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Abstract

We study Lelong numbers of currents of full mass intersection on a compact Kähler manifold in a mixed setting. Our main theorems cover some recent results due to Darvas-Di Nezza-Lu. One of the key ingredients in our approach is a new notion of products of pseudoeffective $(1, 1)$-classes which captures some “pluripolar part” of the “total intersection” of given pseudoeffective $(1, 1)$-classes.
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1 Introduction

Let $X$ be a compact Kähler manifold of dimension $n$. For every closed positive current $S$ on $X$, we denote by $\{S\}$ its cohomology class. For cohomology $(q, q)$-classes $\alpha$ and $\beta$ on $X$, we write $\alpha \leq \beta$ if $\beta - \alpha$ can be represented by a closed positive $(q, q)$-current.

Let $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_m$ be pseudoeffective $(1, 1)$-classes, where $1 \leq m \leq n$. Let $T_j$ and $T'_j$ be closed positive $(1, 1)$-currents in $\alpha_j$ for $1 \leq j \leq m$ such that $T_j$ is more singular than $T'_j$, i.e, potentials of $T_j$ is smaller than those of $T'_j$ modulo an additive constant. By a monotonicity of non-pluripolar products (see [32, Theorem 1.1] and also [7, 13, 34]), there holds

$$\{\langle T_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge T_m \rangle\} \leq \{\langle T'_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge T'_m \rangle\}. \quad (1.1)$$

We are interested in comparing the singularity types of $T_j$ and $T'_j$ when the equality in $(1.1)$ occurs. Given the generality of the problem, it is desirable to put it in a more concrete formulation. In what follows, we focus on the important setting where $T_1, \ldots, T_m$ are of full mass intersection (i.e, $T'_j$’s have minimal singularities).

Let us recall that $T_1, \ldots, T_m$ are said to be of full mass intersection if the equality in $(1.1)$ occurs for $T'_j$ to be a current with minimal singularities $T_{j,\text{min}}$ in $\alpha_j$ for $1 \leq j \leq m$. This is independent of the choice of $T_{j,\text{min}}$. The last notion has played an important role.
in complex geometry, for example, see [11, 7, 11, 12, 21, 27, 30, 33]. We also notice that a connection of the notion of full mass intersection with the theory of density currents (see [22]) was established in [31], see also [25].

One of the most basic objects to measure the singularity of a current is the notion of Lelong numbers. We refer to [15] for its basic properties. Hence, the purpose of this paper is to compare the Lelong numbers of $T_j$ and $T_{j,\min}$ when $T_1, \ldots, T_m$ are of full mass intersection. Our main result below gives a natural setting where the last question is answered in a somewhat complete form. To go into details, we need some notations.

Let $V$ be an irreducible analytic subset of $X$ and let $S$ be a closed positive current on $X$. Denote by $\nu(S,x)$ the Lelong number of $S$ at $x$. By Siu’s analytic semi-continuity of Lelong numbers ([15, 29]), for every $x \in V$ outside a proper analytic subset of $V$, we have

$$\nu(S,x) = \min_{x' \in V} \nu(S,x').$$

The last number is called the generic Lelong number of $S$ along $V$ and is denoted by $\nu(S,V)$.

Let $\alpha$ be a pseudoeffective $(1,1)$-class on $X$. Let $T_{\alpha,\min}$ be a current with minimal singularities in $\alpha$ (see [16, page 41-42]). We denote by $\nu(\alpha,V)$ the generic Lelong number of $T_{\alpha,\min}$ along $V$. This number is independent of the choice of $T_{\alpha,\min}$. It is clear that for every current $S \in \alpha$, we have $\nu(S,V) \geq \nu(\alpha,V)$. Here is our first main result.

**Theorem 1.1.** Let $1 \leq m \leq n$ be an integer. Let $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_m$ be big cohomology classes in $X$ and let $T_j$ be a closed positive $(1,1)$-currents in $\alpha_j$ for $1 \leq j \leq m$. Let $V$ be a proper irreducible analytic subset of $X$ of dimension $n - m$. Assume that $T_1, \ldots, T_m$ are of full mass intersection. Then there exists an index $1 \leq j \leq m$ such that

$$\nu(T_j,V) = \nu(\alpha_j,V). \quad (1.2)$$

We emphasize that the above result is optimal in the sense that in general, it might happen that there is only one index $j$ satisfying (1.2). This can be seen, for example, by taking $X$ to the complex projective space, $\alpha_j$ to be Kähler classes (hence $\nu(\alpha_j,V) = 0$) and $T_1, \ldots, T_m$ suitable currents with analytic singularities so that $\wedge_{j=1}^m T_j$ can be defined classically (see [2, 15, 23]).

We note that when $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_m$ are Kähler, Theorem 1.1 was proved in [32, Theorem 1.2]. The proof presented there is not applicable in the setting of Theorem 1.1. When $\alpha_1 = \cdots = \alpha_m$ and $T_1 = \cdots = T_m$, the condition on the dimension of $V$ in Theorem 1.1 can be relaxed as shown in the following result.

**Theorem 1.2.** Let $1 \leq m \leq n$ be an integer. Let $\alpha$ is a big class and let $T \in \alpha$ be a closed positive $(1,1)$-current so that

$$\{\langle T^m \rangle \} = \langle \alpha^m \rangle.$$

Let $V$ be an irreducible analytic subset of $X$ of dimension at least $n - m$. Then there holds

$$\nu(T,V) = \nu(\alpha_j,V).$$

In particular, if $\alpha$ is big and nef, then $T$ has zero Lelong number at a generic point in $V$.  

Recall that $\langle \alpha^m \rangle$ is defined to be the cohomology class of $\langle T_{\alpha, \min}^m \rangle$, where $T_{\alpha, \min}$ is a current with minimal singularities in $\alpha$, see Section 2 below for details. When $X$ is projective, Theorem 1.2 is a direct consequence of Theorem 1.1 because we can always cut $V$ by suitable hypersurfaces to obtain an analytic subset of dimension $n-m$. However, when $X$ is merely Kähler, such hypersurfaces seem not to be available.

Combining Theorem 1.2 with results in [4,8], we recover the following known result.

**Corollary 1.3.** Let $\theta$ be a smooth closed $(1,1)$-form in a big cohomology class $\alpha$. Let $\varphi$ be a $\theta$-psh function of full Monge-Ampère mass, i.e,

$$\{\langle (dd^c \varphi + \theta)^n \rangle\} = \langle \alpha^n \rangle.$$  

Let $\varphi_{\alpha, \min}$ be a $\theta$-psh function with minimal singularities. Then, we have

$$I(t\varphi) = I(t\varphi_{\alpha, \min}) \quad (1.3)$$

for every $t > 0$, where for every quasi-psh function $\psi$ on $X$, we denote by $I(\psi)$ the multiplier ideal sheaf associated to $\psi$.

Corollary 1.3 was proved in [10,13,14] (hence answering a question posed in [19]); see also [24] for the case where $\theta$ is Kähler. In fact, [13] gives a stronger fact which we describe below. For every closed positive $(1,1)$-current $T'$ with $\int_X \langle T'^n \rangle > 0$, Theorem 1.3 in [13] gives a characterization, in terms of certain plurisubharmonic envelops, of potentials of every closed positive $(1,1)$-current $T$ cohomologous to $T$ such that $T$ is less singular than $T'$ and

$$\int_X \langle T^n \rangle = \int_X \langle T'^n \rangle.$$  

As a consequence, the multiplier ideal sheafs associated to the potentials of $T$ and $T'$ are the same by arguments from the proof of [14, Theorem 1.1]. Nevertheless, in the present setting of our main results, it is unclear how to formulate such a characterization because either $T_1, \ldots, T_m$ can be different or $m \leq n$ (even if one takes $T_1 = \cdots = T_m$).

We present here a completely new strategy to prove Theorems 1.1 and 1.2. We stress that although our main results only involve the usual non-pluripolar products, the notion of relative non-pluripolar products introduced in [32] will play an essential role in our proof. The reason, which will be more clear later, is that relative non-pluripolar products allow us to better control the loss of masses.

The first key ingredient in our proof of Theorem 1.1 is a new notion of products of pseudoeffective classes which was briefly mentioned in [32, Remark 4.5]. This new product of pseudoeffective classes is bounded from below by the positive product introduced in [5,7]. The feature is that this new product also captures some pluripolar part of “total intersection” of classes. This explains why we have a better control on masses.

To get Theorem 1.2 we need to treat the case where $V$ is of dimension not necessarily equal to $n-m$. We will prove an estimate of reversed Alexandrov-Fenchel inequality type for relative non-pluripolar products. We will use this estimate to somehow reduce the problem to the case where $\dim V = n - m$. Our techniques also permit to obtain the following quantitative estimate.
Theorem 1.4. Let $\mathcal{B}_0$ be a compact subset of the cone of big $(1,1)$-classes of $X$. Let $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n$ are in $\mathcal{B}_0$ and let $T_j \in \alpha_j$ be a closed positive $(1,1)$-current for $1 \leq j \leq n$. Let $x_0$ be an arbitrary point in $X$. Then, there exists a constant $C > 0$ independent of $x_0$ and $T_1, \ldots, T_m$ such that

$$\int_X \left( \langle \wedge^n_{j=1} T_j \rangle - \{ \langle \wedge^n_{j=1} T_j \rangle \} \right) \geq C \left( \nu(T_1, x_0) - \nu(\alpha_1, x_0) \right) \cdots \left( \nu(T_1, x_0) - \nu(\alpha_1, x_0) \right).$$

We underline that our arguments in the proof of Theorems 1.1 or 1.2 are not quantifiable as soon as $\dim V \geq 2$. This is due to the fact that we need to use the blowup along $V$ and the desingularization of $V$ (in case $V$ is singular). Despite of this, it is still reasonable to expect an estimate similar to Theorem 1.4 in the case where $V$ is of higher dimension.

A particular situation where $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_m$ are Kähler will be treated in a subsequent paper using a different approach.

Finally, in view of the above discussion of results in [13], one can wonder what should be expected for the equality case of (1.1) when $T_j$’s are not necessarily of minimal singularities. Our approach is likely to be extended to this setting. But there are non-trivial obstructions. To single out one: the condition that $T_j$’s have minimal singularities are needed in our proof of Theorem 1.1 because we will use the fact that there are Kähler currents which are more singular than $T_j$ for every $j$.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we present basic properties of relative non-pluripolar products and introduce the above-mentioned notion of products of pseudoeffective classes. In Section 3, we give a version of reversed Alexandrov-Fenchel inequality for relative non-pluripolar products. Proofs of main results will be presented in the last section.
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2 Relative non-pluripolar products

We first recall some basic facts about relative non-pluripolar products. This notion was introduced in [32] as a generalization of the usual non-pluripolar products given in [3] [7] [24]. To simplify the presentation, we only consider the compact setting.

Let $X$ be a compact Kähler manifold of dimension $n$. Let $T_1, \ldots, T_m$ be closed positive $(1,1)$-currents on $X$. Let $T$ be a closed positive current of bi-degree $(p,p)$ on $X$. By [32], we can define the $T$-relative non-pluripolar product $\langle \wedge^n_{j=1} T_j \rangle$ in a way similar to that of the usual non-pluripolar product. For readers’ convenience, we recall how to do it.

Write $T_j = dd^c u_j + \theta_j$, where $\theta_j$ is a smooth form and $u_j$ is a $\theta_j$-psh function. By the strong quasi-continuity of bounded psh functions ([32 Theorems 2.4 and 2.9]), we have that

$$R_k := 1_{\cap_{j=1}^m \{ u_j > -k \}} \wedge_{j=1}^m (dd^c \max \{ u_j, -k \} + \theta_j) = 1_{\cap_{j=1}^m \{ u_j > -k \}} \wedge_{j=1}^m (dd^c \max \{ u_j, -l \} + \theta_j)$$
for every $l \geq k \geq 1$. A similar equality also holds if we use local potentials of $T_j$ instead of global ones. We can show that $R_k$ is positive (see \cite[Lemma 3.2]{32}).

As in \cite{7}, since $X$ is Kähler, one can check that $R_k$ is of mass bounded uniformly in $k$ and $(R_k)_k$ admits a limit current which is closed as $k \to \infty$. The last limit is denoted by $\langle \wedge_{j=1}^m T_j \rangle T$. The last product is, hence, a well-defined closed positive current of bi-degree $(m + p, m + p)$; and it is symmetric with respect to $T_1, \ldots, T_m$ and homogeneous. We refer to \cite[Proposition 3.5]{32} for more properties of relative non-pluripolar products.

Let $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_m$ be pseudoeffective $(1,1)$-classes on $X$. Recall that by using a monotonicity property of relative non-pluripolar products (\cite[Theorem 1.1]{32}), we can define the cohomology class $\{\langle \alpha_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \alpha_m \rangle T\}$ which is that of the current $\langle \wedge_{j=1}^m T_{j,\min} \rangle T$, where $T_{j,\min}$ is a current with minimal singularities in $\alpha_j$ for $1 \leq j \leq m$. When $T$ is the current of integration along $X$, we write $\langle \alpha_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \alpha_m \rangle$ for $\{\langle \alpha_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \alpha_m \rangle T\}$. By \cite[Proposition 4.6]{32}, the class $\langle \alpha_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \alpha_m \rangle$ is equal to the positive product of $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_m$ defined in \cite[Definition 1.17]{7} provided that $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_m$ are big.

In the next paragraph, we are going to introduce a related notion of products of $(1,1)$-classes. This idea was already suggested in \cite{32}. This new notion will play a crucial role in our proof of Theorem 1.1. We are interested in the case where $T$ is of bi-degree $(1,1)$. We recall the following key monotonicity property.

**Theorem 2.1.** (\cite[Remark 4.5]{32}) Let $X$ be a compact Kähler manifold and let $T_1, \ldots, T_m, T$ be closed positive $(1,1)$-currents on $X$. Let $T_j'$ and $T'$ be closed positive $(1,1)$-currents in the cohomology class of $T_j$ and $T$ respectively such that $T_j'$ is less singular than $T_j$ for $1 \leq j \leq m$ and $T'$ is less singular than $T$. Then we have

$$\langle \langle T_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge T_m \rangle T \rangle \leq \langle \langle T_1' \wedge \cdots \wedge T_m' \rangle T' \rangle.$$ 

Recall that for closed positive $(1,1)$-currents $P$ and $P'$ on $X$, we say that $P'$ is less singular than $P$ if for every global potential $u$ of $P$ and $u'$ of $P'$, then $u \leq u' + O(1)$.

**Proof.** Since this result is crucial for us, we will present its proof below. Write $T_j = dd^c u_j + \theta_j$, $T_j' = dd^c u_j' + \theta_j$, where $\theta_j$ is a smooth form and $u_j, u_j'$ are negative $\theta_j$-psh functions, for every $1 \leq j \leq m$. Similarly, we have $T = dd^c \varphi + \eta$, $T' = dd^c \varphi' + \eta'$.

**Step 1.** Assume for the moment that $T_j, T_j'$ are of the same singularity type for every $1 \leq j \leq m$ and $T, T'$ are also of the same singularity type. We will check that

$$\{\langle T_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge T_m \rangle T \} = \{\langle T_1' \wedge \cdots \wedge T_m' \rangle T' \}. \quad (2.1)$$

Since $T_j, T_j'$ are of the same singularity type, we have $\{u_j = -\infty\} = \{u_j' = -\infty\}$ and $w_j := u_j - u_j'$ is bounded. We have similar properties for $\varphi, \varphi'$. Let $A := \cup_{j=1}^m \{u_j = -\infty\}$ which is a complete pluripolar set. Put $u_{jk} := \max\{u_j, -k\}$, $u_{jk}' := \max\{u_j', -k\}$ and

$$\psi_k := k^{-1} \max \{\sum_{j=1}^n (u_j + u_j'), -k\} + 1 \quad (2.2)$$
which is quasi-psh and $0 \leq \psi_k \leq 1$, $\psi_k(x)$ increases to 1 for $x \notin A$. We have $\psi_k(x) = 0$ if $u_j(x) \leq -k$ or $u_j'(x) \leq -k$ for some $j$. Put $w_{jk} := u_{jk} - u_j'$. Since $w_j$ is bounded, we have

$$|w_{jk}| \leq 1$$

(2.3)
on $X$. Let $J, J' \subset \{1, \ldots, m\}$ with $J \cap J' = \emptyset$. Put

$$R_{J, J'k} := \wedge_{j \in J} (dd^c u_{jk} + \theta_j) \wedge \wedge_{j' \in J'} (dd^c u_{j'k} + \theta_{j'}) \wedge T$$

and

$$R_{J, J'} := \langle \wedge_{j \in J} (dd^c u_{j} + \theta_j) \wedge \wedge_{j' \in J'} (dd^c u_{j'} + \theta_{j'}) \wedge T \rangle.$$ 

Let

$$B_k := \bigcap_{j \in J} \{u_j > -k\} \cap \bigcap_{j' \in J'} \{u_{j'} > -k\}.$$ 

Observe

$$0 \leq 1_{B_k} R_{J, J'} = 1_{B_k} R_{J, J'k}$$

for every $J, J', k$. Put $\tilde{R}_{J, J'} := 1_{X \setminus A} R_{J, J'}$. The last current is closed positive. Using the fact that $\{\psi_k \neq 0\} \subset B_k \setminus A$, we get

$$\psi_k \tilde{R}_{J, J'} = \psi_k R_{J, J'} = \psi_k R_{J, J'k}.$$ 

(2.4)

Put $p' := n - |J| - |J'| - p - 1$. By Claim in the proof of [32, Proposition 4.2], for every $j'' \in \{1, \ldots, m\}\setminus (J \cup J')$ and every closed smooth form $\Phi$ of bi-degree $(p', p')$ on $X$, we have

$$\lim_{k \to \infty} \int_X \psi_k dd^c w'_{jk} \wedge R_{J, J'k} \wedge \Phi = 0.$$ 

(2.5)

Let

$$S_0 := \langle T_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge T_n \wedge T \rangle - \langle T'_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge T'_n \wedge T \rangle$$

and

$$S_1 := \langle T_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge T_n \wedge T \rangle - \langle T'_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge T'_n \wedge T \rangle, \quad S_2 := \langle T'_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge T'_n \wedge (T - T') \rangle.$$ 

We have $S_0 = S_1 + S_2$. Using $T_{jk} = T_{jk}' + dd^c w_{jk}$, one can check that

$$\int_X \psi_k S_1 \wedge \Phi = \sum_{s=1}^{m} \int_X \psi_k \wedge_{j=1}^{s-1} T_{jk}' \wedge dd^c w_{sk} \wedge \wedge_{j=s+1}^{m} T_{jk} \wedge T \wedge \Phi$$

for every closed smooth $\Phi$. This together with (2.5) yields

$$\langle S_1, \Phi \rangle = \lim_{k \to \infty} \langle \psi_k S_1, \Phi \rangle = 0.$$ 

(2.6)

Let $\varphi_l := \max\{\varphi, -l\}$ and $\varphi_l' := \max\{\varphi', -l\}$ for $l \in \mathbb{N}$. By [32, Theorem 2.2], observe

$$\int_X \psi_k S_2 \wedge \Phi = \lim_{l \to \infty} \int_X \psi_k dd^c (\varphi_l - \varphi_l') \wedge T_{1k}' \wedge \cdots \wedge T_{mk}' \wedge \Phi.$$ 

(2.7)
Since $\varphi_l - \varphi'_l$ is bounded uniformly in $l \in \mathbb{N}$, reasoning as in the proof of (2.5), we see that the term under limit in the right-hand side of (2.7) converges to 0 as $k \to \infty$ uniformly in $l$. Hence

$$
\int_X \psi_k S_2 \wedge \Phi \to 0
$$
as $k \to \infty$. Consequently, we get

$$
\int_X \psi_k S \wedge \Phi \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad k \to \infty.
$$
In other words, (2.1) follows. This finishes Step 1.

**Step 2.** Consider now the general case, i.e., $T'_j$ and $T'$ are less singular than $T_j$ and $T$ respectively. Without loss of generality, we can assume that $u'_j \geq u_j$ and $\varphi' \geq \varphi$. For $l \in \mathbb{N}$, put $u'_j := \max\{u_j, u'_j - l\}$ which is of the same singularity type as $u'_j$. Notice that $dd^c u'_j + \theta_j \geq 0$. Similarly, put $\varphi' := \max\{\varphi, \varphi' - l\}$ and $T' := dd^c \varphi' + \eta \geq 0$.

Since $X$ is Kähler, the family of currents $\langle \wedge_{j=1}^m (dd^c u'_j + \theta_j) \wedge T' \rangle$ parameterized by $l$ is of uniformly bounded mass. Let $S$ be a limit current of the last family as $l \to \infty$. Since $u'_j, u'_j$ are of the same singularity type for every $j$ and $\varphi', \varphi'$ are so, using Step 1, we see that

$$
\{S\} = \{ \langle \wedge_{j=1}^m T'_j \wedge T' \rangle \}. \tag{2.8}
$$

On the other hand, since $u'_j, \varphi'$ decrease to $u_j, \varphi$ as $l \to \infty$ respectively, we can apply [32, Lemma 4.1] (and [32, Theorem 2.2]) to get

$$
S \geq \langle \wedge_{j=1}^m T'_j \wedge T \rangle.
$$

This combined with (2.8) gives the desired assertion. The proof is finished.

We note here the following remark which could be useful for other works.

**Remark 2.2.** Let $P$ and $P'$ be closed positive $(1,1)$-currents and $Q$ a closed positive currents such that $P'$ is less singular than $P$ and potentials of $P$ are integrable with respect to the trace measure of $Q$. Put $T := P \wedge Q$ and $T' := P' \wedge Q$. Then Theorem 2.1 still holds for these $T', T$ with the same proof. The only minor modification is that the potentials $\varphi, \varphi'$ of $T, T'$ in the last proof are replaced by those of $P, P'$.

For a $(1,1)$-current $P$, recall that the polar locus $I_P$ of $P$ is the set of $x \in X$ so that the potentials of $P$ are equal to $-\infty$ at $x$. For every pseudoeffective $(1,1)$-class $\beta$ in $X$, we define its polar locus $I_\beta$ to be that of a current with minimal singularities in $\beta$. This is independent of the choice of a current with minimal singularities. We have the following.

**Lemma 2.3.** Assume that $T$ is of bi-degree $(1,1)$. Then we have

$$
\langle T_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge T_m \wedge T \rangle = \langle T_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge T_m \wedge (1_X \setminus I_T) \rangle, \tag{2.9}
$$

In particular, if $T$ has no mass on $I_T$, then

$$
\langle T_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge T_m \wedge T \rangle = \langle T_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge T_m \wedge T \rangle.
$$
Proof. By [32, Proposition 3.6], we get
\[ \langle T_1 \land \cdots \land T_m \land T \rangle = 1_{X \backslash J_T} \langle T_1 \land \cdots \land T_m \land T \rangle. \tag{2.10} \]
Now using (2.10) and [32, Proposition 3.5] (vii) gives (2.9). This finishes the proof. \(\square\)

Let \(1 \leq l \leq m\). Let \(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_m, \beta\) be pseudoeffective \((1, 1)\)-classes of \(X\). Let \(T_{j, \min}, T_{\min}\) be currents with minimal singularities in the classes \(\alpha_j, \beta\) respectively, where \(l \leq j \leq m\). By Theorem 2.1, the class
\[ \{ \langle T_1 \land \cdots \land T_{l-1} \land T_{l, \min} \land \cdots \land T_{m, \min} \land T_{\min} \rangle \} \]
is a well-defined pseudoeffective class which is independent of the choice of \(T_{\min}\) and \(T_{j, \min}\) for \(l \leq j \leq m\). We denote the last class by
\[ \{ \langle T_1 \land \cdots \land T_{l-1} \land \alpha_l \land \cdots \land \alpha_m \land \beta \rangle \}. \]
For simplicity, when \(l = 1\), we remove the bracket \(\{\}\) from the last notation.

The following result holds for the class \(\{ \langle T_1 \land \cdots \land T_{l-1} \land \alpha_l \land \cdots \land \alpha_m \land \beta \rangle \}\) but to avoid cumbersome notations (while keeping the essence of the statements), we only write it for \(l = 1\).

**Proposition 2.4.** (i) The product \(\langle \wedge_{j=1}^m \alpha_j \land \beta \rangle\) is symmetric and homogeneous in \(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_m\).

(ii) If \(\beta'\) is a pseudo-effective \((1, 1)\)-class, then
\[ \langle \wedge_{j=1}^m \alpha_j \land \beta \rangle + \langle \wedge_{j=1}^m \alpha_j \land \beta' \rangle \leq \langle \wedge_{j=1}^m \alpha_j \land (\beta + \beta') \rangle. \]

(iii) Let \(1 \leq l \leq m\) be an integer. Let \(\alpha_1', \ldots, \alpha_l''\) be a pseudoeffective \((1, 1)\)-class such that \(\alpha_j' \geq \alpha_j\) for \(1 \leq j \leq l\). Assume that there is a current with minimal singularities in \(\beta\) having no mass on \(I_{\alpha_j' - \alpha_j}\) for every \(1 \leq j \leq l\). Then, we have
\[ \langle \wedge_{j=1}^l \alpha_j' \land \wedge_{j=l+1}^m \alpha_j \land \beta \rangle \geq \langle \wedge_{j=1}^m \alpha_j \land \beta \rangle. \]

(iv) If there is a current with minimal singularities in \(\beta\) having no mass on proper analytic subsets on \(X\), then the product \(\langle \wedge_{j=1}^m \alpha_j \land \beta \rangle\) is continuous on the set of \((\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_m)\) such that \(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_m\) are big.

(v) We have
\[ \langle \wedge_{j=1}^m \alpha_j \land \beta \rangle \leq \langle \wedge_{j=1}^m \alpha_j \land \beta \rangle \]
and the equality occurs if there is a current with minimal singularities \(P\) in \(\beta\) such that \(P = 0\) on \(I_P\).

**Proof.** We see that (v) is a direct consequence of Lemma 2.3 and the definition of the product \(\langle \wedge_{j=1}^m \alpha_j \land \beta \rangle\). The other desired statements can be proved by using arguments similar to those in the proof of [32, Proposition 4.6]; see also [9] for related materials. This finishes the proof. \(\square\)

The following result will be useful later.
Lemma 2.5. Let $\alpha$ be a big class and let $T_{\alpha,\text{min}}$ be a current with minimal singularities in $\alpha$. Let $T$ be a current in $\alpha$. Then, the current $1_{I_{T_{\alpha,\text{min}}}} T_{\alpha,\text{min}}$ is a linear combination of currents of integration along irreducible hypersurfaces of $X$, and we have

$$1_{I_{T_{\alpha,\text{min}}}} T_{\alpha,\text{min}} \leq 1_{I_T} T. \quad (2.11)$$

In particular, for every pluripolar set $A$, if $T$ has no mass on $A$, then so does $T_{\alpha,\text{min}}$.

Proof. Recall that $I_\alpha = I_{T_{\alpha,\text{min}}}$. By Demailly’s analytic approximation of $(1,1)$-currents ([16]), there exists a Kähler current with analytic singularities $P$ in $\alpha$. It follows that $I_\alpha$ is contained in a proper analytic subset of $X$. This together the fact that $\text{Supp} T_{\alpha,j}$ is contained in the closure of $I_{\alpha,j}$ implies the first desired assertion.

We prove (2.11). It is enough to consider the case where $1_{I_{T_{\alpha,\text{min}}}} T_{\alpha,\text{min}}$ is nonzero. Let $W$ be the support of the last current. By the above observation, $W$ is a hypersurface. Since $T$ is less singular than $T_{\alpha,\text{min}}$, we get

$$\nu(T, x) \geq \nu(T_{\alpha,\text{min}}, x)$$

for every $x$. In particular, the generic Lelong number of $T$ along every irreducible component $W'$ of $W$ is greater than or equal to that of $T_{\alpha,\text{min}}$ along $W'$. We deduce that $T \geq 1_{I_{T_{\alpha,\text{min}}}} T_{\alpha,\text{min}}$. Hence, (2.11) follows.

Let $A$ be a pluripolar set in $X$. Let $\varphi_{\text{min}}$ be a potential of $T_{\alpha,\text{min}}$. We have

$$T_{\alpha,\text{min}} = 1_{\{\varphi_{\text{min}} > -\infty\}} T_{\alpha,\text{min}} + 1_{\{\varphi_{\text{min}} = -\infty\}} T_{\alpha,\text{min}}.$$ 

Observe that the first term in the right-hand side of the last equality has no mass on $A$ (it is equal to the non-pluripolar product of $T_{\alpha,\text{min}}$ itself), whereas the second term satisfies the same property by (2.11) and the hypothesis. This finishes the proof. 

3 Reversed Alexandrov-Fenchel type inequality

We first recall an integration by parts formula for relative non-pluripolar products from [30] generalizing those given in [7, 28, 35].

Let $X$ be a compact Kähler manifold. Recall that a $dsh$ function on $X$ is the difference of two quasi-plurisubharmonic (quasi-psh for short) functions on $X$ (see [20]). These functions are well-defined outside pluripolar sets. Let $v$ be a $dsh$ function on $X$. The last function is said to be bounded in $X$ if there exists a constant $C$ such that $|v| \leq C$ on $X$ (outside certain pluripolar set).

Let $T$ be a closed positive current on $X$. We say that $v$ is $T$-admissible if there exist quasi-psh functions $\varphi_1, \varphi_2$ such that $v = \varphi_1 - \varphi_2$ and $T$ has no mass on $\{\varphi_j = -\infty\}$ for $j = 1, 2$. In particular, if $T$ has no mass on pluripolar sets, then every $dsh$ function is $T$-admissible.

Assume now that $v$ is bounded $T$-admissible. Let $\varphi_1, \varphi_2$ be quasi-psh functions such that $v = \varphi_1 - \varphi_2$ and $T$ has no mass on $\{\varphi_j = -\infty\}$ for $j = 1, 2$. Let

$$\varphi_{j,k} := \max\{\varphi_j, -k\}$$
for every $j = 1, 2$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Put $v_k := \varphi_{1,k} - \varphi_{2,k}$. Put

$$Q_k := dv_k \wedge d^cv_k \wedge T = dd^c v_k^2 \wedge T - v_k dd^c v_k \wedge T.$$ 

By the plurifine locality with respect to $T$ ([32, Theorem 2.9]) applied to the right-hand side of the last equality, we have

$$1_{\cap_{j=1}^2(\varphi_j > k)} Q_k = 1_{\cap_{j=1}^2(\varphi_j > k)} Q_{k'}$$

for every $k' \geq k$. By [30, Lemma 2.5], the mass of $Q_k$ on $X$ is bounded uniformly in $k$. This combined with (3.1) implies that there exists a positive current $Q$ on $X$ such that for every bounded Borel form $\Phi$ with compact support on $X$ such that

$$\langle Q, \Phi \rangle = \lim_{k \to \infty} \langle Q_k, \Phi \rangle.$$ 

We define $\langle dv \wedge d^c v \wedge T \rangle$ to be the current $Q$. This agrees with the classical definition if $v$ is the difference of two bounded quasi-psh functions. One can check that this definition is independent of the choice of $\varphi_1, \varphi_2$.

Let $w$ be another bounded $T$-admissible dsh function. If $T$ is of bi-degree $(n-1, n-1)$, we can also define the current $\langle dv \wedge d^c w \wedge T \rangle$ by a similar procedure as above. We put

$$\langle dd^c v \wedge T \rangle := \langle dd^c \varphi_1 \wedge T \rangle - \langle dd^c \varphi_2 \wedge T \rangle$$

which is independent of the choice of $\varphi_1, \varphi_2$. By $T$-admissibility, we have

$$\langle dd^c (v + w) \wedge T \rangle = \langle dd^c v \wedge T \rangle + \langle dd^c w \wedge T \rangle.$$ 

Here is an integration by parts formula for relative non-pluripolar products.

**Theorem 3.1.** ([30, Theorem 2.6]) Let $T$ a closed positive current of bi-degree $(n-1, n-1)$ on $X$. Let $v$ and $w$ be bounded $T$-admissible dsh functions on $X$. Then, we have

$$\int_X w \langle dd^c v \wedge T \rangle = \int_X v \langle dd^c w \wedge T \rangle = - \int_X \langle dw \wedge d^c v \wedge T \rangle.$$  

Let $\theta$ be a closed smooth $(1, 1)$-form on $X$. Given a $\theta$-psh function $u$, we use the usual notation that

$$\theta_u := dd^c u + \theta.$$ 

Let $T$ be a closed positive current of bi-degree $(n-2, n-2)$ on $X$. Let $u, v, \varphi$ be $\theta$-psh functions such that $u, v \leq \varphi$.

The following can be regarded as an inequality of reversed Alexandrov-Fenchel type. Several related estimates for mixed Monge-Ampère operators were obtained in the local setting; see [13, 26].

**Proposition 3.2.** Assume that

$$\int_X \langle \theta_u^2 \wedge T \rangle = \int_X \langle \theta_v^2 \wedge \theta \wedge T \rangle,$$  

and $T$ has no mass on $\{u = -\infty\}$ and $\{v = -\infty\}$. Then, we have

$$\int_X \left( \langle \theta_u \wedge \theta_v \wedge T \rangle - \langle \theta_u \wedge \theta_v \wedge T \rangle \right) \leq \left( \int_X \left( \langle \theta_u^2 \wedge T \rangle - \langle \theta_v^2 \wedge T \rangle \right) \right)^{1/2} \left( \int_X \left( \langle \theta_u \wedge \theta_v \wedge T \rangle - \langle \theta_v^2 \wedge T \rangle \right) \right)^{1/2}.$$
Proof. By hypothesis, one has
\[ 1_{\{u=-\infty\} \cup \{v=-\infty\}} T = 0. \tag{3.4} \]

Note here that
\[ \{\varphi = -\infty\} \subset \{u = -\infty\} \cap \{v = -\infty\}. \]
Let
\[ u_k := \max\{u, \varphi - k\} - (\varphi - k) \]
and
\[ \psi_k := k^{-1} \max\{u + v - 2\varphi, -k\} + 1 = k^{-1} \max\{u + v, 2\varphi - k\} - k^{-1} 2\varphi + 1 \]

Define \( v_k \) similarly. We have \( \psi_k = 0 \) on \( \{u \leq \varphi - k\} \cup \{v \leq \varphi - k\} \). Note also that
\[ 0 \leq u_k, v_k \leq k \text{ for } j = 1, 2 \] (hence \( u_k, v_k, \psi_k \) are bounded \( T \)-admissible dsh functions by (3.4)) and
\[ dd^c \psi_k + k^{-1} \eta \geq 0, \]
where \( \eta := 2\theta \varphi \).

We can check that
\[ \langle \theta_u \wedge \theta_v \wedge T \rangle = \lim_{k \to \infty} \psi_k \langle (dd^c u_k + \theta \varphi) \wedge (dd^c v_k + \theta \varphi) \wedge T \rangle. \]

Put
\[ B_k := \int_X \psi_k \langle \theta_{\varphi} \wedge (dd^c v_k + \theta \varphi) \wedge T \rangle - \int_X \psi_k \langle (dd^c u_k + \theta \varphi) \wedge (dd^c v_k + \theta \varphi) \wedge T \rangle. \]

Let
\[ A := \int_X \langle (\theta_{\varphi} \wedge \theta_v \wedge T) - \langle \theta_u \wedge \theta_v \wedge T \rangle \rangle \]

By (3.4), we have
\[ A = \lim_{k \to \infty} B_k. \]

Observe
\[ B_k = -\int_X \psi_k \langle dd^c u_k \wedge (dd^c v_k + \theta \varphi) \wedge T \rangle \]
\[ = -\int_X \psi_k \langle dd^c u_k \wedge dd^c v_k \wedge T \rangle - \int_X \psi_k \langle dd^c u_k \wedge \theta \varphi \wedge T \rangle. \]

Denote by \( I_1, I_2 \) the first and second term in the right-hand side of the last equality. Using (3.4) gives
\[ \lim_{k \to \infty} I_2 = -\int_X \psi_k \langle (dd^c u_k + \theta \varphi) \wedge \theta \varphi \wedge T \rangle + \int_X \psi_k \langle \theta^2 \varphi \wedge T \rangle \]
\[ = -\int_X \langle \theta_u \wedge \theta_v \wedge T \rangle + \int_X \langle \theta^2 \varphi \wedge T \rangle = 0 \]

by (3.3). Thus we get
\[ B_k = I_1 + o_{k \to \infty}(1). \tag{3.5} \]
Theorem 3.1 applied to the formula defining \( I_1 \) gives

\[
-I_1 = \int_X u_k \langle dd^c \psi_k \wedge dd^c v_k \wedge T \rangle \tag{3.6}
\]

\[
= - \int_X \langle du_k \wedge d^c v_k \wedge dd^c \psi_k \wedge T \rangle
\]

\[
= - \int_X \langle du_k \wedge d^c v_k \wedge (dd^c \psi_k + k^{-1} \eta) \wedge T \rangle + k^{-1} \int_X \langle du_k \wedge d^c v_k \wedge \eta \wedge T \rangle.
\]

Denote by \( J_1, J_2 \) the first and second term in the right-hand side of the last equality. We treat \( J_2 \). By integration by parts, we obtain

\[
J_2 = -k^{-1} \int_X u_k \langle dd^c v_k \wedge \eta \wedge T \rangle = -k^{-1} \int_X u_k \langle (dd^c v_k + \theta \phi) \wedge \eta \wedge T \rangle + o_{k \to \infty}(1) \tag{3.7}
\]

because of (3.4) and the fact that \( u_k/k \) converges to 0 on \( \{ u > -\infty \} \) and to \(-1 \) otherwise. Using this and noticing that \( u_k \leq 0 \), we infer

\[
\lim_{k \to \infty} J_2 \geq 0. \tag{3.8}
\]

On the other hand, using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we obtain

\[
J_2^2 \leq \int_X \langle du_k \wedge d^c u_k \wedge (dd^c \psi_k + k^{-1} \eta) \wedge T \rangle \int_X \langle dv_k \wedge d^c v_k \wedge (dd^c \psi_k + k^{-1} \eta) \wedge T \rangle. \tag{3.9}
\]

Denote by \( J_{11}, J_{12} \) the first and second term in the right-hand side of the last inequality. Put

\[
J'_{11} := k^{-1} \int_X \langle du_k \wedge d^c u_k \wedge \eta \wedge T \rangle.
\]

Using integration by parts and arguing as in (3.7), we obtain

\[
J'_{11} = -k^{-1} \int_X u_k \langle dd^c u_k \wedge \eta \wedge T \rangle \tag{3.10}
\]

\[
= -k^{-1} \int_X u_k \langle (dd^c u_k + \theta \phi) \wedge \eta \wedge T \rangle + o_{k \to \infty}(1)
\]

\[
= \int_X \langle (dd^c u_k + \theta \phi) \wedge \eta \wedge T \rangle - \int_X (u_k/k + 1) \langle (dd^c u_k + \theta \phi) \wedge \eta \wedge T \rangle + o_{k \to \infty}(1)
\]

\[
= \int_X \langle \theta \phi \wedge \eta \wedge T \rangle - \int_X (u_k/k + 1) \langle \theta \wedge \eta \wedge T \rangle + o_{k \to \infty}(1)
\]

because \( u_k/k + 1 = 0 \) on \( \{ u \leq \varphi - k \} \). Letting \( k \to \infty \) in (3.10) gives converges to

\[
\lim_{k \to \infty} J'_{11} = \int_X \langle \theta \wedge \eta \wedge T \rangle - \int_X \langle \theta \wedge \eta \wedge T \rangle = 2 \int_X \langle \theta^2 \wedge T \rangle - 2 \int_X \langle \theta \wedge \theta \wedge T \rangle. \tag{3.11}
\]
Using Theorem 3.1 and arguing as in (3.10), we have

\[
J_{11} = \int_X \langle du_k \land df_k \land dd^c \psi_k \land T \rangle + J'_{11}
\]

\[
= -\int_X \psi_k \langle dd^c u_k \land dd^c \psi_k \land T \rangle + J'_{11}
\]

\[
= -\int_X \psi_k \langle (dd^c u_k + \theta) \land T \rangle + 2 \int_X \psi_k \langle dd^c u_k \land \theta \land T \rangle + \int_X \psi_k \langle \theta^2 \land T \rangle + J'_{11}
\]

\[
= \int_X \langle \theta^2 \land T \rangle - \int_X \langle \theta^2 \land T \rangle + 2 \int_X \langle \theta \land \theta \land T \rangle - 2 \int_X \langle \theta^2 \land T \rangle + o_{k \to \infty}(1) + J'_{11}
\]

This combined with (3.11) yields that

\[
\limsup_{k \to \infty} J_{11} \leq \int_X \langle \theta^2 \land T \rangle - \int_X \langle \theta^2 \land T \rangle.
\]

By similar computations, we also get

\[
\limsup_{k \to \infty} J_{12} \leq \int_X \langle \theta^2 \land T \rangle - \int_X \langle \theta^2 \land T \rangle.
\]

Now using (3.3) gives

\[
\limsup_{k \to \infty} J_{11} = 0.
\]

This combined with (3.9) yields

\[
J_1 \to 0
\]

as \(k \to \infty\). This together with (3.6) and (3.5) gives

\[
\limsup_{k \to \infty} B_k = \limsup_{k \to \infty} I_1 = -\liminf_{k \to \infty} -I_1 \leq 0.
\]

Thus, \(A \leq 0\). On the other hand, by the monotonicity of relative non-pluripolar products, \(A\) is nonnegative. It follows that \(A = 0\). This finishes the proof.

**Corollary 3.3.** Let \(T\) be closed positive current of bi-dimension \((m, m)\) on \(X\) and let \(\theta\) be a closed smooth \((1, 1)\)-form on \(X\). Let \(u, v, \varphi\) be \(\theta\)-psh functions such that \(u, v \leq \varphi\), and \(T\) has no mass on \(\{u = -\infty\}\) and \(\{v = -\infty\}\). Assume that

\[
\int_X \langle \theta^m \land \varphi \land T \rangle = \int_X \langle \theta^m \land u \land T \rangle.
\]

Then, for every integer \(0 \leq l \leq m\), we have

\[
\int_X \langle \theta^m \land \theta^{m-l} \land \varphi \land T \rangle = \int_X \langle \theta^m \land \theta^{m-l} \land \theta^l \land T \rangle.
\]

**Proof.** By the monotonicity of relative non-pluripolar products and the hypothesis, we get

\[
\int_X \langle \theta^m \land \varphi \land T \rangle = \int_X \langle \theta^{m-l} \land \theta^l \land \varphi \land T \rangle
\] (3.12)
for every \(0 \leq l \leq m\). Consequently, the desired assertion in the case where \(m = 2\) is a direct consequence of Proposition [3.2]. We prove by induction on \(l'\) that for every \(0 \leq l_1, l_2 \leq m\) with \(l_1 + l_2 \leq l'\) we have
\[
\int_X \langle \theta_{\varphi}^{m-l_1-l_2} \wedge \theta_u^{l_1} \wedge \theta_v^{l_2} \wedge T \rangle = \int_X \langle \theta_{\varphi}^{m-l_2} \wedge \theta_v^{l_2} \wedge T \rangle.
\]
(3.13)

When \(l' = 0\), this is clear. Suppose that (3.13) holds for every \(l_1, l_2\) with \(l_1 + l_2 \leq l' - 1\). We need to prove it for \(l'\) in place of \(l' - 1\). To this end, we now use another induction on \(0 \leq l_2 \leq l'\) to prove the statement (*) that (3.13) holds for every \(l_1\) with \(l_1 + l_2 \leq l'\). When \(l_2 = 0\), the statement (*) is a direct consequence of (3.12). Assume now that (*) holds for \(l_2 - 1\). We now prove it for \(l_2\). Let
\[
T' := \langle \theta_{\varphi}^{m-l_1-l_2} \wedge \theta_u^{l_1-1} \wedge \theta_v^{l_2-1} \wedge T \rangle.
\]
We have
\[
\langle \theta_{\varphi}^{m-l_1-l_2} \wedge \theta_u^{l_1} \wedge \theta_v^{l_2} \wedge T \rangle = \langle \theta_u \wedge \theta_v \wedge T' \rangle,
\]
and
\[
\int_X (\theta_u^2 \wedge T') = \int_X (\theta_{\varphi}^{m-l_1-l_2} \wedge \theta_u^{l_1+1} \wedge \theta_v^{l_2-1} \wedge T)
= \int_X (\theta_{\varphi}^{m-l_1-l_2+2} \wedge \theta_u^{l_1-1} \wedge \theta_v^{l_2-1} \wedge T) = \int_X (\theta_v^2 \wedge T')
\]
by induction hypothesis on \(l_2\) that (*) holds for \(l_2 - 1\).

Note that \(T'\) has no mass on \(\{u = -\infty\}\) and \(\{v = -\infty\}\) because \(T\) does so; see [32, Lemma 2.1]. Applying Proposition [3.3] to \(u, v, \varphi, T'\) gives
\[
\langle \theta_u \wedge \theta_v \wedge T' \rangle = \langle \theta_{\varphi} \wedge \theta_v \wedge T' \rangle.
\]
We deduce that
\[
(\theta_{\varphi}^{m-l_1-l_2} \wedge \theta_u^{l_1} \wedge \theta_v^{l_2} \wedge T) = (\theta_{\varphi}^{m-l_1-l_2+1} \wedge \theta_u^{l_1-1} \wedge \theta_v^{l_2} \wedge T)
\]
which is equal to
\[
(\theta_{\varphi}^{m-l_2} \wedge \theta_v^{l_2} \wedge T)
\]
by induction hypothesis on \(l' - 1\). The desired assertion (*) follows. In other words, (3.13) holds for every \(l_1, l_2\) with \(l_1 + l_2 \leq l'\). This is what we want to prove. The proof is finished.

\section{Proof of main results}

We will sometimes use the notations \(\gtrsim, \lesssim\) to denote the inequalities \(\geq, \leq\) modulo some strictly positive multiplicative constant independent of parameters in consideration. For every analytic set \(W\) in a complex manifold \(Y\), we denote by \(|W|\) the current of integration along \(W\).
Let $X$ be a compact Kähler manifold. Let $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_m$ be big classes in $X$. Let $T_{j,\text{min}}$ be a current with minimal singularities in $\alpha_j$ and

$$T_{\alpha_j} := 1_{I_{\alpha_j}} T_{j,\text{min}}$$

(recall here that $I_{\alpha_j}$ is the set of $x \in X$ such that potentials of $T_{j,\text{min}}$ are equal to $-\infty$ at $x$). By Lemma 2.5, the current $T_{\alpha_j}$ is a linear combination of currents of integration along irreducible hypersurfaces of $X$. In view of proving Theorem 1.1, we first explain how to reduce the problem to the case where $T_{\alpha_j}$’s are zero.

**Lemma 4.1.** For every $j$, the class $\alpha_j - \{T_{\alpha_j}\}$ is big and there holds

$$\langle \wedge_{j=1}^m \alpha_j \rangle = \langle \wedge_{j=1}^m (\alpha_j - \{T_{\alpha_j}\}) \rangle. \quad (4.1)$$

**Proof.** Let $\omega$ be a Kähler form on $X$. Fix an index $1 \leq j \leq m$. Let $W_j$ be the support of $T_{\alpha_j}$. Consider a Kähler current $P_j \in \alpha_j$. By Lemma 2.5, the set $W_j$ is a hypersurface (or empty), and $P_j - T_{\alpha_j}$ is a closed positive current. Note that

$$P_j - T_{\alpha_j} = P_j \gtrsim \omega$$

on $X \setminus W_j$. Since $\omega$ is smooth, we get $P_j - T_{\alpha_j} \gtrsim \omega$ on $X$. In other words, $P_j - T_{\alpha_j}$ is a Kähler current. Hence, $\alpha_j - \{T_{\alpha_j}\}$ is big.

It remains to prove $(4.1)$. The inequality direction “$\geq$” is clear because $\alpha_j \geq \alpha_j - \{T_{\alpha_j}\}$. To get the converse inequality, one only needs to notice that

$$\langle \wedge_{j=1}^m T_{j,\text{min}} \rangle = \langle \wedge_{j=1}^m (T_{j,\text{min}} - T_{\alpha_j}) \rangle$$

which is true because both sides are currents which have no mass on

$$W := \bigcup_{j=1}^m W_j$$

(which is a closed pluripolar set) and are equal on $X \setminus W$ (which is an open subset of $X$).

The proof is finished. \qed

Let $T_j \in \alpha_j$ be a closed positive current as in Theorem 1.1. By Lemma 2.5, we have $1_{I_{T_j}} T_j \geq T_{\alpha_j}$. It follows that $T_j - T_{\alpha_j}$ is positive. Using the fact that $T_{\alpha_j}$ is supported on proper analytic subsets on $X$ gives

$$\langle \wedge_{j=1}^m T_j \rangle = \langle \wedge_{j=1}^m (T_j - T_{\alpha_j}) \rangle.$$ 

This combined with Lemma 4.1 yields that $(T_1 - T_{\alpha_1}), \ldots, (T_m - T_{\alpha_m})$ are of full mass intersection. Hence, by considering $T_j - T_{\alpha_j}, \alpha_j - \{T_{\alpha_j}\}$ instead of $T_j, \alpha_j$, we can assume, from now on, that $T_{\alpha_j}$ is zero as desired.

Assume for the moment that $V$ is a smooth submanifold of $X$ of dimension $\leq n - 1$. Let $\sigma : \hat{X} \to X$ be the blowup of $X$ along $V$. Denote by $\hat{V}$ the exceptional hypersurface. Let $\omega$ be a Kähler form on $X$. Let $\omega_h$ be a closed smooth form cohomologous to $-[\hat{V}]$ so that the restriction of $\omega_h$ to each fiber of the projection from $\hat{V}$ to $V$ is strictly positive. Thus, there exist a strictly positive constants $c_V$ satisfying that

$$\hat{\omega} := c_V \sigma^* \omega + \omega_h > 0 \quad (4.2)$$
We note that when \( \dim V = n - 1 \), by convention, we put \( \tilde{X} := X \), \( \sigma := \text{id} \), \( \tilde{V} := V \), 
\( c_V := 1 \) and \( \omega_h := 0 \).

For every closed positive current \( S \) on \( X \), let \( \lambda_S \) be the generic Lelong number of \( S \) along \( V \). By a well-known result on Lelong numbers under blowups (see [5, Corollary 1.1.8]), the generic Lelong number of \( \sigma^* S \) along \( \tilde{V} \) is equal to \( \lambda_S \). Hence, we can decompose 
\[ \sigma^* T_j = \lambda_{T_j} [\tilde{V}] + \eta_j, \quad \sigma^* T_{j,\min} = \lambda_{T_{j,\min}} [V] + \eta_{j,\min}, \]
where \( \eta_j \) and \( \eta_{j,\min} \) are currents whose generic Lelong number along \( \tilde{V} \) are zero. Since \( T_{j,\min} \) is less singular than \( T_j \), we have \( \lambda_{T_j} \geq \lambda_{T_{j,\min}} \).

For every closed smooth \((n - m, n - m)\)-form \( \Phi \), using the fact that \( T_{j,\min} \) has minimal singularities and the monotonicity of non-pluripolar products gives 
\[
\int_X \langle \wedge_{j=1}^m T_{j,\min} \rangle \wedge \Phi = \int_{\tilde{X}} \langle \wedge_{j=1}^m \eta_{j,\min} \rangle \wedge \sigma^* \Phi = \int_{\tilde{X}} \langle \wedge_{j=1}^m \gamma_{j,\min} \rangle \wedge \sigma^* \Phi. \tag{4.3}
\]

Let 
\[ \gamma_j := \{\eta_j\}, \quad \gamma_{j,\min} := \{\eta_{j,\min}\}, \quad \beta := \{[\tilde{V}]\}. \]

These classes are important in the sequel. By [6, 17], the class \( \gamma_{j,\min} \) is big.

**Lemma 4.2.** We have
\[
\langle \wedge_{j=1}^m \eta_j \rangle \leq \langle \wedge_{j=1}^{m-1} \eta_j \hat{\eta}_m \rangle, \quad \langle \wedge_{j=1}^m \eta_{j,\min} \rangle = \langle \wedge_{j=1}^{m-1} \eta_{j,\min} \hat{\eta}_m \hat{\eta}_{m,\min} \rangle, \tag{4.4}
\]
and
\[
\langle \wedge_{j=1}^m \gamma_{j,\min} \rangle = \langle \wedge_{j=1}^{m-1} \gamma_{j,\min} \hat{\gamma}_{m,\min} \rangle. \tag{4.5}
\]

**Proof.** Observe that \( 1_{I_{\eta_{m,\min}}} \eta_{m,\min} \) has no mass on \( \tilde{V} \) because the generic Lelong number of \( \eta_{m,\min} \) along \( \tilde{V} \) is equal to zero. We deduce that
\[
1_{I_{\eta_{m,\min}}} \eta_{m,\min} = 1_{I_{\eta_{m,\min}}} \setminus \tilde{V} \eta_{m,\min} \leq \sigma^* (1_{I_{\eta_{m,\min}}} \sigma^* T_{m,\min}) \leq \sigma^* (1_{I_{\eta_{m,\min}}} T_{m,\min}) = 0.
\]

Hence, \( \eta_{m,\min} \) has no mass on \( I_{\eta_{m,\min}} \). Combining this with Lemma 2.3 yields (4.4).

We now prove (4.5). Let \( Q_m \) be a current with minimal singularities in \( \gamma_{m,\min} \). By Lemma 2.5 and the fact that \( \gamma_{m,\min} \) is big, we see that
\[
1_{I_{Q_m}} Q_m \leq 1_{\eta_{m,\min}} \eta_{m,\min} = 0.
\]

Hence, \( Q_m \) has no mass on \( I_{Q_m} \). Using this and Lemma 2.3 gives the desired equality and finishes the proof. \( \square \)

For \( 1 \leq j \leq m \), let \( P_j \) be a Kähler current with analytic singularities in \( \alpha_j \). Let \( \epsilon > 0 \) be a constant small enough so that \( P_j \geq \epsilon \omega \) for every \( 1 \leq j \leq m \).
Lemma 4.3. For every constant \( \delta \in (0, 1) \), there exist a constant \( c_\delta > 0 \) and a Kähler current with analytic singularities \( Q_j \in \gamma_{j, \min} - c_\delta \beta \) for \( 1 \leq j \leq m \) such that \( I_{Q_j} \) does not contain \( \hat{V} \), and \( Q_j \geq \frac{\delta \epsilon}{2cV} \hat{\omega} \), and

\[
\frac{\delta \epsilon}{2cV} \leq c_\delta \leq (c \| \alpha_j \| + \frac{\epsilon}{2cV}) \delta, \tag{4.6}
\]

for some constant \( c > 0 \) independent of \( \delta, \beta \) and \( \alpha_j \). In particular, the currents with minimal singularities in \( \gamma_{j, \min} - c_\delta \beta \) has no mass on \( \hat{V} \).

Proof. Using Demailly’s analytic approximation of currents ([16]) applied to the Kähler current \((1 - \delta)T_{j, \min} + \delta P_j\) for \( \delta \in (0, 1) \), we obtain that for every \( \delta \in (0, 1) \), there exits a Kähler current \( P_{j, \delta} \) with analytic singularities in the class \( \alpha_j \) such that \( P_{j, \delta} \) is less singular than \((1 - \delta)T_{j, \min} + \delta P_j\) and

\[
P_{j, \delta} \geq \delta \epsilon \omega / 2. \tag{4.7}
\]

We deduce that

\[
\lambda_{T_{j, \min}} \leq \lambda_{P_{j, \delta}} \leq \lambda_{T_{j, \min}} + a_j \delta, \tag{4.8}
\]

where \( a_j := \lambda_{P_j} - \lambda_{T_{j, \min}} \geq 0 \). Write

\[
\sigma^* P_{j, \delta} = \lambda_{P_{j, \delta}} [\hat{V}] + \eta_{j, \delta}.
\]

Since \( P_{j, \delta} \) has analytic singularities, so does \( \eta_{j, \delta} \) and the polar locus of \( \eta_{j, \delta} \) is an analytic subset of \( X \) which doesn’t contain \( \hat{V} \). Hence, \([\hat{V}]\) has no mass on the polar locus of \( \eta_{j, \delta} \).

Recall that by the choice of \( \omega_h \), we have \( \omega_h \in -\beta \). By (4.7) and (4.2), we also get

\[
Q_j := \eta_{j, \delta} + \frac{\delta \epsilon}{2cV} \omega_h \geq \frac{\delta \epsilon}{2cV} \hat{\omega}.
\]

The last current is in the class \( \gamma_{j, \min} - c_\delta \beta \), where

\[
c_\delta := (\lambda_{P_{j, \delta}} - \lambda_{T_{j, \min}} + c/(2cV)) \delta.
\]

Since \( P_{j, \delta} \) is a current in \( \alpha_j \), we get \( \lambda_{P_{j, \delta}} \leq c \| \alpha_j \| \) for some positive constant \( c \) independent of \( \alpha_j \) and \( \delta \). Hence, (4.6) follows.

We have proved that there is a Kähler current with analytic singularities \( Q_j \) in \( \gamma_{j, \min} - c_\delta \beta \) such that \( \hat{V} \not\subset I_{Q_j} \). It follows that \( Q_j \) has no mass on \( \hat{V} \). Using this and Lemma 2.5 yields the last desired assertion and finishes the proof. \[\Box\]

End of the proof of Theorem 1.1. Let

\[
b_j := \lambda_{T_j} - \lambda_{T_{j, \min}} \geq 0.
\]

Note that \( \gamma_j = \gamma_{j, \min} - b_j \beta \). Suppose on contrary that \( b_j > 0 \) for every \( j \). Recall that we are assuming that \( V \) is smooth. The case where \( V \) is singular is dealt with later.
Let $c_\delta$ be the constant associated to a number $\delta \in (0, 1)$ as in Lemma 4.3. Let $c$ be the constant appearing in (4.6). Put 

$$\delta_j := \left( c \| \alpha_j \| + \frac{\epsilon}{2cV} \right)^{-1} b_j$$

for $1 \leq j \leq m$. Note that since $b_j \lesssim \| \alpha_j \|$, we can increase $c$ in order to have $\delta_j \in (0, 1)$. By (4.6), we get $c_{\delta_j} \leq b_j$ for every $j$. Let $\gamma_{j, \min} := \gamma_{j, \min} - c_{\delta_j} \beta$. By Lemma 4.3 and the fact that

$$I_{\gamma_{j, \min} - \gamma_{j, \min}} = I_{(b_j - c_{\delta_j}) \beta} \subset \hat{V},$$

we obtain that the currents with minimal singularities in $\gamma_{m, \min}$ has no mass on $I_{\gamma_{j, \min} - \gamma_{j, \min}}$. This combined with Proposition 2.4 (iii) gives

$$\{ \langle \wedge_{j=1}^m \eta_j \rangle \} \leq \langle \wedge_{j=1}^{m-1} \gamma_j \wedge \gamma_m \rangle \leq \langle \wedge_{j=1}^{m-1} \gamma_j \wedge \gamma_m \rangle \leq \langle \wedge_{j=1}^{m-1} \gamma_j \wedge \gamma_m \rangle$$

Using the suppr-additivity of products of classes (Proposition 2.4 (ii)), we get

$$\langle \wedge_{j=1}^{m-1} \gamma_j \wedge \gamma_m \rangle \leq \langle \wedge_{j=1}^{m-1} \gamma_j \wedge \gamma_m \rangle - c_{\delta_m} \langle \wedge_{j=1}^{m-1} \gamma_j \wedge \beta \rangle$$

Let $I$ be the first term in the right-hand side in the last inequality. Recall that the currents with minimal singularities in $\gamma_{m, \min}$ has no mass on $\hat{V}$. The last set contains $I_{\beta}$. Hence, using Lemma 2.5 (iii) implies

$$I \leq \langle \wedge_{j=1}^{m-1} \gamma_j \wedge \gamma_m \rangle.$$

Consequently,

$$\langle \wedge_{j=1}^{m-1} \gamma_j \wedge \gamma_m \rangle \leq \langle \wedge_{j=1}^{m-1} \gamma_j \wedge \gamma_m \rangle - c_{\delta_m} \langle \wedge_{j=1}^{m-1} \gamma_j \wedge \beta \rangle$$

by Lemma 4.2. Now let $\Phi$ be a closed smooth positive $(n - m, n - m)$-form on $X$. Put $M_j := \frac{\delta_j}{2cV}$. Note that by (4.6), we get $M_j \leq c_{\delta_j}$ for every $j$. Taking into account Lemma 4.3, we see that

$$\int_X \langle \wedge_{j=1}^{m-1} \gamma_j \wedge \beta \rangle \wedge \sigma^* \Phi \geq M_1 \cdots M_{m-1} \int_{\hat{V}} \omega^{m-1} \wedge \sigma^* \Phi$$

$$= M_1 \cdots M_{m-1} \int_{\hat{V}} \omega^{m-1} \wedge \sigma^* \Phi = M_1 \cdots M_{m-1} \langle [V], \Phi \rangle$$

by Fubini’s theorem and the choice of $\omega_h$. Consequently, we obtain

$$\int_X \langle \wedge_{j=1}^{m} T_j \rangle \wedge \Phi = \int_X \langle \wedge_{j=1}^{m} \eta_j \rangle \wedge \sigma^* \Phi$$

(4.9)

$$\leq \int_X \langle \wedge_{j=1}^{m} \gamma_j \rangle \wedge \sigma^* \Phi - M_1 \cdots M_{m} \langle [V], \Phi \rangle$$

which is, by (4.3), equal to

$$\int_X \langle \wedge_{j=1}^{m} T_{j, \min} \rangle \wedge \Phi - M_1 \cdots M_{m} \langle [V], \Phi \rangle.$$
Using this and the hypothesis that
\[
\int_X \langle \wedge_{j=1}^m T_j \rangle \wedge \Phi = \int_X \langle \wedge_{j=1}^m T_{j,\min} \rangle \wedge \Phi,
\]
we infer that \( \langle [V], \Phi \rangle = 0 \) for every closed smooth \((n - m, n - m)\)-form \( \Phi \). By choosing \( \Phi := \omega^{n-m} \), we obtain a contradiction. This finishes Step 1 of the proof. We observe that we didn’t fully use the assumption that \( \{ \langle \wedge_{j=1}^m T_j \rangle \} = \{ \langle \wedge_{j=1}^m T_{j,\min} \rangle \} \). We only needed that there is a closed positive smooth \((n - m, n - m)\)-form \( \Phi \) on \( X \) such that (4.10) holds and \( \langle [V], \Phi \rangle > 0 \).

We now explain how to treat the case where \( V \) is not necessarily smooth. By Hironaka’s desingularization, there is \( \sigma' : X' \rightarrow X \) which is a composition of consecutive blowups along smooth centers starting from \( X \) so that the centers don’t intersect the regular part of \( V \) and the strict transform \( V' \) of \( V \) by \( \sigma' \) is smooth. Note that \( V' \) is of the same dimension as \( V \).

Let \( T'_j := \sigma'^* T_j \) and \( \alpha'_j := \sigma'^* \alpha_j \). One should note that \( T'_{j,\min} \) might not be of full mass intersection, however, we still have
\[
\int_X \langle \wedge_{j=1}^m \alpha_j \rangle \wedge \Phi = \int_{X'} \langle \wedge_{j=1}^m \alpha'_j \rangle \wedge \sigma'^* \Phi,
\]
for every closed smooth \((n - m, n - m)\)-form \( \Phi \) on \( X \). We will use \( \Phi := \omega^{n-m} \). Observe that
\[
\langle [\hat{V}'], \sigma'^* \Phi \rangle > 0
\]
because \( \sigma' \) is isomorphic outside the singularity of \( V \). This together with (4.11) and the observation at the end of Step 1 allows us to apply Step 1 to \( X', \alpha'_j \) and \( T'_j \) to obtain that there exist an index \( j_0 \) such that
\[
\nu(T'_{j_0}, V') = \nu(\alpha'_{j_0}, V').
\]

On the other hand, by construction of \( \sigma' \), we get \( \nu(T'_j, V') = \nu(T_j, V) \) for every \( j \), a similar property also holds for \( T_{j,\min} \). It follows that
\[
\nu(T_{j_0}, V) = \nu(\alpha'_{j_0}, V') \leq \nu(T'_{j_0,\min}, V') = \nu(T_{j_0,\min}, V) \leq \nu(T_{j_0}, V).
\]
Hence, we get \( \nu(T_{j_0,\min}, V) = \nu(T_{j_0}, V) \). This finishes the proof.

\begin{proof}
End of the proof of Theorem 1.2 and Corollary 1.3. It suffices to assume that
\[
l := \dim V > n - m
\]
because otherwise the desired assertion follows directly from Theorem 1.1. Put
\[
l' := l - (n - m).
\]
Note \( l' \leq n - 1 - (n - m) = m - 1 \). Let \( T_{\min} \) is a current with minimal singularities in \( \alpha \). Suppose on contrary that \( \lambda_T > \lambda_{T_{\min}} \). As in the proof of Theorem 1.1, we can assume that \( V \) is smooth and \( 1_{T_{\min}} T_{\min} = 0 \).
Let $P$ be a Kähler current with analytic singularities in $\alpha$. Since $P$ is more singular than $T_{\min}$, using Corollary 3.3 gives
\[
\{ (P^{\nu} \wedge T^{m-l'}) \} = \{ (P^{\nu} \wedge T^{m-l'})_{\min} \}.
\] (4.12)

Let $\sigma, \hat{\lambda}, \hat{V}$ and other notations be as above. We have $\sigma^*P = \lambda_P[\hat{V}] + \eta_P$, where $\eta_P$ is a current with analytic singularities so that its generic Lelong number along $\hat{V}$ is zero. Similarly, we define $\eta, \eta_{\min}$ for $T, T_{\min}$ respectively. Let $\gamma_{\min}$ be the class of $\eta_{\min}$. Note that since $P$ is Kähler, we have
\[
\eta_P \geq \sigma^* \omega.
\] (4.13)

Using (4.12) yields
\[
\{ (\eta_P^{\nu} \wedge T^{m-l'}) \} = \{ (\eta_P^{\nu} \wedge T^{m-l'})_{\min} \}.
\] (4.14)

Denote by $I$ the left-hand side of the last equality. Arguing as in the first step, for a suitable constant $\delta > 0$ small enough, we obtain
\[
\int_X I \wedge \sigma^* \omega^{n-m} \leq \int_X \{ (\eta_P^{\nu} \wedge (\gamma_{\min} - \delta \beta)^{m-l'-1} \hat{\lambda}(\gamma_{\min} - \delta \beta)) \} \wedge \sigma^* \omega^{n-m}
\leq \int_X \{ (\eta_P^{\nu} \wedge (\gamma_{\min} - \delta \beta)^{m-l'-1} \hat{\lambda}) \} \wedge \sigma^* \omega^{n-m}
\leq \delta \int_X \{ (\eta_P^{\nu} \wedge (\gamma_{\min} - \delta \beta)^{m-l'-1} \hat{\lambda}) \} \wedge \sigma^* \omega^{n-m}
\]

Denote by $I_1, I_2$ the first and second term in the right-hand side of the last inequality. As above, we have
\[
I_1 = \int_X (P^{\nu} \wedge T^{m-l'})_{\min} \wedge \omega^{n-m}.
\] (4.15)

By Theorem 2.1, Lemma 4.3 and (4.13),
\[
I_2 \geq \delta \int_X \{ (\eta_P^{\nu} \wedge (\gamma_{\min} - \delta \beta)^{m-l'-1} \hat{\lambda}[\hat{V}]) \} \wedge \sigma^* \omega^{n-m}
\geq \delta \int_X \omega^{m-l'-1} \wedge [\hat{V}] \wedge \sigma^* \omega^{n-m+l'} = \delta \text{vol}(V) > 0.
\] (4.16)

Combining (4.16) and (4.15) gives
\[
\int_X I \wedge \sigma^* \omega^{n-m} < \int_X (P^{\nu} \wedge T^{m-l'})_{\min} \wedge \omega^{n-m} = \int_X \{ (\eta_P^{\nu} \wedge \eta_{\min}^{m-l'}) \} \wedge \sigma^* \omega^{n-m}.
\]

This contradicts (4.14) and finishes the proof of Theorem 1.2.

Now we explain how to obtain Corollary 1.3 from Theorem 1.2. Let $\rho : X' \to X$ be a smooth modification of $X$ and $E$ an irreducible hypersurface in $X'$. Let $\varphi' := \varphi \circ \rho$, $\varphi_{\alpha, \min} := \varphi_{\alpha, \min} \circ \rho$, $\theta' := \rho^* \theta$ and $\alpha' := \rho^* \alpha$. Since non-pluripolar products have no mass on pluripolar sets, we have
\[
\langle (dd^c \varphi' + \theta')^n \rangle = \langle \alpha'^n \rangle = \langle \alpha^n \rangle > 0.
\]
and a similar equality also holds if \( \varphi' \) is replaced by \( \varphi'_{\alpha, \min} \) (note that the latter is not necessarily a quasi-psh function with minimal singularities in \( \alpha' \)). By a well-known result in [6], the class \( \alpha' \) is big.

Applying Theorem 1.2 to \( dd^c \varphi' + \theta' \) and \( V := E \), we obtain that the generic Lelong number of \( \varphi' \) along \( E \) is equal to \( \nu(\alpha', E) \). We also get an analogous property for \( \varphi'_{\alpha, \min} \) by applying Theorem 1.2 to \( dd^c \varphi'_{\alpha, \min} + \theta' \). It follows that the generic Lelong numbers of \( \varphi' \) and \( \varphi'_{\alpha, \min} \) along \( E \) are equal. Now using this property and [4, Corollary 10.18] (or [8, Theorem A]) gives the desired assertion. The proof is finished.

We now present the proof of Theorem 1.4.

Proof of Theorem 1.4. We follow the arguments in the proof of Theorem 1.1. One only needs to review carefully the constants involving in estimates used there.

Let \( \omega \) be a fixed Kähler form on \( X \). Our submanifold \( V \) is now the point set \( \{x_0\} \). Let the notations be as in the proof of Theorem 1.1. By the construction of \( \hat{X} \), the constant \( c_V > 0 \) in (4.2) can be chosen to be independent of \( x_0 \). As in the proof of Theorem 1.1 put

\[
b_j := \nu(T_j, x_0) - \nu(\alpha_j, x_0), \quad \delta_j := (c\|\alpha_j\| + \frac{\epsilon}{2c_V})^{-1} b_j, \quad M_j := \frac{\delta_j \epsilon}{2c_V}
\]

for \( 1 \leq j \leq n \), where \( c \) is a constant big enough depending only on \( X \) (and a fixed Kähler form \( \omega \) on \( X \)). Since \( \alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n \in B_0 \), we get

\[
\delta_j \gtrsim b_j,
\]

and the constant \( \epsilon \) can be chosen independent of \( \alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n \). Using (4.9) for \( \Phi \) to be the constant function equal to 1 gives

\[
\int_X \left( \langle \wedge_{j=1}^n \alpha_j \rangle - \{ \langle \wedge_{j=1}^n T_j \rangle \} \right) \geq M_1 \cdots M_n = \frac{\delta_1 \epsilon}{2c_V} \cdots \frac{\delta_n \epsilon}{2c_V} \gtrsim b_1 \cdots b_n.
\]

The proof is finished.
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