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THE INDEX OF A THREEFOLD CANONICAL SINGULARITY

MASAYUKI KAWAKITA

ABSTRACT. The index of a 3-fold canonical singularity at a crepant centre is at most 6.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let $P \in X$ be a log canonical singularity. Shokurov asked if one can bound the index $r_P$ of $X$ at $P$ in terms of the discrepancies of divisors over $X$.

Suppose that $X$ has log canonical singularities with $P$ a log canonical centre. In $\dim X = 2$, $r_P$ is 1, 2, 3, 4 or 6 by the classification of singularities. In an arbitrary dimension, Ishii [5] and Fujino [2] reduced the boundedness of $r_P$ to a conjectural boundedness of a quotient of the birational automorphism group of a variety $S$ with $K_S \sim 0$. In particular, they proved $r_P \leq 66$ in $\dim X = 3$.

Suppose that $X$ has canonical singularities. In $\dim X = 2$, $P$ is a rational double point, so $r_P = 1$. The purpose of this paper is to provide an affirmative answer in $\dim X = 3$.

Theorem 1.1. Let $P \in X$ be a 3-fold canonical singularity such that $P$ is a crepant centre. Then the index of $X$ at $P$ is at most 6.

Remark 1.2. We have such singularities $P$ with $r_P = 1, 2, 3, 4$ in Example 4.3, but I do not know if there exists $P$ with $r_P = 5$ or 6.

Note that no (even implicit) bound of $r_P$ has been known before. Here a crepant centre means the centre of a divisor with discrepancy zero. The condition that $P$ is a crepant centre is necessary even for a strictly canonical singularity, see Example 5.1. On the other hand, if once the minimal discrepancy at $P$ is fixed, then one can bound $r_P$ for an arbitrary 3-fold canonical singularity $P \in X$ (Theorem 5.3).

We shall prove Theorem 1.1 by using the singular Riemann–Roch formula (singRR) [14], an orbifold version of Riemann–Roch formula, due to Reid. In Sect. 2, we build a tower $Y \to X$ of crepant blow-ups with $\mathbb{Q}$-factorial terminal $Y$, on which the singRR is applicable unconditionally. Then we construct a divisor $F$ on $Y$ which possesses the information on the index $r_P$. The $r_P$ is determined by the Euler characteristics $\chi(iK_Y|_F)$, which can be explicitly computed by the singRR (Sect. 3). We derive a numerical classification of the singularities on $Y$ together with $r_P$ in Sect. 4, by the method [6], [7] in the classification of 3-fold divisorial contractions. The boundedness of indices in terms of minimal discrepancies is discussed in Sect. 5.

We work over an algebraically closed field $k$ of characteristic zero. A germ $P \in X$ means an algebraic germ of a variety $X$ at a closed point $P$.

2. CREPANT BLOW-UPS

Let $X$ be a normal $\mathbb{Q}$-Gorenstein variety.
Definition 2.1. The index of $X$ at a point $P$ is the smallest positive integer $r$ such that $rK_X$ is a Cartier divisor at $P$.

Consider a normal variety $Y$ with a proper birational morphism $f: Y \to X$. A prime divisor $E$ on any such $Y$ is called a divisor over $X$, and the image $f(E)$ is called the centre of $E$ on $X$ and denoted by $c_X(E)$. The valuation $v_E$ on the function field of $X$ given by such $E$ is called an algebraic valuation of $X$. If we write

$$K_Y = f^*K_X + \sum_E a_E(X)E$$

with $a_E(X) \in \mathbb{Q}$,

then $a_E(X)$ is called the discrepancy of $E$. We say that $X$ has log canonical, log terminal, canonical, terminal singularities if $a_E(X) \geq -1, > -1, \geq 0, > 0$ respectively for all exceptional divisors $E$ over $X$.

The notion of crepant is crucial in this paper.

Definition 2.2. (i) A crepant divisor over $X$ is an exceptional divisor $E$ over $X$ with $a_E(X) = 0$. A crepant valuation of $X$ is the algebraic valuation $v_E$ given by a crepant divisor $E$.

(ii) A crepant centre on $X$ is the centre $c_X(E)$ of a crepant divisor $E$.

(iii) A crepant blow-up $f: Y \to X$ is a projective birational morphism from a normal variety $Y$ such that $K_Y = f^*K_X$.

Remark 2.3. (i) Suppose that $X$ is canonical. Then every crepant valuation is realised as a divisor on any resolution of $X$. In particular, the number of crepant valuations of $X$ is finite. The complement of the union of all crepant centres is the largest terminal open subvariety of $X$.

(ii) If $Y \to X$ is a crepant blow-up, then $X$ is canonical if and only if so is $Y$.

We have a crepant blow-up by the LMMP.

Proposition 2.4. Let $X$ be a variety with canonical singularities and $v$ a crepant valuation of $X$. Then there exists a crepant blow-up $f: Y \to X$ such that

(i) $Y$ is $\mathbb{Q}$-factorial,

(ii) $f$ has exactly one exceptional divisor $E$, and $v_E = v$,

(iii) $-E$ is $f$-nef.

Proof. Take a projective resolution of singularities $g: Z \to X$, and denote by $E_Z$ the divisor on $Z$ with $v_{E_Z} = v$. Take a Cartier divisor $H > 0$ on $X$ whose support contains all the crepant centres. We write $g^*H = H_Z + F$ with the strict transform $H_Z$ of $H$, and $m$ for the coefficient of $E_Z$ in $F$. Fix $\varepsilon > 0$ so that $(Z, \varepsilon(H_Z + 2(F - mE_Z)))$ is klt, and run $(K_Z + \varepsilon(H_Z + 2(F - mE_Z)))$-LMMP over $X$ by [1] to get a log minimal model $f: Y \to X$.

By $K_Z + \varepsilon(H_Z + 2(F - mE_Z)) \equiv_X K_Z + \varepsilon(F - 2mE_Z)$, the negativity lemma [11, Lemma 2.19] shows that this LMMP contracts exactly all the $g$-exceptional divisors but $E_Z$, and $-E$ is $f$-nef for the strict transform $E$ of $E_Z$. Hence $f$ is a required crepant blow-up.

q.e.d.

Remark 2.5. If $X$ is $\mathbb{Q}$-factorial, then (ii) implies that $\rho(Y / X) = 1$ and $-E$ is $f$-ample.

Corollary 2.6. Let $X = X_0$ be a variety with canonical singularities and $Z$ a crepant centre on $X$. Then there exists a sequence of crepant blow-ups $f_t: X_t \to X_{t-1}$ for $1 \leq t \leq s$ such that
Then the inclusion $f^*$ is $\mathbb{Q}$-factorial for $t \geq 1$ and $X_t$ is terminal.

(ii) For $t \geq 1$, $f_t$ has exactly one exceptional divisor $E_t$ and $-E_t$ is $f_t$-nef.

(iii) $f_t(E_t) = \mathbb{Z}$.

We construct a divisor on $X_t$ which possesses the information on the index of $X$.

**Theorem 2.7.** Let $P \in X$ be a canonical singularity such that $P$ is a crepant centre. Let $r_P$ denote the index of $X$ at $P$ and $\mathfrak{m}_P$ the maximal ideal sheaf for $P$. Then there exist a crepant blow-up $f: Y \to X$ and an effective divisor $F$ on $Y$ supported in $f^{-1}(P)$ such that

(i) $Y$ is $\mathbb{Q}$-factorial and terminal,

(ii) for $i \in \mathbb{Z}$,

$$f_* \mathcal{O}_Y(iK_Y - F) = \begin{cases} m_P \mathcal{O}_X(iK_X) & \text{if } r_P \mid i, \\ \mathcal{O}_X(iK_X) & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

$$R^j f_* \mathcal{O}_Y(iK_Y - F) = 0 \quad \text{for } j \geq 1.$$

**Proof.** We take a sequence of crepant blow-ups $f_i$ in Corollary 2.6 with $Z = P$, and set $Y := X_t$. We will construct inductively divisors $F_i \geq 0$ on $X_t$ such that

$$f_* \mathcal{O}_{X_t}(iK_{X_t} - F_i) = \begin{cases} m_P \mathcal{O}_X(iK_X) & \text{if } r_P \mid i, \\ \mathcal{O}_X(iK_X) & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

and for $t > 1$,

$$f_* \mathcal{O}_{X_t}(iK_{X_t} - F_t) = \mathcal{O}_{X_{t-1}}(iK_{X_{t-1}} - F_{t-1}),$$

and

$$R^j f_* \mathcal{O}_{X_t}(iK_{X_t} - F_t) = 0 \quad \text{for } j \geq 1.$$

Then Leray’s spectral sequence induces that $F := F_t$ is a required divisor.

We set $F_1 := E_1$. The vanishing (2) follows from Kawamata–Viehweg vanishing theorem [10, Theorem 1.2.5, Remark 1.2.6]. If $r_P \mid i$, then (1) is by the projection formula. To see (1) for $r_P \nmid i$, we regard $K_X$ as a fixed divisor (not a divisor class), and so $K_{X_t} = f_t^* K_X$. Denote by $\mathcal{H}_X$ the constant sheaf of the function field of $X$. Then the inclusion $f_* \mathcal{O}_{X_t}(iK_{X_t} - F_t) \subset \mathcal{H}_X(iK_X)$ is interpreted by the expressions

$$f_* \mathcal{O}_{X_t}(iK_{X_t} - F_t) = \{ u \in \mathcal{H}_X | (u)_{X_t} + i f_t^* K_X - F_t \geq 0 \},$$

$$\mathcal{O}_X(iK_X) = \{ u \in \mathcal{H}_X | (u)_{X_t} + iK_X \geq 0 \}.$$

Suppose $u \in \mathcal{H}_X$ satisfies $(u)_{X_t} + iK_X \geq 0$. If $r_P \nmid i$, then $(u)_{X_t} + iK_X$ is not Cartier at $P$, so there exists a divisor $D > 0$ passing through $P$ such that $(u)_{X_t} + iK_X - D$ is an effective Cartier divisor. Then $(u)_{X_t} + i f_t^* K_X - f_t^* D \geq 0$. By $f_t^* K_X = K_{X_t}$ and $F_t \subset \text{Supp} f_t D$, we obtain $(u)_{X_t} + i f_t^* K_X - F_t \geq 0$, implying (1).

For $t > 1$, we set $F_t := [f_{i}^* F_{t-1}]$ inductively. $F_t = f_t^* F_{t-1} + c_t E_t$ with some $c_t \in [0, 1)$, so $-F_t$ is $f_t$-nef. The (4) is again by Kawamata–Viehweg vanishing theorem. If $c_t = 0$, then (3) is obvious. If $c_t > 0$, then the equality $iK_{X_{t-1}} - F_t = f_t^* (iK_{X_{t-1}} - F_{t-1}) - c_t E_t$ shows that $iK_{X_{t-1}} - F_{t-1}$ is not Cartier at every point in $f_t(E_t)$. Now we get (3) just as in the proof of (1) for $r_P \nmid i$.

q.e.d.
3. THE SINGULAR RIEMANN–ROCH FORMULA

We shall apply the singular Riemann–Roch formula due to Reid to our crepant blow-up, and use the method [6], [7] in the classification of 3-fold divisorial contractions. We briefly recall the formula on a canonical 3-fold.

**Theorem 3.1** ([14, Theorem 10.2]). Let $X$ be a projective 3-fold with canonical singularities and $D$ a divisor on $X$ such that $D \sim iP_K X$ with $i_P \in \mathbb{Z}$ at each $P \in X$.

(i) There is a formula of the form

$$
\chi(O_X(D)) = \chi(O_X) + \frac{1}{12} D(D - K_X)(2D - K_X) + \frac{1}{12} D \cdot c_2(X) + \sum_p c_P(D),
$$

where the summation takes place over the singularities of $O_X(D)$, and $c_P(D) \in \mathbb{Q}$ is a contribution due to the singularity at $P$, depending only on the analytic type.

(ii) For a terminal cyclic quotient singularity $P$ of type $1_{r_P}(1, -1, b_P)$,

$$
c_P(D) = -i_P r_P^2 - \frac{1}{12} \sum_{j=1}^{r_P-1} \frac{jr_P - jb_P}{2r_P},
$$

where $\bar{i} = i - \lfloor \frac{i}{r_P} \rfloor r_P$ denotes the residue of $i$ modulo $r_P$.

(iii) For an arbitrary terminal singularity $P$,

$$
c_P(D) = \sum_Q c_Q(D_Q),
$$

where $\{(Q, D_Q)\}_Q$ is a flat deformation of $(P, D)$ to the basket of terminal cyclic quotient singularities $Q$. Such $Q$ is called a fictitious singularity.

**Remark 3.2.** The condition $D \sim iP_K X$ always holds if $X$ is $\mathbb{Q}$-factorial and terminal [8, Corollary 5.2].

Our object is a germ of a crepant blow-up $f : Y \to X$ with a divisor $F$ on $Y$ in Theorem 2.7 at a 3-fold canonical singularity $P \in X$ with index $r_P$. Shrinking and compactifying it, we may assume that $Y$ is projective and terminal ($f$ is merely a projective morphism outside a neighbourhood of $P$). We shall express the function $\delta_P(i)$ below.

**Definition 3.3.** We define the function $\delta_P(i)$ on $\mathbb{Z}$ as

$$
\delta_P(i) := \begin{cases} 
1 & \text{if } r_P \mid i, \\
0 & \text{otherwise.}
\end{cases}
$$

Applying (ii) in Theorem 2.7 and the vanishing $R^j f_* \mathcal{O}_Y(iK_Y) = 0$ for $j \geq 1$ to the exact sequence

$$
0 \to \mathcal{O}_Y(iK_Y - F) \to \mathcal{O}_Y(iK_Y) \to \mathcal{O}_F(iK_Y|_F) \to 0,
$$

we obtain

$$
\delta_P(i) = \dim_k f_* \mathcal{O}_Y(iK_Y) / f_* \mathcal{O}_Y(iK_Y - F)
= h^0(\mathcal{O}_F(iK_Y|_F))
= \chi(\mathcal{O}_F(iK_Y|_F))
= \chi(\mathcal{O}_Y(iK_Y)) - \chi(\mathcal{O}_Y(iK_Y - F)).
$$
Let $I_0 := \{ Q \text{ with type } \frac{1}{r_0}(1, -1, b_Q) \}$ be the basket of fictitious singularities from singularities on $Y$. Note that $b_Q$ is co-prime to $r_Q$. For $Q \in I_0$, let $f_Q$ denote the smallest non-negative integer such that $F \sim f_QK_Y$ at $Q$. By replacing $b_Q$ with $r_Q - b_Q$ if necessary, we may assume $v_Q := f_Qb_Q \leq r_Q/2$. Set $I := \{ Q \in I_0 \mid f_Q \neq 0 \}$.

With this notation, the singular Riemann–Roch formula computes the right-hand side of (5), to provide

$$(6) \quad \delta_p(i) = \frac{1}{6}F^3 + \frac{1}{12}F \cdot c_2(Y) + \sum_{Q \in I} (A_Q(i) - A_Q(i - f_Q)),$$

where the contribution $A_Q(i)$ is given by

$$A_Q(i) := -\frac{r_Q^2 - 1}{12r_Q} + \sum_{j=1}^{7} \frac{j\mathbb{b}_Q(r_Q - j\mathbb{b}_Q)}{2r_Q}.$$ 

The $A_Q(i)$ satisfies the formula

$$A_Q(i + 1) - A_Q(i) = -\frac{r_Q^2 - 1}{12r_Q} + B_Q(i\mathbb{b}_Q)$$

with

$$B_Q(i) := \frac{\mathbb{b}(r_Q - i)}{2r_Q}.$$ 

Therefore by (6), we have

$$(7) \quad \delta_p(i+1) - \delta_p(i) = \sum_{Q \in I} (B_Q(i\mathbb{b}_Q) - B_Q(i\mathbb{b}_Q - v_Q)).$$

**Lemma 3.4.** The $r_p$ equals the l.c.m. of $r_Q$ for all $Q \in I$.

**Proof.** Since $r_pK_Y = r_p f^*K_X$ is a Cartier divisor near $f^{-1}(P)$, $r_Q$ divides $r_p$ for all $Q \in I$. On the other hand, we see that $r_p$ divides the l.c.m. of $r_Q$ by (7) and the periodic properties of $\delta_p, B_Q$. q.e.d.

### 4. Boundedness of indices

We shall prove Theorem 1.1 in this section. Let $r_p$ denote the index of $X$ at $P$. We take a crepant blow-up $f : Y \to X$ with a divisor $F$ on $Y$ in Theorem 2.7. We restrict the possibilities of $J := \{ (r_Q, v_Q) \}_{Q \in I}$ using (7) for $i = 0$.

**Lemma 4.1.** $J$ is one of the types in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>type</th>
<th>$J$</th>
<th>$r_p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(2, 1), (2, 1), (2, 1), (2, 1)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(2, 1), (2, 1), (4, 2)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(2, 1), (3, 1), (6, 1)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>(2, 1), (4, 1), (4, 1)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>(3, 1), (3, 1), (3, 1)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>(4, 2), (4, 2)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>(2, 1), (6, 3)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For each of these candidates for \( J \), and \( r_p = 1 \) if and only if \( J = \emptyset \). We assume \( r_p > 1 \) from now on. Then (7) for \( i = 0 \) is written as

\[
(8) \quad \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{I}} B_Q(v_Q) = 1.
\]

By the definition of \( B_Q \) and \( r_Q \geq 2v_Q \), we have

\[
(9) \quad v_Q/4 \leq B_Q(v_Q) < v_Q/2.
\]

Then \( J' := \{v_Q\}_{Q \in \mathcal{I}}, \) which satisfies (8) and (9), should be one of

\[
\{1,1,1,1\}, \{1,1,1,1\}, \{1,1,1,1\}, \{2,2\}, \{1,3\}, \{1,2\}, \{3\}, \{4\}.
\]

For each of these candidates for \( J' \), one can solve the equation (8) for \( r_Q (\geq 2v_Q) \) explicitly. Every solution is in Table 1. For example, suppose \( J' = \{1,2\} \). We set \( J = \{(r_1,1),(r_2,2)\} \). Then (8) becomes \( 1/r_1 + 4/r_2 = 1 \). Thus \( (r_1,r_2) = (2,8), (3,6) \) or \( (5,5) \), so \( J \) is of type 8, 9, 10 respectively.

By Lemma 4.1, we have \( r_p \leq 9 \), and for Theorem 1.1 it is enough to exclude types 8, 11, 12. However, we derive a finer numerical classification by determining \( \hat{J} := \{(r_Q, v_Q, b_Q)\}_{Q \in \mathcal{I}} \).

**Theorem 4.2.** \( J \) is one of the types in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>type</th>
<th>( J )</th>
<th>( r_p )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>((2,1,1),(2,1,1),(2,1,1))</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>((1,1,1),(3,1,2),(6,1,5))</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>((2,1,1),(4,1,3),(4,1,3))</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>((3,1,2),(3,1,2),(3,1,2))</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>((5,1,4),(5,2,3))</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>(\emptyset)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proof.** By Lemma 4.1, there exist only finitely many candidates for \( \hat{J} \). For each candidate, one can compute the right-hand side of (7) explicitly. It must coincide with \( \delta_p(i+1) - \delta_p(i) \), but such a coincidence happens only if \( \hat{J} \) is one of the types in Table 2.

Here we demonstrate for type 3. \( \hat{J} = \{(2,1,1),(3,1,b_2),(6,1,b_3)\} \) with \( b_2 = 1 \) or 2 and \( b_3 = 1 \) or 5. The (7) for \( i = 1 \) is \( \delta_p(2) - \delta_p(1) = 1,1,3,2,3,0 \) when \( (b_2,b_3) = (1,1),(1,5),(2,1),(2,5) \) respectively. Thus \( (b_2,b_3) \) must be \( (2,5) \), and in this case (7) surely holds for any \( i \). q.e.d.

**Example 4.3.** In simple cases, Theorem 1.1 is known by the classification.

(i) (Morrison [13], Ishida–Iwashita [4]) If \( P \) is a cyclic quotient singularity, then \( r_p = 1 \) except \( \frac{1}{2n}(1,2n+1,-2) \) \((n \geq 2)\), \( \frac{1}{11}(1,9,11) \), \( \frac{1}{4}(1,4,7) \), with \( r_p = 2,2,3 \) respectively.

(ii) (Hayakawa–Takeuchi [3]) If \( P \) is an isolated singularity which is a cyclic quotient of a hypersurface singularity, then \( r_p \leq 4 \). The only case when \( r_p = 4 \) is \( o \in (x_1x_2 + x_3^2 + x_4^2 = 0) \subset \mathbb{A}_x^4 / \mathbb{Z}_p(1,5,3,7) \).
5. Minimal discrepancies

To begin with, we provide an example which explains the need of $P$ being a crepant centre in Theorem 1.1 even for a strictly canonical singularity. A similar example exists also for a 3-fold strictly log canonical singularity [2, Example 6.1].

**Example 5.1.** Let $r \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $P \in X$ be the germ
\[
\sigma = (x_1 x_2 + x_3^2 = 0) \subset \mathbb{A}_{x_1, x_2, x_3}^4 / \mathbb{Z}_r(1, -1, 0, 1),
\]
which is singular along the $x_3$-axis $C$. Let $f : Y \rightarrow X$ be the weighted blow-up with weights $wt(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4) = \frac{1}{r}(1, r - 1, r, 1)$. Then $K_Y = f^* K_X + \frac{1}{r} E$ with the exceptional divisors $E$ and $Y$ has 2 terminal quotient singularities of types $\frac{1}{r-1} (1, -1, 1)$ and $\frac{1}{r}(1, -1, 1)$ outside the strict transform $C_Y$ of $C$. Let $g : Z \rightarrow Y$ be the blow-up with centre $C_T$. The $g$ is a crepant blow-up and $Z$ is smooth near $g^{-1}(C_T)$. Hence $X$ has canonical singularities with a crepant centre $C$, but $P$ is not a crepant centre. The index of $X$ at $P$ is $r$.

We focus on the minimal discrepancy to grasp this phenomenon. For a normal $\mathbb{Q}$-Gorenstein singularity $P \in X$, the minimal discrepancy $md_P X$ at $P$ is the infimum of discrepancies $a_E(X)$ for all divisors $E$ over $X$ with $c_X(E) = P$. Note that $md_P X \in (-\infty) \cup [-1, \infty)$, and $P \in X$ is log canonical if and only if $md_P X \geq -1$.

In Example 5.1, we have $md_P X = 1/r$. Shokurov formulated a question on the boundedness of indices in terms of minimal discrepancies.

**Question 5.2 (Shokurov).** For each $(n, a) \in \mathbb{N} \times [-1, \infty)$, does there exist a number $r(n, a)$ such that the index of an arbitrary $n$-fold log canonical singularity $P \in X$ with $md_P X = a$ is at most $r(n, a)$?

He raised its weaker variant for canonical singularities.

**Question 5.2’.** For each $(n, a) \in \mathbb{N} \times [0, \infty)$, does there exist a number $r'(n, a)$ such that the index of an arbitrary $n$-fold canonical singularity $P \in X$ with $md_P X = a$ is at most $r'(n, a)$?

The result of Ishii and Fujino gives $r(3, -1) = 66$ for Question 5.2. Theorem 1.1 gives $r'(3, 0) = 6$ for Question 5.2’. Further, we provide an affirmative answer to Question 5.2’ for $n = 3$.

**Theorem 5.3.** Question 5.2’ is true for $n = 3$. More precisely, the minimal discrepancy of a 3-fold canonical singularity is 0, $1/r$ ($r \in \mathbb{N}$) or 2, and one can take
\[
r'(3, 0) = 6, \quad r'(3, 1/r) = r!, \quad r'(3, 2) = 1.
\]

**Proof.** Let $P \in X$ be a 3-fold canonical singularity with index $r_P$. We shall verify the statement for any such $P$. We take a crepant blow-up $f: Y \rightarrow X$ with terminal $P$ by Corollary 2.6.

Suppose $dim f^{-1}(P) = 0$, that is, $P$ is terminal. Then it suffices to recall $md_P X = 1/r_P$ [9], [12] for terminal $P$ except for smooth $P$.

Suppose $dim f^{-1}(P) = 1$. For any curve $C \subset f^{-1}(P)$, the blow-up of $Y$ with centre $C$ generates a divisor $E$ with $a_E(X) = 1$. Together with the mentioned result [9], [12], we see that $md_P X$ is the minimum of $1/r_Q$ for all $Q \in f^{-1}(P)$, where $r_Q$ denotes the index of $Y$ at $Q$. Hence $md_P X = 1/r$ with $r \in \mathbb{N}$ and $r_Q \leq r$ for all $Q \in f^{-1}(P)$. Thus $r! K_Y$ is a Cartier divisor near $f^{-1}(P)$, so $r_P \mid r!$ by [8, Corollary 1.5].
Suppose $\dim f^{-1}(P) = 2$. Then $P$ is a crepant centre, that is, $md_P X = 0$. The statement holds by Theorem 1.1. q.e.d.
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