

RELATIONS BETWEEN TWO LOG MINIMAL MODELS OF LOG CANONICAL PAIRS

KENTA HASHIZUME

ABSTRACT. We study relations between two log minimal models of a fixed lc pair. For any two log minimal models of an lc pair constructed with log MMP, we prove that there are small birational models of the log minimal models which can be connected by a sequence of flops, and the two log minimal models share some properties. We also give examples of two log minimal models of an lc pair which have different properties.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Preliminaries	3
3. Proofs of main results	5
4. Examples	12
References	17

1. INTRODUCTION

Throughout this paper we work over the complex number field \mathbb{C} , and log minimal model means log minimal model in the classical sense ([KM, Definition 3.50]).

For any projective lc pair whose log canonical divisor is pseudo-effective, it is expected that there exists at least one log minimal model of the lc pair. The main technique to construct a log minimal model is the log minimal model program (log MMP, for short), and it is conjectured that all log MMP terminate after finitely many steps. In the case of surfaces, it is known that log minimal model of any lc surface is unique. On the other hand, when the dimension of the underlying variety of an lc pair is more than two, log minimal models of the lc pair are not uniquely determined. Therefore, it is natural to investigate relations between resulting log minimal models of log MMP starting with a fixed lc pair. It is known by Birkar–Cascini–Hacon–McKernan that any two \mathbb{Q} -factorial log minimal models of a klt pair with a big boundary divisor are connected by a sequence of flops ([BCHM, Corollary 1.1.3]). On the other hand, Kawamata [Ka] proved that any birational map between two \mathbb{Q} -factorial terminal pairs over a variety with relatively nef log canonical divisors can be decomposed into a sequence of flops. In this paper, we aim to generalize these results to not necessarily \mathbb{Q} -factorial lc pairs. Recently, the author

Date: 2019/12/11, version 0.16.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. primary: 14E30, secondary: 14E05.

Key words and phrases. lc pair, extremal contraction, flop.

and Hu [HH] proved that for any not necessarily \mathbb{Q} -factorial lc pair over a variety, if its \mathbb{Q} -factorial dlt model has a log minimal model then we can run a log MMP for the lc pair terminating with a log minimal model. So it is natural to consider generalizations to lc pairs.

For any two log minimal models (X, Δ) and (X', Δ') of a given lc pair constructed by running log MMP, the naturally induced birational map $\phi: X \dashrightarrow X'$ has three important properties: ϕ is small (i.e., isomorphic in codimension one), $\phi_*\Delta = \Delta'$, and there is an open subset $U \subset X$ such that ϕ is an isomorphism on U and all lc centers of (X, Δ) intersect U . Taking this into consideration, in this paper, we deal with lc pairs (X, Δ) and (X', Δ') over a variety Z such that $K_X + \Delta$ and $K_{X'} + \Delta'$ are nef over Z and there is a birational map $\phi: X \dashrightarrow X'$ satisfying the three conditions stated above.

The following theorems are main results of this paper.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $\pi: X \rightarrow Z$ and $\pi': X' \rightarrow Z$ be projective morphisms from normal quasi-projective varieties to a quasi-projective variety Z , and let (X, Δ) and (X', Δ') be lc pairs such that $K_X + \Delta$ and $K_{X'} + \Delta'$ are nef over Z . Suppose that there is a small birational map $\phi: X \dashrightarrow X'$ over Z such that*

- $\Delta' = \phi_*\Delta$, and
- *there is an open subset $U \subset X$ on which ϕ is an isomorphism and all lc centers of (X, Δ) intersect U .*

Then, there are projective small birational morphisms $f: \overline{X} \rightarrow X$ and $f': \overline{X}' \rightarrow X'$ from normal quasi-projective varieties such that f and f' are compositions of extremal contractions and the induced birational map $f'^{-1} \circ \phi \circ f: \overline{X} \dashrightarrow \overline{X}'$ is a composition of flops for $K_{\overline{X}} + f_^{-1}\Delta$ over Z*

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} \overline{X} = \overline{X}_0 & \xrightarrow{\varphi_0} & \overline{X}_1 & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \cdots & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \overline{X}_i & \xrightarrow{\varphi_i} & \overline{X}_{i+1} & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \cdots & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \overline{X}_l = \overline{X}' \\ & \searrow & \swarrow & & & & \searrow & \swarrow & & & & & \swarrow \\ & & V_0 & & & & & V_i & & & & & \end{array}$$

satisfying the following property:

- (*) *For any $0 \leq i < l$, the birational morphisms $\overline{X}_i \rightarrow V_i$ and $\overline{X}_{i+1} \rightarrow V_i$ of the flop are extremal contractions.*

In particular, \overline{X}_i is \mathbb{Q} -factorial if and only if \overline{X}_{i+1} is \mathbb{Q} -factorial for any $0 \leq i < l$, and each φ_i induces an isomorphic linear map $\varphi_{i}: N^1(\overline{X}_i/Z)_{\mathbb{R}} \rightarrow N^1(\overline{X}_{i+1}/Z)_{\mathbb{R}}$.*

Theorem 1.2. *Let $\pi: X \rightarrow Z$, $\pi': X' \rightarrow Z$, (X, Δ) , (X', Δ') and $\phi: X \dashrightarrow X'$ be as in Theorem 1.1. Then the followings hold true.*

- *X has a small \mathbb{Q} -factorialization if and only if X' has a small \mathbb{Q} -factorialization,*
- *there is an isomorphism $R^p\pi_*\mathcal{O}_X \xrightarrow{\sim} R^p\pi'_*\mathcal{O}_{X'}$ of sheaves for any $p > 0$, and*
- *for any Cartier divisor D on X such that $D \equiv_Z r(K_X + \Delta)$ for an $r \in \mathbb{R}$, the birational transform ϕ_*D is Cartier and $\phi_*D \equiv_Z r(K_{X'} + \Delta')$.*

For definition of extremal contractions, see Definition 2.1. We emphasize that D and ϕ_*D in the third assertion of Theorem 1.2 are Cartier. In proofs of the main results, a result of non- \mathbb{Q} -factorial log MMP ([HH, Theorem 1.7]) plays a crucial role.

By Theorem 1.2, we obtain the following result.

Corollary 1.3. *Let $X \rightarrow Z$ be a projective morphism from a normal quasi-projective variety to a quasi-projective variety and (X, Δ) an lc pair such that Δ is a boundary \mathbb{Q} -divisor. Let $(X, \Delta) \dashrightarrow (Y, \Gamma)$ and $(X, \Delta) \dashrightarrow (Y', \Gamma')$ be two sequences of steps of the $(K_X + \Delta)$ -MMP over Z to log minimal models. Then the followings hold true.*

- *the Cartier index of $K_Y + \Gamma$ coincides with that of $K_{Y'} + \Gamma'$, and*
- *when Z is a point, $\text{Pic}(Y)_{\mathbb{R}} \simeq N^1(Y)_{\mathbb{R}}$ if and only if $\text{Pic}(Y')_{\mathbb{R}} \simeq N^1(Y')_{\mathbb{R}}$.*

Unfortunately, there are two (not necessarily \mathbb{Q} -factorial) log minimal models of an lc pair which cannot be connected by a sequence of flops (see Example 4.1). In addition to this example, in Section 4, we introduce various examples related to the main results. In Example 4.2, we give a flop for an lc pair which does not satisfy the condition (*) in Theorem 1.1. In Example 4.3, we give two projective lc pairs with nef log canonical divisors such that the two lc pairs are isomorphic in codimension one but the assertion of Theorem 1.1 and the three assertions of Theorem 1.2 does not hold (for the second assertion of Theorem 1.2, see also Example 4.4). In particular, Example 4.3 shows that to prove the same conclusions as in Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.2, the hypothesis on the existence of an open subset is necessary. Related to Corollary 1.3, in Example 4.6, we construct two projective lc pairs with nef log canonical divisors such that the pairs are isomorphic in codimension one and Cartier indices of the log canonical divisors are different. Ideas of examples 4.2–4.4 and 4.6 are inspired by [Ko, Exercise 96] (see also [F2, Example 7.7]), and these examples are similar to [F3, Example 3.13.9] by Fujino, which shows that flops do not always preserve dlt property.

The contents of this paper are as follows: In Section 2, we collect some definitions. In Section 3, we prove Theorem 1.1, Theorem 1.2 and Corollary 1.3. In Section 4, we give some examples.

Acknowledgments. The author was partially supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number JP19J00046. He thanks Professor Yoshinori Gongyo, Doctor Masaru Nagaoka and Doctor Shou Yoshikawa for discussions and comments. He thanks Professor Osamu Fujino for comments and informing him of [F3, Example 3.13.9].

2. PRELIMINARIES

Divisors and morphisms. Let $\pi: X \rightarrow Z$ be a projective morphism from a normal variety to a variety, and let D_1 and D_2 be two \mathbb{R} -Cartier divisors on X . Then D_1 and D_2 are *numerically equivalent over Z* , denoted by $D_1 \equiv_Z D_2$, if $(D_1 \cdot C) = (D_2 \cdot C)$ for all curves $C \subset X$ contained in a fiber of π . When $D_1 \equiv_Z 0$, we say D_1 is *numerically trivial over Z* . Let $N^1(X/Z)_{\mathbb{R}}$ be the \mathbb{R} -vector space consisting of all \mathbb{R} -Cartier divisors on X modulo numerical equivalence over Z . Then the *relative Picard number* $\rho(X/Z)$ is defined by the dimension of $N^1(X/Z)_{\mathbb{R}}$. It is known that $\rho(X/Z) < \infty$. When Z is a point we remove Z in the above notations, i.e., $D_1 \equiv D_2$, $D_1 \equiv 0$, $N^1(X)_{\mathbb{R}}$, and $\rho(X)$.

Definition 2.1 (Contraction and extremal contraction, see also [KM, Definition 3.34]). Let $f: X \rightarrow Y$ be a projective morphism from a normal variety to a variety. Then f is a *contraction* if f is surjective and has connected fibers. A contraction f is an *extremal contraction* if for any two Cartier divisors D_1 and D_2 , there are $a_1, a_2 \in \mathbb{Z}$ which are not both zero and a Cartier divisor D_Y on Y such that $a_1 D_1 - a_2 D_2 \sim f^* D_Y$.

Singularities of pairs. A *pair* (X, Δ) consists of a normal variety X and a boundary \mathbb{R} -divisor Δ on X such that $K_X + \Delta$ is \mathbb{R} -Cartier. For any pair (X, Δ) and any prime divisor P over X , we denote by $a(P, X, \Delta)$ the discrepancy of P with respect to (X, Δ) . In this paper, we use the standard definitions of Kawamata log terminal (klt, for short) pair, log canonical (lc, for short) pair and divisorially log terminal (dlt, for short) pair as in [BCHM]. When (X, Δ) is an lc pair, an *lc center* of (X, Δ) is the image on X of a prime divisor P over X whose discrepancy $a(P, X, \Delta)$ is equal to -1 .

Models. We define some models used in this paper.

Definition 2.2. In this paper, weak lc models, log minimal models and log canonical models are defined in the classical sense ([KM, Definition 3.50]).

Let (X, Δ) be an lc pair and $X \rightarrow Z$ a projective morphism to a variety. Let $X' \rightarrow Z$ be a projective morphism from a normal variety and let $\phi: X \dashrightarrow X'$ be a birational contraction over Z such that $K_{X'} + \phi_*\Delta$ is \mathbb{R} -Cartier. Put $\Delta' = \phi_*\Delta$. Then the pair (X', Δ') is a *weak log canonical model* (*weak lc model*, for short) of (X, Δ) over Z if

- $K_{X'} + \Delta'$ is nef over Z , and
- for any prime divisor D on X which is exceptional over X' , we have

$$a(D, X, \Delta) \leq a(D, X', \Delta').$$

A weak lc model (X', Δ') of (X, Δ) over Z is a *log minimal model* if

- the above inequality on discrepancies is strict.

A log minimal model (X', Δ') of (X, Δ) over Z is a *good minimal model* if

- $K_{X'} + \Delta'$ is semi-ample over Z .

A weak lc model (X', Δ') of (X, Δ) over Z is a *log canonical model* if

- $K_{X'} + \Delta'$ is ample over Z .

In this paper, we do not assume log minimal models to be \mathbb{Q} -factorial or dlt. Thanks to [HH, Theorem 1.7], if an lc pair has a weak lc model in the sense of Definition 2.2 and all the varieties are quasi-projective, then the lc pair has a log minimal model in the sense of Definition 2.2.

For any lc pair (X, Δ) on a normal quasi-projective variety X , we can construct a *dlt blow-up* $(Y, \Gamma) \rightarrow (X, \Delta)$ of (X, Δ) as in [F1, Theorem 10.4] or [KK, Theorem 3.1].

Definition 2.3 (*D-flip*). Let $X \rightarrow Z$ be a projective morphism from a normal variety to a variety and D an \mathbb{R} -Cartier divisor on X . A birational morphism $f: X \rightarrow V$ over Z , where V is projective over Z and normal, is a *D-flipping contraction over Z* if

- $\rho(X/V) = 1$,
- f is small, i.e., f is an isomorphism in codimension one, and
- $-D$ is ample over V .

Let $f': X' \rightarrow V$ be a projective birational morphism over Z from a normal variety X' , and let $\varphi: X \dashrightarrow X'$ be the induced birational map. Then f' is a *flip* of f if

- f' is small, and
- φ_*D is \mathbb{R} -Cartier and ample over V .

We sometimes call the whole diagram *D-flip*.

Definition 2.4 (flop (cf. [F2, Definition 7.5]) and symmetric flop). Let $X \rightarrow Z$ be a projective morphism from a normal variety to a variety, and let (X, Δ) be an lc pair. In this paper, a *flop for $K_X + \Delta$ over Z* consists of the following diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 X & \overset{\varphi}{\dashrightarrow} & X' \\
 \searrow f & & \swarrow f' \\
 & V & \\
 \searrow & \downarrow & \swarrow \\
 & Z &
 \end{array}$$

such that

- f is a D -flipping contraction over Z for some \mathbb{R} -Cartier divisor D on X ,
- f' is a flip of f , and
- $K_X + \Delta \equiv_V 0$.

In this paper, with notations as above, a flop for $K_X + \Delta$ over Z is a *symmetric flop* if

- both f and f' are extremal contractions.

In general, flops are not always symmetric flops (see Example 4.2).

Lemma 2.5. *With notations as in Definition 2.4, the following properties hold true for symmetric flops.*

- $\rho(X/V) = \rho(X'/V) = 1$,
- for any \mathbb{R} -divisor G on X , the birational transform φ_*G on X' is \mathbb{R} -Cartier if and only if G is \mathbb{R} -Cartier, in particular, X is \mathbb{Q} -factorial if and only if X' is \mathbb{Q} -factorial, and
- the map φ induces an isomorphic linear map $\varphi_*: N^1(X/Z)_{\mathbb{R}} \rightarrow N^1(X'/Z)_{\mathbb{R}}$, in particular, the equality $\rho(X/Z) = \rho(X'/Z)$ holds.

Proof. The first property is clear. To prove the second property, pick an \mathbb{R} -divisor G on X , and suppose that G is \mathbb{R} -Cartier. Since $-D$ is ample over V and f is an extremal contraction, we can find a real number r such that $G - rD$ is \mathbb{R} -linearly equivalent to the pullback of an \mathbb{R} -Cartier divisor on V . By taking the birational transform on X' , we see that $\varphi_*G - r\varphi_*D$ is \mathbb{R} -linearly equivalent to the pullback of an \mathbb{R} -Cartier divisor on V . Since φ_*D is \mathbb{R} -Cartier, φ_*G is also \mathbb{R} -Cartier. The converse can be proved in the same way. For the third property, we can easily check from the second property that there are natural linear maps $\varphi_*: N^1(X/Z)_{\mathbb{R}} \rightarrow N^1(X'/Z)_{\mathbb{R}}$ and $\varphi_*^{-1}: N^1(X'/Z)_{\mathbb{R}} \rightarrow N^1(X/Z)_{\mathbb{R}}$, and they are inverse linear maps of each other. \square

3. PROOFS OF MAIN RESULTS

Proposition 3.1. *Let $X \rightarrow Z$ and $X' \rightarrow Z$ be two projective morphisms from normal quasi-projective varieties to a quasi-projective variety Z , and let (X, Δ) and (X', Δ') be lc pairs such that $K_X + \Delta$ and $K_{X'} + \Delta'$ are nef over Z . Suppose that there is a small birational map $\phi: X \dashrightarrow X'$ over Z such that*

- $\Delta' = \phi_*\Delta$, and
- there is an open subset $U \subset X$ on which ϕ is an isomorphism and all lc centers of (X, Δ) intersect U .

Then, there exists a projective small birational morphism $\psi: \overline{X} \rightarrow X$ from a normal quasi-projective variety such that

- ψ is an isomorphism over U , and
- there is an ample \mathbb{R} -divisor $A' \geq 0$ on X' such that $(X', \Delta' + A')$ is lc and if we set \overline{A} as the birational transform of A' on \overline{X} , then $K_{\overline{X}} + \psi_*^{-1}\Delta + \overline{A}$ is \mathbb{R} -Cartier and the pair $(\overline{X}, \psi_*^{-1}\Delta + \overline{A})$ is lc.

Proof. Let $f: Y \rightarrow X$ be a log resolution of (X, Δ) such that the induced birational map $g: Y \dashrightarrow X'$ is a morphism. Let Γ be the sum of $f_*^{-1}\Delta$ and the reduced f -exceptional divisor. Let $A' \geq 0$ be an ample \mathbb{R} -divisor on X' such that the pairs $(X', \Delta' + A')$ and $(Y, \Gamma + g^*A')$ are lc. By running a $(K_Y + \Gamma)$ -MMP with scaling over X , we construct a dlt blow-up $f': (Y', \Gamma') \rightarrow (X, \Delta)$. Let $A_{Y'}$ be the birational transform of g^*A' on Y' . Then the map $Y \dashrightarrow Y'$ is a sequence of steps of a $(K_Y + \Gamma + t_0g^*A')$ -MMP for some $t_0 \in (0, 1)$. So there is $t \in (0, t_0)$ such that $(Y', \Gamma' + tA_{Y'})$ is lc and all lc centers of the pair are lc centers of (Y', Γ') . Then all lc centers of $(Y', \Gamma' + tA_{Y'})$ intersect $f'^{-1}(U)$.

We show that $(Y', \Gamma' + tA_{Y'})$ has the log canonical model over X . It is sufficient to prove that $(Y', \Gamma' + tA_{Y'})$ has a good minimal model over X . We set $U_{Y'} = f'^{-1}(U)$. By [H, Theorem 1.2], we only need to prove that the pair $(U_{Y'}, (\Gamma' + tA_{Y'})|_{U_{Y'}})$ has a good minimal model over U . Since $\phi: X \dashrightarrow X'$ is isomorphic on U , the divisor $\phi_*^{-1}A'|_U$ is \mathbb{R} -Cartier and $A_{Y'}|_{U_{Y'}}$ is equal to the pullback of $\phi_*^{-1}A'|_U$ to $U_{Y'}$. Then we have

$$(*) \quad K_{U_{Y'}} + (\Gamma' + tA_{Y'})|_{U_{Y'}} = f'^*|_{U_{Y'}}(K_U + \Delta|_U + t\phi_*^{-1}A'|_U),$$

thus the pair $(U_{Y'}, (\Gamma' + tA_{Y'})|_{U_{Y'}})$ itself is a good minimal model of $(U_{Y'}, (\Gamma' + tA_{Y'})|_{U_{Y'}})$ over U . Therefore, $(Y', \Gamma' + tA_{Y'})$ has a good minimal model over X . In this way, we see that $(Y', \Gamma' + tA_{Y'})$ has the log canonical model over X .

Let $(Y', \Gamma' + tA_{Y'}) \dashrightarrow (\overline{X}, \Delta_{\overline{X}} + tA_{\overline{X}})$ be the birational contraction over X to the log canonical model, where $\Delta_{\overline{X}}$ (resp. $A_{\overline{X}}$) is the birational transform of Γ' (resp. $A_{Y'}$) on \overline{X} . Let $\psi: \overline{X} \rightarrow X$ be the induced birational morphism. We prove that ψ is isomorphic over U and small. By (*), the restriction of $K_{\overline{X}} + \Delta_{\overline{X}} + tA_{\overline{X}}$ to $\psi^{-1}(U)$ is trivial over U , so ψ is an isomorphism over U . This also implies that all f' -exceptional prime divisors E on Y' are contracted by $Y' \dashrightarrow \overline{X}$ because $-1 \leq a(E, Y', \Gamma' + tA_{Y'}) \leq a(E, Y', \Gamma') = -1$ and all E intersect $f'^{-1}(U)$ by our choice of t . In this way, we see that ψ is small. From these facts, we see that ψ is isomorphic over U and small.

Finally, we prove that ψ is the desired birational morphism. But it is obvious from construction. Indeed, ψ is small and it satisfies the first condition of Proposition 3.1. Moreover the divisor tA' satisfies the second condition of Proposition 3.1. \square

Lemma 3.2. *Let $X \rightarrow Z$ be a projective morphism from a normal variety to a variety. Let $W \rightarrow Z$ be a projective morphism from a \mathbb{Q} -factorial variety to Z such that there is a birational contraction $W \dashrightarrow X$ over Z . Then $\rho(W/Z) \geq \rho(X/Z)$.*

Proof. Take a common resolution $f: \overline{W} \rightarrow W$ and $g: \overline{W} \rightarrow X$ of the map $W \dashrightarrow X$. For any \mathbb{R} -Cartier divisors D_1 and D_2 on X , if $D_1 - D_2 \equiv_Z 0$ then $g^*D_1 - g^*D_2 \equiv_Z 0$, and $f_*g^*D_1 - f_*g^*D_2 \equiv_Z 0$ by the negativity lemma. Thus, we can define a linear map $f_*g^*: N^1(X/Z)_{\mathbb{R}} \rightarrow N^1(W/Z)_{\mathbb{R}}$ by $D \mapsto f_*g^*D$. For any \mathbb{R} -Cartier divisors D_1 and D_2 on X , if $f_*g^*D_1 \equiv_Z f_*g^*D_2$ then we have $D_1 \equiv_Z D_2$ since D_1 and D_2 are the birational

transforms of $f_*g^*D_1$ and $f_*g^*D_2$ on X , respectively. In this way, we see that the linear map $f_*g^*: N^1(X/Z)_{\mathbb{R}} \rightarrow N^1(W/Z)_{\mathbb{R}}$ is injective, so $\rho(W/Z) \geq \rho(X/Z)$. \square

Lemma 3.3. *Let (X, Δ) be an lc pair and $\psi: X' \rightarrow X$ a projective small birational morphism of normal quasi-projective varieties. Suppose that there exists an open subset $U \subset X$ over which ψ is an isomorphism and all lc centers of (X, Δ) intersect U .*

Then the followings hold true.

- $R^p\psi_*\mathcal{O}_{X'} = 0$ for any $p > 0$,
- ψ is an isomorphism or a composition of extremal contractions, and
- for any Cartier divisor D' on X' , if $D' \equiv_X 0$ then there is a Cartier divisor D on X such that $D' \sim \psi^*D$. In particular, ψ_*D' is Cartier.

Proof. Since ψ is small, we may assume that codimension of $X' \setminus \psi^{-1}(U)$ in X' is at least two. First, we find an \mathbb{R} -Cartier divisor $G' \geq 0$ on X' such that $-G'$ is ample over X and $(X', \psi_*^{-1}\Delta + G')$ is lc. We note that $K_{X'} + \psi_*^{-1}\Delta = \psi^*(K_X + \Delta)$, so $(X', \psi_*^{-1}\Delta)$ is lc and all lc centers of $(X', \psi_*^{-1}\Delta)$ intersect $\psi^{-1}(U)$. Pick an ample \mathbb{R} -divisor A' on X' , and pick an ample \mathbb{R} -divisor H on X . Since ψ is an isomorphism over U , we can find $s > 0$ such that the divisor $(s\psi^*H - A')|_{\psi^{-1}(U)}$ is ample. Since all lc centers of $(X', \psi_*^{-1}\Delta)$ intersect $\psi^{-1}(U)$, by taking the closure of a general member in the \mathbb{R} -linear system of $(s\psi^*H - A')|_{\psi^{-1}(U)}$, we get an effective \mathbb{R} -divisor $H' \sim_{\mathbb{R}} s\psi^*H - A'$ such that $\text{Supp}H'$ contains no lc centers of $(X', \psi_*^{-1}\Delta)$. Then $-H'$ is ample over X and there is $t > 0$ such that $(X', \psi_*^{-1}\Delta + tH')$ is lc. Therefore $G' := tH'$ is the desired divisor.

From now on, we prove three assertions of Lemma 3.3. By construction, the divisor $-(K_{X'} + \psi_*^{-1}\Delta + G')$ is ample over X . Since $(X', \psi_*^{-1}\Delta + G')$ is lc, we have $R^p\psi_*\mathcal{O}_{X'} = 0$ for any $p > 0$ by [F3, Theorem 5.6.4]. We prove the second and the third assertion of Lemma 3.3 by induction on $\rho(X'/X)$. If $\rho(X'/X) = 0$, then ψ is an isomorphism and the third assertion is clear. So suppose $\rho(X'/X) > 0$. The pair $(X', \psi_*^{-1}\Delta + G')$ is lc and the divisor $K_{X'} + \psi_*^{-1}\Delta + G'$ is in particular not nef over X . By the cone and contraction theorem ([F3, Theorem 4.5.2]), there is an extremal contraction $f: X' \rightarrow X''$ over X . Furthermore, [F3, Theorem 4.5.2 (4) (iii)] shows that for any Cartier divisor D' on X' , if $D' \equiv_X 0$ then there is a Cartier divisor D'' on X'' such that $D' \sim f^*D''$ and $D'' \equiv_{X''} 0$. Since the morphism $\psi: X' \rightarrow X$ is an isomorphism over U and small, so is the morphism $X'' \rightarrow X$. We denote $X'' \rightarrow X$ by g . It is clear that $\rho(X''/X) < \rho(X'/X)$, therefore we can apply the induction hypothesis to g . In this way, we see that ψ is a composition of extremal contractions, and there is a Cartier divisor D on X such that $D'' \sim g^*D$. Then $D' \sim f^*D'' \sim f^*g^*D = \psi^*D$. Thus the second and the third statement hold. \square

Theorem 3.4. *Let $\pi: X \rightarrow Z$ and $\pi': X' \rightarrow Z$ be projective morphisms from normal quasi-projective varieties to a quasi-projective variety Z , and let (X, Δ) and (X', Δ') be lc pairs such that $K_X + \Delta$ and $K_{X'} + \Delta'$ are nef over Z . Suppose that there is a small birational map $\phi: X \dashrightarrow X'$ over Z such that*

- $\Delta' = \phi_*\Delta$, and
- there is an open subset $U \subset X$ on which ϕ is an isomorphism and all lc centers of (X, Δ) intersect U .

Then, there are projective small birational morphisms $f: \overline{X} \rightarrow X$ and $f': \overline{X}' \rightarrow X'$ from normal quasi-projective varieties such that f and f' are compositions of extremal

contractions and the induced birational map $f'^{-1} \circ \phi \circ f: \bar{X} \dashrightarrow \bar{X}'$ is a composition of symmetric flops for $K_{\bar{X}} + f_*^{-1}\Delta$ over Z .

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} \bar{X} = \bar{X}_0 & \xrightarrow{\varphi_0} & \bar{X}_1 & \dashrightarrow & \cdots & \dashrightarrow & \bar{X}_i & \xrightarrow{\varphi_i} & \bar{X}_{i+1} & \dashrightarrow & \cdots & \dashrightarrow & \bar{X}_l = \bar{X}' \\ & \searrow g_0 & \swarrow g'_0 & & & & \searrow g_i & \swarrow g'_i & & & & & & \\ & & V_0 & & & & & & V_i & & & & & \end{array}$$

Furthermore, the following two conditions hold true.

- (a) f and f' are isomorphisms over U and $\phi(U)$ respectively, and
- (b) for each i and morphisms $g_i: \bar{X}_i \rightarrow V_i$ and $g'_i: \bar{X}_{i+1} \rightarrow V_i$, there are \mathbb{R} -divisors \bar{B}_i and \bar{B}_{i+1} on \bar{X}_i and \bar{X}_{i+1} respectively such that (\bar{X}_i, \bar{B}_i) and $(\bar{X}_{i+1}, \bar{B}_{i+1})$ are lc and $-(K_{\bar{X}_i} + \bar{B}_i)$ and $-(K_{\bar{X}_{i+1}} + \bar{B}_{i+1})$ are ample over V_i .

Proof. By taking a common resolution of $\phi: X \dashrightarrow X'$ and the negativity lemma, we have $a(P, X, \Delta) = a(P, X', \Delta')$ for any prime divisor P over X . Therefore, the set $\phi(U)$ intersects all lc centers of (X', Δ') . We prove that there are projective small birational morphisms $f: \bar{X} \rightarrow X$ and $f': \bar{X}' \rightarrow X'$ from normal quasi-projective varieties such that f and f' satisfy property (a) of Theorem 3.4 and the two lc pairs $(\bar{X}, f_*^{-1}\Delta)$ and $(\bar{X}', f'^{-1}\Delta')$ are connected by a sequence of symmetric flops which satisfy property (b) of Theorem 3.4. If we can obtain these birational maps, then f and f' are compositions of extremal contractions by Lemma 3.3, from which Theorem 3.4 holds true. In this way, it is sufficient to prove the statement. We fix a smooth variety Y projective over Z such that there are birational contractions $Y \dashrightarrow X$ and $Y \dashrightarrow X'$ over Z . We prove Theorem 3.4 by induction on $\rho(Y/Z) - \max\{\rho(X/Z), \rho(X'/Z)\}$.

We start the induction with the case where $\rho(Y/Z) - \max\{\rho(X/Z), \rho(X'/Z)\} = -1$. But the case cannot happen because of Lemma 3.2, thus we settle the starting point of the induction.

From now on, we assume $\rho(Y/Z) - \max\{\rho(X/Z), \rho(X'/Z)\} \geq 0$. By switching (X, Δ) and (X', Δ') if necessary, we may assume $\rho(X/Z) \geq \rho(X'/Z)$. By Proposition 3.1, there is a projective small birational morphism $\psi: \bar{X} \rightarrow X$ from a normal quasi-projective variety such that

- ψ is an isomorphism over U , and
- there is an ample \mathbb{R} -divisor $A' \geq 0$ on X' such that $(X', \Delta' + A')$ is lc and if we set \bar{A} as the birational transform of A' on \bar{X} , then $K_{\bar{X}} + \psi_*^{-1}\Delta + \bar{A}$ is \mathbb{R} -Cartier and the pair $(\bar{X}, \psi_*^{-1}\Delta + \bar{A})$ is lc.

Note that $(\bar{X}, \bar{\Delta})$ is lc and $K_{\bar{X}} + \bar{\Delta}$ is nef since $K_{\bar{X}} + \bar{\Delta} = \psi^*(K_X + \Delta)$. By construction, the set $\psi^{-1}(U)$ intersects all lc centers of $(\bar{X}, \bar{\Delta})$ and the composition $\phi \circ \psi: \bar{X} \dashrightarrow X'$ is an isomorphism on $\psi^{-1}(U)$. Therefore, the lc pairs $(\bar{X}, \bar{\Delta})$ and (X', Δ') and the map $\phi \circ \psi: \bar{X} \dashrightarrow X'$ over Z satisfy the hypothesis of Theorem 3.4. It is obvious that

$$\rho(Y/Z) - \rho(\bar{X}/Z) \leq \rho(Y/Z) - \rho(X/Z) = \rho(Y/Z) - \max\{\rho(X/Z), \rho(X'/Z)\}.$$

From this and argument in the first paragraph, we may replace (X, Δ) with $(\bar{X}, \bar{\Delta})$. In this way, replacing (X, Δ) , we may assume that there is an ample \mathbb{R} -divisor $A' \geq 0$ on X' such that $(X', \Delta' + A')$ is lc, $A := \phi_*^{-1}A'$ is \mathbb{R} -Cartier and the pair $(X, \Delta + A)$ is lc.

For any $t \in (0, 1)$, the pair $(X', \Delta' + tA')$ is lc and $K_{X'} + \Delta' + tA'$ is ample over Z . So the pair $(X', \Delta' + tA')$ is the log canonical model of $(X, \Delta + tA)$ over Z . In particular, $(X, \Delta + tA)$ has a good minimal model over Z for any $t \in (0, 1)$. By argument of length of extremal rays ([F1, Section 18] and [F3, Theorem 4.7.2], see also [H, Remark 2.13]), we can find $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ such that the birational transform of $K_X + \Delta$ is trivial over all extremal contractions of any sequence of steps of the $(K_X + \Delta + \epsilon A)$ -MMP over Z . By [HH, Theorem 1.7], there exists a sequence of steps of a $(K_X + \Delta + \epsilon A)$ -MMP over Z

$$(X, \Delta + \epsilon A) = (X_0, \Delta_0 + \epsilon A_0) \dashrightarrow (X_1, \Delta_1 + \epsilon A_1) \dashrightarrow \cdots \dashrightarrow (X_l, \Delta_l + \epsilon A_l)$$

terminating with a good minimal model $(X_l, \Delta_l + \epsilon A_l)$. Then all maps $X_i \dashrightarrow X_{i+1}$ are flips since $K_X + \Delta + \epsilon A$ is movable over Z . Since $(X', \Delta' + \epsilon A')$ is the log canonical model of $(X, \Delta + tA)$ over Z , there is a natural small birational morphism $\psi': X_l \rightarrow X'$ such that $\Delta' = \psi'_* \Delta_l$. For each $0 \leq i < l$, we denote the birational map $X_i \dashrightarrow X_{i+1}$ by φ_i . As in [HH, Remark 6.1 (2)] and [HH, Proof of Proposition 6.2], each birational map φ_i induces an injective linear map $\varphi_{i*}: N^1(X_i/Z)_{\mathbb{R}} \rightarrow N^1(X_{i+1}/Z)_{\mathbb{R}}$. Then

$$\rho(X/Z) \leq \cdots \leq \rho(X_i/Z) \leq \rho(X_{i+1}/Z) \leq \cdots \leq \rho(X_l/Z).$$

Now there are two possibilities: $\rho(X/Z) < \rho(X_l/Z)$ and $\rho(X/Z) = \rho(X_l/Z)$.

First we assume $\rho(X/Z) < \rho(X_l/Z)$. Because the stable base locus of $K_X + \Delta + \epsilon A$ over Z is contained in $X \setminus U$, by basic properties of log MMP, the induced birational map $X \dashrightarrow X_l$ is an isomorphism on U , and the image of U on X_l is $\psi'^{-1}(\phi(U))$. Since $K_{X_l} + \Delta_l = \psi'^*(K_{X'} + \Delta')$, all lc centers of (X_l, Δ_l) intersect $\psi'^{-1}(\phi(U))$. In this way, the birational map $(X, \Delta) \dashrightarrow (X_l, \Delta_l)$ over Z satisfies the hypothesis of Theorem 3.4. Now we have $\rho(X/Z) = \max\{\rho(X/Z), \rho(X'/Z)\}$, therefore

$$\rho(Y/Z) - \max\{\rho(X/Z), \rho(X_l/Z)\} < \rho(Y/Z) - \max\{\rho(X/Z), \rho(X'/Z)\}.$$

The argument in the first paragraph shows that we may replace (X', Δ') with (X_l, Δ_l) . Replacing (X', Δ') with (X_l, Δ_l) and by the induction hypothesis of Theorem 3.4, we see that Theorem 3.4 holds in this case.

Next, we assume $\rho(X/Z) = \rho(X_l/Z)$. Then $\rho(X_i/Z) = \rho(X_{i+1}/Z)$ for any $0 \leq i < l$. We prove that the sequence of birational maps $X \dashrightarrow X_l$ satisfies all the conditions of Theorem 3.4, in other words, $X \dashrightarrow X_l$ is a sequence of symmetric flops which satisfy property (b) of Theorem 3.4. Note that the birational map $X \dashrightarrow X_l$ is a sequence of flops for $K_X + \Delta$ over Z since each $\varphi_i: X_i \dashrightarrow X_{i+1}$ is a flip over Z and $K_{X_i} + \Delta_i$ is trivial over the extremal contraction of the $(i+1)$ -th step of the log MMP. Fix $0 \leq i < l$ and consider the $(i+1)$ -th step of the log MMP

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X_i & \dashrightarrow^{\varphi_i} & X_{i+1} \\ & \searrow^{g_i} & \swarrow_{g'_i} \\ & & V_i \end{array}$$

where

- (i) $g_i: X_i \rightarrow V_i$ is an extremal contraction and $-(K_{X_i} + \Delta_i + \epsilon A_i)$ is ample over V_i ,
- (ii) $g'_i: X_{i+1} \rightarrow V_i$ is the flip of g_i , and
- (iii) the whole diagram is a flop for $K_{X_i} + \Delta_i$ over Z .

All we have to prove is that the flop is a symmetric flop and satisfies the property (b) of Theorem 3.4.

We first prove that the flop satisfies the property (b) of Theorem 3.4. By construction, the pair $(X_i, \Delta_i + \epsilon A_i)$ is lc and $-(K_{X_i} + \Delta_i + \epsilon A_i)$ is ample over V_i . We take an ample \mathbb{R} -divisor $H_i \geq 0$ on X_i such that $(X_i, \Delta_i + \epsilon A_i + H_i)$ is lc and $K_{X_i} + \Delta_i + \epsilon A_i + H_i \sim_{\mathbb{R}, V_i} 0$. Let H_{i+1} be the birational transform of H_i on X_{i+1} . Then $-H_{i+1}$ is an ample \mathbb{R} -Cartier divisor over V_i (for property of being \mathbb{R} -Cartier, see [HH, Remark 6.1 (2)]), and the pair $(X_{i+1}, \Delta_{i+1} + \epsilon A_{i+1} + H_{i+1})$ is lc. Since $K_{X_{i+1}} + \Delta_{i+1} \sim_{\mathbb{R}, V_i} 0$, we see that the divisor $-(K_{X_{i+1}} + \Delta_{i+1} + H_{i+1})$ is ample over V_i . Since the pair $(X_{i+1}, \Delta_{i+1} + H_{i+1})$ is lc, we see that the flop satisfies the property (b) of Theorem 3.4.

Next, we prove that the flop is a symmetric flop. By (i), it is sufficient to prove that g'_i is an extremal contraction. By property (b) of Theorem 3.4 and [F1, Theorem 13.1], for any \mathbb{Q} -Cartier divisor D_{i+1} on X_{i+1} , if $D_{i+1} \equiv_{V_i} 0$ then $D_{i+1} \sim_{\mathbb{Q}, V_i} 0$. Pick any two Cartier divisors G_1 and G_2 on X_{i+1} . Since $\rho(X_i/Z) = \rho(X_{i+1}/Z)$ from our assumption, the linear map $\varphi_{i*}: N^1(X_i/Z)_{\mathbb{R}} \rightarrow N^1(X_{i+1}/Z)_{\mathbb{R}}$ is an isomorphism, therefore we may find \mathbb{Q} -Cartier divisors B_1 and B_2 on X_i such that $\varphi_{i*}B_1 - G_1 \equiv_Z 0$ and $\varphi_{i*}B_2 - G_2 \equiv_Z 0$. Then $\varphi_{i*}B_1 \sim_{\mathbb{Q}, V_i} G_1$ and $\varphi_{i*}B_2 \sim_{\mathbb{Q}, V_i} G_2$. By condition (i), there are $a_1, a_2 \in \mathbb{Q}$, which are not both zero, such that $a_1B_1 \sim_{\mathbb{Q}, V_i} a_2B_2$. Then we obtain

$$a_1G_1 \sim_{\mathbb{Q}, V_i} a_1\varphi_{i*}B_1 \sim_{\mathbb{Q}, V_i} a_2\varphi_{i*}B_2 \sim_{\mathbb{Q}, V_i} a_2G_2.$$

This shows that $g'_i: X_{i+1} \rightarrow V_i$ is an extremal contraction. We finish the proof. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.1. It immediately follows from Theorem 3.4 and Lemma 2.5. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.2. Firstly, we prove the first assertion of Theorem 1.2. We only prove the existence of a small \mathbb{Q} -factorialization of X' under the assumption on existence of a small \mathbb{Q} -factorialization $f: W \rightarrow X$ because the another direction can be proved similarly. We put $\Gamma = f_*^{-1}\Delta$. Then (W, Γ) is lc since $K_W + \Gamma = f^*(K_X + \Delta)$. By taking a common resolution of ϕ and the negativity lemma, we have $a(P, X, \Delta) = a(P, X', \Delta')$ for any prime divisor P over X . Thus the set $\phi(U)$ intersects all lc centers of (X', Δ') . Let $A' \geq 0$ be an ample \mathbb{R} -divisor on X' such that $(X', \Delta' + A')$ is lc, and let A_W be the birational transform of A' on W .

We show that there is $\epsilon > 0$ such that the pair $(W, \Gamma + \epsilon A_W)$ is lc. It is sufficient to prove that $\text{Supp}A_W$ contains no lc centers of (W, Γ) . Pick any prime divisor P over W with $a(P, W, \Gamma) = -1$. Then it is easy to check $a(P, X', \Delta') = -1$. We denote the center of P on W (resp. X') by $c_W(P)$ (resp. $c_{X'}(P)$). Then $c_{X'}(P)$ is an lc center of (X', Δ') and $c_{X'}(P)$ intersects $\phi(U)$. Since $(X', \Delta' + A')$ is lc, we have $c_{X'}(P)|_{\phi(U)} \not\subset \text{Supp}A'|_{\phi(U)}$. By hypothesis, the induced birational map $\phi \circ f: W \dashrightarrow X'$ is small and it is a morphism over $\phi(U)$. Since $f: W \rightarrow X$ is small, the restriction $A_W|_{f^{-1}(U)}$ is equal to the pullback of $A'|_{\phi(U)}$ to $f^{-1}(U)$. Then $c_W(P)|_{f^{-1}(U)} \not\subset \text{Supp}A_W|_{f^{-1}(U)}$, so any lc center of (W, Γ) is not contained in $\text{Supp}A_W$. Therefore, we can find $\epsilon > 0$ such that $(W, \Gamma + \epsilon A_W)$ is lc.

Since $W \dashrightarrow X'$ is small and $K_{X'} + \Delta' + \epsilon A'$ is ample over Z , the pair $(X', \Delta' + \epsilon A')$ is the log canonical model of $(W, \Gamma + \epsilon A_W)$ over Z . By applying [HH, Theorem 1.7], we construct a sequence of steps of a $(K_W + \Gamma + \epsilon A_W)$ -MMP over Z

$$(W, \Gamma + \epsilon A_W) \dashrightarrow (W', \Gamma' + \epsilon A_{W'})$$

to a good minimal model over Z , and there is a natural birational morphism $W' \rightarrow X'$. It is clear from construction of log MMP that W' is \mathbb{Q} -factorial and $W' \rightarrow X'$ is small. In this way, we see that X' has a small \mathbb{Q} -factorialization.

From now on, we freely use notations as in Theorem 3.4. Next, we prove the second assertion of Theorem 1.2. By property (a) of Theorem 3.4 and Lemma 3.3, we obtain $R^q f_* \mathcal{O}_{\bar{X}} = 0$ and $R^q f'_* \mathcal{O}_{\bar{X}'} = 0$ for any $q > 0$. By relative Leray spectral sequences, there are isomorphisms of sheaves on Z

$$(1) \quad R^p \pi_* \mathcal{O}_X \xrightarrow{\sim} R^p (\pi \circ f)_* \mathcal{O}_{\bar{X}} \quad \text{and} \quad R^p \pi'_* \mathcal{O}_{X'} \xrightarrow{\sim} R^p (\pi' \circ f')_* \mathcal{O}_{\bar{X}'}$$

For each $0 \leq i < l$, we denote the induced morphism $V_i \rightarrow Z$ by π_i . To prove the second assertion of Theorem 1.2, it is sufficient to prove the existence of an isomorphism

$$(2) \quad R^p (\pi_i \circ g_i)_* \mathcal{O}_{\bar{X}_i} \xrightarrow{\sim} R^p (\pi_i \circ g'_i)_* \mathcal{O}_{\bar{X}_{i+1}}$$

for any $p > 0$ and each i . By property (b) of Theorem 3.4 and [F3, Theorem 5.6.4], we have $R^q g_{i*} \mathcal{O}_{\bar{X}_i} = R^q g'_{i*} \mathcal{O}_{\bar{X}_{i+1}} = 0$. By relative Leray spectral sequences, we obtain

$$R^p (\pi_i \circ g_i)_* \mathcal{O}_{\bar{X}_i} \xleftarrow{\sim} R^p \pi_{i*} \mathcal{O}_{V_i} \xrightarrow{\sim} R^p (\pi_i \circ g'_i)_* \mathcal{O}_{\bar{X}_{i+1}}$$

for any $p > 0$. In this way, we get the isomorphism (2). By (1) and (2), the second assertion of Theorem 1.2 holds.

Finally, we prove the third assertion of Theorem 1.2. Pick any Cartier divisor D on X such that $D \equiv_Z r(K_X + \Delta)$ for an $r \in \mathbb{R}$. For any $0 \leq i \leq l$, we denote the birational transforms of D and Δ on \bar{X}_i by \bar{D}_i and $\bar{\Delta}_i$, respectively. Suppose that \bar{D}_i is Cartier and $\bar{D}_i \equiv_Z r(K_{\bar{X}_i} + \bar{\Delta}_i)$. Then $\bar{D}_i \equiv_{V_i} 0$ by construction. By property (b) of Theorem 3.4 and [F1, Theorem 13.1], the divisor $m\bar{D}_i$ is g_i -globally generated for any $m \gg 0$, in other words, the morphism $g_i^* g_{i*} \mathcal{O}_{\bar{X}_i}(m\bar{D}_i) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\bar{X}_i}(m\bar{D}_i)$ is surjective for any $m \gg 0$. Since $\bar{D}_i \equiv_{V_i} 0$, we see that $m\bar{D}_i$ is linearly equivalent to the pullback of a Cartier divisor on V_i for any $m \gg 0$. In this way, we can find a Cartier divisor G_i on V_i such that $\bar{D}_i \sim g_i^* G_i$. Then we have $\bar{D}_{i+1} \sim g_i'^* G_i$, thus \bar{D}_{i+1} is Cartier, and $\bar{D}_{i+1} \equiv_Z r(K_{\bar{X}_{i+1}} + \bar{\Delta}_{i+1})$. Since $\bar{D}_0 = f^* D$ is Cartier and $\bar{D}_0 \equiv_Z r(K_{\bar{X}_0} + \bar{\Delta}_0)$, we can check by induction on i that the birational transform \bar{D}' on $\bar{X}' = \bar{X}_l$ is Cartier and $\bar{D}' \equiv_Z r(K_{\bar{X}'} + \bar{\Delta}')$. By property (a) of Theorem 3.4, we may apply Lemma 3.3 to $f': \bar{X}' \rightarrow X'$ and \bar{D}' , then $\phi_* D = f'_* \bar{D}'$ is Cartier. Furthermore, we have $\phi_* D \equiv_Z r(K_{X'} + \Delta')$. In this way, the third assertion of Theorem 1.2 holds. We complete the proof. \square

Proof of Corollary 1.3. By Theorem 1.2, it is sufficient to prove that the lc pairs (Y, Γ) and (Y', Γ') over Z satisfy the condition of Theorem 1.2. This follows from properties of log MMP, but we write details for the reader's convenience.

We denote the log MMP $X \dashrightarrow Y$ (resp. $X \dashrightarrow Y'$) by φ (resp. φ'). For any prime divisor P over X , we denote the center of P on X (resp. Y, Y') by $c_X(P)$ (resp. $c_Y(P), c_{Y'}(P)$). Let $V \subset X$ (resp. $V' \subset X$) be the largest open subset on which φ (resp. φ') is an isomorphism. We note that $a(P, Y, \Gamma) = a(P, Y', \Gamma')$ for any prime divisor P over Y . By definition of log minimal models, a prime divisor D on X is contracted by φ if and only if $a(D, X, \Delta) < a(D, Y, \Gamma)$. The same property holds for $a(D, Y', \Gamma')$ and φ' . In particular, D is contracted by φ if and only if D is contracted by φ' . So the induced

Since $g: Y \rightarrow X$ is an isomorphism outside T , we see that the morphisms π_V and π_W are small birational morphisms. Then the induced birational map $X_V \dashrightarrow X_W$ is small.

The relation $A_Y = g^*g_*A_Y$ shows

$$g_V^*g_{V*}A_Y = g_V^*g_{V*}g^*g_*A_Y = g_V^*\pi_V^*g_*A_Y = g^*g_*A_Y = A_Y.$$

Similarly, we have $A_Y = g_W^*g_{W*}A_Y$. Put $H_{X_V} = g_{V*}f^*p_V^*H_V$ and $H_{X_W} = g_{W*}f^*p_W^*H_W$. It is easy to see $A_Y + f^*p_V^*H_V = g_V^*g_{V*}(A_Y + f^*p_V^*H_V)$ since g_V is the contraction induced by $A_Y + f^*p_V^*H_V$. Using these two relations

$$A_Y = g_V^*g_{V*}A_Y \quad \text{and} \quad A_Y + f^*p_V^*H_V = g_V^*g_{V*}(A_Y + f^*p_V^*H_V),$$

we obtain $f^*p_V^*H_V = g_V^*H_{X_V}$. Similarly, we obtain $f^*p_W^*H_W = g_W^*H_{X_W}$. Since H_V and H_W are ample, both H_{X_V} and H_{X_W} are semi-ample, and contractions induced by H_{X_V} and H_{X_W} are morphisms $h_V: X_V \rightarrow V$ and $h_W: X_W \rightarrow W$ satisfying $p_V \circ f = h_V \circ g_V$ and $p_W \circ f = h_W \circ g_W$, respectively. Then $H_{X_V} = h_V^*H_V$ and $H_{X_W} = h_W^*H_W$.

We have constructed the following diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & & Y & & \\ & \swarrow p_V \circ f & & \searrow p_W \circ f & \\ \mathbb{P}^n = & V & & & W \\ & \swarrow h_V & X_V \dashrightarrow X_W & \searrow h_W & \\ & & \pi_V & & \pi_W \\ & & X & & \end{array}$$

and \mathbb{Q} -Cartier divisors

- $H_V \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} -K_V$, • $H_{X_V} = g_{V*}(p_V \circ f)^*H_V$,
- H_W , • $H_{X_W} = g_{W*}(p_W \circ f)^*H_W$, and
- $A_Y = T + m(p_V \circ f)^*H_V + m(p_W \circ f)^*H_W$

satisfying

- (1) Y is smooth and (Y, T) is lc,
- (2) $K_Y + T + A_Y + (p_V \circ f)^*H_V \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0$,
- (3) $A_Y = g_V^*g_{V*}A_Y = g_W^*g_{W*}A_Y = (\pi_W \circ g_W)^*(\pi_W \circ g_W)_*A_Y$, and
- (4) $(p_V \circ f)^*H_V = g_V^*H_{X_V}$ and $(p_W \circ f)^*H_W = g_W^*H_{X_W}$.

By construction, the following property also holds.

- (♠) $g_{V*}A_Y + H_{X_V}$, $g_{W*}A_Y + H_{X_W}$ and $(\pi_V \circ g_V)_*A_Y$ are ample.

We investigate properties of diagram consisting of $\pi_V: X_V \rightarrow X$, $\pi_W: X_W \rightarrow X$ and the map $X_V \dashrightarrow X_W$ over X .

Step 1. Firstly, we show that $(X_W, 0)$ is \mathbb{Q} -factorial klt.

Pick any Weil divisor D on X_W . Then $g_W^{-1}D$ is Cartier, and it is linearly equivalent to the sum of a multiple of T and the pullback of a Cartier divisor on $V \times W$. Therefore, we can find a Cartier divisor D' on $V \times W$ such that $D \sim g_{W*}f^*D'$ as Weil divisors. Since $V = \mathbb{P}^n$ and W is smooth, we can find $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{Z}$ and a Cartier divisor D_W on W such that $\alpha \neq 0$ and $\alpha D' \sim \beta p_V^*H_V + p_W^*D_W$ as Cartier divisors. Then

$$\alpha D \sim g_{W*}f^*(\beta p_V^*H_V + p_W^*D_W) = \beta g_{W*}(p_V \circ f)^*H_V + h_W^*D_W$$

as Weil divisors. Hence, we only need to show that $g_{W*}(p_V \circ f)^*H_V$ is \mathbb{Q} -Cartier. Now the divisor $g_{W*}A_Y = m(g_{W*}(p_V \circ f)^*H_V + H_{X_W})$ is \mathbb{Q} -Cartier, and $g_{W*}A_Y + H_{X_W}$ is in particular \mathbb{Q} -Cartier by (\spadesuit) . By these facts, we see that $g_{W*}(p_V \circ f)^*H_V$ is \mathbb{Q} -Cartier. Then D is \mathbb{Q} -Cartier, and therefore X_W is \mathbb{Q} -factorial.

We put $B_{X_W} = g_{W*}(p_V \circ f)^*H_V$. Then

$$K_Y + T + A_Y + (p_V \circ f)^*H_V = g_W^*(K_{X_W} + g_{W*}A_Y + B_{X_W})$$

by (2). By (3), we obtain $K_Y + T + (p_V \circ f)^*H_V = g_W^*(K_{X_W} + B_{X_W})$. Furthermore, we have $g_W^*B_{X_W} = \frac{1}{m}T + (p_V \circ f)^*H_V$ because

$$g_W^*B_{X_W} = g_W^*(\frac{1}{m}g_{W*}A_Y - H_{X_W}) = \frac{1}{m}A_Y - g_W^*H_{X_W} = \frac{1}{m}T + (p_V \circ f)^*H_V$$

by definition of A_Y and (4). Hence we see that $K_Y + (1 - \frac{1}{m})T = g_W^*K_{X_W}$. By (1), the pair $(Y, (1 - \frac{1}{m})T)$ is klt, so $(X_W, 0)$ is klt.

Step 2. Secondary, we show that the divisors $-g_{W*}(p_V \circ f)^*H_V$ and H_{X_V} are both ample over X . Note that H_{X_V} is the birational transform of $g_{W*}(p_V \circ f)^*H_V$ on X_V .

We use the notation $B_{X_W} := g_{W*}(p_V \circ f)^*H_V$ in Step 1. By (3) and definitions of H_{X_W} and A_Y , we obtain $m(B_{X_W} + H_{X_W}) = g_{W*}A_Y \sim_{\mathbb{Q}, X} 0$. Moreover, the divisor H_{X_W} is ample over X since $H_{X_W} + g_{W*}A_Y$ is ample by (\spadesuit) and $H_{X_W} + g_{W*}A_Y \sim_{\mathbb{Q}, X} H_{X_W}$ by (3). Hence $-B_{X_W}$ is ample over X . We also have $H_{X_V} \sim_{\mathbb{Q}, X} H_{X_V} + g_{V*}A_Y$ by (3). Therefore we see that H_{X_V} is ample over X .

Step 3. Thirdly, we show $\dim H^p(X_W, \mathcal{O}_{X_W}) = \dim H^p(W, \mathcal{O}_W)$ for any $p > 0$.

By applying Leray spectral sequence to $h_W: X_W \rightarrow W$, it is sufficient to prove that $R^q h_{W*} \mathcal{O}_{X_W} = 0$ for any $q > 0$. Since $(X_W, 0)$ is klt, by Kawamata–Viehweg vanishing theorem, it is sufficient to prove that $-K_{X_W}$ is nef and big over W . The argument in Step 1 shows $K_Y + (1 - \frac{1}{m})T = g_W^*K_{X_W}$. By (2), we have

$$K_Y + T + A_Y + (p_V \circ f)^*H_V + (p_W \circ f)^*H_W \sim_{\mathbb{Q}, W} 0.$$

Then, by construction of A_Y , we obtain

$$-(K_Y + (1 - \frac{1}{m})T) \sim_{\mathbb{Q}, W} A_Y + \frac{1}{m}T + (p_V \circ f)^*H_V + (p_W \circ f)^*H_W = (1 + \frac{1}{m})A_Y.$$

Then $-(K_Y + (1 - \frac{1}{m})T)$ is nef and big over W by (3) and (\spadesuit) . In this way, we see that $-K_{X_W}$ is also nef and big over W and therefore $R^q h_{W*} \mathcal{O}_{X_W} = 0$ for any $q > 0$. Then we have $\dim H^p(X_W, \mathcal{O}_{X_W}) = \dim H^p(W, \mathcal{O}_W)$ for any $p > 0$.

Step 4. Finally, we prove that X_V is lc Fano.

By (2) and definition of H_{X_V} , we have $K_{X_V} + g_{V*}A_Y + H_{X_V} \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0$. Since $g_{V*}A_Y + H_{X_V}$ is ample by (\spadesuit) , we see that $-K_{X_V}$ is ample. By (2), we have

$$K_Y + T + A_Y + (p_V \circ f)^*H_V = g_V^*(K_{X_V} + g_{V*}A_Y + H_{X_V}).$$

Moreover, we have $K_Y + T = g_V^*K_{X_V}$ by (3) and (4). Therefore, $(X_V, 0)$ is lc.

Since X_V is lc Fano, there is a \mathbb{Q} -divisor $\Delta_{X_V} \geq 0$ on X_V such that $K_{X_V} + \Delta_{X_V} \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0$ and the pair (X_V, Δ_{X_V}) is lc. Let Δ_{X_W} be the birational transform of Δ_{X_V} on X_W . Then $K_{X_W} + \Delta_{X_W} \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0$ and (X_W, Δ_{X_W}) is lc.

From now on, we introduce various examples with this construction.

Example 4.2. First we give a flop for a \mathbb{Q} -factorial lc pair which is not symmetric.

Take W as in Construction such that $\rho(W) = 1$ and $H^1(W, \mathcal{O}_W) \neq 0$, for example, take W as an elliptic curve. We consider the diagram.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X_W & \text{-----} & X_V \\ & \searrow \pi_W & \swarrow \pi_V \\ & & X \end{array}$$

We show $\rho(X_W/X) = 1$. The argument in Step 1 shows that any \mathbb{R} -Cartier divisor \bar{D} on X_W is \mathbb{R} -linearly equivalent to $\gamma g_{W*}(p_V \circ f)^* H_V + h_W^* \bar{D}_W$ for some $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ and an \mathbb{R} -Cartier divisor \bar{D}_W on W . Then $\rho(X_W) = 2$ since $\rho(W) = 1$ from our assumption. We have $1 \leq \rho(X) < \rho(X_W)$, so $\rho(X) = 1$, from which we see that $\rho(X_W/X) = 1$.

By Step 2, we see that the morphism π_W is a $(g_{W*}(p_V \circ f)^* H_V)$ -flipping contraction and π_V is the flip of π_W . Therefore, the diagram is a flop for $K_{X_W} + \Delta_{X_W}$. Moreover, by Step 1, X_W is \mathbb{Q} -factorial. On the other hand, X_V is not \mathbb{Q} -factorial. Indeed, with notations as in Construction, pick a non-torsion $M \equiv 0$ on W and take the birational transform M_{X_V} of $h_W^* M$ on X_V . If X_V is \mathbb{Q} -factorial, then $M_{X_V} \equiv 0$, so $M_{X_V} \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0$ by [F1, Theorem 13.1] and Step 4. Then $h_W^* M \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0$, hence $M \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0$ which contradicts our choice of M . Hence X_V is not \mathbb{Q} -factorial. In particular, the flop is not symmetric by Lemma 2.5. In this way, the above example shows that flops are not always symmetric.

Example 4.3. Next, we introduce an example which shows that the assumption on the existence of an open set U in the hypothesis of Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.2 is necessary to obtain the same conclusions as in Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.2.

In the same way as in Example 4.2, we take W as in Construction such that $\rho(W) = 1$ and $H^1(W, \mathcal{O}_W) \neq 0$. We consider the small birational map

$$X_V \dashrightarrow X_W$$

and the pairs (X_V, Δ_{X_V}) and (X_W, Δ_{X_W}) which are log minimal models of (X_V, Δ_{X_V}) .

Firstly, we check that the same conclusion as in Theorem 1.1 does not hold for the lc pairs (X_V, Δ_{X_V}) and (X_W, Δ_{X_W}) . Note that all small birational morphisms appearing in the conclusion of Theorem 1.1 are extremal contractions. So, if the same conclusion as in Theorem 1.1 holds for (X_V, Δ_{X_V}) and (X_W, Δ_{X_W}) , then the birational transforms of all numerically trivial \mathbb{Q} -Cartier divisors by $X_W \dashrightarrow X_V$ must be \mathbb{Q} -Cartier. As in the argument in Example 4.2, with notations as in Construction, we pick a non-torsion Cartier divisor $M \equiv 0$ on W , and consider the birational transform M_{X_V} of $h_W^* M$ on X_V . As in the argument in Example 4.2, we see that M_{X_V} is not \mathbb{Q} -Cartier. In this way, the same conclusion as in Theorem 1.1 does not hold for (X_V, Δ_{X_V}) and (X_W, Δ_{X_W}) .

Secondly, we check that all the statements as in Theorem 1.2 does not hold for the lc pairs (X_V, Δ_{X_V}) and (X_W, Δ_{X_W}) . By Step 1, X_W is \mathbb{Q} -factorial. Recall that $\rho(X_W) = 2$, which was proved in argument in Example 4.2. The argument in the previous paragraph shows that X_V is not \mathbb{Q} -factorial. From these facts, if X_V has a small \mathbb{Q} -factorialization $\tilde{X} \rightarrow X_V$, then $\rho(\tilde{X}) > \rho(X_V) > \rho(X) = 1$. Therefore we have $\rho(\tilde{X}) \geq 3$. On the other hand, we have $\rho(\tilde{X}) \leq \rho(X_W) = 2$ by Lemma 3.2, which is a contradiction. From this, we see that X_V cannot have a small \mathbb{Q} -factorialization. In this way, the first assertion of Theorem 1.2 does not hold for (X_V, Δ_{X_V}) and (X_W, Δ_{X_W}) .

The variety X_V is lc Fano (Step 4), so $\dim H^1(X_V, \mathcal{O}_{X_V}) = 0$ by [F3, Theorem 5.6.4]. On the other hand, we have $\dim H^1(X_W, \mathcal{O}_{X_W}) = \dim H^1(W, \mathcal{O}_W) > 0$ by Step 3. Then

$$\dim H^1(X_V, \mathcal{O}_{X_V}) \neq \dim H^1(X_W, \mathcal{O}_{X_W})$$

and the second assertion of Theorem 1.2 does not hold for (X_V, Δ_{X_V}) and (X_W, Δ_{X_W}) .

In the third paragraph we have checked that $h_W^* M \equiv 0$ is Cartier but M_{X_V} is not even \mathbb{Q} -Cartier. So the third assertion of Theorem 1.2 does not hold.

Example 4.4. This example shows that to prove the second assertion of Theorem 1.2, the assumption on existence of an open subset as in Theorem 1.2 is necessary even if both varieties of the lc pairs are \mathbb{Q} -factorial.

Take W as in Construction such that $\text{Pic}(W) \simeq \mathbb{Z}$ and $\dim H^p(W, \mathcal{O}_W) > 0$ for some $p > 0$. For example, we take W as a smooth hypersurface of degree $d + 2$ in \mathbb{P}^{d+1} for some $d \geq 3$ (then $\text{Pic}(W) \simeq \text{Pic}(\mathbb{P}^{d+1}) \simeq \mathbb{Z}$ by Grothendieck–Lefschetz theorem, and $\dim H^d(W, \mathcal{O}_W) = 1$ by $K_W \sim 0$ and Serre duality). We consider the birational map

$$X_V \dashrightarrow X_W.$$

Then the lc pairs (X_V, Δ_{X_V}) and (X_W, Δ_{X_W}) are log minimal models of (X_V, Δ_{X_V}) , and X_W is \mathbb{Q} -factorial by Step 1. In the same way as in Step 1, we can prove that X_V is \mathbb{Q} -factorial. Indeed, with notations as in Construction, for any Weil divisor \tilde{D} on X_V we can find a Cartier divisor \tilde{D}' on $V \times W$ such that $\tilde{D} \sim g_{V*} f^* \tilde{D}'$ as Weil divisors. Because $\text{Pic}(W) \simeq \mathbb{Z}$, $V = \mathbb{P}^n$, and W is smooth, we can find $\tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{\beta} \in \mathbb{Z}$ and a Cartier divisor \tilde{D}_V on V such that $\tilde{\alpha} \neq 0$ and $\tilde{\alpha} \tilde{D}' \sim p_V^* \tilde{D}_V + \tilde{\beta} p_W^* H_W$ as Cartier divisors. Then

$$\tilde{\alpha} \tilde{D} \sim g_{V*} f^* (p_V^* \tilde{D}_V + \tilde{\beta} p_W^* H_W) = h_V^* \tilde{D}_V + \tilde{\beta} g_{V*} (p_W \circ f)^* H_W$$

as Weil divisors, and the right hand side is \mathbb{Q} -Cartier. So X_V is \mathbb{Q} -factorial. The variety X_V is lc Fano by Step 4, then $\dim H^p(X_V, \mathcal{O}_{X_V}) = 0$ by [F3, Theorem 5.6.4]. On the other hand, we have $\dim H^p(X_W, \mathcal{O}_{X_W}) = \dim H^p(W, \mathcal{O}_W) \neq 0$ by our choice of W .

Remark 4.5 (cf. [F3, Example 3.13.9]). As in Example 4.4, take W as in Construction such that $\text{Pic}(W) \simeq \mathbb{Z}$ and $\dim H^q(W, \mathcal{O}_W) > 0$ for some $q > 0$. Then it is easy to check that $\rho(X_V/X) = 1$ and the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X_V & \dashrightarrow & X_W \\ & \searrow \pi_V & \swarrow \pi_W \\ & & X \end{array}$$

is a flip for the \mathbb{Q} -factorial lc pair $(X_V, 0)$. The variety X_V is lc Fano by Step 4, but X_W is not even lc Fano type, i.e., there is no divisor $G \geq 0$ on X_W such that (X_W, G) is lc and $-(K_{X_W} + G)$ is ample. Indeed, if X_W is of lc Fano type, then we must have $\dim H^q(X_W, \mathcal{O}_{X_W}) = 0$ by [F3, Theorem 5.6.4], which contradicts our choice of W . So X_W is not of lc Fano type. We have $0 = \dim H^q(X_V, \mathcal{O}_{X_V})$ by [F3, Theorem 5.6.4].

In this way, the above flip shows the following facts:

- Flips for \mathbb{Q} -factorial lc pairs do not always preserve dimension of cohomology of the structure sheaf, and
- Flips for \mathbb{Q} -factorial lc pairs do not always keep property of being lc Fano type.

Example 4.6. Finally, we give two log minimal models of a projective lc pair such that the Cartier indices of log canonical divisors are different.

We take W as in Construction such that $H^0(W, \mathcal{O}_W(K_W)) = 0$, for example, we take W as an Enriques surface. By construction, we have

$$K_Y + T + A_Y - (p_V \circ f)^*K_V - (p_W \circ f)^*K_W \sim 0$$

and both A_Y and $-(p_V \circ f)^*K_V$ are base point free Cartier divisors. We pick a general member G_Y in the linear system of $A_Y - (p_V \circ f)^*K_V$ such that $(Y, T + G_Y)$ is lc. Let G_{X_W} and G_X be the birational transforms of G_Y on X_W and X , respectively. Because $K_W \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0$, we obtain $K_{X_W} + G_{X_W} \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0$ and $K_X + G_X \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0$, and both (X_W, G_{X_W}) and (X, G_X) are lc. In particular, (X_W, G_{X_W}) and (X, G_X) are log minimal models of (X, G_X) . We prove that $K_{X_W} + G_{X_W}$ is Cartier but $K_X + G_X$ is not Cartier. We have

$$K_{X_W} + G_{X_W} \sim g_{W*}(K_Y + T + A_Y - (p_V \circ f)^*K_V) \sim g_{W*}(p_W \circ f)^*K_W = h_W^*K_W.$$

Therefore $K_{X_W} + G_{X_W}$ is Cartier. On the other hand, by construction, $K_Y + T + G_Y$ is equal to the pullback of $K_X + G_X$. Recall that the image of T by the morphism $Y \rightarrow X$ is a point. From these facts, if $K_X + G_X$ is Cartier then $(K_Y + T + G_Y)|_T \sim 0$. Since we have $K_Y + T + G_Y \sim (p_W \circ f)^*K_W$ and $Y \rightarrow W$ has connected fibers, we obtain

$$\dim H^0(W, \mathcal{O}_W(K_W)) = \dim H^0(T, \mathcal{O}_T((K_Y + T + G_Y)|_T)) = 1,$$

a contradiction. In this way, $K_X + G_X$ is not Cartier. From this discussion, we see that Cartier index of $K_{X_W} + G_{X_W}$ is different from that of $K_X + G_X$.

REFERENCES

- [BCHM] C. Birkar, P. Cascini, C. D. Hacon, J. McKernan, Existence of minimal models for varieties of log general type, *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* **23**(2010), no. 2, 405–468.
- [F1] O. Fujino, Fundamental theorems for the log minimal model program, *Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci.* **47** (2011), no. 3, 727–789.
- [F2] O. Fujino, Some remarks on the minimal model program for log canonical pairs, *J. Math. Sci. Univ. Tokyo* **22** (2015), no. 1, 149–192.
- [F3] O. Fujino, *Foundations of the minimal model program*, MSJ Mem. **35**, Mathematical Society in Japan, Tokyo, 2017.
- [H] K. Hashizume, Remarks on special kinds of the relative log minimal model program, *Manuscripta Math.* **160** (2019), no. 3–4, 285–314.
- [HH] K. Hashizume, Z. Hu, On minimal model theory for log abundant lc pairs, to appear in *J. Reine Angew. Math.*
- [Ka] Y. Kawamata, flops connect minimal models, *Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci.* **44** (2008), no. 2, 419–423.
- [Ko] J. Kollar, Exercises in the birational geometry of algebraic varieties, *Analytic and algebraic variety*, 495–524, IAS/Park City Math Ser., **17**, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2010.
- [KK] J. Kollár, S. Kovács, Log canonical singularities are Du Bois, *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* **23** (2010), no. 3, 791–813.
- [KM] J. Kollár, S. Mori, *Birational geometry of algebraic varieties*. With the collaboration of C. H. Clemens and A. Corti. Translated from the 1998 Japanese original. Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics, **134**. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1998.

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, THE UNIVERSITY OF TOKYO, 3-8-1 KOMABA MEGURO-KU TOKYO 153-8914, JAPAN

E-mail address: hkenta@ms.u-tokyo.ac.jp