

ON THE BOUNDEDNESS OF SINGULARITIES VIA NORMALIZED VOLUME

JOAQUÍN MORAGA AND HENDRIK SÜSS

ABSTRACT. In this article we study conjectures regarding normalized volume and boundedness of singularities. We focus on hypersurface singularities and singularities with a torus action of complexity one. Given a positive integer n and a real value $v > 0$, we prove that the class of n -dimensional K -semistable hypersurface singularities with normalized volume at least v forms a bounded family. Analogously, we prove that the class of n -dimensional K -semistable singularities with a complexity one torus action and with normalized volume at least v forms a bounded family. In the general case of klt singularities, i.e. without the assumption on K -semistability, we show that, up to special degenerations, the normalized volume bounds singularities with a complexity one torus action. We exhibit a 3-dimensional example which shows that this last statement is optimal.

CONTENTS

1.	Introduction	1
2.	Preliminaries	3
3.	Kollár components on \mathbb{T} -varieties	12
4.	Minimal log discrepancies of \mathbb{T} -varieties	13
5.	Boundedness for K -semistable singularities	20
	References	26

1. INTRODUCTION

The study of singularities has played a fundamental role in the development of birational geometry [32] and K -stability [33]. The singularities that arise in both theories are known as log terminal singularities (or klt). The normalized volume is an important invariant for klt singularities which plays a fundamental role in the context of K -stability [24]. K -semistable singularities are a special class of Fano cone singularities among klt singularities (see Definition 2.13). It is conjectured that the normalized volume bounds K -semistable singularities:

Conjecture 1. *Let d be a positive integer and v be a positive real number. The class of d -dimensional K -semistable singularities $(X; x)$ for which the normalized volume $\widehat{\text{vol}}(X; x)$ is at least v forms a bounded family.*

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 14B05, 14M25; Secondary 53C25.

Key words and phrases. normalized volume, K -stability, \mathbb{T} -varieties, Sasaki-Einstein metrics.

The conjecture is known to hold for toric singularities (see, e.g., [29, 34]). The aim of this paper is to extend this result to other classes of singularities. First, we consider complexity one \mathbb{T} -singularities, i.e., n -dimensional singularities with an effective action of a $(n - 1)$ -dimensional torus [4, 22]. Log terminal \mathbb{T} -singularities of complexity one can be described in terms of the so-called polyhedral divisors on the projective line [3, 5]. Similar to toric singularities combinatorial methods play an important role in the study of complexity one \mathbb{T} -singularities. However, their geometry is generally richer and their study is often more challenging; they are not necessarily klt, rational, Cohen-Macaulay, nor Du Bois (see, e.g., [26, 20, 21]). Our first main result shows that Conjecture 1 holds for complexity one \mathbb{T} -singularities:

Theorem 1. *Let d be a positive integer and v be a positive real number. The class of d -dimensional K -semistable Fano cone singularities $(X; x)$ of complexity one for which the normalized volume $\widehat{\text{vol}}(X; x)$ is at least v forms a bounded family.*

In a similar vein, we show that the boundedness by normalized volume of K -semistable singularities holds for hypersurface singularities:

Theorem 2. *Let d be a positive integer and v be a positive real number. The class of d -dimensional K -semistable hypersurface singularities $(X; x)$ with normalized volume $\widehat{\text{vol}}(X; x)$ at least v forms a bounded family.*

When working with general klt singularities, it is also expected that the normalized volume can be used to bound these singularities [15] in a weaker sense. It is conjectured that klt singularities whose normalized volume is bounded away from zero, are bounded up to special degeneration. This conjecture is closely related to the boundedness up to deformation of exceptional singularities [27, 14]. In [15], the authors prove the conjecture for terminal 3-fold singularities. In [29], the authors prove the conjecture for toric singularities using combinatorial methods such as the Blaschke-Santaló inequality. However, in such a case, we only get finitely many singularities. In [34], the author draws a connection between the boundedness using normalized volume and minimal log discrepancies, and proves the conjecture for 3-fold singularities. This observation is crucially important for our own work. In fact, as an important step in our proof of Theorem 1 we show this weaker form of boundedness for the case of complexity one \mathbb{T} -singularities.

Theorem 3. *Let d be a positive integer and v be a positive real number. The class of d -dimensional log terminal complexity one \mathbb{T} -singularities $(X; x)$ for which the normalized volume $\widehat{\text{vol}}(X; x)$ is at least v is bounded up to special degeneration.*

Examples show that we really only get boundedness *up to special degenerations*, but not boundedness in the usual sense (see Example 4.12). This shows that without further assumption the outcome of Theorem 3 is optimal. We recall that bounded up to special degeneration means that all the singularities as in the statement are deformations of a bounded set of algebraic singularities.

In order to prove Theorem 3 by applying the results of [34] we need to bound the *minimal log discrepancies* of \mathbb{T} -singularities. This invariant known as mld is tightly related to the termination of flips [7, 28, 13]. Shokurov conjectured that this invariant satisfies the ascending chain condition in a fixed dimension [30]. On the other hand, Ambro conjectured that this invariant is lower semicontinuous [6]. Both conjectures, independently, imply that in a fixed dimension there is an upper

bound for the minimal log discrepancy. We prove the existence of an upper bound for the mld of log terminal complexity one \mathbb{T} -singularities.

Theorem 4. *Let d be a positive integer. There exists a positive integer $A(d)$, only depending on d , satisfying the following. Let $(X; x)$ be a d -dimensional log terminal complexity one \mathbb{T} -singularity. Then, we have that $\text{mld}_x(X) \leq A(d)$.*

In the course of the proof of our main theorems, we will use techniques related to deformation theory and toric geometry.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we introduce some preliminaries related to singularities of the MMP, normalized volume, and \mathbb{T} -varieties. In Section 3, we describe Kollár components of complexity one \mathbb{T} -singularities. In Section 4, we study the minimal log discrepancies of complexity one \mathbb{T} -singularities. In subsection 4.1, we use toric degenerations to control the minimal log discrepancies of complexity one \mathbb{T} -singularities. In subsection 4.2, we study the minimal log discrepancy of complexity one \mathbb{T} -singularities that do not admit toric degenerations. Finally, in Section 5, we prove the boundedness result for \mathbb{K} -semistable log terminal cone singularities which either admit a torus action of complexity one or are hypersurfaces.

Acknowledgements. The authors would like to thank Nathan Owen Ilten for many useful comments. The second author was partly supported by the EPSRC grant EP/V013270/1.

2. PRELIMINARIES

In this subsection, we introduce some preliminaries regarding the singularities of the minimal model program, normalized volume, Fano cone singularities, varieties with torus actions, and special degenerations of singularities.

2.1. Singularities of the MMP. In this subsection, we recall the singularities of the minimal model program and purely log terminal blow-ups.

Definition 2.1. A pair is a couple (X, Δ) such that X is a normal quasi-projective variety and Δ is an effective divisor for which $K_X + \Delta$ is \mathbb{R} -Cartier. Let $x \in X$ be a closed point. We write $(X, \Delta; x)$ for the corresponding singularity. We say that $(X, \Delta; x)$ is a singularity of the pair.

Let $(X, \Delta; x)$ be a singularity of pair. Let $\pi: Y \rightarrow X$ be a projective birational morphism and $E \subset Y$ be a prime divisor. The *log discrepancy* of (X, Δ) at E is the rational number:

$$a_{(X, \Delta)}(E) := 1 + \text{coeff}_E(K_Y - \pi^*(K_X + \Delta)).$$

We say that $(X, \Delta; x)$ is *Kawamata log terminal* (or *log terminal*) if all the log discrepancies of (X, Δ) are positive on a neighborhood of $x \in X$. We may write *klt* or *log terminal* for short. We write $a_E(X)$ if $\Delta = 0$. The *minimal log discrepancy* of (X, Δ) at x is defined to be

$$\text{mld}_x(X, \Delta) := \min\{a_{(X, \Delta)}(E) \mid c_X(E) = x\}.$$

If $(X, \Delta; x)$ is klt, then the minimal log discrepancy of (X, Δ) at x is positive.

Definition 2.2. Let (X, Δ) be a log pair. We say that (X, Δ) has *purely log terminal singularities* if the following conditions hold:

- all the exceptional log discrepancies of (X, Δ) are positive, and

- the coefficients of Δ are in the set $[0, 1]$.

To abbreviate, we write *plt* instead of purely log terminal.

Definition 2.3. Let $(X; x)$ be a klt singularity. We say that a proper birational morphism $f: \tilde{X} \rightarrow X$ induces a *weak component* E if the following conditions hold:

- (1) the morphism f is an isomorphism over $X \setminus \{x\}$,
- (2) the fibre $f^{-1}(x)$ is an irreducible divisor E , and
- (3) we have $-E$ is f -ample.

We say that $f: \tilde{X} \rightarrow X$ induces a *Kollár component* E if furthermore the pair (\tilde{X}, E) is plt.

2.2. Normalized volume. In this subsection, we recall the definition of normalized volume. First, we start with the definition of the volume of a valuation over a singularity (see, e.g., [11]).

Definition 2.4. Let $(X; x)$ be a normal algebraic singularity of dimension d . Let $v \in \text{Val}(X; x)$ be a valuation centered at $x \in X$. We write $a_m(v) := \{f \in \mathcal{O}_{X,x} \mid v(f) \geq m\}$. The *volume* of v is defined to be

$$\text{vol}_X(v) := \limsup_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\ell(\mathcal{O}_{X,x}/a_m(v))}{m^d/d!}$$

where ℓ is the length of the module.

The following is a special case of a definition due to Li [23].

Definition 2.5. Let $(X; x)$ be a d -dimensional log terminal singularity. The *normalized volume function* is the function

$$\widehat{\text{vol}}: \text{Val}(X; x) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{>0} \cup \{\infty\}$$

defined by the formula

$$\widehat{\text{vol}}(v) := a_X(v)^d \text{vol}_X(v)$$

whenever $a_X(v) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ and as ∞ otherwise. The *normalized volume* of a log terminal singularity $(X; x)$ is defined to be

$$\widehat{\text{vol}}(X; x) := \inf \left\{ \widehat{\text{vol}}(v) \mid v \in \text{Val}(X; x) \right\}.$$

Example 2.6. Let $X_d \subset \mathbb{A}^{n+1}$ be a quasi-homogeneous hypersurface of degree d with respect to the weights $w_0, \dots, w_n > 0$. Then the order with respect to the grading defines a valuation v on $(X_d; 0)$ via $v(\sum_u f_u) = \min\{u \mid f_u \neq 0\}$. In this situation we have

$$\widehat{\text{vol}}(v) = \frac{d(\sum_i w_i - d)^n}{w_0 \cdots w_n}.$$

More generally for complete intersections in \mathbb{A}^{n+c} one has

$$\widehat{\text{vol}}(v) = \frac{\left(\prod_j d_j\right) \cdot \left(\sum_i w_i - \sum_j d_j\right)^n}{\prod_i w_i}.$$

This follows from the more general considerations in [23][§2.2].

2.3. Normalized volume and K-semistability of Fano cone singularities.

In this subsection, we recall the connection between normalized volume and the notion of K-semistability.

Definition 2.7. Let X be an affine variety with an effective action of an algebraic torus \mathbb{T} . If M is the character lattice of the torus and $\omega \subset M_{\mathbb{R}} := M \otimes \mathbb{R}$ is the weight cone of that action. If ω is a full-dimensional pointed cone and the only invariant regular functions are the constant functions, then there is a unique fixed point $x \in X$ and the pair $(X; x)$ is called a *cone singularity*. If additionally $(X; x)$ is log terminal, then it is called a *Fano cone singularity*. The cone $\sigma = \omega^{\vee} \subset N_{\mathbb{R}} = M_{\mathbb{R}}^*$ is called the Reeb cone of $(X; x)$.

An element ξ from the interior of

$$\sigma = \omega^{\vee} = \{v \in M_{\mathbb{R}}^* \mid \forall u \in \omega: \langle v, u \rangle \geq 0\} \subset N_{\mathbb{R}} := M_{\mathbb{R}}^*$$

is called a *polarization* of $(X; x)$.

Such a polarization ξ can be interpreted as a \mathbb{T} -invariant valuation $\xi \in \text{Val}(X; x)$ via $\xi(f_u) := \langle u, \xi \rangle$ for a homogeneous function f_u of weight $u \in M$.

Definition 2.8. A *special degeneration* of a singularity $(X; x)$ is a flat family $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{A}^1$ together with a \mathbb{C}^* -action on \mathcal{X} , such that

- (1) the structure map of the family is equivariant with respect to the standard \mathbb{C}^* -action on \mathbb{A}^1 , and
- (2) the generic fibre is isomorphic to X and the fibre \mathcal{X}_0 over $0 \in \mathbb{A}^1$ is normal.

If $\mathcal{X} \cong X \times \mathbb{A}^1$, then we call \mathcal{X} a *product degeneration*.

Given a \mathbb{T} -action on X we say that the special degeneration is equivariant, if there is also a \mathbb{T} -action on \mathcal{X} restricting to the original \mathbb{T} -action on the generic fibre and commuting with the \mathbb{C}^* -action.

Given a cone singularity X , every equivariant special degeneration is induced by a torus invariant divisorial valuation $v \in \text{Val}(X; x)$ via the Rees construction for the associated filtration of the coordinate ring. The central fibre of this special degeneration is then given as the spectrum of the associated graded ring. Now, there exists a generalized version of the Rees construction for so-called quasi-monomial valuations v , see [31, Section 2.1]. When the associated graded ring is finitely generated, then its spectrum X_0 is the central fibre of a degeneration and comes naturally with a polarization ξ_v instead of a \mathbb{C}^* -action. We say that v induces a degeneration with polarized central fibre (X_0, ξ_v) .

Proposition 2.9 ([25, Lemma 4.10]). *Consider a degeneration of a Fano cone singularity $(X; x)$ with polarized special fibre (\mathcal{X}_0, ξ_0) induced by a quasi-monomial valuation v . Then $\widehat{\text{vol}}_X(v) = \widehat{\text{vol}}_{X_0}(\xi_0)$ holds.*

K-(semi-)stability for Fano cone singularities was first defined in [10] as a criterion for the existence of a Sasaki-Einstein metric on the link of the singularity. The authors already observed that this notion has an interpretation in terms of volume minimization of the central fibre of a special degeneration. Now, the correspondence between valuations and degenerations lets us directly express K-semistability in terms of the normalized volume of valuations. More precisely, we have the following result due to Chi Li.

Theorem 2.10 ([25, Theorem 3.5]). *A polarised Fano cone singularity (X, ξ) is K-semistable if and only if ξ is a minimizer of $\widehat{\text{vol}}_X$.*

In our paper this characterization will effectively serve as the definition of K-semistability.

Example 2.11. We consider a hypersurface given by a polynomial $f \in \mathbb{C}[x_0, \dots, x_n]$ which is homogeneous of weight \mathbf{u} with respect to an M -grading given by the weights $u_0, \dots, u_n \in M$. Then the weight cone ω is generated by u_0, \dots, u_n . Take a polarization $\xi \in \sigma = \omega^\vee$ and set $w_i = \langle u_i, \xi \rangle$ and $d = \langle \mathbf{u}, \xi \rangle$. Then the formula of Example 2.6 extends by continuity of $\widehat{\text{vol}}$ on the interior of σ and we once again obtain

$$\widehat{\text{vol}}(\xi) = \frac{d(\sum_i w_i - d)^n}{w_0 \cdots w_n}.$$

In the situation of an isolated singularity there is a well-known obstruction to K-semistability, known as Lichnerowicz obstruction, see [12]. The corresponding inequality for the hypersurface case can be also obtained (even for non-isolated ones) as an easy consequence of Chi Li's theorem.

Theorem 2.12 ([12, 3.23]). *Consider a Fano cone hypersurface singularity $(X; x)$ with polarization ξ corresponding to the weight vector (w_0, \dots, w_n) . If (X, ξ) is K-semistable, then the following inequality holds*

$$\sum_{i=0}^n w_i - d \leq nw_0.$$

Proof. We consider the special degeneration, which is induced by the valuation $v_s = s \cdot \text{ord}_{x_0}$ with $s > 0$, i.e. a positive multiple of the order of vanishing in x_0 . If s is integral, this is simply the degeneration induced by acting with \mathbb{C}^* via the weight s on the coordinate x_0 . The central fibre of the degeneration comes with a polarization inducing the weights $w'_0 = w_0 + s$, $w'_1 = w_1, \dots, w'_n = w_n$. Now, by Proposition 2.9 and Theorem 2.10 we have

$$\widehat{\text{vol}}(v_s) = \frac{d(\sum_i w'_i - d)^n}{w'_0 \cdots w'_n} = \frac{d(\sum_i w_i - d + s)^n}{(w_0 + s)w_1 \cdots w_n} \geq \frac{d(\sum_i w_i - d)^n}{w_0 \cdots w_n} = \widehat{\text{vol}}(v_0)$$

for every $s \geq 0$. In particular, we obtain

$$0 \leq \left. \frac{\partial \widehat{\text{vol}}(v_s)}{\partial s} \right|_{s=0} = \frac{(w_0 \cdots w_n) \cdot nd(\sum_i w_i - d)^{n-1} - (w_1 \cdots w_n) \cdot d(\sum_i w_i - d)^n}{(w_0 \cdots w_n)^2},$$

which gives

$$nw_0 \geq \sum_i w_i - d,$$

as desired. \square

Definition 2.13. By a *K-semistable singularity* we mean a Fano cone singularity which is K-semistable with respect to a suitable polarization.

In particular, every K-semistable singularity is a klt cone singularity.

2.4. \mathbb{T} -varieties of complexity one. In this subsection, we recall some basics about \mathbb{T} -varieties of complexity one.

Definition 2.14. A \mathbb{T} -variety is a normal quasi-projective variety X which admits the effective action of an algebraic torus \mathbb{T} . The *complexity* of a \mathbb{T} -variety X is the

dimension of X minus the dimension of the acting torus. For instance, a complexity one \mathbb{T} -variety is a normal quasi-projective n -dimensional variety admitting the effective action of a $(n - 1)$ -dimensional algebraic torus. A \mathbb{T} -singularity $(X; x)$ is an invariant neighborhood of a \mathbb{T} -variety X around a \mathbb{T} -fixed closed point x .

We proceed to introduce the definition of proper polyhedral divisors on the projective line.

Definition 2.15. Let N be a free finitely generated abelian group. We write $M := \text{Hom}_{\mathbb{Z}}(N, \mathbb{Z})$ for its dual. We denote by $N_{\mathbb{Q}}$ and $N_{\mathbb{R}}$ (resp. $M_{\mathbb{Q}}$ and $M_{\mathbb{R}}$) for the corresponding \mathbb{Q} -vector and \mathbb{R} -vector spaces. Let $\sigma \subset N_{\mathbb{Q}}$ be a polyhedral cone. A σ -polyhedron P is a polyhedron in $N_{\mathbb{Q}}$ for which

$$\text{tail } P := \{v \in N_{\mathbb{Q}} \mid P + tv \subset P \text{ for all } t \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0}\} = \sigma.$$

A *polyhedral divisor* on $(\mathbb{P}^1, N_{\mathbb{Q}})$ is a finite formal sum

$$\mathcal{D} = \sum_{y \in \mathbb{P}^1} \mathcal{D}_y \cdot \{y\},$$

where each \mathcal{D}_y is either a σ -polyhedron or the empty set. The cone σ is called the *tail* of \mathcal{D} . We write $\text{tail } \mathcal{D} = \sigma$. The *locus* of the polyhedral divisor \mathcal{D} is the open subset $Y \setminus \cup_{\mathcal{D}_y = \emptyset} \{y\}$. We denote this set by $\text{Loc}(\mathcal{D}) \subset \mathbb{P}^1$. If $\text{Loc}(\mathcal{D}) = \mathbb{P}^1$, then we say that \mathcal{D} has *complete locus* or *projective locus*.

Given a polyhedral divisor \mathcal{D} on $(\mathbb{P}^1, N_{\mathbb{Q}})$, we have an associated homomorphism

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}: \sigma^{\vee} &\rightarrow \text{CaDiv}_{\mathbb{Q}}(\text{Loc}(\mathcal{D})), \\ u &\mapsto \mathcal{D}(u) := \sum_{y \in \mathbb{P}^1} \min_{v \in \mathcal{D}_y} \langle u, v \rangle \{y\}. \end{aligned}$$

By abuse of notation, we denote by \mathcal{D} both: the polyhedral divisor and the associated homomorphism.

We say that \mathcal{D} is a *proper polyhedral divisor* on $(\mathbb{P}^1, N_{\mathbb{Q}})$ if the two following conditions are satisfied:

- for each $u \in \sigma^{\vee}$, we have that $\mathcal{D}(u)$ is semiample on $\text{Loc}(\mathcal{D})$, and
- for each $u \in \text{relint}(\sigma^{\vee})$, we have that $\mathcal{D}(u)$ is big on $\text{Loc}(\mathcal{D})$.

We may write *p-divisor* instead of proper polyhedral divisor. When the \mathbb{Q} -vector space $N_{\mathbb{Q}}$ is clear from the context, we may say that \mathcal{D} is a *p-divisor* on \mathbb{P}^1 .

For each proper polyhedral divisor on the projective line, we can associate to it an affine complexity one \mathbb{T} -variety.

Construction 2.16. Let \mathcal{D} be a proper polyhedral divisor on $(\mathbb{P}^1, N_{\mathbb{Q}})$. We consider the divisorial sheaf on \mathbb{P}^1 given by

$$\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{D}) := \bigoplus_{u \in \sigma^{\vee} \cap M} \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(\mathcal{D}(u)).$$

The affine variety $X(\mathcal{D}) := \text{Spec}(H^0(\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{D})))$ is called the *complexity one \mathbb{T} -variety* associated to \mathcal{D} . Let $\tilde{X}(\mathcal{D}) := \text{Spec}_{\mathbb{P}^1} \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{D})$ be the associated relative spectrum. Then, we have a good quotient $\tilde{X}(\mathcal{D}) \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$ by a torus of dimension $\dim_{\mathbb{Q}} N_{\mathbb{Q}}$ and there exists an equivariant projective birational morphism $r: \tilde{X}(\mathcal{D}) \rightarrow X(\mathcal{D})$.

The following theorem is a particular case of the main result of [2] in combination with [26, Proposition 2.6.] and [26, Corollary 5.8.].

Theorem 2.17. *Let X be a log terminal affine \mathbb{T} -variety of complexity one. Then every point on X is either locally formally isomorphic to a toric singularity or X is \mathbb{T} -equivariantly isomorphic to $X(\mathcal{D})$ for some proper polyhedral divisor \mathcal{D} on $(\mathbb{P}^1, N_{\mathbb{Q}})$ with complete locus.*

In view of the previous theorem, to understand the log discrepancies of log terminal complexity one \mathbb{T} -singularities, it suffices to study \mathfrak{p} -divisors on \mathbb{P}^1 with complete locus.

Notation 2.18. Given a polyhedron $P \subset N_{\mathbb{Q}}$, we denote by $P^{(k)}$ the set of k -dimensional faces of P . Given an element $v \in N_{\mathbb{Q}}$, we denote by $\mu(v)$ the smallest positive integer for which $\mu(v)v \in N$.

Definition 2.19. Let \mathcal{D} be a \mathfrak{p} -divisor on \mathbb{P}^1 with complete locus and let $y \in \mathbb{P}^1$. We consider the positive integer:

$$\mu_{\mathcal{D}}(y) := \max\{\mu(v) \mid v \in \mathcal{D}_y^{(0)}\}.$$

We call this integer the *multiplicity of \mathcal{D} over y* . Then, we can consider the following effective divisor on \mathbb{P}^1 :

$$B := \sum_y b_y \cdot y = \sum_y \frac{\mu_{\mathcal{D}}(y) - 1}{\mu_{\mathcal{D}}(y)} \cdot \{y\}.$$

We also let $B_z := B + 1 - b_z$. The pair (\mathbb{P}^1, B) is the log pair on \mathbb{P}^1 induced by the \mathfrak{p} -divisor \mathcal{D} .

Definition 2.20. Let \mathcal{D} be a \mathfrak{p} -divisor on \mathbb{P}^1 and let $\rho \in (\text{tail } \mathcal{D})(1)$. We have an associated \mathbb{T} -invariant prime divisor D_{ρ} on $\tilde{X}(\mathcal{D})$ (see, e.g., [8, Proposition 2.23]). The divisors of the previous kind are called *horizontal divisors*, as they dominate the normalized Chow quotient \mathbb{P}^1 of $X(\mathcal{D})$. The divisor D_{ρ} induces a \mathbb{T} -invariant divisorial valuation on $X(\mathcal{D})$.

On the other hand, the choice of $z \in \mathbb{P}^1$ and $v \in \mathcal{D}_z^{(0)}$ induces a \mathbb{T} -invariant prime divisor $D_{z,v}$ whose image on \mathbb{P}^1 is z (see, e.g., [8, Proposition 2.23]). The divisors of the previous form are called *vertical divisors*. The divisor $D_{z,v}$ induces a \mathbb{T} -invariant divisorial valuation on $X(\mathcal{D})$.

The following proposition allows us to check whether a log pair of complexity one induced by a \mathfrak{p} -divisor with complete locus is purely log terminal.

Proposition 2.21. *Let \mathcal{D} be a \mathfrak{p} -divisor on \mathbb{P}^1 with complete locus and let $X = X(\mathcal{D})$ be the associated complexity one \mathbb{T} -variety. Then, the following statements hold.*

- (1) X is log terminal if and only if (Y, B) is log Fano,
- (2) the pair (X, D_{ρ}) is plt if and only if (Y, B) is plt, and
- (3) the pair $(X, D_{z,v})$ is plt if and only if (Y, B_z) is plt.

Proof. Claims (1) and (2) follow from the proof of [26, Theorem 4.1]. The last claim (3) follows from the proof of [26, Theorem 4.1] replacing B by B_z in the argument of the proof. \square

We proceed to introduce the type of a \mathfrak{p} -divisor on \mathbb{P}^1 . The classification by types will allow us to prove statements in a case-by-case analysis.

Definition 2.22. Let \mathcal{D} be a p-divisor on \mathbb{P}^1 . We say that \mathcal{D} is of *type* $(p, q, r) \in \mathbb{N}^3$ if there exists three points $\{y_1, y_2, y_3\} \subset \mathbb{P}^1$ satisfying the following:

- the p-divisor \mathcal{D} has multiplicity one at all points of $\mathbb{P}^1 \setminus \{y_1, y_2, y_3\}$ and
- the set of multiplicities $(\mu_{\mathcal{D}}(y_1), \mu_{\mathcal{D}}(y_2), \mu_{\mathcal{D}}(y_3))$ equals (p, q, r) .

The following corollary follows from (1) in Proposition 2.21.

Corollary 2.23. *Let \mathcal{D} be a p-divisor on \mathbb{P}^1 . Assume that $X(\mathcal{D})$ has log terminal singularities. Then, the type of \mathcal{D} is one of the platonic triples:*

$$(*) \quad (1, q, r), (2, 2, r), (2, 3, 3), (2, 3, 4), (2, 3, 5).$$

We can extend the type of a p-divisor to a set of vertices $(v_y)_{y \in \mathbb{P}^1}$, with $v_y \in \mathcal{D}_y^{(0)}$, as follows.

Definition 2.24. Let \mathcal{D} be a p-divisor on \mathbb{P}^1 . A *family of vertices* of the p-divisor is a set $(v_y)_{y \in \mathbb{P}^1}$ with $v_y \in \mathcal{D}_y^{(0)}$ for each $y \in \mathbb{P}^1$. Note that $v_y = 0 \in N_{\mathbb{Q}}$ holds for all but finitely many $y \in \mathbb{P}^1$. We say that the set $(v_y)_{y \in \mathbb{P}^1}$ is of *type* $(p, q, r) \in \mathbb{N}^3$ if the following conditions hold:

- there are three points $\{y_1, y_2, y_3\} \subset \mathbb{P}^1$ so that $\mu(v_y) = 1$ for every $y \in \mathbb{P}^1 \setminus \{y_1, y_2, y_3\}$, and
- we have that

$$(\mu(v_{y_1}), \mu(v_{y_2}), \mu(v_{y_3})) = (p, q, r).$$

Note that, if $X(\mathcal{D})$ is log terminal, then (p, q, r) must be one of the triples in (*).

The following proposition allows us to check whether a log pair of complexity one is purely log terminal.

Corollary 2.25. *Let X be an affine \mathbb{T} -variety of complexity one. Assume that X is log terminal. Let D_ρ be a horizontal prime divisor on X and let $D_{z,v}$ be a vertical prime divisor on X . Then, the following statements hold.*

- (1) *If X is log terminal, then (X, D_ρ) is plt.*
- (2) *If $\mu_{\mathcal{D}}(y) > 1$ for at most one $y \in \mathbb{P}^1 \setminus \{z\}$, then the pair $(X, D_{z,v})$ is plt.*

Proof. If $X = X(\mathcal{D})$ is given by a p-divisor \mathcal{D} with affine locus, then (X, D) is locally toric by [26, Example 2.5] for $D = D_\rho$ or $D = D_{z,v}$. Then, both claims follow from the fact that a toric pair (X, D) is plt if D is an irreducible and reduced toric divisor. Hence, we may assume that \mathcal{D} is a p-divisor with complete locus \mathbb{P}^1 . The first claim follows from Proposition 2.21 items (1) and (2). For the second claim note that (\mathbb{P}^1, B_z) is plt if any only if $\deg B_z < 2$ and this is the case exactly if there is at most one coefficient $\frac{\mu_{\mathcal{D}}(y)-1}{\mu_{\mathcal{D}}(y)} > \frac{1}{2}$, i.e. there is at most one $y \neq z$ with $\mu_{\mathcal{D}}(y) > 1$. \square

2.5. Special degenerations of Fano cone singularities of complexity one.

Let us now turn to the case of Fano cone singularities with torus action of complexity one. By Section 2.4 every such singularity is given by a p-divisor \mathcal{D} on \mathbb{P}^1 , such that the type of \mathcal{D} matches one of the Platonic triples from (*). The Reeb cone coincides with tail \mathcal{D} .

By [4] the \mathbb{T} -invariant valuations v on $X = X(\mathcal{D})$ correspond to triples $(y, v, m) \in \mathbb{P}^1 \times N_{\mathbb{R}} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ with either $m = 0$ and $v \in \text{tail } \mathcal{D}$ or v/m lying in the interior of \mathcal{D}_y . Moreover, arguing as in the proof of [25, Lemma 2.16] one concludes that every \mathbb{T} -invariant valuation on X is quasi-monomial.

Definition 2.26. A decomposition of a rational σ -polyhedron $P \subset N_{\mathbb{R}}$ as a Minkowski sum $P = P_1 + \dots + P_r$ of σ -polyhedra P_1, \dots, P_r is called *admissible*, if for every $u \in \sigma^{\vee} \cap M$ there is at most one summand P_i with $\min\langle u, P_i \rangle \notin \mathbb{Z}$.

Theorem 2.27. A \mathbb{T} -invariant valuation v on $X = X(\mathcal{D})$ corresponding to the data (z, w, m) , with $m > 0$, $w/m \in \mathcal{D}_z$, and $\Delta = \sum_{y \neq z} \mathcal{D}_y$ being an admissible Minkowski decomposition of Δ . Then this induces a degeneration with special fibre being polarized toric singularity $(X_0, \xi_0) = (X(\sigma_z), (mw, m))$ corresponding to the polyhedral cone

$$\sigma_z := \text{conv}\{\Delta \times \{-1\} \cup (\text{tail } \mathcal{D}) \times \{0\} \cup \mathcal{D}_z \times \{1\}\} \subset \hat{N}_{\mathbb{R}} := N_{\mathbb{R}} \times \mathbb{R}.$$

Conversely, every equivariant special degeneration of X can be obtained in this way.

Proof. For $(v, m) \in N_{\mathbb{R}} \times \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ being integral this is the statement of [18, Theorem 4.1.4.2]¹. The rational case follows immediately by the homogeneity of the map $v \mapsto \xi_v$. The general case then follows by the approximation result of [25, Lemma 2.10], see also [17, Corollary 5.5 and Theorem 6.1]. \square

With the notation of this theorem we may set $R = (0, -1) \in \hat{M}_{\mathbb{R}} \setminus -\sigma^{\vee}$. Then from the identification $N = R^{\perp} \subset \hat{N}$ and Minkowski decomposition of $\Delta = Q_R := \sigma_z \cap [\langle R, \cdot \rangle = 1]$ we are able to reconstruct the coefficients of our polyhedral divisor. Turning the statement of the theorem around we may say that $X = X(\mathcal{D})$ is a *complexity one deformation* of σ_z with respect to $\mathbb{R}_{\geq} R$. Then basically as a reformulation of the above statement we obtain

Corollary 2.28. A toric variety $X = X(\sigma)$, with $\sigma \in \hat{M}_{\mathbb{R}}$ appears as the special fibre of some non-product special degeneration if and only if there exists a primitive lattice element $R \in \hat{N}$, such that $Q_R = \sigma \cap [\langle R, \cdot \rangle = 1]$ admits an admissible Minkowski decomposition. Moreover, the complexity one \mathbb{T} -varieties which can be obtained as homogenous deformations with respect to a single ray $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} R$ form a bounded family.

Proof. This follows already from the results of [1]. For a formulation in terms of polyhedral divisors see [19, Section 3]. \square

Note, that here $R \in \hat{M}$, can be interpreted as minus the degree of a graded vector space T_X^1 , which parametrizes the infinitesimal deformations of the singularity X , with $T_X^1(-kR)$ being non-trivial for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$ if there exist complexity one deformations with respect to $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} R$ (with R being primitive). In [1] Altmann explicitly described the graded components $T_X^1(-R)$ of this vector space for toric singularities. In the following, we recall the main result.

Let $X = X(\sigma)$ be toric singularity with $\sigma \subset \hat{N}$. For $R \in \hat{N}$ the vertices of the polyhedron $Q_R = [\langle R, \cdot \rangle = 1] \cap \sigma$ have the form $\rho_R = \frac{1}{\langle R, n_{\rho} \rangle} n_{\rho}$ for some $\rho \in \sigma(1)$ with $\langle R, n_{\rho} \rangle > 0$, i.e., we have

$$Q_R^{(0)} = \{\rho_R \mid \rho \in \sigma(1), \langle R, n_{\rho} \rangle > 0\}.$$

A vertex $\rho_R \in Q_R^{(0)}$ is a lattice point, i.e. an element of \hat{N} , if and only if $\langle R, n_{\rho} \rangle = 1$. We consider the subset of fractional vertices $F_R = Q_R^{(0)} \setminus \hat{N}$. For each $R \in \hat{N}$, we

¹Note that a different sign convention is used there, where the action on functions is given by $(t \cdot f)(x) = f(tx)$ instead of $(t \cdot f)(x) = f(t^{-1}x)$

may now consider the vector space

$$S = \mathbb{C}^{F_R}$$

with a coordinate s_v for each $v \in F_R$. The polyhedron Q_R itself is not compact. However, we may consider the set of compact edges $C_R \subset Q_R^{(1)}$. Each such edge has the form of a line segment \overline{vw} between two vertices $v, w \in Q_R^{(0)}$. An orientated edge for \overline{vw} is one of the vectors $v - w$ or $w - v$. For each edge we fix once and for all an orientation and treat C_R as a set of oriented edges from now on. Moreover, for a compact 2-face $\varepsilon \prec Q_R$, we consider the sign vector $\underline{\varepsilon} \in \{-1, 0, 1\}^{C_R}$ with

$$\varepsilon_d = \begin{cases} \pm 1 & d \prec \varepsilon \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where ± 1 is chosen in such a way that the $\varepsilon_d \cdot d$ form an oriented boundary cycle of ε , i.e., $\sum_d \varepsilon_d d = 0$. Here, ε_d is only determined up to sign, but any such choice will do. We then set

$$T = \left\{ \underline{t} \in \mathbb{C}^{C_R} \mid \sum_d t_d \varepsilon_d d = 0 \text{ for each compact 2-face } \varepsilon \prec Q_R \right\}$$

with a coordinate t_d for each $d \in C_R$.

For every compact edge $\overline{\rho_R \tau_R} \in C_R$ we consider a set G_{ρ_R, τ_R} of equations in $S \times T$. The choice of these equations will depend on the dimension of the vector space $T_{\langle \rho, \tau \rangle}^1(-R)$ associated to the two-dimensional toric variety corresponding to the cone spanned by ρ and τ .

Case 1. $\rho_R, \tau_R \in \hat{N}$:
 $G_{\rho_R, \tau_R} = \emptyset$.

Case 2. $\rho_R \notin \hat{N}, \tau_R \in \hat{N}$:
 a) $G_{\rho_R, \tau_R} = \emptyset$ if $\dim T_{\langle \rho, \tau \rangle}^1(-R) = 1$,
 b) $G_{\rho_R, \tau_R} = \{s_{\rho_R} = t_{\rho_R w}\}$ if $\dim T_{\langle \rho, \tau \rangle}^1(-R) = 0$.

Case 3. $\rho_R, \tau_R \notin \hat{N}$:
 a) $G_{\rho_R, \tau_R} = \emptyset$ if $\dim T_{\langle \rho, \tau \rangle}^1(-R) = 2$,
 b) $G_{\rho_R, \tau_R} = \{s_{\rho_R} = s_{\tau_R}\}$ if $\dim T_{\langle \rho, \tau \rangle}^1(-R) = 1$,
 c) $G_{\rho_R, \tau_R} = \{t_{\rho_R \tau_R} = s_{\rho_R}, t_{\rho_R \tau_R} = s_{\tau_R}\}$ if $\dim T_{\langle \rho, \tau \rangle}^1(-R) = 0$.

The concrete values of $\dim T_{\langle \rho, \tau \rangle}^1(-R)$ can be found e.g. in [1, (2.2)]. However, for us the following observation suffices.

Remark 2.29. Consider an element $R = kR' \in \hat{M}$, where R' is a primitive lattice element and $k \in \mathbb{N}$. If $\overline{\rho_{R'} \tau_{R'}}$ does not contain any interior lattice point then by [1, (2.2)] we always have $\dim T_{\langle \rho, \tau \rangle}^1(-R) = 0$. Hence, in this situation we are either in *Case 1.* or *Case 2.b)* or *Case 3.c)*.

Theorem 2.30 ([1, Theorem 2.7]). *With the notation as above the infinitesimal deformations of $X = X(\sigma)$ in degree $-R$ are given by*

$$T_X(-R) \cong \{(\underline{s}, \underline{t}) \in S \times T \mid (\underline{s}, \underline{t}) \text{ fulfils the equations in all the } G_{\rho_R, \tau_R}\} / \mathbb{C} \cdot (\underline{1}, \underline{1}).$$

3. KOLLÁR COMPONENTS ON \mathbb{T} -VARIETIES

In this section, we prove statements regarding the existence of Kollár components on \mathbb{T} -singularities of complexity one.

Proposition 3.1. *Let $X = X(\mathcal{D})$ be a log terminal singularity of complexity one. Then every rational point $v \in \text{int } \mathcal{D}_z$ corresponds to a weak component $D_{z,v}$ over X . Furthermore, $D_{z,v}$ is a Kollár component if and only if $\mu(y) > 1$ for at most one $y \in \mathbb{P}^1 \setminus \{z\}$. In this case, X is of type $(1, p, q)$.*

Proof. We consider the polyhedron $\Delta = v + (\sum_{y \neq z} \mathcal{D}_y)$. For a proper face $F \prec \Delta$ the cone over this face is given as $\sigma_F = \overline{\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \cdot F}$. The *face fan* Σ of Δ consist of all cones of the form:

- σ_F whenever $F \cap \text{tail } \mathcal{D} \neq \emptyset$, and
- the proper faces $\tau \prec \text{tail } \mathcal{D}$ with $\tau \cap \text{deg } \mathcal{D} \neq \emptyset$.

Since $v \in \text{int } \mathcal{D}_z$, we have $\Delta \subsetneq \text{deg } \mathcal{D} \subsetneq \text{tail } \mathcal{D}$ and Σ is a polyhedral subdivision of $\text{tail } \mathcal{D}$.

Every face $F \prec \Delta$ will be a sum $F = \sum_{y \neq z} F_y$, where $F_y \prec \mathcal{D}_y$. We will say that F_y is a Minkowski summand of F . For every $y \neq z$ we consider the polyhedral subdivisions \mathcal{S}_y consisting of polyhedra of the form $F_y + \sigma_F$, where $F_y \prec \mathcal{D}_y$, $F \prec \Delta$, F_y is a Minkowski summand of F . For $y = z$, we consider the subdivision \mathcal{S}_z of \mathcal{D}_z consisting of the following polyhedra:

- a translated cone $v + \sigma$ for every $\sigma \in \Sigma$, and
- $\text{conv}(F \cup \{v\})$ for every proper face $F \prec \Delta_z$.

Additionally, we consider a subset $C \subset \Sigma$ of cones in Σ , which are called *marked*. In our case the marked cones are exactly those of the form σ_F . By [4, Theorem 47] this data gives rise to \mathbb{T} -variety $\tilde{X} \rightarrow X$. By [3, Theorem 7.5], the only exceptional torus invariant prime divisor of \tilde{X} is $D_{z,v}$.

Given a facet $F \prec \Delta$ there is a unique linear map $h_F: N_{\mathbb{Q}} \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}$ with $h_F|_F \equiv 1$. This will define a continuous piecewise linear function h on Σ being constant along the boundary of Δ . By construction this is a concave function.

Consider $y \neq z$, then for each F_y being a Minkowski summand of some facet $F \prec \Delta$, we have that $h_F|_{F_y}$ is constant. Indeed, it is constant on F . Let a_y^F be given by $h_F|_{F_y} \equiv a_y^F$. Then $h_{F,y} := h_F - a_y^F$ defines an affine linear function on $F_y + \sigma_F$ with $h_{F,y}|_{F_y} \equiv 0$. This defines a piecewise linear function h_y on \mathcal{S}_y which is constant equal to zero along the boundary of \mathcal{D}_y .

Now, consider $y = z$. For every cone $\sigma_F \in \Sigma$ as above have a unique affine line function $h_{F,z} = h_F + a_z^F$ with $h_{F,z} = 1$. Now, for every facet $F \prec \mathcal{D}_z$. There is a unique affine linear function $h_{F,v}$ with $h_{F,v}|_F \equiv 0$ and $h_{F,v}(v) = 1$. Again this defines a concave piecewise affine function h_z on \mathcal{S}_y which is constant zero along the boundary of \mathcal{D}_z and equal to one at the interior point v . The set of these piecewise affine linear functions h_y is called a support function on \mathcal{S} (see, e.g., [4, §7.4]).

By construction, we have that $h_z(v) = 1$ and $h_y(v) = 0$ for every $v \in \mathcal{D}_y^{(0)}$ with $y \neq z$. Furthermore, we have that $h(n_\rho) = 0$ for every $\rho \in \text{tail } \mathcal{D}(1)$. By [4, Proposition 35], this data corresponds to an ample \mathbb{Q} -Cartier divisor on \tilde{X} and the corresponding Weil divisor is $-D_{z,v}$.

The second statement of the proposition follows from Corollary 2.25 item (2). The last statement follows from the definition of type. \square

Proposition 3.2. *Let $X = X(\mathcal{D})$ be a log terminal singularity of complexity one. Then every primitive lattice point $n_\rho \in \text{int}(\text{tail } \mathcal{D})$ with associated ray $\rho = \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \cdot n_\rho$ corresponds to a Kollár component D_ρ over X .*

Proof. We consider the fan Σ obtained as the star subdivision of $\text{tail } \mathcal{D}$ with respect to ρ . That is the fan $\Sigma = \{\tau + \rho \mid \tau \prec \text{tail } \mathcal{D}\}$. Similar for every $y \in \mathbb{P}^1$ we obtain a polyhedral subdivision $\mathcal{S}_y = \{\Delta + \rho \mid \Delta \prec \mathcal{D}_y\}$. Note, that for every polyhedron $\Delta \in \mathcal{S}_y$ we have $\text{tail } \Delta \in \Sigma$. Additionally, we need to consider a subset $C \subset \Sigma$ of cones in Σ , which are called *marked*. In this case, the marked cones are given as

$$C = \{\tau + \rho \mid \tau \prec \text{tail } \mathcal{D} \text{ and } \deg \mathcal{D} \cap \tau \neq \emptyset\}.$$

By [4, Theorem 47], the polyhedral subdivisions \mathcal{S}_y together with the markings defines a \mathbb{T} -variety $\tilde{X} \rightarrow X$, which is proper over X . By [3, Theorem 7.5], the only exceptional torus invariant prime divisor of \tilde{X} is D_ρ .

For every facet $\tau \prec \text{tail } \mathcal{D}$ there is a unique linear map $h_\tau : N_{\mathbb{Q}} \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}$ with $h|_\tau \equiv 0$ and $h(\lambda n_\rho) = \lambda$. This gives rise to a concave piecewise linear function h on Σ . Moreover, for every facet $F \prec \mathcal{D}_y$ with tail cone τ there is a unique affine linear function $h_F : (F + \rho) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with $h_F|_F \equiv 0$. Furthermore, for every $v + \lambda n_\rho \in F + \rho$, we have $h_F(v + \lambda n_\rho) = h_F(v) + \lambda$. Hence, we obtain a concave piecewise affine linear function h_y on \mathcal{S}_y . The set of these piecewise affine linear functions h_y is called a *support function* on \mathcal{S} (see, e.g., [4, Section 7.4]).

Consider a maximal cone $\sigma = (\tau + \rho) \in \Sigma$. Then there is a unique polyhedron $\Delta_y = F_y + \rho$ in \mathcal{S}_y with tail $F_y = \tau$ and therefore $\text{tail } \Delta_y = \sigma$. Now, for $v \in \Delta$, we have $h_y(v) = h(v) + a_y$. For every $y \in \mathbb{P}^1$, we may pick a point $v_y \in F_y$. Then $h_y(v_y) = h(v_y) + a_y = 0$ and

$$\sum_y h_y(v_y) = h\left(\sum_Y v_y\right) + \sum_y a_y.$$

Now, if σ is marked, then by definition $\sum_y v_y \in \tau$. Since $h|_\tau \equiv 0$, we conclude that $\sum_y a_y = 0$ and therefore $\sum_y a_y \cdot y$ defines a principal divisor on Y . Similarly, we see that in the case that σ is not marked we must have $0 > \sum_y a_y$, i.e., $-\sum_y a_y \cdot y$ is ample.

By construction, $h_y(v) = 0$ for every vertex $v \in \mathcal{D}_y^{(0)}$, $h(n_\rho) = 1$ and $h(n_{\rho'}) = 0$ for every $\rho' \in (\text{tail } \mathcal{D}) \setminus \{\rho\}$. By [4, Proposition 35], this data corresponds to an ample \mathbb{Q} -Cartier divisor on \tilde{X} and the corresponding Weil divisor is $-D_\rho$. Hence, D_ρ is a weak component. We may invoke Corollary 2.25 item (1) to see that it is actually a Kollár component. \square

4. MINIMAL LOG DISCREPANCIES OF \mathbb{T} -VARIETIES

In this section, we study minimal log discrepancies of \mathbb{T} -varieties. In the first subsection, we will study minimal log discrepancies via degenerations, while in the second subsection, we will study minimal log discrepancies using special blow-ups.

4.1. Bounding minimal log discrepancies via degenerations. In this subsection, we prove that a d -dimensional klt complexity one \mathbb{T} -singularity of type $(1, p, q)$ admits a Kollár component of log discrepancy $2d - 1$.

Let \mathcal{D} be the p -divisor defining a log terminal singularity of complexity one and type $(1, p, q)$. We can fix two points $z, z' \in \mathbb{P}^1$ for which $\mu_{\mathcal{D}}(z) = p$, $\mu_{\mathcal{D}}(z') = q$, and $\mu_{\mathcal{D}}(y) = 1$ for every $y \in \mathbb{P}^1 \setminus \{z, z'\}$. Every vertical Kollár component of the form

$D_{z,w}$ (or $D_{z',w'}$) induces a degeneration to a toric singularity (see, e.g., [19]). The log discrepancy at $D_{z,w}$ (resp. $D_{z',w'}$) can then be calculated on the toric special fibre of the degeneration. More precisely, we have the following statement.

Proposition 4.1. *The degeneration induced by $E = D_{z,w}$ is the toric variety $X(\sigma_z)$ associated to the cone*

$$\sigma_z := \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \cdot \left(\mathcal{D}_z \times \{1\} \cup (\text{tail } \mathcal{D}) \times \{0\} \cup \left(\sum_{y \neq z} \mathcal{D}_y \right) \times \{-1\} \right) \subset \hat{N}_{\mathbb{R}} := N_{\mathbb{R}} \times \mathbb{R}.$$

Moreover, the corresponding Kollár component E_0 in $X(\sigma_z)$ is given by the ray

$$\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \cdot (w, 1) \in \hat{N}_{\mathbb{R}}^+ := N_{\mathbb{R}} \times \mathbb{R}^+,$$

and we have $a_X(E) = a_{X(\sigma_z)}(E_0)$

Proof. The existence of this flat degeneration follows from [19, Theorem 2.8]. The admissibility of the degeneration follows from the fact that \mathcal{D} has at most two fractional coefficients. The \mathbb{T} -equivariant blow-up $\tilde{X}(\mathcal{D}) \rightarrow X(\mathcal{D})$ degenerates to the \mathbb{T} -equivariant blow-up $X(\Sigma_z) \rightarrow X(\sigma_z)$, where Σ_z is the fan obtained from σ_z by adding the cone $(\text{tail } \mathcal{D}) \times \{0\}$. Thus, the toroidal blow-up extracting E over $\tilde{X}(\mathcal{D})$ degenerates to the toric blow-up extracting E_0 over $a_{X(\sigma_z)}$. This implies that the equality $a_X(E) = a_{X(\sigma_z)}(E_0)$ holds. \square

Remark 4.2. From now on, given a p -divisor \mathcal{D} on (\mathbb{P}^1, N) of type $(1, p, q)$, we denote by σ_z the cone in $N_{\mathbb{R}} \times \mathbb{R}$ provided by Proposition 4.1, i.e., the cone defining the central fibre of the toric degeneration.

The special fibre of the degeneration only depends on z and not on the choice of $w \in \mathcal{D}_z$. Having fixed the $z \in \mathbb{P}^1$, the choice of a Kollár component $D_{z,w}$ is then equivalent to the choice of a ray of the form $\rho = \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \cdot (w, 1)$ in the interior of σ_z . In other words, this means picking an interior ray of σ_y which intersects $\hat{N}_{\mathbb{R}}^+$.

Lemma 4.3. *Let \mathcal{D} be a p -divisor on \mathbb{P}^1 of type $(1, p, q)$. Let $z, z' \in \mathbb{P}^1$ for which $\mu_{\mathcal{D}}(z') = p$ and $\mu_{\mathcal{D}}(z) = q$. Assume that $p \leq q$. The primitive lattice generators \hat{n}_{ρ} of the rays $\rho \in \sigma_z(1)$ have the form $\hat{n}_{\rho} = (n_{\rho}, m_{\rho}) \in N \times \mathbb{Z}$ with $m_{\rho} \geq -p$. Moreover, there is at least one primitive ray generator with $m_{\rho} = q$.*

Proof. The rays of σ_z are exactly the rays of the following three types:

- (1) rays of the form $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \cdot (v, 1)$, where v is a vertex of \mathcal{D}_z ,
- (2) rays of the form $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \cdot (\sum_{y \neq z} v_y, -1)$, where for each $y \in \mathbb{P}^1 \setminus \{z\}$ the summand v_y is a vertex of \mathcal{D}_y , and
- (3) rays of the form $\rho \times \{0\}$, where ρ is an extremal ray of $\text{tail } \mathcal{D}$ with $\rho \cap \text{deg } \mathcal{D} = \emptyset$.

Now, there is at least one vertex $v \in \mathcal{D}_z$ with $\mu(v) = \mu_{\mathcal{D}}(z) = q$. Hence, the corresponding primitive lattice generator of $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \cdot (v, 1)$ will be (qv, q) . In Case (2), we note that all the $\mu(v_y)$ are equal to one with the potential exception of $\mu(v_{z'}) \leq \mu_{\mathcal{D}}(z') = p$. Hence, $\mu(\sum_{y \neq z} v_y) = \mu(v_{z'}) \leq p$. For the corresponding ray generator we obtain $(\mu(v_{z'}) \sum_{y \neq z} v_y, -\mu(v_{z'}))$ with $-\mu(v_{z'}) \geq -p$. Finally, in Case (3), we have $\rho \subset N_{\mathbb{R}} \times \{0\} \subset N_{\mathbb{R}} \times [-p, +\infty)$. This finishes the proof of the lemma. \square

Theorem 4.4. *Every d -dimensional log terminal complexity one singularity of type $(1, p, q)$ admits a Kollár component of log discrepancy $2d - 1$.*

Proof. By Proposition 4.1 and Remark 4.2 it is sufficient to find a ray ρ in the interior of $\hat{N}_{\mathbb{R}}^+ \cap \sigma_z$ such that for the log discrepancy of the corresponding Kollár component D_ρ , we have $a_{X(\sigma_z)}(D_\rho) = 2d - 1$.

Now, we may pick d rays $\rho_1, \dots, \rho_d \in \sigma_z(1)$, such that the corresponding primitive lattice points $n_{\rho_1}, \dots, n_{\rho_d}$ are linearly independent. By Lemma 4.3, we may assume that $n_{\rho_1} \in N \times \{q\}$ and $n_{\rho_i} \in N \times [-q, +\infty)$ for all $i = 1, \dots, d$. Then $n_\rho := dn_{\rho_1} + \sum_{i=2}^d n_{\rho_i}$ spans a ray ρ in $\hat{N}_{\mathbb{R}}^+ \cap \sigma_z$. Moreover, there exists a unique element $u \in \hat{M}_{\mathbb{Q}}$ which calculates the log discrepancy of every divisor D_ρ over X_0^z as $\langle u, n_\rho \rangle$. Then for the log discrepancy of D_τ , we obtain

$$a_{X_0^z}(D_\rho) = \langle u, n_\rho \rangle = d\langle u, n_{\rho_1} \rangle + \sum_{i=2}^d \langle u, n_{\rho_i} \rangle = d + (d-1) = 2d - 1.$$

□

4.2. Discrepancies of horizontal Kollár components. In this subsection, we study the minimal log discrepancies of complexity one \mathbb{T} -singularities of type $(2, 2, r)$, $(2, 3, 3)$, $(2, 3, 4)$ and $(2, 3, 5)$.

Lemma 4.5. *For $X = X(\mathcal{D})$ and two horizontal divisors D_{ρ_1} and D_{ρ_2} over X . If ρ is the ray spanned by a primitive lattice point $\lambda_1 n_{\rho_1} + \lambda_2 n_{\rho_2}$, then D_ρ has log discrepancy*

$$a_X(D_\rho) = \lambda_1 \cdot a_X(D_{\rho_1}) + \lambda_2 \cdot a_X(D_{\rho_2}).$$

Proof. Since K_X is \mathbb{Q} -Cartier, we can write $mK_X = \text{div}(\chi^u f)$ for some $u \in M$ and $f \in \mathbb{K}(\mathbb{P}^1)$. Then, by the proof of [8, Proposition 3.4], we can write

$$\begin{aligned} a_X(D_\rho) &= \langle u/m, \lambda_1 n_{\rho_1} + \lambda_2 n_{\rho_2} \rangle = \\ &= \lambda_1 \langle u/m, n_{\rho_1} \rangle + \lambda_2 \langle u/m, n_{\rho_2} \rangle = \lambda_1 \cdot a_X(D_{\rho_1}) + \lambda_2 \cdot a_X(D_{\rho_2}). \end{aligned}$$

We conclude that the log discrepancy a_X is linear on the horizontal \mathbb{T} -invariant prime divisors. □

The following statement allows us to control the log discrepancy of horizontal divisors over $X(\mathcal{D})$.

Lemma 4.6. *Let \mathcal{D} be a p -divisor on \mathbb{P}^1 . Let $(v_y)_{y \in \mathbb{P}^1}$ be a family of vertices of \mathcal{D} . Let n_ρ be the primitive lattice generator of the ray ρ generated by $\sum_y v_y \in \text{tail } \mathcal{D}$. Then, the following statements hold:*

- (1) *If $(v_y)_y$ is of type $(2, p, q)$ with $p, q \geq 2$, then $a_X(D_\rho) \leq 2$.*
- (2) *If $(v_y)_y$ is of type $(1, p, q)$ then $a_X(D_\rho) \leq \frac{p+q}{\gcd(p,q)}$.*

Proof. Consider a \mathbb{Q} -divisor $\sum_{y \in \mathbb{P}^1} b_y \{y\}$ on \mathbb{P}^1 of degree -2 . By [26, Proposition 4.4], it follows from the \mathbb{Q} -Gorenstein property that there exists $u \in M_{\mathbb{Q}}$ and a \mathbb{Q} -divisors $\sum_{y \in \mathbb{P}^1} a_y \{y\}$ of degree zero on \mathbb{P}^1 , such that

$$\langle u, v_y \rangle + a_y = b_y + \frac{\mu(v_y) - 1}{\mu(v_y)},$$

for every $y \in \mathbb{P}^1$. Summing over $y \in \mathbb{P}^1$ then gives

$$(1) \quad \left\langle u, \sum_y v_y \right\rangle = \sum_y \frac{\mu(v_y) - 1}{\mu(v_y)} - 2.$$

In the case of type $(2, p, q)$ the right-hand-side is $-\frac{1}{q}$ if $p = 2$ and $-\frac{1}{\text{lcm}(2, p, q)}$ if $p = 3$. Now, the log discrepancy at D_ρ is calculated as $-\langle u, n_\rho \rangle$. On the other hand, $\rho = \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \cdot (\sum_y v_y)$ and $\sum_y v_y \in \frac{1}{\text{lcm}(2, p, q)}N$. Hence, $-\langle u, n_\rho \rangle \leq \text{lcm}(2, p, q) \cdot \langle u, \sum_y v_y \rangle$ and the statement (1) follows.

Similarly, for the type $(1, p, q)$ the right-hand-side of (1) becomes $-\frac{p+q}{pq}$ and $\sum_y v_y \in \frac{1}{\text{lcm}(p, q)}N$. Therefore, we have

$$-\langle u, n_\rho \rangle \leq \text{lcm}(p, q) \frac{p+q}{pq} = \frac{p+q}{\text{gcd}(p, q)}.$$

This shows the second statement. \square

Notation 4.7. We consider a polyhedral cone $\sigma \subset N_{\mathbb{Q}}$. Let $\mathbf{F}(\sigma)$ be the set of all facets of the cone σ . If $\text{tail } \Delta = \sigma$, then every facet $\tau \in \mathbf{F}(\sigma)$ gives rise to a unique facet $F_\tau \prec \Delta$ such that $\text{tail } F_\tau = \tau$. Indeed, let n_τ be the primitive inner normal to τ , then F_τ is the face of Δ where $\langle n_\tau, \cdot \rangle$ takes its minimum. For an element $v \in \Delta$, we now consider the set of facets $\tau \in \mathbf{F}(\sigma)$ such that $v \in F_\tau$. We set:

$$\mathbf{F}(\Delta, v) := \{\tau \prec \sigma \mid v \in F_\tau\}.$$

The element $v \in \sigma$ lies in the interior of σ if and only if $\mathbf{F}(\sigma, v) = \emptyset$. For two elements $v, v' \in \sigma$, we have

$$(2) \quad \mathbf{F}(\sigma, v + v') = \mathbf{F}(\sigma, v) \cap \mathbf{F}(\sigma, v').$$

Let \mathcal{D} be a p -divisor on \mathbb{P}^1 . Then, we define the set:

$$\mathbf{F}(\mathcal{D}) := \{\tau \in \mathbf{F}(\text{tail } \mathcal{D}) \mid \tau \cap \text{deg } \mathcal{D} \neq \emptyset\}.$$

The following lemma follows from the introduced notation.

Lemma 4.8. *Let \mathcal{D} be a p -divisor on \mathbb{P}^1 . Let $(v_y)_{y \in \mathbb{P}^1}$ be a family of vertices of \mathcal{D} . Then, the following statements hold.*

(1) *We have an identity*

$$\mathbf{F}\left(\text{deg } \mathcal{D}, \sum_{y \in \mathbb{P}^1} v_y\right) = \bigcap_{y \in \mathbb{P}^1} \mathbf{F}(\mathcal{D}_y, v_y).$$

(2) *We have that*

$$\mathbf{F}\left(\text{tail } \mathcal{D}, \sum_{y \in \mathbb{P}^1} v_y\right) = \mathbf{F}(\mathcal{D}) \cap \bigcap_{y \in \mathbb{P}^1} \mathbf{F}(\mathcal{D}_y, v_y) \subset \bigcap_{y \in \mathbb{P}^1} \mathbf{F}(\mathcal{D}_y, v_y)$$

Proof. We set $v = \sum_{y \in \mathbb{P}^1} v_y$. We have that $\tau \in \mathbf{F}(\text{deg } \mathcal{D}, v)$ if and only if $\langle n_\tau, w \rangle \geq \langle n_\tau, v \rangle$ for all $w \in \text{deg } \mathcal{D}$, i.e., for all $w = \sum_y w_y$ with $w_y \in \mathcal{D}_y$. Clearly if $v \in \bigcap_{y \in \mathbb{P}^1} \mathbf{F}(\mathcal{D}_y, v_y)$, meaning that $\langle n_\tau, w_y \rangle \geq \langle n_\tau, v_y \rangle$ holds for y and all $w_y \in \mathcal{D}_y$, then also $\langle n_\tau, \sum_y w_y \rangle \geq \langle n_\tau, \sum_y v_y \rangle$. For the other direction assume there is a $z \in \mathbb{P}^1$ and a $w_z \in \mathcal{D}_z$ such that $\langle n_\tau, w_z \rangle < \langle n_\tau, v_z \rangle$ holds. Then for $w := w_z + \sum_{y \neq z} v_y \in \text{deg } \mathcal{D}$ we have $\langle n_\tau, w \rangle < \langle n_\tau, v \rangle$. This proves the first claim.

For the second claim observe that $\mathbf{F}(\text{tail } \mathcal{D}, \sum_{y \in \mathbb{P}^1} v_y) \subset \mathbf{F}(\text{deg } \mathcal{D}, \sum_{y \in \mathbb{P}^1} v_y)$, since $\text{deg } \mathcal{D} \subset \text{tail } \mathcal{D}$. Moreover, since by definition of n_τ the minimum of $\langle n_\tau, \cdot \rangle$ on $\text{tail } \mathcal{D}$ is attained on τ , we see that $\min \langle n_\tau, \text{deg } \mathcal{D} \rangle$ and $\min \langle n_\tau, \text{tail } \mathcal{D} \rangle$ differ if and

only if $\deg \mathcal{D} \cap \tau = \emptyset$. Hence, a facet $\tau \in \mathbf{F}(\deg \mathcal{D}, \sum_{y \in \mathbb{P}^1} v_y)$, is also contained in $\mathbf{F}(\text{tail } \mathcal{D}, \sum_{y \in \mathbb{P}^1} v_y)$ if only if $\tau \in \mathbf{F}(\mathcal{D})$. \square

We turn to prove an arithmetic lemma that will be used in the proof of our main theorem.

Lemma 4.9. *Consider three points $w, w'_1, w'_2 \in N_{\mathbb{Q}}$ with $(w+w'_1)$ and $(w+w'_2)$ being linearly independent. Let v_1 and v_2 be the primitive lattice point in $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \cdot (w+w'_1)$ and $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \cdot (w+w'_2)$, respectively. Then there exist $0 < \lambda_1 < \ell$ and $0 < \lambda_2 < \frac{\ell^2}{\mu(w)}$, such that $\lambda_1 v_1 + \lambda_2 v_2$ is a lattice point, where $\ell := \text{lcm}(\mu(w'_1), \mu(w'_2))$.*

Proof. We set $w_1 = w + w'_1$ and $w_2 = w + w'_2$. We first show the claim for $\mu(w'_1) = \mu(w'_2) = 1$. In this case, we have $\mu(w_1) = \mu(w_2) = \mu(w) =: q$. Furthermore, $qw_1 = p_1 v_1$ and $qw_2 = p_2 v_2$ with $\gcd(p_1, q) = \gcd(p_2, q) = 1$. Note, that

$$p_1 v_1 - p_2 v_2 = qw_1 - qw_2 = q(w'_1 - w'_2)$$

is divisible by q , since we assumed that $\mu(w'_1) = \mu(w'_2) = 1$.

After restricting to the subspace spanned by w_1 and w_2 and to the corresponding sublattice, we may assume that $N \cong \mathbb{Z}^2$. By the above, v_1 and v_2 span a sublattice of index q in N . Hence, after a suitable choice of coordinates, we may assume that $v_1 = (1, 0)$ and $v_2 = (m, q)$ for some $0 \leq m < q$. Then, we have that

$$(1, 1) = \frac{q-m}{q} v_1 + \frac{1}{q} v_2.$$

Giving our claim by choosing $\lambda_1 = \frac{q-m}{q}$ and $\lambda_2 = \frac{1}{q}$.

For the general case, we first replace N by $\bar{N} := \frac{1}{\ell} N$. With respect to this lattice, we are in the previous case. If we consider the multiplicity $\bar{\mu}(w)$ of w with respect to the refined lattice \bar{N} , then we have $\bar{\mu}(w) \geq \mu(w)/\ell$. Hence, we know that there are $0 < \lambda_1 < 1$ and $0 < \lambda_2 < \frac{\ell}{\mu(w)}$ such that $\lambda_1 v_1 + \lambda_2 v_2 \in \bar{N}$. Then, we also have $(\ell \lambda_1) v_1 + (\ell \lambda_2) v_2 \in N$. This finishes the proof of the lemma. \square

Now, we turn to prove the main theorem of this paper.

Theorem 4.10. *There is a constant $A(d)$, depending only on the dimension d , satisfying the following. For a d -dimensional complexity one log terminal singularity $(X; x)$ there is a Kollár component E with log discrepancy $a_X(E) < A(d)$.*

Proof. For a complexity one \mathbb{T} -singularities of type $(1, p, q)$ this follows from Theorem 4.4. Here, we will consider the remaining cases at once. Let $X = X(\mathcal{D})$ be a complexity one \mathbb{T} -singularity of one of the remaining cases, i.e., of type $(2, p, q)$ with either $p = 2$ and $q \geq 2$ arbitrary or $p = 3$ and $q \in \{3, 4, 5\}$. Moreover, we have $z \in \mathbb{P}^1$ with $\mu_{\mathcal{D}}(z) = q$.

Our aim is now to construct a set M of rays in $\text{tail } \mathcal{D}$ such that:

- we have that $\bigcap_{\rho} \mathbf{F}(\text{tail } \mathcal{D}, n_{\rho}) = \emptyset$,
- the cardinality $\#M$ is bounded by some constant $A(d)$, and
- for the log discrepancies we have $a_X(D_{\rho}) \leq A(d)$.

We set $\sigma = \text{tail } \mathcal{D}$ and fix $n = d - 1$ rays $R_1 := \{\rho_1, \dots, \rho_n\} \subset \sigma(1)$ spanning a full-dimensional subcone of σ . Then every positive linear combination of the primitive generators $n_{\rho_1}, \dots, n_{\rho_n}$ lies in the interior of σ . It follows that $\bigcap_{\rho \in R} \mathbf{F}(\sigma, n_{\rho}) = \emptyset$.

First, we consider the set

$$M_1 = \{\rho \mid \rho \in R \text{ and } \deg \mathcal{D} \cap \rho = \emptyset\}.$$

Those correspond to horizontal prime divisors D_ρ in X . In particular, we have $a_X(D_\rho) = 1$.

For every ray $\rho \in R_2 = R_1 \setminus M_1$, we have a family of vertices $(v_y^\rho)_{y \in \mathbb{P}^1}$ with $\sum_{y \in \mathbb{P}^1} v_y^\rho \in \rho$. Assume now such a family is of type $(2, p', q')$ with $p', q' \geq 2$. Then, we have again $a_X(D_\rho) \leq 1$. By Lemma 4.6, we have $a_X(D_\tau) \leq 1$. Let $M_2 \subset R_2$ be the set of those rays. Let $R_3 = R_2 \setminus M_2$ then be the set of the remaining rays.

Now, for every ray $\rho \in R_3$ there is a family $(v_y^\rho)_y$ of type $(1, r, s)$ with $\sum_{y \in \mathbb{P}^1} v_y^\rho \in \rho$. If $\mu(v_z^\rho) = 1$, then $r, s \leq 3$. Indeed, for every $y \in \mathbb{P}^1 \setminus \{z\}$, we have that $\mu_{\mathcal{D}}(y)$ is at most p with $p \leq 3$. Hence, by Lemma 4.6, we must have $a_X(D_\rho) \leq 5$. We set M_3 to be the set consisting of all such rays from R_3 and set $R_4 = R_3 \setminus M_3$.

We consider a family $(t_y)_{y \in \mathbb{P}^1}$ of vertices $t_y \in \mathcal{D}_y$ of type $(2, p, q)$, which must exist as X is of type $(2, p, q)$. This leads to a *distinguished ray* $\tau = \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \cdot (\sum_y t_y)$. By Lemma 4.6, we have $a_X(D_\tau) \leq 1$. Now, the remaining rays $\rho \in M_2$ correspond to families $(v_y^\rho)_{y \in \mathbb{P}^1}$ of type $(1, r_1, r_2)$ such that $\mu(v_z^\rho) = r_i > 1$, with $i \in \{1, 2\}$. Without loss of generality, we assume $\mu(v_z^\rho) = r_1$. Then, we consider the two associated families $(v_y^{\rho_1})_{y \in \mathbb{P}^1}$ and $(v_y^{\rho_2})_{y \in \mathbb{P}^1}$ with

$$v_y^{\rho_1} = \begin{cases} v_z^\rho & y = z \\ t_y & y \neq z \end{cases}, \quad v_y^{\rho_2} = \begin{cases} t_z^\rho & y = z \\ v_y & y \neq z \end{cases}$$

and the associated rays $\rho_1 = \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \cdot (\sum_y v_y^{\rho_1})$ and $\rho_2 = \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \cdot (\sum_y v_y^{\rho_2})$, respectively.

Now, by Lemma 4.8 (2) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{F}(\sigma, n_{\rho_1}) \cap \mathbf{F}(\sigma, n_{\rho_2}) &= \mathbf{F}(\mathcal{D}) \cap \bigcap_y \mathbf{F}(\mathcal{D}_y, v_y^{\rho_1}) \cap \bigcap_y \mathbf{F}(\mathcal{D}_y, v_y^{\rho_2}) \\ &= \mathbf{F}(\mathcal{D}) \cap \bigcap_y \mathbf{F}(\mathcal{D}_y, v_y^\rho) \cap \bigcap_y \mathbf{F}(\mathcal{D}_y, t_y) \\ &= \mathbf{F}(\sigma, n_\rho) \cap \mathbf{F}(\sigma, n_\tau) \\ &\subset \mathbf{F}(\sigma, n_\rho). \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 4.6, we have $a_X(D_{\rho_1}) \leq 1$ and $a_X(D_{\rho_2}) \leq \frac{q+r_2}{\gcd(q, r_2)} \leq q+3$. The latter cannot be bounded by a constant depending only on the dimension. However, note that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_y v_y^{\rho_2} &= t_z + \sum_{y \neq z} v_y^{\rho_2} \quad \text{and} \\ \sum_y t_y &= t_z + \sum_{y \neq z} t_y. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, by applying Lemma 4.9, we see that there is a lattice point $n_{\rho'_2}$ of the form $n_{\rho'_2} = \lambda_1 n_\tau + \lambda_2 n_{\rho_2}$ with $0 < \lambda_1 \leq \text{lcm}(p, q) \leq 6$ and $0 < \lambda_2 \leq \frac{6^2}{q}$. Let $\rho'_2 = \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \cdot n_{\rho'_2}$. By Lemma 4.5, we have that

$$a_X(D_{\rho'_2}) \leq 6 + 2 \cdot 6^2 = 78.$$

We now set $M_4 = \{\rho_1 \mid \rho \in R_4\} \cup \{\rho'_2 \mid \rho \in R_4\}$ and $M = \bigcup_{i=1}^4 M_i$. Note, that

$$\mathbf{F}(\sigma, n_{\rho'_2}) = \mathbf{F}(\sigma, n_{\rho_2}) \cap \mathbf{F}(\sigma, n_\tau) \subset \mathbf{F}(\mathcal{D}, n_{\rho_2})$$

holds. Hence, we have

$$\bigcap_{\rho \in M} \mathbf{F}(\sigma, n_\rho) = \bigcap_{i=1}^4 \bigcap_{\rho \in M_i} \mathbf{F}(\sigma, n_\rho) \subset \bigcap_{\rho \in R} \mathbf{F}(\sigma, n_\rho) = \emptyset.$$

Thus, $\eta := \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \cdot \left(\sum_{\rho \in M} n_\rho \right)$ is a ray in the interior of σ . Therefore, by Proposition 3.2 the prime divisor $E := D_\eta$ over X corresponds to a Kollár component. Finally, Lemma 4.5 implies that

$$a_X(E) \leq \#M \cdot 78 \leq 2(d-1) \cdot 78.$$

Indeed, we have $\#M \leq 2 \cdot \#R_1 = 2(d-1)$, since $M = (R \setminus R_4) \cup M_4$ and $\#M_4 = 2 \cdot \#R_4$. Moreover, for every $\rho \in M$ we have $a_X(D_\rho) \leq 78$. \square

Proof of Theorem 4. This follows from Theorem 4.10. \square

Proof of Theorem 3. This follows from Theorem 4.10, [34, Theorem 1.2], and [27, Theorem 1]. \square

We give an example that shows that complexity one \mathbb{T} -singularities with bounded normalized volume do not form a bounded family. First, we need a lemma that allows us to determine whether a family of complexity one \mathbb{T} -singularities is bounded.

Lemma 4.11. *Let $\{(X_i; x_i)\}$ be a bounded family of complexity one \mathbb{T} -singularities. Let \mathcal{D}_i be a p -divisor on (\mathbb{P}^1, N) defining $(X_i; x_i)$. Then, up to isomorphism of p -divisors, there are only finitely many possible polyhedra $\mathcal{D}_{i,p} \subset N_{\mathbb{Q}}$ for $p \in \mathbb{P}^1$.*

Proof. Since $\{(X_i; x_i)\}$ belongs to a bounded family, we can find an affine space

$$\mathbb{A}_{x_1, \dots, x_n} \times \mathbb{A}_{t_1, \dots, t_k},$$

ideals $I_t = \langle f_1(x, t), \dots, f_s(x, t) \rangle$ depending on $t \in Z \subset \mathbb{A}_{t_1, \dots, t_k}$ such that $(X_i; x_i) \simeq (V(I_{t_i}); 0)$ for some t_i . Note that $(V(I_{t_i}); 0)$ admits the action of an algebraic torus \mathbb{T}_i . By [16, Theorem 1], it follows that we can find $\mathbb{T}_{i,0} \leq \text{Aut}(\mathbb{A}_{x_1, \dots, x_n})$ so that $\mathbb{T}_{i,0}$ fixes $V(I_{t_i})$ and the induced action on $(V(I_t); 0)$ equals the action of \mathbb{T}_i . Indeed, the torus $\mathbb{T}_{i,0}$ is faithfully represented in the first cotangent space of $V(I_{t_i})$ at the origin. Passing to an open subset $Z_U \subset Z \subset \mathbb{A}_{t_1, \dots, t_k}$, we may assume that each I_{t_i} is defined by the same number of polynomials f_j 's and the same monomials on x appear on all the f_j 's. Hence, we can find a torus $\mathbb{T} \leq \text{Aut}(\mathbb{A}_{x_1, \dots, x_n})$ for which $\mathbb{T}|_{V(I_{t_i})} = \mathbb{T}_i$ for each i . Now, let \mathcal{D} be the p -divisor on (Y, N_0) defining the \mathbb{T} -variety $\mathbb{A}_{x_1, \dots, x_n}$. The normalized Chow quotient of $(V(I_{t_i}); 0)$ by \mathbb{T}_i gives a rational curve $Y_i \simeq \mathbb{P}^1 \subset Y$. Furthermore, the p -divisor \mathcal{D}_i is isomorphic to the pull-back of \mathcal{D} to Y_i . Since \mathcal{D} has only finitely many different polyhedra, it follows that each pull-back has only finitely many different polyhedra. This finishes the proof. \square

Example 4.12. We consider the toric 3-fold hypersurface singularity

$$X_0 := \{(x, y, z, w) \mid xy + z^2 = 0\}.$$

This is the toric variety $A_1 \times \mathbb{A}^1$, which corresponds to the cone with vertices $(0, 0, 1), (0, 2, 1), (1, 0, 0)$. The 3-dimensional torus \mathbb{T}_0 acts on X_0 via

$$(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3) \cdot (x, y, z, w) = (\lambda_2 x, \lambda_2^{-1} \lambda_3^2 y, \lambda_3 z, \lambda_1 w).$$

For each $n \geq 1$, we have a deformation of the singularity X_0 given by

$$X_{n,t} := \{(x, y, z, w, t) \mid xy + z^2 + tw^{2k+1}\}.$$

We write x_n for the point $(0, 0, 0, 0, 1)$. Note that $X_{n,1}$ is a complexity one \mathbb{T} -singularity. The \mathbb{P} -divisors \mathcal{D}^k for these Fano cone singularities are given by

$$\mathcal{D}^n = \left(\binom{1/2}{0} + \sigma\right)[0] + \left(\binom{-k/(2k+1)}{0} + \sigma\right)[1] + \left(\overline{\binom{0}{0} \binom{0}{1}} + \sigma\right)[\infty]$$

with tailcone σ being spanned by e_1 and $e_1 + (4k+2)e_2$ if $n = 2k+1$ and

$$\mathcal{D}^n = \left(\overline{\binom{0}{0} \binom{0}{1}} + \sigma\right)[0] + \left(\overline{\binom{0}{0} \binom{0}{1}} + \sigma\right)[1] + \left(\binom{1/k}{0} + \sigma\right)[\infty]$$

with tailcone σ being spanned by e_1 and $e_1 + 2k \cdot e_2$ if $n = 2k$, see [9, 8.1]. In particular, Lemma 4.11 implies that those singularities do not belong to a bounded family. By lower-semicontinuity of the normalized volume [24, Theorem 2.11], they all satisfy that

$$\widehat{\text{vol}}(X_{n,1}; x_n) \geq \widehat{\text{vol}}(X_0; 0) =: v > 0.$$

Hence, we conclude that the family of 3-dimensional complexity one log terminal singularities $\{(X_{n,1}; 0)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ with normalized volume at least v is bounded up to deformation, but it is not bounded.

5. BOUNDEDNESS FOR K-SEMISTABLE SINGULARITIES

In this section, we study the boundedness of K-semistable singularities in the context of complexity one \mathbb{T} -singularities and hypersurface singularities.

5.1. Boundedness for K-semistable singularities of complexity one. We start with proving a refinement of Theorem 4, which says that it is sufficient to consider degenerations to a finite number of toric singularities.

Lemma 5.1. *In every bounded family of singularities there is only finite number of isomorphism classes of toric varieties.*

Proof. By [24, Theorem 1.2] we know that the normalized volume is lower semicontinuous. Hence, there can be only finitely many values in a bounded family. On the other hand, it was proved in [29, Theorem 1] that there are only finitely many isomorphism classes of toric singularities with normalized volume bounded away from 0. \square

Corollary 5.2. *For a fixed positive integer d and $v > 0$. There exists a finite set $\mathcal{T}_{d,v}$ of toric singularities and a bounded family $\mathcal{B}_{d,v}$ of singularities satisfying the following. Every log terminal complexity one \mathbb{T} -singularity $(X; x)$ of dimension d and normalized volume at least v is either:*

- a complexity one deformation of a toric singularity $(T; t) \in \mathcal{T}_{d,v}$, or
- the singularity $(X; x)$ is isomorphic to an element of $\mathcal{B}_{d,v}$.

Proof. Let $(X; x)$ be a singularity as in the statement. In Theorem 4.10 we showed that there is an upper bound for the minimal log discrepancies of torus invariant Kollár components. It, therefore, follows from the proof of [34, Theorem 1.2] that the singularity $(X; x)$ admits a \mathbb{T} -equivariant special degeneration to a singularity from a bounded family. If the central fibre of the special degeneration is not isomorphic to $(X; x)$, then it admits a torus action of lower complexity. In our setting, this means that the special fibre is toric. Hence, our claim follows now from Lemma 5.1. \square

Motivated by Corollary 5.2 we are now studying the K-semistability of deformations of toric singularities. For this recall from 2.5 that complexity one deformations of a toric singularity $X(\sigma)$ with $\sigma \subset \hat{N}_{\mathbb{R}}$ correspond to a ray $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}R \subset \hat{M}_{\mathbb{R}}$. We now give a necessary criterion for the deformation to be K-semistable in terms of the primitive generator $R \in \hat{M}$.

Proposition 5.3. *Assume (X, ξ) is a K-semistable polarized Fano cone singularity of complexity one. If X is a deformation of at toric cone singularity $X_0 = X(\sigma)$ corresponding to a ray $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}R$, then $\langle R, \xi_0 \rangle \geq 0$ holds, where $\xi_0 \in \sigma$ the minimizer of the normalized volume for X_0 .*

Proof. Assume the equivariant special degeneration of X to (X_0, ξ_0) is induced by a torus invariant divisorial valuation corresponding to the data (z, w, m) . Then we may assume $\sigma = \sigma_z \subset \hat{N}_{\mathbb{R}} = N_{\mathbb{R}} \times \mathbb{R}$ and $R = (0, -1)$ as in Theorem 2.27. With this identification we have $\xi_0 = (\xi_0^1, \xi_0^2) \in N_{\mathbb{R}} \times \mathbb{R}$.

By Theorem 2.10 the valuation ξ is the minimizer of the normalized volume among all valuations in $\text{Val}(X; x)$. Now assume $\langle R, \xi_0 \rangle = \xi_0^2 < 0$ holds. Then we consider the torus invariant valuation on X , which corresponds to the data $(z, \xi_0^1, -\xi_0^2)$. Because $-\xi_0^2$ is positive by assumption, this data indeed defines a valuation. The corresponding degeneration has the polarized central fibres (X_0, ξ_0) . Now, by [25, Lemma 3.2] we have $\widehat{\text{vol}}_X(\xi) = \widehat{\text{vol}}_{X_0}((\xi, 0))$. Since ξ_0 was the minimizer of the normalized volume on X_0 and by assumption $\xi_0 \neq (\xi, 0)$ holds, we obtain.

$$\widehat{\text{vol}}_X(\xi) = \widehat{\text{vol}}_{X_0}((\xi, 0)) > \widehat{\text{vol}}_{X_0}(\xi_0) = \widehat{\text{vol}}_X(v).$$

Here, the last equality follows from Proposition 2.9. Now, by Theorem 2.10 we conclude that (X, ξ) is not K-semistable. \square

Proposition 5.4. *Given a toric singularity $X_0 = X(\sigma)$ corresponding to $\sigma \subset \hat{N}_{\mathbb{R}}$. The rays spanned by $R \in \hat{N}$ such that $T_{X_0}(-R) \neq 0$ accumulate only at the boundary of $-\sigma^{\vee}$.*

For the proof, we will need a few lemmas.

Lemma 5.5. *Consider a sequence $(R_i) \subset \hat{M}$, such that $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}R_i \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}R$ but $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}R_i \neq \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}R$ for all i . Assume furthermore that $\langle R_i, n_{\rho} \rangle \geq 0$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Then possibly after considering a subsequence we have*

- (1) $\rho_{R_i} \rightarrow 0$ with $\rho_{R_i} \neq 0$ if $\langle R, n_{\rho} \rangle > 0$ and
- (2) $\rho_{R_i} \rightarrow \lambda n_{\rho}$ with $0 \leq \lambda \leq 1$ if $\langle R, n_{\rho} \rangle = 0$.

Proof. By assumption we have $R_i/|R_i| \rightarrow R/|R|$. on the other hand, the elements R_i are lattice point, but not a multiple of R . Hence, we necessarily have $|R_i| \rightarrow +\infty$ and $\langle R_i/|R_i|, n_{\rho} \rangle \rightarrow \langle R/|R|, n_{\rho} \rangle$. Now if $\langle R, n_{\rho} \rangle > 0$ this immediately implies $\langle R_i, n_{\rho} \rangle \rightarrow +\infty$ and $\rho_{R_i} \rightarrow 0$.

If $\langle R, n_{\rho} \rangle = 0$, then we still obtain a sequence of integers $\langle R_i, n_{\rho} \rangle \geq 1$ which might be bounded or unbounded. In the bounded case we may pass to a subsequence of the R_i such that $\langle R_i, n_{\rho} \rangle^{-1}$ converges to some $0 < \lambda \leq 1$ (more precisely $\langle R_i, n_{\rho} \rangle$ will even become constant for sufficiently large i). In the unbounded case we may pass to a subsequence of the R_i , such that $\langle R_i, n_{\rho} \rangle^{-1} \rightarrow \lambda = 0$. In either case the claim follows. \square

Lemma 5.6. *In the situation of Lemma 5.5 assume that $\langle R, \rho_{\rho} \rangle > 0$ and $\langle R, \tau_{\rho} \rangle \geq 0$. Then for $i \gg 0$ the line segment $\overline{\rho_{R_i} \tau_{R_i}}$ does not contain interior lattice points.*

Proof. Consider a tubular neighbourhood of the line segment $\overline{0n_\tau}$ which contains no other lattice points than the endpoints of the line segment. By Lemma 5.5 we have that for $i \gg 0$ the line segment $\overline{\rho_{R_i}\tau_{R_i}}$ will be contained in this tubular neighbourhood. Moreover, $\tau_{R_i} \in \overline{0n_\tau}$ and $\rho_{R_i} = \frac{1}{\langle R_i, n_\rho \rangle} n_\rho \notin \overline{0n_\tau}$. Hence, $\overline{\rho_{R_i}\tau_{R_i}}$ can contain at most n_τ and only as an endpoint, but not 0 and there are no other lattice points in the tubular neighbourhood. \square

Proof of Proposition 5.4. Assume that $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}R$ is an accumulation point, which does not lie on the boundary of $-\sigma^\vee$. Hence, we may choose a sequence $(R_i)_i \subset \hat{M}$ with $T_X(-R_i) \neq 0$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$ and $R_i/|R_i| \neq R/|R|$ such that $R_i/|R_i| \rightarrow R/|R|$. After passing to a subsequence we may assume that for each $\rho \in \sigma(1)$ we either have $\forall_i: \langle R_i, n_\rho \rangle > 0$ or $\forall_i: \langle R_i, n_\rho \rangle \leq 0$. Then we consider the following subsets of $\sigma(1)$

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma(1)^+ &:= \{\rho \in \sigma(1) \mid \langle R, n_\rho \rangle > 0\} \\ \sigma(1)^0 &:= \{\rho \in \sigma(1) \mid \langle R, n_\rho \rangle = 0 \quad \forall_i \langle R_i, n_\rho \rangle > 0\} \end{aligned}$$

The fact that $R \notin -\sigma^\vee$ implies that $\sigma(1)^+$ is not empty. Notice, that the vertices of $Q_i := Q_{R_i} = [\langle R_i, \cdot \rangle = 1] \cap \sigma$ are all of the form $\rho_i := \rho_{R_i} = \frac{1}{\langle R_i, n_\rho \rangle} n_\rho$ with $\rho \in \sigma(1)^+ \cup \sigma(1)^0$. Assume $\rho \in \sigma(1)^+$. Then for i sufficiently large ρ_i will not be a lattice point by Lemma 5.5. Moreover, by Lemma 5.6 for a general $\tau \in \sigma(1)^+ \cup \sigma(1)^0$ and $i \in \mathbb{N}$ being sufficiently large, the edge $\overline{\rho_{R'_i}\tau_{R'_i}}$ will not contain any interior lattice points, here R'_i is the primitive lattice element corresponding to R_i . In the notation of Theorem 2.30 and by taking into account Remark 2.29 this implies $t_{\overline{\rho_i\tau_i}} = s_{\rho_i}$ and $t_{\overline{\rho_i\tau_i}} = s_{\tau_i}$ for any element $(\underline{s}, \underline{t}) \in S \times T$ fulfilling the equations $G_{v,w}$. Note, that by convexity the set of vertices ρ_i with $\langle R, n_\rho \rangle > 0$ (or equivalently $\langle R, \rho_i \rangle > 0$) is connected by edges among each other. Moreover, vertex τ_i with $\langle R, n_\tau \rangle = 0$ is connected to at least one vertex ρ_i of the former kind.

All vertices ρ_i with $\langle R, n_\rho \rangle > 0$ are contained in $\rho \in \sigma(1)^\infty$ and are therefore non-lattice points for $i \gg 0$ and all vertices τ_i with $\tau \in \sigma(1)^c$ fulfill $\langle R, n_\tau \rangle = 0$. Hence, for each $\tau \in \sigma(1)^+ \cup \sigma(1)^0$ we have $s_{\tau_i} = t_{\overline{\rho_i\tau_i}}$ for a suitable $\rho \in \sigma(1)^+$ and, moreover, for every pair of edges $\overline{\rho_i\tau_i}$ and $\overline{\alpha_i\gamma_i}$ with $\rho, \alpha \in \sigma(1)^+$ and $\tau, \gamma \in \sigma(1)^+ \cup \sigma(1)^0$ we have $t_{\overline{\rho_i\tau_i}} = t_{\overline{\alpha_i\gamma_i}}$. Thus, if we fix any edge d of that type, then we have $t_{d'} = t_d$ for any other edge d' of that type and also $s_v = t_d$ for every non-integral vertex v of Q_i .

The remaining variables correspond edges of the form $\overline{\tau_i\gamma_i}$ with $\tau, \gamma \in \sigma(1)^0$. Recall that this implies that $\langle R, n_\tau \rangle = \langle R, n_\gamma \rangle = 0$. Hence, by convexity of Q_i this edge will be part of a 2-face ε , such that each remaining vertex $\rho_i \in \varepsilon$ fulfils $\langle R, n_\rho \rangle > 0$. In particular, $\rho \in \sigma(1)^+$. Consider the edges d_0, \dots, d_r of ε with $d_0 = \overline{\tau_i\gamma_i}$. Then for the other edges we had seen that $t_{d_j} = t_d$. Together with the equation $0 = \sum_j t_{d_j} \varepsilon_{d_j} d_j$ from the definition of T in the notation of Theorem 2.30 we obtain

$$0 = t_{d_0} \varepsilon_{d_0} d_0 + \sum_{j=1}^r t_d \varepsilon_{d_j} d_j.$$

Since $\underline{\varepsilon}$ was chosen, such that $0 = \sum_{j=0}^r \varepsilon_{d_j} d_j$ holds, we obtain

$$t_d \cdot \sum_{j=0}^r \varepsilon_{d_j} d_j = 0 = t_{d_0} \varepsilon_{d_0} d_0 + \sum_{j=1}^r t_d \varepsilon_{d_j} d_j.$$

Hence, $t_{\overline{\tau_i \gamma_i}} = t_{d_0} = t_d$ holds, as well, and every element of $S \times T$ fulfilling the equations $G_{v,w}$ is a multiple of $(\underline{1}, \underline{1})$. Now, Theorem 2.30 implies that $T^1(-R_i) = 0$, but this contradicts our choice of R_i . \square

Proposition 5.7. *Given a toric singularity $X_0 = X(\sigma)$. Then the K-semistable complexity one Fano cone singularities with an equivariant special degeneration to X_0 form a bounded family.*

Proof. Assume $\sigma \subset \hat{N}_{\mathbb{R}}$ is the cone corresponding to the toric central fibre X_0 . By Corollary 2.28 a special degeneration corresponds to a ray $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}R \subset \hat{M}_{\mathbb{R}} = \hat{N}_{\mathbb{R}}^*$. Now, according to Proposition 5.4 the rays $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}R$ accumulate only at the boundary of $-\sigma^\vee$. Expressed dually this means that for fixed element $\xi \in \text{int } \sigma$ there are only finitely many rays $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}R$ such $\langle \xi, R \rangle > 0$. Hence, by Proposition 5.3 there are only finitely rays $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}R$, which correspond to K-semistable deformations. Now, the claim follows from the fact that the deformations belonging to each ray $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}R$ form a bounded family (Corollary 2.28). \square

Proof of Theorem 1. Consider X_0 one of the finitely many toric singularities from Corollary 5.2. Then by Proposition 5.7 the K-semistable complexity one Fano cone singularities degenerating to this particular toric one form a bounded family. Hence, the claim follows by Corollary 5.2. \square

Corollary 5.8. *The set of $(2n-1)$ -dimensional Sasaki-Einstein manifolds with an effective action of a torus of dimension at least $n-1$ and volume at least v consists of a finite number of finite-dimensional families.*

Example 5.9. We continue with the toric variety X_0 from Example 4.12. By [1, (4.3)] the graded components $T_{X_0}^1(-R)$ of $T_{X_0}^1$ corresponding to complexity one deformations of X_0 to Fano cone singularities are given by

$$R = 2(e_1 + e_3) - (n+2)e_1 = -ne_1 + 2e_3$$

for $n \geq 1$ (for $n = 1, 2$ the deformations are actually still toric). The corresponding Minkowski decompositions of $Q_R = \sigma \cap [\langle R, \cdot \rangle = 1]$ give exactly the polyhedral coefficients for \mathcal{D}^n in front of $[0], [1] \in \mathbb{P}^1$ in Example 4.12. Since the cone is simplicial the minimizer for the normalized volume is the barycentric ray spanned by $\xi = e_1 + 2e_2 + 2e_3$. We see that $\langle R, \xi \rangle \geq 0$ holds if and only if $n \leq 4$. Hence, by Proposition 5.3 starting from $n = 5$ the complexity one deformations are not longer K-semistable. Leaving us with a bounded family of K-semistable deformations for our toric singularity X_0 .

5.2. Boundedness for K-semistable hypersurface singularities. We complement our boundedness results for the complexity one case with an analog one for K-semistable Fano cone hypersurface singularities.

Here, we consider a positive \mathbb{Z} -grading on the polynomial ring $\mathbb{C}[x_0, \dots, x_n]$ with weights $0 < w_0 \leq w_1 \leq \dots \leq w_n$. The hypersurface singularity X_d is given by a weighted homogeneous equation of degree d . We may assume that each variable occurs in a non-linear monomial of the equation. Otherwise, the singularity would be either smooth or a product of a lower dimensional singularity and an affine space. The singularity X_d is log terminal only if $\sum_i w_i - d > 0$ and K-semistability is obstructed by the Lichnerowicz condition of Theorem 2.12, which demands that the inequality $\sum_i w_i - d \leq nw_0$ holds. In the case that X_d is K-semistable with

respect to the polarization given by the grading, the normalized volume of X_d is calculated by the valuation corresponding to the \mathbb{Z} -grading. Here, we have

$$\widehat{\text{vol}}(X_d; x) = \frac{d(\sum_i w_i - d)^n}{w_0 \cdots w_n}.$$

In order, to prove boundedness for K-semistable Fano cone hypersurface singularities with volume bounded by $v > 0$ we consider the tuples $(w_0, \dots, w_n, d) \in \mathbb{N}^{n+2}$, up to taking multiples, which fulfil the following set of conditions.

- (3) $\sum_i w_i - d \geq 0$ (log terminality)
- (4) $\sum_i w_i - d \leq nw_0$ (Lichnerowicz obstruction)
- (5) $w_0 + w_n \leq d$ (every variable appears in a non-linear monomial)
- (6) $\frac{d(\sum_i w_i - d)^n}{w_0 \cdots w_n} \geq v$ (bound on the volume)

As discussed in Example 2.11 of the introduction, we may extend this setting to gradings by some semigroup in $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, when we also allow positive real values for the weights and the degree. Equivalently, this means that the equation is actually homogeneous with respect to a (multi-)grading by some $M = \mathbb{Z}^r$ and our \mathbb{R} -weights are obtained by evaluating a (potentially irrational) element $\xi \in M_{\mathbb{R}}^* = (\mathbb{R}^r)^*$ in the M -weights of the variables. By approximating ξ by rational elements, we see that all conditions still have to hold in this generalized setting.

Proof of Theorem 2. Since we consider the tuples (w_0, \dots, w_n, d) only up to scaling, we may normalize them such that $w_0 = 1$ holds. Hence, we from now on assume that $w_0 = 1$ and allow real values ≥ 1 for the other weights. We will call a such a tuple *weight data*.

Consider the set of weight data corresponding to n -dimensional K-semistable polarized Fano cone singularities. In particular, the weight data has to fulfil all our conditions above. Our aim is to show that d is bounded by some constant. Then we would be done, as there are only finitely many monomials having degree less or equal to d (since the weights always fulfil $w_i \geq 1$). If d is not bounded, then there would exist an infinite sequence of weight data, such that $d \rightarrow \infty$. Assume there is such a sequence. In order to keep the notation simple, we refrain from adding a new index to the w_i and d just to indicate the membership to that sequence.

Recall that the normalized volume

$$\widehat{\text{vol}}(X_d) = \frac{d(\sum_i w_i - d)^n}{w_0 \cdots w_n} = \frac{(\sum_i w_i - d)^n}{\frac{w_0 \cdots w_n}{d}} \geq v$$

associated to our weight data is bounded from below by (6). Since $\sum_i w_i - d \leq n$ by (4), then we have that $\frac{w_0 \cdots w_n}{d} \leq n^n/v$. Hence, after passing to a subsequence we may assume $\frac{w_0 \cdots w_n}{d} \rightarrow c$ for some $c \geq 0$. Similarly, after passing to a subsequence, we may assume that each w_i is either bounded or diverges to $+\infty$. By inequality (3), at least one of the w_i must diverge to $+\infty$.

Case 1. $d \rightarrow \infty$, $w_n \rightarrow \infty$, and $w_{n-1} \not\rightarrow 1$: Because of the convergence $\frac{w_0 \cdots w_n}{d} \rightarrow c$, we eventually have $d > \frac{w_0 \cdots w_n}{1+c}$ in our sequence of weight data. On the other hand, the fact that $w_n \rightarrow \infty$ and $w_{n-1} \not\rightarrow 1$ implies that eventually we have

that

$$\sum_i w_i < \frac{1}{1+c} \prod_i w_i.$$

Hence, at some point, we obtain

$$\sum_i w_i - d < \sum_i w_i - \frac{1}{1+c} \prod_i w_i < 0,$$

but this contradicts the log terminality condition (3).

Note that $1 \leq w_2 \leq \dots \leq w_{n-1} \leq w_n$ for any sequence data. By the first case, we can assume that $w_{n-1} \rightarrow 1$. Hence, we may assume that $w_i \rightarrow 1$ for every $i \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}$.

Case 2. $d \rightarrow \infty$, $w_n \rightarrow \infty$ and $w_0, \dots, w_{n-1} \rightarrow 1$: Consequently, we have $w_n = \lambda d$ with $\lambda \rightarrow c \leq 1$, because $w_n < d$ by (5). Then $\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} w_i$ is bounded from above by some constant C and we obtain

$$\sum_{i=0}^n w_i - d = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} w_i + \lambda d - d < C - (1-\lambda)d.$$

Since $d \rightarrow +\infty$ and $\sum_{i=0}^n w_i - d > 0$ by (3) it follows that $\lambda \rightarrow c = 1$ and therefore $\frac{w_n}{d} \rightarrow 1$.

Now, for $w_n > d/2$ an equation of degree d will look like

$$x_n g_{d-w_n}(x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}) + g_d(x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}),$$

where g_{d-w_n} and g_d are quasi-homogeneous polynomials of the corresponding degrees. We will now construct a special degeneration for such a singularity X_d . For this we embed the singularity as intersection of two hypersurfaces into \mathbb{A}^{n+2} :

$$x_n x_{n+1} + g_d(x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}) = x_{n+1} - g_{d-w_n}(x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}) = 0.$$

These equations becomes quasi-homogeneous of degree d and $d - w_n$, respectively, if we choose the weight $w_{n+1} = d - w_n < w_n$ for x_{n+1} . Now, consider the special degeneration given by

$$x_n x_{n+1} + g_d(x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}) = t^a x_{n+1} - g_{d-w_n}(x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}) = 0.$$

Here, we act on x_n by weight $-a$ and on x_{n+1} by weight a with $0 < a < w_n$. The central fibre of the degeneration is cut out by

$$x_n x_{n+1} + g_d(x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}) = g_{d-w_n}(x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}) = 0.$$

The induced \mathbb{C}^* -action is given by the weights $(w_0, \dots, w_{n-1}, w_n - a, w_{n+1} + a)$. Let v be the valuation on X_d corresponding to the special degeneration. Then we obtain

$$\widehat{\text{vol}}_X(v) = \frac{d(d-w) \left(\sum_{i=0}^n w_i - d \right)^n}{w_0 \cdots (w_n - a) \cdot (w_{n+1} + a)} \leq \frac{d(d-w)n^n}{w_0 \cdots (w_n - a) \cdot (w_{n+1} + a)}.$$

Here, the inequality on the right follows from (4). Now, by choosing $a = w_n/2$ and observing that $\widehat{\text{vol}}(X_d; x) \leq \widehat{\text{vol}}_{X_d}(v)$ we obtain

$$\widehat{\text{vol}}(X_d; x) \leq \frac{d(d-w)n^n}{w_0 \cdots w_{n-1} (w_n/2) \cdot (d + w_n/2)} = \frac{d/w_n (d/w_n - 1)n^n}{w_0 \cdots w_{n-1} \cdot 1/2 \cdot (d/w_n + 1/2)}.$$

From the convergence $w_0, \dots, w_{n-1} \rightarrow 1$ and $d/w_n \rightarrow 1$ we see that $\widehat{\text{vol}}(X_d; x) \rightarrow 0$, but this is in contradiction to (6). Alternatively, we could also argue that $\widehat{\text{vol}}(v) < \widehat{\text{vol}}(\xi) = \frac{d(\sum_i w_i - d)^n}{x_0 \cdots x_n}$ and therefore (X_d, ξ) is not K-semistable, which is in contradiction to our other assumption. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] K. Altmann. One parameter families containing three dimensional toric Gorenstein singularities. In *Explicit birational geometry of 3-folds*, pages 21–50. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- [2] K. Altmann and J. Hausen. Polyhedral divisors and algebraic torus actions. *Math. Ann.*, 334(3):557–607, 2006. doi:10.1007/s00208-005-0705-8.
- [3] K. Altmann, J. Hausen, and H. Süß. Gluing affine torus actions via divisorial fans. *Transform. Groups*, 13(2):215–242, 2008. doi:10.1007/s00031-008-9011-3.
- [4] K. Altmann, N. O. Ilten, L. Petersen, H. Süß, and R. Vollmert. The geometry of T -varieties. In *Contributions to algebraic geometry*, EMS Ser. Congr. Rep., pages 17–69. Eur. Math. Soc., Zürich, 2012. doi:10.4171/114-1/2.
- [5] K. Altmann and L. Petersen. Cox rings of rational complexity-one T -varieties. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, 216(5):1146–1159, 2012. doi:10.1016/j.jpaa.2011.12.018.
- [6] F. Ambro. The set of toric minimal log discrepancies. *Cent. Eur. J. Math.*, 4(3):358–370, 2006. doi:10.2478/s11533-006-0013-x.
- [7] C. Birkar. Existence of log canonical flips and a special LMMP. *Publ. Math. Inst. Hautes Études Sci.*, 115:325–368, 2012. doi:10.1007/s10240-012-0039-5.
- [8] L. Braun, D. Greb, K. Langlois, and J. Moraga. Reductive quotients of klt singularities, 2021, arXiv:2111.02812.
- [9] T. C. Collins and G. Székelyhidi. Sasaki-Einstein metrics and K-stability, 2015, 1512.07213.
- [10] T. C. Collins and G. Székelyhidi. K-semistability for irregular Sasakian manifolds. *J. Differ. Geom.*, 109(1):81–109, 2018. doi:10.4310/jdg/1525399217.
- [11] L. Ein, R. Lazarsfeld, and K. E. Smith. Uniform approximation of Abhyankar valuation ideals in smooth function fields. *Amer. J. Math.*, 125(2):409–440, 2003. URL http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/american_journal_of_mathematics/v125/125.2ein.pdf.
- [12] J. P. Gauntlett, D. Martelli, J. Sparks, and S.-T. Yau. Obstructions to the existence of Sasaki-Einstein metrics. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 273(3):803–827, 2007. doi:10.1007/s00220-007-0213-7.
- [13] C. Hacon and J. Moraga. On weak Zariski decompositions and termination of flips. *Math. Res. Lett.*, 27(5):1393–1422, 2020.
- [14] J. Han, J. Liu, and J. Moraga. Bounded deformations of (ϵ, δ) -log canonical singularities. *J. Math. Sci. Univ. Tokyo*, 27(1):1–28, 2020.
- [15] J. Han, Y. Liu, and L. Qi. Acc for local volumes and boundedness of singularities, 2020, 2011.06509.
- [16] H. Hauser and G. Müller. Algebraic singularities have maximal reductive automorphism groups. *Nagoya Math. J.*, 113:181–186, 1989. doi:10.1017/S0027763000001343.
- [17] N. Ilten and C. Manon. Rational complexity-one T -varieties are well-poised. *International Mathematics Research Notices*, page rnx254, 2017. doi:10.1093/imrn/rnx254.
- [18] N. Ilten and H. Süß. K-stability for Fano manifolds with torus action of complexity 1. *Duke Math. J.*, 166(1):177–204, 2017. doi:10.1215/00127094-3714864.
- [19] N. O. Ilten and R. Vollmert. Deformations of rational T -varieties. *J. Algebraic Geom.*, 21(3):531–562, 2012. doi:10.1090/S1056-3911-2011-00585-7.
- [20] A. Laface, A. Liendo, and J. Moraga. Cohen-macaulay du bois singularities with a torus action of complexity one, 2018, arXiv:1806.08311.
- [21] A. Laface, A. Liendo, and J. Moraga. On the topology of rational T -varieties of complexity one. *Mosc. Math. J.*, 20(2):405–422, 2020. doi:10.17323/1609-4514-2020-2-405-422.
- [22] K. Langlois. Corrigendum to “Polyhedral divisors and torus actions of complexity one over arbitrary fields” [*J. Pure Appl. Algebra* 219 (6) (2015) 2015–2045]. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, 225(1):Paper No. 106457, 2, 2021. doi:10.1016/j.jpaa.2020.106457.

- [23] C. Li. Minimizing normalized volumes of valuations. *Math. Z.*, 289(1-2):491–513, 2018. doi:[10.1007/s00209-017-1963-3](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00209-017-1963-3).
- [24] C. Li, Y. Liu, and C. Xu. A guided tour to normalized volume. In *Geometric analysis. In honor of Gang Tian's 60th birthday*, pages 167–219. Cham: Birkhäuser, 2020. doi:[10.1007/978-3-030-34953-0-10](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-34953-0-10).
- [25] C. Li and C. Xu. Stability of valuations: higher rational rank. *Peking Math. J.*, 1(1):1–79, 2018. doi:[10.1007/s42543-018-0001-7](https://doi.org/10.1007/s42543-018-0001-7).
- [26] A. Liendo and H. Süß. Normal singularities with torus actions. *Tohoku Math. J. (2)*, 65(1):105–130, 2013. doi:[10.2748/tmj/1365452628](https://doi.org/10.2748/tmj/1365452628).
- [27] J. Moraga. A boundedness theorem for cone singularities, 2018, [arXiv:1812.04670](https://arxiv.org/abs/1812.04670).
- [28] J. Moraga. Termination of pseudo-effective 4-fold flips, 2020, [arXiv:1802.10202](https://arxiv.org/abs/1802.10202).
- [29] J. Moraga and H. Süß. Bounding toric singularities with normalized volume, 2021, [arXiv:2111.01738](https://arxiv.org/abs/2111.01738).
- [30] V. V. Shokurov. Letters of a bi-rationalist. V. Minimal log discrepancies and termination of log flips. *Tr. Mat. Inst. Steklova*, 246(Algebr. Geom. Metody, Svyazi i Prilozh.):328–351, 2004.
- [31] B. Teissier. Valuations, deformations, and toric geometry. In *Valuation theory and its applications. Volume II. Proceedings of the international conference and workshop, University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, Canada, July 28–August 11, 1999*, pages 361–459. Providence, RI: American Mathematical Society (AMS), 2003.
- [32] C. Xu. Interaction between singularity theory and the minimal model program, 2017, [arXiv:1712.01041](https://arxiv.org/abs/1712.01041).
- [33] C. Xu. K-stability of Fano varieties: an algebro-geometric approach, 2020, [2011.10477](https://arxiv.org/abs/2011.10477).
- [34] Z. Zhuang. On boundedness of singularities and minimal log discrepancies of Kollár components, 2022, [arXiv:2202.06455](https://arxiv.org/abs/2202.06455). doi:[10.48550/ARXIV.2202.06455](https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2202.06455).