

EXISTENCE OF MINIMAL MODELS FOR THREEFOLD GENERALIZED PAIRS IN POSITIVE CHARACTERISTIC

TIANLE YANG, ZELIN YE, AND ZHIYAO ZHANG

ABSTRACT. Let \mathbb{K} be an algebraically closed field of characteristic $p > 5$. We show the existence of minimal models for pseudo-effective NQC lc generalized pairs in dimension three over \mathbb{K} . As a consequence, we prove the termination of flips for pseudo-effective threefold NQC lc generalized pairs over \mathbb{K} . This provides a new proof on the termination of flips for pseudo-effective pairs over \mathbb{K} without using the non-vanishing theorems. A key ingredient of our proof is the ACC for lc thresholds in dimension ≤ 3 and the global ACC in dimension ≤ 2 for generalized pairs over \mathbb{K} .

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Preliminaries	3
2.1. Sets	3
2.2. \mathbf{b} -divisors and generalized pairs	3
2.3. Models of generalized pair	5
3. Adjunction formula for generalized pairs	5
3.1. Special termination	7
3.2. Existence of dlt modification	8
4. ACC for lc thresholds	10
4.1. ACC for lc thresholds on surfaces	11
4.2. Global ACC for surface	12
4.3. ACC on threefolds	14
5. Existence of Shokurov-type polytope	15
6. Existence of minimal models, terminal case	16
7. Existence of log minimal model	19
8. Termination of pseudo-effective flips	24
References	31

1. INTRODUCTION

Throughout the paper, we work, without further notice, over an algebraically closed field \mathbb{K} of characteristic $p > 5$.

Over any algebraically closed field of characteristic 0, [BCHM10] proved the existence of klt flips, thereby establishing the existence of the minimal model program over any algebraically closed field of characteristic 0. Following this groundbreaking work, there

Date: November 21, 2024.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. 14E30, 14B05.

Key words and phrases. Minimal model program. Positive characteristic. Threefolds.

have been significant developments in minimal model program theory over the past two decades. In particular, much work has been dedicated to improving or varying the corresponding results in [BCHM10]. These improvements and variations usually focus on three main directions: relaxing the restriction of singularities (e.g., from klt singularities to lc singularities, cf. [Bir12, HX13, HH20]), considering new structures (e.g., generalized pairs, cf. [BZ16, HL23], foliations, cf. [CS20, CS21, CHLX23]), and changing the base field (e.g., positive characteristic, cf. [Bir16, HX14, HNT20, HW22], mixed characteristic, cf. [BMPSTWW23]).

It is interesting to ask whether these generalizations can be combined with each other, e.g., by considering multi-directional variations instead of one-directional variations. For example, [HL23] considered the minimal model program for generalized pairs with lc singularities, while [HNT20] considered the minimal model program for lc pairs over fields of characteristic $p > 5$. In this paper, we consider the following variation: the minimal model program for (klt) generalized pairs over an algebraically closed field of positive characteristic, or, more precisely, of characteristic $p > 5$.

There has already been some progress on the minimal model program for klt generalized pairs over fields of positive characteristic [BF23, BS23, FW23]. In particular, the existence of the minimal model program is known in dimension ≤ 3 . However, many fundamental theorems of the minimal model program for generalized pairs over fields of positive characteristic remain unknown in dimension ≤ 3 , particularly the existence of minimal models.

The goal of this paper is to systematically study the minimal model program for (NQC) klt generalized pairs in dimension 3 over an algebraically closed field of characteristic $p > 5$. The first main theorem of our paper is the following:

Theorem 1.1 (Termination of pseudo-effective flips). *Let $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ be an NQC lc generalized pair over an algebraically closed field of characteristic $p > 5$ such that $K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X$ is pseudo-effective/ U . Then any sequence of $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)$ -flips/ U terminates.*

Note that when $\mathbf{M} = \mathbf{0}$, Theorem 1.1 becomes the termination of flips for pseudo-effective lc pairs, which was proven in [Xu24] and essentially relies on the non-vanishing theorem for lc pairs in dimension 3. Theorem 1.1 provides a new proof of the termination of pseudo-effective flips for lc pairs in dimension ≤ 3 that does not rely on any vanishing theorems.

As an immediate consequence of Theorem 1.1, we obtain the following result:

Theorem 1.2 (Existence of log minimal models). *Let $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ be an NQC lc generalized pair over an algebraically closed field of characteristic $p > 5$ such that $K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X$ is pseudo-effective/ U . Then:*

- (1) $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ has a log minimal model (see Definition 2.8).
- (2) If X is \mathbb{Q} -factorial klt, then we may run a $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)$ -MMP/ U and obtain a minimal model of $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$.

Remark 1.3. Follow the ideas in [HNT20], we believe that one could try to prove the lc-MMP with scaling terminates and then get a log minimal model by running an MMP in the lc case. But we will leave it to the readers.

A key ingredient of the proof of Theorem 1.1 is the ACC for lc thresholds for generalized pairs in dimension ≤ 3 .

Theorem 1.4 (ACC for lc thresholds). *Let $\Gamma \subset [0, +\infty)$ be a DCC set. Then there exists an ACC set Γ' depending only on Γ satisfying the following: Let $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ be an lc generalized pair of dimension ≤ 3 over an algebraically closed field of characteristic $p > 5$, $D \geq 0$ an \mathbb{R} -divisor on X , and \mathbf{N} a nef/ U \mathbf{b} -divisor on X satisfying the following. Assume that*

- (1) *the coefficients of B and D belong to Γ ,*
- (2) *$\mathbf{M} = \sum m_i \mathbf{M}_i$ and $\mathbf{N} = \sum n_i \mathbf{N}_i$, where each $\mathbf{M}_i, \mathbf{N}_i$ is a nef/ U \mathbf{b} -Cartier \mathbf{b} -divisor and $m_i, n_i \in \Gamma$, and*
- (3) *$D + \mathbf{N}_X$ is \mathbb{R} -Cartier.*

Then

$$\text{lct}(X, B, \mathbf{M}; D, \mathbf{N}) := \sup\{t \geq 0 \mid (X, B + tD, \mathbf{M} + t\mathbf{N}) \text{ is lc}\}$$

belongs to Γ' .

Another key ingredient of our proof is the existence of Shokurov-type polytopes:

Theorem 1.5. *Let $(X, B = \sum_{j=1}^m b_j B_j, \mathbf{M} = \sum_{k=1}^n m_k \mathbf{M}_k)/U$ be an lc generalized pair of dimension ≤ 3 over an algebraically closed field of characteristic $p > 5$, where B_j are the irreducible components of B , $m_k \geq 0$ for each k , and \mathbf{M}_k is a nef/ U \mathbf{b} -Cartier \mathbf{b} -divisor for any k . Let $\mathbf{v}_0 := (b_1, \dots, b_m, m_1, \dots, m_n) \in \mathbb{R}^{m+n}$.*

Assume that $K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X$ is nef/ U . Then there exists an open subset $V_0 \ni \mathbf{v}_0$ of the rational envelope of \mathbf{v}_0 in \mathbb{R}^{m+n} , such that for any $(b'_1, \dots, b'_m, m'_1, \dots, m'_n) \in V_0$, $K_X + \sum_{j=1}^m b'_j B_j + \sum_{k=1}^n m'_k \mathbf{M}_{k,X}$ is nef/ U and $(X, \sum_{j=1}^m b'_j B_j, \sum_{k=1}^n m'_k \mathbf{M}_k)$ is lc.

Acknowledgement. This project is completed as a part of the research program ‘‘Algebra and Number Theory Summer School Seminars’’ during the period of July 15th – August 24th 2024 in Peking University. The authors would like to thank the organizers and Peking University for their hospitality. The authors would like to thank their summer school advisor Jihao Liu for his guidance, useful discussions and comments. The authors would like to thank Liang Xiao, Shou-wu Zhang for useful comments.

2. PRELIMINARIES

We follow the standard notations and definitions as in [BCHM10, KM98]. We will freely use the fact that log resolution exists for threefolds of an algebraically closed field [CP18, CP19, Cut09].

2.1. Sets.

Definition 2.1. Let $\Gamma \subset [0, +\infty)$ be a set. We define $\Gamma_+ := (\{\sum \gamma_i \mid \gamma_i \in \Gamma\} \cup \{0\}) \cap [0, 1]$ and define $D(\Gamma) := \{\frac{m-1+\gamma}{m} \mid m \in \mathbb{N}^+, \gamma \in \Gamma_+\}$. We say that Γ satisfies the descending chain condition (DCC) if any decreasing sequence in Γ stabilizes. We say that Γ satisfies the ascending chain condition (ACC) if any non-decreasing sequence in Γ stabilizes.

2.2. \mathbf{b} -divisors and generalized pairs. We refer the reader to [HL23, Definition 2.4] for the definition and notation of \mathbf{b} -divisors.

Definition 2.2. Let X be a normal quasi-projective variety of dimension ≤ 3 . \tilde{S} a prime divisor on X with normalization S , and \mathbf{D} a \mathbf{b} -divisor on X which descends on a birational model of X . We defined the *restricted \mathbf{b} -divisor* $\mathbf{D}|_S$ on S in the following way. Let $h : X' \rightarrow X$ be a log resolution of (X, \tilde{S}) such that \mathbf{D} descends to X' and let $S' := h_*^{-1} \tilde{S}$. We let $\mathbf{D}|_S := \overline{\mathbf{D}_{X'}|_{S'}}$.

Definition 2.3. A *generalized pair* $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ consists of a projective morphism $X \rightarrow U$ from a normal quasi-projective variety to a quasi-projective variety, an \mathbb{R} -divisor $B \geq 0$ on X , and a nef/ U \mathbf{b} -divisor \mathbf{M} on X , such that $K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X$ is \mathbb{R} -Cartier. We say that $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ is NQC if \mathbf{M} is NQC/ U , i.e. $\mathbf{M} = \sum m_i \mathbf{M}_i$ where each $m_i \geq 0$ and each \mathbf{M}_i is a nef/ U \mathbf{b} -Cartier \mathbf{b} -divisor. If U is not important then we may drop U . If $U = \{pt\}$ then we may drop U and say that (X, B, \mathbf{M}) is projective.

For any prime divisor E over X and projective birational morphism $f : Y \rightarrow X$ such that E is on Y with $K_Y + B_Y + \mathbf{M}_Y := f^*(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)$, we define

$$a(E, X, B, \mathbf{M}) := 1 - \text{mult}_E B_Y$$

as the *log discrepancy* of E with respect to (X, B, \mathbf{M}) . We say that (X, B, \mathbf{M}) is *klt* (resp. *lc*) if $a(E, X, B, \mathbf{M}) > 0$ (resp. ≥ 0) for any prime divisor E over X . We say that E is an *nklt place* of (X, B, \mathbf{M}) if $a(E, X, B, \mathbf{M}) \leq 0$.

An *nklt center* of (X, B, \mathbf{M}) is the center of an nklt place of (X, B, \mathbf{M}) on X . The *nklt locus* of (X, B, \mathbf{M}) , denoted by $\text{Nklt}(X, B, \mathbf{M})$, is the union of all nklt centers associated with a reduced subscheme structure. If (X, B, \mathbf{M}) is lc, nklt places (resp. nklt centers) are also called *lc places* (resp. *lc centers*). We say that (X, B, \mathbf{M}) is *dlt* if (X, B, \mathbf{M}) is lc, and for any lc center W of (X, B, \mathbf{M}) with generic point η , \mathbf{M} descends to a neighborhood of W and (X, B) is log smooth near η .

Lemma 2.4. *Let $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ be an lc generalized pair and A an ample/ U \mathbb{R} -divisor on X . Assume that there exists a klt generalized pair $(X, B_0, \mathbf{M}_0)/U$. Then there exists a klt pair (X, Δ) such that*

$$\Delta \sim_{\mathbb{R}, U} B + \mathbf{M}_X + A.$$

Proof. Let $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$ be a real number such that $A' := A + \epsilon(B + \mathbf{M}_X) - \epsilon(B_0 + \mathbf{M}_{0, X})$ is ample/ U . Possibly replacing A with A' and replacing (X, B, \mathbf{M}) with $(X, (1 - \epsilon)B + \epsilon B_0, (1 - \epsilon)\mathbf{M} + \epsilon\mathbf{M}_0)$, we may assume that (X, B, \mathbf{M}) is klt.

By [BMPSTWW23, Theorem 2.13] there exists a log resolution $g : W \rightarrow X$ be a log resolution of $(X, \text{Supp } B)$ such that \mathbf{M} descends to X and there exists a g -anti-ample g -exceptional divisor $E \geq 0$ on W . We write

$$K_W + B_W + \mathbf{M}_W := g^*(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X).$$

Let $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$ be a real number such that $\lfloor B_W + eE \rfloor = 0$. Then $g^*A - eE$ is ample/ U , so $\mathbf{M}_W + g^*A - eE$ is ample/ U . Thus there exists $H_W \in |\mathbf{M}_W + g^*A - eE|_{\mathbb{R}}$ such that $(W, \Delta_W := B_W + eE + H_W)$ is sub-klt. $\Delta := g_*\Delta_W$ satisfies our requirements. \square

Lemma 2.5. *Let $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ be a \mathbb{Q} -factorial lc generalized pair such that X is klt, and let $(X, B, \mathbf{M}) \dashrightarrow (X', B', \mathbf{M})$ be a sequence of steps of a $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)$ -MMP/ U . Then X' is \mathbb{Q} -factorial klt. Moreover, if $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ is dlt, then $(X', B', \mathbf{M})/U$ is \mathbb{Q} -factorial dlt.*

Proof. We may assume that $\phi : X \dashrightarrow X'$ is a single step of a $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)$ -MMP/ U .

First we show that X' is \mathbb{Q} -factorial klt. Then $X \dashrightarrow X'$ is a step of a $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X + A)$ -MMP/ U for some ample/ U \mathbb{R} -divisor A . By Lemma 2.4, there exists a klt pair (X, Δ) such that $\Delta \sim_{\mathbb{R}, U} B + \mathbf{M}_X + A$, so $X \dashrightarrow X'$ is a step of a $(K_X + \Delta)$ -MMP/ U . If $X \dashrightarrow X'$ is a divisorial contraction then the \mathbb{Q} -factoriality follows from [Bir16, Lemma 7.2]. If $X \dashrightarrow X'$ is a flip with flipping contraction $X \rightarrow T$ and flipped contraction $X' \rightarrow T$, then X' is the log minimal model of (X, Δ) over T ([Bir16, Page 196, Line -2]),

so X' is \mathbb{Q} -factorial. Moreover, let Δ' be the image of Δ on X' , then (X', Δ') is klt. Thus X' is \mathbb{Q} -factorial klt.

Next we show that (X', B', \mathbf{M}) is dlt. Let W' be an lc place of (X', B', \mathbf{M}) with generic point η' and let E be a nklt place of (X', B', \mathbf{M}) such that $\text{center}_{X'} E = W'$. Then

$$0 = a(E, X', B', \mathbf{M}) \geq a(E, X, B, \mathbf{M}) \geq 0,$$

hence $a(E, X, B, \mathbf{M}) = 0$ and $a(E, X', B', \mathbf{M}) = a(E, X, B, \mathbf{M})$. Thus ϕ^{-1} is an isomorphism near η' . Let $W := \text{center}_X E$ and let η be the generic point of W . Then W is an lc center of (X, B, \mathbf{M}) , so (X, B) is log smooth near η and \mathbf{M} descends over a neighborhood of η . Since ϕ^{-1} is an isomorphism near η' , (X', B') is log smooth near η' and \mathbf{M} descends over a neighborhood of η' . Therefore, (X', B', \mathbf{M}) is dlt. \square

Lemma 2.6. *Let $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ be a \mathbb{Q} -factorial dlt generalized pair and S an irreducible component of $\lfloor B \rfloor$. Then S is normal.*

Proof. By definition, (X, B) is \mathbb{Q} -factorial dlt, so the lemma follows from [Bir16, Lemma 5.2] \square

Definition 2.7. Let $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ be a generalized pair. Let $D \geq 0$ be an \mathbb{R} -divisor and \mathbf{N} a nef/ U \mathbf{b} -divisor such that $D + \mathbf{N}_X$ is \mathbb{R} -Cartier. We define

$$\text{lct}(X, B, \mathbf{M}; D, \mathbf{N}) := \sup\{t \geq 0 \mid (X, B + tD, \mathbf{M} + t\mathbf{N}) \text{ is lc}\}$$

to be the *lc threshold* of (D, \mathbf{N}) with respect to (X, B, \mathbf{M}) .

2.3. Models of generalized pair.

Definition 2.8. Let $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ and $(X', B', \mathbf{M})/U$ be two lc generalized pairs associated with a birational map/ U $\phi: X \dashrightarrow X'$. We say that $(X', B', \mathbf{M})/U$ is a *log birational model* of (X, B, \mathbf{M}) if $B' = \phi_* B + \text{Exc}(\phi^{-1})$.

Assume that $(X', B', \mathbf{M})/U$ is a log birational model of (X, B, \mathbf{M}) and $K_{X'} + B' + \mathbf{M}_{X'}$ is nef/ U . We say that $(X', B', \mathbf{M})/U$ is a *weak lc model* (resp. *minimal model*) of $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ in the sense of Birkar-Shokurov, or a *bs-weak lc model* (resp. *bs-minimal model*) of $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$, if $a(E, X, B, \mathbf{M}) \leq a(E, X', B', \mathbf{M})$ (resp. $a(E, X, B, \mathbf{M}) < a(E, X', B', \mathbf{M})$) for any prime divisor E on X that is exceptional/ X' . In addition, if $X \dashrightarrow X'$ does not extract any divisor, then we say that $(X', B', \mathbf{M})/U$ is a *weak lc model* (resp. *minimal model*) of $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$.

We say that $(X', B', \mathbf{M})/U$ is a *log minimal model* of $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ if $(X', B', \mathbf{M})/U$ is a bs-minimal model of $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ and $(X', B', \mathbf{M})/U$ is \mathbb{Q} -factorial dlt.

3. ADJUNCTION FORMULA FOR GENERALIZED PAIRS

Lemma 3.1. *Let $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ be an lc generalized pair of dimension ≤ 3 , \tilde{S} an irreducible component of $\lfloor B \rfloor$, and S the normalization of \tilde{S} . Assume that $B = \tilde{S} + \sum_{j=1}^m b_j B_j$ and $\mathbf{M} = \sum_{k=1}^n r_k \mathbf{M}_k$, where B_j are the irreducible components of B , and each \mathbf{M}_k is a nef/ U \mathbf{b} -Cartier \mathbf{b} -divisor. Let $\mathbf{M}_k^S := \mathbf{M}_k|_S$ for each i and let $\mathbf{M}^S := \mathbf{M}|_S$. Then there exist prime divisors $T_1, \dots, T_l, C_1, \dots, C_q$ on S , positive integers w_1, \dots, w_q , and non-negative integers $\{d_{i,j}\}_{1 \leq i \leq q, 1 \leq j \leq m}$ and $\{e_{i,k}\}_{1 \leq i \leq q, 1 \leq k \leq n}$, such that for any real numbers $b'_1, \dots, b'_m, r'_1, \dots, r'_n$, we have the following. Let $B' := \tilde{S} + \sum_{j=1}^m b'_j B_j$ and $\mathbf{M}' := \sum_{k=1}^n r'_k \mathbf{M}_k$. Assume that $K_X + B' + \mathbf{M}'_X$ is \mathbb{R} -Cartier. Then:*

(1)

$$K_S + B'_S + \mathbf{M}'_S := (K_X + B' + \mathbf{M}'_X)|_S,$$

where $\mathbf{M}'_S := \mathbf{M}'|_S$, and

$$B'_S = \sum_{i=1}^l T_i + \sum_{i=1}^q \frac{w_i - 1 + \sum_{j=1}^m d_{i,j} b'_j + \sum_{k=1}^n e_{i,k} r'_k}{w_i} C_i.$$

In particular, if b'_j and r'_k belong to a DCC set, then the coefficients of B'_S belong to a DCC set.

(2) If (X, B', \mathbf{M}') is lc, then (S, B'_S, \mathbf{M}'_S) is lc.

Proof. By [FW23, Remark 2.5] we have (2), so we only need to prove (1). We only need to determine the coefficient of V in B'_S for any irreducible component V of B'_S . Fix such a component V and let W be its image in X . Determining $\text{mult}_V B'_S$ is a local problem near the generic point of W , so by replacing X with $\text{Spec} \mathcal{O}_{X,W}$, we may assume that X is a normal excellent scheme of dimension 2, $\dim S = 1$, and V is a closed point.

Since (X, B, \mathbf{M}) is lc, (X, \tilde{S}) is numerically lc (cf. [KM98, Notation 4.1]). If (X, \tilde{S}) is not numerically plt near V , then $B = \tilde{S}$ near V and \mathbf{M} descends to X near a neighborhood of V , and $\text{mult}_V B_S = 1$. Thus $\text{mult}_V B'_S = 1$ and we are done. Therefore, we may assume that (X, \tilde{S}) is numerically plt near V , hence X is numerically klt near the generic point of V . Thus X is \mathbb{Q} -factorial klt near V . Possibly shrinking X to a neighborhood of V , we may assume that X is \mathbb{Q} -factorial.

By [Kol13, 3.35], there exists a positive integer $w = w_V$, such that for any Weil divisor D on X , wD is Cartier near V . We have $B_j|_S := \frac{d_j}{w} V$ near a neighborhood of V for some non-negative integers d_j .

Let $f : X' \rightarrow X$ be a log resolution of (X, B) such that \mathbf{M}_k descends to X' for each i . By the negativity lemma,

$$f^* \mathbf{M}_{k,X} = \mathbf{M}_{k,X'} + E_k$$

for some \mathbb{Q} -divisors $E_k \geq 0$. Since $\mathbf{M}_{k,X'}$ is Cartier and $w\mathbf{M}_{k,X}$ is Cartier near V , wE_k is Cartier over a neighborhood of V . Let $S' := f_*^{-1} \tilde{S}$ and let $f_S : S' \rightarrow S$ be the induced birational morphism, then

$$\mathbf{M}_{k,X}|_S = (f_* (\mathbf{M}_{k,X'} + E_k))|_S = (f_S)_* (\mathbf{M}_{k,S'} + E_k|_{S'}) = \mathbf{M}_{k,S}^S + (f_S)_* E_k|_{S'},$$

Let $e_k := w \text{mult}_V((f_S)_* E_k|_{S'})$, then $e_k \in \mathbb{N}$. By [Bir16, Proposition 4.2],

$$K_S + \frac{w-1}{w} V = (K_X + S)|_S$$

near V . Thus

$$\text{mult}_V B'_S = \frac{w-1}{w} + \sum b'_j \frac{d_j}{w} + \sum r'_k \frac{e_k}{w}.$$

(1) follows. □

Lemma 3.2. *Let $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ be a \mathbb{Q} -factorial dlt generalized pair of dimension ≤ 3 and let S be a component of $[B]$. Let $(S, B_S, \mathbf{M}^S)/U$ be the generalized pair induced by adjunction*

$$K_S + B_S + \mathbf{M}^S := (K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)|_S.$$

Then:

(1) (S, B_S, \mathbf{M}^S) is dlt.(2) For any lc center $V \subset S$ of (X, B, \mathbf{M}) , V is an lc center of (S, B_S, \mathbf{M}^S) .

Proof. By Lemma 2.6, S is normal. Let $h : X' \rightarrow X$ be a log resolution of (X, B) such that \mathbf{M} descends to X' , $K_{X'} + B' + \mathbf{M}_{X'} := h^*(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)$, and $S' := h_*^{-1}S$. Let

$$K_{S'} + B_{S'} + \mathbf{M}_{S'}^S := (K_{X'} + B' + \mathbf{M}_{X'})|_{S'}$$

where $B_{S'} := (B' - S')|_{S'}$, and let $h_S : S' \rightarrow S$ be the induced birational morphism. Then

$$K_{S'} + B_{S'} + \mathbf{M}_{S'}^S = h_S^*(K_S + B_S + \mathbf{M}_S^S).$$

For any lc place E_S of (S, B_S, \mathbf{M}^S) , $\text{center}_{S'} E_S$ is a stratum of $B_{S'}^{-1}$, hence a stratum of B'^{-1} . Let E be an lc place of (X, B, \mathbf{M}) such that $\text{center}_{X'} E = \text{center}_{S'} E_S$. Since (X, B, \mathbf{M}) is dlt, (X, B) is log smooth near the generic point of $\text{center}_X E$ and \mathbf{M} descends over a neighborhood of the generic point of $\text{center}_X E$. Thus (S, B_S) is log smooth near the generic point of $\text{center}_X E = \text{center}_S E_S$ and \mathbf{M}^S descends over a neighborhood of the generic point of $\text{center}_S E_S$. Therefore, (S, B_S, \mathbf{M}^S) is dlt.

For any lc center V of (X, B, \mathbf{M}) , possibly shrinking X to a neighborhood of V , we have that (X, B) is log smooth, V is a stratum of $[B]$, and \mathbf{M} descends to X . Thus (S, B_S) is log smooth, V is a stratum of $[B_S]$ V , and \mathbf{M}^S to S . In particular, V is an lc center of (S, B_S, \mathbf{M}^S) . \square

3.1. Special termination.

Proposition 3.3. *Let $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ be a \mathbb{Q} -factorial NQC dlt generalized pair of dimension 3. Then for any sequence of $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)$ -flips/ U , after finitely many flips, the flipping locus does not intersect the strict transform of $\text{Supp}[B]$.*

Proof. The proof almost follows from the same lines of the proof of [FW23, Proposition 2.16] which proves the case when B is a \mathbb{Q} -divisor and \mathbf{M} is a \mathbb{Q} - \mathbf{b} -divisor. For the reader's convenience, we provide a full proof here.

Step 1. We step up the MMP and deal with dimension 0 lc centers in this step. Let

$$(X, B, \mathbf{M}) =: (X_0, B_0, \mathbf{M}) \dashrightarrow (X_1, B_1, \mathbf{M}) \dashrightarrow (X_2, B_2, \mathbf{M}) \dashrightarrow \cdots \dashrightarrow (X_i, B_i, \mathbf{M}) \dashrightarrow \dots$$

be an infinite sequence of $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)$ -flips/ U . By Lemma 2.5, (X_i, B_i, \mathbf{M}) is \mathbb{Q} -factorial dlt for any i . Possibly truncating the MMP, we may assume that no lc center is contracted by this MMP. In particular, the MMP is an isomorphism near the generic point of any lc center, and in particular, is an isomorphism near any dimension 0 lc center.

Step 2. We deal with dimension 1 lc centers in this step. Let C be a lc center of (X, B, \mathbf{M}) such that $\dim C = 1$. Since (X, B, \mathbf{M}) is dlt, there are two irreducible components S, T of $[B]$ such that C is a component of $S \cap T$. For each i , let S_i, T_i be the strict transforms of S, T on X_i , and let C_i be the image of C on X_i . By Lemma 2.6, S_i, T_i are normal. Let $(S_i, B_{S_i}, \mathbf{M}^S)/U$ be the generalized pair induced by adjunction

$$K_{S_i} + B_{S_i} + \mathbf{M}_{S_i}^{S_i} := (K_{X_i} + B_i + \mathbf{M}_{X_i})|_{S_i}.$$

Since the MMP is an isomorphism near the generic point of S_i of each i , the \mathbf{b} -divisor \mathbf{M}^{S_i} does not depend on i and we may denote it by \mathbf{M}^S .

By Lemma 3.2, $(S_i, B_{S_i}, \mathbf{M}^S)/U$ is dlt and C_i is an lc center of $(S_i, B_{S_i}, \mathbf{M}^S)$. Since S_i is a surface, (S_i, B_{S_i}) is numerically dlt, hence S_i is numerically klt. Thus S_i is \mathbb{Q} -factorial, so $(S_i, B_{S_i}, \mathbf{M}^S)/U$ is \mathbb{Q} -factorial dlt. By Lemma 2.6, C_i is normal. Let $(C_i, B_{C_i}, \mathbf{M}^C)/U$ be the generalized pair induced by adjunction

$$K_{C_i} + B_{C_i} + \mathbf{M}_{C_i}^{C_i} := (K_{S_i} + B_{S_i} + \mathbf{M}_{S_i}^S)|_{C_i}.$$

Since the MMP is an isomorphism near the generic point of C_i of each i , the \mathbf{b} -divisor \mathbf{M}^{C_i} does not depend on i and we may denote it by \mathbf{M}^C . Since C_i are curves, $C_i \cong C$ for any i , hence $\mathbf{M}_{C_i}^C = \mathbf{M}_{C_{i+1}}^C$ for any i .

Since $a(D, X_i, B_i, \mathbf{M}) \leq a(D, X_{i+1}, B_{i+1}, \mathbf{M})$ for each i and any prime divisor D over X , by adjunction,

$$B_{C_i} \geq B_{C_{i+1}}$$

for each i . Here we identify B_{C_i} and $B_{C_{i+1}}$ as \mathbb{R} -divisors on C . By Lemma 3.1, there exists a DCC set Γ depending only on B_0 and \mathbf{M} such that the coefficients of B_{C_i} and $B_{C_{i+1}}$ belong to Γ . Therefore, by truncating the MMP, we have $B_{C_i} = B_{C_{i+1}}$ for any i . Therefore,

$$K_{C_i} + B_{C_i} + \mathbf{M}_{C_i}^C = K_{C_{i+1}} + B_{C_{i+1}} + \mathbf{M}_{C_{i+1}}^C$$

for any i . Thus the MMP is an isomorphism near C .

Step 3. We deal with dimension 2 lc centers in this step and conclude the proof.

Let S be an irreducible component of $[B]$. For each i , let $X_i \rightarrow T_i \leftarrow X_{i+1}$ be each step of the MMP and let E_i, F_i be the exceptional locus of $X_i \rightarrow T_i, X_{i+1} \rightarrow T_i$.

Suppose that S_i contains a component of F_{i-1} and let D_i be such a component. Since $B_{S_i} \geq 0$, $a(D_i, S_0, B_{S_0}, \mathbf{M}^S) < a(D_i, S_i, B_{S_i}, \mathbf{M}^S) \leq 1$. If there exists an lc center of $(S_0, B_{S_0}, \mathbf{M}^S)$ which contains center $_{S_0} D_i$, then there exists a component T_0 of $[B_0]$ such that D_i is contained in $S_0 \cap T_0$. This contradicts **Step 2**. Thus center $_{S_0} D_i$ is not contained in $\text{Nklt}(S_0, B_{S_0}, \mathbf{M}^S)$. Since S_0 is a surface, there are finitely many prime divisors over S_0 whose centers on S_0 are not contained in $\text{Nklt}(S_0, B_{S_0}, \mathbf{M}^S)$ and with log discrepancies ≤ 1 with respect to $\text{Nklt}(S_0, B_{S_0}, \mathbf{M}^S)$. Thus, by identify D_i with its image on X_j for any j , there are only finitely different many choices of D_i . Since the coefficient of D_i in B_{S_j} belongs to a DCC set, possibly truncating the MMP, we may assume for any D_i and any j , the coefficient of D_i in B_{S_j} is a constant. Therefore, possibly truncating the MMP, we may assume that the S_i does not contain any component of F_{i-1} .

Finally, suppose that S_i intersects F_i in finitely many points. Then S_i is anti-ample/ T_{i-1} and then S_{i-1} is ample/ T_{i-1} . Therefore, at least one component of E_{i-1} is contained in S_{i-1} , hence the induced morphism $S_{i-1} \rightarrow S_i$ contracts at least a curve, so $\rho(S_i) < \rho(S_{i-1})$. This can only happen only finitely many times. Thus possibly truncating the MMP, S_i does not intersect F_i in finitely many points.

In summary, S_i does not intersect F_i , so the MMP is an isomorphism near S_i and we are done. \square

3.2. Existence of dlt modification.

Lemma 3.4. *Let (X, B, \mathbf{M}) be an NQC lc generalized pair of dimension ≤ 3 . Let S_1, \dots, S_r be prime divisors that are exceptional/ X such that $a(S_i, X, B, \mathbf{M}) \leq 1$ for each i . Then there exists a projective birational morphism $f : Y \rightarrow X$ satisfying the following:*

- (1) S_1, \dots, S_r are divisors on Y ,
- (2) for any f -exceptional prime divisor E , either $E = S_i$ for some i or $a(E_i, X, B, \mathbf{M}) = 0$.
- (3) (Y, B_Y, \mathbf{M}) is \mathbb{Q} -factorial dlt, where $K_Y + B_Y + \mathbf{M}_Y := f^*(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)$.

Proof. It essentially follows from the same lines of the proof of [BF23, Proposition 2.9] which proves the case when B is a \mathbb{Q} -divisor and \mathbf{M} is a \mathbb{Q} - \mathbf{b} -divisor. For the reader's convenience, we provide a full proof here.

Let $g : W \rightarrow X$ be a log resolution such that \mathbf{M} descends to W , and let E_1, \dots, E_n be all g -exceptional prime divisors, where $E_i = S_i$ for any $1 \leq i \leq r$. Let $a_i := a(E_i, X, B, \mathbf{M})$ for any i and let

$$K_W + B_W + \mathbf{M}_W := g^*(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X) + \sum_{j>r} a_j E_j.$$

Then (W, B_W, \mathbf{M}) is dlt and $K_W + B_W + \mathbf{M}_W \sim_{\mathbb{R}, X} \sum_{j>n} a_j E_j$.

We run a $(K_W + B_W + \mathbf{M}_W)$ -MMP/ X . By special termination (Proposition 3.3), this MMP terminates near the image of $[B_W] = \cup_{i=1}^n E_i$. Since the $(K_W + B_W + \mathbf{M}_W)$ -MMP/ X is also a $(\sum_{i>n} a_i E_i)$ -MMP/ X , this MMP terminates with a minimal model $(Y, B_Y, \mathbf{M})/X$ of $(W, B_W, \mathbf{M})/X$, and any divisor contracted by this MMP is E_i for some $i > n$ such that $a_i > 0$. On the other hand, let $E_{i,Y}$ be the image of E_i on Y for each i , then $\sum_{i>n} a_i E_{i,Y}$ is nef/ X , so by the negativity lemma, $\sum_{i>n} a_i E_{i,Y} = 0$, hence

$$K_Y + B_Y + \mathbf{M}_Y = f^*(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X),$$

and for any $i > n$ such that $a_i > 0$, E_i is contracted by this MMP. Therefore, the divisors extracted by the induced birational morphism $f : Y \rightarrow X$ are exactly E_1, \dots, E_r and the E_i such that $i > r$ and $a_i = 0$. Since (W, B_W, \mathbf{M}) is \mathbb{Q} -factorial dlt, so is (Y, B_Y, \mathbf{M}) . The lemma follows. \square

Definition-Lemma 3.5. Let (X, B, \mathbf{M}) be an lc generalized pair. A \mathbb{Q} -factorial dlt modification of (X, B, \mathbf{M}) is a birational morphism $f : Y \rightarrow X$, such that

- (1) For any f -exceptional prime divisor E , $a(E, X, B, \mathbf{M}) = 0$.
- (2) (Y, B_Y, \mathbf{M}) is \mathbb{Q} -factorial dlt, where $K_Y + B_Y + \mathbf{M}_Y := f^*(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)$.

We say that (Y, B_Y, \mathbf{M}) is a dlt model of (X, B, \mathbf{M}) . By Lemma 3.4, for NQC lc generalized pairs of dimension ≤ 3 , dlt models exist.

Lemma 3.6. Let (X, B, \mathbf{M}) be an NQC lc generalized pair of dimension ≤ 3 , $D \geq 0$ an \mathbb{R} -divisor on X , and \mathbf{N} a nef/ X \mathbf{b} -divisor on X such that $D + \mathbf{N}_X$ is \mathbb{R} -Cartier. Assume that

- (i) $(X, B + D, \mathbf{M} + \mathbf{N})$ is lc,
- (ii) $(X, B + (1 + \epsilon)D, \mathbf{M} + (1 + \epsilon)\mathbf{N})$ is not lc for any $\epsilon > 0$, and
- (iii) for any prime divisor P on X such that $\text{mult}_P(B + D) = 1$, $\text{mult}_P D = 0$.

Then for any real number $t \in (0, 1)$, there are two projective birational morphisms $h : X' \rightarrow X$, $g : Y \rightarrow X'$ satisfying the following.

- (1) h is a \mathbb{Q} -factorial dlt modification of $(X, B + tD, \mathbf{M} + t\mathbf{N})$.
- (2) Any h -exceptional prime divisor P is an lc place of (X, B, \mathbf{M}) . In particular, $\text{mult}_P(D + \mathbf{N}_X) = 0$ and $a(P, X, B + sD, \mathbf{M} + s\mathbf{N}) = 0$ for any real number s .
- (3) g extracts a unique prime divisor E . In particular, $-E$ is ample/ X' .
- (4) $a(E, X, B + D, \mathbf{M} + \mathbf{N}) = 0$ and $a(E, X, B, \mathbf{M}) > 0$.
- (5) Let F be the reduced $(h \circ g)$ -exceptional divisor and B_Y, D_Y the strict transforms of B, D on Y respectively. Then $(Y, B_Y + tD_Y + F, \mathbf{M} + t\mathbf{N})$ is \mathbb{Q} -factorial dlt.

Proof. By condition (ii), there exists a prime divisor P_0 over X such that $a(P_0, B + D, \mathbf{M} + \mathbf{N}) = 0$ and $a(P_0, B + (1 + \epsilon)D, \mathbf{M} + (1 + \epsilon)\mathbf{N}) < 0$ for any $\epsilon > 0$. By condition (iii), P_0 is exceptional/ X . By Lemma 3.4, there exists a \mathbb{Q} -factorial dlt modification $f : W \rightarrow X$ of $(X, B + D, \mathbf{M} + \mathbf{N})$ such that P_0 is on W . Let B_W, D_W be the strict transforms of B and

D on W respectively, F_1, \dots, F_n be the prime f -exceptional divisors, and $F_W = \sum_{i=1}^n F_i$ the reduced f -exceptional divisor. Let $a_i := a(F_i, X, B + tD, \mathbf{M} + t\mathbf{N})$. Then

$$K_W + B_W + D_W + F_W + \mathbf{M}_W + \mathbf{N}_W = f^*(K_X + B + D + \mathbf{M}_X + \mathbf{N}_X).$$

Moreover, $(W, B_W + tD_W + F_W, \mathbf{M} + t\mathbf{N})$ is dlt, and we have

$$K_W + B_W + tD_W + F_W + \mathbf{M}_W + t\mathbf{N}_W \sim_{\mathbb{R}, X} \sum_{i=1}^n a_i F_i.$$

We run a $(K_W + B_W + tD_W + F_W + \mathbf{M}_W + t\mathbf{N}_W)$ -MMP/ X . By special termination (Proposition 3.3), this MMP terminates near the images of F_W . Since this MMP is also a $(\sum_{i=1}^n a_i F_i)$ -MMP/ X , this MMP terminates with a minimal model $(X', B' + tD' + F', \mathbf{M} + t\mathbf{N})/X$ of $(W, B_W + tD_W + F_W, \mathbf{M} + t\mathbf{N})/X$, where B', D', F' are the images of B_W, D_W, F_W on X' respectively. Let $F_{i,W}$ be the image of F_i on W for each i , then $\sum a_i F_{i,W}$ is nef/ X . By the negativity lemma, F_i is contracted by the MMP if $a_i > 0$. Moreover, since the MMP is a $(\sum_{i=1}^n a_i F_i)$ -MMP, the MMP only contracts divisors that are contained in F_W . Therefore, the divisors contracted by this MMP are exactly the F_i such that $a_i > 0$. In particular, $(X', B' + tD' + F', \mathbf{M} + t\mathbf{N})$ is a dlt model of $(X, B + tD, \mathbf{M} + t\mathbf{N})$, and P_0 is contracted by this MMP. We let $h : X' \rightarrow X$ be the induced morphism. Then (1) holds.

Since the induced birational map $W \dashrightarrow X'$ contracts at least one divisor, $W \dashrightarrow X'$ is not the identity morphism. We let $g : Y \dashrightarrow X'$ be the last step of this MMP. Since X' is \mathbb{Q} -factorial and

$$K_{X'} + B' + tD' + F' + \mathbf{M}_{X'} + t\mathbf{N}_{X'} \sim_{\mathbb{R}, X} 0,$$

g is a divisorial contraction of a divisor E .

We show that g and h satisfy our requirement. We have already shown (1), and (5) follows from our construction. (3) follows from our construction and the negativity lemma. For any h -exceptional prime divisor P , we have

$$a(P, X, B + tD, \mathbf{M} + t\mathbf{N}) = 0 = a(P, X, B + D, \mathbf{M} + \mathbf{N})$$

as P is also extracted by f . This implies (2). Finally, since E is extracted by f , $a(E, X, B + D, \mathbf{M} + \mathbf{N}) = 0$. Let B_Y, D_Y, F_Y be the images of B_W, D_W, F_W on Y respectively. Since g is a $(K_Y + B_Y + tD_Y + F_Y + \mathbf{M}_Y + t\mathbf{N}_Y)$ -negative contraction, by (2), we have

$$a(E, X, B + tD, \mathbf{M} + t\mathbf{N}) = a(E, X', B' + tD' + F', \mathbf{M} + t\mathbf{N}) > a(E, Y, B_Y + tD_Y + F_Y, \mathbf{M} + t\mathbf{N}) \geq 0.$$

This implies (4) and we are done. \square

4. ACC FOR LC THRESHOLDS

Notation 4.1. Let $\Gamma \subset \mathbb{R}$ be a set. Let $X \rightarrow U$ be a projective morphism from a normal quasi-projective variety to a quasi-projective variety. For any \mathbb{R} -divisor D on X , we write $D \in \Gamma$ if the coefficients of D belong to Γ . For any NQC/ U \mathbf{b} -divisor \mathbf{M} on X , we write $\mathbf{M} \in \text{Nef}(U, \Gamma)$ if $\mathbf{M} = \sum m_i \mathbf{M}_i$, where each \mathbf{M}_i is a nef/ U \mathbf{b} -Cartier \mathbf{b} -divisor and each $m_i \in \Gamma$. If, in addition, $\mathbf{M}_i \not\equiv_U \mathbf{0}$ for any i , then we may write $\mathbf{M} \in \text{Nef}^0(U, \Gamma)$. If $U = \{pt\}$ then we may drop U and use $\text{Nef}(\Gamma)$ and $\text{Nef}^0(\Gamma)$ respectively.

Conjecture 4.2. Let d be a positive integer and $\Gamma \subset [0, +\infty)$ a DCC set. Then

$$\{\text{let}(X, B, \mathbf{M}; D, \mathbf{N}) \mid \dim X = d, B, D \in \Gamma, \mathbf{M}, \mathbf{N} \in \text{Nef}(X, \Gamma)\}$$

satisfies the ACC.

Conjecture 4.3. *Let d be a positive integer and $\Gamma \subset [0, +\infty)$ a DCC set. Then there exists a finite set $\Gamma_0 \subset \Gamma$ depending only on d and Γ satisfying the following. Assume that*

- (1) (X, B, \mathbf{M}) is a projective lc generalized pair of dimension d ,
- (2) $B \in \Gamma$ and $\mathbf{M} \in \text{Nef}^0(\Gamma)$, and
- (3) $K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X \equiv 0$.

Then $B \in \Gamma_0$ and $\mathbf{M} \in \text{Nef}^0(\Gamma_0)$.

4.1. ACC for lc thresholds on surfaces.

Lemma 4.4. *Conjecture 4.2 holds when $d = 2$.*

Proof. We may assume that $1 \in \Gamma$. Assume the lemma does not hold, then there exists a sequence $(X_i, B_i, \mathbf{M}_i; D_i, \mathbf{N}_i)$ such that $\dim X_i = 2$, $B_i, D_i \in \Gamma$, $\mathbf{M}, \mathbf{N} \in \text{Nef}(X, \Gamma)$, and $t_i := \text{lct}(X_i, B_i, \mathbf{M}_i; D_i, \mathbf{N}_i)$ is strictly increasing. In particular, we may assume that $t_i > 0$ for each i .

Suppose that for infinitely many i , there exist an lc place E_i of $(X_i, \Delta_i := B_i + t_i D_i, \mathbf{P}_i := \mathbf{M}_i + t_i \mathbf{N}_i)$ on X_i such that

$$a(E_i, X_i, B_i + (t_i + \epsilon)D_i, \mathbf{M}_i + (t_i + \epsilon)\mathbf{N}_i) < 0$$

for any $\epsilon > 0$. Then E_i is a component of $B_i + t_i D_i$, $\text{mult}_{E_i} D_i > 0$, and $\text{mult}_{E_i}(B_i + t_i D_i) = 1$, which is not possible as Γ satisfies the DCC and t_i is strictly increasing. Thus possibly passing to a subsequence, we may assume that no such E_i exists.

By Lemma 3.6, there are two projective birational morphisms $h_i : X'_i \rightarrow X_i$ and $g_i : Y_i \rightarrow X'_i$, such that

- h_i is a \mathbb{Q} -factorial dlt modification of $(X_i, \Delta_i, \mathbf{P}_i)$,
- any h_i -exceptional prime divisor P_i is an lc place of (X_i, B_i, \mathbf{M}_i) ,
- g_i extracts a unique prime divisor E_i such that $-E_i$ is ample/ X'_i ,
- $a(E_i, X_i, B_i + t_i D_i, \mathbf{M}_i + t_i \mathbf{N}_i) = 0$ and $a(E_i, X_i, B_i, \mathbf{M}_i) > 0$, and
- $(Y_i, B_{Y_i}, \mathbf{M})$ is \mathbb{Q} -factorial dlt, where B_{Y_i} is the strict transform of B_i on Y_i plus the reduced $(h_i \circ g_i)$ -exceptional divisor. By Lemma 2.6, E_i is normal.

Let D'_i, D_{Y_i} be the strict transforms of D_i on X'_i, Y_i respectively, and let B'_i be the strict transform of B_i on X'_i plus the reduced h_i -exceptional divisor. By our construction,

$$t_i = \text{lct}(X'_i, B'_i, \mathbf{M}_i; D'_i, \mathbf{N}_i),$$

and $D_{Y_i} + \mathbf{N}_{i, Y_i} = g_i^*(D'_i + \mathbf{N}_{i, X'_i}) + b_i E_i$ for some $b_i > 0$. Therefore, $(D_{Y_i} + \mathbf{N}_{i, Y_i})|_{E_i}$ is ample.

Let $x'_i := \text{center}_{X'_i} E_i$ and let

$$K_{E_i} + B_{E_i}(t) + \mathbf{M}_i(t)_{E_i} := (K_{Y_i} + B_{Y_i} + tD_{Y_i} + \mathbf{M}_{i, Y_i} + t\mathbf{N}_{i, Y_i})|_{E_i}$$

for any real number t . Then

$$K_{E_i} + B_{E_i}(t_i) + \mathbf{M}_i(t_i)_{E_i} \equiv 0$$

and

$$K_{E_i} + B_{E_i}(0) + \mathbf{M}_i(0)_{E_i}$$

is anti-ample. Since $B_{E_i}(0) + \mathbf{M}_i(0)_{E_i}$ is pseudo-effective, $E_i \cong \mathbb{P}^1$. Therefore,

$$2 = \deg(B_{E_i}(t_i) + \mathbf{M}_i(t_i)_{E_i}).$$

By Lemma 3.1, the coefficients of $B_{E_i}(t_i)$ belong to a DCC set. Thus possibly passing to a subsequence, the coefficients of $B_{E_i}(t_i)$ belong to a finite set, and $\mathbf{N}_{i, Y_i}|_{E_i} \equiv 0$. Thus

$D_{Y_i}|_{E_i} \neq 0$. Since t_i is strictly increasing, by Lemma 3.1 again, the coefficients of $B_{E_i}(t_i)$ belong to a finite set, a contradiction. \square

4.2. Global ACC for surface.

Lemma 4.5. *Conjecture 4.3 holds when $d = 2$.*

Proof. We may assume that $1 \in \Gamma$. Suppose that the conjecture does not hold, then there exists a sequence $(X_i, B_i := \sum b_{i,j} B_{i,j}, \mathbf{M}_i := \sum m_{i,j} \mathbf{M}_{i,j})$ as in the assumptions, such that $b_{i,j}, m_{i,j} \in \Gamma$, either $b_{i,1}$ is strictly increasing or $m_{i,1}$ is strictly increasing, $B_{i,j}$ are distinct prime divisors for any fixed i , and $\mathbf{M}_{i,j} \neq \mathbf{0}$ for any i, j . By Definition-Lemma 3.5, possibly replacing (X_i, B_i, \mathbf{M}_i) with a dlt model, we may assume that X_i is \mathbb{Q} -factorial klt.

Step 1. We prove the theorem when there exists a contraction $X_i \rightarrow Z_i$ such that Z_i is a curve, $B_{i,1}$ is horizontal/ Z_i if $b_{i,1}$ is strictly increasing, and $\mathbf{M}_{i,1,X_i}$ is ample/ Z_i if $b_{i,1}$ is not strictly increasing.

Let F_i be a general fiber of $X_i \rightarrow Z_i$. Then

$$0 = (K_{X_i} + B_i + \mathbf{M}_{i,X_i}) \cdot F_i = \deg K_{F_i} + \sum b_{i,j} (B_{i,j} \cdot F_i) + \sum m_{i,j} (\mathbf{M}_{i,X_i} \cdot F_i),$$

and $B_{i,j} \cdot F_i, \mathbf{M}_{i,X_i} \cdot F_i \in \mathbb{N}$. So there exists a finite set $\Gamma_0 \subset \Gamma$ depending only on Γ , such that $b_{i,j} \in \Gamma_0$ when $B_{i,j} \cdot F_i > 0$, and $m_{i,j} \in \Gamma_0$ when $\mathbf{M}_{i,X_i} \cdot F_i > 0$. By our assumption, if $b_{i,1}$ is strictly increasing, then $B_{i,1}$ is horizontal/ Z_i , so $B_{i,1} \cdot F_i > 0$, a contradiction; and if $b_{i,1}$ is not strictly increasing, then $m_{i,1}$ is strictly increasing and $\mathbf{M}_{i,1,X_i}$ is ample/ Z_i , so $\mathbf{M}_{i,1,X_i} \cdot F_i = D_i \cdot F_i > 0$, a contradiction.

Step 2. We prove the theorem when (X_i, B_i, \mathbf{M}_i) is not klt for infinitely many i , and reduce to the case when (X_i, B_i, \mathbf{M}_i) is \mathbb{Q} -factorial klt and $\rho(X_i) = 1$ for any i .

Since $\mathbf{M}_{i,j} \neq \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{M}_{i,j,X_i} \neq \mathbf{0}$ for any i, j . Let $D_i := B_{i,1}$ if $b_{i,1}$ is strictly increasing and let $D_i := \mathbf{M}_{i,1,X_i}$ if $b_{i,1}$ is not strictly increasing. Then $K_{X_i} + B_i + \mathbf{M}_i - \epsilon D_i$ is not pseudo-effective, so we may run a $(K_{X_i} + B_i + \mathbf{M}_i - \epsilon D_i)$ -MMP for some $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$, which terminates with a Mori fiber space $X'_i \rightarrow Z_i$ as X_i is a surface. Let $B'_i, B'_{i,j}$ and D'_i be the images of $B_i, B_{i,j}$ and D_i on X'_i for any i, j , then $(X'_i, B'_i, \mathbf{M}_i)$ is \mathbb{Q} -factorial lc, X'_i is klt, and $K_{X'_i} + B'_i + \mathbf{M}_{i,X'_i} \equiv 0$. By **Step 1**, possibly passing to a subsequence, we may assume that Z_i is a point of each i . Thus $\rho(X'_i) = 1$ for each i . Moreover, $(X'_i, B'_i - \epsilon B'_{i,1}, \mathbf{M}_i)$ is \mathbb{Q} -factorial dlt if $b_{i,1}$ is strictly increasing, and $(X'_i, B'_i, \mathbf{M}_i - \epsilon \mathbf{M}_{i,1})$ is \mathbb{Q} -factorial dlt if $b_{i,1}$ is not strictly increasing.

Assume that $[B'_i] \neq 0$ for any i . Let S_i be an irreducible component of $[B'_i]$, then S_i is normal as $(X'_i, B'_i - \epsilon B'_{i,1}, \mathbf{M}_i)$ or $(X'_i, B'_i, \mathbf{M}_i - \epsilon \mathbf{M}_{i,1})$ are \mathbb{Q} -factorial dlt. If $b_{i,1}$ is strictly increasing, then since $\rho(X_i) = 1$, $B'_{i,1} \cdot S_i > 0$, and we get a contradiction to Lemma 3.1 by considering adjunction to S_i . If $b_{i,1}$ is not strictly increasing, then $m_{i,1}$ is strictly increasing. Since $\rho(X_i) = 1$ and $\mathbf{M}_{i,1} \neq \mathbf{0}$, $\mathbf{M}_{i,1,X'_i}$ is ample, so $\mathbf{M}_{i,1,X'_i} \cdot S_i > 0$, and we get a contradiction to Lemma 3.1 again by considering adjunction to S_i . Thus possibly passing to a subsequence, we may assume that $[B'_i] = 0$ for any i .

Assume that $(X'_i, B'_i, \mathbf{M}_i)$ is not klt for any i . Let E_i be an lc place of $(X'_i, B'_i, \mathbf{M}_i)$, then E_i is exceptional/ X_i . Let $f_i : \bar{X}_i \rightarrow X_i$ be the extraction of E_i , and $\bar{B}_i, \bar{B}_{i,j}$ the strict transforms of $B'_i, B'_{i,j}$ on \bar{X}_i . Let $\bar{D}_i := \bar{B}_{i,1}$ if $b_{i,1}$ is strictly increasing and let $\bar{D}_i := \mathbf{M}_{i,1,\bar{X}_i}$ if $b_{i,1}$ is not strictly increasing. Since $[B'_i] \neq 0$, $(X'_i, B'_i - \epsilon B'_{i,1}, \mathbf{M}_i)$ or $(X'_i, B'_i, \mathbf{M}_i - \epsilon \mathbf{M}_{i,1})$ is \mathbb{Q} -factorial dlt, we have that $(X'_i, B'_i - \epsilon B'_{i,1}, \mathbf{M}_i)$ or $(X'_i, B'_i, \mathbf{M}_i - \epsilon \mathbf{M}_{i,1})$ is \mathbb{Q} -factorial

plt. Therefore, $\bar{D}_i|_{E_i} \neq 0$. We get a contradiction to Lemma 3.1 again by considering adjunction to E_i .

Therefore, possibly passing to a subsequence, we may assume that $(X'_i, B'_i, \mathbf{M}_i)$ is plt for any i . Possibly replacing (X_i, B_i, \mathbf{M}_i) with $(X'_i, B'_i, \mathbf{M}_i)$, we may assume that (X_i, B_i, \mathbf{M}_i) is \mathbb{Q} -factorial plt and $\rho(X_i) = 1$ for any i .

Step 3. Let $a_i := \text{mld}(X_i)$ be the minimal log discrepancy of X_i . In this step we prove the case when $\lim_{i \rightarrow +\infty} a_i \neq 0$.

Suppose that either $\lim_{i \rightarrow +\infty} a_i \neq 0$. Possibly passing to a subsequence we may assume that $a := \lim_{i \rightarrow +\infty} a_i$ is well-defined and $a > 0$. By [Ale94, 0.4(1)] implies that X_i belongs to a bounded family. In particular, there exists a positive integer N , and very ample divisors A_i on X_i , such that $-K_{X_i} \cdot A_i \leq N$ for any i . Possibly passing to a subsequence we may assume that $M := -K_{X_i} \cdot A_i$ is a constant positive integer. Therefore,

$$M = \sum b_{i,j}(B_{i,j} \cdot A_i) + \sum m_{i,j}(\mathbf{M}_{i,j,X_i} \cdot A_i).$$

Since $B_{i,j} \cdot A_i$ and $\mathbf{M}_{i,j,X_i} \cdot A_i$ are positive integers, $b_{i,j}$ and $m_{i,j}$ belong to a finite set. A contradiction.

Step 4. In this step we prove the case when there are two prime divisors E_i, C_i on X_i , such that $\lim_{i \rightarrow +\infty} \text{mult}_{E_i} B_i = \lim_{i \rightarrow +\infty} \text{mult}_{C_i} B_i = 1$.

We let $e_i := \text{mult}_{E_i} B_i$, $c_i := \text{mult}_{C_i} B_i$, and $\tilde{B}_i := B_i - e_i E_i - c_i C_i$. Since $\rho(X_i) = 1$, $E_i \equiv \mu_i C_i$ for some $\mu_i > 0$. Possibly passing to a subsequence and switching E_i, C_i , we may assume that $\mu_i < 1$ for each i . We let

$$\tilde{B}'_i := \tilde{B}_i + E_i + (1 - c_i - e_i \mu_i) C_i.$$

By Lemma 4.4, possibly passing to a subsequence, we have that the coefficients of \tilde{B}_i belong to a DCC set, $(X_i, \tilde{B}'_i, \mathbf{M}_i)$ is lc but not plt, X_i is \mathbb{Q} -factorial plt, and $K_{X_i} + \tilde{B}'_i + \mathbf{M}_{i,X_i} \equiv 0$. This contradicts Step 2.

Step 5. Let E_i be a prime divisor over X_i such that $a(E_i, X_i, B_i, \mathbf{M}_i) = \text{mld}(X_i, B_i, \mathbf{M}_i)$. In this step we reduce to the case when E_i is on X_i . Since $a(E_i, X_i, B_i, \mathbf{M}_i) < \text{mld}(X_i)$, so possibly passing to a subsequence, we may assume that e_i is strictly decreasing, $e_i < 1$ for each i , and $\lim_{i \rightarrow +\infty} e_i = 0$. By Lemma 3.4, there exists an extraction $f_i : \bar{X}_i \rightarrow X_i$ of E_i . Let

$$K_{\bar{X}_i} + \bar{B}_i + e_i E_i + \mathbf{M}_{i,\bar{X}_i} := f_i^*(K_{X_i} + B_i + \mathbf{M}_{i,X_i})$$

where $e_i := 1 - a(E_i, X_i, B_i, \mathbf{M}_i)$, and let $0 < e'_i < e_i$ be a real number such $\lim_{i \rightarrow +\infty} (e_i - e'_i) = 0$. Since

$$K_{\bar{X}_i} + \bar{B}_i + e_i E_i + \mathbf{M}_{i,\bar{X}_i} \equiv 0,$$

$K_{\bar{X}_i} + \bar{B}_i + e'_i E_i + \mathbf{M}_{i,\bar{X}_i}$ is not pseudo-effective, so we may run a $(K_{\bar{X}_i} + \bar{B}_i + e'_i E_i + \mathbf{M}_{i,\bar{X}_i})$ -MMP. Let $h_i : \bar{X}_i \rightarrow \bar{X}'_i$ be the first step of this MMP. Note that since \bar{X}_i is a surface, h_i is either a Mori fiber space or a divisorial contraction. Since E_i is ample/ X'_i , by Step 1, h_i is not a Mori fiber space. Thus h_i is a divisorial contraction of a prime divisor F_i . We have that $\rho(\bar{X}'_i) = 1$. Let \bar{B}'_i, E'_i be the image of \bar{B}_i, E_i on \bar{X}'_i for each i .

By Step 3, possibly passing to a subsequence, there exists a prime divisor C_i over \bar{X}'_i such that $a(C_i, \bar{X}'_i)$ is strictly decreasing and $\lim_{i \rightarrow +\infty} a(C_i, \bar{X}'_i) = 0$. In particular, possibly passing to a subsequence, we may assume that C_i is exceptional/ \bar{X}'_i and

$a(C_i, \bar{X}'_i, \bar{B}'_i + e_i E'_i, \mathbf{M}_i)$ is strictly decreasing. Let $c_i := 1 - a(C_i, \bar{X}'_i, \bar{B}'_i + e_i E'_i, \mathbf{M}_i)$ and let $g_i : \hat{X}_i \rightarrow \bar{X}'_i$ be the extraction of C_i . We have

$$K_{\hat{X}_i} + \hat{B}_i + e'_i \hat{E}_i + c_i C_i + \mathbf{M}_{i, \hat{X}_i} = g_i^*(K_{\bar{X}'_i} + \bar{B}'_i + e'_i E'_i + \mathbf{M}_{i, \bar{X}'_i}),$$

where \hat{B}_i, \hat{E}_i are the strict transforms of \bar{B}'_i, E'_i on \hat{X}_i .

We run a $(-C_i)$ -MMP and let $\phi_i : \hat{X}_i \rightarrow \hat{X}'_i$ be the first step of this MMP. Note that since \hat{X}_i is a surface, ϕ_i is either a Mori fiber space or a divisorial contraction. Since C_i is ample/ \hat{X}'_i , by **Step 1**, ϕ_i is not a Mori fiber space, so it is a divisorial contraction. Let $\hat{B}'_i, \hat{E}'_i, C'_i$ be the images of $\hat{B}_i, \hat{E}_i, C_i$ on \hat{X}'_i respectively.

In particular, $\rho(\hat{X}'_i) = 1$. By **Step 4**, \hat{E}_i is contracted by ϕ_i . Then $(\hat{X}'_i, \hat{B}'_i + c_i C'_i, \mathbf{M}_i)$ is \mathbb{Q} -factorial klt and

$$K_{\hat{X}'_i} + \hat{B}'_i + c_i C'_i + \mathbf{M}_{i, \hat{X}'_i} \equiv 0.$$

By Lemma 4.4, possibly passing to a subsequence, $(\hat{X}'_i, \hat{B}'_i + C'_i, \mathbf{M}_i)$ is lc. Thus

$$K_{\hat{X}_i} + \hat{B}_i + e''_i \hat{E}_i + C_i + \mathbf{M}_{i, \hat{X}_i} = \phi_i^*(K_{\hat{X}'_i} + \hat{B}'_i + C'_i + \mathbf{M}_{i, \hat{X}'_i})$$

for some $e''_i \leq 1$. Therefore,

$$(K_{\hat{X}_i} + \hat{B}_i + \hat{E}_i + C_i + \mathbf{M}_{i, \hat{X}_i}) \cdot \hat{E}_i \leq 0.$$

By Lemma 4.4 again, possibly passing to a subsequence, $(\bar{X}'_i, \bar{B}'_i + E'_i, \mathbf{M}_i)$ is lc for any i . Thus

$$K_{\hat{X}_i} + \hat{B}_i + \hat{E}_i + c'_i C_i + \mathbf{M}_{i, \hat{X}_i} = g_i^*(K_{\bar{X}'_i} + \bar{B}'_i + E'_i + \mathbf{M}_{i, \bar{X}'_i})$$

for some $c'_i \leq 1$. Therefore,

$$(K_{\hat{X}_i} + \hat{B}_i + \hat{E}_i + C_i + \mathbf{M}_{i, \hat{X}_i}) \cdot C_i \leq 0.$$

Since $\rho(\hat{X}_i) = 2$ and C_i, E_i are negative extremal rays in $\overline{NE}(X_i)$,

$$-(K_{\hat{X}_i} + \hat{B}_i + \hat{E}_i + C_i + \mathbf{M}_{i, \hat{X}_i})$$

is nef. Thus

$$(1 - c_i)C'_i \equiv (\phi_i)_*(-(K_{\hat{X}_i} + \hat{B}_i + \hat{E}_i + C_i + \mathbf{M}_{i, \hat{X}_i}))$$

is pseudo-effective. This is not possible. \square

4.3. ACC on threefolds.

Proposition 4.6. *Conjecture 4.2 holds when $d = 3$.*

Proof. We may assume that $1 \in \Gamma$. Assume the lemma does not hold, then there exists a sequence $(X_i, B_i, \mathbf{M}_i; D_i, \mathbf{N}_i)$ such that $\dim X_i = 3$, $B_i, D_i \in \Gamma$, $\mathbf{M}, \mathbf{N} \in \text{Nef}(X, \Gamma)$, and $t_i := \text{lct}(X_i, B_i, \mathbf{M}_i; D_i, \mathbf{N}_i)$ is strictly increasing. In particular, we may assume that $t_i > 0$ for each i .

Suppose that for infinitely many i , there exist an lc place E_i of $(X_i, \Delta_i := B_i + t_i D_i, \mathbf{P}_i := \mathbf{M}_i + t_i \mathbf{N}_i)$ on X_i such that

$$a(E_i, X_i, B_i + (t_i + \epsilon)D_i, \mathbf{M}_i + (t_i + \epsilon)\mathbf{N}_i) < 0$$

for any $\epsilon > 0$. Then E_i is a component of $B_i + t_i D_i$, $\text{mult}_{E_i} D_i > 0$, and $\text{mult}_{E_i}(B_i + t_i D_i) = 1$, which is not possible as Γ satisfies the DCC and t_i is strictly increasing. Thus possibly passing to a subsequence, we may assume that no such E_i exists.

By Lemma 3.6, there are two projective birational morphisms $h_i : X'_i \rightarrow X_i$ and $g_i : Y_i \rightarrow X'_i$, such that

- h_i is a \mathbb{Q} -factorial dlt modification of $(X_i, \Delta_i, \mathbf{P}_i)$,
- any h_i -exceptional prime divisor P_i is an lc place of (X_i, B_i, \mathbf{M}_i) ,
- g_i extracts a unique prime divisor E_i such that $-E_i$ is ample/ X'_i ,
- $a(E_i, X_i, B_i + t_i D_i, \mathbf{M}_i + t_i \mathbf{N}_i) = 0$ and $a(E_i, X_i, B_i, \mathbf{M}_i) > 0$, and
- $(Y_i, B_{Y_i}, \mathbf{M})$ is \mathbb{Q} -factorial dlt, where B_{Y_i} is the strict transform of B_i on Y_i plus the reduced $(h_i \circ g_i)$ -exceptional divisor. By Lemma 2.6, E_i is normal.

Let D'_i, D_{Y_i} be the strict transforms of D_i on X'_i, Y_i respectively, and let B'_i be the strict transform of B_i on X'_i plus the reduced h_i -exceptional divisor. By our construction,

$$t_i = \text{lct}(X'_i, B'_i, \mathbf{M}_i; D'_i, \mathbf{N}_i),$$

and $D_{Y_i} + \mathbf{N}_{i, Y_i} = g_i^*(D'_i + \mathbf{N}_{i, X'_i}) + b_i E_i$ for some $b_i > 0$. Therefore, $(D_{Y_i} + \mathbf{N}_{i, Y_i})|_{E_i}$ is ample.

Let $x'_i := \text{center}_{X'_i} E_i$, F_i a general fiber of $E_i \rightarrow x'_i$,

$$K_{E_i} + B_{E_i}(t) + \mathbf{M}_i(t)|_{E_i} := (K_{Y_i} + B_{Y_i} + t D_{Y_i} + \mathbf{M}_{i, Y_i} + t \mathbf{N}_{i, Y_i})|_{E_i}$$

for any real number t , and

$$K_{F_i} + B_{F_i}(t) + \mathbf{M}_i^{F_i}(t)|_{F_i} = (K_{E_i} + B_{E_i}(t) + \mathbf{M}_i(t)|_{E_i})|_{F_i}$$

for any real number t , where $\mathbf{M}_i^{F_i}(t) := \mathbf{M}_i(t)|_{F_i}$. Then

$$K_{F_i} + B_{F_i}(t_i) + \mathbf{M}_i^{F_i}(t_i)|_{F_i} \equiv 0$$

and

$$K_{F_i} + B_{F_i}(0) + \mathbf{M}_i^{F_i}(0)|_{F_i}$$

is anti-ample. Since $\dim F_i \leq 2$, by Lemma 4.5, $B_{E_i}(t_i) \in \Gamma_0$ and $\mathbf{M}_i(t_i) \in \text{Nef}^0(\Gamma_0)$ for some finite set Γ_0 depending only on Γ . By Lemma 3.1(1), $K_{F_i} + B_{F_i}(t) + \mathbf{M}_i^{F_i}(t)|_{F_i} \equiv 0$ for any i , which is not possible as $K_{F_i} + B_{F_i}(0) + \mathbf{M}_i^{F_i}(0)|_{F_i}$ is anti-ample. \square

Remark 4.7. We essentially get the above results by computing the intersection number of F_i with the divisor, which works in the surface case, not by applying the adjunction formula. It's worth investigating deeply on the adjunctions for general fibers of a fibration (or a Mori fiber space) in char p . We believe that one can get more general results following the ideas in [PW22].

5. EXISTENCE OF SHOKUROV-TYPE POLYTOPE

Proposition 5.1. *Let $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ be a \mathbb{Q} -factorial lc generalized pair of dimension ≤ 3 such that X is klt. Then any $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)$ -negative extremal ray R/U is spanned by a rational curve C such that*

$$0 < -(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X) \cdot C \leq 6.$$

Proof. Let R be a $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)$ -negative extremal ray/ U . Then R is a $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X + A)$ -negative extremal ray for some ample/ U \mathbb{R} -divisor A . By Lemma 2.4, R is a $(K_X + \Delta)$ -negative extremal ray/ U for some klt pair (X, Δ) such that $K_X + \Delta \sim_{\mathbb{R}, U} K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X + A$. The proposition follows from [HNT20, Theorem 1.3(4)]. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.5. Let $B(\mathbf{v}) := \sum_{i=1}^m v_i B_i$ and $\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{v}) := \sum_{i=m+1}^{m+n} v_i \mathbf{M}_i$ for any $\mathbf{v} := (v_1, \dots, v_{m+n}) \in \mathbb{R}^{m+n}$. By the existence of log resolutions, there exists an open subset $U_1 \ni \mathbf{v}_0$ in the rational polytope of \mathbf{v}_0 , such that for any $\mathbf{v} \in U_1$, $(X, B(\mathbf{v}), \mathbf{M}(\mathbf{v}))$ is lc. We let $c := \dim U_1$ and let $\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{c+1}$ be vectors in $U_1 \cap \mathbb{Q}^m$ such that \mathbf{v}_0 is contained in the convex hull U_2 spanned by $\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{c+1}$. Then there exist positive real numbers

a_1, \dots, a_{c+1} such that $\sum_{i=1}^{c+1} a_i \mathbf{v}_i = \mathbf{v}_0$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{c+1} a_i = 1$. We let I be a positive integer such that $I(K_X + B(\mathbf{v}_i) + \mathbf{M}(\mathbf{v}_i)_X)$ is Cartier for each i . Let $a_0 := \min_{1 \leq i \leq c+1} \{a_i\}$.

Consider the set

$$\Gamma := \left\{ \sum a_i \gamma_i \mid \gamma_i \in [-6I, +\infty) \cap \mathbb{Z} \right\} \cap (0, +\infty).$$

We have $\gamma_0 := \inf\{\gamma \in \Gamma\} > 0$. We let U be the interior of the set

$$\left\{ \frac{1}{6I + \gamma_0} (6I\mathbf{v}_0 + \gamma_0\mathbf{v}) \mid \mathbf{v} \in U_2 \right\}.$$

We show that U satisfies our requirement. By our construction, $(X, B(\mathbf{v}), \mathbf{M}(\mathbf{v}))$ is lc for any $\mathbf{v} \in U$, so we only need to show that $K_X + \sum_{i=1}^m v_i B_i + \sum_{i=m+1}^{m+n} v_i \mathbf{M}_{i,X}$ is nef/ Z for any $\mathbf{v} = (v_1, \dots, v_{m+n}) \in U$. We let R be an extremal ray in $\overline{NE}(X/U)$. There are three cases.

Case 1. $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X) \cdot R = 0$. In this case, by [HLS19, Lemma 5.3], $(K_X + B(\mathbf{v}) + \mathbf{M}(\mathbf{v})_X) \cdot R = 0$ for any $\mathbf{v} \in U_1$, so $(K_X + B(\mathbf{v}) + \mathbf{M}(\mathbf{v})_X) \cdot R = 0$ for any $\mathbf{v} \in U$.

Case 2. $(K_X + B(\mathbf{v}_i) + \mathbf{M}(\mathbf{v}_i)_X) \cdot R \geq 0$ for any i . In this case, $(K_X + B(\mathbf{v}) + \mathbf{M}(\mathbf{v})_X) \cdot R \geq 0$ for any $\mathbf{v} \in U_2$, so $(K_X + B(\mathbf{v}) + \mathbf{M}(\mathbf{v})_X) \cdot R \geq 0$ for any $\mathbf{v} \in U$.

Case 3. $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X) \cdot R > 0$ and $(K_X + B(\mathbf{v}_j) + \mathbf{M}(\mathbf{v}_j)) \cdot R < 0$ for some j . In this case, by Proposition 5.1, R is spanned by a curve C such that $(K_X + B(\mathbf{v}_i) + \mathbf{M}(\mathbf{v}_i)_X) \cdot C \geq -6$ for any i . Thus

$$I(K_X + B(\mathbf{v}_i) + \mathbf{M}(\mathbf{v}_i)_X) \cdot C \in [-6I, +\infty) \cap \mathbb{Z},$$

so

$$I(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X) \cdot C \in \Gamma.$$

Then for any $\mathbf{v} \in U$, there exists $\mathbf{v}' \in U_2$ such that $(6I + \gamma_0)\mathbf{v} = 6I\mathbf{v}_0 + \gamma_0\mathbf{v}'$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} & I(K_X + B(\mathbf{v}) + \mathbf{M}(\mathbf{v})_X) \cdot C \\ &= \frac{\gamma_0}{6I + \gamma_0} I(K_X + B(\mathbf{v}') + \mathbf{M}(\mathbf{v}')_X) \cdot C + \frac{6I}{6I + \gamma_0} I(K_X + B(\mathbf{v}_0) + \mathbf{M}(\mathbf{v}_0)_X) \cdot C \\ &\geq \frac{\gamma_0}{6I + \gamma_0} \cdot (-6I) + \frac{6I}{6I + \gamma_0} \cdot \gamma_0 = 0, \end{aligned}$$

so $I(K_X + B(\mathbf{v}) + \mathbf{M}(\mathbf{v})_X) \cdot R \geq 0$. The theorem follows. \square

6. EXISTENCE OF MINIMAL MODELS, TERMINAL CASE

Definition 6.1 (Difficulty). Let $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ be a \mathbb{Q} -factorial NQC terminal generalized pair with $B = \sum b_i B_i$ and $\mathbf{M} = \sum \mu_j \mathbf{M}_j$, where B_i are the irreducible components of B and each \mathbf{M}_j is a nef/ U \mathbf{b} -Cartier \mathbf{b} -divisor. Let $b := \max\{b_i, 0\}$ and let

$$\mathcal{S}_b := \left\{ \sum n_i b_i + \sum m_j \mu_j \mid n_i, m_j \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \right\} \cap [b, +\infty).$$

For any $\xi \in \mathcal{S}_b$, we define

$$d_\xi(X, B, \mathbf{M}) := \#\{E \mid E \text{ is exceptional}/X, a(E, X, B, \mathbf{M}) < 2 - \xi\}.$$

The *difficulty* of (X, B, \mathbf{M}) is defined as

$$d(X, B, \mathbf{M}) := \sum_{\xi \in \mathcal{S}_b} d_\xi(X, B, \mathbf{M}).$$

Lemma 6.2. *Let $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ be a \mathbb{Q} -factorial NQC terminal generalized pair. Then*

$$0 \leq d(X, B, \mathbf{M}) < +\infty.$$

Proof. We follow the proof of [CT23, lemma 2.22]. It still holds in positive characteristic. For convenience, we provide a full proof.

For $\xi \geq 1$, $d_\xi(X, B, \mathbf{M}) = 0$ since (X, B, \mathbf{M}) is terminal. Since the set $\mathcal{S}_b \cap [0, 1)$ is finite, we only need to show that $d_\xi(X, B, \mathbf{M}) < \infty$ for any fixed ξ . Since $d_\xi(X, B, \mathbf{M}) \leq d_b(X, B, \mathbf{M})$ for any $\xi \in [0, 1)$, we only need to show that $d_b(X, B, \mathbf{M}) < \infty$. Let $f : X' \rightarrow X$ be a log resolution of (X, B) such that \mathbf{M} descends to X' , and let

$$K_{X'} + B' + \mathbf{M}_{X'} := f^*(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X).$$

We may write $B' = (B')^+ - (B')^-$ for where $(B')^+ \geq 0$, $(B')^- \geq 0$, and $(B')^+ \wedge (B')^- = 0$. Possibly blowing-up more, we may assume that $\text{Supp}(B')^+$ is non-singular. Since (X, B, \mathbf{M}) is terminal, $B'^+ = f_*^{-1}B$. Thus for any prime divisor F that is exceptional/ X , we have

$$a(F, X, B, \mathbf{M}) = a(F, X', B', \mathbf{M}') = a(F, X', B') \geq 2 - b$$

by [KM98, Corollary 2.31(3)]. Therefore,

$$d_b(X, B, \mathbf{M}) \leq \#\{E \mid E \text{ is exceptional}/X, E \text{ is on } X'\} < +\infty.$$

□

Lemma 6.3. *Let $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ be an NQC generalized pair such that $B = \sum_i b_i B_i$ and $\mathbf{M} = \sum_j \mu_j \mathbf{M}_j$, where B_i are the irreducible components of B , each \mathbf{M}_j is a nef/ U \mathbf{b} -Cartier divisor, and each $\mu_j \geq 0$. Assume that X is smooth at the generic point of a codimension $k \geq 2$ closed subvariety V of X and let E be the irreducible component of the blow-up of V which dominates V . Then*

$$a(E, X, B, \mathbf{M}) = k - \sum_i n_i b_i - \sum_j m_j \mu_j$$

for some non-negative integers n_i and m_j .

Proof. Let $h : X' \rightarrow X$ be the blow-up of V . Then

$$a(E, X, B, \mathbf{M}) = a(E, X, B) - \text{mult}_E(f^* \mathbf{M}_X - \mathbf{M}_{X'}).$$

By [KM98, Lemma 2.29], $a(E, X, B) = k - \sum_i n_i b_i$ for some non-negative integers n_i . By the negativity lemma, $f^* \mathbf{M}_{j,X} - \mathbf{M}_{j,X'} \geq 0$ for each j . Since $\mathbf{M}_{j,X}$ is Cartier near the generic point of V , $m_j := \text{mult}_E(f^* \mathbf{M}_{j,X} - \mathbf{M}_{j,X'})$ is a non-negative integer and the lemma follows. □

Theorem 6.4. *Let $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ be a 3-dimensional \mathbb{Q} -factorial NQC terminal generalized pair. Then any sequence of $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)$ -flips/ U terminates.*

Proof. Let

$$(X, B, \mathbf{M}) =: (X_1, B_1, \mathbf{M}) \dashrightarrow (X_2, B_2, \mathbf{M}) \dashrightarrow (X_3, B_3, \mathbf{M}) \dashrightarrow \cdots \dashrightarrow (X_i, B_i, \mathbf{M}) \dashrightarrow \cdots$$

be a sequence of $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)$ -flips/ U and let $f_i : X_i \rightarrow X_{i-1}$ be the flipping contractions. Since log discrepancies does not decrease under the MMP and $X \dashrightarrow X_i$ does not contract any divisor for any i , (X_i, B_i, \mathbf{M}) is terminal for each i . We prove by induction on the number of components of B_1 .

Step 1. First suppose $B_1 = 0$. Since X_{i+1} is terminal, it is smooth along the generic point of a flipped curve C_{i+1} . Let η_{i+1} be the generic point of C_{i+1} . Let E_{i+1} be the exceptional divisor obtained by blowing up X_{i+1} at η_{i+1} , then by Lemma 6.3,

$$a(E_{i+1}, X_i, \mathbf{M}_i) < a(E_{i+1}, X_{i+1}, \mathbf{M}_{i+1}) = 2 - \sum_j m_j \mu_j$$

for some non-negative integers m_j . Therefore, $d(X_i, M_i) > d(X_{i+1}, M_{i+1})$. Since $d(X_1, M_1) < +\infty$, the flips can't be infinite.

Step 2. Now suppose the flip terminates when the number of components of $B_1 \leq s - 1$ for some positive integer s . If the number of components of $B_1 = s$, then we may write $B_1 = \sum_{k=1}^s b_k B_{1,k}$ where $B_{1,k}$ are the irreducible components of B_1 , and let $b := \max_k b_k$. We define

$$D_1 := \sum_{b_k=b} B_{1,k}.$$

and let D_i be the image of D_1 on X_i for each i .

First we reduce to the case when D_i does not contain any flipped curve of $X_i \rightarrow W_{i-1}$. Suppose that D_i contains a flipped curve C_i . Since X_i is terminal, it is smooth along the generic point of a flipped curve C_i . Let η_i be the generic point of C_i . Let E_i be the exceptional divisor obtained by blowing up X_i at η_i , then by Lemma 6.3, then

$$a(E_i, X_{i-1}, B_{i-1}, \mathbf{M}) < a(E_i, X_i, B_i, \mathbf{M}) = 2 - \sum n_i b_i - \sum m_j \mu_j$$

for some non-negative integer n_i, μ_j , and when $b_k = b$, we have $n_k > 0$. Therefore,

$$2 - \sum n_i b_i - \sum m_j \mu_j \leq 2 - \sum_{b_k=b} n_k b_k \leq 2 - b.$$

So $d(X_{i+1}, B_{i+1}, \mathbf{M}) > d(X_i, B_i, \mathbf{M})$. Thus possibly after truncating, we may assume that no D_i does not contain any flipped curve of $X_i \rightarrow W_{i-1}$.

Next we reduce to the case when D_i does not contain any flipping curve of $X_i \rightarrow W_i$. Let $\nu_i : D_i^\nu \rightarrow D_i$ be the normalization of D_i and $\varphi_i : D_i^\nu \rightarrow W_i^\nu, \varphi_i^+ : D_{i+1}^\nu \rightarrow W_{i+1}^\nu$ the induced contractions. Let $g_i : D_i^\nu \dashrightarrow D_{i+1}^\nu$ be the induced birational map, then since no flipped curve of $X_{i+1} \rightarrow W_i$ is contained in D_{i+1} , g_i does not extract any divisor, so g_i is a contraction. We let $q_1 : D_1^\mu \rightarrow D_1^\nu$ be the minimal resolution of D_1^ν and let $q_i : D_i^\mu \rightarrow D_i^\nu$ be the induced contraction and let

$$\rho_i := \rho(D_1^\mu/U) - \#\{E \mid E \text{ is a } q_i\text{-exceptional prime divisor}\}.$$

Then ρ_i is non-increasing and $\rho_i \geq 0$ by [AHK07, Lemma 1.6] (note that [AHK07] works over \mathbb{C} but the same lines of the proof of [AHK07, Lemma 1.6] works over an algebraically closed field of any characteristic). Thus possibly truncating the MMP, we may assume that ρ_i is a constant. Thus g_i does not contract any divisor. However, any flipping curve of $X_i \rightarrow W_i$ that is contained in D_i is contract by g_i . Therefore, D_i does not contain any flipping curve of $X_i \rightarrow W_i$.

Hence, $D_i \cdot C \geq 0$ for every flipping curve $C \subseteq X_i$. Therefore, any $(K_{X_i} + B_i + \mathbf{M}_{i, X_i})$ -flip is also a $(K_{X_i} + (B_i - bD_i) + \mathbf{M}_{i, X_i})$ -flip, but $B_i - bD_i$ contains at most $s - 1$ irreducible components, and we are done by induction on s . \square

7. EXISTENCE OF LOG MINIMAL MODEL

Lemma 7.1. *Let $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ be an lc generalized pair of dimension ≤ 3 , $f : W \rightarrow X$ a log resolution of (X, B) such that \mathbf{M} descends to W , and $B_W := f_*^{-1}B + \text{Exc}(f)$. Let $(X', B', \mathbf{M})/U$ be a log minimal model of $(W, B_W, \mathbf{M})/U$. Then $(X', B', \mathbf{M})/U$ is also a log minimal model of $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$.*

Proof. By definition, we only need to show that

- (1) for any prime divisor D on X that is exceptional/ X' , we have $a(D, X, B, \mathbf{M}) < a(D, X', B', \mathbf{M})$, and
- (2) $(X', B', \mathbf{M})/U$ is a log birational model of $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$.

First we prove (1). For any prime divisor D on X that is exceptional/ X' , $\text{center}_W D$ is a divisor, so $a(D, W, B_W, \mathbf{M}) < a(D, X', B', \mathbf{M})$. Since (X, B, \mathbf{M}) is lc, $a(D, X, B, \mathbf{M}) \leq a(D, W, B_W, \mathbf{M})$. This implies (1).

Now we prove (2). For any prime divisor D on X' that is exceptional/ X , if D is exceptional/ W , then since $(X', B', \mathbf{M})/U$ is a log birational model of $(W, B_W, \mathbf{M})/U$, $\text{mult}_D B' = 1$. If D is not exceptional/ W , then $D_W := \text{center}_W D$ is a divisor and D is exceptional/ X , so $\text{mult}_D B' = \text{mult}_{D_W} B_W = 1$. This implies (2). \square

Lemma 7.2. *Let $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ be an lc generalized pair of dimension ≤ 3 , $(X', B', \mathbf{M})/U$ a bs-weak lc model of $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$, and $g : W \rightarrow X$ and $h : W \rightarrow X'$ two birational morphisms. Then*

$$g^*(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X) = h^*(K_{X'} + B' + \mathbf{M}_{X'}) + F$$

for some $F \geq 0$ that is exceptional/ X' .

Proof. By the definition of bs-weak lc models, $g_*F \geq 0$. By the negativity lemma, $F \geq 0$. If F is not exceptional/ X' , then we let D be a component of F that is not exceptional/ X . If D is not exceptional/ X , then $a(D, X, B, \mathbf{M}) = a(D, X', B', \mathbf{M})$ so D is not a component of F , a contradiction. If D is exceptional/ X , then $\text{mult}_D B' = 1$. Since $F \geq 0$,

$$0 \leq a(D, X, B, \mathbf{M}) \leq a(D, X', B', \mathbf{M}) = 0,$$

so D is not a component of F , a contradiction. \square

Lemma 7.3. *Let $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ be an lc generalized pair of dimension ≤ 3 . Assume that $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ admits a bs-weak lc model. Then $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ admits a log minimal model.*

Proof. Let $(X', B', \mathbf{M})/U$ be a bs-weak lc model of $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$. Let $g : W \rightarrow X$ and $h : W \rightarrow X'$ be a common log resolution such that \mathbf{M} descends to W . Let $B_W := g_*^{-1}B + \text{Exc}(g)$. Then

$$K_W + B_W + \mathbf{M}_W = g^*(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X) + F_1$$

for some $F_1 \geq 0$ that is exceptional/ X . By Lemma 7.2,

$$g^*(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X) = h^*(K_{X'} + B' + \mathbf{M}_{X'}) + F_2$$

for some $F_2 \geq 0$ that is exceptional/ X . Thus

$$K_W + B_W + \mathbf{M}_W = h^*(K_{X'} + B' + \mathbf{M}_{X'}) + F_1 + F_2$$

Since F_1 is exceptional/ X , for any component D of F_1 that is not exceptional/ X' , $\text{mult}_D B' = 1$, so $\text{mult}_D B_W > 1$, which is not possible. Thus F_1 is exceptional/ X' , so $F_1 + F_2$ is exceptional/ X' . We let $B'_W \geq B_W$ be the unique \mathbb{R} -divisor such that

$\text{Supp}(B'_W - B_W) \subset \text{Supp}(F_1 + F_2)$, and for any irreducible component D of $F_1 + F_2$, $\text{mult}_D B'_W = 1$. Then (W, B'_W) is log smooth and

$$K_W + B'_W + \mathbf{M}_W \sim_{\mathbb{R}, X'} F \geq 0$$

where $\text{Supp } F = \text{Supp}(F_1 + F_2)$. We run a $(K_W + B'_W + \mathbf{M}_W)$ -MMP/ X' , which is an F -MMP. By Proposition 3.3, the MMP terminates near $\lfloor B'_W \rfloor$. In particular, this MMP terminates near $\text{Supp } F$, so this MMP terminates with a log minimal model $(X'', B'', \mathbf{M})/X'$ of $(W, B'_W, \mathbf{M})/X'$. Let F'' be the image of F on X'' , then $K_{X''} + B'' + \mathbf{M}_{X''} \sim_{\mathbb{R}, X'} F'' \geq 0$, so F'' is nef/ X' . By the negativity lemma, $F'' = 0$. Let $f : X'' \rightarrow X'$ be the induced birational morphism, then $K_{X''} + B'' + \mathbf{M}_{X''} = f^*(K_{X'} + B' + \mathbf{M}_{X'})$. Therefore, $K_{X''} + B'' + \mathbf{M}_{X''}$ is nef/ U , so $(X'', B'', \mathbf{M})/U$ is a log minimal model of (W, B'_W, \mathbf{M}) .

Since $F'' = 0$, any irreducible component of $B'_W - B_W$ is exceptional/ X'' . Since $B'_W \geq B_W$, $(X'', B'', \mathbf{M})/U$ is a log minimal model of (W, B'_W, \mathbf{M}) . By Lemma 7.1, $(X'', B'', \mathbf{M})/U$ is a log minimal model of $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$. \square

Definition 7.4 (Weak Zariski decomposition). Let $X \rightarrow U$ be a projective morphism from a normal quasi-projective variety to a quasi-projective variety and let D be an \mathbb{R} -Cartier \mathbb{R} -divisor on X . We say that D admits a *weak Zariski decomposition*/ U (resp. an *NQC weak Zariski decomposition*/ U) if there exists a projective birational morphism $f : W \rightarrow X$ such that

$$f^*D = P + N,$$

where P is nef/ U (resp. NQC/ U) and $N \geq 0$. (f, P, N) is called a *weak Zariski decomposition*/ U (resp. an *NQC weak Zariski decomposition*/ U) of $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$.

Definition-Lemma 7.5 (MMP using weak Zariski decomposition). Let $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ be a projective \mathbb{Q} -factorial lc generalized pair of dimension 3 such that X is klt,

$$K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X = P + N$$

for some nef/ U \mathbb{R} -divisor P and $N \geq 0$, and $\text{Supp } N \subset \lfloor B \rfloor$. Let

$$\mu := \sup\{t \in [0, 1] \mid P + tN \text{ is nef}/U\}.$$

Then either $\mu = 1$, or there exists an extremal ray/ U R such that $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X) \cdot R < 0$ and $(P + \mu N) \cdot R = 0$.

Moreover, let $\phi : (X, B, \mathbf{M}) \dashrightarrow (X', B', \mathbf{M})$ be a divisorial contraction/ U or flip/ U , such that it is step of a $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)$ -MMP/ U which contracts R . Then $(X', B', \mathbf{M})/U$ is lc, X' is \mathbb{Q} -factorial klt, and we may write

$$K_{X'} + B' + \mathbf{M}_{X'} = P' + N'$$

for some nef/ U \mathbb{R} -divisor P' and $N' \geq 0$, and $\text{Supp } N' \subset \text{Supp} \lfloor B' \rfloor$. We may replace (X, B, \mathbf{M}) and P, N with (X', B', \mathbf{M}) and P', N' respectively and repeat this process. Such process will be called a $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)$ -MMP/ U using weak Zariski decomposition (P, N) .

Proof. First we prove the existence of such R . We may assume that $\mu < 1$. Replacing P with $P + \mu N$ we may assume $\mu = 0$ and $N \neq 0$. Then for every $\epsilon' > 0$, $P + \epsilon' N$ is not nef/ U . In particular, for every $\epsilon' > 0$, there exists a $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)$ -negative extremal ray/ U R such that $(P + \epsilon' N) \cdot R < 0$, but $(P + \epsilon N) \cdot R = 0$ for some $0 \leq \epsilon < \epsilon'$.

Suppose that the lemma does not hold. Then we can find a strictly decreasing sequence $\{\epsilon_i\}_{i=1}^{+\infty}$ such that $\lim_{i \rightarrow +\infty} \epsilon_i = 0$ and $(P + \epsilon_i N) \cdot R_i = 0$ for some $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)$ -negative extremal ray/ U R_i . By Proposition 5.1, each R_i is generated by a curve C_i such that

$$0 < -(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X) \cdot C_i \leq 6.$$

We may assume that $\epsilon_1 < 1$. Since $\text{Supp } N \subset [B]$, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X - \delta N) \cdot C_i < 0$ for each i , $B - \delta N \geq 0$, and $\text{Supp}(B - \delta N) = \text{Supp } B$. We have

$$K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X - \delta N = P + (1 - \delta)N.$$

We reduce to the case when $N \cdot C_i$ is a constant for any i . Let τ be a positive real number such that for any irreducible component S of N ,

$$B \geq B - \delta N + \tau S \geq B - \delta N - \tau S \geq 0.$$

By Proposition 5.1, for any i and any irreducible component S of N , if $S \cdot R_i \geq 0$, then

$$0 < -(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X - \delta N) \cdot C_i \leq -(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X - \delta N - \tau S) \cdot C_i \leq 6$$

so $0 \leq S \cdot C_i < \frac{6}{\tau}$, and if $S \cdot R_i < 0$, then

$$0 < -(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X - \delta N) \cdot C_i < -(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X - \delta N + \tau S) \cdot C_i \leq 6,$$

so $0 \leq -S \cdot C_i < \frac{6}{\tau}$. Let I be a positive integer such that IS is Cartier for any irreducible component S of N , then $S \cdot C_i \in (-\frac{6}{\tau}, \frac{6}{\tau}) \cap \frac{1}{I}\mathbb{Z}$. Therefore, passing to a subsequence, we may assume that $S \cdot C_i$ is a constant for any irreducible component S of N , hence $N \cdot C_i$ is a constant. Therefore,

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow +\infty} P \cdot C_i = \lim_{i \rightarrow +\infty} -\epsilon_i N \cdot C_i = 0,$$

so possibly passing to a subsequence, $P \cdot C_i$ is strictly decreasing, hence

$$(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X) \cdot C_i = (P + N) \cdot C_i$$

is strictly decreasing.

There exist positive real numbers a_1, \dots, a_k and lc generalized pairs (X, B_j, \mathbf{M}_j) , such that each B_j is a \mathbb{Q} -divisor, each \mathbf{M}_j is a \mathbb{Q} - \mathbf{b} -divisor, $\sum_{j=1}^k a_j = 1$, $\sum_{j=1}^k a_j B_j \cdot jB$, and $\sum_{j=1}^k a_j \mathbf{M}_j = \mathbf{M}$. Let N be a positive integer such that $N(K_{X_j} + B_j + \mathbf{M}_{j,X})$ is Cartier for each i . Then for any i, j , by Proposition 5.1,

$$(K_{X_j} + B_j + \mathbf{M}_{j,X}) \cdot C_i \in \frac{1}{N}\mathbb{Z} \cap [-6, +\infty),$$

so

$$(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X) \cdot C_i \in \Gamma := \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^k a_j \gamma_j \mid N\gamma_j \in [-6, +\infty) \right\} \cap [-6, 0),$$

where Γ is a DCC set. This is not possible as $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X) \cdot C_i$ is strictly decreasing.

We are left to prove the moreover part. Since MMP does not decrease discrepancies, (X', B', \mathbf{M}) is lc. By Lemma 2.5, X' is \mathbb{Q} -factorial klt. Since ϕ is $(P + \mu N)$ -trivial, $\phi_*(P + \mu N)$ is nef/ U . We may let $P' := \phi_*(P + \mu N)$ and $N' := (1 - \mu)\phi_*N$. \square

Proposition 7.6. *Let $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ be an NQC lc generalized pair of dimension 3 such that $K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X$ admits a weak Zariski decomposition/ U . Then $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ has a log minimal model.*

Proof. Step 1. In this step we introduce an invariant $\theta(X, B, \mathbf{M}, f, N)$.

Let \mathfrak{W} be the set of NQC lc generalized pairs $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ of dimension 3 such that $K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X$ admits a weak Zariski decomposition/ U but $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ does not have a log minimal model. It suffices to prove \mathfrak{W} is empty. For any $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U \in \mathfrak{W}$ with weak Zariski decomposition (f, P, N) , we let $\theta(X, B, \mathbf{M}, f, N)$ be the number of components of f_*N that are not contained in $\lfloor B \rfloor$.

Step 2. In this step we reduce to the case when $\theta(X, B, \mathbf{M}, f, N)$ is minimal, $\text{Supp } N \subset \lfloor B \rfloor$, $f = \text{id}_X$, and (X, B) is log smooth, and \mathbf{M} descends to X .

Assume that $\theta(X, B, \mathbf{M}, f, N)$ is minimal, i.e. for any $(X', B', \mathbf{M}')/U' \in \mathfrak{W}$ with weak Zariski decomposition (f', P', N') , we have $\theta(X, B, \mathbf{M}, f, N) \leq \theta(X', B', \mathbf{M}', f', N')$. Possibly replacing f , we may assume that $f : W \rightarrow X$ is a log resolution of $(X, B + f_*N)$ and \mathbf{M} descends to W . We let $B_W := f_*^{-1}B + \text{Exc}(f)$. Then

$$K_W + B_W + \mathbf{M}_W = f^*(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X) + F = P + (N + F)$$

for some $F \geq 0$ that is exceptional/ X . Then $(\text{id}_W, P, N + F)$ is a weak Zariski decomposition/ U of $(W, B_W, \mathbf{M})/U$. Since F is exceptional/ X and $\text{Supp } B_W$ contains $\text{Exc}(f)$, we have $\theta(X, B, \mathbf{M}, f, N) \geq \theta(W, B_W, \mathbf{M}, \text{id}_W, N + F)$. Since $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ does not have a log minimal model, by Lemma 7.1, $(W, B_W, \mathbf{M})/U$ does not have a log minimal model. Therefore, possibly replacing (X, B, \mathbf{M}) with (W, B_W, \mathbf{M}) , we may assume that $f = \text{id}_X$, (W, B_W) is log smooth, and \mathbf{M} descends to X . In particular, (X, B, \mathbf{M}) is \mathbb{Q} -factorial dlt.

Step 3. In this step we deal with the case when $\theta(X, B, \mathbf{M}, f, N) = 0$.

Suppose that $\theta(X, B, \mathbf{M}, f, N) = 0$, then $\text{Supp } N \subset \lfloor B \rfloor$. By Definition-Lemma 7.5, we may run a $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)$ -MMP/ U using weak Zariski decomposition (P, N) . By Proposition 3.3, the MMP terminates near a neighborhood of the image of $\text{Supp } \lfloor B \rfloor$. Since $\text{Supp } N \subset \lfloor B \rfloor$, then MMP terminates near the image of $\text{Supp } N$. This is not possible, because for any sequence of steps of $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)$ -MMP/ U using weak Zariski decomposition (P, N) , then image of N intersects the extremal ray in the MMP negatively. Thus the MMP terminates, which contradicts that $X \in \mathfrak{W}$.

Step 4. From now on we suppose $\theta(X, B, \mathbf{M}, f, N) > 0$. In this step we construct an auxiliary generalized pair $(X, \Delta, \mathbf{M})/U$ which admits a weak Zariski decomposition/ U .

Then we may define

$$\alpha = \min\{t > 0 \mid \lfloor (B + tN)^{\leq 1} \rfloor \neq \lfloor B \rfloor\}.$$

We may write $(B + \alpha N)^{\leq 1} := B + C$ where $C \geq 0$ and $\text{Supp } C \subset \text{Supp } N$, then $\theta(X, B, \mathbf{M}, f, N)$ is the number of components of C and $C \wedge \lfloor B \rfloor = 0$. We may write $\alpha N = A + C$, where $A \geq 0$ and $\text{Supp } A \subset \lfloor B \rfloor$. Since (X, B) is log smooth and \mathbf{M} descends to X , $(X, \Delta := B + C, \mathbf{M})/U$ is lc, and $(\text{id}_X, P, N + C)$ is a weak Zariski decomposition of $(X, \Delta, \mathbf{M})/U$. By our construction,

$$\theta(X, B, \mathbf{M}, f, N) > \theta(X, \Delta, \mathbf{M}, f, N + C).$$

Thus by the minimality of $\theta(X, B, \mathbf{M}, f, N)$, there exists a log minimal model $(Y, \Delta_Y, \mathbf{M})/U$ of (X, Δ, \mathbf{M}) .

Let $g : V \rightarrow X$ and $h : V \rightarrow Y$ be a common resolution, $P' := h^*(K_Y + \Delta_Y + \mathbf{M}_Y)$, and

$$N' := g^*(K_X + \Delta + \mathbf{M}_X) - h^*(K_Y + \Delta_Y + \mathbf{M}_Y).$$

Then $N' \geq 0$, so (g, P', N') is a weak Zariski decomposition/ U of $K_X + \Delta + \mathbf{M}_X$. Moreover, since

$$g^*(P + N + C) = P' + N',$$

$g^*(N + C) - N' = P' - g^*P$ is anti-nef/ Y . Since N' is exceptional/ Y , $h_*(g^*(N + C) - N') \geq 0$, so by the negativity lemma, $g^*(N + C) - N' \geq 0$. Therefore, $\text{Supp } N' \subset \text{Supp } g^*N$.

Step 5. In this step we show that C is exceptional/ Y .

We have

$$\begin{aligned} (1 + \alpha)g^*(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X) &= g^*(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X) + \alpha g^*P + \alpha g^*N \\ &= g^*(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X) + \alpha g^*P + g^*(A + C) \\ &= (P' + \alpha g^*P) + (N' + g^*A). \end{aligned}$$

Let $P'' := \frac{1}{1+\alpha}(P' + \alpha g^*P)$ and $N'' := \frac{1}{1+\alpha}(N' + g^*A)$. Then so (g, P'', N'') is a weak Zariski decomposition/ U of $K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X$. Since $\text{Supp } N'' = \text{Supp}(N' + g^*A) \subseteq \text{Supp } g^*N$, we have $\text{Supp } g_*N'' \subseteq \text{Supp } N$. By the minimality of $\theta(X, B, \mathbf{M}, f, N)$, we have $\theta(X, B, \mathbf{M}, f, N) = \theta(X, B, \mathbf{M}, g, N'')$. Therefore, every component of C is contained in $\text{Supp } g_*N''$. Since N' is exceptional/ Y , $N'' = N' + g^*A$, and no component of C is contained in $\text{Supp } A$, C is exceptional/ Y . In particular, $(Y, \Delta_Y, \mathbf{M})/U$ is a log birational model of $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$.

Step 6. Let $G := g^*C \wedge N'$, $\tilde{C} := g^*C - G$, and $\tilde{N}' := N' - G$. In this step we show that \tilde{C} is not exceptional/ X .

Assume \tilde{C} is exceptional over X . By our construction,

$$\tilde{N}' - \tilde{C} = N' - g^*C' = g^*(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X) - P'$$

is anti-nef/ X . Since \tilde{C} is exceptional/ X , $g_*(N' - g^*C) \geq 0$. By the negativity lemma, $\tilde{N}' - \tilde{C} \geq 0$, so $\tilde{C} = 0$. Thus

$$g^*(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X) - h^*(K_Y + \Delta_Y + \mathbf{M}_Y) = \tilde{N}' \geq 0,$$

so $(Y, \Delta_Y, \mathbf{M})/U$ is a weak lc model of $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$. By Lemma 7.3, $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ has a log minimal model, a contradiction.

Step 7. In this step we conclude the proof. By **Step 6**, \tilde{C} is not exceptional/ X . Let $\beta > 0$ be the smallest real number such that $\beta N - g_*\tilde{C} \geq 0$ and let $\tilde{A} := \beta g^*N - \tilde{C}$. Then there exists a component D of $g_*\tilde{C}$ such that $D \not\subseteq \text{Supp } g_*\tilde{A}$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} (1 + \beta)g^*(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X) &= g^*(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X) + \beta g^*P + \beta g^*N \\ &= g^*(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X) + \beta g^*P + \tilde{A} + \tilde{C} \\ &= (P' + \beta g^*P) + (\tilde{N}' + \tilde{A}). \end{aligned}$$

Let $P''' := \frac{1}{1+\beta}(P' + \beta g^*P)$ and let $N''' := \frac{1}{1+\beta}(\tilde{N}' + \tilde{A})$. Then $g_*N''' \geq 0$ and N''' is anti-nef/ X , so by the negativity lemma, $N''' \geq 0$. Thus (g, P''', N''') is a weak Zariski decomposition/ U of $K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X$ and $\text{Supp } g_*N''' \subset \text{Supp } N$. Since $g_*\tilde{C} \leq C$, D is not a component of $g_*\tilde{N}'$, so D is not a component of g_*N''' . Thus $\theta(X, B, \mathbf{M}, f, N) > \theta(X, B, \mathbf{M}, g, N''')$, which contradicts the minimality of $\theta(X, B, \mathbf{M}, f, N)$. \square

Lemma 7.7. *Let $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ be a \mathbb{Q} -factorial NQC terminal generalized pair of dimension ≤ 3 and $K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X$ is pseudo-effective. Then $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ has a log minimal model.*

Proof. Let B' be an \mathbb{R} -divisor on X such that $B \geq B' \geq 0$, $K_X + B' + \mathbf{M}_X$ is pseudo-effective/ U , and for any $B' \geq B'' \geq 0$ such that $B'' \neq B'$, $K_X + B'' + \mathbf{M}_X$ is not pseudo-effective/ U . We run a $(K_X + B' + \mathbf{M}_X)$ -MMP/ U

$$(X, B', \mathbf{M}) =: (X_1, B_1, \mathbf{M}) \dashrightarrow (X_2, B_2, \mathbf{M}) \dashrightarrow \cdots \dashrightarrow (X_i, B_i, \mathbf{M}) \dashrightarrow \cdots,$$

If this MMP terminates, then $(X, B', \mathbf{M})/U$ has a minimal model, hence $K_X + B' + \mathbf{M}_X$ admits a weak Zariski decomposition/ U , so $K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X$ admits a weak Zariski decomposition/ U , and the lemma follows from Proposition 7.6. Thus we may assume that this MMP does not terminate. By Theorem 6.4, (X_i, B_i, \mathbf{M}) is not terminal for $i \gg 0$. Since (X, B, \mathbf{M}) is terminal, there exists an integer $n \geq 2$ such that (X_n, B_n, \mathbf{M}) is not terminal and $(X_{n-1}, B_{n-1}, \mathbf{M})$ is terminal, and the induced birational map $f : X_{n-1} \dashrightarrow X_n$ is a divisorial contraction of a component D_{n-1} of B_{n-1} . Therefore,

$$f^*(K_{X_n} + B_n + \mathbf{M}_{X_n}) = K_{X_{n-1}} + B_{n-1} + \mathbf{M}_{X_{n-1}} - aD_{n-1}$$

for some $a > 0$. Since $K_{X_n} + B_n + \mathbf{M}_{X_n}$ is pseudo-effective/ U , $K_{X_{n-1}} + B_{n-1} + \mathbf{M}_{X_{n-1}} - aD_{n-1}$ is pseudo-effective/ U , so $K_{X_{n-1}} + B_{n-1} + \mathbf{M}_{X_{n-1}} - tD_{n-1}$ is pseudo-effective/ U for any $t \in [0, a]$.

Let D be the strict transform of D_{n-1} on X . Since the induced birational map $X \dashrightarrow X_{n-1}$ is a sequence of steps of a $(K_X + B' - tD + \mathbf{M}_X)$ -MMP/ U for some $0 < t \ll a$, $K_X + B' - tD + \mathbf{M}_X$ is pseudo-effective/ U for some $0 < t \ll a$. This contradicts our choice of B' . \square

Theorem 7.8. *Let $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ be a projective NQC klt generalized pair of dimension ≤ 3 and $K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X$ is pseudo-effective. Then (X, B, \mathbf{M}) has a log minimal model.*

Proof. Since (X, B, \mathbf{M}) is klt, there are only finitely many prime divisors over X whose log discrepancies with respect to (X, B, \mathbf{M}) are ≤ 1 . By Lemma 3.4, there exists a birational morphism $f : W \rightarrow X$ such that (W, B_W, \mathbf{M}) is \mathbb{Q} -factorial terminal, where

$$K_W + B_W + \mathbf{M}_W := f^*(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X).$$

By Lemma 7.7, $(W, B_W, \mathbf{M})/U$ has a log minimal model. Thus $K_W + B_W + \mathbf{M}_W$ admits a weak Zariski decomposition/ U , so $K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X$ admits a weak Zariski decomposition/ U . By Proposition 7.6, $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ has a log minimal model. \square

8. TERMINATION OF PSEUDO-EFFECTIVE FLIPS

The goal of this section is to prove the termination of flips for generalized pairs when the generalized log canonical \mathbb{R} -divisor $K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X$ is relatively pseudo-effective:

Theorem 8.1 (=Theorem 1.1). *Let $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ be an NQC lc generalized pair of dimension 3 such that $K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X$ is pseudo-effective/ U . Then any sequence of $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)$ -flips/ U terminates.*

To prove Theorem 8.1, we need to prove the following weaker version first:

Theorem 8.2. *Let $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ be a \mathbb{Q} -factorial NQC lc generalized pair of dimension 3 such that X is klt and that $K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X$ is pseudo-effective/ U . Then any sequence of $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)$ -flips/ U terminates.*

Lemma 8.3. *Let (X_1, B_1, \mathbf{M}) be an NQC lc generalized pair of dimension 3 and let*

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} (X_1, B_1, \mathbf{M}) & \dashrightarrow^{\pi_1} & (X_2, B_2, \mathbf{M}) & \dashrightarrow^{\pi_2} & (X_3, B_3, \mathbf{M}) & \dashrightarrow^{\pi_3} & \dots \\ & \searrow^{\theta_1} & & \swarrow^{\theta_1^+} & & \searrow^{\theta_2} & \\ & & Z_1 & & Z_2 & & \end{array}$$

be a sequence of flips/ U . Assume that either X_1 is \mathbb{Q} -factorial klt, or Theorem 8.2 holds. Then there exists a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} (Y_1, B_{Y_1}, \mathbf{M}) & \dashrightarrow^{\rho_1} & (Y_2, B_{Y_2}, \mathbf{M}) & \dashrightarrow^{\rho_2} & (Y_3, B_{Y_3}, \mathbf{M}) & \dashrightarrow^{\rho_3} & \dots \\ \downarrow h_1 & & \downarrow h_2 & & \downarrow h_3 & & \\ (X_1, B_1, \mathbf{M}) & \dashrightarrow^{\pi_1} & (X_2, B_2, \mathbf{M}) & \dashrightarrow^{\pi_2} & (X_3, B_3, \mathbf{M}) & \dashrightarrow^{\pi_3} & \dots \\ & \searrow^{\theta_1} & & \swarrow^{\theta_1^+} & & \searrow^{\theta_2} & \\ & & Z_1 & & Z_2 & & \end{array}$$

where, for each $i \geq 1$, the map $\rho_i : Y_i \dashrightarrow Y_{i+1}$ is a $(K_{Y_i} + B_{Y_i} + \mathbf{M}_{Y_i})$ -MMP/ Z_i and $(Y_i, B_{Y_i}, \mathbf{M})$ is a dlt model of (X_i, B_i, \mathbf{M}) . In particular, the induced sequence

$$(Y_1, B_{Y_1}, \mathbf{M}) \dashrightarrow (Y_2, B_{Y_2}, \mathbf{M}) \dashrightarrow (Y_3, B_{Y_3}, \mathbf{M}) \dashrightarrow \dots$$

is a sequence of steps of a $(K_{Y_1} + B_{Y_1} + \mathbf{M}_{Y_1})$ -MMP/ U .

Proof. By Definition-Lemma 3.5, there exists a \mathbb{Q} -factorial dlt modification $h_1 : (Y_1, B_{Y_1}, \mathbf{M}) \rightarrow (X_1, B_1, \mathbf{M})$. Suppose that we have already constructed \mathbb{Q} -factorial dlt modifications $h_i : (Y_i, B_{Y_i}, \mathbf{M}) \rightarrow (X_i, B_i, \mathbf{M})$ for $i \leq n$ and ρ_i for any $i \leq n-1$ which satisfy our requirements. It suffices to construct $h_{n+1} : (Y_{n+1}, B_{Y_{n+1}}, \mathbf{M}) \rightarrow (X_{n+1}, B_{n+1}, \mathbf{M})$ and ρ_n .

Since θ_n is a $(K_{X_n} + B_n + \mathbf{M}_{X_n})$ -flipping contraction/ U , $K_{X_n} + B_n + \mathbf{M}_{X_n}$ is anti-ample/ Z_n , so there exist an ample/ Z_n \mathbb{R} -divisor H_n on X_n such that $K_{X_n} + B_n + H_n + \mathbf{M}_{X_n} \sim_{\mathbb{R}, Z_n} 0$ and $(X_n, B_n + H_n, \mathbf{M})$ is lc. Let $H_{Y_n} := h_n^* H_n$.

If Theorem 8.2 holds, then we run a $(K_{Y_n} + B_{Y_n} + \mathbf{M}_{Y_n})$ -MMP/ Z_n which terminates with a log minimal model $(Y_{n+1}, B_{Y_{n+1}}, \mathbf{M})/Z_n$ of $(Y_n, B_{Y_n}, \mathbf{M})/Z_n$ with induced birational map $Y_n \dashrightarrow Y_{n+1}$. Since $X_n \dashrightarrow X_{n+1}$ is the ample model/ Z_n of $K_{X_n} + B_n + \mathbf{M}_{X_n}$, there exists an induced birational morphism $h_{n+1} : Y_{n+1} \rightarrow X_{n+1}$. By the negativity lemma, $K_{Y_{n+1}} + B_{Y_{n+1}} + \mathbf{M}_{Y_{n+1}} = h_n^*(K_{X_n} + B_n + \mathbf{M}_{X_n})$, so $h_{n+1} : (Y_{n+1}, B_{Y_{n+1}}, \mathbf{M}) \rightarrow (X_{n+1}, B_{n+1}, \mathbf{M})$ is a \mathbb{Q} -factorial dlt modification. We may repeat this process and the lemma follows. In the following we may assume that X_1 is \mathbb{Q} -factorial klt. By Lemma 2.5, X_n is \mathbb{Q} -factorial dlt.

Let $0 < t \ll 1$ be a real number such that θ_n is $(K_{X_n} + (1-t)(B_n + \mathbf{M}_{X_n}))$ -negative and $B'_{Y_n} \geq 0$, where

$$K_{Y_n} + B'_{Y_n} + (1-t)\mathbf{M}_{Y_n} := h_n^*(K_{X_n} + (1-t)(B_n + \mathbf{M}_{X_n})).$$

Then

$$K_{X_n} + (1-t)(B_n + \mathbf{M}_{X_n}) \equiv_{Z_n} s(K_{X_n} + B_n + \mathbf{M}_{X_n})$$

for some $s > 0$, so

$$K_{Y_n} + B'_{Y_n} + (1-t)\mathbf{M}_{Y_n} + \frac{s}{2}H_{Y_n} \equiv_{Z_n} \frac{s}{2}(K_{Y_n} + B_{Y_n} + \mathbf{M}_{Y_n}).$$

Since X_n is klt, $(X_n, (1-t)B_n, (1-t)\mathbf{M})$ is klt, so $(Y_n, B'_{Y_n}, (1-t)\mathbf{M})$ is klt. Since H_{Y_n} is big/ Z_n and nef/ Z_n , there exists $E_n \geq 0$ and ample/ Z_n \mathbb{R} -divisors $A_{n,m}$ on Y_n , such that

$\frac{s}{2}H_{Y_n} = A_{n,m} + \frac{1}{m}E_n$. Thus for $m \gg 0$, $(Y_n, B'_{Y_n} + \frac{1}{m}E_n, (1-t)\mathbf{M})$ is klt. Fix $m \gg 0$, then by Lemma 2.4, there exists a klt pair (Y_n, Δ_n) such that

$$\Delta_n \sim_{\mathbb{R}, Z_n} B'_{Y_n} + \frac{1}{m}E_n + (1-t)\mathbf{M}_{Y_n} + A_{n,m} = B'_{Y_n} + (1-t)\mathbf{M}_{Y_n} + \frac{s}{2}H_{Y_n}.$$

By [HNT20, Theorem 6.11], we may run a $(K_{Y_n} + \Delta_{Y_n})$ -MMP/ Z_n with scaling of $\frac{s}{2}H_{Y_n}$ which terminates. This MMP is also a $(K_{Y_n} + B_{Y_n} + \mathbf{M}_{Y_n})$ -MMP/ Z_n with scaling of H_{Y_n} , and we let $(Y_{n+1}, B_{Y_{n+1}}, \mathbf{M})/Z_n$ be the output of this MMP with induced birational map $Y_n \dashrightarrow Y_{n+1}$. Since $X_n \dashrightarrow X_{n+1}$ is the ample model/ Z_n of $K_{X_n} + B_n + \mathbf{M}_{X_n}$, there exists an induced birational morphism $h_{n+1} : Y_{n+1} \rightarrow X_{n+1}$. By the negativity lemma, $K_{Y_{n+1}} + B_{Y_{n+1}} + \mathbf{M}_{Y_{n+1}} = h_n^*(K_{X_n} + B_n + \mathbf{M}_{X_n})$, so $h_{n+1} : (Y_{n+1}, B_{Y_{n+1}}, \mathbf{M}) \rightarrow (X_{n+1}, B_{n+1}, \mathbf{M})$ is a \mathbb{Q} -factorial dlt modification. We may repeat this process and the lemma follows. \square

Theorem 8.4. *Let $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ be an NQC lc generalized pair of dimension 3. Assume that either X_1 is \mathbb{Q} -factorial klt, or Theorem 8.2 holds. Then for any sequence of $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)$ -flips/ U*

$$(X, B, \mathbf{M}) =: (X_1, B_1, \mathbf{M}) \dashrightarrow (X_2, B_2, \mathbf{M}) \dashrightarrow \cdots \dashrightarrow (X_i, B_i, \mathbf{M}) \dashrightarrow \cdots,$$

the flipping locus does not intersect $\text{Nklt}(X_i, B_i, \mathbf{M})$ for any $i \gg 0$.

Proof. By Lemma 8.3, there exists a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} (Y_1, B_{Y_1}, \mathbf{M}) & \dashrightarrow^{\rho_1} & (Y_2, B_{Y_2}, \mathbf{M}) & \dashrightarrow^{\rho_2} & (Y_3, B_{Y_3}, \mathbf{M}) \dashrightarrow^{\rho_3} \cdots \\ \downarrow h_1 & & \downarrow h_2 & & \downarrow h_3 \\ (X_1, B_1, \mathbf{M}) & \dashrightarrow^{\pi_1} & (X_2, B_2, \mathbf{M}) & \dashrightarrow^{\pi_2} & (X_3, B_3, \mathbf{M}) \dashrightarrow^{\pi_3} \cdots \\ & \searrow \theta_1 & \swarrow \theta_1^+ & \searrow \theta_2 & \swarrow \theta_2^+ \\ & & Z_1 & & Z_2 \end{array}$$

such that

$$(Y_1, B_{Y_1}, \mathbf{M}) \dashrightarrow (Y_2, B_{Y_2}, \mathbf{M}) \dashrightarrow \cdots \dashrightarrow (Y_i, B_{Y_i}, \mathbf{M}) \dashrightarrow \cdots,$$

is a sequence of steps of a $(K_{Y_1} + B_{Y_1} + \mathbf{M}_{Y_1})$ -MMP, each $(Y_i, B_{Y_i}, \mathbf{M})$ is \mathbb{Q} -factorial dlt, and each $h_i : (Y_i, B_{Y_i}, \mathbf{M}) \rightarrow (X_i, B_i, \mathbf{M})$ is a \mathbb{Q} -factorial dlt modification of (X_i, B_i, \mathbf{M}) . By Proposition 3.3, possibly truncating the sequence, we may assume that the $(K_{Y_1} + B_{Y_1} + \mathbf{M}_{Y_1})$ -MMP is an isomorphism near $[B_1]$. Let $D_{X_i} = K_{X_i} + B_i + \mathbf{M}_{X_i}$, $D_{Y_i} = K_{Y_i} + B_{Y_i} + \mathbf{M}_{Y_i}$, $V_{X_i} = \text{Nklt}(X_i, B_i, \mathbf{M})$, and $V_{Y_i} = \text{Nklt}(Y_i, B_{Y_i}, \mathbf{M})$. In the following, we shall show that π_i is an isomorphism near V_{X_i} for any i , which will conclude the proof.

Suppose that π is not an isomorphism near V_{X_i} . Then there exists $x \in \text{Exc}(\theta_i) \cap V_{X_i}$ and a curve $\gamma \subset \text{Exc}(\theta_i)$ such that $x \in \gamma$ and $D_{X_i} \cdot \gamma < 0$. Then for any $0 \leq H \sim_{\mathbb{R}, Z_i} D_{X_i}$, $H \cdot \gamma < 0$, so $x \in \gamma \subset \text{Supp } H$. Thus $x \in \bigcap \text{Supp } H = \mathbf{B}(X_i/Z_i, D_{X_i}) = \mathbf{B}(X_i/Z_i, D_{X_i})$. Since $V_{Y_i} = h_i^{-1}(V_{X_i})$ and

$$\mathbf{B}(Y_i/Z_i, D_{Y_i}) = \mathbf{B}(Y_i/Z_i, h_i^*D_{X_i}) = h_i^{-1}(\mathbf{B}(X_i/Z_i, D_{X_i})),$$

we have $V_{Y_i} \cap \mathbf{B}(Y_i/Z_i, D_{Y_i}) \neq \emptyset$.

Let $p : W \rightarrow Y_i$ and $q : W \rightarrow Y_{i+1}$ be a common resolution and let $y_i \in V_{Y_i} \cap \mathbf{B}(Y_i/Z_i, D_{Y_i})$ be a closed point. Since ρ_i is an isomorphism near V_{Y_i} , $y_{i+1} := \rho_i(y_i)$ is

well-defined, and $p^{-1}(V_i) = q^{-1}(V_{Y_{i+1}})$. Then we have $p^*D_{Y_i} = q^*D_{Y_{i+1}} + E$ for some $E \geq 0$ that is exceptional/ Y_{i+1} . For any $0 \leq G_{i+1} \sim_{\mathbb{R}, Z_i} D_{Y_{i+1}}$, we let

$$G_i := p_*(q^*G_{i+1} + E) \sim_{\mathbb{R}, Z_i} D_{Y_i},$$

then $p^*G_i = q^*G_{i+1} + E$. Since $y_i \in V_{Y_i} \cap \text{Supp } G_i$,

$$p^{-1}(y_i) \subset p^{-1}(V_{Y_i}) \cap \text{Supp } p^*G_i = q^{-1}(V_{Y_{i+1}}) \cap \text{Supp}(q^*G_{i+1} + E).$$

Suppose that $p^{-1}(y_i) \subset \text{Supp } E$. Then there exists a prime divisor F over X_i such that $\text{center}_{Y_i} F = y_i$ and $\text{center}_{Y_i} F \subset \text{Supp } E$. Thus

$$a(F, Y_i, B_{Y_i}, \mathbf{M}) = a(F, Y_{i+1}, B_{Y_{i+1}}, \mathbf{M}) - \text{mult}_F E < a(F, Y_{i+1}, B_{Y_{i+1}}, \mathbf{M})$$

which is not possible as ρ_i is an isomorphism near y_i . Therefore,

$$p^{-1}(y_i) \cap (q^{-1}(V_{Y_{i+1}}) \cap \text{Supp}(q^*G_{i+1})) \neq \emptyset,$$

so $y_{i+1} \in V_{Y_{i+1}} \cap \text{Supp } G_{i+1}$. Thus $y_{i+1} \in V_{Y_{i+1}} \cap \mathbf{B}(Y_{i+1}/Z_i, D_{Y_{i+1}})$. This is not possible as $D_{Y_{i+1}}$ is semi-ample/ U and $\mathbf{B}(Y_{i+1}/Z_i, D_{Y_{i+1}}) = \emptyset$. \square

Lemma 8.5. *Let $\Gamma_0 \subset [0, +\infty)$ be a finite set such that $1 \in \Gamma_0$. Let $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ be a \mathbb{Q} -factorial lc generalized pair of dimension 3 such that X is klt and let*

$$(X, B, \mathbf{M}) =: (X_1, B_1, \mathbf{M}) \dashrightarrow (X_2, B_2, \mathbf{M}) \dashrightarrow \dots (X_i, B_i, \mathbf{M}) \dashrightarrow \dots$$

be an infinite sequence of $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)$ -flips/ U . Let D be an \mathbb{R} -divisor on X and \mathbf{N} a \mathbf{b} -divisor on X , such that $X_i \dashrightarrow X_{i+1}$ is also a $(D_i + \mathbf{N}_{X_i})$ -flip, where D_i is the image of D on X_i .

Assume that $B, D \in \Gamma_0$ and $\mathbf{N} \in \text{Nef}(U, \Gamma_0)$. Then there exists a \mathbb{Q} -factorial lc generalized pair $(Y, B_Y, \mathbf{M})/U$ of dimension 3 and \mathbb{R} -divisor D_Y on Y satisfying the following.

- (1) Y is klt,
- (2) There exists an infinite sequence of $(K_Y + B_Y + \mathbf{M}_Y)$ -flips/ U

$$(Y, B_Y, \mathbf{M}) =: (Y_1, B_{Y_1}, \mathbf{M}) \dashrightarrow (Y_2, B_{Y_2}, \mathbf{M}) \dashrightarrow \dots (Y_i, B_{Y_i}, \mathbf{M}) \dashrightarrow \dots,$$

- (3) $Y_i \dashrightarrow Y_{i+1}$ is also a $(D_{Y_i} + \mathbf{N}_{Y_i})$ -flip, where D_{Y_i} is the image of D_Y on Y_i .
- (4) $B_Y, D_Y \in \Gamma_0$.
- (5) $\text{lct}(Y, B_Y, \mathbf{M}; D_Y, \mathbf{N}) > \text{lct}(X, B, \mathbf{M}; D, \mathbf{N})$.

Proof. Step 1. Let $t_i := \text{lct}(X_i, B_i, \mathbf{M}; D_i, \mathbf{N})$ for each i . Then the sequence of $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)$ -flips/ U is also a sequence of $(K_X + B + t_i D + \mathbf{M}_X + t_i \mathbf{N}_X)$ -flips/ U for any i . Since $(X_i, B_i + t_i D_i, \mathbf{M} + t_i \mathbf{N})$ is lc, $(X_j, B_j + t_i D_j, \mathbf{M} + t_i \mathbf{N})$ is lc for any $j \geq i$. Therefore, $t_j \geq t_i$ for any $j \geq i$. Thus possibly truncating the MMP, by Theorem 1.4, we may assume that $t := t_i$ is a constant. By Theorem 8.4, possibly truncating more, we may assume that

$$\text{Exc}(\theta_i) \cap \text{Nklt}(X_i, B_i + tD_i, \mathbf{M} + t\mathbf{N}) = \emptyset$$

for any i .

Step 2. In this step we construct Y, B_Y, D_Y and show that they satisfy (1),(4) and (5).

Let $\mathbf{P} := \mathbf{M} + t\mathbf{N}$. By Lemma 8.3, there exists a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
(Y_1, \Delta_{Y_1}, \mathbf{P}) & \dashrightarrow & (Y_{N_2}, \Delta_{Y_{N_2}}, \mathbf{P}) \dashrightarrow \dots \\
\downarrow h_1 & & \downarrow h_2 \\
(X_1, B_1 + tD_1, \mathbf{M} + t\mathbf{N}) & \dashrightarrow^{\pi_1} & (X_2, B_2 + tD_2, \mathbf{M} + t\mathbf{N}) \dashrightarrow^{\pi_2} \dots \\
& \searrow \theta_1 & \swarrow \theta_1^+ \\
& & Z_1
\end{array}$$

where, for each $i \geq 1$, the map $Y_i \dashrightarrow Y_{i+1}$ is a $(K_{Y_i} + \Delta_{Y_i} + \mathbf{P}_{Y_{N_i}})$ -MMP/ Z_i and $(Y_{N_i}, \Delta_{Y_{N_i}}, \mathbf{P})$ is a dlt model of $(X_i, B_i + tD_i, \mathbf{M} + t\mathbf{N})$. Moreover, $N_1 = 1$. In particular, the sequence $(Y_{N_i}, \Delta_{Y_{N_i}}, \mathbf{P})$ comes from a $(K_{Y_1} + \Delta_{Y_1} + \mathbf{P}_{Y_1})$ -MMP/ U

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
(Y_1, \Delta_1, \mathbf{P}) & \dashrightarrow^{\rho_1} & (Y_2, \Delta_{Y_2}, \mathbf{P}) & \dashrightarrow^{\rho_2} & (Y_3, \Delta_{Y_3}, \mathbf{P}) \dashrightarrow^{\rho_3} \dots \\
& \searrow \mu_1 & \swarrow \mu_1^+ & \searrow \mu_2 & \swarrow \mu_2^+ \\
& & Z'_1 & & Z'_2
\end{array}$$

Possibly truncating the MMP, we may assume that ρ_i is a flip for any i .

For each $i \geq 1$, write $B_i = \sum_k b_{i,k} G_{i,k}$ and $D_i = \sum_k d_{i,k} G_{i,k}$, where each $G_{i,k}$ is either an irreducible component of B_i or an irreducible component of D_i . Then $B_i + tD_i = \sum_k (b_{i,k} + td_{i,k}) G_{i,k}$ and $b_{i,k} + td_{i,k} \in [0, 1]$ by construction. Set

$$B_{Y_{N_i}} := \sum_{k: b_{i,k} + td_{i,k} < 1} b_{i,k} (h_i)_*^{-1} G_{i,k}, \quad D_{Y_{N_i}} := \sum_{k: b_{i,k} + td_{i,k} < 1} d_{i,k} (h_i)_*^{-1} G_{i,k}.$$

Then $B_{Y_{N_i}}, D_{Y_{N_i}} \in \Gamma_0$ for any i . By Definition-Lemma 3.5,

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta_{Y_{N_i}} &= (h_i)_*^{-1} ((B_i + tD_i)^{<1}) + (h_i)_*^{-1} ((B_i + tD_i)^{=1}) + E_i \\
&= B_{Y_{N_i}} + tD_{Y_{N_i}} + \lfloor \Delta_{Y_{N_i}} \rfloor,
\end{aligned}$$

where $E_i = \text{Exc}(h_i)$. For different i and j , B_i, D_i are strict transforms of B_j, D_j relatively, hence $B_{Y_{N_i}}, D_{Y_{N_i}}$ are the strict transforms of $B_{Y_{N_j}}, D_{Y_{N_j}}$ relatively. We let B_{Y_r}, D_{Y_r} be the birational transforms of $B_{Y_{N_i}}, D_{Y_{N_i}}$ on Y_r for any r . It is clear that this definition does not depend on the choice of i as Y_i and Y_j are isomorphism in codimension 1 for any i, j .

For any r , $(Y_r, \Delta_{Y_r}, \mathbf{P})$ is \mathbb{Q} -factorial dlt, hence $(Y_r, \Delta_{Y_r}^{<1} = B_{Y_r} + tD_{Y_r}, \mathbf{P})$ is klt. Thus Y is klt, and

$$\text{lct}(Y_r, B_{Y_r}, \mathbf{M}; D_{Y_r}, \mathbf{N}) > t = \text{lct}(X, B, \mathbf{M}; D, \mathbf{N}).$$

Step 3. In this step we show that

$$\text{Exc}(\mu_r) \cap \text{Supp} \lfloor \Delta_{Y_r} \rfloor = \emptyset$$

for all r .

Consider the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
(Y_{N_i}, \Delta_{Y_{N_i}}, \mathbf{P}) & \xrightarrow{\rho_{N_i}} & (Y_{N_{i+1}}, \Delta_{Y_{N_{i+1}}}, \mathbf{P}) \xrightarrow{\rho_{N_{i+1}}} \dots \xrightarrow{\rho_{N_{i+1}}} (Y_{N_{i+1}}, \Delta_{Y_{N_{i+1}}}, \mathbf{P}) \\
\downarrow h_i & & \downarrow h_{i+1} \\
(X_i, B_i + tD_i, \mathbf{M} + t\mathbf{N}) & \xrightarrow{\pi_i} & (X_{i+1}, B_{i+1} + tD_{i+1}, \mathbf{M} + t\mathbf{N}) \\
\searrow \theta_i & & \swarrow \theta_i^+ \\
& Z_i &
\end{array}$$

Let $U_{X_i} := X_i \setminus \text{Exc}(\theta_i)$, $U_{N_i} := h_i^{-1}(U_{X_i}) \subset Y_{N_i}$, and $T_i = \theta_i(U_{X_i})$. Since $\text{Nklt}(X_i, B_i + tD_i, \mathbf{M} + t\mathbf{N}) \subset U_{X_i}$, $\text{Nklt}(Y_{N_i}, \Delta_{Y_{N_i}}, \mathbf{P}) = \text{Supp}[\Delta_{Y_{N_i}}] \subset U_{N_i}$. $\pi_i|_{U_{X_i}} : U_{X_i} \rightarrow \pi_i(U_{X_i})$ is an isomorphism and hence $(K_{X_i} + B_i + tD_i + \mathbf{M}_{X_i} + t\mathbf{N}_{X_i})|_{U_{X_i}}$ is trivially semi-ample over T_i . Then $(K_{Y_{N_i}} + \Delta_{Y_{N_i}} + \mathbf{P}_{Y_{N_i}})|_{U_{N_i}} = (h_i|_{U_{X_i}})^*((K_{X_i} + B_i + tD_i + \mathbf{M}_{X_i} + t\mathbf{N}_{X_i})|_{U_{X_i}})$ is also semi-ample over T_i .

Suppose we have known that $(K_{Y_r} + \Delta_{Y_r} + \mathbf{P}_{Y_r})|_{U_r}$ is semi-ample over T_i for some open subset U_r such that the induced map $U_{N_i} \dashrightarrow U_r$ is an isomorphism, and $\text{Supp}[\Delta_{Y_r}] \subset U_r$ for $N_i \leq r < N_{i+1}$. Since $\text{Exc}(\mu_r)$ is covered by $(K_{Y_r} + \Delta_{Y_r} + \mathbf{P}_{Y_r})$ -negative curves, $U_r \cap \text{Exc}(\mu_r) = \emptyset$, hence ρ_r is an isomorphism over U_r . Thus $\text{Supp}[\Delta_{Y_r}] \cap \text{Exc}(\mu_{N_i}) = \emptyset$.

Set $U_{r+1} = \rho_r(U_r)$, then $(K_{Y_{r+1}} + \Delta_{Y_{r+1}} + \mathbf{P}_{Y_{r+1}})|_{U_{r+1}}$ is semi-ample/ T_i and $\text{Supp}[\Delta_{Y_{r+1}}] \subset U_{r+1}$. By induction,

$$\text{Exc}(\mu_r) \cap \text{Supp}[\Delta_{Y_r}] = \emptyset$$

for all r . Therefore, the $(K_{Y_1} + \Delta_{Y_1} + \mathbf{M}_{Y_1})$ -MMP in **Step 2** is also a $(K_{Y_1} + B_{Y_1} + tD_{Y_1} + \mathbf{M}_{Y_1} + t\mathbf{N}_{Y_1})$ -MMP as $[\Delta_{Y_r}] \cdot R = 0$ for any extremal ray R that is contracted by μ_r .

Step 4. In this step we show that $\rho_r : Y_r \dashrightarrow Y_{r+1}$ is also a $(K_{Y_r} + B_{Y_r} + \mathbf{M}_{Y_r})$ -MMP and a $(D_{Y_r} + \mathbf{N}_{Y_r})$ -flip.

Suppose $N_i \leq r < N_{i+1}$. By construction of $D_{Y_{N_i}}$, $h_i^*(D_i + \mathbf{N}_{X_i}) = D_{Y_{N_i}} + F'_{N_i} + \mathbf{N}_{Y_{N_i}} + F''_{N_i}$, where $\text{mult}_{F'_{N_i}} \Delta_{Y_{N_i}} = 1$ and F''_{N_i} is h_i -exceptional. Then we can write

$$h_i^*(D_i + \mathbf{N}_{X_i}) = D_{Y_{N_i}} + \mathbf{N}_{Y_{N_i}} + F_{N_i}, \quad \text{Supp } F_{N_i} \subset \text{Supp}[\Delta_{Y_{N_i}}].$$

Since $X_i \dashrightarrow X_{i+1}$ is a $(D_i + \mathbf{N}_{X_i})$ -flip/ Z_i ,

$$K_{X_i} + B_i + tD_i + \mathbf{M}_{X_i} + t\mathbf{N}_{X_i} \equiv_{\mathbb{R}, Z_i} (t + \alpha_i)(D_i + \mathbf{N}_{X_i})$$

for some $\alpha_i > 0$. Then

$$K_{Y_{N_i}} + \Delta_{Y_{N_i}}^{\leq 1} + [\Delta_{Y_{N_i}}] + \mathbf{P}_{Y_{N_i}} \equiv_{\mathbb{R}, Z_i} (t + \alpha_i)(D_{Y_{N_i}} + \mathbf{N}_{Y_{N_i}} + F_{N_i})$$

and then

$$K_{Y_r} + \Delta_{Y_r}^{\leq 1} + [\Delta_{Y_r}] + \mathbf{P}_{Y_r} \equiv_{\mathbb{R}, Z_i} (t + \alpha_i)(D_{Y_r} + \mathbf{N}_{Y_r} + F_r),$$

where F_r is the strict transform of F_{N_i} on Y_r . In particular, we have

$$K_{Y_r} + \Delta_{Y_r}^{\leq 1} + [\Delta_{Y_r}] + \mathbf{P}_{Y_r} \equiv_{\mathbb{R}, Z'_r} (t + \alpha_i)(D_{Y_r} + \mathbf{N}_{Y_r} + F_r).$$

By **Step 3** we know $\text{Exc}(\mu_r) \cap \text{Supp}[\Delta_{Y_r}] = \emptyset$ and then $[\Delta_{Y_r}] \equiv_{\mathbb{R}, Z'_r} F_r \equiv_{\mathbb{R}, Z'_r} 0$. Hence we get

$$K_{Y_r} + B_{Y_r} + tD_{Y_r} + \mathbf{M}_{Y_r} + t\mathbf{N}_{Y_r} \equiv_{\mathbb{R}, Z'_r} (t + \alpha_i)(D_{Y_r} + \mathbf{N}_{Y_r}).$$

Then

$$D_{Y_r} + \mathbf{N}_{Y_r} \equiv_{\mathbb{R}, Z'_r} \frac{1}{t + \alpha_i} (K_{Y_r} + B_{Y_r} + tD_{Y_r} + \mathbf{M}_{Y_r} + t\mathbf{N}_{Y_r})$$

and

$$K_{Y_r} + B_{Y_r} + \mathbf{M}_{Y_r} \equiv_{\mathbb{R}, Z_r'} \frac{\alpha_i}{t + \alpha_i} (K_{Y_r} + B_{Y_r} + tD_{Y_r} + \mathbf{M}_{Y_r} + t\mathbf{N}_{Y_r}).$$

The proof is complete by letting $(Y, B_Y, \mathbf{M}) := (Y_1, B_{Y_1}, \mathbf{M})$ and $D_Y := D_{Y_1}$. \square

Proof of Theorem 8.2. Let

$$(X, B, \mathbf{M}) =: (X_1, B_1, \mathbf{M}) \dashrightarrow (X_2, B_2, \mathbf{M}) \dashrightarrow \dots (X_i, B_i, \mathbf{M}) \dashrightarrow \dots$$

be a sequence of $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)$ -flips/ U . By Theorem 7.8, X/U admits a weak Zariski decomposition. So $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ has a weak Zariski decomposition since B is effective and \mathbf{M} is nef/ U . By Proposition 7.6, $(X, B, \mathbf{M})/U$ has a log minimal model $(X_{\min}, B_{\min}, \mathbf{M})/U$. Let $p : W \rightarrow X$ and $q : W \rightarrow X_{\min}$ be a common resolution. By Lemma 7.2,

$$p^*(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X) = q^*(K_{X_{\min}} + B_{\min} + \mathbf{M}_{X_{\min}}) + E$$

for some $E \geq 0$. Let

$$\mathbf{N} := \overline{K_{X_{\min}} + B_{\min} + \mathbf{M}_{X_{\min}}},$$

then \mathbf{N} is a nef/ U \mathbf{b} -divisor. By Theorem 1.5, \mathbf{N} is an NQC/ U \mathbf{b} -divisor. Let $D := p_*E$, then

$$D + \mathbf{N}_X = K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X.$$

In particular, $D + \mathbf{N}_X$ is \mathbb{R} -Cartier, and $X_i \dashrightarrow X_{i+1}$ is a $(D_i + \mathbf{N}_{X_i})$ -flip, where D_i is the image of D on X_i .

Let $\Gamma_0 \subset [0, +\infty)$ be a set such that $B, D \in \Gamma_0$ and $\mathbf{M} \in \text{Nef}(U, \Gamma_0)$. By Lemma 8.5, if this sequence of flips does not terminate, then we may inductively construct a sequence of generalized pairs $(X^i, B^i, \mathbf{M})/U$ and \mathbb{R} -divisors D^i , such that $B^i, D^i \in \Gamma_0$, and

$$\text{lct}(X^{i+1}, B^{i+1}, \mathbf{M}, D^{i+1}, \mathbf{N}) > \text{lct}(X^i, B^i, \mathbf{M}, D^i, \mathbf{N})$$

for each i . This contradicts Theorem 1.4. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Suppose that there exists an infinite sequence

$$(X, B, \mathbf{M}) =: (X_1, B_1, \mathbf{M}) \dashrightarrow (X_2, B_2, \mathbf{M}) \dashrightarrow \dots (X_i, B_i, \mathbf{M}) \dashrightarrow \dots$$

of $(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X)$ -flips/ U . By Lemma 8.3, there exists a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} (Y_1, B_{Y_1}, \mathbf{M}) & \dashrightarrow^{\rho_1} & (Y_2, B_{Y_2}, \mathbf{M}) & \dashrightarrow^{\rho_2} & (Y_3, B_{Y_3}, \mathbf{M}) & \dashrightarrow^{\rho_3} & \dots \\ \downarrow h_1 & & \downarrow h_2 & & \downarrow h_3 & & \\ (X_1, B_1, \mathbf{M}) & \dashrightarrow^{\pi_1} & (X_2, B_2, \mathbf{M}) & \dashrightarrow^{\pi_2} & (X_3, B_3, \mathbf{M}) & \dashrightarrow^{\pi_3} & \dots \\ & \searrow \theta_1 & \swarrow \theta_1^+ & \searrow \theta_2 & \swarrow \theta_2^+ & & \\ & & Z_1 & & Z_2 & & \end{array}$$

where, for each $i \geq 1$, the map $\rho_i : Y_i \dashrightarrow Y_{i+1}$ is a $(K_{Y_i} + B_{Y_i} + \mathbf{M}_{Y_i})$ -MMP/ Z_i and $(Y_i, B_{Y_i}, \mathbf{M})$ is a dlt model of (X_i, B_i, \mathbf{M}) . Thus

$$(Y_1, B_{Y_1}, \mathbf{M}) \dashrightarrow (Y_2, B_{Y_2}, \mathbf{M}) \dashrightarrow \dots \dashrightarrow (Y_i, B_{Y_i}, \mathbf{M}) \dashrightarrow \dots$$

is an infinite sequence of $(K_{Y_1} + B_{Y_1} + \mathbf{M}_{Y_1})$ -MMP/ U . Since Y_i is \mathbb{Q} -factorial klt, this contradicts Theorem 8.2. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.2. (2) It follows from Theorem 1.1.

(1) Let (X', B', \mathbf{M}) be a dlt model of (X, B, \mathbf{M}) . By (2) and Lemma 2.5, $(X', B', \mathbf{M})/U$ has a log minimal model. Thus $K_{X'} + B' + \mathbf{M}_{X'}$ admits a weak Zariski decomposition/ U , so $K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X$ admits a weak Zariski decomposition/ U . (1) follows from Proposition 7.6. \square

REFERENCES

- [Ale94] V. Alexeev, *Boundedness and K^2 for log surfaces*, Internat. J. Math. **5** (1994), 779–810.
- [AHK07] V. Alexeev, C. D. Hacon, and Y. Kawamata, *Termination of (many) 4-dimensional log flips*, Invent. Math. **168** (2007), no. 2, 433–448.
- [BF23] F. Bernasconi and S. Filipazzi, *Rational points on 3-folds with nef anti-canonical class over finite fields*, [arXiv:2308.10824](#).
- [BS23] F. Bernasconi and L. Stigant, *Semiampleness for Calabi-Yau surfaces in positive and mixed characteristic*, Nagoya Math. J., **250** (2023), 365–384.
- [BMPSTWW23] B. Bhatt, L. Ma, Z. Patakfalvi, K. Schwede, K. Tucker, J. Waldron, and J. Witaszek, *Globally + regular varieties and the minimal model program for threefolds in mixed characteristic*, Publ. Math. IHÉS **138** (2023), 69–227.
- [Bir12] C. Birkar, *Existence of log canonical flips and a special LMMP*, Publ. Math. IHÉS **115** (2012), 325–368.
- [Bir16] C. Birkar, *Existence of flips and minimal models for 3-folds in char p* , Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Supér. (4) **49** (2016), no. 1, 169–212.
- [BCHM10] C. Birkar, P. Cascini, C. D. Hacon and J. McKernan, *Existence of minimal models for varieties of log general type*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **23** (2010), no. 2, 405–468.
- [BW17] C. Birkar and J. Waldron, *Existence of Mori fibre spaces for 3-folds in char p* , Advances in Mathematics, **313** (2017), 62–101.
- [BZ16] C. Birkar and D.-Q. Zhang, *Effectivity of Iitaka fibrations and pluricanonical systems of polarized pairs*, Publ. Math. IHÉS **123** (2016), 283–331.
- [CS20] P. Cascini and C. Spicer, *On the MMP for rank one foliations on threefolds*, [arXiv:2012.11433](#).
- [CS21] P. Cascini and C. Spicer, *MMP for co-rank one foliations on threefolds*, Invent. Math. **225** (2021), no. 2, 603–690.
- [CHLX23] G. Chen, J. Han, J. Liu, and L. Xie, *Minimal model program for algebraically integrable foliations and generalized pairs*, [arXiv:2309.15823](#).
- [CT23] G. Chen and N. Tsakanikas, *On the termination of flips for log canonical generalized pairs*, Acta. Math. Sin. English Ser. **39** (2023), 967–994.
- [CP18] V. Cossart and O. Piltant, *Resolution of singularities of threefolds in positive characteristic, I. Reduction to local uniformization on Artin-Schreier and purely inseparable coverings*, J. Algebra **320** (2018), 1051–1082.
- [CP19] V. Cossart and O. Piltant, *Resolution of singularities of threefolds in positive characteristic, II*, J. Algebra **321** (2009), 1836–1976.
- [Cut09] S. D. Cutkosky, *Resolution of singularities for 3-folds in positive characteristic*, Amer. J. Math. **131** (2009), 59–127.
- [DW22] O. Das and J. Waldron, *On the log minimal model program for threefolds over imperfect fields of characteristic p* , J. Lond. Math. Soc. (2) **106** (2022), no. 4, 3895–3937.
- [FW23] S. Filipazzi and J. Waldron, *Connectedness principle for 3-Folds in characteristic $p > 5$* , Michigan Math. J. (2023), Advance Publication 1–27.
- [HL23] C. D. Hacon and J. Liu, *Existence of flips for generalized lc pairs*, Camb. J. Math. **11** (2023), no. 4, 795–828.
- [HW22] C. D. Hacon and J. Witaszek, *The minimal model program for threefolds in characteristic 5*, Duke Math. J. **171** (15 August 2022), no. 11, 2193–2231.
- [HX13] C. D. Hacon and C. Xu, *Existence of log canonical closures*, Invent. Math. **192** (2013), no. 1, 161–195.
- [HX14] C. D. Hacon and C. Xu, *On the three dimensional minimal model program in positive characteristic*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **28** (2015), 711–744.

- [HL22] J. Han and Z. Li, *Weak Zariski decompositions and log terminal models for generalized polarized pairs*, *Math. Z.* **302** (2022), 707–741.
- [HLS19] J. Han, J. Liu, and V. V. Shokurov, *ACC for minimal log discrepancies of exceptional singularities*, [arXiv:1903.04338](https://arxiv.org/abs/1903.04338).
- [HH20] K. Hashizume and Z. Hu, *On minimal model theory for log abundant lc pairs*, *J. Reine Angew. Math.* **767** (2020), 109–159.
- [HNT20] K. Hashizume, Y. Nakamura, and H. Tanaka, *Minimal model program for log canonical threefolds in positive characteristic*, *Math. Res. Lett.* **27** (2020), no. 4, 1003–1054.
- [Kol13] J. Kollár, *Singularities of the minimal model program*, *Cambridge Tracts in Math.* **200** (2013), Cambridge Univ. Press. With a collaboration of Sándor Kovács.
- [KM98] J. Kollár and S. Mori, *Birational geometry of algebraic varieties*, *Cambridge Tracts in Math.* **134** (1998), Cambridge Univ. Press.
- [PW22] Z. Patakfalvi and J. Waldron, *Singularities of general fibers and the LMMP*, *American Journal of Mathematics*. **144** (2022) no. 2, 505–540.
- [Wal17] J. Waldron *Finite generation of the log canonical ring for 3-folds in char p* , *Mathematical Research Letters*. **24** (2017), no.3 933–946.
- [Wal18] J. Waldron, *The LMMP for log canonical 3-folds in characteristic $p > 5$* , *Nagoya Mathematical Journal*. **230** (2018), 48–71.
- [Xu24] Z. Xu, *Note on the three-dimensional log canonical abundance in characteristic > 3* , *Nagoya Math. J.* (online, 2024), 1–30.

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, EAST CHINA NORMAL UNIVERSITY, 500 DONGCHUAN ROAD, 200241 SHANGHAI, CHINA

Email address: 10211510098@stu.ecnu.edu.cn

SHANGHAI CENTER FOR MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, FUDAN UNIVERSITY, 2005 SONGHU ROAD, 200438 SHANGHAI, CHINA

Email address: zlye24@m.fudan.edu.cn

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, SHANGHAI JIAO TONG UNIVERSITY, 800 DONGCHUAN ROAD, 200240 SHANGHAI, CHINA

Email address: aboctopus@sjtu.edu.cn