L² EXTENSION OF HOLOMORPHIC FUNCTIONS FOR LOG CANONICAL PAIRS

DANO KIM

Abstract. In a general L² extension theorem of Demailly for log canonical pairs, the L² condition with respect to the Ohsawa measure determines when a function can be extended. We give a geometric characterization of this analytic condition in terms of log canonical centers. Moreover, the singularity of the Ohsawa measure is shown to be determined according to subadjunction on each maximal log canonical center with a unique log canonical place. This implies that the L² condition is essentially equivalent to one that appeared in a previous L² extension theorem of the author, which enables to combine these results into common generalization/strengthening.

Contents

1. Introduction 1
2. Log canonical centers 8
3. Proofs of the main results 13
4. L² extension theorem for a log canonical center 20
5. Kawamata metric and Ohsawa measure 22
References 26

1. INTRODUCTION

Let Y ⊂ X be a submanifold of a complex manifold. Let L be a line bundle on X and Kₓ the canonical line bundle of X. An L² extension theorem is a statement that (under suitable conditions on X, Y, L, ...) if a certain L² norm ||s||ₓ is finite for a holomorphic section s on Y of (Kₓ ⊗ L)|ₓ, then there exists ˜s ∈ H⁰(X, Kₓ ⊗ L) such that ˜s|ₓ = s and ||˜s||ₓ ≤ c||s||ₓ for some constant c > 0. The input norm ||s||ₓ plays here the crucial role of deciding whether a given section can be extended or not. Since [OT87], there have been extensive developments on L² extension, especially when Y
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is of codimension 1. In this paper, our interest is in the generality of $Y$ allowed to be of arbitrary codimension (and singular).

Important earliest results in this generality include [O2, M93, D00] and [O5, Thm. 4]: the last one replaced a holomorphic defining section of a vector bundle for $Y$ by a quasi-psh function $\Psi$ locally satisfying $\Psi = k \log(|z_1|^2 + \ldots + |z_k|^2) + O(1)$ near $Y$ where $(z_1 = \ldots = z_k = 0)$ are local coordinate equations for $Y$ of codimension $k$ (so that $Y$ is equal to the pole set $P(\Psi)$ of $\Psi$). From the viewpoint of ‘singularity of pairs’ in algebraic geometry (cf. [KM]), the singularity of such $\Psi$ can be regarded as the simplest instance of log canonical singularities in that a single blow-up along $Y$ would give a log resolution of $\Psi$. 1 Employing the viewpoint of singularity of pairs throughout this paper, we will work with the terminology of a pair $(X, \Psi)$, cf. Definition 2.2 keeping $X$ smooth (i.e. the singularity only comes from $\Psi$).

Such $L^2$ extension was generalized for more general $\Psi$ with log canonical analytic singularities by [K07, Thm. 4.2]. Let $N(\Psi) \subset X$ be the non-klt locus of $(X, \Psi)$, i.e. the subvariety defined by the multiplier ideal sheaf of $\Psi$. It is clear that $N(\Psi) \subset P(\Psi)$ and $N(\Psi)$ is reduced, not necessarily connected. The $L^2$ extension theorem of [K07] extended sections from $N(\Psi)$ rather than from $P(\Psi)$ (which coincides with $N(\Psi)$ in the above case of [O5]). More precisely, it extended sections from an irreducible component $Y$ of $N(\Psi)$ under the condition that $Y$ has a unique log canonical place when viewed as a maximal log canonical center (these terms will be explained shortly). As will be discussed, this condition is on the more natural side of a dichotomy for a maximal log canonical center.

On the other hand, more recently there was another generalization of [O5] for log canonical pairs $(X, \Psi)$ due to Demailly [D15, Thm. 2.8] with different perspectives and techniques. Our original motivation was the comparison of these $L^2$ extension theorems from [K07] and [D15].

1.1. Ohsawa measure and log canonical centers. In [D15, Thm. 2.8], the subvariety $Y$ for extension is taken to be the entire non-klt locus $N(\Psi)$ of $(X, \Psi)$. The input norm $\|s\|_Y$ is taken as the $L^2$ norm with respect to a measure called the Ohsawa measure $dV[\Psi]$ (cf. [O5], [O4]), see Definition 3.1. Perhaps one can say that the Ohsawa measure is formulated in a way such that once the corresponding $L^2$ norm condition is satisfied, the rest of the proof of $L^2$ extension can be handled by more or less well established methods of $L^2$ estimates for $\partial$ since [OT87], [O5] and many

1 More precisely, $\Psi$ is allowed to be ‘log canonical along $Y$’ in [O5, Thm. 4] as well as in [D15, Thm. 2.8]. See Remark 1.3

2 However the formulation of [K07, Thm. 4.2] did not use $\Psi$ functions. Also it dealt with divisorial pairs only but the arguments apply to more general pairs as in this paper. In this paper, we will assume $X$ smooth in [K07, Thm. 4.2].

3 This condition should be made explicit in [K07, Thm. 4.2].
others (cf. [D15, Proof of Thm. 2.8]). It is due to the fundamental insight of [D15] that this can be indeed done in the generality of log canonical pairs and also that the singularity of the Ohsawa measure can be understood using log resolutions.

The $L^2$ norm condition with respect to the Ohsawa measure gives an analytic criterion which determines whether a given holomorphic function $s$ on $Y$ can be extended to $X$ or not. However the condition may not be easy to check as long as the singularity of the Ohsawa measure remains rather mysterious. We have the following geometric characterization of the singularity in terms of log canonical centers.

**Theorem 1.1.** Let $(X, \Psi)$ be a log canonical pair where $X$ is a complex manifold and $\Psi$ a quasi-psh function on $X$ with analytic singularities (Definition 2.1). Let $Y \subset X$ be the non-klt locus of $(X, \Psi)$. Let $s$ be a holomorphic function on $Y$. Then the following conditions (1) and (2) are equivalent:

1. The function $s$ is locally $L^2$ at every point of $Y$ with respect to the Ohsawa measure $dV[\Psi]$.
2. The function $s$ vanishes along
   - all non-maximal log canonical centers of $(X, \Psi)$ and
   - all maximal log canonical centers of $(X, \Psi)$ with non-unique log canonical places.

Here the Ohsawa measure is defined on the regular locus $Y_{\text{reg}}$ of $Y$ and all the integrals are taken on $Y_{\text{reg}}$, but in the condition (1) we take every point of $Y$. Let us briefly explain the meaning of the terms in the condition (2): see §2.1, 2.2 for more details. Let $f : X' \to X$ be a log resolution of the singularity of $\Psi$. The nontriviality of the multiplier ideal of $\Psi$ is contributed by divisors $E$ with discrepancy $a(E,X,\Psi)$ equal to $-1$. We will call such a divisor on $X'$ as a log canonical place and its image on $X$ a log canonical center for $(X, \Psi)$ (for short, an lc place and an lc center). A log canonical center is said to be maximal if it is not properly contained in another log canonical center. Maximal log canonical centers are nothing but the irreducible components of the non-klt locus of $(X, \Psi)$.

We will then turn to describing the ‘restriction’ of the Ohsawa measure to each of these irreducible components. The Ohsawa measure $dV[\Psi]$ is defined on the regular part $Y_{\text{reg}}$ of the non-klt locus $Y$ of $(X, \Psi)$. We have the disjoint union $Y_{\text{reg}} = \bigcup_{j \in J} Y'_j$ of complex manifolds (of possibly different dimensions) where each $Y'_j$ is a Zariski open subset of an irreducible component $Y_j$ of $Y$. By the restriction of $dV[\Psi]$ to a maximal lc center $Y_j$, we will mean its restriction to $Y'_j$, which will be denoted simply by $dV[\Psi]_{Y_j}$.

A crucial subtlety in understanding log canonical singularities is that, in general given a log canonical center $Z$, there may exist more than one (i.e. non-unique) log canonical places for $Z$ on a log resolution $X'$ (cf. Example 2.9). For a maximal log
canonical center, the property of having a unique, or non-unique, log canonical place is well defined, independent of the choice of a log resolution (see Proposition 2.8). This gives us a dichotomy for maximal log canonical centers.

We will first deal with the non-unique case of this dichotomy in the following result (which is in fact used in the proof of Theorem 1.1).

**Theorem 1.2.** (Theorem 3.4 (2)) Let \((X, \Psi)\) be a log canonical pair where \(X\) is a complex manifold and \(\Psi\) a quasi-psh function on \(X\) with analytic singularities. Let \(Z\) be a maximal log canonical center of the pair \((X, \Psi)\). If \(Z\) has at least two log canonical places in one (hence every) log resolution, then \(dV[\Psi]_Z\) is the infinity measure, i.e. \(\int_{Z_{\text{reg}}} g \, dV[\Psi]_Z = \infty\) for every continuous function \(g : Z_{\text{reg}} \to \mathbb{R}\) unless \(g \equiv 0\).

The possibility of such a phenomenon of the infinity measure was first pointed out to the author by Chen-Yu Chi. By Theorem 1.2 we confirm that such a phenomenon indeed occurs, even always, in the case of non-unique lc places. To the best of our knowledge, this result refines [D15, Prop. 4.5].

The methods of proofs of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 consist of combining the study of the Ohsawa measure using log resolutions (cf. [D15]) and the theory of log canonical centers from algebraic geometry (cf. [Ka97], [A03], [Ko07], [F11]). Especially a crucial role is played by a connectedness result, cf. Proposition 2.10.

**Remark 1.3.** In [D15, Thm. 2.8], the pair \((X, \Psi)\) is assumed to be log canonical along its non-klt locus \(Y\), which means that the ‘non-lc’ locus can be possibly nonempty but disjoint from \(Y\). In particular, \((X, \Psi)\) is lc in a neighborhood of \(Y\). Theorem 1.1 is valid in this setting since the conditions (1) and (2) only concern a neighborhood of \(Y\). Throughout this paper, we will work with the more standard setting of log canonical pairs.

1.2. Ohsawa measure and subadjunction. Before turning to the case of a unique lc place from the dichotomy, we first note the following consequences from Theorem 1.1.

**Corollary 1.4.** Let \((X, \Psi)\) and \(Y\) be as in Theorem 1.1.

(1) If a holomorphic function \(s\) on \(Y\) is locally \(L^2\) with respect to \(dV[\Psi]\), then \(s\) vanishes along all the intersection of (at least two) irreducible components of the non-klt locus of \((X, \Psi)\).

(2) The Ohsawa measure \(dV[\Psi]\) is locally integrable if and only if each connected component \(Z\) of \(Y\) is irreducible and \(Z\) is a minimal log canonical center of \((X, \Psi)\) with a unique log canonical place.
Corollary 1.4 indicates that the singularity of the Ohsawa measure behaves consistently as would be predicted by (its possible relation to) the so-called subadjunction on a log canonical center. We will confirm this in Theorem 1.5, which will then yield that the input norms of \cite{K07} and \cite{D15} are equivalent in the sense of Corollary 1.7. Also Corollary 1.4 (2) can be regarded as ‘inversion of subadjunction’.

Let us first recall the ideas of Kawamata’s subadjunction \cite{Ka98} from algebraic geometry, cf. Theorem 2.14. Let \( K_X + L \) be an adjoint line bundle on a smooth projective variety \( X \). Let \( Y \) be a smooth subvariety of \( X \). In general, the restriction of an adjoint line bundle to a subvariety would not be an adjoint line bundle in a meaningful way, i.e. when a line bundle \( M \) is defined by the relation \((K_X + L)|_Y = K_Y + M\), \( M \) may not be an interesting line bundle to look at, when the codimension of \( Y \) is higher than 1.

However, according to the striking discovery of \cite{Ka98}, things are quite different when \( Y \) is a log canonical center of some pair. Let \((X, D)\) be a log canonical pair where \( D \) is an effective \( \mathbb{Q} \)-divisor linearly equivalent to \( L \) and let \( Y \) (assume smooth) be a minimal log canonical center of \((X, D)\). The subadjunction theorems \cite{Ka98, FG12} say that \( M \) admits an effective \( \mathbb{Q} \)-divisor \( B \) such that \((Y, B)\) is klt (see Theorem 2.14), which can be converted to a psh metric for \( M \). The fact that \( M \) in \( K_Y + M \) admits a geometrically meaningful metric was the starting point of \cite{K07}, together with the fact that log canonical centers can be regarded as natural candidates of subvarieties to extend sections in algebraic geometry, cf. \cite{KM}.

Indeed in \cite{K07}, we showed that a singular hermitian metric defined by such \( B \) can be used to define the input norm of an \( L^2 \) extension theorem for a maximal log canonical center \( Y \) (not necessarily minimal) with a unique log canonical place. In fact, we do not need a genuine psh metric for this purpose since we only need the resolution data of \( B \) provided by Kawamata’s discriminant divisor (see Definition 3.9) on a smooth modification of \( Y \). We use it to define a metric in a weak sense called a Kawamata metric (see Definition 5.7).

We remark that the above input norm with respect to a Kawamata metric is optimal in the sense that when \( Y \) is minimal as an lc center, a Kawamata metric is locally integrable, hence every function on \( Y \) would have locally finite input norm. Such optimality of the input norm with respect to the Ohsawa measure was confirmed in Corollary 1.4 (2) and also can be reconfirmed by the following description of the Ohsawa measure in terms of the discriminant divisor.

**Theorem 1.5.** Let \((X, \Psi)\) be a log canonical pair where \( X \) is a complex manifold and \( \Psi \) a quasi-psh function on \( X \) with analytic singularities. Let \( Y \) be a maximal log canonical center of the pair \((X, \Psi)\) with a unique log canonical place. Then \( dV[\Psi]_Y \) is a measure determined according to subadjunction in the sense that there exists a smooth modification \( h : Y' \to Y \) such that \( dV[\Psi]_Y \) is the direct image under \( h \) of a
measure $v$ on $Y'$ with poles along Kawamata’s discriminant divisor (say $D$) on $Y'$ multiplied by a local psh weight with vanishing Lelong numbers. In other words, $v$ can be locally written as (up to a bounded positive factor)

\begin{equation}
\label{eq1}
v(w) = \left( \prod_{i=1}^{m} |w_i|^{-2a_i} \right) e^{-\psi(w)} |dw_1 \wedge \ldots \wedge dw_m|^2
\end{equation}

in local coordinates $w = (w_1, \ldots, w_m)$ on open $U \subset Y'$ (with $\dim Y = m$), where $\psi$ is a psh function with vanishing Lelong numbers, $\sum a_i \text{div}(w_i) = D$ (on $U$).

The proof of Theorem 1.5 uses the main result of [K19] which used positivity of direct images and the valuative analysis of plurisubharmonic singularities (see [K19] for more references on these ingredients). The part concerning Theorem 1.5 of the current paper can be viewed as companion to the paper [K19].

**Remark 1.6.** We note that Theorem 1.2 says that such relation as in Theorem 1.5 between Kawamata’s subadjunction and the Ohsawa measure does not extend to the case when a maximal lc center $Y$ has non-unique log canonical places. This is not entirely surprising since we can understand Theorem 2.14 (2) as being rather flexible in its requirement for the divisor $B$. Often in the contexts of geometric applications, the method of tie-breaking tends to be applicable (possibly at the cost of some conditions) which would enable one to modify $\Psi$ in order to avoid the situation of non-unique lc places, cf. [Ko97], [Ka97], [Ko07, §8.1].

Likewise, often in geometric applications, one can simply rescale given $\Psi$ to arrive at a log canonical pair, say $(X, c\Psi)$ for some $c > 0$ so that, in particular, its non-klt locus is reduced. We believe that clear geometric understanding of the Ohsawa measure as provided by Theorems 1.1, 1.2 and 1.5 gives a strong reason to focus on the log canonical case rather than even greater generality such as when the non-klt locus is nonreduced, but perhaps this can depend on the contexts of applications.

1.3. **Further comparison with previous results.** Finally, thanks to Theorem 1.5 we can compare the two aforementioned $L^2$ extension theorems of [K07, Thm. 4.2] and [D15, Thm. 2.8]. For this comparison, we first derive Theorem 4.1 a version of $L^2$ extension for a maximal log canonical center, from [D15, Thm. 2.8]. The common basic setting of Theorem 4.1 and [K07, Thm. 4.2] for the comparison is as follows.

Let $(X, \psi)$ be a log canonical pair where $X$ a complex manifold and $\psi$ is a psh metric with analytic singularities for a $\mathcal{O}$-line bundle $L$ on $X$. Let $\Psi$ be a quasi-psh function given by $e^{-\psi} = h e^{-\Psi}$ for a smooth hermitian metric $h$ of $L$. Let $Y$ be a maximal lc center of $(X, \psi)$ with a unique log canonical place.

---

4i.e. we can ignore for the moment that $X$ is weakly pseudoconvex Kähler in the former and projective (or Stein by the same methods) in the latter
Let $\|s\|_1$ be the input norm of [K07, Thm. 4.2] which was given as the adjoint $L^2$ norm for an adjoint line bundle with respect to a Kawamata metric. Let $\|s\|_2$ be the input norm in Theorem 4.1 with respect to the Ohsawa measure $dV[\Psi]_Y$. From Theorem 1.5 we have the following corollary (see Theorem 5.9 for the full statement) which is indeed nontrivial since the details in the methods of proof are rather different between [K07, Thm. 4.2] and [D15, Thm. 2.8].

**Corollary 1.7** (= see Theorem 5.9). For a holomorphic function $s$ on $Y$, we have $\|s\|_1$ locally finite if and only if $\|s\|_2$ locally finite. In other words, the two input norms give the same criterion for extension of sections.

Moreover this comparison in Theorem 5.9 means that, for all possible purposes, Theorem 4.1 (derived from [D15, Thm. 2.8]) can be regarded as giving a generalization of [K07, Thm. 4.2] once Theorem 4.1 is strengthened (i.e. equipped) with the additional information on the Ohsawa measure provided by Theorem 1.5 (and Theorem 1.1 Corollary 3.8). It is generalization in that a strictly positive curvature condition (“small ample” $A$) in [K07, Thm. 4.2] is replaced with a semipositive one (10) in Theorem 1.1.}  

We record this as a corollary.

**Corollary 1.8.** We derive $L^2$ extension Theorem 4.1 from [D15, Thm. 2.8], which amounts to generalizing the $L^2$ extension theorem of [K07, Thm. 4.2] by replacing a strictly positive curvature condition with a semipositive one.

This article is organized as follows. In Section 2, we recall the theory of singularity of pairs and log canonical centers in our setting. We intend this section to be mostly self-contained for the convenience of readers whose primary interest is in analysis. In Section 3, we revisit the Ohsawa measure and give proofs of the main results. In Section 4, we derive an $L^2$ extension theorem for a maximal log canonical center from [D15]. In Section 5, we recall the definition of the Kawamata metric from [K07] and explain its relation with the Ohsawa measure.

**Acknowledgements.** The author would like to thank for valuable conversations with J. Kollár, O. Fujino, J.-P. Demailly, T. Ohsawa, S. Boucksom and C.-Y. Chi. This research was supported by SRC-GAIA through NRF Korea grant No.2011-0030795 and by Basic Science Research Program through NRF Korea funded by the Ministry of Education (2018R1D1A1B07049683).

---

5 Also $X$ is more general in Theorem 4.1 being weakly pseudoconvex Kähler.
2. Log canonical centers

We refer to [D11] for introduction to plurisubharmonic (psh for short) functions and singular hermitian metrics of line bundles (also cf. §5). We first have some terminology and conventions used in this paper.

- In this paper, a variety will refer to a complex analytic space.
- We will often denote a singular hermitian metric $e^{-\varphi}$ of a line bundle simply by $\varphi$ so that we can write additively both line bundles and metrics as in $(L_1 + L_2, \varphi_1 + \varphi_2)$.
- A function on a complex manifold with values in $\mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}$ is quasi-psh if it is locally the sum of a psh function and a smooth $\mathbb{R}$-valued function.
- A psh metric is a singular hermitian metric of $L$ with semipositive curvature current (so that its local weight functions can be taken as psh functions).
- Whenever integration is taken on a variety as in $\int_X$, it is taken on its regular locus as in $\int_{X_{\text{reg}}}$.

We now begin with the following basic definition.

**Definition 2.1.** cf. [D15, Def. 2.2], [B20, Def. 9.1] A quasi-psh function on a complex manifold has analytic singularities if there exists a real number $c > 0$ and a coherent ideal sheaf $a \subset O_X$ such that locally we have

\[
\varphi = c \log \sum_{i=1}^{m} |g_i|^2 + u
\]

where $g_1, \ldots, g_m$ are local generators of $a$ and $u$ a smooth function. In this case, we will say that $\varphi$ has singularities of type $a^c$.

A psh metric of a line bundle is said to have analytic singularities if its local weight functions are psh with analytic singularities.

Let $L$ be a $\mathbb{Q}$-line bundle on $X$. Let $D$ be an effective $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor such that $D$ is $\mathbb{Q}$-linearly equivalent to $L$. Note that $D$ is the divisor $\frac{1}{m} \text{div}(s_D)$ of a holomorphic section $s_D \in H^0(X, mL)$ for some $m \geq 1$ such that $mL$ is a genuine holomorphic line bundle on $X$. The section $s_D$ defines a psh metric of $L$ which can be denoted by $|s_D|^{-\frac{2}{m}}$.

2.1. Singularity of pairs. In the minimal model program and birational geometry [KM], singularity of pairs such as $(X, D)$ plays an important and central role, cf. [Ko97], [Ko13]. In this paper, we will work with singularity of pairs where $X$ is a complex manifold and $D$ is replaced by a psh metric or by a quasi-psh function.

\footnote{Such a quasi-psh function was said to have neat analytic singularities in [D15].}
**Definition 2.2.** Let $X$ be a complex manifold. A pair $(X, \psi)$ will refer to a pair of $X$ and a psh metric $e^{-\psi}$ with analytic singularities of a $\mathbb{Q}$-line bundle $L$ on $X$. Similarly, a pair $(X, \Psi)$ will refer to a pair of $X$ and $\Psi$, a quasi-psh function with analytic singularities on $X$.

In the setting of the first sentence, we will say that $(X, \psi)$ is associated to the $\mathbb{Q}$-line bundle $K_X + L$. We can also view $\psi$ as represented by a quasi-psh function (say $\Psi$) once we have a choice of a $C^\infty$ hermitian metric $h$ of $L$; i.e. define $\Psi$ by the relation $e^{-\psi} = h e^{-\Psi}$ on $X$.

In the rest of this section, we will revisit the fundamental notions from singularity of pairs (cf. [KM], [Ko97], [Ka97]) in the setting of $(X, \Psi)$. Since $\Psi$ has analytic singularities (say, of type $a^c$), these notions are well known in the setting of pairs taken with ideal sheaves (with formal exponents) $(X, a^c)$, see [Ko13, §8.1].

For simplicity of notation, we will discuss these fundamental notions mostly for pairs $(X, \Psi)$ (among the two in Definition 2.2), but one can also put $(X, \psi)$ in the place of $(X, \Psi)$ (whenever it is clear).

First, we will say that a quasi-psh function $\phi$ (and similarly for a psh metric) has poles along an effective ($\mathbb{Q}$-)divisor $D$ if we have locally $\phi = \sum_{i=1}^{m} a_i \log |g_i|^2 + u$ where $u$ is (bounded) $C^\infty$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{m} a_i \text{div}(g_i)$ is a local expression of the divisor $D$.

A log resolution for a quasi-psh function $\varphi$ with analytic singularities of type $a^c$ (and similarly for a psh metric with analytic singularities) is a smooth modification (cf. [DX, II (10.1)]) $f : X' \to X$ such that the pullback $f^* \varphi$ has poles along a divisor $G$ on $X'$ and $G + F$ is an snc (i.e. simple normal crossing) divisor where $F$ is the exceptional divisor of $f$. Such a log resolution exists since, as is well known, a principalization of the ideal sheaf $a$ exists by Hironaka.

Now let $(X, \Psi)$ be as in Definition 2.2. Let $E \subset X'$ be a prime divisor. The discrepancy of $E$ with respect to $(X, \Psi)$ is defined by $a(E, X, \Psi) := \text{ord}_E(K_{X'/X}) - \text{ord}_E(\Psi)$ where $\text{ord}_E(\Psi)$ is the generic Lelong number of $f^* \Psi$ along $E$, cf. [B20, §10]. The notions of lc and klt (cf. [Ko97], [KM]) are defined in terms of discrepancies:

**Definition 2.3.** Let $(X, \Psi)$ be as in Definition 2.2. A pair $(X, \Psi)$ is lc (resp. klt) if $a(E, X, \psi) \geq -1$ (resp. $a(E, X, \psi) > -1$) for every prime divisor $E \subset X'$ in some (and hence, any) log resolution $X' \to X$.

We find it convenient to indicate the discrepancies $a(E, X, \Psi)$ for $E$’s appearing in a log resolution by formally mimicking the standard notation for pairs $(X, D)$:

$$K_{X'} \equiv f^*(K_X + [\Psi]) + \sum_{E \subset X'} a(E, X, \Psi) E$$

\footnote{Cf. [Ko97], [Ko13]}
which generalizes the usual expression $K_{X'} \equiv f^*(K_X + D) + \sum_{E \subset X'} a(E, X, \Psi)E$ when $\Psi$ has divisorial poles along an effective $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor $D$ (cf. [KM, Notation 2.26]) where the equality (3) is understood as numerical equivalence of divisors. Here in (3), we can regard the notation $\equiv$ and $[\Psi]$ as purely formal (unless we take the divisor corresponding to $f^*[\Psi]$).

2.2. Log canonical centers. Next, we recall the theory of log canonical (lc) centers from algebraic geometry. They can be seen as providing more refined information than the multiplier ideal $\mathcal{J}(\Psi)$ alone.

Let $(X, \Psi)$ be an lc pair. We will say that $\Psi^{-1}(-\infty)$ is the pole set of $\Psi$. Define the non-klt locus of $(X, \Psi)$ to be the union of the images of those prime divisors $E$ on a log resolution $X'$ with discrepancy $a(E, X, \Psi) = -1$. The non-klt locus is the underlying set of the reduced subspace associated to the multiplier ideal $\mathcal{J}(\Psi)$, hence well defined, independent of the choice of a log resolution. It is clear that the non-klt locus is a (possibly strict) subset of the pole set.

Example 2.4. Let $X = \mathbb{C}^2$. Let $\Psi = \alpha \log |x|^2 + \beta \log(|x|^2 + |y|^2)$. If $0 < \alpha < 1$ and $\alpha + \beta = 2$, the non-klt locus of $(X, \Psi)$ is equal to the origin, which is strictly contained in the pole set, the line $x = 0$.

A log canonical center (or an lc center) of $(X, \Psi)$ is an irreducible subvariety $Y \subset X$ that is the image of a prime divisor $E$ in a log resolution $X' \to X$ as above, with its discrepancy $a(E, X, \Psi)$ equal to $-1$ (i.e. the lowest possible value for an lc pair) on a log resolution of the pair $(X, \Psi)$. We will call such $E$ an lc place of $Y$, following [Ka97].

Given a pair, when $Y$ is an lc center and there is no other lc center $Y_1$ such that $Y_1 \supseteq Y$, we call $Y$ a maximal lc center. The maximal lc centers are precisely the irreducible components of the non-klt locus of $(X, \Psi)$. On the other hand, an lc center $Y$ is called minimal if there are no other lc centers properly contained in $Y$.

Example 2.5. Let $Y \subset X$ be an irreducible smooth subvariety in a smooth projective variety. Then there exists an ample line bundle $L$ with a psh metric $\Psi$ such that $Y$ is a minimal lc center of the pair $(X, \Psi)$.

Example 2.6. Let $X = \mathbb{C}^3$ with coordinates $(x, y, z)$. Let $Y$ be the hyperplane given by $(z = 0)$ and let $Z$ be the line given by $(x = y = 0)$. Define $\Psi = \log |z|^2 + \frac{3}{2} \log(|x|^2 + |y|^2)$ which is a psh function and also a psh metric for the trivial line bundle $L = \mathcal{O}_X$. Then the pair $(X, \Psi)$ is lc and the lc centers are $Y$, $Z$ and the point $p := Y \cap Z$.

\textsuperscript{8}In [Ka97, Def. 1.3], an lc place refers to an equivalence class of such $E$ by strict transform between different log resolutions. This convention is useful, but in this paper, it is enough to regard an lc place as a prime divisor appearing in a log resolution.
Note that the maximal lc centers are $Y$ and $Z$ while $p$ is the only minimal lc center of $(X, \Psi)$.

**Example 2.7.** Let $D = D_1 + \ldots + D_m$ be an snc divisor ($m \geq 2$) with coefficients 1 on a complex manifold $X$. Let $\Psi$ be a quasi-psh function having poles along $D$. Then $(X, \Psi)$ is lc. A connected component $C$ of $D_i \cap D_j$ ($i \neq j$) is irreducible and is an lc center of $(X, \Psi)$.

The following says that the property of a maximal lc center having a unique lc place is intrinsic, i.e. independent of the choice of a log resolution.

**Proposition 2.8.** Let $Y$ be a maximal lc center of an lc pair $(X, \Psi)$. If there exists a log resolution $X' \to X$ of $(X, \Psi)$ such that $Y$ has a unique lc place $E$ on $X'$, then there cannot exist another log resolution of $(X, \Psi)$ where $Y$ has at least two lc places.

**Proof.** Since the assertion is local, we may assume that $E_0(= E), E_1, \ldots, E_m$ are all the lc places (associated to some lc centers) of $(X, \Psi)$ in the given log resolution $f : X' \to X$. Suppose that there exists another log resolution $h$ where the lc center $Y$ has at least two lc places. We may assume that it factors through $f$ so that it is given as the composition $h = f \circ g$ of $g : X'' \to X'$ and $f : X' \to X$.

Let $G \subset X''$ be an lc place of $Y$ that is genuinely different from $E$, i.e. not a strict transform of $E$. It is known that (cf. [Ka14, Lem. 1.11.14]) the center of $G$ on $X'$, i.e. $g(G)$, must be an irreducible component of some intersection among $E_0, \ldots, E_m$. Since $G$ is not a strict transform of $E$, there should exist at least one $E_j$ ($j \geq 1$) such that $g(G) \subset E_j$. Then it is impossible to have $h(G) = Y$ since we have $h(G) \subset f(E_j)$ and $Y$ is a maximal lc center, which forces $f(E_j) = Y$. This contradicts to the condition that $E$ is the unique lc place of $Y$ on $X'$.

We remark that the assertion of Proposition 2.8 does not hold when $Y$ is not maximal. For example, let $(X, Y_1 + Y_2)$ be an snc pair with dim $X = 2$ such that $Y_1$ and $Y_2$ intersects at $p \in X$ transversally. The blow up of $p$ provides a log resolution with a unique lc place $E$ for the lc center $p$. Further blow ups of the intersection between $E$ and the strict transforms of $Y_1$ and $Y_2$ provide log resolutions with non-unique lc places for $p$.

An example of a maximal lc center with non-unique lc places is as follows.

**Example 2.9 (Osamu Fujino).** Let $X = \mathbb{P}^2$ and let $C$ be a smooth quadric curve on $X$. Let $p \in C$ be a point and $L$ the tangent line of $C$ at $p$. Let $L_1$ and $L_2$ be two general lines passing through $p$. Now define an effective $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor on $X$ by $D := aC + bL + cL_1 + dL_2$ where $a, b, c, d \in \mathbb{Q} \cap (0,1)$.

Let $f : Y \to X$ be the blow up of $p$ with the exceptional divisor $E \subset Y$. There is a point $q \in E$ where the strict transforms of $C$ and $L$ intersect. Let $g : W \to Y$ be the blow up of $q$ with the exceptional divisor $G \subset W$. Then $h = f \circ g : W \to X$ is a log
resolution of \((X, D)\) and we have \(K_W + D_W = h^*(K_X + D)\) where \(D_W\) has coefficients 

\[3a + 2b + c + d - 2\] 

for \(G\) and 

\[2a + b + c + d - 1\] 

for \(E'\) (the strict transform of \(E\)). When \(a + b = 1\) and \(a + c + d = 1\), the following holds: the pair \((X, D)\) is lc but not klt at \(P\). The non-klt locus is exactly \(P\), hence the lc center \(P\) is both maximal and minimal. It has two lc places \(G\) and \(E'\).

Now the following connectedness result has been well known from \([\text{Ka97}, \text{Thm. 1.6}]\) (cf. \([\text{A03}, \text{A11}, \text{F11}, \text{Lem. 2.3}]\)).

**Proposition 2.10.** Let \((X, \Psi)\) be an lc pair. Let \(f : X' \to X\) be a log resolution of \((X, \Psi)\). Let \(W\) be the union of a finite set of lc centers of \((X, \Psi)\) equipped with the reduced structure. Assume that \(f^{-1}(W)\) is of codimension 1. Let \(T\) be the union of prime divisors on \(X'\) given by the lc places of \((X, \Psi)\) whose images are contained in \(W\). Then the restriction \(f : T \to W\) has connected fibers.

**Proof.** These are special cases for \(X\) smooth of \([\text{A03}, \text{(4.4)}], \text{[A11, (4.2)]}, \text{[F11, (2.3)]}\), with the obvious modifications in using relative vanishing theorems for \(f\) now being a projective bimeromorphic morphism between complex manifolds. □

**Corollary 2.11.** Let \(Y\) be an lc center of an lc pair \((X, \Psi)\). If a log resolution \(f : X' \to X\) of \((X, \Psi)\) contains a unique lc place \(E \subset X'\) for \(Y\), then the restriction lc morphism \(f|_E : E \to Y\) has connected fibers.

**Proof.** Let \(T\) be the union of all the lc places on \(X'\) whose images are contained in \(Y\). Let \(Z \subset Y\) be the closed analytic subset given as the union of those lc centers properly contained in \(Y\). We see that \(f : E \to Y\) has connected fibers over the Zariski open set \(Y \setminus Z\) by Proposition 2.10. Hence it also has connected fibers over \(Y\) in view of Stein factorization. □

**Remark 2.12.** In the case when a maximal lc center \(Y\) has more than one lc places (say \(E_1, E_2, \ldots, E_m\)), there are examples of pairs (cf. Kollár \([\text{Ko19}]\)) where the morphism \(E_j \to Y\) is not with connected fibers for some \(j\).

The following is the key fundamental properties of lc centers, which we recall from \([\text{Ka97}, \text{A03}, \text{F11}, \text{Thm. 2.4}]\) in the current setting.

**Proposition 2.13.** Let \((X, \Psi)\) be an lc pair.

1. Locally there are at most finitely many lc centers of \((X, \Psi)\).
2. The intersection of two lc centers can be written as a union of lc centers.
3. Let \(p \in X\) be a point in the non-klt locus of \((X, \Psi)\). Then there exists a unique minimal lc center \(C_p\) at \(p\), i.e. minimal with respect to inclusion among those lc centers passing through \(p\). Also \(C_p\) is normal at \(p\).
Proof. For the sake of convenience for readers, we recall some of the arguments (cf. [F11, Thm. 2.4]). (1) is clear from the existence of a log resolution. The first sentence of (3) follows from (2). In the rest, we will show (2).

Let $C_1$ and $C_2$ be two lc centers with nonempty intersection (which is not necessarily irreducible or connected). Let $p \in C_1 \cap C_2$. It suffices to show that there exists an lc center $C_3$ such that $p \in C_3 \subset C_1 \cap C_2$. Suppose that there does not exist such $C_3$ for given $p$. Now apply Proposition 2.10 to the set $\{C_1, C_2\}$. Let $T = \sum_{j \in J} E_j$ where $J$ is a finite set. We may assume that the log resolution was chosen such that every lc center contained in the union $C_1 \cup C_2$ has at least one lc place occurring in $T$.

The image of each $E_j$ is an lc center contained in $C_1 \cup C_2$. Since we are assuming that none of them are both passing through $p$ and contained in $C_1 \cap C_2$, by restricting to an open neighborhood of $p$, we may assume that the images $f(E_i)$ are all passing through $p$ and that $J$ is written as a disjoint union $J = J_1 \cup J_2$ such that if $i \in J_k$, then $f(E_i)$ is contained in $C_k$ but not in the intersection $C_1 \cap C_2$.

However, by the connectedness of the fiber $f^{-1}(p)$, there must exist $p \in J_1, q \in J_2$ such that $E_p$ and $E_q$ have nonempty intersection. This provides an lc place whose image is contained in $C_1 \cap C_2$, contradiction. □

Note that if an lc center $Y$ of $(X, \Psi)$ is minimal in the sense given previously (i.e. there are no other lc centers properly contained in $Y$), then it is minimal at every point in $Y$. Hence it follows that $Y$ is normal by (3) of the above proposition.

Finally we recall the following subadjunction theorems.

Theorem 2.14. [Ka98, FG12] Let $(X, D)$ be an lc pair where $X$ is a normal projective variety and $D$ is an effective $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor. Let $Y$ be a minimal lc center of $(X, D)$ (which is then a normal subvariety). Each of the following holds in this setting.

(1) [Ka98] Suppose that there exists $0 \leq D_1 < D$ such that $(X, D_1)$ is klt. Let $H$ be an ample divisor on $X$ and $\epsilon > 0$ a rational number. Then there exists an effective $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor $B$ on $Y$ such that $(K_X + D + \epsilon H)|_Y \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} K_Y + B$ such that $(Y, B)$ is klt.

(2) [FG12] Thm. 1.2] Then there exists an effective $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor $B$ on $Y$ such that $(K_X + D)|_Y \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} K_Y + B$ such that $(Y, B)$ is klt.

3. Proofs of the main results

In this section, we revisit the definition and properties of the Ohsawa measure from [D15] and then give proofs of the main results.

---

9Also for the second sentence of (3), see Corollary 4.3 for a proof (under a condition) using $L^2$ extension.
3.1. Definition of the Ohsawa measure. Let \((X, \Psi)\) be an lc (i.e. log canonical) pair as in Definition 2.3 where \(X\) is a complex manifold and \(\Psi\) is a quasi-psh function with analytic singularities (i.e. neat analytic singularities in the sense of [D15], cf. Definition 2.1). Let \(Y \subset X\) be a maximal lc center of the pair. Let \(Y_{\text{reg}}\) be the regular locus of \(Y\), i.e. the set of regular points.

**Definition 3.1.** [D15] Let \(dV_X\) be a smooth volume form on \(X\). The Ohsawa measure \(dV[\Psi]_Y\) of \(\Psi\) on \(Y\) (with respect to \(dV_X\)) is a positive measure \(d\mu\) on \(Y_{\text{reg}}\) satisfying the following condition: for every \(g\), a real-valued compactly supported continuous function on \(Y_{\text{reg}}\), and for every \(\tilde{g}\), a compactly supported extension of \(g\) to \(X\), we have the relation

(4) \[\int_{Y_{\text{reg}}} g \, d\mu = \lim_{t \to -\infty} \int_{\{x \in X, t < \Psi(x) < t + 1\}} \tilde{g} e^{-\Psi} dV_X.\]

If it exists, the Ohsawa measure is unique from basic properties of measures. The existence is due to [D15, Prop. 4.5 (a)] in this generality (after the initial cases from [O4], [O5] which was also used in [GZ14]), whose arguments we will recall in our setting. In its notation \(dV[\Psi]_Y\), its dependence on \(dV_X\) is suppressed.

**Proposition 3.2.** Let \(Y\) and \((X, \Psi)\) be as above. Then the Ohsawa measure \(dV[\Psi]_Y\) of \((X, \Psi)\) on \(Y\) exists. The measure \(dV[\Psi]_Y\) has the property of putting no mass on closed analytic subsets.

**Proof.** Let \(f : X' \to X\) be a log resolution of the pair \((X, \Psi)\). Let \(E_1, \ldots, E_m\) be the lc places of \(Y\) and let \(T\) be the union of them. As in (3), we can indicate discrepancies (for a \(\mathbb{Q}\)-divisor \(F\) on \(X')\) by writing

(5) \[K_{X'} + E_1 + \ldots + E_m + F \equiv f^*(K_X + [\Psi]).\]

When we take the pull back of the RHS of (4) by \(f\), we are in the position to consider the Ohsawa measure (say \(d\nu\)) of the quasi-psh function \(f^*\Psi\) with respect to the continuous volume form \(f^*dV_X\) on \(X'\):

(6) \[\int_T f^* g \, d\nu = \lim_{t \to -\infty} \int_{\{x \in X', t < f^*\Psi(x) < t + 1\}} (f^* \tilde{g}) e^{-f^*\Psi} f^* dV_X.\]

From [D15] Prop. 4.5 (a) (also see [KS20] Prop. 3.4 (2)), such \(d\nu\) exists as a measure on the regular locus of \(T\). Moreover it is determined by its restrictions on each connected component of the regular locus of \(T\), namely for each \(j = 1, \ldots, m\), \(E'_j := E_j \setminus \bigcup_{i \neq j} E_i\). By [KS20] Prop. 3.4 (2), the restriction of \(d\nu\) on \(E'_j\) has poles along the divisor
\[(7) \quad (\sum_{i \neq j} E_i + F)|_{E_j}.\]

Since \(f : X' \to X\) is modification, from change of variables, we have the equality of the integrals (inside the limit) on the RHSs of (4) and (6). Hence the direct image of \(d\nu\) under \(T \to Y\) satisfies the condition (4), i.e. it is the Ohsawa measure \(dV[\Psi]|_Y\).

Since \(d\nu\) has the property of putting no mass on closed analytic subsets (cf. [KS20, Prop. 3.2]), so does its direct image \(dV[\Psi]|_Y\).

\[\square\]

Thanks to the property of putting no mass on closed analytic subsets, the Ohsawa measure is determined by its restriction to a nonempty Zariski open subset. \[\square\] Note that at this point, we defined \(dV[\Psi]|_Y\) but not \(dV[\Psi] : \) this notation is reserved for the original version of the Ohsawa measure (which we may call the full Ohsawa measure) defined on the entire non-klt locus of \((X, \Psi)\) as in [DI15]. The existence of \(dV[\Psi]\) also follows from that of each \(dV[\Psi]|_Y\) since \(dV[\Psi]\) can be recovered from the collection of its ‘restriction’ to each component as in the following proposition.

**Proposition 3.3.** Let \((X, \Psi)\) be in Definition 3.1. The full Ohsawa measure \(dV[\Psi]\) on the non-klt locus \(N(\Psi)\) of \((X, \Psi)\) is determined by its ‘restriction’ to each irreducible component of \(N(\Psi)\).

**Proof.** This is clear from the fact that the regular part of the non-klt locus \(Y := N(\Psi)\) of \((X, \Psi)\) can be written as the disjoint union \(Y_{\text{reg}} = \bigcup_{j \in J} Y'_j\) of complex manifolds (of possibly different dimensions) where each \(Y'_j\) is a Zariski open subset of an irreducible component \(Y_j\) of (a connected component of) \(Y\). More precisely, \(Y_j \setminus Y'_j\) is the union of the singular locus of \(Y_j\) and all the nonempty intersections of \(Y_j\) with other irreducible components \(Y'_k\)'s. By the restriction of \(dV[\Psi]\) (defined on \(Y_{\text{reg}}\)) to a maximal lc center \(Z := Y_j\), we will mean its restriction to the open subset \(Z' = Y'_j\) and it will be simply denoted by \(dV[\Psi]|_Z\). \[\square\]

**3.2. Proofs of the main results.** First we will consider an example. Suppose that a maximal lc center \(Y\) is a point having two lc places \(E_1, E_2\) in a log resolution. (Example 2.9 provides such an example.) A priori, the Ohsawa measure \(dV[\Psi]|_Y\) will be represented by a single nonnegative real number or infinity. By the proof of Proposition 3.2, \(dV[\Psi]|_Y\) is given by the sum of the integral of a measure with poles along \((E_1 + F)|_{E_2}\) over \(E_2\) and the integral of a measure with poles along \((E_2 + F)|_{E_1}\), both of which are infinity. We will show that this phenomenon of infinity always occurs unless the maximal lc center has a unique lc place.

\[\text{See [BBEGZ (1.3)] for more on this property.}\]
Theorem 3.4. Let $Y$ be a maximal lc center of $(X, \Psi)$ as in Definition 3.1.

1. [D15] If $Y$ has a unique lc place, then the Ohsawa measure $dV[\Psi]_{Y}$ has smooth positive density with respect to the Lebesgue measure on a Zariski open set of $Y_{\text{reg}}$.

2. If $Y$ has at least two lc places, then the Ohsawa measure $dV[\Psi]_{Y}$ is the infinity measure, i.e. $\int_{Y_{\text{reg}}} g dV[\Psi]_{Y} = \infty$ for every continuous function $g$ unless $g \equiv 0$.

Proof. (1) We continue to use the setting and notation of the proof of Proposition 3.2. In particular, let $f : X' \to X$ be a log resolution of the pair $(X, \Psi)$. Let $Y_{0}$ be the Zariski open subset of $Y_{\text{reg}}$ defined by

$$Y_{0} = Y_{\text{reg}} \setminus (Y_{2} \cup \ldots \cup Y_{m} \cup Z_{1} \cup \ldots \cup Z_{k})$$

where $Y_{2}, \ldots, Y_{m}$ are other maximal lc centers than $Y := Y_{1}$ (we may assume that there are only a finite number of them by restricting to a neighborhood of $Y$) and $Z_{1}, \ldots, Z_{k}$ are lc centers of $(X, \Psi)$ that are properly contained in $Y$.

Let $E \subset X'$ be the unique lc place. From the proof of Proposition 3.2, the Ohsawa measure $dV[\Psi]_{Y}$ is the direct image along $f = f|_{E} : E \to Y$ of a measure $dv$ on $E$ with poles along the divisor $R$ from 7 which simplifies to $R = F|_{E}$ since $E$ is the unique lc place of $Y$. The coefficients of the prime divisors $G$ in $R = F|_{E}$ are at most 1. When the coefficient of $G \subset X'$ is equal to 1, its image in $Y$ is contained in the complement of $Y_{0}$. Hence when restricted to $Y_{0}$, the Ohsawa measure is the direct image of a locally integrable volume form on $f^{-1}(Y_{0})$, which concludes the proof.

(2) Let $E_{1}, \ldots, E_{m}$ be the lc places with $m \geq 2$ and let $T = E_{1} \cup \ldots \cup E_{m}$. Note that for any $i, j$, we have $f(E_{i} \cap E_{j}) \subset Y$. We first claim that there exist (at least) two of the lc places, say $E_{1}$ and $E_{2}$, such that $f(E_{1} \cap E_{2}) = Y$.

Suppose otherwise. Then we have a finite number of Zariski closed proper subsets of $Y$ given by $f(E_{i} \cap E_{j})$ for every $1 \leq i, j \leq m$. Hence there exists $p \in Y$ such that $p$ does not belong to any of $f(E_{i} \cap E_{j})$.

On the other hand, since the restriction of $f$ to $T$, $f|_{T} : T \to Y$ has connected fibers by Proposition 2.10, the set $f^{-1}(p) \cap T = (f^{-1}(p) \cap E_{1}) \cup \ldots \cup (f^{-1}(p) \cap E_{m})$ is connected. Hence there exist $i \neq j$ such that $(f^{-1}(p) \cap E_{i}) \cap (f^{-1}(p) \cap E_{j}) \neq \emptyset$. Then we have $p \in f(E_{i} \cap E_{j})$, which is contradiction. The above claim is proved.

The Ohsawa measure is equal to the sum of the measures $f_{*}(dv)|_{E_{j}}$ where $(dv)|_{E_{j}}$ refers to the restriction to the open set $E_{j}'$ in the proof of Proposition 3.2. When $j = 1$, $(dv)|_{E_{j}}$ is the infinity measure, hence so is the Ohsawa measure. □

Remark 3.5. The dichotomy in Theorem 3.4 reconfirms Proposition 2.8 since the definition of the Ohsawa measure is independent of log resolutions.

We now give the proof of Theorem 1.1.1
Proof of Theorem 1.1. Let \( p \in Y \) be a point. For the purpose of examining the property of locally \( L^2 \) at \( p \), we may only consider the finite number of irreducible components \( Y_1, \ldots, Y_m \) each containing \( p \) of the non-klt locus of \( (X, \Psi) \). Depending on \( p \), we have one of the following three cases.

- \( m = 1 \) and \( Y_1 \) has non-unique lc places.
- \( m = 1 \) and \( Y_1 \) has a unique lc place.
- \( m \geq 2 \), i.e. \( p \in Y_1 \cup \ldots \cup Y_m \) and some of \( Y_1, \ldots, Y_m \) have non-unique lc places.

In the first case, \( s \) is locally \( L^2 \) at \( p \) if and only if \( s \) is identically zero on \( Y_j \) due to Theorem 3.4 (2). In the third case, we may restrict our attention to each component \( Y_j \) by considering \( s|_{Y_j} \) with respect to \( dV[\Psi]|_{Y_j} \). Therefore, in order to prove the theorem, it suffices to assume that the non-klt locus is irreducible and equal to \( Y = Y_1 \) with a unique lc place.

From the proof of Proposition 3.2, the Ohsawa measure \( dV[\Psi] = dV[\Psi]|_Y \) is the direct image along \( f = f|_E : E \to Y \) of a measure \( d\nu \) on \( E \) with poles along the divisor \( R = F|_E \) from (7) whose coefficients are at most 1. By the definition of the direct image of a measure, for every open subset \( U \subset Y \), we have (where \( f^{-1}(U) \subset E \))

\[
\int_U |s|^2 dV[\Psi] = \int_{f^{-1}(U)} |f^*s|^2 d\nu.
\]

First, suppose the condition (2). If a prime divisor \( Q \) in the above \( F|_E \) appears with coefficient 1, it must be coming from a properly contained lc center \( C_Q \) in \( Y \) (since \( Y \) itself has a unique lc place). Since \( s \) vanishes along \( C_Q \), \( f^*s \) vanishes along \( Q \). This means that the RHS of (8) is locally finite, hence gives the condition (1) of the assertion.

Now suppose the condition (1) that \( s \) is locally \( L^2 \) at every point of \( Y \) with respect to \( dV[\Psi] \). Let \( C \) be a non-maximal lc center contained in \( Y \). We may assume that \( C \) is not contained in another such lc center \( C' \subset Y \) for the purpose of showing that \( s \) vanishes along \( C \). Let \( E^1_C, \ldots, E^m_C \) be the lc places of \( C \) in the given log resolution.

Lemma 3.6. There exists at least one \( i \) such that \( f(E^i_C \cap E) = C \).

Proof of Lemma 3.6. Suppose otherwise. Consider all the closed subsets given by \( f(E^i_C \cap E) \) for \( 1 \leq i \leq m \) and given by lc centers contained in \( C \). Since these are all properly contained, we may choose \( p \in C \) in the complement. We will apply Proposition 2.10 (2) to the set of lc centers \( \{Y, C\} \) where \( W = Y \cup C = Y \). Consider \( f : T \to Y : \) note that \( T \) may contain prime divisors whose images are properly contained lc centers in \( C \). By restricting to a neighborhood of \( p \), we may assume that \( T \) consists of prime divisors whose images are either \( C \) or \( Y \) : these are precisely \( E^1_C, \ldots, E^m_C \) and \( E \). By Proposition 2.10 (2), we see that \( f^{-1}(p) \cap (E^1_C \cup \ldots \cup E^m_C \cup E) \)
is connected. Hence at least for one $i$, we have $f^{-1}(p) \cap E^k_i$, has nonempty intersection with $f^{-1}(p) \cap E$. Then we have $p \in f(E^k_i \cap E)$, which is contradiction. 

From (8), $f^*s$ vanishes along $E^k_i|_E$ for every lc place $E^k_i$ of $C$. By the above lemma, there exists $i$ such that $f(E^k_i \cap E) = f(E_C) = C$. Hence $s$ vanishes along $C$. □

**Proof of Corollary 1.4**. (1) The irreducible components are maximal lc centers. Since the intersection of a set of lc centers is written as a union of lc centers (Proposition 2.13), the assertion follows from Theorem 1.1.

(2) Clearly one may assume that $Y$ is connected (so $Z = Y$). By definition, $dV[\Psi]$ is locally integrable if and only if the constant function $s = 1$ is locally integrable with respect to $dV[\Psi]$.

If this holds, due to the condition (2) of Theorem 1.1, $Y$ cannot be reducible and $Y$ cannot contain any non-maximal lc center. This gives one direction of the statement and the converse is also clear for the same reason. □

**Example 3.7.** When applying Theorem 1.7 to Example 2.6, the only singularity of the Ohsawa measure $dV[\Psi]$ occurs at $p = Y \cap Z$. If $s$ is $L^2$ with respect to $dV[\Psi]$ in a neighborhood of $p$, then it should vanish at $p$.

We point out the following special case of Theorem 1.1, which yields a geometric characterization of the input norm condition of Theorem 4.1.

**Corollary 3.8.** Let $(X, \Psi)$ be a log canonical pair as in Theorem 1.1. Let $Y$ be a maximal lc center of $(X, \Psi)$ with a unique lc place. Then the following conditions (1) and (2) are equivalent:

(1) The function $s$ is locally $L^2$ at every point of $Y$ with respect to the Ohsawa measure $dV[\Psi]_Y$.

(2) The function $s$ vanishes along all lc centers of $(X, \Psi)$ that are properly contained in $Y$.

It will be worth mentioning a further special case of Corollary 3.8 when $Y$ is the only maximal lc center, i.e. when the non-klt locus of $(X, \Psi)$ is irreducible. It should be noted that even this special case covers a remarkable generality. Given the same $Y$, one can obtain various different statements (from different $\Psi$’s) of $L^2$ extension depending on which sets of subvarieties of $Y$ appear as properly contained lc centers of $(X, \Psi)$.

3.3. **Proof of Theorem 1.5.** In the rest of this section, we will give the proof of Theorem 1.5. This subsection can be regarded as companion to [K19], which we will follow for some setting and notation (along with [Ko07]).

Let $(E, R)$ and $(W, B)$ be two pairs of complex manifolds and snc $Q$-divisors. For a divisor $R = \sum a_iR_i$, let $\text{red}(R) := \sum R_i$. Let $f : E \to W$ be a surjective
projective morphism with connected fibers. An irreducible component \( R_i \) of \( R \) is called horizontal if \( f(R_i) = W \). Otherwise it is called vertical. We write \( R = R_h + R_v \) where \( R_h \) is the horizontal part and \( R_v \) is the vertical part.

**Definition 3.9.** \( [Ko07, \text{Def. 8.3.6}], [Ka98, \text{Thm. 2}] \), cf. \( [K19, \S 4] \) We will say that \( f : (E, R) \to (W, B) \) satisfies the snc conditions if the following hold:

1. \( E, W \) are smooth varieties (or complex manifolds).
2. \( B \) is a reduced snc divisor on \( Y \) (i.e. \( B = \text{red}(B) \)).
3. \( f(\text{Supp}(R_v)) \subseteq B \).
4. \( \text{red}(R) + f^*(B) \) is an snc divisor on \( E \).
5. \( f \) is a smooth morphism over \( W \setminus B \).
6. \( R_h \) is a relative snc divisor over \( W \setminus B \).
7. Coefficients of \( R_h \) are in the interval \((−∞, 1)\).

Let \( B_R \) be the discriminant divisor induced by \( R \), which is defined as the unique smallest \( \mathbb{Q} \)-divisor \( D \) supported on \( B \) satisfying (see \( [Ko07, \text{Thm. 8.3.7}] \))

\[
R_v + f^*(B - D) \leq \text{red}(f^*B),
\]

i.e. we determine the coefficient of each prime divisor \( B_j \) of \( B \) from the inequality (9).

**Proof of Theorem 1.5.** Let \( E \subset X' \) be the unique lc place lying in a log resolution \( f : X' \to X \) of the pair \( (X, \Psi) \). Thanks to \( [Ka98] \), we may assume that there exists a resolution of singularities \( Y' \to Y \) such that the morphism \( E \to Y \) factors through it so that we have morphisms \( g : E \to Y' \) and \( h : Y' \to Y \) and so that \( g : E \to Y' \) satisfies the snc conditions in Definition 3.9 with \( R \) defined as follows. From (5) (in the notation of (3)), we have \( K_{X'} + E + F \equiv f^*(K_X + [\Psi]) \) where \( F \) is a \( \mathbb{Q} \)-divisor on \( X' \). Let \( R := F|_E \).

From the proof of Proposition 3.2 the Ohsawa measure \( dV[\Psi]_Y \) is equal to the direct image \( h_*(g_*d\nu) \) of the measure \( d\nu \) on \( E \) along \( h \circ g : E \to Y' \to Y \). Here \( d\nu \) has poles along \( R \) by (7). Since \( Y \) has a unique lc place, if the coefficient of a component in \( F \) is equal to 1 (which is the maximum value possible), then the component is vertical. Thus the condition (7) in Definition 3.9 is satisfied.

Therefore we can apply \( [K19, \text{Cor. 1.3}] \) taking \( g : E \to Y' \) in the place of \( X \to Y \) in that statement. (Note that the fiber integral of \( [K19, \text{Cor. 1.3}] \) corresponds precisely to the direct image of a measure, cf. \( [DX] \).) Hence \( g_*d\nu \) is a measure with divisorial poles along the discriminant divisor of \( R \) multiplied by a psh weight with vanishing Lelong numbers. Since \( dV[\Psi]_Y = h_*(g_*d\nu) \), the theorem is proved. \( \square \)

\(^{11}\)There is a typo of \( 2a_i \) in (4), \( [K19, \text{Cor. 1.3}] \) in the current version which should be corrected to \(-2a_i \). There will appear a revised version of \( [K19] \).
4. $L^2$ Extension Theorem for a Log Canonical Center

We derive from [D15, Thm. 2.8] the following $L^2$ extension theorem formulated for a maximal lc center with a unique lc place as in [K07].

**Theorem 4.1.** [D15] Let $(X, \omega)$ be a weakly pseudoconvex Kähler manifold. Let $(X, \psi)$ be an lc pair associated to an adjoint $\mathbf{Q}$-line bundle $K_X + L$ as in Definition 2.2 (so that $\psi$ is a psh metric for $L$). Let $Y$ be a maximal lc center of $(X, \psi)$ with a unique lc place. Let $h$ be a $C^\infty$ hermitian metric of $L$. Let $\Psi$ be the quasi-psh function defined by the relation $e^{-\psi} = he^{-\Psi}$. Assume that, for some $\delta > 0$,

$$i\Theta(L, h) + \alpha \sqrt{-1} \partial \overline{\partial} \Psi = i\Theta(L, \psi) + (\alpha - 1) \sqrt{-1} \partial \overline{\partial} \Psi \geq 0$$

for all $\alpha \in [1, 1 + \delta]$. Then there exist

- a constant $C = C((X, \psi), Y)$ and
- a singular hermitian metric in the weak sense $g$ (cf. Definition 5.1) of $L$ that is bounded away from zero,

such that $L^2$ extension holds in the following sense. If we have

- a $\mathbf{Q}$-line bundle $B$ on $X$ such that $K_X + L + B$ a $\mathbf{Z}$-line bundle,
- a psh metric $b$ of $B$ and
- a holomorphic section $s \in H^0(Y, (K_X + L + B)|_Y)$ satisfying

$$\int_{Y_{\text{reg}}} |s|^2_{\omega, h, b} dV[\Psi]_Y < \infty,$$

then there exists a holomorphic section $\tilde{s} \in H^0(X, K_X + L + B)$ such that we have $\tilde{s}|_Y = s$ and moreover

$$\int_X |\tilde{s}|^2 \cdot g \cdot b \leq C \int_{Y_{\text{reg}}} |s|^2_{\omega, h, b} dV[\Psi]_Y.$$

The constant $C$ and the singular metric $g$ of $L$ are independent of $(B, b)$ and the section $s$. Here the Ohsawa measure $dV[\Psi]_Y$ is taken with respect to the smooth volume form $dV_\omega$.

**Proof.** Note that $Y$ is an irreducible component of the non-klt locus $N(\psi) =: W$ of $(X, \psi)$. Given the section $s$ on $Y$ satisfying (11), we will extend it first to the entire $W$ by zero outside $Y$ as follows. Since this zero extension to $W$ is of local nature, we may write $W := Y_1 \cup \ldots \cup Y_m$ where $Y_1, \ldots, Y_m$ are the maximal lc centers of $(X, \psi)$ with $Y = Y_1$.

From (11), we see that the section $s$ (itself) is locally $L^2$ with respect to $dV[\Psi]_Y$ on $Y_{\text{reg}}$ since $b$ is psh. We need to show that $s$ is zero on every intersection $Y \cap Y_j$...
for \( j = 2, \ldots, m \). Fix one such \( j \). Note that \( Y \cap Y_j \) may not be irreducible or even connected. By Proposition 2.13 every irreducible component \( Z \) of \( Y \cap Y_j \) is an lc center of \((X, \psi)\). Then by Theorem 1.1 \( s \) vanishes along every such \( Z \). Therefore we can extend \( s \in H^0(Y, (K_X + L + B)|_Y) \) to a section \( s' \in H^0(W, (K_X + L + B)|_W) \) to be zero on \( W \setminus Y \).

Then it is clear that \( s' \) has finite \( L^2 \) norm with respect to the full Ohsawa measure \( dV[\Psi] \) on \( W \). Thus we can apply [D15, Thm. 2.8] to extend \( s' \) to a section \( \tilde{s} \) on \( X \) as in the conclusion. The constant \( C \) and the metric \( g \) are provided by [D15, Thm. 2.8].

\[ Remark \ 4.2. \] The statement of Theorem 4.1 is formulated so that, in particular, it is directly comparable to [K07, Thm. 4.2]. The statement indicates that \( L \) under the conditions (of Theorem 4.1) has just enough (semi-)positivity with respect to \( Y \subset X \) for \( L^2 \) extension to hold. The (semi-)positivity required on \( B \) is minimal: it can be taken to be \( \mathcal{O}_X \) if \( K_X + L \) is a \( \mathbb{Z} \)-line bundle. Also the LHS of (12) is written in terms of the adjoint \( L^2 \) norm (Definition 5.4) following [K07, Thm. 4.2].

\[ Remark \ 4.3. \] As mentioned in the introduction, in view of Corollary 1.7, Theorem 4.1 amounts to generalizing [K07, Thm. 4.2] by replacing a strictly positive curvature condition with a semipositive one. In particular, this amounts to providing an independent proof of [K07, Thm. 4.2] by the methods of [D15]. This alternative approach also provides some simplifications in arguments. For example, the key property of a Kawamata metric [K07, Thm. 3.2] can be replaced by some natural properties of the direct image of a measure. It might be worth mentioning that the \( L^2 \) estimates methods used respectively in [K07, Thm. 4.2] and in [D15, Thm. 2.8] have some considerable differences in details (hence perhaps making the above alternative approach more valuable). The former was largely influenced by the \( L^2 \) estimates methods of [S02], [MV] which appear somewhat different from methods based on Kähler identities as in [D15], [O5].

We have the following application of Theorem 4.1 which also illustrates use of Theorem 1.1.

\[ Corollary \ 4.4 \ (cf. \ Proposition 2.13 (3)). \] Let \((X, \psi)\) be an lc pair. Let \( p \in X \) be a point in the non-klt locus of \((X, \psi)\). Let \( C_p \) be the lc center of \((X, \psi)\) that is minimal at \( p \), i.e. minimal with respect to inclusion among those lc centers passing through \( p \). Assume that \( C_p \) is also a maximal lc center of \((X, \psi)\) with a unique lc place. Then \( C_p \) is normal at \( p \).

\[ Proof. \] The existence and uniqueness of \( C_p \) was given in Proposition 2.13 (3). Let \( Y := C_p \) and consider the Ohsawa measure \( dV[\Psi]_Y \) (for a choice of \( \Psi \) and \( dV_X \)).

\[ Corollary \ 4.4 \ (cf. \ Proposition 2.13 (3)). \] Let \((X, \psi)\) be an lc pair. Let \( p \in X \) be a point in the non-klt locus of \((X, \psi)\). Let \( C_p \) be the lc center of \((X, \psi)\) that is minimal at \( p \), i.e. minimal with respect to inclusion among those lc centers passing through \( p \). Assume that \( C_p \) is also a maximal lc center of \((X, \psi)\) with a unique lc place. Then \( C_p \) is normal at \( p \).

\[ Proof. \] The existence and uniqueness of \( C_p \) was given in Proposition 2.13 (3). Let \( Y := C_p \) and consider the Ohsawa measure \( dV[\Psi]_Y \) (for a choice of \( \Psi \) and \( dV_X \)).
Since $Y$ is minimal at $p$, there exists a Zariski closed subset $W \subset X$ such that $Y \setminus W$ is a minimal lc center for $(X \setminus W, \psi|_{X \setminus W})$.

Let $Y' := Y \setminus W$ and $X' := X \setminus W$. Let $\mathcal{O}_{Y'}$ be the sheaf of weakly holomorphic functions on $Y'$, i.e. holomorphic functions $f$ on $(Y')_{\text{reg}}$ such that every point of $(Y')_{\text{sing}}$ has a neighborhood $V$ so that $f$ is bounded on $(Y')_{\text{reg}} \cap V$. We need to show that $\mathcal{O}_{Y'} = \mathcal{O}_{Y'}$ by [DX] Chap.II §7.

By Corollary 1.4 (2), the Ohsawa measure $dV[\Psi]_{Y'}$ is locally integrable when restricted to $Y'$. Hence every weakly holomorphic function germ on $Y'$ is locally $L^2$ with respect to $dV[\Psi]_{Y'}$ at every point $q \in Y'$. Applying Theorem 4.1 to a Stein neighborhood $V \subset X'$ of $q$, $f$ can be extended from $V \cap (Y')_{\text{reg}}$ to a holomorphic function $F$ on $V$. The restriction of $F$ to $Y' \cap V$ is holomorphic, hence $\mathcal{O}_{Y'} = \mathcal{O}_{Y'}$ is given. □

5. Kawamata metric and Ohsawa measure

In this section, we will give the comparison between Kawamata metrics from [K07] and Ohsawa measures from [D15].

5.1. Singular hermitian metrics and adjoint $L^2$ norms. Let $M$ be a $\mathbb{Q}$-line bundle on a complex manifold $Y$. A singular hermitian metric in the weak sense of $M$ is a hermitian metric of $M$ whose local weight functions are measurable and defined almost everywhere. More precisely, let $M$ be given (formal) transition functions $\{g_{ij}\}$ on a locally trivializing open cover $\{U_i\}_{i \in I}$ in the sense that for some integer $k \geq 1$, $M^k$ and $\{g_{ij}^k\}$ are a genuine line bundle and its transition functions.

**Definition 5.1.** [K07] Let $M$ be a $\mathbb{Q}$-line bundle on a complex manifold $Y$. Let $Y_0 \subset Y$ be a subset with $Y \setminus Y_0$ with measure zero. A **singular hermitian metric in the weak sense** for $M$ on $Y$ is a family $h := \{e^{-\phi_i}\}_{i \in I}$ of $[0, \infty]$-valued measurable functions on $U_i \cap Y_0$ satisfying $e^{-\phi_i} = |g_{ji}|^2 e^{-\phi_j}$ on $U_i \cap U_j \cap Y_0$ for every $i, j \in I$.

In particular, in the weak sense, a singular hermitian metric is allowed to be undefined on a measure zero subset. A psh metric (whose value is defined at every point) of course gives a singular hermitian metric in the weak sense.

**Remark 5.2.** Often in the literature, a singular hermitian metric is defined such that $\phi_i$ is locally integrable, in which case one can define the curvature current. In this paper, we do not need curvature currents in this generality.

A singular hermitian metric in the weak sense of $M$ is all we need (for a metric) to define the **adjoint $L^2$ norm** of a section of the adjoint line bundle $K_Y + M$. Following [S02], one can naturally define an $L^2$ norm for a holomorphic section $s$ of the adjoint

\[^{12}\text{In [K07] (2.1.2), a similar notion was called as a singular hermitian metric of the second kind.}\]
line bundle $K_Y + M$ provided only with the data of a (singular) hermitian metric $h$ of $M$ as follows. If $dV$ is a smooth volume form on $Y$, then one can take the pointwise length of $s$ with respect to the hermitian metric $dV^{-1} \cdot h$ of $K_Y + M$ and integrate it with respect to $dV$. The resulting $L^2$ norm is independent of the choice of $dV$. We will call it the adjoint $L^2$ norm of $s$ with respect to $(M, h)$ and denote it by $\int_Y |s|^2 \cdot h$.

Now let $Y$ be an irreducible variety.

**Definition 5.3.** An adjoint line bundle $K_Y + M$ on an irreducible variety $Y$ is a $\mathbb{Q}$-line bundle $F$ on $Y$ such that its restriction $F|_{Y_{\text{reg}}}$ to the regular locus of $Y$ is isomorphic to $K_{Y_{\text{reg}}} + M$ as $\mathbb{Q}$-line bundles on $Y_{\text{reg}}$ where $M$ is a $\mathbb{Q}$-line bundle on $Y_{\text{reg}}$.

Since $K_Y$ or $M$ may not be extended as a $\mathbb{Q}$-line bundle on the entire $Y$, writing $F$ as $K_Y + M$ is a convenient abuse of notation. Note that $M$ may not be uniquely determined by $K_Y + M$, see Remark [5.5].

**Definition 5.4.** Let $F = K_Y + M$ be as in Definition [5.3]. Given a singular hermitian metric $h$ in the weak sense of $M$ on $Y_{\text{reg}}$, we define the adjoint $L^2$ norm of a $\mathbb{Q}$-section $s$ of $F$ on $Y$ by taking

$$\int_Y |s|^2 \cdot h := \int_{Y_{\text{reg}}} |s|^2 \cdot h.$$  

**Remark 5.5.** In Definition [5.3] when the complement $Y \setminus Y_{\text{reg}}$ has codimension 1 components, it is possible that there may be two different $\mathbb{Q}$-line bundles $M_1 \neq M_2$ defined on $Y_{\text{reg}}$ whose restrictions to $Y_0$ are isomorphic. This does not matter to the definition of the adjoint $L^2$ norm as long as the metric $h$ is specified on $Y_0$, as illustrated by the following example.

**Example 5.6.** Suppose that $Y$ is a smooth irreducible variety. Let $H \subset Y$ be a smooth hypersurface. Let $Y_0 := Y \setminus H$. Let $t \in H^0(Y, \mathcal{O}(H))$ be a section such that $\text{div}(t) = H$ as a divisor. Let $M$ be a line bundle on $Y$ and let $M_0$ be the restriction of $M$ to $Y_0$. Note that as line bundles on $Y_0$, we have $K_{Y_0} + M_0 \simeq K_{Y_0} + M_0 + \mathcal{O}(H)|_{Y_0}$. Let $h$ be a hermitian metric of $M_0$ on $Y_0$. We can define the same adjoint $L^2$ norm of a section $s$ of $H := K_Y + M$ by the integrals on $Y_0$ in two different ways as follows:

- when we view $s|_{Y_0}$ as a section of $K_{Y_0} + M_0$, the norm is $\int_{Y_0} |s|^2 \cdot h$,
- when we view $s|_{Y_0}$ as a section of $K_{Y_0} + M_0 + \mathcal{O}(H)|_{Y_0}$, the norm is $\int_{Y_0} |s| \cdot \frac{1}{|t|}$.  

Let $\pi : Y' \to Y$ be a proper modification between smooth varieties. Consider adjoint $\mathbb{Q}$-line bundles satisfying $K_{Y'} + M' = \pi^*(K_Y + M)$. If $M'$ has a singular hermitian metric $h'$ in the weak sense, then there is a singular hermitian metric $h'$ on $M$ induced from $h$ by the isomorphism $\pi : Y' \to Y_0$ given by restriction of $\pi$ to a Zariski open...
subset \( Y_0 \subset Y \). These \( h \) and \( h' \) define the same adjoint \( L^2 \) norms in the sense that for every section \( s \) of \( K_Y + M \), we have
\[
\int_Y |s|^2 \cdot h' = \int_{Y'} |\pi^* s|^2 \cdot h.
\]

5.2. Kawamata metric. We begin by recalling the definition of a Kawamata metric from [Ko07]. Let \( Y \) be a maximal lc center of an lc pair \((X, \psi)\) where \( X \) is a complex manifold and \( \psi \) is a psh metric with analytic singularities for a \( \mathbb{Q} \)-line bundle \( L \) on \( X \). Assume that \( Y \) has a unique lc place \( E \to Y \). Then the morphism \( E \to Y \) has connected fibers (Corollary 2.11).

Take a log resolution \( \mu : X' \to X \) of \((X, \psi)\) as in [Ko07] so that the restriction \( \mu|_E : E \to Y \) factors through a smooth modification \( \pi : Y' \to Y \) and moreover \( f : E \to Y' \) satisfies the snc conditions of Definition 3.9.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
E \\
\downarrow f \\
Y' \\
\downarrow \pi \\
Y \\
\downarrow \mu \\
X'
\end{array}
\]

(13)

Define an adjoint line bundle \( K_Y + M \) on \( Y \) in the sense of Definition 5.3 to be the pullback of \( K_X + L \) under the inclusion \( Y \to X \). Also define a \( \mathbb{Q} \)-line bundle \( K_{Y'} + M' \) to be the pullback of \( K_Y + M \) under \( \pi : Y' \to Y \) (so that \( M' \) is defined on \( Y' \) since \( Y' \) is smooth).

The pullback \( \mu^* \psi \) is a divisorial psh metric for \( \mu^* L \) on \( X' \). Combining with \( K_{X'/X} \), we write \( K_{X'} + E + \Delta \equiv \mu^*(K_X + [\psi]) \) as in (3) for an snc divisor \( \Delta \) on \( X' \). Let \( R := \Delta|_E \). We have the equality of \( \mathbb{Q} \)-line bundles (cf. [Ko07, K07 §3.1])
\[
K_E + R = f^*(K_{Y'} + B_R + J)
\]
where \( J = J(X/Y, R) \) is the moduli part line bundle [Ko07, (8.3.7)] and \( B_R \) is the discriminant divisor of \( R \) on \( Y' \) with respect to the morphism \( f : E \to Y' \) as in Definition 3.9. Denote the corresponding \( \mathbb{Q} \)-line bundle by \( \mathcal{O}(B_R) \).

Then from the above relations, we have the equality of \( \mathbb{Q} \)-line bundles \( M' = J + \mathcal{O}(B_R) \) on \( Y' \) (writing the tensor product of \( \mathbb{Q} \)-line bundles as addition) in view of the commutative diagram given by (13). Now endow \( \mathcal{O}(B_R) \) with a singular hermitian metric
\[
(\mathcal{O}(B_R), e^{-\varphi})
\]
given by a canonical meromorphic section \( t \) of the divisor \( B_R \), which may not be an effective divisor (thus \( \varphi \) may not be psh). The section \( t \) (and thus \( \varphi \)) is of course not
unique. On the other hand, endow $J$ with an arbitrary choice of a smooth hermitian metric

$$(J, e^{-\eta})$$

(without any curvature condition). Give the $\mathbb{Q}$-line bundle $M' = J + \mathcal{O}(B_R)$ on $Y'$ the product singular hermitian metric $e^{-\varphi} \cdot e^{-\eta}$. It trivially induces a singular hermitian metric in the weak sense for $M$ over $Y_0$, the largest Zariski open subset of $Y$ on which the restriction of $\pi: Y' \to Y$ is isomorphism

$$M' = \pi^* M$$

via $M' = \pi^* M$ (from $K_Y + M' = \pi^*(K_Y + M)$). In particular, $e^{-\varphi} \cdot e^{-\eta}$ and $e^{-\kappa}$ induce the same adjoint $L^2$ norms, cf. Definition 5.4. We recall from [K07] the following definition (which is now slightly generalized for pairs $(X, \psi)$).

**Definition 5.7.** [K07 Def. 3.1] Let $Y$ be a maximal lc center with a unique lc place of an lc pair $(X, \psi)$. We call the singular hermitian metric in the weak sense $e^{-\kappa}$ for $M$ in (14) a Kawamata metric of the pair $(X, \psi)$ on $Y$.

We note that this definition certainly depends on the choice of a particular section $t$ corresponding to the divisor $B_R$, on the choice of the smooth metric $e^{-\eta}$ for $J$ and also on the choice of a resolution $Y'$.

**Remark 5.8.** For the purpose of defining the adjoint $L^2$ norm for the $L^2$ extension theorem in [K07], we could simply use the hermitian metric $(M', e^{-\varphi} \cdot e^{-\eta})$ on $Y'$, saving the extra step of defining the Kawamata metric for $M$ on $Y$. But having Definition 5.7 still makes sense in that it is defined on $Y$ itself and it is reasonable to expect that there could be a psh metric for $M$ on $Y_{reg}$ among Kawamata metrics in view of subadjunction.

We now establish the following comparison between the Ohsawa measure and the Kawamata metric. Let $(X, \psi)$ be an lc pair where $X$ is a complex manifold equipped with a Kähler metric $\omega$. Let $\Psi$ be a quasi-psh function given by $e^{-\psi} = h e^{-\Psi}$ for a smooth hermitian metric $h$ of $L$. (We are in the same setting as in Theorem 4.1 except that $X$ is not required to be weakly pseudoconvex.)

**Theorem 5.9 (Corollary 1.7).** Let $Y$ be a maximal lc center of $(X, \psi)$ with a unique lc place. Let $B$ be a $\mathbb{Q}$-line bundle on $X$ such that $K_X + L + B$ a $\mathbb{Z}$-line bundle. Let $b$ be a psh metric of $B$. Let $s$ be a holomorphic section of $K_Y + M + B|_Y = (K_X + L + B)|_Y$ on $Y$ (where $K_Y + M$ is as defined after (13)).

Let $p \in Y$ be a point. Then we have the following equivalence: the $L^2$ norm of $s$ with respect to the Ohsawa measure is locally finite at $p$, i.e. there exists a neighborhood...
$U \subset Y$ of $p$ such that

$$\|s\|_2 := \int_U |s|^2_{\omega,h,b} dV[\Psi]_Y < \infty$$

if and only if the adjoint $L^2$ norm of $s$ with respect to a Kawamata metric $e^{-\kappa}$ is locally finite at $p$, i.e. there exists a neighborhood $V \subset Y$ of $p$ such that

$$\|s\|_1 := \int_V |s|^2 e^{-\kappa} \cdot b|_Y < \infty.$$  

Proof. We will use the notation as in the setting of Definition 5.7 (from (13) up to (14)). In particular, we have the relation $K_{Y'} + M' = \pi^*(K_Y + M)$ where $\pi : Y' \to Y$ is the modification as before.

Recall that in the definition of the Kawamata metric $e^{-\kappa}$, we had $e^{-\varphi} e^{-\eta}$ as a metric for $M'$ on $Y'$. On the other hand, by Theorem 1.5, the Ohsawa measure has density locally equal to the product $e^{-\varphi} e^{-\chi}$ where $\chi$ is a local psh weight with vanishing Lelong numbers. Let $\beta$ be a psh function such that $b = e^{-\beta}$ near $p$. Then by Lemma 5.10 we have the equivalence:

$$\int_{\pi^{-1}(V)} |\pi^* s|^2 e^{-\varphi} e^{-\eta} e^{-\beta} < \infty \text{ if and only if } \int_{\pi^{-1}(U)} |\pi^* s|^2 e^{-\varphi} e^{-\chi} e^{-\beta} < \infty$$

where $U$ and $V$ are as in the statement. This completes the proof. Note that $\varphi$ is locally the difference of two psh functions with analytic singularities. □

Lemma 5.10. Let $u$ and $v$ be two psh functions on a complex manifold. Suppose that $v$ has zero Lelong numbers at every point.

(1) For the multiplier ideals, we have $J(u + v) = J(u)$.

(2) More generally, let $\psi$ be a psh function with analytic singularities. We have $e^{\psi - u} \in L^2_{\text{loc}}$ if and only if $e^{\psi - u - v} \in L^2_{\text{loc}}$.

Proof. Note that (2) implies (1). (1) is from [K15, Prop. 2.3] and (2) from [B20, Cor. 10.15]. Both of them use the openness theorem of [GZ15]. □

As mentioned in the introduction, the comparison provided by Theorem 5.9 means that, for all possible purposes, Theorem 4.1 (derived from [D15, Thm. 2.8]) can be regarded as giving a generalization of [K07, Thm. 4.2] once Theorem 4.1 is strengthened (i.e. equipped) with the additional information on the Ohsawa measure provided by Theorem 1.5 (and Theorem 1.1, Corollary 3.8). Also see Remark 4.3.
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