

ON K-STABILITY OF CALABI-YAU FIBRATIONS

MASAFUMI HATTORI

ABSTRACT. We study K-stability of algebraic fiber spaces. In this paper, we prove that Calabi-Yau fibrations over curves are uniformly K-stable in an adiabatic sense if and only if the base curves are log-twisted K-stable, where log-twisted K-stability is a variant of K-stability. Moreover, we prove that there are cscK metrics on rational elliptic surfaces that have only reduced fibers.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
Outline of this paper	4
Acknowledgements	5
2. Notation	5
3. K-stability of a fibration via the twisted canonical class of the base	10
4. K-stability of fibrations via log-twisted K-stability	14
4.1. Convergence of α and δ invariant	14
4.2. Klt-trivial fibrations and log-twisted stability	20
5. Applications to Rational Elliptic Surfaces	27
5.1. Log-twisted K-stability of the base curve	27
5.2. GIT-stability in the sense of Miranda I: Weierstrass fibrations	29
5.3. GIT-stability in the sense of Miranda II: Cubic pencils	32
5.4. Applications to Miranda's conjecture on Chow stability	35
Appendix A. Some results on log-twisted Fano pairs	38
A.1. Notation	38
A.2. Ding stability of log-twisted Fano pairs and δ -invariant	40
A.3. Log-twisted K-semistable Fano pair and destabilizing boundary	44
References	49

1. INTRODUCTION

The Yau-Tian-Donaldson (YTD) conjecture predicts that the existence of cscK metrics is equivalent to a purely algebro-geometric condition called K-polystability. In Fano case, the conjecture is solved by Chen-Donaldson-Sun [14] and Tian [85] independently and algebro-geometers made remarkable progress in K-stability of log Fano varieties in ten years. For example, Fujita [37] and Li [59] established the valuative criterion for K-stability of \mathbb{Q} -Fano varieties independently. Fujita and Odaka [38] introduced the δ -invariant and Blum and Jonsson [9] proved that $\delta(X) \geq 1$ if and only if a \mathbb{Q} -Fano variety $(X, -K_X)$ is K-semistable. In the definition of K-stability, (X, L) is K-semistable if and only if the Donaldson-Futaki invariant of any ample test configuration $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ is nonnegative. Even if $X = \mathbb{P}^2$, it had been difficult to prove K-stability of (X, L) in a purely algebro-geometric way at first. However, thanks to the progress, we can characterize K-stable Fano varieties without using test configurations. On the other hand, Odaka [71] proved K-stability of Calabi-Yau varieties and canonically polarized varieties in a purely algebro-geometric way.

In Kähler geometry, the existence problem of cscK metrics on fibrations is studied by [25], [26], [46], [21]. In contrast, K-stability of algebraic fiber spaces is not known so much. In this

paper, fibrations mean algebraic fiber spaces $f : X \rightarrow B$, where f are morphisms of varieties with connected general fiber (cf., Definition 2.6). We call an algebraic fiber space $f : X \rightarrow B$ a *Calabi-Yau fibration* if K_X is relatively trivial over B . Fine [25], [26] and Dervan-Sektnan studied fibrations when all fibers have cscK metrics. On the other hand, Jian-Shi-Song [46] showed existence of a cscK metric of a Calabi-Yau fibration $f : X \rightarrow B$ when $K_X \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} f^* L_0$, L_0 is ample and f might have a singular fiber. They also proved the existence problem for canonically polarized fibrations over curves. By the result of Berman-Darvas-Lu [6], we can conclude that Jian-Shi-Song [46] proved adiabatic K-(poly)stability (cf., Definition 2.6) of such fibrations. In this paper, we generalize the results of Jian-Shi-Song in a purely algebro-geometric way.

On the other hand, it is known for a polarized algebraic space that adiabatic K-semistability of the total space implies twisted K-semistability of the base space by the work of Dervan-Ross [19, Corollary 4.4]. We also obtain a modification of the result of Dervan-Ross for lc-trivial fibrations (cf., Definition 4.14) and that some stability (log-twisted K-stability in Definition A.3) of the base gives a sufficient condition for adiabatic K-stability of the total space.

Moreover, we also study K-stability of rational elliptic surfaces. Rational elliptic surfaces are important objects both in algebraic geometry and Kähler geometry respectively. In algebraic geometry, Miranda [64], [65] constructed two moduli spaces of rational elliptic surfaces by applying GIT. In the two results, Miranda realized that GIT-stability of a rational elliptic surface X depends on what fiber X has, and furthermore, he conjectured in [66] that asymptotic Chow stability of rational Weierstrass fibrations would be decided by their fibers similarly to the results of [64], [65]. In this paper, we prove that if rational elliptic surfaces have only reduced fibers, then they are adiabatically K-stable and have cscK metrics. In contrast, we also prove that if a rational elliptic surface has at least one “bad” fiber, then it is adiabatically K-unstable.

The main purpose of the paper is to classify adiabatic K-stable Calabi-Yau and canonically polarized fibrations over curves. In [45, Theorem C], we showed that Calabi-Yau fibrations are f-stable. Taking [45, Conjecture] into account, it is natural to conjecture that adiabatic K-stability of Calabi-Yau fibrations is decided by K-stability of the bases in a certain sense. We prove the following main theorems A and B.

Theorem A (Theorem 4.12). *Let $f : (X, \Delta) \rightarrow C$ be a lc-trivial fibration. Let also (C, L) be a polarized normal variety and (X, Δ, H) be a polarized pair. Let*

$$K_X + \Delta = f^*(K_C + M_C + B_C)$$

be the canonical bundle formula (cf., Definition 4.14). If the moduli divisor M_C is \mathbb{Q} -Cartier and (X, Δ, H) is adiabatically K-semistable, then (C, B_C, M_C, L) is log-twisted K-semistable (see Appendix and Definition A.3).

The proof of Theorem A is inspired by [19, Proposition 4.3]. As in the proof of [19, Proposition 4.3], we take test configurations \mathcal{X} for X and \mathcal{C} for C respectively. Applying the canonical bundle formulae of Fujino-Mori [35], Ambro [1] and Fujino-Gongyo [33] and results in MMP (cf., [41], [43]) to the morphism $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$, we analyze the relative canonical bundle $K_{\mathcal{X}/\mathcal{C}}$ more explicitly.

If the base is a curve, we obtain the following partial converse of Theorem A.

Theorem B (Theorem 4.6, Corollary 4.24). *Let $f : (X, \Delta, H) \rightarrow (C, L)$ be a polarized algebraic fiber space pair such that C is a smooth curve, (X, Δ) is klt and $K_X + \Delta \sim_{C, \mathbb{Q}} 0$. Let M be the moduli divisor and B be the discriminant divisor on C as Definition 4.14.*

Then, (X, Δ, H) is uniformly adiabatically K-stable over (C, L) if and only if (C, B, M, L) is log-twisted K-stable. Here, uniform adiabatic K-stability is a stronger condition than adiabatic K-stability (Definition 2.6). Moreover, if $\Delta = 0$, X is smooth and (C, B, M, L) is log-twisted K-stable, then $(X, \epsilon H + L)$ has a cscK metric for sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$.

Remark 1.1. We introduce the log-twisted K-stability of log-twisted pairs as a generalization of log and twisted K-stability of [76] and [18] respectively.

This theorem states that adiabatic K-stability of any Calabi-Yau fibration over a curve depends almost completely on the log-twisted K-stability of the base. We explain the proof briefly here. Let $f : (X, \Delta, H) \rightarrow (B, L)$ be a polarized algebraic fiber space pair. Here, we do not assume that B is a curve. Then, we introduce the twisted canonical class κ_B of B (Definition 3.1) after Fine [26, Theorem 1.1]. We can check that bases of fibrations treated in [46] have the ample twisted canonical classes and generalize the result of Jian-Shi-Song for surfaces by applying results of the author [44, Theorem A] on J-stability as follows,

Theorem C (Corollary 3.13). *Let $f : (X, \Delta) \rightarrow B$ be a lc algebraic fiber space pair over a smooth curve B . Suppose that $\dim X = 2$ and $K_X + \Delta$ is f -ample. If $\deg \kappa_B \geq 0$ for $(X, K_X + \Delta) \rightarrow B$, then $(X, \Delta, K_X + \Delta)$ is adiabatically K-semistable over (B, L) (if furthermore $\deg \kappa_B > 0$ or (X, Δ) is klt, then it is adiabatically uniformly K-stable), where L is a line bundle of degree 1 on B . Moreover, if $\deg \kappa_B \geq 0$, $\Delta = 0$ and X is smooth, $(X, \epsilon K_X + f^*L)$ has cscK metrics for sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$.*

Remark 1.2. Theorem C is different from [46, Theorem 1.2] in that we do not assume that $K_X + \Delta$ is ample here. We also treat the case when $\deg \kappa_B < 0$ in Corollary 4.11.

Note that $\deg \kappa_C \geq 0$ if and only if the log-twisted pair (C, B, M, L) is general type or Calabi-Yau in Theorem B. In this case, the theorem is solved in [44, Theorem G].

Next, we discuss adiabatic K-stability of klt-trivial fibrations $f : (X, \Delta) \rightarrow C$ such that κ_C is not ample (e.g., rational elliptic surfaces). Here, klt (resp., lc)-trivial fibration is an algebraic fiber space pair such that $K_X + \Delta \sim_{C, \mathbb{Q}} 0$ and (X, Δ) is klt (resp., lc). By the argument before Theorem C, it remains to prove Theorem B in this case. We study klt-trivial fibrations over curves such that $-\kappa_C$ is ample by applying the calculation of δ -invariant (cf., [9]) and Theorem A.

The proof of Theorem B when $\deg \kappa_C < 0$ consists of two parts. First, we prove the following theorem.

Theorem D (Theorems 4.2, 4.4). *Let $f : (X, \Delta, H) \rightarrow (C, L)$ be a polarized algebraic fiber space pair. Suppose that (X, Δ) is a klt pair, C is a smooth curve and $\deg L = 1$. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \alpha_{(X, \Delta)}(\epsilon H + f^*L) &= \inf_{p \in C} \text{lct}_{(X, \Delta)}(f^{-1}(p)), \\ \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \delta_{(X, \Delta)}(\epsilon H + f^*L) &= 2 \inf_{p \in C} \text{lct}_{(X, \Delta)}(f^{-1}(p)). \end{aligned}$$

Here, we explain α -invariant and δ -invariant. α -invariant is introduced by Tian [83] for Fano manifolds to detect the existence of Kähler-Einstein metrics. α and δ -invariants are important for K-stability in the following sense. It is known that a polarized klt (resp., Fano) pair with a large α (resp., δ)-invariant is automatically uniformly K-stable. See the details in [74], [9] and Definitions 2.12, 2.13. It has been known that α -invariant and δ -invariant are continuous on the ample cone by Dervan [17] and Zhang [86] respectively. In other words, this theorem states that we can extend them to the fiber class continuously. On the other hand, we prove the following fact that was already known in the case when X is smooth and $\Delta = 0$ by [12, Corollary 2.11].

Fact E (Theorem A.13). *Let (X, Δ, L) be a polarized klt pair. Then*

$$\delta_{(X, \Delta)}(L) \leq \sup\{\lambda > 0 \mid H_{\Delta}^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) \geq \lambda(I^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) - J^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}))\}$$

where $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ runs over the normal semiample test configurations for (X, L) .

Combining Theorem D with Fact E, we prove that (X, Δ, H) is uniformly adiabatically K-stable over (C, L) if (C, B, M, L) is log-twisted K-stable. Next, we want to prove the converse of Theorem B. Indeed, we can prove the following stronger result than Theorem A when the base is log-twisted Fano.

Theorem F (Theorem 4.23). *Notations as in Theorem A. Suppose that (X, Δ, H) is uniformly adiabatically K -stable over (C, L) , (X, Δ) is klt and $L = -(K_C + M + B)$ is ample. Then (C, B, M, L) is log-twisted K -stable.*

We prove Theorem F by applying Theorem A and the following fact.

Fact G (Theorem A.20). *Let $(X, B, T, L = -K_X - B - T)$ be a strictly K -semistable log-twisted Fano pair such that T is semiample (i.e., (X, B, T, L) is K -semistable but not K -stable). Then there exists a \mathbb{Q} -Cartier divisor $D \in |L|_{\mathbb{Q}}$ such that $(X, B + \epsilon D, T, (1 - \epsilon)L)$ is a K -unstable log-twisted Fano pair for sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$.*

As an application of Theorem B to rational elliptic surfaces, we obtain the following,

Corollary H (Corollary 5.3, 5.4). *Let X be a smooth rational elliptic surface and S be a relatively ample divisor over \mathbb{P}^1 . Let also the multiplicity of a unique multiple fiber be $m \geq 1$. Then the following hold.*

- (1) *If $m = 1$ and X has at most reduced fibers, then (X, S) is uniformly adiabatically K -stable and has cscK metrics.*
- (2) *If $m = 2$ and X has no II^* or III^* -type fiber, then (X, S) is uniformly adiabatically K -stable and has cscK metrics.*
- (3) *If $m = 3$ and X has no II^* -type fiber, then (X, S) is uniformly adiabatically K -stable and has cscK metrics.*
- (4) *If $m \geq 4$, then (X, S) is uniformly adiabatically K -stable and has cscK metrics.*

On the other hand,

- (i) *If $m = 1$ and X admits one of II^* , III^* or IV^* -type fibers, then (X, S) is adiabatically K -unstable over \mathbb{P}^1 .*
- (ii) *If $m = 2$ and X admits a II^* -type fiber, then (X, S) is adiabatically K -unstable over \mathbb{P}^1 .*

On the other hand, recall Miranda's conjecture on Chow-stability [66, Conjecture 2.3].

Conjecture (Miranda). *Let W be a rational Weierstrass fibration, X be the minimal resolution and H be an arbitrary ample line bundle. Then, (W, H) is*

- (a) asymptotically Chow-stable if X has only reduced fibers,
- (b) asymptotically Chow-semistable if X has only reduced and I_N^* -type fibers for $N \geq 0$,
- (c) asymptotically Chow-unstable if X has at least one II^* , III^* or IV^* -type fiber.

We also partially settle this conjecture.

Theorem I (Theorems 5.21, 5.24). *Let X be a smooth rational elliptic surface and S be a section over \mathbb{P}^1 . Let W be the log canonical model of (X, S) over \mathbb{P}^1 . Let $f : W \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$ be the fibration and $L = \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(1)$. Then the following hold;*

- (1) *If W has at least one II^* , III^* , IV^* -type fiber, then $(W, aS + f^*L)$ is K -unstable for $0 < a < 1$.*
- (2) *If W has at least one I_N^* -type fiber for some $N > 0$, then $(W, aS + f^*L)$ is asymptotically Chow-unstable for sufficiently small $a > 0$.*

Thus, Conjecture (c) holds for W such that the Picard number $\rho(W) = 2$ and (b) fails in general.

Outline of this paper. We consider a relationship between adiabatic K -stability of the total space and log-twisted K -stability of the base variety (Definition 2.6). In §3, we introduce the twisted canonical class after Fine [26, Theorem 1.1] and we prove that the positivity of the twisted canonical classes of the base spaces implies adiabatic K -stability of some algebraic fiber spaces. In §4, we consider Calabi-Yau fibrations with the negative twisted canonical classes. In §§4.1, we prove Theorem D and obtain that log-twisted K -stability of the base Fano curve implies adiabatic K -stability of the total space of a klt-trivial fibration as in Theorem B. In §§4.2, we prove Theorem A and Theorem B completely by applying MMP. Finally, we apply the

theorems we obtain to rational elliptic surfaces in §5. In §§5.1, we classify log-twisted K-stable Fano curves associated with rational elliptic surfaces and have Corollary H. In §§5.2, §§5.3, we compare adiabatic K-stability of rational elliptic surfaces with results on GIT of Miranda [65] and [64] respectively by the CM line bundle and a method of [75]. In §§5.4, we apply the methods used in §§4.2, §§5.2 and results in differential geometry to show Theorem I.

In Appendix, we introduce log-twisted K-stability and state the results on this. In §§A.1, we define log-twisted K-stability as Dervan defined twisted K-stability in [18]. In §§A.2, we consider log-twisted Ding stability when the twist T is not nef and deduce Fact E. In §§A.3, we prove Fact G. To do this, we generalize the results of Li-Xu [61], Fujita [37] and Blum-Liu-Zhou [10] to the case when T is semiample.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author is grateful to his research advisor Professor Yuji Odaka for a lot of suggestive advices and productive discussions. The author would like to thank him and Doctor Keita Goto for careful reading my draft. The author is also grateful to Professor Yoshinori Hashimoto for giving him a lecture on the paper [87]. The author would like to thank Doctor Eiji Inoue for fruitful discussions and letting him know Fact E in the smooth case in [12]. Discussions with them led the author to improve Theorem B. The author is grateful to Professor Kenta Hashizume for productive discussions and letting the author know his great paper [43], which led the author to improve the proof of Proposition 4.19.

2. NOTATION

In this paper, we work over the complex number field \mathbb{C} . (X, Δ, L) is a polarized log pair if X is a proper normal variety over \mathbb{C} , Δ is a \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X such that $K_{(X, \Delta)} := K_X + \Delta$ is \mathbb{Q} -Cartier and L is a \mathbb{Q} -ample line bundle. For any divisorial valuation $v = \text{cord}_F$ where F is a prime divisor over X , the log discrepancy of (X, Δ) with respect to v is defined as follows. We choose a log resolution $\sigma : Y \rightarrow X$ of (X, Δ) such that F is a smooth prime divisor on Y and then define

$$A_{(X, \Delta)}(v) = v(K_Y + F - \sigma^*(K_X + \Delta)).$$

See the details in [11, §1.5]. In this section, we define K-stability of polarized log pairs as [11]. For deminormal schemes, we follow the definitions of test configuration, J-stability and K-stability from [45].

Fix a polarized log pair (X, Δ, L) .

Definition 2.1 (Test configuration). Let $\pi : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{A}^1$ be a proper and flat morphism such that π is \mathbb{G}_m -equivariant. Here, \mathbb{A}^1 admits the canonical \mathbb{G}_m -action. If $\pi^{-1}(1) \cong X$, π or \mathcal{X} is called a *test configuration*. Let \mathcal{X} be a test configuration. Assume that \mathcal{X} admits an \mathbb{A}^1 -(semi)ample \mathbb{G}_m -linearized \mathbb{Q} -line bundle \mathcal{L} such that $\mathcal{L}|_{\pi^{-1}(1)} = L$. Then, $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ is called a *(semi)ample test configuration* for (X, L) .

If $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ is \mathbb{G}_m -equivariantly isomorphic to $(X \times \mathbb{A}^1, L \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{A}^1})$, then we call this the trivial test configuration and denote it by $(X_{\mathbb{A}^1}, L_{\mathbb{A}^1})$.

Notation. For simplicity, we will denote line bundles and divisors interchangeably and write self intersection products as m -th power of divisors. For instance,

$$L^m \cdot (kH + D) = L^m \cdot (H^{\otimes k} \otimes \mathcal{O}_X(D)).$$

We define the following functionals and the Donaldson-Futaki invariant as in [11].

Definition 2.2 ([11, §6, §7]). Let $\dim X = n$ and take an arbitrary normal semiample test configuration $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$. To consider intersection products, we need the \mathbb{G}_m -equivariant compactification over \mathbb{P}^1 , $(\overline{\mathcal{X}}, \overline{\mathcal{L}})$ (See [11, Definition 2.7]). Then, let $\rho : \overline{\mathcal{X}} \dashrightarrow X_{\mathbb{P}^1}$ be the canonical \mathbb{G}_m -equivariant birational map such that ρ is identical on $X \times \mathbb{P}^1 \setminus 0$, where $(X_{\mathbb{P}^1}, L_{\mathbb{P}^1}) = (\overline{X_{\mathbb{A}^1}}, \overline{L_{\mathbb{A}^1}})$, the canonical compactification. If ρ satisfies the above condition, ρ

is called the *canonical* map. Assume that ρ is a morphism by resolution of indeterminacy. Furthermore, let $\mathcal{X}_{0,\text{red}}$ be the reduced central fiber, $\Delta_{\overline{\mathcal{X}}}$ be the closure of $\Delta \times \mathbb{A}^1 \setminus 0$ in $\overline{\mathcal{X}}$ and $K_{(\overline{\mathcal{X}}, \Delta_{\overline{\mathcal{X}}})/\mathbb{P}^1}^{\log} = K_{(\overline{\mathcal{X}}, \Delta_{\overline{\mathcal{X}}})/\mathbb{P}^1} + (\mathcal{X}_{0,\text{red}} - \mathcal{X}_0)$. Then we define

- $I^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) = (L^n)^{-1}(\overline{\mathcal{L}} \cdot \rho^* L_{\mathbb{P}^1}^n) - (L^n)^{-1}(\overline{\mathcal{L}} - \rho^* L_{\mathbb{P}^1}) \cdot \overline{\mathcal{L}}^n$,
- $E^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) = \frac{\overline{\mathcal{L}}^{n+1}}{(n+1)(L^n)}$,
- $J^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) = (L^n)^{-1}(\overline{\mathcal{L}} \cdot \rho^* L_{\mathbb{P}^1}^n) - E^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$,
- $(\mathcal{J}^H)^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) = (L^n)^{-1}(\rho^* H_{\mathbb{P}^1} \cdot \overline{\mathcal{L}}^n) - (L^n)^{-1}(nH \cdot L^{n-1})E^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ where H is a \mathbb{Q} -line bundle on X ,
- $H_{\Delta}^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) = (L^n)^{-1} \sum_E A_{(X,B)}(v_E)(E \cdot \overline{\mathcal{L}}^n) = (L^n)^{-1}(K_{(\overline{\mathcal{X}}, \Delta_{\overline{\mathcal{X}}})/\mathbb{P}^1}^{\log} - \rho^* K_{(X_{\mathbb{P}^1}, \Delta_{\mathbb{P}^1})/\mathbb{P}^1}) \cdot \overline{\mathcal{L}}^n$ where E runs over the irreducible components of \mathcal{X}_0 , $v_E =$ the restriction of $b_E^{-1} \text{ord}_E$ to the quotient field of X and $b_E = \text{ord}_E(\mathcal{X}_0)$ (v_E is known to be a divisorial valuation or trivial. See the details in [11, §4]),
- $R_{\Delta}^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) = (\mathcal{J}^{K(X,\Delta)})^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) + \frac{n(K(X,\Delta) \cdot L^{n-1})}{(L^n)} E^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$,
- $\text{DF}_{\Delta}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) = (L^n)^{-1}(K_{(\overline{\mathcal{X}}, \Delta_{\overline{\mathcal{X}}})/\mathbb{P}^1} - \rho^* K_{(X_{\mathbb{P}^1}, \Delta_{\mathbb{P}^1})/\mathbb{P}^1}) \cdot \overline{\mathcal{L}}^n + (\mathcal{J}^{K(X,\Delta)})^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$,
- $M_{\Delta}^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) = H_{\Delta}^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) + (\mathcal{J}^{K(X,\Delta)})^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$.

For simplicity, we will denote $(\overline{\mathcal{X}}, \overline{\mathcal{L}})$ as $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$. A semiample test configuration $(\tilde{\mathcal{X}}, \tilde{\mathcal{L}})$ *dominates* $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ via μ if there exists a \mathbb{G}_m -equivariant morphism $\mu : \tilde{\mathcal{X}} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ such that μ is identical on $\mathcal{X} \setminus \mathcal{X}_0$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{L}} = \mu^* \mathcal{L}$. It is proved in [11, §§7.5] that those functionals are *pullback invariant* as defined in [11]. For example, if $(\tilde{\mathcal{X}}, \tilde{\mathcal{L}})$ dominates $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ then $J^{\text{NA}}(\tilde{\mathcal{X}}, \tilde{\mathcal{L}}) = J^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$. We define two semiample test configurations $(\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{L}_i)$ ($i = 1, 2$) are equivalent if there exists a test configuration $(\mathcal{X}_3, \mathcal{L}_3)$ that dominates both of $(\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{L}_i)$. Then let $\mathcal{H}^{\text{NA}}(L) = \{\text{semiample test configurations for } (X, L)\} / \sim$ be the set of all *non-Archimedean positive metrics* for (X, L) where \sim means the equivalence relation. It is well-known that the functionals above are independent of the choice of representatives of $\phi \in \mathcal{H}^{\text{NA}}(L)$. See the details in [11, §6,7].

Remark 2.3. We can define the (log) Donaldson-Futaki invariant for nonnormal test configurations by using the \mathbb{G}_m -actions on \mathcal{X} and $\Delta_{\mathcal{X}}$. See the details in [76], [18] and [11].

Definition 2.4 (K-stability and J-stability). Let (X, Δ, L) be a polarized log pair. (X, Δ, L) is *K-stable* if

$$\text{DF}_{\Delta}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) > 0$$

for any non-trivial normal semiample test configuration. On the other hand, (X, Δ, L) is *uniformly K-stable* (resp, *K-semistable*) if there exists a constant $c > 0$ (resp., $c \geq 0$) such that

$$\text{DF}_{\Delta}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) \geq c I^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$$

for any semiample test configuration. The above condition is known by [11, §8] to be equivalent to

$$M_{\Delta}^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) \geq c I^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}).$$

The definition of J^H -stability is of similar form (cf., [44]). On the other hand, (X, Δ, L) is *K-polystable* if for any normal semiample test configuration $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$,

$$\text{DF}_{\Delta}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) = 0$$

if and only if $(\mathcal{X}, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}})$ is isomorphic to $(X \times \mathbb{A}^1, \Delta \times \mathbb{A}^1)$ as an abstract log pair.

Note that I^{NA} , J^{NA} and $I^{\text{NA}} - J^{\text{NA}}$ are nonnegative and equivalent norms in the sense of [11, Proposition 7.8].

Let us recall the scaling action to a non-Archimedean metric [11, §6.2].

Definition 2.5. Let $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ be a normal semiample test configuration and $d \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. Then let $(\mathcal{X}^{(d)}, \mathcal{L}^{(d)})$ be the normalized base change of $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ via the d -th power map $\mathbb{A}^1 \ni t \mapsto t^d \in \mathbb{A}^1$. If $\phi \in \mathcal{H}^{\text{NA}}(L)$ is represented by $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$, we denote by $\phi^{(d)}$ the metric represented by $(\mathcal{X}^{(d)}, \mathcal{L}^{(d)})$.

It is well-known that $dM_{\Delta}^{\text{NA}}(\phi) = M_{\Delta}^{\text{NA}}(\phi_d)$ and $dDF_{\Delta}(\phi) \geq DF_{\Delta}(\phi_d)$ for any $d \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. See the details in [11, Proposition 7.16].

In this paper, we study K-stability of algebraic fiber spaces.

Definition 2.6. A *polarized algebraic fiber space pair* $f : (X, \Delta, H) \rightarrow (B, L)$ is a surjective morphism of polarized normal pairs with connected geometric fibers such that H is an f -ample line bundle. Let $f : (X, \Delta, H) \rightarrow (C, L)$ be a polarized algebraic fiber space pair. Then (X, Δ, H) is *adiabatically K-stable over* (C, L) if $(X, \epsilon H + f^*L)$ is K-stable for sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$. Adiabatic K-semistability and K-polystability is defined in a similar way. Furthermore, (X, Δ, H) is

- *uniformly adiabatically K-stable over* (C, L) if there exist positive constants $\delta > 0$ and $\epsilon_0 > 0$ such that if $0 < \epsilon < \epsilon_0$ and $\epsilon H + f^*L$ is ample on X , $DF_{\Delta}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{M}) \geq \delta J^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{M})$ for any semiample test configuration $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{M})$ for $(X, \epsilon H + f^*L)$,
- *adiabatically K-unstable over* (C, L) if for sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a semiample test configuration $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{M})$ for $(X, \epsilon H + f^*L)$ such that $DF_{\Delta}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{M}) < 0$.

We call (X, H) has *cscK metrics adiabatically* if X is smooth, $\Delta = 0$ and $(X, \delta H + f^*L)$ has a cscK metric for sufficiently small $\delta > 0$. Here, we will denote $H + f^*L$ by $H + L$ for simplicity. See the detail in Notation after [45, Remark 2.17].

On the other hand, we need to recall the geometric invariant theory (GIT).

Definition 2.7. Let (X, L) be a polarized variety and G be a reductive algebraic group. Here, we do not assume that X is proper. We define G -linearization of a \mathbb{Q} -line bundle where G is an algebraic group (cf., [70, Definition 1.6]) as follows. Let X be a proper scheme and G act on X . A \mathbb{Q} -line bundle L on X is G -linearized if mL has a G -linearization for sufficiently divisible $m \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. If (X, L) is a polarized scheme, an algebraic group G act on X and L is G -linearized, then we call that G acts on (X, L) .

Suppose that G acts on (X, L) . For any $s \in H^0(X, mL)$, we define $X_s = \{x \in X | s(x) \neq 0\}$. If $r \in \mathbb{Z}$ satisfies that rL is \mathbb{Z} -Cartier, then $R(X, rL) := \bigoplus_{m \geq 0} H^0(X, mrL)$ has the induced G -action. $x \in X$ is *GIT-semistable* (resp., *GIT-polystable*; *GIT-stable*) if there exist $m > 0$ and a non-constant G -invariant function $f \in H^0(X, mrL)$ such that X_f is affine and $x \in X_f$ (resp., $G \cdot x$ is closed in X_f ; x is GIT-polystable and its stabilizer group is finite). See the details in [70, Definition 1.6].

Further, suppose that X is proper. A *one-parameter subgroup* (1-PS) λ of G is an algebraic group homomorphism $\lambda : \mathbb{G}_m \rightarrow G$. The *Hilbert-Mumford weight* (*GIT-weight*) $\mu^L(x, \lambda)$ of λ and $x \in X$ defined as follows. Let $y = \lim_{q \rightarrow 0} \lambda(q) \cdot x$ and $\mu^L(x, \lambda)$ is the weight of $L|_y$. Then, $x \in X$ is GIT-(semi)stable if and only if $\mu^L(x, \lambda) > 0$ (resp., ≥ 0) for any 1-PS λ (cf., [70, Theorem 2.1]). See the detail in [70].

Let (V, M) be a polarized variety. First, suppose that M is very ample and $V \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}^N$ is the corresponding embedding. Then, (V, M) is *Chow-(semi)stable* if its Chow form is GIT-(semi)stable in the Chow variety with the natural polarization with respect to the natural $SL(N+1)$ -action. Secondly, suppose that M is a \mathbb{Q} -ample line bundle. Then, (V, M) is *asymptotically Chow-(semi)stable* if (V, M^n) is Chow-(semi)stable for $n \gg 0$. See the detail and the definition of asymptotic Hilbert-stability in [69] or [78].

Next, let us recall the definition of the log CM line bundle (cf., [27]) as follows.

Definition 2.8. Let $f : X \rightarrow B$ be a flat and proper morphism with a generic geometric integral fiber of relative dimension $n \geq 1$ and L be an f -ample line bundle on X such that $R^i f_* L = 0$ for $i > 0$. Let also

$$\det(f_* L^{\otimes m}) = \bigotimes_{j=0}^{n+1} \mathcal{M}_j^{\otimes \binom{m}{j}}$$

be the Knudsen-Mumford expansion [49, Theorem 4]. The *Hilbert bundle* of f is the line bundle

$$\mathrm{Hilb}(X, L^{\otimes r}, k) = \det(f_* L^{\otimes kr})^{\otimes p(r)} \otimes \det(f_* L^{\otimes r})^{\otimes -kp(kr)}$$

for $k, r > 0$ where $p(r) = \mathrm{rank} f_* L^{\otimes r}$. The *Chow bundle* of f is the \mathbb{Q} -line bundle

$$\mathrm{Chow}(X, L) = \mathcal{M}_{n+1} \otimes \det(f_* L)^{\otimes -\frac{a_0(n+1)!}{p(1)}},$$

where $p(m) = a_0 m^n + a_1 m^{n-1} + O(m^{n-2})$. In [27], $\mathrm{Chow}(X, L)^{\otimes p(1)}$ is called the Cornalba-Harris line bundle. It is easy to check that the Hilbert bundle and the Chow bundle do not change when we replace L by $L \otimes f^* \sigma$ for any line bundle σ on B (cf., [27]). Let $\mu = \frac{2a_1}{a_0}$. Then, the *CM line bundle* of $f : (X, L) \rightarrow B$ is

$$\lambda_{\mathrm{CM}}(X, L) = \mathcal{M}_{n+1}^{\otimes \mu + n(n+1)} \otimes \mathcal{M}_n^{\otimes -2(n+1)}.$$

Let D be a relative Cartier divisor of X over B such that $R^i(f|_D)_* L|_D = 0$ for $i > 0$. We define the following line bundle

$$\mathrm{RelHilb}_D(X, L^{\otimes r}, k) = \det((f|_D)_* L|_D^{\otimes kr})^{\otimes p(r)} \otimes \det(f_* L^{\otimes r})^{\otimes -kq(kr)}$$

for $k, r > 0$ where $q(r) = \mathrm{rank} (f|_D)_* L|_D^{\otimes r}$. Let also

$$\det((f|_D)_* L|_D^{\otimes m}) = \bigotimes_{j=0}^n \mathcal{N}_j^{\otimes \binom{m}{j}}$$

be the Knudsen-Mumford expansion. Let \hat{a}_0 be the rational number such that $q(m) = \hat{a}_0 m^{n-1} + O(m^{n-2})$ and $\hat{\mu} = \frac{\hat{a}_0}{a_0}$. Then, the following line bundle

$$\mathcal{N}_n^{\otimes (n+1)} \otimes \mathcal{M}_{n+1}^{\otimes -\hat{\mu}}$$

is the leading order term of $\mathrm{RelHilb}_D(X, L^{\otimes r}, k)$ for $k \gg r \gg 0$. More precisely, we can prove that there exist line bundles $\epsilon_{i,j}$ on B such that

$$\mathrm{RelHilb}_D(X, L^{\otimes r}, k) = (\mathcal{N}_n^{\otimes (n+1)} \otimes \mathcal{M}_{n+1}^{\otimes -\hat{\mu}})^{\otimes \frac{a_0}{(n+1)!} k^{2n} r^n} \otimes \bigotimes_{0 \leq i \leq 2n-1, 0 \leq j \leq n-1} \epsilon_{i,j}^{\otimes k^i r^j}$$

as [27, Proposition 3.1]. Then, we define the *log CM line bundle* of $f : (X, D, L) \rightarrow B$ as

$$\lambda_{\mathrm{CM}}(X, D, L) = \lambda_{\mathrm{CM}}(X, L) \otimes (\mathcal{N}_n^{\otimes (n+1)} \otimes \mathcal{M}_{n+1}^{\otimes -\hat{\mu}}).$$

Lemma 2.9 (cf., [27, Lemma 2.5, Proposition 3.1]). *Notations as in Definition 2.8. Suppose also that a reductive algebraic group G acts on $f : (X, D, L) \rightarrow B$. Then, \mathcal{M}_j and \mathcal{N}_i are G -linearized. Further, suppose that $G = \mathbb{G}_m$ and $b \in B$ is a fixed point. Write the weight of $H^0(D_b, L|_{D_b}^{\otimes k})$ as a polynomial in k with coefficients (cf., [11, Theorem 3.1])*

$$\hat{w}(k) = \hat{b}_0 k^n + O(k^{n-1}).$$

Then, the weight of $\mathcal{N}_n^{\otimes (n+1)} \otimes \mathcal{M}_{n+1}^{\otimes -\hat{\mu}}|_b$ is

$$\frac{(n+1)!}{a_0} (\hat{b}_0 a_0 - \hat{a}_0 b_0).$$

The proof is straightforward (cf., [27]). Thus, we can conclude that the weight of $\lambda_{\mathrm{CM}}(X, D, L)|_b$ is a positive multiple of the log Donaldson-Futaki invariant (cf., [18, Definition 3.25]). More precisely,

Proposition 2.10. *Notations as in Definition 2.9. Write the weight of $H^0(X_b, L_b^{\otimes k})$ as a polynomial in k with coefficients*

$$w(k) = b_0 k^{n+1} + b_1 k^n + O(k^{n-2}).$$

Then, the weight of $\lambda_{\mathrm{CM}}(X, D, L)|_b$ is

$$2 \frac{(n+1)!}{a_0} (b_1 a_0 - a_1 b_0) + \frac{(n+1)!}{a_0} (\hat{b}_0 a_0 - \hat{a}_0 b_0).$$

We will apply this proposition in Example 5.13.

On the other hand, recall the definition of the log canonical threshold and the α -invariant. We also recall the δ -invariant in [38].

Definition 2.11. Let (X, B) be a normal pair and D be an effective \mathbb{Q} -Cartier divisor. Suppose that there exists $l \in \mathbb{Q}$ such that $(X, B + lD)$ is sublc. Then the *log canonical threshold* of (X, B) with respect to D is

$$\text{lct}_{(X,B)}(D) = \inf\{r \in \mathbb{Q} \mid (X, B + rD) \text{ is sublc}\} = \min_v \frac{A_{(X,B)}(v)}{v(D)}$$

where v runs over the divisorial valuations such that $v(D) \neq 0$.

Definition 2.12. Let (X, B, L) be a polarized klt pair. Then the *alpha invariant* of (X, B) with respect to L is

$$\alpha_{(X,B)}(L) = \inf_D \text{lct}_{(X,B)}(D)$$

where D runs over the elements of $|L|_{\mathbb{Q}}$. Here, $|L|_{\mathbb{Q}}$ is the set of effective \mathbb{Q} -Cartier \mathbb{Q} -divisors D such that $D \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} L$.

Definition 2.13. Let (X, B, L) be a polarized klt pair. Suppose first that L is a line bundle. $D \in |L|_{\mathbb{Q}}$ is a divisor of *m -basis type* if there exists a basis $\{f_j\}_{j=1}^{h^0(X, mL)} \subset H^0(X, mL)$ such that

$$D = (mh^0(X, mL))^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^{h^0(X, mL)} \text{div}(f_j).$$

Then, we set

$$\delta_{(X,B)}^m(L) = \inf_D \text{lct}_{(X,B)}(D)$$

where $D \in |L|_{\mathbb{Q}}$ runs over the divisors of m -basis type. $|L|_{m\text{-basis}}$ denotes the set of all m -basis type divisor D with respect to L . By the result of [9], $\{\delta_{(X,B)}^m(L)\}_{m=1}^{\infty}$ converges and let the *delta invariant* of (X, B) with respect to L be

$$\delta_{(X,B)}(L) = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \delta_{(X,B)}^m(L).$$

Moreover, thanks to [9], we can extend the definition for ample \mathbb{Q} -line bundles L as

$$\delta_{(X,B)}(L) = \inf_v \frac{A_{(X,B)}(v)}{S_L(v)}$$

where v runs over the divisorial valuations on X and $S_L(v) = \text{vol}(L)^{-1} \int_0^{\infty} \text{vol}(L - xv) dx$. See the details in [9].

α and δ -invariants are important in K-stability in the following sense.

Theorem 2.14 ([11, Proposition 9.16], [9]). *Let (X, B, L) be a klt polarized pair. Then the following hold.*

(1) $\alpha_{(X,B)}(L) > 0$ and

$$H_B^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) \geq \alpha_{(X,B)}(L) I^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$$

for any semiample normal test configuration for (X, L) ,

(2) Suppose that $K_X + B = -L$. Then, (X, B, L) is uniformly K-stable (resp., K-semistable) if and only if $\delta_{(X,B)}(L) > 1$ (resp., ≥ 1).

3. K-STABILITY OF A FIBRATION VIA THE TWISTED CANONICAL CLASS OF THE BASE

In this section, we consider some sufficiency conditions of adiabatic K-stability of algebraic fiber spaces. Dervan and Sektnan [22] introduced their fibration stability and conjectured that this algebraic condition implies the existence of optimal symplectic connections as K-stability and YTD conjecture. Taking [21, Theorems 1.1, 1.2] into account, it is also natural to conjecture that fibration stability (or \mathfrak{f} -stability) and twisted K-stability of base spaces imply adiabatic K-stability of fibrations over curves also when the fibration has a singular fiber. However, this conjecture does not hold even when the general fiber is Calabi-Yau as we will mention in Corollary 5.6 below. On the other hand, Fine [26] introduced the twisted canonical class of the base as we will define below and he gave a sufficiency condition of existence of cscK metrics on smooth fibrations adiabatically. We study the relationship of his twisted canonical class with adiabatic K-stability in Calabi-Yau and canonically polarized fibrations as we stated in §1. Finally, we obtain the main result 3.13 in this section. This is a generalization of a result of Jian-Shi-Song [46, Theorem 1.2].

First, we introduce the following invariant of polarized algebraic fiber spaces,

Definition 3.1. Let $\pi : (X, \Delta, H) \rightarrow (B, L)$ be a polarized algebraic fiber space pair. Suppose that $n = \dim B$ and $m = \text{rel.dim } \pi$. Then *the twisted canonical class* of B with respect to π is the divisor class on B as follows:

$$\kappa_{(X, \Delta, H)/(B, L)} = \frac{\pi_* \left[\left((m+1)K_{(X, \Delta)} - m \frac{K_{(X_b, \Delta_b)} \cdot H_b^{m-1}}{H_b^m} H \right) \cdot H^m \right]}{(m+1)H_b^m},$$

where $b \in B$ is a general point. We will denote the twisted canonical class of B by $\kappa_B = \kappa_{(X, \Delta, H)/(B, L)}$ simply.

Suppose that κ_B as above is nef (resp. ample) then

$$\left((m+1)K_{(X, \Delta)} - m \frac{K_{(X_b, \Delta_b)} \cdot H_b^{m-1}}{H_b^m} H \right) \cdot H^m \cdot L^{n-1} \geq 0 \quad (\text{resp. } > 0).$$

On the other hand, we can see that

$$S(X_b, \Delta_b, H_b) - S(X, \Delta, H + jL) = \frac{j^{-1}n}{(m+1)H_b^m \cdot L^n} \left((m+1)K_{(X, \Delta)} - m \frac{K_{(X_b, \Delta_b)} \cdot H_b^{m-1}}{H_b^m} H \right) \cdot H^m \cdot L^{n-1} + O(j^{-2}).$$

We can conclude that nefness of κ_B tells us that $S(X_b, \Delta_b, H_b) - S(X, \Delta, H + jL) \geq 0$ for $j \gg 0$. We summarize the argument as follows,

Proposition 3.2. *Notations as above. If κ_B is nef (resp., ample), then*

$$S(X_b, \Delta_b, H_b) - S(X, \Delta, H + jL) \geq 0, \quad (\text{resp., } > 0)$$

for $j \gg 0$. If B is a curve and H is ample, then the converse holds.

Let $\pi : (X, H) \rightarrow (B, L)$ be a smooth fibration of polarized smooth varieties, $\dim B = n$ and $\text{rel.dim } \pi = m$. Fine used the Grothendieck-Riemann-Roch theorem [39, Theorem 15.2] and introduced the rationally equivalent class of divisor κ_B in [26] as follows, (cf., [27, (2.4)])

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa_B &= \frac{c_1(L_{\text{CM}})}{(m+1)\pi_*(c_1(H)^m)} - c_1(B) \\ &= \frac{\pi_* \left[\left((m+1)K_{X/B} - m \frac{K_{X_b} \cdot H_b^{m-1}}{H_b^m} H \right) \cdot H^m \right]}{(m+1)H_b^m} + K_B \\ &\equiv \frac{\pi_* \left[\left((m+1)K_X - m \frac{K_{X_b} \cdot H_b^{m-1}}{H_b^m} H \right) \cdot H^m \right]}{(m+1)H_b^m}, \end{aligned}$$

where $b \in B$ is a general point and $L_{\text{CM}} = \lambda_{\text{CM}}(X, H)$ is the CM line bundle on B .

Next, we see that if the twisted canonical class is positive, then an algebraic fiber space is adiabatically K-stable under some conditions. Recall the following fact,

Theorem 3.3 (cf., [46, Theorem 1.1], [79, Theorem 1.1], [80, Corollary 1.3], [44, Theorem 8.15]). *Let (X, Δ) be a klt minimal pair i.e., $K_X + \Delta$ is nef. Suppose that $f : X \rightarrow B$ is an algebraic fiber space such that there exists a \mathbb{Q} -ample line bundle L on B that satisfies $K_X + \Delta \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} f^*L$. Then $f : (X, \Delta, H) \rightarrow (B, L)$ is uniformly adiabatically K-stable with respect to any relative polarization H on X over B . Moreover, if $\Delta = 0$, X is smooth, then (X, H) has cscK metrics adiabatically.*

Suppose that $f : (X, \Delta, H) \rightarrow (B, L)$ is a polarized algebraic fiber space. If $K_X + \Delta = f^*L_0$ where L_0 is a line bundle on B , then

$$\kappa_B \equiv L_0.$$

It is well-known. In fact, for any integral curve C of B ,

$$\kappa_B \cdot C = \frac{1}{(H_b)^m} C \cdot L_0 \cdot \pi_*(H^m) = L_0 \cdot C$$

where $b \in B$ is a general point. Therefore, we can interpret Theorem 3.3 as follows:

Corollary 3.4. *Notations as above. If κ_B is ample, then (X, Δ, H) is uniformly adiabatically K-stable over (B, κ_B) .*

Therefore, we conclude that positivity of κ_B implies adiabatically K-stability of Iitaka fibrations of klt minimal models.

Remark 3.5. Note that $\kappa_B \equiv K_B + D + M$ where D is the discriminant and M is the moduli divisor (cf., §4.2, Definition 4.14). Thus, κ_B is ample if and only if the log-twisted pair (B, D, M) is canonically polarized. Then (B, D, M, κ_B) is log-twisted K-stable (see §§A.1 for the definition and Proposition A.8).

Remark 3.6. We remark that Theorem 3.3 does not hold for lc pairs. Let $X = \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(\mathcal{O} \oplus \mathcal{O}(e))$ for $e > 0$, C_0 be a section such that $C_0^2 = -e$ and f be the fiber class. Recall that $L = mC_0 + nf$ is ample iff $n > me$ (cf., [42, V Theorem 2.17]). Suppose that $n > me$. Note that

$$2\frac{L \cdot f}{L^2}L - f = C(2C_0 + ef),$$

where $C > 0$ is a positive constant. Since $(2C_0 + ef) \cdot C_0 = -e$, (X, L) is not slope J^f -semistable by [44, Corollary B] and C_0 is a destabilizing subvariety. By [42, V Corollary 2.11], $K_X \equiv -2C_0 - (e + 2)f$. If an ample divisor $H \equiv C_0 + (e + 3)f$ is general, $(X, C_0 + H)$ is plt (cf., [55, Definition 2.34]) and $K_X + C_0 + H \equiv f$. If $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ is the deformation to the normal cone of C_0 for (X, L) , then $H_{(C_0+H)}^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) = 0$ and $M_{(C_0+H)}^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) = (\mathcal{J}^f)^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$. Therefore, $(X, C_0 + H, L)$ is K-unstable for $n \gg 0$. This means that $(X, C_0 + H, C_0)$ is adiabatically K-unstable over \mathbb{P}^1 . Note also that the base curve is log-twisted general type in the sense of Remark 3.5 and hence log-twisted K-stable. Thus we obtain the following fact.

Proposition 3.7. *There exists a polarized lc minimal pair $(X, \Delta, L) \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$ such that $(X, \Delta, \epsilon L + K_X + \Delta)$ is slope K-unstable for sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$ and $\kappa_{\mathbb{P}^1}$ is ample.*

For any normal surface X , let f be a nef \mathbb{Q} -Cartier divisor such that $f^2 = 0$ and L be an ample divisor. Then, for any curve C ,

$$2(f \cdot (L + mf))((L + mf) \cdot C) - (L + mf)^2(f \cdot C) = 2(f \cdot L)(L \cdot C) - (L^2)(f \cdot C).$$

Therefore, J^f -stability of (X, L) coincides with that of $(X, L + mf)$ for $m > 0$. We can conclude that:

Proposition 3.8. *If a polarized lc minimal surface pair (X, Δ, H) that is $J^{K_X + \Delta}$ -stable (resp., $J^{K_X + \Delta}$ -semistable) satisfies that $(K_X + \Delta)^2 = 0$, then $(X, \Delta, \epsilon H + K_X + \Delta)$ is K -stable (resp., K -semistable) for $\epsilon > 0$.*

On the other hand, we can relate the twisted canonical class to the result of Jian-Shi-Song [46, Theorem 1.2] and generalize their theorem to singular varieties (see also Corollary 3.13).

Theorem 3.9 (cf., [46]). *Let (X, Δ, H) be an n -dimensional polarized lc variety and $f : (X, \Delta, H) \rightarrow (B, L)$ be a polarized algebraic fiber space pair over a smooth curve B . Suppose that $K_{(X, \Delta)}$ is nef (resp., $K_{(X, \Delta)}$ is ample or $K_{(X, \Delta)}$ is nef and (X, Δ) is klt) and $H \equiv K_{(X, \Delta)} + f^*L_0$ where L_0 is a line bundle on B .*

Then (X, Δ, H) is adiabatically K -semistable (resp. uniformly adiabatically K -stable) for sufficiently small $\delta > 0$. Moreover, if $\Delta = 0$, X is smooth and $K_{(X, \Delta)}$ is nef, then (X, H) has cscK metrics adiabatically.

We need the following lemma.

Lemma 3.10. *Let $f : (X, \Delta, H) \rightarrow (B, L)$ be an n -dimensional polarized algebraic fiber space pair over a smooth curve B . Suppose that $K_{(X, \Delta)}$ is f -ample and $H \equiv K_{(X, \Delta)} + f^*L_0$ where L_0 is a line bundle on B . Then the following are equivalent.*

- (1) $\kappa_B = \kappa_{(X, \Delta, H)/(B, L)}$ is nef (resp., ample),
- (2)

$$n \frac{K_{(X, \Delta)} \cdot (L + \delta H)^{n-1}}{(L + \delta H)^n} (L + \delta H) - (n-1)K_{(X, \Delta)}$$

is nef (resp., ample),

- (3) $(K_X + \Delta)^n \geq 0$ (resp., > 0).

Furthermore, if κ_B is ample, then there exists a positive constant $a > 0$ such that

$$n \frac{K_{(X, \Delta)} \cdot (L + \delta H)^{n-1}}{(L + \delta H)^n} (L + \delta H) - (n-1)K_{(X, \Delta)} - a(L + \delta H)$$

is ample for sufficiently small $\delta > 0$.

Proof. Since

$$\kappa_B = \frac{\pi_*(K_{(X, \Delta)}^{m+1})}{(m+1)(K_{(X_b, \Delta_b)})^m}$$

holds, (1) \Leftrightarrow (3) follows. A direct computation shows that

$$\begin{aligned} -S(X, \Delta, L + \delta H) &= n \frac{\delta^{n-1} K_{(X, \Delta)} \cdot H^{n-1} + (n-1)\delta^{n-2} K_{(X, \Delta)} \cdot H^{n-2} \cdot f^*L}{\delta^n H^n + n\delta^{n-1}(H^{n-1} \cdot L)} \\ &= \frac{n-1}{\delta} + (\delta H^n + nH^{n-1} \cdot L)^{-1} H^n \left(\frac{K_{(X, \Delta)} \cdot H^{n-1}}{H^n} - \frac{n-1}{n} \right) \\ &= \frac{n-1}{\delta} + n^{-1}(\delta H^n + nH^{n-1} \cdot L)^{-1} H^n (S(X_b, \Delta_b, H_b) - S(X, \Delta, H)), \end{aligned}$$

where $S(X_b, \Delta_b, H_b) = -n + 1$. Let $c_\delta = -S(X, \Delta, L + \delta H)$. Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} c_\delta(f^*L + \delta H) - (n-1)K_{(X, \Delta)} &= c_\delta f^*L + \delta c_\delta (H - K_{(X, \Delta)}) \\ &\quad + n^{-1}(\delta H^n + nH^{n-1} \cdot L)^{-1} H^n (S(X_b, \Delta_b, H_b) - S(X, \Delta, H)) K_{(X, \Delta)} \\ &= c_\delta f^*L + \delta c_\delta f^*L_0 + n^{-1}(\delta H^n + nH^{n-1} \cdot L)^{-1} \cdot H^n (S(X_b, \Delta_b, H_b) - S(X, \Delta, H))(H - f^*L_0) \\ &= f^*(c_\delta L + O(\delta^0)L_0) + n^{-1}(\delta H^n + nH^{n-1} \cdot L)^{-1} (H^n)(S(X_b, \Delta_b, H_b) - S(X, \Delta, H))H. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $c_\delta(f^*L + \delta H) - (n-1)K_{(X, \Delta)}$ is nef (resp., ample) for sufficiently small $\delta > 0$ if and only if $S(X_b, \Delta_b, H_b) - S(X, \Delta, H) \geq 0$ (resp., > 0). Recall that κ_B is nef (resp. ample) if and

only if $S(X_b, \Delta_b, H_b) - S(X, \Delta, H + jL) \geq 0$ (resp., > 0) for sufficiently large $j > 0$. On the other hand, we can see that

$$S(X_b, \Delta_b, H_b) - S(X, \Delta, H + jL) = \frac{j^{-1}}{n(H^{n-1} \cdot L)} \left(nK_{(X,\Delta)} - (n-1) \frac{K_{(X_b,\Delta_b)} \cdot H_b^{n-2}}{H_b^{n-1}} H \right) \cdot H^{n-1}.$$

Therefore, $S(X_b, \Delta_b, H_b) - S(X, \Delta, H + jL)$ is a monotone function in $j > 0$. Hence, κ_B is nef (resp. ample) if and only if $S(X_b, \Delta_b, H_b) - S(X, \Delta, H) \geq 0$ (resp., > 0). Thus, the lemma holds. \square

Proof of Theorem 3.9. If $K_{(X,\Delta)}$ is big and nef, then κ_B is ample. On the other hand, suppose that $K_{(X,\Delta)}^n = 0$. Then, we have $\kappa_B \equiv 0$. Thus, the theorem immediately follows from the criterion for J-stability of Song-Weinkove [81, Theorem 1.1] (cf., [44, Theorem 8.2, Theorem 8.12]). The last assertion follows from [60, Theorem 6.11]. \square

We remark that [46, Theorem 1.2] treats the case when K_X is ample in Theorem 3.9. Next, we will prove that Theorem 3.9 also holds for lc surface pair such that κ_B is ample by [44, Corollary 6.4] even when $K_X + \Delta$ is not ample. More precisely, we prove the generalization of Theorem 3.9 assuming the following conjecture,

Conjecture 3.11. Let (X, L) be an n -dimensional polarized normal variety and H be a pseudoeffective line bundle. If

$$n \frac{H \cdot L^{n-1}}{L^n} L - (n-1)H$$

is nef, then (X, L) is J^H -semistable.

We remark that this conjecture is solved when $n = 2$ by the author [44, Theorem A].

Theorem 3.12. *Let $f : (X, \Delta) \rightarrow B$ be an n -dimensional polarized algebraic fiber space pair over a smooth curve B . Suppose that (X, Δ) is lc and assume Conjecture 3.11. Suppose also that $K_X + \Delta$ is f -ample. If $\kappa_B = \kappa_{(X,\Delta,K_X+\Delta)/(B,L)}$ is nef (resp., κ_B is ample, or κ_B is nef and (X, Δ) is klt), then $(X, \Delta, K_X + \Delta)$ is adiabatically K -semistable over (B, L) (resp., $(X, \Delta, K_X + \Delta)$ is uniformly adiabatically K -stable), where L is a line bundle of degree 1 on B . Moreover, if $\Delta = 0$, κ_B is nef and X is smooth, $(X, \epsilon K_X + L)$ has cscK metrics for sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$.*

Proof. First, we claim that if $(K_X + \Delta)^n > 0$ (resp., ≥ 0), then $K_X + \Delta$ is big (resp., pseudoeffective). Indeed, $K_{X/B} + \Delta$ is nef due to [32, Theorem 1.11]. Hence, it suffices to show the assertions when $B = \mathbb{P}^1$. Suppose first that $(K_X + \Delta)^n > 0$. Since and $-f^*K_{\mathbb{P}^1}$ is nef, we have

$$((K_{X/\mathbb{P}^1} + \Delta) - n(-f^*K_{\mathbb{P}^1})) \cdot (K_{X/\mathbb{P}^1} + \Delta)^{n-1} = (K_X + \Delta)^n > 0.$$

By [56, Theorem 2.2.15], $K_X + \Delta$ is big. If $(K_X + \Delta)^n \geq 0$, note that $K_X + \Delta - \epsilon f^*K_{\mathbb{P}^1}$ is big for sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$ by what we have shown. Thus, the theorem follows from Lemma 3.10 and Conjecture 3.11 immediately as the proof of Theorem 3.9. The last assertion follows from [60, Theorem 6.11]. \square

Since Conjecture 3.11 holds when $n = 2$, we obtain the main result in this section,

Corollary 3.13. *Let $f : (X, \Delta) \rightarrow B$ be a lc algebraic fiber space over a smooth curve B . Suppose that $\dim X = 2$ and $K_X + \Delta$ is f -ample. If $\deg \kappa_B \geq 0$ for $(X, K_X + \Delta) \rightarrow B$, then $(X, \Delta, K_X + \Delta)$ is adiabatically K -semistable over (B, L) (if $\deg \kappa_B > 0$ or $\deg \kappa_B \geq 0$ and (X, Δ) is klt, then it is adiabatically uniformly K -stable), where L is a line bundle of degree 1 on B . Moreover, if $\deg \kappa_B \geq 0$, $\Delta = 0$ and X is smooth, $(X, \epsilon K_X + L)$ has cscK metrics for sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$.*

We will show that if κ_B is not nef in Corollary 3.13, adiabatic K-stability does not hold in general (see Example 5.13).

4. K-STABILITY OF FIBRATIONS VIA LOG-TWISTED K-STABILITY

As we saw in the previous section, Calabi-Yau fibrations over curves are adiabatic K-stable if the twisted canonical classes of the bases are nonnegative. It is also natural to consider the case when the twisted canonical class is negative. For example, it is well-known that $\deg \kappa_{\mathbb{P}^1} < 0$ for rational elliptic surfaces. Let $f : (X, \Delta, H) \rightarrow (C, L)$ be a polarized lc-trivial fibration such that C is a curve, i.e., $K_X + \Delta \sim_{C, \mathbb{Q}} 0$ and (X, Δ) is lc (cf., Definition 4.14). Note that if $\deg \kappa_C < 0$, then $C = \mathbb{P}^1$ since the sum of the discriminant divisor and the moduli divisor $(M + B)$ is nef (cf., §7.2). In this section, we discuss such fibrations and prove Theorem B.

4.1. Convergence of α and δ invariant. In this section, we calculate $\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \delta_X(\epsilon H + L)$ when $f : (X, H) \rightarrow (C, L)$ is a polarized algebraic fiber space and C is a curve in Theorem 4.4. Next, we apply this theorem and obtain the sufficiency condition of adiabatic K-stability of such fibrations in Theorem 4.6.

Definition 4.1. Let $\pi : (X, \Delta) \rightarrow C$ be an algebraic fiber space pair over a smooth curve C . Suppose that (X, Δ) is klt. Let L be a \mathbb{Q} -ample line bundle on C with $\deg L = s > 0$. Then

$$\alpha_{(X, \Delta)}(L) := s^{-1} \inf_{p \in C} \text{lct}_{(X, \Delta)}(\pi^{-1}(p)).$$

Theorem 4.2. Let $\pi : (X, \Delta, H) \rightarrow (C, L)$ be an n -dimensional polarized algebraic fiber space pair over a smooth curve C . Let also $\alpha_{(X, \Delta)}(L) = \alpha$ and suppose that (X, Δ) is klt and $\deg L = 1$. For sufficiently small $\delta > 0$, there exists $\epsilon_0 > 0$ such that if $0 < \epsilon \leq \epsilon_0$, then $\alpha_{(X, \Delta)}(L + \epsilon H) \geq \alpha - \delta$. In other words,

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \alpha_{(X, \Delta)}(L + \epsilon H) = \alpha_{(X, \Delta)}(L).$$

Proof. It is easy to see that $\alpha_{(X, \Delta)}(L + \epsilon H) \leq \alpha_{(X, \Delta)}(L)$ for $\epsilon > 0$. Put $\lambda = \alpha - \delta$ and note that $\alpha_{(X, \Delta)}(L + \epsilon H) \leq \alpha$ for $\epsilon > 0$. Assume that the theorem fails for some δ . Then, for sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $D_\epsilon \in |L + \epsilon H|_{\mathbb{Q}}$ such that $(X, \Delta + \lambda D_\epsilon)$ is not a log canonical pair. Take a log resolution $g : X' \rightarrow X$ of (X, Δ) and let $\pi' = \pi \circ g$. Further, we may assume that the reduced structure of any irreducible component of fiber of π' is smooth. Let Δ' be a \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X' such that

$$K_{X'} + \Delta' = g^*(K_X + \Delta).$$

Fix a very ample divisor A on X' . Let also $D'_\epsilon = g^*D_\epsilon$. Then, we can decompose $\lambda D'_\epsilon = D_{\text{vert}} + D_{\text{hor}}$. Here, D_{vert} has a zero dimensional image of π' and D_{hor} is flat over C .

Let $D_{\text{vert}} = \sum_{i=1}^r a_i F_i + B$, where each F_i is a fiber of π' , B is effective and $a_i \geq 0$. We may assume that B contains no fiber. Then, we will show that B 's coefficients are small for sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$. In fact, there exist finitely many reducible fibers of X . Let $\pi'^{-1}(c) = \sum_{j=0}^k n_j C_j$ be the one of them and $\sum b_j C_j$ be the restriction of B to the neighborhood of $\pi'^{-1}(c)$ where $c \in C$. Here, one of b_j is zero. We may assume that $b_0 = 0$. Cutting by $(n-2)$ -hyperplane sections in $|A|$, we may also assume that X' is a surface. Thanks to Zariski lemma [61, Lemma 1], $\text{Span}_{\mathbb{R}} \langle C_j \rangle_{j=1}^k$ with $\sqrt{-(\cdot, \cdot)}$ is a finite dimensional normed space and hence the norm $\sqrt{-(\cdot, \cdot)}$ is equivalent to the supremum norm, where (\cdot, \cdot) is the intersection product. Therefore, there exists a constant $\beta > 0$ such that $-(\sum b_j C_j, \sum b_j C_j) \geq \beta(\max\{b_j\})^2$. Since D'_ϵ is ample,

$$\sum_{j=1}^k b_j C_j \cdot \left(\sum_{j=1}^k b_j C_j + D_{\text{hor}} \right) = \sum_{j=1}^k b_j C_j \cdot (D_{\text{vert}} + D_{\text{hor}}) > 0.$$

Note that if $m = \min_j n_j > 0$ then $\frac{\max\{b_j\}}{m}(\pi')^{-1}(c) - \sum_{j=1}^k b_j C_j$ is effective. Thus, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\max\{b_j\}}{m} \lambda \epsilon H \cdot L &= \lambda \frac{\max\{b_j\}}{m} \pi^{-1}(c) \cdot D_\epsilon \\ &= \frac{\max\{b_j\}}{m} (\pi')^{-1}(c) \cdot D_{\text{hor}} \\ &\geq \sum_{j=1}^k b_j C_j \cdot D_{\text{hor}} \\ &> - \left(\sum b_j C_j, \sum b_j C_j \right) \\ &\geq \beta (\max\{b_j\})^2. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\max\{b_j\} \leq \frac{\lambda \epsilon}{m \beta} H \cdot L$. The constants β and m depend only on finitely many choices of irreducible components of $(\pi')^{-1}(c)$. Hence, for any B , there exists a constant $M > 0$ such that $M \epsilon \sum_{j=1}^l (\pi')^{-1}(c_j) - B$ is effective for some l and $c_j \in C$. Here, l is the number of singular fibers.

On the other hand, we will prove that the multiplicity of D_{hor} is sufficiently small at every point $P \in X'$. If γ is a curve that passes through P and is not contained in D_{hor} , then

$$\gamma \cdot D_{\text{hor}} \geq \text{mult}_P(D_{\text{hor}}).$$

The theorem follows from the next claim.

Claim. *There exists a positive constant $M > 0$ such that for any D_ϵ , for any closed point P of X' and for any irreducible component G of fiber of π' that contains P , there exists a curve γ satisfying the following:*

- (1) $P \in \gamma \subset (\pi')^{-1}(\pi'(P))$,
- (2) $\gamma \not\subset D_{\text{hor}}$
- (3) $\gamma \cdot D_{\text{hor}} \leq M \epsilon$.

Let us prove the claim. Note that G is smooth as we assumed in the first paragraph of the proof. Since D_{hor} is flat over C , $G \not\subset D_{\text{hor}}$. Let $\mu : \tilde{X} \rightarrow X'$ be the blow up at P and E be the exceptional divisor. By Seshadri's theorem [56, Theorem 1.4.14], we can take a positive constant m_1 independent from P and G such that $\mu^*(mA - K_{X'} - G) - (n-1)E$ and $\mu^*(mA) - E$ are ample for $m \geq m_1$. Indeed, since there are only finitely many numerical classes of such G , we can apply [56, Corollary 1.2.24]. If $\tilde{G} = \mu_*^{-1}G$, then $m\mu^*A_{|\tilde{G}} - K_{\tilde{G}} - E_{|\tilde{G}}$ is ample. Therefore, by the effective base point freeness theorem [51], there exists a constant $m_2 \geq m_1$ independent from P and G' such that $m(m\mu^*A_{|\tilde{G}} - E_{|\tilde{G}})$ is ample and generated by global sections for $m \geq m_2$. We now fix such m . Then there exist $D_1, \dots, D_{n-2} \in |m(m\mu^*A_{|\tilde{G}} - E_{|\tilde{G}})|$ such that $\gamma' = \bigcap_{i=1}^{n-2} D_i \subset \tilde{G}$ is a smooth curve intersecting with E properly by Bertini's theorem and is not contained in μ^*D_{hor} . Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma' \cdot \mu^*D_{\text{hor}} &= m^{2(n-2)} A^{n-2} \cdot G \cdot D_{\text{hor}} \\ &\leq m^{2(n-2)} A^{n-2} \cdot L \cdot D_{\text{hor}} \\ &= m^{2(n-2)} A^{n-2} \cdot L \cdot (\lambda D'_\epsilon - D_{\text{vert}}) \\ &= \lambda \epsilon m^{2(n-2)} A^{n-2} \cdot L \cdot H. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, there exists a positive constant m_3 such that $\gamma' \cdot \mu^*D_{\text{hor}} \leq m_3 \epsilon$. Therefore, let $\gamma = \mu_* \gamma'$ and we obtain the claim.

Now we can prove the theorem. By the claim, there exists a positive constant M independent from D'_ϵ and $\lambda D'_\epsilon = \sum a_i F_i + D''$, where D'' is the effective divisor such that $\text{mult}_P(D'') \leq M \epsilon$ for any point P of X' . We can take $\epsilon > 0$ so small that $M \epsilon < \frac{\delta}{2}$. Note that if $\sum a_i F_i \equiv a (\pi')^* L$

for $a > 0$,

$$aA^{n-1} \cdot L \leq \lambda A^{n-1} \cdot (\epsilon H + L).$$

Then we can take $\epsilon > 0$ so small that $a < \alpha - \frac{\delta}{2}$. By the assumption, $(X', \Delta' + \sum a_i F_i)$ is subklt. If ϵ is so small, $(X', \Delta' + D'' + \sum a_i F_i)$ is subklt by the same argument of the proof of [50, Lemma 8.10]. This is a contradiction and we complete the proof. \square

Remark 4.3. There is a fact that the alpha invariant is continuous on the Kähler cone [17, Theorem 3.5]. Due to this theorem, we can extend the alpha invariant continuously to the fiber class.

As Theorem 4.2, we obtain the following theorem for δ -invariant.

Theorem 4.4. *Let $f : (X, \Delta, H) \rightarrow (B, L)$ be a polarized algebraic fiber space pair. Suppose that (X, Δ) is a klt pair, B is a smooth curve and $\deg L = 1$. Then*

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \delta_{(X, \Delta)}(\epsilon H + L) = 2\alpha_{(X, \Delta)}(L).$$

Proof. First, let $G = \epsilon^{-1}$ and we may assume that L is a \mathbb{Z} -divisor since δ -invariant is independent from numerical equivalence. Thanks to [9],

$$\delta_{(X, \Delta)}(\epsilon H + L) = G\delta_{(X, \Delta)}(H + GL) = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{D_m \in |(H+GL)|_{m\text{-basis}}} \text{lct}_{(X, \Delta)}(G^{-1}D_m).$$

Next we will estimate the multiplicity of D_m along vertical divisors. Let $\pi : X' \rightarrow X$ be a log resolution of singularities of (X, Δ) , $F = f^{-1}(p)$ and F_0 be an irreducible component of π^*F . Fix A a very ample divisor on X' . By the same argument of the proof of [38, Lemma 2.2] and [9], if $\pi^*F = \sum_{i=0}^r l_i F_i$ and $D'_m = G^{-1}\pi^*D_m$,

$$\text{mult}_{F_0}(D'_m) \leq \frac{\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} h^0(X', \pi^*(mH + mGL) - kF_0)}{l_0 m G h^0(X, mH + mGL)}.$$

The denominator of the right hand side is

$$l_0 m G \left(\frac{1}{n!} (mH + mGL)^n + O(m^{n-1}) \right) \geq \frac{l_0 m^{n+1} G^2}{(n-1)!} (H^{n-1} \cdot L) + O(m^n).$$

On the other hand, there exists an effective divisor N on X' such that

$$H^0(X', N + P) \neq 0$$

for any numerically trivial divisor P due to [56, Lemma 2.2.42]. Since π^*H is big, there exists $s \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ such that $s\pi^*H - N$ is big. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} h^0(X', m\pi^*H + mG\pi^*L - kF_0) &\leq h^0(X', m\pi^*H + mG\pi^*F - kF_0 + N) \\ &\leq h^0(X', (m+s)\pi^*H + mG\pi^*F - kF_0) \end{aligned}$$

for any G, k and for sufficiently divisible m that mG is an integer. Then, it is easy to see that there exists an effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor E such that

$$E = \sum_{i=0}^r e_i F_i$$

and

$$F_i \cdot A^{n-2} \cdot (\pi^*H + E) = 0$$

for $i > 0$. Here, recall that $\pi^*F = \sum_{i=0}^r l_i F_i$ is the irreducible decomposition. We may assume that s is sufficiently divisible that sE is a \mathbb{Z} -divisor. Thus we obtain

$$h^0(X', (m+s)\pi^*H + mG\pi^*F - kF_0) \leq h^0(X', (m+s)(\pi^*H + E) + mG\pi^*F - kF_0).$$

On the other hand,

$$\sum_{i=0}^{l_0-1} h^0(X', (m+s)(\pi^*H + E) + mG\pi^*F - (kl_0 + i)F_0) \leq l_0 h^0(X', (m+s)(\pi^*H + E) + mG\pi^*F - kl_0 F_0)$$

and

$$(m+s)(\pi^*H+E) + mG\pi^*F - kl_0F_0 = (m+s)(\pi^*H+E) + (mG-k)\pi^*F + k \sum_{i=1}^r l_i F_i.$$

Here, we claim that

$$h^0(X', (m+s)(\pi^*H+E) + mG\pi^*F - kl_0F_0) = h^0(X', (m+s)(\pi^*H+E) + (mG-k)\pi^*F).$$

Indeed, if $F' = \sum_{i=1}^r a_i F_i \neq 0$ is effective, then

$$F_i \cdot ((m+s)(\pi^*H+E) + (mG-k)\pi^*F + F') \cdot A^{n-2} = F_i \cdot F' \cdot A^{n-2}$$

for $i > 0$ and there exists $i > 0$ such that

$$F_i \cdot F' \cdot A^{n-2} < 0$$

by the Zariski lemma [61, Lemma 1]. This means that F_i is contained in the fixed part of $|(m+s)(\pi^*H+E) + (mG-k)\pi^*F + F'|$. Thus the claim follows from the induction on the multiplicity of F' .

We have shown that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} h^0(X', m\pi^*H + mG\pi^*L - kF_0) &\leq l_0 \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} h^0(X', (m+s)(\pi^*H+E) + (mG-k)\pi^*F) \\ &= l_0 \sum_{k=1}^{mG} h^0(X', (m+s)(\pi^*H+E) + (mG-k)\pi^*F) \\ &\quad + l_0 \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} h^0(X', (m+s)(\pi^*H+E) - k\pi^*F). \end{aligned}$$

It is easy to see that there exists a positive constant $C_1 > 0$ such that

$$l_0 \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} h^0(X', (m+s)(\pi^*H+E) - k\pi^*F) < C_1 m^{n+1}$$

for $m > 0$. We may assume that the very ample divisor A on X' satisfies that $H^i(X', A+M) = 0$ for any $i > 0$ and for any nef divisor M by the Fujita vanishing theorem [56, Theorem 1.4.35]. We may also assume that there exists a positive integer $s' \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ such that $s'\pi^*F - E$ is effective. Therefore,

$$h^0(X', (m+s)(\pi^*H+E) + (mG-k)\pi^*F) \leq h^0(X', (m+s)(\pi^*H+s'\pi^*F) + (mG-k)\pi^*F + A)$$

and we obtain

$$h^0(X', (m+s)(\pi^*H+s'\pi^*F) + (mG-k)\pi^*F + A) = \chi(X', (m+s)(\pi^*H+s'\pi^*F) + (mG-k)\pi^*F + A)$$

for $1 \leq k \leq mG$. Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{k=1}^{mG} h^0(X', (m+s)(\pi^*H+E) + (mG-k)\pi^*F) \\ &\leq \sum_{k=1}^{mG} \chi(X', (m+s)(\pi^*H+s'\pi^*F) + (mG-k)\pi^*F + A) \\ &= \frac{1}{n!} \int_0^{mG} (m(\pi^*H+s'\pi^*F) + (mG-t)\pi^*F)^n dt + O(m^n) \\ &< \frac{m^{n+1}G^2}{2(n-1)!} (H^{n-1} \cdot L) + C_2 m^{n+1}G + C_3 m^{n+1} + O(m^n) \end{aligned}$$

where $C_2 > 0$ and $C_3 > 0$ are positive constants. Therefore, we have

$$\text{mult}_{F_0}(D'_m) \leq \frac{1}{2} + \left(\frac{l_0}{(n-1)!} (H^{n-1} \cdot L) \right)^{-1} (C_2\epsilon + (C_1 + C_3)\epsilon^2) + O(m^{-1}).$$

We claim that we can take a positive constant C' such that

$$\text{mult}_{F_0}(D'_m) \leq \frac{1}{2} + C'\epsilon + O(m^{-1})$$

holds uniformly for any irreducible component F_0 of π^*F and for any point of $p \in B$. Indeed, since $f : X \rightarrow B$ is an algebraic fiber space, the number of reducible fiber is finite. On the other hand, for irreducible fiber $\pi^*F = F_0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} h^0(X', \pi^*(mH + mGL) - kF_0) &\leq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} h^0(X', \pi^*((m+s)H + (mG-k)L)) \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} h^0(X, (m+s)H + (mG-k)L) \\ &= \frac{1}{n!} \int_0^{\infty} \text{vol}((m+s)\pi^*H + (mG-t)\pi^*L) dt + O(m^n). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we prove the claim and there exists a positive constant C' such that

$$\text{mult}_{F_0}(D'_m) \leq \frac{1}{2} + C'\epsilon + O(m^{-1})$$

for any irreducible component F_0 of $\pi^*F = (f \circ \pi)^{-1}(p)$ and for any point of $p \in B$. There exists a positive constant $C'' > 0$ such that for any point $q \in X$, $\text{mult}_q D'_{m,\text{hor}} \leq C''\epsilon$ uniformly by the proof of Claim in the proof of Theorem 4.2. If $K_{X'} + \Delta' = \pi^*(K_X + \Delta)$, there exists a positive constant $C''' > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{lct}_{(X,\Delta)}((mG)^{-1}D_m) &= \text{lct}_{(X',\Delta')}(D'_m) \\ &\geq \left(\frac{1}{2} + C'''\epsilon + O(m^{-1}) \right)^{-1} \alpha_{(X,\Delta)}(L). \end{aligned}$$

Thus we obtain

$$\delta_{(X,\Delta)}(\epsilon H + L) \geq \left(\frac{1}{2} + C'''\epsilon \right)^{-1} \alpha_{(X,\Delta)}(L)$$

and hence

$$\liminf_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \delta_{(X,\Delta)}(\epsilon H + L) \geq 2\alpha_{(X,\Delta)}(L).$$

On the other hand,

$$\limsup_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \delta_{(X,\Delta)}(\epsilon H + L) \leq 2\alpha_{(X,\Delta)}(L)$$

is easier to prove. Indeed, for any fiber $F = f^{-1}(p)$, there exists a divisor of m -basis type $D_m \in |(H + GL)|_{\mathbb{Q}}$ such that

$$l^{-1} \text{mult}_{F_0}(D_m) \geq \frac{\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} h^0(X, mH + mGL - kF)}{m h^0(X, mH + mGL)}$$

for any irreducible component F_0 of F with multiplicity $l = \text{mult}_{F_0}(F)$ and

$$\liminf_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} h^0(X, mH + mGL - kF)}{mG h^0(X, mH + mGL)} = \liminf_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\int_0^{\infty} \text{vol}(\epsilon H + L - xL) dx}{(\epsilon H + L)^n} \geq \frac{1}{2}.$$

Thus we complete the proof. \square

Let $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$ be a Calabi-Yau fibration such that X is smooth. Suppose that B is the discriminant divisor and M is the moduli divisor on \mathbb{P}^1 (cf., §4.2, Definition 4.14). Now, we will prove that if $(\mathbb{P}^1, B, M, L = -(K_{\mathbb{P}^1} + B + M))$ is uniformly log-twisted K-stable, X has cscK metrics and hence adiabatically K-stable by calculating the δ -invariant and applying the results of K. Zhang [86], [87]. First, we prove the following,

Lemma 4.5. *Let $f : (X, H) \rightarrow (C, L)$ be a polarized algebraic fiber space where $\deg L = 1$. Suppose that H is ample. Then for sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$ and for any semiample test configuration $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{M})$ for $(X, \epsilon H + L)$,*

$$(\mathcal{J}^{-f^*L})^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{M}) > -(I^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{M}) - J^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{M})).$$

Proof. It suffices to show that $(X, \epsilon H + L)$ is J^H -stable since $-L + (\epsilon H + L) = \epsilon H$. By the ampleness of

$$n \frac{H \cdot (\epsilon H + L)^{n-1}}{(\epsilon H + L)^n} (\epsilon H + L) - (n-1)H = \frac{\epsilon^2 (H^n) H + n((n-1)H^{n-1} \cdot L + \epsilon H^n) L}{n\epsilon H^{n-1} \cdot L + \epsilon^2 H^n}$$

and by the Song-Weinkove criterion for J-stability [44, Theorem 8.12], $(X, \epsilon H + L)$ is uniformly J^H -stable. \square

Theorem 4.6. *Let $f : (X, \Delta, H) \rightarrow (\mathbb{P}^1, L)$ be a polarized algebraic fiber space pair such that $K_X + \Delta \sim_{\mathbb{P}^1, \mathbb{Q}} 0$. Suppose that (X, Δ) is klt, M is the moduli divisor, B is the discriminant divisor (cf., Definition 4.14), $\deg L = 1$ and $-(K_{\mathbb{P}^1} + M + B)$ is ample. Then (X, Δ, H) is uniformly adiabatically K-stable if (\mathbb{P}^1, B, M, L) is uniformly K-stable. Moreover, if $\Delta = 0$, X is smooth and (\mathbb{P}^1, B, M, L) is uniformly adiabatically K-stable, then (X, H) has cscK metrics adiabatically.*

Proof. Let $\deg(B + M) = s \geq 0$ and then

$$\max_{p \in \mathbb{P}^1} \text{mult}_p(B) < \frac{s}{2}.$$

by Corollary A.30. Since $\text{mult}_p(B) = 1 - \text{lct}_{(X, \Delta)}(f^{-1}(p))$, we have

$$\alpha_{(X, \Delta)}(L) > 1 - \frac{s}{2}.$$

Therefore, by Theorem 4.4

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \delta_{(X, \Delta)}(\epsilon H + L) > 2 - s$$

holds. On the other hand,

$$K_X + \Delta \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} f^*(K_{\mathbb{P}^1} + M + B) \equiv -(2 - s)f^*L.$$

Therefore,

$$(\mathcal{J}^{K_X + \Delta})^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{M}) \geq -(2 - s)(I^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{M}) - J^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{M}))$$

for any semiample test configuration $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{M})$ for $(X, \epsilon H + L)$ by Lemma 4.5. Thus the first assertion follows from Theorem A.13.

On the other hand, we can prove that the K-energy is coercive by [87, Proposition 3.5] and [13, Theorem 1.1] as the proof of the first assertion. Then the second assertion follows from [15, Theorem 4.1]. \square

Remark 4.7. The converse to Theorem 4.6 holds as we will see in Corollary 4.24.

Corollary 4.8. *Let $f : (X, \Delta, H) \rightarrow (C, L)$ be a polarized algebraic fiber space pair such that $K_X + \Delta \sim_{C, \mathbb{Q}} 0$ over a smooth curve C . Suppose that M is the moduli divisor and B is the discriminant divisor. Then (X, Δ, H) is uniformly adiabatically K-stable if (C, B, M, L) is uniformly K-stable.*

Proof. By Corollary 3.4 and Theorem 4.6, we have only to consider the case when $K_C + B + M \equiv 0$. Then, $K_X + \Delta \equiv 0$ and hence (X, Δ, H) is uniformly adiabatically K-stable. \square

Corollary 4.9. *Let $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$ be an algebraic fiber space such that $K_X \sim_{\mathbb{P}^1, \mathbb{Q}} 0$ and X is smooth. Suppose that $\deg f_* \omega_{X/\mathbb{P}^1}^{\otimes m} \neq 0$ for sufficiently large $m > 0$ and f has only reduced and slc fiber. Then (X, H) is uniformly adiabatically K-stable for any polarization H on X and has cscK metrics adiabatically.*

Proof. Let H be an ample divisor on X . By the assumptions and Kawakita's inversion of adjunction of log canonicity [47] (see also [77, Corollary 1.1]), we have $\alpha_X(L) = 1$, where L is a degree 1 line bundle on \mathbb{P}^1 . In other words, the discriminant divisor $B = 0$. On the other hand, the moduli divisor $M \neq 0$ is ample by the assumption. Therefore, the assertion follows from Corollary 4.6 and Corollary A.30. \square

We also obtain the following result on canonically polarized fibrations over curves,

Theorem 4.10. *Let $f : (X, \Delta) \rightarrow C$ be an n -dimensional polarized algebraic fiber space pair over a smooth curve C . Suppose that (X, Δ) is klt and assume Conjecture 3.11. Suppose also that $K_X + \Delta$ is f -ample. Let B be the discriminant divisor i.e., B is defined as*

$$B = \sum_{P \in B} (1 - \text{lct}_{(X_P, \Delta)}(f^*P))P$$

as Definition 4.14. Let also $M = \kappa_C - K_C - B$ and call this the moduli divisor. If $K_C + B + M$ is antiample and (C, B, M, L) is log-twisted uniformly Ding-stable, then $(X, \Delta, K_X + \Delta)$ is uniformly adiabatically K-stable.

Proof. Let $\deg L = 1$. It follows from [32, Theorem 1.11] that $\deg(B + M) = s \geq 0$ and $C = \mathbb{P}^1$. Therefore, if (C, B, M, L) is log-twisted Fano and uniformly Ding-stable, then $\delta_{(C, B)}(L) > 2 - s$ by Corollary A.19. By Theorem 4.4, we also have $d_\epsilon := \delta_{(X, \Delta)}(\epsilon(K_X + \Delta) + L) > 2 - s$ for sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$ by Corollary A.30. By Lemma 4.5, $I^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{M}) - J^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{M}) \geq (\mathcal{J}^L)^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{M})$ holds for any semiample test configuration $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{M})$ for $(X, \epsilon(K_X + \Delta) + L)$. On the other hand, we have $H_\Delta^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{M}) \geq d_\epsilon(I^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{M}) - J^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{M}))$ by Theorem A.13. Therefore, we have to show that $(X, \epsilon(K_X + \Delta) + L)$ is uniformly $J^{K_X + \Delta + d_\epsilon f^*L}$ -stable. As Theorem 3.12, it suffices to show that $(K_X + \Delta + d_\epsilon f^*L)^n \geq 0$. Then, we can calculate

$$(K_X + \Delta + d_\epsilon f^*L)^n = (K_X + \Delta)^n + n d_\epsilon (L \cdot (K_X + \Delta)^{n-1})$$

and

$$s - 2 = \deg(\kappa_C) = \frac{(K_X + \Delta)^n}{n(L \cdot (K_X + \Delta)^{n-1})}.$$

Thus,

$$(K_X + \Delta + d_\epsilon f^*L)^n = n(d_\epsilon - (2 - s))(L \cdot (K_X + \Delta)^{n-1}) > 0.$$

Therefore, $K_X + \Delta + d_\epsilon f^*L$ is big and the assertion follows from Conjecture 3.11. \square

We have the following as Corollary 3.13.

Corollary 4.11. *Let $f : (X, \Delta) \rightarrow C$ be a klt algebraic fiber space pair over a smooth curve C . Suppose that $\dim X = 2$ and $K_X + \Delta$ is f -ample. Define B and M as in Theorem 4.10. If (C, B, M, L) is log-twisted Fano and uniformly Ding-stable, then $(X, \Delta, K_X + \Delta)$ is uniformly adiabatically K-stable.*

4.2. Klt-trivial fibrations and log-twisted stability. In this subsection, we see that log-twisted K-stability of the base of a klt (lc)-trivial fibrations (cf., Definition 4.14) is a necessary condition for adiabatic K-stability under some conditions (cf., Theorems 4.12 and 4.23). Moreover, we also prove a partial converse to Theorem 4.6.

First, we prove the following modified version of [19, Corollary 4.4] for lc-trivial fibrations even when the fibrations have singular fibers.

Theorem 4.12. *Let $f : (X, \Delta) \rightarrow C$ be an algebraic fiber space pair such that $K_{(X, \Delta)} \sim_{C, \mathbb{Q}} 0$. Let also (C, L) be a b -dimensional polarized variety and (X, Δ, H) be an n -dimensional polarized lc pair. Let*

$$K_{(X, \Delta)} = f^*(K_C + M_C + B_C)$$

be the canonical bundle formula (cf., Definition 4.14). If the moduli divisor M_C is \mathbb{Q} -Cartier and (X, Δ, H) is adiabatically K -semistable, then (C, B_C, M_C, L) is log-twisted K -semistable.

For the definition and properties of log-twisted pair, see Appendix A.

Remark 4.13. By Proposition 3.7, the converse does not hold in lc cases.

To prove Theorem 4.12, we shall recall the canonical bundle formula (cf., [35], [1] and [33]).

Definition 4.14 (Klt-trivial fibrations, canonical bundle formula, Ambro model). Let $f : (X, \Delta) \rightarrow C$ be an algebraic fiber space. f is a *sublc-trivial fibration* (resp. *subklt-trivial fibration*) if (X, Δ) is a sublc (resp. subklt) pair satisfying the following properties:

- $K_{(X, \Delta)} \sim_{C, \mathbb{Q}} 0$,
- $\text{rank } f_* \mathcal{O}_X([\mathbf{A}^*(X, \Delta)]) = 1$ (resp., $\text{rank } f_* \mathcal{O}_X([\mathbf{A}(X, \Delta)]) = 1$),
- (X, Δ) is lc (resp. klt) over the generic point of C ,

where $\mathbf{A}(X, \Delta)$ is the discrepancy b-divisor (cf., [1, §1.3]) and

$$\mathbf{A}^*(X, \Delta) = \mathbf{A}(X, \Delta) + \sum_{A_{(X, \Delta)}(E)=0} E.$$

We call f is a *lc (resp., klt)-trivial fibration* if (X, Δ) is a lc (resp., klt) pair and $K_{(X, \Delta)} \sim_{C, \mathbb{Q}} 0$. It is easy to see that if f is a lc (resp., klt)-trivial fibration, then f is a sublc (resp., subklt)-trivial fibration. Note that sublc-trivial fibrations are called lc-trivial fibrations in [33].

If f is a sublc-trivial fibration, then the following *canonical bundle formula* (of Ambro) holds (cf., [1], [33]). There exist a positive integer $b \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ and a rational function $\varphi \in K(X)$ such that

$$K_{(X, \Delta)} + \frac{1}{b}(\varphi) = f^*(K_C + M_{(X, \Delta)/C} + B_{(X, \Delta)/C}),$$

where $M_{(X, \Delta)/C}$ and $B_{(X, \Delta)/C}$ are well-defined \mathbb{Q} -divisors (see [1], [33]). We will denote the formula as $K_{(X, \Delta)} = f^*(K_C + M_{(X, \Delta)/C} + B_{(X, \Delta)/C})$ for simplicity. If there is no afraid of confusion, we will denote $M_{(X, \Delta)/C}$ and $B_{(X, \Delta)/C}$ by M_C and B_C for short. B_C is called the *discriminant divisor* of f defined by the equation

$$B_C = \sum_D (1 - \text{lct}_{(X_D, \Delta)}(f^* D)) D,$$

where X_D is a neighborhood of the fiber of generic point of D and D runs over the prime divisors of C . M_C is called the *moduli divisor*. For any birational morphism $h : C' \rightarrow C$ of projective normal varieties, we can take a sublc-trivial fibration $f' : (X', \Delta') \rightarrow C'$ such that the following commutative diagram holds

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X' & \xrightarrow{\tilde{h}} & X \\ \downarrow f' & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow f \\ C' & \xrightarrow{h} & C \end{array}$$

and $K_{X'} + \Delta' = h^*(K_X + \Delta)$. Then $M_C = h_* M_{C'}$. In other words, the moduli divisors $\{M_C\}_C$ forms a \mathbb{Q} - b divisor (see the details in [1, Lemma 2.6] and [33]). For any birational map $h' : C'' \dashrightarrow C$, we say that a \mathbb{Q} -divisor \mathcal{M} on C'' is *induced by M_C* if the following holds. Let Γ be the normalization of the graph of h'' and let M_Γ be the moduli divisor of a sublc-trivial fibration induced by f . Then, $\mathcal{M} = p_* M_\Gamma$ where $p : \Gamma \rightarrow C$ is the projection.

If M_C is *stable under birational base change* i.e., M_C is \mathbb{Q} -Cartier and

$$M_{C'} = h^* M_C$$

for any birational morphism $h : C' \rightarrow C$, $f : (X, \Delta) \rightarrow C$ or C is an *Ambro model* (cf., [28, §2]). If moreover, M_C is semiample, we call $f : (X, \Delta) \rightarrow C$ a *good Ambro model* in this paper. Thanks to [33, Theorem 1.1], there exists an Ambro model C' dominating C for any sublc-trivial fibration and then the moduli divisor is abundant (cf., [33, Definition 1.2]). For subklt-trivial fibrations, this fact is originally proved in [2].

Remark 4.15. The definition of an Ambro model of Floris-Lazić [28] as follows. Let $f : (X, \Delta) \rightarrow C$ be a sublc-trivial fibration such that the moduli divisor M is stable under birational base change and the discriminant divisor B is simple normal crossing. In this paper, we do not assume that the discriminant B is snc or C is smooth.

Remark 4.16. It immediately follows from the same argument of [1, §5] that if $f : (X, \Delta) \rightarrow C$ is a sublc-trivial fibration over a curve C , then C is an Ambro model.

The following conjecture is still open in general setting.

Conjecture 4.17 (B-semiampleness conjecture, cf., [28, §3]). For any sublc-trivial fibration, there exists a good Ambro model.

Nevertheless, we are particularly interested in Ambro models such that the bases are log-twisted Fano and we can prove the following,

Lemma 4.18. *Let $f : (X, \Delta) \rightarrow C$ be a subklt-trivial fibration and M and B are the moduli divisor and the discriminant divisor on C respectively. If C is an Ambro model and $-(K_C + B)$ or $-(K_C + B + M)$ is big and nef, then C is also a good Ambro model.*

Proof. Thanks to [2], M is abundant and in particular nef. Therefore, if $-(K_C + B + M)$ is big and nef, then so is $-(K_C + B)$. Hence, we may assume that $-(K_C + B)$ is big and nef. On the other hand, (C, B) is klt due to [1, Theorem 3.1]. Thus, M is semiample by [55, Theorem 3.3]. \square

Before proving Theorem 4.12, we explain the proof briefly. Let \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{C} be test configurations for X and C and $\Pi : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ be a morphism of test configurations. Roughly speaking, in the proof of [19, Proposition 4.3], $K_{\mathcal{X}/\mathcal{C}}$ yields the twisted part of the CM line bundle in the Donaldson-Futaki invariant of the base when we consider klt-trivial fibrations. Here, we want to analyze $K_{\mathcal{X}/\mathcal{C}}$ by the canonical bundle formula more explicitly. If \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{C} have a reduced and snc fiber over $0 \in \mathbb{A}^1$, then we have by assumption and the argument of [1],

$$K_{\mathcal{X}} = \Pi^*(K_{\mathcal{C}} + \rho^*M_C + \rho_*^{-1}B_C) + D$$

where $\rho : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow C_{\mathbb{A}^1}$ is a birational morphism of test configurations and D is a \mathbb{Q} -divisor as [35, Theorem 4.5]. Here, we want to ignore D when we compare the log-twisted Donaldson-Futaki invariant of \mathcal{C} and the Donaldson-Futaki invariant of \mathcal{X} as Dervan-Ross did. Then, we apply the result of Hacon-Xu [41, Theorem 1.1] to contract D .

Now, we prove Theorem 4.12. The following is the key step to prove Theorem 4.12:

Proposition 4.19. *Let $f : (X, \Delta) \rightarrow C$ be a lc-trivial fibration and $\pi : Y \rightarrow X$ be a log resolution of (X, Δ) and $\Theta = \pi_*^{-1}\Delta + \sum F$ be an effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor on Y where F runs over the irreducible and reduced π -exceptional divisors. Let also H be an ample divisor on X and L be an ample divisor on C . Let \mathcal{Y} be a smooth test configuration for Y dominating $Y_{\mathbb{A}^1}$ such that $(\rho_{\mathcal{Y}})_*^{-1}\Theta_{\mathbb{A}^1} + \mathcal{Y}_{0,\text{red}}$ is an snc divisor, where $\rho_{\mathcal{Y}} : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow Y_{\mathbb{A}^1}$ is the canonical morphism. Let also \mathcal{C} be a normal test configuration such that $\rho_{\mathcal{C}} : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow C_{\mathbb{A}^1}$ be the dominant morphism. Suppose that the canonical rational map $\Pi : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ is a morphism.*

Then, $(\mathcal{Y}, (\rho_{\mathcal{Y}})_^{-1}\Theta_{\mathbb{A}^1} + \epsilon(\pi \times \text{id}_{\mathbb{A}^1} \circ \rho_{\mathcal{Y}})^*H_{\mathbb{A}^1})$ has a \mathbb{G}_m -equivariant common relative log canonical model $\eta : \mathcal{Y} \dashrightarrow \mathcal{X}$ over \mathcal{C} for sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$. Moreover, there is a \mathbb{Q} -factorial good minimal model $(\mathcal{W}, \Delta_{\mathcal{W}})$ of $(\mathcal{Y}, (\rho_{\mathcal{Y}})_*^{-1}\Theta_{\mathbb{A}^1})$ over \mathcal{C} and a birational contraction $\xi : \mathcal{W} \dashrightarrow \mathcal{X}$.*

Proof. First, note that (Y, Θ) has a relative good minimal model over C . Indeed, by the proof of the existence of a \mathbb{Q} -factorial dlt modification (Z, Δ_Z) over X (cf., [31, 4.1]), the $(K_Y + \Theta)$ -MMP with scaling of an ample divisor will yield a minimal model (Z, Δ_Z) of (Y, Θ) over X . Let $g : Z \rightarrow X$ be the structure morphism. Since $K_Z + \Delta_Z = g^*(K_X + \Delta)$ and $K_X + \Delta \sim_{\mathbb{Q}, C} 0$, (Z, Δ_Z) is also a good minimal model of (Y, Θ) over C . On the other hand, $(Z, \Delta_Z + \epsilon g^*H)$ is also a good minimal model of $(Y, \Theta + \epsilon \pi^*H)$ for sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$. Indeed, if $\psi : Y \dashrightarrow Z$ is the birational contraction, for any ψ -exceptional divisor F , $A_{(Y, \Theta)}(F) < A_{(Z, \Delta_Z)}(F)$. Furthermore, $K_Z + \Delta_Z + \epsilon g^*H$ is semiample over C . Hence, $(Z, \Delta_Z + \epsilon g^*H)$ is a good minimal model.

We have just show that $(\mathcal{Y}, (\rho_{\mathcal{Y}})^{-1}\Theta)$ has a relative good minimal model if we restrict the base to $\mathcal{C} \setminus \mathcal{C}_0$. Since $(\mathcal{Y}, (\rho_{\mathcal{Y}})^{-1}\Theta + \mathcal{Y}_{0, \text{red}})$ is log smooth and dlt, every lc center of the log pair $(\mathcal{Y}, (\rho_{\mathcal{Y}})^{-1}\Theta)$ meets $\mathcal{Y} \setminus \mathcal{Y}_0$. Therefore, we can apply [41, Theorem 1.1] and there exists a good minimal model $(\mathcal{W}, \Delta_{\mathcal{W}})$ of $(\mathcal{Y}, (\rho_{\mathcal{Y}})^{-1}\Theta_{\mathbb{A}^1})$ over \mathcal{C} . Note that the model $(\mathcal{W}, \Delta_{\mathcal{W}})$ is \mathbb{G}_m -equivariant by the argument of [3] and [61].

Let $h : \mathcal{Y} \dashrightarrow \mathcal{W}$ be the birational contraction. We may assume that h is the output of a minimal model program with scaling by [41, Corollary 2.9]. Therefore, \mathcal{W} is \mathbb{Q} -factorial and $(\mathcal{W}, \Delta_{\mathcal{W}} + \epsilon_1 h_*(\pi \times \text{id}_{\mathbb{A}^1} \circ \rho_{\mathcal{Y}})^*H_{\mathbb{A}^1})$ is also dlt and has no lc center in \mathcal{W}_0 for sufficiently small $\epsilon_1 > 0$. By [41, Theorem 1.1], $(\mathcal{W}, \Delta_{\mathcal{W}} + \epsilon_2 h_*(\pi \times \text{id}_{\mathbb{A}^1} \circ \rho_{\mathcal{Y}})^*H_{\mathbb{A}^1})$ also has a good minimal model over \mathcal{C} for $0 \leq \epsilon_2 < \epsilon_1$. Thanks to [43, Lemma 2.5], there exists a birational contraction $\xi : \mathcal{W} \dashrightarrow \mathcal{X}$ such that for sufficiently small $0 < \epsilon \ll \epsilon_1$, the pair $(\mathcal{X}, \xi_*(\Delta_{\mathcal{W}}) + \epsilon \xi_*(h_*(\pi \times \text{id}_{\mathbb{A}^1} \circ \rho_{\mathcal{Y}})^*H_{\mathbb{A}^1}))$ is the lc model of $(\mathcal{W}, \Delta_{\mathcal{W}} + \epsilon h_*(\pi \times \text{id}_{\mathbb{A}^1} \circ \rho_{\mathcal{Y}})^*H_{\mathbb{A}^1})$ over \mathcal{C} . Finally, we can take $\eta = \xi \circ h$. Note that $(\mathcal{W}, \Delta_{\mathcal{W}} + \epsilon h_*(\pi \times \text{id}_{\mathbb{A}^1} \circ \rho_{\mathcal{Y}})^*H_{\mathbb{A}^1})$ has the canonical \mathbb{G}_m -action and hence \mathcal{X} is a test configuration for X . \square

Note that the log canonical model $(\mathcal{X}, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}})$ of $(\mathcal{Y}, (\rho_{\mathcal{Y}})^{-1}\Theta + \epsilon(\pi \circ \rho_{\mathcal{Y}})^*H_{\mathbb{A}^1})$ is a test configuration of X for sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$ by the previous proof. Since \mathcal{C} is projective, $K_{\mathcal{X}} + \Delta_{\mathcal{X}}$ is ample over \mathcal{C} and it is \mathbb{Q} -linearly equivalent over \mathcal{C} to $\epsilon H_{\mathbb{A}^1}$ on $\mathcal{X} \setminus \mathcal{X}_0$, we conclude that \mathcal{X} admits a \mathbb{G}_m -linearized ample \mathbb{Q} -line bundle \mathcal{H} that is an extension of $(H + rL)_{\mathbb{A}^1}|_{X \times (\mathbb{A}^1 \setminus 0)}$ for sufficiently large $r > 0$.

Proposition 4.20. *Let $f : (X, \Delta) \rightarrow C$ be a lc-trivial fibration and H and L be ample line bundles on X and C respectively. Let $\phi \in \mathcal{H}^{\text{NA}}(L)$ be a positive non-Archimedean metric (cf., Definition 2.2). Then, for sufficiently divisible d , there exists a representative $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{L})$ of ϕ_d that satisfies the following (cf., Definition 2.5).*

- (1) $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{L})$ is a semiample, normal and projective test configuration $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{L})$ over (C, L) such that \mathcal{C} dominates $C_{\mathbb{A}^1}$. Let the dominant morphism be $\rho_{\mathcal{C}}$.
- (2) \mathcal{C}_0 is reduced and all irreducible components of \mathcal{C}_0 are \mathbb{Q} -Cartier.
- (3) There exist a sufficiently large integer $r > 0$ and a lc test configuration $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{H})$ for $(X, H + rL)$ that has a \mathbb{G}_m -equivariant morphism $\Pi : (\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{H}) \rightarrow (\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{L})$ and satisfies the following equation,

$$K_{(\mathcal{X}, (\rho_{\mathcal{X}})^{-1}\Delta_{\mathbb{A}^1})} = \Pi^*(K_{\mathcal{C}} + \mathcal{M} + (\rho_{\mathcal{C}})^{-1}B_{(X_{\mathbb{A}^1}, \Delta_{\mathbb{A}^1})/C_{\mathbb{A}^1}}) + \mathcal{D}$$

where $\rho_{\mathcal{X}} : \mathcal{X} \dashrightarrow X_{\mathbb{A}^1}$ is the canonical birational map, \mathcal{M} is induced by $M_{(X_{\mathbb{A}^1}, \Delta_{\mathbb{A}^1})/C_{\mathbb{A}^1}}$ and \mathcal{D} is a \mathbb{Q} -divisor such that $\text{codim}_{\mathcal{C}} \Pi(\mathcal{D}) \geq 2$. Here, Π coincides with f over $1 \in \mathbb{A}^1$.

Proof. Let $\pi : Y \rightarrow X$ be the log resolution and Θ be the divisor on Y as in Proposition 4.19. Then (Y, Θ) is a subdlt and log smooth pair. First, take a normal and projective representative $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{L})$ of ϕ such that \mathcal{C} dominates $C_{\mathbb{A}^1}$. Let the dominant morphism be $\rho_{\mathcal{C}}$. We can prove that (C, B) is an lc pair as [1, Theorem 3.1]. Applying [77, Theorem 1.1] to the log pair $(\mathcal{C}, (\rho_{\mathcal{C}})^{-1}B_{\mathbb{A}^1} + \mathcal{C}_{0, \text{red}})$, we may assume that $(\mathcal{C}, (\rho_{\mathcal{C}})^{-1}B_{\mathbb{A}^1} + \mathcal{C}_{0, \text{red}})$ is lc.

Let \mathcal{Y} be a \mathbb{G}_m -equivariant blow up of $Y_{\mathbb{A}^1}$ that is a smooth and projective test configuration over Y dominates \mathcal{C} (cf., [52], [61]). Let $g : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow X_{\mathbb{A}^1}$ be the canonical birational morphism and let $\rho_{\mathcal{Y}} : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow Y_{\mathbb{A}^1}$ be the morphism. Furthermore, by taking the normalized base change $(\mathcal{C}^{(d)}, \mathcal{L}^{(d)})$ via $g_d : \mathbb{A}^1 \ni x \mapsto x^d \in \mathbb{A}^1$ for sufficiently divisible d , we may assume that \mathcal{C} has a reduced central fiber and $\text{Ex}(g) + \text{red}(g_*^{-1}(\Delta_{\mathbb{A}^1})) + \mathcal{Y}_0$ is a reduced snc divisor on \mathcal{Y} (cf.,

[48], [55, Theorem 7.17]) by replacing \mathcal{C} by $\mathcal{C}^{(d)}$. In fact, we can do this \mathbb{G}_m -equivariantly by the argument of [61, Lemma 5]. By the generic smoothness [42, III Corollary 10.7], \mathcal{Y} has reduced fibers and $\mathcal{Y}_0 + \rho_{\mathcal{Y}}^* \Theta_{\mathbb{A}^1}$ is simple normal crossing over the generic points of the irreducible components of the central fiber \mathcal{C}_0 over $0 \in \mathbb{A}^1$. By [45, Proposition 5.7], there exists a \mathbb{G}_m -equivariant birational morphism $\varphi : \mathcal{C}' \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ of test configurations such that φ is an isomorphism in codimension 1 and irreducible components of central fiber \mathcal{C}'_0 are \mathbb{Q} -Cartier since $(\mathcal{C}, (\rho_{\mathcal{C}})_*^{-1} B_{\mathbb{A}^1} + \mathcal{C}_0)$ is lc. Let $\beta : \mathcal{Y}' \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ be a resolution of indeterminacy of $\mathcal{Y} \dashrightarrow \mathcal{C}'$ such that \mathcal{Y}' is smooth and $\text{Ex}(\beta \circ g) + \text{red}((\beta \circ g)_*^{-1}(\Delta_{\mathbb{A}^1})) + \mathcal{Y}'_{0,\text{red}}$ is an snc divisor. Note that we can take \mathcal{Y}' isomorphic to \mathcal{Y} over codimension 1 points of \mathcal{C}' . Therefore, \mathcal{Y}' also has semistable fibers over the generic points of the irreducible components of the central fiber \mathcal{C}'_0 . We may replace \mathcal{C} by \mathcal{C}' and \mathcal{Y} by \mathcal{Y}' . Thus, $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{L})$ satisfies the conditions (1) and (2) in the assumption now. Moreover, \mathcal{Y} satisfies the following;

- \mathcal{Y} is a smooth test configuration for Y dominating $Y_{\mathbb{A}^1}$. Let $\rho_{\mathcal{Y}} : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow Y_{\mathbb{A}^1}$ be the canonical morphism. Moreover, \mathcal{Y}_0 is reduced over generic points of irreducible components of \mathcal{C}_0 and $\text{Ex}(g) + \text{red}(g_*^{-1}(\Delta_{\mathbb{A}^1})) + \mathcal{Y}_0$ is snc where $g = \pi \times \text{id}_{\mathbb{A}^1} \circ \rho_{\mathcal{Y}} : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow X_{\mathbb{A}^1}$.

Note that $\mathcal{M} = M_{(\mathcal{Y}, g_*^{-1} \Delta_{\mathbb{A}^1} + \sum(1 - A_{(X_{\mathbb{A}^1}, \Delta_{\mathbb{A}^1})(E))E})/\mathcal{C}}$ by the assumption. Then the canonical bundle formula of Ambro [1] is

$$\begin{aligned} K_{\mathcal{Y}} + g_*^{-1} \Delta_{\mathbb{A}^1} + \sum (1 - A_{(X_{\mathbb{A}^1}, \Delta_{\mathbb{A}^1})(E))E} &= \Pi_{\mathcal{Y}}^* \rho_{\mathcal{C}}^* (K_{C_{\mathbb{A}^1}} + M_{(X_{\mathbb{A}^1}, \Delta_{\mathbb{A}^1})/C_{\mathbb{A}^1}} + B_{(X_{\mathbb{A}^1}, \Delta_{\mathbb{A}^1})/C_{\mathbb{A}^1}}) \\ &= \Pi_{\mathcal{Y}}^* (K_{\mathcal{C}} + \mathcal{B} + \mathcal{M}), \end{aligned}$$

where E runs over the g -exceptional divisors and \mathcal{B} is the discriminant divisor of $(\mathcal{Y}, g_*^{-1} \Delta_{\mathbb{A}^1} + \sum(1 - A_{(X_{\mathbb{A}^1}, \Delta_{\mathbb{A}^1})(E))E) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$.

Therefore, we obtain

$$K_{\mathcal{Y}} + (\rho_{\mathcal{Y}})_*^{-1} \Theta_{\mathbb{A}^1} = \Pi_{\mathcal{Y}}^* (K_{\mathcal{C}} + \mathcal{M} + \mathcal{B}) - \sum_E (1 - A_{(X_{\mathbb{A}^1}, \Delta_{\mathbb{A}^1})(E))E} + \sum_F A_{(X_{\mathbb{A}^1}, \Delta_{\mathbb{A}^1})(F)F}$$

where E and F run over all g -exceptional divisors such that $E \subset \mathcal{Y}_0$ and $F \not\subset \mathcal{Y}_0$ respectively. Since \mathcal{Y}_0 is reduced over the generic points of irreducible components P of \mathcal{C}_0 and $\mathcal{Y}_0 + (\rho_{\mathcal{Y}})_*^{-1} \Theta_{\mathbb{A}^1}$ is snc, we have

$$\text{lct}_{(\mathcal{Y}_P, (\rho_{\mathcal{Y}})_*^{-1} \Theta_{\mathbb{A}^1})}(\Pi_{\mathcal{Y}}^* P) = 0.$$

On the other hand,

$$\text{mult}_P(\mathcal{B}) = 1 - \text{lct}_{(\mathcal{Y}_P, g_*^{-1} \Delta_{\mathbb{A}^1} + \sum_E (1 - A_{(X_{\mathbb{A}^1}, \Delta_{\mathbb{A}^1})(E))E})}(\Pi_{\mathcal{Y}}^* P) = \max_F (1 - A_{(X_{\mathbb{A}^1}, \Delta_{\mathbb{A}^1})(F)})$$

where E runs over the g -exceptional divisors and F runs over the divisors dominating P . Thus, there exists a \mathbb{Q} -divisor D such that

$$K_{\mathcal{Y}} + (\rho_{\mathcal{Y}})_*^{-1} \Theta_{\mathbb{A}^1} = \Pi_{\mathcal{Y}}^* (K_{\mathcal{C}} + \mathcal{M} + (\rho_{\mathcal{C}})_*^{-1} B_{(X_{\mathbb{A}^1}, \Delta_{\mathbb{A}^1})/C_{\mathbb{A}^1}}) + D$$

where D_+ is of insufficient fiber type in the sense of [57, 2.9] and $\text{codim}_{\mathcal{C}} \Pi_{\mathcal{Y}}(D_-) \geq 2$. Here, D_+ and D_- are effective divisors such that they have no common component and $D = D_+ - D_-$. Note that $K_{\mathcal{C}} + \mathcal{M} + (\rho_{\mathcal{C}})_*^{-1} B_{(X_{\mathbb{A}^1}, \Delta_{\mathbb{A}^1})/C_{\mathbb{A}^1}}$ is \mathbb{Q} -Cartier by the condition (2). If Q is a prime divisor on \mathcal{Y} dominating P , then

$$\text{mult}_Q(D) = A_{(X_{\mathbb{A}^1}, \Delta_{\mathbb{A}^1})(Q)} - \min_F A_{(X_{\mathbb{A}^1}, \Delta_{\mathbb{A}^1})(F)} \geq 0$$

where F runs over the prime divisors dominating P .

Note that $(\mathcal{Y}, (\rho_{\mathcal{Y}})_*^{-1} \Theta_{\mathbb{A}^1} + \mathcal{Y}_{0,\text{red}})$ is dlt and log smooth. By Proposition 4.19, we can take a \mathbb{G}_m -equivariant common relative log canonical model $(\mathcal{X}, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}})$ of $(\mathcal{Y}, (\rho_{\mathcal{Y}})_*^{-1} \Theta_{\mathbb{A}^1} + \epsilon(\pi_{\mathbb{A}^1} \circ \rho_{\mathcal{Y}})^* H_{\mathbb{A}^1})$ for $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$ over \mathcal{C} . Moreover, there is also a good minimal model $(\mathcal{W}, \Delta_{\mathcal{W}})$ of $(\mathcal{Y}, (\rho_{\mathcal{Y}})_*^{-1} \Theta_{\mathbb{A}^1})$ and a birational contraction $\xi : \mathcal{W} \dashrightarrow \mathcal{X}$ by Proposition 4.19. Then,

$$K_{\mathcal{W}} + \Delta_{\mathcal{W}} = \Pi_{\mathcal{W}}^* (K_{\mathcal{C}} + \mathcal{M} + (\rho_{\mathcal{C}})_*^{-1} B_{(X_{\mathbb{A}^1}, \Delta_{\mathbb{A}^1})/C_{\mathbb{A}^1}}) + D'$$

where $\Pi_{\mathcal{W}} : \mathcal{W} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ is the structure morphism and D' is the strict transformation of D . Now, we can prove that $\text{codim}_{\mathcal{C}} \Pi_{\mathcal{W}}(D') \geq 2$. Indeed, we can check this as follows. Take a prime divisor Q on \mathcal{Y} dominating P such that $Q \not\subset \text{Supp } D_+$. It is easy to see that $Q \notin \mathbf{B}(K_{\mathcal{W}} + \Delta_{\mathcal{W}}/U_P)$ over a neighborhood U_P of the generic point of P . Thus, Q is not contracted by $\mathcal{Y} \dashrightarrow \mathcal{W}$ by [41, 2.4] and D'_+ is also of insufficient fiber type [57, 2.9] over U_P . Therefore, $D' = 0$ over $\mathcal{C} \setminus \Pi_{\mathcal{Y}}(D_-)$ by [57, 2.10] and [41, 2.4 (1)]. Take a polarization \mathcal{H} on \mathcal{X} as the argument after Proposition 4.19. Let \mathcal{D} be the strict transformation of D' on \mathcal{X} . Then, it is easy to check that \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{D} satisfy the condition (3). \square

Proof of Theorem 4.12. Let $\phi \in \mathcal{H}^{\text{NA}}(L)$ be a positive non-Archimedean metric such that

$$M_{(B,M)}^{\text{NA}}(\phi) < 0.$$

Then, take $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{H})$ and $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{L})$ as in Proposition 4.20. We may replace H by $H + rL$ where r is as in Proposition 4.20. For sufficiently large $m \in \mathbb{Q}$,

$$\frac{-K_{\mathcal{X}} \cdot (H + mL)^{n-1}}{(H + mL)^n} = -\frac{b(K_C + M_{(X,\Delta)/C} + B_{(X,\Delta)/C}) \cdot L^{b-1}}{nL^b} m^{-1} + O(m^{-2}).$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} & (H + mL)^n \text{DF}_{\Delta}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{H} + m\Pi^* \mathcal{L}) \\ &= K_{(\mathcal{X}, (\rho_{\mathcal{X}})^{-1} \Delta_{\mathbb{P}^1})/\mathbb{P}^1} \cdot (\mathcal{H} + m\Pi^* \mathcal{L})^n + \frac{n}{n+1} \frac{-K_{\mathcal{X}} \cdot (H + mL)^{n-1}}{(H + mL)^n} (\mathcal{H} + m\Pi^* \mathcal{L})^{n+1} \\ &= K_{(\mathcal{X}, (\rho_{\mathcal{X}})^{-1} \Delta_{\mathbb{P}^1})/\mathbb{P}^1} \cdot (\mathcal{H} + m\Pi^* \mathcal{L})^n \\ &\quad - \frac{n}{n+1} \left(\frac{b(K_C + M_{(X,\Delta)/C} + B_{(X,\Delta)/C}) \cdot L^{b-1}}{nL^b} m^{-1} + O(m^{-2}) \right) (\mathcal{H} + m\Pi^* \mathcal{L})^{n+1}. \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$K_{(\mathcal{X}, (\rho_{\mathcal{X}})^{-1} \Delta_{\mathbb{P}^1})} = \Pi^*(K_{\mathcal{C}} + \mathcal{M} + (\rho_{\mathcal{C}})^{-1} B_{(X_{\mathbb{P}^1}, \Delta_{\mathbb{P}^1})/C_{\mathbb{P}^1}}) + \mathcal{D}$$

holds over \mathcal{C} where $\text{codim}_{\mathcal{C}} \Pi(\mathcal{D}) \geq 2$ and $\rho_{\mathcal{C}}^* M_{(X_{\mathbb{P}^1}, \Delta_{\mathbb{P}^1})/C_{\mathbb{P}^1}} - \mathcal{M}$ is effective by the negativity lemma [55, Lemma 3.39] and [33, Theorem 1.1], the m^{b+1} -term of $(H + mL)^n \text{DF}_{\Delta}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{H} + m\Pi^* \mathcal{L})$ vanishes and the m^b -term is smaller than or equals to

$$\binom{n}{b} (H^{n-b} \cdot L^b) \text{DF}_{(B,M)}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{L}) < 0,$$

Here, we use $\text{DF}_{(B,M)}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{L}) = M_{(B,M)}^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{L})$ since \mathcal{C}_0 is reduced. Thus, $\text{DF}_{\Delta}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{H} + m\Pi^* \mathcal{L}) < 0$ for sufficiently large $m \gg 0$. \square

If C is a curve, C is necessarily an Ambro model for any sublc-trivial fibration $f : (X, \Delta) \rightarrow C$. Thus, we obtain the following by Theorem 4.12:

Corollary 4.21. *Let $f : (X, \Delta) \rightarrow C$ be a lc-trivial fibration. Suppose that C is a smooth curve with an ample line bundle L and H is a f -ample divisor. Let*

$$K_{(X,\Delta)} = f^*(K_C + M + B)$$

be the canonical bundle formula where M (resp., B) is the moduli (resp., discriminant) divisor. If (X, Δ, H) is adiabatically K -semistable over (C, L) , then (C, B, M, L) is log-twisted K -semistable.

Next, we state a partial result that uniform adiabatic K -stability of the total space implies uniform K -stability of the log-twisted Fano base of a klt-trivial fibration.

Lemma 4.22. *Let $f : X \rightarrow C$ be a lc-trivial fibration and suppose that (X, Δ, H) is uniformly adiabatically K -stable over (C, L) . Then there exist three positive constants δ_1, δ_2 and ϵ_0 such that if $0 < \epsilon < \epsilon_0$ and $\epsilon H + f^*L$ is ample on X ,*

$$M_{\Delta}^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{M}) \geq \delta_1 H_{\Delta}^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{M}) + \delta_2 J^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{M})$$

for any semiample test configuration $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{M})$ over $(X, \epsilon H + f^*L)$.

Proof. Decompose $M_{\Delta}^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{M}) = H_{\Delta}^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{M}) + (\mathcal{J}^{K(x,\Delta)})^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{M})$. By the assumption there exist positive constant ϵ_0 and δ such that $H_{\Delta}^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{M}) \geq -(\mathcal{J}^{K(x,\Delta)})^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{M}) + \delta J^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{M})$ for $0 < \epsilon \leq \epsilon_0$ such that $\epsilon H + f^*L$ is ample and for any semiample test configuration $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{M})$ over $(X, \epsilon H + f^*L)$. For $0 < b \ll 1$,

$$(1 - b)H_{\Delta}^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{M}) \geq -(\mathcal{J}^{K(x,\Delta)})^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{M}) + \delta(1 - b)J^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{M}) + b(\mathcal{J}^{K(x,\Delta)})^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{M}).$$

On the other hand, let T be a \mathbb{Q} -line bundle such that $K_{(X,\Delta)} \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} f^*T$. There exists a positive constant $G > 0$ independent from $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{M})$ such that for any sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(n \frac{f^*T \cdot (f^*L + \epsilon H)^{n-1}}{(f^*L + \epsilon H)^n} + \frac{G}{n} \right) (f^*L + \epsilon H) - \frac{n^2 - 1}{n} f^*T \\ &= \left(\frac{G}{n} + c \frac{f^*T \cdot f^*L^{c-1} \cdot H^{n-c}}{f^*L^c \cdot H^{n-c}} + O(\epsilon) \right) f^*L - \frac{n^2 - 1}{n} f^*T \\ &+ \epsilon \left(\frac{G}{n} + c \frac{f^*T \cdot f^*L^{c-1} \cdot H^{n-c}}{f^*L^c \cdot H^{n-c}} + O(\epsilon) \right) H \end{aligned}$$

is ample, where X (resp., C) is n (resp., c)-dimensional. By the proof of [44, Corollary 8.5],

$$G(I^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{M}) - J^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{M})) + (\mathcal{J}^{K(x,\Delta)})^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{M}) \geq 0.$$

Therefore, there exists a positive constant $\delta_2 > 0$ such that for sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$ and $b > 0$,

$$\delta(1 - b)J^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{M}) + b(\mathcal{J}^{K(x,\Delta)})^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{M}) \geq \delta_2 J^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{M}).$$

Hence,

$$H_{\Delta}^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{M}) \geq -(\mathcal{J}^{K(x,\Delta)})^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{M}) + bH_{\Delta}^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{M}) + \delta_2 J^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{M}).$$

Here, let $\delta_1 = b$. □

Theorem 4.23. *Let $f : (X, \Delta) \rightarrow C$ be a klt-trivial fibration, M be the moduli divisor and B be the discriminant divisor on C . Suppose that C is an Ambro model, (X, Δ, H) is uniformly adiabatically K -stable over (C, L) and $L = -(K_C + M + B)$ is ample. Then (C, B, M, L) is log-twisted K -stable.*

Proof. Note that C is also a good Ambro model by Lemma 4.18. By Theorem 4.12, it suffices to show that there exists no non-almost trivial semiample test configuration for (C, B, M, L) whose log-twisted Donaldson-Futaki invariant is 0. Assume that the assertion would fail and hence there would exist a non almost trivial semiample test configuration $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{L})$ over (C, B, M, L) such that $\text{DF}_{(B,M)}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{L}) = 0$. By Theorem A.20, we may assume that there exists a \mathbb{Q} -Cartier \mathbb{Q} -divisor $D \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} L$ on X such that $\text{DF}_{(B+aD,M)}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{L}) < 0$ for sufficiently small $a > 0$. Take a test configuration $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{H})$ for (X, H) and we may assume that there exists a morphism $\Pi : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ as in Proposition 4.20. Then $\text{DF}_{\Delta+af^*D}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{H} + m\mathcal{L}) < 0$ for sufficiently small $a > 0$ and for sufficiently large $m \gg 0$. However, since (X, Δ, H) is uniformly adiabatically K -stable over (C, L) , there exist three positive constants δ_1, δ_2 and ϵ_0 such that if $0 < m^{-1} < \epsilon_0$ and $H + mf^*L$ is ample on X ,

$$M_{\Delta}^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, m^{-1}\mathcal{H} + \mathcal{L}) \geq \delta_1 H_{\Delta}^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, m^{-1}\mathcal{H} + \mathcal{L}) + \delta_2 J^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, m^{-1}\mathcal{H} + \mathcal{L})$$

by Lemma 4.22. Then

$$\begin{aligned} M_{\Delta+af^*D}^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, m^{-1}\mathcal{H} + \mathcal{L}) &\geq \delta_1 H_{(\Delta+\frac{a}{\delta_1}f^*D)}^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, m^{-1}\mathcal{H} + \mathcal{L}) \\ &+ \delta_2 (J^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, m^{-1}\mathcal{H} + \mathcal{L}) + (\mathcal{J}^{(\frac{a}{\delta_2}f^*D)})^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, m^{-1}\mathcal{H} + \mathcal{L})). \end{aligned}$$

For sufficiently small $a > 0$ that $(X, \Delta + \frac{a}{\delta_1}f^*D)$ is klt, $H_{(\Delta+\frac{a}{\delta_1}f^*D)}^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, m^{-1}\mathcal{H} + \mathcal{L}) > 0$ by [11, 9.16]. Similarly to the proof of Lemma 4.22, by [44, Corollary 8.5],

$$J^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, m^{-1}\mathcal{H} + \mathcal{L}) + (\mathcal{J}^{(\frac{a}{\delta_2}f^*D)})^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, m^{-1}\mathcal{H} + \mathcal{L}) > 0$$

for sufficiently small $a > 0$. Therefore,

$$\mathrm{DF}_{\Delta+af^*D}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{H} + m\mathcal{L}) \geq M_{\Delta+af^*D}^{\mathrm{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, m^{-1}\mathcal{H} + \mathcal{L}) > 0$$

for sufficiently small $a > 0$ and for sufficiently large $m \gg 0$. This is a contradiction. \square

It immediately follows from the last theorem and Corollary 4.6:

Corollary 4.24. *Let $f : (X, \Delta) \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$ be a klt-trivial fibration, M be the moduli divisor and B be the discriminant divisor on \mathbb{P}^1 . Suppose that $L = -(K_{\mathbb{P}^1} + M + B)$ is ample. Then, (X, Δ, H) is uniformly adiabatically K -stable over (\mathbb{P}^1, L) if and only if (\mathbb{P}^1, B, M, L) is uniformly K -stable. Moreover, if $\Delta = 0$, X is smooth and (\mathbb{P}^1, B, M, L) is uniformly K -stable, then (X, H) has cscK metrics adiabatically.*

Here, we remark that Theorem B follows immediately from Corollaries 4.8 and 4.24.

5. APPLICATIONS TO RATIONAL ELLIPTIC SURFACES

We apply the general theory established in §8 to rational elliptic surfaces.

5.1. Log-twisted K -stability of the base curve. In this subsection, we classify K -stable log-twisted Fano curve (\mathbb{P}^1, B, M, L) associated with a rational elliptic surface.

Let $f : X \rightarrow C$ be a smooth (relatively minimal) elliptic surface. Thanks to Kodaira's canonical bundle formula (cf., [35]), the relative canonical divisor $K_{X/C}$ is expressed as

$$K_{X/C} = \frac{1}{12}f^*J^*\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(1) + \sum_Q(1 - \mathrm{lct}_X(f^*(Q)))f^*(Q),$$

where $J : C \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$ is the *functional invariant* (cf., [5, V.8]). We call $T = \frac{1}{12}f^*J^*\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(1)$ and $B = \sum_Q(1 - \mathrm{lct}_X(f^*(Q)))f^*(Q)$ to be the moduli divisor and the discriminant divisor, respectively (cf., [1]). Recall that Kodaira classified the singular fibers of elliptic surfaces. See the details in [5, V. §7]. Let F be a fiber. Then the following holds,

- if F is a smooth or I_N -type fiber, then $\mathrm{lct}_X(F) = 1$.
- if F is a II -type fiber, then $\mathrm{lct}_X(F) = \frac{5}{6}$.
- if F is a III -type fiber, then $\mathrm{lct}_X(F) = \frac{3}{4}$.
- if F is a IV -type fiber, then $\mathrm{lct}_X(F) = \frac{2}{3}$.
- if F is an I_N^* -type fiber for some $N \geq 0$, then $\mathrm{lct}_X(F) = \frac{1}{2}$.
- if F is an II^* -type fiber, then $\mathrm{lct}_X(F) = \frac{1}{6}$.
- if F is an III^* -type fiber, then $\mathrm{lct}_X(F) = \frac{1}{4}$.
- if F is an IV^* -type fiber, then $\mathrm{lct}_X(F) = \frac{1}{3}$.
- if F is a multiple fiber with multiplicity m , then $\mathrm{lct}_X(F) = \frac{1}{m}$.

Next, we consider rational elliptic surfaces $f : X \rightarrow C$. By [30, Proposition 3.23], we see that $C = \mathbb{P}^1$ and $\deg f_*\omega_{X/\mathbb{P}^1} = 1$. Let M and B be the moduli and discriminant divisors on \mathbb{P}^1 respectively. Then, $(\mathbb{P}^1, B, M, -(K_{\mathbb{P}^1} + M + B))$ is a log-twisted Fano curve such that (\mathbb{P}^1, B) is klt. Moreover, it is easy to see that a rational elliptic surface X is isomorphic to a blow up of \mathbb{P}^2 at nine points (cf., [16, Theorem 5.6.1]) and X has at most one multiple fiber.

Definition 5.1. If X has one multiple fiber, the *multiplicity* $m(X)$ of X is the multiplicity m of the multiple fiber. If X has no multiple fiber, we define $m(X) = 1$.

Then we have the following.

Theorem 5.2. *Let $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$ be a rational elliptic surface, $B = \sum_{Q \in \mathbb{P}^1} s_Q Q$ be the discriminant and M be the moduli divisor. Then $(\mathbb{P}^1, B, M, L = \mathcal{O}(1))$ is uniformly K -stable (resp, K -semistable, K -unstable) iff $\max_Q s_Q < \frac{2m-1}{2m}$ (resp., $\max_Q s_Q = \frac{2m-1}{2m}$, $\max_Q s_Q > \frac{2m-1}{2m}$).*

Proof. Immediately from Corollary A.30. \square

According to this, the GIT-stability of a rational elliptic surface admitting a section in the sense of Miranda [64], [65] coincides with the log-twisted K-stability of the base. More precisely, we obtain the following by the Kodaira canonical bundle formula.

Corollary 5.3. *Let $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$ be a smooth rational elliptic surface with multiplicity $m(X) = m$. Then the log twisted pair (\mathbb{P}^1, B, M, L) induced by f is K-unstable iff one of the following holds.*

- $m = 1$ and X admits one of II^* , III^* or IV^* -type fibers,
- $m = 2$ and X admits at least one II^* -type fiber.

Proof. This follows immediately from Theorem 5.2. We remark that if $f^{-1}(P)$ is the multiple fiber of multiplicity $m > 1$, $P \in \mathbb{P}^1$ does not destabilize the log-twisted pair since $\frac{m-1}{m} < \frac{2m-1}{2m}$. \square

Therefore, we obtain the following by Theorem 4.12, Corollary 5.3 and the canonical bundle formula:

Corollary 5.4. *Let X be a smooth rational elliptic surface with multiplicity $m(X) = m$. Then the following hold,*

- (1) *If $m = 1$ and X admits one of II^* , III^* or IV^* -type fibers, then X is adiabatically K-unstable for any relative polarization over \mathbb{P}^1 .*
- (2) *If $m = 2$ and X admits at least one II^* -type fiber, then X is adiabatically K-unstable for any relative polarization over \mathbb{P}^1 .*

By [45, Theorem C] and Corollary 5.4, we conclude as follows.

Example 5.5. Let X be a rational elliptic smooth surface over \mathbb{P}^1 admitting a section and a IV^* -type fiber. There is a polarization $H = \epsilon H + F$ on X , where H is relatively ample and F is the fiber class. Let the line bundle $T = M + B = \frac{c_1(\lambda_{\text{CM}}(X, H))}{8\pi_*(c_1(H))}$ on \mathbb{P}^1 . Here, T has degree 1 and M (resp., B) is the moduli (resp., discriminant) divisor on \mathbb{P}^1 . Then, it is easy to see that the twisted pair (\mathbb{P}^1, T, L) is uniformly twisted K-stable for $L = T$. Here, the twisted pair (\mathbb{P}^1, T, L) denotes the log-twisted pair $(\mathbb{P}^1, 0, T, L)$. Then (\mathbb{P}^1, T, L) is a uniformly K-stable twisted Fano pair. By twisted Yau-Tian-Donaldson conjecture (cf., [87]), we conclude that there exists a unique twisted Kähler-Einstein metric in $c_1(L)$. By [45, Theorem C] and Corollary 5.4, we obtain the following.

Corollary 5.6. *There exists a polarized algebraic fiber space $f : (X, H) \rightarrow (B, L)$ such that $\dim X = 2$, $\dim B = 1$, X is smooth and $K_X \sim_{B, \mathbb{Q}} 0$, and f satisfies the following. If $T = \frac{c_1(\lambda_{\text{CM}}(X, H))}{8\pi_*(c_1(H))}$, then the twisted pair (B, T, L) has a unique twisted cscK metric and f is \mathfrak{f} -stable but adiabatically K-unstable.*

Thus, we see that Conjecture in §1 does not hold for fibrations with at least one singular fiber. Hence, it is necessary to consider the relation of K-stability of klt-trivial fibrations and log-twisted K-stability of the base scheme (cf., Theorem 4.12, [19, Corollary 4.3]).

Conversely, we obtain the following by Theorems 4.6 and 5.2 and the canonical bundle formula,

Corollary 5.7. *Let X be a smooth rational elliptic surface and S be a relatively ample divisor over \mathbb{P}^1 . Let also the multiplicity of a unique multiple fiber be $m \geq 1$.*

- (1) *If $m = 1$ and X has at most reduced fibers, then (X, S) is uniformly adiabatically K-stable and has cscK metrics.*
- (2) *If $m = 2$ and X has no II^* or III^* -type fiber, then (X, S) is uniformly adiabatically K-stable and has cscK metrics.*
- (3) *If $m = 3$ and X has no II^* -type fiber, then (X, S) is uniformly adiabatically K-stable and has cscK metrics.*

(4) If $m \geq 4$, then (X, S) is uniformly adiabatically K-stable and has cscK metrics.

From the next section, we will compare the log-twisted K-stability of the base curves with adiabatic K-stability of rational elliptic surfaces.

5.2. GIT-stability in the sense of Miranda I: Weierstrass fibrations. Miranda [65] constructs the family M_1 of rational Weierstrass fibrations as below and applies GIT to obtain the moduli of rational Weierstrass fibrations. Comparing Theorem 5.2 with Miranda's results (e.g., [65, Theorem 6.2]), we realize that the log-twisted K-stability of the base curves coincides with GIT-stability in the sense of Miranda. In this subsection, by comparing the Hilbert-Mumford weight with the weight of CM line bundle, we will prove Theorem 4.12 when X is a rational Weierstrass fibration in another way.

First, recall rational Weierstrass fibrations.

Definition 5.8 (cf., [65]). Let $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$ be a rational elliptic surface. If $m(X) = 1$, it is known that X has at least one section S for f [30, Example 5.12]. $\pi : W \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$ is the *rational Weierstrass form* of (X, S) if W is the relative lc model of (X, S) over \mathbb{P}^1 .

On the other hand, let $\pi : W \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$ be an algebraic fiber space such that W is a normal and irreducible surface that has only canonical singularities (see [55, §4.2]). We call $\pi : W \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$ a *Weierstrass fibration* if there exists a rational elliptic surface $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$ admitting a section S such that W is the Weierstrass form of (X, S) . See the details in [65]. For simplicity, we will also call W a Weierstrass fibration.

We will say that W has a $*$ -type fiber over $p \in \mathbb{P}^1$ if the minimal resolution X has a $*$ -type fiber over the same point. (Here, $*$ = I_N, I_N^*, \dots , etc.)

Next, let us recall the setting of [65]. Let $V_N = H^0(\mathbb{P}^1, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(N))$ parametrizes $A \in H^0(\mathbb{P}^1, \mathcal{O}(4))$ and $B \in H^0(\mathbb{P}^1, \mathcal{O}(6))$. Let $\mathcal{U}' \subset (V_4 \times V_6 \setminus 0) \times \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(-2) \oplus \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(-3) \oplus \mathcal{O})$ be the closed subscheme defined by $y^2z = x^3 + \mathcal{A}xz^2 + \mathcal{B}z^3$, where $\mathcal{A} \in H^0((V_4 \times V_6) \times \mathbb{P}^1, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(4))$ and $\mathcal{B} \in H^0((V_4 \times V_6) \times \mathbb{P}^1, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(6))$ are the universal sections and \mathcal{U}' is flat over $(V_4 \times V_6 \setminus \{0\}) \times \mathbb{P}^1$. Note that

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(-2) \oplus \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(-3) \oplus \mathcal{O}) = \text{Proj}_{\mathbb{P}^1} \left(\bigoplus_n \text{Sym}^n(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(-2) \oplus \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(-3) \oplus \mathcal{O}) \right),$$

and $x \in H^0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(-2) \oplus \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(-3) \oplus \mathcal{O})}(1) \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(2))$, $y \in H^0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(-2) \oplus \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(-3) \oplus \mathcal{O})}(1) \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(3))$ and $z \in H^0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(-2) \oplus \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(-3) \oplus \mathcal{O})}(1))$ are the canonical coordinate functions. Here, we remark that $(V_4 \times V_6) \times \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(-2) \oplus \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(-3) \oplus \mathcal{O})$ and \mathcal{U}' admit canonical $GL(2)$ -actions equivariantly over $V_4 \times V_6 \times \mathbb{P}^1$. There exists a section \mathcal{S}' of $\Pi' : \mathcal{U}' \rightarrow (V_4 \times V_6 \setminus \{0\}) \times \mathbb{P}^1$ defined by $[0 : 1 : 0]$. Note that \mathcal{S}' is a relative Cartier divisor since \mathcal{U}' is smooth around \mathcal{S}' . Furthermore, $\Pi'^*((V_4 \times V_6 \setminus \{0\}) \times [0 : 1])$ and $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{P}^1}}(1)|_{\mathcal{U}'}$ admit the canonical $GL(2)$ -linearizations. Here, we can take a $GL(2)$ -linearized relative polarization $\mathcal{L}'_a = \Pi'^*((V_4 \times V_6 \setminus \{0\}) \times [0 : 1]) + \frac{a}{3}\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{P}^1}}(1)|_{\mathcal{U}'}$ for $0 < a < 1$ and \mathcal{L}'_a has 0-weight of the center $\mathbb{G}_m \subset GL(2)$. Then we can take the quotient by the center of $GL(2)$. Let

$$M_1 = (V_4 \times V_6 \setminus 0)/\mathbb{G}_m \cong \mathbb{P}(2 : 2 : 2 : 2 : 2 : 3 : 3 : 3 : 3 : 3 : 3 : 3)$$

be the universal geometric quotient (cf., [70, Definition 0.7]) and we obtain

$$\Pi : (\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{L}_a) = (\mathcal{U}', \mathcal{L}'_a)/\mathbb{G}_m \rightarrow M_1$$

an $SL(2)$ -linearized polarized family equivariant over M_1 by the following.

Lemma 5.9. $(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{L}_a)$ exists and is the universal geometric quotient of $(\mathcal{U}', \mathcal{L}'_a)$ by \mathbb{G}_m . Here, \mathcal{L}_a is the quotient of \mathcal{L}'_a in the sense that if $q : \mathcal{U}' \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$ is the quotient map, $q^*\mathcal{L}_a = \mathcal{L}'_a$.

Proof. Recall the construction of $p : V_4 \times V_6 \setminus 0 \rightarrow \mathbb{P}(2 : 2 : 2 : 2 : 2 : 3 : 3 : 3 : 3 : 3 : 3 : 3)$. For any nonconstant \mathbb{G}_m -eigenfunction $f \in H^0(V_4 \times V_6 \setminus 0, \mathcal{O})$, any point of $(V_4 \times V_6)_f$ is GIT-stable and $p|(V_4 \times V_6)_f$ is a GIT-quotient (see Definition 2.7). For the first assertion, we have to show that any point of $(V_4 \times V_6)_f \times \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(-2) \oplus \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(-3) \oplus \mathcal{O})$ is GIT-stable with respect to

$\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(1)$ by [70, Theorem 1.10]. Since the action of \mathbb{G}_m has a finite group stabilizer on any point, it suffices to show that any point of \mathcal{U}' is GIT-semistable by [70, Amplification 1.11]. This immediately follows from that x, y and z are \mathbb{G}_m -invariant sections and $\{x = y = z = 0\} = \emptyset$.

On the other hand, we can construct \mathcal{L}_a similarly to the proof of [70, Theorem 1.10]. \square

Recall that $GL(2)$ acts on \mathcal{S}' equivariantly and let $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}'/\mathbb{G}_m$. Note also that $3\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(1)|_{\mathcal{U}'}/\mathbb{G}_m$ as a relative Cartier divisor on \mathcal{U} over $M_1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$. On the other hand, by Lemma 5.9, the fiber of Π' over $p \in (V_4 \times V_6 \setminus 0)$ coincides with the fiber of Π over $p \in M_1$ where p is the image of p' . Therefore, the fiber $(\mathcal{U}_s, \mathcal{L}_a|_{\mathcal{U}_s})$ of Π over $s \in M_1$ can be denoted as $(W, F + aS)$ where W is the corresponding rational Weierstrass fibration (or the corresponding singular surface), S is the section induced by \mathcal{S} and F is the fiber class since \mathcal{L}_a is the sum of $a\mathcal{S}$ and the fiber over \mathbb{P}^1 of the canonical morphism $\mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$. Moreover, Π is flat by [42, III Theorem 9.9]. By Theorem 5.2, GIT-stability of rational Weierstrass fibrations W in the sense of Miranda [65, Theorem 6.2] coincides with log-twisted K-stability of the base curves. Furthermore, if W is GIT-stable in the sense of Miranda, (W, S) is uniformly adiabatically K-stable as Corollary 5.7. Then, we obtain the following,

Theorem 5.10. *Let W be a rational Weierstrass fibration. If the minimal resolution of W has one of II^* , III^* or IV^* -type fibers, then $(W, F + \epsilon S)$ is K-unstable for sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$. If W has a singular fiber type I_N^* , then $(W, F + \epsilon S)$ is not K-stable. Here, F is the fiber class and S is a section.*

Proof. It is well-known that the Picard number $\rho(M_1) = 1$. Moreover, there exists $s \in M_1$ such that $(\mathcal{U}_s, \mathcal{L}_\epsilon|_{\mathcal{U}_s})$ is uniformly K-stable for sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$ by Corollary 5.7. Since $SL(2)$ is a semisimple algebraic group, we can apply [75, Theorem 3.4] and [65, Theorem 6.2] to conclude that there exist $r \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0}$ and a \mathbb{G}_m -equivariant isomorphism $\Lambda_{CM} \cong r\mathcal{O}_{M_1}(6)$ where $\Lambda_{CM} = \lambda_{CM}(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{L}_\epsilon)$ is the CM line bundle with respect to the family $(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{L}_\epsilon) \rightarrow M_1$. Therefore, GIT-stability of $(M_1, \mathcal{O}_{M_1}(6))$ coincides with that of (M_1, Λ_{CM}) . \square

Remark 5.11. The first assertion also follows from Corollary 5.4. On the other hand, the second one does not follow directly from the general theory we constructed in §4.1 and §4.2.

Remark 5.12. As in Theorem 5.10, we can prove the following weaker assertion in a more concrete way when X is a smooth rational elliptic surface than Corollary 5.4.

Claim. *Let X be a smooth rational elliptic surface with $m(X) = 1$ and F be the fiber class. Suppose that X has one of II^* , III^* or IV^* -type fibers. Then for sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$, there exists an ample line bundle H on X such that $(X, \epsilon H + F)$ is K-unstable.*

Proof. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $\pi : X \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$ has a II^* , III^* or IV^* -type fiber at $[0 : 1] \in \mathbb{P}^1$. Fix a section \tilde{S} of π and let W be the Weierstrass fibration of (X, \tilde{S}) . Let S be the strict transformation of \tilde{S} on W . By Theorem 5.10 and the proof of [65, Proposition 5.1], a 1-PS

$$\begin{pmatrix} q & 0 \\ 0 & q^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \in SL(2)$$

induces an ample test configuration $(\mathcal{W}, \mathcal{M})$ of $(W, F + \epsilon S)$ such that $DF(\mathcal{W}, \mathcal{M}) < 0$. It is easy to check that \mathcal{W}_0 is a rational Weierstrass fibration with the same type fiber over $[0 : 1]$ of X and its functional invariant J is constant. Furthermore, \mathcal{W}_0 has a II , III or IV -type fiber over $[1 : 0]$ if X has a II^* , III^* or IV^* -type fiber over $[0 : 1]$ respectively (cf., [65, §5, §9]). Then, we can take a test configuration \mathcal{X} for X by blowing up \mathcal{W} along horizontal singularities over \mathbb{A}^1 as follows. Let $p \in W$ be one of the canonical singularities. Let T be the closure of $\{p\} \times \mathbb{A}^1 \setminus 0$ and \mathcal{I} be the ideal sheaf corresponding to T . By [42, III Proposition 9.8], T is a flat subvariety over \mathbb{P}^1 . Therefore, $T \cong \mathbb{A}^1$ and hence the restriction \mathcal{I}_0 to the fiber of $0 \in \mathbb{A}^1$ coincides with the maximal ideal corresponding to T_0 .

Subclaim. *The exceptional divisor of the blow up along T is the \mathbb{P}^1 -bundle over \mathbb{P}^1 .*

It suffices to show that $\mathcal{I}^n/\mathcal{I}^{n+1}$ is flat over \mathbb{A}^1 for n . For $n \gg 0$ and $t \in \mathbb{A}^1$, $\dim((\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{W}}/\mathcal{I}^n)_t)$ is a constant because all rational double points are hypersurface singularities of \mathbb{A}^3 . Therefore, $(\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{W}}/\mathcal{I}^n)$ is flat and so is $\mathcal{I}^n/\mathcal{I}^{n+1}$ for n . Therefore the exceptional divisor $\text{Proj}(\bigoplus \mathcal{I}^n/\mathcal{I}^{n+1})$ is flat over \mathbb{A}^1 . We complete the proof of Subclaim.

Thus, we can take a test configuration \mathcal{W}_1 by blowing up along T . By the inductive argument, we also obtain the test configuration \mathcal{X} for X . \mathcal{X} is the blow up along the horizontal canonical singularities of \mathcal{W} . All fiber of \mathcal{W} over \mathbb{A}^1 is a Gorenstein scheme and hence $K_{\mathcal{W}}$ is Cartier. Hence, it is easy to see that \mathcal{X} is a normal test configuration of X and $\rho: \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{W}$ is crepant.

We will prove that there exists a polarization H of X such that $\text{DF}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{M}) < 0$ for $(X, \epsilon H + F)$. Let \mathcal{L} be the pullback under ρ of the polarization of \mathcal{W} and $-\mathcal{E}$ be a ρ -ample exceptional divisor. Note that $\mathcal{L} - \delta\mathcal{E}$ is a \mathbb{G}_m -linearized polarization of \mathcal{X} and

$$\text{DF}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L} - \delta\mathcal{E}) < 0$$

for sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$. Thus, $(X, F + \epsilon S - \delta E)$ is K-unstable for $0 \ll \delta \ll \epsilon \ll 1$, where $E = \mathcal{E}_1$ is the fiber over $1 \in \mathbb{A}^1$. \square

On the other hand, we can prove as Theorem 5.10 that there exists the following counter example to Theorem 3.13 when κ_B is not nef.

Example 5.13. There exists an adiabatically K-unstable klt algebraic fiber space pair (W, Δ_W) over \mathbb{P}^1 such that $\dim W = 2$ and $K_W + \Delta_W$ is relative ample over \mathbb{P}^1 . Let W be a rational Weierstrass fibration admitting a section S and a IV^* -type fiber. Let also $\Delta = \delta S$ for $0 < \delta \ll 1$ and L be a degree 1 line bundle on \mathbb{P}^1 . Then, we claim that $(W, \Delta_W, \epsilon(K_W + \Delta) + L)$ is K-unstable for sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$. Note also that $\epsilon(K_W + \Delta) + L \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} (1 - \epsilon)L + \epsilon\delta S$ and $K_W + \Delta$ is relatively ample over \mathbb{P}^1 .

Consider the family $(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{L}_{\frac{\epsilon\delta}{1-\epsilon}}) \rightarrow M_1$ and the log CM line bundle $\lambda_{\text{CM}}(\mathcal{U}, \delta S, \mathcal{L}_{\frac{\epsilon\delta}{1-\epsilon}})$ on M_1 . By the argument of Theorem 5.10, it suffices to prove that $(X, \Delta, \epsilon(K_X + \Delta) + L)$ is K-stable for smooth rational elliptic surface X that has at most I_1 -type fiber and sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$. Here, S, L and Δ on X are as defined in W . Note that $\alpha_{(X, \Delta)}(L) = 1$ (cf., Definition 4.1 and Theorem 4.2) and take δ sufficiently small that $(K_X + \Delta + \frac{5}{4}L)^2 > 0$. Then, $(X, \Delta, \epsilon(K_X + \Delta) + L)$ is K-stable for sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$. Indeed, we can show by Lemma 3.10 that for any ample test configuration $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{M})$ for $(X, \epsilon(K_X + \Delta) + L)$,

$$(\mathcal{J}^{K_X + \Delta + \frac{5}{4}L})^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{M}) \geq 0.$$

Note that $\epsilon(K_X + \Delta) + L = (1 - \frac{5}{4}\epsilon)L + \epsilon(K_X + \Delta + \frac{5}{4}L)$ and hence

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathcal{J}^{K_X + \Delta})^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{M}) &\geq -\frac{5}{4}(\mathcal{J}^L)^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{M}) \\ &\geq -\frac{5}{4 - 5\epsilon}(I^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{M}) - J^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{M})). \end{aligned}$$

If ϵ is so small that $\alpha_{(X, \Delta)}(\epsilon(K_X + \Delta) + L) > \frac{5}{6}$, then

$$\frac{3}{2}\alpha_{(X, \Delta)}(\epsilon(K_X + \Delta) + L) > \frac{5}{4 - 5\epsilon}$$

and hence $(X, \Delta, \epsilon(K_X + \Delta) + L)$ is K-stable by Theorem 4.2, [11, Proposition 9.16] and $\frac{2}{3}I^{\text{NA}} \geq I^{\text{NA}} - J^{\text{NA}}$.

Finally, we prove the next lemma.

Lemma 5.14. *Let $\pi: W \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$ be the rational Weierstrass fibration admitting a section S , $\text{Aut}_0(W)$ be the identity component of the group of automorphisms of W . If W is not GIT-polystable but GIT-semistable, $\text{Aut}_0(W)$ is trivial.*

Proof. Let J be the functional invariant of W . First, we consider the case when J is not constant. By rigidity lemma (cf., [55, Lemma 1.6]), we can conclude that any smooth fiber F satisfies that $\pi \circ \varphi(F)$ is a point for $\varphi \in \text{Aut}_0(W)$. Furthermore, since J is not constant, we

obtain $\pi \circ \varphi(F) = \pi(F)$. Note that $\varphi(S) = S$ since S is a (-1) -curve. Therefore, φ is the identity morphism on a nonempty open subset of W .

Secondly, we consider the case when J is a constant. By [65, Proposition 8.4], $J = 0$ or 1 . Moreover, by the argument of [65, §9], if $J = 1$, W has one I_0^* -type fiber and two III -type fibers. On the other hand, if $J = 0$, W has I_0^* , II and IV -type fibers or has an I_0^* and three II -type fibers. Thus, W has at least three singular fibers. By rigidity lemma, if $\text{Aut}_0(W)$ is nontrivial, $\varphi \in \text{Aut}_0(W)$ induces an automorphism of \mathbb{P}^1 leaving three points fixed. Therefore, φ is trivial again. \square

Thus, by [65, §8, §9] and Lemma 5.14, we can conclude that if a rational Weierstrass fibration (W, S) with a section S is adiabatically K-polystable but not K-stable, then W has two I_0^* -type fiber.

5.3. GIT-stability in the sense of Miranda II: Cubic pencils. In this subsection, we obtain some results of the existence of cscK metrics on a smooth rational elliptic surface when the base curve is log-twisted K-semistable by comparing the weight of CM line bundle with the Hilbert-Mumford weight in [64].

In [64], all pencils of cubic curves in \mathbb{P}^2 are parametrized by G the 16-dimensional Grassmannian variety. Recall the fact that the Picard number of G is 1 (cf., [23, Lemma 11.1]). It is easy to see that a locus F of G consisting of pencils that have fixed parts is of codimension ≥ 2 . In fact, G is the geometric quotient of the GIT-stable locus of $\text{Mat}(2, 10)$ with respect to $GL(2)$ (cf., [68, 7.1, 7.2]). Let F' be a locally closed subset that consists of GIT-stable pencils with fixed parts. Then, F' is the union of 12 and 15-dimensional subvarieties and F is the image of F' . Note that F' is $GL(2)$ -stable and $\text{codim } F \geq 2$. Let $U = G \setminus F$. Let \mathcal{W} be the universal 2-dimensional sub vector space of $\Gamma(\mathbb{P}^2 \times G, \mathcal{O}(3))$ and \mathcal{S} be the image of

$$\mathcal{W} \otimes \mathcal{O}(-3) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}.$$

In fact, $(\mathcal{S}/\mathcal{S}^{n+1})|_{\mathbb{P}^2 \times U}$ is flat over U for $n > 0$ since \mathcal{O}/\mathcal{S} has length 9 over U and by [63, Theorem 17.7] and the fact that \mathcal{S} is locally generated by two sections, $\mathcal{S}^n/\mathcal{S}^{n+1}$ has the same length over U . Then we blow up $\mathbb{P}^2 \times U$ along $\mathcal{S}|_U$ and obtain a flat family \mathcal{V} over U . Note that \mathcal{V} is the family of smooth rational elliptic surfaces admitting a section generically over U . We also remark that $\Pi^*\mathcal{O}(3) - (1 - \epsilon)E$ is ample for sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$, where $\Pi : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^2 \times U$ is the morphism and E is the exceptional divisor. It is easy to see that $(\mathcal{V}, \Pi^*\mathcal{O}(3) - (1 - \epsilon)E)$ admits an $SL(3)$ -action equivariant over U . Then we study the CM line bundle $\Lambda_{\text{CM}} = \lambda_{\text{CM}}(\mathcal{V}, \Pi^*\mathcal{O}(3) - (1 - \epsilon)E)$ on U . By the same argument in the proof of [70, Converse 1.13], it follows that there exists an $SL(3)$ -linearized extension of Λ_{CM} to G and let us call this $\overline{\Lambda}_{\text{CM}}$. We claim the following:

Proposition 5.15. $\overline{\Lambda}_{\text{CM}}$ is ample on G .

Since $\rho(G) = 1$, to show $\overline{\Lambda}_{\text{CM}}$ is ample, we have to show that there exists $s \in G$ such that \mathcal{V}_s is adiabatically K-stable and a nontrivial 1-PS λ such that $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \lambda(t) \cdot s \in U$ as Theorem 5.10. Indeed, if we can show this, the Hilbert-Mumford weight of Λ_{CM} with respect to λ and s coincides with a positive multiple of that of an ample line bundle on G by [64, Theorem 7.1] and Corollary 5.7. Here, we can take a cubic pencil P corresponding to a rational elliptic surface whose all fibers are integral as follows.

- Two smooth cubic curves A and B generate P such that $A = X^3 + Y^3 + Z^3$. Furthermore, $B(X, Y, 0)$ and $A(X, Y, 0)$ have no common component where $[X : Y : Z]$ is the canonical projective coordinate.

Then if 1-PS

$$\lambda(q) = \begin{pmatrix} q^{-1} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & q^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & q^2 \end{pmatrix} \in SL(3)$$

for $q \in \mathbb{C}^*$, then $P_\infty = \lim_{q \rightarrow 0} \lambda(q) \cdot P$ has no fixed part and hence $P_\infty \in U$. Note that P corresponds to a smooth rational elliptic surface X that has at most integral fibers is GIT-stable due to [64, Theorem 7.1]. Recall that X is adiabatically K-stable by Corollary 5.7. Therefore, if such P exists, then Proposition 5.15 follows. The existence of such P follows from the next lemma.

Lemma 5.16. *Let A be a smooth cubic curve such that*

$$A : X^3 + Y^3 + Z^3 = 0.$$

Then there exists a smooth cubic curve $B \in H^0(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{O}(3))$ such that the pencil P generated by A and B corresponds to a rational elliptic surface whose all fibers are integral.

Proof. Consider B as a point on $Y = \mathbb{A}^{h^0(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{O}(3))}$. Note that there exists the universal section $\mathcal{B} \in H^0(Y \times \mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{O}(3))$ on Y . Take an affine open subset $T \subset Y$ such that for any $B \in T$, the locus of $B = 0$ is smooth, $B(X, Y, 0)$ and $A(X, Y, 0)$ have no common component and the pencil $P = \langle A, B \rangle$ has different 9 base points. There exists a morphism $h : T \rightarrow U$ that maps B to $P = \langle A, B \rangle$. By replacing T by a smaller open affine subscheme, we may assume that there is an elliptic fibration

$$\pi : \mathcal{V} \times_U T \rightarrow T \times \mathbb{P}^1$$

defined by A and \mathcal{B} . Here, $P_t = \langle A, B_t \rangle$ induces the elliptic surface $(\mathcal{V} \times_U T)_t$ for $B_t \in T$. Since π is flat and proper, we may assume that all the fiber of π is integral by replacing T by a smaller open neighborhood of 0 (cf., [40, 12.2.1]). \square

Next, [64, Proposition 5.2] and the calculations show that the following lemma.

Lemma 5.17. *Let P be a smooth pencil of cubic curves in \mathbb{P}^2 i.e., the general member of P is smooth. Suppose that the elliptic surface corresponding to P has no I_N^* -type fiber for any $N \geq 1$. If P is GIT-semistable but not properly stable, there exists a nontrivial 1-PS λ such that $\lim_{q \rightarrow 0} \lambda(q) \cdot P \in U$ and the Hilbert-Mumford weight of λ is 0.*

Proof. Notations as in [64, Proposition 5.2]. Let us check the following five cases one by one.

- (6) If P has a triple line, P is GIT-unstable by [64, Proposition 5.1]. Thus, we may assume that $A = x^2z$ and B generate P . A 1-PS

$$\lambda(q) = \begin{pmatrix} q^2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & q^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & q^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \in SL(3)$$

has the Hilbert-Mumford weight 0 (with respect to P) by [64, Proposition 4.4]. Therefore, $\lim_{q \rightarrow 0} \lambda(q) \cdot B \in \langle z^3, yz^2, y^2z, y^3 \rangle$ i.e., $\lim_{q \rightarrow 0} \lambda(q) \cdot B$ is contained in the subspace of $H^0(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{O}(3))$ generated by z^3, yz^2, y^2z, y^3 . If B has the nonzero coefficient of y^3 , then $\lim_{q \rightarrow 0} \lambda(q) \cdot P \in U$ and has a closed orbit due to [64, Proposition 8.3]. Assume that B has the zero coefficient of y^3 . If $\lim_{q \rightarrow 0} \lambda(q) \cdot B = az^3 + byz^2 + cy^2z$, then $c \neq 0$. In fact, if $c = 0$, then the semistable pencil $\lim_{q \rightarrow 0} \lambda(q) \cdot P$ is contained in Case (2) in [64, Proposition 5.1]. This is a contradiction. Hence we may assume that $a = 0$ and $c = 1$ by projective coordinate change. Hence $B \in \langle y^2z, yz^2, xy^2, xyz, xz^2, x^2y, x^2z, x^3 \rangle$. Then a 1-PS

$$\lambda'(q) = \begin{pmatrix} q & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & q^{-2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & q \end{pmatrix} \in SL(3)$$

has the Hilbert-Mumford weight 0 and $\lim_{q \rightarrow 0} \lambda'(q) \cdot B \in \langle y^2z, xy^2 \rangle$. If $\lim_{q \rightarrow 0} \lambda'(q) \cdot P$ has a fixed part, then B 's coefficient of xy^2 equals to 0. Therefore,

$$B \in \langle y^2z, yz^2, xyz, xz^2, x^2y, x^2z, x^3 \rangle.$$

Then a 1-PS

$$\lambda''(q) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & q^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & q \end{pmatrix} \in SL(3)$$

has the Hilbert-Mumford weight 0 and $\lim_{q \rightarrow 0} \lambda''(q) \cdot B \in \langle y^2z, x^2y \rangle$. If $\lim_{q \rightarrow 0} \lambda''(q) \cdot P$ has a fixed part, then B 's coefficient of x^2y equals to 0. Therefore,

$$B \in \langle y^2z, yz^2, xyz, xz^2, x^2z, x^3 \rangle.$$

Then a 1-PS

$$\lambda'''(q) = \begin{pmatrix} q^{-1} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & q^{-4} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & q^5 \end{pmatrix} \in SL(3)$$

has the Hilbert-Mumford weight 0 and $\lim_{q \rightarrow 0} \lambda'''(q) \cdot B \in \langle y^2z, x^3 \rangle$. If $\lim_{q \rightarrow 0} \lambda'''(q) \cdot P$ has a fixed part, then B 's coefficient of x^3 equals to 0. Therefore, $B \in \langle y^2z, yz^2, xyz, xz^2, x^2z \rangle$. Therefore, P has a fixed part and it is a contradiction.

- (7) In this case, P contains no smooth curve. Thus, it is unnecessary to consider this case.
(8) By projective coordinate change, we may assume that P is generated by $A = xy^2 + x^2z$ and $B \in \langle y^2z, y^3, xz^2, xyz, xy^2, x^2z, x^2y, x^3 \rangle$. Then a 1-PS

$$\lambda(q) = \begin{pmatrix} q & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & q^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \in SL(3)$$

has the Hilbert-Mumford weight 0 and $\lim_{q \rightarrow 0} \lambda(q) \cdot B \in \langle y^2z, xz^2 \rangle$. If $\lim_{q \rightarrow 0} \lambda(q) \cdot B \neq y^2z + xz^2$, there is nothing to prove. Suppose that $\lim_{q \rightarrow 0} \lambda(q) \cdot B = y^2z + xz^2$. Then B intersects with the conic $y^2 + xz$ at $[0 : 0 : 1]$ with multiplicity more than 2. Therefore, A and B intersect with multiplicity $m > 3$ at $[0 : 0 : 1]$. Thus, the elliptic surface corresponding to P has a I_N^* -type fiber for some $N \geq 1$.

- (9) By projective coordinate change, we may assume that P is generated by $A = y^3 - x^2y$ and $B \in \langle yz^2, y^2z, y^3, xz^2, xyz, xy^2, x^2z, x^2y, x^3 \rangle$. Then a 1-PS

$$\lambda(q) = \begin{pmatrix} q & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & q & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & q^{-2} \end{pmatrix} \in SL(3)$$

has the Hilbert-Mumford weight 0 and $\lim_{q \rightarrow 0} \lambda(q) \cdot B \in \langle yz^2, xz^2 \rangle$. If $\lim_{q \rightarrow 0} \lambda(q) \cdot B \neq yz^2 \pm xz^2$, or yz^2 , there is nothing to prove. By projective coordinate change, we may assume that $\lim_{q \rightarrow 0} \lambda(q) \cdot B = yz^2$. Then B is tangent to the line y at the point of concurrency. Therefore, A and B intersect with multiplicity $m \geq 3$ at $[0 : 0 : 1]$. Thus, the elliptic surface corresponding to P has a I_N^* -type fiber for some $N \geq 1$.

- (10) In this case, P contains no smooth curve. There is nothing to prove.

We have completed the proof. \square

According to this lemma, we obtain the following theorem.

Theorem 5.18. *Let $\pi : X \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$ be a smooth rational elliptic surface admitting a section without I_N^* -type fiber for $N \geq 1$. Suppose that $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^2$ is a blow up at 9 points. Let $H = f^* \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(3)$ be the π -ample line bundle. If X has one and only one I_0^* -type fiber, then $(X, \epsilon H + \pi^* \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(1))$ is not K -polystable for sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$ and has no cscK metric.*

Proof. Suppose that X has an I_0^* -type fiber but no I_N^* -type fiber for $N \geq 1$. Then as Lemma 5.14, we can prove that X has two I_0^* -type fiber if and only if $\text{Aut}_0(X)$ is non-trivial. They are also equivalent to that the corresponding pencil P is GIT-polystable by [64, Theorem 8.5]. By [64, Theorem 8.1], Lemma 5.17 and Proposition 5.15, if X has one and only one I_0^* -type fiber, there exists an ample test configuration $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{M})$ for $(X, \epsilon H + \pi^* \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(1))$ such that $\text{DF}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{M}) = 0$

for sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$. Therefore, the first assertion follows. The last assertion follows from [6, Theorem 1.6]. \square

5.4. Applications to Miranda's conjecture on Chow stability. In [66], Miranda conjectured as follows:

Conjecture 5.19 ([66, Conjecture 2.3]). Let W be a rational Weierstrass fibration and H be an arbitrary ample line bundle on W . Then, (W, H) is

- (a) asymptotically Chow-stable if W has only reduced fibers,
- (b) asymptotically Chow-semistable if W has only reduced and I_N^* -type fibers for $N \geq 0$,
- (c) asymptotically Chow-unstable if W has at least one II^* , III^* or IV^* -type fiber.

He also proved that if W has at least one II^* , III^* or IV^* -type fiber, there exists an ample divisor H such that (W, H) is asymptotically Chow-unstable in [66]. In this subsection, we will prove that Conjecture 5.19 (c) holds when $\rho(W) = 2$ and Conjecture 5.19 (b) fails.

First, we show the following.

Lemma 5.20. *Let $f : (X, \Delta, H) \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$ be a polarized n -dimensional klt-trivial fibration over \mathbb{P}^1 such that B is the discriminant divisor and M is the moduli divisor of f . Suppose that H is an ample divisor on X and $(\mathbb{P}^1, B, M, L = -(K_{\mathbb{P}^1} + M + B))$ is a log-twisted Fano curve. Let $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{L})$ be a special log-twisted test configuration for (\mathbb{P}^1, B, M, L) (cf., Definition A.21) and $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{H})$ be a normal semiample test configuration for (X, H) such that there exists a \mathbb{G}_m -equivariant morphism $\Pi : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$. Suppose also that*

$$K_{(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{D})} = \Pi^*(K_{\mathcal{C}} + \rho_{\mathcal{C}}^* M_{\mathbb{A}^1} + (\rho_{\mathcal{C}})_*^{-1} B_{\mathbb{A}^1})$$

where \mathcal{D} is the strict transformation of $\Delta_{\mathbb{A}^1}$. Here, $\rho_{\mathcal{C}}^* M_{\mathbb{A}^1}$ is defined as the strict transformation of M_{1, \mathbb{A}^1} of general $M_1 \in |M|_{\mathbb{Q}}$ (see Definition A.9). Then, there exist positive constants $C_0 > 0$ and $C_1 > 0$ such that

$$((H + mL)^n)^2 \text{DF}_{\Delta}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{H} + mL) = \text{DF}_{(B, M)}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{L})(C_0 m^2 + C_1 m) + (H^n)^2 \text{DF}_{\Delta}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{H}).$$

Proof. As in the last part of the proof of Theorem 4.12, we can prove that there exists a positive constant $C_0 > 0$ such that

$$((H + mL)^n)^2 \text{DF}_{\Delta}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{H} + mL) = C_0 m^2 \text{DF}_{(B, M)}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{L}) + O(m).$$

By an easy computation, the m^1 -term of this polynomial is

$$\begin{aligned} & n(L \cdot H^{n-1})(K_{(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{D})/\mathbb{P}^1} \cdot \mathcal{H}^n) + nH^n(K_{(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{D})/\mathbb{P}^1} \cdot \mathcal{L} \cdot \mathcal{H}^{n-1}) - n(K_{(X, \Delta)} \cdot H^{n-1})\mathcal{L} \cdot \mathcal{H}^n \\ & = n((L \cdot H^{n-1})(K_{(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{D})/\mathbb{P}^1} + \mathcal{L}) \cdot \mathcal{H}^n) + H^n(K_{(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{D})/\mathbb{P}^1} \cdot \mathcal{L} \cdot \mathcal{H}^{n-1}). \end{aligned}$$

Since $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{L})$ is a special log-twisted test configuration for (\mathbb{P}^1, B, M, L) , we may assume that $K_{\mathcal{C}} + \rho_{\mathcal{C}}^* M_{\mathbb{P}^1} + (\rho_{\mathcal{C}})_*^{-1} B_{\mathbb{P}^1} = -\mathcal{L}$. Hence,

$$\deg L \text{DF}_{(B, M)}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{L}) = \left(K_{\mathcal{C}/\mathbb{P}^1} + \rho_{\mathcal{C}}^* M_{\mathbb{P}^1} + (\rho_{\mathcal{C}})_*^{-1} B_{\mathbb{P}^1} + \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{L} \right) \cdot \mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{2}(4\mathcal{C}_0 - \mathcal{L}) \cdot \mathcal{L}.$$

Therefore, the m^1 -term is

$$\begin{aligned} & n(H^n(K_{(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{D})/\mathbb{P}^1} \cdot \mathcal{L} \cdot \mathcal{H}^{n-1}) + 2(L \cdot H^{n-1})(H^n)) = nH^n(4\mathcal{X}_0 - \mathcal{L}) \cdot \mathcal{L} \cdot \mathcal{H}^{n-1} \\ & = 2n(H^n)(H^{n-1} \cdot L) \text{DF}_{(B, M)}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{L}). \end{aligned}$$

\square

Next, we explain the following important application of Lemma 5.20:

Theorem 5.21 (cf., [66, Conjecture 2.3 (c)]). *Let W be a rational Weierstrass fibration that has one of II^* , III^* or IV^* -type fibers and S be a section. Then $(W, aS - K_W)$ is K -unstable for $0 < a < 1$. In particular, $(W, -K_W + aS)$ is also asymptotically Chow(Hilbert)-unstable. Moreover, if the Picard number $\rho(W) = 2$, W is K -unstable for any polarization.*

Proof. Without loss of generality, we may assume that the fiber F over $[0 : 1]$ is a II^* , III^* or IV^* -type fiber. Consider the family $(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{L}_a) \rightarrow M_1$ constructed in §5.2 for $0 < a < 1$. There exists a 1-PS λ of $SL(2)$ such that W degenerates to a J -constant elliptic surface via λ (cf., Remark 5.12 and the proof of Claim) and λ has the negative Hilbert-Mumford weight with respect to P . Then, we obtain the test configuration $\mathcal{W} \subset \mathcal{U}$ for W and the product test configuration \mathcal{C} for \mathbb{P}^1 corresponding to λ . Let $\Pi : \mathcal{W} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ be the \mathbb{G}_m -equivariant structure morphism. Note that Π is flat and all fibers are integral. Then \mathcal{W} is a klt minimal model over \mathcal{C} and $(\mathcal{W}, \mathcal{W}_0)$ is plt by the inversion of adjunction since the central fiber \mathcal{W}_0 of \mathcal{W} has only canonical singularities over $0 \in \mathbb{A}^1$. Note that \mathcal{W} has only canonical singularities since \mathcal{W} is Gorenstein and klt and \mathcal{C} is smooth. By the canonical bundle formula of [35], we obtain

$$K_{\mathcal{W}} = \Pi^*(K_{\mathcal{C}} + \mathcal{M} + (\rho_{\mathcal{C}})_*^{-1}B_{\mathbb{A}^1})$$

where \mathcal{M} is the moduli divisor. We claim that $\mathcal{M} = \rho_{\mathcal{C}}^*M_{\mathbb{A}^1}$. It suffices to show that the coefficient of \mathcal{M} is 0 on \mathcal{C}_0 and this can be checked directly as follows. Let $s = \text{mult}_{\mathcal{C}_0}(\mathcal{M})$. Let also $\overline{\mathcal{C}}$ be the canonical compactification of \mathcal{C} over \mathbb{P}^1 and \mathcal{H} be a very ample general hypersurface of $\overline{\mathcal{C}}$ such that $\Pi_*\mathcal{O}(cK_{\mathcal{W}/\mathcal{C}})|_{\mathcal{H}} = (\Pi|_{\mathcal{H}})_*\mathcal{O}(cK_{\mathcal{W} \cap \mathcal{H}/\mathcal{H}})$ for sufficiently divisible $c \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ as [67, (2.6.i)]. Then, by [35, Proposition 2.2], $\mathcal{M}|_{\mathcal{H}}$ is the moduli divisor of $\Pi|_{\mathcal{H}}$. Since $\rho_{\mathcal{C}}$ induces the finite surjection $\rho : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$ of smooth curves, we have $\rho^*M = \mathcal{M}|_{\mathcal{H}}$ by [35, Corollary 2.5]. Thus, $s = 0$ and $\mathcal{M} = \rho_{\mathcal{C}}^*M_{\mathbb{A}^1}$.

We will show that $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{L} = -(K_{\mathcal{C}} + \rho_{\mathcal{C}}^*M_{\mathbb{A}^1} + (\rho_{\mathcal{C}})_*^{-1}B_{\mathbb{A}^1}))$ is the log-twisted special test configuration corresponding to λ . Furthermore, $\text{DF}_{(B,M)}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{L}) < 0$. Indeed, let $h : \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{A}^1}^1 \dashrightarrow \mathcal{C}$ be the \mathbb{G}_m -equivariant birational map. Recall that λ acts on \mathbb{P}^1 as

$$[T_0 : T_1] \rightarrow [qT_0 : q^{-1}T_1], \text{ for } q \in \mathbb{G}_m.$$

Then, $\tilde{\mathcal{C}} = \text{Bl}_{([0:1],0)}(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{A}^1}^1)$ is the resolution of the indeterminacy of h and let $\psi : \tilde{\mathcal{C}} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$. If E is the exceptional divisor of $\rho_{\tilde{\mathcal{C}}} : \tilde{\mathcal{C}} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{A}^1}^1$, then

$$\begin{aligned} K_{\mathcal{C}/\mathbb{A}^1} + \rho_{\mathcal{C}}^*M + (\rho_{\mathcal{C}})_*^{-1}B &= \psi_*(K_{\tilde{\mathcal{C}}/\mathbb{A}^1} + \rho_{\tilde{\mathcal{C}}}^*M + (\rho_{\tilde{\mathcal{C}}})_*^{-1}B) \\ &= \psi_*(K_{\tilde{\mathcal{C}}/\mathbb{A}^1} + \rho_{\tilde{\mathcal{C}}}^*M + (\rho_{\tilde{\mathcal{C}}})_*^{-1}B - s(\rho_{\tilde{\mathcal{C}}})_*^{-1}(\mathbb{P}^1 \times \{0\})) \\ &\sim_{\mathbb{A}^1, \mathbb{Q}} \psi_*(\rho_{\tilde{\mathcal{C}}}^*\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{A}^1}^1}(-1) \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\tilde{\mathcal{C}}}(E)). \end{aligned}$$

Here, $\frac{1}{2} < s = \text{mult}_{[0:1]}B < 1$ and $\rho_{\tilde{\mathcal{C}}}^*\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{A}^1}^1}(1) \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\tilde{\mathcal{C}}}(-E)$ is the pullback of an \mathbb{A}^1 -ample line bundle on \mathcal{C} . Thus, $-(K_{\mathcal{C}} + \rho_{\mathcal{C}}^*M_{\mathbb{A}^1} + (\rho_{\mathcal{C}})_*^{-1}B_{\mathbb{A}^1})$ is \mathbb{A}^1 -ample. It is easy to see that $(\mathcal{C}, \rho_{\mathcal{C}}^*M_{\mathbb{A}^1} + (\rho_{\mathcal{C}})_*^{-1}B_{\mathbb{A}^1} + \psi_*E)$ is plt and

$$\text{DF}_{(B,M)}(\mathcal{C}, -(K_{\mathcal{C}/\mathbb{A}^1} + \rho_{\mathcal{C}}^*M + (\rho_{\mathcal{C}})_*^{-1}B)) = \text{DF}_{(B,M)}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}, -\rho_{\tilde{\mathcal{C}}}^*\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{A}^1}^1}(-1) \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\tilde{\mathcal{C}}}(E)) < 0$$

by the above equation. Therefore, \mathcal{W} satisfies the assumption of Lemma 5.20. Similarly to the argument in Theorem 5.10, we only have to show that the Donaldson-Futaki invariant of the corresponding test configuration $(\mathcal{W}, \mathcal{L}_{1-\epsilon}|_{\mathcal{W}})$ of $(W, (1-\epsilon)S - K_W)$ is negative for sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$. Indeed, since the test configuration \mathcal{W} has only canonical singularities and has the relative trivial canonical divisor over the special log-twisted test configuration \mathcal{C} for \mathbb{P}^1 whose Donaldson-Futaki invariant is negative, $\text{DF}(\mathcal{W}, \mathcal{L}_{1-\epsilon}|_{\mathcal{W}}) > \text{DF}(\mathcal{W}, \mathcal{L}_a|_{\mathcal{W}})$ for $a < 1 - \epsilon$ by Lemma 5.20.

Next, we prove $\text{DF}(\mathcal{W}, \mathcal{L}_{1-\epsilon}|_{\mathcal{W}}) < 0$ as follows. By the same argument of Theorem 5.10, we only have to prove that $(W', (1-\epsilon)S' - K_{W'})$ for elliptic surfaces W' corresponding to general points in M_1 . Here, S' is the restriction of S on \mathcal{U} to W' . Recall that such rational Weierstrass fibration W' has at most irreducible fiber and is smooth, and it is easy to see that $-K_{W'} + S'$ is semiample and the ample model of $-K_{W'} + S'$ is a smooth del Pezzo surface Y of degree 1. Thanks to [84], smooth del Pezzo surfaces of degree 1 have the Kähler-Einstein metrics and hence $(W', (1-\epsilon)S' - K_{W'})$ has a cscK metric due to the main theorem of [4]. As Lemma 5.14, we can prove that $\text{Aut}_0(W')$ is trivial since the functional invariant J of W' is not constant.

Thanks to [82], $(W', (1 - \epsilon)S' - K_{W'})$ is also K-stable. We complete the proof of the first assertion. The rest follows immediately from the first assertion. \square

Remark 5.22. We emphasize that this theorem is different from Theorem 5.10 in that this theorem states not only about adiabatic K-unstability. We also remark that for example, if a rational Weierstrass fibration W has a II^* -type fiber, then $\rho(W) = 2$. Thus, we conclude that [66, Conjecture 2.3 (c)] holds for such rational Weierstrass fibrations.

Next, we recall the fact in [65, §8] that there exist the test configurations \mathcal{W} for rational Weierstrass fibrations W admitting I_N^* -type fibers for some $N \geq 1$ such that the central fiber is a GIT-polystable singular surface W_0 . Here, W_0 is defined by the equation $y^2z = (x - T_0T_1z)^2(x + 2T_0T_1z)$ in $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(\mathcal{O}(-2) \oplus \mathcal{O}(-3) \oplus \mathcal{O})$. W_0 has general nodal rational curve fiber and two cuspidal rational curve fibers. Therefore, W_0 is Gorenstein. The normalization of W_0 equals to $X_0 = \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(\mathcal{O} \oplus \mathcal{O}(1))$ since W_0 has a (-1) -section S and since the singular locus is isomorphic to the base curve. Thus W_0 is an slc surface. Note that the conductor scheme $D \subset X_0$ is smooth, irreducible and linearly equivalent to $2S + 2f$, where f is the fiber class, since $K_{W_0} \sim -f$.

Proposition 5.23. (W_0, S) is adiabatically K-unstable over \mathbb{P}^1 .

Proof. It suffices to show that D is a destabilizing subvariety of $(X_0, D, L = S + mf)$ for $m \gg 0$ i.e., Z induces a semiample deformation to the normal cone $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ such that $\text{DF}_B(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) < 0$ (cf., [78, Definition 4.17]). Let $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L} = L_{\mathbb{A}^1} - \epsilon E)$ be the non almost trivial semiample deformation to the normal cone of D for (X, L) where E is the exceptional divisor and $\epsilon > 0$. Since D is a log canonical center, $H_D^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) = 0$. Note also that

$$\left(2 \frac{f \cdot (S + mf)}{(S + mf)^2} (S + mf) - f \right) \cdot D > 0.$$

Then, it follows that $(\mathcal{J}^f)^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) > 0$ from the similar argument of the proof of [44, Theorem 6.3]. Since $K_{X_0} + D \sim -f$, we can conclude that $M_D^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) = (\mathcal{J}^{-f})^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) < 0$ for sufficiently small ϵ . \square

We deduce the following theorem from Proposition 5.23.

Theorem 5.24 (cf. Conjecture 2.3 (b) [66]). *Rational Weierstrass fibrations admitting an I_N^* -type fiber for some $N \geq 1$ are asymptotically Chow unstable.*

To prove this, recall the following lemma,

Lemma 5.25. *Let $f : (X, L) \rightarrow B$ be a projective morphism of projective varieties and L be a f -ample line bundle such that $R^i f_* L = 0$ for $i > 0$. Suppose that a semisimple algebraic group G acts on (X, L) and B equivariantly. Let Λ be the Chow bundle $\text{Chow}(X, L)$. Suppose that the Picard number $\rho(B) = 1$ and there exists a non trivial 1-PS λ of G and a point $s \in B$ such that a Chow-stable variety (X_s, L_s) degenerates non trivially via λ .*

Then, Λ is ample and a point $b \in B$ is GIT (poly, semi)stable with respect to Λ if (X_b, L_b) is Chow-(poly, semi)stable.

Replacing the CM line bundle by the Chow bundle, the lemma follows similarly to [75, Theorem 3.4].

We also need the following lemma in GIT:

Lemma 5.26. *Let G be a reductive algebraic group and act on a polarized variety (X, L) . Suppose that there exists 1-PS λ such that $\lim_{q \rightarrow 0} \lambda(q) \cdot x = y$. If the Hilbert-Mumford weight of λ is 0 and x is GIT-semistable, then y is also GIT-semistable.*

Proof. For the readers' convenience, we prove this here. As in the first part of the proof of [70, Theorem 2.1], we may assume that $(X, L) = (\mathbb{P}^{n-1}, \mathcal{O}(1))$. Let $\pi : \mathbb{A}^n \setminus \{0\} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^{n-1}$ be the canonical projection and $x^* \in \mathbb{A}^n \setminus \{0\}$ such that $\pi(x^*) = x$. By the assumption and

[70, Proposition 2.3], there exists $y^* = \lim_{q \rightarrow 0} \lambda(q) \cdot x^* \neq 0$. On the other hand, $z \in \mathbb{P}^{n-1}$ is GIT-semistable if and only if there exists a nonconstant G -invariant homogeneous polynomial F such that $F(z^*) \neq 0$ for $z^* \in \mathbb{A}^n \setminus \{0\}$ such that $\pi(z^*) = z$ (see the proof of [70, Proposition 2.2]). Therefore, we can find a nonconstant G -invariant homogeneous polynomial F such that $F(x^*) \neq 0$. By the definition of y^* , we have that $F(y^*) \neq 0$. Therefore, y is also GIT-semistable. \square

Proof of Theorem 5.24. Note that the general points of M_1 corresponds to polarized smooth rational elliptic surfaces admitting cscK metrics adiabatically by Corollary 5.7. Due to [24, Corollary 4], those surfaces are asymptotically Hilbert stable. By [29] (cf., [70, p.215]) and [62] or [72, Theorem 2.5], asymptotic Hilbert stability coincides with asymptotic Chow stability. Therefore, we can apply Lemma 5.25 to M_1 and $(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{L}_\epsilon)$ for sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$ to conclude that $\text{Chow}(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{L}_\epsilon^{\otimes k})$ is ample for sufficiently large $k > 0$ as in Theorem 5.10. Let W be a rational Weierstrass fibration admitting an I_N^* -type fiber for some $N \geq 1$. Take a 1-PS λ whose corresponding test configuration \mathcal{W} satisfies the following property.

- The general fiber of \mathcal{W} is W over \mathbb{A}^1 .
- The central fiber of \mathcal{W} is W_0 as in Proposition 5.23.
- The weight of $\mathcal{O}(6)$ with respect to λ is 0 for sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$ and for sufficiently large $k > 0$.

Then, we conclude that the weight of $\text{Chow}(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{L}_\epsilon^{\otimes k})$ for sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$ and for sufficiently large $k > 0$ with respect to λ is 0. Assume that the theorem would fail for W . Since the Hilbert-Mumford weight of $\text{Chow}(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{L}_\epsilon^{\otimes k})$ with respect to λ and W is 0, W_0 is also Chow semistable with respect to the embedding $W_0 \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}(H^0(\mathcal{L}_{\epsilon|W_0}^{\otimes k}))$ for sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$ and for sufficiently large $k > 0$ by Lemma 5.26. However, (W_0, S) is adiabatically K-unstable by Proposition 5.23 and hence $(W_0, \epsilon S + L)$ is asymptotically Chow unstable for sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$. It is a contradiction. Hence, we complete the proof. \square

Thus, we have proved that [66, Conjecture 2.3 (b)] fails in general.

APPENDIX A. SOME RESULTS ON LOG-TWISTED FANO PAIRS

In this appendix, we will prove some results to apply in §4.1 and §4.2 (Theorem 4.6 and Theorem 4.23). In this appendix, the main results are Theorems A.13 and A.20.

A.1. Notation.

Definition A.1. A quadruple (X, B, T, L) is a *polarized log-twisted pair* if (X, B, L) is a normal polarized log pair and T is a \mathbb{Q} -line bundle on X .

Definition A.2. $T_1 \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} T$ is *general* if there exist two general semiample \mathbb{Q} -divisors A_1 and A_2 such that $T_1 = A_1 - A_2$. If T is semiample, we take $A_2 = 0$.

Definition A.3. Let (X, B, T, L) be a polarized log-twisted pair and $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ be a semiample test configuration for (X, L) . Then the *log-twisted Donaldson-Futaki invariant* is

$$\text{DF}_{(B,T)}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) = \text{DF}_B(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) + (\mathcal{J}^T)^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}).$$

We can also define the *log-twisted non-Archimedean Mabuchi functional* as

$$M_{(B,T)}^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) = M_B^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) + (\mathcal{J}^T)^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}).$$

Then, log-twisted (uniform) K-(semi)stability is defined as §2. (X, B, T, L) is

- *K-semistable* if

$$M_{(B,T)}^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) \geq 0$$

for any normal semiample test configuration,

- *K-stable* if

$$M_{(B,T)}^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) > 0$$

for any non-trivial normal semiample test configuration,

- *uniformly K-stable* if there exists a positive constant $\epsilon > 0$ such that

$$M_{(B,T)}^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) \geq \epsilon I^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$$

for any normal semiample test configuration.

Lemma A.4 (cf., [18, Proposition 3.6]). *Let (X, B, T, L) be an n -dimensional polarized log-twisted pair and $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ be a semiample test configuration. Fix a \mathbb{Q} -Cartier divisor $D \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} T$. If the support of D contains no center of the divisorial valuation v_E for any divisor $E \subset \mathcal{X}_0$ of \mathcal{X} , then*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{DF}_{(B,T)}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) &= \text{DF}_{B+D}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) \\ M_{(B,T)}^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) &= M_{B+D}^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. This essentially follows from [18, Proposition 3.6]. Let $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}$ be a semiample test configuration dominating \mathcal{X} and $X_{\mathbb{A}^1}$. Let the canonical morphisms be $\pi : \tilde{\mathcal{X}} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ and $\rho : \tilde{\mathcal{X}} \rightarrow X_{\mathbb{A}^1}$. Then

$$\text{DF}_{B+D}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) = \frac{1}{L^n} \left((K_{\tilde{\mathcal{X}}/\mathbb{P}^1} + \mathcal{B} + \mathcal{D}) \cdot \pi^* \mathcal{L}^n - \frac{n(K_X + B + T) \cdot L^{n-1}}{(n+1)L^n} \pi^* \mathcal{L}^{n+1} \right)$$

and

$$\text{DF}_{(B,T)}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) = \frac{1}{L^n} \left((K_{\tilde{\mathcal{X}}/\mathbb{P}^1} + \mathcal{B} + \rho^* D_{\mathbb{P}^1}) \cdot \pi^* \mathcal{L}^n - \frac{n(K_X + B + T) \cdot L^{n-1}}{(n+1)L^n} \pi^* \mathcal{L}^{n+1} \right),$$

where \mathcal{B} and \mathcal{D} are the strict transformations of $B_{\mathbb{P}^1}$ and $D_{\mathbb{P}^1}$ respectively. Thus

$$\text{DF}_{(B,T)}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) - \text{DF}_{B+D}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) = \frac{1}{L^n} (\rho^* D_{\mathbb{P}^1} - \mathcal{D}) \cdot \pi^* \mathcal{L}^n.$$

By assumption, $\rho^* D_{\mathbb{P}^1} - \mathcal{D}$ is a π -exceptional divisor and hence $(\rho^* D_{\mathbb{P}^1} - \mathcal{D}) \cdot \pi^* \mathcal{L}^n = 0$. We can similarly prove the assertion for the non-Archimedean Mabuchi functional. \square

By Lemma A.4, we can deduce the similar properties to the log K-stability and twisted K-stability in [76], [11] and [18]. Therefore, we have the following,

Theorem A.5. *If a polarized log-twisted pair (X, B, T, L) is K-semistable, then (X, B) is lc.*

Proof. If $[B]$ is reduced, due to [77, Theorem 1.1], there exists a closed subscheme whose Rees valuations v satisfy that $A_{(X,B)}(v) < 0$. Then, $A_{(X,B+T_1)}(v) = A_{(X,B)}(v) < 0$ for general divisor $T_1 \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} T$. Therefore, the theorem follows from the proof of [45, Theorem 5.1]. The rest also follows from the same argument of [45, Theorem 5.1] and is left to the reader. \square

Definition A.6. (X, B, T, L) is a *log-twisted Fano pair* if it is a polarized log-twisted pair and there exists a positive constant $s > 0$ such that $L \equiv -s(K_X + B + T)$.

Theorem A.7. *If a log-twisted Fano pair (X, B, T, L) is K-semistable, then (X, B) is klt.*

Proof. If $[B] = 0$, due to [11, Proposition 9.9], there exists a closed subscheme whose Rees valuations v satisfy that $A_{(X,B)}(v) \leq 0$. Then, $A_{(X,B+T_1)}(v) \leq 0$ for general divisor $T_1 \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} T$. Therefore, the theorem follows from the proof of [45, Theorem 5.4]. The rest also follows from the same argument of [45, Theorem 5.4] and is left to the reader. \square

Thanks to [11, Proposition 9.16], the following holds as in the logarithmic case.

Proposition A.8 (cf., [11, Corollaries 9.3 and 9.4], [18, Theorems 3.21, 3.23]). *Let (X, B, T, L) be a log-twisted pair. Then the following hold.*

- (1) *If $K_X + B + T \equiv 0$ and (X, B) is klt (resp., lc), then (X, B, T, L) is uniformly K-stable (resp., K-semistable).*
- (2) *If $K_X + B + T \equiv L$ and (X, B) is lc, then (X, B, T, L) is uniformly K-stable.*

A.2. Ding stability of log-twisted Fano pairs and δ -invariant. Let $(X, B, T, L = -K_X - B - T)$ be a log-twisted Fano pair such that (X, B) is klt. In this section, we show that the log-twisted β -invariant classifies Ding-stable log-twisted Fano pairs (X, B, T, L) as [37]. We emphasize that it is necessary to consider the general case even when T is not ample for the application to Theorem 4.6.

Definition A.9. Let $(X, B, T, L = -K_X - B - T)$ be an n -dimensional log-twisted Fano pair such that (X, B) is klt and $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ be a normal semiample test configuration. Let also $\rho : \mathcal{X} \dashrightarrow X_{\mathbb{A}^1}$ be the *canonical birational map*, i.e., ρ is the identity on $\mathcal{X} \setminus \mathcal{X}_0$. Take a divisor $T_1 \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} T$ so general that the support of T_1 contains no center of the divisorial valuation corresponding to the irreducible components of \mathcal{X}_0 , where $\rho_*^{-1}T_{1, \mathbb{A}^1}$ is the strict transformation of T_1 . We may also assume that $(X, B + T_1)$ is subklt. Then the *log-twisted Ding invariant* is defined as

$$\text{Ding}_{(B, T)}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) = \text{Ding}_{(B+T_1)}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) = -\frac{\mathcal{L}^{n+1}}{(n+1)L^n} - 1 + \text{lct}_{(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{B}+D+\rho_*^{-1}T_{1, \mathbb{A}^1})}(\mathcal{X}_0),$$

where \mathcal{B} is the strict transformation of B on \mathcal{X} and D is the \mathbb{Q} -divisor on \mathcal{X} defined by

$$\text{supp } D \subset \mathcal{X}_0$$

and

$$D \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} -(K_{\mathcal{X}/\mathbb{P}^1} + \mathcal{B} + \rho_*^{-1}T_{1, \mathbb{P}^1}) - \mathcal{L}.$$

Note that D is uniquely determined and independent from the choice of T_1 . Thus, we denote that $D = -(K_{\mathcal{X}/\mathbb{P}^1} + \mathcal{B} + \rho_*^{-1}T_{1, \mathbb{P}^1}) - \mathcal{L}$ for simplicity. Here, we remark that we can define $\text{lct}_{(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{B}+D+\rho_*^{-1}T_{1, \mathbb{A}^1})}(\mathcal{X}_0) = \{r \in \mathbb{R} \mid (\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{B} + D + \rho_*^{-1}T_{1, \mathbb{A}^1} + r\mathcal{X}_0) \text{ is sublc}\}$ for sufficiently general T_1 . We will show that the log-twisted Ding invariant is independent from the choice of T_1 in Lemma A.10. On the other hand, let F be a prime divisor over X . Suppose that $\sigma : Y \rightarrow X$ be a resolution of singularities such that F is a smooth divisor on Y . Then the *log-twisted β -invariant* of F with respect to (X, B, T) is

$$\beta_{(X, B, T)}(F) = A_{(X, B)}(F) \text{vol}(L) - \int_0^{\tau_L(F)} \text{vol}(L - xF) dx,$$

where $A_{(X, B)}(F)$ is the log discrepancy, $\text{vol}(L) = \limsup_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{n!h^0(X, mL)}{m^n}$, $\text{vol}(L - xF) = \text{vol}(\sigma^*L - xF)$ and $\tau_L(F) = \sup\{x \in \mathbb{R} : \text{vol}(L - xF) \neq 0\}$ is the pseudoeffective threshold (cf., [37, §1]). We define similarly

$$j_{(X, B, T)}(F) = \tau_L(F) \text{vol}(L) - \int_0^{\tau_L(F)} \text{vol}(L - xF) dx.$$

Lemma A.10. *Let $(X, B, T, L = -K_X - B - T)$ be an n -dimensional log-twisted Fano pair such that (X, B) is klt and $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ be a normal semiample test configuration. Let F be a prime divisor over X . Then for general divisors $T_1, T_2 \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} T$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Ding}_{B+T_1}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) &= \text{Ding}_{(B+T_2)}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) \\ \beta_{(X, B, T)}(F) &= \beta_{(X, B+T_1)}(F). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. It is easy to see that the log(-twisted) Ding invariant is pullback invariant as [37, Proposition 2.5 (2)] for general T_1 . Indeed, if $g : \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ is a birational morphism of test configurations for X and \mathcal{Z} dominates $X_{\mathbb{A}^1}$, then we take T_1 so general that $\rho_{\mathcal{Z}}^*T_{1, \mathbb{P}^1}$ contains no component of \mathcal{Z}_0 where $\rho_{\mathcal{Z}} : \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow X_{\mathbb{A}^1}$ is the canonical morphism. Let $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{Z}}$ be the strict transformation of $B \times \mathbb{A}^1$ and $D_{\mathcal{Z}}$ be the \mathbb{Q} -divisor on \mathcal{Z} defined by

$$D_{\mathcal{Z}} = -(K_{\mathcal{Z}/\mathbb{P}^1} + \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{Z}} + \rho_{\mathcal{Z}}^*T_{1, \mathbb{P}^1}) - g^*\mathcal{L}.$$

Then it is easy to see that

$$\text{lct}_{(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{B}+D+\rho_*^{-1}T_{1, \mathbb{A}^1})}(\mathcal{X}_0) = \text{lct}_{(\mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{Z}}+D_{\mathcal{Z}}+\rho_{\mathcal{Z}}^*T_{1, \mathbb{A}^1})}(\mathcal{Z}_0).$$

Thus, we may assume that \mathcal{X} dominates $X_{\mathbb{A}^1}$ and let $\rho : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow X_{\mathbb{A}^1}$ be the morphism. Take a \mathbb{G}_m -equivariant log resolution $\sigma : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ of \mathcal{X} . Take $D = -(K_{\mathcal{X}/\mathbb{P}^1} + \mathcal{B} + \rho^*T_{1,\mathbb{P}^1}) - \mathcal{L}$. Let $\rho_{\mathcal{Y}} = \rho \circ \sigma$ and $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{Y}}$ be the \mathbb{Q} -divisor such that

$$K_{\mathcal{Y}} + \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{Y}} = \sigma^*(K_{\mathcal{X}} + \mathcal{B}).$$

As in proof of Lemma A.4, we have only to choose T_1 such that $(\rho_{\mathcal{Y}})^*T_{1,\mathbb{P}^1} + \mathcal{Y}_0 + \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{Y}}$ is an snc divisor and $(\rho_{\mathcal{Y}})^*T_{1,\mathbb{P}^1}$ and $\mathcal{Y}_0 + \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{Y}}$ have no common component for the first assertion. Indeed, σ^*D is independent from the choice of T_1 as above and so is D . Thus

$$\text{lct}_{(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{B} + D + \rho^*T_{1,\mathbb{P}^1})}(\mathcal{X}_0) = \text{lct}_{(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{Y}} + \sigma^*D + \rho_{\mathcal{Y}}^*T_{1,\mathbb{P}^1})}(\mathcal{Y}_0)$$

is independent from a general T_1 by the Bertini theorem. For the second assertion, we have only to choose T_1 so that the support of T_1 does not contain the center of F . \square

Thus, the log-twisted Ding invariant is well-defined.

Definition A.11. Let $(X, B, T, L = -(K_X + B + T))$ be a log-twisted Fano pair such that (X, B) is klt. Then, (X, B, T, L) is *Ding-semistable* if $\text{Ding}_{(B,T)}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) \geq 0$ for any normal semiample test configuration $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$. Log-twisted (uniform) Ding-stability is defined in a similar way to log-twisted K-stability in Definition A.3.

Next, we check that [37, Proposition 2.5] also holds for the log-twisted Ding invariant and the log-twisted Donaldson-Futaki invariant.

Proposition A.12. *Let $(X, B, T, L = -(K_X + B + T))$ be a log-twisted Fano pair such that (X, B) is klt. Then the following hold.*

- (1) *Let $(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{Y}})$ and $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ be normal semiample test configurations for (X, L) . Suppose that $(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{Y}})$ dominates $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ via π (cf., Definition 2.2). Then,*

$$\begin{aligned} M_{(B,T)}^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{Y}}) &= M_{(B,T)}^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}), \\ \text{DF}_{(B,T)}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{Y}}) &= \text{DF}_{(B,T)}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}), \\ \text{Ding}_{(B,T)}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{Y}}) &= \text{Ding}_{(B,T)}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}). \end{aligned}$$

- (2) *Let $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ be a normal semiample test configuration for (X, L) and $(\mathcal{X}^{(d)}, \mathcal{L}^{(d)})$ is the normalized base change of $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ via the d -th power map of \mathbb{A}^1 for $d \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. Then,*

$$\text{Ding}_{(B,T)}(\mathcal{X}^{(d)}, \mathcal{L}^{(d)}) = d \text{Ding}_{(B,T)}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}).$$

- (3) *Let $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ be a normal semiample test configuration for (X, L) . Then, $\text{Ding}_{(B,T)}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) \leq \text{DF}_{(B,T)}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ and equality holds if and only if $(\mathcal{X}, \rho_*^{-1}T_{1,\mathbb{A}^1} + \mathcal{B} + \mathcal{X}_0)$ is sublc where \mathcal{B} is the strict transformation of $B \times \mathbb{A}^1$, $\rho : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow X_{\mathbb{A}^1}$ is the canonical birational map, $T_1 \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} T$ is general and $\mathcal{L} \sim_{\mathbb{A}^1, \mathbb{Q}} -K_{(\mathcal{X}, \rho_*^{-1}T_{1,\mathbb{A}^1} + \mathcal{B})}$.*

Proof. Indeed, (1) can be proved similarly to the argument in the proof of Lemma A.10. On the other hand, it is easy to check that the proofs of [37, Proposition 2.5 (3)] and [36, Theorem 3.2] also work in the log-twisted case. \square

We can conclude that the (uniform) Ding-(semi)stability implies the (uniform) K-(semi)stability of log-twisted Fano pairs by Proposition A.12. Next, we obtain the following valuative criterion for Ding-stability of log-twisted Fano pairs as [37].

Theorem A.13. *Let (X, Δ, L) be a polarized klt pair and $T = -(K_X + \Delta + L)$. Then*

$$\delta_{(X,\Delta)}(L) \geq 1$$

if and only if the log twisted Fano pair (X, Δ, T, L) be Ding-semistable. Moreover,

$$\delta_{(X,\Delta)}(L) \leq \sup\{\lambda > 0 \mid H_{\Delta}^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) \geq \lambda(I^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) - J^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}))\}$$

where $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ runs over the normal semiample test configurations for (X, L) .

Remark A.14. We prove this theorem without applying the result [61, Theorem 1].

First, we deduce that (uniform) Ding-stability implies (uniform) positivity of β -invariant as [37, Theorem 4.1]

Theorem A.15 (cf., [37, Theorem 6.12]). *Let $(X, B, T, L = -K_X - B - T)$ be an n -dimensional log-twisted Fano pair such that (X, B) is klt and $\delta \in [0, 1)$. If $\text{Ding}_{(B, T)}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) \geq \delta J^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ for any normal semiample test configuration $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$, then for any prime divisor F over X , $\beta_{(X, B, T)}(F) \geq \delta j_{(X, B, T)}(F)$.*

In particular, if (X, B, T, L) is Ding-semistable, then $\delta_{(X, B)}(L) \geq 1$.

Proof. We reduce to Theorem 6.12 in [37] as follows. As in the proof of [37, Theorem 4.1], take a log resolution $\sigma : Y \rightarrow X$ such that F is a smooth divisor on Y and $r_0 \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ such that $r_0(K_X + B + T)$ is \mathbb{Z} -Cartier. The argument of the proof of [loc.cit, 4.1] shows the following. Let

$$I_{(k, x)} = \text{Image}(H^0(Y, -kr_0\sigma^*(K_X + B + T) - [xF]) \otimes \mathcal{O}_X(-kr_0\sigma^*(K_X + B + T)) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X)$$

and $\mathcal{I}_r = \sum_{j=0}^{r(e_+ - e_-)} I_{(r, re_+ - j)} t^j$ for sufficiently large $r \geq r_0$. Then, we have

$$\text{lct} \left(X \times \mathbb{A}^1, \mathcal{I}_r^{\frac{1}{r_0}} \cdot \mathcal{O}_{(B_{\mathbb{A}^1} + T_{r, \mathbb{A}^1})} \right) (t) \geq d_{r, \delta}$$

where $T_r \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} T$ is general for Y and \mathcal{X}^r . Here, $d_{r, \delta}$ is defined similarly to the proof of [loc.cit, 4.1]. More precisely,

$$d_{r, \delta} = 1 + E^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}^r, \mathcal{L}^r) + \delta J^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}^r, \mathcal{L}^r),$$

where $(\mathcal{X}^r, \mathcal{L}^r)$ is a semiample test configuration induced by \mathcal{I}_r .

Thanks to [37, Claim 3],

$$d_{\infty} = \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} d_{r, \delta} = 1 - \frac{e_+}{r_0} + \delta \tau_L(F) + \frac{1 - \delta}{L^n} \int_0^{\tau_L(F)} \text{vol}(L - xF) dx.$$

On the other hand, the pair

$$\left(Y \times \mathbb{A}^1, \prod_{i=0}^k \mathcal{O}_{Y \times \mathbb{A}^1}(-F_i \times \mathbb{A}^1)^{(1 - A_{(X, B)}(F_i))} \cdot (\mathcal{I}_r \cdot \mathcal{O}_{Y \times \mathbb{A}^1})^{\frac{1}{r_0}} \cdot \mathcal{O}_{Y \times \mathbb{A}^1}(\sigma_*^{-1} B_{\mathbb{A}^1} + \sigma^* T_{r, \mathbb{A}^1}) \cdot (t)^{d_{r, \delta}} \right)$$

is sublc in the sense of [36, Definition 2.4] where $F_0 = F$ and $\{F_i\}$ is the set of σ -exceptional prime divisors. Here, we denote $\sigma \times \text{id}_{\mathbb{A}^1}$ by σ . We can choose T_r so general that $A_{(X, B)}(F_i) = A_{(X, B + T_r)}(F_i)$ for i . On the other hand, we have

$$\mathcal{I}_r \cdot \mathcal{O}_{Y \times \mathbb{A}^1} \subset (\mathcal{O}_{Y \times \mathbb{A}^1}(-F) + t)^{re_+}.$$

Therefore, the pair

$$\left(Y \times \mathbb{A}^1, \prod_{i=0}^k \mathcal{O}_{Y \times \mathbb{A}^1}(-F_i \times \mathbb{A}^1)^{(1 - A_{(X, B)}(F_i))} \cdot (\mathcal{O}_{Y \times \mathbb{A}^1}(-F) + t)^{\frac{e_+}{r_0}} \cdot \mathcal{O}_{Y \times \mathbb{A}^1}(\sigma_*^{-1} B_{\mathbb{A}^1} + \sigma^* T_{r, \mathbb{A}^1}) \cdot (t)^{d_{r, \delta}} \right)$$

is sublc. By [55, Corollary 2.33],

$$\left(Y \times \mathbb{A}^1, \prod_{i=0}^k \mathcal{O}_{Y \times \mathbb{A}^1}(-F_i \times \mathbb{A}^1)^{(1 - A_{(X, B)}(F_i))} \cdot (\mathcal{O}_{Y \times \mathbb{A}^1}(-F) + t)^{\frac{e_+}{r_0}} \cdot \mathcal{O}_{Y \times \mathbb{A}^1}(\sigma_*^{-1} B_{\mathbb{A}^1} + \sigma^* T'_{\mathbb{A}^1}) \cdot (t)^{d_{r, \delta}} \right)$$

is also sublc for general \mathbb{Q} -divisor $T' \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} T$. Hence,

$$\left(Y \times \mathbb{A}^1, \prod_{i=0}^k \mathcal{O}_{Y \times \mathbb{A}^1}(-F_i \times \mathbb{A}^1)^{(1 - A_{(X, B)}(F_i))} \cdot (\mathcal{O}_{Y \times \mathbb{A}^1}(-F) + t)^{\frac{e_+}{r_0}} \cdot \mathcal{O}_{Y \times \mathbb{A}^1}(\sigma_*^{-1} B_{\mathbb{A}^1} + \sigma^* T'_{\mathbb{A}^1}) \cdot (t)^{d_{\infty}} \right)$$

is also sublc and similarly to the last part of the proof of [37, Theorem 4.1], we obtain the assertion. \square

To prove the converse, recall the following explicit formula of the log Ding-invariant by [11].

Proposition A.16 ([11, Proposition 7.29]). *Let (X, B, L) be a polarized klt pair and T be a \mathbb{Q} -line bundle on X such that $T = -(K_X + B + L)$. Let $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ be a semiample test configuration for (X, L) dominating $X_{\mathbb{A}^1}$ such that $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{B} + \rho^*T_{1, \mathbb{A}^1} + \mathcal{X}_{0, \text{red}})$ is sublc for general $T_1 \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} T$. Here, $\rho: \mathcal{X} \rightarrow X_{\mathbb{A}^1}$ is the canonical morphism. Let $b_E = \text{ord}_E(\mathcal{X}_0)$. Then*

$$\text{Ding}_{(B, T)}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) = \text{Ding}_{B+T_1}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) = \min_E (A_{(X, B)}(v_E) + b_E^{-1} \text{ord}_E(\mathcal{L} - L_{\mathbb{A}^1})) - E^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}).$$

Proof. The first equality follows from Lemma A.10. Let

$$L_{(B+T_1)}^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) = \inf_v (A_{(X, B+T_1)}(v) + b_E^{-1} \text{ord}_E(\mathcal{L} - L_{\mathbb{A}^1}))$$

where v runs over the divisorial valuations on X . This functional is homogeneous by [11, Definition 7.1, Proposition 7.27] even when $(X, B + T_1)$ is a subklt pair. Let $-D = \mathcal{L} + K_{(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{B} + \rho^*T_{1, \mathbb{P}^1})/\mathbb{P}^1}$ and $D^{\log} = D - \mathcal{X}_{0, \text{red}} + \mathcal{X}_0$. We will prove that

$$\begin{aligned} L_{(B+T_1)}^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) &= \text{lct}_{(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{B} + \rho^*T_{1, \mathbb{P}^1} + \mathcal{X}_{0, \text{red}} + D^{\log})}(\mathcal{X}_0) \\ &= \min_E (A_{(X, B)}(v_E) + b_E^{-1} \text{ord}_E(\mathcal{L} - L_{\mathbb{A}^1})) \end{aligned}$$

if T_1 is general. Here, E runs over the irreducible components of \mathcal{X}_0 .

By [11, Lemma 7.30], we can prove that

$$L_{(B+T_1)}^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) = \text{lct}_{(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{B} + \rho^*T_{1, \mathbb{P}^1} + \mathcal{X}_{0, \text{red}} + D^{\log})}(\mathcal{X}_0).$$

Furthermore, we can choose T_1 so general that the support of $\rho^*T_{1, \mathbb{P}^1}$ contains no component of \mathcal{X}_0 . Let $l = \min_E (A_{(X, B)}(v_E) + (\phi - \phi_{\text{triv}})(v_E))$. Then, $-D^{\log} \geq l\mathcal{X}_0$ since $\text{mult}_F(\mathcal{B} + \rho^*T_{1, \mathbb{P}^1} + \mathcal{X}_{0, \text{red}}) = 1$ for irreducible component F of \mathcal{X}_0 . On the other hand, $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{B} + \rho^*T_{1, \mathbb{P}^1} + \mathcal{X}_{0, \text{red}} + D^{\log} + l\mathcal{X}_0)$ is sublc since so is $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{B} + \rho^*T_{1, \mathbb{P}^1} + \mathcal{X}_{0, \text{red}})$. Thus,

$$L_{(B+T_1)}^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) = \min_E (A_{(X, B)}(v_E) + b_E^{-1} \text{ord}_E(\mathcal{L} - L_{\mathbb{A}^1})).$$

Thus, we obtain the proof. \square

Here, the assumption of the proposition is not essential that $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ satisfies that $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{B} + \rho^*T_{\mathbb{P}^1} + \mathcal{X}_{0, \text{red}})$ is sublc, because we can take the lc modification as follows.

Proposition A.17 ([61, Proposition 2]). *Let (X, B) be a klt pair and \mathcal{X} be a normal test configuration for X . Then there exists $d \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ such that there exists a normal test configuration \mathcal{Y} for X such that*

- (1) \mathcal{Y} dominates $\mathcal{X}^{(d)}$, where $\mathcal{X}^{(d)}$ is defined as in Proposition A.12,
- (2) $(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{Y}} + \mathcal{Y}_0)$ is lc, where $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{Y}}$ is the strict transformation of $B \times \mathbb{A}^1$.

The proof of this proposition is similarly to [61, Proposition 2] and is left to the reader. Then, we apply these propositions to prove Theorem A.13.

Proof of Theorem A.13. The second assertion follows from the first one. Indeed, let the right hand side of the inequality be $\delta'(L)$. Note that $\delta'(rL) = r^{-1}\delta'(L)$ for any $r \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$. Replacing L by rL for some $r \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0}$, we may assume that $\delta_{(X, \Delta)}(L) \geq 1$. Then, it suffices to show that if $\delta_{(X, \Delta)}(L) \geq 1$, then the log-twisted pair (X, Δ, T, L) is Ding-semistable where $T = -(K_X + \Delta + L)$. In fact, for any normal semiample test configuration $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ for (X, L) ,

$$M_{(\Delta, T)}^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) = H_{\Delta}^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) - (I^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) - J^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}))$$

and

$$\text{Ding}_{(\Delta, T)}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) \leq M_{(\Delta, T)}^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$$

by Proposition A.12 (3). Then, for any $\epsilon > 0$, take $r \in \mathbb{Q}$ such that $1 \leq r^{-1}\delta(L) = \delta(rL) \leq 1 + \epsilon$. If we prove that $\delta'(rL) \geq 1$, then $\delta'(L) \geq r \geq (1 + \epsilon)^{-1}\delta(L)$ and the assertion follows. For the first assertion, we proved that if (X, Δ, T, L) is Ding-semistable then $\delta_{(X, \Delta)}(L) \geq 1$ in Theorem A.15. Thus, it suffices to show the converse.

By Proposition A.12 (1), we may assume that \mathcal{X} dominates $X_{\mathbb{A}^1}$. Furthermore, by Proposition A.12 (2) and Proposition A.17, we may assume that $(\mathcal{X}, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}} + \mathcal{X}_{0,\text{red}})$ is lc where $\Delta_{\mathcal{X}}$ is the strict transformation of $\Delta \times \mathbb{A}^1$. Hence, we may also assume that $(\mathcal{X}, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}} + \rho^*T_{1,\mathbb{P}^1} + \mathcal{X}_{0,\text{red}})$ is sublc where $T_1 \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} T$ is general. Let $\mathcal{L} = L_{\mathbb{P}^1} + D$. Then, we can calculate as follows,

$$\text{Ding}_{(\Delta, T)}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) = \text{Ding}_{(\Delta + T_1)}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) = \min_E (A_{(X, \Delta)}(v_E) + b_E^{-1} \text{ord}_E(D)) - E^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$$

by Proposition A.16 where E runs over the irreducible components of \mathcal{X}_0 . Here, let $F^\lambda H^0(X, mL)$ be the filtration defined by $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ (cf., [11, §2.5]) and $F^\lambda H^0(X, mL) = \bigcap_E \{s \in H^0(X, mL) \mid v_E(s) + mb_E^{-1} \text{ord}_E(D) \geq \lambda\}$ for sufficiently divisible m and all $\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}$ by [11, Lemma 5.17]. Then let $R^{(\lambda)} = \bigoplus_{m \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}} F^{m\lambda} H^0(X, mL)$. On the other hand, let $b_E = \text{ord}_E(\mathcal{X}_0)$ and $\lambda_{(\min)} = \min_E b_E^{-1} \text{ord}_E(D)$.

Now, assume that $\delta_{(X, \Delta)}(L) \geq 1$. Then, $A_{(X, \Delta)}(v_E) \geq S_L(v_E)$ and we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} A_{(X, \Delta)}(v_E) + b_E^{-1} \text{ord}_E(D) - E^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) &\geq S_L(v_E) + b_E^{-1} \text{ord}_E(D) + (L^n)^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \lambda \frac{d}{d\lambda} \text{vol}(R^{(\lambda)}) d\lambda \\ &\geq \int_{x \geq 0} (L^n)^{-1} \text{vol}(L - xv_E) dx + b_E^{-1} \text{ord}_E(D) - \lambda_{(\min)} - \int_{\lambda \geq \lambda_{(\min)}} (L^n)^{-1} \text{vol}(R^{(\lambda)}) d\lambda \\ &\geq \int_{x \geq 0} (L^n)^{-1} \text{vol}(L - xv_E) dx - \int_{\lambda \geq b_E^{-1} \text{ord}_E(D)} (L^n)^{-1} \text{vol}(R^{(\lambda)}) d\lambda \\ &= \int_{x \geq 0} (L^n)^{-1} \text{vol}(L - xv_E) dx - \int_{x \geq 0} (L^n)^{-1} \text{vol}(R^{(x + b_E^{-1} \text{ord}_E(D))}) dx \end{aligned}$$

for any irreducible component E of \mathcal{X}_0 by [11, Theorem 5.16, Lemma 7.3]. Here, we used the fact that $(L^n)^{-1} \text{vol}(R^{(\lambda)}) \leq 1$. For sufficiently divisible m and all $x \in \mathbb{Z}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} F^{(x + mb_E^{-1} \text{ord}_E(D))} H^0(X, mL) &= \bigcap_F \{s \in H^0(X, mL) \mid v_F(s) + mb_F^{-1} \text{ord}_F(D) \geq x + mb_E^{-1} \text{ord}_E(D)\} \\ &\subset \{s \in H^0(X, mL) \mid v_E(s) \geq x\} \end{aligned}$$

where F runs over the irreducible components of \mathcal{X}_0 . Thus, we have

$$\int_{x \geq 0} (L^n)^{-1} \text{vol}(L - xv_E) dx - \int_{x \geq 0} (L^n)^{-1} \text{vol}(R^{(x + b_E^{-1} \text{ord}_E(D))}) dx \geq 0.$$

Therefore, (X, Δ, T, L) is log-twisted Ding-semistable. \square

Remark A.18. To calculate the log-twisted Ding-invariant of a semiample test configuration $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ for a log-twisted Fano pair (X, B, T, L) , it is sufficient that a general divisor $T_1 \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} T$ satisfies the following by Proposition A.16.

- As we saw in the proof of Theorem A.13, we can take a semiample test configuration $(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{Y}})$ such that $(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{Y}})$ dominates $(\mathcal{X}^{(d)}, \mathcal{L}^{(d)})$ for sufficiently divisible $d \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ and $(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{Y}} + \mathcal{Y}_0)$ is sublc. Moreover, \mathcal{Y} dominates $X_{\mathbb{A}^1}$ and let $\rho_{\mathcal{Y}} : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow X_{\mathbb{A}^1}$ be the canonical morphism. Then, $(X, B + T_1)$ is subklt and T_1 contains no center of v_E (cf., Definition 2.2) where E runs over the irreducible components of \mathcal{Y}_0 .

We also obtain the following by the same arguments in the proofs of [12, Theorem 2.12] and [9, Theorem B].

Corollary A.19. *Let $(X, B, T, L = -(K_X + B + T))$ be a log-twisted Fano pair such that (X, B) is klt. Then $\delta_{(X, B)}(L) > 1$ iff (X, B, T, L) is uniformly Ding-stable.*

A.3. Log-twisted K-semistable Fano pair and destabilizing boundary. Finally, we prove that Ding-stability and K-stability coincide for log-twisted Fano pairs when T is semiample. This subsection is different from [10] in considering not only the case when T is ample but when T is semiample. This is the main result in this subsection to obtain Theorem 4.23.

Theorem A.20. *Let $(X, B, T, L = -K_X - B - T)$ be a strictly K -semistable log-twisted Fano pair such that T is semiample (i.e., (X, B, T, L) is K -semistable but not K -stable). Then there exists a \mathbb{Q} -Cartier \mathbb{Q} -divisor $D \in |L|_{\mathbb{Q}}$ such that $(X, B + \epsilon D, T, (1 - \epsilon)L)$ is a K -unstable log-twisted Fano pair for $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$.*

Recall that log-twisted Ding-invariant is independent from the choice of general $T_1 \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} T$. For simplicity, we introduce the following.

Notation. • $\rho^*T_{\mathbb{A}^1}$ means that the strict transformation of $(T_1)_{\mathbb{A}^1}$ for general member $T_1 \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} T$.
 • Let (X, B, T, L) be a log-twisted Fano pair and $(\mathcal{X}^c, \mathcal{L}^c)$ be a normal semiample test configuration. Then we will denote the canonical birational map by $\rho^c : \mathcal{X}^c \dashrightarrow X_{\mathbb{A}^1}$ and the strict transformation of $B \times \mathbb{A}^1$ by \mathcal{B}^c . ($c = \text{lc}, \text{ac}, \text{s}, (d) \cdots$, etc.)

First, let us recall the notions and generalize the results of [61], [37] and [10, Theorem 3.12].

Definition A.21. Let $(X, B, T, L = -K_X - B - T)$ be a log-twisted Fano pair such that (X, B) is klt, T is semiample and $(\mathcal{X}^s, \mathcal{L}^s)$ be a normal semiample test configuration. Then $(\mathcal{X}^s, \mathcal{L}^s)$ is a *log-twisted special test configuration* for (X, B, T, L) if $(\mathcal{X}^s, \mathcal{B}^s + (\rho^s)^*T_{\mathbb{A}^1} + \mathcal{X}_0)$ is plt (cf., [55, 2.34]) and $\mathcal{L} = -(K_{\mathcal{X}^s} + \mathcal{B}^s + (\rho^s)^*T_{\mathbb{A}^1})$ is ample, where the notation as in Definition A.9.

Theorem A.22 (cf., [61, Theorem 2], [37, Theorem 6.7]). *Let $(X, B, T, L = -K_X - B - T)$ be an n -dimensional log-twisted Fano pair such that (X, B) is klt, T is semiample and $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ be a normal and ample test configuration. Then there exist $d \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ and an ample test configuration $(\mathcal{X}^{\text{lc}}, \mathcal{L}^{\text{lc}})$ dominating $(\mathcal{X}^{(d)}, \mathcal{L}^{(d)})$ via π that is the normalization of the base change of the d -th power map of \mathbb{A}^1 such that:*

- (1) $(\mathcal{X}^{\text{lc}}, \mathcal{B}^{\text{lc}} + (\rho^{\text{lc}})^*T_{\mathbb{A}^1} + \mathcal{X}_0^{\text{lc}})$ is lc (i.e., $(\mathcal{X}^{\text{lc}}, \mathcal{B}^{\text{lc}} + (\rho^{\text{lc}})^{-1}(T_1)_{\mathbb{A}^1} + \mathcal{X}_0^{\text{lc}})$ is lc for any general effective divisor $T_1 \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} T$ as Notation).
- (2) $\text{DF}_{(B,T)}(\mathcal{X}^{\text{lc}}, \mathcal{L}^{\text{lc}}) \leq d \text{DF}_{(B,T)}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ and

$$\text{Ding}_{(B,T)}(\mathcal{X}^{\text{lc}}, \mathcal{L}^{\text{lc}}) - \delta J^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}^{\text{lc}}, \mathcal{L}^{\text{lc}}) \leq d (\text{Ding}_{(B,T)}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) - \delta J^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})),$$

for any $\delta \in [0, 1)$.

Proof. We reduce to [37, Theorem 6.7] as follows. By the semistable reduction theorem [48], there exist a log smooth pair $(\mathcal{Y}, \text{Ex}(g) + g_*^{-1}(\mathcal{B}^{(d)}) + \mathcal{Y}_0)$ and a birational morphism $g : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}^{(d)}$ such that the central fiber \mathcal{Y}_0 is reduced (cf., [55, Theorem 7.17]) for sufficiently divisible d . We may assume that \mathcal{Y} dominates the trivial test configuration $X_{\mathbb{A}^1}$. Let $\rho_{\mathcal{Y}} : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow X_{\mathbb{A}^1}$ be the canonical morphism. Then take a general effective divisor $T_1 \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} T$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} d \text{DF}_{(B,T)}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) &= \text{DF}_{(B,T)}(\mathcal{X}^{(d)}, \mathcal{L}^{(d)}) = \text{DF}_{B+T_1}(\mathcal{X}^{(d)}, \mathcal{L}^{(d)}) = d \text{DF}_{B+T_1}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) \\ d \text{Ding}_{(B,T)}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) &= \text{Ding}_{(B,T)}(\mathcal{X}^{(d)}, \mathcal{L}^{(d)}) = \text{Ding}_{B+T_1}(\mathcal{X}^{(d)}, \mathcal{L}^{(d)}) = d \text{Ding}_{B+T_1}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}). \end{aligned}$$

We take the lc modification $h : \mathcal{X}^{\text{lc}} \rightarrow (\mathcal{X}^{(d)}, \mathcal{B}^{(d)} + (\rho^{(d)})_*^{-1}(T_1)_{\mathbb{A}^1} + \mathcal{X}_0^{(d)})$ by Proposition A.17. Note that \mathcal{X}^{lc} is independent from the choice of T_1 . Indeed, let $T_2 \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} T$ be also general. Here, note that \mathcal{X}^{lc} is the lc model of $(\mathcal{Y}, g_*^{-1}(\mathcal{B}^{(d)} + \mathcal{X}_0^{(d)}) + \rho_{\mathcal{Y}}^*(T_1)_{\mathbb{A}^1} + E)$ by [77, Lemma 2.1] where E is the reduced sum of all g -exceptional prime divisors. By [8, Lemma 3.6.9], lc models of $(\mathcal{Y}, g_*^{-1}(\mathcal{B}^{(d)} + \mathcal{X}_0^{(d)}) + \rho_{\mathcal{Y}}^*(T_i)_{\mathbb{A}^1} + E)$ coincide for $i = 1, 2$. Therefore, we can choose T_1 so general for \mathcal{X}^{lc} . Now, $(\mathcal{X}^{\text{lc}}, \pi_*(g_*^{-1}(\mathcal{B}^{(d)} + \mathcal{X}_0^{(d)}) + \rho_{\mathcal{Y}}^*(T_1)_{\mathbb{A}^1} + E))$ is log canonical and $K_{\mathcal{X}^{\text{lc}}} + \pi_*(g_*^{-1}(\mathcal{B}^{(d)} + \mathcal{X}_0^{(d)}) + \rho_{\mathcal{Y}}^*(T_1)_{\mathbb{A}^1} + E)$ is h -ample where $\pi : \mathcal{Y} \dashrightarrow \mathcal{X}^{\text{lc}}$ is the canonical birational contraction. Let F be the h -exceptional divisor such that

$$-F \sim_{\mathcal{X}^{(d)}, \mathbb{Q}} K_{\mathcal{X}^{\text{lc}}} + \pi_*(g_*^{-1}(\mathcal{B}^{(d)} + \mathcal{X}_0^{(d)}) + \rho_{\mathcal{Y}}^*(T_1)_{\mathbb{A}^1} + E).$$

Let $\mathcal{B}^{\text{lc}} = \pi_*(g_*^{-1}(\mathcal{B}^{(d)} + \mathcal{X}_0^{(d)})) + E) - \mathcal{X}_0^{\text{lc}}$ and $\mathcal{L}^{\text{lc}} = h^*\mathcal{L}^{(d)} - \epsilon F$ for sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$. By Remark A.18 and the choice of T_1 , we have for sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Ding}_{(B,T)}(\mathcal{X}^{\text{lc}}, \mathcal{L}^{\text{lc}}) &= \text{Ding}_{B+T_1}(\mathcal{X}^{\text{lc}}, \mathcal{L}^{\text{lc}}) \\ \text{DF}_{(B,T)}(\mathcal{X}^{\text{lc}}, \mathcal{L}^{\text{lc}}) &= \text{DF}_{B+T_1}(\mathcal{X}^{\text{lc}}, \mathcal{L}^{\text{lc}}). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the theorem follows from the logarithmic (untwisted) case [37, Theorem 6.7]. \square

Theorem A.23 (cf., [61, Theorem 3], [37, Theorem 6.8]). *Let $(X, B, T, L = -K_X - B - T)$ be an n -dimensional log-twisted Fano pair such that (X, B) is klt, T is semiample and $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ be a normal ample test configuration such that $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{B} + \rho^*T_{\mathbb{A}^1} + \mathcal{X}_0)$ is lc.*

*Then there exists a normal and ample test configuration $(\mathcal{X}^{\text{ac}}, \mathcal{L}^{\text{ac}})$ for (X, L) such that $(\mathcal{X}^{\text{ac}}, \mathcal{B}^{\text{ac}} + (\rho^{\text{ac}})^*T_{\mathbb{A}^1} + \mathcal{X}_0^{\text{ac}})$ is lc, $-(K_{\mathcal{X}^{\text{ac}}} + \mathcal{B}^{\text{ac}} + (\rho^{\text{ac}})^*T_{\mathbb{A}^1}) \sim_{\mathbb{A}^1, \mathbb{Q}} \mathcal{L}^{\text{ac}}$, $\text{DF}_{(B,T)}(\mathcal{X}^{\text{ac}}, \mathcal{L}^{\text{ac}}) \leq \text{DF}_{(B,T)}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ and*

$$\text{Ding}_{(B,T)}(\mathcal{X}^{\text{ac}}, \mathcal{L}^{\text{ac}}) - \delta J^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}^{\text{ac}}, \mathcal{L}^{\text{ac}}) \leq \text{Ding}_{(B,T)}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) - \delta J^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}),$$

for any $\delta \in [0, 1)$

Proof. We recall and reduce to the proof of [37, Theorem 6.8]. Take a general effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor $T_1 \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} T$. Then $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{B} + \rho_*^{-1}(T_1)_{\mathbb{A}^1} + \mathcal{X}_0)$ is lc and hence $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{B} + \rho_*^{-1}(T_1)_{\mathbb{A}^1})$ is klt. Here, we apply [8, Corollary 1.4.3] to obtain a \mathbb{G}_m -equivariant small \mathbb{Q} -factorial modification $\sigma : (\mathcal{X}^0, \mathcal{B}^0 + (\rho^0)_*^{-1}(T_1)_{\mathbb{A}^1}) \rightarrow (\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{B} + \rho_*^{-1}(T_1)_{\mathbb{A}^1})$. Let $\mathcal{L}^0 = \sigma^*\mathcal{L}$ and for $l \gg 1$, set

$$\mathcal{H}^0 = \mathcal{L}^0 - \frac{1}{l+1}(\mathcal{L}^0 + K_{\mathcal{X}^0} + \mathcal{B}^0 + (\rho^0)_*^{-1}(T_1)_{\mathbb{A}^1}).$$

Then, we run a $K_{\mathcal{X}^0} + \mathcal{B}^0 + (\rho^0)_*^{-1}(T_1)_{\mathbb{A}^1} + \mathcal{H}^0$ -MMP over \mathbb{A}^1 with scaling of \mathcal{H}^0 as in the proof of [loc.cit, Theorem 3.2] and obtain a minimal model $(\mathcal{X}^k, \mathcal{B}^k + (\rho^k)_*^{-1}(T_1)_{\mathbb{A}^1} + \mathcal{H}^k)$. By [61, Lemma 2], we also have that $-(K_{\mathcal{X}^k} + \mathcal{B}^k + (\rho^k)_*^{-1}(T_1)_{\mathbb{A}^1})$ is semiample over \mathbb{A}^1 and let \mathcal{X}^{ac} be the $-(K_{\mathcal{X}^k} + \mathcal{B}^k + (\rho^k)_*^{-1}(T_1)_{\mathbb{A}^1})$ -ample model. Here, we claim that \mathcal{X}^{ac} and the $K_{\mathcal{X}^0} + \mathcal{B}^0 + (\rho^0)_*^{-1}(T_1)_{\mathbb{A}^1} + \mathcal{H}^0$ -MMP are independent from the choice of general T_1 . Indeed, for another general divisor $T'_1 \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} T$, \mathcal{X}^k is also a $K_{\mathcal{X}^0} + \mathcal{B}^0 + (\rho^0)_*^{-1}(T'_1)_{\mathbb{A}^1} + \mathcal{H}^0$ -minimal model and \mathcal{X}^{ac} is the $-(K_{\mathcal{X}^k} + \mathcal{B}^k + (\rho^k)_*^{-1}(T'_1)_{\mathbb{A}^1})$ -canonical model since $(\rho^0)_*^{-1}(T'_1)_{\mathbb{A}^1} \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} (\rho^0)_*^{-1}(T_1)_{\mathbb{A}^1}$ as [10, Lemma 2.12]. Thus we can choose T_1 so general also for \mathcal{X}^{ac} and we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Ding}_{(B,T)}(\mathcal{X}^{\text{ac}}, \mathcal{L}^{\text{ac}}) &= \text{Ding}_{B+T_1}(\mathcal{X}^{\text{ac}}, \mathcal{L}^{\text{ac}}) \\ \text{DF}_{(B,T)}(\mathcal{X}^{\text{ac}}, \mathcal{L}^{\text{ac}}) &= \text{DF}_{B+T_1}(\mathcal{X}^{\text{ac}}, \mathcal{L}^{\text{ac}}) \\ \text{DF}_{(B,T)}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) &= \text{DF}_{B+T_1}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) \\ \text{Ding}_{(B,T)}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) &= \text{Ding}_{B+T_1}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the theorem follows from the logarithmic case [37, Theorem 6.8]. \square

Theorem A.24 (cf., [61, Theorem 4], [37, Theorem 6.9]). *Let $(X, B, T, L = -K_X - B - T)$ be an n -dimensional log-twisted Fano pair such that (X, B) is klt, T is semiample and $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ be a normal ample test configuration such that $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{B} + \rho^*T_{\mathbb{A}^1} + \mathcal{X}_0)$ is lc. Suppose also that $-(K_{\mathcal{X}} + \mathcal{B} + \rho^*T_{\mathbb{A}^1}) \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} \mathcal{L}$. Then there exist $d \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ and a log-twisted special test configuration $(\mathcal{X}^{\text{s}}, \mathcal{L}^{\text{s}} = -(K_{\mathcal{X}^{\text{s}}} + \mathcal{B}^{\text{s}} + (\rho^{\text{s}})^*T_{\mathbb{A}^1}))$ for (X, B, T, L) such that $\text{DF}_{(B,T)}(\mathcal{X}^{\text{s}}, \mathcal{L}^{\text{s}}) \leq d \text{DF}_{(B,T)}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ and*

$$\text{Ding}_{(B,T)}(\mathcal{X}^{\text{s}}, \mathcal{L}^{\text{s}}) - \delta J^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}^{\text{s}}, \mathcal{L}^{\text{s}}) \leq d (\text{Ding}_{(B,T)}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) - \delta J^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}))$$

for any $\delta \in [0, 1)$.

Proof. We reduce to [37, Theorem 6.9] as follows. Note that $\text{Ding}_{(B,T)}(\mathcal{X}^{\text{s}}, \mathcal{L}^{\text{s}}) = \text{DF}_{(B,T)}(\mathcal{X}^{\text{s}}, \mathcal{L}^{\text{s}})$ and $\text{DF}_{(B,T)}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) = \text{Ding}_{(B,T)}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ hold now due to Proposition A.12 (3). Recall the proof of [37, Theorem 6.10]. We take a semistable reduction \mathcal{Y} of $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{B} + \mathcal{X}_0)$. In other words, there exist $d \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ and a birational morphism $g : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}^{(d)}$ such that \mathcal{Y} is smooth, $\mathcal{Y}_0 + \text{Ex}(g) + g_*^{-1}\mathcal{B}^{(d)}$ is snc and \mathcal{Y}_0 is reduced. We may assume that there exists a birational morphism $\rho_{\mathcal{Y}} : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow X_{\mathbb{A}^1}$.

Fix a general effective divisor $T_1 \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} T$ such that $\mathcal{Y}_0 + \text{Ex}(g) + g_*^{-1}\mathcal{B}^{(d)} + \rho_{\mathcal{Y}}^*T_{1,\mathbb{A}^1}$ is also snc and the support of $\rho_{\mathcal{Y}}^*T_{1,\mathbb{A}^1}$ contains no component of \mathcal{Y}_0 . Then, we can take a special test configuration $(\mathcal{X}^s, \mathcal{L}^s)$ for the log Fano pair $(X, B + T_1)$ as [37, Theorem 6.10] by running some MMP of \mathcal{Y} . By the construction, T_1 does not contain the center of $v_{\mathcal{X}_0^s}$ and we can conclude that

$$\text{DF}_{(B,T)}(\mathcal{X}^s, \mathcal{L}^s) = \text{DF}_{B+T_1}(\mathcal{X}^s, \mathcal{L}^s)$$

by Lemma A.4. Thus, the theorem follows from the logarithmic case [37, Theorem 6.9]. \square

Corollary A.25 (cf., [61, Corollary 1], [37, Corollary 6.11]). *Let $(X, B, T, L = -K_X - B - T)$ be a log-twisted Fano pair such that (X, B) is klt and T is semiample. Fix $\delta \in [0, 1)$. Then, $\text{Ding}_{(B,T)}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) \geq \delta J^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ for any semiample test configuration if and only if the inequality holds for any log-twisted special test configuration $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ for (X, B, T, L) .*

Furthermore, (X, B, T, L) is log-twisted (uniformly) K-(semi)stable if and only if (X, B, T, L) is log-twisted (uniformly) Ding-(semi)stable.

Remark A.26. We do not assume that T is semiample in Theorem A.15. Therefore, we can apply this to Theorem A.13.

Definition A.27 ([37, Definition 1.3 (1)]). Let (X, L) be a polarized normal variety and v be a divisorial valuation on X . Suppose that $\sigma : Y \rightarrow X$ be a birational morphism and there exist $c \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0}$ and a prime divisor F on Y such that $v = c \text{ord}_F$. Then, v is *dreamy* if $\bigoplus_{(k,j) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^2} H^0(Y, k r \sigma^* L - j F)$ is a \mathbb{C} -algebra of finite type, where $r \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ satisfies that rL is \mathbb{Z} -Cartier. We also call F a *dreamy* prime divisor over X .

Theorem A.28 (cf., [37, Theorem 6.13]). *Let $(X, B, T, L = -K_X - B - T)$ be a log-twisted Fano pair such that (X, B) is klt and T is semiample and let $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L} = -(K_{\mathcal{X}} + \mathcal{B} + \rho^*T_{\mathbb{A}^1}))$ be a normal ample test configuration for (X, L) with \mathcal{X}_0 irreducible and reduced such that $-(K_{\mathcal{X}} + \mathcal{B} + \rho^*T_{\mathbb{P}^1}) \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} \mathcal{L}$. Then the corresponding valuation $v_{\mathcal{X}_0}$ is dreamy and*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{DF}_{(B,T)}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) &= \frac{\beta_{(X,B,T)}(v_{\mathcal{X}_0})}{\text{vol}(-(K_X + B + T))}, \\ J^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) &= \frac{j_{(X,B,T)}(v_{\mathcal{X}_0})}{\text{vol}(-(K_X + B + T))}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. For general effective divisor $T_1 \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} T$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_{(X,B,T)}(v_{\mathcal{X}_0}) &= \beta_{(X,B)}(v_{\mathcal{X}_0}), \\ \text{DF}_{(B,T)}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) &= \text{DF}_{(B+T_1)}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, this theorem follows immediately from [37, Theorem 6.13]. \square

Theorem A.29 (cf., [37, Theorem 6.5]). *Let $\delta \in [0, 1)$ and $(X, B, T, L = -K_X - B - T)$ be a log-twisted Fano pair such that (X, B) is klt and T is semiample. Then the following are equivalent,*

- (i) $\text{DF}_{(B,T)}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) \geq \delta J^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ for any normal semiample test configuration $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ for (X, L) ,
- (ii) $\beta_{(X,B,T)}(F) \geq \delta j_{(X,B,T)}(F)$ for any prime divisor over X ,
- (iii) $\beta_{(X,B,T)}(F) \geq \delta j_{(X,B,T)}(F)$ for any dreamy prime divisor over X .

Corollary A.30 (cf., [58, Theorem 3]). *Let $(\mathbb{P}^1, \Delta, T)$ be a log-twisted Fano pair with $\Delta = \sum_{i=1}^m a_i p_i$ and a semiample \mathbb{Q} -line bundle T , where $a_i > 0$, $m \geq 0$ and p_i are distinct points. Then, the log-twisted Fano pair $(\mathbb{P}^1, \Delta, T)$ is uniformly K-stable (resp., K-semistable) if and only if*

$$\max_{1 \leq i \leq m} \{a_i\} < \frac{\text{deg}(\Delta + T)}{2} \left(\text{resp. } \max\{a_i\} \leq \frac{\text{deg}(\Delta + T)}{2} \right).$$

Proof. This follows immediately from the logarithmic case [37, Example 6.6]. \square

Next, we prove Theorem A.20. We prepare the following two lemmas:

Lemma A.31 (cf., [38, Lemma 3.3]). *Let $(X, B, T, L = -(K_X + B + T))$ be a log-twisted Fano pair such that (X, B) is klt and T is semiample and F be a prime divisor over X . Then we define*

$$\alpha_F := \inf_{D \in |-(K_X + B + T)|_{\mathbb{Q}}} \frac{A_{(X,B)}(F)}{\text{ord}_F(D)}.$$

Then $\alpha_F > 0$ and

$$\alpha_F \tau_L(F) \leq A_{(X,B)}(F).$$

Proof. The first assertion is trivial since the α -invariant is positive. For any rational positive number $0 < \tau < \tau_L(F)$, we can take $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ such that $H^0(X, kL - k\tau F) \neq 0$. Then there exists an effective \mathbb{Q} -Cartier \mathbb{Q} -divisor $D \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} L$ such that $\text{ord}_F(D) \geq \tau$ and hence we obtain

$$\frac{A_{(X,B)}(F)}{\tau} \geq \alpha_F.$$

Therefore, we obtain

$$\alpha_F \tau_L(F) \leq A_{(X,B)}(F). \quad \square$$

Lemma A.32. *Let (X, B, T, L) be a strictly K -semistable log-twisted Fano pair such that T is semiample. For any prime divisor F over X such that $\beta_{(X,B,T)}(F) = 0$, we have*

$$\alpha_F < 1.$$

Proof. Assume that $\alpha_F \geq 1$. By assumption,

$$\beta_{(X,B,T)}(F) = A_{(X,B)}(F) \text{vol}(-K_X - B - T) - \int_0^{\tau_L(F)} \text{vol}(-K_X - B - T - xF) dx = 0.$$

On the other hand,

$$A_{(X,B)}(F) \geq \alpha_F \tau_L(F) \geq \tau_L(F)$$

by Lemma A.31 and hence

$$\beta_{(X,B,T)}(F) \geq \int_0^{\tau_L(F)} (\text{vol}(-K_X - B - T) - \text{vol}(-K_X - B - T - xF)) dx > 0$$

due to [11, Lemma 5.13]. This is a contradiction. \square

Remark A.33. Let (X, B, T, L) be a strictly K -semistable log-twisted Fano pair such that T is semiample. Then, thanks to Corollary A.25, Theorem A.28 and Theorem A.29, there exists at least one dreamy prime divisor F over X such that $\beta_{(X,B,T)}(F) = 0$.

Proof of Theorem A.20. By assumption and Remark A.33, there exists a dreamy prime divisor F over X such that $\beta_{(X,B,T)}(F) = 0$. Let

$$\beta_+ := A_{(X,B)}(F) \text{vol}(L) = \int_0^{\tau_L(F)} \text{vol}(L - xF) dx > 0.$$

By Lemma A.32, there exists a \mathbb{Q} -Cartier \mathbb{Q} -divisor $D \in |L|_{\mathbb{Q}}$ such that $0 < \frac{A_{(X,B)}(F)}{\text{ord}_F(D)} < 1$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_{(X,B+\epsilon D,T)}(F) &= A_{(X,B+\epsilon D)}(F) \text{vol}((1-\epsilon)L) - \int_0^{(1-\epsilon)\tau_L(F)} \text{vol}((1-\epsilon)L - xF) dx \\ &= (1-\epsilon)^n (A_{(X,B)}(F) - \epsilon \text{ord}_F(D)) \text{vol}(L) - (1-\epsilon)^{n+1} \int_0^{\tau_L(F)} \text{vol}(L - xF) dx \\ &= \beta_+ \epsilon (1-\epsilon)^n \left(1 - \frac{\text{ord}_F(D)}{A_{(X,B)}(F)} \right) < 0 \end{aligned}$$

for sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] F. Ambro, *Shokurov's boundary property*. J. Differential Geom. **67** (2004), no. 2, 229-255.
- [2] F. Ambro, *The moduli b-divisor of an lc-trivial fibration*. Compos. Math. **141**(2) (2005), 385-403.
- [3] M. Andreatta, *Actions of linear algebraic groups on projective manifolds and minimal model program*. Osaka J. Math. **38** (2001), no. 1, 151-166.
- [4] C. Arezzo, F. Pacard, *Blowing up and desingularizing constant scalar curvature Kähler manifolds*. Acta Math. **196**(2): 179-228 (2006).
- [5] W. Barth, K. Hulek, C. Peters, and A. Van de Ven, *Compact complex surfaces*, second edition, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2004.
- [6] R.J. Berman, T. Darvas, C.H. Lu, *Regularity of weak minimizers of the K-energy and applications to properness and K-stability*. Ann. Sci. Ec. Norm. Super. **53** (2020), no. 4, 267-289
- [7] C. Birkar, *Existence of log canonical flips and a special LMMP*, Publ. math. IHES **115**, 325-368 (2012).
- [8] C. Birkar, P. Cascini, C. Hacon, and J. McKernan, *Existence of minimal models for varieties of log general type*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **23** (2010), no. 2, 405-468.
- [9] H. Blum, M. Jonsson. *Thresholds, valuations, and K-stability*, Adv. Math. **365** (2020).
- [10] H. Blum, Y. Liu and C. Zhou. *Optimal destabilization of K-unstable Fano varieties via stability thresholds*, to appear in Geom. Topol.
- [11] S. Boucksom, T. Hisamoto, M. Jonsson. *Uniform K-stability, Duistermaat-Heckman measures and singularities of pairs*, Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) **67**(2), 743-841, 2017.
- [12] S. Boucksom, M. Jonsson. *A non-Archimedean approach to K-stability*. arXiv:1805.11160
- [13] G. Chen, *The J-equation and the supercritical deformed Hermitian-Yang-Mills equation*, Invent. math. **225**, 529-602, 2021.
- [14] X.X. Chen, S. K. Donaldson and S. Sun. *Kähler-Einstein metrics on Fano manifolds, I-III*. J. Amer. Math. Soc. **28** (2015), 183-197, 199-234, 235-278.
- [15] X.X. Chen and J. Cheng. *On the constant scalar curvature Kähler metrics, existence results*, 2018. arXiv:1801.00656.
- [16] F.R. Cossec, I.V. Dolgachev, *Enriques surfaces*. I. Progress in Mathematics, vol. **76**. Birkhäuser, Boston (1989)
- [17] R. Dervan, *Alpha invariants and coercivity of the Mabuchi functional on Fano manifolds*. Ann. Fac. Sci. Toulouse Sér. 6, 25 no. 4 (2016), 919-934
- [18] R. Dervan, *Uniform stability of twisted constant scalar curvature Kähler metrics*, Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN **15** (2016), 4728-4783.
- [19] R. Dervan, J. Ross, *Stable maps in higher dimensions*. Math. Ann. **374**, 1033-1073(2019).
- [20] R. Dervan and L. M. Sektnan. *Moduli theory, stability of fibrations and optimal symplectic connections*, 2019, arXiv:1911.12701v3
- [21] R. Dervan and L. M. Sektnan. *Optimal symplectic connections on holomorphic submersions*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **74**(10) (2021) 2132-2184.
- [22] R. Dervan and L. M. Sektnan. *Moduli theory, stability of fibrations and optimal symplectic connections*, Geom. Topol. **25** (2021) 2643-2697.
- [23] I. Dolgachev, *Lectures on invariant theory*. London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (2003).
- [24] S.K. Donaldson, *Scalar Curvature and Projective Embeddings, I*. J. Differential Geom. **59**(3): 479-522 (2001).
- [25] J. Fine, *Constant scalar curvature Kähler metrics on fiberd complex surfaces*, J. Differential Geom. **68**(3), (2004) 397-432.
- [26] J. Fine, *Fibrations with constant scalar curvature Kahler metrics and the CM-line bundle*, Math. Res. Lett. **14** (2007), no. 2, 239-247. MR 2318622
- [27] J. Fine, J. Ross. *A note on positivity of the CM line bundle*. Int. Math. Res. Not., Article ID 95875, 14pp, 2006.
- [28] E. Floris, V. Lazić. *A travel guide to the canonical bundle formula*. Birational Geometry and Moduli Spaces (E. Colombo, B. Fantechi, P. Frediani, D. Iacono, R. Pardini, eds.), Springer INdAM Series, vol. 39, Springer, 2020, pp. 37-55
- [29] J. Fogarty, *Truncated Hilbert functors*. Journal für die reine und angewandte Mathematik **234** (1969): 65-88.
- [30] R. Friedman, J. W. Morgan. *Smooth Four-Manifolds and Complex Surfaces*. Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete 3. Folge. Band 27 (1991).
- [31] O. Fujino, *Semi-stable minimal model program for varieties with trivial canonical divisor*, Proc. Japan Acad. Ser. A Math. Sci. **87**(3): 25-30.
- [32] O. Fujino, *Semipositivity theorems for moduli problems*. Ann. Math. **187** (2018), 639-665.
- [33] O. Fujino, Y. Gongyo, *On the moduli b-divisors of lc-trivial fibrations*, Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) **64**(4), 1721-1735, 2014.

- [34] O. Fujino, K. Hashizume, *Existence of log canonical modifications and its applications*. arXiv:2103.01417
- [35] O. Fujino, S. Mori, *A canonical bundle formula*. J. Differential Geom. **56** (2000), no. 1, 167-188.
- [36] K. Fujita, *Optimal bounds for the volumes of Kähler-Einstein Fano manifolds*. American Journal of Mathematics, vol. 140 no. 2, 2018, p. 391-414.
- [37] K. Fujita, *A valuative criterion for uniform K-stability of \mathbb{Q} -Fano varieties*. J. reine angew. Math. **751**(2019), 309-338.
- [38] K. Fujita, Y. Odaka, *On the K-stability of Fano varieties and anticanonical divisors*. Tohoku Math. J. (2) **70**(4): 511-521 (2018).
- [39] W. Fulton. *Intersection Theory*. Springer, 1984.
- [40] A. Grothendieck, J.A. Dieudonné, *Eléments de Géométrie Algébrique IV*, Publ. Math. IHÉS **20** (1964), 5-259, **24** (1965), 5-231, **28** (1966), 5-255, **32** (1967), 5-361
- [41] C. Hacon, C. Xu, *Existence of log canonical closures*, Invent. Math. **192**, (2013) 161-195.
- [42] R. Hartshorne. *Algebraic Geometry*, Springer-Verlag, 1977.
- [43] K. Hashizume, *A class of singularity of arbitrary pairs and log canonicalizations*, Asian J. Math, **24** (2020), no. 2, 207-238.
- [44] M. Hattori, *A decomposition formula for J-stability and its applications*, arXiv:2103.04603
- [45] M. Hattori, *On fibration stability after Dervan-Sektnan and singularities*, arXiv:2202.09992.
- [46] W. Jian, Y. Shi and J. Song. *A remark on constant scalar curvature Kähler metrics on minimal models*. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **147** (2019), 3507-3513. MSC (2010).
- [47] M. Kawakita, *Inversion of adjunction on log canonicity*. Invent. Math. **167**, 129-133 (2007)
- [48] G. Kempf, F. Knudsen, D. Mumford, B. Saint-Donat, *Toroidal embeddings*. I, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Vol. **339**. Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1973. viii+209pp.
- [49] F. Knudsen and D. Mumford. *The projectivity of the moduli space of stable curves I: Preliminaries on “det” and “Div”*. Math. Scand., **39**(1), 1976.
- [50] J. Kollár, *Singularities of pairs*. arXiv:alg-geom/9601026
- [51] J. Kollár, *Effective base point freeness*, Math. Ann. **296** (1993), no. 4, 595-605.
- [52] J. Kollár, *Lectures on Resolution of Singularities (AM-166)*. Princeton University Press, 2007.
- [53] J. Kollár. *Singularities of the Minimal Model Program*. Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics **200**. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2015.
- [54] J. Kollár et al. *Flips and Abundance for Algebraic Threefolds*. Soc. Math. France, Astérisque vol. 211, 1992
- [55] J. Kollár and S. Mori. *Birational geometry of algebraic varieties*. Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics **134**. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1998
- [56] R. Lazarsfeld. *Positivity in algebraic geometry*. I. Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete. 3. Folge, Springer. (2004).
- [57] C.J. Lai, *Varieties fibered by good minimal models*. Math. Ann. **350**, 533-547 (2011).
- [58] C. Li. *Remarks on logarithmic K-stability*. Commun. Contemp. Math. **17** (2015), no. 2, Article ID 1450020.
- [59] C. Li, *K-semistability is equivariant volume minimization*, Duke Math. **166**, no. 16 (2017), 3147-3218.
- [60] C. Li. *Geodesic rays and stability in the cscK problem*. to appear in Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Supér.
- [61] C. Li, C. Xu. *Special test configuration and K-stability of Fano varieties*. Ann. Math. **180** (2014), no. 1, p. 197-232.
- [62] T. Mabuchi, *Chow-stability and Hilbert-stability in Mumford’s geometric invariant theory*. Osaka J. Math. **45**(3): 833-846 (2008).
- [63] H. Matsumura, *Commutative ring theory*, Cambridge University Press. 1987.
- [64] R. Miranda, *Stability of pencils of cubic curves*, Amer. J. Math. **102** (1980), no. 6, 1177-1202.
- [65] R. Miranda, *The moduli of Weierstrass fibrations over \mathbb{P}^1* , Math. Ann. **255** (1981), no. 3, 379-394.
- [66] R. Miranda, *Projectively unstable elliptic surfaces*. Illinois J. Math. **27**, no. 3, (1983), 404-420.
- [67] S. Mori, *Classification of higher-dimensional varieties*, Proc. Symp. Pure Math., **46** (1987), 269-331.
- [68] S. Mukai, *An Introduction to Invariants and Moduli*. Cambridge Univ. Press 2003.
- [69] D. Mumford, *Stability of projective varieties*, Enseignement Math. (2) **23** (1977), no. 1-2, 39-110.
- [70] D. Mumford, J. Fogarty, F. Kirwan, *Geometric Invariant Theory*, 3rd. edition, Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete, **34**, Springer-Verlag (1994).
- [71] Y. Odaka. *The Calabi conjecture and K-stability*. Int. Math Res. Not. IMRN (2012), no. 10, 2272-2288.
- [72] Y. Odaka. *A generalization of the Ross-Thomas slope theory*. Osaka J. Math. **50**(1): 171-185 (2013).
- [73] Y. Odaka, *The GIT stability of polarized varieties via discrepancy*, Ann. of Math. **177** (2013), 645-661. MR 3010808. Zbl 1271.14067.
- [74] Y. Odaka, Y. Sano. *Alpha invariant and K-stability of \mathbb{Q} -Fano varieties*. Adv. Math. **229** (2012), 2818-2834.
- [75] Y. Odaka, C. Spotti, S. Sun, *Compact moduli spaces of del Pezzo surfaces and Kähler-Einstein metrics*, J. Differential Geom. **102** (2016), no. 1, 127-172
- [76] Y. Odaka, S. Sun, *Testing log K-stability by blowing up formalism*. Ann. Fac. Sci. Toulouse Math., **24**(3) 505-522, 2015

- [77] Y. Odaka, C. Xu. *Log-canonical models of singular pairs and its applications*. Math. Res. Lett. **19** (2012), no. 2, 325-334.
- [78] J. Ross and R. Thomas. *A study of the Hilbert-Mumford criterion for the stability of projective varieties*. J. Algebraic Geom. **16** (2007), no. 2, 201-255.21.
- [79] Z. Sjöström Dyrefelt, *Existence of cscK metrics on smooth minimal models*, to appear in Annali Della Scuola Normale Superiore Di Pisa - Classe Di Scienze.
- [80] J. Song. *Nakai-Moishezon criterion for complex hessian equations*. arXiv:2012.07956v1, 2020.
- [81] J. Song and B. Weinkove: *On the convergence and singularities of the J-flow with applications to the Mabuchi energy*. Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **61** (2008), no.2, 210-229.
- [82] J. Stoppa, *K-stability of constant scalar curvature Kähler manifolds*, Advances in Mathematics **221**, no. 4, 1397-1408 (2009).
- [83] G. Tian, *On Kähler-Einstein metrics on certain Kähler manifolds with $C_1(M) > 0$* , Invent. Math. **89**, 225-246 (1987).
- [84] G. Tian. *On Calabi's conjecture for complex surfaces with positive first Chern class*. Invent. Math. **101** (1990), no. 1, 101-172.
- [85] G. Tian. *K-stability and Kähler-Einstein metrics*. Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **68** (2015), 1085-1156.
- [86] K. Zhang, *Continuity of delta invariants and twisted Kähler-Einstein metrics*, Adv. Math. 388 (2021), Paper No. 107888.
- [87] K. Zhang, *A quantization proof of the uniform Yau-Tian-Donaldson conjecture*, arXiv:2102.02438v2

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, FACULTY OF SCIENCE, KYOTO UNIVERSITY, KYOTO, 606-8502, JAPAN
Email address: hattori.masafumi.47z@st.kyoto-u.ac.jp