

# CLUSTERING POLAR CURVES

PIOTR MIGUS, LAURENȚIU PĂUNESCU, AND MIHAI TIBĂR

*In memoriam Ștefan Papadima*

ABSTRACT. This essay builds on the idea of clustering the polar curves of 2-variable function germs. In the *Top* category, one may derive from it a bijective correspondence of a certain partition of polar quotients. In case of the *Lip* category, we explain how this bijective correspondence may be refined in terms of gradient canyons.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The classical results by Zariski [Za] and Burau [Bur] tell that two holomorphic function germs  $f, g : (\mathbb{C}^2, 0) \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}, 0)$  are topological right-equivalent, then this topological equivalence induces a bijective correspondence between the irreducible components of the curves  $f = 0$  and  $g = 0$  such that the Puiseux pairs are preserved, as well as the intersection multiplicity of each pair of components. The reciprocal has been proved by Parusinski [Pa]. The polar curve of a function germ encodes information on its topology and beyond. However, the polar curves are more subtle to decode since, unlike the curves  $f = 0$  and  $g = 0$ , they do not correspond even if  $f$  and  $g$  are analytical right-equivalent. Teissier [Te2] proved that the polar quotients are topological invariants (see Theorem 2.3) and Kuo and Lu [KL] studied the contact of the polar branches via the Newton polygon. Many other results enrich periodically the landscape of polar curves in relation to the topological, to the analytical, and to the Lipschitz structures of singularities.

We remark that tracking the contact orders of polar arcs and of roots of  $f$  as in [KL] induces a natural partition of the set of polar arcs into clusters, in such a way that the classical bijective correspondence of branches of topological right-equivalent function germs  $f$  and  $g$  induces a bijective correspondence of these clusters (Theorem 3.6).

We point out several consequences of this clustering: each polar clusters has a maximum of its polar quotients, which one may call Łojasiewicz exponent of the polar cluster, and this “local maximum” is a topological invariant (Corollaries 3.11 and 3.12). Similarly, the polar clusters which are tangent to one of the lines of the tangent cone of  $f$  yield a tangential Milnor number which is a topological invariant (Corollary 3.13), such that the sum of those is the Milnor number of  $f$ .

---

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 32S55, 32S15, 14H20, 58K20, 32S05.

*Key words and phrases.* topological equivalence of functions, polar curves, Lipschitz invariants.

P.M. and M.T. acknowledge the support of the Labex CEMPI (ANR-11-LABX-0007-01). P.M. was also partially supported by NCN-Poland, grant number 2018/02/X/ST1/02699.

Passing to the Lipschitz category, we explain how this clustering may evolve into a more refined class of objects called *gradient canyons* of [KKP], which are arc-neighbourhoods of certain topological sub-clusters. The set of gradient canyons may then be partitioned into certain clusters that turn out to define discrete bi-Lipschitz invariants. Following [PT], we survey the bi-Lipschitz invariance of the gradient canyons, and we show how one may deduce from it the Henry-Parusinski continuous bi-Lipschitz moduli [HP].

This survey attempts to a more systematic point of view over some equivalence relations between holomorphic function germs, embedding the latest developments and thus helping the interested reader to easier access the current research status, and to have a taste of the open questions in higher dimensions.

## 2. POLAR QUOTIENTS AND ŁOJASIEWICZ INEQUALITIES

**2.1. Polar quotients.** Let  $f : (\mathbb{C}^n, 0) \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}, 0)$  be a holomorphic function germ, and let  $m := \text{ord}_0 f$ . Let  $l = \sum_{i=1}^n a_i x_i$  be a non-zero linear form. The *polar curve of  $f$  relative to  $l$*  is the germ  $\Gamma(l, f)$  of the analytic closure of  $\text{Sing}(l, f) \setminus \text{Sing} f$ . If  $l$  is generic then  $\dim \Gamma(l, f) = 1$ . Let  $\Gamma_1, \dots, \Gamma_{s-1}$  be the irreducible components of  $\Gamma(l, f)$ , with multiplicities  $m_j := \text{mult}_0(\Gamma_j)$ .

The *polar quotients of  $f$  relative to  $l$*  are the rational numbers:

$$(1) \quad q_j := \text{mult}_0(\{f = 0\}, \Gamma_j) / m_j$$

as introduced by Teissier [Te2]. They are related to the Milnor number  $\mu(f)$  by the equality:

$$\mu(f) = \sum_{j=1}^{s-1} \text{mult}_0(\{f = 0\}, \Gamma_j) - m_j = \sum_{j=1}^{s-1} m_j (q_j - 1).$$

Teissier [Te1] showed that this set of polar quotients  $Q(f, l)$  does not depend on the generic linear  $l$ , therefore one may use the notation  $Q(f) := Q(f, l)$ .

**2.2. Puiseux expansions.** One has the following very useful interpretation of polar quotients in terms of Puiseux expansions.

Let  $\alpha : (\mathbb{C}, 0) \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}^2, 0)$  be a holomorphic map-germ which is a parametrization of a curve germ  $\text{Im}(\alpha)$ . Then there is a well-defined tangent line  $T(\alpha)$  at 0 and  $T(\alpha) \in \mathbb{C}P^1$ .

Let  $\mathbb{F}$  be the field of convergent fractional power series in an indeterminate  $y$ . By the Newton-Puiseux Theorem we have that  $\mathbb{F}$  is algebraically closed.

A non-zero element of  $\mathbb{F}$  has the form

$$(2) \quad \eta(y) = a_1 y^{\alpha_1} + a_2 y^{\alpha_2} + a_3 y^{\alpha_3} + \dots,$$

where  $a_i \in \mathbb{C}^*$  and  $\alpha_i \in \mathbb{Q}$  with  $0 < \alpha_1 < \alpha_2 < \alpha_3 < \dots$ . The elements of  $\mathbb{F}$  are called *Puiseux arcs*. If  $N$  is the common denominator of  $\alpha_i$ , i.e.  $\alpha_i = n_i/N$  such that  $\text{gcd}(N, n_1, n_2, \dots) = 1$ , then there are  $N - 1$  conjugates of  $\eta$  which are the Puiseux arcs of the form

$$\eta_{\text{conj}}^{(k)}(y) := \sum a_i \varepsilon^{kn_i} y^{n_i/N}, \quad \varepsilon := e^{\frac{2\pi\sqrt{-1}}{N}},$$

where  $k \in \{0, \dots, N - 1\}$ .

By the *order of a Puiseux arc* (2) we mean  $\text{ord } \eta(y) := \alpha_1$  and by the *Puiseux multiplicity* we mean  $m_{\text{puiseux}}(\eta) = N$ . In addition, let us denote by  $\mathbb{F}_1 := \{\eta \in \mathbb{F} : \text{ord } \eta(y) \geq 1\}$ .

For any  $\eta \in \mathbb{F}_1$ ,  $\text{ord } \eta(y) \geq 1$ , the map germ:

$$\alpha : (\mathbb{C}, 0) \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}^2, 0), \quad t \mapsto (\eta(t^N), t^N), \quad N := m_{\text{puiseux}}(\alpha),$$

is holomorphic. All conjugates of  $\eta$  lead to the same holomorphic arc  $\alpha_*$ . When  $\alpha_*$  is given, the conjugate class of  $\eta$  is unique.

DEFINITION 2.1 (Contact order, cf e.g. [KKP]).

The *contact order* between two different holomorphic arcs  $\alpha^*$  and  $\beta^*$  is defined as:

$$(3) \quad \max_y \text{ord}(\alpha(y) - \beta(y))$$

where the maximum is taken over all conjugates of  $\alpha^*$  and of  $\beta^*$ .

The  $e$ -jet of a Puiseux arc  $\eta$ , denoted by  $J^e(\eta)(y)$ , is the truncation of  $\eta$  at the degree  $e$  (i.e. all terms of degrees  $> e$  are deleted). Here we consider  $e \in \mathbb{Q}$  or  $e = \infty$ .

Let  $f : (\mathbb{C}^n, 0) \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}, 0)$  be a holomorphic function germ, and let  $m := \text{ord}_0 f$ . We say that  $f$  is *mini-regular in  $x_1$  of order  $m$*  if the initial form of the Taylor expansion of  $f$  is not equal to 0 at the point  $(1, 0, \dots, 0)$ , in other words  $f_m(1, 0, \dots, 0) \neq 0$  where  $f(x_1, \dots, x_n) = f_m(x_1, \dots, x_n) + f_{m+1}(x_1, \dots, x_n) + \text{h.o.t.}$

Let  $f : (\mathbb{C}^2, 0) \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}, 0)$  be a mini-regular holomorphic function. If  $f = f_1^{p_1} \cdots f_s^{p_s}$  is the decomposition of  $f$  into irreducible components, then  $f$  is reduced iff  $p_i = 1$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, s$ . We have the following Puiseux factorisations of  $f$  and  $f_x$

$$f(x, y) = u \cdot \prod_{i=1}^m (x - \zeta_i(y)), \quad f_x(x, y) = v \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{m-1} (x - \gamma_i(y)),$$

where  $u, v$  are units, in the sense that the function  $u$  and  $v$  are not 0 at the origin. If  $f_x = f_x^1 \cdots f_x^{s-1}$  is the decomposition into irreducible components then  $\Gamma_i = \{f_x^i = 0\}$  and there exists at least one Puiseux root  $\gamma$  of  $f_x$  such that  $f_x^i(\gamma(y), y) \equiv 0$ . The set of the Puiseux roots of  $f_x$  we will denote by  $P(f)$  and its elements will be called *polar arcs*. The set of the Puiseux roots of  $f$  we will denote by  $Z(f)$ .

If  $y \mapsto (\gamma(y), y)$  is any Puiseux parametrisation of  $\Gamma_j$ , then the polar quotient  $q_j$  defined at (1) is:

$$q_j = \text{ord } f(\gamma(y), y).$$

Note that in the definition of the set of polar quotients  $Q(f)$  we do not consider arcs  $\gamma$  such that  $f(\gamma(y), y) \equiv 0$  and  $f_x(\gamma(y), y) \equiv 0$  since these arcs are not components of the polar set, by its definition. However sometimes one refers to such arcs as “polar arcs” because they are solutions of the equation  $f_x(\gamma(y), y) \equiv 0$ .

**2.3. Łojasiewicz exponents.** For an analytic map  $G : (\mathbb{C}^n, 0) \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}^m, 0)$ , one has the following inequality, called *Łojasiewicz distance inequality*:

$$(4) \quad |G(x)| \geq C \operatorname{dist}(x, G^{-1}(0))^\alpha,$$

which holds in some neighbourhood of  $0 \in \mathbb{C}^n$  and for some constant  $C > 0$ . The infimum of all such exponents  $\alpha$  and is denoted by  $l_0(G)$ . By [LT] we have  $l_0(G)$  is rational. For  $G = \operatorname{grad} f$ , the gradient of an analytic function germ  $f : (\mathbb{C}^n, 0) \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}, 0)$ , we have the Łojasiewicz exponent  $l_0(\operatorname{grad} f)$ . In the particular case when  $f$  has an isolated singularity, the inequality (4) for  $\operatorname{grad} f$  takes the form

$$(5) \quad \|\operatorname{grad} f(x)\| \geq C|x|^\beta.$$

Let  $f : (\mathbb{C}^n, 0) \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}, 0)$  be an analytic function. It has been proved by Łojasiewicz [Lo] that there exist a neighbourhood of  $0 \in \mathbb{C}^n$  and constants  $C, \eta > 0$  such that the following *Łojasiewicz gradient inequality* holds

$$(6) \quad \|\operatorname{grad} f(x)\| \geq C|f(x)|^\eta, \quad \text{for } x \in U.$$

The smallest exponent  $\eta$  in (6) is called *Łojasiewicz exponent in the gradient inequality* and we denote it by  $\rho_0(f)$ .

**REMARK 2.2.** The real version of Łojasiewicz exponents were considered by Bochnak and Risler [BR]. For both complex and real analytic functions one has that  $\rho_0(f) \in ]0, 1[$  cf [Te2], [BR], and that  $\rho_0(f)$  is rational, cf [BR].

We say that  $f$  and  $g$  are topological/analytical/Lipschitz equivalent, and denote this by  $f \stackrel{\text{top/an/Lip}}{\sim} g$ , iff  $g = f \circ \varphi$  for some germ  $\varphi : (\mathbb{C}^n, 0) \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}^n, 0)$  of a homeomorphism/bi-analytic/bi-Lipschitz, respectively.

**Theorem 2.3.** [Te2, Corollary 2] *Let  $f : (\mathbb{C}^n, 0) \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}, 0)$  be a holomorphic function with isolated singularity. One has:*

- (a) *If  $f \stackrel{\text{an}}{\sim} g$  then  $Q(f) = Q(g)$ .*
- (b)  *$l_0(\operatorname{grad} f) = \max Q(f) - 1$  and  $\rho_0(f) = (\max Q(f) - 1) / \max Q(f)$ .*
- (c) *The Łojasiewicz exponents  $l_0(\operatorname{grad} f)$  and  $\rho_0(f)$  are realised along at least one of the polar branches of  $f$ .*
- (d) *In case  $n = 2$ , if  $f \stackrel{\text{top}}{\sim} g$  then  $Q(f) = Q(g)$ . In particular the Łojasiewicz exponents of  $f$  and  $g$  are equal.*

*Proof.* The only point which is maybe not explicitly stated in [Te2] is (c), but this is in the proof of [Te2, Theorem 2], where Teissier shows that the polar pairs are the same as the multiplicity pairs for the integral closure of the Jacobian ideal. This means that there is some polar arc which minimises the multiplicity pairs. The polar pairs are finitely many and (positive) integers. Then [Te2, Corollary 2] just gives the consequences for the exponents: they are realised along some polar arc. In particular  $\rho_0(f) \in ]0, 1[$  and they is a rational number. Teissier uses the normalised blow-up of the conormal space of  $f$  and the fact that the Jacobian ideal has only one zero point.  $\square$

One may state the following:

**Conjecture 2.4.** *Teissier's results (a–d) hold for  $f$  with non-isolated singularities, and for any  $n \geq 2$ .*

The case  $n = 2$  with non-isolated singularities can be extracted from [KL] or [Pa]. An explicit proof was given more recently in [HNP]. This will also be a consequence of our Theorem 3.6 on the topological invariance of polar clusters.

Some partial results are available in case  $n > 2$ : for isolated weighted homogeneous functions in  $n = 3$  variables [KOP, Corollary 2], and for isolated semi-quasihomogeneous functions in  $n \geq 2$ -variables and deformations of those [Brz, Corollary 2].

The statement “If  $f$  and  $g$  are topologically equivalent then the Łojasiewicz exponents are the same” is a weaker version of point (d), called “Teissier conjecture” by Brzostowski [Brz], and earlier known as “Teissier question”.

### 3. TOPOLOGICAL INVARIANCE OF POLAR CLUSTERS

Let  $\text{Cone}_0\{f = 0\} = \bigcup_{k=1}^r L_k$  be the decomposition of the tangent cone into the tangent lines intersecting at 0 and let

$$P^T(f) = \{\gamma \in P(f) \mid \text{Im}(\gamma) \text{ is tangent to } L_k \text{ for some } k \in \{1, \dots, s\}\}$$

be the *tangential polar arcs*.

To a polar arc  $\gamma$  one may associate the positive rationals  $h$  and  $\delta$  defined as follows:

$$(7) \quad h := \text{ord } f(\gamma(y), y), \quad \delta := \max_{\zeta \in Z(f)} \{\text{ord}(\gamma(y) - \zeta(y))\}.$$

In terms of the Newton polygon relative to  $\gamma$  (cf [KuPar]) denoted by  $\mathcal{NP}(f, \gamma)$ , these numbers have the following interpretation:  $h$  is the point where  $\mathcal{NP}(f, \gamma)$  intersects the vertical axis and  $\delta$  is the co-slope of the highest edge of  $\mathcal{NP}(f, \gamma)$ .

We introduce the following notations:

DEFINITION 3.1. The following subsets of  $P(f)$  are called *polar clusters*:

$$\mathcal{PC}_{\delta, h} = \{\gamma \in P(f) \mid \max_{\zeta \in Z(f)} \{\text{ord}(\gamma(y) - \zeta(y))\} = \delta, \text{ord } f(\gamma(y), y) = h\} \subset P(f),$$

$$\mathcal{PC}_{k, \delta, h} = \{\gamma \in \mathcal{PC}_{\delta, h} \mid \text{Im}(\gamma) \text{ is tangent to } L_k\} \subset P(f).$$

If  $(k, \delta, h) \neq (k', \delta', h')$  then the polar clusters  $\mathcal{PC}_{k, \delta, h}$  and  $\mathcal{PC}_{k', \delta', h'}$  are disjoint by definition. One may compare the polar clusters  $\mathcal{PC}_{k, \delta, h}$  to the “paquets” defined by Garcia Barroso in terms of the Eggers tree, see [GB1, GB2].

EXAMPLE 3.2 (Polar arcs with the same  $h$  and different  $\delta$ ).

Let us consider  $f(x, y) = (x - y)^2(x - y^2)(x - 2y^2)(x - 3y^2) - 6y^8$ . We have five Puiseux roots:

$$\zeta_1(y) = 4y^2 + \text{h.o.t.}, \quad \zeta_{2,3}(y) = (1 \pm i\sqrt{2})y^2 + \text{h.o.t.}, \quad \zeta_{4,5}(y) = y \pm \sqrt{6}y^{5/2} + \text{h.o.t.}$$

and four polar arcs:

$$\gamma_1(y) = y, \quad \gamma_2(y) = \frac{3}{5}y + \text{h.o.t.}, \quad \gamma_{3,4}(y) = \frac{6 \pm \sqrt{3}}{3}y^2 + \text{h.o.t.}$$

Obviously,  $\text{ord } f(\gamma_1(y), y) = \text{ord } f(\gamma_3(y), y) = \text{ord } f(\gamma_4(y), y) = 8$  but

$$\max_{\zeta \in Z(f)} \{\text{ord}(\gamma_1(y) - \zeta(y))\} = \frac{5}{2}$$

and

$$\max_{\zeta \in Z(f)} \{\text{ord}(\gamma_3(y) - \zeta(y))\} = \max_{\zeta \in Z(f)} \{\text{ord}(\gamma_4(y) - \zeta(y))\} = 2.$$

EXAMPLE 3.3 (Polar arcs with the same  $\delta$  and different  $h$ ).

Let  $f(x, y) = [(x - y)^2 - y^6][(x - y)^2 - 4y^6](x^2 - y^4)(x - y^3)(x - 2y^3)$ . There are eight Puiseux roots:

$$\zeta_{1,2}(y) = y \pm y^3, \quad \zeta_{3,4}(y) = y \pm 2y^3, \quad \zeta_{5,6}(y) = \pm y^2, \quad \zeta_7(y) = y^3, \quad \zeta_8(y) = 2y^3$$

and seven polar arcs:

$$\gamma_{1,2,3}(y) = y + \varepsilon_i y^{11/3} + \text{h.o.t.}, \quad \gamma_4(y) = \frac{2}{3}y + \text{h.o.t.},$$

$$\gamma_{5,6}(y) = \pm \frac{1}{2}y^2 + \text{h.o.t.}, \quad \gamma_7(y) = \frac{2}{3}y^3 + \text{h.o.t.},$$

where  $\varepsilon_i$  are roots of the equation  $\varepsilon^3 = 5$ . One has:

$$\max_{\zeta \in Z(f)} \{\text{ord}(\gamma_7(y) - \zeta(y))\} = \max_{\zeta \in Z(f)} \{\text{ord}(\gamma_{1,2,3}(y) - \zeta(y))\} = 3$$

but

$$\text{ord } f(\gamma_7(y), y) = 14, \quad \text{ord } f(\gamma_{1,2,3}(y), y) = 16.$$

EXAMPLE 3.4 (Polar arcs with the same  $\delta$  and  $h$ , but different tangents).

Let  $f(x, y) = [(x - y)^2 - y^4](x - y^2)(x - y^3)$ . We have three polar arcs:

$$\gamma_1(y) = \frac{1}{2}y^2 + \text{h.o.t.}, \quad \gamma_2(y) = y - y^3 + \text{h.o.t.}, \quad \gamma_3(y) = \frac{1}{2}y + \text{h.o.t.}.$$

We have  $\delta(\gamma_1) = \delta(\gamma_2) = 2$ ,  $h(\gamma_1) = h(\gamma_2) = 6$ , and  $\mathcal{NP}(f, \gamma_1) = \mathcal{NP}(f, \gamma_2)$ . We get  $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in \mathcal{PC}_{2,6}$ , but  $\text{Im}(\gamma_1)$  is tangent to  $\{x = 0\}$  and  $\text{Im}(\gamma_2)$  is tangent to  $\{x = y\}$ .

EXAMPLE 3.5 (More than one polar arc in a cluster).

Let  $f(x, y) = [(x - y^2)^2 - y^6](x - y^3)(x - y^4)$ . We have three polar arcs:

$$\gamma_1(y) = \frac{1}{2}y^3 + \text{h.o.t.}, \quad \gamma_2(y) = y^2 - y^4 + \text{h.o.t.}, \quad \gamma_3(y) = \frac{1}{2}y^2 + \text{h.o.t.}$$

We compute:  $\delta(\gamma_1) = \delta(\gamma_2) = 3$ ,  $h(\gamma_1) = h(\gamma_2) = 10$ ,  $\mathcal{NP}(f, \gamma_1) = \mathcal{NP}(f, \gamma_2)$ , and  $\text{Im}(\gamma_1)$ , and  $\text{Im}(\gamma_2)$  have the same tangent line  $\{x = 0\}$ .

Let  $g : (\mathbb{C}^2, 0) \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}, 0)$  be another holomorphic function, and let  $\text{Cone}_0\{g = 0\} = \cup_{k=1}^{r'} L'_k$  be its tangent cone. One says that  $f$  and  $g$  are *topologically equivalent* if  $g = f \circ \varphi$ , where  $\varphi$  is a homeomorphism. In this case we have  $r = r'$ , and the topological equivalence induces a bijective correspondence  $L_k \mapsto L'_k$  (see [Pa]).

**Theorem 3.6.** *Let  $f, g : (\mathbb{C}^2, 0) \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}, 0)$  be holomorphic functions such that  $f \stackrel{\text{top}}{\simeq} g$ . The topological equivalence induces a bijective correspondence:*

$$(8) \quad \bigsqcup_{k, \delta, h} \mathcal{PC}_{k, \delta, h}(f) \rightarrow \bigsqcup_{k, \delta, h} \mathcal{PC}_{k, \delta, h}(g)$$

which maps  $\mathcal{PC}_{k, \delta, h}(f)$  to  $\mathcal{PC}_{k, \delta, h}(g)$ .

The proof is based on the following reformulation of [KL, Lemma 3.3], where the first statement is just the first part of [KL, Lemma 3.3]. It was remarked in [GLP, Remark 3.2] that the second part of [KL, Lemma 3.3] was not true. However, from the proof of [KL, Lemma 3.3] one can extract the correct statement given below (second claim). See also [HNP, Theorem 3.1] for an explicit proof of it.

**Lemma 3.7.** *For  $\zeta_1, \zeta_2 \in Z(f)$  there exists a polar arc  $\gamma$  of  $f$  such that:*

$$(9) \quad \begin{aligned} \max_{\zeta \in Z(f)} \{\text{ord}(\gamma(y) - \zeta(y))\} &= \text{ord}(\gamma(y) - \zeta_1(y)) \\ &= \text{ord}(\gamma(y) - \zeta_2(y)) = \text{ord}(\zeta_1(y) - \zeta_2(y)). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, for each fixed polar arc  $\gamma \in P(f)$ , there exist two Puiseux roots  $\zeta_1, \zeta_2$  of  $f$  satisfying the equalities (9).  $\square$

The proof of Theorem 3.6 uses a several known results. We shall list them below.

*Fact 1.* By [Pa], the topological equivalence of  $f$  and  $g$  defines a bijective correspondence between the irreducible components of the zero sets  $f^{-1}(0)$  and  $g^{-1}(0)$  that preserves the multiplicities of these components and the contact orders of any pairs of distinct components. Consequently, this bijective correspondence preserves the multiplicities of the Puiseux roots and the set of contacts  $\{\text{ord}(\zeta_i(y) - \zeta_j(y)) \mid \zeta_i, \zeta_j \in Z(f), j \neq i\}$ . Moreover, if  $\zeta_1, \zeta_2$  are Puiseux roots of  $f$  such that  $\text{Im}(\zeta_1)$  and  $\text{Im}(\zeta_2)$  have a common tangent, then this correspondence maps  $\zeta_i$  to  $\zeta'_i \in Z(g)$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ , such that  $\text{Im}(\zeta'_1)$  and  $\text{Im}(\zeta'_2)$  have a common tangent.

*Fact 2.* Let  $f$  be mini-regular in  $x$  of order  $m$ , and let  $f_m = c \prod_{i=1}^r (a_i x - b_i y)^{r_i}$  be the initial form of  $f$ , where  $c, a_i \in \mathbb{C}^*$ ,  $b_i \in \mathbb{C}$ . We claim that there exists a tangential polar arc  $\gamma \in P^T(f)$  such that  $\gamma(y) = ay + \text{h.o.t.}$ ,  $a \in \mathbb{C}$ , if and only if there exists a Puiseux root  $\zeta \in Z(f)$  of the form  $\zeta(y) = ay + \text{h.o.t.}$  and there exists  $j \in \{1, \dots, r\}$  such that  $\frac{b_j}{a_j} = a$  and  $r_j \geq 2$ .

If  $a = 0$  (respectively  $b_j/a_j = 0$ ), this is obvious. When  $a \neq 0$  (respectively  $b_j/a_j \neq 0$ ) then one applies Lemma 3.7 observing that  $\gamma$  is a tangential polar arc if and only if there exists a Puiseux roots  $\zeta \in Z(f)$  such that  $\text{ord} \gamma(y) < \text{ord}(\gamma(y) - \zeta(y))$ .

*Proof of Theorem 3.6.* Without loss of generality, one may assume that  $f$  is mini-regular in  $x$  of order  $m$ . Let  $\gamma \in \mathcal{PC}_{k, \delta, h}(f)$ . By Lemma 3.7 and Fact 2, there exist Puiseux roots  $\zeta_1, \zeta_2 \in Z(f)$  such that  $\text{Im}(\zeta_1)$  and  $\text{Im}(\zeta_2)$  are tangent to  $L_k$  and (9) is



satisfied. Therefore:

$$\begin{aligned} h = \text{ord } f(\gamma(y), y) &= \sum_{i=1}^p m_i \text{ord}(\gamma(y) - \zeta_i(y)) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^p m_i \text{ord}(J^\delta(\gamma)(y) - \zeta_i(y)) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^p m_i \min\{\text{ord}(\zeta_1(y) - \zeta_i(y)), \text{ord}(\zeta_2(y) - \zeta_i(y))\}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $m_i$  is multiplicity of a Puiseux root  $\zeta_i$  and  $p$  is the number of distinct Puiseux roots of  $f$ . By the bijective correspondence we have  $\zeta_i \mapsto \zeta'_i$  with the same contact. By Lemma 3.7, for each pair of Puiseux roots  $\zeta'_i, \zeta'_j \in Z(g)$  there exists a polar arc  $\gamma' \in P(g)$  such that (9) is satisfied. By Fact 1 and the definition (7), we get  $\gamma' \in \mathcal{PC}_{k,\delta,h}(g)$ .  $\square$

REMARK 3.8. Let  $m$  be the multiplicity of  $f$ , which is a topological invariant by the result by Burau [Bur] and Zariski [Za]. The polar cluster  $\mathcal{PC}_{1,m}(f)$  (i.e.  $\delta = 1$  and  $h = m$ ) is actually the set of the non-tangential polar arcs of  $f$ . By [KKP], the number of polar arcs in  $\mathcal{PC}_{1,m}(f)$  is equal to  $r - 1$ , where  $r$  is the number of the distinct lines in  $\text{Cone}_0\{f = 0\}$ . By Theorem 3.6, if  $f \stackrel{\text{top}}{\sim} g$ , then the bijective correspondence (8) maps  $\mathcal{PC}_{1,m}(f)$  to  $\mathcal{PC}_{1,m}(g)$ , and the number of polar arcs in  $\mathcal{PC}_{1,m}(f)$  and  $\mathcal{PC}_{1,m}(g)$  is the same.

One may define two other types of polar clusters:

$$\mathcal{PC}_\delta(f) = \{\gamma \in P(f) \mid \max_{\zeta \in Z(f)} \{\text{ord}(\gamma(y) - \zeta(y))\} = \delta\},$$

$$\mathcal{PC}_h(f) = \{\gamma \in P(f) \mid \text{ord } f(\gamma(y), y) = h\}.$$

By Theorem 3.6 and Remark 3.8, we then have:

**Corollary 3.9.** *Let  $f, g : (\mathbb{C}^2, 0) \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}, 0)$  be holomorphic functions such that  $f \stackrel{\text{top}}{\sim} g$ . Then the topological equivalence induces bijective correspondences*

$$\bigsqcup_{\delta} \mathcal{PC}_\delta(f) \rightarrow \bigsqcup_{\delta} \mathcal{PC}_\delta(g), \quad \text{and} \quad \bigsqcup_h \mathcal{PC}_h(f) \rightarrow \bigsqcup_h \mathcal{PC}_h(g)$$

which map  $\mathcal{PC}_\delta(f)$  to  $\mathcal{PC}_\delta(g)$ , and  $\mathcal{PC}_h(f)$  to  $\mathcal{PC}_h(g)$ , respectively.  $\square$

REMARK 3.10. If  $f : (\mathbb{C}^2, 0) \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}, 0)$  is a *Newton non-degenerate* holomorphic function, than any two polar clusters have the same tangent i.e. if  $\gamma \in \mathcal{PC}_{k,\delta,h}(f)$  and  $\gamma' \in \mathcal{PC}_{k',\delta',h'}(f)$  then  $\text{Im}(\gamma)$  and  $\text{Im}(\gamma')$  are tangent. Moreover,  $\delta = \delta'$  if and only if  $h = h'$ .

If  $f \stackrel{\text{top}}{\sim} g$  and both are Newton non-degenerate, then the bijective correspondence of clusters  $\mathcal{PC}_{k,\delta,h}(f) \mapsto \mathcal{PC}_{k,\delta,h}(g)$  preserves the number of polar arcs in each cluster. One can show the following equalities of numbers:

$$(10) \quad \#\mathcal{PC}_{k,\delta,h}(f) = \begin{cases} \#\{\zeta \in Z(f) \mid \text{ord } \zeta(y) = \delta\} & \text{if } \delta \neq \max_{\zeta \in Z(f)} \{\text{ord } \zeta(y)\} \\ \#\{\zeta \in Z(f) \mid \text{ord } \zeta(y) = \delta\} - 1 & \text{if } \delta = \max_{\zeta \in Z(f)} \{\text{ord } \zeta(y)\} \end{cases}$$



**3.1. The Łojasiewicz exponents of polar clusters.** For any  $k, \delta$  we define *the partial Łojasiewicz exponent of  $\mathcal{PC}_{k,\delta}$*  as follows:

$$\rho_{k,\delta}(f) := \left( \max_{\gamma \in \mathcal{PC}_{k,\delta}(f)} \{\text{ord } f(\gamma(y), y)\} - 1 \right) / \max_{\gamma \in \mathcal{PC}_{k,\delta}(f)} \{\text{ord } f(\gamma(y), y)\}.$$

From Theorem 3.6 we derive immediately:

**Corollary 3.11.** *The partial Łojasiewicz exponents  $\rho_{k,\delta}$  are topological invariants.*  $\square$

This invariance is a more refined version than the well-known topological invariance of the Łojasiewicz exponent  $\rho_0(f)$ , cf [Te2, KL, Pa, HNP], since one can show that  $\rho_0(f) = \max\{\rho_{k,\delta}(f)\}_{k,\delta}$ .

**3.2. The tangential Łojasiewicz exponents.** Let  $f : (\mathbb{C}^2, 0) \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}, 0)$  be a mini-regular holomorphic function, without any assumption about singularities. As before,  $\text{Cone}_0\{f = 0\} = \cup_{k=1}^r L_k$  is the decomposition of the tangent cone into the tangent lines intersecting at 0.

Let  $\Gamma_k^{\text{tan}}(l, f)$  be the subset of polar branches of  $f$  which are tangent to  $L_k$  and the polar curves depend on the generic  $l$ , and the subset  $\Gamma_k^{\text{tan}}(l, f)$  too. Let  $Q_k(f) \subseteq Q(f)$  the set of polar quotients of all the polars in  $\Gamma_k^{\text{tan}}(l, f)$  (let us recall that, according to the earlier convention  $0 \notin Q(f)$ ). It follows from Teissier's [Te2] that  $Q_k(f)$  does not depend on the generic  $l$ .

The Łojasiewicz exponent of all the non-tangential polar arcs is  $(m-1)/m$  where  $m$  is the multiplicity of  $f$ . This is equal to  $\min Q(f)$  and it is a topological invariant, as well as the multiplicity  $m$ . In the general case it follows from Theorem 2.3(d), see also [HNP] for the non-reduced setting, that  $\min Q(f)$  is a topological invariant.

From Theorem 3.6 we may then derive:

**Corollary 3.12.** *The tangential Łojasiewicz exponent*

$$\rho_{0k} := (\max Q_k(f) - 1) / \max Q_k(f)$$

*is a topological invariant, for any  $k \in 1, \dots, r$ .*  $\square$

**3.3. The tangential Milnor numbers.** We have seen that  $\mu(f) = \sum_j m_j(q_j - 1)$ , where  $j$  runs over all the polar branches  $\Gamma_j(l, f) \subset \Gamma(l, f)$ . By the above result we may define the *tangential Milnor numbers* as:

$$\mu_k(f) := \sum_j m_j(q_j - 1),$$

where  $j$  runs over the set  $\Gamma_k^{\text{tan}}(l, f)$  of polars branches which are tangent to  $L_k$ . It then follows also from Theorem 3.6:

**Corollary 3.13.**  *$\mu_k(f)$  is a topological invariant, for any  $k \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ .*  $\square$

Let us point out that from the above results there is no information about the multiplicities of the polar quotients (i.e. the number of polar arcs which have the same polar quotient).

## 4. THE BI-LIPSCHITZ CORRESPONDENCE

Let  $f = g \circ \varphi$ . In case  $\varphi$  is bi-Lipschitz, it appears that there is a bijective correspondence between a more refined version of clusters, based on the gradient canyons. We follow [PT] where these ideas were developed.

DEFINITION 4.1. [KKP] Let  $\gamma$  be a polar arc of  $f$  such that  $f(\gamma(y), y) \not\equiv 0$ . The *gradient degree*  $d_{\text{gr}}(\gamma)$  is the smallest number  $q$  such that

$$(11) \quad \text{ord}_y(\|\text{grad } f(\gamma(y), y)\|) = \text{ord}_y(\|\text{grad } f(\gamma(y) + uy^q, y)\|),$$

holds for generic  $u \in \mathbb{C}$ . The *gradient canyon*  $\mathcal{GC}(\gamma_*)$  is the subset of all the curve germs  $\alpha_*$  which are images of Puiseux arcs  $\alpha$  of the form

$$\alpha(y) := \gamma(y) + uy^{d_{\text{gr}}(\gamma)} + \text{h.o.t.}$$

for any  $u \in \mathbb{C}$ . We may and will call  $d_{\text{gr}}(\gamma)$  the *canyon degree*. When  $\gamma$  is a polar arc such that  $f(\gamma(y), y) \equiv 0$  then we set  $d_{\text{gr}}(\gamma_*) = +\infty$ .

Let  $\mathcal{C}(f)$  denote the set of all gradient canyons of  $f$  of degree  $> 1$ , and let  $\mathcal{C}_k(f) \subseteq \mathcal{C}(f)$  be the subset of canyons which are tangent to the line  $L_k$ . One has a disjoint union  $\mathcal{C}(f) = \bigsqcup_{k=1}^r \mathcal{C}_k(f)$ . The *canyon disks* have been defined in [PT, §5.]. With these notation we may state:

**Theorem 4.2.** [PT] *If the map  $\varphi$ , is bi-holomorphic then the image by  $\varphi$  of a canyon is a canyon, and the degree is preserved.*

*If the map  $\varphi$  is bi-Lipschitz, then it induces a bijection between the canyon disks of  $f$  and the canyon disks of  $g$  by preserving the canyon degree.*  $\square$

This key theorem yields bi-Lipschitz invariants, as follows.

Let  $f = g \circ \varphi$ , for a bi-Lipschitz homeomorphism  $\varphi$ . Theorem 4.2 implies that certain subsets of gradient canyons, defined in terms of the mutual contact, are preserved by  $\varphi$ . Moreover, there are well-defined ‘‘clusters’’ of canyons of  $f$  which are sent by  $\varphi$  into similar clusters of  $g$ , and that such clusters are determined by certain rational numbers which are bi-Lipschitz invariants.

It is shown in [PT, §5.3] that the ‘‘contact orders of canyons’’ is well-defined, and that it yields a more refined partition of each subset  $\mathcal{C}_k$ . We consider the tangential canyons only, i.e. those of degree more than 1. As we have seen before in case of topological equivalence, the tangent cone  $\text{Cone}_0\{f = 0\}$  is a topological invariant, and the contact orders between the Puiseux roots of  $f$  are preserved by  $\varphi$ . A more interesting situations appear after the polar arcs leave the tree, namely at a higher level than the co-slope  $\delta = \tan \theta_{B(h)}$ . Whenever the canyons  $\mathcal{GC}(\gamma_{1*}) \ni \alpha_*$  and  $\mathcal{GC}(\gamma_{2*}) \ni \beta_*$  are different and both of degree  $d > 1$ , this order is lower than  $d$  and therefore does not depend on the choice of  $\alpha_*$  in the first canyon, and of  $\beta_*$  in the second canyon. This yields a well-defined *contact order between two distinct canyons of degree  $d$* . Their contact can be greater or equal to the co-slope of the corresponding bar, say  $\tan \theta_{B(h)}$ , but less than their canyon degrees.

**4.1. Clustering the canyons.** We may cluster the canyons in terms of the essentials bars of the tree of  $f$ , namely those canyons departing from an essential bar  $B(h)$  corresponding to  $h$ , i.e. associated to the polar arcs leaving the tree of  $f$  on that bar  $B(h)$ . The contact order of distinct canyons, can be greater or equal to the co-slope  $\tan \theta_{B(h)}$  of the corresponding bar, but less than their canyon degrees.

Let  $\mathcal{C}_{k,d,B(h)}(f) \subset \mathcal{C}_k$  be the union of canyons of degree  $d > 1$ , the polar arcs of which grow on the same bar  $B(h)$ , and thus have the same  $h$ , where  $d > \tan \theta_{B(h)} > 1$ , more precisely those canyons of degree  $d$  with the same top edge of the Newton polygon relative to some polar arc of the canyon.

One then has the disjoint union decomposition:

$$(12) \quad \mathcal{C}_k(f) = \bigsqcup_{d > 1, h} \mathcal{C}_{k,d,B(h)}(f).$$

Note that each canyon from  $\mathcal{C}_{k,d,B(h)}(f)$  has the same contact  $> 1$  with a fixed irreducible component  $\{f_i = 0\}$ .

Next, each cluster  $\mathcal{C}_{k,d,B(h)}(f)$  has a partition into unions of canyons according to the mutual order of contact between canyons. More precisely, a fixed gradient canyon  $\mathcal{GC}_i(f) \subset \mathcal{C}_{k,d,B(h)}(f)$  has a well defined order of contact  $k(i, j)$  with some other gradient canyon  $\mathcal{GC}_j(f) \subset \mathcal{C}_{k,d,B(h)}(f)$  from the same cluster; we count also the *multiplicity* of each such contact, i.e. the number of canyons  $\mathcal{GC}_j(f)$  from the cluster  $\mathcal{C}_{k,d,B(h)}(f)$  which have exactly the same contact with  $\mathcal{GC}_i(f)$ .

Let then  $K_{k,d,B(h),i}(f)$  be the (un-ordered) set of those contact orders  $k(i, j)$  of the fixed canyon  $\mathcal{GC}_i(f)$ , counted with multiplicity, and varying index  $j$ .

Let now  $\mathcal{C}_{k,d,B(h),\omega}(f)$  be the union of canyons from  $\mathcal{C}_{k,d,B(h)}(f)$  which have exactly the same set  $\omega = K_{k,d,B(h),i}(f)$  of orders of contact with the other canyons from  $\mathcal{C}_{k,d,B(h)}(f)$ . This defines a partition:

$$(13) \quad \mathcal{C}_{k,d,B(h)}(f) = \bigsqcup_{\omega} \mathcal{C}_{k,d,B(h),\omega}(f).$$

In this way each canyon of  $\mathcal{C}_k$  has its “identity card” composed of these contact orders (which are rational numbers), and it belongs to a certain cluster  $\mathcal{C}_{k,d,B(h),\omega}(f)$  in the partition of  $\mathcal{C}_k(f)$ . It is possible that two canyons have the same “identity card”. We clearly have, by definition, the inclusions:

$$\mathcal{C}_k(f) \supset \mathcal{C}_{k,d,B(h)}(f) \supset \mathcal{C}_{k,d,B(h),\omega}(f)$$

for any defined indices.

With these notations, one has:

**Theorem 4.3.** [PT] *The bi-Lipschitz map  $\varphi$  induces a bijection between the gradient canyons of  $f$  and those of  $g$ . For any fixed  $k$ , the following are bi-Lipschitz invariants:*

- (a) *for each fixed degree  $d > 1$ , each bar  $B$  and rational  $h$ , the cluster of canyons  $\mathcal{C}_{k,d,B(h)}(f)$ .*
- (b) *the set of contact orders  $K_{k,d,B(h),i}(f)$ , and for each such set, the sub-cluster of canyons  $\mathcal{C}_{k,d,B(h),K_{k,d,B(h),i}}(f)$ .*

Moreover,  $\varphi$  preserves the contact orders between any two clusters of type  $\mathcal{C}_{k,d,B(h),K_{k,d,B(h),i}}(f)$ .

#### 4.2. The HP-invariant and gradient canyons, after [HP] and [PT].

We explain in terms of canyons how the bi-Lipschitz invariants found by Henry and Parusinski [HP] occur. Let us fix the variable  $y$  and express any polar arc of  $f$  as an expansion  $(\gamma(y), y)$ .

We then have:

$$f(\gamma(y), y) = ay^h + \text{h.o.t.}$$

By [PT], for any polar arc  $\gamma_f$  of  $f$  there is some polar arc  $\gamma_g$  of  $g$  such that  $\varphi(\gamma_f(y), y) \in \mathcal{GC}(\gamma_{g*})$  of canyon degree  $d = d_{\gamma_g} = d_{\gamma_f}$ . We thus have:

$$(14) \quad \|\varphi(\gamma_f(y), y) - (\gamma_g(Y), Y)\| \sim |Y^d|$$

where  $|Y| \sim |\varphi_2(\gamma_f(y), y)| \sim |y|$ .

Let us consider another polar arc  $\gamma'_f$  such that it has contact  $> 1$  with  $\gamma_f$ . In 2 variables, this implies that these two polar arcs are tangent to one of the (singular) lines, call it  $L$ , in the tangent cone of  $\{f = 0\}$ .

We can write for  $\gamma'_f$  a relation similar to (14) but the local variable  $Y$  is not the same; in principle there is another well-defined local variable  $Y'$  with  $|Y'| \sim |\varphi_2(\gamma'_f(y), y)| \sim |y|$  such that:

$$\|\varphi(\gamma'_f(y), y) - (\gamma'_g(Y'), Y')\| \sim |Y'^{d'}|.$$

Since we have  $\text{ord}_0 \|\varphi(\gamma_f(y), y) - \varphi(\gamma'_f(y), y)\| > 1$  we deduce that the fraction  $Y/Y'$  tends to 1, and that the fractions  $Y/y$  and  $Y'/y$  tend to the same constant  $c \neq 0$  whenever one of them converges.

A bi-Lipschitz map  $\varphi$  sends a canyon of  $f$  to a canyon of  $g$  of the same degree. Consider the set  $A_L =$  all canyons of  $f$  tangent to some line  $L \in \text{Cone}_0\{f = 0\}$ . A canyon  $\mathcal{C}$  of  $A_L$  yields a couple  $(d_{\mathcal{C}}, a_{h_{\mathcal{C}}}) \in \mathbb{Q}_+ \times \mathbb{C}$ , where :

$d_{\mathcal{C}} :=$  degree of the canyon

$a_{h_{\mathcal{C}}} :=$  coefficient of  $y^h$  in the expansion of  $f(\gamma(y), y)$ ,

for some polar arc  $\gamma$  in  $\mathcal{C}$  (and where  $a_{h_{\mathcal{C}}}$  is independent on the polar arcs in  $\mathcal{C}$ , and even on the arcs of the canyon, as we have seen before).

By the above computation we have:

**Theorem 4.4.** ([HP] supplemented by [PT])

*The effect of the bi-Lipshitz map  $\varphi$  on each such couple is the identity on  $d_{\gamma}$  and the multiplication of  $a_{h_{\gamma}}$  by  $c^{h_{\gamma}}$ , the constant  $c$  being the same for all  $A_L$ .  $\square$*

## REFERENCES

- [BR] J. Bochnak, J.-J. Risler, *Sur les exposants de Łojasiewicz* Comment. Math. Helv. 50 (1975), 493-507.
- [Brz] S. Brzostowski, *The Łojasiewicz Exponent of Semiquasihomogeneous Singularities*, Bull. London Math. Soc. 47 (2015) 848-852.
- [Bur] W. Burau, *Kennzeichnung der Schlauchknoten*, Abh. Math. Sem. Hamburg, 9 (1932), 125-133.
- [GB1] E. R. Garcíá Barroso, *Un théorème de décomposition pour les polaires génériques d'une courbe plane*. C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math. 326 (1998), no. 1, 59-62.
- [GB2] E. R. Garcíá Barroso, *Sur les courbes polaires d'une courbe plane réduite*. Proc. London Math. Soc. (3) 81 (2000), no. 1, 1-28.
- [GLP] J. Gwoździewicz, A. Lenarcik, A. Płoski, *Polar invariants of plane curve singularities: intersection theoretical approach*. Demonstr. Math. 43 (2010), no. 2, 303-323.
- [HP] J-P. Henry, A. Parusiński, *Existence of moduli for bi-Lipschitz equivalence of analytic functions*. Compositio Math. 136 (2003), no. 2, 217-235.
- [HNP] P.D. Hoang, H.D. Nguyen, T.S. Pham, *Topological invariants of plane curve singularities: polar quotients and Łojasiewicz gradient exponents*, Internat. J. Math. 30 (2019), no. 14, 1950073, 19 pp.
- [KOP] T. Krasinski, G. Oleksik and A. Płoski, *The Łojasiewicz exponent of an isolated weighted homogeneous surface singularity*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 137 (2009), 3387-3397.
- [KL] T.-C. Kuo, Y.C. Lu, *On analytic function germs of two complex variables*, Topology 16 (1977), 299-310.
- [KuPar] T.-C. Kuo, A. Parusinski, *Newton polygon relative to an arc*, in: Real and Complex Singularities (Sao Carlos, 1998), Chapman and Hall Res. Notes Math. 412 (2000), 76-93.
- [KKP] S. Koike, T.-C. Kuo, L. Păunescu, *A'Campo curvature bumps and the Dirac phenomenon near a singular point*, Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. (3) 111 (2015), no. 3, 717-748.
- [LT] M. Lejeune-Jalabert, B. Teissier, *Clôture intégrale des idéaux et équisingularité*, Centre Mathématiques, Université Scientifique et Medical de Grenoble (1974). Ann. Fac. Sci. Toulouse Math. (6) 17 (2008), no. 4, 781-859.
- [Lo] S. Łojasiewicz, *Ensembles semi-analytiques*, preprint IHES, 1965.
- [Pa] A. Parusinski, *A criterion for topological equivalence of two variable complex analytic function germs*, Proc. Japan Acad. 84, Ser. A (2008), 147-150.
- [PT] L. Păunescu, M. Tibăr, *Concentration of curvature and Lipschitz invariants of holomorphic functions of two variables*, J. London Math. Soc. 100 (2019) no.1, 203-222.
- [Te1] B. Teissier, *Introduction to equisingularity problems*, Proceedings of Symposia in Pure Mathematics, Algebraic Geometry, Arcata 1974, Vol. 29.
- [Te2] B. Teissier, *Variétés polaires I. Invariants polaires des singularités d'hypersurfaces* Inventiones math. 40 (1977), 267-292.
- [Za] O. Zariski, *On the Topology of Algebroid Singularities*, Amer. J. Math. 54 (1932), no. 3, 453-465.

AIR FORCE INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, UL. KSIĘCIA BOLESŁAWA 6, 01-494 WARSAW, POLAND  
*Email address:* migus.piotr@gmail.com

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, UNIVERSITY OF SYDNEY, SYDNEY, NSW, 2006, AUSTRALIA.  
*Email address:* laurent@maths.usyd.edu.au

MATHÉMATIQUES, UMR 8524 CNRS, UNIVERSITÉ DE LILLE, 59655 VILLENEUVE D'ASCQ, FRANCE.  
*Email address:* mtibar@univ-lille.fr