ICE CREAM AND ORBIFOLD RIEMANN–ROCH

ANITA BUCKLEY, MILES REID, AND SHENGTIAN ZHOU

To Professor Igor Rostislavovich Shafarevich on his 90th birthday

Abstract. We give an orbifold Riemann–Roch formula in closed form for the Hilbert series of a quasismooth polarized n-fold (X, D), under the assumption that X is projectively Gorenstein with only isolated orbifold points. Our formula is a sum of terms each of which is integral and Gorenstein symmetric of the same canonical weight; the orbifold terms are called *ice cream functions*. This form of the Hilbert series is particularly useful for computer algebra, and we illustrate it on examples of K3 surfaces and Calabi–Yau 3-folds.

These results apply also with higher dimensional orbifold strata (see [8] and [21]), although the correct statements are considerably trickier. We expect to return to this in future publications.

Contents

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 14Q15; 13P20.

Key words and phrases. Orbifold, orbifold Riemann–Roch, Hilbert series, weighted projective varieties.

Partially funded by Korean Government WCU Grant R33-2008-000-10101-0. Shengtian Zhou was supported by a University of Warwick Postgraduate Research Studentship.

1. Introduction

Reid [YPG] introduced Riemann–Roch (RR) formulas for polarized orbifolds (X, D) with isolated orbifold locus, of the form

$$\chi(X, \mathcal{O}_X(D)) = \mathrm{RR}(X, D) + \sum_{P \in \mathcal{B}} c_P(D), \tag{1.1}$$

where $\mathrm{RR}(X, D)$ is a Riemann–Roch like expression and the $c_P(D)$ are certain fractional contributions from the orbifold points $\mathcal{B}$, depending only on the local type of (X, D). The orbifold RR formula of [YPG] has found numerous subsequent extensions and applications; see for example Iano-Fletcher [13], Brown, Altınok and Reid [2], Buckley and Szendrői [8], Chen, Chen and Chen [10] and Kawakita [15], and we expect these ideas to be equally applicable in the study of higher dimensional varieties.

A general RR formula for abstract orbifolds was first proved by Kawasaki [16] by analytic tools. Toën [19] gave another proof using the algebraic methods of Deligne–Mumford stacks. However, at present, how to use these abstract results in practice to compute the dimension of RR spaces is not well understood. Toën's result was applied to weighted projective spaces by Nironi [17], to quasismooth varieties in weighted projective spaces by Zhou [21] and to twisted curves by Abramovich and Vistoli [1]. Our proof, like that of [YPG], is based on a reduction to Atiyah–Singer and Atiyah–Segal equivariant Riemann–Roch [3], [4].

Let D be an ample $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier divisor on a normal projective n-fold X (we usually work over $\mathbb{C}$). The finite dimensional vector spaces $H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(mD))$ fit together as a finitely generated graded ring

$$R(X, D) = \bigoplus_{m \geq 0} H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(mD)), \tag{1.2}$$

with $X \cong \operatorname{Proj} R(X, D)$ and the divisorial sheaf $\mathcal{O}_X(mD)$ equal to the character sheaf $\mathcal{O}_X(m)$ of the Proj. A surjection from a graded polynomial ring

$$k[x_0, \dots, x_N] \twoheadrightarrow R(X, D) \quad \text{with variables } x_i \text{ of weight } a_i \tag{1.3}$$

corresponds to an embedding

$$i \colon X \cong \operatorname{Proj} R(X, D) \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}(a_0, \dots, a_N) \tag{1.4}$$

of X into a weighted projective space as a projectively normal subscheme.

The Hilbert function $m \mapsto P_m(X, D) = h^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(mD))$ and the *Hilbert series* $P_X(t) = \sum_{m \geq 0} P_m t^m$ encode the numerical data of $R(X, D)$. It is a standard result that $\prod(1 - t^{a_i}) \cdot P_X(t)$ is a polynomial where, as above, the a_i are the weights of the generators. The multiplicative group $\mathbb{G}_\mathrm{m}$ ($= \mathbb{C}^\times$ if the ground field is $\mathbb{C}$) has a standard action on the graded ring $R(X, D) = \bigoplus_{m \geq 0} R_m$, with $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}^\times$ multiplying R_m by λ^m. Our aim is a *character formula* expressing the Hilbert series of R in closed form.

1.1. **Plan of the paper.** Section 1 recalls notation and background results from the literature, and states our Main Theorem 1.3. Section 2 defines ice cream functions as inverse polynomials modulo $1+t+\cdots+t^{r-1}$ that contain the same information as Dedekind sums. Section 3.1 deals with the existence of the RR formula for n-folds with isolated orbifold points and the precise nature of the term $\mathrm{RR}(D)$, as a preliminary to the proof of the main theorem in Section 3.2. Section 4 relates the new viewpoint of this paper to traditional formulas for the Hilbert series of K3 surfaces, Fano 3-folds and canonical 3-folds.

Although this paper mostly deals in isolated orbifold points, our ultimate aspiration is to find closed expressions for the Hilbert series of arbitrary orbifolds, having a stratification by orbifold loci of any dimension. Section 5 discusses briefly what we hope to do in this direction, and the difficulties associated with positive dimensional orbifold loci, especially their dissident strata (where the inertia group jumps); we exemplify this with Buckley's results on orbifold RR for polarized Calabi–Yau 3-folds [8].

1.2. **Definitions and notation.** We work over $\mathbb{C}$. A *Weil divisor* on a normal variety X is a formal linear combination of prime divisors with integer coefficients. A Weil divisor D is $\mathbb{Q}$-*Cartier* if mD is Cartier for some integer $m>0$.

We write $\boldsymbol{\mu}_r \subset \mathbb{G}_\mathrm{m}$ for the multiplicative group of rth roots of unity, or the cyclic subgroup of $\mathbb{C}^\times$ generated by $\exp\frac{2\pi i}{r}$. A *cyclic orbifold point* or *cyclic quotient singularity* of type $\frac{1}{r}(a_1,\dots,a_n)$ is the quotient $\pi\colon \mathbb{A}^n \to \mathbb{A}^n/\boldsymbol{\mu}_r$, where $\boldsymbol{\mu}_r$ acts on $\mathbb{A}^n$ by

$$\boldsymbol{\mu}_r \ni \varepsilon\colon (x_1,\dots,x_n) \mapsto (\varepsilon^{a_1}x_1,\dots,\varepsilon^{a_n}x_n). \tag{1.5}$$

We usually assume that no factor of r divides all the a_i, which is equivalent to the $\boldsymbol{\mu}_r$ action being effective; the orbifold point is isolated if and only if all the a_i are coprime to r. The sheaf $\pi_*\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{A}^n}$ decomposes as a direct sum of divisorial eigensheaves

$$\mathcal{L}_i = \bigl\{ f \bigm| \varepsilon(f) = \varepsilon^i \cdot f \text{ for all } \varepsilon \in \boldsymbol{\mu}_r \bigr\} \quad \text{for } i \in \mathbb{Z}/r = \mathrm{Hom}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_r, \mathbb{G}_\mathrm{m}). \tag{1.6}$$

The notation $\frac{1}{r}(a_1,\dots,a_n)$ refers to *polarized* orbifold points. The orbinates x_j of degree a_j modulo r are local sections of $\mathcal{O}_X(a_j)$, which is locally isomorphic to $\mathcal{L}_{-a_j}$. In the terminology of [YPG, Definition 8.3], $\mathcal{O}_X(1) = \mathcal{O}_X(D)$ is of type ${}_{r-1}\bigl(\frac{1}{r}(a_1,\dots,a_n)\bigr)$.

A polarized variety (X,D) is *quasismooth* if the corresponding affine cone $\mathcal{C}_X = \operatorname{Spec} R(X,D)$ is nonsingular outside the origin. In this case, the orbifold points of X arise from the orbits of the group action that are pointwise fixed by a nontrivial isotropy group, necessarily the cyclic subgroup $\boldsymbol{\mu}_r \subset \mathbb{G}_\mathrm{m}$ for some r. In terms of (X,D), quasismooth holds if and only if X has locally cyclic quotient singularities $\frac{1}{r}(a_1,\dots,a_n)$ and the given Weil divisor $D = \mathcal{O}_X(1)$ generates the local class group $\mathbb{Z}/r = \mathrm{Hom}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_r, \mathbb{G}_\mathrm{m})$. Then the local index one cyclic cover defined by a local identification $\mathcal{O}_X(rD) \cong \mathcal{O}_X$ is nonsingular.

All our concrete examples are subvarieties in weighted projective spaces; see Iano-Fletcher [13] for definitions and properties. Our quasismooth assumption implies that X has no orbifold behaviour in codimension 0 or 1, or is *well formed* in the terminology of [13]. This is right here because we work with n-folds for $n \geq 2$ with isolated orbifold locus; it means that the orbifold X as a scheme already knows its orbifold structure, the local universal cover of $X \setminus \operatorname{Sing} X$. This simplifies the treatment, allowing us to circumvent the language of stacks and the graded structure sheaf $\bigoplus_{i\in\mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{O}_X(i)$ (cf. Canonaco [9]). Some of our examples involve fractional divisors on curves, and we leave the elementary treatment of the graded structure sheaf $\bigoplus_{i\in\mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{O}_X(i)$ in this case to the conscientious reader.[1]

A polarized variety (X, D) is *projectively Gorenstein* if its affine cone or the corresponding graded ring $R(X, D)$ is Gorenstein. In this case $\omega_X \cong \mathcal{O}_X(k_X D)$ for some $k_X \in \mathbb{Z}$, called the *canonical weight* of (X, D), and $H^j(X, \mathcal{O}_X(mD)) = 0$ for all $0 < j < \dim X$ and all m. Bruns and Herzog [6, Corollary 4.3.8] give the following elementary result:

Lemma 1.1. *Let R be a graded Gorenstein ring of dimension $\dim R = n+1$ and canonical weight k_R, so that the canonical module of R is $\omega_R = R(k_R)$. Then the Hilbert series $P_R(t)$ of R satisfies the functional equation*

$$t^{k_R} P(\tfrac{1}{t}) = (-1)^{n+1} P(t). \tag{1.7}$$

We refer to property (1.7) of a rational function as *Gorenstein symmetry.* A palindromic polynomial or Laurent polynomial is Gorenstein symmetric. Examples: t and $t^{-1} + 1 + t^2 + t^3$ are both palindromic of degree 2.

Proof. This follows from duality: R is a quotient of a weighted polynomial ring $A = k[x_0, \dots, x_N]$ with $\operatorname{wt} x_i = a_i$. A minimal free resolution

$$R \leftarrow F_0 \leftarrow F_1 \leftarrow \cdots \leftarrow F_{\mathrm{cod}} \leftarrow 0, \tag{1.8}$$

has length equal to the codimension $\mathrm{cod} = N - n$, and $F_{\mathrm{cod}} = A(-\alpha)$ is the free module of rank one and degree $-\alpha$, where $\alpha = k_R + \sum a_i$ is the *adjunction number* for $X = \operatorname{Proj} R \subset \mathbb{P}(a_0, \dots, a_N)$. Duality gives $F_{\mathrm{cod}-i} \cong \operatorname{Hom}_A(F_i, F_{\mathrm{cod}})$ so that, over the denominator $\prod(1 - t^{a_i})$ corresponding to $A = k[x_0, \dots, x_N]$, the numerator of the Hilbert series is a sum of terms $t^d + (-1)^{\mathrm{cod}} t^{\alpha - d}$. □

For quasismooth X, the statement corresponds to Serre duality. However, the proof only uses the definition and basic properties of Gorenstein graded rings, without any assumptions on the singularities of $\operatorname{Spec} R$ or $\operatorname{Proj} R$.

Following Mukai [18], we write $c = k_X + n + 1$ for the *coindex* of (X, D). By the adjunction formula, the coindex is invariant under passing to a hyperplane section of degree 1. For nonsingular varieties, we have:

[1] See for example Exercise 2.14. Compare also Demazure [11] and Watanabe [20]; the latter also treats the graded dualizing sheaf for fractional divisors.

Example 1.2.

projective space $\mathbb{P}^n$	has coindex 0;
a quadric $Q \subset \mathbb{P}^{n+1}$	has coindex 1;
an elliptic curve, del Pezzo surface or Fano 3-fold of index 2	has coindex 2;
a canonical curve, K3 surface or anticanonical Fano 3-fold	has coindex 3;
a canonical surface, Calabi–Yau 3-fold or anticanonical Fano 4-fold	has coindex 4.

1.3. **The main result.** For a quasismooth projectively Gorenstein orbifold (X, D) with isolated orbifold points, Theorem 1.3 parses the Hilbert series of (X, D) into pieces, each of which is integral and Gorenstein symmetric of the same degree k_X. We call the orbifold contributions $P_{\mathrm{orb}}(Q, k_X)$ *ice cream functions*. The result expresses $P_X(t)$ in a closed form that can be calculated readily as a few lines of computer algebra (see Algorithm 2.4).

Theorem 1.3. *Let (X, D) be a quasismooth orbifold of dimension $n \geq 2$. Suppose that (X, D) is projectively Gorenstein of canonical weight k_X, and has isolated orbifold points*

$$\mathcal{B} = \left\{Q \text{ of type } \tfrac{1}{r}(a_1, \dots, a_n)\right\}.$$

Then the Hilbert series of X is

$$P_X(t) = P_I(t) + \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{B}} P_{\mathrm{orb}}(Q, k_X)(t), \tag{1.9}$$

where

(i) *the* initial term *has the form $P_I = \frac{A(t)}{(1-t)^{n+1}}$, where $A(t)$ is the unique integral palindromic polynomial of degree $c = k_X + n + 1$ (the coindex) such that $P_I(t)$ equals the series $P_X(t)$ up to and including degree $\left\lfloor \frac{c}{2} \right\rfloor$. If $c < 0$ then $P_I = 0$.*

(ii) *Each* orbifold term *for $Q \in \mathcal{B}$ of type $\frac{1}{r}(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ is of the form $P_{\mathrm{orb}}(Q, k_X) = \frac{B(t)}{(1-t)^n (1-t^r)}$, with*

$$B(t) = \mathrm{InvMod}\Big(\prod_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1-t^{a_i}}{1-t}, \frac{1-t^r}{1-t}, \left\lfloor \frac{c}{2} \right\rfloor + 1\Big) \tag{1.10}$$

the unique Laurent polynomial supported in $\left[\left\lfloor \frac{c}{2} \right\rfloor + 1, \left\lfloor \frac{c}{2} \right\rfloor + r - 1\right]$ equal to the inverse of $\prod_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1-t^{a_i}}{1-t}$ modulo $\frac{1-t^r}{1-t}$. The polynomial $B(t)$ has integral coefficients and is palindromic of degree $k_X + n + r$.

Addendum 1.4. *We suppose (X, D) is as in Theorem 1.3, but relax the projectively Gorenstein assumption to assume only that K_X is $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier* *and numerically equivalent to $k_X D$. (In other words, omit the projectively Cohen–Macaulay requirement.) Then the Hilbert series of X is*

$$P_X(t) = J(t) + P_I(t) + \sum_{Q\in\mathcal{B}} P_{\mathrm{orb}}(Q, k_X)(t), \tag{1.11}$$

with P_I and P_{orb} as above, where $J(t) = \sum j_m t^m$ is a polynomial treating the irregularity of $\mathcal{O}_X(mD)$, with coefficients

$$\begin{aligned} j_m &= h^0(\mathcal{O}_X(mD)) + (-1)^n h^n(\mathcal{O}_X(mD)) - \chi(\mathcal{O}_X(mD)) \\ &= -\sum_{i=1}^{n-1}(-1)^i h^i(\mathcal{O}_X(mD)). \end{aligned} \tag{1.12}$$

In characteristic zero (or if some form of Kodaira vanishing holds) then $J(t)$ has degree $\le k_X$.

Example 1.5. Consider the general hypersurface $X_{10} \subset \mathbb{P}^4(1,1,2,2,3)$ with coordinates x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2, z. Then X_{10} is a 3-fold with $5 \times \frac{1}{2}(1,1,1)$ orbifold points along $\mathbb{P}^1_{\langle y_1,y_2\rangle}$ and a $\frac{1}{3}(1,2,2)$ point at $P_z = (0,0,0,0,1)$. It has canonical weight $k_X = 1$ and coindex $c = k_X + n + 1 = 5$. The Hilbert series is as follows: the initial term

$$P_I = \frac{1-2t+3t^2+3t^3-2t^4+t^5}{(1-t)^4} = 1 + t + \frac{t+t^2}{(1-t)^2} + 2\frac{t^2+t^3}{(1-t)^4}, \tag{1.13}$$

takes care of $P_1 = 2$, $P_2 = 5$. The orbifold terms

$$P_{\mathrm{orb}}(\tfrac{1}{2}(1,1,1),1) = \tfrac{-t^3}{(1-t)^3(1-t^2)}, \quad P_{\mathrm{orb}}(\tfrac{1}{3}(1,2,2),1) = \tfrac{-t^3-t^4}{(1-t)^3(1-t^3)} \tag{1.14}$$

take care of the periodicity, giving

$$P_I + 5\times P_{\mathrm{orb}}(\tfrac{1}{2}(1,1,1),1) + P_{\mathrm{orb}}(\tfrac{1}{3}(1,2,2),1) = \frac{1-t^{10}}{(1-t)^2(1-t^2)^2(1-t^3)}.$$

Here the numerator of P_I is palindromic of degree $c = 5$, so that P_I is Gorenstein symmetric of degree 1. The two P_{orb} terms are also integral and Gorenstein symmetric of degree 1, and they start with t^3, so do not affect the first two plurigenera P_1 and P_2.

Caution 1.6. The initial term P_I handles the first plurigenera $P_1, \dots, P_{\lfloor \frac{c}{2} \rfloor}$, but is not the *leading term* of the Hilbert function controlling the order of growth of the plurigenera: in this example X_{10} is a canonical 3-fold with $K_X = \mathcal{O}_X(1)$, of degree $K_X^3 = \frac{10}{2\times2\times3} = \frac{5}{6}$, whereas P_I on its own would correspond to degree $K^3 = 4$ (for this, sum the coefficients in the numerator of P_I). In our formula, the orbifold terms contribute to the global order of growth of the plurigenera, in this case $5 \times -\frac{1}{2}$ and $-\frac{2}{3}$.

1.4. **Appendix: Symmetric integral polynomials.** The shape of our Hilbert series in the nonsingular case comes directly from the following result applied to Hilbert polynomials.

Proposition 1.7. (I) *Let* $\sum_{m\geq 0}\rho_m t^m$ *be a power series, and assume that* $\rho_m = F(m)$ *for all* $m \geq m_0$*, where* $F(x)$ *is a polynomial of degree* n *and* $m_0 \geq 0$ *an integer. Then* $(1-t)^{n+1}\left(\sum_{m\geq 0}\rho_m t^m\right)$ *is a polynomial in* t *of degree* $\leq m_0+n+1$*.*

(II) *Let* $F(x)\in\mathbb{Q}[x]$ *be a polynomial taking integer values* $F(m)$ *for all* $m\in\mathbb{Z}$*. Then* F *is an integral linear combination of the binomial coefficients:*

$$F(x) = \sum_{\nu=0}^{n} c_\nu \binom{x}{\nu} \quad \text{with } c_\nu\in\mathbb{Z}. \tag{1.15}$$

Here $n = \deg F$*, and there are* $n+1$ *integral coefficients* c_ν *to specify.*

(III) *Let* $F(x)\in\mathbb{Q}[x]$ *be a polynomial taking integer values* $F(m)$ *for all* $m\in\mathbb{Z}$*. Assume that* F *satisfies* $(-1)^n F(k-x)\equiv F(x)$ *for an integer* k*, where* $\deg F = n$*. Then* $F(X)$ *and its associated power series* $\sum_{m\geq 0}F(m)t^m$ *are integral linear combinations of standard terms as follows*

if $n\equiv k+1 \bmod 2$**:**

$$\begin{aligned} F(x) &= \sum_{\substack{-k\leq\nu\leq n\\ \nu\equiv n \bmod 2}} b_\nu \binom{x+\frac{\nu-k-1}{2}}{\nu},\\ \sum_{m\geq 0}F(m)t^m &= \sum_{\substack{-k\leq\nu\leq n\\ \nu\equiv n \bmod 2}} b_\nu \frac{t^{\frac{\nu+k+1}{2}}}{(1-t)^{\nu+1}}. \end{aligned} \tag{1.16}$$

or if $n\equiv k \bmod 2$**:**

$$\begin{aligned} F(x) &= \sum_{\substack{-k\leq\nu\leq n\\ \nu\equiv n \bmod 2}} b_\nu \left(\binom{x+\frac{\nu-k}{2}}{\nu}+\binom{x+\frac{\nu-k-2}{2}}{\nu}\right),\\ \sum_{m\geq 0}F(m)t^m &= \sum_{\substack{-k\leq\nu\leq n\\ \nu\equiv n \bmod 2}} b_\nu \frac{(1+t)t^{\frac{\nu+k}{2}}}{(1-t)^{\nu+1}}. \end{aligned} \tag{1.17}$$

There are $\left\lfloor\frac{k+n+1}{2}\right\rfloor$ *integral coefficients* b_ν *to specify.*

In part (II) or (III), it is enough to make the assumption that $F(m)\in\mathbb{Z}$ or $F(m)\in\mathbb{Z}$ and $(-1)^n F(k-m) = F(m)$ for all m in an interval of length $n+1$. The proof is a little exercise. Hint: Use induction based on $F(x)-F(x-1)$. □

2. Ice cream functions

2.1. **Fun calculation.** "Income $\frac{3}{7}$ per day means ice cream on Wednesdays, Fridays and Sundays." Consider the step function $i \mapsto \lfloor \frac{3i}{7} \rfloor$, where $\lfloor\ \rfloor$ denotes the rounddown or integral part. As a Hilbert series, it gives

$$P(t) = \sum_{i\geq 0} \left\lfloor \frac{3i}{7} \right\rfloor t^i = 0 + 0t + 0t^2 + t^3 + t^4 + 2t^5 + 2t^6 + 3t^7 + \cdots, \tag{2.1}$$

with closed form

$$P(t) = \frac{t^3 + t^5 + t^7}{(1-t)(1-t^7)}. \tag{2.2}$$

Indeed, $\lfloor \frac{3i}{7} \rfloor$ increments by 1 when $i = 0, 3, 5$ modulo 7, so that

$$(1-t)P(t) = t^3 + t^5 + t^7 + t^{10} + \cdots \tag{2.3}$$

is the sum over the jumps, that repeat weekly. Multiplying (2.3) by $1 - t^7$ cuts the series down to the first week's ice cream ration:

$$(1-t)(1-t^7)P(t) = t^3 + t^5 + t^7. \tag{2.4}$$

The numerator $t^3 + t^5 + t^7$ can be seen as the

inverse of $\dfrac{1-t^5}{1-t} = 1+t+t^2+t^3+t^4 \mod \dfrac{1-t^7}{1-t} = 1+t+t^2+t^3+t^4+t^5+t^6.$

Indeed, by long multiplication

$$\begin{aligned}(1+t+t^2+t^3+t^4) \times (t^3+t^5+t^7) = {}&\\ & t^3 + t^4 + t^5 + t^6 + t^7 + \\ & \qquad\quad t^5 + t^6 + t^7 + t^8 + t^9 \\ & \qquad\qquad\qquad t^7 + t^8 + t^9 + t^{10} + t^{11} \\ = {}& t^3 + t^4 + 2t^5 + 2t^6 + 3t^7 + 2t^8 + 2t^9 + t^{10} + t^{11} \\ \equiv {}& 3 + 2t + 2t^2 + 2t^3 + 2t^4 + 2t^5 + 2t^6 \equiv 1,\end{aligned} \tag{2.5}$$

where $\equiv$ denotes congruence modulo $\frac{1-t^7}{1-t}$. Here $5 = \mathrm{InvMod}(3,7)$ is the inverse of 3 modulo 7. The product in (2.5) has $5 \times 3 = 15 \equiv 1 \mod 7$ terms that distribute themselves equitably among the 7 congruence classes, except that t^7 appears once for each of the 3 terms in the second factor.

There are several other meaningful expressions for $P(t)$. Under $\equiv$, the bounty $t^3 + t^5 + t^7$ can be viewed as famine $-t - t^2 - t^4 - t^6$ "no ice cream on Mondays, Tuesdays, Thursdays or Saturdays". In other words,

$$P(t) = \frac{t^3 + t^5 + t^7}{(1-t)(1-t^7)} = \frac{t}{(1-t)^2} + \frac{-t - t^2 - t^4 - t^6}{(1-t)(1-t^7)}. \tag{2.6}$$

Because $t^7 \equiv 1$, we can shift the exponents of t up or down by 7:

$$\frac{t^{-4} + t^{-2} + 1}{(1-t)(1-t^7)} \quad \text{or} \quad \frac{-t^{-1} - t - t^2 - t^4}{(1-t)(1-t^7)} \tag{2.7}$$

so "ice cream rations from Monday before the start of term" or "famine from the previous Saturday". Of these possible shifts (as Laurent polynomials with short support), $t^{7i}(t^3+t^5+t^7)$ is palindromic of degree $10+14i$, and $t^{7i}(-t^{-1}-t-t^2-t^4)$ is palindromic of degree $3+14i$, *and no other*.

In "macroeconomic" terms, the order of growth is the linear function $\frac{3i}{7}$ with seasonal fractional corrections, that is,

$$P(t) = \frac{3}{7}\cdot\frac{t}{(1-t)^2} + \frac{-\frac{3}{7}t-\frac{6}{7}t^2-\frac{2}{7}t^3-\frac{5}{7}t^4-\frac{1}{7}t^5-\frac{4}{7}t^6}{1-t^7} \tag{2.8}$$

("on Mondays, we lose $\frac{3}{7}$ in small change", etc.). Notice the coefficient $\frac{1}{7}$ of t^5: 5 is the inverse of 3 modulo 7, so as we enjoy our second ice cream on Fridays, we lose $\frac{1}{7}$, the unit of small change.

We can average out the seasonal corrections in (2.8) to sum to zero, giving

$$P(t) = \frac{3}{7}\cdot\frac{2t-1}{(1-t)^2} + \frac{\frac{3}{7}-\frac{3}{7}t^2+\frac{1}{7}t^3-\frac{2}{7}t^4+\frac{2}{7}t^5-\frac{1}{7}t^6}{1-t^7}, \tag{2.9}$$

where the coefficients $\frac{3}{7}, 0, -\frac{3}{7}, \frac{1}{7}, \frac{2}{7}, \frac{2}{7}, -\frac{1}{7}$ are Dedekind sums $\sigma_i\big(\frac{1}{7}(5)\big)$ (see Definition 2.5 and compare [YPG], Theorem 8.5). Our main aim is to explain the orbifold contributions P_{orb} in Theorem 1.3 as minor variations on this simple-minded material.

Exercise 2.1. One of the following two constructions gives the numerator of $P_{\mathrm{orb}}(\frac{1}{r}(a),k)$ (here $ab\equiv 1 \bmod r$ and $\overline{}$ denotes residue modulo r):

(I) $\frac{1-t^{ab}}{1-t^a} = \sum_{i=0}^{b-1} t^{ia}$. Modulo $1-t^r$ this is

$$\sum t^j \quad \text{with } j \in \big\{\overline{ia} \bigm| \text{for } 0\le i\le b-1\big\}. \tag{2.10}$$

It is a sum of b terms, and occurs with the natural symmetric degree $a(b-1)\equiv k+r+1 \bmod r$, because $ab\equiv 1$ and $k\equiv -a$.

(II) $-t\frac{1-t^{(r-b)a}}{1-t^a} = -\sum_{i=0}^{r-b-1} t^{ia+1}$. Modulo $1-t^r$ this is

$$-\sum t^j \quad \text{with } j \in \big\{\overline{ia+1} \bigm| \text{for } 0\le i\le r-b-1\big\}. \tag{2.11}$$

It is minus a sum of $r-b$ terms, and occurs with symmetric degree $(r-b-1)a+2\equiv k+r+1 \bmod r$.

The two sets are complimentary because $ia+1\equiv(i+b)a \bmod r$. Depending on the parity choices specified below, we can fold exactly one of (I) or (II) modulo r into an interval of length $r-2$ while preserving the symmetry.

Write ν for the number of steps in the Euclidean algorithm for coprime integers $0<a<r$; then

$$\text{(I) works} \iff \nu \text{ is even}, \quad \text{(II) works} \iff \nu \text{ is odd}. \tag{2.12}$$

2.2. **The function Inverse Mod.** We start with the following basic result.

Theorem 2.2. *Fix an integer γ and a monic polynomial $F\in\mathbb{Q}[t]$ of degree d with nonzero constant term.*

(I) *The quotient ring* $\mathbb{Q}[t]/(F)$ *is a* d*-dimensional vector space over* $\mathbb{Q}$ *and* t *is invertible in it, so that* $\mathbb{Q}[t]/(F) = \mathbb{Q}[t,t^{-1}]/(F)$.

(II) *Any range* $[t^\gamma,\dots,t^{\gamma+d-1}]$ *of* d *consecutive Laurent monomials maps to a* $\mathbb{Q}$*-basis of* $\mathbb{Q}[t]/(F)$.

(III) *If* $A \in \mathbb{Q}[t]$ *is coprime to* F*, we can write its inverse modulo* F *uniquely as a Laurent polynomial* B *with support in* $[t^\gamma,\dots,t^{\gamma+d-1}]$.

Proof. This is all trivial. The leading term of F is nonzero, so $1,t,\dots,t^{d-1}$ base $\mathbb{Q}[t]/(F)$. The constant term of F is nonzero so t is coprime to F, hence invertible modulo F. Multiplication by t is an invertible linear map, so multiplication by t^γ for any $\gamma \in \mathbb{Z}$ takes a basis to another basis. If A is coprime to F it is invertible in $\mathbb{Q}[t]/(F)$, and its inverse has a unique expression in any basis. □

Definition 2.3. For coprime polynomials $A, F \in \mathbb{Q}[t]$ we set

$$\operatorname{InvMod}(A,F,\gamma) = B \tag{2.13}$$

with B as in (III). That is, $B \in \mathbb{Q}[t,t^{-1}]$ is the uniquely determined Laurent polynomial supported in $[t^\gamma,\dots,t^{\gamma+d-1}]$ such that $AB \equiv 1 \bmod F$. For different $\gamma \in \mathbb{Z}$, these inverses are congruent modulo F, but different polynomials in general. We also write $\operatorname{InvMod}(A,F)$ with unspecified support for any inverse of A modulo F in $\mathbb{Q}[t]$.

Fix positive integers r and $a_1,\dots,a_n$ and set

$$A = \prod_{j=1}^{n}(1-t^{a_j}) \quad \text{and} \quad F = \frac{1-t^r}{\operatorname{hcf}(1-t^r, A)}. \tag{2.14}$$

The polynomial F is the monic polynomial with simple roots only at the rth roots of unity with $A(\varepsilon) \neq 0$, or equivalently $\varepsilon^{a_j} \neq 1$ for all a_j. Since we take out the hcf, A and F are coprime. Theorem 2.2 applies to give $\operatorname{InvMod}(A,F,\gamma)$, the inverse of A modulo F with support in $[t^\gamma,\dots,t^{\gamma+d-1}]$, where $d = \deg F$ and $\gamma \in \mathbb{Z}$ is arbitrary.

We show how to compute InvMod:

Algorithm 2.4. If $\gamma \geq 0$ then $t^\gamma A$ and F are coprime polynomials. Set $d = \deg F$. The Euclidean algorithm in $\mathbb{Q}[t]$ provides a unique solution to

$$t^\gamma AB + FG = 1, \tag{2.15}$$

with $B \in \mathbb{Q}[t]$ a polynomial of degree $< d$. Then $\operatorname{InvMod}(A,F,\gamma) = t^\gamma B$.

If $\gamma < 0$, choose some m with $mr + \gamma \geq 0$, and solve

$$t^{mr+\gamma}AB + FG = 1 \tag{2.16}$$

by the Euclidean algorithm. Then $\operatorname{InvMod}(A,F,\gamma) = t^\gamma B = t^{mr+\gamma}B/t^{mr}$. This trick works because $t^{mr} \equiv 1 \bmod F$. (For more general polynomials F, one would need to calculate powers of the matrix M_t corresponding to multiplication by t in $\mathbb{Q}[t]/(F)$; in our case, $M_t^r = 1$.)

The isolated case is when $a_1, \dots, a_n$ are coprime to r, so $\operatorname{hcf}(1-t^r, A) = 1-t$ and $F = 1+t+\cdots+t^{r-1}$ has degree $d = r-1$ and roots $\varepsilon \in \boldsymbol{\mu}_r \setminus \{1\}$. If moreover r is prime then F is the cyclotomic polynomial, and working modulo F is essentially the same thing as setting $t = \varepsilon$ a primitive rth root of unity.

2.3. **Dedekind sums as Inverse Mod.** We now recall Dedekind sums, and relate them to the function InvMod.

Definition 2.5. We define the ith *Dedekind sum* σ_i by

$$\sigma_i\left(\tfrac{1}{r}(a_1,\dots,a_n)\right) = \frac{1}{r} \sum_{\substack{\varepsilon\in\boldsymbol{\mu}_r \\ \varepsilon^{a_j}\neq 1\,\forall j=1,\dots,n}} \frac{\varepsilon^i}{(1-\varepsilon^{a_1})\cdots(1-\varepsilon^{a_n})}, \tag{2.17}$$

where ε runs over the rth roots of unity for which the denominator is nonzero. Proposition 2.6 characterizes the σ_i as solutions to a set of linear equations.

It is obvious that $\sigma_i = \sigma_{r+i}$. Therefore we only need to consider σ_i for $i = 0, 1, \dots, r-1$. To stress that $a_1, \dots, a_n$ are not all coprime to r, we may call σ_i the ith *generalized* Dedekind sum. When $a_1, \dots, a_n$ are all coprime to r, the above sum runs over all nontrivial rth roots of unity.

Proposition 2.6. *Consider the $r \times r$ system of linear equations*

$$\sum_{i=0}^{r-1} \sigma_i \varepsilon^i = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \varepsilon \in \boldsymbol{\mu}_{a_j} \text{ for some } j, \\ \dfrac{1}{(1-\varepsilon^{-a_1})\cdots(1-\varepsilon^{-a_n})} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{2.18}$$

in unknowns σ_i indexed by $i \in \mathbb{Z}/r = \operatorname{Hom}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_r, \mathbb{C}^\times)$, with equations indexed by $\varepsilon \in \boldsymbol{\mu}_r$.

Then (2.18) *is a nondegenerate system, with unique solution the Dedekind sums $\sigma_i = \sigma_i\left(\frac{1}{r}(a_1,\dots,a_n)\right)$.*

Proof. Fix a prime root of unity $\varepsilon \in \boldsymbol{\mu}_r$. Then $(\varepsilon^{ij})_{i,j=0,\dots,r-1}$ is a Vandermonde matrix, with inverse $\frac{1}{r}\left(\varepsilon^{-ij}\right)_{i,j=0,\dots,r-1}$. □

Lemma 2.7. *Let β be a common divisor of r and some a_j. Then*

$$\sum_{\substack{i=0,\dots,r-1, \\ i\equiv d \mod \beta}} \sigma_i = 0 \quad \text{for any integer } d. \tag{2.19}$$

In other words, the average of σ_i over any coset of $\beta\mathbb{Z}/r \subset \mathbb{Z}/r$ is zero. In particular, $\sum_{i=0}^{r-1} \sigma_i = 0$.

Proof. Note that $\varepsilon \in \boldsymbol{\mu}_r$ gives $\varepsilon^\beta \in \boldsymbol{\mu}_{r/\beta}$. Then by Definition 2.5,

$$\sigma_d + \sigma_{d+\beta} + \cdots + \sigma_{d+r-\beta} = \frac{1}{r} \sum_{\substack{\varepsilon \in \boldsymbol{\mu}_r \\ \varepsilon^{a_j} \neq 1 \,\forall j}} \frac{\varepsilon^d}{\prod_j (1-\varepsilon^{a_j})} \left(1 + \varepsilon^\beta + \varepsilon^{2\beta} + \cdots + \varepsilon^{\beta\left(\frac{r}{\beta}-1\right)}\right) = 0. \quad \square$$

For example

$$\sigma_i(\tfrac{1}{14}(1,2,5,7)) = \frac{1}{14}\{-2,-2,-1,\tfrac12,0,-\tfrac12,1,2,2,1,-\tfrac12,0,\tfrac12,-1\}, \tag{2.20}$$

with $\sigma_i + \sigma_{7+i} = \sum_{l=0}^{6} \sigma_{2l+i} = \sum_{l=0}^{13} \sigma_{l+i} = 0$ for each i.

The next result was first stated and proved by Buckley [7, Theorem 2.2], following the ideas of [YPG].

Theorem 2.8. *Let A and F be as in* (2.14) *and $\sigma_i = \sigma_i(\frac{1}{r}(a_1,\dots,a_n))$. Then the polynomial $B(t) := A(t)\sum_{i=1}^{r} \sigma_{r-i}t^i$ is congruent to* 1 *modulo F. Equivalently,*

$$\operatorname{InvMod}(A,F,\gamma) \equiv \sum_{i=1}^{r} \sigma_{r-i}t^i \in \mathbb{Q}[t]/(F) \quad \textit{for any } \gamma. \tag{2.21}$$

Proof. Substitute $t=\varepsilon$ any root of F in B and use (2.18) with the inverse value of ε. This gives

$$B(\varepsilon) = A(\varepsilon)\sum_{i=1}^{r} \sigma_{r-i}\varepsilon^i = \frac{A(\varepsilon)}{\prod_j (1-\varepsilon^{a_j})} = 1. \tag{2.22}$$

This holds for every root ε of F, so $B(t)-1$ is divisible by F, that is,

$$A(t)\sum_{i=1}^{r} \sigma_{r-i}t^i \equiv 1 \mod F. \quad \square \tag{2.23}$$

Algorithm 2.9. The Dedekind sums σ_i are obtained as the coefficients of an Inverse Mod polynomial:

- In the coprime case, first calculate $\operatorname{InvMod}(A,F,0) = \sum_{i=0}^{r-2} s_{r-i}t^i$ by the Euclidean algorithm. Next subtract aF where $a = \frac{1}{r}\sum_{i=0}^{r-2} s_{r-i}$, to give $\operatorname{InvMod}(A,F,0) - aF = \sum_{i=0}^{r-1} \sigma_{r-i}t^i$, with $\sigma_1 = -a$.
- In the noncoprime case use Lemma 2.7. The point is just to average out the σ_i so that any coset modulo β adds to 0; see Zhou [21], 3.2.3 for the algorithm in Magma.

Proposition 2.10. *Assume all the a_i are coprime to r, so that $F = \frac{1-t^r}{1-t}$ and $d = \deg F = r-1$. Then for any γ,*

$$(2.24)\qquad (1-t)^n \sum_{i=0}^{r-1} \sigma_{r-i} t^i \equiv \operatorname{InvMod}\Big(\prod_{j=1}^{n} \frac{1-t^{a_j}}{1-t}, F\Big)$$

$$\equiv \operatorname{InvMod}\Big(\frac{A}{(1-t)^n}, F, \gamma+1\Big) = \sum_{l=\gamma+1}^{\gamma+r-1} \theta_l t^l,$$

with integer coefficients $\theta_l = \sum_{s=0}^{n} (-1)^s \binom{n}{s} (\sigma_{s-l} - \sigma_{s-\gamma}) \in \mathbb{Z}$

Proof. Replace the InvMod of a product by the product of InvMods. Each factor $\operatorname{InvMod}\big(\frac{1-t^{a_j}}{1-t}, F, 1\big)$ is an integral polynomial; indeed, it is the ice cream function for $\frac{b_j}{r}$ where $b_j = \operatorname{InvMod}(a_j, r)$, by the calculation of 2.1, or Exercise 2.1.

□

Exercise 2.11 (Serre duality, Gorenstein symmetry)**.** If X is projectively Gorenstein of canonical weight k_X, prove the following:

(1) Each $Q = \frac{1}{r}(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ satisfies $k_X + \sum_{j=1}^{n} a_j \equiv 0 \bmod r$.
(2) The σ_i are $(-1)^n$ symmetric under $i \mapsto \sum a_j - i$. [Hint: replace $\varepsilon \mapsto \varepsilon^{-1}$ in the characterization (2.18) of σ_i, or in (2.17).]
(3) Now let θ_l be as in Proposition 2.10. Then $l_1 + l_2 \equiv k_X + n \bmod r$ implies $\theta_{l_1} = \theta_{l_2}$. In particular, for c even and $\gamma = \frac{c}{2}$, we have $\theta_{\gamma+r-1} = 0$, since $\theta_\gamma = 0$ by definition.

2.4. **Ice cream gives the correct periodicity.** There are two expressions for the orbifold contributions to RR. The first, given in [YPG], is in terms of Dedekind sums:

$$(2.25)\qquad \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{r-1} (\sigma_{r-i} - \sigma_0) t^i}{1-t^r}.$$

The alternative introduced here is the ice cream function

$$(2.26)\qquad P_{\mathrm{orb}}(\tfrac{1}{r}(a_1, \dots, a_r), k_X) = \frac{B(t)}{(1-t)^n (1-t^r)},$$

with $B(t)$ as in (1.10). The first is strictly periodic (from the denominator $1-t^r$), but fractional. The second is integral by Proposition 2.10, and Gorenstein symmetric of degree k, but has order of growth $O(m^n)$. They both give the same periodicity, as a simple consequence of Proposition 2.10. The point already appeared clearly in the different treatments of $P(t)$ in (2.1) and (2.8)–(2.9).

Corollary 2.12.

$$(2.27)\qquad P_{\mathrm{orb}}(\tfrac{1}{r}(a_1, \dots, a_r), k_X) - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{r-1} (\sigma_{r-i} - \sigma_0) t^i}{1-t^r} = \frac{C(t)}{(1-t)^{n+1}}$$

with numerator $C(t) \in \mathbb{Q}[t]$.

Indeed, put the left hand side over the common denominator $(1-t)^n(1-t^r)$ and use Proposition 2.10. □

Example 2.13. The ice cream function of 2.1 corresponds to $\sigma_i\left(\frac{1}{7}(5)\right)$: the periodic rounding loss of (2.9) is

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i=0}^{6}\sigma_{7-i}t^i &= \tfrac{1}{7}(3-3t^2+t^3-2t^4+2t^5-t^6)\\ &\equiv \operatorname{InvMod}\bigl(1-t^5, \tfrac{1-t^7}{1-t}\bigr).\end{aligned}$$

Multiplication by $1-t$ gives a Gorenstein symmetric polynomial with integral coefficients θ_l

$$\begin{aligned}&(1-t)\times\tfrac{1}{7}(3-3t^2+t^3-2t^4+2t^5-t^6)\\ &\qquad\equiv t^3+t^5+t^7 = \operatorname{InvMod}\Bigl(\frac{1-t^5}{1-t}, \frac{1-t^7}{1-t}, 3\Bigr).\end{aligned}$$

The fractional divisor $\frac{3}{7}P$ on a nonsingular curve is an orbifold point of type $\frac{1}{7}(5)$, with orbinate in $\mathcal{L}_5$ having genuine pole of order two, but fractional zero of order $\frac{1}{7}$ in lost change. The same considerations apply with $\frac{3}{7}$ replaced by a general reduced fraction $\frac{a}{r}$, corresponding to the orbifold point $\frac{1}{r}(b)$ with b the inverse of a modulo r.

Consider for example the weighted projective line $X = \mathbb{P}(5,7)$. It has $k_X = -12$, and has two orbifold points of type $\frac{1}{7}(5)$ and $\frac{1}{5}(2)$. Its Hilbert series

$$P_X(t) = \frac{1}{(1-t^5)(1-t^7)} \tag{2.28}$$

satisfies Theorem 1.3: since $c = -10 < 0$, the initial term $P_I = 0$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}P_X(t) &= P_{\text{orb}}\bigl(\tfrac{1}{7}(5), -12\bigr) + P_{\text{orb}}\bigl(\tfrac{1}{5}(2), -12\bigr)\\ &= \frac{t^{-4}+t^{-2}+1}{(1-t)(1-t^7)} + \frac{-t^{-4}-t^{-2}}{(1-t)(1-t^5)},\end{aligned}$$

where $-t^{-4}-t^{-2} = \operatorname{InvMod}(\frac{1-t^2}{1-t}, \frac{1-t^5}{1-t}, -4)$.

Exercise 2.14. Fun and games with the ice cream functions of 2.1.

(1) An elliptic curve polarized by $A = \frac{3}{7}P$ embeds as $C_{15} \subset \mathbb{P}(1,5,7)$ with canonical weight 2, that is, $K_{C,\text{orb}} = 2A = \frac{6}{7}P$.
(2) A quasismooth complete intersection $C_{10,15} \subset \mathbb{P}(1,3,5,7)$ is a curve of genus 7 with $K_C = 3P+9Q$ having P as an orbifold point of type $\frac{1}{7}(5)$, polarized by $A = \frac{3}{7}P+Q$ and having $K_{C,\text{orb}} = 9A$. (Its initial term P_I is quite involved.)
(3) A curve of genus 2 polarized by $P+\frac{3}{7}Q$ with P a Weierstrass point embeds in $\mathbb{P}(1,2,3,5,7)$ as a Pfaffian with Hilbert numerator

$$1-t^6-t^7-t^8-t^9-t^{10}+t^{10}+t^{11}+t^{12}+t^{13}+t^{14}-t^{20}.$$

3. Proof of Main Theorem

3.1. **The existence of the Riemann–Roch formula.** Let X be a normal projective n-fold; assume that the singularities of X are isolated, rational and $\mathbb{Q}$-factorial. We want to calculate $\chi(\mathcal{O}_X(D))$ for D a Weil divisor on X using the RR formula

$$\big(\operatorname{ch}(\mathcal{O}_X(D)) \cdot \operatorname{Td}(T_X)\big)[n], \tag{3.1}$$

that is, the component of top degree n of the product of

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{ch}(\mathcal{O}_X(D)) &= \exp(D) = \sum \tfrac{D^i}{i!}, \quad \text{and} \\ \operatorname{Td}(T_X) &= \sum_{i=0}^{n} \operatorname{Td}_i(T_X) \\ &= 1 - \tfrac{1}{2}K_X + \tfrac{1}{12}(K_X^2 + c_2) - \tfrac{1}{24}K_X c_2 \\ &\qquad - \tfrac{1}{720}(K_X^4 - 4K_X^2 c_2 - 3c_2^2 + K_X c_3 + c_4) + \cdots . \end{aligned}$$

We must get around the problem that the terms in (3.1) are not defined, because T_X is not a vector bundle on a singular X. For this, we use the following conventions. First, choose a resolution of singularities $f\colon Y \to X$ that is an isomorphism over the nonsingular locus of X.

(a) Replace the degree n term $\operatorname{Td}_n(T_X)$ in (3.1) by $\chi(\mathcal{O}_X) = \chi(\mathcal{O}_Y) = \operatorname{Td}_n(T_Y)$.
(b) Replace the terms involving a product with D on X by the same expression on Y involving its pullback as a $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier divisor. In more detail: the pullback of a $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier divisor D is defined as usual by $f^*D = \frac{1}{m} f^*(mD)$ with mD Cartier. Except for $\operatorname{Td}_n(T_X)$, the terms in (3.1) are $D^i \operatorname{Td}_{n-i}(T_X)/i!$ with $i \geq 1$, and we replace

$$D^i \operatorname{Td}_{n-i}(T_X) \quad \text{by} \quad (f^*D)^i \operatorname{Td}_{n-i}(T_Y).$$

Remark 3.1. Our interpretation of (3.1) is independent of the choice of the resolution Y. Indeed, $\chi(\mathcal{O}_Y)$ is a birational invariant. Each of the other terms involves a product with the $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier divisor D; now a multiple mD is linearly equivalent to a linear combination of nonsingular prime divisors disjoint from the singularities of X, so we can calculate $D^i \operatorname{Td}(T_X)$ for $i > 0$ on the nonsingular locus of X itself.

In (a), we use $\chi(\mathcal{O}_X)$ as a substitute for $\operatorname{Td}_n(T_X)$. In the 3-fold case, it is well known that the expression $\operatorname{Td}_3(T_X) = -\frac{1}{24}K_X \cdot c_2(T_X)$ can be defined using the same trick as in (b) (taking the pullback of the $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier divisor K_X), but *is not equal* to $\chi(\mathcal{O}_X)$ in general. See [YPG, Corollary 10.3] and compare Kawamata [Ka1, 2.2] and [Ka2].

Theorem 3.2. *Let X be a normal projective n-fold with isolated, rational, $\mathbb{Q}$-factorial singularities and $f\colon Y \to X$ as above. Then the expression*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{RR}(D) &= \chi(\mathcal{O}_X) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1}{i!}(f^*D)^i \operatorname{Td}_{n-i}(T_Y) \\ &= \text{“}\big(\operatorname{ch}(\mathcal{O}_X(D)) \cdot \operatorname{Td}(T_X)\big)[n]\text{”} \end{aligned} \tag{3.2}$$

is a polynomial in the $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier Weil divisor D such that for every D, the difference

$$\chi(X, \mathcal{O}_X(D)) - \mathrm{RR}(D) = \sum_{Q \in \operatorname{Sing} X} c_Q(D) \tag{3.3}$$

is a sum of fractional terms $c_Q(D) \in \mathbb{Q}$ depending only on the local analytic type of X and D at each singular point Q of X.

Plan of proof. We set $\mathcal{L} = f^*\mathcal{O}_X(D)/\text{torsion}$, which is a torsion free sheaf of rank 1 on Y, and write $\mathcal{O}_Y(D_Y) = \mathcal{L}^{\vee\vee}$ for its reflexive hull, which is an invertible sheaf. The proof has two parts: the first uses the Leray spectral sequence to compare $\chi(X, \mathcal{O}_X(D))$ with $\chi(Y, \mathcal{O}_Y(D_Y))$, given by RR on Y. After this, we compare the RR formula for D_Y on Y with our interpretation $\mathrm{RR}(D)$ of the RR formula for D on X. No sooner said than done.

The reflexive hull of $\mathcal{L}$ fits in a short exact sequence

$$0 \to \mathcal{L} \to \mathcal{O}_Y(D_Y) \to \mathcal{Q} \to 0, \tag{3.4}$$

where the cokernel $\mathcal{Q}$ has support of codimension ≥ 2 in Y contained in the exceptional locus of f.

Now $f_*\mathcal{L} = f_*\mathcal{O}_Y(D_Y) = \mathcal{O}_X(D)$ because $\mathcal{O}_X(D)$ is saturated. Moreover, all the sheaves $R^if_*\mathcal{L}$ for $i \geq 1$ and $R^if_*\mathcal{Q}$ for $i \geq 0$ are finite dimensional vector spaces supported at the singular points of X.

Now the Leray spectral sequence together with the long exact sequence associated with (3.4) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \chi(Y, \mathcal{O}_Y(D_Y)) &= \chi(\mathcal{L}) + \chi(\mathcal{Q}) \\ &= \chi(X, \mathcal{O}_X(D)) + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1}(-1)^i h^0(X, R^if_*\mathcal{L}) \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=0}^{n-1}(-1)^i h^0(X, R^if_*\mathcal{Q}). \end{aligned} \tag{3.5}$$

We deduce that $\chi(X, \mathcal{O}_X(D)) = \chi(Y, \mathcal{O}_Y(D_Y)) + \mathcal{P}$, where

$$\mathcal{P} = -\sum\nolimits_i (-1)^i h^0(X, R^if_*\mathcal{L}) - \sum\nolimits_i (-1)^i h^0(X, R^if_*\mathcal{Q}) \tag{3.6}$$

The second part of the proof depends on the exceptional locus of f. Write E_j for the exceptional divisors over the singular points, and set

$$f^*D = D_Y + F, \quad \text{where} \quad F = \sum\nolimits_j m_jE_j \quad \text{with } m_j \in \mathbb{Q}. \tag{3.7}$$

The exceptional divisor F here is the fixed part of the birational transform of the linear system $|D+H|$ for any sufficiently ample Cartier divisor H on X.

Then

$$\chi(Y, \mathcal{O}_Y(D_Y)) - \mathrm{RR}(D) = \sum_{i>0} \tfrac{1}{i!}(-F)^i \,\mathrm{Td}_{n-i}(T_Y). \tag{3.8}$$

In fact, our interpretation $\mathrm{RR}(D)$ of $\mathrm{ch}(D)\cdot\mathrm{Td}(T_X)$ replaces $\mathrm{Td}_n(T_X)$ by $\chi(\mathcal{O}_X) = \chi(\mathcal{O}_Y) = \mathrm{Td}_n(T_Y)$, and $D^i\,\mathrm{Td}_{n-i}(X)$ by $(f^*D)^i\,\mathrm{Td}_{n-i}(Y)$, whereas the terms in RR on Y are $D_Y^i\,\mathrm{Td}_{n-i}(Y)$. Therefore the difference in (3.8) is

$$\sum_{i>0} \tfrac{1}{i!}(D_Y^i - (f^*D)^i)\,\mathrm{Td}_{n-i}(T_Y). \tag{3.9}$$

However, f^*D is orthogonal to the exceptional divisors, and one checks using the binomial expansion that $D_Y^i - (f^*D)^i = (D_Y - f^*D)^i = (-F)^i$.

In conclusion, the difference required in Theorem 3.2 is

$$\chi(X, \mathcal{O}_X(D)) - \mathrm{RR}(D) = \mathcal{P} + \sum_{i>0} \tfrac{1}{i!}(-F)^i\,\mathrm{Td}_{n-i}(T_Y). \tag{3.10}$$

We can choose the resolution of singularities of X and D depending only on the local analytic type of X and D. The resolution determines the sheaves $\mathcal{L}$ and $\mathcal{Q}$ and their higher direct images, so the quantity $\mathcal{P}$, and it determines the fixed part F and its intersection numbers. This proves the theorem.

3.2. **The main proof.** The Main Theorem 1.3 follows formally from the above arguments together with Proposition 1.7. The plan of the proof: for an orbifold point Q, the local analytic type of $X, \mathcal{O}_X(mD)$ is periodic in m, so also the fractional contributions $c_Q(mD)$ of Theorem 3.2. The argument of [YPG, Theorem 8.5] calculates them by equivariant RR on a global quotient orbifold as Dedekind sums. Section 2.3 tells us how to replace the Dedekind sums by ice cream functions, that are integral and Gorenstein symmetric of the given canonical weight. After subtracting these off, we obtain an integral valued Hilbert polynomial for $m \gg 0$ that is Gorenstein symmetric, to which Proposition 1.7 applies.

Step 1. The local contributions of Theorem 3.2 making up the difference $\chi(mD) - \mathrm{RR}(mD)$ were calculated in [YPG, Theorem 8.5] for an isolated orbifold point of type $\frac{1}{r}(a_1, \dots, a_n)$.

Theorem 3.3. *Let X be a projective n-fold with a basket of isolated cyclic orbifold points $\mathcal{B} = \{Q = \frac{1}{r}(a_1, \dots, a_n)\}$, and D a $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier Weil divisor. Then for $m \in \mathbb{Z}$,*

$$\chi(X, \mathcal{O}_X(mD)) = \mathrm{RR}(mD) + \sum_{Q\in\mathcal{B}} c_Q(mD)), \tag{3.11}$$

where

$$c_Q(mD) = (\sigma_{r-m} - \sigma_0)(\tfrac{1}{r}(a_1, \dots, a_n)). \tag{3.12}$$

Recall the main idea of the proof: by Theorem 3.2, the contributions depend only on the analytic type of (X, mD). Thus we can reduce to the case of a global quotient $X = M/\boldsymbol{\mu}_r$ having all fixed points of the same type type $\frac{1}{r}(a_1, \dots, a_n)$. The result then follows by equivariant RR (that is, the Lefschtz fixed point theorem).

Step 2. Ignoring for the moment finitely many initial terms, as traditional in treating Hilbert polynomials, we replace the genuine Hilbert series $P_{X,D}(t) = \sum_{m\ge0} h^0(X, mD)t^m$ by the series $P^\chi_{X,D}(t) = \sum_{m\ge0} \chi(X, mD)t^m$. Since in (3.11) $\mathrm{RR}(mD)$ is a polynomial of degree n and the $c_Q(mD)$ are periodic, summing them gives a term of the form $A(t)/(1 - t)^{n+1}$ with $A(t) \in \mathbb{Q}[t]$ plus periodic terms of the form $B(t)/(1 - t^r)$ for each orbifold point.

Now Corollary 2.12 says that the mth term in $P_{\mathrm{orb}}(Q, k_X)$ matches the periodic correction $c_Q(mD)$, so that subtracting off our ice cream functions P_{orb} reduces us to a formal power series

$$P^0_I(t) = P^\chi_{X,D}(t) - \sum_{Q\in\mathcal{B}} P_{\mathrm{orb}}(\tfrac{1}{r}(a_1, \dots, a_n), k_X) \tag{3.13}$$

where $(1-t)^{n+1}P^0_I(t)$ is a polynomial. It follows as usual that the coefficient of t^m in $P^0_I(t)$ is a polynomial $H(m)$ of degree n for $m \gg 0$, a modified Hilbert polynomial.

Step 3. Now $H(x)$ satisfies the assumptions of Proposition 1.7. Indeed, it is integer valued because $\chi(\mathcal{O}_X(mD))$ and the coefficients of the power series P_{orb} are all integers by (2.26). Moreover, $H(k - x) = (-1)^nH(x)$ because $\chi(\mathcal{O}_X((k - m)D)) = (-1)^n\chi(\mathcal{O}_X(mD))$ by Serre duality, and we know by Exercise 2.11 that $\sigma_{k-m} = (-1)^n\sigma_m$.

Step 4. We define the initial term P_I in terms of the modified Hilbert polynomial:

$$P_I(t) = \sum_{m\ge0} H(m)t^m. \tag{3.14}$$

By construction, the two formal power series $P_{X,D}(t)$ and $P_I(t)+\sum_Q P_{\mathrm{orb}}(t)$ coincide except for an initial segment (since the first $\lfloor\frac{c}{2}\rfloor$ coefficients of $P_{\mathrm{orb}}(t)$ are zero). This proves Addendum 1.4.

Step 5. By Appendix 1.4, $P_I(t)$ has denominator $(1-t)^{n+1}$ and numerator a palindromic polynomial of degree $n + k_X + 1$, and is therefore determined by its first $\lfloor\frac{c}{2}\rfloor$ coefficients. Finally, if $R(X, K_X)$ is Gorenstein then these coefficients are equal to the first $\lfloor\frac{c}{2}\rfloor$ values of $h^0(X, mD)$. This completes the proof.

4. K3 surfaces and Fano 3-folds

Theorem 1.3 simplifies known results on K3s and Fano 3-folds (see Altınok, Brown and Reid [2]). Let (S, D) be a polarized K3 surface with a basket of orbifold points $\mathcal{B} = \{\frac{1}{r}(a, r-a)\}$. [YPG], Appendix to Section 8, gives

$$\sigma_i = \frac{r^2-1}{12r} - \frac{\overline{bi}(r-\overline{bi})}{2r}, \tag{4.1}$$

where $ab = 1 \bmod r$ and $\overline{}$ denotes the smallest nonnegative residue $\bmod r$. By Theorem 2.8,

$$\operatorname{InvMod}\Big((1-t^a)(1-t^{r-a}), \frac{1-t^r}{1-t}\Big) \equiv -\frac{1}{2r}\sum_{i=1}^{r-1} \overline{bi}(r-\overline{bi})t^i$$

and

$$\operatorname{InvMod}\Big(\frac{(1-t^a)(1-t^{r-a})}{(1-t)^2}, \frac{1-t^r}{1-t}\Big) \equiv -\frac{(1-t)^2}{2r}\sum_{i=1}^{r-1} \overline{bi}(r-\overline{bi})t^i.$$

Applying RR for surfaces [2, Theorem 4.6] gives the Hilbert series

$$P_S(t) = \frac{1+t}{1-t} + \frac{t+t^2}{(1-t)^3}\cdot\frac{D^2}{2} - \sum_{\mathcal{B}} \frac{1}{1-t^r}\sum_{i=1}^{r-1}\frac{\overline{bi}(r-\overline{bi})}{2r}t^i. \tag{4.2}$$

We can parse $P_S(t)$ into the ice cream functions of Theorem 1.3 as follows. Comparing the coefficients of t in (4.2) yields

$$D^2 = 2g-2+\sum_{\mathcal{B}}\frac{b(r-b)}{r}, \tag{4.3}$$

where the genus g is defined by $P_1 = h^0(S, \mathcal{O}_S(D)) = g+1$. Then $P_S(t) = P_I + \sum_{\mathcal{B}} P_{\mathrm{orb}}$, where

$$P_I = \frac{1+(g-2)t+(g-2)t^2+t^3}{(1-t)^3} = \frac{1+t}{1-t} + (g-1)\frac{t+t^2}{(1-t)^3}, \tag{4.4}$$

and one checks as above that

$$P_{\mathrm{orb}} = \frac{\operatorname{InvMod}\Big(\frac{(1-t^a)(1-t^{r-a})}{(1-t)^2}, \frac{1-t^r}{1-t}, 2\Big)}{(1-t)^2(1-t^r)} \tag{4.5}$$

$$= \frac{t+t^2}{(1-t)^3}\cdot\frac{b(r-b)}{2r} - \frac{1}{1-t^r}\sum_{i=1}^{r-1}\frac{\overline{bi}(r-\overline{bi})}{2r}t^i. \tag{4.6}$$

Indeed, the coindex is $c = 3$ and the numerator of (4.6) is supported in $[2, \dots, r]$.

Corollary 4.1. *Let V be a $\mathbb{Q}$-Fano 3-fold with basket $\mathcal{B} = \big\{\frac{1}{r}(1, a, r-a)\big\}$ of terminal quotient singularities. The Hilbert series of its anticanonical ring is $P_V(t) = P_I + \sum_{\mathcal{B}} P_{\mathrm{orb}}$, with*

$$P_I = \frac{1+(g-2)t+(g-2)t^2+t^3}{(1-t)^4} \tag{4.7}$$

where $h^0(-K_X) = g+2$ *and* $-K^3 = 2g-2+\sum\frac{b(r-b)}{r}$, *and*

$$P_{\mathrm{orb}} = \frac{\mathrm{InvMod}\Big(\frac{(1-t)(1-t^a)(1-t^{r-a})}{(1-t)^3}, \frac{1-t^r}{1-t}, 2\Big)}{(1-t)^3(1-t^r)}. \tag{4.8}$$

Proof. By [2, Theorem 4.6] the Hilbert series of $(V, -K_V)$ equals

$$P_V(t) = \frac{1+t}{(1-t)^2} - \frac{t+t^2}{(1-t)^4}\cdot\frac{K_V^3}{2} - \sum_{\mathcal{B}}\frac{1}{(1-t)(1-t^r)}\sum_{i=1}^{r-1}\frac{\overline{bi}(r-\overline{bi})}{2r}t^i. \tag{4.9}$$

The coefficient of t gives the stated value of $-K_V^3$. Clearly Fano 3-folds and K3 surfaces have coindex 3 and the same InverseMod polynomials $\mathrm{InvMod}\Big(\frac{(1-t)(1-t^b)(1-t^{r-b})}{(1-t)^3}, \frac{1-t^r}{1-t}\Big) \equiv \mathrm{InvMod}\Big(\frac{(1-t^b)(1-t^{r-b})}{(1-t)^2}, \frac{1-t^r}{1-t}\Big)$. □

Exercise 4.2. Consider the general weighted projective hypersurfaces

- $S_5 \subset \mathbb{P}(1,1,1,2)$ with an orbifold point of type $\frac{1}{2}(1,1)$ at $Q = (0,0,0,1)$;
- $S_7 \subset \mathbb{P}(1,1,2,3)$ with basket $\{\frac{1}{2}(1,1), \frac{1}{3}(1,2)\}$;
- $S_{11} \subset \mathbb{P}(1,2,3,5)$ with basket $\{\frac{1}{2}(1,1), \frac{1}{3}(1,2), \frac{1}{5}(2,3)\}$.

All three are K3 surfaces and have $k_{S_i} = 0$ and $c = 3$. Their Hilbert series parsed as $P_{S_i}(t) = P_I + \sum_{\mathcal{B}_i} P_{\mathrm{orb}}$ are as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
P_{S_5}(t) &= \tfrac{1-t^5}{(1-t)^3(1-t^2)} = \tfrac{1+t^3}{(1-t)^3} + \tfrac{t^2}{(1-t)^2(1-t^2)},\\
P_{S_7}(t) &= \tfrac{1-t^7}{(1-t)^2(1-t^2)(1-t^3)}\\
&= \tfrac{1-t-t^2+t^3}{(1-t)^3} + \tfrac{t^2}{(1-t)^2(1-t^2)} + \tfrac{t^2+t^3}{(1-t)^2(1-t^3)},\\
P_{S_{11}}(t) &= \tfrac{1-t^{11}}{(1-t)(1-t^2)(1-t^3)(1-t^5)} = \tfrac{1-2t-2t^2+t^3}{(1-t)^3}\\
&\quad + \tfrac{t^2}{(1-t)^2(1-t^2)} + \tfrac{t^2+t^3}{(1-t)^2(1-t^3)} + \tfrac{2t^2+t^3+t^4+2t^5}{(1-t)^2(1-t^5)}.
\end{aligned}$$

5. Notes towards the nonisolated case

5.1. **A general conjecture.** Let $P(t) = \frac{H(t)}{\prod_{i=1}^N(1-t^{b_i})}$ be a rational function with integral numerator $H(t) \in \mathbb{Z}[t]$ satisfying Gorenstein symmetry (1.7). For example, P might be the Hilbert series of a Gorenstein graded ring R of dimension $n+1$ and canonical weight k_R (more generally, a finite Gorenstein graded module M over a polynomial ring with $n+1$-dimensional support).

Conjecture 5.1. *Under the above assumptions,* $P(t)$ *has a unique partial fraction decomposition of the form*

$$P_R(t) = \sum_A \frac{N_A}{\prod_{a\in A}(1-t^a)}. \tag{5.1}$$

The sum runs over sequences $A = \{a_1, \dots, a_{n+1}\}$ *consisting of a main period* $r = a_{n+1}$ *and some divisors* $a_i \mid r$ *(some or all of the* a_i *may be* 1 *or* r*); each* a_i *divides one of the original* b_j*, so that a priori only finitely many*

A occur. The numerator N_A of each part is an integral polynomial that is symmetric of degree $k_A = k + \sum_{a\in A} a$, so that the part as a whole has the same Gorenstein symmetry; moreover $N_A(t)$ is "of shortest support", a minimal residue modulo

$$F_A = \frac{1-t^r}{\operatorname{hcf}\Big(1-t^r, \prod_{a\in A, a<r}(1-t^a)\Big)} \tag{5.2}$$

(as in (2.14)) supported in an interval of length $< \deg F_A$ centred at $k_A/2$.

If all the $b_i = 1$, there is only one part, and the result follows from Proposition 1.7. We expect the proof to be formal. The idea is to take account of the poles of $P(t)$ at roots of unity in terms of its principal parts. The A term should deal with the highest order principal part of $P(t)$ at primitive rth roots, while possibly modifying the principal parts of higher order poles at nonprimitive rth roots.

5.2. **The case of curve orbifold locus.** In application to orbifolds, the order of poles of $P(t)$ corresponds to one plus the dimension of the strata: for if X has a $1/s$ orbifold stratum of dimension ν, its graded ring $R(X, D)$ must have at least $\nu+1$ generators x_i of degree b_i divisible by s. Nonisolated orbifold points Q where the inertia group jumps are *dissident points*. Experiments and the results of [8] and [21] suggest that for a dissident point, we can deal with the fractional periodic contributions given by generalized Dedekind sums (Definition 2.5) by adding an integral term that modifies the adjacent strata.

Let X be a quasismooth projectively Gorenstein orbifold of dimension ≥ 2 with orbifold locus of dimension ≤ 1. (The main case we have worked with is Calabi–Yau 3-folds, but similar ideas apply to canonical and anticanonical 4-folds with terminal singularities.) Then the orbifold strata of X are

(a) curves Γ of transverse type $\frac{1}{s}(a_1, \ldots, a_{n-1})$
(b) points Q of type $\frac{1}{r}(a_1, \ldots, a_n)$.

Write $s_i = \operatorname{hcf}(a_i, r)$. Dissident points are characterized by having some s_i a nontrivial factor of r, with $1 < s_i < r$. The x_i-axis is then pointwise fixed by $\boldsymbol{\mu}_{s_i}$ and so its image is contained in a $1/s_i$ orbifold stratum of X. Our assumption on the dimension of the orbifold locus implies that the s_i are pairwise coprime, and Q is in the closure of orbifold curve strata Γ_i of transverse type $\frac{1}{s_i}(a_1, \ldots, \widehat{a_i}, \ldots, a_n)$.

We summarize the logic of our result. We treat the $1/s$ orbifold curves (a) by adding contributions of the form

$$c_\Gamma(t) = \frac{\mathrm{Num}_{D_C}}{(1-t^s)^2(1-t)^{n-1}} + \frac{\mathrm{Num}_{N_C}}{(1-t^s)(1-t)^n} \tag{5.3}$$

where the numerators are integral, Gorenstein symmetric of the appropriate degree, and with short support. We expect to see the $(1-t^s)^2$ in the denominator for the reason outlined above. In the numerators, D_C and N_C refer to quantities involving the degree of C, respectively of the isotypical components of its normal bundle. Multiplying (5.3) by $1-t^{ms}$, corresponding to taking a transverse hypersurface section in $|msA|$ for some m, leaves $m \times \mathrm{Num}_{D_C}$ distinguished as the numerator of an isolated orbifold point.

We deal with points (b) by putting in ice cream of the form

$$P_{\mathrm{orb}}(Q, k_X) = \frac{\mathrm{InvMod}(B, F, \gamma)}{\prod_{a\in[r,s_1,\dots,s_n]}(1-t^a)}, \quad \text{where} \quad B = \prod \frac{1-t^{a_i}}{1-t^{s_i}}, \tag{5.4}$$

F is as in (2.14), and γ is arranged to make the numerator Gorenstein symmetric of degree $k_X + \sum_{c\in[r,s_1,\dots,s_n]} c$. This contribution is well defined, integral and Gorenstein symmetric of degree k. It gives the correct periodicity modulo r by an argument similar to Corollary 2.12. The curious point, however, is that when $s_i > 1$, it usually contains contributions with denominator $(1-t^{s_i})^2(1-t)^{n-1}$ and $(1-t^{s_i})(1-t)^n$ that one might at first sight want to assign to the $\frac{1}{s_i}$ curve Γ_i.

A dissident point Q of type $\frac{1}{r}$ on an orbifold $\frac{1}{s}$ curve Γ almost always implies that the degree of Γ and the isotypical components of its normal bundle are fractions with denominator r. Attributing fractional terms with denominator $(1-t^{s_i})^2(1-t)^{n-1}$ and $(1-t^{s_i})(1-t)^n$ to the dissident point is the same idea as adding a global fractional term with denominator $(1-t)^{n+1}$ into the local contribution from an isolated orbifold point, as discussed in Caution 1.6.

We omit the proof of the following sample theorem, which follows from the results of [8] and [21] plus substantial calculations.

Theorem 5.2. *Consider a Calabi–Yau 3-fold (X, D) with the following orbifold locus:*

(a) *curves C of generic type $\frac{1}{s}(a, s-a)$.*
(b) *points Q of type $\frac{1}{r}(a_1, a_2, a_3)$ with $a_1 + a_2 + a_3 \equiv 0 \bmod r$;*

Then the Hilbert series of X can be parsed as

$$P_X(t) = P_I + \sum_Q P_{\mathrm{orb}} + \sum_C P_{\mathrm{per}} + \sum_C P_{\mathrm{grow}}, \tag{5.5}$$

where P_I and P_{orb} are as in Theorem 1.3,

$$P_{\mathrm{grow}} = \frac{s\cdot \deg D|_C}{(1-t)^2(1-t^s)^2}\cdot \mathrm{InvMod}\left(\frac{(1-t^a)(1-t^{s-a})}{(1-t)^2}, \frac{1-t^s}{1-t}, \left\lceil\frac{s}{2}\right\rceil + 2\right),$$

$$P_{\mathrm{per}} = \frac{1}{(1-t)^3(1-t^s)}\cdot\left(\deg D|_C \cdot \mathrm{Num}_{D_C} - \frac{N_C}{2s}\cdot \mathrm{Num}_{N_C}\right),$$

and the numerators Num_{D_C}, Num_{N_C} are palindromic polynomials supported in $[3, \dots, s]$. Moreover, for $j = 3, \dots, \lceil\frac{s}{2}\rceil + 1$ the t^j term in Num_{D_C} equals

$$\sum_{i=0}^{3}(-1)^i\binom{3}{i}\left((j-i)\sigma_{-j+i} - (2-i)\sigma_{-2+i}\right), \tag{5.6}$$

and Num_{N_C} *is computed as an ice cream function from*

$$\mathrm{Num}_{N_C} \times \frac{(1-t^a)(1-t^{s-a})^2}{(1-t)^3} \equiv 1 + t^{s-a} \mod \frac{1-t^s}{1-t}. \tag{5.7}$$

Example 5.3. Consider the Calabi–Yau 3-fold $X_{66} \subset \mathbb{P}(5,6,11,11,33)$. It has $\frac{1}{3}(2,2,2)$ and $\frac{1}{5}(1,1,3)$ points and a $\frac{1}{11}(5,6)$ curve Γ of degree $\frac{2}{11}$. We parse its Hilbert series as

$$\frac{1-t^{66}}{\prod_{a\in[5,6,11,11,33]}(1-t^a)} = P_I + P_{\mathrm{orb}}(\tfrac{1}{3}) + P_{\mathrm{orb}}(\tfrac{1}{5}) + P_{\mathrm{per}}(\Gamma) + P_{\mathrm{grow}}(\Gamma),$$

where our standard terms are

$$P_I = 1, \quad P_{\mathrm{orb}}(\tfrac{1}{3}) = -\frac{t^3}{(1-t)^3(1-t^3)}, \quad P_{\mathrm{orb}}(\tfrac{1}{5}) = \frac{t^3(1+t^2)}{(1-t)^3(1-t^5)},$$

and the contributions from Γ are

$$\begin{aligned} P_{\mathrm{per}}(\Gamma) &= -\frac{t^6+t^8}{(1-t)^3(1-t^{11})} \\ P_{\mathrm{grow}}(\Gamma) &= \frac{2t^8(1+t+t^2+t^3-t^4+t^5+t^6+t^7+t^8)}{(1-t)^2(1-t^{11})^2} \\ &= 2 \times \frac{P_{\mathrm{orb}}(\frac{1}{11}(5,6),11)}{1-t^{11}}. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} -t^6 - t^8 &= \tfrac{2}{11}\cdot \mathrm{Num}_{D_C} - \tfrac{1}{11}\cdot \mathrm{Num}_{N_C} \\ &= \tfrac{2t}{11}(2t^2+2t^3+2t^4-4t^5-t^6-4t^7+2t^8+2t^9+2t^{10}) \\ &\qquad - \tfrac{1}{11}(4t^3+4t^4+4t^5+3t^6-2t^7+3t^8+4t^9+4t^{10}+4t^{11}). \end{aligned}$$

Example 5.4. Anita's example: Calabi–Yau 3-fold $X_{40} \subset \mathbb{P}(2,5,8,10,15)$ with a $\frac{1}{15}(2,5,8)$ dissident point on curve of transverse type $\frac{1}{5}(2,3)$ of degree $\frac{4}{15}$ and with a $\frac{1}{2}(1,1)$ orbifold line. Its Hilbert series parses as

$$\begin{aligned} P &= \frac{1-t^{40}}{[2,5,8,10,15]} \\ &= \frac{1-4t+7t^2-4t^3+t^4}{(1-t)^4} + P_{\mathrm{orb}}(\tfrac{1}{15}(2,5,8),0) \\ &\qquad + \frac{P_{\mathrm{orb}}(\frac{1}{5}(2,3),5)}{1-t^5} + \frac{P_{\mathrm{orb}}(\frac{1}{2}(1,1),2)}{1-t^2} + \frac{-3t^3+2t^4-3t^5}{[1,1,1,5]}; \end{aligned}$$

```
P := (1-t^40)/Denom([2,5,8,10,15]);
PI := (1-4*t+7*t^2-4*t^3+t^4)/(1-t)^4;
P eq PI + Qorb(15,[2,5,8],0)
    + Qorb(5,[2,3],5)/(1-t^5) + Qorb(2,[1,1],2)/(1-t^2)
    + (-3*t^3 + 2*t^4 - 3*t^5)/Denom([1,1,1,5]);
```

Example 5.5. A harder case $X_{80} \subset \mathbb{P}(3,4,15,20,38)$ (a random choice from the vast lists of Kreuzer and Skarke). It has orbifold loci:

- a $\frac{1}{2}$ curve $C_{80} \subset \mathbb{P}(4,20,38)$
- a dissident point $\frac{1}{38}(3,15,20)$ on C_{80}
- $4 \times$ dissident points $\frac{1}{4}(3,3,2)$ on C_{80}
- a $\frac{1}{3}(1,2)$ curve $\mathbb{P}(3,5)$ with normal monomials ux^{14}, tz^4
- a dissident point $\frac{1}{15}(3,4,8)$ on $\frac{1}{3}$ curve
- an isolated point 1/5(3,4,3)

```
PI := 1;  // because the first two plurigenera are zero.
P := (1-t^80)/Denom([3,4,15,20,38]); P;
P1 := P - PI; P1;
P2 := P1 - Qorb(38,[3,15,20],0) - Qorb(15,[3,4,8],0)
    - 4*Qorb(4,[3,3,2],0) - Qorb(5,[3,4,3],0); P2;
  // The denominator drops on subtracting each term.
PartialFractionDecomposition(P2*(1-t)^4);
  // This hints as to what remaining degree of the curve is.
  // I experiment by subtracting off different degrees
P3:=P2-Qorb(2,[1,1],2)/(1-t^2); P3;
P3:=P2-Qorb(2,[1,1],2)/(1-t^2)-Qorb(3,[1,2],3)/(1-t^3); P3;
P3:=P2-Qorb(2,[1,1],2)/(1-t^2)+Qorb(3,[1,2],3)/(1-t^3); P3;
PartialFractionDecomposition(P3*(1-t)^4);
P4 := P3 - t^3/Denom([1,1,1,3]); P4;

P eq PI + Qorb(38,[3,15,20],0) + Qorb(15,[3,4,8],0)
    + 4*Qorb(4,[3,3,2],0) + Qorb(5,[3,4,3],0)
    + Qorb(2,[1,1],2)/(1-t^2) - Qorb(3,[1,2],3)/(1-t^3)
    + t^3/Denom([1,1,1,3]);

Qorb(38,[3,15,20],0)*Denom([1,1,2,38]);
t^38 - 2*t^37 + 2*t^36 - 2*t^34 + 2*t^33 + t^32 - 3*t^31
 + 3*t^30 - t^29 - t^28 + 2*t^27 - t^26 - t^25 + 3*t^24
 - 2*t^23 + t^21 - 2*t^19 + 3*t^18 - t^17 - t^16 + 2*t^15
 - t^14 - t^13 + 3*t^12 - 3*t^11 + t^10 + 2*t^9 - 2*t^8
 + 2*t^6 - 2*t^5 + t^4
The numerator is Gor symm of same degree 42 and support
[t^4 .. t^38], which has length < 38 - 2

Qorb(15,[3,4,8],0)*Denom([1,1,3,15])
t^15 - t^13 + 2*t^12 - t^10 + 2*t^8 - t^7 + t^5
The numerator in [t^5 .. t^15] of length 10 < 15 - 3
```

OLD: A note on higher dimensional orbifold singularities. Our aim is to apply these methods to quasismooth polarized n-folds (X, D) with higher dimensional orbifold strata. We hope to parse their Hilbert series as a sum of Gorenstein symmetric ice cream functions as neatly as in Theorem 1.3. We give a foretaste of these ideas with some results and examples on Calabi–Yau 3-folds.

Remark 5.6. The contribution $P_{\mathrm{orb}}(t)$ from a dissident point P of type $\frac{1}{r}(a_1,a_2,a_3)$ with $s_i=\mathrm{hcf}(r,a_i)$ usually includes fractional terms with denominator $(1-t^{s_i})^2(1-t)^2$ that might appear to be native to the curves C_i of type $\frac{1}{s_i}(a_1,\dots,\widehat{a_i},\dots,a_3)$ through P. This introduces ambiguity into our parsing.

For example, $X_{40}\subset\mathbb{P}(2,5,8,10,15)$ is a Calabi–Yau with a $\frac{1}{15}(2,5,8)$ dissident point on a degree $\frac{4}{15}$ curve of generic type $\frac{1}{5}(2,3)$ and with a $\frac{1}{2}(1,1)$ orbifold line. In the proof of Theorem 5.2 we computed the Hilbert series

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1-t^{40}}{(1-t^2)(1-t^5)(1-t^8)(1-t^{10})(1-t^{15})}\\
&=P_I+P_{\mathrm{grow}\,1/2}+P_{\mathrm{per}\,1/2}+P_{\mathrm{orb}\,1/15}+P_{\mathrm{grow}\,1/5}+P_{\mathrm{per}\,1/5}\\
&=\frac{1-4t+7t^2-4t^3+t^4}{(1-t)^4}-\frac{t^3}{(1-t)^2(1-t^2)^2}\\
&\quad+\frac{1}{3}\times\frac{\begin{array}{c}(-t^3+2t^4-2t^5+2t^6-2t^7+3t^8-4t^9\\ +3t^{10}-2t^{11}+2t^{12}-2t^{13}+2t^{14}-t^{15})\end{array}}{(1-t)^3(1-t^{15})}\\
&\quad+\frac{4}{15}\times\frac{5t^5(1-t+t^2)}{(1-t)^2(1-t^5)^2}-\frac{4}{3}\times\frac{2t^3-t^4+2t^5}{(1-t)^3(1-t^5)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that the only nonzero contribution from the $\frac{1}{2}$ curve is $P_{\mathrm{grow}\,1/2}=\frac{1}{2}\frac{2(-t^3)}{(1-t)^2(1-t^2)^2}$. Note also, that the numerator of $P_{\mathrm{per}\,1/5}$ equals

$$\begin{aligned}
-\frac{4}{3}(2t^3-t^4+2t^5)&=\frac{4}{15}\cdot\mathrm{Num}_{D_C}-\frac{4}{5}\cdot\mathrm{Num}_{N_C}\\
&=\frac{4}{15}(-t^3-t^4-t^5)-\frac{4}{5}(3t^3-2t^4+3t^5).
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, $P_{\mathrm{orb}\,1/15}$ is not unique modulo $1+t^5+t^{10}=\frac{1-t^{15}}{(1-t^5)}$. The computer output for the inverse of $\frac{(1-t^2)(1-t^5)(1-t^8)}{(1-t)^3}$ modulo $1+t^5+t^{10}$ supported in $[5,\dots,13]$ is

$$-\frac{1}{3}t^5+\frac{2}{3}t^6-\frac{2}{3}t^7+\frac{4}{3}t^8-2t^9+\frac{4}{3}t^{10}-\frac{2}{3}t^{11}+\frac{2}{3}t^{12}-\frac{1}{3}t^{13}, \tag{5.8}$$

which relates it to $P_{\mathrm{orb}\,1/15}$ as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
P_{\mathrm{orb}\,1/15}&=\frac{-\frac{1}{3}t^5+\frac{2}{3}t^6-\frac{2}{3}t^7+\frac{4}{3}t^8-2t^9+\frac{4}{3}t^{10}-\frac{2}{3}t^{11}+\frac{2}{3}t^{12}-\frac{1}{3}t^{13}}{(1-t)^3(1-t^{15})}\\
&\quad+\frac{-\frac{1}{3}t^3+\frac{2}{3}t^4-\frac{1}{3}t^5}{(1-t)^3(1-t^5)}.
\end{aligned}$$

In a mysterious way, $P_{\rm per}$ and the contribution from $P_{\rm orb}$ to the curve always sum into a numerator with integer coefficients. In our example

$$-\frac{4}{3}(2t^3 - t^4 + 2t^5) + (-\frac{1}{3}t^3 + \frac{2}{3}t^4 - \frac{1}{3}t^5) = -3t^3 + 2t^4 - 3t^5. \tag{5.9}$$

It is work in progress to determine such contributions explicitly.

References

[1] D. Abramovich, T. Graber and A. Vistoli, *Gromov–Witten theory of Deligne–Mumford stacks*, American Journal of Mathematics Vol. 130 **5**, (2008) 1337–1398

[2] S. Altınok, G. Brown and M. Reid, *Fano 3-folds, K3 surfaces and graded rings*, Topology and geometry: commemorating SISTAG, Contemp. Math. 314, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI (2002) pp. 25–53

[3] M. F.Atiyah and G. B. Segal, *The index of elliptic operators. II*, Ann. of Math. **87** (1968) 531–545

[4] M. F.Atiyah and I. M. Singer, *The index of elliptic operators. III*, Ann. of Math. **87** (1968) 546–604

[5] G. Brown, *Graded ring database*, `http://grdb.lboro.ac.uk/ + links`

[6] W. Bruns and J. Herzog, *Cohen-Macaulay rings* , Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics **39**, Cambridge University Press, 1993

[7] A. Buckley, *Computing Dedekind sums using the Euclidean algorithm*, in EUROSIM 2007: proceedings of the 6th EUROSIM Congress on Modelling and Simulation, Ljubljana, Slovenia. Full papers. Vienna: ARGESIM, cop. **2** (2007) 1–6

[8] A. Buckley and B. Szendrői, *Orbifold Riemann–Roch for 3-folds with an application to Calabi–Yau geometry*, J. Algebraic Geometry **14** (2005) 601–622

[9] Alberto Canonaco, *The Beilinson complex and canonical rings of irregular surfaces*, Memoirs of AMS **183** (2006) 99 pp.

[10] Jheng-Jie Chen, Jungkai Alfred Chen and Meng Chen, *On quasismooth weighted complete intersections*, arXiv:0908.1439, 22 pp.

[11] Michel Demazure, *Anneaux gradués normaux, Introduction à la théorie des singularités*, II, Travaux en Cours **37** Hermann, Paris (1988) 35–68

[12] A. R. Fletcher, *Contributions to Riemann–Roch on projective* 3*-folds with only canonical singularities and applications*, in Algebraic geometry, Bowdoin (Brunswick, Maine, 1985, ed. S. J. Bloch), Proc. Sympos. Pure Math. **46** Part 1, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI (1987) 221–231

[13] A. R. Fletcher, *Working with weighted complete intersections*, Explicit birational geometry of 3-folds (ed. A. Corti and M. Reid), London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser. **281**, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge (2000) 101–173

[14] R. Hartshorne, *Algebraic Geometry,* Graduate Texts in Mathematics **52**, Springer-Verlag, 1977

[15] Masayuki Kawakita, *Three-fold divisorial contractions to singularities of higher indices*, preprint arXiv:math/0306065, 55 pp.

[Ka1] KAWAMATA Yujiro, *On the plurigenera of minimal algebraic 3-folds with* $K \approx 0$*,* Math. Ann. **275** (1986) 539–546

[Ka2] KAWAMATA Yujiro, *Boundedness of* $\mathbb{Q}$*-Fano threefolds,* in Proc. Internat. Conference on Algebra (Novosibirsk, 1989), Contemp. Math. **131**, AMS, 1992, Part 3, pp. 439–445

[16] T. Kawasaki, *The Riemann–Roch theorem for complex* V*-manifolds*, Osaka J. Math. **16** (1979) 151–159

[17] F. Nironi, *Riemann–Roch for weighted projective spaces*, preprint 2008

[18] S. Mukai, *Biregular classification of Fano 3-folds and Fano manifolds of coindex 3*, Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci USA **86** (1989) 3000–3002

[YPG] M. Reid, *Young person's guide to canonical singularities*, Algebraic geometry (Bowdoin 1985, ed. S. Bloch), Proc. Sympos. Pure Math. **46** Part 1, AMS, Providence, RI, (1987) 345–414

[19] B. Toën, *Théorémes de Riemann–Roch pour les champs de Deligne–Mumford*, *K*-Theory **18** (1999) 33–76

[20] Keiichi Watanabe, *Some remarks concerning Demazure's construction of normal graded rings*, Nagoya Math. J. **83** (1981) 203–211

[21] Zhou Shengtian, Orbifold Riemann–Roch and Hilbert series, University of Warwick PhD thesis, March 2011, 91+vii pp.

Anita Buckley,
Department of Mathematics, University of Ljubljana,
Jadranska 19, 1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia
e-mail: Anita.Buckley@fmf.uni-lj.si

Shengtian Zhou,
Mathematics Institute, University of Warwick,
Coventry CV4 7AL, England
e-mail: Shengtian.Zhou@googlemail.com

Miles Reid,
Mathematics Institute, University of Warwick,
Coventry CV4 7AL, England
e-mail: Miles.Reid@warwick.ac.uk