

# LOGARITHMIC $\partial\bar{\partial}$ -LEMMA AND SEVERAL GEOMETRIC APPLICATIONS

RUNZE ZHANG

*A Tribute to Professor Kefeng Liu: On the Occasion of His 60th Birthday*

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we prove a  $\partial\bar{\partial}$ -type lemma on compact Kähler manifolds for logarithmic differential forms valued in the dual of a certain pseudo-effective line bundle, thereby confirming a conjecture proposed by X. Wan.

We then derive several applications, including strengthened results by H. Esnault–E. Viehweg on the degeneracy of the spectral sequence at the  $E_1$ -stage for projective manifolds associated with the logarithmic de Rham complex, as well as by L. Katzarkov–M. Kontsevich–T. Pantev on the unobstructed locally trivial deformations of a projective generalized log Calabi–Yau pair with some weights, both of which are extended to the broader context of compact Kähler manifolds.

Furthermore, we establish the Kähler version of an injectivity theorem originally formulated by F. Ambro in the algebraic setting. Notably, while O. Fujino previously addressed the Kähler case, our proof takes a different approach by avoiding the reliance on mixed Hodge structures for cohomology with compact support.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

**1.1. Backgrounds and main results.** One of the strongest results in deformation theory is the *Bogomolov–Tian–Todorov (abbrev. BTT) theorem* [Bog78, Tia87, Tod89], which, using differential geometric methods, establishes that Calabi–Yau manifolds have unobstructed deformations. This means that the Kuranishi space of deformations of complex structures on such manifolds is smooth. We should remark here that while many authors consider Calabi–Yau manifolds to be projective, we make no projectivity assumptions. Specifically, in this paper, a *Calabi–Yau manifold*  $X$  is defined as a compact Kähler manifold with trivial canonical bundle  $K_X \simeq \mathcal{O}_X$ . Algebraic proofs of the BTT theorem have also been provided using the degeneration of the Hodge-to-de Rham spectral sequence plus the nowadays called  $T^1$ -lifting technique [Ran92, Kaw92, FM99], see also [IM10]. In fact, the Kähler condition in this theorem can be relaxed. For instance, it applies to a compact complex manifold  $X$  with trivial canonical bundle that satisfies the  $\partial\bar{\partial}$ -lemma, see e.g. [Huy05, the proof in Chapter 6 after minor changes] and [Pop19, Theorem 1.3], or, more generally, if the Frölicher spectral sequence degenerates at the first page, see for example, [KKP08, the proof in Theorem 4.18] and [ACRT18, Theorem 3.3] (this case is even true when  $K_X$  is a torsion bundle, see e.g. [Iac17, Corollary 4.1]). Recall that the  $\partial\bar{\partial}$ -lemma refers to: for every pure-type  $d$ -closed form on a compact complex manifold, the properties of  $d$ -exactness,  $\partial$ -exactness,  $\bar{\partial}$ -exactness, and  $\partial\bar{\partial}$ -exactness are equivalent.

Noteworthy to mention that the BTT theorem has various extensions, which include results on the unobstructedness of deformations of the following:

---

*Date:* December 17, 2024.

*2010 Mathematics Subject Classification.* 58A14, 32G05, 32Q25, 58A10, 58A25, 18G40.

*Key words and phrases.* Logarithmic  $\partial\bar{\partial}$ -lemma, (generalized) log Calabi–Yau pair, unobstructed deformations, spectral sequences, injectivity theorem, closedness of the twisted logarithmic forms.

- ( $D_1$ ) (generalized) log Calabi–Yau pairs [KKP08, San14, Iac15, Ran17, LRW19, Wan18];
- ( $D_2$ ) (weak) Fano varieties [Ran92, Min01, San14, Ran17];
- ( $D_3$ ) (weak) Poisson structures [Got10, Hit11, FM12, Ran17, Ran19];
- ( $D_4$ ) Landau–Ginzburg models [KKP17];
- ( $D_5$ ) a pair  $(X, L)$  (resp.  $(X, \mathcal{F})$ ), where  $L$  (resp.  $\mathcal{F}$ ) is a line bundle (resp. coherent sheaf) on a smooth projective variety  $X$  over an algebraically closed field of characteristic zero, with a trivial canonical bundle [IM19, IM21].

Notice that direction ( $D_1$ ) is particularly interesting from a mirror symmetry perspective, as the deformations of a (generalized) log Calabi–Yau pair are expected to mirror to the deformations of the corresponding complexified symplectic form on the mirror Landau–Ginzburg model, see [Aur07, Aur09, KKP08, Kon08] for further details. Additionally, the BTT theorem has applications in the context of logarithmic geometry, see for instance, [Fri83, KN94, CLM23, FFR21, Fel22, FP22, Fel23, FPR23].

In this paper, we focus our attention on the direction ( $D_1$ ), specifically considering the pair  $(X, D)$ , where  $X$  is a compact Kähler manifold and  $D$  is a simple normal crossing divisor. One of our main theorems, stated below, strengthens all the corresponding results in this direction.

**Theorem A.** *Let  $X$  be a compact Kähler manifold, and let  $D = \sum_{i=1}^s D_i$  be a simple normal crossing divisor on  $X$ . Assume there exists a collection of weights  $\{a_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq s} \subset [0, 1] \cap \mathbb{Q}$  such that*

$$(1.1) \quad \sum_{i=1}^s \mathcal{O}_X(a_i D_i) = -K_X \in \text{Pic}(X) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Q} =: \text{Pic}_{\mathbb{Q}}(X),$$

which means that

$$(1.1') \quad \sum_{i=1}^s \mathcal{O}_X(N a_i D_i) = -N K_X \in \text{Pic}(X),$$

for some positive integer  $N$ .

Then, the locally trivial (infinitesimal) deformations of the pair  $(X, D)$  are unobstructed. That is, for such deformations, the pair admits a semi-universal (or Kuranishi) family over a smooth base (see §5.4.1 for further details).

*Remark 1.1.* The locally trivial deformations of a pair  $(X, D)$  can be roughly understood as deformations of  $X$  in which  $D$  deforms along with it in a locally trivial manner, so in particular, keeping the analytic singularity types. Therefore, considering locally trivial deformations is *not a restriction* but rather has geometric significance. Notice that if  $D$  is smooth, then every deformation of the pair is locally trivial, see for example [Mane22, Lemmata 4.3.4 & 4.3.5 & Theorem 4.4.3]. Consequently in this case, the pair  $(X, D)$  in Theorem A has unobstructed deformations.

Furthermore, it is noteworthy that the deformations of a projective log Calabi–Yau pair, where the pair is not required to remain a local product (i.e., allowing partial smoothing of  $D$ ), may be obstructed, see [FPR23].

*Remark 1.2.* (i) Theorem A for the case of projective manifolds was proved by L. Katzarkov–M. Kontsevich–T. Pantev [KKP08, §4.3.3 (iii)] (see also [Kon08, §3, Case 3] for a special case). In the projective setting, the equality (1.1) can be rephrased using the terminology and concepts from algebraic geometry as the  $\mathbb{Q}$ -divisor

$$K_X + \sum_{i=1}^s a_i D_i$$

being  $\mathbb{Q}$ -trivial. Here, we also denote by  $K_X$  the *canonical divisor* on a projective manifold  $X$ .

We present a rough tour through the proof in [KKP08]. Katzarkov–Kontsevich–Pantev constructed a differential graded Batalin–Vilkovisky algebra (abbrev. DG-BVA), with an associated differential graded Lie algebra (abbrev. DGLA), denoted by  $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{d}_{\mathfrak{g}})$ . This DGLA includes another “smaller” DGLA, denoted by  $(\mathfrak{g}', \mathfrak{d}_{\mathfrak{g}'})$ , as a direct summand, where  $(\mathfrak{g}', \mathfrak{d}_{\mathfrak{g}'})$  controls the *locally trivial* deformations of the pair  $(X, D)$ .<sup>1</sup> A key step in their construction is proving that the above DG-BVA satisfies the *degeneration property*, which they established using *mixed Hodge theory*, see [KKP08, Lemma 4.21]. This degeneration property implies the homotopy abelianity of  $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{d}_{\mathfrak{g}})$  and, consequently, that of  $(\mathfrak{g}', \mathfrak{d}_{\mathfrak{g}'})$ , ultimately leading to the conclusion of unobstructedness.

(ii) Notably, the setup (1.1) encompasses two important situations (the corresponding projective cases were also presented in [KKP08, §4.3.3 (i) & (ii)], respectively), namely, for  $1 \leq i \leq s$ :

- (1) any  $a_i$  is equal to 1 and  $N = 1$  in (1.1'), i.e., the *logarithmic canonical line bundle*  $\Omega_X^n(\log D) \simeq K_X \otimes \mathcal{O}_X(D)$  is trivial. We then call  $(X, D)$  a *log Calabi–Yau pair*;
- (2) any  $a_i$  is equal to 0 and  $N = 1$ , i.e.,  $X$  is a *Calabi–Yau manifold*.

Therefore, we can regard the pair  $(X, D)$  in Theorem A as a *generalized log Calabi–Yau pair (with some weights)*.

Based on the theory of DGLA and the Cartan homotopy construction, D. Iacono proved cases (1) and (2) in the algebraic setting over an algebraically closed field of characteristic zero [Iac15, Corollaries 5.5 & 5.8 & Remark 5.6] (see also [Iac17, §4.2] from the perspective of abstract BTT theorem), and later extended the case (1) to the context of the compact complex manifolds where the logarithmic Hodge-to-de Rham spectral sequence degenerates at the  $E_1$ -level [Iac17, Corollary 4.5]. Additionally, see K. Sato’s work employing the  $T^1$ -lifting technique [San14, Remark 2.5] and Z. Ran’s approach via Poisson deformations [Ran17, Theorem 12]. More recently, K. Liu–S. Rao–X. Wan proved cases (1) and (2) using a power series method, more faithfully following Tian–Todorov’s approach [LRW19, Theorems 0.8 & 0.9].

Furthermore, Iacono proved the case (also in the algebraic setting) if any  $a_i$  is equal to  $\frac{1}{M}$  for some positive integer  $M$  in (1.1), via a cyclic covering construction, see [Iac15, Proposition 6.4]. Wan also contributed to this line of research by settling the case of  $M = 2$  (when  $X$  is a compact Kähler manifold), with his proof also relying on a cyclic cover trick, as shown in [Wan18, Theorem 0.5].

Indeed, inspired by the method in [KKP08], as outlined in *Remark 1.2 (i)*, we derive Theorem A via the following  $\bar{\partial}$ -equation for logarithmic forms twisted by the dual of a certain pseudo-effective line bundle, as conjectured by Wan [Wan18]. Here in Theorem B,  $D'_{h_{L^*}}$  represents the  $(1, 0)$ -part of the integrable logarithmic connection  $\nabla_{h_{L^*}}$  along  $D$ , induced by the singular metric on the dual bundle  $L^*$  (for further details, consult §2).

**Theorem B** ([Wan18, Conjecture 0.8]). *Let  $X$  be a compact Kähler manifold,  $D = \sum_{i=1}^s D_i$  be a simple normal crossing divisor on  $X$ , and let  $L$  be a holomorphic line*

<sup>1</sup>Roughly speaking, the underlying philosophy can be described by Deligne’s principle in the letter to J. Millson in 1986: “in characteristic 0, a deformation problem is controlled by a DGLA, with quasi-isomorphic DGLAs giving the same deformation theory”, see [Del86].

bundle over  $X$ . Assume there exists a collection of weights  $\{q_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq s} \subset [0, 1] \cap \mathbb{Q}$  such that

$$(1.2) \quad L = \sum_{i=1}^s \mathcal{O}_X(q_i D_i) \in \text{Pic}_{\mathbb{Q}}(X).$$

Then, for any  $\alpha \in A^{0,q}(X, \Omega_X^p(\log D) \otimes L^*)$  satisfying  $\bar{\partial} D'_{h_{L^*}} \alpha = 0$  pointwise on

$$X^\circ := X \setminus \text{Supp } D,$$

the following logarithmic  $\bar{\partial}$ -equation:

$$(1.3) \quad \bar{\partial} \chi = D'_{h_{L^*}} \alpha \quad \text{pointwise on } X^\circ$$

has a solution  $\chi \in A^{0,q-1}(X, \Omega_X^{p+1}(\log D) \otimes L^*)$ .

*Remark 1.3.* Theorem B revisits two extreme cases:  $L \simeq \mathcal{O}_X$ , and  $L \simeq \mathcal{O}_X(D)$ , both of which were proved by Liu–Rao–Wan [LRW19, Theorem 0.1 & 0.2]. It also revisits the case where all  $q_i$  are equal to  $\frac{1}{M}$  for some positive integer  $M$ , and  $D$  is a smooth divisor, as proved by Wan [Wan18, Theorem 0.1]. See also [RZ20, §4] for some discussions related to Wan’s conjecture from the perspective of double complexes.

*Remark 1.4.* Strictly speaking, Theorem B is weaker than the “genuine” logarithmic version of the (standard)  $\partial\bar{\partial}$ -lemma aforementioned, as we cannot guarantee that the solution  $\chi$  obtained in (1.3) is moreover  $D'_{h_{L^*}}$ -exact.<sup>2</sup> It would be very interesting to know if this can be achieved. We should also mention that much recently, a general logarithmic type  $\partial\bar{\partial}$ -lemma (for top degree) proved by J. Cao–M. Păun [CP23b, Theorem 1.1] plays an important role when establishing the Kähler version of an injectivity theorem due to O. Fujino in the projective case [CP23b, Theorem 1.2] (see also recent independent work by T. O. M. Chan–Y.-J. Choi–S. Matsumura [CCM23]) as well as providing some results concerning the invariance of plurigenera conjecture in the Kähler setting [CP23a].

As is widely recognized, the  $E_1$ -degeneration of certain spectral sequences is a useful tool in algebraic geometry and complex geometry, such as being used to imply several injectivity, vanishing and torsion-free theorems. For a more comprehensive discussion, we refer the reader to [EV92, deFEM, Fuj-Book], along with the references therein.

By utilizing the logarithmic counterpart of the general description of terms in the Frölicher spectral sequence as in [CFGU97, Theorems 1 & 3], we have the expression  $E_r^{p,q} \simeq Z_r^{p,q} / B_r^{p,q}$  with the differentiable map  $d_r : E_r^{p,q} \rightarrow E_r^{p+r,q-r+1}$ . The subgroups  $Z_r^{p,q}$  and  $B_r^{p,q}$  are detailed in §5.2. As a direct corollary of Theorem B, we deduce that  $d_r = 0$  for all  $r \geq 1$ . This leads to the following result, which extends the work of H. Esnault and E. Viehweg on projective manifolds [EV92, Theorem 3.2 & Remarks 3.3] to the broader setting of compact Kähler manifolds.

**Theorem C.** *With the same setting (1.2) as in Theorem B, the following spectral sequence*

$$E_1^{p,q} = H^q(X, \Omega_X^p(\log D) \otimes L^*) \implies \mathbb{H}^{p+q}(X, \Omega_X^\bullet(\log D) \otimes L^*)$$

*associated to the logarithmic de Rham complex (see §2)*

$$(\Omega_X^\bullet(\log D) \otimes L^*, \nabla_{h_{L^*}})$$

*degenerates at the  $E_1$ -level. Here,  $\mathbb{H}^{p+q}(X, \Omega_X^\bullet(\log D) \otimes L^*)$  denotes the hypercohomology.*

---

<sup>2</sup>Notice that the weak version of the standard  $\partial\bar{\partial}$ -lemma was initially introduced in [FY11] while investigating deformations of balanced manifolds. Following the terminology of [RZ18, Notation 3.5] (see also [RZ22] for the foliated setting), we can analogously say that the pair  $(X, D)$  satisfies  $\mathbb{S}^{p,q}$  with respect to  $(L^*, h_{L^*})$ .

Building on this, we obtain the following injectivity theorem, which serves as the Kähler version of F. Ambro’s main result [Amb14, Theorem 2.3 & Remark 2.6]. Ambro’s original theorem was established in the algebraic setting for proper, non-singular varieties over an algebraically closed field of characteristic zero. The proof of Theorem D is detailed in §5.3. Notably, the case of Theorem D where  $X$  is a complex manifold in Fujiki’s class  $\mathcal{C}$  (i.e., bimeromorphic to a compact Kähler manifold) was established by Fujino [Fuj17, Theorem 1.2], utilizing the theory of mixed Hodge structures for cohomology with compact support. Our approach is quite different from Fujino’s.

**Theorem D.** *Let  $X$  be a compact Kähler manifold,  $D = \sum_{i=1}^s D_i$  be a simple normal crossing divisor on  $X$ , and let  $L$  be a holomorphic line bundle over  $X$  such that*

$$(1.4) \quad L = K_X \otimes \sum_{i=1}^s \mathcal{O}_X(b_i D_i) \in \text{Pic}_{\mathbb{Q}}(X) \quad \text{with } b_i \in (0, 1] \cap \mathbb{Q} \text{ for all } i.$$

*Then the restriction homomorphism*

$$(1.5) \quad H^q(X, L) \xrightarrow{i} H^q(X^\circ, L|_{X^\circ})$$

*is injective, for all  $q$ . Equivalently, for every effective Cartier divisor  $\widehat{D}$  with  $\text{Supp } \widehat{D} \subset \text{Supp } D$ , the natural homomorphism*

$$(1.6) \quad H^q(X, L) \xrightarrow{i'} H^q(X, L \otimes \mathcal{O}_X(\widehat{D}))$$

*induced by the inclusion  $\mathcal{O}_X \subset \mathcal{O}_X(\widehat{D})$  is injective, for all  $q$ .*

In addition to Theorems A, C, and D, we present another application of Theorem B: the closedness of twisted logarithmic forms, see §5.1.

**1.2. Idea of the proofs.** We briefly outline the basic strategies behind the proofs of Theorem B and Theorem A.

✦ For Theorem B, let us first consider the special case:  $0 < q_i \leq 1$  for every  $1 \leq i \leq s$ , which corresponds to Theorem 3.1. The first observation is that any  $\alpha \in A^{0,q}(X, \Omega_X^p(\log D) \otimes L^*)$ , and consequently  $D'_{h_{L^*}} \alpha$ , is in fact *smooth in conic sense* (Proposition 3.11). By utilizing the *Hodge decomposition for forms that are smooth in conic sense*, as established in [CP23b], we can deduce that  $[D'_{h_{L^*}} \alpha]_{\bar{\partial}} = 0$  in the  $L^*$ -valued  $(p, q)$ -conic Dolbeault cohomology group (Notation 3.13). Finally, to ensure the existence of a solution  $\chi$  (with at most logarithmic poles) in equation (3.1), we require an *acyclic resolution* of the sheaf  $\Omega_X^p(\log D) \otimes L^*$  by sheaves of germs of  $L^*$ -valued  $(p, \bullet)$ -forms that are smooth in conic sense (Proposition 3.14).

In the more general setting of Theorem B,  $D'_{h_{L^*}} \alpha$  is no longer smooth in conic sense; however, the good news is that it remains a *conic current with values in  $(L^*, h_{L^*})$* , denoted by  $T_{D'_{h_{L^*}}} \alpha$ . We then decompose  $D$  into  $E$  and  $F$  (Dec.), where, roughly speaking,  $E$  (resp.  $F$ ) represents the  $q_i = 0$  part (resp.  $q_i > 0$  part). By using the *de Rham–Kodaira decomposition for conic currents* [CP23b], we can decompose  $T_{D'_{h_{L^*}}} \alpha$  into two parts. One part falls in the image of  $\bar{\partial}$ , and the other one is a *residue term*.

Inspired by [LRW19, Lemma 2.3], the key Lemma 4.27 shows that the residue term can also be expressed as  $\bar{\partial} \widehat{T}$ , where  $\widehat{T}$  is a conic current, modulo the space of *on- $E$  conic currents valued in  $L^*$*  on  $X$  (where, roughly speaking, any element in this space annihilates all test forms valued in  $L$  that are smooth in conic sense and moreover vanish on  $E$ ; consequently, they will vanish on  $D$  as shown in (4.13)). This concept is motivated by the work of J. R. King [Kin83]. The final step to find the solution  $\chi$  in equation (1.3)

follows a similar approach. The main difference is that this time we need to replace the protagonists in the corresponding acyclic resolution (Proposition 4.22) with the *sheaf of log- $E$  conic currents with values in  $(L^*, h_{L^*})$* , which is defined as the quotient sheaf of the sheaf of  $(L^*, h_{L^*})$ -conic currents by the sheaf of on- $E$  conic currents valued in  $(L^*, h_{L^*})$ , see Definition 4.20.

Note that Theorem 3.1 can also be derived using the conic current approach, see Corollary 4.24. Moreover, our method provides part of a new proof of [LRW19, Theorem 0.1], see Remark 4.28 (b).

✦ For Theorem A, as noted in Remark 1.2 (i), the key requirement is the *degeneration property* (Definition 5.13) for a suitable DGBVA (Definition 5.9). With the aid of Theorem B (or more practical, Theorem C), we achieve this by considering the DGBVA  $(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{\Delta})$ , where

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{A} &:= A^{0,\bullet}(X, \wedge^\bullet T_X(-\log D)); \\ \mathbf{d} &:= \bar{\partial}; \\ \mathbf{\Delta} &:= \mathbf{i}_\Omega^{-1} \circ D'_{h_{L^*}} \circ \mathbf{i}_\Omega.\end{aligned}$$

Here,  $T_X(-\log D)$  is the logarithmic tangent bundle (Definition 5.4);

$$\Omega \in A^{0,0}(X, \Omega_X^n(\log D) \otimes L^*)$$

is a nowhere vanishing section of the logarithmic  $(n, 0)$ -form valued in  $L^*$ , where

$$L := \Omega_X^n(\log D) \simeq K_X \otimes \mathcal{O}_X(D),$$

thus

$$L = \sum_{i=1}^s \mathcal{O}_X(q_i D_i) \in \text{Pic}_{\mathbb{Q}}(X) \quad \text{with } q_i := 1 - a_i \in [0, 1];$$

and

$$\mathbf{i}_\Omega : \wedge^\bullet T_X(-\log D) \rightarrow \Omega_X^{n-\bullet}(\log D) \otimes L^*$$

is the isomorphism defined by contraction with  $\Omega$ .

**1.3. Overview and outlook.** We prove Theorem B via an analytic approach, and Theorem A is an application of it, generalizing [KKP08, §4.3.3 (iii)], and consequently [KKP08, §4.3.3 (i) & (ii)], to the context of compact Kähler manifolds. Indeed, by constructing again a DGBVA and employing the mixed Hodge theory, Katzarkov–Kontsevich–Pantev provided another generalization of the previous results, that is [KKP08, §4.3.3 (iv)], specifically when  $X$  is a *projective normal-crossings Calabi–Yau*. More precisely, assume that  $X$  is a simple normal crossings variety with irreducible components  $X = \bigcup_{j \in J} X_j$  equipped with a holomorphic volume form  $\Omega_X$  on  $X - X_{\text{sing}}$ . This form  $\Omega_X$  satisfies the condition that its restriction to each  $X_j$  has a logarithmic pole along  $X_j \cap (\bigcup_{k \neq j} X_k)$ , and the residues of these restricted forms cancel along each  $X_j \cup X_k$ . Motivated by this, the following question naturally arises, which we will consider in a forthcoming paper.

**Question.** *Could further analytic methods be developed to generalize the variety  $X$  in Theorem B to the setting of normal-crossing Calabi–Yau varieties that are Kähler but not necessarily projective? If so, it may also be promising to extend the variety  $X$  in Theorem A to this broader context without relying on the mixed Hodge theory.*

**Notations and conventions.** Throughout this paper, we work over the field of complex numbers.

- Any (compact) complex manifold  $X$  in this paper are assumed to be connected.
- Denote by  $\mathcal{A}_X$  (resp.  $\mathcal{O}_X$ ) the sheaf of germs of  $\mathcal{C}^\infty$  differentiable functions (resp. holomorphic functions) over  $X$ .

- *Locally free sheaves of  $\mathcal{A}_X$ -modules (resp.  $\mathcal{O}_X$ -modules) and  $\mathcal{C}^\infty$  complex (resp. holomorphic) vector bundles* are considered synonymous.
- The terminology *Cartier divisors, invertible sheaves, and holomorphic line bundles* are used interchangeably.
- A sheaf  $\mathcal{F}$  is called *flabby* if for every open subset  $V$  of  $X$ , the restriction map  $\mathcal{F}(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(V)$  is onto, i.e., if every section of  $\mathcal{F}$  on  $V$  can be extended to  $X$ .
- A flabby sheaf  $\mathcal{F}$  is *acyclic* on all open sets  $V \subset X$ , meaning that  $H^q(V, \mathcal{F}) = 0$  for any  $q \geq 1$ .
- We use additive notation for tensor products and powers of line bundles, and multiplicative notation (resp. additive notation) for hermitian metrics (resp. local weights) of line bundles. For example,  $(L_1, h_1, \varphi_1)$ ,  $(L_2, h_2, \varphi_2)$ , and  $(L_1 + L_2, h_1 \cdot h_2, \varphi_1 + \varphi_2)$ . Here  $h_1 = e^{-\varphi_1}$  (resp.  $h_2 = e^{-\varphi_2}$ ) is a (possibly singular) metric on  $L_1$  (resp.  $L_2$ ).
- For  $\aleph \in \mathbb{Q}$ ,  $\lfloor \aleph \rfloor$  denotes the *integral part* of  $\aleph$ , defined as the only integer such that  $\lfloor \aleph \rfloor \leq \aleph \leq \lfloor \aleph \rfloor + 1$ .

This paper is organized as follows.

## CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
1.1. Backgrounds and main results	1
1.2. Idea of the proofs	5
1.3. Overview and outlook	6
2. Logarithmic connection and logarithmic complex	8
3. Warm-up: all $q_i > 0$	10
3.1. Hodge decomposition: conic version	10
3.2. Proof of Theorem 3.1	13
4. General case: not all $q_i > 0$	15
4.1. de Rham–Kodaira decomposition for conic currents	15
4.2. Log conic current	17
4.3. Proof of Theorem B	23
5. Applications	29
5.1. Closedness of the twisted logarithmic forms	29
5.2. Degeneracy of spectral sequence	30
5.3. Injectivity theorem	30
5.4. Unobstructed deformations	32
5.4.1. Deformations of pairs	32
5.4.2. Differentiable graded Batalin–Vilkovisky algebra	33
5.4.3. Proof of Theorem A	35
Appendix I. Proof of King’s quasi-isomorphisms	36
Appendix II. Directed limits	38
References	39

**Acknowledgement** The author is deeply grateful to his advisors, Professors Junyan Cao and Sheng Rao, for their insightful discussions and constant encouragement. He is also grateful to Professors Tsz On Mario Chan, Ya Deng, Simon Felten, Andreas H\"oring, Donatella Iacono, Kefeng Liu, Shin-ichi Matsumura, Mihai P\"aun, Helge Ruddat and Xueyuan Wan for many helpful discussions and/or comments on this work. He extends

his gratitude to Donatella Iacono and Simon Felten for kindly answering his questions via emails. Special thanks to Xueyuan Wan for pointing out a serious mistake in the first version of this paper. The author is supported by the China Scholarship Council (Grant No. 202306270252).

## 2. LOGARITHMIC CONNECTION AND LOGARITHMIC COMPLEX

In this section, we will recall some basic notions regarding the logarithmic connection (induced by the singular metric on a holomorphic line bundle) and the logarithmic de Rham complex. For more details refer to [GH78, Chapter 3.5] and [EV92, Chapter 2].

Let  $X$  be a compact complex manifold of dimension  $n$  and  $D = \sum_{i=1}^s D_i$  be a simple normal crossing divisor (i.e., a divisor with non-singular components  $D_i$  intersecting each other transversally) on  $X$ . Let

$$\Omega_X^p(\star D) = \varinjlim_v \Omega_X^p(vD)$$

be the sheaf of germs of  $p$ -meromorphic forms which are holomorphic on  $X - D$  but possibly with arbitrary orders of poles along  $D$ . Obviously,  $(\Omega_X^\bullet(\star D), d)$  is a complex. Deligne introduced the *sheaf of germs of logarithmic  $p$ -forms* [Del69]

$$\Omega_X^p(\log D),$$

which is defined as the subsheaf of  $\Omega_X^p(\star D)$  with logarithmic poles along  $D$ , i.e., if  $V \subset X$  is open, then

$$\Gamma(V, \Omega_X^p(\log D)) = \{\alpha \in \Gamma(V, \Omega_X^p(\star D)) \mid \alpha \text{ and } d\alpha \text{ both have simple poles along } D\}.$$

It turns out that there exists a subcomplex  $(\Omega_X^\bullet(\log D), d) \subset (\Omega_X^\bullet(\star D), d)$ , see for example [Del70, II, 3.1-3.7] or [EV92, Properties 2.2]. Furthermore,

$$\Omega_X^p(\log D) = \bigwedge^p \Omega_X^1(\log D)$$

is locally free. More precisely, for any  $z \in X$ , suppose  $z \in D_i$  for any  $1 \leq i \leq d$  and  $z \notin D_i$  for  $d+1 \leq i \leq s$ . We can then choose local coordinates  $\{z^1, \dots, z^n\}$  in a small neighborhood  $V$  of  $z = (0, \dots, 0)$  such that  $D_i \cap V = \{z^i = 0\}$  for  $1 \leq i \leq d$ . One writes

$$\delta_j = \begin{cases} \frac{dz^j}{z^j} & \text{if } j \leq d; \\ dz^j & \text{if } j > d, \end{cases}$$

and for  $J = \{j_1, \dots, j_p\} \subset \{1, \dots, n\}$  with  $j_1 < j_2 < \dots < j_p$ ,

$$\delta_J = \delta_{j_1} \wedge \dots \wedge \delta_{j_p}.$$

Then

$$(2.1) \quad \{\delta_J \mid \#J = p\}$$

forms a basis of  $\Omega_X^p(\log D)$  as a free  $\mathcal{O}_X$ -module over  $V$ . Furthermore, we denote by

$$\mathcal{A}^{0,q}(\Omega_X^p(\log D))$$

the sheaf of germs of  $(0, q)$ -forms valued in  $\Omega_X^p(\log D)$ , which is a locally free sheaf of  $\mathcal{A}_X$ -modules. Elements in

$$A^{0,q}(X, \Omega_X^p(\log D)),$$

i.e., the global sections of  $\mathcal{A}^{0,q}(\Omega_X^p(\log D))$ , are called *logarithmic  $(p, q)$ -forms*.

Next, we recall the definition of (integrable) logarithmic connection along  $D$  with respect to a holomorphic vector bundle.



**Definition 2.1** ([EV92, Definition 2.4]). Let  $\mathcal{E}$  be a locally free sheaf of  $\mathcal{O}_X$ -modules and let

$$\nabla : \mathcal{E} \longrightarrow \Omega_X^1(\log D) \otimes \mathcal{E}$$

be a  $\mathbb{C}$ -linear map satisfying

$$\nabla(f \cdot e) = f \cdot \nabla(e) + df \otimes e.$$

One defines

$$\nabla_p : \Omega_X^p(\log D) \otimes \mathcal{E} \longrightarrow \Omega_X^{p+1}(\log D) \otimes \mathcal{E}$$

by the rule

$$\nabla_p(\omega \otimes e) = d\omega \otimes e + (-1)^p \omega \wedge \nabla(e).$$

We assume that

$$\nabla_{p+1} \circ \nabla_p = 0.$$

Such  $\nabla$  will be called an *integrable logarithmic connection along  $D$* , or just a connection. The complex

$$(\Omega_X^\bullet(\log D) \otimes \mathcal{E}, \nabla_\bullet)$$

is called the *logarithmic de Rham complex* of  $(\mathcal{E}, \nabla)$ .

Let  $L$  be a holomorphic line bundle over  $X$  satisfying

$$L = \sum_{i=1}^s \mathcal{O}_X(q_i D_i) \in \text{Pic}_{\mathbb{Q}}(X)$$

with  $q_i \in \mathbb{Q}$  (note that here we do not restrict the sign of  $q_i$ ). Then there naturally exists a singular metric  $h_L := e^{-\varphi_L}$  on  $L$ , where  $\varphi_L$  is a collection of functions defined on small open sets, called the *local weight*, locally can be written as

$$\varphi_L = \sum_{i=1}^s q_i \log |z^i|^2,$$

with  $z^i = 0$  ( $i = 1, \dots, s$ ) representing the local equations of components of  $D$ , see e.g. [Dem92, §2]. We then obtain that the curvature current with respect to  $h_L$  is

$$i\Theta_{h_L}(L) = 2\pi i \sum_{i=1}^s q_i [D_i],$$

thanks to the Lelong–Poincaré formula, where  $[D_i]$  is the current of integration over the irreducible  $(n-1)$ -dimensional analytic set  $D_i$  for any  $i$ . In particular,  $L$  is *pseudo-effective* if all  $q_i$  are non-negative. One can verify without difficulty that there exists a (global) integrable logarithmic connection along  $D$  induced by the metric  $h_L$ , denoted by  $\nabla_{h_L}$ , which has a decomposition

$$\nabla_{h_L} = D'_{h_L} + \bar{\partial}.$$

Here,  $D'_{h_L}$  is the  $(1,0)$ -part of  $\nabla_{h_L}$ , which has the local expression

$$D'_{h_L} := \partial - \partial\varphi_L = \partial - \sum_{i=1}^s q_i \frac{dz^i}{z^i}.$$

More explicitly, following the notations as in Definition 2.1, we have

$$(2.2) \quad \nabla_{h_L}(\omega \otimes e) = d\omega \otimes e + (-1)^p \omega \wedge \left( \sum_{i=1}^s q_i \frac{dz^i}{z^i} \right) \otimes e.$$

One then can check that

$$\nabla_{h_L}^2 = 0.$$

### 3. WARM-UP: ALL $q_i > 0$

As a warm-up, we first consider a simple case of Theorem B. In this section, we are devoted to proving:

**Theorem 3.1.** *Under the same settings as in Theorem B, assume further that all rational numbers  $q_i$  in (1.2) lie in  $(0, 1]$ . Then, for any  $\alpha \in A^{0,q}(X, \Omega_X^p(\log D) \otimes L^*)$  satisfying  $\bar{\partial} D'_{h_{L^*}} \alpha = 0$  pointwise on  $X^\circ$ , the logarithmic  $\bar{\partial}$ -equation:*

$$(3.1) \quad \bar{\partial} \chi = D'_{h_{L^*}} \alpha \text{ pointwise on } X^\circ$$

has a solution  $\chi \in A^{0,q-1}(X, \Omega_X^p(\log D) \otimes L^*)$ .

**3.1. Hodge decomposition: conic version.** In this subsection, we will state the Hodge decomposition for metric with conic singularities, following [CP23b, §2.2, 2.3].

The *setting* of this subsection is as follows. Let  $X$  be a compact Kähler manifold with dimension  $n$ , and let  $D = \sum_{i=1}^s D_i$  be a simple normal crossing divisor on  $X$ . Let  $L$  be a holomorphic line bundle over  $X$  admitting a singular metric  $h_L = e^{-\varphi_L}$  which has *logarithmic poles*, i.e., its local weight can be written as

$$(\heartsuit) \quad \varphi_L = \sum_{i=1}^s q_i \log |z^i|^2 + \varphi_{L,0},$$

where  $q_i \in \mathbb{Q}$ ,  $z^i = 0$  represent the local equations of components of  $D$  and  $\varphi_{L,0}$  is a smooth function. Note that the  $q_i$  are not necessarily positive. The condition  $(\heartsuit)$  implies the corresponding curvature current is given by

$$(3.2) \quad i\Theta_{h_L}(L) = 2\pi i \sum_{i=1}^s q_i [D_i] + \theta_L,$$

where  $\theta_L$  is a smooth function on  $X$ . Choose a positive integer  $m$  such that

$$(\spadesuit) \quad \text{for each } q_i \in \mathbb{Q} \setminus \mathbb{Z}, \quad mq_i \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ and } \lfloor q_i - \frac{1}{m} \rfloor = \lfloor q_i \rfloor \text{ both hold true.}$$

One then denotes by  $\omega_c$  a metric (on  $X^\circ = X \setminus \text{Supp } D$ ) with *conic singularities* along the  $\mathbb{Q}$ -divisor

$$D_m := \sum_{i=1}^s \left(1 - \frac{1}{m}\right) D_i.$$

By this we mean that if  $z^1 \cdots z^s = 0$  is the local equation of the divisor  $D$ , then

$$(3.3) \quad \omega_c \simeq \sum_{j=1}^s \frac{idz^j \wedge d\bar{z}^j}{|z^j|^{2-\frac{2}{m}}} + \sum_{j=s+1}^n idz^j \wedge d\bar{z}^j =: \omega_{\text{model}},$$

that is to say,  $\omega_c$  is *quasi-isometric* with  $\omega_{\text{model}}$ , i.e.,

$$C^{-1} \cdot \omega_{\text{model}} \leq \omega_c \leq C \cdot \omega_{\text{model}}$$

for some constant  $C > 0$ . Notice that  $\omega_c$  is a closed positive  $(1, 1)$ -current (smooth away from the support of  $D$ ) on  $X$ . For the existence and the explicit constructions of such metric, refer to e.g. [Cla08, Proposition 2.1]. Now let

$$(V_i; z_i^1, \dots, z_i^n)_{i \in \mathfrak{J}}$$

be a finite cover with coordinate charts such that

$$z_i^1 \cdots z_i^s = 0$$

is the local equation of the divisor  $D$  when restricted to the set  $V_i$ . We next consider the local ramified maps

$$\pi_i : U_i \rightarrow V_i, \quad \pi_i(w_i^1, \dots, w_i^n) := ((w_i^1)^m, \dots, (w_i^s)^m, w_i^{s+1}, \dots, w_i^n).$$

It defines the orbifold structure corresponding to  $(X, D_m)$ .

Then, introducing the following definition is natural in our context, as it accounts for the singularities of the metric  $h_L$  on  $L$ . This can be seen as a generalization of the usual definition of “orbifold differential forms”, see e.g. [MM07, §5.4] and [Cam04, §2].

**Definition 3.2** ([CP23b, Definition 2.14]). Let  $\phi$  be a smooth form of  $(p, q)$ -type with values in  $L$  defined on the open set  $X^\circ$ . We say that  $\phi$  is *smooth in conic sense* if the quotient of the local inverse images

$$(3.4) \quad \tilde{\phi}_i := \frac{1}{w_i^{qm}} \pi_i^*(\phi|_{V_i})$$

admits a smooth extension to  $U_i$ . Here in (3.4) we are using the notation

$$w_i^{qm} := (w_i^1)^{q_1 m} \dots (w_i^s)^{q_s m}$$

in order to simplify the writing.

**Remark 3.3.** Obviously, the notion of “smooth in conic sense” from the above definition can be applied to general (not necessarily compact) complex manifolds.

The following proposition plays an important role, as it builds a correspondence between the intrinsic differential operators and the local ones associated to the data  $(\omega_c, h_L)$ .

**Proposition 3.4** ([CP23b, Proposition 2.17]). *Let  $\phi$  be an  $L$ -valued  $(p, q)$ -form, smooth in conic sense. Then its “natural” derivatives  $D'_{h_L}, D'^*_{h_L}, \bar{\partial}, \bar{\partial}^*$ , are also smooth in conic sense. Furthermore, one has*

- (a)  $\sup_{X^\circ} |\phi|_{h_L, \omega_c} < \infty$ , i.e., forms which are smooth in conic sense are bounded.
- (b) The following equalities hold true

$$(3.5) \quad \pi_i^*(D'\phi) = \omega_i^{qm} D'\tilde{\phi}_i, \quad \pi_i^*(\bar{\partial}\phi) = \omega_i^{qm} \bar{\partial}\tilde{\phi}_i;$$

together with

$$\pi_i^*(D'^*\phi) = \omega_i^{qm} D'^*\tilde{\phi}_i, \quad \pi_i^*(\bar{\partial}^*\phi) = \omega_i^{qm} \bar{\partial}^*\tilde{\phi}_i.$$

Here, the notation  $D'$  on the left-hand side (resp. the right-hand side) of the first equality in (3.5) refers to  $D'_{h_L}$  (resp. is defined by  $D'\zeta := \partial\zeta - \partial(\varphi_{L,0} \circ \pi_i) \wedge \zeta$ ).

We recall that  $\varphi_L = \sum_{i=1}^s q_i \log |z^i|^2 + \varphi_{L,0}$ .

- (c) Let  $\Delta'' := [\bar{\partial}, \bar{\partial}^*]$  be the Laplace operator with respect to  $(\omega_c, h_L)$ . Then one has

$$(3.6) \quad \pi_i^* \Delta'' \phi = \omega_i^{qm} \cdot \Delta''_{\text{sm}} \tilde{\phi}_i,$$

where  $\Delta''_{\text{sm}}$  is the Laplace operator for the local, non singular setting  $(\pi_i^* \omega_c, \varphi_{L,0} \circ \pi_i)$ .

As a result, we know that forms which are smooth in conic sense behave well by integrations by parts.

**Proposition 3.5** ([CP23b, Corollary 2.19]). *Let  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  be an  $L$ -valued  $(p, q)$  form and an  $L^*$ -valued  $(n-p-1, n-q)$  form, respectively, both of which are smooth in conic sense. Then the usual integration by parts formula holds true*

$$\int_X D'_{h_L} \alpha \wedge \beta = (-1)^{p+q+1} \int_X \alpha \wedge D'_{h_L^*} \beta.$$

Furthermore, one has the following regularity theorem.

**Proposition 3.6** ([CP23b, Corollary 2.20]). *Suppose that  $\zeta$  is a  $L$ -valued  $L^2$  form on  $X$  such that  $\Delta''(\zeta) = \phi$  holds in the sense of currents (see Definition 4.1) on  $X$  for some  $\phi$ , smooth in conic sense. Then  $\zeta$  is also smooth in conic sense. In particular, any  $L$ -valued  $L^2$  form which is  $\Delta''$ -harmonic is smooth in conic sense.*

Setting  $\Delta' := [D'_{h_L}, D'^*_{h_L}]$ ,<sup>3</sup> one gets the conic version of Bochner–Kodaira–Nakano formula.

**Proposition 3.7** ([CP23b, Proposition 2.21]). *Let  $\phi$  be an  $L$ -valued  $(p, q)$ -form, which is smooth in conic sense. Then the equality*

$$(3.7) \quad \Delta''\phi = \Delta'\phi + [\theta_L, \Lambda_c]\phi$$

holds pointwise on  $X^\circ$  (for the notation  $\theta_L$  see (3.2)), where  $\Lambda_c$  is the adjoint of the Lefschetz operator  $L_c := \omega_c \wedge \bullet$ . Furthermore, we have the following Bochner formula

$$(3.8) \quad \int_X |\bar{\partial}\phi|^2 e^{-\varphi_L} dV_{\omega_c} + \int_X |\bar{\partial}^*\phi|^2 e^{-\varphi_L} dV_{\omega_c} = \int_X |D'_{h_L}\phi|^2 e^{-\varphi_L} dV_{\omega_c} + \int_X |D'^*_{h_L}\phi|^2 e^{-\varphi_L} dV_{\omega_c} + \int_X \langle [\theta_L, \Lambda_c]\phi, \phi \rangle e^{-\varphi_L} dV_{\omega_c}.$$

Indeed, the special choice of the curvature of the line bundle  $L$  will broaden the range of validity for (3.7). We will use the following useful proposition later.

**Proposition 3.8.** *Assume further that  $q_i \geq 0$  for every  $i$  and  $\varphi_{L,0} = 0$  in (♥). Let  $\phi$  be an  $L$ -valued  $(p, q)$ -form, smooth in conic sense. Then the equality*

$$\Delta''\phi = \Delta'\phi$$

holds pointwise on the whole of  $X$ .

*Proof.* On each local ramified cover  $\pi_i : U_i \rightarrow V_i$ , the relationship (3.6), combined with the usual Bochner equality

$$\Delta''_{\text{sm}} = \Delta'_{\text{sm}} + [i\Theta_{\varphi_{L,0} \circ \pi_i}, \Lambda_{\pi_i^* \omega_c}],$$

where  $\Lambda_{\pi_i^* \omega_c}$  is the adjoint of the Lefschetz operator  $L_{\pi_i^* \omega_c} := \pi_i^* \omega_c \wedge \bullet$ , implies that, on  $U_i$ , we have the following as smooth forms (noting that  $w_i^{qm}$  does not introduce poles along the divisors since  $q_i \geq 0$  for every  $i$ ):

$$\pi_i^* \Delta''\phi = \omega_i^{qm} \cdot \Delta''_{\text{sm}} \tilde{\phi}_i = \omega_i^{qm} \cdot \Delta'_{\text{sm}} \tilde{\phi}_i = \pi_i^* \Delta'\phi.$$

This leads to the desired result.  $\square$

Similarly to the smooth case, one defines the Hodge operators  $*$  and  $\sharp$  in our setting, namely, given an  $L$ -valued  $(p, q)$ -form  $t$ , there exists a unique  $L^*$ -valued  $(n-p, n-q)$ -form, denoted by  $\sharp t$ , such that for any  $L$ -valued  $(p, q)$ -form  $s$ , we have

$$\langle s, t \rangle_{h_L} dV_{\omega_c} = s \wedge \sharp t,$$

where  $s \wedge \sharp t$  is calculated via the natural pairing  $L \otimes L^* \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ . One then can derive:

**Proposition 3.9** ([CP23b, Propositions 2.24 & 2.25]). (1) *Let  $t$  be an  $L$ -valued  $(p, q)$ -form, smooth in conic sense. Then  $\sharp t$  is an  $L^*$ -valued  $(n-p, n-q)$  form, also smooth in conic sense (with respect to  $(h_{L^*}, \omega_c)$ ).*  
(2) *Let  $t$  be a  $\Delta''$ -harmonic form with values in  $L$ . Then  $\sharp t$  is also a  $\Delta''$ -harmonic form with values in  $L^*$ .*

<sup>3</sup>We leave out the subscript here for simplicity, as long as it does not cause confusion.

Cao–Păun also obtained the conic version of *Gårding* and *Sobolev inequalities* together with the *Rellich embedding theorem*. As a consequence, they finally got the “conic Hodge decomposition” as follows.

**Theorem 3.10** ([CP23b, Theorem 2.28]). *Let  $(L, h_L)$  be a line bundle on  $X$  endowed with a metric  $h_L$  such that the requirements (♥) and (♠) are satisfied. Let  $\omega_c$  be a Kähler metric with conic singularities as in (3.3). Then we have the following Hodge decomposition*

$$(3.9) \quad A_{\text{co}}^{p,q}(X, L) = \text{Ker } \Delta_{h_L}'' \oplus \text{Im } \Delta_{h_L}'',$$

and

$$L_{p,q}^2(X, L) = \text{Ker } \Delta_{h_L}'' \oplus \text{Im } \bar{\partial} \oplus \text{Im } \bar{\partial}^*,$$

where  $A_{\text{co}}^{p,q}(X, L)$  (resp.  $L_{p,q}^2(X, L)$ ) is the space of  $L$ -valued  $(p, q)$ -forms, which are smooth in conic sense (resp. in the  $L^2$  sense) with respect to  $(h_L, \omega_c)$ . Notice that  $A_{\text{co}}^{p,q}(X, L) \subset L_{p,q}^2(X, L)$ .

**3.2. Proof of Theorem 3.1.** We first give the following simple but important observation:

**Proposition 3.11.** *Let  $\alpha \in A^{0,q}(X, \Omega_X^p(\log D) \otimes L^*)$ . Suppose that  $q_i > 0$  (not necessarily equal to or less than 1) for every  $i$  in (♥). Then  $\alpha$  is smooth in conic sense.*

*Proof.* This conclusion is based on a local computation. Without loss of generality, we only consider the one-variable case, where  $w^{qm} \cdot \frac{d(w^m)}{w^m}$  is smooth. It’s worth noting that here  $qm$  is a positive integer.  $\square$

**Remark 3.12.** Noteworthy to mention that the converse of Proposition 3.11 is in general false when the antiholomorphic degree  $q \geq 1$ . For example, let  $X$  be the unit disc with coordinate  $z$ ,  $D$  be a simple normal crossing divisor on it defined by the equation  $z = 0$ , and  $L$  be the trivial bundle over  $X$ , endowed with the metric  $\varphi_L = \frac{1}{2} \log |z|$ . In this case, the  $(L^*$ -valued)-form  $\alpha = \frac{dz \wedge d\bar{z}}{|z|}$  is smooth in conic sense but does not admit logarithmic poles along  $D$ . However, these two concepts coincide in terms of (Dolbeault type) cohomology, provided that  $0 < q_i \leq 1$  for every  $i$  in (♥), see Proposition 3.14.

**Notation 3.13.** (1) Fix  $(p, q)$ , denote by  $\text{co}\mathcal{A}_{L^*}^{p,q}$  the sheaf of germs of  $L^*$ -valued  $(p, q)$ -forms that are smooth in conic sense. The union of elements in  $\text{co}\mathcal{A}_{L^*}^{p,q}(X)$ , i.e., global sections of  $\text{co}\mathcal{A}_{L^*}^{p,q}$ , is then the space  $A_{\text{co}}^{p,q}(X, L^*)$ .

(2) Define the  $L^*$ -valued  $(p, q)$ -conic Dolbeault cohomology group as the following vector space

$$H_{\text{co}}^{p,q}(X, L^*) := \frac{\text{Ker } \{\bar{\partial} : A_{\text{co}}^{p,q}(X, L^*) \rightarrow A_{\text{co}}^{p,q+1}(X, L^*)\}}{\text{Im } \{\bar{\partial} : A_{\text{co}}^{p,q-1}(X, L^*) \rightarrow A_{\text{co}}^{p,q}(X, L^*)\}}.$$

Now we are going to show:

**Proposition 3.14.** *Suppose that  $0 < q_i \leq 1$  for every  $i$  in (♥). Then  $(\text{co}\mathcal{A}_{L^*}^{p,\bullet}, \bar{\partial})$  is an acyclic resolution of  $\Omega_X^p(\log D) \otimes L^*$ , i.e., one has the following exact sequence of sheaves over  $X$ :*

$$(3.10) \quad \begin{aligned} 0 \rightarrow \Omega_X^p(\log D) \otimes L^* &\xrightarrow{\iota} \text{co}\mathcal{A}_{L^*}^{p,0} \xrightarrow{\bar{\partial}} \text{co}\mathcal{A}_{L^*}^{p,1} \rightarrow \dots \\ &\rightarrow \text{co}\mathcal{A}_{L^*}^{p,q} \xrightarrow{\bar{\partial}} \text{co}\mathcal{A}_{L^*}^{p,q+1} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow \text{co}\mathcal{A}_{L^*}^{p,n} \rightarrow 0, \end{aligned}$$

such that  $\mathcal{A}_{\text{co}}^{p,q}(L^*)$  is an acyclic sheaf on  $X$  for any  $0 \leq p, q \leq n$ . In particular,

$$(3.11) \quad H^q(X, \Omega_X^p(\log D) \otimes L^*) \simeq H_{\text{co}}^{p,q}(X, L^*).$$

*Proof.* This is a purely local statement. For any  $x \in X$ , which  $d$  of these  $D_i$  pass, we may choose local holomorphic coordinates  $\{z^1, \dots, z^n\}$  in a small neighborhood  $V$  around  $x = (0, \dots, 0)$  such that  $D \cap U = \{z^1 \cdots z^d = 0\}$ . One then considers the local ramified map

$$\pi : U \rightarrow V, \quad \pi(w^1, \dots, w^n) := ((w^1)^m, \dots, (w^d)^m, w^{d+1}, \dots, w^n).$$

As all  $q_i > 0$ , it follows that  $\iota$  is indeed injective by Proposition 3.11. Suppose that  $\alpha$  is a local  $(p, 0)$ -form with values in  $L^*$ , smooth in conic sense. Fix a local basis of  $L^*$  on  $V$ , by Definition 3.2 plus the assumption on  $q_i$ , write locally

$$(3.12) \quad \alpha = \alpha_{i_1 \dots i_p} \frac{dz^{i_1}}{(z^{i_1})^{a_{i_1}}} \wedge \cdots \wedge \frac{dz^{i_p}}{(z^{i_p})^{a_{i_p}}},$$

where  $a_{i_j}$  is an integer for any  $j = 1, \dots, p$  and  $\alpha_{i_1 \dots i_p}$  is a smooth function that is not divisible by  $z^{i_1}, \dots, z^{i_p}$ . We then get that

– if  $i_j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ , then

$$a_{i_j} \leq 1 + q_{i_j} - \frac{1}{m} \leq 2 - \frac{1}{m}, \text{ so } a_{i_j} \text{ is an integer no more than } 1;$$

– if  $i_j \notin \{1, \dots, d\}$ , then

$$a_{i_j} \leq 0.$$

Furthermore, if  $\bar{\partial}\alpha = 0$ , then  $\alpha_{i_1 \dots i_p}$  is a holomorphic function. Therefore,  $\alpha$  in (3.12) is a logarithmic form. Furthermore, as one can verify  $\bar{\partial} \circ \iota = 0$  easily, the exactness of (3.10) at level 0 is thus proved.

Let us now turn to the proof of the exactness of  $(\text{co}\mathcal{A}_{L^*}^{p,q}, \bar{\partial})$  at any level  $q \geq 1$ . Thanks to Proposition 3.4, we can conclude that  $(\mathcal{A}_{\text{co}}^{p,\bullet}(L^*), \bar{\partial})$  is a differential complex. Now, suppose that  $\alpha$  is a local  $(p, q)$ -form with  $q \geq 1$ , smooth in conic sense. If  $\bar{\partial}\alpha = 0$ , then so is

$$\tilde{\alpha} := w^{qm} \cdot \pi^* \alpha.$$

Here  $w^{qm} = (w^1)^{q_1 m} \cdots (w^d)^{q_d m}$ . By definition,  $\tilde{\alpha}$  is a smooth form on  $U$  (after smooth extension). Thus, via Dolbeault–Grothendieck lemma, one can find a local smooth form  $\beta$  on  $U$  such that

$$\bar{\partial}\beta = \tilde{\alpha}.$$

Equivalently,

$$(3.13) \quad \frac{\bar{\partial}\beta}{w^{qm}} = \pi^* \alpha.$$

Recall that the  $m$ -ramified cover  $\pi : U \rightarrow V$  induces the Galois groups  $\rho_1, \dots, \rho_m$  which are the automorphisms  $\rho_i : U \rightarrow U$  invariant over  $V$ . Since the right-hand side of (3.13) is  $\rho_i$ -invariant, we have

$$\bar{\partial}\gamma = \pi^* \alpha,$$

where

$$\gamma := \frac{1}{m} \sum_i \rho_i^* \frac{\beta}{w^{qm}}$$

is  $\pi$ -invariant and the multiplication  $w^{qm} \cdot \gamma$  is smooth. Accordingly,  $\gamma$  is the pull back of some form  $\varphi$  on  $V$ , smooth in conic sense. Therefore, we get, on  $U$ ,

$$\bar{\partial}\pi^* \varphi = \pi^* \bar{\partial}\varphi = \pi^* \alpha.$$

As a result, on  $V$ ,

$$\bar{\partial}\varphi = \alpha.$$

Finally,  $\text{co}\mathcal{A}_{L^*}^{p,q}$  is an acyclic sheaf on  $X$  for any  $0 \leq p, q \leq n$  since one can check that it is a  $\mathcal{A}_X$ -module, cf. [Dem-eBook, Corollary 4.19].

The proof of Proposition 3.14 is, thus, completed.  $\square$

With these preparations, we now come to prove Theorem 3.1.

*Proof of Theorem 3.1.* Given  $\alpha \in A^{0,q}(X, \Omega_X^p(\log D) \otimes L^*)$ , we can deduce that  $\alpha$  is smooth in conic sense according to Proposition 3.11; consequently, so is  $\alpha' := D'_{h_L^*} \alpha$ , as shown in Proposition 3.4. By assumption  $D'_{h_L^*} \alpha$  is  $\bar{\partial}$ -closed as a logarithmic form, one can then verify that it is also  $\bar{\partial}$ -closed in the conic sense. Using Theorem 3.10, we obtain the following decomposition:

$$D'_{h_L^*} \alpha = \mathfrak{h} + \bar{\partial} \mathfrak{u},$$

where  $\mathfrak{h} \in \text{Ker} \Delta''_{h_L^*}$ ,  $\mathfrak{u}$  is also smooth in conic sense. One also can derive that  $\mathfrak{h} = 0$ , thus  $D'_{h_L^*} \alpha$  is  $\bar{\partial}$ -exact. Indeed, denote by  $(s, t)$  the inner product of two  $L^*$ -valued  $(p, q)$ -forms  $s$  and  $t$  associated to the pointwise norm with respect to the data  $(\omega_c, h_L^*)$ , i.e.,  $(s, t) := \int_X \langle s, t \rangle_{h_L^*} dV_{\omega_c}$ . We also write  $\|s\| = \sqrt{(s, s)}$ . Then, one gets

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{h}) &= (\mathfrak{h}, D'_{h_L^*} \alpha - \bar{\partial} \mathfrak{u}) \\ &= (\mathfrak{h}, D'_{h_L^*} \alpha) \\ &= (D'_{h_L^*} \mathfrak{h}, \alpha) = 0, \end{aligned}$$

where the third equality comes from Proposition 3.5, and the last equality holds because  $|(D'_{h_L^*} \mathfrak{h}, \alpha)|$  is bounded by  $\|D'_{h_L^*} \mathfrak{h}\| \cdot \|\alpha\|$ , which equals zero by the Bochner formula (3.8) in Proposition 3.7.

Thanks to the isomorphism (3.11), we can obtain an  $L^*$ -valued logarithmic form  $\chi \in A^{0,q-1}(X, \Omega_X^{p+1}(\log D) \otimes L^*)$  that satisfies (3.1). This concludes the proof of Theorem 3.1.  $\square$

#### 4. GENERAL CASE: NOT ALL $q_i > 0$

This section aims to prove Theorem B. Notice that in this general case (i.e., not all  $q_i > 0$  in (♥)),  $\alpha$  may not be smooth in conic sense. For example, let  $X$  be the unit bidisc  $\mathbb{D}^2 = \{(z^1, z^2) \in \mathbb{C}^2 : |z^i| < 1, i = 1, 2\}$ ,  $D$  be a simple normal crossing divisor defined by the equation  $z^1 z^2 = 0$ , and  $L$  be the trivial bundle over  $X$ , endowed with the metric  $\varphi_L = \frac{1}{2} \log |z^1|$ . Then the form  $\alpha = \frac{dz^1}{z^1} \wedge \frac{dz^2}{z^2} \in A^{0,0}(X, \Omega_X^2(\log D) \otimes L^*)$  defined over  $\mathbb{D}^2 \setminus \{z^1 = 0\} \cup \{z^2 = 0\}$  is not smooth in conic sense. However, it is now indeed a  $(L^*, h_L^*)$ -conic current (see Definition 4.1 and (4.17) in Proposition 4.22). Therefore, it should be no surprise that the (conic) current theory will play a crucial role in this section.

In this section, we *always* let  $(L, h_L)$  be a line bundle on  $X$  endowed with a metric  $h_L$  such that the requirements (♥) and (♠) are satisfied. Let  $\omega_c$  be a Kähler metric with conic singularities as in (3.3).

**4.1. de Rham–Kodaira decomposition for conic currents.** We first provide the definition of conic currents valued in  $(L, h_L)$ .

**Definition 4.1** ([CP23b, Definition 2.30 & Remark 2.31]). A  $(p, q)$ -conic current  $T$  with values in  $(L, h_L)$  on  $X$  is a “ $L$ -valued current” such that there exist a constant  $C > 0$  and a positive integer  $\mathfrak{s} > 0$  such that the inequality

$$(4.1) \quad \left| \int_X T \wedge \phi \right| \leq C \sum_{j=0}^{\mathfrak{s}} \sup_{X \setminus \text{Supp } D} |\nabla^j \phi|_{h_L^*, \omega_c}$$

holds for any  $L^*$ -valued  $(n-p, n-q)$  form  $\phi$  which is moreover smooth in conic sense. Here,  $\int_X T \wedge \phi$  is a *formal expression* denoting the pairing between a conic current  $T$  and a test form  $\phi$ .

The condition (4.1) is equivalent to the following.

**Proposition 4.2** ([CP23b, Proposition 2.33]). *A  $(p, q)$ -conic current  $T$  with values in  $(L, h_L)$  is represented by a collection of  $T_i^{\text{inv}}$  on  $U_i$  (where  $i \in \mathfrak{I}$ ) such that for each compact subset  $K \subset U_i$ , there exists a constant  $C_K > 0$  and a positive integer  $\mathfrak{s} > 0$  such that*

$$\left| \int_{U_i} \frac{T_i^{\text{inv}}}{w_i^{qm}} \wedge \tilde{\phi}_i \right| \leq C_K \sum_{j=0}^{\mathfrak{s}} \sup_{U_i} |\nabla^j \tilde{\phi}_i|$$

holds for any  $(n-p, n-q)$ -form  $\phi$ , which is  $L^*$ -valued, with compact support in  $V_i$  and smooth in conic sense. Here  $\tilde{\phi}_i = w_i^{qm} \cdot \pi_i^*(\phi|_{V_i})$ .

*Proof.* The equivalence is evident upon observing that locally we have  $T|_{V_i} = \pi_{i*} T_i^{\text{inv}}$ , and the relationship

$$\sum_{j=0}^{\mathfrak{s}} \sup_{V_i \setminus \text{Supp } D} |\nabla^j \phi_i|_{h_{L^*}, \omega_c} \simeq \sum_{j=0}^{\mathfrak{s}} \sup_{U_i} |\nabla^j \tilde{\phi}_i|.$$

□

Thanks to the “stabilities” of forms which are smooth in conic sense under the “natural” operators (cf. Proposition 3.4), we can define operators  $D'_{h_L}$ ,  $D'^*_{h_L}$ ,  $\bar{\partial}$ , and  $\bar{\partial}^*$  acting on an  $(L, h_L)$ -valued  $(p, q)$ -conic current  $T$  by the following way:

$$(4.2) \quad \int_X D'_{h_L}(T) \wedge \beta := (-1)^{p+q+1} \int_X T \wedge D'_{h_{L^*}}(\beta), \quad \int_X D'^*_{h_L}(T) \wedge \beta := (-1)^{p+q} \int_X T \wedge D'^*_{h_{L^*}}(\beta),$$

and

$$(4.3) \quad \int_X \bar{\partial}(T) \wedge \beta := (-1)^{p+q+1} \int_X T \wedge \bar{\partial}(\beta), \quad \int_X \bar{\partial}^*(T) \wedge \beta := (-1)^{p+q} \int_X T \wedge \bar{\partial}^*(\beta).$$

Via (4.2) and (4.3), we derive

$$(4.4) \quad \int_X \Delta'(T) \wedge \beta = \int_X T \wedge \Delta'(\beta), \quad \int_X \Delta''(T) \wedge \beta = \int_X T \wedge \Delta''(\beta).$$

Cao–Păun showed that the results of de Rham–Kodaira in [deRK50] concerning the Hodge decomposition for currents on compact manifolds have a complete analogue in the conic setting.

**Theorem 4.3** ([CP23b, p.23]). *With the same settings for  $(X, \omega_c)$  and  $(L, h_L)$  as in the beginning of this section. Let  $T$  be a conic current of  $(p, q)$ -type with values in  $(L, h_L)$ . Then, there exists a unique operator, called the Green operator  $\mathfrak{G}$ , acting on  $T$  by duality and maintaining the degree, defined as*

$$(4.5) \quad \int_X \mathfrak{G}(T) \wedge \beta := \int_X T \wedge \mathfrak{G}(\beta),$$

where  $\beta$  is any  $L^*$ -valued form of  $(n-p, n-q)$ -type on  $X$ , which moreover is smooth in conic sense with respect to the data  $(\omega_c, h_{L^*})$ . The Green operator satisfies that

$$\bar{\partial} \mathfrak{G} T = \mathfrak{G} \bar{\partial} T, \quad \bar{\partial}^* \mathfrak{G} T = \mathfrak{G} \bar{\partial}^* T.$$



We furthermore have the following identities:

$$T - \mathcal{H}T = \Delta''\mathcal{G}T = \mathcal{G}\Delta''T, \quad \mathcal{H}\mathcal{G}T = \mathcal{G}\mathcal{H}T,$$

where  $\mathcal{H}$  is the harmonic projection, defined as

$$(4.6) \quad \mathcal{H}(T) := \sum_i \langle T, \zeta_i \rangle \cdot \zeta_i = \sum_i \left( \int_X T \wedge \zeta_i \right) \cdot \zeta_i,$$

where  $\{\zeta_i\}_i$  is a basis of  $L^2$   $\Delta''$ -harmonic forms of  $(n-p, n-q)$ -type with values in  $L^*$ .

For the specific restrictions on  $(L, h_L)$  of interest, the following useful properties hold:

**Proposition 4.4.** *Suppose further that  $q_i \geq 0$  for every  $i$  and that  $\varphi_{L,0} = 0$  in  $(\heartsuit)$ . Let  $T$  be a conic current valued in  $(L^*, h_{L^*})$ . Then, there exists a Green operator  $\mathcal{G}$  acting on  $T$  as in (4.5) that satisfies the following relations:*

$$(4.7) \quad \bar{\partial}\mathcal{G}T = \mathcal{G}\bar{\partial}T, \quad \bar{\partial}^*\mathcal{G}T = \mathcal{G}\bar{\partial}^*T, \quad D'_{h_{L^*}}\mathcal{G}T = \mathcal{G}D'_{h_{L^*}}T, \quad D'^*_{h_{L^*}}\mathcal{G}T = \mathcal{G}D'^*_{h_{L^*}}T.$$

Moreover, we have the following identities:

$$(4.8) \quad \Delta'\mathcal{G}T = \mathcal{G}\Delta'T = T - \mathcal{H}T = \Delta''\mathcal{G}T = \mathcal{G}\Delta''T, \quad \mathcal{H}\mathcal{G}T = \mathcal{G}\mathcal{H}T,$$

where the harmonic projection  $\mathcal{H}$  is defined as in (4.6).

*Proof.* This proposition follows from  $\Delta'T = \Delta''T$ , which is a consequence of Proposition 3.8 along with the equalities in (4.4).  $\square$

**4.2. Log conic current.** In this subsection, following King [Kin83], we extend the notion of log currents to the conic setting, incorporating the metric on the twisted line bundle.

Note that throughout *this subsection and the next §4.3*, we consistently impose additional assumptions on  $(L, h_L)$  as specified in the setting of Theorem B. Write

$$i\Theta_{h_L}(L) = \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq r; \\ q_i = 0}} q_i [D_i] + \sum_{\substack{r+1 \leq i \leq s; \\ 0 < q_i \leq 1}} q_i [D_i],$$

and consider the decomposition

$$(Dec.) \quad D = E + F.$$

Here,

$$E := \sum_{1 \leq i \leq r} E_i \quad \text{with} \quad E_i = D_i \quad \text{for} \quad 1 \leq i \leq r;$$

and

$$F := \sum_{r+1 \leq i \leq s} F_i \quad \text{with} \quad F_i = D_i \quad \text{for} \quad r+1 \leq i \leq s,$$

both being simple normal crossing divisors, do not intersect with each other.

Let  $Y$  be a simple normal crossing divisor on a complex manifold  $X$ .

**Definition 4.5** ([Kin83, Definitions 1.1.3 & 1.1.7]). (1) Let  $\Omega_X^p(\text{null } Y)$  be the subsheaf of  $\Omega_X^p$  consisting of forms that vanish on  $F$ . More precisely, if  $\iota : Y \rightarrow X$  is the inclusion and  $\lambda$  is a holomorphic  $p$ -form on an open set  $V \subset X$ , then  $\lambda \in \Omega_X^p(\text{null } Y)(V)$  if and only if  $\iota^*\lambda = 0$  on  $\text{Reg}Y \cap V$ .

(2) Set

$$\mathcal{A}_X^{p,q}(\text{null } Y) := \Omega_X^p(\text{null } Y) \wedge \mathcal{A}_X^{0,q}.$$

This sheaf is a subsheaf of  $\mathcal{A}_X^{p,q}$ . The usual wedge product of forms gives  $\mathcal{A}_X^{p,q}(\text{null } Y)$  the structure of an  $\mathcal{A}_X$ -module. In particular, it is an acyclic sheaf on  $X$ .

The relationships between these sheaves and the logarithmic sheaf are described below.

**Proposition 4.6** ([Kin83, Propositions 1.1.4 & 1.1.6 & 1.1.8]). (1)  $\Omega_X^p(\text{null } Y)$  is a  $\mathcal{O}_X$ -coherent sheaf.

(2) If  $Y$  locally defined as  $z^1 \cdots z^k = 0$ , then

$$(4.9) \quad z^1 \cdots z^k \cdot \Omega_X^p(\log Y) = \Omega_X^p(\text{null } Y).$$

Consequently,  $\Omega_X^\bullet(\text{null } Y)$  is a graded ideal of  $\Omega_X^\bullet(\log Y)$ . Similarly, the bigraded algebra  $\mathcal{A}_X^{\bullet, \bullet}(\text{null } Y)$  is a bigraded ideal in  $\mathcal{A}_X^{0, \bullet}(\Omega_X^\bullet(\log Y))$ .

**Remark 4.7.** In fact, King defined the subsheaf and proved the above propositions for a general divisor, i.e., a complex analytic subset of codimension one. In our setting, however, we focus exclusively on the normal crossing case.

King defined the sheaf of currents which can annihilate the null- $Y$  forms.

**Definition 4.8** ([Kin83, Definition 1.3.9]). The sheaf of on- $Y$   $(p, q)$ -currents,  $\mathcal{D}_X^{p, q}(\text{on } Y)$ , is defined as the subsheaf of  $\mathcal{D}_X^{p, q}$ , the sheaf of germs of  $(p, q)$ -currents on  $X$ , that is obtained by imposing the condition that

$$(4.10) \quad T \in \mathcal{D}_X^{p, q}(\text{on } Y, V) \iff \int_V T \wedge \phi = 0$$

for all  $\phi \in \Gamma_c(V, \mathcal{A}_X^{n-p, n-q}(\text{null } Y))$ , the forms with values in  $\mathcal{A}_X^{n-p, n-q}(\text{null } Y)$  that have compact support in  $V$ . Here,  $\int_V T \wedge \phi$  is still a formal expression denoting the pairing between a current  $T$  and a (special) test form  $\phi$ . It follows that the on- $Y$  currents form a bigraded subcomplex of  $\mathcal{D}_X^{\bullet, \bullet}$ .

**Remark 4.9.** Let  $T \in \mathcal{D}_X^{p, q}(V)$ ,  $\mu \in \mathcal{A}_X^{r, s}(V)$ , and let  $\varphi$  be a test form. Recall that the exterior product of  $T$  and  $\mu$  is defined by

$$T \wedge \mu \in \mathcal{D}_X^{p+r, q+s}(V) : \varphi \mapsto \int_V T \wedge (\mu \wedge \varphi).$$

Another equivalent formulation of (4.10) is then given by

$$(4.11) \quad T \in \mathcal{D}_X^{p, q}(\text{on } Y, V) \iff T \wedge \xi = 0 \text{ as currents for all } \xi \in \Gamma(V, \mathcal{A}_X^{n-p, n-q}(\text{null } Y)).$$

(4.10) implies (4.11) is obvious. For the converse direction, we should notice that

$$\int_V T \wedge \phi = \int_V (T \wedge \phi) \wedge \lambda,$$

where  $\lambda$  is any test function equal to 1 on  $\text{Supp } \phi$ .

**Remark 4.10.** Every on- $Y$  current has support in  $Y$ , however, the converse does not generally hold. For example, let  $X$  be the unit disc with coordinate  $z$  and let  $T$  be a non-zero on- $Y$  current of  $(1, 1)$ -type, where  $Y$  is non-singular and given by  $\{z = 0\}$ . Then  $zT = 0$  as currents. But  $\frac{\partial}{\partial z}T$  is a current supported in  $Y$  such that  $z(\frac{\partial}{\partial z}T) = T - \frac{\partial}{\partial z}(zT) = T \neq 0$ , so  $\frac{\partial}{\partial z}T$  is not an on- $Y$  current.

Nonetheless, this property does hold when restricted to rectifiable currents, such as integral currents. This result follows from a flatness theorem, see [Kin71, Theorem 2.1.8].

The notation for log currents was also introduced.

**Definition 4.11** ([Kin83, Definition 1.3.10]). The sheaf of log- $Y$  currents of bidegree  $(p, q)$  is the quotient sheaf

$$\mathcal{D}_X^{p, q}(\log Y) = \mathcal{D}_X^{p, q} / \mathcal{D}_X^{p, q}(\text{on } Y).$$

**Remark 4.12.** (1) When taking  $p = 0$ , one has  $\mathcal{D}_X^{0,q}(\text{on } Y) = \{0\}$ , since

$$\mathcal{A}_X^{n,n-q}(\text{null } Y) \simeq \mathcal{A}_X^{n,n-q}.$$

As a result,  $\mathcal{D}_X^{0,q}(\log Y) = \mathcal{D}_X^{0,q}$ .

- (2) Observe that  $\mathcal{A}^{0,q}(\Omega_X^p(\log Y))$  is canonically isomorphic onto a subsheaf of the sheaf of log- $Y$  currents of bidegree  $(p, q)$ , via the quotient map  $\gamma : \mathcal{D}_X^{p,q} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_X^{p,q}(\log Y)$ . This holds because

$$\mathcal{A}^{0,q}(\Omega_X^p(\log Y)) \cap \mathcal{D}_X^{p,q}(\text{on } Y) = \{0\},$$

given that any logarithmic form with support contained in  $Y$  must be zero.

- (3) The log current sheaf is flabby because it is the quotient of two flabby sheaves.  
(4) Sometimes it is convenient to consider the log currents as elements of a function space and not just as a quotient. More precisely,  $\mathcal{D}_X^{p,q}(\log Y, V)$  is canonically isomorphic to the space of linear functionals on  $\Gamma_c(V, \mathcal{A}_X^{n-p,n-q}(\text{null } Y))$ , continuous in the relative topology from  $\Gamma_c(V, \mathcal{A}_X^{n-p,n-q})$ . See [Kin83, Proposition 1.3.12] for a detailed proof.

**Example 4.13.** Let  $f$  be holomorphic function on  $X = \mathbb{C}$  with coordinate  $z$ . Set  $Y = \{0\}$ . The equivalence class of  $\bar{\partial}(f \frac{dz}{z})$  in  $\mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{C}}^{1,0}(\log Y)$ , denoted by  $[\bar{\partial}(f \frac{dz}{z})]$ , is equal to  $[f\delta_0]$  and is therefore indeed the zero class. Here  $\delta_0$  denotes the Dirac mass at 0.

The following crucial properties hold, as demonstrated by King, with the quasi-isomorphisms (4.12) playing an important role in our proof of Proposition 4.22. For the convenience of the readers, a detailed proof of Proposition 4.14 are provided in Appendix I.

**Proposition 4.14** ([Kin83, Theorems 1.3.11 & 2.1.2]). *The sheaf  $\mathcal{D}_X^{\bullet,\bullet}(\log Y)$  is a bi-graded  $\mathcal{A}^{0,\bullet}(\Omega_X^{\bullet}(\log Y))$ -module, and this module structure defines a canonical isomorphism  $\Omega_X^p(\log Y) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \mathcal{D}_X^{0,q} \xrightarrow{\simeq} \mathcal{D}_X^{p,q}(\log Y)$ . We furthermore have the quasi-isomorphisms of complexes of sheaves:*

$$(4.12) \quad \Omega_X^p(\log Y) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{A}^{0,\bullet}(\Omega_X^p(\log Y)) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{D}_X^{p,\bullet}(\log Y).$$

So,  $(\mathcal{D}_X^{p,\bullet}(\log Y), \bar{\partial})$  is an acyclic resolution of  $\Omega_X^p(\log Y)$ .

Motivated by King's work, we will explore the more general twisted case, taking the bundle's metric into account, see construction (Dec.). From now on we assume further that  $X$  is a compact Kähler manifold.

**Proposition 4.15.** *We have the following isomorphism for the two aforementioned sheaves:*

$$\text{co}\mathcal{A}_L^{p,q} \simeq \mathcal{A}_X^{p,q}(\text{null } F) \otimes L.$$

*In particular, for any  $\beta \in A_{\text{co}}^{p,q}(X, L)$  (see Notation 3.13),  $\beta$  vanishes on each component of  $F$ . This property can be seen as the dual version of Proposition 3.11.*

*Proof.* The proof is nearly identical to that in Proposition 3.14. Nevertheless, we provide a proof here for the sake of completeness. Assume there are  $d$  specific  $D_i$  that intersect at a chosen point  $x \in X$ . We can select a small neighborhood  $V$  around  $x$  such that  $E \cap V$  is defined by  $\{z^1 \cdots z^c = 0\}$  and  $F \cap V$  by  $\{z^{c+1} \cdots z^d = 0\}$ . In this context, consider the local ramified map given by:

$$\pi : U \rightarrow V, \quad \pi(w^1, \dots, w^n) = ((w^1)^m, \dots, (w^d)^m, w^{d+1}, \dots, w^n).$$

Now, suppose that  $\alpha$  is a local  $(p, q)$ -form with values in  $L$ , smooth in conic sense. Fix a local basis of  $L$  on  $V$ , by Definition 3.2 plus the assumption on  $q_i$ , write locally

$$\alpha = \alpha_{i_1 \dots i_p j_1 \dots j_q} dz^{i_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge dz^{i_p} \wedge d\bar{z}^{j_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge d\bar{z}^{j_q},$$

where  $\alpha_{i_1 \dots i_p j_1 \dots j_q}$  is a smooth function. We then obtain the following two cases:

- if each  $i_j \in \{1, \dots, c, d+1, \dots, n\}$ , then  $\alpha_{i_1 \dots i_p j_1 \dots j_q}$  is divisible by  $(z^k)^{a_k}$ , for every  $k = c+1, \dots, d$ , where

$$a_k \geq q_k, \text{ so } a_k \text{ is an integer no less than } 1.$$

This means that  $\alpha_{i_1 \dots i_p j_1 \dots j_q}$  is divisible by  $z^{c+1} \dots z^d$ .

- if there exists any  $i_j \in \{c+1, \dots, d\}$ , say without loss of generality,  $i_1, \dots, i_l$ , then we set

$$\{k_1, \dots, k_{d-c-l}\} = \{c+1, \dots, d\} \setminus \{i_1, \dots, i_l\}.$$

We can deduce that  $\alpha_{i_1 \dots i_p j_1 \dots j_q}$  is divisible by  $(z^{i_j})^{a_{i_j}}$  for  $1 \leq j \leq l$  and also by  $z^{k_1} \dots z^{k_{d-c-l}}$  (as shown by the previous case). Here for  $1 \leq j \leq l$ ,

$$a_{i_j} \geq q_{i_j} + \frac{1}{m} - 1, \text{ so } a_{i_j} \text{ is an integer no less than } 0.$$

Thus,  $\alpha_{i_1 \dots i_p j_1 \dots j_q}$  is divisible by  $z^{k_1} \dots z^{k_{d-c-l}}$ .

In summary, the above two cases can imply that the natural sheaf morphism

$$z^{c+1} \dots z^d \cdot \mathcal{A}^{0,q}(\Omega_X^p(\log F)) \otimes L \longrightarrow \text{co}\mathcal{A}_L^{p,q}$$

is an isomorphism. Thus, the proof is complete, thanks to Proposition 4.6 (2).  $\square$

**Definition 4.16.** Let  $\text{co}\mathcal{A}_L^{p,q}(\text{null } E)$  be the subsheaf of  $\text{co}\mathcal{A}_L^{p,q}$  consisting of forms that vanish on  $E$ . Then analogous to Proposition 4.15, we can show that

$$(4.13) \quad \text{co}\mathcal{A}_L^{p,q}(\text{null } E) \simeq \mathcal{A}_X^{p,q}(\text{null } D) \otimes L.$$

**Notation 4.17.** For fixed  $(p, q)$ , denote by  $\text{co}\mathcal{D}_{L^*}^{p,q}$  the sheaf of germs of  $(L^*, h_{L^*})$ -valued  $(p, q)$ -conic current. Elements in  $\text{co}\mathcal{D}_{L^*}^{p,q}(X)$ , i.e., global sections of  $\text{co}\mathcal{D}_{L^*}^{p,q}$ , are then  $(L^*, h_{L^*})$ -valued  $(p, q)$ -conic current on  $X$ .

**Definition 4.18.** The sheaf of on- $E$   $(p, q)$ -conic currents valued in  $(L^*, h_{L^*})$ , denoted by  $\text{co}\mathcal{D}_{L^*}^{p,q}(\text{on } E)$ , is defined as a subsheaf of  $\text{co}\mathcal{D}_{L^*}^{p,q}$ . Specifically, for  $T \in \text{co}\mathcal{D}_{L^*}^{p,q}(V)$ , we say  $T$  is an on- $E$  conic current on  $V$ , written as

$$T \in \text{co}\mathcal{D}_{L^*}^{p,q}(\text{on } E, V),$$

if and only if

$$\int_V T \wedge \phi = 0,$$

for all  $\phi \in \Gamma_c(V, \text{co}\mathcal{A}_L^{n-p, n-q}(\text{null } E))$ , the forms with values in  $\text{co}\mathcal{A}_L^{n-p, n-q}(\text{null } E)$  that have compact support in  $V$ .

**Remark 4.19.** Every on- $E$  conic currents has support in  $E$ , since the restriction of  $\text{co}\mathcal{A}_L^{n-p, n-q}(\text{null } E)$  to  $X - E$  is simply  $\text{co}\mathcal{A}_L^{n-p, n-q}$ .

We proceed to introduce the notation for log- $E$  conic currents valued in  $(L^*, h_{L^*})$ .

**Definition 4.20.** The sheaf of log- $E$  conic currents of bidegree  $(p, q)$  valued in  $(L^*, h_{L^*})$  is the quotient sheaf

$$(4.14) \quad \text{co}\mathcal{D}_{L^*}^{p,q}(\log E) = \text{co}\mathcal{D}_{L^*}^{p,q} / \text{co}\mathcal{D}_{L^*}^{p,q}(\text{on } E).$$

**Remark 4.21.** (1) It is straightforward to verify that both  $D'_{h_{L^*}}$  and  $\bar{\partial}$  preserve the form valued in  $\text{co}\mathcal{A}_L^{n-p, n-q}(\text{null } E)$ , and consequently, they also preserve  $\text{co}\mathcal{D}_{L^*}^{p,q}(\text{on } E)$ . Therefore, the operator  $\nabla_{h_{L^*}} = D'_{h_{L^*}} + \bar{\partial}$  on conic currents makes  $\text{co}\mathcal{D}_{L^*}^{p,q}(\log E)$  into a double complex of sheaves. By abuse of notation, this operator will also be referred to as  $\nabla_{h_{L^*}}$  on the quotient.

- (2) By directly checking the definitions, we find that the two sheaves on the right-hand side of (4.14) are both flabby via the push-forward operator, which implies that the sheaf of  $\log E$  conic currents valued in  $(L^*, h_{L^*})$  is also flabby. Consequently, all these sheaves are acyclic on any open set  $V$  in  $X$ . One can then derive that

$$co\mathcal{D}_{L^*}^{p,q}(\log E, V) \simeq \frac{co\mathcal{D}_{L^*}^{p,q}(V)}{co\mathcal{D}_{L^*}^{p,q}(\text{on } E, V)}.$$

Next we are going to state the ‘‘singular’’ version of Proposition 3.14.

**Proposition 4.22.** *One has the following acyclic resolution of  $\Omega_X^p(\log D) \otimes L^*$ ,*

$$(4.15) \quad \begin{aligned} 0 \rightarrow \Omega_X^p(\log D) \otimes L^* &\xrightarrow{\iota} co\mathcal{D}_{L^*}^{p,0}(\log E) \xrightarrow{\bar{\partial}} co\mathcal{D}_{L^*}^{p,1}(\log E) \rightarrow \cdots \\ &\rightarrow co\mathcal{D}_{L^*}^{p,q}(\log E) \xrightarrow{\bar{\partial}} co\mathcal{D}_{L^*}^{p,q+1}(\log E) \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow co\mathcal{D}_{L^*}^{p,n}(\log E) \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

In particular,

$$(4.16) \quad H^q(X, \Omega_X^p(\log D) \otimes L^*) \simeq H_{co; \mathcal{D}'_{\log E}}^{p,q}(X, L^*) := \frac{\text{Ker} \{ \bar{\partial} : co\mathcal{D}_{L^*}^{p,q}(\log E, X) \rightarrow co\mathcal{D}_{L^*}^{p,q+1}(\log E, X) \}}{\text{Im} \{ \bar{\partial} : co\mathcal{D}_{L^*}^{p,q-1}(\log E, X) \rightarrow co\mathcal{D}_{L^*}^{p,q}(\log E, X) \}}.$$

*Proof.* Consider the same setup as in the beginning of the proof of Proposition 4.15, with the 7-tuple  $(c, d, E, F, \pi, U, V)$ .

Assume that  $\alpha$  is a local  $L^*$ -valued  $(p, q)$ -form with logarithmic poles along  $D$  defined on the open set  $V$ . Since  $\alpha$  has  $L_{\text{loc}}^1$ -coefficients, it can be associated with a local conic current  $T_\alpha$  defined by

$$(4.17) \quad \int_V T_\alpha \wedge \beta := \int_V \alpha \wedge \beta, \quad \beta \in \Gamma_c(V, co\mathcal{A}_L^{n-p, n-q}).$$

The proof of this follows the same argument as in [Dem-eBook, §2.A, Example (2.5)]. This association shows that  $\Omega_X^p(\log D) \otimes L^*$  can be viewed as a subsheaf of  $co\mathcal{D}_{L^*}^{p,0}$ . Additionally, the map  $\iota$  is injective, by the same reasoning as given in Remark 4.12 (2): indeed, suppose that  $\alpha \in co\mathcal{D}_{L^*}^{p,q}(\text{on } E, V)$ . Then, the coefficients of the  $L^*$ -valued logarithmic form  $\alpha$  must vanish everywhere on  $X$ , owing to the condition that  $\text{Supp}(\alpha) \subseteq E$  as a conic current, see Remark 4.19. Furthermore, we have  $\bar{\partial} \circ \iota = 0$ , by virtue of Proposition 4.15 and based on the definition of the sheaf  $co\mathcal{D}_{L^*}^{p,q}(\text{on } E)$ . To prove  $\text{Ker } \bar{\partial} \subset \text{Im } \iota$ , we will need the following property:

**Claim:** On  $V$ , any local  $(p, q)$ -type conic current  $T$  valued in  $(L^*, h_{L^*})$  can be represented by a usual (untwisted) current  $\tilde{T}_{\text{usu}}$  on  $U$ , such that  $\tilde{T}_{\text{usu}} = w^{qm} \cdot T_{\text{inv}}$ , where  $\pi_* T_{\text{inv}} = T$ .

*Proof of the Claim.* For any  $(n-p, n-q)$ -smooth form  $\eta$  with compact support  $K$  in  $U$ , since the local current  $T_{\text{inv}}$  is  $\pi$ -invariant, we have

$$\int_U \tilde{T}_{\text{usu}} \wedge \eta = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \int_U \tilde{T}_{\text{usu}} \wedge \frac{\rho_i^*(w^{qm} \cdot \eta)}{w^{qm}}.$$

Here, the Galois group elements  $\rho_i$  for  $i = 1, \dots, m$  are the automorphisms  $\rho_i : U \rightarrow U$  that are invariant over  $V$  and induced by the  $m$ -ramified covering  $\pi : U \rightarrow V$ .

By a similar argument as in Proposition 3.14, there exists an  $L$ -valued form  $\phi$  on  $V$ , smooth in conic sense, such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^m \rho_i^*(w^{qm} \cdot \eta) = \pi^* \phi.$$

Invoking Proposition 4.2 and the compact support condition, there exist two positive constants  $C_K^1$  and  $C_K^2$  and a positive integer  $\mathfrak{s} > 0$  such that

$$\left| \int_U \tilde{T}_{\text{usu}} \wedge \eta \right| \leq C_K^1 \sum_{j=0}^{\mathfrak{s}} \sup_U |\nabla^j \tilde{\phi}| \leq C_K^2 \sum_{j=0}^{\mathfrak{s}} \sup_U |\nabla^j \eta|,$$

where  $\tilde{\phi} = \frac{\pi^* \phi}{w^{qm}}$ . This implies that  $\tilde{T}_{\text{usu}}$  is indeed a local  $(p, q)$ -current. This claim is thus proved.  $\square$

We then let  $[T]$  denote the equivalence class of  $T \in \text{co}\mathcal{D}_{L^*}^{p,0}(V)$  in  $\text{co}\mathcal{D}_{L^*}^{p,0}(\log E, V)$  such that  $\bar{\partial}[T] = [0]$ , i.e.,  $\bar{\partial}T \in \text{co}\mathcal{D}_{L^*}^{p,1}(\text{on } E, V)$ . By the above claim and the quasi-isomorphisms (4.12) given by King, we have

$$\tilde{T}_{\text{usu}} = w^{qm} \cdot T_{\text{inv}} \in \Gamma(U, \Omega_X^p(\log E)).^4$$

This means that  $T$  is a (local)  $\bar{\partial}$ -closed  $L^*$ -valued *conic logarithmic form*<sup>5</sup> of bidegree  $(p, 0)$ , i.e.,  $T$  is smooth outside  $D$ , and  $\tilde{T}_{\text{usu}}$  satisfies both of the following:

- (i) it extends smoothly across  $F$ ;
- (ii) it admits at most logarithmic poles along  $E$ .

Therefore, by similar arguments as in Proposition 3.14 near (3.12), we can deduce that  $T \in \Gamma(V, \Omega_X^p(\log D) \otimes L^*)$ . Thus, the exactness of (4.15) at level zero is proved.

We now proceed to the proof of the exactness of (4.15) at higher levels. By Remark 4.21 (1), we know that  $(\text{co}\mathcal{D}_{L^*}^{p,\bullet}(\log E), \bar{\partial})$  forms a differential complex. Now for  $q \geq 1$ , denote by  $[T]$  the equivalence class of  $T \in \text{co}\mathcal{D}_{L^*}^{p,q}(V)$  in  $\text{co}\mathcal{D}_{L^*}^{p,q}(\log E, V)$ , such that  $\bar{\partial}[T] = [0]$ , i.e.,  $\bar{\partial}T \in \text{co}\mathcal{D}_{L^*}^{p,q+1}(\text{on } E, V)$ .

By the above claim and King's result again, we deduce that there exists a local untwisted current  $T_1 \in \mathcal{D}_X^{p,q-1}(U)$  such that

$$w^{qm} \cdot T_{\text{inv}} - \bar{\partial}T_1 \in \mathcal{D}_X^{p,q}(\text{on } E, U).$$

It is worth noting a classical result by L. Schwartz [Sch55] states that, for any given current  $T$  and holomorphic function  $g$  on an arbitrary complex manifold  $Z$ , there always exists a (not necessarily unique) current  $S$  on  $Z$  such that  $gS = T$ . Using this, we find that

$$(4.18) \quad T_{\text{inv}} - \bar{\partial}S \in \frac{\mathcal{D}_X^{p,q}(\text{on } E, U)}{w^{qm}},$$

where  $S$  is a local current on  $U$  satisfying  $w^{qm} \cdot S = T_1$ . Considering the actions of the Galois group elements  $\rho_i$  for  $i = 1, \dots, m$  on (4.18), we have

$$T_{\text{inv}} - \bar{\partial}S_{\text{inv}} \in \frac{\mathcal{D}_X^{p,q}(\text{on } E, U)}{w^{qm}},$$

where  $S_{\text{inv}} = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \rho_{i*} S$  is  $\pi$ -invariant. It follows that

$$w^{qm} \cdot (T_{\text{inv}} - \bar{\partial}S_{\text{inv}}) = w^{qm} \cdot T_{\text{inv}} - \bar{\partial}(w^{qm} \cdot S_{\text{inv}}) \in \mathcal{D}_X^{p,q}(\text{on } E, U).$$

The above claim then implies the existence of a local  $(p, q-1)$ -type conic current  $S'$ , valued in  $(L^*, h_{L^*})$ , such that  $\pi_* S_{\text{inv}} = S'$  and

$$T - \bar{\partial}S' \in \text{co}\mathcal{D}_{L^*}^{p,q}(\text{on } E, V).$$

<sup>4</sup>Here we abuse notation by still denoting by  $E$  (resp.  $F$ ) the inverse image of  $E$  (resp.  $F$ ).

<sup>5</sup>This notion naturally generalizes the concept of a form being smooth in conic sense, as defined in Definition 3.2.

In other words,

$$[T] = [\overline{\partial}S']$$

in  $co\mathcal{D}_{L^*}^{p,q}(\log E, V)$ , thus completing the proof.  $\square$

**Remark 4.23.** The construction in (4.17) depends on the condition that  $q_i \in [0, 1] \cap \mathbb{Q}$  in  $(\heartsuit)$  (or, more generally, that all  $q_i \geq 0$ ). In the most general case, for any  $L$ -valued  $(p, q)$ -form  $\lambda$  on  $X$  with logarithmic poles along  $D$ , if these rational numbers are chosen arbitrarily (i.e.,  $\lambda$  may not have sufficient integrability), there still exists a conic current  $T_\lambda$  associated with  $\lambda$ , as shown in [CP23b, Examples 2.3.1, second bullet].

$$\int_X T_\lambda \wedge \beta := \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \sum_i \frac{1}{\delta_i} \int_{U_i} \mu_\epsilon \frac{\theta_i}{w_i^{qm}} \pi_i^* \lambda \wedge \overline{\beta}_i, \quad \beta \in A_{co}^{n-q, n-p}(X, L),$$

where  $\overline{\beta}_i = \frac{\pi_i^*(\beta|_{V_i})}{w_i^{qm}}$ ,  $\{\theta_i\}$  is a partition of unity with respect to the local ramified maps  $\{\pi_i : U_i \rightarrow V_i\}$ , the integer  $\delta_i$  is the degree of the map  $\pi_i$ , and  $\mu_\epsilon$  is a family of truncation functions corresponding to the divisor  $D$  (see [CP23b, Lemma 2.1] for the explicit constructions). Notice that (4.17) is equivalent to the above construction by Cao–Păun when our restriction is added, due to the natural isomorphism  $L^* \simeq \overline{L}$  and the Lebesgue’s dominated convergence theorem.

**Corollary 4.24.** *When  $E = \emptyset$ , i.e.,  $D = F$ , we obtain the following quasi-isomorphisms of complexes of sheaves using the above proposition in conjunction with Proposition 3.14:*

$$\Omega_X^p(\log F) \otimes L^* \hookrightarrow \mathcal{A}^{0, \bullet}(\Omega_X^p(\log F) \otimes L^*) \hookrightarrow co\mathcal{A}_{L^*}^{p, \bullet} \hookrightarrow co\mathcal{D}_{L^*}^{p, \bullet}.$$

*This result can be seen as the conic analogue of the well-known quasi-isomorphisms from the Dolbeault–Grothendieck lemma:*

$$\Omega_X^p \hookrightarrow \mathcal{A}_X^{p, \bullet} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{D}_X^{p, \bullet}.$$

**4.3. Proof of Theorem B.** In this subsection, we aim to prove Theorem B. Aside from the de Rham–Kodaira decomposition for conic currents and Proposition 4.22 from the previous subsections §4.1 and §4.2, the key Lemma 4.27, inspired by [LRW19, Lemma 2.3], serves as a critical component.

Before proceeding, we need to introduce the concept of *residue*. Given any  $\alpha \in A^{0,q}(X, \Omega_X^p(\log D) \otimes L^*)$ , locally on a coordinate subset  $V \subset X$  such that  $D_1 \cap V = \{z^1 = 0\}$ , one writes

$$\alpha = \frac{dz^1}{z^1} \wedge \alpha_1 + \alpha_2,$$

where  $\alpha_1$  has at most poles along components  $D_i, i \neq 1$ , and  $\alpha_2$  is not divisible by the form  $\frac{dz^1}{z^1}$ . Set

$$\text{Res}_{D_1}(\alpha) = \alpha_1|_{D_1}$$

on  $V \cap D_1$ . It can be checked that  $\text{Res}_{D_1}(\alpha)$  is globally well-defined. According to our decomposition (Dec.), we set

$$\text{Res}_D(\alpha) := \text{Res}_E(\alpha) + \text{Res}_F(\alpha),$$

where

$$\text{Res}_E(\alpha) := \sum_{i=1}^r \text{Res}_{E_i}(\alpha) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Res}_F(\alpha) := \sum_{i=r+1}^s \text{Res}_{F_i}(\alpha).$$

In the sequel, we will always view  $\text{Res}_D(\alpha)$  (similarly for  $\text{Res}_E(\alpha)$  or  $\text{Res}_F(\alpha)$ ) as a conic current, defined as follows:

$$(4.19) \quad \int_X \text{Res}_D(\alpha) \wedge \beta := \sum_{i=1}^s \int_{D_i} \text{Res}_{D_i} \alpha \wedge \iota_{D_i}^* \beta$$

for  $\beta \in A_{\text{co}}^{n-p, n-q-1}(X, L)$ . Here,  $\iota_{D_i} : D_i \hookrightarrow X$  represents the natural embedding. For simplicity, we will omit the pull-back operator  $\iota_{D_i}^*$  in (4.19) whenever it does not lead to ambiguity.

We now present several properties that will be used later. Notice that (1) and (2) in Proposition 4.25 can be regarded as the conic version of the usual residue formulae (see for example [Nog95, formula (2.2)] and [LRW19, pp.10-11]).

**Proposition 4.25.** *For any  $\alpha \in A^{0,q}(X, \Omega_X^p(\log D) \otimes L^*)$ , one has*

- (1)  $D'_{h_{L^*}} T_\alpha = T_{D'_{h_{L^*}} \alpha}$  in the sense of conic current;
- (2)  $\bar{\partial} T_\alpha - T_{\bar{\partial}\alpha} = 2\pi i \text{Res}_E(\alpha)$  in the sense of conic current;
- (3)  $D'_{h_{L^*}}(\text{Res}_{E_i} \alpha) + \text{Res}_{E_i}(D'_{h_{L^*}} \alpha) = 0$  on  $E_i$ ;
- (4)  $\bar{\partial}(\text{Res}_{E_i} \alpha) + \text{Res}_{E_i}(\bar{\partial}\alpha) = 0$  on  $E_i$ .

*Proof.* We first prove (2) and the proof of (1) is similar. For any  $\beta \in A_{\text{co}}^{n-p, n-q-1}(X, L)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_X (\bar{\partial} T_\alpha - T_{\bar{\partial}\alpha}) \wedge \beta &= \int_X (-1)^{p+q+1} \alpha \wedge \bar{\partial} \beta - \bar{\partial} \alpha \wedge \beta \\
&= - \int_X \bar{\partial}(\alpha \wedge \beta) \\
&= - \int_X d(\alpha \wedge \beta) \\
&= 2\pi i \sum_{i=1}^s \int_{D_i} \text{Res}_{D_i}(\alpha) \wedge \beta \\
&= 2\pi i \left( \sum_{i=1}^r \int_{E_i} \text{Res}_{E_i}(\alpha) \wedge \beta + \sum_{i=r+1}^s \int_{F_i} \text{Res}_{F_i}(\alpha) \wedge \beta \right) \\
&= 2\pi i \sum_{i=1}^r \int_{E_i} \text{Res}_{E_i}(\alpha) \wedge \beta.
\end{aligned}$$

Here, the third equality holds due to type considerations, the second-to-last equality follows from the Stokes formula for the regularized integral (cf. [LZ21, Theorem 2.14] for the one-dimensional case and [CMW23, Theorem B.4] for arbitrary-dimensional cases), and the last equality arises from Proposition 4.15.

We then prove (3) and the proof of (4) is similar. Suppose that  $E_i$  is defined by  $z^i = 0$  and  $h_{L^*} = e^\varphi$  on a coordinate subset  $V \subset X$ . Write  $\alpha = \frac{dz^i}{z^i} \wedge \alpha_1 + \alpha_2$  for two logarithmic forms  $\alpha_1, \alpha_2$  on  $V$ . Then,

$$D'_{h_{L^*}}(\text{Res}_{E_i} \alpha) = (\partial \alpha_1 + \partial \varphi \wedge \alpha_1)|_{E_i}.$$

Also,

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Res}_{E_i}(D'_{h_{L^*}} \alpha) &= \text{Res}_{E_i}(D'_{h_{L^*}} \left( \frac{dz^i}{z^i} \wedge \alpha_1 \right)) \\
&= \text{Res}_{E_i} \left( -\frac{dz^i}{z^i} \wedge \partial \alpha_1 + \partial \varphi \wedge \frac{dz^i}{z^i} \wedge \alpha_1 \right) = -(\partial \alpha_1 + \partial \varphi \wedge \alpha_1)|_{E_i}
\end{aligned}$$

These yield (3). □

As applications, we get

**Corollary 4.26.** *Let  $\alpha \in A^{0,q}(X, \Omega_X^p(\log D) \otimes L^*)$  satisfy that  $\bar{\partial} D'_{h_{L^*}} \alpha = 0$  pointwise on  $X^\circ$ . Then as conic currents,*

$$(4.20) \quad \mathcal{H}(T_{D'_{h_{L^*}} \alpha}) = 0,$$



$$(4.21) \quad \bar{\partial}^* \bar{\partial} \mathcal{G} T_{D'_{h_L^*}} \alpha = 2\pi i \sum_{i=1}^r \bar{\partial}^* \mathcal{G} \text{Res}_{E_i}(D'_{h_L^*} \alpha),$$

and

$$(4.22) \quad T_{D'_{h_L^*}} \alpha = \bar{\partial} \bar{\partial}^* \mathcal{G} T_{D'_{h_L^*}} \alpha + 2\pi i \sum_{i=1}^r \bar{\partial}^* \mathcal{G} \text{Res}_{E_i}(D'_{h_L^*} \alpha).$$

*Proof.* For (4.20),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}(T_{D'_{h_L^*}} \alpha) &= \sum_i \left( \int_X D'_{h_L^*} \alpha \wedge \zeta_i \right) \cdot \zeta_i \\ &= (-1)^{p+q+1} \sum_i \left( \int_X \alpha \wedge D'_{h_L} \zeta_i \right) \cdot \zeta_i = 0, \end{aligned}$$

where the first equality follows from Definition 4.6 (here  $\{\zeta_i\}_i$  is a basis of  $L^2 \Delta''$ -harmonic forms valued in  $L$ , which is in particular smooth in conic sense) and (4.17), the second equality holds by Proposition 4.25 (1) and (4.2), and the last equality is a consequence of Proposition 3.8.

For (4.21), it holds due to the commutativity of  $\mathcal{G}$  and  $\bar{\partial}$  (4.7), Proposition 4.25 (2) plus the assumption that  $\bar{\partial} D'_{h_L^*} \alpha = 0$  on  $X^\circ$ .

Finally, the de Rham–Kodaira decomposition for conic currents as in (4.8) implies that

$$T_{D'_{h_L^*}} \alpha = \mathcal{H} T_{D'_{h_L^*}} \alpha + \bar{\partial} \bar{\partial}^* \mathcal{G} T_{D'_{h_L^*}} \alpha + \bar{\partial}^* \bar{\partial} \mathcal{G} T_{D'_{h_L^*}} \alpha.$$

Therefore, (4.20) and (4.21) yield (4.22).  $\square$

We are then particularly interested in the *second term* on the right-hand side of (4.22) and wonder whether it can be expressed in a *more refined shape* in the sense of conic current.

To gain some insight, we first examine the *simplest case where*  $r = 1$ , i.e.,  $E = E_1$  is a smooth divisor. For any  $L$ -valued  $(n - p - 1, n - q)$  form  $\beta$  on  $X$ , which is moreover smooth in conic sense, the pairing of that term and  $\beta$  is given by

$$(4.23) \quad (**):= 2\pi i (-1)^{p+q} \int_E \text{Res}_E(D'_{h_L^*} \alpha) \wedge \left( \iota_E^* \bar{\partial}^* \mathcal{G} \beta \right).$$

Applying Corollary 4.26 to  $\text{Res}_E(D'_{h_L^*} \alpha)$ , Proposition 4.25 (3) and using the assumption that  $E$  has only one component, we obtain

$$(4.24) \quad (**)= 2\pi i (-1)^{p+q} \int_E \left( \bar{\partial} \bar{\partial}_E^* \mathcal{G}_E \text{Res}_E(D'_{h_L^*} \alpha) \right) \wedge \left( \iota_E^* \bar{\partial}^* \mathcal{G} \beta \right),$$

where  $\mathcal{G}_E, \bar{\partial}_E^*$  are the operators on  $E$  with respect to the induced metrics from  $(h_L, \omega_c)$  on  $X$ . Then,

$$(4.25) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2\pi i} (**) &= \int_E \left( \bar{\partial}_E^* \mathcal{G}_E \text{Res}_E(D'_{h_L^*} \alpha) \right) \wedge \left( \iota_E^* \bar{\partial} \bar{\partial}^* \mathcal{G} \beta \right), \\ &= \int_E \left( \bar{\partial}_E^* \mathcal{G}_E \text{Res}_E(D'_{h_L^*} \alpha) \right) \wedge \iota_E^* \beta - \int_E \left( \bar{\partial}_E^* \mathcal{G}_E \text{Res}_E(D'_{h_L^*} \alpha) \right) \wedge \iota_E^* \mathfrak{h} \\ &\quad - \int_E \left( \bar{\partial}_E^* \mathcal{G}_E \text{Res}_E(D'_{h_L^*} \alpha) \right) \wedge \left( \iota_E^* \bar{\partial}^* \mathcal{G} \bar{\partial} \beta \right), \end{aligned}$$

where the first equality holds by (4.3), and the second equality comes from the Hodge decomposition (3.9) (where  $\mathfrak{h}$  is a  $\Delta''$ -harmonic form with values in  $L$  on  $X$ ). Furthermore,

we have

$$(4.26) \quad \int_E \left( \bar{\partial}_E^* \mathcal{G}_E \text{Res}_E(D'_{h_{L^*}} \alpha) \right) \wedge \iota_E^* \mathfrak{h} = - \int_E \left( D'_{h_{L^*}} \bar{\partial}_E^* \mathcal{G}_E \text{Res}_E \alpha \right) \wedge \iota_E^* \mathfrak{h} \\ = (-1)^{p+q} \int_E \left( \bar{\partial}_E^* \mathcal{G}_E \text{Res}_E \alpha \right) \wedge \left( \iota_E^* D'_{h_L} \mathfrak{h} \right) = 0$$

where the first equality holds because  $D'_{h_{L^*}}$  commutes with  $\text{Res}_E$ ,  $\mathcal{G}_E$  and  $\bar{\partial}_E^*$  (cf. Proposition 4.25 (3) and (4.7)), the second equality follows from Proposition 4.25 (1) plus the commutativity of  $\iota_E^*$  and  $D'_{h_L}$ , and the last equality is a consequence of Proposition 3.8.

Combining (4.23), (4.25) and (4.26) together, one gets, as conic currents on  $X$ ,

$$(4.27) \quad \bar{\partial}^* \mathcal{G} \text{Res}_E(D'_{h_{L^*}} \alpha) - \bar{\partial} \bar{\partial}^* \mathcal{G} \iota_{E^*} \bar{\partial}_E^* \mathcal{G}_E \text{Res}_E(D'_{h_{L^*}} \alpha) = \bar{\partial}_E^* \mathcal{G}_E \text{Res}_E(D'_{h_{L^*}} \alpha),$$

since our choice of  $\beta$  is arbitrary. Here in (4.27),  $\iota_{E^*}$  is the push-forward operator with respect to the embedding  $E \hookrightarrow X$ . It is easy to verify that the right-hand side of (4.27) is an on- $E$  conic current (i.e., it annihilates all  $L$ -valued test form that are smooth in conic sense and moreover vanish on  $E$ ). Let us define:

$$\widehat{T} := \bar{\partial}^* \mathcal{G} \iota_{E^*} \bar{\partial}_E^* \mathcal{G}_E \text{Res}_E(D'_{h_{L^*}} \alpha).$$

Then, we have

$$(4.28) \quad \bar{\partial}^* \mathcal{G} \text{Res}_E(D'_{h_{L^*}} \alpha) - \bar{\partial} \widehat{T} \in \text{co}\mathcal{D}'_{L^*}{}^{p,q}(\text{on } E, X).$$

In fact, a similar result to (4.28) also holds when  $E$  has several components, i.e.,  $r > 1$ , as demonstrated in Lemma 4.27, which plays a crucial role in the proof of Theorem B. The underlying idea behind the proof remains the same, though it requires a little more involved inductive arguments.

Before presenting the lemma, we first introduce some notations. For any positive integer  $v \leq r$ , let  $I_v \subset \{1, \dots, r\}$  with  $|I_v| = v$ . Set  $E_{I_v} := \bigcap_{i \in I_v} E_i$  and  $E_{I_0} := X$ . We also set  $E_{I_v} := \emptyset$  for any integer  $v$  bigger than  $r$ . Let  $\phi$  be an  $L$ -valued form, defined on a space containing  $E_{I_{v-1}}$ , and smooth in conic sense with respect to the induced metrics from  $(h_L, \omega_c)$ . Define

$$\mathcal{I}_{I_v}(\phi) := \bar{\partial}_{I_{v-1}}^* \mathcal{G}_{I_{v-1}}(\phi|_{E_{I_{v-1}}}),$$

where  $\mathcal{G}_{I_v}$  (resp.  $\bar{\partial}_{I_v}^*$ ) is the Green operator (resp. the  $\bar{\partial}^*$ -operator) on  $E_{I_v}$  with respect to the induced metrics from  $(h_L, \omega_c)$  on  $X$ . For any fixed sequence  $I_1 \subset \dots \subset I_k$ , we define the residue  $\text{Res}_{E_{I_k}}$  on  $D'_{h_{L^*}} \alpha$  as follows:

$$(4.29) \quad \text{Res}_{E_{I_k}}(D'_{h_{L^*}} \alpha) := \text{Res}_{E_{I_k}}(\dots \text{Res}_{E_{I_1}}(D'_{h_{L^*}} \alpha)).$$

We will also interpret (4.29) as a conic current.

**Lemma 4.27.** *Let  $\alpha \in A^{0,q}(X, \Omega_X^p(\log D) \otimes L^*)$  satisfy  $\bar{\partial} D'_{h_{L^*}} \alpha = 0$  pointwise on  $X^\circ$ . Then for any  $k = 1, \dots, r$ , there exists an  $(L^*, h_{L^*})$ -valued conic current  $\widehat{T}_k$  on  $X$  of  $(p+1, q-1)$ -type such that, as conic currents,*

$$T_k := \sum_{I_1 \subset \dots \subset I_k} \bar{\partial}^* \mathcal{G}_{E_{I_1^*}} \circ \dots \circ \bar{\partial}_{I_{k-1}}^* \mathcal{G}_{I_{k-1}} \text{Res}_{E_{I_k}}(D'_{h_{L^*}} \alpha) \equiv \bar{\partial} \widehat{T}_k \pmod{\text{co}\mathcal{D}'_{L^*}{}^{p+1,q}(\text{on } E, X)},$$

where  $\iota_{E_{I_k^*}}$  is the push-forward operator. In particular, taking  $k = 1$ , we have

$$(4.30) \quad \sum_{i=1}^r \bar{\partial}^* \mathcal{G} \text{Res}_{E_i}(D'_{h_{L^*}} \alpha) \equiv \bar{\partial} \widehat{T}_1 \pmod{\text{co}\mathcal{D}'_{L^*}{}^{p+1,q}(\text{on } E, X)},$$

meaning that on  $X$ , the difference of two conic currents

$$\sum_{i=1}^r \bar{\partial}^* \mathcal{G} \text{Res}_{E_i} (D'_{h_{L^*}} \alpha) - \bar{\partial} \widehat{T}_1$$

is an on- $E$  conic current.

*Proof.* For any  $L$ -valued  $(n-p-1, n-q)$  form  $\beta$  on  $X$ , which is moreover smooth in conic sense, the pairing of  $T_k$  and  $\beta$  is given by

$$\mathbf{P}_k := \langle T_k, \beta \rangle = m_k \sum_{\mathbf{I}_1 \subset \cdots \subset \mathbf{I}_k} \int_{E_{\mathbf{I}_k}} \text{Res}_{E_{\mathbf{I}_k}} (D'_{h_{L^*}} \alpha) \wedge (\mathcal{J}_{\mathbf{I}_k} \circ \cdots \circ \mathcal{J}_{\mathbf{I}_1} \beta),$$

where  $m_k = (-1)^{k(p+q) + \frac{k(k-1)}{2}}$ . Applying Corollary 4.26 to  $\text{Res}_{E_{\mathbf{I}_k}} (D'_{h_{L^*}} \alpha)$  and using Proposition 4.25 (3), we deduce that

(4.31)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}_k &= m_k \sum_{\mathbf{I}_1 \subset \cdots \subset \mathbf{I}_k} \int_{E_{\mathbf{I}_k}} \left( \bar{\partial}_{\mathbf{I}_k}^* \bar{\partial} \mathcal{G}_{\mathbf{I}_k} \text{Res}_{E_{\mathbf{I}_k}} (D'_{h_{L^*}} \alpha) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \bar{\partial} \bar{\partial}_{\mathbf{I}_k}^* \mathcal{G}_{\mathbf{I}_k} \text{Res}_{E_{\mathbf{I}_k}} (D'_{h_{L^*}} \alpha) \right) \wedge (\mathcal{J}_{\mathbf{I}_k} \circ \cdots \circ \mathcal{J}_{\mathbf{I}_1} \beta) = m_k (\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{II}), \end{aligned}$$

<sup>6</sup> where

$$\mathbf{I} := \sum_{\mathbf{I}_1 \subset \cdots \subset \mathbf{I}_k} \int_{E_{\mathbf{I}_k}} \left( \bar{\partial}_{\mathbf{I}_k}^* \bar{\partial} \mathcal{G}_{\mathbf{I}_k} \text{Res}_{E_{\mathbf{I}_k}} (D'_{h_{L^*}} \alpha) \right) \wedge (\mathcal{J}_{\mathbf{I}_k} \circ \cdots \circ \mathcal{J}_{\mathbf{I}_1} \beta),$$

and

$$\mathbf{II} := \sum_{\mathbf{I}_1 \subset \cdots \subset \mathbf{I}_k} \int_{E_{\mathbf{I}_k}} \left( \bar{\partial} \bar{\partial}_{\mathbf{I}_k}^* \mathcal{G}_{\mathbf{I}_k} \text{Res}_{E_{\mathbf{I}_k}} (D'_{h_{L^*}} \alpha) \right) \wedge (\mathcal{J}_{\mathbf{I}_k} \circ \cdots \circ \mathcal{J}_{\mathbf{I}_1} \beta).$$

For  $\mathbf{I}$ , with the aid of Proposition 4.25 (2) and the assumption  $\bar{\partial} D'_{h_{L^*}} \alpha = 0$  on  $X^\circ$ , we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{I} &= 2\pi i \cdot m_k \sum_{\mathbf{I}_1 \subset \cdots \subset \mathbf{I}_k \subset \mathbf{I}_{k+1}} (-1)^{p+q-k-1} \int_{E_{\mathbf{I}_{k+1}}} \text{Res}_{E_{\mathbf{I}_{k+1}}} (D'_{h_{L^*}} \alpha) \wedge \left( \bar{\partial}_{\mathbf{I}_k}^* \mathcal{G}_{\mathbf{I}_k} \mathcal{J}_{\mathbf{I}_k} \circ \cdots \circ \mathcal{J}_{\mathbf{I}_1} \beta \right) \\ &= 2\pi i \cdot (-1)^{p+q-k-1} \mathbf{P}_{k+1} \\ &= 2\pi i \cdot (-1)^{p+q-k-1} \langle T_{k+1}, \beta \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

For  $\mathbf{II}$ , by (4.3) one obtains

$$\mathbf{II} = (-1)^{p+q-k-1} \sum_{\mathbf{I}_1 \subset \cdots \subset \mathbf{I}_k} \int_{E_{\mathbf{I}_k}} \left( \bar{\partial}_{\mathbf{I}_k}^* \mathcal{G}_{\mathbf{I}_k} \text{Res}_{E_{\mathbf{I}_k}} (D'_{h_{L^*}} \alpha) \right) \wedge \left( \bar{\partial} (\mathcal{J}_{\mathbf{I}_k} \circ \cdots \circ \mathcal{J}_{\mathbf{I}_1} \beta) \right).$$

Then we apply the Hodge decomposition (3.9) to  $(\mathcal{J}_{\mathbf{I}_{k-1}} \circ \cdots \circ \mathcal{J}_{\mathbf{I}_1} \beta)|_{E_{\mathbf{I}_{k-1}}}$  to get

$$\bar{\partial} (\mathcal{J}_{\mathbf{I}_k} \circ \cdots \circ \mathcal{J}_{\mathbf{I}_1} \beta) = \mathfrak{h} + (\mathcal{J}_{\mathbf{I}_{k-1}} \circ \cdots \circ \mathcal{J}_{\mathbf{I}_1} \beta)|_{E_{\mathbf{I}_{k-1}}} - \mathcal{J}_{\mathbf{I}_k} \circ \bar{\partial} (\mathcal{J}_{\mathbf{I}_{k-1}} \circ \cdots \circ \mathcal{J}_{\mathbf{I}_1} \beta),$$

where  $\mathfrak{h}$  is an  $L$ -valued  $\Delta''_{E_{\mathbf{I}_{k-1}}}$ -harmonic form on  $E_{\mathbf{I}_{k-1}}$ . By applying the same reasoning as in (4.26), we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{II} &= (-1)^{p+q-k-1} \sum_{\mathbf{I}_1 \subset \cdots \subset \mathbf{I}_k} \int_{E_{\mathbf{I}_k}} \left( \bar{\partial}_{\mathbf{I}_k}^* \mathcal{G}_{\mathbf{I}_k} \text{Res}_{E_{\mathbf{I}_k}} (D'_{h_{L^*}} \alpha) \right) \\ &\quad \wedge \left( (\mathcal{J}_{\mathbf{I}_{k-1}} \circ \cdots \circ \mathcal{J}_{\mathbf{I}_1} \beta) - \mathcal{J}_{\mathbf{I}_k} \circ \bar{\partial} (\mathcal{J}_{\mathbf{I}_{k-1}} \circ \cdots \circ \mathcal{J}_{\mathbf{I}_1} \beta) \right) = \mathbf{III} + \mathbf{IV}, \end{aligned}$$

<sup>6</sup>Compare (4.31) with (4.24).

where

$$\mathbf{III} := (-1)^{p+q-k-1} \sum_{I_1 \subset \dots \subset I_k} \int_{E_{I_k}} \left( \bar{\partial}_{I_k}^* \mathcal{G}_{I_k} \text{Res}_{E_{I_k}} (D'_{h_{L^*}} \alpha) \right) \wedge (\mathcal{J}_{I_{k-1}} \circ \dots \circ \mathcal{J}_{I_1} \beta),$$

and

$$\mathbf{IV} := (-1)^{p+q-k} \sum_{I_1 \subset \dots \subset I_k} \int_{E_{I_k}} \left( \bar{\partial}_{I_k}^* \mathcal{G}_{I_k} \text{Res}_{E_{I_k}} (D'_{h_{L^*}} \alpha) \right) \wedge \left( \mathcal{J}_k \circ \bar{\partial} (\mathcal{J}_{I_{k-1}} \circ \dots \circ \mathcal{J}_{I_1} \beta) \right).$$

For  $\mathbf{III}$ , one should notice that the involved term equals to zero as soon as  $k \geq 2$ . Indeed, there only exists two elements for every fixed pair  $I_k \setminus I_{k-2}$ . Then the alternate sum for every  $I_{k-1}$  with  $I_{k-2} \subset I_{k-1} \subset I_k$  equals to zero by our construction of  $\text{Res}_{E_{I_k}}$  (4.29). Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{III} &= (-1)^{p+q} \sum_{i=1}^r \int_{E_i} \left( \bar{\partial}_{E_i}^* \mathcal{G}_{E_i} \text{Res}_{E_i} (D'_{h_{L^*}} \alpha) \right) \wedge \beta \\ &= \langle T_{\text{on } E}, \beta \rangle \end{aligned}$$

where

$$T_{\text{on } E} := (-1)^{p+q} \sum_{i=1}^r \bar{\partial}_{E_i}^* \mathcal{G}_{E_i} \text{Res}_{E_i} (D'_{h_{L^*}} \alpha).$$

This trick is indeed inspired by [Nog95, (2.3)]. We then can easily check that

$$T_{\text{on } E} \in \text{co}\mathcal{D}'_{L^*}{}^{p+1,q}(\text{on } E, X).$$

For  $\mathbf{IV}$ , repeating the aforementioned arguments in succession, we get

$$\mathbf{IV} = (-1)^{p+q-1} \sum_{I_1 \subset \dots \subset I_k} \int_{E_{I_k}} \left( \bar{\partial}_{I_k}^* \mathcal{G}_{I_k} \text{Res}_{E_{I_k}} (D'_{h_{L^*}} \alpha) \right) \wedge (\mathcal{J}_k \circ \mathcal{J}_{I_{k-1}} \circ \dots \circ \mathcal{J}_{I_1} \circ \bar{\partial} \beta).$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{IV} &= (-1)^{\frac{k(k+1)}{2}} \sum_{I_1 \subset \dots \subset I_k} \int_X \left( \bar{\partial} \bar{\partial}^* \mathcal{G}_{\iota_{E_{I_1^*}}} \circ \bar{\partial}_{I_1}^* \mathcal{G}_{I_1 \iota_{E_{I_2^*}}} \circ \dots \circ \iota_{E_{I_k^*}} \bar{\partial}_{I_k}^* \mathcal{G}_{I_k} \text{Res}_{E_{I_k}} (D'_{h_{L^*}} \alpha) \right) \wedge \beta \\ &= \langle \bar{\partial} T'_k, \beta \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$T'_k := (-1)^{\frac{k(k+1)}{2}} \sum_{I_1 \subset \dots \subset I_k} \bar{\partial}^* \mathcal{G}_{\iota_{E_{I_k^*}}} \circ \bar{\partial}_{I_1}^* \mathcal{G}_{I_1 \iota_{E_{I_2^*}}} \circ \dots \circ \iota_{E_{I_k^*}} \bar{\partial}_{I_k}^* \mathcal{G}_{I_k} \text{Res}_{E_{I_k}} (D'_{h_{L^*}} \alpha).$$

Putting everything together, we have, as conic currents on  $X$ ,

$$T_k = 2\pi i \cdot (-1)^{p+q-k-1} T_{k+1} + \bar{\partial} T'_k + T_{\text{on } E}.$$

In other words,

$$T_k \equiv 2\pi i \cdot (-1)^{p+q-k-1} T_{k+1} + \bar{\partial} T'_k \pmod{\text{co}\mathcal{D}'_{L^*}{}^{p+1,q}(\text{on } E, X)}.$$

By induction, the fact  $T_{r+1} = 0$  implies Lemma 4.27.  $\square$

With these preparations in place, we now turn to the proof of Theorem B.

*Proof of Theorem B.* Thanks to Corollary 4.26 and (4.30) in Lemma 4.27, there exists a conic current  $\widehat{T}$  on  $X$  such that

$$T_{D'_{h_{L^*}} \alpha} \equiv \bar{\partial} \widehat{T} \pmod{\text{co}\mathcal{D}'_{L^*}{}^{p+1,q}(\text{on } E, X)}.$$

Notice that

$$\mathrm{co}\mathcal{D}'_{L^*}{}^{p,q}(\log E, X) \simeq \frac{\mathrm{co}\mathcal{D}'_{L^*}{}^{p,q}(X)}{\mathrm{co}\mathcal{D}'_{L^*}{}^{p,q}(\mathrm{on} E, X)}$$

due to the acyclicity of the sheaf  $\mathrm{co}\mathcal{D}'_{L^*}{}^{p,q}(\mathrm{on} E)$  on  $X$ , cf. Remark 4.21 (2). Consequently, using the isomorphism between the two cohomology groups established in (4.16) in Proposition 4.22, there exists an  $L^*$ -valued logarithmic form  $\chi \in A^{0,q-1}(X, \Omega_X^{p+1}(\log D) \otimes L^*)$  satisfying (1.3). Hence, the proof of Theorem B is finalized.  $\square$

**Remark 4.28.** (a) As a special case of Theorem B, Theorem 3.1 can also be obtained via the conic current approach, see Corollary 4.24 for further details.

(b) Our method indeed provides an alternative understanding of [LRW19, Theorem 0.1] where the bundle  $L$  is trivial (see Remark 1.3). Specifically, one can verify that a combination of [LRW19, Lemma 2.3] with King's original quasi-isomorphism (4.12) will yield the result, without the need to use the bundle-valued Hodge theorem to treat logarithmic  $(p, q)$ -forms as bundle-valued  $(0, q)$ -forms, as was done in [LRW19, Proposition 2.4].

## 5. APPLICATIONS

In this section, we will give several applications of Theorem B.

**5.1. Closedness of the twisted logarithmic forms.** Our result in this subsection is as follows.

**Proposition 5.1.** *Let  $X$  be a compact Kähler manifold,  $D = \sum_{i=1}^s D_i$  be a simple normal crossing divisor on  $X$ , and let  $L$  be a holomorphic line bundle over  $X$ . Assume there exists a set of weights  $\{q_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq s} \subset [0, 1] \cap \mathbb{Q}$  such that:*

$$L = \sum_{i=1}^s \mathcal{O}_X(q_i D_i) \in \mathrm{Pic}_{\mathbb{Q}}(X).$$

*If  $\alpha \in A^{0,0}(X, \Omega_X^p(\log D) \otimes L^*)$  satisfies  $\bar{\partial} D'_{h_{L^*}} \alpha = 0$  pointwise on  $X^\circ = X \setminus \mathrm{Supp} D$ , then  $D'_{h_{L^*}} \alpha = 0$  pointwise on  $X^\circ$ .*

*Proof.* According to Theorem B, there exists a solution

$$\chi \in A^{0,-1}(X, \Omega_X^p(\log D) \otimes L^*) = \{0\}$$

such that  $\bar{\partial} \chi = D'_{h_{L^*}} \alpha$  on  $X^\circ$ . It then yields the desired result.  $\square$

We can then provide an alternative proof for the closedness of twisted logarithmic forms in a special setting. The general case, where  $(L, h_L)$  has analytic singularities and  $i\Theta_{h_L}(L) \geq 0$ , was proved recently by Cao–A. Höring, see [CH24, Proposition 3.1 & Remark 3.2].

**Corollary 5.2.** *Under the settings of Proposition 5.1. For any  $\alpha \in H^0(X, \Omega_X^p(\log D) \otimes L^*)$ , we have  $D'_{h_{L^*}} \alpha = 0$  pointwise on  $X^\circ$ .*

*Proof.* We observe that  $\bar{\partial} D'_{h_{L^*}} = -D'_{h_{L^*}} \bar{\partial}$  on  $X^\circ$ , since the curvature current vanishes outside  $D$ .  $\square$

**5.2. Degeneracy of spectral sequence.** The aim in this subsection is to prove Theorem C.

*Proof.* The Dolbeault isomorphism theorem, along with a logarithmic analogue regarding the terms in the Frölicher spectral sequence as presented in [CFGU97, Theorems 1 & 3], shows that

$$E_r^{p,q} \simeq \frac{Z_r^{p,q}}{B_r^{p,q}}.$$

Here,

$$\begin{aligned} Z_1^{p,q} &= \{\alpha_{p,q} \in A^{0,q}(X, \Omega_X^p(\log D) \otimes L^*) \mid \bar{\partial}\alpha_{p,q} = 0 \text{ on } X^\circ\}; \\ B_1^{p,q} &= \{\alpha_{p,q} \in A^{0,q}(X, \Omega_X^p(\log D) \otimes L^*) \mid \alpha_{p,q} = \bar{\partial}\beta_{p,q-1} \text{ on } X^\circ, \\ &\quad \text{for } \beta_{p,q-1} \in A^{0,q-1}(X, \Omega_X^p(\log D) \otimes L^*)\}. \end{aligned}$$

For  $r \geq 2$ ,

(5.1)

$$\begin{aligned} Z_r^{p,q} &= \{\alpha_{p,q} \in A^{p,q}(X, \Omega_X^p(\log D) \otimes L^*) \mid \bar{\partial}\alpha_{p,q} = 0 \text{ on } X^\circ, \\ &\quad \text{and there exist } \alpha_{p+i,q-i} \in A^{0,q-i}(X, \Omega_X^{p+i}(\log D) \otimes L^*), 1 \leq i \leq r-1, \\ &\quad \text{such that } D'_{h_{L^*}}\alpha_{p+i-1,q-i+1} + \bar{\partial}\alpha_{p+i,q-i} = 0 \text{ on } X^\circ\}; \\ B_r^{p,q} &= \{D'_{h_{L^*}}\beta_{p-1,q} + \bar{\partial}\beta_{p,q-1} \in A^{0,q}(X, \Omega_X^p(\log D) \otimes L^*) \mid \text{there exist} \\ &\quad \beta_{p-i,q+i-1} \in A^{0,q+i-1}(X, \Omega_X^{p-i}(\log D) \otimes L^*), 2 \leq i \leq r-1, \text{ such that} \\ &\quad D'_{h_{L^*}}\beta_{p-i,q+i-1} + \bar{\partial}\beta_{p-i+1,q+i-2} = 0 \text{ and } \bar{\partial}\beta_{p-r+1,q+r-2} = 0 \text{ on } X^\circ\}. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, the map  $d_r : E_r^{p,q} \rightarrow E_r^{p+r,q-r+1}$  is given by

$$d_r[\alpha_{p,q}] = [D'_{h_{L^*}}\alpha_{p+r-1,q-r+1}],$$

where  $[\alpha_{p,q}] \in E_r^{p,q}$  and  $\alpha_{p+r-1,q-r+1}$  are presented in (5.1). By applying Theorem B and performing direct computations, we deduce that for every  $r \geq 1$ ,

$$d_r = 0.$$

We thus get the desired degeneration. □

**5.3. Injectivity theorem.** In this subsection, we are going to prove Theorem D.

*Proof.* Define a new holomorphic line bundle

$$(5.2) \quad L' := \Omega_X^n(\log D) \otimes L^* \simeq K_X \otimes \mathcal{O}_X(D) \otimes L^*,$$

which satisfies

$$L' = \sum_{i=1}^s \mathcal{O}_X(q_i D_i) \in \text{Pic}_{\mathbb{Q}}(X),$$

where  $q_i := 1 - b_i \in [0, 1)$  for all  $i$ .

**Step (I).** *Injectivity of  $i$  (1.5).*

By (5.2), it is equivalent to show that the restriction homomorphism

$$(5.3) \quad H^q(X, K_X \otimes \mathcal{O}_X(D) \otimes L'^*) \rightarrow H^q(X^\circ, K_{X^\circ} \otimes L'^*|_{X^\circ})$$

is injective, for all  $q$ .

Let  $\iota : X^\circ \hookrightarrow X$  be the inclusion. Notice that there is an injective map of complexes

$$j : \Omega_X^\bullet(\log D) \otimes L'^* \hookrightarrow \iota_* \Omega_{X^\circ}^\bullet \otimes L'^*,$$

which is a quasi-isomorphism by Deligne’s result (cf. [Del70, II, Corollary 3.14] and [EV92, §2, 2.11] in the analytic case) since all eigenvalues of  $\text{Res}_{D_i}(\nabla_{h_{L'^*}}) = q_i$  along  $D_i$  lie in  $[0, 1)$  according to the formula (2.2).

We then consider the naive filtrations  $F$  on these two complexes. The inclusion  $F^n \subseteq F^0$  induces the following commutative digram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbb{H}^{q+n}(X, F^n(\Omega_X^\bullet(\log D) \otimes L'^*)) & \xrightarrow{\alpha} & \mathbb{H}^{q+n}(X, \Omega_X^\bullet(\log D) \otimes L'^*) \\ \beta^n \downarrow & & \downarrow \beta \\ \mathbb{H}^{q+n}(X, F^n(\iota_*\Omega_{X^\circ}^\bullet \otimes L'^*)) & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \mathbb{H}^{q+n}(X, \iota_*\Omega_{X^\circ}^\bullet \otimes L'^*). \end{array}$$

Since  $j$  is a quasi-isomorphism, it follows that  $\beta$  is an isomorphism. On the other hand, Theorem C implies that  $\alpha$  is injective. We conclude from the commutative diagram that  $\beta^n$  is also injective.

But

$$F^n(\Omega_X^\bullet(\log D) \otimes L'^*) = \Omega_X^n(\log D) \otimes L'^*[-n]$$

and

$$F^n(\iota_*\Omega_{X^\circ}^\bullet \otimes L'^*) = \iota_*\Omega_{X^\circ}^n \otimes L'^*[-n].$$

Therefore,  $\beta^n$  becomes

$$\beta^n : H^q(X, \Omega_X^n(\log D) \otimes L'^*) \rightarrow H^q(X, \iota_*\Omega_{X^\circ}^n \otimes L'^*).$$

Moreover, the inclusion  $\iota$  is an Stein morphism<sup>7</sup>, so the higher direct images  $R^q\iota_*(\Omega_{X^\circ}^n \otimes \iota^*L'^*)$  vanish for  $q \geq 1$  by Cartan’s Theorem B, and hence

$$H^q(X, \iota_*\Omega_{X^\circ}^n \otimes L'^*) \simeq H^q(X^\circ, \Omega_{X^\circ}^n \otimes L'^*|_{X^\circ})$$

by virtue of the Leray spectral sequence plus the projection formula. As a result,  $\beta^n$  becomes the restriction map (5.3) as desired.

**Step (II).** *Injectivity of  $i'$  (1.6) and its equivalence to that of  $i$ .*

We note that the corresponding result in the algebraic setting was first proposed in [Amb14, Remark 2.6]. Here, we adapt the arguments therein to the analytic case.

We have

$$\mathcal{O}_X \hookrightarrow \mathcal{O}_X(\widehat{D}) \hookrightarrow \iota_*\mathcal{O}_{X^\circ},$$

where the first map is given by multiplication with the section defining  $\widehat{D}$ . By tensoring this with  $L$  and taking the  $q$ -th cohomology, we obtain

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} H^q(X, L) & \xrightarrow{i'} & H^q(X, L \otimes \mathcal{O}_X(\widehat{D})) & \longrightarrow & H^q(X, \iota_*\mathcal{O}_{X^\circ} \otimes L) & \xrightarrow{\simeq} & H^q(X^\circ, L|_{X^\circ}), \\ & & & & \searrow & & \nearrow \\ & & & & i & & \end{array}$$

<sup>7</sup>To be more precise we shall call a holomorphic map  $p : \Omega \rightarrow X$  a *Stein morphism* of complex manifolds if every point  $x \in X$  has a neighborhood  $V = V(x)$  such that  $p^{-1}(V)$  is Stein. Indeed, if  $R$  is an effective Cartier divisor on a complex manifold  $X$ , then the inclusion  $X \setminus \text{Supp } R \hookrightarrow X$  is a Stein morphism. This is because the property is local on  $X$ , which allows us to assume that  $R$  is defined by an equation in  $\mathcal{O}(X)$ , where  $X$  is Stein. In this case, the assertion is clear, see e.g. [GPR94, III, Examples 3.3 (6)].

where the isomorphism follows from the fact that  $\iota$  is a Stein morphism. So the injectivity of  $i$  implies that of  $i'$ .

Conversely, suppose that  $H^q(X, L) \rightarrow H^q(X, L \otimes \mathcal{O}_X(\widehat{D}))$  is injective for all divisors  $\widehat{D}$  supported on  $X^\circ$ . Then, it follows that the map  $H^q(X, L) \rightarrow H^q(X, L \otimes \mathcal{O}_X(mD))$  is also injective for every  $m \geq 0$ . By Lemma II.3, this implies the injectivity of the map

$$H^q(X, L) \rightarrow \varinjlim_m H^q(X, L \otimes \mathcal{O}_X(mD)).$$

Now, observe that

$$\varinjlim_m H^q(X, L \otimes \mathcal{O}_X(mD)) \simeq H^q(X, \varinjlim_m (L \otimes \mathcal{O}_X(mD))) \simeq H^q(X, \iota_*(L|_{X^\circ})) \simeq H^q(X^\circ, L|_{X^\circ}),$$

where the first isomorphism holds by the commutativity of directed limits with cohomology on quasi-compact topological spaces (see e.g. [Sta, Tag 01FE, Lemma 20.19.1]), the second isomorphism follows from the properties of sheaf operations, and the last isomorphism relies on the Stein property of the inclusion map  $\iota$  again. We then achieve the injectivity of the map  $i$ .

The proof of Theorem D is, therefore, complete.  $\square$

**5.4. Unobstructed deformations.** In this subsection, we are devoted to proving Theorem A.

5.4.1. *Deformations of pairs.* We begin by reviewing basic notations and properties of locally trivial deformations of pairs, following [Kaw78]. For further details, see [Mane22, §4.4 & Exercise 4.6.7] and [Ser06, §3.4.4].

**Definition 5.3** ([Kaw78, Definition 3]). A family of *locally trivial (infinitesimal) deformations*<sup>8</sup> of a pair  $(X, D)$ , or, a family of locally trivial (infinitesimal) deformations of the closed embedding  $D \hookrightarrow X$ , is a 7-tuple  $\mathcal{F} = (X^\circ, \mathcal{X}, \mathcal{D}, \pi, S, s_0, \psi)$  that satisfies the following conditions:

- (1)  $\pi : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow S$  is a proper smooth morphism between these two complex spaces.
- (2)  $\mathcal{D}$  is a closed analytic subset of  $\mathcal{X}$  and  $\mathcal{X}^\circ = \mathcal{X} - \mathcal{D}$ .
- (3)  $\psi : X \rightarrow \pi^{-1}(s_0)$  is an isomorphism such that  $\psi(X - D) = \pi^{-1}(s_0) \cap \mathcal{X}^\circ$ .
- (4)  $\pi$  locally is a projection of a product space as well as the restriction of it to  $\mathcal{D}$ , that is, for each  $p \in \mathcal{X}$ , there exist an open neighborhood  $\mathcal{U}$  of  $p$  and an isomorphism  $\varsigma : \mathcal{U} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{W}$ , where  $\mathcal{V} = \pi(\mathcal{U})$  and  $\mathcal{W} = \mathcal{U} \cap \pi^{-1}(\pi(p))$ , such that the following diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{U} & \xrightarrow{\varsigma} & \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{W} \\ & \searrow \pi & \downarrow \text{pr}_1 \\ & & \mathcal{V} \end{array}$$

is commutative and the restriction  $\varsigma|_{\mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{D}} : \mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{D} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{V} \times (\mathcal{W} \cap \mathcal{D})$  is also an isomorphism.

**Definition 5.4.** Let  $T_X(-\log D)$  be the *logarithmic tangent bundle*, which is the dual bundle of  $\Omega_X^1(\log D)$ . Recall that  $T_X(-\log D)$  is naturally a subsheaf of the *holomorphic tangent bundle*  $T_X^{1,0}$ , and that it is closed under the Lie bracket on  $T_X^{1,0}$ . Indeed, under

<sup>8</sup>Kawamata referred to these as “logarithmic deformations”.



the same settings near (2.1),  $T_X(-\log D)$  is locally generated by the  $n$  commuting vector fields

$$z^1 \frac{\partial}{\partial z^1}, \dots, z^d \frac{\partial}{\partial z^d}, \frac{\partial}{\partial z^{d+1}}, \dots, \frac{\partial}{\partial z^n},$$

and is therefore closed under the Lie bracket.

As proved in [Gro58], the set of the *first-order locally trivial deformations of a pair*  $(X, D)$  (i.e., families of locally trivial deformations over the space  $\text{Spec } \mathbb{C}[\epsilon]/(\epsilon^2)$ ) is the finite-dimensional space  $H^1(X, T_X(-\log D))$ . Furthermore, the *obstructions* for the locally trivial deformations lie in  $H^2(X, T_X(-\log D))$ . In the usual way, one has a *Kodaira–Spencer map*

$$\rho_{s_0} : T_{S, s_0} \rightarrow H^1(X, T_X(-\log D)).$$

**Definition 5.5** ([Kaw78, Definition 5]). A family  $\mathcal{F} = (\mathcal{X}^\circ, \mathcal{X}, \mathcal{D}, \pi, S, s_0, \psi)$  of locally trivial deformations of a pair  $(X, D)$  is called to be *semi-universal* if for any family  $\mathcal{F}' = (\mathcal{X}'^\circ, \mathcal{X}', \mathcal{D}', \pi', S', s_0', \psi')$  of locally trivial deformations of the pair  $(X, D)$ , there exist an open neighborhood  $S''$  of  $s_0'$  in  $S'$  and a morphism  $\alpha : S'' \rightarrow S$  such that the following conditions are satisfied:

- (i) the restriction  $\mathcal{F}'|_{S''}$  of  $\mathcal{F}'$  over  $S''$  is isomorphic to the induced family  $\alpha^* \mathcal{F}$ ;
- (ii) the differential map  $T_{S'', s_0'} \rightarrow T_{S, s_0}$  is unique.

Kawamata then proved the following Kuranishi-type theorem.

**Theorem 5.6** ([Kaw78, Theorem 1]). *There exists a semi-universal (or Kuranishi) family  $\mathcal{F}$  of locally trivial deformations for the pair  $(X, D)$ .*

**Definition 5.7.** We say that a pair  $(X, D)$  has *unobstructed locally trivial deformations* if its Kuranishi space is smooth, meaning that it admits a Kuranishi family over a smooth base (i.e.,  $S$  is a complex manifold).

5.4.2. *Differentiable graded Batalin–Vilkovisky algebra.* We next introduce the definition and key properties of the differentiable graded Batalin–Vilkovisky algebra, following primarily [Mane22] and [KKP08], to lay the groundwork for establishing the unobstructedness in §5.4.3.

**Definition 5.8** ([Mane22, p.145]). A *differential-graded Lie algebra* (abbrev. DGLA) is the data of a differential-graded vector space  $(\mathbf{L}, \mathbf{d})$  together with a bilinear map  $[\cdot, \cdot] : \mathbf{L} \times \mathbf{L} \rightarrow \mathbf{L}$  (called *bracket*) of degree 0, such that the following conditions hold:

- (a) (graded skew-symmetry)  $[a, b] = -(-1)^{|a||b|}[b, a]$ ;
- (b) (graded Jacobi identity)  $[a, [b, c]] = [[a, b], c] + (-1)^{|a||b|}[b, [a, c]]$ ;
- (c) (graded Leibniz rule)  $\mathbf{d}[a, b] = [\mathbf{d}a, b] + (-1)^{|a|}[a, \mathbf{d}b]$ .

Here,  $|a|$  denotes the *degree* of  $a$ .

Particularly, the Leibniz rule implies that the bracket of a DGLA induces a structure of graded Lie algebra on its cohomology. Furthermore, we have the following terminologies.

- A DGLA is said to be *abelian* if its bracket is trivial.
- A *morphism* between two DGLAs  $\zeta : \mathbf{L} \rightarrow \mathbf{M}$  is a linear map that commutes with both the brackets and differentials, and also preserves degrees.
- A *quasi-isomorphism* between two DGLAs  $\zeta : \mathbf{L} \rightarrow \mathbf{M}$  is a morphism that induces an isomorphism in cohomologies.
- Two DGLAs  $\mathbf{L}$  and  $\mathbf{M}$  are said to be *homotopy equivalent*, if there exists a quasi-isomorphism between them. In particular, a DGLA is said to be *homotopy abelian* if it is homotopy equivalent to an abelian DGLA.

**Definition 5.9** ([Mane22, p.440]). Let  $k$  be a fixed odd integer. A *differential graded Batalin–Vilkovisky algebra* (abbrev. *DGBVA*) of degree  $k$  over  $\mathbb{C}$  is the data  $(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{d}, \Delta)$ , where  $(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{d})$  is a differential  $\mathbb{Z}$ -graded commutative algebra with unit  $1 \in \mathbf{A}$ , and  $\Delta \in \text{Hom}_{\mathbb{C}}^{-k}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{A})$  is an order  $\leq 2$  differential operator of degree  $-k$ , such that the following properties hold:

- (1)  $\mathbf{d}(1) = \Delta(1) = 0$ ;
- (2)  $\mathbf{d}^2 = \Delta^2 = \mathbf{d}\Delta + \Delta\mathbf{d} = 0$ .

**Remark 5.10.** For the case  $k = 1$ , one may also refer to [Mani99, Chapter III.9] or [KKP08, Definition 4.12] for the definition.

**Remark 5.11.** By e.g. [Mane22, Corollary 9.3.5], the conditions  $\Delta \in \text{Diff}_{\mathbf{A}/\mathbb{C}}^2(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{A})$  and  $\Delta(1) = 0$  in Definition 5.9 are equivalent to the *seven-term relation*:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(abc) + \Delta(a)(bc) + (-1)^{|a||b|} \Delta(b)ac + (-1)^{|c|(|a|+|b|)} \Delta(c)ab \\ = \Delta(ab)c + (-1)^{|a|(|b|+|c|)} \Delta(bc)a + (-1)^{|b||c|} \Delta(ac)b. \end{aligned}$$

Here for every integer  $l$ , we denote by

$$\text{Diff}_{\mathbf{A}/\mathbb{C}}^l(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{A}) \subseteq \text{Hom}_{\mathbb{C}}^{\bullet}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{A})$$

the *graded subspace of differential operators of order  $\leq l$* ; it is defined recursively by setting

$$\text{Diff}_{\mathbf{A}/\mathbb{C}}^l(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{A}) = 0$$

for  $l < 0$ , and

$$\text{Diff}_{\mathbf{A}/\mathbb{C}}^l(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{A}) = \{f \in \text{Hom}_{\mathbb{C}}^{\bullet}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{A}) \mid [f, a] \in \text{Diff}_{\mathbf{A}/\mathbb{C}}^{l-1}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{A}), \text{ for all } a \in \mathbf{A}\}$$

for  $l \geq 0$ . For  $f \in \text{Diff}_{\mathbf{A}/\mathbb{C}}^{l_1}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{A})$  and  $g \in \text{Diff}_{\mathbf{A}/\mathbb{C}}^{l_2}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{A})$  we have (see [Mane22, §2.3] for similar computations):

$$fg \in \text{Diff}_{\mathbf{A}/\mathbb{C}}^{l_1+l_2}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{A}) \quad \text{and} \quad [f, g] \in \text{Diff}_{\mathbf{A}/\mathbb{C}}^{l_1+l_2-1}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{A}).$$

In particular,

$$\text{Diff}_{\mathbf{A}/\mathbb{C}}^1(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{A}) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Diff}_{\mathbf{A}/\mathbb{C}}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{A}) := \bigcup_l \text{Diff}_{\mathbf{A}/\mathbb{C}}^l(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{A})$$

are graded Lie sub-algebras of  $\text{Hom}_{\mathbb{C}}^{\bullet}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{A})$ .

**Remark 5.12.** As is well-known (see e.g. [Kos85], [KKP08, §4.2.2] or [Mane22, Lemma 9.43]), given a DGBVA of degree  $k$ , a DGLA associated with it, is then canonically defined. This DGLA is denoted by  $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{d}_{\mathfrak{g}})$ , where

$$\mathfrak{g} := \mathbf{A}[k], \quad \mathbf{d}_{\mathfrak{g}} := -\mathbf{d}_{\mathbf{A}},$$

and the bracket is defined by

$$[a, b] := (-1)^{|a|} \Delta(ab) - (-1)^{|a|} \Delta(a)b - a\Delta(b).$$

**Definition 5.13** ([Mane22, Definition 13.6.2]). A DGBVA of degree  $k$  is said to have the *degeneration property* if for every  $a_0 \in \mathbf{A}$  such that  $\mathbf{d}a_0 = 0$ , there exists a sequence  $\{a_i\}_{i \geq 0}$ , with  $|a_{i+1}| = |a_i| - k - 1$  and such that for any  $i \geq 0$ ,

$$\Delta a_i = \mathbf{d}a_{i+1}.$$

**Remark 5.14.** For an equivalent definition of Definition 5.13 based on the  $\mathbb{C}[[u]]$ -module freeness of  $H^{\bullet}(\mathbf{A}[[u]], \mathbf{d} + u\Delta)$ , see [KKP08, Definition 4.1.3], where  $\mathbf{A}[[u]]$  represents the graded vector space of formal power series with coefficients in  $\mathbf{A}$ .

The following theorem is of great significance.

**Theorem 5.15.** *Let  $(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{\Delta})$  be a DGBVA with the degeneration property. Then the associated DGLA  $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{d}_{\mathfrak{g}})$  is homotopy abelian.*

*Proof.* See [KKP08, Theorem 4.14] or [Ter08, Theorem 2] for  $k = 1$ , [Iac15, Theorem 7.6] for any odd  $k$ . See also [BK98] for a slightly weaker result.  $\square$

### 5.4.3. Proof of Theorem A.

*Proof.* The approach follows the spirit of [KKP08, §4.3.3] or [Kon08, §3]. In our situation, one can verify that the components of the appropriate DGBVA possessing the degeneration property are as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{A} &:= A^{0,\bullet}(X, \wedge^{\bullet} T_X(-\log D)); \\ \mathbf{d} &:= \bar{\partial}; \\ \mathbf{\Delta} &:= \mathbf{i}_{\Omega}^{-1} \circ D'_{h_{L^*}} \circ \mathbf{i}_{\Omega}.\end{aligned}$$

Here,

$$\Omega \in A^{0,0}(X, \Omega_X^n(\log D) \otimes L^*)$$

is a nowhere vanishing section of logarithmic  $(n, 0)$ -form with values in  $L^*$ , where

$$L := \Omega_X^n(\log D) \simeq K_X \otimes \mathcal{O}_X(D),$$

thus

$$L = \sum_{i=1}^s \mathcal{O}_X(q_i D_i) \in \text{Pic}_{\mathbb{Q}}(X) \text{ with } q_i := 1 - a_i \in [0, 1];$$

and

$$\mathbf{i}_{\Omega} : \wedge^{\bullet} T_X(-\log D) \rightarrow \Omega_X^{n-\bullet}(\log D) \otimes L^*$$

is the isomorphism given by the contraction with  $\Omega$ . The degeneration property follows from Theorem B, or more practically, Theorem C, as the contraction  $\mathbf{i}_{\Omega}$  provides an isomorphism of double complexes between the DGBVA  $(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{\Delta})$  and the logarithmic Dolbeault-type double complex  $(A^{0,\bullet}(X, \Omega_X^n(\log D) \otimes L^*), \bar{\partial}, D'_{h_{L^*}})$ . Theorem 5.15 then implies that the associated DGLA,

$$(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{d}_{\mathfrak{g}}) = (A^{0,\bullet}(X, \wedge^{\bullet} T_X(-\log D)), \bar{\partial})$$

is homotopy abelian. Consider the following DGLA,

$$(\mathfrak{g}', \mathbf{d}_{\mathfrak{g}'}) = (A^{0,\bullet}(X, T_X(-\log D)), \bar{\partial}),$$

which controls the locally trivial deformations of the pair  $(X, D)$ . We then have a natural inclusion of DGLAs

$$(\mathfrak{g}', \mathbf{d}_{\mathfrak{g}'}) \hookrightarrow (\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{d}_{\mathfrak{g}}),$$

which embeds  $(\mathfrak{g}', \mathbf{d}_{\mathfrak{g}'})$  as a direct summand in  $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{d}_{\mathfrak{g}})$ , and so induces an embedding

$$H^{\bullet}(\mathfrak{g}', \mathbf{d}_{\mathfrak{g}'}) \subset H^{\bullet}(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{d}_{\mathfrak{g}})$$

in cohomology. By [KKP08, Proposition 4.11 (ii)],  $(\mathfrak{g}', \mathbf{d}_{\mathfrak{g}'})$  is also homotopy abelian. Consequently, the formal moduli space associated with the DGLA  $(\mathfrak{g}', \mathbf{d}_{\mathfrak{g}'})$  is smooth, thereby implying the desired unobstructedness.

The proof of Theorem A is, therefore, complete.  $\square$

---

<sup>9</sup>The degree of this DGBVA is then  $k = 1$ .

APPENDIX I. PROOF OF KING'S QUASI-ISOMORPHISMS

We provide here a detailed proof of Proposition 4.14 for the comfort of the readers.

**Proposition I.1** (=Proposition 4.14). *Let  $X$  be a complex manifold of complex dimension  $n$ , and let  $Y$  be a simple normal crossing divisor on  $X$ . Then we have the following properties.*

- (a) *The sheaf  $\mathcal{D}'_{X^{\bullet,\bullet}}(\log Y)$  is a bigraded  $\mathcal{A}^{0,\bullet}(\Omega_X^{\bullet}(\log Y))$ -module.*
- (b) *This module structure from (a) defines a canonical isomorphism:*

$$\Omega_X^p(\log Y) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \mathcal{D}'_X^{0,q} \xrightarrow{\simeq} \mathcal{D}'_X^{p,q}(\log Y).$$

- (c) *There exist quasi-isomorphisms of complexes of sheaves:*

$$\Omega_X^p(\log Y) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{A}^{0,\bullet}(\Omega_X^p(\log Y)) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{D}'_X^{p,\bullet}(\log Y).$$

*So,  $(\mathcal{D}'_X^{p,\bullet}(\log Y), \bar{\partial})$  is an acyclic resolution of  $\Omega_X^p(\log Y)$ .*

The above proposition is purely a local problem. Hence, we may assume  $Y = \{z^1 \cdots z^k = 0\}$  and set  $h = z^1 \cdots z^k$ . We also denote the coordinates as  $(z^1, \dots, z^k, w^{k+1}, \dots, w^n)$ .

*Proof of Proposition I.1 (a).* Suppose that  $T$  is a current and  $g$  is a holomorphic function such that  $h$  can be divided by  $g$ , then it would be desirable to define  $T \wedge \frac{dg}{g}$  to be  $\frac{T}{g} \wedge dg$  where  $\frac{T}{g}$  is a suitably chosen current  $S$  satisfying  $gS = T$ . In fact, by virtue of the work of Schwartz [Sch55], it is always possible to find such an  $S$ . However,  $S$  is not unique, since it can be modified by adding a current whose product with  $g$  equals zero. Conversely, if  $gS = gS'$ , then  $g(S - S') = 0$ . Sometimes, it is possible to define explicit procedures to obtain a preferred  $S$  under various transversality conditions, but in general, this is impossible, and the current  $\frac{T}{g} \wedge dg$  is not well-defined. However, by passing to the complex of log currents through the quotient map, the ambiguity disappears. We will define the following maps to form a commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{D}'_X^{\bullet,\bullet} \otimes_{\mathcal{A}_X} \mathcal{A}^{0,\bullet}(\Omega_X^{\bullet}(\log Y)) & \xrightarrow{\alpha} & \mathcal{D}'_X^{\bullet,\bullet}(\log Y). \\ \downarrow \gamma \otimes \text{id} & \nearrow \bar{\alpha} & \\ \mathcal{D}'_X^{\bullet,\bullet}(\log Y) \otimes_{\mathcal{A}_X} \mathcal{A}^{0,\bullet}(\Omega_X^{\bullet}(\log Y)) & & \end{array}$$

Here the map  $\gamma$  is the quotient map  $\mathcal{D}'_X^{\bullet,\bullet} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}'_X^{\bullet,\bullet}(\log Y)$ . Let  $T$  be a current and  $\mu$  be a logarithmic form. Choose a current  $S$  such that  $hS = T$ . The form  $h\mu$  is then smooth, therefore the product  $S \wedge (h\mu)$  is defined. This current depends on the choice of  $S$  but  $\gamma(S \wedge (h\mu))$  just depends on  $T$  and  $\mu$ . Indeed, if  $S'$  is another current satisfying  $hS' = T$ , then  $hQ = 0$ , where  $Q := S - S'$ . For any null- $Y$  form  $\varphi$  with suitable bidegree, as currents,

$$(Q \wedge (h\mu)) \wedge \varphi = Q \wedge (h\mu \wedge \varphi) = hQ \wedge (\mu \wedge \varphi) = 0,$$

since  $\mu \wedge \varphi$  is smooth. Therefore,  $Q \wedge (h\mu)$  is an on- $Y$  current by the equivalent Definition (4.11). In other words,

$$\gamma(S \wedge (h\mu)) = \gamma(S' \wedge (h\mu))$$

is a well-defined log current, which we denote by

$$\alpha(T \otimes \mu).$$

To define the map  $\bar{\alpha}$ , it suffices to show that  $\mathcal{D}'_{X^{\bullet,\bullet}}(\text{on } Y) \otimes_{\mathcal{A}_X} \mathcal{A}^{0,\bullet}(\Omega_X^{\bullet}(\log Y)) \subset \text{Ker } \alpha$ . If  $T$  above is an on- $Y$  current and the forms are the same as before, we then have

$$(S \wedge (h\mu)) \wedge \varphi = hS \wedge (\mu \wedge \varphi) = T \wedge (\mu \wedge \varphi) = 0$$

since  $\mu \wedge \varphi$  is a null- $Y$  form according to the ‘‘ideal’’ property in Proposition 4.6 (2). Therefore,  $S \wedge (h\mu)$  is also an on- $Y$  current, which completes the proof.  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition I.1 (b).* If  $\alpha$  and  $\gamma$  are the same maps in the proof of (a), one then has a commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \mathcal{D}'_{X^{p,q}} & \\ & \swarrow \beta & \searrow \gamma \\ \mathcal{D}'_{X^{0,q}} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \Omega_X^p(\log Y) & \xrightarrow{\alpha} & \mathcal{D}'_{X^{p,q}}(\log Y). \\ & \dashleftarrow \bar{\beta} & \end{array}$$

Here, if  $T = \sum_{|I|+|J|=p} T_{IJ} dz^I \wedge dw^J$ , where  $T_{IJ}$  is a  $(0, q)$ -current, then we set

$$\beta(T) = \sum_{|I|+|J|=p} (z^I T_{IJ}) \otimes \frac{dz^I}{z^I} \wedge dw^J.$$

We should also observe that in this case,  $\alpha = \bar{\alpha}$ , since  $\mathcal{D}'_{X^{0,q}}(\log Y) = \mathcal{D}'_{X^{0,q}}$  (see Remark 4.12 (1)).

Through the rest of the proof, we will adopt the convention that for a current  $T$  and a holomorphic function  $g$ ,  $\frac{T}{g}$  refers to any *fixed* current  $S$  such that  $gS = T$ .

(1)  $\beta$  is surjective.

This follows because

$$\sum_{|I|+|J|=p} R_{IJ} \otimes \frac{dz^I}{z^I} \wedge dw^J = \beta \left( \sum_{|I|+|J|=p} \left( \frac{R_{IJ}}{z^I} \right) dz^I \wedge dw^J \right).$$

(2)  $\bar{\beta}$  is surjective.

We first show that  $\bar{\beta}$  is well-defined. Then, it suffices to show that  $\mathcal{D}'_{X^{p,q}}(\text{on } Y) \subset \text{Ker } \beta$ . For any null- $Y$  form  $\varphi$  of  $(n-p, n-q)$ -type, by (4.9) we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi &= \sum_{|K|+|L|=n-p} h \cdot \varphi_{KL} \frac{dz^K}{z^K} \wedge dw^L \\ &= \sum_{|K|+|L|=n-p} \varphi_{KL} z^{K'} dz^K \wedge dw^L, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\varphi_{KL}$  is a  $(0, n-q)$ -smooth form, and  $K' = \{1, \dots, k\} - K$ . Therefore,  $T$  is an on- $Y$  current if and only if

$$z^I T_{IJ} = 0$$

as currents. Then in this case,  $\beta(T) = 0$ .

As a result,  $\bar{\beta}$  is also surjective thanks to (1).

(3)  $\alpha \circ \beta = \gamma$ .

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha(\beta(T)) &= \gamma\left(\sum\left(\frac{z^I T_{IJ}}{h}\right) \wedge h \frac{dz^I}{z^I} \wedge dw^J\right) \\ &= \gamma\left(\sum\left(\frac{T_{IJ}}{z^{I'}}\right) \wedge z^{I'} dz^I \wedge dw^J\right) \\ &= \gamma\left(\sum T_{IJ} dz^I \wedge dw^J\right) = \gamma(T),\end{aligned}$$

where  $I' = \{1, \dots, k\} - I$ . Consequently,  $\alpha \circ \bar{\beta} = \text{id}$  so  $\bar{\beta}$  is injective and  $\alpha = \bar{\beta}^{-1}$ .

Putting (1), (2) and (3) together, we get

$$\Omega_X^p(\log Y) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \mathcal{D}_X^{0,q} \xrightarrow{\simeq} \mathcal{D}_X^{p,q}(\log Y).$$

□

*Proof of Proposition I.1 (c).* Thanks to (b), the sequence

$$\Omega_X^p(\log Y) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{A}^{0,\bullet}(\Omega_X^p(\log Y)) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{D}_X^{p,\bullet}(\log Y)$$

can be obtained by tensoring the sequence

$$\mathcal{O}_X \hookrightarrow \mathcal{A}_X^{0,\bullet} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{D}_X^{0,\bullet}$$

with the locally free  $\mathcal{O}_X$ -sheaf  $\Omega_X^p(\log Y)$ . The desired quasi-isomorphisms in the former sequence follows since the latter sequence consists of quasi-isomorphisms, as established by the celebrated Dolbeault–Grothendieck lemma. □

## APPENDIX II. DIRECTED LIMITS

We give some basic knowledge of the directed limit of a directed family of abelian groups to be used in the proof of Theorem D.

**Definition II.1.** A *directed family* of abelian groups  $\{A_m\}_{m \in \mathbb{Z}}$  is a collection of abelian groups equipped with homomorphisms  $\phi_{mn} : A_m \rightarrow A_n$  for all  $m \leq n$ , satisfying the following conditions:

- $\phi_{mm} = \text{id}_{A_m}$  for all  $m$  (identity property);
- $\phi_{np} \circ \phi_{mn} = \phi_{mp}$  for all  $m \leq n \leq p$  (compatibility property).

**Definition II.2.** The *directed limit*  $\varinjlim_m A_m$  of  $\{A_m\}_{m \in \mathbb{Z}}$  is defined as the quotient of

$\bigoplus_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} A_m$  modulo the subgroup generated by

$$x_m - \phi_{mn}(x_m)$$

for all  $m \leq n$  and  $x_m \in A_m$ .

One obtains from this definition the homomorphisms

$$\mu_m : A_m \rightarrow \varinjlim_n A_n, \quad a_m \mapsto [a_m],$$

which are compatible with  $\phi_{mn}$ , and satisfy the following *universal property*: if  $G$  is an abelian group and  $g_m : A_m \rightarrow G$  are homomorphisms compatible with  $\phi_{mn}$ , then there exists a unique homomorphism

$$g : \varinjlim_n A_n \rightarrow G$$

such that  $g_m = g \circ \mu_m$  for all  $m$ .

From the explicit description of the directed limit, we have the following properties:

- (i)  $\varinjlim_n A_n = \bigcup_m \mu_m(A_m)$ ;
- (ii)  $\text{Ker}(A_m \rightarrow \varinjlim_n A_n) = \bigcup_{m \leq n} \text{Ker}(A_m \rightarrow A_n)$ .

In particular, one obtains the following lemma:

**Lemma II.3.** *Let  $\{A_m\}_{m \in \mathbb{Z}}$  be a directed family of abelian groups.*

- (1) *We have that  $A_m \rightarrow \varinjlim_n A_n$  is injective if and only if  $A_m \rightarrow A_n$  is injective for all  $m \leq n$ .*
- (2) *Let  $\{B_m\}_{m \in \mathbb{Z}}$  be another directed family of abelian groups. Let  $f_m : A_m \rightarrow B_m$  be a sequence of compatible homomorphisms, which induce a homomorphism*

$$f : \varinjlim_m A_m \rightarrow \varinjlim_m B_m.$$

*If  $f_m$  is injective for some  $m \geq m_0$ , then  $f$  is injective.*

## REFERENCES

- [Amb14] F. Ambro, *An injectivity theorem*, *Compositio Math.* 150 (2014), 999-1023.
- [ACRT18] B. Anthes, A. Cattaneo, S. Rollenske, A. Tomassini,  *$\partial\bar{\partial}$ -complex symplectic and Calabi-Yau manifolds: Albanese map, deformations and period maps*, *Ann. Global Anal. Geom.* 54 (2018), no.3, 377-398.
- [Aur07] D. Auroux, *Mirror symmetry and T-duality in the complement of an anticanonical divisor*, *Journal of Gokova Geometry Topology* 1 (2007): 51-91.
- [Aur09] D. Auroux, *Special Lagrangian Fibrations, Wall-Crossing, and Mirror Symmetry*, *Surveys in Differential Geometry*, Vol. 13, edited by H. D. Cao and S. T. Yau, 1-47. Intl. Press, 2009.
- [BK98] S. Barannikov, M. Kontsevich, *Frobenius manifolds and formality of Lie algebras of polyvector fields*, *Internat. Math. Res. Notices* 1998, vol. 4, pp. 201-215.
- [Bog78] F. Bogomolov, *Hamiltonian Kählerian manifolds*, *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR*, 243, (1978), 1101-1104, *Soviet Math. Dokl.*, 19, (1979), 1462-1465.
- [Cam04] F. Campana, *Orbifolds, special varieties and classification theory*, *Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble)* 54 (2004), no. 3, 499-630.
- [CH24] J. Cao, A. Höring, *Frobenius integrability of certain p-forms on singular spaces*, *C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris* 362 (2024), Special issue, 43-54.
- [CP23a] J. Cao, M. Păun, *Infinitesimal extension of pluricanonical forms*, [arXiv:2012.05063v5](https://arxiv.org/abs/2012.05063v5), to appear in *Annales de l'Institut Fourier*.
- [CP23b] J. Cao, M. Păun,  *$\partial\bar{\partial}$ -lemmas and a conjecture of O. Fujino*, [arXiv:2303.16239](https://arxiv.org/abs/2303.16239).
- [CCM23] T. O. M. Chan, Y.-J. Choi, S. Matsumura, *An injectivity theorem on snc compact Kähler spaces: an application of the theory of harmonic integrals on log-canonical centers via adjoint ideal sheaves*, [arXiv:2307.12025v2](https://arxiv.org/abs/2307.12025v2).
- [CLM23] K. Chan, N. C. Leung, and Z. N. Ma, *Geometry of the Maurer–Cartan equation near degenerate Calabi-Yau varieties*, *J. Differential Geom.* 125 (2023), no. 1, 1-84.
- [CMW23] K. Chan, Z. N. Ma, H. Wen, *A perturbative construction of primitive forms from log Landau–Ginzburg mirrors of toric manifolds*, [arXiv:2312.04239v2](https://arxiv.org/abs/2312.04239v2).
- [Cla08] B. Claudon,  *$\Gamma$ -reduction for smooth orbifolds*, *Manuscripta Math.* 127 (2008), no. 4, 521–532.
- [CFGU97] L. A. Cordero, M. Fernandez, A. Gray, L. Ugarte, *A general description of the terms in the Frölicher spectral sequence*, *Diff. Geom. Applic.* 7 (1997), 75-84.
- [deFEM] T. de Fernex, L. Ein, M. Mustață, *Vanishing theorems and singularities in birational geometry*, available on Ein's homepage.
- [deRK50] G. de Rham, K. Kodaira, *Harmonic Integrals*, Institute for Advanced Study (IAS), Princeton, NJ, 1950. iii+114 pp.
- [Del69] P. Deligne, *Théorème de Lefschetz et critères de dégénérescence de suites spectrales*, *Publ. Math. Inst. Hautes Études Sci.* 35 (1969), 107-126.
- [Del70] P. Deligne, *Equations différentielles à points singuliers réguliers*, *Springer Lect. Notes Math.* 163 (1970).
- [Del86] P. Deligne, *Letter to J. Millson on April 24, 1986*, Scanned copy available on J. Millson's webpage, [Deligne's letter](#).

- [Dem92] J.-P. Demailly, *Singular Hermitian metrics on positive line bundles*, Complex algebraic varieties (Bayreuth, 1990), 87-104, Lecture Notes in Math., 1507, Springer, Berlin, 1992.
- [Dem-eBook] J.-P. Demailly, *Complex analytic and differential geometry* (2012), <http://www-fourier.ujf-grenoble.fr/~demailly/books.html>.
- [EV92] H. Esnault, E. Viehweg, *Lectures on vanishing theorems*, DMV Seminar, 20. Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 1992.
- [FM99] B. Fantechi, M. Manetti, *On the  $T^1$ -lifting theorem*, J. Algebraic Geom., 8 (1):31-39, 1999.
- [Fel22] S. Felten, *Log smooth deformation theory via Gerstenhaber algebras*, Manuscripta Math. 167 (2022), no. 1-2, 1-35.
- [Fel23] S. Felten, *Global logarithmic deformation theory*, arXiv:2310.07949v2.
- [FFR21] S. Felten, M. Filip, H. Ruddat, *Smoothing toroidal crossing spaces*, Forum Math. Pi 9 (2021), Paper No. e7, 36 pp.
- [FP22] S. Felten, A. Petracci, *The logarithmic Bogomolov–Tian–Todorov theorem*, Bull. Lond. Math. Soc. 54 (2022), no. 3, 1051-1066.
- [FPR23] S. Felten, A. Petracci, S. Robins, *Deformations of log Calabi–Yau pairs can be obstructed*, Math. Res. Lett. 30 (2023), no. 5, 1357-1374.
- [FM12] D. Fiorenza, M. Manetti, *Formality of Koszul brackets and deformations of holomorphic Poisson manifolds*, Homology, Homotopy Appl. 14 (2012) 63-75.
- [Fri83] R. Friedman, *Global smoothings of varieties with normal crossings*, Ann. of Math.(2), 118(1):75-114, 1983.
- [FY11] J. Fu, S.-T. Yau, *A note on small deformations of balanced manifolds*, C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris 349 (2011), no. 13-14, 793-796.
- [Fuj-Book] O. Fujino, *Foundations of the minimal model program*, MSJ Memoirs, 35. Mathematical Society of Japan, Tokyo, 2017. xv+289 pp.
- [Fuj17] O. Fujino, *Notes on the weak positivity theorems*, Algebraic varieties and automorphism groups, 73–118, Adv. Stud. Pure Math., 75, Math. Soc. Japan, Tokyo, 2017.
- [Got10] R. Goto, *Deformations of generalized complex and generalized Kähler structures*, J. Differential Geom. 84 (2010) 525-560.
- [GPR94] H. Grauert, T. Peternell, R. Remmert (Eds.), *Several Complex Variables. VII*, Encyclopaedia of Mathematical Sciences, vol. 74, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1994, Sheaf-theoretical methods in complex analysis. A reprint of Current problems in mathematics. Fundamental directions. Vol. 74 (Russian), Vseross. Inst. Nauchn. i Tekhn. Inform. (VINITI), Moscow.
- [GH78] P. Griffiths, J. Harris, *Principles of Algebraic Geometry*, Wiley, New York, 1978.
- [Gro58] A. Grothendieck, *A general theory of fiber spaces with structure sheaf*, Univ. of Kansas report, (1958).
- [Hit11] N. Hitchin, *Deformations of holomorphic Poisson manifolds*, arXiv:1105.4775v1.
- [Huy05] D. Huybrechts, *Complex geometry. An introduction*. Universitext. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2005. xii+309 pp.
- [Iac15] D. Iacono, *Deformations and obstructions of pairs  $(X, D)$* , International Mathematics Research Notices, 2015 (19): 9660-9695.
- [Iac17] D. Iacono, *On the abstract Bogomolov–Tian–Todorov theorem*, Rend. Mat. Appl. (7) 38 (2017), no. 2, 175-198.
- [IM10] D. Iacono, M. Manetti, *An algebraic proof of Bogomolov–Tian–Todorov theorem*, Deformation spaces, 113-133, Aspects Math., E40, Vieweg+Teubner, Wiesbaden, 2010.
- [IM19] D. Iacono, M. Manetti, *On deformations of pairs (manifold, coherent sheaf)*, Canad. J. Math. 71 (2019), no. 5, 1209-1241.
- [IM21] D. Iacono, M. Manetti, *Homotopy abelianity of the DG-Lie algebra controlling deformations of pairs (variety with trivial canonical bundle, line bundle)*, Internat. J. Math. 32 (2021), no. 11, Paper No. 2150086, 7 pp.
- [KKP08] L. Katzarkov, M. Kontsevich, T. Pantev, *Hodge theoretic aspects of mirror symmetry*, From Hodge theory to integrability and TQFT tt\*-geometry, 87-174, Proc. Sympos. Pure Math., 78, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2008.
- [KKP17] L. Katzarkov, M. Kontsevich, T. Pantev, *Bogomolov–Tian–Todorov theorems for Landau–Ginzburg models*, J. Differential Geom. 105 (2017), no. 1, 55-117.
- [Kaw78] Y. Kawamata, *On deformations of compactifiable complex manifolds*, Math. Ann. 235, (1978), 247-265.



- [Kaw92] Y. Kawamata, *Unobstructed deformations. A remark on a paper of Z. Ran: “Deformations of manifolds with torsion or negative canonical bundle”* [*J. Algebraic Geom.* 1 (1992), no. 2, 279-291; MR1144440], *J. Algebraic Geom.* 1 (1992), no. 2, 183-190.
- [KN94] Y. Kawamata, Y. Namikawa, *Logarithmic deformations of normal crossing varieties and smoothing of degenerate Calabi–Yau varieties*, *Invent. math.*, 118, (1994), 395-409.
- [Kin71] J. R. King, *The currents defined by analytic varieties*, *Acta Mathematica*, 127(1):185-220, 1971.
- [Kin83] J. R. King, *Log complexes of currents and functorial properties of the Abel–Jacobi map*, *Duke Math. J.* 50 (1983), no. 1, 1-53.
- [Kon08] M. Kontsevich, *Generalized Tian–Todorov theorems*, *Notes for talk on Kinoshita conference 2008*.
- [Kos85] J. L. Koszul, *Élie Cartan et les mathématiques d’aujourd’hui*, 257-271. Astérisque 1985, Numéro Hors Série. Paris: Société Mathématique de France, 1985.
- [LZ21] S. Li, J. Zhou, *Regularized integrals on Riemann surfaces and modular forms*, *Comm. Math. Phys.* 388 (2021), no. 3, 1403-1474.
- [LRW19] K. Liu, S. Rao, X. Wan, *Geometry of logarithmic forms and deformations of complex structures*, *J. Algebraic Geom.* 28 (2019), no. 4, 773-815.
- [MM07] X. Ma, G. Marinescu, *Holomorphic Morse inequalities and Bergman kernels*, *Progress in Mathematics*, 254. Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 2007.
- [Mane22] M. Manetti, *Lie methods in deformation theory*, Springer Monographs in Mathematics. Springer, Singapore, [2022], 2022. xii+574 pp.
- [Mani99] Yu. I. Manin, *Frobenius manifolds, quantum cohomology, and moduli spaces*, volume 47 of American Mathematical Society Colloquium Publications. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1999.
- [Min01] T. Minagawa, *Deformations of weak Fano 3-folds with only terminal singularities*, *Osaka J. Math.* Volume 38, No. 3 (2001), 533-540.
- [Nog95] J. Noguchi, *A short analytic proof of closedness of logarithmic forms*, *Kodai Math. J.* 18 (1995), no. 2, 295-299.
- [Pop19] D. Popovici, *Holomorphic deformations of balanced Calabi–Yau  $\partial\bar{\partial}$ -manifolds*, *Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble)* 69 (2019), no. 2, 673-728.
- [Ran92] Z. Ran, *Deformations of manifolds with torsion or negative canonical bundle*, *J. Algebraic Geom.*, 1(2):279-291, 1992.
- [Ran17] Z. Ran, *Deformations of holomorphic pseudo-symplectic Poisson manifolds*, *Adv. Math.* 304 (2017), 1156-1175.
- [Ran19] Z. Ran, *A Bogomolov unobstructedness theorem for lo-symplectic manifolds in general position*, *J. Inst. Math. Jussieu* 19 (2018), 1509-1519.
- [RZ18] S. Rao, Q. Zhao, *Several special complex structures and their deformation properties*, *J. Geom. Anal.* 28 (2018), no. 4, 2984-3047.
- [RZ22] S. Rao, R. Zhang, *On extension of closed complex (basic) differential forms: (basic) Hodge numbers and (transversely)  $p$ -Kähler structures*, [arXiv:2204.06870v2](https://arxiv.org/abs/2204.06870v2).
- [RZ20] S. Rao, Y. Zou,  *$\partial\bar{\partial}$ -lemma and double complex*, to appear in *Commun. Math. Stat.*, [version on researchgate](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/358111111).
- [San14] T. Sano, *Unobstructedness of deformations of weak Fano manifolds*, *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN* (2014), no.18, 5124-5133.
- [Sch55] L. Schwartz, *Division par une fonction holomorphe sur une variété analytique complexe*, *Summa Brasil. Math.* 3, 181-209 (1955).
- [Ser06] E. Sernesi, *Deformations of Algebraic Schemes*, Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften 334. New York Berlin: Springer, 2006.
- [Sta] The Stacks Project Authors, *Stacks Project*, <http://stacks.math.columbia.edu>.
- [Ter08] J. Terilla, *Smoothness theorem for differential BV algebras*, *Journal of Topology*, 2008 1: 693-702.
- [Tia87] G. Tian, *Smoothness of the universal deformation space of compact Calabi–Yau manifolds and its Petersson–Weil metric*, *Mathematical aspects of string theory (San Diego, Calif., 1986)*, 629-646, *Adv. Ser. Math. Phys.*, 1, World Sci. Publishing, Singapore, (1987).
- [Tod89] A. Todorov, *The Weil–Petersson geometry of the moduli space of  $SU(n \geq 3)$  (Calabi–Yau) manifolds I*, *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 126 (2), (1989), 325-346.
- [Wan18] X. Wan, *A logarithmic  $\bar{\partial}$ -equation on a compact Kähler manifold associated to a smooth divisor*, [arXiv:1805.11920](https://arxiv.org/abs/1805.11920).

UNIVERSITÉ CÔTE D'AZUR, CNRS, LABORATOIRE J.-A. DIEUDONNÉ, PARC VALROSE, F-06108  
NICE CEDEX 2, FRANCE; SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, WUHAN UNIVERSITY, WUHAN  
430072, CHINA  
*Email address:* `runze.zhang@unice.fr`