

ON SMOOTH CALABI-YAU THREEFOLDS OF PICARD NUMBER TWO

CHRISTIAN MAUZ

ABSTRACT. We classify all smooth Calabi-Yau threefolds of Picard number two that have a general hypersurface Cox ring.

1. INTRODUCTION

This article contributes to the explicit classification of Calabi-Yau threefolds. Recall that a Calabi-Yau variety is a normal projective complex variety X with trivial canonical class \mathcal{K}_X , at most canonical singularities and $h^i(X, \mathcal{O}_X) = 0$ for $i = 1, \dots, \dim(X) - 1$. Calabi-Yau varieties form a vast and actively studied area of research, also aiming for classification results such as [12, 15, 27, 33, 34] or more recently [14, 16, 17, 37].

The present paper takes up the classification approach based on positively graded rings [9–11] yet in the multigraded setting. We study Calabi-Yau threefolds X in terms of their Cox ring. Recall that the Cox ring of a normal projective variety X with finitely generated divisor class group $\mathrm{Cl}(X) = K$ is the graded algebra

$$\mathcal{R}(X) := \bigoplus_{[D] \in \mathrm{Cl}(X)} \Gamma(X, \mathcal{O}_X(D)).$$

We consider the case that our Calabi-Yau threefold X comes with a hypersurface Cox rings, that means that we have a K -graded presentation

$$\mathcal{R}(X) = R_g = \mathbb{C}[T_1, \dots, T_r] / \langle g \rangle$$

with a homogeneous polynomial g of degree $\mu \in K$ such that T_1, \dots, T_r form a minimal system of K -prime generators for R_g . In particular $\mathcal{R}(X) = R_g$ is a finitely generated \mathbb{C} -algebra, hence X is a Mori dream space in the sense of [23]. Note that a smooth Calabi-Yau variety of dimension at most three is a Mori dream space if and only if its cone of effective divisors is rational polyhedral [30]. More general, Mori dream spaces of Calabi-Yau type are completely characterized via the singularities of their total coordinate space $\mathrm{Spec} \mathcal{R}(X)$ [22].

Following [20], we say that R_g resp. g is *spread* if each monomial of degree μ is a convex combination over those monomials showing up in g with non-zero coefficient. Besides, we call R_g *general (smooth, Calabi-Yau)* if g admits an open neighbourhood U in the finite dimensional vector space of all μ -homogeneous polynomials such that every $h \in U$ yields a hypersurface Cox ring R_h of a normal (smooth, Calabi-Yau) variety X_h with divisor class group K . In [20] general hypersurface Cox rings were applied to the classification of smooth Fano fourfolds of Picard number two.

In dimension two Calabi-Yau varieties are K3 surfaces. Their Cox rings have been studied in [3, 4, 35], in particular describing several classes of K3 surfaces with a hypersurface Cox ring. Numbers 1, 2, 6 and 12 from Oguiso's classification of smooth Calabi-Yau threefolds that arise as a general complete intersection in some weighted projective space [33] comprise all smooth Calabi-Yau threefolds X

with $\text{Pic}(X) = \mathbb{Z}$ having a general hypersurface Cox ring; see also [24]. Besides, Przyjalkowski and Shramov have established explicit bounds for smooth Calabi-Yau weighted complete intersections in any dimension [36].

Our main result concerns smooth Calabi-Yau threefolds of Picard number two with a hypersurface Cox ring R_g . Any projective variety X with class group K and Cox ring R_g is encoded by R_g and an ample class $u \in K$ in the sense that X occurs as the GIT quotient of the set of u -semistable points of $\text{Spec } R_g$ by the quasitorus $\text{Spec } \mathbb{C}[K]$. In this setting, we write $w_i = \deg(T_i)$ and refer to the Cox ring generator degrees $w_1, \dots, w_r \in K$, the relation degree $\mu \in K$ and an ample class $u \in K$ as *specifying data* of the variety X . Note $r = \dim(X) + 1 + \text{rank}(K)$, hence a hypersurface Cox ring R_g of a threefold with Picard number two has six generators w_1, \dots, w_6 .

Theorem 1.1. *The following table lists specifying data, w_1, \dots, w_6 , μ and u in $\text{Cl}(X)$ for all smooth Calabi-Yau threefolds X of Picard number two that have a spread hypersurface Cox ring.*

No.	$\text{Cl}(X)$	$[w_1, \dots, w_6]$	μ	u
1	\mathbb{Z}^2	$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 3 \\ 3 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$
2	$\mathbb{Z}^2 \times \mathbb{Z}/3\mathbb{Z}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 2 & 0 & 1 & 2 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 3 \\ 3 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$
3	\mathbb{Z}^2	$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 4 \\ 4 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$
4	\mathbb{Z}^2	$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 3 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 3 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 6 \\ 6 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$
5	\mathbb{Z}^2	$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 3 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$
6	\mathbb{Z}^2	$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & -2 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 3 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$
7	$\mathbb{Z}^2 \times \mathbb{Z}/3\mathbb{Z}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & -3 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 2 & 1 & 2 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 3 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$
8	\mathbb{Z}^2	$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & -3 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 2 & 3 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 6 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$
9	\mathbb{Z}^2	$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ -2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 4 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$
10	\mathbb{Z}^2	$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 3 & 0 & 0 \\ -2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 6 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$
11	\mathbb{Z}^2	$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 4 \\ 3 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$
12	\mathbb{Z}^2	$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 4 \\ 3 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 2 \end{bmatrix}$
13	\mathbb{Z}^2	$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 3 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 2 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 6 \\ 4 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$
14	\mathbb{Z}^2	$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 3 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 6 \\ 2 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$
15	\mathbb{Z}^2	$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 4 \\ 2 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$
16	\mathbb{Z}^2	$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 4 \\ 2 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 2 \end{bmatrix}$
17	\mathbb{Z}^2	$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ -2 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 4 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$
18	\mathbb{Z}^2	$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ -2 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 4 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 2 \end{bmatrix}$
19	\mathbb{Z}^2	$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 2 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 6 \\ 3 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 3 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$
20	\mathbb{Z}^2	$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 4 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 2 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 8 \\ 4 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 3 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$
21	\mathbb{Z}^2	$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 5 & 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 2 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 10 \\ 4 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 3 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$
22	\mathbb{Z}^2	$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 2 & 5 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 2 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 10 \\ 4 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 3 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$
23	\mathbb{Z}^2	$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 2 & 7 & 3 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 2 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 14 \\ 4 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 4 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$
24	\mathbb{Z}^2	$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 2 & 1 & 0 \\ -2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 6 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$
25	\mathbb{Z}^2	$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 3 & 0 \\ -2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 7 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 4 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$
26	\mathbb{Z}^2	$\begin{bmatrix} 2 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 3 & 0 \\ -2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 8 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 4 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$
27	\mathbb{Z}^2	$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 2 & 5 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 3 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 10 \\ 6 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 3 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$
28	\mathbb{Z}^2	$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 2 & 5 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 3 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 10 \\ 6 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 3 \\ 2 \end{bmatrix}$
29	\mathbb{Z}^2	$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 4 & 1 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 8 \\ 2 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 5 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$
30	\mathbb{Z}^2	$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 2 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ -1 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 6 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$

Moreover, each of the items 1 to 30 even defines a general smooth Calabi-Yau hypersurface Cox ring and thus provides the specifying data for a whole family of smooth Calabi-Yau threefolds. Any two smooth Calabi-Yau threefolds of Picard

number two with specifying data from distinct items of the table are not isomorphic to each other.

Note that the varieties from Theorem 1.1 constitute a finite number of families. For recent general results on boundedness of Calabi-Yau threefolds we refer to [13] as well as [38] for the case of Picard number two.

Hypersurfaces in toric Fano varieties form a rich source of examples for Calabi-Yau varieties, e.g. [1, 6, 7]. Theorem 1.1 comprises several varieties of this type.

Remark 1.2. Any Mori dream space X can be embedded into a projective toric variety by choosing a graded presentation of its Cox ring $\mathcal{R}(X)$; see [5, Sec. 3.2.5] for details. The following table shows for which varieties X from Theorem 1.1 the presentation $\mathcal{R}(X) = R_g$ gives rise to an embedding into a (possibly singular) toric Fano variety. Observe that in our situation this simply means $\mu \in \text{Ample}(X)$.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
✓	✓	✗	✗	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓
16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30
✗	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	✓	✗

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Background on Mori dream spaces	3
3. Combinatorial constraints on smooth hypersurface Cox rings	8
4. Proof of Theorem 1.1: Collecting Candidates	12
5. Constructing general hypersurface Cox rings	22
6. Proof of Theorem 1.1: Verification	27
References	32

The author would like to thank Jürgen Hausen for his constant support and very valuable advice. In addition, the author is grateful to Antonio Laface for helpful discussions and his interest in this work.

2. BACKGROUND ON MORI DREAM SPACES

A Mori dream space is an irreducible normal projective variety X with finitely generated divisor class group $\text{Cl}(X)$ and finitely generated Cox ring $\mathcal{R}(X)$. As observed by Hu and Keel [23], Mori dream spaces are characterized by their eponymous feature, which is optimal behavior with respect to the Mori program [31, 32]. In this section we gather basic facts on the combinatorial description of Mori dream spaces from [5]. The ground field \mathbb{K} is algebraically closed and of characteristic zero.

Let us first recall some terminology concerning graded algebras. Consider a finitely generated abelian group K and an integral \mathbb{K} -algebra $R = \bigoplus_{w \in K} R_w$ with a K -grading. A non-zero non-unit $f \in R$ is K -prime if it is homogeneous and $f \mid gh$ with homogeneous elements $g, h \in R$ implies $f \mid g$ or $f \mid h$. We say that R is K -factorial or that the K -grading on R is factorial if any homogeneous non-zero non-unit is a product of K -prime elements. Fix a system $f_1, \dots, f_r \in R$ of pairwise non-associated K -prime generators for R . The *effective cone* and the *moving cone* of R in the rational vector space $K_{\mathbb{Q}} = \mathbb{Q} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} K$ associated with K are

$$\text{Eff}(R) := \text{cone}(\deg(f_1), \dots, \deg(f_r)), \quad \text{Mov}(R) := \bigcap_{i=1}^r \text{cone}(\deg(f_j); j \neq i).$$

This definition does not depend on the choice of f_1, \dots, f_r . The K -grading on R is called *pointed* if $R_0 = \mathbb{K}$ holds and $\text{Eff}(R)$ contains no line and it is called *almost free* if any $r - 1$ of $\deg(f_1), \dots, \deg(f_r)$ generate K as a group.

Moreover, by an *abstract Cox ring* we mean a K -graded algebra R such that

- (i) R is normal, integral and finitely generated,
- (ii) R has only constant homogeneous units, the K -grading is almost free, pointed and factorial, and
- (iii) the moving cone $\text{Mov}(R)$ is of full dimension in $K_{\mathbb{Q}}$.

The Cox ring of a Mori dream space always satisfies the conditions of an abstract Cox ring. Vice versa, we can produce Mori dream spaces from abstract Cox rings using the following construction [5, Constr. 3.2.1.3].

Construction 2.1. Let R be an abstract Cox ring and consider the action of the quasitorus $H = \text{Spec } \mathbb{K}[K]$ on the affine variety $\bar{X} = \text{Spec } R$. For every GIT-cone $\lambda \in \Lambda(R)$ with $\lambda^\circ \subseteq \text{Mov}(R)^\circ$, we set

$$X(\lambda) := \bar{X}^{ss}(\lambda) // H.$$

Then $X = X(\lambda)$ is normal, projective and of dimension $\dim(R) - \dim(K_{\mathbb{Q}})$. The divisor class group and the Cox ring of X are given as

$$\text{Cl}(X) = K, \quad \mathcal{R}(X) = \bigoplus_{\text{Cl}(X)} \Gamma(X, \mathcal{O}_X(D)) = \bigoplus_K R_w = R.$$

Moreover, the cones of effective, movable, semiample and ample divisor classes of X are given in $\text{Cl}_{\mathbb{Q}}(X) = K_{\mathbb{Q}}$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Eff}(X) &= \text{Eff}(R), & \text{Mov}(X) &= \text{Mov}(R), \\ \text{SAmple}(X) &= \lambda, & \text{Ample}(X) &= \lambda^\circ. \end{aligned}$$

See [5, Thm. 3.2.1.4] for the description of the Cox ring and [5, Prop. 3.3.2.9] for the description of the cones of effective, movable, semiample and ample divisors. Moreover [5, Thm. 3.2.1.9] guarantees that indeed all Mori dream spaces arise from Construction 2.1

Choosing homogeneous generators for an abstract Cox ring gives rise to a closed embedding into a projective toric variety [5, Constr. 3.2.5.7].

Construction 2.2. In the situation of Construction 2.1, consider a graded presentation

$$R = \mathbb{K}[T_1, \dots, T_r] / \mathfrak{a}$$

where T_1, \dots, T_r define pairwise non-associated K -primes in R and $\mathfrak{a} \subseteq S = \mathbb{K}[T_1, \dots, T_r]$ is a homogeneous ideal. The GIT-fan $\Lambda(S)$ w.r.t. the diagonal H -action on $\mathbb{K}^r = \text{Spec } S$ refines the GIT-fan $\Lambda(R)$. Let $\tau \in \Lambda(S)$ with $\lambda^\circ \subseteq \tau^\circ$. Running Construction 2.1 for S and τ yields a projective toric variety Z fitting in the following diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \bar{X}^{ss}(\lambda) & \longrightarrow & (\mathbb{K}^r)^{ss}(\tau) \\ \parallel H \downarrow & & \downarrow \parallel H \\ X & \xrightarrow{\iota} & Z \end{array}$$

The embedding $\iota : X \rightarrow Z$ is neat, i.e. it is a closed embedding, the torus invariant prime divisors on Z restrict to pairwise different prime divisors on X and the induced pullback of divisor class groups $\iota^* : \text{Cl}(Z) \rightarrow \text{Cl}(X)$ is an isomorphism.

Varieties arising from abstract Cox rings admit the following description for their local behavior [5, Cor. 3.3.1.9; 5, Cor 3.3.1.12].

Proposition 2.3. *In the situation of Construction 2.2 the following hold.*

- (i) X is \mathbb{Q} -factorial if and only if λ is of full dimension.
- (ii) X is smooth if and only if \bar{X}^{ss} is smooth and $X \subseteq Z^{\text{reg}}$ holds.

Furthermore, for hypersurface Cox rings we have an explicit formula for the anticanonical class [5, Prop. 3.3.3.2].

Proposition 2.4. *Consider the situation of Construction 2.2. If $\mathfrak{a} = \langle g \rangle$ holds, then the anticanonical class of X is given in $K = \text{Cl}(X)$ as*

$$-\mathcal{K}_X = \deg(T_1) + \cdots + \deg(T_r) - \deg(g).$$

We call an irreducible normal variety X *weakly Calabi-Yau* if its canonical class \mathcal{K}_X vanishes. For varieties with hypersurface Cox ring this notion only depends on the generator degrees and the relation degree. Moreover, it turns out that smooth weakly Calabi-Yau hypersurfaces are Calabi-Yau varieties in the strong sense.

Remark 2.5. In the situation of Construction 2.2 assume $\mathfrak{a} = \langle g \rangle$.

- (i) From Proposition 2.4 we deduce that X is weakly Calabi-Yau if and only if $\mu = w_1 + \cdots + w_r$ holds. In particular, μ lies in the relative interior of $\text{Eff}(R)$ whenever X is weakly Calabi-Yau.
- (ii) If X is weakly Calabi-Yau, then Proposition 2.4 shows that X is an anticanonical hypersurface of a projective toric variety Z as in Construction 2.2. If, in addition, X is smooth, then Proposition 2.3 allows us to apply [2, Prop. 6.1]. From this we infer $h^i(X, \mathcal{O}_X) = 0$ for all $0 < i < \dim(X)$, hence X is Calabi-Yau.

Let us briefly recall the notion of flops [25, 26] in our situation. A Weil divisor D on a variety X is said to be *relatively ample* w.r.t a morphism $\varphi : X \rightarrow Y$ of varieties, or just φ -*ample*, if there is an open affine covering $Y = \bigcup V_i$ such that D restricts to an ample divisor on each $\varphi^{-1}(V_i)$. Moreover a proper birational morphism $\varphi : X \rightarrow Y$ of normal varieties is called *extremal*, if X is \mathbb{Q} -factorial and for each two Cartier divisors D_1, D_2 on X there are $a_1, a_2 \in \mathbb{Z}$ where at least one of a_1, a_2 is non-zero and $a_1 D_1 - a_2 D_2$ is linearly equivalent to the pullback $\varphi^* C$ of some Cartier divisor C on Y . A birational map $\psi : X^- \dashrightarrow X^+$ of \mathbb{Q} -factorial weakly Calabi-Yau varieties is a *flop* if it fits into a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X^- & \xrightarrow{\psi} & X^+ \\ \varphi^- \searrow & & \swarrow \varphi^+ \\ & Y & \end{array}$$

where $\varphi^- : X^- \rightarrow Y$ and $\varphi^+ : X^+ \rightarrow Y$ are small proper birational morphisms, φ^- is extremal and there is a Weil divisor D on X^- such that $-D$ is φ^- -ample and the proper transform of D on X^+ is φ^+ -ample.

Later we will use that weakly Calabi-Yau Mori dream spaces of Picard number two that share a common Cox ring are connected by flops; for convenience we give a direct proof here.

Proposition 2.6. *Let R be an abstract Cox ring with grading group K of rank two and $\lambda, \eta \in \Lambda(R)$ full-dimensional cones with $\lambda^\circ, \eta^\circ \subseteq \text{Mov}(R)^\circ$. Consider the varieties $X(\lambda)$ and $X(\eta)$ arising from Construction 2.1. If the canonical class of $X(\lambda)$ is trivial, then there is a sequence of flops*

$$X(\lambda) \dashrightarrow X_1 \dashrightarrow \cdots \dashrightarrow X_k \dashrightarrow X(\eta).$$

We study the toric setting first. Consider $S = \mathbb{K}[T_1, \dots, T_r]$ with a linear, pointed, almost free grading of an abelian group K of rank two and the associated action of the quasitorus $H = \text{Spec } \mathbb{K}[K]$ on \mathbb{K}^r . Let us recall some facts about toric varieties arising from GIT-cones as treated e.g. in [5, Chap. 2–3]. The degree homomorphism $Q : \mathbb{Z}^r \rightarrow K$, $e_i \mapsto w_i := \deg(T_i)$ gives rise to a pair of mutually dual exact sequences:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & L & \longrightarrow & \mathbb{Z}^r & \xrightarrow{P} & \mathbb{Z}^n \\ & & & & & & \\ 0 & \longleftarrow & K & \xleftarrow{Q} & \mathbb{Z}^r & \xleftarrow{P^*} & \mathbb{Z}^n \longleftarrow 0 \end{array}$$

Given a GIT-cone $\tau \in \Lambda(S)$ with $\tau^\circ \subseteq \text{Mov}(S)^\circ$, the associated toric variety $Z = (\mathbb{K}^r)^{\text{ss}}(\tau) // H$ has the describing fan $\Sigma(\tau)$ given by

$$\Sigma(\tau) = \{P(\gamma_0^*); \gamma_0 \in \text{rlv}(\tau)\}, \quad \text{rlv}(\tau) = \{\gamma_0 \preceq \gamma; \tau^\circ \subseteq Q(\gamma_0)^\circ\}$$

In particular all such fans share the same one-skeleton consisting of the pairwise different rays generated by v_1, \dots, v_r where $v_i := P(e_i) \in \mathbb{Z}^n$. Moreover, we denote Z_{γ_0} for the affine toric variety associated with the lattice cone $P(\gamma_0^*) \subseteq \mathbb{Q}^n$. The covering of Z by affine toric charts then formulates as

$$Z = \bigcup_{\gamma_0 \in \text{rlv}(\tau)} Z_{\gamma_0}.$$

Lemma 2.7. *Let $\tau_1, \tau_2 \in \Lambda(S)$ with $\tau_i^\circ \subseteq \text{Mov}(S)^\circ$. Then for any $\gamma_1 \in \text{rlv}(\tau_1)$, $\gamma_2 \in \text{rlv}(\tau_2)$ we have*


$$P(\gamma_2^*) \subseteq P(\gamma_1^*) \iff \gamma_1 \subseteq \gamma_2.$$

Proof. The implication “ \Leftarrow ” is clear. We show “ \Rightarrow ”. Note that the cones $P(\gamma_1^*) \in \Sigma(\tau_1)$ and $P(\gamma_2^*) \in \Sigma(\tau_2)$ both live in lattice fans having precisely v_1, \dots, v_r as primitive ray generators. Thus for $j = 1, 2$ and any v_i we have

$$v_i \in P(\gamma_j^*) \iff \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0} v_i \text{ is an extremal ray of } P(\gamma_j^*) \iff e_i \in \gamma_j^*.$$

From this we infer that $P(\gamma_2^*) \subseteq P(\gamma_1^*)$ implies $\gamma_2^* \subseteq \gamma_1^*$. This in turn means $\gamma_1 \subseteq \gamma_2$. \square

Let $\tau^-, \tau^+ \subseteq \mathbb{Q}^2 = K_{\mathbb{Q}}$ be full-dimensional GIT-cones with $(\tau^-)^\circ, (\tau^+)^\circ \subseteq \text{Mov}(S)^\circ$ intersecting in a common ray $\tau^0 := \tau^- \cap \tau^+$.



Consider the projective toric varieties Z^0, Z^-, Z^+ associated with τ^0, τ^- and τ^+ and denote $\Sigma^0 = \Sigma(\tau^0)$, $\Sigma^- = \Sigma(\tau^-)$ and $\Sigma^+ = \Sigma(\tau^+)$ for the describing fans. Moreover the inclusions of the respective semistable points induce proper birational toric morphisms $\varphi^- : Z^- \rightarrow Z^0$, $\varphi^+ : Z^+ \rightarrow Z^0$ described by the refinements of fans $\Sigma^- \preceq \Sigma^0$ and $\Sigma^+ \preceq \Sigma^0$ respectively. This yields a small birational map $\psi : Z^- \dashrightarrow Z^+$ as shown in the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} (\mathbb{K}^r)^{\text{ss}}(\tau^-) & \subseteq & (\mathbb{K}^r)^{\text{ss}}(\tau^0) & \supseteq & (\mathbb{K}^r)^{\text{ss}}(\tau^+) \\ \parallel H \downarrow & & \parallel H \downarrow & & \parallel H \downarrow \\ Z^- & \xrightarrow{\varphi^-} & Z^0 & \xleftarrow{\varphi^+} & Z^+ \\ & & \psi & & \end{array}$$

Lemma 2.8. *Let $-D$ be an ample divisor on Z^- , then D regarded as a divisor on Z^+ is φ^+ -ample.*

Proof. By suitably applying an automorphism of K and relabeling $w_1, \dots, w_r \in K$ we achieve counter-clockwise ordering i.e.

$$i \leq j \implies \det(w_i, w_j) \geq 0$$

and $\det(w^-, w^+) \geq 0$ for all $w^- \in \tau^-$, $w^+ \in \tau^+$. Moreover, we name the indices of the weights that approximate τ^0 from the outside

$$i^- := \max(i; w_i \in \tau^-), \quad i^+ := \min(i; w_i \in \tau^+).$$

The geometric constellation of w_1, \dots, w_r in \mathbb{Q}^2 directly yields that the set of minimal cones of $\text{rlv}(\tau^0)$ is

$$\{\gamma_i; i^- < i < i^+\} \cup \{\gamma_{i,j}; i \leq i^-, j \geq i^+\},$$

where $\gamma_{i_1, \dots, i_r} = \text{cone}(e_{i_1}, \dots, e_{i_r}) \preceq \gamma$. The corresponding cones $P(\gamma_0)^*$ are precisely the maximal cones of Σ^0 , in particular the associated toric charts Z_{γ_0} form an open affine covering of Z^0 . We show that D is ample on each open subset $(\varphi^+)^{-1}(Z_{\gamma_0})$ of Z^+ .

First, note that φ^+ is an isomorphism over the affine toric charts of Z^0 associated with the common minimal cones of $\text{rlv}(\tau^0)$ and $\text{rlv}(\tau^+)$, namely all $Z_{\gamma_{i,j}}$ where $i \leq i^+$ and $j \geq i^+$. In particular each preimage $(\varphi^+)^{-1}(Z_{\gamma_{i,j}})$ is affine. Since Z^+ is \mathbb{Q} -factorial by Proposition 2.3, the divisor D is \mathbb{Q} -Cartier thus restricts to an ample divisor on any open affine subvariety of Z^+ .

It remains to consider the charts of Z^0 defined by the faces of the form γ_j . Let us fix some $i^- < j < i^+$. The minimal cones $\gamma_0 \in \text{rlv}(\tau^+)$ with $\gamma_j \subseteq \gamma_0$ are precisely those of the form $\gamma_{j,i}$ where $i \geq j$. As the toric morphism φ^+ is described by the refinement $\Sigma^+ \preceq \Sigma^0$, Lemma 2.7 yields

$$U := (\varphi^+)^{-1}(Z_{\gamma_j}) = \bigcup_{i \geq i^+} Z_{\gamma_{j,i}} \subseteq Z^+.$$

Note that $U \subseteq Z^+$ is an open toric subset and the maximal cones of the associated subfan Σ' of Σ^+ are precisely the cones $P(\gamma_{j,i}^*)$ where $i \geq i^+$. This shows that the rays of Σ' are the rays of Σ^+ minus ϱ_j . Thus the divisor class group of U is given by $\text{Cl}(U) = K/\langle w_j \rangle$ and the projection corresponds to the restriction of divisor classes

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{Cl}(Z^+) & \xrightarrow{i^*} & \text{Cl}(U) \\ \cong \downarrow & & \downarrow \cong \\ K & \longrightarrow & K/\langle w_j \rangle \end{array}$$

Taking $\text{rank } K = 2$ into account, we may choose suitable coordinates leading to an isomorphism $\text{Cl}(U)_{\mathbb{Q}} \cong \mathbb{Q}$ such that for any $w \in \text{Cl}(Z^+)$ the restriction $i^*(w)$ to $\text{Cl}(U)$ and $\det(w_j, w)$ have the same sign. Graphically this means that the sign of $i^*(w) \in \text{Cl}(U)$ is positive if w lies above the ray τ^0 and negative if w lies below τ^0 .

Since we know the maximal cones of Σ' we may compute the ample cone of U as

$$\text{Ample}(U) = \bigcap_{i \geq i^+} (i^* \circ Q(\gamma_{j,i}))^\circ = \mathbb{Q}_{>0} \subseteq \mathbb{Q} = \text{Cl}(U)_{\mathbb{Q}}.$$

Note that $[-D] \in \text{Ample}(Z^-) = \tau^-$ lies below τ , thus the class of $-D$ (regarded on Z^+) restricted to U is negative, hence $i^*[D] \in \text{Ample}(U)$. In other words, D is ample on U . Altogether, we conclude that D is φ^+ -ample. \square

Proof of Proposition 2.6. First, we deal with the case that λ and η intersect in a common ray $\varrho := \lambda \cap \eta$. Consider a K -graded presentation

$$R = \mathbb{K}[T_1, \dots, T_r]/\mathfrak{a}$$

where T_1, \dots, T_r define pairwise non-associated K -primes in R and $\mathfrak{a} \subseteq S = \mathbb{K}[T_1, \dots, T_r]$ is a homogeneous ideal. The GIT-fan $\Lambda(S)$ w.r.t. the H -action on S refines the GIT-fan $\Lambda(R)$. We may choose $\tau^+, \tau^- \in \Lambda(S)$ such that

$$(\tau^-)^\circ \subseteq \lambda^\circ \quad (\tau^+)^\circ \subseteq \eta^\circ, \quad \tau^- \cap \tau^+ = \varrho.$$

The toric morphisms φ_Z^-, φ_Z^+ arising from the face relations $\varrho \preceq \tau^-, \tau^+$ of GIT-cones are compatible with the toric morphisms φ^-, φ^+ arising from $\varrho \preceq \lambda, \eta$ as shown in the following diagram where the vertical arrows are neat embeddings as in Construction 2.2

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} Z(\tau^-) & \xrightarrow{\varphi_Z^-} & Z(\varrho) & \xleftarrow{\varphi_Z^+} & Z(\tau^+) \\ \uparrow & & \uparrow & & \uparrow \\ X(\lambda) & \xrightarrow{\varphi^-} & X(\varrho) & \xleftarrow{\varphi^+} & X(\eta) \end{array}$$

We claim that the resulting birational map $\psi : X(\lambda) \dashrightarrow X(\eta)$ is a flop. First observe that X^- is \mathbb{Q} factorial by Proposition 2.3 (i) and φ^-, φ^+ are small birational morphisms; see [5, Rem. 3.3.3.4]

We show that φ^- is extremal. Let D_1, D_2 be Cartier divisors on X . If D_1, D_2 lie on a common ray in $\text{Pic}(X)_{\mathbb{Q}} = \mathbb{Q}^2$ we find $a_1, a_2 \in \mathbb{Z}$, not both zero, such that $a_1 D_1 - a_2 D_2$ is principal, thus linearly equivalent to the pullback of any principal divisor on Y . Otherwise the subgroup $G \subseteq \text{Pic}(X)$ spanned by $[D_1], [D_2] \in \text{Pic}(X)$ is of rank two and thus of finite index in $\text{Pic}(X)$. Hence, for any Cartier divisor C on Y , we find $b \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ such that $b[(\varphi^-)^*(C)] \in G$, i.e., $a_1[D_1] + a_2[D_2] = b[(\varphi^-)^*(C)]$ for some $a_1, a_2 \in \mathbb{Z}$. In other words, $a_1 D_1 - a_2 D_2$ is linearly equivalent to the pullback of bC . If C is not principal, then $(\varphi^-)^*C$ is not principal either, thus at least one of a_1, a_2 is non-zero.

Let D_Z be a torus invariant divisor on $Z(\tau^-)$ such that $-D_Z$ is ample for $Z(\tau^-)$. Since $X(\lambda) \subseteq Z(\tau^-)$ is neatly embedded, we may restrict D_Z to a divisor D_X on $X(\lambda)$. Note that $-D_X$ is ample since $-D_Z$ is so. In particular $-D_X$ is φ^- -ample. Lemma 2.8 yields that D_Z is φ_Z^+ -ample. Let $U \subseteq Z(\varrho)$ be an affine open subset such that D_Z is ample on

$$V := (\varphi_Z^+)^{-1}(U) \subseteq Z(\tau^+).$$

The further restriction of D_Z from V to $V \cap X(\eta)$ is still ample. In other words, D_X restricted to $(\varphi^+)^{-1}(X(\tau) \cap U)$ is ample. We conclude that D_X is φ^+ -ample.

Altogether $\psi : X(\lambda) \dashrightarrow X(\eta)$ is a flop.

In the general case we find full-dimensional GIT-cones $\lambda = \eta_1, \dots, \eta_k = \eta$ where $\eta_i^\circ \subseteq \text{Mov}(R)^\circ$ holds for all i and each intersection $\eta_i \cap \eta_{i+1}$ is a ray of $\Lambda(R)$. According to the preceding discussion, we may successively construct the desired sequence of flops. \square

3. COMBINATORIAL CONSTRAINTS ON SMOOTH HYPERSURFACE COX RINGS

The proof of Theorem 1.1 basically uses the combinatorial framework for the classification of smooth Mori dream spaces of Picard number two with hypersurface Cox ring established in [20, Sec. 5]; see also [29]. Let us recall the notation from there and slightly extend it to address the torsion subgroup of the grading group explicitly. We also present the accompanying toolkit. Moreover we add some new tools for dealing with torsion.

We work over an algebraically closed field \mathbb{K} of characteristic zero.

Setting 3.1. Consider $K = \mathbb{Z}^2 \times \Gamma$ where Γ is some finite abelian group of order t , a K -graded algebra R and $X = X(\lambda)$, where $\lambda \in \Lambda(R)$ with $\lambda^\circ \subseteq \text{Mov}(R)^\circ$, as in Construction 2.1. Assume that we have an irredundant K -graded presentation

$$R = R_g = \mathbb{K}[T_1, \dots, T_r] / \langle g \rangle$$

such that the T_i define pairwise nonassociated K -primes in R . Write $w_i := \deg(T_i)$, $\mu := \deg(g)$ for the degrees in K . According to the presentation $K = \mathbb{Z}^2 \times \Gamma$ we denote

$$w_i = (u_i, \zeta_i), \quad \mu = (\alpha, \theta), \quad u_i, \alpha \in \mathbb{Z}^2, \quad \zeta_i, \theta \in \Gamma.$$

Similarly the degree matrix $Q = [w_1, \dots, w_r]$ is divided into a free part Q^0 and a torsion part Q^{tor} , i.e., we set

$$Q^0 = [u_1 \quad \dots \quad u_r], \quad Q^{\text{tor}} = [\zeta_1 \quad \dots \quad \zeta_r].$$


Regarded as elements of $K_{\mathbb{Q}}$ we identify w_i with u_i and μ with α . Suitably numbering w_1, \dots, w_r , we ensure counter-clockwise ordering, that means that we always have

$$i \leq j \implies \det(w_i, w_j) = \det(u_i, u_j) \geq 0.$$

Note that each ray of $\Lambda(R)$ is of the form $\varrho_i = \text{cone}(w_i)$, but not vice versa. We assume X to be \mathbb{Q} -factorial. According to Proposition 2.3 this means $\dim(\lambda) = 2$. Then the effective cone of X is uniquely decomposed into three convex sets,

$$\text{Eff}(X) = \lambda^- \cup \lambda^\circ \cup \lambda^+,$$

where λ^- and λ^+ are convex polyhedral cones not intersecting $\lambda^\circ = \text{Ample}(X)$ and $\lambda^- \cap \lambda^+$ consists of the origin.



Remark 3.2. Setting 3.1 is respected by orientation preserving automorphisms of K . If we apply an orientation reversing automorphism of K , then we regain Setting 3.1 by reversing the numeration of w_1, \dots, w_r . Moreover, we may interchange the numeration of T_i and T_j if w_i and w_j share a common ray without affecting Setting 3.1. We call these operations *admissible coordinate changes*. Note that any automorphism of \mathbb{Z}^2 naturally extends to an automorphism of $K = \mathbb{Z}^2 \times \Gamma$ acting as the identity on Γ .

We state an adapted version of [20, Prop. 2.4] locating the relation degree.

Proposition 3.3. *In the situation of Setting 3.1 we have $\mu \in \text{cone}(w_3, w_{r-2}) \subseteq K_{\mathbb{Q}}$.*

A further important observation is that the GIT-fan structure of R_g can be read off from the geometric constellation of w_1, \dots, w_r and μ .

Proposition 3.4. *Situation as in Setting 3.1. Assume that $X(\lambda)$ is locally factorial and R is a spread hypersurface Cox ring. Then the full-dimensional cones of $\Lambda(R)$ are precisely the cones $\eta = \text{cone}(w_i, w_j)$ where $\varrho_i \neq \varrho_j$ and one of the following conditions is satisfied:*

- (i) $\mu \in \varrho_i$ holds, ϱ_i contains at least two generator degrees and η° contains no generator degree,
- (ii) $\mu \in \varrho_j$ holds, ϱ_j contains at least two generator degrees and η° contains no generator degree,

- (iii) $\mu \in \eta^\circ$ holds and there is at most one $w_k \in \eta^\circ$, which lays on the ray through μ ,
- (iv) $\mu \notin \eta$ holds and η° contains no generator degrees.

Recall that a point $x \in X$ of a variety X is *factorial* if its stalk $\mathcal{O}_{X,x}$ admits unique factorization. We call X *locally factorial* if every point $x \in X$ is factorial. In particular smooth varieties are locally factorial.

The following lemmas are crucial in gaining constraints on specifying data of hypersurface Cox rings.

Lemma 3.5. *Situation as in Setting 3.1. Let i, j with $\lambda \subseteq \text{cone}(w_i, w_j)$. If $X = X(\lambda)$ is locally factorial, then either w_i, w_j generate K as a group, or g has precisely one monomial of the form $T_i^{l_i} T_j^{l_j}$, where $l_i + l_j > 0$.*

Lemma 3.6. *Let $X = X(\lambda)$ be as in Setting 3.1 and let $1 \leq i < j < k \leq r$. If X is locally factorial, then w_i, w_j, w_k generate K as a group provided that one of the following holds:*

- (i) $w_i, w_j \in \lambda^-, w_k \in \lambda^+$ and g has no monomial of the form $T_k^{l_k}$,
- (ii) $w_i \in \lambda^-, w_j, w_k \in \lambda^+$ and g has no monomial of the form $T_i^{l_i}$,
- (iii) $w_i \in \lambda^-, w_j \in \lambda^\circ, w_k \in \lambda^+$.

Moreover, if (iii) holds, then g has a monomial of the form $T_j^{l_j}$ where l_j is divisible by the order of the factor group $K/\langle w_i, w_k \rangle$. In particular l_j is a multiple of $\det(u_i, u_k)$.

Lemma 3.7. *Assume u, w_1, w_2 generate the abelian group \mathbb{Z}^2 . If $w_i = a_i w$ holds with a primitive $w \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ and $a_i \in \mathbb{Z}$, then (u, w) is a basis for \mathbb{Z}^2 and u is primitive.*

Now we present some structural observations which prove useful at different places inside the proof of Theorem 1.1 when we deal with specific configurations of generator and relation degrees.

Lemma 3.8. *In Setting 3.1, assume that $X = X(\lambda)$ is locally factorial and R_g a spread hypersurface Cox ring. If w_i lies on the ray through μ , then g has a monomial of the form $T_i^{l_i}$ where $l_i \geq 2$.*

Lemma 3.9. *In Setting 3.1 assume that $\text{Mov}(R) = \text{Eff}(R)$ and $\mu \in \text{Eff}(R)^\circ$ hold. Let Ω denote the set of two-dimensional cones $\eta \in \Lambda(R)$ with $\eta^\circ \subseteq \text{Mov}(R)^\circ$.*

- (i) *If $X(\eta)$ is locally factorial for some $\eta \in \Omega$, then $\text{Eff}(R)$ is a regular cone and every u_i on the boundary of $\text{Eff}(R)$ is primitive.*
- (ii) *If $X(\eta)$ is locally factorial for all $\eta \in \Omega$, then, for any $w_i \in \text{Eff}(R)^\circ$, we have $u_i = u_1 + u_r$ or g has a monomial of the form $T_i^{l_i}$.*

Lemma 3.10. *Situation as in Setting 3.1. If we have $w_2 = w_3$ and $\mu \in \varrho_2$, then $w_4 \in \varrho_2$ holds.*

Proof. Suppose $w_4 \notin \varrho_2$. Then every monomial of g not being divisible by T_1 is of the form $T_2^{l_2} T_3^{l_3}$ where $l_2 + l_3 > 0$. Since g is prime, thus not divisible by T_1 , at least one such monomial occurs with non-zero coefficient in g . From $w_2 = w_3$ we deduce that $g_1 := g(0, T_2, \dots, T_r)$ is a classical homogeneous polynomial in T_2, T_3 , thus admits a presentation $g_1 = \ell_1 \cdots \ell_m$ where ℓ_1, \dots, ℓ_m are linear forms in T_2 and T_3 . Here $w_2 = w_3$ ensures that ℓ_1, \dots, ℓ_m are homogeneous w.r.t. the K -grading. Observe $m > 1$ as the presentation of R is irredundant. We conclude that g_1 is not K -prime, hence $T_1 \in R$ is not K -prime either. A contradiction. \square

We have to bear in mind that the divisor class group $K = \text{Cl}(X)$ of a smooth Calabi-Yau threefold X is not necessarily torsion-free. The following lemmas show that in the case of a hypersurface Cox ring the order of the torsion subgroup is

bounded in terms of monomials of the relation degree. A first important constraint is that the torsion subgroup of K is cyclic.

Lemma 3.11. *Situation as in Setting 3.1. If $X = X(\lambda)$ is locally factorial and $\mu \notin \lambda$, then $K \cong \mathbb{Z}^2$ holds.*

Proof. We have $\lambda = \text{cone}(w_i, w_j)$ for some generator degrees w_i, w_j lying on the boundary of λ . Due to $\mu \notin \lambda$, there is no monomial $T_i^{l_i} T_j^{l_j}$ of degree μ . Lemma 3.5 yields that K is generated by w_i, w_j . Since $\text{rank}(K) = 2$, this implies $K \cong \mathbb{Z}^2$. \square

Lemma 3.12. *Situation as in Setting 3.1. If X is locally factorial, then $K \cong \mathbb{Z}^2 \times \mathbb{Z}/t\mathbb{Z}$ holds.*

Proof. Both λ^- and λ^+ contain at least two Cox ring generator degrees. This allows us to choose w_i, w_j, w_k such that Lemma 3.6 applies. This ensures that K is generated by three elements. By Setting 3.1 we have $\text{rank}(K) = 2$, thus K is as claimed. \square

Lemma 3.13. *Situation as in Setting 3.1. Let $1 \leq i, j \leq n$ with $\text{cone}(w_i, w_j) \cap \lambda^\circ \neq \emptyset$. If $X = X(\lambda)$ is locally factorial and $\mu \in \lambda$ holds, then there is a monomial $T_i^{l_i} T_j^{l_j}$ of degree μ where $l_i + l_j > 0$.*

Proof. Since g is μ -homogeneous, we are done when g has a monomial of the form $T_i^{l_i} T_j^{l_j}$ with $l_i + l_j > 0$.

We assume that g has no monomial of the form $T_i^{l_i} T_j^{l_j}$. Then ϱ_i and ϱ_j both are GIT-rays, thus none of w_i, w_j lies in λ° . This forces $\lambda \subseteq \text{cone}(w_i, w_j)$. Then Lemma 3.5 tells us that w_i, w_j generate K as a group. Using $\mu \in \lambda \subseteq \text{cone}(w_i, w_j)$ we deduce that μ is an positive integral combination over w_i, w_j , i.e., there exists a monomial as desired. \square

Lemma 3.14. *Situation as in Setting 3.1. Let $1 \leq i, j, k \leq r$ such that w_i, w_j, w_k generate K as a group, $\det(u_i, u_j) = 1$ and $\text{cone}(w_i, w_j) \cap \lambda^\circ \neq \emptyset$. If X is locally factorial, then $t \mid l_k$ holds for any monomial $T_i^{l_i} T_k^{l_k}$ of degree μ .*

Proof. Using $\det(u_i, u_j) = 1$ enables us to apply a suitable admissible coordinate change such that $\zeta_i = \zeta_j = 0$. Moreover we may assume $\lambda \in \mu$; otherwise Lemma 3.11 yields $t = 1$ and there is nothing left to show. This allows us to use Lemma 3.13. From this we infer that $\mu = (\alpha, \theta)$ is an integral positive combination over w_i, w_j , thus $\theta = 0$. Since w_i, w_j, w_k generate K as a group, ζ_k is a generator for Γ . Using $\zeta_i = 0$ we obtain $l_k \zeta_k = \theta = 0$ whenever $T_i^{l_i} T_k^{l_k}$ is of degree μ . This implies $t \mid l_k$. \square

Lemma 3.15. *Situation as in Setting 3.1. Assume that $X = X(\lambda)$ is locally factorial. If $\det(u_1, u_r) = 1$ and $\alpha = l_k u_k$ holds, then $t \mid l_k$.*

Proof. Lemma 3.6 yields that w_1, w_k, w_r generate K as a group. Besides $T_k^{l_k}$ is of degree μ by Lemma 3.8. Now Lemma 3.14 tells us $t \mid l_k$. \square

Lemma 3.16. *Let $w_i = (u_i, \zeta_i) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \times \mathbb{Z}/t\mathbb{Z}$ for $1 \leq i \leq 3$. If $u_1 = u_2$ holds and w_1, w_2, w_3 span $\mathbb{Z}^2 \times \mathbb{Z}/t\mathbb{Z}$ as a group, then $\zeta_1 - \zeta_2$ is a generator for $\mathbb{Z}/t\mathbb{Z}$.*

Lemma 3.17. *Situation as in Setting 3.1. If X is locally factorial, $\det(u_1, u_r) = 1$, and $u_i = u_j$ holds for some $1 < i < j < r$, then $\zeta_1 - \zeta_2$ is a generator for Γ . In particular K is torsion-free or $t \neq 2, 4$ holds.*

Proof. First note that w_i, w_j share a common ray in $K_{\mathbb{Q}}$, thus do not lie in the relative interior of the GIT-cone λ ; see Proposition 3.4. So we have $w_i, w_j \in \lambda^-$ or

$w_i, w_j \in \lambda^+$. By applying an orientation reversing coordinate change if necessary we achieve $w_i, w_j \in \lambda^-$.

We have $K = \mathbb{Z}^2 \times \mathbb{Z}/t\mathbb{Z}$; see Lemma 3.12. Using $\det(u_1, u_r) = 1$ enables us to apply a suitable admissible coordinate change such that $\zeta_1 = \zeta_r = \bar{0}$. Remark 2.5 ensures that g has no monomial of the form $T_r^{l_r}$. Hence Lemma 3.6 yields that both triples w_1, w_i, w_r and w_1, w_j, w_r generate K as a group. In particular ζ_i, ζ_j both are generators for $\mathbb{Z}/t\mathbb{Z}$. Moreover Lemma 3.6 tells us that w_i, w_j, w_r form a generating set for K . Lemma 3.16 yields that $\zeta_i - \zeta_j$ is a generator for $\mathbb{Z}/t\mathbb{Z}$. The proof is finished by the fact that the difference of two generators for $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$ resp. $\mathbb{Z}/4\mathbb{Z}$ is never a generator for the respective group. \square

4. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1: COLLECTING CANDIDATES

The first and major task in the proof of Theorem 1.1 is to show that we find specifying data for any given smooth Calabi-Yau threefold X with spread hypersurface Cox ring among the items displayed in Theorem 1.1. This is done by a case-by-case analysis of the geometric constellation of the Cox ring generator degrees.

Now the ground field is $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{C}$. The sole reason for this is the reference involved in the proof of the following proposition.

Proposition 4.1. *Consider the situation of Setting 3.1. If $X(\lambda)$ is a smooth weakly Calabi-Yau threefold, then any variety $X(\eta)$ arising from a full-dimensional GIT-cone η satisfying $\eta^\circ \subseteq \text{Mov}(R)^\circ$ is smooth.*

Proof. Proposition 2.6 provides us with a sequence of flops

$$X(\lambda) = X_1 \dashrightarrow \cdots \dashrightarrow X_k = X(\eta).$$


According to [26, Thm. 6.15], see also [25], flops of threefolds preserve smoothness. So we successively obtain smoothness for all varieties in the above sequence, especially for $X(\eta)$. \square

Given a positive integer n , a sum of the form $n_1 + \cdots + n_k = n$ where $n_1, \dots, n_k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ is called an *integer partition* of n . If one wants to emphasize the order of the summands, one calls such a sum an *integer composition* of n . For instance, $1 + 1 + 2 = 4$ and $1 + 2 + 1 = 4$ are two different integer compositions of 4 but they are equal as integer partitions.

Remark 4.2. In Setting 3.1 the geometric constellation of w_1, \dots, w_r is described by an integer composition of r in the following sense: First, we take into account that some of the rays $\varrho_i = \text{cone}(w_i)$ may coincide and label the actual rays properly. Let $1 \leq j_1 < \cdots < j_s \leq r$ such that $\varrho_{j_k} \neq \varrho_{j_l}$ holds for $j_k \neq j_l$ and each ϱ_i equals some ϱ_{j_k} . Set $\sigma_k := \varrho_{j_k}$. We denote N_k for the number of Cox ring generator degrees w_i lying on σ_k . Then the distribution of the degrees w_i on the rays σ_k is encoded by the composition

$$N_1 + \cdots + N_s = r.$$

For example, when $r = 4$ holds, the integer compositions $1 + 1 + 2 = 4$ and $1 + 2 + 1 = 4$ correspond to the constellations of w_1, \dots, w_4 illustrated below.



Proposition 4.3. *Situation as in Setting 3.1. If X is a weakly Calabi-Yau threefold, then $r = 6$ holds and the constellation of w_1, \dots, w_6 corresponds to one of the following integer partitions $N_1 + \dots + N_s = 6$ in the sense of Remark 4.2.*

	s	N_1	N_2	N_3	N_4	N_5	N_6
<i>I</i>	2	3	3	—	—	—	—
<i>II</i>	3	2	2	2	—	—	—
<i>III</i>	3	1	2	3	—	—	—
<i>IV</i>	4	1	1	2	2	—	—
<i>V</i>	4	1	1	1	3	—	—
<i>VI</i>	5	1	1	1	1	2	—
<i>VII</i>	6	1	1	1	1	1	1

Proof. Observe $r = \dim(X) + \dim(K_{\mathbb{Q}}) + 1 = 6$. The subsequent table shows all integer partitions $N_1 + \dots + N_s = 6$.

	s	N_1	N_2	N_3	N_4	N_5	N_6
	1	6	—	—	—	—	—
	2	1	5	—	—	—	—
	2	2	4	—	—	—	—
<i>I</i>	2	3	3	—	—	—	—
<i>II</i>	3	2	2	2	—	—	—
<i>III</i>	3	1	2	3	—	—	—
	3	1	1	4	—	—	—
<i>IV</i>	4	1	1	2	2	—	—
<i>V</i>	4	1	1	1	3	—	—
<i>VI</i>	5	1	1	1	1	2	—
<i>VII</i>	6	1	1	1	1	1	1

Our task is to show that in the situation of Setting 3.1 those partitions without roman label do not admit a composition corresponding to the constellation of w_1, \dots, w_6 in $K_{\mathbb{Q}}$.

Observe that in the cases $s = 1$ and $s = 2$ where $N_1 = 1$, $N_2 = 5$ the moving cone $\text{Mov}(R)$ of R must be one-dimensional; a contradiction. From Proposition 3.3 we deduce that any constellation given by $N_1 + N_2 = 2 + 4 = 6$ forces μ to live in the boundary of $\text{Eff}(R)$. This contradicts Remark 2.5. Furthermore, the partition $N_1 + N_2 + N_3 = 1 + 1 + 4$ comprises precisely two compositions, that is to say

$$N_1 + N_2 + N_3 = 1 + 4 + 1 \quad \text{and} \quad N_1 + N_2 + N_3 = 1 + 1 + 4.$$

The first of them implies that $\text{Mov}(R)$ is one-dimensional; a contradiction. Considering the latter, Proposition 3.3 shows that μ lies on the boundary of $\text{Eff}(R)$; a contradiction to Remark 2.5. \square

Throughout the proof of Theorem 1.1 we will often encounter inequations of the following type.

Remark 4.4. The following table describes the solutions of the inequation

$$x_1 \cdots x_n \leq x_1 + \cdots + x_n, \quad x_1, \dots, x_n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$$

for $n = 3, 4, 5$ where x_1, \dots, x_n are in ascending order. Here, $*$ stands for an arbitrary positive integer.

n	x_1	x_2	x_3	x_4
3	1	1	*	—
	1	2	2	—
	1	2	3	—
4	1	1	1	*
	1	1	2	3
	1	1	2	4

n	x_1	x_2	x_3	x_4	x_5
5	1	1	1	1	*
	1	1	1	2	2
	1	1	1	2	3
	1	1	1	2	4
	1	1	1	2	5
	1	1	1	3	3


We work in Setting 3.1 for the proof of Theorem 1.1. According to Remark 2.5 (i) it suffices to determine the degree matrix $Q = [w_1, \dots, w_6]$ in order to figure out candidates for specifying data of X since the relation degree μ is given by

$$\mu = w_1 + \dots + w_6.$$

When Q and μ are fixed, we cover all possibilities (up to isomorphism) by picking an interior point u of each full-dimensional GIT-chamber λ with $\lambda^\circ \subseteq \text{Mov}(R)^\circ$.

Our proof of Theorem 1.1 will be split into Parts I, \dots , VII discussing the constellations of w_1, \dots, w_6 in the sense of Remark 4.2 given by the accordingly labeled integer partition of six from Proposition 4.3. In the present article we elaborate Parts I–IV and VII. The remaining parts are treated with similar arguments and can be found in [29].

Part I. We consider $3 + 3 = 6$ i.e. the generator degrees w_i are evenly distributed on two rays σ_1, σ_2 . So w_1, \dots, w_6 lie all in the boundary of $\text{Eff}(R)$.



Lemma 3.9 (i) tells us that each w_i is primitive and $\text{Eff}(R)$ is regular. In particular $u_1 = u_2 = u_3$ and $u_4 = u_5 = u_6$. A suitable admissible coordinate change leads to

$$Q^0 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$


If K is torsion-free, this leads to specifying data as in Number 1 from Theorem 1.1.

We assume that K admits torsion. Remark 2.5 (i) implies $\alpha = u_1 + \dots + u_6 = (3, 3)$. Lemma 3.13 guarantees that $T_2^3 T_4^3$ is of degree μ . Lemma 3.6 tells us that w_1, w_2, w_4 generate K as a group and we have $\det(u_1, u_4) = 1$. Thus we may apply Lemma 3.14. From this we infer $t \mid 3$, hence $t = 3$ i.e. $K = \mathbb{Z}^2 \times \mathbb{Z}/3\mathbb{Z}$; see also Lemma 3.12. Furthermore Lemma 3.6 yields that K is generated by each of the triples

$$(w_1, w_2, w_4), \quad (w_1, w_3, w_4), \quad (w_2, w_3, w_4).$$

Since $u_1 = u_2 = u_3$, we conclude that η_1, η_2, η_3 are pairwise different. Otherwise two of w_1, w_2, w_3 coincide, hence K is generated by two elements; a contradiction. In the same manner we obtain that η_4, η_5, η_6 are pairwise different. After suitably reordering T_1, \dots, T_6 we arrive at specifying data as in Number 2 from Theorem 1.1.

Part II. We discuss the degree constellation determined by $2 + 2 + 2 = 6$. Here the generator degrees w_i are evenly distributed on three rays $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma_3$.



We have $\mu \in \sigma_2$ by Proposition 3.3. Proposition 3.4 provides us with two GIT-cones

$$\eta_1 = \text{cone}(w_1, w_3), \quad \eta_2 = \text{cone}(w_3, w_5).$$

According to Proposition 4.1 the associated varieties $X(\eta_1)$, $X(\eta_2)$ both are smooth. Lemma 3.9 (i) yields $u_1 = u_2$, $u_5 = u_6$ and $\det(u_1, u_5) = 1$. After applying a suitable admissible coordinate change the degree matrix is of the form

$$Q^0 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & a_3 & a_4 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & b_3 & b_4 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad a_3, a_4 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}.$$

We may assume $a_3 \leq a_4$. Let $v = (v_1, v_2) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ be the primitive vector lying on σ_2 . Applying Lemma 3.6 to $X(\eta_2)$ and the triple w_3, w_4, w_5 shows $\gcd(a_3, a_4) = 1$. In addition, we obtain $v_1 = 1$ from Lemma 3.7. Lemma 3.6 again, this time applied to $X(\eta_1)$ and w_1, w_2, w_3 , gives $v_2 = 1$. From $v_1 = v_2$ we deduce $a_3 = b_3$ and $a_4 = b_4$. Lemma 3.8 ensures that μ_1 is divisible by both a_3 and a_4 , thus $a_3 a_4 \mid \mu_1$. Remark 2.5 (i) says $\mu = w_1 + \dots + w_6$. We conclude

$$a_3 a_4 \mid \mu_1 = a_3 + a_4 + 2.$$

First we deduce $a_4 \mid a_3 + 2$. Moreover we obtain $a_3 \leq 4$ due to $a_3 \leq a_4$. Altogether the integers a_3, a_4 are bounded, so we just have to examine the possible configurations.

- $a_3 = 1$: From $a_4 \mid a_3 + 2 = 3$ we infer $a_4 = 1, 3$. Now we show that K is torsion-free. For $a_4 = 1$ we have

$$Q^0 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \alpha = (4, 4).$$


Observe $\mu^0 = 4u_3$. Lemma 3.11 tells us $t \mid 4$, thus K is torsion-free according to Lemma 3.17. Similarly, for $a_4 = 3$ we have

$$Q^0 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 3 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 3 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \alpha = (6, 6).$$


Observe $\alpha = 2u_4$. Lemma 3.11 tells us $t \mid 2$, thus K is torsion-free according to Lemma 3.17. We arrive at specifying data as in Numbers 3 and 4 from Theorem 1.1. Observe $X(\eta_1) \cong X(\eta_2)$ in both cases due to the symmetry of the geometric constellation of w_1, \dots, w_6, μ . Thus it suffices to list an ample class for $X(\eta_1)$ only.

- $a_3 = 2$: From $a_4 \mid a_3 + 2 = 4$ and $a_3 \leq a_4$ we infer $a_4 = 2, 4$. This contradicts $\gcd(a_3, a_4) = 1$.
- $a_3 = 3$: From $a_4 \mid a_3 + 2 = 5$ and $a_3 \leq a_4$ we infer $a_4 = 5$. This leads to $\mu_1 = a_3 + a_4 + 2 = 10$. A contradiction to $a_3 \mid \mu_1$.
- $a_3 = 4$: From $a_4 \mid a_3 + 2 = 6$ and $a_3 \leq a_4$ we infer $a_4 = 6$. This contradicts $\gcd(a_3, a_4) = 1$.


Part III. In this part we consider the arrangements of w_1, \dots, w_6 associated with the integer partition $1 + 2 + 3 = 6$. Here we have precisely three rays $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma_3$ each of which contains a different number of Cox ring generator degrees. A suitable admissible coordinate change turns the setting into one of the following:



III-i



III-ii



III-iii

Case III-i. Here we have $\lambda = \text{cone}(w_1, w_4)$. Let $v \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ be a primitive vector on σ_2 . Proposition 3.3 and Remark 2.5 (i) tell us $\mu \in \lambda^\circ \cup \sigma_2$. This allows us to apply Lemma 3.6 to w_i, w_4, w_5 for $i = 1, 2, 3$. From this we infer $\det(u_i, v) = 1$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$. In particular u_1, u_2, u_3 are primitive, thus $u_1 = u_2 = u_3$. Applying Lemma 3.6 to the triple w_1, w_2, w_6 shows $\det(u_1, u_6) = 1$. A suitable admissible coordinate change amounts to $v = (0, 1)$ and

$$Q^0 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & -a_6 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & b_4 & b_5 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad a_6, b_4, b_5 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$$

We may assume $b_4 \leq b_5$. To proceed we have to take the position of μ into account.

Assume $\mu \in \lambda^\circ$. Then we may apply Lemmas 3.6 and 3.7 to the two triples w_1, w_2, w_4 and w_1, w_2, w_5 . We obtain that u_4 and u_5 both are primitive, hence

$$u_4 = u_5 = v = (0, 1).$$

From Remark 2.5 (i) we infer $\alpha = (3 - a_6, 3)$. Since μ lives in the relative interior of λ , which is the positive orthant, we end up with $a_6 = 1, 2$. We show that K is torsion free in both cases.

- $a_6 = 1$. The free parts of the specifying data are given as

$$Q^0 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \alpha = (2, 3).$$

Lemma 3.13 ensures that $T_1^2 T_4^3$ is of degree μ . Moreover Lemma 3.6 shows that both triples w_1, w_4, w_5 and w_1, w_2, w_4 generate K as a group. Applying Lemma 3.14 to w_1, w_4, w_5 and $T_1^2 T_4^3$ yields $t \mid 3$. Again Lemma 3.14, this time applied to w_1, w_2, w_4 and $T_1^2 T_3^3$ shows $t \mid 2$. Altogether $t = 1$, thus K is torsion-free.

- $a_6 = 2$. The free parts of the specifying data are given as

$$Q^0 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & -2 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \alpha = (1, 3).$$

Lemma 3.13 ensures that $T_1^1 T_4^3$ of degree μ . Moreover Lemma 3.6 shows that w_1, w_2, w_4 generate K as a group. Applying Lemma 3.14 to w_1, w_2, w_4 and $T_1^1 T_4^3$ shows $t = 1$ i.e. K is torsion-free.

Eventually this leads to specifying data as in Numbers 5 and 6 from Theorem 1.1.

Assume $\mu \in \sigma_2$. Recall that $v = (0, 1)$ spans the ray σ_2 . So here we have $\alpha_1 = 0$. From Remark 2.5 (i) we obtain $a_6 = 3$ and $\alpha_2 = b_4 + b_5 + 1$. Lemma 3.8 yields $b_4, b_5 \mid \alpha_2$. Applying Lemma 3.6 to w_1, w_4, w_5 shows $\gcd(b_4, b_5) = 1$. We conclude

$$b_4 b_5 \mid \alpha_2 = b_4 + b_5 + 1.$$

This implies $b_5 \mid b_4 + 1$. Moreover we deduce $b_4 \leq 3$. We discuss the resulting cases:

- $b_4 = 1$: From $b_5 \mid b_4 + 1 = 2$ we deduce $b_5 = 1, 2$. For $b_5 = 1$ we have

$$Q^0 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & -3 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \alpha = (0, 3).$$

Suppose that K is torsion-free. Then $w_4 = w_5$ holds. Reversing the order of the variables by applying a suitable admissible coordinate change enables us to use Lemma 3.10. This forces two of the rays σ_i to coincide; a contradiction. So K has torsion. From $\alpha = 3u_4$ and Lemma 3.15 we obtain $t \mid 3$, hence $t = 3$. So we have $K = \mathbb{Z}^2 \times \mathbb{Z}/3\mathbb{Z}$. Using $\det(u_1, u_6) = 1$ enables us to apply a suitable admissible coordinate change such that $\zeta_1 = \zeta_6 = 0$. Now Lemma 3.6 shows that both triples w_1, w_2, w_6 and w_1, w_3, w_6 generate K as a group. From this we infer that ζ_2 and ζ_3 both are generators for $\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}/3\mathbb{Z}$. Lemma 3.6 yields that w_2, w_3, w_6 form a

generating set for K as well. This forces $\zeta_2 \neq \zeta_3$. Otherwise $w_2 = w_3$ holds, thus K is spanned by two elements; a contradiction. Similarly, Lemma 3.6 applied to w_1, w_4, w_6 and w_1, w_5, w_6 yields that ζ_4 and ζ_5 both are generators for $\mathbb{Z}/3\mathbb{Z}$. Moreover applying Lemma 3.6 to w_1, w_4, w_5 ensures $\zeta_4 \neq \zeta_5$. After suitably reordering T_2, T_3 and T_4, T_5 we arrive at Number 7 from Theorem 1.1.

We turn to $b_5 = 2$. Here the free parts of degree matrix and relation degree are given by

$$Q^0 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & -3 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 2 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \alpha = (0, 4).$$

Note $\alpha = 2u_5$. From Lemma 3.15 we infer $t \mid 2$, hence K is torsion-free according to Lemma 3.17. Moreover every μ -homogeneous polynomial not depending on T_6 is a linear combination over the monomials $T_4^4, T_4^2T_5, T_5^2$, thus reducible. This implies that $T_6 \in R$ is not prime. A contradiction.

- $b_4 = 2$: From $b_5 \mid b_4 + 1 = 3$ and $b_4 \leq b_5$ follows $b_5 = 3$. This leads to

$$Q^0 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & -3 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 2 & 3 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \alpha = (0, 6).$$

Observe $\alpha = 3u_2 = 2u_3$. Lemma 3.15 yields $t \mid 2$ and $t \mid 3$, hence $t = 1$. So K is torsion-free. We end up with Number 8 from Theorem 1.1.

- $b_4 = 3$: From $b_5 \mid b_4 + 1 = 4$ and $b_4 \leq b_5$ we infer $b_5 = 4$. This implies $\alpha_2 = 8$; a contradiction to $b_4 \mid \alpha_2$.

Case III-ii. Here, we have $\lambda = \text{cone}(w_2, w_5)$. Proposition 3.3 says $\mu \in \sigma_2$. Let $v \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ be a primitive vector on σ_2 . Applying Lemma 3.6 to w_2, w_3, w_5 as well as w_2, w_3, w_6 shows $\det(v, u_5) = 1$ and $\det(v, u_6) = 1$. In particular u_5, u_6 are primitive and lie on the same ray hence coincide. Again by Lemma 3.6, now applied to w_1, w_5, w_6 , we obtain $\det(u_1, u_5) = 1$. A suitable admissible coordinate change amounts to $v = (1, 0)$ and $u_5 = (0, 1)$. As a result the free part Q^0 of the degree matrix Q is of the form

$$Q^0 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & a_2 & a_3 & a_4 & 0 & 0 \\ -2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad a_2, a_3, a_4 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}.$$

Note that the second coordinate of u_1 is determined by $\alpha_2 = 0$ and Remark 2.5 (i). Furthermore, we may assume $a_2 \leq a_3 \leq a_4$. Lemma 3.8 shows that α_1 is divisible by each of a_2, a_3, a_4 . From applying Lemma 3.6 to all triples w_i, w_j, w_6 where $2 \leq i < j \leq 4$ we infer that a_2, a_3, a_4 are pairwise coprime. This leads to

$$a_2 a_3 a_4 \mid a_2 + a_3 + a_4 + 1.$$

According to Remark 4.4 we have $a_2 = 1$ and one of the following two configurations

$$a_3 = 1, \quad a_3 = 2 \text{ and } a_4 = 3.$$

Note that $a_3 = 2$ and $a_4 = 3$ amounts to $\alpha_1 = 7$; a contradiction to $a_3 \mid \alpha_1$. So we have $a_3 = 1$. Then $a_4 \mid \alpha_1 = 3 + a_4$ holds. We conclude $a_4 \mid 3$ i.e. $a_4 = 1, 3$. We show that K is torsion-free in both cases:

- $a_4 = 1$. Here we have

$$Q^0 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ -2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \alpha = (4, 0).$$

Note $\alpha = 4u_2$, thus $t \mid 4$ by Lemma 3.15. Now Lemma 3.17 ensures that K is torsion-free.

- $a_4 = 2$. Here we have

$$Q^0 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 3 & 0 & 0 \\ -2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \alpha = (6, 0).$$

Note $\alpha = 2u_4$, thus $t \mid 2$ by Lemma 3.15. Now Lemma 3.17 ensures that K is torsion-free.

We have arrived at Numbers 9 and 10 from Theorem 1.1.

Case III-iii. From Lemma 3.9 (i) we obtain

$$u_1 = u_2 = u_3, \quad u_5 = u_6, \quad \det(u_1, u_6) = 1.$$

A suitable admissible coordinate change brings the degree matrix into the following form

$$Q^0 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & a_4 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & b_4 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad a_4, b_4 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}.$$

Moreover, Proposition 3.3 tells us $\mu \in \text{cone}(w_1, w_4)^\circ$ or $\mu \in \varrho_4$. Let us first assume $\mu \in \text{cone}(w_1, w_4)^\circ$. According to Proposition 3.4 we have GIT-cones

$$\eta_1 = \text{cone}(w_1, w_4), \quad \eta_2 = \text{cone}(w_4, w_5),$$

both of them giving rise to a smooth variety $X(\eta_i)$; see Proposition 4.1. We obtain that K is torsion-free by applying Lemma 3.11 to $X(\eta_2)$. Applying Lemma 3.9 (ii) gives $u_4 = u_1 + u_6 = (1, 1)$. We have arrived at Numbers 11 and 12 from Theorem 1.1.

The next step is to consider $\mu \in \varrho_4$. Lemma 3.8 provides us with some $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 2}$ such that $\mu = kw_4$ holds. Using Remark 2.5 (i) gives $kb_4 = \alpha_2 = b_4 + 2$. We conclude $b_4 \mid 2$. This leads to one of the following two configurations


$$k = 3 \text{ and } b_4 = 1, \quad k = 2 \text{ and } b_4 = 2.$$

Suppose $k = 3$. Using Remark 2.5 (i) again shows $3a_4 = 3 + a_4$, equivalently $2a_4 = 3$. A contradiction. We must have $k = 2$ and $b_4 = 2$. Here Remark 2.5 (i) implies $2a_4 = 3 + a_4$, thus $a_4 = 3$. We have

$$Q^0 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 3 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 2 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \alpha = (6, 4).$$

From $\alpha = 2u_4$ we infer $t \mid 2$ by Lemma 3.15. Thus Lemma 3.17 yields that K is torsion-free. This amounts to Number 13 from Theorem 1.1.

Part IV. This part deals with the case of w_1, \dots, w_6 being disposed on four rays according to the integer partition $1 + 1 + 2 + 2 = 6$. A suitable admissible coordinate change leads to one of the subsequent constellations:



Case IV-i. Here, Proposition 3.3 tells us $\mu \in \sigma_3$. As a result, Proposition 3.4 provides us with two GIT-cones

$$\eta_1 = \text{cone}(w_2, w_3), \quad \eta_2 = \text{cone}(w_3, w_5).$$

Proposition 4.1 ensures that the associated varieties $X(\eta_1)$ and $X(\eta_2)$ both are smooth. Let $v \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ denote the primitive lattice vector lying on σ_3 . Consider $X(\eta_2)$. Applying Lemmas 3.6 and 3.7 to the triples w_3, w_4, w_5 and w_3, w_4, w_6 yields $u_5 = u_6$

and $\det(v, u_5) = 1$. Thus we may apply a suitable admissible coordinate change such that $v = (1, 0)$ and $u_5 = u_6 = (0, 1)$. We apply Lemma 3.6 again, this time to w_1, w_5, w_6 and w_2, w_5, w_6 . This shows that the first coordinate of both u_1 and u_2 equals one. Now, consider $X(\eta_1)$. We apply Lemma 3.6 to w_1, w_3, w_4 , hence obtain $u_1 = (1, -1)$. Analogously, we obtain $u_2 = (1, -1)$, thus $u_1 = u_2$. This contradicts $\sigma_1 \neq \sigma_2$.

Case IV-ii. Proposition 3.3 says $\mu \in \text{cone}(w_2, w_4)$. First, we assume $\mu \in \varrho_4 = \sigma_3$. Then Proposition 3.4 ensures $\lambda = \text{cone}(w_2, w_5)$. Let $v \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ be the primitive lattice vector on σ_2 . Applying Lemmas 3.6 and 3.7 to all four triples

$$(w_2, w_3, w_5), \quad (w_2, w_3, w_6), \quad (w_2, w_5, w_6), \quad (w_3, w_5, w_6)$$

shows that u_2, u_3, u_5, u_6 are primitive, thus $u_2 = u_3$ and $u_5 = u_6$. Additionally we obtain $\det(u_2, u_5) = 1$. Lemma 3.6 again, this time applied to w_1, w_5, w_6 , tells us $\det(u_1, u_5) = 1$. A suitable admissible coordinate change eventually amounts to

$$Q^0 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & a_4 & 0 & 0 \\ -b_1 & 0 & 0 & b_4 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad a_4, b_1, b_4 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}.$$

From Remark 2.5 (i) we infer $\alpha = (a_4 + 3, b_4 - b_1 + 2)$. Lemma 3.8 provides us with some $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 2}$ such that $\mu = kw_4$. In particular $a_4 \mid \alpha_1 = a_4 + 3$. This implies $a_4 = 1, 3$. Suppose $a_4 = 1$. Then $k = 4$ holds. This leads to $4b_4 = \alpha_2 = b_4 - b_1 + 2$, hence $3b_4 = 2 - b_1$. A contradiction to $b_1, b_4 \geq 1$. We are left with $a_4 = 3$ and $k = 2$. Inserting into $\alpha = ku_3$ gives $2b_4 = b_4 - b_1 + 2$, thus $b_4 = 2 - b_1$. This forces $b_1 = 1$ and $b_4 = 1$ due to $b_1, b_4 \geq 1$. Moreover $k = 2$ implies $t \mid 2$ by Lemma 3.15. Thus K is torsion-free according to Lemma 3.17. We have arrived at Number 14 from Theorem 1.1.

We turn to the case $\mu \notin \sigma_3$. Here Proposition 3.4 provides us with two GIT-cones

$$\eta_1 = \text{cone}(w_2, w_4), \quad \eta_2 = \text{cone}(w_4, w_5).$$

According to Proposition 4.1 the according varieties $X(\eta_1)$ and $X(\eta_2)$ both are smooth. Consider $X(\eta_2)$. Lemma 3.5 applied to w_4, w_5 and w_4, w_6 yields $\det(u_4, u_5) = 1$ as well as $\det(u_4, u_6) = 1$. Besides, Lemmas 3.6 and 3.7 applied to w_1, w_5, w_6 give us $\det(u_1, u_5) = 1$. Now consider $X(\eta_1)$. Let $v \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ be the primitive vector contained in σ_2 . Applying Lemmas 3.6 and 3.7 to w_2, w_3, w_4 and w_2, w_3, w_5 shows $\det(v, u_4) = 1$ and $\det(v, u_5) = 1$. Now we apply an admissible coordinate change such that $v = (1, 0)$ and $u_5 = (0, 1)$ holds. Taking the determinantal equations from above into account amounts to the following degree matrix

$$Q^0 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & a_2 & a_3 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ -b_1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad a_2, a_3, b_1 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}.$$

We may assume $a_2 \leq a_3$. From Remark 2.5 (i) follows $\alpha_2 = 3 - b_1$. Proposition 3.3 guarantees that μ lives in the positive orthant, hence $b_1 \leq 3$. Furthermore, Lemma 3.5 applied w.r.t $X(\eta_1)$ and the pairs w_2, w_5 and w_3, w_5 shows $a_2, a_3 \mid \alpha_1$. Applying Lemma 3.6 to w_2, w_3, w_5 shows $\gcd(a_2, a_3) = 1$. Consequently $a_2 a_3 \mid \alpha_1 = a_2 + a_3 + 2$ holds. We end up with $a_2 = 1$ and $a_3 = 1, 3$.

Let us discuss the case $a_3 = 1$. Here specifying data looks as follows

$$Q^0 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ -b_1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \alpha = (4, 3 - b_1), \quad b_1 \in \{1, 2, 3\}.$$

Suppose $b_1 = 3$. This implies $\alpha = (4, 0) = 4u_2$. Lemmas 3.15 and 3.17 yield that K is torsion-free. So $w_2 = w_3$ holds. Note that $\alpha_2 = 0$ means $\mu \in \varrho_2$. In this situation Lemma 3.10 shows $w_4 \in \varrho_2$. A contradiction to $\sigma_2 \neq \sigma_3$. So we have $b_1 = 1, 2$. Observe $\mu \in \eta_1^\circ$. Applying Lemma 3.11 to $X(\eta_2)$ guarantees that K is torsion-free. We end up with Numbers 15 to 18 from Theorem 1.1.

We turn to $a_3 = 3$. Here we have $\alpha_1 = 6$. According to Lemma 3.5 applied to $X(\eta_1)$ and w_3, w_4 , there must be some monomial $T_3^{l_3}T_4^{l_4}$ of degree μ because of $\det(u_3, u_4) = 3$. As the second coordinate of u_3 vanishes, $l_4 = \alpha_2 = 3 - b_1$ holds. Inserting this into the equation $\alpha_1 = l_3a_3 + l_4a_4$ yields $3l_3 + 3 - b_1 = \alpha_1 = 6$. This forces b_1 to be divisible by 3, hence $b_1 = 3$. We arrive at the following data

$$Q^0 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 3 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ -3 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \alpha = (6, 0).$$

Observe that this grading does not admit any monomial of the form $T_1^{l_1}T_4^{l_4}$ of degree μ . Thus $\det(u_1, u_4) = 1$ by Lemma 3.5 applied to $X(\eta_1)$ and w_1, w_4 . A contradiction.


Case IV-iii. Proposition 3.4 ensures $\lambda = \text{cone}(w_3, w_5)$. Let $v, v' \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ be the primitive ray generators of σ_2, σ_3 . We may apply Lemmas 3.6 and 3.7 to at least one of the triples w_2, w_3, w_4 and w_2, w_4, w_5 . From this we infer $\det(v, v') = 1$. A suitable admissible coordinate change leads to $v = (1, 0)$ and $v' = (0, 1)$. Applying Lemma 3.6 to w_2, w_3, w_6 yields $w_6 = (-a_6, 1)$ for some $a_6 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$. Similarly, one obtains $w_1 = (1, -b_1)$ with $b_1 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$. Counter-clockwise orientation yields $\det(w_1, w_6) = 1 - a_6b_1 \leq 0$. We conclude $b_1 = a_6 = 1$, hence $w_1 = -w_6$. This contradicts $\text{Eff}(R)$ being pointed.

Case IV-iv. We have $\mu \in \text{cone}(w_3, w_4)$ by Proposition 3.3. Suppose $\mu \in \text{cone}(w_3, w_4)^\circ$. Proposition 4.1 allows us to apply Lemma 3.9 (ii). From this we infer $u_3 = u_4$, thus $\sigma_2 = \sigma_3$; a contradiction. So we have $\mu \in \sigma_2 \cup \sigma_3$. Taking the symmetry in the geometric constellation of w_1, \dots, w_6 into account a suitable admissible coordinate change amounts to $\mu \in \sigma_2$. Lemma 3.9 yields $u_1 = u_2, u_5 = u_6$ and $u_4 = u_1 + u_6$. Furthermore we obtain $\det(u_1, u_6) = 1$. After applying another suitable admissible coordinate change the degree matrix is of the following form


$$Q^0 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & a_3 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & b_3 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad a_3, b_3 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}.$$

From X being Calabi-Yau we infer $\alpha = (a_3 + 3, b_3 + 3)$; see Remark 2.5. Besides Lemma 3.8 provides us with some $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 2}$ such that $\mu = kw_3$ holds. Altogether we obtain $(k - 1)a_3 = 3 = (k - 1)b_3$, hence $a_3 = b_3$. This contradicts $\sigma_2 \neq \sigma_3$.

Part VII. We work out the the constellation where the Cox ring generator degrees w_1, \dots, w_6 lie on pairwise different rays i.e. we have $\sigma_i = \varrho_i$ for all $i = 1, \dots, 6$. Proposition 3.3 says $\mu \in \text{cone}(w_3, w_4)$. After applying a suitable admissible coordinate change we have either $\mu \in \text{cone}(w_3, w_4)^\circ$ or $\mu \in \varrho_3$.



VII-a: $\mu \in \text{cone}(w_3, w_4)^\circ$



VII-b: $\mu \in \varrho_3$

Case VII-a. Here, we assume $\mu \in \text{cone}(w_3, w_4)^\circ$. According to Proposition 3.4 the cones

$$\eta_1 = \text{cone}(w_2, w_3), \quad \eta_2 = \text{cone}(w_3, w_4), \quad \eta_3 = \text{cone}(w_4, w_5)$$

are GIT-cones leading to smooth varieties $X(\eta_i)$; see also Proposition 4.1. Let us consider $X(\eta_1)$. Lemma 3.5 applied to w_1, w_3 and w_2, w_3 yields $\det(u_1, u_3) = 1$ and $\det(u_2, u_3) = 1$. Thus a suitable admissible coordinate change leads to

$$Q^0 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 & -a_4 & -a_5 & -a_6 \\ -b_1 & 0 & 1 & b_4 & b_5 & b_6 \end{bmatrix}, \quad a_i, b_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}.$$

Consider $X(\eta_3)$. Applying Lemma 3.5 to w_4, w_5 and w_4, w_6 gives $\det(u_4, u_5) = 1$ and $\det(u_4, u_6) = 1$. Since $a_4 \neq 0$, this is equivalent to

$$(1) \quad b_5 = \frac{a_5 b_4 - 1}{a_4}, \quad b_6 = \frac{a_6 b_4 - 1}{a_4}.$$

Now consider $X(\eta_2)$. Applying Lemma 3.5 to the pair w_3, w_i for $i = 4, 5, 6$ shows that α_1 is divisible by each of a_4, a_5, a_6 . Moreover, Lemma 3.6 applied to w_2, w_i, w_j where $4 \leq i < j \leq 6$ ensures that a_4, a_5, a_6 are pairwise coprime. Together with Remark 2.5 (i) we obtain

$$a_4 a_5 a_6 \mid \alpha_1 = a_4 + a_5 + a_6 - 2.$$

One quickly checks that this forces two of a_4, a_5, a_6 to equal one. Suppose $a_5 = a_6 = 1$. Then Eq. (1) implies $b_5 = b_6$, thus $u_5 = u_6$. A contradiction. So we must have $a_4 = 1$, in particular

$$(2) \quad b_5 = a_5 b_4 - 1, \quad b_6 = a_6 b_4 - 1.$$

Furthermore, Lemma 3.5 applied to w_2, w_j gives $b_j \mid \alpha_2$ for $j = 4, 5, 6$. In addition, applying Lemma 3.6 to all triples w_2, w_i, w_j where $4 \leq i < j \leq 6$ shows that b_4, b_5, b_6 are pairwise coprime. Once again by Remark 2.5 (i) we obtain

$$(3) \quad b_4 b_5 b_6 \mid \alpha_2 = b_4 + b_5 + b_6 + 1 - b_1.$$

Note that the right-hand side is positive due to the position of μ . From this we deduce $b_4 b_5 b_6 \leq b_4 + b_5 + b_6$. According to Remark 4.4 this inequation implies that either two of b_4, b_5, b_6 equal one or $\{b_4, b_5, b_6\} = \{1, 2, 3\}$.

We exclude the first option. Here we have $b_5 \neq b_6$ by Eq. (2), thus $b_4 = 1$. However, we also have $a_i = 1$ for some $i \in \{5, 6\}$. Then again Eq. (2) implies $b_i = a_i - 1 = 0$. A contradiction. So we have $\{b_4, b_5, b_6\} = \{1, 2, 3\}$.

Inserting into Eq. (3) amounts to $b_1 = 1$. Currently the degree matrix has the form

$$Q^0 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 & -1 & -a_5 & -a_6 \\ -1 & 0 & 1 & b_4 & b_5 & b_6 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Recall that $a_5 = 1$ or $a_6 = 1$ holds. So we have $b_4 > b_5$ or $b_4 > b_6$ due to the counter-clockwise orientation of w_4, w_5, w_6 . From this we infer $b_4 \neq 1$, hence $b_i = 1$ for some $i \in \{5, 6\}$. We are left with the cases $b_4 = 2, 3$. With $b_4 = 3$, inserting into Eq. (2) gives $3a_i - 1 = b_i = 1$. A contradiction to $a_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$. With $b_4 = 2$ we deduce $a_i = 1$ from Eq. (2). In particular $w_i = (-1, 1) = -w_1$ holds. A contradiction to $\text{Eff}(R)$ being pointed.

Case VII-b. Here, we assume $\mu \in \varrho_3$. Proposition 3.4 provides us with two GIT-cones

$$\eta_1 = \text{cone}(w_2, w_4), \quad \eta_2 = \text{cone}(w_4, w_5).$$

Both of them give rise to a smooth variety $X(\eta_i)$; see Proposition 4.1. Consider $X(\eta_2)$. Applying Lemma 3.5 to both pairs w_4, w_5 and w_4, w_6 yields $\det(u_4, u_5) = 1$ and $\det(u_4, u_6) = 1$. A suitable admissible coordinate change leads to

$$Q^0 = \begin{bmatrix} a_1 & a_2 & a_3 & 1 & a_5 & 0 \\ -b_1 & -b_2 & -b_3 & 0 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad a_i, b_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}.$$

Lemma 3.8 provides us with some $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 2}$ such that $\mu = kw_3$ holds. In particular, we have $\alpha_1 = ka_3$. Now consider $X(\eta_1)$. Lemma 3.6 applied to the triples w_1, w_3, w_5 and w_2, w_3, w_5 shows that $a_1 + b_1a_5$ and $a_2 + b_2a_5$ both divide k . Moreover, applying Lemma 3.6 to w_1, w_2, w_5 yields $\gcd(a_1 + b_1a_5, a_2 + b_2a_5) = 1$. Together with Remark 2.5 (i) we obtain

$$(a_1 + b_1a_5)(a_2 + b_2a_5)a_3 \mid \alpha_1 = a_1 + a_2 + a_3 + a_5 + 1.$$

We expand the left-hand side and give a rough estimation:

$$\begin{aligned} (a_1 + b_1a_5)(a_2 + b_2a_5)a_3 &= a_1a_2a_3 + a_1a_3a_5b_2 + a_2a_3a_5b_1 + a_3a_5^2b_1b_2 \\ &\geq a_1 + a_2 + a_3 + a_5 \end{aligned}$$

Since $\gcd(n, n+1) = 1$ is true for every integer n , this inequation shows that equality holds in the above divisibility condition. From this we infer

$$a_2(a_1a_3 - 1) + a_1(a_3a_5b_2 - 1) + a_3(a_2a_5b_1 - 1) + a_5(a_3a_5b_1b_2 - 1) = 1.$$

Observe that every summand on the left-hand side is non-negative, hence precisely one of them equals one while the other vanish. Since a_1, a_2, a_3, a_5 are non-zero, the factor in the parenthesis vanishes whenever the whole summand vanishes. There are two summands where b_1 shows up in the second factor. At least one of those parenthesis must vanish, hence $b_1 = 1$. Repeating this argument yields $b_2 = 1$ as well as $a_3 = 1$. Similarly, we obtain $a_1 = 1$ or $a_2 = 1$. Altogether we have $u_3 = (1, -b_3)$ and $u_i = (1, -1)$ where $i \in \{1, 2\}$. This implies $\det(u_i, u_3) = 1 - b_3 \leq 0$; a contradiction to our assumption that w_1, \dots, w_6 are in counter-clockwise order.

5. CONSTRUCTING GENERAL HYPERSURFACE COX RINGS

This section is devoted to the construction of general hypersurface Cox rings with prescribed specifying data. First, we describe the toolbox for producing general hypersurface Cox rings from [20, Sec. 4] in outline. Then we extend it with new explicit factoriality criterions for general hypersurface rings; see Corollaries 5.12 and 5.13.

Construction 5.1. Consider a linear, pointed, almost free K -grading on the polynomial ring $S := \mathbb{K}[T_1, \dots, T_r]$ and the quasitorus action $H \times \bar{Z} \rightarrow \bar{Z}$, where

$$H := \operatorname{Spec} \mathbb{K}[K], \quad \bar{Z} := \operatorname{Spec} S = \mathbb{K}^r.$$

We write $Q: \mathbb{Z}^r \rightarrow K$, $e_i \mapsto w_i := \deg(T_i)$ for the degree map. Assume that $\operatorname{Mov}(S) \subseteq K_{\mathbb{Q}}$ is of full dimension and fix $\tau \in \Lambda(S)$ with $\tau^\circ \subseteq \operatorname{Mov}(S)^\circ$. Set

$$\hat{Z} := \bar{Z}^{ss}(\tau), \quad Z := \hat{Z} // H.$$

Then Z is a projective toric variety with divisor class group $\operatorname{Cl}(Z) = K$ and Cox ring $\mathcal{R}(Z) = S$. Moreover, fix $0 \neq \mu \in K$, and for $g \in S_\mu$ set

$$R_g := S/\langle g \rangle, \quad \bar{X}_g := V(g) \subseteq \bar{Z}, \quad \hat{X}_g := \bar{X}_g \cap \hat{Z}, \quad X_g := \hat{X}_g // H \subseteq Z.$$

Then the factor algebra R_g inherits a K -grading from S and the quotient $X_g \subseteq Z$ is a closed subvariety. Moreover, we have

$$X_g \subseteq Z_g \subseteq Z$$

where $Z_g \subseteq Z$ is the minimal ambient toric variety of X_g , that means the (unique) minimal open toric subvariety containing X_g .

The spread μ -homogeneous polynomials form an open subset $U_\mu \subseteq S_\mu$. Moreover all polynomials $g \in U_\mu$ share the same minimal ambient toric variety Z_g . We call $Z_\mu := Z_g$, where $g \in U_\mu$, the μ -minimal ambient toric variety. The following propositions enable us to verify smoothness of Z_μ and the general X_g in a purely combinatorial manner.

Proposition 5.2. *In the situation of Construction 5.1 the following are equivalent.*

- (i) *The μ -minimal ambient toric variety Z_μ is smooth.*
- (ii) *For each $\gamma_0 \preceq \gamma$ with $\tau^\circ \in Q(\gamma_0)^\circ$ and $|Q^{-1}(\mu) \cap \gamma_0| \neq 1$ the group K is generated by $Q(\gamma_0 \cap \mathbb{Z}^r)$.*

Proposition 5.3. *In the setting of Construction 5.1, assume $\text{rank}(K) = 2$ and that $Z_\mu \subseteq Z$ is smooth. If $\mu \in \tau$ holds, then μ is base point free. Moreover, then there is a non-empty open subset of polynomials $g \in S_\mu$ such that X_g is smooth.*

Remark 5.4. In the situation of Construction 5.1 assume that R_g is normal, factorially graded and T_1, \dots, T_r define pairwise non-associated K -primes in R_g . Then R_g is an abstract Cox ring and we find a GIT-cone $\lambda \in \Lambda(R_g)$ with $\tau^\circ \subseteq \lambda^\circ$ and $\hat{X}_g = \bar{X}^{\text{ss}}(\lambda)$. This brings us into the situation of Constructions 2.1 and 2.2, so we have

$$\text{Cl}(X_g) = K, \quad \mathcal{R}(X_g) = R_g, \quad \tau^\circ \subseteq \text{Ample}(X_g).$$

Moreover, for any $g \in U_\mu$ the variables T_1, \dots, T_r form a minimal system of generators for all R_g if and only if we have $\mu \neq w_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, r$.

Constructing a general hypersurface Cox ring with prescribed specifying data essentially means to find a suitable open subset $U \subseteq S_\mu$ such that R_g , where $g \in U$, satisfies the conditions from the above remark. In the subsequent text we present several criterions to check these conditions.

Proposition 5.5. *Consider the setting of Construction 5.1. For $1 \leq i \leq r$ denote by $U_i \subseteq S_\mu$ the set of all $g \in S_\mu$ such that g is prime in S and T_i is prime in R_g . Then $U_i \subseteq S_\mu$ is open. Moreover, U_i is non-empty if and only if there is a μ -homogeneous prime polynomial not depending on T_i .*

By a *Dolgachev polytope* we mean a convex polytope $\Delta \subseteq \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}^r$ of dimension at least four such that each coordinate hyperplane of \mathbb{Q}^r intersects Δ non-trivially and the dual cone of $\text{cone}(\Delta - u; u \in \Delta_0)$ is regular for each one-dimensional face $\Delta_0 \preceq \Delta$.

Proposition 5.6. *In the situation of Construction 5.1, there is a non-empty open subset of polynomials $g \in S_\mu$ such that the ring R_g is factorial provided that one of the following conditions is fulfilled:*

- (i) *K is of rank at most $r - 4$ and torsion free, there is a $g \in S_\mu$ such that T_1, \dots, T_r define primes in R_g , we have $\mu \in \tau^\circ$ and μ is base point free on Z .*
- (ii) *The set $\text{conv}(\nu \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^r; Q(\nu) = \mu)$ is a Dolgachev polytope.*

We combine the concepts of algebraic modifications [5, Sec. 4.1.2] and Σ -homogenizations [21] to provide further factoriality criterions for graded hypersurface rings. These will apply to several cases where the relation degree lies on the boundary of the moving cone. Let us first briefly recall the notion of polynomials arising from Laurent polynomials by homogenization with respect to a lattice fan from [21].

Remark 5.7. Let Σ be a complete lattice fan in \mathbb{Z}^n and v_1, \dots, v_r the primitive lattice vectors generating the rays of Σ . Consider the mutually dual exact sequences

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & L & \longrightarrow & \mathbb{Z}^r & \xrightarrow[e_i \mapsto v_i]{P} & \mathbb{Z}^n \\ & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & \\ 0 & \longleftarrow & K & \xleftarrow{Q} & \mathbb{Z}^r & \xleftarrow{P^*} & \mathbb{Z}^n \longleftarrow 0 \end{array}$$

This induces a pointed K -grading on the polynomial algebra $S = \mathbb{K}[T_1, \dots, T_r]$ via $\deg(T_i) := Q(e_i) \in K$. For any $w \in K$ we denote $S_w \subseteq S$ for the finite-dimensional vector space of homogeneous polynomials of degree w .

Moreover, fix a lattice polytope $B \subseteq \mathbb{Q}^n$ and set

$$a(\Sigma) := (a_1, \dots, a_r) \in \mathbb{Z}^r, \quad a_i := -\min_{u \in B} \langle u, v_i \rangle.$$

We call $\mu = Q(a(\Sigma)) \in K$ the Σ -degree of B . Besides $\mu \in K = \text{Cl}(Z)$ regarded as a divisor class is base point free if Σ refines the normal fan of B . The Σ -homogenization of a Laurent polynomial $f \in \mathbb{K}[T_1^{\pm 1}, \dots, T_n^{\pm 1}]$ with Newton polytope $B(f)$ equal to B is the μ -homogeneous polynomial $g = T^{a(\Sigma)} p^* f \in S$ where $p : \mathbb{T}^r \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^n$ is the homomorphism of tori associated with P . Each spread polynomial $g \in S_\mu$ arises as Σ -homogenization of a Laurent polynomial f with $B(f) = B$.

Let Σ_1, Σ_2 be lattice fans refining the normal fan $\Sigma(B)$ of B . The vector space $V(B)$ of all Laurent polynomials of the form $\sum_{\nu \in B \cap \mathbb{Z}^r} a_\nu T^\nu$ fits into the following commutative diagram of vector space isomorphisms

$$\begin{array}{ccc} S_{\mu_1} & \xrightarrow{\varphi} & S_{\mu_2} \\ & \nwarrow \scriptstyle f \mapsto T^{a(\Sigma_1)} p_1^* f & \nearrow \scriptstyle f \mapsto T^{a(\Sigma_2)} p_2^* f \\ & V(B) & \end{array}$$

Moreover, if $g \in S_{\mu_1}$ is spread, then $\varphi(g) \in S_{\mu_2}$ is spread as well and $g, \varphi(g)$ are homogenizations of a common Laurent polynomial with respect to different fans Σ_i .

We state an adapted version of [5, Thm. 4.1.2.2]; see also [5, Prop. 4.1.2.4].

Theorem 5.8. *Let $f \in \text{LP}(n)$ be a Laurent polynomial and $\Sigma_2 \preceq \Sigma_1 \preceq \Sigma(B(f))$ a refinement of fans in \mathbb{Z}^n . Moreover, let $g_i \in \mathbb{K}[T_1, \dots, T_{r_i}]$ be the respective Σ_i -homogenization of f and consider the K_i -graded algebra*

$$R_{g_i} = \mathbb{K}[T_1, \dots, T_{r_i}] / \langle g_i \rangle.$$

Assume that g_1, g_2 are prime polynomials, T_1, \dots, T_{r_1} define K_1 -primes in R_{g_1} and T_1, \dots, T_{r_2} define K_2 -primes in R_{g_2} . Then the following statements are equivalent.

- (i) *The algebra R_{g_1} is factorially K_1 -graded.*
- (ii) *The algebra R_{g_2} is factorially K_2 -graded.*

Now let us bring this theorem in the context of general hypersurface rings. We observe that factoriality is inherited between general hypersurface rings with relation degrees stemming from a common lattice polytope.

Proposition 5.9. *Let $B \subseteq \mathbb{Q}^n$ be a lattice polytope, $\Sigma_2 \preceq \Sigma_1 \preceq \Sigma(B)$ a refinement of fans in \mathbb{Z}^n , and $\mu_i \in K_i$ the respective Σ_i -degree. Assume that for $i = 1, 2$ there is a μ_i -homogeneous prime polynomial g_i and a non-empty open subset $U_i \subseteq S_{\mu_i}$ such that for all $g_i \in U_i$ the variables T_1, \dots, T_{r_i} define K_i -primes in the K_i -graded algebra*

$$R_{g_i} = \mathbb{K}[T_1, \dots, T_{r_i}] / \langle g_i \rangle.$$

Then the following statements are equivalent.

- (i) *There is a non-empty open subset of polynomials $g_1 \in S_{\mu_1}$ such that R_{g_1} is K_1 -factorial.*
- (ii) *There is a non-empty open subset of polynomials $g_2 \in S_{\mu_2}$ such that R_{g_2} is K_2 -factorial.*

Proof. We know that the subset $U_{\mu_i} \subseteq S_{\mu_i}$ of spread μ_i -homogeneous polynomials is open and non-empty. According to Remark 5.7 there is an isomorphism $\varphi : S_{\mu_1} \rightarrow S_{\mu_2}$ of vector spaces such that g and $\varphi(g)$ arise as Σ_i -homogenization of the same Laurent polynomial whenever $g \in U_{\mu_1}$. Besides, by [20, Lem. 4.9] the μ_i -homogeneous prime polynomials form an open subset of S_{μ_i} , which is non-empty by assumption. Therefore, by suitably shrinking U_1 and U_2 we achieve

- $\varphi(U_1) = U_2$,
- g_1 and $g_2 := \varphi(g_1)$ are respective Σ_i -homogenizations of a common Laurent polynomial whenever $g_1 \in U_1$,
- for every $g_1 \in U_1$ the ring R_{g_1} is integral and $T_1, \dots, T_{r_1} \in R_{g_1}$ are K_1 -prime,
- for every $g_2 \in U_2$ the ring R_{g_2} is integral and $T_1, \dots, T_{r_2} \in R_{g_2}$ are K_2 -prime.

In this situation Theorem 5.8 tells us that for any $g_1 \in U_1$ and $g_2 := \varphi(g_1)$ we have

$$R_{g_1} \text{ is } K_1\text{-factorial} \iff R_{g_2} \text{ is } K_2\text{-factorial}.$$

Now let $V_1 \subseteq S_{\mu_1}$ be a non-empty open subset such that R_{g_1} is factorially graded for each $g_1 \in V_1$. Then $V_2 := \varphi(U_1 \cap V_1)$ is a non-empty open subset of S_{μ_2} and R_{g_2} is K_2 -factorial for all $g_2 \in V_2$. This proves “(i) \Rightarrow (ii)”. The inverse implication is shown analogously. \square

Remark 5.10. In the situation of Construction 5.1, assume that Z is a fake weighted projective space, i.e., Z is \mathbb{Q} -factorial and $\text{Cl}(Z) = K$ is of rank one. Then $\mu \in \text{Cl}(Z)$ is base point free if and only if there is an $l_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ with $\mu = l_i w_i$ for all $1 \leq i \leq 6$.

According to [21, Rem. 5.8] general base point free hypersurfaces in fake weighted projective spaces of dimension at least four always stem from Cox ring embeddings.

Proposition 5.11. *In the situation of Construction 5.1, suppose that K is of rank one, $r \geq 5$ holds and that for any $i = 1, \dots, r$ there is an $l_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ with $\mu = l_i w_i$. Then there is a non-empty open subset of polynomials $g \in S_\mu$ such that the ring R_g is normal and K -factorial, and $T_1, \dots, T_r \in R_g$ are prime.*

Corollary 5.12. *Let $n \geq 4$, $B \subseteq \mathbb{Q}^n$ an integral n -simplex, Σ a fan in \mathbb{Z}^n refining the normal fan of B , and $\mu \in K$ the Σ -degree of B . Assume that there is a μ -homogeneous prime polynomial g and a non-empty open subset $U \subseteq S_\mu$ such that for all $g \in U$ the variables T_1, \dots, T_r define K -primes in the K -graded algebra*

$$R_g = \mathbb{K}[T_1, \dots, T_r]/\langle g \rangle.$$

Then there is a non-empty open subset of polynomials $g \in S_\mu$ such that R_g is K -factorial.

Proof. Since B is a simplex, the toric variety associated with $\Sigma(B)$ is a fake weighted projective space. Now we apply Proposition 5.9 to the refinement $\Sigma \preceq \Sigma(B)$ and the suitable open subset of polynomials provided by Proposition 5.11. \square

In many situations we encounter it can be read off straight from the specifying data whether the conditions from Corollary 5.12 are met.

Corollary 5.13. *Situation as in Construction 5.1. Assume that we have $r \geq 5$, $K = \mathbb{Z}^2$ and the degree matrix is of the form*

$$Q = [w_1, \dots, w_{r+1}] = \begin{bmatrix} x_1 & \dots & x_r & 0 \\ -d_1 & \dots & -d_r & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad x_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}, d_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}.$$

Then for any $\mu = (\mu_1, \mu_2) \in K = \mathbb{Z}^2$ satisfying the subsequent conditions there is a non-empty open subset of polynomials $g \in S_\mu$ such that R_g is factorial:

- (i) for each i there exists some $l_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ with $\mu = l_i x_i$,
- (ii) $\mu_2 = -\min_{\nu} \nu_1 d_1 + \cdots + d_r \nu_r$ where the minimum runs over all lattice points $\nu = (\nu_1, \dots, \nu_r) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^r$ with $\nu_1 x_1 + \cdots + \nu_r x_r = \mu_1$,
- (iii) there is some $g \in S_{\mu}$ such that T_1, \dots, T_{r+1} define primes in R_g .

Proof. Observe that each $r-1$ of x_1, \dots, x_r generate \mathbb{Z} as a group since the first coordinate of w_{r+1} vanishes and the \mathbb{Z}^2 -grading associated with Q is almost free according to the assumptions made in Construction 5.1. Consider the weighted projective space

$$Z' := \mathbb{P}(x_1, \dots, x_r).$$

Condition (i) ensures that $\mu_1 \in \mathbb{Z} = \text{Cl}(Z')$ regarded as a divisor class on Z' is ample and base point free. Choose some representative $D \in \text{WDiv}(Z')$ of μ_1 . The associated divisorial polytope $B := B(D) \subseteq \mathbb{Q}^{r-1}$ is a full-dimensional integral simplex.

The normal fan Σ' of B is a lattice fan in \mathbb{Z}^{r-1} corresponding with Z' . Write $v_1, \dots, v_r \in \mathbb{Z}^{r-1}$ for the primitive ray generators of Σ' . Observe that the maps

$$P' : \mathbb{Z}^r \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^{r-1}, \quad e_i \mapsto v_i, \quad Q' : \mathbb{Z}^r \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}, \quad e_i \mapsto x_i$$

fit into a mutually dual pair of exact sequences as shown in Remark 5.7. Now set

$$v_{r+1} := d_1 v_1 + \cdots + d_r v_r \in \mathbb{Z}^{r-1}, \quad d := (d_1, \dots, d_r) \in \mathbb{Z}^r.$$

The second row of Q encodes the relation statisfied by v_1, \dots, v_{r+1} thus indicates that the following maps constitute a pair of mutually dual sequences as well

$$P : \mathbb{Z}^{r+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^n, \quad e_i \mapsto v_i, \quad Q : \mathbb{Z}^{r+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^2, \quad e_i \mapsto w_i.$$

Since the first r columns of Q generate \mathbb{Z}^2 , the vector $v_{r+1} \in \mathbb{Z}^{r-1}$ is primitive; see [5, Lemma 2.1.4.1]. This allows us to consider the stellar subdivision Σ of Σ' along v_{r+1} .

We show that $\mu \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ is the Σ -degree μ_B of B . First note that μ_1 is the Σ' -degree of B by construction. Consider

$$a' := a(\Sigma') = (a'_1, \dots, a'_r), \quad a := a(\Sigma) = (a_1, \dots, a_{r+1})$$

from Remark 5.7. Since Σ arises from Σ' by introducing an $(r+1)$ -th ray, we have $a_i = a'_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, r$. From this we infer

$$\mu_1 = Q'(a') = a_1 x_1 + \cdots + a_r x_r, \quad \mu_B = Q(a) = a_1 w_1 + \cdots + a_{r+1} w_{r+1}.$$

As the first coordinate of w_{r+1} vanishes, we conclude that the first coordinate of μ_B equals μ_1 . It remains to investigate the second coordinate of μ_B . We have

$$a_{r+1} = -\min_{u \in B} \langle u, v_{r+1} \rangle = -\min_{u \in B} \langle u, P'(d) \rangle = -\min_{u \in B} \langle (P')^* u, d \rangle.$$

Using this presentation of a_{r+1} , the second coordinate of μ_B is given as

$$a_{r+1} - \sum_{i=1}^r a_i d_i = -\min_{u \in B} \langle (P')^* u, d \rangle - \langle a', d \rangle = -\min_{u \in B} \langle (P')^* u + a', d \rangle.$$

From condition (ii) and the fact that the lattice points $\nu \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^r$ with $Q'(\nu) = \mu_1$ are precisely those of the form $\nu = (P')^* u + a'$, where $u \in B \cap \mathbb{Z}^{r-1}$, follows that the second coordinate of μ_B equals μ_2 . Altogether we have verified $\mu = \mu_B$.

Note that condition (iii) ensures the existence of a μ -homogeneous prime polynomial; see Proposition 5.5. The above discussion combined with condition (iii) ensures that we may apply Corollary 5.12 to B and Σ which finishes the proof. \square

6. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1: VERIFICATION

The second mission in the proof of Theorem 1.1 is to ensure that the list of specifying data given there does not contain any superfluous items. So we have to verify that all items from Theorem 1.1 are realized by pairwise non-isomorphic smooth Calabi-Yau threefolds having a (general) hypersurface Cox ring.

Let us highlight generator and relation degrees of a graded algebra as invariants of hypersurface Cox rings that distinguish varieties with different specifying data; see [19, Sec. 2] for details.

Remark 6.1. Let $R = \bigoplus_{w \in K} R_w$ be an integral pointed K -graded algebra. We denote $S(R) = \{w \in K; R_w \neq 0\}$. An important invariant of R is the *set of generator degrees*

$$\Omega_R := \{w \in S(R); R_w \not\subseteq R_{<w}\} \subseteq K$$

where $R_{<w}$ denotes the subalgebra of R spanned by all homogeneous components $R_{w'}$ such that $w = w' + w_0$ holds for some $0 \neq w_0 \in S(R)$. In the situation of Setting 3.1 the set of generator degrees is given as

$$\Omega_R = \{w_1, \dots, w_r\} \subseteq K.$$

The set of generator degrees is unique and does not depend on a graded presentation of R . From this emerges another invariant: Choose pairwise different $u_1, \dots, u_l \in K$ such that $\Omega_R = \{u_1, \dots, u_l\}$ and set $d_i := \dim_{\mathbb{K}} R_{u_i}$. By suitably reordering u_1, \dots, u_l we achieve $d_1 \leq \dots \leq d_l$. We call (d_1, \dots, d_l) the *generator degree dimension tuple* of R . If two graded algebras are isomorphic, then they have the same generator degree dimension tuple.

Moreover, if R admits an irredundant graded presentation $R = \mathbb{K}[T_1, \dots, T_r]/\langle g \rangle$, then the *relation degree* $\mu = \deg(g) \in K$ is unique and does not depend on the choice of the minimal graded presentation.

Lemma 6.2. Consider n -dimensional varieties X_1, X_2 with hypersurface Cox rings having relation degree μ_1 resp. μ_2 . If X_1 and X_2 are isomorphic, then $\mu_1^n = \mu_2^n$ where μ_i^n is the self-intersection number of μ_i regarded as a divisor class on X_i .

Proof. Let $\varphi : X_1 \rightarrow X_2$ be an isomorphism. Then the induced pull-back maps

$$\varphi^* : \mathcal{R}(X_2) \rightarrow \mathcal{R}(X_1), \quad \tilde{\varphi}^* : \text{Cl}(X_2) \rightarrow \text{Cl}(X_1)$$

form an isomorphism $(\varphi^*, \tilde{\varphi}^*)$ of $\text{Cl}(X_i)$ -graded algebras. From this we deduce that the pull-back $\tilde{\varphi}^*(\mu_2) \in \text{Cl}(X_1)$ of the relation degree $\mu_2 \in \text{Cl}(X_2)$ of $\mathcal{R}(X_2)$ is the unique relation degree $\mu_1 \in \text{Cl}(X_1)$ of $\mathcal{R}(X_1)$; see also Remark 6.1. Hence $\mu_1^n = \tilde{\varphi}^*(\mu_2)^n = \mu_2^n$. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.1: Verification. We show that each item from Theorem 1.1 indeed stems from a smooth Calabi-Yau threefold with a general hypersurface Cox ring.

Let (Q, μ, u) be specifying data as presented in Theorem 1.1. Consider the linear K -grading on $S = \mathbb{K}[T_1, \dots, T_6]$ given by $Q : \mathbb{Z}^6 \rightarrow K$. We run Construction 5.1 with the unique GIT-chamber $\tau \in \Lambda(S)$ containing u in its relative interior τ° . In doing so $u \in \text{Mov}(S)^\circ$ guarantees $\tau^\circ \subseteq \text{Mov}(S)^\circ$. In what follows we construct a non-empty open subset $U \subseteq U_\mu$ of polynomials satisfying the conditions from Remark 5.4, thereby obtaining a smooth general Calabi-Yau hypersurface Cox ring. This is done by starting with $U := U_\mu$ and shrinking U successively.

Since $\mu \neq w_i$ holds for all i , Remark 5.4 ensures that T_1, \dots, T_6 form a minimal system of generators for R_g , whenever $g \in U_\mu$. We want to achieve K -primeness of $T_1, \dots, T_6 \in R$. Here Numbers 2 and 7 have to be treated separately. For all remaining items from Theorem 1.1 and any $1 \leq i \leq 6$ we find in Table 1 on

page 31 a μ -homogeneous prime binomial $T^\kappa - T^\nu \in S$ not depending on T_i . Thus, Proposition 5.5 allows us to shrink U such that T_1, \dots, T_6 define primes in R_g for all $g \in U$.

Number 2. For Number 2 observe that all the generator degrees $w_i = \deg(T_i)$ are indecomposable in the weight monoid

$$S(R) = \{u \in K; R_u \neq 0\} = \text{Pos}_{\mathbb{Z}}(w_1, \dots, w_6) \subseteq K.$$

Thus every $T_i \in R_g$ is K -irreducible. As soon as we know that R_g is K -factorial, we may conclude that T_i is K -prime.

Number 7. Table 1 on page 31 shows μ -homogeneous prime binomials $T^\kappa - T^\nu \in S$ not depending on T_i for $i = 1, \dots, 5$. Thus, Proposition 5.5 allows us to shrink U such that T_1, \dots, T_5 define primes in R_g for all $g \in U$.

Observe that T_6 defines a K -prime in R_g if and only if $h := g(T_1, \dots, T_5, 0) \in S$ is K -prime. Since S is a UFD, thus K -factorial, the latter is equivalent to $h \in S$ being K -irreducible. The only monomials of degree μ not depending on T_6 are T_4^3 and T_5^3 , hence $h = aT_4^3 - bT_5^3$. Note that T_4^3, T_5^3 are vertices of the polytope

$$\text{conv}(\nu \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^6; \deg(T^\nu) = \nu).$$

From g being spread we infer $a, b \in \mathbb{K}^*$. For degree reasons, any non-trivial factorization of h has a linear form $\ell = a'T_4 + b'T_5$ with $a', b' \in \mathbb{K}^*$ among the factors. From $w_4 \neq w_5$ we deduce that such ℓ is not homogeneous w.r.t the K -grading. We conclude that h admits no non-trivial presentation as product of homogeneous elements, i.e., $h \in S$ is K -irreducible. This implies that $T_6 \in R_g$ is K -prime.

We take the next step, that is to make sure that each R_g is normal and factorially graded. For example this holds when R_g admits unique factorization. Whenever K is torsion-free the converse is also true. Here we encounter different classes of candidates.

Numbers 1, 2, 5, 6, 10 – 22, and 26 – 28. One directly checks that the convex hull over the $\nu \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^6$ with $Q(\nu) = \mu$ is Dolgachev polytope; we have used the Magma function `IsDolgachevPolytope` from [28] for this task. Proposition 5.6 (ii) ensures that R_g is factorial after suitably shrinking U .

Numbers 3, 4, and 30. Here, the cone $\tau' = \text{cone}(w_3) \in \Lambda(S)$ satisfies $(\tau')^\circ \subseteq \text{Mov}(S)^\circ$. Thus, Construction 5.1 gives rise to a toric variety Z' . We have $\mu \in (\tau')^\circ$ and one directly verifies that μ is basepoint free for Z' . Hence Proposition 5.6 (i) shows that after shrinking U suitably, R_g admits unique factorization for all $g \in U$.

Number 7. We are aiming to apply Corollary 5.12. For this purpose we have to verify that μ occurs as degree associated with a simplex in the sense of Remark 5.7. The following polytope does the job:

$$B = \text{conv}((0, 0, 0, 0), (0, 0, 0, 3), (0, 0, 9, -3), (3, 0, 3, -1), (3, 3, 3, -2)) \subseteq \mathbb{Q}^4.$$

The rays of its normal fan $\Sigma(B)$ are given as the columns of the following matrix

$$P_1 = \begin{bmatrix} -2 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & -1 \\ -2 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ -3 & 3 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Now consider the stellar subdivision Σ_2 of $\Sigma(B)$ along $(-1, 0, 0, 0)$. The associated data of Σ_2 is $K_2 = \mathbb{Z}^2 \times \mathbb{Z}/3\mathbb{Z}$ and

$$P_2 = \begin{bmatrix} -2 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 1 & -1 \\ -1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & -1 & 0 \\ -2 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -3 & 3 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad Q_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & -3 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 2 & 1 & 2 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

We compute the Σ_2 -degree μ_2 of B . Observe $a(\Sigma_2) = (9, 0, 0, 0, 3)$. From this we infer $\mu_2 = Q_2(a(\Sigma_2)) = (0, 3, \overline{0})$. Note that (Q_2, μ_2) coincides with the specifying data (Q, μ) for which we run the verification process. In the previous step of this process we have ensured that $U \subseteq S_\mu$ is a non-empty open subset of prime polynomials such that T_1, \dots, T_6 define K -primes in R_g whenever $g \in U$. According to Corollary 5.12 we may shrink U such that R_g is K -factorial for each $g \in U$.

Finally, Bechtold's criterion [8, Cor. 0.6; 18, Prop. 4.1] directly implies that R_g is normal since each five of w_1, \dots, w_6 generate K as a group.

Numbers 8, 9, 10, and 24, 25. By applying a suitable coordinate change we achieve that the degree matrix Q and the relation degree μ are as in the following table.

No.	Q	μ
8	$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 6 & 9 & 0 \\ -1 & -1 & -1 & -4 & -6 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$	$(18, -12)$
9	$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 6 & 9 & 0 \\ -1 & -1 & -1 & -4 & -6 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$	$(8, -4)$
10	$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & -1 \end{bmatrix}$	$(8, -4)$
24	$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 2 & 2 & 4 & 3 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 & -1 & -2 & -2 & -1 \end{bmatrix}$	$(12, -6)$
25	$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 7 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & -4 & -1 \end{bmatrix}$	$(14, -7)$

We apply Corollary 5.13. In the last three cases it is necessary to reorder the variables such that Q has precisely the shape requested by Corollary 5.13. Now the conditions from there can be directly checked. As a result, we may shrink U such that each R_g is a factorial ring.

Number 26. Again we want to use Corollary 5.12 thus we have to present μ as degree associated with a simplex in the sense of Remark 5.7. Consider

$$B = \text{conv}((0, 0, 0, 0), (0, 0, 0, 8), (0, 8, 0, 0), (0, 0, 4, 0), (2, 2, 1, 2)) \subseteq \mathbb{Q}^4.$$

Its normal fan $\Sigma_1 = \Sigma(B)$ has the rays given by the columns of the matrix

$$P_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 & 3 \\ 1 & 0 & 2 & -1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 2 & -1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 3 & -1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Now consider the stellar subdivision Σ_2 of $\Sigma(B)$ along $(1, 0, 0, 0)$. Here associated data of Σ_2 is given by $K_2 = \mathbb{Z}^2$ and

$$P_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 & 3 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 2 & -1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 2 & -1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 3 & -1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad Q_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 2 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 3 & 0 \\ -2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

We compute the Σ_2 -degrees μ_2 of B . Observe $a(\Sigma_2) = (0, 8, 0, 0, 0)$. From this we infer $\mu_2 = Q_2(a(\Sigma_2)) = (8, 0)$. Here (Q_2, μ_2) equals (Q, μ) from the specifying data for which we run the verification process. In the previous step of this process we have ensured that $U \subseteq S_\mu$ is a non-empty open subset such that T_1, \dots, T_6 define primes in R_g whenever $g \in U$. Now Corollary 5.12 shows that we may shrink U such that R_g is factorial for each $g \in U$.

At this point we have that U defines a general hypersurface Cox ring. Note that Proposition 2.4 immediately yields that the corresponding varieties X_g are weakly Calabi-Yau. The next step is to attain X_g being smooth. Checking the condition from Proposition 5.2 with the help of the Magma program `IsMuAmbientSmooth` from [28] shows that Z_μ is smooth in all 30 cases. Observe that we have $\mu \in \tau$ except for Numbers 12, 16, 18, and 27. Whenever $\mu \in \tau$ holds we may apply Proposition 5.3 allowing us to shrink U once more such that X_g is smooth for all $g \in U$. The four exceptional cases turn out to be small quasimodifications of smooth weakly Calabi-Yau threefolds, hence are smooth by Proposition 4.1. Eventually Remark 2.5 (ii) ensures that X_g is Calabi-Yau.

The last task in the proof of Theorem 1.1 is to make sure that two varieties from different families from Theorem 1.1 are non-isomorphic. Note that if two varieties from Theorem 1.1 are isomorphic, then their Cox rings are isomorphic as graded rings. For each family from Theorem 1.1 we give the number l of generator degrees, the entries of the generator degree dimension tuple (d_1, \dots, d_l) and the self-intersection number μ^3 of the relation degree in the following table.

No.	l	d_1	d_2	d_3	d_4	d_5	d_6	μ^3	No.	l	d_1	d_2	d_3	d_4	d_5	μ^3
1	2	3	3	–	–	–	–	486	16	4	1	2	4	8	–	512
2	6	1	1	1	1	1	1	162	17	4	1	2	5	9	–	539
3	3	2	2	6	–	–	–	512	18	4	1	2	5	9	–	512
4	4	2	2	5	31	–	–	864	19	4	1	3	4	10	–	567
5	3	1	3	5	–	–	–	513	20	4	1	3	4	32	–	896
6	6	1	1	1	1	2	3	243	21	4	1	3	7	35	–	992
7	3	1	3	8	–	–	–	594	22	5	1	2	3	4	28	784
8	4	1	3	29	66	–	–	1944	23	5	1	2	4	7	32	912
9	3	1	2	6	–	–	–	512	24	5	1	1	3	4	8	432
10	4	1	2	5	31	–	–	864	25	4	1	1	4	21	–	686
11	3	2	3	7	–	–	–	513	26	4	1	1	3	14	–	512
12	3	2	3	7	–	–	–	512	27	5	1	2	3	6	31	864
13	3	2	3	31	–	–	–	864	28	5	1	2	3	6	31	872
14	4	1	2	4	31	–	–	864	29	5	1	1	3	4	29	808
15	4	1	2	4	8	–	–	520	30	5	1	1	3	4	4	432

Most of the varieties from Theorem 1.1 are distinguished by the generator degree dimension tuple. Note that the pairs having the same generator dimension degree tuple are precisely Numbers 11 & 12, 15 & 16, 17 & 18 and 27 & 28 as they share the same Cox ring. These pairs can be distinguished by the relation degree self-intersection number; see Lemma 6.2. \square

TABLE 1. Binomials used to ensure primeness of $T_1, \dots, T_6 \in R_g$ in the proof of Theorem 1.1

No.	T_1	T_2	T_3	T_4	T_5	T_6
1	$-T_2^3 T_5 T_6^2 + T_3^3 T_4^3$	$-T_1^3 T_5 T_6^2 + T_3^3 T_4^3$	$T_1^3 T_4^3 - T_2^3 T_5 T_6^2$	$T_1^3 T_5^3 - T_2^3 T_3^2 T_6^3$	$T_1^3 T_4^3 - T_2^3 T_3^2 T_6^3$	$T_1^3 T_5^3 - T_2^3 T_3^2 T_4^3$
2	—	—	—	—	—	—
3	$-T_2^3 T_4 T_5^3 + T_3^4$	$-T_1^3 T_4 T_5^3 + T_3^4$	$T_1^3 T_2 T_5^2 T_6^2 - T_4^4$	$T_1^3 T_2 T_5^2 T_6^2 - T_3^4$	$-T_1^3 T_2 T_6^4 + T_3^4$	$-T_1^3 T_2 T_5^4 + T_3^4$
4	$-T_2^6 T_5^6 T_6 + T_4^2$	$-T_1^6 T_5^6 T_6 + T_4^2$	$-T_1^3 T_2^3 T_5^6 + T_4^2$	$T_1 T_2^5 T_5^6 T_6 - T_3^6$	$-T_2^6 T_6^6 + T_3^3 T_4$	$-T_2^6 T_5^6 + T_3^3 T_4$
5	$-T_2^2 T_5^3 + T_3^5 T_6^3$	$-T_1^2 T_5^3 + T_3^5 T_6^3$	$T_1^5 T_6^3 - T_2^2 T_5^3$	$-T_1^5 T_6^3 + T_2^2 T_5^3$	$-T_1^5 T_6^3 + T_2^2 T_4^3$	$T_2^2 T_5^3 - T_3^3 T_4^3$
6	$-T_2^5 T_5 T_6^2 + T_3 T_4^3$	$-T_1^5 T_5 T_6^2 + T_3 T_4^3$	$T_1 T_4^3 - T_2^5 T_5 T_6^2$	$-T_1^4 T_3^3 T_6^3 + T_2 T_5^3$	$-T_1^4 T_3^3 T_6^3 + T_2 T_4^3$	$T_2 T_5^3 - T_3 T_4^3$
7	$-T_2^4 T_3^2 T_4 T_6^2 + T_5^3$	$-T_1^4 T_3^2 T_4 T_6^2 + T_5^3$	$-T_1^4 T_2^3 T_4 T_6^2 + T_5^3$	$T_1^2 T_2^5 T_3^2 T_6^3 - T_5^3$	$T_1^2 T_2^5 T_3^2 T_6^3 - T_4^3$	—
8	$-T_2^{11} T_3^7 T_6^6 + T_5^2$	$-T_1^{11} T_3^7 T_6^6 + T_5^2$	$-T_1^7 T_2^{11} T_6^6 + T_5^2$	$-T_1^{15} T_2^2 T_3 T_6^6 + T_5^2$	$T_1^2 T_2 T_3^{15} T_6^6 - T_4^3$	$T_4^3 - T_5^2$
9	$-T_2 T_3^3 + T_4^4$	$T_1^3 T_3 T_5^5 T_6 - T_4^4$	$T_1^3 T_2 T_5^5 T_6 - T_4^4$	$T_1^3 T_3 T_5^5 T_6 - T_4^2$	$-T_1^2 T_3^2 T_4^4 + T_2^2 T_4$	$-T_1^2 T_3^2 T_4^4 + T_2^2 T_4$
10	$T_2^5 T_3 - T_4^2$	$-T_1^5 T_3 T_5^5 T_6 + T_4^2$	$-T_1^5 T_2 T_5^5 T_6 + T_4^2$	$T_1^6 T_5^{11} T_6 - T_2^2 T_4^3$	$T_2^5 T_3 - T_4^2$	$T_2^5 T_3 - T_4^2$
11	$-T_2^4 T_5^3 + T_3^3 T_4 T_6^2$	$-T_1^4 T_5^3 + T_3^3 T_4 T_6^2$	$T_1^3 T_4 T_6^2 - T_2^4 T_5^3$	$T_1^4 T_5^3 - T_2^2 T_3^2 T_6^3$	$T_1^2 T_2^2 T_6^3 - T_3 T_4^3$	$T_1^2 T_2^2 T_5^3 - T_3 T_4^3$
12	$-T_2^2 T_5^3 + T_3^3 T_4 T_6^2$	$-T_1^4 T_5^3 + T_3^3 T_4 T_6^2$	$T_1^3 T_4 T_6^2 - T_2^2 T_5^3$	$T_1^4 T_5^3 - T_2^2 T_3^2 T_6^3$	$T_1^2 T_2^2 T_6^3 - T_3 T_4^3$	$T_1^2 T_2^2 T_5^3 - T_3 T_4^3$
13	$-T_2 T_3^5 T_4^4 + T_4^2$	$-T_1 T_3^5 T_4^4 + T_4^2$	$-T_1^5 T_2 T_5^4 + T_4^2$	$T_1^5 T_2 T_5^4 - T_3^6 T_6^4$	$-T_1 T_2^2 T_3^3 T_6^4 + T_4^2$	$-T_1 T_2^2 T_3^3 T_5^4 + T_4^2$
14	$T_2^3 T_3 T_5 T_6 - T_4^2$	$-T_1^4 T_3^2 T_5 T_6 + T_4^2$	$-T_1^4 T_2^2 T_5 T_6 + T_4^2$	$T_1^5 T_3 T_5^7 - T_2^6 T_6^2$	$-T_1^3 T_3^3 T_6^5 + T_4^2$	$-T_1^3 T_3^3 T_5^5 + T_4^2$
15	$-T_2^3 T_4 T_6 + T_3^4 T_5^2$	$T_1 T_4^3 - T_3^4 T_6^2$	$T_1 T_4^3 - T_2^4 T_6^2$	$-T_1^4 T_5^6 + T_2 T_3^3 T_6^2$	$T_1^4 T_6^6 - T_2 T_3 T_4^2$	$T_1^4 T_5^6 - T_2 T_3 T_4^2$
16	$-T_2^3 T_4 T_6 + T_3^4 T_5^2$	$T_1 T_4^3 - T_3^4 T_6^2$	$T_1 T_4^3 - T_2^4 T_6^2$	$-T_1^4 T_5^6 + T_2 T_3^3 T_6^2$	$T_1^4 T_6^6 - T_2 T_3 T_4^2$	$T_1^4 T_5^6 - T_2 T_3 T_4^2$
17	$T_2^4 T_5 - T_3^3 T_4$	$-T_1^2 T_4^2 T_5^3 + T_3^4 T_6$	$-T_1^2 T_4^2 T_5^3 + T_3^4 T_6$	$-T_1^4 T_6^9 + T_3^4 T_5$	$-T_1^4 T_6^9 + T_3^3 T_4$	$-T_1^4 T_5^9 + T_3^3 T_4$
18	$T_2^4 T_5 - T_3^3 T_4$	$-T_1^2 T_4^2 T_5^3 + T_3^4 T_6$	$-T_1^2 T_4^2 T_5^3 + T_3^4 T_6$	$-T_1^4 T_6^9 + T_3^4 T_5$	$-T_1^4 T_6^9 + T_3^3 T_4$	$-T_1^4 T_5^9 + T_3^3 T_4$
19	$-T_4^4 T_5^2 T_6 + T_4^3$	$-T_3^4 T_5^2 T_6 + T_4^3$	$-T_1^4 T_5^2 T_6 + T_4^3$	$T_1^4 T_3^3 T_6^3 - T_3^2 T_5^3$	$-T_2^2 T_4^4 T_6^3 + T_4^3$	$-T_2^2 T_3^2 T_5^3 + T_4^3$
20	$-T_2^4 T_3 T_5^3 T_6 + T_4^2$	$-T_1^4 T_3 T_5^3 T_6 + T_4^2$	$-T_1 T_2^2 T_5^3 T_6 + T_4^2$	$T_1^8 T_4^4 - T_2^3 T_3 T_5^4$	$T_2^3 T_5^4 T_6^4 - T_4^2$	$T_2^3 T_3 T_5^4 - T_4^2$
21	$T_2^7 T_3^3 T_4^4 - T_4^2$	$T_1^7 T_3^3 T_4^4 - T_4^2$	$T_1^3 T_2^7 T_6^4 - T_4^2$	$-T_1 T_2^9 T_6^4 + T_3^2 T_4^4$	$T_1^4 T_2 T_3^5 T_4^4 - T_2^2$	$-T_1 T_2 T_3^4 T_4^4 + T_2^2$
22	$T_2^5 T_3^2 T_5 T_6^3 - T_4^2$	$T_1^5 T_3^2 T_5 T_6^3 - T_4^2$	$T_1^3 T_4 T_5^2 - T_2^{10} T_4^6$	$T_1^6 T_5^4 - T_2^4 T_3^3 T_6^4$	$-T_1^3 T_2^5 T_3 T_6^4 + T_4^2$	$-T_1^3 T_2^3 T_5^4 + T_4^2$
23	$T_2^3 T_3 T_5^3 T_6 - T_4^2$	$T_1 T_3^2 T_5 T_6 - T_4^2$	$-T_1^3 T_2^5 T_5^2 T_6^2 + T_4^2$	$-T_1^{10} T_2^4 T_6^4 + T_3 T_5^4$	$-T_1^9 T_2^5 T_6^4 + T_4^2$	$-T_3 T_5^4 + T_4^2$
24	$-T_2^6 + T_3^4 T_4$	$-T_1^3 T_4 T_5 T_6^5 + T_3^6$	$-T_1^3 T_4 T_5 T_6^5 + T_3^6$	$-T_1^7 T_5^4 + T_2^5 T_3$	$-T_1^4 T_4 T_6^8 + T_3^6$	$-T_1 T_3^3 T_5^2 + T_3^3$
25	$-T_2^4 T_3^3 + T_4^7$	$-T_1 T_3^{14} + T_3^5 T_2^2$	$-T_1^7 T_6^{14} + T_2^2 T_4^2$	$-T_1^7 T_6^{14} + T_2^2 T_3^5$	$-T_1^2 T_4^5 T_6^4 + T_4^7$	$T_1 T_5^2 - T_2 T_3^3 T_4^2$
26	$-T_2^7 T_3 + T_4^8$	$-T_1 T_3^6 T_2^2 + T_4^8$	$-T_1 T_2^6 T_2^2 + T_4^8$	$-T_1 T_3^6 T_2^2 + T_2^8$	$-T_1^4 T_6^8 + T_2 T_3 T_4^6$	$-T_1 T_5^2 + T_2^6 T_3^2$
27	$-T_2^3 T_3 T_5 T_6^2 + T_4^2$	$-T_1^3 T_3 T_5 T_6^2 + T_4^2$	$T_1^7 T_5^3 T_6^3 - T_2^4$	$-T_1^2 T_2^2 T_6^6 + T_5^3 T_6$	$-T_1^5 T_3^3 T_3 T_5^5 + T_4^2$	$-T_1 T_2 T_3^2 T_4^4 + T_4^2$
28	$-T_2^3 T_3 T_5 T_6^2 + T_4^2$	$-T_1^3 T_3 T_5 T_6^2 + T_4^2$	$T_1^7 T_5^3 T_6^3 - T_2^4$	$-T_1^2 T_2^2 T_6^6 + T_5^3 T_6$	$-T_1^5 T_3^3 T_3 T_5^5 + T_4^2$	$-T_1 T_2 T_3^2 T_4^4 + T_4^2$
29	$-T_3^7 T_5 T_6 + T_4^2$	$-T_3^7 T_5 T_6 + T_4^2$	$-T_2^7 T_5 T_6 + T_4^2$	$T_1 T_2^7 T_3^3 - T_6^6 T_5^2$	$-T_1 T_2^6 T_3 T_3^3 + T_4^2$	$-T_3^3 T_5^5 + T_4^2$
30	$T_2^2 T_5^2 - T_3^5 T_4$	$-T_1 T_4^4 T_5 + T_3^6$	$-T_1^3 T_5^3 + T_2^2 T_4^2 T_6^2$	$-T_1^3 T_5^3 + T_2^2 T_3^2 T_6^2$	$-T_1^2 T_2^2 T_4^6 + T_3^3 T_4^3$	$-T_2^2 T_5^2 + T_3 T_4^5$

REFERENCES

- [1] Michela Artebani, Paola Comparin, and Robin Guillot, *Families of Calabi-Yau hypersurfaces in \mathbb{Q} -Fano toric varieties*, J. Math. Pures Appl. (9) **106** (2016), no. 2, 319–341, DOI 10.1016/j.matpur.2016.02.012 (English, with English and French summaries). MR3515305 ↑3
- [2] ———, *Quasismooth hypersurfaces in toric varieties*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **147** (2019), no. 11, 4565–4579. ↑5
- [3] Michela Artebani, Claudia Correa Deisler, and Antonio Laface, *Cox rings of K3 surfaces of Picard number three*, J. Algebra **565** (2021), 598–626, DOI 10.1016/j.jalgebra.2020.08.016. MR4163070 ↑1
- [4] Michela Artebani, Jürgen Hausen, and Antonio Laface, *On Cox rings of K3 surfaces*, Compos. Math. **146** (2010), no. 4, 964–998, DOI 10.1112/S0010437X09004576. MR2660680 ↑1
- [5] Ivan Arzhantsev, Ulrich Derenthal, Jürgen Hausen, and Antonio Laface, *Cox rings*, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, vol. 144, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2015. ↑3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 23, 24, 26
- [6] Victor V. Batyrev, *Dual polyhedra and mirror symmetry for Calabi-Yau hypersurfaces in toric varieties*, J. Algebraic Geom. **3** (1994), no. 3, 493–535. MR1269718 ↑3
- [7] Victor Batyrev, *The stringy Euler number of Calabi-Yau hypersurfaces in toric varieties and the Mavlyutov duality*, Pure Appl. Math. Q. **13** (2017), no. 1, 1–47, DOI 10.4310/PAMQ.2017.v13.n1.a1. MR3858013 ↑3
- [8] Benjamin Bechtold, *Valuative and geometric characterizations of Cox sheaves*, J. Commut. Algebra **10** (2018), no. 1, 1–43, DOI 10.1216/JCA-2018-10-1-1. MR3804845 ↑29
- [9] Gavin Brown and Konstantinos Georgiadis, *Polarized Calabi-Yau 3-folds in codimension 4*, Math. Nachr. **290** (2017), no. 5–6, 710–725, DOI 10.1002/mana.201600123. MR3636373 ↑1
- [10] Gavin Brown and Alexander Kasprzyk, *Four-dimensional projective orbifold hypersurfaces*, Exp. Math. **25** (2016), no. 2, 176–193, DOI 10.1080/10586458.2015.1054054. MR3463567 ↑1
- [11] Gavin Brown, Alexander Kasprzyk, and Lei Zhu, *Gorenstein formats, canonical and Calabi-Yau threefolds* (2014), available at 1409.4644. ↑1
- [12] P. Candelas, A. M. Dale, C. A. Lütken, and R. Schimmrigk, *Complete intersection Calabi-Yau manifolds*, Nuclear Phys. B **298** (1988), no. 3, 493–525, DOI 10.1016/0550-3213(88)90352-5. MR928308 ↑1
- [13] Weichung Chen, Gabriele Di Cerbo, Jingjun Han, Chen Jiang, and Roberto Svaldi, *Birational boundedness of rationally connected Calabi-Yau 3-folds*, Adv. Math. **378** (2021), 107541, 32, DOI 10.1016/j.aim.2020.107541. MR4191257 ↑3
- [14] Sławomir Cynk and Beata Kocel-Cynk, *Classification of double octic Calabi-Yau threefolds with $h^{1,2} \leq 1$ defined by an arrangement of eight planes*, Commun. Contemp. Math. **22** (2020), no. 1, 1850082, 38, DOI 10.1142/S0219199718500827. MR4064906 ↑1
- [15] James Gray, Alexander S. Haupt, and Andre Lukas, *All complete intersection Calabi-Yau four-folds*, J. High Energy Phys. **7** (2013), 070, front matter+17, DOI 10.1007/JHEP07(2013)070. MR3106229 ↑1
- [16] Thomas W. Grimm, Fabian Ruehle, and Damian van de Heisteeg, *Classifying Calabi-Yau Threefolds Using Infinite Distance Limits*, Comm. Math. Phys. **382** (2021), no. 1, 239–275, DOI 10.1007/s00220-021-03972-9. MR4223474 ↑1
- [17] Kenji Hashimoto and Atsushi Kanazawa, *Calabi-Yau three-folds of type K (I): Classification*, Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN **21** (2017), 6654–6693, DOI 10.1093/imrn/rnw197. MR3719475 ↑1
- [18] Jürgen Hausen, Christoff Hische, and Milena Wrobel, *On torus actions of higher complexity*, Forum Math. Sigma **7** (2019), e38. ↑29
- [19] Jürgen Hausen, Simon Keicher, and Rüdiger Wolf, *Computing automorphisms of Mori dream spaces*, Math. Comp. **86** (2017), no. 308, 2955–2974, DOI 10.1090/mcom/3185. MR3667033 ↑27
- [20] Jürgen Hausen, Antonio Laface, and Christian Mauz, *On smooth Fano fourfolds of Picard number two*, Rev. Mat. Iberoam., to appear, available at 1907.08000. ↑1, 8, 9, 22, 25
- [21] Jürgen Hausen, Christian Mauz, and Milena Wrobel, *The anticanonical complex for non-degenerate toric complete intersections* (2020), available at 2006.04723. ↑23, 25
- [22] Yujiro Kawamata and Shinnosuke Okawa, *Mori dream spaces of Calabi-Yau type and log canonicity of Cox rings*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **701** (2015), 195–203, DOI 10.1515/crelle-2013-0029. MR3331731 ↑1
- [23] Yi Hu and Sean Keel, *Mori dream spaces and GIT*, Michigan Math. J. **48** (2000), 331–348. Dedicated to William Fulton on the occasion of his 60th birthday. ↑1, 3
- [24] A. R. Iano-Fletcher, *Working with weighted complete intersections*, Explicit birational geometry of 3-folds, London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser., vol. 281, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2000, pp. 101–173. ↑2

- [25] János Kollár, *Flops*, Nagoya Math. J. **113** (1989), 15–36, DOI 10.1017/S0027763000001240. MR986434 ↑5, 12
- [26] János Kollár and Shigefumi 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. MR1658959 ↑5, 12
- [27] Maximilian Kreuzer and Harald Skarke, *Reflexive polyhedra, weights and toric Calabi-Yau fibrations*, Rev. Math. Phys. **14** (2002), no. 4, 343–374, DOI 10.1142/S0129055X0200120X. MR1901220 ↑1
- [28] Christian Mauz, *Magma toolkit*, <https://github.com/cm-math/ci-tools>. ↑28, 30
- [29] ———, *On Fano and Calabi-Yau varieties with hypersurface Cox ring*, PhD Thesis, in preparation, Universität Tübingen. ↑8, 14
- [30] James McKernan, *Mori dream spaces*, Jpn. J. Math. **5** (2010), no. 1, 127–151, DOI 10.1007/s11537-010-0944-7. MR2609325 ↑1
- [31] Shigefumi Mori, *Classification of higher-dimensional varieties*, Algebraic geometry, Bowdoin, 1985 (Brunswick, Maine, 1985), Proc. Sympos. Pure Math., vol. 46, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1987, pp. 269–331. MR927961 ↑3
- [32] ———, *Flip theorem and the existence of minimal models for 3-folds*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **1** (1988), no. 1, 117–253, DOI 10.2307/1990969. MR924704 ↑3
- [33] Keiji Oguiso, *On polarized Calabi-Yau 3-folds*, J. Fac. Sci. Univ. Tokyo Sect. IA Math. **38** (1991), no. 2, 395–429. MR1127089 ↑1
- [34] ———, *On the complete classification of Calabi-Yau threefolds of type III₀*, Higher-dimensional complex varieties (Trento, 1994), de Gruyter, Berlin, 1996, pp. 329–339. MR1463185 ↑1
- [35] John Christian Ottem, *Cox rings of K3 surfaces with Picard number 2*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra **217** (2013), no. 4, 709–715, DOI 10.1016/j.jpaa.2012.09.016. MR2983845 ↑1
- [36] Victor Przyjalkowski and Constantin Shramov, *Bounds for smooth Fano weighted complete intersections*, Commun. Number Theory Phys. **14** (2020), no. 3, 511–553, DOI 10.4310/CNTP.2020.v14.n3.a3. MR4124110 ↑2
- [37] Friedrich Schöller and Harald Skarke, *All weight systems for Calabi-Yau fourfolds from reflexive polyhedra*, Comm. Math. Phys. **372** (2019), no. 2, 657–678, DOI 10.1007/s00220-019-03331-9. MR4032876 ↑1
- [38] Pelham Wilson, *Boundedness questions for Calabi-Yau threefolds* (2021), available at 1706.01268. ↑3

MATHEMATISCHES INSTITUT, UNIVERSITÄT TÜBINGEN, AUF DER MORGENSTELLE 10, 72076 TÜBINGEN, GERMANY

Email address: mauz@math.uni-tuebingen.de