

# A bound of the number of weighted blow-ups to compute the minimal log discrepancy for smooth 3-folds

Shihoko Ishii

1

## Abstract

We study a pair consisting of a smooth 3-fold defined over an algebraically closed field and a “general” real ideal. We show that the minimal log discrepancy (“mld” for short) of every such a pair is computed by a prime divisor obtained by at most two weighted blow-ups. This bound is regarded as a weighted blow-up version of Mustață-Nakamura’s conjecture. We also show that if the mld of such a pair is not less than 1, then it is computed by at most one weighted blow-up. As a consequence, ACC of mld holds for such pairs.

## 1 Introduction

Throughout this paper, the base field  $k$  of varieties is an algebraically closed field of arbitrary characteristic. We study pairs  $(A, \mathfrak{a})$  consisting of a smooth variety  $A$  of dimension  $N > 1$  and a “real ideal”  $\mathfrak{a}$  which means  $\mathfrak{a} = \mathfrak{a}_1^{e_1} \cdots \mathfrak{a}_r^{e_r}$ , where  $\mathfrak{a}_i$ ’s are non-zero coherent ideal sheaves on  $A$  and  $e = (e_1, \dots, e_r) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^r$ . We fix a closed point  $0 \in A$ .

The minimal log discrepancy (“mld” for short)  $\text{mld}(0; A, \mathfrak{a})$  is an important invariant to measure the singularity of the pair  $(A, \mathfrak{a})$  at  $0$  and plays important roles in birational geometry. We consider every prime divisor over  $A$  with the center at  $0$  and construct a “good model” of the divisor to approximate the mld. The prototype is as follows:

**Theorem 1.1** ([9],[6]). *Assume  $N = 2$ . For every prime divisor  $E$  over  $A$  with the center at  $0$ , there exists a prime divisor  $F$  obtained by one weighted blow-up satisfying*

$$a(E; A, \mathfrak{a}) \geq a(F; A, \mathfrak{a}),$$

for every real ideal  $\mathfrak{a}$  such that  $a(E; A, \mathfrak{a}) \geq 0$ .

The inequality in the theorem implies that  $F$  is a better divisor to approximate the mld. Therefore the theorem states that every prime divisor over  $A$  with the center at  $0$  has a better divisor which is

---

<sup>1</sup>The author is partially supported by JSPS 19K03428

obtained in a simple procedure. Here, we note that  $F$  is constructed from  $E$  and does not depend on the choice of a real ideal  $\mathfrak{a}$ .

Actually, in the paper [9] and [6], the main theorem is not stated in this form, but its proof shows Theorem 1.1. The paper [9] is for char  $k = 0$ , and the paper [6] is for char  $k = p > 0$  and the main statements of the both papers are in the following form:

**Corollary 1.2** ([9],[6]). *Assume  $N = 2$ . Then, for every pair  $(A, \mathfrak{a})$ , the minimal log discrepancy  $\text{mld}(0; A, \mathfrak{a})$  is computed by a prime divisor obtained by one weighted blow-up.*

The corollary follows from the theorem immediately. See, for example, the proof of Corollary 1.9 in the section 5.

When we consider the case  $N = 3$ , we can see that one weighted blow-up is not sufficient to obtain a prime divisor computing the mld (see Example 3.2). On the other hand, in the example we can also show that the mld is computed by a prime divisor obtained by two weighted blow-ups. So it is natural to expect the following conjecture:

**Conjecture 1.3.** *Assume  $N \geq 3$ . For every prime divisor  $E$  over  $A$  with the center at 0, there exists a prime divisor  $F$  obtained by at most  $N - 1$  weighted blow-ups satisfying*

$$a(E; A, \mathfrak{a}) \geq a(F; A, \mathfrak{a}),$$

for every real ideal  $\mathfrak{a}$  such that  $a(E; A, \mathfrak{a}) \geq 0$ .

As an immediate consequence of the conjecture, we obtain the following:

**Conjecture 1.4** (Corollary of Conjecture 1.3). *Assume  $N \geq 3$ . Then, for every pair  $(A, \mathfrak{a})$ , the minimal log discrepancy  $\text{mld}(0; A, \mathfrak{a})$  is computed by a prime divisor obtained by at most two weighted blow-ups.*

One of the motivations of the conjectures is that it is considered as a “weighted blow-up version” of Mustaă-Nakamura Conjecture (MN-Conjecture for short):

**Conjecture 1.5** (MN-Conjecture [12]). *Fix  $N$  and the exponent  $e$  of real ideals. Then, there exists a number  $\ell_{N,e} \in \mathbb{N}$  depending only on  $N$  and  $e$  such that for any real ideal  $\mathfrak{a}$  with the exponent  $e$  the minimal log discrepancy  $\text{mld}(0; A, \mathfrak{a})$  is computed by a prime divisor obtained by at most  $\ell_{N,e}$  times blow-ups. Here, the blow-up means the “usual blow-up”, i.e., blow-up with the center at an irreducible reduced closed subset.*

If this conjecture holds, then ACC Conjecture for these pairs holds ([12]), so it seems to be a significant conjecture. On the other hand, MN-Conjecture is equivalent to a reasonable conjecture on arc spaces ([5]), so it makes sense to study it.

Note that MN-Conjecture requires to fix an exponent  $e$ , while the weighted blow-up versions (Conjecture 1.3, 1.4) do not require it.

Another motivation of Conjecture 1.3 is for the project to bridge between positive characteristic and characteristic 0 ([5]). In [5], we have:

**Lemma 1.6.** *Let  $\mathfrak{a}$  be a real ideal on a smooth variety  $A_k$  over  $k$  ( $\text{char } k = p > 0$ ) and  $E$  a prime divisor over  $(A_k, 0)$  computing  $\text{mld}(0_k; A_k, \mathfrak{a})$ .*

*If there exists a real ideal  $\tilde{\mathfrak{a}}$  on a smooth variety  $A_{\mathbb{C}}$  over  $\mathbb{C}$  and a prime divisor  $\tilde{E}$  over  $(A_{\mathbb{C}}, 0_{\mathbb{C}})$ , where  $0_{\mathbb{C}} \in A_{\mathbb{C}}$  such that*

1.  $\tilde{\mathfrak{a}}(\text{mod } p) = \mathfrak{a}$  (see [5] for the definition of  $(\text{mod } p)$ )
2.  $a(\tilde{E}; A_{\mathbb{C}}, \tilde{\mathfrak{a}}) \leq a(E; A_k, \mathfrak{a})$ .

*Then,  $\text{mld}(0_{\mathbb{C}}; A_{\mathbb{C}}, \tilde{\mathfrak{a}}) = \text{mld}(0_k; A_k, \mathfrak{a})$ .*

**Remark 1.7.** In particular, if such  $\tilde{\mathfrak{a}}$  and  $\tilde{E}$  exist for every  $\mathfrak{a}$  and  $E$  and assume that  $\text{mld}(0_k; A_k, \mathfrak{a})$  is computed by a divisor, then the set of  $\text{mld}(0_k; A_k, \mathfrak{a})$ 's is contained in the set of  $\text{mld}(0_{\mathbb{C}}; A_{\mathbb{C}}, \mathfrak{b})$ 's. Therefore, if we fix the exponent  $e$  then the number of the values  $\{\text{mld}(0, A_k, \mathfrak{a})\}$  is finite for  $\text{char } k > 0$ , because it is proved in characteristic 0 by [8]. On the other hand, if ACC holds in characteristic 0, then it also holds in positive characteristic.

Now, the problem is to construct appropriate  $\tilde{E}$  and  $\tilde{\mathfrak{a}}$  for given  $E$  and  $\mathfrak{a}$ . If Conjecture 1.3 holds, we can reduce this problem to a divisor  $F$  of special type (i.e., obtained by at most  $N - 1$  weighted blow-ups), which seems easier to handle.

The main results of this paper are the following:

**Theorem 1.8.** *Assume  $N = 3$ . For every prime divisor  $E$  over  $A$  with the center at 0, there exists a prime divisor  $F$  obtained by at most two weighted blow-ups satisfying*

$$a(E; A, \mathfrak{a}) \geq a(F; A, \mathfrak{a}),$$

*for every "general" real ideal  $\mathfrak{a}$  for  $E$  such that  $a(E; A, \mathfrak{a}) \geq 0$ .*

The weighted blow-ups will be constructed by "standard" blow-ups (see, Definition 4.3) depending only on  $E$  and it works for every general ideal. Here, "general" is necessary, because there exists an example of non-general ideal such that two standard blow-ups do not give the required divisor in the theorem (cf. Example 5.5). But it does not give a counter example for Conjecture 1.3, indeed for the example there exists another sequence of weighted blow-ups to obtain the required divisor (see, also Example 5.5).

As a corollary we obtain:

**Corollary 1.9.** *Assume  $N = 3$ . Then, for every pair  $(A, \mathfrak{a})$  with a "general" real ideal  $\mathfrak{a}$ , the minimal log discrepancy  $\text{mld}(0; A, \mathfrak{a})$  is computed by a prime divisor obtained by at most two weighted blow-ups.*

It is known as the Zariski's sequence that every prime divisor  $E$  over  $A$  with the center at 0 is obtained by successive usual blow-ups from  $A$ , such that the centers of blow-ups are the center of  $E$  on each step ([10, VI, 1.3]). The following corollary shows that in some cases, we obtain the two weighted blow-ups to compute the mld by just looking at the center of the second blow-up in the Zariski's sequence.

**Corollary 1.10** (Corollary 5.9). *Assume  $N = 3$ . Let  $E$  be a prime divisor over  $A$  computing  $\text{mld}(0; A, \mathfrak{a})$  for a pair  $(A, \mathfrak{a})$ . Assume that the center  $C \subset A_1$  of  $E$  on the first blow-up  $A_1 \rightarrow A$  is a curve of degree  $\geq 2$  in the exceptional divisor  $E_1 \simeq \mathbb{P}^2$ . Then a “standard blow-up” at  $C$  gives a divisor computing  $\text{mld}(0; A, \mathfrak{a})$ .*

Note that in this case the first blow-up is also a standard blow-up. Example 3.2 is just in this case. In Section 5, we show a more general corollary. On the other hand, if we restrict to the case  $\text{mld} \geq 1$ , then we have the following:

**Theorem 1.11.** *Assume  $N = 3$ . Then, for every general pair  $(A, \mathfrak{a})$  with  $a$  and  $\text{mld}(0; A, \mathfrak{a}) \geq 1$ , the minimal log discrepancy is computed by a prime divisor obtained by one weighted blow-up.*

**Corollary 1.12.** *Assume  $N = 3$ . In*

$$\{(A, \mathfrak{a}) \mid \text{mld}(0; A, \mathfrak{a}) \geq 1 \text{ with general } \mathfrak{a}\}$$

*Mustață-Nakamura Conjecture holds and also ACC Conjecture holds for  $\text{char } k \geq 0$ .*

The corollary follows from Theorem 1.11 in the same way as in the proof of [6, Corollary 1.6], since the  $\text{mld}$  is computed by one weighted blow-up.

This paper is organized as follows: in Section 2 we prepare basic terminologies which will be used in this paper. In Section 3 we discuss about weighted blow-up at a (not necessarily closed) smooth point and basic formula on weighted projective space, that is the exceptional divisor appearing in a weighted blow-up. In Section 4 we construct an appropriate regular system of parameter (RSP for short) with the weight, in order to make a weighted blow-up. In Section 5 we give the proofs of the main results.

**Acknowledgement** The author would like to thank Lawrence Ein, Masayuki Kawakita and Yuri Prokhorov for useful discussions.

## 2 Preliminaries

**Definition 2.1.** For a prime divisor  $E$  over a non-singular variety  $A$ , let  $\varphi : A' \rightarrow A$  be a proper birational morphism with normal  $A'$  such that  $E$  appears on  $A'$ . Let  $k_E$  (or sometimes written as  $k_{E/A}$ ) be the coefficient of the relative canonical divisor  $K_{A'/A}$  at  $E$  and  $v_E$  the valuation defined by the prime divisor  $E$ . Here, note that  $k_E$  ( $k_{E/A}$ ) does not depend on the choice of  $A'$ .

Let  $\mathfrak{a}$  be a real ideal on  $A$  as in the beginning of the first section and  $e_i$ 's are the exponents. The *log discrepancy* of the pair  $(A, \mathfrak{a})$  at  $E$  is defined as

$$a(E; A, \mathfrak{a}) := k_E - \sum_i e_i v_E(\mathfrak{a}_i) + 1$$

and the *minimal log discrepancy* of the pair at a closed point  $0$  is defined as

$$\text{mld}(0; A, \mathfrak{a}) := \inf\{a(E; A, \mathfrak{a}) \mid E \text{ prime divisor over } A \text{ with the center at } 0\}$$

It is known that for  $N \geq 2$ , either  $\text{mld}(0; A, \mathfrak{a}) \geq 0$  or  $\text{mld}(0; A, \mathfrak{a}) = -\infty$  holds.

**Definition 2.2.** We say that a prime divisor  $E$  over  $A$  with the center at 0 computes  $\text{mld}(0; A, \mathfrak{a})$

either if  $a(E; A, \mathfrak{a}) = \text{mld}(0; A, \mathfrak{a})$  (when the right hand side is  $\geq 0$ )

or if  $a(E; A, \mathfrak{a}) < 0$  (when the mld is  $-\infty$ ).

**Remark 2.3.** Assume  $\text{mld}(0; A, \mathfrak{a}) \geq 0$ . If there exists a log resolution of the pair  $(A, \mathfrak{am}_0)$ , then there is a prime divisor on the log resolution computing  $\text{mld}(0; A, \mathfrak{a})$ , where  $\mathfrak{m}_0$  is the maximal ideal defining  $0 \in A$ . If  $\text{mld}(0; A, \mathfrak{a}) = -\infty$  and  $Z(\mathfrak{a}) \subset A$  contains an irreducible component of codimension one, there may not exist a prime divisor computing the mld among the exceptional divisors appearing in the log resolution (cf. [3, Proposition 7.2]). But in that case, we replace  $\mathfrak{a}$  by  $\mathfrak{a} + \mathfrak{m}_0^s$  with  $s \gg 0$  so that a prime divisor computing  $\text{mld}(0; A, \mathfrak{a}) = -\infty$  appears in the log resolution. Therefore, if  $\text{char } k = 0$  or  $N \leq 3$ , then there is a prime divisor in the log resolution computing mld for any pair.

Next, we will introduce arc and jet spaces on a variety.

**Definition 2.4.** Let  $X$  be a  $k$ -scheme of finite type over  $k$ . For every  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  and an extension field  $L \supset k$ , an  $m$ -jet over  $k$  on  $X$  is a  $k$ -morphism

$$\alpha : \text{Spec } L[t]/(t^{m+1}) \longrightarrow X.$$

We denote the space of  $m$ -jets over  $k$  on  $X$  by  $X_{m/k}$ .

For an extension field  $L \supset k$ , an  $\infty$ -jet over  $k$  on  $X$  is a  $k$ -morphism

$$\alpha : \text{Spec } L[[t]] \longrightarrow X.$$

We denote the space of arcs over  $k$  on  $X$  by  $X_{\infty/k}$ .

Sometimes a  $k$ -scheme  $X$  has also a structure of  $K$ -scheme for another base field  $K$  and we need to study  $m$ -jets over  $K$  on  $X$  for  $m \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ . In that case, it is important to write the fields  $k$  and  $K$ , as  $X_{m/k}$  and  $X_{m/K}$  to distinguish the spaces of  $m$ -jets over  $k$  and that over  $K$ . Note that  $X_{m/k}$  and  $X_{m/K}$  are  $k$ -scheme and  $K$ -scheme, respectively.

**2.5.** If  $k \subset K$ , then  $X_{m/K}$  is also a  $k$ -scheme and there exists a canonical  $k$ -morphism

$$X_{m/K} \longrightarrow X_{m/k},$$

but there is no morphism of opposite direction in general.

**Definition 2.6.** Let  $X$  be a  $K$ -scheme and  $m > m'$  be elements in  $\mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ . Then the canonical projection  $K[t]/(t^{m+1}) \longrightarrow K[t]/(t^{m'+1})$  induces the canonical  $K$ -morphism

$$\psi_{m,m'}^X : X_{m/K} \longrightarrow X_{m'/K},$$

which is called a *truncation morphism*. In particular for  $m' = 0$ , the truncation morphism  $\psi_{m,0}^X$  is denoted by  $\pi_m^X$ .

Let  $P \in X$  be a point, then we denote the fiber scheme  $(\pi_m^X)^{-1}(P)$  by  $X_{m/K}(P)$ . An  $m$ -jet belonging to this fiber is called an  *$m$ -jet with the center at  $P$* .

**Proposition-Defintion 2.7.** Let  $A$  be a smooth scheme of dimension  $N$  over a field  $K$  and  $P \in A$  a  $K$ -valued point. Let  $\{x_1, \dots, x_c\}$  be an RSP (regular system of parameters) of  $A$  at  $P$ . Then,  $A_{\infty/K}(P) = \text{Spec } K[x_i^{(j)} \mid i = 1, \dots, c, 1 \leq j]$ , where  $x_i^{(j)}$  is an indeterminate for every  $i, j$ . Here, the universal arc on  $A_{\infty/K}(P)$  is given by the following ring homomorphism:

$$\Phi^* : \mathcal{O}_{A,P} \longrightarrow K \left[ x_i^{(j)} \mid i = 1, \dots, c, 1 \leq j \right] [[t]], \quad x_i \mapsto \sum_{j \geq 1} x_i^{(j)} t^j.$$

For  $f \in \mathcal{O}_{A,P}$ , we define  $f^{(j)}$  such that

$$\Phi^*(f) = \sum_{j \geq 1} f^{(j)} t^j.$$

**Definition 2.8.** Let  $P \in A$  and  $\Phi$  be as above. Let  $S \subset A_{m/K}(P)$  be a locally closed subset, then  $\psi_m^{-1}(S) \subset A_{\infty/K}$  is called a *cylinder*. Let  $C = \psi_m^{-1}(S)$  be an irreducible cylinder, then  $C$  gives a divisorial valuation  $v_C$  as follows:

Define  $\alpha$  as the composite  $\alpha := \pi \circ \Phi$ :

$$\mathcal{O}_{A,P} \xrightarrow{\Phi} K \left[ x_i^{(j)} \mid i = 1, \dots, c, 1 \leq j \right] [[t]] \xrightarrow{\pi} \left( K \left[ x_i^{(j)} \mid i = 1, \dots, c, 1 \leq j \right] / I_C \right) [[t]],$$

where  $I_C$  is the defining ideal of  $C$  in  $A_{\infty/K}(P)$  and the second homomorphism is the canonical surjection. Define the valuation  $v_C(f)$  for  $f \in \mathcal{O}_{A,P}$  as

$$v_C(f) := \text{ord}_t(\alpha^*(f)).$$

Note that  $\alpha \in C$  is the generic point. Sometimes we denote  $v_C$  by  $v_\alpha$ . As  $C$  is determined by an irreducible subset  $S \subset A_{m/K}(P)$  for some  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ , we sometimes denote  $v_C$  by  $v_{\alpha'}$ , where  $\alpha' \in S$  is the generic point.

By the definition,  $v_C(f) = r$  if and only if  $f^{(j)} \in I_C$  for every  $j \leq r - 1$  and  $f^{(r)} \notin I_C$ .

**Definition 2.9** ([2],[4], [7]). Let  $A$  be a smooth variety over  $k$  of dimension  $N$ . For a prime divisor  $E$  over  $A$  with the center at  $P$ , denote by  $v_E$  the valuation corresponding to  $E$ . A discrete valuation on the rational function field  $K(A)$  of  $A$  of the form  $n \cdot v_E$  ( $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ) is called a *divisorial valuation* over  $A$  with the center at  $P$  and  $v_E$  is called a *prime divisorial valuation* over  $A$  with the center at  $P$ .

Let  $v$  be a divisorial valuation. The *maximal divisorial set*  $C_A(v) \subset A_{\infty/k}$  is defined as follows:

$$C_A(v) := \overline{\{\alpha \in A_{\infty/k} \mid v_\alpha = v\}}.$$

**Remark 2.10.** Let  $S \subset A_{m/k}$  be an irreducible closed subset for  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  such that the generic point  $P \in \pi_m^A(S)$  is not the generic point of  $A$ . Then, for the generic point  $\alpha$  of the pull-back  $(\psi_{\infty,m}^A)^{-1}(S)$ , the valuation  $v_\alpha$  is a divisorial valuation with the center at  $P$ . Conversely, for a divisorial valuation  $v$  with the center at  $P$ , there exist  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  and an irreducible closed subset  $S \subset A_{m/k}(P)$  such that the generic point  $\alpha$  of the pull-back  $(\psi_{\infty,m}^A)^{-1}(S)$  satisfies  $v = v_\alpha$ .

**Proposition 2.11** ([2],[4], [7]). *The maximal divisorial set over a smooth variety  $A$  defined over an algebraically closed field  $k$  has the following properties:*

(i) Let  $\varphi : \tilde{A} \rightarrow A$  be a birational morphism such that  $E$  appears on a normal  $\tilde{A}$ ; Let  $\mathcal{E} \subset \tilde{A}_{\infty/k}$  be the irreducible component of  $(\pi_{\infty}^{\tilde{A}})^{-1}(E)$  containing the fiber of the generic point of  $E$ . Then,

$$C_A(v_E) = \overline{\varphi_{\infty}(\mathcal{E})},$$

in particular, it is irreducible;

(ii) Let  $v$  be a divisorial valuation. For every arc  $\gamma \in A_{m/k}$  such that  $v_{\gamma} = v$ , it follows  $\gamma \in C_A(v)$ ;

(iii) Let  $v$  be a divisorial valuation and  $\alpha \in C_A(v)$  the generic point, then  $v_{\alpha} = v$ ;

(iv) Let  $v$  be a divisorial valuation, then  $C_A(v)$  is a closed cylinder, i.e., there exist  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  and a closed subset  $S \subset A_{m/k}$  such that  $C_A(v) = \psi_{\infty, m}^{-1}(S)$ ;

(v) Let  $v$  be a divisorial valuation of the form  $n \cdot v_E$ , where  $E$  is a prime divisor over  $A$ , then

$$\text{codim}(C_A(v), A_{\infty/k}) = n(k_E + 1).$$

Here,  $\text{codim}(C_A(v), A_{\infty/k}) = \text{codim}(S, A_{m/k})$ , for  $m \gg 0$ , where  $S \subset A_{m/k}$  is as in (iv).

### 3 Weighted blow-ups and weighted projective spaces

In this section  $A$  is always a smooth variety of dimension  $N \geq 2$  defined over an algebraically closed field  $k$  and  $P \in A$  is a (not necessarily closed) point.

**Definition 3.1.** Let  $x_1, \dots, x_c$  be an RSP of  $\mathcal{O}_{A, P}$  and  $w_1, \dots, w_c$  be positive integers with  $\text{gcd}(w_1, \dots, w_c) = 1$ . For  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , denote by  $\mathcal{I}_n$  the ideal in  $\mathcal{O}_A$  generated by all monomials  $x_1^{s_1} \cdots x_c^{s_c}$  such that  $\sum_{i=1}^c s_i w_i \geq n$ . The weighted blow-up of  $A$  with  $wt_w(x_1, \dots, x_c) = (w_1, \dots, w_c)$  is the canonical projection:

$$\text{Proj}_A(\oplus_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{I}_n) \rightarrow A.$$

The exceptional divisor  $E'$  for the weighted blow-up is called a *prime divisor obtained by the weighted blow-up* of  $A$  at  $P$ .

We know that  $\mathcal{O}_{A, P}$  is contained in its completion  $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{A, P}$  by the maximal ideal. By Cohen's structure theorem,  $R := \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{A, P}$  is a formal power series ring of  $c$  variables with the coefficient field  $K := k(P)$ , the residue field at  $P$ . Let  $\overline{K}$  be the algebraic closure of  $K$ . Let  $\overline{R}$  be the formal power series ring of the same variables with the coefficient field  $\overline{K}$ , then there are canonical inclusions  $\mathcal{O}_{A, P} \hookrightarrow R \hookrightarrow \overline{R}$ . Define  $A_{\overline{K}} := \text{Spec } \overline{R}$  and let  $0 \in A_{\overline{K}}$  be the closed point. These notation will be used in Proposition 3.3.

Note that a weighted blow-up is defined only at a smooth point which is not necessarily closed.

Here, we show a 3-dimensional example that the minimal log discrepancy is not computed by a divisor obtained by only one blow-up, but computed by a divisor obtained by two weighted blow-ups .

**Example 3.2.** Assume char  $k \neq 2, 5$ . Let  $A := \mathbb{A}_k^3$  and  $\mathfrak{a} = (f)^{7/10}$ , where

$$f = (x^2 + y^2 + z^2)^2 + x^5 + y^5 + z^5.$$

Then, a divisor computing  $\text{mld}(0; A, \mathfrak{a}) = 0$  is not obtained by one weighted blow-up ([11, Ex. 6.45]).

On the other hand, there is a sequence of weighted blow-ups

$$A_2 \xrightarrow{\varphi_2} A_1 \xrightarrow{\varphi_1} A$$

where  $\varphi_1$  is the usual blow-up at 0 and  $\varphi_2$  is a weighted blow-up with weight  $(1, 2)$  at the generic point of the curve  $x^2 + y^2 + z^2 = 0$  on  $E_1 = \mathbb{P}_k^2$ . Here,  $E_1$  is the exceptional divisor for  $\varphi_1$ . The exceptional divisor  $E_2$  for  $\varphi_2$  computes  $\text{mld}(0; A, \mathfrak{a}) = 0$

One of the purposes of the following proposition is to induce Corollary 3.7 which seems classical and maybe well known. However, our proposition below states more. It gives information about the structure of arc spaces which will be used in the discussions in Section 4. So, we present here the proof.

**Proposition 3.3.** *Let  $A$  be a smooth  $N$ -fold,  $P \in A$  a non-closed point,  $K$  the residue field of  $P$  and  $A_K = \text{Spec } \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{A,P}$ . Let  $\overline{K}$  be an algebraically closed extension field of  $K$  (here,  $\overline{K}$  is not necessarily the algebraic closure of  $K$ ) and  $A_{\overline{K}} = \text{Spec } \overline{K} \widehat{\otimes} \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{A,P}$ , where  $\overline{K} \widehat{\otimes} \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{A,P}$  is the completion of  $\overline{K} \otimes_K \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{A,P}$  with the ideal generated by the maximal ideal of  $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{A,P}$ .*

Then, we obtain the following:

- (i) *For every divisorial valuation  $v$  over  $A$  with the center at  $P$ , there exists unique divisorial valuation  $\overline{v}$  over  $A_{\overline{K}}$  with the center at the closed point 0 such that*
  - (a)  $\overline{v}|_{K(A)^\times} = v$ , where  $K(A)$  is the rational function field of  $A$ ;
  - (b)  $C_{A_{\overline{K}}}(\overline{v})$  is maximal with respect to the inclusion among those of the divisorial valuations over  $A_{\overline{K}}$  with the center at 0 satisfying (a);
  - (c)  $\text{codim}(C_A(v), A_{\infty/k}) = \text{codim}(C_{A_{\overline{K}}}(\overline{v}), (A_{\overline{K}})_{\infty/\overline{K}})$ .
- (ii) *Under the notation as in (i), a divisorial valuation  $v$  over  $A$  with the center at 0 is prime, if and only if  $\overline{v}$  is prime.*

*Proof.* First note the following equality of  $k$ -schemes:

$$A_{m/k}(P) = (A_K)_{m/k}(0), \quad \text{for every } m \in \mathbb{N} \tag{1}$$

where  $A_K = \text{Spec } \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{A,P}$  and  $0 \in A_K$  is the closed point.



On the other hand, there is a diagram of spaces of  $m$ -jets:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
& (A_K)_{m/k}(0) & \\
& \uparrow p_1 & \\
(A_K)_{m/k}(0) \times_k \text{Spec } K & \xrightarrow{q} & (A_K)_{m/K}(0) \\
& & \uparrow p_{K,1} \\
& & (A_K)_{m/K}(0) \times_K \text{Spec } \overline{K} \\
& & \parallel \\
& & (A_{\overline{K}})_{m/\overline{K}}(0)
\end{array} \tag{2}$$

Here, note that  $p_1$  and  $p_{K,1}$  are flat morphisms, as these correspond to the base changes of the field extensions  $k \hookrightarrow K$  and  $K \hookrightarrow \overline{K}$ , respectively, which are flat. On the other hand,  $q$  is also flat. Indeed, as  $(A_K)_{m/k}(0) = (\text{Spec } K)_{m/k} \times_k (\mathbb{A}_k^c)_{m/k}(0)$ , we have

$$(A_K)_{m/k}(0) \times_k \text{Spec } K = ((\text{Spec } K)_{m/k} \times_k \text{Spec } K) \times_K (A_K)_{m/K}(0).$$

Here,  $q$  is the projection to the second factor, therefore it is flat.

Now, take irreducible closed subsets  $S \subset (A_K)_{m/k}(0) = A_{m/k}(P)$  and  $\tilde{S} \subset (A_{\overline{K}})_{m/\overline{K}}(0)$  and let  $\alpha \in (\psi_{\infty, m}^A)^{-1}(S)$  and  $\tilde{\alpha} \in (\psi_{\infty, m}^{A_{\overline{K}}})^{-1}(\tilde{S})$  be the generic points of the cylinders, respectively. Then, we know that  $v := v_\alpha$  and  $\tilde{v} := v_{\tilde{\alpha}}$  are divisorial valuations over  $A$  with the center at  $P$  and over  $A_{\overline{K}}$  with the center at 0, respectively (see, for example, [2], [7]).

**Lemma 3.4.** *Let  $m$ ,  $S$ ,  $\tilde{S}$ ,  $v$  and  $\tilde{v}$  be as above. If there exists an irreducible closed subset  $S' \subset (A_K)_{m/k}(0) \times_k \text{Spec } K$  such that  $p_1(S') = S$  and  $q(S') = p_{K,1}(\tilde{S})$ . Then, we can see that*

$$\tilde{v}|_{K(A)^\times} = v.$$

*Proof of Lemma 3.4.* The required relation follows from  $\tilde{v}(f) = v(f)$  for every  $f \in \mathcal{O}_A$ , which is proved as follows:

Let  $\alpha \in S$  and  $\tilde{\alpha} \in \tilde{S}$  be the generic points of  $S$  and  $\tilde{S}$ , respectively. Let  $I_S$  and  $I_{\tilde{S}}$  be the defining ideals of  $S$  and  $\tilde{S}$  in  $\mathcal{O}_{(A_K)_{m/K}(0)} = \mathcal{O}_{A_{m/k}(P)}$  and in  $(A_{\overline{K}})_{m/\overline{K}}(0)$ , respectively. Let  $I_{\infty S}$  and  $I_{\infty \tilde{S}}$  be the ideal generated by  $I_S$  and  $I_{\tilde{S}}$  in  $\mathcal{O}_{(A_K)_{\infty/K}(0)} = \mathcal{O}_{A_{\infty/k}(P)}$  and in  $\mathcal{O}_{(A_{\overline{K}})_{\infty/\overline{K}}(0)}$ , respectively. By Definition 2.8 the equality  $v_{\tilde{\alpha}}(f) = r$  is equivalent to

$$f^{(j)} \in I_{\infty \tilde{S}} \text{ for every } j \leq r-1 \text{ and } f^{(r)} \notin I_{\infty \tilde{S}}.$$

On the other hand the equality  $v_\alpha(f) = r$  is equivalent to

$$f^{(j)} \in I_{\infty S} \text{ for every } j \leq r-1 \text{ and } f^{(r)} \notin I_{\infty S}.$$

By the definition of  $S'$ , we have

$$R_1 \cap (I_{S'}) = I_S, \quad R_3 \cap (I_{S'}) = R_3 \cap (I_{\tilde{S}}), \quad (3)$$

where  $R_1, R_2, R_3$  and  $R_4$  are the affine rings of  $(A_K)_{m/k}(0)$ ,  $(A_K)_{m/k}(0) \times_k \text{Spec } K$ ,  $(A_K)_{m/K}(0)$  and  $(A_{\overline{K}})_{m/\overline{K}}(0)$  in the diagram (2), respectively. Note that every  $R_i$  ( $i = 1, \dots, 4$ ) contains  $R_1$  canonically, and the two equalities in (3) shows  $R_1 \cap (I_{\tilde{S}}) = I_S$ . Therefore, we have  $f^{(j)} \in I_{\infty S}$  if and only if  $f^{(j)} \in I_{\infty \tilde{S}}$  for every  $f \in \mathcal{O}_A$ . [QED of Lemma 3.4.]

This fact suggests us how to find the restriction  $v$  as in Lemma 3.4 of a given divisorial valuation  $\tilde{v}$  over  $A_{\overline{K}}$  with the center at 0. By making use of this fact, we obtain the following lemma.

**Lemma 3.5.** *For a divisorial valuation  $\tilde{v}$  over  $A_{\overline{K}}$  with the center at 0, let  $v := \tilde{v}|_{K(A)^\times}$ . Then,*

$$\text{codim}(C_A(v), A_{\infty/k}) \leq \text{codim}(C_{A_{\overline{K}}}(\tilde{v}), (A_{\overline{K}})_{\infty/\overline{K}}).$$

*Proof of Lemma 3.5.* Take  $m \gg 0$  such that

$$C_{A_{\overline{K}}}(\tilde{v}) = (\psi_{\infty, m}^{A_{\overline{K}}})^{-1}(\tilde{S})$$

for some irreducible closed subsets  $\tilde{S} \subset (A_{\overline{K}})_{m/\overline{K}}(0)$ . Let  $S' := q^{-1}(p_{K,1}(\tilde{S}))$  and  $S := p_1(S')$ . Then, by Lemma 3.4,  $S$  gives the restriction  $v = \tilde{v}|_{K(A)^\times}$  of  $\tilde{v}$ . On the other hand, as  $\tilde{S} \subset p_{K,1}^{-1}(p_{K,1}(\tilde{S}))$  and  $S' \subset p_1^{-1}p_1(S') = p_1^{-1}(S)$ , it follows that

$$\text{codim}(\tilde{S}, (A_{\overline{K}})_{m/\overline{K}}(0)) \geq \text{codim}(p_{K,1}(\tilde{S}), (A_K)_{m/K}(0)) \quad (4)$$

and

$$\text{codim}(S', (A_K)_{m/k}(0) \times_k \text{Spec } K) \geq \text{codim}(S, (A_K)_{m/k}(0)). \quad (5)$$

Here, we used flatness of  $p_{K,1}$  and of  $p_1$ . By flatness of  $q$  we also obtain

$$\text{codim}(p_{K,1}(\tilde{S}), (A_K)_{m/K}(0)) = \text{codim}(S', (A_K)_{m/k}(0) \times_k \text{Spec } K) \quad (6)$$

By combining (4), (5) and (6), we obtain

$$\text{codim}(\tilde{S}, (A_{\overline{K}})_{m/\overline{K}}(0)) \geq \text{codim}(S, (A_K)_{m/k}(0)) = \text{codim}(S, A_{m/k}(P)).$$

As  $P \in A$  is a point of codimension  $c$  in a smooth variety  $A$ , and  $0 \in A_{\overline{K}}$  is a point of codimension  $c$  in a smooth scheme  $A_{\overline{K}}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{codim}(\tilde{S}, (A_{\overline{K}})_{m/\overline{K}}(0)) + c &= \text{codim}(\tilde{S}, (A_{\overline{K}})_{m/\overline{K}}) \\ \text{codim}(S, A_{m/k}(P)) + c &= \text{codim}(S, A_{m/k}). \end{aligned}$$

Now we obtain

$$\text{codim}(\tilde{S}, (A_{\overline{K}})_{m/\overline{K}}) \geq \text{codim}(S, A_{m/k}), \quad (7)$$

The left hand side equals to  $\text{codim}(C_{A_{\overline{K}}}(\tilde{v}), (A_{\overline{K}})_{\infty/\overline{K}})$  and the right hand side is greater than or equal to  $\text{codim}(C_A(v), A_{\infty/k})$  by (ii) in Proposition 2.11. This yields the required inequality. [QED of Lemma 3.5.]

*Continuation of the proof of Proposition 2.11.* Let  $v$  be a divisorial valuation over  $A$  with the center at  $P$ . Take  $m \gg 0$  such that there exists a closed subset  $S \subset (A_K)_{m/k}(0)$  with the property

$$C_A(v) = (\psi_{\infty, m}^{A_K})^{-1}(S).$$

Then, by flatness of  $p_1$ , we have

$$\text{codim}(C_A(v), A_{\infty/k}) = \text{codim}(S, (A_K)_{m/k}(0)) + c = \text{codim}(p_1^{-1}(S), (A_K)_{m/k}(0) \times_k \text{Spec } K) + c. \quad (8)$$

Let  $S_1 := p_1^{-1}(S)$  and  $\bar{S} := p_{K,1}^{-1}q(S_1)$ . Then, by flatness of  $q$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{codim}(q(S_1), (A_K)_{m/K}(0)) \\ = \text{codim}(q^{-1}q(S_1), (A_K)_{m/k}(0) \times_k \text{Spec } K) \leq \text{codim}(S_1, (A_K)_{m/k}(0) \times_k \text{Spec } K). \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

Next, by flatness of  $p_{K,1}$ , we have

$$\text{codim}(\bar{S}, (A_{\bar{K}})_{m/\bar{K}}(0)) = \text{codim}(q(S_1), (A_K)_{m/K}(0)). \quad (10)$$

Let  $\bar{v}$  be the divisorial valuation over  $A_{\bar{K}}$  with the center at 0 defined by the cylinder  $(\psi_{\infty, m}^{A_{\bar{K}}})^{-1}(\bar{S})$ . Then the inequalities (8), (9), (10) and maximality of  $C_{A_{\bar{K}}}(\bar{v})$  yield

$$\text{codim}(C_A(v), A_{\infty/k}) \geq \text{codim}(\bar{S}, (A_{\bar{K}})_{m/\bar{K}}(0)) + c \geq \text{codim}(C_{A_{\bar{K}}}(\bar{v}), (A_{\bar{K}})_{\infty/\bar{K}}).$$

As  $\bar{v}|_{K(A)^\times} = v$ , we can apply Lemma 3.5 to obtain (a) and (c) in (i) of our proposition

$$\text{codim}(C_A(v), A_{\infty/k}) = \text{codim}(C_{A_{\bar{K}}}(\bar{v}), (A_{\bar{K}})_{\infty/\bar{K}}).$$

About (b) in (i), take any divisorial valuation  $\tilde{v}$  over  $A_{\bar{K}}$  with the center at 0 such that  $\tilde{v}|_{K(A)^\times} = v$ . We use the notation in the proof of Lemma 3.5. Take  $m \gg 0$  such that

$$C_{A_{\bar{K}}}(\bar{v}) = (\psi_{\infty, m}^{A_{\bar{K}}})^{-1}(S_{\bar{v}}), \quad C_{A_{\bar{K}}}(\tilde{v}) = (\psi_{\infty, m}^{A_{\bar{K}}})^{-1}(S_{\tilde{v}}), \quad \text{and} \quad C_A(v) = (\psi_{\infty, m}^A)^{-1}(S_v)$$

for closed subsets  $S_{\bar{v}}$ ,  $S_{\tilde{v}}$  and  $S_v$  in each scheme in the diagram (2). Then, by maximality of  $C_A(v)$  described in (iii) of Proposition 2.11, it follows  $p_1(S') \subset S_v$ , where  $S' := q^{-1}(p_{K,1}(S_{\tilde{v}}))$ . Applying  $p_1^{-1}$  on this inclusion, we obtain

$$S' \subset p_1^{-1}p_1(S') \subset p_1^{-1}(S_v).$$

By applying  $p_{K,1}^{-1}q$  to these inclusions, we obtain

$$p_{K,1}^{-1}q(S') \subset p_{K,1}^{-1}qp_1^{-1}p_1(S') \subset p_{K,1}^{-1}qp_1^{-1}(S_v).$$

Note that the first term contains  $S_{\tilde{v}}$  and the third term is contained in  $S_{\bar{v}}$ , by the construction of  $\bar{v}$ . Therefore,  $C_{A_{\bar{K}}}(\tilde{v}) \subset C_{A_{\bar{K}}}(\bar{v})$ , which implies (b) in (i). This discussion also implies the uniqueness of  $\bar{v}$ .

For the proof of (ii), first take a prime divisorial valuation  $v = v_F$ , where  $F$  is a prime divisor over  $A$  with the center at  $P$ . Assuming  $\bar{v} = nv_{\bar{F}}$  for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and a prime divisor  $\bar{F}$  over  $A_{\bar{K}}$  with the center at 0, we will prove that  $n = 1$ . Let  $v' := v_{\bar{F}}|_{K(A)^\times}$ , then we can write  $v' = sv_{F'}$  for a prime divisor  $F'$  over  $A$  with the center at  $P$ . Then,

$$v_F = nsv_{F'},$$

where  $ns$  is a positive integer. Therefore, we obtain that  $v_F(f) \geq 0$  if and only if  $v_{F'}(f) \geq 0$  for every  $f \in K(A)^\times$ , which implies that the valuation rings of  $v_F$  and of  $v_{F'}$  coincide. Therefore,  $F = F'$  and  $n = 1$ .

Conversely, if  $\bar{v} = v_{\bar{F}}$  for a prime divisor  $\bar{F}$  over  $A_{\bar{K}}$  with the center at 0. Assume that  $v = nv_F$  for a prime divisor  $F$  over  $(A, P)$ . Then apply the discussion above to  $v_F$  and we obtain a prime divisor  $\bar{F}'$  over  $A_{\bar{K}}$  with the center at 0 such that

$$\bar{v}_{\bar{F}} = v_{\bar{F}'}$$

and by (c) of (i) we also have

$$k_F = k_{\bar{F}'}$$

As  $n\bar{v}_{\bar{F}}|_{K(A)^\times} = v$  and  $\bar{v}|_{K(A)^\times} = v$ , it follows that

$$C_{A_{\bar{K}}}(nv_{\bar{F}'}) \subset C_{A_{\bar{K}}}(\bar{v}) \tag{11}$$

by maximality of  $C_{A_{\bar{K}}}(\bar{v})$  obtained in (b) of (i). On the other hand, we have

$$\text{codim}(C_{A_{\bar{K}}}(nv_{\bar{F}'}), (A_{\bar{K}})_{\infty/\bar{K}}) = n(k_{\bar{F}'} + 1),$$

$$\text{codim}(C_{A_{\bar{K}}}(\bar{v}), (A_{\bar{K}})_{\infty/\bar{K}}) = \text{codim}(C_A(v), A_{\infty/k}) = \text{codim}(C_A(nv_F), A_{\infty/k}) = n(k_F + 1).$$

As the last terms of the both equalities above coincide, we have

$$\text{codim}(C_{A_{\bar{K}}}(nv_{\bar{F}'}), (A_{\bar{K}})_{\infty/\bar{K}}) = \text{codim}(C_{A_{\bar{K}}}(\bar{v}), (A_{\bar{K}})_{\infty/\bar{K}})$$

and the inclusion (11) becomes identity. Now we obtain  $v_{\bar{F}} = \bar{v} = nv_{\bar{F}'}$ . In the same way as above, we have  $\bar{F} = \bar{F}'$  and  $n = 1$ .  $\square$

**Remark 3.6.** In the proof of (a) and (c) of (i) in the proposition above, for a prime divisor  $E$  over  $A$  with the center at a non-closed point  $P \in A$  we construct the unique prime divisor  $\bar{E}$  over  $A_{\bar{K}}$  with the center at the closed point  $0 \in A_{\bar{K}}$  such that  $v_{\bar{E}}$  has required properties in (i) of the proposition. Here, we should note that  $C_{A_{\bar{K}}}(v_{\bar{E}}) = \psi_{\infty, m}^{A_{\bar{K}}^{-1}}(\bar{S})$  and  $C_{A_K}(v_E) = \psi_{\infty, m}^{A_K^{-1}}(q(S_1))$  under the notation in the proof of the proposition. As  $p_{K,1}^{-1}(q(S_1)) = \bar{S}$  which is seen in the proof above, we have

$$C_{A_{\bar{K}}}(v_{\bar{E}}) = p_{K,1}^{-1}(C_{A_K}(v_E)),$$

where  $p_{K,1} : (A_{\bar{K}})_{\infty/\bar{K}}(0) \rightarrow (A_K)_{\infty/K}(0)$  is the projective limit of  $p_{K,1} : (A_{\bar{K}})_{m/\bar{K}}(0) \rightarrow (A_K)_{m/K}(0)$ .

By the above proposition, we obtain the following corollary.

**Corollary 3.7.** *Under the notation as above, let  $E$  be a prime divisor over  $A$  with the center at  $P$ , then for every prime divisor  $\tilde{E}$  over  $(A_{\overline{K}}, 0)$  such that  $v_{\tilde{E}}|_{K(A)^\times} = v_E$  satisfies*

$$k_E \leq k_{\tilde{E}}.$$

*Moreover, for every prime divisor  $E$  over  $A$  with the center at  $P$ , there exists unique prime divisor  $\overline{E}$  over  $A_{\overline{K}}$  with the center at  $0$  such that*

- (a)  $v_{\overline{E}}|_{K(A)^\times} = v_E$ , where  $K(A)$  is the rational function field of  $A$ ;
- (b)  $k_E = k_{\overline{E}}$ .

The following lemma for a weighted projective space with a special weight is used for our main results. The statement is easily generalized to higher dimensional case, but for simplicity of notation we state here only for 2-dimensional case.

**Lemma 3.8.** *Let  $r \leq s$  be positive integers such that  $\gcd(r, s) = 1$ . Let  $g \in k[x_1, x_2, x_3]$  be a weighted homogeneous polynomial with respect to the weight  $w = (w(x_1), w(x_2), w(x_3)) = (r, r, s)$  and  $Q \in \mathbb{P}_k(r, r, s)$  a closed point not contained in the coordinate planes, i.e.,  $Q \notin (x_1 \cdot x_2 \cdot x_3 = 0)$ . Let  $\ell \in k[x_1, x_2, x_3]$  be a weighted homogeneous polynomial of  $\deg_w(\ell) = r$  such that  $\ell(Q) = 0$ . If  $\ell \nmid g$ , then it follows*

$$r \cdot s \cdot \text{ord}_Q(g) \leq r \cdot s \cdot \text{ord}_Q(g|_L) \leq \deg_w g,$$

where  $L \subset \mathbb{P}_k(r, r, s)$  is the divisor defined by  $\ell = 0$  in  $\mathbb{P}_k(r, r, s)$ .

*Proof.* As  $\text{ord}_Q g \leq \text{ord}_Q(g|_\ell)$ , the first inequality is trivial. We will show the second inequality. Let  $G \subset \mathbb{P}_k(r, r, s)$  be the subscheme defined by  $g = 0$  on  $\mathbb{P}_k(r, r, s)$ . Let

$$\pi : \mathbb{P}_k^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{P}(r, r, s), (X_1, X_2, X_3) \mapsto (X_1^r, X_2^r, X_3^s) = (x_1, x_2, x_3)$$

be the canonical covering. Then, as  $\pi^*L$  and  $\pi^*G$  has no common irreducible components, Bezout's theorem on  $\mathbb{P}^2$  implies

$$\pi^*L \cdot \pi^*G = \deg \pi^*\ell \cdot \deg \pi^*g = \deg_w \ell \cdot \deg_w g = r \cdot \deg_w g \quad (12)$$

In case  $\text{char } k = 0$  or  $\text{char } k = p > 0$  and  $p \nmid r \cdot s$ , the morphism  $\pi$  is étale around  $Q$ . Therefore,  $\pi^{-1}(Q)$  consists of  $r^2 \cdot s$  closed points  $\{Q_i \mid i = 1, \dots, r^2 \cdot s\}$  whose analytic neighborhoods of  $\pi^*G$  and  $\pi^*L$  are isomorphic to those of  $G$  and  $L$  at  $Q$ , respectively. Then, by (12) we obtain

$$r^2 \cdot s \cdot \text{ord}_Q(g|_L) = \sum_{i=1}^{r^2 s} \text{ord}_{Q_i}(\pi^*g|_{\pi^*L}) \leq \pi^*L \cdot \pi^*G = r \cdot \deg_w g,$$

which yields the required inequality.

In case  $p|r$ , denote  $r = p^e \cdot q$  ( $\gcd(p, q) = 1$ ). Then, the fiber  $\pi^{-1}(Q)$  consists of  $q^2 \cdot s$  closed points, as a topological space. For a closed point  $Q_i$  ( $i = 1, \dots, q^2 \cdot s$ ) in the fiber  $\pi^{-1}(Q)$  we obtain

$$\mathfrak{m}_Q \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2} \subset \mathfrak{m}_{Q_i}^{p^e},$$

where  $\mathfrak{m}_Q$  and  $\mathfrak{m}_{Q_i}$  are the maximal ideals of  $Q \in \mathbb{P}(r, r, s)$  and of  $Q_i \in \mathbb{P}^2$ , respectively. Let  $C \subset \mathbb{P}^2$  be the subscheme with the reduced structure of  $\pi^*L$ . Then, we have

$$\mathfrak{m}_{L,Q}\mathcal{O}_C \subset \mathfrak{m}_{C,Q_i}^{p^e},$$

where  $\mathfrak{m}_{L,Q}$  and  $\mathfrak{m}_{C,Q_i}$  are the maximal ideals of  $Q \in L$  and of  $Q_i \in C$ , respectively. Therefore, for every  $i = 1, \dots, q^2 \cdot s$  it follows

$$p^e \cdot \text{ord}_Q(g | L) \leq \text{ord}_{Q_i}(\pi^*g) |_C.$$

Now, there are  $q \cdot s$  points  $Q_i$  lying on  $C$ . Then, by Bezout's theorem on  $\mathbb{P}^2$  for  $C$  and  $\pi^*G$ , we obtain

$$q \cdot s \cdot p^e \text{ord}_Q(g | L) \leq q \cdot s \cdot \text{ord}_{Q_i}(\pi^*g) |_C \leq C \cdot \pi^*G = \deg_w g.$$

Here noting that  $q \cdot s \cdot p^e = r \cdot s$ , this is the required inequality.

In case  $p|s$ , the proof is similar. □

## 4 Standard Systems and Standard Blow Ups

**Definition 4.1.** Let  $P \in A$  be a smooth point (not necessarily closed) and  $E$  a prime divisor over  $A$  with the center at  $P$ . An RSP  $\{x_1, \dots, x_c\}$  of  $A$  at  $P$  is called a *standard system* for  $E$  at  $P$ , if  $v_i := v_E(x_i)$  ( $i = 1, \dots, c$ ) satisfy

1.  $v_1 = \dots = v_{r-1} \leq v_c$ ,
2.  $v_1 := \min\{v_E(x) \mid x \in \mathfrak{m}_{A,P} \setminus \mathfrak{m}_{A,P}^2\}$
3.  $v_c := \max\{v_E(x) \mid x \in \mathfrak{m}_{A,P} \setminus \mathfrak{m}_{A,P}^2\}$

In this case,

$$v' := (v'_1, \dots, v'_c) = \frac{(v_1, \dots, v_c)}{\gcd(v_1, \dots, v_c)}$$

is called a *standard weight* for  $E$  at  $P$ .

Let  $E$  and  $v' = (v'_1, \dots, v'_r)$  be as above. In this case, we call  $E$  a prime divisor of type  $v'$ .

Note that the standard weight is determined by a prime divisor but standard system is not uniquely determined by the prime divisor.

**Remark 4.2.** For every  $A, P$  and  $E$  as above, there exists a standard system of  $\mathcal{O}_{A,P}$ . Indeed, it is obvious that there is  $x_1 \in \mathfrak{m}_{A,P} \setminus \mathfrak{m}_{A,P}^2$  such that  $v(x_1)$  is the minimal value among  $\{v_E(x) \mid x \in \mathfrak{m}_{A,P} \setminus \mathfrak{m}_{A,P}^2\}$ . Existence of the maximal  $v(x_c)$  among the set is proved by Zariski's subspace theorem (cf. [1, (10.6)]). Now, we extend  $\{x_1, x_c\}$  to an RSP  $\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_c\}$  of  $\mathcal{O}_{A,P}$ . Here, if  $v_E(x_i) > v_E(x_1)$  for  $2 \leq i \leq r-1$ , replace  $x_i$  by  $x_1 + x_i$ . Then, we obtain a standard system  $\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_c\}$ .

**Definition 4.3.** Let  $A, P$  and  $E$  as above and let  $\{x_1, \dots, x_c\}$  be a standard system for  $E$  and  $v' = (v'_1, \dots, v'_r)$  be the standard weight. We call the weighted blow-up of weight  $v'$  with respect to the coordinate system  $\{x_1, \dots, x_c\}$  is called a *standard blow-up* for  $E$ .

**Remark 4.4.** Let  $A, P$  and  $E$  as above and let  $\{x_1, \dots, x_c\}$  be a standard system for  $E$ . Denote the algebraic closure of the residue field  $K$  of  $P$  by  $\overline{K}$ . Let  $A_K := \text{Spec } K[[x_1, \dots, x_c]]$ ,  $A_{\overline{K}} := \text{Spec } \overline{K}[[x_1, \dots, x_c]]$  and  $\tilde{E}$  be the prime divisor over  $A_{\overline{K}}$  with the center at the closed point  $0$  such that  $v_{\tilde{E}}|_{K(A)^\times} = v_E$ . Then a standard system of  $\{x_1, \dots, x_c\}$  for  $E$  in  $\mathcal{O}_{A,P}$  is not necessarily standard for  $\tilde{E}$  in  $\overline{K}[[x_1, \dots, x_c]]$ . The following is an example.

**Example 4.5.** Let  $A_K := \text{Spec } K[[y, z]]$  and  $A_{\overline{K}} := \text{Spec } \overline{K}[[y, z]]$ , where  $\overline{K}$  is the algebraic closure of  $K$ . Take an element  $a \in \overline{K} \setminus K$  and  $\varphi \in K[T]$  be the minimal polynomial of  $a$ . Let  $E$  be the prime divisor over  $\text{Spec } A_K$  defined by the following arc:

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha : K[[y, z]] &\longrightarrow K(a) \left[ y^{(i)}, z^{(j)} \mid i \geq 2, j \geq 3 \right] [[t]] \\ y &\mapsto t + \sum_{i \geq 2} y^{(i)} t^i \\ z &\mapsto at^2 + \sum_{j \geq 3} z^{(j)} t^j, \end{aligned}$$

where  $y^{(i)}, z^{(j)}$  are indeterminates. Then,  $\{y, z\}$  is a standard system for  $E$  and  $v_E(z) = 2$  is the maximal value in  $\{v_E(x) \mid x \in \mathfrak{m} \setminus \mathfrak{m}^2\}$ .

Let  $\tilde{E}$  be the prime divisor over  $A_{\overline{K}}$  defined by the arc:

$$\tilde{\alpha} : \overline{K}[[y, z]] \longrightarrow \overline{K} \left[ y^{(i)}, z^{(j)} \mid i \geq 2, j \geq 3 \right] [[t]]$$

with  $\tilde{\alpha}(y) = \alpha(y)$  and  $\tilde{\alpha}(z) = \alpha(z)$ . Then, by the definition, we have  $v_{\tilde{E}}|_{K(A)^\times} = v_E$ . On the other hand, let  $z' := z - ay^2$ , then  $z' \in \overline{K}[[y, z]] \setminus K[[y, z]]$  and  $v_{\tilde{E}}(z') \geq 3 > 2 = v_E(z)$ . Therefore, the RSP  $\{y, z\}$  is not a standard system for  $\tilde{E}$ .

**Remark 4.6.** Let  $A, P, E, A_K, A_{\overline{K}}$  be as in Remark 4.4 and  $\{x_1, \dots, x_c\}$  be a standard system for  $E$ . Let  $\tilde{E}$  be a prime divisor over  $A_{\overline{K}}$  such that  $v_{\tilde{E}}|_{K(A)^\times} = v_E$ . Then, we can include the first  $c-1$  elements  $\{x_1, \dots, x_{c-1}\}$  into a standard system  $\{x_1, \dots, x_{c-1}, y\}$  for  $\tilde{E}$  in  $A_{\overline{K}}$ , since these are also a part of RSP in  $A_{\overline{K}}$  and  $v_{\tilde{E}}(x_i)$  ( $i < c$ ) attains the minimal value among  $\{v_{\tilde{E}}(x) \mid x \in \overline{\mathfrak{m}} \setminus \overline{\mathfrak{m}}^2\}$ , where  $\overline{\mathfrak{m}}$  is the maximal ideal of the closed point of  $A_{\overline{K}}$ .

**Lemma 4.7.** Let  $A, P, E, A_K$  and  $A_{\overline{K}}$  be as above. Assume moreover  $N = 3$  and  $c = 2$ . Let  $\overline{E}$  be as in Corollary 3.7. Let  $\{x_1, x_2\}$  be a standard system for  $E$ . Then, it is also a standard system for  $\overline{E}$ .

*Proof.* Assume that  $\{x_1, x_2\}$  is not a standard system for  $\overline{E}$  and  $\{x_1, y\}$  is a standard system for  $\overline{E}$ . By the definition of  $\overline{E}$  in Corollary 3.7, we obtain

$$C_{A_{\overline{K}}}(v_{\overline{E}})_m = p_{K,1}^{-1}(C_{A_K}(v_E)_m),$$

for  $m \gg 0$ , where  $(\cdot)_m$  means the image  $\psi_{\infty, m}(\cdot)$  (see Remark 3.6). Algebraically, it gives the equality of their defining ideals:

$$I_{C_{A_{\overline{K}}}(v_{\overline{E}})_m} = I_{C_{A_K}(v_E)_m} \cdot \mathcal{O}_{(A_{\overline{K}})_m}.$$

Note that  $C_{A_{\overline{K}}}(v_{\overline{E}}) = \psi_{\infty, m}^{A_{\overline{K}}}{}^{-1}(C_{A_{\overline{K}}}(v_{\overline{E}})_m)$  and  $C_{A_K}(v_E) = \psi_{\infty, m}^{A_K}{}^{-1}(C_{A_K}(v_E)_m)$ . Denote, for simplicity,  $I := I_{C_{A_K}(v_E)}$ ,  $\overline{I} := I_{C_{A_{\overline{K}}}(v_{\overline{E}})}$ ,  $\mathcal{O}_K := \mathcal{O}_{(A_K)_\infty}$  and  $\mathcal{O}_{\overline{K}} := \mathcal{O}_{(A_{\overline{K}})_\infty}$ . Then, we obtain

$$\overline{I} = I \cdot \mathcal{O}_{\overline{K}} \quad (13)$$

Express  $y \in \overline{K}[[x_1, x_2]]$  as follows:

$$y = f(x_1) + x_2g(x_1, x_2),$$

where  $f \in \overline{K}[[x_1]]$  and  $g \in \overline{K}[[x_1, x_2]]$ . As  $\{x_1, y\}$  is RSP of  $\overline{K}[[x_1, x_2]]$ ,  $g$  must have a constant term  $b \in \overline{K}$ . Then  $v_{\overline{E}}(x_2g(x_1, x_2)) = v_{\overline{E}}(x_2) = v_2$  and therefore it follows  $v_{\overline{E}}(f(x_1)) = v_2$ . Hence, if we set  $d = \min\{i \mid x_1^i \text{ appears in } f_1(x_1)\}$ , we obtain

$$v_1d = v_2 \quad (14)$$

Therefore, from  $v_{\overline{E}}(y) > v_2$  we have  $y^{(v_2)} = f^{(v_2)} + (x_2g)^{(v_2)} \in \overline{I} = I\mathcal{O}_{\overline{K}}$ , and therefore it follows that

$$f^{(v_2)} + bx_2^{(v_2)} \in I\mathcal{O}_{\overline{K}}$$

for  $b \in \overline{K}$ . Then, this element is represented as

$$f^{(v_2)} + bx_2^{(v_2)} = \sum_m \ell_m \phi_m \quad (\ell_m \in \mathcal{O}_{\overline{K}}, \phi_m \in I).$$

Here, there must exist  $m$  such that  $\phi_m$  contains the monomial  $x_2^{(v_2)}$  and let this  $m$  be 1. Then we can write

$$\phi_1 = \lambda(x_1^{(j)}) + \mu x_2^{(v_2)}, \quad (15)$$

where  $\lambda$  is a polynomial in  $x_1^{(j)}$ 's with weight  $v_2$  and  $\mu \in K$ . On the other hand, by [2, Theorem 4.2], there are finite elements  $f_i \in K[[x_1, x_2]]$  ( $i = 1, \dots, n$ ) such that

$$C_{A_K}(v_E) = \overline{\bigcap_{i=1}^m \text{Cont}^{w_i}(f_i)}$$

for  $f_i \in K[[x_1, x_2]]$  and  $w_i = v_E(f_i)$ . Let  $(A_K)_\infty = \text{Spec } S$ ,  $h := f_1^{(w_1)} \cdots f_n^{(w_n)}$  and

$$\Lambda := \left\{ f_i^{(j)} \mid j < w_i, f_i \in K[[x_1, x_2]] \right\}.$$

As  $C_{A_K}(v_E)$  is defined by  $f_i^{(j)} = 0$  ( $j < w_i$ ) on the open subset  $D(h) := \{h \neq 0\} \subset (A_K)_\infty$ , we see that  $\lambda$  generates  $IS_h$  on  $S_h$ . Here, we may assume  $\phi_1$  is one of the generators of  $IS_h$ . Then, we can express  $\phi_1 = f_1^{(j)}/h^r$  for  $j < w_1$  and  $r \in \mathbb{N}$ . Now we obtain

$$h^r \cdot (\lambda(x_1^{(j)}) + \mu x_2^{(v_2)}) = f_1^{(j)}. \quad (16)$$



Here, the degree of the right hand side is  $\deg f_1$ , while, if  $r > 0$ , the degree of the left hand side is greater than  $\deg f_1$ . Therefore,  $r = 0$ ,  $j = v_2$  and  $\phi_1 = \lambda(x_1^{(j)}) + \mu x_2^{(v_2)} = f_1^{(v_2)}$ . Hence, there exists a polynomial  $\xi(x_1) \in K[x_1]$  such that

$$\phi_1 = \xi(x_1)^{(v_2)} + \mu x_2^{(v_2)} \in I.$$

Here, let  $x'_2 = \xi(x_1) + \mu x_2$ , then  $x_1, x'_2$  is a RSP in  $K[[x_1, x_2]]$  and  $v_E(x'_2) > v_2$ , which is a contradiction to that  $\{x_1, x_2\}$  is a standard system for  $E$  on  $A_K$ . Therefore  $\{x_1, x_2\}$  is a standard system for  $\overline{E}$ .  $\square$

Now we are going to define "general" ideal.

**Definition 4.8.** Let  $E$  be a prime divisor  $A$  of type  $(v'_1, v'_2, v'_3)$  (note that  $v'_1 = v'_2$ ) and let  $E_1$  be the exceptional divisor obtained by the standard blow-up with respect to a standard system  $\{x_1, x_2, x_3\}$ .

An irreducible curve  $B \subset E_1 = \mathbb{P}(v'_1, v'_2, v'_3)$  with the following properties is called a *bad curve* for  $E$  on  $E_1$ .

- (1)  $B$  is a curve of degree  $v'_1$  with respect to  $(v'_1, v'_2, v'_3)$ .
- (2)  $B$  contains the center of  $E$ .

**Lemma 4.9.** (i) *A bad curve does not always exist. More precisely a bad curve does not exist if and only if one of the following holds*

- (a) *The standard weight is  $(1, 1, 1)$ , or*
- (b) *The standard weight is  $(v'_1, v'_2, v'_3)$  with  $v'_1 < v'_3$  such that the center of  $E$  on  $E_1$  is a curve of degree  $> v'_1$ , or*
- (c)  $E = E_1$

(ii) *If a bad curve exists, then it is unique in  $E_1$ .*

*Proof.* It is clear that if  $E = E_1$ , then the center of  $E$  on  $E_1$  is the generic point, so there is no bad curve on  $E_1$ . We exclude this trivial case in the following discussions. In case the standard blow-up is the usual blow-up, then the exceptional divisor does not have a bad curve. Because if  $B$  is a bad curve, it is defined by linear form  $\ell = \sum_i a_i X_i = 0$  with  $a_3 \neq 0$ , where  $\{X_1, X_2, X_3\}$  is the projective coordinate system on  $E_1 = \mathbb{P}^2$  corresponding to the standard system  $\{x_1, x_2, x_3\}$  on  $\mathcal{O}_{A,0}$ . This is a contradiction to the fact that  $(1, 1, 1)$  is the standard system, as we obtain another RSP  $\{x_1, x_2, \ell(x_1)\}$  such that

$$v_E(x_1) < v_E(\ell(x_1)). \quad (17)$$

Here, we give the proof of this inequality, as this kind of discussion is used frequently in this paper.

Let  $\varphi_1 : A_1 \rightarrow A$  be the standard blow-up and  $\psi : \tilde{A} \rightarrow A_1$  a birational morphism on which  $E$  appears. Denote the composite  $\varphi_1 \circ \psi$  by  $\varphi$ . Let  $D$  be the proper transform of  $Z(\ell(x_i)) \subset A$  in  $A_1$ , then  $D \cap E_1$  contains the center of  $E$  on  $A_1$  by the assumption. Note that we can express

$$(\varphi_1^* \ell(x_i)) = rE_1 + D, \quad (r = v_{E_1}(\ell(x_i)))$$

Here, we remind us that  $v_E(\ell(x_i))$  is the coefficient of the divisor  $(\varphi^*\ell(x_i)) = \psi^*(rE_1 + D)$  at the component  $E$ . The center of  $E$  on  $A_1$  is contained in  $D$ , therefore the contribution from  $\psi^*(D)$  to  $v_E(\ell(x_i))$  is positive. Therefore,  $v_E(\ell(x_i)) > rv_E(E_1) = v_{E_1}(\ell(x_i))v_E(E_1) = v_E(x_1)$ . This shows the inequality (17).

For the exceptional divisor  $E_1$  of a standard blow-up with respect to  $(v'_1, v'_2, v'_3)$  with  $v'_1 < v'_3$ , if the center  $C$  of  $E$  on  $E_1$  is a curve of degree  $> v'_1$ , then there is no bad curve. Because, a curve of degree  $v'_1$  cannot contain a curve of degree  $> v'_1$ . This gives the proof of "if" part of (i).

Assume a bad curve exists on  $E_1$ . When the center of  $E$  on  $E_1$  is a curve, then it should coincide with the bad curve by the definition, therefore the center should be of degree  $v'_1$ . When the center of  $E$  on  $E_1$  is a closed point  $P$ , then a bad curve should contain  $P$ . Express the point  $P$  by the homogeneous coordinates  $(a, b, c)$  with  $a, b, c \in k$ . Then a curve of degree  $v'_1$  containing  $P$  is defined by  $bX_1 - aX_2 = 0$ . Now we obtain the uniqueness of the bad curve on  $E_1$ . This completes the proof of "only if" part of (i) and the proof of (ii).  $\square$

**Definition 4.10.** Let  $E$  be as above. A real ideal  $\mathfrak{a}$  is called *general for  $E$*  if there exist standard blow-ups with the exceptional divisors  $E_i$  ( $i = 1, 2$ ) satisfying the following:

- (1)  $\text{ord}_B \mathfrak{a}_{A_1} \mathcal{O}_{E_1} \leq 1$ , where  $B$  is the bad curve on  $E_1$  and  $\mathfrak{a}_{A_1}$  is the weak transform of  $\mathfrak{a}$  at  $A_1$ . If there is no bad curve on  $E_1$  then, we account it as the inequality automatically holds.
- (2) In addition, if  $a(E; A, \mathfrak{a}) < a(E_1; A, \mathfrak{a})$  and the center  $P$  of  $E$  on  $A_1$  is a closed point, take a standard blow-up  $A_2 \rightarrow A_1$  at  $P$  and let  $E_2$  be the exceptional divisor. Then,  $\text{ord}_{B'} I_L \mathfrak{a}_{A_2} \mathcal{O}_{E_2} \leq 1$ , where  $B'$  is the bad curve on  $E_2$ ,  $\mathfrak{a}_{A_2}$  is the weak transform of  $\mathfrak{a}$  at  $A_2$  and  $I_L$  is the defining ideal of the intersection  $L := E_2 \cap E'_1$  in  $E_2$ . Here,  $E'_1$  is the proper transform of  $E_1$  on  $A_2$ . If there is no bad curve on  $E_2$  then, we account it as the inequality automatically holds.

We say that a pair  $(A, \mathfrak{a})$  is *general* if the real ideal  $\mathfrak{a}$  is general for a prime divisor computing  $\text{mld}(0; A, \mathfrak{a})$ .

**Remark 4.11** (A sufficient condition for generality). The definition of generality of an ideal is rather complicated. The following gives a sufficient condition for generality of the ideal.

Under the same symbols as in Definition 4.10, the real ideal  $\mathfrak{a}$  is general for  $E$  if the following hold:

- (1)  $\text{ord}_B \mathfrak{a}_{A_1} \mathcal{O}_{E_1} = 0$ , where  $B$  is the bad curve on  $E_1$  and
- (2)  $\text{ord}_{B'} \mathfrak{a}_{A_2} \mathcal{O}_{E_2} = 0$ , where  $B'$  is the bad curve on  $E_2$ .

## 5 Proofs of the main results

For the proofs of the main theorems we need the following lemma which guarantees that the second weighted blow-up is possible.

**Lemma 5.1.** *Let  $E$  be a prime divisor over a smooth  $N$ -fold  $A$  ( $N \geq 2$ ) with the center at the closed point  $0$ . Let  $\{x_1, \dots, x_N\}$  be a RSP at  $0$ . Let  $v_i := v_E(x_i)$ ,  $v := (v_1, \dots, v_N)$  and define*

$$v' := (v'_1, \dots, v'_N) = \frac{(v_1, \dots, v_N)}{\gcd v}$$

*Let  $\varphi_1 : A_1 \rightarrow A$  be the weighted blow-up with respect to  $\{x_1, \dots, x_N\}$  with weight  $v'$ . Denote the exceptional divisor of  $\varphi_1$  by  $E_1$ . Assume  $E \neq E_1$  and let  $C$  be the center of  $E$  on  $A_1$  and  $P \in C$  the generic point of  $C$ .*

*Then,*

$$P \in E_1 \setminus \left\{ \bigcup (X_i = 0) \right\} \subset E_1 = \mathbb{P}(v'_1, \dots, v'_N),$$

*where  $X_i$  is a homogeneous coordinate function corresponding to  $x_i$ . In particular,  $P$  is smooth on  $A_1$  and also on  $E_1$ .*

*Proof.* Assume that the statement does not hold, then we may assume that  $P$  is in the hyperplane defined by  $X_1 = 0$  in  $E_1 = \mathbb{P}(v')$ . There exists at least one homogeneous coordinate function  $X_i$  such that  $P$  does not lay in the hyperplane defined by  $X_i = 0$ . Then we obtain

$$v_E(x_i) = v_{E_1}(x_i) \cdot v_E(E_1) = v'_i \cdot v_E(E_1).$$

$$v_E(x_1) = v_{E_1}(x_1) \cdot v_E(E_1) + \text{ord}_P X_1 \geq v'_1 \cdot v_E(E_1) + 1.$$

This is a contradiction to the fact that

$$v_E(x_1) : v_E(x_i) = v'_1 : v'_i.$$

□

The following lemma is a basic idea appeared in [9].

**Lemma 5.2.** *Let  $E$  and  $D$  be prime divisors over  $A$  with the same center. Let  $\mathfrak{a}$  be a real ideal on  $A$  with  $a(E, A, \mathfrak{a}) \geq 0$ . Let  $A' \rightarrow A$  be a proper birational morphism with normal  $A'$  on which  $D$  appears. Assume  $a(D, A, \mathfrak{a}) > a(E, A, \mathfrak{a})$  and the generic point  $P$  of the center of  $E$  on  $A'$  is smooth.*

*Then, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{mld}(P; D, \mathfrak{a}_{A'} \mathcal{O}_D) &= -\infty, \quad \text{in particular} \\ \text{ord}_P \mathfrak{a}_{A'} \mathcal{O}_D &> 1, \end{aligned}$$

*where  $\mathfrak{a}_{A'}$  is a weak transform of  $\mathfrak{a}$  on  $A'$ .*

*Proof.* First we express the log discrepancy at  $E$  as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} a(E, A, \mathfrak{a}) &= k_{E/A} + 1 - v_E(\mathfrak{a}) \\ &= k_{E/A'} + k_{D/A} \cdot v_E(D) + 1 - v_D(\mathfrak{a}) \cdot v_E(D) - v_E(\mathfrak{a}_{A'}) \\ &= a(E, A', I_D \cdot \mathfrak{a}_{A'}) + v_E(D) \cdot a(D, A, \mathfrak{a}), \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

where  $k_{E/A'}$  is the coefficient of the relative canonical divisor  $K_{\tilde{A}/A'}$  at  $E$  and  $I_D$  is the defining ideal of  $D$  in  $A'$ . Then, by the assumption, it follows  $a(E; A', I_D \cdot \mathfrak{a}_{A'}) < 0$  and therefore we obtain

$$\text{mld}(P; A', I_D \cdot \mathfrak{a}_{A'}) = -\infty.$$

By Inversion of Adjunction ([3], [7]) we obtain  $\text{mld}(P; D, \mathfrak{a}_{A'} \cdot \mathcal{O}_D) = -\infty$ . Hence, it follows  $\text{ord}_P(\mathfrak{a}_{A'} \cdot \mathcal{O}_D) > 1$  as claimed.  $\square$

### Setting for the proof of Theorem 1.8.

Let  $E$  be a prime divisor over a smooth 3-fold  $A$  with the center at a closed point  $0$ . Let

$$\varphi_1 : A_1 \longrightarrow A$$

be a standard blow-up with respect to a standard system  $\{x_1, x_2, x_3\}$  with the weight  $v' = (v'_1, v'_2, v'_3)$  (note that  $v'_1 = v'_2$ ). We may assume that the condition (1) in Definition 4.10 holds. If  $a(E_1, A, \mathfrak{a}) \leq a(E, A, \mathfrak{a})$ , then  $E_1$  is the required prime divisor  $F$  in the theorem. Therefore, from now on, we assume that the inequality  $a(E_1, A, \mathfrak{a}) > a(E, A, \mathfrak{a}) \geq 0$  holds.

**Lemma 5.3.** *Let  $A$ ,  $E$  and  $E_1$  be as above. If  $\mathfrak{a}$  is general for  $E$  and the inequality  $a(E_1, A, \mathfrak{a}) > a(E, A, \mathfrak{a}) \geq 0$  holds, then the following hold:*

(i)  $0 < a(E_1; A, \mathfrak{a}) < 1$ .

(ii)  $v' = (1, 1, n)$  with  $n \geq 1$  or  $v' = (2, 2, 3)$ .

(a) In case  $(1, 1, n)$  the center of  $E$  on  $A_1$  is a curve defined by a curve in  $E_1 = \mathbb{P}(1, 1, n)$  of degree  $n + 1$ .

(b) In case  $(2, 2, 3)$  the center of  $E$  on  $A_1$  is either a curve of degree 6 or a closed point in  $E_1 = \mathbb{P}(2, 2, 3)$ .

*Proof.* We divide into two cases according to the dimension of the center of  $E$  on  $A_1$ . Let  $P \in A_1$  be the generic point of the center of  $E$  on  $A_1$ .

**Case 1.**  $\dim \overline{\{P\}} = 1$ .

Let  $C := \overline{\{P\}}$  and defined by  $\ell = 0$  on  $E_1 = \mathbb{P}(v')$ , where  $\ell$  is homogeneous of degree  $v'_1$  with respect to the weight  $v'$ . Let  $f^e = f_1^{e_1} \cdots f_r^{e_r} \in \mathfrak{a}$  be a general element, i.e.,  $v_{E_1}(\mathfrak{a}) = \sum_i e_i \cdot \deg_{v'}(\text{inf}_i)$ , where  $\text{inf}$  is the initial part of  $f$  with respect to the weight  $v'$ .

The real divisor on  $E_1$  induced from a general element  $f^e = f_1^{e_1} \cdots f_r^{e_r}$  is expressed as follows:

$$\left( \prod \text{in}_{v'} f_i^{e_i} \right) = \alpha C + \sum_j \gamma_j C_j, \quad \text{with } \alpha > 1, \gamma_i \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$$

Here, note that  $\alpha > 1$  follows from Lemma 5.2. As  $\mathfrak{a}$  is general,  $C$  is not the bad curve, therefore its degree is greater than  $v'_1$ . Then,  $\deg_{v'} \ell \geq v'_1 v'_3$  and we have:

$$v_{E_1}(\mathfrak{a}) = \sum_i e_i \cdot \deg_{v'}(\text{inf}_i) = \deg_{v'}(\alpha C + \sum_j \gamma_j C_j) > \deg_{v'} C = \deg_{v'} \ell \geq v'_1 v'_3.$$

By the assumption  $a(E_1, A, \mathbf{a}) > a(E, A, \mathbf{a}) \geq 0$ , it follows

$$0 \leq a(E_1; A, \mathbf{a}) = 2v'_1 + v'_3 - v_{E_1}(\mathbf{a}) < 2v'_1 + v'_3 - v'_1 \cdot v'_3. \quad (19)$$

The possibilities of  $(v'_1, v'_1, v'_3)$  are only  $(1, 1, n)$  with  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $(2, 2, 3)$ . In case  $(2, 2, 3)$ , by (19) we have  $a(E_1; A, \mathbf{a}) < 2 \cdot 2 + 3 - 2 \cdot 3 = 1$ . Then, in this case we have (i) and (b) of (ii).

In case  $(1, 1, n)$  for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , we have  $\deg_{v'} \ell \geq n + 1$ . Indeed, if not, we have  $\deg_{v'} \ell = n$  and  $\ell = X_3 + h(X_1, X_2)$  for a nonzero homogeneous polynomial  $h$  of degree  $n$ . As  $E$  has the center at the curve  $\ell = 0$ , in the same way as the proof of (17) we have

$$v_E(x_3 + h(x_1, x_2)) > v_E(x_3),$$

and also  $x_3 + h(x_1, x_2) \in \mathfrak{m}_0 \setminus \mathfrak{m}_0^2$  which is a contradiction to the maximality of  $v_E(x_3)$ . Therefore, in this case also we have  $a(E_1; A, \mathbf{a}) < 2 + n - (n + 1) = 1$ , which shows (i) and (a) of (ii).

**Case 2.**  $\dim \overline{\{P\}} = 0$

First we can see that  $v'_1 \neq 1$ . To see this, assume that  $v'_1 = 1$  and let  $P = (1 : a : b) \in E_1 = \mathbb{P}(v')$  ( $a, b \neq 0$ ) be the homogeneous coordinate of the point  $P$ . Then a curve  $bx_1^{v'_3} - X_3 = 0$  contains  $P$ , therefore

$$v_E(bx_1^{v'_3} - x_3) > v_E(x_3) = v_3,$$

and also  $bx_1^{v'_3} - x_3 \in \mathfrak{m}_0 \setminus \mathfrak{m}_0^2$  which is a contradiction to the maximality of  $v_E(x_3)$ .

Now we may assume that  $v'_1 \geq 2$ . Then, of course  $v'_1 < v'_3$  and the curve  $B$  defined by  $aX_1 - X_2 = 0$  contains  $P$ . Note that  $B$  is the bad curve.

Take a general element  $f^e = f_1^{e_1} \cdots f_r^{e_r} \in \mathfrak{a}$  such that  $v_{E_1}(\mathbf{a}) = v_{E_1}(f^e) = \deg_{v'}(\text{in} f^e)$ . The real divisor on  $E_1 = \mathbb{P}(v')$  induced from a general element  $f^e = f_1^{e_1} \cdots f_r^{e_r}$  is expressed as follows:

$$\left( \prod \text{in}_{v'} f_i^{e_i} \right) = \alpha B + \sum_j \gamma_j C_j, \quad \text{with } \alpha, \gamma_i \in \mathbb{R}_{>0} \quad (20)$$

By generality of  $\mathfrak{a}$ , we have  $\alpha \leq 1$ . By Lemma 5.2, we have  $\text{mld}(P; E_1, \mathfrak{a}_{A_1} \mathcal{O}_{E_1}) = -\infty$ . By the description (20) of the divisor defined by a general element  $f^e$ , we have

$$-\infty = \text{mld}(P; E_1, \mathfrak{a}_{A_1} \mathcal{O}_{E_1}) = \text{mld}(P; E_1, I_B^\alpha \cdot \prod_i I_{C_i}^{\gamma_i}) \geq \text{mld}(P; E_1, I_B \cdot \prod_i I_{C_i}^{\gamma_i}) = \text{mld}(P; B, (\prod_i I_{C_i}^{\gamma_i}) \mathcal{O}_B).$$

Hence, it follows  $\text{ord}_P(\prod_i I_{C_i}^{\gamma_i}) \mathcal{O}_B > 1$ . Applying Lemma 3.8 to the curve  $B$  of degree  $v'_1$ , we obtain

$$1 < \text{ord}_P(\prod_i I_{C_i}^{\gamma_i}) \mathcal{O}_B \leq \frac{\sum \gamma_i \deg_{v'} C_i}{v'_1 v'_3} \leq \frac{v_{E_1}(f^e)}{v'_1 v'_3} \leq \frac{2v'_1 + v'_3}{v'_1 v'_3}.$$

Then, the only possibility of  $v'$  satisfying these inequalities is  $(2, 2, 3)$  and we also have  $v_{E_1}(\mathbf{a}) = v_{E_1}(f^e) > 2 \cdot 3$  which completes the proof of (i) and (ii) in case  $\dim \{P\} = 0$ .

□

**Corollary 5.4** (Theorem 1.11). *For any general pair  $(A, \mathfrak{a})$  with  $\text{mld}(0; A, \mathfrak{a}) \geq 1$  the minimal log discrepancy is computed by a prime divisor obtained by one weighted blow-up.*

*Proof.* As  $a(E_1, A, \mathfrak{a}) \geq \text{mld}(0; A, \mathfrak{a}) \geq 1$ , the inequality  $a(E_1, A, \mathfrak{a}) > a(E, A, \mathfrak{a})$  does not hold by (i) in Lemma 5.3.  $\square$

**Proof of Theorem 1.8.**

Let  $A_1, E_1$  be as above. Assuming  $a(E; A, \mathfrak{a}) < a(E_1; A, \mathfrak{a})$ , we will prove that  $a(E; A, \mathfrak{a}) \geq a(E_2; A, \mathfrak{a})$  for a divisor  $E_2$  obtained by the second ‘‘blow-up’’ constructed below.

Let  $P \in E_1 \subset A_1$  be the center of  $E$ . First, for every prime divisor  $D$  over  $A_1$  with the center at  $P$  and with the inequality  $a(D, A, \mathfrak{a}) > a(E, A, \mathfrak{a}) \geq 0$ , we observe that

$$a(D; A_1, \mathfrak{a}_{A_1}) \geq 0. \tag{21}$$

Indeed, we have an expression of  $a(D; A, \mathfrak{a})$  as follows:

$$a(D; A, \mathfrak{a}) = a(D; A_1, \mathfrak{a}_{A_1}) + v_D(E_1)(a(E_1; A, \mathfrak{a}) - 1).$$

As  $a(D; A, \mathfrak{a}) \geq 0$  and  $a(E_1; A, \mathfrak{a}) - 1 < 0$  ( Lemma 5.3 ), we have  $a(D; A_1, \mathfrak{a}_{A_1}) \geq 0$ .

**Case 1.**  $\dim \overline{\{P\}} = 1$

Let  $\{y_1, y_2\}$  be a standard system for  $E$  on  $A_1$  at  $P$  and  $E_2$  a prime divisor obtained by the standard blow-up of  $A_1$  at  $P$  with respect to  $\{y_1, y_2\}$ . Let  $K := \mathcal{O}_{A_1, P} / \mathfrak{m}_{A_1, P}$  and  $\overline{K}$  the algebraic closure of  $K$ . Let  $A_{1K} := \text{Spec } \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{A, P} = \text{Spec } K[[y_1, y_2]]$ ,  $A_{1\overline{K}} := \text{Spec } \overline{K}[[y_1, y_2]]$ . Denote the both closed points of  $A_{1K}$  and of  $A_{1\overline{K}}$  by 0. By Lemma 4.7  $\{y_1, y_2\}$  is also a standard system for the prime divisor  $\overline{E}$  over  $A_{1\overline{K}}$  with the center at the closed point 0. Here, the definition of  $\overline{E}$  is as in Corollary 3.7. We note that the prime divisor  $\overline{E}_2$  over  $A_{1\overline{K}}$  with the center at 0 is the same as the one obtained by the standard blow-up of  $A_{1\overline{K}}$  with respect to the standard system  $\{y_1, y_2\}$ . Let  $\overline{E}_1 \subset A_{1\overline{K}}$  be the divisor obtained from  $E_1$  in Corollary 3.7.

Describe our situation in the diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 E & & E_2 & & E_1 \\
 \cap & & \cap & & \cap \\
 \tilde{A} & \longrightarrow & A_2 & \longrightarrow & A_1 & \xrightarrow{\varphi_1} & A \\
 & & & & \uparrow & & \\
 & & & & A_{1K} & & \\
 & & & & \uparrow & & \\
 \tilde{A} & \longrightarrow & A_{2\overline{K}} & \xrightarrow{\varphi_2} & A_{1\overline{K}} & & \\
 \cup & & \cup & & \cup & & \\
 \overline{E} & & \overline{E}_2 & & \overline{E}_1 & & 
 \end{array}$$

Here, we note that the second horizontal line is a sequence of morphisms of smooth surfaces over an algebraically closed field  $\overline{K}$ . So, we can apply the discussion for surfaces in [9] and [6].

If  $\overline{E} = \overline{E}_2$ , then we have  $E = E_2$  and we are done. So, we may assume that the center of  $\overline{E}$  on  $A_{2\overline{K}}$  is a point. Then the center is not on the proper transform of  $\overline{E}_1$  on  $A_{2\overline{K}}$ . This is proved as follows:

Let  $w = (r, s)$  be the weight of the standard system  $\{y_1, y_2\}$  on  $A_{1\overline{K}}$ .

First, we show that  $r = s$  does not happen. Assume  $r = s$ , *i.e.*,  $w = (1, 1)$ , then we can take an expression  $Q = (a, b)$  of  $Q \in \overline{E}_2 = \mathbb{P}_{\overline{K}}^1$  by homogeneous coordinates with  $a, b \neq 0$ . Let  $z := by_1 - ay_2 \in \mathcal{O}_{A_{1\overline{K}}}$ . As  $Q$  is the center of  $\overline{E}$  on  $\overline{E}_2 \subset A_{2\overline{K}}$  and satisfying  $bY_1 - aY_2 = 0$  ( $Y_1, Y_2$  are the homogeneous coordinates on  $\overline{E}_2 = \mathbb{P}_{\overline{K}}^1$  corresponding to  $y_1, y_2$ .), it follows

$$z \in \mathfrak{m}_P \setminus \mathfrak{m}_P^2, \quad \text{and} \quad v_{\overline{E}}(z) > v_{\overline{E}}(y_1), v_{\overline{E}}(y_2),$$

which is a contradiction to the fact that  $\{y_1, y_2\}$  is a standard system. Now, we may assume that  $r < s$ . Let  $h = 0$  be the defining equation of  $E_1$  in  $A_1$  around  $P$ , then  $\overline{E}_1$  is also defined by  $h = 0$  and it is smooth at the closed point  $0 \in A_{1\overline{K}}$ . Therefore, we have  $\text{ord}_{y_1, y_2} h = 1$ . Then the initial part of  $h$  with respect to  $w$  is one of the following:

(1)  $\text{in}_w(h) = y_1$ , (2)  $\text{in}_w(h) = y_2$ , (3)  $\text{in}_w(h) = y_2 + ay_1^d$  ( $a \in \overline{K}$ ,  $w_1 d = w_2$ ). In the first two cases,  $\overline{E}'_1|_{\overline{E}_2}$  is in the zero locus of the coordinate functions, where  $\overline{E}'_1$  is the proper transform of  $\overline{E}_1$  on  $A_{2\overline{K}}$ . Therefore it does not contain the center  $Q$  of  $\overline{E}$  by Lemma 5.1. In case (3), it follows  $w = (1, d)$ . If  $Q$  is in  $\overline{E}'_1|_{\overline{E}_2}$ , then we have  $y'_2 := y_2 + ay_1^d \in \mathfrak{m}_{A_{1\overline{K}}, 0} \setminus \mathfrak{m}_{A_{1\overline{K}}, 0}^2$  and  $v_{\overline{E}}(y'_2) > v_{\overline{E}}(y_2)$  which is a contradiction to the assumption that  $\{y_1, y_2\}$  is a standard system. Now, in any case we obtain that  $Q \notin \overline{E}'_1$ .

On the other hand,  $a(E; A, \mathfrak{a})$  has another expression as follows:

$$a(E; A, \mathfrak{a}) = k_{E/A_1} + k_{E_1/A} \cdot v_E(E_1) + 1 - v_E(\mathfrak{a}).$$

Now define a formal invariant for a divisor  $D$  over  $A_{1\overline{K}}$  with the center at the closed point  $0$  as follows:

$$\overline{a}(D; A, \mathfrak{a}) := k_{D/A_{1\overline{K}}} + k_{E_1/A} \cdot v_D(\overline{E}_1) + 1 - v_D(\mathfrak{a}).$$

By the definitions of  $\overline{a}(\ )$  and  $\overline{E}$ , we have the following:

$$\overline{a}(\overline{E}; A, \mathfrak{a}) = a(E; A, \mathfrak{a}), \quad \overline{a}(\overline{E}_2; A, \mathfrak{a}) = a(E_2; A, \mathfrak{a}). \quad (22)$$

Therefore, it is sufficient to show that

$$\overline{a}(\overline{E}; A, \mathfrak{a}) \geq \overline{a}(\overline{E}_2; A, \mathfrak{a}).$$

Assume contrary, then

$$0 > \overline{a}(\overline{E}; A, \mathfrak{a}) - \overline{a}(\overline{E}_2; A, \mathfrak{a}) = a(\overline{E}; A_{2\overline{K}}, I_{\overline{E}_2} \cdot \mathfrak{a}_{A_{2\overline{K}}}) + (v_{\overline{E}}(\overline{E}_2) - 1) \cdot \overline{a}(\overline{E}_2; A, \mathfrak{a}), \quad (23)$$

where  $\mathfrak{a}_{A_{2\overline{K}}}$  is the weak transform of  $\mathfrak{a}_{A_1} \mathcal{O}_{A_{1\overline{K}}}$ . For the calculation of (23), we used

- $v_{\overline{E}}(\overline{E}_1) = v_{\overline{E}}(\overline{E}_2)v_{\overline{E}_2}(\overline{E}_1) + v_{\overline{E}}(\overline{E}'_1) = v_{\overline{E}}(\overline{E}_2)v_{\overline{E}_2}(\overline{E}_1).$

Then the inequality (23) shows that  $a(\overline{E}; A_{2\overline{K}}, I_{\overline{E}_2} \cdot \mathfrak{a}_{A_{2\overline{K}}}) < 0$  which implies

$$\text{mld}(Q; A_{2\overline{K}}, I_{\overline{E}_2} \cdot \mathfrak{a}_{A_{2\overline{K}}}) = -\infty.$$

Then, by Inversion of Adjunction ([3], [7]), it follows

$$\text{mld}(Q; \overline{E}_2, \mathfrak{a}_{A_{2\overline{K}}} \cdot \mathcal{O}_{\overline{E}_2}) = -\infty$$

which yields  $\text{ord}_Q((\mathfrak{a}_{A_1} \mathcal{O}_{A_{1\overline{K}}})_{A_{2\overline{K}}} \cdot \mathcal{O}_{\overline{E}_2}) = \text{ord}_Q(\mathfrak{a}_{A_{2\overline{K}}} \cdot \mathcal{O}_{\overline{E}_2}) > 1$

Let  $(r, s)$  be the standard weight for  $\overline{E}$  at the closed point  $0 \in A_{1\overline{K}}$ , then

$$a(\overline{E}, A_{1\overline{K}}, \mathfrak{a}_{A_{1\overline{K}}}) = a(E, A_1, \mathfrak{a}_{A_1}) \geq 0,$$

where the last inequality follows from (21). Now we reach the situation in Theorem 1.1 and apply the argument in ([9]) for the surface pair  $(A_{1\overline{K}}, \mathfrak{a}_{A_{1\overline{K}}})$ , we obtain

$$1 < \text{ord}_Q((\mathfrak{a}_{A_1} \mathcal{O}_{A_{1\overline{K}}})_{A_{2\overline{K}}} \cdot \mathcal{O}_{\overline{E}_2}) \leq \frac{v_{\overline{E}_2}(\mathfrak{a}_{A_1} \mathcal{O}_{A_{1\overline{K}}})}{r \cdot s} \leq \frac{r+s}{r \cdot s}, \quad (24)$$

where note that  $\mathfrak{a}_{A_{2\overline{K}}} = (\mathfrak{a}_{A_1} \mathcal{O}_{A_{1\overline{K}}})_{A_{2\overline{K}}}$  and the third inequality follows from

$$r+s - v_{\overline{E}_2}(\mathfrak{a}_{A_1} \mathcal{O}_{A_{1\overline{K}}}) = a(\overline{E}_2; A_{1\overline{K}}, \mathfrak{a}_{A_1}) = a(E_2, A_1, \mathfrak{a}_{A_1}) \geq 0$$

by (21). The possible positive intergers  $\{r, s\}$  satisfying (24) with  $\text{gcd}(r, s) = 1$  are only  $\{1, s\}$ . In this case let  $z' := y_1^s - cy_2$ , where  $Q = (c, 1) \in \overline{E}_2 = \mathbb{P}(1, s)$ , then  $v_{\overline{E}}(z') > v_{\overline{E}}(y_2)$ , which is a contradiction to that  $\{y_1, y_2\}$  is a standard system for  $\overline{E}$ . Hence we obtain

$$\overline{a}(\overline{E}; A, \mathfrak{a}) \geq \overline{a}(\overline{E}_2; A, \mathfrak{a}),$$

which completes the proof of the theorem for Case 1.

**Case 2.**  $\dim \overline{\{P\}} = 0$

Assume  $a(E; A, \mathfrak{a}) < a(E_1, A, \mathfrak{a})$ , then by Lemma 5.3 only possibility of  $v'$  is  $(2, 2, 3)$  and we have  $0 \leq a(E_1; A, \mathfrak{a}) < 1$ .

Now take a standard blow-up  $A_2 \rightarrow A_1$  of weight  $w = (w_1, w_2, w_3)$  at  $P$  and let  $E_2$  be the exceptional divisor. We may assume that the condition (2) in Definition 4.10 holds. Let  $Q \in E_2$  be the center of  $E$  on  $A_2$ .

Let  $E'_1$  be the proper transform of  $E_1$  on  $A_2$ . Denote the defining ideals of  $E'_1$  and  $E_2$  in  $A_2$  by  $I_{E'_1}$  and  $I_{E_2}$ , respectively.

Then, we have the similar expansion of  $a(E; A, \mathfrak{a})$  as in (18) as follows:

$$a(E; A, \mathfrak{a}) = a(E; A_2, I_{E'_1} \cdot I_{E_2} \cdot \mathfrak{a}_{A_2}) + v_E(E_2)a(E_2; A, \mathfrak{a}) + v_E(E'_1)a(E_1; A, \mathfrak{a}), \quad (25)$$

where  $\mathfrak{a}_{A_2}$  is the weak transform of  $\mathfrak{a}$  on  $A_2$  and is also the weak transform of  $\mathfrak{a}_{A_1}$  on  $A_2$ .

**Case 2.1.**  $\dim \overline{\{Q\}} = 0$ :



We will prove  $a(E_2; A, \mathfrak{a}) \leq a(E; A, \mathfrak{a})$ . Assume contrary ;  $a(E_2; A, \mathfrak{a}) > a(E; A, \mathfrak{a})$ . Then, by (25), we obtain

$$a(E; A_2, I_{E'_1} \cdot I_{E_2} \cdot \mathfrak{a}_{A_2}) < 0 \quad (26)$$

It implies that  $\text{mld}(Q; A_2, I_{E'_1} \cdot I_{E_2} \cdot \mathfrak{a}_{A_2}) = -\infty$ . Let  $L := E'_1 \cap E_2$ , by Inversion of Adjunction, we obtain

$$\text{mld}(Q, E_2, I_L \mathfrak{a}_{A_2} \mathcal{O}_{E_2}) = -\infty.$$

Let  $B'$  be the bad curve on  $E_2$  (note that a bad curve exists in our case by Lemma 4.9). Then, we obtain

$$\text{ord}_{B'} \mathfrak{a}_{A_2} \mathcal{O}_{E_2} \leq 1. \quad (27)$$

Indeed, when  $L = B'$ , then generality of  $\mathfrak{a}$  implies that  $\text{ord}_{B'} \mathfrak{a}_{A_2} \mathcal{O}_{E_2} = 0$ , as  $\text{ord}_{B'} I_L = 1$ . On the other hand, when  $L \neq B'$ , then  $Q \notin L$  and therefore generality implies  $\text{ord}_{B'} \mathfrak{a}_{A_2} \mathcal{O}_{E_2} \leq 1$ . Now, in the same way as Case 2 in the proof of Lemma 5.3, we obtain that the weight of the second standard blow-up is  $(2, 2, 3)$ .

We will show a contradiction under this situation. In this case, we have

$$v_{E_2}(\mathfrak{a}_{A_1}) > 6, \quad \text{as well as} \quad v_{E_1}(\mathfrak{a}) > 6 \quad (28)$$

As the standard system  $\{y_1, y_2, y_3\}$  at  $P \in A_1$  has weight  $(2, 2, 3)$ , it follows  $v_{E_2}(f) \leq 3 \cdot \text{ord}_P f$  for every  $f \in \mathfrak{a}_{A_1}$ . Therefore we obtain

$$v_{E_2}(\mathfrak{a}_{A_1}) \leq 3 \cdot \text{ord}_P \mathfrak{a}_{A_1} \leq 3 \cdot \text{ord}_P \mathfrak{a}_{A_1} \mathcal{O}_{E_1}. \quad (29)$$

On the other hand, applying Lemma 5.3 to  $E_1 = \mathbb{P}(2, 2, 3)$  and general element of  $\mathfrak{a}_{A_1} \cdot \mathcal{O}_{E_1}$ , we obtain  $1 < \text{ord}_P \mathfrak{a}_{A_1} \mathcal{O}_{E_1} \leq \frac{v_{E_1}(\mathfrak{a})}{2 \cdot 3}$ .

Then, it follows

$$7 = 2 + 2 + 3 = k_{E_1} + 1 \geq v_{E_1}(\mathfrak{a}) > 6 \cdot \text{ord}_P \mathfrak{a}_{A_1} \mathcal{O}_{E_1}. \quad (30)$$

Using (28), (29) and (30) we obtain

$$\frac{7}{2} > 3 \cdot \text{ord}_P \mathfrak{a}_{A_1} \mathcal{O}_{E_1} \geq v_{E_2}(\mathfrak{a}_{A_1}) > 6$$

which is a contradiction. Therefore  $a(E_2; A, \mathfrak{a}) \leq a(E; A, \mathfrak{a})$  holds.

**Case 2.2.**  $\dim \overline{\{Q\}} = 1$ .

In the following, we will prove  $a(E_2; A, \mathfrak{a}) \leq a(E; A, \mathfrak{a})$ . Assume contrary,  $a(E_2; A, \mathfrak{a}) > a(E; A, \mathfrak{a})$ . The curve  $\overline{\{Q\}}$  is not the bad curve, because if it is, then

$$-\infty = \text{mld}(Q; A_2, I_{E'_1} \cdot I_{E_2} \cdot \mathfrak{a}_{A_2}) = \text{mld}(Q; E_2, I_L \mathfrak{a}_{A_2} \mathcal{O}_{E_2})$$

implies  $\text{ord}_Q I_L \mathfrak{a}_{A_2} \mathcal{O}_{E_2} > 1$ , while the generality of  $\mathfrak{a}$  implies the converse inequality  $\text{ord}_Q I_L \mathfrak{a}_{A_2} \mathcal{O}_{E_2} = \text{ord}_{B'} I_L \mathfrak{a}_{A_2} \mathcal{O}_{E_2} \leq 1$ . We also have  $\overline{\{Q\}} \neq L$ . This is proved as follows:

Let  $h' \in \mathcal{O}_{A_1}$  define  $E_1$  around  $P$ . As  $P$  is smooth on  $E_1$  and also on  $A_1$ , we have  $\text{ord} h' = 1$  with respect to RSP  $\{y_1, y_2, y_3\}$  of  $\mathcal{O}_{A_1}$  at  $P$ . Then, considering of the initial term of  $h'$  with respect to the weight  $w$ , we see that one of the following holds:

- (1)  $L$  is a coordinate axis of  $E_2 = \mathbb{P}(w)$ ;
- (2)  $L$  is defined by  $Y_1 + aY_2$  ( $a \in k$ ) in  $E_2$ ;
- (3)  $L$  is defined by  $Y_3 + f(Y_1, Y_2)$  in  $E_2$ , where  $f$  is a homogeneous polynomial of degree  $d$ .

In the third case, the weight  $w$  must be  $(1, 1, d)$ . In this case, if  $\overline{\{Q\}} = L$ , it follows  $y'_3 := y_3 + f(y_1, y_2) \in \mathfrak{m}_{A_1, P} \setminus \mathfrak{m}_{A_1, P}^2$  and  $v_E(y'_3) > v_E(y_3)$ , which is a contradiction to the maximality of  $v_E(y_3)$ . In case (1),  $\overline{\{Q\}} \neq L$  because  $Q$  is not contained in the coordinate axes (Lemma 5.1). In case (2),  $L$  becomes the bad curve, therefore  $\overline{\{Q\}} \neq L$ , because  $\overline{\{Q\}}$  is not the bad curve, as we saw above.

Now we obtain  $Q \notin E'_1 \cap E_2$ . By using this, we have

$$\text{mld}(Q; A_2, I_{E_2} \cdot \mathfrak{a}_{A_2}) = \text{mld}(Q; A_2, I_{E'_1} \cdot I_{E_2} \cdot \mathfrak{a}_{A_2}) = -\infty.$$

By Inversion of Adjunction, we have

$$\text{mld}(Q; E_2, \mathfrak{a}_{A_2} \mathcal{O}_{E_2}) = -\infty.$$

Then, we have  $1 < \text{ord}_Q \mathfrak{a}_{A_2} \cdot \mathcal{O}_{E_2}$

First we show that the standard weight  $w = (r, r, s)$  for  $E$  at  $P \in A_1$  is  $(1, 1, n)$  for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Let  $C := \overline{\{Q\}}$  be defined by  $\ell = 0$  in  $E_2 = \mathbb{P}(r, r, s)$ . If  $w \neq (1, 1, n)$ , then the other possible weight  $w$  is  $(2, 2, 3)$ . In this case the smallest possible value for the degree of  $\ell$  on  $\mathbb{P}(2, 2, 3)$  with respect to  $w$  is 6. Therefore, by  $1 < \text{ord}_Q \mathfrak{a}_{A_2} \cdot \mathcal{O}_{E_2}$ ,

$$v_{E_2}(\mathfrak{a}_{A_1}) \geq \deg_w \ell \cdot \text{ord}_Q(\mathfrak{a}_{A_1})_{A_2} \geq 6 \cdot \text{ord}_Q(\mathfrak{a}_{A_1})_{A_2} > 6$$

Now we obtain the inequality (28). The inequalities (29) and (30) also hold in the present case. Therefore, we induce a contradiction and  $w$  must be  $(1, 1, n)$ . By Lemma 5.3,  $\deg_w \ell = 1 + n$ .

Let  $\{y_1, y_2, y_3\}$  be a standard system at  $P \in A_1$  with the weight  $(1, 1, n)$ . Let  $\{Y_1, Y_2, Y_3\}$  be the homogeneous coordinates of  $E_2 = \mathbb{P}(1, 1, n)$  corresponding to  $\{y_1, y_2, y_3\}$ . As  $\ell$  is irreducible of degree  $1 + n$  with respect to the weight  $(1, 1, n)$ , we can express

$$\ell = Y_1 Y_3 - Y_2^{n+1}.$$

For simplicity, assume  $\mathfrak{a} = \mathfrak{a}_1^{e_1}$  and take a general element  $f \in \mathfrak{a}_1 \mathcal{O}_{A, 0} \subset k[[x_1, x_2, x_3]]$ , where  $\{x_1, x_2, x_3\}$  is a standard system for  $E$  at  $0 \in A$  of weight  $(2, 2, 3)$ . Then the weak transform  $f_{A_1}$  of  $f$  on  $A_1$  is written as

$$f_{A_1} = (y_1 \cdot y_3 - y_2^{n+1})^r \cdot \ell' + g(y), \quad (31)$$

where  $\ell'$  is weighted homogeneous and  $g(y)$  is the term with the higher weight with respect to the weight  $w = (1, 1, n)$ .

Here, we may assume that  $P = (1, 1, 1) \in E_1 = \mathbb{P}(2, 2, 3)$ , then we can take a RSP at  $P \in A_1$  by making use of the standard system  $\{x_1, x_2, x_3\}$  of standard weight  $(2, 2, 3)$  which gives the first weighted blow-up  $\varphi_1 : A_1 \rightarrow A$ :

$$z_1 = \frac{x_1^3 - x_3^2}{x_3^2}, \quad z_2 = \frac{x_2^3 - x_3^2}{x_3^2}, \quad z_3 = x_3,$$

where  $x_3$  defines  $E_1$  in the neighborhood of  $P$ . Take the minimal  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  such that

$$f = x_3^m \cdot f_{A_1} \in \mathcal{O}_{A,0} \subset k[[x_1, x_2, x_3]]. \quad (32)$$

We note that for  $m \geq 2$ ,

$$\text{ord}_0 x_3^m \cdot z_i = m \quad (i = 1, 2), \quad \text{ord}_0 x_3^m \cdot z_3 = m + 1, \quad (33)$$

where  $\text{ord}_0$  is the order with respect to the parameters  $x_1, x_2, x_3$  in  $\mathcal{O}_{A,0}$ . Then, by (33),

$$\text{ord}_0 f = \text{ord}_0(x_3^m \cdot f_A) \geq m.$$

On the other hand if  $x_3^s(y_1 y_3 - y_2^{n+1})^r \in \mathcal{O}_{A,0}$ , it should be  $s \geq 4r$ . In fact, if a quadratic monomial  $z_i z_j$  ( $i, j \in \{1, 2\}$ ) appears in  $y_1 y_3$  which is expressed as a function of  $z_1, z_2, z_3$ , then  $s \geq 4r$ . If such a monomial  $z_i z_j$  ( $i, j \in \{1, 2\}$ ) does not appear in  $y_1 y_3$ , then  $z_i$  ( $i < 3$ ) appears in  $y_2$ , because  $\{z_1, z_2, z_3\}$  and  $\{y_1, y_2, y_3\}$  are both RSP at  $P \in A_1$ . This yields  $s \geq 2(n+1)r \geq 4r$ .

Consider the initial part  $(y_1 \cdot y_3 - y_2^{n+1})^r \cdot \ell'$  of  $f_{A_1}$  with respect to the weight  $w = (1, 1, n)$ . We know that  $a(E_2, A_1, \mathfrak{a}_{A_1}) \geq 0$ , therefore  $v_{E_2}(f_{A_1}^{e_1}) = v_{E_2}(\mathfrak{a}_{A_1}^{e_1}) \leq k_{E_2/A_1} + 1 = n + 2$ . Then, it follows that

$$e_1(r(n+1) + \deg_w \ell') \leq n + 2. \quad (34)$$

As  $1 < \text{ord}_Q \mathfrak{a}_{A_2} \mathcal{O}_{E_2}$ , it follows  $1 < \text{ord}_Q (y_1 y_3 - y_2^{n+1})^{r e_1}$  which yields  $r e_1 > 1$ . By this and (34), we have  $\deg_w \ell' < r$ , therefore  $\text{ord}_P \ell' < r$  which yields that the factor of  $z_3 (= x_3)$  appears in  $\ell'$  at most  $r - 1$  times. Hence, as (32) the inclusion  $x_3^m (y_1 \cdot y_3 - y_2^{n+1})^r \cdot \ell' \in \mathcal{O}_{A,0}$  should hold, which implies  $m \geq 4r - (r - 1) = 3r + 1$ .

Then,  $\text{ord}_0 f = \text{ord}_0(x_3^m \cdot f_{A_1}) \geq 3r + 1$ , and therefore, taking  $e_1 r > 1$  into account, we have

$$\text{ord}_0 \mathfrak{a}_1^{e_1} = \text{ord}_0 f^{e_1} \geq e_1(3r + 1) > 3.$$

Then, for every prime divisor  $D$  over  $A$  with the center at 0 has the discrepancy  $a(D; A, \mathfrak{a}) < 0$ , which is a contradiction to the condition that  $a(E; A, \mathfrak{a}) \geq 0$ . **QED of Theorem 1.8.**

The condition "general" is necessary as far as we use "standard" blow-ups to construct a required divisor in Theorem 1.8. Actually, we have a non-general ideal such that two standard blow-ups do not give the required divisor.

**Example 5.5.** Let  $f = (x_1 - x_2)^2 + x_3^2 + x_1^4 \in k[x_1, x_2, x_3]$ ,  $e = 6/5$  and  $\mathfrak{a} = (f)^e$ . Define  $E$  as follows:

Let  $\varphi_1 : A_1 \rightarrow A$  be the weighted blow-up with weight  $(1, 1, 2)$  with respect to the coordinates  $\{x_1, x_2, x_3\}$ . Let  $E_1$  be the exceptional divisor of  $\varphi_1$ . Let  $\varphi_2 : A_2 \rightarrow A_1$  be the (usual) blow-up with the center at  $E_1 \cap (f_{A_1} = 0)$ , where  $(f_{A_1})$  is the weak transform of  $(f)$  on  $A_1$ . Let  $E_2$  be the exceptional divisor of  $\varphi_2$ . Let  $\varphi_3 : \tilde{A} \rightarrow A_2$  be the (usual) blow-up with the center at  $E_2 \cap (f_{A_2} = 0)$ , where  $(f_{A_2})$  is the weak transform of  $(f)$  on  $A_2$ . Let  $E$  be the exceptional divisor of  $\varphi_3$ . Then,  $\varphi_1$  and  $\varphi_2$  are standard blow-ups for  $E$ ,  $\mathfrak{a}$  is not general for  $E$  and the following hold:

$$0 = a(E; A, \mathfrak{a}) < a(E_2; A, \mathfrak{a}) = \frac{1}{5} < a(E_1; A, \mathfrak{a}) = \frac{3}{5}.$$

So, we can see that the standard blow-ups do not work for this ideal. But if we do not stick to standard blow-up, we can find two weighted blow-ups to obtain the required  $F$  in the theorem. Let  $\{x'_1, x'_2, x'_3\}$  be another RSP defined by  $x'_i = x_i$  ( $i = 1, 3$ ) and  $x'_2 = x_1 - x_2$ . Then,  $v_E(x'_1) = 1, v_E(x'_2) = 2, v_E(x'_3) = 2$ . (We can see that this RSP is not standard.) Now, let  $\psi_1 : A'_1 \rightarrow A$  be the weighted blow-up with weight  $(1, 2, 2)$  with respect to  $\{x'_1, x'_2, x'_3\}$ . Let  $E'_1$  be the exceptional divisor of  $\psi_1$ . Let  $\psi_2 : A'_2 \rightarrow A'_1$  be the (usual) blow-up with the center at  $E'_1 \cap (f_{A'_1} = 0)$ . Let  $E'_2$  be the exceptional divisor of  $\psi_2$ . Then, we can see that  $E = E_2$  at the generic points. So,  $E$  itself is obtained by two weighted blow-ups.

The example suggests us that we may take an appropriate weighted blow-up to obtain the required  $F$  in the theorem, if  $\mathfrak{a}$  is not general.

**Corollary 5.6** (Corollary 1.9). *Assume  $N = 3$ . Then, for every "general" pair  $(A, \mathfrak{a})$ , the minimal log discrepancy  $\text{mld}(0; A, \mathfrak{a})$  is computed by a prime divisor obtained by at most two weighted blow-ups. More concretely, the blow-ups are standard blow-ups.*

*Proof.* When  $\text{mld}(0; A, \mathfrak{a}) \geq 0$ , then apply the theorem for a divisor  $E$  computing the mld. When  $\text{mld}(0; A, \mathfrak{a}) = -\infty$ , then in a similar way as in [9], take a prime divisor  $E$  computing the mld. Then by taking a positive real number  $t < 1$  such that  $a(E; A, \mathfrak{a}^t) = 0$  and apply Theorem 1.8.  $\square$

**Corollary 5.7.** *Let  $E$  be a prime divisor over  $A$  with the center at 0 and  $E_1 = \mathbb{P}(r, r, s)$  ( $r, s \geq 1$ ) the exceptional divisor of standard blow-up. Assume that  $a(E, A, \mathfrak{a}) \geq 0$  and the center of  $E$  on  $E_1$  is a curve of degree  $> r$ , then there is a prime divisor  $F$  such that*

$$a(F; A, \mathfrak{a}) \leq a(E, A, \mathfrak{a})$$

*holds for every real ideal  $\mathfrak{a}$  and  $F$  is obtained by at most two weighted blow-ups.*

*Proof.* We can see that there is no bad curve on  $E$ . Therefore, every real ideal  $\mathfrak{a}$  is general for  $E$ .  $\square$

The proof of the theorem shows also the following corollary.

**Corollary 5.8.** *Let  $E$  be a prime divisor over  $A$  with the center at 0 computing  $\text{mld}(0; A, \mathfrak{a}) \geq 0$ . Let  $E'$  be the exceptional divisor of a weighted blow-up with weight  $v := (r, s, t)$ , where  $\gcd(r, s, t) = 1$ . Assume that the center  $C$  of  $E$  on  $E'$  is a curve of degree  $d \geq r + s + t - 1$ . If  $\text{mld}(0; A, \mathfrak{a})$  is not computed by  $E'$ , then the mld is computed by the divisor obtained by one additional weighted blow-up at  $C$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $A' \rightarrow A$  be the weighted blow-up with weight  $(r, s, t)$ . By the assumption, we have  $a(E; A, \mathfrak{a}) < a(E'; A, \mathfrak{a})$ . Then, by Lemma 5.2, we have  $\alpha := \text{ord}_P \mathfrak{a}_{A'} \mathcal{O}_{E'} > 1$ , where  $P$  is the generic point of  $C$ . Therefore, we obtain  $v_{E'}(\mathfrak{a}) = \alpha d > r + s + t - 1$ , and therefore  $a(E'; A, \mathfrak{a}) < 1$ . Now, in the same way as Case 1 in the proof of Theorem 1.8, we obtain that the standard blow-up at  $P$  gives a divisor  $F$  satisfying  $a(F; A, \mathfrak{a}) \leq a(E; A, \mathfrak{a}) = \text{mld}(0; A, \mathfrak{a})$ .  $\square$

The following is a special case of the corollary above. Example 3.2 is in this case.

**Corollary 5.9** (Corollary 1.10). *Let  $E$  be a prime divisor over  $A$  with the center at 0 computing  $\text{mld}(0; A, \mathfrak{a}) \geq 0$ . Let  $E'$  be the exceptional divisor of the usual blow-up with the center at 0. Assume that the center  $C$  of  $E$  on  $E'$  is a curve of degree  $d \geq 2$ . Then,  $\text{mld}(0; A, \mathfrak{a})$  is computed by the divisor obtained by one additional weighted blow-up at  $C$ .*

## References

1. S. S. Abhyankar, *Resolution of singularities of embedded algebraic surfaces, 2nd, enl. ed.*, Springer Monographs in Mathematics, Springer (1998)
2. T. De Fernex, L. Ein and S. Ishii, *Divisorial valuations via arcs*, Publ. RIMS, **44**, (2008), 425–448.
3. L. Ein and M. Mustața, *Jet schemes and singularities*, Proc. Symp. Pure Math. **80.2**, (2009), 505–546.
4. S. Ishii, *Maximal divisorial sets in arc spaces*, Adv. St. in Pure Math. 50 (2008), 237–249
5. S. Ishii, *Inversion of modulo  $p$  reduction and a partial descent from characteristic 0 to positive characteristic*, (ArXiv: 1808.10155), Romanian Journal of Pure and Applied Math. Vol. LXIV, No.4 (2019), 431-459.
6. S. Ishii, *The minimal log discrepancies on a smooth surface in positive characteristic*, Math. Zeitschrift, **297**, (2021), 389-39
7. S. Ishii and A. Reguera, *Singularities in arbitrary characteristic via jet schemes*, (ArXiv:1510.05210), Hodge theory and  $L^2$  analysis (2017), 419-449.
8. M. Kawakita, *Discreteness of log discrepancies over log canonical triples on a fixed pair*, J. Algebraic Geom., **23** (2014), no. 4, 765–774.
9. M. Kawakita, *Divisors computing the minimal log discrepancy on a smooth surface*, Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society **163**, No. 1, (2017),187–192.
10. J. Kollár, *Rational Curves on Algebraic Varieties*, Springer-Verlag, Ergebnisse der Math. 32, (1995).
11. J. Kollár, K. Smith and A. Corti, *Rational and Nearly Rational Varieties*, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Math., **92** (2002), 235 pages.
12. M. Mustața and Y. Nakamura, *A boundedness conjecture for minimal log discrepancies on a fixed germ*, AMS Contemporary Mathematics, **712**, (2018), 287–306.

Graduate School of Math. Sci., the University of Tokyo,  
 shihokoishii@mac.com/ shihoko@ms.u-tokyo.ac.jp