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Abstract. We classify three-dimensional non-normal semi-terminal singularities.

## 1. Introduction

The notion of terminal singularities is very important in the minimal model program. For the two-dimensional case, the notion of terminal singularities is equivalent to the notion of smoothness. Three-dimensional terminal singularities are understood by explicit equations and was given by [8] and the sufficiency of the conditions was checked in [6].

On the other hand, the importance of the class of certain non-normal varieties, which are called demi-normal varieties (see Definition 2.2), has been well-understood (see $[4, \S 5]$ ). For example, it is natural to allow semi-logcanonical singularities, that is, demi-normal with a log-canonicity condition, in order to consider families of canonically polarized varieties (see [6]). In [2], the author introduced the notion of semi-terminal singularities (see Definition 2.3 ) which is a natural generalization of terminal singularities. It is important to consider the notion of semi-terminal singularities since the author proved in [2] that there exists a semi-terminal modification for any demi-normal pair. However, it has not been known so much about semi-terminal singularities. In this paper, we classify all of the non-normal three-dimensional semi-terminal singularities.

Theorem 1.1. Let $0 \in X$ be a three-dimensional non-normal semi-terminal singularity. Then $0 \in X$ is analytically isomorphic to one of the following singularities:
(1) Double normal crossing point, that is, $0 \in\left(x_{1} x_{2}=0\right) \subset \mathbb{A}^{4}$.
(2) Pinch point, that is, $0 \in\left(x_{1}^{2}-x_{2}^{2} x_{3}=0\right) \subset \mathbb{A}^{4}$.

[^0](3) 2-twirl point, that is, $0 \in\left(x_{1} x_{3}-x_{2}^{2}=x_{1} x_{4}^{2}-x_{5}^{2}=x_{2} x_{4}^{2}-x_{5} x_{6}=\right.$ $\left.x_{3} x_{4}^{2}-x_{6}^{2}=0\right) \subset \mathbb{A}^{6}$.

Remark 1.2. Both double normal crossing point and pinch point are hypersurface singularities. Thus both are Gorenstein. However, as we will see in Section 6 , for a 2-twirl point $0 \in X, X$ is not Gorenstein but $2 K_{X}$ is Cartier. A general element $0 \in S \in\left|-K_{X}\right|$ has a pinch point at $0 \in S$, the index 1 cover $\pi: \tilde{X} \rightarrow X$ of $0 \in X$ is double normal crossing, and $\pi^{*} S$ is double normal crossing. See Example 2.7, Remark 2.9 and Section 6 in detail.

Now we organize the strategy of the proof of Theorem 1.1. The strategy is similar to the earlier works in [7-10]. For a demi-normal variety $X$, it is natural to consider its normalization $\bar{X}$, the conductor divisor $D_{\bar{X}}$ of $\bar{X} / X$ and the involution $\iota_{X}: \bar{D}_{\bar{X}} \rightarrow \bar{D}_{\bar{X}}$ obtained by the natural double cover, where $\bar{D}_{\bar{X}}$ is the normalization of $D_{\bar{X}}$. In fact, the study of demi-normal varieties $X$ can reduced to the study of such $\left(\bar{X}, D_{\bar{X}}\right)$ and $\iota_{X}: \bar{D}_{\bar{X}} \rightarrow \bar{D}_{\bar{X}}$ by $[4, \S 9]$. From Section 3 to Section 4, we consider germs $0 \in(\bar{X}, \bar{D})$ of normal pairs in place of considering non-normal singularities. For a germ $0 \in(\bar{X}, \bar{D})$ of normal semi-terminal pair, by taking the index 1 cover, we reduce to the case that $K_{\bar{X}}+\bar{D}$ is Cartier (see Theorem 4.4). Then a general hypersurface $0 \in$ $S \subset \bar{X}$ satisfies that the germ $0 \in(S, S \cap \bar{D})$ has either canonical singularities or log-elliptic singularities (see Definition 3.1). In Section 3, we analyze logelliptic singularities. In Section 4, we classify three-dimensional normal semiterminal pairs with nonzero reduced boundaries. In Section 5, we see how those pairs in Section 4 glue and we prove Theorem 1.1. In Section 6, we see ring-theoretical properties of twirl singularities, which are important examples of higher-dimensional semi-terminal singularities.
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Throughout the paper, we work over the complex number field $\mathbb{C}$. In the paper, a variety means a reduced, separated and of finite type scheme over $\mathbb{C}$. For any variety $X$, the morphism $\nu_{X}: \bar{X} \rightarrow X$ denotes the normalization of $X$. For the minimal model program, we refer the readers to [4] and [5].

## 2. Preliminaries

We collect some basic definitions and results in this section.
Definition 2.1. (1) Let $X$ be a variety, let $x \in X$ be a closed point, and let $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{X, x}$ be the formal completion of the local ring $\mathcal{O}_{X, x}$. We say that $x \in X$ is a double normal crossing (dnc, for short) point if $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{X, x} \simeq$ $\mathbb{C}\left[\left[x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n+1}\right]\right] /\left(x_{1} x_{2}\right) ;$ a pinch point if $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{X, x} \simeq \mathbb{C}\left[\left[x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n+1}\right]\right] /\left(x_{1}^{2}\right.$ $\left.-x_{2}^{2} x_{3}\right)$, respectively.
(2) A variety $X$ is called a double normal crossing variety (dnc variety, for short) if any closed point $x \in X$ is either a smooth or a dnc point; a semi-smooth variety if any closed point $x \in X$ is one of a smooth, a dnc or a pinch point, respectively.

Definition 2.2 ([4, §5.1]). (1) Let $X$ be an equi-dimensional variety. We call that $X$ is a demi-normal variety if $X$ satisfies Serre's $S_{2}$ condition and $X$ is dnc outside codimension 2.
(2) Assume that an equi-dimensional variety $X$ is dnc outside codimension 2. Then there exists a unique finite and birational morphism $d: X^{d} \rightarrow$ $X$ such that $X^{d}$ is a demi-normal variety and the morphism $d$ is an isomorphism in codimension 1 over $X$. We call the morphism $d$ the demi-normalization of $X$.
(3) Let $X$ be a demi-normal variety and $\nu_{X}: \bar{X} \rightarrow X$ be the normalization of $X$. The conductor ideal of $X$ is defined to be $\operatorname{cond}_{X}:=$ $\mathcal{H o m}_{\mathcal{O}_{X}}\left(\left(\nu_{X}\right)_{*} \mathcal{O}_{\bar{X}}, \mathcal{O}_{X}\right) \subset \mathcal{O}_{X}$. This ideal can be seen as an ideal sheaf $\operatorname{cond}_{\bar{X}}$ on $\bar{X}$. Set

$$
D_{X}:=\operatorname{Spec}_{X}\left(\mathcal{O}_{X} / \operatorname{cond}_{X}\right) \text { and } D_{\bar{X}}:=\operatorname{Spec}_{\bar{X}}\left(\mathcal{O}_{\bar{X}} / \operatorname{cond}_{\bar{X}}\right)
$$

We call the subscheme $D_{X}$ (resp., $D_{\bar{X}}$ ) as the conductor divisor of $X$ (resp., of $\bar{X} / X$ ). It has been known that both $D_{\bar{X}}$ and $D_{X}$ are reduced and of pure codimension 1. Moreover, for the normalization morphism $\nu_{D_{\bar{X}}}: \bar{D}_{\bar{X}} \rightarrow D_{\bar{X}}$, we get the Galois involution $\iota_{X}: \bar{D}_{\bar{X}} \rightarrow \bar{D}_{\bar{X}}$ defined from $\nu_{X}$ unless $\nu_{X}$ is an isomorphism.
Definition 2.3. (1) The pair $(X, \Delta)$ is called a demi-normal pair if $X$ is a demi-normal variety, $\Delta$ is a formal $\mathbb{Q}$-linear sum $\Delta=\sum_{i=1}^{k} a_{i} \Delta_{i}$ of reduced and irreducible closed subvarieties $\Delta_{i}$ of codimension 1 with $\Delta_{i} \not \subset \operatorname{Supp} D_{X}$ and $a_{i} \in[0,1] \cap \mathbb{Q}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq k$. Moreover, if $X$ is normal, then the pair $(X, \Delta)$ is called a normal pair.
(2) Let $(X, \Delta)$ be a demi-normal pair, let $\nu_{X}: \bar{X} \rightarrow X$ be the normalization of $X$, and set $\Delta_{\bar{X}}:=\left(\nu_{X}\right)_{*}^{-1} \Delta$.
(i) [6, Definition 4.17] The pair $(X, \Delta)$ is said to be purely semi-logterminal if $K_{X}+\Delta$ is $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier and the pair $\left(\bar{X}, \Delta_{\bar{X}}+D_{\bar{X}}\right)$ is purely log-terminal.
(ii) [6, Definition 4.17] The pair $(X, \Delta)$ is said to be semi-canonical if $K_{X}+\Delta$ is $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier and the pair $\left(\bar{X}, \Delta_{\bar{X}}+D_{\bar{X}}\right)$ has canonical singularities.
(iii) [2, Definition 2.3] The pair $(X, \Delta)$ is said to be semi-terminal if the pair $(X, \Delta)$ is semi-canonical and for any exceptional prime divisor $E$ over $\bar{X}$ we have the inequality $a\left(E, \bar{X}, \Delta_{\bar{X}}+D_{\bar{X}}\right)>0$ unless center $\bar{X}_{\bar{X}} E \subset \operatorname{Supp}\left\lfloor\Delta_{\bar{X}}+D_{\bar{X}}\right\rfloor$ and $\operatorname{codim}_{\bar{X}}\left(\operatorname{center}_{\bar{X}} E\right)=2$. A demi-normal variety $X$ is said to be semi-log-terminal (resp., semicanonical, semi-terminal) if the demi-normal pair $(X, 0)$ is purely semi-log-terminal (resp., semi-canonical, semi-terminal).

Remark 2.4 ([2, Remark 2.4]). Let us consider a normal pair $(Y, \Delta+S)$ such that $S=\lfloor S\rfloor$.
(1) If $(Y, \Delta+S)$ has canonical singularities, then Diff $_{S} \Delta=0$ and the variety $S$ with the reduced structure has canonical singularities. In particular, $S$ is a normal variety.
(2) If $(Y, \Delta+S)$ is semi-terminal, then the variety $S$ with the reduced structure has terminal singularities.
In particular, for any demi-normal pair $(X, \Delta)$, the following holds. (1) If $(X, \Delta)$ is semi-canonical, then $\operatorname{Supp}\left\lfloor\Delta_{\bar{X}}+D_{\bar{X}}\right\rfloor$ with the reduced structure has canonical singularities. (2) If $(X, \Delta)$ is semi-terminal, then $\operatorname{Supp}\left\lfloor\Delta_{\bar{X}}+D_{\bar{X}}\right\rfloor$ with the reduced structure has terminal singularities.

Example 2.5. (1) [5, Corollary 2.31] Assume that $(X, \Delta)$ is a normal pair such that $X$ is a smooth variety and $\operatorname{Supp} \Delta \subset X$ is a (possibly nonconnected) smooth divisor. Then $(X, \Delta)$ is semi-terminal.
(2) If $X$ is a semi-smooth variety, then the variety $X$ is semi-terminal by (1).
(3) [5, Theorem 4.5] Let $(S, C)$ be a two-dimensional normal pair with $C$ reduced and $0 \in C$ be a point. Then $(S, C)$ has canonical singularities around 0 if and only if both $S$ and $C$ are smooth at 0 .
(4) [6, Proposition 4.12] Let $X$ be a demi-normal surface and $0 \in X$ be a closed point. The variety $X$ is semi-canonical around $0 \in X$ if and only if $0 \in X$ is one of a smooth, a du Val, a dnc or a pinch point. Thus, $X$ is semi-terminal around 0 if and only if $X$ is semi-smooth around $0 \in X$.

Lemma 2.6. Let $X, X^{\prime}$ be semi-log-terminal varieties.
(1) All of the varieties $X, \bar{X}$ and $D_{\bar{X}}$ are Cohen-Macaulay. The variety $D_{\bar{X}}$ is normal.
(2) The variety $D_{X}$ is equal to the quotient $D_{\bar{X}} / \iota_{X}$ (thus $D_{X}$ is normal) and the variety $X$ is obtained by the universal push-out (see [4, Theorem 9.30]) of the following diagram:

(3) For two singularities $p \in X$ and $p^{\prime} \in X^{\prime}$ are analytically isomorphic to each other if and only if there exist analytical neighborhoods of $\bar{X}$ and $\bar{X}^{\prime}$ around $\nu_{X}^{-1}(p)$ and $\nu_{X^{\prime}}^{-1}\left(p^{\prime}\right)$ such that the triplets $\left(\bar{X}, D_{\bar{X}}, \iota_{X}\right)$ and $\left(\bar{X}^{\prime}, D_{\bar{X}^{\prime}}, \iota_{X^{\prime}}\right)$ are analytically isomorphic around those neighborhoods.

Proof. (1) Both the varieties $D_{\bar{X}}$ and $\bar{X}$ are normal and Cohen-Macaulay by [5, Corollary 5.25 and Proposition 5.51]. We show that $X$ is Cohen-Macaulay.

By taking the index 1 cover (see [4, Definition 2.49]), we can assume that $X$ is semi-canonical and $K_{X}$ is Cartier by [5, Proposition 5.7]. Take a semi-resolution $f: Y \rightarrow X$ of $X$ in the sense of [4, Theorem 10.54]. Since $X$ is semi-canonical and $K_{X}$ is Cartier, there exists an effective $f$-exceptional Cartier divisor $B$ on $Y$ such that $\omega_{Y}(-B)=f^{*} \omega_{X}$ holds. By [1, Theorem 1.10], $R^{i} f_{*} \mathcal{O}_{Y}(B)=0$ and $R^{i} f_{*} \omega_{Y}=0$ for all $i>0$. The composition of the following natural morphisms

$$
f_{*} \mathcal{O}_{Y} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} f_{*} \mathcal{O}_{Y} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} f_{*} \mathcal{O}_{Y}(B) \simeq_{\text {qis }} f_{*} \mathcal{O}_{Y}(B)=f_{*} \mathcal{O}_{Y}
$$

in the derived category of coherent sheaves on $Y$ is a quasi-isomorphism. By [4, Corollary 2.75], the variety $X$ is Cohen-Macaulay.
(2) We know that the set of log-canonical centers of the pair $\left(\bar{X}, D_{\bar{X}}\right)$ is equal to the set of connected components of the variety $D_{\bar{X}}$. Thus (2) is a very special case of $[4, \S 9.1]$.
(3) Follows from (2) immediately.

We see important examples of semi-terminal singularities.
Example 2.7. Fix $m \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. Set $\bar{X}_{m}:=\mathbb{A}_{x_{1}, \ldots, x_{m+1}}^{m+1}$ and $\bar{D}_{m}:=\left(x_{m+1}=0\right) \subset$ $\bar{X}_{m}$. We set the involution $\iota: \bar{D}_{m} \rightarrow \bar{D}_{m}$ defined by $x_{i} \mapsto-x_{i}$ for $1 \leq i \leq m$. Let $X_{m}$ be the demi-normal variety obtained by the triplet ( $\left.\bar{X}_{m}, \bar{D}_{m}, \iota\right)$ (see [4, Corollaries 5.33, 9.31(3) and Theorem 5.38]). In fact, by a direct calculation in Lemma 2.6(2), $X_{m}=\operatorname{Spec} R_{m}$ with

$$
R_{m}=\mathbb{C}\left[\left\{x_{i} x_{j}\right\}_{1 \leq i \leq j \leq m}, x_{m+1},\left\{x_{i} x_{m+1}\right\}_{1 \leq i \leq m}\right] .
$$

Let $\nu: \bar{X}_{m} \rightarrow X_{m}$ be the normalization morphism and let $0 \in X_{m}$ be the image of $0 \in \bar{X}_{m}$. Consider a section $\phi:=1 / x_{m+1}\left(d x_{1} \wedge \cdots \wedge d x_{m+1}\right)$ of $\omega_{\bar{X}_{m}}\left(\bar{D}_{m}\right)$. Then $\operatorname{Res}_{\bar{X}_{m} \rightarrow \bar{D}_{m}}(\phi)=(-1)^{m} d x_{1} \wedge \cdots \wedge d x_{m} \in \omega_{\bar{D}_{m}}$ is $\iota$-anti-invariant if $m$ is odd and $\iota$-invariant if $m$ is even, where $\operatorname{Res}_{\bar{X}_{m} \rightarrow \bar{D}_{m}}$ is the residue map. By [4, Proposition 5.8], $2 K_{X_{m}}$ is Cartier. Moreover, $K_{X_{m}}$ is Cartier if $m$ is odd. In fact, $X_{m}$ is Gorenstein if and only if $m$ is odd (see Section 6). From now on, we consider the index 1 cover $\pi: \tilde{X}_{m} \rightarrow X_{m}$ of $X_{m}$ with respects to $\phi^{2}$ for the case $m$ is even. By [4, Proposition 5.8], the global section $\Gamma\left(X_{m}, \omega_{X_{m}}\right)$ is equal to

$$
\sum_{i=1}^{m+1} R_{m} \cdot \frac{x_{i}}{x_{m+1}} d x_{1} \wedge \cdots \wedge d x_{m+1}
$$

Thus $\tilde{X}_{m}=\operatorname{Spec} \tilde{R}_{m}$ with

$$
\begin{aligned}
\tilde{R}_{m} & =R_{m}\left[\left\{y_{i}\right\}_{1 \leq i \leq m+1}\right] /\left(\left\{y_{i} y_{j}-x_{i} x_{j}\right\}_{1 \leq i \leq j \leq m+1}\right) \\
& \simeq \mathbb{C}\left[x_{m+1}, y_{1}, \ldots, y_{m+1}\right] /\left(y_{m+1}^{2}-x_{m+1}^{2}\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Hence $\tilde{X}_{m}$ is a dnc variety.
Definition 2.8. An $n$-dimensional demi-normal singularity $0 \in X$ is called an $m$-twirl point if $0 \in X$ is analytically isomorphic to the singularity $0 \in$ $X_{m} \times \mathbb{A}^{n-m-1}$, where $0 \in X_{m}$ is the singularity defined in Example 2.7.

Remark 2.9. (1) The notion of 1-twirl points is equal to the notion of pinch points since there exists a natural isomorphism $\mathbb{C}\left[x_{1}^{2}, x_{2}, x_{1} x_{2}\right] \simeq$ $\mathbb{C}\left[y_{1}, y_{2}, y_{3}\right] /\left(y_{2}^{2}-y_{3}^{2} y_{1}\right)$.
(2) We consider a three-dimensional 2-twirl point $0 \in X_{2}$. Let $\pi: \tilde{X}_{2} \rightarrow$ $X_{2}$ be the index 1 cover as in Example 2.7. Take a general element $0 \in S \in\left|-K_{X_{2}}\right|$ and set $\tilde{S}:=\pi^{*} S \subset \tilde{X}_{2}$. By a suitable coordinate change, we may assume that the embedding $S \subset X_{2}$ corresponds to the following surjection

$$
\mathbb{C}\left[x_{1}^{2}, x_{1} x_{2}, x_{2}^{2}, x_{3}, x_{1} x_{3}, x_{2} x_{3}\right] \rightarrow \mathbb{C}\left[x_{2}^{2}, x_{3}, x_{2} x_{3}\right]
$$

such that $x_{1}^{2}, x_{1} x_{2}$ and $x_{1} x_{3}$ map to zero. Thus the double cover $(0 \in \tilde{S}) \rightarrow(0 \in S)$ is from a double normal crossing point to a pinch point.

## 3. Log-elliptic singularities

We consider log-elliptic singularities. The concept of log-elliptic singularities is a logarithmic analogue of the concept of elliptic singularities. In this section, many arguments are similar to the arguments in $[5, \S 4.4]$ based on the works [7] and [9].
Definition 3.1. A germ $0 \in(S, C)$ of a two-dimensional normal pair is called a log-elliptic singularity if $C$ is nonzero, $0 \in C, K_{S}+C$ is Cartier and for any projective birational morphism $f: T \rightarrow S$ such that $T$ is smooth and $C_{T}:=f_{*}^{-1} C$ is smooth, $f_{*} \omega_{T}\left(C_{T}\right)=\mathfrak{m}_{0, S} \cdot \omega_{S}(C)$ holds, where $\mathfrak{m}_{0, S}$ is the maximal ideal sheaf corresponds to $0 \in S$.
Remark 3.2. For a two-dimensional normal pair $(S, C)$ with $C$ reduced and $K_{S}+C$ Cartier and for a projective birational morphism $f: T \rightarrow S$ such that $T$ is smooth and $C_{T}:=f_{*}^{-1} C$ is smooth, $f_{*} \omega_{T}\left(C_{T}\right)=\omega_{S}(C)$ holds if and only if the pair $(S, C)$ has canonical singularities. The proof is essentially same as the proof of [4, Claim 2.3.1]. Thus in Definition 3.1, it is enough to check the condition $f_{*} \omega_{T}\left(C_{T}\right)=\mathfrak{m}_{0, S} \cdot \omega_{S}(C)$ for only one birational morphism $f$.

For the reason to consider log-elliptic singularities, see Lemma 4.1.
Notation 3.3. Let $0 \in(S, C)$ be a germ of a two-dimensional normal pair such that $K_{S}+C$ is Cartier and $(S, C)$ has not canonical singularities. Let $g: S^{\prime} \rightarrow S$ be the canonical modification (see [2, Definition 2.6]) of the normal pair ( $S, C$ ), $h: T \rightarrow S^{\prime}$ be the minimal resolution, $f: T \rightarrow S$ be the composition and $C_{T}$ be the strict transform of $C$ on $T$. We note that $f: T \rightarrow S$ is a semi-terminal modification (see [2, Definition 2.6]) of the normal pair ( $S, C$ ). By [4, Claim 2.26.4], there exists a unique $f$-exceptional effective Cartier divisor $Z$ on $T$ such that $K_{T}+C_{T}+Z \sim 0$ and the support of $Z$ is equal to the exceptional locus of the morphism $f$.

The following two propositions are essentially same as [5, Propositions 4.45 and 4.47].

Proposition 3.4. Fix Notation 3.3. Let L be an $f$-nef line bundle on $T$. Then the following hold:
(1) The homomorphism $H^{0}(T, L) \rightarrow H^{0}\left(Z,\left.L\right|_{Z}\right)$ is surjective.
(2) The homomorphism $H^{1}(T, L) \rightarrow H^{1}\left(Z,\left.L\right|_{Z}\right)$ is an isomorphism.
(3) $L \simeq \mathcal{O}_{T}$ if and only if $L \equiv_{f} 0$ and $\left.L\right|_{Z} \simeq \mathcal{O}_{Z}$.
(4) $f_{*} \omega_{T}\left(C_{T}+Z\right)=\omega_{S}(C)$ holds.
(5) $\omega_{S}(C) / f_{*} \omega_{T}\left(C_{T}\right) \simeq H^{0}\left(Z, \omega_{Z}\left(\left.C_{T}\right|_{Z}\right)\right)$ holds.
(6) $\omega_{S}(C) / f_{*} \omega_{T}\left(C_{T}\right)$ and $H^{1}\left(Z, \mathcal{O}_{Z}\left(-C_{T} \mid z\right)\right)$ are dual to each other.

Proposition 3.5. Under Notation 3.3, for any nonzero effective divisor $Z^{\prime} \lesseqgtr$ $Z$, we have $h^{1}\left(Z^{\prime}, \mathcal{O}_{Z^{\prime}}\left(-\left.C_{T}\right|_{Z^{\prime}}\right)\right)<h^{1}\left(Z, \mathcal{O}_{Z}\left(-\left.C_{T}\right|_{Z}\right)\right)$.
Lemma 3.6 (cf. [5, Proposition 4.51]). Fix Notation 3.3. Assume that $0 \in$ $(S, C)$ is a log-elliptic singularity. Then $h^{1}\left(Z, \mathcal{O}_{Z}\right)=0$ holds. Moreover, for any reduced and irreducible component $E \leq Z, E$ is isomorphic to $\mathbb{P}^{1}$ and $\left(\left(C_{T}+Z-E\right) \cdot E\right)=2$ holds.
Proof. From the exact sequence

$$
0 \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{Z^{\prime}}\left(-\left.C_{T}\right|_{Z^{\prime}}\right) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{Z^{\prime}} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{Z^{\prime} \cap C_{T}} \rightarrow 0
$$

we have $h^{1}\left(Z^{\prime}, \mathcal{O}_{Z^{\prime}}\left(-\left.C_{T}\right|_{Z^{\prime}}\right)\right) \geq h^{1}\left(Z^{\prime}, \mathcal{O}_{Z^{\prime}}\right)$ for any nonzero effective divisor $Z^{\prime} \leq Z$. By Proposition $3.4(6), h^{1}\left(Z, \mathcal{O}_{Z}\left(-C_{T} \mid Z\right)\right)=1$ holds. Thus $h^{1}\left(Z, \mathcal{O}_{Z}\right)=0$ or 1 . Assume that $h^{1}\left(Z, \mathcal{O}_{Z}\right)=1$. Then $h^{0}\left(Z, \omega_{Z}\right)=1$. Thus $\left(\omega_{Z} \cdot Z\right) \geq 0$. Moreover, since the support of $Z$ is equal to the exceptional locus of $f,\left(C_{T} . Z\right)>0$ holds. However, since $K_{T}+C_{T}+Z \sim 0$, we have $0=\left(\omega_{Z} . Z\right)+$ $\left(C_{T} . Z\right)$. This leads to a contradiction. Thus $h^{1}\left(Z, \mathcal{O}_{Z}\right)=0$. By Proposition 3.5, we have $h^{1}\left(E, \mathcal{O}_{E}\right)=0$ for any reduced and irreducible component $E \leq Z$. Moreover, we have $0=\left(\left(K_{T}+C_{T}+Z\right) \cdot E\right)=-2+\left(\left(C_{T}+Z-E\right) . E\right)$.

Proposition 3.7 (cf. [5, Lemma 4.53]). Fix Notation 3.3. Assume that $0 \in$ $(S, C)$ is a log-elliptic singularity. Let $L$ be a nef line bundle on $Z$. Then $H^{1}(Z, L)=0$ and there exists a section $s \in H^{0}(Z, L)$ such that the associated subscheme $V:=(s=0) \subset Z$ does not intersect $C_{T}$ and the singular locus of $\operatorname{red}(Z)$, and $\left.s\right|_{\operatorname{red}(Z)}$ is smooth. Moreover, for such $s$ and $V$, if we set $A:=\mathcal{O}_{V}$, then the natural homomorphism $H^{0}(Z, L) \rightarrow A \otimes L$ is surjective.

Proof. By Lemma 3.6, we have $h^{1}\left(Z, \mathcal{O}_{Z}\right)=0$. Thus the assertion follows from [5, Lemma 4.50].
Proposition 3.8 (cf. [5, Proposition 4.54]). Under the notation in Proposition 3.7, assume that the integer $k:=(L . Z)$ satisfies that $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. Then there exists an isomorphism

$$
\bigoplus_{n \geq 0} H^{0}\left(Z, L^{\otimes n}\right) \simeq \mathbb{C}\left[s, t, x_{1}, \ldots, x_{k-1}\right] /\left(\left\{x_{i} x_{j}+q_{i j}(s, t)\right\}_{1 \leq i \leq j \leq k-1}\right)
$$

of graded $\mathbb{C}$-algebras, where $s, t, x_{1}, \ldots, x_{k-1}$ are of degree one and $q_{i j}(s, t) \in$ $\mathbb{C}[s, t]$ are homogeneous polynomials of degree two.

Proof. We set

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
R_{Z}(n):=H^{0}\left(Z, L^{\otimes n}\right), & R_{Z}:=\bigoplus_{n \geq 0} R_{Z}(n), \\
R_{V}(n):=H^{0}\left(V,\left.L\right|_{V} ^{\otimes n}\right), \text { and } & R_{V}:=\bigoplus_{n \geq 0} R_{V}(n) .
\end{array}
$$

For any $n \geq 0$, there exists a natural exact sequence

$$
0 \rightarrow R_{Z}(n) \xrightarrow{\cdot s} R_{Z}(n+1) \rightarrow R_{V}(n+1) \rightarrow 0 .
$$

Since $\operatorname{dim}_{\mathbb{C}} R_{Z}(0)=1$, we have $\operatorname{dim}_{\mathbb{C}} R_{Z}(n)=k n+1$ for any $n \geq 0$. Let $T \in R_{V}(1)=A \otimes L$ be an element generating $A \otimes L$ and $t \in R_{Z}(1)$ be an extension of $T$. Since $R_{V}(n)=A \cdot T^{n}$ for any $n \geq 0$, we have

$$
\left(R_{Z} / s R_{Z}\right)(n)= \begin{cases}\mathbb{C} & (n=0) \\ A \cdot T^{n} & (n \geq 1)\end{cases}
$$

Thus there exists elements $x_{1}, \ldots, x_{k-1} \in R_{Z}(1)$ such that

$$
R_{Z} /(s, t) R_{Z}=\mathbb{C}\left[\bar{x}_{1}, \ldots, \bar{x}_{k-1}\right] /\left(\left\{\bar{x}_{i} \bar{x}_{j}\right\}_{1 \leq i \leq j \leq k-1}\right),
$$

where $\bar{x}_{i} \in\left(R_{Z} /(s, t) R_{Z}\right)(1)$ is the image of $x_{i}$. Therefore the assertion follows from [5, Lemma 4.55].

Theorem 3.9 (cf. [5, Theorem 4.57]). Fix Notation 3.3. Assume that $0 \in$ $(S, C)$ is a log-elliptic singularity. Let $g: S^{\prime} \rightarrow S$ be the blowing up along the maximal ideal sheaf $\mathfrak{m}_{0, S}$ corresponds to $0 \in S$, that is, $S^{\prime}=\operatorname{Proj}_{S} \bigoplus_{n \geq 0} \mathfrak{m}_{0, S}^{n}$. Let $\mathcal{O}_{S^{\prime}}(1)$ be the $g$-ample line bundle on $S^{\prime}$ corresponds to the projectivization. Then the morphism is equal to the canonical modification of the normal pair $(S, C)$. Thus there exists a morphism $h: T \rightarrow S^{\prime}$ such that $g \circ h=f$ holds. Moreover, $K_{S^{\prime}}+C_{S^{\prime}} \sim \mathcal{O}_{S^{\prime}}(1) \sim-h_{*} Z$ holds, where $C_{S^{\prime}} \subset S^{\prime}$ be the strict transform of $C$.

Proof. Set $L:=\mathcal{O}_{T}(-Z) \simeq \omega_{T}\left(C_{T}\right)$. Then $\left.L\right|_{Z}$ is nef and $(L . Z) \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. Since $f^{*}$ gives a natural isomorphism $H^{0}\left(S, \mathcal{O}_{S}\right) \simeq H^{0}\left(T, \mathcal{O}_{T}\right)$, we get an ideal $I_{n} \subset H^{0}\left(S, \mathcal{O}_{S}\right)$ defined by

$$
H^{0}\left(T, L^{\otimes n}\right)=H^{0}\left(T, \mathcal{O}_{T}(-n Z)\right)=: I_{n} \subset H^{0}\left(S, \mathcal{O}_{S}\right)
$$

for any $n \geq 0$. Since $H^{0}\left(Z, \mathcal{O}_{Z}\right) \simeq \mathbb{C}$, we have $I_{1}=\mathfrak{m}_{0, S}$. Take general global sections $s_{1}, s_{2} \in H^{0}(T, L)$. Since there exists an exact sequence

$$
0 \rightarrow L^{\otimes n-1} \xrightarrow{t}\left(s_{2},-s_{1}\right) L^{\otimes n} \oplus L^{\otimes n} \xrightarrow{\left(s_{1}, s_{2}\right)} L^{\otimes n+1} \rightarrow 0
$$

and $H^{1}\left(T, L^{n}\right)=0$ for any $n \geq 0$ (see [5, Corollary 2.68]), we have $I_{n+1}=I_{n} \cdot I_{1}$ for any $n \geq 0$. Since there exists a natural exact sequence

$$
\begin{aligned}
0 \rightarrow H^{0}\left(T, \mathcal{O}_{T}(-(n+1) Z)\right) & \rightarrow H^{0}\left(T, \mathcal{O}_{T}(-n Z)\right) \\
& \rightarrow H^{0}\left(Z, \mathcal{O}_{Z}(-n Z)\right) \rightarrow 0
\end{aligned}
$$

for any $n \geq 0$, we have an isomorphism

$$
\bigoplus_{n \geq 0} I_{n} / I_{n+1} \simeq \bigoplus_{n \geq 0} H^{0}\left(Z,\left.L^{\otimes n}\right|_{Z}\right)
$$

of graded $\mathbb{C}$-algebras. By Proposition 3.8, the algebra $\bigoplus_{n \geq 0} I_{n} / I_{n+1}$ is generated by $I_{1} / I_{2}$. Hence $I_{n}=I_{n+1}+I_{1}^{n}=I_{n} \cdot I_{1}+I_{1}^{n}$ holds for any $n \geq 0$. By Nakayama's lemma, $I_{1}^{n}=I_{n}$ for any $n \geq 0$. Hence $I_{n}=\mathfrak{m}_{0, S}^{n}$ for any $n \geq 0$. Thus there exists isomorphisms

$$
\bigoplus_{n \geq 0} \mathfrak{m}_{0, S}^{n} \simeq \bigoplus_{n \geq 0} f_{*} \mathcal{O}_{T}(-n Z) \simeq \bigoplus_{n \geq 0} f_{*} \mathcal{O}_{T}\left(n\left(K_{T}+C_{T}\right)\right)
$$

of graded $\mathcal{O}_{S}$-algebras. Thus $S^{\prime} \simeq \operatorname{Proj}_{S} \bigoplus_{n \geq 0} f_{*} \mathcal{O}_{T}\left(n\left(K_{T}+C_{T}\right)\right)$ is the canonical modification of $(S, C)$ by [2, Proposition 3.2]. Since $\mathcal{O}_{T}(-n Z)$ is generated by global sections for any $n \gg 0$, the induced morphism $h: T \rightarrow S^{\prime}$ satisfies that $h^{*} \mathcal{O}_{S^{\prime}}(1) \sim \mathcal{O}_{T}(-Z)$. Thus we have $\mathcal{O}_{S^{\prime}}(1) \sim-h_{*} Z \sim K_{S^{\prime}}+C_{S^{\prime}}$ since $K_{T}+C_{T}+Z \sim 0$.

## 4. Normal semi-terminal pairs

For a semi-terminal variety $X$, the pair $\left(\bar{X}, D_{\bar{X}}\right)$ is a normal semi-terminal pair. In this section, we consider three-dimensional such objects with nonzero $D_{\bar{X}}$.

Lemma 4.1 (cf. [5, Lemma 5.30]). Let $0 \in(X, D)$ be a germ of a threedimensional canonical singularity with $0 \in D \neq 0$ and $K_{X}+D$ Cartier. Let $0 \in S \subset X$ be a general hypersurface passing through $0 \in X$ and let $C:=$ $D \cap S$. Then the two-dimensional singularity $0 \in(S, C)$ is either a canonical singularity or a log-elliptic singularity.

Proof. Let $f: Y \rightarrow X$ be a $\log$ resolution of the normal pair $(X, D)$ which dominates the blowing up of $X$ along the maximal ideal sheaf $\mathfrak{m}_{0, X}$ corresponds to $0 \in X$. Then there exists an $f$-exceptional effective divisor $E$ on $Y$ such that $f^{*} \mathfrak{m}_{0, X}=\mathcal{O}_{Y}(-E)$ holds. Moreover, since $0 \in S \subset X$ is general, we have $f^{*} S=S^{\prime}+E, S^{\prime}$ is smooth and $C^{\prime}:=D^{\prime} \cap S^{\prime} \subset S^{\prime}$ is equal to $\left(\left.f\right|_{S^{\prime}}\right)_{*}^{-1} C$, where $S^{\prime}:=f_{*}^{-1} S$ and $D^{\prime}:=f_{*}^{-1} D$. Since $X$ and $D$ are Cohen-Macaulay, $S$ is normal, $C$ is reduced and $K_{S}+C=\left.\left(K_{X}+D+S\right)\right|_{S}$ is Cartier. There exists an $f$-exceptional effective divisor $F$ on $Y$ such that $\omega_{Y}\left(D^{\prime}\right)=f^{*} \omega_{X}(D)(F)$ holds since $(X, D)$ has canonical singularities. Since

$$
\begin{aligned}
\omega_{S^{\prime}}\left(C^{\prime}\right) & =\left.\omega_{Y}\left(D^{\prime}+S^{\prime}\right)\right|_{S^{\prime}} \\
& =\left.f^{*}\left(\omega_{X}(D+S)\right)(F-E)\right|_{S^{\prime}}=\left(\left.f\right|_{S^{\prime}}\right)^{*}\left(\omega_{S}(C)\right)\left(F-\left.E\right|_{S^{\prime}}\right),
\end{aligned}
$$

we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left(\left.f\right|_{S^{\prime}}\right)_{*} \omega_{S^{\prime}}\left(C^{\prime}\right) & =\omega_{S}(C) \otimes\left(\left.f\right|_{S^{\prime}}\right)_{*} \mathcal{O}_{S^{\prime}}\left(F-\left.E\right|_{S^{\prime}}\right) \\
& \supset \omega_{S}(C) \otimes\left(\left.f\right|_{S^{\prime}}\right)_{*} \mathcal{O}_{S^{\prime}}\left(-\left.E\right|_{S^{\prime}}\right)=\mathfrak{m}_{0, S} \cdot \omega_{S}(C),
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\mathfrak{m}_{0, S}$ is the maximal ideal sheaf of $\mathcal{O}_{S}$ corresponds to $0 \in S$. Thus the assertion follows.

Theorem 4.2 (cf. [5, Theorems 5.34 and 5.35]). Let $0 \in(X, D)$ be a germ of a three-dimensional normal semi-terminal singularity with $0 \in D \neq 0$ and $K_{X}+D$ Cartier. Let $0 \in S \subset X$ be a general hypersurface passing through $0 \in X$ and let $C:=D \cap S$. Then the two-dimensional singularity $0 \in(S, C)$ has a canonical singularity.

Proof. Assume not. Then the singularity $0 \in(S, C)$ is a log-elliptic singularity by Lemma 4.1. Let $f: Y \rightarrow X$ be the blowing up along the maximal ideal sheaf $\mathfrak{m}_{0, X}$ corresponding to $0 \in X$ and let $\bar{f}: \bar{Y} \rightarrow X$ be the composition $f \circ \nu_{Y}$. Let $E \subset Y$ be the $f$-exceptional Cartier divisor on $Y$ defined by $f^{*} \mathfrak{m}_{0, X}=$ $\mathcal{O}_{Y}(-E)$ and let $S^{\prime} \subset Y$ be the strict transform of $S$. By Theorem 3.9, the morphism $\left.f\right|_{S^{\prime}}: S^{\prime} \rightarrow S$ is the canonical modification of the normal pair $(S, C)$. In particular, $S^{\prime}$ is normal. Since $f^{*} S=S^{\prime}+E$ and $\nu_{Y}$ is an isomorphism around $S^{\prime}, \nu_{Y}^{*} S^{\prime}\left(\simeq S^{\prime}\right)$ is $\bar{f}$-ample and $\nu_{Y}^{*} S^{\prime}$ intersects any component of $\bar{f}$ exceptional divisors. Since $(X, D)$ has canonical singularities, there exists an $\bar{f}$-exceptional effective Cartier divisor $F$ on $\bar{Y}$ such that $K_{\bar{Y}}+D_{\bar{Y}}=\bar{f}^{*}\left(K_{X}+\right.$ $D)+F$ holds, where $D_{\bar{Y}}:=\bar{f}_{*}^{-1} D$. Since $0 \in S \subset X$ is general, $\left.D_{\bar{Y}}\right|_{\nu_{Y}^{*} S^{\prime}}=C_{S^{\prime}}$ holds, where $C_{S^{\prime}} \subset \nu_{Y}^{*} S^{\prime}$ is the strict transform of $C \subset S$. By Theorem 3.9, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
-\left.\nu_{Y}^{*} E\right|_{\nu_{Y}^{*} S^{\prime}} & \equiv K_{\nu_{Y}^{*} S^{\prime}}+C_{S^{\prime}}=K_{\bar{Y}}+D_{\bar{Y}}+\left.\nu_{Y}^{*} S^{\prime}\right|_{\nu_{Y}^{*} S^{\prime}} \\
& =\left.\left.\left(\bar{f}^{*}\left(K_{X}+D+S\right)+F-\nu_{Y}^{*} E\right)\right|_{\nu_{Y}^{*} S^{\prime}} \equiv\left(F-\nu_{Y}^{*} E\right)\right|_{\nu_{Y}^{*} S^{\prime}}
\end{aligned}
$$

Hence $\left.F\right|_{\nu_{Y}^{*} S^{\prime}} \equiv 0$. Any component of $F$ maps onto $0 \in X$. Thus $\left.F\right|_{\nu_{Y}^{*} S^{\prime}} \subset \nu_{Y}^{*} S^{\prime}$ is exceptional with respects to the morphism $\nu_{Y}^{*} S^{\prime} \rightarrow S$. By the negativity lemma [5, Lemma 3.39], $\left.F\right|_{\nu_{Y}^{*} S^{\prime}}=0$. Since any component of $F$ intersects $\nu_{Y}^{*} S^{\prime}$, we have $F=0$. Therefore, there exists an exceptional prime divisor $G$ over $X$ such that center ${ }_{X} G=\{0\}$ and $a(G, X, D)=0$. This leads to a contradiction since $(X, D)$ is semi-terminal. Thus the assertion follows.

By Example 2.5(3) and Theorem 4.2, we have the following:
Corollary 4.3. Let $0 \in(X, D)$ be a germ of a three-dimensional normal semiterminal singularity with $D \neq 0,0 \in D$ and $K_{X}+D$ Cartier. Then both $X$ and $D$ are smooth at 0 .

The following theorem is proven similar to [10, Theorem (3.1)].
Theorem 4.4. Let $0 \in(X, D)$ be a germ of a three-dimensional normal semiterminal singularity such that $0 \in \operatorname{Supp} D$ and $D$ is a nonzero reduced divisor. Then both $X$ and $D$ are smooth at 0 .

Proof. We set

$$
r:=\min \left\{r \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0} \mid r\left(K_{X}+D\right) \text { is Cartier }\right\} .
$$

Take the index 1 cover $\pi: 0 \in(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D}) \rightarrow 0 \in(X, D)$ of $0 \in(X, D)$ (see [4, Proposition $2.50(2)]$ ). Then we have $K_{\tilde{X}}+\tilde{D}=\pi^{*}\left(K_{X}+D\right), \pi^{-1}(0)=$ $\{0\}, K_{\tilde{X}}+\tilde{D}$ is Cartier, the normal pair $(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D})$ is semi-terminal, the group $\mu_{r}$ of $r$-th roots of unity acts on $(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D})$ and the normal pair $(X, D)$ is the quotient of the group action. We note that the group action is free outside $0 \in \tilde{X}$ by Example 2.5(3). By Corollary 4.3, both $\tilde{X}$ and $\tilde{D}$ are smooth at 0 . Therefore the assertion follows if $r=1$. Assume that $r>1$. By taking an analytical neighborhood of $0 \in \tilde{X}$, we can assume that $0 \in(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D})$ is equal to $0 \in\left(\mathbb{A}_{x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}}^{3}, \mathbb{A}_{x_{1}, x_{2}}^{2}=\left(x_{3}=0\right)\right)$ and the action $\mu_{r} \curvearrowright\left(\mathbb{A}_{x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}}^{3}, \mathbb{A}_{x_{1}, x_{2}}^{2}\right)$ is given by $x_{i} \mapsto \varepsilon^{a_{1}} x$ for some $0 \leq a_{i} \leq r-1(1 \leq i \leq 3)$, where $\varepsilon \in \mu_{r}$ is a generator. Since the group action is free outside $0 \in \tilde{X}$, all of $a_{1}, a_{2}$ and $a_{3}$ are nonzero. By replacing a generator $\varepsilon \in \mu_{r}$ if necessary, we can assume that $\operatorname{gcd}\left(a_{1}, a_{2}, a_{3}\right)=1$ and $a_{1}+a_{2} \leq r$.

Let $f: Y \rightarrow \mathbb{A}_{x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}}^{3}$ be the weighted blowup with weights $\left(a_{1}, a_{2}, a_{3}\right)$. By [4, Theorem 3.21], a local chart is

$$
f: \mathbb{A}_{y_{1}, y_{2}, y_{3}}^{3} / \frac{1}{a_{1}}\left(1,-a_{2},-a_{3}\right) \rightarrow \mathbb{A}_{x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}}^{3}
$$

with $f^{*} x_{1}=y_{1}^{a_{1}}, f^{*} x_{2}=y_{1}^{a_{2}} y_{2}$ and $f^{*} x_{3}=y_{1}^{a_{3}} y_{3}$. Set $F:=\left(y_{1}=0\right)$. Since

$$
f^{*}\left(x_{3}^{-1} d x_{1} \wedge d x_{2} \wedge d x_{3}\right)=a_{1} y_{3}^{-1} y_{1}^{a_{1}+a_{2}-1} d y_{1} \wedge d y_{2} \wedge d y_{3}
$$

we have $a(F, \tilde{X}, \tilde{D})=a_{1}+a_{2}-1$. Let $E$ be the exceptional prime divisor over $X$ which is dominated by $F$. We note that center ${ }_{X} E=\{0\}$. By [4, Theorem 3.21], we have $a(E, X, D)=\left(a_{1}+a_{2}\right) / r-1 \leq 0$. Since $(X, D)$ is semi-terminal, this leads to a contradiction. Thus $r$ must be equal to one.

## 5. Proof of Theorem 1.1

As a corollary of Theorem 4.4, we can prove Theorem 1.1. Let $0 \in X$ be a germ of a three-dimensional non-normal semi-terminal singularity. By Theorem 4.4, both $\bar{X}$ and $\bar{D}$ are smooth.

We consider the case that the inverse image $\nu_{X}^{-1}(0)$ does not consist of only one point. By Lemma 2.6(2), $\nu_{X}^{-1}(0)=\left\{q_{1}, q_{2}\right\}$. By taking analytical neighborhoods of $q_{1}, q_{2} \in \tilde{X}$, we can assume that $q_{1}, q_{2} \in\left(\tilde{X}, D_{\tilde{X}}\right)$ is equal to the disjoint union of

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left(q_{1}=\right) 0 \in\left(\mathbb{A}_{x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}}^{3}, \mathbb{A}_{x_{1}, x_{2}}^{2}=\left(x_{3}=0\right)\right), \\
& \left(q_{2}=\right) 0 \in\left(\mathbb{A}_{y_{1}, y_{2}, y_{3}}^{3}, \mathbb{A}_{y_{1}, y_{2}}^{2}=\left(y_{3}=0\right)\right),
\end{aligned}
$$

and the involution $\iota_{X}: D_{\tilde{X}} \rightarrow D_{\tilde{X}}$ is given by $x_{i} \mapsto y_{i}$ and $y_{i} \mapsto x_{i}$ for $1 \leq i \leq 2$. Then the coordinate ring $\mathcal{O}_{X}$ is equal to

$$
\left\{(f, g) \in \mathbb{C}\left[x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}\right] \times \mathbb{C}\left[y_{1}, y_{2}, y_{3}\right] \mid f\left(x_{1}, x_{2}, 0\right)=g\left(x_{1}, x_{2}, 0\right)\right\}
$$

Consider the ring surjection $\mathbb{C}\left[x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}, y_{3}\right] \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{X}$ defined by $x_{1} \mapsto\left(x_{1}, y_{1}\right)$, $x_{2} \mapsto\left(x_{2}, y_{2}\right), x_{3} \mapsto\left(x_{3}, 0\right)$ and $y_{3} \mapsto\left(0, y_{3}\right)$. The kernel of the surjection is generated by $x_{3} y_{3}$. Thus $X$ is a dnc variety.

We consider the case that the inverse image $\nu_{X}^{-1}(0)$ consists of only one point, say $0 \in \bar{X}$. Then $0 \in D_{\tilde{X}}$ is a fixed point of the involution $\iota_{X}: D_{\tilde{X}} \rightarrow D_{\tilde{X}}$. By taking an analytical neighborhood of $0 \in \tilde{X}$, we can assume either

$$
0 \in \bar{X}=\mathbb{A}_{x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}}^{3}, D_{\tilde{X}}=\mathbb{A}_{x_{1}, x_{2}}^{2}=\left(x_{3}=0\right), \iota_{X}:\left\{\begin{array}{l}
x_{1} \mapsto x_{1} \\
x_{2} \mapsto-x_{2}
\end{array}\right.
$$

or

$$
0 \in \bar{X}=\mathbb{A}_{x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}}^{3}, D_{\tilde{X}}=\mathbb{A}_{x_{1}, x_{2}}^{2}=\left(x_{3}=0\right), \iota_{X}:\left\{\begin{array}{l}
x_{1} \mapsto-x_{1}, \\
x_{2} \mapsto-x_{2}
\end{array}\right.
$$

As we have seen in Example 2.7, $0 \in X$ is a 1-twirl point (that is, a pinch point) for the former case; a 2-twirl point for the latter case.

As a consequence, we have completed the proof of Theorem 1.1.

## 6. Appendix: ring-theoretical properties of twirl singularities

In this section, we determine whether a given $m$-twirl point is Gorenstein or not by using [3, Theorem (2)]. Fix a positive integer $m$ and a lattice $N:=$ $\mathbb{Z} e_{1} \oplus \cdots \oplus \mathbb{Z} e_{m+1}$. Set $H \subset N$ such that

$$
H:=\sum_{1 \leq i \leq j \leq m} \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\left(e_{i}+e_{j}\right)+\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} e_{m+1}+\sum_{1 \leq i \leq m} \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\left(e_{i}+e_{m+1}\right)
$$

Then $H \subset N$ is a finitely generated additive semigroup with identity. Moreover, the semigroup ring $\mathbb{C}[H]$ is equal to $R_{m}$ in Example 2.7. We set $f_{i}:=2 e_{i}$ $(1 \leq i \leq m)$ and $f_{m+1}:=e_{m+1}$. Then $f_{1}, \ldots, f_{m+1}$ satisfies the conditions (1) and (2) in [3, p. 1]. Set

$$
F_{i}:=H \cap \sum_{1 \leq p \leq m+1, p \neq i} \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0} f_{p}
$$

for $1 \leq i \leq m+1$, that is,

$$
\left\{\begin{aligned}
F_{p}= & \sum_{1 \leq i \leq j \leq m, i \neq p, j \neq p} \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\left(e_{i}+e_{j}\right)+\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} e_{m+1} \\
& +\sum_{1 \leq i \leq m, i \neq p} \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\left(e_{i}+e_{m+1}\right) \quad(p \neq m+1) \\
F_{m+1}= & \sum_{1 \leq i \leq j \leq m} \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\left(e_{i}+e_{j}\right)
\end{aligned}\right.
$$

Set

$$
H_{i}:=\left\{w \in N \mid \text { there exists } g \in F_{i} \text { such that } w+g \in H\right\}
$$

for $1 \leq i \leq m+1$, that is,

$$
\left\{\begin{aligned}
H_{p}= & \sum_{1 \leq i \leq j \leq m, i \neq p, j \neq p} \mathbb{Z}\left(e_{i}+e_{j}\right)+\mathbb{Z} e_{m+1} \\
& +\sum_{1 \leq i \leq m, i \neq p} \mathbb{Z}\left(e_{i}+e_{m+1}\right)+\sum_{1 \leq i \leq m} \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\left(e_{i}+e_{p}\right) \\
& +\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\left(e_{p}+e_{m+1}\right) \quad(p \neq m+1), \\
H_{m+1}= & \sum_{1 \leq i \leq j \leq m} \mathbb{Z}\left(e_{i}+e_{j}\right)+\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} e_{m+1}+\sum_{1 \leq i \leq m} \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\left(e_{i}+e_{m+1}\right) .
\end{aligned}\right.
$$

Hence the set $N \backslash \bigcup_{1 \leq i \leq m+1} H_{i}$ is equal to

$$
\left\{\sum_{1 \leq i \leq m} a_{i} e_{i} \mid a_{i} \in \mathbb{Z}_{<0}, \sum_{1 \leq i \leq m} a_{i} \text { is odd }\right\} \cup \sum_{1 \leq i \leq m+1} \mathbb{Z}_{<0} e_{i} .
$$

By $[3$, Theorem (2)], $\mathbb{C}[H]$ is Gorenstein if and only if there exists $c \in N$ such that $c-H=N \backslash \bigcup_{1 \leq i \leq m+1} H_{i}$. Thus $\mathbb{C}[H]$ is Gorenstein if and only if $m$ is odd. Therefore we have the following:

Proposition 6.1. m-twirl point is Gorenstein if and only if $m$ is odd.
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