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Let $S$ be a Burniat surface with $K_{S}^{2}=6$. Then we show that $\operatorname{glct}\left(S, K_{S}\right)=\frac{1}{2}$ by showing that $\operatorname{glct}\left(S, 2 K_{S}\right)=\operatorname{lct}(S, E)=\frac{1}{4}$ for some divisor $E \in\left|2 K_{S}\right|$. This implies that Tian's conjecture (which fails in general) holds for the polarized pair $\left(S, 2 K_{S}\right)$, since the corresponding graded algebra is generated by sections of $H^{0}\left(S, 2 K_{S}\right)$.

Moreover we verify that any divisor $D \in\left|m K_{S}\right|$ such that $\operatorname{glct}\left(S, K_{S}\right)=\operatorname{lct}\left(S, \frac{1}{m} D\right)$ for a positive even integer $m$ is invariant under the $\mathbb{Z}_{2}^{2}$-action associated to the bicanonical map of $S$.

## 1. Introduction

Let $X$ be a normal variety with at worst $\log$ canonical singularities and let $D$ be an effective $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier divisor on it. The discrepancy of the log pair $(X, D)$ is used to measure how singular it is. If $(X, D)$ is not $\log$ canonical then the discrepancy of it is $-\infty$. In such a case, it gives no more information than non-log canonicity of $(X, D)$. Then we need the notion of $\log$ canonical threshold. The following number is the definition of the $\log$ canonical threshold of $D$ along a subvariety $Z$ of $X$.

$$
\operatorname{lct}_{Z}(X, D):=\sup \{\lambda \in \mathbb{Q} \mid(X, \lambda D) \text { is } \log \text { canonical along } Z\} .
$$

If $Z=X$ then we write $\operatorname{lct}(X, D)=\operatorname{lct}_{Z}(X, D)$.
Now we suppose that the variety $X$ is Fano with at worst $\log$ canonical singularities, that is, the anti-canonical divisor $-K_{X}$ of it is ample. Using the definition of the $\log$ canonical threshold we can define the global log canonical threshold of $X$.

Definition 1.1. The global log canonical threshold of $X$ is the number

$$
\operatorname{glct}(X):=\inf \left\{\begin{array}{l|l}
\operatorname{lct}(X, D) & \begin{array}{l}
D \text { is an effective } \mathbb{Q} \text {-Cartier divisor on } X \\
\mathbb{Q} \text {-linearly equivalent to }-K_{X}
\end{array}
\end{array}\right\} .
$$

Meanwhile, Tian introduced the $\alpha$-invariant to study the existence of Kähler-Einstein metrics on Fano manifolds. He proved that if the $\alpha$-invariant of a smooth Fano manifold $X$ is bigger than $\operatorname{dim} X /(\operatorname{dim} X+1)$ then it admits a Kähler-Einstein metric (see [11, 13, 18, 21]). The global log canonical threshold is an algebraic counterpart to Tian's $\alpha$-invariant [11]. Thus, to prove the existence of a Kähler-Einstein metric of Fano manifolds we can use the global $\log$ canonical threshold instead of the $\alpha$-invariant. Later, Tian generalized the $\alpha$-invariant for arbitrary polarized pairs $(X, L)$ which is still a counterpart of the global $\log$ canonical threshold [11], where $X$ is a smooth variety and $L$ is an ample divisor on it.

Here, we use the global log canonical threshold for a $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier divisor $\mathcal{L}$ on a normal variety $X$ with at worst $\log$ canonical singularity.

Definition 1.2. Let $X$ be a normal variety with at worst log canonical singularity, and $\mathcal{L}$ be a $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier divisor on $X$. The global log canonical threshold of a pair $(X, \mathcal{L})$ is the number

$$
\operatorname{glct}(X, \mathcal{L}):=\inf \left\{\operatorname{lct}(X, D) \left\lvert\, \begin{array}{l}
D \text { is an effective } \mathbb{Q} \text {-Cartier divisor on } X \\
\mathbb{Q} \text {-linearly equivalent to } \mathcal{L}
\end{array}\right.\right\} .
$$

At the moment, we know plenty of results about global log canonical thresholds of del Pezzo surfaces and higher dimensional Fano varieties. Thus, it seems interesting to do the same for other varieties. Surfaces of general type (polarized by their canonical divisors) is the most natural choice to start with. However, this is impossible to do for all surfaces of general type, simply because they do not form a bounded family. But one can try to do this for some of them whose geometry is somehow similar to del Pezzo surfaces.

Chen, Chen and Jiang [12] recently established Noether inequality for projective 3 -folds with an appendix by Kollár which is the first application of a global $\log$ canonical threshold of a surface of general type via its canonical divisor. Kollár in the appendix gave an optimal lower bound of $\operatorname{glct}(X, \mathcal{L})$ in the case when $X$ is a surface of general type with Du Val singularities such that $K_{X}$ is ample, $K_{X}^{2}=1$ and $h^{0}\left(X, K_{X}\right)=2$, where $\mathcal{L}=K_{X}$.

In this paper we consider global log canonical thresholds of Burniat surfaces with $K^{2}=6$ via their canonical divisors. Burniat [8] constructed minimal surfaces of general type with $p_{g}=0$, and $K^{2}=2,3, \ldots, 6$ using bidouble coverings on $\mathbb{P}^{2}$, called by Burniat surfaces with $K^{2}$. Peters [20] later reconsidered the surfaces constructed by Burniat. He calculated torsion groups of $H_{1}(S, \mathbb{Z})$ for Burniat surfaces $S$ with $K_{S}^{2}$. Note the calculation of Burniat surface with $K^{2}=2$ did not correct. Bauer, Catanese [5] and Kulikov [16]
pointed out and corrected it. Mendes Lopes and Pardini [17] considered a moduli of Burniat surfaces with $K^{2}=6$. Bauer and Catanese [4-7] also dealt with properties of a moduli of Burniat surfaces with each $K^{2}$, and they found extended Burniat surfaces. They clearly verified that surfaces constructed by Inoue [14] is exactly Burniat surfaces in [5]. Inoue [14] constructed the surfaces as quotients of $\mathbb{Z}_{2}^{3}$-invariant hypersurfaces of multidegree ( $2,2,2$ ) in a product of three elliptic curves by the action $\mathbb{Z}_{2}^{3}$. Alexeev and Pardini [3] compactfied Burniat surfaces with $K^{2}=6$ by adding semi log canonical surfaces with ample $K$. And Alexeev and Orlov [2] considered derived categories of Burniat surfaces. They constructed an exceptional collection of maximal possible length of Burniat surfaces with $K^{2}=6$, and showed that the complement of the exceptional collection is a quasi-phantom category.

We firstly treat a polarized pair $\left(S, 2 K_{S}\right)$ where a smooth surface $S$ is a Burniat surface with $K_{S}^{2}=6$. The bicanonical map $\varphi$ of $S$ has an image that is a del Pezzo surface $\Sigma$ of degree 6 in $\mathbb{P}^{6}$ blown-up at three points in $\mathbb{P}^{2}$ in general position. Note the image of a Burniat surface with $K^{2}=5$ is a del Pezzo surface of degree 5 in $\mathbb{P}^{5}$ blown-up at four points in $\mathbb{P}^{2}$ in general position. So the case $K^{2}=6$ is easier to treat than other $K^{2}$ in some sense. Moreover since Catanese [9] described a bidouble covering using a locally explicit equations (see Section 3 ), we use it to calculate the global $\log$ canonical threshold of $S$ via $2 K_{S}$ (see Proposition 4.2). Then we obtain as follows.

Theorem 1.3 (Theorem 4.3). Let $S$ be a Burniat surface with $K_{S}^{2}=6$. Then the global log canonical threshold of the polarized pair $\left(S, K_{S}\right)$ is $\frac{1}{2}$.

To prove Theorem 1.3 we show that

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

for some divisor $D \in\left|2 K_{S}\right|$.
Since a Burniat surface $S$ with $K_{S}^{2}=6$ has the $\mathbb{Z}_{2}^{2}$-action induced by the bicanonical map $\varphi$ of $S$, we ask that the global log canonical threshold of the polarized pair $\left(S, K_{S}\right)$ is given by an invariant global section of $m K_{S}$ or not by an anti-invariant section of $m K_{S}$ via the $\mathbb{Z}_{2}^{2}$-action for any positive integer $m$. In Section 5 we give the answer when $m$ is an even integer $m>0$ as follows.

Theorem 1.4 (Theorem 5.3). Let $S$ be a Burniat surface with $K_{S}^{2}=6$ and $m$ be a positive even integer. Then for any divisor $D \in\left|m K_{S}\right|$ such that
$\operatorname{glct}\left(S, K_{S}\right)=\operatorname{lct}\left(S, \frac{1}{m} D\right)$ it is invariant under the $\mathbb{Z}_{2}^{2}$-action associated to the bicanonical map $\varphi$ of $S$.

## 2. Preliminary

Let $X$ be a normal variety with at worst $\log$ canonical singularities and let $A$ be an ample divisor on it. The following is called the convex lemma.

Lemma 2.1. Let $B$ and $B^{\prime}$ be $\mathbb{Q}$-divisors on $X$. Then the log pair

$$
\left(X, \alpha B+(1-\alpha) B^{\prime}\right)
$$

is $\log$ canonical if both $(X, B)$ and $\left(X, B^{\prime}\right)$ are log canonical where $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$.
There is a useful lemma to obtain a global log canonical threshold. Note that $\sim_{\mathbb{Q}}$ means the $\mathbb{Q}$-linearly equivalent relation.

Lemma 2.2. Let $D \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} A$ be an effective $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier divisor on $X$ such that the $\log$ pair $(X, D)$ is not $\log$ canonical at a point p . And let $D_{0} \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} A$ be an effective $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier divisor on $X$ such that the $\log$ pair $\left(X, D_{0}\right)$ is $\log$ canonical at the point p . Then there is an effective $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier divisor $D^{\prime} \sim_{\mathbb{Q}}$ $A$ on $X$ such that at least one component of $D_{0}$ is not contained in the support of $D^{\prime}$ and the log pair $\left(X, D^{\prime}\right)$ is not log canonical at the point p .

Proof. See [11, Remark 2.22].
For a non log canonical pair at some smooth point we use the following.
Lemma 2.3 (cf. [15, 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

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

holds.

## 3. Local coordinates of a Burniat surface

Throughout this paper, a smooth surface $S$ is a Burniat surface with $K_{S}^{2}=$ 6. Then there is the bicanonical morphism $\varphi: S \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^{6}$ given by the linear system $\left|2 K_{S}\right|$ of $S$. Let $\Sigma$ be the image of $\varphi$. Then we have the morphism $\varphi$
that is a bidouble covering map of $\Sigma$ which is a del Pezzo surface of degree 6 (see [17, Proposition 3.1]). Meanwhile, the bidouble covering map $\varphi$ is constructed by the data of effective divisors $B_{1}, B_{2}$ and $B_{3}$ of $\Sigma$ with the conditions

$$
2 L_{i} \sim B_{j}+B_{k}
$$

for $\{i, j, k\}=\{1,2,3\}$, where $L_{i}$ is a divisor on $\Sigma$ (see [19]). Indeed, there is the blow-up $\rho: \Sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^{2}$ at three points $p_{1}, p_{2}$ and $p_{3}$ in general position on $\mathbb{P}^{2}$ with the exceptional divisors $e_{1}, e_{2}$ and $e_{3}$ such that $\rho^{-1}\left(p_{i}\right)=e_{i}$. Let $l_{i}$ be the line in $\mathbb{P}^{2}$ passing through the points $p_{j}$ and $p_{k}$. Denote by $e_{i}^{\prime}$ the strict transform of $l_{i}$. Then $B_{i}=e_{i}+e_{i}^{\prime}+m_{1}^{j}+m_{2}^{j}$ for $(i, j, k) \in$ $\{(1,2,3),(2,3,1),(3,1,2)\}$, where $\varphi\left(m_{1}^{j}\right)$ and $\varphi\left(m_{2}^{j}\right)$ are general lines passing through $p_{j}$ (see [17, Section 3]. Let $V$ be the vector bundle $\bigoplus_{i=1}^{3} \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}\left(L_{i}\right)$ and denote by $w_{1}, w_{2}$ and $w_{3}$ fibre coordinates relative to the three summands. Then there are three equations

$$
w_{i}^{2}=f_{j} f_{k}
$$

where $f_{*}$ is a defining equation of $B_{*}$. The Burniat surface $S$ is a subvariety of $V$ given by

$$
w_{i}^{2}=f_{j} f_{k}, \quad f_{k} w_{k}=w_{i} w_{j}
$$

Let $p$ be the point of $S$ such that $\varphi(p)=e_{2}^{\prime} \cap e_{3}$. Since $f_{1}(p) \neq 0 w_{1}, w_{2}$, $w_{3}$ and $f_{1}$ are local coordinates of $V$ at $p$. On $S$ we have the following

$$
f_{2}=\frac{w_{3}^{2}}{f_{1}}, \quad f_{3}=\frac{w_{2}^{2}}{f_{1}}, \quad w_{1}=\frac{w_{2} w_{3}}{f_{1}}
$$

It implies that $w_{2}$ and $w_{3}$ are local coordinates of $S$ at $p$.
Now we find an effective divisor with a small log canonical threshold. In fact, it is to be the global log canonical threshold of the polarized pair $\left(S, 2 K_{S}\right)$.

Proposition 3.1. There is an effective divisor $E \in\left|2 K_{S}\right|$ such that $\operatorname{lct}(S, E)=\frac{1}{4}$ and $E$ is invariant by the $\mathbb{Z}_{2}^{2}$-action associated to the bidouble covering map over $\Sigma$, the bicanonical map $\varphi$ of $S$.

Proof. Let $L:=l_{1}+2 l_{2}$ be the divisor of $\mathbb{P}^{2}$. Then

$$
\rho^{*}\left(K_{\mathbb{P}^{2}}+L\right) \sim K_{\Sigma}+e_{1}^{\prime}+2 e_{2}^{\prime}+e_{1}+2 e_{3} .
$$

It implies that $-K_{\Sigma} \sim e_{1}^{\prime}+2 e_{2}^{\prime}+e_{1}+2 e_{3}$. We set $e:=e_{1}^{\prime}+2 e_{2}^{\prime}+e_{1}+2 e_{3}$ and $\varphi(p)=e_{2}^{\prime} \cap e_{3}$. Since $e$ is locally isomorphic to the divisor given by $f_{2}^{2} f_{3}^{2}$ at $\varphi(p), E:=\varphi^{*}(e) \sim 2 K_{S}$ is given by $\frac{w_{2}^{4} w_{3}^{4}}{f_{4}^{4}}$ at $p$. Therefore $\operatorname{lct}(S, E)=\frac{1}{4}$.

Also since $E$ is defined by the pull-back of $e$ it is clear that $E$ is invariant by the $\mathbb{Z}_{2}^{2}$-action.

## 4. Global log canonical threshold

In this section, we consider the global log canonical threshold (see Theorem 4.3) for a Burniat surface with $K^{2}=6$. For those we prove Proposition 4.2, that is, the global log canonical threshold of the polarized pair $\left(S, 2 K_{S}\right)$ is $\frac{1}{4}$ where $S$ is a Burniat surface with $K_{S}^{2}=6$. To do so, we assume that there is an effective $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier divisor $D$ such that the $\log$ pair $(S, \mu D)$ is not $\log$ canonical at some point $\mathrm{p} \in S$ where $\mu=\frac{1}{4}$. Then we obtain a contradiction with Lemma 4.1.

A bidouble covering map $\psi$ from a normal variety $X$ to a smooth variety $Y$ gives the building data, divisors $\mathcal{L}_{i}$ and effective divisors $\mathcal{B}_{i}$ on $Y$ for $i=$ $1,2,3$ such that the branch divisor $\mathcal{B}=\mathcal{B}_{1}+\mathcal{B}_{2}+\mathcal{B}_{3}$ of $\psi$ and the relations $2 \mathcal{L}_{i} \sim \mathcal{B}_{j}+\mathcal{B}_{k}$ for $\{i, j, k\}=\{1,2,3\}$. Conversely the building data with the relations constructs the bidouble covering map $\psi$. Then $K_{X} \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} \psi^{*}\left(K_{Y}+\right.$ $\left.\frac{1}{2} \mathcal{B}\right)$. We refer [19] as a reference.

Lemma 4.1 (cf. [15, 3. 16 Proposition and 8.12 Lemma]). 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

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

Proof. Suppose the $\log$ pair $(X, \mathcal{D})$ is not $\log$ canonical at some point q in $S$, then so is $\left(X, \psi^{*}(\psi(\mathcal{D}))\right)$ because $\psi^{*}(\psi(\mathcal{D})) \geq \mathcal{D}$. Since $K_{X}+\psi^{*}(\psi(\mathcal{D})) \sim_{\mathbb{Q}}$ $\psi^{*}\left(K_{Y}+\psi(\mathcal{D})+\frac{1}{2} \mathcal{B}\right)$ the pair $\left(X, \psi^{*}(\psi(\mathcal{D}))\right)$ is $\log$ canonical if and only if the pair $\left(Y, \psi(\mathcal{D})+\frac{1}{2} \mathcal{B}\right)$ is $\log$ canonical by [15, 3.16 Proposition]. Thus the pair $\left(Y, \psi(\mathcal{D})+\frac{1}{2} \mathcal{B}\right)$ is not $\log$ canonical at $\psi(\mathrm{q})$.

We use the notations of Section 3.

Proposition 4.2. Let $S$ be a Burniat surface with $K_{S}^{2}=6$. Then the global log canonical threshold of the polarized pair $\left(S, 2 K_{S}\right)$ is $\frac{1}{4}$.

Proof. Suppose that $\operatorname{glct}\left(S, 2 K_{S}\right)$ is not $\frac{1}{4}$. Since there is an effective $\mathbb{Q}$ Cartier divisor such that the log canonical threshold of it is $\frac{1}{4}$ (see Proposition 3.1), $\operatorname{glct}\left(S, 2 K_{S}\right)<\frac{1}{4}$. Then there is an effective $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier divisor $D \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 2 K_{S}$ such that the log pair $\left(S, \frac{1}{4} D\right)$ is not log canonical at some point $\mathrm{p} \in S$. By Lemma 2.3, we have

$$
\operatorname{mult}_{\mathrm{p}}(D)>4
$$

We put an effective $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor $d:=\varphi(D)$ on $\Sigma$. Then

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

by Lemma 4.1, where $B:=B_{1}+B_{2}+B_{3}$.
We consider the case that $\varphi(\mathrm{p}) \notin B_{1} \cup B_{2} \cup B_{3}$. Thus $\left(\Sigma, \frac{1}{4} d\right)$ is not log canonical at $\varphi(\mathrm{p})$ which implies

$$
\operatorname{glct}(\Sigma, d)<\frac{1}{4}
$$

However it contradicts since $d \sim_{\mathbb{Q}}-K_{\Sigma}$ and $\operatorname{glct}\left(\Sigma,-K_{\Sigma}\right) \geq \frac{1}{2}$ since $\Sigma$ is a nonsingular del Pezzo surface of degree 6 (see [10, Theorem 1.7]). Thus $\varphi(\mathrm{p}) \in B_{1} \cup B_{2} \cup B_{3}$.

Now we treat the case $\mathrm{p} \in\left(\cup_{i=1}^{3} E_{i}\right) \cup\left(\cup_{i=1}^{3} E_{i}^{\prime}\right) \cup\left(\cup_{i=1}^{2} \cup_{j=1}^{3} M_{i}^{j}\right)$, where $2 E_{i}=\varphi^{*}\left(e_{i}\right), 2 E_{i}^{\prime}=\varphi^{*}\left(e_{i}^{\prime}\right)$ and $2 M_{i}^{j}=\varphi^{*}\left(m_{i}^{j}\right)$. Note the intersection numbers

$$
E_{i}^{2}=E_{i}^{\prime 2}=-1, D \cdot E_{i}=D \cdot E_{i}^{\prime}=2, M_{i}^{j^{2}}=0, \text { and } D \cdot M_{i}^{j}=4
$$

First we consider the case when $\mathrm{p} \in E_{3} \backslash\left(E_{1}^{\prime} \cup E_{2}^{\prime}\right)$, that is the log pair ( $S, \frac{1}{4} D$ ) is not $\log$ canonical at p . We write

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

where $\alpha_{3}, \alpha_{1}^{\prime}$ and $\alpha_{2}^{\prime}$ are nonnegative rational numbers and $E_{3}, E_{1}^{\prime}, E_{2}^{\prime} \not \subset$ $\operatorname{Supp}(\Omega)$ with an effective $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier divisor $\Omega$. If $\alpha_{3}=0$ then we have

$$
2=D \cdot E_{3}=\operatorname{mult}_{\mathrm{p}}(D) \cdot \operatorname{mult}_{\mathrm{p}}\left(E_{3}\right)>4
$$

It is impossible. Thus $\alpha_{3}>0$. Let $L$ be a general curve on $S$ such that $\rho \circ \varphi(L)$ is a line in $\mathbb{P}^{2}$ passing through $p_{3}$. Then $L \not \subset \operatorname{Supp}(D)$. To determine
a bound of $\alpha_{3}$ we consider the following

$$
8=D \cdot L \geq \alpha_{3} E_{3} \cdot L=2 \alpha_{3}
$$

It implies $4 \geq \alpha_{3}$. On the other hand, since $\mathrm{p} \notin E_{1}^{\prime} \cup E_{2}^{\prime}$ and $1 \geq \frac{1}{4} \alpha_{3}$, the $\log$ pair $\left(S, E_{3}+\frac{1}{4} \Omega\right)$ is not $\log$ canonical at p. By the inversion of adjunction formula we know that the $\log$ pair $\left(E_{3},\left.\frac{1}{4} \Omega\right|_{E_{3}}\right)$ is not $\log$ canonical at p. It induces

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

and so $\alpha_{3}>2+\alpha_{1}^{\prime}+\alpha_{2}^{\prime}$. Meanwhile, we have

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

It gives $\alpha_{2}^{\prime}<0$ which is impossible. Similarly, for cases that $\mathrm{p} \in E_{i} \backslash\left(E_{j}^{\prime} \cup\right.$ $\left.E_{k}^{\prime}\right)$ and $\mathrm{p} \in E_{i}^{\prime} \backslash\left(E_{j} \cup E_{k}\right)$ with $\{i, j, k\}=\{1,2,3\}$ we can obtain contradictions.

We consider the case that $\mathrm{p} \in M_{i}^{j}$, with $i=1,2$ and $j=1,2,3$. We write

$$
D=\alpha_{i}^{j} M_{i}^{j}+\Omega
$$

where $\alpha_{i}^{j} \geq 0$ and $M_{i}^{j} \not \subset \operatorname{Supp}(\Omega)$ with an effective $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier divisor $\Omega$. Let $L$ be a general curve such that $\rho \circ \varphi(L)$ is a line in $\mathbb{P}^{2}$ passing through $p_{j^{\prime}}$ with $j^{\prime} \in\{1,2,3\} \backslash\{j\}$. Then we have the following intersection numbers

$$
D \cdot L=8, \quad M_{i}^{j} \cdot L=2
$$

To determine a bound of $\alpha_{i}^{j}$ we consider the following

$$
8=D \cdot L \geq \alpha_{i}^{j} M_{i}^{j} \cdot L=2 \alpha_{i}^{j}
$$

It implies $4 \geq \alpha_{i}^{j}$. Thus the $\log$ pair $\left(S, M_{i}^{j}+\frac{1}{4} \Omega\right)$ is not $\log$ canonical at p , and so

$$
4=\left(D-\alpha_{i}^{j} M_{i}^{j}\right) \cdot M_{i}^{j} \geq \operatorname{mult}_{\mathrm{p}}\left(\left.\Omega\right|_{M_{i}^{j}}\right)>4
$$

which is impossible.

Hence $\mathrm{p} \in E_{i} \cap E_{j}^{\prime}$ for $i \neq j$ and $i, j=1,2,3$. Without loss of generality $\mathrm{p} \in E_{3} \cap E_{2}^{\prime}$. Suppose that $E_{3} \not \subset \operatorname{Supp}(D)$. Then

$$
2=D \cdot E_{3} \geq \operatorname{mult}_{\mathrm{p}}(D) \cdot \operatorname{mult}_{\mathrm{p}}\left(E_{3}\right)=\operatorname{mult}_{\mathrm{p}}(D)
$$

It contradicts to $\operatorname{mult}_{\mathbf{p}}(D)>4$, and so $E_{3} \subset \operatorname{Supp}(D)$. Similarly, we can prove that $E_{2}^{\prime} \subset \operatorname{Supp}(D)$. It provides

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

where $\alpha_{3}, \alpha_{2}^{\prime}>0$ and $E_{3}, E_{2}^{\prime} \not \subset \operatorname{Supp}(\Omega)$ with an effective $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier divisor $\Omega$. Meanwhile, the $\log$ pair $\left(S, \frac{1}{4}\left(2 E_{1}^{\prime}+4 E_{2}^{\prime}+2 E_{1}+4 E_{3}\right)\right)$ is $\log$ canonical at p. By Lemma [2.2, we can assume that the support of $D$ does not contain at least one component of $2 E_{1}^{\prime}+4 E_{2}^{\prime}+2 E_{1}+4 E_{3}$. We may assume $E_{1}^{\prime} \not \subset \operatorname{Supp}(D)$ since we can do a similar procedure when we assume $E_{1} \not \subset \operatorname{Supp}(D)$. Then

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

It implies that $1>\frac{1}{2} \geq \frac{1}{4} \alpha_{3}$. Since the $\log$ pair $\left(S, \frac{1}{4} D\right)$ is not $\log$ canonical at p , the $\log$ pair

$$
\left(S, E_{3}+\frac{\alpha_{2}^{\prime}}{4} E_{2}^{\prime}+\frac{1}{4} \Omega\right)
$$

is not $\log$ canonical at p . By the inversion of adjunction formula the log pair

$$
\left(E_{3},\left.\left(\frac{\alpha_{2}^{\prime}}{4} E_{2}^{\prime}+\frac{1}{4} \Omega\right)\right|_{E_{3}}\right)
$$

is not $\log$ canonical at p . Thus

$$
\operatorname{mult}_{\mathrm{p}}\left(\frac{\alpha_{2}^{\prime}}{4} E_{2}^{\prime}+\frac{1}{4} \Omega\right)>1
$$

and so

$$
\begin{aligned}
2+\alpha_{3} & =\left(D-\alpha_{3} E_{3}\right) \cdot E_{3}=4\left(\frac{\alpha_{2}^{\prime}}{4} E_{2}^{\prime}+\frac{1}{4} \Omega\right) \cdot E_{3} \\
& \geq 4 \operatorname{mult}_{\mathrm{p}}\left(\frac{\alpha_{2}^{\prime}}{4} E_{2}^{\prime}+\frac{1}{4} \Omega\right)>4
\end{aligned}
$$

which contradicts to $2 \geq \alpha_{3}$.

Theorem 4.3. Let $S$ be a Burniat surface with $K_{S}^{2}=6$. Then the global log canonical threshold of the polarized pair $\left(S, K_{S}\right)$ is $\frac{1}{2}$.

Proof. Since $\operatorname{glct}\left(S, K_{S}\right)=2 \operatorname{glct}\left(S, 2 K_{S}\right)$ we obtain the result by Proposition 4.2.

Remark 4.4. Tian's conjecture (cf. [1, Conjecture 1.1] and [22, Conjecture 5.3]) which fails in general (cf. [1]) holds for a Burniat surface $S$ with $K_{S}^{2}=6$ via even pluricanonical divisor because $\operatorname{glct}\left(S, 2 K_{S}\right)=\operatorname{lct}(S, E)$ for a divisor $E \in\left|2 K_{S}\right|$ (cf. Proposition 3.1).

## 5. Invariant global sections of the pluricanonical divisor $\boldsymbol{m} K_{S}$

In this section we follow the notations of Section 4. Let $S$ be a Burniat surface with $K_{S}^{2}=6$. Then $S$ is constructed by a bidouble covering of the del Pezzo surface $\Sigma$ of degree 6. There are the divisors

$$
B_{i}=e_{i}+e_{i}^{\prime}+m_{1}^{j}+m_{2}^{j}
$$

and $L_{i}$ such that

$$
2 L_{i} \sim B_{j}+B_{k}
$$

where $(i, j, k) \in\{(1,2,3),(2,3,1),(3,1,2)\}$ (see Section 3).
For an integer $m \geq 2$ the action of $G:=\mathbb{Z}_{2} \times \mathbb{Z}_{2}$ via the bidouble covering map $\varphi$, the bicanonical map of $S$, gives a splitting:

$$
H^{0}\left(S, m K_{S}\right)=\bigoplus_{\chi \in \hat{G}} H_{\chi},
$$

where $G$ acts on $H_{\chi}$ via the character $\chi$ in the character group $\hat{G}$ of $G$.
For instance, when $m$ is even we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
H^{0}\left(S, m K_{S}\right)= & \varphi^{*}\left(H^{0}\left(\Sigma,-\frac{m}{2} K_{\Sigma}\right)\right) \\
& \bigoplus \bigoplus_{i=1}^{3} H^{0}\left(S, \varphi^{*}\left(-\frac{m}{2} K_{\Sigma}-L_{i}\right)+F_{i}\right),
\end{aligned}
$$

where $F_{i} \sim E_{j}+E_{j}^{\prime}+E_{k}+E_{k}^{\prime}+M_{1}^{k}+M_{2}^{k}+M_{1}^{i}+M_{2}^{i}$.
We consider the following.

Lemma 5.1. If $m$ is a positive even integer and $D \in H_{\chi}$ for $\chi \neq i d$ then $D-F_{i}$ is effective for some $i=1,2,3$.

Proof. When $m=2$ we have $H^{0}\left(S, 2 K_{S}\right)=\varphi^{*}\left(H^{0}\left(\Sigma,-K_{\Sigma}\right)\right)$. When $m(>$ 2) is positive even we obtain it since $-\frac{m}{2} K_{\Sigma}-L_{i}$ is effective for all $i=$ $1,2,3$.

In this section, since we have a decomposition of the global sections of $m K_{S}$ via the $\mathbb{Z}_{2}^{2}$-action associated to the bicanonical map $\varphi$ of $S$ (i.e. $\left.H^{0}\left(S, m K_{S}\right)=\bigoplus_{\chi \in \hat{G}} H_{\chi}\right)$ we show that for a positive even integer $m$, $\operatorname{glct}\left(S, K_{S}\right)=\operatorname{lct}\left(S, \frac{1}{m} D\right)$ for some $D \in\left|m K_{S}\right|$ implies $D \in H_{i d}$ (called by an invariant global section of $m K_{S}$ ) which is not in $H_{\chi}$ (called by an antiinvariant global section of $m K_{S}$ ) with $\chi \neq i d$.

Proposition 5.2. For every even integer $m>2$ and $D \in H_{\chi}$ with $\chi \neq i d$, $\operatorname{lct}(S, D)>\frac{1}{2 m}$.

Proof. Suppose that $\operatorname{lct}(S, D) \leq \frac{1}{2 m}$. It implies that for every $\epsilon>0$, the $\log$ pair $\left(S,\left(\frac{1}{2 m}+\epsilon\right) D\right)$ is not $\log$ canonical at some point p . We set $\frac{1}{\delta}:=\frac{1}{2 m}+\epsilon$. Then

$$
\operatorname{mult}_{\mathrm{p}}(D)>\delta
$$

We put an effective divisor $d:=\varphi(D)$ on $\Sigma$. Then

$$
\left(\Sigma, \frac{1}{\delta} d+\frac{1}{2} B\right) \text { is not } \log \text { canonical at a point } \varphi(\mathrm{p}) \text { on } \Sigma
$$

by Lemma 4.1 .
We consider the case $\varphi(\mathrm{p}) \notin B_{1} \cup B_{2} \cup B_{3}$. Then $\left(\Sigma, \frac{1}{\delta} d\right)$ is not log canonical at $\varphi(\mathrm{p})$ which implies

$$
\operatorname{glct}(\Sigma, d)<\frac{1}{\delta}
$$

However it contradicts because $d \sim_{\mathbb{Q}}-\frac{m}{2} K_{\Sigma}$ and $\operatorname{glct}(\Sigma, \Delta) \geq \frac{1}{2}$ for any effective $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier divisor $\Delta \sim_{\mathbb{Q}}-K_{\Sigma}$ since $\Sigma$ is a nonsigular del Pezzo surface of degree 6 (see [10, Theorem 1.7]). Thus $\varphi(\mathrm{p}) \in B_{1} \cup B_{2} \cup B_{3}$.

By Lemma 5.1 we have an effective $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier divisor $D-F_{i}$ for some $i=1,2,3$. We may deal with $i=1$.

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

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

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 $\Omega$. Since $\mathrm{p} \notin E_{2} \cup E_{3}^{\prime}$, the $\log$ pair $\left(S, \frac{1}{\delta}\left(D-\alpha_{2} E_{2}-\alpha_{3}^{\prime} E_{3}^{\prime}\right)\right)$ is not $\log$ canonical at p.

Suppose $\alpha_{1}=0$, and then $m=D \cdot E_{1} \geq \operatorname{mult}_{\mathrm{p}}(D) \operatorname{mult}_{\mathrm{p}}\left(E_{1}\right)>\delta$. It induces $\frac{1}{m}<\frac{1}{\delta}=\frac{1}{2 m}+\epsilon$ which is a contradiction for a small $\epsilon>0$. So $\alpha_{1} \neq 0$.

Since $D-F_{1}$ is effective $M_{1}^{1} \cdot \Omega \geq M_{1}^{1} \cdot M_{1}^{3}=1>0$. Thus $2 m=$ $D \cdot M_{1}^{1}=\alpha_{1}+M_{1}^{1} \cdot \Omega$ implies $2 m>\alpha_{1}$. So

$$
\frac{\alpha_{1}}{\delta}=\alpha_{1}\left(\frac{1}{2 m}+\epsilon\right)<1 \text { for a small } \epsilon>0
$$

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

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

It implies that

$$
m+\alpha_{1}-\alpha_{3}^{\prime}=\left(D-\alpha_{1} E_{1}-\alpha_{2} E_{2}-\alpha_{3}^{\prime} E_{3}^{\prime}\right) \cdot E_{1}>\delta
$$

On the other hand, we have

$$
m=D \cdot E_{3}^{\prime} \geq \alpha_{1}+\alpha_{2}-\alpha_{3}^{\prime}
$$

Then we obtain

$$
2 m-\alpha_{2}>\delta
$$

which is a contradiction for a very small $\epsilon>0$.
The case $\mathrm{p} \in E_{2}^{\prime} \cap E_{3}$
We have

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

where $\alpha_{1} \geq 0$ 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 we get

$$
m=D \cdot E_{1} \geq-\alpha_{1}+\alpha_{2}^{\prime}+\alpha_{3}^{\prime}
$$

On the other hand, by a similar argument of the case $\mathrm{p} \in E_{1} \cap E_{2}^{\prime}$ the inversion of adjunction formula implies

$$
m-\alpha_{1}+\alpha_{2}^{\prime}=\left(D-\alpha_{1} E_{1}-\alpha_{2}^{\prime} E_{2}^{\prime}-\alpha_{3}^{\prime} E_{3}^{\prime}\right) \cdot E_{2}^{\prime}>\delta
$$

Thus we have

$$
2 m-\alpha_{3}^{\prime}>\delta
$$

which is a contradiction for a very small $\epsilon>0$.
The case $\mathrm{p} \in E_{3} \cap E_{1}^{\prime}$
We have

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

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

$$
m=D \cdot E_{2} \geq \alpha_{1}^{\prime}-\alpha_{2}+\alpha_{3}^{\prime}
$$

and

$$
m+\alpha_{1}^{\prime}-\alpha_{2}=\left(D-\alpha_{1}^{\prime} E_{1}^{\prime}-\alpha_{2} E_{2}-\alpha_{3}^{\prime} E_{3}^{\prime}\right) \cdot E_{1}^{\prime}>\delta
$$

Thus

$$
2 m-\alpha_{3}^{\prime}>\delta
$$

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

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

where $\alpha_{1} \geq 0$ 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 the inequalities

$$
m=D \cdot E_{2}^{\prime} \geq \alpha_{1}-\alpha_{2}^{\prime}
$$

and

$$
m+\alpha_{1}-\alpha_{2}^{\prime}-\alpha_{3}^{\prime}=\left(D-\alpha_{1} E_{1}-\alpha_{2}^{\prime} E_{2}^{\prime}-\alpha_{3}^{\prime} E_{3}^{\prime}\right) \cdot E_{1}>\delta
$$

imply that

$$
2 m-\alpha_{3}>\delta
$$

It is a contradiction.

The case $\mathrm{p} \in E_{2}^{\prime} \backslash\left(E_{1} \cup E_{3}\right), \mathrm{p} \in E_{3} \backslash\left(E_{1}^{\prime} \cup E_{2}^{\prime}\right)$ or $\mathrm{p} \in E_{1}^{\prime} \backslash\left(E_{2} \cup E_{3}\right)$ We can induce a contradiction like the case $\mathrm{p} \in E_{1} \backslash\left(E_{2}^{\prime} \cup E_{3}^{\prime}\right)$.

The case $\mathrm{p} \in E_{1} \cup E_{3}^{\prime}, \mathrm{p} \in E_{2} \cup E_{3}^{\prime}, \mathrm{p} \in E_{1}^{\prime} \cup E_{2}, \mathrm{p} \in E_{3}^{\prime} \backslash\left(E_{1} \cup E_{2}\right)$ or $\mathrm{p} \in E_{2} \backslash\left(E_{1}^{\prime} \cup E_{3}^{\prime}\right)$
Since we deal with $i=1$ we obtain a contradiction directly from the previous cases.

Since we induce a contradiction for every case, we have

$$
\operatorname{lct}(S, D)>\frac{1}{2 m}
$$

Theorem 5.3. Let $S$ be a Burniat surface with $K_{S}^{2}=6$. For any positive even 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 invariant under the $\mathbb{Z}_{2}^{2}$-action associated to the bicanonical map $\varphi$ of $S$.

Proof. We obtain the result by Theorem 4.3 and Proposition 5.2 ,
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