ON THE PLURIGENUS OF A CANONICAL THREEFOLD

DONG-KWAN SHIN

ABSTRACT. It is well known that plurigenus does not vanish for a sufficiently large multiple on a canonical threefold over $\mathbb{C}$. There is Reid-Fletcher formula for plurigenus. But, unlike in the case of surface of general type, it is not easy to compute plurigenus. In this paper, we induce a different version of Reid-Fletcher formula and show that the constant term in the induced formula has periodic properties. Using these properties we have an application to nonvanishing of plurigenus.

Throughout this paper $X$ is assumed to be a projective threefold with only canonical singularities and an ample canonical divisor $K_X$ over the complex number field $\mathbb{C}$, i.e., a canonical threefold.

It is well known that $H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(mK_X))$ does not vanish for a sufficiently large integer $m$. In the case of surface of general type and an algebraic curve, such integer $m$ is well known. In a case of threefold, when $\chi(\mathcal{O}_X) \leq 0$, it is easy to have such integer $m$ (see Fletcher [1]); however, when $\chi(\mathcal{O}_X) > 0$, it is not easy even to obtain an integer $m$ such that $\dim H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(mK_X)) \geq 1$. There are some results about $\dim H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(mK_X))$, i.e., plurigenus. In Fletcher [1], A. R. Fletcher showed that

$$\dim H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(12K_X)) \geq 1$$ and $$\dim H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(24K_X)) \geq 2$$

when $\chi(\mathcal{O}_X) = 1$. In Shin [7], Shin improved results of Fletcher. In Hanamura [2], Hanamura induced a formula for plurigenus and computed plurigenus according to ‘global index’. For detailed matters, see Fletcher [1], Reid [6], Hanamura [2], Shin [7]. In this paper, we induce a different version of Reid-Fletcher formula and show that the constant term in the induced formula has periodic properties. Using these properties we have an application to nonvanishing of plurigenus.

M. Reid and A. R. Fletcher described the formula for $\chi(\mathcal{O}_X(nK_X))$. Combining the formula for $\chi(\mathcal{O}_X(nK_X))$ with a vanishing theorem, it is possible to compute $\dim H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(nK_X))$.
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Reid-Flethcer formula for $\chi(O_X(nK_X))$ is described as follows:

$$\chi(O_X(nK_X)) = \frac{n(n-1)(2n-1)}{12} K_X^3 + (1-2n)\chi(O_X) + \sum_q l(q,n),$$

where the summation is over a basket of singularities. Although singularities in a basket are not necessarily singularities in $X$, the singularities in $X$ make the contribution as if they were in a basket. For detailed explanations about a basket of singularities, see Reid [6], Fletcher [1] or Kawamata [3]. The exact formula for $l(q,n)$ is as follows:

$$l(q,n) = \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \left( \frac{kb_q(r_q - kb_q)}{2r_q} \right),$$

where $q$ is a singularity of type $\frac{1}{r_q} (1,-1,b_q)$, $r_q$ and $b_q$ are relatively prime, and $kb_q$ is the nonnegative least residue of $ib_q$ modulo $r_q$. To distinguish each point in a basket of singularities, we keep using a notation $r_q$, but for the sake of simplicity, we use a notation $b_q$ instead of $b_q$ without causing troubles.

We denote l.c.m of $r_q$ in the baskets of singularities by $r$. Let’s denote $n(n-1)(2n-1)K_X^3$ by $K_n$ for the sake of simplicity.

**Proposition 1.** For all $n \geq 2$,

$$p_n \overset{\text{def}}{=} \dim H^0(X,O_X(nK_X)) = K_n + (1-2n)\chi(O_X) + \sum_q l(q,n).$$

**Lemma 1.** Let $(r,b) = 1$ and $0 < b < r$. Then

$$\sum_{k=1}^{r} bk(r - bk) = \sum_{k=1}^{r-1} k(r - k) = \frac{r(r^2 - 1)}{6}.$$

*Proof.* The set $\{ \overline{b}, \overline{2b}, \ldots, \overline{rb} \}$ is the same as $\{0,1,2,\ldots,r-1\}$ since $(r,b) = 1$. \qed

In Reid [6] or Fletcher [1], R. Barlow’s work is given as follows:

$$\rho^* K_X \cdot c_2(Y) = \sum \frac{r_q^2 - 1}{r_q} - 24\chi(O_X),$$

where $\rho : Y \to X$ is a resolution of singularities of $X$. For the sake of simplicity, let’s denote $\rho^* K_X \cdot c_2(Y)$ by $K_X \cdot c_2(X)$.

In [2], Hanamura induced the formula of the same type as in the following theorem, but our method is different and is a key to find the periodic behavior of the constant term in the formula.
Theorem 1. Let $X$ be a canonical threefold and let $K_X$ be a canonical divisor of $X$. Then for $n \geq 2$,

$$p_n = K_n + \frac{2n-1}{24} K_X \cdot c_2(X) + c_t,$$

where $n = mr + s$, $0 \leq s < r$ and $c_t$ is a constant depending on $s$.

Proof. By Proposition 1 and R. Barlow’s work, $p_n$ is given as follows:

$$p_n = K_n + (1 - 2n) \chi(X, \mathcal{O}_X) + \sum_q l(q, n)$$

$$= K_n + (1 - 2n) \left[ \frac{1}{24} \sum_q \frac{r_q^2 - 1}{r_q} - \frac{1}{24} K_X \cdot c_2(X) \right] + \sum_q l(q, n)$$

$$= K_n + \frac{2n-1}{24} K_X \cdot c_2(X) + \sum_q l(q, n) - \frac{2n-1}{24} \sum_q \frac{r_q^2 - 1}{r_q}.$$ 

The term $\sum_q l(q, n) - \frac{2n-1}{24} \sum_q \frac{r_q^2 - 1}{r_q}$ can be computed easily as follows:

$$\sum_q l(q, n) - \frac{2n-1}{24} \sum_q \frac{r_q^2 - 1}{r_q}$$

$$= \sum_q \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \frac{b_k(r_q - b_k)}{2r_q} - \frac{2n-1}{24} \sum_q \frac{r_q^2 - 1}{r_q}$$

$$= \sum_q \frac{1}{2r_q} \left[ \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} b_k(r_q - b_k) - \frac{(2n-1)(r_q^2 - 1)}{12} \right].$$

Since $r$ is a multiple of $r_q$, we let $r = h_q r_q$ and $n = mr + s = mh_q r_q + s$. When $s = 0$ or 1, we have

$$\sum_{k=1}^{n-1} b_k(r_q - b_k) - \frac{(2n-1)(r_q^2 - 1)}{12} = 0.$$ 

Thus,

$$\sum_{k=1}^{n-1} b_k(r_q - b_k) - \frac{r_q(r_q^2 - 1)}{6} = - \frac{(2s-1)(r_q^2 - 1)}{12}.$$ 

By Lemma 1, $\sum_{k=1}^{n-1} b_k(r_q - b_k) - \frac{r_q(r_q^2 - 1)}{6} = 0$. Thus,

$$\sum_{k=1}^{n-1} b_k(r_q - b_k) - \frac{(2n-1)(r_q^2 - 1)}{12} = - \frac{(2s-1)(r_q^2 - 1)}{12}.$$
When \( s > 1 \), we have
\[
\sum_{k=1}^{n-1} b_k(r_q - \bar{b}k) - \frac{(2n-1)(r_q^2 - 1)}{12} = \sum_{k=1}^{m_i} b_k(r_q - \bar{b}k) - \frac{2m_i r_q(r_q^2 - 1)}{12} + \sum_{k=m_i+1}^{m_i+s-1} b_k(r_q - \bar{b}k) - \frac{(2s-1)(r_q^2 - 1)}{12} = mh_q \left[ \sum_{k=1}^{r_q-1} b_k(r_q - \bar{b}k) - \frac{r_q(r_q^2 - 1)}{6} \right] + \sum_{k=1}^{s-1} b_k(r_q - \bar{b}k) - \frac{(2s-1)(r_q^2 - 1)}{12}.
\]

By Lemma 1, \( \sum_{k=1}^{r_q-1} b_k(r_q - \bar{b}k) - \frac{r_q(r_q^2 - 1)}{6} = 0 \). Thus,
\[
\sum_{k=1}^{n-1} b_k(r_q - \bar{b}k) - \frac{(2n-1)(r_q^2 - 1)}{12} = \sum_{k=1}^{s-1} b_k(r_q - \bar{b}k) - \frac{(2s-1)(r_q^2 - 1)}{12}.
\]

For the sake of simplicity, we may denote that the notation of the sum means a zero if \( j < i \) in the summation notation \( \sum_{k=i}^{j} \). Hence
\[
\left[ \sum_{q=1}^{r_q} \left( \sum_{k=1}^{s-1} b_k(r_q - \bar{b}k) - \frac{(2s-1)(r_q^2 - 1)}{12} \right) \right].
\]

Then we denote
\[
\sum_{q=1}^{r_q} \frac{1}{2r_q} \left[ \sum_{k=1}^{s-1} b_k(r_q - \bar{b}k) - \frac{(2s-1)(r_q^2 - 1)}{12} \right]
\]

by \( ct_s \).

Hence we have
\[
p_n = K_n + \frac{2n-1}{24} K_X \cdot c_2(X) + ct_s,
\]

where the term \( ct_s \) depends on \( s \).

\( \square \)

**Corollary 1** (Formula for \( ct_s \)). Under the same conditions and notations in Theorem 1, let \( s = m_q r_q + s_q, \) \((0 \leq s_q < r_q)\) for each point in a basket of singularities. Then we have
\[
ct_s = \sum_{q=1}^{r_q} \frac{1}{2r_q} \left[ \sum_{k=1}^{s_q-1} b_k(r_q - \bar{b}k) - \frac{(2s_q-1)(r_q^2 - 1)}{12} \right].
\]

**Proof.** As in the proof of Theorem 1, we apply the same procedure and notation to the term in \( ct_s \) which is computed as follows:
\[
\sum_{k=1}^{s-1} b_k(r_q - \bar{b}k) - \frac{(2s-1)(r_q^2 - 1)}{12}
\]
\[ = \sum_{k=1}^{m^r_s} \frac{r_k}{bk}(r_q - bk) \quad - \frac{2m^r_q}{r_q^2 - 1} - \sum_{k=m^r_q}^{m^r_q+s_q-1} \frac{r_k}{bk}(r_q - bk) - \frac{(2s_q - 1)(r_q^2 - 1)}{12} \]
\[ = m_q \sum_{k=1}^{r_q-1} \frac{r_k}{bk}(r_q - bk) - \frac{r_q(r_q^2 - 1)}{6} \quad + \sum_{k=1}^{s_q-1} \frac{r_k}{bk}(r_q - bk) - \frac{(2s_q - 1)(r_q^2 - 1)}{12} \]
\[ = \sum_{k=1}^{s_q-1} \frac{r_k}{bk}(r_q - bk) - \frac{(2s_q - 1)(r_q^2 - 1)}{12}. \]

By Lemma 1, we have a formula for \( c_t \).

**Remark 1.** Recall that \( K_X \cdot c_2(X) \) is positive (For a reference, see Miyaoka [4]). Thus, in order for \( p_n \) to be 0, \( c_t \) must be negative.

By the periodic property (Theorem 1), we consider \( c_{r+s} \) as the same as \( c_t \). Denote by \( [x] \) the largest integer less than or equal to \( x \).

**Theorem 2** (Properties of \( c_t \)). Under the same conditions and notations in Theorem 1, we have the following:

1. \( c_0 = \sum_{q=1}^{r_q^2-1} \frac{r_q^2-1}{2r_q} \). In particular, \( c_0 \geq 0 \).
2. \( c_0 = -c_t \).
3. \( c_{r+s} = -c_{r+s+1} \) when \( s \geq 2 \).
4. \( c_{(r/2)+1} = 0 \) when \( r \) is odd \( \geq 3 \).
5. \( c_{r-1} \geq 0 \) if \( r \) is odd or even without the type \( \frac{r}{2} \)(1, 1, 1).
6. \( \chi(O_X) < ct \).

**Proof.** Since \( r \) is the l.c.m of \( r_q \), the cases (1) and (2) both come directly from a formula of \( ct \) in the proof of Theorem 1. Thus, we may assume \( s \geq 2 \). Recall that \( s = m^r_q r_q + s_q \) \((0 \leq s_q < r_q)\).

The constant \( c_t \) is given as follows:

\[ c_t = \sum_{q=1}^{r_q^2-1} \frac{r_q^2-1}{2r_q} \left[ \sum_{k=1}^{r_q^2-1} \frac{r_k}{bk}(r_q - bk) - \frac{(2s_q - 1)(r_q^2 - 1)}{12} \right]. \]

Let’s denote \( \sum_{k=1}^{s_q-1} \frac{r_k}{bk}(r_q - bk) - \frac{(2s_q - 1)(r_q^2 - 1)}{12} \) by \( c_{ts, q} \). Then

\[ c_t = \sum_{q=1}^{r_q^2-1} \frac{1}{2r_q} c_{ts, q}. \]

If we prove \( c_{ts, q} = -c_{t_{r-s+1}, q} \), then our proof for (3) is complete.

If \( s_q = 0 \) or 1, then \( c_{ts, q} = -c_{t_{r-s+1}, q} \) clearly. Thus we may assume \( s_q \geq 2 \). Then \( r_q - s_q + 1 \) is the nonnegative least residue of \( r - s + 1 \) modulo \( r_q \).

\[ c_{t_{r-s+1}, q} = \sum_{k=1}^{r_q^2-1} \frac{r_k}{bk}(r_q - bk) - \frac{(2r_q - 2s_q + 2 - 1)(r_q^2 - 1)}{12} \]
The sum \( \sum_{r_q-1}^{r_q-1} b_k(r_q - b_k) \) can be computed as follows:

\[
\sum_{r_q-s_q+1}^{r_q-1} b_k(r_q - b_k) = b(r_q - s_q + 1)(r_q - b(r_q - s_q + 1)) + \cdots + b(r_q - 1)(r_q - b(r_q - 1)) = b(s_q - 1)(r_q - b(s_q - 1)) + \cdots + (r_q - b)(r_q - b)
\]

Therefore,

\[
ct_{r-s+1,q} = - \sum_{r_q-s_q+1}^{r_q-1} b_k(r_q - b_k) + \frac{(2s_q - 1)(r_q^2 - 1)}{12}
\]

So the property (3) is proved.

For a proof of the property (4), \( ct_{r-1} = -ct_{r-[r/2]} \) by the property (3).

Since \( r \) is odd, \( [r/2] + 1 = r - [r/2] \). Hence \( ct_{[r/2]+1} = 0 \).

For a proof of the property (5), \( ct_{r-1} = -ct_{2} \) by the property (3). It is enough to prove \( ct_{2} \leq 0 \).

\[
ct_{2} = \sum_{q} \frac{1}{2r_q} \left( b(r_q - b) - \frac{r_q^2 - 1}{4} \right)
\]
\[
\sum_{q} \frac{1}{2q} \left( \frac{1 - (r_q - 2b)^2}{4} \right).
\]

1 - (r - 2b)^2 \leq 0 since r is odd or even without the type \( \frac{1}{2}(1, -1, 1) \).

For a proof of the property (6), as in the proof of Theorem 1,
\[
\chi(X, \mathcal{O}_X) = \frac{1}{24} \sum_{q} \frac{r_q^2 - 1}{r_q} - \frac{1}{24} K_X \cdot c_2(X).
\]

Since \( \frac{1}{24} K_X \cdot c_2(X) > 0 \) by Miyaoka inequality and \( ct_0 = \sum_{q} \frac{r_q^2 - 1}{24r_q} \), we have \( \chi(X, \mathcal{O}_X) < ct_0 \) (For a reference, see Miyaoka [4]). \( \square \)

In the next theorem, we show an application of these periodic properties of constant terms \( ct_s \). Some of the following results may be already known, but we may have the same results very easily using these periodic properties.

**Theorem 3.** Under the same conditions and notations in Theorem 1, we have the following:

1. \( p_{\lfloor r/2 \rfloor + 1} \geq 1 \) when \( r \) is odd \( \geq 3 \).
2. \( p_{r-1} \geq 1 \) if \( r \) is odd or even without the type \( \frac{1}{2}(1, -1, 1) \).
3. For \( r \geq 3 \) we have the following:

\[
1 \leq p_{r-\lfloor r/2 \rfloor} + p_{\lfloor r/2 \rfloor + 1} < p_{r-\lfloor r/2 \rfloor - 1} + p_{\lfloor r/2 \rfloor + 2} < \cdots < p_{2} + p_{r-1}.
\]

Thus, \( p_n \geq 1 \) for more than half of \( \{2, \ldots, r-1\} \).

Moreover, if \( r \geq 7 \), then \( 3 \leq p_{r-\lfloor r/2 \rfloor} + p_{\lfloor r/2 \rfloor + 1} \). Thus, \( p_n \geq 2 \) for more than half of \( \{2, \ldots, r-1\} \).

4. \( p_r \geq 1 \). Moreover, \( p_r \geq 2 \) with the following possible exceptions:

   (i) \( K_X^3 = 1/2 \), \( K_X \cdot c_2 = 9/2 \), \( \chi(\mathcal{O}_X) = 0 \), \( r = 2 \)

   \[
   B = \left\{ \frac{1}{2}(1, -1, 1) \times 3 \right\}, \quad p_2 = 1, \quad p_n \geq 2 \ (n \geq 3),
   \]

   (ii) \( K_X^3 = 1 \), \( K_X \cdot c_2 = 3 \), \( \chi(\mathcal{O}_X) = 0 \), \( r = 2 \)

   \[
   B = \left\{ \frac{1}{2}(1, -1, 1) \times 2 \right\}, \quad p_2 = 1, \quad p_n \geq 2 \ (n \geq 3),
   \]

   (iii) \( K_X^3 = 3/2 \), \( K_X \cdot c_2 = 3/2 \), \( \chi(\mathcal{O}_X) = 0 \), \( r = 2 \)

   \[
   B = \left\{ \frac{1}{2}(1, -1, 1) \right\}, \quad p_2 = 1, \quad p_n \geq 2 \ (n \geq 3),
   \]

   where \( \frac{1}{2}(1, -1, 1) \times n \) means \( n \) points of type \( \frac{1}{2}(1, -1, 1) \).

   (5) \( p_n \geq 2 \) for \( n > r + 1 \).

**Proof.** For a proof of (1), \( ct_{\lfloor r/2 \rfloor + 1} = 0 \) by (4) of Theorem 2 when \( r \) is odd \( \geq 3 \).

\( p_{\lfloor r/2 \rfloor + 1} \geq 1 \) by Theorem 1 since \( K_X \cdot c_2(X) > 0 \).
For a proof of (2), recall $ct_{r-1} \geq 0$ if $r$ is odd or even without type $\frac{1}{2}(1, -1, 1)$. Thus $pr_{-1} \geq 1$ by Theorem 1.

For a proof of (3), recall $ct_s = -ct_{r-s+1}$ for $s \geq 2$ by (3) of Theorem 2. For $s \left(\lceil r/2 \rceil + 1 \leq s \leq r - 1\right)$, add up $pr_{r-s+1} + ps$. Then we have

\[ pr_{r-s+1} + ps = \frac{[(r + 1)(2r + 1) + 6s(s - r - 1)]}{12} rK^3_X + \frac{rK_X \cdot c_2(X)}{12}. \]

In the above expression, the minimum of term $6s(s - r - 1)$ occurs at $s = \frac{r+1}{2}$. Thus, $pr_{r-s+1} + ps$ is strictly increasing from $s = \lceil r/2 \rceil + 1$ to $s = r - 1$. Now, we have

\[ pr_{r-s+1} + ps > \frac{r^2 - 1}{24}, \]

since $K_X \cdot c_2(X) > 0$ and $rK^3_X$ is a positive integer. $pr_{r-s+1} + ps \geq 1$ and moreover, greater than $2$ if $r \geq 7$. Thus, a proof for (3) is complete.

For a proof of (4), $pr \geq 1$ since $ct_0 \geq 0$. For the second part, we are going to consider the following three cases:

(i) $\chi(O_X) < 0$, (ii) $\chi(O_X) > 0$, (iii) $\chi(O_X) = 0$.

If $\chi(O_X) < 0$, then $pr \geq 2$ for $n \geq 2$ by Reid-Fletcher formula.

If $\chi(O_X) > 0$, then $pr \geq 2$ since $ct_0 > \chi(O_X) \geq 1$ by (6) of Theorem 2.

In the case of $\chi(O_X) = 0$, $ct_0 = \frac{1}{24} K_X \cdot c_2(X)$ since $\chi(X, O_X) = ct_0 - \frac{1}{24} K_X \cdot c_2(X)$ by combining the Barlow’s work and (1) of Theorem 2. Thus,

\[ pr = \frac{(r - 1)(2r - 1)}{12} rK^3_X + 2rct_0. \]

If $r \geq 4$, then $\frac{(r - 1)(2r - 1)}{12} > 1$. Thus, $pr \geq 2$ since $ct_0 > 0$.

If $r = 3$, then the basket of singularities must contain points of type $\frac{1}{3}(1, -1, b)$ only. Thus we have $ct_0 \geq \frac{1}{4}$ by (1) of Theorem 2 and $p_3 \geq \frac{5}{8} + \frac{3}{4}$ by the formula of $pr$ given above. Thus $p_3 \geq 2$.

Hence it is enough to consider the case $r = 2$. The basket of singularities must contain points of type $\frac{1}{2}(1, -1, 1)$ only. Thus, by (1) of Theorem 2,

\[ ct_0 = \frac{1}{16} \# , \]

where $\#$ is the number of points in the basket of singularities. Then, by the formula of $pr$ given above, we have

\[ p_2 = \frac{K^3_X}{2} + \frac{1}{4} \#. \]

If $\# \geq 4$, then $p_2 \geq 2$. The only remaining cases $p_2 = 1$ can occur when $\# \leq 3$. Recall $p_2 \geq 1$ since $ct_0 > 0$. By computing $p_2$ according to the cases $\# = 1, 2, 3$, we have three possible exceptions which are described in the statement of Theorem 3.

For a proof of (5), if $X$ is one of the possible exceptions in (4), then $pr$ is positive and strictly increasing. Thus we may assume $pr \geq 2$. 

Let \( n = qr + s \) \((0 \leq s < r)\). We consider the following three cases:

(i) \( s = 0 \),  
(ii) \( s \geq 2 \),  
(iii) \( s = 1 \).

If \( s = 0 \), then \( n \) is a multiple of \( r \), i.e., \( n = qr \) \((q \geq 2)\) since \( n > r + 1 \). Since \( p_t \geq 2 \), \( p_{n} \geq 2 \) clearly (For a reference, see [5, Theorem 3.4.15, p. 258]).

Let’s prove the case \( s \geq 2 \). For this case, it is enough to prove \( p_{r+s} \geq 2 \). The reason is as follows: if \( p_{r+s} \geq 2 \) and \( q \geq 2 \), then \( p_{n} \geq p_{(q-1)r} + p_{r+s} - 1 \geq 2 \) (For a reference, see [5, Theorem 3.4.15, p. 258]).

We have proved \( p_s + p_{r-s+1} \geq 1 \) in (3). Compute the following:

\[
p_{r+s} - p_s - (p_s + p_{r-s+1}) = r^2(s - 1/2)K_X^3 > 0.
\]

Thus, \( p_{r+s} > p_s + p_{r-s+1} \geq 1 \). Hence we prove \( p_{r+s} \geq 2 \).

Now, we are going to prove the case \( s = 1 \). Similarly, for this case, it is enough to prove \( p_{2r+1} \geq 2 \). If \( p_{2r+1} \geq 2 \), then \( p_{qr+1} \geq p_{2r+1} \) clearly for \( q \geq 3 \) since \( p_{qr+1} \geq p_{(q-2)r} + p_{2r+1} - 1 \).

Choose \( k \) such that \( 2 \leq r - k \leq r - 1 \) and \( p_{r-k} \geq 1 \). This is possible because \( p_t \neq 0 \) for more than half of \( t \in \{2, \ldots, r - 1\} \). We proved \( p_{r+k+1} \geq 2 \) just before since \( 2 \leq k + 1 \leq r - 1 \). Thus,

\[
p_{2r+1} \geq p_{r-k} + p_{r+k+1} - 1 \geq 2.
\]

A proof for (5) is complete. \( \square \)

**Remark 2.** In Theorem 3, we described the numerical data of possible exceptions. But it does not imply the existence of canonical threefolds with given numerical data. Those exceptional cases may or may not exist.

**Remark 3.** We have no example which shows \( p_{r+1} = 0 \) yet.
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