

# UNIRULEDNESS OF STABLE BASE LOCI OF ADJOINT LINEAR SYSTEMS WITH AND WITHOUT MORI THEORY

SÉBASTIEN BOUCKSOM, AMAËL BROUSTET AND GIANLUCA PACIENZA

ABSTRACT. We explain how to deduce from recent results in the Minimal Model Program a general uniruledness theorem for base loci of adjoint divisors. We also show how to recover special cases by extending a technique introduced by Takayama.

## INTRODUCTION

Let  $\alpha \in N^1(X)$  be a numerical equivalence class of divisors on a smooth projective variety  $X$ . The *non-ample locus* of  $\alpha$  is the Zariski closed subset  $\mathbf{B}_+(\alpha)$  defined as follows. If  $\alpha$  is *big* one sets

$$\mathbf{B}_+(\alpha) := \bigcap_{\alpha - E \text{ ample}} \text{Supp } E$$

where  $E$  ranges over all effective  $\mathbf{R}$ -divisors such that  $\alpha - E$  is ample. If  $\alpha$  is not big, one simply puts  $\mathbf{B}_+(\alpha) := X$ . One easily shows that  $\mathbf{B}_+(\alpha)$  is empty iff  $\alpha$  is ample (which partly accounts for the name). Non-ample loci were probably first explicitly introduced in [Nak] (where they are called *augmented base loci*) and have been extensively studied since then in relation with the asymptotic behaviour of linear series (see e.g. [Nak, Bou, ELMNP1, ELMNP2]).

It is easy to see that  $\alpha \mapsto \mathbf{B}_+(\alpha)$  is left-continuous in ample directions, in the sense that given a class  $\alpha \in N^1(X)$  we have

$$\mathbf{B}_+(\alpha) = \mathbf{B}_+(\alpha - \omega)$$

for all sufficiently small ample classes  $\omega$ . On the other hand it is not right-continuous in general, and the *non-nef locus*  $\mathbf{B}_-(\alpha)$  of  $\alpha$  is defined as the right-hand limit, that is one sets

$$\mathbf{B}_-(\alpha) := \bigcup_{\omega \text{ ample}} \mathbf{B}_+(\alpha + \omega)$$

It is easy to show that  $\mathbf{B}_-(\alpha)$  is in fact an at most countable union of Zariski closed subsets, but it is expected *not* to be Zariski closed in general even though no specific example seems to be known for the moment. We have  $\mathbf{B}_-(\alpha) = X$  iff  $\alpha$  is not pseudo-effective whereas  $\mathbf{B}_-(\alpha)$  is empty iff  $\alpha$  is nef (which again explains the terminology).

We discuss in Section 1 the definition of these loci on an arbitrary normal variety  $X$ , trying to underline the precautions needed in order to have the desired properties in the general case.

---

*Date:* February 6, 2009.

**Key-words :** big and pseff adjoints divisors; stable, non-ample and non-nef base locus; rational curves.  
**A.M.S. classification :** 14J40.

The goal of the present paper is to investigate the uniruledness properties of the non-nef and non-ample loci of adjoint divisors. After having collected basic facts in Section 1, we explain in Section 2 how to obtain the following general result using known parts of the Minimal Model Program [Kawa, BCHM].

**Theorem A.** *Let  $X$  be a normal projective variety and let  $\Delta$  be an effective  $\mathbf{R}$ -divisor such that  $(X, \Delta)$  is klt.*

- (i) *If  $K_X + \Delta$  is pseudo-effective, then every irreducible component of the non-nef locus  $\mathbf{B}_-(K_X + \Delta)$  is uniruled.*
- (ii) *If  $X$  is  $\mathbf{Q}$ -factorial and  $K_X + \Delta$  is big, then every irreducible component of its non-ample locus  $\mathbf{B}_+(K_X + \Delta)$  is uniruled.*

Note that (i) is also true when  $K_X + \Delta$  is *not* pseudo-effective, as follows from [MM] and [BDPP]. The assumption on  $\mathbf{Q}$ -factoriality is used to reduce (ii) to (i).

As explained in Section 1, the non-nef locus  $\mathbf{B}_-(\alpha)$  of a pseudo-effective class  $\alpha$  is Zariski closed as soon as  $\alpha$  admits a *Zariski decomposition* in the sense of Fujita. This holds in particular if  $\alpha$  is the class of a big  $\mathbf{Q}$ -divisor  $D$  whose algebra of sections

$$R(X, D) := \bigoplus_{m \geq 0} H^0(X, mD)$$

is finitely generated, since indeed  $\mathbf{B}_-(D)$  coincides in that case with the *stable base locus* of  $D$ , that is the intersection

$$\mathbf{B}(D) := \bigcap_m \text{Bs}(|mD|)$$

of the base loci of all multiples of  $D$ . When  $(X, \Delta)$  is a klt pair with  $\Delta$  a  $\mathbf{Q}$ -divisor and  $K_X + \Delta$  big, Theorem A above and the finite generation result of [BCHM] therefore yield that every component of the stable base locus  $\mathbf{B}(K_X + \Delta)$  is uniruled.

The special cases of Theorem A in which  $X$  is smooth and either  $K_X$  or  $\Delta$  vanishes was obtained by S. Takayama in [Taka2] by a completely different (and more direct) method, which combined his extension result for log-pluricanonical forms (see [Taka1, Theorem 4.5]) with the characterisation of uniruled varieties in terms of the non-pseudo-effectivity of the canonical class already mentioned.

In Section 3, we show how to obtain from Takayama's method the following further special cases of Theorem A.

**Theorem B.** *Let  $X$  be a smooth projective variety and  $L$  a line bundle on  $X$  such that either  $-K_X$  or  $L - K_X$  is nef.*

- (i) *If  $L$  is pseudo-effective, then every irreducible component of the non-nef locus  $\mathbf{B}_-(L)$  is uniruled.*
- (ii) *If  $L$  is furthermore big, then every irreducible component of the stable base locus  $\mathbf{B}(L)$  or of the non-ample locus  $\mathbf{B}_+(L)$  is uniruled.*

**Acknowledgements.** Part of this work was done by G.P. during his stay at the Università di Roma "La Sapienza". He wishes to thank K. O'Grady for making this stay very pleasant and stimulating and for providing the financial support. A.B. thanks Laurent Bonavero for stimulating conversations on this subject.

## 1. PRELIMINARIES

Unless otherwise specified we will use the standard notation, definitions and terminology (as in [KM]).

**1.1. Non-ample loci.** When  $X$  is an arbitrary normal variety, it is natural to define non-ample loci as follows, which might differ from the definition given in [ELMNP1] when  $X$  is not  $\mathbf{Q}$ -factorial.

**Definition 1.1.**

$$\mathbf{B}_+(\alpha) := \bigcap_{\pi^*\alpha - E \text{ ample}} \pi(\text{Supp } E)$$

where  $E$  ranges over all effective  $\mathbf{R}$ -Cartier  $\mathbf{R}$ -divisors on a birational model  $\pi : X' \rightarrow X$  such that  $\pi^*\alpha - E$  is ample. When  $\alpha$  is not big we set  $\mathbf{B}_+(\alpha) := X$ .

When  $X$  is  $\mathbf{Q}$ -factorial, every effective divisor  $D \equiv \pi^*\alpha$  can be written as the pull-back  $D = \pi^*E$  of an effective divisor  $E$  on  $X$ , and we recover the definition recalled in the introduction for smooth varieties.

In general, the non-ample locus can equivalently be described as follows:

**Proposition 1.2.** *Let  $\alpha$  be a big class on  $X$ . Then we have*

$$\mathbf{B}_+(\alpha) = \bigcap_{\mathcal{I}} V(\mathcal{I})$$

where  $\mathcal{I}$  runs over all coherent ideal sheaves on  $X$  such that there exists  $t > 0$  and a (small) ample class  $\omega$  on  $X$  for which  $\pi^*(\alpha - \omega) - tE$  is nef on the normalised blow-up  $\pi : X' \rightarrow X$  of  $\mathcal{I}$  (with  $\mathcal{O}(-E) := \pi^{-1}\mathcal{I}$ ).

*Proof.* If  $\pi : X' \rightarrow X$  is the normalised blow-up of  $\mathcal{I}$  then  $-E$  is  $\pi$ -ample, thus  $\pi^*\omega - \varepsilon E$  is ample on  $X'$  for each  $\varepsilon > 0$  sufficiently small, and it follows that  $\pi^*\alpha - (t - \varepsilon)E$  is ample. We thus get  $\mathbf{B}_+(\alpha) \subset V(\mathcal{I})$ . Conversely if  $E$  is an effective  $\mathbf{R}$ -divisor on some birational model  $\pi : X' \rightarrow X$  such that  $\pi^*\alpha - E$  is ample, then upon perturbing the coefficients of  $E$  a little bit we can assume that  $E$  is a  $\mathbf{Q}$ -divisor. To be more precise, we write  $E = \sum_{j=1}^N t_j E_j$  with  $t_j > 0$  and consider the subspace  $V \subset \mathbf{R}^N$  of coefficients  $s_j$  such that  $\sum_j s_j E_j$  is  $\mathbf{R}$ -Cartier. The subspace  $V$  is defined over  $\mathbf{Q}$ , thus we can take our perturbation of  $E$  in there, which preserves the  $\mathbf{R}$ -Cartier condition. Now  $-E$  is  $\pi$ -ample, thus we get  $\mathcal{O}(-mE) = \pi^{-1}\mathcal{I}_m$  for  $\mathcal{I}_m := \pi_*\mathcal{O}(-mE)$  and  $m$  sufficiently large and divisible, and the result follows since  $\pi(\text{Supp } E) = V(\mathcal{I}_m)$ .  $\square$

The non-ample loci so defined satisfy the expected left-continuity property:

**Lemma 1.3.** *Let  $\alpha \in N^1(X)$  be a numerical class on a normal projective variety  $X$  and let  $\omega$  be an ample class. Then we have*

$$\mathbf{B}_+(\alpha - \varepsilon\omega) = \mathbf{B}_+(\alpha)$$

for all  $\varepsilon > 0$  small enough.

*Proof.* It is clear that  $\mathbf{B}_+(\alpha - \varepsilon\omega)$  decreases as  $\varepsilon > 0$  decreases to 0, thus there exists  $\varepsilon_0 > 0$  such that

$$\mathbf{B}_+(\alpha) \subset \mathbf{B}_+(\alpha - \varepsilon\omega) = \mathbf{B}_+(\alpha - \varepsilon_0\omega)$$

for all  $0 < \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0$  by noetherianity. Now let  $x \in X \setminus \mathbf{B}_+(\alpha)$ . By definition, there exists an effective  $\mathbf{R}$ -divisor  $E$  on a birational model  $\pi : X' \rightarrow X$  such that  $\pi^*\alpha - E$  is ample and  $x$  does not belong to  $\pi(\text{Supp } E)$ . But then  $\pi^*(\alpha - \varepsilon\omega) - E$  is also ample for  $\varepsilon > 0$  small enough since ampleness is an open property and  $\pi^*$  is continuous. As a consequence  $x$  does not belong to  $\mathbf{B}_+(\alpha - \varepsilon\omega)$  for some  $\varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0$ , hence the result.  $\square$

**1.2. Asymptotic vanishing orders and non-nef loci.** The definition of asymptotic vanishing orders goes back at least as far as Definition 2.4 in [Cut]. They were investigated in [Naka, Bou, ELMNP1]. Here we adopt the following convenient definition. We let  $X$  be a normal projective variety.

**Definition 1.4.** *Let  $\nu$  be a divisorial valuation on  $X$ .*

(i) *If  $\alpha \in N^1(X)$  is a big class, one sets*

$$\nu(\alpha) := \inf_E \nu(E)$$

*where  $E$  ranges over all effective  $\mathbf{R}$ -divisors on a birational model  $\pi : X' \rightarrow X$  above  $X$  such that  $E \equiv \pi^*\alpha$ .*

(ii) *If  $\alpha \in N^1(X)$  is a pseudo-effective class, one sets*

$$\nu(\alpha) := \sup_{\varepsilon > 0} \nu(\alpha + \varepsilon\omega)$$

*where  $\omega$  ranges over all ample classes.*

Some explanations are in order. On the one hand a simple monotonicity argument shows that the supremum in (ii) coincides with the limit as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$  and is independent of the choice of  $\omega$ . On the other hand it is immediate to see that  $\alpha \mapsto \nu(\alpha)$  defined by (i) on big classes is homogeneous and sub-additive. It is thus a convex and therefore continuous function on the big cone, since the latter is open and convex in the finite dimensional space  $N^1(X)$ . As a consequence, the extension (ii) to the pseudo-effective cone is well-defined. It also follows from Corollary 2.7 of [ELMNP1] that the present definition coincides with Definition 2.2 there.

The extension (ii) to the pseudo-effective cone is continuous in pseudo-effective directions, that is we have

$$(1.1) \quad \lim_{\beta \rightarrow 0, \beta \text{ pseudo-effective}} \nu(\alpha + \beta) = \nu(\alpha).$$

However we stress that it is in general *not* continuous up to the boundary (cf. [Naka] for a counterexample).

**Remark 1.5.** *When  $X$  is smooth (or merely  $\mathbf{Q}$ -factorial) it is enough to consider divisors  $E$  on  $X$  itself in definition (i), but this might be false in general.*

**Remark 1.6.** *Given an effective  $\mathbf{R}$ -divisor  $D$  one should be careful not to confuse the usual  $\nu$ -value  $\nu(D)$  of  $D$  with  $\nu(\{D\})$  of its numerical class  $\{D\} \in N^1(X)$ .*

We will use the following easy property.

**Lemma 1.7.** *Let  $\pi : X' \rightarrow X$  be an birational morphism between normal varieties and let  $F$  be an effective  $\pi$ -exceptional Cartier  $\mathbf{R}$ -divisor on  $X'$ . Then for every divisorial valuation  $\nu$  we have*

$$\nu(\pi^*\alpha + \{F\}) = \nu(\alpha) + \nu(F).$$

*Proof.* Upon adding a small ample class to  $\alpha$  we may assume that  $\alpha$  is big in view of (1.1). If  $\rho : X'' \rightarrow X'$  is another birational morphism, then  $\rho^*F$  is of course effective and exceptional over  $X$ . The "negativity lemma" ([KM], Lemma 3.39) thus implies that every effective  $\mathbf{R}$ -divisor  $E$  on  $X''$  such that

$$E \equiv \rho^*\pi^*\alpha + \rho^*F$$

is of the form  $E = D + \rho^*F$  where  $D \equiv \rho^*\pi^*\alpha$  is an effective  $\mathbf{R}$ -divisor. But in that case we have  $\nu(E) = \nu(D) + \nu(F)$  and the result follows immediately.  $\square$

Recall from the introduction that if  $X$  is a *smooth* projective variety then the non-nef locus of a class  $\alpha \in N^1(X)$  is *defined* by

$$(1.2) \quad \mathbf{B}_-(\alpha) = \bigcup_{\varepsilon > 0} \mathbf{B}_+(\alpha + \varepsilon\omega)$$

for any ample class  $\omega$ . The following result is Theorem B of [ELMNP1].

**Theorem 1.8** ([ELMNP1]). *If  $\alpha \in N^1(X)$  is a pseudo-effective class on a smooth projective variety  $X$  and  $\nu$  is a divisorial valuation, then  $\nu(\alpha) > 0$  holds iff the center of  $\nu$  on  $X$  is contained in the non-nef locus  $\mathbf{B}_-(\alpha)$ .*

This shows in particular the following birational invariance property of non-nef loci: if  $\pi : X' \rightarrow X$  is a birational morphism between smooth projective varieties, then we have

$$\mathbf{B}_-(\alpha) = \pi(\mathbf{B}_-(\pi^*\alpha))$$

for any class  $\alpha$  on  $X$ . In order to keep this highly desirable property, we are thus led to the following definition for a normal variety:

**Definition 1.9.** *Let  $X$  be a normal projective variety and let  $\alpha \in N^1(X)$  be a pseudo-effective class. The non-nef locus of  $\alpha$  is defined by*

$$\mathbf{B}_-(\alpha) := \bigcup_{\nu(\alpha) > 0} c_X(\nu)$$

where  $\nu$  ranges over all divisorial valuations such that  $\nu(\alpha) > 0$  and  $c_X(\nu)$  denotes the centre of  $\nu$  on  $X$ . When  $\alpha$  is not pseudo-effective we set  $\mathbf{B}_-(\alpha) = X$ .

By Theorem 1.8 we thus get  $\mathbf{B}_-(\alpha) = \pi(\mathbf{B}_-(\pi^*\alpha))$  for any resolution of singularities  $\pi : X' \rightarrow X$ . In particular  $\mathbf{B}_-(\alpha)$  is still an at most countable union of Zariski closed subsets.

The following properties are trivial and left to the reader.

**Lemma 1.10.** *Let  $X$  be a normal projective variety. Let  $\alpha$  be a given class and  $\omega$  an ample one.*

- (i) *We have  $\mathbf{B}_-(\alpha + \varepsilon\omega) \subset \mathbf{B}_-(\alpha)$  for every  $\varepsilon > 0$ , and conversely every irreducible component  $V$  of  $\mathbf{B}_-(\alpha)$  is a component of  $\mathbf{B}_-(\alpha + \varepsilon\omega)$  for  $\varepsilon > 0$  small enough.*
- (ii) *The following inclusions hold:*

$$\bigcup_{\varepsilon > 0} \mathbf{B}_-(\alpha + \varepsilon\omega) \subset \mathbf{B}_-(\alpha) \subset \mathbf{B}_+(\alpha) \subset \bigcup_{\varepsilon > 0} \mathbf{B}_+(\alpha + \varepsilon\omega)$$

Now a main issue is whether (1.2) still holds in the normal case. The expected equality is thus equivalent to the inclusion

$$\mathbf{B}_+(\alpha + \omega) \subset \mathbf{B}_-(\alpha)$$

for every ample class  $\omega$ , which turns out to be non-trivial. We now sketch the proof in the  $\mathbf{Q}$ -factorial case, adapting the arguments of Theorem B in [ELMNP1].

**Proposition 1.11.** *Let  $X$  be a  $\mathbf{Q}$ -factorial projective variety. Then we have*

$$\mathbf{B}_+(\alpha + \omega) \subset \mathbf{B}_-(\alpha)$$

for any class  $\alpha$  and any ample class  $\omega$  on  $X$ , hence the equality (1.2) holds.

*Proof.* Arguing as [ELMNP1] p.15, we can assume that  $\alpha$  is represented by a big  $\mathbf{Q}$ -divisor. Let  $\nu$  be a divisorial valuation such that  $\nu(\alpha) = 0$ . By Proposition 1.2 we have to construct an ideal sheaf  $\mathcal{I}$  on  $X$  with  $\nu(\mathcal{I}) = 0$  and such that  $\alpha - tE(\mathcal{I}) + (1 - \varepsilon)\omega$  is a nef  $b$ -divisor class for some  $t, \varepsilon > 0$  (we refer to [Corti+] for the definition and the basic properties of  $b$ -divisors). This is done using asymptotic multiplier ideals. More precisely, if  $E$  is an effective Cartier  $b$ -divisor then one can define its multiplier ideal in the usual way since  $K_X$  is  $\mathbf{Q}$ -Cartier. Now we define the asymptotic multiplier ideal  $\mathcal{I}(\alpha)$  of the big class  $\alpha$  as the largest element among all multiplier ideals  $\mathcal{I}(E)$  of effective Cartier  $b$ -divisors  $E$  such that  $\alpha - E$  is nef. One shows as in the usual case that

$$\mu(\mathcal{I}(\alpha)) \leq \mu(\alpha)$$

holds for every divisorial valuation  $\mu$ . Now we claim that there exists a sufficiently ample class  $\omega_0$  on  $X$  such that

$$k\alpha - E(\mathcal{I}(k\alpha)) + \omega_0$$

is nef Cartier for all sufficiently divisible  $k$ . Indeed it is enough to take  $\omega_0$  ample enough to absorb  $K_X$  and satisfy the uniform global generation property for multiplier ideals, itself a consequence of Nadel's vanishing (see [Laz, Prop. 9.4.26 and Cor. 11.2.13]). We now get the desired result by dividing by  $k$  and taking  $k$  large enough so that  $\omega - \frac{1}{k}\omega_0$  is ample, since we have

$$\nu(\mathcal{I}(k\alpha)) \leq \nu(k\alpha) = k\nu(\alpha) = 0$$

by assumption. □

**Corollary 1.12.** *If  $X$  is  $\mathbf{Q}$ -factorial and  $\alpha$  is a class on  $X$ , then given an ample class  $\omega$  we have*

$$\mathbf{B}_+(\alpha) = \mathbf{B}_-(\alpha - \varepsilon\omega)$$

for all  $\varepsilon > 0$  small enough.

*Proof.* We have

$$\mathbf{B}_-(\alpha - \varepsilon\omega) \subset \mathbf{B}_+(\alpha - \varepsilon\omega) = \mathbf{B}_+(\alpha)$$

for all  $\varepsilon > 0$  small enough by Lemma 1.3, and on the other hand

$$\mathbf{B}_+(\alpha) \subset \mathbf{B}_-(\alpha - \varepsilon\omega)$$

by Proposition 1.11 hence the result. □

**1.3. Pairs.** We will use the standard definitions of klt and log-canonical pairs (see for instance [KM], Definition 2.34). We will moreover occasionally say that an effective divisor  $\Delta$  on a normal projective variety  $X$  is klt if  $(X, \Delta)$  is a klt pair.

**1.4. Zariski decompositions.** A pseudo-effective class  $\alpha$  is said to admit a *Zariski decomposition* (in the sense of Fujita) if there exists a smallest effective Cartier  $\mathbf{R}$ -divisor  $N(\alpha)$  on some model  $\pi : X' \rightarrow X$  such that  $\pi^*\alpha - N(\alpha)$  is nef. This means that given any other model  $\rho = \pi \circ \mu : Y \rightarrow X$  dominating  $X'$  and any effective  $\mathbf{R}$ -divisor  $E$  on  $Y$  such that  $\rho^*\alpha - E$  is nef we must have  $\mu^*N(\alpha) \leq E$ .

This definition generalises one of the characterisations of Zariski decompositions on surfaces, which always exists (with  $\pi$  the identity in that case). The existence of higher dimensional Zariski decompositions is investigated in detail in Nakayama's book [Naka]. One of the main results is the construction of big line bundles *without* a Zariski decomposition.

Zariski decompositions are closely related to asymptotic vanishing orders. Indeed Lemma 1.7 implies that  $\nu(\alpha) = \nu(N(\alpha))$  whenever  $\alpha$  admits a Zariski decomposition. It follows in particular that  $\mathbf{B}_-(\alpha)$  is *Zariski closed* when  $\alpha$  admits a Zariski decomposition. The converse is not true:  $\mathbf{B}_-(\alpha)$  is Zariski closed for Nakayama's counter-example.

On the other hand Zariski decompositions hold the following well-known relations to finite generation and the MMP.

**Proposition 1.13.** *Let  $X$  be a normal projective variety.*

- (i) *Let  $D$  be a big  $\mathbf{Q}$ -Cartier divisor on  $X$  whose algebra  $R(X, D) := \bigoplus_m H^0(mD)$  is finitely generated. Then  $D$  admits a Zariski decomposition and we have  $\mathbf{B}_-(D) = \mathbf{B}(D)$ .*
- (ii) *Let  $\Delta$  be an effective Weil  $\mathbf{R}$ -divisor such that  $(X, \Delta)$  is log-canonical and  $K_X + \Delta$  is  $\mathbf{R}$ -Cartier and pseudo-effective. If a minimal model for  $(X, \Delta)$  can be reached by a finite number of divisorial contractions and flips, then  $K_X + \Delta$  admits a Zariski decomposition.*

*Proof.* (i) Since  $D$  is big, the finite generation of  $R(X, D)$  is equivalent to the existence of birational morphisms  $\pi : Y \rightarrow X$  and  $\pi' : Y \rightarrow X'$  such that

$$\pi^*D = \pi'^*A + F$$

where  $A$  is ample and  $E$  is effective and  $\pi'$ -exceptional (just take a log-resolution of the base scheme of  $mD$  if  $R(X, D)$  is generated in degree  $m$ ). Such a decomposition is a Zariski decomposition by the negativity lemma ([KM], Lemma 3.39), and we also have

$$\mathbf{B}(D) = \pi(\text{Supp } F) = \mathbf{B}_-(D)$$

by Lemma 1.7.

(ii) Set  $D := K_X + \Delta$ . The MMP yields a similar situation as in (i), but with  $A := K_{X'} + \Delta'$  merely nef. This property is called the " $D$ -negativity" of the birational map  $X \dashrightarrow X'$  in [BCHM], and is indeed a well-known consequence of the same negativity lemma as before applied to each step of the MMP. Yet another application of the negativity lemma then shows as above that  $K_X + \Delta$  admits a Zariski decomposition.  $\square$

## 2. PROOF OF THEOREM A

Let  $X$  be a normal projective and let  $\Delta$  be an effective  $\mathbf{R}$ -divisor on  $X$  such that  $(X, \Delta)$  be a klt pair and assume that  $K_X + \Delta$  is pseudo-effective. Let  $V$  be a irreducible component of the non-nef locus  $\mathbf{B}_-(K_X + \Delta)$ . By Lemma 1.10 we can add a small ample divisor to  $\Delta$  in order to prove (i) of Theorem A for  $V$ , and we thus assume from now

on that  $K_X + \Delta$  is big. As in [BCHM] we can furthermore assume for both (i) and (ii) that  $\Delta$  is big. Indeed let  $D \equiv K_X + \Delta$  be an effective divisor. We have

$$\frac{1}{1-\varepsilon}(K_X + \Delta) \equiv K_X + \Delta + \frac{\varepsilon}{1-\varepsilon}D$$

and  $\Delta + \frac{\varepsilon}{1-\varepsilon}D$  is big and klt for  $\varepsilon > 0$  small enough.

Now we claim that (ii) follows from (i). Indeed given an ample divisor  $A$  we have

$$\mathbf{B}_+(K_X + \Delta) = \mathbf{B}_-(K_X + \Delta - \varepsilon A)$$

for  $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$  by Corollary 1.12 (which applies since, by one of the hypotheses of (ii),  $X$  is  $\mathbf{Q}$ -factorial) and  $\Delta - \varepsilon A$  is numerically equivalent to a klt divisor for  $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$  since  $\varepsilon A$  can be absorbed in the ample part of  $\Delta$ .

We now focus on the proof of (i). Recall that  $V$  is a irreducible component of the non-nef locus  $\mathbf{B}_-(K_X + \Delta)$  and suppose by contradiction that  $V$  is not uniruled. Let  $X \dashrightarrow X'$  be a first step in a (directed) MMP of  $K_X + \Delta$ , i.e. a divisorial extremal contraction or the flip of a small extremal contraction since  $K_X + \Delta$  is pseudo-effective. The pair  $(X', \Delta')$  is also klt if we denote by  $\Delta'$  the strict transform of  $\Delta$  on  $X'$ . We will show that the strict transform  $V'$  of  $V$  on  $X'$  is well-defined and is a component of the non-nef locus of the strict transform  $K_{X'} + \Delta'$ . By [BCHM] we can reach a model where the non-nef locus is empty after a finite number  $N$  of steps (since  $K_X + \Delta$  is big) and arguing by induction on  $N$  will thus yield the result.

For the sake of clarity, we consider the cases of a divisorial and of a small contraction separately. We thus first assume that  $\rho : X \rightarrow X'$  is a divisorial extremal contraction whose exceptional (prime) divisor we denote by  $E$ . Note that  $E$  has to be contained in the non-nef locus of  $K_X + \Delta$  since it is covered by curves  $C$  such that  $(K_X + \Delta) \cdot C < 0$ . The divisor  $E$  is uniruled by [Kawa]. It follows that  $V$  is not contained in  $E$ , since we would have  $V = E$  otherwise ( $V$  is assumed to be a component of the non-nef locus) and this would contradict the assumption that  $V$  is not uniruled. Now we can write

$$(2.1) \quad K_X + \Delta = \rho^*(K_{X'} + \Delta') + tE$$

for some  $t > 0$  since  $-(K_X + \Delta)$  is  $\rho$ -ample. It follows from Lemma 1.7 that given a divisorial valuation  $\nu$  the asymptotic multiplicities satisfy

$$(2.2) \quad \nu(\{K_X + \Delta\}) = \nu(\{K_{X'} + \Delta'\}) + t\nu(E).$$

By Definition 1.9 we can pick a divisorial valuation  $\nu$  with centre  $V$  on  $X$  and such that  $\nu(\{K_X + \Delta\}) > 0$ . We have  $\nu(E) = 0$  since  $V$  is not contained in  $E$ , and we conclude that  $\nu(\{K_{X'} + \Delta'\}) > 0$ , i.e. that  $V'$  is contained in the non-nef locus of  $K_{X'} + \Delta'$ .

We now claim that  $V'$  is a component on the non-nef locus of  $K_{X'} + \Delta'$ . If not we find a divisorial valuation  $\mu$  with  $\mu(\{K_{X'} + \Delta'\}) > 0$  and whose centre  $W'$  on  $X'$  strictly contains  $V'$ . By (2.2) we infer that  $\mu(\{K_X + \Delta\}) > 0$  so that the strict transform  $W$  of  $W'$  on  $X$  is contained in the non-nef locus of  $K_X + \Delta$ . Since  $W$  strictly contains  $V$ , this contradicts the assumption that  $V$  is a component of the non-nef locus of  $K_X + \Delta$ .

We now consider the case of a flip. We have a diagram

$$X \xrightarrow{\rho} Z \xleftarrow{\rho'} X'$$

where  $X \rightarrow Z$  is a small contraction whose exceptional locus we denote by  $E$  and  $X' \rightarrow Z$  is its flip. In particular

- (1)  $-(K_X + \Delta)$  is relatively ample over  $Z$ .
- (2)  $K_{X'} + \Delta'$  is relatively ample over  $Z$ .

We see as above that  $V$  cannot be contained in  $E$ . Indeed the first condition shows again that  $E$  is contained in the non-nef locus of  $K_X + \Delta$ . If  $V \subset E$ , then  $V$  would be a component of  $E$ , and we would conclude again that  $V$  is uniruled by [Kawa].

Since  $X'$  can be described as the Proj over  $Z$  of the relative algebra of sections of  $K_X + \Delta$ , we see that  $X \dashrightarrow X'$  is defined outside  $E$ . We can thus find a resolution of indeterminacies

$$X \xleftarrow{\pi} Y \xrightarrow{\pi'} X'$$

such that  $Y \rightarrow X$  is isomorphic over  $X - E$ . By the negativity lemma ([KM], Lemma 3.39) properties (1) and (2) above imply

$$\pi^*(K_X + \Delta) = (\pi')^*(K_{X'} + \Delta') + F$$

where  $F$  is an effective  $\mathbf{R}$ -divisor on  $Y$  which is exceptional over  $X'$ . It follows again from Lemma 1.7 that given a divisorial valuation  $\nu$  the asymptotic multiplicities satisfy

$$(2.3) \quad \nu(\{K_X + \Delta\}) = \nu(\{K_{X'} + \Delta'\}) + \nu(F).$$

We pick again a divisorial valuation  $\nu$  with centre  $V$  on  $X$  and such that  $\nu(\{K_X + \Delta\}) > 0$ . Since  $F$  is  $\pi'$ -exceptional and  $X \dashrightarrow X'$  is isomorphic in codimension 1, it follows that  $\pi(F) \subset E$  doesn't contain  $V$ , i.e.  $\nu(F) = 0$ . We now conclude that  $V'$  is a component of the non-nef locus of  $K_{X'} + \Delta'$  just as before.

### 3. PROOF OF THEOREM B

In this section we first explain how to infer Theorem B from Theorem A, and then give a direct proof following Takayama's approach and thus avoiding [BCHM].

**3.1. Theorem A implies Theorem B.** We are actually going to show that Theorem A implies Theorem B when  $L$  is an  $\mathbf{R}$ -divisor. As in the proof of Theorem A, we then have the flexibility to assume that  $L$  is big upon adding to it a small multiple of an ample divisor.

Assume first that  $-K_X$  is nef. We then have

$$\varepsilon L = K_X + (\varepsilon L - K_X)$$

and  $\varepsilon L - K_X$  is numerically equivalent to a klt divisor  $\Delta$  for  $\varepsilon > 0$  small enough. Indeed we can write  $L \equiv A + E$  where  $A$  is ample and  $E$  is effective, hence

$$\varepsilon L - K_X \equiv \varepsilon E + \varepsilon A - K_X$$

where  $\varepsilon A - K_X$  is ample and  $\varepsilon E$  is klt for  $\varepsilon$  small enough. Since both  $\mathbf{B}_-(L)$  and  $\mathbf{B}_+(L)$  are invariant under scaling  $L$  we thus get the result by Theorem A applied to  $(X, \Delta)$ .

Now assume instead that  $L - K_X =: N$  is nef. We can then write

$$\frac{1}{1-\varepsilon}L = K_X + N + \frac{\varepsilon}{1-\varepsilon}L$$

and  $N + \frac{\varepsilon}{1-\varepsilon}L$  is numerically equivalent to a klt divisor  $\Delta$  for  $\varepsilon > 0$  small enough just as before, and Theorem A again implies the desired result after scaling  $L$ .

**3.2. A (more) direct proof of Theorem B.** Takayama's key idea is that the proof of his extension result [Taka1, Theorem 4.5] may be used in combination with [MM] and [BDPP] to obtain the following criteria for uniruledness.

**Theorem 3.1** (Takayama, [Taka2], Corollary 3.3). *Let  $X$  be a smooth projective variety and  $V \subset X$  be an irreducible subvariety. Let  $D$  be a line bundle on  $X$ . Assume there exists a decomposition  $D \equiv A + E$ , where  $A$  is an ample  $\mathbf{Q}$ -divisor and  $E$  is an effective  $\mathbf{Q}$ -divisor which is a maximal lc center for the pair  $(X, E)$ .*

- (a) *If  $V$  is contained in the stable base locus  $\mathbf{B}(K_X + D)$ , then  $V$  is uniruled.*
- (b) *If  $K_X + D$  is big and  $V$  is a component of the non-ample locus  $\mathbf{B}_+(K_X + D)$ , then  $V$  is uniruled.*

Recall that a maximal log-canonical (lc for short) center of  $(X, E)$  is a subvariety along which the generic log-canonical threshold of  $E$  is equal to 1 (cf. [Laz]) and which is maximal for that property.

We now consider the situation of Theorem B. Let thus  $L$  be a line bundle and assume that either  $-K_X$  or  $L - K_X$  is nef. We begin with (ii) of Theorem B. We thus assume that  $L$  is big and let  $V$  be an irreducible component of either  $\mathbf{B}(L)$  or  $\mathbf{B}_+(L)$  that is not contained in  $\mathbf{B}_-(L)$ . We try to apply Theorem 3.1. The desired Kodaira-type decomposition will be obtained thanks to the following result.

**Lemma 3.2** ([Taka2], Proposition 4.3). *Let  $X$  be a smooth projective variety and  $D$  a big  $\mathbf{Q}$ -divisor on  $X$ . Assume that  $V \subset X$  is an irreducible component of either  $\mathbf{B}(D)$  or  $\mathbf{B}_+(D)$ . Then there exists a rational number  $\alpha > 0$  and a decomposition  $\alpha D \equiv A + E$  with  $A$  ample  $\mathbf{Q}$ -divisor and  $E$  effective  $\mathbf{Q}$ -divisor on  $X$  such that  $V$  is a maximal lc center for  $(X, E)$ .*

We can now extend [Taka2, Propositions 5.1 and 5.2] as follows.

**Proposition 3.3.** *Let  $X$  be a smooth projective variety and let  $L$  be a big line bundle on  $X$ . Let  $V$  be an irreducible component of either  $\mathbf{B}(L)$  or  $\mathbf{B}_+(L)$  which is not contained in  $\mathbf{B}_-(L)$ . Then  $V$  is uniruled if either  $-K_X$  or  $L - K_X$  is nef.*

*Proof.* By Lemma 3.2 there exists a rational number  $\alpha > 0$  and a decomposition

$$\alpha L \equiv A + E$$

with  $A$  an ample  $\mathbf{Q}$ -divisor and  $E$  an effective  $\mathbf{Q}$ -divisor such that  $V$  is a maximal lc center for  $(X, E)$ .

Suppose first that  $V$  is a component of  $\mathbf{B}(L)$ . In case  $-K_X$  is nef we write

$$D := mL - K_X = \left( (m - \alpha)L + \frac{1}{2}A \right) + \left( \frac{1}{2}A - K_X \right) + E$$

and the result follows from Theorem 3.1, item (a), applied to  $D$  since  $\frac{1}{2}A - K_X$  is ample and  $V$  is not contained in  $\mathbf{B}((m - \alpha)L + \frac{1}{2}A)$  for  $m \gg 1$  since it is not contained in  $\mathbf{B}_-(L)$  by assumption. In case  $L - K_X$  is nef we write

$$D := (m + 1)L - K_X = \left( (m - \alpha)L + \frac{1}{2}A \right) + \left( \frac{1}{2}A + L - K_X \right) + E$$

and we conclude similarly since  $\frac{1}{2}A + L - K_X$  is ample and  $V$  is not contained in  $\mathbf{B}((m - \alpha)L + \frac{1}{2}A)$  for  $m \gg 1$ .

Assume now that  $V$  is a component of  $\mathbf{B}_+(L)$  not contained in  $\mathbf{B}(L)$ . In case  $-K_X$  is nef we write

$$D := mL - K_X = (m - \alpha)L + (A - K_X) + E$$

and in case  $L - K_X$

$$D := (m + 1)L - K_X = (m - \alpha)L + (A + L - K_X) + E$$

and conclude as above by applying Theorem 3.1, item (b), to  $D$ .  $\square$

Proposition 3.3 already proves (ii) of Theorem B in case the component  $V$  of either  $\mathbf{B}(L)$  or  $\mathbf{B}_+(L)$  is not contained in  $\mathbf{B}_-(L)$ . We now focus on the case where  $V$  is a component of  $\mathbf{B}_-(L)$ . It is then as before a component of  $\mathbf{B}(L + \varepsilon A)$  if  $A$  is ample and  $\varepsilon > 0$  is small enough, but this does not directly reduce case (i) to case (ii) since  $L + \varepsilon A$  is not a line bundle anymore, and one thus has to exercise a little more care in the reduction trick. We will argue as in [Taka2, Proof of Proposition 6.1, (2)].

Let thus

$$t_0 := \inf\{t \in \mathbf{Q}, V \subset \mathbf{B}(tL + A)\}.$$

Note that  $t_0 > 0$  since  $tL + A$  is ample for  $0 < t \ll 1$ . On the other hand we also have  $t_0 < \infty$ , by [Taka2, Lemma 2.5, item (1)].

**Lemma 3.4.** *There exist two positive integers  $m$  and  $n$  such that*

$$(3.1) \quad \frac{m+1}{n} > t_0$$

and such that

$$(3.2) \quad mL + nA \sim_{\mathbf{Q}} A_1 + E_1$$

and

$$(3.3) \quad (m+1)L + nA \sim_{\mathbf{Q}} A_2 + E_2$$

where, for each  $i = 1, 2$ , the divisor  $A_i$  is an ample  $\mathbf{Q}$ -divisor and  $E_i$  is an effective  $\mathbf{Q}$ -divisor such that  $V$  is a maximal lc center for  $(X, E_i)$ .

Assume this result for the moment. By the definition of  $t_0$ , condition (3.1) guarantees that  $V \subset \mathbf{B}((m+1)L + nA)$ . If  $-K_X$  is nef, we write

$$D := (m+1)L + nA - K_X \stackrel{(3.2)}{\sim}_{\mathbf{Q}} (A_2 - K_X) + E_2$$

and we conclude by Theorem 3.1, item (i), since  $A_2 - K_X$  is ample. If  $L - K_X$  is nef we write

$$D := (m+1)L + nA - K_X \stackrel{(3.3)}{\sim}_{\mathbf{Q}} (A_1 + L - K_X) + E_1$$

and we conclude as before since  $A_1 + L - K_X$  is nef.

*Proof of Lemma 3.4.* Choose an integer  $m_1 > t_0 + 1$ . Since  $V$  is an irreducible component of  $\mathbf{B}(m_1L + A)$  we can apply Lemma 3.2 and write

$$(3.4) \quad \alpha(m_1L + A) = H + F$$

where  $\alpha$  is a positive rational number,  $H$  is ample and  $V$  is a maximal lc center for  $(X, F)$ . Now choose two positive integers  $m$  and  $n$  such that

$$(3.5) \quad m > \max\{\alpha m_1, t_0\},$$

$$(3.6) \quad n > \max\{\alpha, 1\}$$

and

$$(3.7) \quad -1 < m - nt_0 < \alpha.$$

The existence of such  $m$  and  $n$  may be seen as follows: if  $t_0 \in \mathbf{Q}$ , then take  $m$  and  $n$  two sufficiently divisible integers such that  $t_0 = m/n$ . If  $t_0 \notin \mathbf{Q}$ , then the existence follows from elementary diophantine approximation.

Since  $m_1 > t_0 + 1$ , by conditions (3.5) and (3.7), for all such integers  $m, n$  we have that

$$(3.8) \quad \frac{m - \alpha m_1}{n - \alpha} < t_0.$$

Now notice that, for every  $\epsilon > 0$ , among the integers satisfying (3.5) and (3.7) we can choose  $n$  big enough such that

$$\frac{1}{n - \alpha} < \epsilon.$$

In conclusion there exist  $m$  and  $n$  satisfying (3.5), (3.6) and (3.7) and such that we also have

$$(3.9) \quad \frac{m - \alpha m_1}{n - \alpha} < \frac{(m + 1) - \alpha m_1}{y - \alpha} = \frac{m - \alpha m_1}{n - \alpha} + \frac{1}{n - \alpha} < t_0.$$

From (3.9) and the definition of  $t_0$  one deduces (as in [Taka2, Lemma 2.5, item (2)]) the existence of the following decompositions

$$(3.10) \quad (m - \alpha m_1)L + (n - \alpha)A \sim_{\mathbf{Q}} A'_1 + E'_1$$

and

$$(3.11) \quad (m + 1 - \alpha m_1)L + (n - \alpha)H \sim_{\mathbf{Q}} A'_2 + E'_2$$

where, for each  $i = 1, 2$ , the divisor  $A_i$  is an ample  $\mathbf{Q}$ -divisor and  $E'_i$  is an effective  $\mathbf{Q}$ -divisor such that

$$(3.12) \quad V \not\subset \text{Supp}(E'_i).$$

To conclude the proof of the Lemma, notice that thanks to (3.10) and (3.11), we can write

$$mL + nA = \alpha(m_1L + A) + ((m - \alpha m_1)L + (n - \alpha)A) \equiv A'_1 + H + (F + E'_1)$$

and

$$(m + 1)L + nA = \alpha(m_1L + A) + ((m + 1 - \alpha m_1)L + (n - \alpha)A) \equiv A'_2 + H + (F + E'_2).$$

The proof is now concluded by setting  $A_i := A'_i + H$  and  $E_i := F + E'_i$  for  $i = 1, 2$ . □

## REFERENCES

- [BCHM] C. Birkar, P. Cascini, C. Hacon, J. McKernan: Existence of minimal models for varieties of log general type. Preprint arXiv:math.AG/0610203.
- [Bou] S. Boucksom, Divisorial Zariski decompositions on compact complex manifolds, *Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4)* **37** (2004), 45–76.
- [BDPP] S. Boucksom, J.-P. Demailly, M. Păun, Th. Peternell, The pseudo-effective cone of a compact Kähler manifold and varieties of negative Kodaira dimension, preprint math.AG/0405285.
- [Corti+] A. Corti et al., *Flips for 3-folds and 4-folds*. Edited by Alessio Corti. Oxford Lecture Series in Mathematics and its Applications, **35**. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2007.

- [Cut] S. D. Cutkosky, Zariski decomposition of divisors on algebraic varieties, *Duke Math. J.* **53** (1986), no. 1, 149–156.
- [ELMNP1] L. Ein, R. Lazarsfeld, M. Mustața, M. Nakayama, M. Popa, Asymptotic invariants of base loci, *Ann. Inst. Fourier.* **56** (2006), 1701–1734.
- [ELMNP2] L. Ein, R. Lazarsfeld, M. Mustața, M. Nakayama, M. Popa, Restricted volumes and asymptotic intersection theory, preprint [math.AG/0607221](https://arxiv.org/abs/math/0607221). To appear in *Amer. J. Math.*
- [Kawa] Y. Kawamata, On the length of an extremal rational curve, *Invent. Math.* **105** (1991), no. 3, 609–611.
- [KM] J. Kollár, S. Mori, *Birational geometry of algebraic varieties*, Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics, **134**, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1998.
- [Laz] R. Lazarsfeld, *Positivity in algebraic geometry I,II* Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete **48**, Springer-Verlag, Heidelberg, 2004.
- [MM] Y. Miyaoka, S. Mori, A numerical criterion for uniruledness, *Ann. of Math.* **124** (1986), 65–69.
- [Nak] M. Nakamaye, Stable base loci of linear series, *Math. Ann.* **318** (2000), 837–847.
- [Naka] N. Nakayama, *Zariski-decomposition and abundance*, MSJ Memoirs, **14**, Math. Soc. Japan, 2004.
- [Taka1] S. Takayama, Pluricanonical systems on algebraic varieties of general type, *Invent. Math.* **165** (2006), 551–587.
- [Taka2] S. Takayama, On the uniruledness of stable base loci, *J. Diff. Geom.* **78** (2008), 521–541.

Sébastien Boucksom  
 CNRS–Université Paris 7  
 Institut de Mathématiques  
 F-75251 Paris Cedex  
 E-mail : [boucksom@math.jussieu.fr](mailto:boucksom@math.jussieu.fr)

Amaël Broustet and Gianluca Pacienza  
 Institut de Recherche Mathématique Avancée  
 Université de Strasbourg et CNRS  
 7, Rue R. Descartes - 67084 Strasbourg Cedex, France  
 E-mail : [amael.broustet@math.u-strasbg.fr](mailto:amael.broustet@math.u-strasbg.fr) and [pacienza@math.u-strasbg.fr](mailto:pacienza@math.u-strasbg.fr)