

LOG CANONICAL FOLIATION SINGULARITIES ON SURFACES

YEN-AN CHEN

ABSTRACT. We give a classification of the dual graphs of the exceptional divisors on the minimal resolutions of log canonical foliation singularities on surfaces. For an application, we show the set of foliated minimal log discrepancies for foliated surface triples satisfies the ascending chain condition and a Grauert-Riemenschneider type vanishing theorem for foliated surfaces with good log canonical foliation singularities.

INTRODUCTION

Singularities play an important role in many areas of algebraic geometry. For instance, singular varieties naturally appear in the minimal model program and in the study of moduli spaces, where it often happens that smooth objects degenerate to singular ones. However, many classes of singularities that naturally occur are mild and can sometimes be understood in detail. One of the natural classes of singularities is (log) canonical singularities. These singularities have been extensively studied, especially in the case of surfaces. In particular, we have a full classification of log canonical surface singularities. (For a reference, see [Wat80], [KM98, Section 4.1], or [Har98, Appendix].)

When studying foliations, one expects that similar results may hold. In this direction, McQuillan introduces in [McQ08] a notion of log canonical foliation singularities, which is a natural generalization of log canonical singularities. Moreover, he also gives a classification for the canonical foliation singularities on surfaces. (See [McQ08, Corollary I.2.2 and Fact I.2.4].)

In this paper, we first give a full list of all possibilities of the dual graphs of the exceptional divisors on the minimal resolutions of log canonical foliation singularities on surfaces. (See also Theorem 2.4.) This is achieved with the help of the work of Brunella, Camacho, and Sad on the indices and a theorem on separatrices.

Theorem 0.1. *Let (X, \mathcal{F}, p) be a germ of a foliated surface. Assume that p is a log canonical singularity of \mathcal{F} . Let $\pi : (Y, \mathcal{G}) \rightarrow (X, \mathcal{F})$ be the minimal resolution (see subsection 1.3) for (X, \mathcal{F}, p) with exceptional divisors $E = \cup E_i$. Then E belongs to one of the following types:*

- (1) A \mathcal{G} -chain.
- (2) A chain of three invariant curves $E_1 \cup E_2 \cup E_3$ where E_1 and E_3 are (-1) - \mathcal{G} -curves with self-intersection -2 and E_2 is a bad tail.
- (3) A chain of (-2) - \mathcal{G} -curves.
- (4) A dihedral singularity. More precisely, two (-1) - \mathcal{G} -curves with self-intersection -2 joined by a bad tail which itself connects to a chain of (-2) - \mathcal{G} -curves.
- (5) An elliptic Gorenstein leaf.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 32S65, Secondary 32M25, 14B05, 14J99.

The author was partially supported by NSF research grants no: DMS-1801851, DMS-1840190 and by a grant from the Simons Foundation; Award Number: 256202.

- (6) A chain $E = \bigcup_{i=1}^r E_i$ with exactly one non-invariant curve E_ℓ with $1 \leq \ell \leq r$. Moreover, E_ℓ has tangency order zero and $\bigcup_{i=1}^{\ell-1} E_i$ and $\bigcup_{i=\ell+1}^r E_i$ are \mathcal{G} -chains.
- (7) The dual graph is star-shaped with a non-invariant center $[E_0]$. Moreover, E_0 has tangency order zero, all branches are \mathcal{G} -chains, and all first curves of \mathcal{G} -chains have intersection number one with E_0 .

Note that type (1) is terminal, and types (1) - (5) are canonical.

Inspired by the work in [Ale93] on the ascending chain condition (ACC) for the set of the minimal log discrepancies of surface singularities, we show the set of foliated minimal log discrepancies satisfies the ACC. (See also Definition 3.2 and Theorem 4.7.)

Theorem 0.2. *For any set B satisfying the descending chain condition, the set*

$$\text{MLD}(2, B) := \{\text{mld}_x(\mathcal{F}, \Delta) \mid (X, \mathcal{F}, \Delta) \text{ is a foliated triple with } x \in X \text{ and } \Delta \in B\}$$

satisfies the ascending chain condition (ACC).

Finally, we prove a Grauert-Riemannschneider type vanishing theorem for foliated surfaces with *good* log canonical foliation singularities by using the method in [Kol13, Theorem 10.4]. (See Definition 5.1 and Theorem 5.3.) This is a generalization of [HL21, Theorem 6.1] in which (X, \mathcal{F}) is assumed to have only canonical foliation singularities.

Theorem 0.3. *Let $f : (Y, \mathcal{G}) \rightarrow (X, \mathcal{F})$ be a proper birational morphism where (X, \mathcal{F}) is a foliated surface with good log canonical foliation singularities and (Y, \mathcal{G}) is a foliated surface with only reduced singularities. Then $R^i f_* \mathcal{O}_Y(K_{\mathcal{G}}) = 0$ for $i > 0$.*

Acknowledgements. The author would like to thank Christopher D. Hacon for his insightful suggestions and encouragements.

1. PRELIMINARIES

In this paper, we always work over \mathbb{C} . By a surface, we mean a normal algebraic space of dimension two. In this section, we recall several definitions and results which will be used later.

1.1. Foliations on surfaces. A *foliation* \mathcal{F} on a surface X is a rank 1 saturated subsheaf \mathcal{F} of the tangent sheaf T_X of X . So we have the following short exact sequence:

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{F} \rightarrow T_X \rightarrow T_X/\mathcal{F} \rightarrow 0$$

with T_X/\mathcal{F} torsion-free.

The point p on X is called a *singular* point of the foliation if either a singular point of X or a point at which the quotient T_X/\mathcal{F} is *not* locally free. Since X is normal, the foliation singularities are isolated.

Definition 1.1. A *foliated surface* is a pair (X, \mathcal{F}) consisting of a surface X and a foliation \mathcal{F} on X . A *foliated triple* is a triple (X, \mathcal{F}, Δ) consisting of a foliated surface (X, \mathcal{F}) and an \mathbb{R} -divisor $\Delta = \sum a_i D_i$.

Notice that $T_X \cong \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_X}(\Omega_X, \mathcal{O}_X)$ is reflexive. Thus, \mathcal{F} is also reflexive and therefore we can define the *canonical divisor* $K_{\mathcal{F}}$ of the foliation as a Weil divisor on X with $\mathcal{O}_X(-K_{\mathcal{F}}) \cong \mathcal{F}$.

Definition 1.2. Let (X, \mathcal{F}) be a foliated surface. Given any birational map between normal surfaces $f : Y \dashrightarrow X$ and a foliation \mathcal{F} on X , then we define the *pullback foliation* $f^*\mathcal{F}$ as follows:

Let U be an open subset such that $V := f^{-1}(U) \rightarrow U$ is an isomorphism. Note that $\mathcal{F}|_U \subset T_U \cong T_V$. By [Har77, Exercise II.5.15], we have a coherent subsheaf \mathcal{G} of T_Y such that $\mathcal{G}|_V = \mathcal{F}|_U \subset T_V$. Then the pullback foliation $f^*\mathcal{F}$ is defined to be the saturation of \mathcal{G} . By [HL21, Lemma 1.8], this definition is well-defined.

Also if \mathcal{G} is a foliation on Y , then we can define the *pushforward foliation* $f_*\mathcal{G}$ by taking the saturation of the image of the composition

$$f_*T_{\mathcal{G}} \rightarrow f_*T_Y \rightarrow (f_*T_Y)^{**} = T_X.$$

Definition 1.3 (Invariant curves). Let (X, \mathcal{F}) be a foliated surface and U be the non-singular locus of X . A curve C on X is called *\mathcal{F} -invariant* if the inclusion map

$$T_{\mathcal{F}|_U}|_C \rightarrow T_U|_C$$

factors through $T_C|_U$.

Definition 1.4 ([McQ08, Definition I.1.5]). Let (X, \mathcal{F}, Δ) be a foliated triple and $f : Y \rightarrow X$ be a proper birational morphism. For any divisor E on Y , we define the *discrepancy* of (\mathcal{F}, Δ) along E to be $a(E, \mathcal{F}, \Delta) = \text{ord}_E(K_{f^*\mathcal{F}} - f^*(K_{\mathcal{F}} + \Delta))$. We say

$$(X, \mathcal{F}, \Delta) \text{ is } \begin{cases} \text{terminal} & \text{if } a(E, \mathcal{F}, \Delta) > 0 \\ \text{canonical} & \text{if } a(E, \mathcal{F}, \Delta) \geq 0 \\ \text{log terminal} & \text{if } a(E, \mathcal{F}, \Delta) > -\varepsilon(E) \\ \text{log canonical} & \text{if } a(E, \mathcal{F}, \Delta) \geq -\varepsilon(E) \end{cases} \quad \text{for every divisor } E \text{ over } X$$

where $\varepsilon(E)$ is defined to be 0 if E is $f^*\mathcal{F}$ -invariant, and 1 otherwise.

1.2. Indices on foliated surfaces. Most definitions in this subsection follow from [Bru15] with some generalizations.

Let $p \in \text{Sing}(\mathcal{F}) \setminus \text{Sing}(X)$. That is, p is a smooth point on X but a singular point of the foliation. Let v be the vector field around p generating \mathcal{F} . Since $p \in \text{Sing}(\mathcal{F})$, we have $v(p) = 0$. Then we can consider the eigenvalues λ_1, λ_2 of $(Dv)|_p$, which do not depend on the choice of v .

Definition 1.5. If one of the eigenvalues is non-zero, say λ_2 , then we say p is *semi-reduced* and define the eigenvalue of the foliation \mathcal{F} at p to be

$$\lambda := \frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_2}.$$

For $\lambda \neq 0$, this definition is unique up to reciprocal $\lambda \sim \frac{1}{\lambda}$.

If $\lambda = 0$, then p is called a *saddle-node*; otherwise, we say p is *non-degenerate*. If $\lambda \notin \mathbb{Q}^+$, then p is called a *reduced* singularity of \mathcal{F} .

Reduced singularities arise naturally. Indeed, blowing up a smooth foliation point will introduce a reduced singularity with $\lambda = -1$.

Theorem 1.6 (Seidenberg's theorem). *Given any foliated surface (X, \mathcal{F}) with X smooth. There is a sequence of blowups $\pi : (Y, \mathcal{G}) \rightarrow (X, \mathcal{F})$ such that (Y, \mathcal{G}) has only reduced singularities.*

Proof. See [Sei68], [MM80, Appendix], or [Bru15, Theorem 1.1]. □

Definition 1.7 (Separatrices). Let p be a singular point of \mathcal{F} . A *separatrix* of \mathcal{F} at p is a holomorphic (possibly singular) irreducible \mathcal{F} -invariant curve C on a neighborhood of p which passes through p .

Theorem 1.8. *Let \mathcal{F} be a foliation on a normal surface X and $C \subset X$ be a connected, compact \mathcal{F} -invariant curve such that*

- (1) *all the singularities of \mathcal{F} on C are reduced.*
- (2) *the intersection matrix of C is negative definite and the dual graph is a tree.*

Then there exists at least one point $p \in C \cap \text{Sing}\mathcal{F}$ and a separatrix through p not contained in C .

Proof. See [Cam88], [Seb97], or [Bru15, Theorem 3.4]. □

1.2.1. *Non-invariant curves.* We first consider the non-invariant curves and define the tangency order for them.

Definition 1.9. Let (X, \mathcal{F}) be a foliated surface and C be a *non-invariant* reduced curve. Let $p \in C \setminus \text{Sing}(X)$ and v be the vector field generating \mathcal{F} around p . Let f be the local defining function of C at p . We define the *tangency order* of \mathcal{F} along C at p to be

$$\text{tang}(\mathcal{F}, C, p) := \dim_{\mathbb{C}} \frac{\mathcal{O}_{X,p}}{\langle f, v(f) \rangle}.$$

Note that $\text{tang}(\mathcal{F}, C, p) \geq 0$ and is independent of the choices of v and f . Moreover, if \mathcal{F} is transverse to C at p , then $\text{tang}(\mathcal{F}, C, p) = 0$. Therefore, if C is compact, then we can define

$$\text{tang}(\mathcal{F}, C) := \sum_{p \in C} \text{tang}(\mathcal{F}, C, p).$$

Proposition 1.10 ([Bru97], [Bru15, Proposition 2.2]). *Let \mathcal{F} be a foliation on a smooth projective surface X , and C be a non-invariant curve on X . Then we have*

$$K_{\mathcal{F}} \cdot C = \text{tang}(\mathcal{F}, C) - C^2.$$

Corollary 1.11. *Let C be a non-invariant curve on a foliated surface (X, \mathcal{F}) . If C is contained in the smooth locus of X , then we have $(K_{\mathcal{F}} + C) \cdot C \geq 0$.*

1.2.2. *Invariant curves.* Now we study the invariant curves.

Definition 1.12. Let (X, \mathcal{F}) be a foliated surface and C be an invariant curve. Let $p \in C \setminus \text{Sing}(X)$ and ω be a 1-form generating \mathcal{F} around p . If C is an invariant curve and f is the local defining function of C at p , then we can write

$$g\omega = hdf + f\eta$$

where g and h are holomorphic functions, η is a holomorphic 1-form, and h, f are relatively prime functions.

We define the index $Z(\mathcal{F}, C, p)$ to be the vanishing order of $\frac{h}{g}|_C$ at p . Also we define the Camacho-Sad index $\text{CS}(\mathcal{F}, C, p)$ to be the residue of $\frac{-1}{h}\eta|_C$ at p . These two definitions are independent of the choices of f, g, h, ω, η . (For a reference, see [Bru15, page 15 in Chapter 2 and page 27 in Chapter 3].)

Note that if $p \notin \text{Sing}(\mathcal{F})$, then $Z(\mathcal{F}, C, p) = 0 = \text{CS}(\mathcal{F}, C, p)$. Therefore, if C is compact, then we can define

$$\begin{aligned} Z(\mathcal{F}, C) &:= \sum_{p \in C} Z(\mathcal{F}, C, p), \text{ and} \\ \text{CS}(\mathcal{F}, C) &:= \sum_{p \in C} \text{CS}(\mathcal{F}, C, p) \end{aligned}$$

where the sums are taken over only finitely many points.

Definition 1.13. We define the *virtual Euler characteristic* $\chi(C)$ of C on a normal surface X to be $\chi(C) = -K_X \cdot C - C^2$.

Theorem 1.14 ([Bru97],[Bru15, Proposition 2.3 and Theorem 3.2]). *Let \mathcal{F} be a foliation on a smooth projective surface X , and C be an invariant curve on X . Then we have*

- (1) $K_{\mathcal{F}} \cdot C = Z(\mathcal{F}, C) - \chi(C)$, and
- (2) $C^2 = \text{CS}(\mathcal{F}, C)$. This identity is called *Camacho-Sad formula*.

Lemma 1.15. *Given a foliated surface (X, \mathcal{F}) and p a reduced singularity.*

- (1) *If p is non-degenerate, assume $\omega = \lambda y(1 + o(1))dx - x(1 + o(1))dy$ generates \mathcal{F} around p . Then*

$$\text{CS}(\mathcal{F}, x = 0, p) = \frac{1}{\lambda}, \text{CS}(\mathcal{F}, y = 0, p) = \lambda, \text{ and } Z(\mathcal{F}, x = 0, p) = Z(\mathcal{F}, y = 0, p) = 1.$$

- (2) *If p is a saddle-node, assume $\omega = y^{k+1}dx - (x(1 + \nu y^k) + y o(k))dy$ generates \mathcal{F} around p where $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\nu \in \mathbb{C}$. Then*

$$\text{CS}(\mathcal{F}, y = 0, p) = 0 \text{ and } Z(\mathcal{F}, y = 0, p) = 1.$$

Suppose there exists a weak separatrix, then

$$\text{CS}(\mathcal{F}, x = 0, p) = \nu \text{ and } Z(\mathcal{F}, x = 0, p) = k + 1.$$

Proof. This is done by direct computation. For a reference, see [Bru15, page 30-31 in Chapter 3]. \square

1.3. Minimal resolutions of foliated surfaces.

Definition 1.16. A morphism $\pi : (Y, \mathcal{G}) \rightarrow (X, \mathcal{F})$ of foliated surfaces is called a *resolution* if (Y, \mathcal{G}) has only reduced foliation singularities.

A resolution $\pi : (Y, \mathcal{G}) \rightarrow (X, \mathcal{F})$ of a foliated surface (X, \mathcal{F}) is called *minimal* if any resolution $\phi : (Z, \mathcal{H}) \rightarrow (X, \mathcal{F})$ of the foliated surface (X, \mathcal{F}) factors through π . That is, there is a morphism $\psi : (Z, \mathcal{H}) \rightarrow (Y, \mathcal{G})$ with $\mathcal{H} = \psi^*\mathcal{G}$ such that $\phi = \pi \circ \psi$.

Proposition 1.17. *Any foliated surface (X, \mathcal{F}) has a unique minimal resolution up to isomorphism.*

Proof. Taking a resolution of X , and then by Seidenberg's theorem 1.6, we have a resolution $\pi : (Y, \mathcal{G}) \rightarrow (X, \mathcal{F})$ of the foliated surface (X, \mathcal{F}) . After blowing down \mathcal{G} -exceptional curves, we may assume that (Y, \mathcal{G}) has no \mathcal{G} -exceptional curves. We will show that this π gives a minimal resolution of the foliated surface (X, \mathcal{F}) .

Given any resolution $\phi : (Z, \mathcal{H}) \rightarrow (X, \mathcal{F})$ of the foliated surface (X, \mathcal{F}) . Let W be the minimal resolution of singularities of $Z \times_X Y$, and \mathcal{E} be the pullback foliation on W . So we have the following diagram of foliated surfaces

$$\begin{array}{ccc} (W, \mathcal{E}) & \xrightarrow{\alpha} & (Z, \mathcal{H}) \\ \beta \downarrow & & \downarrow \phi \\ (Y, \mathcal{G}) & \xrightarrow{\pi} & (X, \mathcal{F}). \end{array}$$

We may assume (W, \mathcal{E}) is minimal in the sense that there is no birational morphism of foliated surfaces $\theta : (W, \mathcal{E}) \rightarrow (W', \mathcal{E}')$, which is not an isomorphism, such that both α and β factor through θ .

Suppose α is not an isomorphism, then there is a (last) α -exceptional curve \tilde{C} on W with $\tilde{C}^2 = -1$, which is also \mathcal{E} -exceptional. By the minimality of (W, \mathcal{E}) , \tilde{C} is not contracted by β . Let $C \subset Y$ be the curve $\beta(\tilde{C})$. Since $p_a(\tilde{C}) = 0$, we have that $p_a(C) = 0$. Note that C is contracted by π because \tilde{C} is contracted by $\phi \circ \alpha = \pi \circ \beta$. Hence $C^2 \leq -1$. Also, $C^2 \geq \tilde{C}^2 = -1$ and thus, $C^2 = -1$. Moreover, β is isomorphic around \tilde{C} . Therefore, C is \mathcal{G} -exceptional. But this is impossible since (Y, \mathcal{G}) has no \mathcal{G} -exceptional curves. \square

Remark 1.18. In general, for any minimal resolution $\pi : (Y, \mathcal{G}) \rightarrow (X, \mathcal{F})$ of the foliated surface (X, \mathcal{F}) , the morphism $\pi : Y \rightarrow X$ of surfaces is not the minimal resolution of X .

1.4. Dual graphs.

Definition 1.19. Let $C = \bigcup C_i$ be a collection of proper curves on the smooth locus of a surface X . Then the (weighted) *dual graph* $\Gamma = \Gamma(C)$ of C is defined as follows:

- (1) The vertices of Γ are the curves C_i . We will use $[C_i]$ to indicate the vertex of Γ corresponding to the curve C_i .
- (2) Two vertices $[C_i]$ and $[C_j]$ for $i \neq j$ are connected with $C_i \cdot C_j$ edges.
- (3) The weight $w([C_i])$ of vertex $[C_i]$ is given by $-C_i^2$.

Definition 1.20. For any (dual) graph Γ , we have the following definitions:

- (1) A *cycle* is a graph whose vertices and edges can be ordered as $[C_1], \dots, [C_m]$ and e_1, \dots, e_m where $m \geq 2$ such that edge e_i connects vertices $[C_i]$ and $[C_{i+1}]$ for $i = 1, \dots, m$ where $[C_{m+1}] := [C_1]$.
- (2) We say Γ *has simple edges* if any two vertices are connected by at most one edge.
- (3) A *tree* is a connected graph which has no cycle as its subgraph.
- (4) The *degree*, denoted by $\deg [C_i]$, of the vertex $[C_i]$ is the number of edges connecting to $[C_i]$.
- (5) The vertex $[C_i]$ is called a *leaf* of Γ if the degree of $[C_i]$ is 1.
- (6) The vertex $[C_i]$ is called a *fork* of Γ if the degree of $[C_i]$ is at least 3.
- (7) A tree without forks is called a *chain*.
- (8) The connected components of a tree minus a fork are called the *branches* of the fork.
- (9) A tree is *star-shaped* if there is exactly one fork.
- (10) We define $\Delta(\Gamma)$ to be the absolute value of the determinant of the intersection matrix for Γ . We set $\Delta(\emptyset) = 1$.

By direct computation, we have the following lemma.

Lemma 1.21. *Suppose Γ is a tree with simple edges.*

(1) *For any vertex $[C]$ of Γ of weight $w([C])$, we have*

$$\Delta(\Gamma) = w([C])\Delta(\Gamma \setminus \{[C]\}) - \sum_{i=1}^s \Delta(\Gamma \setminus \{[C], [C_i]\})$$

where C_1, \dots, C_s are all vertices adjacent to C .

(2) *For any two vertices $[C_i]$ and $[C_j]$ of Γ , the (i, j) -cofactor of the intersection matrix A of Γ is*

$$A_{i,j} = (-1)^{n+1} \Delta(\Gamma \setminus \{\text{path from } [C_i] \text{ to } [C_j]\})$$

where $n = |\Gamma|$.

2. CLASSIFICATION

In this section, we prove Theorem 2.4 which gives a full list of all possibilities of the dual graphs of the exceptional divisors on the minimal resolutions of log canonical foliation singularities on surfaces.

In order to describe the exceptional divisor over a foliation singularity, we recall the following definitions. (See also [Bru15, Definition 5.1 and 8.1] and [McQ08, Definition III.0.2 and III.2.3].)

Definition 2.1. Given a foliated surface (X, \mathcal{F}) with X smooth.

- (1) $E = \bigcup_{i=1}^s E_i$ is called a string if
 - (a) each E_i is a smooth rational curve and
 - (b) $E_i \cdot E_j = 1$ if $|i - j| = 1$ and 0 if $|i - j| \geq 2$.
- (2) If, moreover, $E_i^2 \leq -2$ for all i , then we call E a Hirzebruch-Jung string.
- (3) A curve $C \subset X$ is called \mathcal{F} -exceptional if
 - (a) C is a (-1) -curve.
 - (b) The contraction of C gives a foliated surface (X', \mathcal{F}') with only *reduced* singularities.
- (4) C is called a (-1) - \mathcal{F} -curve (resp. (-2) - \mathcal{F} -curve) if
 - (a) C is a smooth rational curve.
 - (b) $Z(\mathcal{F}, C) = 1$ (resp. $Z(\mathcal{F}, C) = 2$).
- (5) We say $C = \bigcup_{i=1}^s C_i$ is an \mathcal{F} -chain if
 - (a) C is a Hirzebruch-Jung string.
 - (b) Each C_i is \mathcal{F} -invariant.
 - (c) $\text{Sing}(\mathcal{F}) \cap C$ are all reduced and non-degenerate.
 - (d) $Z(\mathcal{F}, C_1) = 1$ and $Z(\mathcal{F}, C_i) = 2$ for all $i \geq 2$.
- (6) If an \mathcal{F} -invariant curve E is not contained in a \mathcal{F} -chain C but meets the chain, then we call E the tail of the chain C .
- (7) C is called a bad tail if
 - (a) C is a smooth rational curve with $Z(\mathcal{F}, C) = 3$ and $C^2 \leq -2$.
 - (b) C intersects two (-1) - \mathcal{F} -curves whose self-intersections are both -2 .

Before proving the main theorem, we recall the following well-known lemma.

Lemma 2.2. *Let $C = \bigcup_i C_i$ be a set of proper curves on a smooth surface. Assume that the intersection matrix $(C_i \cdot C_j)_{i,j}$ is negative definite. Let $A = \sum a_i C_i$ be an \mathbb{R} -linear combination of the curves C_i 's. If $A \cdot C_j \geq 0$ for all j , then*

- (1) $a_i \leq 0$ for all i .
- (2) If C is connected, then either $a_i = 0$ for all i or $a_i < 0$ for all i . Moreover, if $A \cdot C_j > 0$ for some j , then $a_i < 0$ for all i .

Proof. For a reference, see [KM98, Lemma 3.41].

Remark 2.3. The exceptional divisor E of a resolution of a singularity is connected by Zariski's main theorem. Moreover, it is well-known that the intersection matrix of E is negative definite. (For a reference, see [KM98, Lemma 3.40].)

Theorem 2.4. *Let (X, \mathcal{F}, p) be a germ of a foliated surface. Assume that p is a log canonical singularity of \mathcal{F} . Let $\pi : (Y, \mathcal{G}) \rightarrow (X, \mathcal{F})$ be the minimal resolution (see subsection 1.3) for (X, \mathcal{F}, p) with exceptional divisors $E = \cup E_i$. Then E belongs to one of the following types:*

- (1) A \mathcal{G} -chain.
- (2) A chain of three invariant curves $E_1 \cup E_2 \cup E_3$ where E_1 and E_3 are (-1) - \mathcal{G} -curves with self-intersection -2 and E_2 is a bad tail.
- (3) A chain of (-2) - \mathcal{G} -curves.
- (4) A dihedral singularity. More precisely, two (-1) - \mathcal{G} -curves with self-intersection -2 joined by a bad tail which itself connects to a chain of (-2) - \mathcal{G} -curves.
- (5) An elliptic Gorenstein leaf.
- (6) A chain $E = \bigcup_{i=1}^r E_i$ with exactly one non-invariant curve E_ℓ with $1 \leq \ell \leq r$. Moreover, E_ℓ has tangency order zero and $\bigcup_{i=1}^{\ell-1} E_i$ and $\bigcup_{i=\ell+1}^r E_i$ are \mathcal{G} -chains.
- (7) The dual graph is star-shaped with a non-invariant center $[E_0]$. Moreover, E_0 has tangency order zero, all branches are \mathcal{G} -chains, and all first curves of \mathcal{G} -chains have intersection number one with E_0 .

Note that type (1) is terminal, and types (1) - (5) are canonical.

Proof. Let Γ be the dual graph of exceptional divisors $E = \cup E_i$, which is connected by Zariski's main theorem. Let Δ be the sum over all non-invariant exceptional curves E_i . Then we write $K_{\mathcal{G}} + \Delta = \pi^* K_{\mathcal{F}} + \sum a_i E_i$ where $a_i \geq 0$ since p is a log canonical singularity of \mathcal{F} .

We divide the proof into several steps.

- (1) *Claim.* For any vertex $[E_i]$ with E_i invariant, we have $(K_{\mathcal{G}} + \Delta) \cdot E_i \geq \deg [E_i] - 2$.

Proof. Let $d = \deg [E_i]$. Suppose there are exactly m edges of $[E_i]$ connecting to the vertices corresponding to *invariant* curves. Since the intersections of two invariant curves are reduced singularities and at most two separatrices pass through any reduced singularity, there are at least m distinct foliation singularities on E_i . Thus, we have that $Z(\mathcal{G}, E_i) \geq m$.

The other $d - m$ edges of $[E_i]$ connect to the vertices corresponding to *non-invariant* curves, which are in the support of Δ . Thus, we have that $\Delta \cdot E_i = d - m$ by the definition of edges. Therefore, by Theorem 1.14, we have

$$(K_{\mathcal{G}} + \Delta) \cdot E_i = Z(\mathcal{G}, E_i) + 2p_a(E_i) - 2 + \Delta \cdot E_i \geq m - 2 + (d - m) = d - 2.$$

- (2) *Claim.* Suppose $\Gamma = \{[E_1]\}$ is a one-vertex graph. Then we have the following two possibilities.
- (a) If E_1 is non-invariant, then the tangency order of E_1 is zero.
 - (b) If E_1 is invariant, then E_1 is a \mathcal{G} -chain, a (-2) - \mathcal{G} -curve, or a rational curve with only one node.

Proof. If E_1 is non-invariant, then we have $\Delta = E_1$ and, by Theorem 1.10,

$$(K_{\mathcal{G}} + \Delta) \cdot E_1 = (K_{\mathcal{G}} + E_1) \cdot E_1 = \text{tang}(\mathcal{G}, E_1) \geq 0.$$

By Lemma 2.2, we have $a_1 \leq 0$ and $a_1 = 0$ if and only if $(K_{\mathcal{G}} + \Delta) \cdot E_1 = 0$. Since $a_1 \geq 0$, we have $a_1 = 0$ and hence

$$\text{tang}(\mathcal{G}, E_1) = (K_{\mathcal{G}} + E_1) \cdot E_1 = (K_{\mathcal{G}} + \Delta) \cdot E_1 = \pi^* K_{\mathcal{F}} \cdot E_1 = 0.$$

If E_1 is invariant, then we have $\Delta = 0$ and, by Theorem 1.14,

$$K_{\mathcal{G}} \cdot E_1 = Z(\mathcal{G}, E_1) + 2p_a(E_1) - 2 \geq -2.$$

- If $K_{\mathcal{G}} \cdot E_1 = -2$, then $Z(\mathcal{G}, E_1) = 0$ and $p_a(E_1) = 0$. So E_1 is smooth with no foliation singularity, which is impossible by Theorem 1.8.
- If $K_{\mathcal{G}} \cdot E_1 = -1$, then $Z(\mathcal{G}, E_1) = 1$ and $p_a(E_1) = 0$. So E_1 is a smooth rational curve with exactly one reduced singularity. Since π is minimal, we have $E_1^2 \leq -2$, and thus E_1 is a \mathcal{G} -chain.
- If $K_{\mathcal{G}} \cdot E_1 \geq 0$, then by Lemma 2.2, we have $a_1 \leq 0$ and $a_1 = 0$ if and only if $K_{\mathcal{G}} \cdot E_1 = 0$. Since $a_1 \geq 0$, we have $a_1 = 0$ and $K_{\mathcal{G}} \cdot E_1 = 0$. Thus we have $p_a(E_1) = 0$ or 1 . If $p_a(E_1) = 0$, then $Z(\mathcal{G}, E_1) = 2$, which is a (-2) - \mathcal{G} -curve. If $p_a(E_1) = 1$, then $Z(\mathcal{G}, E_1) = 0$. So E_1 is not smooth, otherwise $E_1^2 = 0$ by Theorem 1.14, which is impossible. Thus, E_1 is a rational curve with only one node.

- (3) From now on, we assume that Γ has at least two vertices.

Claim. For any vertices $[E_i]$, we have $(K_{\mathcal{G}} + \Delta) \cdot E_i \geq -1$ and the equality holds if and only if E_i is invariant and $[E_i]$ is a leaf.

Proof. Since Γ is connected with at least two vertices, we have $\deg [E_i] \geq 1$ for any vertex $[E_i]$. If E_i is invariant, then we have the required inequality by step (1).

If E_i is non-invariant, then we have $E_i \subset \Delta$ and

$$(K_{\mathcal{G}} + \Delta) \cdot E_i \geq (K_{\mathcal{G}} + E_i) \cdot E_i = \text{tang}(\mathcal{G}, E_i) \geq 0$$

by Theorem 1.10.

- (4) We call $[E_i]$ a *special leaf* if E_i is invariant with $(K_{\mathcal{G}} + \Delta) \cdot E_i = -1$. We will denote $L := E_i$ if $[E_i]$ is a special leaf.

Note that, by Theorem 1.14, we have

$$-1 = (K_{\mathcal{G}} + \Delta) \cdot L = Z(\mathcal{G}, L) + 2p_a(L) - 2 + \Delta \cdot L \geq -2.$$

Hence, we have $p_a(L) = 0$, and thus L is a smooth rational curve. Since $L^2 \leq -1$, we have $Z(\mathcal{G}, L) \geq 1$, and hence $Z(\mathcal{G}, L) = 1$ and $\Delta \cdot L = 0$. Then by the minimality of π , we have $L^2 \leq -2$. Thus L itself is a \mathcal{G} -chain. Therefore, we consider the chain C_L of maximal length N_L starting from L , which is a \mathcal{G} -chain and disjoint from Δ .

- (5) *Claim.* Fix a special leaf $[L]$. Other than those curves in C_L , there is at most one curve in E connecting to the last curve C_{L,N_L} of $C_L = \bigcup_{i=1}^{N_L} C_{L,i}$ with $C_{L,1} = L$ and $C_{L,j} \cdot C_{L,j+1} = 1$ for $j = 1, \dots, N_L - 1$. Precisely, if the dual graph of C_L is not Γ , then such curve exists and is called the tail of C_L , denoted by C_{L,N_L+1} . Moreover, it is invariant with

$$Z(\mathcal{G}, C_{L,N_L+1}) \geq 2 \text{ and } (K_{\mathcal{G}} + \Delta) \cdot C_{L,N_L+1} \geq 1.$$

Proof. If the dual graph of C_L is Γ , then the statement is clear. If not, then such vertex $[V]$ exists because Γ is connected. Since C_L is disjoint from Δ , so the curve V must be invariant. Since C_L is a \mathcal{G} -chain, there is precisely one such curve V . Besides, this curve V must connect to the last curve C_{L,N_L} . So we denote it by C_{L,N_L+1} . Note that $Z(\mathcal{G}, C_{L,N_L+1}) \geq 1$ since C_{L,N_L+1} intersects C_L .

- (a) If $Z(\mathcal{G}, C_{L,N_L+1}) = 1$, then $\bigcup_{j=1}^{N_L+1} C_{L,j}$ contradicts to Theorem 1.8.
(b) If $Z(\mathcal{G}, C_{L,N_L+1}) = 2$, then $\Delta \cdot C_{L,N_L+1} \geq 1$ by the maximality of C_L . Thus, by Theorem 1.14, we have

$$(K_{\mathcal{G}} + \Delta) \cdot C_{L,N_L+1} = Z(\mathcal{G}, C_{L,N_L+1}) - 2 + \Delta \cdot C_{L,N_L+1} \geq 1.$$

- (c) If $Z(\mathcal{G}, C_{L,N_L+1}) \geq 3$, then $(K_{\mathcal{G}} + \Delta) \cdot C_{L,N_L+1} \geq 1$.

- (6) From now on, we assume that Γ is not a dual graph of a \mathcal{G} -chain. So by step (5), C_{L,N_L+1} always exists for any special leaf $[L]$.
(7) *Claim.* For two distinct special leaves $[L]$ and $[L']$, two chains C_L and $C_{L'}$ are disjoint.

Proof. If not, then two \mathcal{G} -chains intersect at the last curves, and $C_L \cup C_{L'}$ forms a chain which contradicts Theorem 1.8.

- (8) Now for any special leaf $[L]$, we define a divisor

$$D_L = \sum_{j=1}^{N_L} \frac{N_L + 1 - j}{N_L + 1} C_{L,j}.$$

Let $D = \sum D_L$ where the sum is over all special leaves $[L]$.

- (9) *Claim.* There is a vertex $[V]$ of Γ such that the coefficient of V in D is zero.

Proof. Suppose not, then the support of D , which is a union of C_L 's where $[L]$'s are special leaves, is the same as the support of E . Since Γ is connected and any two distinct C_L and $C_{L'}$ are disjoint by step (7), we conclude that Γ is the dual graph of C_L for one special leaf $[L]$. Therefore, Γ is the dual graph of a \mathcal{G} -chain, which contradicts step (6).

- (10) *Claim.* We have $D \cdot L \leq -1 = (K_{\mathcal{G}} + \Delta) \cdot L$ for any special leaf $[L]$. Moreover, $D \cdot L = -1$ if and only if $L^2 = -2$.

Proof. If $N_L = 1$, then

$$D \cdot L = \frac{1}{2} L^2 \leq -1$$

and the equality holds if and only if $L^2 = -2$.

If $N_L \geq 2$, then

$$D \cdot L = \frac{N_L}{N_L + 1} L^2 + \frac{N_L - 1}{N_L + 1} C_{L,2} \cdot L \leq \frac{-2N_L}{N_L + 1} + \frac{N_L - 1}{N_L + 1} = -1$$

and the equality holds if and only if $L^2 = -2$.

(11) *Claim.* For any special leaf $[L]$, we have

$$D \cdot C_{L,j} \leq 0 = (K_{\mathcal{G}} + \Delta) \cdot C_{L,j}$$

for $2 \leq j \leq N_L$.

Proof. Since $C_{L,j}$ is a (-2) - \mathcal{G} -curve and C_L is disjoint from Δ , we have $K_{\mathcal{G}} \cdot C_{L,j} = 0$ and $\Delta \cdot C_{L,j} = 0$. Therefore, we have $(K_{\mathcal{G}} + \Delta) \cdot C_{L,j} = 0$.

For $D \cdot C_{L,j}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} D \cdot C_{L,j} &= \frac{N_L + 2 - j}{N_L + 1} + \frac{N_L + 1 - j}{N_L + 1} C_{L,j}^2 + \frac{N_L - j}{N_L + 1} \\ &\leq \frac{N_L + 2 - j}{N_L + 1} + \frac{N_L + 1 - j}{N_L + 1} (-2) + \frac{N_L - j}{N_L + 1} = 0. \end{aligned}$$

(12) *Claim.* For any fork $[F]$, we have

$$D \cdot F = \sum \frac{1}{N_L + 1}$$

where the sum is over all special leaves $[L]$ such that $C_{L,N_L+1} = F$. Also we have $D \cdot F \leq (K_{\mathcal{G}} + \Delta) \cdot F$.

Proof. It is clear that

$$D \cdot F = \sum \frac{1}{N_L + 1} C_{L,N_L} \cdot F = \sum \frac{1}{N_L + 1}$$

where the sum is over all special leaves $[L]$ such that $C_{L,N_L+1} = F$.

- If F is non-invariant, then $D \cdot F = 0$ since C_{L,N_L+1} is always invariant by step (5). Also, by Theorem 1.10, we have $(K_{\mathcal{G}} + \Delta) \cdot F \geq (K_{\mathcal{G}} + F) \cdot F \geq 0$.
- If F is invariant, then $D \cdot F \leq m/2$ where m is the number of special leaves $[L]$ such that $C_{L,N_L+1} = F$. Also, by Theorem 1.14, we have

$$(K_{\mathcal{G}} + \Delta) \cdot F \geq K_{\mathcal{G}} \cdot F \geq Z(\mathcal{G}, F) - 2 \geq m - 2.$$

Moreover, by step (1), we have $(K_{\mathcal{G}} + \Delta) \cdot F \geq \deg[F] - 2 \geq 1$. Hence, we have

$$(K_{\mathcal{G}} + \Delta) \cdot F \geq \max\{m - 2, 1\} \geq \frac{m}{2} \geq D \cdot F.$$

(13) *Claim.* For any vertex $[V]$ of Γ , we have $D \cdot V \leq (K_{\mathcal{G}} + \Delta) \cdot V$.

Proof. The only vertices we have not checked yet are vertices $[V]$ of degree ≤ 2 , which are not in any C_L where $[L]$ is a special leaf. If $V = C_{L,N_L+1}$ for some special leaf $[L]$, then we have

$$D \cdot V \leq \frac{1}{N_{L_1} + 1} + \frac{1}{N_{L_2} + 1} \leq 1$$

since $\deg[V] \leq 2$ and $N_L \geq 1$ for all special leaves $[L]$. Also, by step (5), we have that $(K_{\mathcal{G}} + \Delta) \cdot V \geq 1$.

If V is not C_{L,N_L+1} for any special leaf $[L]$, then $D \cdot V = 0$. Thus, by step (3), we have $(K_{\mathcal{G}} + \Delta) \cdot V \geq 0$.

(14) *Claim.* $(K_{\mathcal{G}} + \Delta) \cdot V = D \cdot V$ for all vertices $[V]$ of Γ .

Proof. Suppose there is a vertex $[V]$ such that $(K_{\mathcal{G}} + \Delta) \cdot V \neq D \cdot V$. By steps (13), (9), and Lemma 2.2, we have that $a_i < 0$ for some i , which gives a contradiction.

- (15) *Claim.* For any special leaf $[L]$, we have $N_L = 1$ and $C_{L,2}$ must be a bad tail which has

$$\deg[C_{L,2}] = 2 \text{ or } 3$$

and is disjoint from Δ .

Proof. Let $V := C_{L,N_L+1}$ and L_1, \dots, L_s be all special leaves such that $C_{L_i, N_{L_i}+1} = V$ for $i = 1, \dots, s$. So we have $Z(\mathcal{G}, V) \geq s$.

If $Z(\mathcal{G}, V) = s$, then $V \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^s C_{L_i}$ contradicts to Theorem 1.8. Thus, we have

$$(1) \quad Z(\mathcal{G}, V) \geq s + 1$$

and then $(K_{\mathcal{G}} + \Delta) \cdot V \geq s - 1$.

For the case when $s = 1$, we have $D \cdot V = \frac{1}{N_L+1} \leq \frac{1}{2}$ and $(K_{\mathcal{G}} + \Delta) \cdot V \geq 1$ by step (5), which is a contradiction to step (14).

For the case when $s \geq 2$, we have

$$s - 1 \leq (K_{\mathcal{G}} + \Delta) \cdot V = D \cdot V = \sum_{i=1}^s \frac{1}{n_{L_i} + 1} \leq \frac{s}{2}.$$

This inequality holds only when $s = 2$, $N_{L_1} = N_{L_2} = 1$, and $(K_{\mathcal{G}} + \Delta) \cdot V = 1$. Thus, by step (1), we have $\deg[V] \leq 3$ and hence $\deg[V] = 2$ or 3 . Notice that, by Theorem 1.14, we have

$$1 = (K_{\mathcal{G}} + \Delta) \cdot V \geq Z(\mathcal{G}, V) - 2 + \Delta \cdot V \geq 3 - 2 = 1.$$

Therefore, all inequalities are equalities, that is, $\Delta \cdot V = 0$, $Z(K_{\mathcal{G}}, V) = 3$, and $p_a(V) = 0$.

- (16) *Claim.* Let $[F]$ be a fork. Then F is either a bad tail or a non-invariant curve with tangency order zero.

Proof. Assume that F is not a bad tail. Because of step (15), we have $F \neq C_{L,N_L+1}$ for any special leaf $[L]$. Therefore, we have $D \cdot F = 0$.

If F is invariant, then $(K_{\mathcal{G}} + \Delta) \cdot F \geq 1$ by step (1), which is a contradiction to step (14).

Hence, F is non-invariant with tangency order zero since

$$0 = D \cdot F = (K_{\mathcal{G}} + \Delta) \cdot F \geq (K_{\mathcal{G}} + F) \cdot F = \text{tang}(\mathcal{G}, F) \geq 0.$$

- (17) *Claim.* All vertices $[V]$ of degree ≤ 2 belong to one of the following types:

- (a) A non-invariant curve V with tangency order zero.
- (b) A special leaf.
- (c) A bad tail V .
- (d) An invariant curve V with $p_a(V) = 0$, $Z(\mathcal{G}, V) = 1$, and $\Delta \cdot V = 1$.
- (e) An invariant curve V with $p_a(V) = 0$, $Z(\mathcal{G}, V) = 2$, and $\Delta \cdot V = 0$.

Proof. If V is non-invariant, then the tangency order is zero since

$$0 = D \cdot V = (K_{\mathcal{G}} + \Delta) \cdot V \geq (K_{\mathcal{G}} + V) \cdot V = \text{tang}(\mathcal{G}, V) \geq 0.$$

Now suppose V is invariant but not a bad tail, and $[V]$ is not a special leaf. Then, by step (15), we have $D \cdot V = 0$. Thus we have $(K_{\mathcal{G}} + \Delta) \cdot V = 0$ by

step (14). Moreover, $Z(\mathcal{G}, V) \geq 1$, otherwise $V^2 = 0$ by Theorem 1.14, which is impossible. So

$$0 = (K_{\mathcal{G}} + \Delta) \cdot V = Z(\mathcal{G}, V) + 2p_a(V) - 2 + \Delta \cdot V \geq 2p_a(V) - 1.$$

Hence $p_a(V) = 0$ and $Z(\mathcal{G}, V) + \Delta \cdot V = 2$. Therefore we have either $Z(\mathcal{G}, V) = 1$ and $\Delta \cdot V = 1$ or $Z(\mathcal{G}, V) = 2$ and $\Delta \cdot V = 0$.

(18) *Claim.* There is at most one fork.

Proof. Suppose there are at least two forks. Let $[F_1]$ be one of the forks. If F_1 is invariant, then it is a bad tail by step (16), and the degree of $[F_1]$ must be three by step (15). Also, two of the three branches of $[F_1]$ are special leaves $[L_1]$ and $[L_2]$.

Let $[F_2]$ be the fork connecting to $[F_1]$ by a chain of vertices $[V_1], \dots, [V_r]$ of degree two where V_1 intersects F_1 . Let $V_{r+1} = F_2$.

If V_i is a non-invariant curve for some $1 \leq i \leq r+1$, then we put i_0 be the minimum of i such that V_i is non-invariant. By step (15), we have $i_0 \geq 2$. Also by step (17), $[V_j]$ is of type (e) for $1 \leq j \leq i_0 - 2$ and of type (d) for $j = i_0 - 1$. Thus, $L_1 \cup L_2 \cup F_1 \cup \bigcup_{j=1}^{i_0-1} V_j$ contradicts to Theorem 1.8.

Therefore, all C_i are invariant for $1 \leq i \leq r+1$. In particular, F_2 is an invariant fork, which is a bad tail by step (16). However, Γ contradicts Theorem 1.8.

Hence we may assume that all forks are non-invariant. Then there are two (non-invariant) forks connected by a chain of vertices $[V_1], \dots, [V_r]$ of degree two. Let $[V_0]$ and $[V_{r+1}]$ be these two forks. Thus by step (17), we have that $[V_1]$ and $[V_r]$ are of type (d) and $[V_j]$ is of type (e) for $2 \leq j \leq r-1$. However, $\bigcup_{i=1}^r V_i$ contradicts to Theorem 1.8.

(19) *Claim.* If $\Gamma = \Gamma(E)$ has no fork, then E belongs to one of the following types:

- (a) A \mathcal{G} -chain.
- (b) A chain of three invariant curves $E_1 \cup E_2 \cup E_3$ where E_1, E_3 are special leaves of self-intersection -2 and E_2 is a bad tail.
- (c) A chain of (-2) - \mathcal{G} -curves.
- (d) A chain $E = \bigcup_{i=1}^r E_i$ with exactly one non-invariant curve E_ℓ with $1 \leq \ell \leq r$.
Moreover, E_ℓ has tangency order zero and $\bigcup_{i=1}^{\ell-1} E_i$ and $\bigcup_{i=\ell+1}^r E_i$ are \mathcal{G} -chains.
- (e) An elliptic Gorenstein leaf.

Proof. Note that Γ is either a chain or a cycle since Γ has no fork. Assume that Γ is a chain but not the dual graph of a \mathcal{G} -chain. If Γ has a special leaf, then by step (15), the tail of the special leaf is actually a bad tail, and the degree of the tail must be two since there is no fork in Γ . So E is of type (b).

If Γ has no special leaf, then $D = 0$ and $(K_{\mathcal{G}} + \Delta) \cdot V = 0$ for all vertices $[V]$ of Γ by step (14). Suppose there are more than two vertices $[V]$ with non-invariant V . Let $[V_1]$ and $[V_2]$ be two such vertices and be connected by a chain of vertices $[C_1], \dots, [C_r]$ with C_i invariant for $i = 1, \dots, r$. Then by step (17), we have that $[C_1]$ and $[C_r]$ are of type (d) and $[C_j]$ is of type (e) for $2 \leq j \leq r-1$. However, $\bigcup_{i=1}^r C_i$ contradicts to Theorem 1.8. Hence E is of type (c) if there is no non-invariant curve and type (d) if there is precisely one non-invariant curve.

When Γ is a cycle, there is no non-invariant curve by the same argument as above, and hence Γ is an elliptic Gorenstein leaf.

(20) *Claim.* If $\Gamma = \Gamma(E)$ has exactly one fork, then Γ belongs to one of the following types:

- (a) A graph of D_n type. More precisely, two (-1) - \mathcal{G} -curves with self-intersections -2 joined by a bad tail which itself connects to a chain of (-2) - \mathcal{G} -curves.
- (b) A star-shaped graph with non-invariant center E_0 . Moreover, E_0 has tangency order zero, all branches are \mathcal{G} -chains, and all first curves of \mathcal{G} -chains have intersection number one with E_0 .

Proof. Let $[F]$ be the fork. If F is invariant, then F must be a bad tail by step (16). Let $[V]$ be a vertex other than $[F]$ and its associated two special leaves $[L_1]$ and $[L_2]$. Note that $D \cdot V = 0$ and therefore we have $(K_{\mathcal{G}} + \Delta) \cdot V = 0$ by step (14). Note that the graph $\Gamma' := \Gamma \setminus \{[F], [L_1], [L_2]\}$ is a chain by step (19). Moreover, Γ' must be the graph of some curves belonging to one of the types in step (19). Since $(K_{\mathcal{G}} + \Delta) \cdot V = 0$ for all vertices $[V]$ in Γ' , the type (a) and (b) in step (19) is impossible. Note that Γ' is a chain, so the type (e) in step (19) is also impossible. If Γ' is of type (d) in step (19), we put E_1 be the curve intersecting F and then $\ell \geq 2$ where E_ℓ is non-invariant. However, $L_1 \cup L_2 \cup F \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^{\ell-1} E_i$ contradicts to Theorem 1.8. Thus, Γ' is of type (c) in step (19), which gives Γ is of type (a).

Now if F is non-invariant, then there is no special leaf, otherwise, by step (15), there is a bad tail B with $\deg[B] = 3$, which is impossible by step (18). Thus we have $D = 0$, and by step (14), $(K_{\mathcal{G}} + \Delta) \cdot V = D \cdot V = 0$ for all vertices $[V]$. Moreover, every branch of $[F]$ belongs to one of the types in step (19).

Let $B = \{[B_i]\}_{i=1}^r$ be one of the branches of $[F]$ with B_1 intersecting F . Let Δ_B be the sum over all non-invariant curves among B_i 's. Note that

$$(K_{\mathcal{G}} + \Delta_B) \cdot B_1 = (K_{\mathcal{G}} + \Delta) \cdot B_1 - F \cdot B_1 \leq -1.$$

By steps (2) and (19), we have that B_1 is a (-1) - \mathcal{G} -curve and $F \cdot B_1 = 1$. For any $j \geq 2$, we have $(K_{\mathcal{G}} + \Delta_B) \cdot B_j = (K_{\mathcal{G}} + \Delta) \cdot B_j = 0$. Since B is a chain and belongs to one of the types in step (19), we have that $\bigcup_{i=1}^r B_i$ is a \mathcal{G} -chain. Hence, Γ is of type (b).

□

3. FOLIATED MINIMAL LOG DISCREPANCY

In this section, we define the foliated minimal log discrepancy and show some of its properties.

Definition 3.1. Let (X, \mathcal{F}, Δ) be a foliated triple. For any divisor E over X , we define the *foliated log discrepancy* of (X, \mathcal{F}, Δ) along E to be $a(E, \mathcal{F}, \Delta) + \varepsilon(E)$ where $\varepsilon(E) = 0$ if E is invariant under the pullback foliation and $\varepsilon(E) = 1$ otherwise.

Definition 3.2. Given (X, \mathcal{F}, Δ) a foliated triple. Let (Y, \mathcal{G}) be the minimal resolution of (X, \mathcal{F}) . We define the *foliated minimal log discrepancy* of (X, \mathcal{F}, Δ) as

$$\text{mld}(\mathcal{F}, \Delta) := \inf\{a(E, \mathcal{F}, \Delta) + \varepsilon(E) \neq 0 \mid E \text{ is a divisor over } X\}$$

and the *partial log discrepancy* as

$$\text{pld}(\mathcal{F}, \Delta) := \min\{a(E, \mathcal{F}, \Delta) + \varepsilon(E) \neq 0 \mid E \text{ is a divisor on } Y\}.$$

Also, for any fixed $x \in X$, we define

$$\begin{aligned} \text{mld}_x(\mathcal{F}, \Delta) &:= \inf\{a(E, \mathcal{F}, \Delta) + \varepsilon(E) \neq 0 \mid \text{the center of } E \text{ on } X \text{ is } x\} \text{ and} \\ \text{pld}_x(\mathcal{F}, \Delta) &:= \min\{a(E, \mathcal{F}, \Delta) + \varepsilon(E) \neq 0 \mid E \text{ is a divisor on } Y \text{ over } x.\} \end{aligned}$$

From now on, we make the convention that $\min \emptyset = \inf \emptyset = 0$.

Remark 3.3. By Corollary 3.6, if $\text{mld}_x(\mathcal{F}, \Delta) \geq 0$, then it is indeed a minimum, that is, there is a divisor E over X that computes the $\text{mld}_x(\mathcal{F}, \Delta)$.

Proposition 3.4. *If $\text{mld}(\mathcal{F}, \Delta) < 0$, then $\text{mld}(\mathcal{F}, \Delta) = -\infty$.*

Proof. Suppose $\text{mld}(\mathcal{F}, \Delta) < 0$, then there is a divisor E over X such that

$$a(E, \mathcal{F}, \Delta) + \varepsilon(E) < 0.$$

If E is non-invariant, that is $\varepsilon(E) = 1$, then blowing up a general point p on E introduces an invariant exceptional divisor E' with $a(E', \mathcal{F}, \Delta) + \varepsilon(E') \leq a(E, \mathcal{F}, \Delta) + 1 < 0$. Therefore, we may assume that E is invariant.

Let $a(E, \mathcal{F}, \Delta) = -c$ for some positive number c . Now blowing up a general point p on E introduces an invariant exceptional divisor E_1 with

$$a(E_1, \mathcal{F}, \Delta) \leq 1 + a(E, \mathcal{F}, \Delta) = 1 - c.$$

Notice that the proper transform of the support of Δ doesn't contain the intersection of E_1 and the proper transform of E .

Next we blow up the intersection of E_1 and the proper transform of E , then we have an invariant exceptional divisor E_2 with

$$a(E_2, \mathcal{F}, \Delta) = a(E, \mathcal{F}, \Delta) + a(E_1, \mathcal{F}, \Delta) \leq 1 + 2a(E, \mathcal{F}, \Delta) = 1 - 2c.$$

Then we blow up the intersection of the proper transform of E and E_2 to have an invariant exceptional divisor E_3 with

$$a(E_3, \mathcal{F}, \Delta) \leq 1 + 3a(E, \mathcal{F}, \Delta) = 1 - 3c.$$

Repeating the process, by inductively, we have an invariant exceptional divisor E_n over X with $a(E_n, \mathcal{F}, \Delta) \leq 1 - nc$. This shows that $\text{mld}(\mathcal{F}, \Delta) = -\infty$. \square

Proposition 3.5. *Let (X, \mathcal{F}, Δ) be a foliated triple with only log canonical foliation singularities, that is $\text{mld}(\mathcal{F}, \Delta) \geq 0$. Assume that $\Delta = \sum a_i D_i$ is an \mathbb{R} -divisor which has the simple normal crossing support where $a_i \leq 1$. Suppose X is smooth, \mathcal{F} has only reduced singularities, and any separatrix C through a non-smooth foliation point on non-invariant D_i has $C \cdot D_i = 1$, then we have*

$$\text{mld}(\mathcal{F}, \Delta) = \min \left\{ \min_{(i,j) \in S_1} \{1 - a_i - a_j\}, \min_{(i,j) \in S_0} \{-a_i - a_j\}, \min_{i \in I} \{1 - a_i\}, \min_{i \notin I} \{-a_i\}, 1 \right\}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} S_1 &= \{(i, j) \mid i \neq j, D_i \cap D_j \neq \emptyset, \text{ and } D_i \cap D_j \text{ supports on smooth foliation points}\}, \\ S_0 &= \{(i, j) \mid i \neq j \text{ and } D_i \cap D_j \neq \emptyset\} \setminus S_1, \text{ and} \\ I &= \{i \mid D_i \text{ is non-invariant and has only smooth foliation points}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Let $r(\mathcal{F}, \Delta)$ be the right hand side of the equality. It is clear that $\text{mld}(\mathcal{F}, \Delta) \leq r(\mathcal{F}, \Delta)$.

Let E be the exceptional divisor for some birational morphism $f : Y \rightarrow X$. It is well-known that f is a composition of t blowups for some $t \in \mathbb{N}$. Without loss of generality, we assume that t is minimal, which will be denoted as $t(E)$. Then it suffices to show the following claim.

Claim. For any divisor E over X , if $a(E, \mathcal{F}, \Delta) + \varepsilon(E) > 0$, then $a(E, \mathcal{F}, \Delta) + \varepsilon(E) \geq r(\mathcal{F}, \Delta)$.

Proof (Claim). Note that, for $t(E) = 0$, we have that E is a divisor on X and

$$a(E, \mathcal{F}, \Delta) + \varepsilon(E) = -\text{ord}_E \Delta + \varepsilon(E) \geq r(\mathcal{F}, \Delta).$$

When $t(E) = 1$, we have $v(E) = 0$ and $a(E, \mathcal{F}, \Delta) \geq r(\mathcal{F}, \Delta)$. Then we will proceed by induction on t .

Suppose $t(E) \geq 2$. Note that $\varepsilon(E) = 0$. Let $g_1 : X_1 \rightarrow X$ be the blowup at $f(E)$ and E_1 be the (invariant) exceptional divisor for g_1 . Let $K_{\mathcal{F}_1} + \Delta_1 \equiv g_1^*(K_{\mathcal{F}} + \Delta)$ where \mathcal{F}_1 is the pullback foliation on X_1 . Then we have

$$r(\mathcal{F}_1, \Delta_1) \geq \min\{r(\mathcal{F}, \Delta), a(E_1, \mathcal{F}, \Delta)\} \geq r(\mathcal{F}, \Delta)$$

where the last inequality follows since $t(E_1) = 1$. Moreover, we have

$$a(E, \mathcal{F}, \Delta) = a(E, \mathcal{F}_1, \Delta_1) \geq r(\mathcal{F}_1, \Delta_1) \geq r(\mathcal{F}, \Delta)$$

where the first inequality comes from the induction hypothesis. □

Corollary 3.6. Given $(X, \mathcal{F}, \Delta = \sum a_i D_i)$ a foliated triple with only log canonical foliation singularities where $a_i \leq 1$. Then there is a (log) resolution $f : (Y, \mathcal{G}, \Theta) \rightarrow (X, \mathcal{F}, \Delta)$ such that

- (1) $K_{\mathcal{G}} + \Theta = f^*(K_{\mathcal{F}} + \Delta)$,
- (2) Y is smooth,
- (3) \mathcal{G} has only reduced singularities,
- (4) Θ has the simple normal crossing support,
- (5) the proper transform Δ_Y on Y of Δ is smooth,
- (6) the union of the support of Θ and the exceptional divisor of f is $\cup_i T_i$,
- (7) all non-invariant irreducible components of $\cup_i T_i$ are pairwise disjoint, and
- (8) any separatrix C through a non-smooth foliation point on a non-invariant prime divisor T_i has $C \cdot T_i = 1$.

Then we have

$$\text{mld}(\mathcal{F}, \Delta) = \min \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \min_{E_i \in \tilde{I}} \{1 + a(E_i, \mathcal{F}, \Delta)\}, \min_{E_i \notin \tilde{I}} \{a(E_i, \mathcal{F}, \Delta)\}, \\ \min_{(f_*)^{-1}D_i \in \tilde{I}} \{1 - a_i\}, \min_{(f_*)^{-1}D_i \notin \tilde{I}} \{-a_i\}, 1 \end{array} \right\}$$

where $\tilde{I} = \{T_k \mid T_k \text{ in non-invariant and has only smooth foliation points}\}$.

Proof. First we take $\pi : (Y, \mathcal{F}_Y) \rightarrow (X, \mathcal{F})$ to be the minimal resolution of (X, \mathcal{F}) . Then we take $\phi : Z \rightarrow Y$ to be a log resolution of $(Y, (\pi_*)^{-1}\Delta + \text{Exc}(\pi))$. After some further blowups, this gives the existence of such f .

Let $b_j = -a(E_j, \mathcal{F}, \Delta) \leq \varepsilon(E_j)$. By Proposition 3.5, we have that $\text{mld}(\mathcal{G}, \Theta)$ is a minimum of numbers of the following forms:

- 1.
- $-a_i$ if $(f_*)^{-1}D_i \notin \tilde{I}$.
- $1 - a_i$ if $(f_*)^{-1}D_i \in \tilde{I}$.
- $-b_j$ if $E_j \notin \tilde{I}$.
- $1 - b_j$ if $E_j \in \tilde{I}$.
- $-a_i - b_j$ where $(f_*)^{-1}D_i \cap E_j \neq \emptyset$ has some non-smooth foliation singularities.
- $1 - a_i - b_j$ where $(f_*)^{-1}D_i \cap E_j \neq \emptyset$ has only smooth foliation singularities.
- $-b_{j_1} - b_{j_2}$ for $E_{j_1} \cap E_{j_2} \neq \emptyset$ has some non-smooth foliation singularities.
- $1 - b_{j_1} - b_{j_2}$ for $E_{j_1} \cap E_{j_2} \neq \emptyset$ has only smooth foliation singularities.

Then it suffices to show the following claim.

Claim. The last four terms above are irrelevant when taking the minimum.

Proof (Claim). It is clear if one of a_i and b_j (resp. b_{j_1} and b_{j_2}) is non-positive. So we may assume that both numbers are positive. Moreover, the associated divisors are contained in \tilde{I} ; otherwise, either $-a_i$ or $-b_j$ (resp. either $-b_{j_1}$ or $-b_{j_2}$) is strictly less than zero, which gives a contradiction. Thus, both associated divisors are non-invariant, and hence they have empty intersections. This completes the proof of the claim. \square

4. ASCENDING CHAIN CONDITION FOR FOLIATED MINIMAL LOG DISCREPANCY

In this section, we fix the following notations.

The set $B \subset [0, 1]$ is always assumed to satisfy the descending chain condition. Let (\mathcal{F}, Δ, x) be the germ of a log canonical foliation singularity where Δ is a \mathbb{Q} -divisor whose coefficients are in B . Let $\Gamma = \{E_j\}_{j=1}^r$ be the dual graph of exceptional divisors of a resolution $\pi : (Y, \mathcal{G}) \rightarrow (X, \mathcal{F}, x)$ and $\Theta = \sum_{i=1}^s b_i B_i$ be the proper transform of Δ on Y . Let $a_j := a(E_j, \mathcal{F}, \Delta) \geq 0$ all $j = 1, \dots, r$.

Lemma 4.1. *Assume that Γ is a tree, all E_j are invariant, and $a_j \leq 1$ for all $j = 1, \dots, r$. Then we have:*

- (a) *If $a_j \geq \varepsilon$ for some positive real number ε , then $-E_j^2 \leq \lfloor \frac{2}{\varepsilon} \rfloor$.*
- (b) *If $-E_j^2 \geq 2$ for some j , then*

$$1 - a_j \geq \frac{1 - a_k}{2}$$

and $2a_j \leq a_k + a_\ell$ for any $k \neq \ell$ such that $E_j \cdot E_k = E_j \cdot E_\ell = 1$.

- (c) *Suppose the vertex $[E_{j_0}]$ is a fork and the vertices $[E_{j_k}]$ are connected to $[E_{j_0}]$ for $k = 1, 2, 3$. If $-E_{j_k}^2 \geq 2$ for $k = 0, 1, 2$, then $a_{j_0} \leq a_{j_3}$.*
- (d) *If $-E_j^2 = 1$ for some j , $-E_k^2 \geq 2$, $a_j < a_k$ for all $k \neq j$, and the vertex $[E_j]$ is not a fork, then Γ is a chain.*
- (e) *Given a sequence of vertices $[E_1], \dots, [E_m]$ where $E_i \cdot E_{i+1} = 1$ for all $i = 1, \dots, m - 1$. Suppose $-E_i^2 \geq 2$ for $i = 2, \dots, m - 1$ and $a_1 \leq a_2$. If either $-E_2^2 \geq 3$ and $a_2 \geq \varepsilon$ or $\Theta \cdot E_2 \geq \varepsilon$, then $m \leq \lfloor \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \rfloor + 2$.*

Proof. Notice that

$$(2) \quad \left\{ \begin{aligned} 0 &= \left(K_{\mathcal{G}} + \Theta - \sum_{i=1}^r a_i E_i \right) \cdot E_j \\ &= K_{\mathcal{G}} \cdot E_j + \sum_{i=1}^s t_{i,j} b_i - a_j E_j^2 - \sum_{E_i \cdot E_j = 1} a_i \\ &\geq \#\{i \mid E_i \cdot E_j = 1\} - 2 + \sum_{i=1}^s t_{i,j} b_i - a_j E_j^2 - \sum_{E_i \cdot E_j = 1} a_i \\ &= -2 + \sum_{i=1}^s t_{i,j} b_i - a_j E_j^2 + \sum_{E_i \cdot E_j = 1} (1 - a_i) \end{aligned} \right.$$

where $t_{i,j} = B_i \cdot E_j \geq 0$.

(a) From the inequality (2), we have that $0 \geq -2 - a_j E_j^2$. Thus,

$$-E_j^2 \leq \frac{2}{a_j} \leq \frac{2}{\varepsilon}.$$

Since $-E_j^2 \in \mathbb{Z}$, we have that $-E_j^2 \leq \lfloor \frac{2}{\varepsilon} \rfloor$.

(b) From the inequality (2), we have that $0 \geq -2 - a_j E_j^2 + 1 - a_k \geq -1 + 2a_j - a_k$ and $0 \geq -2 - a_j E_j^2 + 1 - a_k + 1 - a_\ell \geq 2a_j - a_k - a_\ell$. Then we get $1 - a_j \geq \frac{1 - a_k}{2}$ and $2a_j \leq a_k + a_\ell$.

(c) By (b), we have

$$1 - a_{j_k} \geq \frac{1 - a_{j_0}}{2}$$

for $k = 1, 2$. Thus

$$(3) \quad 1 - a_{j_1} + 1 - a_{j_2} \geq 1 - a_{j_0}.$$

Also from the inequality (2), we have

$$0 \geq 1 + 2a_{j_0} - \sum_{k=1}^3 a_{j_k}.$$

Combining with the inequality (3), we get

$$a_{j_3} \geq 1 + 2a_{j_0} - a_{j_1} - a_{j_2} \geq 2a_{j_0} - a_{j_0} = a_{j_0}.$$

(d) Assume Γ is not a chain. Let the vertex $[E_k]$ be a fork. Let $[E_k] =: [E_{\ell_0}], [E_{\ell_1}], \dots, [E_{\ell_m}] := [E_j]$ be a sequence of vertex connecting from $[E_k]$ to $[E_j]$. By (c), we know that $a_{\ell_0} \leq a_{\ell_1}$. By (b), we get $a_{\ell_1} \leq a_{\ell_2} \leq \dots \leq a_{\ell_m}$. Thus, $a_k \leq a_j$, which gives a contradiction.

(e) From the inequality (2) with $j = 2$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\geq -2 + \sum_{i=1}^s t_{i,2} b_i - a_2 E_2^2 + (1 - a_1) + (1 - a_3) \\ &\geq 2a_2 - a_1 - a_3 + \varepsilon \\ &\geq a_2 - a_3 + \varepsilon \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $a_3 \geq a_2 + \varepsilon$.

Claim. $a_{j+1} - a_j \geq \varepsilon$ for all $j = 2, \dots, m-1$.

Proof (Claim). We have seen the claim holds true when $j = 2$. Then by (b), we have $a_{j+1} + a_{j-1} \geq 2a_j$. Thus, $a_{j+1} - a_j \geq a_j - a_{j-1} \geq \varepsilon$ by induction on j .

Therefore, we have

$$1 \geq a_m \geq a_{m-1} + \varepsilon \geq \dots \geq a_2 + (m-2)\varepsilon \geq (m-2)\varepsilon.$$

Hence, $m \leq \lfloor \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \rfloor + 2$.

□

Lemma 4.2. *Assume that (Y, \mathcal{G}) is the minimal resolution of the germ (X, \mathcal{F}, x) . Then we have the followings:*

- (a) $\text{pld}_x(\mathcal{F}) = 0$ if Γ is not of the type (1) in Theorem 2.4.
- (b) If $a_j > 0$ for all j , then $a_j \leq a(E_j, \mathcal{F}) \leq 1$ for all E_j 's.
- (c) Fix a number δ , there are only finitely many sequences $\{t_1, \dots, t_r\}$ where $t_i \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^r t_i b_i \leq \delta$ for some $b_i \in B \setminus \{0\}$.

Proof. (a) This is straightforward.

(b) Note that

$$\left(\sum_{i=1}^r a_i E_i \right) \cdot E_j = (K_{\mathcal{G}} + \Theta) \cdot E_j \geq K_{\mathcal{G}} \cdot E_j = \left(\sum_{i=1}^r a(E_i, \mathcal{F}) E_i \right) \cdot E_j$$

for all j . By Lemma 2.2, we have $0 < a_j \leq a(E_j, \mathcal{F})$ for all j . Then Γ is of type (1) in Theorem 2.4. Also, we notice that

$$K_{\mathcal{G}} \cdot E_j \geq \left(\sum_{i=1}^r E_i \right) \cdot E_j.$$

Thus, we have $a(E_j, \mathcal{F}) \leq 1$ by Lemma 2.2.

(c) Since B is a DCC set, there is a positive number ε such that $b_i \geq \varepsilon$ for all $b_i \in B \setminus \{0\}$. Note that

$$\delta \geq \sum_{i=1}^r t_i b_i \geq \sum_{i=1}^r t_i \varepsilon \text{ and thus } \sum_{i=1}^r t_i \leq \frac{\delta}{\varepsilon}.$$

This shows that there are only finitely many possible r and, for any fixed r , there are only finitely many sequences $\{t_1, \dots, t_r\}$ such that $\sum t_i \leq \frac{\delta}{\varepsilon}$. This proves (c). □

Lemma 4.3. *Fix $\varepsilon > 0$. Suppose (Y, \mathcal{G}) is the minimal resolution of the germ (X, \mathcal{F}, x) with $\text{pld}_x(\mathcal{F}, \Delta) \geq \varepsilon$ and $b_j \geq \varepsilon$ for all j . Then Γ belongs to one of the following cases:*

- (1) Finitely many graphs (that include the way how B_i intersects E_j).
- (2) The chain $\cup_j E_j$ given by the ordered curves $L_{\ell_1}, \dots, L_1, M_1, \dots, M_n, R_1, \dots, R_{\ell_2}$ where $K_{\mathcal{G}} \cdot L_{\ell_1} = -1$, the weights of M_k 's are 2, and each B_j does not meet any M_k 's. Moreover, the partial log discrepancy $\text{pld}_x(\mathcal{F}, \Delta)$ is achieved at either L_1 or R_1 and there are only finitely many possibilities (independent of n) for the dual graphs $\{L_1, \dots, L_{\ell_1}\}$ and $\{R_1, \dots, R_{\ell_2}\}$ and the way how B_i intersects L_α and R_β .

Proof. By Lemma 4.2, we have that Γ is of type (1), and therefore Γ satisfies the assumption in Lemma 4.1. So from the inequality (2), we have that $0 \geq -2 + \sum t_{i,j}b_i - a_j E_j^2$ and hence $\sum t_{i,j}b_i \leq 2 + a_j E_j^2 \leq 2$. Therefore, there are only finitely many possibilities for $t_{i,j}$ for any i, j by Lemma 4.2 (c).

Let the chain be $\cup_j E_j$. By Lemma 4.1 (b), the function $f : \{1, \dots, r\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ which maps j to a_j is convex. Let $S = \{j \mid a_j = \min_k \{a_k\}\}$, $N = \#S$, and $j_0 = \min S$.

If $N \geq 2$, then $S = \{j_0, \dots, j_0 + N - 1\}$ by convexity of f . Note that, by inequality (2) with fixed j , we have

$$0 \geq -2 + \sum_{i=1}^s t_{i,j}b_i - a_j E_j^2 + (1 - a_{j-1}) + (1 - a_{j+1})$$

and thus

$$(4) \quad a_{j-1} - 2a_j + a_{j+1} \geq \sum_{i=1}^s t_{i,j}b_i - a_j(E_j^2 + 2) \geq \left(\sum_{i=1}^s t_{i,j} - E_j^2 - 2 \right) \varepsilon \geq \varepsilon$$

whenever $-E_j^2 \geq 3$ or $t_{i,j} \geq 1$ for some i . So we can choose $L_1 = E_{j_0}$ and $R_1 = E_{j_0+N-1}$. By Lemma 4.1 (e), we have $\ell_i \leq \lfloor \frac{2}{\varepsilon} \rfloor + 1$ for $i = 1, 2$.

If $N = 1$, then $S = \{j_0\}$. Let $T = \{j \mid E_j^2 = -2 \text{ and } E_j \cdot \Theta = 0\}$. We have the following three cases:

- (i) If both $j_0 - 1$ and $j_0 + 1$ are not in T , then we choose $L_1 = E_{j_0}$ and $R_1 = E_{j_0+1}$.
- (ii) If $j_0 - 1 \in T$, then we choose $R_1 = E_{j_0}$ and $L_1 = E_u$ where u is the maximal integer strictly less than j_0 and not in T .
- (iii) If $j_0 + 1 \in T$, then we choose $L_1 = E_{j_0}$ and $R_1 = E_u$ where u is the minimal integer strictly greater than j_0 and not in T .

By Lemma 4.1 (e), we also have $\ell_i \leq \lfloor \frac{2}{\varepsilon} \rfloor + 1$ for $i = 1, 2$. To complete the proof, it remains to show the following claim.

Claim. *There are only finitely many possibilities for the dual graphs $\{L_1, \dots, L_{\ell_1}\}$ and $\{R_1, \dots, R_{\ell_2}\}$ and the way how B_i intersects L_α and R_β .*

Proof. To simplify some notations, we assume that we have a chain $C = \cup_{j=1}^\ell C_j$ with increasing associated discrepancies $a_j \geq \varepsilon$. By inequality (4), we have

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &\geq a_\ell \\ &\geq a_{\ell-1} + \left(\sum_{i=1}^s t_{i,\ell-1} - E_{\ell-1}^2 - 2 \right) \varepsilon \\ &\vdots \\ &\geq a_1 + \sum_{j=1}^{\ell-1} \left(\sum_{i=1}^s t_{i,j} - E_j^2 - 2 \right) \varepsilon \\ &\geq \varepsilon + \sum_{j=1}^{\ell-1} \left(\sum_{i=1}^s t_{i,j} - E_j^2 - 2 \right) \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have

$$\sum_{j=1}^{\ell-1} \left(\sum_{i=1}^s t_{i,j} - E_j^2 - 2 \right) \leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon} - 1.$$

Therefore, there are only finitely many possibilities for E_j^2 for any j since we have seen that there are only finitely many possibilities for $t_{i,j}$ for any i, j . □

Lemma 4.4. *For the second case in Lemma 4.3, if the chain has length $r = \ell_1 + n + \ell_2 > 2n_0 + 2$ where $n_0 = \lfloor \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \rfloor$, then*

$$\text{mld}_x(\mathcal{F}, \Delta) = \text{pld}_x(\mathcal{F}, \Delta).$$

Moreover, for the fixed graphs $\{L_1, \dots, L_{\ell_1}\}$ and $\{R_1, \dots, R_{\ell_2}\}$, the fixed number t of irreducible components of B , and the fixed way how B_i intersects E_j , if $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} b_j = \bar{b}_j$ exists where (b_1, \dots, b_s) is some ordering of coefficients of Θ , then

$$\text{pld}(\mathcal{F}, \Delta) \geq \min \left\{ \frac{\alpha^L}{m_1 - q_1}, \frac{\alpha^R}{m_2 - q_2} \right\}$$

and

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{pld}(\mathcal{F}, \Delta) = \min \left\{ \frac{\bar{\alpha}^L}{m_1 - q_1}, \frac{\bar{\alpha}^R}{m_2 - q_2} \right\}.$$

where

- $c_i^L = \sum_j (B_i \cdot L_j) g_j^L$ and $c_i^R = \sum_j (B_i \cdot R_j) g_j^R$,
- g_j^L (resp. g_j^R) is the determinant of the chain $L_{j+1}, \dots, L_{\ell_1}$ (resp. $R_{j+1}, \dots, R_{\ell_2}$),
- $m_1 = g_0^L$, $q_1 = g_1^L$, $m_2 = g_0^R$, and $q_2 = g_1^R$,
- $\alpha^L = 1 - \sum_i b_i c_i^L$ and $\alpha^R = - \sum_i b_i c_i^R$,
- $\bar{\alpha}^L = 1 - \sum_i \bar{b}_i c_i^L$ and $\bar{\alpha}^R = - \sum_i \bar{b}_i c_i^R$.

Proof. We first show that $\text{mld}_x(\mathcal{F}, \Delta) = \text{pld}_x(\mathcal{F}, \Delta)$ if $r > 2n_0 + 2$. Suppose not, then there is an irreducible divisor F over Y such that $a(F, \mathcal{F}, \Delta) < \text{pld}(\mathcal{F}, \Delta)$. Then F is an exceptional divisor for the composition of t blowups. Let $F_1, \dots, F_t := F$ be the exceptional divisors for the corresponding blowups. We may assume that $a(F_j, \mathcal{F}, \Delta) < a(F_{j+1}, \mathcal{F}, \Delta)$ for all $1 \leq j \leq t-1$. Note that $-F_j^2 \geq 2$ for all $1 \leq j \leq t-1$ and $[F]$ is not a fork since $\sum_{i=1}^{t-1} F_i$ has the simple normal crossing support. Then by Lemma 4.1 (d), the graph $\{E_i, F_j\} = \{G_k\}_{k=1}^N$ is a chain with $F = F_t = G_u$ for some u . Notice that exactly one of $-G_{u-1}^2$ or $-G_{u+1}^2$ is 2. Without loss of generality, we assume that $-G_{u+1}^2 = 2$ and $-G_{u-1}^2 \geq 3$. Then $u \leq n_0 + 2$ by Lemma 4.1 (e).

Put $\gamma = \min\{k > u \mid -G_k^2 \geq 3\}$. Then, by Lemma 4.1 (e) again, we have $N - \gamma \leq n_0$. By blowing down $G_u, \dots, G_{\gamma-1}$ successively, we get a new foliated surface with only reduced singularities and with at most $(u-1) + (N-\gamma+1) \leq 2n_0 + 2 < r$ exceptional divisors over X . However, since this new foliated surface factors through the minimal resolution, the number of exceptional divisors over X is at least r , which gives a contradiction.

Now we compute the partial log discrepancy $\text{pld}_x(\mathcal{F}, \Delta)$. It is known that the graph Γ is uniquely determined by these five numbers m_1, q_1, m_2, q_2, n . By Lemma 4.5, we

have that both $a(L_1, \mathcal{F}, \Delta)$ and $a(R_1, \mathcal{F}, \Delta)$ are between

$$\min \left\{ \frac{\alpha^L}{m_1 - q_1}, \frac{\alpha^R}{m_2 - q_2} \right\} \text{ and } \max \left\{ \frac{\alpha^L}{m_1 - q_1}, \frac{\alpha^R}{m_2 - q_2} \right\}.$$

Moreover, we have that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a(L_1, \mathcal{F}, \Delta) = \frac{\overline{\alpha^L}}{m_1 - q_1} \text{ and } \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a(R_1, \mathcal{F}, \Delta) = \frac{\overline{\alpha^R}}{m_2 - q_2}.$$

□

Lemma 4.5. *Notation as in Lemma 4.4, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} a(L_1, \mathcal{F}, \Delta) &= \frac{\alpha^L(n(m_2 - q_2) + m_2) + \alpha^R q_1}{n(m_1 - q_1)(m_2 - q_2) + m_2(m_1 - q_1) + q_1(m_2 - q_2)} \\ &= \frac{\frac{\alpha^L}{m_1 - q_1} \left(n + \frac{m_2}{m_2 - q_2} \right) + \frac{\alpha^R}{m_2 - q_2} \frac{q_1}{m_1 - q_1}}{n + \frac{m_2}{m_2 - q_2} + \frac{q_1}{m_1 - q_1}} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} a(R_1, \mathcal{F}, \Delta) &= \frac{\alpha^R(n(m_1 - q_1) + m_1) + \alpha^L q_2}{n(m_1 - q_1)(m_2 - q_2) + m_1(m_2 - q_2) + q_2(m_1 - q_1)} \\ &= \frac{\frac{\alpha^R}{m_2 - q_2} \left(n + \frac{m_1}{m_1 - q_1} \right) + \frac{\alpha^L}{m_1 - q_1} \frac{q_2}{m_2 - q_2}}{n + \frac{m_1}{m_1 - q_1} + \frac{q_2}{m_2 - q_2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. We denote Γ as $\Gamma_{m_1, q_1, m_2, q_2, n}$ and its intersection matrix A as $A_{m_1, q_1, m_2, q_2, n}$. Let $S_n = \det(-A_{1,1, m_2, q_2, n})$. Then by Lemma 1.21 (1), we have that

$$\det(-A_{m_1, q_1, m_2, q_2, n}) = 2m_1 S_{n-1} - a_1 S_{n-1} - m_1 S_{n-2} = (2m_1 - q_1) S_{n-1} - m_1 S_{n-2}$$

and $S_n = 2S_{n-1} - S_{n-2}$. Thus, $S_{i+1} - S_i = S_i - S_{i-1}$ for all i . Since $S_0 = m_2$ and $S_1 = 2S_0 - q_2 = 2m_2 - q_2$, we have

$$S_n = \sum_{i=1}^n (S_i - S_{i-1}) + S_0 = n(S_1 - S_0) + S_0 = n(m_2 - q_2) + m_2$$

and thus

$$\begin{aligned} \det(-A) &= \det(-A_{m_1, q_1, m_2, q_2, n}) \\ &= (2m_1 - q_1) \left((n-1)(m_2 - q_2) + m_2 \right) - m_1 \left((n-2)(m_2 - q_2) + m_2 \right) \\ &= n(m_1 - q_1)(m_2 - q_2) + m_2(m_1 - q_1) + q_1(m_2 - q_2). \end{aligned}$$

Also by Lemma 1.21 (2), we have

$$\begin{aligned} (L_1, L_j)\text{-cofactor} &= (-1)^{|\Gamma|+1} g_j^L S_n, \\ (L_1, M_j)\text{-cofactor} &= (-1)^{|\Gamma|+1} q_1 S_{n-j}, \text{ and} \\ (L_1, R_j)\text{-cofactor} &= (-1)^{|\Gamma|+1} g_j^R q_1. \end{aligned}$$

Put $d_j^L = (K_{\mathcal{G}} + \Theta) \cdot L_j$, $d_j^R = (K_{\mathcal{G}} + \Theta) \cdot R_j$, and $d_j^M = (K_{\mathcal{G}} + \Theta) \cdot M_j$. By assumption, we know that $d_j^M = 0$ and $d_j^R = \Theta \cdot R_j$ for all j . Moreover, $d_j^L = \Theta \cdot L_j$ for $j \neq \ell_1$ and

$d_{\ell_1}^L = -1 + \Theta \cdot L_{\ell_1}$. Then we have

$$\det(A)a(L_1, \mathcal{F}, \Delta) = \sum_{j=1}^{\ell_1} d_j^L \cdot (L_1, L_j)\text{-cofactor} + \sum_{j=1}^{\ell_2} d_j^R \cdot (L_1, R_j)\text{-cofactor}.$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} & -\det(-A)a(L_1, \mathcal{F}, \Delta) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{\ell_1} d_j^L g_j^L S_n + \sum_{j=1}^{\ell_2} d_j^R g_j^R q_1 \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{\ell_1} \left(\sum_{i=1}^s b_i(B_i \cdot L_j) \right) g_j^L S_n - g_{\ell_1}^L S_n + \sum_{j=1}^{\ell_2} \left(\sum_{i=1}^s b_i(B_i \cdot R_j) \right) g_j^R q_1 \\ &= \left(\sum_{i=1}^s b_i c_i^L - 1 \right) S_n + \left(\sum_{i=1}^s b_i c_i^R \right) q_1 \\ &= -\alpha^L S_n - \alpha^R q_1. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} a(L_1, \mathcal{F}, \Delta) &= \frac{\alpha^L(n(m_2 - q_2) + m_2) + \alpha^R q_1}{n(m_1 - q_1)(m_2 - q_2) + m_2(m_1 - q_1) + q_1(m_2 - q_2)} \\ &= \frac{\frac{\alpha^L}{m_1 - q_1} \left(n + \frac{m_2}{m_2 - q_2} \right) + \frac{\alpha^R}{m_2 - q_2} \frac{q_1}{m_1 - q_1}}{n + \frac{m_2}{m_2 - q_2} + \frac{q_1}{m_1 - q_1}}. \end{aligned}$$

By the similar way, we also have

$$\begin{aligned} a(R_1, \mathcal{F}, \Delta) &= \frac{\alpha^R(n(m_1 - q_1) + m_1) + \alpha^L q_2}{n(m_1 - q_1)(m_2 - q_2) + m_1(m_2 - q_2) + q_2(m_1 - q_1)} \\ &= \frac{\frac{\alpha^R}{m_2 - q_2} \left(n + \frac{m_1}{m_1 - q_1} \right) + \frac{\alpha^L}{m_1 - q_1} \frac{q_2}{m_2 - q_2}}{n + \frac{m_1}{m_1 - q_1} + \frac{q_2}{m_2 - q_2}}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Theorem 4.6. *For any DCC set B , the set*

$\text{PLD}(2, B) := \{\text{pld}_x(\mathcal{F}, \Delta) \mid (X, \mathcal{F}, \Delta) \text{ is a foliated triple with } x \in X \text{ and } \Delta \in B\}$
satisfies the ascending chain condition (ACC).

Proof. Given any non-decreasing sequence $\{\text{pld}_{x_k}(\mathcal{F}_k, \Delta_k)\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ in the set $\text{PLD}(2, B)$ where $(X_k, \mathcal{F}_k, \Delta_k)$ is a germ of foliated triple around x_k and $\Delta_k \in B$ for all k . We may assume that

$$\text{pld}_{x_k}(\mathcal{F}_k, \Delta_k) > 0$$

for all k , otherwise the sequence $\{\text{pld}_{x_k}(\mathcal{F}_k, \Delta_k)\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ stabilizes. Now let $\varepsilon > 0$ be a number such that $\text{pld}_{x_k}(\mathcal{F}_k, \Delta_k) \geq \varepsilon$ for all k . Since B satisfies the descending chain condition, we may assume that $\min(B \setminus \{0\}) \geq \varepsilon$.

Claim. We may also assume that the number s of irreducible components of Θ_k is independent of k .

Proof. For ease of our notation, we will drop the subscription k .

By Lemma 4.3, the number of irreducible components of exceptional divisors E_i which meet Θ is bounded by N for some $N > 0$. Moreover, by the inequality (2), we have $\sum_{i=1}^s t_{i,j} b_i \leq 2$ where s is the number of irreducible components of Θ . Then

$$2N \geq \sum_{j=1}^r \sum_{i=1}^s t_{i,j} b_i \geq \sum_{i=1}^s \sum_{j=1}^r t_{i,j} \varepsilon \geq \sum_{i=1}^s \varepsilon = s\varepsilon$$

where the third inequality follows from $t_{i,j} \geq 1$ for some j for any fixed i . Therefore, $s \leq \frac{2N}{\varepsilon}$. Hence, after taking a subsequence, we may assume that the number of irreducible components of Θ_k is independent of k .

Let $(b_{1,k}, \dots, b_{s,k})$ be some ordering of coefficients of Θ_k . After taking a further subsequence, we may assume the sequence $\{b_{j,k}\}_{k=1}^\infty$ is non-decreasing for any $j = 1, \dots, s$. If there are infinitely many dual graph Γ_k belonging to the first case of Lemma 4.3, then, by Lemma 2.2 and after taking a further subsequence, we have that $\text{pld}_{x_k}(\mathcal{F}_k, \Delta_k)$ is non-increasing. Since it is also non-decreasing, the sequence $\{\text{pld}_{x_k}(\mathcal{F}_k, \Delta_k)\}_{k=1}^\infty$ stabilizes.

Thus, there are infinitely many dual graphs Γ_k belonging to the second case of Lemma 4.3. After taking a subsequence, we may assume that the dual graphs of $\{L_1, \dots, L_{\ell_1}\}$ and $\{R_1, \dots, R_{\ell_2}\}$ are fixed, the way how B_i intersects E_j is fixed, and n is sufficiently large. Since $b_{j,k} \leq 1$, the limit $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} b_{j,k} = \bar{b}_j$ exists for any $j = 1, \dots, s$.

By Lemma 4.4, we have, for all k , that

$$\text{pld}_{x_k}(\mathcal{F}_k, \Delta_k) \geq \min \left\{ \frac{\alpha^L}{m_1 - q_1}, \frac{\alpha^R}{m_2 - q_2} \right\} \geq \min \left\{ \frac{\bar{\alpha}^L}{m_1 - q_1}, \frac{\bar{\alpha}^R}{m_2 - q_2} \right\}$$

and

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{pld}_{x_k}(\mathcal{F}_k, \Delta_k) = \min \left\{ \frac{\bar{\alpha}^L}{m_1 - q_1}, \frac{\bar{\alpha}^R}{m_2 - q_2} \right\}.$$

Thus, the sequence $\{\text{pld}_{x_k}(\mathcal{F}_k, \Delta_k)\}_{k=1}^\infty$ stabilizes. \square

Theorem 4.7. *For any DCC set B , the set*

$$\text{MLD}(2, B) := \{\text{mld}_x(\mathcal{F}, \Delta) \mid (X, \mathcal{F}, \Delta) \text{ is a foliated triple with } x \in X \text{ and } \Delta \in B.\}$$

satisfies the ascending chain condition (ACC).

Proof. Given any non-decreasing sequence $\{\text{mld}_{x_k}(\mathcal{F}_k, \Delta_k)\}_{k=1}^\infty$ in the set $\text{MLD}(2, B)$ where $(X_k, \mathcal{F}_k, \Delta_k)$ is a germ of foliated triple around x_k and $\Delta_k \in B$ for all k . We may assume that

$$\text{pld}_{x_k}(\mathcal{F}_k, \Delta_k) > 0$$

for all k , otherwise the sequence $\{\text{mld}_{x_k}(\mathcal{F}_k, \Delta_k)\}_{k=1}^\infty$ stabilizes. Now let $\varepsilon > 0$ be a number such that $\text{mld}_{x_k}(\mathcal{F}_k, \Delta_k) \geq \varepsilon$ for all k . Since B satisfies the descending chain condition, we may assume that $\min(B \setminus \{0\}) \geq \varepsilon$.

If there are infinitely many k such that $\text{pld}_{x_k}(\mathcal{F}_k, \Delta_k) = \text{mld}_{x_k}(\mathcal{F}_k, \Delta_k)$, then by Theorem 4.6, we get the sequence $\{\text{mld}_{x_k}(\mathcal{F}_k, \Delta_k)\}_{k=1}^\infty$ stabilizes.

Thus, by Lemma 4.3 and 4.4, after taking a subsequence, we may assume $(X_k, \mathcal{F}_k, \Delta_k)$ have the same weighted dual graph for the minimal resolution $(Y_k, \mathcal{G}_k, \Theta_k)$, the ways how B_i intersects E_j are the same, and $\text{pld}_{x_k}(\mathcal{F}_k, \Delta_k) > \text{mld}_{x_k}(\mathcal{F}_k, \Delta_k)$.

We may assume the number of irreducible components of Θ_k is fixed as the claim in the proof of Theorem 4.6. Let $(b_{1,k}, \dots, b_{s,k})$ be some ordering of the coefficients of Θ_k . Then, by taking a further subsequence, we may assume the sequence $\{b_{j,k}\}_{k=1}^\infty$ is non-decreasing for any $j = 1, \dots, s$.

Since $\text{pld}_{x_k}(\mathcal{F}_k, \Delta_k) > \text{mld}_{x_k}(\mathcal{F}_k, \Delta_k)$, there exists an exceptional divisor F_k over Y_k such that $a(F_k, \mathcal{F}_k, \Delta_k) = \text{mld}_{x_k}(\mathcal{F}_k, \Delta_k)$. Then F_k is an exceptional divisor of the birational morphism $\pi_k : Z_k \rightarrow Y_k$ which is the composition of N_k blowups. Let $F_{1,k}, \dots, F_{N_k,k} =: F_k$ be all π_k -exceptional divisors. We may assume that $a(F_{j,k}, \mathcal{F}_k, \Delta_k) > a(F_k, \mathcal{F}_k, \Delta_k)$ for all $j \leq N_k - 1$. Notice that $-(F_{j,k})^2 \geq 2$ for all $j \leq N_k - 1$ and $[F_k]$ is not a fork since $\bigcup_i E_i \cup \bigcup_j F_{j,k}$ has the simple normal crossing support. By Lemma 4.1 (d), the dual graph of $\{E_i, F_{j,k}\}_{i,j}$ is a chain.

By Lemma 4.8, the length of the chain of the dual graph of $\{E_i, F_{j,k}\}_{i,j}$ is bounded. After taking a subsequence, we may assume they have the same dual graphs, and the ways B_i intersecting E_j and $F_{j,k}$ are the same.

Therefore, by Lemma 2.2, we have that

$$\text{mld}_{x_k}(\mathcal{F}_k, \Delta_k) = a(F_k, \mathcal{F}_k, \Delta_k) \geq a(F_{k+1}, \mathcal{F}_{k+1}, \Delta_{k+1}) = \text{mld}_{x_k}(\mathcal{F}_{k+1}, \Delta_{k+1})$$

for all k . This shows that the sequence $\{\text{mld}_{x_k}(\mathcal{F}_k, \Delta_k)\}_{k=1}^\infty$ stabilizes. \square

Lemma 4.8. *Fix an $\varepsilon > 0$. Suppose the sequence $(X_k, \mathcal{F}_k, \Delta_k)$ with $\text{pld}_{x_k}(\mathcal{F}_k, \Delta_k) > \text{mld}_{x_k}(\mathcal{F}_k, \Delta_k) \geq \varepsilon$ and $b_i \geq \varepsilon$ have the following properties:*

- (i) *The dual graph for the minimal resolution $(Y_k, \mathcal{G}_k, \Theta_k)$ are the same.*
- (ii) *The number s of irreducible components of Θ_k are the same.*
- (iii) *$(b_{1,k}, \dots, b_{s,k})$ is some ordering of the coefficients of Θ_k .*
- (iv) *$\{b_{j,k}\}_{k=1}^\infty$ is non-decreasing for any $j = 1, \dots, s$.*

Then there is a positive integer N independent of k such that, for each $(Y_k, \mathcal{G}_k, \Theta_k)$, there exists a birational morphism $\pi_k : Z_k \rightarrow Y_k$ such that

- (1) *the relative Picard number $\rho(Z_k/Y_k) \leq N$ and*
- (2) *one of the exceptional divisors on Z_k over X_k computes the minimal log discrepancy.*

Proof. To simplify our notation, we will drop the subscript k and, for any fixed divisor D , denote all of the proper transforms of D by D . Since the set B satisfies DCC, there is a $\delta_a > 0$ for any $a \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^s m_i \beta_i - 1 \geq \delta_a$ if $\sum_{i=1}^s m_i \beta_i - a > 0$ for some $\beta_i \in B$.

We have seen in the proof of Theorem 4.7 that the dual graph of $\{G_n\} = \{E_i, F_j\}$ is a chain. This implies that π is the composition of blowups with center p either at the foliation singularities or on two curves at the ends. We may also assume that N is minimal for all k . We will proceed induction on $\sum_{i=1}^s \text{mult}_p B_i$. Note that

$$\sum_{i=1}^s \text{mult}_p B_i \leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \sum_{j=1}^r \Theta \cdot E_j \leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \sum_{j=1}^r 2 = \frac{2r}{\varepsilon}$$

by the inequality (2) and $\frac{2r}{\varepsilon}$ is independent of k .

Let F_1 be the exceptional divisor of blowup at p . We have following three cases:

- (1) Suppose p is a smooth foliation point on the curve at the end. Note that

$$a(F_1, \mathcal{F}, \Delta) = a(E_r, \mathcal{F}, \Delta) + 1 - \sum_{i=1}^s (\text{mult}_p B_i) b_i.$$

If all B_i 's meet E_r at p transversally and $\sum_{i=1}^s (\text{mult}_p B_i) b_i \leq 1$, then the exceptional divisors from further blowups have discrepancies at least $a(F_1, \mathcal{F}, \Delta)$.

If all B_i 's meet E_r at p transversally but $\sum_{i=1}^s (\text{mult}_p B_i) b_i > 1$, then

$$\sum_{i=1}^s (\text{mult}_p B_i) b_i - 1 \geq \delta_1 > 0$$

and $a(F_1, \mathcal{F}, \Delta) \leq a(E_r, \mathcal{F}, \Delta) - \delta_1 \leq 1 - \delta_1$. If $\sum_{i=1}^s \text{mult}_q B_i < \sum_{i=1}^s \text{mult}_p B_i$ for all $q \in F_1$, then we are done by induction. If not, then the exceptional divisor from blowing up at such q has discrepancy $\leq a(F_1, \mathcal{F}, \Delta) - \delta_1 \leq 1 - 2\delta_1$. Since the minimal log discrepancy $\text{mld}_x(\mathcal{F}, \Delta)$ is positive, after finitely many blowups, the quantity $\sum_{i=1}^s \text{mult}_p B_i$ will strictly decrease.

If some of B_i 's meet E_r at p transversally and some do not, then the quantity $\sum_{i=1}^s \text{mult}_p B_i$ strictly decreases.

If each B_i does not meet E_r at p transversally, then all B_i 's meet F_1 at the reduced singularity q on F_1 . Notice that we have $\sum_{i=1}^s \text{mult}_q B_i \leq \sum_{i=1}^s \text{mult}_p B_i$. If it is not an equality, then we are done by induction. Suppose it is an equality, then we may assume that p is contained in two exceptional divisors, say E_j and E_{j+1} for some j .

- (2) Suppose p is contained in two exceptional divisors, say E_j and E_{j+1} for some j . Note that

$$a(F_1, \mathcal{F}, \Delta) = a(E_j, \mathcal{F}, \Delta) + a(E_{j+1}, \mathcal{F}, \Delta) - \sum_{i=1}^s (\text{mult}_p B_i) b_i.$$

Assume $a(E_j, \mathcal{F}, \Delta) \leq a(E_{j+1}, \mathcal{F}, \Delta)$. If $a(F_1, \mathcal{F}, \Delta) \geq a(E_j, \mathcal{F}, \Delta)$, then all exceptional divisors from further blowups have discrepancies at least $a(E_j, \mathcal{F}, \Delta)$. Thus, we may assume that $\sigma < a(E_j, \mathcal{F}, \Delta)$. Notice that

$$a(E_j, \mathcal{F}, \Delta) - \sigma = \sum_{i=1}^s (\text{mult}_p B_i) b_i - a(E_{j+1}, \mathcal{F}, \Delta) \geq \delta_\alpha$$

where $\alpha = a(E_{j+1}, \mathcal{F}, \Delta)$. Therefore, $a(F_1, \mathcal{F}, \Delta) \leq a(E_j, \mathcal{F}, \Delta) - \delta_\alpha \leq 1 - \delta_\alpha$. There are two reduced singularities q_1 and q_2 on F_1 . Note that the quantities $\sum_{i=1}^s \text{mult}_{q_1} B_i$ and $\sum_{i=1}^s \text{mult}_{q_2} B_i$ are at most $\sum_{i=1}^s \text{mult}_p B_i$.

If both are strictly inequalities, then we are done by induction.

If one of them is an equality, say q_1 , then the exceptional divisor F_2 from blowing up at q_1 has discrepancy

$$a(F_2, \mathcal{F}, \Delta) \leq a(F_1, \mathcal{F}, \Delta) - \delta_\alpha \leq 1 - 2\delta_\alpha.$$

Since the minimal log discrepancy $\text{mld}_x(\mathcal{F}, \Delta)$ is positive, after finitely many blowups, the quantity $\sum_{i=1}^s \text{mult}_p B_i$ will strictly decrease.

- (3) Suppose p is a reduced singularity contained in precisely one exceptional divisor E_r . Note that

$$\begin{aligned} a(F_1, \mathcal{F}, \Delta) &= a(E_r, \mathcal{F}, \Delta) - \sum_{i=1}^s (\text{mult}_p B_i) b_i \\ &\leq a(E_r, \mathcal{F}, \Delta) - \varepsilon \sum_{i=1}^s \text{mult}_p B_i. \end{aligned}$$

If $\sum_{i=1}^s \text{mult}_q B_i < \sum_{i=1}^s \text{mult}_p B_i$ for all $q \in F_1$, then we are done by induction.

When $\sum_{i=1}^s \text{mult}_q B_i = \sum_{i=1}^s \text{mult}_p B_i$ for some q , if q is either a smooth foliation point or contained in two exceptional divisors, then we are done. Otherwise, q is a reduced singularity contained in precisely one exceptional divisor. Then the exceptional divisor F_2 from blowing up at q has discrepancy

$$\begin{aligned} a(F_2, \mathcal{F}, \Delta) &\leq a(F_1, \mathcal{F}, \Delta) - \sum_{i=1}^s (\text{mult}_q B_i) b_i \\ &\leq a(E_r, \mathcal{F}, \Delta) - 2\varepsilon \sum_{i=1}^s \text{mult}_p B_i. \end{aligned}$$

Since the minimal log discrepancy $\text{mld}_x(\mathcal{F}, \Delta)$ is positive, after finitely many blowups, the quantity $\sum_{i=1}^s \text{mult}_p B_i$ will strictly decrease. □

Remark 4.9. When $B = \emptyset$, we have

$$\text{MLD}(2, \emptyset) = \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \mid n \in \mathbb{N} \right\} \cup \{0, -\infty\}.$$

5. VANISHING THEOREM FOR FOLIATIONS

Definition 5.1. In Theorem 2.4, we say a log canonical foliation singularity is *good* if it is either of the type (1)-(5), or of the type (6) and (7) such that all invariant curves are (-1) - \mathcal{G} -curves and the non-invariant curve E satisfying

$$-E^2 \geq \max\{2p_a(E) - 1 + \deg[E], 2 - 2p_a(E)\}.$$

Remark 5.2. All canonical foliation singularities are good log canonical foliation singularities.

Theorem 5.3. *Let $f : (Y, \mathcal{G}) \rightarrow (X, \mathcal{F})$ be a proper birational morphism where (X, \mathcal{F}) is a foliated surface with good log canonical foliation singularities and (Y, \mathcal{G}) is a foliated surface with only reduced singularities. Then $R^i f_* \mathcal{O}_Y(K_{\mathcal{G}}) = 0$ for $i > 0$.*

Proof. We divide the proof into several steps.

- (1) We first consider (Y, \mathcal{G}) is the *minimal resolution* of (X, \mathcal{F}) with exceptional divisors E_1, \dots, E_r . Let $Z = \sum_{i=1}^r a_i E_i$ where a_i 's are non-negative integers. By the theorem on formal functions, it suffices to show that

$$h^1(Z, \mathcal{O}_Y(K_{\mathcal{G}}) \otimes \mathcal{O}_Z) = 0$$

for any effective (non-zero) divisor Z . Let $A := \sum_{i=1}^r a_i$. We will show the vanishing by induction on A .

- (2) When $A = 1$, there is exactly one i such that a_i is positive and equals to 1. Without loss of generality, we assume $a_1 = 1$ and $a_i = 0$ for $i \geq 2$.

Claim. $\deg(K_{E_1}) - K_{\mathcal{G}} \cdot E_1 < 0$.

Proof. (a) If E_1 is invariant, then we have $K_{\mathcal{G}} \cdot E_1 \geq -1$ and

$$\deg(K_{E_1}) - K_{\mathcal{G}} \cdot E_1 = -2 - K_{\mathcal{G}} \cdot E_1 \leq -1 < 0.$$

(b) If E_1 is non-invariant, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \deg(K_{E_1}) - K_{\mathcal{G}} \cdot E_1 &= 2p_a(E_1) - 2 + E_1^2 \\ &\leq 2p_a(E_1) - 2 - (2p_a(E_1) - 1 + \deg[E_1]) \\ &= -1 - \deg[E_1] < 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $h^1(E_1, \mathcal{O}_Y(K_{\mathcal{G}}) \otimes \mathcal{O}_{E_1}) = h^0(E_1, \omega_{E_1} \otimes \mathcal{O}_{E_1}(-K_{\mathcal{G}})) = 0$.

- (3) Let $Z_\ell = Z - E_\ell$ for some ℓ with positive a_ℓ , which will be determined later. Then we combine the following two short exact sequences

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_Y(-Z) \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_Y(-Z_\ell) \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{E_\ell} \otimes \mathcal{O}_Y(-Z_\ell) \longrightarrow 0$$

and

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_Y(-Z_\ell)/\mathcal{O}_Y(-Z) \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_Z \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{Z_\ell} \longrightarrow 0$$

into a short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{E_\ell} \otimes \mathcal{O}_Y(-Z_\ell) \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_Z \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{Z_\ell} \longrightarrow 0.$$

Tensoring with $\mathcal{O}_Y(K_{\mathcal{G}})$, we get

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{E_\ell} \otimes \mathcal{O}_Y(K_{\mathcal{G}} - Z_\ell) \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_Y(K_{\mathcal{G}}) \otimes \mathcal{O}_Z \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_Y(K_{\mathcal{G}}) \otimes \mathcal{O}_{Z_\ell} \longrightarrow 0.$$

Now, by induction hypothesis, we have $h^1(Z_\ell, \mathcal{O}_Y(K_{\mathcal{G}}) \otimes \mathcal{O}_{Z_\ell}) = 0$. Therefore, it suffices to show $h^1(E_\ell, \mathcal{O}_{E_\ell} \otimes \mathcal{O}_Y(K_{\mathcal{G}} - Z_\ell)) = 0$. This follows from

$$K_{\mathcal{G}} \cdot E_\ell - Z_i \cdot E_\ell > \deg(K_{E_\ell}) = K_Y \cdot E_\ell + E_\ell^2,$$

which is equivalent to

$$(K_{\mathcal{G}} - K_Y - Z) \cdot E_\ell > 0.$$

- (4) Let $K_{\mathcal{G}} - K_Y \equiv_f \sum_{i=1}^r b(E_i)E_i$ for some $b(E_i) \in \mathbb{R}$. We will denote $b(E_i)$ by b_i as well.

Claim. $b(E_i) \leq 1$ for all i . Moreover, either $b(E_i) = 1$ for all i or $b(E_i) < 1$ for all i .

Proof. (a) If E_j is invariant, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} (K_{\mathcal{G}} - K_Y) \cdot E_j &= Z(\mathcal{G}, E_j) - 2 + E_j^2 + 2 \\ &= Z(\mathcal{G}, E_j) + E_j^2 \geq \left(\sum_{i=1}^r E_i \right) \cdot E_j. \end{aligned}$$

(b) If E_j is non-invariant, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} (K_{\mathcal{G}} - K_Y) \cdot E_j &= -E_j^2 + E_j^2 + 2 - 2p_a(E_j) \\ &> \deg[E_j] + E_j^2 = \left(\sum_{i=1}^r E_i \right) \cdot E_j. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 2.2, we have that $b_i \leq 1$ for all i . Moreover, $\bigcup_{i=1}^r E_i$ is connected, we have either $b_i = 1$ for all i or $b_i < 1$ for all i .

Claim. We have $b(E_i) \geq 0$ for all i except for the non-invariant E_0 of (6) and (7) in Theorem 2.4.

Proof. Let $2D$ be the sum of all (-1) - \mathcal{G} -curves whose self-intersections are -2 . Then we have $(K_{\mathcal{G}} - K_Y) \cdot E_i \leq D \cdot E_i$ for all i . Thus, by Lemma 2.2, we have that $b_i \geq 0$ for all i .

In the case of type (6) and (7), we note that

$$(K_{\mathcal{G}} - K_Y) \cdot E_0 \leq 2 - 2p_a(E_0) \leq -E_0^2$$

and

$$(K_{\mathcal{G}} - K_Y) \cdot E_j = 1 + E_j^2 \leq -1 = -E_0 \cdot E_j$$

for any invariant curve E_j . Then, by Lemma 2.2, we have $b(E_j) \geq 0$ for all invariant curves E_j .

(5) Let $W = \sum_{i=1}^r c_i E_i$ be an f -anti-ample effective divisor where $c_i > 0$ for all i . We have following two cases:

(a) If $a_i - b_i$ is positive for some i , then we define $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ to be the maximal number such that $\alpha(a_i - b_i) \leq c_i$ for all i . Then there is an index ℓ such that $c_\ell - \alpha(a_\ell - b_\ell) = 0$, and therefore

$$(W + \alpha(K_{\mathcal{G}} - K_Y - Z)) \cdot E_\ell = \left(\sum_{i=1}^r (c_i - \alpha(a_i - b_i)) E_i \right) \cdot E_\ell \geq 0.$$

Hence, we have

$$(K_{\mathcal{G}} - K_Y - Z) \cdot E_\ell \geq \frac{-1}{\alpha} W \cdot E_\ell > 0.$$

(b) If $a_i - b_i \leq 0$ for all i , then $a_i \leq b_i \leq 1$ for all i . Thus, $b_i = 1$ for all i , otherwise, we have $b_i < 1$ for all i , and then $a_i = 0$ for all i since a_i 's are non-negative integers.

(6) Suppose $\bigcup_{i=1}^r E_i$ forms a dual graph for a canonical foliation singularity. Then we have $b(E_i) \geq 0$ for all i . If $b_i < 1$ for all i , then, from $c_\ell - \alpha(a_\ell - b_\ell) = 0$, we have $a_\ell = b_\ell + \frac{c_\ell}{\alpha} > 0$.

If $b_i = 1$ for all i , then $a_i \leq 1$ for all i and $\bigcup_{i=1}^r E_i$ is an elliptic Gorenstein leaf Γ . By [McQ08, Fact III.0.4 and Theorem IV.2.2], we have $\mathcal{O}_\Gamma(K_{\mathcal{G}})$ is not torsion and has degree 0. Also Γ is Cohen-Macaulay with trivial dualizing sheaf, then by Serre duality, we have

$$h^1(\Gamma, \mathcal{O}_Y(K_{\mathcal{G}}) \otimes \mathcal{O}_\Gamma) = h^0(\Gamma, \mathcal{O}_Y(-K_{\mathcal{G}}) \otimes \mathcal{O}_\Gamma) = 0.$$

Thus, we have shown the case when $a_i = 1$ for all i . Therefore, when $a_i = 0$ for some i , we have an index j such that

$$(K_{\mathcal{G}} - K_Y - Z) \cdot E_j = \left(\sum_i (b_i - a_i) E_i \right) \cdot E_j > 0.$$

- (7) Now suppose $\bigcup_{i=1}^r E_i$ forms a dual graph for a non-canonical foliation singularity. Note that we have $b_i < 1$ for all i . If E_ℓ in step (5) is invariant, then from $c_\ell - \alpha(a_\ell - b_\ell) = 0$, we have $a_\ell = b_\ell + \frac{c_\ell}{\alpha} > 0$. Thus, it suffices to consider the case when E_ℓ is non-invariant and $a_\ell = 0$. Then the support of $Z = \sum_i Z_i = \sum_i a_i E_i$ is the disjoint union of (-1) - \mathcal{G} -curves E_i where $Z_i = a_i E_i$. Note that

$$H^1(Z, \mathcal{O}_Y(K_{\mathcal{G}}) \otimes \mathcal{O}_Z) = \bigoplus_i H^1(Z_i, \mathcal{O}_Y(K_{\mathcal{G}}) \otimes \mathcal{O}_{Z_i}).$$

Since the contraction of E_i introduces a terminal foliation singularity, we have $h^1(Z_i, \mathcal{O}_Y(K_{\mathcal{G}}) \otimes \mathcal{O}_{Z_i}) = 0$ for all i , and thus $h^1(Z, \mathcal{O}_Y(K_{\mathcal{G}}) \otimes \mathcal{O}_Z) = 0$.

- (8) Now we consider the general resolution. Note that any general resolution $f : (Y, \mathcal{G}) \rightarrow (X, \mathcal{F})$ factors through the minimal resolution $h : (Z, \mathcal{H}) \rightarrow (X, \mathcal{F})$. Let $f = h \circ g$. So g is the composition of blowups.

We have shown that $R^1 h_* \mathcal{O}_Z(K_{\mathcal{H}}) = 0$. Notice that $g_* \mathcal{O}_Y(K_{\mathcal{G}}) = \mathcal{O}_Z(K_{\mathcal{H}})$. By Grothendieck spectral sequence, we have the following exact sequence:

$$0 \longrightarrow R^1 h_*(g_* \mathcal{O}_Y(K_{\mathcal{G}})) \longrightarrow R^1 f_* \mathcal{O}_Y(K_{\mathcal{G}}) \longrightarrow h_* R^1 g_* \mathcal{O}_Y(K_{\mathcal{G}}).$$

Since $R^1 h_*(g_* \mathcal{O}_Y(K_{\mathcal{G}})) = R^1 h_* \mathcal{O}_Z(K_{\mathcal{H}}) = 0$ and $R^1 g_* \mathcal{O}_Y(K_{\mathcal{G}}) = 0$ by Lemma 5.4, we have $R^1 f_* \mathcal{O}_Y(K_{\mathcal{G}}) = 0$. \square

Lemma 5.4. *Let (X, \mathcal{F}, p) is a germ of a foliated surface with at worst reduced singularity at p . Let $\pi : (Y, E) \rightarrow (X, p)$ be a blowup at p and \mathcal{G} be the pullback foliation of \mathcal{F} . Then we have $R^1 \pi_* \mathcal{O}_Y(K_{\mathcal{G}}) = 0$.*

Proof. Note that $K_{\mathcal{G}} = \pi^* K_{\mathcal{F}} + a(E)E$ where $a(E)$ is either 0 or 1. Also, since p is a smooth point of X , we have $R^1 \pi_* \mathcal{O}_Y = 0$.

If $a(E) = 0$, then, by the projection formula, we have

$$R^1 \pi_* \mathcal{O}_Y(K_{\mathcal{G}}) = R^1 \pi_* \pi^* \mathcal{O}_X(K_{\mathcal{F}}) = R^1 \pi_* \mathcal{O}_Y \otimes \mathcal{O}_X(K_{\mathcal{F}}) = 0.$$

If $a(E) = 1$, then we consider the following short exact sequence:

$$0 \longrightarrow \pi^* \mathcal{O}_X(K_{\mathcal{F}}) \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_Y(K_{\mathcal{G}}) \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_E(E) \longrightarrow 0$$

Pushing forward via π , we obtain the exact sequence

$$0 = R^1 \pi_* \pi^* \mathcal{O}_X(K_{\mathcal{F}}) \longrightarrow R^1 \pi_* \mathcal{O}_Y(K_{\mathcal{G}}) \longrightarrow R^1 \pi_* \mathcal{O}_E(E) \longrightarrow 0.$$

Since $R^1 \pi_* \mathcal{O}_E(E) = H^1(\mathbb{P}^1, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(-1)) = 0$, we have $R^1 \pi_* \mathcal{O}_Y(K_{\mathcal{G}}) = 0$. \square

REFERENCES

- [Ale93] V. Alexeev, *Two two-dimensional terminations*, Duke Math. J. **69** (1993), no. 3, 527–545. MR 1208810
- [Bru97] M. Brunella, *Feuilletages holomorphes sur les surfaces complexes compactes*, Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4) **30** (1997), no. 5, 569–594. MR 1474805
- [Bru15] ———, *Birational geometry of foliations*, IMPA Monographs, vol. 1, Springer, Cham, 2015. MR 3328860
- [Cam88] C. Camacho, *Quadratic forms and holomorphic foliations on singular surfaces*, Math. Ann. **282** (1988), no. 2, 177–184. MR 963011
- [Har77] R. Hartshorne, *Algebraic geometry*, Springer-Verlag, New York-Heidelberg, 1977, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, No. 52. MR 0463157
- [Har98] N. Hara, *Classification of two-dimensional F -regular and F -pure singularities*, Adv. Math. **133** (1998), no. 1, 33–53. MR 1492785
- [HL21] C. D. Hacon and A. Langer, *On birational boundedness of foliated surfaces*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **770** (2021), 205–229. MR 4193468
- [KM98] J. Kollár and S. Mori, *Birational geometry of algebraic varieties*, Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics, vol. 134, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1998, With the collaboration of C. H. Clemens and A. Corti, Translated from the 1998 Japanese original. MR 1658959
- [Kol13] J. Kollár, *Singularities of the minimal model program*, Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics, vol. 200, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2013, With a collaboration of Sándor Kovács. MR 3057950
- [McQ08] M. McQuillan, *Canonical models of foliations*, Pure Appl. Math. Q. **4** (2008), no. 3, Special Issue: In honor of Fedor Bogomolov. Part 2, 877–1012. MR 2435846
- [MM80] J.-F. Mattei and R. Moussu, *Holonomie et intégrales premières*, Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4) **13** (1980), no. 4, 469–523. MR 608290
- [Seb97] M. Sebastiani, *Sur l'existence de séparatrices locales des feuilletages des surfaces*, An. Acad. Brasil. Ciênc. **69** (1997), no. 2, 159–162. MR 1754036
- [Sei68] A. Seidenberg, *Reduction of singularities of the differential equation $A dy = B dx$* , Amer. J. Math. **90** (1968), 248–269. MR 220710
- [Wat80] K. Watanabe, *On plurigenera of normal isolated singularities. I*, Math. Ann. **250** (1980), no. 1, 65–94. MR 581632

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF UTAH, SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84112, USA
Email address: yachen@math.utah.edu