ which converges in $L^1_{\text{loc}}(X)$ and almost everywhere to a function $\eta_i \in \text{PSH}(X, \theta + \varepsilon_i \theta')$, thus $\eta_i = \varphi$ almost everywhere. But then $\eta_i = \varphi$ by Corollary 2.3, and in particular, $\varphi \in \text{PSH}(X, \theta + \varepsilon_i \theta')$. This finishes the proof. \square

2.6. Positivity of classes. Let X be compact complex manifold, let ω be a fixed smooth positive $(1, 1)$ -form on X , and consider a cohomology class $\alpha \in H_{\text{BC}}^{1,1}(X, \mathbb{R})$. Then α is:

- (i) *pseudoeffective* if there exists a closed positive $(1, 1)$ -current $T \in \alpha$;
- (ii) *nef* if for each $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a smooth form $\theta_\varepsilon \in \alpha$ such that $\theta_\varepsilon \geq -\varepsilon\omega$;
- (iii) *big* if there exist $\varepsilon > 0$ and a closed $(1, 1)$ -current $T \in \alpha$ such that $T \geq \varepsilon\omega$.

These definitions do not depend on the choice of ω , and they correspond to the usual notions from algebraic geometry when X is projective and α is an algebraic class.

2.7. Lelong numbers. Let $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{C}^n$ be an open subset and let φ be a psh function on Ω . The *Lelong number* of φ at a point $x \in \Omega$ is

$$\nu(\varphi, x) := \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{\sup_{B(x,r)} \varphi}{\log r};$$

this is equivalent to other definitions in the literature by [Dem12, Example III.6.9]. Thus, if $\nu(\varphi, x) > 0$, then $\varphi(x) = -\infty$, but the converse does not always hold. The Lelong number $\nu(\varphi, x)$ does not depend on the choice of local coordinates around x . For psh functions u and v on Ω and for each point $x \in \Omega$ we have

$$\nu(u + v, x) = \nu(u, x) + \nu(v, x);$$

note that $u + v$ is a psh function by Example 2.6(d) below.

Let now T be a closed positive $(1, 1)$ -current on a complex manifold X . Then locally at a point $x \in X$ we can write $T = dd^c \varphi$ for a psh function φ , and we define the Lelong number of T at x as

$$\nu(T, x) := \nu(\varphi, x);$$

this does not depend on the choice of φ . If Y is an analytic subset of X and if $x \in X$, then a result of Thie states that $\nu(Y, x)$ is equal to the multiplicity of Y at x .

We will need the following result which compares the Lelong numbers under pullbacks [Fav99, Corollary 4], see also [Kis00, Théorème 5.1].

Theorem 2.5. *Let $f: Y \rightarrow X$ be a surjective holomorphic map between compact complex manifolds. Then there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for every closed positive $(1, 1)$ -current T on X and for all points $y \in Y$ and $x := f(y) \in X$ we have*

$$\nu(T, x) \leq \nu(f^*T, y) \leq C\nu(T, x).$$

If T is a closed almost positive $(1, 1)$ -current on X and if x is a point in X with local coordinates $z = (z_1, \dots, z_n)$ around x , then there exists a positive constant C such that $T + Cdd^c|z|^2 \geq 0$ locally around x . Then we define the Lelong number $\nu(T, x)$ as $\nu(T + Cdd^c|z|^2, x)$; this does not depend on the choice of C .

For $c \geq 0$ define the *Lelong upperlevel sets* as

$$E_c(T) := \{x \in X \mid \nu(T, x) \geq c\}.$$

Then a fundamental theorem of [Siu74] states that for each $c > 0$, the set $E_c(T)$ is a proper analytic subset of X . Thus, for any analytic subset Y of X we may define the *generic Lelong number of T along Y* as

$$\nu(T, Y) := \inf\{\nu(T, x) \mid x \in Y\},$$

which is equal to $\nu(T, x)$ for a very general point $x \in Y$.

2.8. Divisorial valuations. Let X be compact complex manifold. Following [BBJ21, B.5 and B.6], a *prime divisor over X* denotes a prime divisor $E \subseteq X'$, where $\mu: X' \rightarrow X$ is a resolution. We say that two prime divisors $E_1 \subseteq X_1$ and $E_2 \subseteq X_2$ over X are *equivalent* if there exists a common resolution X' of X_1 and X_2 such that the strict transforms of E_1 and E_2 on X' coincide. When X is projective, a prime divisor over X is the same thing as a geometric divisorial valuation on X by [KM98, Lemma 2.45].

Let T be a closed positive $(1, 1)$ -current on X . If E is a prime divisor on a resolution $f: Y \rightarrow X$, we denote

$$\nu(T, E) := \nu(f^*T, E).$$

If E' is another prime divisor over X equivalent to E , then $\nu(T, E) = \nu(T, E')$. If D is an \mathbb{R} -divisor on X , then we define the *multiplicity of D along E* by

$$\text{mult}_E D := \text{mult}_E f^*D.$$

2.9. Siu decomposition. If X is a complex manifold and if T is a closed positive $(1, 1)$ -current on X , then there exist at most countably many codimension 1 irreducible analytic subsets D_k such that T has the *Siu decomposition*

$$T = R + \sum \nu(T, D_k) \cdot D_k,$$

where R is a closed positive $(1, 1)$ -current such that $\text{codim}_X E_c(R) \geq 2$ for each $c > 0$. In this paper we call $\sum \nu(T, D_k) \cdot D_k$ the *divisorial part* and R the *residual part* of (the Siu decomposition of) T .

Now assume that T is closed almost positive $(1, 1)$ -current, and let γ be a continuous form on X such that $T \geq \gamma$. Then one can construct the Siu decomposition $T = \sum \nu(T, D_k) \cdot D_k + R$ of T similarly as above, where now R is a closed almost positive $(1, 1)$ -current satisfying $R \geq \gamma$.

With notation as above, if $\pi: Y \rightarrow X$ is a resolution and if

$$\pi^*T = R_Y + \sum \nu(\pi^*T, D'_\ell) \cdot D'_\ell$$

is the Siu decomposition of π^*T , then it is clear that each D'_ℓ is a component of π^*D_k for some k , or it is a π -exceptional divisor. In particular, if the divisorial part of T is an \mathbb{R} -divisor, then so is the divisorial part of π^*T .

2.10. Singular metrics. Let L be a holomorphic line bundle on a complex manifold X . A *singular hermitian metric* or simply a *singular metric* h on L is a metric given in every trivialisaton $\theta: L|_\Omega \rightarrow \Omega \times \mathbb{C}$ by

$$h(\xi, \xi) := |\theta(\xi)|^2 e^{-2\varphi(x)} \quad \text{for } x \in \Omega, \xi \in L_x \text{ and } \varphi \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\Omega).$$

We also denote $|\cdot|_h := h(\cdot, \cdot)^{1/2}$. The function φ is called the *local weight* of h with respect to the trivialisaton θ . The *curvature current* $\Theta_h(L) := dd^c \varphi$ is globally defined and lies in $\{L\} \in H^1_{\text{BC}}(X, \mathbb{R})$. The curvature current $\Theta_h(L)$ of h is *semipositive* if it is positive in the sense of currents.

Now fix a smooth metric h_∞ on L . Then there exists a locally integrable function φ on X such that $h = h_\infty e^{-2\varphi}$, and we call φ the *global weight* of h with respect to the reference metric h_∞ . Then we have

$$\Theta_h(L) = \Theta_{h_\infty}(L) + dd^c \varphi.$$

Conversely, for any closed $(1, 1)$ -current $T \in \{L\}$ there exists a degree 0 current φ such that $T = \Theta_{h_\infty}(L) + dd^c \varphi$. When additionally T is almost positive, then $\varphi \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(X)$, hence every almost positive current $T \in \{L\}$ is the curvature current of a singular hermitian metric on L , and the global weight φ is a quasi-psh function on X .

We now mention several examples of quasi-psh functions which are relevant for this paper.

Example 2.6.

- (a) Let $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{C}^n$ be an open subset and let f_1, \dots, f_m be holomorphic functions on Ω . Then $\log(|f_1|^2 + \dots + |f_m|^2)$ is psh on Ω by [Dem12, Example I.5.12].

- (b) More generally, let L be a holomorphic line bundle with a continuous metric h on a complex manifold X , and consider global holomorphic sections $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_m$ of L . Then the function $\varphi: X \rightarrow [-\infty, +\infty)$ given by

$$\varphi := \frac{1}{2} \log (|\sigma_1|_h^2 + \dots + |\sigma_m|_h^2)$$

is quasi-psh on X : indeed, let θ be a local continuous weight of h on some trivialisation of L . Then locally and by (a) we have

$$dd^c(\theta + \varphi) = \frac{1}{2} dd^c \log (|\sigma_1|^2 + \dots + |\sigma_m|^2) \geq 0,$$

hence the function $\theta + \varphi$ is psh. In particular, globally we have $\Theta_h(L) + dd^c \varphi \geq 0$, hence the curvature current of the singular metric $he^{-2\varphi}$ on L is semipositive. The metric $he^{-2\varphi}$ and the current $\Theta_h(L) + dd^c \varphi$ do not depend on the choice of h .

- (c) In the context of (b), let σ be a global holomorphic section of L and let $\sum m_i D_i$ be the zero-divisor of f . Then we have the *global Lelong-Poincaré equation*

$$\Theta_h(L) + dd^c \log |\sigma|_h = \sum m_i D_i,$$

understood in the sense of currents, see [Dem12, Theorem III.2.15 and Section V.13].

- (d) Let $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{C}^n$ be an open subset, let u_1, \dots, u_r be psh functions on Ω and let $\chi: [-\infty, +\infty)^r \rightarrow [-\infty, +\infty)$ be a convex function which is non-decreasing in each coordinate. Then by [Dem12, Theorem I.5.6], the function $\chi(u_1, \dots, u_r)$ is psh on Ω . In particular, the functions $u_1 + \dots + u_r$, $\max\{u_1, \dots, u_r\}$ and $e^{u_1} + \dots + e^{u_r}$ are psh on Ω .
- (e) Let X be a complex manifold, let θ be a continuous real $(1, 1)$ -form on X , and let $\{\varphi_j\}$ be a sequence of θ -psh functions on X which are locally uniformly bounded from above. If $\sum \varepsilon_j$ is a convergent series of positive real numbers, then the function $\sum \varepsilon_j \varphi_j$ is θ -psh. Indeed, there exists a constant C such that $\varphi'_j := \varphi_j - C \leq 0$ for all j . Then each partial sum $\Phi_k := \sum_{j \leq k} \varepsilon_j \varphi'_j$ is θ -psh by (d), and the sequence $\{\Phi_k\}$ is decreasing, hence $\sum \varepsilon_j \varphi'_j = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \Phi_k \in \text{PSH}(X, \theta)$ by Theorem 2.4(d); note that the limit is not $-\infty$ since the union of pluripolar sets of all φ_j is of Lebesgue measure zero in X . Since $\sum \varepsilon_j \varphi_j = \sum \varepsilon_j \varphi'_j + C \sum \varepsilon_j$, we obtain the claim.

We will need later the following remark, which we extract from the proof of [Vu19, Theorem 1.1].

Remark 2.7. Let X be a compact complex manifold, let θ be a continuous real $(1, 1)$ -form on X , and let $\{\varphi_j\}$ be a sequence of θ -psh functions on X . Then the union of pluripolar loci of all φ_j is again a pluripolar set. In order to see this, first note that by subtracting a constant from each φ_j , we may assume that $\varphi_j \leq 0$ for all j . Then by Example 2.6(e) the function

$\varphi := \sum j^{-2} \varphi_j$ is θ -psh, and the union of pluripolar loci of all φ_j is contained in the set $\{\varphi = -\infty\}$.

2.11. Multiplier ideals. If φ is a quasi-psh function on a complex manifold X , the *multiplier ideal sheaf* $\mathcal{I}(\varphi) \subseteq \mathcal{O}_X$ is defined by

$$\mathcal{I}(\varphi)(U) := \{f \in \mathcal{O}_X(U) \mid |f|e^{-\varphi} \in L_{\text{loc}}^2(U)\}$$

for every open set $U \subseteq X$. Note that we set $|f(x)|e^{-\varphi(x)} = 0$ at points $x \in X$ where $f(x) = 0$ and $\varphi(x) = -\infty$. The sheaf $\mathcal{I}(\varphi)$ is a coherent ideal sheaf on X .

If now h is a singular metric on a holomorphic line bundle L on X whose curvature current $\Theta_h(L)$ is almost positive, then its associated global weight φ (with respect to some fixed smooth metric on L) is quasi-psh, and we define $\mathcal{I}(h) := \mathcal{I}(\varphi)$. This does not depend on the choice of the smooth metric on L .

Finally, if T is a closed almost positive $(1,1)$ -current on X , then any of its associated global potentials φ (see §2.4) is quasi-psh, and we define $\mathcal{I}(T) := \mathcal{I}(\varphi)$. This does not depend on the choice of φ . If $\nu(T, x) < 1$ at a point $x \in X$, then $\mathcal{I}(T)_x = \mathcal{O}_{X,x}$ by Skoda's lemma [Dem01, Lemma 5.6].

The following is a fundamental result, proved first in [GZ15, 3.3]; similar results with easier proofs are in [Lem17, Theorem 1.1] and [Hie14, Corollary 1.1 and Remark 1.4].

Theorem 2.8. *Let φ and $\{\varphi_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ be psh functions on an open set U of a complex manifold X . Assume that $\varphi_i \leq \varphi$ for all i , and that the sequence $\{\varphi_i\}$ converges to φ in $L_{\text{loc}}^1(X)$. Then for every $U' \Subset U$ there exists a positive integer i_0 such that $\mathcal{I}(\varphi_i)|_{U'} = \mathcal{I}(\varphi)|_{U'}$ for all $i \geq i_0$.*

We will need the following important result, Theorem 2.9. In order to state it, we need a piece of notation: Assume that T is a closed positive $(1,1)$ -current on a complex manifold X , which can be written as a sum

$$T = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \lambda_i D_i,$$

where $\lambda_i \geq 0$ for all i and each D_i is a prime divisor on X ; in other words, the residual part of the Siu decomposition of T is zero. Then $\lfloor T \rfloor$ denotes the closed positive $(1,1)$ -current

$$\lfloor T \rfloor := \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \lfloor \lambda_i \rfloor D_i.$$

Theorem 2.9. *Let X be a complex manifold.*

(a) *Let T_1 and T_2 be two closed almost positive $(1,1)$ -currents on X . Then*

$$\mathcal{I}(T_1 + T_2) \subseteq \mathcal{I}(T_1) \cdot \mathcal{I}(T_2).$$

- (b) Let T_1 and T_2 be two closed almost positive $(1, 1)$ -currents on X . If for $x \in X$ we have $\nu(T_1, x) = 0$, then

$$\mathcal{I}(T_1 + T_2)_x = \mathcal{I}(T_2)_x.$$

- (c) If G is an effective \mathbb{R} -divisor on X with simple normal crossings support, then

$$\mathcal{I}(G) = \mathcal{O}_X(-\lfloor G \rfloor).$$

- (d) If G is a closed positive $(1, 1)$ -current on X whose residual part is zero, then $\lfloor G \rfloor$ is a divisor on X and

$$\mathcal{I}(G) \subseteq \mathcal{O}_X(-\lfloor G \rfloor).$$

- (e) Let T be a closed almost positive $(1, 1)$ -current on X and let

$$T = R + D$$

be its Siu decomposition, where R is the residual part and D is the divisorial part. Then $\lfloor D \rfloor$ is a divisor on X , we have

$$\mathcal{I}(T) \subseteq \mathcal{O}_X(-\lfloor D \rfloor),$$

and this inclusion is an equality on a Zariski open subset U with the property that $\text{codim}_X(X \setminus U) \geq 2$.

Remark 2.10. Here and elsewhere in the paper, if D is an integral divisor on a complex manifold, then $\mathcal{O}_X(D)$ denotes the subsheaf of the sheaf of meromorphic functions on X whose divisor of zeroes and poles is precisely D . Thus, if D is effective, then $\mathcal{O}_X(-D)$ is the sheaf of germs of holomorphic functions on X which vanish along D ; in particular, we have $\mathcal{O}_X(-D) \subseteq \mathcal{O}_X$, and if D' is another integral divisor on X , then we have $\mathcal{O}_X(-D) \subseteq \mathcal{O}_X(-D')$ if and only if $D' \leq D$.

Proof of Theorem 2.9. Part (a) is [DEL00, Theorem 2.6(ii)], and part (b) is [LP20b, Lemma 2.14]. Part (c) is well known [Dem01, Remark 5.9].

For (d), first note that the closed positive $(1, 1)$ -current $G' := \lfloor G \rfloor$ is a divisor since the Lelong upperlevel set $E_1(G)$ is analytic. Then $G - G'$ is also a closed positive $(1, 1)$ -current on X , and by (a) we have

$$(1) \quad \mathcal{I}(G) \subseteq \mathcal{I}(G - G') \cdot \mathcal{I}(G') \subseteq \mathcal{I}(G').$$

Let V be the maximal Zariski open subset of X such that $G'|_V$ is a smooth divisor. Then $\text{codim}_X(X \setminus V) \geq 2$, and by (c) we have $\mathcal{I}(G')|_V = \mathcal{O}_V(-G')$. Since $\mathcal{I}(G')$ is torsion free and $\mathcal{O}_X(-G')$ is a line bundle, it follows that $\mathcal{I}(G') \subseteq \mathcal{O}_X(-G')$, which together with (1) implies (d).

Part (e) is [DP03, Proposition 3.2]; since the notation and context is slightly different, we provide the proof for the benefit of the reader. The current $D' := \lfloor D \rfloor$ is a divisor since $E_1(T)$ is an analytic subset of X . Then $T - D'$ is also a closed almost positive $(1, 1)$ -current on X , and by (a) and (d) we have

$$\mathcal{I}(T) \subseteq \mathcal{I}(T - D') \cdot \mathcal{I}(D') \subseteq \mathcal{I}(D') \subseteq \mathcal{O}_X(-D'),$$

which gives the second claim in (e).

Now we show the last claim in (e). If D_i are the components of D and if $D_{i,\text{sing}}$ is the singular locus of D_i for each i , set

$$Z := \bigcup_i D_{i,\text{sing}} \cup \bigcup_{k,\ell} (D_k \cap D_\ell) \cup \bigcup_{c>0} E_c(R).$$

Then Z is the union of at most countably many analytic subsets of X of codimension at least 2, and it suffices to show that

$$(2) \quad \mathcal{I}(T)_x = \mathcal{O}_X(-D')_x \quad \text{for all } x \in X \setminus Z,$$

since the locus in X where the coherent sheaves $\mathcal{I}(T)$ and $\mathcal{O}_X(-\lfloor D \rfloor)$ differ is an analytic subset of X . To that end, fix $x \in X \setminus Z$. Assume first that x does not belong to any component of D . Then $\nu(T, x) = 0$ by the definition of Z , hence by Skoda's lemma we have $\mathcal{I}(T)_x = \mathcal{O}_{X,x}$, and clearly also $\mathcal{O}_X(-\lfloor D \rfloor)_x = \mathcal{O}_{X,x}$, which shows (2) in this first case. Finally, assume that x belongs to a component Γ of D and set $R_1 := R + (D - \nu(T, \Gamma) \cdot \Gamma)$. Then by the definition of Z we have $\nu(R_1, x) = 0$, thus (b) and (c) yield

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}(T)_x &= \mathcal{I}(R_1 + \nu(T, \Gamma) \cdot \Gamma)_x = \mathcal{I}(\nu(T, \Gamma) \cdot \Gamma)_x \\ &= \mathcal{O}_X(-\lfloor \nu(T, \Gamma) \rfloor \cdot \Gamma)_x = \mathcal{O}_X(-D')_x, \end{aligned}$$

which gives (2) also in this second case, and finishes the proof. \square

We will also need the following consequence of the change of variables formula.

Lemma 2.11. *Let X be a complex manifold and let $f: Y \rightarrow X$ be a resolution of X . Let φ_1 and φ_2 be two quasi-psh functions on X such that $\mathcal{I}(\varphi_1) \subseteq \mathcal{I}(\varphi_2)$. If $A := K_Y - f^*K_X$, then*

$$\mathcal{I}(f^*\varphi_1) \otimes \mathcal{O}_X(-A) \subseteq \mathcal{I}(f^*\varphi_2).$$

Proof. This is [Cao14, Lemma 2.2]; note that there is a typo in that statement: the divisor E in op. cit. should be defined as $E = K_{\tilde{X}} - \pi^*K_X$. \square

2.12. Currents with analytic singularities. A closed almost positive $(1,1)$ -current T on a compact complex manifold X , and any of its global potentials φ , are said to have *analytic singularities* if there exist a coherent ideal sheaf \mathcal{I} and a constant $c > 0$ such that, locally on X , we have

$$\varphi = c \log(|f_1|^2 + \cdots + |f_k|^2) + u,$$

where u is smooth and f_1, \dots, f_k are local generators of \mathcal{I} . The current T is smooth outside of the co-support of \mathcal{I} . Now, if $\pi: Y \rightarrow X$ is a resolution of X which factors through the blowup of the scheme $V(\mathcal{I})$, there exists an effective divisor D on Y such that $\pi^{-1}\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{O}_Y(-D)$, and the Siu decomposition of π^*T has the form

$$\pi^*T = \theta + cD,$$

where θ is a smooth $(1,1)$ -form. If $T \geq \gamma$ for some smooth form γ , then $\theta \geq \pi^*\gamma$.

2.13. Currents with generalised analytic singularities. We need a generalisation of the concept of currents with analytic singularities introduced in [LP20b]. A closed almost positive $(1, 1)$ -current T on a compact complex manifold X , and any of its global potentials φ , are said to have *generalised analytic singularities* if there exists a resolution $\pi: Y \rightarrow X$ such that the Siu decomposition of π^*T has the form

$$\pi^*T = \Theta + D,$$

where Θ is a closed almost positive $(1, 1)$ -current whose all Lelong numbers are zero and D is an effective \mathbb{R} -divisor on Y . In that case we say that the current T *descends* to Y . If D is additionally a \mathbb{Q} -divisor, we say that T has *generalised algebraic singularities*.

Clearly, if a closed almost positive $(1, 1)$ -current has analytic singularities, then it has generalised analytic singularities.

Let $f: Z \rightarrow Y$ be a further resolution, and set $g := \pi \circ f$. Then the current $f^*\Theta$ has all Lelong numbers zero by Theorem 2.5, hence the Siu decomposition of g^*T has the form

$$g^*T = f^*\Theta + f^*D.$$

Thus, if f is a sufficiently high resolution, then we may assume that the support of the divisorial part f^*D has simple normal crossings.

2.14. Scalar products and norms. Let X be a complex manifold of dimension n with a hermitian metric ω , and L be a hermitian line bundle on X with a singular metric h . If u and v are L -valued (p, q) -forms with measurable coefficients, then $|u|_{h,\omega}$ denotes the pointwise norm on $\bigwedge^{p,q} T_X^* \otimes L$ induced by the hermitian metric on T_X whose fundamental form is ω and by h , $\langle u, v \rangle_{h,\omega}$ is the corresponding scalar product, and $dV_\omega := \omega^n/n!$ is the volume form associated to ω ; cf. [Hör65, p. 99]. Set

$$\langle\langle u, v \rangle\rangle_{h,\omega} := \int_X \langle u, v \rangle_{h,\omega} dV_\omega \quad \text{and} \quad \|u\|_{h,\omega} := \langle\langle u, u \rangle\rangle_{h,\omega}^{1/2}.$$

If $L_{p,q}^2(X, L)_{h,\omega}$ is the set of L -valued (p, q) -forms with measurable coefficients such that $\|u\|_{h,\omega} < \infty$, then $L_{p,q}^2(X, L)_{h,\omega}$ is a Hilbert space with the scalar product $\langle\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle\rangle_{h,\omega}$.

If σ is a global holomorphic section of the line bundle $\mathcal{O}_X(K_X) \otimes L$, then we may view it as a smooth L -valued $(n, 0)$ -form and we write $\|\sigma\|_{h,\omega}$ for the corresponding norm. If h_{K_X} is the smooth metric on $\mathcal{O}_X(K_X)$ induced by the hermitian metric on T_X whose fundamental form is ω , and if $g := h_{K_X}h$ is the induced metric on $\mathcal{O}_X(K_X) \otimes L$, then we also write $\|\sigma\|_g := \|\sigma\|_{h,\omega}$.

We will need the following remark in the proof of Theorem 13.1.

Remark 2.12. With notation as above, fix a smooth metric h_0 on the line bundle $\mathcal{O}_X(K_X) \otimes L$ and assume that $|\cdot|_{h,\omega} = |\cdot|_{h_0} e^{-\varphi}$, where φ is a locally integrable function on X which is bounded from above by a constant C .

Assume that there exists a coordinate ball $U \subseteq X$, an integrable function $\theta: U \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}$ and a section $s \in C^\infty(U, \mathcal{O}_X(K_X) \otimes L)$ such that

$$\int_U |s|_{h,\omega}^2 e^{-2\theta} dV_\omega < \infty,$$

but the function $e^{-2\theta}$ is not locally integrable around some point $x \in U$. Then we claim that $s(x) = 0$. Indeed, assume that $s(x) \neq 0$, and pick a small ball $x \in V \subseteq U$ such that $M := \min\{|s(x)|_{h_0} \mid x \in V\} > 0$. Then

$$Me^{-2C} \int_V e^{-2\theta} dV_\omega \leq \int_U |s|_{h_0}^2 e^{-2\varphi} e^{-2\theta} dV_\omega = \int_U |s|_{h,\omega}^2 e^{-2\theta} dV_\omega < \infty,$$

hence $\int_V e^{-2\theta} dV_\omega < \infty$, a contradiction which implies the claim.

2.15. Hörmander's estimates. We will need the following result which follows by expanding on the techniques of Hörmander L^2 estimates [Hör65, Hör90]. The most general result of this form is in [Dem82, Théorème 5.1 and Lemme 3.2], where it was proved for complete Kähler varieties; see also [Dem01, Corollary 5.3]. In this paper we only need it for projective manifolds, in which case the proof is much simpler, see [Dem92b, Theorem 3.1] or [Ber10, Lecture 5, Theorem 1.1]

Theorem 2.13. *Let X be a compact Kähler manifold with a Kähler form ω . Let L be a line bundle on X with a singular metric h such that $\Theta_h(L) \geq \varepsilon\omega$. Then for every form $v \in L_{p,q}^2(X, L)_{h,\omega}$ with $q \geq 1$ and $\bar{\partial}v = 0$ there exists a form $u \in L_{p,q-1}^2(X, L)_{h,\omega}$ such that*

$$\bar{\partial}u = v \quad \text{and} \quad \|u\|_{h,\omega}^2 \leq \frac{1}{2\pi q\varepsilon} \|v\|_{h,\omega}^2.$$

3. PRELIMINARIES: BIRATIONAL GEOMETRY

A *fibration* is a projective surjective morphism with connected fibres between two normal varieties.

We write $D \geq 0$ for an effective \mathbb{R} -divisor D on a normal variety X . If $f: X \rightarrow Y$ is a surjective morphism of normal varieties and if D is an \mathbb{R} -divisor on X , then D is *f-exceptional* if $\text{codim}_Y f(\text{Supp } D) \geq 2$.

If X is a normal projective variety and if D is an \mathbb{R} -Cartier \mathbb{R} -divisor on X , we denote $|D|_{\mathbb{R}} := \{D' \geq 0 \mid D' \sim_{\mathbb{R}} D\}$.

A *pair* (X, Δ) consists of a normal variety X and a Weil \mathbb{R} -divisor $\Delta \geq 0$ such that the divisor $K_X + \Delta$ is \mathbb{R} -Cartier. The standard reference for the foundational definitions and results on the singularities of pairs and the Minimal Model Program (MMP) is [KM98], and we use these freely in this paper. We recall additionally that flips for klt pairs exist by [BCHM10, Corollary 1.4.1]. We use the MMP with scaling of an ample (or just big) divisor as described in [BCHM10, Remark 3.10.10].

Remark 3.1. We will need the following observation in Section 10: if (X, Δ) is a \mathbb{Q} -factorial pair such that X is not uniruled, then $K_X + \Delta$ is pseudoeffective. Indeed, let $\pi: Y \rightarrow X$ be a resolution of X . Then Y is not uniruled, hence the divisor K_Y is pseudoeffective by [BDPP13, Corollary 0.3]. Then the divisor $K_X \sim_{\mathbb{R}} \pi_* K_Y$ is pseudoeffective, and the claim is immediate.

3.1. Models. We recall the definition of negative maps, of minimal models and of good minimal models.

Definition 3.2. Let X and Y be \mathbb{Q} -factorial varieties, and let D be an \mathbb{R} -divisor on X . A birational contraction $f: X \dashrightarrow Y$ is *D -non-positive* (respectively *D -negative*) if there exists a resolution $(p, q): W \rightarrow X \times Y$ of the map f such that

$$p^*D \sim_{\mathbb{R}} q^*f_*D + E,$$

where $E \geq 0$ is a q -exceptional \mathbb{R} -divisor (respectively, $E \geq 0$ is a q -exceptional \mathbb{R} -divisor and $\text{Supp } E$ contains the proper transform of every f -exceptional divisor).

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & W & \\ p \swarrow & & \searrow q \\ X & \overset{f}{\dashrightarrow} & Y \end{array}$$

If f is D -negative and additionally f_*D is nef, the map f is a *minimal model* for D . If moreover f_*D is semiample, the map f is a *good minimal model* for D , or simply a *good model* for D .

We use these notions almost exclusively for divisors of the form $D = K_X + \Delta$, where (X, Δ) is a klt pair. Then we talk of minimal and good models of a klt pair (X, Δ) .

Note that if (X, Δ) is a klt pair, then it has a good model if and only if there exists a Minimal Model Program with scaling of an ample divisor which terminates with a good model of (X, Δ) ; this follows from the proof of [Laz24, Lemma 2.1].

3.2. Nakayama–Zariski and Boucksom–Zariski functions. There are two ways to assign asymptotic functions to pseudoeffective classes: the algebraic construction from [Nak04] and the analytic construction from [Bou04]. They coincide on projective manifolds, but we will need both constructions in this paper.

Let X be a \mathbb{Q} -factorial projective variety and let Γ be a prime divisor on X . Nakayama [Nak04] defined σ_{Γ} -*functions* on the pseudoeffective cone of X ; this was originally done when X is smooth, but the definition works well in the \mathbb{Q} -factorial setting [LX23, Lemma 2.12]. We explain briefly their construction. If D is a big \mathbb{R} -divisor on X , set

$$\sigma_{\Gamma}(D) := \inf\{\text{mult}_{\Gamma} \Delta \mid 0 \leq \Delta \sim_{\mathbb{R}} D\};$$

and if D is a pseudoeffective \mathbb{R} -divisor on X and A is an ample \mathbb{R} -divisor on X , define

$$\sigma_{\Gamma}(D) := \lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \sigma_{\Gamma}(D + \varepsilon A);$$

this does not depend on the choice of A and is compatible with the definition above for big divisors. Moreover, $\sigma_{\Gamma}(D)$ only depends on the numerical class of D , hence σ_{Γ} is well-defined on the pseudoeffective cone of X . Each function σ_{Γ} is homogeneous of degree 1, convex and lower semicontinuous on the cone of pseudoeffective divisors on X , and it is continuous on the cone of big divisors on X .

Set

$$N_{\sigma}(D) := \sum_{\Gamma} \sigma_{\Gamma}(D) \cdot \Gamma \quad \text{and} \quad P_{\sigma} := D - N_{\sigma}(D),$$

where the formal sum runs through all prime divisors Γ on X . Both $N_{\sigma}(D)$ and $P_{\sigma}(D)$ are \mathbb{R} -divisors on X , and the decomposition $D = P_{\sigma}(D) + N_{\sigma}(D)$ is the *Nakayama–Zariski decomposition* of D .

If X is a compact Kähler manifold and if Γ is an analytic prime divisor on X , Boucksom [Bou04] defined $\nu(\cdot, \Gamma)$ -*functions* on the cone of pseudoeffective classes in $H^{1,1}(X, \mathbb{R})$, and he showed that they coincide with Nakayama's σ_{Γ} -functions when one considers algebraic classes. To avoid possible confusion with Lelong numbers, we will denote these Boucksom's functions also by σ_{Γ} . We explain briefly their construction, adopting for the moment the concept of currents with minimal singularities which will be dealt with in detail in Section 5.

Let α be a pseudoeffective class in $H^{1,1}(X, \mathbb{R})$. After fixing a reference Kähler form ω , and if $T_{\min, \varepsilon}$ is a current with minimal singularities in the class $\alpha + \varepsilon\{\omega\}$ for a positive real number ε , set

$$\sigma_{\Gamma}(\alpha) := \inf_{x \in \Gamma} \sup_{\varepsilon > 0} \nu(T_{\min, \varepsilon}, x);$$

this does not depend on the choice of ω , and one has $\sigma_{\Gamma}(\alpha) = \nu(T_{\min}, \Gamma)$ when α is a big class and $T_{\min} \in \alpha$ is a current with minimal singularities.

Remark 3.3. Even though the notation is slightly different, the definition above is equivalent to that from [Bou04]. We explain this briefly now. If α is a class in $H^{1,1}(X, \mathbb{R})$ and if ω is a Kähler form on X , then [Bou04, §2.8] introduces $\alpha[\gamma]$ as the set of closed almost positive $(1, 1)$ -currents $T \in \alpha$ such that $T \geq \gamma$. Then [Bou04, §3.1] defines

$$\sigma_{\Gamma}(\alpha) := \inf_{x \in \Gamma} \sup_{\varepsilon > 0} \nu(\tilde{T}_{\min, \varepsilon}, x),$$

where for each $\varepsilon > 0$, $\tilde{T}_{\min, \varepsilon}$ is the current with minimal singularities in $\alpha[-\varepsilon\omega]$; this is defined analogously as for pseudoeffective classes in Section 5. Now, since ω is closed, one shows easily that $T_{\min, \varepsilon} = \tilde{T}_{\min, \varepsilon} + \varepsilon\omega$, which yields that the definition from [Bou04] is equivalent to the one given in this paper.

The following lemma is well known and we include the proof for completeness.

Lemma 3.4. *Let (X, Δ) be a projective log canonical pair such that $K_X + \Delta$ is pseudoeffective, Δ is a \mathbb{Q} -divisor and such that (X, Δ) has a minimal model. If $f: Y \rightarrow X$ is a resolution, then $N_\sigma(f^*(K_X + \Delta))$ is a \mathbb{Q} -divisor.*

Proof. Let $\varphi: (X, \Delta) \dashrightarrow (X', \Delta')$ be a minimal model of (X, Δ) and let $(p, q): W \rightarrow X \times X'$ be a resolution of indeterminacies of φ such that W is smooth. We may assume that p factors through f ; let $w: W \rightarrow Y$ be the resulting map.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} Y & \xleftarrow{w} & W \\ f \downarrow & \swarrow p & \searrow q \\ X & \dashrightarrow \varphi & X' \end{array}$$

Then there exists an effective q -exceptional \mathbb{Q} -divisor E on W such that

$$p^*(K_X + \Delta) \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} q^*(K_{X'} + \Delta') + E.$$

Then $N_\sigma(p^*(K_X + \Delta)) = N_\sigma(q^*(K_{X'} + \Delta')) + E = E$ by [LP20a, Lemma 2.4], hence by [LX23, Lemma 2.13] we have

$$N_\sigma(f^*(K_X + \Delta)) = w_*N_\sigma(p^*(K_X + \Delta)) = w_*E,$$

which proves the lemma. \square

3.3. Stable, diminished and augmented base loci. A good reference for basic results on the *asymptotic base loci* treated in this subsection is [ELM⁺06], see also [TX23, Section 2].

If X is a normal projective variety and if D is a pseudoeffective \mathbb{R} -Cartier \mathbb{R} -divisor on X , the *stable base locus* of D is

$$\mathbf{B}(D) := \bigcap_{D' \in |D|_{\mathbb{R}}} \text{Supp } D';$$

this is a closed subset of X .

Remark 3.5. If D is a \mathbb{Q} -divisor, by [BCHM10, Lemma 3.5.3] this is equivalent to saying that $\mathbf{B}(D) = \bigcap_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \text{Bs } |kD|$, hence by [Laz04, Proposition 2.1.21]

we have $\mathbf{B}(D) = \text{Bs } |kD|$ for all k sufficiently divisible.

The *diminished base locus* of D is

$$\mathbf{B}_-(D) := \bigcup_{A \text{ ample on } X} \mathbf{B}(D + A);$$

this only depends on the numerical equivalence class of D and is a countable union of closed subsets of X . If X is additionally \mathbb{Q} -factorial, then $N_\sigma(D)$ is the divisorial part of $\mathbf{B}_-(D)$, see [LX23, Lemma 2.17]. This locus is sometimes called the *non-nef locus* of D ; we use both names for this locus interchangeably.

The *augmented base locus* of D is

$$\mathbf{B}_+(D) := \bigcap_{A \text{ ample on } X} \mathbf{B}(D - A);$$

it only depends on the numerical equivalence class of D and is a closed subset of X . This locus is sometimes called the *non-ample locus* of D ; we use both names for this locus interchangeably.

Remark 3.6. We have

$$(3) \quad \mathbf{B}_-(D) \subseteq \mathbf{B}(D) \subseteq \mathbf{B}_+(D).$$

Further, by [ELM⁺06, Proposition 1.5] we have $\mathbf{B}(D)_+ = \mathbf{B}(D - A)$ for any ample \mathbb{R} -divisor A whose numerical class is of sufficiently small norm. From this it is easy to deduce that D is ample if and only if $\mathbf{B}_+(D) = \emptyset$. By [ELM⁺06, Lemma 1.14] we have

$$\mathbf{B}_-(D) = \bigcup_{A \text{ ample on } X} \mathbf{B}_+(D + A).$$

3.4. Finite generation. We review now several facts about finitely generated multigraded rings and the existence of minimal models, which will be used in Section 12.

If X is a normal projective variety and if D is a \mathbb{Q} -Cartier \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X , we define the global sections of D by

$$H^0(X, D) = \{f \in k(X) \mid \operatorname{div} f + D \geq 0\};$$

note that clearly $H^0(X, D) = H^0(X, \lfloor D \rfloor)$. If D_1, \dots, D_r are \mathbb{Q} -Cartier \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X , we define the corresponding *divisorial ring* as

$$\mathfrak{R} := R(X; D_1, \dots, D_r) := \bigoplus_{(n_1, \dots, n_r) \in \mathbb{N}^r} H^0(X, n_1 D_1 + \dots + n_r D_r).$$

The *support* of \mathfrak{R} , denoted by $\operatorname{Supp} \mathfrak{R}$, is the convex hull of all integral divisors D in the cone $\sum_{i=1}^r \mathbb{R}_+ D_i \subseteq \operatorname{Div}_{\mathbb{R}}(X)$ such that $H^0(X, D) \neq 0$.

The following result gives the most important example of a finitely generated divisorial ring. The first part of Theorem 3.7 was proved in [BCHM10, Corollary 1.1.9] and [CL12, Theorem A]; see also [CL13, Theorem 2] and Remark 3.8 for the formulation we adopt in this paper. The second part is a special case of [KKL16, Theorem 5.4], and can be also deduced from [BCHM10, Theorem F].

Theorem 3.7. *Let X be a \mathbb{Q} -factorial projective variety and let Δ_i be \mathbb{Q} -divisors on X such that each pair (X, Δ_i) is klt for $i = 1, \dots, r$. Assume that for each i that Δ_i is big or that $K_X + \Delta_i$ is big. Then the ring*

$$\mathfrak{R} = R(X; K_X + \Delta_1, \dots, K_X + \Delta_r)$$

is finitely generated. Moreover, $\operatorname{Supp} \mathfrak{R}$ is a rational polyhedral cone and there is a finite rational polyhedral subdivision $\operatorname{Supp} \mathfrak{R} = \bigcup C_k$ with the property that for each k there exist a \mathbb{Q} -factorial projective variety X_k and a

birational contraction $\varphi_k: X \dashrightarrow X_k$ such that φ_k is a minimal model for every klt pair (X, B_k) with $K_X + B_k \in \mathcal{C}_k$.

Remark 3.8. Even though the formulation is slightly different, Theorem 3.7 follows easily from [CL13, Theorem 2]. Indeed, without loss of generality we may assume that $K_X + \Delta_i$ are big for $i \leq k$ and that Δ_i are big for $i > k$. For each $i \leq k$ let E_i be an effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor such that $K_X + \Delta_i \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} E_i$, and pick a rational number $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $(X, \Delta_i + \varepsilon E_i)$ is klt for each $i \leq k$. Then by [CL13, Theorem 2] the ring

$$R(X; K_X + \Delta_1 + \varepsilon E_1, \dots, K_X + \Delta_k + \varepsilon E_k, K_X + \Delta_{k+1}, \dots, K_X + \Delta_r).$$

Since $K_X + \Delta_i + \varepsilon E_i \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} (1 + \varepsilon)(K_X + \Delta_i)$ for $i \leq k$, the ring \mathfrak{R} is finitely generated by [CL12, Lemma 2.25].

4. AUXILIARY RESULTS

4.1. (Pluri)subharmonic functions. In this paper we need very precise properties of (pluri)subharmonic functions. We start with the following easy lemma.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{C}^n$ be a domain, let $x \in \Omega$ and let $f: \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}$ be an upper semicontinuous function. Let $\{a_m\}$ and $\{b_m\}$ be sequences of positive real numbers such that $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} a_m = 1$ and $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} b_m = 0$, and denote $c_m := \sup_{B(x, 1/m)} f$. Then:*

- (a) $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} a_m c_m \leq f(x)$,
- (b) $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} b_m c_m \leq 0$,
- (c) if f is subharmonic, then $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} a_m c_m = f(x)$,
- (d) if f is psh, then $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{m} c_m = 0$.

Proof. Note that the sequence $\{c_m\}$ is decreasing, hence converging to a value in $\mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}$. Therefore,

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} a_m c_m = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} c_m = \limsup_{x' \rightarrow x} f(x') \leq f(x),$$

which shows (a). When f is subharmonic, then the last inequality is an equality by Lemma 2.2(a), which gives (c).

If $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} c_m \in \mathbb{R}$, then $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} b_m c_m = 0$; otherwise we have $c_m < 0$ for all $m \gg 0$, thus (b) follows.

For (d), note that

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{c_m}{m} = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{c_m}{\log m} \frac{\log m}{m}.$$

Since $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{c_m}{-\log m} = \nu(f, x)$ and $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log m}{m} = 0$, the claim follows. \square

The following two approximation results are much deeper, and they will be crucial in Part IV.

Lemma 4.2. *Let X be a complex manifold and let α be a continuous $(1, 1)$ -form on X . Let $\{\varphi_n\}$ be a sequence of α -psh functions which are locally uniformly bounded from above and which converge in $L^1_{\text{loc}}(X)$ to a function $\varphi \in \text{PSH}(X, \alpha)$. Then for every sequence of points $\{x_n\}$ in X which converges to a point $x \in X$ we have*

$$\varphi(x) \geq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varphi_n(x_n).$$

Proof. Set $a := \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varphi_n(x_n)$. Then by passing to subsequences of $\{\varphi_n\}$ and $\{x_n\}$ we may assume that φ_n converges to φ almost everywhere and

$$a = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varphi_n(x_n).$$

As in the proof of Theorem 2.4(a), locally around x there exists a smooth closed form $\omega \geq \alpha$. By replacing α by ω and X by a small neighbourhood around x , we may assume that α is smooth and closed.

Fix a small coordinate ball $B(x, 2r)$ in X such that the functions φ_n are uniformly bounded from above on $B(x, 2r)$ and let θ be a smooth potential of α on $B(x, 2r)$. Then the functions $\theta + \varphi$ and all $\theta + \varphi_n$ are psh on $B(x, 2r)$. We may assume that $x_n \in B(x, r)$, so that $B(x_n, r) \subseteq B(x, 2r)$, and let χ_A denote the characteristic function of a set $A \subseteq B(x, 2r)$. Then the sequence $\{e^{\theta + \varphi_n} \chi_{B(x_n, r)}\}$ is uniformly bounded from above on $B(x, 2r)$, and converges almost everywhere to $e^{\theta + \varphi} \chi_{B(x, r)}$, hence by Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem and by the mean value inequality we have

$$(4) \quad \begin{aligned} \int_{B(x, r)} e^{\theta + \varphi} dV_\omega &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{B(x_n, r)} e^{\theta + \varphi_n} dV_\omega \\ &\geq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} e^{\theta(x_n) + \varphi_n(x_n)} = e^{\theta(x) + a}. \end{aligned}$$

By letting $r \rightarrow 0$ in (4) we conclude by Lemma 2.2(b) that

$$e^{\theta(x) + \varphi(x)} \geq e^{\theta(x) + a},$$

which gives the desired inequality. \square

Lemma 4.3. *Let φ be a subharmonic function on a domain $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{C}^n$ and let $A \subseteq \Omega$ be a set of Lebesgue measure zero such that $\Omega \setminus A$ is dense in Ω . Then there exists a countable set $D \subseteq \Omega \setminus A$ which is dense in Ω , such that for every $z \in \Omega$ there exists a sequence $\{z_q\}$ in D with*

$$\lim_{q \rightarrow \infty} z_q = z \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{q \rightarrow \infty} \varphi(z_q) = \varphi(z).$$

Proof. Denote by $\|\cdot\|$ the euclidean norm on \mathbb{C}^n . Set

$$\mathcal{C} := \{(y, r) \in \mathbb{Q}^{2n} \times \mathbb{Q} \mid B(y, 2r) \subseteq \Omega\},$$

where we view \mathbb{Q}^{2n} as a subset of \mathbb{C}^n . For each $(y, r) \in \mathcal{C}$, let $\tilde{z}_{y,r}$ be a point in $\overline{B(y, r)}$ such that $\varphi(\tilde{z}_{y,r}) = \max(\varphi|_{\overline{B(y, r)}})$. Then by applying Lemma 2.2(a) to the point $\tilde{z}_{y,r}$ we obtain that there exists a point

$$(5) \quad z_{y,r} \in (\Omega \setminus A) \cap B(y, 2r)$$

such that

$$(6) \quad \varphi(z_{y,r}) \geq \varphi(\tilde{z}_{y,r}) - r = \max(\varphi|_{\overline{B(y,r)}}) - r.$$

Then we claim that the countable set

$$D := \{z_{y,r} \mid (y,r) \in \mathcal{C}\} \subseteq \Omega \setminus A$$

is dense in Ω . Indeed, consider a point $w \in \Omega$. Let m_0 be a positive integer such that $B(w, 2^{-m_0}) \subseteq \Omega$, and for each $m \geq m_0$ pick points

$$w_m \in \mathbb{Q}^{2n} \cap B(w, 2^{-m-1}).$$

Then $(w_m, 2^{-m-2}) \in \mathcal{C}$ by the definition of \mathcal{C} , hence

$$z_{w_m, 2^{-m-2}} \in B(w_m, 2^{-m-1}) \cap D$$

by (5) and by the definition of D . Therefore, $z_{w_m, 2^{-m-2}} \in B(w, 2^{-m})$ for any $m \geq m_0$, which proves that D is dense in Ω .

Now, fix $z \in \Omega$. To finish the proof it suffices to show that for each $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists

$$z' \in D \cap B(z, \varepsilon) \quad \text{with} \quad |\varphi(z) - \varphi(z')| < \varepsilon.$$

Assume otherwise. Then there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $B(z, \varepsilon) \subseteq \Omega$ and such that for all $z' \in D \cap B(z, \varepsilon)$ we have $|\varphi(z) - \varphi(z')| \geq \varepsilon$. By Lemma 2.2(a), this implies that there exists a rational number $0 < \delta \leq \varepsilon/3$ such that

$$(7) \quad \text{for all } z' \in D \cap B(z, 3\delta) \text{ we have } \varphi(z') \leq \varphi(z) - \varepsilon.$$

Pick a point $z_0 \in \mathbb{Q}^{2n} \cap B(z, \delta)$. Then the point $z_{z_0, \delta} \in D \cap B(z_0, 2\delta)$ constructed as above belongs to $D \cap B(z, 3\delta)$, and by (6) we have

$$\varphi(z_{z_0, \delta}) \geq \max(\varphi|_{\overline{B(z_0, \delta)}}) - \delta \geq \varphi(z) - \delta,$$

which contradicts (7). This concludes the proof. \square

We will, in fact, need the following global version of the previous lemma, which follows from Lemma 4.3 by compactness.

Corollary 4.4. *Let φ be a quasi-psh function on a compact complex manifold X and let $A \subseteq X$ be a set of Lebesgue measure zero such that $X \setminus A$ is dense in X . Then there exists a countable set $D \subseteq X \setminus A$ which is dense in X , such that for every $z \in X$ there exists a sequence $\{z_q\}$ in D with*

$$\lim_{q \rightarrow \infty} z_q = z \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{q \rightarrow \infty} \varphi(z_q) = \varphi(z).$$

4.2. Estimates of sections of line bundles. The following two lemmas will be essential in Part IV.

Lemma 4.5. *Let $U \subseteq \mathbb{C}^n$ be a domain and let $\{L_j\}_{j \in J}$ be a collection of \mathbb{Q} -divisors on U . For each $j \in J$, let h_j be a smooth metric on L_j with the associated curvature Θ_j , and assume that the $(1,1)$ -forms Θ_j are uniformly bounded on U . Then for each $x \in X$ there exist constants $C > 0$ and $r_0 > 0$ such that for every ball $B(x, r) \subseteq U$ with $r \leq r_0$ and for each $\sigma \in H^0(B(x, r), mL_j)$ with $j \in J$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that mL_j is Cartier,*

(a) *the function*

$$\log |\sigma(z)|_{h_j^m} + mC|z - x|^2$$

is psh on $B(x, r)$, and

(b) *we have*

$$|\sigma(x)|_{h_j^m}^2 \leq e^{2mCr^2} \int_{B(x,r)} |\sigma|_{h_j^m}^2 dV_\omega.$$

Proof. Fix $x \in X$. By the proof of Lemma 2.1 applied to the standard Kähler metric on \mathbb{C}^n , there exist constants $C > 0$ and $r_0 > 0$ such that $-\Theta_j + Cdd^c|z - x|^2 \geq 0$ on $B(x, r_0)$ for all $j \in J$. For $j \in J$, for $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that mL_j is Cartier, for $r \leq r_0$ and for $\sigma \in H^0(B(x, r), mL_j)$ we have $m\Theta_j + dd^c \log |\sigma|_{h_j^m} \geq 0$ on $B(x, r)$ by Example 2.6(b), hence

$$dd^c \log |\sigma|_{h_j^m} + mCdd^c|z - x|^2 \geq 0 \quad \text{on } B(x, r).$$

This shows (a).

Now, for each $j \in J$ consider the smooth metric $g_j := h_j e^{C|z-x|^2}$ on $L_j|_{B(x, r_0)}$. Since

$$|\sigma|_{g_j^m}^2 = e^{2 \log |\sigma|_{h_j^m} + 2mC|z-x|^2},$$

the function $|\sigma|_{g_j^m}^2$ is psh on $B(x, r)$ by (a) and by Example 2.6(d), hence the mean value inequality at the point x gives

$$|\sigma(x)|_{h_j^m}^2 = |\sigma(x)|_{g_j^m}^2 \leq \int_{B(x,r)} |\sigma|_{g_j^m}^2 dV_\omega \leq e^{2mCr^2} \int_{B(x,r)} |\sigma|_{h_j^m}^2 dV_\omega,$$

which finishes the proof. \square

Lemma 4.6. *Let X be a complex compact manifold and let L be a line bundle on X with a continuous metric h . Let $V \subseteq H^0(X, L)$ be a compact subset with respect to a norm $\|\cdot\|$ on $H^0(X, L)$. Consider sections $\{\sigma_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ in V such that $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \sigma_j = \sigma_0$ in the norm $\|\cdot\|$. Then the following holds.*

- (a) *The sections σ_j converge uniformly to σ_0 in the metric h , i.e. for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a positive integer N such that $|\sigma_0(z) - \sigma_j(z)|_h \leq \varepsilon$ for all $j \geq N$ and all $z \in X$.*
- (b) *For any sequence of points $\{x_j\}$ in X such that $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} x_j = x_0$ we have*

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} |\sigma_j(x_j)|_h = |\sigma_0(x_0)|_h.$$

Proof. Fix a basis e_1, \dots, e_n of $H^0(X, L)$, and write

$$\sigma_j = \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_{j,i} e_i \quad \text{for some } \alpha_{j,i} \in \mathbb{C}.$$

Then $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_{j,i} = \alpha_{0,i}$ by assumption. Fix $\varepsilon > 0$. Then, by the continuity of h , for each $z_0 \in X$ there exists $r_{z_0} > 0$ and a positive integer N_{z_0} such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^n |\alpha_{0,i} - \alpha_{j,i}| \cdot |e_i(z)|_h \leq \varepsilon$$

for all $j \geq N_{z_0}$ and $z \in B(z_0, r_{z_0})$, hence the triangle inequality gives

$$(8) \quad |\sigma_0(z) - \sigma_j(z)|_h \leq \varepsilon$$

for all $j \geq N_{z_0}$ and $z \in B(z_0, r_{z_0})$. By compactness we can find finitely many points $z_1, \dots, z_k \in X$ such that the balls $B(z_i, r_{z_i})$ cover X . If we set $N := \max\{N_{z_i} \mid 1 \leq i \leq k\}$, then $|\sigma_0(z) - \sigma_j(z)|_h \leq \varepsilon$ for all $j \geq N$ and all $z \in X$ by (8), which shows (a).

To show (b), fix $\varepsilon > 0$. Then there exists a positive integer N_1 such that

$$\left| |\sigma_0(x_0)|_h - |\sigma_0(x_j)|_h \right| \leq \varepsilon \quad \text{for all } j \geq N_1$$

On the other hand, by (a) there exists a positive integer N_2 such that $|\sigma_0(z) - \sigma_j(z)|_h \leq \varepsilon$ for all $j \geq N_2$ and all $z \in X$. In particular,

$$\left| |\sigma_0(x_j)|_h - |\sigma_j(x_j)|_h \right| \leq |\sigma_0(x_j) - \sigma_j(x_j)|_h \leq \varepsilon \quad \text{for every } j \geq N_2.$$

Therefore, for all $j \geq \max\{N_1, N_2\}$ we have

$$\left| |\sigma_0(x_0)|_h - |\sigma_j(x_j)|_h \right| \leq 2\varepsilon,$$

which finishes the proof. \square

4.3. Special quasi-psh functions. The following results construct particular quasi-psh functions which will be needed in Part IV.

Lemma 4.7. *Let X be a smooth projective variety and let D be a pseudo-effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X . Let A be an ample \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X , let $\omega \in \{A\}$ be a positive smooth form and let $\alpha \in \{D + A\}$ be a smooth form. Then for each rational number $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ there exists a quasi-psh function ψ_ε on X which has logarithmic singularities with poles along $\mathbf{B}(D + \varepsilon A)$ such that*

$$\alpha + dd^c \psi_\varepsilon \geq (1 - \varepsilon)\omega.$$

Proof. Fix a rational number $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, let h be a smooth metric on D such that $\Theta_h(D) = \alpha - \omega \in \{D\}$, and let h_A be the smooth metric on A such that $\omega = \Theta_{h_A}(A)$. The \mathbb{Q} -divisor $D + \varepsilon A$ is big, hence by Remark 3.5 there exists a positive integer m such that

$$\mathbf{B}(D + \varepsilon A) = \text{Bs } |m(D + \varepsilon A)|.$$

Let $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_k$ be a basis of the vector space $H^0(X, m(D + \varepsilon A))$, and set

$$\psi_\varepsilon = \frac{1}{2m} \log \sum_{i=1}^k |\sigma_i|_{h^m h_A^{m\varepsilon}}^2.$$

Then $(\alpha - \omega) + \varepsilon\omega + dd^c\psi_\varepsilon \geq 0$ by Example 2.6(b) and ψ_ε clearly has poles along $\text{Bs}|m(D + \varepsilon A)|$. This concludes the proof. \square

Corollary 4.8. *Let X be a smooth projective variety with a Kähler form ω , let D be a big \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X and let $\alpha \in \{D\}$ be a smooth form. Then there exists a rational number $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ and a quasi-psh function ψ on X which has logarithmic singularities with poles along $\mathbf{B}_+(D)$ such that*

$$\alpha + dd^c\psi \geq \varepsilon\omega.$$

Proof. Let A be an ample \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X such that the \mathbb{Q} -divisor $D - A$ is big, and let $\omega' \in \{A\}$ be a positive smooth form. Then by Lemma 2.1 there exists a positive constant C such that $C\omega' \geq \omega$, hence by replacing ω by ω' , we may assume that $\omega \in \{A\}$.

By Remark 3.6 there exists a rational number $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$\mathbf{B}_+(D) = \mathbf{B}(D - \varepsilon A) = \mathbf{B}((D - A) + (1 - \varepsilon)A).$$

Then the result follows from Lemma 4.7 applied to the \mathbb{Q} -divisor $D - A$, the ample \mathbb{Q} -divisor A and the rational number $1 - \varepsilon$. \square

Part II. Currents with minimal singularities

5. SINGULARITIES OF CURRENTS

In this section X is always a compact complex manifold. Good sources for the foundational material on currents with minimal singularities are [DPS01, Bou04].

5.1. Comparison of singularities. Let φ_1 and φ_2 be quasi-psh functions on a compact complex manifold X . We say that φ_1 is *less singular* than φ_2 , and write $\varphi_1 \preceq \varphi_2$, if there exists a constant C such that $\varphi_2 \leq \varphi_1 + C$. We denote by $\varphi_1 \approx \varphi_2$ the induced equivalence relation, i.e. we say that φ_1 and φ_2 have *equivalent singularities* if $\varphi_1 \preceq \varphi_2 \preceq \varphi_1$.

If T_1 and T_2 are two closed almost positive $(1,1)$ -currents on X with corresponding global potentials φ_1 and φ_2 , we say that T_1 is *less singular* than T_2 , and write $T_1 \preceq T_2$, if $\varphi_1 \preceq \varphi_2$; and similarly for $T_1 \approx T_2$. This does not depend on the choice of global potentials. It is immediate that any two closed almost positive $(1,1)$ -currents with equivalent singularities have the same Lelong numbers.

Remark 5.1. The relation \preceq behaves well with respect to multiplication by positive constants and sums of currents. More precisely, let φ_1, φ_2 and φ_3 be quasi-psh functions on a compact complex manifold X and let λ be a positive real number. If $\varphi_1 \preceq \varphi_2$, then it follows immediately that $\lambda\varphi_1 \preceq \lambda\varphi_2$ and $\varphi_1 + \varphi_3 \preceq \varphi_2 + \varphi_3$. Conversely, if $\varphi_1 + \varphi_3 \preceq \varphi_2 + \varphi_3$, then $\varphi_1 \preceq \varphi_2$: this is clear away from the pole set $\{\varphi_1 + \varphi_2 + \varphi_3 = -\infty\}$, hence it holds everywhere on X by Corollary 2.3. Similar statements hold for currents, and are proved by considering their global potentials.

Now, let φ_1 and φ_2 be quasi-psh functions on a compact complex manifold X such that $\varphi_1 \preceq \varphi_2$. Then it is immediate to check that

$$\mathcal{I}(\varphi_2) \subseteq \mathcal{I}(\varphi_1).$$

In particular, if φ_1 and φ_2 have equivalent singularities, then they have the same multiplier ideal.

5.2. Minimal singularities. Let α be a closed real continuous $(1,1)$ -form on X whose class $\{\alpha\} \in H_{BC}^{1,1}(X, \mathbb{R})$ is pseudoeffective. A minimal element $\varphi_{\min} \in \text{PSH}(X, \alpha)$ with respect to the relation \preceq is called a *global potential with minimal singularities in $\text{PSH}(X, \alpha)$* , and the corresponding current

$$T_{\min} = \alpha + dd^c \varphi_{\min}$$

is a *current with minimal singularities in $\{\alpha\}$* ; such a global potential and a current always exist by the next paragraph. Note that $T_{\min} \in \{\alpha\}$ is unique up to equivalence of singularities, but is in general not unique, see [LX24, Proposition 5.2]. One checks immediately that for each point $x \in X$ we have

$$(9) \quad \nu(T_{\min}, x) = \min_{T \in \alpha} \nu(T, x).$$

It is also clear by Remark 5.1 that for each positive number λ , the current λT_{\min} has minimal singularities in the class $\{\lambda\alpha\}$. By §5.1, all currents with minimal singularities in a fixed cohomology class have the same multiplier ideal.

To show the existence of global potentials with minimal singularities, following the notation from [GZ05, BEGZ10] we consider the upper envelope

$$V_\alpha = \sup \{ \varphi \in \text{PSH}(X, \alpha) \mid \sup_X \varphi = 0 \}.$$

The function V_α is again α -psh. Indeed, by Theorem 2.4(a) we have $V_\alpha^* \in \text{PSH}(X, \alpha)$, and clearly $V_\alpha \leq V_\alpha^*$ by the definition of upper semicontinuous regularisations. But then

$$V_\alpha^* \in \{ \varphi \in \text{PSH}(X, \alpha) \mid \sup_X \varphi = 0 \},$$

hence $V_\alpha^* \leq V_\alpha$ by the definition of V_α . Thus, $V_\alpha = V_\alpha^*$.

The functions V_α are good for showing some existence results, such as the one above, and they have good regularity properties on the non-ample locus when α is a big class, see [DNT21] and the references therein. However, they seem to be too general to be useful in birational geometry. That is the reason why we will consider different global potentials with minimal singularities in this paper: *supercanonical potentials*, studied in Section 6.

The main reason why functions V_α are useful is that, as showed above, they themselves belong to the envelope $\{ \varphi \in \text{PSH}(X, \alpha) \mid \sup_X \varphi = 0 \}$ (supercanonical potentials do not satisfy this property and this is one of the main issues in dealing with them). To demonstrate how this is used in practice, we prove the following result noted already in [BEGZ10, Lemma 5.2].

Lemma 5.2. *Let X be a compact Kähler manifold with a Kähler form ω , and let α be a real continuous $(1, 1)$ -form on X whose class $\{\alpha\} \in H^{1,1}(X, \mathbb{R})$ is pseudoeffective. Denote $\alpha_t := \alpha + t\omega$ for $t \geq 0$. Then the functions V_{α_t} decrease pointwise to V_α as $t \rightarrow 0$. In particular, the positive currents $\alpha_t + dd^c V_{\alpha_t}$ converge weakly to $\alpha + dd^c V_\alpha$ as $t \rightarrow 0$, and for real numbers $0 \leq t_1 \leq t_2$ we have $\mathcal{I}(V_{\alpha_{t_1}}) \subseteq \mathcal{I}(V_{\alpha_{t_2}})$.*

Proof. Since $\omega \geq 0$, we have $V_{\alpha_{t'}} \in \{ \varphi \in \text{PSH}(X, \alpha_t) \mid \sup_X \varphi = 0 \}$ when $t' \leq t$, hence $V_{\alpha_{t'}} \leq V_{\alpha_t}$ by the definition of V_{α_t} ; this also shows the statement on multiplier ideals in the lemma. Therefore, the limit $V_0 := \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} V_{\alpha_t}$ exists and clearly $V_\alpha \leq V_0 \leq 0$. Further, by Theorem 2.4(e) we have $V_0 \in \text{PSH}(X, \alpha)$ and the functions V_{α_t} converge to V_0 in $L^1_{\text{loc}}(X)$. Thus, $V_0 \leq V_\alpha$ by the definition of V_α , and so $V_0 = V_\alpha$, as desired. \square

5.3. Minimal singularities under pullbacks and sums. Currents with minimal singularities are stable under pullback:

Proposition 5.3. *Let $\pi: Y \rightarrow X$ be a surjective morphism with connected fibres between compact complex manifolds and let $\theta \in H_{\text{BC}}^{1,1}(X, \mathbb{R})$ be a pseudoeffective class. Then a closed positive $(1, 1)$ -current $T \in \theta$ has minimal singularities if and only if the current $f^*T \in f^*\theta$ has minimal singularities.*

The proof is in [BEGZ10, Proposition 1.12], see also [LX24, Proposition 5.1].

Remark 5.4. Let T be a closed positive $(1, 1)$ -current on a compact complex manifold X which is a current with minimal singularities in the class $\{T\}$, and let $T_1 \leq T$ be a closed positive $(1, 1)$ -current on X . Then T_1 is a current with minimal singularities in the class $\{T_1\}$. Indeed, denote $T_2 := T - T_1 \geq 0$. If S is any closed positive $(1, 1)$ -current in $\{T_1\}$, then $S + T_2 \in \{T\}$. By the definition of currents with minimal singularities we have $T_1 + T_2 = T \preceq S + T_2$. But then $T_1 \preceq S$ by Remark 5.1, as desired.

We will need later the following results.

Lemma 5.5. *Let $\pi: Y \rightarrow X$ be a surjective morphism with connected fibres from a smooth complex projective variety to a normal complex projective variety. Let D be a pseudoeffective \mathbb{R} -divisor on X and let E be an effective π -exceptional \mathbb{R} -divisor on Y .*

- (a) *For each closed positive current $T \in \{\pi^*D + E\}$ we have $T \geq E$.*
- (b) *If a current $S \in \{\pi^*D\}$ has minimal singularities, then the current $S + E \in \{\pi^*D + E\}$ has minimal singularities.*
- (c) *If a current $T \in \{\pi^*D + E\}$ has minimal singularities, then $T - E \in \{\pi^*D\}$ is a positive current with minimal singularities.*

Proof. Part (a) has the same proof as [LP20b, Lemma 2.15]; alternatively, the proof can be extracted from that of [LX24, Corollary 4.4], by replacing there the reference [Nak04, Proposition III.5.7 and Lemma III.5.14] by either [GL13, Lemma 2.16] or [LP20a, Lemma 2.4]. Note that some of those results are stated for \mathbb{Q} -divisors, but the proofs work for \mathbb{R} -divisors.

For (b), consider a current $S' \in \{\pi^*D + E\}$. Then by (a) we have that $S' - E$ is a positive current in $\{\pi^*D\}$, hence $S \preceq S' - E$ since S has minimal singularities. Therefore, $S + E \preceq S'$ by Remark 5.1, which shows that $S + E$ has minimal singularities.

To show (c), note that $T - E \geq 0$ by (a). We conclude by Remark 5.4. \square

Lemma 5.6. *Let X be a compact complex manifold and let α and β be smooth forms whose classes in $H_{\text{BC}}^{1,1}(X, \mathbb{R})$ are pseudoeffective.*

- (a) *If $\varphi \in \text{PSH}(X, \alpha)$ is bounded, then φ has minimal singularities.*
- (b) *Assume that there exist $\varphi_\alpha \in \text{PSH}(X, \alpha)$ and $\varphi_\beta \in \text{PSH}(X, \beta)$ with minimal singularities such that the function $\varphi_\alpha + \varphi_\beta \in \text{PSH}(X, \alpha + \beta)$ has minimal singularities. Then for all functions $\varphi'_\alpha \in \text{PSH}(X, \alpha)$ and $\varphi'_\beta \in \text{PSH}(X, \beta)$ with minimal singularities, the function $\varphi'_\alpha + \varphi'_\beta \in \text{PSH}(X, \alpha + \beta)$ has minimal singularities.*

- (c) Let D_1 and D_2 be semiample \mathbb{Q} -divisors on X , and let $T_1 \in \{D_1\}$ and $T_2 \in \{D_2\}$ be currents with minimal singularities. Then for each $0 \leq t \leq 1$, the current $tT_1 + (1-t)T_2 \in \{tD_1 + (1-t)D_2\}$ has minimal singularities.

Proof. We first show (a). By assumption there exists a constant C_φ such that $\varphi \geq C_\varphi$. If $\varphi' \in \text{PSH}(X, \alpha)$, then it is bounded from above, hence there exists a constant $C_{\varphi'}$ such that $\varphi' \leq C_{\varphi'}$. Therefore, $\varphi' \leq \varphi + C_{\varphi'} - C_\varphi$, so that $\varphi \preceq \varphi'$ and consequently, φ has minimal singularities.

For (b), by the definition of minimal singularities we have $\varphi_\alpha \approx \varphi'_\alpha$ and $\varphi_\beta \approx \varphi'_\beta$. Then $\varphi_\alpha + \varphi_\beta \approx \varphi'_\alpha + \varphi'_\beta$ by Remark 5.1, which gives (b).

Finally, we show (c). By passing to multiples, we may assume that D_1 and D_2 are integral basepoint free divisors. Then by Example 2.6(b) there exist smooth positive $(1, 1)$ -forms $\alpha_1 \in \{D_1\}$ and $\alpha_2 \in \{D_2\}$, which have minimal singularities by (a). Then again by (a), for each $0 \leq t \leq 1$, the current $t\alpha_1 + (1-t)\alpha_2 \in \{tD_1 + (1-t)D_2\}$ has minimal singularities, and we conclude by (b). \square

Remark 5.7. If D is a semiample \mathbb{Q} -divisor on a compact complex manifold X and if $T \in \{D\}$ is a current with minimal singularities, then all Lelong numbers of T are zero. Indeed, as in the proof of Lemma 5.6 there exists a smooth positive $(1, 1)$ -form $\alpha \in \{D\}$, which clearly has all Lelong numbers zero. We conclude by (9).

5.4. Siu decomposition of currents with minimal singularities. One of the advantages of working with currents with minimal singularities is that the divisorial part of their Siu decomposition always has finitely many components. This was observed already in [LM23, Lemma 4.11]; here we provide a slightly different proof. In the following lemma $\rho(X)$ denotes the Picard number of a compact complex manifold X .

Lemma 5.8. *Let X be a compact complex manifold, let $\theta \in H_{\text{BC}}^{1,1}(X, \mathbb{R})$ be a pseudoeffective class, and let $T_{\min} \in \alpha$ be a current with minimal singularities. Let*

$$T_{\min} = D + R$$

be the Siu decomposition of T_{\min} , where D is its divisorial part and R is its residual part. Then D is an \mathbb{R} -divisor which has at most $\rho(X)$ components.

Proof. Write

$$D = \sum_{i \in I} \lambda_i D_i,$$

where D_i are prime divisors on X , and assume for contradiction that $\#I > \rho(X)$. If we denote $M = \{1, \dots, \rho(X) + 1\}$, then there exist $m \in M$ and real numbers λ'_i such that

$$(10) \quad D_m \equiv \sum_{i \in M \setminus \{m\}} \lambda'_i D_i.$$

Choose a positive real number ε such that $\lambda_m > \varepsilon$ and $\lambda_i + \varepsilon\lambda'_i > 0$ for all $i \in M \setminus \{m\}$. Then we have

$$\sum_{i > \rho(X)+1} \lambda_i D_i + R \geq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{i \in M \setminus \{m\}} (\lambda_i + \varepsilon\lambda'_i) D_i + (\lambda_m - \varepsilon) D_m \geq 0,$$

hence

$$T := \sum_{i \in M \setminus \{m\}} (\lambda_i + \varepsilon\lambda'_i) D_i + (\lambda_m - \varepsilon) D_m + \sum_{i > \rho(X)+1} \lambda_i D_i + R \geq 0,$$

and note that, by (10), we have

$$T \equiv T + \varepsilon \left(D_m - \sum_{i \in M \setminus \{m\}} \lambda'_i D_i \right) = T_{\min}.$$

But then

$$\nu(T, D_m) = \lambda_m - \varepsilon < \lambda_m = \nu(T_{\min}, D_m),$$

a contradiction which proves the lemma. \square

6. SUPERCANONICAL CURRENTS

In this section we introduce a special kind of currents with minimal singularities: *supercanonical currents*. As mentioned in the introduction and as we will see in Lemma 6.1, these are defined by an exponential L^1 -condition. This property will yield in Part IV that supercanonical currents on big line bundles can be defined only by using global holomorphic sections of their multiples. This *algebraicity* is the main reason why supercanonical currents should be fundamental for applications within the MMP, and this is spelled out in Theorem B and in other results in Sections 14 and 15.

Supercanonical currents for \mathbb{Q} -divisors of the form $K_X + \Delta$, where (X, Δ) is a projective klt pair, were defined in [BD12]. We use a similar, but somewhat simpler version of that definition in order to extend it to all pseudoeffective classes.

Supercanonical currents are defined in the following lemma, whose proof follows closely, for the most part, the presentation in [BD12, Section 5].

Lemma 6.1. *Let X be a compact complex manifold and let α be a smooth $(1, 1)$ -form on X whose class $\{\alpha\} \in H_{\text{BC}}^{1,1}(X, \mathbb{R})$ is pseudoeffective. Let*

$$\mathcal{S}_\alpha := \{ \varphi \in \text{PSH}(X, \alpha) \mid \int_X e^{2\varphi} dV_\omega \leq 1 \},$$

and define the supercanonical potential $\varphi_{\alpha, \text{can}}$ associated to α as

$$\varphi_{\alpha, \text{can}}(x) := \sup_{\varphi \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha} \varphi(x) \quad \text{for } x \in X.$$

Then:

- (a) $\mathcal{S}_\alpha \neq \emptyset$,
- (b) all $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha$ are uniformly bounded from above on X ,
- (c) $\varphi_{\alpha, \text{can}}(x) = \max_{\varphi \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha} \varphi(x)$ for $x \in X$,
- (d) $\varphi_{\alpha, \text{can}} \in \text{PSH}(X, \alpha)$,

(e) *the current*

$$T_{\alpha, \text{can}} = \alpha + dd^c \varphi_{\alpha, \text{can}}$$

is a closed positive (1,1)-current with minimal singularities in $\{\alpha\}$, called the supercanonical current associated to α .

Proof. Step 1. Consider any $\varphi_0 \in \text{PSH}(X, \alpha)$. As φ_0 is bounded from above, there exists a constant C_0 such that $\int_X e^{2\varphi_0} dV_\omega \leq 2C_0$, hence $\varphi_0 - \log C_0 \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha$. This gives (a).

Step 2. By compactness of X there exist finitely many coordinate balls $U_i = B(z_i, 2r_i)$ for $z_i \in X$ such that the balls $V_i = B(z_i, r_i)$ cover X and for each i there is a smooth function θ_i on $\overline{U_i}$ such that $\alpha|_{U_i} = dd^c \theta_i$. Denote $M_{i, \min} := \inf_{U_i} e^{2\theta_i}$ and $M_{i, \max} := \sup_{U_i} e^{2\theta_i}$.

Let $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha$ and let $x \in V_i$ for some i . Then $\theta_i + \varphi|_{U_i}$ is plurisubharmonic on U_i , hence so is $e^{\theta_i + \varphi}|_{U_i}$, and we have $B(x, r_i) \subseteq U_i$. The mean value inequality and the assumption $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha$ give

$$\begin{aligned} e^{2\varphi(x)} M_{i, \min} &\leq e^{2(\theta_i(x) + \varphi(x))} \leq \frac{n!}{\pi^n r_i^{2n}} \int_{B(x, r_i)} e^{2(\theta_i + \varphi)} dV_\omega \\ &\leq \frac{n!}{\pi^n r_i^{2n}} \int_{U_i} e^{2\varphi} e^{2\theta_i} dV_\omega \leq \frac{n!}{\pi^n r_i^{2n}} M_{i, \max}, \end{aligned}$$

hence

$$\varphi(x) \leq \frac{1}{2} \log \left(\frac{n!}{\pi^n r_i^{2n}} M_{i, \max} / M_{i, \min} \right).$$

This shows (b).

Step 3. The function $\varphi_{\alpha, \text{can}}$ is well defined by (b), and set $\Phi = (\varphi_{\alpha, \text{can}})^*$. Then $\Phi \in \text{PSH}(X, \alpha)$ by Theorem 2.4(a), and we claim that $\Phi = \varphi_{\alpha, \text{can}}$.

To that end, fix $x \in X$. We may assume that $\Phi(x) \neq -\infty$, since otherwise the claim is clear. Then there exists a sequence $\{x_n\}$ of points in X such that $x_n \rightarrow x$ and

$$\Phi(x) = \limsup_{z \rightarrow x} \varphi_{\alpha, \text{can}}(z) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varphi_{\alpha, \text{can}}(x_n),$$

hence, by the definition of $\varphi_{\alpha, \text{can}}$, there exists a sequence of functions $\{\varphi_n\}$ in \mathcal{S}_α such that

$$(11) \quad \Phi(x) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varphi_n(x_n).$$

By (b) and by Theorem 2.4(b), after passing to a subsequence we may assume that the sequence $\{\varphi_n\}$ converges in $L_{\text{loc}}^1(X)$ and almost everywhere to a function $\tilde{\varphi} \in \text{PSH}(X, \alpha)$, and then $\tilde{\varphi} \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha$ by Fatou's lemma. In particular, we have

$$(12) \quad \tilde{\varphi}(x) \leq \varphi_{\alpha, \text{can}}(x) \leq \Phi(x)$$

by the definition of $\varphi_{\alpha, \text{can}}$. On the other hand, we have $\tilde{\varphi}(x) \geq \Phi(x)$ by Lemma 4.2 and by (11), which, together with (12), finishes the proof of the

claim and of (d). The same proof also shows that $\varphi_{\alpha, \text{can}}(x) = \tilde{\varphi}(x)$, which gives (c).

Step 5. Finally, we show (e). Consider any $\varphi_1 \in \text{PSH}(X, \alpha)$. Then as in Step 1 there exists a constant C_1 such that $\varphi_1 - C_1 \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha$, hence $\varphi_{\alpha, \text{can}} \leq \varphi_1$ by the definition of $\varphi_{\alpha, \text{can}}$. This finishes the proof. \square

The following lemma proves the first easy properties of supercanonical currents.

Lemma 6.2. *Let X be a compact complex manifold, and let α and β be smooth real $(1, 1)$ -forms on X whose cohomology classes are pseudoeffective. With notation from Lemma 6.1 the following holds.*

(a) *For each $0 \leq \varepsilon \leq 1$ we have*

$$\varepsilon\varphi_{\alpha, \text{can}} + (1 - \varepsilon)\varphi_{\beta, \text{can}} \leq \varphi_{\varepsilon\alpha + (1 - \varepsilon)\beta, \text{can}}.$$

(b) *There exists a constant C such that for each $0 \leq \varepsilon \leq 1$ and each $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}_{\alpha + \varepsilon\beta}$ we have $\varphi \leq C$.*

(c) *If $\beta \geq 0$, then for each $0 \leq \varepsilon_1 \leq \varepsilon_2 \leq 1$ we have*

$$\mathcal{S}_{\alpha + \varepsilon_1\beta} \subseteq \mathcal{S}_{\alpha + \varepsilon_2\beta} \quad \text{and} \quad \varphi_{\alpha + \varepsilon_1\beta, \text{can}} \leq \varphi_{\alpha + \varepsilon_2\beta, \text{can}}.$$

Proof. Part (c) follows immediately from the inclusion $\text{PSH}(X, \alpha + \varepsilon_1\beta) \subseteq \text{PSH}(X, \alpha + \varepsilon_2\beta)$ and from the definition of supercanonical potentials, so we concentrate on (a) and (b).

For (a), fix $0 \leq \varepsilon \leq 1$. For fixed $\varphi_\alpha \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha$ and $\varphi_\beta \in \mathcal{S}_\beta$, it is immediate that

$$\varepsilon\varphi_\alpha + (1 - \varepsilon)\varphi_\beta \in \text{PSH}(X, \varepsilon\alpha + (1 - \varepsilon)\beta),$$

and by Hölder's inequality we have

$$\int_X e^{2(\varepsilon\varphi_\alpha + (1 - \varepsilon)\varphi_\beta)} dV_\omega \leq \left(\int_X e^{2\varphi_\alpha} dV_\omega \right)^\varepsilon \left(\int_X e^{2\varphi_\beta} dV_\omega \right)^{1 - \varepsilon} \leq 1.$$

Therefore, we have $\varepsilon\varphi_\alpha + (1 - \varepsilon)\varphi_\beta \in \mathcal{S}_{\varepsilon\alpha + (1 - \varepsilon)\beta}$, hence

$$\varepsilon\varphi_\alpha + (1 - \varepsilon)\varphi_\beta \leq \varphi_{\varepsilon\alpha + (1 - \varepsilon)\beta, \text{can}}.$$

Then (a) follows by taking the pointwise supremum over all $\varphi_\alpha \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha$ and $\varphi_\beta \in \mathcal{S}_\beta$.

Next we show (b). The proof is analogous to that of Lemma 6.1(b). By compactness of X there exist finitely many coordinate balls $U_i = B(z_i, 2r_i)$ for $z_i \in X$ such that the balls $W_i = B(z_i, r_i)$ cover X and for each i there are smooth functions θ_i and ξ_i on $\overline{U_i}$ such that $\alpha|_{U_i} = dd^c\theta_i$ and $\beta|_{U_i} = dd^c\xi_i$. Denote

$$M_{i, \min} := \inf_{\varepsilon \in [0, 1]} \inf_{U_i} e^{2(\theta_i + \varepsilon\xi_i)} \quad \text{and} \quad M_{i, \max} := \sup_{\varepsilon \in [0, 1]} \sup_{U_i} e^{2(\theta_i + \varepsilon\xi_i)}.$$

Now, fix $0 \leq \varepsilon \leq 1$ and $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}_{\alpha + \varepsilon\beta}$, and let $x \in W_i$ for some i . Then $\theta_i + \varepsilon\xi_i + \varphi|_{U_i}$ is plurisubharmonic on U_i , hence so is $e^{\theta_i + \varepsilon\xi_i + \varphi|_{U_i}}$, and we

have $B(x, r_i) \subseteq U_i$. Then as in Step 2 of the proof of Lemma 6.1, the mean value inequality and the assumption $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}_{\alpha+\varepsilon\beta}$ give

$$e^{2\varphi(x)} \leq \frac{n!}{\pi^n r_i^{2n}} M_{i,\max}/M_{i,\min}.$$

This shows (b). □

Part III. Asymptotically equisingular approximations

In Part III we prove the first main result of this paper, Theorem A. We first study in detail the different instances of approximations of currents which are relevant for this paper, in an increasing order of complexity: *asymptotically equisingular approximations*, *good approximations* and finally *excellent approximations*. One of the main technical results of this part is Corollary 8.4, which essentially says that in the context of the MMP, the approximation by currents with minimal singularities is asymptotically equisingular if and only if it is excellent. This is one of the main ingredients in the proof of Theorem A.

7. ASYMPTOTICALLY EQUISINGULAR APPROXIMATIONS

In this section we introduce the weakest form of approximations of currents relevant for this paper.

Definition 7.1. Let T be a closed almost positive $(1, 1)$ -current on a compact complex manifold X . A sequence of closed almost positive $(1, 1)$ -currents $\{T_m\}_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ on X is an *asymptotically equisingular approximation* of T if there exist an effective divisor D on X and a sequence of positive integers $\{m_\ell\}_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}}$ such that $m_\ell \rightarrow \infty$ and

$$\mathcal{I}(\ell T_{m_\ell}) \otimes \mathcal{O}_X(-D) \subseteq \mathcal{I}(\ell T) \subseteq \mathcal{I}(\ell T_{m_\ell}) \otimes \mathcal{O}_X(D) \quad \text{for all } \ell.$$

Remark 7.2. In the definition we use the convention from Remark 2.10: in particular, all sheaves in Definition 7.1 are understood as subsheaves of the sheaf of meromorphic functions on X .

Definition 7.1 is inspired by equisingular approximations from [Cao14, Definition 2.3] and [Dem15, Definition 4.1.3], although equisingular approximations from op. cit. seem to be a too restrictive notion to consider in the context of the Minimal Model Program. Note that in Definition 7.1 we do not require that the sequence $\{T_m\}_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges weakly to T , hence the concept of asymptotically equisingular approximations seems to be a very weak one (we will see in Theorem 8.2 that any positive $(1, 1)$ -current on a compact Kähler manifold has such an approximation). The word *approximation* might a priori be misleading, but is in some sense justified by the following lemma.

Lemma 7.3. *Let X be a compact complex manifold and let T be a closed almost positive $(1, 1)$ -current on X with an asymptotically equisingular approximation $\{T_m\}_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$. Then there exists a sequence of positive integers $\{m_\ell\}_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}}$ with $m_\ell \rightarrow \infty$, such that for each prime divisor E over X we have*

$$\nu(T, E) = \lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \nu(T_{m_\ell}, E).$$

Proof. Fix a prime divisor E over X , let $\pi: Y \rightarrow X$ be a modification such that E is a prime divisor on Y , and let

$$A := K_Y - \pi^* K_X$$

denote the ramification divisor on Y . Let

$$\pi^* T = R + D \quad \text{and} \quad \pi^* T_m = R_m + D_m$$

be the Siu decompositions of $\pi^* T$ and each $\pi^* T_m$, respectively.

By the definition of asymptotically equisingular approximations, there exist an effective integral divisor G on X and a sequence of positive integers $\{m_\ell\}_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}}$ such that $m_\ell \rightarrow \infty$ and

$$(13) \quad \mathcal{I}(\ell T_{m_\ell}) \otimes \mathcal{O}_X(-G) \subseteq \mathcal{I}(\ell T) \subseteq \mathcal{I}(\ell T_{m_\ell}) \otimes \mathcal{O}_X(G) \quad \text{for all } \ell.$$

By Theorem 2.9(a)(d) we have

$$\mathcal{I}(\ell T_{m_\ell} + G) \subseteq \mathcal{I}(\ell T_{m_\ell}) \otimes \mathcal{O}_X(-G),$$

which together with the first inclusion in (13) gives

$$\mathcal{I}(\ell T_{m_\ell} + G) \subseteq \mathcal{I}(\ell T).$$

Then Lemma 2.11 implies

$$(14) \quad \mathcal{I}(\ell \pi^* T_{m_\ell} + \pi^* G) \otimes \mathcal{O}_Y(-A) \subseteq \mathcal{I}(\ell \pi^* T).$$

Similarly we obtain

$$(15) \quad \mathcal{I}(\ell \pi^* T + \pi^* G) \otimes \mathcal{O}_Y(-A) \subseteq \mathcal{I}(\ell \pi^* T_{m_\ell}).$$

Now, note that for each ℓ , the $(1, 1)$ -current $\ell D + \pi^* G$ is the divisorial part of the Siu decomposition of $\ell \pi^* T + \pi^* G$, and $\ell D_{m_\ell} + \pi^* G$ is the divisorial part of the Siu decomposition of $\ell \pi^* T_{m_\ell} + \pi^* G$. Thus, by Theorem 2.9(e) there exists an analytic open subset $U \subseteq Y$ such that $\text{codim}_Y(Y \setminus U) \geq 2$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}(\ell \pi^* T + \pi^* G)|_U &= \mathcal{O}_U(-[\ell D] - \pi^* G), \\ \mathcal{I}(\ell \pi^* T_{m_\ell} + \pi^* G)|_U &= \mathcal{O}_U(-[\ell D_{m_\ell}] - \pi^* G), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\mathcal{I}(\ell \pi^* T)|_U = \mathcal{O}_U(-[\ell D]) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{I}(\ell \pi^* T_{m_\ell})|_U = \mathcal{O}_U(-[\ell D_{m_\ell}]).$$

This together with (14) and (15) gives

$$\mathcal{O}_U(-[\ell D_{m_\ell}] - \pi^* G - A) \subseteq \mathcal{O}_U(-[\ell D])$$

and

$$\mathcal{O}_U(-[\ell D] - \pi^* G - A) \subseteq \mathcal{O}_U(-[\ell D_{m_\ell}]).$$

Considering the order of vanishing along E , these inclusions imply

$$\begin{aligned} \lfloor \ell \nu(T, E) \rfloor - \text{mult}_E \pi^* G - \text{mult}_E A &\leq \lfloor \ell \nu(T_{m_\ell}, E) \rfloor \\ &\leq \lfloor \ell \nu(T, E) \rfloor + \text{mult}_E \pi^* G + \text{mult}_E A. \end{aligned}$$

We conclude by dividing these inequalities by ℓ and letting $\ell \rightarrow \infty$. \square

8. GOOD APPROXIMATIONS

In the context of the MMP, asymptotically equisingular approximations carry a priori too little information on the currents involved. We need first a stronger notion.

Definition 8.1. Let T be a closed almost positive $(1,1)$ -current on a compact complex manifold X . A sequence of closed almost positive $(1,1)$ -currents $\{T_m\}_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ on X is a *good approximation* of T if:

- (i) $\{T_m\}_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ is an asymptotically equisingular approximation of T , and
- (ii) all T_m have generalised analytic singularities.

The definition of good approximations is motivated by the following result hidden in [Dem15, Section 1], which shows that every closed positive $(1,1)$ -current on a compact Kähler manifold always has at least one good approximation. Theorem 8.2 is not necessary for the remainder of the paper, but we include it for the sake of completeness: it demonstrates how the concept of good approximations is inspired by the approximation techniques of Demailly [Dem92a].

Theorem 8.2. *Let T be a closed positive $(1,1)$ -current on a compact Kähler manifold X . Then there exists a good approximation of T .*

Proof. We recall the argument from [Dem15, Section 1]. Fix a smooth form $\alpha \in \{T\}$ and let φ be a quasi-psh function on X such that $T = \alpha + dd^c\varphi$. By subtracting a constant from φ we may assume that $\varphi \leq 0$. By the Bergman kernel approximation technique [Dem15, Theorem 1.2], there exist quasi-psh functions with analytic singularities $\varphi_m \leq 0$ and a constant $C > 0$ such that:

- (i) $\alpha + dd^c\varphi_m \geq -\varepsilon_m\omega$, where $\lim_{m \rightarrow +\infty} \varepsilon_m = 0$,
- (ii) $\varphi_m \geq \varphi - \frac{C}{m}$ for every m .

Setting $T_m := \alpha + dd^c(\frac{m+1}{m}\varphi_m)$, we claim that $\{T_m\}_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ is the desired sequence. Indeed, we only need to show $\{T_m\}_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ is an asymptotically equisingular approximation. To that end, fix $\ell > 0$. We have $\mathcal{I}(\frac{m+1}{m}\ell\varphi) \subseteq \mathcal{I}(\frac{m+1}{m}\ell\varphi_m)$ by (ii), and since $\mathcal{I}(\frac{m+1}{m}\ell\varphi) = \mathcal{I}(\ell\varphi)$ for $m \gg 0$ by Theorem 2.8, we conclude that

$$\mathcal{I}(\ell T) \subseteq \mathcal{I}(\ell T_m) \quad \text{for } m \gg 0.$$

Conversely, by [Dem15, Corollary 1.12] for $\lambda = \ell$ and $\lambda' = \ell\frac{m+1}{m}$, we have

$$\mathcal{I}(\ell T_m) \subseteq \mathcal{I}(\ell T) \quad \text{for } m \gg 0,$$

which proves the result. \square

The following proposition and corollary are the crucial MMP results on which the rest of the arguments in Part III rely. They relate the Minimal Model Program and good approximations.

Proposition 8.3. *Let (X, Δ) be a projective klt pair such that $K_X + \Delta$ is pseudoeffective and X is smooth. Assume that (X, Δ) has a good minimal model. Let T_{\min} be a current with minimal singularities in $\{K_X + \Delta\}$. Then the following holds.*

- (a) *The current T_{\min} has generalised analytic singularities, and moreover, it has generalised algebraic singularities if Δ is a \mathbb{Q} -divisor.*
- (b) *If $\varphi: (X, \Delta) \dashrightarrow (X', \Delta')$ is a $(K_X + \Delta)$ -non-positive birational contraction such that the divisor $K_{X'} + \Delta'$ is semiample, and if $W \rightarrow X$ is a resolution of indeterminacies of φ which is smooth, then T_{\min} descends to W .*
- (c) *If $\pi: Y \rightarrow X$ is a resolution such that the Siu decomposition of π^*T_{\min} has the form*

$$\pi^*T_{\min} = R + D,$$

where the residual part R has all Lelong numbers zero and D is the divisorial part, then

$$D = N_\sigma(\pi^*(K_X + \Delta)).$$

Proof. We first show (a). As mentioned in §3.1, we may run a $(K_X + \Delta)$ -MMP $\varphi: (X, \Delta) \dashrightarrow (X', \Delta')$ with scaling of an ample divisor which terminates with a good minimal model (X', Δ') . Let $(p, q): W \rightarrow X \times X'$ be a resolution of indeterminacies of φ such that W is smooth.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & W & \\ p \swarrow & & \searrow q \\ X & \overset{\varphi}{\dashrightarrow} & X' \end{array}$$

By the Negativity lemma [KM98, Lemma 3.39], there exists an effective q -exceptional \mathbb{R} -divisor E on W such that

$$(16) \quad p^*(K_X + \Delta) \sim_{\mathbb{R}} q^*(K_{X'} + \Delta') + E_W.$$

The current $p^*T_{\min} \in \{p^*(K_X + \Delta)\}$ has minimal singularities by Proposition 5.3. By (16) and by Lemma 5.5(c), the current

$$R_W := p^*T_{\min} - E_W \in \{q^*(K_{X'} + \Delta')\}$$

is a positive current with minimal singularities. As $q^*(K_{X'} + \Delta')$ is semiample, Remark 5.7 gives that R_W has all Lelong numbers zero. In particular,

$$p^*T_{\min} = R_W + E_W$$

is the Siu decomposition of p^*T_{\min} and therefore, the current T_{\min} has generalised analytic singularities. If Δ is a \mathbb{Q} -divisor, then clearly so is E_W . This shows (a).

The proof of (b) is the same as that of (a).

Now we show (c). With notation as in the proof of (a) above, we may assume that p factors through π ; let $w: W \rightarrow Y$ be the resulting map. Then

$$(17) \quad E_W = w^*D$$

by the discussion in §2.13. By [LP20a, Lemma 2.4] we have

$$(18) \quad N_\sigma(p^*(K_X + \Delta)) = E_W.$$

Then by (17), (18) and [LX23, Lemma 2.13] we obtain

$$N_\sigma(\pi^*(K_X + \Delta)) = w_* N_\sigma(p^*(K_X + \Delta)) = w_* E_W = D,$$

as desired. \square

Corollary 8.4. *Let (X, Δ) be a projective klt pair such that $K_X + \Delta$ is pseudoeffective and X is smooth. Let $A \geq 0$ be a big \mathbb{R} -divisor on X such that the pair $(X, \Delta + A)$ is klt, and for each $\varepsilon > 0$ let $T_{\varepsilon, \min}$ be a current with minimal singularities in $\{K_X + \Delta + \varepsilon A\}$.*

- (a) *Assume that (X, Δ) has a minimal model. Then there exists a positive rational number δ and a resolution $\pi: Y \rightarrow X$ such that for each $0 < \varepsilon \leq \delta$ the current $T_{\varepsilon, \min}$ has generalised analytic singularities and it descends to Y . If $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{Q}$ and Δ is a \mathbb{Q} -divisor, then the current $T_{\varepsilon, \min}$ has generalised algebraic singularities.*
- (b) *Assume that (X, Δ) has a good minimal model. Then there exists a positive rational number δ and a resolution $\pi: Y \rightarrow X$ such that for each $0 \leq \varepsilon \leq \delta$ the current $T_{\varepsilon, \min}$ has generalised analytic singularities and it descends to Y . If $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{Q}$ and Δ is a \mathbb{Q} -divisor, then the current $T_{\varepsilon, \min}$ has generalised algebraic singularities.*

Proof. We first show (a). By [HH20, Theorem 1.7] we may run a $(K_X + \Delta)$ -MMP $\varphi: (X, \Delta) \dashrightarrow (X', \Delta')$ with scaling of an ample divisor which terminates with a minimal model (X', Δ') , and denote $A' := \varphi_* A$. Then there exists $0 \leq \delta_0 \ll 1$ such that φ is also a partial $(K_X + \Delta + \varepsilon A)$ -MMP for all $0 \leq \varepsilon \leq \delta_0$. By [LT22, Proposition 2.12] there exists $0 < \delta \ll \delta_0$ such that, if we run a $(K_{X'} + \Delta' + \delta A')$ -MMP with scaling of an ample divisor, then it is a $(K_{X'} + \Delta')$ -trivial MMP.

Since $K_{X'} + \Delta' + \delta A'$ is big, this last $(K_{X'} + \Delta' + \delta A')$ -MMP terminates by [BCHM10, Corollary 1.4.2]; denote the resulting map by $\rho: X' \dashrightarrow X''$, and set $A'' := \rho_* A'$. Then for each $0 < \varepsilon \leq \delta$, the map $\rho \circ \varphi: X \dashrightarrow X''$ is a $(K_X + \Delta + \varepsilon A)$ -MMP such that $(X'', \Delta'' + \varepsilon A'')$ is a minimal model of $(X, \Delta + \varepsilon A)$, and in fact, it is a good minimal model of $(X, \Delta + \varepsilon A)$ by the Basepoint free theorem [KM98, Theorem 3.3]. Let $(\pi, \pi''): Y \rightarrow X \times X''$ be a resolution of indeterminacies of $\rho \circ \varphi$ such that Y is smooth.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & Y & \\ \pi \swarrow & & \searrow \pi'' \\ X & \dashrightarrow \varphi & X' \dashrightarrow \rho & X'' \end{array}$$

Then for each $0 < \varepsilon \leq \delta$ the current $T_{\varepsilon, \min}$ has generalised analytic singularities by Proposition 8.3(a), and it descends to Y by Proposition 8.3(b). The statement on generalised algebraic singularities follows also from Proposition 8.3(a). This shows (a).

If the pair (X, Δ) has a good minimal model, then as mentioned in §3.1 we may run a $(K_X + \Delta)$ -MMP $\varphi: (X, \Delta) \dashrightarrow (X', \Delta')$ with scaling of an ample divisor which terminates with a minimal model (X', Δ') . Then we repeat the proof of (a) above verbatim. The only thing to notice is that the divisor $K_{X''} + \Delta''$ is semiample since the map ρ is $(K_{X'} + \Delta')$ -trivial, hence the current $T_{0, \min}$ has generalised analytic singularities by Proposition 8.3(a), and it descends to Y by Proposition 8.3(b). This finishes the proof. \square

We can now prove Proposition 1.1 announced in the introduction. The heart of the proof is in the following result.

Proposition 8.5. *Let (X, Δ) be a projective klt pair such that $K_X + \Delta$ is pseudoeffective and X is smooth. Assume that (X, Δ) has a good minimal model. Let $A \geq 0$ be a big \mathbb{R} -divisor on X such that the pair $(X, \Delta + A)$ is klt, and for each $\varepsilon > 0$ let $T_{\varepsilon, \min}$ be a current with minimal singularities in $\{K_X + \Delta + \varepsilon A\}$. Then the sequence $\{T_{\frac{1}{m}, \min}\}_{m \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}}$ is an asymptotically equisingular approximation of $T_{0, \min}$.*

Proof. By Corollary 8.4(b) there exists a positive rational number δ and a birational model $\pi: Y \rightarrow X$ such that for each $0 \leq \varepsilon \leq \delta$ the current $T_{\varepsilon, \min}$ has generalised analytic singularities and it descends to Y . Possibly by blowing up further, we may assume additionally that

$$\pi^*(N_\sigma(K_X + \Delta) + N_\sigma(A)) \cup \text{Exc}(\pi)$$

is a divisor with simple normal crossings support. Define F to be the reduced divisor whose support is $\pi^*(N_\sigma(K_X + \Delta) + N_\sigma(A)) \cup \text{Exc}(\pi)$.

For each $0 \leq \varepsilon \leq \delta$, let D_ε be the divisorial part of the Siu decomposition of $\pi^*T_{\varepsilon, \min}$. Then

$$(19) \quad D_\varepsilon = N_\sigma(\pi^*(K_X + \Delta + \varepsilon A)) \quad \text{for } 0 \leq \varepsilon \leq \delta$$

by Proposition 8.3(c), hence by [Nak04, Lemma III.1.7(2)] we have

$$(20) \quad \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} D_\varepsilon = D_0.$$

On the other hand, by (19), by the convexity of Nakayama-Zariski functions and by [Nak04, Theorem III.5.16], for each $0 \leq \varepsilon \leq \delta$ there exists an effective π -exceptional divisor E_ε on Y such that

$$D_\varepsilon \leq N_\sigma(\pi^*(K_X + \Delta)) + \varepsilon N_\sigma(\pi^*A) = \pi^*N_\sigma(K_X + \Delta) + \varepsilon \pi^*N_\sigma(A) + E_\varepsilon,$$

hence

$$(21) \quad \text{Supp } D_\varepsilon \subseteq \text{Supp } F \quad \text{for all } 0 \leq \varepsilon \leq \delta.$$

Then by (20), for each positive integer ℓ we may choose a positive integer $m_\ell \gg \ell$ such that

$$(22) \quad \ell D_{1/m_\ell} - F \leq \ell D_0 \leq \ell D_{1/m_\ell} + F.$$

As the divisors D_ε have simple normal crossings support by (21) for $0 \leq \varepsilon \leq \delta$, by Theorem 2.9(b)(c) we have

$$(23) \quad \mathcal{I}(\ell\pi^*T_{\varepsilon,\min}) = \mathcal{O}_Y(-\lfloor \ell D_\varepsilon \rfloor) \quad \text{for all } 0 \leq \varepsilon \leq \delta.$$

Therefore, by (22) and (23) and since F is an integral divisor, we conclude that

$$\mathcal{I}(\ell\pi^*T_{\frac{1}{m_\ell},\min}) \otimes \mathcal{O}_Y(-F) \subseteq \mathcal{I}(\ell\pi^*T_{0,\min}) \subseteq \mathcal{I}(\ell\pi^*T_{\frac{1}{m_\ell},\min}) \otimes \mathcal{O}_Y(F)$$

for all ℓ .

Now, there exists an effective divisor G on X such that $F \leq \pi^*G$, hence the inclusions above give

$$\mathcal{I}(\ell\pi^*T_{\frac{1}{m_\ell},\min}) \otimes \mathcal{O}_Y(-\pi^*G) \subseteq \mathcal{I}(\ell\pi^*T_{0,\min}) \subseteq \mathcal{I}(\ell\pi^*T_{\frac{1}{m_\ell},\min}) \otimes \mathcal{O}_Y(\pi^*G)$$

for all ℓ . Tensoring these inclusions with $\mathcal{O}_Y(K_Y - \pi^*K_X)$, pushing forward by π and applying [Dem01, Proposition 5.8] we obtain

$$\mathcal{I}(\ell T_{\frac{1}{m_\ell},\min}) \otimes \mathcal{O}_X(-G) \subseteq \mathcal{I}(\ell T_{0,\min}) \subseteq \mathcal{I}(\ell T_{\frac{1}{m_\ell},\min}) \otimes \mathcal{O}_X(G)$$

for all ℓ . This finishes the proof. \square

Finally, we have:

Proof of Proposition 1.1. By [Laz24, Corollary 2.2] the pair (Y, Δ_Y) has a good minimal model. We conclude immediately by Proposition 8.5. \square

9. EXCELLENT APPROXIMATIONS

In order to exploit the MMP fully, we need to consider a yet stronger type of approximations.

Definition 9.1. Let T be a closed almost positive $(1,1)$ -current on a compact complex manifold X . A sequence of closed almost positive $(1,1)$ -currents $\{T_m\}_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ on X is an *excellent approximation* of T if:

- (i) $\{T_m\}_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a good approximation of T ,
- (ii) all T_m descend to the same birational model $\pi: Y \rightarrow X$, and
- (iii) there exists an effective divisor B on Y such that $\text{Supp } B_m \subseteq \text{Supp } B$ for each m , where B_m is the divisorial part of the Siu decomposition of π^*T_m .

The main reason why excellent approximations are very useful is contained in the following result.

Theorem 9.2. *Let X be a compact complex manifold. Let T be a closed almost positive $(1,1)$ -current on X such that the divisorial part of its Siu decomposition contains only finitely many components. Then the following are equivalent:*

- (a) T is a current with generalised analytic singularities,
- (b) there exists an excellent approximation $\{T_m\}_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ of T .

Proof. If T has generalised analytic singularities, then trivially the currents $T_m := T$ for $m \in \mathbb{N}$ form an excellent approximation of T .

Conversely, assume that there exists an excellent approximation $\{T_m\}$ of T . By the discussion in §2.9 we have that the divisorial part of the Siu decomposition of the pullback of T to any resolution of X also contains only finitely many components. Then there exists a modification $\pi: Y \rightarrow X$ from a compact complex manifold Y such that all T_m descend to Y , and the Siu decompositions of π^*T and π^*T_m have the form

$$(24) \quad \pi^*T = R + \sum_{i \in I} \lambda_i D_i$$

and

$$(25) \quad \pi^*T_m = R_m + \sum_{i \in I} \lambda_{i,m} D_i,$$

where R and R_m are the residual parts, and:

- (i) $\lambda_i = \nu(\pi^*T, D_i)$ and $\lambda_{i,m} = \nu(\pi^*T_m, D_i)$ for each m and i ,
- (ii) the index set I is finite, and
- (iii) each R_m has all Lelong numbers zero.

It suffices to show that all Lelong numbers of R are zero.

To that end, pick a point $y \in Y$. Take a resolution $\mu: Z \rightarrow Y$ which factors through the blowup of Y at y and let E be the corresponding prime divisor on Z . By Lemma 7.3 there exists a sequence of positive integers $\{m_\ell\}_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}}$ with $m_\ell \rightarrow \infty$, such that

$$(26) \quad \lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \nu(T_{m_\ell}, E) = \nu(T, E) \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_{i,m_\ell} = \lambda_i.$$

On the other hand, by (24) and (25) we have

$$(27) \quad \nu(T, E) = \nu(\mu^* \pi^* T, E) = \sum_{i \in I} \lambda_i \text{mult}_E \mu^* D_i + \nu(\mu^* R, E)$$

and

$$(28) \quad \nu(T_{m_\ell}, E) = \nu(\mu^* \pi^* T_{m_\ell}, E) = \sum_{i \in I} \lambda_{i,m_\ell} \text{mult}_E \mu^* D_i + \nu(\mu^* R_{m_\ell}, E).$$

Therefore, letting $\ell \rightarrow \infty$ in (28) and using (26) and (27) yields

$$\lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \nu(\mu^* R_{m_\ell}, E) = \nu(\mu^* R, E).$$

Since $\nu(\mu^* R_{m_\ell}, E) = 0$ for all ℓ by Theorem 2.5, we obtain $\nu(\mu^* R, E) = 0$, hence $\nu(R, y) = 0$ by Theorem 2.5 again, as desired. \square

10. EXCELLENT APPROXIMATIONS AND THE MMP

In this section we connect excellent approximations and the Minimal Model Program.

We first need the following extension of [LP18, Theorem 4.3] to klt pairs. The proof is almost the same as that of [LP18, Theorem 4.3] and [LP20b, Theorem 4.1]; the assumptions in those results are however different. In order to avoid confusion and for completeness, we include the proof here.

Theorem 10.1. *Assume the existence of good minimal models for projective klt pairs in dimensions at most $n - 1$.*

Let (X, Δ) be a projective \mathbb{Q} -factorial klt pair of dimension n such that X is not uniruled and Δ is a \mathbb{Q} -divisor. Let t be a positive integer such that $M := t(K_X + \Delta)$ is Cartier, and let $\pi: Y \rightarrow X$ be a resolution of X . Assume that for some positive integer p we have

$$H^0(Y, (\Omega_Y^1)^{\otimes p} \otimes \mathcal{O}_Y(m\pi^*M)) \neq 0$$

for infinitely many integers m . Then $\kappa(X, K_X + \Delta) \geq 0$.

Proof. We note first that the \mathbb{Q} -divisor $K_X + \Delta$ is pseudoeffective by Remark 3.1. If $K_X + \Delta \equiv 0$, then $K_X + \Delta \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0$ by [Nak04, Corollary V.4.9]. Therefore, from now on we may assume that $M \neq 0$. We apply [LP18, Lemma 4.1] with $\mathcal{E} := (\Omega_Y^1)^{\otimes p}$ and $\mathcal{L} := \pi^*\mathcal{O}_X(M)$. Then there exist a positive integer r , a saturated line bundle \mathcal{M} in $\bigwedge^r \mathcal{E}$, an infinite set $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ and integral divisors $N_m \geq 0$ for $m \in \mathcal{S}$ such that

$$\mathcal{O}_Y(N_m) \simeq \mathcal{M} \otimes \mathcal{L}^{\otimes m} \quad \text{for all } m \in \mathcal{S}.$$

Since Y is not uniruled by assumptions, the divisor K_Y is pseudoeffective by [BDPP13, Corollary 0.3], hence [LP18, Proposition 4.2] implies that there exist a positive integer ℓ and a pseudoeffective divisor F such that

$$N_m + F \sim m\pi^*M + \ell K_Y.$$

By pushing forward this relation to X we get

$$\pi_*N_m + \pi_*F \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} mM + \ell K_X,$$

and hence

$$\pi_*N_m + (\pi_*F + \ell\Delta) \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} (mt + \ell)(K_X + \Delta).$$

Noting that π_*N_m is effective and that $\pi_*F + \ell\Delta$ is pseudoeffective, we conclude by [LP18, Theorem 3.3]. \square

Now we can deduce a criterion for Nonvanishing, related to the existence of excellent approximations of currents with minimal singularities.

Theorem 10.2. *Let (X, Δ) be a projective klt pair of dimension n such that X is smooth and not uniruled. Then $K_X + \Delta$ is pseudoeffective by Remark 3.1, and let T_{\min} be a closed positive $(1, 1)$ -current with minimal singularities in $\{K_X + \Delta\}$. Assume that there exists an excellent approximation $\{T_m\}_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ of T_{\min} .*

- (a) Then T_{\min} has generalised analytic singularities.
 (b) Assume the existence of good minimal models for projective klt pairs in dimensions at most $n-1$. If Δ is a \mathbb{Q} -divisor and $\kappa(X, K_X + \Delta) = -\infty$, then for every resolution $\pi: Y \rightarrow X$ with the property that T_{\min} descends to Y and that the divisorial part D of the Siu decomposition of π^*T_{\min} has simple normal crossings support, we have

$$H^p(Y, \mathcal{O}_Y(K_Y + \ell\pi^*(K_X + \Delta) - \lfloor \ell D \rfloor)) = 0$$

for all p and all $\ell > 0$ sufficiently divisible. Moreover, if T_{\min} has generalised algebraic singularities, then D is a \mathbb{Q} -divisor.

Proof. Part (a) follows from Lemma 5.8 and Theorem 9.2.

After part (a) is settled, the rest of the argument for (b) is hidden in the proofs of [LP18, Corollary 4.5] and [LP20b, Theorem 5.1] and we reproduce the details here. By (a) and by §2.13 there exists a resolution $\pi: Y \rightarrow X$ such that the Siu decomposition of π^*T_{\min} has the form

$$\pi^*T_{\min} = R + D,$$

where the residual part R has all Lelong numbers zero and D is the divisorial part of the decomposition with simple normal crossings support. By Theorem 2.9(b)(c) we have

$$(29) \quad \mathcal{I}(\ell\pi^*T_{\min}) = \mathcal{O}_Y(-\lfloor \ell D \rfloor) \quad \text{for all } \ell \geq 0.$$

Since we assume that $\kappa(X, K_X + \Delta) = -\infty$, we conclude by Theorem 10.1 that for all $p \geq 0$ and for all $\ell > 0$ sufficiently divisible we have

$$H^0(Y, \Omega_Y^p \otimes \pi^*\mathcal{O}_X(\ell(K_X + \Delta))) = 0,$$

and thus

$$H^0(Y, \Omega_Y^p \otimes \pi^*\mathcal{O}_X(\ell(K_X + \Delta)) \otimes \mathcal{I}(\ell\pi^*T_{\min})) = 0.$$

Then [DPS01, Theorem 0.1] implies that for all $p \geq 0$ and for all $\ell > 0$ sufficiently divisible we have

$$H^p(Y, \mathcal{O}_Y(K_Y + \ell\pi^*(K_X + \Delta)) \otimes \mathcal{I}(\ell\pi^*T_{\min})) = 0,$$

which together with (29) finishes the proof. \square

11. PROOF OF THEOREM A

We now have all the ingredients to prove the first main result of the paper. As announced in the introduction, we can actually show the following much more precise version.

Theorem 11.1. *Let (X, Δ) be a projective klt pair of dimension n such that $K_X + \Delta$ is nef and Δ is a \mathbb{Q} -divisor. Let $\pi: Y \rightarrow X$ be a log resolution of (X, Δ) and write*

$$K_Y + \Delta_Y \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} \pi^*(K_X + \Delta) + E,$$

where Δ_Y and E are effective \mathbb{Q} -divisors without common components. Let A be an ample \mathbb{R} -divisor on Y , and assume that there exist an effective

divisor D on Y and a sequence of positive integers $\{m_\ell\}_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}}$ such that $m_\ell \rightarrow \infty$ and

$$\mathcal{I}(\ell(K_Y + \Delta_Y + \frac{1}{m_\ell}A))_{\min} \subseteq \mathcal{I}(\ell(K_Y + \Delta_Y))_{\min} \otimes \mathcal{O}_Y(D) \quad \text{for all } \ell.$$

Then

- (a) any current with minimal singularities in the class $\{K_Y + \Delta_Y\}$ is a current with generalised algebraic singularities.

Assume additionally the existence of good minimal models for projective klt pairs in dimensions at most $n - 1$. Then:

- (b) if $\kappa(X, K_X + \Delta) \geq 0$, then $K_X + \Delta$ is semiample,
 (c) if $\chi(X, \mathcal{O}_X) \neq 0$, then $K_X + \Delta$ is semiample.

We will give the proof of Theorem 11.1 – and thus of Theorem A – at the end of the section. It will be an easy consequence of the following main technical result of this section.

Theorem 11.2. *Let (X, Δ) be a projective klt pair of dimension n such that X is smooth, Δ is a \mathbb{Q} -divisor and $K_X + \Delta$ is pseudoeffective. Assume that (X, Δ) has a minimal model. Let $A \geq 0$ be a big \mathbb{R} -divisor on X such that the pair $(X, \Delta + A)$ is klt, and for each $\varepsilon \geq 0$ let $T_{\varepsilon, \min}$ be a current with minimal singularities in $\{K_X + \Delta + \varepsilon A\}$. Assume that the sequence $\{T_{\frac{1}{m}, \min}\}_{m \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}}$ is an asymptotically equisingular approximation of $T_{0, \min}$.*

- (a) Then $T_{0, \min}$ is a current with generalised algebraic singularities.

Assume additionally the existence of good minimal models for projective klt pairs in dimensions at most $n - 1$. Then:

- (b) if $\kappa(X, K_X + \Delta) \geq 0$, then (X, Δ) has a good minimal model,
 (c) if $\chi(X, \mathcal{O}_X) \neq 0$, then (X, Δ) has a good minimal model.

Proof. We divide the proof in several steps.

Step 1. By Corollary 8.4(a) there exist a positive integer m_0 and a birational model $\pi: Y \rightarrow X$ such that for each $m \geq m_0$ the current $T_{\frac{1}{m}, \min}$ descends to Y . For each $m \geq m_0$, let D_m be the divisorial part of the Siu decomposition of $\pi^*T_{\frac{1}{m}, \min}$. Then

$$(30) \quad D_m = N_\sigma(\pi^*(K_X + \Delta + \frac{1}{m}A)) \quad \text{for } m \geq m_0$$

by Proposition 8.3(c), and we have

$$\text{Supp } N_\sigma(\pi^*(K_X + \Delta + \frac{1}{m}A)) \subseteq \text{Supp } N_\sigma(\pi^*(K_X + \Delta)) \cup \text{Supp } N_\sigma(\pi^*A)$$

for all $m > 0$ by the convexity of Nakayama–Zariski functions. This and (30) show that

$$(31) \quad \text{the sequence } \{T_{\frac{1}{m}, \min}\}_{m \geq m_0} \text{ is an excellent approximation of } T_{0, \min}.$$

Step 2. By (31) and by Theorem 10.2(a) we deduce that $T_{0, \min}$ has generalised analytic singularities. By possibly replacing Y by a higher birational

model, we may assume that $T_{0,\min}$ descends to Y , and let

$$\pi^*T_{0,\min} = R_0 + D_0$$

be the Siu decomposition of $T_{0,\min}$, where the residual part R_0 has all Lelong numbers zero and D_0 is the divisorial part. By Lemma 7.3, there exists a sequence of positive integers $\{m_\ell\}_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}}$ with $m_\ell \rightarrow \infty$, such that

$$D_0 = \lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} D_{m_\ell},$$

which together with (30) and [Nak04, Lemma III.1.7(2)] gives

$$(32) \quad D_0 = \lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} N_\sigma(\pi^*(K_X + \Delta + \frac{1}{m_\ell}A)) = N_\sigma(\pi^*(K_X + \Delta)).$$

Hence, D_0 is a rational divisor by Lemma 3.4. In other words, $T_{0,\min}$ has generalised *algebraic* singularities, which proves (a).

Step 3. In this step we assume that $\chi(X, \mathcal{O}_X) \neq 0$, and we show that $\kappa(X, K_X + \Delta) \geq 0$.

If X is uniruled, then $\kappa(X, K_X + \Delta) \geq 0$ by [LM21, Theorem 1.1]. Therefore, from now on we may assume that X is not uniruled. We follow the arguments of [LP18, Corollary 4.5] closely.

Assume that $\kappa(X, K_X + \Delta) = -\infty$. By possibly replacing Y by a higher birational model, we may assume that the \mathbb{Q} -divisor D_0 on Y has simple normal crossings support. Then by Theorem 10.2(b) we have

$$\chi(Y, \mathcal{O}_Y(K_Y + \ell\pi^*(K_X + \Delta) - \lfloor \ell D_0 \rfloor)) = 0$$

for all $\ell > 0$ divisible by some positive integer q , and we may assume that qD_0 and $q(K_X + \Delta)$ are Cartier. Then Serre duality gives

$$(33) \quad \chi(Y, \mathcal{O}_Y(\ell q D_0 - \ell q \pi^*(K_X + \Delta))) = 0 \quad \text{for all } \ell > 0.$$

Since the Euler–Poincaré characteristic $\chi(Y, \mathcal{O}_Y(\ell q D_0 - \ell q \pi^*(K_X + \Delta)))$ is a polynomial in ℓ by the Hirzebruch–Riemann–Roch theorem, (33) implies that it must be identically zero, hence $\chi(Y, \mathcal{O}_Y) = 0$ by setting $\ell = 0$. Thus, $\chi(X, \mathcal{O}_X) = 0$ as X has rational singularities, a contradiction which proves that $\kappa(X, K_X + \Delta) \geq 0$.

Step 4. Finally, in this step we show (b) and (c) simultaneously. By Step 3, we may assume that

$$(34) \quad \kappa(X, K_X + \Delta) \geq 0.$$

By assumption, there exists a minimal model $\varphi: (X, \Delta) \dashrightarrow (X', \Delta')$ of (X, Δ) . By possibly replacing Y by a higher birational model, we may assume that $(\pi, \pi'): Y \rightarrow X \times X'$ is a resolution of indeterminacies of φ such that Y is smooth.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & Y & \\ \pi \swarrow & & \searrow \pi' \\ X & \overset{\varphi}{\dashrightarrow} & X' \end{array}$$

Then as in the proof of Lemma 3.4 we obtain that

$$P_\sigma(\pi^*(K_X + \Delta)) \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} (\pi')^*(K_{X'} + \Delta').$$

This together with (32) implies

$$\begin{aligned} R_0 = \pi^*T_{\min} - D_0 &\equiv \pi^*(K_X + \Delta) - N_\sigma(\pi^*(K_X + \Delta)) \\ &= P_\sigma(\pi^*(K_X + \Delta)) \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} (\pi')^*(K_{X'} + \Delta'). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\kappa(X', K_{X'} + \Delta') = \kappa(X, K_X + \Delta) \geq 0$ by (34) and since R_0 has all Lelong numbers zero, we conclude that $K_{X'} + \Delta'$ is semiample by [GM17, Theorem 1.5]. Thus, φ is a good minimal model of (X, Δ) , which concludes the proof. \square

Finally, we have:

Proof of Theorem 11.1. We first note that the pair (Y, Δ_Y) has a minimal model by [LX23, Lemma 2.14(e)].

For each $\varepsilon \geq 0$ let $T_{\varepsilon, \min}$ be a current with minimal singularities in $\{K_Y + \Delta_Y + \varepsilon A\}$. Then by Lemma 5.2, for all positive integers m and ℓ we have

$$\mathcal{I}(\ell T_{0, \min}) \subseteq \mathcal{I}(\ell T_{\frac{1}{m}, \min}),$$

hence the assumptions of Theorem 11.1 imply that $\{T_{\frac{1}{m}, \min}\}_{m \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}}$ is an asymptotically equisingular approximation of $T_{0, \min}$. Then part (a) follows from Theorem 11.2(a) applied to the pair (Y, Δ_Y) .

For (b) and (c), note that $\kappa(X, K_X + \Delta) = \kappa(Y, K_Y + \Delta_Y)$, as well as $\chi(X, \mathcal{O}_X) = \chi(Y, \mathcal{O}_Y)$ since X has rational singularities. Thus, if $\kappa(X, K_X + \Delta) \geq 0$ or if $\chi(X, \mathcal{O}_X) \neq 0$, then (Y, Δ_Y) has a good minimal model by Theorem 11.2(b)(c). This implies that (X, Δ) has a good minimal model by [Laz24, Corollary 2.2]. But then $K_X + \Delta$ is semiample by the same argument as in the third paragraph of the proof of [LM21, Lemma 4.1]. This proves (b) and (c), and finishes the proof of the theorem. \square

12. LOCAL BEHAVIOUR

In this section we prove a general result on local linearity of currents with minimal singularities in the context of the Minimal Model Program, and on the local behaviour of the asymptotic base loci. It will be one of the ingredients in the proof of Theorem B.

Theorem 12.1. *Let (X, Δ) be a projective klt pair of dimension n such that Δ is a \mathbb{Q} -divisor and $K_X + \Delta$ is pseudoeffective. Assume that (X, Δ) has a minimal model. Let A be an ample \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X . Then there exists a rational number $0 < \delta \leq 1$ such that the following holds.*

- (a) *The sets $\mathbf{B}_-(K_X + \Delta + \varepsilon A)$ are independent of $\varepsilon \in [0, \delta)$.*
- (b) *For each $\varepsilon \in (0, \delta)$ we have*

$$\mathbf{B}_-(K_X + \Delta + \varepsilon A) = \mathbf{B}(K_X + \Delta + \varepsilon A) = \mathbf{B}_+(K_X + \Delta + \varepsilon A).$$

- (c) Assume that X is additionally smooth, and for each $\varepsilon \geq 0$ let $T_{\varepsilon, \min}$ be a current with minimal singularities in $\{K_X + \Delta + \varepsilon A\}$. Then for any two $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2 \in (0, \delta]$ and for any $t \in [0, 1]$ the current

$$tT_{\varepsilon_1, \min} + (1-t)T_{\varepsilon_2, \min}$$

has minimal singularities in the class $\{K_X + \Delta + (t\varepsilon_1 + (1-t)\varepsilon_2)A\}$.

Proof. First note that by replacing A by a sufficiently general divisor \mathbb{Q} -linearly equivalent to A , we may assume that the pair $(X, \Delta + A)$ is klt.

Step 1. As in the proof of Corollary 8.4(a), there exists a rational number $\delta > 0$ and a $(K_X + \Delta)$ -non-positive birational contraction $\xi: X \dashrightarrow X'$ such that for each $0 < \varepsilon \leq \delta$, the map ξ is a $(K_X + \Delta + \varepsilon A)$ -MMP. Moreover, if we set $\Delta' := \xi_*\Delta$ and $A' := \xi_*A$, then $(X', \Delta' + \varepsilon A')$ is a good minimal model of $(X, \Delta + \varepsilon A)$ for $0 < \varepsilon \leq \delta$ by the Basepoint free theorem [KM98, Theorem 3.3].

Let $(p, q): Y \rightarrow X \times X'$ be a resolution of indeterminacies of ξ such that Y is smooth.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & Y & \\ p \swarrow & & \searrow q \\ X & \xrightarrow{\xi} & X' \end{array}$$

By the Negativity lemma [KM98, Lemma 3.39], for each $\varepsilon \in [0, \delta]$ there exists an effective q -exceptional \mathbb{R} -divisor E_ε on Y such that

$$(35) \quad p^*(K_X + \Delta + \varepsilon A) \sim_{\mathbb{R}} q^*(K_{X'} + \Delta' + \varepsilon A') + E_\varepsilon.$$

Then

$$(36) \quad \text{the function } \varepsilon \mapsto E_\varepsilon \text{ is affine on } [0, \delta],$$

since both functions $\varepsilon \mapsto p^*(K_X + \Delta + \varepsilon A)$ and $\varepsilon \mapsto q^*(K_{X'} + \Delta' + \varepsilon A')$ are.

Step 2. In this step we prove (a). First note that by (35) and since each divisor $K_{X'} + \Delta' + \varepsilon A'$ is semiample for $\varepsilon \in (0, \delta]$, we have

$$\mathbf{B}(p^*(K_X + \Delta + \varepsilon A)) = \text{Supp } E_\varepsilon \quad \text{for all } \varepsilon \in (0, \delta],$$

which together with [BBP13, Proposition 2.8] and [LMT23, Lemma 2.3] implies

$$(37) \quad \mathbf{B}_-(K_X + \Delta + \varepsilon A) = \mathbf{B}(K_X + \Delta + \varepsilon A) = p(\text{Supp } E_\varepsilon) \quad \text{for all } \varepsilon \in (0, \delta].$$

On the other hand, (35) and [LP20a, Lemma 2.4] give

$$(38) \quad N_\sigma(p^*(K_X + \Delta + \varepsilon A)) = E_\varepsilon \quad \text{for all } \varepsilon \in [0, \delta].$$

Moreover, since A is ample, by the convexity of Nakayama–Zariski functions we have for each $0 \leq \xi_1 \leq \xi_2$:

$$\begin{aligned} N_\sigma(p^*(K_X + \Delta + \xi_2 A)) &\leq N_\sigma(p^*(K_X + \Delta + \xi_1 A)) + N_\sigma((\xi_2 - \xi_1)p^*A) \\ &= N_\sigma(p^*(K_X + \Delta + \xi_1 A)), \end{aligned}$$

hence $\text{Supp } E_{\xi_2} \subseteq \text{Supp } E_{\xi_1}$ when $0 \leq \xi_1 \leq \xi_2$. This together with (36) and (38) shows that

$$(39) \quad \text{Supp } E_0 = \text{Supp } E_\varepsilon \quad \text{for all } \varepsilon \in [0, \delta].$$

Now, (37) and (39) imply that

$$(40) \quad \mathbf{B}_-(K_X + \Delta + \varepsilon A) = p(\text{Supp } E_0) \quad \text{for all } \varepsilon \in (0, \delta),$$

whereas [ELM⁺06, Proposition 1.19] together with (37) and (39) gives

$$\mathbf{B}_-(K_X + \Delta) = \bigcup_{\varepsilon \in (0, \delta)} \mathbf{B}(K_X + \Delta + \varepsilon A) = p(\text{Supp } E_0)$$

This and (40) give (a).

Step 3. For (b), fix $\varepsilon \in (0, \delta)$. Then by [ELM⁺06, Proposition 1.21] there exists $\xi \in (0, \varepsilon)$ such that

$$\mathbf{B}_+(K_X + \Delta + \varepsilon A) = \mathbf{B}_-(K_X + \Delta + (\varepsilon - \xi)A).$$

Since $\mathbf{B}_-(K_X + \Delta + (\varepsilon - \xi)A) = \mathbf{B}_-(K_X + \Delta + \varepsilon A)$ by (a), we conclude that

$$\mathbf{B}_-(K_X + \Delta + \varepsilon A) = \mathbf{B}_+(K_X + \Delta + \varepsilon A),$$

which together with (3) proves (b).

Step 4. Finally, in this step we prove (c). By (35), for $\varepsilon \in [0, \delta]$ we have

$$p^*T_{\varepsilon, \min} \equiv q^*(K_{X'} + \Delta' + \varepsilon A') + E_\varepsilon,$$

and set

$$(41) \quad S_\varepsilon := p^*T_{\varepsilon, \min} - E_\varepsilon \in \{q^*(K_{X'} + \Delta' + \varepsilon A')\}.$$

Since $p^*T_{\varepsilon, \min}$ is a positive current with minimal singularities by Proposition 5.3, so is also S_ε by Lemma 5.5(c).

Fix $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2 \in (0, \delta]$. Then by (36) we have

$$(42) \quad E_{t\varepsilon_1 + (1-t)\varepsilon_2} = tE_{\varepsilon_1} + (1-t)E_{\varepsilon_2} \quad \text{for each } t \in [0, 1].$$

Since for every $\varepsilon \in (0, \delta]$ the current S_ε has minimal singularities and the \mathbb{R} -divisor $q^*(K_{X'} + \Delta' + \varepsilon A')$ is semiample, for each $t \in [0, 1]$ the current

$$tS_{\varepsilon_1} + (1-t)S_{\varepsilon_2} \in \{q^*(K_{X'} + \Delta' + (t\varepsilon_1 + (1-t)\varepsilon_2)A')\}$$

has minimal singularities by Lemma 5.6(c). Thus, by Lemma 5.5(b) and by (35) each current

$$(43) \quad tS_{\varepsilon_1} + (1-t)S_{\varepsilon_2} + E_{t\varepsilon_1 + (1-t)\varepsilon_2} \in \{p^*(K_X + \Delta + (t\varepsilon_1 + (1-t)\varepsilon_2)A)\}$$

has minimal singularities. Note that by (41) and (42) we have

$$\begin{aligned} p^*(tT_{\varepsilon_1, \min} + (1-t)T_{\varepsilon_2, \min}) &= t(S_{\varepsilon_1} + E_{\varepsilon_1}) + (1-t)(S_{\varepsilon_2} + E_{\varepsilon_2}) \\ &= tS_{\varepsilon_1} + (1-t)S_{\varepsilon_2} + E_{t\varepsilon_1 + (1-t)\varepsilon_2}, \end{aligned}$$

which together with (43) gives that for each $t \in [0, 1]$ the current

$$p^*(tT_{\varepsilon_1, \min} + (1-t)T_{\varepsilon_2, \min}) \in \{p^*(K_X + \Delta + (t\varepsilon_1 + (1-t)\varepsilon_2)A)\}$$

has minimal singularities. We conclude by Proposition 5.3. \square

We conclude this section with a few comments on the behaviour of the asymptotic base loci; the following example and proposition were obtained in discussions with Nikolaos Tsakanikas.

Recall that according to [ELM⁺06] a pseudoeffective \mathbb{R} -Cartier \mathbb{R} -divisor D on a normal projective variety X is called *stable* if $\mathbf{B}_-(D) = \mathbf{B}_+(D)$. Therefore, Theorem 12.1(b) shows that the stability of adjoint divisors holds, in a certain sense, locally on a klt pair (X, Δ) . Proposition 12.3, which complements results from [BBP13, TX23], says that in a similar situation as in Theorem 12.1, actually *all but finitely many* divisors of the form $K_X + \Delta + \varepsilon A$ are stable. We first note that, however, one cannot conclude that *all* such divisors are stable.

Example 12.2. This example is a slightly modified version of [TX23, Example 3.5], and it shows that there exists a projective klt pair (X, Δ) such that $K_X + \Delta$ is big, but

$$\mathbf{B}(K_X + \Delta) \neq \mathbf{B}_+(K_X + \Delta).$$

To that end, let X be the blowup of \mathbb{P}^2 along three distinct points which belong to a line $L \subseteq \mathbb{P}^2$, and let E_1, E_2 and E_3 be the exceptional divisors. Then $-K_X \sim 3L' + 2(E_1 + E_2 + E_3)$, where L' is the strict transform of L on X . From this it is easy to check that $-K_X$ is nef, but it is not ample since $K_X \cdot L' = 0$. Moreover, $-K_X$ is big as $K_X^2 = 6$. By [KM98, Proposition 2.61(3)] there exists an effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor $\Delta \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} -2K_X$ such that the pair (X, Δ) is klt. Therefore, $K_X + \Delta \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} -K_X$ is nef and big, hence semiample by the Basepoint free theorem [KM98, Theorem 3.3]. Thus, $\mathbf{B}(K_X + \Delta) = \emptyset$, whereas $\mathbf{B}_+(K_X + \Delta) \neq \emptyset$ since $K_X + \Delta$ is not ample.

Proposition 12.3. *Let (X, Δ) be a projective klt pair such that Δ is a \mathbb{Q} -divisor and $K_X + \Delta$ is pseudoeffective, and assume that (X, Δ) has a minimal model. Let A be an ample \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X . Then there exist only finitely many real numbers $\varepsilon \geq 0$ such that $K_X + \Delta + \varepsilon A$ is not stable, and all such ε are rational.*

When (X, Δ) is a projective klt pair such that $K_X + \Delta$ is big, then it has a minimal model by [BCHM10, CL13], hence Proposition 12.3 applies unconditionally to such pairs.

Proof. Set $n := \dim X$.

Assume first that $K_X + \Delta$ is big. By [KM98, Theorem 3.7(1)] we have that $K_X + \Delta + mA$ is ample for all $m > 2n$, and in particular each such divisor is stable. On the other hand, by Theorem 3.7 applied to the ring

$$R(X; K_X + \Delta, K_X + \Delta + 2nA),$$

there exist finitely many rational numbers $0 = \varepsilon_1 < \varepsilon_2 < \dots < \varepsilon_k = 2n$ such that for each i there exists a \mathbb{Q} -factorial projective variety X_i and a birational contraction $\varphi_i: X \dashrightarrow X_i$ such that φ_i is a minimal model for every klt pair

$(X, \Delta + \xi A)$ with $\varepsilon_i < \xi < \varepsilon_{i+1}$. Then for each $\xi \in (\varepsilon_i, \varepsilon_{i+1})$ the divisor $K_X + \Delta + \xi A$ is stable, by repeating verbatim the proof of Theorem 12.1(b). Therefore, if $K_X + \Delta + \varepsilon A$ is not stable for some $\varepsilon \geq 0$, then $\varepsilon \in \{\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_k\}$. This proves the proposition when $K_X + \Delta$ is big.

In the general case, by Theorem 12.1(b) there exists a rational number $0 < \delta \leq 1$ such that for each $\varepsilon \in (0, \delta)$ the divisor $K_X + \Delta + \varepsilon A$ is stable. On the other hand, by the first part of the proof there exist only finitely many real numbers $\varepsilon \geq \delta$ such that $K_X + \Delta + \varepsilon A$ is not stable, and they are all rational. This finishes the proof. \square

Part IV. Approximations by supercanonical currents

13. A UNIFORM BOUND THEOREM

In this section we prove a crucial result that will be used several times in the remainder of the paper. It shows the existence of global holomorphic sections of adjoint line bundles with precise properties, which depend only on a prescribed open cover of the given compact complex manifold.

The method of the proof is to construct holomorphic sections locally by the Ohsawa-Takegoshi extension theorem, and then use smooth cut-off functions and solve a $\bar{\partial}$ -equation by a version of Hörmander's L^2 estimates to find global holomorphic sections satisfying similar estimates. These techniques go back at least to the proofs of [Hör07, Theorem 4.2.7] and [Dem92a, Proposition 3.1]. One of the main difficulties is to organise the proof in such a way that all the constants depend only on the starting data.

Theorem 13.1. *Let X be a compact Kähler manifold with a Kähler form ω , and fix an open covering \mathcal{U} of X by coordinate balls on which K_X trivialises. Then there exist positive constants δ and C , depending only on \mathcal{U} , with the following property. For each line bundle L on X which trivialises on \mathcal{U} , for every singular metric h on L with $\Theta_h(L) \geq \delta\omega$, and for each $x \in X$ such that the restriction of h to the fibre L_x is well defined, there is a section $\sigma_x \in H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(K_X) \otimes L)$ such that*

$$(44) \quad |\sigma_x(x)|_{h,\omega} = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \|\sigma_x\|_{h,\omega} \leq C.$$

Proof. Let $n := \dim X$.

Step 1. In this step we prepare an open covering of X and a sequence of new metrics we will need in the next steps.

We fix a finite covering $\{V_1, \dots, V_r\}$ of X by coordinate balls such that for each $1 \leq i \leq r$ we have $V_i \Subset W_i \Subset U_i$ for some coordinate balls W_i and U_i , where the covering $\{U_1, \dots, U_r\}$ is subordinate to \mathcal{U} ; this is possible by the compactness of X . For each $1 \leq i \leq r$ fix a function $\chi_i \in C_c^\infty(X)$ such that $0 \leq \chi_i \leq 1$, $\text{Supp}(\chi_i) \subseteq U_i$ and $\chi_i \equiv 1$ on W_i .

Given a point $x \in \bar{V}_i$ for some $1 \leq i \leq r$, consider the function

$$\varphi_{i,x}(z) := n\chi_i(z) \log |z - x| \quad \text{for } z \in U_i.$$

Then the extension by zero of $\varphi_{i,x}$ defines a function $\varphi_{i,x}: X \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}$ such that $\text{Supp}(\varphi_{i,x}) \subseteq U_i$, and such that the following properties hold:

- (i) $dd^c \varphi_{i,x} \geq 0$ on W_i , since $\chi_i \equiv 1$ on W_i and the function $z \mapsto \log |z - x|$ is plurisubharmonic,
- (ii) $dd^c \varphi_{i,x}$ is a smooth form on $X \setminus W_i$ whose coefficients are bounded independently of i and x , since $(x, z) \mapsto \chi_i(z) \log |z - x|$ is a smooth function on the compact set $\bar{V}_i \times (\text{Supp}(\chi_i) \setminus W_i)$.

Then (i), (ii) and Lemma 2.1 imply that there exists a constant $\eta > 0$ such that

$$(45) \quad dd^c \varphi_{i,x} \geq -\eta\omega \quad \text{for all } i \text{ and } x.$$

Note that η depends only on the choice of sets V_i, W_i and U_i and on the choice of functions χ_i .

Set

$$(46) \quad M_1 := \max_{1 \leq i \leq r} \max \{ \bar{\partial} \chi_i(z) \mid z \in X \}$$

and

$$(47) \quad M_2 := \max_{1 \leq i \leq r} \sup \{ e^{-2\varphi_{i,x}(z)} \mid (x, z) \in V_i \times (U_i \setminus W_i) \};$$

note that M_2 is well defined for the same reason as in (ii) above and since $\text{Supp}(\varphi_{i,x}) \subseteq U_i$. Further, set

$$(48) \quad M_3 := \min_{1 \leq i \leq r} \inf \{ e^{-2\varphi_{i,x}(z)} \mid (x, z) \in V_i \times X \}.$$

Then $M_3 > 0$ since $\varphi_{i,x}(z) \leq n \log(\text{diam}(U_i))$ for $(x, z) \in V_i \times U_i$ and $\varphi_{i,x}(z) = 0$ otherwise. Note that M_1, M_2 and M_3 depend only on the choice of sets V_i, W_i and U_i and on the choice of functions χ_i .

Step 2. Set $\delta := 2\eta$. In the remainder of the proof we show that there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for any singular metric h on L with $\Theta_h(L) \geq \delta\omega$ and for each $x \in X$ such that the restriction of h to the fibre L_x is well defined, there is a section $\sigma_x \in H^0(X, K_X + L)$ such that (44) holds.

Fix a singular metric h on L with

$$(49) \quad \Theta_h(L) \geq \delta\omega,$$

and fix a point $x \in V_i$ for some $1 \leq i \leq r$ for which the restriction of h to the fibre L_x is well defined. By the Ohsawa–Takegoshi extension theorem [OT87, Theorem] on U_i , applied successively n times to a collection of n hyperplanes intersecting at x , there exist a constant C_1 depending only on the cover $\{U_1, \dots, U_r\}$ (and, in particular, not on x and h) and a section $s_x \in H^0(U_i, \mathcal{O}_X(K_X) \otimes L)$ such that

$$(50) \quad |s_x(x)|_{h,\omega} = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{U_i} |s_x|_{h,\omega}^2 dV_\omega \leq C_1.$$

The problem is that s_x is a holomorphic section only on U_i and not on the whole X . The strategy is to use Theorem 2.13 to rectify this.

Note that $\chi_i s_x$ is a smooth L -valued $(n, 0)$ -form on X , and set

$$f_x := \bar{\partial}(\chi_i s_x).$$

Then f_x is a smooth L -valued $(n, 1)$ -form on X such that $\bar{\partial} f_x = 0$, and note that

$$(51) \quad f_x = \bar{\partial} \chi_i \cdot s_x$$

since s_x is holomorphic, hence

$$(52) \quad \text{Supp}(f_x) \subseteq U_i \setminus W_i$$

since $\chi_i \equiv 1$ on W_i and $\text{Supp}(\chi_i) \subseteq U_i$.

Now, consider the singular metric $h_{i,x} := he^{-2\varphi_{i,x}}$ on L . Then by (45) and (49) we have

$$\Theta_{h_{i,x}}(L) \geq (\delta - \eta)\omega = \eta\omega.$$

Therefore, as $\eta > 0$, by Theorem 2.13 there exists an L -valued $(n, 0)$ -form u_x on X such that $\bar{\partial}u_x = f_x$ in the sense of currents and

$$(53) \quad \|u_x\|_{h_{i,x},\omega}^2 \leq \frac{1}{2\pi\eta} \|f_x\|_{h_{i,x},\omega}^2.$$

Moreover, observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \|f_x\|_{h_{i,x},\omega}^2 &= \int_X |f_x|_{h,\omega}^2 e^{-2\varphi_{i,x}} dV_\omega \\ &= \int_{U_i \setminus W_i} |f_x|_{h,\omega}^2 e^{-2\varphi_{i,x}} dV_\omega && \text{by (52)} \\ &\leq M_2 \int_{U_i \setminus W_i} |f_x|_{h,\omega}^2 dV_\omega && \text{by (47)} \\ &= M_2 \int_{U_i \setminus W_i} |\bar{\partial}\chi_i \cdot s_x|_{h,\omega}^2 dV_\omega && \text{by (51)} \\ &\leq C_1 M_1^2 M_2, && \text{by (46) and (50)} \end{aligned}$$

and therefore, setting $C_2 := \frac{1}{2\pi\eta} C_1 M_1^2 M_2$, by (53) we have

$$(54) \quad \|u_x\|_{h_{i,x},\omega}^2 \leq C_2.$$

Step 3. Set

$$\sigma_x := \chi_i s_x - u_x.$$

Then $\bar{\partial}\sigma_x = \bar{\partial}(\chi_i s_x) - \bar{\partial}u_x = 0$ in the sense of currents, which implies that σ_x is a holomorphic L -valued $(n, 0)$ -form by the regularity of the $\bar{\partial}$ -operator. In particular, u_x is a smooth L -valued $(n, 0)$ -form, as it is the difference of smooth forms $\chi_i s_x$ and σ_x . Since

$$|u_x|_{h_{i,x},\omega}^2 = |u_x|_{h,\omega}^2 |z - x|^{-2n\chi_i(z)},$$

and since the function $|z - x|^{-2n}$ is not locally integrable at $z = x$, the inequality (54) and Remark 2.12 imply that $u_x(x) = 0$. Thus, $|\sigma_x(x)|_{h,\omega} = 1$ by (50).

On the other hand, by (48) and (54) we have

$$(55) \quad M_3 \|u_x\|_{h,\omega}^2 \leq \int_X |u_x|_{h,\omega}^2 e^{-2\varphi_{i,x}} dV_\omega = \|u_x\|_{h_{i,x},\omega}^2 \leq C_2.$$

Finally, the triangle inequality together with (50) and (55) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \|\sigma_x\|_{h,\omega} &\leq \|\chi_i s_x\|_{h,\omega} + \|u_x\|_{h,\omega} \\ &\leq \left(\int_{U_i} |s_x|_{h,\omega}^2 dV_\omega \right)^{1/2} + \|u_x\|_{h,\omega} \leq \sqrt{C_1} + \sqrt{C_2/M_3}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $C := \sqrt{C_1} + \sqrt{C_2/M_3}$ is the desired constant. \square

14. SUPERCANONICAL CURRENTS ON BIG LINE BUNDLES

In this section we analyse supercanonical currents on big \mathbb{Q} -divisors on a projective manifold in detail. The main result of the section, Theorem 14.3, says that the corresponding supercanonical potentials depend only on the global sections of multiples of L in a very precise sense.

The main technical result of the section is Theorem 14.1. The proof uses the main ideas of the proof of [BD12, Proposition 5.19], which we occasionally follow closely and which in turn uses essentially Demailly's estimates from his regularisation results [Dem92a]. However, several arguments in [BD12] are difficult to follow. Instead, in this paper we use crucially the uniform bounds result (Theorem 13.1) as well as the approximation result (Corollary 4.4) to make arguments streamlined and more precise.

Theorem 14.1. *Let X be a projective manifold with a Kähler form ω . Let L be a big \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X and set $N := \{m \in \mathbb{N} \mid mL \text{ is Cartier}\}$. Fix a smooth metric h on L and denote $\alpha := \Theta_h(L) \in \{L\}$. Let $\varphi \in \text{PSH}(X, \alpha)$ such that*

$$(56) \quad \int_X e^{2\varphi} dV_\omega \leq 1.$$

Then there exists a sequence of sections $\sigma_m \in H^0(X, mL)$ for $m \in N$ such that

$$\int_X |\sigma_m|_{h^m}^{2/m} dV_\omega \leq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \varphi = \left(\limsup_{m \rightarrow \infty} \log |\sigma_m|_{h^m}^{1/m} \right)^*.$$

Proof. Step 1. In this step we prepare several constants that will be used throughout the proof.

Fix a finite covering \mathcal{U} of X by coordinate balls on which K_X and all mL trivialise, for $m \in N$. Fix constants δ and C , depending only on \mathcal{U} , as in Theorem 13.1. As L is big, there exist a positive constant ε and $\psi \in \text{PSH}(X, \alpha)$ such that

$$(57) \quad \alpha + dd^c \psi \geq \varepsilon \omega.$$

Since ψ is bounded from above, by subtracting a constant from ψ we may assume that

$$(58) \quad \psi \leq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \int_X e^{2\psi} dV_\omega \leq \frac{1}{2}.$$

Let h_ω be the smooth metric on K_X induced by the hermitian metric on T_X whose fundamental form is ω . Note that by Lemma 2.1 there exists a constant $C_\omega > 0$ such that

$$(59) \quad -\Theta_{h_\omega}(K_X) + C_\omega \omega \geq 0.$$

We fix for the remainder of the proof an integer $p > 1$ such that:

- (i) $p\varepsilon - C_\omega \geq \delta$,
- (ii) $C \leq 2^{(p-1)/2}$.

Since $\frac{p}{p-1}\psi \leq \psi$ by the first inequality in (58), by the second inequality in (58) we have

$$(60) \quad \int_X e^{2\frac{p}{p-1}\psi} dV_\omega \leq \frac{1}{2}.$$

Step 2. In this step we prepare several Cartier divisors on X and singular metrics on them.

Set

$$N_{\geq p} := \{n \in N \mid n \geq p\}.$$

For each $m \in N_{\geq p}$ set

$$L_m := mL - K_X.$$

Then

$$h_m := e^{-2(m-p)\varphi - 2p\psi} h^m h_\omega^{-1}$$

is a singular metric on L_m with curvature current

$$\begin{aligned} \Theta_{h_m}(L_m) &= m\alpha + (m-p)dd^c\varphi + pdd^c\psi - \Theta_{h_\omega}(K_X) \\ &\geq (p\varepsilon - C_\omega)\omega \end{aligned}$$

by (57), by (59) and since $\alpha + dd^c\varphi \geq 0$. This together with the property (i) from Step 1 yields

$$(61) \quad \Theta_{h_m}(L_m) \geq \delta\omega.$$

For each $m \in N_{\geq p}$ define the singular metric

$$g_m := h_m h_\omega = e^{-2(m-p)\varphi - 2p\psi} h^m$$

on $K_X + L_m = mL$.

Step 3. By Theorem 13.1, by the choices of the constants δ and C in Step 1 and by (61), for each $m \in N_{\geq p}$ and each $x \in X \setminus \{\varphi + \psi = -\infty\}$ there is a section

$$\sigma_{m,x} \in H^0(X, K_X + L_m)$$

such that

$$(62) \quad |\sigma_{m,x}(x)|_{g_m} = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \|\sigma_{m,x}\|_{g_m} \leq C.$$

For $m \in N_{\geq p}$, Hölder's inequality for conjugate exponents $\frac{1}{m} + \frac{m-p}{m} + \frac{p-1}{m} = 1$ gives

$$\begin{aligned} \int_X |\sigma_{m,x}|_{h^m}^{2/m} dV_\omega &= \int_X (|\sigma_{m,x}|_{h^m}^2 e^{-2(m-p)\varphi - 2p\psi})^{\frac{1}{m}} e^{2\frac{m-p}{m}\varphi} e^{2\frac{p}{m}\psi} dV_\omega \\ &\leq \|\sigma_{m,x}\|_{g_m}^{2/m} \left(\int_X e^{2\varphi} dV_\omega \right)^{\frac{m-p}{m}} \left(\int_X e^{2\frac{p}{p-1}\psi} dV_\omega \right)^{\frac{p-1}{m}} \\ &\leq C^{\frac{2}{m}} 2^{\frac{1-p}{m}}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from (56), (60) and (62). This together with the property (ii) from Step 1 gives

$$(63) \quad \int_X |\sigma_{m,x}|_{h^m}^{2/m} dV_\omega \leq 1 \quad \text{for all } m \in N_{\geq p}.$$

Furthermore, for $x \in X \setminus \{\varphi + \psi = -\infty\}$, from (62) we have

$$1 = |\sigma_{m,x}(x)|_{g_m} = |\sigma_{m,x}(x)|_{h^m} e^{-(m-p)\varphi(x) - p\psi(x)},$$

and thus

$$(64) \quad \log |\sigma_{m,x}(x)|_{h^m}^{1/m} = \left(1 - \frac{p}{m}\right)\varphi(x) + \frac{p}{m}\psi(x).$$

Step 4. Set

$$\mathcal{P} := \{z \in X \mid (\varphi + \psi)(z) = -\infty\}.$$

Then the set \mathcal{P} is of Lebesgue measure zero in X and the set $X \setminus \mathcal{P}$ is dense in X . By Corollary 4.4 there exists a countable set

$$\mathcal{D} := \{x_q \mid q \in \mathbb{N}\} \subseteq X \setminus \mathcal{P}$$

which is dense in X , such that for each $z \in X$ there exists a sequence $\{z_s\}$ in \mathcal{D} with

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} z_s = z \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} \varphi(z_s) = \varphi(z).$$

Fix a sequence $\{q_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}}$ of positive integers, in which each positive integer occurs infinitely many times. For each integer $m \in N_{\geq p}$ we have $x_{q_m} \in X \setminus \{\varphi + \psi = -\infty\}$, hence we may, by Step 3, define sections

$$\sigma_m \in H^0(X, mL) = H^0(X, K_X + L_m)$$

by

$$(65) \quad \sigma_m := \sigma_{m, x_{q_m}},$$

and note that $\sigma_{m, x_{q_m}}$ satisfy inequalities (63). Set

$$u := \limsup_{m \rightarrow \infty} \log |\sigma_m|_{h^m}^{1/m}.$$

We will show that

$$\varphi = u^*.$$

Step 5. Fix a point $x \in X$. In this step we show that

$$(66) \quad \varphi(x) \geq u^*(x).$$

By Lemma 4.5 (applied to the \mathbb{Q} -divisor L and the metric h) there exist constants $C_2 > 0$ and $r_0 > 0$ such that for every coordinate ball $B(x, r)$ with $r \leq r_0$ and for each integer $m \in N_{\geq p}$ we have

$$(67) \quad |\sigma_m(x)|_{h^m}^2 \leq e^{2mC_2r^2} \int_{B(x,r)} |\sigma_m|_{h^m}^2 dV_\omega.$$

Now, since the functions φ and ψ are bounded from above on $B(x, r)$, (62) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B(x,r)} |\sigma_m|_{h^m}^2 dV_\omega &= \int_{B(x,r)} |\sigma_m|_{g_m}^2 e^{2(m-p)\varphi+2p\psi} dV_\omega \\ &\leq \|\sigma_m\|_{g_m}^2 \sup_{B(x,r)} e^{2(m-p)\varphi+2p\psi} \leq C^2 \sup_{B(x,r)} e^{2(m-p)\varphi+2p\psi}, \end{aligned}$$

which together with (67) implies

$$|\sigma_m(x)|_{h^m}^2 \leq \frac{e^{2mC_2r^2} n! C^2}{r^{2n} \pi^n} \sup_{B(x,r)} e^{2(m-p)\varphi+2p\psi}.$$

Plugging in $r := \frac{1}{m}$ for $m \geq \max\{p, \frac{1}{r_0}\}$, taking logarithms of both sides and dividing by $2m$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \log |\sigma_m(x)|_{h^m}^{1/m} &\leq \frac{C_2}{m^2} + \frac{n \log m}{m} + \frac{1}{2m} \log(n! C^2 / \pi^n) \\ &\quad + \sup_{B(x, \frac{1}{m})} \left(1 - \frac{p}{m}\right) \varphi + \sup_{B(x, \frac{1}{m})} \frac{p}{m} \psi. \end{aligned}$$

Taking lim sup as $m \rightarrow \infty$, by Lemma 4.1(a)(b) we obtain

$$u(x) = \limsup_{m \rightarrow \infty} \log |\sigma_m(x)|_{h^m}^{1/m} \leq \varphi(x),$$

which gives (66) since φ is upper semicontinuous.

Step 6. Fix a point $x \in X$. In this step we finally show that

$$\varphi(x) \leq u^*(x).$$

To this end, recalling the construction of the set \mathcal{D} from Step 4, we may find a strictly increasing sequence $\{q'_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}}$ of positive integers such that $x_{q'_j} \in \mathcal{D}$ for all j and we have

$$(68) \quad \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} x_{q'_j} = x \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \varphi(x_{q'_j}) = \varphi(x).$$

By the construction in Step 4, for each fixed j there is a strictly increasing sequence $\{m_\ell\}_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}}$ in the set $N_{\geq p}$ such that $q'_j = q_{m_\ell}$ for all ℓ . Then $\sigma_{m_\ell} = \sigma_{m_\ell, x_{q_{m_\ell}}}$ by (65). Hence, by (64) and since $\psi(x_{q'_j}) \neq -\infty$ by the construction of \mathcal{D} we have

$$\begin{aligned} u(x_{q'_j}) &\geq \limsup_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \log |\sigma_{m_\ell}(x_{q'_j})|_{h^{m_\ell}}^{1/m_\ell} \\ &= \limsup_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \log |\sigma_{m_\ell, x_{q_{m_\ell}}}(x_{q_{m_\ell}})|_{h^{m_\ell}}^{1/m_\ell} = \varphi(x_{q'_j}). \end{aligned}$$

Then this last inequality and (68) give

$$u^*(x) \geq \limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} u(x_{q'_j}) \geq \limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} \varphi(x_{q'_j}) = \varphi(x),$$

which finishes the proof. \square

Remark 14.2. In the proof of Theorem 14.1 the auxiliary quasi-psh function ψ had to be introduced for two reasons: (a) to create a singular metric on each L_m whose curvature current is sufficiently positive, and (b) to be able to prove inequality (63). The positive integer p in the proof of Theorem 14.1 does not depend on φ nor on any integer m in the proof, but it does depend on the choice of ψ .

The following main result of this section is inspired by [BD12, Remark 5.23].

Theorem 14.3. *Let X be a projective manifold with a Kähler form ω . Let L be a big \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X and set $N := \{m \in \mathbb{N} \mid mL \text{ is Cartier}\}$. Fix a smooth metric h on L and denote $\alpha := \Theta_h(L) \in \{L\}$. For each $m \in N$ set*

$$V_{h,m} := \left\{ \sigma \in H^0(X, mL) \mid \int_X |\sigma|_{h^m}^{2/m} dV_\omega \leq 1 \right\}$$

and

$$\varphi_{h,m} := \sup_{\sigma \in V_{h,m}} \log |\sigma|_{h^m}^{1/m}.$$

Then:

- (i) for each $m \in N$ and each $\sigma \in H^0(X, mL)$ there exists a positive real number λ such that $\lambda\sigma \in V_{h,m}$,
- (ii) there exists a constant C such that $\log |\sigma|_{h^m}^{1/m} \leq C$ for each $m \in N$ and each $\sigma \in V_{h,m}$,
- (iii) $V_{h,m}$ is compact in $H^0(X, mL)$ for each $m \in N$,
- (iv) $\varphi_{h,m} = \max_{\sigma \in V_{h,m}} \log |\sigma|_{h^m}^{1/m}$ for each $m \in N$,
- (v) $\varphi_{h,m} \in \text{PSH}(X, \alpha)$ for each $m \in N$,
- (vi) $\varphi_{h,km} \geq \varphi_{h,m}$ for each $m \in N$ and each positive integer k ,
- (vii) the supercanonical potential of L associated to α is

$$\varphi_{\alpha, \text{can}} = \left(\sup_{m \in N} \varphi_{h,m} \right)^*,$$

- (viii) the sequence $\{\varphi_{h,m}\}_{m \in N}$ converges to $\varphi_{\alpha, \text{can}}$ in $L_{\text{loc}}^1(X)$,
- (ix) $\mathcal{I}(\varphi_{h,m}) = \mathcal{I}(\varphi_{\alpha, \text{can}})$ for all $m \in N$ sufficiently large,
- (x) $\varphi_{h,m}$ is continuous on $X \setminus \mathbf{B}(L)$ for all $m \in N$ sufficiently divisible,
- (xi) the sequence $\{\varphi_{h,m}\}_{m \in N}$ converges uniformly on compact subsets of $X \setminus \mathbf{B}_+(L)$ to $\varphi_{\alpha, \text{can}}$,
- (xii) $\varphi_{\alpha, \text{can}}$ is bounded on $X \setminus \mathbf{B}(L)$, it is continuous on $X \setminus \mathbf{B}_+(L)$, and

$$\varphi_{\alpha, \text{can}} = \sup_{m \in N} \varphi_{h,m} \quad \text{on } X \setminus \mathbf{B}_+(L).$$

Proof. Set

$$\mathcal{S}_\alpha := \left\{ \varphi \in \text{PSH}(X, \alpha) \mid \int_X e^{2\varphi} dV_\omega \leq 1 \right\},$$

and recall from Lemma 6.1 that the supercanonical potential associated to α was defined as

$$\varphi_{\alpha, \text{can}}(x) := \sup_{\varphi \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha} \varphi(x) \quad \text{for } x \in X.$$

Step 1. Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\sigma \in H^0(X, mL)$. Then $\log |\sigma|_{h^m}^{1/m} \in \text{PSH}(X, \alpha)$ by Example 2.6(b). Moreover, since $|\sigma|_{h^m}$ is bounded from above on X , there exists a constant $C_\sigma > 0$ such that

$$\int_X |\sigma|_{h^m}^{2/m} dV_\omega \leq C_\sigma,$$

hence $C_\sigma^{-m/2} \sigma \in V_{h,m}$, which gives (i). If $\sigma \in V_{h,m}$, then

$$\int_X e^{2 \log |\sigma|_{h^m}^{1/m}} dV_\omega = \int_X |\sigma|_{h^m}^{2/m} dV_\omega \leq 1,$$

thus

$$(69) \quad \{ \log |\sigma|_{h^m}^{1/m} \mid \sigma \in V_{h,m} \} \subseteq \mathcal{S}_\alpha.$$

Then (ii) follows from Lemma 6.1(b).

Step 2. Define the norm $\| \cdot \|_{\max}$ on $H^0(X, mL)$ by

$$\|s\|_{\max} := \sup_X |s|_{h^m} \quad \text{for } s \in H^0(X, mL).$$

Consider a sequence $\{\sigma_\ell\}$ in $V_{h,m}$. Since $V_{h,m}$ is bounded in $H^0(X, mL)$ with respect to the norm $\| \cdot \|_{\max}$ by (ii), by passing to a subsequence we may assume that the sequence $\{\sigma_\ell\}$ converges to a section $\sigma \in H^0(X, mL)$. To prove (iii) it suffices to show that $\sigma \in V_{h,m}$.

Note that $\log |\sigma|_{h^m}$, as well as all the functions $\log |\sigma_\ell|_{h^m}$, belong to $\text{PSH}(X, m\alpha)$ by Example 2.6(b). By (ii) and by Theorem 2.4(b), after passing to a subsequence we may assume that the sequence $\{\log |\sigma_\ell|_{h^m}\}$ converges in $L_{\text{loc}}^1(X)$ and almost everywhere to a function $\varphi \in \text{PSH}(X, m\alpha)$. Thus $\varphi = \log |\sigma|_{h^m}$ almost everywhere, hence everywhere by Corollary 2.3. But then $\log |\sigma|_{h^m} \in \mathcal{S}_{m\alpha}$ by Fatou's lemma, hence $\sigma \in V_{h,m}$, as desired.

Step 3. Now we show (iv). Fix $x \in X$. Then there exists a sequence of sections $\sigma_j \in V_{h,m}$ such that $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \log |\sigma_j(x)|_{h^m}^{1/m} = \varphi_{h,m}(x)$. By (iii) and by passing to a subsequence we may assume that there exists $\sigma \in V_{h,m}$ such that $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \sigma_j = \sigma$. Thus $\varphi_{h,m}(x) = \log |\sigma(x)|_{h^m}^{1/m}$.

Step 4. Next we prove (v). By (ii) and Theorem 2.4(a) we have that $(\varphi_{h,m})^* \in \text{PSH}(X, \alpha)$. Fix $x \in X$. As $(\varphi_{h,m})^*(x) = \limsup_{z \rightarrow x} \varphi_{h,m}(z)$, by (iv) there exists a sequence of sections $\sigma_j \in V_{h,m}$ and a sequence of points $x_j \in X$ such that

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} x_j = x \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \log |\sigma_j(x_j)|_{h^m}^{1/m} = (\varphi_{h,m})^*(x).$$

By (iii) and by passing to a subsequence we may assume that there exists $\sigma \in V_{h,m}$ such that $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \sigma_j = \sigma$. Then Lemma 4.6(b) gives

$$(\varphi_{h,m})^*(x) = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \log |\sigma_j(x_j)|_{h^m}^{1/m} = \log |\sigma(x)|_{h^m}^{1/m} \leq \varphi_{h,m}(x),$$

which shows that $\varphi_{h,m} = (\varphi_{h,m})^*$. Thus, $\varphi_{h,m}$ is α -psh.

Step 5. For (vi), fix $x \in X$, $m \in N$ and a positive integer k . By (iv) there exists $\sigma \in V_{h,m}$ such that $\varphi_{h,m}(x) = \log |\sigma(x)|_{h^m}^{1/m}$. Since $|\sigma^k|_{h^{mk}}^{1/mk} = |\sigma|_{h^m}^{1/m}$, we have $\sigma^k \in V_{h,mk}$, and hence

$$\varphi_{h,km}(x) \geq \log |\sigma^k(x)|_{h^{mk}}^{1/mk} = \log |\sigma(x)|_{h^m}^{1/m} = \varphi_{h,m}(x),$$

which was to be shown.

Step 6. By (ii) and by Theorem 2.4(a) we have

$$\varphi_{h,\text{alg}} := \left(\sup_{m \in N} \varphi_{h,m} \right)^* \in \text{PSH}(X, \alpha).$$

It is immediate that $\varphi_{h,\text{alg}} \leq \varphi_{\alpha,\text{can}}$ by (69). For the reverse inequality, let $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha$. Then by Theorem 14.1 there exists a sequence of sections $\tau_m \in V_{h,m}$ for $m \in N$ such that

$$\varphi = \left(\limsup_{m \rightarrow \infty} \log |\tau_m|_{h^m}^{1/m} \right)^*.$$

Since $\log |\tau_m|_{h^m}^{1/m} \leq \varphi_{h,m}$ for each $m \in N$ by the definition of $\varphi_{h,m}$, we obtain

$$\varphi \leq \left(\limsup_{m \rightarrow \infty} \varphi_{h,m} \right)^* \leq \left(\sup_{m \in N} \varphi_{h,m} \right)^* = \varphi_{h,\text{alg}},$$

hence

$$\varphi_{\alpha,\text{can}} = \sup_{\varphi \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha} \varphi \leq \varphi_{h,\text{alg}}.$$

This shows (vii). Part (viii) follows from (vi) and from Theorem 2.4(d).

Step 7. Part (ix) follows from (vii) and (viii) and from Theorem 2.8.

Step 8. In this step we prove (x). We first show that $\varphi_{h,m} \neq -\infty$ away from $\mathbf{B}(L)$ for all $m \in N$ sufficiently divisible. Indeed, by Remark 3.5 we have $\text{Bs } |mL| = \mathbf{B}(L)$ for all m sufficiently divisible. Therefore, for each point $x \in X \setminus \mathbf{B}(L)$ there exists $\sigma \in H^0(X, mL)$ such that $\sigma(x) \neq 0$. By (i) there exists a positive real number λ such that $\lambda\sigma \in V_{h,m}$, hence $\varphi_{h,m}(x) \geq \log |\lambda\sigma(x)|_{h^m}^{1/m} > -\infty$.

Fix one such sufficiently divisible m . Fix $x_0 \in X \setminus \mathbf{B}(L)$ and a sequence of points $\{x_j\}$ in $X \setminus \mathbf{B}(L)$ such that $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} x_j = x_0$. By sequential continuity it suffices to show that

$$(70) \quad \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \varphi_{h,m}(x_j) = \varphi_{h,m}(x_0).$$

To that end, set

$$a := \limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} \varphi_{h,m}(x_j),$$

and note that $a \neq +\infty$ since $\varphi_{h,m}$ are uniformly bounded from above by (ii). By (iv) there exists $\sigma_0 \in V_{\alpha,m}$ such that $\varphi_{\alpha,m}(x_0) = \log |\sigma_0(x_0)|_{h^m}^{1/m}$.

Note first that $\varphi_{h,m}(x_j) \geq \log |\sigma_0(x_j)|_{h^m}^{1/m}$ by the definition of $\varphi_{\alpha,m}$, hence

$$(71) \quad a \geq \liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} \log |\sigma_0(x_j)|_{h^m}^{1/m} = \log |\sigma_0(x_0)|_{h^m}^{1/m} = \varphi_{h,m}(x_0).$$

We will now show that $a \leq \varphi_{h,m}(x_0)$, which together with (71) will then prove (70). By passing to a subsequence of $\{x_j\}$ we may assume that $a = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \varphi_{h,m}(x_j)$. By (iv), for each $j \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $\sigma_j \in V_{h,m}$ such that

$\varphi_{h,m}(x_j) = \log |\sigma_j(x_j)|_{h^m}^{1/m}$. By (iii) and by passing to a subsequence we may assume that there exists $\tilde{\sigma} \in V_{h,m}$ such that $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \sigma_j = \tilde{\sigma}$. Then Lemma

4.6(b) gives

$$a = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \log |\sigma_j(x_j)|_{h^m}^{1/m} = \log |\tilde{\sigma}(x_0)|_{h^m}^{1/m} \leq \varphi_{h,m}(x_0).$$

This concludes the proof of (x).

Step 9. In this step we prove (xi). To this end, we use the notation from the proof of Theorem 14.1. We first note that, by Corollary 4.8 we may and do choose the function ψ as in the proof of Theorem 14.1 such that it has logarithmic poles which all lie in $\mathbf{B}_+(L)$.

Let $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Then by (63), (64) and Remark 14.2 there exist a positive integer p (independent of φ and m) and sections $\sigma_{m,x} \in V_{h,m}$ for each $x \in X \setminus \{\varphi + \psi = -\infty\}$ such that

$$\log |\sigma_{m,x}(x)|_{h^m}^{1/m} = \left(1 - \frac{p}{m}\right)\varphi(x) + \frac{p}{m}\psi(x),$$

hence by the definition of the function $\varphi_{h,m}$, for each $x \in X \setminus \{\varphi + \psi = -\infty\}$ we obtain

$$\varphi_{h,m}(x) \geq \left(1 - \frac{p}{m}\right)\varphi(x) + \frac{p}{m}\psi(x).$$

This inequality holds trivially when $\varphi(x) = -\infty$ or $\psi(x) = -\infty$, hence it holds for all $x \in X$. By the definition of $\varphi_{\alpha,\text{can}}$ this then implies

$$(72) \quad \varphi_{h,m}(x) \geq \left(1 - \frac{p}{m}\right)\varphi_{\alpha,\text{can}}(x) + \frac{p}{m}\psi(x) \quad \text{for all } x \in X.$$

Note that $\varphi_{h,m} \neq -\infty$ on $X \setminus \mathbf{B}(L)$ by (x), hence $\varphi_{\alpha,\text{can}} \neq -\infty$ on $X \setminus \mathbf{B}(L)$ by (vii). As $\psi \neq -\infty$ on $X \setminus \mathbf{B}_+(L)$ by construction, we have

$$0 \leq \varphi_{\alpha,\text{can}}(x) - \varphi_{h,m}(x) \leq \frac{p}{m}(\varphi_{\alpha,\text{can}}(x) - \psi(x)) \quad \text{for } x \in X \setminus \mathbf{B}_+(L)$$

by (vii) and (72). Since ψ is smooth on $X \setminus \mathbf{B}_+(L)$ and $\varphi_{\alpha,\text{can}}$ is bounded from above, we conclude that for each compact set $K \subseteq X \setminus \mathbf{B}_+(L)$ there exists a constant $C_K > 0$ such that

$$0 \leq \varphi_{\alpha,\text{can}}(x) - \varphi_{h,m}(x) \leq \frac{C_K}{m},$$

so (xi) follows.

Step 10. Finally, the first part of (xii) was already noticed in Step 9, the second part of (xii) follows from (x) and (xi) by the uniform convergence

theorem, and then the third part of (xii) follows from the second part of (xii) and from (vii). \square

15. PROOF OF THEOREM B

In this section we prove the second main result of this paper, Theorem B. The first technical result is Theorem 15.1, which is a pseudoeffective analogue of Theorem 14.1. A related, but somewhat more involved statement for klt pairs was mentioned without proof in [BD12, Generalization 5.24]. The proof is similar, but somewhat more involved than that of Theorem 14.1, and we provide all the details. In particular, the very precise conclusion of Theorem 15.1 will be needed in the proof of Theorem 15.2.

Theorem 15.1. *Let X be a projective manifold. Let L be a pseudoeffective \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X and set $N := \{m \in \mathbb{N} \mid mL \text{ is Cartier}\}$. Fix a smooth metric h on L and denote $\alpha := \Theta_h(L) \in \{L\}$. Let A be an ample Cartier divisor on X , fix a Kähler form $\omega \in \{A\}$, and let h_A be a smooth metric on A such that $\omega = \Theta_{h_A}(A)$. For each positive integer ℓ denote $L_\ell := L + \frac{1}{\ell}A$ and denote by $h_\ell := hh_A^{1/\ell}$ the smooth metric on L_ℓ .*

Then there exists a positive integer p such that the following holds. Let $\varphi \in \text{PSH}(X, \alpha)$ such that

$$(73) \quad \int_X e^{2\varphi} dV_\omega \leq 1.$$

Then for any sequence $\{m_\ell\}_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}}$ satisfying $m_\ell \in N \cap \ell\mathbb{N}$, $m_\ell \geq 2p\ell$ and $\lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \ell/m_\ell = 0$, there exists a sequence of sections $\sigma_\ell \in H^0(X, m_\ell L_\ell)$ such that

$$\int_X |\sigma_\ell|_{h_\ell}^{2/m_\ell} dV_\omega \leq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \varphi = \left(\limsup_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \log |\sigma_\ell|_{h_\ell}^{1/m_\ell} \right)^*.$$

Proof. Step 1. In this step we prepare several constants that will be used throughout the proof.

Fix a finite covering \mathcal{U} of X by coordinate balls on which K_X , A and all mL trivialise, for $m \in N$. Fix constants δ and C , depending only on \mathcal{U} , as in Theorem 13.1. For every positive integer ℓ let

$$\alpha_\ell := \alpha + \frac{1}{\ell}\omega \in \{L_\ell\},$$

and note that

$$(74) \quad \alpha_\ell + dd^c \varphi \geq \frac{1}{\ell}\omega.$$

Since for each ℓ the divisor L_ℓ is big, by Corollary 4.8 there exist functions $\psi_\ell \in \text{PSH}(X, \alpha_\ell)$ with logarithmic singularities such that $\{\psi_\ell = -\infty\} \subseteq \mathbf{B}_+(L_\ell)$ and

$$(75) \quad \alpha_\ell + dd^c \psi_\ell \geq 0.$$

Since each ψ_ℓ is bounded from above, by subtracting constants from ψ_ℓ we may assume that for each ℓ we have

$$(76) \quad \psi_\ell \leq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \int_X e^{2\psi_\ell} dV_\omega \leq \frac{1}{2}.$$

Let h_ω be the smooth metric on K_X induced by the hermitian metric on T_X whose fundamental form is ω . Note that by Lemma 2.1 there exists a constant $C_\omega > 0$ such that

$$(77) \quad -\Theta_{h_\omega}(K_X) + C_\omega\omega \geq 0.$$

We fix for the remainder of the proof an integer $p > 1$ such that:

- (i) $p - C_\omega \geq \delta$,
- (ii) $C \leq 2^{(p-1)/2}$.

Set

$$p_\ell := p\ell \quad \text{for each positive integer } \ell.$$

Since $\frac{p_\ell}{p_\ell-1}\psi_\ell \leq \psi_\ell$ for each ℓ by the first inequality in (76), by the second inequality in (76) we have

$$(78) \quad \int_X e^{2\frac{p_\ell}{p_\ell-1}\psi_\ell} dV_\omega \leq \frac{1}{2} \quad \text{for all positive integers } \ell.$$

Step 2. In this step we prepare several Cartier divisors on X and singular metrics on them.

Set

$$N_{\geq 2p_\ell} := \{n \in N \cap \ell\mathbb{N} \mid n \geq 2p_\ell\}.$$

For each $m \in N_{\geq 2p_\ell}$ set

$$L_{m,\ell} := mL_\ell - K_X.$$

Then

$$h_{m,\ell} := e^{-2(m-p_\ell)\varphi - 2p_\ell\psi_\ell} h_\ell^m h_\omega^{-1}$$

is a singular metric on $L_{m,\ell}$ with curvature current

$$\begin{aligned} \Theta_{h_{m,\ell}}(L_{m,\ell}) &= m\alpha_\ell + (m - p_\ell)dd^c\varphi + p_\ell dd^c\psi_\ell - \Theta_{h_\omega}(K_X) \\ &\geq \frac{m - p_\ell}{\ell}\omega - \Theta_{h_\omega}(K_X) \geq (p - C_\omega)\omega \end{aligned}$$

by (74), (75) and (77), and since $m \geq 2p_\ell = 2p\ell$. This together with the property (i) from Step 1 yields

$$(79) \quad \Theta_{h_{m,\ell}}(L_{m,\ell}) \geq \delta\omega.$$

For each $m \in N_{\geq 2p_\ell}$, define the singular metric

$$g_{m,\ell} := h_{m,\ell}h_\omega = e^{-2(m-p_\ell)\varphi - 2p_\ell\psi_\ell} h_\ell^m$$

on $K_X + L_{m,\ell} = mL_\ell$.

Step 3. By Theorem 13.1, by the choices of the constants δ and C in Step 1 and by (79), for each $m \in N_{\geq 2p_\ell}$ and each $x \in X \setminus \{\varphi + \psi_\ell = -\infty\}$ there is a section

$$\sigma_{m,\ell,x} \in H^0(X, K_X + L_{m,\ell})$$

such that

$$(80) \quad |\sigma_{m,\ell,x}(x)|_{g_{m,\ell}} = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \|\sigma_{m,\ell,x}\|_{g_{m,\ell}} \leq C.$$

Similarly as in Step 3 of the proof of Theorem 14.1, for $m \in N_{\geq 2p_\ell}$, by Hölder's inequality for conjugate exponents $\frac{1}{m} + \frac{m-p_\ell}{m} + \frac{p_\ell-1}{m} = 1$ and by (73), (78) and (80) we obtain

$$\int_X |\sigma_{m,\ell,x}|_{h_\ell^m}^{2/m} dV_\omega \leq C^{\frac{2}{m}} 2^{\frac{1-p_\ell}{m}} \leq C^{\frac{2}{m}} 2^{\frac{1-p}{m}}.$$

This together with the property (ii) from Step 1 gives

$$(81) \quad \int_X |\sigma_{m,\ell,x}|_{h_\ell^m}^{2/m} dV_\omega \leq 1 \quad \text{for all } m \in N_{\geq 2p_\ell}.$$

Furthermore, for $x \in X \setminus \{\varphi + \psi_\ell = -\infty\}$, from (80) we have

$$1 = |\sigma_{m,\ell,x}(x)|_{g_{m,\ell}} = |\sigma_{m,\ell,x}(x)|_{h_\ell^m} e^{-(m-p_\ell)\varphi(x) - p_\ell\psi_\ell(x)},$$

and thus

$$(82) \quad \log |\sigma_{m,\ell,x}(x)|_{h_\ell^m}^{1/m} = \left(1 - \frac{p_\ell}{m}\right)\varphi(x) + \frac{p_\ell}{m}\psi_\ell(x).$$

Step 4. Set

$$\mathcal{P} := \{z \in X \mid \varphi(z) = -\infty\} \cup \bigcup_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}} \{z \in X \mid \psi_\ell(z) = -\infty\},$$

and note that the function φ , as well as all the functions ψ_ℓ , are α_1 -psh. Therefore, \mathcal{P} is a pluripolar set by Remark 2.7, hence \mathcal{P} is of Lebesgue measure zero in X and $X \setminus \mathcal{P}$ is dense in X . By Corollary 4.4 there exists a countable set

$$\mathcal{D} := \{x_q \mid q \in \mathbb{N}\} \subseteq X \setminus \mathcal{P}$$

which is dense in X , such that for each $z \in X$ there exists a sequence $\{z_s\}$ in \mathcal{D} with

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} z_s = z \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} \varphi(z_s) = \varphi(z).$$

Fix a sequence $\{q_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}}$ of positive integers, in which each positive integer occurs infinitely many times. Fix an arbitrary sequence $\{m_\ell\}_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}}$ such that

$$(83) \quad m_\ell \in N_{\geq 2p_\ell} \text{ for each } \ell, \text{ and } \lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \ell/m_\ell = 0.$$

Since $\{\varphi + \psi_\ell = -\infty\} \subseteq \mathcal{P}$, we have $x_{q_\ell} \in X \setminus \{\varphi + \psi_\ell = -\infty\}$ for each ℓ , hence by Step 3 we may define sections

$$\sigma_{m_\ell,\ell} \in H^0(X, m_\ell L_\ell) = H^0(X, K_X + L_{m_\ell,\ell})$$

by

$$(84) \quad \sigma_{m_\ell, \ell} := \sigma_{m_\ell, \ell, x_{q_\ell}},$$

and note that $\sigma_{m_\ell, \ell, x_{q_\ell}}$ satisfy inequalities (81). Set

$$u := \limsup_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \log |\sigma_{m_\ell, \ell}|_{h_\ell}^{1/m_\ell}.$$

We will show that

$$\varphi = u^*.$$

Step 5. Fix a point $x \in X$. In this step we show that

$$(85) \quad \varphi(x) \geq u^*(x).$$

By Lemma 4.5 (applied to the \mathbb{Q} -divisors L_ℓ , the smooth metrics metric h_ℓ and the associated curvature forms α_ℓ) there exist constants $C_2 > 0$ and $r_0 > 0$ such that for every coordinate ball $B(x, r)$ with $r \leq r_0$, for each positive integer ℓ and for each integer $m_\ell \in N_{\geq 2p_\ell}$ we have

$$(86) \quad |\sigma_{m_\ell, \ell}(x)|_{h_\ell}^2 \leq e^{2m_\ell C_2 r^2} \int_{B(x, r)} |\sigma_{m_\ell, \ell}|_{h_\ell}^2 dV_\omega.$$

Then similarly as in Step 5 of the proof of Theorem 14.1, from (80) and (86) we obtain

$$|\sigma_{m_\ell, \ell}(x)|_{h_\ell}^2 \leq \frac{e^{2m_\ell C_2 r^2} n! C^2}{r^{2n} \pi^n} \sup_{B(x, r)} e^{2(m_\ell - p_\ell)\varphi + 2p_\ell \psi_\ell}.$$

Plugging in $r := \frac{1}{m_\ell}$ for $m_\ell \geq \max\{p_\ell, \frac{1}{r_0}\}$, taking logarithms of both sides, dividing by $2m_\ell$, and taking \limsup as $\ell \rightarrow \infty$, as in Step 5 of the proof of Theorem 14.1 we obtain

$$u(x) = \limsup_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \log |\sigma_{m_\ell, \ell}(x)|_{h_\ell}^{1/m_\ell} \leq \varphi(x),$$

which gives (85) since φ is upper semicontinuous.

Step 6. Fix a point $x \in X$. In this step we finally show that

$$\varphi(x) \leq u^*(x).$$

To this end, recalling the construction of the set \mathcal{D} from Step 4, we may find a strictly increasing sequence $\{q'_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}}$ of positive integers such that $x_{q'_j} \in \mathcal{D}$ for all j and we have

$$(87) \quad \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} x_{q'_j} = x \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \varphi(x_{q'_j}) = \varphi(x).$$

By the construction in Step 4, for each fixed j there is a strictly increasing sequence $\{\ell_s\}_{s \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}}$ of positive integers such that $q'_j = q_{\ell_s}$ for all s and

$\sigma_{m_{\ell_s}, \ell_s} = \sigma_{m_{\ell_s}, \ell_s, x_{q_{\ell_s}}}$ by (84). Hence by (82), since $\lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} (p_{\ell_s}/m_{\ell_s}) = 0$ by (83), and since $\psi_{\ell_s}(x_{q'_j}) \neq -\infty$ for all s by the construction of \mathcal{D} , we have

$$\begin{aligned} u(x_{q'_j}) &\geq \limsup_{s \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{m_{\ell_s}} \log |\sigma_{m_{\ell_s}, \ell_s}(x_{q'_j})|_{h_{\ell_s}^{m_{\ell_s}}} \\ &= \limsup_{s \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{m_{\ell_s}} \log |\sigma_{m_{\ell_s}, \ell_s, x_{q_{\ell_s}}}(x_{q_{\ell_s}})|_{h_{\ell_s}^{m_{\ell_s}}} = \varphi(x_{q'_j}). \end{aligned}$$

Then this last inequality and (87) give

$$u^*(x) \geq \limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} u(x_{q'_j}) \geq \limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} \varphi(x_{q'_j}) = \varphi(x),$$

which finishes the proof. \square

The following is the main result of this section.

Theorem 15.2. *Let X be a projective manifold. Let L be a pseudoeffective \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X , fix a smooth metric h on L and denote $\alpha := \Theta_h(L) \in \{L\}$. Let A be an ample Cartier divisor on X , fix a Kähler form $\omega \in \{A\}$, and let h_A be a smooth metric on A such that $\omega = \Theta_{h_A}(A)$. For each positive integer ℓ denote $L_\ell := L + \frac{1}{\ell}A$, denote by $h_\ell := hh_A^{1/\ell}$ the smooth metric on L_ℓ , let $\alpha_\ell := \alpha + \frac{1}{\ell}\omega \in \{L_\ell\}$ be the corresponding smooth form, and set $N_\ell := \{m \in \mathbb{N} \mid mL_\ell \text{ is Cartier}\}$. For each $m \in N_\ell$ set*

$$V_{h_\ell, m} := \left\{ \sigma \in H^0(X, mL_\ell) \mid \int_X |\sigma|_{h_\ell^m}^{2/m} dV_\omega \leq 1 \right\}$$

and

$$\varphi_{h_\ell, m} := \sup_{\sigma \in V_{h_\ell, m}} \log |\sigma|_{h_\ell^m}^{1/m}.$$

Then:

(i) $\varphi_{h_\ell, m} \in \text{PSH}(X, \alpha_\ell)$ for each ℓ and $m \in N_\ell$, and

$$\varphi_{h_\ell, m} = \max_{\sigma \in V_{h_\ell, m}} \log |\sigma|_{h_\ell^m}^{1/m},$$

(ii) for each ℓ the sequence $\{\varphi_{h_\ell, m}\}_{m \in N_\ell}$ is non-decreasing,

(iii) for each ℓ the supercanonical potential $\varphi_{\alpha_\ell, \text{can}}$ of L_ℓ associated to α_ℓ is

$$\varphi_{\alpha_\ell, \text{can}} = \left(\sup_{m \in N_\ell} \varphi_{h_\ell, m} \right)^*,$$

(iv) for all ℓ and all $m \in N_\ell$, the functions $\varphi_{h_\ell, m}$ are uniformly bounded from above,

(v) there exists a positive integer p such that for any sequence $\{m_\ell\}_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}}$ with the properties that $m_\ell \in N_\ell$, $m_\ell \geq 2p\ell$ and $\lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \ell/m_\ell = 0$, the supercanonical potential of L associated to α is

$$\varphi_{\alpha, \text{can}} = \left(\limsup_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \varphi_{h_\ell, m_\ell} \right)^*,$$

(vi) for positive integers $\ell' \geq \ell$ we have

$$\varphi_{\alpha_\ell, \text{can}} \geq \varphi_{\alpha_{\ell'}, \text{can}} \geq \varphi_{\alpha, \text{can}},$$

(vii) for each ℓ the function $\varphi_{\alpha_\ell, \text{can}}$ is bounded on $X \setminus \mathbf{B}(L)$, it is continuous on $X \setminus \mathbf{B}_+(L_\ell)$, and

$$\varphi_{\alpha_\ell, \text{can}} = \sup_{m \in N_\ell} \varphi_{h_\ell, m} \quad \text{on } X \setminus \mathbf{B}_+(L_\ell),$$

(viii) we have

$$\varphi_{\alpha, \text{can}} = \lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \varphi_{\alpha_\ell, \text{can}}.$$

Proof. For a smooth $(1, 1)$ -form θ on X whose class $\{\theta\} \in H^{1,1}(X, \mathbb{R})$ is pseudoeffective, set

$$\mathcal{S}_\theta := \{\varphi \in \text{PSH}(X, \theta) \mid \int_X e^{2\varphi} dV_\omega \leq 1\},$$

and recall from Lemma 6.1 that the supercanonical potential associated to θ was defined as

$$\varphi_{\theta, \text{can}}(x) := \sup_{\varphi \in \mathcal{S}_\theta} \varphi(x) \quad \text{for } x \in X.$$

Step 1. Part (i) follows from Theorem 14.3(iv)(v). Part (ii) follows from Theorem 14.3(vi), and (iii) follows from Theorem 14.3(vii).

For part (iv), first notice that for each positive integer ℓ , for each $m \in N_\ell$ and for each $\sigma \in V_{h_\ell, m}$ we have $\log |\sigma|_{h_\ell}^{1/m} \in \mathcal{S}_{\alpha_\ell}$ as in Step 1 of the proof of Theorem 14.3. Then we conclude by Lemma 6.2(b).

Step 2. Next we show (v). Let p be a positive integer as in Theorem 15.1. Fix a sequence $\mathbf{m} := \{m_\ell\}_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}}$ satisfying $m_\ell \in N_\ell$, $m_\ell \geq 2p\ell$ and $\lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \ell/m_\ell = 0$, and set

$$\varphi_{\mathbf{m}, \text{alg}} := \limsup_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \varphi_{h_\ell, m_\ell}.$$

By (iv) we have that all the functions φ_{h_ℓ, m_ℓ} are uniformly bounded from above on X , hence $\varphi_{\mathbf{m}, \text{alg}}$ is well defined. It suffices to prove that

$$(88) \quad (\varphi_{\mathbf{m}, \text{alg}})^* = \varphi_{\alpha, \text{can}}.$$

We first show that

$$(89) \quad (\varphi_{\mathbf{m}, \text{alg}})^* \leq \varphi_{\alpha, \text{can}}.$$

To that end, fix $x \in X$. We may assume that $(\varphi_{\mathbf{m}, \text{alg}})^*(x) \neq -\infty$, since otherwise the claim is clear. Then there exists a sequence $\{x_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of points in X such that $x_n \rightarrow x$ and

$$(\varphi_{\mathbf{m}, \text{alg}})^*(x) = \limsup_{z \rightarrow x} \varphi_{\mathbf{m}, \text{alg}}(z) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varphi_{\mathbf{m}, \text{alg}}(x_n),$$

hence, by the definition of $\varphi_{\mathbf{m}, \text{alg}}$, there exists an increasing sequence $\{\ell_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of positive integers such that

$$(90) \quad (\varphi_{\mathbf{m}, \text{alg}})^*(x) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varphi_{h_{\ell_n}, m_{\ell_n}}(x_n).$$

By (i), for each n there exists a section $\sigma_n \in V_{h_{\ell_n}, m_{\ell_n}}$ such that

$$\varphi_{h_{\ell_n}, m_{\ell_n}}(x_n) = \frac{1}{m_{\ell_n}} \log |\sigma_n(x_n)|_{h_{\ell_n}}^{m_{\ell_n}},$$

hence (90) gives

$$(91) \quad (\varphi_{\mathfrak{m}, \text{alg}})^*(x) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{m_{\ell_n}} \log |\sigma_n(x_n)|_{h_{\ell_n}}^{m_{\ell_n}}.$$

Note that as in Step 1 we have $\frac{1}{m_{\ell_n}} \log |\sigma_n|_{h_{\ell_n}}^{m_{\ell_n}} \in \text{PSH}(X, \alpha_{\ell_n})$ and all these functions are uniformly bounded. Therefore, by Theorem 2.4(e) and after passing to a subsequence we may assume that the sequence of functions $\{\frac{1}{m_{\ell_n}} \log |\sigma_n|_{h_{\ell_n}}^{m_{\ell_n}}\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges in $L_{\text{loc}}^1(X)$ and almost everywhere to a function $\tilde{\varphi} \in \text{PSH}(X, \alpha)$, and then $\tilde{\varphi} \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha$ by Fatou's lemma. In particular, we have

$$(92) \quad \tilde{\varphi}(x) \leq \varphi_{\alpha, \text{can}}(x)$$

by the definition of $\varphi_{\alpha, \text{can}}$. On the other hand, by Lemma 4.2 and by (91) we have

$$\tilde{\varphi}(x) \geq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{m_{\ell_n}} \log |\sigma_n(x_n)|_{h_{\ell_n}}^{m_{\ell_n}} = (\varphi_{\mathfrak{m}, \text{alg}})^*(x),$$

which together with (92) shows (89).

For the reverse inequality, let $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha$. Then by Theorem 15.1 there exists a sequence of sections $\tau_\ell \in V_{h_\ell, m_\ell}$ such that

$$\varphi = \left(\limsup_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \log |\tau_\ell|_{h_\ell}^{1/m_\ell} \right)^*.$$

Since $\log |\tau_\ell|_{h_\ell}^{1/m_\ell} \leq \varphi_{h_\ell, m_\ell}$ for each ℓ by the definition of φ_{h_ℓ, m_ℓ} , we obtain

$$\varphi \leq \left(\limsup_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \varphi_{h_\ell, m_\ell} \right)^* = (\varphi_{\mathfrak{m}, \text{alg}})^*,$$

hence

$$\varphi_{\alpha, \text{can}} = \sup_{\varphi \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha} \varphi \leq (\varphi_{\mathfrak{m}, \text{alg}})^*.$$

This together with (89) shows (88).

Step 3. Part (vi) follows from Lemma 6.2(c), and (vii) follows from Theorem 14.3(xii).

Step 4. Finally, in this step we show (viii). Denote

$$\hat{\varphi} := \lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \varphi_{\alpha_\ell, \text{can}},$$

which is well defined by (vi) and we have

$$(93) \quad \hat{\varphi} \geq \varphi_{\alpha, \text{can}}.$$

In order to prove (viii) we need to show the reverse inequality. First note that $\widehat{\varphi} \in \text{PSH}(X, \alpha)$ by (93), (vi) and Theorem 2.4(e), hence by Corollary 2.3 it suffices to show that

$$(94) \quad \widehat{\varphi} \leq \varphi_{\alpha, \text{can}} \quad \text{on } X \setminus \mathbf{B}_-(L),$$

since $\mathbf{B}_-(L)$ is a countable union of analytically closed subsets of X , hence of Lebesgue measure zero.

To show (94), fix a point $x \in X \setminus \mathbf{B}_-(L)$, and let $\varepsilon > 0$. Fix a sequence $\{m_\ell\}_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}}$ satisfying $m_\ell \in N_\ell$, $m_\ell \geq 2p\ell$ and $\lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \ell/m_\ell = 0$, where p is a positive integer as in (v). Since $x \in X \setminus \mathbf{B}_+(L_\ell)$ by Remark 3.6, we have by (ii) and (vii) that there exists a positive integer ℓ such that

$$(95) \quad \varphi_{\alpha_\ell, \text{can}}(x) \leq \varphi_{h_\ell, m_\ell}(x) + \varepsilon.$$

Therefore, taking limes superior in (95) as $\ell \rightarrow \infty$, and then taking the upper semicontinuous regularisation, by (v) we obtain

$$\widehat{\varphi}(x) \leq \varphi_{\alpha, \text{can}}(x) + \varepsilon.$$

We conclude by letting $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. □

Finally, we have:

Proof of Theorem B. Part (a) of the theorem is an immediate consequence of Theorem 15.2(i)(iii), whereas (b) follows from Theorem 15.2(viii) and Theorem 2.4(d).

If $K_X + \Delta$ is nef, then the pair (Y, Δ_Y) has a minimal model by [LX23, Lemma 2.14(e)]. Then (c) follows from Theorem 12.1(a)(b), whereas (e) is a special case of Theorem 12.1(c). Finally, (d) follows from (c) and from Theorem 15.2(vii). □

REFERENCES

- [BBJ21] R. J. Berman, S. Boucksom, and M. Jonsson, *A variational approach to the Yau-Tian-Donaldson conjecture*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **34** (2021), no. 3, 605–652.
- [BBP13] S. Boucksom, A. Broustet, and G. Pacienza, *Uniruledness of stable base loci of adjoint linear systems via Mori theory*, Math. Z. **275** (2013), no. 1-2, 499–507.
- [BCHM10] C. Birkar, P. Cascini, C. D. Hacon, and J. McKernan, *Existence of minimal models for varieties of log general type*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **23** (2010), no. 2, 405–468.
- [BD12] R. Berman and J.-P. Demailly, *Regularity of plurisubharmonic upper envelopes in big cohomology classes*, Perspectives in analysis, geometry, and topology, Progr. Math., vol. 296, Birkhäuser/Springer, New York, 2012, pp. 39–66.
- [BDPP13] S. Boucksom, J.-P. Demailly, M. Păun, and Th. Peternell, *The pseudo-effective cone of a compact Kähler manifold and varieties of negative Kodaira dimension*, J. Algebraic Geom. **22** (2013), no. 2, 201–248.
- [BEGZ10] S. Boucksom, P. Eyssidieux, V. Guedj, and A. Zeriahi, *Monge-Ampère equations in big cohomology classes*, Acta Math. **205** (2010), no. 2, 199–262.
- [Ber10] B. Berndtsson, *An introduction to things $\bar{\partial}$* , Analytic and algebraic geometry, IAS/Park City Math. Ser., vol. 17, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2010, pp. 7–76.
- [Bou02] S. Boucksom, *Cônes positifs des variétés complexes compactes*, PhD Thesis, Université Joseph Fourier Grenoble, 2002, available at <https://theses.hal.science/tel-00002268>.
- [Bou04] ———, *Divisorial Zariski decompositions on compact complex manifolds*, Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4) **37** (2004), no. 1, 45–76.
- [BT06] F. Bracci and S. Trapani, *Notes on pluripotential theory*, available at <http://cmt.p.uniroma2.it/~fbracci/download/pluripotential.pdf>.
- [Cao14] J. Cao, *Numerical dimension and a Kawamata-Viehweg-Nadel-type vanishing theorem on compact Kähler manifolds*, Compos. Math. **150** (2014), no. 11, 1869–1902.
- [CL12] P. Cascini and V. Lazić, *New outlook on the Minimal Model Program, I*, Duke Math. J. **161** (2012), no. 12, 2415–2467.
- [CL13] A. Corti and V. Lazić, *New outlook on the Minimal Model Program, II*, Math. Ann. **356** (2013), no. 2, 617–633.
- [DEL00] J.-P. Demailly, L. Ein, and R. Lazarsfeld, *A subadditivity property of multiplier ideals*, Michigan Math. J. **48** (2000), 137–156.
- [Dem82] J.-P. Demailly, *Estimations L^2 pour l'opérateur $\bar{\partial}$ d'un fibré vectoriel holomorphe semi-positif au-dessus d'une variété kählérienne complète*, Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4) **15** (1982), no. 3, 457–511.
- [Dem92a] ———, *Regularization of closed positive currents and intersection theory*, J. Algebraic Geom. **1** (1992), no. 3, 361–409.
- [Dem92b] ———, *Singular Hermitian metrics on positive line bundles*, Complex algebraic varieties (Bayreuth, 1990), Lecture Notes in Math., vol. 1507, Springer, Berlin, 1992, pp. 87–104.
- [Dem01] ———, *Multiplier ideal sheaves and analytic methods in algebraic geometry*, School on Vanishing Theorems and Effective Results in Algebraic Geometry (Trieste, 2000), ICTP Lect. Notes, vol. 6, Abdus Salam Int. Cent. Theoret. Phys., Trieste, 2001, pp. 1–148.
- [Dem12] ———, *Complex Analytic and Differential Geometry*, available at <https://www-fourier.ujf-grenoble.fr/~demailly/manuscripts/agbook.pdf>.
- [Dem15] ———, *On the cohomology of pseudoeffective line bundles*, Complex geometry and dynamics, Abel Symp., vol. 10, Springer, Cham, 2015, pp. 51–99.

- [DNT21] E. Di Nezza and S. Trapani, *The regularity of envelopes*, arXiv:2110.14314, to appear in Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup.
- [DP03] J.-P. Demailly and Th. Peternell, *A Kawamata-Viehweg vanishing theorem on compact Kähler manifolds*, J. Differential Geom. **63** (2003), no. 2, 231–277.
- [DPS01] J.-P. Demailly, Th. Peternell, and M. Schneider, *Pseudo-effective line bundles on compact Kähler manifolds*, Int. J. Math. **12** (2001), no. 6, 689–741.
- [ELM⁺06] L. Ein, R. Lazarsfeld, M. Mustață, M. Nakamaye, and M. Popa, *Asymptotic invariants of base loci*, Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) **56** (2006), no. 6, 1701–1734.
- [Fav99] C. Favre, *Note on pull-back and Lelong number of currents*, Bull. Soc. Math. France **127** (1999), no. 3, 445–458.
- [GL13] Y. Gongyo and B. Lehmann, *Reduction maps and minimal model theory*, Compos. Math. **149** (2013), no. 2, 295–308.
- [GM17] Y. Gongyo and S.-i. Matsumura, *Versions of injectivity and extension theorems*, Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Supér. (4) **50** (2017), no. 2, 479–502.
- [GZ05] V. Guedj and A. Zeriahi, *Intrinsic capacities on compact Kähler manifolds*, J. Geom. Anal. **15** (2005), no. 4, 607–639.
- [GZ15] Q. Guan and X. Zhou, *A proof of Demailly’s strong openness conjecture*, Ann. of Math. (2) **182** (2015), no. 2, 605–616.
- [GZ17] V. Guedj and A. Zeriahi, *Degenerate complex Monge-Ampère equations*, EMS Tracts in Mathematics, vol. 26, European Mathematical Society (EMS), Zürich, 2017.
- [HH20] K. Hashizume and Z.-Y. Hu, *On minimal model theory for log abundant lc pairs*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **767** (2020), 109–159.
- [Hie14] P. H. Hiep, *The weighted log canonical threshold*, C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris **352** (2014), no. 4, 283–288.
- [Hör65] L. Hörmander, *L^2 estimates and existence theorems for the $\bar{\partial}$ operator*, Acta Math. **113** (1965), 89–152.
- [Hör90] ———, *An introduction to complex analysis in several variables*, third ed., North-Holland Mathematical Library, vol. 7, North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, 1990.
- [Hör07] ———, *Notions of convexity*, Modern Birkhäuser Classics, Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 2007, Reprint of the 1994 edition.
- [IMM24] M. Iwai, S.-i. Matsumura, and N. Müller, *Abundance theorem for minimal projective varieties satisfying Miyaoka’s equality*, arXiv:2404.07568.
- [Kaw85] Y. Kawamata, *Minimal models and the Kodaira dimension of algebraic fiber spaces*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **363** (1985), 1–46.
- [Kaw92] ———, *Abundance theorem for minimal threefolds*, Invent. Math. **108** (1992), no. 2, 229–246.
- [Kis00] C. O. Kiselman, *Ensembles de sous-niveau et images inverses des fonctions plurisousharmoniques*, Bull. Sci. Math. **124** (2000), no. 1, 75–92.
- [KKL16] A.-S. Kaloghiros, A. Küronya, and V. Lazić, *Finite generation and geography of models*, Minimal Models and Extremal Rays (Kyoto 2011), Adv. Stud. Pure Math., vol. 70, Mathematical Society of Japan, Tokyo, 2016, pp. 215–245.
- [Kli91] M. Klimek, *Pluripotential theory*, London Mathematical Society Monographs. New Series, vol. 6, The Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press, New York, 1991, Oxford Science Publications.
- [KM98] J. Kollár and S. Mori, *Birational geometry of algebraic varieties*, Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics, vol. 134, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1998.
- [KMM94] S. Keel, K. Matsuki, and J. M^cKernan, *Log abundance theorem for threefolds*, Duke Math. J. **75** (1994), 99–119.

- [Laz04] R. Lazarsfeld, *Positivity in algebraic geometry. I, II*, Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete, vol. 48, 49, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2004.
- [Laz24] V. Lazić, *A few remarks on effectivity and good minimal models*, arXiv:2401.14190.
- [Lem17] L. Lempert, *Modules of square integrable holomorphic germs*, Analysis meets geometry, Trends Math., Birkhäuser/Springer, Cham, 2017, pp. 311–333.
- [LM21] V. Lazić and F. Meng, *On nonvanishing for uniruled log canonical pairs*, Electron. Res. Arch. **29** (2021), no. 5, 3297–3308.
- [LM23] H. Liu and S.-i. Matsumura, *Strictly nef divisors on K -trivial fourfolds*, Math. Ann. **387** (2023), no. 1-2, 985–1008.
- [LMT23] V. Lazić, J. Moraga, and N. Tsakanikas, *Special termination for log canonical pairs*, Asian J. Math. **27** (2023), no. 3, 423–440.
- [LP18] V. Lazić and Th. Peternell, *Abundance for varieties with many differential forms*, Épijournal Geom. Algébrique **2** (2018), Article 1.
- [LP20a] ———, *On Generalised Abundance, I*, Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci. **56** (2020), no. 2, 353–389.
- [LP20b] ———, *On Generalised Abundance, II*, Peking Math. J. **3** (2020), no. 1, 1–46.
- [LT22] V. Lazić and N. Tsakanikas, *Special MMP for log canonical generalised pairs (with an appendix joint with Xiaowei Jiang)*, Selecta Math. (N.S.) **28** (2022), no. 5, Paper No. 89.
- [LX23] V. Lazić and Z. Xie, *Nakayama–Zariski decomposition and the termination of flips*, arXiv:2305.01752.
- [LX24] ———, *Rigid currents in birational geometry*, arXiv:2402.05807.
- [Miy87] Y. Miyaoka, *The Chern classes and Kodaira dimension of a minimal variety*, Algebraic geometry, Sendai, 1985, Adv. Stud. Pure Math., vol. 10, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1987, pp. 449–476.
- [Miy88a] ———, *Abundance conjecture for 3-folds: case $\nu = 1$* , Compositio Math. **68** (1988), no. 2, 203–220.
- [Miy88b] ———, *On the Kodaira dimension of minimal threefolds*, Math. Ann. **281** (1988), no. 2, 325–332.
- [Nak04] N. Nakayama, *Zariski-decomposition and abundance*, MSJ Memoirs, vol. 14, Mathematical Society of Japan, Tokyo, 2004.
- [NS68] M. S. Narasimhan and R. R. Simha, *Manifolds with ample canonical class*, Invent. Math. **5** (1968), 120–128.
- [OT87] T. Ohsawa and K. Takegoshi, *On the extension of L^2 holomorphic functions*, Math. Z. **195** (1987), no. 2, 197–204.
- [Sho85] V. V. Shokurov, *A nonvanishing theorem*, Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR Ser. Mat. **49** (1985), no. 3, 635–651.
- [Siu74] Y. T. Siu, *Analyticity of sets associated to Lelong numbers and the extension of closed positive currents*, Invent. Math. **27** (1974), 53–156.
- [Tsu07] H. Tsuji, *Canonical volume forms on compact Kähler manifolds*, arXiv:0707.0111.
- [Tsu11] ———, *Canonical singular Hermitian metrics on relative canonical bundles*, Amer. J. Math. **133** (2011), no. 6, 1469–1501.
- [TX23] N. Tsakanikas and Z. Xie, *Comparison and uniruledness of asymptotic base loci*, arXiv:2309.01031.
- [Vu19] D.-V. Vu, *Locally pluripolar sets are pluripolar*, Internat. J. Math. **30** (2019), no. 13.
- [Vu21] ———, *An introduction to pluripotential theory*, available at http://www.mi.uni-koeln.de/~vuviet/Vu_lectures.chapter1-3.pdf.

FACHRICHTUNG MATHEMATIK, CAMPUS, GEBÄUDE E2.4, UNIVERSITÄT DES SAARLAN-
DES, 66123 SAARBRÜCKEN, GERMANY

Email address: `lazic@math.uni-sb.de`