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Abstract. Let $S$ be a Burniat surface with $K_{S}^{2}=6$ and $\varphi$ be the bicanonical map of $S$. In this paper we show optimal lower bounds of $\log$ canonical thresholds of members of pluricanonical sublinear systems of $S$ via Klein group $G$ induced by $\varphi$. Indeed, for a positive even integer $m$, the $\log$ canonical threshold of members of an invariant (resp. anti-invariant) part of $\left|m K_{S}\right|$ is greater than or equal to $1 /(2 m)$ (resp. $1 /(2 m-2)$ ). For a positive odd integer $m$, the $\log$ canonical threshold of members of an invariant (resp. anti-invariant) part of $\left|m K_{S}\right|$ is greater than or equal to $1 /(2 m-5)($ resp. $1 /(2 m))$. The inequalities are all optimal.

## 1. Introduction

Let $X$ be a variety and $\mathrm{p} \in X$ be a smooth point. And let $D$ be an effective Cartier divisor on $X$. The $\log$ canonical threshold or the complex singularity exponent of $D$ at p is the number

$$
\operatorname{lct}_{\mathrm{p}}(X, D):=\sup \left\{\left.c \in \mathbb{Q}| | f\right|^{-c} \text { is locally } L^{2} \text { near } \mathrm{p}\right\}
$$

where $f$ is a local defining equation of $D$ at p . In [7] we have the following inequalities

$$
\frac{1}{\operatorname{mult}_{\mathrm{p}}(D)} \leq \operatorname{lct}_{\mathrm{p}}(X, D) \leq \frac{\operatorname{dim} X}{\operatorname{mult}_{\mathrm{p}}(D)}
$$

and the $\log$ canonical threshold of $D$ at p is equal to the absolute value of the largest root of the Bernstein-Sato polynomial of $f$.

The $\log$ canonical threshold can be formally defined for $\log$ pairs (cf. [7, 8.2 Proposition]). Let $X$ be a normal variety with at worst $\log$ canonical singularities, $Z$ be a closed subvariety of $X$ and $D$ be an effective $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier divisor on $X$. The $\log$ canonical threshold of $D$ along $Z$ on $X$ is the number
$\operatorname{lct}_{Z}(X, D):=\sup \{c \in \mathbb{Q} \mid(X, c D)$ is $\log$ canonical in an open neighborhood of $Z\}$.
For simplicity, we put $\operatorname{lct}(X, D)=\operatorname{lct}_{X}(X, D)$.
We have the following invariant for every polarised pair $(X, \mathcal{L})$.

[^0]Definition 1.1. Let $X$ be a normal variety with at worst $\log$ canonical singularities, and $\mathcal{L}$ be an ample $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier divisor on $X$. The global $\log$ canonical threshold of a pair $(X, \mathcal{L})$ is the number

$$
\operatorname{glct}(X, \mathcal{L})
$$

$:=\inf \{\operatorname{lct}(X, D) \mid D$ is an effective $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier divisor on $X, \mathbb{Q}$-linearly equivalent to $\mathcal{L}\}$.
Chen, Chen and Jiang [5] proved the Noether inequality for projective 3-folds of general type. They use the global log canonical threshold of a surface of general type with $p_{g}=2$ and $K^{2}=1$ via its ample canonical divisor (see the appendix by Kollár in [5]).

The authors in [6] showed that the global log canonical threshold of a Burniat surface with $K^{2}=6$ via its ample canonical divisor is $1 / 2$, where the Burniat surface is a minimal surface of general surface with $p_{g}=0$ and $K^{2}=6$.

In this paper, we give optimal lower bounds of log canonical thresholds of members of pluricanonical sublinear systems via Klein group induced by the bicanonical map of a Burniat surface with $K^{2}=6$.

Let $S$ be a Burniat surface with $K_{S}^{2}=6$ (see [1, 2, 8 10]). The bicanonical map $\varphi$ of $S$ has an image, a del Pezzo surface $\Sigma$ of degree 6 in $\mathbb{P}^{6}$ which is a blow-up $\rho: \Sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^{2}$ at three point $p_{1}, p_{2}, p_{3}$ in general position. Denote by $e_{i}$ the $(-1)$-curve corresponding to $p_{i}$, by $e_{i}^{\prime}$ the strict transform of the line passing through the two points $p_{j}$ and $p_{k}$ by $\rho$, and by $m_{l}^{i}$ the strict transform of a general line passing through the point $p_{i}$ by $\rho$ for each $\{i, j, k\}=\{1,2,3\}$ and $l=1,2$. Then $\varphi$ is a bidouble covering map over $\Sigma$ with a branch divisor $B:=B_{1}+B_{2}+B_{3}$ satisfying $2 L_{i} \sim B_{j}+B_{k}$ for a line bundle $L_{i}$ on $\Sigma$ and $\{i, j, k\}=\{1,2,3\}$, where

$$
\begin{aligned}
& B_{1}=e_{1}+e_{1}^{\prime}+m_{1}^{2}+m_{2}^{2}, \\
& B_{2}=e_{2}+e_{2}^{\prime}+m_{1}^{3}+m_{2}^{3}, \\
& B_{3}=e_{3}+e_{3}^{\prime}+m_{1}^{1}+m_{2}^{1},
\end{aligned}
$$

and $\sim$ means the linearly equivalent relation between divisors.
For $i=1,2,3$, we note $\varphi^{*}\left(B_{i}\right)=2 R_{i}$ for some divisor $R_{i}$ ramified by $\varphi$, and denote by $G$ the Klein group $\mathbb{Z} / 2 \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z} / 2 \mathbb{Z}=\left\{\operatorname{Id}_{S}, \sigma_{1}, \sigma_{2}, \sigma_{3}\right\}$ induced by $\varphi$ such that $R_{i}$ is the divisorial fixed part of $\sigma_{i}$.

For a positive integer $m$, the natural action of the group $G$ splits the set of global sections of the pluricanonical divisor $m K_{S}$ of $S$ into eigen spaces via the characters of $G$ :

$$
H^{0}\left(S, m K_{S}\right)=H^{0}\left(S, m K_{S}\right)^{\mathrm{inv}} \oplus \bigoplus_{i=1}^{3} H^{0}\left(S, m K_{S}\right)^{\chi_{i}}
$$

where $\chi_{i}$ is a character of $G$ such that $\chi_{i}\left(\sigma_{j}\right)=\delta_{i j}$ for $i, j \in\{1,2,3\}$. Then the pluricanonical linear system $\left|m K_{S}\right|$ for a positive integer $m$ contains an invariant part $\left|m K_{S}\right|_{0}$
(resp. an anti-invariant part $\left.\left|m K_{S}\right|_{i}\right)$ that consists of zeros of sections of $H^{0}\left(S, m K_{S}\right)^{\text {inv }}$ (resp. $\left.H^{0}\left(S, m K_{S}\right)^{\chi_{i}}\right)$ for $i=1,2,3$, that is,

$$
\left|m K_{S}\right| \supseteq\left|m K_{S}\right|_{0} \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^{3}\left|m K_{S}\right|_{i}
$$

We consider the log canonical threshold of members of the invariant and anti-invariant parts of the complete linear system $\left|m K_{S}\right|$, where $m$ is a positive integer. To calculate the $\log$ canonical threshold, we use the following representation of pluricanonical linear systems for a bidouble covering map $\varphi: S \rightarrow \Sigma$. Denote by $R$ the ramification divisor $R_{1}+R_{2}+R_{3}$ of $\varphi$.

Proposition 1.2. (cf. [10, Proposition 1.6]) For a positive integer $n$ and each $i=1,2,3$ with $\{i, j, k\}=\{1,2,3\}$,
(i) $\left|2 n K_{S}\right|_{0}=\varphi^{*}\left|n\left(2 K_{\Sigma}+B\right)\right|$ and $\left|2 n K_{S}\right|_{i}=R_{j}+R_{k}+\left|\varphi^{*}\left(n\left(2 K_{\Sigma}+B\right)-L_{i}\right)\right|$;
(ii) $\left|(2 n+1) K_{S}\right|_{0}=R+\left|\varphi^{*}\left((2 n+1) K_{\Sigma}+n B\right)\right|$ and $\left|(2 n+1) K_{S}\right|_{i}=R_{i}+\mid \varphi^{*}((2 n+$ 1) $\left.K_{\Sigma}+n B+L_{i}\right) \mid$.

We apply

$$
B \sim-3 K_{\Sigma}
$$

to Proposition 1.2 and obtain log canonical thresholds of members of the pluricanonical sublinear systems of Burniat surfaces $S$ with $K_{S}^{2}=6$ via the Klein group induced by the bicanonical map of $\varphi$ as follows.

Theorem 1.3 (Main theorem). Let $S$ be a Burniat surface with $K_{S}^{2}=6$. Then for a positive integer $n$ and each $i=1,2,3$,
(i) if $D_{0} \in\left|2 n K_{S}\right|_{0}$ and $D_{i} \in\left|2 n K_{S}\right|_{i}$,

$$
\operatorname{lct}\left(S, D_{0}\right) \geq \frac{1}{4 n} \quad \text { and } \quad \operatorname{lct}\left(S, D_{i}\right) \geq \frac{1}{4 n-2}
$$

(ii) if $D_{0}^{\prime} \in\left|(2 n+1) K_{S}\right|_{0}$ and $D_{i}^{\prime} \in\left|(2 n+1) K_{S}\right|_{i}$,

$$
\operatorname{lct}\left(S, D_{0}^{\prime}\right) \geq \frac{1}{4 n-3} \quad \text { and } \quad \operatorname{lct}\left(S, D_{i}^{\prime}\right) \geq \frac{1}{4 n+2}
$$

Moreover the inequalities are optimal.
Remark 1.4. Since $\left|2 K_{S}\right|_{i}=\emptyset$ for all $i=1,2,3$ (see [9, Proposition 3.1]), we actually have $\operatorname{lct}\left(S, D_{i}\right) \geq 1 /(4 n-2)$ for any $D_{i} \in\left|2 n K_{S}\right|_{i}$ when an integer $n \geq 2$ in Theorem 1.3(i).

Corollary 1.5. Let $S$ be a Burniat surface with $K_{S}^{2}=6$. Then for a positive integer $n$ and each $i=1,2,3$,
(i) if $D_{i} \in\left|2 n K_{S}\right|_{i}$,

$$
\operatorname{lct}\left(S, D_{i}\right)>\frac{1}{4 n}
$$

(ii) if $D_{0}^{\prime} \in\left|(2 n+1) K_{S}\right|_{0}$,

$$
\operatorname{lct}\left(S, D_{0}^{\prime}\right)>\frac{1}{4 n+2}
$$

Remark 1.6. Corollary 1.5(i) is [6, Proposition 5.2].
Since

$$
\operatorname{glct}\left(S, K_{S}\right)=\frac{1}{2}
$$

(see [6, Theorem 1.3],) we obtain
Corollary 1.7. Let $S$ be a Burniat surface with $K_{S}^{2}=6$. For any positive even (resp. odd) integer $m$, if a divisor $D$ is in the linear system $\left|m K_{S}\right|$ such that $\operatorname{glct}\left(S, K_{S}\right)=\operatorname{lct}\left(S, \frac{1}{m} D\right)$, then the divisor $D$ is not in the anti-invariant parts $\left|m K_{S}\right|_{i}$ (resp. the invariant part $\left.\left|m K_{S}\right|_{0}\right)$ for $i=1,2,3$.

Proof. We get the result by Corollary 1.5 .

## 2. Preliminaries

Let $X$ be a normal variety with at worst $\log$ canonical singularities. Note that $\sim_{\mathbb{Q}}$ means the $\mathbb{Q}$-linearly equivalent relation.

Lemma 2.1. Let $\mathcal{N}_{0} \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} A$ be an effective $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier divisor on $X$ such that the log pair $\left(X, \mathcal{N}_{0}\right)$ is not $\log$ canonical at a point $p$. And let $\mathcal{N} \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} A$ be an effective $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier divisor on $X$ such that the $\log$ pair $(X, \mathcal{N})$ is log canonical at the point $p$. Then there is an effective $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier divisor $\mathcal{N}^{\prime} \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} A$ on $X$ such that at least one component of $\mathcal{N}$ is not contained in the support of $\mathcal{N}^{\prime}$ and the $\log$ pair $\left(X, \mathcal{N}^{\prime}\right)$ is not log canonical at the point $p$.

Proof. See [4, Remark 2.22].
The following is used for a non $\log$ canonical pair at some smooth point.
Lemma 2.2. (cf. [7, 8.10 Lemma]) Let $D$ be an effective $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier divisor on $X$. If the $\log$ pair $(X, D)$ is not $\log$ canonical at some smooth point p , then the inequality

$$
\operatorname{mult}_{\mathfrak{p}}(D)>1
$$

holds.

## 3. Proof of the main theorem

We remark that for $i=1,2,3$ and $j=1,2$,

$$
E_{i}^{2}=E_{i}^{\prime 2}=-1, \quad K_{S} \cdot E_{i}=K_{S} \cdot E_{i}^{\prime}=1, \quad M_{j}^{2^{2}}=0 \quad \text { and } \quad K_{S} \cdot M_{j}^{i}=2
$$

where $\varphi^{*}\left(e_{i}\right)=2 E_{i}, \varphi^{*}\left(e_{i}^{\prime}\right)=2 E_{i}^{\prime}$ and $\varphi^{*}\left(m_{j}^{i}\right)=2 M_{j}^{i}$.

### 3.1. Even pluricanonical linear system

For a positive integer $n$, the complete linear system $\left|2 n K_{S}\right|$ contains the invariant part $\left|2 n K_{S}\right|_{0}$ and the anti-invariant parts $\left|2 n K_{S}\right|_{i}$ with $i=1,2,3$, that is,

$$
\left|2 n K_{S}\right| \supseteq \bigcup_{i=0}^{3}\left|2 n K_{S}\right|_{i}
$$

### 3.1.1. Invariant part

In [6] we have

$$
\operatorname{glct}\left(S, 2 K_{S}\right)=\operatorname{lct}\left(S, \bar{D}_{0}\right)=\frac{1}{4}
$$

for some divisor $\bar{D}_{0} \in\left|2 K_{S}\right|$. For example, $\bar{D}_{0}:=2 E_{1}+4 E_{3}+2 E_{1}^{\prime}+4 E_{2}^{\prime}$, then

$$
\operatorname{lct}\left(S, D_{0}\right) \geq \frac{1}{4 n}
$$

for any $D_{0} \in\left|2 n K_{S}\right|_{0}$ and the inequality is optimal.

### 3.1.2. Anti-invariant parts

To show

$$
\operatorname{lct}\left(S, D_{i}\right) \geq \frac{1}{4 n-2}
$$

for any $D_{i} \in\left|2 n K_{S}\right|_{i}$, we need the following lemma.
Lemma 3.1. [6, Lemma 4.1] Let $\psi: X \rightarrow Y$ be a bidouble covering map between a normal variety $X$ and a smooth variety $Y$ branched along an effective divisor $\mathcal{B}$ on $Y$, and $\mathcal{D}$ be an effective $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier divisor on $X$. Then

$$
(X, \mathcal{D}) \text { is log canonical if }\left(Y, \psi(\mathcal{D})+\frac{1}{2} \mathcal{B}\right) \text { is log canonical. }
$$

We deal with an integer $n \geq 2$ by Remark 1.4. Suppose that $\operatorname{lct}\left(S, D_{i}\right)<1 /(4 n-2)$. Then the $\log$ pair $\left(S, \frac{1}{4 n-2} D_{i}\right)$ is not $\log$ canonical at some point p. By Lemma 2.2 ,

$$
\operatorname{mult}_{\mathrm{p}}\left(D_{i}\right)>4 n-2 .
$$

We put an effective divisor $d_{i}:=\varphi\left(D_{i}\right)$ on $\Sigma$. Then

$$
\left(\Sigma, \frac{1}{4 n-2} d_{i}+\frac{1}{2} B\right) \text { is not } \log \text { canonical at a point } \varphi(\mathrm{p}) \text { on } \Sigma
$$

by Lemma 3.1.
We consider the case $\varphi(\mathrm{p}) \notin B_{1} \cup B_{2} \cup B_{3}$. Then $\left(\Sigma, \frac{1}{4 n-2} d_{i}\right)$ is not $\log$ canonical at $\varphi(\mathrm{p})$ which implies

$$
\operatorname{glct}\left(\Sigma, d_{i}\right)<\frac{1}{4 n-2}
$$

However, it contradicts because $d_{i} \sim_{\mathbb{Q}}-n K_{\Sigma}$ and $\operatorname{glct}(\Sigma, \Delta) \geq 1 / 2$ for any effective $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier divisor $\Delta \sim_{\mathbb{Q}}-K_{\Sigma}$ since $\Sigma$ is a nonsingular del Pezzo surface of degree 6 (see [3, Theorem 1.7]). Thus $\varphi(\mathrm{p}) \in B_{1} \cup B_{2} \cup B_{3}$.

By Proposition 1.2, we have an effective $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier divisor $D_{i}-\left(R_{j}+R_{k}\right)$ for $\{i, j, k\}=$ $\{1,2,3\}$. We may deal with $i=1$.

The case $\mathrm{p} \in E_{1} \cap E_{2}^{\prime}$. We have

$$
D_{1}=\alpha_{1} E_{1}+\alpha_{2} E_{2}+\alpha_{3}^{\prime} E_{3}^{\prime}+\Omega
$$

where rational numbers $\alpha_{1} \geq 0$ and $\alpha_{2}, \alpha_{3}^{\prime} \geq 1$, and $E_{1}, E_{2}, E_{3}^{\prime} \not \subset \operatorname{Supp}(\Omega)$ with an effective $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier divisor $\Omega$ (denote by $\operatorname{Supp}(\Omega)$ the support of $\Omega$ ). Since p $\notin E_{2} \cup E_{3}^{\prime}$, the $\log$ pair $\left(S, \frac{1}{4 n-2}\left(D_{1}-\alpha_{2} E_{2}-\alpha_{3}^{\prime} E_{3}^{\prime}\right)\right)$ is not $\log$ canonical at the point p.

Suppose $\alpha_{1}=0$, and then $2 n=D_{1} \cdot E_{1} \geq \operatorname{mult}_{\mathrm{p}}\left(D_{1}\right) \operatorname{mult}_{\mathrm{p}}\left(E_{1}\right)>4 n-2$ which is a contradiction. So $\alpha_{1} \neq 0$.

Since $D_{1}-\left(R_{2}+R_{3}\right)$ is effective,

$$
\Omega \cdot M_{1}^{1} \geq\left(M_{1}^{3}+M_{2}^{3}\right) \cdot M_{1}^{1}=2
$$

Thus $4 n=D_{1} \cdot M_{1}^{1}=\alpha_{1}+\Omega \cdot M_{1}^{1}$ implies $4 n-2 \geq \alpha_{1}$, and so

$$
\frac{\alpha_{1}}{4 n-2} \leq 1
$$

We have a pair $\left(S, E_{1}+\frac{1}{4 n-2} \Omega\right)$ is not $\log$ canonical at p. By the inversion of adjunction formula,

$$
\text { the pair }\left(E_{1},\left.\frac{1}{4 n-2} \Omega\right|_{E_{1}}\right) \text { is not } \log \text { canonical at } \mathrm{p} \text {. }
$$

This implies that

$$
2 n+\alpha_{1}-\alpha_{3}^{\prime}=\left(D_{1}-\alpha_{1} E_{1}-\alpha_{2} E_{2}-\alpha_{3}^{\prime} E_{3}^{\prime}\right) \cdot E_{1}>4 n-2
$$

On the other hand, since $D_{1}-\left(R_{2}+R_{3}\right)$ is effective,
$2 n=D_{1} \cdot E_{3}^{\prime}=\alpha_{1}+\alpha_{2}-\alpha_{3}^{\prime}+\Omega \cdot E_{3}^{\prime} \geq \alpha_{1}+\alpha_{2}-\alpha_{3}^{\prime}+\left(M_{1}^{3}+M_{2}^{3}\right) \cdot E_{3}^{\prime}=\alpha_{1}+\alpha_{2}-\alpha_{3}^{\prime}+2$.

Hence

$$
\alpha_{2}<0
$$

which is a contradiction.
The case $\mathrm{p} \in E_{1} \backslash\left(E_{2}^{\prime} \cup E_{3}^{\prime}\right)$. We have

$$
D_{1}=\alpha_{1} E_{1}+\alpha_{2}^{\prime} E_{2}^{\prime}+\alpha_{3}^{\prime} E_{3}^{\prime}+\Omega
$$

where rational numbers $\alpha_{1} \geq 0$ and $\alpha_{2}^{\prime}, \alpha_{3}^{\prime} \geq 1$, and $E_{1}, E_{2}^{\prime}, E_{3}^{\prime} \not \subset \operatorname{Supp}(\Omega)$ with an effective $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier divisor $\Omega$. Then

$$
2 n=D_{1} \cdot E_{3}^{\prime}=\alpha_{1}-\alpha_{3}^{\prime}+\Omega \cdot E_{3}^{\prime} \geq \alpha_{1}-\alpha_{3}^{\prime}+\left(E_{2}+M_{1}^{3}+M_{2}^{3}\right) \cdot E_{3}^{\prime}=\alpha_{1}-\alpha_{3}^{\prime}+3
$$

And since

$$
4 n=D_{1} \cdot M_{1}^{1}=\alpha_{1}+\Omega \cdot M_{1}^{1} \geq \alpha_{1}+\left(M_{1}^{3}+M_{2}^{3}\right) \cdot M_{1}^{1}=\alpha_{1}+2
$$

we obtain

$$
2 n+\alpha_{1}-\alpha_{2}^{\prime}-\alpha_{3}^{\prime}=\left(D_{1}-\alpha_{1} E_{1}-\alpha_{2}^{\prime} E_{2}^{\prime}-\alpha_{3}^{\prime} E_{3}^{\prime}\right) \cdot E_{1}>4 n-2
$$

by the inversion of adjunction formula. Hence

$$
\alpha_{2}^{\prime}<-1
$$

which is a contradiction.
The case $\mathrm{p} \in M_{1}^{1} \backslash\left(E_{1} \cup E_{1}^{\prime}\right)$. The log pair

$$
\left(S, \frac{1}{4 n-2}\left(M_{1}^{1}+M_{1}^{3}+M_{2}^{3}+D\right)\right)
$$

is not $\log$ canonical at the point p , where $D_{1} \sim R_{2}+R_{3}+D$ for some $D \in\left|\varphi^{*}\left(-n K_{\Sigma}-L_{1}\right)\right|$ by Proposition 1.2 (i). We have

$$
D=\alpha M_{1}^{3}+\Delta
$$

where a rational number $\alpha \geq 0$ and $M_{1}^{3} \not \subset \operatorname{Supp}(\Delta)$ with an effective $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier divisor $\Delta$. By using a general member $\bar{M}$ of the linear system $\left|2 M_{1}^{2}\right|$ such that $\bar{M} \not \subset \operatorname{Supp}(D)$,

$$
8 n-12=D \cdot \bar{M} \geq \alpha M_{1}^{3} \cdot \bar{M}=2 \alpha .
$$

Thus we can use the inversion of adjunction formula. So the log pair

$$
\left(M_{1}^{3},\left.\frac{1}{4 n-2}\left(M_{1}^{1}+M_{2}^{3}+\Delta\right)\right|_{M_{1}^{3}}\right)
$$

is not $\log$ canonical at p . Then

$$
1+(4 n-4)=\left(M_{1}^{1}+M_{2}^{3}+\Delta\right) \cdot M_{1}^{3} \geq \operatorname{mult}_{p}\left(\left.\left(M_{1}^{1}+M_{2}^{3}+\Delta\right)\right|_{M_{1}^{3}}\right)>4 n-2
$$

which is a contradiction.
We can induce a contradiction by using a similar argument like the above cases for each point of $R$. Therefore for all cases $i=1,2,3$,

$$
\operatorname{lct}\left(S, D_{i}\right) \geq \frac{1}{4 n-2} \quad \text { for any } D_{i} \in\left|2 n K_{S}\right|_{i} .
$$

And the inequality is optimal because $\operatorname{lct}_{\mathrm{p}}\left(S, \bar{D}_{i}\right)=1 /(4 n-2)$ for

$$
\bar{D}_{i}:=R_{i+1}+R_{i+2}+2\left((2 n-1) E_{i}^{\prime}+(n-2) E_{i+1}^{\prime}+(2 n-3) E_{i+1}+n E_{i+2}\right) \in\left|2 n K_{S}\right|_{i}
$$

and

$$
\mathrm{p} \in E_{i}^{\prime} \backslash\left(E_{i+1} \cup E_{i+2} \cup M_{1}^{i} \cup M_{2}^{i}\right)
$$

where the index $i \in\{1,2,3\}$ is considered as modulo 3 .

### 3.2. Odd pluricanonical linear system

For a positive integer $n$, the complete linear system $\left|(2 n+1) K_{S}\right|$ contains the invariant part $\left|(2 n+1) K_{S}\right|_{0}$ and the anti-invariant parts $\left|(2 n+1) K_{S}\right|_{i}$ with $i=1,2,3$, that is,

$$
\left|(2 n+1) K_{S}\right| \supset \bigcup_{i=0}^{3}\left|(2 n+1) K_{S}\right|_{i}
$$

### 3.2.1. Invariant part

We prove that for any $D_{0}^{\prime} \in\left|(2 n+1) K_{S}\right|_{0}$, the $\log$ pair $\left(S, \frac{1}{4 n-3} D_{0}^{\prime}\right)$ is $\log$ canonical. To obtain a contradiction, we assume that there is a member $D_{0}^{\prime}$ of $\left|(2 n+1) K_{S}\right|_{0}$ such that the $\log$ pair $\left(S, \frac{1}{4 n-3} D_{0}^{\prime}\right)$ is not $\log$ canonical at some point p . Note that

$$
\left|(2 n+1) K_{S}\right|_{0}=R+\left|2(n-1) K_{S}\right|
$$

(see Proposition 1.2 and apply $B \sim-3 K_{\Sigma}$ and $K_{S} \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} \varphi^{*}\left(K_{\Sigma}+\frac{1}{2} B\right)$ ). Thus there is the member $D^{\prime}$ of the complete linear system $\left|2(n-1) K_{S}\right|$ such that $D_{0}^{\prime}=R+D^{\prime}$. Since the global $\log$ canonical threshold of the pair $\left(S, 2(n-1) K_{S}\right)$ is $1 /(4 n-4)$ (see [6, Theorem 1.3]), p is contained in $R$. We consider the following cases.

The case $\mathrm{p} \in E_{3} \cap E_{1}^{\prime}$. The $\log$ pair $\left(S, \frac{1}{4 n-3}\left(E_{3}+E_{1}^{\prime}+D^{\prime}\right)\right)$ is not $\log$ canonical at the point $p$. For the effective divisor

$$
N:=(4 n-3) E_{3}+(4 n-3) E_{1}^{\prime}+(2 n-2) E_{2}+(2 n-2) E_{2}^{\prime} \sim E_{3}+E_{1}^{\prime}+D^{\prime}
$$

the $\log$ canonical threshold of the $\log$ pair $(S, N)$ is $1 /(4 n-3)$. By Lemma 2.1, there is an effective $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier divisor $N^{\prime} \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} N$ such that at least one component of $N$ is not
contained in the support of $N^{\prime}$ and the $\log$ pair $\left(S, \frac{1}{4 n-3} N^{\prime}\right)$ is not $\log$ canonical at p . Thus at least one of $E_{2}, E_{3}, E_{1}^{\prime}$ and $E_{2}^{\prime}$ is not contained in $\operatorname{Supp}\left(N^{\prime}\right)$.

We can represent

$$
N^{\prime}=\alpha_{3} E_{3}+\alpha_{1}^{\prime} E_{1}^{\prime}+\Omega
$$

where rational numbers $\alpha_{3}, \alpha_{1}^{\prime} \geq 0$ and $E_{3}, E_{1}^{\prime} \not \subset \operatorname{Supp}(\Omega)$ with an effective $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier divisor $\Omega$.

Suppose $E_{2} \not \subset \operatorname{Supp}\left(N^{\prime}\right)$. Then

$$
2 n-1=N^{\prime} \cdot E_{2} \geq \alpha_{1}^{\prime} E_{1}^{\prime} \cdot E_{2}=\alpha_{1}^{\prime}
$$

By the inversion of adjunction formula, the log pair

$$
\left(E_{1}^{\prime},\left.\frac{1}{4 n-3}\left(\alpha_{3} E_{3}+\Omega\right)\right|_{E_{1}^{\prime}}\right)
$$

is not $\log$ canonical at p . Thus

$$
(2 n-2)+\alpha_{1}^{\prime}=\left(\alpha_{3} E_{3}+\Omega\right) \cdot E_{1}^{\prime} \geq \operatorname{mult}_{\mathrm{p}}\left(\left.\left(\alpha_{3} E_{3}+\Omega\right)\right|_{E_{1}^{\prime}}\right)>4 n-3
$$

which is a contradiction.
For each case $E_{2}^{\prime}, E_{3}$ or $E_{1}^{\prime} \not \subset \operatorname{Supp}\left(N^{\prime}\right)$, we also get a contradiction by using a similar argument as above. We remark that $E_{3} \not \subset \operatorname{Supp}\left(N^{\prime}\right)\left(\right.$ resp. $\left.E_{1}^{\prime} \not \subset \operatorname{Supp}\left(N^{\prime}\right)\right)$ means $\alpha_{3}=0$ (resp. $\alpha_{1}^{\prime}=0$ ).

The case $\mathrm{p} \in E_{3} \backslash\left(E_{1}^{\prime} \cup E_{2}^{\prime}\right)$. The log pair $\left(S, \frac{1}{4 n-3}\left(E_{3}+M_{1}^{3}+M_{2}^{3}+D^{\prime}\right)\right)$ is not log canonical at the point $p$. We have

$$
D^{\prime}=\alpha_{3} E_{3}+\alpha_{1}^{\prime} E_{1}^{\prime}+\alpha_{2}^{\prime} E_{2}^{\prime}+\Delta,
$$

where rational numbers $\alpha_{3}, \alpha_{1}^{\prime}, \alpha_{2}^{\prime} \geq 0$ and $E_{3}, E_{1}^{\prime}, E_{2}^{\prime} \not \subset \operatorname{Supp}(\Delta)$ with an effective $\mathbb{Q}$ Cartier divisor $\Delta$. Let $\widetilde{M}$ be a general member of the linear system $\left|2 M_{1}^{3}\right|$ such that $\widetilde{M} \not \subset \operatorname{Supp}\left(D^{\prime}\right)$. Then

$$
8 n-8=D^{\prime} \cdot \widetilde{M} \geq \alpha_{3} E_{3} \cdot \widetilde{M}=2 \alpha_{3}
$$

implies that $4 n-4 \geq a_{3}$. By the inversion of adjunction formula, the $\log$ pair

$$
\left(E_{3},\left.\frac{1}{4 n-3}\left(M_{1}^{3}+M_{2}^{3}+\Delta\right)\right|_{E_{3}}\right)
$$

is not $\log$ canonical at p . Thus

$$
(2 n-1)+\alpha_{3}-\alpha_{1}^{\prime}-\alpha_{2}^{\prime} \geq\left(\left(M_{1}^{3}+M_{2}^{3}+\Delta\right) \cdot E_{3}\right)_{\mathrm{p}} \geq \operatorname{mult}_{\mathrm{p}}\left(\left.\left(M_{1}^{3}+M_{2}^{3}+\Delta\right)\right|_{E_{3}}\right)>4 n-3
$$

which implies $\alpha_{3}>(2 n-2)+\alpha_{1}^{\prime}+\alpha_{2}^{\prime}$. Meanwhile, the inequality

$$
(2 n-2)-\alpha_{3}+\alpha_{1}^{\prime}=\Delta \cdot E_{1}^{\prime} \geq 0
$$

implies that $(2 n-2)+\alpha_{1}^{\prime} \geq \alpha_{3}$ which is a contradiction.
The case $\mathrm{p} \in M_{1}^{1} \backslash\left(E_{1} \cup E_{1}^{\prime}\right)$. Set $M:=M_{1}^{2}+M_{2}^{2}+M_{1}^{3}+M_{2}^{3}$. Then the log pair

$$
\left(S, \frac{1}{4 n-3}\left(M_{1}^{1}+M+D^{\prime}\right)\right)
$$

is not $\log$ canonical at the point p . We have

$$
D^{\prime}=\alpha M_{1}^{1}+\Delta
$$

where a rational number $\alpha \geq 0$ and $M_{1}^{1} \not \subset \operatorname{Supp}(\Delta)$ with an effective $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier divisor $\Delta$. By using a general member $\widehat{M}$ of the linear system $\left|2 M_{1}^{2}\right|$ such that $\widehat{M} \not \subset \operatorname{Supp}\left(D^{\prime}\right)$,

$$
8 n-8=D^{\prime} \cdot \widehat{M} \geq \alpha M_{1}^{1} \cdot \widehat{M}=2 \alpha
$$

which implies $4 n-4 \geq \alpha$. By the inversion of adjunction formula, the $\log$ pair

$$
\left(M_{1}^{1},\left.\frac{1}{4 n-3}(M+\Delta)\right|_{M_{1}^{1}}\right)
$$

is not $\log$ canonical at p . Then

$$
1+(4 n-4) \geq\left((M+\Delta) \cdot M_{1}^{1}\right)_{\mathrm{p}} \geq \operatorname{mult}_{\mathrm{p}}\left(\left.(M+\Delta)\right|_{M_{1}^{1}}\right)>4 n-3
$$

which is a contradiction.
We can induce a contradiction by using a similar argument like the above cases for each point of $R$. Hence

$$
\operatorname{lct}\left(S, D_{0}^{\prime}\right) \geq \frac{1}{4 n-3} \quad \text { for any } D_{0}^{\prime} \in\left|(2 n+1) K_{S}\right|_{0}
$$

And the inequality is optimal because $\operatorname{lct}_{\mathrm{p}}\left(S, \bar{D}_{0}^{\prime}\right)=1 /(4 n-3)$ for

$$
\bar{D}_{0}^{\prime}:=R+2(n-1)\left(2 E_{2}^{\prime}+E_{3}^{\prime}+2 E_{1}+E_{3}\right) \in\left|(2 n+1) K_{S}\right|_{0}
$$

and

$$
\mathrm{p} \in E_{2}^{\prime} \backslash\left(E_{1} \cup E_{3} \cup M_{1}^{2} \cup M_{2}^{2}\right)
$$

### 3.2.2. Anti-invariant part

For a positive integer $n$ and $i=1,2,3,\left|(2 n+1) K_{S}\right|_{i}$ is represented by

$$
R_{i}+\left|\varphi^{*}\left((1-n) K_{\Sigma}+L_{i}\right)\right|
$$

(see Proposition 1.2 and apply $B \sim-3 K_{\Sigma}$ ).

We may consider for $i=1$. The divisor

$$
\bar{D}_{1}^{\prime}:=E_{1}+E_{1}^{\prime}+M_{1}^{2}+M_{2}^{2}+2\left((2 n+1) E_{2}^{\prime}+(n-1) E_{1}^{\prime}+n E_{1}+2 n E_{3}\right)
$$

is in $\left|(2 n+1) K_{S}\right|_{1}$. The log canonical threshold of the log pair $\left(S, \bar{D}_{1}^{\prime}\right)$ is $1 /(4 n+2)$. Note that the global $\log$ canonical threshold of the $\log$ pair $\left(S, K_{S}\right)$ is $1 / 2$ (see [6, Theorem 1.3]). This means that the infimum of the set

$$
\left\{\left.\operatorname{lct}\left(S, D_{1}^{\prime}\right)\left|D_{1}^{\prime} \in\right|(2 n+1) K_{S}\right|_{1}\right\}
$$

is $1 /(4 n+2)$. Thus

$$
\inf \left\{\left.\operatorname{lct}\left(S, D_{i}^{\prime}\right)\left|D_{i}^{\prime} \in\right|(2 n+1) K_{S}\right|_{i}\right\}=\frac{1}{4 n+2}
$$

for each $i=1,2,3$.
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