1. Introduction

Let $X$ be a smooth variety and $S \subset X$ a smooth hypersurface. The Poincaré residue map is an isomorphism 

$$\mathcal{R} : \omega_X(S)|_S \cong \omega_S.$$ 

In additive form it gives the adjunction formula $(K_X + S)|_S \sim K_S$, but this variant does not show that $\mathcal{R}$ is a canonical isomorphism.

Its generalization to log canonical pairs $(X, S + \Delta)$ has been an important tool in birational geometry; see, for instance, [Kol92, KM98]. One defines a twisted version of the restriction of $\Delta$ to $S$, called the different and, for $m > 0$ sufficiently divisible, one gets a Poincaré residue map

$$\mathcal{R}^m : (\omega_X^m(mS + m\Delta))|_S \cong \omega_S^m(m \text{Diff}_S \Delta),$$

where the exponent $[m]$ denotes the double dual of the $m$th tensor power. As before, it is frequently written as a $\mathbb{Q}$-linear equivalence of divisors

$$(K_X + S + \Delta)|_S \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} K_S + \text{Diff}_S \Delta.$$ 

There have been several attempts to extend these formulas to the case when $S$ is replaced by a higher codimension log canonical center of a pair $(X, \Delta)$ [Kaw97, Kaw98, Kol07]. None of these have been completely successful; the main difficulty is understanding what kind of object the different should be.

Let $Z \subset X$ be a log canonical center of a pair $(X, \Delta)$. We can choose a resolution $f : X' \to X$ such that if we write $f^*(K_X + \Delta) \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} K_{X'} + \Delta'$ then there is a divisor $S \subset X'$ that dominates $Z$ and appears in $\Delta'$ with coefficient 1. The usual adjunction formula now gives

$$(K_{X'} + \Delta')|_S \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} K_S + \text{Diff}_S(\Delta' - S) =: K_S + \Delta_S.$$ 

Note further that $K_{X'} + \Delta'$ is trivial on the fibers of $f$, hence so is $K_S + \Delta_S$. Thus

$$f|_S : (S, \Delta_S) \to Z$$

is a fiber space whose (possibly disconnected) fibers have (numerically) trivial (log) canonical class. The aim of previous attempts was to generalize Kodaira’s canonical bundle formula for elliptic surfaces (cf. [BPV84, Sec.V.12]) to this setting. The difficulty is to make sure that we do not lose information in the summand that corresponds to the $j$-invariant of the fibers in the classical case. (For families of elliptic curves this could be achieved by keeping the corresponding variation of Hodge structures as part of our data.)

This suggests that it could be better to view the pair $(S, \Delta_S)$ as the answer to the problem. However, in general there are many divisors $S_j \subset X'$ that satisfy our requirements and they do not seem to be related to each other in any nice way.
Our aim is to remedy this problem, essentially by looking at the smallest possible intersections of the various divisors $S_j$ on a dlt model of $(X, \Delta)$. There can be many of these models and intersections, but they turn out to be birational to each other and have several unexpectedly nice properties. These are summarized in the next theorem. For the rest of this note we work over a field of characteristic 0.

Dlt models, the different and crepant birational equivalence are recalled in Definitions 1-6.

**Theorem 1.** Let $(X, \Delta)$ be an lc pair, $Z \subset X$ an lc center and $n : Z^n \to Z$ its normalization. Let $f : (X^m, \Delta^m) \to (X, \Delta)$ be a dlt model and $S \subset X^m$ a minimal (with respect to inclusion) lc center of $(X^m, \Delta^m)$ that dominates $Z$. Set $\Delta_S := \text{Diff}_S \Delta^m$ and $f_S := f|_{S}$. Let $f^n_S : S \to \bar{Z}_S \to Z^n$ denote the Stein factorization.

1. (Uniqueness of sources) The crepant birational equivalence class of $(S, \Delta_S)$ does not depend on the choice of $X^m$ and $S$. It is called the source of $Z$ and denoted by $\text{Src}(Z, X, \Delta)$.
2. (Uniqueness of springs) The isomorphism class of $\bar{Z}_S$ does not depend on the choice of $X^m$ and $S$. It is called the spring of $Z$ and denoted by $\text{Spr}(Z, X, \Delta)$.
3. (Crepant log structure) $(S, \Delta_S)$ is dlt, $K_S + \Delta_S \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} f_S^*(K_X + \Delta)$ and $(S, \Delta_S)$ is klt on the generic fiber of $f_S$.
4. (Poincaré residue map) For $m > 0$ sufficiently divisible, there are well defined isomorphisms

$$f^*(\omega_X^m(m\Delta)|_S) \cong \omega_S^m(m\Delta_S)$$

$$n^*(\omega_X^m(m\Delta)|_Z) \cong (f^n_S)_* \omega_S^m(m\Delta_S)^{\text{inv}}$$

where the exponent inv denotes the invariants under the action of the group of crepant birational self-maps $\text{Bir}_Z(S, \Delta_S)$.
5. (Galois property) The extension $\bar{Z}_S \to Z$ is Galois and $\text{Bir}_Z(S, \Delta_S) \to \text{Gal}(\bar{Z}_S/Z)$ is surjective.
6. (Adjunction) Assume $\Delta = D + \Delta_1$. Let $n_D : D^n \to D$ be the normalization and $Z_D \subset D^n$ an lc center of $(D^n, \text{Diff}_{D^n} \Delta_1)$ such that $n_D(Z_D) = Z$. Then there is a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{Src}(Z_D, D^n, \text{Diff}_{D^n} \Delta_1) & \xrightarrow{\text{clir}} & \text{Src}(Z, X, D + \Delta_1) \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
Z_D & \xrightarrow{n_D} & Z.
\end{array}$$

Crepant log structures are defined in Section 2. Theorem 1 shows that minimal lc centers are birational to each other; this proves (1) and it also establishes (16). Its consequences for the Poincaré residue map are derived in Section 3. Sources and springs are formally defined in Section 4 and (15) is proved in Proposition 1. Section 5 contains the main application, Theorems 23-24. We show that normalization gives a one-to-one correspondence:

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{c}
\text{slc pairs } (X, \Delta) \\
\text{such that} \\
K_X + \Delta \text{ is ample}
\end{array} \right\} \cong \left\{ \begin{array}{c}
\text{lc pairs } (\bar{X}, \bar{D} + \bar{\Delta}) \text{ such that} \\
K_{\bar{X}} + \bar{D} + \bar{\Delta} \text{ is ample plus an} \\
\text{involution } \tau \text{ of } (\bar{D}^n, \text{Diff}_{D^n} \Delta)
\end{array} \right\}.$$
2. Crepant log structures

**Definition 2.** Let $Z$ be a normal variety. A crepant log structure on $Z$ is a proper, surjective morphism $f : (X, \Delta) \to Z$ such that

1. $f$ has connected fibers,
2. $(X, \Delta)$ is lc and
3. $K_X + \Delta \sim_{f, Q} 0.$

A proper morphism $f : (X, \Delta) \to Z$ is called a weak crepant log structure on $Z$ if it satisfies (1) and (3) but $\Delta$ is allowed to be a non-effective sub-boundary.

Any lc pair $(Z, \Delta_Z)$ has a trivial crepant log structure where $(X, \Delta) = (Z, \Delta_Z)$.

Conversely, if $f$ is birational then $(Z, \Delta_Z := f_* \Delta)$ is lc.

An irreducible subvariety $W \subset Z$ is a log canonical center or lc center of a weak crepant log structure $f : (X, \Delta) \to Z$ iff it is the image of an lc center $W_X \subset X$ of $(X, \Delta)$. A weak crepant log structure has only finitely many lc centers.

Let $(Z, \Delta_Z)$ be an lc pair and $f : X \to Z$ a proper, birational morphism. Write $K_X + \Delta_X \sim_Q f^*(K_Z + \Delta_Z)$. Then $f : (X, \Delta_X) \to Z$ is a weak crepant log structure.

The lc centers of $f : (X, \Delta_X) \to Z$ are the same as the lc centers of $(Z, \Delta_Z)$.

By Proposition 3 we can choose $f$ such that $f : (X, \Delta_X) \to (Z, \Delta_Z)$ is a crepant log structure, $X$ is $\mathbb{Q}$-factorial and $(X, \Delta_X)$ is dlt.

Let $f : (X, \Delta_X) \to Z$ be a dlt crepant log structure and $Y \subset X$ an lc center. Consider the Stein factorization

$$f|_Y : Y \xrightarrow{f|_Y} Z_Y \xrightarrow{\pi} Z,$$

and set $\Delta_Y := \text{Diff}^*_Y \Delta_X$. Then $(Y, \Delta_Y)$ is dlt and $f_Y : (Y, \Delta_Y) \to Z_Y$ is a crepant log structure.

**Definition 3** (Divisorial log terminal). A pair $(X, \sum a_i D_i)$ is called simple normal crossing (abbreviated as snc) if $X$ is smooth and for every $p \in X$ one can choose an open neighborhood $p \in U$ and local coordinates $x_i$ such that for every $i$ there is an index $a(i)$ such that $D_i \cap U = (x_{a(i)} = 0)$.

As key examples, I emphasize that the pair $(\mathbb{A}^2_k, (x^2 + y^3))$ is not snc and $(\mathbb{A}^2_k, (x^2 + y^2 = 0))$ is snc iff $\sqrt{-1} \in k$. Thus being snc is a Zariski local (but not étale local) property.

Given any pair $(X, \Delta)$, there is a largest open subset $X^{\text{snc}} \subset X$ such that $(X^{\text{snc}}, \Delta|_{X^{\text{snc}}})$ is snc.

A pair $(X, \Delta)$ is called divisorial log terminal (abbreviated as dlt) if the discrepancy $a(E, X, \Delta)$ is $> -1$ for every divisor whose center is contained in $X \setminus X^{\text{snc}}$.

**Definition 4** (Different). Let $(X, \Delta)$ be a dlt pair and $Y \subset X$ an lc center. Generalizing the usual notion of the different $[\text{Kol}92 \text{ Sec.16}]$, there is a naturally defined $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor $\text{Diff}^*_Y \Delta$, called the different of $\Delta$ on $Y$ such that

$$(K_X + \Delta)|_Y \sim_Q K_Y + \text{Diff}^*_Y \Delta.$$
The traditional different [Kol92, Sec.16] is defined such that if \( Y = D \) is a divisor then

\[
(K_X + D + \Delta)|_D \sim_\mathbb{Q} K_D + \text{Diff}_D \Delta.
\]

Thus, in this case, \( \text{Diff}_D(D + \Delta) = \text{Diff}_D \Delta \). This inductively defines \( \text{Diff}_Y \Delta \) whenever \( Y \) is an irreducible component of a complete intersection of divisors in \( |\Delta| \). In the dlt case, this takes care of every lc center by [Fuj07, Sec.3.9]; see also [Kol13, Sec.4.1] for details.

The following result was proved by Hacon (and published in [KK10]). A simplified proof is in [Fuj10].

**Proposition 5.** Let \((Z, \Delta_Z)\) be an lc pair. Then it has a \( \mathbb{Q} \)-factorial, crepant, dlt model \( p : (X, \Delta_X) \to (Z, \Delta_Z) \). That is, \( X \) is \( \mathbb{Q} \)-factorial, \( (X, \Delta_X) \) is dlt, \( K_X + \Delta_X \) is \( p \)-nef and \( \Delta_X = E + p_*^{-1} \Delta_Z \) where \( E \) contains all \( p \)-exceptional divisors with multiplicity 1. \( \square \)

**6 (Birational weak crepant log structures).**

Let \( f : (X, \Delta) \to Z \) be a weak crepant log structure. If \( f \) factors as \( X \xrightarrow{g} X' \xrightarrow{f'} Z \) where \( g \) is birational, then \( f' : (X', \Delta' := g_* \Delta) \to Z \) also a weak crepant log structure. We say that \( f : (X, \Delta) \to Z \) birationally dominates \( f' : (X', \Delta') \to Z \).

Conversely, assume that \( f' : (X', \Delta') \to Z \) is a weak crepant log structure and \( g : X \to X' \) is a proper birational morphism. Write \( K_X + \Delta \sim_\mathbb{Q} g^*(K_{X'} + \Delta') \). Then \( f := f' \circ g : (X, \Delta) \to Z \) is also a weak crepant log structure.

By Proposition 5, every (weak) crepant log structure \( f : (X, \Delta) \to Z \) is dominated by another (weak) crepant log structure \( f^* : (X^*, \Delta^*) \to Z \) such that \((X^*, \Delta^*)\) is dlt and \( \mathbb{Q} \)-factorial. If \( \Delta \) is effective then we can choose \( \Delta^* \) to be effective.

Two weak crepant log structures \( f_i : (X_i, \Delta_i) \to Z \) are called crepant birational if there is a third weak crepant log structure \( h : (Y, \Delta_Y) \to Z \) which birationally dominates both of them. Crepant birational equivalence is denoted by \( \sim_{\text{cbir}} \).

The group of crepant birational self-maps of a weak crepant log structure \( f : (X, \Delta) \to Z \) is denoted by \( \text{Bir}^\text{cbir}_Z(X, \Delta) \). By also allowing \( k \)-automorphisms, we get the larger group \( \text{Bir}^k_Z(X, \Delta) \).

Let \( f : (X, \Delta) \to Z \) be a weak crepant log structure and \( f' : X' \to Z \) a proper morphism. Assume that there is a birational map \( \phi : X \dashrightarrow X' \) such that \( f' \circ \phi = f \).

By the above, there is a unique \( \mathbb{Q} \)-divisor \( \Delta' \) such that \( f' : (X', \Delta') \to Z \) is a weak crepant log structure that is birational to \( f : (X, \Delta) \to Z \). If \( \phi^{-1} \) has no exceptional divisors, then \( \Delta' = \phi_* \Delta \) and hence \( \Delta' \) is effective if \( \Delta \) is.

Let \( f_i : (X_i, \Delta_i) \to S \) be weak crepant log structures and \( \phi : X_1 \to X_2 \) a birational map. Let \( Z_1 \subset X_1 \) an lc center such that, at the generic point of \( Z_1 \), the pair \((X_1, \Delta_1)\) is dlt and \( \phi \) is a local isomorphism. Then \( Z_2 := \phi_* Z_1 \) is also an lc center and

\[
\phi|_{Z_1} : (Z_1, \text{Diff}_Z^* \Delta_1) \to (Z_2, \text{Diff}_Z^* \Delta_1) \quad \text{is crepant birational.}
\]

**Theorem 7.** [NU73, Uen75, Gon10, FG10] Let \( f : (X, \Delta_X) \to Z \) be a crepant log structure. Then:

1. The \( \text{Bir}^\text{cbir}_Z(X, \Delta_X) \) action on \( \omega_X^{[m]}(m \Delta_X) \) is finite for every \( m \geq 0 \).
2. If \( Z \) is projective and \( K_X + \Delta_X \sim_\mathbb{Q} f^*(\text{ample \mathbb{Q}-divisor}) \) then the \( \text{Bir}^k_Z(X, \Delta_X) \) action on \( Z \) is finite. \( \square \)
8 (Minimal dominating lc centers). Let \( f : (X, \Delta) \to S \) be a dlt, weak crepant log structure. Let \( W \subset S \) be an lc center and \( \{ W_i : i \in I(W) \} \) the minimal (with respect to inclusion) lc centers of \( (X, \Delta) \) that dominate \( W \). We claim that the set of their crepant birational isomorphism classes
\[
\{ (W_i, \text{Diff}^*_W \Delta) : i \in I(W) \}
\]
is a birational invariant of \( f : (X, \Delta) \to S \).

To see this note that by \([\text{Sza94}]\) we can assume that \( (X, \Delta) \) is snc. Then it is enough to check birational invariance for one smooth blow up. If we blow up \( V \subset X \) that is not an lc center, then the set of lc centers is unchanged.

If \( V \) is an lc center that is the complete intersection of say \( D_1, \ldots, D_r \subset |\Delta| \), then we get an exceptional divisor \( E_V \) that is a \( \mathbb{P}^{r-1} \)-bundle over \( V \). Locally on \( V \), we get a direct product
\[
(E_V, \text{Diff}^*_E \Delta_{B_V X}) \cong (V, \text{Diff}^*_V \Delta) \times (\mathbb{P}^{r-1}, (x_1 \cdots x_r = 0)),
\]
thus every minimal lc center of \( (V, \text{Diff}^*_V \Delta) \) corresponds to \( r \) isomorphic copies of itself among the minimal lc centers of \( (E_V, \text{Diff}^*_E \Delta_{B_V X}) \), hence among the minimal lc centers of \( (B_V X, \Delta_{B_V X}) \).

Our next aim is to prove that for crepant log structures, the invariant defined in (8.1) consist of a single birational equivalence class.

\( \mathbb{P}^1 \)-linking of minimal lc centers.

**Definition 9 (\( \mathbb{P}^1 \)-linking).** A standard \( \mathbb{P}^1 \)-link is a dlt, \( \mathbb{Q} \)-factorial, pair \( (X, D_1 + D_2 + \Delta) \) whose sole lc centers are \( D_1, D_2 \) (hence \( D_1 \) and \( D_2 \) are disjoint) plus a proper morphism \( \pi : X \to S \) such that \( K_X + D_1 + D_2 + \Delta \sim_{\mathbb{Q}, \pi} 0 \), \( \pi : D_i \to S \) are both isomorphisms and every reduced fiber \( X_s \) is isomorphic to \( \mathbb{P}^1 \).

Let \( F \) denote a general smooth fiber. Then \( (K_X + D_1 + D_2) \cdot F = 0 \), hence \( (\Delta \cdot F) = 0 \). That is, \( \Delta \) is a vertical divisor, the projection gives an isomorphism \((D_1, \text{Diff}_{D_1} \Delta) \cong (D_2, \text{Diff}_{D_2} \Delta) \) and these pairs are klt.

The simplest example of a standard \( \mathbb{P}^1 \)-link is a product
\[
(S \times \mathbb{P}^1, S \times \{0\} + S \times \{\infty\} + \Delta_S \times \mathbb{P}^1)
\]
for some \( \mathbb{Q} \)-divisor \( \Delta_S \).

It turns out that every standard \( \mathbb{P}^1 \)-link is locally the quotient of a product. To see this note that \((D_1 - D_2) \cdot F = 0 \), thus every point \( s \in S \) has an open neighborhood \( U \) such that \( D_1 - D_2 \sim_{\mathbb{Q}, \pi} 0 \) on \( \pi^{-1}(U) \). Taking the corresponding cyclic cover we get another standard \( \mathbb{P}^1 \)-link
\[
\tilde{\pi} : (\tilde{X}_U, \tilde{D}_1 + \tilde{D}_2 + \tilde{\Delta}) \to \tilde{U}
\]
where the \( \tilde{D}_i \) are now Cartier divisors and \( \tilde{\Delta} = \tilde{\pi}^* \Delta_U \) for some \( \mathbb{Q} \)-divisor \( \Delta_U \). Here \( \tilde{D}_1 \sim \tilde{D}_2 \), hence the linear system \( |\tilde{D}_1, \tilde{D}_2| \) maps \( \tilde{X}_U \) to \( \mathbb{P}^1 \). Together with \( \tilde{\pi} \) this gives an isomorphism
\[
(\tilde{U} \times \mathbb{P}^1, \tilde{U} \times \{0\} + \tilde{U} \times \{\infty\} + \Delta_U \times \mathbb{P}^1) \cong (\tilde{X}_U, \tilde{D}_1 + \tilde{D}_2 + \tilde{\Delta}).
\]

Let \( g : (X, \Delta) \to S \) be a crepant, dlt log structure and \( Z_1, Z_2 \subset X \) two lc centers. We say that \( Z_1, Z_2 \) are directly \( \mathbb{P}^1 \)-linked if there is an lc center \( W \subset X \) containing the \( Z_i \) such that \( g(W) = g(Z_1) = g(Z_2) \) and \( (W, \text{Diff}^*_W \Delta) \) is crepant birational to a standard \( \mathbb{P}^1 \)-link with \( Z_1 \) mapping to \( D_1 \).
We say that $Z_1, Z_2 \subset X$ are $\mathbb{P}^1$-linked if there is a sequence of lc centers $Z'_1, \ldots, Z'_m$ such that $Z'_1 = Z_1, Z'_m = Z_2$ and $Z'_i$ is directly $\mathbb{P}^1$-linked to $Z'_{i+1}$ for $i = 1, \ldots, m-1$ (or $Z_1 = Z_2$).

The following strengthening of [KK10, 1.7] was the reason to introduce the notion of $\mathbb{P}^1$-linking.

**Theorem 10.** Let $k$ be a field and $S$ essentially of finite type over $k$. Let $f : (X, \Delta) \rightarrow S$ be a proper morphism such that $K_X + \Delta \sim_{Q, f} 0$ and $(X, \Delta)$ is dlt. Let $s \in S$ be a point such that $f^{-1}(s)$ is connected (as a $k(s)$-scheme). Let $Z \subset X$ be minimal (with respect to inclusion) among the lc centers of $(X, \Delta)$ such that $s \in f(Z)$. Let $W \subset X$ be an lc center of $(X, \Delta)$ such that $s \in f(W)$.

Then there is an lc center $Z_W \subset W$ such that $Z$ and $Z_W$ are $\mathbb{P}^1$-linked.

In particular, all the minimal (with respect to inclusion) lc centers $Z_i \subset X$ such that $s \in f(Z_i)$ are $\mathbb{P}^1$-linked to each other.

Remarks. For the applications it is crucial to understand the case when $k(s)$ is not algebraically closed.

Each $\mathbb{P}^1$-linking defines a birational map $Z \rightarrow Z_W$, but different $\mathbb{P}^1$-linkings can give different birational maps.

Proof. We use induction on dim $X$ and on dim $Z$.

Write $|\Delta| = \sum D_i$. By passing to a suitable étale neighborhood of $s \in S$ we may assume that each $D_i \rightarrow Y$ has connected fiber over $s$ and every lc center of $(X, \Delta)$ intersects $f^{-1}(s)$. (We need to do this without changing the residue field so that $f^{-1}(s)$ stays connected, cf. [Mil80, I.4.2].)

Assume first that $f^{-1}(s) \cap \sum D_i$ is connected. By suitable indexing, we may assume that $Z \subset D_1, W \subset D_r$ and $f^{-1}(s) \cap D_i \cap D_{i+1} \neq \emptyset$ for $i = 1, \ldots, r - 1$.

By induction, we can apply Theorem 10 to $D_1 \rightarrow S$ with $Z$ as $Z$ and $D_1 \cap D_2$ as $W$. We get that there is an lc center $Z_2 \subset W$ such that $Z$ and $Z_2$ are $\mathbb{P}^1$-linked. As we noted in Definition 9, $Z_2$ is also minimal (with respect to inclusion) among the lc centers of $(X, \Delta)$ such that $s \in f(Z_2)$. Note that $Z_2$ is an lc center of $(D_1, \text{Diff}^+_{D_1}(\Delta))$. By adjunction, it is an lc center of $(X, \Delta)$ and also an lc center of $(D_2, \text{Diff}^+_{D_2}(\Delta))$.

Next we apply Theorem 10 to $D_2 \rightarrow S$ with $Z_2$ as $Z$ and $D_2 \cap D_1$ as $W$, and so on. At the end we work on $D_r \rightarrow S$ with $Z_r$ as $Z$ and $W$ as $W$ to get an lc center $Z_W \subset W$ such that $Z$ and $Z_W$ are $\mathbb{P}^1$-linked. This proves the first claim if $f^{-1}(s) \cap \sum D_i$ is connected.

If $f^{-1}(s) \cap \sum D_i$ is disconnected, then write $\Delta = \sum_{i=1}^m D_i + \Delta_1$. We claim that in this case $m = 2$ and $D_1, D_2 \subset X$ are directed $\mathbb{P}^1$-linked (by $W = X$). We may assume that $X$ is $Q$-factorial.

First we show that $\sum D_i$ dominates $S$. Indeed, consider the exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X(-\sum D_i) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\sum D_i} \rightarrow 0$$

and its push-forward

$$\mathcal{O}_S \cong f_* \mathcal{O}_X \rightarrow f_* \mathcal{O}_{\sum D_i} \rightarrow R^1 f_* \mathcal{O}_X(-\sum D_i).$$

Since $-\sum D_i \sim_{Q, f} K_X + \Delta_1$, the sheaf $R^1 f_* \mathcal{O}_X(-\sum D_i)$ is torsion free by [Kol86] (see [KK10] for the extension to the klt case that we use). Thus $\mathcal{O}_S \rightarrow f_* \mathcal{O}_{\sum D_i}$ is surjective hence $\sum D_i \rightarrow S$ has connected fibers, a contradiction.
This implies that \(K_X + \Delta_1\) is not \(f\)-pseudo-effective and so by [BCHM10] 1.3.2 one can run the \((X, \Delta_1)\)-MMP over \(S\).

Every step is numerically \(K_X + \sum D_i + \Delta_1\)-trivial, hence \(\sum D_i\) is ample on every extremal ray. Therefore a connected component of \(\sum D_i\) can never be contracted by a birational contraction. By the Connectedness Theorem [Kol92 17.4], the connected components of \(\sum D_i\) are unchanged for birational contractions and flips. Thus, at some point, we must encounter a Fano contraction \(p : (X^*, \Delta^*_1) \to V\) where \(\sum D_{i}^*\) is \(p\)-ample. So there is an irreducible component, say \(D_{i}^*\) that has positive intersection with the contracted ray. Therefore \(D_{i}^*\) is \(p\)-ample. By assumption, there is another irreducible component, say \(D_{j}^*\) that is disjoint from \(D_{i}^*\). Let \(F_v \subset X^*\) be any fiber that intersects \(D_{j}^*\). Since \(D_{j}^*\) is disjoint from \(D_{i}^*\), we see that \(D_{j}^*\) does not contain \(F_v\). Thus \(D_{j}^*\) also has positive intersection with the contracted ray, hence \(D_{j}^*\) is also \(p\)-ample.

Thus \(D_{i}^*\) and \(D_{j}^*\) are both relatively ample (possibly multi-) sections of \(p\) and they are disjoint. This is only possible if \(p\) has fiber dimension 1, the generic fiber is a smooth rational curve and \(D_{i}^*\) and \(D_{j}^*\) are sections of \(p\).

Since \(p\) is an extremal contraction, \(R^1p_*O_{X^*} = 0\), which implies that every fiber of \(p\) is a tree of smooth rational curves. Both \(D_{i}^*\) and \(D_{j}^*\) intersects every fiber in a single point and they both intersect every contracted curve. Thus every fiber is irreducible and so \(p : (X^*, \Delta^*) \to V\) is a standard \(\mathbb{P}^1\)-link with \(D_{i}^*, D_{j}^*\) as sections. As we noted in Definition 9, the rest of \(\Delta^*\) consists of vertical divisors. Thus any other \(D_{k}^*\) would make \(f^{-1}(s) \cap \sum D_i\) connected. Therefore \(D_{i}^*, D_{j}^*\) are the only lc centers of \((X^*, \sum D_i^* + D_j^* + \Delta_i^*)\) and so \(D_1, D_2\) are the only lc centers of \((X, \Delta)\). As noted at the end of Definition 6 \((X, \Delta)\) is a dlt, crepant log structure.

\[ \square \]

**Corollary 11.** Let \(f : (X, \Delta_X) \to S\) be a dlt, crepant log structure. Let \(Y \subset X\) be an lc center. Consider the Stein factorization \(f|_Y : Y \xrightarrow{f_Y} S_Y \xrightarrow{\pi} S\) and set \(\Delta_Y := \text{Diff}_Y \Delta_X\). Then

1. \(f_Y : (Y, \Delta_Y) \to S_Y\) is a dlt, crepant log structure.
2. Let \(W_Y \subset S_Y\) be an lc center of \(f_Y : (Y, \Delta_Y) \to S_Y\). Then \(\pi(W_Y) \subset S\) is an lc center of \(f : (X, \Delta_X) \to S\) and every minimal lc center of \((Y, \Delta_Y)\) dominating \(W_Y\) is also a minimal lc center of \((X, \Delta_X)\) dominating \(\pi(W_Y)\).
3. Let \(W \subset S\) be an lc center of \(f : (X, \Delta_X) \to S\). Then every irreducible component of \(\pi^{-1}(W)\) is an lc center of \(f_Y : (Y, \Delta_Y) \to S_Y\).

**Proof.** (1) is clear. To see (2), note that \(W_Y\) is dominated by an lc center \(V_Y\) of \((Y, \text{Diff}_Y \Delta)\). Thus, by adjunction, \(V_Y\) is also an lc center of \((X, \Delta)\), hence \(\pi(W_Y) = f(V_Y)\) is an lc center of \(S\). By Theorem 10, a minimal lc center of \(Y\) that dominates \(W_Y\) is also a minimal lc center of \(X\) that dominates \(\pi(W_Y)\). Thus \(\text{Src}(W_Y, Y, \Delta_Y) \sim \text{Src}(\pi(W_Y), X, \Delta_X)\).

Finally let \(W \subset S\) be an lc center of \(f : (X, \Delta_X) \to S\) and \(w \in W\) the generic point. Let \(V_X \subset X\) be a minimal lc center that dominates \(W\). By Theorem 10 there is an lc center \(V_Y \subset Y\) that is \(\mathbb{P}^1\)-linked to \(V_X\). By adjunction, \(V_Y\) is also an lc center of \((Y, \text{Diff}_Y \Delta)\). Thus \(f_Y(V_Y) \subset S_Y\) is an lc center of \(f_Y : (Y, \Delta_Y) \to S_Y\) and it is also one of the irreducible components of \(\pi^{-1}(W)\).

In order to get (3), after replacing \(S\) by an étale neighborhood of \(w\), we may assume that \(Y = \cup Y_j\) such that each \(f^{-1}(w) \cap Y_j\) is connected. By the previous
argument, each $Y_j$ yields an lc center $f_{Y_j}(V_{Y_j}) \subseteq S_{Y_j}$ and together these show that every irreducible component of $\pi^{-1}(W)$ is an lc center of $f_Y : (Y, \Delta_Y) \to S_Y$. □

Example 12. Fix $m \geq 3$ and $\epsilon$ a primitive $m$th root of unity. On $\mathbb{P}^{m-1}$ consider the $\mu_m$-action generated by

$$
\tau_1 : (x_0 : x_1 : \cdots : x_{m-1}) \mapsto (x_0 : \epsilon x_1 : \cdots : \epsilon^{m-1}x_{m-1}).
$$

The action moves the divisor $D_0 := (x_0 + x_1 + \cdots + x_{m-1} = 0)$ into $m$ different divisors $D_0, \ldots, D_{m-1}$. One easily checks that $(\mathbb{P}^{m-1}, D_0 + \cdots + D_{m-1})$ is snc (if $\epsilon$ is in our base field) and has trivial log canonical class.

Let $A$ be an abelian variety with a $\mu_m$-action generated by $\tau$. On

$$(\mathbb{P}^{m-1} \times A, \Delta := D_0 \times A + \cdots + D_{m-1} \times A)$$

we have a $\mu_m$-action generated by $\tau := (\tau_1, \tau_2)$.

Let $X_1 := (\mathbb{P}^{m-1} \times A)/\langle \tau \rangle$. The quotient of the boundary $\Delta$ has only 1 component but it has complicated self-intersections, hence it is not dlt. Let $(X, \Delta_X)$ be a dlt model.

We see that the minimal lc centers are isomorphic to $(A,0)$ and the different $\mathbb{P}^1$-linkings between them differ from each other by a power of $\tau_2$.

3. Poincaré residue map

Definition 13. Let $(X, \Delta)$ be a dlt pair and $Z \subset X$ an lc center. As in Definition \[4\] if $\omega^m_X(m\Delta)$ is locally free, then, by iterating the usual Poincaré residue maps for divisors, we get a Poincaré residue map

$$
\mathcal{R}^m_{X \to Z} : \omega^m_Z(m\Delta)|_{Z} \xrightarrow{\epsilon^*} \omega^m_Z(m \cdot \text{Diff}_Z^* \Delta).
$$

(13.1)

(This is well defined if $m$ is even, defined only up to sign if $m$ is odd.)

Let $f : (X, \Delta) \to Y$ be a dlt, weak crepant log structure. Choose $m > 0$ even such that $\omega^m_X(m\Delta) \cong f^*L$ for some line bundle $L$ on $Y$. Let $Z \subset X$ be an lc center of $(X, \Delta)$. We can view the Poincaré residue map as

$$
\mathcal{R}^m_{X \to Z} : f^*L|_Z \cong \omega^m_X(m\Delta)|_Z \xrightarrow{\epsilon^*} \omega^m_Z(m \cdot \text{Diff}_Z^* \Delta).
$$

(13.2)

The following result shows, that, for minimal lc centers, (13.2) is essentially independent of the choice of $Z$.

Proposition 14. Let $f : (X, \Delta) \to Y$ be a dlt crepant log structure. Choose $m > 0$ even such that $\omega^m_X(m\Delta) \cong f^*L$ for some line bundle $L$ on $Y$. Let $Z_1, Z_2$ be minimal lc centers of $(X, \Delta)$ such that $f(Z_1) = f(Z_2)$. Then there is a birational map $\phi : Z_2 \dasharrow Z_1$ such that the following diagram commutes

$$
\begin{array}{ccc}
\omega^m_X(m\Delta) & \cong f^*L & \cong \omega^m_X(m\Delta) \\
\mathcal{R}^m_{X \to Z_1} & \downarrow & \mathcal{R}^m_{X \to Z_2} \\
\omega^m_{Z_1}(m \cdot \text{Diff}^*_Z \Delta) & \xrightarrow{\phi^*} & \omega^m_{Z_2}(m \cdot \text{Diff}^*_Z \Delta)
\end{array}
$$

(14.1)

Proof. By Theorem [10] it is sufficient to prove this in case there is an lc center $W$ that is birational to a $\mathbb{P}^1$-bundle $\mathbb{P}^1 \times U$ with $Z_1, Z_2$ as sections. Thus projection to $U$ provides a birational isomorphism $\phi : Z_2 \dasharrow Z_1$. 

Since $R^m_{X \to Z}$ is defined only up to the action of $\text{Bir}_Y(Z, \Delta_Z)$. However, by Theorem 7 the image of this action is a finite group of $r$th roots of unity for some $r$. Thus the $\text{Bir}_Y(Z, \Delta_Z)$ action is trivial on $\omega_Z^{mr}(\Delta_Z)$ hence

$$R^{mr}_{X} : \omega_X^{mr}(\Delta_X)|_Z \cong \omega_Z^{mr}(\Delta_Z)$$

(15.1) is completely canonical. Assume next that $\omega_X^{mr}(\Delta_X) \sim f^* L$. Let us factor $f|_Z : Z \to f(Z)$ using $g : Z \to W$ and the normalization $n : W \to f(Z)$. Then we can push forward (15.1) to get an isomorphism

$$n^* L \cong (g_* \omega_Z^{[m]}(m \Delta_Z))^\text{inv}$$

(15.2)

where the exponent $\text{inv}$ denotes the invariants under the action of the group of birational self-maps $\text{Bir}_Y(Z, \Delta_Z)$. This shows the second isomorphism in (1.4).

**Notation 16.** Let $(Y, \Delta_Y)$ be lc and $(X, \Delta_X) \to (Y, \Delta_Y)$ a crepant, dlt model. Let $W \subset Y$ be an lc center of $(Y, \Delta_Y)$ and $Z \subset X$ minimal (with respect to inclusion) among the lc centers of $(X, \Delta_X)$ that dominate $W$. By Definition 14 we obtain a Poincaré residue map $R_{X \to Z}$.

Let $D \subset |\Delta_Y|$ be a divisor with normalization $\pi : D^n \to D$. Let $D_X \subset X$ be its birational transform on $X$ and set $\Delta_{D_X} := \text{Diff}_{D_X}^{\pi} \Delta_X$. Let $W_D \subset D^n$ be an lc center of $(D^n, \text{Diff}_{D^n}^{\pi} \Delta_Y)$. Then $W_X := \pi(W_D)$ is an lc center of $(Y, \Delta_Y)$. Choose minimal lc centers $Z_X \subset X$ (resp. $Z_D \subset D_X$) dominating $W_X$ (resp. $W_D$).

**Theorem 17.** Notation and assumptions as above. Then there is a birational map $\phi : Z_D \dashrightarrow Z_X$ such that for $m$ sufficiently divisible, the following diagram commutes

$$
\begin{array}{ccc}
\omega^{[m]}_X(m \Delta_X) & \xrightarrow{R^m_{X \to Z_X}} & \omega^{[m]}_{D_X}(m \Delta_{D_X}) \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
\omega^{[m]}_{Z_X}(m \text{Diff}_{Z_X}^{\phi} \Delta_X) & \xrightarrow{\phi^*} & \omega^{[m]}_{Z_D}(m \text{Diff}_{Z_D}^{\phi} \Delta_{D_X})
\end{array}
$$

Proof. If we choose $Z_X$ as the image of $Z_D$, this holds by the definition of the higher codimension residue maps. This and Proposition 14 proves the claim for every other choice of $Z_X$. □

### 4. Sources and Springs

**Definition 18.** Let $f : (X, \Delta) \to S$ be a crepant, dlt log structure and $Z \subset S$ an lc center. An lc center $Z'$ of $(X, \Delta)$ is called a source of $Z$ if $f(Z') = Z$ and $Z'$ is minimal (with respect to inclusion) among the lc centers that dominate $Z$. 

By restriction we have $f|_{Z'} : (Z', \text{Diff}_{Z'}^*, \Delta') \rightarrow Z$ and $K_{Z'} + \text{Diff}_{Z'}^*, \Delta \sim_{f, \mathbb{Q}} 0$. By adjunction, there is a one-to-one correspondence between lc centers of $(Z', \text{Diff}_{Z'}^*, \Delta)$ and lc centers of $(X, \Delta)$ that are contained in $Z'$. Thus $Z'$ is a source of $Z$ iff the general fiber of $(Z', \text{Diff}_{Z'}^*, \Delta) \rightarrow Z$ is klt.

By Theorem 10 all sources of $Z$ are birational to each other (as weak crepant log structures over $Z$). Any representative of their birational equivalence class will be denoted by $\text{Src}(Z, X, \Delta)$. One can choose a representative $(S^i, \Delta^i) \rightarrow Z$ whose generic fiber is terminal. Such models are not unique, but their generic fiber models are isomorphic outside codimension 2 sets. However, if there is an irreducible component of $\Delta^i$ whose coefficient is 1 (these cannot dominate $Z$) then it does not seem possible to choose a sensible subclass of models that are isomorphic to each other outside codimension 2 sets.

Note further that by Remark 5 if two crepant log structures $f_i : (X_i, \Delta_i) \rightarrow Y$ are crepant birational over $Y$, then $\text{Src}(Z, X_i, \Delta_i)$ is crepant birational to $\text{Src}(Z, X_2, \Delta_2)$.

One can uniquely factor $f|_{Z'}$ as

$$f|_{Z'} : (Z', \text{Diff}_{Z'}^*, \Delta') = \text{Src}(Z, X, \Delta) \xrightarrow{c_z} \tilde{Z}' \xrightarrow{p_Z} Z$$

where $\tilde{Z}'$ is normal, $p_Z$ is finite and $c_Z$ has connected fibers.

Thus in (18.1), $\tilde{Z}'$ is uniquely defined up to isomorphism over $Z$. Any representative of its isomorphism class will be denoted by $\text{Spr}(Z, X, \Delta)$ and called the spring of $Z$.

Define the group of source-automorphisms of $\text{Spr}(Z, X, \Delta)$ as

$$\text{Aut}^s \text{Spr}(Z, X, \Delta) := \text{im}[\text{Bir}^s \text{Spr}(Z, X, \Delta) \rightarrow \text{Aut}_k \text{Spr}(Z, X, \Delta)].$$

By Theorem 7 if $K_X + \Delta$ is ample then $\text{Aut}^s \text{Spr}(Z, X, \Delta)$ is finite for every lc center $Z \subset X$.

Let $(Y, \Delta)$ be lc and $f : (X, \Delta_X) \rightarrow (Y, \Delta)$ a dlt model. Let $Z \subset Y$ be an lc center of $(Y, \Delta)$. As noted above, the source $\text{Src}(Z, X, \Delta_X)$ of $Z$ depends only on $(Y, \Delta)$ but not on the choice of $(X, \Delta_X)$. Thus we also use $\text{Src}(Z, Y, \Delta)$ (resp. $\text{Spr}(Z, Y, \Delta)$) to denote the source (resp. spring) of $Z$.

Next we prove (15).

**Proposition 19.** Let $f : (X, \Delta) \rightarrow Y$ be a crepant log structure and $Z \subset Y$ an lc center. Then the field extension $k(\text{Spr}(Z, X, \Delta))/k(Z)$ is Galois and

$$\text{Gal}(\text{Spr}(Z, X, \Delta)/Z) \subset \text{Aut}^s \text{Spr}(Z, X, \Delta).$$

**Proof.** We may localize at the generic point of $Z$. Thus we may assume that $Z$ is a point and then prove the following more precise result.

**Lemma 20.** Let $g : (X, \Delta) \rightarrow Y$ be a weak crepant log structure over a field $k$. Assume that $(X, \Delta)$ is dlt and $X$ is $\mathbb{Q}$-factorial. Let $z \in Y$ be an lc center such that $g^{-1}(z)$ is connected (as a $k(z)$-scheme). Then there is a unique smallest finite field extension $K(z) \supset k(z)$ such that the following hold.

1. Every lc center of $(X_{\bar{z}}, \Delta_{\bar{z}})$ that intersects $g^{-1}(z)$ is defined over $K(z)$.
2. Let $W_{\bar{z}} \subset Y_{\bar{z}}$ be a minimal lc center contained in $g^{-1}(z)$. Then $K(z) = k_{ch}(W_{\bar{z}})$, the field of definition of $W_{\bar{z}}$.
3. $K(z) \supset k(z)$ is a Galois extension.
4. Let $W_{\bar{z}}$ be a minimal lc center contained in $g^{-1}(z)$. Then

$$\text{Bir}^s_{k(z)}(W_{\bar{z}}, \text{Diff}_{W_{\bar{z}}}^*, \Delta) \rightarrow \text{Gal}(K(z)/k(z))$$

is surjective.
Proof. There are only finitely many lc centers and a conjugate of an lc center is also an lc center. Thus the field of definition of any lc center is a finite extension of $k$. Since $K(z)$ is the composite of some of them, it is finite over $k(z)$.

Let $W_z \subset X_z$ be a minimal lc center contained in $g^{-1}(z)$ and $k_{ch}(W_z)$ its field of definition. Let $D_i \subset \Delta$ be the irreducible components that contain $W_z$. Each $D_i$ is smooth at the generic point of $W_z$, hence the $k$-irreducible component of $D_i$ that contains $W_z$ is also defined over $k_{ch}(W_z)$. Thus every lc center of $(X_z, \Delta_z)$ containing $W_z$ is also defined over $k_{ch}(W_z)$. Therefore, any lc center that is $\mathbb{P}^1$-linked to $W_z$ is defined over $k_{ch}(W_z)$. By Theorem 10 this implies that every lc center of $(X_z, \Delta_z)$ that intersects $g^{-1}(z)$ is defined over $k_{ch}(W_z)$, hence $k_{ch}(W_z) \supset K(z)$. By construction, $k_{ch}(W_z) \subset K(z)$, thus $k_{ch}(W_z) = K(z)$.

A conjugate of $W_z$ over $k(z)$ is defined over the corresponding conjugate field of $k_{ch}(W_z)$. By the above, every conjugate of the field of $k_{ch}(W_z)$ over $k(z)$ is itself, hence $k_{ch}(W_z) = K(z)$ is Galois over $k(z)$.

Finally, in order to see (4), fix $\sigma \in \text{Gal}(K(z)/k(z))$ and let $W_z^\sigma$ be the corresponding conjugate of $W_z$. By Theorem 10 $W_z^\sigma$ is $\mathbb{P}^1$-linked over $K(z)$; fix one such $\mathbb{P}^1$-link. The union of the conjugates of this $\mathbb{P}^1$-link over $k(z)$ define an element of $\text{Bir}^i_k(W_z, \text{Diff}^\Delta_{D_z}(\Delta))$ which induces $\sigma$ on $K(z)/k(z)$. (The $\mathbb{P}^1$-link is not unique, hence the lift is not unique. Thus in (4) we only claim surjectivity, not a splitting.)

We also note the following direct consequence of Corollary 11.

**Corollary 21** (Adjunction for sources). Let $(X, D + \Delta)$ be lc and $n : D^n \to D$ the normalization. Let $Z_D \subset D^n$ be an lc center of $(D^n, \text{Diff}_{D^n} \Delta)$ and $Z_X := n(Z_D)$ its image in $X$. Then

\begin{enumerate}[(1)]
\item $\text{Src}(Z_D, D^n, \text{Diff}_{D^n} \Delta) \simeq \text{Src}(Z_X, X, D + \Delta)$ and
\item $\text{Spr}(Z_D, D^n, \text{Diff}_{D^n} \Delta) \simeq \text{Spr}(Z_X, X, D + \Delta)$.
\end{enumerate}

\[\Box\]

5. Applications to slc pairs

22 (Normalization of slc pairs). Let $(X, \Delta)$ be a semi log canonical pair. Let $\pi : \bar{X} \to X$ denote the normalization of $X$, $\bar{\Delta}$ the divisorial part of $\pi^{-1}(\Delta)$ and $\bar{D} \subset \bar{X}$ the conductor of $\pi$. Since $X$ is seminormal, $\bar{D}$ is reduced. $X$ has an ordinary node at a codimension 1 singular point, thus interchanging the two preimages of the node gives an involution $\tau$ of the normalization $n : D^n \to \bar{D}$. This gives an injection

\[\left\{ \text{slc pairs } (X, \Delta) \right\} \rightarrow \left\{ \text{lc pairs } (\bar{X}, \bar{D} + \bar{\Delta}) \text{ plus an involution } \tau \text{ of } \bar{D}^n \right\}.
\]

\[\text{(22.1)}\]

For many purposes, it is important to understand the image of this map. That is, we would like to know which quadruples $(\bar{X}, \bar{D} + \bar{\Delta}, \tau)$ correspond to an slc pair $(X, \Delta)$. An easy condition to derive is that $\tau$ is an involution not just of the variety $\bar{D}^n$ but of the lc pair $(\bar{D}^n, \text{Diff}_{\bar{D}^n} \Delta)$. Thus we obtain a refined version of the map

\[\left\{ \text{slc pairs } (X, \Delta) \right\} \rightarrow \left\{ \text{lc pairs } (\bar{X}, \bar{D} + \bar{\Delta}) \text{ plus an involution } \tau \text{ of } (\bar{D}^n, \text{Diff}_{\bar{D}^n} \Delta) \right\}.
\]

\[\text{(22.2)}\]

For surfaces, the above constructions are discussed in [Kol92, Sec.12]. The higher dimensional generalizations are straightforward; see [Kol13, Chap.5].
There are three major issues involved in trying to prove that the map \((22.2)\) is surjective.

22.3.1. Does \(\tau\) generate a finite equivalence relation?

The normalization \(n: \bar{D}^n \to \bar{X}\) and \(\tau\) generate an equivalence relation \(R(\tau)\), called the gluing relation, on the points of \(\bar{X}\) by declaring \(n(p) \sim n(\tau(p))\) for every \(p \in \bar{D}^n\). It is easy to see (cf. [Kol12]) that \(R(\tau)\) is a set-theoretic, profinite, algebraic equivalence relation. That is, one can give \(R(\tau)\) by countably many subschemes

\[
\{ \{ R_i \subset \bar{X} \times \bar{X} : i \in I \} \}
\]

such that \(\bigcup_i R_i(K) \subset \bar{X}(K) \times \bar{X}(K)\) is an equivalence relation on \(\bar{X}(K)\) for every algebraically closed field \(K\) and the coordinate projections induce finite morphisms

\[
\pi_1: R_i \to \bar{X} \quad \text{and} \quad \pi_2: R_i \to \bar{X}.
\]

(One can make the \(R_i\) unique if we choose them irreducible, reduced and assume that none of them contains another.)

It is clear that if \(X\) exists then every equivalence class of \(R(\tau)\) is contained in a fiber of \(\pi: \bar{X} \to X\). In particular, if \(X\) exists then the \(R(\tau)\)-equivalence classes are finite. Equivalently, \(I\) is a finite set.

In general the \(R(\tau)\)-equivalence classes need not be finite. Moreover, non-finiteness can appear in high codimension. This is the question that we will study here using the sources of lc centers, especially their Galois property \((1.5)\).

A closely related example is given by [BT09]: there is a smooth curve \(D\) of genus \(\geq 2\) and a finite relation \(R_0 \subset D \times D\) such that both projections \(R_0 \rightrightarrows D\) are étale yet \(R_0\) generates a non-finite equivalence relation.

22.3.2. Constructing \((X, \Delta)\) from \((\bar{X}, \bar{D} + \bar{\Delta}, \tau)\).

Following the method of [Kol12], it is proved in [Kol13, Chap.5], that if the \(R(\tau)\)-equivalence classes are finite, then \((X, \Delta)\) exists.

22.3.3. Is \(K_X + \Delta\) a \(\mathbb{Q}\)-Cartier divisor?

The answer turns out to be yes, see [Kol13, Chap.5], but my proof, using Poincaré residue maps and Theorem 7, is somewhat indirect.

As a consequence we obtain that \((22.2)\) is one-to-one for pairs with ample log canonical class.

**Theorem 23.** Taking the normalization gives a one-to-one correspondence between the following two sets, where \(X, \bar{X}\) are projective schemes over a field.

\[
\left\{ \begin{array}{c}
\text{slc pairs (}X, \Delta\text{) such that } \\
K_X + \Delta \text{ is ample}
\end{array} \right\} \cong \left\{ \begin{array}{c}
\text{lc pairs (}\bar{X}, \bar{D} + \bar{\Delta}\text{) such that } \\
K_{\bar{X}} + \bar{D} + \bar{\Delta}\text{ is ample plus an} \\
\text{involution } \tau \text{ of } (\bar{D}^n, \text{Diff}_{\bar{D}^n} \bar{\Delta})
\end{array} \right\}.
\]

This can be extended to the relative case as follows.

**Theorem 24.** Let \(S\) be a scheme which is essentially of finite type over a field. Taking the normalization gives a one-to-one correspondence between the following two sets.

1. Slc pairs \((X, \Delta)\) such that \(X/S\) is proper and \(K_X + \Delta\) is ample on the generic fiber of \(W \to S\) for every lc center \(W \subset X\).
Roughly speaking, we prove that for every lc center \( \bar{\text{Aut}}(W) \) defined finite cover \( p: W \to S \) for every lc center \( W \subset \bar{X} \), plus an involution \( \tau \) of \( (\bar{D}^n, \text{Diff}_{\bar{D}^n} \Delta) \).

Furthermore, the cases when \( K_X + \Delta \) is ample on \( X/S \) correspond to the cases when \( K_X + \bar{D} + \bar{\Delta} \) is ample on \( \bar{X}/S \).

As we noted in (22.3), the following result implies Theorem (23).

**Proposition 25.** Let \( (\bar{X}, \bar{D} + \bar{\Delta}) \) be an lc pair and \( \tau \) an involution of \( (\bar{D}^n, \text{Diff}_{\bar{D}^n} \Delta) \).

Assume that \( X \) is proper over a base scheme \( S \) that is essentially of finite type over a field. Assume furthermore that \( K_X + \bar{D} + \bar{\Delta} \) is ample on the generic fiber of \( W \to S \) for every lc center \( W \subset \bar{X} \).

Then the gluing relation \( R(\tau) \), defined in (23.1), is finite.

This in turn will be derived from Theorem (28) on the gluing relation \( R(\tau) \) which applies whether \( K_X + \bar{D} + \bar{\Delta} \) is ample or not.

**Definition 26.** Let \( Y \) be a normal scheme and \( R = \cup_{i \in I} R_i \subset Y \times Y \) a set-theoretic, pro-finite, algebraic equivalence relation where the \( R_i \) are irreducible.

\( R \) is called a groupoid if every \( R_i \) is the graph of an isomorphism between two irreducible components of \( Y \).

Let \( Y^j \subset Y \) be an irreducible component. The restriction of \( R \) to \( Y^j \) is \( R^j := R \cap (Y^j \times Y^j) \). If \( R \) is a groupoid then one can identify \( R^j \) with a subgroup of \( \text{Aut}(Y^j) \) called the stabilizer of \( Y^j \) in \( R \).

We are now ready to formulate and prove a structure theorem for gluing relations. Roughly speaking, we prove that for every lc center \( W \subset \bar{X} \) there is a “canonically” defined finite cover \( p: W \to \bar{W} \) such that \( (p \times p)^{-1}(R(\tau)) \) is a groupoid and the stabilizer action \( W \to \bar{W} \) is compatible with \( p^* (K_X + \bar{D} + \bar{\Delta}) \). The compatibility condition is somewhat delicate to state. Thus I give the actual construction of \( W \) and then specify the compatibility condition for that particular case.

**Notation 27.** Let \( (X, \Delta) \) be lc. Let \( S^*_i(X, \Delta) \) be the union of all \( \leq i \)-dimensional lc centers of \( (X, \Delta) \) and set \( S_i(X, \Delta) := S^*_i(X, \Delta) \setminus S_{i-1}(X, \Delta) \). Let \( Z^0_{ij} \subset S_i(X, \Delta) \) be the irreducible components. The closure \( Z_{ij} \) of \( Z^0_{ij} \) is an lc center of \( (X, \Delta) \), hence it has a spring \( p_{ij} : \text{Spr}(Z_{ij}, X, \Delta) \to Z_{ij} \). Set \( \text{Spr}(Z^0_{ij}, X, \Delta) := p_{ij}^{-1}(Z^0_{ij}) \) and \( \text{Spr}_i(X, \Delta) := I \cup \text{Spr}(Z^0_{ij}, X, \Delta) \).

Let \( p_i : \text{Spr}_i(X, \Delta) \to S_i(X, \Delta) \) be the induced morphism. Then \( p_i \) is finite, surjective and universally open since \( S_i(X, \Delta) \) is normal. Furthermore, \( p_i \) is Galois over every \( Z_{ij} \) by Proposition (19).

**Theorem 28.** Let \( (X, D + \Delta) \) be lc, \( \tau \) an involution of \( (D^n, \text{Diff}_{D^n} \Delta) \) and \( R(\tau) \subset X \times X \) the corresponding equivalence relation as in (22.3.1). Let \( p_i : \text{Spr}_i(X, D + \Delta) \to S_i \) be as above. Then

1. \( (p_i \times p_i)^{-1}(R(\tau) \cap (S_i(X, \Delta) \times S_i(X, \Delta))) \) is a groupoid on \( \text{Spr}_i(X, D + \Delta) \).
2. For every irreducible component \( Z^0_{ij} \subset S_i(X, \Delta) \), the stabilizer of its spring \( \text{Spr}(Z^0_{ij}, X, D + \Delta) \subset \text{Spr}_i(X, D + \Delta) \) is a subgroup of the source-automorphism group \( \text{Aut}(\text{Spr}(Z^0_{ij}, X, D + \Delta)) \).
Proof. We need to describe how the generators of $R(\tau)$ pull back to the spring $\text{Spr}_i(X, D + \Delta)$.

First, the preimage of the diagonal of $Z^0_{ij} \times Z^0_{ij}$ is a group $\Gamma(G_{ij})$ and $G_{ij} = \text{Gal}(\text{Spr}(Z_{ij}, X, D + \Delta)/Z_{ij})$ is a subgroup of $\text{Aut}^+ \text{Spr}(Z_{ij}, X, D + \Delta)$ by Proposition 29.

Second, let $Z_{ijk} \subset D^n$ be an irreducible component of the preimage of $Z_{ij}$. Then $Z_{ijk}$ is an lc center of $(D^n, \text{Diff}_{D^n} \Delta)$ and

$$\text{Src}(Z_{ijk}, D^n, \text{Diff}_{D^n} \Delta) \sim \text{Src}(Z_{ij}, X, D + \Delta)$$

by Corollary 21. Thus, for each $ijk$, the isomorphism $\tau : D^n \cong D^n$ lifts to isomorphisms

$$\tau_{ijkl} : \text{Spr}(Z^0_{ij}, X, D + \Delta) \cong \text{Spr}(Z^0_{il}, X, D + \Delta).$$

Given $ijk$, the value of $l$ is determined by $Z_{il} := n(\tau(Z_{ijk}))$, but the lifting is defined only up to left and right multiplication by elements of $G_{ij}$ and $G_{il}$.

Thus $(p_i \times p_i)^{-1}(R(\tau) \cap (S_i(X, \Delta) \times S_i(X, \Delta)))$ is the groupoid generated by the $G_{ij}$ and the $\tau_{ijkl}$, hence the stabilizer of $\text{Spr}(Z^0_{ij}, X, D + \Delta)$ is generated by the groups $\tau_{ijkl}^{-1} G_{il} \tau_{ijkl}$. The latter are all subgroups of $\text{Aut}^+ \text{Spr}(Z_{ij}, X, D + \Delta)$. \qed

29 (Proof of Proposition 29). Since $\text{Spr}_i(X, D + \Delta)$ has finitely many irreducible components, the groupoid is finite iff the stabilizer of each $\text{Spr}(Z^0_{ij}, X, D + \Delta)$ is finite. By Theorem 28 this holds if the groups $\text{Aut}^+ \text{Spr}(Z_{ij}, X, D + \Delta)$ are finite.

The automorphism group of a variety $\tilde{Z}$ over a base scheme $S$ injects into the automorphism group of the generic fiber $\tilde{Z}_{\text{gen}}$. By assumption, $K_{\tilde{Z}} + \tilde{D} + \tilde{\Delta}$ is ample on the generic fiber of $Z_{ij} \to S$, thus Theorem 7 implies that each $\text{Aut}^+ \text{Spr}(Z_{ij}, X, D + \Delta)$ is finite. \qed
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