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#### Abstract

We use reduction maps to study the minimal model program. Our main result is that the existence of a good minimal model for a Kawamata log terminal pair ( $X, \Delta$ ) can be detected on a birational model of the base of the ( $K_{X}+\Delta$ )-trivial reduction map. We then interpret the main conjectures of the minimal model program as a natural statement about the existence of curves on $X$.


## 1. Introduction

The minimal model program relates the geometry of a complex projective variety $X$ to properties of its canonical divisor $K_{X}$. One of the central ideas of the program is that $X$ should admit a birational model $X^{\prime}$ where $K_{X^{\prime}}$ has particularly close ties to geometry. More precisely we have the following definition.

Definition 1.1. Let $(X, \Delta)$ be a $\mathbb{Q}$-factorial projective Kawamata $\log$ terminal pair. We say that $(X, \Delta)$ has a good minimal model if there is a sequence of $\left(K_{X}+\Delta\right)$-flips and divisorial contractions $\varphi: X \rightarrow X^{\prime}$ such that some multiple of $K_{X^{\prime}}+\varphi_{*} \Delta$ is basepoint free.

The following conjecture, implicit in [Kaw85], lies at the heart of the minimal model program.
Conjecture 1.2. Let $(X, \Delta)$ be a $\mathbb{Q}$-factorial projective Kawamata log terminal pair such that $K_{X}+\Delta$ is pseudo-effective. Then $(X, \Delta)$ has a good minimal model.

An important principle from [Kaw85] is that Conjecture 1.2 can be naturally interpreted using numerical properties of $K_{X}+\Delta$. Recall that the numerical dimension $\nu(D)$ of a pseudo-effective divisor $D$ as defined by [BDPP04, Nak04] is a numerical measure of the 'positivity' of $D$ (see Definition 2.10). Conjecture 1.2 is known in the two extremal cases: when $\nu\left(K_{X}+\Delta\right)=\operatorname{dim} X$ by [BCHM10] and when $\nu\left(K_{X}+\Delta\right)=0$ by [Dru11, Nak04] (cf. [Gon11]). Furthermore, recent results of [Lai11] show that the existence of a good minimal model is equivalent to the equality $\kappa\left(K_{X}+\Delta\right)=\nu\left(K_{X}+\Delta\right)$.

From this viewpoint, it is very natural to focus on morphisms $f: X \rightarrow Z$ for which $K_{X}+\Delta$ has good numerical behavior along the fibers. Our main theorem shows that the existence of a good minimal model can be detected on (birational models of) the base of such maps.

Theorem 1.3 (Corollary 4.5). Let $(X, \Delta)$ be a $\mathbb{Q}$-factorial projective Kawamata log terminal pair. Suppose that $f: X \rightarrow Z$ is a morphism with connected fibers to a normal projective variety $Z$ such that for a general fiber $F$ of $f$ we have $\nu\left(\left.\left(K_{X}+\Delta\right)\right|_{F}\right)=0$. Then there exist a smooth
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projective birational model $Z^{\prime}$ of $Z$ and a Kawamata $\log$ terminal pair $\left(Z^{\prime}, \Delta_{Z^{\prime}}\right)$ such that $(X, \Delta)$ has a good minimal model if and only if ( $Z^{\prime}, \Delta_{Z^{\prime}}$ ) has a good minimal model.

We use the techniques of [Amb04] which proves the special case of Theorem 1.3 when $K_{X}+\Delta$ is nef. Our theorem has the important advantage that it can be applied to deduce the existence of a minimal model (rather than requiring that $K_{X}+\Delta$ be nef in the first place). Some low dimension cases were worked out in [BDPP04]; related results appear in [Fuk02] and independently in the recent preprint [Siu11].

In order to apply Theorem 1.3 in practice, the key question is whether, perhaps after a birational modification, one can find a map such that the numerical dimension of $\left.\left(K_{X}+\Delta\right)\right|_{F}$ vanishes for a general fiber $F$. The $\left(K_{X}+\Delta\right)$-trivial reduction map constructed in [Leh11a] satisfies precisely this property. We develop a birational version of this theory better suited for working with the minimal model program. Finally, we reinterpret the existence of good minimal models as a statement about curves. Recall that an irreducible curve $C$ is said to be movable if it is a member of a family of curves dominating $X$. Movable curves are used to construct the $\left(K_{X}+\Delta\right)$-reduction map and are thus related to the existence of good minimal models by Theorem 1.3. Conjecture 1.2 implies the following well-known prediction.

Conjecture 1.4. Let $(X, \Delta)$ be a $\mathbb{Q}$-factorial projective Kawamata log terminal pair. Suppose that $\left(K_{X}+\Delta\right) \cdot C>0$ for every movable curve $C$ on $X$. Then $K_{X}+\Delta$ is big.

We show that the two conjectures are equivalent to the following theorem.
Theorem 1.5 (Corollary 4.7). Conjecture 1.4 holds up to dimension $n$ if and only if Conjecture 1.2 holds up to dimension $n$.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 is devoted to preliminary definitions and results. Section 3 develops the theory of the $D$-trivial reduction map to allow for applications to the minimal model program. In $\S 4$, we first discuss the relationship between abundance and the existence of good minimal models. We then prove Theorems 1.3 and 1.5.

## 2. Preliminaries

In this section, we introduce definitions and collect some lemmas for the proof of main results.
Convention 2.1. Throughout this paper we work over $\mathbb{C}$.

### 2.1 Log pairs

We start by discussing log pairs and their resolutions.
Definition 2.2. A $\log$ pair $(X, \Delta)$ consists of a normal variety $X$ and an effective $\mathbb{Q}$-Weil divisor $\Delta$ such that $K_{X}+\Delta$ is $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier. We say that $(X, \Delta)$ is Kawamata log terminal if the discrepancy $a(E, X, \Delta)>-1$ for every prime divisor $E$ over $X$.

Definition 2.3. Let $(X, \Delta)$ be a Kawamata $\log$ terminal pair and $\varphi: W \rightarrow X$ a $\log$ resolution of $(X, \Delta)$. Choose $\Delta_{W}$ so that

$$
K_{W}+\Delta_{W}=\varphi^{*}\left(K_{X}+\Delta\right)+E
$$

where $\Delta_{W}$ and $E$ are effective $\mathbb{Q}$-Weil divisors that have no common component. We call ( $W, \Delta_{W}$ ) a $\log$ smooth model of $(X, \Delta)$.

Note that a minimal model of $\left(W, \Delta_{W}\right)$ may not be a minimal model of $(X, \Delta)$. To compensate for this deficiency, define for any $\epsilon>0$

$$
F=\sum_{F_{i} \text { a } \varphi \text {-exceptional prime divisor }} F_{i} \text { and } \Delta_{W}^{\epsilon}=\Delta_{W}+\epsilon F .
$$

We call $\left(W, \Delta_{W}^{\epsilon}\right)$ an $\epsilon$-log smooth model.
Remark 2.4. Note that our definition of a $\log$ smooth model differs from that of Birkar and Shokurov (cf. [Bir11]). Under our definition, for sufficiently small $\epsilon$ a good minimal model for $\left(W, \Delta_{W}^{\epsilon}\right)$ is also a good minimal model for $(X, \Delta)$ (see [BCHM10, Lemma 3.6.10]).

## $2.2 \mathbb{R}$-Cartier divisors

We next turn to the birational theory of pseudo-effective $\mathbb{R}$-Cartier divisors.
Suppose that $D=\sum_{j=1}^{r} d_{j} D_{j}$ is an $\mathbb{R}$-Weil divisor such that $D_{j}$ is a prime divisor for every $j$ and $D_{i} \neq D_{j}$ for $i \neq j$. We define the round-down $\llcorner D\lrcorner=\sum_{j=1}^{r}\left\llcorner d_{j}\right\lrcorner D_{j}$, where, for every real number $x,\llcorner x\lrcorner$ is the integer defined by $x-1<\llcorner x\lrcorner \leqslant x$.

Definition 2.5. For an $\mathbb{R}$-Cartier divisor $D$ on a normal projective variety $X$, the Iitaka dimension is

$$
\kappa(D)=\max \left\{k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geqslant 0} \mid \limsup _{m \rightarrow \infty} m^{-k} \operatorname{dim} H^{0}(X,\llcorner m D\lrcorner)>0\right\}
$$

if $H^{0}(X,\llcorner m D\lrcorner) \neq 0$ for infinitely many $m \in \mathbb{N}$ or $\kappa(D)=-\infty$ otherwise.
Definition 2.6 (See [ELMNP06]). Let $X$ be a normal projective variety and $D$ be an $\mathbb{R}$-Cartier divisor on $X$. Fix an ample divisor $A$. Define

$$
\mathbf{B}(D)=\bigcap_{D \sim \mathbb{R} E, E \geqslant 0} \operatorname{Supp} E \quad \text { and } \quad \mathbf{B}_{-}(D)=\bigcup_{\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}>0} \mathbf{B}(D+\epsilon A) .
$$

As suggested by the notation, $\mathbf{B}_{-}(D)$ is independent of the choice of $A$.
As mentioned in the introduction, numerical properties of divisors play an important role this paper. The essential technical tools we need were first introduced in [Nak04]: the $\sigma$-decomposition and the numerical dimension.

Definition 2.7. Let $X$ be a smooth projective variety and $D$ be a pseudo-effective $\mathbb{R}$-Cartier divisor on $X$. Fix an ample divisor $A$ on $X$. Given a prime divisor $\Gamma$ on $X$, define

$$
\sigma_{\Gamma}(D)=\min \left\{\operatorname{mult}_{\Gamma}\left(D^{\prime}\right) \mid D^{\prime} \geqslant 0 \text { and } D^{\prime} \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} D+\epsilon A \text { for some } \epsilon>0\right\}
$$

This definition is independent of the choice of $A$.
It is shown in [Nak04] that for any pseudo-effective divisor $D$ there are only finitely many prime divisors $\Gamma$ such that $\sigma_{\Gamma}(D)>0$. Thus, the following definition makes sense.

Definition 2.8. Let $X$ be a smooth projective variety and $D$ be a pseudo-effective $\mathbb{R}$-Cartier divisor on $X$. Define the $\mathbb{R}$-Cartier divisors $N_{\sigma}(D)=\sum_{\Gamma} \sigma_{\Gamma}(D) \Gamma$ and $P_{\sigma}(D)=D-N_{\sigma}(D)$. The decomposition

$$
D=P_{\sigma}(D)+N_{\sigma}(D)
$$

is known as the $\sigma$-decomposition. It is also known as the sectional decomposition [Kaw88], the divisorial Zariski decomposition [Bou04], and the numerical Zariski decomposition [Kaw10].
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The basic properties of the $\sigma$-decomposition are given below.
Lemma 2.9 [Nak04]. Let $X$ be a smooth projective variety and $D$ a pseudo-effective $\mathbb{R}$-Cartier divisor. Then we have that:
(1) $\kappa(D)=\kappa\left(P_{\sigma}(D)\right)$;
(2) $\operatorname{Supp}\left(N_{\sigma}(D)\right) \subset \mathbf{B}_{-}(D)$;
(3) for any prime divisor $\Gamma$ on $X,\left.P_{\sigma}(D)\right|_{\Gamma}$ is pseudo-effective; and
(4) if $0 \leqslant D^{\prime} \leqslant N_{\sigma}(D)$, then $D-D^{\prime}$ is pseudo-effective and $N_{\sigma}\left(D-D^{\prime}\right)=N_{\sigma}(D)-D^{\prime}$.

Proof. The proof of [Bou04, Theorem 5.5] shows that the inclusion

$$
i_{m}: H^{0}\left(X, \mathcal{O}_{X}\left(\left\lfloor m P_{\sigma}(D)\right\rfloor\right)\right) \rightarrow H^{0}\left(X, \mathcal{O}_{X}(\lfloor m D\rfloor)\right)
$$

is an isomorphism for any positive integer $m$. This implies part (1). Part (2) follows immediately from the definition. We see part (4) by [Nak04, III.1.8 Lemma]. Part (3) follows from part (4) and [Nak04, III.1. 14 Proposition (1)].

Closely related to the $\sigma$-decomposition is the numerical dimension, a numerical measure of the positivity of a divisor.

Definition 2.10. Let $X$ be a normal projective variety, $D$ an $\mathbb{R}$-Cartier divisor and $A$ an ample divisor on $X$. Set

$$
\nu(D, A)=\max \left\{k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geqslant 0} \mid \limsup _{m \rightarrow \infty} m^{-k} \operatorname{dim} H^{0}(X,\llcorner m D\lrcorner+A)>0\right\}
$$

if $H^{0}(X,\llcorner m D\lrcorner+A) \neq 0$ for infinitely many $m \in \mathbb{N}$ or $\nu(D, A)=-\infty$ otherwise. Define

$$
\nu(D)=\max _{A \text { ample }} \nu(D, A) .
$$

Remark 2.11. By the results of [Leh11b], this definition coincides with the notions of $\kappa_{\nu}(D)$ from [Nak04, V.2.20, Definition] and $\nu(D)$ from [BDPP04, 3.6, Definition].
Lemma 2.12 ([Nak04, V.2.7 Proposition], [Leh11b, Theorem 6.7]). Let $X$ be a normal projective variety, $D$ be an $\mathbb{R}$-Cartier divisor on $X$, and $\varphi: W \rightarrow X$ be a birational map from a normal projective variety $W$. Then we have that:
(1) $\nu(D)=\nu\left(D^{\prime}\right)$ for any $\mathbb{R}$-Cartier divisor $D^{\prime}$ such that $D^{\prime} \equiv D$;
(2) $\nu\left(\varphi^{*} D\right)=\nu(D)$;
(3) $\nu(D) \geqslant \kappa(D)$; and
(4) if $X$ is smooth then $\nu(D)=\nu\left(P_{\sigma}(D)\right)$.

Furthermore, if $X$ is smooth, then $\nu(D)=0$ if and only if $P_{\sigma}(D) \equiv 0$.

### 2.3 Exceptional divisors

Finally, we identify several different ways a divisor can be 'exceptional' for a morphism.
Definition 2.13. Let $f: X \rightarrow Y$ be a morphism of normal projective varieties and let $D$ be an $\mathbb{R}$-Cartier divisor on $X$. We say that $D$ is $f$-horizontal if $f(\operatorname{Supp}(D))=Y$ or that $D$ is $f$-vertical otherwise.

Definition 2.14 ([Nak04, III, §5.a], [Lai11, Definition 2.9] and [Tak08, Definition 2.4]). Let $f$ : $X \rightarrow Y$ be a surjective morphism of normal projective varieties with connected fibers and $D$ be
an effective $f$-vertical $\mathbb{R}$-Cartier divisor. We say that $D$ is $f$-exceptional if

$$
\operatorname{codim} f(\operatorname{Supp} D) \geqslant 2 .
$$

We call $D f$-degenerate if for any prime divisor $P$ on $Y$ there is some prime divisor $\Gamma$ on $X$ such that $f(\Gamma)=P$ and $\Gamma \not \subset \operatorname{Supp}(D)$. Note that every $f$-exceptional divisor is also $f$-degenerate.

Lemma 2.15. Let $f: X \rightarrow Y$ be a surjective morphism of normal projective varieties where $Y$ is $\mathbb{Q}$-factorial. Suppose that $D$ is an effective $f$-vertical $\mathbb{R}$-Cartier divisor such that $f_{*} \mathcal{O}_{X}(\llcorner k D\lrcorner)^{* *} \cong$ $\mathcal{O}_{Y}$ for every positive integer $k$. Then $D$ is $f$-degenerate.

Proof. If $D$ were not $f$-degenerate, there would be an effective $f$-exceptional divisor $E$ on $X$ and a nonzero effective $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier divisor $T$ on $Y$ such that $f^{*} T \leqslant D+E$. However, since $E$ is $f$-exceptional we have $f_{*} \mathcal{O}_{X}(\llcorner k(D+E)\lrcorner)^{* *} \cong \mathcal{O}_{Y}$ for every $k$, yielding a contradiction.

Degenerate divisors behave well with respect to the $\sigma$-decomposition.
Lemma 2.16 (See [Nak04, III.5.7 Proposition]). Let $f: X \rightarrow Y$ be a surjective morphism from a smooth projective variety to a normal projective variety and let $D$ be an effective $f$-degenerate divisor. For any pseudo-effective $\mathbb{R}$-Cartier divisor $L$ on $Y$ we have $D \leqslant N_{\sigma}\left(f^{*} L+D\right)$ and $P_{\sigma}\left(f^{*} L+D\right)=P_{\sigma}\left(f^{*} L\right)$.

Proof. [Nak04, III.5.1 Lemma] and [Nak04, III.5.2 Lemma] together show that for an $f$ degenerate divisor $D$ there is some component $\Gamma \subset \operatorname{Supp}(D)$ such that $\left.D\right|_{\Gamma}$ is not pseudo-effective. Since $\left.P_{\sigma}\left(f^{*} L+D\right)\right|_{\Gamma}$ is pseudo-effective, we see that $\Gamma$ must occur in $N_{\sigma}\left(f^{*} L+D\right)$ with positive coefficient.

Set $D^{\prime}$ to be the coefficient-wise minimum of the effective divisors $N_{\sigma}\left(f^{*} L+D\right)$ and $D$. Since $D^{\prime} \leqslant N_{\sigma}\left(f^{*} L+D\right)$, we may apply Lemma $2.9(4)$ to see that

$$
N_{\sigma}\left(f^{*} L+D\right)=N_{\sigma}\left(f^{*} L+D-D^{\prime}\right)+D^{\prime}
$$

Suppose that $D^{\prime}<D$. Then $D-D^{\prime}$ is still $f$-degenerate, so there is some component of $D-D^{\prime}$ that appears in $N_{\sigma}\left(f^{*} L+\left(D-D^{\prime}\right)\right)=N_{\sigma}\left(f^{*} L+D\right)-D^{\prime}$ with a positive coefficient, a contradiction. Thus $D=D^{\prime} \leqslant N_{\sigma}\left(f^{*} L+D\right)$. The final claim follows from Lemma 2.9(4).

## 3. Reduction maps and $\widetilde{\tau}(X, \Delta)$

For a pseudo-effective divisor $D$ on a variety $X$, the $D$-trivial reduction map can be thought of as the 'quotient' of $X$ by all movable curves $C$ satisfying $D \cdot C=0$. A priori, the ( $K_{X}+\Delta$ )-trivial reduction map may change if we pass to a log smooth model. The main goal of this section is to develop a birational theory that takes this discrepancy into account.

Theorem 3.1 [Leh11a, Theorem 1.1]. Let $X$ be a normal projective variety and $D$ be a pseudoeffective $\mathbb{R}$-Cartier divisor on $X$. Then there exist a birational morphism $\varphi: W \rightarrow X$ from a smooth projective variety $W$ and a surjective morphism $f: W \rightarrow Y$ with connected fibers such that:
(1) $\nu\left(\left.\varphi^{*} D\right|_{F}\right)=0$ for a general fiber $F$ of $f$;
(2) if $w \in W$ is a very general point and $C$ is an irreducible curve through $w$ with $\operatorname{dim} f(C)=1$, then $\varphi^{*} D \cdot C>0$; and
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(3) for any birational morphism $\varphi^{\prime}: W^{\prime} \rightarrow X$ from a smooth projective variety $W^{\prime}$ and dominant morphism $f^{\prime}: W^{\prime} \rightarrow Y^{\prime}$ with connected fibers satisfying condition (2), $f^{\prime}$ factors birationally through $f$.

We call the composition $f \circ \varphi^{-1}: X \rightarrow Y$ the $D$-trivial reduction map. Note that it is only unique up to birational equivalence.

Remark 3.2. Property (2) is equivalent to the following.
$\left(2^{\prime}\right)$ If $C$ is an irreducible movable curve with $\operatorname{dim} f(C)=1$, then $\varphi^{*} D \cdot C>0$.
Remark 3.3. The $D$-trivial reduction map is different from the pseudo-effective reduction map (cf. [Eck05, Leh11a]), the partial nef reduction map (cf. [BDPP04]), and Tsuji's numerically trivial fibration with minimal singular metrics (cf. [Eck04, Tsu00]).

Definition 3.4. Let $X$ be a normal projective variety and $D$ be a pseudo-effective $\mathbb{R}$-Cartier divisor on $X$. If $f: X \rightarrow Y$ denotes the $D$-trivial reduction map, we define

$$
\tau(D):=\operatorname{dim} Y .
$$

Lemma 3.5. Let $X$ be a normal projective variety and $D$ be a pseudo-effective $\mathbb{R}$-Cartier divisor on $X$. Then we have that:
(1) $\tau(D) \geqslant \nu(D) \geqslant \kappa(D)$;
(2) if $D^{\prime}$ is a pseudo-effective $\mathbb{R}$-Cartier divisor on $X$ such that $D^{\prime} \geqslant D$, then $\tau\left(D^{\prime}\right) \geqslant \tau(D)$; and
(3) $\tau\left(f^{*} D\right)=\tau(D)$ for every surjective morphism $f: Y \rightarrow X$ from a normal variety.

Proof. Since $\kappa(D) \leqslant \nu(D)$ by Lemma 2.12, it suffices to prove the first inequality of part (1). Write $f: W \rightarrow Y$ for the $D$-trivial reduction map as in Theorem 3.1. [Nak04, V.2.22 Proposition] states that $\nu(D) \leqslant \nu\left(\left.D\right|_{F}\right)+\operatorname{dim} Y$ for a general fiber $F$ of $f$. Since $\nu\left(\left.D\right|_{F}\right)=0$, we find $\nu(D) \leqslant \operatorname{dim} Y=\tau(D)$. Parts (2) and (3) follow easily from the definition.

As mentioned above, a priori $\tau\left(K_{X}+\Delta\right)$ may change if we replace $(X, \Delta)$ by a $\log$ smooth model. Thus we need to introduce a variant of this construction that accounts for every $\epsilon$-log smooth model simultaneously.

Definition 3.6. Let $(X, \Delta)$ be a Kawamata $\log$ terminal pair such that $K_{X}+\Delta$ is pseudoeffective. We define
$\widetilde{\tau}(X, \Delta)=\max \left\{\tau\left(K_{W}+\Delta_{W}^{\epsilon}\right) \mid\left(W, \Delta_{W}^{\epsilon}\right)\right.$ is an $\epsilon$-log smooth model of $(X, \Delta)$ for some $\left.\epsilon>0\right\}$.
Remark 3.7. Note that the maximum value of $\tau$ in the previous definition can be achieved by any sufficiently small $\epsilon>0$. More precisely, suppose that $(X, \Delta)$ is a Kawamata log terminal pair with $K_{X}+\Delta$ pseudo-effective and that $\varphi: W \rightarrow X$ is a $\log$ resolution of $(X, \Delta)$. Then the value of $\tau\left(K_{W}+\Delta_{W}^{\epsilon}\right)$ for the $\epsilon-\log$ smooth model $\left(W, \Delta_{W}^{\epsilon}\right)$ is independent of the choice of $\epsilon>0$ : if $C$ is a movable curve with $\left(K_{W}+\Delta_{W}^{\epsilon}\right) \cdot C=0$ then (by the pseudo-effectiveness of $K_{X}+\Delta$ and [BDPP04, 0.2 , Theorem]) we must have $\varphi^{*}\left(K_{X}+\Delta\right) \cdot C=0$ and $E \cdot C=0$ for any $\varphi$-exceptional divisor $E$.

Lemma 3.8. Let $(X, \Delta)$ be a projective Kawamata log terminal pair such that $K_{X}+\Delta$ is pseudo-effective. For any $\epsilon>0$, there exists an $\epsilon$-log smooth model $\varphi:\left(W, \Delta_{W}^{\epsilon}\right) \rightarrow(X, \Delta)$ such that the $\left(K_{W}+\Delta_{W}^{\epsilon}\right)$-trivial reduction map can be realized as a morphism on $W$ whose image has dimension $\widetilde{\tau}(X, \Delta)$.

Proof. By Remark 3.7, the construction of the reduction map for any $\epsilon$-log smooth model is completely independent of the choice of $\epsilon>0$. Hence we may fix an arbitrary $\epsilon>0$ for the remainder of the proof.

First choose an $\epsilon$-log smooth model $\left(W^{\prime}, \Delta_{W^{\prime}}^{\epsilon}\right)$ such that $\tau\left(K_{W^{\prime}}+\Delta_{W^{\prime}}^{\epsilon}\right)=\widetilde{\tau}(X, \Delta)$. Let ( $W, \Delta_{W}^{\epsilon}$ ) be an $\epsilon$-log smooth model such that there is a birational map $\varphi: W \rightarrow W^{\prime}$ and a morphism $f: W \rightarrow Z$ resolving the $\left(K_{W^{\prime}}+\Delta_{W^{\prime}}^{\epsilon}\right)$-trivial reduction map. Note that there is some effective $\varphi$-exceptional divisor $E$ such that $K_{W}+\Delta_{W}^{\epsilon}+E \geqslant \varphi^{*}\left(K_{W^{\prime}}+\Delta_{W^{\prime}}^{\epsilon}\right)$. If $K_{W}+\Delta_{W}^{\epsilon}$ has a vanishing intersection with a movable curve on $W$, then $E$ does as well, and hence so does $\varphi^{*}\left(K_{W^{\prime}}+\Delta_{W^{\prime}}^{\epsilon}\right)$. This means that $f$ factors birationally through the ( $K_{W}+\Delta_{W}^{\epsilon}$ )-trivial reduction map by the universal property of reduction maps. Since $\tau\left(K_{W^{\prime}}+\Delta_{W^{\prime}}^{\epsilon}\right)$ is maximal over all $\epsilon$-log smooth models, $f$ must in fact be (birationally equivalent to) the ( $K_{W}+\Delta_{W}^{\epsilon}$ )-trivial reduction map.

Remark 3.9. If $D$ is a nef divisor, the $D$-trivial reduction map is birationally equivalent to the nef reduction map of $D$ (see [BCEK02+]). Thus $n(D)=\tau(D)$, where $n(D)$ is the nef dimension of $D$ in [BCEK02+, Definition 2.7]. Moreover, for a projective Kawamata log terminal pair $(X, \Delta)$ such that $K_{X}+\Delta$ is nef, $\tau\left(K_{X}+\Delta\right)=\widetilde{\tau}(X, \Delta)$ since the nef reduction map is almost holomorphic.

The remainder of this section is devoted to proving that $\widetilde{\tau}(X, \Delta)$ is preserved upon passing to a minimal model. In fact $\widetilde{\tau}$ does not change under any flip or divisorial contraction.

Definition 3.10. Let $X$ be a normal projective variety and $T \subset \operatorname{Chow}(X)$ be an irreducible proper subvariety parametrizing 1 -cycles. We say that the family of 1 -cycles $\left\{C_{t}\right\}_{t \in T}$ is a covering family if the map to $X$ is dominant.

Let $D$ be a $\mathbb{R}$-Cartier divisor on $X$. A covering family $\left\{C_{t}\right\}_{t \in T}$ is $D$-trivial if $D \cdot C_{t}=0$ for all $t \in T$. A covering family $\left\{C_{t}\right\}_{t \in T}$ is 1-connected if for general points $x$ and $y \in X$ there is $t \in T$ such that $C_{t}$ is an irreducible curve containing $x$ and $y$.
Proposition 3.11 (See [Leh11a, Proposition 4.8]). Let $X$ be a normal projective variety and $D$ an $\mathbb{R}$-Cartier divisor on $X$. Suppose that there exists a $D$-trivial 1-connected covering family $\left\{C_{t}\right\}_{t \in T}$. Then $\nu(D)=0$.
Proof. For any birational map $\varphi: W \rightarrow X$, the strict transforms of the curves $C_{t}$ are still 1 -connecting. Thus, the generic quotient (in the sense of [Leh11a, Construction 3.2]) of $X$ by the family $\left\{C_{t}\right\}_{t \in T}$ contracts $X$ to a point. Thus $\nu(D)=\nu\left(f^{*} D\right)=0$ by [Leh11a, Theorem 1.1].
Proposition 3.12. Let $(X, \Delta)$ be a projective Kawamata log terminal pair. Then $\nu\left(K_{X}+\Delta\right)=$ 0 if and only if there exists a $\left(K_{X}+\Delta\right)$-trivial 1-connected covering family $\left\{C_{t}\right\}_{t \in T}$ such that $C_{t} \cap \mathbf{B}_{-}\left(K_{X}+\Delta\right)=\emptyset$ for general $t \in T$.

Proof. The reverse implication follows from Proposition 3.11. Now assume that $\nu\left(K_{X}+\Delta\right)=$ 0 . By [Dru11, Corollaire 3.4], there is a good minimal model $\varphi: X \rightarrow X^{\prime}$ of $(X, \Delta)$ with $K_{X^{\prime}}+\varphi_{*} \Delta \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0$. Take a $\log$ resolution of $(X, \Delta)$ and $\left(X^{\prime}, \varphi_{*} \Delta\right)$, as in the following diagram.


Set $E$ to be the effective $q$-exceptional divisor such that

$$
p^{*}\left(K_{X}+\Delta\right)=q^{*}\left(K_{X^{\prime}}+\varphi_{*} \Delta\right)+E .
$$
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Now, since $K_{X^{\prime}}+\varphi_{*} \Delta \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0$,

$$
p^{*}\left(K_{X}+\Delta\right) \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} E .
$$

Because $\operatorname{codim} q(\operatorname{Supp} E) \geqslant 2$, there exists a complete intersection irreducible curve $C$ on $X^{\prime}$ with respect to very ample divisors $H_{1}, \ldots, H_{n-1}$ containing two general points $x, y$ such that $C \cap q(\operatorname{Supp} E)=\emptyset$. Let $\bar{C}$ be the strict transform of $C$ on $X$. Then

$$
\left(K_{X}+\Delta\right) \cdot \bar{C}=0 .
$$

In general, $\mathbf{B}_{-}(D) \subseteq \operatorname{Supp} D$ for an effective $\mathbb{R}$-Cartier divisor $D$. Moreover, when $\nu(D)=0$, $\mathbf{B}_{-}(D)=\operatorname{Supp} D$ by the equality $D=N_{\sigma}(D)$ and Lemma 2.9(2). Thus we have $p(\operatorname{Supp} E)=$ $\mathbf{B}_{-}\left(K_{X}+\Delta\right)$. (See $[\mathrm{BBP} 09$, Theorem $\mathrm{A}(\mathrm{i})]$ and [CD11, Theorem 1.2] for more general results.) The desired family can be constructed by taking the strict transform of deformations of $C$ which avoid $q(\operatorname{Supp} E)$.

Proposition 3.13. Let $(X, \Delta)$ be a $\mathbb{Q}$-factorial projective Kawamata log terminal pair such that $K_{X}+\Delta$ is pseudo-effective. Suppose that

$$
\varphi:(X, \Delta) \rightarrow\left(X^{\prime}, \Delta^{\prime}\right)
$$

is a $\left(K_{X}+\Delta\right)$-flip or divisorial contraction. Then $\widetilde{\tau}(X, \Delta)=\widetilde{\tau}\left(X^{\prime}, \Delta^{\prime}\right)$.
Proof. Consider a $\log$ resolution of $(X, \Delta)$ and $\left(X^{\prime}, \Delta^{\prime}\right)$, as in the following diagram.


For a sufficiently small positive number $\epsilon$, write

$$
K_{W}+\Delta_{W}^{\epsilon}=p^{*}\left(K_{X}+\Delta\right)+G
$$

for the $\epsilon$-log smooth structure induced by $(X, \Delta)$ and

$$
K_{W}+\Delta_{W}^{\prime \epsilon}=q^{*}\left(K_{X^{\prime}}+\Delta^{\prime}\right)+G^{\prime}
$$

for the $\epsilon$-log smooth structure induced by $\left(X^{\prime}, \Delta^{\prime}\right)$. (Note that these structures might differ, if for example $\varphi$ is centered in a locus along which the discrepancy is negative.) Using Lemma 3.8, we may assume that the log resolution $W$ satisfies both the following.
(1) The $\left(K_{W}+\Delta_{W}^{\epsilon}\right)$-trivial reduction map is a morphism $f: W \rightarrow Y$ with $\operatorname{dim} Y=\widetilde{\tau}(X, \Delta)$.
(2) The $\left(K_{W}+\Delta_{W}^{\prime \epsilon}\right)$-trivial reduction map is a morphism $f^{\prime}: W \rightarrow Y^{\prime}$ with $\operatorname{dim} Y^{\prime}=\widetilde{\tau}\left(X^{\prime}, \Delta^{\prime}\right)$ and $Y^{\prime}$ is smooth.

When $\varphi$ is a flip, then there is some effective $q$-exceptional divisor $E^{\prime}$ such that $K_{W}+\Delta_{W}^{\epsilon}=$ $K_{W}+\Delta_{W}^{\prime \epsilon}+E^{\prime}$. From Lemma 3.5(2), it holds that $\widetilde{\tau}(X, \Delta) \geqslant \widetilde{\tau}\left(X^{\prime}, \Delta^{\prime}\right)$. When $\varphi$ is a divisorial contraction, then there is some effective $q$-exceptional divisor $E^{\prime}$ such that $K_{W}+\Delta_{W}^{\epsilon}+\epsilon T=$ $K_{W}+\Delta_{W}^{\prime \epsilon}+E^{\prime}$, where $T$ denotes the strict transform on $W$ of the $\varphi$-exceptional divisor. In this case, we know that $K_{W}+\Delta_{W}^{\epsilon}-\delta T$ is pseudo-effective for some $\delta>0$. Thus any movable curve $C$ with $\left(K_{W}+\Delta_{W}^{\epsilon}\right) \cdot C=0$ also satisfies $\left(K_{W}+\Delta_{W}^{\epsilon}+\epsilon T\right) \cdot C=0$, and in particular $\widetilde{\tau}(X, \Delta)=$ $\tau\left(K_{W}+\Delta_{W}^{\epsilon}+\epsilon T\right)$. Again applying Lemma 3.5(2) we have $\widetilde{\tau}(X, \Delta) \geqslant \widetilde{\tau}\left(X^{\prime}, \Delta^{\prime}\right)$. Conversely, by Proposition 3.12 a very general fiber $F^{\prime}$ of $f^{\prime}$ admits a 1-connecting covering family of $K_{W}+\Delta_{W^{-}}^{\prime \epsilon}$ trivial curves $\left\{C_{t}\right\}_{t \in T}$ such that $C_{t} \cap \mathbf{B}_{-}\left(\left.\left(K_{W}+\Delta_{W}^{\prime \epsilon}\right)\right|_{F^{\prime}}\right)=\emptyset$ for general $t \in T$. Let $E^{\prime}$ denote the $q$-exceptional divisor defined earlier. Note that, since $E^{\prime}$ is $q$-exceptional and $\left(W, \Delta_{W}^{\prime \epsilon}\right)$ is
an $\epsilon$-log smooth model with $\epsilon>0$, we have $\mu E^{\prime} \leqslant N_{\sigma}\left(K_{W}+\Delta_{W}^{\prime \epsilon}\right)$ for some $\mu>0$. Furthermore, since $\left.E^{\prime}\right|_{F^{\prime}}$ is effective and $\nu\left(\left.\left(K_{W}+\Delta_{W}^{\prime \epsilon}\right)\right|_{F^{\prime}}\right)=0$, we know that $\left.\mu E^{\prime}\right|_{F^{\prime}} \leqslant N_{\sigma}\left(\left.\left(K_{W}+\Delta_{W}^{\prime \epsilon}\right)\right|_{F^{\prime}}\right)$. Thus $E^{\prime} \cdot C_{t}=0$ for general $t$ since $C_{t}$ avoids $\mathbf{B}_{-}\left(\left.\left(K_{W}+\Delta_{W}^{\prime \epsilon}\right)\right|_{F^{\prime}}\right)$. Hence

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left(K_{W}+\Delta_{W}^{\epsilon}\right) \cdot C_{t} & \leqslant\left(K_{W}+\Delta_{W}^{\epsilon}+E^{\prime}\right) \cdot C_{t} \\
& =0
\end{aligned}
$$

Since the $C_{t}$ form a 1-connected covering family in a very general fiber of $f^{\prime}$, the universal property of the $\left(K_{W}+\Delta_{W}^{\prime \epsilon}\right)$-trivial reduction map implies that $f$ factors birationally through $f^{\prime}$. This demonstrates the reverse inequality $\widetilde{\tau}(X, \Delta) \leqslant \widetilde{\tau}\left(X^{\prime}, \Delta^{\prime}\right)$.
Corollary 3.14. Let $(X, \Delta)$ be a $\mathbb{Q}$-factorial projective Kawamata log terminal pair such that $K_{X}+\Delta$ is pseudo-effective. Suppose that $(X, \Delta)$ has a good minimal model. Then

$$
\widetilde{\tau}(X, \Delta)=\tau\left(K_{X}+\Delta\right)=\kappa\left(K_{X}+\Delta\right) .
$$

Proof. We always have $\widetilde{\tau}(X, \Delta) \geqslant \tau\left(K_{X}+\Delta\right) \geqslant \kappa\left(K_{X}+\Delta\right)$. Since $\widetilde{\tau}(X, \Delta)$ is preserved by steps of the minimal model program, the equality of the outer two quantities can be checked on the good minimal model.

So suppose that $K_{X}+\Delta$ is semiample and let $f: X \rightarrow Z$ denote the morphism defined by a sufficiently high multiple of $K_{X}+\Delta$. For any birational map $\varphi: W \rightarrow X$, we can intersect a general fiber $F$ of $f$ with general very ample divisors to find a movable curve $C$ contained in $F$ and avoiding the image of the $\varphi$-exceptional locus. In particular, if $\left(W, \Delta_{W}^{\epsilon}\right)$ is an $\epsilon$-log smooth model of $(X, \Delta)$, the strict transform $\widetilde{C}$ of $C$ satisfies $\left(K_{W}+\Delta_{W}^{\epsilon}\right) \cdot \widetilde{C}=0$ and the $\left(K_{W}+\Delta_{W}^{\epsilon}\right)$-trivial reduction map is $f \circ \varphi$. This shows that $\tau\left(K_{W}+\Delta_{W}^{\epsilon}\right)=\kappa\left(K_{X}+\Delta\right)$ for every $\epsilon$-log smooth $\operatorname{model}\left(W, \Delta_{W}^{\epsilon}\right)$.

## 4. Applications to the minimal model program

In this section we first discuss how the existence of a good minimal model can be reinterpreted using the notion of abundance. We then prove Lemma 4.4, the main technical tool, and conclude with proofs of the theorems.

### 4.1 Abundance and the existence of good minimal models

The notion of abundance was introduced to capture those divisors with particularly good numerical behavior.
Lemma 4.1 [Nak04, V.4.2 Corollary]. Let $(X, \Delta)$ be a projective Kawamata log terminal pair such that $K_{X}+\Delta$ is pseudo-effective. Then the following are equivalent:
(i) $\kappa\left(K_{X}+\Delta\right)=\nu\left(K_{X}+\Delta\right)$;
(ii) $\kappa\left(K_{X}+\Delta\right) \geqslant 0$, and if $\varphi: X^{\prime} \rightarrow X$ is a birational morphism and $f: X^{\prime} \rightarrow Z^{\prime}$ a morphism resolving the Iitaka fibration for $K_{X}+\Delta$, then

$$
\nu\left(\left.\varphi^{*}\left(K_{X}+\Delta\right)\right|_{F}\right)=0
$$

for a general fiber $F$ of $f$.
If either of these equivalent conditions hold, we say that $K_{X}+\Delta$ is abundant.
To relate abundance to the existence of minimal models, we will use the following special case.

## Y. Gongyo and B. Lehmann

Theorem 4.2 ([Nak04, V.4.9 Corollary] and [Dru11, Corollaire 3.4] (cf. [Gon11])). Let ( $X, \Delta$ ) be a $\mathbb{Q}$-factorial projective Kawamata log terminal pair such that $\nu\left(K_{X}+\Delta\right)=0$. Then $K_{X}+\Delta$ is abundant and $(X, \Delta)$ admits a good minimal model.

The following theorem is known to experts; for example, see [DHP10, Remark 2.6]. The theorem is a consequence of [Lai11, Theorem 4.4]. Note that the statement does not involve any inductive assumptions.

Theorem 4.3 (See [DHP10]). Let $(X, \Delta)$ be a $\mathbb{Q}$-factorial projective Kawamata log terminal pair. Then $K_{X}+\Delta$ is abundant if and only if $(X, \Delta)$ has a good minimal model.

Proof. First suppose that $(X, \Delta)$ has a good minimal model $\left(X^{\prime}, \Delta^{\prime}\right)$. Let $Y$ be a common resolution of $X$ and $X^{\prime}$ (with morphisms $f$ and $g$ respectively), and write

$$
f^{*}\left(K_{X}+\Delta\right)=g^{*}\left(K_{X^{\prime}}+\Delta^{\prime}\right)+E
$$

where $E$ is an effective $g$-exceptional $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor. Thus

$$
P_{\sigma}\left(f^{*}\left(K_{X}+\Delta\right)\right)=P_{\sigma}\left(g^{*}\left(K_{X^{\prime}}+\Delta^{\prime}\right)\right),
$$

and since the latter divisor is semiample the first is semiample as well. The abundance of $K_{X}+\Delta$ follows from the fact that the Iitaka and numerical dimensions are invariant under pulling-back and passing to the positive part.

Conversely, suppose that $K_{X}+\Delta$ is abundant. Let $f:(X, \Delta) \rightarrow Z$ be the Iitaka fibration of $K_{X}+\Delta$. Choose an $\epsilon$-log smooth model $\varphi:\left(W, \Delta_{W}^{\epsilon}\right) \rightarrow X$ with sufficiently small $\epsilon>0$ so that $f$ is resolved on $W$. By [BCHM10, Lemma 3.6.10] we can find a minimal model for $(X, \Delta)$ by constructing a minimal model of $\left(W, \Delta_{W}^{\epsilon}\right)$. Moreover, we see that $f \circ \varphi$ is also the Iitaka fibration of $K_{W}+\Delta_{W}^{\epsilon}$ and $\nu\left(K_{W}+\Delta_{W}^{\epsilon}\right)=\nu\left(K_{X}+\Delta\right)$. Replacing $(X, \Delta)$ by $\left(W, \Delta_{W}^{\epsilon}\right)$, we may suppose that the Iitaka fibration $f$ is a morphism on $X$.

By [Nak04, V.4.2 Corollary], $\nu\left(K_{F}+\Delta_{F}\right)=0$ where $F$ is a general fiber of $f$ and $K_{F}+\Delta_{F}=$ $\left.\left(K_{X}+\Delta\right)\right|_{F}$. Thus $\left(F, \Delta_{F}\right)$ has a good minimal model by Theorem 4.2. The arguments of [Lai11, Theorem 4.4] for $(X, \Delta)$ now show that $(X, \Delta)$ has a good minimal model.

### 4.2 Main results

The following lemma is key for proving our main results.
Lemma 4.4. Let $(X, \Delta)$ be a projective Kawamata log terminal pair. Suppose that $f: X \rightarrow Z$ is a projective morphism with connected fibers to a projective normal variety $Z$ such that $\nu\left(\left.\left(K_{X}+\Delta\right)\right|_{F}\right)=0$ for a general fiber $F$ of $f$. Then there exists a $\log$ resolution $\mu: X^{\prime} \rightarrow X$ of $(X, \Delta)$, a projective smooth birational model $Z^{\prime}$ of $Z$, a Kawamata $\log$ terminal pair $\left(Z^{\prime}, \Delta_{Z^{\prime}}\right)$, and a morphism $f^{\prime}: X^{\prime} \rightarrow Z^{\prime}$ birationally equivalent to $f$ such that

$$
P_{\sigma}\left(\mu^{*}\left(K_{X}+\Delta\right)\right) \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} P_{\sigma}\left(f^{\prime *}\left(K_{Z^{\prime}}+\Delta_{Z^{\prime}}\right)\right) .
$$

Proof. We first reduce to the case when $f$ satisfies the stronger property that $\left.\left(K_{X}+\Delta\right)\right|_{F} \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0$ for a general fiber $F$ of $f$. Run the relative minimal model program with scaling of an ample divisor on $(X, \Delta)$ over $Z$. By [Fuj11, Theorem 2.3], after finitely many steps we obtain a birational model $\psi: X \rightarrow X_{i}$ with a morphism $f_{i}: X_{i} \rightarrow Z$ such that $\mathbf{B}_{-}\left(\left.\left(K_{X_{i}}+\psi_{*} \Delta\right)\right|_{F_{i}}\right)$ has no divisorial components for a general fiber $F_{i}$ of $f_{i}$. Moreover, $\nu\left(\left.\left(K_{X_{i}}+\psi_{*} \Delta\right)\right|_{F_{i}}\right)=$ $\kappa\left(\left.\left(K_{X_{i}}+\psi_{*} \Delta\right)\right|_{F_{i}}\right)=0$ by Theorem 4.2. Thus we have the property $\left.\left(K_{X_{i}}+\psi_{*} \Delta\right)\right|_{F_{i}} \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0$ (see the proof of Proposition 3.12).

## Reduction maps and minimal model theory

Furthermore, recall that for any common log resolution $W$ of $(X, \Delta)$ and $\left(X_{i}, \psi_{*} \Delta\right)$

there is an effective $q$-exceptional divisor $M$ on $W$ such that $p^{*}\left(K_{X}+\Delta\right)=q^{*}\left(K_{X_{i}}+\psi_{*} \Delta\right)+M$. In particular $P_{\sigma}\left(p^{*}\left(K_{X}+\Delta\right)\right)=P_{\sigma}\left(q^{*}\left(K_{X_{i}}+\psi_{*} \Delta\right)\right)$ by Lemma 2.16. If we prove the statement of the theorem for $\left(X_{i}, \psi_{*} \Delta\right)$ for the morphism $f: X^{\prime} \rightarrow Z^{\prime}$, the conclusion also holds for any composition $f \circ q^{\prime}: W \rightarrow X^{\prime} \rightarrow Z^{\prime}$ where $W$ is a smooth birational model of $X^{\prime}$. Letting $W$ be a common $\log$ resolution as above, we conclude the statement of the theorem for $(X, \Delta)$.

So we assume from now on that $\left.\left(K_{X}+\Delta\right)\right|_{F} \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0$ for a general fiber $F$ of $f$. We may apply the techniques of $[F M 00,4.4]$ to find a morphism birationally equivalent to $f$ that satisfies nice properties. That is, there exist:

- a $\log$ smooth model $\left(X^{\prime}, \Delta^{\prime}\right)$ of $(X, \Delta)$ with birational map $\mu: X^{\prime} \rightarrow X$, where we write $K_{X^{\prime}}+\Delta^{\prime}=\mu^{*}\left(K_{X}+\Delta\right)+E$ for an effective $\mu$-exceptional divisor $E$;
- a $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier divisor $B$ on $X^{\prime}$ which we express as the difference $B=B^{+}-B^{-}$of effective divisors $B^{+}$and $B^{-}$with no common components;
- a smooth variety $Z^{\prime}$ and a divisor $\Delta_{Z^{\prime}}$; and
- a morphism $f^{\prime}: X^{\prime} \rightarrow Z^{\prime}$ birationally equivalent to $f$;
satisfying the properties:
(1) $K_{X^{\prime}}+\Delta^{\prime} \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} f^{\prime *}\left(K_{Z^{\prime}}+\Delta_{Z^{\prime}}\right)+B$;
(2) there is a positive integer $b$ such that

$$
H^{0}\left(X^{\prime}, m b\left(K_{X^{\prime}}+\Delta^{\prime}\right)\right)=H^{0}\left(Z^{\prime}, m b\left(K_{Z^{\prime}}+\Delta_{Z^{\prime}}\right)\right)
$$

for any positive integer $m$;
(3) $B^{-}$is $f^{\prime}$-exceptional and $\mu$-exceptional; and
(4) $f_{*}^{\prime} \mathcal{O}_{X^{\prime}}\left(\left\llcorner l B^{+}\right\lrcorner\right)=\mathcal{O}_{Z^{\prime}}$ for every positive integer $l$.

We next apply the results of [Amb05]. Choose an integer $m$ so that $m\left(K_{X}+\Delta\right)$ is a Cartier divisor and $\left.m\left(K_{X}+\Delta\right)\right|_{F} \sim 0$ for the general fiber $F$ of $f$. Then $f_{*} \mathcal{O}_{X}\left(m\left(K_{X}+\Delta\right)\right) \neq 0$ since it is invertible over an open subset of $Z$ by Grauert's theorem. Thus there is an ample divisor $A$ on $Z$ so that $H^{0}\left(X, m\left(K_{X}+\Delta\right)+f^{*} A\right) \neq 0$. Choose an effective divisor $\Omega$ in this linear system; $\Omega$ must be $f$-vertical since $\left.\Omega\right|_{F} \equiv 0$ for the general fiber $F$ of $f$. In the notation of [Amb05], $f:(X, \Delta-(1 / m) \Omega) \rightarrow Z$ is an LC-trivial fibration. The theorem [Amb05, Theorem 3.3] allows us to conclude the additional key property that $\left(Z^{\prime}, \Delta_{Z^{\prime}}\right)$ may be taken to be a Kawamata $\log$ terminal pair (perhaps after additional birational modifications which we absorb into the notation).

We finish by comparing $P_{\sigma}\left(K_{X}+\Delta\right)$ and $P_{\sigma}\left(K_{Z^{\prime}}+\Delta_{Z^{\prime}}\right)$. Write $B^{+}=B_{h}^{+}+B_{v}^{+}$for the decomposition into the $f^{\prime}$-horizontal components $B_{h}^{+}$and the $f^{\prime}$-vertical components $B_{v}^{+}$. We analyze in turn $B^{-}$, then $B_{h}^{+}$, then $B_{v}^{+}$.
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First consider $B^{-}$. Since $B^{-}$and $E$ are $\mu$-exceptional, Lemma 2.16 shows that $E+B^{-} \leqslant$ $N_{\sigma}\left(\mu^{*}\left(K_{X}+\Delta\right)+E+B^{-}\right)$. Thus we may apply Lemma $2.9(4)$ to $B^{-}$to obtain

$$
\begin{align*}
N_{\sigma}\left(K_{X^{\prime}}+\Delta^{\prime}+B^{-}\right) & =N_{\sigma}\left(\mu^{*}\left(K_{X}+\Delta\right)+E+B^{-}\right) \\
& =N_{\sigma}\left(\mu^{*}\left(K_{X}+\Delta\right)+E\right)+B^{-} \quad \text { by Lemma 2.9(4) } \\
& =N_{\sigma}\left(K_{X^{\prime}}+\Delta^{\prime}\right)+B^{-} \tag{*}
\end{align*}
$$

Next consider $B_{h}^{+}$. Note that $\nu\left(\left.\left(K_{X^{\prime}}+\Delta^{\prime}\right)\right|_{F^{\prime}}\right)=0$ for a general fiber $F^{\prime}$ of $f^{\prime}$. Indeed, for a general $F^{\prime}$ the map $\left.\mu\right|_{F^{\prime}}$ is birational so that $\left.E\right|_{F^{\prime}}$ is $\left.\mu\right|_{F^{\prime}}$-exceptional. By Lemma 2.16, $P_{\sigma}\left(\left.\left(K_{X^{\prime}}+\Delta^{\prime}\right)\right|_{F^{\prime}}\right)=P_{\sigma}\left(\left.\mu^{*}\left(K_{X}+\Delta\right)\right|_{F^{\prime}}\right)$ and so, by Lemma 2.12,

$$
\nu\left(\left.\left(K_{X^{\prime}}+\Delta^{\prime}\right)\right|_{F}\right)=\nu\left(\left.\mu^{*}\left(K_{X}+\Delta\right)\right|_{F^{\prime}}\right)=0 .
$$

This implies that if $D$ is an effective divisor on $F^{\prime}$ such that $\left.\left(K_{X^{\prime}}+\Delta^{\prime}\right)\right|_{F^{\prime}}-D$ is pseudo-effective, then $D \leqslant N_{\sigma}\left(\left.\left(K_{X^{\prime}}+\Delta^{\prime}\right)\right|_{F^{\prime}}\right)$. Applying this fact to $\left.B_{h}^{+}\right|_{F^{\prime}}$ we obtain

$$
\left.B_{h}^{+}\right|_{F^{\prime}} \leqslant N_{\sigma}\left(\left.\left(K_{X^{\prime}}+\Delta^{\prime}\right)\right|_{F^{\prime}}\right) \leqslant\left. N_{\sigma}\left(K_{X^{\prime}}+\Delta^{\prime}\right)\right|_{F^{\prime}}
$$

As $F^{\prime}$ is general, this equation implies that $B_{h}^{+} \leqslant N_{\sigma}\left(K_{X^{\prime}}+\Delta^{\prime}\right)$. By our earlier work for $B^{-}$, it is also true that $B_{h}^{+} \leqslant N_{\sigma}\left(K_{X^{\prime}}+\Delta^{\prime}+B^{-}\right)$.

Finally, consider $B_{v}^{+}$. By Lemma 2.15, property (4) shows that $B_{v}^{+}$is $f^{\prime}$-degenerate. Again applying Lemma 2.16, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
P_{\sigma}\left(f^{\prime *}\left(K_{Z^{\prime}}+\Delta_{Z^{\prime}}\right)+B_{v}^{+}\right)=P_{\sigma}\left(f^{\prime *}\left(K_{Z^{\prime}}+\Delta_{Z^{\prime}}\right)\right) . \tag{**}
\end{equation*}
$$

Putting it all together, we find

$$
\begin{aligned}
P_{\sigma}\left(\mu^{*}\left(K_{X}+\Delta\right)\right) & =P_{\sigma}\left(K_{X^{\prime}}+\Delta^{\prime}\right) \quad \text { since } E \text { is } \mu \text {-exceptional, } \\
& =P_{\sigma}\left(K_{X^{\prime}}+\Delta^{\prime}+B^{-}\right) \quad \text { by }(*), \\
& =P_{\sigma}\left(K_{X^{\prime}}+\Delta^{\prime}+B^{-}-B_{h}^{+}\right) \quad \text { by analysis of } B_{h}^{+}, \\
& \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} P_{\sigma}\left(f^{\prime *}\left(K_{Z^{\prime}}+\Delta_{Z^{\prime}}\right)+B_{v}^{+}\right) \quad \text { by property }(1), \\
& =P_{\sigma}\left(f^{\prime *}\left(K_{Z^{\prime}}+\Delta_{Z^{\prime}}\right)\right) \text { by }(* *) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Corollary 4.5. Let $(X, \Delta)$ be a projective $\mathbb{Q}$-factorial Kawamata log terminal pair. Suppose that $f: X \rightarrow Z$ is a morphism with connected fibers to a projective normal variety $Z$ such that $\nu\left(\left.\left(K_{X}+\Delta\right)\right|_{F}\right)=0$ for a general fiber $F$ of $f$. Then there exists a smooth projective birational model $Z^{\prime}$ of $Z$ and a Kawamata log terminal pair $\left(Z^{\prime}, \Delta_{Z^{\prime}}\right)$ such that $(X, \Delta)$ has a good minimal model if and only if ( $Z^{\prime}, \Delta_{Z^{\prime}}$ ) has a good minimal model.

Proof. By Lemma 4.4 and the fact that the Iitaka and numerical dimensions are invariant under pull-back and under passing to the positive part $P_{\sigma}$, we see that $K_{X}+\Delta$ is abundant if and only if $K_{Z^{\prime}}+\Delta_{Z^{\prime}}$ is abundant. We finish the proof by applying Theorem 4.3.

Theorem 4.6. Assume the existence of good minimal models for $\mathbb{Q}$-factorial projective Kawamata log terminal pairs in dimension d. Let $(X, \Delta)$ be a $\mathbb{Q}$-factorial projective Kawamata $\log$ terminal pair such that $K_{X}+\Delta$ is pseudo-effective and $\widetilde{\tau}(X, \Delta)=d$. Then there exists a good log minimal model of $(X, \Delta)$.

Proof. Using Lemma 3.8, we can find a birational morphism $\varphi: W \rightarrow X$ from an $\epsilon$-log smooth model $\left(W, \Delta_{W}^{\epsilon}\right)$ of $(X, \Delta)$ for a sufficiently small positive number $\epsilon$ and a morphism $f: W \rightarrow Z$
with connected fibers such that:
(i) $\nu\left(\left.\left(K_{W}+\Delta_{W}^{\epsilon}\right)\right|_{F}\right)=0$ for the general fiber $F$ of $f$; and
(ii) $\operatorname{dim} Z=\widetilde{\tau}(X, \Delta)$.

Corollary 4.5 implies that $\left(W, \Delta_{W}^{\epsilon}\right)$ has a good minimal model; $(X, \Delta)$ then has a good minimal model by [BCHM10, Lemma 3.6.10].

Corollary 4.7. Conjecture 1.4 holds up to dimension $n$ if and only Conjecture 1.2 holds up to dimension $n$.

Proof. Assume that Conjecture 1.4 holds up to dimension $n$. By induction on dimension, we may assume that Conjecture 1.2 holds up to dimension $n-1$. Let $(X, \Delta)$ be a projective Kawamata $\log$ terminal pair of dimension $n$. If $\widetilde{\tau}(X, \Delta)<n$, then $K_{X}+\Delta$ is abundant by Theorem 4.6 and the induction hypothesis. If $\widetilde{\tau}(X, \Delta)=n$ then some $\epsilon$-log smooth model $\left(W, \Delta_{W}^{\epsilon}\right)$ does not admit a $\left(K_{W}+\Delta_{W}^{\epsilon}\right)$-trivial covering family of curves. Since we are assuming Conjecture 1.4, $K_{W}+\Delta_{W}^{\epsilon}$ must be big. The article [BCHM10] then gives the existence of a good minimal model for ( $W, \Delta_{W}^{\epsilon}$ ) and hence also for $(X, \Delta)$.

Conversely, assume that Conjecture 1.2 holds up to dimension $n$. Suppose that $(X, \Delta)$ is a projective Kawamata log terminal pair of dimension at most $n$ admitting a ( $K_{X}+\Delta$ )-trivial covering family of curves. Then $\tau\left(K_{X}+\Delta\right)<\operatorname{dim} X$. Corollary 3.14 shows that $\kappa\left(K_{X}+\Delta\right)<$ $\operatorname{dim} X$ so $K_{X}+\Delta$ is not big.

Remark 4.8. It seems likely that one could formulate a stronger version of Corollary 4.7 using the pseudo-effective reduction map for $K_{X}+\Delta$ (cf. [Eck05, Leh11a]). The difficulty is that the pseudo-effective reduction map only satisfies the weaker condition $\nu\left(\left.P_{\sigma}\left(K_{X}+\Delta\right)\right|_{F}\right)=0$ on a general fiber $F$, so it is unclear how to use the inductive hypothesis to relate $F$ with $X$.
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