

**INFINITESIMAL EXTENSION OF PLURICANONICAL FORMS
AND
AN INJECTIVITY THEOREM**

JUNYAN CAO, MIHAI PAUN

*To Bo Berndtsson,
On the Occasion of His 70th Birthday*

1. INTRODUCTION

Let $p : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{D}$ be a holomorphic family of smooth, n -dimensional compact manifolds whose central fiber -denoted by X - is assumed to be Kähler. We denote by $K_{\mathcal{X}}$ the canonical bundle of \mathcal{X} and let $\mathcal{L} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ be an arbitrary line bundle.

We are interested in the extension properties of global sections of the adjoint bundle $K_{\mathcal{X}} + \mathcal{L}$ defined over the k^{th} infinitesimal neighborhood of the central fiber of p , where $k \geq 1$ is a positive integer. In other words, we consider the sheaves

$$(1.0.1) \quad \mathcal{F}_k := (K_{\mathcal{X}} + \mathcal{L}) \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}/t^{k+1}\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}},$$

and the corresponding spaces of sections $H^0(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F}_k)$.

In this article we are establishing sufficient criteria for a given $s \in H^0(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F}_k)$ to be in the image of the map induced by the projection

$$(1.0.2) \quad \pi_k : \mathcal{F}_{k+1} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_k.$$

We are particularly interested in the case $\mathcal{L} = (m-1)K_{\mathcal{X}}$ where $m \geq 1$ is a positive integer, so we state next our main result in this setting. In order to do so we have to introduce further notations. Let s be a holomorphic section of \mathcal{F}_k ; we denote by h_L the metric on the bundle $L := (m-1)K_X$ induced by the restriction of s to the central fiber X .

Then the following holds true.

Theorem 1.1. *Let s be a section of the sheaf (1.0.1) with $\mathcal{L} = (m-1)K_{\mathcal{X}}$, which admits a C^∞ extension s_k so that if we write $\bar{\partial}s_k = t^{k+1}\Lambda_k$, the integral*

$$(1.1.1) \quad \int_X \left| \frac{\Lambda_k}{dt} \right|^2 e^{-(1-\varepsilon)\varphi_L} dV < \infty$$

converges for any positive $\varepsilon > 0$. Then there exists a section \hat{s} of \mathcal{F}_{k+1} such that $s = \pi_k(\hat{s})$.

The notations in (1.1.1) are as follows: we measure the $(n,1)$ -form $\frac{\Lambda_k}{dt} \Big|_X$ with respect to an arbitrary Kähler metric on X and the metric $e^{-(1-\varepsilon)\varphi_L - \varepsilon\phi_L}$ where $e^{-\phi_L}$ is a smooth metric on L and $e^{-\varphi_L} = h_L$ is the singular metric induced by s .

Coming back to the general setting, let $\mathcal{E}_1, \dots, \mathcal{E}_K$ be a set of line bundles on \mathcal{X} such that

$$(1.1.2) \quad (1-r_0)c_1(\mathcal{L}) = r_0c_1(K_{\mathcal{X}}) + \sum_{i=1}^K r_i c_1(\mathcal{E}_i),$$

where $0 \leq r_0 < 1$ and $r_j \geq 0$ for $j = 2, \dots, K$ are rational numbers. In (1.1.2) we denote by $c_1(\mathcal{E})$ the first Chern class of \mathcal{E} . Let s be a section of \mathcal{F}_k and for each $i = 1, \dots, K$ let σ_i be a section of the sheaf $\mathcal{E}_i \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}/t^{k+2}\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}$ (notice that this is one order higher than s). We denote by h_L the metric induced on the bundle $L := \mathcal{L}|_X$ by the set of holomorphic sections (s, σ_i) restricted to the central fiber -notice that this makes sense thanks to (1.1.2).

Then we have the following version of Theorem 1.1.

Theorem 1.2. *Let $(s, \sigma_i)_{i=1, \dots, K}$ be a family of holomorphic sections of $(\mathcal{F}_k, \mathcal{E}_i)_{i=1, \dots, K}$ respectively as above. We assume that s admits a \mathcal{C}^∞ extension s_k such that if we write $\bar{\partial}s_k = t^{k+1}\Lambda_k$ then*

$$(1.2.1) \quad \int_X \left| \frac{\Lambda_k}{dt} \right|^2 e^{-(1-\varepsilon)\varphi_L} dV < \infty$$

for any positive $\varepsilon > 0$. Then there exists a section \hat{s} of \mathcal{F}_{k+1} such that $s = \pi_k(\hat{s})$.

A very interesting result in connection to Theorem 1.2 was established by Cao, Demailly and Matsumura in [3]. They show that if \mathcal{L} admits a global, semi-positively curved metric $h_{\mathcal{L}}$ such that the analogue of (1.2.1) holds on \mathcal{X} , then $s \in H^0(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F}_k)$ admits an extension to \mathcal{X} . In our case, the curvature hypothesis is weaker and as a consequence the conclusion is that we can only extend s "one step further".

Theorem 1.2 is motivated by a conjecture in Kähler geometry that we next recall. After Y.-T. Siu's invariance of plurigenera articles [22, 23] (see also [20]) concerning the extension of s in case of a projective family \mathcal{X} , the following very important problem is still open (despite of the avalanche of articles and crucial achievements that followed Siu's work).

Conjecture 1.3. [23] *Let $p : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{D}$ be a family of smooth, n -dimensional compact manifolds whose central fiber is denoted by X . We assume that the total space \mathcal{X} admits a Kähler metric. Then any holomorphic pluricanonical section defined on X extends holomorphically to \mathcal{X} .*

Among the articles dedicated to Conjecture 1.3 we first mention here [13] and [14], due to M. Levine. A direct consequence of Theorem 1.1 is the following statement, which represents a more general version of the results in [13, 14].

Corollary 1.4. *Let $p : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{D}$ be a smooth holomorphic family whose central fiber X is Kähler, and let $s \in H^0(X, mK_X)$ be a pluricanonical section defined on X . We assume that the set of zeros of the ideal*

$$\mathfrak{J} := \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{I} \left((1 - \varepsilon) \frac{m-1}{m} \Sigma \right)$$

is discrete, where Σ is the divisor corresponding to s . Then s admits a holomorphic extension to \mathcal{X} .

Furthermore we obtain a new proof of the next statement, which represents the main result in [13] (cf. Section 6). Our main objective in doing that is to understand better the set-up in which the hypothesis (1.2.1) is verified.

Theorem 1.5. [13] *Let $s \in H^0(X, mK_X)$ be a pluricanonical section defined on the central fiber. We assume that the set of zeroes ($s = 0$) $\subset X$ of s is non-singular. Then s admits an extension to \mathcal{X} .*

Many other results in this framework are established in Section 8; since they are a bit more technical to state, we will not reproduce them here. We mention nevertheless Theorem 8.12 in which a sufficient condition for the L^2 hypothesis (1.2.1) to be satisfied is given.

Finally, we highlight some parts of the proof of Theorem 1.1 which seem interesting to us. By hypothesis the section s admits a \mathcal{C}^∞ extension s_k such that

$$(1.5.1) \quad \bar{\partial}s_k = t^{k+1}\Lambda_k$$

for some form $\Lambda_k \in \mathcal{C}_{n+1,1}^\infty(\mathcal{X}, (m-1)K_{\mathcal{X}})$ whose restriction to X is $\bar{\partial}$ -closed. The first step is to show that there exist forms α_k and β_k which are smooth in the complement of the support of $(s = 0) \subset X$ and such that

$$(1.5.2) \quad \frac{\Lambda_k}{dt} \Big|_X = \bar{\partial}\alpha_k + D'(\beta_k)$$

holds pointwise in the complement of $s = 0$, where D' is the $(1, 0)$ -part of the Chern connection on $L := (m-1)K_X$ induced by the given section $s = s_k|_X$.

Note that the equality (1.5.2) is true in general, i.e. without any L^2 assumption. But the problem is that the L -valued forms α_k and β_k have singularities of type $\frac{\Phi}{s^{k+1}}$, where Φ is smooth. We

therefore find ourselves in a rather strange situation, in which the LHS of (1.5.2) is non-singular but the primitives appearing in the RHS are meromorphic. Of course, this is -so to speak- the price to pay in order to have an intrinsic decomposition as in (1.5.2). Anyway, in order to prove Theorem 1.1, it would be sufficient to establish the following result.

Theorem 1.6. *Let γ be a $\bar{\partial}$ -closed smooth $(n, 1)$ -form on a compact Kähler manifold X with values in L such that the following hold.*

(a) *The bundle L is endowed with a singular metric $h_L = e^{-\varphi_L}$ such that*

$$\varphi_L = \sum_i q_i \log |f_i|^2 + C^\infty,$$

for some rational coefficients $q_i \in \mathbb{Q}^+$, where f_i are holomorphic functions and such that the curvature current $i\Theta_{h_L}$ is supported in a proper subvariety of X .

(b) *We suppose that*

$$\int_X |\gamma|^2 e^{-(1-\varepsilon)\varphi_L} < +\infty$$

for every $\varepsilon > 0$.

(c) *Set $Y := \{h_L = +\infty\}$. There exists a $(n-1, 1)$ -form β and a $(n, 0)$ -form α with poles along Y such that*

$$\gamma = \bar{\partial}\alpha + D'_{h_L}(\beta)$$

on $X \setminus Y$, where D'_{h_L} is induced by the singular metric h_L on L .

Then γ is $\bar{\partial}$ -exact.

The assumption (c) above means that the coefficients of the two forms can be locally written as $\frac{g}{\prod f_i^N}$, where g is smooth. For the proof of Theorem 1.6, an important point is that after the log-resolution of $(X, \text{Div}(s))$ combined with a few other reductions the singularities of α and β can be improved significantly. Modulo this, we obtain 1.6 as a consequence of the following general vanishing theorem.

Theorem 1.7. *Let X be a n -dimensional compact Kähler manifold and let E be a snc divisor on X , s_E be the canonical section of E . Let (L, h_L) be a holomorphic line bundle on X such that*

$$i\Theta_{h_L}(L) = \sum q_i [Y_i] + \theta_L,$$

where $q_i \in]0, 1[\cap \mathbb{Q}$, $E + \sum Y_i$ is snc, and the form θ_L is smooth, semi-positive. Let λ be a $\bar{\partial}$ -closed smooth (n, q) -form with value in $L + E$. If there exists β_1 and β_2 , two L -valued $(n-1, q)$ -form and $(n-1, q-1)$ -form with log poles along $E + \sum Y_i$ respectively, such that

$$(1.7.1) \quad \frac{\lambda}{s_E} = D'_{h_L}\beta_1 + \theta_L \wedge \beta_2 \quad \text{on } X \setminus (E + \sum Y_i),$$

then the form λ is $\bar{\partial}$ -exact, i.e., the class $[\lambda] = 0 \in H^q(X, K_X + L + E)$.

Theorem 1.7 can be seen as a generalisation of the familiar $\partial\bar{\partial}$ lemma. Hence it should be no surprise that Hodge theory plays a key role in its proof. The corresponding version of Hodge decomposition theorem needed here (for metrics with Poincaré or conic singularities) will be established in Section 3. We refer to [18] and the references therein for statements with a similar flavour. As consequence, we obtain in Section 4 a "conic version" of the Kodaira-de Rham decomposition of currents. The terminology refers to the fact that under the hypothesis of Theorem 1.7 we are forced to work with a Kähler metric with conic singularities on X ; moreover, the model for the type of currents we have to manipulate here is provided by the RHS of (1.7.1). Finally, we mention here that a important part of our proof is inspired by the key lemma in [15].

As consequence of the methods developed in this paper (especially Theorem 1.7) we obtain the following injectivity statement, conjectured by O. Fujino long ago (cf. [12]).

Theorem 1.8. [12, Conj 2.21] *Let X be a compact Kähler manifold and let $E = \sum E_i$ be a simple normal crossing divisor on X . We consider a semi-positive line F bundle on X and a holomorphic*

section s of mF (for some $m \in \mathbb{N}$). We assume moreover that the zero locus of s contains no lc centres of the lc pair (X, E) . Then the multiplication map induced by the tensor product with s

$$(1.8.1) \quad s \otimes : \quad H^q(X, K_X + E + F) \rightarrow H^q(X, K_X + E + (m+1)F)$$

is injective for every $q \in \mathbb{N}$.

We refer to [17, 4] for some special cases of the above result.

Given the results obtained in [16], it would be natural to adapt our method to the case of a singular metric h_F (with arbitrary singularities). More precisely, we propose the following question.

Question 1.9. *Let $E = \sum E_i$ be a simple normal crossing divisor on a compact Kähler manifold X and let F be a holomorphic line bundle on X , endowed with a possible singular metric h_F such that $i\Theta_{h_F}(F) \geq 0$. We suppose that $\mathcal{I}(h_F) = \mathcal{I}(h_F \cdot e^{-(1-\varepsilon)\log|s_E|^2})$ for every $\varepsilon > 0$.*

Let s be a (holomorphic) section of mF (for some $m \in \mathbb{N}$) such that $|s|_{h_F^m} < +\infty$ point-wise and the zero locus of s contains no lc centres of the lc pair (X, E) . Then the multiplication map induced by the tensor product with s

$$(1.9.1) \quad s \otimes : \quad H^q(X, K_X \otimes E \otimes F \otimes \mathcal{I}(h)) \rightarrow H^q(X, K_X \otimes E \otimes (m+1)F \otimes \mathcal{I}(h^{m+1}))$$

is injective for every $q \in \mathbb{N}$.

Other than the aforementioned references, the articles [19], [15] by J. Noguchi, K. Liu, S. Rao and X. Wan contain important ideas in connection with our work here. Recent and exciting contributions in the direction of Conjecture 1.1 are due to J.-P. Demailly in [7] as well as to S. Rao and I.-H. Tsai in [21].

Acknowledgments. During part of the preparation of this article we have enjoyed the hospitality and excellent working conditions offered by the *Freiburg Institut for Advanced Study*. At FRIAS we had the opportunity to meet many visitors, but the math exchanges we have had with S. Kebekus and C. Schnell have been exceptionally fruitful. We thank A. Höring, J. Lott, R. Mazzeo and Y. Rubinstein for valuable discussions. JC thanks the Institut Universitaire de France and the A.N.R JCJC project Karmapolis (ANR-21-CE40-0010) for providing excellent working condition. Finally, our work was completed during MP's visit at *Center for Complex Geometry* (in Daejeon, South Korea). Many thanks to J.-M. Hwang for the invitation and vibrant working atmosphere in this institute!

This paper is organised as follows.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. First order differential operators	5
2.1. Connection induced by a smooth section	5
2.2. Lie derivative and commutation relations	6
3. A few results from L^2 Hodge theory	7
3.1. Hodge decomposition for metrics with Poincaré singularities	7
3.2. Hodge decomposition for metrics with conic singularities, I	15
3.3. Hodge decomposition for metrics with conic singularities, II	19
4. De Rham-Kodaira decomposition for conic currents	26
4.1. Regularity of the Green kernel for certain currents	27
5. Proof of Theorem 1.6	30
5.1. Preliminaries and some reductions	31
5.2. Improving the pole order of α and β (cosmetics)	32
5.3. A general vanishing statement	35
5.4. Application: an injectivity theorem	39
6. Commutation relations	43
7. Proof of Theorem 1.1, Corollary 1.4 and Theorem 1.2	44
8. More results and applications	45
8.1. A remark: first order extension	46
8.2. Extension of sections whose zero set is non-singular	48

8.3. A sufficient condition	50
8.4. Extension to the second infinitesimal neighbourhood	51
8.5. An application of Theorem 8.1	55
9. Appendix	56
References	61

2. FIRST ORDER DIFFERENTIAL OPERATORS

In this subsection we will recall a few facts from differential geometry of line bundles. We take this opportunity to fix some notations as well.

2.1. Connection induced by a smooth section.

Notation 2.1. *In the setting of our article, let $L \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ be a holomorphic line bundle endowed with a connection whose $(0, 1)$ -component is given by the $\bar{\partial}$ operator,*

$$(2.1.1) \quad \nabla = D'_{\mathcal{X}} + \bar{\partial}.$$

Since no confusion is likely, we will use the same symbol to denote the induced operator on the space of smooth, L -valued (p, q) -forms,

$$(2.1.2) \quad D'_{\mathcal{X}} : \mathcal{C}^{\infty}(\mathcal{X}, \Omega_{\mathcal{X}}^{p,q} \otimes L) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}^{\infty}(\mathcal{X}, \Omega_{\mathcal{X}}^{p+1,q} \otimes L).$$

Construction 2.2. *Let $L \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ be a holomorphic line bundle, and let \tilde{s} be a smooth section of L , with vanishing locus $Z \subseteq \mathcal{X}$. Assume that the open cover $(U_i)_i$ trivialises the bundle L and choose trivialisations, $L|_{U_i} \cong \mathcal{O}_{U_i}$. The section \tilde{s} will therefore give rise to smooth functions \tilde{s}_i on U_i . Set $U_i^{\circ} := U_i \setminus Z$.*

Given any index i we can now define a differential operator $D'_i : \mathcal{O}_{U_i^{\circ}} \rightarrow \Omega_{U_i^{\circ}}^1$ on U_i° as follows,

$$(2.2.1) \quad D'_i : \mathcal{O}_{U_i^{\circ}} \rightarrow \Omega_{U_i^{\circ}}^1, \quad \sigma \mapsto D'_t(\sigma_i)dt + \sum_{\alpha} D'_{\alpha}(\sigma_i)dz_i^{\alpha}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} D'_t(\sigma_i) &:= \partial_t \sigma_i - \frac{\partial_t \tilde{s}_i}{\tilde{s}_i} \sigma_i, & D'_{\alpha}(\sigma_i) &:= \partial_{\alpha} \sigma_i - \frac{\partial_{\alpha} \tilde{s}_i}{\tilde{s}_i} \sigma_i. \\ \partial_t &:= \partial / \partial t & \partial_{\alpha} &:= \partial / \partial z_i^{\alpha} \end{aligned}$$

Using the trivialisations chosen above, we can view D'_i as differential operators $D'_i : L|_{U_i^{\circ}} \rightarrow L|_{U_i^{\circ}} \otimes \Omega_{U_i^{\circ}}^1$ on U_i° . One computes without much pain that these differential operators glue to give a globally defined operator

$$D'_{\mathcal{X}} : L \rightarrow L \otimes \Omega_{\mathcal{X}}^1$$

on $\mathcal{X} \setminus Z$. In particular, we obtain a connection $\nabla := D'_{\mathcal{X}} + \bar{\partial}$ on $L|_{\mathcal{X} \setminus Z}$.

Lemma 2.3. *Setting as in Construction 2.2. Then, we have the following graded commutator identity*

$$(2.3.1) \quad [D'_{\mathcal{X}}, \bar{\partial}] = -\bar{\partial} \left(\frac{\partial \tilde{s}}{\tilde{s}} \right) \wedge$$

Proof. Direct computation that we skip. We note that the symbol $\bar{\partial} \left(\frac{\partial \tilde{s}}{\tilde{s}} \right)$ which appears in (2.3.1) is a global $(1, 1)$ form on the complement of the set $\tilde{s} = 0$, as we now explain. The global section \tilde{s} corresponds to local smooth functions denoted by \tilde{s}_i such that we have

$$(2.3.2) \quad \tilde{s}_i = g_{ij} \tilde{s}_j$$

on overlapping subsets of \mathcal{X} . Then we have

$$(2.3.3) \quad \frac{\partial \tilde{s}_i}{\tilde{s}_i} = \frac{\partial g_{ij}}{g_{ij}} + \frac{\partial \tilde{s}_j}{\tilde{s}_j}$$

and since $\bar{\partial} \left(\frac{\partial g_{ij}}{g_{ij}} \right) = 0$, we obtain

$$(2.3.4) \quad \bar{\partial} \left(\frac{\partial \tilde{s}_i}{s_i} \right) = \bar{\partial} \left(\frac{\partial \tilde{s}_j}{s_j} \right)$$

which proves our claim. We note that if \tilde{s} is holomorphic, then the $(1, 1)$ -form is simply zero on $\mathcal{X} \setminus Z$. \square

Remark 2.4. *We note that in general, the differential operator ∇ defined in (2.1.1) does not coincide with the Chern connection induced by the metric corresponding to \tilde{s} . This is of course the case if \tilde{s} is holomorphic.*

Remark 2.5. *As in the usual case, a smooth section \tilde{s} of the bundle mL induces a connection on L itself by a slight modification of the construction above that is to say, by multiplication with a constant, cf. next subsection.*

2.2. Lie derivative and commutation relations. Let

$$(2.5.1) \quad s \in H^0(X, mK_X)$$

be a holomorphic section of the pluricanonical bundle, where $m \geq 1$ is a positive integer.

Let \tilde{s} be arbitrary smooth extension of the section s . As already hinted, we can use the section \tilde{s} in order to define a connection on the bundle $L := (m-1)K_{\mathcal{X}/\mathbb{D}}$ restricted to the complement of the set of zeros of \tilde{s} . The local differential operators corresponding to $D'_{\mathcal{X}}$ are given by

$$(2.5.2) \quad D'_t(\sigma) := \partial_t \sigma - \frac{m-1}{m} \frac{\partial_t \tilde{s}_i}{\tilde{s}_i} \sigma, \quad D'_\alpha(\sigma) := \partial_\alpha \sigma - \frac{m-1}{m} \frac{\partial_\alpha \tilde{s}_i}{\tilde{s}_i} \sigma.$$

where $\partial_t := \partial/\partial t$ and $\partial_\alpha := \partial/\partial z_i^\alpha$ for each $\alpha = 1, \dots, n$. In (2.5.2) the symbol σ represents a local section of the bundle $(m-1)K_{\mathcal{X}/D}$. The sum

$$D'_t(\sigma) dt + \sum_\alpha D'_\alpha(\sigma) dz_i^\alpha$$

corresponds to a global connection of $(1, 0)$ type on $L := (m-1)K_{\mathcal{X}}$. If \tilde{s} would have been holomorphic, then this is nothing but the Chern connection; in any case, this is well (i.e. globally) defined. It is clear that we have

$$(2.5.3) \quad D'_{\mathcal{X}} \circ D'_{\mathcal{X}} = 0.$$

We consider next a vector field Ξ on the total space \mathcal{X} which projects into $\frac{\partial}{\partial t}$ on \mathbb{D} . It can be written in local coordinates as follows

$$(2.5.4) \quad \Xi|_{U_i} = \frac{\partial}{\partial t} + \sum_{\alpha=1}^n v_i^\alpha \frac{\partial}{\partial z_i^\alpha}$$

where v_i^α for $i = 1, \dots, n$ are smooth functions.

Our vector field induces a Lie derivative operator \mathcal{L}_Ξ as follows

$$(2.5.5) \quad \mathcal{L}_\Xi(\sigma) := D'_{\mathcal{X}}(\Xi] \sigma)$$

where σ is any $(n+1, q)$ -form with values in L . The result $\mathcal{L}_\Xi(\sigma)$ is a form of the same type as σ , and it will play an important role in what follows.

Let i_Ξ be the operator of degree $(-1, 0)$ given by the contraction with the vector field Ξ . Since we have $\mathcal{L}_\Xi = [D'_{\mathcal{X}}, i_\Xi]$ on $(n+1, q)$ -differential forms, the following Jacobi identity

$$[\bar{\partial}, \mathcal{L}_\Xi] + [D'_{\mathcal{X}}, [i_\Xi, \bar{\partial}]] + [i_\Xi, [\bar{\partial}, D'_{\mathcal{X}}]] = 0$$

holds true, and therefore we obtain the next formula over $(n+1, q)$ -forms

$$(2.5.6) \quad [\bar{\partial}, \mathcal{L}_\Xi] = -D'_{\mathcal{X}} \circ (\bar{\partial} \Xi) - [i_\Xi, [\bar{\partial}, D'_{\mathcal{X}}]].$$

Our next statement is playing an important role in the “algebra” part of the proof of our main results.

Lemma 2.6. *Let ρ be a $(n-1, 1)$ -form with values in L on \mathcal{X} . Then we have the equality*

$$(2.6.1) \quad \mathcal{L}_\Xi(D'_\mathcal{X}(dt \wedge \rho)) = D'_\mathcal{X} \left(dt \wedge \left(\Xi \lrcorner D'_\mathcal{X}(\Xi \lrcorner (dt \wedge \rho)) \right) \right)$$

on \mathcal{X} .

Proof. The argument is quite clear; we start with the left hand side and we remark that we have

$$(2.6.2) \quad D'_\mathcal{X}(dt \wedge \rho) = -dt \wedge D'_\mathcal{X}(\rho)$$

and so

$$(2.6.3) \quad \Xi \lrcorner (D'_\mathcal{X}(dt \wedge \rho)) = -D'_\mathcal{X}(\rho) + dt \wedge (\Xi \lrcorner D'_\mathcal{X}(\rho))$$

since the contraction with the vector field Ξ is a derivation. The LHS of (2.6.1) is therefore equal to

$$(2.6.4) \quad -dt \wedge D'_\mathcal{X}(\Xi \lrcorner D'_\mathcal{X}(\rho)).$$

For the RHS, we have

$$(2.6.5) \quad \Xi \lrcorner (dt \wedge \rho) = \rho - dt \wedge (\Xi \lrcorner \rho)$$

so

$$(2.6.6) \quad D'_\mathcal{X}(\Xi \lrcorner (dt \wedge \rho)) = D'_\mathcal{X}\rho + dt \wedge D'_\mathcal{X}(\Xi \lrcorner \rho).$$

A contraction with Ξ gives

$$(2.6.7) \quad \Xi \lrcorner \left(D'_\mathcal{X}(\Xi \lrcorner (dt \wedge \rho)) \right) \equiv \Xi \lrcorner (D'_\mathcal{X}\rho) + D'_\mathcal{X}(\Xi \lrcorner \rho)$$

modulo a term in $dt \wedge \cdot$, so we have

$$(2.6.8) \quad dt \wedge \left(\Xi \lrcorner \left(D'_\mathcal{X}(\Xi \lrcorner (dt \wedge \rho)) \right) \right) = dt \wedge \left(\Xi \lrcorner (D'_\mathcal{X}\rho) \right) + dt \wedge D'_\mathcal{X}(\Xi \lrcorner \rho)$$

and a further derivative of (2.6.8) shows that the LHS of (2.6.1) equals

$$(2.6.9) \quad -dt \wedge D'_\mathcal{X}(\Xi \lrcorner D'_\mathcal{X}(\rho)),$$

so our statement is proved. In the argument just finished, we have used many times the fact that $D'_\mathcal{X} \circ D'_\mathcal{X} = 0$. \square

3. A FEW RESULTS FROM L^2 HODGE THEORY

3.1. Hodge decomposition for metrics with Poincaré singularities. Let X be a n -dimensional compact Kähler manifold, and let (L, h_L) be a line bundle endowed with a (singular) metric $h_L = e^{-\varphi_L}$. The terminology in this section is as follows.

- (a) We say that the metric h_L has log poles, if its local weights can be written as follows

$$\varphi_L \equiv \sum a_i \log |f_i|^2$$

modulo a smooth function, where a_i are rational numbers and f_i are holomorphic functions.

- (b) If the metric h_L has log poles, then we will consistently write

$$i\Theta_{h_L}(L) = \sum a_i [Y_i] + \theta_L$$

where θ_L is a smooth form.

We consider a modification $\pi : \widehat{X} \rightarrow X$ of X such that the support of the singularities of $\varphi_L \circ \pi$ is a simple normal crossing divisor E . As usual, we can construct π such that its restriction to $\widehat{X} \setminus E$ is an biholomorphism. We write

$$(3.0.1) \quad \varphi_L \circ \pi|_\Omega \equiv \sum_{\alpha=1}^p e_\alpha \log |z_\alpha|^2$$

modulo a smooth function. Here $\Omega \subset \widehat{X}$ is a coordinate subset, and $(z_\alpha)_{\alpha=1, \dots, n}$ are coordinates such that $E \cap \Omega = (z_1 \dots z_p = 0)$.

Let $\widehat{\omega}_E$ be a complete Kähler metric on $\widehat{X} \setminus E$, with Poincaré singularities along E , and let

$$(3.0.2) \quad \omega_E := \pi_*(\widehat{\omega}_E)$$

be the direct image metric. We note that in this way (X_0, ω_E) becomes a complete Kähler manifold, where $X_0 := X \setminus (h_L = \infty)$.

The following statement is well-known, but we recall the precise version we need here. We denote by s the section of a line bundle for which the support of its zero divisor coincides with the support of $(h_L = \infty)$.

Lemma 3.1. *There exist a family of smooth functions $(\mu_\varepsilon)_{\varepsilon>0}$ with the following properties.*

- (a) *For each $\varepsilon > 0$, the function μ_ε has compact support in X_0 , and $0 \leq \mu_\varepsilon \leq 1$.*
- (b) *The sets $(\mu_\varepsilon = 1)$ are providing an exhaustion of X_0 .*
- (c) *There exists a positive constant $C > 0$ such that we have*

$$\sup_{X_0} (|\partial\mu_\varepsilon|_{\omega_E}^2 + |\bar{\partial}\mu_\varepsilon|_{\omega_E}^2) \leq C.$$

Proof. It is enough to obtain the corresponding statement on \widehat{X} , so that the divisor E is snc. Then we take

$$(3.1.1) \quad \mu_\varepsilon = \rho_\varepsilon \left(\log \log \frac{1}{|\widehat{s}|^2} \right)$$

where ρ_ε is equal to 1 on the interval $[1, \varepsilon^{-1}]$ and is equal to zero on $[1 + \varepsilon^{-1}, \infty]$. Also, we denote by $|\widehat{s}|$ the inverse image of the norm of the section s with respect to an arbitrary, smooth metric. Actually we can also impose the condition that

$$(3.1.2) \quad \max_{j=1, \dots, N} \sup_{\varepsilon>0} \sup_{\mathbb{R}_+} |\rho_\varepsilon^{(j)}| < C_N < \infty,$$

for any positive integer N . The properties (a)-(c) are then verified by a simple computation. In what follows we will use this statement for

$$L := (m-1)K_X, \quad \varphi_L := \frac{m-1}{m} \log |f|^2$$

and s the pluricanonical section we have to extend (the holomorphic function f above corresponds locally to s). \square

In this context we have the following statement, which is a slight generalisation of the usual result in L^2 Hodge theory.

Theorem 3.2. *Consider a line bundle $(L, h_L) \rightarrow X$ endowed with a metric h_L such that the requirement (a) above is satisfied, as well as the corresponding complete Kähler manifold (X_0, ω_E) , cf. (3.0.2).*

Then the following assertions are true.

- (i) *If in addition $\theta_L \geq 0$, then we have the Hodge decomposition for (n, q) forms, i.e.*

$$L_{n,q}^2(X_0, L) = \mathcal{H}_{n,q}(X_0, L) \oplus \text{Im } \bar{\partial} \oplus \text{Im } \bar{\partial}^*,$$

where $\mathcal{H}_{n,q}(X_0, L)$ is the space of L^2 Δ'' -harmonic (n, q) -forms with respect to (ω_E, h_L) .

- (ii) *Let u be an L -valued $\bar{\partial}$ -closed L^2 -form of type (n, q) on X_0 , and assume that we have $u = D'_{h_L} w$, where $w \in L_{n-1,q}^2(X_0, L)$. Then there exists $v \in L_{n,q-1}^2(X_0, L)$ such that $u = \bar{\partial}v$.*

The proof of Theorem 3.2, which we give below, makes use of the following statement which is the $\bar{\partial}$ -version of the Poincaré inequality established in [2].

Theorem 3.3. *Let $p \leq n$ be an integer. There exists a positive constant $C > 0$ such that the following inequality holds*

$$(3.3.1) \quad \int_{X_0} |u|_{\omega_E}^2 e^{-\varphi_L} dV_{\omega_E} \leq C \int_{X_0} |\bar{\partial}u|_{\omega_E}^2 e^{-\varphi_L} dV_{\omega_E}$$

for any L -valued form u of type $(p, 0)$ which belongs to the domain of $\bar{\partial}$ and which is orthogonal to the space of L^2 holomorphic $(p, 0)$ -forms. Note that here θ_L is arbitrary.

Proof of Theorem 3.3. The first observation is that we can assume from the very beginning that the polar set $h_L = \infty$ has snc support. Indeed, via the map π the hypothesis and the conclusion of our Poincaré inequality transform as follows.

- The form

$$(3.3.2) \quad \widehat{u} = \pi^* u$$

on \widehat{X} is $\pi^* L$ -valued and L^2 with respect to $\widehat{\omega}_E$ and $\pi^* h_L$.

- The form \widehat{u} is orthogonal on the space of L^2 -harmonic $(p, 0)$ forms with values in $\pi^* L$. Indeed, given any $\pi^* L$ -valued form of $(p, 0)$ -type $\widehat{\gamma}$ on $\widehat{X} \setminus E$ there exists a form γ on $X \setminus Z$ such that

$$(3.3.3) \quad \widehat{\gamma} = p^* \gamma$$

because $p : \widehat{X} \setminus E \rightarrow X \setminus Z$ is a biholomorphism. Also, p establish an isometry between $(\widehat{X} \setminus E, \widehat{\omega}_E)$ and $(X \setminus Z, \omega_E)$ respectively. The same is true for the pairs $(p^* L, p^* h_L)$ and (L, h_L) , so our claim is clear.

This means that it is enough to assume that $\widehat{X} = X$, i.e. the metric ω_E has Poincaré singularities along an snc divisor E which coincides with the support of the analytic set $h_L = \infty$.

The following statement represents an important step towards the proof of Theorem 3.3.

Proposition 3.4. *Let $(\Omega_j)_{j=1, \dots, N}$ be a finite union of coordinate sets of X covering E , and let U be any open subset contained in their union. Let τ be a $(p, 0)$ -form with compact support in a set $U \setminus E \subset X$ and values in (L, h_L) . Then we have*

$$(3.4.1) \quad \frac{1}{C} \int_U |\tau|_{\omega_E}^2 e^{-\varphi_L} dV_{\omega_E} \leq \int_U |\bar{\partial}\tau|_{\omega_E}^2 e^{-\varphi_L} dV_{\omega_E}$$

where C is a positive numerical constant.

The arguments in [2], Lemma 1.10 correspond to the case $p = 0$ and $\varphi_L = 0$. For the general case we need the following auxiliary statement.

Lemma 3.5. *Let δ be an arbitrary real number. Then there exists $x_\delta < 1$ such that the following holds. For any smooth function f defined on the closure of the unit disk \mathbb{D} in \mathbb{C} , such that there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ with the property that $f(z) = 0$ for all $|z| \leq \varepsilon$ or $|z| \geq 1 - x_\delta$ we have*

$$(3.5.1) \quad \int_{\mathbb{D}} |f|^2 \frac{d\lambda(z)}{|z|^{2\delta}} \leq C \int_{\mathbb{D}} \left| \frac{\partial f}{\partial \bar{z}} \right|^2 |z|^{2-2\delta} \log^2 |z| d\lambda(z)$$

as well as

$$(3.5.2) \quad \int_{\mathbb{D}} |f|^2 \frac{d\lambda(z)}{|z|^{2+2\delta} \log^2 |z|} \leq C \int_{\mathbb{D}} \left| \frac{\partial f}{\partial \bar{z}} \right|^2 \frac{d\lambda(z)}{|z|^{2\delta}}.$$

Proof of Lemma 3.5. Let $x_\delta < 1$ be a positive real number whose expression will be determined in what follows. Let $v : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be a smooth function whose support is contained in the interval $[\varepsilon, x_\delta]$ for some positive, small enough ε .

We claim that the following inequalities hold

$$(3.5.3) \quad \int_0^1 |v|^2 t^k dt \leq C \int_0^1 |v'|^2 t^{k+2} \log^2 t dt$$

as well as

$$(3.5.4) \quad \int_0^1 |v|^2 t^k \frac{dt}{\log^2 t} \leq C \int_0^1 |v'|^2 t^{k+2} dt$$

where k is any element of the set $\delta + \mathbb{Z}$, and C is a numerical constant (in particular independent of v, ε, k, \dots).

We first check that (3.5.3) holds true: we have

$$(3.5.5) \quad - \int_0^1 |v|^2 t^{k+1} \log^2 d \left(\frac{1}{\log t} \right) = \int_0^1 \frac{1}{\log t} \frac{d}{dt} (v^2 t^{k+1} \log^2 t) dt$$

and this equals

$$(3.5.6) \quad 2 \int_0^1 (\bar{v}v' + v\bar{v}')t^{k+1} \log t dt + \int_0^1 \frac{t^k v^2}{\log t} ((k+1) \log^2 t + 2 \log t) dt.$$

Now two things can happen: either $k+1 = 0$, and then the second term in (3.5.6) is equal to twice the quantity we are interested in, or $k+1 \neq 0$. Note that in the latter case it is possible to fix x_δ uniformly with respect to k so that

$$(3.5.7) \quad |(k+1) \log^2 t + 2 \log t| \geq 2 |\log t|$$

for any $t \in [0, x_\delta]$ precisely because $k \in \delta + \mathbb{Z}$.

As a consequence, we have

$$(3.5.8) \quad \left| \int_0^1 (\bar{v}v' + v\bar{v}')t^{k+1} \log t dt \right| \geq \int_0^1 t^k v^2 dt.$$

for any v of compact support in $]0, x_\delta[$.

Moreover, we have

$$(3.5.9) \quad \left| \int_0^1 (\bar{v}v' + v\bar{v}')t^{k+1} \log t dt \right|^2 \leq \int_0^1 |v'|^2 t^{k+2} \log^2 t dt \int_0^1 |v|^2 t^k dt.$$

by Cauchy-Schwarz, so the inequality (3.5.3) is settled.

The arguments for (3.5.4) are completely similar: we have

$$(3.5.10) \quad \int_0^1 |v|^2 t^k \frac{dt}{\log^2 t} = \int_0^1 |v|^2 \frac{t^{k+1}}{\log^2 t} d \log t$$

which equals

$$(3.5.11) \quad - \int_0^1 \log t \frac{d}{dt} \left(|v|^2 \frac{t^{k+1}}{\log^2 t} \right) dt = \int_0^1 \frac{|v|^2 t^k}{\log^2 t} \left(2 + (k+1) \log \frac{1}{t} \right) dt - \int_0^1 \frac{t^{k+1}}{\log t} (v'\bar{v} + v\bar{v}') dt.$$

and two things can happen. If $k+1 \geq 0$, then we have $2 + (k+1) \log \frac{1}{t} \geq 2$ for any $t \in [0, 1]$ and (3.5.4) follows. For each element $k \in \delta + \mathbb{Z}$ such that $k+1 < 0$ we can assume that

$$(3.5.12) \quad (k+1) \log \frac{1}{t} + 2 \leq \frac{1}{2}$$

for any $t \in [0, x_\delta]$ by imposing a supplementary (but uniform) condition on x_δ if necessary, and we proceed exactly as we did for (3.5.3).

Therefore, we obtain (3.5.3) and (3.5.4) for any $k \in \delta + \mathbb{Z}$.

Lemma 3.5 follows from this: we consider the Fourier series

$$(3.5.13) \quad f = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} a_k(t) e^{\sqrt{-1}k\theta}$$

of f , and then we have

$$(3.5.14) \quad \frac{\partial v}{\partial z} = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \left(a'_k(t) - \frac{k}{t} a_k(t) \right) e^{\sqrt{-1}k\theta}.$$

The identity

$$(3.5.15) \quad t^k \frac{d}{dt} \left(\frac{a_k}{t^k} \right) = a'_k(t) - \frac{k}{t} a_k(t)$$

reduces the proof of our statement to inequalities of type (3.5.3) and (3.5.4) which are already established. In conclusion, Lemma 3.5 is completely established. \square

We now return to the proof of Proposition 3.4.

Proof of Proposition 3.4. We consider the restriction of the form τ to some co-ordinate open set Ω whose intersection with E is of type $z_1 \dots z_r = 0$. It can be written as sum of forms of type

$$(3.5.16) \quad \tau_I := f_I dz_I$$

and assume that $I \cap \{1, \dots, r\} = \{1, \dots, p\}$ for some p or $I \cap \{1, \dots, r\} = \emptyset$.

In the first case we have

$$(3.5.17) \quad \frac{|\tau_I|_g^2 e^{-\varphi_L} dV_g}{d\lambda} = \frac{|f_I|^2 e^{-\varphi_L}}{\prod_{\alpha=p+1}^r |z_\alpha|^2 \log^2 |z_\alpha|^2}$$

where $e^{-\varphi_L} = \frac{1}{\prod_{i=1}^r |z_i|^{2\delta_i}}$ and in the second case this is the same with $p = 0$. In (3.5.17) we denote by g the model Poincaré metric

$$\sum_{i=1}^r \frac{\sqrt{-1} dz_i \wedge d\bar{z}_i}{|z_i|^2 \log^2 |z_i|^2} + \sum_{i=r+1}^n \sqrt{-1} dz_i \wedge d\bar{z}_i.$$

Now for the $\bar{\partial}\tau_I$ we have

$$(3.5.18) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{|\bar{\partial}\tau_I|_g^2 e^{-\varphi_L} dV_g}{d\lambda} &= \sum_{i=1}^r \left| \frac{\partial f_I}{\partial \bar{z}_i} \right|^2 \frac{|z_i|^2 \log^2 |z_i|^2 e^{-\varphi_L}}{\prod_{\alpha=p+1}^r |z_\alpha|^2 \log^2 |z_\alpha|^2} \\ &+ \sum_{i=r+1}^n \left| \frac{\partial f_I}{\partial \bar{z}_i} \right|^2 \frac{e^{-\varphi_L}}{\prod_{\alpha=p+1}^r |z_\alpha|^2 \log^2 |z_\alpha|^2} \end{aligned}$$

and the observation is that for every $\xi \in \Omega$ there exist some index $j \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ for which the support condition we require in Lemma 3.5 is satisfied for

$$(3.5.19) \quad f(z) := f_I(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{j-1}, z, \xi_{j+1}, \dots, \xi_n).$$

We use (3.5.3) or (3.5.4) according to the case where $j \geq p$ in (3.5.18) or not. Proposition 3.4 is therefore completely proved. \square

Remark 3.6. *The constant C in (3.4.1) only depends on the distortion between the model Poincaré metric on Ω_j with singularities on E and the global metric ω_E restricted to Ω_j . Another important observation is that by using the cut-off function μ_ε in Lemma 3.1, we infer that (3.4.1) holds in fact for any L^2 -bounded form with compact support in U .*

Now we finish the proof of Theorem 3.3, which follows the arguments in [2, Lemma 1.10]: if a positive constant as in (3.3.1) does not exist, then we obtain a sequence u_j of L -valued forms of type $(p, 0)$ orthogonal to the space of holomorphic forms such that

$$(3.6.1) \quad \int_X |u_i|_{\omega_E}^2 e^{-\varphi_L} dV_{\omega_E} = 1, \quad \lim_i \int_X |\bar{\partial}u_i|_{\omega_E}^2 e^{-\varphi_L} dV_{\omega_E} = 0$$

It follows that the weak limit u_∞ of (u_i) is holomorphic. On the other hand, each u_i is perpendicular to the space of holomorphic forms, so it follows that u_∞ is equal to zero. Moreover, by Bochner formula combined with Proposition 3.4 we can assume that u_i converges weakly in the Sobolev space W^1 , so strongly in L^2 to zero. In particular we have

$$(3.6.2) \quad u_i|_K \rightarrow 0$$

in L^2 for any compact subset $K \subset X \setminus E$.

The last step in the proof is to notice that the considerations above contradict the fact that the L^2 norm of each u_i is equal to one. This is not quite immediate, but is precisely as the end of the proof of Lemma 1.10 in [2], so we will not reproduce it here. The idea is however very clear: we decompose each $u_j = \chi u_j + (1 - \chi)u_j$ where χ is a cutoff function which is equal to 1 in U and whose norm of the corresponding gradient is small. Then the L^2 norm of χu_j is small by (3.4.1) and (3.6.1). The L^2 norm of $(1 - \chi)u_j$ is equally small by (3.6.2), and this is how we reach a contradiction. \square

We have the following (almost) direct consequences of Proposition 3.4.

Corollary 3.7. *There exists a positive constant $C > 0$ such that the following holds true. Let v be a L -valued form of type (n, q) for some $q \geq 1$. We assume that v is L^2 , and orthogonal to the kernel of the operator $\bar{\partial}^*$. Then we have*

$$(3.7.1) \quad \int_{X_0} |v|_{\omega_E}^2 e^{-\varphi_L} dV_{\omega_E} \leq C \int_{X_0} |\bar{\partial}^* v|_{\omega_E}^2 e^{-\varphi_L} dV_{\omega_E}.$$

Proof. To start with, we consider the Hodge star $u := \star v$ (of type $(n - q, 0)$ and values in L) is orthogonal to the space $\text{Ker}(D'_{h_L})$. This can be seen as follows: let ϕ be a L^2 -form of type $(n - q, 0)$ such that $D'_{h_L} \phi = 0$. Then we have

$$\int_{X_0} \langle u, \phi \rangle e^{-\varphi_L} dV_{\omega_E} = \int_{X_0} \langle v, \star \phi \rangle e^{-\varphi_L} dV_{\omega_E} = 0.$$

since $\bar{\partial}^*(\star \phi) = -\star D'_{h_L}(\phi) = 0$.

We therefore have to show that there exists some constant $C > 0$ such that the inequality

$$(3.7.2) \quad \int_{X_0} |u|_{\omega_E}^2 e^{-\varphi_L} dV_{\omega_E} \leq C \int_{X_0} |D'_{h_L} u|_{\omega_E}^2 e^{-\varphi_L} dV_{\omega_E}.$$

holds for any L -valued form u of type $(n - q, 0)$ orthogonal to the kernel of D' . As before, this is done contradiction: if we cannot find a constant C as in (3.7.2), then we get a sequence of forms u_i such that

$$(3.7.3) \quad \|u_i\|^2 = 1, \quad \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \|D'_{h_L}(u_i)\|^2 = 0,$$

where the norms in (3.7.3) are precisely the ones in (3.7.2). It follows that any weak limit u_∞ of the sequence (u_i) must be zero, since it belongs to both $\text{Ker}(D'_{h_L})$ and to its orthogonal. Therefore we get

$$(3.7.4) \quad u_i|_K \rightarrow 0$$

in L^2 for any compact subset $K \subset X \setminus E$.

On the other hand, for each index i we have $D'^*(u_i) = 0$ so Bochner formula reads

$$(3.7.5) \quad \int_{X_0} |\bar{\partial} u_i|_{\omega_E}^2 e^{-\varphi_L} dV_{\omega_E} = \int_{X_0} |D'_{h_L} u_i|_{\omega_E}^2 e^{-\varphi_L} dV_{\omega_E} + \int_{X_0} \langle [\theta_L, \Lambda_{\omega_E}] u_i, u_i \rangle e^{-\varphi_L} dV_{\omega_E}$$

and since -by assumption- $\theta_L \geq 0$, we have

$$(3.7.6) \quad \int_{X_0} \langle [\theta_L, \Lambda_{\omega_E}] u_i, u_i \rangle e^{-\varphi_L} dV_{\omega_E} \leq 0$$

because of the type of u_i .

It follows that $\lim_i \|\bar{\partial} u_i\|^2 = 0$ and we obtain a contradiction exactly as in end of the proof of Theorem 3.3. \square

The following is the ‘‘adjoint’’ version of the preceding corollary.

Corollary 3.8. *There exists a positive constant $C > 0$ such that the following holds true. Let v be a L -valued form of type (n, q) for some $q \geq 1$. We assume that v is L^2 , and orthogonal to the kernel of the operator $\bar{\partial}$. Then we have*

$$(3.8.1) \quad \int_{X_0} |v|_{\omega_E}^2 e^{-\varphi_L} dV_{\omega_E} \leq C \int_{X_0} |\bar{\partial} v|_{\omega_E}^2 e^{-\varphi_L} dV_{\omega_E}.$$

Proof. The arguments are completely identical: if v is orthogonal on $\text{Ker}(\bar{\partial})$, then $u := \star v$ is orthogonal to the kernel of D'^* . Thus the inequality to be established is

$$(3.8.2) \quad \int_{X_0} |u|_{\omega_E}^2 e^{-\varphi_L} dV_{\omega_E} \leq C \int_{X_0} |D'^* u|_{\omega_E}^2 e^{-\varphi_L} dV_{\omega_E}.$$

holds for any L -valued form u of type $(n - q, 0)$ orthogonal to the kernel of D'^* . This is (again) done by contradiction -note that in this case $D'_{h_L} u = 0$ -, and we will skip the details. \square

Proof of Theorem 3.2. This statement is almost contained in [5, chapter VIII, pages 367-370]. Indeed, in the context of complete manifolds one has the following decomposition

$$(3.8.3) \quad L_{n,q}^2(X_0, L) = \mathcal{H}_{n,q}(X_0, L) \oplus \overline{\text{Im } \bar{\partial}} \oplus \overline{\text{Im } \bar{\partial}^*}.$$

We also know (see *loc. cit.*) that the adjoints $\bar{\partial}^*$ and D'^* in the sense of von Neumann coincide with the formal adjoints of $\bar{\partial}$ and D' respectively.

It remains to show that the ranges of the $\bar{\partial}, \bar{\partial}^*$ -operators are closed with respect to the L^2 topology. In our set-up, this is a consequence of the particular shape of the metric ω_E at infinity (i.e. near the support of $\pi(E)$). The image of $\bar{\partial}^*$ is closed thanks to Corollary 3.7 and the fact that the image of $\bar{\partial}$ is closed follows from Corollary 3.8

The assertion (ii) is an easy consequences of (i), together with standard considerations. \square

Remark 3.9. It would be very interesting to know if the images of the operators $\bar{\partial}$ and $\bar{\partial}^*$ are closed for L -valued forms of arbitrary type, especially if the non-singular part θ_L of the curvature of (L, h_L) has arbitrary sign. In our arguments, the requirement $\theta_L \geq 0$ is imposed by the -extensive use of Bochner formula. We refer to [10] and [11] for results in this direction.

In the setting of the current section, the harmonic $(n, 1)$ -forms have the following properties.

Lemma 3.10. *We assume that (X_0, ω_E) and (L, h_L) have the property (a) (at the beginning of this section) such that moreover $\theta_L \geq 0$. Let α be a Δ'' -harmonic L^2 form of type $(n, 1)$ with values in L . We denote by F its Hodge dual. Then the following hold.*

(1) *We have*

$$\bar{\partial}F = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad D'_{h_L}F = 0.$$

(2) *Let $\Omega \subset X$ be a coordinate open set, and let f be any holomorphic function defined on $\overline{\Omega}$. We assume that the support of the set of zeroes of f is contained in $(h_L = \infty)$. Then the form $F \wedge \frac{df}{f}$ is non-singular on X (but it is not clear whether this form is L^2 with respect to $e^{-\varphi_L}$ or not).*

(3) *Let $\Omega \subset X$ be a coordinate open set, and let g be any holomorphic function defined on $\overline{\Omega}$. Then we have*

$$\int_{\Omega} |F \wedge dg|^2 e^{-\varphi_L} < \infty.$$

Proof. Note that given any Δ'' -harmonic $(n, 1)$ -form α , by Bochner formula combined with the fact that the curvature of (L, h_L) is semi-positive, we have

$$(3.10.1) \quad D'^*\alpha = 0 \quad \text{on } X \setminus (h_L = \infty).$$

So if we write $\alpha = \omega_E \wedge F$, it follows that

$$(3.10.2) \quad F \in H^0(X, \Omega_X^{n-1} \otimes L), \quad \int_X |F|_{\omega_E}^2 e^{-\varphi_L} dV_{\omega_E} < \infty$$

thanks to the property (3.10.1). Moreover, as $\bar{\partial}^*\alpha = 0$ it turns out that we have $D'_{h_L}F = 0$ as well. We obtain thus (1) and (3). Note that (3.10.2) is valid in a more general setting, cf. [8], [25].

As for (2), by our choice of the metric ω_E , we show first that we have

$$(3.10.3) \quad |df|_{\omega_E}^2 \sim |f|^2 \log^2 |f|.$$

Indeed, assume that via the bimeromorphism $\pi : \widehat{X} \rightarrow X$ the function f corresponds locally to the function $\prod_{i=1}^r z_i^{p_i}$ (notations as in the beginning of this section). Then the metric ω_E is quasi-isometric to the Poincaré metric with singularities along $z_1 \dots z_r = 0$. The π -inverse image of $\frac{df}{f}$ is equal to

$$\sum_{i=1}^r p_i \frac{dz_i}{z_i}$$

and thus we have

$$\left| \frac{\partial f}{f} \right|_{\omega_E}^2 \simeq \sum p_i^2 \log^2 |z_i|^2$$

and the RHS of this quantity is the same as $\log^2 |f|^2$.

Therefore we infer

$$(3.10.4) \quad \int_{\Omega} \left| F \wedge \frac{df}{f} \right|^2 \frac{e^{-\varphi_L}}{\log^2 |f|} \leq C \int_X |F|_{\omega_E}^2 e^{-\varphi_L} dV_{\omega_E}.$$

Since the RHS of (3.10.4) is finite and φ_L has non zero Lelong number over any component of $Div(f)$, it follows that $F \wedge df$ vanishes along $Div(f)$. \square

Consider the equation

$$(3.10.5) \quad \bar{\partial}u = D'_{h_L} w + \Theta(L, h_L) \wedge \tau \quad \text{on } X \setminus \{h_L = \infty\}$$

where τ, w and $D'w$ are L^2 , and $D'_{h_L} w + \Theta(L, h_L) \wedge \tau$ is $\bar{\partial}$ -closed on $X \setminus \{h_L = \infty\}$. We show next that one can solve it in a fair general context, and moreover obtain L^2 estimates for the solution with minimal norm. We refer to [24, Thm A.5] for a similar argument in the non-singular case.

Theorem 3.11. *Let (L, h_L) be a holomorphic line bundle on X with a possible singular metric h_L with analytic singularities along a subvarieties $Z \subset X$ and whose curvature current is semi-positive. Consider a complete Kähler metric $(X \setminus Z, \omega_E)$. Let w be an L -valued $(n-1, 1)$ -form on $X \setminus Z$ such that w and $D'_{h_L} w$ are in L^2 . Let also τ be an L -valued $(n-1, 0)$ -form on $X \setminus Z$ such that τ and $\Theta(L, h_L) \wedge \tau$ are L^2 .*

If $D'_{h_L} w + \Theta(L, h_L) \wedge \tau$ is $\bar{\partial}$ -closed on $X \setminus Z$, then there exists a solution u of the equation (3.10.5) such that

$$(3.11.1) \quad \int_X |u|^2 e^{-\varphi_L} \leq \int_X |w|_{\omega_E}^2 e^{-\varphi_L} dV_{\omega_E} - \int_{X \setminus Z} \langle [\Theta(L, h_L), \Lambda_{\omega_E}] \tau, \tau \rangle_{\omega_E} e^{-\varphi_L} dV_{\omega_E}$$

Proof. Let ξ be a smooth $(n, 1)$ -form of compact support in $X \setminus Z$. Let $\xi = \xi_1 + \xi_2$ be its decomposition according to $\text{Ker}(\bar{\partial})$ and its orthogonal.

By using the L^2 -assumptions, we have

$$\int_{X \setminus Z} \langle D'w + \Theta(L, h_L) \wedge \tau, \xi \rangle_{\omega_E} e^{-\varphi_L} dV_{\omega_E} = \int_{X \setminus Z} \langle D'w + \Theta(L, h_L) \wedge \tau, \xi_1 \rangle_{\omega_E} e^{-\varphi_L} dV_{\omega_E}.$$

Then the semipositive curvature condition and the Bochner equality imply that

$$(3.11.2) \quad \left| \int_{X \setminus Z} \langle D'w, \xi_1 \rangle_{\omega_E} e^{-\varphi_L} dV_{\omega_E} \right|^2$$

is smaller than

$$(3.11.3) \quad \int_X |w|_{\omega_E}^2 e^{-\varphi_L} dV_{\omega_E} \cdot \int_X |\bar{\partial}^* \xi|_{\omega_E}^2 e^{-\varphi_L} dV_{\omega_E}.$$

For the term containing the curvature of (L, h_L) we are using Cauchy inequality and we infer that

$$(3.11.4) \quad \left| \int_{X \setminus Z} \langle \Theta(L, h_L) \wedge \tau, \xi_1 \rangle_{\omega_E} e^{-\varphi_L} dV_{\omega_E} \right|^2$$

is smaller than

$$(3.11.5) \quad \int_X \langle -[\Theta(L, h_L), \Lambda_{\omega_E}] \tau, \tau \rangle_{\omega_E} e^{-\varphi_L} dV_{\omega_E} \cdot \int_X \langle [\Theta(L, h_L), \Lambda_{\omega_E}] \xi_1, \xi_1 \rangle_{\omega_E} e^{-\varphi_L} dV_{\omega_E}.$$

We are using again Bochner equality and we infer that

$$(3.11.6) \quad \left| \int_{X \setminus Z} \langle \Theta(L, h_L) \wedge \tau, \xi_1 \rangle_{\omega_E} e^{-\varphi_L} dV_{\omega_E} \right|^2$$

is smaller than

$$(3.11.7) \quad \int_X \langle -[\Theta(L, h_L), \Lambda_{\omega_E}] \tau, \tau \rangle_{\omega_E} e^{-\varphi_L} dV_{\omega_E} \cdot \int_X |\bar{\partial}^* \xi|_{\omega_E}^2 e^{-\varphi_L} dV_{\omega_E}.$$

Then the theorem is proved by the standard L^2 -estimate argument. \square

3.2. Hodge decomposition for metrics with conic singularities, I. We discuss in this section the analog of Theorem 3.2 for metrics with conic singularities. This will be important for the applications we are aiming at. There are two possibilities to deal with this sort of problems: either we approximate our metrics with complete ones (e.g. with Poincaré singularities), or directly, by using local uniformisations. In this subsection we use the former approach and in the next one we present the later.

Since most of the arguments in the proof of Theorem 3.2 will be used here, we will skip a few details. In the last part of this section we offer a few comments about the L^2 estimates in this class of singularities.

Let X be a compact Kähler manifold, and let $Y = \sum Y_i$ be a snc divisor. We denote by ω_C a metric with conic singularities along the \mathbb{Q} -divisor

$$(3.11.8) \quad \sum_{i \in I} \left(1 - \frac{1}{m}\right) Y_i$$

where m is a positive integer. By this we mean that locally we have

$$(3.11.9) \quad \omega_C \simeq \sum_{i=1}^r \frac{\sqrt{-1} dz_i \wedge d\bar{z}_i}{|z_i|^{2-\frac{2}{m}}} + \sum_{i \geq r+1} \sqrt{-1} dz_i \wedge d\bar{z}_i$$

that is to say, ω_C is quasi-isometric with the RHS of (3.11.9), where $z_1 \dots z_r = 0$ is the local equation of the divisor Y .

Let (L, h_L) be a line bundle endowed with a (singular) metric h_L such that the following holds.

- (i) The singularities of the metric h_L are contained in the support of Y , i.e. $\varphi_L \simeq \sum q_i \log |z_i|^2$ modulo a smooth function, where $q_i \in \mathbb{Q}$ and as above, z_i represent the local equations of the components of Y . Note that the q_i are not necessarily positive.
- (ii) For each $q_i \in \mathbb{Q} \setminus \mathbb{Z}$, we assume that $\left\lfloor q_i - \frac{1}{m} \right\rfloor = [q_i]$ holds true and that $m q_i \in \mathbb{Z}$.
- (iii) The curvature current of (L, h_L) will be written as

$$i\Theta(L, h_L) = \sum q_i [Y_i] + \theta_L$$

where θ_L is a smooth form on X .

Our next result states as follows.

Theorem 3.12. *Let $(L, h_L) \rightarrow X$ be a line bundle endowed with a metric h_L such that the requirements (i)-(ii) above are satisfied; in addition, we assume $\theta_L \geq 0$. Let ω_C be a Kähler metric with conic singularities as above.*

- (i) *The following equality holds*

$$L_{n,q}^2(X_0, L) = \mathcal{H}_{n,q}(X_0, L) \oplus \text{Im } \bar{\partial} \oplus \text{Im } \bar{\partial}^*,$$

for any $q \geq 0$, where $X_0 := X \setminus Y$.

- (ii) *If $i\Theta(L, h_L) \geq 0$ then for any harmonic form $\xi \in \mathcal{H}_{n,q}(X_0, L)$, we have*

$$\bar{\partial} \xi = \bar{\partial}^* \xi = (D')^* \xi = 0.$$

In particular, $\star \xi$ is a L^2 -holomorphic form on X .

The proof of Theorem 3.12 is based on the corresponding version for metrics with Poincaré singularities, together with the following result. A different argument for a more general version of this statement will be given by the end of this section. We have decided to include this first proof here because the statement (3.13) below could be useful in other contexts.

Let

$$(3.12.1) \quad \omega_{Y,\varepsilon} := \omega_C + \varepsilon\omega_{\mathcal{P}}$$

be a sequence approximating ω_C , where $\omega_{\mathcal{P}}$ is a metric with Poincaré singularities on Y . We have the following statement.

Theorem 3.13. *Let $p \leq n$ be an integer. There exists a positive constant $C > 0$ (independent of ε) such that the following inequality holds*

$$(3.13.1) \quad \int_{X_0} |u|_{\omega_{Y,\varepsilon}}^2 e^{-\varphi_L} dV_{\omega_{Y,\varepsilon}} \leq C \int_{X_0} |\bar{\partial}u|_{\omega_{Y,\varepsilon}}^2 e^{-\varphi_L} dV_{\omega_{Y,\varepsilon}}$$

for any L -valued form u of type $(p,0)$ which belongs to the domain of $\bar{\partial}$ and which is orthogonal to the space of L^2 harmonic $(p,0)$ -forms (with respect the metric $\omega_{Y,\varepsilon}$).

We first prove Theorem 3.13, and then derive Theorem 3.12 as consequence.

Proof of Theorem 3.13. The case $\varepsilon = 0$ is quite easy and even if the general case does not follows from it, we give here a direct proof.

We argue by contradiction: if (3.13.1) does not holds, then there exists a sequence (u_k) of $(p,0)$ -forms orthogonal to $\text{Ker}(\bar{\partial})$ such that

$$(3.13.2) \quad \int_X |u_k|_{\omega_C}^2 e^{-\varphi_L} dV_{\omega_C} = 1, \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{X_0} |\bar{\partial}u_k|_{\omega_C}^2 e^{-\varphi_L} dV_{\omega_C} = 0.$$

It follows that the weak limit u_0 of $(u_k)_{k \geq 1}$ has the following properties

$$(3.13.3) \quad \int_X |u_0|_{\omega_C}^2 e^{-\varphi_L} dV_{\omega_C} \leq 1, \quad \bar{\partial}u_0 = 0.$$

Since on the other hand u_0 is orthogonal to $\text{Ker}(\bar{\partial})$, it follows that $u_0 = 0$. We show next that this contradicts the first equality of (3.13.2) for k large enough.

Let Ω be a coordinate ball whose origin belongs to Y . The restriction $\bar{\partial}u_k|_{\Omega \setminus Y}$ is a closed $(p,1)$ -form, but we can also see it as $(n,1)$ -form with values in the vector bundle $\Lambda^{n-p}T_X \otimes L|_{\Omega}$. We equip the tangent bundle $E := T_X|_{\Omega}$ with the standard metric with conic singularities, and L with $e^{-\phi_L}$ where

$$(3.13.4) \quad \phi_L = \varphi_L + \|z\|^2 + C \sum |z_i|^{\frac{2}{m_i}}.$$

In (3.13.4) we denote by $(z_i)_{i=1,\dots,n}$ a coordinate system adapted to Y . Then the curvature of E is greater than $\omega_C \otimes \text{Id}_E$ and by the L^2 estimates applied on $\Omega \setminus Y$ we can solve the equation

$$(3.13.5) \quad \bar{\partial}v_{\Omega,k} = \bar{\partial}u_k, \quad \int_{\Omega} |v_{\Omega,k}|^2 e^{-\varphi_L} \leq C \int_{X_0} |\bar{\partial}u_k|_{\omega_C}^2 e^{-\varphi_L} dV_{\omega_C}.$$

Here we are using the fact that local term added to the global metric of L in (3.13.4) is two-sided bounded.

We cover X with a finite subset of coordinate subsets Ω , and we construct the forms $v_{\Omega,k}$ as above (if the set Ω do not intersects the support of the divisor Y , then we just use the flat metric). If all the coefficients q_i in (i) are positive it follows that the holomorphic forms $(u_k - v_{\Omega,k})$ are converging to zero weakly, hence strongly as well. Moreover, the L^2 norm of each $v_{\Omega,k}$ tends to zero as $k \rightarrow \infty$, so for k large enough the first equality in (3.13.2) cannot hold. The contradiction we obtained ends the proof of the case $\varepsilon = 0$.

Now assume that we only have one negative coefficient $q_1 < 0$, then we write $q_1 = \lfloor q_1 \rfloor + \{q_1\}$ and replace this coefficient with its fractionally part $\{q_1\}$ in the expression of the metric. Then can argue as above, by considering $z_1^{-\lfloor q_1 \rfloor}(u_k - v_{\Omega,k})$.

The general case (i.e. for an arbitrary ε) is quite similar, except that the we cannot rely on the "correction" forms $v_{\Omega,k}$ for $\Omega \cap Y \neq \emptyset$. Instead we are using the following two facts.

The first fact is a version of Proposition 3.4: let U be a finite union of coordinate subsets of X containing Y . There exists a positive constant $C > 0$ (independent of ε) such that for any L -valued $(p, 0)$ form u with support in U we have the inequality

$$(3.13.6) \quad \frac{1}{C} \int_U |u|_{\omega_{Y,\varepsilon}}^2 e^{-\varphi_L} dV_{\omega_{Y,\varepsilon}} \leq \int_U |\bar{\partial}u|_{\omega_{Y,\varepsilon}}^2 e^{-\varphi_L} dV_{\omega_{Y,\varepsilon}} + \int_{U \setminus \frac{1}{2}U} |u|_{\omega_{Y,\varepsilon}}^2 e^{-\varphi_L} dV_{\omega_{Y,\varepsilon}}.$$

We will not prove (3.13.6) here, because it follows directly from the arguments invoked for Proposition 3.4.

The second fact is that the space of L^2 holomorphic p -forms is independent of $\varepsilon \geq 0$. Let Φ be a holomorphic p -form on X_0 with values in L . If Φ is L^2 with respect to $(\omega_{Y,\varepsilon}, h_L)$, it is also L^2 integrable with respect to (ω_Y, h_L) because of the inequality

$$(3.13.7) \quad \|\Phi\|_{\omega_{Y,\varepsilon}}^2 \geq \|\Phi\|_{\omega_Y}^2.$$

We next assume that Φ is L^2 with respect to (ω_Y, h_L) . In local coordinates this writes as

$$(3.13.8) \quad \int_{\Omega} \sum |\Phi_I(z)|^2 \prod_{j \notin I} \lambda_j(z) e^{-\varphi_L(z)} d\lambda(z) < \infty$$

where λ_j are the eigenvalues of ω_C with respect to the Euclidean metric on $(\Omega, (z_1, \dots, z_n))$. We take the coordinates z so that they are adapted to (X, Y) , i.e. $\Omega \cap Y = z_1 \dots z_r = 0$. It follows that the holomorphic functions Φ_I are divisible by

$$(3.13.9) \quad \prod_{i \leq r, i \in I} z_i^{\lfloor q_i \rfloor} \prod_{i \leq r, i \notin I} z_i^{\lfloor 1+q_i - \frac{1}{m} \rfloor}$$

cf. notations at the beginning. Recall that we have chosen m so that

$$(3.13.10) \quad \left\lfloor q_i - \frac{1}{m} \right\rfloor = \lfloor q_i \rfloor,$$

for each non-integer coefficient q_i which appears in the expression of the metric h_L .

So summing up we see that by the careful choice of the singularities of the metric ω_C cf. (ii), for any holomorphic form Φ satisfying $\|\Phi\|_{\omega_C}^2 < \infty$, we have

$$(3.13.11) \quad \|\Phi\|_{\omega_{Y,\varepsilon}}^2 < \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \|\Phi\|_{\omega_{Y,\varepsilon}}^2 = \|\Phi\|_{\omega_C}^2.$$

The rest of the proof is absolutely similar (i.e. by contradiction) to the case of Theorem 3.3: we suppose by contradiction that there exists a sequence u_ε such that $\|u_\varepsilon\|_{\omega_{Y,\varepsilon}} = 1$, u_ε is orthogonal to the space of L^2 -holomorphic forms with respect to $\omega_{Y,\varepsilon}$ and $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \|\bar{\partial}u_\varepsilon\|_{\omega_{Y,\varepsilon}} = 0$. By passing to some subsequence, u_ε converges weakly to some $(p, 0)$ -form u on X_0 . Then $\|u\|_{\omega_C} \leq 1$ and $\bar{\partial}u = 0$. Therefore u is a holomorphic L^2 -form on X . Since u_ε is orthogonal to the holomorphic forms, we have $\int_X \langle u, u_\varepsilon \rangle_{\omega_{Y,\varepsilon}} = 0$. Together with (3.13.11), we obtain $u = 0$. Then we obtain a contradiction by the same arguments as in Theorem 3.3 combined with (3.13.6). \square

We prove next Theorem 3.12.

Proof. Let ξ be any L^2 -form of type (n, q) with values in (L, h_L) (with respect to the metric ω_C). Then we also have $\|\xi\|_{\omega_{Y,\varepsilon}} < \infty$ and thus we write

$$(3.13.12) \quad \xi = \xi_\varepsilon + \bar{\partial}(\eta_\varepsilon) + \bar{\partial}^*(\tau_\varepsilon),$$

where ξ_ε is harmonic, η_ε is orthogonal to $\text{Ker}(\bar{\partial})$ and τ_ε orthogonal on $\text{Ker}(\bar{\partial}^*)$. We have

$$(3.13.13) \quad \|\xi_\varepsilon\|_{\omega_{Y,\varepsilon}}^2 \leq \|\xi\|_{\omega_{Y,\varepsilon}}^2 \leq \|\xi\|_{\omega_Y}^2$$

and therefore the limit of $(\xi_\varepsilon)_{\varepsilon > 0}$ will be harmonic with respect to ω_C, h_L . Moreover, thanks to Theorem 3.13, we have

$$(3.13.14) \quad \|\eta_\varepsilon\|_{\omega_{Y,\varepsilon}}^2 \leq C \|\bar{\partial}\eta_\varepsilon\|_{\omega_{Y,\varepsilon}}^2 \leq C \|\xi\|_{\omega_Y}^2$$

and thus we can extract a limit of $(\eta_\varepsilon)_{\varepsilon > 0}$ on compacts of X_0 .

In order to deal with the family $(\tau_\varepsilon)_{\varepsilon > 0}$, thanks to the uniform estimate of Theorem 3.13, the proof of Corollary 3.7 applies. We get thus a constant $C > 0$ so that

$$(3.13.15) \quad \|\tau_\varepsilon\|_{\omega_{Y,\varepsilon}}^2 \leq C \|\bar{\partial}^*(\tau_\varepsilon)\|_{\omega_{Y,\varepsilon}}^2$$

and the RHS of (3.13.15) is bounded uniformly with respect to ε . We can therefore take the limit $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ and we get ξ_0 harmonic, $\eta_0 \in \text{Dom}(\bar{\partial})$ and $\tau_0 \in \text{Dom}(\bar{\partial}^*)$ such that

$$(3.13.16) \quad \xi = \xi_0 + \bar{\partial}\eta_0 + \bar{\partial}^*\tau_0.$$

To prove that $\mathcal{H}_{n,q}(X_0, L)$, $\text{Im } \bar{\partial}$ and $\text{Im } \bar{\partial}^*$ are orthogonal with each other, we use the partition of unity and the local covering. For example, let $\xi_0 \in \mathcal{H}_{n,q}(X_0, L)$ and $\eta_0 \in L^2$. Let θ_i be a partition of unity. We have

$$\int_{X_0} \langle \xi_0, \bar{\partial}\eta_0 \rangle = \sum_i \int_{X_0} \langle \xi_0, \bar{\partial}(\theta_i\eta_0) \rangle.$$

Let $\pi_i : V_i \rightarrow U_i$ be a local ramified cover such that $\pi_i^*\omega_C$ is smooth and $\text{Supp}\theta_i \Subset U_i$. Then

$$\int_{X_0} \langle \xi_0, \bar{\partial}(\theta_i\eta_0) \rangle = \int_{U_i} \langle \xi_0, \bar{\partial}(\theta_i\eta_0) \rangle = \frac{1}{r} \int_{V_i} \langle \pi_i^*\xi_0, \bar{\partial}(\pi_i^*(\theta_i\eta_0)) \rangle_{\pi_i^*\omega_C} = 0,$$

where the last equality comes from the fact that $\pi_i^*\omega_C$ is smooth on V_i and $\text{Supp}\theta_i \Subset V_i$.

To conclude the proof, it remains to check (3.12.1). Let $\xi \in \mathcal{H}_{n,q}(X_0, L)$ (with respect to the conic metric). Then ξ is still L^2 with respect to $\omega_{Y,\varepsilon}$ for every ε . We consider the Hodge decomposition of ξ with respect to $\omega_{Y,\varepsilon}$:

$$\xi = \xi_\varepsilon + \bar{\partial}\eta_\varepsilon + \bar{\partial}^*\tau_\varepsilon.$$

Then ξ_ε is harmonic with respect to the complete metric $\omega_{Y,\varepsilon}$. In particular, by using Bochner, we know that

$$(3.13.17) \quad \bar{\partial}\xi_\varepsilon = \bar{\partial}^*\xi_\varepsilon = (D')^*\xi_\varepsilon = 0.$$

By passing to some subsequence, the above argument implies that $\xi_\varepsilon, \eta_\varepsilon$ and τ_ε converge to some ξ_0, η_0 and τ_0 which are L^2 with respect to ω_C and we have

$$\xi = \xi_0 + \bar{\partial}\eta_0 + \bar{\partial}^*\tau_0.$$

As we proved that $\mathcal{H}_{n,q}(X_0, L)$, $\text{Im } \bar{\partial}$ and $\text{Im } \bar{\partial}^*$ are orthogonal with each other, we obtain that $\xi = \xi_0$. Together with (3.13.17), (3.12.1) is proved. \square

Remark 3.14. The decomposition

$$L_{n,q}^2 = \text{Ker}\Delta'' \oplus \text{Im } \Delta''$$

with respect to the Poincaré type/conic metrics, still holds, as we will see next. Given our previous results, all we need to prove is the image of Δ'' is closed.

We prove it for the Poincaré case, and the conic case is similar. If (by contradiction) this is not true, then there exists a sequence of smooth f_i of compact support such that

$$(3.14.1) \quad \|f_i\|_{L^2}^2 = 1, \quad \|\Delta''f_i\|_{L^2}^2 \rightarrow 0.$$

Moreover, each of the forms f_i is orthogonal to the space of harmonic forms, i.e. to $\text{Ker}(\bar{\partial})$ and $\text{Ker}(\bar{\partial}^*)$.

As consequence of (3.14.1) we have

$$(3.14.2) \quad \langle f_i, \Delta''f_i \rangle \rightarrow 0$$

as $i \rightarrow \infty$. On the other hand, we have $\langle f_i, \Delta''f_i \rangle = \|\bar{\partial}f_i\|^2 + \|\bar{\partial}^*f_i\|^2$, and this leads to a contradiction as follows. We can write

$$(3.14.3) \quad f_i = \bar{\partial}\alpha_i + \bar{\partial}^*\beta_i,$$

according to Theorem 3.2. Moreover, it follows from the proof of Theorem 3.2 that

$$(3.14.4) \quad \|f_i - \bar{\partial}\alpha_i\|^2 \leq C\|\bar{\partial}f_i\|^2, \quad \|f_i - \bar{\partial}^*\beta_i\|^2 \leq C\|\bar{\partial}^*f_i\|^2$$

since $f_i - \bar{\partial}\alpha_i$ is orthogonal to $\text{Ker}(\bar{\partial})$ and $f_i - \bar{\partial}^*\beta_i$ is orthogonal to $\text{Ker}(\bar{\partial}^*)$. Adding the two inequalities shows that

$$(3.14.5) \quad \|f_i\|^2 \leq C(\|\bar{\partial}f_i\|^2 + \|\bar{\partial}^*f_i\|^2),$$

which is impossible as $i \rightarrow \infty$.

3.3. Hodge decomposition for metrics with conic singularities, II. The setting here will be the same as in the previous section. We will use systematically the ramified covers corresponding to the orbifold structure

$$(3.14.6) \quad \Delta := \sum_{i \in I} \left(1 - \frac{1}{m}\right) Y_i$$

in order to establish a generalization of Theorem 3.12.

Let $(V_i, z_i)_{i \in I}$ be a finite cover of X with coordinate charts such that

$$(3.14.7) \quad z_i^1 \dots z_i^r = 0$$

is the local equation of the divisor Y when restricted to the set V_i . We then consider the local ramified maps

$$(3.14.8) \quad \pi_i : U_i \rightarrow V_i, \quad \pi_i(w_i^1, \dots, w_i^n) := ((w_i^1)^m, \dots, (w_i^r)^m, w_i^{r+1}, \dots, w_i^n)$$

which define the orbifold structure corresponding to (X, Δ) .

We first define the analog of smooth forms in our geometric context.

Definition 3.15. Let ϕ be a C^∞ form of (p, q) -type with values in L defined on $X_0 := X \setminus Y$. We say that ϕ is smooth in conic sense if the quotient of the local inverse images

$$(3.15.1) \quad \phi_i := \frac{1}{w_i^{qm}} \pi_i^*(\phi|_{V_i})$$

admit a C^∞ -extension to U_i . In order to simplify the writing, in the equality above we are using the notation $w_i^{qm} := (w_i^1)^{q_1 m} \dots (w_i^r)^{q_r m}$.

In the absence of the twisting bundle L , this corresponds to the usual definition of ‘‘orbifold differential forms’’. Here in some sense the idea is the same, except that we take into account the singularities of the metric h_L of L . In what follows we will establish a few simple properties.

Proposition 3.16. Let ϕ be a smooth (n, q) -form on X with value in L in the standard sense, and we suppose that $q_i < 1$ for every i . Then ϕ is smooth in conic sense.

Proof. The matter is immediate, via a local calculation. This is based on the fact that $\frac{d(z^m)}{z^{qm}}$ is smooth (recall that qm is an integer). \square

Remark 3.17. Let ϕ be a smooth L -valued (p, q) -form on X . Even if $q_i \in]0, 1[$ for every i , it is possible that ϕ is not smooth in conic sense. But we will show later that it defines a current in conic sense.

The following statement establishes a correspondence between the intrinsic differential operators associated to the data (X, ω_C) and (L, h_L) and the local ones.

Proposition 3.18. Let ϕ be a L -valued (p, q) -form, smooth in orbifold sense. Then its ‘‘natural’’ derivatives $D'_{h_L}, D^*_{h_L}, \dots$ are also smooth in the orbifold sense. Moreover, we have:

- (1) $\sup_{X \setminus Y} |\phi|_{h_L, \omega_C} < \infty$, i.e. forms which are smooth in conic sense are bounded.
- (2) The following equalities hold true

$$\pi_i^*(D'\phi) = w_i^{qm} D'\phi_i; \quad \pi_i^*(\bar{\partial}\phi) = w_i^{qm} \bar{\partial}\phi_i,$$

as well as

$$\pi_i^*(D'^*\phi) = w_i^{qm} D'^*\phi_i; \quad \pi_i^*(\bar{\partial}^*\phi) = w_i^{qm} \bar{\partial}^*\phi_i$$

where the D' on the LHS is D'_{h_L} and the rest of the notations are $D'\psi := \partial\psi - \partial(\varphi_{L,0} \circ \pi_i) \wedge \psi$ and $\varphi_L = \sum q_i \log |z_i|^2 + \varphi_{L,0}$.

- (3) Let $\Delta'' := [\bar{\partial}, \bar{\partial}^*]$ be the Laplace with respect to (ω_C, h_L) . Then we have

$$\pi_i^* \Delta'' \phi = w_i^{qm} \cdot \Delta''_{sm} \phi_i,$$

where Δ''_{sm} is the Laplace for the local, non-singular setting $(\pi_i^* \omega_C, \varphi_{L,0} \circ \pi_i)$

Proof. The first inequality is clear; for the rest we will only discuss the first equality of (2), since the verification of all the others is completely analogue. Also, we will drop the index i in order to simplify the notations. By definition, locally on V we have

$$(3.18.1) \quad D'_{h_L} \phi = \partial \phi - \left(\partial \varphi_{L,0} + \sum q_\alpha \frac{dz_\alpha}{z_\alpha} \right) \wedge \phi$$

and its pull-back to U via the map π is equal to

$$(3.18.2) \quad \pi^*(D'_{h_L} \phi) = \partial \pi^* \phi - \left(\partial \varphi_{L,0} \circ \pi + m \sum q_\alpha \frac{dw_\alpha}{w_\alpha} \right) \wedge \pi^* \phi.$$

The equality

$$(3.18.3) \quad \frac{1}{w^{mq}} \pi^*(D'_{h_L} \phi) = \partial \frac{\pi^* \phi}{w^{mq}} - \partial(\varphi_{L,0} \circ \pi) \wedge \frac{\pi^* \phi}{w^{mq}}$$

follows immediately and the RHS equals precisely $D' \left(\frac{1}{w^{qm}} \pi^* \phi \right)$. \square

Example 3.19. The terminology we are using could be sometimes misleading. Let L be the trivial bundle over $X = \mathbb{D}$, endowed with the metric $\varphi_L = -\frac{1}{2} \ln |z|$. Then the form $\frac{dz}{z}$ defined over the pointed disk is smooth in the sense of our Definition 3.15. Moreover, its $\bar{\partial}$ is also smooth in conic sense: the requirement is that $w \bar{\partial} \left(\frac{dw}{w} \Big|_{\mathbb{D}^*} \right)$ extends over the disk and this is obviously the case.

A first consequence of the statement 3.18 is that forms which are smooth in conic sense behave well by integration by parts.

Corollary 3.20. *Let α and β be an L -valued (p, q) -form and an L^* -valued $(n-p-1, n-q)$ form, respectively, both smooth in conic sense. Then the usual integration by parts formula holds true*

$$(3.20.1) \quad \int_X D'_{h_L} \alpha \wedge \beta = (-1)^{p+q+1} \int_X \alpha \wedge D'_{h_L^*} \beta.$$

Proof. Let $(\mu_\varepsilon)_{\varepsilon>0}$ be the family of truncation functions corresponding to Y . We obviously have

$$(3.20.2) \quad \int_X D'_{h_L} (\mu_\varepsilon \alpha) \wedge \beta = (-1)^{p+q+1} \int_X \mu_\varepsilon \alpha \wedge D'_{h_L^*} \beta$$

for each positive ε . The integrals $\int_X \mu_\varepsilon \alpha \wedge D'_{h_L^*} \beta$ and $\int_X \mu_\varepsilon D'_{h_L} \alpha \wedge \beta$ are converging to the expected value by Lebesgue theorem, since

$$(3.20.3) \quad \sup_{X \setminus Y} (|D'_{h_L} \alpha| + |\alpha| + |D'_{h_L^*} \beta| + |\beta|) < \infty$$

(cf. Proposition 3.18 above). The remaining term is bounded by

$$(3.20.4) \quad \int_X |\partial \mu_\varepsilon| dV_C$$

up to a uniform constant –because of (3.20.3)– and this converges to zero as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. \square

The following corollary is very useful.

Corollary 3.21. *Let ϕ be a L -valued L^2 -form on X such that $\Delta''(\phi) = \psi$ holds in the sense of currents on X for some form ψ smooth in conic sense. Then ϕ is smooth in conic sense.*

Proof. Let $V \subset X$ be a coordinate open subset, such that we have a local ramified cover $\pi : U \rightarrow V$ given by the orbifold structure. By hypothesis we have

$$(3.21.1) \quad \int_V \phi \wedge \overline{\Delta''} \tau e^{-\varphi_L} = \int_V \psi \wedge \overline{\tau} e^{-\varphi_L}$$

for any L -valued form τ with compact support in V , smooth in orbifold sense. The Laplace operator in (3.21.1) is induced by ω_C and h_L .

We first prove that

$$(3.21.2) \quad \int_U \frac{\pi^*(\phi)}{w^{mq}} \wedge \overline{\Delta''_{sm}(\rho)} = \int_U \frac{\pi^*(\psi)}{w^{mq}} \wedge \overline{\rho}$$

for any smooth form ρ of compact support in U .

In fact, the m -ramified cover $\pi : U \rightarrow V$ induces the Galois group $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_m$ which are the automorphisms $\gamma_i : U \rightarrow U$ invariant over V . Since $\pi^*\psi$ is γ_i -invariant, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_U \frac{\pi^*(\psi)}{w^{mq}} \wedge \bar{\rho} &= \frac{1}{m} \sum_i \int_U \pi^*(\psi) \wedge \gamma_i^* \frac{\bar{\rho}}{w^{mq}} = \frac{1}{m} \sum_i \int_U \pi^*(\psi) \wedge \gamma_i^*(\overline{w^{mq} \cdot \rho}) \cdot e^{-\pi^* \varphi_L} \\ &= \frac{1}{m} \int_U \pi^*(\psi) \wedge \overline{G} \cdot e^{-\pi^* \varphi_L}, \end{aligned}$$

where $G := \sum_i \gamma_i^*(w^{mq} \rho)$ is π -invariant and the quotient $\frac{G}{w^{mq}}$ is smooth by construction. By definition, G is the pull back of some form τ on V , smooth in conic sense. Therefore we have

$$(3.21.3) \quad \int_U \frac{\pi^*(\psi)}{w^{mq}} \wedge \bar{\rho} = \int_V \psi \wedge \bar{\tau} \cdot e^{-\varphi_L}.$$

For the term $\int_U \frac{\pi^*(\phi)}{w^{mq}} \wedge \overline{\Delta''_{sm}(\rho)}$, we do the same argument:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_U \frac{\pi^*(\phi)}{w^{mq}} \wedge \overline{\Delta''_{sm}(\rho)} &= \frac{1}{m} \sum_i \int_U \pi^*(\phi) \wedge \gamma_i^* \frac{\overline{\Delta''_{sm}(\rho)}}{w^{mq}} = \frac{1}{m} \sum_i \int_U \pi^*(\phi) \wedge \gamma_i^*(\overline{w^{mq} \cdot \Delta''_{sm}(\rho)}) \cdot e^{-\pi^* \varphi_L} \\ &= \frac{1}{m} \int_U \pi^*(\phi) \wedge \overline{H} \cdot e^{-\pi^* \varphi_L}, \end{aligned}$$

where $H := \sum_i \gamma_i^*(w^{mq} \Delta''_{sm}(\rho))$ is π -invariant and the quotient $\frac{H}{w^{mq}}$ is smooth. Then there exists a form θ on V smooth in conic sense such that $H = \pi^*\theta$. Then

$$(3.21.4) \quad \int_U \frac{\pi^*(\phi)}{w^{mq}} \wedge \overline{\Delta''_{sm}(\rho)} = \int_V \phi \wedge \bar{\theta} \cdot e^{-\varphi_L}.$$

Since Δ''_{sm} commute with γ_i , we obtain $H = w^{qm} \Delta''_{sm}(\frac{G}{w^{qm}})$. Together with Proposition 3.18, we know that $\theta = \Delta'' \tau$ on V . Combining this with (3.21.3), (3.21.4) and (3.21.1), we obtain finally

$$\int_U \frac{\pi^*(\phi)}{w^{mq}} \wedge \overline{\Delta''_{sm}(\rho)} = \int_U \frac{\pi^*(\psi)}{w^{mq}} \wedge \bar{\rho}.$$

Therefore, the equality

$$(3.21.5) \quad \Delta''_{sm}(\hat{\phi}) = \frac{\pi^*(\psi)}{w^{mq}}$$

holds in the sense of distributions on U , where $\hat{\phi} := \frac{\pi^*(\phi)}{w^{mq}}$ is moreover L^2 . The corollary follows. \square

Another consequence is the following version of Bochner formula.

Proposition 3.22. *Let ϕ be a L -valued (p, q) -form, smooth in orbifold sense. Then the equality*

$$(3.22.1) \quad \Delta'' \phi = \Delta' \phi + [\theta_L, \omega_C] \phi$$

holds pointwise on $X \setminus Y$. Moreover the following Bochner formula holds.

$$\begin{aligned} \int_X |\bar{\partial} \phi|^2 e^{-\varphi_L} dV_C + \int_X |\bar{\partial}^* \phi|^2 e^{-\varphi_L} dV_C &= \int_X |D' \phi|^2 e^{-\varphi_L} dV_C + \int_X |D'^* \phi|^2 e^{-\varphi_L} dV_C \\ &\quad + \int_X \langle [\theta_L, \omega_C] \phi, \phi \rangle e^{-\varphi_L} dV_C \end{aligned}$$

Proof. On every local ramified cover $\pi_i : U_i \rightarrow V_i$, thanks to Proposition 3.18, we have

$$\pi_i^*(\Delta'' \phi) = w_i^{qm} \cdot \Delta''_{sm} \phi_i.$$

Using the same type of arguments we infer that we have

$$\pi_i^*(\Delta' \phi) = w_i^{qm} \cdot \Delta'_{sm} \phi_i.$$

Together with the usual Bochner equality $\Delta''_{sm} = \Delta'_{sm} + [i\Theta_{\pi^* \varphi_0}, \pi_i^* \omega_C]$, we obtain (3.22.1).

In order to obtain the integral identity, we first see that the formula holds if we replace ϕ with $\mu_\varepsilon\phi$, where the cut-off function μ_ε is defined in Lemma 3.1. Since the error terms e.g. of type

$$(3.22.2) \quad \int_X \langle \bar{\partial}\mu_\varepsilon \wedge \phi, \bar{\partial}\phi \rangle e^{-\varphi_L} dV_{\mathcal{C}}$$

tend to zero, we are done. Note that here we are using the fact that the function $|\phi||\bar{\partial}\phi|e^{-\varphi_L}$ is bounded (and not only L^1). \square

Corollary 3.23. *If $i\Theta_{h_L} \geq 0$ (resp. $i\Theta_{h_L} \leq 0$), and ϕ is a L -valued Δ'' -harmonic (n, q) -form (resp. $(0, q)$ -form) smooth in conic sense. Then $D_{h_L}\phi = D_{h_L}^*\phi = 0$ and $\theta_L \wedge \phi = 0$.*

Proof. All we have to do is to combine the previous results: harmonic forms are smooth in conic sense, hence Bochner formula applies and the corollary follows. \square

Like in the smooth case, we can define the Hodge operators \star and $\sharp = \bar{\star}$ in our setting, namely give a L -value (p, q) -form s , there exists a unique L^* -value $(n-p, n-q)$ -form, denoted by $\sharp t$, such that for every L -valued (p, q) -form s , we have

$$\langle s, t \rangle_{h_L} dV_{\omega_{\mathcal{C}}} = s \wedge \sharp t,$$

where $s \wedge \sharp t$ is calculated by using the natural pairing $L \otimes L^* \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$. We have the following statements, whose proofs are left to the interested readers.

Proposition 3.24. *Let t be a L -valued (p, q) -form, smooth in the conic sense. Then $\sharp t$ is a L^* -valued $(n-p, n-q)$ -form, smooth in the conic sense (with respect to $(\omega_{\mathcal{C}}, h_L^*)$).*

Proposition 3.25. *Let t be a Δ'' -harmonic form with value in L . Then $\sharp t$ is Δ'' -harmonic form with value in L^**

The usual Gårding and Sobolev inequalities together with Rellich embedding theorem still hold in conic setting. They are established by their usual versions via the local uniformisations of (X, Δ) . We will state and comment Gårding inequality, but prior to doing that, we introduce the analogue of Sobolev spaces in our context.

Definition 3.26. *We denote by $W_{p,q}^k(X, L)$ the space of L^2 forms u of type (p, q) with values in L , such that its pull back $\frac{\pi_i^* u}{w_i^{qm}}$ via the ramified coverings belongs to the usual Sobolev space $W^k(U_i)$. The Sobolev norm of $W_{p,q}^k(X, L)$ is obtained by a partition of unit and the usual Sobolev norm of the local forms $\frac{\pi_i^* u}{w_i^{qm}}$.*

Given a form $u \in W_{p,q}^k(X, L)$, we can approximate it by smooth forms u_ε in the sense of conic. In fact, by using the partition of unity, it is sufficient to consider the case when u is supported in some open set V_i . Let z be the coordinate on U_i . Let $\rho_\varepsilon(\|w\|^2)$ be the standard convolution function. Let G be the Galois group of the covering $\pi : U_i \rightarrow V_i$ and let $\gamma \in G$. Then $\rho_\varepsilon(\|w\|^2)$ is G -invariant. Assume for simplicity that $p = q = 0$; we then consider the function

$$v_\varepsilon(w) := \frac{(w^{-qm} \cdot \pi^* u) \star \rho_\varepsilon}{w^{-qm}}.$$

Note that $\gamma(w)^{-qm} = c_\gamma \cdot w^{-qm}$ for some constant c_γ independent of w . Then

$$\begin{aligned} v_\varepsilon(\gamma(w)) &= \frac{\int_{U_i} (\gamma(w) - \tau)^{-qm} \cdot \pi^* u(\gamma(w) - \tau) \cdot \rho_\varepsilon(\|\tau\|^2) dV_\tau}{\gamma(w)^{-qm}} \\ &= \frac{c_\gamma \int_{U_i} (w - \gamma^{-1}(\tau))^{-qm} \cdot \pi^* u(w - \gamma^{-1}(\tau)) \cdot \rho_\varepsilon(\|\tau\|^2) dV_\tau}{c_\gamma \cdot w^{-qm}} \\ &= \frac{c_\gamma \int_{U_i} (w - \tau)^{-qm} \cdot \pi^* u(w - \tau) \cdot \rho_\varepsilon(\|\gamma(\tau)\|^2) dV_{\gamma(\tau)}}{c_\gamma \cdot w^{-qm}} = v_\varepsilon(w), \end{aligned}$$

where we use the fact that $\pi^* u$, $\rho_\varepsilon(\|w\|^2)$ and dV_w are G -invariant. Therefore v_ε is G -invariant and we can find some form u_ε on U_i such that $v_\varepsilon = \pi^* u_\varepsilon$. Then u_ε is smooth in conic sense and $\|u_\varepsilon - u\|_{W_{p,q}^k} \rightarrow 0$.

The general case of an arbitrary (p, q) -form is similar, obtained by regularising locally its coefficients.

We have the following version of Gårding theorem.

Theorem 3.27. *Let $\Delta'' := [\bar{\partial}^*, \bar{\partial}]$ be the Laplace operator induced by (h_L, ω_C) . Then for any $u \in L^2_{p,q}(X, L)$, if $\Delta''u \in W^k_{p,q}(X, L)$, then $u \in W^{k+2}_{p,q}(X, L)$ and*

$$\|u\|_{k+2} \leq C_k(\|\Delta''u\|_k + \|u\|_0).$$

Proof. We first observe that this is a direct consequence of the usual Gårding inequality if the form u has compact support contained in one of the sets V_i . Moreover, the “dictionary” established in Proposition 3.18, shows that one could define the space $(W^k_{p,q}(X, L), \|\cdot\|_k)$ directly on X , by using the covariant derivative on L -valued forms induced by h_L and ω_C . The general case is obtained by a partition of unit argument. \square

As a consequence, the Hodge decomposition still holds in the conic setting, as we see e.g. from the proof presented in [5], Chapter 6.

Theorem 3.28. *Let $(L, h_L) \rightarrow X$ be a line bundle endowed with a metric h_L such that the requirements (i)-(ii) at the beginning of this section are satisfied. Let ω_C be a Kähler metric with conic singularities as in (3.11.8). Then we have the following Hodge decomposition*

$$(3.28.1) \quad L^2_{p,q}(X, L) = \text{Ker}\Delta''_{h_L} \oplus \text{Im}\bar{\partial} \oplus \text{Im}\bar{\partial}^*$$

and

$$(3.28.2) \quad \mathcal{C}^\infty_{p,q}(X, (L, h_L)) = \text{Ker}\Delta''_{h_L} \oplus \text{Im}\Delta''_{h_L},$$

where $\mathcal{C}^\infty_{p,q}(X, (L, h_L))$ and $L^2_{p,q}(X, L)$ are the spaces of L -valued (p, q) -forms smooth in conic sense and L^2 , respectively.

We will not give a formal argument for this statement, because it follows as in the non-singular case (by using the ellipticity of the Laplace operator combined with the three big theorems mentioned above). Similarly, existence of a positive constant $C > 0$ such that the familiar elliptic estimate

$$(3.28.3) \quad \int_X |u|^2 e^{-\varphi_L} dV_C \leq C \int_X |\Delta''_{h_L} u|^2 e^{-\varphi_L} dV_C$$

holds true for all L^2 -forms orthogonal to $\text{Ker}\Delta''_{h_L}$ follows as consequence of the corresponding statement in non-singular setting.

To end this section, we collect a few results concerning the L^2 theory for the data (L, h_L) and (X, ω_C) . The first and foremost of them is the following statement, due to J.-P. Demailly.

Theorem 3.29. [5] *Let $v \in L^2_{n,q}(X, L)$ be an L -valued (n, q) -form such that $\bar{\partial}v = 0$. We assume that $i\Theta(L, h_L) \geq 0$ and that the coefficients $q_i \in]0, 1[$. Moreover, suppose that the integrability condition*

$$\int_X \langle [\theta_L, \Lambda_{\omega_C}]^{-1} v, v \rangle e^{-\varphi_L} dV_C < \infty$$

holds true. Then there exists $u \in L^2_{n,q-1}(X, L)$ such that

$$(3.29.1) \quad \bar{\partial}u = v, \quad \int_X |u|^2 e^{-\varphi_L} dV_C \leq \int_X \langle [\theta_L, \Lambda_{\omega_C}]^{-1} v, v \rangle e^{-\varphi_L} dV_C.$$

This is done by an approximation process (by reducing to the complete case) and it holds in much more general setting, see [6].

In our specific situation, an important observation is that it would be sufficient to solve the equation

$$(3.29.2) \quad \bar{\partial}u = v$$

in the sense of distributions on $X \setminus Y$, provided that u is in L^2 . Again, this can be seen as in the usual, non-singular setting. Indeed, let ϕ be any smooth $(0, n - q)$ form with values in the dual bundle L^* of the bundle L . We have

$$(3.29.3) \quad \int_X \bar{\partial}u \wedge (\mu_\varepsilon \phi) = \int_X v \wedge (\mu_\varepsilon \phi)$$

so in order to show that (3.29.2) holds globally on X it would be enough to prove that we have

$$(3.29.4) \quad \lim_{\varepsilon} \int_X u \wedge \phi \wedge \bar{\partial} \mu_{\varepsilon} = 0.$$

This is however clear, by Cauchy-Schwarz: we have $\sup_{X \setminus Y} |\phi|_{\omega_C}^2 e^{\varphi_L} < \infty$ since the coefficients q_i corresponding to the singularities of h_L are positive and ϕ is smooth on X . Thus (3.29.4) boils down to showing that the limit of $\int_X |\bar{\partial} \mu_{\varepsilon}|_{\omega_C}^2 dV_C$ is equal to zero. But this is clear by a quick computation that we skip.

We discuss next two more results specific to the conic setting.

• Let τ be a smooth (n, q) -form with values in (L, h_L) and support in $X \setminus Y$. We assume that we have $q_j < 1$ and consider the (usual) orthogonal decomposition

$$(3.29.5) \quad \tau = \tau_1 + \tau_2$$

where $\tau_1 \in \text{Ker} \bar{\partial}$ and $\tau_2 \in (\text{Ker} \bar{\partial})^{\perp}$. But then we have

$$(3.29.6) \quad \bar{\partial} \tau_1 = 0, \quad \bar{\partial}^* \tau_1 = 0$$

when restricted to U , the complement of the support of τ . In other words, $\tau_1|_U$ is harmonic, hence smooth in conic sense.

• As a consequence of the first bullet, Bochner formula holds true for the projection τ_1 of τ on the kernel of $\bar{\partial}$. This is true more generally for forms ρ such that $\sup_{X \setminus Y} |\rho|_{h_L, \omega_C} < \infty$.

We introduce the following notion, which -so to speak- represents the formalisation of the examples that we discuss afterwards.

Definition 3.30. A (p, q) -current T of with values in (L, h_L) is simply a L -valued current such that there exist a constant $C > 0$ and a positive integer d such that the inequality

$$(3.30.1) \quad \left| \int_X T \wedge \star \bar{\phi} e^{-\varphi_L} \right|^2 \leq C \sum_{s=0}^d \sup_{X \setminus Y} |\nabla^s \phi|_{h_L, \omega_C}^2$$

holds for all (p, q) -forms ϕ , with values in L which moreover are smooth in conic sense. Here h_0 is a non-singular metric on L .

Remark 3.31. Instead of the expression (3.30.1) we could have as well said that T acts on L^* -valued $(n-p, n-q)$ forms smooth in conic sense.

Remark 3.32. A current T as in the Definition 3.30 is “more singular” than a L -valued current, since it only acts on forms which are smooth in conic sense.

The condition (3.30.1) is equivalent to the following.

Proposition 3.33. A (p, q) -current T with values in (L, h_L) is given by a collection of invariant currents T_i on U_i (where $i \in I$) such that for each compact $K \subset U_i$ there exists a constant $C_K > 0$ and a number $d \in \mathbb{N}$ such that following holds

$$(3.33.1) \quad \left| \int_{U_i} \frac{1}{w_i^{mq}} T_i \wedge \bar{\rho}_i \right|^2 \leq C_K \sum_{s=0}^d \sup_{V_i \setminus Y} |\nabla^s \rho_i|^2$$

for all $(n-q, n-p)$ -forms ρ which are L -valued, with compact support in V_i and smooth in conic sense, where $\rho_i := \frac{1}{w_i^{mq}} \pi_i^* (\rho)$.

Proof. This is due to the fact that we have

$$(3.33.2) \quad \sum_{s=0}^d \sup_{V_i \setminus Y} |\nabla_{h_L}^s \rho|^2 \simeq \sum_{s=0}^d \sup_{U_i} |\nabla^s \rho_i|^2,$$

and one can see by the same arguments as in Proposition 3.18. \square

Remark 3.34. We have the following alternative description of T in terms of the local currents (T_i) . Let ϕ be an L -valued form, smooth in conic sense and let T be a current as in Definition 3.30. Then we have

$$(3.34.1) \quad \int_X T \wedge \bar{\phi} e^{-\varphi_L} = \sum_{i \in I} \frac{1}{\delta_i} \int_{U_i} \frac{\theta_i \cdot (T_i \wedge \bar{\phi}_i)}{w_i^{qm}}$$

where we recall that $\phi_i = \frac{1}{w_i^{mq}} \pi_i^*(\phi)$ and (θ_i) is a partition of unit corresponding to $(V_i)_{i \in I}$. The integer δ_i is the degree of the map π_i . Note that $\frac{T_i \wedge \bar{\phi}_i}{w_i^{qm}}$ is considered as a (n, n) -current on U_i by using the smooth metric h_0 on $L_0 := L - \sum q_i Y_i$, where $h_0 := h_L e^{\sum q_i \log |s_{Y_i}|^2}$.

3.3.1. *Examples.* We are discussing next a few examples.

- We suppose that $q_i \in]0, 1[$. Let Θ be a smooth L -valued (p, q) -form on X . If $p < n$, Θ is in general not smooth in the conic sense. However, Θ induces a current in conic sense (via its principal value) as follows:

$$(3.34.2) \quad \int_X \Theta \wedge \bar{\rho} := \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \sum_i \frac{1}{\delta_i} \int_{U_i} \mu_\varepsilon \frac{\theta_i}{w_i^{qm}} \pi_i^* \Theta \wedge \bar{\rho}_i,$$

where θ_i is a partition of unity.

- More generally, let $E = \sum E_i$ be a divisor on X such that $E + Y$ is snc (so in particular E and Y do not have any common components). We still assume that $q_i \in]0, 1[$ for every i . Let Θ be an L -valued (p, q) -form on X with log-poles along $E + Y$ and smooth on $X \setminus (E + Y)$. Θ induces naturally an (L, h_L) -valued current as follows:

$$(3.34.3) \quad \int_X \Theta \wedge \bar{\rho} := \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \sum_i \frac{1}{\delta_i} \int_{U_i} \mu_\varepsilon \frac{\theta_i}{w_i^{qm}} \pi_i^* \Theta \wedge \bar{\rho}_i.$$

We do not detail here the verification of the fact that the equalities (3.34.2) and (3.34.2) define currents in conic setting but rather refer to the Appendix where this is extensively discussed.

- Let $E = \sum E_i$ and W be a divisor on X and an additional hypersurface, respectively such that $E + W$ is snc. If α is an L -valued $(n-1, 0)$ -form with log-poles along $E|_W$ on W , then the corresponding current is defined by the formula

$$(3.34.4) \quad \int_X T \wedge \bar{\phi} := \sum_i \frac{1}{\delta_i} \int_{W_i} \theta_i \frac{1}{w_i^{qm}} \pi_i^* \alpha \wedge \bar{\phi}_i$$

where $W_i := \pi_i^{-1}(W \cap V_i)$. Because of the type of α it is immediate to verify that (3.30.1) holds true (with $d = 0$).

- Let λ be a smooth, $(n, 1)$ form with values in the bundle $L + kE$. A more general version of the current introduced at first bullet above is given as follows

$$(3.34.5) \quad \int_{U_i} \frac{1}{w_i^{qm}} T_i \wedge \bar{\phi} := \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{d_i} \int_{U_i} \frac{1}{w_i^{qm}} \pi_i^* \left(\theta_\varepsilon \frac{\lambda}{s_E^k} \Big|_{V_i} \right) \wedge \bar{\phi}$$

where θ_ε is a sequence of cutoff functions with compact support in $X \setminus E$ and converging to the identity function of this open subset of X . By using the argument involving the Taylor expansion of θ_ε we infer that the global object T defined by (3.34.5) has the following property

$$(3.34.6) \quad \left| \int_X T \wedge \bar{\phi} e^{-\varphi_L} \right|^2 \leq C \sum_{i \in I} \sum_{s=0}^k \sup_{U_i} |\nabla^s \phi_i|^2.$$

where ϕ is an L -valued form of type $(n-1, 0)$, smooth in conic sense and ϕ_i are defined in (3.15.1). Again, the verification of (3.34.6) is detailed at the end of the Appendix.

The next statement can be seen as "mise en bouche" for the type of arguments in the Appendix.

Lemma 3.35. *Let ϕ be a negative, C^∞ real function defined on the unit disk in \mathbb{C} . We define*

$$\mathcal{D}_\varepsilon := \{z \in \mathbb{D} : \varepsilon < |z|e^{-\phi(z)} < 2\varepsilon\}, \quad \mathcal{D}_{\varepsilon,r} := \{z \in \mathbb{D} : \varepsilon < |z|e^{-\phi(z)} < r\}.$$

The following hold true.

- (a) For any smooth function f and any $\delta < 1$ we have $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{\mathcal{D}_\varepsilon} f(z) \frac{d\lambda}{z|z|^{2\delta}} = 0$.
- (b) For any smooth function f , any $\delta < 1$ and any fixed $r > 0$ the set of complex numbers $\left(\int_{\mathcal{D}_{\varepsilon,r}} f(z) \frac{d\lambda}{z|z|^{2\delta}} \right)_{\varepsilon > 0}$ is bounded.

Proof. We discuss the point (a). A first remark is that it is enough to show that the limit is zero for constant functions f (as we see by writing $f(z) = f(0) + zf_1(z) + \bar{z}f_{\bar{1}}(z)$ and observing that for the second and third term things are immediate).

We take then $f = 1$; since ϕ is negative, we can write

$$(3.35.1) \quad \int_{\mathcal{D}_\varepsilon} \frac{d\lambda}{z|z|^{2\delta}} = \int_{\varepsilon < |z| < 2\varepsilon} \frac{d\lambda}{z|z|^{2\delta}} - \int_{2\varepsilon e^{\phi(z)} < |z| < 2\varepsilon} \frac{d\lambda}{z|z|^{2\delta}} + \int_{\varepsilon e^{\phi(z)} < |z| < \varepsilon} \frac{d\lambda}{z|z|^{2\delta}}$$

and the first term of the RHS is equal to zero. We can assume that $1 \leq 2\delta < 2$ and it is enough to show that we have

$$(3.35.2) \quad \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{\varepsilon(1-C\varepsilon) < |z| < \varepsilon} \frac{d\lambda}{|z|^{1+2\delta}} = 0,$$

where C is a positive constant depending on the function ϕ . This in turn is obvious.

We leave the rest of the proof of the lemma to the interested readers. □

As application, we obtain the following result. Let β be an L -valued form of type $(n-1, 1)$ and logarithmic poles along $E + Y$. Then we have

$$(3.35.3) \quad \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_X \theta_\varepsilon D' \beta \wedge \bar{\gamma} e^{-\varphi_L} = 0$$

for any holomorphic L^2 form γ , where θ_ε is the standard cut-off functions.

4. DE RHAM-KODAIRA DECOMPOSITION FOR CONIC CURRENTS

In this subsection, we would like to show that the results of de Rham-Kodaira in [9] concerning Hodge decomposition for currents on compact manifolds have a complete analogue in our setting, i.e. for (X, ω_C) and (L, h_L) .

By Theorem 3.28, for any L -valued (p, q) -form ϕ , smooth in conic sense, we have

$$(4.0.1) \quad \phi = \mathcal{H}(\phi) + \Delta'' \psi$$

where $\mathcal{H}(\phi)$ is the harmonic part of ϕ and ψ is an L -valued (p, q) -form. If we add to ψ a harmonic form, the equality (4.0.1) still holds. Thus, as in the standard case we introduce the Green operator.

Definition 4.1. *We denote by $\mathcal{G}(\phi)$ the unique L -valued (p, q) -form which is orthogonal to the harmonic space and such that*

$$(4.1.1) \quad \phi = \mathcal{H}(\phi) + \Delta''(\mathcal{G}(\phi))$$

holds true.

Remark 4.2. Since harmonic forms are in particular smooth in conic sense, we infer that $\mathcal{G}(\varphi)$ has this property as well.

It is easy to see that \mathcal{G} commutes with $\bar{\partial}$. As a consequence, if $\bar{\partial}\phi = 0$, then $\bar{\partial}\mathcal{G}(\phi) = 0$ and so the equality (4.0.1) becomes

$$(4.2.1) \quad \phi = \mathcal{H}(\phi) + \bar{\partial}S$$

where $S := \bar{\partial}^* \mathcal{G}(\phi)$. The same is true for forms with value in the dual L^* of L .

Let T be an (L, h_L) -valued (p, q) -current. Precisely as in the untwisted case [9] (i.e. without any "L"), we can define the *harmonic part* of α as

$$(4.2.2) \quad \mathcal{H}(T) := \sum_i \langle T, \xi_i \rangle \xi_i$$

where $(\xi_i)_i$ is a basis of L^2 harmonic L -valued forms of type (p, q) and where the notation in (4.2.2) is

$$(4.2.3) \quad \langle T, \xi \rangle := \int_X T \wedge \overline{\gamma_\xi},$$

and $\gamma_\xi := \star \xi$ and so $\overline{\gamma_\xi} = \sharp \xi$ becomes an $(n-p, n-q)$ form with values in L^* .

Let T be a (p, q) -current with values in (L, h_L) , cf. Definition 3.30. We define next by duality the Green operator on T by the formula

$$(4.2.4) \quad \int_X \mathcal{G}(T) \wedge \star \overline{\phi} := \int_X T \wedge \overline{\star \mathcal{G}(\phi)},$$

for any L -valued (p, q) -form ϕ , smooth in conic sense. This induces a decomposition of the current T as in the usual case

$$(4.2.5) \quad T = \mathcal{H}(T) + \Delta''(\mathcal{G}(T)).$$

Definition 4.3. *The equality (4.2.5) is called de Rham-Kodaira decomposition of the current T .*

Remark 4.4. If moreover T is closed, then we can write

$$(4.4.1) \quad T = \mathcal{H}(T) + \bar{\partial} T_1$$

where $T_1 = \bar{\partial}^*(\mathcal{G}(T))$. This can be seen as follows: thanks to (3.12.1), we know that $\mathcal{H}(T)$ is $\bar{\partial}$ -closed. Then we have $\Delta'' \bar{\partial}(\mathcal{G}(T)) = 0$. It follows that $\bar{\partial}(\mathcal{G}(T))$ is smooth in orbifold sense and then we get $\bar{\partial}^* \bar{\partial}(\mathcal{G}(T)) = 0$ by the usual integration by parts.

We have the following compatibility relation between the notions we have introduced above.

Lemma 4.5. *Let s be a L -valued (p, q) -current and t be a L^* -valued $(n-p, n-q)$ -form smooth in conic sense. We have*

$$(4.5.1) \quad \int_X \mathcal{G}(s) \wedge t = \int_X s \wedge \mathcal{G}(t).$$

Proof. Note first that, since $\mathcal{G}(s)$ is orthogonal to the harmonic space, by Proposition (3.25), we have

$$\int_X \mathcal{G}(s) \wedge \mathcal{H}(t) = 0.$$

Then we have

$$(4.5.2) \quad \int_X \mathcal{G}(s) \wedge t = \int_X \mathcal{G}(s) \wedge \Delta''(\mathcal{G}t) = \int_X \Delta''(\mathcal{G}(s)) \wedge \mathcal{G}(t) = \int_X s \wedge \mathcal{G}(t).$$

□

4.1. Regularity of the Green kernel for certain currents. Coming back to the case of a current induced by a form α with log-poles, the Green current $\mathcal{G}(\alpha)$ has a few interesting properties that we collect in our next statement.

Proposition 4.6. *Let $E = \sum E_i$ be divisor on X such that $E + Y$ is snc. Let α be a smooth L -valued (n, q) -form on $X \setminus (E \cup Y)$, with log pole along $E + Y$. The following statements hold true.*

- (1) *The current $\mathcal{G}(\alpha)$ is a smooth L -valued (n, q) -form on $X \setminus (E \cup Y)$ which moreover is L^2 on X .*

- (2) For each index i the local form $v_i := \frac{1}{\prod w_i^{q_i m}} \pi_i^*(\mathcal{G}(\alpha))$ is a solution of an equation of the following type

$$\Delta''_{sm}(v_i) = u_i$$

where u_i is a (n, q) -form with logarithmic poles along $E + Y$.

- (3) For every $\delta > 0$ form v_i belongs to the Sobolev space $W^{2, 2-\delta}$ (i.e. it has two derivatives in $L^{2-\delta}$).
- (4) The form $\tau_i := \partial^* v_i$ is L^2 and moreover “smooth” with respect to the variables w_j for each $j = r + 1, \dots, n$, in the sense that it admits a Taylor expansion

$$\tau_i(w) = \sum_{|I|+|J| \leq N-1} w'^{\alpha} \bar{w}'^{\beta} \tau_{I\bar{J}}(w'') + \sum_{|I|+|J|=N} w'^{\alpha} \bar{w}'^{\beta} \tau_{I\bar{J}}(w)$$

where

$$w' = (w_{r+1}, \dots, w_n), \quad w'' = (w_1, \dots, w_r)$$

and $\tau_{I\bar{J}}$ are L^2 .

Proof. In order to prove the point (1), our first remark is that

$$(4.6.1) \quad \int_X |\mathcal{G}(\Phi)|^2 e^{-\varphi} \leq C \int_X |\Phi - \mathcal{H}(\Phi)|^2 e^{-\varphi}$$

by Poincaré inequality. The inequality (4.6.1) is valid for (n, q) -forms and it implies that

$$(4.6.2) \quad \int_X |\mathcal{G}(\Phi)|^2 e^{-\varphi} \leq C \int_X |\Phi|^2 e^{-\varphi}$$

because the L^2 norm of $\mathcal{H}(\Phi)$ is smaller than the L^2 norm of Φ . The smoothness of $\mathcal{G}(\alpha)$ in the complement of the support of the divisor $E + Y$ is standard. Then the Sobolev norm of order two of $\mathcal{G}(\Phi)$ is bounded by the RHS of (4.6.2).

The first part of the point (2) (i.e. the equation satisfied by the form v_i) was already discussed in Proposition 3.18. The fact that the RHS is a form with log-poles is immediate and we skip the details.

The points (3) and (4) are a bit more interesting and we will provide a complete treatment.

By the definition of the current $\mathcal{G}(\alpha)$ as in (4.2.4) it follows that we have

$$(4.6.3) \quad |\langle \mathcal{G}(\alpha), \bar{\Phi} \rangle| \leq \|\alpha\|_{L^{2-\delta}} \|\mathcal{G}(\Phi)\|_{L^{\frac{2-\delta}{1-\delta}}}.$$

Now the $L^{\frac{2-\delta}{1-\delta}}$ -norm of $\mathcal{G}(\Phi)$ is certainly controlled by the Sobolev norm above (at least when δ is small enough) so in conclusion we get

$$(4.6.4) \quad |\langle \mathcal{G}(\alpha), \bar{\Phi} \rangle|^2 \leq C_{\delta} \|\Phi\|_{L^2}^2$$

which shows that $\mathcal{G}(\alpha)$ is in L^2 .

In particular, this preliminary discussion allow us to assume that the form v_i in (4.6.1) is in L^2 . Together with the Gårding inequality established in [1], Theorem 7.1 we obtain

$$(4.6.5) \quad \|v_i\|_{W^{2, 2-\delta}} \leq C_p (\|v_i\|_{L^{2-\delta}} + \|u_i\|_{L^{2-\delta}})$$

for any $0 < \delta < 2$. The point (3) is thus proved.

To prove the point (4), let Ξ be any local vector field with constant coefficients of the following shape

$$(4.6.6) \quad \Xi = \sum_{i=r+1}^n a_i \frac{\partial}{\partial w_i}.$$

The equation (4.6.1) implies that we have

$$(4.6.7) \quad \Delta''_{sm}(\Xi \cdot v_i) = \Xi \cdot u_i + \mathcal{L}(v_i)$$

where \mathcal{L} is a second order operator. In (4.6.7) we denote by $\Xi \cdot v_i$ the form whose coefficients are the derivative of those of v_i in the direction of Ξ .

By Sobolev embedding theorem we infer that $\Xi(v)$ is in L^2 (provided that $\delta \ll 1$). It follows from (4.6.7) that $\Xi(v)$ has two derivatives in L^p . We can iterate this method, and infer that $\Xi^m(v) \in L^2$ for any m .

Finally, the usual argument –by using a Fourier expansion– implies that v_i admits a Taylor expansion as required in (4). We discuss here only a particular case, for notational reasons. Let $f \in L^2(\mathbb{D})$ be a square integrable function defined on the unit disk in \mathbb{R}^2 , and such that $\frac{\partial^m}{\partial x^m}(f)$ is in L^2 for any positive integer m .

We consider the convolution f_ε of f with the usual regularisation kernel and as usual we can assume that this functions are 1-periodic. We then write

$$(4.6.8) \quad f_\varepsilon(x, y) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} f_{\varepsilon, k}(y) e^{\sqrt{-1}kx}$$

and by hypothesis, together with the L^2 convergence of convolutions and their derivatives we infer in particular that for any $m \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ we have

$$(4.6.9) \quad \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} k^{2m} \int_{|y| < 1} |f_{\varepsilon, k}(y)|^2 d\lambda(y) < C_m$$

where C_m is a constant independent of ε .

A first consequence of (4.6.9) is the existence of $C > 0$ such that

$$(4.6.10) \quad \int_{|y| < 1} |f_\varepsilon(0, y)|^2 d\lambda(y) < C$$

which can be seen by observing that

$$\left| \sum_{k=-N}^N f_{\varepsilon, k}(y) \right|^2 \leq 2 \sum_{k=-N}^N k^2 |f_{\varepsilon, k}(y)|^2 \sum_{k=1}^N \frac{1}{k^2}$$

and integrating.

We next write $f_\varepsilon(x, y) = f_\varepsilon(0, y) + x \int_0^1 \partial_1 f_\varepsilon(tx, y) dt$. Remark that we already know that the L^2 norm of the first term of the RHS is uniformly bounded, hence it is weakly convergent towards a function in L^2 . We will analyse next the other function; notice that

$$(4.6.11) \quad \int_{\mathbb{D}} \left| \int_0^1 \partial_1 f_\varepsilon(tx, y) dt \right|^2 d\lambda \leq \int_0^1 dt \int_{\mathbb{D}} |\partial_1 f_\varepsilon(tx, y)|^2 d\lambda$$

which equals

$$(4.6.12) \quad \int_{\mathbb{D}} \log \frac{1}{|x|} |\partial_1 f_\varepsilon(x, y)|^2 d\lambda.$$

By Hölder inequality the expression (4.6.12) is smaller than

$$(4.6.13) \quad C_\delta \int_{|y| < 1} dy \left(\int_{|x| < 1} |\partial_1 f_\varepsilon(x, y)|^{2+2\delta} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{1+\delta}},$$

and on the other hand, for each fixed y we have

$$(4.6.14) \quad \frac{1}{C} \left(\int_{|x| < 1} |\partial_1 f_\varepsilon(x, y)|^{2+2\delta} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{1+\delta}} \leq \int_{|x| < 1} |\partial_1 f_\varepsilon(x, y)|^2 dx + \int_{|x| < 1} |\partial_{11} f_\varepsilon(x, y)|^2 dx$$

by Sobolev inequality. The integration with respect to y of (4.6.14) shows that the LHS of (4.6.11) is uniformly bounded.

The arguments for the general case are completely similar –modulo the fact that the number of indexes is greater– and we will not provide any further detail. \square

Let $E = \sum E_i$ be divisor on X such that $E + Y$ is snc. Consider next a current of the following type

$$(4.6.15) \quad T := \frac{\lambda}{s_E} - \sum_i T_{\gamma_i},$$

where λ is a $L + E$ -valued form, smooth in conic sense, γ_i is a L -valued form on E_i , smooth in conic sense, and T_{γ_i} is the current on X defined by γ_i , cf. Subsection 3.3.1. We establish next some of the properties of $\mathcal{G}(T)$. We will namely discuss the following result.

Proposition 4.7. *Let T be the current defined in (4.6.15). The associated current $\mathcal{G}(T)$ is smooth in the complement of the divisor $E + F$ and it is moreover L^2 , i.e.*

$$(4.7.1) \quad \int_X |\mathcal{G}(T)|_{\omega_c}^2 e^{-\varphi} dV_{\omega_c} < \infty.$$

Proof. We first remark that T is more singular than e.g. a current induced by a form with log poles, so it is natural that the regularity properties of $\mathcal{G}(T)$ are considerably weaker than those established in Proposition 4.6.

By definition we have

$$(4.7.2) \quad \langle \mathcal{G}(T), \Phi \rangle = \int_X \frac{\lambda}{s_E} \wedge \overline{\mathcal{G}(\Phi)} e^{-\varphi_L} + \sum_i \int_{E_i} \gamma_i \wedge \overline{\mathcal{G}(\Phi)} e^{-\varphi_L},$$

and the absolute value of the first part of the sum is bounded by $\|\Phi\|_{L^2}$ up to a constant: this is a consequence of the proof of the first point of Proposition 4.6.

We treat now the second part of the RHS of (4.7.2). Let Γ_i be a L^2 and *smooth* extension of the L -valued form γ_i . This is constructed e.g. by a partition of unit –we notice the L^2 condition is fulfilled precisely because $E + Y$ is a snc divisor. For each i we can write

$$(4.7.3) \quad \int_{E_i} \gamma_i \wedge \overline{\mathcal{G}(\Phi)} e^{-\varphi_L} = \int_X (\theta_i + dd^c \log |s_i|^2) \wedge \Gamma_i \wedge \overline{\mathcal{G}(\Phi)} e^{-\varphi_L}.$$

where θ_i is the curvature of the bundle associated to the divisor E_i endowed with a non-singular metric.

The first term of the RHS of (4.7.3) is bounded by the L^2 norm of Φ , given that $\theta_i \wedge \Gamma_i$ is L^2 with respect to h_L .

For the second term of the RHS of (4.7.3), we are using Stokes and we have to estimate

$$(4.7.4) \quad \int_X \frac{\partial s_i}{s_i} \wedge \bar{\partial} \Gamma_i \wedge \overline{\mathcal{G}(\Phi)} e^{-\varphi_L}, \quad \int_X \frac{\partial s_i}{s_i} \wedge \Gamma_i \wedge \overline{D' \mathcal{G}(\Phi)} e^{-\varphi_L}.$$

To this end we simply use the Gårding inequality (after composing with the local ramification maps) and infer that

$$(4.7.5) \quad \|\mathcal{G}(\Phi)\|_{W^{2,2}}^2 \leq C (\|\Phi\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\mathcal{G}(\Phi)\|_{L^2}^2).$$

By Sobolev inequality the $L^{2+\delta}$ -norm of $\mathcal{G}(\Phi)$ and $D' \mathcal{G}(\Phi)$ are bounded by the left hand side of (4.7.5) provided that $\delta \ll 1$. This ends the proof of our proposition. \square

5. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.6

The plan for this section is to prove Theorem 1.6. Since the argument is rather long, we have divided it in a few subsections, as follows. After a few reductions, we show that the singularities of the forms α and β can be improved significantly, cf. section 5.2. Then we state Theorem 1.6, which implies Theorem 1.1. We will prove the statement 1.6 in a far more general setting in the subsection 5.3. To start with, we recall here the statement to be established.

Theorem 5.1. [=Theorem 1.6] *Let γ be a $\bar{\partial}$ -closed smooth $(n,1)$ -form on a compact Kähler manifold X with values in the bundle L such that the following hold.*

(a) The bundle L is endowed with a singular metric $h_L = e^{-\varphi_L}$ such that

$$\varphi_L = \sum_i q_i \log |f_i|^2 + C^\infty,$$

for some rational coefficients $q_i \in \mathbb{Q}^+$, where f_i are holomorphic functions and such that the curvature current has no diffuse part.

(b) We suppose that

$$\int_X |\gamma|^2 e^{-(1-\varepsilon)\varphi_L} < +\infty$$

for every $\varepsilon > 0$.

(c) Set $Y := \{h_L = +\infty\}$. There exists a $(n-1, 1)$ -form β with poles (not necessary simple pole) on Y and a $(n, 0)$ -form α with poles (not necessary simple pole) along Y such that

$$\gamma = \bar{\partial}\alpha + D'_{h_L}(\beta)$$

on $X \setminus Y$, where D'_{h_L} is induced by the singular metric h_L on L .

Then γ is $\bar{\partial}$ -exact.

5.1. Preliminaries and some reductions. Let $\pi : \widehat{X} \rightarrow X$ be a log-resolution of (X, h_L) , namely $\pi^*\varphi_L$ is of type

$$\pi^*\varphi_L = \sum m_i \log |s_{E_i}| + \sum_{j \in J} q_j \log |s_{F_j}| + C^\infty,$$

where the convention is that $m_i \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, $q_j \in \mathbb{Q}_+ \setminus \mathbb{Z}$, s_{E_i}, s_{F_j} are the canonical sections associated to the divisors E_i, F_j , and $\sum E_i + \sum F_j$ is simple normal crossing. We can write thus

$$(5.1.1) \quad \widehat{L} := \pi^*L = \sum_{i \in I} m_i E_i + \sum_{j \in J} q_j F_j + L_0,$$

where L_0 is a \mathbb{Q} -line bundle equipped with a smooth metric h_0 such that $i\Theta_{h_0}(L_0) \geq 0$.

Then $\pi^*\gamma$ is a $(n, 1)$ -form with values in \widehat{L} , such that

$$(5.1.2) \quad \int_X |\pi^*\gamma|_{\widehat{\omega}}^2 e^{-(1-\varepsilon)\varphi_{\widehat{L}}} dV_{\widehat{\omega}} < +\infty$$

holds true for every positive ε , where $\widehat{\omega}$ is any (non-singular) metric on \widehat{X} . By solving the local $\bar{\partial}$ -equations, the condition (5.1.2) implies the existence of a smooth $(n, 1)$ -form $\widehat{\gamma}$ with value in \widehat{L} such that $[\widehat{\gamma}] = [\pi^*\gamma] \in H^1(\widehat{X}, K_{\widehat{X}} + \widehat{L})$ and the form

$$(5.1.3) \quad \lambda := \frac{\widehat{\gamma}}{\prod_{i \in I} s_{E_i}^{m_i-1} \prod_{j \in J} s_{F_j}^{\lfloor q_j \rfloor}}$$

is smooth -and of course, $\bar{\partial}$ -closed.

The relation (c) becomes

$$(5.1.4) \quad \lambda = \bar{\partial}\alpha + D'\beta$$

on $\widehat{X} \setminus (E \cup F)$, where D' is the $(1, 0)$ -part of the Chern connection for singular metric on the line bundle $\mathcal{O}(E + \sum(q_j - \lfloor q_j \rfloor)F_j + L_0)$, and α, β are some forms with value in $\mathcal{O}(E + \sum(q_j - \lfloor q_j \rfloor)F_j + L_0)$ and have some poles along $E + F$.

Thus, by changing the notations we have the following setup.

- (1) λ is a $\bar{\partial}$ -closed form of type $(n, 1)$ and values in $E + L$ on a compact Kähler manifold X .
- (2) $E + F$ is a snc divisor on X and $L = \mathcal{O}(\sum(q_j - \lfloor q_j \rfloor)F_j + L_0)$ is a line bundle which we endow with the singular metric h_L induced by F and L_0 .
- (3) α and β are two $E + L$ -forms of type $(n, 0)$ and $(n-1, 1)$, respectively with poles at most along $E + F$, i.e.

$$(5.1.5) \quad \alpha = \frac{1}{s^N} \mathcal{O}(1), \quad \beta = \frac{1}{s^N} \mathcal{O}(1)$$

where $s = s_E \cdot s_F$ and such that (5.1.4) holds in the complement of the support of $E + F$.

Our next step would be to improve the "shape" of the two forms in (5.1.5): we show in the next subsection that we can replace them with forms having logarithmic poles on $E + F$.

5.2. Improving the pole order of α and β (cosmetics). Notice that by hypothesis (3) above, the meromorphic form $\frac{\lambda}{s_E}$ has logarithmic poles along E ; it can therefore be interpreted as a $(0, 1)$ -form with values in $\Lambda^n T_X^*(E) \otimes L$. In this set-up, we formulate the next statement.

Proposition 5.2. *There exists α_1 and β_1 differential forms with log-poles along E , such that*

$$(5.2.1) \quad \bar{\partial}\alpha_1 + D'\beta_1 = \frac{\lambda}{s_E}$$

holds in the complement of E , where D' is the $(1, 0)$ -part of the Chern connection for (L, h_L) .

Proof. We start by choosing a finite covering $(\Omega_i)_{i \in I}$ of X , together with corresponding coordinates (z_i^1, \dots, z_i^n) such that for every index $i \in I$ we have

$$(5.2.2) \quad E_j \cap \Omega_i = (z_i^j = 0), \quad F_k \cap \Omega_i = (z_i^k = 0)$$

for each $j = 1, \dots, r$ and $k = r + 1, \dots, r + s$.

Consider next the component E_1 of E . We then define an associated vector field

$$(5.2.3) \quad V_1 := \sum \theta_i(z) z_i^1 \frac{\partial}{\partial z_i^1}$$

where $(\theta_i)_{i \in I}$ is a partition of unit and $\Omega_i \cap E_1 = (z_i^1 = 0)$. Notice that since E_1 is a global hypersurface, we have

$$(5.2.4) \quad V_1|_{\Omega_i} = (z_i^1 + \mathcal{O}(z_i^1)^2) \frac{\partial}{\partial z_i^1} + \sum_{k=2}^{r+s} \mathcal{O}(z_i^1 z_i^k) \frac{\partial}{\partial z_i^k} + \sum_{k>r+s} \mathcal{O}(z_i^1) \frac{\partial}{\partial z_i^k}$$

where the notation $\mathcal{O}(z_i^1)$ means a function belonging to the ideal $\mathcal{O}(-E_1) \otimes \mathcal{C}^\infty(\Omega_i)$. Indeed, given that the transition functions for the coordinate system we have are

$$(5.2.5) \quad z_i^\alpha = g_{ij}^\alpha(z_j) z_j^\alpha$$

the expression (5.2.4) obviously corresponds to the restriction of V_1 to Ω_i .

Notice also that the local expression of the covariant derivative D' induced by the singular metric on $E + L$ reads as

$$(5.2.6) \quad D'|_{\Omega_i} = \partial - \sum_{j=1}^r \frac{dz_j}{z_j} - \sum_{k=r+1}^{r+s} q_k \frac{dz_k}{z_k}.$$

We first modify the form α . Assume that α has a pole of order N along E_1 for some $N \geq 1$. We define

$$(5.2.7) \quad \alpha_N := \alpha + \frac{1}{N} D'(V_1 \lrcorner \alpha)$$

where D' is the $(1, 0)$ part of the Chern connection corresponding to the singular metric on $E + L$, cf. (5.2.6). By a direct computation, we show now that the pole order of α_N is at most $N - 1$.

Indeed, we write $\alpha|_{\Omega} = \frac{f}{z_1^N} dz$ (where Ω is one of the Ω_i ; we also drop the index i) and then we have

$$(5.2.8) \quad V_1 \lrcorner \alpha = (z_1 + \mathcal{O}(z_1)^2) \frac{f}{z_1^N} \widehat{dz}_1 + \sum_{j \geq 2} (-1)^{j-1} \mathcal{O}(z_1) \frac{f}{z_1^N} \widehat{dz}_j.$$

By the formula (5.2.6) we have

$$(5.2.9) \quad D'(V_1 \lrcorner \alpha) \equiv -N \frac{f}{z_1^N} dz$$

modulo a form whose pole order is smaller than $N - 1$, so our claim is proved

Moreover, we have

$$(5.2.10) \quad \lambda = \bar{\partial}\alpha_N + D'(\beta + \frac{1}{N} \bar{\partial}(V_1 \lrcorner \alpha))$$

in the complement of $E \cup F$. We repeat this procedure until the exponent N is equal to zero. At this moment we have

$$(5.2.11) \quad \lambda = \bar{\partial}\alpha_0 + D'(\beta_0)$$

where α_0 has no poles along E_1 and the coefficients of β_0 are similar to the ones of our initial β .

We are dealing with the other components of E and F similarly. For example for E_2 we proceed as follows. We define the vector field

$$(5.2.12) \quad V_2 := \sum \theta_i(z) z_i^2 \frac{\partial}{\partial z_i^2}$$

constructed by using coordinate system (5.2.2). It then follows that locally the V_2 can be written as

$$(5.2.13) \quad V_2|_{\Omega_i} = (z_i^2 + \mathcal{O}(z_i^2)^2) \frac{\partial}{\partial z_i^2} + \mathcal{O}(z_i^1 z_i^2) \frac{\partial}{\partial z_i^1} + \sum_{j \neq 1,2} \mathcal{O}(z_i^2) \frac{\partial}{\partial z_i^k}.$$

With this choice of vector field, if α is a smooth form along E_1 then the same is true for

$$(5.2.14) \quad \alpha + \frac{1}{N} D'(V_2 \lrcorner \alpha)$$

in other words, we are not losing what we have gained at the first step. Furthermore, the pole order of (5.2.14) along E_2 has dropped by at least one unit if α is of pole order $N \geq 1$ along E_2 . The same procedure as before applies.

Finally we get some new α and β such that

$$(5.2.15) \quad \lambda = \bar{\partial}\alpha + D'\beta$$

holds in the complement of $E + F$ and such that the form α is smooth on X and the coefficients of β are of type $\frac{b}{s^k}$ for some smooth function b and positive integer k .

We now turn to the form β , and prove that modulo the image of the D' -operator it has no poles along $E + F$. Assume that β has a pole of order $N \geq 1$ along E_1 . Then we define

$$(5.2.16) \quad \beta_N := \beta + \frac{1}{N} D'(V_1 \lrcorner \beta)$$

and the same type of calculations as before will show that it has a pole of order at most $N - 1$ along E_1 .

To see this, we write

$$(5.2.17) \quad \beta|_{\Omega} = \sum_{j \geq 2, k} \frac{\eta_{j\bar{k}}}{z_1^N} dz_1 \wedge \widehat{dz_j} \wedge d\bar{z}_k + \sum_k \frac{\eta_{k\bar{k}}}{z_1^N} d\widehat{z_1} \wedge d\bar{z}_k$$

in local coordinates. Since λ and α in (5.2.15) are smooth, $D'\beta$ has no poles along E_1 . Therefore for each k , $\eta_{k\bar{k}}$ is divisible by z_1 . We can then write

$$(5.2.18) \quad \beta|_{\Omega} = \sum_{j \geq 2, k} \frac{\eta_{j\bar{k}}}{z_1^N} dz_1 \wedge \widehat{dz_j} \wedge d\bar{z}_k + \sum_k \frac{\eta_{k\bar{k}}}{z_1^{N-1}} d\widehat{z_1} \wedge d\bar{z}_k.$$

By using the expression (5.2.4), a direct computation -which we skip- shows that adding $\frac{1}{N} D'(V_1 \lrcorner \beta)$ to our form β has the effect of removing the first sum in (5.2.18), and so β_N has a pole of order at most $N - 1$ along E_1 . We still have

$$(5.2.19) \quad \lambda = \bar{\partial}\alpha + D'\beta_N \quad \text{on } X \setminus (E + F),$$

where α is unchanged. We repeat this procedure until the exponent N is equal to zero. We get

$$(5.2.20) \quad \lambda = \bar{\partial}\alpha + D'(\beta)$$

where α is smooth on X and (the resulting) β has no pole along E_1 .

A little observation is in order at this point: if we write the form β in coordinates

$$(5.2.21) \quad \beta|_{\Omega} = \sum_{j \geq 2, k} \eta_{j\bar{k}} dz_1 \wedge \widehat{dz_j} \wedge d\bar{z}_k + \sum_k \eta_{1\bar{k}} d\widehat{z_1} \wedge d\bar{z}_k,$$

where $\eta_{j\bar{k}}$ and $\eta_{1\bar{k}}$ are smooth with respect to z_1 , the equality (5.2.20) shows that $D'\beta$ is smooth. By the explicit expression of the operator D' is (5.2.6) it follows that $\eta_{1\bar{k}}$ is divisible by z_1 , for each k .

In order to treat the remaining components of E and F we are using the argument already employed for α , namely we consider $\beta + \frac{1}{N}D'(V_2)\beta$. This form has no pole along E_1 (this is where the divisibility of the coefficient $\eta_{1\bar{k}}$ by z_1 is playing an important role) and pole order along E_2 drops.

Finally we obtain two smooth forms α and β such that

$$(5.2.22) \quad \lambda = \bar{\partial}\alpha + D'(\beta)$$

holds at each point of $X \setminus (E \cup F)$. If we write

$$(5.2.23) \quad \beta = \sum_{j,k} \eta_{j\bar{k}} \widehat{dz}_j \wedge d\bar{z}_k$$

then we automatically have $\eta_{j\bar{k}}$ divisible by z_j , for all $j = 1, \dots, r+s$. In particular (5.2.22) holds point-wise on X and by division with the section s_E we have

$$(5.2.24) \quad \frac{\lambda}{s_E} = \bar{\partial}\alpha_1 + D'(\beta_1)$$

on $X \setminus E$, where α_1 and β_1 have logarithmic poles along E . The proposition is proved. \square

Remark 5.3. Assume that E is equal to zero. Then the particular shape of the coefficients of $\beta = \beta_1$ in (5.2.23) shows that

$$(5.3.1) \quad \int_X |\beta|_{\omega_P}^2 e^{-\varphi_L} < \infty$$

in other words, β is L^2 with respect to the Poincaré metric.

Therefore, in order to complete the proof of Theorem 1.6 it would be enough to establish the following statement.

Theorem 5.4. Let λ be a smooth $(n,1)$ -form on a compact Kähler manifold X with values in the bundle $E + L$ such that the following hold.

- (a) The bundle L is endowed with a metric h_L such that $\varphi_L \simeq \sum q_i \log |f_i|^2$ modulo smooth functions, where $0 < q_i < 1$ are rational numbers. The curvature $\Theta(L, h_L) \geq 0$ on X .
- (c) We have $E := \sum_{i \in I} E_i$ and the divisor $E + F$ is snc.
- (d) There exists a $(n-1,1)$ -form β with values in L and log poles on E , and a $(n,0)$ -form α with values in L and log poles along E such that

$$(5.4.1) \quad \frac{\lambda}{s_E} = \bar{\partial}\alpha + D'(\beta)$$

on $X \setminus E$, where D' is induced by the singular metric on L .

Then λ is $\bar{\partial}$ -exact.

We will actually prove a much more general statement in the next subsection. Remark however that the case $E = 0$ is quite simple, along the following lines.

Let λ be a $\bar{\partial}$ -closed form of type $(n,1)$ with values in $L = (m-1)K_X$, which is L^2 with respect to h_L and the Poincaré metric ω_P corresponding to the divisor F . Thanks to Theorem 3.2, we have a L^2 -decomposition

$$(5.4.1) \quad \lambda = u + \bar{\partial}v$$

where u is harmonic. From Lemma 3.10 it follows that λ is $\bar{\partial}$ -exact if and only if

$$(5.4.2) \quad \int_X \lambda \wedge \bar{\gamma} e^{-\varphi_L} = 0$$

for any L^2 holomorphic form γ of type $(n-1,0)$ with values in L .

Under the current assumption (i.e. $E = 0$) we have the following equality

$$(5.4.3) \quad \lambda = \bar{\partial}\alpha + D'\beta$$

on X , where α and β are smooth. As we have seen in Remark 5.3, the form β is L^2 with respect to the Poincaré metric and h_L . It follows that

$$(5.4.4) \quad \int_X \bar{\partial}\alpha \wedge \bar{\gamma} e^{-\varphi_L} = 0$$

as well as

$$(5.4.5) \quad \int_X D'\beta \wedge \bar{\gamma} e^{-\varphi_L} = 0$$

because $D'\gamma$ and $\bar{\partial}\gamma$ are equal to zero. The conclusion follows, i.e. we are done with the case $E = 0$.

5.3. A general vanishing statement. In what follows we prove the following more general version of Theorem 5.4.

Theorem 5.5. [= Theorem 1.7] *Let X be a n -dimensional compact Kähler manifold and let E be a snc divisor on X , s_E be the canonical section of E . Let (L, h_L) be a holomorphic line bundle on X such that*

$$i\Theta_{h_L}(L) = \sum q_i [Y_i] + \theta_L,$$

where $q_i \in]0, 1[\cap \mathbb{Q}$, $E + \sum Y_i$ is snc, and the form θ_L is smooth, semi-positive.

Let λ be a $\bar{\partial}$ -closed smooth (n, q) -form with value in $L + E$. If there exists β_1 and β_2 , two L -valued $(n-1, q)$ -form and $(n-1, q-1)$ -form with log poles along $E + \sum Y_i$ respectively, such that

$$(5.5.1) \quad \frac{\lambda}{s_E} = D'_{h_L} \beta_1 + \theta_L \wedge \beta_2 \quad \text{on } X \setminus (E + \sum Y_i),$$

then the form λ is $\bar{\partial}$ -exact, i.e. the class $[\lambda] = 0 \in H^q(X, K_X + L + E)$.

Proof. We consider a test form $\varphi \in C_{(0, n-q)}^\infty(X, -L - E)$ with compact support in $X \setminus Y$. Then we have the orthogonal decomposition

$$(5.5.2) \quad \varphi = \varphi_1 + \varphi_2, \quad \varphi_1 \in \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}, \quad \varphi_2 \in (\text{Ker } \bar{\partial})^\perp$$

where the reference metric on X is ω_C . The bundle L is endowed with the metric h_L and E with a smooth, arbitrary metric.

Our proof relies on the following two statements:

$$(5.5.3) \quad \int_X s_E (D'_{h_L} \beta_1 + \theta_L \wedge \beta_2) \wedge \varphi_1 = 0$$

and moreover there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$(5.5.4) \quad \int_X |\varphi_2|^2 dV_C \leq C \int_X |\bar{\partial}\varphi_2|^2 dV_C = C \int_X |\bar{\partial}\varphi|^2 dV_C.$$

To prove (5.5.3), note first that, thanks to Theorem 3.28, φ_1 is smooth in the sense of conic. Then $s_E \cdot \varphi_1$ is also smooth in the sense of conic. Moreover, $\bar{\partial}(s_E \varphi_1) = 0$ and $s_E \varphi_1$ vanishes along E . Then we obtain (5.5.3) as consequence of Lemma 5.7 below. For (5.5.4), we simply use Theorem 3.28 which implies that the image of $\bar{\partial}$ operator is closed (regardless to the fact that the curvature of L^* is negative).

We consider next the linear application

$$\bar{\partial}\varphi \rightarrow \int_X s_E (D'_{h_L} \beta_1 + \theta_L \wedge \beta_2) \wedge \varphi.$$

It follows from (5.5.3) and (5.5.4) that it is bounded. By standard functional analysis there exists a form $f \in L_{(n, q-1)}^2(X, L + E)$ such that

$$\int_X s_E (D'_{h_L} \beta_1 + \theta_L \wedge \beta_2) \wedge \varphi = \int_X \bar{\partial}\varphi \wedge f.$$

Therefore we infer that the equality

$$(5.5.5) \quad \lambda = s_E(D'_{h_L}\beta_1 + \theta_L \wedge \beta_2) = \bar{\partial}f \quad \text{on } X \setminus Y.$$

Since f is L^2 and the LHS in (5.5.5) is smooth by assumption, by using the remark after Theorem 3.29, we know that (5.5.5) holds on the total space X . Theorem 1.7 is thus proved modulo the lemma 5.7 below. \square

The following key result is a generalization of [15, Lemma .2.3] in our setting. Prior to stating it, we introduce a further notation. Let γ be an L -valued form of (p, q) -type which moreover has log-poles along E and it is $\bar{\partial}$ -closed when restricted to the complement of the support of E . Locally on a coordinate subset $\Omega \subset X$ such that $E_1 \cap \Omega = (z_1 = 0)$ we can write

$$(5.5.6) \quad \gamma|_{\Omega} = \frac{dz_1}{z_1} \wedge \gamma_1 + \gamma_2$$

where γ_1 and γ_2 are smooth along $E_1 \cap \Omega$. We define

$$(5.5.7) \quad \text{Res}_{E_1}(\gamma)|_{\Omega} := \gamma_1|_{\Omega}$$

and it is not difficult to see that the following hold:

- The forms $\text{Res}_{E_1}(\gamma)|_{\Omega}$, even if given locally as in (5.5.7), defines a global $(p-1, q)$ -form on E_1 with values in $L|_{E_1}$ and log-poles on $(E - E_1)|_{E_1}$. We will denote it with $\text{Res}_{E_1}(\gamma)$

- We have

$$(5.5.8) \quad \text{Res}_{E_1}(\gamma) = -\chi_{E_1} \bar{\partial}\gamma$$

i.e. residue along E_1 can be obtained by multiplying the current $\bar{\partial}\gamma$ with the characteristic function of E_1 .

- The equality $\bar{\partial}\text{Res}_{E_1}(\gamma) = 0$ holds in the complement of the support of $(E - E_1)|_{E_1}$.

All the properties above are completely standard. In the specific context of Theorem 1.7, we consider the current

$$(5.5.9) \quad \widehat{\Theta} := D'_{h_L}\beta_1 + \theta_L \wedge \beta_2$$

and its residues along the components of E . As a preparation for the proof of this result, we discuss next a few properties of $\widehat{\Theta}$ that we will next use.

- The first fact to remark is that by hypothesis we have a non-singular (n, q) -form λ with values in $E + L$ such that

$$(5.5.10) \quad \lambda = s_E(D'_{h_L}\beta_1 + \theta_L \wedge \beta_2)$$

and it follows that we have the equality

$$(5.5.11) \quad \frac{\lambda}{s_E} = D'_{h_L}\beta_1 + \theta_L \wedge \beta_2$$

in the sense of currents on X . This is due to the fact that the current $D'_{h_L}\beta_1$ has no residue on $E + Y$. Note that this is absolutely not the case in general if we replace D'_{h_L} with $\bar{\partial}$.

- Another important observation is that the residue of $\widehat{\Theta}$ along any component of E has the same “shape”. i.e. it belongs to the image of $D' + \theta$. This is a simple calculation that we skip.

- The residue on the components of Y is equal to zero. This claim may look strange/suspicious, since the forms β_i could have log-poles on Y , so the residues of each form $D'_{h_L}\beta_1$ and $\theta_L \wedge \beta_2$ could be non-zero on some of the components of Y . However, the equality (5.5.11) clarifies the matter.

We have the next auxiliary result which will be very useful in the proof of Theorem 5.7 below.

Lemma 5.6. *Let γ be a harmonic $(0, n-1)$ -form with values in the dual bundle L^* of L . Then the equality*

$$(5.6.1) \quad \int_X (D'_{h_L}\beta_1 + \theta_L \wedge \beta_2) \wedge \gamma = 0$$

holds (here as everywhere, the integral is computed in the complement of $E + Y$ as a matter of fact, the form in (5.6.1) is absolutely integrable).

Proof. Since γ is harmonic, it is in particular smooth in conic sense and moreover, as explained above the equality $D'_{h_L}\beta_1 + \theta_L \wedge \beta_2 = \frac{\lambda}{s_E}$ holds in the sense of currents. It follows that the form under the integral (5.6.1) is absolutely integrable: this is seen as follows. Let $\pi : U \rightarrow V$ be a ramified cover adapted to our setting and coordinates on V such that

$$Y \cap V = (z_1 \dots z_r = 0), \quad E \cap V = (z_{r+1} \dots z_{r+s} = 0).$$

We have

$$\frac{1}{w^q m} \pi^* \left(\frac{\lambda}{s_E} \Big|_V \right) \wedge \tau = \frac{\mathcal{O}(1)}{\prod w_j^{q_j m + 1 - m} \prod w_i} d\lambda(w)$$

for any smooth form τ of type $(0, n-1)$, so our claim follows.

Thus, it would be enough to show that we have

$$(5.6.2) \quad \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_X \mu_\varepsilon (D'_{h_L}\beta_1 + \theta_L \wedge \beta_2) \wedge \gamma = 0$$

where (μ_ε) is the usual family of truncation functions. Now γ is harmonic, so we have

$$(5.6.3) \quad D'\gamma = 0, \quad \theta_L \wedge \gamma = 0.$$

Therefore, it all boils down to the next equality

$$(5.6.4) \quad \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_X \partial \mu_\varepsilon \wedge \beta_1 \wedge \gamma = 0$$

which in turn is clear (by a local calculation using the fact that γ is smooth in conic sense). For example, say that $n = 2$, so that β_1 is a $(1, 1)$ -form and $Y = (z_1 = 0), E = (z_2 = 0)$. Then the expression (5.6.4) is locally equal to

$$(5.6.5) \quad \int_V \frac{\rho'_\varepsilon(z)}{\log(|z_1|^2 e^{-\phi})} \frac{dz_1}{z_1} \wedge \frac{dz_2}{z_2} \wedge (a d\bar{z}_1 + b d\bar{z}_2) \wedge \gamma|_V$$

and by the local transformation $(w_1, w_2) \rightarrow (w_1^m, w_2)$ this expression above becomes

$$(5.6.6) \quad \int_U \frac{\rho'_\varepsilon(w)}{\log(|w_1|^2 e^{-\phi})} \frac{dw_1}{w_1} \wedge \frac{dw_2}{w_2} \wedge (a_1 d\bar{w}_1 + b_1 d\bar{z}_2) \wedge \frac{\tau}{w_1^{mq}}$$

where a_1, b_1 are smooth functions with compact support on U and τ is a smooth $(0, 1)$ form. This is a consequence of the fact that harmonic forms are smooth in conic sense. Arguments as in Lemma 3.35 and the examples above do apply, so we get

$$(5.6.7) \quad \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_U \rho'_\varepsilon(w) \frac{f(w)}{w_1^{1+mq} w_2} \frac{d\lambda}{\log(|w_1|^2 e^{-\phi})} = 0.$$

Actually we refer to the Appendix for a complete proof of (5.6.7). \square

Our next statement is as follows.

Theorem 5.7. *In the setting of Theorem 1.7, set $\widehat{\Theta} := D'_{h_L}\beta_1 + \theta_L \wedge \beta_2$. Let $E = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq r} E_i$. Let $I_d \subset \{1, \dots, r\}$ with $|I_d| = d$. Let α be a smooth form defined on some space which contains E_{I_d} . We define $L_{I_d}(\alpha) := \bar{\partial}^{*I_d} \mathcal{G}_{I_d}(\alpha|_{E_{I_d}})$, where \mathcal{G}_{I_d} is the Green operator on E_{I_d} . Let φ be a $\bar{\partial}$ -closed $(0, n-q)$ -form on X with values in the dual of L , which moreover is smooth in conic sense. We assume that φ vanishes along E . Then for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we have*

$$(5.7.1) \quad \sum_{I_k \subset I_{k-1} \subset \dots \subset I_0} \int_{E_{I_k}} \text{Res}_{E_{I_k}}(\widehat{\Theta}) \wedge L_{I_{k-1}} \circ L_{I_{k-2}} \cdots \circ L_{I_0} \varphi = 0,$$

where $L_{I_0} \varphi := \bar{\partial}^* \mathcal{G}(\varphi)$ on X . Here, if $k = 0$, (5.7.1) means that

$$(5.7.2) \quad \int_X \widehat{\Theta} \wedge \varphi = 0.$$

For every sequence $I_k \subset I_{k-1} \subset \dots \subset I_0$ fixed, the residue $\text{Res}_{E_{I_k}}(\widehat{\Theta})$ in (5.7.1) is defined by the following way:

$$(5.7.3) \quad \text{Res}_{E_{I_k}}(\widehat{\Theta}) := \text{Res}_{E_{I_k}} \left(\text{Res}_{E_{I_{k-1}}} \left(\dots \text{Res}_{E_{I_1}}(\widehat{\Theta}) \right) \right).$$

Proof. We prove it by induction on k from large to small. For $k = n + 1$, it is automatically true since $E_{I_{n+1}}$ is empty. We suppose that the lemma holds for $k + 1$. Now we prove the lemma for k .

First of all, we have

$$(5.7.4) \quad \int_{E_{I_k}} \text{Res}_{E_{I_k}}(\widehat{\Theta}) \wedge \gamma = 0$$

for any harmonic $\gamma \in C_{(0, n-k-1)}^\infty(E_{I_k}, L^*)$. Indeed, we know that the residue $\text{Res}_{E_{I_k}}(\widehat{\Theta})$ obtained by iterating the construction we have recalled before the lemma 5.6 can be written as

$$\text{Res}_{E_{I_k}}(\widehat{\Theta}) = D'(\beta_k) + \theta_L \wedge \alpha_k$$

for some forms β_k, α_k with log poles. Then Lemma 5.6 implies (5.7.4).

Then the deRham-Kodaira decomposition implies that the equality

$$\text{Res}_{E_{I_k}}(\widehat{\Theta}) = \bar{\partial} \bar{\partial}^{*I_k} \mathcal{G}_{I_k}(\text{Res}_{E_{I_k}}(\widehat{\Theta})) + \bar{\partial}^{*I_k} \bar{\partial} \mathcal{G}_{I_k}(\text{Res}_{E_{I_k}}(\widehat{\Theta}))$$

holds. As a consequence, we obtain

$$\sum_{I_k \subset I_{k-1} \subset \dots \subset I_0} \int_{E_{I_k}} \text{Res}_{E_{I_k}}(\widehat{\Theta}) \wedge L_{I_{k-1}} \circ L_{I_{k-2}} \cdots \circ L_{I_0} \varphi = A + B,$$

where

$$A := \sum_{I_k \subset I_{k-1} \subset \dots \subset I_0} \int_{E_{I_k}} \bar{\partial}^{*I_k} \bar{\partial} \mathcal{G}_{I_k}(\text{Res}_{E_{I_k}}(\widehat{\Theta})) \wedge L_{I_{k-1}} \circ \dots \circ L_{I_0} \varphi$$

and

$$B := \sum_{I_k \subset I_{k-1} \subset \dots \subset I_0} \int_{E_{I_k}} \bar{\partial} \bar{\partial}^{*I_k} \mathcal{G}_{I_k}(\text{Res}_{E_{I_k}}(\widehat{\Theta})) \wedge L_{I_{k-1}} \circ \dots \circ L_{I_0} \varphi.$$

We would like to prove that $A = B = 0$.

We first estimate A . Since \mathcal{G} commutes with $\bar{\partial}$, together with the relation (5.5.8), we have

$$\begin{aligned} A &= \sum_{I_k \subset I_{k-1} \subset \dots \subset I_0} \int_{E_{I_k}} \bar{\partial}^{*I_k} \mathcal{G}_{I_k} \bar{\partial}(\text{Res}_{E_{I_k}}(\widehat{\Theta})) \wedge L_{I_{k-1}} \circ \dots \circ L_{I_0} \varphi \\ &= - \sum_{I_{k+1} \subset I_k \subset \dots \subset I_0} \int_{E_{I_{k+1}}} \text{Res}_{E_{I_{k+1}}}(\widehat{\Theta}) \wedge L_{I_k} \circ L_{I_{k-1}} \circ \dots \circ L_{I_0} \varphi = 0. \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality is a consequence of the induction hypothesis.

Next, we estimate the quantity B . We have

$$\begin{aligned} B &= \sum_{I_k \subset I_{k-1} \subset \dots \subset I_0} \int_{E_{I_k}} \bar{\partial} \bar{\partial}^{*I_k} \mathcal{G}_{I_k}(\text{Res}_{E_{I_k}}(\widehat{\Theta})) \wedge L_{I_{k-1}} \circ \dots \circ L_{I_0} \varphi \\ &= \sum_{I_k \subset I_{k-1} \subset \dots \subset I_0} \int_{E_{I_k}} \bar{\partial}^{*I_k} \mathcal{G}_{I_k}(\text{Res}_{E_{I_k}}(\widehat{\Theta})) \wedge \bar{\partial}(L_{I_{k-1}} \circ \dots \circ L_{I_0} \varphi). \end{aligned}$$

By applying the deRham-Kodaira decomposition (4.2.5) to $(L_{I_{k-2}} \circ \dots \circ L_{I_0} \varphi)|_{E_{I_{k-1}}}$, we obtain

$$\bar{\partial}(L_{I_{k-1}} \circ \dots \circ L_{I_0} \varphi) = \gamma + (L_{I_{k-2}} \circ \dots \circ L_{I_0} \varphi)|_{E_{I_{k-1}}} + L_{I_{k-1}} \circ \bar{\partial}(L_{I_{k-2}} \cdots \circ L_{I_0} \varphi),$$

where γ is a $\Delta''_{E_{I_{k-1}}}$ -harmonic $(0, n - k + 1)$ -form on $E_{I_{k-1}}$ with values in the restriction of the dual of L .

We next estimate the integral involving the first two terms.

• *The term involving γ .* Since γ is a harmonic $(0, n - k + 1)$ -form on $E_{I_{k-1}}$ with values in L^* , it follows that $D'\gamma = 0$ and $\theta_L|_{E_{I_{k-1}}} \wedge \gamma = 0$ on $E_{I_{k-1}}$. These crucial equalities obviously are still verified by restriction one level deeper, to E_{I_k} . We infer that the restriction

$$\gamma|_{E_{I_k}}$$

is still harmonic and thus

$$\int_{E_{I_k}} \bar{\partial}^{*I_k} \mathcal{G}_{I_k}(\text{Res}_{E_{I_k}}(\widehat{\Theta})) \wedge \gamma = 0.$$

- The term involving $L_{I_{k-2}} \circ \cdots \circ L_{I_0} \varphi$. The sum

$$\sum_{I_k \subset I_{k-1} \subset \cdots \subset I_0} \int_{E_{I_k}} \bar{\partial}^{*I_k} \mathcal{G}_{I_k}(\text{Res}_{E_{I_k}}(\widehat{\Theta})) \wedge (L_{I_{k-2}} \circ \cdots \circ L_{I_0} \varphi)$$

equals zero as soon as $k - 1 \geq 1$: for every $I_k \subset I_{k-2}$ fixed, $I_{k-2} \setminus I_k$ contains only two elements. By construction of Res_{I_k} (5.7.3), the alternate sum for I_{k-1} satisfying $I_k \subset I_{k-1} \subset I_{k-2}$ equals to 0.

It follows that if $k - 1 \geq 1$, we obtain

$$B = \sum_{I_k \subset I_{k-1} \subset \cdots \subset I_0} \int_{E_{I_k}} \bar{\partial}^{*I_k} \mathcal{G}_{I_k}(\text{Res}_{E_{I_k}}(\widehat{\Theta})) \wedge L_{I_{k-1}} \circ \bar{\partial}(L_{I_{k-2}} \circ \cdots \circ L_{I_0} \varphi).$$

Now we can repeat the same argument for $\bar{\partial}(L_{I_{k-2}} \circ \cdots \circ L_{I_0} \varphi)$ as long as $k \geq 3$. The only difference is to treat the integral involving the harmonic forms γ on $E_{I_{k-2}}$: we use the fact that $\mathcal{G}_{I_{k-1}}(\gamma|_{E_{I_{k-2}}}) = 0$. We finally get

$$\begin{aligned} B &= \sum_{I_k \subset I_{k-1} \subset \cdots \subset I_0} \int_{E_{I_k}} \bar{\partial}^{*I_k} \mathcal{G}_{I_k}(\text{Res}_{E_{I_k}}(\widehat{\Theta})) \wedge L_{I_{k-1}} \circ \bar{\partial}(L_{I_{k-2}} \circ \cdots \circ L_{I_0} \varphi) \\ \cdots &= \sum_{I_k \subset I_{k-1} \subset \cdots \subset I_0} \int_{E_{I_k}} \bar{\partial}^{*I_k} \mathcal{G}_{I_k}(\text{Res}_{E_{I_k}}(\widehat{\Theta})) \wedge L_{I_{k-1}} \circ L_{I_{k-2}} \circ \cdots \circ L_{I_1} \circ \bar{\partial}(L_{I_0}(\varphi)). \end{aligned}$$

Concerning the term $\bar{\partial}(L_{I_0}(\varphi)) = \bar{\partial} \bar{\partial}^* \mathcal{G}(\varphi)$, we consider the Hodge decomposition

$$\bar{\partial} \bar{\partial}^* \mathcal{G}(\varphi) = \gamma + \varphi - \bar{\partial}^* \mathcal{G}(\bar{\partial} \varphi) = \gamma + \varphi,$$

where γ is harmonic. Since $\varphi = 0$ on E , we have $L_{I_1}(\varphi) = 0$.

We obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{I_k \subset I_{k-1} \subset \cdots \subset I_0} \int_{E_{I_k}} \bar{\partial}^{*I_k} \mathcal{G}_{I_k}(\text{Res}_{E_{I_k}}(\widehat{\Theta})) \wedge L_{I_{k-1}} \circ L_{I_{k-2}} \circ \cdots \circ \bar{\partial}(L_{I_0}(\varphi)) \\ &= \sum_{I_k \subset I_{k-1} \subset \cdots \subset I_0} \int_{E_{I_k}} \bar{\partial}^{*I_k} \mathcal{G}_{I_k}(\text{Res}_{E_{I_k}}(\widehat{\Theta})) \wedge L_{I_{k-1}} \circ \cdots \circ L_{I_1}(\gamma + \varphi) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of Theorem 1.7. \square

Remark 5.8. It is important and challenging to refine further Theorem 1.7 and solve the equation $\lambda = \bar{\partial} f$ with estimates. A quick inspection of our arguments shows that one "only" needs to understand on what the constant C in (5.5.4) depends. This might not be the easiest thing to do, given the proof (by contradiction) for the existence of this constant.

5.4. Application: an injectivity theorem. As corollary of Theorem 1.7, we obtain the following result.

Theorem 5.9. *Let $E = \sum E_i$ be a simple normal crossing divisor on a compact Kähler manifold X and F be a holomorphic line bundle on X with a smooth metric h_F such that $i\Theta_{h_F}(F) \geq 0$. Let $m \in \mathbb{N}^*$ and consider a section $s \in H^0(X, mF)$ such that the zero locus s contains no lc centres of the lc pair (X, E) . Then the multiplication map induced by the tensor product with s*

$$(5.9.1) \quad s \otimes : H^q(X, K_X + E + F) \rightarrow H^q(X, K_X + E + (m+1)F)$$

is injective for every $q \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof. Let s_E be the canonical section of E . After some desingularisation, by the assumption on the zero locus of s , we can suppose that

$$\text{Div}(s) = \sum a_i F_i,$$

and $\sum F_i + E$ is snc. Indeed, consider a birational map $\pi : \widehat{X} \rightarrow X$ such that the inverse image of $E + \text{Div}(s)$ is snc. Given a (n, q) -form λ with values in $E + F$, the π inverse image of $\frac{\lambda}{s_E}$ is a (n, q) -form with log-poles along the support of the inverse image of E , i.e. we have

$$(5.9.2) \quad \pi^* \left(\frac{\lambda}{s_E} \right) = \frac{\widehat{\lambda}}{s_{\widehat{E}}}$$

where $\widehat{\lambda}$ is a (n, q) form on \widehat{X} with values in $\widehat{E} + \pi^*(F)$. Another way to express this is the familiar equality

$$(5.9.3) \quad G + \pi^*(K_X + E) = K_{\widehat{X}} + \widehat{E}$$

where G is effective and the components of \widehat{E} are projecting onto the log-canonical centers of (X, E) (since we are only blowing up submanifolds which are transverse to E). In particular, the components of the support of \widehat{E} is disjoint from the inverse image of $\text{Div}(s)$.

Now if we are able to show that $\widehat{\lambda}$ is $\bar{\partial}$ -exact, then we write

$$(5.9.4) \quad \pi^*(\lambda) = \frac{\widehat{\lambda}}{s_{\widehat{E}}} \otimes \pi^*(s_E).$$

The RHS is holomorphic, since \widehat{E} is reduced and its support is contained in the inverse image of E . It follows that the inverse image of λ is zero in cohomology and then the same is true for λ .

We suppose for simplicity that $\text{Div}(s) = aF_1 + bF_2$ (the general case follows from the same argument, by using the remark after Lemma 5.11). Let s_i and s_E be the canonical section of F_i and of E , respectively. One of the important points in our proof is to construct a sequence $(a_k, b_k) \in \mathbb{N}^2$ with the following properties.

- (1) We have $(a_0, b_0) = (0, 0)$, $(a_N, b_N) = (a, b)$ and for each $k \geq 0$ the successive differences $a_{k+1} - a_k, b_{k+1} - b_k$ are elements of the set $\{0, 1\}$.
- (2) The bundle $F_k := F + a_k F_1 + b_k F_2$ admits a metric h_k whose local weights can be written as

$$\varphi_k = c\varphi_F + c_1 \log |f_1|^2 + c_2 \log |f_2|^2$$

where $h_F = e^{-\varphi_F}$ is the non-singular, semi-positively curved metric on F , the constant c is positive and $c_i \in]0, 1[$ for $i = 1, 2$.

Such sequence will be constructed in Lemma 5.11. We denote by

$$(5.9.5) \quad s_k := s_1^{(a_{k+1}-a_k)} \otimes s_2^{(b_{k+1}-b_k)} \in H^0(X, (a_{k+1} - a_k)F_1 + (b_{k+1} - b_k)F_2).$$

The property (1) above shows that (5.9.1) can be written as composition of the maps

$$(5.9.6) \quad s_k : H^q(X, K_X + E + F_k) \rightarrow H^q(X, K_X + E + F_{k+1}).$$

Thus, in order to conclude it is sufficient to prove that (5.9.6) is injective for every k .

Let λ be a smooth form in $H^q(X, K_X + E + F_k)$ such that

$$\lambda \otimes s_k = 0 \in H^q(X, K_X + E + F_{k+1}).$$

In other words there exists a smooth form $\alpha \in C_{(n, q-1)}^\infty(X, E + F_{k+1})$ such that

$$s_k \otimes \lambda = \bar{\partial}\alpha.$$

By property (2) we can equip $F_k = F + a_k F_1 + b_k F_2$ with the metric h_k . Now since the weight of the metric h_k contains a singular part $c_i \log |f_i|^2$ for some rational number $0 < c_i < 1$ and it

follows from Lemma 5.10 below that we can find forms β_1, β_2 and θ with log poles along $E + F$ and E , respectively such that the equality

$$(5.9.7) \quad \frac{\lambda}{s_E} = \bar{\partial} \left(\frac{\alpha}{s_E s_k} \right) = D'_{h_k}(\beta_1) + \bar{\partial}\theta + i\Theta_{h_k} \wedge \beta_2$$

holds true on $X \setminus (E + F_1 + F_2)$. Therefore

$$\frac{\lambda}{s_E} - \bar{\partial}\theta = D'_{h_k}(\beta_1) + i\Theta_{h_k} \wedge \beta_2$$

in the complement of $E + F_1 + F_2$. Since θ is smooth near a generic point of $F_1 + F_2$, the forms on the LHS of the previous equality are non-singular at the generic point of $F_1 + F_2$, we are precisely in the framework of Theorem 1.7.

We infer that

$$\lambda - s_E \bar{\partial}\theta$$

is $\bar{\partial}$ -exact. Since θ has by construction only simple poles along E , $\bar{\partial}(\theta) \otimes s_E = \bar{\partial}(\theta \cdot s_E)$ is $\bar{\partial}$ -exact. Then λ is $\bar{\partial}$ -exact and (5.9.6) is injective. The theorem is thus proved, modulo the two lemmas below. \square

To complete our proof, we establish next the auxiliary statements we used; we start with the existence of forms β_i, θ .

Lemma 5.10. *Let A be a L -valued smooth $(n, 0)$ -form on $X \setminus (E + F_1 + F_2)$ with log poles along $E + F_1 + F_2$. Then we can find forms β_1, β_2 and θ with at most log poles along $E + F$ and E , respectively such that the equality*

$$\bar{\partial}A = \bar{\partial}\theta + D'_{h_L}(\beta_1) + i\Theta_{h_L} \wedge \beta_2$$

holds in the complement of the support of $E + F_1 + F_2$.

Proof. We prove the lemma by the same argument as in subsection 5.2. We suppose that F_1 and F_2 are defined by $z_1 = 0$ and $z_2 = 0$ respectively on an open set $\Omega \subset X$. We have seen that we can construct a vector field V_1 on X such that

$$V_1|_{\Omega} = (z_1 + \mathcal{O}((z_1)^2)) \frac{\partial}{\partial z_1} + \mathcal{O}(z_1 z_2) \frac{\partial}{\partial z_2} + \sum_{i \geq 3} a_i \frac{\partial}{\partial z_i}.$$

Then there is a constant c such that $A_1 := A - cD'_{h_L}(V_1 \lrcorner A)$ is smooth on $X \setminus (E + F_2)$ and simple pole along $E + F_2$. Moreover, by construction, $V_1 \lrcorner A$ has no poles along F_1 and it has at most log poles along $E + F_2$.

Now

$$\bar{\partial}(A) = \bar{\partial}(A_1) + c\bar{\partial}(D'_{h_L}(V_1 \lrcorner A)) = \bar{\partial}(A_1) + D'_{h_L} \bar{\partial}(cV_1 \lrcorner A) + i\Theta_{h_L}(L) \wedge (cV_1 \lrcorner A)$$

pointwise on $X \setminus (E + F_1 + F_2)$. By construction, $\bar{\partial}(cV_1 \lrcorner A)$ and $cV_1 \lrcorner A$ have log poles $E + F_2$.

We repeat the same argument for A_1 to remove its pole along F_2 . The resulting forms are θ with log poles along E and β_1, β_2 with log poles along $E + F$ so our lemma proved. \square

Finally, the construction of the sequence $(a_k, b_k)_{k=0, \dots, N}$ with the two properties (1) and (2) can be done as follows.

Lemma 5.11. *Let F be a holomorphic line bundle on X and let $m \in \mathbb{N}^*$. Let $s \in H^0(X, mF)$ such that $\text{Div}(s) = aF_1 + bF_2$ for some $a, b \in \mathbb{N}^*$. We consider a sequence $\{(a_k, b_k)\}_{k=1}^N \subset \mathbb{N}^2$ constructed as follows:*

- (i) We define $(a_0, b_0) = (0, 0)$. For $k \geq 1$, if $(a_k, b_k) = (a, b)$, then we stop at this step. If not, we take $c_k := \min\{\frac{a_k}{a}, \frac{b_k}{b}\}$.
- (ii) If $\frac{a_k}{a} > c_k$, then we set $a_{k+1} := a_k$ and if $\frac{a_k}{a} = c_k$, we define $a_{k+1} := a_k + 1$.
- (iii) We do the same for b_{k+1} : if $\frac{b_k}{b} > c_k$, then $b_{k+1} := b_k$ and if $\frac{b_k}{b} = c_k$, then we set $b_{k+1} := b_k + 1$.

Then for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$(5.11.1) \quad 0 = \min\{a_k - c_k a, b_k - c_k b\} \leq \max\{a_k - c_k a, b_k - c_k b\} < 1.$$

In particular, there exist $c_{1,k}, c_{2,k} \in]0, 1[\cap \mathbb{Q}$ and $d_k \in \mathbb{Q}^+$ such that

$$(5.11.2) \quad F + a_k F_1 + b_k F_2 \equiv d_k F + c_{1,k} F_1 + c_{2,k} F_2.$$

Proof. We prove (5.11.1) by induction. By the definition of c_k , we have

$$\min\{a_k - c_k a, b_k - c_k b\} = 0$$

so it is enough to establish the strict inequality for max.

Assume that (5.11.1) holds for k . Note first that by construction, $c_{k+1} > c_k$. There are three cases to consider.

- $c_k = \frac{a_k}{a} = \frac{b_k}{b}$. Then $a_{k+1} - c_k a = b_{k+1} - c_k b = 1$. As $c_{k+1} > c_k$, we know that (5.11.1) holds for $k+1$.
- $c_k = \frac{a_k}{a} < \frac{b_k}{b}$. Then $a_{k+1} = a_k + 1$ and $b_{k+1} = b_k$. Therefore

$$a_{k+1} - c_{k+1} a = a_k + 1 - c_{k+1} a = 1 + (c_k - c_{k+1}) a < 1,$$

and

$$b_{k+1} - c_{k+1} b = b_k - c_{k+1} b < b_k - c_k b < 1.$$

Then (5.11.1) holds for $k+1$.

- $c_k = \frac{b_k}{b} < \frac{a_k}{a}$. We argue as in the second case.

For the second part of the lemma, thanks to (5.11.1), we have

$$F + a_k F_1 + b_k F_2 \equiv (1 + c_k m) F + (a_k - c_k a) F_1 + (b_k - c_k b) F_2.$$

Let $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{Q}^+$ small enough. Then

$$F + a_k F_1 + b_k F_2 \equiv (1 + c_k m - \varepsilon m) F + (a_k - c_k a + \varepsilon a) F_1 + (b_k - c_k b + \varepsilon b) F_2.$$

Thanks to (5.11.1), for ε small enough, we know that $(a_k - c_k a + \varepsilon a)$ and $(b_k - c_k b + \varepsilon b) \in]0, 1[$. Moreover $(1 + c_k m - \varepsilon m) > 0$. Then (5.11.2) is proved. \square

In general ($s = 0$) may have several components, $\text{Div}(s) = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq s} a_i F_i$. The construction of the sequence $\{(a_{1,k}, \dots, a_{s,k})\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is absolutely identical.

Indeed, suppose that $(a_{1,k}, \dots, a_{s,k})$ has already been constructed, for some $k \geq 1$. The next element $(a_{1,k+1}, \dots, a_{s,k+1})$ of our sequence is obtained as follows: let

$$c_k = \min \left\{ \frac{a_{1,k}}{a_1}, \frac{a_{2,k}}{a_2}, \dots, \frac{a_{s,k}}{a_s} \right\}.$$

We define

$$a_{i,k+1} := a_{i,k} + 1$$

in case $\frac{a_{i,k}}{a_i} = c_k$, and

$$a_{i,k+1} := a_{i,k}$$

if $\frac{a_{i,k}}{a_i} > c_k$. One can easily verify by induction that for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ the relation

$$(5.11.3) \quad 0 = \min\{a_{i,k} - c_k a_i\}_{i=1}^s \leq \max\{a_{i,k} - c_k a_i\}_{i=1}^s < 1$$

holds, precisely as we did in the case $s = 2$.

6. COMMUTATION RELATIONS

Let $p : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{D}$ be a holomorphic family of smooth, n -dimensional compact manifolds whose central fiber -denoted by X - is assumed to be Kähler. We denote by $K_{\mathcal{X}}$ the canonical bundle of \mathcal{X} and let $\mathcal{L} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ be a multiple of the canonical bundle, say $\mathcal{L} = (m-1)K_{\mathcal{X}}$. We are interested in the extension properties of global sections of the adjoint bundle $K_{\mathcal{X}} + \mathcal{L}$ defined over the k^{th} infinitesimal neighborhood of the central fiber of p , where $k \geq 1$ is a positive integer.

Let $\cup U_i$ be a Stein cover of \mathcal{X} . Let $s \in H^0(X, K_{\mathcal{X}} + \mathcal{L})$. Let s_i be an arbitrary holomorphic extension of $s|_{U_i \cap X}$. Then we have

$$(6.0.1) \quad s_i dz_i \wedge dt \otimes e_i = s_j dz_j \wedge dt \otimes e_j + t \Lambda_{ij} dz_j \wedge dt \otimes e_j.$$

on overlapping coordinate sets $U_i \cap U_j$. Hence we interpret s as a top form on X with values in $L := K_{\mathcal{X}}^{\otimes(m-1)}|_X$. In (6.0.1) the symbol e_i stands for $dz_i^{\otimes(m-1)}$, the local frame of $K_{\mathcal{X}/\mathbb{D}}^{\otimes(m-1)}$.

We can reformulate this data as follows: *there exists a smooth section s_1 of the bundle $K_{\mathcal{X}} + L$ such that*

$$(6.0.2) \quad \bar{\partial} s_1 = t \Lambda_1$$

on \mathcal{X} .

Consider next the Lie derivative operator \mathcal{L}_{Ξ} associated to a vector field Ξ such that $dp(\Xi) = \frac{\partial}{\partial t}$.

If we apply \mathcal{L}_{Ξ} to (6.0.2) on the RHS we obtain

$$(6.0.3) \quad \Lambda_1 + t \mathcal{L}_{\Xi}(\Lambda_1)$$

By the commutation relation (2.5.6), the LHS of (6.0.2) becomes

$$(6.0.4) \quad \bar{\partial}(\mathcal{L}_{\Xi}(s_1)) + D'_{\mathcal{X}}(\bar{\partial}\Xi]s_1) + [i_{\Xi}, [\bar{\partial}, D'_{\mathcal{X}}]]s_1$$

Modulo a factor divisible with t , the last term of (6.0.4) is equal to $\frac{m-1}{m}\Lambda_1$ on $X \setminus Z$. Therefore we get

$$(6.0.5) \quad \frac{1}{m}\Lambda_1 \equiv \bar{\partial}(\mathcal{L}_{\Xi}(s_1)) + D'_{\mathcal{X}}(\bar{\partial}\Xi]s_1)$$

on $X \setminus Z$, modulo a forms which is divisible by t and which is non-singular on $X \setminus Z$.

Another interesting observation is that the form $\bar{\partial}\Xi]s_1$ can be written as follows

$$(6.0.6) \quad \bar{\partial}\Xi]s_1 = dt \wedge \rho_1$$

given the shape of the vector field Ξ , cf. (2.5.4). We have therefore obtained the first step of the next statement.

Lemma 6.1. *Let s_k be a smooth section of the bundle $K_{\mathcal{X}/\Delta} + L$, such that*

$$(6.1.1) \quad \bar{\partial} s_k = t^{k+1} \Lambda_k$$

for some $(n+1, 1)$ -form Λ_k . We assume that the connection on $L = (m-1)K_{\mathcal{X}}$ is induced by the section s_k . Then we can find the forms α_k and β_k such that we have

$$(6.1.2) \quad c_k \Lambda_k \equiv \bar{\partial} \alpha_k + D'_{\mathcal{X}}(dt \wedge \beta_k) \quad \text{on } X \setminus Z$$

modulo the ideal generated by t . Moreover, the forms α_k and β_k are smooth in the complement of the set $s_k = 0$ and c_k is a positive constant.

Proof. This is obtained as follows: we take the Lie derivative in (6.1.2) and use the commutation relation (2.5.6). The result of this first operation is that we have

$$(6.1.3) \quad \frac{k+1}{m} t^k \Lambda_k \equiv \bar{\partial}(\mathcal{L}_{\Xi}(s_k)) + D'_{\mathcal{X}}(\bar{\partial}\Xi]s_k) \quad \text{on } X \setminus Z$$

modulo the ideal generated by t^{k+1} . In order to start the inductive process which will prove our statement, we rewrite (6.1.3) as follows

$$(6.1.4) \quad \frac{k+1}{m} t^k \Lambda_k \equiv \bar{\partial} u_1 + D'_{\mathcal{X}}(dt \wedge v_1) \quad \text{on } X \setminus Z,$$

modulo t^{k+1} . Here we use the notations

$$(6.1.5) \quad u_1 := \mathcal{L}_{\Xi}(s_k), \quad dt \wedge v_1 := \bar{\partial}\Xi]s_k.$$

We show next that if we apply the operator \mathcal{L}_Ξ to the RHS of (6.1.5) the result is an expression of a similar type. Indeed, we have

$$(6.1.6) \quad \mathcal{L}_\Xi(\bar{\partial}u_1) = \bar{\partial}(\mathcal{L}_\Xi(u_1)) + D'_X(\bar{\partial}\Xi]u_1) \quad \text{on } X \setminus Z$$

modulo the curvature term which is of order t^k : this is one higher than we have to take into account, so we just drop it.

Also, we have

$$(6.1.7) \quad \mathcal{L}_\Xi(D'_X(dt \wedge v_1)) = D'_X \left(dt \wedge \left(\Xi]D'_X(\Xi](dt \wedge v_1)) \right) \right)$$

thanks to Lemma 2.6, so summing up we get

$$(6.1.8) \quad \frac{k(k+1)}{m} t^{k-1} \Lambda_k \equiv \bar{\partial}u_2 + D'_X(dt \wedge v_2),$$

modulo t^k , where we use the notations

$$(6.1.9) \quad u_2 := \mathcal{L}_\Xi(u_1), \quad dt \wedge v_2 := \bar{\partial}\Xi]u_1 + dt \wedge \left(\Xi]D'_X(\Xi](dt \wedge v_1)) \right)$$

Our statement follows by induction on k –and moreover we have

$$(6.1.10) \quad c_k := \frac{(k+1)!}{m}$$

as we see by taking successive derivatives of (6.1.8). \square

Remark 6.2. *The relations (6.1.9) give the explicit process of constructing α_k and β_k . They will play an important role in the analysis of the singularities of these forms (this is required by Theorem 3.2).*

7. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1, COROLLARY 1.4 AND THEOREM 1.2

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Thanks to Lemma 6.1, we can find α_k and β_k which are smooth in the complement of $s_k = 0$, and of poles along $s_k = 0$ such that

$$(7.0.1) \quad \Lambda_k \equiv \bar{\partial}\alpha_k + D'(dt \wedge \beta_k) \quad \text{on } X \setminus Z,$$

where D' is the connection with respect to the singular metric induced by $s_k|_X$. By applying the discussion in Section 5 to (7.0.1), we know that Λ_k is $\bar{\partial}$ -exact. The theorem is proved. \square

Proof of Corollary 1.4. We suppose by induction that there exists a smooth extension s_k such that $\bar{\partial}s_k = t^{k+1}\Lambda_k$. To prove the corollary, it is sufficient to prove that Λ_k is $\bar{\partial}$ -exact. Let

$$(7.0.2) \quad \lambda_k := \frac{\Lambda_k}{dt} \Big|_X$$

be the restriction of Λ_k to X . Then we have $\bar{\partial}\lambda_k = 0$. Since \mathfrak{J} is discrete, the image of λ_k via the projection morphism

$$(7.0.3) \quad H^1(X, mK_X) \rightarrow H^1(X, \mathcal{O}_X(mK_X) \otimes \mathcal{O}_X/\mathfrak{J})$$

is equal to zero. It follows that there exist a \mathcal{C}^∞ form a_k of type $(n, 0)$ with values in $(m-1)K_X$, as well as a \mathcal{C}^∞ form b_k of type $(n, 1)$ with values the sheaf $K_X^{\otimes(m-1)} \otimes \mathfrak{J}$ so that

$$(7.0.4) \quad \lambda_k = b_k + \bar{\partial}a_k.$$

Thanks to Theorem 1.1, we know that b_k is $\bar{\partial}$ -exact. Then λ_k is $\bar{\partial}$ -exact. It means that we can find a smooth extension s_{k+1} such that $\bar{\partial}s_{k+1} = t^{k+1}\Lambda_{k+1}$. By induction, s admits an extension for any order. Therefore s admits a holomorphic extension to the total space \mathcal{X} cf. [13, Lemma 1.1]. \square

The proof of Theorem 1.2 follows along the same lines as in Theorem 1.1, so we only sketch it very briefly.

Proof. Notice first that since σ_i is a section of $\mathcal{E}_i \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}/t^{k+2}\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}$, the curvature term containing σ_i vanishes on $X \setminus \text{Div}(\sigma_i)$ up to order k . Then the same argument as Lemma 6.1 implies that

$$(7.0.5) \quad \lambda_k = \bar{\partial}\alpha_k + D'(\beta_k) \quad \text{on } X \setminus (\text{Div}(s) + \sum_i \text{Div}(\sigma_i)).$$

The scheme of the proof of Theorem 1.1 applies *mutatis mutandis* and we infer that λ_k is $\bar{\partial}$ -exact. The theorem is proved. \square

8. MORE RESULTS AND APPLICATIONS

The subsections contained in this part of our article are organized as follows.

- In subsection 8.2, we provide an alternative argument for Theorem 1.5. The main point is to show that if the divisor $s = 0$ is smooth, then for each order k we can construct a particular vector field Ξ , so that the resulting forms α_k and β_k are automatically smooth (hence in particular L^2 , given that the multiplier ideal sheaf corresponding to $\frac{m-1}{m}\text{Div}(s)$ is trivial). Then we can extend s over infinitesimal nbd's of any order and the conclusion follows.
- In subsection 8.3, we provide a sufficient condition for the L^2 requirement in Theorem 1.1 to be fulfilled. This is formulated as follows: we assume that there exists a divisor Σ on the total space \mathcal{X} of our family such that $\Sigma + X$ is snc and such that the support of the divisor $\text{Div}(s)$ is contained in $\Sigma|_X$. Then for any k we can find a C^∞ extension s_k such that (1.1.1) is satisfied –so in particular, s extends to \mathcal{X} .
- In subsection 8.4, we discuss the second order extension. The problem extending sections of the sheaf \mathcal{F}_1 is already very interesting, since we have to deal with an unreduced space. The partial result we obtain in this direction is the following.

Theorem 8.1. *Let $s \in H^0(X, mK_X)$ be a pluricanonical section defined on the central fiber X of a family $p: \mathcal{X} \rightarrow D$ of compact Kähler manifolds. We assume that there exists a non-singular vector field Ξ on the total space \mathcal{X} such that*

$$(8.1.1) \quad dp(\Xi) = \frac{\partial}{\partial t}, \quad \sup_X \frac{|\bar{\partial}\Xi|_X|_{\omega_E}^2}{\log^2 \frac{1}{|s|^2}} \leq C,$$

where ω_E is a metric with Poincaré singularities along the set $(s = 0)$. Then there exists a section $s_2 \in C^\infty(\mathcal{X}, mK_{\mathcal{X}})$ such that $s_2|_X = s$ and

$$(8.1.2) \quad \bar{\partial}s_2 = t^3\Lambda_2,$$

where Λ_2 belongs to the space $C_{0,1}^\infty(\mathcal{X}, mK_{\mathcal{X}})$.

We discuss next the main technical result needed in the proof of Theorem 8.1. The general setup is as follows. Let (L, h_L) be a Hermitian line bundle on X , endowed with a metric with analytic singularities. We assume that the curvature current $\Theta(L, h_L) \geq 0$ is semi-positive. Let v be an L -valued form of type $(n-1, 1)$, such that $D'v$ is $\bar{\partial}$ -closed. We are interested in the $\bar{\partial}$ -equation

$$(8.1.3) \quad \bar{\partial}u = D'v.$$

We assume further that X is endowed with a Poincaré-type metric ω_E , with poles along the singular locus of h_L . The result we obtain is as follows.

Theorem 8.2. *Assume moreover that v is L^2 with respect to a Poincaré-type metric ω_E on X . Then the equation (8.1.3) admits a solution u such that*

$$(8.2.1) \quad \int_X |u|^2 e^{-\varphi_L} \leq \int_X |v|_{\omega_E}^2 e^{-\varphi_L} dV_{\omega_E}.$$

The new aspect of Theorem 8.2 is that we do not assume that $D'v$ belongs to L^2 .

It is a very interesting question to decide whether the equation (8.1.3) can be solved with estimates involving an incomplete metric ω on $X \setminus (h_L = \infty)$. Let ω be non-singular Kähler metric on X . In this direction we obtain the following result.

Theorem 8.3. *Let (L, h_L) be a Hermitian line bundle, such that $\Theta(L, h_L) \geq 0$ is semi-positive. Let v be an L -valued form of type $(n-1, 1)$, such that $D'v$ is $\bar{\partial}$ -closed. We assume that the following hypothesis are satisfied.*

- (1) The metric h_L has analytic singularities, and let Z be the support of the set $(h_L = \infty)$.
(2) The integrals

$$\int_X |v|_\omega^2 e^{-\varphi_L} dV_\omega, \quad \int_X |D'v|^2 e^{-\varphi_L} dV_\omega$$

are convergent.

- (3) There exists a complete metric ω_Z on $X \setminus Z$ such that we have

$$\int_X |v|_{\omega_Z}^2 e^{-\varphi_L} dV_{\omega_Z} < \infty$$

Then the equation (8.1.3) has a solution u such that

$$(8.3.1) \quad \int_X |u|^2 e^{-\varphi_L} \leq \int_X |v|_\omega^2 e^{-\varphi_L} dV_\omega.$$

Remark 8.4. For applications, it would be very important to remove the hypothesis (3) in Theorem 8.3. However, we are not sure whether the statement is still correct.

8.1. A remark: first order extension. The first result that we establish here is that one can always extend a pluricanonical section s defined on X to the first infinitesimal neighborhood. This is established in the paper [13] by different methods.

We are in the context of (6.0.2) and let $\lambda_1 := \frac{\Lambda_1}{dt}|_X$ be the restriction on the central fiber. By applying the Lie derivative \mathcal{L}_Ξ to (6.0.2), as we have seen in the section 6, this can be rewritten as in (6.0.5). The restriction of this expression to the central fiber gives

$$(8.4.1) \quad \frac{1}{m} \lambda_1 = \bar{\partial} a_1 + D'_X(b_1)$$

on $X \setminus Z$, where we use the (abuse of...) notation

$$(8.4.2) \quad a_1 := \frac{\mathcal{L}_\Xi(s_1)}{dt}|_X, \quad b_1 := \rho_1|_X$$

and ρ_1 is the form already appearing in Lemma 6.1.

The form $D'_X(b_1)$ is certainly closed on $X \setminus Z$. In order to apply Theorem 3.2, we have to check the L^2 hypothesis. We recall that here the data is

$$(8.4.3) \quad L := (m-1)K_X, \quad \varphi_L := \frac{m-1}{m} \log |s_i|^2$$

where s_i is the local expression of of the section s of mK_X .

Given the explicit expression of a_1 and b_1 , the L^2 hypothesis in (ii) of Theorem 3.2 are easy to check. “For punishment”, we will give the details for b_1 and its derivative.

With respect to the local coordinates in (6.0.1), we have

$$(8.4.4) \quad b_1|_U \simeq s_i \sum_\alpha \widehat{dz}_i^\alpha \wedge \bar{\partial} v_i^\alpha$$

and this is clearly L^2 with respect to the weight in (8.4.3). The symbol \simeq in (8.4.4) means that the restriction of b_1 to U equals the RHS with respect to the coordinates (z_i) .

Moreover, the fact that $D'_X(b_1)$ is equally L^2 boils down to the convergence of the integral

$$(8.4.5) \quad \int_{U_i} \frac{|df|^2}{|f|^{\frac{m-1}{m}}} d\lambda$$

where f is a holomorphic function defined in the open set of \mathbb{C}^n containing U . This in turn is quickly verified by a change of variables formula.

In conclusion, we have

$$(8.4.6) \quad \lambda_1 = \bar{\partial} \gamma_1$$

on X .

Now we can construct the 2-jet extension as follows. Let $\cup U_i$ be a Stein cover of \mathcal{X} and $\{\phi_i\}_i$ be a partition of unity. On every U_i , we can thus find a $\gamma_{1,i}$ such that $\Lambda_1|_{U_i} = \bar{\partial} \gamma_{1,i}$ and $\frac{\gamma_{1,i}}{dt}|_{U_i \cap X} = \gamma_1$.

Therefore $\gamma_{1,i} - \gamma_{1,j} = t \cdot \gamma_{i,j}$ since the difference is holomorphic. Set $s_2 := s_1 - t \sum \phi_i \gamma_{1,i}$. Then s_2 is a smooth section of the bundle $K_{\mathcal{X}} + L$ such that

$$(8.4.7) \quad s_2|_X = s, \quad \bar{\partial}s_2 = t^2 \Lambda_2.$$

Remark 8.5. *As we see from the equation (6.0.5), we have*

$$(8.5.1) \quad \frac{1}{m} \Lambda_1 \equiv \bar{\partial}(\mathcal{L}_{\Xi}(s_1)) + D'_{\mathcal{X}}(\bar{\partial}\Xi|s_1)$$

point-wise in the complement of Z . By the L^2 arguments invoked above, we can solve the equation

$$(8.5.2) \quad \bar{\partial}\gamma_1 = D'_{h_L} \rho_1$$

on X , where $\rho_1 := \frac{\bar{\partial}\Xi|s_1}{dt}\Big|_X$. We will assume that γ_1 is orthogonal to the space of holomorphic forms, but even so, this minimal solution of (8.5.2) depends on the vector field Ξ we are using in (8.5.1), so we will denote by γ_{Ξ} .

From this point on we speculate: assume that there exists a vector field Ξ_{\min} such that the corresponding solution γ_{\min} has minimal L^2 norm. If Ξ is any other lift of $\frac{\partial}{\partial t}$ then we have

$$(8.5.3) \quad \bar{\partial}(\gamma_{\min} - \gamma_{\Xi}) = \bar{\partial}(D'(\Xi_{\min} - \Xi)|s_1)$$

(up to a sign) in the complement of Z , hence by orthogonality we get

$$(8.5.4) \quad \gamma_{\min} - \gamma_{\Xi} = D'((\Xi_{\min} - \Xi)|s_1).$$

Another question: does this implies that

$$(8.5.5) \quad D'^* \gamma_{\min} = 0$$

on $X \setminus Z$? If yes, then things will be much simpler for the extension at the second order. But again, it is not clear that the representative γ_{\min} exists.

Remark 8.6. *Let $(\Omega_i, (t, z_i))_{i \in I}$ be an arbitrary coordinate system on \mathcal{X} . This induces automatically a trivialization of the relative canonical bundle, so our section s corresponds to a family of holomorphic functions $(f_i)_{i \in I}$ such that we have*

$$(8.6.1) \quad f_i(z_i) = \xi_{ij}(t, z_j) f_j(z_j) + t \Lambda_{ij}(t, z_j)$$

on overlapping subsets $\Omega_i \cap \Omega_j$. In (8.6.1) we denote by ξ_{ij} the transition functions corresponding to the pluricanonical bundle $mK_{\mathcal{X}/\mathbb{D}}$ and Λ_{ij} are holomorphic on $\Omega_i \cap \Omega_j$. By taking the derivative with respect to t in (8.6.1) and restricting to the central fiber, we see that

$$(8.6.2) \quad \int_{U_{ij}} \frac{|\Lambda_{ij}(0, z_j)|^2}{|f_j(z_j)|^{2\frac{m-1}{m}}} d\lambda(z_j) < \infty$$

where $U_{ij} = \Omega_i \cap \Omega_j \cap X$.

The global interpretation of this is that we can construct a C^∞ extension s_1 of s such that with respect to the coordinates fixed above we have

$$(8.6.3) \quad s_1|_{\Omega_i} = (f_i(z_i) + t\rho_i(t, z_i)) (dt \wedge dz_i)^{\otimes m}$$

where ρ_i is smooth and its restriction to the central fiber verifies the integrability condition (8.6.2).

Moreover, the solution γ_1 of the equation (8.4.6) is also L^2 . In conclusion, we can always assume that the extension s_1 obtained in (8.4.7) can be locally written as

$$(8.6.4) \quad s_1|_{\Omega_i} \simeq (f_i(z_i) + t f_{i1}(z_i)) (dt \wedge dz_i)^{\otimes m}$$

modulo t^2 , where f_{i1} is holomorphic and $\int_{U_i} \frac{|f_{i1}(z_i)|^2}{|f_i(z_i)|^{2\frac{m-1}{m}}} d\lambda(z_i) < \infty$.

Remark 8.7. *This first step in the extension of the section s is somehow misleading, i.e. too simple in some sense. Some of the real difficulties one has to deal with are appearing during the extension to the second infinitesimal nbd, see the subsection 8.4 below.*

8.2. Extension of sections whose zero set is non-singular. In order to extend our section s to the first infinitesimal neighbourhood, we have used the Lie derivative with respect to an arbitrary vector field Ξ . For higher order extension, this does not seem to be possible because of the singularities of the operator $D'_{\mathcal{X}}$. In the case of a section s whose zero set $(s = 0) \subset X$ is non-singular (treated in [13]), this is done as follows.

We assume that the extension s_k to the k^{th} infinitesimal neighbourhood has already been constructed. For each trivialising open set $\Omega_i \subset \mathcal{X}$ together with fixed coordinates functions $(z_i^\alpha)_{\alpha=1, \dots, n}$ we denote by

$$(8.7.1) \quad f_i$$

the holomorphic function corresponding to the k^{th} -jet of s_k . The set $(f_i = 0) \subset \Omega_i$ is non-singular and transversal to the central fiber X . Then we define a new set of local coordinates

$$(8.7.2) \quad (t, w_i^1, \dots, w_i^n)$$

on Ω_i such that $w_i^1 = f_i$ —here we use the fact that at each point of Ω_i we can find an index α such that the form

$$(8.7.3) \quad df_i \wedge dt \wedge \widehat{dz_i^\alpha} \neq 0$$

is non-vanishing at the said point. Strictly speaking we have shrink eventually the set Ω_i ; however, given that the map $p : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{D}$ is proper we can assume that the coordinates (8.7.2) are defined on Ω_i itself.

Therefore the equality

$$(8.7.4) \quad w_i^1 = g_{ij}(t, w_j) \cdot w_j^1 + t^{k+1} \tau_{ij}(t, w_j)$$

is valid on the overlapping subsets $\Omega_i \cap \Omega_j$, where (g_{ij}) are the transition functions for the bundle $K_{\mathcal{X}} + L$.

We introduce next the following vector field

$$(8.7.5) \quad \Xi_k := \sum \theta_i \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \Big|_{\Omega_i}$$

corresponding to the covering $(\Omega_i, (t, w_i))$.

By the transition relation (8.7.4), we have

$$(8.7.6) \quad \Xi_k|_{\Omega_i} = \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \Big|_{\Omega_i} + (a_i w_i^1 + b_i t^k) \frac{\partial}{\partial w_i^1} + \sum_{\alpha \geq 2} v_i^\alpha \frac{\partial}{\partial w_i^\alpha}$$

where a_i, b_i and v_i^α are smooth. We notice that the vector field Ξ_k have the following important properties.

- (i) Its coefficients are smooth.
- (ii) The projection $dp(\Xi_k)$ equals $\frac{\partial}{\partial t}$.
- (iii) Modulo the ideal (t^k) , it is tangent to the set $f_i = 0$.

The connection we are using on the bundle $(m_0 - 1)K_{\mathcal{X}}$ is induced by the \mathcal{C}^∞ section s_k . This means that with respect to our local coordinates in (8.7.2) we have

$$(8.7.7) \quad \widetilde{f}_i(t, w) = w_i^1 h_i(t, w_i) + t^{k+1} g_i(t, w_i)$$

for some smooth functions g_i, h_i . Here $\widetilde{f}_i(t, w)$ is the local expression of the section s_k .

Given these considerations, we infer the following.

Lemma 8.8. *Let $k \geq 0$ be a positive integer, and assume that the extension s_k such that*

$$(8.8.1) \quad \bar{\partial} s_k = t^{k+1} \Lambda_k$$

has been already constructed. We use the vector field Ξ_k introduced in (8.7.5) and consider the Lie derivative \mathcal{L}_{Ξ_k} induced by it. Lemma 6.1 provides us with forms α_k and β_k such that

$$(8.8.2) \quad \Lambda_k = \bar{\partial} \alpha_k + D'_{\mathcal{X}}(dt \wedge \beta_k)$$

modulo the ideal generated by t . Then the restrictions $\alpha_k|_X$ and $\beta_k|_X$ are smooth.

Before explaining the proof, we note that Lemma 8.8 combined with Theorem 3.2 show that the restriction

$$(8.8.3) \quad \left. \frac{\Lambda_k}{dt} \right|_X$$

is $\bar{\partial}$ -exact. Thus we can extend s one step further, given that there exist forms μ_k and Λ_{k+1} of type $(n+1, 0)$ and $(n+1, 1)$ respectively, such that

$$(8.8.4) \quad \Lambda_k = \bar{\partial}\mu_k + t\Lambda_{k+1}.$$

By combining (8.8.1) and (8.8.4) we infer the existence of s_{k+1} such that

$$(8.8.5) \quad \bar{\partial}s_{k+1} = t^{k+2}\Lambda_{k+1}.$$

We can repeat this procedure inductively, showing that the section s admits an extension to the infinitesimal nbd of an arbitrary order. The formal arguments in [13] are implying that s extends to a topological nbd of X in \mathcal{X} .

We turn now to the proof of Lemma 8.8.

Proof. Considering the preparation we have done in the previous sections, the arguments which follow should be clear: we will proceed by induction, by using the fact that for each k we have the relations (6.1.9).

To this end, it would be helpful to remark that we have the following while computing the obstruction to extend the section modulo t^{k+2} , we have to deal with quantities as

$$(8.8.6) \quad \mathcal{L}_{\Xi_k} s_k, \quad D'_{\mathcal{X}} \left(dt \wedge \left(\Xi \rfloor D'_{\mathcal{X}}(\Xi \rfloor (\bar{\partial}\Xi \rfloor s_k)) \right) \right)$$

and their iterations. Locally we can write $s_k = f\sigma$, where f is the function given by the expression like (8.7.7), and σ is a top form with values in $(m-1)K_{\mathcal{X}}$. We have

$$(8.8.7) \quad \mathcal{L}_{\Xi_k} s_k = \Xi(f)\sigma + f\mathcal{L}_{\Xi_k} \sigma$$

in which the second term has a -potentially- singular component

$$(8.8.8) \quad f\mathcal{L}_{\Xi_k} \sigma \equiv -\frac{m-1}{m} f \cdot \frac{df}{f} \wedge (\Xi_k \rfloor \sigma) = -\frac{m-1}{m} \Xi_k(f)\sigma.$$

The point here is that the vector field Ξ_k was constructed in such a way that $\Xi_k(f)$ is a *multiple* of f , plus some power of t . More precisely, we have

$$(8.8.9) \quad \Xi_k \cdot (f, t^{k+1}) \subset (f, t^k)$$

where we remark that the ideal (f, t^{k+1}) is in fact globally defined on \mathcal{X} .

Therefore we can take as many times the Lie derivative as the power of t allows, the result will still be of the same type. We show next that the same is true for the second term in (8.8.6).

Indeed we have

$$(8.8.10) \quad D'_{\mathcal{X}}(\Xi_k \rfloor (\bar{\partial}\Xi_k \rfloor s_k)) = \partial f \wedge \Xi_k \rfloor (\bar{\partial}\Xi_k \rfloor \sigma) + f D'_{\mathcal{X}}(\Xi_k \rfloor (\bar{\partial}\Xi_k \rfloor \sigma))$$

and a further contraction with Ξ gives

$$(8.8.11) \quad \Xi_k \rfloor (\partial f \wedge \Xi_k \rfloor (\bar{\partial}\Xi_k \rfloor \sigma)) = \Xi_k(f) \cdot \Xi_k \rfloor (\bar{\partial}\Xi_k \rfloor \sigma)$$

for the first term in (8.8.10). The singular part of the second one is

$$(8.8.12) \quad f \cdot \frac{df}{f} \wedge \Xi_k \rfloor (\bar{\partial}\Xi_k \rfloor \sigma)$$

and when we contract it with Ξ_k the result will be the RHS of (8.8.11).

In conclusion, after the first derivative of the relation (6.1.1) the forms u_2 and v_2 of (6.1.9) have their coefficients in the ideal (f, t^k) . We can therefore iterate this procedure, and obtain the conclusion. \square

Remark 8.9. *We note that at each step k we choose a vector field Ξ_k adapted to the corresponding extension s_k .*

Remark 8.10. *If the zero set ($s = 0$) of our initial section is singular, then one can still construct a vector field adapted to it as in the proof just finished, but the difference is that the new Ξ will be singular along $s = 0, ds = 0$.*

8.3. A sufficient condition. In this subsection we assume that the divisor $\text{Div}(s)$ corresponding to the section $s \in H^0(X, mK_X)$ has the following property.

Hypothesis 8.11. *There exists a divisor Σ on \mathcal{X} such that we have.*

- (i) *The divisor $\Sigma + X$ is snc.*
- (ii) *The support of $\text{Div}(s)$ is contained in the restriction $\Sigma|_X$.*

Then we show that the following holds true.

Theorem 8.12. *Let $s \in H^0(X, mK_X)$ be a pluricanonical section such that Hypothesis 8.11 is satisfied. Then s admits a holomorphic extension to \mathcal{X} .*

Proof. The role of the two conditions (i) and (ii) above is to furnish a special coordinate system on \mathcal{X} which we will use during all the proof.

As consequence of these requirements we have a finite covering $(\Omega, (t, z_i))_{i \in I}$ of an open subset of the central fiber X of p such that for each $i \in I$ we have $\Sigma \cap \Omega_i = (z_i^1 \dots z_i^r = 0)$ together with the transition functions

$$(8.12.1) \quad z_i^\gamma = g_{ij}^\alpha(t, z_j) z_j^\gamma, \quad z_i^\beta = \phi_{ij}^\beta(t, z_j)$$

for each $\gamma = 1, \dots, r$ and $\beta = r + 1, \dots, n$. We denote the resulting function by Φ .

These coordinates are inducing a trivialisation of the canonical bundle of $K_{\mathcal{X}}$ with respect to which our section s corresponds locally to holomorphic functions

$$(8.12.2) \quad f_{i0}(z_i) = g_i(z_i) \prod_{q=1}^r (z_i^q)^{m_q}$$

where g_i is a nowhere vanishing holomorphic function on $\Omega_i \cap X$ and $m_q \geq 0$.

We formulate the next statement.

Claim 8.13. *For every order $k \geq 0$ there exists a section $s_k \in H^0(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F}_k)$ with $\mathcal{L} = (m-1)K_{\mathcal{X}}$ such that $s_k|_X = s$ and such that it can be written locally as follows*

$$(8.13.1) \quad f_i(t, z_i) = \sum_{\alpha=0}^k \frac{t^\alpha}{\alpha!} f_{i\alpha}(z_i)$$

where $f_{i\alpha}$ are holomorphic, such that for every positive real $\varepsilon > 0$ and for every $\alpha = 0, \dots, k$ we have $\int_{X \cap \Omega_i} \frac{|f_{i\alpha}|^2}{|f_{i0}|^{2(1-\varepsilon)\frac{m-1}{m}}} < \infty$.

We prove next Claim 8.13 by induction on k . For $k = 0$ this is simply the hypothesis, so let us assume that a section s_k as in (8.13.1) exists. We are constructing next s_{k+1} . If we denote by ξ_{ij} the transition functions of the bundle $mK_{\mathcal{X}}$, then we have

$$(8.13.2) \quad f_i(t, z_i) = \xi_{ij}(t, z_j) (f_j(t, z_j) + t^{k+1} \Lambda_{ij}(t, z_j))$$

on the overlapping sets $\Omega_i \cap \Omega_j$. By the equalities (8.12.1) it follows that

$$(8.13.3) \quad \left. \frac{\partial^l f_{i\alpha}(\Phi(t, z_j))}{\partial t^l} \right|_{t=0}$$

is L^2 integrable with respect to the measure $\frac{d\lambda(z_i)}{|f_{i0}|^{2(1-\varepsilon)\frac{m-1}{m}}}$ for any positive integer l and for every

positive $\varepsilon > 0$. Indeed, given (8.12.1) if some monomial, say, $(z_i^1)^{\delta_1}$ divides $f_{i\alpha}$, the same is true for any derivative with respect to t as in (8.13.3) since the effect of the transition functions is to replace this monomial by $(g_{ij}^1(t, z_j) z_j^1)^{\delta_1}$. Thus the L^2 condition that we are imposing to each component $f_{i\alpha}$ is preserved.

The conclusion is that we have

$$(8.13.4) \quad \int_{X \cap \Omega_{ij}} \frac{|\Lambda_{ij}(0, z_j)|^2}{|f_{j0}(z_j)|^{2(1-\varepsilon)\frac{m-1}{m}}} d\lambda(z_j) < \infty$$

for every positive $\varepsilon > 0$ which means precisely that the $(n, 1)$ form $(m-1)K_X$ -valued form λ associated to the cocycle $(\Lambda_{ij}|_X)_{i,j}$ verifies the hypothesis of Theorem 1.1.

The proof of Theorem 1.1 shows that $\frac{\lambda}{\prod s_{Y_i}^{\nu_q}}$ is $\bar{\partial}$ -exact, where Y_i are the components of $\Sigma|_X$ and $\nu_q := \left\lfloor \frac{m-1}{m} m_q \right\rfloor$ if $\frac{m-1}{m} m_q \notin \mathbb{Z}$ and $\nu_q := \frac{m-1}{m} m_q - 1$ if this number is an integer.

This can be re-interpreted in terms of cocycles as follows: there exists holomorphic L^2 functions $f_{jk+1}(z_j)$ such that we have

$$(8.13.5) \quad \Lambda_{ij}(0, z_j) = f_{jk+1}(z_j) - \xi_{ji}(0, z_i) f_{ik+1}(z_i),$$

such that the holomorphic functions f_{jk+1} verify the L^2 requirement in the Claim. When combined with (8.13.2), this completes the proof Theorem 8.12. \square

Remark 8.14. In general (i.e. without the special co-ordinate system provided by the hypothesis at the beginning of this subsection) a section of mK_X which is holomorphic mod t^2 is described by the co-cycle relation

$$(8.14.1) \quad f_i(t, z_i) = \xi_{ij}(t, z_j) (f_j(t, z_j) + t^2 \Lambda_{ij}(t, z_j))$$

on the overlapping sets $\Omega_i \cap \Omega_j$. Moreover, we can assume that the equality

$$(8.14.2) \quad f_i(t, z_i) = f_i(z_i) + t f_{i1}(z_i)$$

holds, with $f_{i\alpha}$ belonging to the space L^2 with respect to the metric $\frac{m-1}{m} \log |s|^2$ on the central fiber, cf. Remark 8.6.

It follows that the function $z_j \rightarrow \Lambda_{ij}(0, z_j)$ in (8.14.1) belongs to the ideal generated by the functions f_j (i.e. our initial section s) and their partial derivatives up to order 2.

In this context, would be good to know the answer to the following question.

Question 8.15. *Does it follows that the resulting $(n, 1)$ -form λ can be written as*

$$(8.15.1) \quad \lambda = D'u + v$$

where v is L^2 and u is obtained by successive integration, both being $\bar{\partial}$ -closed? It is certainly the case locally. A positive answer to this question would certainly be a good news: by the global Lie derivative argument we know that λ belongs to the image of $D' + \bar{\partial}$ so writing

$$(8.15.2) \quad v = D'(\alpha - u) + \bar{\partial}\beta$$

we will be able to show that v is $\bar{\partial}$ -exact.

8.4. Extension to the second infinitesimal neighbourhood. We have already mentioned that the techniques we are developing in this paper are allowing us -in some particular cases- to extend the section s to the second infinitesimal nbd of the central fiber. We present the arguments in this section.

Thanks to the subsection 8.1, we can always find a 1-order extension s_2 , i.e.

$$s_2|_X = s, \quad \bar{\partial}s_2 = t^2 \Lambda_2.$$

The main observation is that if we write

$$(8.15.3) \quad \Lambda_2 = \bar{\partial}\alpha_2 + D'_X(dt \wedge \rho_2),$$

as in Lemma 8.8, then the restriction $\rho_2|_X$ is *automatically* in L^2 under the assumption of Theorem 8.1. Here the properties (8.1.1) of the vector field Ξ used in order to define the Lie derivative. This is the content of our next statement.

Lemma 8.16. *Under the hypothesis of Theorem 8.1, we have*

$$(8.16.1) \quad \int_X |\rho_2|_{\omega_E}^2 e^{-\varphi_L} dV_{\omega_E} < \infty.$$

Proof. This will be done by an explicit evaluation of ρ_2 . Our first claim is that it is enough to show the convergence of the integrals

$$(8.16.2) \quad \int_{(\mathbb{C}^n, 0)} |f \widehat{dz}^\alpha \wedge \bar{\partial} v|_{\omega_E}^2 \frac{dV_{\omega_E}}{|f|^{2\frac{m-1}{m}}}$$

and

$$(8.16.3) \quad \int_{(\mathbb{C}^n, 0)} |\partial f \wedge \widehat{dz}^{\alpha, \beta_k} \wedge \bar{\partial} v|_{\omega_E}^2 \frac{dV_{\omega_E}}{|f|^{2\frac{m-1}{m}}},$$

as well as

$$(8.16.4) \quad \int_{(\mathbb{C}^n, 0)} |\partial_t f|^2 |\bar{\partial} \Xi|_{\omega_E}^2 \frac{d\lambda}{|f|^{2\frac{m-1}{m}}}.$$

This is a consequence of formula (6.1.9), the computations are as follows. We have

$$(8.16.5) \quad \bar{\partial} \Xi \lrcorner \mathcal{L}_\Xi(s) \simeq \frac{1}{m} \Xi(f) \cdot \bar{\partial} \Xi \lrcorner (dt \wedge dz)$$

modulo a term divisible by f . On the other hand, we have

$$(8.16.6) \quad D'(\Xi \lrcorner (\bar{\partial} \Xi \lrcorner s)) \simeq \frac{1}{m} \partial f \wedge \left(\Xi \lrcorner (\bar{\partial} \Xi \lrcorner (dt \wedge dz)) \right)$$

again modulo a multiple of f . A further contraction with Ξ gives

$$(8.16.7) \quad \Xi \lrcorner \left(D'(\Xi \lrcorner (\bar{\partial} \Xi \lrcorner s)) \right) \simeq \frac{1}{m} \Xi(f) \cdot \Xi \lrcorner (\bar{\partial} \Xi \lrcorner (dt \wedge dz)).$$

Finally, we apply $dt \wedge \cdot$ in (8.16.7), and what we get is the same as the RHS of (8.16.5). Now given the formula which computes $dt \wedge \rho_2$ our claim follows.

Coming back to the integrals above, for (8.16.2) things are clear because the volume of (X, ω_E) is finite. Modulo the blow-up map π in Section 3, the integral (8.16.3) reduces to the evaluation of the next quantity

$$(8.16.8) \quad \sum_{\beta_k=1}^p \int_{(\mathbb{C}^n, 0)} \prod_{\alpha=1}^p |z_\alpha|^{2\delta_\alpha} \left| \frac{\widehat{dz}_\beta}{z_\beta} \right|_{\omega_E}^2 dV_{\omega_E}.$$

where $\delta_\alpha > 0$ are positive rational numbers. The convergence of (8.16.8) follows, given that we know the singularities of the metric ω_E .

For the expression (8.16.4) we use the fact that after the first order extension cf. Section 8.1, we have

$$(8.16.9) \quad \int_{(\mathbb{C}^n, 0)} |\partial_t f|^2 \frac{d\lambda}{|f|^{2\frac{m-1}{m}}} < \infty.$$

But then it follows that we also have

$$(8.16.10) \quad \int_{(\mathbb{C}^n, 0)} |\partial_t f|^2 \frac{d\lambda}{|f|^{2\frac{m-1}{m} + \varepsilon_0}} < \infty$$

for some positive real $\varepsilon_0 > 0$. This is enough to absorb the term arising from $|\bar{\partial} \Xi|_{\omega_E}^2$, because of the hypothesis (8.1.1). \square

In conclusion, we find ourselves in the following situation i.e. the setting of Theorem 8.2: let (L, h_L) be a holomorphic line bundle on X and the possible singular metric h_L is of analytic singularities. Let Z be the singular locus of h_L and let ω_E be a Poincaré type metric on X with poles along the Z . We have a L -valued L^2 form ρ of type $(n-1, 1)$ on X , such that

$$(8.16.11) \quad \tau := D'_X \rho$$

is $\bar{\partial}$ closed. If τ would be L^2 , then we can apply directly Theorem 3.11 and conclude that τ is $\bar{\partial}$ -exact. However, we do not possess this information, and we will follow a different path.

We define the linear form T_ρ by the formula

$$(8.16.12) \quad T_\rho(\psi) := \int_X \langle \rho, (D'_X)^* \psi \rangle_{\omega_E} e^{-\varphi_L} dV_{\omega_E}$$

where ψ is a L -valued smooth form of $(n, 1)$ -type with compact support in $X \setminus Z$. The current T_ρ has the following properties.

Lemma 8.17. *Let ψ be a test form as above, and consider the decomposition*

$$(8.17.1) \quad \psi = \xi_1 + \xi_2$$

according to $\text{Ker}(\bar{\partial})$ and its orthogonal. Then $T_\rho(\xi_2) = 0$.

Proof. Note that $T_\rho(\xi_2)$ is indeed well-defined, thanks to Friedrichs lemma (cf. e.g. [5]): the L^2 form ξ_2 belongs to the domain of $\bar{\partial}$, hence it is a limit in graph norm of smooth forms $(\xi_{2,k})$ with compact support. It follows that we have

$$(8.17.2) \quad (D'_X)^*(\xi_{2,k}) \rightarrow (D'_X)^*(\xi_2)$$

in L^2 as $k \rightarrow \infty$. This is a consequence of Bochner formula

$$(8.17.3) \quad \int_X |(D'_X)^*(\xi_{2,k} - \xi_2)|^2 dV \leq \int_X |\bar{\partial}(\xi_{2,k} - \xi_2)|^2 dV + \int_X |\bar{\partial}^*(\xi_{2,k} - \xi_2)|^2 dV$$

(here semi-positive curvature is sufficient) and by Friedrichs lemma the RHS of (8.17.3) tends to zero as $k \rightarrow \infty$.

It follows that $T_\rho(\xi_2)$ is well-defined and moreover we have

$$(8.17.4) \quad T_\rho(\xi_2) = \int_X \langle \rho, (D'_X)^* \xi_2 \rangle_{\omega_E} e^{-\varphi_L}.$$

Thanks to the L^2 hypothesis on ρ , we have

$$(8.17.5) \quad \int_X \langle \rho, (D'_X)^* \xi_2 \rangle_{\omega_E} e^{-\varphi_L} = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_X \langle \rho, (D'_X)^* (\mu_\varepsilon \xi_2) \rangle_{\omega_E} e^{-\varphi_L}$$

where $(\mu_\varepsilon)_{(\varepsilon > 0)}$ is the family of cut-off functions adapted to Poincaré metric, whose construction was recalled in Lemma 3.1.

Indeed, (8.17.5) follows since we have

$$(8.17.6) \quad D'^*(\mu_\varepsilon \xi_2) = \mu_\varepsilon D'^*(\xi_2) + \partial \mu_\varepsilon \lrcorner \xi_2$$

and again by the L^2 condition, we have

$$(8.17.7) \quad \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_X \langle \rho, D'^*(\mu_\varepsilon \xi_2) \rangle_{\omega_E} e^{-\varphi_L} = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_X \langle \rho, \mu_\varepsilon D'^*(\xi_2) \rangle_{\omega_E} e^{-\varphi_L}.$$

Therefore, we infer that

$$(8.17.8) \quad \int_X \langle \rho, D'^* \xi_2 \rangle_{\omega_E} e^{-\varphi_L} = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_X \langle \mu_\varepsilon D' \rho, \xi_2 \rangle_{\omega_E} e^{-\varphi_L}.$$

On the other hand, $\xi_2 = \bar{\partial}^* \lambda$ for some L^2 form λ which can be assumed to be $\bar{\partial}$ -closed and then we write

$$(8.17.9) \quad \int_X \langle \mu_\varepsilon D' \rho, \xi_2 \rangle_{\omega_E} e^{-\varphi_L} = \int_X \langle \bar{\partial} \mu_\varepsilon \wedge D' \rho, \lambda \rangle_{\omega_E} e^{-\varphi_L}$$

because $D' \rho$ is $\bar{\partial}$ -closed. The RHS term in (8.17.9) is equal to

$$(8.17.10) \quad \int_X \langle D'(\bar{\partial} \mu_\varepsilon \wedge \rho), \lambda \rangle_{\omega_E} e^{-\varphi_L} + \int_X \langle \partial \bar{\partial} \mu_\varepsilon \wedge \rho, \lambda \rangle_{\omega_E} e^{-\varphi_L}$$

up to a sign. The second term of (8.17.10) tends to zero as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, and so does the first one, because by Bochner formula we have

$$(8.17.11) \quad \int_X |D'^*(\lambda)|^2 dV \leq \int_X |\bar{\partial}^* \lambda|^2 dV = \int_X |\xi_2|^2 dV$$

(because we assume that $\bar{\partial} \lambda = 0$), and the RHS of (8.17.11) is convergent. Note again that here the semi-positivity of the curvature is enough, given that λ is of type $(n, 2)$.

In conclusion, the $T_\rho(\xi_2) = 0$. □

Now we are ready to prove Theorem 8.1 and Theorem 8.2.

Proof of Theorem 8.2. Let ψ be an L -valued smooth form of $(n, 1)$ -type with compact support in $X \setminus Z$. Consider the Hodge decomposition (8.17.1); then we have

$$(8.17.12) \quad T_v(\psi) = T_v(\xi_1)$$

by Lemma 8.17. Then it follows by Cauchy-Schwarz inequality combined with Bochner formula and the usual L^2 theory that there exists a u such that

$$(8.17.13) \quad T_v(\psi) = \int_X \langle u, \bar{\partial}^* \psi \rangle e^{-\varphi_L}$$

in other words we infer that

$$(8.17.14) \quad D'_X(v) = \bar{\partial}u.$$

□

Proof of Theorem 8.1. Our aim is to prove that the $\Lambda_2|_X$ in (8.15.3) is $\bar{\partial}$ -exact, which is equivalent to prove that the $\bar{\partial}$ -closed form $D'_X(\rho_2|_X)$ is $\bar{\partial}$ -exact. It is a direct consequence of Lemma 8.17 and Theorem 8.2. □

We prove next Theorem 8.3. Actually the motivation for this result is that the form $\rho_2|_X$ is automatically L^2 if we are using a non-singular metric on X .

Proof of Theorem 8.3. The main technical difficulty here is that the metric ω on $X \setminus Z$ is not complete. Usually this is bypassed by using a sequence of complete metrics

$$(8.17.15) \quad \omega_\varepsilon := \omega + \varepsilon\omega_Z$$

and invoke the usual arguments in L^2 theory. This works perfectly for forms of type (n, q) (because in this case, a monotonicity argument can be used) but in our case the form v is of type $(n-1, 1)$, hence in the absence of hypothesis (3), it is not necessarily L^2 with respect to ω_δ above. We proceed as follows.

We recall that the weight φ_L of the metric h_L is assumed to have log poles along Z . Let ξ be an L -valued $(n, 1)$ -form whose support is contained in $X \setminus Z$. We have to evaluate the quantity

$$(8.17.16) \quad \int_X \langle D'v, \xi \rangle e^{-\varphi_L} dV_\omega.$$

The form ξ can be written as

$$(8.17.17) \quad \xi = \xi_1 + \xi_2$$

according to $\text{Ker}(\bar{\partial})$ and its orthogonal. Since $D'v$ is L^2 and $\bar{\partial}$ -closed, we have

$$(8.17.18) \quad \int_X \langle D'v, \xi_2 \rangle e^{-\varphi_L} dV_\omega = 0.$$

So (8.17.16) equals the expression

$$(8.17.19) \quad \int_X \langle D'v, \xi_1 \rangle e^{-\varphi_L} dV_\omega.$$

Note that we have

$$(8.17.20) \quad \int_X \langle D'v, \xi_1 \rangle e^{-\varphi_L} dV_\omega = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_X \langle D'v, \xi_{1,\varepsilon} \rangle e^{-\varphi_L} dV_{\omega_\varepsilon}.$$

In (8.17.20), the notations are as follows. The metric ω_ε was introduced in (8.17.15), and $\xi_{1,\varepsilon}$ is the orthogonal projection of ξ on the $\text{Ker}(\bar{\partial})$ with respect to $(X \setminus Z, \omega_\varepsilon)$ and (L, h_L) , respectively. The equality (8.17.20) follows from the fact that $\xi_{1,\varepsilon} \rightarrow \xi_1$ uniformly on the compact sets of $X \setminus Z$.

It is at this point that we have to use the hypothesis (3): as a consequence of it, we can write

$$(8.17.21) \quad \int_X \langle D'v, \xi_{1,\varepsilon} \rangle e^{-\varphi_L} dV_{\omega_\varepsilon} = \int_X \langle v, D'^*(\xi_{1,\varepsilon}) \rangle e^{-\varphi_L} dV_{\omega_\varepsilon}.$$

Moreover we have

$$(8.17.22) \quad \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_X |v|_{\omega_\varepsilon}^2 dV_{\omega_\varepsilon} = \int_X |v|_\omega^2 dV_\omega$$

because if we write in coordinates

$$(8.17.23) \quad v = \sum v_{p\bar{q}} \widehat{dz}_p \wedge \overline{dz}_q,$$

then we have

$$(8.17.24) \quad |v|_{\omega_\varepsilon}^2 dV_{\omega_\varepsilon} = \sum |v_{p\bar{q}}|^2 \frac{1 + \varepsilon \lambda_p}{1 + \varepsilon \lambda_q} dz \wedge d\bar{z}$$

and the trivial inequality $\frac{1 + \varepsilon \lambda_p}{1 + \varepsilon \lambda_q} < 1 + \frac{\lambda_p}{\lambda_q}$ implies that $|v|_{\omega_\varepsilon}^2 dV_{\omega_\varepsilon} \leq |v|_\omega^2 dV_\omega + |v|_{\omega_Z}^2 dV_{\omega_Z}$. This allows us to use dominated convergence theorem and infer (8.17.22).

The L^2 norm of the form $D'^*(\xi_{1,\varepsilon})$ is smaller than

$$(8.17.25) \quad \int_X |\bar{\partial}^*(\xi_{1,\varepsilon})|^2 e^{-\varphi_L} dV_{\omega_\varepsilon} = \int_X |\bar{\partial}^*\xi|^2 e^{-\varphi_L} dV_{\omega_\varepsilon}$$

and since we assume from the beginning that the support of the form ξ is contained in $X \setminus Z$, the limit as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ of the RHS of (8.17.25) is precisely

$$(8.17.26) \quad \int_X |\bar{\partial}^*\xi|^2 e^{-\varphi_L} dV_\omega,$$

and we are done. \square

8.5. An application of Theorem 8.1. In this subsection we consider the simplest case of a pluricanonical section whose corresponding divisor is unreduced. Let $s \in H^0(X, mK_X)$ such that

$$(8.17.27) \quad \text{Div}(s) = 2Z$$

where Z is a non-singular hypersurface of the central fiber X of our family.

We have the following result.

Theorem 8.18. *Let $s \in H^0(X, mK_X)$ be a pluricanonical section, such that (8.17.27) is satisfied. Then there exists a section $s_2 \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathcal{X}, mK_{\mathcal{X}})$ such that the following hold*

$$(8.18.1) \quad s_2|_X = s, \quad \bar{\partial}s_2 = t^3 \Lambda_2.$$

Proof. We will show that under the hypothesis (8.17.27) we can construct the vector field Ξ as requested in Theorem 8.1.

To this end, we first use Subsection 8.1, so that the first order extension s_1 of s can be written as

$$(8.18.2) \quad s_1|_\Omega \simeq (z_1^2 + tz_1 f_1(z)) (dt \wedge dz)^{\otimes m}$$

modulo t^2 , where Ω is one of the Ω_i , $z_1 = 0$ is the equation of the divisor Z on the central fiber X and f_1 is holomorphic.

We change the coordinates on Ω by taking

$$(8.18.3) \quad w_1 := z_1 + \frac{t}{2} f_1(z), \quad w_i = z_i$$

for $i = 2, \dots, n$. The new local expression for the section s_1 reads as

$$(8.18.4) \quad s_1|_\Omega \simeq w_1^2 (1 + tg(w)) (dt \wedge dw)^{\otimes m}$$

where g is holomorphic, again modulo smooth terms divisible by monomials in t and \bar{t} of degree at least 2.

Let h_s be the Hermitian metric on $\mathcal{X} \setminus (s_1 = 0)$ defined as follows

$$(8.18.5) \quad h_s := \omega + \frac{\sqrt{-1} D' s_1 \wedge \overline{D' s_1}}{|s_1|^2}$$

where ω is an arbitrary smooth metric on \mathcal{X} and D' is the covariant derivative given by the Chern connection induced by a smooth metric on $mK_{\mathcal{X}}$.

The metric h_s is singular and in general not Kähler, but its task is to allow us to define Ξ as the canonical lifting of the vector field $\frac{\partial}{\partial t}$ in an intrinsic, computable manner. Recall that with respect to the coordinates (t, w) as above we have

$$(8.18.6) \quad \Xi|_{\Omega} = \frac{\partial}{\partial t} - \sum v_i \frac{\partial}{\partial w_i}$$

where the coefficients $v_i := \sum_{\alpha} h^{\bar{\alpha}i} h_{t\bar{\alpha}}$ are expressed by the usual formula with respect to the coefficients of h_s .

We evaluate next briefly the coefficients of h_s ; we write

$$(8.18.7) \quad D's_1|_{\Omega} = 2w_1 dw_1 + \mathcal{O}(w_1^2) + \mathcal{O}(t, \bar{t})$$

where $\mathcal{O}(w_1^2)$ and $\mathcal{O}(t, \bar{t})$ denote forms of type $(1,0)$ on Ω whose coefficients belong to the ideal (w_1^2) and (t, \bar{t}) , respectively. Therefore, at points $\Omega \cap X$ we can write

$$(8.18.8) \quad h_{t\bar{1}} = g_{t\bar{1}} + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{w_1}\right), \quad h_{t\bar{\alpha}} = g_{t\bar{\alpha}} + \mathcal{O}(1)$$

for each $\alpha = 2, \dots, n$, where $g_{t\bar{\alpha}}$ are the coefficients of the non-singular metric ω . Moreover, the determinant of the matrix corresponding to h_s is clearly equal to $\frac{\mathcal{O}(1)}{|w_1|^2}$, where here $\mathcal{O}(1)$ is smooth, positive and bounded away from zero.

Thus the coefficients of the inverse matrix can be written as

$$(8.18.9) \quad h^{\bar{1}1} = |w_1|^2 (1 + \mathcal{O}(1)), \quad h^{\bar{\alpha}1} = |w_1|^2 \left(1 + \frac{\mathcal{O}(1)}{\bar{w}_1}\right)$$

for each $\alpha = 2, \dots, n$ and hence we have

$$(8.18.10) \quad v_1 = \mathcal{O}(w_1), \quad v_i = \mathcal{O}(1)$$

for each $i = 2, \dots, n$.

This case-by case analysis shows that the requirements of Thm 8.1 are satisfied, since in our present case the Poincaré metric is quasi-isometric to

$$(8.18.11) \quad \frac{\sqrt{-1} dw_1 \wedge d\bar{w}_1}{|w_1|^2 \log^2 |w_1|^2} + \sum_{i=2}^n \sqrt{-1} dw_i \wedge d\bar{w}_i.$$

□

9. APPENDIX

We detail here the calculations needed for the evaluation of the limit (5.6.7) (and discussion of the examples). They are rather long, but after all, nothing more than Taylor expansions.

As a "warm-up" we consider the following particular case.

(\diamond) *Assume that we can find a smooth metric h_0 on $\mathcal{O}(Y)$ whose local weights φ_0 are independent on the z_1, \dots, z_r , where the $(z_i)_{i=1, \dots, n}$ are coordinates such that $\varphi_L(z) = \sum q_i \log |z_i|^2 + \varphi_{L,0}$.*

In such case we argue as follows. Consider the following measure

$$(9.0.1) \quad d\lambda_{f,q}(z) := \frac{f(z)}{\prod_{i=1}^r z_i^{k_i}} \frac{d\lambda(z)}{\prod_{i=1}^r |z_i|^{2-2\delta_i}}$$

where the δ_i are strictly positive reals and k_i are positive integers.

Thanks to (\diamond) we immediately see that the quantity

$$(9.0.2) \quad \int_{(\mathbb{C}^n, 0)} \rho'_\varepsilon \left(\prod |z_i|^2 e^{-\varphi_0(z')} \right) d\lambda_{f,q}(z)$$

where $z' = (z_{r+1}, \dots, z_n)$ tends to zero, regardless to the size of the multiplicities q_i . This is the case, since f is smooth, so (9.0.2) amounts to the evaluation of

$$(9.0.3) \quad \int_{(\mathbb{C}^n, 0)} g(z') \rho'_\varepsilon \left(\prod |z_i|^2 e^{-\varphi_0(z')} \right) \frac{\prod_{i=1}^r z_i^{m_i} \bar{z}_i^{m_{\bar{i}}}}{\prod_{i=1}^r z_i^{k_i}} \frac{d\lambda(z)}{\prod_{i=1}^r |z_i|^{2-2\delta_i}}$$

where g is a smooth function only depending of the variables z' .

The integral (9.0.3) is *equal* to zero -for any $\varepsilon > 0$ - unless we have

$$(9.0.4) \quad m_i - k_i = m_{\bar{i}} \geq 0.$$

But for such exponents the limit as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ of (9.0.3) is equal to zero, because the pole of order k_i disappears, and $\delta_i > 0$.

9.0.1. *Taylor expansions.* In general, i.e. in the absence of the assumption (\diamond), our arguments are virtually the same, modulo a few technicalities that we discuss next.

We will use Taylor formula with integral reminder. In order to illustrate the type of statement we are after, we first start with a simple case.

Let ϕ be a smooth function defined on \mathbb{R} , and consider

$$(9.0.5) \quad f(x_1, x_2) := \phi(x_1 + x_2)$$

a function defined say in a ball centred at the origin in \mathbb{R}^2 .

The Taylor expansion of f with respect to x_1 reads as follows

$$(9.0.6) \quad f(x_1, x_2) = \phi(x_2) + x_1 \phi'(x_2) + \cdots + \frac{x_1^k}{k!} \phi^{(k)}(x_2)$$

$$(9.0.7) \quad + \frac{x_1^{k+1}}{(k+1)!} \int_0^1 \phi^{(k+1)}(tx_1 + x_2)(1-t)^k dt.$$

Next we expand each of the functions involved in (9.0.6) and (9.0.7) with respect to x_2 , and we have:

$$(9.0.8) \quad f(x_1, x_2) = \sum_{0 \leq m_1, m_2 \leq k} \frac{x_1^{m_1} x_2^{m_2}}{m_1! m_2!} \phi^{(m_1+m_2)}(0)$$

$$(9.0.9) \quad + \sum_{0 \leq m_1 \leq k} \frac{x_1^{m_1} x_2^{k+1}}{(k+1)! m_1!} \int_0^1 \phi^{(m_1+k+1)}(tx_2)(1-t)^k dt$$

$$(9.0.10) \quad + \sum_{0 \leq m_2 \leq k} \frac{x_1^{k+1} x_2^{m_2}}{(k+1)! m_2!} \int_0^1 \phi^{(k+1+m_2)}(tx_1)(1-t)^k dt$$

$$(9.0.11) \quad + \frac{x_1^{k+1} x_2^{k+1}}{(k+1)!^2} \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \phi^{(2k+2)}(t_1 x_1 + t_2 x_2)(1-t_1)^k (1-t_2)^k dt_1 dt_2.$$

Now we remark that in the expressions (9.0.8)-(9.0.11) we have three type of terms, according to the exponents of x_1 and x_2 , respectively.

- (1) If both exponents m_1 and m_2 are smaller than k , then the function $\phi^{(m_1+m_2)}(0)$ is constant with respect to both variables.
- (2) If, say, $m_1 \leq k$ and $m_2 = k+1$, then the function in question is only depending on x_2 . The same is of course true if the roles of x_1 and x_2 are exchanged.
- (3) If both exponents m_1 and m_2 are equal to $k+1$, then the function in (9.0.11) is smooth (and in general, depending on both variables).

This is not limited to the case of two variables, and the result is the same: the function which multiplies the monomial

$$(9.0.12) \quad x_1^{m_1} \dots x_r^{m_r}$$

is independent on x_i if we have $m_i \leq k$, for each $i = 1, \dots, r$

Coming back to our problem, we will use a variation of this type of considerations in order to obtain an expansion which is adapted to our context.

Assume that the section s of $\mathcal{O}(Y)$ corresponds to the monomial $z_1 \dots z_r$ when restricted to Ω

$$(9.0.13) \quad s|_{\Omega} \simeq z_1 \dots z_r.$$

The function we want to expand is

$$(9.0.14) \quad \rho_\varepsilon \left(\log \log \frac{1}{|s|^2 e^{-\phi(z)}} \right).$$

To this end, remark that we have

$$(9.0.15) \quad \log \frac{1}{|s|^2 e^{-\phi(z)}} = \log \frac{1}{|s|^2 e^{-\phi_1(z)}} + z_1 \phi_1(z) + \bar{z}_1 \phi_{\bar{1}}(z)$$

for some functions $\phi_1, \phi_{\bar{1}}$, where $\phi_{\bar{1}}(z) := \phi(0, z_2, \dots, z_n)$.

We consider a function τ_1 defined by the formula

$$(9.0.16) \quad \tau_1(z) := \log \left(1 + \frac{z_1 \phi_1(z) + \bar{z}_1 \phi_{\bar{1}}(z)}{\log \frac{1}{|s|^2 e^{-\phi_1(z)}}} \right),$$

and then we have

$$(9.0.17) \quad \log \log \frac{1}{|s|^2 e^{-\phi(z)}} = \log \log \frac{1}{|s|^2 e^{-\phi_1(z)}} + \tau_1(z).$$

In order to simplify the writing, we set the following notations, valid throughout the current appendix.

Conventions.

- We will systematically denote by $a_{\overline{1\dots p}}$ any smooth function independent of the set of variables z_1, \dots, z_p and their conjugates.
- We use the same notation e.g. a, b, ϕ, \dots for functions which are not necessarily identical, but they share similar properties, which will be clearly specified.

Then we have

$$(9.0.18) \quad \mu_\varepsilon(z) = \rho_\varepsilon \left(\log \log \frac{1}{|s|^2 e^{-\phi_1(z)}} \right)$$

$$(9.0.19) \quad + \rho'_\varepsilon \left(\log \log \frac{1}{|s|^2 e^{-\phi_1(z)}} \right) \tau_1(z) + \dots$$

$$(9.0.20) \quad + \rho_\varepsilon^{(k)} \left(\log \log \frac{1}{|s|^2 e^{-\phi_1(z)}} \right) \frac{\tau_1^k(z)}{k!}$$

$$(9.0.21) \quad + \frac{1}{k!} \tau_1(z)^{k+1} \int_0^1 \rho_\varepsilon^{(k)} \left(t \tau_1(z) + \log \log \frac{1}{|s|^2 e^{-\phi_1(z)}} \right) (1-t)^k dt.$$

We consider next the quantity

$$(9.0.22) \quad \frac{z_1 \phi_1(z) + \bar{z}_1 \phi_{\bar{1}}(z)}{\log \frac{1}{|s|^2 e^{-\phi_1(z)}}}$$

involved in the expression of the function τ_1 . It can be rewritten as

$$(9.0.23) \quad \frac{z_1 \phi_1(z) + \bar{z}_1 \phi_{\bar{1}}(z)}{\log \frac{1}{|s|^2 e^{-\phi(z')}} + z_2 a_2(z) + \bar{z}_2 a_{\bar{2}}(z) + \dots + z_r a_r(z) + \bar{z}_r a_{\bar{r}}(z)}$$

where $a_i, a_{\bar{i}}$ are smooth, and $z' := (z_{r+1}, \dots, z_n)$.

In conclusion, we have

$$(9.0.24) \quad \tau_1(z) = \Psi_1(z_1, w_1, \dots, z_r, w_r, z')$$

where

$$(9.0.25) \quad w_i := \frac{z_i}{\log \frac{1}{|s|^2 e^{-\phi(z')}}}$$

for $i = 1, \dots, r$, and Ψ_1 is smooth and belonging to the ideal generated by w_1, \bar{w}_1 .

Next we iterate this: in the expressions (9.0.18)–(9.0.21), we use the fact that

$$(9.0.26) \quad \log |s|^2 e^{-\phi_1(z)} = \log |s|^2 e^{-\phi_{12}(z)} + z_2 \phi_{12}(z) + \bar{z}_2 \phi_{\bar{1}2}(z)$$

where $\phi_{\widehat{12}}$ and $\phi_{\widehat{1\bar{2}}}$ are independent of z_1 .
We define

$$(9.0.27) \quad \tau_2(z) := \log \left(1 + \frac{z_2 \phi_{\widehat{12}}(z) + \bar{z}_2 \phi_{\widehat{1\bar{2}}}(z)}{\log \frac{1}{|s|^2 e^{-\phi_{\widehat{12}}(z)}}} \right),$$

and consider the Taylor expansion of ρ_ε and its derivatives up to order k in (9.0.18)-(9.0.19).
For (9.0.21) we do the following. First we remark that we can write

$$(9.0.28) \quad \tau_1(z) = a_{\widehat{2}}(z, w) + b(z, w)$$

where the notations in (9.0.28) are as indicated below.

- As above, we have $w_i := \frac{z_i}{\log \frac{1}{|s|^2 e^{-\phi(z')}}}$.
- The function $a_{\widehat{2}}$ is smooth, and it only depends on $z_1, w_1, z_3, \dots, z_n$.
- The function b belongs to the ideal generated by z_2, \bar{z}_2 .

By (9.0.26) we have

$$\log \log \frac{1}{|s|^2 e^{-\phi_{\widehat{1}}(z)}} = \log \log \frac{1}{|s|^2 e^{-\phi_{\widehat{12}}(z)}} + b(z, w)$$

with the same properties as in the third bullet above.

Then the function inside (9.0.21) can be written as follows

$$(9.0.29) \quad t\tau_1(z) + \log \log \frac{1}{|s|^2 e^{-\phi(z_2, z')}} = ta_{\widehat{2}}(z, w) + \log \log \frac{1}{|s|^2 e^{-\phi_{\widehat{12}}(z)}} \\ + b_0(z, w) + tb_1(z, w).$$

and we expand the function $\rho_\varepsilon^{(k)}$ in (9.0.21) at

$$ta_{\widehat{2}}(z, w) + \log \log \frac{1}{|s|^2 e^{-\phi_{\widehat{12}}(z)}}.$$

After this second step, we see that the function μ_ε can be written as sum of terms of the following type.

$$(9.0.30) \quad \tau_1^{m_1} \tau_2^{m_2} \rho_\varepsilon^{(m)} \left(\log \log \frac{1}{|s|^2 e^{-\phi_{\widehat{12}}(z)}} \right)$$

where $m := m_1 + m_2$ and both m_i are smaller or equal than k ,

$$(9.0.31) \quad \tau_1^{m_1} \tau_2^{k+1} \int_0^1 \rho_\varepsilon^{(k+1+m_1)} \left(t\tau_2(z) + \log \log \frac{1}{|s|^2 e^{-\phi_{\widehat{12}}(z)}} \right) (1-t)^k dt$$

where $m_1 \leq k+1$ together with

$$(9.0.32) \quad \tau_1^{k+1} \tau_2^{m_2} \int_0^1 \rho_\varepsilon^{(k+1+m_2)} \left(ta_{\widehat{2}}(z) + \log \log \frac{1}{|s|^2 e^{-\phi_{\widehat{12}}(z)}} \right) (1-t)^k dt$$

(here τ_2 is not the same as in (9.0.31), but it belongs to the ideal generated by z_2 and \bar{z}_2 , so we are using the same notation).

Finally, the last term is

$$(9.0.33) \quad \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \rho_\varepsilon^{(2k+2)} \left(t_1 b_1 + t_2 b_2 + t_1 t_2 b_3 + \log \log \frac{1}{|s|^2 e^{-\phi_{\widehat{12}}(z)}} \right) (1-t)^k dt.$$

multiplied with $\tau_1^{k+1} \tau_2^{k+1}$, where $(1-t)^k dt := (1-t_1)^k (1-t_2)^k dt_1 dt_2$.

The conclusion is that in the resulting expression all the terms except for the RHS of (9.0.18) have support contained in the domain

$$(9.0.34) \quad \frac{1}{\varepsilon} - C < \log \log \frac{1}{|s|^2 e^{-\phi_{\widehat{12}}(z)}} < \frac{1}{\varepsilon} + C.$$

Moreover, the function

$$(9.0.35) \quad z \rightarrow \rho_\varepsilon^{(m)} \left(\log \log \frac{1}{|s|^2 e^{-\phi_{I\bar{2}}(z)}} \right)$$

in (9.0.30) only depends on $|z_1|, |z_2|, z_3, \dots, z_n$. The functions involved in the other expressions have similar properties, i.e. the one in (9.0.31) is independent of z_1 , the one in (9.0.32) is independent of z_2 . Note that the function in (9.0.33) depends -in general- on the full set of variables, but the exponents of τ_i are $k+1$.

We emphasize all this because integrals of the type

$$(9.0.36) \quad \int_\Omega \frac{\tau_1^{m_1} \tau_2^{m_2}}{z_1^{q_1} z_2^{q_2}} \rho_\varepsilon^{(m)} \left(\log \log \frac{1}{|s|^2 e^{-\phi_{I\bar{2}}(z)}} \right) \Psi(z, w) \frac{d\lambda(z)}{|z_1|^{2-2\delta_1} |z_2|^{2-2\delta_2}}$$

are converging to zero as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ for any $m \geq 1$, for any q_1, q_2 positive integers, and $\delta_i > 0$ positive reals. In (9.0.36) we denote by Ψ a smooth function.

Anyway, we iterate this procedure, and we obtain the following statement.

Proposition 9.1. *The function $\mu_\varepsilon(\cdot)$ admits a Taylor expansion whose finite number of terms are of the following type*

$$(9.1.1) \quad \tau_1^{m_1}(z, w) \dots \tau_r^{m_r}(z, w) \Phi_{\varepsilon, m}(z, w)$$

where:

- (a) the integer r is given by (9.0.13), and $\max(m_i) \leq k+1$;
- (b) for each $i = 1, \dots, r$ we have $w_i := \frac{z_i}{\log \frac{e^{\phi(z')}}{|z_1 \dots z_r|^2}}$, where $z' := (z_{r+1}, \dots, z_n)$;
- (c) the functions τ_i are smooth and they belong to the ideal generated by w_i and \bar{w}_i ;
- (d) the function $\Phi_{\varepsilon, m}(z, w)$ only depends on $|z_i|$ and $|w_i|$ if the corresponding exponent m_i is smaller or equal to k , for all $i = 1, \dots, r$;
- (e) if $m_1 = \dots = m_r = 0$, then we have

$$\Phi_{\varepsilon, 0}(z, w) = \rho_\varepsilon \left(\log \log \frac{e^{\phi(z')}}{|z_1 \dots z_r|^2} \right);$$

- (f) the support of the function $\Phi_{\varepsilon, m}(z, w)$ is contained in a set similar to (9.0.34) (i.e. rotationally symmetric with respect to each of the variables z_1, \dots, z_r) if $|m| \geq 1$. Note that even if $m_1 = \dots = m_r = 0$, the support of the function $\Phi_{\varepsilon, 0}$ is still rotationally symmetric.

Thanks to Proposition 9.1, the integrals we have to evaluate are of the following type

$$(9.1.2) \quad \int_{(\mathbb{C}^n, 0)} \rho_\varepsilon^{(m)}(z) \frac{\Psi(z, w)}{\prod_{i=1}^r z_i^{b_i} \prod_{i=1}^r |z_i|^{2-2\delta_i} \log |\prod_{i=1}^r z_i^{p_i}|^2} \frac{d\lambda(z)}{|z_1 \dots z_r|^2}$$

where $m \geq 1$ and $z' := (z_{r+1}, \dots, z_n)$. We denote by Ψ a smooth function, the b_i in (9.1.2) are positive integers and

$$\rho_\varepsilon^{(m)}(z) := \rho_\varepsilon^{(m)} \left(\log \log \frac{e^{\phi(z')}}{|z_1 \dots z_r|^2} \right).$$

Now as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ the expression (9.1.2) clearly tends to zero, as we have already explained.

To end with, we discuss now the examples presented in subsection 3.3.1.

Let $E = \sum E_i$ be a divisor on X such that $E + Y$ is snc and let Θ be a (p, q) -form with values in L and log poles along $E + Y$. We show next that the formula

$$(9.1.3) \quad \int_X \Theta \wedge \bar{\rho} := \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \sum_i \int_{U_i} \mu_\varepsilon(w) \frac{\theta_i}{w_i^{mq}} \pi_i^* \Theta \wedge \bar{\rho}_i$$

defines a (p, q) -current with values in (L, h_L) . In (9.1.3) we denote by ρ a $(n-q, n-p)$ -form with values in L , smooth in conic sense, so that ρ_i on the LHS is \mathcal{C}^∞ .

In what follows we drop the index "i" and assume that locally the equations of the two divisors are

$$(9.1.4) \quad Y \cap V = (z_1 \dots z_r = 0), \quad E \cap V = (z_{r+1} \dots z_{r+s} = 0).$$

Then the integrals we have to evaluate are written as follows

$$(9.1.5) \quad \int_U \mu_\varepsilon(w) \theta(|w|) \frac{f(w) d\lambda(w)}{\prod_{i=1}^r w_i^{b_i} \prod_{j=r+1}^{r+s} w_j}$$

where f is obtained by coefficients of ρ_i multiplied with smooth functions (coefficients of the inverse image of Θ).

Now Proposition 9.1 shows that it would be enough to assume that

$$(9.1.6) \quad \mu_\varepsilon(w) = \rho_\varepsilon \left(\log \log \frac{e^{\phi(w'')}}{|w_1 \dots w_r|^{2m}} \right)$$

where $w'' = (w_{r+1}, \dots, w_n)$. We consider the Taylor expansion of f with respect to the first r variables and observe that for the integrals

$$(9.1.7) \quad \int_U \mu_\varepsilon(w) \theta(|w|) \frac{\prod_{i=1}^r w_i^{\alpha_i} \bar{w}_i^{\beta_i}}{\prod_{i=1}^r w_i^{b_i} \prod_{j=r+1}^{r+s} w_j} d\lambda(w)$$

is equal to zero as soon as for some index i we have $\alpha_i + \beta_i \leq b_i - 1$: indeed, the integral in (9.1.7) is uniformly convergent, so our assertion follows by Fubini together with the fact that the integration domain is rotationally symmetric.

Therefore, only the terms

$$(9.1.8) \quad \int_U \mu_\varepsilon(w) \theta(|w|) \frac{\prod_{i=1}^r w_i^{\alpha_i} \bar{w}_i^{\beta_i} f_{\alpha\beta}(w)}{\prod_{i=1}^r w_i^{b_i} \prod_{j=r+1}^{r+s} w_j} d\lambda(w)$$

with $\alpha_i + \beta_i = b_i$ for each i "survive". But this type of integrals are bounded by $\sup_U |f_{\alpha\beta}|$, which in turn is bounded by the sup norm of a certain number of derivatives of ρ_i .

Hence Θ induces a (p, q) -current with values in (L, h_L) , as claimed in 3.3.1. A last remark is that if $p = n$ and Θ has only log-poles along E , then the limit process above is not needed, because the quantity $\frac{1}{w^{mq}} \pi^*(dz_1 \wedge \dots \wedge dz_n)$ is bounded as $mq_i \leq m - 1$.

REFERENCES

- [1] Agmon, S. : *The L^p approach to the Dirichlet problem*, Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa - Classe di Scienze, Série 3, Tome 13 (1959) no. 4, pp. 405-448.
- [2] Auvray, H.: *The space of Poincaré type Kähler metrics on the complement of a divisor*, J. Reine Angew. Math. 722 (2017), 1-64.
- [3] Cao, J.; Demailly, J.-P.; Matsumura, S.-I.: *A general extension theorem for cohomology classes on non reduced analytic spaces* Sci. China Math. 60 (2017), no. 6, 949–962
- [4] T. Chan, Y. Choi *On an injectivity theorem for log-canonical pairs with analytic adjoint ideal sheaves* <https://arxiv.org/abs/2205.06954>
- [5] Demailly, J.-P. : *Complex Analytic and Differential Geometry*, on author's web page.
- [6] Demailly, J.-P. : *Analytic Methods in Algebraic Geometry*, Higher Education Press, Surveys of Modern Mathematics, Vol. 1, 2010
- [7] Demailly, J.-P. : *Bergman bundles and applications to the geometry of compact complex manifolds*, arXiv 2003.04003, 2019.
- [8] Demailly, J.-P.; Peternell, Th. and Schneider, M.: *Pseudo-effective line bundles on compact Kähler manifolds*, International Journal of Math 6 (2001) 689-741.
- [9] de Rham, G.; Kodaira, K.: *Harmonic Integrals* Institute for Advanced Study, 1950.
- [10] H. Esnault.; E. Viehweg.: *Logarithmic De Rham complexes and vanishing theorems* Invent. math. 86, 161-194 (1986); Appendix by K. Timmerscheidt
- [11] A. Fujiki: *An L^2 Dolbeault Lemma and Its Applications* Publ. RIMS, Kyoto Univ. 28 (1992), 845-884
- [12] O. Fujino *On Semipositivity, Injectivity, and Vanishing Theorems*. Hodge Theory and L^2 -analysis, 245–282, Advanced Lecture in Mathematics (ALM), 39, International Press, Somerville, MA; Higher Education Press, Beijing, 2017
- [13] Levine, M.: *Pluri-canonical divisors on Kähler manifolds*, Invent. Math. 74, (1983)
- [14] Levine, M.: *Pluri-canonical divisors on Kähler manifolds II*, Duke Math. J. 52, 61–65 (1985)
- [15] Liu, K.; Rao, S.; and Wan, X.: *Geometry of logarithmic forms and deformations of complex structures* J. Algebraic Geom. 28 (2019), 773–815
- [16] Matsumura, S.-I: *An injectivity theorem with multiplier ideal sheaves of singular metrics with transcendental singularities*. Journal of Algebraic Geometry, Volume 27 (2018), no. 2, 305–337.
- [17] Matsumura, S.-I: *A transcendental approach to injectivity theorem for log canonical pairs*. The Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa, Classe di Scienze (5) 19 (2019), no. 1, 311–334.

- [18] Naumann , P: *Positivity of direct images with a Poincaré type twist* <https://arxiv.org/abs/2005.01500>.
- [19] Noguchi, J.: *A short analytic proof of closedness of logarithmic forms* Kodai Math. J. Volume 18, Number 2 (1995), 295-299.
- [20] Paun, M.: *Siu's invariance of plurigenera: a one-tower proof*, J. Differential Geom., 76 (2007), 485–493.
- [21] Rao, S.; Tsai, I.-H.: *Invariance of plurigenera and Chow-type lemma* <https://arxiv.org/abs/2011.03306>
- [22] Siu, Y.T. *Invariance of Plurigenera*, Invent. Math., 134 (1998), 661–673.
- [23] Siu, Y.T. : *Extension of twisted pluricanonical sections with plurisubharmonic weight and invariance of semi-positively twisted plurigenera for manifolds not necessarily of general type*, Complex Geometry (Göttingen, 2000), Springer, Berlin, 2002, 223-277.
- [24] Wang, X.: *A curvature formula associated to a family of pseudoconvex domains* Annales de l'Institut Fourier, Volume 67 (2017) no. 1, p. 269-313
- [25] Wu, X.: *On the hard Lefschetz theorem for pseudoeffective line bundles* <https://arxiv.org/abs/1911.13253>

UNIVERSITÉ CÔTE D'AZUR, CNRS, LJAD, FRANCE
Email address: `junyan.cao@unice.fr`

UNIVERSITÄT BAYREUTH, MATHEMATISCHES INSTITUT, LEHRSTUHL MATHEMATIK VIII, UNIVERSITÄTSSTRASSE 30,
 D-95447, BAYREUTH, GERMANY
Email address: `mihai.paun@uni-bayreuth.de`