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Abstract. We show that the moduli stack $M_h$ of polarized complex manifolds with Hilbert polynomial $h$ is Borel hyperbolic in the following sense: if for some quasi-projective variety $U$ there exists a quasi-finite morphism $U \to M_h$, induced by a family, then all holomorphic maps from any quasi-projective variety to $U$ are algebraic.

1. Introduction

In this paper we study the algebraicity of a holomorphic curve into the moduli space of polarized complex projective manifolds (polarized manifold for short). More precisely, let $f : V \to U$ be an analytic family of polarized manifolds with semi-ample canonical divisor, $U$ a quasi-projective variety and $\gamma : C \to U$ a holomorphic map from a quasi-projective smooth curve $C$ to the base space $U$. We prove that if the classifying map from $U$ to the moduli space induced by the family is quasi-finite, then the holomorphic map $\gamma$ is induced from an algebraic morphism between varieties.

It is well understood that big-Picard-type theorems are strongly related to hyperbolicity. For instance, every holomorphic map $\gamma : \mathbb{D} \setminus \{0\} \to U$ extends to a holomorphic map $\overline{\gamma} : \mathbb{D} \to \overline{U}$ if $U$ is hyperbolically imbedded in some compactification $\overline{U}$ (cf. [Kob98, Page 284, Theorem (6.3.7)]). Motivated by the Shafarevich problem (cf. [Vie01, Kov03] for an introduction) and its higher dimensional generalizations, the hyperbolicity properties of moduli space of polarized varieties has been extensively studied for over half a century with many major advances.

In one direction, the moduli space of canonically polarized varieties (i.e. varieties with ample canonical line bundle) has been proved to be Brody hyperbolic (i.e., absence of non-constant holomorphic maps from $\mathbb{C}$) in a previous work of Eckart Viehweg and the third named author, [VZ03]. This was accomplished by combining the construction of certain Hodge-theoretic objects (the so-called Viehweg-Zuo sheaves) and the Ahlfors-Schwarz lemma.

Recently, To and Yeung proved that the moduli space of canonically polarized varieties is Kobayashi hyperbolic (cf. [TY15]). This is stronger than Brody hyperbolicity for a noncompact moduli space, but unfortunately, is still weaker than having a hyperbolically imbedding (cf. [Lan87, Chapter 2] or [Kob98, Chapter 3, §3]). Thus one cannot get the big Picard theorem by applying the above theorem on hyperbolically embedded spaces directly. The difficulty in obtaining a hyperbolic imbedding of the moduli space in general is mainly due to the lack of a good compactification.

For some moduli space, like the moduli space of abelian varieties or that of K3 surfaces, there is indeed a good compactification. Recall that those moduli spaces are all locally symmetric varieties. And for those varieties we have the famous Baily-Borel compactification, which is actually a minimal compactification (cf. [BB64]). And the big Picard theorem on those moduli space follows from a theorem of Borel [Bor72].

1Thus our use of the term moduli space is in the stacky sense unless otherwise specified.
Theorem 1.1 (Borel). Let $X$ be a torsion-free arithmetic quotient of a bounded symmetric domain. And denote by $X^*$ the Baily-Borel compactification of $X$. Then $X$ is hyperbolically imbedded into $X^*$.

Inspired by Borel’s theorem, Javanpeykar and Kucharczyk in [JK18] formulated the following notion:

Definition 1.2. A finite type scheme $X$ over $\mathbb{C}$ is Borel hyperbolic if, for every finite type reduced scheme $S$ over $\mathbb{C}$, any holomorphic map from $S$ to $X$ is algebraic.

It is easy to see that Borel hyperbolicity implies Brody hyperbolicity. And hyperbolically imbedded-ness implies Borel hyperbolicity by the extension theorem of Kobayashi. We remark that although [JK18] refers to the work of Armand Borel in [Bor72], almost a century earlier, Emil Borel in e.g. [Bor97] has done seminal and foundational works on hyperbolicity, even obtaining such extension theorems in the logarithmic (i.e. quasiprojective) setting, though outside the moduli space context. We have thus welcomed the term Borel hyperbolicity in these natural contexts.

By the works of Viehweg-Zuo, To-Yeung et al. we already know that the moduli space has certain hyperbolicity. So the following question naturally arises:

Is the moduli space (not necessarily a locally symmetric variety) Borel hyperbolic?

1.1. Previous results. There are generalizations of Borel’s theorem. For a family with local Torelli injectivity (i.e. the period map induced by the family is quasi-finite), the Borel hyperbolicity is a direct corollary of a conjecture of Griffiths on the quasi-projectivity of images of period maps. Recently this conjecture was settled by Bakker, Brunebarbe and Tsimerman together via their deep results on the o-minimal GAGA theorem. As an application, they got

Theorem 1.3 ([BBT18, Corollary 7.1]). Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a separated Deligne-Mumford stack of finite type over $\mathbb{C}$ admitting a quasi-finite $\mathbb{R}_{an,exp}$-definable period map, and let $Z$ be a reduced algebraic space. Then any analytic map $Z_{an} \to \mathcal{M}_{an}$ is algebraic.

So moduli spaces admitting (generic) injective period maps, like the moduli of curves with genus $\geq 1$ and the moduli of hypersurfaces of certain degree in $\mathbb{P}^n$, are Borel hyperbolic.

Nevertheless, families of polarized varieties where the local Torelli injectivity fails abounds. Note that in Viehweg-Zuo and in To-Yeung, the hyperbolicity obtained holds without the assumptions on the period maps. This motivates us to investigate the general situation.

1.2. Hodge theory and tools from Nevanlinna theory. Given a family $f : X \rightarrow Y$ of projective manifolds over a projective base $Y$ with degeneration locus $S$, Griffiths introduced the notion of polarized variation of Hodge structure on $U = Y \setminus S$ in his seminal papers [Gri68a, Gri68b, Gri70], by taking the Betti cohomology of the smooth fibers endowed with the Hodge structures. Deligne and Cattani-Kaplan-Schmid studied the asymptotic behavior and the degeneration of Hodge structures and the Hodge metric near the degeneration locus (cf. [Sch73, Del87, CKS86]). All these theorems have fundamental importance in the study of the geometry of families. Kawamata and Viehweg’s positivity theorems on the direct image sheaves $f_* \omega^n_{X/Y}$ of powers of the relative dualizing sheaf are examples that play crucial roles in the investigation of the Iitaka conjecture and in Viehweg’s work on constructing moduli space of varieties with semi-ample dualizing sheaves.
Like we mentioned above, the Torelli-type theorem fails in general. As a substitution, Viehweg and the third named author constructed a non-trivial comparison map between the Kodaira-Spencer map in deformation theory and the Kodaira-Spencer map on the Hodge bundles associated to a new family built from certain cyclic coverings. Consequently, with the semi-negativity of the kernel of the Kodaira-Spencer maps on Hodge bundle (proven in [Zuo00]) and the positivity results on the direct image sheaves, the maximal non-zero iterated Kodaira-Spencer map yields the “bigness” of the so-called Viehweg-Zuo subsheaves in the symmetric power $Sym^m \Omega^1_Y(\log S)$. Analytically, the Viehweg-Zuo subsheaf gives rise to a negatively curved complex Finsler pseudometric on $U$.

On the other hand, the big Picard theorem has close relations with Nevanlinna theory. In fact Nevanlinna theory begins with Nevanlinna’s work on extending the classical Picard theorems, resulting in his first and second main theorem (see for example [Ru01] for a general introduction). It can be used to detect the rate of growth of a meromorphic function.

In the fundamental paper [GK73], Griffiths and King studied the higher dimensional generalization of Nevanlinna theory. One of the notable application is that they found a Nevanlinna-theoretic proof of Borel’s theorem (cf. [GK73, Corollary (9.22)]), although the proof still relies on some results in [BB64].

The existence of a negatively curved complex Finsler pseudometric arising from Hodge theory in our case makes the tools from Nevanlinna theory as developed in Griffiths-King applicable. In fact, an appropriate modification of their proof allows their boundedness hypothesis by the Hermitian metric to be relaxed to the boundedness by the curvature form of the metric. By this, we obtain:

**Theorem 1.4 (Main theorem).** Let $f : V \to U$ be a family of polarized manifolds with semi-ample canonical divisors. Suppose that the classifying map from $U$ to the moduli space induced by the family is quasi-finite. Let $\gamma : C \to U$ be any analytic map from any quasi-projective curve $C$ to $U$. Then this analytic map is an algebraic morphism.

**Remark on family of polarized varieties with good minimal models.** We shall remark that all the constructions described above can be carried out for a family $f : X \to Y$ with fibers admitting good minimal models. Kawamata [Kaw85] showed that $\det f_*\omega^a_{X/Y}$ is big for $a \gg 0$. Hence for an ample line bundle $A$ on $Y$, one finds that $(\det f_*\omega^a_{X/Y})^b \otimes A^{-1}$ has a non-zero section. By replacing the original family by the self-fiber product of suitable power we may assume that $(f_*\omega_{X/Y} \otimes A^{-1})^\nu$ has a non-zero section $s$. One takes the cyclic cover by taking out the $\nu$-th root of $s$ and obtains a negatively curved Finsler metric by the comparison map.)

We have chosen to follow the approach of Griffiths-King in this paper as it is natural in our moduli space context. It is clear that a more general extension theorem holds even in the non-algebraic context and will be addressed via a direct metric approach in another paper.

Our theorem can be regarded as a generalization of Borel’s theorem on algebraicity. Note that Borel’s original approach to this is by proving that the locally symmetric variety is hyperbolically imbedded into its Baily-Borel compactification (cf. Theorem [11]). Of course, to talk about the notion of hyperbolically imbedding in general, certain good compactification must be involved. For moduli space of canonically polarized varieties, the KSBA compactification seems to be a natural candidate (see the survey [Ko13] for an introduction). As a generalization to Borel’s theorem, we can ask the following
**Question 1.5.** Let \( f : X \to Y \) be a KSBA stable family over a projective variety \( Y \). Denote by \( U \) the smooth locus of \( f \) in \( Y \). Is \( U \) hyperbolically imbedded into \( Y \)?

1.3. **Outline.** In Section 2 we recollect the construction of Viehweg and the third named author in \([VZ03, VZ02]\), as well as the curvature property of the Finsler pseudometric they produced. In Section 3 we consider an analytic map from a smooth curve to the base space of the family. We use the Finsler pseudometric constructed in Section 2 to get an inequality related to this analytic map, in a similar manner to that of \([GK73, \S 9(b)]\). In Section 4 we use this inequality to derive the big Picard theorem, and the Borel hyperbolicity follows as a corollary.

1.4. **Notation.** In general we follow the notations of \([VZ03, VZ02]\) about the construction of Higgs bundles, and the notations of \([GK73]\) about the Nevanlinna theory. Let \( u, v \) be real non-negative valued functions on a set \( S \). We write \( u \gtrsim v \) if there exists a constant \( c > 0 \) such that \( u(s) \geq c \cdot v(s) \) for all \( s \in S \).
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2. **Recollections on Viehweg-Zuo construction**

In \([VZ03, VZ02]\) Viehweg and the third named author constructed two graded logarithmic Higgs bundles for a given smooth family of polarized manifolds \( f : V \to U \), which can be used to prove the hyperbolicity of the base manifold \( U \). We recall the construction briefly here with some simplifications but the details can be found in \( loc. \ cit. \).

2.1. **Cyclic covering and the comparison map.** Let \( V \to U \) be a smooth family of polarized manifolds with semi-ample canonical divisors. Denote by \( f : X \to Y \) a partial good compactification of the original family, meaning that:

1) \( X \) and \( Y \) are quasi-projective manifolds, and \( U \subset Y \).
2) \( S := Y \setminus U \) and \( \Delta := f^*S \) are normal crossing divisors.
3) \( f \) is a log smooth projective morphism between the log pairs \((X, \Delta)\) and \((Y, S)\), and \( f^{-1}(U) \to U \) coincides with the original family \( V \to U \).
4) \( Y \) has a non-singular projective compactification \( \bar{Y} \) such that \( \bar{Y} \setminus U \) is a normal crossing divisor and \( \text{codim}(\bar{Y} \setminus Y) \geq 2 \).

To use the strategy from Viehweg-Zuo \([VZ03, VZ02]\), one needs to construct some cyclic covering over the total space \( X \). Thus we first collect the following result about the positivity of the direct image sheaf of the relative canonical bundle that is to be used to construct the cyclic covering.
Theorem 2.1 ([VZ03 Corollary 4.3] or [VZ02 Proposition 3.9]). Denote by \( \mathcal{L} := \Omega^{n}_{X/Y}(\log \Delta) \) the sheaf of top relative log differential forms (\( n \) is the dimension of a general fiber). Suppose that \( \text{Var}(f) = \dim Y \) (cf. [Kaw85 Section 1] for the definition). Then there exists an ample line bundle \( A \) on \( \bar{Y} \) and some integer \( \nu \gg 1 \) such that \( \mathcal{L}^{\nu} \otimes f^*A^{-\nu} \) is globally generated over \( V_0 := f^{-1}(U_0) \), where \( U_0 \) is some open dense subset of \( Y \).

By this theorem, we know that the linear system \( |\mathcal{L}^{\nu} \otimes f^*A^{-\nu}| \) has plenty of sections. For a section \( s \in H^0(\mathcal{L}^{\nu} \otimes f^*A^{-\nu}) \), we can get a cyclic covering of \( X \) by taking the \( \nu \)-th roots out of \( s \). We choose \( Z \) to be a desingularization of this covering and denote the induced morphisms by \( \psi : Z \to X \) and \( g : Z \to Y \). Obviously the new family \( g \) has a larger discriminant locus than \( S \) since one can only choose \( s \) such that the restriction of the zero divisor \( H \) on a general fiber of \( f \) is non-singular. Let \( T \) denote the discriminant of \( H \) over \( Y \). Then the restriction of \( g \) on \( Y \setminus (S \cup T) \) is smooth, which we denote by \( g_0 : Z_0 \to U_0 \).

2.1.1. The Higgs bundle coming from variation of Hodge structures. It is well known that the local system \( R^ng_0_*\mathcal{C}_Z \) induces a VHS on \( U_0 \). By blowing up the closure of \( S + T \) in \( \bar{Y} \) (which we denote by \( \bar{S} + \bar{T} \)), one can assume that \( \bar{S} + \bar{T} \) is normal crossing. So we can apply Deligne’s quasi-canonical extension and get a locally free sheaf \( \mathcal{V} \) on \( \bar{Y} \) with the Gauss-Manin connection:

\[
\nabla : \mathcal{V} \to \mathcal{V} \otimes \Omega^{1}_Y(\log (\bar{S} + \bar{T})).
\]

The Hodge filtrations \( \{\mathcal{F}^p\} \) can be extended as subbundles of \( \mathcal{V} \) as guaranteed by the nilpotent orbit theorem (cf. [Sch73,CKS86]). So the associated Hodge bundle

\[
E := \text{Gr}_{\mathcal{F}^*} \mathcal{V}
\]

is locally free on \( \bar{Y} \). And the induced Higgs map

\[
\theta := \text{Gr}_{\mathcal{F}^*} \nabla : E \to E \otimes \Omega^{1}_Y(\log (\bar{S} + \bar{T}))
\]

has logarithmic poles along \( \bar{S} + \bar{T} \). It is well known that one can write the Hodge bundle explicitly as higher direct image sheaves of log forms if the divisor \( \bar{S} + \bar{T} \) is smooth (cf. [Zuc84]). More precisely, if we denote \( Y_0 := Y \setminus \text{Sing}(\bar{S} + \bar{T}) \), then

\[
E^{p,q}|_{Y_0} \cong R^p g_* \Omega^{p}_Z(\log \Pi)|_{Y_0}
\]

\((q := n - p)\), where \( \Pi := g^{-1}(S \cup T) \) (\( \Pi \) can be assumed to be normal crossing after birational modification of \( Z \)). It is apparent that \( \text{codim}(\bar{Y} \setminus Y_0) \geq 2 \).

Remark. In the construction above we have already changed the birational model of \( U \) since we have to blow up \( T \) inside \( U \). It will be clear that this modification is allowed in our application.

2.1.2. The Higgs bundle coming from deformation theory. The Hodge bundle \((E, \theta)\) has extra logarithmic poles along \( T \), which is introduced artificially. To study the hyperbolicity of the original base space \( U \), we shall construct a Higgs bundle directly from the original family, whose Higgs map has logarithmic poles only along the boundary \( S \).

Like in [VZ03] and [VZ02], we shall use the tautological short exact sequences

\[
0 \to f^*\Omega^{1}_Y(\log S) \otimes \Omega^{p-1}_{X/Y}(\log \Delta) \to \text{gr}(\Omega^p_X(\log \Delta)) \to \Omega^{p}_{X/Y}(\log \Delta) \to 0
\]

where

\[
\text{gr}(\Omega^p_X(\log \Delta)) := \Omega^p_X(\log \Delta)/f^*\Omega^2_Y(\log S) \otimes \Omega^{p-2}_{X/Y}(\log \Delta).
\]
Note that the short exact sequence can be established only when \( f : (X, \Delta) \to (Y, S) \) is log smooth. Denote by \( \mathcal{L} = \Omega^n_{X/Y}(\log \Delta) \) as before. We define
\[
F_0^{p,q} := R^q f_* (\Omega^p_{X/Y}(\log \Delta) \otimes \mathcal{L}^{-1})/\text{torsion}
\]
together with the edge morphisms
\[
\tau_0^{p,q} : F_0^{p,q} \to F_0^{p-1,q+1} \otimes \Omega^1_Y(\log S),
\]
induced by the exact sequence (2.1), tensored with \( \mathcal{L}^{-1} \).

Remark. It is easy to see that \( \tau_0^{n,0} \) is nothing but the Kodaira-Spencer map of the family. So the Higgs maps \( \tau_0^{p,q} \) can be regarded as the generalized Kodaira-Spencer maps.

We denote by \( F^{p,q} \) the reflexive hull of \( F_0^{p,q} \) on \( \bar{Y} \). The Higgs maps \( \tau_0^{p,q} \) extends automatically since \( \text{codim}(\bar{Y} \setminus Y) \geq 2 \). So we get the Higgs sheaf \((F, \tau)\) defined on \( \bar{Y} \).

2.1.3. The comparison maps. In [VZ03, VZ02] Viehweg and Zuo constructed the following comparison maps \( \rho^{p,q} \), which connects \((F, \tau)\) and \((E, \theta)\).

**Lemma 2.2.** Using the same notations introduced above, let
\[
i : \Omega^1_Y(\log \bar{S}) \to \Omega^1_Y(\log (\bar{S} + T))
\]
be the natural inclusion. Then there exists morphisms \( \rho^{p,q} : F^{p,q} \to A^{-1} \otimes E^{p,q} \) such that the following diagram
\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
F^{p,q} & \xrightarrow{\tau^{p,q}} & F^{p-1,q+1} \otimes \Omega^1_Y(\log \bar{S}) \\
\rho^{p,q} \downarrow & & \rho^{p-1,q+1} \otimes \iota \downarrow \\
A^{-1} \otimes E^{p,q} & \xrightarrow{id \otimes \theta^{p,q}} & A^{-1} \otimes E^{p-1,q+1} \otimes \Omega^1_Y(\log (\bar{S} + T))
\end{array}
\]
commutes.

Remark. Note that our comparison map \( \rho^{p,q} \) is defined only on \( Y_0 \) \textit{a priori}, that is, a morphism between \( F^{p,q}|_{Y_0} \cong R^q f_* (\Omega^p_{X/Y}(\log \Delta) \otimes \mathcal{L}^{-1})|_{Y_0}/\text{torsion} \) and \( E^{p,q}|_{Y_0} \cong R^q g_* \Omega^p_{Z/Y}(\log \Pi)|_{Y_0} \). Since \( F^{p,q} \) is reflexive, \( E^{p,q} \) is locally free and \( \text{codim}(\bar{Y} \setminus Y_0) \geq 2 \), the comparison map \( \rho^{p,q} \) extends to \( \bar{Y} \).

2.1.4. The injectivity of the comparison map. In order to use the comparison map to construct a negatively curved Finsler metric, one need to show the pointwise injectivity of the comparison map
\[
(\rho^{n-1,1} \otimes \iota) \circ \tau^{n,0} : F^{n,0} \to A^{-1} \otimes E^{n-1,1} \otimes \Omega^1_Y(\log (\bar{S} + T))
\]
evaluated in each tangent vector.

Denote by \( \rho^{p,q}_y \) the restriction of \( \rho^{p,q} \) at a point \( y \in Y \). Then in [VZ03] Viehweg-Zuo obtained the injectivity in the following cases:

1) \( \rho^{n,0}_y \) is always injective for every \( y \in U \setminus T \).

2) If the family is canonically polarized, then \( \rho^{p,q}_y \) is injective for each \((p, q)\) with \( p + q = n \) and for every \( y \in U \setminus T \).

While the injectivity of all \( \rho^{p,q} \) follows from the Kodaira-Akizuki-Nakano vanishing theorem, we note that for the injectivity of \( \rho^{n-1,1} \) it suffices to use only the Bogomolov-Sommese vanishing theorem [PTW18], which holds true for varieties of general type. Hence one obtains
Theorem 2.3 (Viehweg-Zuo). Let $V \to U$ be a family of polarized varieties with semi-ample and big canonical divisors. Then the map $(\rho^{n-1,1} \otimes \iota) \circ \tau^n,0$ is injective at all the points in $U \setminus T$, evaluated in each tangent vector.

In the case of semi-ample canonical divisors, Viehweg-Zuo showed that

Theorem 2.4 (Viehweg-Zuo). Suppose that the family $V \to U$ has semi-ample canonical divisors. Then the map $\rho^{n-1,1} \otimes \iota \tau^n,0$ along any algebraic curve $\gamma : C \to U$ does not vanish.

The proof of Theorem 2.4 used a global argument relying on the Griffiths curvature computation for Hodge metric. Suppose that $(\rho^{n-1,1} \otimes \iota) \circ \tau^n,0$ vanishes along $\gamma(C)$. Then the image $\mathcal{O}_V = E^n,0 \subset E^n,0 \otimes A^{-1}$ falls into $\ker(\theta^{n,1}) \otimes A^{-1}$. Note that $\ker(\theta^{n,1})$ is semi-negatively curved for the degenerated Hodge metric (cf. [Zuo00]), which essentially follows from the Griffiths curvature computation for the degenerated Hodge metric. By taking integration of the curvature form of Hodge metric restricted to $\mathcal{O}_V$ one shows that the trivial line bundle is strictly negative because of the curvature decreasing for holomorphic sub bundle. This is of course a contradiction.

Very recently, Deng observed that the argument of Viehweg-Zuo can be made pointwisely, combining with a usual maximal principle argument. His argument runs as following: Instead of taking integration of the curvature form of Hodge metric, Deng evaluated the curvature form on a special point evaluated in some tangent vector vanishes, then the Griffiths curvature formula and the strict negativity of $A^{-1}$ implies that the the curvature form on $\mathcal{O}_V$ at $y_0$ is strictly negative along this tangent vector, which gives us a contradiction.

Theorem 2.5 ([Den18]). Suppose that the family $V \to U$ has semi-ample canonical divisors. Then the map $(\rho^{n-1,1} \otimes \iota) \circ \tau^n,0$ is injective at all points in a Zariski open subset of $U$, evaluated at each tangent vector. In particular, the analytic version of Theorem 2.4 holds true: the map $(\rho^{n-1,1} \otimes \iota) \circ \tau^n,0$ along any holomorphic curve $\gamma : C \to U$ with a Zariski dense image does not vanish.

Conjecture 2.6. Suppose that the family $V \to U$ has semi-ample canonical divisors. Then the map $(\rho^{n-1,1} \otimes \iota) \circ \tau^n,0$ is pointwisely injective for all the points in $U \setminus (S + T)$, evaluated at all the tangent vectors.

Conjecture 2.6 has been verified for family of Kodaira dimension one in a joint paper of the second and third named authors with Xin Lu [LSZ].

2.2. Maximal non-zero iterated Kodaira-Spencer maps. We shall consider the composition of Higgs maps

$$\tau^q := \tau^{n-q+1,q-1} \circ \cdots \circ \tau^{n,0} : E^n,0 \to E^{n-q,q} \otimes \bigotimes_{i=1}^q \Omega^1_Y(\log \overline{S})$$

which actually factors through

$$\tau^q : E^n,0 \to E^{n-q,q} \otimes \text{Sym}^q \Omega^1_Y(\log \overline{S})$$
since the Higgs field $\tau$ satisfies the integral condition $\tau \wedge \tau = 0$. Note that $O_Y$ is a subsheaf of $F^{n,0}$. Then we have the following composition map

$$Sym^q T_Y(-\log \bar{S}) \xrightarrow{\subset} F^{n,0} \otimes Sym^q T_Y(-\log \bar{S}) \xrightarrow{\tau^q \otimes id} F^{n-q,q} \otimes Sym^q \Omega^1_Y(\log \bar{S}) \otimes Sym^q T_Y(-\log \bar{S}) \xrightarrow{id \otimes \langle ., >} F^{n-q,q}$$

which will still be denoted as $\tau^q$ for the simplicity of notations. Composing $\tau^q$ with the comparison map, we get the \textit{iterated Kodaira-Spencer map}

$$Sym^q T_Y(-\log \bar{S}) \xrightarrow{\tau^q} F^{n-q,q} \xrightarrow{\rho^{n-q,q}} A^{-1} \otimes E^{n-q,q}. \quad (2.3)$$

\subsection{Maximal non-zero iteration.}

We define the \textit{maximal non-zero iterated Kodaira-Spencer map} to be the the $m$-th iterated Kodaira-Spencer map with $\rho^{n-m,m} \circ \tau^m(Sym^m T_Y(-\log \bar{S})) \neq 0$, and $m$ is the largest number satisfying this property. More precisely,

$$Sym^q T_Y(-\log \bar{S}) \xrightarrow{\rho^{n-m,m} \circ \tau^m \neq 0} A^{-1} \otimes E^{n-m,m} \xrightarrow{id \otimes \theta^{n-m,m}} A^{-1} \otimes E^{n-m-1,m+1} \otimes \Omega^1_Y(\log (\bar{S} + \bar{T})).$$

Apparently, $\text{Im}(\rho^{n-m,m} \circ \tau^m) \subset A^{-1} \otimes \text{Ker}(\theta^{n-m,m})$. We call this number $m$ the \textit{maximal length of iteration}.

\textbf{Lemma 2.7.} \textit{Keeping the assumptions above, we have that $\rho^{n-1,1} \circ \tau^1$ is injective at the generic point, evaluated at each tangent vector.}

\textit{Proof.} This follows from Theorem 2.4 when the canonical divisor of a general fiber of the family is semi-ample and big and from Theorem 2.5 when the canonical divisor of a general fiber of the family is semi-ample. \qed

\textbf{Corollary 2.8.} \textit{The maximal non-zero iterated Kodaira-Spencer map on $Y$. And its length $m$ is bounded by $1 \leq m \leq n$.}

\textit{Proof.} By Lemma 2.7 we know that at least $\rho^{n-1,1} \circ \tau^1$ is non-zero. The upper bound of $m$ follows from the fact that $\theta^{0,n} = 0$. \qed

\subsection{Maximal non-zero iterated Kodaira-Spencer map along an analytic map.}

In our application we shall consider an analytic map $\gamma$ from a quasi-projective curve $C$ to the base manifold $U$ (with Zariski dense image). So all the Higgs bundles will be pulled back to $C$, as well as the iteration process. We define the composition

$$\tau^q_{\gamma}: \gamma^* F^{p,q} \xrightarrow{\gamma^* \tau^q_{\bar{\gamma}}} \gamma^* F^{p-1,q+1} \otimes \gamma^* \Omega^1_Y(\log \bar{S}) \xrightarrow{id \otimes d\gamma} \gamma^* F^{p-1,q+1} \otimes \Omega^1_C,$$

as the \textit{Higgs map along $\gamma$}. We define $\theta_{\gamma}$ in the same manner. Then $(\gamma^* F, \tau_{\gamma})$ and $(\gamma^* E, \theta_{\gamma})$ are holomorphic Higgs bundles on the Riemann surface $C$. The iterated Kodaira-Spencer maps are defined in the similar way:

$$T^q_C \xrightarrow{\tau^q_{\gamma}} \gamma^* F^{n-q,q} \xrightarrow{\gamma^* \rho^{n-q,q}} \gamma^* A^{-1} \otimes \gamma^* E^{n-q,q}.$$
Corollary 2.9. The maximal non-zero iterated Kodaira-Spencer map along $\gamma$ exists, i.e., $m \geq 1$.

Proof. Since $\gamma(C) \subset U$ is Zariski dense, we know from Lemma 2.7 that $\rho^{n-1,1} \circ \tau_1^m$ is injective at all the points of $\gamma(C)$ contained in a Zariski open subset of $U$, evaluated at all tangent directions at those points. This implies that at least $\gamma^*(\rho^{n-1,1} \circ \tau_1^m)(T_C)$ is non-zero. □

By its definition, the maximal non-zero iterated Kodaira-Spencer map along $\gamma$ of the length $m$ has the properties: $\gamma^*(\rho^{n-m,m} \circ \tau_1^q)(T_C^{\otimes m}) \neq 0$ and $\text{Im}(\gamma^*(\rho^{n-m,m} \circ \tau_1^q)) \subset \gamma^* A^{-1} \otimes \text{Ker}(\theta_i)$. Those properties are crucial for constructing a negatively curved Finsler metric along $\gamma$ in section 2.3.

Remark. One should be warned that the maximal length of iteration along $\gamma$ could be shorter than the maximal length of iteration of the original family. This is because the iterated Kodaira-Spencer maps $\text{Sym}^q T_Y(-\log S) \xrightarrow[\rho^{n-q,q} \otimes q]{} A^{-1} \otimes E^{n-q,q}$ with $q > 1$ are not injective in general.

2.3. The Finsler pseudometric. Using the maximally iterated Kodaira-Spencer map

$$\text{Sym}^m T_Y(-\log S) \xrightarrow[\rho^{n-m,m} \circ \tau_1^m]{} A^{-1} \otimes E^{n-m,m},$$

one can now derive the hyperbolicity of the base manifold $U$. Note that there is a natural hermitian metric $g_A \otimes g_{\text{hod}}$ on $A^{-1} \otimes E^{n-m,m}$, where $g_A$ is the Fubini-Study metric of the ample line bundle $A$ and $g_{\text{hod}}$ is the Hodge metric on the Hodge bundle $E$. Pulling it back via $\rho^{n-m,m} \circ \tau_1^m$ and taking $m$-th root, we get a Finsler pseudometric on $T_Y(-\log S)$ which, for our purpose, has the right kind of curvature property. Viehweg and the third named author used some modified version of the Finsler pseudometric described above to derive the Brody hyperbolicity of $U$. Next we shall give the details about this modification.

2.3.1. Modification along the boundary. The following method of modifying metric appears in the first named author’s thesis about extending meromorphic maps [Lu91], as well as in [VZ03].

First we construct an auxiliary function associated to the boundary divisor $\bar{S}$. Denote by $\bar{S}_1, \ldots, \bar{S}_p$ the non-singular components of $\bar{S}$. Let $L_i$ be the line bundle with section $s_i$ such that $\bar{S}_i = \text{div}(s_i)$. Equip each $L_i$ with a smooth hermitian metric $g_i$. Let $l_i := -\log \|s_i\|_{g_i}^2$ and $l_S := l_1l_2 \cdots l_p$.

Recall that the Hodge metric $g_{\text{hod}}$ has extra degeneration along $\bar{T}$ since the Hodge bundle $(E, \theta)$ also has logarithmic poles along the divisor $\bar{T}$. Since $\gamma(C)$ intersects $\bar{T}$ in general, it is necessary to construct another auxiliary function which can control the asymptotic behaviour of $g_{\text{hod}}$ near $\bar{T}$. We construct an auxiliary function associated to $\bar{T}$ in a similar manner as $l_S$. Denote by $\bar{T}_1, \ldots, \bar{T}_q$ the non-singular components of $\bar{T}$. Let $L'_i$ be the line bundle with section $t_i$ such that $\bar{T}_i = \text{div}(t_i)$. Equip each $L'_i$ with a smooth hermitian metric $g_i'$. Let $l'_i := -\log \|t_i\|_{g_i'}^2$ and $l_T := l'_1l'_2 \cdots l'_q$.

Now for each positive integer $\alpha$, we define a new singular hermitian metric $g_\alpha := g_A \cdot l_S^\alpha \cdot l_T^\alpha$ on the ample line bundle $A$. Furthermore, for a carefully chosen $\alpha$, the singular hermitian metric $g_\alpha$ will enjoy the following special curvature property:

Lemma 2.10. For $1 \leq q \leq n$, there exists a positive integer $\alpha$ (depends on $q$) such that

$$\Theta(A, g_\alpha)(v \wedge \bar{v}) \gtrsim \|\rho^{n-q,q} \circ \tau^q(v \otimes \bar{v})\|_{g_\alpha}^{2/q}$$

for $v \in T_Y(-\log \bar{S})$. 

Remark. As we mentioned above, the first named author used this type of modification of metrics to prove his extension theorem (cf. \cite{Lu91 §4}). Later, Viehweg and the third named author applied it to the situation where the metric comes from the family and obtained the curvature estimate in Lemma \ref{gauge} (cf. \cite{VZ03 §7}). Since the family concerned in \cite{VZ03} is canonically polarized, one can move the branch divisor of the cyclic covering such that the discriminant locus $T$ intersects with the analytic curve $\gamma(C)$ only at the smooth part of $T$, and the intersection is transversal. Then, the monodromy of the pull-back local system around $\gamma^*T$ is finite, and the pull-back Hodge metric $\gamma^*g_{\text{hod}}$ is bounded (see section 5 of \cite{VZ03} for details). Popa-Taji-Wu observed that a similar modification along $T$ applies without violating the curvature estimate and choose $\alpha$ sufficiently large such that the singular hermitian metric $g_{\alpha}^{-1} \otimes g_{\text{hod}}$ is bounded near $T$ (cf. \cite{PTW18 §3.1}).

Remark. In fact $\Theta(A,g_{\alpha})$ can dominate $\Theta(A,g_A)$, where $g_A$ is the Fubini-Study metric on $A$. Thus $\Theta(A,g_{\alpha})$ can dominate the Kähler form $\omega_{FS} = \Theta(A,g_A)$ on $Y$. This follows from the inequalities

$$\Theta(A,g_{\alpha}) = \Theta(A,g_A \cdot l_S^1 \cdot l_T^2) = \Theta(A,g_A) - \alpha \Sigma \frac{ddc_i l_i}{l_i} - \alpha \Sigma \frac{ddc'_i l'_i}{l'_i} + \frac{1}{2\pi} \alpha \Sigma \frac{\partial l_i \wedge \overline{\partial} l_i}{l_i^2} + \frac{1}{2\pi} \alpha \Sigma \frac{\partial l'_i \wedge \overline{\partial} l'_i}{l'_i^2} \geq \Theta(A,g_A) - \alpha \Sigma \frac{ddc_i l_i}{l_i} - \alpha \Sigma \frac{ddc'_i l'_i}{l'_i} \geq c \cdot \Theta(A,g_A)$$

(note that one can rescale $g_i$ (resp. $g'_i$) to make $l_i$ (resp. $l'_i$) sufficiently large and leave $ddc_i l_i$ (resp. $ddc'_i l'_i$) unchanged). Here $c$ is some positive constant.

2.3.2. The curvature bound. Now we consider an analytic map $\gamma$ between a quasi-projective curve $C$ and the base manifold $U$. Denote by $m$ the maximal length of iteration along $\gamma$.

It is very natural to use the hermitian metric $g_{\alpha} \otimes g_{\text{hod}}$ and the iterated Kodaira-Spencer map to construct a Finsler pseudometric $F_\alpha$ on $Y(-\log S)$:

$$\|v\|_{F_\alpha}^2 := \|\rho^{n-m} \circ \tau^m (v_{\otimes m})^{2/m} g_{\alpha}^{-1} \otimes g_{\text{hod}}\|_Y^2, \text{ for } v \in T_Y(-\log S). \quad (2.5)$$

Using Lemma \ref{gauge}, Viehweg and the third named author successfully got the negative upper bound of the holomorphic sectional curvature of $F_\alpha$ along the analytic curve $\gamma(C)$ (cf. \cite{Kob98 Chapter 2, §2 and §3} for the definition of the holomorphic sectional curvature of a Finsler pseudometric).

**Theorem 2.11** (Viehweg-Zuo). Fix the analytic map $\gamma: C \to U$. Then there exists a positive integer $\alpha$ (which depends on $m$ the maximal length along $\gamma$) and a positive constant $c_\alpha$ (which depends on $\alpha$) such that

$$K_{F_\alpha}(v) \leq -c_\alpha$$

where $v := \gamma'(z)$ is any nonzero tangent vector of $\gamma$.

**Proof.** Lemma 7.6 + Lemma 7.7 in \cite{VZ03}. \qed

We shall remark that those curvature estimate can be established only if we know that the Hodge metric has at most logarithmic growth near the boundary. The study of the asymptotic behavior of the Hodge metric in the higher dimensional case in \cite{CKS86} guaranteed this (cf. Claim 7.8 in \cite{VZ03}). Since the metric $g_{\alpha}^{-1}$ on $A^{-1}$ decays to zero near $\tilde{S} + T$ with the rate $\prod (-\log |z_i|^2)^{-\alpha}$, one can choose $\alpha$ sufficiently large so that $g_{\alpha}^{-1} \otimes g_{\text{hod}}$ is bounded near $\tilde{S} + T$. Then the inequality in Lemma \ref{gauge} follows from the compactness of $Y$. This lemma and Theorem 2.11 will play a crucial role in the derivation of the defect relations associated to $\gamma: C \to U$.

**Remark.** Although $C = \mathbb{C}$ in \cite{VZ03}, all the arguments above go through for a general Riemann surface $C$, except the final step in \cite{VZ03} Lemma 7.9 where the Ahlfors-Schwarz lemma is used.
Before entering the next section, we list the points here as a summary, which are crucial to the Nevanlinna-theoretic arguments we present here:

- **logarithmic growth of the Hodge metric near boundary**: In fact this is the crucial point of Viehweg-Zuo’s curvature estimates; and those estimates are crucial to our argument.

- **local boundedness of the Finsler metric near \( \bar{T} \)**: It’s used in our definition of the Nevanlinna characteristic function.

### 3. Holomorphic curves into moduli space

Let \( \gamma : C \to U \) be an analytic map from a quasi-projective curve \( C \) to the base space \( U \) as before. We want to show that this analytic map is actually an algebraic morphism.

Remember that one needs to change the birational model of \( U \) in the construction of those two Higgs bundles \((F, \tau)\) and \((E, \theta)\). In our application, we can always assume that the image of \( \gamma \) is Zariski dense by simply replacing \( \bar{Y} \) by the Zariski closure of \( \gamma(C) \). Then the analytic map can lift to \( \tilde{\gamma} : C \to \tilde{U} \), where \( \tilde{U} \) is the new birational model of the original base space. Clearly, it suffices to prove the algebraicity for the lifted \( \tilde{\gamma} \). We will still use the notation \( \gamma : C \to U \) hereafter.

First we can choose a general projection \( \pi : C \subset \mathbb{C}^N \to \mathbb{C} \). So we have the following diagram:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
C & \xrightarrow{\gamma} & U \\
\downarrow{\pi} & & \downarrow{\pi} \\
\mathbb{C} & & \\
\end{array}
\]

Recall that in [2.3.2] we have defined a Finsler pseudometric \( F_\alpha \) on \( T_Y(-\log S) \) as following:

\[
\|v\|^2_{F_\alpha} := \|\rho^{n-m,m} \circ \tau^m(v^{\otimes m})\|^{2/m}_{g_{\alpha}^{1\otimes \text{hod}}} , \text{ for } v \in T_Y(-\log S).
\]

Then the pull-back metric \((d\gamma)^*F_\alpha\) induces a semi-positive hermitian \((1,1)\)-form \( \omega_\gamma \) on \( C \).

Now take any ample line bundle \( L \) on \( \bar{Y} \) and any section \( \sigma \in H^0(\bar{Y}, L) \). We consider the pull-back section \( \sigma_\gamma := \gamma^*\sigma \in H^0(C, \gamma^*L) \) and the associated analytic divisor \( D_\gamma \) of \( \sigma_\gamma \) on \( C \). We shall estimate the rate of growth of \( D_\gamma \).

Now we define

\[
\begin{cases}
\varphi := \pi^*dd^c|z|^2, & \text{the pull-back of the standard volume form on } \mathbb{C} \\
\theta_\varepsilon := \|\sigma_\varepsilon\|^2_{g_L} \cdot \omega_\gamma = \xi_\varepsilon \cdot \varphi, & g_L \text{ is the Fubini-Study metric on } L \\
T(r) := \int_0^r \frac{dt}{t} \int_{C[t]} \omega_\gamma, & \text{here } C[t] := \pi^{-1}(\Delta(t)).
\end{cases}
\]

Note that the **Nevanlinna characteristic function** \( T(r) \) is usually defined by taking integration \( \int_0^r \frac{dt}{t} \int_{C[t]} \bullet \) of the pull back of \( \omega_{FS} \). For our purpose we shall use the \((1,1)\)-form \( \omega_\gamma \) induced by the modified metric. By the remark below Theorem 2.11 we know that \( \omega_\gamma \) is locally bounded near \( \gamma^*\bar{T} \) and thus this integration makes sense.

Recall that for a \((1,1)\)-form \( \alpha \) on a Riemann surface, its Ricci form can be defined as following. Under a local coordinate system we write \( \alpha \) as \( \sqrt{-1}f \, dz \wedge d\bar{z} \). Then \( \text{Ric}(\alpha) := dd^c \log f \). Here we
follow the definition of Griffiths-King [GK73], which differs from Kobayashi [Kob98] by a minus sign.

Thus we have the following equalities:

\[
\text{Ric}(\|\sigma_\gamma\|^2_{g_L}, \omega_\gamma) = \text{Ric}(\theta_\varepsilon) = \text{Ric}(\xi_\varepsilon \cdot \varphi).
\]  

(3.1)

Computing the left hand side we get
\[
\text{LHS} = -\varepsilon g^* \Theta(L, g_L) + \varepsilon D_\gamma + \text{Ric}(\omega_\gamma) = -\varepsilon g^* \omega_{FS} + \varepsilon D_\gamma + \text{Ric}(\omega_\gamma).
\]

Note that \( \omega_\gamma = \sqrt{-1} \|g'(z)\|^2_{F_c} dz \wedge \overline{dz} \). So \( \text{Ric}(\omega_\gamma) = dd^c \log \|g'(z)\|^2_{F_c} = -\Theta(T_C, (d\gamma)^* F_\alpha) + R \), where \( R \) is the ramification divisor of \( \gamma \). Denote by \( N \) the image of \( d\gamma : T_C \to \gamma^* T_Y \). Then we have the following curvature estimate

\[
\Theta(T_C, (d\gamma)^* F_\alpha) = \Theta(N, g^* F_\alpha) = \frac{1}{m} \Theta(N \otimes_m, g^* F^{\otimes_m})
\]

\[
\leq \frac{1}{m} \gamma^* \Theta(\text{Sym}^m T_Y (-\log S), (\rho^{-m,m} \circ \tau^m)^* (g_\alpha^{-1} \otimes g_{\text{hod}})) |_{N \otimes_m}
\]

\[
\leq \frac{1}{m} \gamma^* \Theta(A^{-1} \otimes E, g_\alpha^{-1} \otimes g_{\text{hod}}) |_{\gamma^* (\rho^{-m,m} \circ \tau^m)(N \otimes_m)}
\]

\[
= -\frac{1}{m} \gamma^* \Theta(A, g_\alpha) + \frac{1}{m} \gamma^* \Theta(E, g_{\text{hod}}) |_{\gamma^* A \otimes \gamma^* (\rho^{-m,m} \circ \tau^m)(N \otimes_m)}.
\]

Recall that we choose the integer \( m \) to be the maximal length of iteration along \( \gamma \). Therefore, the image \( \gamma^* A \otimes \gamma^* (\rho^{-m,m} \circ \tau^m)(N \otimes_m) \) falls into the kernel of \( \theta_\gamma \) and thus the last term \( \gamma^* \Theta(E, g_{\text{hod}}) |_{\gamma^* A \otimes \gamma^* (\rho^{-m,m} \circ \tau^m)(N \otimes_m)} \) is semi-negative by the Griffiths curvature computation (see [Sch73 Lemma (7.18)] and [Zuo00] for details). So we have

\[
\Theta(T_C, (d\gamma)^* F_\alpha) \leq -\frac{1}{m} \gamma^* \Theta(A, g_\alpha).
\]

And

\[
\text{Ric}(\omega_\gamma) \geq \frac{1}{m} \gamma^* \Theta(A, g_\alpha) + R.
\]

Since one can choose \( \varepsilon \ll 1 \) such that \( \frac{1}{2m} \Theta(A, g_\alpha) \geq \varepsilon \omega_{FS} \) (cf. the remark below Lemma 2.10),

\[
\text{LHS} \geq \varepsilon D_\gamma - \varepsilon \varepsilon g^* \omega_{FS} + \frac{1}{m} \gamma^* \Theta(A, g_\alpha) + R \geq \varepsilon D_\gamma + \frac{1}{2m} \gamma^* \Theta(A, g_\alpha) + R.
\]

Thanks to Lemma 2.10, we are able to find a constant \( c_1 > 0 \) such that

\[
\frac{1}{2m} \gamma^* \Theta(A, g_\alpha) \geq c_1 \omega_\gamma.
\]

In fact this is how we get the curvature bound in Theorem 2.11. So we get the following estimate:

\[
\text{LHS} \geq \varepsilon D_\gamma + c_1 \omega_\gamma + R.
\]

Now we deal with the right hand side of eq.(3.1):

\[
\text{RHS} = d\bar{d} \log \xi_\varepsilon + \text{Ric}(\varphi) = d\bar{d} \log \xi_\varepsilon + B,
\]

where \( B \) is the ramification divisor of \( \pi : C \to \mathbb{C} \). Note that \( B \) is algebraic since \( \pi \) is.

The above discussion gives the following inequality:

\[
\varepsilon D_\gamma + c_1 \omega_\gamma + R \leq d\bar{d} \log \xi_\varepsilon + B.
\]
Applying \( \int_0^r \frac{dt}{t} \int_{C[t]} \bullet \) to both side, we get
\[
\varepsilon N(D_{\gamma}, r) + c_1 T(r) + N(R, r) \leq \int_0^r \frac{dt}{t} \int_{C[t]} dd^* \log \xi + N(B, r).
\]
Here \( N(D, r) \) is the counting function of an analytic divisor \( D \).

We define a new function \( \xi \) on \( C \) such that \( \omega_{\gamma} = \xi \cdot \varphi \). Obviously \( \xi = \| \sigma_{\gamma} \|_{L^\infty} \cdot \xi \). Note that we can rescale \( g_L \) so that \( \| \sigma_{\gamma} \|_{L^\infty} \leq 1 \) since \( Y \) is compact. Thus we have \( \xi \leq 1 \).

By using Green-Jensen’s formula (cf. [Ru01, Page 52, Lemma A2.1.3]), we have
\[
\int_0^r \frac{dt}{t} \int_{C[t]} dd^* \log \xi = \int_{\partial C[r]} \log \xi \cdot d^c \pi^* \log |z| + O(1).
\]
The constant term depends on the values of \( \xi \) at \( C[0] = \pi^{-1}(0) \) (and is independent of \( r \)). Here we assume that \( \xi \neq 0 \) on \( C[0] \). This can be guaranteed via a sufficiently general projection \( \pi : C \to \mathbb{C} \).

Now we define the proximity function \( \mu(r) := \int_{\partial C[r]} \log \xi \cdot d^c \pi^* \log |z| \) and get the inequality
\[
\varepsilon N(D_{\gamma}, r) + c_1 T(r) + N(R, r) \leq \mu(r) + N(B, r) + O(1).
\] (3.2)
Since \( B \) is algebraic, we know that \( N(B, r) \leq d \cdot \log r \) for \( d = \#B \). Then eq. (3.2) becomes
\[
\varepsilon N(D_{\gamma}, r) + c_1 T(r) \leq \mu(r) + (d + 1) \cdot \log r.
\]
In order to derive the “defect relation” in the next section, we need to estimate the function \( \mu(r) \).

**Lemma 3.1.** Denote by \( \frac{d}{ds} := r \cdot \frac{dr}{ds} \) the logarithmic derivative. Then
\[
\mu(r) \leq \log \frac{d^2 T(r)}{ds^2} + O(\log r).
\]

**Proof.** By direct computation one finds that
\[
\frac{1}{r} \frac{d}{dr} \left( \frac{d}{dr} T(r) \right) = \int_{\partial C[r]} \xi \cdot d^c \pi^* \log |z|.
\]
Using the concavity of the logarithmic function, we obtain
\[
\mu(r) = \int_{\partial C[r]} \log \xi \cdot d^c \pi^* \log |z| \leq \log \int_{\partial C[r]} \xi \cdot d^c \pi^* \log |z|
\]
\[
= \log \left\{ \frac{1}{r} \frac{d}{dr} \left( r \frac{d}{dr} T(r) \right) \right\} = \log \left\{ r^{-2} \cdot \frac{d^2 T(r)}{ds^2} \right\}
\]
\[
= -2 \log r + \log \frac{d^2 T(r)}{ds^2}.
\]
\[\square\]
By using the Calculus lemma (cf. [Ru01, Page 53, Lemma A2.1.4]) twice, we can choose positive constants \( \epsilon \) and \( \delta \) such that
\[
\frac{d^2 T(r)}{ds^2} \leq r^{2+\epsilon} \cdot T(r)^{2+\delta} \cdot ||, \]
where \( || \) here means that the inequality holds for \( r \) outside a set of finite Lebesque measure in \( \mathbb{R} \).
So we get the estimate for \( \mu(r) \):
\[
\mu(r) \leq (2 + \delta) \log T(r) + O(\log r) ||.
\]
Combining this with the eq. (3.2), we get the inequality

\[ \varepsilon N(D_\gamma, r) + c_1 T(r) \leq (2 + \delta) \log T(r) + c_2 \cdot \log r \]  

(3.3)

for some constant \( c_2 > 0 \).

4. The defect relations and Borel hyperbolicity

We now use the inequality (3.3) to derive defect relations. Dividing (3.3) by \( T(r) \) and taking limits for \( r \to \infty \) on both sides, we have

\[ c_1 + \varepsilon \cdot \liminf_{r \to \infty} \frac{N(D_\gamma, r)}{T(r)} \leq c_2 \cdot \limsup_{r \to \infty} \frac{\log r}{T(r)} \]

So we get a lower bound

\[ \limsup_{r \to \infty} \frac{\log r}{T(r)} \geq \frac{c_1}{c_2} > 0 \]

which means by considering an appropriate sequence \( r_k \to \infty \) and the monotonicity of \( T(r) \) that

\[ T(r) \leq c_3 \cdot \log r, \quad \text{for } r \gg 0. \]

On the other hand, we know that \( T(r) \gtrsim \log r \) always holds since \( \omega_\gamma \geq 0 \) on \( C \) and \( \omega_\gamma \not\equiv 0 \). Thus we can get an upper bound

\[ c_1 + \varepsilon \cdot \liminf_{r \to \infty} \frac{N(D_\gamma, r)}{T(r)} \leq c_2 \cdot \limsup_{r \to \infty} \frac{\log r}{T(r)} \leq C \]

for some constant \( C > 0 \). Hence, we get similarly the inequalities

\[ N(D_\gamma, r) \leq C' \cdot T(r) \leq C'' \cdot \log r \quad \text{for } r \gg 0. \]

Since our divisor \( D_\sigma := \text{div}(\sigma) \) is an arbitrary ample divisor on \( Y \), the analytic divisor \( D_\gamma \) is actually algebraic, this said fact being the content of Proposition 4.1 of [GK73]. This latter proposition as observed in op. cit. follows either from basic considerations via the classical first main theorem, in appropriate forms, or from the classical basic fact that \( \gamma \) is algebraic (i.e. rational) if its usual charateristic function \( T(r, \omega_{FS}) \) or that of its compositions with the projections \( \pi \) to \( \mathbb{P}^1 \) is \( O(\log r) \)2, which as in op. cit. now derives easily from any classical version of the second main theorem for maps into projective space \( \mathbb{P}^n \) (for the case \( n = 1 \) since we can compose with \( \pi \)) in the form

\[ \epsilon T(r, \omega_{FS}) \leq \sum_{i=0}^{n+1} N(r, \gamma^* H_i) + O(\log r T(r, \omega_{FS}) \|, \]

where \( \sum_{i=0}^{n+1} H_i \) is given by the divisor in \( \mathbb{P}^n \) of the homogeneous polynomial \( (\sum_{i=0}^{n+1} z_i) \Pi_{i=0}^{n+1} z_i \).

Therefore, we get the following big-Picard-type theorem.

2Even if the source \( C \) of \( \gamma \) is a higher dimensional algebraic variety, it suffice to obtain our Borel extension theorem 4.2 to have extension of \( \gamma \) in codimension one by the Hartog extension theorem. We are thus reduced to the case \( C \) is a curve and algebraicity of \( \pi \circ \gamma \) with its (usual) characteristic function bounded by \( O(\log r) \) then follows from an elementary classical argument, see e.g. the last theorem of [NW14, p.10] or of [Lan87, p.170].
Theorem 4.1 (Big Picard theorem). Let $f : V \to U$ be a family of polarized manifolds with semi-ample canonical divisors. Suppose that the classifying map from $U$ to the moduli space induced by the family is quasi-finite. Let $\gamma : C \to U$ be any analytic map from any quasi-projective curve $C$ to $U$. Then this analytic map is an algebraic morphism.

Corollary 4.2 (Borel hyperbolicity). Let $f : V \to U$ be a family as above. Then the base space $U$ is Borel hyperbolic.

Proof. This follows from holomorphic extension in codimension one of the source map $\gamma$ into $U$ by the above theorem and Hartog extension of meromorphic functions across co-dimension two. □
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