

Affine cones over smooth cubic surfaces

Ivan Cheltsov

Jihun Park

Joonyeong Won

Abstract

We show that affine cones over smooth cubic surfaces do not admit non-trivial \mathbb{G}_a -actions.

Keywords. affine cone, α -invariant, anticanonical divisor, cylinder, del Pezzo surface, \mathbb{G}_a -action, log canonical singularity.

Throughout this article, we assume that all considered varieties are algebraic and defined over an algebraically closed field of characteristic 0.

1 Introduction

One of the motivations for the present article originates from the articles of H. A. Schwartz ([34]) and G. H. Halphen ([17]) in the middle of 19th century, where they studied polynomial solutions of Brieskorn-Pham polynomial equations in three variables after L. Euler (1756), J. Liouville (1879) and so fourth ([12]). Meanwhile, since the middle of 20th century the study of rational singularities has witnessed great development ([2], [5], [26]). These two topics, one classic and the other modern, encounter each other in contemporary mathematics. For instance, there is a strong connection between the existence of a rational curve on a normal affine surface, i.e., a polynomial solution to algebraic equations, and rational singularities ([15]).

As an additive analogue of toric geometry, unipotent group actions, specially \mathbb{G}_a -actions, on varieties are very attractive objects to study. Indeed, \mathbb{G}_a -actions have been

I. Cheltsov: School of Mathematics, The University of Edinburgh, James Clerk Maxwell Building, The King's Buildings, Mayfield Road, Edinburgh EH9 3JZ, UK; e-mail: I.Cheltsov@ed.ac.uk

J. Park: Center for Geometry and Physics, Institute for Basic Science (IBS), 77 Cheongam-ro, Nam-gu, Pohang, Gyeongbuk, 790-784, Korea; Department of Mathematics, POSTECH, 77 Cheongam-ro, Nam-gu, Pohang, Gyeongbuk, 790-784, Korea; e-mail: wlog@postech.ac.kr

J. Won: KIAS 85 Hoegiro Dongdaemun-gu, Seoul 130-722, Korea; e-mail: leonwon@kias.re.kr

Mathematics Subject Classification (2010): Primary 14E15, 14J45, 14R20, 14R25; Secondary 14C20, 14E05, 14J17

investigated for their own sake ([3], [18], [29], [35], [40]). We also observe that \mathbb{G}_a -actions appear in the study of rational singularities. In particular, the article [15] shows that a Brieskorn-Pham surface singularity is a cyclic quotient singularity if and only if the surface admits a non-trivial regular \mathbb{G}_a -action. Considering its 3-dimensional analogue, H. Flenner and M. Zaidenberg in 2003 proposed the following question ([15, Question 2.22]):

Does the affine Fermat cubic threefold $x^3 + y^3 + z^3 + w^3 = 0$ in \mathbb{A}^4 admit a non-trivial regular \mathbb{G}_a -action?

Even though it is simple-looking, this problem stands open for 10 years. It turns out that this problem is purely geometric and can be considered in a much wider setting ([19], [20], [21], [22], [31]).

To see the problem from a wider view point, we let X be a smooth projective variety with a polarisation H , where H is an ample divisor on X . The *generalized cone* over (X, H) is the affine variety defined by

$$\hat{X} = \text{Spec} \left(\bigoplus_{n \geq 0} H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(nH)) \right).$$

Remark 1.1. The affine variety \hat{X} is the usual cone over X embedded in a projective space by the linear system $|H|$ provided that H is very ample and the image of the variety X is projectively normal.

Let S_d be a smooth del Pezzo surface of degree d and let \hat{S}_d be the generalized cone over $(S_d, -K_{S_d})$. For $3 \leq d \leq 9$, the anticanonical divisor $-K_{S_d}$ is very ample and the generalized cone \hat{S}_d is the affine cone in \mathbb{A}^{d+1} over the smooth variety anticanonically embedded in \mathbb{P}^d . In particular, for $d = 3$, the cubic surface S_3 is defined by a cubic homogenous polynomial equation $F(x, y, z, w) = 0$ in \mathbb{P}^3 , and hence the generalized cone \hat{S}_3 is the affine hypersurface in \mathbb{A}^4 defined by the equation $F(x, y, z, w) = 0$. For $d = 2$, the generalized cone \hat{S}_2 is the affine cone in \mathbb{A}^4 over the smooth hypersurface in the weighted projective space $\mathbb{P}(1, 1, 1, 2)$ defined by a quasi-homogeneous polynomial of degree 4. For $d = 1$, the generalized cone \hat{S}_1 is the affine cone in \mathbb{A}^4 over the smooth hypersurface in the weighted projective space $\mathbb{P}(1, 1, 2, 3)$ defined by a quasi-homogeneous polynomial of degree 6 ([16, Theorem 4.4]).

It is natural to ask whether the affine variety \hat{S}_d admits a non-trivial \mathbb{G}_a -action. The problem at the beginning is just a special case of this.

T. Kishimoto, Yu. Prokhorov and M. Zaidenberg have been studying this generalized problem and proved the following:

Theorem 1.2. *If $4 \leq d \leq 9$, then the generalized cone \hat{S}_d admits an effective \mathbb{G}_a -action.*

Proof. See [19, Theorem 3.19]. \square

Theorem 1.3. *If $d \leq 2$, then the generalized cone \hat{S}_d does not admit a non-trivial \mathbb{G}_a -action.*

Proof. See [22, Theorem 1.1]. \square

Their proofs make good use of a geometric property called cylindricity, which is worthwhile to be studied for its own sake.

Definition 1.4 ([19]). Let M be a \mathbb{Q} -divisor on a smooth projective variety X . An M -polar cylinder in X is an open subset

$$U = X \setminus \text{Supp}(D)$$

defined by an effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor D on X with $D \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} M$ such that U is isomorphic to $Z \times \mathbb{A}^1$ for some affine variety Z .

They show that the existence of an H -polar cylinder on X is equivalent to the existence of a non-trivial \mathbb{G}_a -action on the generalized cone over (X, H) .

Lemma 1.5. *Let H be an ample Cartier divisor on a smooth projective variety X . Suppose that the generalized cone \hat{X} over (X, H) is normal. Then the generalized cone \hat{X} admits an effective \mathbb{G}_a -action if and only if X contains an H -polar cylinder.*

Proof. See [21, Corollary 3.2]. \square

Remark 1.6. If X is a rational surface, then there always exists an ample Cartier divisor H on X such that \hat{X} is normal and X contains an H -polar cylinder (see [19, Proposition 3.13]), which implies, in particular, that \hat{X} admits an effective \mathbb{G}_a -action.

Indeed, what T. Kishimoto, Yu. Prokhorov and M. Zaidenberg proved for their two theorems is that the del Pezzo surface S_d has a $(-K_{S_d})$ -polar cylinder if $4 \leq d \leq 9$ but no $(-K_{S_d})$ -polar cylinder if $d \leq 2$.

The main result of the present article is

Theorem 1.7. *A smooth cubic surface S_3 in \mathbb{P}^3 does not contain any $(-K_{S_3})$ -polar cylinders.*

Together with Theorems 1.2 and 1.3, this makes us reach the following conclusion via Lemma 1.5.

Corollary 1.8. *Let S_d be a smooth del Pezzo surface of degree d . Then the generalized cone over $(S_d, -K_{S_d})$ admits a non-trivial regular \mathbb{G}_a -action if and only if $d \geq 4$.*

In particular, we here present a long-expected answer to the question raised by H. Flenner and M. Zaidenberg.

Corollary 1.9. *The affine Fermat cubic threefold $x^3 + y^3 + z^3 + w^3 = 0$ in \mathbb{A}^4 does not admit a non-trivial regular \mathbb{G}_a -action.*

The following lemma shows that having anticanonical cylinders on del Pezzo surfaces is strongly related to the log canonical thresholds of their effective anticanonical \mathbb{Q} -divisors³. It may also be one example that shows how important it is to study singularities of effective anticanonical \mathbb{Q} -divisors on Fano manifolds. Indeed, the proof of Theorem 1.7 is substantially based on the lemma below.

Lemma 1.10. *Let S_d be a smooth del Pezzo surface of degree $d \leq 4$. Suppose that S_d contains a $(-K_{S_d})$ -polar cylinder, i.e., there is an open affine subset $U \subset S_d$ and an effective anticanonical \mathbb{Q} -divisor D such that $U = S_d \setminus \text{Supp}(D)$ and $U \cong Z \times \mathbb{A}^1$ for some smooth rational affine curve Z . Then there exists a point P on S_d such that*

- *the log pair (S_d, D) is not log canonical at the point P ;*
- *if there exists a unique divisor T in the anticanonical linear system $|-K_{S_d}|$ such that the log pair (S_d, T) is not log canonical at P , then there is an effective anticanonical \mathbb{Q} -divisor D' on the surface S_d such that*
 - *the log pair (S_d, D') is not log canonical at P ;*
 - *the support of the divisor T is not contained in the support of D' .*

Proof. This follows from [19, Lemma 4.11] and the proof of [19, Lemma 4.14] (cf. the proof of [22, Lemma 5.3]). Since the proof is presented dispersedly in [19] or [22], for the convenience of the readers, we give a detailed and streamlined proof in Appendix A. \square

Applying Lemma 2.2 below, we easily obtain

Corollary 1.11. *Let S_3 be a smooth del Pezzo surface of degree 3. Suppose that S_3 contains a $(-K_{S_3})$ -polar cylinder. Then there is an effective anticanonical \mathbb{Q} -divisor D on S_3 such that*

- *the log pair (S_3, D) is not log canonical at some point P on S_3 ;*
- *the support of D does not contain at least one irreducible component of the tangent hyperplane section T_P of S_3 at the point P .*

³An anticanonical \mathbb{Q} -divisor on a variety X is a \mathbb{Q} -divisor \mathbb{Q} -linearly equivalent to an anticanonical divisor of X , meanwhile, an effective anticanonical divisor on X is a member of the anticanonical linear system $|-K_X|$.

In order to prove Theorem 1.7, it suffices to show that there is no such a divisor D described in Corollary 1.11 on a smooth del Pezzo surface of degree 3. In this article, this will be done in a bit wider setting. To be precise, we prove

Theorem 1.12. *Let S_d be a smooth del Pezzo surface of degree $d \leq 3$ and let D be an effective anticanonical \mathbb{Q} -divisor on S_d . Suppose that the log pair (S_d, D) is not log canonical at a point P . Then there exists a unique divisor T in the anticanonical linear system $|-K_{S_d}|$ such that the log pair (S_d, T) is not log canonical at the point P . Moreover, the support of D contains all the irreducible components of $\text{Supp}(T)$.*

Corollary 1.13. *Let S_3 be a smooth cubic surface in \mathbb{P}^3 and let D be an effective anticanonical \mathbb{Q} -divisor on S_3 . Suppose that the log pair (S_3, D) is not log canonical at a point P . Then for the tangent hyperplane section T_P at the point P , the log pair (S_3, T_P) is not log canonical at P and $\text{Supp}(D)$ contains all the irreducible components of $\text{Supp}(T_P)$.*

Note that Corollary 1.13 contradicts the conclusion of Corollary 1.11. This simply means that the hypothesis of Corollary 1.11 fails to be true. This shows that Theorem 1.12 implies Theorem 1.7. Moreover, we see that Theorem 1.12 recovers Theorem 1.3 through Lemma 1.10 as well.

Remark 1.14. The condition $d \leq 3$ is crucial in Theorem 1.12. Indeed, if $d \geq 4$, then the assertion of Theorem 1.12 is no longer true (see the proof of [19, Theorem 3.19]). For example, consider the case when $d = 4$. There exists a birational morphism $f: S_4 \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^2$ such that f is the blow up of \mathbb{P}^2 at five points that lie on a unique irreducible conic. Denote this conic by C . Let \tilde{C} be the proper transform of the conic C on the surface S_4 and let E_1, \dots, E_5 be the exceptional divisors of the morphism f . Put

$$D = \frac{3}{2}\tilde{C} + \sum_{i=1}^5 \frac{1}{2}E_i.$$

It is an effective anticanonical \mathbb{Q} -divisor on S_4 and the log pair (S_4, D) is not log canonical at any point P on \tilde{C} . Moreover, for any $T \in |-K_{S_4}|$, its support cannot be contained in the support of the divisor D .

To our surprise, Theorem 1.12 has other applications that are interesting for their own sake.

From here to the end of this section, let X be a projective variety with at worst Kawamata log terminal singularities and let H be an ample divisor on X .

Definition 1.15. The α -invariant of the log pair (X, H) is the number defined by

$$\alpha(X, H) = \sup \left\{ \lambda \in \mathbb{Q} \mid \begin{array}{l} \text{the log pair } (X, \lambda D) \text{ is log canonical for every} \\ \text{effective } \mathbb{Q}\text{-divisor } D \text{ on } X \text{ with } D \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} H. \end{array} \right\}.$$

The invariant $\alpha(X, H)$ has been studied intensively by many authors who used different notations for $\alpha(X, H)$ ([1], [6], [14], [4, § 3.4] [10, Definition 3.1.1], [11, Appendix A], [38, Appendix 2]). The notation $\alpha(X, H)$ is due to G. Tian who defined $\alpha(X, H)$ in a different way ([38, Appendix 2]). However, both the definitions coincide by [11, Theorem A.3]. In the case when X is a Fano variety, the invariant $\alpha(X, -K_X)$ is known as the famous α -invariant of Tian and it is denoted simply by $\alpha(X)$. The α -invariant of Tian plays a very important role in Kähler geometry due to the following.

Theorem 1.16 ([13], [30], [36]). *Let X be a Fano variety of dimension n with at worst quotient singularities. If $\alpha(X) > \frac{n}{n+1}$, then X admits an orbifold Kähler–Einstein metric.*

The exact values of the α -invariants of smooth del Pezzo surfaces, as below, have been obtained in [7, Theorem 1.7]. Those of del Pezzo surfaces defined over a field of positive characteristic are presented in [28, Theorem 1.6] and those of del Pezzo surfaces with du Val singularities in [8] and [33].

Theorem 1.17. *Let S_d be a smooth del Pezzo surface of degree d . Then*

$$\alpha(S_d) = \begin{cases} 1/3 & \text{if } d = 9, 7 \text{ or } d = 8 \text{ and } S_8 = \mathbb{F}_1; \\ 1/2 & \text{if } d = 6, 5 \text{ or } d = 8 \text{ and } S_8 = \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1; \\ 2/3 & \text{if } d = 4; \end{cases}$$

$$\alpha(S_3) = \begin{cases} 2/3 & \text{if } S_3 \text{ is a cubic surface in } \mathbb{P}^3 \text{ with an Eckardt point;} \\ 3/4 & \text{if } S_3 \text{ is a cubic surface in } \mathbb{P}^3 \text{ without Eckardt points;} \end{cases}$$

$$\alpha(S_2) = \begin{cases} 3/4 & \text{if } |-K_{S_2}| \text{ has a tacnodal curve;} \\ 5/6 & \text{if } |-K_{S_2}| \text{ has no tacnodal curves;} \end{cases}$$

$$\alpha(S_1) = \begin{cases} 5/6 & \text{if } |-K_{S_1}| \text{ has a cuspidal curve;} \\ 1 & \text{if } |-K_{S_1}| \text{ has no cuspidal curves.} \end{cases}$$

Remark 1.18. Theorem 1.12 also provides the exact values of the α -invariants for smooth del Pezzo surfaces of degrees ≤ 3 . We here show how to extract the values from Theorem 1.12. Let ν be the greatest number such that $(S_d, \nu C)$ is log canonical for every member C in $|-K_{S_d}|$. The number ν can be easily obtained from [32, Section 3] and checked to be the same as the value listed in Theorem 1.17 for the α -invariant of S_d . By the definition of ν , there is an effective anticanonical divisor C on the surface S_d such that $(S_d, \nu C)$ is log canonical but not Kawamata log terminal. This gives us $\alpha(S_d) \leq \nu$.

Suppose that $\alpha(S_d) < \nu$. Then there are an effective anticanonical \mathbb{Q} -divisor D and a positive rational number $\lambda < \nu$ such that $(S_d, \lambda D)$ is not log canonical at some point P on S_d . Since $\lambda < 1$, the log pair (S_d, D) is not log canonical at the point P either. By Theorem 1.12, there exists a divisor $T \in |-K_{S_d}|$ such that (S_d, T) is not log canonical at P . In addition, $\text{Supp}(D)$ contains all the irreducible components of $\text{Supp}(T)$.

The log pair $(S_d, \lambda T)$ is log canonical since $\lambda < \nu$. Put $D_\epsilon = (1 + \epsilon)D - \epsilon T$ for every non-negative rational number ϵ . Then $D_0 = D$ and D_ϵ is effective for $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$ because $\text{Supp}(D)$ contains all the irreducible components of $\text{Supp}(T)$. Choose the greatest ϵ such that D_ϵ is still effective. Then $\text{Supp}(D_\epsilon)$ does not contain at least one irreducible component of $\text{Supp}(T)$.

Since $(S_d, \lambda T)$ is log canonical at P and $(S_d, \lambda D)$ is not log canonical at P , the log pair $(S_d, \lambda D_\epsilon)$ is not log canonical at P (see Lemma 2.2). In particular, the log pair (S_d, D_ϵ) is not log canonical at P . However, this contradicts Theorem 1.12 since D_ϵ is an effective anticanonical \mathbb{Q} -divisor. Therefore, $\alpha(S_d) = \nu$.

Corollary 1.19. *Let S_d be a smooth del Pezzo surface of degree $d \leq 3$. If $d = 3$, suppose, in addition, that S_3 does not contain an Eckardt point. Then S_d admits a Kähler–Einstein metric.*

The problem on the existence of Kähler–Einstein metrics on smooth del Pezzo surfaces is completely solved by G. Tian and S.-T. Yau in [37] and [39]. In particular, Corollary 1.19 follows from [37, Main Theorem].

The invariant $\alpha(X, H)$ has a global nature. It measures the singularities of effective \mathbb{Q} -divisors on X in a fixed \mathbb{Q} -linear equivalence class. F. Ambro suggested in [1] a function that encodes the local behavior of $\alpha(X, H)$.

Definition 1.20 ([1]). The α -function α_X^H of the log pair (X, H) is a function on X into real numbers defined as follows: for a given point $P \in X$,

$$\alpha_X^H(P) = \sup \left\{ \lambda \in \mathbb{Q} \left| \begin{array}{l} \text{the log pair } (X, \lambda D) \text{ is log canonical at } P \text{ for} \\ \text{every effective } \mathbb{Q}\text{-divisor } D \text{ on } X \text{ with } D \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} H. \end{array} \right. \right\}.$$

Lemma 1.21. *The identity $\alpha(X, H) = \inf_{P \in X} \alpha_X^H(P)$ holds.*

Proof. It is easy to check. □

In the case when X is a Fano variety, we denote the α -function of the log pair $(X, -K_X)$ simply by α_X .

Example 1.22. One can easily see that $\alpha_{\mathbb{P}^n}(P) \leq \frac{1}{n+1}$ for every point P on \mathbb{P}^n . This implies that the α -function $\alpha_{\mathbb{P}^n}$ is the constant function with the value $\frac{1}{n+1}$ since $\alpha(\mathbb{P}^n) = \frac{1}{n+1}$.

Example 1.23. It is easy to see $\alpha_{\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1}(P) \leq \frac{1}{2}$ for every point P on $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$. Since $\alpha(\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1) = \frac{1}{2}$ by Theorem 1.17, the α -function $\alpha_{\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1}$ is the constant function with the value $\frac{1}{2}$ by Lemma 1.21. Moreover, if X is a Fano variety with at most Kawamata log terminal singularities, then the proof of [11, Lemma 2.21] shows that

$$\alpha_{X \times \mathbb{P}^1}(P) = \min \left\{ \frac{1}{2}, \alpha_X(\text{pr}_1(P)) \right\}$$

for every point P on $X \times \mathbb{P}^1$, where $\text{pr}_1 : X \times \mathbb{P}^1 \rightarrow X$ is the projection on the first factor. Using the same argument as that in the proof of [11, Lemma 2.29], one can show that the α -function of a product of Fano varieties with at most Gorenstein canonical singularities is the point-wise minimum of the pull-backs of the α -functions on the factors.

As shown in Remark 1.18, the following can be obtained from Theorem 1.12 in a similar manner.

Corollary 1.24. *Let S_d be a smooth del Pezzo surface of degree $d \leq 3$. Then the α -function of S_d is as follows:*

$$\alpha_{S_3}(P) = \begin{cases} 2/3 & \text{if the point } P \text{ is an Eckardt point;} \\ 3/4 & \text{if the tangent hyperplane section at } P \text{ has a tacnode at } P; \\ 5/6 & \text{if the tangent hyperplane section at } P \text{ has a cusp at } P; \\ 1 & \text{otherwise;} \end{cases}$$

$$\alpha_{S_2}(P) = \begin{cases} 3/4 & \text{if there is an effective anticanonical divisor with a tacnode at } P; \\ 5/6 & \text{if there is an effective anticanonical divisor with a cusp at } P; \\ 1 & \text{otherwise;} \end{cases}$$

$$\alpha_{S_1}(P) = \begin{cases} 5/6 & \text{if there is an effective anticanonical divisor with a cusp at } P; \\ 1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

By Lemma 1.21, Corollary 1.24 implies that Theorem 1.17 holds for smooth del Pezzo surfaces of degrees at most 3. Thus, it is quite natural that we should extend Corollary 1.24 to all smooth del Pezzo surfaces in order to obtain a functional generalisation of Theorem 1.17. This will be done in Section 6, where we prove

Theorem 1.25. *Let S_d be a smooth del Pezzo surface of degree $d \geq 4$. Then the α -function of S_d is as follows:*

$$\alpha_{\mathbb{P}^2}(P) = 1/3;$$

$$\alpha_{\mathbb{F}_1}(P) = 1/3; \quad \alpha_{\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1}(P) = 1/2;$$

$$\alpha_{S_7}(P) = \begin{cases} 1/3 & \text{if the point } P \text{ lies on the } (-1)\text{-curve that} \\ & \text{intersects two other } (-1)\text{-curves;} \\ 1/2 & \text{otherwise;} \end{cases}$$

$$\alpha_{S_6}(P) = 1/2;$$

$$\alpha_{S_5}(P) = \begin{cases} 1/2 & \text{if there is } (-1)\text{-curve passing through the point } P; \\ 2/3 & \text{if there is no } (-1)\text{-curve passing through } P; \end{cases}$$

$$\alpha_{S_4}(P) = \begin{cases} 2/3 & \text{if } P \text{ is on a } (-1)\text{-curve;} \\ 3/4 & \text{if there is an effective anticanonical divisor that} \\ & \text{consists of two } 0\text{-curves intersecting tangentially at } P; \\ 5/6 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The primary statement in this article is Theorem 1.12. As explained before, it immediately implies the main result of the article, Theorem 1.7 and also recovers Theorem 1.3. Theorem 1.12 will be proved in the following way.

In Section 2, we review the results that will be used in this article. As a warm-up, we verify Theorem 1.12 for a smooth del Pezzo surface of degree 1 (see Lemma 2.3). This is very easy and instructive.

In Section 3, we establish two results about *singular* del Pezzo surfaces of degree 2 that play a role in the proof of Theorems 1.12 for smooth cubic surfaces. In addition, these two results immediately yield Theorem 1.12 for a smooth del Pezzo surface of degree 2 (see Lemma 3.4).

In Section 4, we prove Theorem 1.12 for a smooth cubic surface. This will be done by a thorough case-by-case analysis of all possible types of tangent hyperplane sections on a smooth cubic surface. Indeed, for a given point P on the smooth cubic surface, we show that every effective anticanonical \mathbb{Q} -divisor is log canonical at P if the tangent hyperplane section at P is log canonical at P (Lemmas 4.7, 4.8 and 4.9), whereas we show that its support contains the support of the tangent hyperplane section at P if an effective anticanonical \mathbb{Q} divisor and the tangent hyperplane section at P are not log canonical at P (see Lemmas 4.3, 4.5 and 4.6).

The proof of Lemma 4.8 deserves a separate section because it is the central and the most beautiful part of the article and it is a bit lengthy. This will be presented in Section 5.

Appendix A will deal with Lemma 1.10 for the readers' convenience.

2 Preliminaries

This section presents simple but essential tools for the article. Most of the described results here are well-known and valid in much more general settings (cf. [23], [24] and [25]).

Let S be a projective surface with at most du Val singularities, let P be a smooth point of the surface S and let D be an effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor on S .

Lemma 2.1. *If the log pair (S, D) is not log canonical at the smooth point P , then*

$$\text{mult}_P(D) > 1.$$

Proof. This is a well-known fact. See [25, Proposition 9.5.13], for instance. □

Write $D = \sum_{i=1}^r a_i D_i$, where D_i 's are distinct prime divisors on the surface S and a_i 's are positive rational numbers.

Lemma 2.2. *Let T be an effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor on S such that*

- $T \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} D$ but $T \neq D$;

- $T = \sum_{i=1}^r b_i D_i$ for some non-negative rational numbers b_1, \dots, b_r .

For every non-negative rational number ϵ , put $D_\epsilon = (1 + \epsilon)D - \epsilon T$. Then

1. $D_\epsilon \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} D$ for every $\epsilon \geq 0$;
2. the set $\{\epsilon \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0} \mid D_\epsilon \text{ is effective}\}$ attains the maximum μ ;
3. the support of the divisor D_μ does not contain at least one component of $\text{Supp}(T)$;
4. if (S, T) is log canonical at P but (S, D) is not log canonical at P , then (S, D_μ) is not log canonical at P .

Proof. The first assertion is obvious. For the rest we put

$$c = \max \left\{ \frac{b_i}{a_i} \mid i = 1, \dots, r \right\}.$$

For some index k we have $c = \frac{b_k}{a_k}$.

Suppose that $c \leq 1$. Then $a_i \geq b_i$ for every i . This means that the divisor $D - T = \sum_{i=1}^r (a_i - b_i)D_i$ is effective. However, it is impossible since $D - T$ is non-zero and numerically trivial on a projective surface. Thus, $c > 1$, and hence $b_k > a_k$.

Put $\mu = \frac{1}{c-1}$. Then $\mu = \frac{a_k}{b_k - a_k} > 0$ and

$$D_\mu = \frac{b_k}{b_k - a_k} D - \frac{a_k}{b_k - a_k} T = \sum_{i=1}^r \frac{b_k a_i - a_k b_i}{b_k - a_k} D_i,$$

where $b_k a_i - a_k b_i \geq 0$ by the choice of k . In particular, the divisor D_μ is effective and its support does not contain the curve D_k . Moreover, for every positive rational number ϵ , $D_\epsilon = \sum_{i=1}^r (a_i + \epsilon a_i - \epsilon b_i) D_i$. If $\epsilon > \mu$, then

$$\epsilon(b_k - a_k) > \mu(b_k - a_k) = \frac{a_k}{b_k - a_k} (b_k - a_k) = a_k,$$

and hence D_ϵ is not effective. This proves the second and the third assertions.

If both (S, T) and (S, D_μ) are log canonical at P , then (S, D) must be log canonical at P because $D = \frac{\mu}{1+\mu} T + \frac{1}{1+\mu} D_\mu$ and $\frac{\mu}{1+\mu} + \frac{1}{1+\mu} = 1$. \square

Despite its naïve appearance, Lemma 2.2 is a very handy tool. To illustrate this, we here verify Theorem 1.12 for a del Pezzo surface of degree 1. This simple case also immediately follows from the proof of [7, Lemma 3.1] or from the proof of [22, Proposition 5.1].

Lemma 2.3. *Suppose that S is a smooth del Pezzo surface of degree 1 and D is an effective anticanonical \mathbb{Q} -divisor on S . If the log pair (S, D) is not log canonical at the point P , then there exists a unique divisor $T \in |-K_S|$ such that (S, T) is not log canonical at P . Moreover, the support of D contains all the irreducible components of T .*

Proof. Let T be a curve in $| -K_S |$ that passes through the point P . Note that T is irreducible. If the log pair (S, T) is log canonical at P , then it follows from Lemma 2.2 that there exists an effective anticanonical \mathbb{Q} -divisor D' on the surface S such that the log pair (S, D') is not log canonical at P and $\text{Supp}(D')$ does not contain the curve T . We then obtain $1 = T \cdot D' \geq \text{mult}_P(D')$. This is impossible by Lemma 2.1. Thus, the log pair (S, T) is not log canonical at P .

Moreover, by Lemma 2.1 the divisor T is singular at the point P . Therefore, the point P is not the base point of the pencil $| -K_S |$. Consequently, such a divisor T is unique.

If the curve T is not contained in $\text{Supp}(D)$, then we obtain an absurd inequality $1 = T \cdot D \geq \text{mult}_P(D) > 1$. Therefore, the curve T must be contained in $\text{Supp}(D)$ by Lemma 2.1. \square

The following is a ready-made Adjunction for our situation.

Lemma 2.4. *Suppose that the log pair (S, D) is not log canonical at the smooth point P . If a component D_j with $a_j \leq 1$ is smooth at P , then*

$$D_j \cdot \left(\sum_{i \neq j} a_i D_i \right) \geq \sum_{i \neq j} a_i (D_j \cdot D_i)_P > 1,$$

where $(D_j \cdot D_i)_P$ is the local intersection number of C_i and C_j at P .

Proof. It immediately follows from [24, Theorem 5.50]. \square

Let $f: \tilde{S} \rightarrow S$ be the blow up of the surface S at the point P with the exceptional divisor E and let \tilde{D} be the proper transform of D by the blow up f . Then

$$K_{\tilde{S}} + \tilde{D} + (\text{mult}_P(D) - 1)E = f^*(K_S + D).$$

The log pair (S, D) is log canonical at P if and only if the log pair $(\tilde{S}, \tilde{D} + (\text{mult}_P(D) - 1)E)$ is log canonical along the curve E .

Remark 2.5. If the log pair (S, D) is not log canonical at P , then there exists a point Q on E at which the log pair $(\tilde{S}, \tilde{D} + (\text{mult}_P(D) - 1)E)$ is not log canonical. Lemma 2.1 then implies

$$\text{mult}_P(D) + \text{mult}_Q(\tilde{D}) > 2. \quad (2.1)$$

If $\text{mult}_P(D) \leq 2$, then the log pair $(\tilde{S}, \tilde{D} + (\text{mult}_P(D) - 1)E)$ is log canonical at every point of the curve E other than the point Q . Indeed, if the log pair $(\tilde{S}, \tilde{D} + (\text{mult}_P(D) - 1)E)$ is not log canonical at another point O on E , then Lemma 2.4 generates an absurd inequality

$$2 \geq \text{mult}_P(D) = \tilde{D} \cdot E \geq \text{mult}_Q(\tilde{D}) + \text{mult}_O(\tilde{D}) > 2.$$

Notation 2.6. From now on, when we have a birational morphism of a surface denoted by a capital roman character with tilde onto a surface, in order to denote the proper transform of a divisor by this morphism, we will add tilde to the same character that denotes the original divisor. For example, in the similar situation as the one preceding Remark 2.5, we use \tilde{D} for the proper transform of D by f without mentioning.

3 Del Pezzo surfaces of degree 2

Let S be a del Pezzo surface of degree 2 with at most two ordinary double points. Then the linear system $| -K_S |$ is base-point-free and induces a double cover $\pi: S \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^2$ ramified along a reduced quartic curve $R \subset \mathbb{P}^2$. Moreover, the curve R has at most two ordinary double points. In particular, the quartic curve R is irreducible.

Lemma 3.1. *For an effective anticanonical \mathbb{Q} -divisor D on S , the log pair (S, D) is log canonical outside finitely many points on S .*

Proof. Suppose the converse. Then we may write $D = a_1 C_1 + \Omega$, where C_1 is an irreducible reduced curve, a_1 is a positive rational number strictly bigger than 1 and Ω is an effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor whose support does not contain the curve C_1 . Since

$$2 = -K_S \cdot D = -K_S \cdot (a_1 C_1 + \Omega) = -a_1 K_S \cdot C_1 - K_S \cdot \Omega \geq -a_1 K_S \cdot C_1 > -K_S \cdot C_1,$$

we have $-K_S \cdot C_1 = 1$. Then $\pi(C_1)$ is a line in \mathbb{P}^2 . Thus, there exists an irreducible reduced curve C_2 on S such that $C_1 + C_2 \sim -K_S$ and $\pi(C_1) = \pi(C_2)$. Note that $C_1 = C_2$ if and only if the line $\pi(C_1)$ is an irreducible component of the branch curve R . Since R is irreducible, this is not the case. Thus, we have $C_1 \neq C_2$.

Note that $C_1^2 = C_2^2$ because C_1 and C_2 are interchanged by the biregular involution of S induced by the double cover π . Thus, we have

$$2 = (-K_S)^2 = (C_1 + C_2)^2 = 2C_1^2 + 2C_1 \cdot C_2,$$

which implies that $C_1 \cdot C_2 = 1 - C_1^2$. Since C_1 and C_2 are smooth rational curves, we can easily obtain $C_1^2 = C_2^2 = -1 + \frac{k}{2}$, where k is the number of singular points of S that lie on C_1 .

Now we write $D = a_1 C_1 + a_2 C_2 + \Gamma$, where a_2 is a non-negative rational number and Γ is an effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor whose support contains neither C_1 nor C_2 . Then

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &= C_1 \cdot (a_1 C_1 + a_2 C_2 + \Gamma) = a_1 C_1^2 + a_2 C_1 \cdot C_2 + C_1 \cdot \Gamma \\ &\geq a_1 C_1^2 + a_2 C_1 \cdot C_2 = a_1 C_1^2 + a_2 (1 - C_1^2), \end{aligned}$$

and hence $1 \geq a_1 C_1^2 + a_2 (1 - C_1^2)$. Similarly, from $C_2 \cdot D = 1$, we obtain $1 \geq a_2 C_1^2 + a_1 (1 - C_1^2)$. The obtained two inequalities imply that $a_1 \leq 1$ and $a_2 \leq 1$ since $C_1^2 = -1 + \frac{k}{2}$, $k = 0, 1, 2$. Since $a_1 > 1$ by our assumption, this is a contradiction. \square

The following two lemmas can be verified in a similar way as that of [7, Lemma 3.5]. Nevertheless we present their proofs since we should carefully deal with singular points on S that have been considered neither in [7] nor in [22].

Lemma 3.2. *For any effective anticanonical \mathbb{Q} -divisor D on S , the log pair (S, D) is log canonical at every point outside the ramification divisor of the double cover π .*

Proof. Suppose that (S, D) is not log canonical at a point P whose image by π lies outside R .

Let H be a general curve in $|-K_S|$ that passes through the point P . Since $\pi(P) \notin R$, the surface S is smooth at the point P . Then

$$2 = H \cdot D \geq \text{mult}_P(H)\text{mult}_P(D) \geq \text{mult}_P(D),$$

and hence $\text{mult}_P(D) \leq 2$.

Let $f: \tilde{S} \rightarrow S$ be the blow up of the surface S at P . We have

$$K_{\tilde{S}} + \tilde{D} + (\text{mult}_P(D) - 1)E = f^*(K_S + D),$$

where E is the exceptional curve of the blow up f . Then, Remark 2.5 gives a unique point Q on E such that the log pair $(\tilde{S}, \tilde{D} + (\text{mult}_P(D) - 1)E)$ is not log canonical at Q on E .

Since $\pi(P) \notin R$, there exists a unique reduced but possibly reducible curve $C \in |-K_S|$ such that C passes through P and its proper transform \tilde{C} passes through the point Q . Note that C is smooth at P . Since (S, C) is log canonical at P , Lemma 2.2 enables us to assume that the support of D does not contain at least one irreducible component of C .

If the curve C is irreducible, then

$$2 - \text{mult}_P(D) = 2 - \text{mult}_P(C)\text{mult}_P(D) = \tilde{C} \cdot \tilde{D} \geq \text{mult}_Q(\tilde{C})\text{mult}_Q(\tilde{D}) = \text{mult}_Q(\tilde{D}).$$

This contradicts (2.1). Thus, the curve C must be reducible.

We may then write $C = C_1 + C_2$, where C_1 and C_2 are irreducible smooth curves that intersect at two points. Without loss of generality we may assume that the curve C_1 is not contained in the support of D . The point P must belong to C_2 : otherwise we would have

$$1 = D \cdot C_1 \geq \text{mult}_P(D) > 1.$$

We put $D = aC_2 + \Omega$, where a is a non-negative rational number and Ω is an effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor whose support does not contain the curve C_2 . Then

$$1 = C_1 \cdot D = (2 - \frac{1}{2}k)a + C_1 \cdot \Omega \geq (2 - \frac{1}{2}k)a,$$

where k is the number of singular points of S on C_1 . On the other hand, the log pair $(\tilde{S}, a\tilde{C}_2 + \tilde{\Omega} + (\text{mult}_P(D) - 1)E)$ is not log canonical at Q , where we have $a \leq 1$ by Lemma 3.1. We then obtain

$$(2 - \frac{1}{2}k)a = \tilde{C}_2 \cdot (\tilde{\Omega} + (\text{mult}_P(D) - 1)E) > 1$$

from Lemma 2.4. This is a contradiction. \square

Lemma 3.3. *For a smooth point P of S with $\pi(P) \in R$, let T_P be the unique divisor in $|-K_S|$ that is singular at the point P . If the log pair (S, T_P) is log canonical at P , then for any effective anticanonical \mathbb{Q} -divisor D on S the log pair (S, D) is log canonical at P .*

Proof. Suppose that (S, D) is not log canonical at the point P . Applying Lemma 2.2 to the log pairs (S, D) and (S, T_P) , we may assume that $\text{Supp}(D)$ does not contain at least one irreducible component of T_P . Thus, if the divisor T_P is irreducible, then Lemma 2.1 gives an absurd inequality

$$2 = T_P \cdot D \geq \text{mult}_P(T_P)\text{mult}_P(D) \geq 2\text{mult}_P(D) > 2$$

since T_P is singular at P . Hence, T_P must be reducible.

We may then write $T_P = T_1 + T_2$, where T_1 and T_2 are smooth rational curves. Note that the point P is one of the intersection points of T_1 and T_2 . Without loss of generality, we may assume that the curve T_1 is not contained in the support of D . Then

$$1 = T_1 \cdot D \geq \text{mult}_P(T_1)\text{mult}_P(D) = \text{mult}_P(D) > 1$$

by Lemma 2.1. The obtained contradiction completes the proof. \square

Lemmas 3.2 and 3.3 prove the following result.

Lemma 3.4. *Suppose that the del Pezzo surface S of degree 2 is smooth. Let D be an effective anticanonical \mathbb{Q} -divisor on S . Suppose that the log pair (S, D) is not log canonical at a point P . Then there exists a unique divisor $T \in |-K_S|$ such that (S, T) is not log canonical at P . The support of the divisor D contains all the irreducible components of T . The divisor T is either an irreducible rational curve with a cusp at P or a union of two (-1) -curves meeting tangentially at P .*

Proof. By Lemma 3.2, the point $\pi(P)$ must lie on R . Then there exists a unique curve $T \in |-K_S|$ that is singular at the point P . By Lemma 3.3, the log pair (S, T) is not log canonical at P .

Suppose that the support of D does not contain an irreducible component of T . Then the proof of Lemma 3.3 works verbatim to derive a contradiction.

The last assertion immediately follows from [32, Proposition 3.2]. \square

Lemma 3.4 shows that Theorem 1.12 holds for a smooth del Pezzo surface of degree 2.

4 Cubic surfaces

In the present section we prove Theorem 1.12. Lemma 2.3 and Lemma 3.4 show that Theorem 1.12 holds for del Pezzo surfaces of degrees 1 and 2, respectively. Thus, to

complete the proof, we let S be a smooth cubic surface in \mathbb{P}^3 and let D be an effective anticanonical \mathbb{Q} -divisor on S .

Lemma 4.1. *The log pair (S, D) is log canonical outside finitely many points.*

Proof. Suppose not. Then we may write $D = aC + \Omega$, where C is an irreducible curve, a is a positive rational number strictly bigger than 1 and Ω is an effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor whose support does not contain the curve C . Then

$$3 = -K_S \cdot (aC + \Omega) = -aK_S \cdot C - K_S \cdot \Omega \geq -aK_S \cdot C > -K_S \cdot C.$$

This implies that C is either a line or an irreducible conic.

Suppose that C is a line. Let Z be a general irreducible conic on S such that $Z + C \sim -K_S$. Since Z is general, it is not contained in the support of D . We then obtain

$$2 = Z \cdot D = Z \cdot (aC + \Omega) = 2a + Z \cdot \Omega \geq 2a.$$

This contradicts our assumption.

Suppose that C is an irreducible conic. Then there exists a unique line L on S such that $L + C \sim -K_S$. Write $D = aC + bL + \Gamma$, where b is a non-negative rational number and Γ is an effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor whose support contains neither the conic C nor the line L . Then

$$1 = L \cdot D = L \cdot (aC + bL + \Gamma) = 2a - b + L \cdot \Gamma \geq 2a - b.$$

On the other hand,

$$2 = C \cdot D = C \cdot (aC + bL + \Gamma) = 2b + C \cdot \Gamma \geq 2b.$$

Combining these two inequalities, we obtain $a \leq 1$. This contradicts our assumption too. \square

For a point P on S , let T_P be the tangent hyperplane section of the surface S at the point P . This is the unique anticanonical divisor that is singular at P . The curve T_P is reduced but it may be reducible.

In order to prove Theorem 1.12 we must show that (S, D) is log canonical at P provided that one of the following two conditions is satisfied:

- the log pair (S, T_P) is log canonical at P ;
- the log pair (S, T_P) is not log canonical at P but $\text{Supp}(D)$ does not contain at least one irreducible component of T_P .

The log pair (S, T_P) is log canonical at P if and only if the point P is an ordinary double point of T_P (see [32, Proposition 3.2]). Thus, (S, T_P) is log canonical at P if and only if T_P is one of the following curves: an irreducible cubic curve with one ordinary double point, a union of three coplanar lines that do not intersect at one point, a union of a line and a conic that intersect transversally at two points.

Overall, we must consider the following cases:

- (a) T_P is a union of three lines that intersect at P (Eckardt point);
- (b) T_P is a union of a line and a conic that intersect tangentially at P ;
- (c) T_P is an irreducible cubic curve with a cusp at P ;
- (d) T_P is an irreducible cubic curve with one ordinary double point;
- (e) T_P is a union of three coplanar lines that do not intersect at one point;
- (f) T_P is a union of a line and a conic that intersect transversally at two points.

We consider these cases one by one in separate lemmas, i.e., Lemmas 4.3, 4.5, 4.6, 4.7, 4.8 and 4.9. We however present the detailed proof of Lemma 4.8 in Section 5 to improve the readability of this section. These lemmas altogether imply Theorem 1.12.

For simplicity, put $m = \text{mult}_P(D)$.

Lemma 4.2. *If the log pair (S, D) is not log canonical at the point P , then the support of D contains all the lines on S passing through P .*

Proof. Let L be a line passing through the point P that is not contained in the support of D . Then the inequality $1 = L \cdot D \geq m$ implies that the log pair (S, D) is log canonical at P by Lemma 2.1. \square

Lemma 4.3 ([19, Lemma 4.13]). *Suppose that the tangent hyperplane section T_P consists of three lines intersecting at the point P . If the support of D does not contain at least one of the three lines, then the log pair (S, D) is log canonical at the point P .*

Proof. It immediately follows from Lemma 4.2. \square

From now on, let $f : \tilde{S} \rightarrow S$ be the blow up of the cubic surface S at the point P . In addition, let E be the exceptional curve of f . We then have

$$K_{\tilde{S}} + \tilde{D} + (m - 1)E = f^*(K_S + D).$$

Note that the log pair (S, D) is log canonical at P if and only if the log pair

$$(\tilde{S}, \tilde{D} + (m - 1)E)$$

is log canonical along the exceptional divisor E .

Remark 4.4. If there is a line passing through P , then the surface \tilde{S} is a weak del Pezzo surface of degree 2, i.e., $K_{\tilde{S}}^2 = 2$ and $-K_{\tilde{S}}$ is nef and big. The proper transforms of the lines passing through P will be (-2) -curves on \tilde{S} . All the (-2) -curves on \tilde{S} are disjoint each other and they come from the lines passing through P on S . By contracting these (-2) -curves we obtain a birational morphism $g : \tilde{S} \rightarrow \bar{S}$. Then \bar{S} is a del Pezzo surface of degree 2 with ordinary double points. In particular, the linear system $| -K_{\bar{S}} |$ induces a double cover $\pi : \bar{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^2$ ramified along a quartic curve $R \subset \mathbb{P}^2$. The (-2) -curves on \tilde{S} are contracted to the ordinary double points on \bar{S} . Therefore, the number of the ordinary double points on \bar{S} is given by the number of lines passing through P on S . Since we have at most two lines passing through P , the surface \bar{S} has at most two ordinary double points, and hence the quartic curve R must be an irreducible curve with at most two ordinary double points.

Lemma 4.5. *Suppose that the tangent hyperplane section T_P consists of a line and a conic intersecting tangentially at the point P . If the support of D does not contain both the line and the conic, then the log pair (S, D) is log canonical at the point P .*

Proof. Suppose that the log pair (S, D) is not log canonical at the point P . Let L and C be the line and the conic, respectively, such that $T_P = L + C$. By Lemma 4.2, we may assume that the conic C is not contained but the line L is contained in the support of D . We write $D = aL + \Omega$, where a is a positive rational number and Ω is an effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor whose support contains neither the line L nor the conic C . We have $m \leq C \cdot D = 2$.

Note that the three curves \tilde{L} , \tilde{C} and E meet at one point transversally. Since $m \leq 2$, we have the unique point Q on E defined in Remark 2.5. The point Q does not belong to \tilde{C} , and hence not to \tilde{L} either. Indeed, otherwise

$$2 - m = \tilde{C} \cdot (a\tilde{L} + \tilde{\Omega}) \geq a + \text{mult}_Q(\tilde{\Omega}) = \text{mult}_Q(\tilde{D}).$$

This contradicts (2.1).

Let $g : \tilde{S} \rightarrow \bar{S}$ be the contraction defined in Remark 4.4. Note that the point $g(\tilde{L})$ is the ordinary double point of the surface \bar{S} . Put $\bar{\Omega} = g(\tilde{\Omega})$, $\bar{E} = g(E)$, $\bar{C} = g(\tilde{C})$ and $\bar{Q} = g(Q)$. Then $\pi(\bar{E}) = \pi(\bar{C})$ since $\bar{E} + \bar{C}$ is an anticanonical divisor on \bar{S} . The point $\pi(\bar{Q})$ lies outside R because the point Q lies outside \tilde{C} . Since the divisor $\bar{\Omega} + (m-1)\bar{E}$ is \mathbb{Q} -linearly equivalent to $-K_{\bar{S}}$ by our construction, Lemma 3.2 shows that the log pair $(\bar{S}, \bar{\Omega} + (m-1)\bar{E})$ is log canonical at \bar{Q} . However, it is not log canonical at the point \bar{Q} since g is an isomorphism in a neighborhood of the point Q . This is a contradiction. \square

Lemma 4.6. *Suppose that the tangent hyperplane section T_P is an irreducible cubic curve with a cusp at P . If T_P is not contained in the support of D , then the log pair (S, D) is log canonical at P .*

Proof. Suppose that (S, D) is not log canonical at P . From the inequality

$$3 = T_P \cdot D \geq m \cdot \text{mult}_P(T_P) = 2m,$$

we obtain $m \leq \frac{3}{2}$. Then, we have the unique point Q on E defined in Remark 2.5.

The surface \tilde{S} is a smooth del Pezzo surface of degree 2. The linear system $| -K_{\tilde{S}} |$ induces a double cover $\pi: \tilde{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^2$ ramified along a smooth quartic curve $R \subset \mathbb{P}^2$. Then the integral divisor $E + \tilde{T}_P$ is linearly equivalent to $-K_{\tilde{S}}$, and hence $\pi(E) = \pi(\tilde{T}_P)$ is a line in \mathbb{P}^2 . Moreover, \tilde{T}_P tangentially meet E at a single point. Thus the point $\pi(Q)$ lies on R if and only if the point Q is the intersection point of E and \tilde{T}_P .

Applying Lemma 3.2 to the log pair $(\tilde{S}, \tilde{D} + (m-1)E)$, we see that the point $\pi(Q)$ belongs to R because the log pair $(\tilde{S}, \tilde{D} + (m-1)E)$ is not log canonical at the point Q and the divisor $\tilde{D} + (m-1)E$ is \mathbb{Q} -linearly equivalent to $-K_{\tilde{S}}$. The point Q therefore lies on the curve \tilde{T}_P . Then from (2.1) we obtain

$$3 - 2m = \tilde{T}_P \cdot \tilde{D} \geq \text{mult}_Q(\tilde{D}) > 2 - m.$$

This contradicts Lemma 2.1. □

For the remaining three cases, we show that the hypothesis of Theorem 1.12 is never fulfilled, so that Theorem 1.12 is true.

Lemma 4.7. *If the tangent hyperplane section T_P is an irreducible cubic curve with a node at P , then the log pair (S, D) is log canonical at P .*

Proof. Suppose that (S, D) is not log canonical at P . The surface \tilde{S} is a smooth del Pezzo surface of degree two. Since $\tilde{D} + (m-1)E \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} -K_{\tilde{S}}$ and the log pair $(\tilde{S}, \tilde{D} + (m-1)E)$ is not log canonical at some point Q on E , it follows from Lemma 3.4 that there must be an anticanonical divisor H on the surface \tilde{S} that has either a tacnode or a cusp at the point Q .

If the divisor H has a tacnode at Q , then it consists of the exceptional divisor E and another (-1) -curve L meeting E tangentially at Q . Then the divisor $f(H)$ is an effective anticanonical divisor on S such that it has a cusp at P and it is distinct from the divisor T_P . This is impossible.

If the divisor H has a cusp at the point Q , then it must be irreducible. However, it is impossible since H is singular at Q and $E \cdot H = 1$. □

Lemma 4.8. *Suppose that the tangent hyperplane section T_P consists of three lines one of which does not pass through the point P . Then the log pair (S, D) is log canonical at P .*

Proof. The proof of this lemma is the central and the most beautiful part of the proof of Theorem 1.12. Since it is a bit lengthy, it will be presented in a separate section. See Section 5. □

Lemma 4.9. *Suppose that the tangent hyperplane section T_P consists of a line and a conic intersecting transversally. Then the log pair (S, D) is log canonical at the point P .*

Proof. We write $T_P = L + C$, where L is a line and C is an irreducible conic that intersect L transversally at P . Suppose that (S, D) is not log canonical at P .

By Lemmas 2.2 and 4.2, we may assume that the conic C is not contained but the line L is contained in the support of D . We write $D = aL + \Omega$, where a is a positive rational number and Ω is an effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor whose support contains neither the line L nor the conic C .

We have the unique point Q on E defined in Remark 2.5 since $m \leq D \cdot C = 2$.

Suppose that the point Q does not belong to the (-2) -curve \tilde{L} . Let $g: \tilde{S} \rightarrow \bar{S}$ be the contraction defined in Remark 4.4. Then \bar{S} is a del Pezzo surface of degree 2 with only one ordinary double point at the point $g(\tilde{L})$. Put $\bar{\Omega} = g(\Omega)$, $\bar{E} = g(E)$, $\bar{C} = g(C)$ and $\bar{Q} = g(Q)$. Then $\pi(\bar{E}) = \pi(\bar{C})$ since $\bar{E} + \bar{C}$ is an anticanonical divisor on \bar{S} . The point $\pi(\bar{Q})$ lies on R if and only if the point Q lies on \tilde{C} . The log pair $(\bar{S}, \bar{\Omega} + (m-1)\bar{E})$ is not log canonical at \bar{Q} since g is an isomorphism in a neighborhood of the point Q . Since the divisor $\bar{\Omega} + (m-1)\bar{E}$ is \mathbb{Q} -linearly equivalent to $-K_{\bar{S}}$ by our construction, Lemma 3.2 shows that the point Q belongs to \tilde{C} .

Note that $\tilde{C} + \bar{E}$ is the unique curve in $| -K_{\bar{S}} |$ that is singular at \bar{Q} . But the log pair $(\bar{S}, \tilde{C} + \bar{E})$ is log canonical at \bar{Q} . Hence, it follows from Lemma 3.3 that $(\bar{S}, \bar{\Omega} + (m-1)\bar{E})$ is log canonical at \bar{Q} . This is a contradiction. Therefore, the point Q must belong to the (-2) -curve \tilde{L} .

Now we can apply [8, Theorem 1.28] to the log pair $(\tilde{S}, a\tilde{L} + (m-1)E + \tilde{\Omega})$ at the point Q to obtain a contradiction immediately. Indeed, it is enough to put $M = 1$, $A = 1$, $N = 0$, $B = 2$, and $\alpha = \beta = 1$ in [8, Theorem 1.28] and check that all the conditions of [8, Theorem 1.28] are satisfied. However, there is a much simpler way to obtain a contradiction. Let us take this simpler way.

There exists another line M on the surface S that intersects L at a point. The line M does not intersect the conic C since $1 = T_P \cdot M = (L + C) \cdot M = L \cdot M$. In particular, the point P does not lie on the line M . Let $h: \check{S} \rightarrow \tilde{S}$ be the contraction of the proper transform of the line M on the surface \tilde{S} . Since M is a (-1) -curve and the point P does not lie on M , the surface \check{S} is a smooth cubic surface in \mathbb{P}^3 .

Put $\check{\Omega} = h(\tilde{\Omega})$, $\check{E} = h(E)$, $\check{L} = h(\tilde{L})$, $\check{C} = h(\tilde{C})$, $\check{P} = h(Q)$ and $\check{D} = h(\tilde{D})$. Then (\check{S}, \check{D}) is not log canonical at the point \check{P} since h is an isomorphism in a neighborhood of the point Q . On the other hand, the divisor $\check{L} + \check{C} + \check{E}$ is an anticanonical divisor of the surface \check{S} . Since the point \check{P} is the intersection point of \check{L} and \check{E} and the divisor \check{D} is \mathbb{Q} -linearly equivalent to $-K_{\check{S}}$, Lemma 4.8 implies that (\check{S}, \check{D}) is log canonical at \check{P} . This is a contradiction. \square

As we already mentioned, Theorem 1.12 follows from Lemmas 4.3, 4.5, 4.6, 4.7, 4.8

and 4.9. Thus Theorem 1.12 has been proved under the assumption that Lemma 4.8 is valid. The assumption will be confirmed in the following section.

5 The proof of Lemma 4.8

To prove Lemma 4.8, we keep the notations used in Section 4. We write $T_P = L + M + N$, where L , M , and N are three coplanar lines on S . We may assume that the point P is the intersection point of the two lines L and M , whereas it does not lie on the line N . We also write $D = a_0L + b_0M + c_0N + \Omega_0$, where a_0 , b_0 , and c_0 are non-negative rational numbers and Ω_0 is an effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor on S whose support contains none of the lines L , M and N . Put $m_0 = \text{mult}_P(\Omega_0)$.

Suppose that the log pair (S, D) is not log canonical at the point P . Let us look for a contradiction.

By Lemma 4.1, the log pair (S, D) is log canonical outside finitely many points. In particular, we have $0 \leq a_0, b_0, c_0 \leq 1$. Also, Lemma 2.1 implies that $m_0 + a_0 + b_0 > 1$ and Lemma 4.2 implies that $a_0, b_0 > 0$.

Lemma 5.1. *The inequality $m_0 + a_0 + b_0 > c_0 + 1$ holds.*

Proof. Since the log pair $(S, a_0L + b_0M + \Omega_0)$ is not log canonical at the point P , it follows from Lemma 2.4 that

$$1 + a_0 - c_0 = L \cdot (D - a_0L - c_0N) = L \cdot (b_0M + \Omega_0) > 1,$$

which implies $a_0 > c_0$. Similarly, $b_0 > c_0$.

The log pair $(S, L + M + N)$ is log canonical. Since the log pair $(S, a_0L + b_0M + c_0N + \Omega_0)$ is not log canonical at P , it follows from Lemma 2.2 and its proof that the log pair

$$\left(S, \frac{1}{1-c_0}D - \frac{c_0}{1-c_0}T_P \right)$$

is not log canonical at P . Then Lemma 2.1 shows that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{mult}_P \left(\frac{1}{1-c_0}D - \frac{c_0}{1-c_0}T_P \right) &= \text{mult}_P \left(\frac{a_0-c_0}{1-c_0}L + \frac{b_0-c_0}{1-c_0}M + \frac{1}{1-c_0}\Omega_0 \right) \\ &= \frac{a_0-c_0}{1-c_0} + \frac{b_0-c_0}{1-c_0} + \frac{m_0}{1-c_0} > 1. \end{aligned}$$

This verifies $m_0 + a_0 + b_0 > c_0 + 1$. □

Since the rational numbers a_0, b_0, c_0 are smaller or equal to 1 and the log pair $(S, L + M + N)$ is log canonical, the effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor Ω_0 cannot be the zero-divisor. Let r be

the number of the irreducible components of the support of the \mathbb{Q} -divisor Ω_0 . Then we write

$$\Omega_0 = \sum_{i=1}^r e_i C_{i0},$$

where e_i 's are positive rational numbers and C_{i0} 's are irreducible reduced curves of degrees d_{i0} on S . We then see

$$3 = -K_S \cdot \left(a_0 L + b_0 M + c_0 N + \sum_{i=1}^r e_i C_{i0} \right) = a_0 + b_0 + c_0 + \sum_{i=1}^r e_i d_{i0}. \quad (5.1)$$

We have

$$K_{\tilde{S}} + a_0 \tilde{L} + b_0 \tilde{M} + c_0 \tilde{N} + (a_0 + b_0 + m_0 - 1) E + \sum_{i=1}^r e_i \tilde{C}_{i0} = f^*(K_S + D).$$

Recall that $a_0 + b_0 + m_0 = m$.

Lemma 5.2. *The inequality $m = a_0 + b_0 + m_0 \leq 2$ holds.*

Proof. It immediately follows from the three inequalities

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &= L \cdot (a_0 L + b_0 M + c_0 N + \Omega_0) = -a_0 + b_0 + c_0 + L \cdot \Omega_0 \geq -a_0 + b_0 + c_0 + m_0, \\ 1 &= M \cdot (a_0 L + b_0 M + c_0 N + \Omega_0) = a_0 - b_0 + c_0 + M \cdot \Omega_0 \geq a_0 - b_0 + c_0 + m_0, \\ 1 &= N \cdot (a_0 L + b_0 M + c_0 N + \Omega_0) = a_0 + b_0 - c_0 + N \cdot \Omega_0 \geq a_0 + b_0 - c_0. \end{aligned}$$

□

The log pair

$$\left(\tilde{S}, a_0 \tilde{L} + b_0 \tilde{M} + c_0 \tilde{N} + (a_0 + b_0 + m_0 - 1) E + \sum_{i=1}^r e_i \tilde{C}_{i0} \right) \quad (5.2)$$

is not log canonical at some point Q on E . Since $\text{mult}_P(D) = a_0 + b_0 + m_0 \leq 2$, it follows from Remark 2.5 that Q is the only point on E where the log pair (5.2) fails to be log canonical.

Let $g: \tilde{S} \rightarrow \bar{S}$ be the contraction defined in Remark 4.4. Then \bar{S} is a del Pezzo surface of degree 2 with two ordinary double points at the points $g(\tilde{L})$ and $g(\tilde{M})$.

Lemma 5.3. *The point Q on the exceptional curve E belongs to either \tilde{L} or \tilde{M} .*

Proof. Suppose that the point Q lies on neither \tilde{L} nor \tilde{M} . Put $\bar{E} = g(E)$, $\bar{N} = g(\tilde{N})$ and $\bar{Q} = g(Q)$. In addition, we put $\bar{C}_{i0} = g(\tilde{C}_{i0})$ for each i . Then $\pi(\bar{E}) = \pi(\bar{N})$. The point $\pi(\bar{Q})$ lies outside the quartic curve R since \bar{Q} is a smooth point of the anticanonical divisor $\bar{E} + \bar{N}$ on \bar{S} .

Since g is an isomorphism in a neighborhood of the point Q , the log pair

$$\left(\bar{S}, c_0 \bar{N} + (a_0 + b_0 + m_0 - 1) \bar{E} + \sum_{i=1}^r e_i \bar{C}_{i0} \right) \quad (5.3)$$

is not log canonical at the point \bar{Q} . The divisor $c_0 \bar{N} + (a_0 + b_0 + m_0 - 1) \bar{E} + \sum_{i=1}^r e_i \bar{C}_{i0}$ is an effective anticanonical \mathbb{Q} -divisor on the surface \bar{S} . Hence, we are able to apply Lemma 3.2 to the log pair (5.3) to obtain a contradiction. \square

From now on we may assume that the point Q is the intersection point of \tilde{L} and E without loss of generality.

Let $\rho: S \dashrightarrow \mathbb{P}^2$ be the linear projection from the point P . Then ρ is a generically 2-to-1 rational map. Thus the map ρ induces a birational involution τ_P of the cubic surface S . The involution τ_P is classically known as the Geiser involution associated to the point P (see [27]).

Remark 5.4. By construction, the involution τ_P is biregular outside the union $L \cup M \cup N$. In fact, one can show that τ_P is biregular outside the point P and the line N . Moreover, one can show that $\tau_P(L) = L$ and $\tau_P(M) = M$.

For each i , put $C_{i1} = \tau_P(C_{i0})$ and denote by d_{i1} the degree of the curve C_{i1} . We then employ new effective \mathbb{Q} -divisors

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_1 &= \sum_{i=1}^r e_i C_{i1}; \\ D_1 &= a_1 L + b_1 M + c_1 N + \Omega_1, \end{aligned}$$

where $a_1 = a_0$, $b_1 = b_0$ and $c_1 = a_0 + b_0 + m_0 - 1$. Note that $a_0 + b_0 + m_0 - 1 > 0$ by Lemma 2.1 (cf. Lemma 5.1).

Lemma 5.5. *The divisor D_1 is an effective anticanonical \mathbb{Q} -divisor on the surface S . The log pair (S, D_1) is not log canonical at the intersection point of L and N .*

Proof. Let $h: \tilde{S} \rightarrow S'$ be the contraction of the (-1) -curve \tilde{N} . Then S' is a smooth cubic surface in \mathbb{P}^3 . Put $E' = h(E)$, $L' = h(\tilde{L})$, $M' = h(\tilde{M})$, $Q' = h(Q)$ and $C'_{i0} = h(\tilde{C}_{i0})$ for each i . Then the integral divisor $L' + M' + E'$ is an anticanonical divisor of S' . In particular, the curves L' , M' and E' are coplanar lines on S' . Moreover, the point Q' is the intersection point of L' and E' by the assumption right after Lemma 5.3. It does not lie on the line M' .

Let ι_P be the biregular involution of the surface \bar{S} induced by the double cover π . Then ι_P induces a biregular involution ν_P of the surface \tilde{S} since the surface \tilde{S} is the minimal

resolution of singularities of the surface \bar{S} . Thus, we have a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 \tilde{S} & \xrightarrow{v_P} & \tilde{S} & & \\
 \downarrow f & \searrow g & \bar{S} & \xrightarrow{\iota_P} & \bar{S} & \swarrow g & \tilde{S} & \downarrow f \\
 S & & & & & & S & \\
 & \searrow \pi & & \swarrow \pi & & & & \\
 & & \mathbb{P}^2 & & & & & \\
 & \swarrow \rho & & \nwarrow \rho & & & &
 \end{array}$$

This shows $\tau_P = f \circ v_P \circ f^{-1}$. On the other hand, we have $v_P(E) = \tilde{N}$ since $\pi \circ g(E) = \pi \circ g(\tilde{N})$. This means that there exists an isomorphism $\sigma: S \rightarrow S'$ that makes the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \tilde{S} & \xrightarrow{v_P} & \tilde{S} \\
 \downarrow h & & \downarrow f \\
 S' & \xleftarrow{\sigma} & S
 \end{array}$$

commute. By construction, $\sigma(L) = L'$, $\sigma(M) = M'$, $\sigma(N) = E'$, and $\sigma(C_{i1}) = C'_{i0}$ for every i . Recall that Q' is the intersection point of L' and E' .

Since h is an isomorphism locally around Q , the log pair

$$\left(S', a_0 L' + b_0 M' + (a_0 + b_0 + m_0 - 1) E' + \sum_{i=1}^r e_i C'_{i0} \right)$$

is not log canonical at Q' . Since $a_0 \tilde{L} + b_0 \tilde{M} + c_0 \tilde{N} + (a_0 + b_0 + m_0 - 1) E + \sum_{i=1}^r e_i \tilde{C}_{i0} \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} -K_{\tilde{S}}$, we have $a_0 L' + b_0 M' + (a_0 + b_0 + m_0 - 1) E' + \sum_{i=1}^r e_i C'_{i0} \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} -K_{S'}$. Therefore, it follows that

$$a_0 L + b_0 M + (a_0 + b_0 + m_0 - 1) N + \sum_{i=1}^r e_i C_{i1} \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} -K_S,$$

and the log pair $(S, a_0 L + b_0 M + (a_0 + b_0 + m_0 - 1) N + \sum_{i=1}^r e_i C_{i1})$ is not log canonical at the intersection the point of L and N . \square

Now we are able to replace the original effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor D by the new effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor D_1 . By Lemma 5.5, both the \mathbb{Q} -divisors have the same properties that we have been using so far. However, the new \mathbb{Q} -divisor Ω_1 is *slightly better* than the original one Ω_0 in the sense of the following lemma.

Lemma 5.6. *The degree of the \mathbb{Q} -divisor Ω_1 is strictly smaller than the degree of Ω_0 , i.e.,*

$$\sum_{i=1}^r e_i d_{i1} < \sum_{i=1}^r e_i d_{i0}.$$

Proof. Since $D_1 \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} -K_S$ by Lemma 5.5, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 3 &= -K_S \cdot \left(a_0L + b_0M + (a_0 + b_0 + m_0 - 1)N + \sum_{i=1}^r e_i C_{i1} \right) \\ &= 2a_0 + 2b_0 + m_0 - 1 + \sum_{i=1}^r e_i d_{i1}. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, we have $a_0 + b_0 + c_0 + \sum_{i=1}^r e_i d_{i0} = 3$ by (5.1). Thus, we obtain

$$\sum_{i=1}^r e_i d_{i1} = \sum_{i=1}^r e_i d_{i0} - (a_0 + b_0 + m_0 - 1 - c_0) < \sum_{i=1}^r e_i d_{i0}$$

because $a_0 + b_0 + m_0 - 1 - c_0 > 0$ by Lemma 5.1. \square

Repeating this process, we can obtain a sequence of the effective anticanonical \mathbb{Q} -divisors

$$D_k = a_k L + b_k M + c_k N + \Omega_k$$

on the surface S such that each log pair (S, D_k) is not log canonical at one of the three intersection points $L \cap M$, $L \cap N$ and $M \cap N$. Note that

$$\Omega_k = \sum_{i=1}^r e_i C_{ik},$$

where C_{ik} 's are irreducible reduced curves of degrees d_{ik} . We then obtain a strictly decreasing sequence of rational numbers

$$\sum_{i=1}^r e_i d_{i0} > \sum_{i=1}^r e_i d_{i1} > \cdots > \sum_{i=1}^r e_i d_{ik} > \cdots$$

by Lemma 5.6. This is a contradiction since the subset

$$\left\{ \sum_{i=1}^r e_i n_i \mid n_1, n_2, \dots, n_r \in \mathbb{N} \right\} \subset \mathbb{Q}$$

is discrete and bounded from below. This completes the proof of Lemma 4.8.

6 α -functions on smooth del Pezzo surfaces

In this section, we prove Theorem 1.25. Let S_d be a smooth del Pezzo surface of degree d .

Before we proceed, we here make a simple but useful observation.

Lemma 6.1. *Let $f : S_d \rightarrow S$ be the blow down of a (-1) -curve E on the del Pezzo surface S_d . Then S is a smooth del Pezzo surface and $\alpha_{S_d}(P) \geq \alpha_S(f(P))$ for a point P of S_d outside the curve E .*

Proof. It is easy to check that $-K_S$ is ample. The second statement immediately follows from the definition of the α -function. \square

We have already shown that the α -function $\alpha_{\mathbb{P}^2}$ of the projective plane is the constant function with the value $\frac{1}{3}$ (see Example 1.22) and the α -function $\alpha_{\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1}$ of the quadric surface is the constant function with the value $\frac{1}{2}$ (see Example 1.23).

Lemma 6.2. *The α -function $\alpha_{\mathbb{F}_1}$ on the blow-up \mathbb{F}_1 of \mathbb{P}^2 at one point is the constant function with the value $\frac{1}{3}$.*

Proof. Let P be a given point on \mathbb{F}_1 . Let $\pi: \mathbb{F}_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$ be the \mathbb{P}^1 -bundle morphism onto \mathbb{P}^1 . Let C be its section with $C^2 = -1$ and let L_P be the fiber of the morphism π over the point $\pi(P)$. Since $2C + 3L_P \sim -K_{\mathbb{F}_1}$, we have $\alpha_{\mathbb{F}_1}(P) \leq \frac{1}{3}$. But $\alpha(\mathbb{F}_1) = \frac{1}{3}$ by Theorem 1.17. Thus, $\alpha_{\mathbb{F}_1}$ is the constant function with the value $\frac{1}{3}$ by Lemma 1.21. \square

The surface S_7 is the blow-up of \mathbb{P}^2 at two distinct points Q_1 and Q_2 . Let E be the proper transform of the line passing through Q_1 and Q_2 by the two-point blow up $f: S_7 \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^2$ with the exceptional curves E_1 and E_2 .

Lemma 6.3. *The α -function on the del Pezzo surface S_7 of degree 7 has the following values*

$$\alpha_{S_7}(P) = \begin{cases} 1/2 & \text{if } P \notin E \\ 1/3 & \text{if } P \in E. \end{cases}$$

Proof. Let P be a point on S . Then $\alpha_{S_7}(P) \geq \alpha(S) = \frac{1}{3}$ by Theorem 1.17 and Lemma 1.21.

If the point P belongs to E , then $\alpha_{S_7}(P) \leq \frac{1}{3}$ since $2E_1 + 2E_2 + 3E \sim -K_S$. Therefore, $\alpha_{S_7}(P) = \frac{1}{3}$.

Suppose that the point P lies outside E . Let L be a line on \mathbb{P}^2 whose proper transform by the blow up f passes through P . Since $f^*(2L) + E$ is an effective anticanonical divisor passing through P , we have $\alpha_{S_7}(P) \leq \frac{1}{2}$.

Let $g: S \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$ be the birational morphism obtained by contracting the (-1) -curve E . Then this morphism is an isomorphism around P . Then $\alpha_{S_7}(P) \geq \alpha_{\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1}(g(P))$ by Lemma 6.1. Since $\alpha_{\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1}$ is the constant function with the value $\frac{1}{2}$, we obtain $\alpha_{S_7}(P) = \frac{1}{2}$. \square

Lemma 6.4. *The α -function α_{S_6} on the del Pezzo surface S_6 of degree 6 is the constant function with the value $\frac{1}{2}$.*

Proof. Let P be a given point on the del Pezzo surface S_6 . One can easily check that $\alpha_{S_6}(P) \leq \frac{1}{2}$. On the other hand, we have a birational morphism $h: S_6 \rightarrow S_7$, where S_7 is a del Pezzo surface of degree 7, such that the morphism h is an isomorphism around the point P and the point $h(P)$ is not on the (-1) -curve of S_7 connected to two different (-1) -curves. Then $\alpha_{S_6}(P) \geq \frac{1}{2}$ by Lemmas 6.1 and 6.3. \square

Lemma 6.5. *The α -function on a del Pezzo surface S_5 of degree 5 has the following values*

$$\alpha_{S_5}(P) = \begin{cases} 1/2 & \text{if there is a } (-1)\text{-curve passing through } P; \\ 2/3 & \text{if there is no } (-1)\text{-curve passing through } P. \end{cases}$$

Proof. Let P be a point on S_5 . Suppose that P lies on a (-1) -curve. Then there exists an effective anticanonical divisor not reduced at P . Thus, $\alpha_{S_5}(P) \leq \frac{1}{2}$. Meanwhile, we have $\frac{1}{2} = \alpha(S_5) \leq \alpha_{S_5}(P)$ by Lemma 1.21 and Theorem 1.17. Therefore, $\alpha_{S_5}(P) = \frac{1}{2}$.

Suppose that the point P is not contained in any (-1) -curve. Then there exist exactly five irreducible smooth rational curves C_1, \dots, C_5 passing through the point P with $-K_S \cdot C_i = 2$ for each i (cf. the proof of [7, Lemma 5.8]). Moreover, for every C_i , there are four irreducible smooth rational curves E_1^i, E_2^i, E_3^i and E_4^i such that $3C_i + E_1^i + E_2^i + E_3^i + E_4^i$ belongs to the bi-anticanonical linear system $|-2K_{S_5}|$ (cf. Remark 1.14). Therefore, $\alpha_{S_5}(P) \leq \frac{2}{3}$.

Suppose that $\alpha_{S_5}(P) < \frac{2}{3}$. Then there is an effective anticanonical \mathbb{Q} -divisor D such that $(S, \lambda D)$ is not log canonical at P for some positive rational number $\lambda < \frac{2}{3}$. Then $\text{mult}_P(D) > \frac{1}{\lambda}$ by Lemma 2.1. Let $f: S_4 \rightarrow S_5$ be the blow up of S_5 at P with the exceptional curve E and let \tilde{D} be the proper transform of the divisor D on S_4 . Then the surface S_4 is a smooth del Pezzo surface of degree 4. We have

$$K_{S_4} + \lambda\tilde{D} + (\lambda\text{mult}_P(D) - 1)E = f^*(K_{S_5} + \lambda D),$$

which implies that the log pair $(S_4, \lambda\tilde{D} + (\lambda\text{mult}_P(D) - 1)E)$ is not log canonical.

On the other hand, the log pair $(S_4, \lambda\tilde{D} + \lambda(\text{mult}_P(D) - 1)E)$ is log canonical because the divisor $\tilde{D} + (\text{mult}_P(D) - 1)E$ is an effective anticanonical \mathbb{Q} -divisor of S_4 and $\alpha(S_4) = \frac{2}{3}$ by Theorem 1.17. However, this is absurd because $\lambda(\text{mult}_P(D) - 1) > \lambda\text{mult}_P(D) - 1$. \square

Lemma 6.6. *The α -function on a del Pezzo surface S_4 of degree 4 has the following values*

$$\alpha_{S_4}(P) = \begin{cases} 2/3 & \text{if } P \text{ is on a } (-1)\text{-curve;} \\ 3/4 & \text{if there is an effective anticanonical divisor that consists of} \\ & \text{two } 0\text{-curves meeting tangentially at } P; \\ 5/6 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Proof. Let P be a point on S_4 . If the point P lies on a (-1) -curve L , then there are mutually disjoint five (-1) -curves E_1, \dots, E_5 that intersect L . Let $h: S_4 \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^2$ be the contraction of all E_i 's. Since $h(L)$ is a conic in \mathbb{P}^2 , we see that $3L + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq 5} E_i$ is a member in the linear system $|-2K_{S_4}|$ (cf. Remark 1.14). This means that $\alpha_{S_4}(P) \leq \frac{2}{3}$. Therefore, $\alpha_{S_4}(P) = \frac{2}{3}$ since $\alpha(S_4) \leq \alpha_{S_4}(P)$ by Lemma 1.21 and $\alpha(S_4) = \frac{2}{3}$ by Theorem 1.17.

Suppose that the point P does not lie on a (-1) -curve. Put $\omega = \frac{3}{4}$ in the case when there is an effective anticanonical divisor that consists of two 0-curves intersecting tangentially at the point P and put $\omega = \frac{5}{6}$ otherwise.

One can easily find an effective anticanonical divisor F on S_4 such that $(S_4, \lambda F)$ is not log canonical at P for every positive rational number $\lambda > \omega$ (see [32, Proposition 3.2]). This shows that $\alpha_{S_4}(P) \leq \omega$. Moreover, it is easy to check that the log pair $(S_4, \omega C)$ is log canonical at P for each $C \in |-K_{S_4}|$.

Suppose $\alpha_{S_4}(P) < \omega$. Then there is an effective anticanonical \mathbb{Q} -divisor D such that $(S, \omega D)$ is not log canonical at P . Note that there are only finitely many effective anticanonical divisors C_1, \dots, C_k such that each (S_4, C_i) is not log canonical at P . Applying Lemma 2.2, we may assume that for each i at least one irreducible component of $\text{Supp}(C_i)$ is not contained in the support of D .

Let $f: S_3 \rightarrow S_4$ be the blow up of the surface S_4 at P with the exceptional curve E and let \tilde{D} be the proper transform of the divisor D on S_3 . Then S_3 is a smooth cubic surface in \mathbb{P}^3 and E is a line in S_3 . Moreover, the log pair $(S_3, \tilde{D} + (\text{mult}_P(D) - 1)E)$ is not log canonical at some point Q on E because the log pair (S_4, D) is not log canonical at P .

Let T_Q be the tangent hyperplane section of the cubic surface S_3 at Q . Note that the divisor T_Q contains the line E . Since $\tilde{D} + (\text{mult}_P(D) - 1)E$ is an effective anticanonical \mathbb{Q} -divisor on S_3 , it follows from Corollary 1.13 that the log pair (S_3, T_Q) is not log canonical at Q and the support of \tilde{D} contains all the irreducible components of T_Q . In fact, it follows that the divisor T_Q is either a union of three lines meeting at Q or a union of a line and a conic intersecting tangentially at Q . The divisor $f(T_Q)$ is an effective anticanonical divisor on S_4 such that the log pair $(S_4, f(T_Q))$ is not log canonical at P . This contradicts our assumption since the support of D contains all the irreducible components of the divisor $f(T_Q)$. \square

Consequently, Theorem 1.25 follows from Examples 1.22 and 1.23, and Lemmas 6.2, 6.3, 6.4, 6.5 and 6.6.

A Appendix

This appendix is devoted to the proof of Lemma 1.10. The proof originates from [19] and [22], where the proof is presented dispersedly. For the readers' convenience, we give a detailed and streamlined one here.

Let S be a smooth del Pezzo surface of degree at most 4. Suppose that S contains a $(-K_S)$ -polar cylinder, i.e., there is an open affine subset $U \subset S$ and an effective anticanonical \mathbb{Q} -divisor D such that $U = S \setminus \text{Supp}(D)$ and $U \cong Z \times \mathbb{A}^1$ for some smooth

rational affine curve Z . Put $D = \sum_{i=1}^r a_i D_i$, where each D_i is an irreducible reduced curve and each a_i is a positive rational number.

Lemma A.1 ([22, Lemma 4.4]). *The number of the irreducible components of the divisor D is not smaller than the rank of the Picard group of S , i.e., $r \geq \text{rk Pic}(S) = 10 - K_S^2 \geq 6$.*

To prove Lemma 1.10, we must show that there exists a point $P \in S$ such that

- the log pair (S, D) is not log canonical at the point P ;
- if there exists a *unique* divisor T in the anticanonical linear system $| -K_S |$ such that the log pair (S, T) is not log canonical at P , then there is an effective anticanonical \mathbb{Q} -divisor D' on the surface S such that
 - the log pair (S, D') is not log canonical at P ;
 - the support of the divisor T is not contained in the support of D' .

The natural projection $U \cong Z \times \mathbb{A}^1 \rightarrow Z$ induces a rational map $\pi: S \dashrightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$ given by a pencil \mathcal{L} on the surface S . Then either \mathcal{L} is base-point-free or its base locus consists of a single point.

Lemma A.2 ([22, Lemma 4.2]). *The pencil \mathcal{L} is not base-point-free.*

Proof. Suppose that the pencil \mathcal{L} is base-point-free. Then π is a morphism, which implies that there exists exactly one irreducible component of $\text{Supp}(D)$ that does not lie in a fiber of π . Moreover, this component is a section. Without loss of generality, we may assume that this component is D_r . Let L be a sufficiently general curve in \mathcal{L} . Then

$$2 = -K_S \cdot L = D \cdot L = \sum_{i=1}^r a_i D_i \cdot L = a_r D_r \cdot L,$$

and hence $a_r = 2$. This implies that $\alpha(S) \leq \frac{1}{2}$. However, this contradicts Theorem 1.17 since the degree of the surface S is at most 4. \square

Denote the unique base point of the pencil \mathcal{L} by P . Let us show that P is the point we are looking for. Resolving the base locus of the pencil \mathcal{L} , we obtain a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & W & \\ f \swarrow & & \searrow g \\ S & \overset{\pi}{\dashrightarrow} & \mathbb{P}^1, \end{array}$$

where f is a composition of blow ups at smooth points over P and g is a morphism whose general fiber is a smooth rational curve. Denote by E_1, \dots, E_n the exceptional curves of

the birational morphism f . Then there exists exactly one curve among them that does not lie in the fibers of the morphism g . Without loss of generality, we may assume that this curve is E_n . Then E_n is a section of the morphism g .

For every D_i , denote by \tilde{D}_i its proper transform on the surface W . Then every curve \tilde{D}_i lies in a fiber of the morphism g .

The following lemma is a bit stronger version of [22, Lemma 4.6] even though its proof is almost the same as that of [22, Lemma 4.6].

Lemma A.3 (cf. [22, Lemma 4.6]). *For every effective anticanonical \mathbb{Q} -divisor H with $\text{Supp}(H) \subseteq \text{Supp}(D)$, the log pair (S, H) is not log canonical at the point P .*

Proof. The proof of [22, Lemma 4.6] works verbatim for this generalized version. \square

Applying Lemma A.3 to (S, D) , we see that the log pair (S, D) is not log canonical at P . Thus, if there exists no anticanonical divisor T such that (S, T) is not log canonical at P , then we are done. Hence, to complete the proof of Lemma 1.10, we assume that there exists a *unique* divisor $T \in |-K_S|$ such that (S, T) is not log canonical at P . Then Lemma 1.10 follows from the lemma below.

Lemma A.4. *There exists an effective anticanonical \mathbb{Q} -divisor D' on S such that the log pair (S, D') is not log canonical at P and $\text{Supp}(D')$ does not contain at least one irreducible component of $\text{Supp}(T)$.*

Proof. If $\text{Supp}(D)$ does not contain at least one irreducible component of $\text{Supp}(T)$, then we can simply put $D = D'$. Suppose that it is not the case, i.e., we have $\text{Supp}(T) \subseteq \text{Supp}(D)$. Then $T \neq D$. Indeed, the number of the irreducible components of $\text{Supp}(D)$ is at least 6 by Lemma A.1. On the other hand, the number of the irreducible components of $\text{Supp}(T)$ is at most 4 because $-K_S \cdot T = K_S^2$ and $-K_S$ is ample.

Since $T \neq D$, there exists a positive rational number μ such that the \mathbb{Q} -divisor $(1 + \mu)D - \mu T$ is effective and its support does not contain at least one irreducible component of $\text{Supp}(T)$. Put $D' = (1 + \mu)D - \mu T$. Note that D' is also an effective anticanonical \mathbb{Q} -divisor on S . By our construction, $\text{Supp}(D') \subseteq \text{Supp}(D)$. Thus, the log pair (S, D') is not log canonical at P by Lemma A.3. This completes the proof. \square

Remark A.5. Note that $U \neq S \setminus \text{Supp}(D')$, which implies that the number of the irreducible components of $\text{Supp}(D')$ may be less than $\text{rk Pic}(S)$. Because of this, we can apply Lemma 2.2 only once here. This shows that we really need to use the *uniqueness* of the divisor T in the anticanonical linear system $|-K_S|$ such that (S, T) is not log canonical at P in the proof of Lemma A.4. Indeed, if there is another divisor T' in $|-K_S|$ such that (S, T') is not log canonical at P , then we would not be able to apply Lemma 2.2 since we might have $D' = T'$.

Acknowledgments. The authors would like to express their thanks to the referee for the careful reading and the comments that improve this article. The first author was supported by AG Laboratory NRI-HSE, RF government grant, 11.G34.31.0023. The second author was supported by the Institute for Basic Science (Grant No. CA1305-02).

References

- [1] Ambro, F.: The minimal log discrepancy. In: Proceedings of the workshop, Arc spaces and multiplier ideal sheaves (Ed. Kei-ichi Watanabe), RIMS kokyuroku, No. **1550**, 121–130 (2006)
- [2] Artin, M.: On isolated rational singularities of surfaces. *Amer. J. Math.* **88**, 129–136 (1966)
- [3] Bass, H.: A nontriangular action of \mathbb{G}_a on \mathbb{A}^3 . *J. Pure Appl. Algebra* **33**, 1–5 (1984)
- [4] Berman, R.: A thermodynamical formalism for Monge–Ampère equations, Moser–Trudinger inequalities and Kähler–Einstein metrics. *Adv. Math.* **248**, 1254–1297 (2013)
- [5] Brieskorn, E.: Rationale Singularitäten komplexer Flächen. *Invent. Math.* **4**, 336–358 (1968)
- [6] Cheltsov, I.: Log canonical thresholds on hypersurfaces. *Sb. Math.* **192**, 1241–1257 (2001)
- [7] Cheltsov, I.: Log canonical thresholds of del Pezzo surfaces. *Geom. Funct. Anal.* **11**, 1118–1144 (2008)
- [8] Cheltsov, I., Kosta, D.: Computing α -invariants of singular del Pezzo surfaces. To appear in *J. Geom. Anal.* DOI: 10.1007/s12220-012-9357-6.
- [9] Cheltsov, I., Park, J.: Global log-canonical thresholds and generalized Eckardt points. *Sb. Math.* **193**, 779–789 (2002)
- [10] Cheltsov, I., Park, J., Won, J.: Log canonical thresholds of certain Fano hypersurfaces. To appear in *Math. Z.* DOI: 10.1007/s00209-013-1186-1.
- [11] Cheltsov, I., Shramov, C.: Log canonical thresholds of smooth Fano threefolds (with an appendix by Jean-Pierre Demailly). *Russian Math. Surveys* **63**, 73–180 (2008)
- [12] Darmon, H., Granville, A.: On the equations $z^m = F(x, y)$ and $Ax^p + By^q = Cz^r$. *Bull. London Math. Soc.* **27**, no. 6, 513–543 (1995)
- [13] Demailly, J.-P., Kollár, J.: Semi-continuity of complex singularity exponents and Kähler–Einstein metrics on Fano orbifolds. *Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup.* **34**, 525–556 (2001)

- [14] de Fernex, T., Ein, L., Mustařă, M.: Bounds for log canonical thresholds with applications to birational rigidity. *Math. Res. Letters* **10**, 219–236 (2003)
- [15] Flenner, H., Zaidenberg, M.: Rational curves and rational singularities. *Math. Z.* **244**, 549–575 (2003)
- [16] Hidaka, F., Watanabe, K.: Normal Gorenstein surfaces with ample anti-canonical divisor. *Tokyo J. Math.* **4**, no. 2, 319–330 (1981)
- [17] Halphen, G. H.: Sur la r duction des  quation diff rentielles lin aires aux formes int grales. In: M moires pr sent s par divers savants   l'Academie des sciences de l'Institut National de France, T. XXVIII, N 1 (Paris, F. Krantz, 1883), Oeuvres. **Vol. 3**, Paris, 1–260 (1921)
- [18] Kaliman, S.: Free \mathbb{C}_+ -actions on \mathbb{C}^3 are translations. *Invent. Math.* **156**, 163–173 (2004)
- [19] Kishimoto, T., Prokhorov, Yu., Zaidenberg, M.: Group actions on affine cones. In: Affine algebraic geometry, CRM Proc. Lecture Notes **54**, Amer. Math. Soc., 123–163 (2011)
- [20] Kishimoto, T., Prokhorov, Yu., Zaidenberg, M.: Affine cones over Fano threefolds and additive group actions. To appear in *Osaka J. Math.* arXiv:1106.1312.
- [21] Kishimoto, T., Prokhorov, Yu., Zaidenberg, M.: \mathbb{G}_a -actions on affine cones. *Transform. Groups* **18**, 1137–1153 (2013)
- [22] Kishimoto, T., Prokhorov, Yu., Zaidenberg, M.: Unipotent group actions on del Pezzo cones. *Algebraic Geometry* **1**, 46–56 (2014)
- [23] Koll r, J.: Singularity of pairs. In: Algebraic geometry (Santa Cruz, 1995) Part 1, Proc. Sympos. Pure Math. **62**, Amer. Math. Soc., 221–287 (1997)
- [24] Koll r, J., Mori, S.: Birational geometry of algebraic varieties. Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics **134**, Cambridge University Press (1998)
- [25] Lazarsfeld, R.: Positivity in algebraic geometry II. *Ergeb. Math. Grenzgeb. (3)* **49**, Springer-Verlag (2004)
- [26] Laufer, H. B.: On rational singularities. *Amer. J. Math.* **94**, 597–608 (1972)
- [27] Manin, Yu.: Rational surfaces over perfect fields, II. *Mat. Sb.* **72**, 161–192 (1967)
- [28] Martinez-Garcia, J.: Log canonical thresholds of del Pezzo surfaces in characteristic p . arXiv:1203.0995.
- [29] Masuda, K., Miyanishi, M.: The additive group actions on \mathbb{Q} -homology planes. *Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble)* **53**, 429–464 (2003)

- [30] Nadel, A.: Multiplier ideal sheaves and Kähler–Einstein metrics of positive scalar curvature. *Ann. of Math.* **132**, 549–596 (1990)
- [31] Perepechko, A.: Flexibility of affine cones over del Pezzo surfaces of degree 4 and 5. To appear in *Funct. Anal. Appl.* arXiv:1108.5841v1.
- [32] Park, J.: Birational maps of del Pezzo fibrations. *J. Reine Angew. Math.* **538**, 213–221 (2001)
- [33] Park, J., Won, J.: Log-canonical thresholds on del Pezzo surfaces of degrees ≥ 2 . *Nagoya Math. J.* **200**, 1–26 (2010)
- [34] Schwartz, H. A.: Über diejenigen Fälle, in welchen die Gaußsche hypergeometrische Reihe eine algebraische Funktion ihres vierten Elementes darstellt. *J. Reine Angew. Math.* **75**, 292–335 (1873)
- [35] Snow, D.: Unipotent actions on affine space. In: *Topological methods in algebraic transformation groups*, *Progress in Math.* **80**, 165–176 (1989)
- [36] Tian, G.: On Kähler–Einstein metrics on certain Kähler manifolds with $c_1(M) > 0$. *Invent. Math.* **89**, 225–246 (1987)
- [37] Tian, G.: On Calabi’s conjecture for complex surfaces with positive first Chern class. *Invent. Math.* **101**, 101–172 (1990)
- [38] Tian, G.: Existence of Einstein metrics on Fano manifolds. In: *Metric and differential geometry*, *Progress in Math.* **297**, 119–162 (2012)
- [39] Tian, G., Yau, S.-T.: Kähler-Einstein metrics on complex surfaces with $C_1 > 0$. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **112**, 175–203 (1987)
- [40] Winkelmann, J.: On free holomorphic \mathbb{C} -actions on \mathbb{C}^n and homogeneous Stein manifolds. *Math. Ann.* **286**, 593–612 (1990)