

# GENERALIZED CANONICAL MODELS OF FOLIATED SURFACES

YEN-AN CHEN

ABSTRACT. We study generalized canonical models of foliated surfaces of general type. In particular, we show that generalized canonical models of general type and their minimal partial du Val resolutions are bounded. Moreover, we show the valuative criterion of separatedness and properness and local-closedness for  $\mathcal{S}_P$ -families.

On the way, we also show a result on the invariance of plurigenera.

## INTRODUCTION

The study of foliated surfaces of general type has seen significant progress in recent years. By work of McQuillan and Brunella (see [McQ08] and [Bru15]), it is known that foliated surfaces of general type with only canonical foliation singularities admit a unique canonical model. Thus it is natural to study the moduli theory for these canonical models, for instance, the existence of the moduli functor.

A first step toward this was achieved in [HL21] where it is shown that canonical models of foliated surfaces of general type with fixed Hilbert function are birationally bounded. Notice that, by a result of McQuillan,  $K_{\mathcal{F}}$  is not  $\mathbb{Q}$ -Cartier for any canonical model  $(X, \mathcal{F})$  with cusp singularities. Thus, the moduli functor is expected not to be algebraic. However, if we consider the moduli functor for some natural birational modifications of these canonical models, then it is better behaved. For instance, in [Che19], it is shown that minimal partial du Val resolutions (see Definition 2.5) of these canonical models are bounded. As a consequence, the boundedness of these canonical models also follows.

The next natural property to investigate is the local-closedness. We recall the following example.

*Example 0.1* ([Bru01, page 114]). Consider  $\pi : \mathbb{C}_{x,y}^2 \times (\mathbb{C}_\lambda \setminus \{0, 1\}) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}_\lambda \setminus \{0, 1\}$  and a family of foliations given by

$$x \frac{\partial}{\partial x} + \lambda y \frac{\partial}{\partial y}.$$

We can extend this family to a family  $\mathbb{P}^2 \times (\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0, 1\}) \rightarrow \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0, 1\}$ . Note that the singularity is reduced (see Definition 1.15) if and only if  $\lambda \notin \mathbb{Q}^+$ .

In light of this example, the moduli functor for canonical models (or their minimal partial du Val resolutions) is *not* locally closed. To solve this issue, we allow some special *log canonical* foliation singularities and consider *generalized* canonical models (see Definition 1.27). As in [HL21] and [Che19], we first show the following boundedness for minimal partial du Val resolutions of generalized canonical models. (See Theorem 2.10.)

---

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. Primary 32M25, Secondary 14C20, 14E99, 14D20.

The author was partially supported by NSF research grants no: DMS-1801851, DMS-1840190 and by a grant from the Simons Foundation; Award Number: 256202.

**Theorem 0.2.** *Fix a function  $P : \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ . Then the set  $\mathcal{S}_P$  consisting of minimal partial du Val resolutions  $(Y, \mathcal{G}, D)$  (see Definition 2.5) of GENERALIZED CANONICAL models  $(X, \mathcal{F})$  of general type with Hilbert function  $\chi(mK_{\mathcal{F}}) = P(m)$  is bounded. More precisely, there exists a projective morphism  $\mu : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow T$  and a family of pre-foliations  $\mathcal{F}$  on  $\mathcal{Y}$  with respect to  $\mu$  (see Definition 2.9) where  $\mathcal{Y}$  and  $T$  are quasi-projective varieties of finite type such that, for any  $(Y, \mathcal{G}, D) \in \mathcal{S}_P$ , there is a  $t \in T$  and an isomorphism  $\rho : Y \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}_t$  such that  $\mathcal{G}(-D) \cong \rho^*(\mathcal{F}|_{\mathcal{Y}_t})$ .*

Using the techniques in [CF18], we also show the following invariance of plurigenera for families of minimal partial du Val resolutions of *generalized* canonical models of general type with fixed Hilbert function. (See Theorem 3.2.) Note that condition  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F}, \Delta)_t \in \mathcal{S}_P$  puts a very strong restriction on  $\Delta$ .

**Theorem 0.3.** *Given any family of foliated triples  $f : (\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F}, \Delta) \rightarrow T$  where  $T$  is connected and  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F}, \Delta)_t \in \mathcal{S}_P$  for all  $t \in T$  (see Definition 2.17 for families of foliated triples), there exists an integer  $m_f$  depending only on this family  $f$  such that*

$$h^0(\mathcal{X}_t, m(K_{\mathcal{F}} + \Delta)|_{\mathcal{X}_t})$$

*is independent of  $t$  for  $m \geq m_f$  and divisible by  $i(P)$ . (See Lemma 3.1.)*

Next, for a fixed function  $P : \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ , we use the techniques from [Spi20] and [CS18], to establish the semi-stable  $(K_{\mathcal{F}} + \Delta)$ -minimal model program for a special type of families of foliated surfaces. (See Section 4 and Theorem 4.25.)

**Theorem 0.4.** *Let  $f : (\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F}, \Delta) \rightarrow T$  be a family of foliated triples which is a semi-stable reduction of  $\mathcal{S}_P$ -families. (See subsection 4.2.) Then the semi-stable  $(K_{\mathcal{F}} + \Delta)$ -minimal model program exists and stops with  $f^m : (\mathcal{X}^m, \mathcal{F}^m, \Delta^m) \rightarrow T$  such that  $(K_{\mathcal{F}^m} + \Delta^m)$  is nef over  $T$ ,  $f^m : \mathcal{X}^m \rightarrow T$  is dlt (see Definition 4.6), and  $(\mathcal{X}^m, \mathcal{F}^m, \Delta^m)$  is  $\mathcal{F}^m$ -dlt (see Definition 4.8).*

Utilizing this semi-stable  $(K_{\mathcal{F}} + \Delta)$ -minimal model program, we show that  $\mathcal{S}_P$ -family (see Definition 2.17) satisfies the valuative criteria for separatedness and properness (after a finite base change). (See Theorem 5.1 and Theorem 4.26.) This is the first step toward the separatedness and properness of a suitable moduli functor parametrizing  $\mathcal{S}_P$ .

**Theorem 0.5** (Separatedness). *Let  $T$  be a smooth curve,  $T^\circ = T \setminus \{0\}$  where  $0 \in T$ , and  $(\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{F}_i, \Delta_i)$  for  $i = 1, 2$  be two  $\mathcal{S}_P$ -families (see Definition 2.17) over  $T$ . Then any isomorphism  $\varphi^\circ : (\mathcal{X}_1, \mathcal{F}_1, \Delta_1)_{T^\circ} \rightarrow (\mathcal{X}_2, \mathcal{F}_2, \Delta_2)_{T^\circ}$  over  $T^\circ$  extends uniquely to an isomorphism  $\varphi : (\mathcal{X}_1, \mathcal{F}_1, \Delta_1) \rightarrow (\mathcal{X}_2, \mathcal{F}_2, \Delta_2)$  over  $T$ .*

**Theorem 0.6** (Properness). *Let  $T$  be a smooth curve and  $f^\circ : (\mathcal{X}^\circ, \mathcal{F}^\circ, \Delta^\circ) \rightarrow T^\circ$  be an  $\mathcal{S}_P$ -family (see Definition 2.17) over  $T^\circ$  where  $T^\circ = T \setminus \{0\}$  and  $0 \in T$ . Then there exists a smooth curve  $C$  and a finite morphism  $C \rightarrow T$  such that, after the base change via  $C \rightarrow T$ , the pullback  $\mathcal{S}_P$ -family  $(\mathcal{X}_C^\circ, \mathcal{F}_C^\circ, \Delta_C^\circ)$  extends uniquely to an  $\mathcal{S}_P$ -family  $(\mathcal{X}_C, \mathcal{F}_C, \Delta_C)$  over  $C$  with the special fiber  $\mathcal{S}_P$ -smoothable. (See Definition 2.19.)*

Finally, by a Seidenberg-type Theorem [PS19, Proposition 7.4] for a family of foliated surfaces, we show the following theorem (see also Theorem 6.4), which gives us a hint of the local-closedness of a suitable moduli functor parametrizing smoothable foliated surfaces.

**Theorem 0.7.** *Given a family of foliated triples  $f : (\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F}, \Delta) \rightarrow T$ . ( $T$  is not necessarily a curve.) Assume that there is a dense subset  $T' \subset T$  such that  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F}, \Delta)_t \in \mathcal{S}_P$  for all  $t \in T'$ . (See Definition 2.8 and Definition 2.17.) Then there exists an open subset  $U \subset T$  such that all fibers of  $f$  over  $U$  are in  $\mathcal{S}_P$ . Moreover, there is an open subset  $U' \subset U$  such that all fibers of  $f$  over  $U'$  are exactly  $\mathcal{S}_P$ -smoothable fibers. (See Definition 2.19.)*

**Acknowledgements.** The author would like to thank Christopher D. Hacon and Fabio Bernasconi for invaluable discussions, precious suggestions, and encouragements.

## 1. PRELIMINARIES

In this paper, we always work over  $\mathbb{C}$ . In this section, we recall several definitions and results which will be used later.

**1.1. Intersection theory on normal complete surfaces.** We will use Mumford's intersection pairing on normal surfaces (see, e.g., [Sak84]) and some of its properties.

Let  $X$  be a normal complete surface and  $f : Y \rightarrow X$  be a proper birational morphism from a smooth surface  $Y$ , for instance, the minimal resolution of singularities. Let  $E = \cup_j E_j$  be the exceptional divisor of  $f$ . Since the intersection matrix  $(E_i \cdot E_j)$  is negative definite, for any Weil  $\mathbb{R}$ -divisor  $D$  on  $X$ , we can define  $f^*D$  as  $\tilde{D} + \sum_j a_j E_j$  where  $\tilde{D}$  is the proper transform of  $D$  and the  $a_j$ 's are real numbers uniquely determined by the property that  $(\tilde{D} + \sum_j a_j E_j) \cdot E_i = 0$  for every  $i$ .

For any two Weil  $\mathbb{R}$ -divisors  $D_1$  and  $D_2$  on  $X$ , we define the intersection number  $D_1 \cdot D_2 := (f^*D_1) \cdot (f^*D_2)$ . Note that if  $D_1$  is Cartier and  $D_2$  is an irreducible curve, then  $D_1 \cdot D_2$  agrees with the degree of  $\mathcal{O}_{D_2}(D_1)$ .

## 1.2. A criterion for very-ampleness.

**Theorem 1.1** ([Lan01, Theorem 0.2]). *Let  $X$  be a normal projective surface and  $M$  be a  $\mathbb{Q}$ -divisor on  $X$  such that  $K_X + \lceil M \rceil$  is Cartier. Let  $\zeta$  be a 0-dimensional subscheme of  $X$  and  $\delta_\zeta > 0$  be the number defined in [Lan01, Definition 1.1.2] associated to  $\zeta$ . If*

- (1)  $M^2 > \delta_\zeta$  and
- (2)  $M \cdot C \geq \frac{1}{2}\delta_\zeta$  for every curve  $C$  on  $X$ ,

then  $H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(K_X + \lceil M \rceil)) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_\zeta(K_X + \lceil M \rceil)$  is surjective.

*Remark 1.2.* For the case when  $|\zeta| = 2$ , we have following remarks.

- (1) If the support of  $\zeta = \{x_1, x_2\}$  is two distinct points, then  $\delta_\zeta = \delta_{x_1} + \delta_{x_2}$ . ([Lan01, 1.1.3])
- (2)  $\delta_x \leq 4$  if  $x$  is a smooth point or a du Val singularity. ([Lan01, 0.3.2])
- (3) If  $\zeta$  is supported at only one point  $x$ , then
  - (a)  $\delta_\zeta \leq 8$  if  $x$  is a smooth point or a du Val singularity. ([Lan01, 0.3.2])
  - (b)  $\delta_\zeta \leq 4(\text{edim}_x X - 1)$  if  $x$  is a rational (non-smooth) singularity where  $\text{edim}_x X$  is the embedding dimension of  $X$  at  $x$ . ([Lan01, 0.3.4])

**Proposition 1.3** ([Har77, Proposition II.7.3]). *Let  $X$  be a projective scheme over  $k$  and  $\mathcal{L}$  be a line bundle on  $X$ . Then  $\mathcal{L}$  is very ample if and only if it separates points and tangents.*

**1.3. Foliations on schemes.** Most definitions in this subsection follow from [Ayo, Section 6] with some generalizations.

**Definition 1.4** ([Ayo, Définition 6.1.1]). Let  $X$  be a scheme over  $\mathbb{C}$ . A *pre-foliation*  $\mathcal{F}$  on  $X$  is a pair  $(\Omega_{\mathcal{F}}, d_{\mathcal{F}})$  consisting of a quasi-coherent  $\mathcal{O}_X$ -module  $\Omega_{\mathcal{F}}$  and of a  $\mathbb{C}$ -linear derivation  $d_{\mathcal{F}} : \mathcal{O}_X \rightarrow \Omega_{\mathcal{F}}$  such that the  $\mathcal{O}_X$ -linear morphism  $\rho_{\mathcal{F}} : \Omega_X \rightarrow \Omega_{\mathcal{F}}$  associated with  $d_{\mathcal{F}}$  satisfies the following conditions:

- (1) it is surjective;
- (2) its kernel is contained in the kernel of the composition of

$$\Omega_X \xrightarrow{d} \wedge_{\mathcal{O}_X}^2 \Omega_X \xrightarrow{\wedge^2 \rho_{\mathcal{F}}} \wedge_{\mathcal{O}_X}^2 \Omega_{\mathcal{F}}$$

The rank of  $\mathcal{F}$  is defined to be the generic rank of  $\Omega_{\mathcal{F}}$ . A pre-foliation  $\mathcal{F}$  is called a *foliation* if  $\Omega_{\mathcal{F}}$  is *pure*, that is, the closure of each associated point of  $\Omega_{\mathcal{F}}$  has dimension  $\dim X$ . A *foliated scheme* is a triple  $(X, \Omega_{\mathcal{F}}, d_{\mathcal{F}})$  where  $X$  is a scheme and  $(\Omega_{\mathcal{F}}, d_{\mathcal{F}})$  is a foliation on  $X$ . We will denote a foliated scheme as  $(X, \mathcal{F})$  if there is no confusion.

*Remark 1.5* ([Ayo, Remarque 6.1.2]). In Definition 1.4, the condition (2) is, under the condition (1), equivalent to the existence of a  $\mathbb{C}$ -linear morphism  $d_{\mathcal{F}} : \Omega_{\mathcal{F}} \rightarrow \wedge_{\mathcal{O}_X}^2 \Omega_{\mathcal{F}}$  making the following square commutative

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Omega_X & \xrightarrow{d} & \wedge_{\mathcal{O}_X}^2 \Omega_X \\ \rho_{\mathcal{F}} \downarrow & & \downarrow \wedge^2 \rho_{\mathcal{F}} \\ \Omega_{\mathcal{F}} & \xrightarrow{d_{\mathcal{F}}} & \wedge_{\mathcal{O}_X}^2 \Omega_{\mathcal{F}}. \end{array}$$

*Remark 1.6.* We have the following remarks:

- (1) Given a pre-foliation  $\mathcal{F}$  whose support has dimension  $\dim X$ . The *saturation*  $\mathcal{F}^{\text{sat}}$  of  $\mathcal{F}$  is defined to be

$$(\text{pure}(\Omega_{\mathcal{F}}) := \Omega_{\mathcal{F}} / \text{tors}(\Omega_{\mathcal{F}}), \pi \circ d_{\mathcal{F}})$$

where  $\text{tors}(\Omega_{\mathcal{F}}) \subset \Omega_{\mathcal{F}}$  is the subsheaf of all local sections whose supports have dimension strictly less than  $\dim X$ , and  $\pi : \Omega_{\mathcal{F}} \rightarrow \text{pure}(\Omega_{\mathcal{F}})$  is the canonical quotient map. Note that  $\mathcal{F}^{\text{sat}}$  is a foliation.

- (2) Suppose  $X$  is smooth, the condition (2) in Definition 1.4 is equivalent to the integrability condition of  $\ker(\rho_{\mathcal{F}})$ .
- (3) If the rank of  $\mathcal{F}$  is one, then the condition (2) in Definition 1.4 is automatically satisfied since  $\wedge_{\mathcal{O}_X}^2 \Omega_{\mathcal{F}} = 0$ .

**Lemma 1.7.** *If  $X$  is normal and of finite type, then a foliation  $\mathcal{F}$  of rank one on  $X$  is equivalent to a saturated rank-one coherent subsheaf  $T_{\mathcal{F}}$  of the tangent sheaf  $T_X$ . Here a subsheaf  $T_{\mathcal{F}}$  of  $T_X$  is called saturated if  $T_X/T_{\mathcal{F}}$  is torsion-free.*

*Proof.* Given a foliation  $\mathcal{F}$  on  $X$ , we have an exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow K \longrightarrow \Omega_X \xrightarrow{\rho_{\mathcal{F}}} \Omega_{\mathcal{F}} \longrightarrow 0$$

where  $K$  is the kernel of  $\rho_{\mathcal{F}}$ . Dualizing this sequence, we get

$$0 \longrightarrow \Omega_{\mathcal{F}}^{\vee} \xrightarrow{\rho_{\mathcal{F}}^{\vee}} T_X \longrightarrow A \longrightarrow 0$$

where  $A$  is the cokernel of  $\rho_{\mathcal{F}}^{\vee}$ . Note that  $A$  is a subsheaf of  $K^{\vee}$  and  $K^{\vee}$  is torsion-free. So  $A$  is also torsion-free. Thus, we have a rank-one coherent subsheaf  $\Omega_{\mathcal{F}}^{\vee}$  of  $T_X$ . Hence, we have a function  $F$  sending a foliation  $\mathcal{F}$  of rank one on  $X$  to a saturated rank-one coherent subsheaf of the tangent sheaf  $T_X$ .

Conversely, given a saturated coherent subsheaf  $T_{\mathcal{F}}$  of  $T_X$ , that is, we have an exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow T_{\mathcal{F}} \longrightarrow T_X \xrightarrow{\pi} T_X/T_{\mathcal{F}} \longrightarrow 0 .$$

Since  $\Omega_X$  is reflexive, we get, after dualizing the sequence,

$$0 \longrightarrow (T_X/T_{\mathcal{F}})^{\vee} \xrightarrow{\pi^{\vee}} \Omega_X \xrightarrow{\delta} B \longrightarrow 0$$

where  $B$  is the cokernel of  $\pi^{\vee}$ . Notice that  $B$  is a subsheaf of  $T_{\mathcal{F}}^{\vee}$  and  $T_{\mathcal{F}}^{\vee}$  is torsion-free. Thus,  $B$  is also torsion-free and  $(B, \delta)$  gives a foliation on  $X$ . Hence, we have a function  $G$  sending a saturated rank-one coherent subsheaf  $T_{\mathcal{F}}$  of the tangent sheaf  $T_X$  to a foliation of rank one on  $X$ .

Therefore, by [HL21, Lemma 1.8],  $G \circ F$  and  $F \circ G$  are identity functions up to isomorphism.  $\square$

**Definition 1.8** ([Ayo, Définition 6.1.6]). Given two pre-foliations  $\mathcal{G}$  on  $Y$  and  $\mathcal{F}$  on  $X$ . A *morphism of pre-foliations*  $\mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$  is a morphism of schemes  $f : Y \rightarrow X$  such that the kernel of  $\rho_{\mathcal{F}} : \Omega_X \rightarrow \Omega_{\mathcal{F}}$  is contained in the kernel of the composition of

$$\Omega_X \xrightarrow{-\circ f} f_*\Omega_Y \xrightarrow{f_*\rho_{\mathcal{G}}} f_*\Omega_{\mathcal{G}} .$$

That is, we have the following commutative square.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Omega_X & \xrightarrow{-\circ f} & f_*\Omega_Y \\ \rho_{\mathcal{F}} \downarrow & & \downarrow f_*\rho_{\mathcal{G}} \\ \Omega_{\mathcal{F}} & \xrightarrow{-\circ f} & f_*\Omega_{\mathcal{G}} . \end{array}$$

**Lemma 1.9** ([Ayo, Lemme 6.1.10]). *Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be a pre-foliation on  $X$  and  $f : Y \rightarrow X$  a morphism of schemes. There then exists a pre-foliation  $f^*\mathcal{F}$  on  $Y$ , unique up to a unique isomorphism, such that the following properties are satisfied.*

- (1) *The morphism  $f$  defines a morphism of pre-foliations  $f : f^*\mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$ .*
- (2) *(Universal property) For any morphism of pre-foliations  $\mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$  where  $(\Omega_{\mathcal{H}}, d_{\mathcal{H}})$  is a pre-foliation on  $Z$ , the forgetful functor induces a bijection*

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{H}, f^*\mathcal{F}) \cong \mathrm{Hom}_X(Z, Y).$$

*We say that the pre-foliation  $f^*\mathcal{F}$  is the pullback of the pre-foliation  $\mathcal{F}$  via the morphism  $f : Y \rightarrow X$ .*

**1.4. Foliations on normal varieties.** Let  $X$  be a normal variety. A *foliation*  $\mathcal{F}$  on  $X$  is a rank-one saturated subsheaf  $\mathcal{F}$  of the tangent sheaf  $T_X$  of  $X$ . So we have the following short exact sequence:

$$0 \rightarrow T_{\mathcal{F}} \rightarrow T_X \rightarrow T_X/\mathcal{F} \rightarrow 0$$

with  $T_X/\mathcal{F}$  torsion free. By Lemma 1.7, this is equivalent to Definition 1.4.

A point  $p$  on  $X$  is called a singular point of the foliation if either it is a singular point of  $X$  or a point at which the quotient  $T_X/\mathcal{F}$  is *not* locally free.

**Definition 1.10.** A foliated variety is a pair  $(X, \mathcal{F})$  consisting of a *normal* variety  $X$  and a foliation  $\mathcal{F}$  on  $X$ .

Since  $T_X \cong \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_X}(\Omega_X, \mathcal{O}_X)$  is reflexive, we have that  $\mathcal{F}$  is also reflexive because it is a saturated subsheaf of a reflexive sheaf  $T_X$ . Hence, we can define the canonical divisor  $K_{\mathcal{F}}$  of the foliation as a Weil divisor on  $X$  with  $\mathcal{O}_X(-K_{\mathcal{F}}) \cong \mathcal{F}$ .

**Definition 1.11.** Let  $(X, \mathcal{F})$  be a foliated variety. Given any proper birational morphism of normal varieties  $f : Y \rightarrow X$ . We define the *pullback foliation*  $f^*\mathcal{F}$  as follows:

Let  $U$  be the largest open subset such that  $V := f^{-1}(U) \rightarrow U$  is an isomorphism. Note that  $\mathcal{F}|_U \subset T_U \cong T_V$ . By [Har77, Exercise II.5.15], we have a coherent subsheaf  $\mathcal{G}$  of  $T_Y$  such that  $\mathcal{G}|_V = \mathcal{F}|_U \subset T_V$ . Then the pullback foliation  $f^*\mathcal{F}$  is defined to be the saturation of  $\mathcal{G}$ . By [HL21, Lemma 1.8], this definition is well-defined.

Also, we can define the pullback foliation  $f^*\mathcal{F}$  as the saturation (see Remark 1.6(1)) of pullback pre-foliation in Lemma 1.9. Both definitions are equivalent by [HL21, Lemma 1.8].

Moreover if  $\mathcal{G}$  is a foliation on  $Y$ , then we can define the *pushforward foliation*  $f_*\mathcal{G}$  by taking the saturation of the image of the composition

$$f_*T_{\mathcal{G}} \rightarrow f_*T_Y \rightarrow (f_*T_Y)^{**} = T_X.$$

**Definition 1.12.** We define the Kodaira dimension of  $\mathcal{F}$  as

$$\kappa(\mathcal{F}) = \max\{\dim \phi_{mK_{\mathcal{F}}}(X) \mid m \in \mathbb{N}_{>0} \text{ and } h^0(X, mK_{\mathcal{F}}) > 0\}$$

where by convention  $\kappa(\mathcal{F}) = -\infty$  if the set above is empty, that is,  $h^0(X, mK_{\mathcal{F}}) = 0$  for all  $m \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$ . We say that  $\mathcal{F}$  is of *general type* if  $\kappa(K_{\mathcal{F}}) = \dim X$ .

**Definition 1.13.** Let  $(X, \mathcal{F})$  be a foliated variety and let  $f : Y \rightarrow X$  be a proper birational morphism. For any divisor  $E$  on  $Y$ , we define the *foliated discrepancy* of  $\mathcal{F}$  along  $E$  to be  $a_E(\mathcal{F}) = \text{ord}_E(K_{f^*\mathcal{F}} - f^*K_{\mathcal{F}})$ . We say

$$x \text{ is } \begin{cases} \text{terminal} & \text{if } a_E(\mathcal{F}) > 0 \\ \text{canonical} & \text{if } a_E(\mathcal{F}) \geq 0 \\ \text{log terminal} & \text{if } a_E(\mathcal{F}) > -\varepsilon(E) \\ \text{log canonical} & \text{if } a_E(\mathcal{F}) \geq -\varepsilon(E) \end{cases} \quad \text{for every divisor } E \text{ over } x$$

where  $\varepsilon(E) = 0$  if  $E$  is  $f^*\mathcal{F}$ -invariant and  $\varepsilon(E) = 1$  if  $E$  is not  $f^*\mathcal{F}$ -invariant.

**Definition 1.14.** Let  $(X, \mathcal{F})$  be a foliated variety. We have the following definitions for indices.

- (1) The index  $i(X)$  of  $X$  is the smallest positive integer  $m$  such that  $mD$  is Cartier for every Weil divisor  $D$  on  $X$ . (We set  $i(X) = \infty$  if there is no such  $m$ .)
- (2) The index  $i(K_X)$  of  $K_X$  is the smallest positive integer  $m$  such that  $mK_X$  is Cartier. (We set  $i(K_X) = \infty$  if  $K_X$  is not  $\mathbb{Q}$ -Cartier.)
- (3) The index  $i(\mathcal{F})$  of a foliation  $\mathcal{F}$  on  $X$  is the smallest positive integer  $m$  such that  $mK_{\mathcal{F}}$  is Cartier. (We set  $i(\mathcal{F}) = \infty$  if  $K_{\mathcal{F}}$  is not  $\mathbb{Q}$ -Cartier.)
- (4) The  $\mathbb{Q}$ -index  $i_{\mathbb{Q}}(\mathcal{F})$  of a foliation  $\mathcal{F}$  on  $X$  is the smallest positive integer  $m$  such that  $mK_{\mathcal{F}}$  is Cartier for all  $\mathbb{Q}$ -Gorenstein points of the foliation.

**1.5. Invariants on foliated normal surfaces.** In this subsection, we will focus on some indices on foliated normal surfaces. Most definitions follow from [Bru15] with some generalizations. Let  $(X, \mathcal{F})$  be a foliated normal surface.

Given any  $p \in \text{Sing}(\mathcal{F}) \setminus \text{Sing}(X)$ . That is,  $p$  is a smooth point on  $X$  but a singular point of the foliation  $\mathcal{F}$ . Let  $v$  be the vector field around  $p$  generating  $\mathcal{F}$ . Since  $p \in \text{Sing}(\mathcal{F})$ , we have  $v(p) = 0$ . Then we can consider the eigenvalues  $\lambda_1, \lambda_2$  of  $(Dv)|_p$ , which do not depend on the choices of  $v$ .

**Definition 1.15.** If one of the eigenvalues is non-zero, say  $\lambda_2$ , then we say  $p$  is *semi-reduced* and define the eigenvalue of the foliation  $\mathcal{F}$  at  $p$  to be

$$\lambda := \frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_2}.$$

For  $\lambda \neq 0$ , this definition is unique up to reciprocal  $\lambda \sim \frac{1}{\lambda}$ .

If  $\lambda = 0$ , then  $p$  is called a *saddle-node*; otherwise, we say  $p$  is *non-degenerate*. If  $\lambda \notin \mathbb{Q}^+$ , then  $p$  is called a *reduced singularity* of  $\mathcal{F}$ .

**Theorem 1.16** (Seidenberg's theorem). *Given any foliated surface  $(X, \mathcal{F})$  with  $X$  smooth. Then there is a sequence of blowups  $\pi : (Y, \mathcal{G}) \rightarrow (X, \mathcal{F})$  such that  $(Y, \mathcal{G})$  has only reduced singularities.*

*Proof.* See [Sei68], [MM80, Appendix], or [Bru15, Theorem 1.1]. □

**Definition 1.17** (Invariant curves). Let  $(X, \mathcal{F})$  be a foliated surface. A curve  $C$  on  $X$  is called  $\mathcal{F}$ -invariant if the inclusion map

$$T_{\mathcal{F}}|_C \rightarrow T_X|_C$$

factors through  $T_C$  on the smooth locus of  $X$ .

**Definition 1.18** (Separatrices). Let  $p$  be a singular point of  $\mathcal{F}$ . A *separatrix* of  $\mathcal{F}$  at  $p$  is a holomorphic (possibly singular) irreducible  $\mathcal{F}$ -invariant curve  $C$  on a *neighborhood* of  $p$  which passes through  $p$ .

**Theorem 1.19.** *Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be a foliation on a normal surface  $X$  and  $C \subset X$  be a connected, compact  $\mathcal{F}$ -invariant curve such that the followings hold.*

- (1) *All the singularities of  $\mathcal{F}$  on  $C$  are reduced and on the non-singular locus of  $X$ .*
- (2) *The intersection matrix of  $C$  is negative definite, and the dual graph is a tree.*

*Then there exists at least one point  $p \in C \cap \text{Sing}(\mathcal{F})$  and a separatrix through  $p$  not contained in  $C$ .*

*Proof.* See [Cam88], [Seb97], or [Bru15, Theorem 3.4]. □

**1.5.1. Non-invariant curves.** We first consider the non-invariant curves and define the tangency order for them.

**Definition 1.20** (Tangency order). Let  $(X, \mathcal{F})$  be a foliated normal surface and  $p \in \text{Sing}(\mathcal{F}) \setminus \text{Sing}(X)$ . Let  $v$  be the vector field generating  $\mathcal{F}$  around  $p$  and  $C$  be a *non-invariant* curve through  $p$ . Let  $f$  be the local defining function of  $C$  at  $p$ . We define the *tangency order* of  $\mathcal{F}$  along  $C$  at  $p$  to be

$$\text{tang}(\mathcal{F}, C, p) := \dim_{\mathbb{C}} \frac{\mathcal{O}_{X,p}}{\langle f, v(f) \rangle}.$$

Note that  $\text{tang}(\mathcal{F}, C, p) \geq 0$  and is independent of the choices of  $v$  and  $f$ . Moreover, if  $\mathcal{F}$  is transverse to  $C$  at  $p$ , then  $\text{tang}(\mathcal{F}, C, p) = 0$ . Therefore, if  $C$  is compact, then we can define

$$\text{tang}(\mathcal{F}, C) := \sum_{p \in C} \text{tang}(\mathcal{F}, C, p).$$

**Proposition 1.21** ([Bru97],[Bru15, Proposition 2.2]). *Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be a foliation on a smooth projective surface  $X$ , and  $C$  be a non-invariant curve on  $X$ . Then we have*

$$K_{\mathcal{F}} \cdot C = \text{tang}(\mathcal{F}, C) - C^2.$$

**Corollary 1.22.** *Let  $C$  be a non-invariant curve on a foliated surface  $(X, \mathcal{F})$ . If  $C$  is contained in the smooth locus of  $X$ , then we have  $(K_{\mathcal{F}} + C) \cdot C \geq 0$ .*

1.5.2. *Invariant curves.* Now we consider the invariant curves.

**Definition 1.23.** Let  $(X, \mathcal{F})$  be a foliated surface and  $p \in \text{Sing}(\mathcal{F}) \setminus \text{Sing}(X)$ . Let  $\omega$  be a 1-form generating  $\mathcal{F}$  around  $p$ . If  $C$  is an invariant curve and  $f$  is the local defining function at  $p$ , then we can write

$$g\omega = hdf + f\eta$$

where  $g$  and  $h$  are holomorphic functions,  $\eta$  is a holomorphic 1-form, and  $h, f$  are relatively prime functions.

We define the index  $Z(\mathcal{F}, C, p)$  to be the vanishing order of  $\frac{h}{g}|_C$  at  $p$ . Also we define Camacho-Sad index  $\text{CS}(\mathcal{F}, C, p)$  to be the residue of  $\frac{-1}{h}\eta|_C$  at  $p$ . These two definitions are independent of the choices of  $f, g, h, \omega, \eta$ . (For a reference, see [Bru15, page 15 in Chapter 2 and page 27 in Chapter 3].)

Note that if  $p \notin \text{Sing}(\mathcal{F})$ , then  $Z(\mathcal{F}, C, p) = 0 = \text{CS}(\mathcal{F}, C, p)$ . Therefore, if  $C$  is compact, then we can define

$$\begin{aligned} Z(\mathcal{F}, C) &:= \sum_{p \in C} Z(\mathcal{F}, C, p) \\ \text{CS}(\mathcal{F}, C) &:= \sum_{p \in C} \text{CS}(\mathcal{F}, C, p) \end{aligned}$$

**Definition 1.24.** We define the virtual Euler characteristic  $\chi(C)$  of  $C$  on a normal surface  $X$  to be  $\chi(C) = -K_X \cdot C - C^2$ .

**Theorem 1.25** ([Bru97],[Bru15, Proposition 2.3 and Theorem 3.2]). *Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be a foliation on a smooth projective surface  $X$ , and  $C$  be an invariant curve on  $X$ . Then we have*

- (1)  $K_{\mathcal{F}} \cdot C = Z(\mathcal{F}, C) - \chi(C)$ .
- (2)  $C^2 = \text{CS}(\mathcal{F}, C)$ . *This identity is called Camacho-Sad formula.*

**Lemma 1.26.** *Given a foliated normal surface  $(X, \mathcal{F})$  and  $p$  a semi-reduced singularity.*

- (1) *If  $p$  is reduced and non-degenerate, assume  $\omega = \lambda y(1 + o(1))dx - x(1 + o(1))dy$  generates  $\mathcal{F}$  around  $p$ . Then*

$$\text{CS}(\mathcal{F}, x = 0, p) = \frac{1}{\lambda}, \text{CS}(\mathcal{F}, y = 0, p) = \lambda, \text{ and } Z(\mathcal{F}, x = 0, p) = 1 = Z(\mathcal{F}, y = 0, p).$$



(2) If  $p$  is a saddle-node, assume  $\omega = y^{k+1}dx - (x(1 + \nu y^k) + yo(k))dy$  generates  $\mathcal{F}$  around  $p$ . Then

$$\text{CS}(\mathcal{F}, y = 0, p) = 0 \text{ and } Z(\mathcal{F}, y = 0, p) = 1.$$

Suppose there exists a weak separatrix, then

$$\text{CS}(\mathcal{F}, x = 0, p) = \nu \text{ and } Z(\mathcal{F}, x = 0, p) = k + 1.$$

(3) If  $p$  is not reduced, assume its eigenvalue  $\lambda = \frac{m}{n} \in \mathbb{Q}^+$  in the reduced form. Assume  $\omega = \lambda y(1 + o(1))dx - x(1 + o(1))dy$  generates  $\mathcal{F}$  around  $p$ . Then

$$\text{CS}(\mathcal{F}, x = 0, p) = \frac{1}{\lambda}, \text{CS}(\mathcal{F}, y = 0, p) = \lambda, \text{ and } Z(\mathcal{F}, x = 0, p) = 1 = Z(\mathcal{F}, y = 0, p).$$

Moreover, for the invariant curve  $C$  through  $p = (0, 0)$  which is locally defined by  $ax^m(1 + o(1)) - y^n(1 + o(1)) = 0$ , we have

$$\text{CS}(\mathcal{F}, C, p) = mn \text{ and } Z(\mathcal{F}, C, p) = 1 - (m - 1)(n - 1).$$

*Proof.* We will only show the case (3). For the first two cases, the computations are similar. (See also [Bru15, page 30-31 in Chapter 3].)

For the case  $f = x$ , note that  $1 \cdot \omega = (\lambda y(1 + o(1)))dx + x(-(1 + o(1))dy)$ . Then we take  $g = 1$ ,  $h = \lambda y(1 + o(1))$ , and  $\eta = -(1 + o(1))dy$ . Thus we have

$$\text{CS}(\mathcal{F}, x = 0, p) = \text{res}_p \frac{-1}{h} \eta|_{f=0} = \text{res}_p \frac{1}{\lambda y(1 + o(1))} (1 + o(1))dy|_{x=0} = \frac{1}{\lambda}.$$

$$\begin{aligned} Z(\mathcal{F}, x = 0, p) &= \text{vanishing order of } \frac{h}{g}|_{f=0} \\ &= \text{vanishing order of } \frac{\lambda y(1 + o(1))}{1}|_{x=0} \\ &= 1. \end{aligned}$$

For the case  $f = y$ , it is similar.

For the case  $C = (ax^m(1 + o(1)) - y^n(1 + o(1)) = 0)$ , we assume  $C = (f = ax^m - y^n = 0)$  and  $\omega = mydx - nxdy$  for simplicity. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} ax^{m-1}\omega &= amx^{m-1}ydx - anx^m dy \\ &= amx^{m-1}ydx - ny^n dy - nfdy \\ &= ydf - nfdy. \end{aligned}$$

So we take  $g = ax^{m-1}$ ,  $h = y$ , and  $\eta = -ndy$ . Thus,

$$\text{CS}(\mathcal{F}, C, p) = \text{res}_p \frac{-1}{h} \eta|_{f=0} = \text{res}_p \frac{1}{y} ndy|_{f=0} = mn.$$

$$\begin{aligned} Z(\mathcal{F}, C, p) &= \text{vanishing order of } \frac{h}{g}|_{f=0} \\ &= \text{vanishing order of } \frac{y}{ax^{m-1}}|_{f=0} \\ &= 1 - (n - 1)(m - 1). \end{aligned}$$

□

**1.6. Generalized canonical models.** In light of the Example 0.1, we would like to allow some mild singularities in order to get local-closedness in a family.

**Definition 1.27.** A foliated normal surface  $(X, \mathcal{F})$  is called a *generalized canonical model* if the following conditions hold:

- (1)  $\mathcal{F}$  is a foliation on a normal proper algebraic space  $X$  of dimension two with only log canonical foliation singularities such that all points at which  $\mathcal{F}$  is *not* canonical are either smooth points of  $X$  or cyclic quotient singularities of  $X$ .
- (2)  $K_{\mathcal{F}}$  is nef.
- (3)  $K_{\mathcal{F}} \cdot C = 0$  implies  $C^2 \geq 0$  for any irreducible curve  $C$ .

Moreover, we say  $(X, \mathcal{F})$  has *mild* log canonical foliation singularities if the first condition above holds.

In Lemma 1.33 and Remark 1.34, we study more properties of mild log canonical foliation singularities. Actually, there are log canonical foliation singularities which are not mild.

*Example 1.28* ([McQ08, Example I.2.5]). On the normal surface  $(x^{n+2} + y^{n+1} + xz^n = 0)$  for  $n \geq 2$ , it is not a rational singularity but the foliation given by

$$\partial = n(n+1)x \frac{\partial}{\partial x} + n(n+2)y \frac{\partial}{\partial y} + (n+1)^2 z \frac{\partial}{\partial z}$$

is log canonical.

**Definition 1.29.** We say a foliated normal surface  $(X, \mathcal{F})$  is a *canonical model* if it is a generalized canonical model with only canonical foliation singularities.

**Lemma 1.30.** *Let  $(X, \mathcal{F})$  be a generalized canonical model. If the foliation  $\mathcal{F}$  is of general type, then  $K_{\mathcal{F}}$  is numerically ample, that is  $K_{\mathcal{F}}^2 > 0$  and  $K_{\mathcal{F}} \cdot C > 0$  for any irreducible curve  $C$  on  $X$ .*

*Proof.* The proof follows closely from the proof of [HL21, Lemma 1.11]. □

To describe the resolutions of canonical foliation singularities and mild log canonical foliation singularities, we recall the following definitions. (See also [Bru15, Definition 5.1 and 8.1] and [McQ08, Definition III.0.2 and III.2.3].)

**Definition 1.31.** Given a foliated surface  $(X, \mathcal{F})$  with  $X$  smooth.

- (1)  $E = \bigcup_{i=1}^s E_i$  is called a string if
  - (a) each  $E_i$  is a smooth rational curve and
  - (b)  $E_i \cdot E_j = 1$  if  $|i - j| = 1$  and 0 if  $|i - j| \geq 2$ .
- (2) If, moreover,  $E_i^2 \leq -2$  for all  $i$ , then we call  $E$  a Hirzebruch-Jung string.
- (3) A curve  $C \subset X$  is called  $\mathcal{F}$ -exceptional if
  - (a)  $C$  is a  $(-1)$ -curve and
  - (b) the contraction of  $C$  introduces  $(X', \mathcal{F}')$  with only *reduced* singularities.
- (4) An  $\mathcal{F}$ -invariant curve  $C$  is called a  $(-1)$ - $\mathcal{F}$ -curve (resp.  $(-2)$ - $\mathcal{F}$ -curve) if
  - (a)  $C$  is a smooth rational curve and
  - (b)  $Z(\mathcal{F}, C) = 1$  (resp.  $Z(\mathcal{F}, C) = 2$ ).
- (5) We say  $C = \bigcup_{i=1}^s C_i$  is an  $\mathcal{F}$ -chain if
  - (a)  $C$  is a Hirzebruch-Jung string,
  - (b) each  $C_i$  is  $\mathcal{F}$ -invariant,

- (c)  $\text{Sing } \mathcal{F} \cap C$  are all reduced and non-degenerate, and
- (d)  $Z(\mathcal{F}, C_1) = 1$  and  $Z(\mathcal{F}, C_i) = 2$  for all  $i \geq 2$ .
- (6) If an  $\mathcal{F}$ -invariant curve  $E$  is not contained in an  $\mathcal{F}$ -chain  $C$  but meets the chain, then we call  $E$  the tail of the chain  $C$ .
- (7)  $C$  is called a bad tail if
  - (a)  $C$  is a smooth rational curve with  $Z(\mathcal{F}, C) = 3$  and  $C^2 \leq -2$  and
  - (b)  $C$  intersects two  $(-1)$ - $\mathcal{F}$ -curves whose self-intersections are both  $-2$ .

**Theorem 1.32** ([McQ08, Theorem III.3.2]). *Given any canonical model  $(X, \mathcal{F})$ . Let  $\pi : Y \rightarrow X$  be the minimal resolution at points at which  $\mathcal{F}$  is singular. Let  $\mathcal{G}$  be the pullback foliation on  $Y$ . Then all connected components of exceptional divisors of  $\pi$  are one of the following types:*

- (1) ( $A_n$  type) *A string of smooth rational curves. More precisely, it consists of either a  $\mathcal{G}$ -chain, two  $(-1)$ - $\mathcal{G}$ -curves of self-intersections  $-2$  joined by a bad tail, or a chain of  $(-2)$ - $\mathcal{G}$ -curves.*
- (2) ( $D_n$  type) *Two  $(-1)$ - $\mathcal{G}$ -curves of self-intersections  $-2$  joined by a bad tail which itself connects to a chain of  $(-2)$ - $\mathcal{G}$ -curves.*
- (3) (e.g.l.) *Elliptic Gorenstein leaves. That is, either a cycle of  $(-2)$ - $\mathcal{G}$ -curves or a rational curve with only one node.*

Now we study *log canonical* foliation singularities on *smooth* points.

**Lemma 1.33.** *Let  $(X, \mathcal{F}, p)$  be a germ of a foliated surface. Suppose  $p$  is a semi-reduced singularity with positive rational eigenvalue, and  $p \in X$  is a smooth point. Then there is a sequence of blowups  $\pi : (Y, \mathcal{G}) \rightarrow (X, \mathcal{F}, p)$  with  $\mathcal{G}$  having only reduced singularities on the exceptional divisor  $E$ . Thus we have the following:*

- (1) *The support of the exceptional divisor  $\bigcup_{i=1}^s E_i$  is a string,*
- (2) *All  $E_i$ 's except for one  $j \in \{1, \dots, s\}$  are invariant. Moreover, this  $E_j$  has  $\text{tang}(\mathcal{G}, E_j) = 0$ .*
- (3) *The string  $\bigcup_{i=1}^{j-1} E_i$  (resp.  $\bigcup_{i=j+1}^s E_i$ ) is a  $\mathcal{G}$ -chain with the first curve  $E_{j-1}$  (resp.  $E_{j+1}$ ).*
- (4)  $\pi^* K_{\mathcal{F}} = K_{\mathcal{G}} + E_j$ .

*Proof.* Since the eigenvalue is defined up to reciprocal, we may assume that the eigenvalue is  $\frac{m}{n} \in \mathbb{Q}^+$  with  $\gcd(m, n) = 1$  and  $m \geq n$ . We proceed by induction on the pair  $(m, n) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}$  (by lexicographic ordering).

- (1) We may assume that  $p = (0, 0)$  and that  $\mathcal{F}$  is generated by

$$v = nx \frac{\partial}{\partial x} + my \frac{\partial}{\partial y}$$

around  $p$ . Let  $\varphi : (Y, \mathcal{G}) \rightarrow (X, \mathcal{F})$  be the blowup at  $p$  and  $E_0$  be the exceptional divisor. Notice that there are two singularities on the exceptional curve locally generated by

$$v_1 = nx' \frac{\partial}{\partial x'} + (m-n)y' \frac{\partial}{\partial y'}$$

and

$$v_2 = (n-m)x' \frac{\partial}{\partial x'} + my' \frac{\partial}{\partial y'}.$$

- (2) For the base case  $(m, n) = (1, 1)$ , by the computation above, the exceptional curve  $E_0$  has no foliation singularity and is not invariant with  $\text{tang}(\mathcal{G}, E_0) = 0$ . Moreover, we have  $\pi^*K_{\mathcal{F}} = K_{\mathcal{G}} + E_0$ . Thus, we complete the proof of the base case.
- (3) Assume  $(m, n) \neq (1, 1)$  and all pairs (strictly) less than  $(m, n)$  have the desired properties. Then  $E_0$  is invariant and  $\pi^*K_{\mathcal{F}} = K_{\mathcal{G}}$ . Notice that  $v_1$  is still semi-reduced with corresponding pair  $(m - n, n)$  or  $(n, m - n)$  while  $v_2$  is reduced.

By induction hypothesis,  $v_1$  has a sequence of blowups  $\psi : (Z, \mathcal{H}) \rightarrow (Y, \mathcal{G})$  with exceptional divisor  $E = \bigcup_{i=1}^s E_i$ . Since the proper transform  $\tilde{E}_0$  of  $E_0$  on  $Z$  meets  $E$ ,  $\tilde{E}_0$  can only meet  $E$  as a tail of an  $\mathcal{H}$ -chain. Note that  $\tilde{E}_0^2 \leq E_0^2 - 1 = -2$ . Thus,  $\tilde{E}_0$  is a member of that  $\mathcal{H}$ -chain. Also  $\psi^*\pi^*K_{\mathcal{F}} = \psi^*K_{\mathcal{G}} = K_{\mathcal{H}} + E_i$  for some  $i$ .  $\square$

*Remark 1.34.* By [McQ08, Fact I.2.4 and its remarks], a mild log canonical foliation singularity  $p$  (see Definition 1.27) is formally locally of the form  $\partial = x\frac{\partial}{\partial x} + \lambda y\frac{\partial}{\partial y}$  quotient by  $\mathbb{Z}/n$  for some  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$  and  $\lambda \in \mathbb{Q}^+$ . Also  $K_{\mathcal{F}}$  is Cartier around  $p$ . Let  $\pi : Y \rightarrow X$  be the *minimal* resolution of  $X$  over  $p$  and  $\mathcal{G}$  be the pullback foliation on  $Y$ . Then, after some computations, we have the following:

- (1) The support of the exceptional divisor  $E = \bigcup_{i=1}^s E_i$  is a string.
- (2) For general  $\lambda \in \mathbb{Q}^+$ , all  $E_i$ 's are  $(-2)$ - $\mathcal{G}$ -curves and exactly one foliation singularity on  $E$  is not reduced but semi-reduced.
- (3) Fix the action of  $\mathbb{Z}/n$  on  $\partial$ , for any  $j \in \{1, \dots, s\}$ , there is a  $\lambda \in \mathbb{Q}^+$  such that  $E_j$  is not  $\mathcal{G}$ -invariant with  $\text{tang}(\mathcal{G}, E_j) = 0$ , the string  $\bigcup_{i=1}^{j-1} E_i$  (resp.  $\bigcup_{i=j+1}^s E_i$ ) is a  $\mathcal{G}$ -chain with the first curve  $E_{j-1}$  (resp.  $E_{j+1}$ ), and  $\pi^*K_{\mathcal{F}} = K_{\mathcal{G}} + E_j$ .

**Definition 1.35.** We call the string appearing as (3) in Remark 1.34 a *generalized  $\mathcal{G}$ -chain*.

*Example 1.36.* Consider the foliation of the form  $\partial = x\frac{\partial}{\partial x} + \lambda y\frac{\partial}{\partial y}$  on the germ  $(\mathbb{C}^2/\mu_7, 0)$  of the type  $\frac{1}{7}(1, 4)$ . Let  $Y \rightarrow X$  be the minimal resolution of singularities. Then we have two irreducible exceptional divisors  $E_1$  and  $E_2$ , and we need three copies of  $\mathbb{C}^2$  to cover  $Y$ . More explicitly,  $Y = \mathbb{C}_{\xi_0, \eta_0}^2 \cup \mathbb{C}_{\xi_1, \eta_1}^2 \cup \mathbb{C}_{\xi_2, \eta_2}^2 = \mathbb{A}_0^2 \cup \mathbb{A}_1^2 \cup \mathbb{A}_2^2$  where

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_0 &= x^{-4}y, & \xi_1 &= x^{-1}y^2, & \xi_2 &= y^7 \\ \eta_0 &= x^7, & \eta_1 &= x^4y^{-1}, & \eta_2 &= xy^{-2} \end{aligned}$$

Thus, on  $\mathbb{C}_{\xi_0, \eta_0}^2$ , we have

$$\partial_0 = (\lambda - 4)\xi_0 \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi_0} + 7\eta_0 \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta_0}.$$

On  $\mathbb{C}_{\xi_1, \eta_1}^2$ , we have

$$\partial_1 = (2\lambda - 1)\xi_1 \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi_1} + (4 - \lambda)\eta_1 \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta_1}.$$

And on  $\mathbb{C}_{\xi_2, \eta_2}^2$ , we have

$$\partial_2 = 7\lambda\xi_2 \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi_2} + (1 - 2\lambda)\eta_2 \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta_2}.$$

Assume that  $E_1$  is on  $\mathbb{A}_0^2 \cup \mathbb{A}_1^2$  and thus defined by  $\eta_0 = 0$  on  $\mathbb{A}_0^2$  and by  $\xi_1 = 0$  on  $\mathbb{A}_1^2$ . So  $E_2$  is on  $\mathbb{A}_1^2 \cup \mathbb{A}_2^2$  and defined by  $\eta_1 = 0$  on  $\mathbb{A}_1^2$  and by  $\xi_2 = 0$  on  $\mathbb{A}_2^2$ .

Therefore, if  $\lambda = 4$ , then  $E_1$  is non-invariant. Also if  $\lambda = \frac{1}{2}$ , then  $E_2$  is non-invariant. For other  $\lambda \in \mathbb{Q}^+$ , the exceptional curves  $E_1$  and  $E_2$  are both invariant, and precisely one of three foliation singularities is not reduced but still semi-reduced.

Now we summarize the descriptions of the singularities on a generalized canonical model.

**Theorem 1.37.** *Let  $(X, \mathcal{F})$  be a generalized canonical model. Let  $\pi : Y \rightarrow X$  be the minimal resolution at points at which  $\mathcal{F}$  is singular. Let  $\mathcal{G}$  be the pullback foliation on  $Y$ . Write  $K_{\mathcal{G}} + D = \pi^*K_{\mathcal{F}} + E$  where  $D$  and  $E$  are effective and have no common components. Then  $\mathcal{G}$  has at worst semi-reduced singularities,  $D$  is reduced, the support of  $E$  is the union of  $\mathcal{G}$ -chains which are disjoint from  $D$ , and all irreducible components of  $D$  are pairwise disjoint with tangency order zero. Moreover, the connected components of  $\pi$ -exceptional divisors belong to one of the following types:*

- (1) ( $A_n$  type) A chain of rational invariant curves consisting of an  $\mathcal{G}$ -chain, two  $(-1)$ - $\mathcal{G}$ -curves of self-intersections  $-2$  joined by a bad tail, a chain of  $(-2)$ - $\mathcal{G}$ -curves, a generalized  $\mathcal{G}$ -chain (see Definition 1.35), or a non-invariant smooth rational curve with tangency order zero.
- (2) ( $D_n$  type) Two  $(-1)$ - $\mathcal{G}$ -curves of self-intersections  $-2$  joined by a bad tail which itself connects to a chain of  $(-2)$ - $\mathcal{G}$ -curves.
- (3) (e.g.l.) Elliptic Gorenstein leaves. That is, either a cycle of  $(-2)$ - $\mathcal{G}$ -curves or a rational curve with only one node.

*Remark 1.38.* Only the eigenvalues of foliation singularities on the chain of  $(-2)$ - $\mathcal{G}$ -curves can vary in a family.

**1.7.  $\varepsilon$ -canonical singularities.** From Example 0.1, we know that there is no Seidenberg theorem for a family. Nevertheless, in [PS19], we can still have a Seidenberg-type theorem for a family by allowing  $\varepsilon$ -canonical singularities, which will be defined as follows.

**Definition 1.39** ([PS19, Definition 4.1]). Let  $(X, \mathcal{F})$  be a foliated surface with  $X$  smooth and let  $\pi : Y \rightarrow X$  be a birational morphism. Denote  $\mathcal{G}$  be the pullback foliation of  $\mathcal{F}$  via  $\pi$ . If  $E$  is a prime exceptional divisor of  $\pi$ , then we define the *adjoint discrepancy* of  $\mathcal{F}$  along  $E$  to be the function

$$a(\mathcal{F}, E) : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

which sends  $t$  to  $\text{ord}_E((1-t)(K_{\mathcal{G}} - \pi^*K_{\mathcal{F}}) + t(K_Y - \pi^*K_X))$ .

**Definition 1.40** ([PS19, Definition 4.2]). A point  $x$  on a foliated surface  $(X, \mathcal{F})$  with  $X$  smooth is called  $\varepsilon$ -canonical if the adjoint discrepancy of  $\mathcal{F}$  along any divisor  $E$  over  $x$  satisfies  $a(\mathcal{F}, E)(t) \geq 0$  for every  $t \geq \varepsilon$ .

**Lemma 1.41** ([PS19, Lemma 7.3]). *Let  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F})$  be a smooth family over an algebraic variety  $T$  such that all fibers are smooth projective surfaces. If  $0 < \varepsilon < \frac{1}{4}$ , then the subset of  $T$  corresponding to foliations with isolated and  $\varepsilon$ -canonical singularities is a Zariski open subset of  $T$ .*

**Proposition 1.42** ([PS19, Proposition 7.4]). *Given a smooth family  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F})$  over  $T$  such that all fibers are smooth projective surfaces and a real number  $\varepsilon$  with  $0 < \varepsilon < \frac{1}{4}$ . Then there exists a non-empty Zariski open subset  $U \subset T$  and a family  $(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{G})$  over  $U$  obtained from  $\mathcal{F}|_U$  by a finite composition of blowups over (multi)-sections such that, for*

all  $t \in U$ , the foliation  $\mathcal{G}_t$  has at worst  $\varepsilon$ -canonical singularities. In fact,  $\mathcal{G}_t$  has at worst semi-reduced singularities for all  $t \in U$ .

**1.8. Quot scheme.** In this section, we recall some properties of Quot schemes.

**Definition 1.43.** Let  $X \rightarrow S$  be a scheme of finite type over a noetherian base scheme  $S$  and  $\mathcal{E}$  be a coherent sheaf on  $X$ . We consider the functor

$$\mathrm{Quot}_{\mathcal{E}/X/S} : (\mathrm{Sch}/S)^{\mathrm{op}} \rightarrow (\mathrm{Sets})$$

sending  $T \rightarrow S$  to the set

$$\mathrm{Quot}_{\mathcal{E}/X/S}(T) = \left\{ (\mathcal{F}, q) \mid \begin{array}{l} \mathcal{F} \in \mathrm{Coh}(X_T), \mathrm{Supp} \mathcal{F} \text{ is proper over } T \\ \mathcal{F} \text{ is flat over } T, q : \mathcal{E}_T \rightarrow \mathcal{F} \text{ is surjective.} \end{array} \right\} / \sim$$

where  $X_T = X \times_S T$ ,  $\mathcal{E}_T = \mathrm{pr}_X^* \mathcal{E}$  under the projection  $\mathrm{pr}_X : X_T \rightarrow X$ , and  $(\mathcal{F}, q) \sim (\mathcal{F}', q')$  if  $\ker q = \ker q'$ .

**Definition 1.44.** Let  $X \rightarrow S$  be a scheme of a finite type over a noetherian base scheme  $S$  and  $\mathcal{A}$  be a relatively ample line bundle. For any coherent sheaf  $\mathcal{F}$  on  $X$  flat over  $S$ , we define the Hilbert polynomial  $\Phi_{\mathcal{F}}$  with respect to  $\mathcal{A}$  as

$$\Phi_{\mathcal{F}}(m) = \chi(\mathcal{F}_s(m)) = \sum_{i=0}^{\dim X} (-1)^i h^i(X_s, \mathcal{F}_s \otimes \mathcal{A}_s^{\otimes m})$$

for any fixed  $s \in S$ . Note that this definition is independent of the choice of  $s \in S$ .

**Proposition 1.45.** Fix any relatively ample line bundle  $\mathcal{A}$  on  $X$ . There is a natural stratification:

$$\mathrm{Quot}_{\mathcal{E}/X/S} = \coprod_{\Phi \in \mathbb{Q}[\lambda]} \mathrm{Quot}_{\mathcal{E}/X/S}^{\Phi, \mathcal{A}}$$

where  $\mathrm{Quot}_{\mathcal{E}/X/S}^{\Phi, \mathcal{A}}(T) = \{(\mathcal{F}, q) \in \mathrm{Quot}_{\mathcal{E}/X/S}(T) \mid \Phi_{\mathcal{F}} = \Phi\}$ .

**Theorem 1.46** (Grothendieck). The functor  $\mathrm{Quot}_{\mathcal{E}/X/S}^{\Phi, \mathcal{A}}$  is representable by a projective scheme  $\mathrm{Quot}_{\mathcal{E}/X/S}^{\Phi, \mathcal{A}}$  over  $S$ .

## 2. BOUNDEDNESS OF GENERALIZED CANONICAL MODELS

**2.1. Local contributions of generalized canonical models.** From now on, we assume that the foliation  $\mathcal{F}$  is of general type, that is,  $K_{\mathcal{F}}$  is big. Fix  $\chi(mK_{\mathcal{F}}) = P(m)$  where  $P : \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$  is an integral valued function. As in [HL21], we would like to study the following singular Riemann-Roch theorem and get some boundedness results.

**Theorem 2.1** ([Rei87],[Lan00, Section 3]). Let  $X$  be a normal complete surface and  $D$  be a Weil divisor on  $X$ . Then we have

$$\chi(D) = \frac{1}{2} D \cdot (D - K_X) + \chi(\mathcal{O}_X) + \sum_{x \in \mathrm{Sing}(X)} a(x, D)$$

where  $a(x, D)$  is a local contribution of  $\mathcal{O}_X(D)$  at  $x$  depending only on the local isomorphism class of the reflexive sheaf  $\mathcal{O}_X(D)$  at  $x$ .

If  $X$  has only quotient singularities, then the theorem follows from [Rei87]. In general, the theorem follows from [Lan00, Section 3].

**Proposition 2.2.** *Let  $m$  be a non-negative integer.*

- (1) *If  $D$  is Cartier at  $x$ , then  $a(x, D) = 0$ .*  
(2) *If  $(X, \mathcal{F}, x)$  is a mild log canonical non-canonical foliation singularity, then*

$$a(x, mK_{\mathcal{F}}) = 0 \text{ for all } m.$$

- (3) *If  $(X, \mathcal{F}, x)$  is a canonical foliation singularity, which is  $\mathbb{Q}$ -Gorenstein but it is not terminal. Then we have two cases:*  
(a)  *$\mathcal{F}$  is Gorenstein and  $a(x, mK_{\mathcal{F}}) = 0$  for all  $m$ .*  
(b)  *$\mathcal{F}$  is 2-Gorenstein and*

$$a(x, mK_{\mathcal{F}}) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{for } m \text{ even.} \\ -\frac{1}{2} & \text{for } m \text{ odd.} \end{cases}$$

- (4) *If  $(X, \mathcal{F}, x)$  be a canonical foliation singularity and assume  $\mathcal{F}$  is not  $\mathbb{Q}$ -Gorenstein at  $x$ , then we have*

$$a(x, mK_{\mathcal{F}}) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{for } m = 0. \\ -1 & \text{for positive } m. \end{cases}$$

- (5) *If  $(X, \mathcal{F}, x)$  is a terminal foliation singularity, then  $a(x, K_{\mathcal{F}}) = \frac{1-n}{2n}$  where the surface singularity at  $x$  is of the type  $\frac{1}{n}(1, q)$  for some  $n$  and  $q$ .*

*Proof.* (1) follows from the definition. (2) follows from (1) since  $K_{\mathcal{F}}$  is Cartier at these foliation singularities. (3) is [HL21, Proposition 2.4] and (4) is [HL21, Proposition 2.6]. (5) follows from [HL21, Corollary 2.2] and [Lan00, Example 5.6].  $\square$

*Remark 2.3.* In addition to any singularities on canonical models, we only allow *mild* log canonical foliation singularities, which have no local contributions by Proposition 2.2. Thus, we have the following similar proposition as [HL21, Proposition 4.1] for generalized canonical models.

**Proposition 2.4.** *Fix a function  $P : \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ . There exist constants  $B_1, B_2, B_3$ , and  $B_4$  such that if  $(X, \mathcal{F})$  is a generalized canonical model with Hilbert function  $\chi(mK_{\mathcal{F}}) = P(m)$  for all  $m \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ , then  $K_{\mathcal{F}}^2 = B_1$ ,  $K_{\mathcal{F}} \cdot K_X = B_2$ ,  $\chi(\mathcal{O}_X) = B_3$ , and the number of cusp singularities is equal to  $B_4$ . Moreover, there exists some constants  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  such that the number of terminal and dihedral singularities is at most  $C_1$  and the index at any terminal foliation singularity is at most  $C_2$ .*

*Proof.* The proof follows closely from the proof of [HL21, Proposition 4.1]. For the reader's convenience, we include the proof.

By Theorem 2.1, we have

$$P(m) = \chi(mK_{\mathcal{F}}) = \frac{1}{2}mK_{\mathcal{F}} \cdot (mK_{\mathcal{F}} - K_X) + \chi(\mathcal{O}_X) + \sum_{x \in \text{Sing}(X)} a(x, mK_{\mathcal{F}})$$

Since  $K_{\mathcal{F}}^2$  is the quadratic term of  $P$  and  $K_{\mathcal{F}} \cdot K_X$  is the linear term of  $P$ , both of them are fixed. Also  $\chi(\mathcal{O}_X) = P(0)$  is also fixed. If we put  $m = 1$ , then we get the number

$$\sum_{x \in \text{Sing}(X)} a(x, K_{\mathcal{F}})$$

is fixed.

Let  $\Sigma_1$  be the set of terminal foliation singularities,  $\Sigma_2$  be the set of dihedral quotient singularities, and  $\Sigma_3$  be the set of cusp singularities. Also let  $\Sigma = \Sigma_1 \cup \Sigma_2 \cup \Sigma_3$ . Then by Proposition 2.2, we have

$$-\sum_{x \in \text{Sing}(X)} a(x, K_{\mathcal{F}}) = \sum_{x \in \Sigma_1} \frac{n_x - 1}{2n_x} + \sum_{x \in \Sigma_2} \frac{1}{2} + \sum_{x \in \Sigma_3} 1 \geq \frac{1}{4} |\Sigma|.$$

So the number of singularities is bounded and hence

$$\sum_{x \in \Sigma_1} \frac{1}{n_x} = |\Sigma| + |\Sigma_3| + 2 \sum_{x \in \text{Sing}(X)} a(x, K_{\mathcal{F}})$$

assumes finitely many values. By [HL21, Lemma 3.4], the indices at the terminal foliation singularities are bounded by  $C_2$ .

Finally, let  $m = (2C_2)!$ . Then by Theorem 2.1 and Proposition 2.2, we have

$$P(m) = \chi(mK_{\mathcal{F}}) = \frac{1}{2} m K_{\mathcal{F}} \cdot (mK_{\mathcal{F}} - K_X) + \chi(\mathcal{O}_X) - |\Sigma_3|.$$

Hence, the number of cusps is fixed.  $\square$

**2.2. Minimal partial du Val resolution.** Fix a function  $P : \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ . Given any generalized canonical model  $(X, \mathcal{F})$  of general type with  $\chi(mK_{\mathcal{F}}) = P(m)$  for all  $m \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ . We first consider the minimal resolution  $g : X^m \rightarrow X$  at points at which  $\mathcal{F}$  is *not* terminal. Let  $\mathcal{F}^m$  be the pullback foliation on  $X^m$ . Then let  $h : X^m \rightarrow Y$  be the (traditional) relative canonical model of  $K_{X^m}$  over  $X$  which is given by a sequence of contractions of smooth rational curves  $C$  in the fiber of  $g$  with  $C^2 = -2$ . Put  $\mathcal{G}$  be the pushforward foliation on  $Y$ . Thus we have  $f : (Y, \mathcal{G}) \rightarrow (X, \mathcal{F})$  a morphism of foliated surfaces such that  $g = f \circ h$ .

By Theorem 1.37, we have  $K_{\mathcal{F}^m} + D^m = g^* K_{\mathcal{F}} + E$  where each irreducible component of  $E$  is an  $(-1)$ - $\mathcal{F}^m$ -curve with self-intersection  $-2$  and  $D^m = \sum D_i^m$  is an effective reduced divisor such that all irreducible components  $D_i^m$ 's are pairwise disjoint and non-invariant with  $\text{tang}(\mathcal{F}^m, D_i^m) = 0$ . (See also Remark 1.34.) Moreover,  $E$  is contracted by  $h$  since each irreducible component is  $(-1)$ - $\mathcal{F}^m$ -curve with self-intersection  $-2$  and any two  $(-1)$ - $\mathcal{F}^m$ -curves are disjoint. Thus, we have  $K_{\mathcal{G}} + D = f^* K_{\mathcal{F}}$  where  $D = h_* D^m$ .

$$\begin{array}{ccc} (X^m, \mathcal{F}^m) & & \\ \downarrow g & \searrow h & \\ & & (Y, \mathcal{G}) \\ & \swarrow f & \\ (X, \mathcal{F}) & & \end{array}$$

**Definition 2.5.** We call  $f : (Y, \mathcal{G}, D) \rightarrow (X, \mathcal{F})$  as above the *minimal partial du Val resolution* of the given generalized canonical model where  $(Y, \mathcal{G}, D)$  is a foliated triple (see Definition 2.6).

**Definition 2.6** (Foliated triple). A *foliated triple* is a triple  $(X, \mathcal{F}, D)$  where  $(X, \mathcal{F})$  is a foliated surface (see Definition 1.10) and  $D$  is a reduced divisor.

In addition, we may view a foliated surface  $(X, \mathcal{F}) = (X, \mathcal{F}, \emptyset)$  as a foliated triple.



*Remark 2.7.* If  $(Y, \mathcal{G}, D)$  is the minimal partial du Val resolution of some generalized canonical models  $(X, \mathcal{F})$  of general type, then  $(X, \mathcal{F})$  is unique. More precisely, if  $(Y, \mathcal{G}, D)$  is the minimal partial du Val resolution of generalized canonical models  $(X_1, \mathcal{F}_1)$  and  $(X_2, \mathcal{F}_2)$ . We have  $f_1^*K_{\mathcal{F}_1} = K_{\mathcal{G}} + D = f_2^*K_{\mathcal{F}_2}$ . Let  $C$  be a curve contracted by  $f_1$ . So we have  $f_2^*K_{\mathcal{F}_2} \cdot C = f_1^*K_{\mathcal{F}_1} \cdot C = 0$ . Since  $K_{\mathcal{F}_2}$  is numerically ample by Lemma 1.30,  $C$  is also contracted by  $f_2$ .

**Definition 2.8.** Fix a function  $P : \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ . Let  $\mathcal{S}_P$  be the set of foliated triples  $(Y, \mathcal{G}, D)$  which are minimal partial du Val resolutions of GENERALIZED CANONICAL models  $(X, \mathcal{F})$  of general type with  $\chi(mK_{\mathcal{F}}) = P(m)$ . Also let  $\mathcal{S}_P^{\mathcal{C}} \subset \mathcal{S}_P$  be the subset consisting of foliated triples  $(Y, \mathcal{G}, \emptyset)$  which are minimal partial du Val resolutions of CANONICAL models  $(X, \mathcal{F})$  of general type with  $\chi(mK_{\mathcal{F}}) = P(m)$ .

**Definition 2.9.** Let  $\mu : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow T$  be a projective morphism between two quasi-projective varieties of finite type. We say a (pre-)foliation  $\mathcal{F}$  on  $\mathcal{Y}$  is a family of (pre-)foliations with respect to  $\mu$  if  $\mathcal{F} \subset T_X$  factors through the relatively tangent sheaf of  $\mu$ .

Now we would like to prove the following boundedness for the set  $\mathcal{S}_P$ .

**Theorem 2.10.** *The set  $\mathcal{S}_P$  is bounded. More precisely, there exists a projective morphism  $\mu : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow T$  and a family of pre-foliations  $\mathcal{F}$  on  $\mathcal{Y}$  with respect to  $\mu$  where  $\mathcal{Y}$  and  $T$  are quasi-projective varieties of finite type such that, for any  $(Y, \mathcal{G}, D) \in \mathcal{S}_P$ , there is a  $t \in T$  and an isomorphism  $\rho : Y \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}_t$  such that  $\mathcal{G}(-D) \cong \rho^*(\mathcal{F}|_{\mathcal{Y}_t})$ .*

*Proof.* The proof follows closely from the proof of [Che19, Theorem 0.1] for canonical models. For the reader's convenience, we include the proof. The difference is that now we possibly have non-invariant exceptional divisors  $D = \sum D_j$ .

Let  $(X, \mathcal{F})$  be the generalized canonical model of  $(Y, \mathcal{G}, D)$  (see Remark 2.7) and  $f : (Y, \mathcal{G}, D) \rightarrow (X, \mathcal{F})$  be the associated morphism. Notice that  $f^*K_{\mathcal{F}} = K_{\mathcal{G}} + D$ . Let  $E = \cup E_i$  be the exceptional divisor of  $f : Y \rightarrow X$ . We divide the proof into several steps.

- (1) *Claim.*  $K_Y + mi(\mathcal{G})(K_{\mathcal{G}} + D)$  is nef (resp. ample) when  $m \geq 3$  (resp.  $m \geq 4$ ).

*Proof.* Given any irreducible curve  $C$  on  $Y$ .

- (a) If  $C = E_i$  for some  $i$ , then

$$(K_Y + mi(\mathcal{G})(K_{\mathcal{G}} + D)) \cdot C = K_Y \cdot C > 0$$

since  $K_Y$  is ample over  $X$ .

- (b) If  $C$  is not contained in the exceptional divisor, then we have two cases:

- (i) If  $K_Y \cdot C \geq 0$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} (K_Y + mi(\mathcal{G})(K_{\mathcal{G}} + D)) \cdot C &\geq mi(\mathcal{G})(K_{\mathcal{G}} + D) \cdot C \\ &= mi(\mathcal{G})K_{\mathcal{F}} \cdot f_*C > 0 \end{aligned}$$

since  $K_{\mathcal{F}}$  is numerically ample (see Lemma 1.30).

- (ii) If  $K_Y \cdot C < 0$ , by [Fuj12, Proposition 3.8], every  $K_Y$  negative extremal ray is spanned by a rational curve  $C$  with  $0 < -K_Y \cdot C \leq 3$ . Thus, if we write  $C \equiv \sum a_i C_i + B$  where  $B \cdot K_Y \geq 0$ , the  $C_i$ 's are  $K_Y$  negative extremal rays, the  $a_i$ 's are non-negative, and at least one of  $a_i$  is positive. By what we have seen above, we have

$$(K_Y + mi(\mathcal{G})(K_{\mathcal{G}} + D)) \cdot B \geq 0.$$

Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & (K_Y + mi(\mathcal{G})(K_{\mathcal{G}} + D)) \cdot C \\ & \geq \sum_i a_i \left( K_Y \cdot C_i + mi(\mathcal{G})(K_{\mathcal{G}} + D) \cdot C_i \right) \\ & \geq \sum_i a_i (-3 + m) \geq 0 \text{ (resp. } > 0 \text{)}. \end{aligned}$$

When  $m \geq 4$ , we notice that

$$K_Y + mi(\mathcal{G})(K_{\mathcal{G}} + D) = K_Y + 3i(\mathcal{G})(K_{\mathcal{G}} + D) + (m - 3)i(\mathcal{G})(K_{\mathcal{G}} + D)$$

is big since it is the sum of a nef divisor and a big divisor.

- (2) *Claim.*  $i(K_Y)$  and  $i(\mathcal{G})$  are bounded at foliation singularities.

*Proof.* By Proposition 2.4,  $i(K_Y)$  and  $i(\mathcal{G})$  are bounded in terms of  $\chi(mK_{\mathcal{F}})$  at terminal foliation singularities. Other foliation singularities are at du Val singularities at which  $\mathcal{G}$  is canonical. Then we have  $i(K_Y) = 1$  and  $i(\mathcal{G}) \leq 2$  by Proposition 2.2(3).

- (3) *Claim.* The embedding dimension at each point at which  $\mathcal{G}$  is singular is bounded.

*Proof.* By Proposition 2.4, the index at each point at which  $\mathcal{G}$  is terminal is bounded in terms of  $\chi(mK_{\mathcal{F}})$ . Actually, it is shown that the order of each cyclic group acting at each point at which  $\mathcal{G}$  is terminal is bounded. Thus, the embedding dimension at each point at which  $\mathcal{G}$  is terminal is bounded. See for example [Rei, Corollary 2.5]. If the action is  $\frac{1}{n}(1, q)$  and  $\frac{n}{n-q} = [a_1, \dots, a_k]$ , then the embedding dimension is at most  $k + 2$ .

Other singularities on  $Y$  are du Val singularities, at which the embedding dimensions are 3.

Thus, we have a uniform bound  $\delta$  such that  $\delta_{\zeta} \leq \delta$  for  $|\zeta| = 2$ . See Remark 1.2.

- (4) We consider the  $\mathbb{Q}$ -Cartier divisor

$$\begin{aligned} L &= \alpha i(K_Y)(K_Y + 4i(\mathcal{G})(K_{\mathcal{G}} + D)) - K_Y \\ &= (\alpha i(K_Y) - 1)(K_Y + 3i(\mathcal{G})(K_{\mathcal{G}} + D)) + (\alpha i(K_Y) + 3)i(\mathcal{G})(K_{\mathcal{G}} + D). \end{aligned}$$

Since  $i(\mathcal{G})(K_{\mathcal{G}} + D)$  is Cartier, we can fix an  $\alpha$ , which only depends on the Hilbert function  $\chi(mK_{\mathcal{F}})$ , such that for any irreducible curve  $C$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} L^2 &\geq (\alpha i(K_Y) + 3)^2 > \delta \\ L \cdot C &\geq \alpha i(K_Y) + 3 > \delta/2. \end{aligned}$$

By Theorem 1.1,  $K_Y + [L] = \alpha i(K_Y)(K_Y + 4i(\mathcal{G})(K_{\mathcal{G}} + D))$  separates points and tangents. Hence by Theorem 1.3, it is very ample.

- (5) *Claim.* The set of surfaces  $X$  where  $(X, \mathcal{F}) \in \mathcal{S}_P$  forms a bounded family.

*Proof.* Let  $\varphi : Y \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^N$  be an embedding defined via  $|K_Y + L|$ . We may assume that  $N$  is minimal in the sense that  $\varphi(Y)$  is not contained in any hyperplane of  $\mathbb{P}^N$ . In this case, it is known that

$$\deg \varphi(Y) \geq 1 + (N - \dim \varphi(Y)) = N - 1.$$

By [HL21, Lemma 3.5], we know that  $\gamma K_{\mathcal{F}} - K_X$  is pseudo-effective for

$$\gamma = \max \left\{ \frac{2K_{\mathcal{F}} \cdot K_X}{K_{\mathcal{F}}^2} + 3i_{\mathbb{Q}}(\mathcal{F}), 0 \right\}$$

which is bounded in terms of  $\chi(mK_{\mathcal{F}})$ . Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
\deg \varphi(Y) &= \text{vol}(K_Y + L) \\
&= \text{vol}\left(\alpha i(K_Y)(K_Y + 4i(\mathcal{G})(K_{\mathcal{G}} + D))\right) \\
&\leq \text{vol}\left(\alpha i(K_Y)(K_X + 4i(\mathcal{G})K_{\mathcal{F}})\right) \\
&\leq \text{vol}\left(\alpha i(K_Y)(K_X + 4i(\mathcal{G})K_{\mathcal{F}}) + \alpha i(K_Y)(\gamma K_{\mathcal{F}} - K_X)\right) \\
&= \text{vol}\left(\alpha i(K_Y)(\gamma + 4i(\mathcal{G}))K_{\mathcal{F}}\right) \\
&= \left(\alpha i(K_Y)(\gamma + 4i(\mathcal{G}))K_{\mathcal{F}}\right)^2
\end{aligned}$$

which is bounded in terms of  $\chi(mK_{\mathcal{F}})$ . Therefore  $N$  is also bounded.

Hence, by the boundedness result about Chow varieties, we have the boundedness of surfaces  $Y$  where  $(Y, \mathcal{G}, D) \in \mathcal{S}_P$ .

- (6) Now, we would like to show the boundedness of the pre-foliations  $\mathcal{G}(-D)$ .

We have shown that there exists a projective morphism  $\mu : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow T$  where  $\mathcal{Y}$  and  $T$  are quasi-projective varieties of finite type such that for any  $(Y, \mathcal{G}, D) \in \mathcal{S}_P$ , there is a  $t \in T$  such that  $\mathcal{Y}_t \cong Y$  and by construction we have

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\mathcal{Y}^c & \longrightarrow & \mathbb{P}_T^N \\
\mu \downarrow & \swarrow & \\
T & & 
\end{array}$$

and  $\mathcal{O}_Y(m(K_{\mathcal{G}} + D) + nK_Y) = \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Y}_t}(1)$  where  $m = 4\alpha i(K_Y)i(\mathcal{G})$  and  $n = \alpha i(K_Y)$ . Note that  $\alpha, i(K_Y)$ , and  $i(\mathcal{G})$  are fixed and determined by the function  $P$ . Without loss of generality, we may assume that  $T$  is the closure of  $T'$  where

$$T' = \{t \mid \mathcal{Y}_t \cong Y \text{ for some } (Y, \mathcal{G}, D) \in \mathcal{S}_P\}.$$

- (7) We may assume that  $T$  is reduced.

*Claim.* We may assume that  $T$  is irreducible.

*Proof.* Let  $T = \bigcup_i T_i$  be the decomposition of  $T$  into irreducible components. If there is a family of pre-foliations  $\mathcal{F}_i$  on each  $\mathcal{Y}_i = \mathcal{Y} \times_T T_i$  such that for any  $(Y, \mathcal{G}, D) \in \mathcal{S}_P$ , there exist an  $i$  and  $t \in T_i$  with  $(Y, \mathcal{G}(-D)) \cong (\mathcal{Y}_i, \mathcal{F}_i)_t$ , then the disjoint union of these families gives the required family.

*Claim.* We may assume that  $T$  is smooth.

*Proof.* This is achieved by the existence of a finite stratification of  $T$  by smooth locally closed subsets.

- (8) Recall that, by Serre's criterion,  $\mathcal{Y}$  is normal if and only if it is  $R_1$  and  $S_2$ .

*Claim.* We may assume that  $\mathcal{Y}$  is normal.

*Proof.* Suppose that  $\mathcal{Y}_t$  is  $R_1$  (resp.  $S_2$ ), then there exists an open subset  $U \subset T$  containing  $t$  such that  $\mathcal{Y}_U := \mathcal{Y} \times_T U$  is  $R_1$  (resp.  $S_2$ ) and every fiber  $\mathcal{Y}_t$  is also  $R_1$  (resp.  $S_2$ ) for  $t \in U$ . (For a reference, see [Gro66, Théorème 12.2.4].) It follows

that there is an open subset  $V \subset T$  such that  $\mathcal{Y}_V := \mathcal{Y} \times_T V$  is normal, every fiber  $\mathcal{Y}_t$  is normal for  $t \in V$ , and for all  $Y \in \mathcal{S}$ , there exists a  $t \in V$  such that  $Y \cong \mathcal{Y}_t$ . Hence, by shrinking  $T$ , we may assume that  $\mathcal{Y}$  is normal.

(9) *Claim.* We may assume that  $K_{\mathcal{Y}}$  is  $\mathbb{Q}$ -Cartierness.

*Proof.* This is well-known; see, for example, [Sim94, Lemma 1.27]. We include proof for the convenience of the reader.

Since  $\mathcal{Y}$  is normal, the canonical sheaf  $K_{\mathcal{Y}}$  is defined as a divisorial sheaf. By assumption,  $i(K_Y)K_{\mathcal{Y}_t}$  is Cartier for

$$t \in T^\circ := \{t \in T \mid \text{there exists } (Y, \mathcal{G}, D) \in \mathcal{S}_P \text{ such that } \mathcal{Y}_t \cong Y\}.$$

Note that  $T^\circ$  is a dense subset of  $T$ . For any  $t \in T^\circ$ , we fix a  $d$  such that  $i(K_Y)K_{\mathcal{Y}_t}(d)$  is generated by global sections. Then by replacing  $T$  by an open subset, we may assume that the map

$$\mu_* \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Y}}(i(K_Y)K_{\mathcal{Y}}(d)) \otimes k(t) \rightarrow H^0(\mathcal{Y}_t, i(K_Y)K_{\mathcal{Y}_t}(d))$$

is surjective by [Har77, Theorem 12.8 and Corollary 12.9]. Since  $i(K_Y)K_{\mathcal{Y}_t}(d)$  is locally generated by some section of  $H^0(\mathcal{Y}_t, i(K_Y)K_{\mathcal{Y}_t}(d))$ , by lifting this section to a section of  $H^0(\mathcal{Y}, i(K_Y)K_{\mathcal{Y}}(d))$  using the surjection above and by Nakayama's lemma,  $i(K_Y)K_{\mathcal{Y}}(d)$  is locally generated by one section on a neighborhood of  $\mathcal{Y}_t$ . Therefore,  $i(K_Y)K_{\mathcal{Y}}$  is Cartier on a neighborhood of  $\mathcal{Y}_t$ . Shrinking  $T$ , we may assume that  $i(K_Y)K_{\mathcal{Y}}$  is Cartier.

(10) Now we consider the function

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi(\ell) &= \chi(Y, \mathcal{O}_X(K_{\mathcal{G}} + D + \ell(m(K_{\mathcal{G}} + D) + nK_Y))) \\ &= \chi(X, \mathcal{O}_X((m\ell + 1)(K_{\mathcal{G}} + D) + n\ell K_Y)) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left( (m\ell + 1)(K_{\mathcal{G}} + D) + n\ell K_Y \right) \cdot \left( (m\ell + 1)(K_{\mathcal{G}} + D) + (n\ell - 1)K_Y \right) \\ &\quad + \chi(\mathcal{O}_Y) + \sum_{y \in \text{Sing}(Y)} a(y, (m\ell + 1)(K_{\mathcal{G}} + D) + n\ell K_Y) \end{aligned}$$

Note that  $m(K_{\mathcal{G}} + D)$  and  $nK_Y$  are Cartier, we have that

$$a(y, (m\ell + 1)(K_{\mathcal{G}} + D) + n\ell K_Y) = a(y, K_{\mathcal{G}} + D)$$

for any singularity  $y \in Y$ . Also we have

$$\begin{aligned} \chi(\mathcal{O}_Y) + \sum_{y \in \text{Sing}(Y)} a(y, K_{\mathcal{G}} + D) &= \chi(K_{\mathcal{G}} + D) - \frac{1}{2}(K_{\mathcal{G}} + D) \cdot (K_{\mathcal{G}} + D - K_Y) \\ &= P(1) - \frac{1}{2}(K_{\mathcal{G}} + D) \cdot (K_{\mathcal{G}} + D - K_Y). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi(\ell) &= \frac{1}{2} \left( (m\ell + 1)(K_{\mathcal{G}} + D) + n\ell K_Y \right) \cdot \left( (m\ell + 1)(K_{\mathcal{G}} + D) + (n\ell - 1)K_Y \right) \\ &\quad + P(1) - \frac{1}{2}(K_{\mathcal{G}} + D) \cdot (K_{\mathcal{G}} + D - K_Y) \end{aligned}$$

is a polynomial with coefficients in terms of  $P(1)$ ,  $(K_{\mathcal{G}} + D) \cdot K_Y = K_{\mathcal{F}} \cdot K_X$ ,  $(K_{\mathcal{G}} + D)^2 = K_{\mathcal{F}}^2$ , and  $K_Y^2$ . Since the function  $P$  is fixed, we have  $K_{\mathcal{F}}^2$  and  $K_{\mathcal{F}} \cdot K_X$

are fixed by Proposition 2.4. Moreover,  $K_Y^2$  has only finitely many possibilities since the surfaces  $Y$  are in a bounded family. Therefore, we have finitely many possible polynomials  $\Phi(\ell)$ .

Notice that  $\frac{m+1}{n-1} > \frac{m}{n} = 4i(\mathcal{G}) \geq 4$ . So we have  $(m+1)(K_{\mathcal{G}} + D) + (n-1)K_Y$  is ample by step (1) and thus  $\Phi(1) = h^0(Y, \mathcal{O}_Y((m+1)(K_{\mathcal{G}} + D) + nK_Y))$ . Let  $\varphi$  be the maximum of  $\Phi(1)$  among all possible polynomials  $\Phi(\ell)$ .

- (11) For any polynomial  $\Psi(\ell) := \Phi(\ell) - s$  where  $0 \leq s \leq \varphi$ , we consider the Quot scheme

$$Q := \text{Quot}_{\Omega_{\mathcal{Y}/T}/\mathcal{Y}/T}^{\Psi(\ell), \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Y}}(1)}$$

which is projective over  $T$ . Let  $\mathcal{U} := \mathcal{Y} \times_T Q$ . By a flattening stratification on  $Q$ , we may assume that the projection morphism  $\mathcal{U} \rightarrow Q$  is flat. Then by the universal property of Quot schemes, there is a (universal) quotient sheaf  $\mathcal{L}$  of  $\Omega_{\mathcal{U}/Q}$  on  $\mathcal{U}$ . By [Gro66, Théorème 12.2.1 (v)], the locus

$$\{q \in Q : \mathcal{L}^\vee|_{\mathcal{U}_q} \text{ is reflexive}\}$$

is open. After shrinking  $Q$ , we may assume that  $\mathcal{L}^\vee$  is reflexive over any point of  $Q$  and  $\mathcal{L}^\vee$  is reflexive. Then  $\mathcal{L}^\vee \subset T_{\mathcal{U}/Q} \subset T_{\mathcal{U}}$  gives a family of pre-foliations on  $\mathcal{U}$  with respect to  $\mathcal{U} \rightarrow Q$ .

Now for any  $(Y, \mathcal{G}, D) \in \mathcal{S}_P$ , we dualize the following short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{G} \longrightarrow T_Y \xrightarrow{\tau} T_Y/\mathcal{G} \longrightarrow 0$$

and get the short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow (T_Y/\mathcal{G})^\vee \xrightarrow{\tau^\vee} \Omega_Y \longrightarrow \text{coker}(\tau^\vee) \longrightarrow 0.$$

Note that

$$0 \longrightarrow \text{coker}(\tau^\vee) \otimes \mathcal{O}_Y(D) \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_Y(K_{\mathcal{G}} + D) \longrightarrow \mathcal{Z} \otimes \mathcal{O}_Y(D) \longrightarrow 0$$

where  $\mathcal{Z}$  is the sheaf supported at a 0-dimensional subscheme whose length is at most  $\varphi$ . Then we have

$$\chi(Y, \mathcal{O}_Y((K_{\mathcal{G}} + D) + \ell(m(K_{\mathcal{G}} + D) + nK_Y))) - \chi(Y, \text{coker}(\tau^\vee) \otimes \mathcal{O}_Y(D + \ell(m(K_{\mathcal{G}} + D) + nK_Y)))$$

is a non-negative constant  $\leq \varphi$ . Thus, the function

$$\chi(Y, \text{coker}(\tau^\vee) \otimes \mathcal{O}_Y(D + \ell(m(K_{\mathcal{G}} + D) + nK_Y)))$$

has the form  $\Phi(\ell) - s$ . So by the construction of  $Q$ , there is a  $q \in Q$  such that  $\rho : Y \rightarrow \mathcal{U}_q$  is an isomorphism and  $\text{coker}(\tau^\vee) \otimes \mathcal{O}_Y(D) \cong \rho^*(\mathcal{L}|_{\mathcal{U}_q})$  and thus

$$\mathcal{G}(-D) \cong \text{coker}(\tau^\vee)^\vee \otimes \mathcal{O}_Y(-D) \cong (\text{coker}(\tau^\vee) \otimes \mathcal{O}_Y(D))^\vee \cong \rho^*(\mathcal{L}|_{\mathcal{U}_q})^\vee.$$

Notice that  $\rho^*(\mathcal{L}|_{\mathcal{U}_q})^\vee$  and  $\rho^*(\mathcal{L}^\vee|_{\mathcal{U}_q})$  are isomorphic at the generic point of  $\mathcal{U}_q$ . By [HL21, Lemma 1.8], they are indeed isomorphic. Hence,  $\mathcal{L}^\vee$  gives the desired family of pre-foliations.

□

*Remark 2.11.* After some stratification on  $\mathcal{Q}$ , we have  $(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{D}) \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}$  is a family of foliated triples (see Definition 2.17) for some reduced divisor  $\mathcal{D}$ .

**2.3. Boundedness of non-cusp singularities.** One application of Theorem 2.10 is the boundedness of non-cusp singularities. Before we show the boundedness of non-cusp singularities, we need the following lemma.

**Lemma 2.12.** *Let  $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow T$  be a flat family of projective varieties of dimension  $n$  and  $D$  is a  $\mathbb{Q}$ -Cartier divisor on  $\mathcal{X}$  and flat over  $T$ . If there is a  $t_0 \in T$  such that  $D_{t_0}$  is nef (resp. strictly nef) and big, then there exists an open subset  $U \subset T$  containing  $t_0$  such that  $D_t$  is nef (resp. strictly nef) and big for all  $t \in U$ . Moreover, there exists an  $N$  such that  $h^0(\mathcal{X}_t, ND_t) \geq 1$  for all  $t \in T$ .*

*Proof.* We may assume that  $T$  is irreducible. Indeed, suppose the lemma holds whenever  $T$  is irreducible. In general, we write  $T = \bigcup_{j=1}^m T^j$  as the decomposition of irreducible components  $T^j$ . Since  $t_0 \in T$ , we have  $t_0 \in T^j$  for some  $j$ . Let's say  $t_0 \in T^1$ . By the assumption, we have an open subset  $U^1 \subset T^1$  containing  $t_0$  such that  $D_t$  is nef (resp. strictly nef) and big for all  $t \in U^1$ . If  $U^1$  is contained in  $T \setminus \bigcup_{j=2}^m T^j$  which is an open subset of  $T$ , then  $U^1$  is an open subset of  $T$  and we are done. If not, there is a point  $t_1 \in U^1 \cap \bigcup_{j=2}^m T^j \subset \bigcup_{j=2}^m T^j$ . By induction on the number of the irreducible components of  $T$ , we have an open subset  $U^2 \subset \bigcup_{j=2}^m T^j$  containing  $t_1$  such that  $D_t$  is nef (resp. strictly nef) and big for all  $t \in U^2$ . Note that  $C^1 := T^1 \setminus U^1$  and  $C^2 := \bigcup_{j=2}^m T^j \setminus U^2$  are closed subsets of  $T$ . Thus  $U := T \setminus (C^1 \cup C^2)$  is an open subset of  $T$  containing  $t_0$  such that  $D_t$  is nef (resp. strictly nef) and big for all  $t \in U$ .

So from now on, we assume that  $T$  is irreducible. Since  $D_{t_0}$  is nef, we have  $D_t$  is nef for very general  $t \in T^* = T \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} T_i$  where  $T_i$ 's are all proper closed subsets of  $T$ . (For a reference, see [Laz04, Proposition 1.4.14].) Note that, for all  $t \in T^*$ , we have  $D_t^n = D_{t_0}^n > 0$  since  $D_{t_0}$  is nef and big. Hence,  $D_t$  is also nef and big for all  $t \in T^*$ .

Let  $S_N := \{t \in T \mid h^0(\mathcal{X}_t, ND_t) \geq 1\}$  which is a closed subset in  $T$  by the upper semi-continuity. Note that we have

$$T(\mathbb{C}) = \left( \bigcup_N S_N(\mathbb{C}) \right) \cup \left( \bigcup_i T_i(\mathbb{C}) \right).$$

By the Baire category theorem, there is an  $N$  such that  $S_N = T$ . Thus, the relative base locus of  $D$  is proper. Let  $U$  be an open subset of  $T$  such that all irreducible components of the relative base locus of  $D$  are flat over  $U$ . Notice that it is possible that  $t_0$  is *not* in  $U$ .

Now for any  $u \in U$ , if there is a curve  $C_u$  such that  $D_u \cdot C_u < 0$  (resp.  $\leq 0$ ), then  $C_u$  is in the relative base locus of  $D$  and moves in the family over  $U$ . So for any  $t \in T^* \cap U$ , we have  $D_t \cdot C_t = D_u \cdot C_u < 0$  (resp.  $\leq 0$ ), which is a contradiction. Therefore,  $D_u$  is nef (resp. strictly nef) for all  $u \in U$ . Moreover,  $D_u^n = D_t^n > 0$  where  $t \in T^* \cap U$ , then  $D_u$  is also big for  $u \in U$ .

If  $t_0 \in U$ , then we are done. If not, that is  $t_0 \in T \setminus U$ , then by induction on  $\dim T$ , there exists an open subset  $V \subset T \setminus U$  containing  $t_0$  such that  $D_t$  is nef (resp. strictly nef) and big for all  $t \in V$ . So  $(T \setminus U) \setminus V$  is a closed subset of  $T \setminus U$ , which is a closed subset of  $T$ . Thus,  $(T \setminus U) \setminus V$  is a closed subset of  $T$ . Therefore  $V \cup U = T \setminus ((T \setminus U) \setminus V) \subset T$  is an open subset containing  $t_0$  such that  $D_t$  nef (resp. strictly nef) and big for all  $t \in V \cup U$ .  $\square$

This proof also gives the following Corollary.

**Corollary 2.13.** *Every  $(K_{\mathcal{G}} + D)$ -trivial curve moves in the family over  $U$ .*

**Proposition 2.14.** *Fix a function  $P : \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ . There exist constants  $C_1, C_2$ , and  $C_3$  such that, for any generalized canonical model  $(X, \mathcal{F})$  with Hilbert function  $\chi(X, mK_{\mathcal{F}}) = P(m)$ , the index (resp. embedding dimension) at the dihedral singularities is at most  $C_1$  (resp.  $C_2$ ) and the number of dihedral singularities is at most  $C_3$ . Moreover, there exist constants  $B_1, B_2$ , and  $B_3$  such that the index (resp. embedding dimension) at the non-terminal foliation singularities which are cyclic quotient singularities is at most  $B_1$  (resp.  $B_2$ ) and the number of non-terminal foliation singularities which are cyclic quotient singularities is at most  $B_3$ .*

*Proof.* The proof follows closely from the proof of [Che19, Proposition 3.1] for canonical models. For the reader's convenience, we include the proof.

By Theorem 2.10, there exists a projective morphism  $\mu : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow T$  of quasi-projective varieties of finite type and a family of pre-foliations  $\mathcal{F}$  on  $\mathcal{Y}$  such that for any  $(Y, \mathcal{G}, D) \in \mathcal{S}_P$ , there exists a  $t \in T$  and an isomorphism  $\rho : Y \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}_t$  such that  $\mathcal{G}(-D) \cong \rho^*(\mathcal{F}|_{\mathcal{Y}_t})$ . We may assume that

$$T^* := \{t \in T \mid (\mathcal{Y}_t, \mathcal{F}_t) \cong (Y, \mathcal{G}(-D)) \text{ for some } (Y, \mathcal{G}, D) \in \mathcal{S}_P\}$$

is dense in  $T$ .

Notice that  $K_{\mathcal{F}}$  is relatively big. Then  $K_{\mathcal{F}} \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} \mathcal{A} + \mathcal{E}$  where  $\mathcal{A}$  is a relative ample divisor and  $\mathcal{E}$  is an effective divisor. Note that, for general  $t$  and for any irreducible curve  $E \subset \mathcal{Y}_t$  over a non-terminal foliation singularity, we have  $K_{\mathcal{F}} \cdot E = (K_{\mathcal{G}} + D) \cdot E = 0$ . Thus,  $\mathcal{E} \cdot E < 0$ . That is,  $E$  is in the support of  $\mathcal{E}$ . By shrinking  $T$  if necessary, we may assume that all irreducible components of  $\mathcal{E}$  are flat over  $T$ . Let  $\mathcal{E}_j$ 's be those irreducible components of  $\mathcal{E}$  of codimension 1 in  $\mathcal{Y}$ .

Let  $\pi : \tilde{\mathcal{Y}} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$  be the log resolution of  $(\mathcal{Y}, \sum_j \mathcal{E}_j)$  with the exceptional divisors  $\sum \mathcal{F}_\ell$ . By shrinking  $T$  further, we may assume that  $\nu := \mu \circ \pi$  is smooth and  $\mathcal{F}_\ell$  is flat over  $T$ . Let  $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_j$  be the proper transform of  $\mathcal{E}_j$  via  $\pi$ .

Note that  $\Lambda := \{\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_j, \mathcal{F}_\ell\}$  is a finite set. So there are only finitely many possible connected subsets of  $\Lambda$  with dual graphs of  $D_n$  type or  $A_n$  type.

By [Bri68, Satz 2.9 and Satz 2.11], the intersection matrix of a dihedral singularity determines the embedding dimension and the group acting on it. Since the intersection matrix remains the same in the family, we have the boundedness of the embedding dimension and the order of the group acting on these singularities. Hence the index of  $X$  at the dihedral singularities is also bounded. Similarly, by [Rei], the embedding dimension and the index of a cyclic quotient singularity is determined by the intersection matrix. Therefore, we have the boundedness of the embedding dimension and of the index at the cyclic quotient singularities.  $\square$

*Remark 2.15.* (1) It is possible that some connected subset of  $\Lambda$  of  $D_n$  type or of  $A_n$  type is redundant.

(2) By the same argument as above, we also show the boundedness of the cusps. Precisely, the number of exceptional divisors and the intersection matrix over any cusp singularity are bounded.

We also have the following theorem.

**Theorem 2.16.** *Fix a function  $P : \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ . There exists an integer  $m_P$  such that if  $(X, \mathcal{F})$  is a generalized canonical model of general type and  $\chi(mK_{\mathcal{F}}) = P(m)$  for all*

$m \geq 0$ , then for any  $m > 0$  divisible by  $m_P$ ,  $|mK_{\mathcal{F}}|$  defines a birational map which is an isomorphism on the complement of the cusp singularities.

*Proof.* This follows closely from [HL21, Theorem 4.3]. See also [Che19, Theorem 3.3]. For the reader's convenience, we include the proof.

Let  $g : (Y, \mathcal{G}) \rightarrow (X, \mathcal{F})$  be the minimal resolution of cusps. Then  $K_{\mathcal{G}} = g^*K_{\mathcal{F}}$  and  $i(\mathcal{G}) = i_{\mathbb{Q}}(\mathcal{F})$ . (See Definition 1.14.)

*Claim.*  $K_Y + 3i(\mathcal{G})K_{\mathcal{G}}$  is nef.

*Proof (Claim).* Given any irreducible curve  $C$  on  $Y$ .

(1) If  $C$  is contracted by  $g$ , then

$$(K_Y + 3i(\mathcal{G})K_{\mathcal{G}}) \cdot C = K_Y \cdot C = -2 - C^2 \geq 0$$

since  $C^2 \leq -2$  by the minimality of  $g$ .

(2) If  $C$  is not contracted by  $g$ ,

(a) If  $K_Y \cdot C \geq 0$ , then

$$(K_Y + 3i(\mathcal{G})K_{\mathcal{G}}) \cdot C \geq 3i(\mathcal{G})K_{\mathcal{F}} \cdot g_*C > 0$$

by Lemma 1.30.

(b) If  $K_Y \cdot C < 0$ , by [Fuj12, Proposition 3.8], every  $K_Y$  negative extremal ray is spanned by a rational curve  $C$  with  $0 < -K_Y \cdot C \leq 3$ . Thus, if we write  $C \equiv \sum a_i C_i + D$  where  $D \cdot K_Y \geq 0$ , the  $C_i$ 's are  $K_Y$  negative extremal rays, the  $a_i$ 's are non-negative, and at least one of  $a_i$  is positive. By what we have seen above,  $(K_Y + 3i(\mathcal{G})K_{\mathcal{G}}) \cdot D \geq 0$ . Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} (K_Y + 3i(\mathcal{G})K_{\mathcal{G}}) \cdot C &= \sum_i a_i \left( (K_Y + 3i(\mathcal{G})K_{\mathcal{G}}) \cdot C_i \right) + (K_Y + 3i(\mathcal{G})K_{\mathcal{G}}) \cdot D \\ &\geq \sum_i a_i (-3 + 3) + 0 = 0 \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of the nefness of  $K_Y + 3i(\mathcal{G})K_{\mathcal{G}}$ .

Now, by [HL21, Lemma 3.5], we know that  $\gamma K_{\mathcal{G}} - K_Y$  is big for any fixed integer  $\gamma$  with

$$\gamma > \left\lceil \max \left\{ \frac{2K_{\mathcal{F}} \cdot K_X}{K_{\mathcal{F}}^2} + 3i_{\mathbb{Q}}(\mathcal{F}), 0 \right\} \right\rceil.$$

Note that  $L := (\beta - \gamma)K_{\mathcal{G}} + (\gamma K_{\mathcal{G}} - K_Y)$  is pseudo-effective for any  $\beta > \gamma$ . Let  $L = P + N$  be the Zariski decomposition. Then we have

$$P^2 \geq (\beta - \gamma)^2 K_{\mathcal{G}}^2 \geq \left( \frac{\beta - \gamma}{i_{\mathbb{Q}}(\mathcal{F})} \right)^2$$

And if  $C$  is not in the exceptional divisor of  $g$ , then

$$P \cdot C \geq (\beta - \gamma)K_{\mathcal{G}} \cdot C \geq \frac{\beta - \gamma}{i_{\mathbb{Q}}(\mathcal{F})}.$$

By Proposition 2.14 and Proposition 2.4, we have the boundedness of embedding dimension of each rational singularity on  $Y$ . Thus, we have a uniform bound  $\delta$  such that  $\delta_{\zeta} \leq \delta$  for  $|\zeta| = 2$ . Now we fix a  $\beta$  divisible by  $i_{\mathbb{Q}}(\mathcal{F})$  such that  $P^2 > \delta$  and  $P \cdot C > \delta/2$  for any irreducible curve  $C$ . By [Lan01, Theorem 0.1] and Proposition 1.3, we have



that  $K_Y + L = \beta K_{\mathcal{G}}$  is very ample on the complement of the exceptional divisor of  $g$ . By [Sak84, Theorem 6.2],  $g_*\mathcal{O}_Y(\beta K_{\mathcal{G}}) = \mathcal{O}_X(\beta K_{\mathcal{F}})$ . Hence,  $\beta K_{\mathcal{F}}$  is very ample on the complement of the cusps.  $\square$

## 2.4. Families of foliations.

**Definition 2.17.** Fix  $P : \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ .

- (1) We call  $\pi : (\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F}, \Delta) \rightarrow B$  a *family of foliated triples* (see also Definition 2.6) if
  - (a)  $\pi : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow B$  is a projective morphism between normal varieties such that all fibers are surfaces with at worst semi-log canonical singularities. (For a reference, see [HK10, Definition 3.13.5].)
  - (b)  $\mathcal{F}$  is a foliation of rank 1 on normal variety  $\mathcal{X}$  such that  $\mathcal{F}$  is tangent to the fibers of  $\pi$ . More precisely, the map  $d_{\mathcal{F}} : \Omega_{\mathcal{X}} \rightarrow \Omega_{\mathcal{F}}$  factors through  $\Omega_{\mathcal{X}/B}$ .
  - (c)  $\Delta = \sum \Delta_i$  is a reduced divisor with all  $\Delta_i$ 's flat over  $B$ .
  - (d) For general  $b \in B$  with  $\mathcal{X}_b$  normal,  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F}, \Delta)_b := (\mathcal{X}_b, \mathcal{F}_b^{sat}, \Delta_b + D)$  is a foliated triple where  $\Delta_b = \Delta|_{\mathcal{X}_b}$  and  $\mathcal{F}_b^{sat}$  is given by the saturation of the pre-foliation  $\Omega_{\mathcal{X}_b} \rightarrow \Omega_{\mathcal{F}|_{\mathcal{X}_b}}$  and  $D = K_{\mathcal{F}}|_{\mathcal{X}_b} - K_{\mathcal{F}_b^{sat}} \geq 0$ . (See Remark 2.18.)
- (2) We say  $\pi : (\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F}, \Delta) \rightarrow T$  a  $\mathcal{S}_P$ -family if  $\pi$  is a family of foliated triples and, for general  $t \in T$ , we have  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F}, \Delta)_t \in \mathcal{S}_P$ . (See Definition 2.8.)

*Remark 2.18.* (1) If  $\Delta = \emptyset$ , then we call  $\pi : (X, \mathcal{F}, \emptyset) \rightarrow B$  a family of foliations, which agrees with Definition 2.9.

- (2) The restriction of a family of foliated triples  $\pi : (\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F}, \Delta) \rightarrow T$  to a fiber  $\mathcal{X}_t$  is *not*  $(\mathcal{X}_t, \mathcal{F}|_{\mathcal{X}_t}, \Delta|_{\mathcal{X}_t})$ . This is because  $\mathcal{F}|_{\mathcal{X}_t}$  may not be saturated.
- (3) For general  $b \in B$  with  $\mathcal{X}_b$  normal, we put  $U \subset \mathcal{X}$  be an open subset in the smooth locus of  $\mathcal{X}$  such that  $U_b := U|_{\mathcal{X}_b}$  is in the smooth locus of  $\mathcal{X}_b$ . From the short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow K \longrightarrow \Omega_{\mathcal{X}/B} \xrightarrow{\rho} \Omega_{\mathcal{F}} \longrightarrow 0,$$

we have the following exact sequences

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \Omega_{\mathcal{F}}^{\vee}|_{U_b} & \longrightarrow & T_{\mathcal{X}/B}|_{U_b} & \longrightarrow & \text{coker}(\rho^{\vee})|_{U_b} \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow \iota_1 & & \parallel & & \downarrow \iota_2 \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & (\Omega_{\mathcal{F}}|_{U_b})^{\vee} & \longrightarrow & T_{\mathcal{X}_b} & \longrightarrow & (K|_{U_b})^{\vee} \end{array}$$

where the upper horizontal one comes from taking the dual and then the restriction, the lower horizontal one comes from taking the restriction and then the dual,  $\iota_1$  is the natural restriction, and  $\iota_2$  comes from the diagram chasing.

Note that  $\iota_1$  is injective. Thus we have  $c_1(\Omega_{\mathcal{F}}^{\vee}|_{U_b}) \leq c_1((\Omega_{\mathcal{F}}|_{U_b})^{\vee})$  and therefore  $-K_{\mathcal{F}}|_{\mathcal{X}_b} \leq -K_{\mathcal{F}_b^{sat}}$ .

**Definition 2.19.** Fix an integral-valued function  $P : \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ . A triple  $(X, \mathcal{F}, D)$  is called  $\mathcal{S}_P$ -smoothable if the followings hold:

- (1)  $X$  is a surface with at worst semi-log canonical singularities. (For a reference, see [HK10, Definition 3.13.5].)
- (2)  $\mathcal{F}$  is a pre-foliation on  $X$ .

- (3) There exists a flat projective  $\mathbb{Q}$ -Gorenstein (that is, both  $K_{\mathcal{X}}$  and  $K_{\mathcal{F}}$  are  $\mathbb{Q}$ -Cartier) one-parameter  $\mathcal{S}_P$ -family  $\pi : (\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F}, \Delta) \rightarrow C$  (see Definition 2.17) such that the restriction on the special fiber  $\mathcal{X}_0$  of  $\pi$  is  $(X, \mathcal{F}, D)$ , that is,  $X \cong \mathcal{X}_0$ ,  $\mathcal{F}|_{\mathcal{X}_0} \cong \mathcal{F}$ , and  $\Delta|_{\mathcal{X}_0} = D$ .
- (4)  $(K_{\mathcal{F}} + \Delta)|_X$  is nef and  $K_X + 6i(P)(K_{\mathcal{F}} + \Delta)|_X$  is ample. (See Lemma 3.1 for the definition of  $i(P)$ )

### 3. INVARIANCE OF PLURIGENERA

In this section, we would like to show the invariance of plurigenera for the family of minimal partial du Val resolutions of generalized canonical models of general type with fixed Hilbert function.

**Lemma 3.1.** *Fix a function  $P : \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ . Then there exists an  $i(P) \in \mathbb{N}$  depending only on  $P$  such that  $i(P)(K_{\mathcal{G}} + D)$  is Cartier for all  $(Y, \mathcal{G}, D) \in \mathcal{S}_P$ .*

*Proof.* We can take  $i(P) = C_2!$  where  $C_2$  comes from Proposition 2.4 and depends only on  $P$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 3.2.** *Fix a function  $P : \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ . Given any family of foliated triples  $f : (\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F}, \Delta) \rightarrow T$  where  $T$  is connected and  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F}, \Delta)_t \in \mathcal{S}_P$  for all  $t \in T$  (see Definition 2.17 for families of foliated triples), there exists an  $m_f$  depending only on this family  $f$  such that*

$$h^0(\mathcal{X}_t, m(K_{\mathcal{F}} + \Delta)|_{\mathcal{X}_t})$$

*is independent of  $t$  for  $m \geq m_f$  and divisible by  $i(P)$ . (See Lemma 3.1.)*

*Proof.* The idea of the proof is from the proof of [CF18, Proposition 3.7]. We divide the proof into the following steps. Let  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  be a positive integer divisible by  $i(P)$ .

- (1) Fix a point  $0 \in T$  and let  $(X, \mathcal{F}, D) := (\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F}, \Delta)|_{\mathcal{X}_0} \in \mathcal{S}_P$ . Let  $(X_c, \mathcal{F}_c)$  be the generalized canonical model of  $(X, \mathcal{F}, D)$ ,  $\rho : X^m \rightarrow X_c$  be the minimal resolution of  $X_c$ , and  $\mathcal{F}^m$  be the pullback foliation. Contracting down all  $\mathcal{F}^m$ -chains to get  $(Y, \mathcal{G})$ , we have a morphism  $\pi : (Y, \mathcal{G}) \rightarrow (X, \mathcal{F})$ . Let  $E$  be the proper transform of  $D$ . Thus, we have  $K_{\mathcal{G}} + E = \pi^*(K_{\mathcal{F}} + D)$  is nef and big.

Let  $\Gamma_1, \dots, \Gamma_p$  be all elliptic Gorenstein leaves on  $Y$  and  $C_1, \dots, C_q$  be all disconnected chains of rational curves *exceptional* over its generalized canonical model such that  $(K_{\mathcal{G}} + E) \cdot C_j^{(k)} = 0$  where  $C_j = \sum_{k=1}^{r_j} C_j^{(k)}$  is the sum of its irreducible components. Also let  $Z = \sum_{i=1}^p \Gamma_i + \sum_{j=1}^q C_j$ .

- (2) *Claim.*  $h^1(\Gamma_i, m(K_{\mathcal{G}} + E)) = 0$  for all  $i$ .

*Proof.* Notice that  $\Gamma_i$  is Cohen-Macaulay with the trivial dualizing sheaf. Since each irreducible component of  $E$  is either over a log canonical non-canonical foliation singularity or over a dihedral singularity, we have that  $E$  does not meet  $\Gamma_i$ . So we have

$$h^1(\Gamma_i, m(K_{\mathcal{G}} + E)) = h^0(\Gamma_i, -m(K_{\mathcal{G}} + E)) = h^0(\Gamma_i, -mK_{\mathcal{G}}) = 0$$

where the last equality is because  $\mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_i}(mK_{\mathcal{G}})$  is not torsion and has degree 0 by [McQ08, FactIII.0.4 and Theorem IV.2.2].

- (3) *Claim.*  $h^1(C_j, m(K_{\mathcal{G}} + E - G)) = 0$  for all  $j$ .

*Proof.* Note that we have

$$(K_{\mathcal{G}} + E) \cdot C_j^{(k)} = 0$$

for all  $j$  and  $k$ . Since  $C_j^{(k)}$ 's are smooth rational curves, we have

$$(1) \quad h^1(C_j^{(k)}, m(K_{\mathcal{G}} + E)) = 0$$

for all  $j$  and  $k$ . Now, for any fixed  $j$ , we consider the following short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{C_j} \longrightarrow \bigoplus_{k=1}^{r_j} \mathcal{O}_{C_j^{(k)}} \longrightarrow \bigoplus_{k=1}^{r_j-1} \mathcal{O}_{C_j^{(k)} \cap C_j^{(k+1)}} \longrightarrow 0.$$

Tensoring with  $\mathcal{O}_{C_j}(m(K_{\mathcal{G}} + E))$  and taking the induced long exact sequence, we notice that the map

$$\bigoplus_{k=1}^{r_j} H^0(C_j^{(k)}, m(K_{\mathcal{G}} + E)) \longrightarrow \bigoplus_{k=1}^{r_j-1} H^0(C_j^{(k)} \cap C_j^{(k+1)}, m(K_{\mathcal{G}} + E))$$

is surjective and thus, we have that  $h^1(C_j, m(K_{\mathcal{G}} + E)) = 0$  for all  $j$  by equation (1).

- (4) *Claim.*  $h^j(Y, m(K_{\mathcal{G}} + E) - Z) = 0$  for  $j > 0$  and for all  $m \geq m_0$  for some  $m_0$ .

*Proof.* For any irreducible curve  $C$  in the support of  $Z$ , we have that

$$(m(K_{\mathcal{G}} + E) - (K_Y + Z)) \cdot C = -(K_Y + Z) \cdot C \geq 0.$$

Note that  $K_{\mathcal{G}} + E = \pi^*(K_{\mathcal{F}} + D)$  is nef and big, and the  $(K_{\mathcal{G}} + E)$ -trivial curves are exactly the curves in the support of  $Z$ . Then there exists an  $m_0$  depending only on  $(X, \mathcal{F}, D)$  such that

$$m(K_{\mathcal{G}} + E) - (K_Y + Z)$$

is nef and big for  $m \geq m_0$ . Since  $Y$  is klt, we have

$$h^j(Y, m(K_{\mathcal{G}} + E) - Z) = h^j(Y, K_Y + m(K_{\mathcal{G}} + E) - (K_Y + Z)) = 0$$

by Kawamata-Viehweg vanishing theorem.

- (5) *Claim.*  $h^j(Y, m(K_{\mathcal{G}} + E)) = 0$  for  $j > 0$  and for all  $m \geq m_0$ .

*Proof.* By steps (2) and (3), we have that  $h^1(Z, m(K_{\mathcal{G}} + E)) = 0$ . Now we consider the short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_Y(-Z) \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_Y \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_Z \longrightarrow 0.$$

Tensoring with  $\mathcal{O}_Y(m(K_{\mathcal{G}} + E))$  and taking the induced long exact sequence, we have the map

$$H^1(Y, m(K_{\mathcal{G}} + E) - Z) \rightarrow H^1(Y, m(K_{\mathcal{G}} + E))$$

is surjective and  $H^2(Y, m(K_{\mathcal{G}} + E) - Z) \cong H^2(Y, m(K_{\mathcal{G}} + E))$ . Thus, we have  $h^j(Y, m(K_{\mathcal{G}} + E)) = 0$  for  $j > 0$  and for all  $m \geq m_0$  by step (4).

- (6) *Claim.*  $h^1(X, m(K_{\mathcal{F}} + D)) = 0$  for all  $m \geq m_0$ .

*Proof.* Note that  $\pi_*(m(K_{\mathcal{G}} + E)) = m(K_{\mathcal{F}} + D)$  by the projection formula. Since  $h^1(Y, m(K_{\mathcal{G}} + E)) = 0$  for all  $m \geq m_0$  by step (5), we have that

$$h^1(X, m(K_{\mathcal{F}} + D)) = 0$$

for all  $m \geq m_0$  by Leray spectral sequence.

(7) *Claim.*  $h^2(\mathcal{X}_t, m(K_{\mathcal{F}_t} + \Delta_t)) = 0$  for all  $t \in T$  and for  $m \geq m_P$  for some  $m_P$ .

*Proof.* Note that  $K_{\mathcal{F}_t} + \Delta_t$  is nef and big since  $(\mathcal{X}_t, \mathcal{F}_t, \Delta_t) \in \mathcal{S}_P$ . In addition, we have already seen, in the proof of Theorem 2.10, that  $K_{\mathcal{X}_t} + 4i(P)(K_{\mathcal{F}_t} + \Delta_t)$  is ample. Moreover, by [HL21, Lemma 3.5], we have that  $m(K_{\mathcal{F}_t} + \Delta_t) - K_{\mathcal{X}_t}$  is big for  $m \geq m_P$  where

$$m_P := \max \left\{ \frac{2(K_{\mathcal{F}_t} + \Delta_t) \cdot K_{\mathcal{X}_t}}{(K_{\mathcal{F}_t} + \Delta_t)^2} + 4i(P) + 1, 1 \right\}.$$

By Proposition 2.4, we have that  $m_P$  depends only on  $P$ .

Now by Serre duality, we have, for  $m \geq m_P$ , that

$$h^2(\mathcal{X}_t, m(K_{\mathcal{F}_t} + \Delta_t)) = h^0(\mathcal{X}_t, K_{\mathcal{X}_t} - m(K_{\mathcal{F}_t} + \Delta_t)) = 0$$

since there is no section for an anti-big divisor.

(8) Take  $m_f := \max\{m_0, m_P\}$  which only depends on the family  $f$ . Now we have, for all  $t \in T$  and for all  $m \geq m_f$ , that

$$\begin{aligned} h^0(\mathcal{X}_t, m(K_{\mathcal{F}_t} + \Delta_t)) &\geq \chi(\mathcal{X}_t, m(K_{\mathcal{F}_t} + \Delta_t)) \\ &= \chi(\mathcal{X}_0, m(K_{\mathcal{F}_0} + \Delta_0)) \\ &= h^0(\mathcal{X}_0, m(K_{\mathcal{F}_0} + \Delta_0)) \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality comes from step (7) and the last equality comes from steps (6) and (7).

On the other hand, by upper semi-continuity, we have

$$h^0(\mathcal{X}_t, m(K_{\mathcal{F}_t} + \Delta_t)) \leq h^0(\mathcal{X}_0, m(K_{\mathcal{F}_0} + \Delta_0))$$

Therefore, we get the desired equality. □

*Remark 3.3.* The arguments above also show that

$$h^1(\mathcal{X}_t, m(K_{\mathcal{F}_t} + \Delta_t)) = 0$$

for  $m \geq m_f$  and divisible by  $i(P)$ .

**Corollary 3.4.** *Fix a function  $P : \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ . There is an  $m_P$  depending only on  $P$  such that, for all  $m \geq m_P$  and divisible by  $i(P)$ , we have that*

$$h^1(X, m(K_{\mathcal{F}} + D)) = h^2(X, m(K_{\mathcal{F}} + D)) = 0$$

and  $h^0(X, m(K_{\mathcal{F}} + D))$  is constant for all  $(X, \mathcal{F}, D) \in \mathcal{S}_P$ .

*Proof.* By Theorem 2.10 and 6.4, we have finitely many  $\mathcal{S}_P$ -families. Taking the maximal  $m_f$  in Theorem 3.2, we have

$$h^1(X, m(K_{\mathcal{F}} + D)) = h^2(X, m(K_{\mathcal{F}} + D)) = 0$$

for all  $(X, \mathcal{F}, D) \in \mathcal{S}_P$ . Since  $\chi(X, m(K_{\mathcal{F}} + D))$  is constant for all  $(X, \mathcal{F}, D) \in \mathcal{S}_P$ , so is  $h^0(X, m(K_{\mathcal{F}} + D))$ . □

## 4. SEMI-STABLE MINIMAL MODEL PROGRAM

In this section, we establish the semi-stable  $(K_{\mathcal{F}} + \Delta)$ -minimal model program for a particular type of families of foliated surfaces and show the valuative criterion for properness for  $\mathcal{S}_P$ -families (see Theorem 4.26).

**4.1. Preparations.** We first recall some definitions and results that will be used in this section.

**Lemma 4.1.** *Let  $\phi : X \dashrightarrow X'$  be a birational map between normal varieties and*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X & \overset{\phi}{\dashrightarrow} & X' \\ & \searrow f & \swarrow f' \\ & Y & \end{array}$$

be a commutative diagram where  $Y$  is a normal variety and  $f, f'$  are proper birational morphisms. Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be a foliation on  $X$  and  $\mathcal{F}'$  be the induced foliation on  $X'$ . Assume that

- (1)  $-K_{\mathcal{F}}$  is  $\mathbb{Q}$ -Cartier and  $f$ -nef;
- (2)  $K_{\mathcal{F}'}$  is  $\mathbb{Q}$ -Cartier and  $f'$ -nef.

Then for an exceptional divisor  $E$  over  $Y$ , we have  $a_E(\mathcal{F}) \leq a_E(\mathcal{F}')$ . Moreover, the strict inequality holds if either

- (a)  $-K_{\mathcal{F}}$  is  $f$ -ample and  $f$  is not an isomorphism above the generic point of the center of  $E$  on  $Y$ , or
- (b)  $K_{\mathcal{F}'}$  is  $f'$ -ample and  $f'$  is not an isomorphism above the generic point of the center of  $E$  on  $Y$ .

*Proof.* This is the consequence of negativity lemma. The proof is the same as [KM98, Lemma 3.38]. For the reader's convenience, we include the proof.

Let  $W$  be a normal variety with birational morphisms  $g : W \rightarrow X$  and  $W \rightarrow X'$  such that the center of  $E$  on  $W$  is a divisor. Note that  $\mathcal{F}_W := g^*\mathcal{F} \cong g'^*\mathcal{F}'$  since they are saturated and isomorphic on an open dense subset. Put  $h = f \circ g = f' \circ g'$ . Let  $m > 0$  be a sufficiently divisible integer. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} -m \left( K_{\mathcal{F}_W} - \sum a_{E_i}(\mathcal{F}) E_i \right) &\sim -mg^* K_{\mathcal{F}} \\ m \left( K_{\mathcal{F}_W} - \sum a_{E_i}(\mathcal{F}') E_i \right) &\sim mg'^* K_{\mathcal{F}'} \end{aligned}$$

Adding these two, we obtain that  $H := \sum (a_{E_i}(\mathcal{F}) - a_{E_i}(\mathcal{F}')) E_i$  is  $h$ -nef and  $h$ -exceptional. By negativity lemma, all coefficients of  $H$  are non-positive. Moreover, if  $H$  is not numerically  $h$ -trivial over the generic point of the center of  $E$  on  $W$ , then the coefficient of  $E$  in  $H$  is negative.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.2** ([Spi20, Corollary 2.28, foliated Bend and Break]). *Let  $X$  be a normal projective variety of dimension  $n$ . Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be a foliation of rank  $r$  on  $X$  and  $\Delta$  be an effective divisor on  $X$ . Let  $M$  be any nef divisor. Suppose that there are nef  $\mathbb{R}$ -divisors  $D_1, \dots, D_n$  such that*

- (1)  $D_1 \cdot \dots \cdot D_n = 0$  and
- (2)  $-(K_{\mathcal{F}} + \Delta) \cdot D_2 \cdot \dots \cdot D_n > 0$ .

Then, through a general point of  $X$ , there is a rational curve  $\Sigma$  with  $D_1 \cdot \Sigma = 0$ ,

$$M \cdot \Sigma \leq 2n \frac{M \cdot D_2 \cdot \dots \cdot D_n}{-K_{\mathcal{F}} \cdot D_2 \cdot \dots \cdot D_n},$$

and  $\Sigma$  is tangent to  $\mathcal{F}$ .

**Definition 4.3.** Let  $X$  be a smooth variety,  $\mathcal{F}$  be a foliation of rank 1 on  $X$ , and  $p$  be a singularity of  $\mathcal{F}$ . Let  $v$  be a germ of a vector field around  $p$  associated to  $\mathcal{F}$ . Then  $p$  is called *elementary* if  $v$  has a non-zero non-nilpotent linear part.

*Remark 4.4.* Elementary singularities are log canonical.

By the Introduction and Theorem 1 in [CR14], we have the following.

**Theorem 4.5** ([CR14, Introduction and Theorem 1]). *Any germ of vector fields on  $(\mathbb{C}^3, 0)$  tangent to a codimension one foliation can be desingularized. That is, there exists a finite sequence of blowups such that the pullback foliation has only elementary singularities.*

**Definition 4.6** ([KM98, Definition 7.1]). Let  $X$  be a normal variety,  $B$  an effective  $\mathbb{Q}$ -divisor, and  $f : X \rightarrow C$  a non-constant morphism to a smooth curve  $C$ . We say that  $f : (X, B) \rightarrow C$  is a *divisorial log terminal* (dlt) if  $(X, B + f^{-1}(c))$  is dlt for every closed point  $c \in C$ .

**Definition 4.7.** Let  $X$  be a normal threefold and  $\mathcal{F}$  be a rank one foliation on  $X$ . We say  $(X, \mathcal{F}, \Delta)$  is *foliated log smooth* if the following holds:

- (1)  $(X, \Delta)$  is log smooth.
- (2)  $\mathcal{F}$  has only elementary singularities.

Given a normal threefold  $X$ , a rank one foliation  $\mathcal{F}$  on  $X$ , and an effective divisor  $\Delta = \sum a_i D_i$  where  $0 \leq a_i \leq 1$  for all  $i$ , a *foliated log resolution* of  $(X, \mathcal{F}, \Delta)$  is a proper birational morphism  $\pi : Y \rightarrow X$  so that  $\text{Exc}(\pi)$  is a divisor and  $(\mathcal{G}, \pi_*^{-1}\Delta + \sum_i E_i)$  is foliated log smooth where  $\mathcal{G}$  is the pullback foliation on  $Y$  and  $E_i$ 's are all  $\pi$ -exceptional divisors.

**Definition 4.8.** Let  $X$  be a normal threefold and  $\mathcal{F}$  be a rank one foliation on  $X$ . Suppose  $K_{\mathcal{F}} + \Delta$  is  $\mathbb{Q}$ -Cartier. We say  $(X, \mathcal{F}, \Delta)$  is *foliated divisorial log terminal* ( $\mathcal{F}$ -dlt) if the following holds:

- (1) Each irreducible component of  $\Delta$  is transverse to  $\mathcal{F}$  and has coefficient at most one.
- (2) There exists a foliated log resolution  $Y \rightarrow X$  of  $(X, \mathcal{F}, \Delta)$  which only extracts divisors  $E$  of discrepancy  $> -\varepsilon(E)$  where  $\varepsilon(E) = 0$  if  $E$  is invariant and  $\varepsilon(E) = 1$  if  $E$  is *not* invariant.

**Lemma 4.9** (Adjunction). *Let  $X$  be a smooth variety and  $\mathcal{F}$  be a foliation on  $X$ , which is given by a coherent saturated subsheaf  $T_{\mathcal{F}} \subset T_X$  of rank 1. For any prime divisor  $D$  of  $X$  with normalization  $D^\nu$ , we have the following:*

- (1) If  $D$  is invariant, then  $K_{\mathcal{F}}|_{D^\nu} = K_{\mathcal{F}_{D^\nu}} + \Delta_{D^\nu}$  where  $\Delta_{D^\nu} \geq 0$ .
- (2) If  $D$  is not invariant, then  $(K_{\mathcal{F}} + D)|_{D^\nu} = \Theta$  for some  $\Theta \geq 0$ .

*Proof.* If  $D$  is invariant, then we have a morphism  $T_{\mathcal{F}}|_{D^\nu} \rightarrow T_{D^\nu}$ . Thus  $(T_{\mathcal{F}}|_{D^\nu})^{**} \rightarrow (T_{D^\nu})^{**} = T_{D^\nu}$  gives a foliation on  $D^\nu$  and  $K_{\mathcal{F}}|_{D^\nu} = K_{\mathcal{F}_{D^\nu}} + \Delta_{D^\nu}$  where  $\Delta_{D^\nu} \geq 0$  since it comes from the saturation.

If  $D$  is not invariant, then we consider the following composition:

$$\psi : N_{\mathcal{F}}^*|_{D^\nu} \rightarrow \Omega_X^1|_{D^\nu} \rightarrow \Omega_{D^\nu}^1$$

where  $N_{\mathcal{F}}^*$  is the conormal bundle of the foliation. Thus,  $\text{im } \psi$  defines a foliation  $\mathcal{F}_{D^\nu}$  on  $D^\nu$ . Since  $N_{\mathcal{F}_{D^\nu}}^*$  is the saturation of  $N_{\mathcal{F}}^*|_{D^\nu}$  in  $\Omega_{D^\nu}^1$ , we have  $N_{\mathcal{F}_{D^\nu}}^* = N_{\mathcal{F}}^*|_{D^\nu} + \Theta$  for some effective divisor  $\Theta$ . Therefore, we have

$$K_{D^\nu} - K_{\mathcal{F}_{D^\nu}} = (K_X - K_{\mathcal{F}})|_{D^\nu} + \Theta.$$

Hence, by adjunction  $(K_X + D^\nu)|_{D^\nu} = K_{D^\nu}$ , we have that  $(K_{\mathcal{F}} + D)|_{D^\nu} = K_{\mathcal{F}_{D^\nu}} + \Theta$ . Notice that  $\mathcal{F}_{D^\nu}$  is a foliation of rank 0 on  $D^\nu$ , then  $K_{\mathcal{F}_{D^\nu}} = 0$ .  $\square$

**4.2. Semi-stable reduction.** We are specifically interested in starting from the following two types of families.

- (a) The  $\mathcal{S}_P$ -families  $(\bar{f} : (\bar{\mathcal{X}}, \bar{\mathcal{F}}, \bar{\Delta}) \rightarrow C)$  over  $C$  where  $\bar{\mathcal{X}}$  is normal and  $C$  is a smooth curve. (See Definition 2.8 and Definition 2.17.)
- (b) The  $\mathcal{S}_P$ -families  $(f^\circ : (\mathcal{X}^\circ, \mathcal{F}^\circ, \Delta^\circ) \rightarrow C^\circ)$  over  $C^\circ$  where  $\mathcal{X}^\circ$  is normal,  $C^\circ = C \setminus \{0\}$ , and  $C$  is a smooth curve containing 0. (See Definition 2.8 and Definition 2.17.)

We first compactify the family of type (b) to get a family  $\bar{f} : (\bar{\mathcal{X}}, \bar{\mathcal{F}}, \bar{\Delta}) \rightarrow C$  over  $C$ . Then for both types of families, after possibly taking a base change, we have a semi-stable reduction for the family of surfaces  $(\bar{\mathcal{X}}, \bar{\Delta})$  over the curve  $C$  by [KKMSD73] (see also [KM98, Theorem 7.17]) and we denote this family as  $f : (\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F}, \Delta) \rightarrow T$ .

Notice that now  $(\mathcal{X}, \Delta)$  is log smooth, and  $\mathcal{F}$  is tangent to the fibration, which is a codimension one foliation. By Theorem 4.5, we may assume, after a finite sequence of blowups, that  $\mathcal{F}$  has only elementary singularities. Moreover, by taking base changes and resolutions, we may assume that the central fiber of  $f$  is reduced and  $\mathcal{F}$  has only elementary singularities. We call  $f : (\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F}, \Delta) \rightarrow T$  be a semi-stable reduction of the  $\mathcal{S}_P$ -family  $\bar{f} : (\bar{\mathcal{X}}, \bar{\mathcal{F}}, \bar{\Delta}) \rightarrow C$  over  $C$ . Moreover, we call the exceptional divisors of the map  $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \bar{\mathcal{X}}_T$  the exceptional divisors for the semi-stable reduction  $f : (\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F}, \Delta)$  of the  $\mathcal{S}_P$ -family  $\bar{f} : (\bar{\mathcal{X}}, \bar{\mathcal{F}}, \bar{\Delta}) \rightarrow C$  over  $C$ .

Thus, we have that  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F}, \Delta)$  is foliated log smooth. In particular,  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F}, \Delta)$  is  $\mathcal{F}$ -dlt (see Definition 4.8) and  $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow T$  is dlt (see Definition 4.6.)

**4.3. Foliation on the central fiber of semi-stable reduction.** Let  $\mathcal{X}_0 = E_0 \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^r E_i$  where  $E_0$  and  $E_i$ 's are distinct irreducible components. From subsection 4.2, we know that  $\mathcal{X}$  is smooth and  $\mathcal{F}$  has elementary singularities. Thus, we have three types of local expressions around a fixed point  $p \in \mathcal{X}_0$ .

- (Type 1) Around  $E_0 \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^r E_i$ , we may assume that  $\mathcal{F}$  is induced by  $f(x, y, z) \frac{\partial}{\partial x} + g(x, y, z) \frac{\partial}{\partial y}$  where  $E_0 = (z = 0)$ ,  $f(x, y, z), g(x, y, z) \in \mathbb{C}[[x, y, z]]$ , and one of  $f(x, y, z), g(x, y, z)$  has order  $\leq 1$ .
- (Type 2) Around  $(E_0 \cap E_i) \setminus \bigcup_{0 < j \neq i} E_j$  (if non-empty) for some  $i$ , we may assume that  $\mathcal{F}$  is induced by
  - (Type 2a)  $xf(x, y, z) \frac{\partial}{\partial x} - yf(x, y, z) \frac{\partial}{\partial y} + z \frac{\partial}{\partial z}$  or
  - (Type 2b)  $x \frac{\partial}{\partial x} - y \frac{\partial}{\partial y} + g(x, y, z) \frac{\partial}{\partial z}$

where  $E_0 = (x = 0)$ ,  $E_i = (y = 0)$ ,  $f(x, y, z), g(x, y, z) \in \mathbb{C}[[x, y, z]]$ .

(Type 3) Around  $E_0 \cap E_i \cap E_j$  (if non-empty) for some non-zero distinct  $i$  and  $j$ , we may assume that  $\mathcal{F}$  is induced by  $ax\frac{\partial}{\partial x} + by\frac{\partial}{\partial y} + cz\frac{\partial}{\partial z}$  where  $E_0 = (x = 0)$ ,  $E_i = (y = 0)$ ,  $E_j = (z = 0)$  and  $a + b + c = 0$

**Lemma 4.10.** *Let  $\mathcal{X}_0 = E_0 \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^r E_i$  where  $E_0$  and  $E_i$ 's are distinct irreducible components. We have that  $K_{\mathcal{F}}|_{E_0} - K_{\mathcal{F}_{E_0}} = \sum_j C_j$  is a reduced divisor with pairwise disjoint irreducible components  $C_j$ 's. Moreover, for any irreducible component  $C_j$ , we have*

- (1) either  $C_j \cap \bigcup_{i=1}^r E_i = \emptyset$
- (2) or  $C_j$  is a strata of  $\mathcal{X}_0 = E_0 \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^r E_i$  of dimension one with zero tangency order.

*Proof.* Note that  $K_{\mathcal{F}}|_{E_0} - K_{\mathcal{F}_{E_0}}$  is supported on components of the singular locus of  $\mathcal{F}$  whose restrictions on  $E_0$  are of codimension one. Since  $\mathcal{F}$  has only elementary singularities, we have that  $K_{\mathcal{F}}|_{E_0} - K_{\mathcal{F}_{E_0}} = \sum_j C_j$  is a reduced divisor with pairwise disjoint irreducible components  $C_j$ 's. If  $C_j$  meets one of the stratum of  $\mathcal{X}_0$ , then it is of type 2 or 3 around the intersection points.

- (2a) For the type 2a, it is impossible.
- (2b) For the type 2b, the possible irreducible component for  $C_j$  is  $(x = y = 0)$ , which is some strata of  $\mathcal{X}_0$  of dimension one with zero tangency order.
- (3) For the type 3, the possible irreducible component for  $C_j$  is either  $(x = y = 0)$  or  $(x = z = 0)$ , both of which are some stratum of  $\mathcal{X}_0$  of dimension one with zero tangency order.

□

**4.4. Cone theorem.** In proving the cone theorem, we use the following result from convex geometry.

**Lemma 4.11.** [Roc70] *If  $K$  is a closed convex cone containing no lines, then  $K$  is the closure of the subcone generated by the extremal rays.*

Then it is natural to investigate a  $(K_{\mathcal{F}} + \Delta)$ -negative extremal ray  $R$  of  $\overline{\text{NE}}(\mathcal{X}/T)$ . Let  $R$  be a relative  $(K_{\mathcal{F}} + \Delta)$ -negative extremal ray over  $T$ .

**Definition 4.12.** We define  $\text{loc}(R)$  to be all those points  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  such that there exists a curve  $C$  with  $x \in C$  and  $[C] \in R$ .

*Remark 4.13.* At this point, it is not apparent that there is a curve  $C$  with  $[C] \in R$ . However, the proof of the following lemma will give the existence.

**Lemma 4.14.**  *$\text{loc}(R)$  is non-empty and closed. Moreover, if  $\text{loc}(R)$  is two-dimensional, then it is irreducible and invariant.*

*Proof.* The proof is inspired by [Spi20, Lemma 8.4].

We may pick a suitable ample divisor  $H$  such that  $H_R = (K_{\mathcal{F}} + \Delta) + tH$  is a supporting hyperplane to  $R$ , that is  $H_R$  is nef and exactly zero on  $R$ .

- (1) Suppose first that  $\nu(H_R) < 3$ . Put  $D_i = H_R$  for  $i \leq \nu(H_R) + 1$  and  $D_i = H$  otherwise. Then  $D_1 \cdot D_2 \cdot D_3 = 0$  and  $(K_{\mathcal{F}} + \Delta) \cdot D_2 \cdot D_3 = -tH \cdot D_2 \cdot D_3 < 0$ . Thus, by Lemma 4.2, through a general point, there is a rational curve  $\Sigma$  with  $H_R \cdot \Sigma = D_1 \cdot \Sigma = 0$ , and hence  $[\Sigma] \in R$ . Therefore, we have that  $R$  is spanned by a family of rational  $\mathcal{F}$ -invariant curves passing through general points of  $\mathcal{X}$ .



Let  $B$  be the closed subscheme of Hilbert scheme of  $\mathcal{X}$  parametrizing those subvarieties tangent to  $\mathcal{F}$ . Now we consider the following diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} U & \xrightarrow{F} & \mathcal{X} \\ \downarrow p & & \\ Z & & \end{array}$$

where  $Z$  is the closed subscheme of  $B$  whose general element parametrizes a rational curve tangent to  $\mathcal{F}$  and spanning  $R$ . Note that  $F$  is surjective. So if  $\Sigma$  is any curve contained in the fiber of  $p$ , then  $[F(\Sigma)] \in R$ . Thus,  $\text{loc}(R) = \mathcal{X}$ .

- (2) Otherwise  $H_R$  is nef and big. So we may write  $H_R$  as the sum of an ample divisor and an effective divisor. Thus, there is an irreducible effective divisor  $D$  with  $D \cdot R < 0$ . In particular, we have  $\text{loc}(R) \subset D$ . Let  $D^\nu$  be the normalization of  $D$ . If  $D \subset \Delta$ , then  $\varepsilon(D) = 1$  and  $G_1 := H_R|_{D^\nu}$  is effective by Lemma 4.9. If not, we can take  $H'_R = (K_{\mathcal{F}} + \Delta) + \varepsilon(D)D + A$ , which is also a supporting hyperplane to  $R$  where  $A$  is an ample divisor. Let  $G_2 = H'_R|_{D^\nu}$ . Note that  $G_2 = K_{\mathcal{F}_{D^\nu}} + \Theta$  where  $\Theta \geq 0$  or  $G$  itself is effective by Lemma 4.9.

Using the similar argument as above, we have the following.

- (a) If  $\nu(G_i) = 2$  for  $i = 1$  or  $2$ , then  $\text{loc}(R)$  is a finite union of curves.  
(b) Otherwise, by bend and break, we have  $\text{loc}(R) = D$  and  $D$  is invariant. □

*Remark 4.15.* The proof above also shows that  $R = \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}[C]$  for some irreducible curve  $C$ . If  $\text{loc}(R)$  is not one-dimensional, then we may take  $C$  to be invariant and rational.

We will prove the following cone theorem.

**Theorem 4.16** (Cone theorem). *Let  $f : (\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F}, \Delta) \rightarrow T$  be a family of foliated triples which is a semi-stable reduction of  $\mathcal{S}_P$ -families. (See subsection 4.2.) Moreover, we put  $\mathcal{E}_1, \dots, \mathcal{E}_v$  be all exceptional prime divisors flat over  $T$  for the semi-stable reduction where  $\mathcal{E}_1, \dots, \mathcal{E}_u$  are invariant with  $\mathcal{E}_{i,t} := \mathcal{E}_i|_{\mathcal{X}_t}$  which is over a canonical foliation surface singularity for  $i = 1, \dots, u$  and for general  $t \in T$ . Let  $a_1, \dots, a_u$  be any numbers with  $0 \leq a_i < 1$  for  $i = 1, \dots, u$  such that*

$$\left( K_{\mathcal{X}} + \sum_{i=1}^u a_i \mathcal{E}_i \right) \cdot \mathcal{E}_{j,t} < 0$$

for all  $j = 1, \dots, u$  and for general  $t \in T$  where  $\mathcal{E}_{j,t} = \mathcal{E}_j|_{\mathcal{X}_t}$ . Let  $\mathcal{D} = \sum a_i \mathcal{E}_i$ . Suppose  $\phi : (\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F}, \Delta) \rightarrow (\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{G} := \phi_* \mathcal{F}, \Theta := \phi_* \Delta)$  be the contraction of some  $(K_{\mathcal{F}} + \Delta)$ -negative extremal rays which is given by the  $(K_{\mathcal{X}} + \mathcal{D})$ -MMP over  $T$ . Then:

- (1) There are finitely many rational curves  $C_j \subset \mathcal{Y}$  such that

$$\overline{\text{NE}}(\mathcal{Y}/T) = \overline{\text{NE}}(\mathcal{Y}/T)_{K_{\mathcal{G}} + \Theta \geq 0} + \sum \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}[C_j]$$

and  $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}[C_j]$ 's are extremal rays of  $\overline{\text{NE}}(\mathcal{Y}/T)$  with two dimensional loci, which are corresponding to  $\phi_* \mathcal{E}_1, \dots, \phi_* \mathcal{E}_u$ , or irreducible components of special fibers.

- (2)  $(K_{\mathcal{Y}} + \phi_* \mathcal{D}) \cdot C_j < 0$  for all  $j$ . Moreover, by the  $(K_{\mathcal{Y}} + \phi_* \mathcal{D})$ -MMP over  $T$ , there is, for each  $j$ , a contraction  $\text{cont}_j : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}$  over  $T$  such that an irreducible curve  $C \subset \mathcal{Y}$  is mapped to a point if and only if  $[C] \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}[C_j]$ .

- (3) Let  $\mathcal{X}_0 = \sum_{i=0}^r E_i$ . For any  $i$  and  $j$ , if  $\phi_* E_i \neq 0$ , then  $(\text{cont}_j \circ \phi)|_{E_i}$  is either the identity or the contraction of some  $\mathcal{F}_{E_i}$ -exceptional curves or some  $\mathcal{F}_{E_i}$ -chains.

*Remark 4.17.* We have the following remarks.

- (1) By MMP on foliated surfaces, we can always find  $a_i$ 's with  $0 \leq a_i < 1$  such that  $(K_{\mathcal{X}} + \sum a_i \mathcal{E}_i) \cdot \mathcal{E}_{i,t} < 0$  for general  $t \in T$ . Moreover,  $f^{-1}(t) \cup \bigcup_i \mathcal{E}_i$  has simple normal crossing support since  $f$  is a semi-stable reduction. Thus,  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{D})$  is klt and  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{D} + f^{-1}(t))$  is dlt for any  $t \in T$ . Therefore, the  $(K_{\mathcal{X}} + \mathcal{D} + f^{-1}(t))$ -MMP over  $T$  exists for any  $t \in T$ .
- (2) Notice that  $(K_{\mathcal{X}} + \mathcal{D})$ -MMP over  $T$  is equivalent to  $(K_{\mathcal{X}} + \mathcal{D} + f^{-1}(t))$ -MMP over  $T$  since  $f^{-1}(t) \equiv_f 0$  for any  $t \in T$ .
- (3) For any  $i$  with  $\phi_* E_i \neq 0$ ,  $\phi|_{E_i}$  is either the identity or the contraction of some  $\mathcal{F}_{E_i}$ -exceptional curves or  $\mathcal{F}_{E_i}$ -chains.
- (4) For any  $\mathcal{E}_j$  with  $j > u$ , we have that  $(K_{\mathcal{F}} + \Delta) \cdot \mathcal{E}_{j,t} = 0$

Before we prove the cone theorem, we need the following lemmas.

**Lemma 4.18.** *Assumptions as in Theorem 4.16, the locus of a  $(K_{\mathcal{G}} + \Theta)$ -negative extremal ray  $R$  is not  $\mathcal{Y}$ .*

*Proof.* Since the general fibers of the original family of  $(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{G}) \rightarrow T$  are in  $\mathcal{S}_P$ , the locus  $\text{loc}(R)$  is not the whole  $\mathcal{Y}$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 4.19.** *Assumptions as in Theorem 4.16. Then the locus of a  $(K_{\mathcal{G}} + \Theta)$ -negative extremal ray  $R$  has dimension two.*

*Proof.* By Lemma 4.18, it suffices to show that any locus is not one-dimensional. Now suppose  $R = \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}[C]$  has one dimensional locus and  $C \subset F_0$  where  $\mathcal{Y}_0 = \bigcup_{i=0}^s F_i$ . We divide the proof into several steps.

- (1) *Claim.*  $\Theta \cdot C \geq 0$ .

*Proof.* Since the locus of  $C$  is one-dimensional, we have  $C \not\subset \Theta$ . Thus  $\Theta \cdot C \geq 0$ .

- (2) *Claim.* The curve  $C$  is invariant with  $C^2 < 0$  on  $F_0$ .

*Proof.* If  $C^2 \geq 0$  on  $F_0$ , then by Lemma 4.10, we have

$$K_{\mathcal{G}_{F_0}} \cdot C \leq K_{\mathcal{G}} \cdot C \leq (K_{\mathcal{G}} + \Theta) \cdot C < 0.$$

Then by Theorem 4.2, the locus of  $R$  contains  $F_0$ , which is a contradiction. Thus  $C^2 < 0$  on  $E_0$ . If  $C$  is not invariant, then

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &> (K_{\mathcal{G}} + \Theta) \cdot C \\ &\geq K_{\mathcal{G}} \cdot C \\ &\geq (K_{\mathcal{G}_{F_0}} + C) \cdot C \\ &\geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality holds by step (1), the third inequality holds by Lemma 4.10, and the last inequality holds by the first part of the proof of [McQ08, Proposition III.1.2]. Thus, we get a contradiction, and hence  $C$  is invariant.

- (3) *Claim.*  $K_{\mathcal{G}} \cdot C \geq K_{\mathcal{G}_{F_0}} \cdot C$ .

*Proof.* By Lemma 4.10, we have

$$K_{\mathcal{G}} \cdot C = \left( K_{\mathcal{G}_{F_0}} + \sum_{j \in J} C_j \right) \cdot C \geq K_{\mathcal{G}_{F_0}} \cdot C$$

where the last inequality holds since  $C_j$ 's are non-invariant and  $C$  is invariant.

- (4) *Claim.*  $Z(\mathcal{G}_{F_0}, C, p) \geq 0$  for all  $p$  on the smooth locus of  $C$ .

*Proof.* Let  $p_1, \dots, p_w$  be all foliation singularities on the smooth locus of  $C$  such that  $Z(\mathcal{G}_{F_0}, C, p) < 0$ . By Lemma 1.26, we may assume that the eigenvalue for  $p_i$  is  $\frac{m_i}{n_i}$  where  $m_i \geq n_i \geq 2$  and  $\gcd(m_i, n_i) = 1$ . Thus, we notice, by the proof of [McQ08, Proposition III.2.1], that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &> (K_{\mathcal{G}} + \Theta) \cdot C \\ &\geq K_{\mathcal{G}_{F_0}} \cdot C \\ &\geq k - 2 - \frac{k}{2} + \sum_{i=1}^w Z(\mathcal{G}_{F_0}, C, p_i) + (K_{F_0} + C) \cdot C \\ &\geq \frac{k}{2} - 2 + \sum_{i=1}^w (1 - (m_i - 1)(n_i - 1)) + \sum_{i=1}^w (m_i - 1)(n_i - 1) - 2 \\ &= \frac{k}{2} + w - 4 \end{aligned}$$

where  $k$  is the number of singularities of  $C$ . Hence,  $w \leq 3$  and  $k \leq 7$ . Therefore, by Lemmas 1.25 and 1.26, we have

$$0 > C^2 > \tilde{C}^2 > \sum_{i=1}^w m_i n_i - k \geq 4w - 7$$

where  $\tilde{C}$  is the proper transform of  $C$  on  $\tilde{F}_0$ , which is the minimal resolution of  $F_0$ . Thus  $w = 1$ ,  $k \leq 5$ , and  $\tilde{C}^2 > m_1 n_1 - k \geq -1$ . Since  $\tilde{C}^2$  is an integer, we have that  $C^2 > \tilde{C}^2 \geq 0$ , which is a contradiction.

- (5) Therefore, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &> (K_{\mathcal{G}} + \Theta) \cdot C \\ &\geq K_{\mathcal{G}} \cdot C \\ &= K_{\mathcal{G}_{F_0}} \cdot C + \sum_{j \in J} C_j \cdot C \\ &\geq k - 2 - \frac{k}{2} + \sum_{j \in J} C_j \cdot C \end{aligned}$$

where the equality comes from Lemma 4.10. So  $\sum_{j \in J} C_j \cdot C \leq 1$ . We will study and exclude all cases. In particular, there is no flipping contraction.

- (6) If  $\sum_{j \in J} C_j \cdot C = 1$ , then  $k \leq 1$ . Thus  $\tilde{C}$  must be a tail of some  $\mathcal{G}_{\tilde{F}_0}$ -chains with at most one reduced singularity, which is impossible by Theorem 1.19.
- (7) So  $\sum_{j \in J} C_j \cdot C = 0$ , and thus we have  $k < 4$  and  $\tilde{C}$  is a smooth rational curve.

- (8) If  $k = 0$ . Then  $C$  is in the smooth locus of  $F_0$  and has no foliation singularities. Thus  $C^2 = 0$ , which contradicts to step (2).
- (9) If  $k = 2$  (resp.  $k = 3$ ), then  $\tilde{C}$  must meet three  $\mathcal{G}_{\tilde{F}_0}$ -chains and has exactly two (resp. three) reduced singularities, which is impossible by Theorem 1.19.
- (10) If  $k = 1$ , then  $\tilde{C}$  must meet exactly one  $\mathcal{G}_{\tilde{F}_0}$ -chain  $D$  and has exactly two reduced singularities. So  $\tilde{C} \cup D$  gives a new  $\mathcal{G}_{\tilde{F}_0}$ -chain. Then by Lemma 4.20, we see  $\text{loc}([\tilde{C}])$  has dimension at least two. Therefore,  $\text{loc}(R) = \text{loc}([C])$  also has dimension at least two, which gives a contradiction.

□

**Lemma 4.20.** *Let  $f : (\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F}) \rightarrow T$  be an  $\mathcal{S}_P$ -family over  $T$  with  $\mathcal{X}$  smooth. For a fixed  $t \in T$  and an  $\mathcal{F}_t$ -chain  $C_t = \sum_i C_{t,i}$ , we can deform  $C_t$  to an  $\mathcal{F}_s$ -chain  $C_s = \sum_i C_{s,i}$  for  $s \in T$  close to  $t$ .*

*Proof.* The proof is similar to the proof of [Bru01, Lemme 3]. We first deform  $C_t$  to very general  $s$  closed to  $t$ . Thus the eigenvalues of  $\mathcal{F}_s$  at singularities on  $C_s$  remain the same for  $s$  close to  $t$ . Therefore,  $C_s$  is an  $\mathcal{F}_s$ -chain all  $s$  close to  $t$ . □

**Lemma 4.21.** *Assumptions as in Theorem 4.16. Let  $R$  be a  $(K_G + \Theta)$ -negative extremal ray and  $\mathcal{E} = \text{loc}(R)$ . Then we have, for general  $t \in T$ , that*

- (1) either  $\mathcal{E}_t := \mathcal{E}|_{\mathcal{Y}_t}$  is a  $\mathcal{G}_t$ -exceptional curve or the first curve of a  $\mathcal{G}_t$ -chain
- (2) or the proper transform  $(\phi_{t*})^{-1}(\mathcal{E}_t)$  is the tail of some  $\phi_t$ -contracted  $\mathcal{F}_t$ -chain.

Moreover,  $\mathcal{E}$  meets exactly one irreducible component of  $\mathcal{Y}_0$ .

*Proof.* The first statement follows because  $\mathcal{Y}_t$  is a birational model over an element in  $\mathcal{S}_P$  and  $\mathcal{E}_t$  is a  $(K_{\mathcal{G}_t} + \Theta_t)$ -negative curve. Assume that  $\mathcal{E}_0 = \sum C_j$  has at least two irreducible components.

- (1) If  $\mathcal{E}_t$  is an  $\mathcal{G}_t$ -exceptional curve or the first curve of an  $\mathcal{G}_t$ -chain, then

$$K_G \cdot \sum_j C_j = K_G \cdot \mathcal{E}_t = -1$$

for all  $j$ . Since  $R$  is extremal, all  $[C_j]$ 's are in  $R$ . Thus  $K_G \cdot C_j$  is a negative integer for any  $j$ . Therefore,  $K_G \cdot \sum_j C_j \leq -2$ , which is impossible.

- (2) If the proper transform  $E_t := (\phi_{t*})^{-1}(\mathcal{E}_t)$  is the tail of some  $\phi_t$ -contracted  $\mathcal{F}_t$ -chains, then  $-1 < K_G \cdot \mathcal{E}_t < 0$ . So  $K_G \cdot C_j < 0$  for all  $j$ . Notice that at least one  $C_j$  is in the smooth locus  $\mathcal{Y}$ . Thus, for such  $j$ , we have  $K_G \cdot C_j \leq -1$  and hence  $K_G \cdot \sum_j C_j < -1$ , which is impossible. □

**Lemma 4.22.** *Assumptions as in Theorem 4.16. Let  $R = \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}[C_R]$  be a  $(K_G + \Theta)$ -negative extremal ray. Then  $(K_{\mathcal{Y}} + \phi_*\mathcal{D}) \cdot C_R < 0$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{E} = \text{loc}(R)$ . Then we have two cases:

- (1) If  $\mathcal{E}$  is flat over  $T$ , then  $\mathcal{E} = \phi_*\mathcal{E}_i$  for some  $i = 1, \dots, u$ . By Lemma 4.21 and the assumption in Theorem 4.16, we have that

$$(K_{\mathcal{Y}} + \phi_*\mathcal{D}) \cdot C_R = (K_{\mathcal{X}} + \mathcal{D}) \cdot (\phi_*)^{-1}(C_R) < 0.$$

- (2) If  $\mathcal{E} = \text{loc}(R)$  is one of the irreducible component of the central fiber  $\mathcal{Y}_0$  of  $g : (\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{G}) \rightarrow T$ .

Let  $C_R$  be an invariant rational curve by Remark 4.15. Notice that  $\mathcal{E}$  is covered by rational curves. Also,  $\mathcal{G}_\mathcal{E}$  has only finitely many foliation singularities, all of which are  $\mathbb{Q}$ -foliated Gorenstein log canonical singularities. By classification of canonical foliation singularities, there are at most two separatrices passing through these singularities. Therefore we may assume that  $C_R$  has only non-reduced foliation singularities and is in the smooth locus of  $\mathcal{E}$ . Let  $p_1, \dots, p_r$  be those non-reduced singularities with the eigenvalues  $\frac{m_i}{n_i}$  where  $m_i \geq n_i \geq 1$  and  $\gcd(m_i, n_i) = 1$ .

In the proof of Lemma 4.14, we have known that  $C_R \cdot \mathcal{E} < 0$ . Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &> (K_G + \Theta) \cdot C_R \\
&= K_{\mathcal{G}_\mathcal{E}} \cdot C_R + \sum_{j \in J} C_R \cdot C_j \\
&\geq \sum_{i=1}^r Z(\mathcal{G}_\mathcal{E}, C_R, p_i) + (K_\mathcal{E} + C_R) \cdot C_R \\
&\geq \sum_{i=1}^r (1 - (m_i - 1)(n_i - 1)) + \sum_{i=1}^r (m_i - 1)(n_i - 1) - 2 \\
&= r - 2
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have that  $r \leq 1$ . Let  $\mathcal{Y}_0 = \sum_{i=0}^s F_i$  and  $\mathcal{E} = F_0$ . Then we have

$$0 < -C_R \cdot \mathcal{E} = C_R \cdot \sum_{i=1}^s F_i \leq \sum_{j \in J} C_R \cdot C_j + r.$$

- (a) If  $r = 1$ , then  $\sum_{j \in J} C_R \cdot C_j = 0$  and  $C_R \cdot \mathcal{E} = -1$ . Thus  $C_R^2 = m_1 n_1$ . Therefore, by adjunction, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
K_{\mathcal{Y}} \cdot C_R &= K_\mathcal{E} \cdot C_R - \mathcal{E} \cdot C_R \\
&= -2 + (m_1 - 1)(n_1 - 1) - m_1 n_1 - (-1) \\
&= -m_1 - n_1 < 0.
\end{aligned}$$

- (b) If  $r = 0$ , then  $\sum_{j \in J} C_R \cdot C_j = 1$  and  $C_R \cdot \mathcal{E} = -1$ . Since there is no foliation singularity on  $C_R$ , we have  $C_R^2 = 0$ . Therefore, by adjunction, we have

$$K_{\mathcal{Y}} \cdot C_R = K_\mathcal{E} \cdot C_R - \mathcal{E} \cdot C_R = -2 - C_R^2 - (-1) = -1.$$

Hence,  $\mathcal{Y}_0$  is a ruled surface with smooth rational general fibers. Since there is no reduced singularity on  $C_R$ , we have that  $\phi_* \mathcal{D} \cdot C_R = 0$  by Lemma 4.21 and  $(K_{\mathcal{Y}} + \phi_* \mathcal{D}) \cdot C_R < 0$ .  $\square$

*Proof* (Cone Theorem 4.16). By Lemma 4.19, all loci  $\mathcal{E}$ 's of  $(K_G + \Theta)$ -negative extremal rays are of dimension two. Then by Lemma 4.21 and MMP on foliated surfaces, there are finitely many  $\mathcal{E}$  flat over  $T$ . For  $\mathcal{E}$  non-flat over  $T$ ,  $\mathcal{E}$  is in an irreducible component of the special fiber of  $g : (\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{G}) \rightarrow T$ . This proves (1).

(2) follows from Lemma 4.22 and (3) follows from Lemma 4.21.  $\square$

**4.5. Semi-stable minimal model program.** Let  $f : (\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F}, \Delta) \rightarrow T$  be a semi-stable reduction as in subsection 4.2. Since Picard number is finite and is decreased by one after each divisorial contraction, by Theorem 4.16, we can get, after partial  $(K_{\mathcal{X}} + \mathcal{D} + f^{-1}(t))$ -MMP for any  $t \in T$ , that  $f^m : (\mathcal{X}^m, \mathcal{F}^m, \Delta^m) \rightarrow T$  has no  $(K_{\mathcal{F}^m} + \Delta^m)$ -negative extremal ray over  $T$ , that is,  $(K_{\mathcal{F}^m} + \Delta^m)$  is nef over  $T$ . Let  $\pi : (\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F}, \Delta) \rightarrow (\mathcal{X}^m, \mathcal{F}^m, \Delta^m)$  be the contraction over  $T$ .

**Lemma 4.23.**  $f^m : \mathcal{X}^m \rightarrow T$  is dlt (see Definition 4.6) and  $(\mathcal{X}^m, \mathcal{F}^m, \Delta^m)$  is  $\mathcal{F}^m$ -dlt (see Definition 4.8).

*Proof.* Note that  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{D} + f^{-1}(t))$  is dlt for any  $t \in T$ . Since  $\pi$  is the composition of divisorial contractions of  $(K_{\mathcal{X}} + \mathcal{D} + f^{-1}(t))$ -negative extremal rays, we have that  $(\mathcal{X}^m, \pi_*\mathcal{D} + (f^m)^{-1}(t))$  is also dlt. (For a reference, see [KM98, Corollary 3.44].) Thus,  $(\mathcal{X}^m, (f^m)^{-1}(t))$  is dlt for any  $t \in T$  and hence  $f^m : \mathcal{X}^m \rightarrow T$  is dlt.

Also  $(\mathcal{X}^m, \mathcal{F}^m, \Delta^m)$  is  $\mathcal{F}^m$ -dlt by Lemma 4.1.  $\square$

*Remark 4.24.* In fact, we have  $\pi_*\mathcal{D} = \emptyset$ .

To sum up, we have the following theorem.

**Theorem 4.25.** *Let  $f : (\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F}, \Delta) \rightarrow T$  be a family of foliations which is a semi-stable reduction of  $\mathcal{S}_P$ -families. (See subsection 4.2.) Then the semi-stable  $(K_{\mathcal{F}} + \Delta)$ -minimal model program exists and stops with  $f^m : (\mathcal{X}^m, \mathcal{F}^m, \Delta^m) \rightarrow T$  such that  $(K_{\mathcal{F}^m} + \Delta^m)$  is nef over  $T$ ,  $f^m : \mathcal{X}^m \rightarrow T$  is dlt (see Definition 4.6), and  $(\mathcal{X}^m, \mathcal{F}^m, \Delta^m)$  is  $\mathcal{F}^m$ -dlt (see Definition 4.8).*

Moreover, we show the following valuative criterion of properness for  $\mathcal{S}_P$ -families.

**Theorem 4.26.** *Let  $T$  be a smooth curve and  $f^\circ : (\mathcal{X}^\circ, \mathcal{F}^\circ, \Delta^\circ) \rightarrow T^\circ$  be an  $\mathcal{S}_P$ -family (see Definition 2.17) over  $T^\circ$  where  $T^\circ = T \setminus \{0\}$  and  $0 \in T$ . Then there exists a smooth curve  $C$  and a finite morphism  $C \rightarrow T$  such that, after the base change via  $C \rightarrow T$ , the pullback  $\mathcal{S}_P$ -family  $(\mathcal{X}_C^\circ, \mathcal{F}_C^\circ, \Delta_C^\circ)$  extends uniquely to an  $\mathcal{S}_P$ -family  $(\mathcal{X}_C, \mathcal{F}_C, \Delta_C)$  over  $C$  with the special fiber  $\mathcal{S}_P$ -smoothable. (See Definition 2.19.)*

*Proof.* As in subsection 4.2, we take the closure and semi-stable resolution to get  $g : (\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{G}, \Theta) \rightarrow C$  where  $C \rightarrow T$  is a finite morphism and  $C$  is a smooth curve. Then by Theorem 4.25, we run the semi-stable  $(K_{\mathcal{G}} + \Theta)$ -MMP over  $C$ . Thus, we get a family  $g : (\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{G}, \Theta) \rightarrow C$  such that  $K_{\mathcal{G}} + \Theta$  is nef over  $C$ . By running additional partial  $K_{\mathcal{Y}}$ -MMP over  $C$ , we may assume that  $K_{\mathcal{Y}} + 6i(P)(K_{\mathcal{G}} + \Theta)$  is nef over  $C$ . (See Lemma 3.1 for the definition of  $i(P)$ .) Note that  $(K_{\mathcal{Y}} + 6i(P)(K_{\mathcal{G}} + \Theta)) - K_{\mathcal{Y}}$  is nef and big over  $C$ . By relative base point free theorem (see [KM98, Theorem 3.24] for a reference),  $K_{\mathcal{Y}} + 6i(P)(K_{\mathcal{G}} + \Theta)$  is semi-ample over  $C$ . Thus, we have the relative canonical model  $g : (\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{G}, \Theta) \rightarrow C$ .

Let  $f_C^\circ$  be the base change of  $f^\circ$  via the morphism  $C^\circ \rightarrow T^\circ$  where  $C^\circ = C \setminus \{0\}$ . Notice that for any  $c \in C \setminus \{0\}$ , the fibers of  $f_C^\circ$  and  $g$  over  $c$  are isomorphic. Moreover, for  $c = 0$ , we have that  $(K_{\mathcal{G}} + \Theta)|_{\mathcal{Y}_0}$  is nef and  $K_{\mathcal{Y}_0} + 6i(P)(K_{\mathcal{G}} + \Theta)|_{\mathcal{Y}_0}$  is ample. Hence, the fiber of  $g$  over  $0 \in C$  is smoothable. Therefore,  $g : (\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{G}, \Theta) \rightarrow C$  is an  $\mathcal{S}_P$ -family over  $C$  with the special fiber  $\mathcal{S}_P$ -smoothable.  $\square$

## 5. VALUATIVE CRITERION OF SEPARATEDNESS FOR $\mathcal{S}_P$ -FAMILIES

In this section, we show the following theorem.

**Theorem 5.1.** *Fix a function  $P : \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ . Let  $T$  be a smooth curve,  $T^\circ = T \setminus \{0\}$  where  $0 \in T$ , and  $(\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{F}_i, \Delta_i)$  for  $i = 1, 2$  be two  $\mathcal{S}_P$ -families (see Definition 2.17) over  $T$ . Then any isomorphism  $\varphi^\circ : (\mathcal{X}_1, \mathcal{F}_1, \Delta_1)_{T^\circ} \rightarrow (\mathcal{X}_2, \mathcal{F}_2, \Delta_2)_{T^\circ}$  over  $T^\circ$  extends uniquely to an isomorphism  $\varphi : (\mathcal{X}_1, \mathcal{F}_1, \Delta_1) \rightarrow (\mathcal{X}_2, \mathcal{F}_2, \Delta_2)$  over  $T$ .*

The proof follows the classical approach. We will need the following lemmas that, for  $(Y, \mathcal{G}, D) \in \mathcal{S}_P$ ,  $Y$  is indeed a Proj of a (finitely generated) graded ring associated with the adjoint bundle  $K_Y + 6i(P)(K_{\mathcal{G}} + D)$  and this adjoint bundle behaves well after taking resolutions.

**Lemma 5.2.** *Fix a function  $P : \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ . For any  $(Y, \mathcal{G}, D) \in \mathcal{S}_P$ , we have*

$$Y \cong \text{Proj} \bigoplus_{m \geq 0} H^0(Y, m(K_Y + 6i(P)(K_{\mathcal{G}} + D)))$$

where  $i(P)$  is defined in Lemma 3.1.

*Proof.* Notice that  $K_Y + 6i(P)(K_{\mathcal{G}} + D)$  is ample by the part (1) of the proof of Theorem 2.10.  $\square$

**Lemma 5.3.** *Fix a function  $P : \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ . For any  $(Y, \mathcal{G}, D) \in \mathcal{S}_P$  and any resolution of singularities  $f : Z \rightarrow Y$ , we write*

$$K_Z + 6i(P) \left( K_{\mathcal{H}} + f_*^{-1}D + \sum \varepsilon(E_j)E_j \right) = f^*(K_Y + 6i(P)(K_{\mathcal{G}} + D)) + \sum a_j E_j$$

where  $\mathcal{H}$  is the pullback foliation on  $Z$  and  $E_j$ 's are exceptional divisors of  $f$ . Then we have  $a_j \geq -1$  for all  $j$  where  $\varepsilon(E_j) = 0$  if  $E_j$  is  $\mathcal{H}$ -invariant and  $\varepsilon(E_j) = 1$  otherwise.

*Proof.* We first consider that  $Z = Y^m$  is the minimal resolution  $h$  of singularities of  $Y$  and  $\mathcal{G}^m$  is the pullback foliation on  $Y^m$ . We have two cases for any singularity  $p$  of  $Y$ :

- (1) If  $p$  is a terminal foliation singularity, then we have

$$i(P)(K_{\mathcal{G}^m} + h_*^{-1}D) = h^*(i(P)(K_{\mathcal{G}} + D)) + \sum a'_j E_j$$

and  $a'_j > 0$  for all  $j$ . Besides,  $p$  is a klt singularity for  $Y$ . So we have  $K_{Y^m} = h^*K_Y + \sum a''_j E_j$  where  $a''_j > -1$ . Thus, we have  $a_j = 6i(P)a'_j + a''_j > -1$ .

- (2) If  $p$  is a non-terminal foliation singularity, then  $p$  is a canonical singularity of  $Y$ ,  $K_{Y^m} = h^*K_Y$ , and  $K_{\mathcal{G}^m} + h_*^{-1}D = h^*(K_{\mathcal{G}} + D)$ . Hence  $a_j = 0$ .

Now for general  $f$ ,  $f$  factors through the minimal resolution  $h$ . Put  $f = h \circ g$  where  $g : Z \rightarrow Y^m$  is a sequence of blowups. Since  $Y^m$  is smooth, all discrepancy contributions from  $K_{Y^m}$  are positive integers. Moreover, the discrepancy contributions from  $K_{\mathcal{G}^m} + h_*^{-1}D$  are non-negative over all singularities except for the non-reduced singularities. However, by Lemma 1.33 and Remark 1.34, those discrepancies are at least  $-1$  and the corresponding exceptional divisors are non-invariant. Therefore,  $a_j \geq -1$  for all  $j$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 5.4.** *Fix a function  $P : \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ . Let  $f : (\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F}, \Delta) \rightarrow T$  be an  $\mathcal{S}_P$ -family where  $T$  is a smooth affine curve. Suppose there is a birational morphism  $g : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$  such that  $f \circ g : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow T$  is a semi-stable reduction of  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F}, \Delta)$ . Let  $\mathcal{G}$  be the pullback foliation of  $\mathcal{F}$  and  $\Theta$  be the proper transform of  $\Delta$ . We may write*

$$K_{\mathcal{Y}} + 6i(P)(K_{\mathcal{G}} + \Theta) = g^*(K_{\mathcal{X}} + 6i(P)(K_{\mathcal{F}} + \Delta)) + \sum a_i E_i + \sum b_j F_j$$

where  $E_i$  are all exceptional divisors mapping to  $0 \in T$  and  $F_j$  are all exceptional divisors flat over  $T$ . Then  $a_i \geq 0$  for all  $i$  and  $b_j \geq -1$  for all  $j$ .

*Proof.* Restriction the equality to the general element  $t \in T$ , not 0, we have

$$K_{\mathcal{Y}_t} + 6i(P)(K_{\mathcal{G}} + \Theta)|_{\mathcal{Y}_t} = g_t^*(K_{\mathcal{X}_t} + 6i(P)(K_{\mathcal{F}_t} + \Delta_t)) + \sum b_j F_j.$$

By Lemma 5.3, we have, for all  $j$ , that  $b_j \geq -1$ .

Moreover, let  $X$  be an irreducible component of  $\mathcal{X}_0$  and  $Y$  be its proper transform on  $\mathcal{Y}$ . Let  $\mathcal{Y}_0 = \bigcup_{i=0}^r Y_i$  be the decomposition into distinct irreducible components. By adjunction, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & K_Y + 6i(P) \left( K_{\mathcal{G}_Y} + \sum \varepsilon(E_i|_Y) E_i|_Y + \Theta|_Y \right) \\ &= K_Y + 6i(P)(K_{\mathcal{G}} + \Theta)|_Y \\ &= (K_{\mathcal{Y}} + Y + 6i(P)(K_{\mathcal{G}} + \Theta))|_Y \\ &= \left( K_{\mathcal{Y}} - \sum_{i=1}^r Y_i + 6i(P)(K_{\mathcal{G}} + \Theta) \right)|_Y \\ &= \left( g^*(K_{\mathcal{X}} + 6i(P)(K_{\mathcal{F}} + \Delta)) - \sum_{i=1}^r Y_i + \sum a_i E_i + \sum b_j F_j \right)|_Y \\ &= g_0^*(K_X + 6i(P)(K_{\mathcal{F}_X} + \Delta|_X)) + \sum (a_i - 1) E_i|_Y + \sum b_j F_j|_Y \end{aligned}$$

where  $g_0$  is the morphism from  $Y$  to  $X$ . By Lemma 5.3, we have  $a_i \geq 0$  for all  $i$ .  $\square$

Now we are ready to prove Theorem 5.1.

*Proof* (Theorem 5.1). Let  $\mathcal{Y}$  be a common resolution of  $(\mathcal{X}_1, \Delta_1)$ ,  $(\mathcal{X}_2, \Delta_2)$ , and  $\varphi^\circ$ . Let  $g_1$  and  $g_2$  be the morphisms fitting into the following commutative diagram.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \mathcal{Y} & \\ g_1 \swarrow & & \searrow g_2 \\ \mathcal{X}_1 & \overset{\varphi^\circ}{\dashrightarrow} & \mathcal{X}_2 \\ f_1 \searrow & & \swarrow f_2 \\ & T & \end{array}$$

Note that  $g_1^* \mathcal{F}_1$  and  $g_2^* \mathcal{F}_2$  are isomorphic over  $U$ , so they are isomorphic at the generic point of  $\mathcal{Y}$ . By [HL21, Lemma 1.8], they are in fact isomorphic. Let  $\mathcal{G} = g_1^* \mathcal{F}_1 = g_2^* \mathcal{F}_2$ . Moreover, we have the proper transforms  $(g_{1*})^{-1} \Delta_1$  and  $(g_{2*})^{-1} \Delta_2$  are the same. Then we put  $\Theta = (g_{1*})^{-1} \Delta_1 = (g_{2*})^{-1} \Delta_2$ .

As in subsection 4.2, we may assume that  $(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{G}, \Theta) \rightarrow T$  is a semi-stable reduction. Note that  $\mathcal{X}_1$  and  $\mathcal{X}_2$  may not be normal after base change.

Suppose first that  $\mathcal{X}_1$  is normal. We write

$$K_{\mathcal{Y}} + 6i(P)(K_{\mathcal{G}} + \Theta) = g_1^*(K_{\mathcal{X}_1} + 6i(P)(K_{\mathcal{F}_1} + \Delta_1)) + \sum a_i E_i + \sum b_j F_j$$

where  $E_i$  are exceptional divisors mapping to  $0 \in T$  and  $F_j$  are flat over  $T$ .



Now, by Lemma 5.4,  $a_i \geq 0$ , and  $b_j \geq -1$ . Also, by adjunction formula, we notice that

$$\begin{aligned} & (g_1)_*(K_{\mathcal{Y}} + 6i(P)(K_{\mathcal{G}} + \Theta) + \sum F_j) \\ &= (g_1)_*(g_1^*(K_{\mathcal{X}_1} + 6i(P)(K_{\mathcal{F}_1} + \Delta_1)) + \sum a_i E_i + \sum (b_j + 1)F_j) \\ &= K_{\mathcal{X}_1} + 6i(P)(K_{\mathcal{F}_1} + \Delta_1). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{X}_1 &\cong \text{Proj} \bigoplus_{m \geq 0} H^0(\mathcal{X}_1, m(K_{\mathcal{X}_1} + 6i(P)(K_{\mathcal{F}_1} + \Delta_1))) \\ &= \text{Proj} \bigoplus_{m \geq 0} H^0(\mathcal{Y}, m(K_{\mathcal{Y}} + 6i(P)(K_{\mathcal{G}} + \Theta) + \sum F_j)). \end{aligned}$$

If  $\mathcal{X}_1$  is not normal, then using the same argument as above, we have

$$\mathcal{X}_1^\nu \cong \text{Proj} \bigoplus_{m \geq 0} H^0(\mathcal{Y}, m(K_{\mathcal{Y}} + 6i(P)(K_{\mathcal{G}} + \Theta) + \sum F_j)).$$

Note that the conductor of  $\mathcal{X}_1^\nu$  is in the support of  $\sum F_j$ . Thus we have

$$\mathcal{X}_1^\nu \cong \text{Proj} \bigoplus_{m \geq 0} H^0(\mathcal{Y}, m(K_{\mathcal{Y}} + 6i(P)(K_{\mathcal{G}} + \Theta) + \sum F_j)) \cong \mathcal{X}_2^\nu.$$

Therefore  $\mathcal{X}_1$  and  $\mathcal{X}_2$  are isomorphic in codimension 1 where  $\mathcal{X}_1$  and  $\mathcal{X}_2$  here are the original one (before taking a base change). Since they both satisfy Serre's condition  $S_2$ , they are, in fact, isomorphic.

Now we put  $\mathcal{X}_1 \cong \mathcal{X}_2 \cong \mathcal{X}$ . Notice that  $\mathcal{F}_1$  and  $\mathcal{F}_2$  are isomorphic at the generic point of  $\mathcal{X}$ . So they are indeed isomorphic. Moreover,  $\Delta_1$  and  $\Delta_2$  are isomorphic.  $\square$

## 6. LOCAL-CLOSEDNESS FOR $\mathcal{S}_P$ -FAMILIES


In this section, we will show in Theorem 6.4 the local-closedness for  $\mathcal{S}_P$ -families. (See Definition 2.8.)

**Lemma 6.1.** *Let  $(X, \mathcal{F})$  be a foliated surface with only semi-reduced singularities. Given a Hirzebruch-Jung string  $\bigcup_{i=1}^s E_i$  of  $(-2)$ - $\mathcal{F}$ -curves. Assume that there are at most two foliation singularities on each  $E_i$ . Then, after re-indexing, we have that  $E_1$  has one or two singularities and  $E_i$  has exactly two singularities for  $i = 2, \dots, s$ . Moreover, let  $p_{i-1}$  and  $p_i$  be the singularities on  $E_i$  for  $i = 2, \dots, s$  where  $p_i$  is the intersection of  $E_i$  and  $E_{i+1}$  for  $i = 2, \dots, s-1$ . (See Figure 1.) Then we have the following two cases:*

- (1) *If  $E_1$  has only one singularity  $p_1$ , then  $p_1$  is a saddle-node and, for  $i \geq 2$ ,  $p_i$  is a reduced and non-degenerate singularity with eigenvalue uniquely determined by  $E_2^2, \dots, E_s^2$ .*
- (2) *If  $E_1$  has two singularities  $p_0$  and  $p_1$ , then there is at most one  $i \in \{0, \dots, s\}$  such that  $p_i$  is not reduced. Moreover, if  $Z(\mathcal{F}, E_i, p_i)$  (resp.  $Z(\mathcal{F}, E_{i+1}, p_i)$ ) is non-positive, then  $p_{i-1}$  (resp.  $p_{i+1}$ ) is a saddle-node.*

*Proof.* (1) If  $E_1$  has only one singularity  $p_1$ , we have that

$$Z(\mathcal{F}, E_1, p_1) = Z(\mathcal{F}, E_1) = 2.$$

FIGURE 1. Chain of  $(-2)$ - $\mathcal{F}$ -curves

Thus by Lemma 1.26, we know that  $p_1$  is a saddle-node,  $Z(\mathcal{F}, E_2, p_1) = 1$ , and  $\text{CS}(\mathcal{F}, E_2, p_1) = 0$ . By Camacho-Sad formula (Theorem 1.25), we have that

$$\lambda_2 := \text{CS}(\mathcal{F}, E_2, p_2) = E_2^2 - \text{CS}(\mathcal{F}, E_2, p_1) = E_2^2 \leq -2.$$

Hence  $p_2$  is reduced and non-degenerate.

*Claim.* For all  $i = 2, \dots, s$ ,  $\lambda_i := \text{CS}(\mathcal{F}, E_i, p_i)$  are negative rational numbers less than  $-1$  and  $p_i$  are reduced non-degenerate singularities.

We have seen that the claim holds for  $i = 2$ . Now we assume that  $p_i$ 's are reduced and non-degenerate with  $\lambda_i < -1$  for  $i = 2, \dots, k-1$ . Then we have that  $Z(\mathcal{F}, E_k, p_{k-1}) = 1$  and  $Z(\mathcal{F}, E_k, p_k) = 1$ . By Camacho-Sad formula (Theorem 1.25) and Lemma 1.26, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_k &= E_k^2 - \text{CS}(\mathcal{F}, E_k, p_{k-1}) \\ &= E_k^2 - \frac{1}{\lambda_{k-1}} < -2 + 1 = -1. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by induction, we complete the proof of the claim and of the first case.

- (2) Now we assume that all  $E_i$ 's have two foliation singularities. Suppose there are two non-reduced singularities  $p_i$  and  $p_j$ . As the proof of Lemma 1.33, after a sequence of blowups, we get a string with two separatrices at each singularity, which is impossible by Theorem 1.19.

Moreover, if  $Z(\mathcal{F}, E_i, p_i) \leq 0$ , then  $Z(\mathcal{F}, E_i, p_{i-1}) = 2 - Z(\mathcal{F}, E_i, p_i) \geq 2$ . So, by Lemma 1.26, we have that  $p_{i-1}$  is a saddle-node. □

**Lemma 6.2.** *Let  $(X, \mathcal{F})$  be a foliated surface with only semi-reduced singularities. Given a cycle  $E = \bigcup_{i=1}^s E_i$  of  $(-2)$ - $\mathcal{F}$ -curves where  $s \geq 2$ . Then all singularities on  $E$  are reduced and non-degenerate.*

*Proof.* (1) If there is only one non-reduced singularity  $p$ , then we can (virtually) break the cycle into one Hirzebruch-Jung string of  $(-2)$ - $\mathcal{F}$ -curves with 2 non-reduced singularities. Thus by Lemma 6.1, it is impossible.

- (2) If there are more than two non-reduced singularities, then we can take any Hirzebruch-Jung string of  $(-2)$ - $\mathcal{F}$ -curves such that both endpoints are non-reduced. Then by Lemma 6.1, it is impossible.
- (3) Now we know that all singularities on  $E$  are reduced. Since all  $E_i$ 's are  $(-2)$ - $\mathcal{F}$ -curves, we have that all singularities on  $E$  are non-degenerate by Lemma 1.26. □

**Lemma 6.3.** *Let  $\pi : (\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F}) \rightarrow T$  be a smooth family such that*

- (1) *each irreducible component of foliation singularities is finite over  $T$  and pairwise disjoint, and*
- (2)  *$\mathcal{F}_t$  has at worst semi-reduced singularities for all  $t \in T$ .*

*Given any irreducible component  $W$  of singularities of  $\mathcal{F}$ , we can define a holomorphic function  $\lambda : W \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$  such that  $\lambda(w)$  is the eigenvalue of  $\mathcal{F}_{\pi(w)}$  at  $w$ .*

*Proof.* For any  $w \in W$ , we can pick an étale open subset  $\mathcal{U}$  of  $\mathcal{X}$  containing  $w$  such that  $(x, y, t)$  are local coordinates of  $\mathcal{U}$  with  $\pi(x, y, t) = t$  and  $W \cap \mathcal{U} = (x = y = 0)$ .

Then, on  $\mathcal{U}$ , the foliation is given by

$$(a(t)x + b(t)y + \text{h.o.t.}) \frac{\partial}{\partial x} + (c(t)x + d(t)y + \text{h.o.t.}) \frac{\partial}{\partial y}$$

where  $a, b, c$ , and  $d$  are holomorphic functions from  $\pi(V)$  to  $\mathbb{C}$  and h.o.t stands for higher order terms (in  $x, y$ , and  $t$ ). Thus we form a matrix

$$A(t) := \begin{pmatrix} a(t) & b(t) \\ c(t) & d(t) \end{pmatrix}$$

which has two eigenvalues  $\mu_+(t)$  and  $\mu_-(t)$ . Since all singularities are semi-reduced, at least one of two eigenvalues is not zero. Therefore, we can define a holomorphic map  $\lambda : W \cap \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$  by  $\lambda(w) = [\mu_+(\pi(w)) : \mu_-(\pi(w))]$ . Notice that this map is independent of the open subset  $\mathcal{U}$  and of change of coordinates. Thus,  $\lambda$  can be defined on  $W$  and is holomorphic.  $\square$

**Theorem 6.4.** *Given a family of foliated triples  $f : (\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F}, \Delta) \rightarrow T$ . ( $T$  is not necessarily a curve.) Assume that there is a dense subset  $T' \subset T$  such that  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F}, \Delta)_t \in \mathcal{S}_P$  for all  $t \in T'$ . (See Definition 2.8 and Definition 2.17.) Then there exists an open subset  $U \subset T$  such that all fibers of  $f$  over  $U$  are in  $\mathcal{S}_P$ . Moreover, there is an open subset  $U'$  with  $U \subset U' \subset T$  such that all fibers of  $f$  over  $U'$  are exactly  $\mathcal{S}_P$ -smoothable fibers. (See Definition 2.19.)*

*Proof.* We divide the proof into several steps.

- (1) Let  $g : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$  be a resolution of singularities,  $\mathcal{G} = g^*\mathcal{F}$  be the pullback foliation, and  $\Theta$  be the proper transform of  $\Delta$ . Let  $\pi = f \circ g$ . By Proposition 1.42, replacing  $\mathcal{Y}$  with its higher model (via some blowups), we may assume that  $\mathcal{G}_t$  has at worst semi-reduced singularities for all  $t \in U$  for some open subset  $U \subset T$ .
- (2) *Claim.* After shrinking  $U$  further if necessary, the following conditions hold:
  - (a)  $\pi_U$  is smooth.
  - (b) Each irreducible component of singularities of  $\mathcal{G}$  is finite over  $U$  and pairwise disjoint.
  - (c) Each irreducible component of exceptional divisors of  $g$  is flat over  $U$ .
  - (d) For any irreducible component  $C$  of singularities of  $\mathcal{G}$  and any irreducible component  $E$  of exceptional divisors of  $g$ , we have  $C \cap E$  is either  $C$  or empty.
  - (e) For each irreducible component  $E$  of exceptional divisors of  $g$ , either  $E_u$  is invariant for all  $u \in U$  or  $E_u$  is not invariant for all  $u \in U$ .

*Proof.* More explicitly, (a) comes from the generic smoothness. For others, let

$$S_1 = \bigcup \pi(C)$$

where the union is taken over all irreducible components  $C$  of singularities of  $\mathcal{G}$  and of exceptional divisors of  $g$ , which are *not* finite over  $U$ . Let

$$S_2 = \bigcup \{t \mid C_{i,t} = C_{j,t}\}$$

where the union is taken over all distinct irreducible components  $C_i$  and  $C_j$  of singularities of  $\mathcal{G}$ . Let

$$S_3 = \bigcup \pi(C \cap E)$$

where the union is taken over all irreducible components  $C$  of singularity of  $\mathcal{G}$  and all irreducible components  $E$  of exceptional divisors of  $g$  such that  $C \cap E$  is neither  $C$  nor empty.

Note that  $S_1$ ,  $S_2$ , and  $S_3$  are all proper closed subsets of  $U$ . So by replacing  $U$  by  $U \setminus (S_1 \cup S_2 \cup S_3)$ , conditions (a)-(d) hold. The condition (e) can be achieved since being non-invariant is an open condition.

- (3) The conditions (a)-(d) will ensure that the number of foliation singularities on an exceptional prime divisor of  $g$  is constant over  $U$ . Furthermore, all singularities of  $\mathcal{G}$  do not collide over  $U$ . Also there is a  $t_0 \in T' \cap U$  since  $T'$  is dense in  $T$ .
- (4) We say an irreducible component  $E$  of exceptional divisors a *relative  $\mathcal{G}$ -exceptional curve* if  $E_{t_0}$  is a  $\mathcal{G}_{t_0}$ -exceptional curve. Then, for any  $u \in U$ , we have that  $E_u$  is invariant, and the contraction of  $E_u$  introduces either a smooth or a semi-reduced singularity.

Contracting all relative  $\mathcal{G}$ -exceptional curves and by induction on Picard number, we may assume that there is no relative  $\mathcal{G}$ -exceptional curve.

- (5) Now we say  $E = \bigcup_{i=1}^s E_i$  is a *relative  $\mathcal{G}$ -chain* if  $E_{t_0} = \bigcup_{i=1}^s E_{i,t_0}$  is a  $\mathcal{G}_{t_0}$ -chain and  $E_{i,t_0} \cdot \Theta_{t_0} = 0$  for  $i = 1, \dots, s$ . (See Figure 2.)




FIGURE 2.  $\mathcal{F}$ -chain

Since, over  $t_0$ , there is only one singularity  $p_{1,t_0}$  on  $E_{1,t_0}$ , we have that, over any  $u \in U$ , there is also only one singularity  $p_{1,u}$  on  $E_{1,u}$ .

By Camacho-Sad formula (Theorem 1.25), we have  $\text{CS}(\mathcal{G}_u, E_{1,u}, p_{1,u}) = E_{1,u}^2 \leq -2$ . And by Lemma 1.26, the eigenvalue  $\lambda_1 = \text{CS}(\mathcal{G}_u, E_{1,u}, p_{1,u})$  must be a negative integer less than  $-2$ . Thus,  $p_{1,u}$  is a reduced non-degenerate singularity.

Let the singularities on  $E_{k,u}$  be  $p_{k-1,u}$  and  $p_{k,u}$  for  $k = 2, \dots, s$ .

*Claim.* For all  $k = 1, \dots, s$ ,  $\lambda_k := \text{CS}(\mathcal{G}_u, E_{k,u}, p_{k,u})$  are negative rational numbers less than  $-1$  and  $p_{k,u}$  are reduced non-degenerate singularities.

*Proof.* We have shown that this holds when  $k = 1$ . Assume the claim holds for  $k - 1$ . By Camacho-Sad formula (Theorem 1.25) and Lemma 1.26, we have that

$$-2 \geq E_{k,u}^2 = \text{CS}(\mathcal{G}_u, E_{k,u}, p_{k-1,u}) + \text{CS}(\mathcal{G}_u, E_{k,u}, p_{k,u}) = \frac{1}{\lambda_{k-1}} + \lambda_k.$$

Thus,  $\lambda_k \leq -2 - \frac{1}{\lambda_{k-1}} < -2 + 1 = -1$ . Hence,  $\lambda_k$  is a negative rational number less than  $-1$ . Therefore,  $p_{k,u}$  is also a reduced non-degenerate singularity. This completes the proof of the claim.

- (6) We contract all relative  $(\mathcal{G}, \Theta)$ -chains and still using the notation  $(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{G}, \Theta)$  for the resulting foliation. Then we have a family such that

$$(K_{\mathcal{G}} + \Theta)|_{\mathcal{Y}_t}$$

is nef and big for all  $t \in T' \cap U$ . By Lemma 2.12, after shrinking  $U$  further, we have  $(K_{\mathcal{G}} + \Theta)|_{\mathcal{Y}_u}$  is nef and big for all  $u \in U$ .

Next, in order to show that  $(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{G}, \Theta)_t \in \mathcal{S}_P$ , we will study the *relative  $(K_{\mathcal{G}} + \Theta)$ -trivial curves*, that is, the irreducible component  $E$  of exceptional divisors such that  $E_{t_0}$  is  $(K_{\mathcal{G}_{t_0}} + \Theta_{t_0})$ -trivial.

- (7) Let  $E = E_{0,1} \cup E_{0,2} \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^s E_i$  be the exceptional divisor over a *dihedral singularity* where, for all  $u \in U$ ,  $\bigcup_{i=1}^s E_{i,u}$  is a Hirzebruch-Jung string, and  $E_{0,1,u}$  and  $E_{0,2,u}$  are disjoint, of self-intersection  $-2$  and both intersect the bad tail  $E_{1,u}$ . (See the Figure 3 for its dual graph.)




FIGURE 3. Dual graph of a  $D_n$  type singularity

Let  $p_{0,1,u}, p_{0,2,u}$ , and  $p_{1,u}$  be three singularities on  $E_{1,u}$ . Let  $p_{k-1,u}$  and  $p_{k,u}$  be two singularities on  $E_{k,u}$  for  $k = 2, \dots, s$ . (See the Figure 4.)




FIGURE 4.  $D_n$  type singularity

By Camacho-Sad formula (Theorem 1.25), we have, for any  $u \in U$ , that  $-2 = E_{0,1,u}^2 = \text{CS}(\mathcal{G}_u, E_{0,1,u}, p_{0,1,u})$  and  $-2 = E_{0,2,u}^2 = \text{CS}(\mathcal{G}_u, E_{0,2,u}, p_{0,2,u})$ .

So  $p_{0,1,u}$  and  $p_{0,2,u}$  are reduced. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} E_{1,u}^2 &= \text{CS}(\mathcal{G}_u, E_{1,u}, p_{1,u}) + \text{CS}(\mathcal{G}_u, E_{1,u}, p_{0,1,u}) + \text{CS}(\mathcal{G}_u, E_{1,u}, p_{0,2,u}) \\ &= \text{CS}(\mathcal{G}_u, E_{1,u}, p_{1,u}) - \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{So } \lambda_1 := \text{CS}(\mathcal{G}_u, E_{1,u}, p_{1,u}) = E_{1,u}^2 + 1 \leq -1$$

*Claim.* For all  $k = 1, \dots, s$ ,  $\lambda_k := \text{CS}(\mathcal{G}_u, E_{k,u}, p_{k,u})$  are negative rational numbers at most  $-1$  and  $p_{k,u}$  are reduced non-degenerate singularities.

*Proof.* We have shown that this holds when  $k = 1$ . Assume the claim holds for  $k - 1$ .

$$-2 \geq E_{k,u}^2 = \text{CS}(\mathcal{G}_u, E_{k,u}, p_{k-1,u}) + \text{CS}(\mathcal{G}_u, E_{k,u}, p_{k,u}) = \frac{1}{\lambda_{k-1}} + \lambda_k.$$

Thus,  $\lambda_k \leq -2 - \frac{1}{\lambda_{k-1}} \leq -2 + 1 = -1$ . Hence,  $\lambda_k$  is a negative rational number at most  $-1$ . Therefore,  $p_{k,u}$  is also a reduced non-degenerate singularity. This completes the proof of the claim.

So the contraction of  $E_u$  introduces a dihedral singularity.

- (8) Let  $E = \bigcup_{i=1}^s E_i$  be a connected component of exceptional divisors such that  $E_{t_0} = \bigcup_{i=1}^s E_{i,t_0}$  is an *elliptic Gorenstein leaf*. Then  $E_u = \bigcup_{i=1}^s E_{i,u}$  is also an elliptic Gorenstein leaf for all  $u \in U$ . By Lemma 6.2, all singularities on  $E_u$  are reduced and non-degenerate. Therefore, the contraction of  $E_u$  introduces a cusp singularity.
- (9) (Cyclic non-terminal canonical foliation singularities) Let  $E = \bigcup_{i=1}^s E_i$  be a connected component of exceptional divisors such that the contraction of  $E_{t_0} = \bigcup_{i=1}^s E_{i,t_0}$  gives a *cyclic non-terminal* foliation singularity such that  $E_{i,t_0}$  are *invariant* for all  $i$ .

Then  $E_{t_0}$  is a chain of  $(-2)$ - $\mathcal{G}_{t_0}$ -curves. Thus  $E_u$  is also a chain of  $(-2)$ - $\mathcal{G}_u$ -curves for  $u \in U$ . By Lemma 6.1, we have the following two cases.

- (a) In the first case, all singularities are reduced. So the contraction of  $E_u$  introduces a canonical foliation singularity.
- (b) In the second case, if all  $p_{i,u}$  are reduced (see Figure 5), then the contraction of  $E_u$  introduces a canonical foliation singularity as well.




FIGURE 5.  $A_n$  type singularity

*Claim.* If there is an  $i$  such that  $p_{i,u}$  is not reduced, then all  $p_{j,u}$  are non-degenerate for  $j \neq i$ .

*Proof.* Suppose not, then one of  $p_{i-1,u}$  and  $p_{i+1,u}$  is a saddle-node. Without loss of generality, we assume that  $p_{i+1,u}$  is a saddle-node and

$$Z(\mathcal{G}_u, E_{i+1,u}, p_{i,u}) \leq 0.$$

Let  $W_i$  be the irreducible component of the singularities of  $\mathcal{G}$  containing  $p_{i,u}$ . By Lemma 6.3, we have a holomorphic map  $\lambda_i : W_i \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$ . Note that  $W_i$  is connected and locally path-connected (in the analytic topology). We have that  $W_i$  is path-connected. Note that the claim holds true when  $\lambda$  is a constant function. So we now assume that  $\lambda$  is not a constant function.

There is a sequence  $\{w_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$  converging to  $p_{i,u}$  such that  $\lambda_i(w_j)$  is not a positive rational and converges to  $\lambda(p_{i,u})$ . For any  $w_j$  close to  $p_{i,u}$ , there are only two separatrices, one of which is  $E_{i+1,\pi(w_j)}$ . So we may assume  $E_{i+1,\pi(w_j)}$  converges to  $E_{i+1,u}$ . Thus  $Z(\mathcal{G}_u, E_{i+1,u}, p_{i,u}) = 1$ , which gives a contradiction. This completes the proof of the claim.

Therefore, the contraction of  $E_u$  introduces a mild log canonical foliation singularity.

- (10) Let  $E = \bigcup_{i=1}^s E_i$  be a connected component of exceptional divisors such that the contraction of  $E_{t_0} = \bigcup_{i=1}^s E_{i,t_0}$  gives a *cyclic non-canonical foliation singularity*. So there is a unique  $j \in \{1, \dots, s\}$  such that  $E_{j,t_0}$  is *non-invariant*. Since being non-invariant is an open condition, by shrinking  $U$  further, we may assume that  $E_{u,t_0}$  is non-invariant for all  $u \in U$ .

By (5), when  $u$  varies, we know that  $\bigcup_{i=1}^{j-1} E_{i,u}$  and  $\bigcup_{i=j+1}^s E_{i,u}$  have the same structures, respectively. Therefore, the contraction of  $E_u$  introduces a *mild log canonical* foliation singularities.

- (11) Fix any  $u \in U$ , we may contract all  $E_u$  where  $E$  is any *relative  $(K_{\mathcal{G}} + \Theta)$ -trivial curve*. It will end up with a *foliated surface*  $(Z, \mathcal{H})$  with

$$K_{\mathcal{G}_u} + \Theta_u = \pi^* K_{\mathcal{H}}$$

where  $\pi : Y \rightarrow Z$  is the contraction morphism.

*Claim.* There is no  $K_{\mathcal{H}}$ -trivial curve  $C$  with  $C^2 < 0$ .

*Proof.* Suppose  $C$  is a  $K_{\mathcal{H}}$ -trivial curve with  $C^2 < 0$ . Then the proper transform  $\tilde{C}$  on  $Y$  is a  $(K_{\mathcal{G}_u} + \Theta_u)$ -trivial curve. Note that  $\tilde{C}^2 \leq C^2 < 0$ . Also, by Corollary 2.13, this  $\tilde{C}$  moves in a family  $\mathcal{C}$  with  $\mathcal{C}_u = \tilde{C}$ . However,  $\mathcal{C}_{t_0}^2 = \mathcal{C}_u^2 = \tilde{C}^2 < 0$  and  $(K_{\mathcal{G}_{t_0}} + \Theta_{t_0}) \cdot \mathcal{C}_{t_0} = (K_{\mathcal{G}_u} + \Theta_u) \cdot \mathcal{C}_u = K_{\mathcal{H}} \cdot C = 0$ . Therefore,  $\mathcal{C}$  is a *relative  $(K_{\mathcal{G}} + \Theta)$ -trivial curve*. Hence,  $\tilde{C} = \mathcal{C}_u$  is contracted by  $\pi$ , which gives a contradiction. This completes the proof of the claim.

Therefore,  $(Z, \mathcal{H})$  is a generalized canonical model and hence  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F}, \Delta)_u \in \mathcal{S}_P$  for any  $u \in U$ .

□

## REFERENCES

- [Ayo] J. Ayoub, *Topologie feuilletée et théorie de galois différentielle*, Preprint available at <http://user.math.uzh.ch/ayoub/PDF-Files/Feui-DGal.pdf>, Accessed: 2021-03-15.
- [Bri68] E. Brieskorn, *Rationale Singularitäten komplexer Flächen*, *Invent. Math.* **4** (1967/68), 336–358. MR 222084
- [Bru97] M. Brunella, *Feuilletages holomorphes sur les surfaces complexes compactes*, *Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4)* **30** (1997), no. 5, 569–594. MR 1474805
- [Bru01] ———, *Invariance par déformations de la dimension de Kodaira d'un feuilletage sur une surface*, *Essays on geometry and related topics, Vol. 1, 2, Monogr. Enseign. Math.*, vol. 38, Enseignement Math., Geneva, 2001, pp. 113–132. MR 1929324
- [Bru15] ———, *Birational geometry of foliations*, *IMPA Monographs*, vol. 1, Springer, Cham, 2015. MR 3328860
- [Cam88] C. Camacho, *Quadratic forms and holomorphic foliations on singular surfaces*, *Math. Ann.* **282** (1988), no. 2, 177–184. MR 963011
- [CF18] P. Cascini and E. Floris, *On invariance of plurigenera for foliations on surfaces*, *J. Reine Angew. Math.* **744** (2018), 201–236. MR 3871444
- [Che19] Y.-A. Chen, *Boundedness of minimal partial du Val resolutions of canonical surface foliations*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.02931 (2019).
- [CR14] F. Cano and C. Roche, *Vector fields tangent to foliations and blow-ups*, *J. Singul.* **9** (2014), 43–49. MR 3249046
- [CS18] P. Cascini and C. Spicer, *MMP for co-rank one foliation on threefolds*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1808.02711 (2018).
- [Fuj12] O. Fujino, *Minimal model theory for log surfaces*, *Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci.* **48** (2012), no. 2, 339–371. MR 2928144
- [Gro66] A. Grothendieck, *Éléments de géométrie algébrique. IV. Étude locale des schémas et des morphismes de schémas. III*, *Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math.* (1966), no. 28, 255. MR 217086
- [Har77] R. Hartshorne, *Algebraic geometry*, Springer-Verlag, New York-Heidelberg, 1977, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, No. 52. MR 0463157
- [HK10] C. D. Hacon and S. J. Kovács, *Classification of higher dimensional algebraic varieties*, *Oberwolfach Seminars*, vol. 41, Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 2010. MR 2675555
- [HL21] C. D. Hacon and A. Langer, *On birational boundedness of foliated surfaces*, *J. Reine Angew. Math.* **770** (2021), 205–229. MR 4193468
- [KKMSD73] G. Kempf, F. Knudsen, D. Mumford, and B. Saint-Donat, *Toroidal embeddings. I*, *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, Vol. 339, Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1973. MR 0335518
- [KM98] J. Kollár and S. Mori, *Birational geometry of algebraic varieties*, *Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics*, vol. 134, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1998, With the collaboration of C. H. Clemens and A. Corti, Translated from the 1998 Japanese original. MR 1658959
- [Lan00] A. Langer, *Chern classes of reflexive sheaves on normal surfaces*, *Math. Z.* **235** (2000), no. 3, 591–614. MR 1800214
- [Lan01] ———, *Adjoint linear systems on normal log surfaces*, *Compositio Math.* **129** (2001), no. 1, 47–66. MR 1856022
- [Laz04] R. Lazarsfeld, *Positivity in algebraic geometry. I*, *Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete. 3. Folge. A Series of Modern Surveys in Mathematics [Results in Mathematics and Related Areas. 3rd Series. A Series of Modern Surveys in Mathematics]*, vol. 48, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2004, Classical setting: line bundles and linear series. MR 2095471
- [McQ08] M. McQuillan, *Canonical models of foliations*, *Pure Appl. Math. Q.* **4** (2008), no. 3, Special Issue: In honor of Fedor Bogomolov. Part 2, 877–1012. MR 2435846
- [MM80] J.-F. Mattei and R. Moussu, *Holonomie et intégrales premières*, *Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4)* **13** (1980), no. 4, 469–523. MR 608290
- [PS19] J. V. Pereira and R. Svaldi, *Effective algebraic integration in bounded genus*, *Algebr. Geom.* **6** (2019), no. 4, 454–485. MR 3957403



- [Rei] M. Reid, *Surface cyclic quotient singularities and Hirzebruch-Jung resolutions*, manuscript available at <http://homepages.warwick.ac.uk/~masda/surf/more/cyclic.pdf>, Accessed: 2021-03-15.
- [Rei87] ———, *Young person's guide to canonical singularities*, Algebraic geometry, Bowdoin, 1985 (Brunswick, Maine, 1985), Proc. Sympos. Pure Math., vol. 46, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1987, pp. 345–414. MR 927963
- [Roc70] R. T. Rockafellar, *Convex analysis*, Princeton Mathematical Series, No. 28, Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J., 1970. MR 0274683
- [Sak84] F. Sakai, *Weil divisors on normal surfaces*, Duke Math. J. **51** (1984), no. 4, 877–887. MR 771385
- [Seb97] M. Sebastiani, *Sur l'existence de séparatrices locales des feuilletages des surfaces*, An. Acad. Brasil. Ciênc. **69** (1997), no. 2, 159–162. MR 1754036
- [Sei68] A. Seidenberg, *Reduction of singularities of the differential equation  $A dy = B dx$* , Amer. J. Math. **90** (1968), 248–269. MR 220710
- [Sim94] C. T. Simpson, *Moduli of representations of the fundamental group of a smooth projective variety. I*, Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math. (1994), no. 79, 47–129. MR 1307297
- [Spi20] C. Spicer, *Higher-dimensional foliated Mori theory*, Compos. Math. **156** (2020), no. 1, 1–38. MR 4036447

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF UTAH, SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84112, USA  
Email address: [yachen@math.utah.edu](mailto:yachen@math.utah.edu)