

$2n^2$ -INEQUALITY FOR cA_1 POINTS AND APPLICATIONS TO BIRATIONAL RIGIDITY

IGOR KRYLOV, TAKUZO OKADA, ERIK PAEMURRU, AND JIHUN PARK

ABSTRACT. The $4n^2$ -inequality for smooth points plays an important role in the proofs of birational (super)rigidity. The main aim of this paper is to generalize such an inequality to terminal singular points of type cA_1 , and obtain a $2n^2$ -inequality for cA_1 points. As applications, we prove birational (super)rigidity of sextic double solids, many other prime Fano 3-fold weighted complete intersections, and del Pezzo fibrations of degree 1 over \mathbb{P}^1 satisfying the K^2 -condition, all of which have at most terminal cA_1 singularities and terminal quotient singularities. These give first examples of birationally (super)rigid Fano 3-folds and del Pezzo fibrations admitting a cA_1 point which is not an ordinary double point.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	2
1.1. $2n^2$ -inequality for cA_1 points	2
1.2. Applications to birational rigidity	2
2. Preliminaries	4
2.1. Birational (super)rigidity	4
2.2. Maximal singularity	5
2.3. Exclusion methods	6
3. Local inequalities for cA points	7
3.1. Blow-ups and degrees of cycles	7
3.2. Blow-up of a cA_1 point	7
3.3. Tower of blow-ups associated to a divisorial valuation	9
3.4. $2n^2$ -inequalities for cA_1 points	11
3.5. Corti inequality for cA_1 points	12
4. Sextic double solids	13
4.1. Exclusion of smooth points	14
4.2. Exclusion of curves	14
4.3. Exclusion of cA_1 points and proof of Theorem 4.1	18
4.4. Sarkisov links centered at cA_3 singular points	19
4.5. Factorial sextic double solids	21
5. Prime Fano 3-fold weighted complete intersections	28
5.1. Exclusion of curves	28
5.2. Exclusion of smooth points	29
5.3. Exclusion of cA_1 points	34
5.4. Links centered at quotient points and proof of Theorem 5.2	35
6. del Pezzo fibrations of degree 1	35

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 14J45, 14E08.

1. INTRODUCTION

Throughout the paper we work over the field \mathbb{C} of complex numbers.

1.1. $2n^2$ -inequality for cA_1 points. Birational (super)rigidity of a Mori fiber space is roughly an essential uniqueness of the Mori fiber space structure in its birational equivalence class (see Definition 2.3 for the precise definition). Birational non-(super)rigidity of a Mori fiber space implies the existence of a non-biregular birational map to a Mori fiber space, and this further implies the existence of a mobile linear system that is highly singular. In order to prove the birational (super)rigidity of a given Mori fiber space, one has to exclude the possibility of the existence of such a highly singular mobile linear system. The $4n^2$ -inequality, which is stated below, is quite useful in this context, and it is one of the most important ingredients in the proofs of birational (super)rigidity of Mori fiber spaces.

Theorem 1.1 ($4n^2$ -inequality, [Puk13, Theorem 2.1]). *Let $\mathfrak{p} \in X$ be the germ of a smooth 3-fold. Let \mathcal{M} be a mobile linear system on X and let n be a positive rational number. If \mathfrak{p} is a center of non-canonical singularities of the pair $(X, \frac{1}{n}\mathcal{M})$, then for general members D_1, D_2 in \mathcal{M} we have*

$$\text{mult}_{\mathfrak{p}} D_1 \cdot D_2 > 4n^2.$$

To the best knowledge of the authors, there is no known example of a birationally (super)rigid 3-dimensional Mori fiber space admitting a singularity other than quotient singularities and ordinary double points. This is mainly because of the lack of a local inequality for singular points that is similar to $4n^2$ -inequality.

In this paper we consider a 3-fold terminal singularity $\mathfrak{p} \in X$ of type cA_k which is by definition an isolated hypersurface singularity whose general hyperplane section is the Du Val singularity of type A_k . Our first goal is to obtain a similar inequality for singular points of type cA_1 .

Theorem 1.2 ($2n^2$ -inequality for cA_1 points). *Let $\mathfrak{p} \in X$ be the germ of a cA_1 singularity. Let \mathcal{M} be a mobile linear system on X and let n be a positive rational number. If \mathfrak{p} is a center of non-canonical singularities of the pair $(X, \frac{1}{n}\mathcal{M})$, then for general members D_1, D_2 in \mathcal{M} we have*

$$\text{mult}_{\mathfrak{p}}(D_1 \cdot D_2) > 2n^2.$$

As applications, we give first examples of birationally (super)rigid Fano 3-folds and del Pezzo fibrations admitting cA_1 points.

1.2. Applications to birational rigidity. We explain applications of the $2n^2$ -inequality for cA_1 points to birational rigidity of some prime Fano 3-folds and del Pezzo fibrations.

A *Fano 3-fold* is a normal projective \mathbb{Q} -factorial variety of dimension 3 with only terminal singularities whose anticanonical divisor is ample. A Fano 3-fold X is *prime* if its class group $\text{Cl}(X)$ is isomorphism to \mathbb{Z} and is generated by $-K_X$.

1.2.1. *Sextic double solids.* A *sextic double solid* is a normal projective variety which is a double cover of \mathbb{P}^3 branched along a sextic surface. Birational super-rigidity of smooth sextic double solids is proved by Iskovskikh [Isk80], and later on, birational superrigidity of \mathbb{Q} -factorial sextic double solids with only ordinary double points is proved by Cheltsov and Park [CP10].

In [Pae21], birational geometry of sextic double solids with cA_k points are investigated, and it is in particular proved that a general sextic double solid with a cA_k singular point, where $k \geq 4$, is not birationally rigid. Moreover the following expectation (which we pose as a conjecture) is made.

Conjecture 1.3. A \mathbb{Q} -factorial sextic double solid with only terminal cA_1 and cA_2 singularities is birationally superrigid, and a \mathbb{Q} -factorial sextic double solid with only terminal cA_1, cA_2 and cA_3 singularities is birationally rigid.

We generalize the result of Cheltsov and Park [CP10], and prove the following.

Theorem 1.4 (= Theorem 4.1). *Let X be a \mathbb{Q} -factorial sextic double solid with only terminal singularities of type cA_1 . Then X is birationally superrigid.*

We also consider sextic double solids with a cA_3 point in Section 4.4 and construct a Sarkisov self-link under a generality assumption.

In Theorem 1.4 we are assuming that sextic double solids with cA_1 singularities are \mathbb{Q} -factorial, which is a crucial condition for them to be birationally superrigid. However it is not a simple problem to determine whether a given singular variety is \mathbb{Q} -factorial or not. We provide a criterion for \mathbb{Q} -factoriality of sextic double solids with cA_1 singularities in Section 4.5.

1.2.2. *Prime Fano 3-fold weighted complete intersections.* Quasismooth prime Fano 3-fold WCIs are classified under some extra conditions and they consist of 95 families of weighted hypersurfaces, 85 families of WCIs of codimension 2, and the family of complete intersections of 3 quadrics in \mathbb{P}^6 (see [IF00, 16.6, 16.7] and [CCC, Theorems 1.3, 6.1 and 7.4]). The study of birational (super)rigidity of these objects is almost completed under the assumption of quasi-smoothness:

- It is proved by [CPR00] and [CP17] that every quasi-smooth prime Fano 3-fold weighted hypersurface is birationally rigid.
- It is proved by [Oka14] and [AZ16] that a quasi-smooth prime Fano 3-fold WCI of codimension 2 other than a complete intersection of a quadric and a cubic in \mathbb{P}^5 is birationally rigid if and only if it belongs to one of the specific 18 families.
- It is proved by [IP96] that a general smooth complete intersection of a quadric and a cubic in \mathbb{P}^5 is birationally rigid.

Quasi-smoothness of a prime Fano 3-fold WCI implies that the variety has only terminal cyclic quotient singularities. We consider 78 families of prime Fano 3-fold weighted hypersurfaces and 18 families of prime Fano 3-fold WCIs of codimension 2, and prove birational (super)rigidity of their special members admitting cA_1 points.

Theorem 1.5 (= Theorem 5.2). *Let X be a prime Fano 3-fold WCI which belongs to one of the families listed in Tables 2 and 3. Suppose that X is quasi-smooth along the singular locus of the ambient weighted projective space, and X*

has only cA_1 singularities besides terminal quotient singular points. Then X is birationally rigid.

1.2.3. *del Pezzo fibrations of degree 1.* Let $\pi: X \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$ be a del Pezzo fibration of degree 1, that is, it is a Mori fiber space and its general fiber is a smooth del Pezzo surface of degree 1. We say that X/\mathbb{P}^1 satisfies the K^2 -condition if the 1-cycle $(-K_X)^2$ is not contained in the interior of the cone $\overline{\text{NE}}(X)$ of effective curves on X , i.e.,

$$(1.1) \quad (-K_X)^2 \notin \text{Int}(\overline{\text{NE}}(X)).$$

Pukhlikov [Puk98] proved birational superrigidity of nonsingular del Pezzo fibrations satisfying the K^2 -condition. As an application of $2n^2$ -inequality for cA_1 points, we generalize the Pukhlikov's result and obtain the following.

Theorem 1.6. *Let $\pi: X \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$ be a del Pezzo fibration of degree 1 with only cA_1 singularities. If X/\mathbb{P}^1 satisfies the K^2 -condition, then X is birationally super-rigid.*

Acknowledgments. The first author is supported by KIAS Individual Grant n. MG069802. The second author is partially supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Numbers JP18K03216 and JP22H01118. The third author is supported by the Simons Investigator Award HMS, National Science Fund of Bulgaria, National Scientific Program "Excellent Research and People for the Development of European Science" (VIHREN), Project No. KP-06-DV-7. The fourth author has been supported by IBS-R003-D1, Institute for Basic Science in Korea.

2. PRELIMINARIES

2.1. Birational (super)rigidity.

Definition 2.1. Let $\pi: X \rightarrow S$ be a morphism between normal projective varieties. We say that $\pi: X \rightarrow S$ (or simply X/S if π is understood) is a *Mori fiber space* if

- $\dim S < \dim X$ and π has connected fibers,
- X is \mathbb{Q} -factorial and has only terminal singularities,
- $-K_X$ is π -ample and the relative Picard rank is 1.

We call X/S a *del Pezzo fibration* if $\dim X - \dim S = 2$.

Note that Mori fiber spaces over a point are exactly Fano varieties of Picard rank 1.

Definition 2.2. Let $\pi_X: X \rightarrow S$ and $\pi_Y: Y \rightarrow T$ be Mori fiber spaces. A birational map $\chi: X \dashrightarrow Y$ is called *square* if it fits into a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X & \xrightarrow{\chi} & Y \\ \pi_X \downarrow & & \downarrow \pi_Y \\ S & \xrightarrow{\xi} & T \end{array}$$

where ξ is birational and in addition the induced map on the generic fibers $\chi_\eta: X_\eta \dashrightarrow Y_\eta$ is an isomorphism. In this case we say that X/S and Y/T are *square birational*.

Definition 2.3. We say that a Mori fiber space $\pi: X \rightarrow S$ is *birationally rigid* if, for any Mori fiber space Y/T , the variety Y is birational to X if and only if X/S and Y/T are square birational.

We say that X/S is *birationally superrigid* if, for any Mori fiber space Y/T , any birational map $X \dashrightarrow Y$ (if it exists) is square.

Note that a Fano variety X of Picard rank 1 is birationally superrigid if and only if it is birationally rigid and $\text{Bir}(X) = \text{Aut}(X)$, where $\text{Bir}(X)$ is the birational automorphism group of X .

2.2. Maximal singularity. For a normal variety V , a prime divisor E on a normal variety W admitting a projective birational morphism $\varphi: W \rightarrow V$ is called a *prime divisor over V* . A prime divisor over V is *exceptional* if its center on V is a subvariety of codimension greater than 1.

In the following, let $\pi: X \rightarrow S$ be a Mori fiber space. For a mobile linear system \mathcal{M} on X , the rational number $n \geq 0$ such that $\mathcal{M} \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} -nK_X + \pi^*A$ for some \mathbb{Q} -divisor A on S is called the *quasi-effective threshold* of \mathcal{M} .

Definition 2.4. A prime exceptional divisor E over X is a *maximal singularity* if there exists a mobile linear system \mathcal{M} on X such that

$$\text{ord}_E \varphi^* \mathcal{M} > na_E(K_X),$$

where $n > 0$ is the quasi-effective threshold of \mathcal{M} , $\varphi: Y \rightarrow X$ is a projective birational morphism such that $E \subset Y$ and $a_E(K_X)$ denotes the discrepancy of K_X along E . The center $\Gamma \subset X$ of a maximal singularity is called a *maximal center*. An extremal divisorial contraction $\varphi: Y \rightarrow X$ is called a *maximal extraction* if its exceptional divisor is a maximal singularity.

We have the following characterization of birational superrigidity for Fano 3-folds of Picard rank 1.

Theorem 2.5 ([CS08, Theorem 1.26] and [Cor95, (2.10) Proposition-definition]). *Let X be a Fano 3-fold of Picard rank 1. Then the following are equivalent.*

- (1) X is birationally superrigid.
- (2) X does not admit a maximal singularity.
- (3) X does not admit a maximal extraction.

Let X be a Fano variety of Picard rank 1. An *elementary link of type II* is a non-biregular birational map $\sigma: X \dashrightarrow X'$ to a Fano variety of Picard number 1 which sits in the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} Y & \xrightarrow{\tau} & Y' \\ \varphi \downarrow & & \downarrow \varphi' \\ X & \xrightarrow{\sigma} & X' \end{array}$$

where φ and φ' are extremal divisorial contractions and τ is a birational map which is an isomorphism in codimension 1. An elementary link of type II which is a birational self-map is called an *elementary self-link of type II*.

Lemma 2.6 ([Oka18, Lemmas 2.34 and 2.22]). *Let X be a Fano 3-fold of Picard number 1. If for any maximal extraction $\varphi: Y \rightarrow X$ there exists a Sarkisov self-link of type II initiated by φ , then X is birationally rigid.*

2.3. Exclusion methods. We explain several methods which will be used to exclude maximal centers.

2.3.1. *Methods for curves.*

Lemma 2.7 ([CPR00, Proof of Theorem 5.1.1] and [Oka18, Lemma 2.9]). *Let X be a Fano 3-fold of Picard rank 1 and let $\Gamma \subset X$ be an irreducible and reduced curve. If $(-K_X \cdot \Gamma) \geq (-K_X)^3$, then Γ is not a maximal center.*

The following is a simplified version of [Oka18, Lemma 2.11], which is enough for the purpose of this paper.

Lemma 2.8 (cf. [Oka18, Lemma 2.11]). *Let X be a Fano 3-fold of Picard rank 1, and let $\Gamma \subset X$ be an irreducible and reduced curve. Assume that there is a pencil \mathcal{P} of divisors on X satisfying the following properties.*


- (1) $\mathcal{P} \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} -mK_X$ for some rational number $m \geq 1$.
- (2) A general member of \mathcal{P} is a normal surface.
- (3) For distinct general members $S, T \in \mathcal{P}$, we have $T|_S = \Gamma + \Delta$, where Δ is an irreducible and reduced curve such that $\Delta \neq \Gamma$, and we have $(\Gamma \cdot \Delta)_S \geq (-K_X \cdot \Delta)$.

Then Γ is not a maximal center.

When we apply Lemma 2.8, we need to compute $(\Gamma \cdot \Delta)_S$, which will follow from the computation of $(\Gamma^2)_S$. In this paper we need to consider the case where $\Gamma \cong \mathbb{P}^1$ and S has Du Val singular points of type A along Γ , and the computation of $(\Gamma^2)_S$ will be done by the following method.

Definition 2.9. Let $\mathfrak{p} \in S$ be the germ of a normal surface and Γ an irreducible and reduced curve on S . Let $\hat{S} \rightarrow S$ be the minimal resolution of $\mathfrak{p} \in S$ and denote by E_1, \dots, E_m the prime exceptional divisors. We define $G(S, \mathfrak{p}, \Gamma)$ to be the dual graph of E_1, \dots, E_m together with the proper transform $\hat{\Gamma}$ of Γ on \hat{S} : vertices of $G(S, \mathfrak{p}, \Gamma)$ corresponds to E_1, \dots, E_m and $\hat{\Gamma}$, and two vertices corresponding to E_i and E_j (resp. E_i and $\hat{\Gamma}$) are joined by $(E_i \cdot E_j)$ -ple edge (resp. $(E_i \cdot \hat{\Gamma})$ -ple edge). We call $G(S, \mathfrak{p}, \Gamma)$ the *extended dual graph* of $(S, \mathfrak{p}, \Gamma)$.

Definition 2.10. We say that $G(S, \mathfrak{p}, \Gamma)$ is of type $A_{n,k}$ if it is of the form



Here, \circ means that the corresponding exceptional divisor is a (-2) -curve. In other words, $G(S, \mathfrak{p}, \Gamma)$ is of type $A_{n,k}$ if (S, \mathfrak{p}) is of type A_n , $(\hat{\Gamma} \cdot E_i) = 0$ for $i \neq k$ and $(\hat{\Gamma} \cdot E_k) = 1$.

Lemma 2.11. *Let S be a normal projective surface, and let Γ be a smooth rational curve on S . Let $\mathfrak{p}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{p}_m$ be points on Γ . Suppose that S is smooth along $\Gamma \setminus \{\mathfrak{p}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{p}_m\}$ and that each extended dual graph $G(S, \mathfrak{p}_i, \Gamma)$ is of type A_{n_i, k_i} for some positive integers n_i, k_i . Then,*

$$(\Gamma^2) = -2 - (K_S \cdot \Gamma) + \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{k_i(n_i - k + 1)}{n_i + 1}.$$

Proof. This follows from [Oka20b, Lemma 10.7]. □

3. LOCAL INEQUALITIES FOR cA POINTS

Let V be an n -dimensional variety. For $i = 0, \dots, n$, we denote by $Z_i(V)$ the group of i -cycles on V , and by $A_i(V) = Z_i(V) / \sim_{\text{rat}}$ the *Chow group of i -cycles* on V , where \sim_{rat} is the rational equivalence. For Cartier divisors D_1, \dots, D_k on V that intersect properly, that is, the irreducible components of $\text{Supp}(D_1) \cap \dots \cap \text{Supp}(D_k)$ all have codimension equal to k in V , there is a uniquely defined intersection cycle

$$D_1 \cdot D_2 \cdots D_k \in Z_{n-k}(\text{Supp}(D_1) \cap \dots \cap \text{Supp}(D_k)).$$

See [Ful98, Definition 2.4.2].

3.1. Blow-ups and degrees of cycles. Let X be a normal 3-fold, and let $B \subset X$ be an irreducible subvariety of codimension at least 2. Let $\varphi: \tilde{X} \rightarrow X$ be the blow-up of X along B . For a cycle $\Gamma \in Z_i(V)$ on X such that $\text{Supp} \Gamma \not\subset B$, we denote by $\varphi_*^{-1} \Gamma$ the proper transform of Γ on \tilde{X} .

Definition 3.1. Under the above setting, suppose that B is not contained in the singular locus of X , and let $E \subset \tilde{X}$ be the unique exceptional divisor dominating B . Let $Z = \sum_i m_i Z_i$ be a 1-cycle supported on the exceptional set $\varphi^{-1}(B)$, where $Z_i \subset \sigma^{-1}(B)$ is an irreducible curve. We define the *degree* of Z by

$$\deg_E Z := \sum_i m_i \deg(Z_i \cap \varphi^{-1}(b)),$$

where $\varphi^{-1}(b) \cong \mathbb{P}^{2-\dim B}$ is the fiber over a general point $b \in B$.

Lemma 3.2 ([Puk13, Lemma 2.2]). *Let X be a normal 3-fold, $B \subset X$ be an irreducible subvariety of codimension at least 2 such that $B \not\subset \text{Sing} X$, and let D_1, D_2 be Cartier divisors on X which share no common component.*

(1) *Assume that B is a point. Then, for the 1-cycle*

$$Z := \varphi_*^{-1} D_1 \cdot \varphi_*^{-1} D_2 - \varphi_*^{-1}(D_1 \cdot D_2),$$

which is supported on $\varphi^{-1}(B)$, we have

$$\deg_E Z = \text{mult}_B(D_1 \cdot D_2) - \text{mult}_B D_1 \text{mult}_B D_2.$$

(2) *Assume that B is a curve. Then, for the decomposition*

$$\varphi_*^{-1} D_1 \cdot \varphi_*^{-1} D_2 = Z + Z_1,$$

where $\text{Supp} Z \subset \varphi^{-1}(B)$ and $\text{Supp} \varphi_ Z_1$ does not contain B , we have*

$$D_1 \cdot D_2 = (\text{mult}_B D_1 \text{mult}_B D_2 + \deg_E Z)B + \varphi_* Z_1.$$

3.2. Blow-up of a cA_1 point.

Definition 3.3. Let $\mathfrak{p} \in X$ be the germ of a 3-fold singularity. We say that $\mathfrak{p} \in X$ is a *singularity of type cA_k* (or simply a *cA_k point*), if the germ is analytically equivalent to the germ of a hypersurface singularity whose general hyperplane section is the Du Val singular point of type A_k .

Note that a cA_k point is terminal if and only if it is an isolated singularity. Let $\mathfrak{p} \in X$ be the germ of a terminal singularity of type cA_1 . Then there is an analytic equivalence between germs $\mathfrak{p} \in X$ and $o \in (f = 0) \subset \mathbb{A}^4$, where

$$f = xy + z^2 + w^M,$$

for some $M \geq 2$. In the following we identify $\mathfrak{p} \in X$ with the above hypersurface germ, that is, we assume that $\mathfrak{p} \in X$ is the hypersurface germ defined by the vanishing of the above f . We set $W = \mathbb{A}^4$. Let $\varphi_W: \tilde{W} \rightarrow W$ be the blowup of W at the origin \mathfrak{p} , \tilde{X} the proper transform of X in \tilde{W} , and $\varphi = \varphi_W|_{\tilde{X}}: \tilde{X} \rightarrow X$ the restriction. We denote by $E_W \cong \mathbb{P}^3$ the exceptional divisor of φ_W and we set $E = E_W|_{\tilde{X}}$.

For a cycle Γ on X , we denote by $\text{mult}_{\mathfrak{p}} \Gamma$ to be the multiplicity of Γ , viewed as a cycle on W , at the smooth point $\mathfrak{p} \in W$.

Definition 3.4. Under the above setting, let Z be a 1-cycle supported on E_W . By the *degree* of Z which is denoted by $\deg_{E_W} Z$, we mean the degree of Z viewed as a 1-cycle on $E_W \cong \mathbb{P}^3$. By a slight abuse of notation, we use the notation $\deg_E Z = \deg_{E_W} Z$ when Z is supported on E .

Lemma 3.5. *Let \mathcal{M} be a mobile linear system of Cartier divisors on X , let D_1, D_2 be general members of \mathcal{M} , and denote $\nu = \text{ord}_E \varphi^* \mathcal{M}$. Let $\Gamma = D_1 \cdot D_2$ and denote $m = \text{mult}_{\mathfrak{p}} \Gamma$. Then, for the 1-cycle*

$$Z := \varphi_*^{-1} D_1 \cdot \varphi_*^{-1} D_2 - \varphi_*^{-1} \Gamma,$$

which is supported on E , we have

$$\deg_E Z = m - 2\nu^2.$$

Proof. Let $e \in A_1(E_W)$ be the class of a line. In $A_1(\tilde{W})$, we have

$$(3.1) \quad \varphi_W^* \Gamma = \tilde{\Gamma} + me.$$

Since D_i is a Cartier divisor on X , it is defined by a single element in the residue ring $\mathcal{O}_{X, \mathfrak{p}} = \mathcal{O}_{W, \mathfrak{p}} / (xy + z^2 + w^M)$, hence we can take a Cartier divisor G_i on W such that $G_i|_X = D_i$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_W^* \Gamma &= \varphi_W^*(D_1 \cdot D_2) \\ &= \varphi_W^*(G_1 \cdot G_2 \cdot X) \\ &= \varphi_W^* G_1 \cdot \varphi_W^* G_2 \cdot \varphi_W^* X \\ &= \varphi_W^* G_1 \cdot \varphi_W^* G_2 \cdot \tilde{X} \\ &= \varphi^* D_1 \cdot \varphi^* D_2, \end{aligned}$$

and thus

$$(3.2) \quad \begin{aligned} \tilde{D}_1 \cdot \tilde{D}_2 &= (\varphi^* D_1 - \nu E) \cdot (\varphi^* D_2 - \nu E) \\ &= \varphi^* D_1 \cdot \varphi^* D_2 + \nu^2 E^2 \\ &= \varphi_W^* \Gamma - 2\nu^2 e. \end{aligned}$$

By (3.1) and (3.2), the 1-cycle Z is rationally equivalent to $(m - 2\nu^2)e$ and the claim follows. \square

3.3. Tower of blow-ups associated to a divisorial valuation. We set up notations for proving 2n²-type inequalities.

Let $\mathfrak{p} \in X$ be the germ of a terminal singular point of type cA_1 . Let ν be a divisorial valuation of $\mathbb{C}(X)$ realized by a prime divisor E_∞ over $\mathfrak{p} \in X$. Consider the tower of blow-ups realizing ν :

$$(3.3) \quad X_N \xrightarrow{\varphi_N} \dots \xrightarrow{\varphi_2} X_1 \xrightarrow{\varphi_1} X_0 = X,$$

where $\varphi_i: X_i \rightarrow X_{i-1}$ is the blow-up of X_{i-1} along the center B_{i-1} of E_∞ on X_{i-1} , $E_i \subset X_i$ is the φ_i -exceptional divisor dominating B_{i-1} , and E_N realizes the valuation ν , i.e. $\nu = \nu_{E_N}$. For $j > i$, the composite $X_j \rightarrow X_{j-1} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow X_i$ is denoted by $\varphi_{j,i} = \varphi_{i+1} \circ \dots \circ \varphi_j$.

For a cycle Γ on X_i and $j > i$, we denote by $\Gamma^{(j)}$ its proper transform on X_j via $\varphi_{j,i}: X_j \rightarrow X_i$ if no component of Γ is supported on B_i . Similarly, for a linear system \mathcal{M} of Cartier divisors on X_i and $j > i$, we denote by $\mathcal{M}^{(j)}$ the proper transform of \mathcal{M} via $\varphi_{j,i}$.

We introduce an oriented graph structure as follows: The vertices E_j and E_i are joined by an oriented edge, which is denoted by $j \rightarrow i$, if $j > i$ and $B_{j-1} \subset E_i^{(j-1)}$. For $1 \leq i \leq N-1$, we define p_i to be the number of paths from E_N to E_i in the oriented graph, and we define $p_N = 1$. We define

$$K = \max\{i \mid B_{i-1} \text{ is a } cA_1 \text{ point}\},$$

$$L = \max\{i \mid B_{i-1} \text{ is a point}\}.$$

Note that $B_0 = \mathfrak{p}$ and we have $1 \leq K \leq L \leq N$. Let \mathcal{M} be a mobile linear system of Cartier divisors on $X = X_0$. We define $\nu_i = \nu_{E_i}(\mathcal{M}^{(i-1)})$. For general members $D_1, D_2 \in \mathcal{M}$, we define a sequence of 1-cycles Z_i on X_i by

$$(3.4) \quad \begin{aligned} D_1 \cdot D_2 &= Z_0, \\ D_1^{(1)} \cdot D_2^{(1)} &= Z_0^{(1)} + Z_1, \\ &\dots, \\ D_1^{(i)} \cdot D_2^{(i)} &= (D_1^{(i-1)} \cdot D_2^{(i-1)})^{(i)} + Z_i, \\ &\dots, \\ D_1^{(L)} \cdot D_2^{(L)} &= (D_1^{(L-1)} \cdot D_2^{(L-1)})^{(L)} + Z_L. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $\text{Supp } Z_i \subset E_i$ and for any $i \leq L$ we get

$$D_1^{(i)} \cdot D_2^{(i)} = Z_0^{(i)} + Z_1^{(i)} + \dots + Z_{i-1}^{(i)} + Z_i.$$

For any i, j with $L \geq j > i$, we set

$$m_{i,j} = \text{mult}_{B_{j-1}}(Z_i^{(j-1)}).$$

Then there is a lower bound on multiplicities of $Z = Z_0$ at B_i in terms of ν_i .

Proposition 3.6. *Suppose $\mathfrak{p} \in X$ is a terminal singularity of type cA_1 , and let ν be a divisorial valuation of $\mathbb{C}(X)$ centered at \mathfrak{p} . Let \mathcal{M} be a mobile linear system of Cartier divisors on X and let $Z_0 = D_1 \cdot D_2$ be the intersection 1-cycle of general members D_1, D_2 in \mathcal{M} . Then, for p_i, ν_i and $m_{i,j}$ defined as above, the inequality*

holds:

$$(3.5) \quad 2 \sum_{i=1}^K p_i \nu_i^2 + \sum_{i=K+1}^N p_i \nu_i^2 \leq \sum_{i=1}^L p_i m_{0,i}.$$

Proof. Set $d_i = \deg_{E_i} Z_i$. By Lemmas 3.2 and 3.5, we obtain a system of equalities corresponding to the sequence of cycles (3.4):

$$(3.6) \quad \begin{aligned} 2\nu_1^2 + d_1 &= m_{0,1}, \\ 2\nu_2^2 + d_2 &= m_{0,2} + m_{1,2}, \\ &\dots, \\ 2\nu_K^2 + d_K &= m_{0,K} + \dots + m_{K-1,K}, \\ \nu_{K+1}^2 + d_{K+1} &= m_{0,K+1} + \dots + m_{K,K+1}, \\ &\dots, \\ \nu_L^2 + d_L &= m_{0,L} + \dots + m_{L-1,L}. \end{aligned}$$

We multiply the i -th equality in (3.6) by p_i and sum them up:

$$(3.7) \quad 2 \sum_{i=1}^K p_i \nu_i^2 + \sum_{i=K+1}^L p_i \nu_i^2 + \sum_{i=1}^L p_i d_i = \sum_{j=1}^L p_j m_{0,j} + \sum_{i=1}^{L-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^L p_j m_{i,j}.$$

For each i with $0 \leq i \leq L-1$, we consider the expression

$$\sum_{j=i+1}^L p_j m_{i,j}$$

which appears in the RHS of the summation (3.7). We have $m_{i,j} \leq d_i$ for any i, j with $L \geq j > i \geq 1$ by [Puk13, Lemma 2.4]¹. Note that, for $i \geq 1$, we have $p_i \geq \sum_{j \rightarrow i} p_j$, and if $m_{i,j} \neq 0$, then $j \rightarrow i$. It follows that, for $i = 1, \dots, L-1$, we have

$$\sum_{j=i+1}^L p_j m_{i,j} = \sum_{\substack{i+1 \leq j \leq L \\ m_{i,j} \neq 0}} p_j m_{i,j} \leq d_i \sum_{\substack{i+1 \leq j \leq L \\ j \rightarrow i}} p_j \leq p_i d_i.$$

Thus, for $i = 1, \dots, L-1$, we can remove all $m_{i,*}$ and $p_i d_i$ from the summation (3.7) if we replace $=$ with \leq , and obtain

$$(3.8) \quad 2 \sum_{i=1}^K p_i \nu_i^2 + \sum_{i=K+1}^L p_i \nu_i^2 + p_L d_L \leq \sum_{i=1}^L p_i m_{0,i}.$$

Iterating the application of Lemma 3.2 (2) for φ_i with $i = L+1, \dots, N$, we obtain

$$d_L \geq \sum_{i=L+1}^N \nu_i^2 \deg_{E_L}(\varphi_{i-1,L})_* B_{i-1} \geq \sum_{i=L+1}^N \nu_i^2.$$

Combining this inequality with (3.8), we obtain the inequality (3.5). \square

¹This is valid for $j \leq L$ by applying the lemma for the ambient fourfold.

Corollary 3.7. *Let the notation and assumption be as in Proposition 3.6. Then the following inequality holds:*

$$\sum_{i=1}^L p_i m_{0,i} \geq \frac{2\nu(\mathcal{M})^2}{\sum_{i=1}^K p_i + 2 \sum_{i=K+1}^N p_i}.$$

Proof. The minimum of the LHS of (3.5), viewed as a quadratic form in ν_i , under the constraint

$$\sum_{i=1}^N p_i \nu_i = \nu(\mathcal{M}),$$

is attained at

$$2\nu_1 = \cdots = 2\nu_K = \nu_{K+1} = \cdots = \nu_N = \frac{2\nu(\mathcal{M})}{\sum_{i=1}^K p_i + 2 \sum_{i=K+1}^L p_i}.$$

Calculating the minimum, we get the required inequality. \square

3.4. $2n^2$ -inequalities for cA_1 points. We keep the notations as in Section 3.3. We set

$$(3.9) \quad \Sigma_0 = \sum_{i=1}^K p_i, \quad \Sigma_1 = \sum_{i=K+1}^L p_i, \quad \Sigma_2 = \sum_{i=L+1}^N p_i.$$

Theorem 3.8 ($2n^2$ -inequality for cA_1 points). *Let $\mathfrak{p} \in X$ be a terminal singularity of type cA_1 , \mathcal{M} be a mobile linear system of Cartier divisors on X , and let n be a positive rational number. If \mathfrak{p} is a center of non-canonical singularities of the pair $(X, \frac{1}{n}\mathcal{M})$, then for general members D_1, D_2 in \mathcal{M} we have*

$$\text{mult}_{\mathfrak{p}}(D_1 \cdot D_2) > 2n^2.$$

Proof. By the assumption, there exists a divisorial valuation ν of $\mathbb{C}(X)$ centered at \mathfrak{p} such that $(X, \frac{1}{n}\mathcal{M})$ is not canonical at ν , that is, the inequality

$$(3.10) \quad \nu(\mathcal{M}) > n(\Sigma_0 + 2\Sigma_1 + \Sigma_2)$$

holds for ν . Note that

$$(3.11) \quad \text{mult}_{\mathfrak{p}}(D_1 \cdot D_2) = m_{0,1} \geq m_{0,i}$$

for any $1 \leq i \leq L$. By (3.10), (3.11) and Corollary 3.7, we obtain

$$(3.12) \quad \text{mult}_{\mathfrak{p}}(D_1 \cdot D_2) > 2n^2 \frac{(\Sigma_0 + 2\Sigma_1 + \Sigma_2)^2}{(\Sigma_0 + \Sigma_1)(\Sigma_0 + 2\Sigma_1 + 2\Sigma_2)}.$$

It is then easy to get the required inequality. \square

Theorem 3.9 ($2n^2$ -type inequality for Kawakita blow-ups). *Let $\mathfrak{p} \in X$ be a terminal singularity of type cA_1 , n be a positive rational number, and \mathcal{M} be a mobile linear system of Cartier divisors on X . Let E be the exceptional divisor of $(s, 2t - s, t, 1)$ -blow-up of $\mathfrak{p} \in X$, where s, t are coprime integers such that $0 < s \leq t \leq M/2$. If the pair $(X, \frac{1}{n}\mathcal{M})$ is not canonical at E , then, for general members D_1, D_2 in \mathcal{M} , we have*

$$\text{mult}_{\mathfrak{p}}(D_1 \cdot D_2) > \frac{2t^2}{s(2t - s)} n^2.$$

Proof. We can get E by the sequence of regular blow-ups. The graph of the tower is a simple chain, there are s blow-ups of a double point and $(t - s)$ -blow-ups of a curve. Thus we have $N = t$, $\Sigma_0 = K = L = s$, $\Sigma_1 = 0$, and $\Sigma_2 = t - s$. The required inequality is obtained by substituting these values into the inequality (3.12). \square

Remark 3.10. In Theorem 3.8, compared to the $4n^2$ -inequality (Theorem 1.1), we keep the dimension three but we make the germ of a point worse by introducing singularities. As a result, we weaken the original inequality.

On the other hand one can increase the dimension and see what kind of singularities still satisfy the $4n^2$ -inequality, for example see [Puk17]. This approach has been applied to prove birational rigidity of many families of high dimensional varieties: hypersurfaces, cyclic covers, complete intersections ([Puk19a], [Puk19b], [EP18], [EP19]).

3.5. Corti inequality for cA_1 points. We keep the notations as in Section 3.3 and let $\Sigma_0, \Sigma_1, \Sigma_2$ be as in (3.9). The following is a version of Corti inequality [Cor00, Theorem 3.12] for cA_1 points.

Theorem 3.11 (Corti inequality for cA_1 points). *Let $\mathfrak{p} \in X$ be a terminal singularity of type cA_1 , and let \mathcal{M} be a mobile linear system of Cartier divisors on X . Let $F_1, \dots, F_l \subset X$ be irreducible surfaces containing \mathfrak{p} . For the intersection 1-cycle $Z = D_1 \cdot D_2$ of general members D_1, D_2 in \mathcal{M} , we write*

$$Z = Z_h + \sum_{j=1}^l Z_j,$$

where $\text{Supp } Z_j \subset F_j$, and Z_h intersects $\sum_{i=1}^l F_i$ properly. Let n and γ_j be positive rational numbers such that \mathfrak{p} is a center of non-canonical singularities of the pair

$$(3.13) \quad \left(X, \frac{1}{n} \mathcal{M} - \sum_{j=1}^l \gamma_j F_j \right).$$

Then there are rational numbers $0 < t_j \leq 1$ such that

$$\text{mult}_{\mathfrak{p}} Z_h + \sum_{j=1}^l t_j \text{mult}_{\mathfrak{p}} Z_j > 2n^2 + 4n^2 \sum_{j=1}^l \gamma_j t_j.$$

Proof. We first note that

$$a(E_{\infty}, X) = \Sigma_0 + 2\Sigma_1 + \Sigma_2,$$

where we recall that $E_{\infty} = E_N$ is the prime exceptional divisor realizing ν . By the assumption that the pair (3.13) is not canonical at ν , we have

$$(3.14) \quad \nu(\mathcal{M}) > n \left(\Sigma_0 + 2\Sigma_1 + \Sigma_2 + \sum_{j=1}^k \gamma_j \nu(F_j) \right).$$

For $j = 1, \dots, l$, we set

$$K_j = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } \mathfrak{p} \notin F_j, \\ \max \{ i \leq L \mid B_{i-1} \notin F_j^{(i-1)} \}, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

and then set

$$\Xi_j = \sum_{i=1}^{K_j} p_i.$$

We have

$$(3.15) \quad \begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^L p_i m_{0,i} &= \sum_{i=1}^L p_i \operatorname{mult}_{B_{i-1}}(Z_h^{(i-1)}) + \sum_{j=1}^l \sum_{i=1}^{K_j} p_i \operatorname{mult}_{B_{i-1}}(Z_j^{(i-1)}) \\ &\leq (\Sigma_0 + \Sigma_1) \operatorname{mult}_{\mathbf{p}} Z_h + \sum_{j=1}^l \Xi_j \operatorname{mult}_{\mathbf{p}} Z_j, \end{aligned}$$

since $\operatorname{mult}_{B_{i-1}}(Z_h^{(i-1)}) \leq \operatorname{mult}_{\mathbf{p}} Z_h$ and $\operatorname{mult}_{B_{i-1}}(Z_j^{(i-1)}) \leq \operatorname{mult}_{\mathbf{p}} Z_j$ for every $1 \leq i \leq L$.

By the inequality in Corollary 3.7 combined with two inequalities (3.14), (3.15), we get the inequality

$$(3.16) \quad \begin{aligned} &(\Sigma_0 + \Sigma_1) \operatorname{mult}_{\mathbf{p}} Z_h + \sum_{j=1}^l \Xi_j \operatorname{mult}_{\mathbf{p}} Z_j \\ &\geq \sum_{i=1}^L p_i m_{0,i} \\ &> 2n^2 \Sigma_0 + 4n^2 \Sigma_1 + 4n^2 \sum_{j=1}^l \gamma_j \nu(F_j) + 2n^2 \frac{(\Sigma_2 - \sum_{j=1}^l \gamma_j \nu(F_j))^2}{\Sigma_0 + 2\Sigma_1 + 2\Sigma_2} \\ &\geq 2n^2(\Sigma_0 + \Sigma_1) + 4n^2 \sum_{j=1}^l \gamma_j \Xi_j, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from the inequality $\nu(F_j) \geq \sum_{i=1}^{K_j} p_i = \Xi_j$. Dividing (3.16) by $\Sigma_0 + \Sigma_1$ and setting

$$t_j = \frac{\Xi_j}{\Sigma_0 + \Sigma_1},$$

we get the required inequality. \square

4. SEXTIC DOUBLE SOLIDS

Recall that a sextic double solid is a normal projective 3-fold X which is a double cover of \mathbb{P}^3 branched along a sextic surface. A sextic double solid can be expressed as a weighted hypersurface in $\mathbb{P}(1, 1, 1, 1, 3)$ with homogeneous coordinates x, y, z, t, w of weights 1, 1, 1, 1, 3, respectively, defined by an equation of the form

$$(4.1) \quad w^2 + g_6(x, y, z, t) = 0,$$

where $g_6 \in \mathbb{C}[x, y, z, t]$ is a homogeneous polynomial of degree 6.

The aim of this section is to prove the following.

Theorem 4.1. *Let X be a factorial sextic double solid with at worst terminal singularities of type cA_1 . Then X is birationally superrigid.*

In the rest of this section, X is a sextic double solid and we assume that X is factorial and has only terminal Gorenstein singularities. We do not impose any other condition on the singularities unless otherwise specified. We denote by $\pi: X \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^3$ the double cover and by $B \subset \mathbb{P}^3$ the branch divisor which is a sextic surface.

Remark 4.2. Under the assumption that a sextic double solid X has only Gorenstein terminal singularities, \mathbb{Q} -factoriality of X is equivalent to factoriality of X , that is, $\text{Pic}(X) = \text{Cl}(X) = \mathbb{Z}[-K_X]$ (see [Kaw88, Lemma 6.3]).

4.1. Exclusion of smooth points. The exclusion of smooth points as a maximal center is done as follows.

Proposition 4.3 ([CP10, Lemma 3.1]). *No smooth point of X is a maximal center.*

4.2. Exclusion of curves.

Lemma 4.4. *A curve on X is not a maximal center except possibly for a curve of degree 1 which passes through a singular point of X and whose image via π is not contained in the sextic surface B .*

Proof. Let Γ be a curve on X . Suppose that Γ is a maximal center. Then $(-K_X \cdot \Gamma) < (-K_X)^3 = 2$ by Lemma 2.7. It follows that Γ is a curve of degree 1 on X . By the assumption, there exists a movable linear system $\mathcal{M} \sim -nK_X$ on X such that the pair $(X, \frac{1}{n}\mathcal{M})$ is not canonical along Γ . In particular we have $\text{mult}_\Gamma \mathcal{M} > n$.

In the following, we merely repeat the arguments in the proof of [CP10, Lemma 3.8] for readers' convenience. Suppose that $\pi(\Gamma)$ is contained in the sextic surface $B \subset \mathbb{P}^3$. We choose and fix a smooth point $\mathfrak{p} \in \Gamma$ which is contained in the smooth locus of X and which is not contained in any curve in $\text{Bs } \mathcal{M}$ other than Γ . Let $L \subset \mathbb{P}^3$ be a general line tangent to B at $\pi(\mathfrak{p})$ and let Δ be the inverse image of L by π . We see that Δ is a curve of degree 2 which is singular at \mathfrak{p} . Moreover, by our choice of \mathfrak{p} , Δ is not contained in the base locus of \mathcal{M} . Then we obtain

$$2n = (\mathcal{M} \cdot \Delta) \geq \text{mult}_{\mathfrak{p}} \mathcal{M} \text{mult}_{\mathfrak{p}} \Delta \geq \text{mult}_\Gamma \mathcal{M} \text{mult}_{\mathfrak{p}} \Delta > 2n.$$

This is a contradiction. \square

In the following, let Γ be a curve of degree 1 such that $\Gamma \cap \text{Sing } X \neq \emptyset$ and $\pi(\Gamma) \not\subset B$. The image $\pi(\Gamma) \subset \mathbb{P}^3$ is a line and we can write

$$\Gamma = (\ell_1 = \ell_2 = w - g_3 = 0),$$

where $\ell_1, \ell_2 \in \mathbb{C}[x, y, z, t]$ are linear forms and $g_3 \in \mathbb{C}[x, y, z, t]$ is a cubic form. We define \mathcal{P} to be the linear subsystem of $|-K_X|$ consisting of members containing Γ , which is the pencil generated by ℓ_1 and ℓ_2 , and let S, T be distinct general members of \mathcal{P} . We have $T|_S = \Gamma + \Delta$, where

$$\Delta = (\ell_1 = \ell_2 = w + g_3 = 0).$$

By the assumption that $\pi(\Gamma) \not\subset B$, we have $g_3 \neq 0$, in other words, $\Delta \neq \Gamma$. Consider the scheme-theoretic intersection

$$\Gamma \cap \Delta = (\ell_1 = \ell_2 = w = g_3 = 0) \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 1, 1, 1, 3),$$

which consists of 3 points counting with multiplicity.

Remark 4.5. We have $\Gamma \cap \Delta = \pi^{-1}(\pi(\Gamma) \cap B)$ set-theoretically. A singular point $\mathbf{p} \in X$ necessary satisfies $\pi(\mathbf{p}) \in B$, so that a point $\mathbf{p} \in \Gamma \cap \text{Sing } X$ is contained in $\Gamma \cap \Delta$.

We choose and fix a point $\mathbf{p} \in \Gamma$ which is a cA_k point of X , where $k = 1, 2$. We choose homogeneous coordinates x, y, z, t, w of $\mathbb{P}(1, 1, 1, 1, 3)$ so that X is defined by

$$(4.2) \quad -w^2 + x^4 f_2 + x^3 f_3 + x^2 f_4 + x f_5 + f_6 = 0,$$

where $f_i = f_i(y, z, t)$ is a homogeneous polynomial of degree i , and $\mathbf{p} = (1:0:0:0:0)$. This choice of coordinates is possible by [Pae21, Theorem A]. Replacing coordinates y, z, t (while fixing the point $\mathbf{p} = (1:0:0:0:0)$), we may assume $\pi(\Gamma) = (z = t = 0) \subset \mathbb{P}^3$, that is, $\ell_1 = z$ and $\ell_2 = t$. Then we can write

$$(4.3) \quad \Gamma = (z = t = w - (\lambda x^2 y + \mu x y^2 + \nu y^3) = 0) \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 1, 1, 1, 3),$$

for some $\lambda, \mu, \nu \in \mathbb{C}$. Note that at least one of λ, μ, ν is nonzero since $\pi(\Gamma) \not\subset B$. Note also that

$$(4.4) \quad x^4 f_2(y, 0, 0) + x^3 f_3(y, 0, 0) + \cdots + f_6(y, 0, 0) = (\lambda x^2 y + \mu x y^2 + \nu y^3)^2$$

since $\Gamma \subset X$. With this choice of coordinates, the pencil \mathcal{P} is generated by z and t . The point \mathbf{p} is a multiplicity 1 (resp. 2, resp. 3) point of $\Gamma \cap \Delta$ if and only if $\lambda \neq 0$ (resp. $\lambda = 0$ and $\mu \neq 0$, resp. $\lambda = \mu = 0$ and $\nu \neq 0$). Let S be a general member of \mathcal{P} . We analyze the type of $G(S, \mathbf{p}, \Gamma)$.

Lemma 4.6. *Under the notation and assumption as above, let $\mathbf{p} \in \Gamma$ be a cA_1 point of X . Then the following assertions hold.*

- (1) *If $\text{mult}_{\mathbf{p}} \Gamma \cap \Delta = 1$, then $G(S, \mathbf{p}, \Gamma)$ is of type $A_{1,1}$.*
- (2) *If $\text{mult}_{\mathbf{p}} \Gamma \cap \Delta = 2$, then $G(S, \mathbf{p}, \Gamma)$ is of type $A_{1,1}$ or $A_{3,2}$.*
- (3) *If $\text{mult}_{\mathbf{p}} \Gamma \cap \Delta = 3$, then $G(S, \mathbf{p}, \Gamma)$ is of type $A_{1,1}$, $A_{3,2}$ or $A_{5,3}$.*

Proof. We choose homogeneous coordinates of $\mathbb{P} := \mathbb{P}(1, 1, 1, 1, 3)$ as above, that is, $\mathbf{p} = (1:0:0:0:0)$, X is defined by the equation (4.2), and Γ is the one given in (4.3). In the following, we assume that a general member $S \in \mathcal{P}$ is cut out by the equation $t = \theta z$ for a general $\theta \in \mathbb{C}$. We set $U_x := \mathbb{P}(1, 1, 1, 1, 3) \setminus (x = 0)$ and, by a slight abuse of notation, we identify U_x with the affine space \mathbb{A}^4 with affine coordinates y, z, t, w .

We first prove (1). Suppose $\text{mult}_{\mathbf{p}} \Gamma \cap \Delta = 1$, that is, $\lambda \neq 0$. In view of the equation (4.4), we can write

$$f_2 = \lambda^2 y^2 + y \ell(z, t) + q(z, t),$$

where $\ell(z, t)$ and $q(z, t)$ are linear and quadratic forms, respectively. Note that at least one of $\ell(z, t)$ and $q(z, t)$ is nonzero since $\mathbf{p} \in X$ is of type cA_1 . By eliminating the variable $t = \theta z$, S is defined in $\mathbb{P}(1, 1, 1, 1, 3)$ by the equation

$$-w^2 + x^4 (\lambda^2 y^2 + \zeta y z + \eta z^2) + x^3 f_3(y, z, \theta z) + \cdots = 0,$$

where $\zeta, \eta \in \mathbb{C}$ satisfy $(\zeta, \eta) \neq (0, 0)$. By setting $x = 1$, $S \cap U_x$ is isomorphic to the hypersurface in $\mathbb{A}_{y,z,w}^3$ defined by

$$-w^2 + \lambda^2 y^2 + \zeta y z + \eta z^2 + h_{\geq 3}(y, z) = 0,$$

where $h_{\geq 3}(y, z)$ is a polynomial of order at least 3. The point $\mathfrak{p} = (1:0:0:0:0)$ corresponds to the origin and the curve Γ is defined in \mathbb{A}^3 by the equations

$$(4.5) \quad z = w - \lambda y - \mu y^2 - \nu y^3 = 0.$$

It is easy to see that $\mathfrak{p} \in S$ is of type A_1 and the proper transform via the blowup of $\mathfrak{p} \in S$ of Γ intersects the exceptional divisor transversally at one point. It follows that $G(S, \mathfrak{p}, \Gamma)$ is of type $A_{1,1}$.

We prove (2). Suppose $\text{mult}_{\mathfrak{p}} \Gamma \cap \Delta = 2$, that is, $\lambda = 0$ and $\mu \neq 0$. We can write

$$f_2 = y\ell(z, t) + q(z, t),$$

where $\ell(z, t)$ and $q(z, t)$ are linear and quadratic forms, respectively. Let $\zeta, \eta \in \mathbb{C}$ be such that $\ell(z, \theta z) = \zeta z$ and $q(z, \theta z) = \eta z^2$. Then, by eliminating t and setting $x = 1$, $S \cap U_x$ is isomorphic to the hypersurface in $\mathbb{A}_{y,z,w}^3$ defined by the equation

$$-w^2 + \zeta yz + \eta z^2 + z(h_2(y, z) + h_3(y, z)) + \mu^2 y^4 + h_{\geq 5}(y, z) = 0,$$

where $h_2, h_3 \in \mathbb{C}[y, z]$ are homogeneous polynomials of degree 2, 3, respectively, and $h_{\geq 5} \in \mathbb{C}[y, z]$ is a polynomial of order at least 5. The curve Γ is defined in \mathbb{A}^3 by the equations

$$(4.6) \quad z = w - \mu y^2 - \nu y^3 = 0.$$

Suppose that $\ell(z, t) \neq 0$. Then $\zeta \neq 0$, and it is easy to see that $\mathfrak{p} \in S$ is of type A_1 and $G(S, \mathfrak{p}, \Gamma)$ is of type $A_{1,1}$.

Suppose that $\ell(z, t) = 0$. Then $\zeta = 0$ and $\eta \neq 0$. We see that $\mathfrak{p} \in S$ is of type A_3 . The exceptional divisors of the blow-up $\tilde{S} \rightarrow S$ at \mathfrak{p} consist of two lines E_1, E_2 intersecting the A_1 point of \tilde{S} which we denote by \mathfrak{q} , and the proper transform $\tilde{\Gamma}$ intersects $E_1 \cup E_2$ only at the point \mathfrak{q} . Let $\hat{S} \rightarrow \tilde{S}$ be the blow-up at \mathfrak{q} , and let $\hat{\Gamma}, \hat{E}_1, \hat{E}_2$ be proper transforms of $\tilde{\Gamma}, E_1, E_2$, respectively. We see that $\hat{\Gamma}$ intersects the new exceptional divisor E_3 transversally at one point which is disjoint from \hat{E}_1 and \hat{E}_2 . It follows that $G(S, \mathfrak{p}, \Gamma)$ is of type $A_{3,2}$.

We prove (3). Suppose $\text{mult}_{\mathfrak{p}} \Gamma \cap \Delta = 3$, that is, $\lambda = \mu = 0$ and $\nu \neq 0$. We can write

$$f_2 = y\ell(z, t) + q(z, t)$$

as before. If $\ell(z, t) \neq 0$, then $G(S, \mathfrak{p}, \Gamma)$ is of type $A_{1,1}$ as in the previous case. We assume $\ell(z, t) = 0$. Then $q(z, t) \neq 0$, and by eliminating t and setting $x = 1$, $S \cap U_x$ is isomorphic to the hypersurface in $\mathbb{A}_{y,z,w}^3$ defined by the equation

$$-w^2 + \eta z^2 + zh(y, z) + \nu^2 y^6 = 0,$$

where $\eta \in \mathbb{C}$ is nonzero and $h(y, z)$ is a polynomial consisting of monomials of degree 2, 3, 4, 5. The curve Γ is defined in \mathbb{A}^3 by the equations

$$(4.7) \quad z = w - \nu y^3 = 0.$$

We write

$$h(y, 0) = \alpha_2 y^2 + \alpha_3 y^3 + \alpha_4 y^4 + \alpha_5 y^5,$$

where $\alpha_i \in \mathbb{C}$.

If $\alpha_2 \neq 0$, then $\mathfrak{p} \in S$ is of type A_3 and $G(S, \mathfrak{p}, \Gamma)$ is of type $A_{3,2}$. If $\alpha_2 = 0$, then $\mathfrak{p} \in S$ is of type A_5 and $G(S, \mathfrak{p}, \Gamma)$ is of type $A_{5,3}$. This completes the proof. \square

TABLE 1. Types of $G(S, \mathfrak{p}, \Gamma)$

$\mathfrak{p} \in X$	$\text{mult}_{\mathfrak{p}} \Gamma \cap \Delta$	$G(S, \mathfrak{p}, \Gamma)$	Correct. term
cA_1	1	$A_{1,1}$	$\frac{1}{2}$
cA_1	2	$A_{1,1}$ or $A_{3,2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$ or 1
cA_1	3	$A_{1,1}$ or $A_{3,2}$ or $A_{5,3}$	$\frac{1}{2}$ or 1 or $\frac{3}{2}$
cA_2	1	$A_{2,1}$	$\frac{2}{3}$
cA_2	2	$A_{3,2}$	1
cA_2	3	$A_{3,2}$ or $A_{5,3}$	1 or $\frac{3}{2}$

Lemma 4.7. *Under the notation and assumption as above, let $\mathfrak{p} \in \Gamma$ be a cA_2 -point of X . Then the following assertions hold.*

- (1) *If $\text{mult}_{\mathfrak{p}} \Gamma \cap \Delta = 1$, then $G(S, \mathfrak{p}, \Gamma)$ is of type $A_{2,1}$.*
- (2) *If $\text{mult}_{\mathfrak{p}} \Gamma \cap \Delta = 2$, then $G(S, \mathfrak{p}, \Gamma)$ is of type $A_{3,2}$.*
- (3) *If $\text{mult}_{\mathfrak{p}} \Gamma \cap \Delta = 3$, then $G(S, \mathfrak{p}, \Gamma)$ is of type $A_{3,2}$ or $A_{5,3}$.*

Proof. We use the same notation as in the previous proof.

We prove (1). Suppose $\text{mult}_{\mathfrak{p}} \Gamma \cap \Delta = 1$, that is, $\lambda \neq 0$. Since $\mathfrak{p} \in X$ is of type cA_2 , we have $f_2 = \lambda^2 y^2$ and $f_3(0, z, t) \neq 0$ as a polynomial. Then, by eliminating t and setting $x = 1$, $S \cap U_x$ is isomorphic to the hypersurface in $\mathbb{A}_{y,z,w}^3$ defined by the equation

$$-w^2 + \lambda^2 y^2 + \zeta z^3 + \alpha y z^2 + \beta y^2 z + h_{\geq 4}(y, z) = 0,$$

where $\alpha, \beta, \zeta \in \mathbb{C}$ with $\zeta \neq 0$ and $h_{\geq 4}(y, z)$ is a polynomial of order at least 4. The point $\mathfrak{p} = (1:0:0:0:0)$ corresponds to the origin and the curve Γ is defined in \mathbb{A}^3 by the equations (4.5). We see that $\mathfrak{p} \in S$ is of type A_2 and, by considering the blow-up of $\mathfrak{p} \in S$, it is also easy to see that $G(S, \mathfrak{p}, \Gamma)$ is of type $A_{2,1}$.

We prove (2). Suppose $\text{mult}_{\mathfrak{p}} \Gamma \cap \Delta = 2$, that is, $\lambda = 0$ and $\nu \neq 0$. We see that f_2 is a square of a linear form in z and t . We may assume $f_2 = z^2$ by replacing z and t . By eliminating t and setting $x = 1$, $S \cap U_x$ is isomorphic to the hypersurface in $\mathbb{A}_{y,z,w}^3$ defined by the equation

$$-w^2 + z^2 + zh_2(y, z) + \mu^2 y^4 + h_{\geq 5}(y, z) = 0,$$

where $h_2(y, z)$ is a homogeneous polynomial of degree 2 and $h_{\geq 5}(y, z)$ is a polynomial of order at least 5. The curve Γ is defined in \mathbb{A}^3 by the equations (4.6). We see that $\mathfrak{p} \in S$ is of type A_3 and $G(S, \mathfrak{p}, \Gamma)$ is of type $A_{3,2}$.

We prove (3). Suppose $\text{mult}_{\mathfrak{p}} \Gamma \cap \Delta = 3$, that is, $\lambda = \mu = 0$ and $\nu \neq 0$. As in previous arguments, $S \cap U_x$ is isomorphic to the hypersurface in $\mathbb{A}_{y,z,w}^3$ defined by the equation

$$-w^2 + z^2 + zh(y, z) + \nu^2 y^6 = 0,$$

where $h(y, z)$ is a polynomial consisting of monomials of degree 2, 3, 4, 5. The curve Γ is defined in \mathbb{A}^3 by the equations (4.7). By the same argument as in the proof of Lemma 4.6 (3), we conclude that $G(S, \mathfrak{p}, \Gamma)$ is of type $A_{3,2}$ or $A_{5,3}$. \square

The results obtained by Lemmas 4.6 and 4.7 are summarized in Table 1, where the correction term given in the right-most column is the number $k(n-k+1)/(n+1)$ (corresponding to the extended graph of type $A_{n,k}$) appearing in Lemma 2.11.

Proposition 4.8. *Let X be a factorial sextic double solid with at worst terminal singularities of type cA_1 and cA_2 . Then no curve on X is a maximal center.*

Proof. By Lemma 4.4, it remains to consider a curve Γ of degree 1 such that $\Gamma \cap \text{Sing } X \neq \emptyset$ and $\pi(\Gamma) \not\subset B$.

Let $\mathcal{P} \subset |-K_X|$ be the pencil as above, and let $S, T \in \mathcal{P}$ be general members. By [Oka20b, Lemma 10.4], S and T are smooth outside $\Gamma \cap \text{Sing } X$. We have $T|_S = \Gamma + \Delta$, where $\Delta \neq \Gamma$ is also a curve of degree 1. We see that $\Gamma \cap \Delta$ consists of 3 points counting with multiplicity.

We compute the self-intersection number $(\Gamma^2)_S$. Let $\mathfrak{p}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{p}_l$ be the points in $\Gamma \cap \text{Sing}(X)$. By Remark 4.5, these points are contained in $\Gamma \cap \Delta$. We set $m_i = \text{mult}_{\mathfrak{p}_i} \Gamma \cap \Delta$. Then $l \leq \sum m_i \leq 3$. Let A_{n_i, k_i} be the type of $G(S, \mathfrak{p}_i, \Gamma)$ which is described in Lemmas 4.6 and 4.7 (see also Table 1). Since $K_S = 0$ and $\Gamma \cong \mathbb{P}^1$, we have

$$(\Gamma^2)_S = -2 + \sum_{i=1}^l \frac{k_i(n_i - k_i + 1)}{n_i + 1}$$

by Lemma 2.11. By considering all the possible combinations of singular points $\mathfrak{p}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{p}_l$ satisfying $m_i \leq 3$, we have the upper bound

$$(\Gamma^2)_S \leq -2 + \left(\frac{2}{3} + \frac{2}{3} + \frac{2}{3} \right) = 0,$$

where this maximum (of the correction term corresponding to singular points) is attained when $\Gamma \cap \Delta$ consists of 3 multiplicity 1 points of $\Gamma \cap \Delta$ which are cA_2 singular points of X . Since $T|_S = \Gamma + \Delta$, we have

$$(\Gamma \cdot \Delta)_S = (T|_S \cdot \Gamma)_S - (\Gamma^2)_S \geq 1 = (-K_X \cdot \Delta).$$

Thus, by Lemma 2.8, the curve Γ is not a maximal center. \square

4.3. Exclusion of cA_1 points and proof of Theorem 4.1.

Proposition 4.9. *Let X be a factorial sextic double solid with at worst terminal singularities of type cA_1 . Then no singular point on X is a maximal center.*

Proof. Let $\mathfrak{p} \in X$ be a cA_1 point. Suppose that \mathfrak{p} is a maximal center. Then, by Theorems 3.8, there exists a mobile linear system $\mathcal{M} \subset |\mathcal{O}_X(n)|$ on X such that

$$\text{mult}_{\mathfrak{p}}(D_1 \cdot D_2) > 2n^2,$$

where D_1, D_2 are general members in \mathcal{M} . Let \mathcal{H} be the linear subsystem of $|\mathcal{O}_X(1)|$ consisting of divisors vanishing at \mathfrak{p} . Then the base locus of \mathcal{H} consists of at most 2 points (including \mathfrak{p}), and hence we can take a divisor S in \mathcal{H} which does not contain any component of the effective 1-cycle $D_1 \cdot D_2$. Then, we have

$$2n^2 = (S \cdot D_1 \cdot D_2) > 2n^2.$$

This is a contradiction and \mathfrak{p} is not a maximal center. \square

Proof of Theorem 4.1. This is a consequence of Propositions 4.3, 4.8 and 4.9. \square

4.4. Sarkisov links centered at cA_3 singular points. Let X be a factorial sextic double solid with only terminal Gorenstein singularities and suppose that X admits a cA_3 point $\mathfrak{p} \in X$. Then X is a hypersurface of degree 6 in $\mathbb{P}(1, 1, 1, 1, 3)$ with homogeneous coordinates x, y, z, t, w of weights 1, 1, 1, 1, 3, respectively, and by [Pae21, Theorem A] the defining polynomial can be written as

$$(4.8) \quad f = -w^2 + x^4 t^2 + x^3 t f_2 + x^2 f_4 + x f_5 + f_6,$$

where $f_i \in \mathbb{C}[y, z, t]$ is a homogeneous polynomial of degree i . Moreover the cA_3 point \mathfrak{p} is $(1:0:0:0) \in X$. We set $g_4 = f_4 - \frac{1}{4}f_2^2$ and then

$$(4.9) \quad f_{\pm} = -w(w \pm (x^2 t + x f_2)) + x^2 g_4 + x f_5 + f_6.$$

Let $X_{\pm} \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 1, 1, 1, 3)$ be the hypersurface defined by $f_{\pm} = 0$. We see that X is isomorphic to X_{\pm} by the coordinate change $w \mapsto w \pm (x^2 t + \frac{1}{2} x f_2)$.

We set $U = X \setminus (x = 0) \cap X$ and $U_{\pm} = X_{\pm} \setminus (x = 0) \cap X_{\pm}$ which are affine open subsets of X and X_{\pm} , respectively, and we have

$$\begin{aligned} U &= (-w^2 + t^2 + t f_2 + f_4 + f_5 + f_6 = 0) \subset \mathbb{A}_{y,z,t,w}^4, \\ U_{\pm} &= (-w(w \pm (t + f_2)) + g_4 + f_5 + f_6 = 0) \subset \mathbb{A}_{y,z,t,w}^4. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\varphi: Y \rightarrow X$ and $\varphi_{\pm}: Y_{\pm} \rightarrow X_{\pm}$ be the birational morphisms obtained as the weighted blow-up of U and U_{\pm} at the origin with weights $\text{wt}(y, z, t, w) = (1, 1, 2, 2)$ and $\text{wt}(y, z, t, w) = (1, 1, 1, 3)$, respectively. According to the classification of divisorial contractions to cA points [Kaw03, Theorem 1.13], φ, φ_{\pm} are all the divisorial contractions of $\mathfrak{p} \in X$ with discrepancy 1. We sometimes identify φ_{\pm} with the composite $Y_{\pm} \xrightarrow{\varphi_{\pm}} X_{\pm} \cong X$. We call φ_+ , φ and φ_- the $(3, 1, 1, 1)$ -, $(2, 2, 1, 1)$ - and $(1, 3, 1, 1)$ -Kawakita blow-ups of $\mathfrak{p} \in X$, respectively.

4.4.1. $(3, 1, 1, 1)$ -, and $(1, 3, 1, 1)$ -Kawakita blow-ups. We consider the $(3, 1, 1, 1)$ - and $(1, 3, 1, 1)$ -Kawakita blow-up φ_{\pm} of $\mathfrak{p} \in X$, and show that there is a Sarkisov self-link initiated by φ_{\pm} if φ_{\pm} is a maximal extraction.

Let $\pi_{X_{\pm}}: X_{\pm} \dashrightarrow \mathbb{P}(1, 1, 1, 3)$ be the projection to the coordinates y, z, t, w , which is defined outside the point $\mathfrak{p} = (1:0:0:0) \in X_{\pm}$. The sections $y, z, t \in H^0(X_{\pm}, -K_{X_{\pm}})$ lift to sections $\tilde{y}, \tilde{z}, \tilde{t}$ in $H^0(Y_{\pm}, -K_{Y_{\pm}})$, and $w \in H^0(X_{\pm}, -3K_{X_{\pm}})$ lifts to a section \tilde{w} in $H^0(Y_{\pm}, -3K_{Y_{\pm}})$. These sections $\tilde{y}, \tilde{z}, \tilde{t}$ and \tilde{w} define the composite $\pi_{Y_{\pm}} := \pi_{X_{\pm}} \circ \varphi_{\pm}: Y_{\pm} \dashrightarrow \mathbb{P}(1, 1, 1, 3)$, and their common zero locus (on Y_{\pm}) is empty. This is verified in the following way. For the φ_{\pm} -exceptional divisor E_{\pm} , we have the natural isomorphism

$$E_{\pm} \cong (-w(\pm t + f_2) + g_4 = 0) \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 1, 1, 3) = \text{Proj } \mathbb{C}[y, z, t, w],$$

and the restriction of the sections $\tilde{y}, \tilde{z}, \tilde{t}, \tilde{w}$ on E_{\pm} are y, z, t, w , respectively. Thus their common zero loci on E_{\pm} , and hence on Y_{\pm} , are empty. It follows that $\pi_{Y_{\pm}}: Y_{\pm} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}(1, 1, 1, 3)$ is a morphism. The defining polynomial f_{\pm} given in (4.9) is quadratic with respect to x :

$$f_{\pm} = x^2(g_4 \mp wt) + x(f_5 \mp w f_2) + f_6 - w^2.$$

We set

$$D_4 := (wt + f_4 = 0)_{X_{\pm}}, \quad D_5 := (w f_2 + f_5 = 0)_{X_{\pm}}, \quad D_6 := (w^2 + f_6 = 0)_{X_{\pm}},$$

and denote by \tilde{D}_i the proper transform of D_i on Y_{\pm} . We see that $\pi_{Y_{\pm}}$ is a generically finite morphism of degree 2 which contracts the subset $\Xi := \tilde{D}_4 \cap \tilde{D}_5 \cap \tilde{D}_6$ onto its image

$$\pi_{Y_{\pm}}(\Xi) = (g_4 \mp wt = f_5 \mp wf_2 = f_6 - w^2 = 0) \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 1, 1, 3).$$

Let $Y_{\pm} \xrightarrow{\psi_{\pm}} Z_{\pm} \xrightarrow{\pi_{Z_{\pm}}} \mathbb{P}(1, 1, 1, 3)$ be the Stein factorization of $\pi_{Y_{\pm}}$. Then ψ_{\pm} is the birational morphism defined by $|-rK_{Y_{\pm}}|$ for sufficiently large $r > 0$ and $\pi_{Z_{\pm}}$ is a double cover. Note that $-K_{Y_{\pm}}$ is nef and big but not ample. Let $\iota_{\pm}: Z_{\pm} \rightarrow Z_{\pm}$ be the biregular involution interchanging two points in fibers of the double cover $\pi_{Z_{\pm}}$, and consider the diagram

$$(4.10) \quad \begin{array}{ccccc} & & Y_{\pm} & \overset{\tau_{\pm}}{\dashrightarrow} & Y_{\pm} & & \\ & \swarrow \varphi_{\pm} & & & & \searrow \varphi_{\pm} & \\ & X_{\pm} & & & & X_{\pm} & \\ & & \searrow \psi_{\pm} & & \swarrow \psi_{\pm} & & \\ & & Z_{\pm} & \xrightarrow{\iota_{\pm}} & Z_{\pm} & & \end{array}$$

where $\tau_{\pm} := \psi_{\pm}^{-1} \circ \iota_{\pm} \circ \psi_{\pm}$.

Proposition 4.10. *Let X be a factorial sextic double solid X with only terminal Gorenstein singularities and let $\mathfrak{p} \in X$ be a cA_3 point. Let $\varphi_{\pm}: Y_{\pm} \rightarrow X$ be the $(3, 1, 1, 1)$ -, $(1, 3, 1, 1)$ -Kawakita blow-ups with center \mathfrak{p} . Then one of the following holds.*

- (1) ψ_{\pm} is divisorial. In this case φ_{\pm} is not a maximal extraction.
- (2) ψ_{\pm} is small. In this case τ_{\pm} is the flop of ψ_{\pm} and the diagram (4.10) gives a Sarkisov self-link $\sigma_{\pm}: X \dashrightarrow X$ initiated by φ_{\pm} .

Proof. This follows from the above arguments and [Oka18, Lemma 3.2]. \square

4.4.2. $(2, 2, 1, 1)$ -Kawakita blow-up. We consider the $(2, 2, 1, 1)$ -Kawakita-blow-up $\varphi: Y \rightarrow X$ of $\mathfrak{p} \in X$, and show that φ is not a maximal extraction.

Proposition 4.11. *Let X be a factorial sextic double solid X with only terminal Gorenstein singularities and let $\mathfrak{p} \in X$ be a cA_3 point. Let $\varphi: Y \rightarrow X$ be the $(2, 2, 1, 1)$ -Kawakita blow-up. Then φ is not a maximal extraction.*

Proof. Let $\pi: X \dashrightarrow \mathbb{P}(1, 1, 1, 2, 4)$ be the map defined by

$$(x:y:z:t:w) \mapsto (y:z:t:xt:wt).$$

Let y, z, t, α, β be the homogeneous coordinates of $\mathbb{P}(1, 1, 1, 2, 4)$ of weights 1, 1, 1, 2, 4, respectively. Then the image of π , denoted by Z , is the hypersurface in $\mathbb{P}(1, 1, 1, 2, 4)$ defined by

$$h := -\beta^2 + \alpha^4 + \alpha^3 f_2 + \alpha^2 f_4 + \alpha t f_5 + t^2 f_6 = 0,$$

where h is obtained by replacing xt by α and wt by β in $t^2 f$. The sections y, z, t, xt, wt lift to pluri-anticanonical sections on Y and their common zero locus (on Y) is empty. It follows that the induced map $\psi = \pi \circ \varphi: Y \dashrightarrow Z$ is a morphism, and we have the commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & Y & \\ \varphi \swarrow & & \searrow \psi \\ X & \dashrightarrow \pi & Z \end{array}$$

Note that ψ is a birational morphism and it contracts the proper transform of the divisor $(t = 0)_X$ to the curve

$$\mathbb{P}^1 \cong (t = \alpha = \beta = 0) \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 1, 1, 2, 4).$$

Moreover ψ is defined by $|-rK_Y|$ for a sufficiently large $r > 0$, and thus any curve contracted by ψ is K_Y -trivial. It follows that there are infinitely many curves on Y which intersect $-K_Y$ non-positively and the ψ -exceptional divisor E positively. By [Oka18, Lemma 2.20], φ is not a maximal extraction. \square

Remark 4.12. Let X be a factorial sextic double solid with only terminal cA_1, cA_2, cA_3 points. We can exclude smooth points and cA_1 points as a maximal center. Moreover we can exclude curves on X except possibly for curves of degree 1 passing through a cA_3 point. Therefore, for the proof of birational rigidity of X , it remains to show the following:

- Any curve of degree 1 passing through a cA_3 point is not a maximal center.
- Any cA_2 point is not a maximal center.
- Any divisorial contraction to a cA_3 point with discrepancy at least 2 (if it exists) is not a maximal extraction.

4.5. Factorial sextic double solids. In this section, we provide a criterion for \mathbb{Q} -factoriality of sextic double solids with terminal cA_1 singularities. If a 3-fold X with only terminal singularities is a Fano, a hypersurface of \mathbb{P}^4 , or a cyclic cover of \mathbb{P}^3 , the Picard group is isomorphic to the 2nd integral cohomology because $H^1(Y, \mathcal{O}_Y) = H^2(Y, \mathcal{O}_Y) = 0$ on a resolution Y of X . In this case, the variety X is \mathbb{Q} -factorial if and only if the global topological property

$$\text{rank}(H^2(X, \mathbb{Z})) = \text{rank}(H_4(X, \mathbb{Z})),$$

holds. This duality fails on singular varieties in general. The failure of the duality may be measured by the difference of their ranks, so called, the *defect* of X

$$\delta_X := \text{rank}(H_4(X, \mathbb{Z})) - \text{rank}(H^2(X, \mathbb{Z})).$$

With this notion, one may say that X is \mathbb{Q} -factorial if and only if $\delta_X = 0$.

We first consider a double cover X of \mathbb{P}^3 branched along a surface $B \subset \mathbb{P}^3$ of degree $2r$ with only isolated singularities. We may consider X as a hypersurface of degree $2r$ in the weighted projective space $\mathbb{P} = \mathbb{P}(1, 1, 1, 1, r)$. In general, the singular points on X may have an effect on the integral (co)homology groups of X (See [Cle83], [Cyn02] and [Dim90]). However, it follows from a Lefschetz-type theorem ([Mal99, Proposition 1.4]) that $\text{Pic}(X) \cong \text{Pic}(\mathbb{P})$, in particular, $\text{rank}(\text{Pic}(X)) = 1$.

Meanwhile, as aforementioned, it follows from [Kaw88, Lemma 6.3] that on Gorenstein terminal 3-folds, factoriality is equivalent to \mathbb{Q} -factoriality. Therefore, in our case, the double solid X is \mathbb{Q} -factorial if and only if it is factorial.

To determine whether the double solid X is factorial or not, we have to see whether the defect of X is trivial or not. However it is not simple to compute the defect. Fortunately, a method to compute some Hodge numbers for resolutions of double solids branched along surfaces with only Du Val singularities has been introduced by Rams [Ram08] which has evolved from the paper of Clemens [Cle83]. The paper [Ram08] formulates the difference between the Hodge numbers of the

big resolution Y and the Hodge numbers of \mathbb{P} . Here the *big resolution* $\rho: Y \rightarrow X$ is defined by the composition of blow ups:

$$\rho = \rho_k \circ \cdots \circ \rho_1: Y \rightarrow Y_0 = X,$$

where $\rho_i: Y_i \rightarrow Y_{i-1}$ for $i = 1, \dots, k$, is the blow up with center $\text{Sing}(Y_{i-1}) \neq \emptyset$ and $Y_k = Y$ is smooth. The Hodge numbers of \mathbb{P} are considered with the Zariski sheaf of germs of 1-forms $\overline{\Omega}_{\mathbb{P}}^1 := \iota_*(\Omega_{\text{reg}(\mathbb{P})}^1)$, where $\iota: \text{reg}(\mathbb{P}) \rightarrow \mathbb{P}$ is the inclusion.

The defect of X appears in a Hodge number of the big resolution Y of X , i.e.,

$$h^{1,1}(Y) = h^1(\mathbb{P}, \overline{\Omega}_{\mathbb{P}}^1) + \mu_X + \delta_X,$$

where μ_X is the number of components of the exceptional locus of the big resolution ρ ([Ram08, Theorem 4.1]). Note that $h^1(\mathbb{P}, \overline{\Omega}_{\mathbb{P}}^1) = \text{rank}(\text{Pic}(\mathbb{P})) = 1$.

If the double solid X has only terminal cA_1 singularities, then the surface B has only A_n singularities. Conversely, the double solid branched along a surface with only A_n singularities has only terminal cA_1 singularities. Meanwhile, a non-cyclic Du Val singular point of B yields a terminal cA_2 singular point on X . However, a terminal cA_2 singular point on X does not necessarily come from a Du Val singular point of B .

From now on, for our purpose we suppose that the double solid X has only terminal cA_1 singularities unless otherwise mentioned.

The following method to compute the defect δ_X is given by [Ram08, Theorem 4.1].

Theorem 4.13. *Put*

$$\mathcal{H}_X = \{ H \in H^0(\mathbb{P}^3, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(3r-4)) \mid H \text{ fulfills the condition } (\mathbf{A}) \},$$

where the condition (\mathbf{A}) is as follows:

For each singular point $p \in \text{Sing}(B)$, suppose the surface B is given by

$$x_{1,p}^{m+1} + x_{2,p}^2 + x_{3,p}^2 + f(x_{1,p}, x_{2,p}, x_{3,p}) = 0$$

for some positive integer m locally around p , where $x_{i,p}$'s are analytic coordinates centered at the point p and $f(x_{1,p}, x_{2,p}, x_{3,p})$ is a polynomial of order strictly greater than 1 with respect to the weights $\text{wt}(x_{1,p}) = \frac{1}{m+1}$, $\text{wt}(x_{2,p}) = \text{wt}(x_{3,p}) = \frac{1}{2}$. For the singular point p , impose the conditions:

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{C}_{p,0}) \quad & H(p) = 0; \\ (\mathbf{C}_{p,j}) \quad & \frac{\partial^j H}{\partial x_{1,p}^j}(p) = 0 \text{ for } 1 \leq j \leq \lceil \frac{m}{2} \rceil - 1. \end{aligned}$$

Then,

$$\delta_X = \dim(\mathcal{H}_X) - (h^0(\mathbb{P}^3, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(3r-4)) - \mu_X).$$

Proof. The following have been verified in [Dol82, Theorem in §1.4 and Theorem in §2.3]:

$$\begin{aligned} H^i(\mathbb{P}, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(-2r)) &= 0 \text{ for } i \leq 3; \\ H^i(\mathbb{P}, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(-4r)) &= 0 \text{ for } i \leq 3; \\ H^2(\mathbb{P}, \overline{\Omega}_{\mathbb{P}}^1) &= 0; \\ H^i(\mathbb{P}, \overline{\Omega}_{\mathbb{P}}^1 \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(-2r)) &= 0 \text{ for } i = 1, 2, 3. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore the equality immediately follows from [Ram08, Theorem 4.1]. \square

Theorem 4.13 reduces the topological problem to a relatively simpler problem concerning the linear system $|\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(3r - 4)|$ and 0-dimensional subschemes in \mathbb{P}^3 .

Corollary 4.14. *The double solid X is \mathbb{Q} -factorial if and only if the condition (A) in Theorem 4.13 imposes linearly independent μ_X conditions on the linear system $|\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(3r - 4)|$.*

Corollary 4.15. *Suppose that the surface B has singularities*

$$a_1A_1 + a_2A_2 + \cdots + a_mA_m,$$

where a_i is the number of singular points of type A_i on B . If the double solid X is \mathbb{Q} -factorial, then $\lceil \frac{m}{2} \rceil \leq 3r - 3$ and

$$\sum_{n=1}^m a_n \lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil \leq h^0(\mathbb{P}^3, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(3r - 4)) = \frac{1}{2}(3r - 1)(3r - 2)(r - 1).$$

Proof. Each singular point of type A_n yields $\lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil$ conditions on $|\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(3r - 4)|$. Therefore, the statement follows from Corollary 4.14. \square

Based on [CP10, Example 1.5], we may construct the following example of a non- \mathbb{Q} -factorial double solid X branched along a surface B with only terminal cA_k singularities.

Example 4.16. Let B be the surface of degree $2r$, where $r \geq 2$, defined by

$$xf_{2r-1}(x, y, z) + t^{2r-3}x(x^2 + y^2) + t^{2r-2}z^2 = 0 \subset \mathbb{P}^3,$$

where $f_{2r-1} \in \mathbb{C}[x, y, z]$ is a general homogeneous polynomial of degree $2r - 1$. Then the surface B has $2r - 3$ singular points of type A_1 , $2r - 1$ singular points of type A_{2r-3} , and one singular point of type D_4 . The double solid X branched along the surface B has $4r - 4$ terminal singular points of type cA_1 and one terminal singular point of type cA_2 . Furthermore, it can be defined by the weighted homogeneous equation

$$w^2 = xf_{2r-1}(x, y, z) + t^{2r-3}x(x^2 + y^2) + t^{2r-2}z^2 \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 1, 1, 1, r).$$

The hyperplane section defined by $x = 0$ splits into two divisors given by the equation

$$(w + zt^{r-1})(w - zt^{r-1}) = 0,$$

each of which is a non- \mathbb{Q} -Cartier divisor.

\mathbb{Q} -factoriality of nodal double solids has been extensively studied in [CP10], [Che09], [HP07] and [Klo22]. Their results are mainly based on the result of [Cle83]. As aforementioned, in this section, we use the result of [Ram08] that is applicable to the cases with wider range of singularities. Before we proceed, let us mention that some results in [CP10], [Che09], [HP07] and [Klo22] remain true if we allow only singularities slightly worse than nodes.

Theorem 4.17. *Let X be the double solid branched along a surface B of degree $2r$. Suppose that B has at worst A_1 and A_2 singularities.*

- (1) *If the number of singular points of X is less than $r(2r - 1)$, then X is factorial.*
- (2) *If the number of singular points of X is $r(2r - 1)$ and X is not \mathbb{Q} -factorial, then the surface B is defined by an equation of the form*

$$f_r(x, y, z, t)^2 + f_1(x, y, z, t)f_{2r-1}(x, y, z, t) = 0,$$

where $f_i(x, y, z, t) \in \mathbb{C}[x, y, z, t]$ is a homogeneous polynomial of degree i .

Proof. The statements have been verified under the condition that B has only A_1 singularities in [CP10, Theorem B], [Che09, Theorem 3], [HP07, Theorems 4.3 and 5.3], and [Klo22, Theorem 4.6]. However, as A_1 singularities, singular points of type A_2 on B produce only one condition $(C_{p,0})$ in the condition **(A)**. From the view point of factoriality, we do not have to distinguish between A_1 and A_2 . Therefore, the proofs of [Che09, Theorem 3] and [Klo22, Theorem 4.6] work verbatim for the case when B allows A_2 singularities also. \square

Example 4.18. Let B be the surface of degree $2r$, where $r \geq 2$, defined by

$$L_1(x, y, z)L_2(x, y, z) \cdots L_{2r}(x, y, z) + t^{2r-1}z = 0 \subset \mathbb{P}^3,$$

where $L_1(x, y, z), \dots, L_{2r}(x, y, z)$ are general linear forms.

Then the surface B has exactly $r(2r - 1)$ singular points and they are A_{2r-2} singularities. These singular points correspond to the intersection points p_{nm} of the lines $L_n(x, y, z)$ and $L_m(x, y, z)$ on the plane $t = 0$, $1 \leq n < m \leq 2r$. The double solid X branched along the surface B also has $r(2r - 1)$ terminal singular points of type cA_1 .

Let $F_l(x, y, z)$ be a general form of degree l in x, y, z . For $0 \leq j \leq r - 2$ and $1 \leq n < m \leq 2r$, put

$$H_{n,m,j}(x, y, z) = t^j F_{r-2-j}(x, y, z) \frac{L_1(x, y, z)L_2(x, y, z) \cdots L_{2r}(x, y, z)}{L_n(x, y, z)L_m(x, y, z)}.$$

It is a form of degree $3r - 4$. Observe that for fixed n, m, j ,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial^j H_{n,m,j}}{\partial t^j}(p_{nm}) &\neq 0; \\ \frac{\partial^k H_{n,m,j}}{\partial t^k}(p_{nm}) &= 0 \text{ if } k \neq j; \\ \frac{\partial^k H_{n,m,j}}{\partial t^k}(p_{n'm'}) &= 0 \text{ if } (n', m') \neq (n, m). \end{aligned}$$

This implies that the $r(2r - 1)(r - 1)$ conditions $\{(C_{p_{nm},j})\}$ impose linearly independent conditions on $H^0(\mathbb{P}^3, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(3r - 4))$. Therefore, Theorem 4.13 implies that the double solid X is factorial.

Example 4.19. Let B be the surface of degree $2r$, where $r \geq 2$, defined by

$$t^{2r} + xh_{2r-1}(x, y, z) = 0 \subset \mathbb{P}^3,$$

where h_{2r-1} is a general homogeneous polynomial of degree $2r - 1$. Then the surface B has exactly $2r - 1$ singular points which are of type A_{2r-1} . The double solid X branched along the surface B also has $2r - 1$ terminal singular points of type cA_1 . As before, this can be defined by the weighted homogeneous equation

$$w^2 = t^{2r} + xh_{2r-1}(x, y, z) \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 1, 1, 1, r).$$

The hyperplane section defined by $x = 0$ splits into two divisors given by the equation

$$(w + t^r)(w - t^r) = 0,$$

each of which is a non- \mathbb{Q} -Cartier divisor.

Example 4.20. Let B be the sextic surface defined by

$$x^4yz + xyt^4 + z^2t^4 + y^6 + z^6 = 0 \subset \mathbb{P}^3.$$

The surface B has a A_{11} singularity at $(1 : 0 : 0 : 0)$ and a A_1 singularity at $(0 : 0 : 0 : 1)$. Note that the latter singular point lies on the line defined by the intersection of the two Zariski tangent planes at the former singular point. The former point impose three linearly independent conditions on $H^0(\mathbb{P}^3, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(5))$. However, the condition imposed by the latter point is redundant. Therefore, the sextic double solid branched along B is not \mathbb{Q} -factorial.

Examples 4.19 and 4.20 suggest the following conjecture.

Conjecture 4.21. Let X be the double solid branched along a sextic surface with at worst A_m singularities, $m \leq 10$. If the number of singular points on X is at most four, then X is factorial.

Due to lack of information on Du Val singularities of sextic surfaces, we manage to verify the conjecture only under some extra conditions.

Theorem 4.22. *Conjecture 4.21 holds good under the assumption that*

- B allows at worst A_6 singularities;
- no three of the singular points of B lie on a single line;
- if B has four coplanar singular points, then the line defined by the intersection of the two Zariski tangent planes at a singular point of type A_m , $m \geq 5$, cannot pass through two singular points of B .

Proof. We assume that B has four singular points p_1, \dots, p_4 . The proof for the smaller number of singular points is almost the same.

Each point yields linear conditions

$$\begin{aligned} (C_{i,0}) : & \quad H(p_i) = 0; \\ (C_{i,1}) : & \quad \frac{\partial H}{\partial x_{1,p_i}}(p_i) = 0 \text{ if } p_i \text{ is of type } A_m, m \geq 3; \\ (C_{i,2}) : & \quad \frac{\partial^2 H}{\partial x_{1,p_i}^2}(p_i) = 0 \text{ if } p_i \text{ is of type } A_m, m \geq 5 \end{aligned}$$

on the linear system of quintic hypersurfaces H in \mathbb{P}^3 . It is enough to show that for a given condition $(C_{i,j})$ there is a quintic hypersurface H that fails the condition $(C_{i,j})$ but satisfies the other conditions.

We use homogeneous coordinates $(x : y : z : t)$ for \mathbb{P}^3 . Fix a condition $(C_{i,j})$. We may assume that $p_i = (1 : 0 : 0 : 0)$. For convenience, assume that $i = 4$. By our assumption, p_4 is of type A_m , $m \leq 6$. In case when $m \geq 2$, assume that the Zariski tangent planes at p_4 are defined by $y = 0$ and $z = 0$, respectively. Since no three points of the singular points of B are collinear, we may assume that p_1 and p_2 does not lie on the line $y = z = 0$. We may regard x_{1,p_4} as t . Let P_{ij} be the linear form of a general plane containing the singular points p_i and p_j . Set

$$P_1 = P_{12}^2 P_{13}^2 P_{23}, \quad P_2 = P_{12}^2 P_{13} P_{23}^2, \quad P_3 = P_{12} P_{13}^2 P_{23}^2.$$

Case 1. $m \leq 2$.

In this case, we do not have the conditions $(C_{4,1})$, $(C_{4,2})$. The quintic P_1 fails $(C_{4,0})$ but satisfies all the other conditions.

Case 2. $3 \leq m \leq 4$.

In this case, we do not have the condition $(C_{4,2})$. Since

$$\det \begin{pmatrix} P_{12} & P_{13} \\ \frac{\partial P_{12}}{\partial t} & \frac{\partial P_{13}}{\partial t} \end{pmatrix} (p_4)$$

vanishes if and only if the singular point p_1 lies on the line defined by $y = z = 0$, we have

$$\det \begin{pmatrix} P_2 & P_3 \\ \frac{\partial P_2}{\partial t} & \frac{\partial P_3}{\partial t} \end{pmatrix} (p_4) = \left\{ P_{12}^2 P_{13}^2 P_{23}^4 \cdot \det \begin{pmatrix} P_{12} & P_{13} \\ \frac{\partial P_{12}}{\partial t} & \frac{\partial P_{13}}{\partial t} \end{pmatrix} \right\} (p_4) \neq 0.$$

Therefore, for given condition $(C_{4,j})$, there is a point $(\mu_2 : \mu_3) \in \mathbb{P}^1$ such that between two values

$$(0) \quad (\mu_2 P_2 + \mu_3 P_3)(p_4);$$

$$(1) \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial t} (\mu_2 P_2 + \mu_3 P_3)(p_4),$$

the value (j) is non-zero and the other is zero. Then the quintic

$$\mu_2 P_2 + \mu_3 P_3$$

fails the condition $(C_{4,j})$ but satisfies all the other conditions.

Case 3. $5 \leq m \leq 6$ and the point p_3 does not lie on the line $y = z = 0$.

Since none of the points p_1, p_2, p_3 lies on the line $y = z = 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \det \begin{pmatrix} P_1 & P_2 & P_3 \\ \frac{\partial P_1}{\partial t} & \frac{\partial P_2}{\partial t} & \frac{\partial P_3}{\partial t} \\ \frac{\partial^2 P_1}{\partial t^2} & \frac{\partial^2 P_2}{\partial t^2} & \frac{\partial^2 P_3}{\partial t^2} \end{pmatrix} (p_4) \\ &= \left\{ 2P_{12}^3 P_{13}^3 P_{23}^3 \cdot \det \begin{pmatrix} P_{12} & P_{13} \\ \frac{\partial P_{12}}{\partial t} & \frac{\partial P_{13}}{\partial t} \end{pmatrix} \cdot \det \begin{pmatrix} P_{12} & P_{23} \\ \frac{\partial P_{12}}{\partial t} & \frac{\partial P_{23}}{\partial t} \end{pmatrix} \cdot \det \begin{pmatrix} P_{13} & P_{23} \\ \frac{\partial P_{13}}{\partial t} & \frac{\partial P_{23}}{\partial t} \end{pmatrix} \right\} (p_4) \\ & \neq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Then, for the given condition (C_{4,j}), we can find a point (λ₁:λ₂:λ₃) ∈ ℙ² such that among the three values

$$\begin{aligned} (0) \quad & (\lambda_1 P_1 + \lambda_2 P_2 + \lambda_3 P_3)(p_4); \\ (1) \quad & \frac{\partial}{\partial t}(\lambda_1 P_1 + \lambda_2 P_2 + \lambda_3 P_3)(p_4); \\ (2) \quad & \frac{\partial^2}{\partial t^2}(\lambda_1 P_1 + \lambda_2 P_2 + \lambda_3 P_3)(p_4), \end{aligned}$$

the value (j) is non-zero and the other values are zero. Then the quintic

$$\lambda_1 P_1 + \lambda_2 P_2 + \lambda_3 P_3$$

fails the condition (C_{4,j}) but satisfies all the other conditions.

Case 4. 5 ≤ m ≤ 6 and the point p₃ lies on the line y = z = 0.

In this case, we may assume that p₃ = (0 : 0 : 0 : 1). By our assumption, there is a plane P that passes through p₁, p₂, p₃, but not p₄. Note that $\frac{\partial P}{\partial t} = 0$. For the conditions (C_{4,0}), (C_{4,1}), (C_{4,2}), we consider the quintics P⁵, tP⁴, t²P³, respectively. Then in each case the quintic violates the corresponding condition (C_{4,j}) but obeys the other conditions.

Consequently, the conditions {(C_{i,j})} are linearly independent on the linear system of quintic surfaces in ℙ³, and hence the double solid X is factorial. □

Based on the fact that a variety with a small resolution is not ℚ-factorial, we may construct the following non-ℚ-factorial sextic double solids.

Example 4.23. Let V be the smooth 3-fold of bidegree (2, 3) in ℙ¹ × ℙ³ defined by the bihomogeneous equation

$$f_3(x, y, z)u^2 - 2t^3uv + h_3(x, y, z)v^2 = 0,$$

where f₃ and h₃ are general cubic homogeneous polynomials in ℂ[x, y, z]. In addition, we denote the natural projection of V to ℙ³ by π: V → ℙ³. The system of equations

$$f_3(x, y, z) = t = h_3(x, y, z) = 0$$

defines exactly 9 points in ℙ³. The 3-fold V then has exactly 9 lines C_i, i = 1, ..., 9, such that H · C_i = 0, where H is a divisor cut by a hypersurface of bidegree (0, 1) in ℙ¹ × ℙ³. The projection π has degree 2 in the outside of the points π(C_i). The model

$$\text{Proj} \left(\bigoplus_{n \geq 0} H^0(V, \mathcal{O}_V(nH)) \right)$$

of V is the double cover X of ℙ³ branched along the surface B defined by

$$t^6 + f_3(x, y, z)h_3(x, y, z) = 0.$$

It has 9 terminal singular points of type cA₁ each of which comes from each line C_i. The morphism φ_{|mH|}: V → X given by the complete linear system of bidegree (0, m) on V with sufficiently large m contracts these 9 lines to cA₁ points of X. Therefore, it is a small morphism of V onto X and hence the double cover X cannot be ℚ-factorial.

5. PRIME FANO 3-FOLD WEIGHTED COMPLETE INTERSECTIONS

We consider some prime Fano 3-fold weighted complete intersections with only cA_1 points together with terminal quotient singular points, and prove their birational rigidity. We make the setting precise.

Setting 5.1. Let X be a prime Fano 3-fold which is either a weighted hypersurface of index 1 in one of the families listed in Table 2, or a weighted complete intersection of codimension 2 and index 1 in one of the families listed in Table 3. Let \mathbb{P} be the ambient weighted projective space of X . We assume that X is quasi-smooth along the singular locus of \mathbb{P} .

Theorem 5.2. *Let X be as in Setting 5.1 and suppose that X has at worst cA_1 points besides terminal quotient singular points. Then X is birationally rigid.*

We fix some notations. Let $\mathbb{P} = \mathbb{P}(a_0, \dots, a_n)$ be a weighted projective space with homogeneous coordinates x_0, \dots, x_n of weights a_0, \dots, a_n , respectively. For homogeneous polynomials g_1, \dots, g_N in variables x_0, \dots, x_n , we denote by

$$(g_0 = \dots = g_N = 0) \subset \mathbb{P}(a_0, \dots, a_n)$$

the closed subscheme defined by the homogeneous ideal (g_1, \dots, g_N) .

Definition 5.3. Under the above notation, let $V = (f_1 = \dots = f_m = 0) \subset \mathbb{P}$ be a closed subscheme, where f_1, \dots, f_m are homogeneous polynomials in variables x_0, \dots, x_n . The *quasi-smooth locus* $\text{Qsm}(V)$ of V is defined to be the image of the smooth locus of $C_V^* := C_V \setminus \{o\}$ under the natural map $\mathbb{A}^{n+1} \setminus \{o\} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}$, where

$$C_V := \text{Spec } \mathbb{C}[x_0, \dots, x_n]/(f_1, \dots, f_m)$$

is the *affine cone* of V and o is the origin of \mathbb{A}^{n+1} . For a subset $S \subset V$, we say that V is *quasi-smooth along S* if $S \subset \text{Qsm}(V)$. We say that V is *quasi-smooth* if it is quasi-smooth along V , that is, $V = \text{Qsm}(V)$.

For $X \subset \mathbb{P}$ as in Setting 5.1 and $s \in \{x, y, z, t, w\}$, we set

$$U_s = (s \neq 0) \cap X := X \setminus ((s = 0) \cap X).$$

5.1. Exclusion of curves.

Proposition 5.4. *Let X be as in Setting 5.1. Then no curve on X is a maximal center.*

Proof. Suppose that there is a curve $\Gamma \subset X$ which is a maximal center. By [Kaw96], there exists no divisorial contraction centered along a curve through a terminal quotient singular point. Hence Γ does not pass through a terminal quotient singular point. In particular we have $(-K_X \cdot \Gamma) \geq 1$. On the other hand we have $(-K_X)^3 \leq 1$. By Lemma 2.7, Γ cannot be a maximal center. This is a contradiction and the proof is completed. \square

TABLE 2. Fano 3-fold weighted hypersurfaces of index 1

No	$X_d \subset \mathbb{P}(1, a_1, \dots, a_4)$	$-K_X^3$	Case	No	$X_d \subset \mathbb{P}(1, a_1, \dots, a_4)$	$-K_X^3$	Case
6	$X_8 \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 1, 1, 2, 4)$	1	◇	57	$X_{24} \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 3, 4, 5, 12)$	1/30	♡
10	$X_{10} \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 1, 1, 3, 5)$	2/3	◇	58	$X_{24} \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 3, 4, 7, 10)$	1/35	♡
11	$X_{10} \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 1, 2, 2, 5)$	1/2	◇	59	$X_{24} \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 3, 6, 7, 8)$	1/42	♡
14	$X_{12} \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 1, 1, 4, 6)$	1/2	◇	60	$X_{24} \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 4, 5, 6, 9)$	1/45	♡
15	$X_{12} \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 1, 2, 3, 6)$	1/3	♡	61	$X_{25} \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 4, 5, 7, 9)$	5/252	♡
16	$X_{12} \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 1, 2, 4, 5)$	3/10		62	$X_{26} \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 1, 5, 7, 13)$	2/35	◇
17	$X_{12} \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 1, 3, 4, 4)$	1/4		63	$X_{26} \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 2, 3, 8, 13)$	1/24	◇
18	$X_{12} \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 2, 2, 3, 5)$	1/5	♣	64	$X_{26} \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 2, 5, 6, 13)$	1/30	◇
19	$X_{12} \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 2, 3, 3, 4)$	1/6	♡	65	$X_{27} \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 2, 5, 9, 11)$	3/110	♣
21	$X_{14} \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 1, 2, 4, 7)$	1/4	◇	66	$X_{27} \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 5, 6, 7, 9)$	1/70	♡
22	$X_{14} \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 2, 2, 3, 7)$	1/6	◇	67	$X_{28} \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 1, 4, 9, 14)$	1/18	◇
25	$X_{15} \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 1, 3, 4, 7)$	5/28		68	$X_{28} \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 3, 4, 7, 14)$	1/42	♡
26	$X_{15} \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 1, 3, 5, 6)$	1/6	♣	69	$X_{28} \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 4, 6, 7, 11)$	1/66	♡
27	$X_{15} \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 2, 3, 5, 5)$	1/10	♡	70	$X_{30} \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 1, 4, 10, 15)$	1/20	◇
28	$X_{15} \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 3, 3, 4, 5)$	1/12	♡	71	$X_{30} \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 1, 6, 8, 15)$	1/24	◇
29	$X_{16} \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 1, 2, 5, 8)$	1/5	◇	72	$X_{30} \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 2, 3, 10, 15)$	1/30	♡
30	$X_{16} \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 1, 3, 4, 8)$	1/6	◇	73	$X_{30} \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 2, 6, 7, 15)$	1/42	◇
31	$X_{16} \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 1, 4, 5, 6)$	2/15		74	$X_{30} \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 3, 4, 10, 13)$	1/52	♣
32	$X_{16} \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 2, 3, 4, 7)$	2/21	♣	75	$X_{30} \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 4, 5, 6, 15)$	1/60	♡
34	$X_{18} \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 1, 2, 6, 9)$	1/6	◇	76	$X_{30} \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 5, 6, 8, 11)$	1/88	♡
35	$X_{18} \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 1, 3, 5, 9)$	2/15	◇	77	$X_{32} \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 2, 5, 9, 16)$	1/45	◇
36	$X_{18} \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 1, 4, 6, 7)$	3/28		78	$X_{32} \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 4, 5, 7, 16)$	1/70	♡
37	$X_{18} \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 2, 3, 4, 9)$	1/12	◇	79	$X_{33} \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 3, 5, 11, 14)$	1/70	♣
38	$X_{18} \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 2, 3, 5, 8)$	3/40		80	$X_{34} \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 3, 4, 10, 17)$	1/60	◇
41	$X_{20} \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 1, 4, 5, 10)$	1/10	♡	81	$X_{34} \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 4, 6, 7, 17)$	1/84	♡
42	$X_{20} \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 2, 3, 5, 10)$	1/15	♡	82	$X_{36} \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 1, 5, 12, 18)$	1/30	◇
43	$X_{20} \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 2, 4, 5, 9)$	1/18	♣	83	$X_{36} \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 3, 4, 11, 18)$	1/66	◇
44	$X_{20} \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 2, 5, 6, 7)$	1/21	♡	84	$X_{36} \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 7, 8, 9, 12)$	1/168	♡
45	$X_{20} \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 3, 4, 5, 8)$	1/24	♡	85	$X_{38} \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 3, 5, 11, 19)$	2/165	◇
46	$X_{21} \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 1, 3, 7, 10)$	1/10		86	$X_{38} \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 5, 6, 8, 19)$	1/120	♡
47	$X_{21} \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 1, 5, 7, 8)$	3/40		87	$X_{40} \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 5, 7, 8, 20)$	1/140	♡
48	$X_{21} \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 2, 3, 7, 9)$	1/18	♣	88	$X_{42} \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 1, 6, 14, 21)$	1/42	♡
49	$X_{21} \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 3, 5, 6, 7)$	1/30	♡	89	$X_{42} \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 2, 5, 14, 21)$	1/70	♡
51	$X_{22} \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 1, 4, 6, 11)$	1/12	◇	90	$X_{42} \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 3, 4, 14, 21)$	1/84	♡
52	$X_{22} \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 2, 4, 5, 11)$	1/20	◇	91	$X_{44} \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 4, 5, 13, 22)$	1/130	◇
53	$X_{24} \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 1, 3, 8, 12)$	1/12	♡	92	$X_{48} \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 3, 5, 16, 24)$	1/120	♡
54	$X_{24} \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 1, 6, 8, 9)$	1/18	♣	93	$X_{50} \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 7, 8, 10, 25)$	1/280	♡
55	$X_{24} \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 2, 3, 7, 12)$	1/21	◇	94	$X_{54} \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 4, 5, 18, 27)$	1/180	♡
56	$X_{24} \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 2, 3, 8, 11)$	1/22	♣	95	$X_{66} \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 5, 6, 22, 33)$	1/330	♡

5.2. Exclusion of smooth points. The aim of this section is to show that no smooth point on X is a maximal center for X as in Setting 5.1. It may be possible to say that this follows from the same arguments as in [CP17, Section 2.1] and

TABLE 3. Fano 3-fold WCIs of codimension 2 and index 1

No	$X_{d_1, d_2} \subset \mathbb{P}(a_0, \dots, a_5)$	$-K_X^3$	No	$X_{d_1, d_2} \subset \mathbb{P}(a_0, \dots, a_5)$	$-K_X^3$
8	$X_{4,6} \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 1, 2, 2, 2, 3)$	1	59	$X_{12,14} \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 4, 4, 5, 6, 7)$	1/20
14	$X_{6,6} \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 2, 2, 2, 3, 3)$	1/2	60	$X_{12,14} \subset \mathbb{P}(2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7)$	1/30
20	$X_{6,8} \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 2, 2, 3, 3, 4)$	1/3	64	$X_{12,16} \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 8)$	2/35
24	$X_{6,10} \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 2, 2, 3, 4, 5)$	1/4	71	$X_{14,16} \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)$	1/30
31	$X_{8,10} \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 2, 3, 4, 4, 5)$	1/6	75	$X_{14,18} \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 9)$	1/24
37	$X_{8,12} \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)$	2/15	76	$X_{12,20} \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10)$	1/35
45	$X_{10,12} \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 2, 4, 5, 5, 6)$	1/10	78	$X_{16,18} \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9)$	1/42
47	$X_{10,12} \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 3, 4, 4, 5, 6)$	1/12	84	$X_{18,30} \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 6, 8, 9, 10, 15)$	1/120
51	$X_{10,14} \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7)$	1/12	85	$X_{24,30} \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 8, 9, 10, 12, 15)$	1/180

[Oka14, Section 7]. However we reproduce the proofs in a general setting mainly because these arguments will also be useful in the exclusion of cA_1 points as a maximal center (see Section 5.3).

Definition 5.5. Let V be a closed subscheme of a weighted projective space $\mathbb{P}(a_0, \dots, a_n)$ with homogeneous coordinates x_0, \dots, x_n of weights a_0, \dots, a_n , respectively, and let $\mathfrak{p} \in V$ be a point. We say that homogeneous polynomials g_1, \dots, g_N in variables x_0, \dots, x_n (resp. effective Weil divisors D_1, \dots, D_N on V) *isolate* \mathfrak{p} or they are *\mathfrak{p} -isolating polynomials* (resp. *\mathfrak{p} -isolating divisors*) if the set

$$(g_1 = \dots = g_N = 0) \cap V \quad (\text{resp. } \text{Supp } D_1 \cap \dots \cap \text{Supp } D_N)$$

is a finite set of points including \mathfrak{p} . For a positive integer e , we also say that g_1, \dots, g_N (resp. D_1, \dots, D_N) are *\mathfrak{p} -isolating polynomials of degree at most e* (resp. *\mathfrak{p} -isolating divisors of degree at most e*) if $\max\{\deg g_1, \dots, \deg g_N\} \leq e$ (resp. $D_i \in |\mathcal{O}_V(e_i)|$ for $i = 1, \dots, N$ and $\max\{e_1, \dots, e_N\} \leq e$).

Remark 5.6. Let V be as in Definition 5.5 and let $\mathfrak{p} \in V$ be a point. Suppose that there are \mathfrak{p} -isolating divisors of degree at most e . Let $\Gamma \subset V$ be a closed subset such that $\mathfrak{p} \in \Gamma$ and any component of Γ is of positive dimension. Then we can take a divisor $D \in |\mathcal{O}_V(e')|$ for some $e' \leq e$ such that $\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Supp } D$ and no component of Γ is contained in $\text{Supp } D$.

Lemma 5.7. *Let V be a complete intersection of codimension $c \in \{1, 2\}$ in a weighted projective space $\mathbb{P}(a_0, \dots, a_n)$ with homogeneous coordinates x_0, \dots, x_n of weights a_0, \dots, a_n , respectively.*

(1) *Let $\mathfrak{p} \in V$ be a point.*

(a) *There exist \mathfrak{p} -isolating divisors of degree at most*

$$\max\{\text{lcm}(a_i, a_j) \mid i, j \in \{0, 1, \dots, n\}\}.$$

(b) *If there is k such that $\mathfrak{p} \notin \bigcap_{j \neq k} (x_j = 0) \cap V$, then there exist \mathfrak{p} -isolating divisors of degree at most*

$$\max\{\text{lcm}(a_i, a_j) \mid i, j \in \{0, 1, \dots, n\} \setminus \{k\}\}.$$

(c) If $c = 2$ and there are k_1, k_2 such that $\mathfrak{p} \notin \bigcap_{j \neq k_1, k_2} (x_j = 0)$, then there exist \mathfrak{p} -isolating divisors of degree at most

$$\max\{\text{lcm}(a_i, a_j) \mid i, j \in \{0, 1, \dots, n\} \setminus \{k_1, k_2\}\}.$$

(2) Let $\mathfrak{p} \in U_{x_i} = (x_i \neq 0) \cap V$ be a point.

(a) There exist \mathfrak{p} -isolating divisors of degree at most

$$\max\{\text{lcm}(a_i, a_j) \mid j \in \{0, 1, \dots, n\}\}.$$

(b) If there is $k \neq i$ such that $\mathfrak{p} \notin \bigcap_{j \neq k} (x_j = 0) \cap V$, then there exists \mathfrak{p} -isolating divisors of degree at most

$$\max\{\text{lcm}(a_i, a_j) \mid j \in \{0, 1, \dots, n\} \setminus \{k\}\}.$$

(c) If $c = 2$ and there are $k_1, k_2 \neq i$ such that $\mathfrak{p} \notin \bigcap_{j \neq k_1, k_2} (x_j = 0) \cap V$, then there exists \mathfrak{p} -isolating divisors of degree at most

$$\max\{\text{lcm}(a_i, a_j) \mid j \in \{0, 1, \dots, n\} \setminus \{k_1, k_2\}\}.$$

Proof. We set $U_{x_j} = (x_j \neq 0) \cap V$. (1) follows from (2) since V is covered by the U_{x_j} .

We prove (2). We can write $\mathfrak{p} = (\alpha_0 : \dots : \alpha_n)$, with $\alpha_i \neq 0$. We set $m_j = \text{lcm}(a_i, a_j)$. Then the polynomials in the set

$$\left\{ \alpha_i^{m_j/a_i} x_j^{m_j/a_j} - \alpha_j^{m_j/a_j} x_i^{m_j/a_i} \mid j \in \{0, 1, \dots, n\} \setminus \{i\} \right\}$$

isolate \mathfrak{p} , and the first assertion follows by considering the divisors $(g_j = 0) \cap V$.

Suppose that $\mathfrak{p} \notin \bigcap_{j \neq k} (x_j = 0) \cap V$, where $k \neq i$. Then the natural projection

$$V \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}(a_0, \dots, a_n) \dashrightarrow \mathbb{P}(a_0, \dots, \hat{a}_k, \dots, a_n) =: \mathbb{P}'$$

is a finite morphism in a neighborhood of $\mathfrak{p} \in V$. The polynomials in the set

$$\left\{ \alpha_i^{m_j/a_i} x_j^{m_j/a_j} - \alpha_j^{m_j/a_j} x_i^{m_j/a_i} \mid j \in \{0, 1, \dots, n\} \setminus \{i, k\} \right\}$$

isolate $\tau(\mathfrak{p}) \in \mathbb{P}'$, that is, the common zero locus of the polynomials in the above set is a finite set of points on \mathbb{P}' . It follows that the common zero locus of the polynomials in the same set, considered as a subset of $\mathbb{P}(a_0, \dots, a_n)$, is again a finite set of points since τ is a finite morphism. This shows that the above set isolates \mathfrak{p} and the second assertion is proved.

Suppose that $c = 2$ and $\mathfrak{p} \notin \bigcap_{j \neq k_1, k_2} (x_j = 0) \cap V$, where $k_1, k_2 \neq i$. Then the natural projection

$$V \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}(a_0, \dots, a_n) \dashrightarrow \mathbb{P}(a_0, \dots, \hat{a}_{k_1}, \dots, \hat{a}_{k_2}, \dots, a_n) =: \mathbb{P}''$$

is a finite morphism in a neighborhood of $\mathfrak{p} \in V$. By the similar argument as above considering the set

$$\left\{ \alpha_i^{m_j/a_i} x_j^{m_j/a_j} - \alpha_j^{m_j/a_j} x_i^{m_j/a_i} \mid j \in \{0, 1, \dots, n\} \setminus \{i, k_1, k_2\} \right\},$$

we obtain the third assertion. \square

Lemma 5.8. *Let X be a prime Fano 3-fold weighted hypersurface of index 1 which belongs to one of the families listed in Table 2. Let $\mathfrak{p} \in X$ be a point contained in the smooth locus of the ambient weighted projective space. Then the following assertions hold.*

- (1) *There exist \mathfrak{p} -isolating divisors of degree at most $4/(-K_X)^3$ except when the family number of X is 25 and $\mathfrak{p} \in (x = y = z = 0) \cap X$.*
- (2) *If X belongs to a family which is given one of $\heartsuit, \diamondsuit, \clubsuit$ in the “Case” column of Table 2, then there exist \mathfrak{p} -isolating divisors of degree at most $2/(-K_X^3)$.*

Proof. Let $X = X_d \subset \mathbb{P}(a_0, a_1, \dots, a_4) =: \mathbb{P}$ with $1 = a_0 \leq a_1 \leq \dots \leq a_4$, where $d = a_1 + \dots + a_4$. Let x, y, z, t, w be homogeneous coordinates of weights a_0, a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4 , respectively.

We prove (2). We consider X belonging to a family which is given one of $\heartsuit, \diamondsuit, \clubsuit$ in the “Case” column of Table 2. Then the assertions follow from the following observations.

- Case: X belongs to a family with \heartsuit . We have

$$\max\{\text{lcm}(a_i, a_j) \mid i, j \in \{0, 1, 2, 3, 4\}\} \leq 2/(-K_X)^3,$$

and the assertion follows from Lemma 5.7 (1-a).

- Case: X belongs to a family with \diamondsuit . We have $a_3 < a_4$, $a_4 \mid d$, and

$$\max\{\text{lcm}(a_i, a_j) \mid i, j \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}\} \leq 2/(-K_X)^3.$$

It follows from $a_3 < a_4$ and $a_4 \mid d$ that the monomial w^{d/a_4} appears in the defining polynomial of X with nonzero coefficient, and thus $(x = y = z = t = 0) \cap X = \emptyset$. The assertion now follows from Lemma 5.7 (1-b).

- Case: X belongs to a family with \clubsuit . We have $a_2 < a_3 < a_4$, $a_3 \mid d$ and

$$\max\{\text{lcm}(a_i, a_j) \mid i, j \in \{0, 1, 2, 4\}\} \leq 2/(-K_X)^3.$$

It follows from $a_2 < a_3 < a_4$ and $a_3 \mid d$ that the monomial t^{d/a_3} appears in the defining polynomial of X with nonzero coefficient, and thus $(x = y = z = w = 0) \cap X = \emptyset$. The assertion now follows from Lemma 5.7 (1-b).

We prove (1). It is enough to consider X whose family number i belongs to

$$\{16, 17, 25, 31, 36, 38, 46, 47\}.$$

- Case: $i \in \{17, 31, 38\}$. We have

$$\max\{\text{lcm}(a_i, a_j) \mid i, j \in \{0, 1, 2, 3, 4\}\} \leq 4/(-K_X)^3,$$

and the assertion follows from Lemma 5.7 (1-a).

- Case: $i \in \{16, 36, 46, 47\}$. In this case $a_3 \mid d$ and w^{d/a_3} appears in the defining polynomial of X . Hence $(x = y = z = w = 0) \cap X = \emptyset$. We have

$$\max\{\text{lcm}(a_i, a_j) \mid i, j \in \{0, 1, 2, 4\}\} \leq 4/(-K_X)^3,$$

and the assertion follows from Lemma 5.7 (1-b).

- Case $i = 25$: By the assumption, we have $\mathfrak{p} \in U_x \cup U_y \cup U_z$. For $i = 0, 1, 2$, it is straightforward to check

$$\max\{\text{lcm}(a_i, a_j) \mid j \in \{0, 1, 2, 3, 4\}\} \leq 4/(-K_X)^3.$$

Thus the assertion follows from Lemma 5.7 (2-a).

The proof is now completed. □

Lemma 5.9. *Let X be a prime Fano 3-fold weighted complete intersection of codimension 2 and index 1 which belongs to one of the families listed in Table 3. Let $\mathfrak{p} \in X$ be a point which is contained in the smooth locus of the ambient weighted projective space. Then there exist \mathfrak{p} -isolating divisors of degree at most $2/(-K_X)^3$.*

Proof. Let $X = X_{d_1, d_2} \subset \mathbb{P}(a_0, \dots, a_5)$ with $a_0 \leq \dots \leq a_5$ and $d_1 < d_2$. Let x, y, z, t, v, w be homogeneous coordinates of weights $a_0, a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4, a_5$, respectively, and let $f_1, f_2 \in \mathbb{C}[x, y, z, t, v, w]$ be the defining polynomials of X of degree d_1, d_2 , respectively. We denote by i the family number of X .

We consider the case $i = 60, 71, 76, 78, 84, 85$. We have

$$\max\{\text{lcm}(a_i, a_j) \mid i, j \in \{0, 1, \dots, 5\}\} \leq 2/(-K_X)^3,$$

and thus the assertion follows from Lemma 5.7 (1-a).

Case: $i = 8, 20, 31, 45, 47, 59$. In this case $a_4 < a_5$, $a_5 \mid d_2$ and

$$\max\{\text{lcm}(a_i, a_j) \mid i, j \in \{0, 1, 2, 3, 4\}\} \leq 2/(-K_X)^3.$$

Then $w^{d_2/a_5} \in f_2$ since $a_4 < a_5$ and $a_5 \mid d_2$, and thus $(x = y = z = t = v = 0) \cap X = \emptyset$. The assertion follows from Lemma 5.7 (1-b).

We consider the case $i = 24, 37, 51, 64, 75$. In this case $a_2 < a_3 < a_4 < a_5$, $d_1 < a_3 + a_5$, $a_3 \mid d_1$, $a_5 \mid d_2$, and

$$\max\{\text{lcm}(a_i, a_j) \mid i, j \in \{0, 1, 2, 4\}\} \leq 2/(-K_X)^3.$$

Then

$$f_1(0, 0, 0, t, 0, w) = \alpha t^{d_1/a_3}, \quad f_2(0, 0, 0, t, 0, w) = \beta w^{d_2/a_4}$$

for some nonzero $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{C}$. It follows that $(x = y = z = v = 0) \cap X = \emptyset$, and thus the assertion follows from Lemma 5.7 (1-c).

We consider the case $i = 14$. In this case we have $(x = yz = t = 0) \cap X = \emptyset$ and

$$\max\{\text{lcm}(a_i, a_j) \mid i, j \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}\} = 2 < 2/(-K_X)^3 = 4.$$

Thus the assertion follows from Lemma 5.7 (1-c), and the proof is completed. \square

Remark 5.10. In Lemmas 5.8 and 5.9, we do not assume that \mathfrak{p} is a smooth point of X , and the case where \mathfrak{p} is a Gorenstein singular point of X is covered. This will be utilized in the proof of Lemma 5.12 below.

Proposition 5.11. *Let X be as in Setting 5.1. Then no smooth point on X is a maximal center.*

Proof. Let $\mathfrak{p} \in X$ be a smooth point. If X is a weighted hypersurface and its family number is 25, and \mathfrak{p} is contained in $(x = y = z = 0) \cap X$, then we can repeat the argument of the proof of [CP17, Lemma 2.1.5] without any change and conclude that \mathfrak{p} is not a maximal center. In what follows, we assume that $\mathfrak{p} \notin (x = y = z = 0) \cap X$ when X is a weighted hypersurface and its family number is 25.

Suppose that X admits a smooth point $\mathfrak{p} \in X$ which is a maximal center. Then there exists a movable linear system $\mathcal{M} \subset |-nK_X|$ such that \mathfrak{p} is a center of non-canonical singularities of $(X, \frac{1}{n}\mathcal{M})$. Let $D_1, D_2 \in \mathcal{M}$ be general members of \mathcal{M} . By Lemmas 5.8 and 5.9, we can take a divisor $T \in |-lK_X|$ for some

positive integer $l \leq 4/(-K_X^3)$ such that $\text{Supp } T$ passes through \mathfrak{p} and does not contain any component of $D_1 \cap D_2$. Thus we have

$$4n^2 \geq ln^2(-K_X^3) = (T \cdot D_1 \cdot D_2) > 4n^2,$$

where the last inequality follows from the $4n^2$ -inequality for smooth points (see Theorem 1.1). This is a contradiction. \square

5.3. Exclusion of cA_1 points. The aim of this section is to exclude singularities of type cA_1 on X as a maximal singularity for X as in Setting 5.1.

Lemma 5.12. *Let X be as in Setting 5.1 and let $\mathfrak{p} \in X$ be a singular point contained in the smooth locus of the ambient weighted projective space. Then there exist \mathfrak{p} -isolating divisors of degree at most $2/(-K_X^3)$.*

Proof. By Lemmas 5.8 and 5.9, it remains to consider the case where X is a weighted hypersurface whose family number i belongs to

$$\{16, 17, 25, 31, 36, 38, 46, 47\}.$$

We consider the case $i = 38$. In this case $X = X_{18} \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 2, 3, 5, 8)$. We claim that the set $\Delta := (x = y = z = 0) \cap X$ is contained in $\text{Qsm}(X)$. We have $f = \alpha t^2 w + \beta y w^2 + \gamma z t^3 + G$, where $\alpha, \beta, \gamma \in \mathbb{C}$ and $G = G(x, y, z, t, w) \in (x, y, z)^2$. We have $(\alpha, \gamma) \neq (0, 0)$ and $\beta \neq 0$. Arguing as in the case of $i = 33$, we conclude that $\Delta \subset \text{Qsm}(X)$, and the claim is proved. It follows that $\mathfrak{p} \in U_x \cup U_y \cup U_z$ and there exist \mathfrak{p} -isolating divisors of degree at most $3a_4$ by Lemma 5.7 (2-a), and we have $3a_4 = 24 \leq 2/(-K_X)^3 = 80/3$.

Finally, we consider the case $i \in \{16, 17, 25, 31, 36, 46, 47\}$. In this case $X = X_d \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 1, a_2, a_3, a_4)$ with $d = 1 + a_2 + a_3 + a_4$ and $a_2 \geq 2$. We claim that $\mathfrak{p} \in U_x \cup U_y$. Assume to the contrary that $\mathfrak{p} \in (x = y = 0) \cap X$. Then, since X is not quasi-smooth at \mathfrak{p} , we have

$$(5.1) \quad \frac{\partial f(0, 0, z, t, w)}{\partial z}(\mathfrak{p}) = \frac{\partial f(0, 0, z, t, w)}{\partial t}(\mathfrak{p}) = \frac{\partial f(0, 0, z, t, w)}{\partial w}(\mathfrak{p}) = 0.$$

An explicit description of $f(0, 0, z, t, w)$ is given in the second column of Table 4, where the coefficients α, β, \dots satisfy the conditions given in the third column. It is then straightforward to see that either the equations in (5.1) have only trivial solution or they imply that $\mathfrak{p} \in \{\mathfrak{p}_z, \mathfrak{p}_t, \mathfrak{p}_w\}$. We have a contradiction in the former case, and the latter case is impossible since any point in $\{\mathfrak{p}_z, \mathfrak{p}_t, \mathfrak{p}_w\} \cap X$ is a quotient singular point of X . Thus the claim is proved, and we have $\mathfrak{p} \in U_x \cup U_y$. By Lemma 5.7 (2-a), there exist \mathfrak{p} -isolating divisors of degree most a_4 . It is easy to check $a_4 \leq 2/(-K_X)^3$ (see the fourth column of Table 4) and the proof is completed. \square

Proposition 5.13. *Let X be as in Setting 5.1, and let $\mathfrak{p} \in X$ be a singular point of type cA_1 . Then \mathfrak{p} is not a maximal center.*

Proof. Suppose that $\mathfrak{p} \in X$ is a maximal center. Then there exists a movable linear system $\mathcal{M} \sim -nK_X$ such that \mathfrak{p} is the center of a non-canonical singularities of the pair $(X, \frac{1}{n}\mathcal{M})$. Let $D_1, D_2 \in \mathcal{M}$ be general members. Then by Lemma 5.12, we can take a divisor $T \in |-lK_X|$ for some positive integer $l \leq 2/(-K_X)^3$ such

TABLE 4. Descriptions of $f(0, 0, z, t, w)$

No.	$f(0, 0, z, t, w)$	Conditions	$2/(-K_X)^3$
16	$\alpha w^2 z + \beta t^3 + \gamma t^2 z^2 + \delta t z^4 + \varepsilon z^6$	$\alpha \neq 0, \beta \neq 0$	20/3
17	$\alpha z^4 + \beta t^3 + \gamma t^2 w + \delta w^3$	$\alpha \neq 0$	8
25	$\alpha w t^2 + \beta t^3 z + \gamma z^5$	$(\alpha, \beta) \neq (0, 0), \gamma \neq 0$	56/5
31	$\alpha w^2 z + \beta w t^2 + \gamma z^4$	$\alpha \neq 0, \gamma \neq 0$	15
36	$\alpha w^2 z + \beta t^3 + \gamma t z^3$	$\alpha \neq 0, \beta \neq 0, \gamma \neq 0$	56/3
46	$\alpha t^3 + \beta z^7$	$\alpha \neq 0, \beta \neq 0$	20
47	$\alpha w^2 z + \beta t^3$	$\alpha \neq 0, \beta \neq 0$	80/3

that $\text{Supp } T$ passes through \mathfrak{p} and does not contain any component of $D_1 \cap D_2$. Thus, we have

$$2n^2 \geq \ln^2(-K_X^3) = (T \cdot D_1 \cdot D_2) > 2n^2,$$

where the last inequality follows from Theorem 3.8. This is a contradiction. \square

5.4. Links centered at quotient points and proof of Theorem 5.2.

Proposition 5.14. *Let X be as in Setting 5.1 and let $\mathfrak{p} \in X$ be a terminal quotient singular point. If the point \mathfrak{p} is a maximal center, then there exists an elementary self-link $X \dashrightarrow X$ of type II initiated by the Kawamata blow-up at \mathfrak{p} .*

Proof. Suppose that X is a weighted hypersurface. Then the same arguments as in [CP17, Chapter 5] prove the assertion. To be more precise, although X is assumed to be quasi-smooth in [CP17], the arguments in [CP17, Chapter 5] in fact relies only on the quasi-smoothness of X along $X \cap \text{Sing}(\mathbb{P})$, where \mathbb{P} is the ambient weighted projective 4-space, besides the basic assumption that X is a prime Fano 3-folds.

Similarly, for weighted complete intersections of codimension 2, the same arguments as in [Oka14, Section 7] and [AZ16, Section 4] prove the assertion. \square

Remark 5.15. It should be mentioned that, for some weighted hypersurface X of index 1 which is not listed Table 2, the arguments in [CP17, Chapter 5] do rely on the entire quasi-smoothness of X . For example, the singular point of type $\frac{1}{3}(1, 1, 2)$ on a quasi-smooth member $X_{17} \subset \mathbb{P}(1, 2, 3, 5, 7) =: \mathbb{P}$ of family No. 33 is excluded as a maximal center in [CP17, Chapter 5] and the proof of this fact does rely on the quasi-smoothness of X (not only on the quasi-smoothness along $X \cap \text{Sing } \mathbb{P}$).

Proof of Theorem 5.2. This is a consequence of Lemma 2.6 and Propositions 5.4, 5.11, 5.13 and 5.14. \square

6. DEL PEZZO FIBRATIONS OF DEGREE 1

The aim of this section is to prove the following by the method of maximal singularities developed in [Puk98] and [Oka20a] combined with Corti's inequality for smooth points and cA_1 points.

Theorem 6.1. *Let $\pi: X \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$ be a del Pezzo fibration of degree 1 with only cA_1 points. If X/\mathbb{P}^1 satisfies the K^2 -condition (1.1), then it is birationally superrigid.*

The rest of this section is devoted to the proof of Theorem 6.1. In what follows, let $\pi: X \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$ be a del Pezzo fibration of degree 1 with only cA_1 singularities and assume that X satisfies the K^2 -condition (1.1). We denote by $F \in \text{Pic}(X)$ the fiber class.

We see that X can be embedded in a toric $\mathbb{P}(1, 1, 2, 3)$ -bundle $P \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$ in such a way that the morphism π coincides with the restriction of $P \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$. A fiber of π is a Gorenstein del Pezzo surface (which can be non-normal), and it is an irreducible and reduced hypersurface of degree 6 in $\mathbb{P}(1, 1, 2, 3)$.

Proposition 6.2 ([Puk98, Section 3]). *Under the above setting, no curve on X is a center of non-canonical singularities of the pair $(X, \frac{1}{n}\mathcal{M})$ for any movable linear system $\mathcal{M} \subset |-nK_X + mF|$ on X .*

Proof. In [Puk98, Section 3] this statement is proven under the assumption that X is smooth, but the same proof works in Gorenstein case. \square

We say that an irreducible curve $C \subset X$ is *vertical* if $\pi(C) = \mathbb{P}^1$ and that it is *horizontal* if $\pi(C)$ is a point. A 1-cycle C is *vertical* (resp. *horizontal*) if every irreducible curve in $\text{Supp } C$ is vertical (resp. horizontal).

Proof of Theorem 6.1. Suppose that X/\mathbb{P}^1 is not birationally superrigid. Then there exists a Mori fiber space Y/T and a birational map $\sigma: X \dashrightarrow Y$ which is not square. Let $\mathcal{M} \subset |-nK_X + mF|$ be the proper transform on X of a very ample complete linear system on Y . The K^2 -condition (1.1) implies that $-K_X$ is not in the movable cone of X , and thus $m \geq 0$. By Proposition 6.2 and [Oka20a, Proposition 2.7], there are points $\mathfrak{p}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{p}_k \in X$ in distinct π -fibers and positive rational numbers $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k$ such that $\mathfrak{p}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{p}_k$ are centers of non-canonical singularities of the pair $(X, \frac{1}{n}\mathcal{M} - \sum \lambda_i F_i)$ and $\sum \lambda_i > m/n$, where F_i is the π -fiber containing \mathfrak{p}_i .

Let D_1, D_2 be general members of \mathcal{M} and let $Z := D_1 \cdot D_2$. We decompose Z into the vertical and the horizontal components: $Z = Z^v + Z^h$, and write

$$Z^v = \sum Z_i^v,$$

where the support of Z_i^v is in a π -fiber and Z^h is horizontal. By the Corti's inequality 3.11, there are numbers $t_i, i = 1, \dots, k$, with $0 < t_i \leq 1$ such that

$$\text{mult}_{\mathfrak{p}_i} Z^h + t_i \text{mult}_{\mathfrak{p}_i} Z_i^v > 2n^2 + 4\lambda_i t_i n^2.$$

We have

$$\text{mult}_{\mathfrak{p}_i} Z^h \leq (F_i \cdot Z^h) = (F \cdot Z) = (F \cdot D_1 \cdot D_2) = n^2,$$

and thus

$$\text{mult}_{\mathfrak{p}_i} Z_i^v > \frac{1}{t_i} n^2 + 4\lambda_i n^2 \geq n^2 + 4\lambda_i n^2.$$

Note that F_i is isomorphic to an irreducible and reduced weighted hypersurface of degree 6 in $\mathbb{P}(1, 1, 2, 3)$. By Lemma [Oka20a, Lemma 2.10], we can take a curve $C_i \in |\mathcal{O}_{F_i}(2)|$ which passes through \mathfrak{p}_i and which does not contain any component of $\text{Supp}(Z_i^v)$. Then we can take a divisor $H_i \in |-2K_X + r_i F|$, where r_i is a sufficiently large integer, such that $H_i|_{F_i} = C_i$. We have

$$(-K_X \cdot Z_i^v) = \frac{1}{2}(H_i \cdot Z_i^v) \geq \frac{1}{2} \text{mult}_{\mathfrak{p}_i} Z_i^v > \frac{1}{2} n^2 + 2\lambda_i n^2,$$

and, by the inequality $\sum \lambda_i > m/n$, we have

$$(6.1) \quad (-K_X \cdot Z^v) = \sum_{i=1}^k (-K_X \cdot Z_i^v) > \frac{k}{2}n^2 + 2n^2 \sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_i > \frac{1}{2}n^2 + 2mn.$$

We define $\ell := -K_X \cdot F \in \overline{\text{NE}}(X)$ so that $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \cdot \ell \subset \overline{\text{NE}}(X)$ is the extremal ray corresponding to π . Denote by $[Z^h] \in \overline{\text{NE}}(X)$ the class of Z^h . We can write $[Z^h] = \alpha(-K_X)^2 + \beta\ell$ for some numbers α, β . We have $\alpha = (F \cdot Z^h) = n^2$, and the K^2 -condition (1.1) implies that $\beta \geq 0$. It follows that

$$(-K_X \cdot Z^h) = (-K_X \cdot \alpha(-K_X)^2 + \beta\ell) \geq n^2(-K_X)^3.$$

Combining this with

$$(-K_X \cdot Z) = (-K_X) \cdot (-nK_X + mF)^2 = n^2(-K_X)^3 + 2mn,$$

we obtain the inequality

$$(6.2) \quad (-K_X \cdot Z^v) = (-K_X \cdot Z) - (-K_X \cdot Z^h) \leq 2mn.$$

Two inequalities (6.1) and (6.2) are impossible, and this shows that X/\mathbb{P}^1 is birationally superrigid. \square

REFERENCES

- [AZ16] H. Ahmadinezhad and F. Zucconi, Mori dream spaces and birational rigidity of Fano 3-folds, *Adv. Math.* **292** (2016), 410–445. [3](#), [35](#)
- [CCC] J.-J. Chen, J. A. Chen and M. Chen, On quasismooth weighted complete intersections, *J. Algebraic Geom.* **20** (2011), 239–262. [3](#)
- [Che09] I. Cheltsov, Points in projective spaces and applications. *J. Differential Geom.* **81** (2009), no. 3, 575–599. [24](#)
- [CP10] I. Cheltsov and J. Park, Sextic double solids. *Cohomological and geometric approaches to rationality problems*, 75–132, *Progr. Math.*, **282**, Birkhäuser Boston, Boston, MA, 2010. [3](#), [14](#), [23](#), [24](#)
- [CP17] I. Cheltsov and J. Park, Birationally rigid Fano threefold hypersurfaces, *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.* **246** (2017), no. 1167, v+117pp. [3](#), [29](#), [33](#), [35](#)
- [CS08] I. Cheltsov and K. A. Shramov, Log-canonical thresholds for nonsingular threefolds. *Russian Math. Surveys* **63** (2008), no. 5, 859–958. [5](#)
- [Cle83] C. H. Clemens, Double solids. *Adv. in Math.* **47** (1983), no. 2, 107–230. [21](#), [24](#)
- [Cor95] A. Corti, Factoring birational maps of threefolds after Sarkisov. *J. Algebraic Geom.* **4** (1995), no. 2, 223–254. [5](#)
- [Cor00] A. Corti, Singularities of linear systems and 3-fold birational geometry, *Explicit birational geometry of 3-folds*, London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser., **281**, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2000. [12](#)
- [CPR00] A. Corti, A. V. Pukhlikov and M. Reid, Fano 3-fold hypersurfaces, *Explicit birational geometry of 3-folds*, London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser., **281**, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2000. [3](#), [6](#)
- [Cyn02] S. Cynk, Cohomologies of a double covering of a non-singular algebraic 3-fold. *Math. Z.* **240** (2002), no. 4, 731–743. [21](#)
- [Dim90] A. Dimca, Betti numbers of hypersurfaces and defects of linear systems. *Duke Math. J.* **60** (1990), no. 1, 285–298. [21](#)
- [Dol82] I. Dolgachev, Weighted projective varieties. *Group actions and vector fields (Vancouver, B.C., 1981)*, 34–71, *Lecture Notes in Math.*, **956**, Springer, Berlin, 1982. [23](#)
- [EP18] T. Eckl, A. Pukhlikov, Effective birational rigidity of Fano double hypersurfaces. *Arnold Math. J.* **4** (2018), no. 3–4, 505–521. [12](#)
- [EP19] D. Evans, A. Pukhlikov, Birationally rigid complete intersections of high codimension. *Izvestiya: Mathematics* **83** (2019), No. 4, 743–769. [12](#)

- [Ful98] W. Fulton, Intersection theory. Second edition. Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete. 3. Folge. A Series of Modern Surveys in Mathematics, 2. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1998. xiv+470 pp. [7](#)
- [HP07] K. Hong and J. Park, On factorial double solids with simple double points. J. Pure Appl. Algebra **208** (2007), no. 1, 361–369. [24](#)
- [IF00] A. R. Iano-Fletcher, Working with weighted complete intersections, *Explicit birational geometry of 3-folds*, London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser., **281**, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2000. [3](#)
- [Isk80] V. Iskovskikh, Birational automorphisms of three-dimensional algebraic varieties. J. Math. Sci. **13** (1998), 815–868. [3](#)
- [IP96] V. A. Iskovskikh and A. V. Pukhlikov, Birational automorphisms of multidimensional algebraic manifolds, J. Math. Sci. **82** (1996), 3528–3613. [3](#)
- [Kaw03] M. Kawakita, General elephants of three-fold divisorial contractions, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **16** (2003), no. 2, 331–362. [19](#)
- [Kaw88] Y. Kawamata, Crepant blowing-up of 3-dimensional canonical singularities and its application to degenerations of surfaces. Ann. of Math. (2) **127** (1988), no. 1, 93–163. [14](#), [21](#)
- [Kaw96] Y. Kawamata, “Divisorial contractions to 3-dimensional terminal quotient singularities” in Higher-Dimensional Complex Varieties (Trento, Italy, 1994), de Gruyter, Berlin, 1996, 241–246. [28](#)
- [Klo22] R. Kloosterman, Maximal families of nodal varieties with defect. Math. Z. **300** (2022), no. 2, 1141–1156. [24](#)
- [Mal99] A. R. Malvlyutov, Cohomology of complete intersections in toric varieties. Pacific J. Math. **191** (1999), no. 1, 133–144. [21](#)
- [Oka14] T. Okada, Birational Mori fiber structures of \mathbb{Q} -Fano 3-fold weighted complete intersections, Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. (3) **109** (2014), no. 6, 1549–1600. [3](#), [30](#), [35](#)
- [Oka18] T. Okada, Birational Mori fiber structures of \mathbb{Q} -Fano 3-fold weighted complete intersections, II, J. Reine Angew. Math. **738** (2018), 73–129. [5](#), [6](#), [20](#), [21](#)
- [Oka20a] T. Okada, On birational rigidity of singular del Pezzo fibrations of degree 1. J. Lond. Math. Soc. (2) **102** (2020), no. 1, 1–21. [35](#), [36](#)
- [Oka20b] T. Okada, Birational Mori fiber structures of \mathbb{Q} -Fano 3-fold weighted complete intersections, III. Kyoto J. Math. **60** (2020), no. 3, 825–893. [7](#), [18](#)
- [Pae21] E. Paemurru, Birational geometry of sextic double solids with a compound A_n singularity, arXiv:2101.00501. [3](#), [15](#), [19](#)
- [Puk98] A. Pukhlikov, Birational automorphisms of three-dimensional algebraic varieties with a pencil of del Pezzo surfaces, Izv. Ross. Akd. Nauk Ser. Mat. **62** (1998), no. 1, 123–164; translation in Izv. Math. **62** (1998), no. 1, 115–155. [4](#), [35](#), [36](#)
- [Puk13] A. Pukhlikov, Birationally rigid varieties. *Mathematica Surveys and Monographs*, **190**. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2013. vi+365 pp. [2](#), [7](#), [10](#)
- [Puk17] A. Pukhlikov, The $4n^2$ -inequality for complete intersection singularities. Arnold Math. J. **3** (2017), no. 2, 187–196. [12](#)
- [Puk19a] A. Pukhlikov, Birationally rigid complete intersections with a singular point of high multiplicity. Proc. Edinburgh Math. Soc. **62** (2019), 221–239. [12](#)
- [Puk19b] A. Pukhlikov, Birationally rigid finite covers of the projective space. Proc. Steklov Inst. of Math. **307** (2019), 232–244. [12](#)
- [Ram08] S. Rams, Defect and Hodge numbers of hypersurfaces. Adv. Geom. **8** (2008), no. 2, 257–288. [21](#), [22](#), [23](#), [24](#)

KOREA INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY, 85 HOEGIRO, DONGDAEMUN-GU, SEOUL 02455,
REPUBLIC OF KOREA

Email address: `IKrylov@kias.re.kr`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, FACULTY OF SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING, SAGA UNIVERSITY,
SAGA 840-8502 JAPAN

Email address: `okada@cc.saga-u.ac.jp`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF MIAMI, CORAL GABLES, FLORIDA 33146,
USA. INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS AND INFORMATICS, BULGARIAN ACADEMY OF SCIENCES,
ACAD. G. BONCHEV STR. BL. 8, 1113, SOFIA, BULGARIA.

Email address: `erik.paemurru@miami.edu`

CENTER FOR GEOMETRY AND PHYSICS, INSTITUTE FOR BASIC SCIENCE, 77 CHEONGAM-RO,
NAM-GU, POHANG, GYEONGBUK, 37673, KOREA

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, POSTECH, 77 CHEONGAM-RO, NAM-GU, POHANG, GYEONGBUK,
37673, KOREA

Email address: `wlog@postech.ac.kr`