GLOBAL HIGHER ORDER ESTIMATES FOR COLLAPSING CALABI-YAU METRICS ON ELLIPTIC K3 SURFACES
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ABSTRACT. We improve Gross-Wilson’s local estimates in [1] to global ones. As an application, we study the blow-up limits of the degenerating Calabi-Yau metrics on singular fibers.
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1. Introduction

Let \( f : X \to B = \mathbb{C}P^1 \) be an elliptic K3 surface with 24 singular fibers of Kodaira type \( I_1 \). Let \( p_1, \ldots, p_{24} \in B \) be the images of the singular fibers. We denote by \( X_b = f^{-1}(b) \) the fiber over \( b \in B \). Let \( [\omega_\epsilon] \) be a Kähler class on \( X \) with \( [\omega_\epsilon] \cdot X_b = \epsilon \). By Yau’s proof of Calabi’s conjecture, there is always a unique Ricci-flat Kähler metric on \( X \) in the class \([\omega_\epsilon]\). Motivated by the Strominger-Yau-Zaslow conjecture of mirror symmetry, Gross-Wilson [1] studied the asymptotic behavior of these degenerating Ricci-flat Kähler metrics. In particular, they found very accurate approximation metrics \( \tilde{\omega}_\epsilon \) to the unique Ricci-flat metrics \( \tilde{\omega}_\epsilon \in [\omega_\epsilon] \). To be precise, fix a non-vanishing holomorphic 2-form \( \Omega \) on \( X \), let \( \tilde{\omega}_\epsilon := \omega_\epsilon + \sqrt{-1} \partial \bar{\partial} u_\epsilon \) be the Ricci-flat metric, then \( u_\epsilon \) satisfies

\[
\begin{align*}
\left( \omega_\epsilon + \sqrt{-1} \partial \bar{\partial} u_\epsilon \right)^2 &= e^{F_\epsilon} \omega_\epsilon^2, \\
\int_X u_\epsilon \omega_\epsilon^2 &= 0,
\end{align*}
\]

(1.1)

where \( F_\epsilon = \log \left( \frac{\Omega \wedge \Omega}{2\omega_\epsilon} \right) \). They proved that \( \tilde{\omega}_\epsilon \) is uniformly equivalent to \( \omega_\epsilon \) globally, and locally the \( C^k \)-norm of \( u_\epsilon \) decays to 0 exponentially fast as \( \epsilon \to 0 \) in any compact set outside the singular fibers.
Higher order estimates on K3 surface

The main result of this paper is the following global exponential convergence estimates, which strengthen Gross-Wilson’s estimates:

**Theorem 1.1.** Assume as above, then there exists some $\epsilon_0 > 0$ such that for all $0 < \epsilon \leq \epsilon_0$, there are constants $C_k, \delta_k > 0$ for each $k$ which are independent of $\epsilon$, such that

$$\|\tilde{\omega}_\epsilon - \omega_\epsilon\|_{C^k(X, \omega_\epsilon)} \leq C_k e^{-\frac{\delta_k}{\epsilon}},$$

(1.2)

and

$$\|\text{Rm}(\tilde{\omega}_\epsilon) - \text{Rm}(\omega_\epsilon)\|_{C^k(X, \omega_\epsilon)} \leq C_k e^{-\frac{\delta_k}{\epsilon}}.$$  

(1.3)

Combining (1.3) with Proposition 3.8 of [1] (see also (2.3) of Theorem 2.1 of this paper), we immediately obtain a global curvature estimate for the degenerating Ricci-flat metric:

**Corollary 1.2.** Assume as in Theorem 1.1, then we have

$$C_0 \epsilon^{-1} \left(\log(\epsilon^{-1})\right)^{-2} \leq \|\text{Rm}(\tilde{\omega}_\epsilon)\|_{C^0(X, \tilde{\omega}_\epsilon)} \leq C_0 \epsilon^{-1} \log(\epsilon^{-1}),$$

(1.4)

where $C_0$ is a positive constant independent of $\epsilon$.

The proof of Theorem 1.1 is an application of our “Boundedness Implies Convergence” (“BIC” for short) principle developed in [4]. Our method also works in other situations. For example, in [2] Hein-Sun-Viaclovsky-Zhang studied other types of degenerations of Calabi-Yau metrics on K3 surfaces. From their construction of approximation metrics, one can see that our proof also works in their situation, therefore also gives similar global higher order estimates.

As an application of Theorem 1.1 and also motivated by the work [2], we study the blow-up limit of $\tilde{\omega}_\epsilon$ at singular fibers. We have the following result: (The precise definition of the coordinates $u, y_1, y_2$ is given in section 4.)

**Theorem 1.3.** Assume as above, and let $p_0 \in X_{\tilde{p}_i}$ be a point on the singular fibre. We have:

1. (Region (1): Bubbling regions) If there exists a sequence $\epsilon_k \to 0$ and a uniform $R_0 > 0$ such that

$$d_{\epsilon_k^{-1} g_{\epsilon_k}}(p_0, \bar{p}_i) \leq R_0 \cdot \left(\frac{1}{2\pi} \log \left(\epsilon_k^{-1}\right)\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}},$$

set $\tilde{g}_k^\# = \frac{1}{2\pi} \log \left(\epsilon_k^{-1}\right) \cdot \epsilon_k^{-1} \tilde{g}_{\epsilon_k}$, then we have

$$(X, \tilde{g}_k^\#, p_0) \xrightarrow{C^\infty-\text{Cheeger-Gromov}} (\mathbb{R}^4, \tilde{g}_\infty, p_\infty),$$

where $\tilde{g}_\infty$ is the standard Ricci-flat Taub-NUT metric on $\mathbb{R}^4$ with origin $0_{\mathbb{R}^4}$, and $p_\infty$ is some point on $\mathbb{R}^4$.
(2) (Region (2): Neck region) If there exists a sequence $\epsilon_k \to 0$ such that
\[
d_{\epsilon^{-1} g_0}(p_0, \bar{p}_i) \cdot \left(\frac{1}{2\pi} \log \left(\epsilon_k^{-1}\right)\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \to \infty, \quad d_{\epsilon^{-1} g_0}(p_0, \bar{p}_i) \cdot \left(\frac{1}{2\pi} \log \left(\epsilon_k^{-1}\right)\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \to 0,
\]
then there exists some $r_k \to 0$ such that if we set
\[
\tilde{g}_k = d_{\epsilon^{-1} g_0}(p_0, \bar{p}_i)^{-2} \cdot \epsilon_k^{-1} g_0, \quad W_k = \{(u, y_1, y_2) | u^2 + y_1^2 + y_2^2 \leq \epsilon_k^2 r_k^2\},
\]
then we have
\[
\left(X \setminus \bar{\pi}^{-1}(W_k), \tilde{g}_k, p_0\right) \xrightarrow{GH} \left(\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \{0_{\mathbb{R}^3}\}, g_{\mathbb{R}^3}, p_\infty\right),
\]
where $g_{\mathbb{R}^3}$ is the standard Euclidean metric on $\mathbb{R}^3$, and $p_\infty$ is some point on $\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \{0_{\mathbb{R}^3}\}$.

(3) (Region (3): Outer region) If there exists a sequence $\epsilon_k \to 0$ and uniform constants $r_0, C_0 > 0$ such that
\[
r_0 \cdot \left(\frac{1}{2\pi} \log \left(\epsilon_k^{-1}\right)\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq d_{\epsilon^{-1} g_0}(p_0, \bar{p}_i) \leq C_0 \cdot \left(\frac{1}{2\pi} \log \left(\epsilon_k^{-1}\right)\right)^{\frac{1}{2}},
\]
then there exists some $r_k \to 0$ such that if we set
\[
\tilde{g}_k = d_{\epsilon^{-1} g_0}(p_0, \bar{p}_i)^{-2} \cdot \epsilon_k^{-1} g_0, \quad W_k = \{(u, y_1, y_2) | u^2 + y_1^2 + y_2^2 \leq \epsilon_k^2 r_k^2\},
\]
then after passing to a subsequence, we have
\[
\left(X \setminus \bar{\pi}^{-1}(W_k), \tilde{g}_k, p_0\right) \xrightarrow{GH} \left(S^1 \times \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{0\}, g_0, p_\infty\right),
\]
where $g_0$ is a flat product metric on $S^1 \times \mathbb{R}^2$, and $p_\infty$ is some point on $S^1 \times \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{0\}$.

**Remark 1.4.** We should note that, by the diameter estimates of Gross-Wilson in [1, Proposition 3.5], the diameter of the singular fiber $X_{\bar{p}_i}$ under $e^{-1} g_0$ is exactly of the order $\left(\frac{1}{2\pi} \log \left(\epsilon_k^{-1}\right)\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$, hence the three regions in Theorem 1.3 exhaust all the possibilities.

The paper is organized as follows: In section 2, we summarize the estimates of Gross-Wilson [1] that we shall use, and improve their local $C^2$- estimates of the Kähler potential to a global exponential decay estimate. This is a crucial step for the application of our “BIC”-principle in [4]. Then in section 3, we derive global higher order bounds for the metrics and the curvature tensors. Though the constants bounding these tensors blow up as polynomials of $1/\epsilon$, the exponential decay of section 2 makes the BIC principle applicable. This finishes the proof of Theorem 1.1. Finally in section 4, we prove Theorem 1.3.

**Acknowledgements.** The authors would like to thank Zhenlei Zhang, Jian Song and Ruobing Zhang for their interest in this work and for helpful discussions.
2. Summary of [1] and improved global $C^2$ estimate

First we recall some known results in [1]. As before, we let $f : X \to B = \mathbb{CP}^1$ be an elliptic $K3$ surface with 24 singular fibers of Kodaira type $I_1$. Let $p_1, \ldots, p_{24} \in B$ be the images of the singular fibers. Then [1, Theorems 4.4] implies the existence of a family of almost Ricci-flat metrics $\omega_\epsilon$ with good estimates:

**Theorem 2.1** (Theorems 4.4, Lemmas 5.2, 5.3 of [1]). Assume as above. Then there exists some $\epsilon_0 > 0$ such that for all $0 < \epsilon \leq \epsilon_0$, there are constants $D, C_k, \delta_k > 0$ for each $k$ which are independent of $\epsilon$, such that the following hold.

For all $0 < \epsilon \leq \epsilon_0$, for any class $[\omega_\epsilon]$ on $X$ with $[\omega_\epsilon] \cdot X_b = \epsilon$, there exists a Kähler metric $\omega_\epsilon$ representing $[\omega_\epsilon]$ on $X$ such that the following properties hold.

1. Set $F_\epsilon = \log \left( \frac{\Omega \wedge \Omega}{2\omega_\epsilon^2} \right)$, then we have
   \[
   \|F_\epsilon\|_{C^k(X, \omega_\epsilon)} \leq C_ke^{-\frac{\delta_k}{\epsilon}},
   \]
   which further implies
   \[
   \|\text{Ric}(\omega_\epsilon)\|_{C^k(X, \omega_\epsilon)} \leq C_ke^{-\frac{\delta_k}{\epsilon}}.
   \]

2. We use the $\text{Rm}$ to denote the Riemannian curvature tensor, then we have
   \[
   D^{-1}\epsilon^{-1} \left( \log(\epsilon^{-1}) \right)^{-2} \leq \|\text{Rm}(\omega_\epsilon)\|_{C^0(X, \omega_\epsilon)} \leq De^{-1}\log(\epsilon^{-1}),
   \]
   \[
   (2.3)
   \]

3. If $\tilde{\omega}_\epsilon = \omega_\epsilon + \sqrt{-1}\partial \bar{\partial} u_\epsilon$ is the unique Ricci-flat metric in the class $[\omega_\epsilon]$ with $u_\epsilon$ satisfying (1.1), then we have
   \[
   \|u_\epsilon\|_{C^0(X)} \leq Ce^{-\frac{\delta}{\epsilon}},
   \]
   and
   \[
   C^{-1}\omega_\epsilon \leq \tilde{\omega}_\epsilon \leq C\omega_\epsilon, \text{ on } X,
   \]
   for some constants $C, \delta > 0$ which are independent of $\epsilon$.

**Remark 2.2.** We shall remark that, although in the statements of Theorems 4.4 of [1], Gross-Wilson only state the exponential decay on the $C^0(X)$ norm of $F_\epsilon$ and $\Delta F_\epsilon$, where the $\Delta$ is with respect to $\omega_\epsilon$, the same decay estimates for all order derivatives of $F_\epsilon$ with respect to $\omega_\epsilon$ are easily seen to be true by the proofs of Theorem 4.4.

Now we can prove the following global $C^2$-estimate of $u_\epsilon$, which strengthens (2.5) and is a crucial point for the application of the BIC principle:

**Lemma 2.3.** Assume as above. Then we have
   \[
   \|\tilde{\omega}_\epsilon - \omega_\epsilon\|_{C^0(X, \omega_\epsilon)} \leq C_0e^{-\frac{\delta_0}{\epsilon}},
   \]
   \[
   (2.6)
   \]
Indeed, we rewrite Equation (2.9) as

\[ c_\epsilon \to \infty, \quad c_\epsilon + \inf_{x \in X} \inf_{i \neq j} R_{ij}(x) > 1, \quad 1 < c_\epsilon \leq C_0 \epsilon^{-2}, \]  

(2.7)

for all small \( \epsilon \). Also let

\[ k(x) = \frac{-\inf_{i \neq j} R_{ij}(x)}{R_\epsilon}, \]

so that \( k(x) \leq 1 \). Let \( \Delta' \) be the Laplacian with respect to \( \tilde{\omega}_\epsilon \) and \( \Delta \) be the Laplacian with respect to \( \omega_\epsilon \). Then we suppose that \( e^{-c_\epsilon u_\epsilon} (2 + \Delta u_\epsilon) \) assumes its maximum at the point \( x_0 \in X \), then the proof of [1, Lemma 5.3] yields that at \( x_0 \) the estimate

\[ 0 \geq e^{c_\epsilon u_\epsilon} \Delta' (e^{-c_\epsilon u_\epsilon} (2 + \Delta u_\epsilon)) \]

\[ \geq e^{-F_\epsilon} (2 - k(x_0)) R_\epsilon \cdot \left[ \left( 2 + \Delta u_\epsilon - \frac{2e^{F_\epsilon}}{2 - k(x_0)} \right)^2 - \left( \frac{2e^{F_\epsilon}}{2 - k(x_0)} \right)^2 + \frac{e^{F_\epsilon}}{(2 - k(x_0)) R_\epsilon} \right], \]

(2.8)

and since \( |k(x)| \leq 1 \), we obtain that

\[ \left| (2 + \Delta u_\epsilon) - \frac{2e^{F_\epsilon}}{2 - k(x_0)} \right| \leq \left| \frac{2e^{F_\epsilon}}{2 - k(x_0)} \right|^2 - \frac{4e^{F_\epsilon} k(x_0)}{(2 - k(x_0)) R_\epsilon}. \]

(2.9)

Now, as in the proof of [1, Lemma 5.3], if we are outside the region where the gluing is taking place, then \( F_\epsilon = 0 \), so we get

\[ 2 + \Delta u_\epsilon \leq \frac{2}{2 - k(x_0)} + \left( \frac{2}{2 - k(x_0)} \right)^2 - \frac{4k(x_0)}{(2 - k(x_0)) R_\epsilon} \]

\[ = 2. \]

(2.10)

The point is that, using the bound (2.11), we have almost such estimate if we are on the gluing region. Indeed, we rewrite Equation (2.9) as

\[ \left| (2 + \Delta u_\epsilon) - \frac{2e^{F_\epsilon}}{2 - k(x_0)} \right| \leq \left| \frac{2e^{F_\epsilon}}{2 - k(x_0)} \right|^2 - \frac{4e^{F_\epsilon} k(x_0)}{(2 - k(x_0)) R_\epsilon}. \]

(2.11)

But we have

\[ \left( \frac{2e^{F_\epsilon}}{2 - k(x_0)} \right)^2 - \frac{4e^{F_\epsilon} k(x_0)}{(2 - k(x_0))^2} = \frac{4e^{F_\epsilon}}{2 - k(x_0)} - \frac{4e^{F_\epsilon} (1 - k(x_0))^2 + 4e^{F_\epsilon} (e^{F_\epsilon} - 1)}{(2 - k(x_0))^2}. \]
Hence from Equation (2.11) we obtain

\[
(2 + \Delta u_\epsilon) - \frac{2e^{F_\epsilon}}{2 - k(x_0)} \leq \left| \frac{4e^{F_\epsilon} (1 - k(x_0))^2}{(2 - k(x_0))^2} + \frac{4e^{F_\epsilon} (e^{F_\epsilon} - 1)}{(2 - k(x_0))^2} - \frac{e^{F_\epsilon} \Delta F_\epsilon}{(2 - k(x_0)) R_\epsilon} \right|^{\frac{1}{2}} 
\]

\[
\leq \left\{ \frac{4e^{F_\epsilon} (1 - k(x_0))^2}{(2 - k(x_0))^2} + \frac{4e^{F_\epsilon} (e^{F_\epsilon} - 1)}{(2 - k(x_0))^2} + \frac{e^{F_\epsilon} \Delta F_\epsilon}{(2 - k(x_0)) R_\epsilon} \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}}.
\]

(2.12)

But since \(|k(x)| \leq 1, R_\epsilon \to \infty and \|F_\epsilon\|_{C^2(X,\omega_0)} \leq C_2 e^{-\frac{\omega_0}{2}}\) we have

\[
\left| \frac{4e^{F_\epsilon} (e^{F_\epsilon} - 1)}{(2 - k(x_0))^2} + \frac{e^{F_\epsilon} \Delta F_\epsilon}{(2 - k(x_0)) R_\epsilon} \right| \leq C e^{-\frac{x}{2}},
\]

hence using the simple fact that \((a + b)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq a^{\frac{1}{2}} + b^{\frac{1}{2}}\) for \(a, b \geq 0\), we obtain from Equation (2.12) that

\[
2 + \Delta u_\epsilon \leq \frac{2e^{F_\epsilon}}{2 - k(x)} + \frac{2e^{F_\epsilon} (1 - k(x))}{2 - k(x)} + Ce^{-\frac{x}{2}}
\]

\[
= 2e^{F_\epsilon} + \left[ \frac{2e^{F_\epsilon}}{2 - k(x)} - e^{F_\epsilon} \right] + \frac{2e^{\frac{k}{2}F_\epsilon} (1 - k(x))}{2 - k(x)} + Ce^{-\frac{x}{2}}
\]

\[
= 2e^{F_\epsilon} + \frac{2e^{\frac{k}{2}F_\epsilon} (k(x) - 1)}{2 - k(x)} + \frac{2e^{\frac{k}{2}F_\epsilon} (1 - k(x))}{2 - k(x)} + Ce^{-\frac{x}{2}}
\]

(2.13)

\[
= 2e^{F_\epsilon} + \frac{2e^{\frac{k}{2}F_\epsilon} (1 - k(x)) (1 - e^{\frac{k}{2}F_\epsilon})}{2 - k(x)} + Ce^{-\frac{x}{2}}.
\]

Use again the bound \(|k(x)| \leq 1\) and \(\|F_\epsilon\|_{C^2(X)} \leq C_0 e^{-\frac{x}{4}}\) we get from (2.13) that

\[
2 + \Delta u_\epsilon \leq 2 + Ce^{-\frac{x}{4}}.
\]

Hence we conclude that no matter whether the maximum point \(x_0\) is outside the gluing region or inside the gluing region, we have at \(x_0\) the estimate

\[
2 + \Delta u_\epsilon \leq 2 + Ce^{-\frac{x}{4}}.
\]

(2.14)

for some constants \(C, \delta > 0\) independent of \(\epsilon\). Now we have for any \(x \in X\)

\[
e^{-c_{x, u_\epsilon}(x)} (2 + \Delta u_\epsilon(x)) \leq e^{-c_{x, u_\epsilon}(x_0)} (2 + \Delta u_\epsilon(x_0)).
\]

Using the estimates (2.14) and (2.7), we have \(e^{c_{x, u_\epsilon}} \leq 1 + Ce^{-\frac{x}{4}}\). So we have

\[
2 + \Delta u_\epsilon(x) \leq e^{c_{x, u_\epsilon}(x)} e^{-c_{x, u_\epsilon}(x_0)} (2 + \Delta u_\epsilon(x_0)) \leq 2 + Ce^{-\frac{x}{4}}
\]

(2.15)

for any point \(x \in X\).
Now around $x$, we choose normal coordinates $z_1, z_2$ with respect to $\omega_\epsilon$ such that $\tilde{\omega}_\epsilon = \omega_\epsilon + \sqrt{-1} \bar{\partial} \partial u_\epsilon$ is diagonalized, that is
\[
(\tilde{g}_\epsilon)_{ij} = \delta_{ij} (1 + (u_\epsilon)_{ij}).
\]
Denote this positive definite $2 \times 2$ Hermitian matrix by $A$, then we have from (2.15)
\[
\text{tr} A \leq 2 + Ce^{-\hat{x}}.
\]
Also, we have
\[
det A = \frac{(\tilde{\omega}_\epsilon)^2}{(\omega_\epsilon)^2} = e^{F_\epsilon} = 1 + O(e^{-\hat{x}}).
\]
Now we need the following elementary lemma [7, Lemma 2.6]:

**Lemma 2.4.** Let $A$ be an $n \times n$ positive definite Hermitian matrix such that
\[
\text{tr} A \leq n + \epsilon, \quad \det A \geq 1 - \epsilon,
\]
for some $0 < \epsilon < 1$. Then there is a constant $C$ which depends only on $n$ such that
\[
\|A - \text{Id}\|^2 \leq C \epsilon,
\]
where $\| \cdot \|$ is the Hilbert-Schmidt norm, and $\text{Id}$ is the $n \times n$ identity matrix.

By Lemma 2.4 we obtain
\[
\|A - \text{Id}\|^2 \leq Ce^{-\hat{x}},
\]
which implies that
\[
\|\tilde{\omega}_\epsilon - \omega_\epsilon\|_{C^0(X, \omega_\epsilon)} \leq C_0 e^{-\hat{x}_0}.
\]
This completes the proof. \hfill \Box

3. **Global Higher-Order Convergence Estimates**

In this section, for a Kähler metric $\omega$ with its associated Riemannian metric $g$, we use $\nabla^{k,g}$ to denote all possible directions of covariant derivatives (including holomorphic and anti-holomorphic), unless otherwise stated.

3.1. **Global Polynomial Growth of Higher-Order Derivatives.**

We first recall a lemma [4, Lemma 3.4], which follows by simple and direct computations.

**Lemma 3.1.** Let $X$ be a Kähler manifold. Let $\tilde{\omega}, \omega$ be any two Kähler metrics on $X$ and $\alpha$ be any tensor field on $X$. Then we have for any $k \geq 1$
\[
\nabla^{k,g} \alpha = \sum_{j \geq 1, j_1 + \cdots + j_l = k, l, j_1, \ldots, j_l \geq 0} \nabla^{i_1, \tilde{g}} \beta \ast \cdots \ast \nabla^{i_l, \tilde{g}} \beta.
\] (3.1)
where $\beta$ means either the metric $\tilde{g}$ or the tensor $\alpha$, and $\ast$ denotes the tensor contraction by $\tilde{g}$. 
We start with the following general proposition.

**Proposition 3.2.** Let $X^n$ be any compact Kähler manifold. Suppose we have a family of Kähler metrics $\omega_\epsilon$ on $X$ such that the following holds:

$$\begin{align*}
\|\text{Ric}(\omega_\epsilon)\|_{C^0(X,\omega_\epsilon)} &\leq C_k, \\
\|\text{Rm}(\omega_\epsilon)\|_{C^0(X,\omega_\epsilon)} &\leq C_0\epsilon^{-n_0},
\end{align*}$$

(3.2)

where $n_0, C_k, (k \geq 0)$ are positive constants which are independent of $\epsilon$. Then we have

$$\|\text{Rm}(\omega_\epsilon)\|_{C^0(X,\omega_\epsilon)} \leq D_k\epsilon^{-n_k},$$

(3.3)

where $n_k, D_k$ are positive constants which are independent of $\epsilon$.

**Proof.** In general, given a Kähler metric $\omega$ on $X$ associated with Riemannian metric $g$, we have (by second Bianchi identity and Ricci identity)

$$\Delta R_{ijkl} = \nabla_i \nabla_k R_{ij} + \text{Rm} \ast \text{Rm},$$

(3.4)

where $\ast$ denotes tensor contraction by $g$ and also multiplication by some absolute constants, and $\Delta$ is with respect to $\omega$. For any smooth tensor field $\alpha$, and any non-negative integer $k$, we always have

$$\Delta \left( \nabla^g_{i_1} \nabla^g_{i_2} \alpha \right) = \nabla^g_{i_1} \left( \Delta \alpha \right) + \sum_{i_1+i_2=k, i_1, i_2 \geq 0} \nabla^{i_1, g}_{i_1} \text{Rm} \ast \nabla^{i_2, g}_{i_2} \alpha,$$

(3.5)

where $\ast$ denotes tensor contraction by $g$. Indeed, for $k = 0$, this is trivial. Assume this is true for $0, \ldots, k$ with $k \geq 0$. Then for $k+1$, we have

$$\Delta \left( \nabla^g_{i_1} \nabla^g_{i_2} \alpha \right) = \nabla^g_{i_1} \left( \Delta \alpha \right) + \sum_{i_1+i_2=k, i_1, i_2 \geq 0} \nabla^{i_1, g}_{i_1} \text{Rm} \ast \nabla^{i_2, g}_{i_2} \alpha$$

Same argument works for $\Delta \left( \nabla^g_{i_1} \nabla^g_{i_2} \alpha \right)$. This establish (3.5).
Combining (3.4) and (3.5) with \( \alpha = \text{Rm} \), we obtain

\[
\Delta \left( \nabla^{k, g} \text{Rm} \right) = \nabla^{k, g} \left( \Delta \text{Rm} \right) + \sum_{i_1 + i_2 = k, i_1, i_2 \geq 0} \nabla^{i_1, g} \text{Rm} \ast \nabla^{i_2, g} \text{Rm} \\
= \nabla^{k, g} \left( \nabla^{2, g} \text{Ric} + \text{Rm} \ast \text{Rm} \right) + \sum_{i_1 + i_2 = k, i_1, i_2 \geq 0} \nabla^{i_1, g} \text{Rm} \ast \nabla^{i_2, g} \text{Rm} \\
= \nabla^{k+2, g} \text{Ric} + \sum_{i_1 + i_2 = k, i_1, i_2 \geq 0} \nabla^{i_1, g} \text{Rm} \ast \nabla^{i_2, g} \text{Rm}.
\]

(3.6)

From this, we have for all \( k \geq 0 \)

\[
(-\Delta) \left( \left| \nabla^{k, g} \text{Rm} \right|_\omega^2 \right) \\
= - \left| \nabla^{k+1, g} \text{Rm} \right|_\omega^2 \ast 2 \text{Re} \left\{ \left( \Delta \left( \nabla^{k, g} \text{Rm} \right), \nabla^{k, g} \text{Rm} \right)_\omega \right\} + \text{Rm} \ast \nabla^{k, g} \text{Rm} \ast \nabla^{k, g} \text{Rm} \\
= - \left| \nabla^{k+1, g} \text{Rm} \right|_\omega^2 \ast \nabla^{k+2, g} \text{Ric} \ast \nabla^{k, g} \text{Rm} + \sum_{i_1 + i_2 + i_3 = 2k, 0 \leq i_1, i_2, i_3 \leq k} \nabla^{i_1, g} \text{Rm} \ast \nabla^{i_2, g} \text{Rm} \ast \nabla^{i_3, g} \text{Rm}.
\]

(3.7)

Now we prove (3.3) by induction. The \( k = 0 \) case is true by condition (3.2). Now assume (3.3) is true for \( 0, \ldots, k - 1 \) with \( k \geq 1 \), then we prove (3.3) for \( k \). Using (3.7) with \( \omega = \omega_k \), we get (We remind our readers that the constants \( C_k, n_k \) may differ from line to line.)

\[
(-\Delta_{\omega_k}) \left( \left| \nabla^{k, g} \text{Rm}(\omega_k) \right|_{\omega_k}^2 \right) \\
\leq \nabla^{k+2, g} \text{Ric}(\omega_k) \ast \nabla^{k, g} \text{Rm}(\omega_k) + \sum_{i_1 + i_2 + i_3 = 2k, 0 \leq i_1, i_2, i_3 \leq k} \nabla^{i_1, g} \text{Rm}(\omega_k) \ast \nabla^{i_2, g} \text{Rm}(\omega_k) \ast \nabla^{i_3, g} \text{Rm}(\omega_k) \\
\leq C_{k+2} \left| \nabla^{k, g} \text{Rm}(\omega_k) \right|_{\omega_k}^2 + \left[ C_k \epsilon^{-n_0} \left| \nabla^{k, g} \text{Rm}(\omega_k) \right|_{\omega_k}^2 + C_k \epsilon^{-n_2} \right] + C_k \epsilon^{-n_2}.
\]

(3.8)

Similarly we have

\[
(-\Delta_{\omega_k}) \left( \left| \nabla^{k-1, g} \text{Rm}(\omega_k) \right|_{\omega_k}^2 \right) \leq - \left| \nabla^{k, g} \text{Rm}(\omega_k) \right|_{\omega_k}^2 + C_k \epsilon^{-n_2}. \]

(3.9)

Set

\[
Q := \epsilon^{n_k} \left| \nabla^{k, g} \text{Rm}(\omega_k) \right|_{\omega_k}^2 + (C_k + 1) \left| \nabla^{k-1, g} \text{Rm}(\omega_k) \right|_{\omega_k}^2,
\]

then we obtain

\[
(-\Delta_{\omega_k}) Q \leq \left\{ C_k \left| \nabla^{k, g} \text{Rm}(\omega_k) \right|_{\omega_k}^2 \ast C_k + (C_k + 1) \left\{ - \left| \nabla^{k, g} \text{Rm}(\omega_k) \right|_{\omega_k}^2 + C_k \epsilon^{-n_k} \right\} \right\} \\
\leq - \left| \nabla^{k, g} \text{Rm}(\omega_k) \right|_{\omega_k}^2 + C_k \epsilon^{-n_k}.
\]

Now at a maximum point \( x_0 \in X \) of \( Q \), we have

\[
0 \leq (-\Delta_{\omega_k}) Q(x_0) \leq - \left| \nabla^{k, g} \text{Rm}(\omega_k) \right|_{\omega_k}^2 (x_0) + C_k \epsilon^{-n_k}.
\]
which implies that
\[ |\nabla^{k,\varepsilon} Rm(\omega_\varepsilon)|^2_{\omega_\varepsilon}(x_0) \leq C_k \varepsilon^{-n_k}. \]

By induction hypothesis we obtain
\[ Q \leq Q(x_0) \leq C_k \varepsilon^{-n_k}, \]
by modifying \( C_k \) and \( n_k \). This implies
\[ |\nabla^{k,\varepsilon} Rm(\omega_\varepsilon)|^2_{\omega_\varepsilon} \leq C_k \varepsilon^{-n_k}, \]
by modifying \( C_k \) and \( n_k \) again. \( \square \)

Applying Proposition 3.2 to the almost Ricci-flat metrics \( \omega_\varepsilon \), we obtain the higher order polynomial bounds of the curvature tensor:

**Corollary 3.3.** Assume as in Theorem 2.1. Then we have
\[ \|Rm(\omega_\varepsilon)\|_{C^k(X,\omega_\varepsilon)} \leq C_k \varepsilon^{-n_k}, \quad (3.10) \]
where \( C_k, n_k \) are positive constants which are independent of \( \varepsilon \).

Now we turn to the higher order estimates for the Ricci-flat metrics \( \tilde{\omega}_\varepsilon \).

**Proposition 3.4.** Assume as in the previous section. Then we have
\[ \|\tilde{\omega}_\varepsilon\|_{C^1(X,\tilde{\omega}_\varepsilon)} \leq C_1 \varepsilon^{-n_1}, \quad (3.11) \]
where \( C_1, n_1 \) are positive constants which are independent of \( \varepsilon \).

**Proof.** We define the smooth tensor field
\[ \Psi(\varepsilon)^{ip}_{\varepsilon} := \Gamma(\tilde{\omega}_\varepsilon)^i_{ip} - \Gamma(\omega_\varepsilon)^i_{ip} = (\tilde{g}_e)^{ik} \nabla_i (\tilde{g}_e)_{kp}^{\varepsilon}. \]

Then using the fact that \( \tilde{\omega}_\varepsilon \) is Ricci-flat, routine computation gives
\[ \Delta_{\tilde{\omega}_\varepsilon} \Psi(\varepsilon)^{ip}_{\varepsilon} = (\tilde{g}_e)^{ik} \nabla_i \nabla^{\tilde{g}_e}_{kp} \text{Rm}(\omega_\varepsilon)_{ip}^{\varepsilon} \]
\[ = (\tilde{g}_e)^{ik} \nabla_i \text{Rm}(\omega_\varepsilon)_{kp}^{\varepsilon}. \quad (3.12) \]

To prove (3.11) it suffices to prove the following third-order estimate
\[ \|\Psi(\varepsilon)\|_{C^3(X,\tilde{\omega}_\varepsilon)} \leq C_1 \varepsilon^{-n_1}. \quad (3.13) \]

Note that since globally \( \tilde{\omega}_\varepsilon \) and \( \omega_\varepsilon \) are uniformly equivalent, it doesn’t matter which metric we choose to take the point-wise norm.
Since $\tilde{\omega}_\epsilon$ is Ricci-flat, we have $\Delta_{\tilde{\omega}_\epsilon} = \tilde{\Delta}_{\tilde{\omega}_\epsilon}$ on any smooth tensor fields by Ricci identity. Hence we get

$$(-\Delta_{\tilde{\omega}_\epsilon}) |\Psi(\epsilon)|^2_{\tilde{\omega}_\epsilon} = -|\nabla^k \Psi(\epsilon)|^2_{\tilde{\omega}_\epsilon} - 2 \text{Re} \left\{ (\tilde{g}_\epsilon)^{ij}(\tilde{g}_\epsilon)^{pq}(\tilde{g}_\epsilon)^{kl} \left( \Delta_{\tilde{\omega}_\epsilon} \Psi(\epsilon)^{i}_{kp} \right) \right\}$$

$$= -|\nabla^k \Psi(\epsilon)|^2_{\tilde{\omega}_\epsilon} + \nabla^k \text{Rm}(\omega_\epsilon) \ast \Psi(\epsilon)$$

$$= -|\nabla^k \Psi(\epsilon)|^2_{\tilde{\omega}_\epsilon} + \nabla^k \text{Rm}(\omega_\epsilon) \ast \Psi(\epsilon) + \text{Rm}(\omega_\epsilon) \ast \Psi(\epsilon) \ast \Psi(\epsilon),$$

where the $\ast$ denotes tensor contraction by $\tilde{g}_\epsilon$ or $g_\epsilon$. Since $\tilde{g}_\epsilon$ and $g_\epsilon$ are uniformly equivalent, using Corollary 3.3 and Cauchy-Schwartz inequality we obtain

$$(-\Delta_{\tilde{\omega}_\epsilon}) |\Psi(\epsilon)|^2_{\tilde{\omega}_\epsilon} \leq -|\nabla^k \Psi(\epsilon)|^2_{\tilde{\omega}_\epsilon} + C |\nabla^k \text{Rm}(\omega_\epsilon)|_{\tilde{\omega}_\epsilon} |\Psi(\epsilon)|_{\tilde{\omega}_\epsilon} + C |\text{Rm}(\omega_\epsilon)|_{\tilde{\omega}_\epsilon} |\Psi(\epsilon)|^2_{\tilde{\omega}_\epsilon}$$

$$\leq -|\nabla^k \Psi(\epsilon)|^2_{\tilde{\omega}_\epsilon} + C \epsilon^{-n_1} |\Psi(\epsilon)|^2_{\tilde{\omega}_\epsilon} + C \epsilon^{-n_1}. \quad (3.14)$$

Also, we compute the trace term under normal coordinates with respect to $\tilde{\omega}_\epsilon$, we have

$$(-\Delta_{\tilde{\omega}_\epsilon}) (\text{tr}_{\tilde{\omega}_\epsilon} \omega_\epsilon)$$

$$= - (\tilde{g}_\epsilon)^{ij} \cdot \partial_k \partial_l (\tilde{g}_\epsilon)^{ij} \cdot (g_\epsilon)_{ij} - (\tilde{g}_\epsilon)^{ij} \cdot \partial_k \partial_l (g_\epsilon)^{ij}$$

$$= - \text{Ric}(\tilde{\omega}_\epsilon) \tilde{g}_\epsilon^{ij} \cdot (\tilde{g}_\epsilon)^{kl} \cdot (\tilde{g}_\epsilon)^{ij} \cdot (g_\epsilon)_{ij} - (\tilde{g}_\epsilon)^{kl} \cdot (\tilde{g}_\epsilon)^{ij} \cdot (g_\epsilon)^{pq} \partial_k (\tilde{g}_\epsilon)_{pq} \partial_l (g_\epsilon)_{ij}$$

$$\leq (\tilde{g}_\epsilon)^{kl} \cdot (\tilde{g}_\epsilon)^{ij} \cdot (g_\epsilon)_{ij} - C^{-1} |\Psi(\epsilon)|^2_{\tilde{\omega}_\epsilon}$$

$$\leq C \epsilon^{-n_0} - C^{-1} |\Psi(\epsilon)|^2_{\tilde{\omega}_\epsilon}. \quad (3.15)$$

Now fix the constant $C$ in (3.14) and (3.15), then we set

$$Q = \epsilon^{-n_1} |\Psi(\epsilon)|^2_{\tilde{\omega}_\epsilon} + (C + 1)^2 \text{tr}_{\tilde{\omega}_\epsilon} \omega_\epsilon,$$

then we have

$$(-\Delta_{\tilde{\omega}_\epsilon}) Q \leq \left\{ C |\Psi(\epsilon)|^2_{\tilde{\omega}_\epsilon} + C \right\} + (C + 1)^2 \left\{ -C^{-1} \cdot |\Psi(\epsilon)|^2_{\tilde{\omega}_\epsilon} + C \epsilon^{-n_0} \right\}$$

$$\leq - |\Psi(\epsilon)|^2_{\tilde{\omega}_\epsilon} + C \epsilon^{-n_0}.$$

Same argument as before gives us the estimate

$$|\Psi(\epsilon)|^2_{\tilde{\omega}_\epsilon} \leq C_1 \epsilon^{-n_1}$$

for some (perhaps larger) $n_1$. This establish (3.13) and finish the proof of Proposition 3.4. \qed

Next, we bound the curvature tensor of $\tilde{\omega}_\epsilon$.

**Proposition 3.5.** Assume as in the previous section. Then we have

$$\| \text{Rm}(\tilde{\omega}_\epsilon) \|_{C^0(X, \tilde{\omega}_\epsilon)} \leq C_1 \epsilon^{-n_1}, \quad (3.16)$$

where $C_1, n_1$ are positive constants which are independent of $\epsilon$. 
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Proof. Standard computations for Ricci-flat metrics give

\((-\Delta_{\tilde{\omega}_e}) |\text{Rm}(\tilde{\omega}_e)|_{\tilde{\omega}_e} \leq C |\text{Rm}(\tilde{\omega}_e)|_{\tilde{\omega}_e}^2 .\)

Then we apply Corollary 3.3 and Proposition 3.4 to (3.14):

\((-\Delta_{\tilde{\omega}_e}) |\Psi(\epsilon)|_{\tilde{\omega}_e}^2 \leq - |\text{Rm}(\tilde{\omega}_e)|_{\tilde{\omega}_e}^2 + C\epsilon^{-n_1} + C\epsilon^{-n_1} \)

where \(\text{Rm}^\sharp\) denotes the \((1, 3)\)-type curvature tensor. We can fix \(C\) now and let

\(Q := |\text{Rm}(\tilde{\omega}_e)|_{\tilde{\omega}_e}^2 + 2(C + 1) |\Psi(\epsilon)|_{\tilde{\omega}_e}^2 ,\)

then we have

\((-\Delta_{\tilde{\omega}_e}) Q \leq C |\text{Rm}(\tilde{\omega}_e)|_{\tilde{\omega}_e}^2 + 2(C + 1) \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} |\text{Rm}(\tilde{\omega}_e)|_{\tilde{\omega}_e}^2 + C\epsilon^{-n_1} \right\} \)

\leq - |\text{Rm}(\tilde{\omega}_e)|_{\tilde{\omega}_e}^2 + C\epsilon^{-n_1} .\)

Same argument as before gives us the estimate

\(|\text{Rm}(\tilde{\omega}_e)|_{\tilde{\omega}_e}^2 \leq C_1 \epsilon^{-n_1}\)

for some (perhaps larger) \(n_1\). This finishes the proof of Proposition 3.5.

Finally, we can bound the higher-order derivatives of \(\tilde{\omega}_e\) with respect to \(\omega_e\).

**Proposition 3.6.** Assume as in the previous section. Then we have for all \(k \geq 1\)

\[\|\tilde{\omega}_e\|_{C^k(X, \tilde{\omega}_e)} \leq C_k \epsilon^{-n_k},\]  

(3.17)

where \(n_k, C_k\) are positive constants which are independent of \(\epsilon\).

Proof. We prove by induction that

\[\|\Psi(\epsilon)\|_{C^m(X, \tilde{\omega}_e)} \leq C_m \epsilon^{-n_m},\]  

(3.18)

for \(m \geq 0\). The \(m = 0\) case is just (3.13). Now we assume this to be true for \(0, \ldots, m - 1\) for \(m \geq 1\). Now we prove this bound for \(m\).

We first claim that

**Claim:** Under the induction hypotheses, we have

\[\|\omega_e\|_{C^l(X, \tilde{\omega}_e)} \leq C_l \epsilon^{-n_l}, \quad \|\tilde{\omega}_e\|_{C^l(X, \tilde{\omega}_e)} \leq C_l \epsilon^{-n_l}.\]  

(3.19)

for any \(l = 0, \ldots, m\).
Proof of the Claim. First look at the first estimate. We still prove this by induction for $0 \leq l \leq m$. For $l = 0$, (3.19) follows from the fact that $\tilde{g}_\epsilon$ and $g_\epsilon$ are uniformly equivalent. Now assume (3.19) holds for $0, \ldots, l - 1$ for $1 \leq l \leq m$, we shall prove (3.19) for $l$. We have

$$
\nabla^{l-1, \tilde{g}_\epsilon} \Psi(\epsilon)^{k}_{ij} = \nabla^{l-1, \tilde{g}_\epsilon} \left( - (g_\epsilon)^{kl} \nabla^{k}_{i} (g_\epsilon)_{pl} \right)
$$

$$
= g_\epsilon \ast \nabla^{l, \tilde{g}_\epsilon} g_\epsilon + \sum_{j \geq 1, i_1 + \cdots + i_j = l, 0 \leq i_1, \ldots, i_j \leq l-1} \nabla^{i_1, \tilde{g}_\epsilon} g_\epsilon \ast \cdots \ast \nabla^{i_j, \tilde{g}_\epsilon} g_\epsilon.
$$

where $\ast$ denotes tensor contraction by $g_\epsilon$. So we have

$$
\nabla^{l, \tilde{g}_\epsilon} g_\epsilon = g_\epsilon \ast \nabla^{l-1, \tilde{g}_\epsilon} \Psi(\epsilon) + \sum_{j \geq 1, i_1 + \cdots + i_j = l, 0 \leq i_1, \ldots, i_j \leq l-1} \nabla^{i_1, \tilde{g}_\epsilon} g_\epsilon \ast \cdots \ast \nabla^{i_j, \tilde{g}_\epsilon} g_\epsilon. \quad (3.20)
$$

By induction hypotheses, we have

$$
\left| \nabla^{l, \tilde{g}_\epsilon} g_\epsilon \right|_{\tilde{\omega}_\epsilon}^2 \leq C \left| \nabla^{l-1, \tilde{g}_\epsilon} \Psi(\epsilon) \right|_{\tilde{\omega}_\epsilon}^2 + C \epsilon^{-n_{l-1}} \leq C \epsilon^{-n_l}.
$$

Hence we prove the first estimate. The second estimate follows from the first one and Lemma 3.1. \hfill \Box

Now, applying (3.20) to $\alpha = \Psi(\epsilon)$ and use (3.12), we have

$$
\Delta_{\omega_\epsilon} \left( \nabla^{k, \tilde{g}_\epsilon} \Psi(\epsilon) \right) = \nabla^{k, \tilde{g}_\epsilon} \left( \Delta_{\omega_\epsilon} \Psi(\epsilon) \right) + \sum_{i_1 + i_2 = k, i_1, i_2 \geq 0} \nabla^{i_1, \tilde{g}_\epsilon} \mathrm{Rm}(\tilde{\omega}_\epsilon) \ast \nabla^{i_2, \tilde{g}_\epsilon} \Psi(\epsilon)
$$

$$
= \nabla^{k, \tilde{g}_\epsilon} \left( \nabla^{k}_{\tilde{g}_\epsilon} \mathrm{Rm}(\omega_\epsilon) \right) + \sum_{i_1 + i_2 = k, i_1, i_2 \geq 0} \nabla^{i_1, \tilde{g}_\epsilon} \mathrm{Rm}(\tilde{\omega}_\epsilon) \ast \nabla^{i_2, \tilde{g}_\epsilon} \Psi(\epsilon)
$$

$$
= \nabla^{k+1, \tilde{g}_\epsilon} \mathrm{Rm}(\omega_\epsilon) + \sum_{i_1 + i_2 = k, i_1, i_2 \geq 0} \nabla^{i_1, \tilde{g}_\epsilon} \mathrm{Rm}(\tilde{\omega}_\epsilon) \ast \nabla^{i_2, \tilde{g}_\epsilon} \Psi(\epsilon), \quad (3.21)
$$

where $\ast$ denotes tensor contraction by $\tilde{g}_\epsilon$. Since $\tilde{\omega}_\epsilon$ are Ricci-flat, we have $\Delta_{\tilde{\omega}_\epsilon} = \tilde{\Delta}_{\tilde{\omega}_\epsilon}$ on any smooth tensor fields. Hence using (3.21) we have

$$
(-\Delta_{\omega_\epsilon}) \left| \nabla^{k, \tilde{g}_\epsilon} \Psi(\epsilon) \right|_{\tilde{\omega}_\epsilon}^2
$$

$$
= - \left| \nabla^{k+1, \tilde{g}_\epsilon} \Psi(\epsilon) \right|_{\tilde{\omega}_\epsilon}^2 + \left( \Delta_{\omega_\epsilon} \left( \nabla^{k, \tilde{g}_\epsilon} \Psi(\epsilon) \right) \right) \ast \nabla^{k, \tilde{g}_\epsilon} \Psi(\epsilon)
$$

$$
= - \left| \nabla^{k+1, \tilde{g}_\epsilon} \Psi(\epsilon) \right|_{\tilde{\omega}_\epsilon}^2 + \nabla^{k+1, \tilde{g}_\epsilon} \mathrm{Rm}(\omega_\epsilon) \ast \nabla^{k, \tilde{g}_\epsilon} \Psi(\epsilon) + \sum_{i_1 + i_2 = k, i_1, i_2 \geq 0} \nabla^{i_1, \tilde{g}_\epsilon} \mathrm{Rm}(\tilde{\omega}_\epsilon) \ast \nabla^{i_2, \tilde{g}_\epsilon} \Psi(\epsilon) \ast \nabla^{k, \tilde{g}_\epsilon} \Psi(\epsilon)
$$

$$
= - \left| \nabla^{k+1, \tilde{g}_\epsilon} \Psi(\epsilon) \right|_{\tilde{\omega}_\epsilon}^2 + I + II. \quad (3.22)
$$

We now assume $k \leq m$ and bound each term.

**Estimate of the term I.** We use Lemma 3.1 to compute

$$
I = \nabla^{k+1, \tilde{g}_\epsilon} \mathrm{Rm}(\omega_\epsilon) \ast \nabla^{k, \tilde{g}_\epsilon} \Psi(\epsilon)
$$

$$
= \sum_{j \geq 1, i_1 + \cdots + i_j = k+1, i_1, \ldots, i_j \geq 0} \nabla^{i_1, \tilde{g}_\epsilon} \beta \ast \cdots \ast \nabla^{i_j, \tilde{g}_\epsilon} \beta \ast \nabla^{k, \tilde{g}_\epsilon} \Psi(\epsilon).
$$
where $*$ denotes tensor contraction by $\bar{\g}_e$, and $\beta$ denotes $\bar{\g}_e$ or $\text{Rm}(\omega_e)$. If one term in this sum involves some components like $\nabla^{k+1,\bar{\g}_e}\bar{\g}_e$, then using (3.20) (here we change the roles of $\bar{\g}_e$ and $g_e$), this term can be written as

$$\bar{\g}_e \ast \nabla^{k,\bar{\g}_e}\Psi(e) + \sum_{j \geq 1, i_1 + \cdots + i_j = k+1, 0 \leq i_1, \ldots, i_j \leq k} \nabla^{i_1,\bar{\g}_e}\bar{\g}_e \ast \cdots \ast \nabla^{i_j,\bar{\g}_e}\bar{\g}_e,$$

where $*$ denotes tensor contraction by $\bar{\g}_e$. Hence using the claim (3.19), such terms are bounded above by

$$C \left| \nabla^{k+1,\bar{\g}_e}g_e \right|_{\omega_e} \cdot C_0 \epsilon^{-n_1} \cdot \left| \nabla^{k,\bar{\g}_e}\Psi(e) \right|_{\omega_e} \leq C \left( C \left| \nabla^{k,\bar{\g}_e}\Psi(e) \right|_{\omega_e} + C_k \epsilon^{-n_2} \right) \cdot C_0 \epsilon^{-n_1} \cdot \left| \nabla^{k,\bar{\g}_e}\Psi(e) \right|_{\omega_e} \leq C_k \epsilon^{-n_2} \left| \nabla^{k,\bar{\g}_e}\Psi(e) \right|_{\omega_e}^2 + C_k \epsilon^{-n_2}.$$

All other terms only contain $\nabla^{i,\bar{\g}_e}\bar{\g}_e$ with $0 \leq i \leq k$ and $\nabla^{i,\bar{\g}_e}\text{Rm}(\omega_e)$ with $0 \leq i \leq k+1$, using the claim (3.19) together with Corollary 3.3 such terms are bounded above by

$$C_k \epsilon^{-n_2} \left| \nabla^{k,\bar{\g}_e}\Psi(e) \right|_{\omega_e}^2 + C_k \epsilon^{-n_2}.$$

Hence we get the following estimate

$$I \leq C_k \epsilon^{-n_2} \left| \nabla^{k,\bar{\g}_e}\Psi(e) \right|_{\omega_e}^2 + C_k \epsilon^{-n_2}.$$

Estimate of the term II. We rewrite $II$ as

$$II = \nabla^{k,\bar{\g}_e}\text{Rm}(\bar{\omega}_e) \ast \nabla^{k,\bar{\g}_e}\Psi(e) + \nabla^{k-1,\bar{\g}_e}\text{Rm}(\bar{\omega}_e) \ast \nabla^{k-1,\bar{\g}_e}\Psi(e) \ast \nabla^{k,\bar{\g}_e}\Psi(e) + \sum_{i_1+i_2=k, i_1 \geq 0, i_1 \leq k-2} \nabla^{i_1,\bar{\g}_e}\text{Rm}(\bar{\omega}_e) \ast \nabla^{i_2,\bar{\g}_e}\Psi(e) \ast \nabla^{k,\bar{\g}_e}\Psi(e)$$

$$= : II_1 + II_2 + II_3.$$

We have

$$\nabla^{\bar{\g}_e}\Psi(e)_{ip}^k = \partial_p \Psi(e)_{ip}^k = \partial_p \Gamma(\bar{\g}_e)^k_{ip} - \partial_p \Gamma(g_e)^k_{ip} = -\text{Rm}(\bar{\omega}_e)_{bp}^k + \text{Rm}(\omega_e)_{bp}^k.$$

and hence

$$\text{Rm}(\bar{\omega}_e) = g_e \ast \text{Rm}(\omega_e) + \nabla^{\bar{\g}_e}\Psi(e).$$

Hence we have for $0 \leq i \leq k$

$$\nabla^{i,\bar{\g}_e}\text{Rm}(\bar{\omega}_e) = \nabla^{i+1,\bar{\g}_e}\Psi(e) + \sum_{i_1+i_2=i, i_1, i_2 \geq 0} \nabla^{i_1,\bar{\g}_e}\text{Rm}(\omega_e) \ast \nabla^{i_2,\bar{\g}_e}g_e.$$

Using Lemma 3.1 we have

$$\nabla^{i,\bar{\g}_e}\text{Rm}(\omega_e) = \sum_{j \geq 1, s_1 + \cdots + s_j = i, s_1, \ldots, s_j \geq 0} \nabla^{s_1,\bar{\g}_e}\beta \ast \cdots \ast \nabla^{s_j,\bar{\g}_e}\beta.$$
where $*$ denotes tensor contraction by $\bar{g}_\epsilon$, and $\beta$ denotes $\bar{g}_\epsilon$ or $\text{Rm}(\omega_\epsilon)$. Using Corollary 3.3 and the claim, we have for $i_1 \leq k$

$$|\nabla^{i_1,\tilde{g}_\epsilon}\text{Rm}(\omega_\epsilon)|_{\bar{\omega}_\epsilon} \leq C_k \epsilon^{-n_k}.$$ 

Then we obtain from (3.24) for $0 \leq l \leq k$

$$|\nabla^{l,\tilde{g}_\epsilon}\text{Rm}(\tilde{\omega}_\epsilon)|_{\bar{\omega}_\epsilon} \leq |\nabla^{l+1,\tilde{g}_\epsilon}\Psi(\epsilon)|_{\bar{\omega}_\epsilon} + C_k \epsilon^{-n_k}. \quad (3.25)$$

From this, we get

$$II_1 \leq \left( |\nabla^{k+1,\tilde{g}_\epsilon}\Psi(\epsilon)|_{\bar{\omega}_\epsilon} + C_k \epsilon^{-n_k} \right) |\nabla^{k,\tilde{g}_\epsilon}\Psi(\epsilon)|_{\bar{\omega}_\epsilon}$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{100} \left| \nabla^{k+1,\tilde{g}_\epsilon}\Psi(\epsilon) \right|_{\bar{\omega}_\epsilon}^2 + C_k \left| \nabla^{k,\tilde{g}_\epsilon}\Psi(\epsilon) \right|_{\bar{\omega}_\epsilon}^2 + C_k \epsilon^{-n_k}.$$ 

Then apply (3.25) to $II_3$ with $l \leq k - 2$, by induction hypothesis we have

$$|\nabla^{l,\tilde{g}_\epsilon}\text{Rm}(\tilde{\omega}_\epsilon)|_{\bar{\omega}_\epsilon} \leq |\nabla^{l+1,\tilde{g}_\epsilon}\Psi(\epsilon)|_{\bar{\omega}_\epsilon} + C_k \epsilon^{-n_k} \leq C_k \epsilon^{-n_k},$$

hence

$$II_3 \leq C_k \epsilon^{-n_k} \left( |\nabla^{k,\tilde{g}_\epsilon}\Psi(\epsilon) |_{\bar{\omega}_\epsilon}^2 + |\nabla^{k,\tilde{g}_\epsilon}\Psi(\epsilon) |_{\bar{\omega}_\epsilon} \right) \leq C_k \epsilon^{-n_k} |\nabla^{k,\tilde{g}_\epsilon}\Psi(\epsilon) |_{\bar{\omega}_\epsilon}^2 + C_k \epsilon^{-n_k}.$$ 

For the term $II_2$, we need to be careful about whether $k = 1$ or not. If $k > 1$, then by the induction hypothesis, we have

$$|\nabla^{1,\tilde{g}_\epsilon}\Psi(\epsilon)|_{\bar{\omega}_\epsilon} \leq C_1 \epsilon^{-n_1},$$

thus we can apply (3.25) to $II_2$ with $l = k - 1$ to obtain

$$II_2 \leq \left( |\nabla^{k,\tilde{g}_\epsilon}\Psi(\epsilon)|_{\bar{\omega}_\epsilon} + C_k \epsilon^{-n_k} \right) \cdot C_1 \epsilon^{-n_1} \cdot |\nabla^{k,\tilde{g}_\epsilon}\Psi(\epsilon)|_{\bar{\omega}_\epsilon}$$

$$\leq C_k \epsilon^{-n_k} \left| \nabla^{k,\tilde{g}_\epsilon}\Psi(\epsilon) \right|_{\bar{\omega}_\epsilon}^2 + C_k \epsilon^{-n_k}.$$ 

When $k = 1$, by Proposition 3.5 we have

$$II_2 = \text{Rm}(\tilde{\omega}_\epsilon) \ast \nabla^{1,\tilde{g}_\epsilon}\Psi(\epsilon) \ast \nabla^{1,\tilde{g}_\epsilon}\Psi(\epsilon)$$

$$\leq |\text{Rm}(\tilde{\omega}_\epsilon)|_{\bar{\omega}_\epsilon} \cdot |\nabla^{1,\tilde{g}_\epsilon}\Psi(\epsilon)|_{\bar{\omega}_\epsilon}^2$$

$$\leq C_1 \epsilon^{-n_1} \cdot |\nabla^{1,\tilde{g}_\epsilon}\Psi(\epsilon)|_{\bar{\omega}_\epsilon}^2.$$ 

Note that we cannot use (3.25) to bound this term by $C_1 \epsilon^{-n_1} \left| \nabla^{1,\tilde{g}_\epsilon}\Psi(\epsilon) \right|_{\bar{\omega}_\epsilon}^3 + C_1 \epsilon^{-n_1}$, since we cannot bound the term $|\nabla^{1,\tilde{g}_\epsilon}\Psi(\epsilon)|_{\bar{\omega}_\epsilon}^3$. This is why we need to bound $|\text{Rm}(\tilde{\omega}_\epsilon)|_{\bar{\omega}_\epsilon}$ first.

Now we conclude that for $k \leq m$

$$\left( -\Delta_{\bar{\omega}_\epsilon} \right) \left| \nabla^{k,\tilde{g}_\epsilon}\Psi(\epsilon) \right|_{\bar{\omega}_\epsilon}^2 \leq -\frac{1}{2} \left| \nabla^{k+1,\tilde{g}_\epsilon}\Psi(\epsilon) \right|_{\bar{\omega}_\epsilon}^2 + C_k \epsilon^{-n_k} \left| \nabla^{k,\tilde{g}_\epsilon}\Psi(\epsilon) \right|_{\bar{\omega}_\epsilon}^2 + C_k \epsilon^{-n_k}. \quad (3.26)$$
In particular, let \( k = m \), we get

\[
(-\Delta_{\tilde{\omega}_0}) \left| \nabla^{m,\bar{\partial}_e} \Psi(e) \right|_{\tilde{\omega}_0}^2 \leq C_m \epsilon^{-n_m} \left| \nabla^{m,\bar{\partial}_e} \Psi(e) \right|_{\tilde{\omega}_e}^2 + C_m \epsilon^{-n_m}. \tag{3.27}
\]

Again, let \( k = m - 1 \) and use the induction hypothesis, we have

\[
(-\Delta_{\tilde{\omega}_0}) \left| \nabla^{m-1,\bar{\partial}_e} \Psi(e) \right|_{\tilde{\omega}_0}^2 \leq -\frac{1}{2} \left| \nabla^{m,\bar{\partial}_e} \Psi(e) \right|_{\tilde{\omega}_e}^2 + C_m \epsilon^{-n_m}. \tag{3.28}
\]

Now we can fix \( C_m \) in (3.27) and (3.28), then we set

\[
Q := \epsilon^{n_m} \left| \nabla^{m,\bar{\partial}_e} \Psi(e) \right|_{\tilde{\omega}_0}^2 + 2(C_m + 1) \left| \nabla^{m-1,\bar{\partial}_e} \Psi(e) \right|_{\tilde{\omega}_e}^2.
\]

We have

\[
(-\Delta_{\tilde{\omega}_0}) Q \leq \left\{ C_m \left| \nabla^{m,\bar{\partial}_e} \Psi(e) \right|_{\tilde{\omega}_0}^2 + C_m \right\} + 2(C_m + 1) \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} \left| \nabla^{m,\bar{\partial}_e} \Psi(e) \right|_{\tilde{\omega}_e}^2 + C_m \epsilon^{-n_m} \right\}
\]

\[
\leq -\left| \nabla^{m,\bar{\partial}_e} \Psi(e) \right|_{\tilde{\omega}_e}^2 + C \epsilon^{-n_m}.
\]

By maximum principle as before, we get

\[
\left| \nabla^{m,\bar{\partial}_e} \Psi(e) \right|_{\tilde{\omega}_e}^2 \leq C_m \epsilon^{-n_m},
\]

for some (perhaps larger) \( n_m \). This finish the proof of (3.18). Finally, use the Claim again to finish the proof of Proposition 3.6. \( \square \)

### 3.2. Application of BIC principle.

We need the BIC principle of [4]:

**Lemma 3.7** (The “Boundedness Implies Convergence” Principle). Let \( X \) be an \( n \)-dimension Riemannian manifold (not necessarily to be compact or complete) and \( U \) be an open subset. Let \( \tilde{g}(t) \) be a family of Riemannian metrics on \( X \), \( t \in \mathbb{R} \) and let \( \eta(t) \) be a family of smooth functions or general tensor fields on \( X \), satisfying the following conditions:

There exists positive constants \( A_1, A_2, \ldots \), and a positive function \( h_0(t) \) which tends to zero as \( t \to \infty \) such that

(A) \( \| \eta(t) \|_{C^k(U, \tilde{g}(t))} \leq h_0(t) \).

(B) \( \| \eta(t) \|_{C^k(U, \tilde{g}(t))} \leq A_k \), for \( k = 1, 2, \ldots \).

(C) For any compact subset \( K \subset U \), there exists smooth cut-off function \( \rho \) with compact support \( \hat{K} \subset U \) such that \( 0 \leq \rho \leq 1 \), and \( \rho \equiv 1 \) in a neighborhood of \( K \), satisfying

\[
| \nabla \rho |^2_{\tilde{g}(t)} + | \Delta_{\tilde{g}(t)} \rho | \leq B_K. \tag{3.29}
\]

on \( \hat{K} \times [0, \infty) \), for some constant \( B_K \) independent of \( t \) (but may depend on the geometry of \( K \)).
Then we have: For any compact subset $K \subset \subset U$ the estimates
\[
\|\eta(t)\|_{C^k(K, \bar{\beta}(t))} \leq h_{K,k}(t).
\]
(3.30)

where $h_{K,k}(t)$ are positive functions which tend to zero as $t \to \infty$, depending on the constants $A_0$, $A_1$, $\ldots$, $A_{k+2}$, $B_K$ and the function $h(t)$.

If we only have Condition (B) for $1 \leq k \leq N+2$, then we still have the estimate (3.30) for $1 \leq k \leq N$.

**Remark 3.8.** In this paper, we work globally, hence we don’t need to use cut-off functions at all. Or equivalently, we choose $\rho \equiv 1$ in condition (C) in Lemma 3.7. Also, the proof of Lemma 3.7 shows that if $h_0(t)$ is of exponential decay, so are all the $h_k(t)$’s.

Now we can prove Theorem 1.1.

**Proof of Theorem 1.1.** From Proposition 3.6, we have
\[
\left| \nabla^k g \bar{g}_\epsilon \right|_{\bar{\omega}_t}^2 \leq C_k \epsilon^{-n_k},
\]
for all $k \geq 0$, where $n_k$, $C_k$ are positive constants independent of $\epsilon$. Without loss of generality, we can assume that $n_1 \leq n_2 \leq \ldots$ and $C_0 \leq C_1 \leq C_2 \leq \ldots$. Now, given any positive integer $N$, we have
\[
\left| \nabla^k g \bar{g}_\epsilon \right|_{\bar{\omega}_t}^2 \leq C_{N+2} \epsilon^{-n_{N+2}},
\]
for all $1 \leq k \leq N + 2$. Now we set
\[
\begin{align*}
\bar{\omega}_\epsilon &= \epsilon^{-n_{N+2}} \bar{\omega}_K, \\
\omega_\epsilon &= \epsilon^{-n_{N+2}} \omega_K,
\end{align*}
\]
then for all $1 \leq k \leq N + 2$, we have
\[
\left| \nabla^k g \bar{g}_\epsilon \right|_{\bar{\omega}_t}^2 = \epsilon^{(k+2)n_{N+2}} \epsilon^{-2n_{N+2}} \left| \nabla^k g \bar{g}_\epsilon \right|_{\bar{\omega}_t}^2
\]
\[
= \epsilon^{k n_{N+2}} \left| \nabla^k g \bar{g}_\epsilon \right|_{\bar{\omega}_t}^2
\]
\[
\leq \epsilon^{n_{N+2}} \left| \nabla^k g \bar{g}_\epsilon \right|_{\bar{\omega}_t}^2
\]
\[
\leq C_{N+2} \epsilon^{-n_k}
\]
\[
\leq C_{N+2}.
\]

Also by Lemma 2.3, we have
\[
\|\bar{\omega}_\epsilon - \omega_\epsilon\|_{C^0(\bar{X}, \omega_\epsilon^*)} = \|\bar{\omega}_K - \omega_K\|_{C^0(\bar{X}, \omega_\epsilon^*)} \leq C_0 \epsilon^{-\tilde{\delta}_N},
\]
Hence, we can apply the BIC principle Lemma 3.7 to obtain
\[
\|\bar{\omega}_\epsilon - \omega_\epsilon\|_{C^N(\bar{X}, \omega_\epsilon^*)} \leq C_N \epsilon^{-\tilde{\delta}_N},
\]
for some constants $C_N$ and $\tilde{\delta}_N$. Scaling back, we get
\[
\|\bar{\omega}_\epsilon - \omega_\epsilon\|_{C^N(\bar{X}, \omega_\epsilon^*)} \leq C_N \epsilon^{-\tilde{\delta}_N},
\]
for some (possibly different) $C_N$ and $\delta_N$. This completes the proof of (1.2).

For (1.3), note that

$$R(\omega_i)_{jkl} - R(\omega_i)_{jkl} = (g_{ij})^\kappa [((g_e)_{k\bar{\nu}} - (g_e)_{k\bar{\nu}}) R(\omega_i)_{jkl} + (g_e)^{\bar{s}i}(g_e)_{\bar{k}\bar{l}} g_{j\bar{s}} g^j g_{k\bar{l}} - (g_e)^{\bar{s}i}(g_e)_{\bar{k}\bar{l}} g_{j\bar{s}} g^j g_{k\bar{l}}],$$

hence we have

$$\text{Rm}(\omega_i) - \text{Rm}(\omega_i) = [(\tilde{g}_{ij} - g_{ij}) \ast \text{Rm}(\omega_i) + \sum_{j \geq i, i_i + \ldots + i_j = 2, i_i \ldots i_j \geq 0} \nabla^{i_i, \ldots, i_j} g_{ij} \ast \ldots \ast \nabla^{i_i, \ldots, i_j} g_{ij},$$

where $\ast$ denotes tensor contraction by $\tilde{g}_e$ or $g_e$. So we have

$$\nabla^{i_i, \ldots, i_j} (\text{Rm}(\omega_i) - \text{Rm}(\omega_i)) = \sum_{j \geq i, i_i + \ldots + i_j = 2, i_i \ldots i_j \geq 0} \nabla^{i_i, \ldots, i_j} g_{ij} \ast \ldots \ast \nabla^{i_i, \ldots, i_j} g_{ij} + \sum_{j \geq i, i_i + \ldots + i_j = 2, i_i \ldots i_j \geq 0} \nabla^{i_i, \ldots, i_j} g_{ij} \ast \ldots \ast \nabla^{i_i, \ldots, i_j} g_{ij}.$$ 

By (1.2) Corollary 3.3 and Lemma 3.1, we obtain for all $k \geq 0$

$$\left| \nabla^{i_i, \ldots, i_j} (\text{Rm}(\omega_i) - \text{Rm}(\omega_i)) \right|_{\omega_i} \leq C_k e^{-\frac{\delta_k}{C}} \cdot C_k e^{-\frac{\delta_k}{\lambda}} \leq C_k e^{-\frac{\delta_k}{\lambda}}.$$ 

This completes the proof of Theorem 1.1. □

4. Blow-up Limit at Singular Fibers

In this section, we prove Theorem 1.3. Again, we remark that similar analysis has been done for other types of Calabi-Yau metrics degenerations on K3 surfaces by Hein-Sun-Viaclovsky-Zhang in [2, Section 7].

The following simple observation should be well-known to experts.

**Lemma 4.1.** If a sequence of pointed Riemannian manifolds $(M_i^p, \lambda_i g_i, p_i)$ converges in the $C^\infty$ Cheeger-Gromov sense to a pointed Riemannian manifold $(N, g_\infty, p_\infty)$, and if $h_i$ is another family of metrics on $M_i$ such that for any integer $k \geq 0$, $\lambda_i^{-\frac{1}{k}} \|h_i - g_i\|_{C^k(M_i, g_i)} \to 0$ as $i \to \infty$, then we have

$$\xrightarrow{\text{C}^\infty-\text{Cheeger-Gromov}} (M_i^p, \lambda_i h_i, p_i) \to (N, g_\infty, p_\infty).$$

**Proof.** Let $K_i \subset K_{i+1} \subset \ldots$ be an exhaustion of $N$ by relatively compact domains and $\phi_i : K_i \to M_i$ be diffeomorphisms such that $\lambda_i^\frac{1}{k} g_i \to g_\infty$ in $C^k$ topology for any $k$ and on any fixed compact set $K$. We also assume that $p_\infty \in K_i$ and $\phi_i(p_\infty) = p_i$ for any $i$. Fix $k$ and $K$, for any $\epsilon > 0$, we can find a $i_0$ such that for all $i \geq i_0$, we have $K \subset K_i$, all the metrics $\lambda_i \phi_i^* g_i$ are uniformly equivalent to $g_\infty$, and

$$\|\lambda_i \phi_i^* g_i - g_\infty\|_{C^k(K, g_\infty)} < \epsilon.$$
So we have
\[
\|\lambda_i\phi_i^gh_i - g_\infty\|_{C^4(K,g_\infty)} \\
\leq \|\lambda_i\phi_i^g g_i - g_\infty\|_{C^4(K,g_\infty)} + \lambda_i\|\phi_i^gh_i - \phi_i^g g_i\|_{C^4(K,g_\infty)} \\
\leq \epsilon + \lambda_i C_K \|\phi_i^gh_i - \phi_i^g g_i\|_{C^4(K,g_\infty)} \\
\leq \epsilon + C_K \lambda_i^{-\frac{2}{i}} \|h_i - g_i\|_{C^4(M,g_i)} < 2\epsilon
\]
when \(i\) is large enough. Here \(C_K\) is a constant independent of \(i\) when \(i \geq i_0\). This finishes the proof. \(\square\)

For pointed Gromov-Hausdorff limits, similar conclusion holds by the same argument. In view of this lemma and Theorem 1.1, to prove Theorem 1.3, it suffices to find out the blow-up limits for \(\omega_\epsilon\) when \(\epsilon \to 0\).

To fix notations, we review the construction of \(\omega_\epsilon\) in [1]. Outside the singular fibers, we have the semi-flat metric \(\omega_{SF}\), whose restrictions to fibers are flat. Let \(X_{p_i}\) be a singular fiber. Choose a holomorphic coordinate \(y\) in a neighborhood \(\tilde{U}\) of \(p_i\), with \(\tilde{U}\) contractible and \(p_i\) is the unique point in \(U\) whose preimage is singular. Let \(\tilde{U}^* = \tilde{U} - \{p_i\}\), \(X_{0*} = f^{-1}(\tilde{U}^*)\). We can then choose over \(\tilde{U}^*\) (possibly multi-valued) holomorphic function \(\tau(y)\) with \(\text{Im } \tau(y) > 0\) such that the fiber at \(y\) is biholomorphic to \(\mathbb{C}/\mathbb{Z}(1, \tau(y))\).

Now, by the results of Gross-Wilson in [1] Section 3, we can then construct for all \(\epsilon\) less than some \(\epsilon_0\), the Ooguri-Vafa metric \(\omega_{OV}\) on \(f^{-1}(U)\), for some \(U = \{y \mid |y| < r\}\), where \(r > 0\) only depends on the period \(\tau\) and \(\epsilon_0\), but not \(\epsilon\). Fix \(r_1 < r_2 < r\) independent of \(\epsilon\), and let \(U_1 = \{y \mid |y| < r_1\}\), \(U_2 = \{y \mid |y| < r_2\}\). In the construction of the almost Ricci-flat metrics in [1] Section 4, \(U_2 \setminus U_1\) is our gluing region. We focus on the region \(U_1\).

Now let \(\tilde{p}_i\) being the unique point on the singular fibre \(X_{p_i} = f^{-1}(p_i)\) such that \(df\) is not surjective. As the construction in [1] Section 3, we can view \(f^{-1}(U)\) as a singular \(S^1\)-bundle over \(\tilde{Y} = (U_1 \times \mathbb{R})/\epsilon\mathbb{Z}\), say \(\tilde{\pi} : f^{-1}(U) \to \tilde{Y}\), with the singular fiber being the \(S^1\) collapsing to the point \(\tilde{p}_i\) at \(\{0\} \times \epsilon\mathbb{Z}\). If we restrict \(\tilde{\pi}\) to \(Y = (U_1 \times \mathbb{R} - \{0\} \times \epsilon\mathbb{Z})/\epsilon\mathbb{Z}\), then we obtain an principal \(S^1\)-bundle over \(Y\). We then apply the Gibbons-Hawking ansatz to \(\pi : \pi^{-1}(Y) \to Y\), where the coordinates on \(U_1 - \{0\}\) is our holomorphic coordinate \(y = y_1 + iy_2\), and the coordinate on \((\mathbb{R} - \epsilon\mathbb{Z})/\epsilon\mathbb{Z}\) is \(u\). Let \(\theta\) be a connection one form on the principal \(S^1\) bundle. Then the curvature \(d\theta\) is the pull back of a closed 2-form on \(Y\). If we can find a function \(V\) on \(Y\) such that \(*dV = \frac{d\theta}{2\pi}\), where * is the Hodge star taking with respect to the flat metric \(du^2 + dy_1^2 + dy_2^2\). The Gibbons-Hawking ansatz is a metric on \(\pi^{-1}(Y)\) of the form
\[
g = V(du^2 + dy_1^2 + dy + 2^2) + V^{-1}\theta_0^2,
\]
where \(\theta_0 = \theta/2\pi\).
Since the singular fiber $X_{\tau_i}$ is of Kodaira type $I_1$, we have $\tau(y) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \log(y) + ih(y)$, where $h(y) = f(y) + ig(y)$ is a holomorphic function on $U_1$ independent of $\epsilon$. Define

$$ V(\epsilon) = V_0(\epsilon) + \epsilon^{-1} f(y) $$

where $V_0(\epsilon) = \frac{1}{4\pi} \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{|\epsilon + f|^2 + |\epsilon|^2}} - a_n \right)$. Here $a_n = \frac{1}{n\pi} (n > 0)$ and $a_0 = 2\epsilon^{-1}(-\gamma + \log(2\epsilon))$, with $\gamma$ is the Euler’s constant. Then there exists a connection 1-form $\gamma$ on $\tilde{\pi}^{-1}(Y)$ such that $d\gamma/2\pi i = *dS$, then set $\theta_0 = \theta/2\pi$. Under these coordinates, the Ooguri-Vafa metric on $\tilde{\pi}^{-1}(Y)$ is

$$ V(\epsilon) \left( du^2 + dy_1^2 + dy_2^2 \right) + V(\epsilon)^{-1} \theta_0^2. $$

Since the gluing is outside $U_1$, this equals the restriction of $g_\epsilon$.

Now we can prove Theorem 1.3.

**Proof of Theorem 1.3** Fix a point $p_0 \in X_{\tau_i}$ as in the description of Theorem 1.3. We change the coordinates

$$ s = \epsilon^{-1} u, \; v_1 = \epsilon^{-1} y_1, \; v_2 = \epsilon^{-1} y_2. $$

Then we have

$$ \epsilon^{-1} g_\epsilon = V_1(\epsilon) \left( ds^2 + dv_1^2 + dv_2^2 \right) + V_1(\epsilon)^{-1} \theta_0^2, $$

where

$$ V_1(\epsilon) = \epsilon V(\epsilon) = \tilde{V}_0 + \frac{1}{2\pi} \log(\epsilon^{-1}) + f, $$

and $\tilde{V}_0$ is the standard function $V_0$ in variables $s, v_1, v_2$ for $\epsilon = 1$. Also, if we write $\rho = (s^2 + v_1^2 + v_2^2)^{1/2}$, then

$$ V_1(\epsilon) = \rho^{-1} + f_1 + \frac{1}{2\pi} \log(\epsilon^{-1}), $$

where $f_1$ is a globally well-defined harmonic function independent of $\epsilon$.

Finally, we denote by

$$ \beta_k = \frac{1}{2\pi} \log \left( \epsilon_k^{-1} \right), $$

$$ d_k = d_{\epsilon_k^{-1} \theta_0} (p_0, \tilde{p}_i). $$

Now we can analyze the geometry in all three regions.

**Region (1).** If $p_0$ is in Region (1), then there exists a sequence $\epsilon_k \to 0$ and a uniform $R_0 > 0$ such that $d_k \leq R_0 \beta_k^{-1}$. We set $\tilde{g}_k = \beta_k \epsilon_k^{-1} \tilde{g}_{\epsilon_k}$ and $g_k = \beta_k \epsilon_k^{-1} \tilde{g}_{\epsilon_k}$. We use the rescaled coordinates

$$ a = \beta_k s = \beta_k \epsilon_k^{-1} u, \; w_1 = \beta_k v_1 = \beta_k \epsilon_k^{-1} y_1, \; w_2 = \beta_k v_2 = \beta_k \epsilon_k^{-1} y_2. $$

Then we have

$$ g_k^\# = \frac{V_1(\epsilon_k)}{\beta_k} (da^2 + dw_1^2 + dw_2^2) + \frac{\beta_k}{V_1(\epsilon_k)} \theta_0^2. $$
Note that rescaling of coordinates is equivalent to choosing diffeomorphisms in the Cheeger-Gromov convergence. Then as [2, Lemma 7.9], since
\[
\frac{V_1(\epsilon_k)}{\beta_k} \to \frac{1}{\sqrt{d^2 + w_1^2 + w_2^2}} + 1,
\]
we have
\[
(X, g^\#, \tilde{p}_i) \xrightarrow{C^\infty-\text{Cheeger–Gromov}} (\mathbb{R}^4, \bar{g}_\infty, 0_{\mathbb{R}^4}),
\]
where \(\bar{g}_\infty\) is the standard Ricci-flat Taub-NUT metric on \(\mathbb{R}^4\) with origin \(0_{\mathbb{R}^4}\). Now we have
\[
d_{g^\#}(p_0, \tilde{p}_i) = \beta_k^\frac{1}{2}d_k \leq \beta_k^\frac{1}{2}R_0\beta_k^\frac{1}{2} = R_0.
\]
Hence \(p_0\) must converges to some point \(p_\infty \in \mathbb{R}^4\), and using the Theorem 1.1 and Lemma 4.1, we obtain
\[
(X, g^\#, p_0) \xrightarrow{C^\infty-\text{Cheeger–Gromov}} (\mathbb{R}^4, \bar{g}_\infty, p_\infty).
\]

**Region (2).** If \(p_0\) is in Region (2), then there exists a sequence \(\epsilon_k \to 0\) such that \(d_k\beta_k^\frac{1}{2} \to \infty\) and \(d_k\beta_k^\frac{-1}{2} \to 0\) as \(k \to \infty\). We then set \(\gamma_k > 0\) to be
\[
\gamma_k^2 = d_k\beta_k^\frac{1}{2},
\]
then \(\gamma_k \to \infty\) as \(k \to \infty\). Set
\[
r_k = \gamma_k\beta_k^\frac{-1}{2},
\]
then we have \(r_k = (d_k\beta_k^\frac{-1}{2})^\frac{1}{2}\beta_k^\frac{-1}{2} \to 0\) as \(k \to \infty\). We then set
\[
W_k = \{(s, v_1, v_2) \mid s^2 + v_1^2 + v_2^2 \leq r_k^2\} = \{(u, y_1, y_2) \mid u^2 + y_1^2 + y_2^2 \leq \epsilon_k^2 r_k^2\}
\]
and \(W_k \subset \bar{Y}\) after \(k\) is sufficiently large. We define
\[
\tilde{g}_k^\# = d_k\epsilon_k^{-1}\bar{g}_\epsilon, \quad g_k^\# = d_k\epsilon_k^{-1}g_\epsilon.
\]
Now, the diameter of an circle \(S^1\) of the fibration \(\pi\), denoted by \(S^1_v\), is controlled by
\[
\text{Diam}_{g^\#}(S^1_v) = a_k^{-1}\text{Diam}_{g^\#_{g_k}}(S^1_v) \leq a_k^{-1} \cdot C\beta_k^\frac{1}{2} \to 0, \text{ as } k \to \infty.
\]
Meanwhile the diameter of an \(S^1\) mapping onto \(\{y\} \times S^1 \subset Y\), denoted by \(S^1_h\), satisfies
\[
\text{Diam}_{g^\#_{g_k}}(S^1_h) = a_k^{-1}\text{Diam}_{g^\#_{g_k}}(S^1_h) \geq a_k^{-1} \cdot C^{-1}\beta_k^\frac{1}{2} \to \infty, \text{ as } k \to \infty.
\]
and similarly $\text{Diam}_{\tilde{s}}(f^{-1}(U_1)) \to \infty$, as $k \to \infty$. Next by triangle inequality we have for $k$ large

$$\text{Diam}_{\tilde{s}}(\tilde{\pi}^{-1}(W_k)) \leq d_k^{-1} \cdot \int_0^\infty V_1(\epsilon_k)^{\frac{1}{2}} d\rho + d_k^{-1} \cdot C\beta_k^{-\frac{1}{2}}$$

$$\leq d_k^{-1} \cdot \int_0^\infty \left(\rho^{-1} + 2\beta_k\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} d\rho + C\beta_k^{-\frac{1}{2}}d_k^{-1}$$

$$\leq d_k^{-1} \cdot 2r_k^\frac{1}{2} + d_k^{-1} \cdot 2\beta_k^2 r_k + C\beta_k^{-\frac{1}{2}}d_k^{-1}$$

$$= 2\gamma_k^{-\frac{1}{2}} + 2\gamma_k^{-1} + C\beta_k^{-\frac{1}{2}}d_k^{-1} \to 0.$$ 

We now use the rescaled coordinates

$$a = \beta_k^\frac{1}{2}d_k^{-1}s = \beta_k^\frac{1}{2}d_k^{-1}\epsilon_k^{-1}u,$$

$$w_1 = \beta_k^\frac{1}{2}d_k^{-1}v_1 = \beta_k^\frac{1}{2}d_k^{-1}\epsilon_k^{-1}y_1,$$

$$w_2 = \beta_k^\frac{1}{2}d_k^{-1}v_2 = \beta_k^\frac{1}{2}d_k^{-1}\epsilon_k^{-1}y_2,$$

on $\mathbb{R}^3$, then we have

$$g_k^\# = d_k^{-2} \cdot \left(\left[V_1(\epsilon_k) \left(ds^2 + dv_1^2 + dv_2^2\right) + V_1(\epsilon_k)^{-1}\theta_0^2\right]\right)$$

$$= \beta_k^{-1}V_1(\epsilon_k)\left(da^2 + dw_1^2 + dw_2^2\right) + d_k^{-2}V_1(\epsilon_k)^{-1}\theta_0^2.$$ 

But on $f^{-1}(U_1) \setminus \tilde{\pi}^{-1}(W_k)$ we have

$$d_k^{-2}V_1(\epsilon_k)^{-1} \leq d_k^{-2} \cdot C\beta_k^{-1} \to 0, \text{ as } k \to \infty,$$

and since $\rho \geq r_k$ we have $\beta_k^{-1}\rho^{-1} \leq \beta_k^{-1}r_k^{-1} = \gamma_k^{-1} \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$, we have

$$\beta_k^{-1}V_1(\epsilon_k) = \beta_k^{-1}\rho^{-1} + \beta_k^{-1}f_1 + 1 \to 1, \text{ as } k \to \infty,$$

hence we have $g_k^\# \to g_{\mathbb{R}^3} = da^2 + dw_1^2 + dw_2^2$ in the Gromov-Hausdorff sense. Hence we can conclude using Theorem 1.1 that

$$\left(X \setminus \tilde{\pi}^{-1}(W_k), g_k^\#, p_0\right) \xrightarrow{GH} \left(\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \{0_{\mathbb{R}^3}\}, g_{\mathbb{R}^3}, p_\infty\right),$$

with $p_\infty = (1, 0, 0)$.

**Region (3).** If $p_0$ is in Region (3), then there exists a sequence $\epsilon_k \to 0$ and uniform constants $r_0, C_0 > 0$ such that $r_0 \beta_k^\frac{1}{2} \leq d_k \leq C_0 \beta_k^\frac{1}{2}$. We now set

$$r_k = \beta_k^{-\frac{1}{2}},$$

then $r_k \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$. We then set

$$W_k = \left\{(s, v_1, v_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid s^2 + v_1^2 + v_2^2 \leq r_k^2\right\} = \left\{(u, y_1, y_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid u^2 + y_1^2 + y_2^2 \leq \epsilon_k^2 r_k^2\right\}$$

and then $W_k \subset \tilde{Y}$ after $k$ is sufficiently large. We set $\tilde{g}_k^\# = d_k^{-2}\epsilon_k^{-1}g_{\epsilon_k}$ and $g_k^\# = d_k^{-2}\epsilon_k^{-1}g_{\alpha}.$

Now as before the diameter of a “vertical” circle $S_{V_k}^1$ of the fibration $\pi$ is controlled by

$$\text{Diam}_{\tilde{g}_k^\#}(S_{V_k}^1) = d_k^{-1}\text{Diam}_{\tilde{g}_k^\#}(S_{V_k}^1) \leq d_k^{-1} \cdot C_0 \beta_k^{-\frac{1}{2}} \to 0, \text{ as } k \to \infty,$$
while the diameter of a “horizontal” circle $S^1_h$ mapping onto $\{y\} \times S^1 \subset Y$ satisfies

$$\text{Diam}_{s_k}(S^1_h) = d_k^{-1} \text{Diam}_{s_k^{-1}}(S^1_h) \approx d_k^{-1} \cdot \beta_k^\perp \in [r_0, C_0].$$

Also, we have

$$\text{Diam}_{s_k}(f^{-1}(U_1)) \geq d_k^{-1} \cdot C^{-1} \epsilon_k^{-1} r_1 \beta_k^\perp \to \infty, \text{ as } k \to \infty.$$ 

Next by triangle inequality we have for $k$ large

$$\text{Diam}_{s_k}(\bar{\pi}^{-1}(W_k)) \leq d_k^{-1} \cdot \int_0^{r_k} V_1(\epsilon_k)^\perp d\rho + d_k^{-1} \cdot C \beta_k^\perp \rho^{\perp} \leq d_k^{-1} \cdot \int_0^{r_k} \left(\rho^{-1} + 2 \beta_k\right)^{\perp} d\rho + C \beta_k^\perp d_k^{-1} \rho^{\perp} \leq C \beta_k^\perp \beta_k^\perp + C \beta_k^\perp \beta_k^\perp + C \beta_k^\perp \beta_k^\perp \to 0.$$

We now use the rescaled coordinates

$$a = s = \epsilon_k^{-1} u, \quad w_1 = v_1 = \epsilon_k^{-1} y_1, \quad w_2 = v_2 = \epsilon_k^{-1} y_2,$$

on $S^1 \times \mathbb{R}^2$, then we have

$$g_k^\# = d_k^{-2} \cdot V_1(\epsilon_k) \left(da^2 + dw_1^2 + dw_2^2\right) + d_k^{-2} \cdot V_1(\epsilon_k)^{-1} \theta_0^2,$$

But on $f^{-1}(U_1) \setminus \bar{\pi}^{-1}(W_k)$ we have

$$d_k^{-2} V_1(\epsilon_k)^{-1} \leq C \beta_k^{-2} \to 0, \text{ as } k \to \infty,$$

and since $\rho \geq r_k$ we have $\beta_k^{-1} \rho^{-1} \leq \beta_k^{-1} r_k^{-1} = \beta_k^\perp \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$. Now, since $d_k^{-2} \beta_k$ is uniformly bounded from above and below from zero, we can pass to a subsequence such that $d_k^{-2} \beta_k \to \gamma_0^2 > 0$ as $k \to \infty$, hence $d_k^{-2} \cdot V_1(\epsilon_k) \to \gamma_0^2$ on $f^{-1}(U_1) \setminus \bar{\pi}^{-1}(W_k)$. Hence we have $g_k^\# \to g_0 = \gamma_0^2(da^2 + dw_1^2 + dw_2^2)$ on $f^{-1}(U_1) \setminus \bar{\pi}^{-1}(W_k)$ in the Gromov-Hausdorff sense. Hence we can conclude using Theorem [1.1] that

$$\left(X \setminus \bar{\pi}^{-1}(W_k), \tilde{g}_k^\#, p_0\right) \xrightarrow{GH} \left(S^1 \times \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{0\}, g_0, p_\infty\right).$$

This completes the proof of Theorem [1.3] \hfill $\square$
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