$$H^{p,q}_{\bar\partial}(M) \xrightarrow{\cong} H^{p,*}(\mathcal{D}^{p,*}(M), \bar\partial)$$
$$H^{p}_{DR}(M) \longrightarrow H^{*}(\mathcal{D}^{*}(M), d),$$ P 385.

I think the authors were confused by their notations. If T_ϵ is the smoothing of T, as they claimed in the proof of Lemma, P390, T_ϵ should be positive and $\lim_{\epsilon\to 0} T_\epsilon = T$ by P375. But this T_ϵ is obtained through the isomorphisms above. $\lim_{\epsilon\to 0} T_\epsilon$ does not make sense at all. They chose bad notations so they made a mistake. 」

However, we can not say that the T_ϵ are positive forms. For example, suppose that $M = \tilde{N}_p$ is the blow-up of a two-dimensional complex manifold N at a point p. The fiber over p in $M \longrightarrow N$ is a curve $E \cong \mathbb{P}^1$ with normal bundle H^*, where $H \longrightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$ has Chern class $+1$.

「 $M = \tilde{N}_p = N - p \cup_\pi \tilde{\Delta}$, $\tilde{\Delta} \subset \Delta \times \mathbb{P}^{n-1}$
$\tilde{\Delta} = \{(z, l) ; z \in l\}$

$\tilde{\Delta} \longrightarrow \mathbb{P}^{n-1}$ is the universal bundle $J = H^*$, see P182 and P145. 」

Thus the self-intersection number $E \cdot E = -1$.