



HAL
open science

UNIPOTENT GROUP ACTIONS ON DEL PEZZO CONES

Takashi Kishimoto, Yuri Prokhorov, Mikhail Zaidenberg

► **To cite this version:**

Takashi Kishimoto, Yuri Prokhorov, Mikhail Zaidenberg. UNIPOTENT GROUP ACTIONS ON DEL PEZZO CONES. Algebraic Geometry, 2014, 1 (1 January 2015), pp.46-56. 10.14231/AG-2014-003 . hal-00766761v2

HAL Id: hal-00766761

<https://hal.science/hal-00766761v2>

Submitted on 31 Dec 2012

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

UNIPOTENT GROUP ACTIONS ON DEL PEZZO CONES

TAKASHI KISHIMOTO, YURI PROKHOROV, AND MIKHAIL ZAIDENBERG

ABSTRACT. In our previous paper [KPZ11b] we showed that for any del Pezzo surface Y of degree $d \geq 4$ and for any $r \geq 1$, the affine cone $X = \text{cone}_{r(-K_Y)}(Y)$ admits an effective \mathbb{G}_a -action. In particular, the group $\text{Aut}(X)$ is infinite dimensional. In this note we prove that for a del Pezzo surface Y of degree ≤ 2 the generalized cones X as above do not admit any non-trivial action of a unipotent algebraic group.

1. INTRODUCTION

We are working over an algebraically closed field \mathbb{k} of characteristic 0. Let Y be a smooth projective variety with a polarization H , where H is an ample Cartier divisor. A *generalized affine cone* over (Y, H) is the normal affine variety

$$\text{cone}_H(Y) = \text{Spec} \bigoplus_{\nu \geq 0} H^0(Y, \nu H).$$

This variety $\text{cone}_H(Y)$ is the usual affine cone over Y embedded in a projective space \mathbb{P}^n by the linear system $|H|$ provided that H is very ample and the image of Y in \mathbb{P}^n is projectively normal.

In this paper we deal with a del Pezzo surface Y and a pluri-anticanonical divisor $H = -rK_Y$ on Y , where $r \geq 1$; we call then $\text{cone}_H(Y)$ a *del Pezzo cone*. This is a usual cone if $r \geq 4 - d$ (see e.g. [Dol12, Theorem 8.3.4]) and a generalized cone otherwise.

It is known [KPZ11b, 3.1.13] that for any smooth rational surface there is an ample polarization such that the associated affine cone admits an effective \mathbb{G}_a -action. Furthermore, for any del Pezzo surface of degree ≥ 4 the corresponding del Pezzo cones $\text{cone}_{-rK_Y}(Y)$ ($r \geq 1$) admit such an action (*loc.cit*). The latter holds also for some smooth rational Fano threefolds with Picard number 1 [KPZ11b, KPZ11a]. However, for del Pezzo surfaces of small degrees the consideration turns out to be more complicated. It is unknown so far whether the affine cone over a smooth cubic surface in \mathbb{P}^3 admits a \mathbb{G}_a -action (cf. [KPZ11b, §4]). In this paper we investigate the cases $d = 1$ and $d = 2$. Our main result can be stated as follows.

Theorem 1.1. *Let Y be a del Pezzo surface of degree $d = K_Y^2 \leq 2$. Then for any $r \geq 1$ there is no non-trivial action of a unipotent group on the generalized affine cone*

$$X_r = \text{cone}_{-rK_Y}(Y) = \text{Spec} A, \quad \text{where} \quad A = \bigoplus_{\nu \geq 0} H^0(Y, -\nu r K_Y).$$

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 14R20, 14J45; Secondary 14J50, 14R05 .

Key words and phrases. affine cone, del Pezzo surface, additive group, group action.

The first author was supported by a Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research of JSPS No. 24740003. The second author was partially supported by RFBR grants No. 11-01-00336-a, the grant of Leading Scientific Schools No. 4713.2010.1, Simons-IUM fellowship, and AG Laboratory SU-HSE, RF government grant ag. 11.G34.31.0023.

Corollary 1.2. *In the notation as before assume that $d \leq 2$ and $r \geq 4 - d$ so that $X_r = \text{cone}_{-rK_Y}(Y)$ is a usual del Pezzo cone. Then any algebraic subgroup $G \subset \text{Aut}(X_r)$ is isomorphic to a subgroup of $\mathbb{G}_m \times \text{Aut}(Y)$, where $\text{Aut}(Y)$ is finite.*

Proof. As follows from Theorem 1.1 G is a reductive group. Thus by Lemma 2.3.1 and Proposition 2.2.6 in [KPZ11b] there are an injection and an isomorphism

$$G \hookrightarrow \text{Lin}(X_r) \simeq \mathbb{G}_m \times \text{Lin}(Y) \subset \mathbb{G}_m \times \text{Aut}(Y),$$

where the group $\text{Aut}(Y)$ is finite, see [Dol12]. □

We suggest the following

1.3. Conjecture. *If $d \leq 2$ then for any $r \geq d - 4$ the full automorphism group $\text{Aut}(X_r)$ is a finite extension of the multiplicative group \mathbb{G}_m .*

Likewise in [KPZ11a, KPZ11b] we use a geometric criterion of existence of an effective \mathbb{G}_a -action on the affine cone $\text{cone}_H(Y)$ (see [KPZ12] and Theorem 2.1 below).

Sections 2, 3, and 4 contain necessary preliminaries. Theorem 1.1 is proven in section 5. The proof proceeds as follows. Assuming to the contrary that there exists a non-trivial unipotent group action on $X_r = \text{cone}_{(-rK_Y)}(Y)$, there also exists an effective \mathbb{G}_a -action on X_r . By Theorem 2.1 there is an effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor D on Y such that $D \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} -K_Y$ and $U = Y \setminus D \cong Z \times \mathbb{A}^1$, where Z is a smooth rational affine curve. Such a principal open subset U is called in [KPZ11b] a *$(-K_Y)$ -polar cylinder*. One of the key points consists in an estimate for the singularities of the pair (Y, D) . More precisely, we consider the linear pencil \mathcal{L} on Y generated by the closures of the fibers of the projection $U \cong Z \times \mathbb{A}^1 \rightarrow Z$. Letting S be the last exceptional divisor appearing in the process of the minimal resolution of the base locus of \mathcal{L} we compute the discrepancy $a(S; D)$. Using this and some subtle geometrical properties of the pair (Y, D) we finally come to a contradiction.

2. CRITERION

Let Y be a projective variety and H be an ample divisor on Y . Recall [KPZ11b] that an *H -polar cylinder* in Y is an open subset $U = Y \setminus \text{supp}(D)$ isomorphic to $Z \times \mathbb{A}^1$ for some affine variety Z , where $D = \sum_i \delta_i \Delta_i$ with $\delta_i > 0 \ \forall i$ is an effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor on Y such that qD is integral and $qD \sim H$ for some $q \in \mathbb{N}$. Corollary 2.12 in [KPZ12]¹ provides the following useful criterion of existence of an effective \mathbb{G}_a -action on the affine cone.

Theorem 2.1. *Let Y be a normal projective algebraic variety with an ample polarization $H \in \text{Div}(Y)$, and let $X = \text{cone}_H(Y)$ be the corresponding generalized affine cone. If X is normal then X admits an effective \mathbb{G}_a -action if and only if Y contains an H -polar cylinder.*

We apply this criterion to a del Pezzo surface Y of degree $d \leq 2$ and a generalized cone

$$X_r = \text{Spec} \bigoplus_{\nu \geq 0} H^0(Y, -\nu r K_Y)$$

associated with $H = -rK_Y$, where $r \geq 1$. It follows, in particular, that if the cone X_r admits an effective \mathbb{G}_a -action then Y contains a cylinder $Y \setminus \text{supp} D$ with $qD \sim -rK_Y$.

¹Cf. also [KPZ11b, 3.1.9].

Hence $\frac{d}{r}D \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} -K_Y$. Replacing D by $\frac{d}{r}D$ we assume in the sequel that $D \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} -K_Y$. This assumption leads finally to a contradiction, which proves Theorem 1.1.

3. PRELIMINARIES ON WEAK DEL PEZZO SURFACES

A smooth projective surface Y is called a *del Pezzo surface* if the anticanonical divisor $-K_Y$ is ample, and a *weak del Pezzo surface* if $-K_Y$ is big and nef. The *degree* of such a surface is $\deg Y = K_Y^2 \in \{1, \dots, 9\}$.

Lemma 3.1 (see e.g. [Dol12, Proposition 8.1.23]). *Blowing up a point on a del Pezzo surface of degree $d \geq 2$ yields a weak del Pezzo surface of degree $d - 1$.*

Theorem 3.2 (see e.g. [Dol12, Thm. 8.3.2]). *Let Y be a del Pezzo surface of degree d . Then the following hold.*

- (i) *If $d \geq 3$ then $| -K_Y |$ defines an embedding $Y \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}^d$.*
- (ii) *If $d = 2$ then $| -K_Y |$ defines a double cover $\Phi : Y \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^2$ branched along a smooth curve $B \subset \mathbb{P}^2$ of degree 4.*
- (iii) *If $d = 1$ then $| -K_X |$ is a pencil with a single base point, say O . The linear system $| -2K_Y |$ defines a double cover $\Phi : Y \rightarrow Q' \subset \mathbb{P}^3$, where Q' is a quadric cone with vertex at $\Phi(O)$. Furthermore Φ is branched along a smooth curve $B \subset Q'$ cut out on Q' by a cubic surface.*

The Galois involution $\tau : Y \rightarrow Y$ associated to the double cover Φ is a regular morphism. It is called *Geiser involution* in the case $d = 2$ and *Bertini involution* in the case $d = 1$.

Remark 3.3. Recall the following facts (see e.g. [Dol12]). For an irreducible curve C on Y we have $C^2 \geq -1$ if Y is a del Pezzo surface and $C^2 \geq -2$ if Y is a weak del Pezzo surface. In both cases $C^2 = -1$ if and only if C is a (-1) -curve, if and only if $-K_Y \cdot C = 1$, and $C^2 = -2$ if and only if C is a (-2) -curve, if and only if $-K_Y \cdot C = 0$. A weak del Pezzo surface is del Pezzo if and only if it has no (-2) -curve.

If $d \geq 2$ then any curve C on Y such that $-K_Y \cdot C = 1$ is an irreducible smooth rational curve by (i) and (ii). By the adjunction formula such C must be a (-1) -curve.

Lemma 3.4. *Let Y be a del Pezzo surface of degree $d \leq 2$. Then any member $R \in | -K_Y |$ is reduced and $p_a(R) = 1$. Moreover, R is irreducible except in the case where*

- $d = 2$, $R = R_1 + R_2$, $R_i^2 = -1$, $i = 1, 2$, $R_1 \cdot R_2 = 2$, and $R_2 = \tau(R_1)$.

Furthermore, $\text{Sing}(R) \subset \Phi^{-1}(B)$ and for any $P \in \Phi^{-1}(B)$ there is a unique member $R \in | -K_Y |$ singular at P .

Proof. We have $p_a(R) = 1$ by adjunction. Let $R_1 \subsetneq R$ be a reduced irreducible component. Then $(-K_Y) \cdot R_1 < (-K_Y) \cdot R = d$ and so $d = 2$ and R_1 is a (-1) -curve by Remark 3.3. Since $R^2 = d = 2$, $R \neq 2R_1$. Therefore $R = R_1 + R_2$, where the R_i ($i = 1, 2$) are (-1) -curves and $R_1 \cdot R_2 = \frac{1}{2}(R^2 - R_1^2 - R_2^2) = 2$. Finally, in both cases we have $R = \Phi^{-1}(L)$, where L is a line in \mathbb{P}^2 . Thus R is singular at P if and only if $\Phi(P) \in B$ and L is tangent to B at $\Phi(P)$. \square

Remark 3.5. Let R_1 and R_2 be (-1) -curves on a del Pezzo surface Y of degree 2 such that $R_1 \cdot R_2 \geq 2$. Then $R_2 = \tau(R_1)$, $R_1 \cdot R_2 = 2$, and $R_1 + R_2 \in | -K_Y |$. Indeed, $R_1 + \tau(R_1) \sim -K_Y$. Hence $\tau(R_1) \cdot R_2 = -1$ and so $\tau(R_1) = R_2$.

4. $(-K)$ -POLAR CYLINDERS ON DEL PEZZO SURFACES

We adjust here some lemmas in [KPZ11b, §4] to our setting.

Notation 4.1. Let Y be a del Pezzo surface of degree d . Suppose that Y admits a $(-K_Y)$ -polar cylinder

$$(4.2) \quad U = Y \setminus \text{supp}(D) \cong Z \times \mathbb{A}^1, \quad \text{where} \quad D = \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_i \Delta_i \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} -K_Y \quad (\delta_i > 0)$$

and Z is a smooth rational affine curve. We let \mathcal{L} be the linear pencil on Y defined by the rational map $\Psi : Y \dashrightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$ which extends the projection $\text{pr}_1 : U \cong Z \times \mathbb{A}^1 \rightarrow Z$.

Resolving, if necessary, the base locus of the pencil \mathcal{L} we obtain a diagram

$$(4.3) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} & W & \\ p \swarrow & & \searrow q \\ Y & \overset{\Psi}{\dashrightarrow} & \mathbb{P}^1 \end{array}$$

where we let $p : W \rightarrow Y$ be the shortest succession of blowups such that the proper transform $\mathcal{L}_W := p_*^{-1}\mathcal{L}$ is base point free. Let S be the last exceptional curve of the modification p unless p is the identity map, i.e., $\text{Bs } \mathcal{L} = \emptyset$. Notice that S is a unique (-1) -curve in the exceptional locus $p^{-1}(P)$ and a section of q . The restriction $\Phi_{\mathcal{L}_W}|_U$ is an \mathbb{A}^1 -fibration and its fibers are reduced, irreducible affine curves with one place at infinity, situated on S .

Lemma 4.4. *One of the following holds.*

- (i) $\text{Bs } \mathcal{L}$ consists of a single point, say P ;
- (ii) $\text{Bs } \mathcal{L} = \emptyset$ and $5 \leq d \leq 8$.

Proof. Since the general members of \mathcal{L} are disjoint in U and each one meets the cylinder U along an \mathbb{A}^1 -curve, $\text{Bs } \mathcal{L}$ consists of at most one point, which we denote by P . Suppose that $\text{Bs } \mathcal{L} = \emptyset$. Then the pencil \mathcal{L} yields a conic bundle $\Psi : Y \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$ with a section, which is a component of D , say Δ_0 . In particular $d \leq 8$. For a general fiber L of Ψ we have

$$L^2 = 0, \quad -K_Y \cdot L = 2 = D \cdot L = \delta_0.$$

Note that Ψ has exactly $8 - d$ degenerate fibers L_1, \dots, L_{8-d} . Each of these fibers is reduced and consists of two (-1) -curves meeting transversally at a point. Let C_i be the component of L_i that meets Δ_0 . We claim that each C_i is a component of D . Indeed, otherwise

$$1 = -K_Y \cdot C_i = D \cdot C_i \geq \delta_0 \Delta_0 \cdot C_i = \delta_0 = 2,$$

a contradiction. Therefore we may assume that $C_i = \Delta_i$ and so

$$1 = D \cdot C_i \geq \delta_0 \Delta_0 \cdot C_i + \delta_i C_i^2 = 2 - \delta_i.$$

Hence $\delta_i \geq 1$, $i = 1, \dots, 8 - d$. We obtain

$$d = -K_Y \cdot D \geq \sum \delta_i \geq \delta_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{8-d} \delta_i \geq 2 + 8 - d = 10 - d.$$

Thus $d \geq 5$ as stated. □

Remark 4.5. If $\text{Bs } \mathcal{L} = \{P\}$ ($\text{Bs } \mathcal{L} = \emptyset$, respectively) then all components of D (all components of D except for Δ_0 , respectively) are contained in the fibers of Ψ . Indeed, otherwise not all the fibers of $\Psi|_U$ were \mathbb{A}^1 -curves, contrary to the definition of a cylinder.

Lemma 4.6. *The number of irreducible components of the reduced curve $\text{supp}(D)$, say n , is greater than or equal to $10 - d$.*

Proof. Consider the exact sequence

$$\bigoplus_{i=1}^n \mathbb{Z}[\Delta_i] \longrightarrow \text{Pic}(Y) \longrightarrow \text{Pic}(U) \longrightarrow 0.$$

Since $\text{Pic}(Z) = 0$ and $U \cong Z \times \mathbb{A}^1$ we have $\text{Pic}(U) = 0$. Hence $n \geq \rho(Y) = 10 - d$, as stated. \square

Lemma 4.7. *Assume that $\text{Bs } \mathcal{L} = \{P\}$. Let L be a member of \mathcal{L} and C be an irreducible component of L . Then the following hold.*

- (i) $\text{supp}(L)$ is simply connected and $\text{supp}(L) \setminus \{P\}$ is an SNC divisor;
- (ii) C is rational and smooth outside P ;
- (iii) if $P \in C$ then $C \setminus \{P\} \simeq \mathbb{A}^1$.

Proof. All the assertions follow from the fact that q in (4.3) is a rational curve fibration and the exceptional locus of p coincides with $p^{-1}(P)$. \square

In the next lemma we study the singularities of the pair (Y, D) . We refer to [Kol97] or to [KM98, Chapter 2] for the standard terminology on singularities of pairs.

Lemma 4.8 (Key Lemma). *Assume that $\text{Bs } \mathcal{L} = \{P\}$. Then the pair (Y, D) is not log canonical at P . More precisely, in notation as in 4.1 the discrepancy $a(S; D)$ of S with respect to $K_Y + D$ is equal to -2 .*

Proof. We write

$$(4.9) \quad K_W + D_W \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} p^*(K_Y + D) + a(S; D)S + \sum a(E; D)E,$$

where the summation on the right hand side ranges over the components of the exceptional divisor of p except for S , and D_W is the proper transform of D on W . Letting l be a general fiber of q , by (4.9) we obtain

$$-2 = (K_W + D_W) \cdot l = a(S; D).$$

Indeed, $K_Y + D \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0$ and l does not meet the curve $\text{supp}(D_W + p^*(P) - S)$. This proves the assertion. \square

Corollary 4.10. *If $\text{Bs } \mathcal{L} = \{P\}$ then $\text{mult}_P(D) > 1$.*

Proof. Indeed, otherwise the pair (Y, D) would be canonical by [Kol97, Ex. 3.14.1], and in particular, log canonical at P , which contradicts Lemma 4.8. \square

Corollary 4.11. *If $\text{Bs } \mathcal{L} = \{P\}$ then every (-1) -curve C on Y passing through P is contained in $\text{supp}(D)$.*

Proof. Assume to the contrary that C is not a component of D . Then

$$\text{mult}_P D \leq C \cdot D = -K_Y \cdot C = 1,$$

which contradicts Corollary 4.10. \square

Convention 4.12. From now on we assume that $d \leq 3$. By Lemma 4.4 we have $\text{Bs } \mathcal{L} = \{P\}$.

Lemma 4.13. *We have $[D] = 0$ i.e. $\delta_i < 1$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$.*

Proof. For the case $d = 3$ see [KPZ11b, Lemma 4.1.5]. Consider the case $d = 1$. By Lemma 4.6 $n \geq 9$. For any $i = 1, \dots, n$ we have

$$1 = -K_Y \cdot D = \sum_{j=1}^n \delta_j (-K_Y) \cdot \Delta_j > \delta_i (-K_Y) \cdot \Delta_i.$$

Since the anticanonical divisor $-K_Y$ is ample, it follows that $\delta_i < 1$, as required.

Let further $d = 2$. Assuming that $\delta_1 \geq 1$ we obtain:

$$(4.14) \quad 2 = -K_Y \cdot D = \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_i (-K_Y) \cdot \Delta_i > \delta_1 (-K_Y) \cdot \Delta_1 \geq -K_Y \cdot \Delta_1,$$

where $n \geq 8$ by Lemma 4.6. It follows that $-K_Y \cdot \Delta_1 = 1$, i.e. Δ_1 is a (-1) -curve. Then $C := \tau(\Delta_1)$ is also a (-1) -curve, where τ is the Geiser involution, and $\Delta_1 + C \sim -K_Y$. If $C \subset \text{supp}(D)$, e.g. $C = \Delta_2$, then by (4.14) we obtain that $\delta_2 < 1$. Now $\Delta_1 + \Delta_2 \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} D$ yields a relation with positive coefficients

$$(1 - \delta_2)\Delta_2 \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} (\delta_1 - 1)\Delta_1 + \sum_{i=3}^n \delta_i \Delta_i.$$

This implies that $C^2 = \Delta_2^2 \geq 0$, a contradiction.

Hence $C \not\subset \text{supp}(D)$. Thus $C \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} D - \Delta_1$, where the right hand side is effective. This leads to a contradiction as before. \square

Lemma 4.15. ² *For a member L of \mathcal{L} , any irreducible component of L passes through the base point P of \mathcal{L} .*

Proof. Assume to the contrary that there exists a component C of L such that $P \notin C$. Then clearly $C^2 < 0$ (see the proof of Lemma 4.4). Since also $-K_Y \cdot C > 0$, C is a (-1) -curve. Let C' be a component of L meeting C . If $P \notin C'$, then C and C' are both (-1) -curves and so $L = C + C'$. Thus $\mathcal{L} = |C + C'|$ is base point free, which contradicts Lemma 4.4. Hence C' passes through P . Since P is a unique base point of \mathcal{L} , C does not meet any member $L' \in \mathcal{L}$ different from L . By Lemma 4.7 L is simply connected, so C' is the only component of L meeting C . Note that $\text{supp}(D)$ is connected because D is ample. Hence C' must be contained in $\text{supp}(D)$. In fact, supposing to the contrary that C' is not contained in $\text{supp}(D)$, the curve C must be contained in $\text{supp}(D)$. Indeed, the affine surface $U = Y \setminus \text{supp}(D)$ does not contain any complete curve. Since $\text{supp}(D)$ is connected there is an irreducible component of $\text{supp}(D)$ intersecting C and passing through P . This contradicts Lemma 4.7. Thus we may suppose that $C' = \Delta_1$.

If $C \subset \text{supp}(D)$, say, $C = \Delta_2$, then

$$1 = -K_Y \cdot C = \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \delta_i \Delta_i \right) \cdot \Delta_2 = \delta_1 - \delta_2.$$

Hence $\delta_1 = \delta_2 + 1 > 1$, which contradicts Lemma 4.13.

²Cf. [KPZ11b, Lemma 4.1.6].

Therefore $C \not\subset \text{supp}(D)$ and so

$$1 = -K_Y \cdot C = \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \delta_i \Delta_i \right) \cdot C = \delta_1,$$

which again gives a contradiction by Lemma 4.13. \square

5. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1

According to our geometric criterion 2.1, Theorem 1.1 is a consequence of the following proposition.

Proposition 5.1. *Let Y be a del Pezzo surface of degree $d \leq 2$. Then Y does not admit any $(-K_Y)$ -polar cylinder.*

Convention 5.2. We let Y be a del Pezzo surface of degree $d \leq 2$. We assume to the contrary that Y possesses a $(-K_Y)$ -polar cylinder U as in (4.2). By Lemma 4.4 we have $\text{Bs } \mathcal{L} = \{P\}$.

Lemma 5.3. *For any $R \in |-K_Y|$ we have $\text{supp}(R) \not\subset \text{supp}(D)$.*

Proof. Suppose to the contrary that $\text{supp}(R) \subset \text{supp}(D)$. Let $\lambda \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0}$ be maximal such that $D - \lambda R$ is effective. We can write

$$D = \lambda R + D_{\text{res}},$$

where D_{res} is an effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor such that $\text{supp}(R) \not\subset \text{supp}(D_{\text{res}})$. For $t \in \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}$ we consider the following linear combination

$$D_t := D - tR + \frac{t}{1-\lambda} D_{\text{res}} \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} -K_Y.$$

We have $D_0 = D$ and $D_\lambda = \frac{1}{1-\lambda} D_{\text{res}}$. For $t < \lambda$, the \mathbb{Q} -divisor D_t is effective with $\text{supp}(D_t) = \text{supp}(D)$. By Lemma 4.8 applied to D_t instead of D , for any $t < \lambda$ the pair (Y, D_t) is not log canonical at P , with discrepancy $a(S; D_t) = -2$. Since the function $t \mapsto a(S; D_t)$ is continuous, passing to the limit we obtain $a(S; D_\lambda) = -2$. Hence the pair (Y, D_λ) is not log canonical at P either and so $\text{mult}_P(D_\lambda) > 1$.

Assume that R is irreducible. Since $R \subset \text{supp}(D)$, R is a component of a member of \mathcal{L} . Hence the curve R is smooth outside P and rational (see Lemma 4.7(ii)). Since $p_a(R) = 1$, R is singular at P and $\text{mult}_P(R) = 2$. Since R is different from the components of D_λ and $\text{mult}_P(D_\lambda) > 1$ we obtain

$$(5.4) \quad 2 \geq K_Y^2 = D_\lambda \cdot R \geq \text{mult}_P(D_\lambda) \text{mult}_P(R) > 2,$$

a contradiction.

Let further R be reducible. By Lemma 3.4 we have $d = 2$ and $R = R_1 + R_2$, where, say, $R_i = \Delta_i$, $i = 1, 2$, are (-1) -curves passing through P (see Lemma 4.15). We may assume that $\delta_1 \leq \delta_2$ and so $\lambda = \delta_1$. Since Δ_1 is not a component of D_λ we obtain

$$1 = -K_Y \cdot R_1 = D_\lambda \cdot \Delta_1 \geq \text{mult}_P(D_\lambda) > 1,$$

a contradiction. This finishes the proof. \square

Proof of Proposition 5.1 in the case $d = 1$. Since $\dim | -K_Y | = 1$ there is $C \in | -K_Y |$ passing through P . Furthermore, by Lemma 3.4 C is irreducible. By Lemma 5.3 C is not contained in $\text{supp}(D)$. Likewise in (5.4) we get a contradiction. Indeed, by Corollary 4.10 we have

$$1 = C^2 = D \cdot C \geq \text{mult}_P D \cdot \text{mult}_P C > 1.$$

□

Convention 5.5. We assume in the remaining part that $d = 2$.

Lemma 5.6. *A member $R \in | -K_Y |$ cannot be singular at P .*

Proof. Assume that $P \in \text{Sing}(R)$. By Lemma 3.4 we have two possibilities for R . Suppose first that R is irreducible. By Lemma 5.3 $R \not\subset \text{supp}(D)$ and we get a contradiction likewise in (5.4). In the second case $R = R_1 + R_2$, where R_1 and R_2 are (-1) -curves passing through P . Hence $R_1, R_2 \subset \text{supp}(D)$ by Corollary 4.11. The latter contradicts Lemma 5.3. □

Notation 5.7. We let $f : Y' \rightarrow Y$ be the blowup of P and $E' \subset Y'$ be the exceptional divisor. By Lemma 3.1 Y' is a weak del Pezzo surface of degree 1.

5.8. Applying Proposition 5.1 with $d = 1$, we can conclude that Y' is not del Pezzo because it contains a $-K_Y$ -polar cylinder. Indeed, let D' be the crepant pull-back of D on Y' , that is,

$$K_{Y'} + D' = f^*(K_Y + D) \quad \text{and} \quad f_* D' = D.$$

Then

$$(5.9) \quad D' = \sum_{i=1}^6 \delta_i \Delta'_i + \delta_0 E', \quad \text{where} \quad \delta_0 = \text{mult}_P(D) - 1 > 0$$

(see Lemma 4.10) and Δ'_i is the proper transform of Δ_i on Y' . Thus D' is an effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor on Y' such that $D' \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} -K_{Y'}$ and $Y' \setminus \text{supp} D' \simeq U \simeq Z \times \mathbb{A}^1$ is a $-K_Y$ -polar cylinder.

Lemma 5.10. *We have $\text{mult}_P(D) < 2$ and $\lfloor D' \rfloor = 0$.*

Proof. Suppose first that all components of D are (-1) -curves. Then $\Delta_i \cdot \Delta_j = 1$ for $i \neq j$ by Remark 3.5 and Lemma 5.3. Hence f is a log resolution of the pair (Y, D) . Therefore $1 - \sum \delta_i = a(Y, E') < -1$ by Lemma 4.8, so $\sum \delta_i > 2$. On the other hand $2 = -K_Y \cdot D = \sum \delta_i$, a contradiction. This shows that there exists a component Δ_i of D which is not a (-1) -curve. By the dimension count there exists an effective divisor $R \in | -K_Y |$ passing through P and a general point $Q \in \Delta_i$. On the other hand, there is no (-1) -curve in Y passing through Q . So by Lemma 3.4 we may assume that R is reduced and irreducible. By Lemma 5.3 R is different from the components of D . Assuming that $\text{mult}_P(D) \geq 2$ we obtain

$$2 = R \cdot D \geq \text{mult}_P(D) + \delta_i > 2,$$

a contradiction. This proves the first assertion. Now the second follows since $\delta_0 > 0$ in (5.9). □

Corollary 5.11. *The pair (Y', D') is Kawamata log terminal in codimension one and is not log canonical at some point $P' \in E'$.*

Proof. This follows from Lemma 5.10 taking into account that D' is the crepant pull-back of D , see [Kol97, L. 3.10]. \square

Since $\dim | -K_{Y'}| = 1$ there exists an element $C' \in | -K_{Y'}|$ passing through the point P' as in Corollary 5.11.

Lemma 5.12. *The point $P \in Y$ is a smooth point of the image $C = f_*C'$.*

Proof. This follows by Lemma 5.6 since $C \in | -K_Y|$ passes through P . \square

Corollary 5.13. *E' is not a component of C' .*

Proof. We can write $f^*C = C' + kE'$ for some $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then $k = -kE'^2 = C' \cdot E' = 1$. By Lemma 5.12 the coefficient of E' in f^*C is equal to 1 as well. Now the assertion follows. \square

Lemma 5.14. *C is reducible.*

Proof. Indeed, otherwise C' is irreducible by Corollary 5.13. Since $\text{mult}_{P'} D' > 1$ by Corollary 5.11 and $D' \cdot C' = K_{Y'}^2 = 1$, C' is a component of D' . Hence C is a component of D . This contradicts Lemma 5.3. \square

Lemma 5.15. *We have $C' = C'_1 + C'_2$, where C_1 is a (-1) -curve, C'_2 is a (-2) -curve, and $C'_1 \cdot C'_2 = 2$. Furthermore, $P' \in C'_2 \setminus C'_1$, and $C_2 = f(C'_2)$ is a (-1) -curve.*

Proof. Since C is reducible and $C \in | -K_Y|$, by Lemma 3.4 $C = C_1 + C_2$, where C_1, C_2 are (-1) -curves with $C_1 \cdot C_2 = 2$. By Lemma 5.12 $P \notin C_1 \cap C_2$, where C_2 is a component of D by Corollary 4.11, while by Lemma 5.3 C_1 is not. So we may assume that $P \in C_2 \setminus C_1$. Now the lemma follows from Corollary 5.11. \square

5.16. Letting in the sequel $C_2 = \Delta_1$ we can write $D = \delta_1 C_2 + D_{\text{res}}$, where $\delta_1 > 0$, D_{res} is an effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor, and C_2 is not a component of D_{res} . Similarly

$$D' = \delta_1 C'_2 + D'_{\text{res}} + \delta_0 E',$$

where D'_{res} is the proper transform of D_{res} and $\delta_0 = \text{mult}_{P'}(D) - 1$ (cf. (5.9)).

Lemma 5.17. *We have $2\delta_1 \leq 1$.*

Proof. This follows from

$$0 \leq D_{\text{res}} \cdot C_1 = (D - \delta_1 C_2) \cdot C_1 = 1 - 2\delta_1.$$

\square

Lemma 5.18. *In the notation as before $\delta_0 + D'_{\text{res}} \cdot C'_2 > 1$.*

Proof. Let us show first that $\{P'\} = C'_2 \cap E' = C'_2 \cap \text{supp}(D'_{\text{res}})$. Indeed, $P' \in E'$ by construction, $P' \in C'_2$ by Lemma 5.15, and $P' \in \text{supp}(D'_{\text{res}})$ because otherwise P' would be a node of D' (indeed, E' meets C'_2 transversally at P') and so the pair (Y', D') would be log canonical at P' contrary to Corollary 5.11. On the other hand, the curves C'_2 and D'_{res} have only one point in common by Lemma 4.7(i).

Since $\delta_1 < 1$ the pair $(Y', C'_2 + D'_{\text{res}} + \delta_0 E')$ is not log canonical at P' . Now applying [KM98, Corollary 5.57] we obtain

$$1 < (D'_{\text{res}} + \delta_0 E') \cdot C'_2 = \delta_0 + D'_{\text{res}} \cdot C'_2,$$

as stated. \square

Proof of Proposition 5.1 in the case $d = 2$. We use the notation as above. Since C'_2 is a (-2) -curve, by virtue of Lemmas 5.17 and 5.18 we obtain

$$1 - \delta_0 < D'_{\text{res}} \cdot C'_2 = (D' - \delta_1 C'_2 - \delta_0 E') \cdot C'_2 = 2\delta_1 - \delta_0 \leq 1 - \delta_0,$$

a contradiction. Now the proof of Proposition 5.1 is completed. \square

Remark 5.19. Our proof of Proposition 5.1 goes along the lines of that of Lemmas 3.1 and 3.5 in [Chel08].³ However, this proposition does not follow immediately from the results in [Chel08]. Indeed, in notation of [Chel08] by Lemma 4.8 we have $\text{lct}(Y, D) < 1$. This is not sufficient to get a contradiction with [Chel08, Theorem 1.7]. The point is that our boundary D is not arbitrary, in contrary, it is rather special (see Lemma 4.7).

Acknowledgements. This work was done during a stay of the second and third authors at the Max Planck Institute für Mathematik at Bonn and a stay of the first and the second authors at the Institute Fourier, Grenoble. The authors thank these institutions for their hospitality and support.

REFERENCES

- [Chel08] I. Cheltsov. Log canonical thresholds of del Pezzo surfaces. *Geom. Funct. Anal.* 18 (2008), 1118–1144.
- [Dol12] I. Dolgachev. Classical Algebraic Geometry: A Modern View. *Cambridge University Press*, 2012.
- [KM98] J. Kollár and S. Mori. Birational geometry of algebraic varieties. *Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics* 134. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1998. With the collaboration of C. H. Clemens and A. Corti, Translated from the 1998 Japanese original.
- [Kol97] J. Kollár. Singularities of pairs. In *Algebraic geometry—Santa Cruz 1995, Proc. Sympos. Pure Math.* 62, 221–287. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1997.
- [KPZ11a] T. Kishimoto, Yu. Prokhorov, and M. Zaidenberg. Affine cones over Fano threefolds and additive group actions. *arXiv:1106.1312* (2011), 20p.
- [KPZ11b] T. Kishimoto, Yu. Prokhorov, and M. Zaidenberg. Group actions on affine cones. In *Affine algebraic geometry*, 123–163. Peter Russell’s Festschrift, CRM Proc. Lecture Notes, 54, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2011.
- [KPZ12] T. Kishimoto, Yu. Prokhorov, and M. Zaidenberg. \mathbf{G}_a -actions on affine cones. *arXiv:1212.4249* (2012), 14p.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, FACULTY OF SCIENCE, SAITAMA UNIVERSITY, SAITAMA 338-8570, JAPAN

E-mail address: tkishimo@rimath.saitama-u.ac.jp

DEPARTMENT OF ALGEBRA, FACULTY OF MATHEMATICS, MOSCOW STATE UNIVERSITY, MOSCOW 117234, RUSSIA AND LABORATORY OF ALGEBRAIC GEOMETRY, SU-HSE, 7 VAVILOVA STR., MOSCOW 117312, RUSSIA

E-mail address: prokhor@gmail.com

UNIVERSITÉ GRENoble I, INSTITUTE FOURIER, UM 5582 CARS-UHF, B 74, 38402 ST. MARTIN DERRIÈRES CODEX, FRANCE

E-mail address: zaidenbe@ujf-grenoble.fr

³We are grateful to Ivan Cheltsov who attracted our attention to this fact.