

ON LOG CANONICAL THRESHOLDS, II

YU. G. PROKHOROV

ABSTRACT. We prove that the only accumulation points of the set \mathcal{T}_3 of all three-dimensional log canonical thresholds in the interval $[1/2, 1]$ are $1/2 + 1/n$, where $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, $n \geq 3$.

1. INTRODUCTION

In this paper we continue our study of the structure of the set \mathcal{T}_3 of all three-dimensional log canonical thresholds started in [10]. Notation and results of the Log Minimal Model Program [7] will be used freely.

Let X be a normal algebraic variety and let F be an effective integral non-zero \mathbb{Q} -Cartier divisor on X . Assume that X has at worst log canonical singularities. *The log canonical threshold* of (X, F) is defined by

$$c(X, F) = \sup \{c \mid (X, cF) \text{ is log canonical}\}.$$

For each $d \in \mathbb{Z}$, $d \geq 2$ define the following set $\mathcal{T}_d \subset [0, 1]$ by

$$\mathcal{T}_d := \left\{ c(X, F) \mid \begin{array}{l} \dim X = d, X \text{ has only log canonical singularities and } F \text{ is an effective non-zero Weil} \\ \mathbb{Q}\text{-Cartier divisor} \end{array} \right\}.$$

The above does not define \mathcal{T}_1 but it is naturally to put

$$\mathcal{T}_1 := \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \mid n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\} \right\}.$$

The sets \mathcal{T}_d have rather inductive nature: it is easy to show that $\mathcal{T}_{d-1} \subset \mathcal{T}_d$ and $\partial\mathcal{T}_d \supset \mathcal{T}_{d-1}$ (see [6, 8.21]), where $\partial\mathcal{T}$ is the set of all accumulation points of \mathcal{T} .

Conjecture 1.1 ([6]). *The accumulation set $\partial\mathcal{T}_d$ of \mathcal{T}_d is precisely \mathcal{T}_{d-1} .*

This conjecture is the only one instance where the such a phenomena occurs. The similar behavior is expected for the fractional indices of log Fano varieties [11], [1], minimal log discrepancies [11], [13], [3], Kodaira energy [4] etc.

This work was partially supported by the grant INTAS-OPEN-97-2072.

In dimension two Conjecture 1.1 easily follows from explicit description of \mathcal{T}_2 [8]. In this paper we generalize the result of [10] and prove Conjecture 1.1 in dimension three for the interval $[\frac{1}{2}, 1]$:

Theorem 1.2.

$$(1.1) \quad \partial\mathcal{T}_3 \cap \left[\frac{1}{2}, 1\right] = \mathcal{T}_2 \cap \left[\frac{1}{2}, 1\right] = \left\{ \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{n} \mid n \in \mathbb{Z}, n \geq 3 \right\}.$$

Note that (1.1) is very similar to the corresponding results for log Del Pezzo surfaces [1]. Our proof is based on inductive arguments and boundedness result [2]. As an intermediate result, we prove the following easy but very important fact:

Proposition 1.3. *Assume the LMMP in dimension d . Let $X \ni o$ be a d -dimensional \mathbb{Q} -factorial log terminal singularity* and let F be an (integral) Weil divisor on X . Let $c := c(X, F)$ be the log canonical threshold. Then one of the following holds:*

- (i) $c \in \mathcal{T}_{d-1}$; or
- (ii) $c \notin \mathcal{T}_{d-1}$ and there is exactly one divisor S of the function field $\mathcal{K}(X)$ with discrepancy $a(S, cF) = -1$ (i.e., the pair (X, cF) is exceptional in the sense of [12]).

Moreover in case (ii), $\text{Center}(S) = o$.

Acknowledgments. This work was carried out during my stay at Max-Planck-Institut für Mathematik. I would like to thank MPIM for wonderful working environment.

2. PRELIMINARY RESULTS

Notation. All varieties are assumed to be algebraic varieties defined over the field \mathbb{C} . A *log variety* (or a *log pair*) (X, D) is a normal quasiprojective variety X equipped with a *boundary* that is a \mathbb{Q} -divisor $D = \sum d_i D_i$ such that $0 \leq d_i \leq 1$ for all i . We use terminology, definitions and abbreviations of the Log Minimal Model Program [7]. Recall that $a(E, D)$ denotes the discrepancy of E with respect to D and

$$\text{discr}(X, D) = \inf_E \{a(E, D) \mid \text{codim Center}(E) \geq 2\}.$$

$$\text{totaldiscr}(X, D) = \inf_E \{a(E, D) \mid \text{codim Center}(E) \geq 1\}.$$

Recall also our notation of [10]:

$$\Phi_{\text{sm}} = \left\{ 1 - \frac{1}{m} \mid m \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\} \right\},$$

$$\Phi_{\text{sm}}^\alpha = \Phi_{\text{sm}} \cup [\alpha, 1], \quad \text{for } \alpha \in [0, 1].$$

*By [10, Lemma 4.1] computing \mathcal{T}_d we can consider only those singularities X which are \mathbb{Q} -factorial and log terminal.

Let Φ be any subset of \mathbb{Q} and let $D = \sum D_i$ be a \mathbb{Q} -divisor. We write $D \in \Phi$ if $d_i \in \Phi$ for all i .

Lemma 2.1. *Fix a constant $N \in \mathbb{Z}$, $N \geq 6$. Let $\Lambda = \sum_{i=1}^r \lambda_i \Lambda_i$ be a boundary on \mathbb{P}^1 such that*

- (i) $K_{\mathbb{P}^1} + \Lambda \equiv 0$;
- (ii) $\Lambda \in \Phi_{\mathbf{sm}}^{\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{N}}$; and
- (iii) $1 > \lambda_j > \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{N}$ for some j .

Then $\lambda_i \leq 1 - \frac{1}{N}$ for all i .

Proof. Clearly, $r = 3$ and $[\Lambda] = 0$. Assume that $\lambda_1 > 1 - \frac{1}{N}$. Then

$$1 < \lambda_2 + \lambda_3 < 1 + \frac{1}{N}.$$

Since $\lambda_i \geq \frac{1}{2}$, we have $\lambda_2, \lambda_3 < \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{N}$. Thus $\lambda_2 = \lambda_3 = \frac{1}{2}$ and $\lambda_1 = 1$, a contradiction. \square

Lemma 2.2. *Fix a constant $N \in \mathbb{N}$, $N \geq 6$. Let $(S \ni o, \Theta = \sum \vartheta_i \Theta_i)$ be a klt log surface germ with $\Theta \in \Phi_{\mathbf{sm}}^{\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{N}}$. Define the following boundary Ξ with $\text{Supp}(\Xi) = \text{Supp}(\Theta)$:*

$$(2.2) \quad \Xi := \sum \xi_i \Theta_i, \quad \xi_i = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \vartheta_i > 1 - \frac{1}{N}, \\ \vartheta_i & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then (S, Ξ) is lc.

Proof. If $\vartheta_i \leq 1 - \frac{1}{N}$ for all i , there is nothing to prove. Assume that $\Xi \neq \Theta$ and (S, Ξ) is not lc. Replacing Θ with $\Theta + \alpha(\Xi - \Theta)$, $\alpha > 0$, we may assume that (S, Θ) is lc but not klt (and $[\Theta] = 0$). Let $\mu: \bar{S} \rightarrow S$ be an *inductive blowup*[†] of the pair (S, Θ) (see [9, Prop. 5]) and let E be the exceptional divisor. By definition, E is irreducible, $a(E, \Theta) = -1$ and (\bar{S}, E) is plt. Write

$$\mu^*(K_S + \Theta) = K_{\bar{S}} + E + \bar{\Theta},$$

where $\bar{\Theta}$ is the proper transform of Θ . Clearly, $\mu(E) \in \Theta_j$ with $\vartheta_j > 1 - \frac{1}{N}$.

2.3. By [10, Corollary 2.5], $\text{Diff}_E(\bar{\Theta}) \in \Phi_{\mathbf{sm}}^{\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{N}}$. Pick a point $\bar{P} \in E \cap \bar{\Theta}_j$. Then $\bar{\Theta}_j$ is the only component of $\bar{\Theta}$, passing through \bar{P} (see [10, Corollary 2.4]). Moreover, $(\bar{S}, E + \bar{\Theta}_j)$ is lc at \bar{P} [10, Lemma 3.2]. Hence $(\bar{S}, E + \bar{\Theta})$ is plt at \bar{P} and the coefficient λ' of $\text{Diff}_E(\bar{\Theta})$ at \bar{P} satisfies the inequality $1 - \frac{1}{N} < \lambda' < 1$. Therefore, $\Lambda := \text{Diff}_E(\bar{\Theta})$

[†]In [9] such a μ was called *plt-blowup of the pair* (S, Θ) .

satisfies conditions of Lemma 2.1. This gives us $\text{Diff}_E(\overline{\Theta}) \in [1, \frac{1}{N}]$, a contradiction. \square

Lemma 2.4. *Let $(S \ni o, \Lambda = \sum \lambda_i \Lambda_i)$ be a log surface germ such that $\Lambda \in (1 - \frac{1}{N}, 1]$. Assume that $\text{discr}(S, \Lambda) \geq -1 + \frac{1}{N}$ at o for $N \in \mathbb{Z}$, $N \geq 6$. Then $\sum \lambda_i \leq 2 - \frac{1}{N}$. In particular, Λ has at most two components.*

Proof. For some $\Lambda' := \Lambda + t(\lceil \Lambda \rceil - \Lambda)$, $0 < t \leq 1$ the pair (S, Λ') is lc but not plt at o . By Lemma 2.2, we have $\Lambda' = \lceil \Lambda \rceil$, i.e., $(S, \lceil \Lambda \rceil)$ is lc. If Λ has only one component, there is nothing to prove. So, we may assume that Λ has exactly two components [7, Ch. 3]. Then near o we have

$$(S, \lceil \Lambda \rceil) \simeq_{\text{an}} (\mathbb{C}^2, \{xy = 0\}, 0) / \mathbb{Z}_m(1, q),$$

where $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\gcd(m, q) = 1$. Take q so that $1 \leq q \leq m$. As in the proof of Lemma 3.3 in [10], considering the weighted blow up with weights $\frac{1}{m}(1, q)$ we get $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 \leq 2 - \frac{1}{N}$. \square

3. PROOF OF PROPOSITION 1.3. COROLLARIES

Notation and assumption as in Proposition 1.3. Let $f: Y \rightarrow X$ be an inductive blowup of the pair (X, cF) (see [9, Prop. 5]). Write

$$f^*(K_X + cF) = K_Y + cF_Y + S,$$

where F_Y is the proper transform of F and S is the (irreducible) exceptional divisor. By definition, (Y, S) is plt.

Assume that $c \notin \mathcal{T}_{d-1}$. If $f(S) \neq o$, then the pair (X, cF) is lc but not klt along $f(S)$. Taking the general hyperplane section we get $c \in \mathcal{T}_{d-1}$.

Hence $f(S) = o$. It is sufficient to show that $(Y, S + cF_Y)$ is plt (see [6, 3.10]). Assume the converse. Then there is a divisor $E \neq S$ of the field $\mathcal{K}(Y)$ such that $a(E, S + cF_Y) = -1$. Since (Y, S) is plt, $\text{Center}_Y(E) \subset E \cap F_Y$.

Pick a point $P \in \text{Center}_Y(E)$ and consider Y as a germ near P . Take the minimal $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $mS \sim 0$ near P and let

$$Y' := \text{Spec} \left(\bigoplus_{i=0}^{m-1} \mathcal{O}_Y(iS) \right).$$

Then the projection $\varphi: Y' \rightarrow Y$ is an étale in codimension one \mathbb{Z}_m -covering. Put $P' := \varphi^{-1}(P)$, $F'_Y := \varphi^*F_Y$, and $S' := \varphi^*S$. Then (Y', S') is plt and $(Y, S' + cF'_Y)$ is lc but not plt near P' (see [12, §2]). Since S' is Cartier, $\text{Diff}_{S'}(0) = 0$ (i.e., no codimension two components of $\text{Sing}(Y')$ are contained in S'). By the Adjunction [7, Th. 17.6,

17.7] $(S', cF_Y'|_{S'})$ is lc but not klt near P' . Hence $c = c(S', F_Y'|_{S'})$ and $c \in \mathcal{T}_{d-1}$.

The Adjunction [7, 17.6] and [12, Cor. 3.10] gives us the following:

Corollary 3.1. *Let $c \in \mathcal{T}_d \setminus \mathcal{T}_{d-1}$. Assume that the LMMP in dimension d holds. Then there is a log pair (S, Θ) such that*

- (i) (S, Θ) is klt;
- (ii) $K_S + \Theta \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0$;
- (iii) $\Theta = \sum_i \vartheta_i \Theta_i$, where

$$\vartheta_i = 1 - \frac{1}{m_i} + \frac{k_i c}{m_i}, \quad m_i \in \mathbb{N}, \quad k_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}, \quad k_i c < 1;$$

- (iv) $-(K_S + \sum_i (1 - \frac{1}{m_i}) \Theta_i)$ is ample. In particular, $\sum k_i > 0$.

Corollary 3.2. *Let $c \in \mathcal{T}_2 \setminus \mathcal{T}_1$. Then there are $m_i \in \mathbb{N}$, $k_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ such that*

$$(3.3) \quad k_i c < 1, \quad \sum k_i > 0, \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_i \left(1 - \frac{1}{m_i} + \frac{k_i c}{m_i}\right) = 2.$$

Moreover, allowing $k_i c = 1$ in (3.3), we get $c = \frac{1}{k_i} \in \mathcal{T}_1 \subset \mathcal{T}_2$. Conversely, if there are $m_i \in \mathbb{N}$, $k_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ satisfying (3.3), then $c \in \mathcal{T}_2$.

Proof. Apply Corollary 3.1. We obtain $S \simeq \mathbb{P}^1$ and $\deg \Theta = 2$. The inverse implication follows by [8]. \square

Corollary 3.3 ([8]). *Any $c \in \mathcal{T}_2 \cap (\frac{1}{2}, 1]$ has the following form*

$$\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{n}, \quad n \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad n \geq 2.$$

3.4. For $c \in [0, 1] \cap \mathbb{Q}$, let $\mathcal{LP}(c)$ be the class of all projective klt log surfaces (S, Θ) satisfying conditions (i)-(iv) of Corollary 3.1. Then

$$\mathcal{T}_3 \setminus \mathcal{T}_2 \subset \{c \mid \mathcal{LP}(c) \neq \emptyset\}.$$

Lemma 3.5. *Let c and (S, Θ) be as in Corollary 3.1 with $d = 3$. Assume that there is a contraction $g: S \rightarrow W$ onto a curve. Then all components Θ_i with $k_i > 0$ are vertical (i.e., $g(\Theta_i) \neq W$).*

Proof. Assume that there is a horizontal component Θ_i with $k_i > 0$. Let S_w be the general fiber. Then $S_w \simeq \mathbb{P}^1$ and by Adjunction we have equality (3.3):

$$\deg \Theta|_{S_w} = \sum_{\Theta_i \cap S_w \neq \emptyset} \left(1 - \frac{1}{m_i} + \frac{k_i c}{m_i}\right) = 2.$$

By our assumption, $\sum_{\Theta_i \cap S_w \neq \emptyset} k_i > 0$. Thus $c \in \mathcal{T}_2$, a contradiction. \square

Corollary 3.6. *Let $c \in \mathcal{T}_3 \setminus \mathcal{T}_2$. Then there is a log surface $(S, \Theta) \in \mathcal{LP}(c)$ with $\rho(S) = 1$.*

Proof. Denote

$$\Theta^c := \sum_{k_i > 0} \left(1 - \frac{1}{m_i} + \frac{k_i c}{m_i}\right) \Theta_i$$

and run $K_S + \Theta - \Theta^c$ -MMP. Since $K_S + \Theta \equiv 0$, each time we contract an extremal ray R such that $R \cdot \Theta^c > 0$. Hence Θ^c is not contracted. By Lemma 3.5, at the end we obtain a model with $\rho = 1$. \square

4. PROOF OF THE MAIN THEOREM

In this section we prove Theorem 1.2.

Lemma 4.1. *For any $\epsilon > 0$ and $\frac{1}{2} > \xi > 0$ there exists a finite set $\mathcal{M}_{\xi, \epsilon} \subset [0, 1]$ such that $c \in \mathcal{M}_{\xi, \epsilon}$ whenever $c > \xi$ and there is $(S, \Theta) \in \mathcal{LP}(c)$ with*

$$\text{totaldiscr}(S, \Theta) > -1 + \epsilon.$$

Proof. Since $\Theta \neq 0$, one can apply [2, Th. 6.9] to (S, Θ) . This gives us that the family \mathbf{S} of all such S is bounded. That is there is a family $\mathbf{S} \rightarrow \mathbf{H}$ such that every S is a fiber of $\mathbf{S} \rightarrow \mathbf{H}$. Therefore there is a polarization \mathbf{L} on \mathbf{S} giving us an embedding $\mathbf{S} \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}$ over \mathbf{H} . This induces a very ample divisor L on each $S \in \mathbf{S}$. For all coefficients of Θ we have $\vartheta_i > \xi$. Then

$$L \cdot \sum_i \Theta_i < -\frac{1}{\xi} L \cdot K_S \leq \text{Const}(\epsilon, \xi).$$

Hence the family of all $\sum \Theta_i$ is represented by a closed subscheme of \mathbb{P} over \mathbf{H} . This shows that the pair $(S, \text{Supp}(\Theta))$ is bounded. From the equality

$$L \cdot K_S + L \cdot \Theta = 0$$

we obtain the following linear equation in c :

$$L \cdot K_S + \sum_i \left(1 - \frac{1}{m_i} + \frac{k_i c}{m_i}\right) (L \cdot \Theta_i) = 0,$$

where

$$1 - \frac{1}{m_i} + \frac{k_i c}{m_i} \leq -\text{totaldiscr}(S, \Theta) < 1 - \epsilon.$$

This gives us a finite number of possibilities for the m_i , k_i and c . \square

Lemma 4.2. Fix constants $N \in \mathbb{Z}$, $N \geq 6$ and $0 < \epsilon < \frac{1}{N}$. Let $(S, \Theta = \sum \vartheta_i \Theta_i)$ be a klt log surface such that $\Theta \in \Phi_{\mathbf{sm}}^{\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{N}}$. Assume that there are at least two divisors of the function field $\mathcal{K}(S)$ such that

$$a(\quad, \Theta) < -1 + \frac{1}{N} - \epsilon.$$

Then

$$\text{totaldiscr}(S, \Theta) > -1 + \epsilon.$$

Proof. Let $\mu: \tilde{S} \rightarrow S$ be the blowup of all divisors with discrepancies $a(\quad, \Theta) < -1 + \frac{1}{N}$ (see [7, Th. 17.10, 2.12.2]) and let $\tilde{\Theta}$ be the crepant pullback of Θ :

$$K_{\tilde{S}} + \tilde{\Theta} = \mu^*(K_S + \Theta), \quad \mu_* \tilde{\Theta} = \Theta.$$

Then $(\tilde{S}, \tilde{\Theta})$ satisfies conditions of Lemma 4.2. Moreover,

$$\text{discr}(\tilde{S}, \tilde{\Theta}) \geq -1 + \frac{1}{N}.$$

Clearly,

$$\text{totaldiscr}(S, \Theta) = \text{totaldiscr}(\tilde{S}, \tilde{\Theta})$$

(see [6, 3.10]). Replace (S, Θ) with $(\tilde{S}, \tilde{\Theta})$. Up to permutations of the Θ_i we may assume that

$$\vartheta_1, \vartheta_2 > 1 - \frac{1}{N} + \epsilon.$$

Now it is sufficient to show that $\vartheta_i < 1 - \epsilon$ for all i . Consider the boundary Ξ with $\text{Supp}(\Xi) = \text{Supp}(\Theta)$ as in (2.2). Then $\lfloor \Xi \rfloor = \lceil \Xi - \Theta \rceil$. For a sufficiently small positive rational α , the \mathbb{Q} -divisor $\Theta - \alpha(\Xi - \Theta)$ is a boundary. It is clear that

$$K_S + \Theta - \alpha(\Xi - \Theta) \equiv -\alpha(\Xi - \Theta)$$

cannot be nef. By Lemma 2.2 the pair (S, Ξ) is lc.

Run $K_S + \Theta - \alpha(\Xi - \Theta)$ -MMP. On each step we contract an extremal ray R such that

$$(K_S + \Xi) \cdot R = (\Xi - \Theta) \cdot R > 0.$$

4.3. We claim that none of the components of $\lfloor \Xi \rfloor$ is contracted. Indeed, assume that $\varphi: S \rightarrow S^\circ$ contracts $C \subset \lfloor \Xi \rfloor$. Take $\Theta' := \Theta + \beta C$ so that $\lfloor \Theta' \rfloor = C$ and $\Theta' \leq \Xi$. Since $(K_S + \Xi) \cdot C > 0$ and $(K_S + \Theta) \cdot C < 0$, there is a component, say Θ_0 , of $\lfloor \Xi \rfloor$ meeting C . Further, take $\Theta'' := \Theta' + \gamma(\Xi - \Theta')$ so that $(K_S + \Theta'') \cdot C = 0$. Then $0 < \gamma < 1$. It is easy to see that $\Theta'' \in \Phi_{\mathbf{sm}}^{\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{N}}$ and $\lfloor \Theta'' \rfloor = C$. Note that (S, Θ'') is lc (because so is (S, Ξ)). As in the 2.3, we can apply

Lemma 2.1 to $\text{Diff}_C(\Theta'' - C)$ to derive a contradiction. This proves our claim.

4.4. By Lemma 2.2 the lc property of (S, Ξ) is preserved on each step. At the end of the MMP we get a birational model $(\bar{S}, \bar{\Theta})$ with nonbirational extremal $\bar{\Xi} - \bar{\Theta}$ -positive contraction $g: \bar{S} \rightarrow W$, where W is either a curve or a point.

4.4.1. *Subcase: W is a curve.* Then $\rho(\bar{S}) = 2$. Let \bar{S}_w be the general fiber of g . Then $\text{Diff}_{\bar{S}_w}(\bar{\Theta})$ satisfy conditions of Lemma 2.1. This yields a contradiction.

4.4.2. *Subcase: W is a point.* Then $\rho(\bar{S}) = 1$ and every two components of $\bar{\Theta}$ intersects each other. By Lemma 2.4,

$$\vartheta_1 \leq 2 - \frac{1}{N} - \vartheta_2 < 1 - \epsilon.$$

Similarly, if $i \neq 1$ and the image of Θ_i on \bar{S} is not a point, then

$$\vartheta_i \leq 2 - \frac{1}{N} - \vartheta_1 < 1 - \epsilon.$$

But if Θ_i is contracted to a point on \bar{S} , then $\Theta \not\subset [\Xi]$. In this case, $\theta_i \leq 1 - \frac{1}{N} < 1 - \epsilon$. This proves our lemma. \square

4.5. Now we are ready to prove Theorem 1.2. Assume that there is a sequence $c_n \in \mathcal{T}_3 \cap [\frac{1}{2}, 1]$ such that $c_{n_1} \neq c_{n_2}$ for $n_1 \neq n_2$ and $\lim c_n = c_\infty \notin \mathcal{T}_2$. Take constants $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\epsilon \in \mathbb{Q}$ so that

$$N \geq 6, \quad \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{N} < c_\infty, \text{ and} \\ 0 < \epsilon < \min \left\{ c_\infty - \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{N}, \frac{1}{N} \right\}.$$

By passing to a subsequence, we may assume that $c_n > \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{N} + \epsilon$ for all n . For every c_n we have the corresponding log surface $(S_n, \Theta_n) \in \mathcal{LP}(c_n)$ with $\rho(S_n) = 1$ (see Corollaries 3.1 and 3.6). In particular, $\Theta_n \in \Phi_{\text{sm}}^{\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{N} + \epsilon}$. Write $\Theta_n = \sum_i \vartheta_{n,i} \Theta_{n,i}$. By construction,

$$(4.4) \quad \vartheta_{n,i} = 1 - \frac{1}{m_{n,i}} + \frac{k_{n,i} c_n}{m_{n,i}}, \quad k_{n,i} c_n < 1, \quad \sum_i k_{n,i} > 0.$$

If

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{totaldiscr}(S_n, \Theta_n) > -1,$$

we can take $\nu > 0$ so that $\text{totaldiscr}(S_n, \Theta_n) \geq -1 + \nu$ for $n \gg 0$, then c_n belongs to a finite set $\mathcal{M}_{\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{N}, \nu}$ by Lemma 4.1. This contradicts to

our choice of the sequence c_n . From now on we assume that

$$(4.5) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{totaldiscr}(S_n, \Theta_n) = -1,$$

In particular,

$$\text{totaldiscr}(S_n, \Theta_n) < -1 + \frac{1}{N} - \epsilon \text{ for all } n.$$

Assume that for $n \gg 0$ there are at least two divisors of the field $\mathcal{K}(S_n)$ with discrepancies $a(\Gamma_n, \Theta_n) < -1 + \frac{1}{N} - \epsilon$. Then (S_n, Θ_n) satisfies conditions of Lemma 4.2. Therefore

$$\text{totaldiscr}(S_n, \Theta_n) > -1 + \epsilon,$$

This contradicts (4.5).

4.6. Main case. Finally we consider the case when for $n \gg 0$ there is exactly one divisor Γ_n with

$$\gamma_n := -a(\Gamma_n, \Theta_n) > 1 - \frac{1}{N} + \epsilon.$$

We construct a new birational model $(\bar{S}_n, \gamma_n \bar{\Gamma}_n + \bar{\Theta}_n)$ of (S_n, Θ_n) with $\rho(\bar{S}_n) = 1$ and such that the center of Γ_n on \bar{S}_n is a curve.

4.6.1. If $\text{Center}_{S_n}(\Gamma_n)$ is a curve, then $\Gamma_n = \Theta_{n,i}$ and $\gamma_n = \vartheta_{n,i}$ for some i . In this case we just put $\bar{S}_n := S_n$ and $\bar{\Theta}_n := \Theta_n - \gamma_n \Gamma_n$. Thus

$$\bar{\Theta}_n = \sum_i \bar{\vartheta}_{n,i} \bar{\Theta}_{n,i},$$

where $\bar{\Theta}_{n,i} := \Theta_{n,i}$ whenever $\Theta_{n,i} \neq \Gamma_n$ and

$$\bar{\vartheta}_{n,i} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \Theta_{n,i} = \Gamma_n, \\ \vartheta_{n,i} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

4.6.2. If $\text{Center}_{S_n}(\Gamma_n)$ is a point, we consider the blowup of this Γ_n : $\mu: \tilde{S}_n \rightarrow S_n$ [7, Th. 17.10]. Clearly, $\rho(\tilde{S}_n) = 2$. Write

$$K_{\tilde{S}_n} + \gamma_n \Gamma_n + \tilde{\Theta}_n = \mu^*(K_{S_n} + \Theta_n),$$

$$\tilde{\Theta}_n = \sum \vartheta_i \tilde{\Theta}_{n,i}, \quad \text{where } \mu_* \tilde{\Theta}_{n,i} = \Theta_{n,i}.$$

By construction, $\vartheta_{n,i} \leq 1 - \frac{1}{N} + \epsilon$. The divisor $K_{\tilde{S}_n} + \tilde{\Theta}_n \equiv -\gamma_n \Gamma_n$ cannot be nef. Therefore, there is a Γ_n -positive extremal contraction $\varphi: \tilde{S}_n \rightarrow \bar{S}_n$, where $\rho(\bar{S}_n) = 1$. By Lemma 2.2, $(\tilde{S}_n, \Gamma_n + \tilde{\Theta}_n)$ is lc. If \bar{S}_n is a curve, we derive a contradiction as in 4.4.1.

Therefore φ is birational. Put $\bar{\Theta}_n := \varphi_* \tilde{\Theta}_n$, $\bar{\Theta}_{n,i} := \varphi_* \tilde{\Theta}_{n,i}$, and $\bar{\Gamma}_n := \varphi_* \Gamma_n$. Then $(\bar{S}_n, \gamma_n \bar{\Gamma}_n + \bar{\Theta}_n)$ is klt and $K_{\bar{S}_n} + \gamma_n \bar{\Gamma}_n + \bar{\Theta}_n$ is numerically trivial. Again by Lemma 2.2, $(\bar{S}_n, \bar{\Gamma}_n + \bar{\Theta}_n)$ is lc.

Further,

$$\bar{\Theta}_n = \sum_i \bar{\vartheta}_{n,i} \bar{\Theta}_{n,i},$$

where

$$\bar{\vartheta}_{n,i} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \varphi(\tilde{\Theta}_{n,i}) \text{ is a point,} \\ \vartheta_{n,i} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

4.6.3. In both cases 4.6.1 and 4.6.2 we have

$$(4.6) \quad \bar{\vartheta}_{n,i} \leq 1 - \frac{1}{N} + \epsilon.$$

As in the proof of Lemma 4.1, apply [2, Th. 6.9] to $(\bar{S}_n, \bar{\Theta}_n)$. We get that the family of all $(\bar{S}_n, \text{Supp}(\bar{\Theta}_n + \bar{\Gamma}_n))$ is bounded. By passing to a subsequence we may assume that all the discrete invariants $(\bar{\Gamma}_n)^2$, $\bar{\Gamma}_n \cdot K_{\bar{S}_n}$, $\Theta_{n,i} \cdot K_{\bar{S}_n}$, $p_a(\bar{\Gamma}_n)$, and $K_{\bar{S}_n}^2$ do not depend on n . For short denote them by $\bar{\Gamma}^2$, $\bar{\Gamma} \cdot K_{\bar{S}}$, $\Theta_i \cdot K_{\bar{S}}$, $p_a(\bar{\Gamma})$, and $K_{\bar{S}}^2$, respectively.

From (4.6) by passing to a subsequence we may assume that all constants $m_{n,i}$ and $k_{n,i}$ in (4.4) also do not depend on n :

$$\bar{\vartheta}_{n,i} = 1 - \frac{1}{m_i} + \frac{k_i c_n}{m_i}.$$

By the Adjunction [7, Ch. 16],

$$K_{\bar{\Gamma}_n} + \text{Diff}_{\bar{\Gamma}_n}(\bar{\Theta}_n) \equiv (1 - \gamma_n) \bar{\Gamma}_n|_{\bar{\Gamma}_n},$$

where $\text{Diff}_{\bar{\Gamma}_n}(\bar{\Theta}_n) \geq 0$. Since $(\bar{S}_n, \bar{\Gamma}_n + \bar{\Theta}_n)$ is lc, $\text{Diff}_{\bar{\Gamma}_n}(\bar{\Theta}_n)$ is a boundary (see [7, Prop. 16.6]). The coefficients of $\text{Diff}_{\bar{\Gamma}_n}(\bar{\Theta}_n)$ have the same form as the coefficients of Θ_n :

$$\text{Diff}_{\bar{\Gamma}_n}(\bar{\Theta}_n) = \sum_j \left(1 - \frac{1}{s_j} + \frac{r_j c_n}{s_j}\right) P_j,$$

where $n_j \in \mathbb{N}$, $r_j \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, and $r_j c_n \leq 1$ (see [12, Lemma 4.2]). Thus

$$(4.7) \quad \sum_j \left(1 - \frac{1}{s_j} + \frac{r_j c_n}{s_j}\right) = 2 - 2p_a(\bar{\Gamma}) + (1 - \gamma_n) \bar{\Gamma}^2.$$

Here $\bar{\Gamma}^2 > 0$, $1 - \frac{1}{N} + \epsilon < \gamma_n < 1$ and $p_a(\bar{\Gamma}) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. If $r_j = 0$ for all j , then γ_n can be found from the equation

$$\sum_j \left(1 - \frac{1}{s_j}\right) = 2 - 2p_a(\bar{\Gamma}) + (1 - \gamma_n) \bar{\Gamma}^2.$$

In this case, $\gamma := \gamma_n$ does not depend on n and $\gamma < 1$. Therefore,

$$\text{totaldiscr}(S^n, \Theta^n) > -\gamma > -1.$$

This contradicts our assumption (4.5).

Assume that there is at least one component with $r_i = 1$. Passing to the limit as $n \rightarrow \infty$ in (4.7) we obtain

$$\sum_j \left(1 - \frac{1}{s_j} + \frac{r_j c_\infty}{s_j} \right) = 2 - 2p_a(\bar{\Gamma}) + (1 - \gamma_\infty) \bar{\Gamma}^2.$$

If $\gamma_\infty < 1$, then

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{totaldiscr}(S^n, \Theta^n) \geq \min \left\{ -\gamma_\infty, \quad -1 + \frac{1}{N} - \epsilon \right\} > -1.$$

Again we have a contradiction with (4.5). Hence $\gamma_\infty = 1$ and

$$0 < \sum_j \left(1 - \frac{1}{s_j} + \frac{r_j c_\infty}{s_j} \right) = 2 - 2p_a(\bar{\Gamma}).$$

This gives us that $p_a(\bar{\Gamma})$. By Lemma 3.1, $c_\infty \in \mathcal{T}_2$. Theorem 1.2 is proved.

REFERENCES

- [1] Alexeev V. *Fractional indices of log del Pezzo surfaces*, (Russian) Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR Ser. Mat. **52** (1988) 1288–1304, 1328; English transl. in Math. USSR-Izv. **33** (1989) 613–629
- [2] Alexeev V. *Boundedness and K^2 for log surfaces*, Internat. J. Math. **5** (1994) 779–810
- [3] Borisov A. *Minimal discrepancies of toric singularities*, Manuscripta Math. **92** (1997) 33–45
- [4] Fujita T. *On Kodaira energy of polarized log varieties*. J. Math. Soc. Japan **48** (1996) 1–12
- [5] Kollár J. *Log surfaces of general type; some conjectures*, Contemporary Math. AMS **162** (1994) 261–275
- [6] Kollár J. *Singularities of pairs*, Proc. Symp. Pure Math. **62** (1995) 221–287
- [7] Kollár J. et al. *Flips and abundance for algebraic threefolds*, A summer seminar at the University of Utah, Salt Lake City, 1991. Astérisque **211** (1992)
- [8] Kuwata T. *On log canonical thresholds of reducible plane curves*, Amer. J. Math. **121** (1999) 701–721
- [9] Prokhorov Yu. G. *Blow-ups of canonical singularities*, in “Algebra” (Moscow, 1998), 301–317, de Gruyter, Berlin, 2000
- [10] Prokhorov Yu. G. *On log canonical thresholds*, e-print math.AG/0102090, to appear in Communications in Algebra **29** (2001) no. 9-10
- [11] Shokurov V. V. *Problems about Fano varieties*, in “Birational Geometry of Algebraic Varieties. Open Problems”. XXIII International Taniguchi Symposium, 1988, Preprint
- [12] Shokurov V. V. *3-fold log flips*, Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR Ser. Mat. **56** (1992) 105–201; (Russian) English transl. in Izv. Math. Russian Acad. Sci. **40** (1993) 93–202

- [13] Shokurov V. V. *Complements on surfaces*, J. Math. Sci., New York **102**
(2000) no. 2, 3876–3932

DEPARTMENT OF ALGEBRA, FACULTY OF MATHEMATICS, MOSCOW STATE
LOMONOSOV UNIVERSITY, 117234 MOSCOW, RUSSIA
E-mail address: prokhorov@mech.math.msu.su

CURRENT ADDRESS: MAX-PLANK-INSTITUT FÜR MATHEMATIK VIVATSGASSE
7, 53111 BONN, GERMANY
E-mail address: prokhorov@mpim-bonn.mpg.de