

NUMBER OF SINGULAR POINTS ON PROJECTIVE SURFACES

JIHAO LIU AND LINGYAO XIE

ABSTRACT. The number of singular points on a klt Fano surface X is $\leq 2\rho(X) + 2$.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Preliminaries	2
2.1. Pairs and singularities	2
2.2. Surfaces	3
2.3. G-pairs	3
3. Proofs of the main theorems	4
4. Examples on surfaces	7
5. Discussions	8
References	9

1. INTRODUCTION

We work over the field of complex numbers \mathbb{C} . For any normal projective variety X , we let $\rho(X)$ be the Picard number of X .

Let X be a klt Fano surface, i.e. a klt projective surface such that $-K_X$ is ample. It is interesting to ask when are the number of singular points of X bounded from above, and to give an estimate of the maximal number of singular points on X .

For simplicity, for any surface X , we let $n(X)$ be the number of singular points on X . When X is klt Fano, Keel and McKernan show that $n(X) \leq 5$ when $\rho(X) = 1$ [20, Page 72]. This is strengthened by Belousov who shows that $n(X) \leq 4$:

Theorem 1.1 ([1, Theorem 1.2],[2, Theorem 1.1]). *Let X be a klt Fano surface such that $\rho(X) = 1$. Then $n(X) \leq 4$.*

This bound is optimal even for Fano surfaces with canonical singularities by [23] (see also [12, 27, 28, 29] and Example 4.2(1)). In this note, we show that $n(X)$ is bounded from above by a number depending only on $\rho(X)$.

Theorem 1.2. *Let X be a klt Fano surface. Then $n(X) \leq 2\rho(X) + 2$.*

It is easy to see that Theorem 1.2 and Theorem 1.1 are equivalent when $\rho(X) = 1$.

In fact, we can relax the assumption “klt Fano” to “ (X, B) is klt log Calabi-Yau for some boundary $B \neq 0$ ” without changing the bound $2\rho(X) + 2$. Moreover, we can relax the assumption “klt Fano” to “ (X, B) is lc and $-(K_X + B)$ is nef for some boundary B ” if we allow a small increase on the bound $2\rho(X) + 2$. We have the following result:

Date: December 13, 2021.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary 14E30, Secondary 14B05.

Theorem 1.3. *Let (X, B) be an lc surface pair such that $-(K_X + B)$ is nef. Then:*

- (1) $n(X) \leq \max\{2\rho(X) + 10, 16\}$.
- (2) If (X, B) is klt, $B \neq 0$, and $K_X + B \equiv 0$, then $n(X) \leq 2\rho(X) + 2$.
- (3) If X is klt and $K_X \not\equiv 0$, then $n(X) \leq 2\rho(X) + 4$.
- (4) If X is klt but not canonical and $K_X \equiv 0$, then $n(X) \leq 2\rho(X) + 7$.
- (5) If X is canonical and $K_X \equiv 0$, then $n(X) \leq 16$.
- (6) If X is not klt, then $n(X) \leq 2\rho(X) + 10$.
- (7) If X is not klt and $-K_X$ is big and nef, then $n(X) \leq 2\rho(X) + 7$.

- Remark 1.4.**
- (1) The assumption of Theorem 1.3(2) includes the case when X is klt Fano or of Fano type, hence immediately implies Theorem 1.2.
 - (2) Theorem 1.2 may be well-known to experts, but we cannot find any references except [1, 2, 20], and we cannot find any similar results in papers citing [1], [2], or [20], so we believe that Theorem 1.2 is new.
 - (3) The assumption “ $-(K_X + B)$ is nef” in Theorem 1.3 cannot be further relaxed to “ $-K_X$ is pseudo-effective” even when X is canonical and $-K_X$ is effective (Example-Proposition 4.1(1)).
 - (4) The assumption “ (X, B) is lc” Theorem 1.3 cannot be further relaxed even when $\rho(X) = 1$ and X is Fano, otherwise $n(X)$ may be unbounded (Example 4.2(3)).
 - (5) The bounds for Theorem 1.3(2)(3) are optimal at least for low Picard numbers and the bounds for Theorem 1.3(5) is optimal. We don’t know if the bounds for Theorem 1.3(4)(6) are optimal even for small values of $\rho(X)$, however $2\rho(X) + 2$ is not satisfied even when $\rho(X) = 1$ and X is Fano (Example 4.2(2)).
 - (6) We expect some boundedness results on singular points to hold in high dimensions (see Section 5). We prove the boundedness on the number of torus invariant singular points for toric varieties with bounded Picard numbers (Theorem 5.1), but one needs to be careful for non-toric varieties due to Example-Proposition 5.2.

Acknowledgement. The authors would like to thank Christopher D. Hacon for useful discussions and suggestions. The authors would like to thank Paolo Cascini, Meng Chen, Jingjun Han, Chen Jiang, Yuchen Liu, and Qingyuan Xue for useful discussions. The authors were partially supported by NSF research grants no: DMS-1801851, DMS-1952522 and by a grant from the Simons Foundation; Award Number: 256202.

2. PRELIMINARIES

We adopt the standard notation and definitions in [21] and [4].

2.1. Pairs and singularities.

Definition 2.1. A *pair* (X, B) consists of a normal quasi-projective variety X and an \mathbb{R} -divisor $B \geq 0$ such that $K_X + B$ is \mathbb{R} -Cartier. If $B \in [0, 1]$, then B is called a *boundary*.

Let E be a prime divisor on X and D an \mathbb{R} -divisor on X . We define $\text{mult}_E D$ to be the *multiplicity* of E along D . Let $\phi : W \rightarrow X$ be any log resolution of (X, B) and let

$$K_W + B_W := \phi^*(K_X + B).$$

The *log discrepancy* of a prime divisor D on W with respect to (X, B) is $1 - \text{mult}_D B_W$ and it is denoted by $a(D, X, B)$. We say that (X, B) is lc (resp. klt) if $a(D, X, B) \geq 0$ (resp. > 0) for every log resolution $\phi : W \rightarrow X$ as above and every prime divisor D on W .

A germ $X \ni x$ consists of a normal quasi-projective variety X and a closed point $x \in X$.

Definition 2.2. Let $f : X \dashrightarrow Y$ be a birational map which does not extract any divisor, $p : W \rightarrow X$ and $q : W \rightarrow Y$ a common resolution, and D an \mathbb{R} -Cartier \mathbb{R} -divisor on X such that f_*D is \mathbb{R} -Cartier. We say that f is D -negative if

$$p^*D = q^*D_Y + E$$

for some $E \geq 0$, and $\text{Exc}(f) \subset \text{Supp}(p_*E)$.

Definition 2.3. Let X be a normal projective variety. We say that X is *Fano* if $-K_X$ is ample. We say that X is *of Fano type* if (X, B) is klt and $-(K_X + B)$ is ample for some boundary B on X . We say that (X, B) is *log Calabi-Yau* if $K_X + B \equiv 0$.

2.2. Surfaces.

Definition 2.4. A surface is a normal quasi-projective variety of dimension 2. For any non-negative integer m , the Hirzebruch surface \mathbb{F}_m is given by $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1} \oplus \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(m))$.

In some references, a klt Fano surface is also called a *log del Pezzo* surface.

Definition 2.5 (Dual graph). Let n be a non-negative integer, and $C = \cup_{i=1}^n C_i$ a collection of irreducible curves on a smooth surface U . We define the *dual graph* $\mathcal{D}(C)$ of C as follows.

- (1) The vertices $v_i = v_i(C_i)$ of $\mathcal{D}(C)$ correspond to the curves C_i .
- (2) For $i \neq j$, the vertices v_i and v_j are connected by $C_i \cdot C_j$ edges.

For any birational morphism $f : Y \rightarrow X$ between surfaces, let $E = \cup_{i=1}^n E_i$ be the reduced exceptional divisor for some non-negative integer n . We define $\mathcal{D}(f) := \mathcal{D}(E)$.

A dual graph is called a *tree* if the graph contains no cycles.

Lemma 2.6. (1) Let $f' : Y' \rightarrow X \ni x$ be a resolution of a klt surface germ $X \ni x$. Then $\mathcal{D}(f')$ is a tree whose vertices are all smooth rational curves.
 (2) Let $f' : Y' \rightarrow X$ be a projective morphism between smooth surfaces. Then $\mathcal{D}(f')$ is a tree whose vertices are all smooth rational curves.

Proof. (1) follows from Lemma [18, Lemma 3.10] and the classification of klt surface singularities by taking $f : Y \rightarrow X$ to be the minimal resolution of $X \ni x$. (2) follows from (1) because Y' is a resolution of X . \square

Lemma 2.7. Let (X, B) be an lc surface pair. Then K_X is \mathbb{Q} -Cartier.

Proof. Pick any closed point $x \in X$. If $(X, 0)$ is numerically dlt near x , then X is \mathbb{Q} -Cartier near x by [21, Proposition 4.11]. If $(X, 0)$ is not numerically dlt near x , since (X, B) is lc, (X, B) is numerically lc near x . By [21, Corollary 4.2], $x \notin B$, hence K_X is \mathbb{Q} -Cartier near x . Thus K_X is \mathbb{Q} -Cartier. \square

Lemma 2.8. Let X be a smooth projective surface, $X \rightarrow Z \cong \mathbb{P}^1$ a fibration, and $X \rightarrow X'$ a K_X -MMP over Z which terminates with a Mori fiber space $f : X' \rightarrow Z$. Assume that $X \neq X' \cong \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$. Then there exists a K_X -MMP over Z : $X \rightarrow X''$, such that $X'' \cong \mathbb{F}_1$.

Proof. Let $g : Y \rightarrow X'$ be the last step of the MMP $X \rightarrow X'$. Then g is a blow-up of a closed point $x' \in X'$. Let $F := g_*^{-1}(f^{-1}(f(x')))$, then $F^2 = -1$. Let $g' : Y \rightarrow X''$ be the contraction of F , then $X'' \cong \mathbb{F}_1$ and the induced morphism $X \rightarrow X''$ is a K_X -MMP. \square

2.3. G-pairs. We need the following definitions on generalized pairs (g-pairs for short). See [6] for more details.

Definition 2.9 (**b-divisors**). Let X be a normal quasi-projective variety. We call Y a *birational model* over X if there exists a projective birational morphism $Y \rightarrow X$.

Let $X \dashrightarrow X'$ be a birational map. For any valuation ν over X , we define $\nu_{X'}$ to be the center of ν on X' . A **b-divisor** \mathbf{M} over X is a formal sum $\mathbf{M} = \sum_{\nu} r_{\nu} \nu$ where ν are valuations over X , such that ν_X is not a divisor except for finitely many ν . If in addition, $r_{\nu} \in \mathbb{Q}$ for every ν , then \mathbf{M} is called a \mathbb{Q} -**b-divisor**. The *trace* of \mathbf{M} on X' is the \mathbb{R} -divisor

$$\mathbf{M}_{X'} := \sum_{\nu_{i,X'} \text{ is a divisor}} r_i \nu_{i,X'}.$$

If $\mathbf{M}_{X'}$ is \mathbb{R} -Cartier and \mathbf{M}_Y is the pullback of $\mathbf{M}_{X'}$ on Y for any birational model Y of X' , we say that \mathbf{M} *descends* to X' , and write $\mathbf{M} = \overline{\mathbf{M}_{X'}}$. If X is projective and \mathbf{M} is a **b-divisor** over X , such that \mathbf{M} descends to some birational model Y over X and \mathbf{M}_Y is nef, then we say that \mathbf{M} is *nef*.

Definition 2.10 (G-pairs). A *projective g-pair* (X, B, \mathbf{M}) consists of a normal projective variety X , an \mathbb{R} -divisor $B \geq 0$ on X , and a nef **b-divisor** \mathbf{M} over X , such that $K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X$ is \mathbb{R} -Cartier. If B is a \mathbb{Q} -divisor and \mathbf{M} is a \mathbb{Q} -**b-divisor**, then we say that (X, B, \mathbf{M}) is a \mathbb{Q} -g-pair.

Let (X, B, \mathbf{M}) be a projective g-pair, $\phi : W \rightarrow X$ any log resolution of $(X, \text{Supp } B)$ such that \mathbf{M} descends to W , and

$$K_W + B_W + \mathbf{M}_W := \phi^*(K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X).$$

We say that (X, B, \mathbf{M}) is *glc* if the coefficients of B_W are ≤ 1 .

For any projective glc g-pair (X, B, \mathbf{M}) and \mathbb{R} -Cartier \mathbb{R} -divisor $D \geq 0$ on X , we define

$$\text{glct}(X, B, \mathbf{M}; D) := \sup\{t \mid (X, B + tD; \mathbf{M}) \text{ is glc}\}$$

to be the *glc threshold* of D with respect to (X, B, \mathbf{M}) .

3. PROOFS OF THE MAIN THEOREMS

Lemma 3.1. *Let (X, B) be an lc pair such that (X, B) is lc and $-(K_X + B)$ is nef (resp. $K_X + B \equiv 0$). Then there exists a \mathbb{Q} -divisor B' on X such that (X, B') is lc and $-(K_X + B')$ is nef (resp. $K_X + B \equiv 0$).*

Proof. Cf. [17, Proposition 2.6], [16, Corollary 3.5], and [15, Lemma 5.4, Theorem 5.6]. \square

Lemma 3.2. *Let X be a klt surface, $f : X \rightarrow Y$ a K_X -negative divisorial contraction of a curve C , and $y := f(C)$. Then C contains at most 2 singular points of X .*

Proof. We may assume that C contains n singular points of X for some integer $n \geq 3$. Let $g : W \rightarrow X$ be the minimal resolution of X near C with exceptional divisors E_1, \dots, E_m for some integer $m \geq n$. Let $C_W := g_*^{-1}C$. Possibly reordering indices, we may assume that C_W intersects E_1, E_2 and E_3 .

Since $f \circ g$ is a resolution of $Y \ni y$, by Lemma 2.6(1), $C_W \cong \mathbb{P}^1$. If $C_W \leq -2$ then $f \circ g$ is actually the minimal resolution of $Y \ni y$. But $a(C, Y, 0) > 1$ since f is K_X -negative, thus C is not contained in the minimal resolution of $Y \ni y$. Hence $C_W^2 = -1$ and we may let $p : W \rightarrow T$ be the contraction of C_W . Then there exists an induced morphism $h : T \rightarrow Y$ which is a resolution of $Y \ni y$. Let $E_{i,T} := p_* E_i$ for each i , then $E_{i,T} \cdot E_{j,T} \geq 1$ for every $i, j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ with $i \neq j$. Thus $\mathcal{D}(\cup_{i=1}^m E_{i,T}) = \mathcal{D}(h)$ is not a tree, which contradicts Lemma 2.6(1). \square

Lemma 3.3. *Let X be a klt surface, $f : X \rightarrow Z$ a K_X -Mori fiber space such that $\dim Z = 1$, and $z \in Z$ a closed point. If f^*z is reduced, then X is smooth near $f^{-1}z$.*

Proof. Since $f : X \rightarrow Z$ is a K_X -Mori fiber space, $f^{-1}z$ is an irreducible curve and $R^i f_* \mathcal{O}_X = 0$ for any $i > 0$. Since Z is regular and X is Cohen-Macaulay, f is flat [22, Theorem 23.1]. If f^*z is reduced, then by Cohomology and Base change [13, III 12.11], $H^1(X_z, \mathcal{O}_{X_z}) = 0$ so $X_z \cong \mathbb{P}^1$. Combining with the fact that f is flat, we deduce that X is regular along $f^{-1}z$ because both $X_z = f^{-1}z$ and Z are regular [22, Theorem.23.7]. \square

Lemma 3.4. *Let (X, B) be an lc projective surface pair such that $-(K_X + B)$ is nef, and $f : X \rightarrow Z$ a K_X -Mori fiber space such that $\dim Z = 1$. Then*

- (1) any fiber of f contains at most 2 singular points of X ,
- (2) (a) at most four fibers of f contain singular point(s) of X , and
 (b) if (X, B) is klt and $K_X + B \equiv 0$, then at most three fibers of f contain singular point(s) of X .

Proof. By Lemma 3.1, we may assume that B is a \mathbb{Q} -divisor. There exists a non-negative integer n , closed points $z_1, \dots, z_n \in Z$, and fibers $F_i := f^{-1}z_i$ for each i , such that F_1, \dots, F_n are the only closed fibers of f which contain singular points of X . If $n = 0$, there is nothing left to prove, so in the rest of the proof, we may assume that $n \geq 1$.

First we prove (1). Suppose that there exists a fiber F of f , such that F contains at least 3 singular points of X and $F = f^{-1}z$ for some closed point $z \in Z$. We let $g : W \rightarrow X$ be the minimal resolution of X , E_1, \dots, E_m the g -exceptional divisors for some integer $m \geq 3$ such that $\text{center}_X E_i \in F$ for each i , and $F_W := g_*^{-1}F$. Then $E_i^2 \leq -2$ for each i . Possibly reordering indices, we may assume that F_W intersects E_1, E_2, E_3 .

We may run a K_W -MMP over Z , which induces a birational contraction $h : W \rightarrow Y$ between smooth projective varieties and a K_Y -Mori fiber space $f' : Y \rightarrow Z$, such that Y is a geometrically ruled surface. In particular, h contracts m elements of $\{F_W, E_1, \dots, E_m\}$. Since Y is smooth and X is not smooth, F_W is contracted by h . Since W is smooth, h is a K_W -MMP over Z , and $E_i^2 \leq -2$, we have that $F_W \cong \mathbb{P}^1$ and $F_W^2 = -1$. Thus we may let $p : W \rightarrow T$ be the contraction of F_W , and there is an induced morphism $q : T \rightarrow Y$. Let $E_{i,T} := p_* E_i$ for each i , then $E_{i,T} \cdot E_{j,T} \geq 1$ for every $i, j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ with $i \neq j$. Thus $\mathcal{D}(\cup_{i=1}^m E_{i,T})$ is not a tree, hence $\mathcal{D}(q)$ is not a tree, which contradicts Lemma 2.6(2).

Now we prove (2.a). We let $\mathbf{M}_X := -(K_X + B)$ and $\mathbf{M} := \overline{\mathbf{M}_X}$. Then (X, B, \mathbf{M}) is a projective glc \mathbb{Q} -g-pair. By the generalized canonical bundle formula ([9, Theorem 1.4], [16, Theorem 1.2]), we have

$$0 = K_X + B + \mathbf{M}_X \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} f^*(K_Z + B_Z + M_Z)$$

such that M_Z is pseudo-effective and

$$\text{mult}_z B_Z = 1 - \text{glet}(X, B, \mathbf{M}; f^*z)$$

for any point $z \in Z$. By Lemma 3.3, each f^*z_i is not reduced, hence $\text{mult}_{z_i} B_Z \geq \frac{1}{2}$ for each i . Thus

$$0 = \deg(K_Z + B_Z + M_Z) \geq -2 + n \cdot \frac{1}{2} + 0 = -2 + \frac{n}{2},$$

which implies that $n \leq 4$. Since $n \geq 1$, we have $\deg(K_Z) < 0$ so $Z \cong \mathbb{P}^1$. Moreover, $n = 4$ if and only if $M_Z \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0$ and $B_Z = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^4 z_i$.

Under the assumptions of (2.b), by abundance, $K_X + B \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0$, so

$$K_X + B \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} f^*(K_Z + B_Z + M_Z)$$

is the canonical bundle formula for $K_X + B$ as well. Let $g : Y \rightarrow X$ be the minimal resolution of X and $h : X \rightarrow X'$ a K_Y -MMP over Z which terminates with a Mori fiber

space $f' : X' \rightarrow Z$. By Lemma 2.8, we may assume that $X' \cong \mathbb{F}_m$ for some positive integer m . Let $K_{X'} + B' := h_* g^*(K_X + B)$, then

$$K_{X'} + B' \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} (f')^*(K_Z + B_Z + M_Z)$$

is the canonical bundle formula for $K_{X'} + B'$, and (X', B') is klt.

Assume that $n = 4$. Then $M_Z \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0$ and $B_Z = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^4 z_i$. Let τ and σ denote the fiber and the negative section of \mathbb{F}_m , and D the only element of $|\sigma|$. Then $-K_{X'} \sim 2\sigma + (m+2)\tau$. By the definition of the canonical bundle formula, $B' \geq (f')^* B_Z \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 2\tau$, which implies that $0 \leq B' - (f')^* B_Z \in |2\sigma + m\tau|_{\mathbb{Q}}$. Thus for any element $D' \in |2\sigma + m\tau|_{\mathbb{Q}}$, $D' \geq D$ (cf. [11, Chapter 5, Proposition 3]). So $B' \geq D$, hence (X', B') is not klt, a contradiction. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.3 (2)(3). Since K_X is not pseudo-effective, we may run a K_X -MMP which terminates with a Mori fiber space $f : Y \rightarrow Z$. Let $g : X \rightarrow Y$ be the induced morphism and $B_Y := g_* B$, then $-(K_Y + B_Y)$ is nef. Moreover, if (X, B) is klt log Calabi-Yau, then (Y, B_Y) is klt log Calabi-Yau.

Case 1. $\dim Z = 0$. In this case, $\rho(Y) = 1$ and Y is klt Fano, so f is a composition of $\rho(X) - 1$ divisorial contractions between klt surfaces. By Lemma 3.2 and Theorem 1.1,

$$n(X) \leq n(Y) + 2(\rho - 1) \leq 4 + 2(\rho - 1) = 2\rho + 2.$$

Case 2. $\dim Z = 1$. In this case, $\rho(Y) = 2$, so f is a composition of $\rho(X) - 2$ divisorial contractions between klt surfaces. By Lemma 3.2, $n(X) \leq n(Y) + 2(\rho - 2)$. By Lemma 3.4, $n(Y) \leq 8$ and $n(Y) \leq 6$ when (X, B) is klt log Calabi-Yau. Thus $n(X) \leq 2\rho(X) + 4$ and $n(X) \leq 2\rho(X) + 2$ when (X, B) is klt log Calabi-Yau and $B \neq 0$. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.3(4). Since X is klt but not canonical and $K_X \equiv 0$, there exists an extraction $f : Y \rightarrow X$ of a prime divisor E such that Y is klt and $K_Y + aE = f^* K_X \equiv 0$ for some positive real number a . By Theorem 1.3(3),

$$n(Y) \leq 2\rho(Y) + 4 = 2\rho(X) + 6,$$

thus $n(X) \leq n(Y) + 1 \leq 2\rho(X) + 7$. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.3(5). By abundance, $K_X \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0$, hence there exists a smallest positive integer m such that $mK_X \sim 0$. Since K_X is Cartier, there exists an étale cyclic cover $Y \rightarrow X$ of degree m such that $K_Y \sim 0$. In particular, Y is canonical and $n(X) \leq n(Y)$ (cf. [21, Lemma 2.51]).

Let $f : W \rightarrow X$ be the minimal resolution of Y . Then $K_W = f^* K_Y \sim 0$, hence W is either an abelian surface or a smooth K3 surface. If W is an abelian surface, then W does not contain any rational curves, so $W = Y$ and hence $n(Y) = 0$. If W is a smooth K3 surface, then Y is a K3 surface with at most canonical singularities. By [24, Corollary 4.6], $n(Y) \leq 16$. Thus $n(X) \leq n(Y) \leq 16$. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.3(6)(7). By Lemma 2.7, K_X is \mathbb{Q} -Cartier. By (3), we may assume that X is not klt, hence there exists at least 1 point on X where X is not klt. By applying the connectedness theorem ([25, Proposition 3.3.2], [14, Theorem 1.2], [3, Theorem 1.2(1)]) to (X, B) (or apply [10, Theorem 1.1] to the g-pair $(X, B, \mathbf{M} := \overline{-(K_X + B)})$; see also [26, Lemma 6.9]), we know that there exist at most 2 points on X where X is not klt. If $-K_X$ is big and nef, then by the Shokurov-Kollár connectedness principle, there exists exactly 1 point on X where X is not klt.

Thus there exists an extraction $f : Y \rightarrow X$ and a divisor $E \geq 0$ on X , such that Y is klt, $1 \leq \rho(Y) - \rho(X) \leq 2$, $K_Y + E = f^*(K_X + B)$, (Y, E) is lc, and $-(K_Y + E)$ is nef. Moreover, $\rho(Y) - \rho(X) = 1$ when $-K_X$ is big and nef. In particular, $K_Y \not\equiv 0$. By Theorem 1.3(3),

$n(Y) \leq 2\rho(Y) + 4$, hence $n(X) \leq n(Y) + 2 \leq 2\rho(X) + 10$, and $n(X) \leq n(Y) + 1 \leq 2\rho(X) + 7$ when $-K_X$ is big and nef. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.3. We only left to prove (1), which follows from (3)(4)(5)(6). \square

Proof of Theorem 1.2. It follows from Theorem 1.3(2). \square

4. EXAMPLES ON SURFACES

In this section, we discuss how far our bounds in Theorem 1.3 are away from being optimal. The following Example-Proposition shows that even when $\rho(X) = 2$,

- (1) the assumption “ $-(K_X + B)$ is nef” is necessary in Theorem 1.3,
- (2) Theorem 1.3(2) is optimal even when X is klt Fano, and
- (3) Theorem 1.3(3) is optimal.

Example-Proposition 4.1. *Let n be a positive integer, $Z := \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$, and $z_i := (u_i, v_i) \in Z$ closed points in Z for any $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ such that $u_i \neq u_j$ for any $i \neq j$. We let $p_1 : Z \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$ and $p_2 : Z \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$ are the first and second projection of Z to \mathbb{P}^1 , and $L_i := p_1^*u_i$ and $R_i := p_2^*v_i$ for each i .*

We let $f : Y \rightarrow Z$ be the blow-up of z_1, \dots, z_n . For each i , we let E_i be the exceptional curve of f over z_i , $L_{i,Y} := f_^{-1}L_i$, $R_{i,Y} := f_*^{-1}R_i$, and $y_i := L_{i,Y} \cap E_i$. We let $g : X \rightarrow Y$ be the blow-up of y_1, \dots, y_n . For each i , we let F_i be the exceptional curve of g over y_i , $L_{i,X} := g_*^{-1}L_{i,Y}$, $R_{i,X} := g_*^{-1}R_{i,Y}$, and $E_{i,X} := g_*^{-1}E_i$.*

*We let $h : X \rightarrow S$ be the contraction of $E_{1,X}, \dots, E_{n,X}$ and $L_{1,X}, \dots, L_{n,X}$. For each i , we let $F_{i,S} := h_*F_i$, $R_{i,S} := h_*R_{i,X}$, $s_i := h(E_{i,X})$, and $t_i := h(L_{i,X})$. Then s_1, \dots, s_n and t_1, \dots, t_n are the only singular points on S and are $\frac{1}{2}(1, 1)$ singularities.*

- (1) When $t_1 = t_2 \cdots = t_n$, $-K_S$ is effective.
- (2) When $n = 4$ and $t_1 = t_3 \neq t_2 = t_4$, (S, B) is lc log Calabi-Yau for some B .
- (3) When $n = 3$ and $t_i \neq t_j$ for any $i \neq j$, S is klt Fano.

Proof. Most of the proofs are elementary computations on pullbacks and pushforwards of divisors which we omit. In (1), $-K_S \sim 4F_{1,S} + 2R_{1,S} \geq 0$. In (2), we may pick $B = R_{1,S} + R_{2,S}$. In (3), $-K_S \sim 2R_{i,S}$, $R_{i,S}^2 = \frac{1}{2}$, $s_i \in R_{i,S}$, and $t_i \in R_{j,S}$ for any $i \neq j$. Thus $-K_S$ is nef and big and we may let $\phi : S \rightarrow T$ be the ample model of $-K_S$.

If $S \neq T$, then $-K_S$ is not ample, and ϕ contracts an irreducible curve $C \subset S$ such that $-K_S \cdot C = 0$. Since $\rho(S) = 2$, T is a klt Fano variety and $\rho(T) = 1$. Since $-K_S \sim 2R_{i,S}$ for any i and $R_{i,S}^2 > 0$, C does not intersect $R_{i,S}$ for any i , so C is contained in the smooth locus of S . Thus $n(T) \geq n(S) = 6$, which contradicts Theorem 1.1.

Thus $S = T$, hence $-K_S$ is ample, and we are done. \square

The following example shows that even when $\rho(X) = 1$ and X is Fano,

- (1) Theorem 1.1 is optimal,
- (2) the bound “ $2\rho(X) + 2$ ” is not enough if X is not klt, and
- (3) the assumption “ (X, B) is lc” is necessary for Theorem 1.3.

Example 4.2. Assumptions and notations as in Example-Proposition 4.1 and assume that $t_1 = t_2 \cdots = t_n$. Let $R' := p_2^*v$ for some $v \neq v_1$, and $R'_S := h_*((f \circ g)_*^{-1}R')$. Since the intersection matrix of $R_{1,X} \cup_{i=1}^n (E_{i,X} \cup L_{i,X})$ is negative definite, there exists a contraction $\phi : S \rightarrow T$ of $R_{1,S}$. In particular, $\rho(T) = 1$. Since

$$D := -(K_S + \frac{2(n-2)}{n}R_{1,S}) \sim 4F_{1,S} + \frac{4}{n}R_{1,S}$$

is big and nef and ϕ -trivial, and since $nD \sim 4nF_{1,S} + 4R_{1,S} \sim 4nF_{2,S} + 4R_{1,S} \sim 4R'_S$, $|nD|$ is base-point-free and defines ϕ . Thus $nD \sim \phi^* \phi_*(nD)$, and in particular, $-K_T = \phi_* D$ is ample. Since $a(R_{1,S}, T, 0) = \frac{4-n}{n}$, we have:

- (1) When $n = 3$, T is a klt Fano surface, $\rho(T) = 1$ and $n(T) = 4$.
- (2) When $n = 4$, T is an lc Fano surface, $\rho(T) = 1$ and $n(T) = 5 > 2\rho(T) + 2$.
- (3) When $n \geq 5$, T is a non-lc Fano surface, $\rho(T) = 1$ and $n(T) = n + 1$. When $n \rightarrow +\infty$, $n(T) \rightarrow +\infty$.

The following well-known example shows that Theorem 1.3(5) is optimal:

Example 4.3. Some Kummer surfaces are canonical K3 surfaces with 16 singular points.

We do not know if Theorem 1.3(4)(6) are optimal or not even when $\rho(X) = 1$, and we do not now if Theorem 1.3(2)(3) are optimal when $\rho(X)$ is large. We guess that under the assumption of Theorem 1.3, $n(X) \leq \rho(X) + C$ for some constant number C , but we do not know how to prove this yet. The next example shows that the linear term $\rho(X)$ is necessary in an expression of an upper bound of $n(X)$ even when X is klt Fano.

Example 4.4. Fix a positive integer $n \geq 2$, let $e_1 = (1, 0)$, $e_2 = (0, 1) \in \mathbb{R}^2$, and $u_{-1} = -e_1$, $u_i = ie_1 + (i^2 - 1)e_2$ ($0 \leq i \leq n$). Then each u_i is primitive. Now let Σ be the complete fan in $N_{\mathbb{R}} = \mathbb{R}^2$ generated by rays u_{-1}, u_0, \dots, u_n . Then the projective toric surface X_{Σ} is klt Fano with $\rho(X_{\Sigma}) = n + 2 - 2 = n$. The number of singular points corresponds to the number of non-smooth maximal cones in $\Sigma(2) = \{\text{Cone}(u_{i-1}, u_i), \text{Cone}(u_n, u_{-1}) \mid 0 \leq i \leq n\}$. Notice that $\text{Cone}(u_n, u_{-1}), \text{Cone}(u_{i-1}, u_i)$ ($2 \leq i \leq n$) are not smooth because none of $\{u_n, u_{-1}\}, \{u_{i-1}, u_i\}$ ($2 \leq i \leq n$) generates $N = \mathbb{Z}^2$. Thus X_{Σ} has exactly n singular points.

5. DISCUSSIONS

For toric varieties, the singular locus is torus invariant and thus can be nicely described as a disjoint union of torus orbits:

Theorem 5.1. *If X is a proper \mathbb{Q} -factorial toric variety of dimension d , then for any $2 \leq k \leq d$, there exists a polynomial h_k of degree $\leq \min\{k, d - 1\}$ such that the number of torus invariant singular points of codimension k on X is $\leq h_k(\rho(X))$.*

Proof. Let Σ be the complete fan in $N_{\mathbb{R}} \cong \mathbb{R}^d$ which defines X , then the cones in Σ are all simplicial and naturally gives a triangulation of $S^{d-1} \cong \{\mathbb{R}^d - 0\}/(x \sim \lambda x)$, where each cone of dimension $k \geq 1$ corresponds to a $(k - 1)$ -simplex.

Recall $\Sigma(k)$ is the set of k dimensional cones in Σ , then we have $\rho(X) + d = |\Sigma(1)|$ and $|\Sigma(k)| \leq \binom{|\Sigma(1)|}{k}$. Thus any $|\Sigma(k)|$ ($1 \leq k \leq d - 1$) is bounded by a polynomial of $\rho(X)$ with degree $\leq k$. Also, we have $1 - (-1)^d = \chi(S^{d-1}) = \sum_{k=1}^d (-1)^{k-1} |\Sigma(k)|$. Hence $|\Sigma(d)|$ is bounded by a polynomial of $\rho(X)$ with degree $\leq d - 1$. Since the torus invariant singular points correspond to torus orbits in $\text{Sing}(X)$, the statements follows directly by the orbit-cone correspondence theorem. □

It is natural to ask whether we can have a bound on the number of singular points in high dimensions for non-toric klt Fano varieties with bounded Picard number as well. However, the first question is: since the singular locus may be of dimension > 0 , how can we effectively define the “number of singular points” for a non-toric variety?

The most straightforward idea is to consider the number of isolated singular points. Unfortunately, we have the following counterexample for klt Fano varieties with only isolated singularities of Picard number 1 even in dimension 3. This example is given by Chen Jiang:

Example-Proposition 5.2. *Fix a positive integer k . Let $X = X_{6k+3} \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 3, 3, 3k + 1, 3k + 2)$ be a general hypersurface of degree $6k + 3$. Then*

- (1) *X is quasismooth klt Fano of Picard number 1, and*
- (2) *X contains exactly the following singularities:*
 - (a) *a cyclic quotient singularity of type $\frac{1}{3k+1}(1, 3, 3)$,*
 - (b) *a cyclic quotient singularity of type $\frac{1}{3k+2}(1, 3, 3)$, and*
 - (c) *$(2k + 1)$ cyclic quotient singularities of type $\frac{1}{3}(1, 1, 2)$.*

Proof. (1) follows from [19, Theorem 8.1] (see also [7, Theorem 2.7]) and [8, Theorem 3.2.4(i)]. (2) follows from (1) and [19, Section 9–10] (see also [7, Theorem 2.8]). \square

Nevertheless, we may still ask the following questions. These questions arise in personal communications of the first author with Paolo Cascini, Christopher D. Hacon, Jingjun Han and Chen Jiang during the summer of 2020.

Question 5.3. Let d, ρ be two positive integers. Does there exist a positive integer $N_1 = N_1(d, \rho)$, such that for any klt Fano variety X of dimension d with $\rho(X) \leq \rho$, the number of isolated non-terminal singularities of X is $\leq N_1$?

Question 5.4. Let d, ρ be two positive integers. Does there exist a positive integer $N_2 = N_2(d, \rho)$, such that for any klt Fano variety X of dimension d with $\rho(X) \leq \rho$, the number of codimension 2 singularities of X is $\leq N_2$?

Theorem 1.2 answers these two questions when $d = 2$, but both questions seem to be widely open in dimension ≥ 3 even when $\rho = 1$. We remark that if we have satisfactory answers for these questions in the Picard number 1 case, then the methods used in our paper are expected to be applied to prove the bounded Picard number cases.

For similar questions and results, we also refer the readers to [5].

REFERENCES

- [1] G. N. Belousov, *Del Pezzo surfaces with log terminal singularities*, Mat. Zametki **83** (2008), no. 2, 170–180 (Russian) English translate Math. Notes.
- [2] G. N. Belousov, *The maximal number of singular points on log del Pezzo surfaces*, J. Math. Sci. Univ. Tokyo **16** (2009), no. 2, 231–238.
- [3] C. Birkar, *On connectedness of non-klt loci of singularities of pairs*, arXiv: 2010.08226v1.
- [4] C. Birkar, P. Cascini, C.D. Hacon, and J. M^cKernan, *Existence of minimal models for varieties of log general type*. J. Amer. Math. Soc. **23** (2010), no. 2, 405–468.
- [5] M. Brown, J. McKernan, R. Svaldi, and H. R. Zong, *A geometric characterization of toric varieties*, Duke Math. J. **167** (2018), no. 5, 923–968.
- [6] C. Birkar and D.-Q. Zhang, *Effectivity of Iitaka fibrations and pluricanonical systems of polarized pairs*, Pub. Math. IHES., **123** (2016), 283–331.
- [7] M. Chen, C. Jiang, and B. Li, *On minimal varieties growing from quasismooth weighted hypersurfaces*, arXiv: 2005.09828v1.
- [8] I. Dolgachev, *Weighted projective varieties*, In: Group actions and vector fields (Vancouver, B.C., 1981), 34–71, Lecture Notes in Math., 956, Springer, Berlin, 1982.
- [9] S. Filipazzi, *On a generalized canonical bundle formula and generalized adjunction*, arXiv:1807.04847v3, to appear in Ann. Sc. Norm. Super. Pisa Cl. Sci. (5) (2018).
- [10] S. Filipazzi and R. Svaldi, *On the connectedness principle and dual complexes for generalized pairs*, arXiv: 2010.08018v2.
- [11] R. Friedman, *Algebraic surfaces and holomorphic vector bundles*, Universitext, Springer-Verlag, New York (1998).
- [12] M. Furushima, *Singular del Pezzo surfaces and analytic compactifications of 3-dimensional complex affine space \mathbb{C}^3* , Nagoya Math. J. **104** (1986), 1–28.
- [13] R. Hartshorne, *Algebraic geometry*, Springer-Verlag, New York-Heidelberg (1977). Graduate Texts in Mathematics, no. 52.

- [14] C. D. Hacon and J. Han, *On a connectedness principle of Shokurov-Kollár type*, Sci. China Math. **62** (2019), no. 3, 411–416.
- [15] J. Han, J. Liu, and V.V. Shokurov, *ACC for minimal log discrepancies for exceptional singularities*, arXiv: 1903.04338v2.
- [16] J. Han and W. Liu, *On a generalized canonical bundle formula for generically finite morphisms*, arXiv: 1905.12542v3, to appear in Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble).
- [17] J. Han and W. Liu, *On numerical nonvanishing for generalized log canonical pairs*, Doc. Math. **25** (2020), 93–123.
- [18] J. Han and Y. Luo, *On boundedness of divisors computing minimal log discrepancies for surfaces*, arXiv: 2005.09626v2.
- [19] A.R. Iano-Fletcher, *Working with weighted complete intersections*, In: Explicit birational geometry of 3-folds, 101–173, London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser., 281, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2000.
- [20] S. Keel and J. McKernan, *Rational curves on quasi-projective surfaces*, Memoirs AMS **140** (1999), no. 669.
- [21] J. Kollár and S. Mori, *Birational geometry of algebraic varieties*. Cambridge Tracts in Math. **134** (1997), Cambridge Univ. Press.
- [22] H. Matsumura, *Commutative ring theory*. Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, **8** (1989), Cambridge Univ. Press.
- [23] M. Miyanishi, D.-Q. Zhang, *Gorenstein log del Pezzo surfaces of rank one*, J. Algebra, 118:1 (1988), 63–84.
- [24] C. Peters, *On the maximal number of du Val singularities for a K3 surface*, arXiv: 2011.02808v2.
- [25] Y. Prokhorov, *Lectures on complements on log surfaces*, MSJ Memoirs, **10** (2001), Mathematical Society of Japan, Tokyo.
- [26] V.V. Shokurov, *3-fold log flips*. Izv. Ross. Akad. Nauk Ser. Mat., 56:105–203, 1992.
- [27] D.-Q. Zhang, *On Itaka surfaces*, Osaka J. Math. **46** (1987), 435–450.
- [28] D.-Q. Zhang, *Logarithmic del Pezzo surfaces of rank one with contractible boundaries*, Osaka J. Math. **25** (1988), no. 2, 461–497.
- [29] D.-Q. Zhang, *Logarithmic del Pezzo surfaces one with rational double and triple singular points*, Tohoku Math. J. (2) **41**:3 (1989), 399–452.

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

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