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#### Abstract

If $X$ is a smooth complex projective 3 -fold with ample canonical divisor $K$, then the inequality $K^{3} \geq(2 / 3)\left(2 p_{g}-7\right)$ holds, where $p_{g}$ denotes the geometric genus. This inequality is nearly sharp. We also give similar, but more complicated, inequalities for general minimal 3 -folds of general type.


## Introduction.

Given a minimal surface $S$ of general type, we have two famous inequalities, which play crucial roles in detailed analysis of surfaces. One is the Bogomolov-Miyaoka-Yau inequality $K_{S}^{2} \leq 9 \chi(S)$ M1], [Y1], [Y2]), while the other is the classical Noether inequality $K_{S}^{2} \geq 2 p_{g}-4 \geq 2 \chi(S)-6$. The fundamental importance of these inequalities in mind, M. Reid asked in 1980s.

Question 1. What would be the right analogue of the Noether inequality in dimension three?

Let $X$ be a minimal threefold. If $K_{X}$ is Cartier and very ample, then $K_{X}^{3} \geq 2 p_{g}-6$ by Clifford's theorem applied to the intersection curve cut out by two general members of $\left|K_{X}\right|$. In 1992, Kobayashi Kob] studied Gorenstein canonical 3-folds and obtained an effective, but partial, upper bound of $K_{X}^{3}$ in terms of $p_{g}(X)$ for such varieties. One of his discoveries is that too naive a generalization of the classical Noether inequality is in general false; there are a series of smooth projective 3 -folds $X$ with ample canonical divisor such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
K_{X}^{3}=\frac{2}{3}\left(2 p_{g}(X)-5\right), \quad\left(p_{g}(X)=7,10,13, \ldots\right) . \tag{0.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

In what follows, we show that Kobayashi's examples indeed attain the minima of $K_{X}^{3}$, provided $X$ is smooth and $K_{X}$ is ample:

Corollary 2. If $X$ is a smooth complex projective 3-fold with ample canonical divisor. Then

$$
K_{X}^{3} \geq \frac{2}{3}\left(2 p_{g}(X)-7\right)
$$

When $X$ is not necessarily smooth, we have the following

[^0]Theorem 3. Let $X$ be a minimal projective 3-fold of general type (with only $\boldsymbol{Q}$ factorial terminal singularities). Assume that $n+1=p_{g}(X) \geq 2$ and let $\phi_{1}: X \rightarrow \boldsymbol{P}^{n}$ be the canonical map. Then we have the following inequalities according to the dimension of $\phi_{1}(X)$ :
(1) $K_{X}^{3} \geq 2 p_{g}(X)-6$ if $\operatorname{dim} \phi_{1}(X)=3$.
(2) $K_{X}^{3} \geq p_{g}(X)-2$ if $\operatorname{dim} \phi_{1}(X)=2$ and $p_{g}(X) \geq 6$. If, in addition, a general fibre of $\phi_{1}$ is a curve of genus $\geq 3$, then $K_{X}^{3} \geq 2 p_{g}(X)-4$.
(3) When $\phi_{1}(X)$ is a curve, let $S$ be the minimal model of a general irreducible member of the movable part of $\left|K_{X}\right|$ and put $a=K_{S}^{2}, \quad b=p_{g}(S)$. Assume $k=\left[\left(p_{g}-2\right) / 2\right] \geq 4$, where $[x]$ stands for the round down of $x$. Then we have

$$
K_{X}^{3} \geq \begin{cases}\min \left\{\frac{6 k^{2}}{3 k^{2}+8 k+4} \cdot\left(p_{g}(X)-\frac{4}{3}\right), \frac{6 k}{3 k+4} \cdot\left(p_{g}(X)-\frac{5}{3}\right)\right\}, & \text { if }(a, b)=(1,1) \\ \frac{k^{2}}{(k+1)^{2}} \cdot a \cdot\left(p_{g}(X)-1\right), & \text { if }(a, b) \neq(1,1)\end{cases}
$$

The intersection numbers between Weil divisors on singular surfaces are not necessarily integers, which causes difficulties to get optimal estimates in case (3).

Remark 4. We make extra assumptions on $p_{g}(X)$ in Theorem 3(2), 3(3) simply for getting better inequalities. Our method works also for the case $p_{g}(X) \geq 2$. Recall that the geometric genus of a surface of general type with $K_{S}^{2}=1$ is bounded by 2 from above. Furthermore, the surface in case (3) of the theorem has positive geometric genus. Hence Theorem 3 asserts that $K_{X}^{3} \geq 2 p_{g}(X)-6$ unless $X$ is canonically fibred by curves of genus two in case (2) or by surfaces with $a=K_{S}^{2}=1, b=p_{g}(S)=2$ in case (3).

When $X$ is Gorenstein, we have the following theorem, which improves the results known so far:

Theorem 5. Let $X$ be a minimal projective Gorenstein 3-fold of general type with only locally factorial terminal singularities.
(1) Assume that $X$ is neither canonically fibred by surfaces $S$ with $c_{1}(S)^{2}=1$, $p_{g}(S)=2$ nor by curves of genus two. Then $K_{X}^{3} \geq 2 p_{g}(X)-6$.
(2) Assume that $X$ is smooth and that $X$ is not canonically fibred by surfaces $S$ with $c_{1}(S)^{2}=1, p_{g}(S)=2$. Then $K_{X}^{3} \geq(2 / 3)\left(2 p_{g}(X)-5\right)$.
(3) Assume that the canonical model of $X$ is factorial. If $K_{X}^{3}<(2 / 21)$. $\left(11 p_{g}(X)-16\right)$, then $X$ is not smooth and is canonically fibred by curves of genus two.

These inequalities have a certain interesting application which will be presented in another note.

## 1. Preliminaries.

### 1.1. Conventions.

Let $X$ be a normal projective variety of dimension $d$. We denote by $\operatorname{Div}(X)$ the group of Weil divisors on $X$. An element $D \in \operatorname{Div}(X) \otimes \boldsymbol{Q}$ is called a $\boldsymbol{Q}$-divisor. A $\boldsymbol{Q}$ -
divisor $D$ is said to be $\boldsymbol{Q}$-Cartier if $m D$ is a Cartier divisor for some positive integer $m$. For a $\boldsymbol{Q}$-Cartier divisor $D$ and an irreducible curve $C \subset X$, we can define the intersection number $D \cdot C$ in a natural way. A $\boldsymbol{Q}$-Cartier divisor $D$ is called nef (or $n u$ merically effective) if $D \cdot C \geq 0$ for any effective curve $C \subset X$. A nef divisor $D$ is called big if $D^{d}>0$. We say that $X$ is $\boldsymbol{Q}$-factorial if every Weil divisor on $X$ is $\boldsymbol{Q}$-Cartier. For a Weil divisor $D$ on $X$, denote by $\mathcal{O}_{X}(D)$ the corresponding reflexive sheaf. Denote by $K_{X}$ a canonical divisor of $X$, which is a Weil divisor. $\quad X$ is called minimal if $K_{X}$ is a nef $Q$-Cartier divisor. $\quad X$ is said to be of general type if $\kappa(X)=\operatorname{dim}(X)$. We refer to [R1] for definitions of canonical and terminal singularities.

The symbols $\sim \equiv$ and $=\boldsymbol{Q}$ respectively stands for linear, numerical and $\boldsymbol{Q}$-linear equivalences.

### 1.2. Vanishing theorem.

Let $D=\sum a_{i} D_{i}$ be a $\boldsymbol{Q}$-divisor on $X$, where the $D_{i}$ are distinct prime divisors and $a_{i} \in \boldsymbol{Q}$. We define
the round-down ${ }_{\llcorner } D_{\lrcorner}:=\sum_{\llcorner } a_{i\lrcorner} D_{i}$, where ${ }_{\llcorner } a_{i 」}$ is the integral part of $a_{i}$;
the round-up $\ulcorner D\urcorner:=-\llcorner-D\lrcorner$;
the fractional part $\{D\}:=D-{ }_{\llcorner } D$ 」
We always use the Kawamata-Viehweg vanishing theorem in the following form.
Vanishing Theorem (Ka] or V1]). Let $X$ be a smooth complete variety, $D \in$ $\operatorname{Div}(X) \otimes \boldsymbol{Q} . \quad$ Assume the following two conditions:
(i) $D$ is nef and big;
(ii) the fractional part of $D$ has supports with only normal crossings. Then $H^{i}\left(X, \mathcal{O}_{X}\left(K_{X}+\ulcorner D\urcorner\right)\right)=0$ for all $i>0$.

Note that, when $S$ is a surface, the above theorem is true without the condition (ii) according to Sakai ([S]) or Miyaoka ([M3, Proposition 2.3]) (also cited in [E-L, (1.2)]).

### 1.3. Set up for canonical maps.

Let $X$ be a projective minimal 3 -fold with only $\boldsymbol{Q}$-factorial terminal singularities. Suppose $p_{g}(X) \geq 2$. We study the canonical map $\phi_{1}$ which is usually a rational map. Take the birational modification $\pi: X^{\prime} \rightarrow X$, following Hironaka, such that
(1) $X^{\prime}$ is smooth;
(2) the movable part of $\left|K_{X^{\prime}}\right|$ is base point free;
(3) $\pi^{*}\left(K_{X}\right)$ is linearly equivalent to a divisor supported by a divisor of normal crossings.

Denote by $g$ the composition $\phi_{1} \circ \pi$. So $g: X^{\prime} \rightarrow W^{\prime} \subseteq \boldsymbol{P}^{p_{g}(X)-1}$ is a morphism. Let $g: X^{\prime} \xrightarrow{f} W \xrightarrow{s} W^{\prime}$ be the Stein factorization of $g$. We can write

$$
K_{X^{\prime}}=\underline{\boldsymbol{o}} \pi^{*}\left(K_{X}\right)+E=\boldsymbol{Q} S_{1}+Z_{1},
$$

where $S_{1}$ is the movable part of $\left|K_{X^{\prime}}\right|, Z_{1}$ the fixed part and $E$ is an effective $Q$-divisor which is a $\boldsymbol{Q}$-linear combination of distinct exceptional divisors. We can also write

$$
\pi^{*}\left(K_{X}\right)=\emptyset S_{1}+E^{\prime}
$$

where $E^{\prime}=Z_{1}-E$ is actually an effective $\boldsymbol{Q}$-divisor and so $\left\ulcorner\pi^{*}\left(K_{X}\right)\right\urcorner$ means $\left\ulcorner S_{1}+E^{\prime}\right\urcorner$. We note that $1 \leq \operatorname{dim}(W) \leq 3$.

If $\operatorname{dim} \phi_{1}(X)=2$, we see that a general fiber of $f$ is a smooth projective curve of genus $g \geq 2$. We say that $X$ is canonically fibred by curves of genus $g$.

If $\operatorname{dim} \phi_{1}(X)=1$, we see that a general fiber $F$ of $f$ is a smooth projective surface of general type. We say that $X$ is canonically fibred by surfaces with invariants $\left(c_{1}^{2}, p_{g}\right):=\left(K_{F_{0}}^{2}, p_{g}(F)\right)$, where $F_{0}$ is the minimal model of $F$.

## 2. Several simple lemmas.

The following result is a direct application of an inequality on curves proved by Castelnuovo ([Cas]) and Beauville ([Be]).

Lemma 2.1 ([Ch1, Proposition 2.1]). Let $S$ be a smooth projective algebraic surface and $L$ an effective, nef and prime divisor on $S$. Suppose $\left(K_{S}-L\right) \cdot L \geq 0$ and $|L|$ defines a birational rational map onto its image. Then

$$
L^{2} \geq 3 h^{0}\left(S, \mathcal{O}_{S}(L)\right)-7
$$

Lemma 2.2. Let $S$ be a smooth projective surface of general type and $L$ a nef divisor on $S$. The following holds.
(i) Suppose that $|L|$ gives a non-birational, generically finite map onto its image. Then $L^{2} \geq 2 h^{0}\left(S, \mathcal{O}_{S}(L)\right)-4$.
(ii) Suppose that there exists a linear subsystem $\Lambda \subset|L|$ such that $\Lambda$ defines a generically finite map of degree $d$ onto its image. Then $L^{2} \geq d\left[\operatorname{dim}_{C} \Lambda-1\right]$ where $\operatorname{dim}_{C} \Lambda$ denotes the projective dimension of $\Lambda$.

Proof. (i) is a special case of (ii).
In order to prove (ii), we take blow-ups $\pi: S^{\prime} \rightarrow S$ such that $\Phi_{\pi^{*} \Lambda}$ gives a morphism. Let $M$ be the movable part of $\pi^{*} \Lambda$. Then $h^{0}\left(S^{\prime}, M\right)=\operatorname{dim}_{C} \Lambda+1$ and

$$
M^{2} \geq d\left(h^{0}\left(S^{\prime}, M\right)-2\right)
$$

Since $M \leq \pi^{*}(L)$, we get the inequality $L^{2} \geq M^{2} \geq d\left(\operatorname{dim}_{C} \Lambda-1\right)$.
Lemma 2.3. Let $C$ be a complete smooth algebraic curve. Suppose $D$ is a divisor on $C$ such that $h^{0}\left(C, \mathcal{O}_{C}(D)\right) \geq g(C)+1$. Then $\operatorname{deg}(D) \geq 2 g(C)$.

Proof. This is a direct result by virtue of R-R and Clifford's theorem.
Lemma 2.4. Let $S$ be a smooth minimal projective surface of general type. The following holds:
(i) $\left|m K_{S}\right|$ is base point free for all $m \geq 4$;
(ii) $\left|3 K_{S}\right|$ is base point free provided $K_{S}^{2} \geq 2$;
(iii) $\left|3 K_{S}\right|$ is base point free provided $p_{g}(S)>0$ and $p_{g}(S) \neq 2$;
(iv) $\left|2 K_{S}\right|$ is base point free provided $p_{g}(S)>0$ or $K_{S}^{2} \geq 5$.

Proof. Both (i) and (ii) can be derived from results of Bombieri (Bo]) and Reider ([Rr]).

If $p_{g}(S) \geq 3$, then $K_{S}^{2} \geq 2$ by Noether inequality. The base point freeness of $\left|3 K_{S}\right|$
follows from (ii). If $K_{S}^{2}=1$ and $p_{g}(S)=1,\left|3 K_{S}\right|$ is base point free by [Cat]. If $K_{S}^{2}=1$ and $p_{g}(S)=2,\left|3 K_{S}\right|$ definitely has base points. So (iii) is true.
(iv) follows from $[\mathbf{C i}$, Theorem 3.1] and Reider's theorem.

Lemma 2.5. Let $S$ be a smooth projective surface of general type. Let $\sigma: S \rightarrow S_{0}$ be the contraction onto the minimal model. Suppose that there is an effective irreducible curve $C$ on $S$ such that $C \leq \sigma^{*}\left(2 K_{S_{0}}\right)$ and $h^{0}(S, C)=2$. If $K_{S_{0}}^{2}=p_{g}(S)=1$, then $C \cdot \sigma^{*}\left(K_{S_{0}}\right) \geq 2$.

Proof. We may assume that $|C|$ is a free pencil. Otherwise, we blow-up $S$ at base points of $|C|$. Denote $C_{1}:=\sigma(C)$. Then $h^{0}\left(S_{0}, C_{1}\right) \geq 2$. Suppose $C \cdot \sigma^{*}\left(K_{S_{0}}\right)=1$. Then $C_{1} \cdot K_{S_{0}}=1$. Because $p_{a}\left(C_{1}\right) \geq 2$, we see that $C_{1}^{2}>0$. From $K_{S_{0}}\left(K_{S_{0}}-C_{1}\right)=0$, we get $\left(K_{S_{0}}-C_{1}\right)^{2} \leq 0$, i.e. $C_{1}^{2} \leq 1$. Thus $C_{1}^{2}=1$ and $K_{S_{0}} \equiv C_{1}$. This means $K_{S_{0}} \sim C_{1}$ by virtue of [Cat], which is impossible because $p_{g}(S)=1$. So $C \cdot \sigma^{*}\left(K_{S_{0}}\right) \geq 2$.

Lemma 2.6 ([Ch4, Lemma 2.7]). Let $X$ be a smooth projective variety of dimension $\geq 2$. Let $D$ be a divisor on $X$ such that $h^{0}\left(X, \mathcal{O}_{X}(D)\right) \geq 2$. Let $S$ be a smooth prime divisor on $X$ and assume that $S$ is not contained in the fixed part of $|D|$. Denote by $M$ the movable part of $|D|$ and by $N$ the movable part of $|D|_{S} \mid$ on $S$. If the natural restriction map

$$
H^{0}\left(X, \mathcal{O}_{X}(D)\right) \xrightarrow{\theta} H^{0}\left(S, \mathcal{O}_{S}\left(\left.D\right|_{S}\right)\right)
$$

is surjective, then $\left.M\right|_{S} \geq N$ and, in particular,

$$
h^{0}\left(S, \mathcal{O}_{S}\left(\left.M\right|_{S}\right)\right)=h^{0}\left(S, \mathcal{O}_{S}(N)\right)=h^{0}\left(S, \mathcal{O}_{S}\left(\left.D\right|_{S}\right)\right)
$$

## 3. Proof of Theorem 3.

We give estimates of $K_{X}^{3}$ according to the dimension of the canonical image $\phi_{1}(X)$. Let the notation be as in (1.3) throughout this section. Thus $S_{1}$ is a general member of the movable part of $\left|\pi^{*}\left(K_{X}\right)\right|$ on a resolution of the indeterminacy of $\phi_{1}$.

The first case is $\operatorname{dim} \phi_{1}(X)=3$. Kobayashi (Kob]) proved
Proposition 3.1. Let $X$ be a projective minimal algebraic 3-fold of general type with only $\boldsymbol{Q}$-factorial terminal singularities. Suppose $\operatorname{dim} \phi_{1}(X)=3$. Then

$$
K_{X}^{3} \geq 2 p_{g}(X)-6
$$

Proof. We give a very simple proof of this result in order to keep this note selfcontained.

In this situation, a general member $S_{1} \in\left|S_{1}\right|$ is a smooth irreducible projective surface of general type. Because $K_{X}$ is nef and big, we have $K_{X}^{3}=\pi^{*}\left(K_{X}\right)^{3} \geq S_{1}^{3}$. Denote $L:=\left.S_{1}\right|_{S_{1}}$. Then $L$ is a nef and big divisor on $S_{1}$ and $|L|$ defines a generically finite map onto its image. It is obvious that

$$
h^{0}\left(S_{1}, L\right) \geq h^{0}\left(X^{\prime}, S_{1}\right)-1=p_{g}(X)-1
$$

Note also that $p_{g}(X) \geq 4$ under the assumption of this proposition.
If $|L|$ gives a birational map, then, by Lemma 2.1,

$$
L^{2} \geq 3 h^{0}\left(S_{1}, L\right)-7 \geq 3 p_{g}(X)-10 \geq 2 p_{g}(X)-6
$$

If $|L|$ gives a non-birational rational map, then, by Lemma 2.2,

$$
L^{2} \geq 2 h^{0}\left(S_{1}, L\right)-4 \geq 2 p_{g}(X)-6
$$

Therefore $K_{X}^{3} \geq S_{1}^{3}=L^{2} \geq 2 p_{g}(X)-6$. The proof is complete.
The second case is $\operatorname{dim} \phi_{1}(X)=2$. The general member $S_{1}$ is an irreducible smooth surface of general type. The canonical map gives a fibration $f: X^{\prime} \rightarrow W$, and we let $C$ denote its general fiber, which is a smooth curve of genus $\geq 2$.

Proposition 3.2. Let $X$ be a projective minimal algebraic 3-fold of general type with only $Q$-factorial terminal singularities. Suppose $\operatorname{dim} \phi_{1}(X)=2$ and $p_{g}(X) \geq 6$. Then either $g(C) \geq 3$ and $K_{X}^{3} \geq(2 / 3) g(C)\left(p_{g}(X)-2\right)$ or $C$ is a curve of genus 2 and $K_{X}^{3} \geq p_{g}(X)-2$.

Proof. We prove the proposition through several steps.
Step 1 (bounding $K_{X}^{3}$ in terms of $\left(L_{1}, C\right)$ ). Recall that we have $\pi^{*}\left(K_{X}\right)=\boldsymbol{Q}$ $S_{1}+E^{\prime}$, where $E^{\prime}$ is an effective $\boldsymbol{Q}$-divisor. Put $L_{1}:=\left.\pi^{*}\left(K_{X}\right)\right|_{S_{1}}$ and $L:=\left.S_{1}\right|_{S_{1}}$. Then $L_{1}$ is a nef and big $\boldsymbol{Q}$-divisor on the surface $S_{1}$ and $|L|$ is composed of a free pencil of curves on $S_{1}$. It is obvious that $L_{1}^{2} \geq L_{1} \cdot L$. We can write

$$
L=\left.S_{1}\right|_{S_{1}} \sim \sum_{i=1}^{a} C_{i} \equiv a C
$$

where $a \geq h^{0}\left(S_{1}, L\right)-1 \geq p_{g}(X)-2$ and the $C_{i}^{\prime} s$ are fibers of $f$ contained in the surface $S_{1}$. Thus we see that

$$
K_{X}^{3}=\pi^{*}\left(K_{X}\right)^{3} \geq L_{1}^{2} \geq L_{1} \cdot L \geq\left(L_{1} \cdot C\right) \cdot\left(p_{g}(X)-2\right)
$$

and we get a lower bound of $K_{X}^{3}$ by giving an estimate of $\left(L_{1} \cdot C\right)$ from below.
Step 2 (the generic finiteness of the tricanonical map $\phi_{3}$ ). Look at the sublinear system

$$
\left|K_{X^{\prime}}+\left\ulcorner\pi^{*}\left(K_{X}\right)\right\urcorner+S_{1}\right| \subset\left|3 K_{X^{\prime}}\right| .
$$

We claim that $\phi_{3}$ is generically finite whenever $p_{g}(X) \geq 4$. We only have to prove that $\left.\phi_{3}\right|_{S_{1}}$ is generically finite for a general member $S_{1}$. By the vanishing theorem, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left.\left|K_{X^{\prime}}+\left\ulcorner\pi^{*}\left(K_{X}\right)\right\urcorner+S_{1}\right|\right|_{S_{1}} & =\left|K_{S_{1}}+\left\ulcorner\pi^{*}\left(K_{X}\right)\right\urcorner\right|_{S_{1}} \mid \\
& \supset \mid K_{S_{1}}+\left\ulcorner\left.\pi^{*}\left(K_{X}\right)\right|_{S_{1}}\right\urcorner .
\end{aligned}
$$

We want to prove that $\Phi_{\mid K_{S_{1}}+\left\ulcorner\left.\pi^{*}\left(K_{X}\right)\right|_{S_{1}}\right\urcorner}$ is generically finite. Because $K_{S_{1}}+\left\ulcorner\left.\pi^{*}\left(K_{X}\right)\right|_{S_{1}}\right\urcorner$ $\geq L$, we see that $\mid K_{S_{1}}+\left\ulcorner\left.\pi^{*}\left(K_{X}\right)\right|_{S_{1}}\right\urcorner$ separates different fibers of $\Phi_{|L|}$. So we only have to verify that $\Phi_{\left|K_{S_{1}}+\left\ulcorner\left.\pi^{*}\left(K_{X}\right)\right|_{S_{1}}\right\urcorner\right|_{C}}$ is finite for an arbitrary smooth fiber $C$ of $f$ contained in $S_{1}$. We have

$$
L_{1} \equiv L+E_{Q} \equiv a C+E_{Q}
$$

where $a \geq p_{g}(X)-2 \geq 2$ and $E_{\underline{Q}}:=\left.E^{\prime}\right|_{S_{1}}$ is an effective $\boldsymbol{Q}$-divisor on $S_{1}$. Thus

$$
L_{1}-C-\frac{1}{a} E_{Q} \equiv\left(1-\frac{1}{a}\right) L_{1}
$$

is a nef and big $\boldsymbol{Q}$-divisor. Using the vanishing theorem again, we get

$$
H^{1}\left(S_{1}, K_{S_{1}}+\left\ulcorner L_{1}-\frac{1}{a} E_{Q}\right\urcorner-C\right)=0 .
$$

This means that $\left.\left|K_{S_{1}}+\left\ulcorner L_{1}-(1 / a) E_{Q}\right\urcorner\right|\right|_{C}=\left|K_{C}+D\right|$, where $D:=\left.\left\ulcorner L_{1}-(1 / a) E Q\right\urcorner\right|_{C}$ is a divisor on $C$ with positive degree. Because $g(C) \geq 2$, the linear system $\left|K_{C}+D\right|$ gives a finite map, implying the generic finiteness of $\phi_{3}$.

Step 3 (Estimation of $\left(L_{1} \cdot C\right)$ ). Since $\left|3 K_{X^{\prime}}\right|$ gives a generically finite map, so does $\left|M_{3}\right|_{S_{1}} \mid$ on the surface $S_{1}$, where $M_{3}$ is the movable part of $\left|3 K_{X^{\prime}}\right|$. Thus $\Phi_{\left|M_{3}\right| S_{1} \mid}$ maps general $C$ of genus $\geq 2$ to a curve and hence $\left.M_{3}\right|_{S_{1}} \cdot C \geq 2$. Noting that $3 \pi^{*}\left(K_{X}\right)=\boldsymbol{Q}$ $M_{3}+E_{3}$ where $E_{3}$ is an effective $\boldsymbol{Q}$-divisor, we see that

$$
\left.3 \pi^{*}\left(K_{X}\right)\right|_{S_{1}} \cdot C \geq\left. M_{3}\right|_{S_{1}} \cdot C \geq 2
$$

i.e., $L_{1} \cdot C \geq 2 / 3$. From this crude initial estimate, we derive a better one. To do this, we run a recursive program (the $\alpha$-program) below.

Pick up a positive integer $\alpha$. We have

$$
\left|K_{X^{\prime}}+\left\ulcorner\alpha \pi^{*}\left(K_{X}\right)\right\urcorner+S_{1}\right| \subset\left|(\alpha+2) K_{X^{\prime}}\right| .
$$

The vanishing theorem gives

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left.\left|K_{X^{\prime}}+\left\ulcorner\alpha \pi^{*}\left(K_{X}\right)\right\urcorner+S_{1}\right|\right|_{S_{1}} & =\left|K_{S_{1}}+\left\ulcorner\alpha \pi^{*}\left(K_{X}\right)\right\urcorner\right|_{S_{1}} \mid \\
& \supset\left|K_{S_{1}}+\left\ulcorner\alpha L_{1}\right\urcorner\right| .
\end{aligned}
$$

We see that $\alpha L_{1}-C-(1 / a) E_{Q} \equiv(\alpha-1 / a) L_{1}$ is a nef and big $\boldsymbol{Q}$-divisor. Using the vanishing theorem on $S_{1}$ again, we get

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left.\left|K_{S_{1}}+\left\ulcorner\alpha L_{1}-\frac{1}{a} E Q_{Q}\right\urcorner\right|\right|_{C}=\left|K_{C}+D_{\alpha}\right|, \tag{3.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $D_{\alpha}:=\left.\left\ulcorner\alpha L_{1}-(1 / a) E_{Q}\right\urcorner\right|_{C}$ with $\operatorname{deg}\left(D_{\alpha}\right) \geq\left\ulcorner(\alpha-1 / a) L_{1} \cdot C\right\urcorner$. We have to use several symbols in order to obtain our result. Let $M_{\alpha+2}$ be the movable part of $\left|(\alpha+2) K_{X^{\prime}}\right|$. Let $M_{\alpha+2}^{\prime}$ be the movable part of

$$
\left|K_{X^{\prime}}+\left\ulcorner\alpha \pi^{*}\left(K_{X}\right)\right\urcorner+S_{1}\right| .
$$

Clearly we have $M_{\alpha+2}^{\prime} \leq M_{\alpha+2}$. Let $N_{\alpha}$ be the movable part of $\left|K_{S_{1}}+\left\ulcorner\alpha L_{1}\right\urcorner\right|$. Then it is easy to see $\left.M_{\alpha+2}^{\prime}\right|_{S_{1}} \geq N_{\alpha}$ by Lemma 2.6. So

$$
(\alpha+2) L_{1} \geq\left._{\boldsymbol{Q}} M_{\alpha+2}\right|_{S_{1}} \geq\left. M_{\alpha+2}^{\prime}\right|_{S_{1}} \geq N_{\alpha}
$$

Let $N_{\alpha}^{\prime}$ be the movable part of $\left|K_{S_{1}}+\left\ulcorner\alpha L_{1}-(1 / a) E_{Q}\right\urcorner\right|$. Then obviously $N_{\alpha} \geq N_{\alpha}^{\prime}$. From (3.1) and Lemma 2.6, we have $h^{0}\left(C,\left.N_{\alpha}^{\prime}\right|_{C}\right)=h^{0}\left(C, K_{C}+D_{\alpha}\right)$. Thus we see that

$$
h^{0}\left(C,\left.N_{\alpha}\right|_{C}\right) \geq h^{0}\left(C,\left.N_{\alpha}^{\prime}\right|_{C}\right)=h^{0}\left(C, K_{C}+D_{\alpha}\right) .
$$

Now take $\alpha=2$ and run the $\alpha$-program. We get $4 L_{1} \cdot C \geq N_{2} \cdot C$. Because $a>3$ under the assumption, we see that $\operatorname{deg}\left(D_{2}\right) \geq\ulcorner(2-1 / a)(2 / 3)\urcorner=2$. Thus $h^{0}\left(C,\left.N_{2}\right|_{C}\right) \geq g(C)+1$. By Lemma 2.3, we have $N_{2} \cdot C \geq 2 g(C)$. If $g(C)=2$, we get
$L_{1} \cdot C \geq 1$ and thus the inequality $K_{X}^{3} \geq p_{g}(X)-2$. If $g(C) \geq 3$, we get $L_{1} \cdot C \geq 3 / 2$. This is a better bound than the initial one. However this is not enough to derive our statement. We have to optimize our estimation.

Step 4 (Optimization). As has been seen in the previous step, we have $L_{1} \cdot C \geq 3 / 2$ when $g \geq 3$. We take $\alpha=1$ now and run the $\alpha$-program. Since $p_{g}(X) \geq 6$, we have $a \geq 4$. Thus

$$
\operatorname{deg}\left(D_{1}\right) \geq\left\ulcorner\left(1-\frac{1}{a}\right) \frac{3}{2}\right\urcorner=2 .
$$

So $h^{0}\left(C,\left.N_{1}\right|_{C}\right) \geq g(C)+1$. Therefore we get, by Lemma 2.3, that

$$
3 L_{1} \cdot C \geq N_{1} \cdot C \geq 2 g(C) \geq 6 \quad \text { whenever } g(C) \geq 3 .
$$

This means $L_{1} \cdot C \geq 2$, which is what we want. So we have the inequality

$$
\begin{equation*}
K_{X}^{3} \geq \frac{2}{3} \cdot g(C) \cdot\left(p_{g}(X)-2\right) \tag{3.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

whenever $g(C) \geq 3$. The proof is complete.
The last case is $\operatorname{dim} \phi_{1}(X)=1$. The canonical map gives a fibration $f: X^{\prime} \rightarrow W$ where $W$ is a smooth projective curve. Denote $b:=g(W)$. We see that a general fiber $F$ of $f$ is a smooth projective surface of general type. Let $\sigma: F \rightarrow F_{0}$ be the contraction onto the minimal model. Note that we always have $p_{g}(F)>0$ in this situation. We also have $S_{1} \sim \sum_{i=1}^{b_{1}} F_{i} \equiv b_{1} F$, where the $F_{i}^{\prime} s$ are fibers of $f$ and $b_{1} \geq p_{g}(X)-1$.

Proposition 3.3. Let $X$ be a projective minimal algebraic 3-fold of general type with only $\boldsymbol{Q}$-factorial terminal singularities. Suppose $\operatorname{dim} \phi_{1}(X)=1$. Let $k \geq 4$ be an integer and assume that $p_{g}(X) \geq 2 k+2$. Then $K_{X}^{3} \geq\left(k^{2} /(k+1)^{2}\right) \cdot K_{F_{0}}^{2} \cdot\left(p_{g}(X)-1\right)$.

Proof. The proof proceeds through two steps.
Step 1 (bounding $K_{X}^{3}$ in terms of $L^{2}$ ). On the surface $F$, we denote $L:=\left.\pi^{*}\left(K_{X}\right)\right|_{F}$. Then $L$ is an effective nef and $\operatorname{big} \boldsymbol{Q}$-divisor. Because $\pi^{*}\left(K_{X}\right) \equiv b_{1} F+E^{\prime}$ with $E^{\prime}$ effective, we get

$$
K_{X}^{3}=\pi^{*}\left(K_{X}\right)^{3} \geq\left(\pi^{*}\left(K_{X}\right)^{2} \cdot F\right) \cdot\left(p_{g}(X)-1\right)=L^{2} \cdot\left(p_{g}(X)-1\right) .
$$

So the main point is to estimate $L^{2}$ from below in order to prove the proposition.
Step 2 (bounding $L^{2}$ from below by studying the $(k+1)$-canonical map $\phi_{k+1}$ ). Let $M_{k+1}$ be the movable part of $\left|(k+1) K_{X^{\prime}}\right|$. Then we may write

$$
(k+1) \pi^{*}\left(K_{X}\right)=\boldsymbol{Q} M_{k+1}+E_{k+1}
$$

where $E_{k+1}$ is an effective $\boldsymbol{Q}$-divisor. Therefore we see that $(k+1) L \geq\left._{\text {num }} M_{k+1}\right|_{F}$. Let $N_{k}$ be the movable part of $\left|k K_{F}\right|$. According to Lemma 2.4, $\left|k K_{F_{0}}\right|$ is base point free. Thus $N_{k}=\sigma^{*}\left(k K_{F_{0}}\right)$. We claim that $\left.M_{k+1}\right|_{F} \geq N_{k}$. Then $(k+1) L \geq N_{k}$ and we get

$$
L^{2} \geq \frac{1}{(k+1)^{2}} N_{k}^{2}=\frac{k^{2}}{(k+1)^{2}} K_{F_{0}}^{2}
$$

So we have the inequality

$$
\begin{equation*}
K_{X}^{3} \geq \frac{k^{2}}{(k+1)^{2}} \cdot K_{F_{0}}^{2} \cdot\left(p_{g}(X)-1\right) \tag{3.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Now we prove the claim. In fact, $\phi_{1}$ is a morphism if $b>0$. In this case, we do not need any modification and $f: X^{\prime}=X \rightarrow W$ is a fibration. A general fiber $F$ is a smooth projective surface of general type, because the singularities on $X$ are isolated. Furthermore $F$ is minimal because $K_{X}$ is nef. By Kawamata's vanishing theorem for $\boldsymbol{Q}$-Cartier Weil divisor $(\overline{\mathbf{K M M}]})$, we have $H^{1}\left(X, k K_{X}\right)=0$. This means $\left.\left|k K_{X}+F\right|\right|_{F}=$ $\left|k K_{F}\right|$. Noting that $F \leq K_{X}$ and using Lemma 2.6, we see that the claim is true in this case.

We then consider the case with $b=0$. We use the approach in $[\mathbf{K o l}$, Corollary 4.8] to prove it. The canonical map gives a fibration $f: X^{\prime} \rightarrow \boldsymbol{P}^{1}$. Because $p_{g}(X) \geq$ $2 k+2$, we see that $\mathcal{O}(2 k+1) \hookrightarrow f_{*} \omega_{X^{\prime}}$. Thus we have

$$
\mathscr{E}:=\mathcal{O}(1) \otimes f_{*} \omega_{X^{\prime} / \boldsymbol{P}^{1}}^{k}=\mathcal{O}(2 k+1) \otimes f_{*} \omega_{X^{\prime}}^{k} \hookrightarrow f_{*} \omega_{X^{\prime}}^{k+1}
$$

Note that $H^{0}\left(\boldsymbol{P}^{1}, f_{*} \omega_{X^{\prime}}^{k+1}\right) \cong H^{0}\left(X^{\prime}, \omega_{X^{\prime}}^{k+1}\right)$. It is well known that $\mathscr{E}$ is generated by global sections and that $f_{*} \omega_{X^{\prime} / \boldsymbol{P}^{1}}^{k}$ is a sum of line bundles with non-negative degree (cf. [ $\mathbf{F}],[\mathbf{V 2}],[\mathbf{V 3}]]$. Thus the global sections of $\mathscr{E}$ separates different fibers of $f$. On the other hand, the local sections of $f_{*} \omega_{X^{\prime}}^{k}$ give the $k$-canonical map of $F$ and these local sections can be extended to global sections of $\mathscr{E}$. This essentially means $\left.M_{k+1}\right|_{F} \geq N_{k}$.

Proposition 3.4. Let $X$ be a projective minimal algebraic 3-fold of general type with only $\boldsymbol{Q}$-factorial terminal singularities. Suppose that $\operatorname{dim} \phi_{1}(X)=1$. Let $k \geq 3$ be an integer and assume $p_{g}(X) \geq 2 k+2$. If $\left(K_{F_{0}}^{2}, p_{g}(F)\right)=(1,1)$, then

$$
K_{X}^{3} \geq \min \left\{\frac{6 k^{2}}{3 k^{2}+8 k+4} \cdot\left(p_{g}(X)-\frac{4}{3}\right), \frac{6 k}{3 k+4} \cdot\left(p_{g}(X)-\frac{5}{3}\right)\right\}
$$

Proof. From Step 2 in the proof of Proposition 3.3, we have shown that

$$
\left.(k+1) \pi^{*}\left(K_{X}\right)\right|_{F} \geq\left. M_{k+1}\right|_{F} \geq k \sigma^{*}\left(K_{F_{0}}\right)
$$

(Although we suppose $k \geq 4$ in Proposition 3.3, the case with $k=3$ can be parallelly treated since $\left|3 K_{F_{0}}\right|$ is base point free for a surface with $\left(K_{F_{0}}^{2}, p_{g}(F)\right)=(1,1)$.)

The canonical map derives a fibration $f: X^{\prime} \rightarrow W$. Because $q(F)=0$, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
q(X) & =h^{1}\left(\mathcal{O}_{X^{\prime}}\right)=b+h^{1}\left(W, R^{1} f_{*} \omega_{X^{\prime}}\right)=b \\
h^{2}\left(\mathcal{O}_{X}\right) & =h^{1}\left(W, f_{*} \omega_{X^{\prime}}\right)+h^{0}\left(W, R^{1} f_{*} \omega_{X^{\prime}}\right) \\
& =h^{1}\left(W, f_{*} \omega_{X^{\prime}}\right) \leq 1
\end{aligned}
$$

It is obvious that $h^{2}\left(\mathcal{O}_{X}\right)=0$ when $b=0$, since $f_{*} \omega_{X^{\prime}}$ is a line bundle of positive degree. Anyway, we have $q(X)-h^{2}\left(\mathcal{O}_{X}\right) \geq 0$. Thus we get

$$
\chi\left(\omega_{X}\right)=p_{g}(X)+q(X)-h^{2}\left(\mathcal{O}_{X}\right)-1 \geq p_{g}(X)-1 .
$$

By the plurigenus formula of Reid ([R1]), we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
P_{2}(X) \geq \frac{1}{2} K_{X}^{3}-3 \chi\left(\mathcal{O}_{X}\right) \geq \frac{1}{2} K_{X}^{3}+3\left[p_{g}(X)-1\right] . \tag{3.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Let $M_{2}$ be the movable part of $\left|2 K_{X^{\prime}}\right|$. We consider the natural restriction map $\gamma$ :

$$
H^{0}\left(X^{\prime}, M_{2}\right) \xrightarrow{\gamma} V_{2} \subset H^{0}\left(F,\left.M_{2}\right|_{F}\right) \subset H^{0}\left(F, 2 K_{F}\right),
$$

where $V_{2}$ is the image of $\gamma$ as a $C$-subspace of $H^{0}\left(F,\left.M_{2}\right|_{F}\right)$. Because $h^{0}\left(2 K_{F}\right)=3$, we see that $1 \leq \operatorname{dim}_{C} V_{2} \leq 3$. Denote by $\Lambda_{2}$ the linear system corresponding to $V_{2}$. We have $\operatorname{dim} \Lambda_{2}=\operatorname{dim}_{C} V_{2}-1$.

Case 1. $\operatorname{dim}_{C} V_{2}=3$.
Since $\Lambda_{2}$ is a sub-system of $\left|2 K_{F}\right|$, we see that the restriction of $\phi_{2, X^{\prime}}$ to $F$ is exactly the bicanonical map of $F$. Because $\phi_{2, F}$ is a generically finite morphism of degree 4, $\phi_{2, X^{\prime}}$ is also a generically finite map of degree 4. Let $S_{2} \in\left|M_{2}\right|$ be a general member. We can further modify $\pi$ such that $\left|M_{2}\right|$ is base point free. Then $S_{2}$ is a smooth projective irreducible surface of general type. On the surface $S_{2}$, denote $L_{2}:=\left.S_{2}\right|_{S_{2}}$. $L_{2}$ is a nef and big divisor. We have

$$
\left.2 \pi^{*}\left(K_{X}\right)\right|_{S_{2}} \geq\left. S_{2}\right|_{S_{2}}=L_{2}
$$

We consider the natural map

$$
H^{0}\left(X^{\prime}, S_{2}\right) \xrightarrow{\gamma^{\prime}} \overline{V_{2}} \subset H^{0}\left(S_{2}, L_{2}\right)
$$

where $\overline{V_{2}}$ is the image of $\gamma^{\prime}$. Denote by $\overline{\Lambda_{2}}$ the linear system corresponding to $\overline{V_{2}}$. Because $\phi_{2}$ is generically finite map of degree 4 , we see that $\left|L_{2}\right|$ has a sub-system $\overline{\Lambda_{2}}$ which gives a generically finite map of degree 4 . By Lemma 2.2(ii), we get $L_{2}^{2} \geq$ $4\left(\operatorname{dim}_{C} \overline{\Lambda_{2}}-1\right) \geq 4\left(P_{2}(X)-3\right)$. Therefore we have

$$
K_{X}^{3} \geq \frac{1}{8} L_{2}^{2} \geq \frac{1}{2}\left(P_{2}(X)-3\right) \geq \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{1}{2} K_{X}^{3}+3 p_{g}(X)-6\right)
$$

Therefore

$$
\begin{equation*}
K_{X}^{3} \geq 2 p_{g}(X)-4 \tag{3.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

Case 2. $\operatorname{dim}_{C} V_{2}=2$.
In this case, $\operatorname{dim} \phi_{2}(F)=1$ and $\operatorname{dim} \phi_{2}(X)=2$. We may further modify $\pi$ such that $\left|M_{2}\right|$ is base point free. Taking the Stein factorization of $\phi_{2}$, we get a derived fibration $f_{2}: X^{\prime} \rightarrow W_{2}$ where $W_{2}$ is a surface. Let $C$ be a general fiber of $f_{2}$. we see that $F$ is naturally fibred by curves with the same numerical type as $C$. On the surface $F$, we have a free pencil $\Lambda_{2} \subset\left|2 K_{F}\right|$. Let $\left|C_{0}\right|$ be the movable part of $\Lambda_{2}$. Then $h^{0}\left(F, C_{0}\right)=2$. Because $q(F)=0$, we see that $\left|C_{0}\right|$ is a pencil over the rational curve. So a general member of $\left|C_{0}\right|$ is an irreducible curve. According to Lemma 2.5, we have $\left(C_{0} \cdot \sigma^{*}\left(K_{F_{0}}\right)\right)_{F} \geq 2$ whence

$$
\left(\pi^{*}\left(K_{X}\right) \cdot C\right)_{X^{\prime}}=\left(\left.\pi^{*}\left(K_{X}\right)\right|_{F} \cdot C_{0}\right)_{F} \geq \frac{k}{k+1}\left(\sigma^{*}\left(K_{F_{0}}\right) \cdot C_{0}\right)_{F} \geq \frac{2 k}{k+1} .
$$

Now we study on the surface $S_{2}$. We may write

$$
\left.S_{2}\right|_{S_{2}} \sim \sum_{i=1}^{a_{2}} C_{i} \equiv a_{2} C
$$

where the $C_{i}^{\prime} s$ are fibers of $f_{2}$ and $a_{2} \geq P_{2}(X)-2$. Noting that

$$
\left(\left.\pi^{*}\left(K_{X}\right)\right|_{S_{2}} \cdot C\right)_{S_{2}}=\left(\pi^{*}\left(K_{X}\right) \cdot C\right)_{X^{\prime}} \geq \frac{2 k}{k+1}
$$

and $\left.2 \pi^{*}\left(K_{X}\right)\right|_{S_{2}} \geq\left. S_{2}\right|_{S_{2}}$, we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
4 K_{X}^{3} & \geq 2 \pi^{*}\left(K_{X}\right)^{2} \cdot S_{2}=2\left(\left.\pi^{*}\left(K_{X}\right)\right|_{S_{2}}\right)_{S_{2}}^{2} \\
& \geq a_{2}\left(\left.\pi^{*}\left(K_{X}\right)\right|_{S_{2}} \cdot C\right)_{S_{2}} \geq \frac{2 k}{k+1}\left(P_{2}(X)-2\right) \\
& \geq \frac{2 k}{k+1}\left(\frac{1}{2} K_{X}^{3}+3 p_{g}(X)-5\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

Equivalently

$$
\begin{equation*}
K_{X}^{3} \geq \frac{6 k}{3 k+4} p_{g}(X)-\frac{10 k}{3 k+4} \tag{3.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Case 3. $\operatorname{dim}_{C} V_{2}=1$.
In this case, $\operatorname{dim} \phi_{2}(X)=1$. Because $p_{g}(X)>0$, we see that both $\phi_{2}$ and $\phi_{1}$ give the same fibration $f: X^{\prime} \rightarrow W$ after taking the Stein factorization of them. So we may write

$$
2 \pi^{*}\left(K_{X}\right) \sim \sum_{i=1}^{a_{2}^{\prime}} F_{i}+E_{2}^{\prime} \equiv a_{2}^{\prime} F+E_{2}^{\prime}
$$

where the $F_{i}^{\prime} s$ are fibers of $f, E_{2}^{\prime}$ is an effective $Q$-divisor, $a_{2}^{\prime} \geq P_{2}(X)-1$ and $F$ is a surface with $\left(K_{F_{0}}^{2}, p_{g}(F)\right)=(1,1)$. So we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
2 K_{X}^{3} & \geq a_{2}^{\prime}\left(\left.\pi^{*}\left(K_{X}\right)\right|_{F}\right)_{F}^{2} \geq \frac{k^{2}}{(k+1)^{2}}\left(P_{2}(X)-1\right) \\
& \geq \frac{k^{2}}{(k+1)^{2}}\left(\frac{1}{2} K_{X}^{3}+3 p_{g}(X)-4\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

Equivalently

$$
\begin{equation*}
K_{X}^{3} \geq \frac{6 k^{2}}{3 k^{2}+8 k+4} p_{g}(X)-\frac{8 k^{2}}{3 k^{2}+8 k+4} \tag{3.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

Comparing (3.5), (3.6) and (3.7), we get the inequality.
Propositions 3.1, 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4 imply Theorem 3.

## 4. Inequalities for minimal Gorenstein 3-folds.

This section is devoted to study lower bounds for $K_{X}^{3}$ of Gorenstein 3-folds. Let $X$ be a projective minimal Gorenstein 3-fold of general type with only locally factorial
terminal singularities. It is well known that $K_{X}^{3}$ is a positive even integer and $\chi\left(\mathcal{O}_{X}\right)<0$. We also have the Miyaoka-Yau inequality ([M2]): $K_{X}^{3} \leq-72 \chi\left(\mathcal{O}_{X}\right)$. Besides, after taking a special birational modification to $X$ according to Reid ([R2]) while using a result of Miyaoka ([M2]), we get the plurigenus formula as follows.

$$
\begin{equation*}
P_{m}(X)=(2 m-1)\left(\frac{m(m-1)}{12} K_{X}^{3}-\chi\left(\mathcal{O}_{X}\right)\right) \tag{4.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

The following theorem improves [Kob, Main Theorem], where we use the same notations as in previous sections.

Theorem 4.1. Let $X$ be a projective minimal Gorenstein 3-fold of general type with only locally factorial terminal singularities. Then we have
(i) If $\operatorname{dim} \phi_{1}(X)=3$, then $K_{X}^{3} \geq 2 p_{g}(X)-6$.
(ii) If $\operatorname{dim} \phi_{1}(X)=2$, i.e., $X$ is canonically fibered by curves of genus $g$, then

$$
K_{X}^{3} \geq\left\ulcorner\frac{2}{3}(g-1)\right\urcorner\left(p_{g}(X)-2\right) .
$$

(iii) If $\operatorname{dim} \phi_{1}(X)=1$, then either $K_{X}^{3} \geq 2 p_{g}(X)-4$ or $\left(K_{F_{0}}^{2}, p_{g}(F)\right)=(1,2)$.

Proof. By Proposition 3.1, it is sufficient to study the cases $\operatorname{dim} \phi_{1}(X)<3$.
Case 1. $\operatorname{dim} \phi_{1}(X)=2$.
The canonical map gives a fibration $f: X^{\prime} \rightarrow W$, where a general fiber $C$ is a smooth curve of genus $g$. If $g=2$, our inequality is $K_{X}^{3} \geq p_{g}(X)-2$, which is trivially true. Now we assume $g \geq 3$. Denote $L:=\left.\pi^{*}\left(K_{X}\right)\right|_{S_{1}}$, which is a nef and big Cartier divisor. Let $S_{1} \in\left|M_{1}\right|$ be a general member. Then $S_{1}$ is a smooth projective surface of general type. Noting that $\left|S_{1}\right|_{S_{1}} \mid$ is composed of a free pencil of curves with the same numerical type as $C$, we have

$$
\left.\pi^{*}\left(K_{X}\right)\right|_{S_{1}} \equiv a C+E_{2},
$$

where $E_{2}$ is effective and $a \geq p_{g}(X)-2$, and we immediately see

$$
K_{X}^{3} \geq(L \cdot C)\left(p_{g}(X)-2\right)
$$

Thus it is sufficient to bound $(L \cdot C)$ from below.
We run once more a recursive program (the $\beta$-program) which is essentially similar to the $\alpha$-program. There is, however, a minor difference between them. Pick up a positive integer $\beta$. Obviously, we have

$$
\left|K_{X^{\prime}}+\beta \pi^{*}\left(K_{X}\right)+S_{1}\right| \subset\left|(\beta+2) K_{X^{\prime}}\right| .
$$

The vanishing theorem gives

$$
\left.\left|K_{X^{\prime}}+\beta \pi^{*}\left(K_{X}\right)+S_{1}\right|\right|_{S_{1}}=\left|K_{S_{1}}+\beta L\right| .
$$

We have $L \geq C$. If $\beta>1$, then we have

$$
\left.\left|K_{S_{1}}+(\beta-1) L+C\right|\right|_{C}=\left|K_{C}+D_{\beta}\right|,
$$

where $D_{\beta}:=\left.(\beta-1) L\right|_{C}$. Let $M_{\beta+2}$ be the movable part of $\left|(\beta+2) K_{X^{\prime}}\right|$ and $M_{\beta+2}^{\prime}$
be the movable part of $\left|K_{X^{\prime}}+\beta \pi^{*}\left(K_{X}\right)+S_{1}\right|$. Then $M_{\beta+2} \geq M_{\beta+2}^{\prime}$. Let $N_{\beta}$ be the movable part of $\left|K_{S_{1}}+(\beta-1) L+C\right|$. Then, by Lemma 2.6, we have

$$
(\beta+2) L \geq\left. M_{\beta+2}\right|_{S_{1}} \geq\left. M_{\beta+2}^{\prime}\right|_{S_{1}} \geq N_{\beta}
$$

Also by Lemma 2.6, we have $h^{0}\left(C,\left.N_{\beta}\right|_{C}\right)=h^{0}\left(K_{C}+D_{\beta}\right)$. If $\operatorname{deg}\left(D_{\beta}\right)=(\beta-1)$. $(L \cdot C) \geq 2$, then

$$
h^{0}\left(C,\left.N_{\beta}\right|_{C}\right)=g-1+(\beta-1)(L \cdot C) .
$$

Using R-R again and Clifford's theorem, we see that $h^{1}\left(C,\left.N_{\beta}\right|_{C}\right)=0$ and

$$
(\beta+2)(L \cdot C) \geq N_{\beta} \cdot C=2 g-2+(\beta-1)(L \cdot C)
$$

We get the inequality

$$
\begin{equation*}
L \cdot C \geq \frac{2 g-2+(\beta-1)(L \cdot C)}{\beta+2} \tag{4.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Now take $\beta=3$. Then $\operatorname{deg}\left(D_{3}\right) \geq 2$. According to (4.2), we see $L \cdot C>1$, i.e. $L \cdot C \geq 2$. From now on, we can constantly take $\beta=2$. We see that $\operatorname{deg}\left(D_{2}\right) \geq 2$. So (4.2) becomes $L \cdot C \geq(2 g-2) / 3$. This means $L \cdot C \geq\ulcorner(2 / 3)(g-1)\urcorner$.

Case 2. $\quad \operatorname{dim} \phi_{1}(X)=1$.
In this case, the canonical map derives a fibration $f: X^{\prime} \rightarrow W$ onto a smooth curve $W$ where a general fiber $F$ of $f$ is a smooth irreducible surface of general type. We have $\pi^{*}\left(K_{X}\right)=S_{1}+E^{\prime}$ and $S_{1} \equiv b_{1} F$, where $b_{1} \geq p_{g}(X)-1$. Denote $\bar{S}=\pi\left(S_{1}\right)$ and $\bar{F}=\pi(F)$. Then $\bar{S} \equiv b_{1} \bar{F}$. Because $\bar{F}^{2}$ is pseudo-effective, $K_{X} \cdot \bar{F}^{2} \geq 0$. Note that $K_{X} \cdot \bar{F}^{2}$ is an even integer.

If $K_{X} \cdot \bar{F}^{2}>0$, then we have $K_{X}^{2} \cdot \bar{F} \geq 2\left(p_{g}(X)-1\right)$ and thus $K_{X}^{3} \geq 2\left(p_{g}(X)-1\right)^{2}$.
If $K_{X} \cdot \bar{F}^{2}=0$, then $\mathcal{O}_{F}\left(\left.\pi^{*}\left(K_{X}\right)\right|_{F}\right) \cong \mathcal{O}_{F}\left(\sigma^{*}\left(K_{F_{0}}\right)\right)$ by a trivial generalization of [Ch3, Lemma 2.3]. Thus we always have

$$
\begin{aligned}
K_{X}^{3} & =\pi^{*}\left(K_{X}\right)^{3} \geq\left(\pi^{*}\left(K_{X}\right)^{2} \cdot F\right)\left(p_{g}(X)-1\right) \\
& =\sigma^{*}\left(K_{F_{0}}\right)^{2}\left(p_{g}(X)-1\right) \geq 2\left(p_{g}(X)-1\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

whenever $K_{F_{0}}^{2} \geq 2$.
When $K_{F_{0}}^{2}=1$, the only possibility is $1 \leq p_{g}(F) \leq 2$. We can prove that $K_{X}^{3} \geq$ $2 p_{g}(X)-4$ if $\left(K_{F_{0}}^{2}, p_{g}(F)\right)=(1,1)$. In fact, this is the special case of Proposition 3.4 and the estimation here is more exact since $X$ is Gorenstein. The main point is that we have $\left.\pi^{*}\left(K_{X}\right)\right|_{F} \sim \sigma^{*}\left(K_{F_{0}}\right)$. We see from the proof of Proposition 3.4 that (3.5) is still as $K_{X}^{3} \geq 2 p_{g}(X)-4$, that (3.6) corresponds to $K_{X}^{3} \geq 2 p_{g}(X)-3(1 / 3)$ and that (3.7) will be replaced by $K_{X}^{3} \geq 2 p_{g}(X)-2(2 / 3)$.

From Theorem 4.1, one sees that bad cases possibly occur when $X$ is canonically fibered by curves of genus 2 or by surfaces with invariants $\left(c_{1}^{2}, p_{g}\right)=(1,2)$. For technical reasons, we are only able to treat a nonsingular 3 -fold. One needs a new method to cover singular 3 -folds.

Now suppose that $X$ is a smooth projective 3-fold. Let $\bar{M}$ be a divisor on $X$ such that $h^{0}(X, \bar{M}) \geq 2$ and that $|\bar{M}|$ has base points but no fixed part. By Hironaka's theorem ([Hi]), we may take successive blow-ups

$$
\pi: X^{\prime}=X_{n} \xrightarrow{\pi_{n}} X_{n-1} \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow X_{i} \xrightarrow{\pi_{i}} X_{i-1} \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow X_{1} \xrightarrow{\pi_{1}} X_{0}=X
$$

such that
(i) $\pi_{i}$ is a single blow-up along smooth center $W_{i}$ on $X_{i-1}$ for all $i$;
(ii) $W_{i}$ is contained in the base locus of the movable part of

$$
\left|\left(\pi_{1} \circ \pi_{2} \circ \cdots \circ \pi_{i-1}\right)^{*}(\bar{M})\right|
$$

and thus $W_{i}$ is a reduced closed point or a smooth projective curve on $X_{i-1}$;
(iii) the movable part of $\left|\pi^{*}(\bar{M})\right|$ has no base points.

It is clear that the resulting 3 -fold $X^{\prime}$ is still smooth. Let $E_{i}$ be the exceptional divisor on $X^{\prime}$ corresponding to $W_{i}$. Then we may write

$$
K_{X^{\prime}}=\pi^{*}\left(K_{X}\right)+\sum_{i=1}^{n} a_{i} E_{i}, \quad \pi^{*}(\bar{M})=M+\sum_{i=1}^{n} e_{i} E_{i}
$$

where $a_{i}, e_{i} \in \boldsymbol{Z}, a_{i} \geq 0$ and $M$ is the movable part of $\left|\pi^{*}(\bar{M})\right|$. From the definition of $\pi$, we see $e_{i}>0$ for all $i$.

Lemma 4.2. $a_{i} \leq 2 e_{i}$ for all $i$.
Proof. We prove the simple lemma by induction. Denote by $M_{i}$ the strict transform of $\bar{M}$ in $X_{i}$ for all $i$. Let $E_{i}^{(i)}$ be the exceptional divisor on $X_{i}$ corresponding to $W_{i}$. Let $E_{i}^{(j)}$ be the strict transform of $E_{i}^{(i)}$ in $X_{j}$ for $j>i$.

For $i=1$, we have

$$
K_{X_{1}}=\pi_{1}^{*}\left(K_{X}\right)+a_{1}^{(1)} E_{1}^{(1)} \quad \text { and } \quad \pi_{1}^{*}(\bar{M})=M_{1}+e_{1}^{(1)} E_{1}^{(1)} .
$$

From the definition of $\pi_{1}$, we know that $e_{1}^{(1)} \geq 1$. Note that $a_{1}^{(1)}$ is computable. In fact, $a_{1}^{(1)}=2$ if $W_{1}$ is a reduced smooth point of $X ; a_{1}^{(1)}=1$ if $W_{1}$ is a smooth curve on $X$. Clearly, we have $a_{1}^{(1)} \leq 2 e_{1}^{(1)}$.

For $i=n-1$, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
& K_{X_{n-1}}=\left(\pi_{1} \circ \cdots \circ \pi_{n-1}\right)^{*}\left(K_{X}\right)+\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} a_{i}^{(n-1)} E_{i}^{(n-1)} \\
& \left(\pi_{1} \circ \cdots \circ \pi_{n-1}\right)^{*}(\bar{M})=M_{n-1}+\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} e_{i}^{(n-1)} E_{i}^{(n-1)} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Suppose we have already had $a_{i}^{(n-1)} \leq 2 e_{i}^{(n-1)}$. Then we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
K_{X_{n}} & =\pi_{n}^{*}\left(K_{X_{n-1}}\right)+a_{n}^{(n)} E_{n}^{(n)} \\
& =\pi^{*}\left(K_{X}\right)+\pi_{n}^{*} \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} a_{i}^{(n-1)} E_{i}^{(n-1)}+a_{n}^{(n)} E_{n}^{(n)} . \\
\pi^{*}(\bar{M}) & =\pi_{n}^{*}\left(M_{n-1}\right)+\pi_{n}^{*} \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} e_{i}^{(n-1)} E_{i}^{(n-1)} \\
& =M+\pi_{n}^{*} \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} e_{i}^{(n-1)} E_{i}^{(n-1)}+e_{n}^{(n)} E_{n}^{(n)} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Because $\pi_{n}$ is also a single blow-up, we see similarly that $a_{n}^{(n)} \leq 2 e_{n}^{(n)}$. Note that $E_{n}^{(n)}=E_{n}$ and

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_{i} E_{i}=\pi_{n}^{*} \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} a_{i}^{(n-1)} E_{i}^{(n-1)}+a_{n}^{(n)} E_{n} \\
& \sum_{i=1}^{n} e_{i} E_{i}=\pi_{n}^{*} \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} e_{i}^{(n-1)} E_{i}^{(n-1)}+e_{n}^{(n)} E_{n}
\end{aligned}
$$

We see that $a_{i} \leq 2 e_{i}$. The proof is complete.
Theorem 4.3. Let $X$ be a projective minimal smooth 3-fold of general type. Suppose $\operatorname{dim} \phi_{1}(X)=2$ and $X$ is canonically fibred by curves of genus 2 . Then

$$
K_{X}^{3} \geq \frac{1}{3}\left(4 p_{g}(X)-10\right)
$$

The inequality is sharp.
Proof. We keep the same notations as in 1.3 and in Case 1 of the proof of Theorem 4.1. Set $K_{X} \sim \bar{M}+\bar{Z}$, where $\bar{M}$ is the movable part of $\left|K_{X}\right|$ and $\bar{Z}$ is the fixed part. We may take the same successive blow-ups

$$
\pi: X^{\prime}=X_{n} \xrightarrow{\pi_{n}} X_{n-1} \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow X_{i} \xrightarrow{\pi_{i}} X_{i-1} \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow X_{1} \xrightarrow{\pi_{1}} X_{0}=X
$$

as in the set up for Lemma 4.2.
Let $g=\phi_{1} \circ \pi$. Taking the Stein-factorization of $g$, we get the induced fibration $f: X^{\prime} \rightarrow W$. A general fiber of $f$ is a smooth curve of genus 2 by assumption of the theorem. Let $S_{1}$ be the movable part of $\left|\pi^{*}(\bar{M})\right|$. Then we have

$$
K_{X^{\prime}}=\pi^{*}\left(K_{X}\right)+E=\pi^{*}\left(K_{X}\right)+\sum_{i=0}^{p} a_{i} E_{i}
$$

and $\pi^{*}(\bar{M}) \sim S_{1}+\sum_{i=0}^{p} e_{i} E_{i}$. We know that $a_{i} \geq 0, e_{i}>0$ and both $a_{i}$ and $e_{i}$ are integers for all $i$. We also have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\pi^{*}\left(K_{X}\right) & =\pi^{*}(\bar{M})+\pi^{*}(\bar{Z})=S_{1}+\sum_{i=0}^{p} e_{i} E_{i}+\pi^{*}(\bar{Z}) \\
& \sim S_{1}+\sum_{i=0}^{p} e_{i}^{\prime} E_{i}+\sum_{j=1}^{q} d_{j} L_{j}=S_{1}+E^{\prime}
\end{aligned}
$$

where $e_{i}^{\prime} \geq e_{i}, d_{j}>0, E_{i} \neq L_{j}$ and $L_{j_{1}} \neq L_{j_{2}}$ provided $j_{1} \neq j_{2}$. On the surface $S_{1}$, set $L:=\left.\pi^{*}\left(K_{X}\right)\right|_{S_{1}}$. We also have $\left.S_{1}\right|_{S_{1}} \equiv a C$ where $a \geq p_{g}(X)-2$ and $C$ is a general fiber of the restricted fibration $\left.f\right|_{S_{1}}: S_{1} \rightarrow f\left(S_{1}\right)$. Note that the above $C$ lies in the same numerical class as that of a general fiber of $f$. If $L \cdot C \geq 2$, we have already seen in the proof of Theorem 4.1 that $K_{X}^{3} \geq 2 p_{g}(X)-4$. From now on, we suppose $L \cdot C=1$. Note that, in this situation, $|\bar{M}|$ definitely has base points. (Otherwise, $\pi=$ identity and

$$
L \cdot C=\left.K_{X}\right|_{S_{1}} \cdot C=\left.\left(K_{X}+S_{1}\right)\right|_{S_{1}} \cdot C=K_{S_{1}} \cdot C=2
$$

which contradicts to the assumption $L \cdot C=1$.)

Denote $\left.E^{\prime}\right|_{S_{1}}:=E_{V}^{\prime}+E_{H}^{\prime}$, where $E_{V}^{\prime}$ is the vertical part, i.e., $\left.\operatorname{dim} f\right|_{S_{1}}\left(E_{V}^{\prime}\right)=0$, and $E_{H}^{\prime}$ is the horizontal part, i.e., $E_{H}^{\prime} \cdot C>0$. Because $\left.E^{\prime}\right|_{S_{1}} \cdot C=L \cdot C=1$, we see that $E_{H}^{\prime} \cdot C=1$. This means that $E_{H}^{\prime}$ is an irreducible curve and is a section of the restricted fibration $\left.f\right|_{S_{1}}$. Denote $\left.E\right|_{S_{1}}:=E_{V}+E_{H}$, where $E_{V}$ is the vertical part and $E_{H}$ is the horizontal part. From $K_{S_{1}} \cdot C=2$, one sees that $E_{H} \cdot C=\left.E\right|_{S_{1}} \cdot C=1$. This also means that $E_{H}$ is an irreducible curve and $E_{H}$ comes from some exceptional divisor $E_{i}$ with $a_{i}=1$. We may suppose that $E_{H}$ comes from $E_{0}$. Then $a_{0}=1$. Because $e_{0}^{\prime}>0$ and $\pi^{*}\left(K_{X}\right) \cdot C=1$, we see that $e_{0}^{\prime}=1$ and thus $E_{H}^{\prime}$ also comes from $E_{0}$. Since $\left.E_{0}\right|_{S_{1}}$ has only one horizontal part, $E_{H}$ and $E_{H}^{\prime}$ coincide with a curve $G$. Now it is quite clear that

$$
\begin{aligned}
E_{V} & =\sum_{i=1}^{p} a_{i}\left(\left.E_{i}\right|_{S_{1}}\right)+\left(\left.E_{0}\right|_{S_{1}}-G\right), \\
E_{V}^{\prime} & =\sum_{i=1}^{p} e_{i}^{\prime}\left(\left.E_{i}\right|_{S_{1}}\right)+\sum_{j=1}^{q} d_{j}\left(\left.L_{j}\right|_{S_{1}}\right)+\left(\left.E_{0}\right|_{S_{1}}-G\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

We have the following
Claim. $\quad E_{V} \leq 2 E_{V}^{\prime}$.
This is apparently a direct consequence of Lemma 4.2. In fact, we have $a_{i} \leq$ $2 e_{i} \leq 2 e_{i}^{\prime}$ by Lemma 4.2 for all $i>0$. Thus

$$
\sum_{i=1}^{p} a_{i}\left(\left.E_{i}\right|_{S_{1}}\right) \leq 2 \sum_{i=1}^{p} e_{i}^{\prime}\left(\left.E_{i}\right|_{S_{1}}\right) \leq 2\left(\sum_{i=1}^{p} e_{i}^{\prime}\left(\left.E_{i}\right|_{S_{1}}\right)+\sum_{j=1}^{q} d_{j}\left(\left.L_{j}\right|_{S_{1}}\right)\right)
$$

On the other hand, it is obvious that $\left.E_{0}\right|_{S_{1}}-G \leq 2\left(\left.E_{0}\right|_{S_{1}}-G\right)$. Therefore we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
E_{V} & =\left(\left.E_{0}\right|_{S_{1}}-G\right)+\sum_{i=1}^{p} a_{i}\left(\left.E_{i}\right|_{S_{1}}\right) \\
& \leq 2\left(\left.E_{0}\right|_{S_{1}}-G\right)+2\left(\sum_{i=1}^{p} e_{i}^{\prime}\left(\left.E_{i}\right|_{S_{1}}\right)+\sum_{j=1}^{q} d_{j}\left(\left.L_{j}\right|_{S_{1}}\right)\right)=2 E_{V}^{\prime}
\end{aligned}
$$

and the claim is proved.
Since that $2 E_{V}^{\prime}-E_{V}$ is effective and vertical, we see that $E_{V} \cdot G \leq 2 E_{V}^{\prime} \cdot G$. On the surface $S_{1}$, we have

$$
\left(K_{S_{1}}+2 C+G\right) G=2 p_{a}(G)-2+2 G \cdot C=2 p_{a}(G) \geq 0 .
$$

On the other hand, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left(K_{S_{1}}\right. & +2 C+G) G \\
& =\left(\left(\left.\pi^{*}\left(K_{X}\right)\right|_{S_{1}}+E_{V}+G+\left.S_{1}\right|_{S_{1}}\right)+2 C+G\right) G \\
& \leq\left(\left.\pi^{*}\left(K_{X}\right)\right|_{S_{1}}+\left.S_{1}\right|_{S_{1}}+G\right) \cdot G+2 E_{V}^{\prime} \cdot G+2+G^{2} \\
& =\left.2 \pi^{*}\left(K_{X}\right)\right|_{S_{1}} \cdot G+E_{V}^{\prime} \cdot G+G^{2}+2 .
\end{aligned}
$$

So we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left.2 \pi^{*}\left(K_{X}\right)\right|_{S_{1}} \cdot G+E_{V}^{\prime} \cdot G+G^{2}+2 \geq 0 \tag{4.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

We also have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left.\pi^{*}\left(K_{X}\right)\right|_{S_{1}} \cdot G=\left.S_{1}\right|_{S_{1}} \cdot G+E_{V}^{\prime} \cdot G+G^{2} \tag{4.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Combining (4.3) and (4.4), we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left.3 \pi^{*}\left(K_{X}\right)\right|_{S_{1}} \cdot G \geq\left. S_{1}\right|_{S_{1}} \cdot G-2 \geq p_{g}(X)-4 \\
& \pi^{*}\left(K_{X}\right) \cdot S_{1} \cdot E^{\prime} \geq\left.\pi^{*}\left(K_{X}\right)\right|_{S_{1}} \cdot G \geq \frac{1}{3}\left(p_{g}(X)-4\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

Finally, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
K_{X}^{3} & =\pi^{*}\left(K_{X}\right)^{3} \geq \pi^{*}\left(K_{X}\right)^{2} \cdot S_{1} \\
& =\left.\left.\pi^{*}\left(K_{X}\right)\right|_{S_{1}} \cdot S_{1}\right|_{S_{1}}+\left.\left.\pi^{*}\left(K_{X}\right)\right|_{S_{1}} \cdot E^{\prime}\right|_{S_{1}} \\
& \geq\left(p_{g}(X)-2\right)+\frac{1}{3}\left(p_{g}(X)-4\right)=\frac{2}{3}\left(2 p_{g}(X)-5\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

The inequality is sharp by virtue of (0.1). The proof is complete.
Remark 4.4. As was pointed out by M. Reid ([R3, Remark (0.4)(v)]), the blow-up of a canonical singularity need not be normal and thus it need not be canonical, even if the original canonical point is a hypersurface singularity of multiplicity 2. Because of this reason, we would rather treat a smooth 3-fold in Theorem 4.3, although the method might be all right for Gorenstein 3 -folds.

Lemma 4.5. Let $X$ be a smooth projective 3-fold of general type. Suppose $p_{g}(X) \geq 3, \quad \operatorname{dim} \phi_{1}(X)=1$. Keep the same notations as in subsection 1.3. If $\left(K_{F_{0}}^{2}, p_{g}(F)\right)=(1,2)$, then one of the following holds:
(i) $b=1, q(X)=1$ and $h^{2}\left(\mathcal{O}_{X}\right)=0$;
(ii) $b=0, q(X)=0$ and $h^{2}\left(\mathcal{O}_{X}\right) \leq 1$.

Proof. Replacing $X$ by a birational model, if necessary, we may suppose that $\phi_{1}$ is a morphism. Note that we do not need here the minimality of $X$. Taking the Steinfactorization of $\phi_{1}$, we get a derived fibration $f: X \rightarrow W$. Let $F$ be a general fiber of $f$. By assumption, $\left(K_{F_{0}}^{2}, p_{g}(F)\right)=(1,2)$ where $F_{0}$ is the minimal model of $F$. According to [Ch2, Theorem 1], we see that $b=g(W) \leq 1$ whenever $p_{g}(X) \geq 3$. Because $q(F)=0$, we can easily see that $q(X)=b$ and $h^{2}\left(\mathcal{O}_{X}\right)=h^{1}\left(W, f_{*} \omega_{X}\right)$. In order to prove the lemma, it is sufficient to study $h^{1}\left(W, f_{*} \omega_{X}\right)$. Since we are in a very special situation, we should be able to obtain much more explicit information.

Let $\mathscr{L}_{0}$ be the saturated sub-bundle of $f_{*} \omega_{X}$ which is generated by $H^{0}\left(W, f_{*} \omega_{X}\right)$. Because $\left|K_{X}\right|$ is composed of a pencil of surfaces and $\phi_{1}$ factors through $f$, we see that $\mathscr{L}_{0}$ is a line bundle on $W$. Denote $\mathscr{L}_{1}:=f_{*} \omega_{X} / \mathscr{L}_{0}$. Then we have the exact sequence:

$$
0 \rightarrow \mathscr{L}_{0} \rightarrow f_{*} \omega_{X} \rightarrow \mathscr{L}_{1} \rightarrow 0
$$

Noting that $\operatorname{rk}\left(f_{*} \omega_{X}\right)=2$, we see that $\mathscr{L}_{1}$ is also a line bundle. Noting that $H^{0}\left(W, \mathscr{L}_{0}\right) \cong H^{0}\left(W, f_{*} \omega_{X}\right), \quad$ we have $h^{1}\left(W, \mathscr{L}_{0}\right) \geq h^{0}\left(W, \mathscr{L}_{1}\right)$. When $b=1$,
$\operatorname{deg}\left(\mathscr{L}_{0}\right)=p_{g}(X) \geq 3$. When $b=0, \quad \operatorname{deg}\left(\mathscr{L}_{0}\right)=p_{g}(X)-1 \geq 2$. Anyway, we have $h^{1}\left(W, \mathscr{L}_{0}\right)=0$. So $h^{0}\left(W, \mathscr{L}_{1}\right)=0$. On the other hand, it is well-known that $f_{*} \omega_{X / W}$ is semi-positive. Thus $\operatorname{deg}\left(\mathscr{L}_{1} \otimes \omega_{W}^{-1}\right) \geq 0$. This means $\operatorname{deg}\left(\mathscr{L}_{1}\right) \geq 2(b-1)$. Using the R-R, we may easily deduce that $h^{1}\left(\mathscr{L}_{1}\right) \leq 1-b$. So

$$
h^{1}\left(W, f_{*} \omega_{X}\right) \leq h^{1}\left(W, \mathscr{L}_{0}\right)+h^{1}\left(W, \mathscr{L}_{1}\right) \leq 1-b
$$

So $h^{2}\left(\mathcal{O}_{X}\right) \leq 1-b$. The proof is complete.
Lemma 4.6. Let $X$ be a smooth projective 3-fold of general type. Suppose $p_{g}(X) \geq 3, \operatorname{dim} \phi_{1}(X)=1$ and $\left(K_{F_{0}}^{2}, p_{g}(F)\right)=(1,2)$. Let $f: X \rightarrow W$ be a derived fibration of $\phi_{1}$. Suppose $F_{1}$ and $F_{2}$ are two fixed smooth fibres of $f$ such that $\phi_{1}\left(F_{1}\right) \neq \phi_{1}\left(F_{2}\right)$. Then $\operatorname{dim} \Phi_{\left|K_{X}+F_{1}+F_{2}\right|}(X)=2$ and $\left.\Phi_{\left|K_{X}+F_{1}+F_{2}\right|}\right|_{F}=\Phi_{\left|K_{F}\right|}$ for a general fiber $F$.

Proof (i) If $b=1$, we have $h^{2}\left(\mathcal{O}_{X}\right)=0$ by Lemma 4.5. From the exact sequence

$$
H^{0}\left(X, K_{X}+F_{1}+F_{2}\right) \rightarrow H^{0}\left(F_{1}, K_{F_{1}}\right) \oplus H^{0}\left(F_{2}, K_{F_{2}}\right) \rightarrow 0
$$

one may easily see that $\operatorname{dim} \Phi_{\left|K_{X}+F_{1}+F_{2}\right|}(X)=2$. Thus, for a general fiber $F$, $\operatorname{dim} \Phi_{\left|K_{X}+F_{1}+F_{2}\right|}(F)=1$. Since $p_{g}(F)=2$, one sees that $\left.\Phi_{\left|K_{X}+F_{1}+F_{2}\right|}\right|_{F}=\Phi_{\left|K_{F}\right|}$.
(ii) If $b=0$, we only have to study $\left.\left|K_{X}+2 F_{1}\right|\right|_{F}$ for a general fiber $F$. From the short exact sequence:

$$
0 \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{X}\left(K_{X}+F_{1}-F\right) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{X}\left(K_{X}+F_{1}\right) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{F}\left(K_{F}\right) \rightarrow 0
$$

we have the long exact sequence

$$
\begin{aligned}
\cdots & \rightarrow H^{0}\left(X, K_{X}+F_{1}\right) \xrightarrow{\alpha_{1}} H^{0}\left(F, K_{F}\right) \xrightarrow{\beta_{1}} H^{1}\left(X, K_{X}\right) \\
& \rightarrow H^{1}\left(X, K_{X}+F_{1}\right) \rightarrow H^{1}\left(F, K_{F}\right)=0
\end{aligned}
$$

If $\alpha_{1}$ is surjective for general $F$, then we see that

$$
\operatorname{dim} \Phi_{\left|K_{X}+F_{1}\right|}(F)=\operatorname{dim} \Phi_{\left|K_{F}\right|}(F)=1 \quad \text { and } \quad \operatorname{dim} \Phi_{\left|K_{X}+F_{1}\right|}(X)=2
$$

So $\operatorname{dim} \Phi_{\left|K_{X}+2 F_{1}\right|}(X)=2$. We are done. Otherwise, $\alpha_{1}$ is not surjective. Because $\alpha_{1} \neq 0$, we see that $h^{2}\left(\mathcal{O}_{X}\right)=h^{1}\left(X, K_{X}\right) \geq 1$. Because $h^{2}\left(\mathcal{O}_{X}\right) \leq 1, h^{2}\left(\mathcal{O}_{X}\right)=1$ and $\beta_{1}$ is surjective. Therefore $H^{1}\left(X, K_{X}+F_{1}\right)=0$. This also means that $H^{1}\left(X, K_{X}+F^{\prime}\right)=0$ for any smooth fiber $F^{\prime}$ since $F^{\prime} \sim F_{1}$. So we have $H^{1}\left(X, K_{X}+2 F_{1}-F\right)=0$, which means $\left.\left|K_{X}+2 F_{1}\right|\right|_{F}=\left|K_{F}\right|$. So $\operatorname{dim} \Phi_{\left|K_{X}+2 F_{1}\right|}(X)=2$. The proof is complete.

Theorem 4.7. Let $X$ be a smooth projective 3-fold with ample canonical divisor. Suppose $\operatorname{dim} \phi_{1}(X)=1$ and $X$ is canonically fibered by surfaces with invariants $\left(c_{1}^{2}, p_{g}\right)=$ $(1,2)$. Then $K_{X}^{3} \geq(2 / 3)\left(2 p_{g}(X)-7\right)$.

Proof. The proof is slightly longer, however with the same flavour as that of Theorem 4.3.

Denote by $\bar{F}$ a generic irreducible element of $\left|K_{X}\right|$. We see that $\bar{F}^{2}$ is a 1 -cycle on $X$. If the movable part of $\left|K_{X}\right|$ has base points, then $\bar{F}^{2}$ is a non-trivial effective 1cycle. So $K_{X} \cdot \bar{F}^{2} \geq 2$. Thus $K_{X}^{3} \geq 2 p_{g}(X)-2$. Therefore we only have to treat the case when $\phi_{1}$ is a morphism.

We suppose $p_{g}(X) \geq 3$. We still assume that $f: X \rightarrow W$ is a derived fibration of $\phi_{1}$. Note that $b=g(W) \leq 1$. Let $\bar{M}$ be the movable part of $\left|K_{X}+F_{1}+F_{2}\right|$. Also note that $F$ is minimal in this situation and $\left(K_{F}^{2}, p_{g}(F)\right)=(1,2)$. It is well-known that $\left|K_{F}\right|$ has exactly one base point, but no fixed part, and that a general member of $\left|K_{F}\right|$ is a smooth irreducible curve of genus 2. Since $\left.\left|K_{X}+F_{1}+F_{2}\right|\right|_{F}=\left|K_{F}\right|$ and according to Lemma 2.6, we see that $\left.\bar{M}\right|_{F}=K_{F}$. This means that $|\bar{M}|$ definitely has base points. According to Hironaka, we can take successive blow-ups

$$
\pi: X^{\prime}=X_{n} \xrightarrow{\pi_{n}} X_{n-1} \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow X_{i} \xrightarrow{\pi_{i}} X_{i-1} \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow X_{1} \xrightarrow{\pi_{1}} X_{0}=X
$$

such that
(i) $\pi_{i}$ is a single blow-up along smooth center $W_{i}$ on $X_{i-1}$ for all $i$;
(ii) $W_{i}$ is contained in the base locus of the movable part of

$$
\left|\left(\pi_{1} \circ \pi_{2} \circ \cdots \circ \pi_{i-1}\right)^{*}(\bar{M})\right|
$$

and thus $W_{i}$ is a reduced closed point or a smooth projective curve on $X_{i-1}$;
(iii) the movable part of $\left|\pi^{*}(\bar{M})\right|$ has no base points.

Denote by $E_{i}$ the exceptional divisor on $X^{\prime}$ corresponding to $W_{i}$ for all $i$. Note that the resulting 3 -fold $X^{\prime}$ is still smooth. Let $M$ be the movable part of $\left|\pi^{*}(\bar{M})\right|$ and $S \in|M|$ be a general member. Then $S$ is a smooth irreducible projective surface of general type. Denote $f^{\prime}:=f \circ \pi$. Then $f^{\prime}: X^{\prime} \rightarrow W$ is still a fibration. Let $F^{\prime}$ be a general fiber of $f^{\prime}$. Note that $F^{\prime}$ has the minimal model $F$. We may write

$$
K_{X^{\prime}} \sim \pi^{*}\left(K_{X}\right)+\sum_{i=0}^{p} a_{i} E_{i}=\pi^{*}\left(K_{X}\right)+E
$$

and $\pi^{*}(\bar{M})=M+\sum_{i=0}^{p} e_{i} E_{i}$. According to Lemma 4.2, we have $0<a_{i} \leq 2 e_{i}$ for all $i$. Recall that we have $K_{X} \sim S_{1}+Z=\sum_{i=1}^{b_{1}} F_{i}+Z$, where $b_{1} \geq p_{g}(X)-1$, the $F_{i}^{\prime} s$ are fibers of $f, S_{1}$ is the movable part of $\left|K_{X}\right|$ and $Z$ the fixed part of $\left|K_{X}\right|$. Note that there is an effective divisor $Z_{0} \leq Z$ such that $\bar{M} \sim S_{1}+F_{1}+F_{2}+Z_{0}$. We write

$$
\begin{aligned}
\pi^{*}\left(K_{X}+F_{1}+F_{2}\right) & \sim \pi^{*}\left(\bar{M}+Z-Z_{0}\right)=M+\sum_{i=0}^{p} e_{i} E_{i}+\pi^{*}\left(Z-Z_{0}\right) \\
& =M+\sum_{i=0}^{p} e_{i}^{\prime} E_{i}+\sum_{j=1}^{q} d_{j} L_{j}=: M+E^{\prime}
\end{aligned}
$$

where $E_{i} \neq L_{j}, d_{j}>0, e_{i}^{\prime} \geq e_{i}$ for all $i$ and $L_{j_{1}} \neq L_{j_{2}}$ whenever $j_{1} \neq j_{2}$. Note that $\pi^{*}(\bar{M}) \geq \pi^{*}\left(S_{1}+F_{1}+F_{2}\right)$ and that the strict transform of $S_{1}$ is a union of $b_{1}$ fibers of $f^{\prime}$, we see that

$$
\left.M\right|_{S} \geq\left.\left.\sum_{j=1}^{b_{1}+m} F_{j}^{\prime}\right|_{S} \equiv\left(b_{1}+m\right) F^{\prime}\right|_{S}
$$

where the $F_{j}^{\prime} s$ are fibers of $f^{\prime}$ and $m=2$. Because $\operatorname{dim} \Phi_{|M|}\left(X^{\prime}\right)=2$, we see $\operatorname{dim} \Phi_{|M|}(S)=1$ for a general member $S$. So, on $S$, the system $|M|_{S} \mid$ should be composed of a free pencil of curves since $\left(\left.M\right|_{S}\right)^{2}=M^{3}=0$. On the other hand, we
obviously have $H^{0}\left(X^{\prime}, K_{X^{\prime}}-S\right)=0$. This instantly gives the inclusion $H^{0}\left(X^{\prime}, K_{X^{\prime}}\right) \hookrightarrow$ $H^{0}\left(S,\left.K_{X^{\prime}}\right|_{S}\right)$. So $\operatorname{dim} \Phi_{\left|K_{X^{\prime}}\right|}(S) \geq 1$. Because $\operatorname{dim} \phi_{1}(X)=1$, we see that $\operatorname{dim} \Phi_{\left|K_{X^{\prime}}\right|}(S)$ $=1$. Thus it is clear $f^{\prime}(S)=W$. So we have a surjective morphism $\left.f^{\prime}\right|_{S}: S \rightarrow W$. The fiber of $\left.f^{\prime}\right|_{S}$ is exactly $F^{\prime} \cap S$ or the divisor $\left.F^{\prime}\right|_{S}$. Since $|M|_{S} \mid$ is composed of a pencil of curves, $\left.M\right|_{S} \geq\left.\sum_{j=1}^{b_{1}+m} F_{j}^{\prime}\right|_{S}$ and $\left|\sum_{j=1}^{b_{1}+m} F_{j}^{\prime}\right|_{S} \mid$ is vertical, we see that $|M|_{S} \mid$ is also vertical, i.e. $\left.\operatorname{dim} f^{\prime}\right|_{S}\left(\left.M\right|_{S}\right)=0$. This means that the divisor $\left.M\right|_{S}$ is vertical with respect to the morphism $\left.f^{\prime}\right|_{S}$. By taking the Stein-factorization of $\left.f^{\prime}\right|_{S}$, one can see that $\left.F^{\prime}\right|_{S}$ is linearly equivalent to a disjoint union of irreducible curves of the same numerical type and $\left.F^{\prime}\right|_{S} \equiv \xi C$ where $C$ is certain irreducible curve and $\xi$ is a positive integer.

Recall that $E^{\prime}:=\sum_{i=0}^{p} e_{i}^{\prime} E_{i}+\sum_{j=1}^{q} d_{j} L_{j}$. We may write $\left.E^{\prime}\right|_{S}:=E_{V}^{\prime}+E_{H}^{\prime}$ where $E_{V}^{\prime}$ is the vertical part and $E_{H}^{\prime}$ is the horizontal part with $\left.E_{H}^{\prime} \cdot F^{\prime}\right|_{S}>0$. Noting that $\left.\pi^{*}\left(K_{X}+F_{1}+F_{2}\right)\right|_{S}$ is nef and big and that $\left.M\right|_{S}$ is vertical, we see that $E_{H}^{\prime}$ is nontrivial. So we have

$$
\left.\pi^{*}\left(K_{X}+F_{1}+F_{2}\right)\right|_{S}=\left.M\right|_{S}+\left.E^{\prime}\right|_{S}=\left.M\right|_{S}+E_{V}^{\prime}+E_{H}^{\prime}
$$

Also recall that $E:=\sum_{i=0}^{p} a_{i} E_{i}$. Denote $\left.E\right|_{S}:=E_{V}+E_{H}$ where $E_{V}$ is the vertical part and $E_{H}$ is the horizontal part. We have

$$
\begin{aligned}
0 & <\left.F^{\prime}\right|_{S} \cdot E_{H}^{\prime}=\left.\left.F^{\prime}\right|_{S} \cdot E^{\prime}\right|_{S}=\left.\left.F^{\prime}\right|_{S} \cdot \pi^{*}\left(K_{X}+F_{1}+F_{2}\right)\right|_{S} \\
& =F^{\prime} \cdot \pi^{*}\left(K_{X}+F_{1}+F_{2}\right) \cdot S \\
& \leq F^{\prime} \cdot \pi^{*}\left(K_{X}+F_{1}+F_{2}\right) \cdot \pi^{*}\left(K_{X}+F_{1}+F_{2}\right)=K_{X}^{2} \cdot F=1 .
\end{aligned}
$$

This means

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left.F^{\prime}\right|_{S} \cdot E_{H}^{\prime}=\left.\left.F^{\prime}\right|_{S} \cdot \pi^{*}\left(K_{X}\right)\right|_{S}=1,  \tag{4.5}\\
& \left.\left.\pi^{*}\left(F_{1}\right)\right|_{S} \cdot F^{\prime}\right|_{S}=0 . \tag{4.6}
\end{align*}
$$

Thus we see that $\xi=1$ and thus $\left.f^{\prime}\right|_{S}: S \rightarrow W$ is a fibration. This also means that $E_{H}^{\prime}$ is irreducible and that it comes from certain irreducible component of $E^{\prime}$. For generic $S$ and $F^{\prime}$, because $\left.S\right|_{F^{\prime}}$ is the movable part of $\left|K_{F^{\prime}}\right|$, we see that $\left.S\right|_{F^{\prime}}$ is an irreducible curve of genus two. This means $C=S \cap F^{\prime}$ is a smooth curve of genus 2 on $S$ and $C^{2}=\left(\left.F^{\prime}\right|_{S}\right)^{2}=0$. Thus $K_{S} \cdot C=2$, i.e.

$$
\left(E_{V}+E_{H}+\left.\pi^{*}\left(K_{X}\right)\right|_{S}+\left.S\right|_{S}\right) \cdot C=2
$$

Noting that, from (4.5), $\left.\quad S\right|_{S} \cdot C=\left.\left.M\right|_{S} \cdot F^{\prime}\right|_{S}=0$ and $\pi^{*}\left(K_{X}\right) \cdot C=1$, we have $E_{H} \cdot C=1$. This also says that $E_{H}$ comes from certain irreducible component $E_{i}$ in $E$ with $a_{i}=1$. For simplicity we may suppose that this component is just $E_{0}$. So $a_{0}=1$. Now it is quite clear about the structure of $\left.E^{\prime}\right|_{S}$ and $\left.E\right|_{S}$ :

$$
\begin{aligned}
& E_{H}=E_{H}^{\prime} \leq\left. E_{0}\right|_{S}, \quad \sum_{i=1}^{p} a_{i}\left(\left.E_{i}\right|_{S}\right)+\left(\left.E_{0}\right|_{S}-E_{H}\right)=E_{V} \\
& \sum_{i=1}^{p} e_{i}^{\prime}\left(\left.E_{i}\right|_{S}\right)+\sum_{j=1}^{q} d_{j}\left(\left.L_{j}\right|_{S}\right)+\left(\left.E_{0}\right|_{S}-E_{H}^{\prime}\right)=E_{V}^{\prime}
\end{aligned}
$$

Noting that $\left.E_{0}\right|_{S}$ can have only one horizontal component, we denote it by $G:=E_{H}=$ $E_{H}^{\prime}$. Similar to the Claim in the proof of Theorem 4.3, It is easy to see that $E_{V} \leq 2 E_{V}^{\prime}$. Now we may perform the computation on the surface $S$. We have

$$
\left(K_{S}+G+\left.2(1-b) F^{\prime}\right|_{S}\right) \cdot G=2 p_{a}(G)-2+2(1-b) \geq 0
$$

(One notes that $p_{a}(G) \geq 1$ if $b=1$ and $p_{a}(G) \geq 0$ if $b=0$.)

$$
\begin{aligned}
K_{S} \cdot G & =\left(\left.E\right|_{S}+\left.\pi^{*}\left(K_{X}\right)\right|_{S}+\left.S\right|_{S}\right) \cdot G=E_{V} \cdot G+G^{2}+\left.\pi^{*}\left(K_{X}\right)\right|_{S} \cdot G+\left.S\right|_{S} \cdot G \\
& \leq 2 E_{V}^{\prime} \cdot G+G^{2}+\left.S\right|_{S} \cdot G+\left.\pi^{*}\left(K_{X}\right)\right|_{S} \cdot G \\
& =E_{V}^{\prime} \cdot G+\left.\pi^{*}\left(K_{X}+F_{1}+F_{2}\right)\right|_{S} \cdot G+\left.\pi^{*}\left(K_{X}\right)\right|_{S} \cdot G
\end{aligned}
$$

So we get

$$
\begin{equation*}
E_{V}^{\prime} \cdot G+\left.\pi^{*}\left(2 K_{X}+F_{1}+F_{2}\right)\right|_{S} \cdot G+G^{2}+2(1-b) \geq 0 \tag{4.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

On the other hand, we have

$$
\begin{align*}
\left.\pi^{*}\left(K_{X}+F_{1}+F_{2}\right)\right|_{S} \cdot G & =\left.S\right|_{S} \cdot G+E_{V}^{\prime} \cdot G+G^{2} \\
& \geq\left.\left(b_{1}+m\right) F^{\prime}\right|_{S} \cdot G+E_{V}^{\prime} \cdot G+G^{2} \tag{4.8}
\end{align*}
$$

where we note that $\left.S\right|_{S}$ is vertical and, numerically, $\left.S\right|_{S} \geq\left._{\text {num }}\left(b_{1}+m\right) F^{\prime}\right|_{S}$ and $\left.F^{\prime}\right|_{S} \cdot G=1$ by (4.5). Combining (4.7) and (4.8), we get

$$
\left.\pi^{*}\left(3 K_{X}+2 F_{1}+2 F_{2}\right)\right|_{S} \cdot G \geq\left(b_{1}+m\right)+2(b-1)
$$

We have

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left.\pi^{*}\left(3 K_{X}+2 F_{1}+2 F_{2}\right)\right|_{S} \cdot G \leq\left.\left.\pi^{*}\left(3 K_{X}+2 F_{1}+2 F_{2}\right)\right|_{S} \cdot E^{\prime}\right|_{S} \\
& \quad=\left.\pi^{*}\left(3 K_{X}+2 F_{1}+2 F_{2}\right)\right|_{S} \cdot\left(\left.\pi^{*}\left(K_{X}+F_{1}+F_{2}\right)\right|_{S}-\left.S\right|_{S}\right) \\
& \quad=\left.\left.\pi^{*}\left(3 K_{X}+2 F_{1}+2 F_{2}\right)\right|_{S} \cdot \pi^{*}\left(K_{X}+F_{1}+F_{2}\right)\right|_{S}-\left.\left.\pi^{*}\left(3 K_{X}+2 F_{1}+2 F_{2}\right)\right|_{S} \cdot S\right|_{S} \\
& \quad \leq\left(3 K_{X}+2 F_{1}+2 F_{2}\right)\left(K_{X}+F_{1}+F_{2}\right)^{2}-\left.\left.\pi^{*}\left(3 K_{X}+2 F_{1}+2 F_{2}\right)\right|_{S} \cdot S\right|_{S} \\
& \quad=3 K_{X}^{3}+8 m-\left.\left.\pi^{*}\left(3 K_{X}+2 F_{1}+2 F_{2}\right)\right|_{S} \cdot S\right|_{S}
\end{aligned}
$$

Thus $3 K_{X}^{3} \geq b_{1}-7 m+2(b-1)+\left.\left.\pi^{*}\left(3 K_{X}+2 F_{1}+2 F_{2}\right)\right|_{S} \cdot S\right|_{S}$. By (4.5) and (4.6), we get

$$
\left.\left.\pi^{*}\left(3 K_{X}+2 F_{1}+2 F_{2}\right)\right|_{S} \cdot S\right|_{S} \geq\left.\left.\pi^{*}\left(3 K_{X}+2 F_{1}+2 F_{2}\right)\right|_{S} \cdot\left(b_{1}+m\right) F^{\prime}\right|_{S}=3\left(b_{1}+m\right)
$$

So $3 K_{X}^{3} \geq 4 b_{1}-4 m+2(b-1)$. We obtain

$$
K_{X}^{3} \geq \frac{4}{3} b_{1}-\frac{4}{3} m+\frac{2}{3}(b-1) \geq \begin{cases}\frac{4}{3} p_{g}(X)-\frac{8}{3}, & \text { if } b=1 \\ \frac{4}{3} p_{g}(X)-\frac{14}{3}, & \text { if } b=0\end{cases}
$$

Finally, we discuss what happens when $K_{X}^{3}>(4 / 3) p_{g}(X)-(10 / 3)$. Definitely,
$b=0$ and $3 K_{X}^{3}=4 p_{g}(X)-11,4 p_{g}(X)-12,4 p_{g}(X)-13$, or $4 p_{g}(X)-14$. Noting that $K_{X}^{3}$ is an even number, one excludes possibilities $4 p_{g}(X)-11$ and $4 p_{g}(X)-13$. The proof is complete.

Corollary 4.8. Let $X$ be a smooth projective 3-fold with ample canonical divisor. Then we have the following Noether inequality

$$
K_{X}^{3} \geq \frac{2}{3}\left(2 p_{g}(X)-7\right)
$$

Proof. This is a direct result of Theorem 4.1, Theorem 4.3 and Theorem 4.7.

Corollary 4.8 implies Corollary 2. Theorem 4.1, Theorem 4.3 and Theorem 4.7 imply Theorem 5(1) and Theorem 5(2).

## 5. An appendix.

We go on proving Theorem 5 in this section.
Proposition 5.1. Let $X$ be a projective minimal Gorenstein 3-fold of general type with only locally factorial terminal singularities. Suppose $X$ has a locally factorial canonical model. If $\operatorname{dim} \phi_{1}(X)=1$ and $\left(K_{F_{0}}^{2}, p_{g}(F)\right)=(1,2)$, then

$$
K_{X}^{3} \geq \frac{2}{21}\left(11 p_{g}(X)-16\right)
$$

Proof. If the movable part of $\left|K_{X}\right|$ has base points, then we have $K_{X}^{3} \geq$ $2 p_{g}(X)-2$ according to [Kob, Case 1, Theorem (4.1)] because $X$ is assumed to have a locally factorial canonical model. So we may suppose $\Phi_{\left|K_{X}\right|}$ is a morphism.

Taking the Stein-factorization of $\Phi_{\left|K_{X}\right|}$, we get the derived fibration $f: X \rightarrow W$. Let $M_{1}$ be the movable part of $\left|K_{X}\right|$ and $S_{1} \in\left|M_{1}\right|$ a general member. We may write $S_{1} \sim \sum_{i=1}^{b_{1}} F_{i} \equiv b_{1} F$, where the $F_{i}^{\prime} s$ are fibers of $f, F$ is a general fiber of $f$ and $b_{1} \geq p_{g}(X)-1$. Because $X$ is minimal, $F$ is a minimal surface. Since $X$ has isolated singularities, $F$ is smooth. Note that we have $K_{F}^{2}=1$ and $p_{g}(F)=2$ under the assumption of the proposition. We may also write $K_{X} \equiv b_{1} F+Z$, where $Z$ is the fixed part of $\left|K_{X}\right|$. According to [Ch2, Theorem 1], we have $b:=g(W) \leq 1$ provided $p_{g}(X) \geq 3$. From $[\mathbf{L}]$, we know that $\left|4 K_{X}\right|$ is base point free. Let $S_{4} \in\left|4 K_{X}\right|$ be a general member. Since $X$ has isolated singularities, $S_{4}$ is a smooth projective irreducible surface of general type. We see that $f\left(S_{4}\right)=W$. Denote $f_{0}:=\left.f\right|_{S_{4}}$. Then $f_{0}: S_{4} \rightarrow W$ is a proper surjective morphism onto $W$ ( $f_{0}$ need not be a fibration). Because $f(F)$ is a point, $\left.F\right|_{S_{4}}$ is vertical with respect to $f_{0}$, i.e., $\operatorname{dim} f_{0}\left(\left.F\right|_{S_{4}}\right)=0$. Now we have $\left.\left.K_{X}\right|_{S_{4}} \equiv b_{1} F\right|_{S_{4}}+\left.Z\right|_{S_{4}}$. Denote $\left.Z\right|_{S_{4}}:=Z_{V}+Z_{H}$, where $Z_{V}$ is the vertical part and $Z_{H}$ is the horizontal part. We may write $Z_{H}:=\sum m_{i} G_{i}$, where $m_{i}>0$ and the $G_{i}^{\prime} s$ are distinct irreducible curves on $S_{4}$. We have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left(\left.F\right|_{S_{4}} \cdot Z_{H}\right)_{S_{4}} & =\left(\left.\left.F\right|_{S_{4}} \cdot Z\right|_{S_{4}}\right)_{S_{4}}=\left(F \cdot S_{4} \cdot Z\right)_{X} \\
& =\left(\left.\left.S_{4}\right|_{F} \cdot Z\right|_{F}\right)_{F}=4\left(\left.\left.K_{X}\right|_{F} \cdot K_{X}\right|_{F}\right)_{F}=4 K_{F}^{2}=4 .
\end{aligned}
$$

Thus $m_{i} \leq 4$ for all i. Denote

$$
D:=4 K_{S_{4}}-\left.8(b-1) F\right|_{S_{4}}+Z_{V}+Z_{H}
$$

We claim that $D \cdot G_{i} \geq 0$ for all $i$. In fact, since $Z_{V} \cdot G_{i} \geq 0$ and $G_{i} \cdot G_{j} \geq 0$ for $i \neq j$, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
D \cdot G_{i} & \geq 4 K_{S_{4}} \cdot G_{i}-\left.8(b-1) F\right|_{S_{4}} \cdot G_{i}+m_{i} G_{i}^{2} \\
& =\left(4-m_{i}\right) K_{S_{4}} \cdot G_{i}+m_{i}\left(K_{S_{4}} \cdot G_{i}+G_{i}^{2}\right)-\left.8(b-1) F\right|_{S_{4}} \cdot G_{i} \\
& =\left(4-m_{i}\right) K_{S_{4}} \cdot G_{i}+m_{i}\left(2 p_{a}\left(G_{i}\right)-2\right)-\left.8(b-1) F\right|_{S_{4}} \cdot G_{i} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Note that both $K_{S_{4}}$ and $\left.F\right|_{S_{4}}$ are nef. When $b=1$, we have $p_{a}\left(G_{i}\right) \geq b=1$. Thus $D \cdot G_{i} \geq\left(4-m_{i}\right) K_{S_{4}} \cdot G_{i} \geq 0$. When $b=0$,

$$
D \cdot G_{i} \geq\left(4-m_{i}\right) K_{S_{4}} \cdot G_{i}+\left.\left(8-2 m_{i}\right) F\right|_{S_{4}} \cdot G_{i}+m_{i}\left[2 p_{a}\left(G_{i}\right)-2+\left.2 F\right|_{S_{4}} \cdot G_{i}\right] \geq 0 .
$$

Therefore we get $D \cdot Z_{H} \geq 0$. This means

$$
\begin{equation*}
4 K_{S_{4}} \cdot Z_{H}-\left.8(b-1) F\right|_{S_{4}} \cdot Z_{H}+\left(Z_{V}+Z_{H}\right) Z_{H} \geq 0 \tag{5.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

On the other hand, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left.K_{X}\right|_{S_{4}} \cdot Z_{H}=\left.b_{1} F\right|_{S_{4}} \cdot Z_{H}+\left(Z_{V}+Z_{H}\right) Z_{H} \tag{5.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Combining (5.1) and (5.2), we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
4 K_{S_{4}} \cdot Z_{H}+\left.K_{X}\right|_{S_{4}} \cdot Z_{H} & \geq\left.\left(b_{1}+8(b-1)\right) F\right|_{S_{4}} \cdot Z_{H} \\
& \geq 4\left(p_{g}(X)+10 b-11\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

We also have

$$
\begin{aligned}
4 K_{S_{4}} \cdot Z_{H}+\left.K_{X}\right|_{S_{4}} \cdot Z_{H} & =\left.5 K_{X}\right|_{S_{4}} \cdot Z_{H}+\left.4 S_{4}\right|_{S_{4}} \cdot Z_{H} \\
& \leq\left.\left. 5 K_{X}\right|_{S_{4}} \cdot Z\right|_{S_{4}}+\left.\left.4 S_{4}\right|_{S_{4}} \cdot Z\right|_{S_{4}}=84 K_{X}^{2} \cdot Z
\end{aligned}
$$

Thus we obtain

$$
K_{X}^{2} \cdot Z \geq \frac{1}{21}\left(p_{g}(X)+10 b-11\right)= \begin{cases}\frac{1}{21}\left(p_{g}(X)-11\right), & \text { if } b=0 \\ \frac{1}{21}\left(p_{g}(X)-1\right), & \text { if } b=1\end{cases}
$$

Finally we get

$$
K_{X}^{3} \geq b_{1} K_{X}^{2} \cdot F+K_{X}^{2} \cdot Z \geq \begin{cases}\frac{2}{21}\left(11 p_{g}(X)-16\right), & \text { if } b=0 \\ \frac{22}{21}\left(p_{g}(X)-1\right), & \text { if } b=1\end{cases}
$$

The proof is complete.
Section 4 and Proposition 5.1 imply Theorem 5(3).
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