

**ON THE STRUCTURE OF A LOG SMOOTH PAIR  
IN THE EQUALITY CASE OF  
THE BOGOMOLOV-GIESEKER INEQUALITY**

MASATAKA IWAI

ABSTRACT. We study the structure of a log smooth pair when the equality holds in the Bogomolov-Gieseker inequality for the logarithmic tangent bundle and this bundle is semistable with respect to some ample divisor. We also study the case of the canonical extension sheaf.

CONTENTS

1.	Introduction	1
2.	Preliminaries	4
3.	Proofs	5
3.1.	Proof of Theorem 1.4	5
3.2.	Proof of Theorem 1.5	7
4.	Examples	7
4.1.	Projective spaces	8
4.2.	Hirzebruch surfaces	8
4.3.	On slope rationally connected varieties	10
5.	Question	11
	References	12

1. INTRODUCTION

Let  $E$  be a vector bundle on a smooth projective variety  $X$ . If  $E$  is semistable with respect to some ample divisor  $H$ , then the Bogomolov-Gieseker inequality holds:

$$\left( c_2(E) - \frac{r-1}{2r} c_1(E)^2 \right) H^{n-2} \geq 0.$$

If the equality holds, then  $E$  is projectively flat. Therefore, in the equality case of the Bogomolov-Gieseker inequality, the structure of a vector bundle is restricted. We are interested in the structure of  $X$  when the equality holds in the Bogomolov-Gieseker inequality for the tangent bundle  $T_X$  or the canonical extension sheaf  $\mathcal{E}$ . (We will define the canonical extension sheaf in Definition 1.3.) In [GKP20a] and

---

*Date:* April 29, 2021, version 0.01.

*2020 Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 32Q30, Secondary 14M22, 14E30, 32Q26.

*Key words and phrases.* Bogomolov-Gieseker inequality, Logarithmic tangent bundle, Log smooth pair, Projectively flat, Numerically projectively flat, Stability, Uniformization, Rational curve, MRC fibration, Rationally connected.

[GKP20b], under the some assumptions, we already know the structure of  $X$  in the equality case.

**Theorem 1.1.** [GKP20a, Theorem 1.3] *Let  $X$  be a projective klt variety. Assume that  $-K_X$  is nef. Then the following are equivalent.*

- (1) *There exists an ample Cartier divisor  $H$  on  $X$  such that the canonical extension sheaf  $\mathcal{E}$  is  $H$ -semistable and the equality holds in the Bogomolov-Gieseker inequality for  $\mathcal{E}$ :*

$$\left( \hat{c}_2(\mathcal{E}) - \frac{n}{2(n+1)} \hat{c}_1(\mathcal{E})^2 \right) [H]^{n-2} = \left( \hat{c}_2(\Omega_X^{[1]}) - \frac{n}{2(n+1)} \hat{c}_1(\Omega_X^{[1]})^2 \right) [H]^{n-2} = 0.$$

- (2)  *$X$  is a quotient of a projective space or an Abelian variety by the action of a finite group of automorphisms without fixed points in codimension one.*

**Theorem 1.2.** [GKP20b, Theorem 1.2] *Let  $X$  be a projective klt variety of dimension  $n \geq 2$  and  $H$  be an ample divisor on  $X$ . If  $\Omega_X^{[1]}$  is  $H$ -semistable and*

$$\left( \hat{c}_2(\Omega_X^{[1]}) - \frac{n-1}{2n} \hat{c}_1(\Omega_X^{[1]})^2 \right) [H]^{n-2} = 0,$$

*then  $X$  is a quasi-Abelian variety, that is, there exists a quasi-étale cover  $\tilde{X} \rightarrow X$  from an Abelian variety  $\tilde{X}$  to  $X$ .*

We point out that  $\Omega_X^1$  is  $H$ -semistable if and only if  $T_X$  is  $H$ -semistable,  $c_1(\Omega_X^1)^2 = c_1(T_X)^2 = c_1(\mathcal{E})^2$ , and  $c_2(\Omega_X^1) = c_2(T_X) = c_2(\mathcal{E})$  for any smooth projective variety  $X$  and the canonical extension sheaf  $\mathcal{E}$ . By Theorem 1.1 and 1.2, we have the structure theorem of a klt variety  $X$  when the equality holds in the Bogomolov-Gieseker inequality for the tangent sheaf  $T_X$  (or the canonical extension sheaf  $\mathcal{E}$ ) and this sheaf is  $H$ -semistable.

In this paper, we study a generalization of Theorem 1.1 and 1.2 to a log smooth pair  $(X, D)$ . Before the main theorems, we recall the definition of the canonical extension sheaf.

**Definition 1.3.** [Li18, Proposition 2.10], [GKP20a, Chapter 4] *Let  $X$  be a smooth projective variety,  $D$  be a simple normal crossing divisor on  $X$ , and  $L$  be a line bundle on  $X$ . By the natural homomorphism of cohomology groups*

$$H^1(X, \mathcal{O}_X^*) \xrightarrow{c_1} H^1(X, \Omega_X^1) \xrightarrow{\Phi} H^1(X, \Omega_X^1(\log D)) = \text{Ext}^1(\mathcal{O}_X, \Omega_X^1(\log D)),$$

*there exist a vector bundle  $W_L$  induced by  $\Phi(c_1(L))$  and the following exact sequence*

$$0 \rightarrow \Omega_X^1(\log D) \rightarrow W_L \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X \rightarrow 0.$$

*Let  $\mathcal{E}_L$  be a dual bundle of  $W_L$ . Then we have*

$$(1.1) \quad 0 \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X \rightarrow \mathcal{E}_L \rightarrow T_X(-\log D) \rightarrow 0.$$

$\mathcal{E}_L$  is called the *extension sheaf of  $T_X(-\log D)$  by  $\mathcal{O}_X$  with the extension class  $c_1(L)$* . In particular,  $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{O}_X(-K_X+D)}$  is called the *canonical extension sheaf of  $T_X(-\log D)$  by  $\mathcal{O}_X$* .

By [Tia92, Theorem 0.1], if  $D = 0$  and a Fano variety  $X$  has a Kähler-Einstein metric, then the canonical extension sheaf  $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{O}_X(-K_X)}$  is  $-K_X$ -semistable. In the case of a log smooth pair, by [Li18, Theorem 1.4], if  $(X, D)$  is a log smooth log-Calabi-Yau pair, then the extension sheaf  $\mathcal{E}_H$  is  $H$ -semistable for any ample line bundle  $H$ . It is easily seen that  $c_1(\mathcal{E}_L) = c_1(T_X(-\log D))$  and  $c_2(\mathcal{E}_L) = c_2(T_X(-\log D))$ .

Now we state the main results.

**Theorem 1.4.** *Let  $X$  be a smooth projective variety of dimension  $n \geq 2$ ,  $D$  be a simple normal crossing divisor on  $X$ , and  $H$  be an ample divisor on  $X$ . Assume that  $-(K_X + D)$  is nef.*

*If the extension sheaf  $\mathcal{E}_L$  is  $H$ -semistable for some line bundle  $L$  and*

$$(1.2) \quad \left( c_2(T_X(-\log D)) - \frac{n}{2(n+1)} c_1(T_X(-\log D))^2 \right) H^{n-2} = 0,$$

*then one of the following statements holds.*

- (1)  $(X, D)$  is a toric fiber bundle over a finite étale quotient of an Abelian variety. Strictly speaking, there exists a smooth morphism  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  such that  $Y$  is a finite étale quotient of an Abelian variety (i.e. there exists a finite étale cover  $A \rightarrow Y$  from an Abelian variety  $A$  to  $Y$ ),  $f : (X, D) \rightarrow Y$  is locally trivial for the analytic topology, and any fiber  $F$  of  $f$  is a smooth toric variety with a boundary divisor  $D|_F$ .
- (2)  $(X, D)$  is isomorphic to  $(\mathbb{P}^n, 0)$ .

**Theorem 1.5.** *Let  $X$  be a smooth projective variety of dimension  $n \geq 2$ ,  $D$  be a simple normal crossing divisor on  $X$ , and  $H$  be an ample divisor on  $X$ . Assume that  $-(K_X + D)$  is nef.*

*If  $T_X(-\log D)$  is  $H$ -semistable and*

$$(1.3) \quad \left( c_2(T_X(-\log D)) - \frac{n-1}{2n} c_1(T_X(-\log D))^2 \right) H^{n-2} = 0,$$

*then one of the following statements holds.*

- (1)  $(X, D)$  is a toric fiber bundle over a finite étale quotient of an Abelian variety.
- (2)  $X$  is rationally connected,  $K_X + D \neq 0$ , and there exists a Cartier divisor  $B$  on  $X$  such that  $T_X(-\log D) \cong \mathcal{O}_X(B)^{\oplus n}$ .

*Moreover, if (2) holds and  $(X, D)$  is a Mori fiber space, then  $(X, D)$  is isomorphic to  $(\mathbb{P}^n, H_{\mathbb{P}^n})$ , where  $H_{\mathbb{P}^n}$  is a hyperplane of  $\mathbb{P}^n$ .*

As a difference from Theorem 1.2, even if  $T_X(-\log D)$  is  $H$ -semistable and Equality (1.3) holds,  $(X, D)$  is not necessarily a toric fiber bundle over a finite étale quotient of an Abelian variety. In fact, we obtain the following examples which are different from toric fiber bundles.

**Proposition 1.6** (= Subsection 4.1 and Subsection 4.2).

- (1) Let  $H_{\mathbb{P}^n}$  be a hyperplane of  $\mathbb{P}^n$ . Then  $-(K_{\mathbb{P}^n} + H_{\mathbb{P}^n})$  is nef,  $T_{\mathbb{P}^n}(-\log H_{\mathbb{P}^n})$  is  $H_{\mathbb{P}^n}$ -semistable, and Equality (1.3) holds.
- (2) Let  $m$  be a positive integer and  $\mathbb{F}_m := \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1} \oplus \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(-m))$  be a Hirzebruch surface. Then there exists a simple normal crossing divisor  $D$  on  $\mathbb{F}_m$  such that  $-(K_{\mathbb{F}_m} + D)$  is nef,  $T_{\mathbb{F}_m}(-\log D)$  is  $H$ -semistable, Equality (1.3) holds,

and  $(\mathbb{F}_m, D)$  is not a Mori fiber space. Moreover, if  $m \geq 2$ , then a minimal model of  $(\mathbb{F}_m, D)$  is not isomorphic to  $(\mathbb{P}^2, H_{\mathbb{P}^2})$ .

Therefore we do not completely know the structure of  $(X, D)$  when (2) in Theorem 1.5 holds. We will discuss about it in Section 5.

By Theorem 1.4 and [Li18, Theorem 1.4], we obtain the following corollary.<sup>1</sup>

**Corollary 1.7** (A characterization of a toric fiber bundle). *Let  $(X, D)$  and  $H$  be as in Theorem 1.4. If  $c_1(K_X + D) = 0$  and  $c_2(T_X(-\log D))H^{n-2} = 0$ , then  $(X, D)$  is a toric fiber bundle over a finite étale quotient of an Abelian variety.*

We recall some earlier works related to the structure theorem of a log smooth pair  $(X, D)$ . In [Tsu88, Theorem 1] and [TY87, Theorem 3.1], under the assumption that  $K_X + D$  is nef, big, and ample modulo  $D$ , if the equality holds in the Miyaoka-Yau inequality, then the universal cover of  $X \setminus D$  is a unit ball in  $\mathbb{C}^n$ . In [Den20, Theorem A], if the natural log Higgs bundle  $(\Omega_X^1(\log D) \oplus \mathcal{O}_X, \theta)$  is  $H$ -polystable and the equality holds in the Bogomolov-Gieseker inequality, then  $X \setminus D \cong \mathbb{B}^n/\Gamma$ , where  $\mathbb{B}^n$  is a unit ball in  $\mathbb{C}^n$  and  $\Gamma$  is a lattice of  $PU(n, 1)$ . In the above works, they studied the structure of  $(X, D)$  when  $\Omega_X^1(\log D)$  is positive. In [DLB20, Corollary 1.7], if  $T_X(-\log D)$  is numerically flat, then  $(X, D)$  is a toric fiber bundle over a finite étale quotient of an Abelian variety. In this work, they studied the structure of  $(X, D)$  when  $T_X(-\log D)$  is flat.

Under the assumptions in Theorem 1.4 or 1.5, we know that  $T_X(-\log D)$  is nef. Therefore, in this paper, we study the structure of  $(X, D)$  when  $T_X(-\log D)$  is (semi)positive.

**Acknowledgment.** The author would like to thank Prof. Osamu Fujino for answering his questions and pointing out his crucial mistakes in the first draft of this paper. He also would like to thank Prof. Shin-ichi Matsumura for some discussions and helpful comments. He also would like to thank Prof. Chi Li for answering his questions. The author was supported by the public interest incorporated foundation Fujukai and by Foundation of Research Fellows, The Mathematical Society of Japan. This work was partly supported by Osaka City University Advanced Mathematical Institute (MEXT Joint Usage/Research Center on Mathematics and Theoretical Physics JPMXP0619217849). This work was supported by the Research Institute for Mathematical Sciences, an International Joint Usage/Research Center located in Kyoto University.

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

Throughout this paper, we work over the field  $\mathbb{C}$  of complex numbers. We denote  $\mathcal{H}om(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{O}_X)$  by  $\mathcal{F}^\vee$  for any torsion-free coherent sheaf  $\mathcal{F}$  on any variety  $X$ . A pair  $(X, D)$  is *log smooth* if  $X$  is a smooth projective variety and  $D$  is a simple normal crossing divisor on  $X$ .

We recall the definition of numerically projectively flat.

---

<sup>1</sup>We emphasize that Corollary 1.7 is also an easy consequence of [DLB20, Corollary 1.7] and [Li18, Theorem 1.4]. In Remark 3.1, we give another short proof of [DLB20, Corollary 1.7].

**Theorem-Definition 2.1.** [Nak04, Theorem 4.1][LOY20, Definition 4.1] Let  $X$  be a smooth projective variety of dimension  $n \geq 2$  and  $\mathcal{E}$  be a rank  $r$  reflexive coherent sheaf on  $X$ . Then the following are equivalent.

- (1)  $\mathcal{E}\langle\frac{\det \mathcal{E}^\vee}{r}\rangle$  is nef. (For the definition of a  $\mathbb{Q}$ -twisted coherent sheaf, see [LOY20, Definition 3.1])
- (2)  $\mathcal{E}$  is semistable with respect to some ample divisor  $H$  and

$$\left(c_2(\mathcal{E}) - \frac{r-1}{2r}c_1(\mathcal{E})^2\right)H^{n-2} = 0.$$

If (1) or (2) holds, then  $\mathcal{E}$  is called *numerically projectively flat*.

By [Nak04, Theorem 4.1], if  $\mathcal{E}$  is numerically projectively flat, then  $\mathcal{E}$  is a vector bundle. By [LOY20, Lemma 4.3], if  $\mathcal{E}$  is numerically projectively flat, then  $\mathcal{E}^\vee$  is so. We have the following corollary by [LOY20, Theorem 1.7] and [Kob87, Corollary 2.7].

**Corollary 2.2.** *If  $X$  is simply connected and  $E$  is numerically projectively flat, then there exists a line bundle  $L$  such that  $E \cong L^{\oplus r}$ , where  $r$  is a rank of  $E$ .*

### 3. PROOFS

#### 3.1. Proof of Theorem 1.4.

*Proof.* By Theorem-Definition 2.1,  $\mathcal{E}_L\langle\frac{\det \mathcal{E}_L^\vee}{n+1}\rangle$  is nef. Hence  $T_X(-\log D)\langle\frac{K_X+D}{n+1}\rangle$  is also nef by (1.1). Since  $-(K_X + D)$  is nef,  $T_X(-\log D)$  is nef by [LOY20, Lemma 4.3]. By [Fjn20, Lemma 3.1.12],  $T_X$  is pseudo-effective.<sup>2</sup> By [HIM21, Theorem 1.1], there exists a smooth morphism  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  such that  $Y$  is a finite étale quotient of an Abelian variety and any fiber  $F$  of  $f$  is rationally connected.

*Claim 1.*  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  is locally a projection of a product space as well as the restriction of  $f$  to  $D$ , i.e. for any  $x \in X$ , there exist an open neighborhood  $U$  of  $x$  and an isomorphism  $\phi : U \rightarrow V \times W$ , where  $V := f(U)$  and  $W := U \cap f^{-1}(f(x))$ , such that the following diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} U & \xrightarrow{\phi} & V \times W \\ & \searrow f & \swarrow \text{projection} \\ & & V \end{array}$$

is commutative and  $\phi(U \cap D) = V \times (W \cap D)$ .

In particular,  $f : (X, D) \rightarrow Y$  is a logarithmic deformation in the sense of [Kaw78, Definition 3].

*Proof.* By a differential map  $f^*\Omega_Y^1 \rightarrow \Omega_X^1$ , we obtain an injective morphism  $s : f^*\Omega_Y^1 \rightarrow \Omega_X^1(\log D)$ . Hence we obtain a morphism

$$\wedge^{\dim Y} s : f^* \det \Omega_Y^1 \rightarrow \wedge^{\dim Y} \Omega_X^1(\log D).$$

Since  $\wedge^{\dim Y} s$  belongs to  $H^0(X, \wedge^{\dim Y} \Omega_X^1(\log D) \otimes f^* \det T_Y)$  and  $\wedge^{\dim Y} T_X(-\log D) \otimes f^* \det \Omega_Y^1$  is nef,  $\wedge^{\dim Y} s$  has no zero point on  $X$  by [CP91, Proposition 1.2].

<sup>2</sup>A vector bundle  $E$  is *pseudo-effective* if  $E$  is weakly positive in the sense of Nakayama in [Nak04, Definition 3.20]

Fix  $x \in X$ . Let  $U$  be a neighborhood of  $x$ ,  $(z_1, \dots, z_n)$  be a local coordinate on  $U$ , and  $\Delta$  be a unit disk of  $\mathbb{C}$ . We may regard  $U$  as  $\Delta^n$  and regard  $x \in U$  as an origin. We may assume that  $D \cap U = \{z_{n-r+1} \cdots z_n = 0\}$ . Set  $m := \dim Y$  and  $V := f(U)$ . Let  $(w_1, \dots, w_m)$  be a local coordinate on  $V$ . Then  $f$  is written in  $U$  as follows:

$$f : \quad U \quad \rightarrow \quad V \\ (z_1, \dots, z_n) \mapsto (f_1(z), \dots, f_m(z)).$$

Define  $m \times n$  matrix  $J$  as follows:

$$J := \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial f_1}{\partial z_1} & \cdots & \frac{\partial f_1}{\partial z_{n-r}} & \frac{\partial f_1}{\partial z_{n-r+1}} z_{n-r+1} & \cdots & \frac{\partial f_1}{\partial z_n} z_n \\ \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ \frac{\partial f_m}{\partial z_1} & \cdots & \frac{\partial f_m}{\partial z_{n-r}} & \frac{\partial f_m}{\partial z_{n-r+1}} z_{n-r+1} & \cdots & \frac{\partial f_m}{\partial z_n} z_n \end{pmatrix}.$$

Set  $\mathcal{I} := \{(i_1, i_2, \dots, i_m) \in \mathbb{N}^m \mid 1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \cdots < i_m \leq n\}$ . For any  $I = (i_1, \dots, i_m) \in \mathcal{I}$ ,  $J_I$  is defined by the determinant of  $(J_{k,i_l})_{1 \leq k, l \leq m}$ . Then we have

$$f^*(dw_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge dw_m) = \sum_{I=(i_1, \dots, i_m) \in \mathcal{I}} J_I \delta_{i_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge \delta_{i_m},$$

where  $\delta_i$  is defined by

$$\delta_i := \begin{cases} dz_i & (1 \leq i \leq n-r) \\ \frac{dz_i}{z_i} & (n-r+1 \leq i \leq n). \end{cases}$$

Since  $\wedge^{\dim Y} s$  has no zero point,  $f^*(dw_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge dw_m)$  also has no zero point at  $x = (0, \dots, 0)$ . Therefore  $m \leq n-r$  and there exists  $I_0 = (i_1, i_2, \dots, i_m) \in \mathcal{I}$  such that  $J_{I_0}(x) \neq 0$  and  $1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \cdots < i_m \leq n-r$ . We may assume that  $I_0 = (1, 2, \dots, m)$  and  $J_{I_0}$  has no zero point on  $U$ . Hence we define a morphism  $\phi$  as follows:

$$\phi : \quad U \quad \rightarrow \quad V \times \Delta^{n-m} \\ (z_1, \dots, z_n) \mapsto (f_1(z), \dots, f_m(z), z_{m+1}, \dots, z_n),$$

then  $\phi$  is isomorphism and  $\phi(U \cap D) = V \times (\Delta^{n-m} \cap D)$ .  $\square$

Hence any fiber  $F$  of  $f$  intersects  $D$  transversally. Set  $D_F := D|_F$ , then  $(K_{X/Y} + D)|_F = K_F + D_F$ . By [KK08, Lemma 2.14],

$$(3.1) \quad 0 \rightarrow T_F(-\log D_F) \rightarrow T_X(-\log D)|_F \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_F^{\oplus \dim Y} \rightarrow 0.$$

In particular,  $T_F(-\log D_F)$  is nef.

First, we consider the case where  $K_F + D_F \equiv 0$  for any fiber  $F$  of  $f$ . In this case,  $T_F(-\log D_F)$  is numerically flat. Since  $F$  is rationally connected,  $T_F(-\log D_F)$  is trivial. Hence  $F$  is a smooth toric variety with a boundary divisor  $D|_F$  by [Win04, Corollary 1]. From  $H^1(F, T_F(-\log D_F)) = 0$ ,  $f : (X, D) \rightarrow Y$  is isotrivial by [Kaw78, Corollary 2].

Second, we consider the case where there exists a fiber  $F$  of  $f$  with  $K_F + D_F \not\equiv 0$ . Since  $T_X(-\log D) \langle \frac{K_X + D}{n+1} \rangle$  is nef,  $T_X(-\log D)|_F \langle \frac{K_F + D_F}{n+1} \rangle$  is also nef. If  $\dim Y \neq 0$ , then  $K_F + D_F$  is nef by (3.1) and [LOY20, Corollary 3.3], hence  $K_F + D_F \equiv 0$ , which is impossible. Therefore  $\dim Y = 0$  and  $X$  is rationally connected. By Corollary 2.2, there exists a Cartier divisor  $B$  on  $X$  such that  $\mathcal{E}_L \cong \mathcal{O}_X(B)^{\oplus (n+1)}$ . Thus

$-(K_X + D) \sim (n + 1)B$ . Since  $K_X + D$  is not nef, by [FM20, Theorem 2.1],  $X \cong \mathbb{P}^n$  and  $D = 0$ .  $\square$

*Remark 3.1.* We give another proof of [DLB20, Corollary 1.7]. If  $T_X(-\log D)$  is numerically flat, then by Claim 1,  $(X, D)$  is a logarithmic deformation over  $Y$  such that  $Y$  is a finite étale quotient of an Abelian variety. By (3.1),  $T_F(-\log D_F)$  is numerically flat for any fiber  $F$ . Therefore, by the same argument of Theorem 1.4,  $(F, D_F)$  is a toric variety and  $(X, D)$  is a toric fiber bundle over  $Y$ .

### 3.2. Proof of Theorem 1.5.

*Proof.* By the proof of Theorem 1.4, if  $T_X(-\log D)$  is numerically projectively flat, then (1) or (2) in Theorem 1.5 holds. We show that, if (2) in Theorem 1.5 holds and  $(X, D)$  is a Mori fiber space, then  $(X, D)$  is isomorphic to  $(\mathbb{P}^n, H_{\mathbb{P}^n})$ .

Let  $\phi : (X, D) \rightarrow Z$  be a Mori fiber space. We show that  $\dim Z = 0$ . To obtain a contradiction, assume that  $\dim Z \neq 0$ . Let  $F$  be a general fiber of  $\phi$ . Notice that  $\dim F \leq n - 1$ . Set  $D_F := D|_F$ , then

$$-(K_F + D_F) = -(K_{X/Z} + D)|_F \sim nB|_F.$$

Since  $B|_F$  is ample, we obtain  $F \cong \mathbb{P}^{n-1}$ ,  $\mathcal{O}_F(B|_F) = \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^{n-1}}(1)$ , and  $D_F = 0$  by [FM20, Theorem 2.1]. By [KK08, Lemma 2.14], we have

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_F^{\oplus \dim Z} \rightarrow \Omega_X^1(\log D)|_F \rightarrow \Omega_F^1(\log D_F) = \Omega_F^1 \rightarrow 0.$$

Hence we obtain a group homomorphism

$$H^1(F, \Omega_X^1(\log D)|_F) \rightarrow H^1(F, \Omega_F^1) \rightarrow H^2(F, \mathcal{O}_F)^{\oplus \dim Z}.$$

From  $n \geq 2$ ,

$$H^1(F, \Omega_X^1(\log D)|_F) = H^1(F, \mathcal{O}_X(-B)^{\oplus n}|_F) = H^1(\mathbb{P}^{n-1}, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^{n-1}}(-1))^{\oplus n} = 0$$

and  $H^2(F, \mathcal{O}_F)^{\oplus \dim Z} = H^2(\mathbb{P}^{n-1}, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^{n-1}})^{\oplus \dim Z} = 0$ . Hence  $H^1(F, \Omega_F^1) = 0$ , which is impossible since the Picard number of  $F$  is one.

Hence  $(X, D)$  is log Fano. If  $D = 0$ , then we obtain

$$H^1(X, \Omega_X^1) = H^1(X, \mathcal{O}_X(-B))^{\oplus n} = H^1(X, \mathcal{O}_X(K_X + (n - 1)B))^{\oplus n} = 0,$$

which is impossible since the Picard number of  $X$  is non zero. Hence  $D \neq 0$ . Since the log Fano index of  $(X, D)$  is more than or equal to  $n$ , by [Fjt14, Proposition 4.1],  $(X, D) \cong (\mathbb{P}^n, H_{\mathbb{P}^n})$ .  $\square$

## 4. EXAMPLES

We recall the first Chern class and the second Chern class of a logarithmic tangent bundle. Let  $X$  be a smooth variety and  $D = \sum_{i=1}^l D_i$  be a simple normal crossing divisor on  $X$ . By [GT16, Example 3.5], we have  $c_1(T_X(-\log D)) = -(K_X + D)$  and

$$c_2(T_X(-\log D)) = c_2(T_X) + K_X D + D^2 - \sum_{i < j} D_i D_j.$$

**4.1. Projective spaces.** In Subsection 4.1, let  $n$  be a positive integer with  $n \geq 2$  and  $H$  be a hyperplane of  $\mathbb{P}^n$ .

**Lemma 4.1.**  *$-(K_{\mathbb{P}^n} + H)$  is nef and the equality holds in the Bogomolov-Gieseker inequality for  $T_{\mathbb{P}^n}(-\log H)$ :*

$$(4.1) \quad \left( c_2(T_{\mathbb{P}^n}(-\log H)) - \frac{n-1}{2n} c_1(T_{\mathbb{P}^n}(-\log H))^2 \right) H^{n-2} = 0.$$

*Proof.* From  $c_1(T_{\mathbb{P}^n}) = (n+1)H$  and  $c_2(T_{\mathbb{P}^n}) = \frac{n(n+1)}{2}H^2$ , we have  $c_1(T_{\mathbb{P}^n}(-\log H)) = nH$  and

$$c_2(T_{\mathbb{P}^n}(-\log H)) = \left( \frac{n(n+1)}{2} - (n+1) + 1 \right) H^2 = \frac{n(n-1)}{2} H^2.$$

Hence  $-(K_{\mathbb{P}^n} + H)$  is nef and Equality (4.1) holds.  $\square$

**Proposition 4.2.**

- (1) For any  $1 \leq r \leq n$ , if  $-r < x$ , then  $H^0(\mathbb{P}^n, \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^n}^r(\log H) \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n}(-x)) = 0$ .
- (2)  $T_{\mathbb{P}^n}(-\log H)$  is numerically projectively flat. In particular,  $T_{\mathbb{P}^n}(-\log H) \cong \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n}(H)^{\oplus n}$  holds.

*Proof.* The proof is the same as [CI14, Lemma 2.1 and Proposition 5.2].

(1). Fix  $1 \leq r \leq n$ . For any torsion-free coherent sheaf  $\mathcal{F}$  on  $\mathbb{P}^n$ , the slope  $\mu_H(\mathcal{F})$  with respect to  $H$  is defined by  $\mu_H(\mathcal{F}) := \frac{c_1(\mathcal{F})H^{n-1}}{\text{rank}\mathcal{F}}$ . By [EV92, Properties 2.3],

$$(4.2) \quad 0 \rightarrow \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^n}^r \rightarrow \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^n}^r(\log H) \rightarrow \Omega_H^{r-1} \rightarrow 0.$$

Since  $\Omega_{\mathbb{P}^n}^r$  is  $H$ -semistable and  $\mu_H(\Omega_{\mathbb{P}^n}^r) = \frac{-r(n+1)}{n}$ , if  $\frac{-r(n+1)}{n} < x$ , then  $H^0(\mathbb{P}^n, \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^n}^r \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n}(-x)) = 0$ . By the same argument, if  $\frac{-(r-1)n}{n-1} < x$ , then  $H^0(H, \Omega_H^{r-1} \otimes \mathcal{O}_H(-x)) = 0$ . Therefore by (4.2), if  $-r < x$ , then  $H^0(\mathbb{P}^n, \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^n}^r(\log H) \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n}(-x)) = 0$ .

(2). By Theorem-Definition 2.1 and Lemma 4.1, it is enough to show that  $\Omega_{\mathbb{P}^n}^1(\log H)$  is  $H$ -semistable. To obtain a contradiction, assume that there exists a rank  $r$  torsion-free coherent sheaf  $\mathcal{F} \subset \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^n}^1(\log H)$  with  $\mu_H(\mathcal{F}) > \mu_H(\Omega_{\mathbb{P}^n}^1(\log H)) = -1$ . Let  $x$  be a real number with  $\det \mathcal{F} \cong \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n}(x)$ . By the assumption,  $\mu_H(\mathcal{F}) = \frac{x}{r} > -1$ . From  $\det \mathcal{F} \subset \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^n}^r(\log H)$ , we have  $H^0(\mathbb{P}^n, \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^n}^r(\log H) \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n}(-x)) \neq 0$ , contrary to (1).  $\square$

**4.2. Hirzebruch surfaces.** In Subsection 4.2, let  $m$  be a positive integer,  $\mathbb{F}_m := \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1} \oplus \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(-m))$  be a Hirzebruch surface, and  $\sigma : \mathbb{F}_m \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$  be the ruling of  $\mathbb{F}_m$ . By [Har77, Proposition 2.8], there exists a section  $C_0$  with  $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{F}_m}(C_0) \cong \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{F}_m}(1)$ . Let  $f$  be a fiber of  $\sigma$ . By [Har77, Theorem 2.17], there exists a section  $C_\infty$  with  $C_\infty \sim C_0 + mf$ . Set  $D := C_0 + C_\infty$ . Notice that  $D$  is a simple normal crossing divisor on  $\mathbb{F}_m$ .

**Lemma 4.3.**  *$-(K_{\mathbb{F}_m} + D)$  is nef and the equality holds in the Bogomolov-Gieseker inequality for  $T_{\mathbb{F}_m}(-\log D)$ :*

$$(4.3) \quad c_2(T_{\mathbb{F}_m}(-\log D)) - \frac{1}{4} c_1(T_{\mathbb{F}_m}(-\log D))^2 = 0.$$



*Proof.* We have  $(C_0)^2 = -m$ ,  $C_0f = 1$ , and  $f^2 = 0$ . From

$$(4.4) \quad -(K_{\mathbb{F}_m} + D) \sim (2C_0 + (m+2)f) - (2C_0 + mf) = 2f,$$

$-(K_{\mathbb{F}_m} + D)$  is nef and  $c_1(T_{\mathbb{F}_m}(-\log D))^2 = (2f)^2 = 0$ . From

$$c_2(T_{\mathbb{F}_m}) = c_1(T_{\mathbb{F}_m/\mathbb{P}^1})c_1(\sigma^*T_{\mathbb{P}^1}) = (2C_0 + mf)2f = 4,$$

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} c_2(T_{\mathbb{F}_m}(-\log D)) &= c_2(T_{\mathbb{F}_m}) + K_{\mathbb{F}_m}D + D^2 - C_0C_\infty \\ &= 4 - (2C_0 + (m+2)f)(2C_0 + mf) + (2C_0 + mf)^2 - C_0(C_0 + mf) \\ &= 4 - 4 + 0 - 0 = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore Equality (4.3) holds.  $\square$

**Proposition 4.4.**

$$\Omega_{\mathbb{F}_m}^1(\log D) \otimes \sigma^*(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(1)) \cong \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{F}_m}^{\oplus 2}$$

*holds. In particular,  $T_{\mathbb{F}_m}(-\log D)$  is numerically projectively flat.*

*Proof.* From  $\mathbb{F}_m = \{([x_1 : x_2], [y_0 : y_1 : y_2]) \in \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^2 \mid y_1x_2^m = y_2x_1^m\}$ , we obtain

$$C_0 = \{([x_1 : x_2], [1 : 0 : 0]) \in \mathbb{F}_m \mid [x_1 : x_2] \in \mathbb{P}^1\}$$

and

$$C_\infty = \{([x_1 : x_2], [0 : x_1^m : x_2^m]) \in \mathbb{F}_m \mid [x_1 : x_2] \in \mathbb{P}^1\}.$$

We define the Zariski open sets  $W_k \cong \mathbb{C}^2$  in  $\mathbb{F}_m$  for  $k = 1, 2, 3, 4$  as follows:

$$\begin{array}{lll} \tau_1 : W_1 & \rightarrow & \mathbb{F}_m \\ (x, y) & \mapsto & ([1 : x], [1 : y : x^m y]) \\ \tau_3 : W_3 & \rightarrow & \mathbb{F}_m \\ (\xi, \eta) & \mapsto & ([\xi : 1], [1 : \xi^m \eta : \eta]) \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{lll} \tau_2 : W_2 & \rightarrow & \mathbb{F}_m \\ (u, v) & \mapsto & ([1 : u], [v : 1 : u^m]) \\ \tau_4 : W_4 & \rightarrow & \mathbb{F}_m \\ (z, w) & \mapsto & ([z : 1], [w : z^m : 1]). \end{array}$$

By computations, we have

$$x = u = \frac{1}{\xi} = \frac{1}{z} \quad \text{and} \quad y = \frac{1}{v} = \xi^m \eta = \frac{z^m}{w}.$$

Hence the local basis of  $\Omega_{\mathbb{F}_m}^1(\log D)$  are as shown in the following table:

	on $W_1$	on $W_2$	on $W_3$	on $W_4$
local basis of $\Omega_{\mathbb{F}_m}^1(\log D)$	$dx, \frac{dy}{y}$	$du, \frac{dv}{v}$	$d\xi, \frac{d\eta}{\eta}$	$dz, \frac{dw}{w}$

Set

$$h_{W_1W_2} := 1, h_{W_1W_3} := x, h_{W_1W_4} := x, h_{W_2W_3} := u, h_{W_2W_4} := u, h_{W_3W_4} := 1,$$

and  $h_{W_jW_i} := h_{W_iW_j}^{-1}$  for any  $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $1 \leq i < j \leq 4$ . Then  $\{h_{W_iW_j}\}_{1 \leq i, j \leq 4}$  are transition functions of  $\sigma^*(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(1))$ .

We would like to find two nowhere vanishing global sections in  $\Omega_{\mathbb{F}_m}^1(\log D) \otimes \sigma^*(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(1))$ . To find a global section, it is enough to find a 4-tuple  $(t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4)$  of local holomorphic logarithmic differential forms such that  $t_i \in H^0(W_i, \Omega_{\mathbb{F}_m}^1(\log D))$  and  $t_i = h_{W_iW_j}t_j$  for any  $1 \leq i, j \leq 4$ .

The first section  $S_1$  is given by

$$S_1 := \left( \frac{dy}{y}, -\frac{dv}{v}, md\xi + \frac{\xi d\eta}{\eta}, mdz - \frac{zdw}{w} \right),$$

and the second section  $S_2$  is given by

$$S_2 := \left( mdx + \frac{xdy}{y}, mdu - \frac{udv}{v}, \frac{d\eta}{\eta}, -\frac{dw}{w} \right).$$

$S_1$  and  $S_2$  are nowhere vanishing global sections in  $\Omega_{\mathbb{F}_m}^1(\log D) \otimes \sigma^*(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(1))$ . Moreover,  $S_1$  and  $S_2$  are linearly independent. Hence  $\Omega_{\mathbb{F}_m}^1(\log D) \otimes \sigma^*(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(1)) \cong \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{F}_m}^{\oplus 2}$ .

From  $\Omega_{\mathbb{F}_m}^1(\log D) \cong \sigma^*(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(-1))^{\oplus 2}$ ,  $\Omega_{\mathbb{F}_m}^1(\log D)$  is semistable with respect to some ample divisor. By Theorem-Definition 2.1 and Lemma 4.3,  $T_{\mathbb{F}_m}(-\log D)$  is numerically projectively flat.  $\square$

By (4.4), we have  $(K_{\mathbb{F}_m} + D)C_0 = -2 < 0$  and  $(K_{\mathbb{F}_m} + D)f = 0$ . From  $\overline{NE}(\mathbb{F}_m) = \mathbb{R}_+[f] + \mathbb{R}_+[C_0]$ , only  $\mathbb{R}_+[C_0]$  is a  $(K_{\mathbb{F}_m} + D)$ -negative extremal ray. If  $m = 1$ , then a blow-down  $(\mathbb{F}_1, D) \rightarrow (\mathbb{P}^2, H_{\mathbb{P}^2})$  along  $C_0$  is a  $(K_{\mathbb{F}_1} + D)$ -negative extremal contraction induced by  $\mathbb{R}_+[C_0]$ . Hence  $(\mathbb{F}_1, D)$  is not a Mori fiber space.

We consider the case of  $m \geq 2$ . Let  $R$  be an image of an  $m$ -th Veronese embedding  $\mathbb{P}^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^m$  and  $Y$  be a projective cone over  $R$ . By [Har77, Example 2.11.4], there exists a  $(K_{\mathbb{F}_m} + D)$ -negative extremal contraction  $\tau : (\mathbb{F}_m, D) \rightarrow (Y, R)$  induced by  $\mathbb{R}_+[C_0]$  such that  $\tau$  contracts  $C_0$  to the vertex of  $Y$ . Hence  $(\mathbb{F}_m, D)$  is not a Mori fiber space and a minimal model of  $(\mathbb{F}_m, D)$  is not isomorphic to  $(\mathbb{P}^2, H_{\mathbb{P}^2})$ .

**4.3. On slope rationally connected varieties.** This study is motivated by the following conjecture.

**Conjecture 4.5.** [CCM19, Conjecture 1.5] *Let  $X$  be a smooth projective variety and  $D$  be an effective  $\mathbb{Q}$ -divisor on  $X$ . Assume that  $(X, D)$  is klt and  $-(K_X + D)$  is nef. Then there exists an orbifold morphism  $\rho : (X, D) \rightarrow (R, D_R)$  with the following properties:*

- (1)  $(R, D_R)$  is a klt pair and  $c_1(K_R + D_R) = 0$ .
- (2) For general point  $r \in R$ , the general fiber  $(X_r, D_r)$  is slope rationally connected. (For the definition of slope rationally connectedness, see [Cam16, Definition 1.2].)
- (3)  $\rho$  is locally trivial with respect to pairs.

An orbifold morphism  $\rho : (X, D) \dashrightarrow (R, D_R)$  is called *slope rationally connected quotient* (in short *sRC-quotient*) if a general fiber  $(X_r, D_r)$  is slope rationally connected and  $K_R + D_R$  is pseudo-effective. By [Cam16, Theorem 1.5], an sRC-quotient exists and is unique up to orbifold birational equivalence. Notice that an sRC-quotient is a generalization of an MRC-fibration to an orbifold pair.

From Conjecture 4.5, it is expected that we can take an sRC-quotient as a smooth morphism for any klt pair  $(X, D)$  such that  $-(K_X + D)$  is nef. If  $X$  is a smooth surface, then Conjecture 4.5 holds by [CCM19, Theorem 1.6].

We propose the following conjecture.

**Conjecture 4.6.** *Let  $(X, D)$  be a log smooth pair. If a logarithmic tangent bundle  $T_X(-\log D)$  is nef, then we can take a smooth sRC-quotient.*

By [CP91] and [DPS94] (or by the argument of [HIM21, Theorem 1.1]), if  $T_X$  is nef, then we can take a smooth MRC fibration  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  such that  $Y$  is a finite étale quotient of an Abelian variety. Since any fiber  $F$  of  $f$  is rationally connected and  $T_F$  is nef,  $F$  is Fano by [DPS94, Proposition 3.10]. Hence if  $T_X$  is nef, then  $X$  consists of an Abelian variety and a Fano variety, up to a finite étale cover. Therefore to study Conjecture 4.6 is to study the structure of a log smooth pair with a nef logarithmic tangent bundle, such as [CP91] and [DPS94].

However, there exists a counter-example of Conjecture 4.6.

**Proposition 4.7.** *Let  $[z_0 : z_1 : z_2]$  be a coordinate of  $\mathbb{P}^2$ . Set  $H_1 := \{z_1 = 0\}$  and  $H_2 := \{z_2 = 0\}$ . Then  $T_{\mathbb{P}^2}(-\log(H_1 + H_2))$  is nef but  $(\mathbb{P}^2, H_1 + H_2)$  is not slope rationally connected. In this example, we can not take an sRC-quotient as a smooth morphism.*

This is a counter-example of Conjecture 4.6. By [Cam16, Example 10.2], we already know that  $(\mathbb{P}^2, H_1 + H_2)$  is not slope rationally connected. In the following proof, we give a proof of this fact for the reader's convenience.

*Proof.* Let  $\pi : X \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^2$  be a blow-up of  $\mathbb{P}^2$  at  $[1 : 0 : 0]$ ,  $E$  be an exceptional divisor of  $\pi$ , and  $\widetilde{H}_1$  (resp.  $\widetilde{H}_2$ ) be a strict transform of  $H_1$  (resp.  $H_2$ ) by  $\pi$ . Set  $D := \widetilde{H}_1 + \widetilde{H}_2 + E$ . From  $K_X + D = \pi^*(K_{\mathbb{P}^2} + H_1 + H_2)$  and  $\pi^{-1}(\text{Supp}(H_1 + H_2)) = \text{Supp}(D)$ , we obtain

$$T_X(-\log D) \cong \pi^*T_{\mathbb{P}^2}(-\log(H_1 + H_2))$$

by [Iit82, Chapter 11]. It is enough to show that  $T_X(-\log D)$  is nef.

Notice that  $X \cong \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1} \oplus \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(-1))$ . Let  $\sigma : X \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$  be the ruling of  $X$  and  $[z_1 : z_2]$  be a coordinate of  $\mathbb{P}^1$ . Set  $[0] := \{z_1 = 0\} \subset \mathbb{P}^1$  and  $[\infty] := \{z_2 = 0\} \subset \mathbb{P}^1$ . Then we have  $\sigma_*\widetilde{H}_1 = [0]$  and  $\sigma_*\widetilde{H}_2 = [\infty]$ . Since  $\sigma : (X, D) \rightarrow (\mathbb{P}^1, [0] + [\infty])$  is a log smooth morphism in the sense of [Kat98, Chapter 3], there exists a line bundle  $F$  on  $X$  such that

$$0 \rightarrow F \rightarrow T_X(-\log D) \rightarrow \sigma^*T_{\mathbb{P}^1}(-\log([0] + [\infty])) \rightarrow 0$$

by [Kat98, Proposition 3.12]. From  $F \cong \mathcal{O}_X(-K_X - D) \cong \pi^*\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(H_1)$ ,  $F$  is nef. Since  $\sigma^*T_{\mathbb{P}^1}(-\log([0] + [\infty]))$  is nef,  $T_X(-\log D)$  is also nef.

A general fiber of  $\sigma : (X, D) \rightarrow (\mathbb{P}^1, [0] + [\infty])$  is isomorphic to  $(\mathbb{P}^1, [p])$  for some  $p \in \mathbb{P}^1$ . Hence a general fiber of  $\sigma$  is slope rationally connected. Thus  $\sigma \circ \pi^{-1} : (\mathbb{P}^2, H_1 + H_2) \dashrightarrow (\mathbb{P}^1, [0] + [\infty])$  is an sRC-quotient, and finally  $(\mathbb{P}^2, H_1 + H_2)$  is not slope rationally connected. Since the Picard number of  $\mathbb{P}^2$  is one, we can not take an sRC-quotient as a (smooth) morphism.  $\square$

## 5. QUESTION

We propose the following question.

*Question 5.1.* Let  $(X, D)$  be a log smooth pair. What is the structure of  $(X, D)$  if  $T_X(-\log D)$  is numerically projectively flat?

We do not completely know the structure of  $(X, D)$  even if  $-(K_X + D)$  is nef. However, if (2) in Theorem 1.5 holds and  $-(K_X + D)$  is nef, then we know the structure of a  $(K_X + D)$ -negative extremal contraction.

**Proposition 5.2.** *Let  $(X, D)$  be a log smooth pair such that  $-(K_X + D)$  is nef, and let  $f : (X, D) \rightarrow Y$  be a  $(K_X + D)$ -negative extremal contraction. If (2) in Theorem 1.5 holds, then one of the following statements holds.*

- (a)  $\dim Y = 0$  and  $(X, D)$  is isomorphic to  $(\mathbb{P}^n, H_{\mathbb{P}^n})$ .
- (b) *There exists an irreducible component  $C$  of  $D$  such that  $f(C)$  is a point,  $\text{Exc}(f) = C$ ,  $C \cong \mathbb{P}^{n-1}$ , and  $C$  does not meet any other irreducible component of  $D$ .*

*Proof.* This argument is based on Fujino's comments and the first draft of this paper. If  $f$  is a Fano contraction, then  $\dim Y = 0$  and  $(X, D) \cong (\mathbb{P}^n, H_{\mathbb{P}^n})$  by the proof of Theorem 1.5. Hence we assume that  $f$  is not a Fano contraction. By the argument of [FM20, Theorem 2.1], there exist an effective  $\mathbb{R}$ -Cartier divisor  $E$  on  $Y$  and a log canonical center  $C$  of  $(X, D + f^*E)$  such that  $n - 1 \geq \dim C \geq 1$  and  $f(C)$  is a point. By the proof of [FM20, Theorem 1.2], we have

$$(5.1) \quad -(K_X + D + f^*E)|_C \sim nB|_C$$

and  $[C, (K_X + D + f^*E)|_C]$  is quasi-log canonical outside finitely many points. Since  $B|_C$  is ample, we obtain  $C \cong \mathbb{P}^{n-1}$  by the argument of [FM20, Theorem 1.2]. From  $C \subset \text{Exc}(f)$ ,  $f$  is a divisorial contraction and  $\text{Exc}(f) = C$ . Since  $C$  is a log canonical center of  $(X, D + f^*E)$  and  $-K_C \sim nB|_C$ , by (5.1),  $E = 0$  and  $C$  is an irreducible component of  $D$ . From  $(D - C)|_C = 0$ ,  $C$  does not meet any other irreducible component of  $D$ .  $\square$

We point out that the divisorial contraction  $f : (X, D) \rightarrow Y$  in Proposition 5.2 (b) is not necessarily a monoidal transform. (A typical example is  $(\mathbb{F}_m, D)$  in Subsection 4.2.) Set  $D_Y := f_*D$  and  $H_Y := f_*H$ , then  $H_Y$  is not necessarily a Cartier divisor on  $Y$ . Hence we do not know the structure of a  $(K_Y + D_Y)$ -negative extremal contraction since the argument of Proposition 5.2 is invalid.

*Remark 5.3.* Without some assumptions such as semistability in Theorem 1.4 or 1.5, it is difficult to study the structure of a log smooth pair when the equality holds in the Bogomolov-Gieseker inequality. In fact, there exist many examples of log smooth pairs such that Equality (1.2) or (1.3) holds. We give a few examples. In this remark, Let  $X$  be a smooth projective variety and  $D = \sum_{i=1}^l D_i$  be a simple normal crossing divisor on  $X$ .

First, we consider the case of  $X = \mathbb{P}^n$ . Let  $H$  be a hyperplane of  $\mathbb{P}^n$  and  $d_i$  be a positive integer with  $D_i \sim d_i H$  for any  $1 \leq i \leq l$ . If  $n = 7$ ,  $l = 3$ , and  $(d_1, d_2, d_3) = (2, 1, 1)$ , then Equality (1.2) holds. If  $n = 8$ ,  $l = 4$ , and  $(d_1, d_2, d_3, d_4) = (2, 1, 1, 1)$ , then Equality (1.3) holds. We have at least 18 examples such that Equality (1.2) or (1.3) holds,  $D \neq 0$ , and  $D \neq H$ .

Second, we consider the case where  $X$  is a degree  $q$  hypersurface of  $\mathbb{P}^{n+1}$ . We assume that  $q \geq 2$  and any degree of  $D_i$  is one. Then we have at least 90 examples such that Equality (1.2) or (1.3) holds. For example, if  $(n, q, l) = (7, 2, 3)$ , then Equality (1.2) holds, and if  $(n, q, l) = (8, 2, 4)$ , then Equality (1.3) holds.

## REFERENCES

- [Cam16] F. Campana, *Orbifold slope-rational connectedness*, preprint, available at arXiv:1607.07829v2.

- [CP91] F. Campana, T. Peternell, *Projective manifolds whose tangent bundles are numerically effective*, Math. Ann., **289**, (1991), 169–187.
- [CCM19] F. Campana, J. Cao, S. Matsumura, *Projective klt pairs with nef anti-canonical divisor*, to appear in Algebr. Geom., available at arXiv:1910.06471v1.
- [CI14] S. Chintapalli, J. NN. Iyer, *Semistability of logarithmic cotangent bundle on some projective manifolds*, Comm. Algebra, **42**, (2014), no. 4, 1732–1746.
- [DPS94] J.-P. Demailly, T. Peternell, M. Schneider, *Compact complex manifolds with numerically effective tangent bundles*, J. Algebraic Geom., **3**, (1994), no.2, 295–345.
- [Den20] Y. Deng, *A characterization of complex quasi-projective manifolds uniformized by unit balls*, preprint, available at arXiv:2006.16178v2.
- [DLB20] S. Druel, F. Lo Bianco, *Numerical characterization of some toric fiber bundles*, preprint, available at arXiv:2003.13818v2.
- [EV92] H. Esnault, E. Viehweg, *Lectures on vanishing theorems*, DMV Seminar, **20** Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, (1992). vi+164.
- [FM20] O. Fujino, K. Miyamoto *A characterization of projective spaces from the Mori theoretic viewpoint*, to appear in Osaka J. Math., available at arXiv:2001.05274v3.
- [Fjn20] O. Fujino, *Iitaka conjecture. An introduction*, SpringerBriefs in Mathematics. Springer, Singapore, **128**, (2020),
- [Fjt14] K. Fujita, *Simple normal crossing Fano varieties and log Fano manifolds*. Nagoya Math. J. **214** (2014), 95–123.
- [GKP20a] D. Greb, S. Kebekus, T. Peternell, *Projective flatness over klt spaces and uniformisation of varieties with nef anti-canonical divisor*, preprint, available at arXiv:2006.08769v1.
- [GKP20b] D. Greb, S. Kebekus, T. Peternell, *Projectively flat KLT varieties*, preprint, available at arXiv:2010.06878v1.
- [GT16] H. Guenancia, B. Taji, *Orbifold Stability and Miyaoka-Yau Inequality for minimal pairs*, preprint, available at arXiv:1611.05981v1.
- [Har77] R. Hartshorne. *Algebraic geometry*. Grad. Texts in Math., Vol. 52. New York-Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag, 1977.
- [HIM21] G. Hosono, M. Iwai, S. Matsumura. *On projective manifolds with pseudo-effective tangent bundle*. Journal of the Institute of Mathematics of Jussieu, 1-30. doi 10.1017/S1474748020000754.
- [Iit82] S. Iitaka, *Algebraic geometry. An introduction to birational geometry of algebraic varieties*. Graduate Texts in Mathematics, **76**, North-Holland Mathematical Library, **24** Springer-Verlag, New York-Berlin, (1982), x+357.
- [Kat98] K. Kato, *Logarithmic structures of Fontaine-Illusie*. Algebraic analysis, geometry, and number theory (1998), 191–224, Johns Hopkins Univ. Press.
- [Kaw78] Y. Kawamata, *On deformations of compactifiable complex manifolds*. Math. Ann., **235**, (1978), no. 3.
- [KK08] S. Kebekus, S. Kovács, *Families of canonically polarized varieties over surfaces*. Invent. Math., **172**, (2008), no. 3, 657–682.
- [Kob87] S. Kobayashi, *Differential geometry of complex vector bundles*. Publications of the Mathematical Society of Japan, **15** Kano Memorial Lectures, **5**. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ; Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, (1987). xii+305.
- [Li18] C. Li *On the stability of extensions of tangent sheaves on Kähler-Einstein Fano/Calabi-Yau pairs*, to appear in Math. Ann., available at arXiv:1803.01734v3.
- [LOY20] J. Liu, W. Ou, X. Yang. *Projective manifolds whose tangent bundle contains a strictly nef subsheaf*. Preprint, arXiv:2004.08507.
- [Nak04] N. Nakayama, *Zariski-decomposition and abundance*, MSJ Memoirs, **14**, Mathematical Society of Japan, Tokyo, 2004. xiv+277.
- [TY87] G. Tian, S.-T. Yau, *Existence of Kähler-Einstein metrics on complete Kähler manifolds and their applications to algebraic geometry*. Mathematical aspects of string theory (San Diego, Calif., 1986), 574–628, Adv. Ser. Math. Phys., **1**, World Sci. Publishing, Singapore, (1987).

- [Tia92] G. Tian, *On stability of the tangent bundles of Fano varieties*. Internat. J. Math., **3**, (1992), no. 3, 401–413.
- [Tsu88] H. Tsuji, *A characterization of ball quotients with smooth boundary*. Duke Math. J. **57**, (1988), no. 2, 537–553.
- [Win04] J. Winkelmann, *On manifolds with trivial logarithmic tangent bundle*. Osaka J. Math., **41**, (2004), no. 2, 473–484.

OSAKA CITY UNIVERSITY ADVANCED MATHEMATICAL INSTITUTE, 3-3-138 SUGIMOTO, SUMIYOSHI-KU, OSAKA, 558-8585, JAPAN.

RESEARCH INSTITUTE FOR MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, KYOTO UNIVERSITY, KYOTO 606-8502, JAPAN.

*Email address:* `masataka.math@gmail.com`, `masataka@sci.osaka-cu.ac.jp`