

IMPLICITIZATION OF A PLANE CURVE GERM

Joao Cabral - NOVA School of Science and Technology, Portugal; jpb@fct.unl.pt and
Ana Casimiro - NOVA School of Science and Technology, Portugal; amc@fct.unl.pt

ABSTRACT. Let $Y = \{f(x, y) = 0\}$ be the germ of an irreducible plane curve. We present an algorithm to obtain polynomials, whose valuations coincide with the semigroup generators of Y . These polynomials are obtained sequentially, adding terms to the previous one in an appropriate way. To construct this algorithm, we perform truncations of the parametrization of Y induced by the Puiseux Theorem. Then, an implicitization theorem of Tropical Geometry (Theorem 1.1 of [4]) for plane curves is applied to the truncations. The identification between the local ring and the semigroup of Y plays a key role in the construction of the algorithm, allowing us to carry out a formal elimination process, which we prove to be finite. The complexity of this elimination process equals the complexity of an integer linear programming problem. This algorithm also allows us to obtain an approximation of the series f , with the same multiplicity and characteristic exponents. We present a pseudocode of the algorithm and examples, where we compare computation times between an implementation of our algorithm and elimination through Gröbner bases.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors were supported by national funds through the FCT - Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia, I.P., under the scope of the projects UIDB/00297/2020 and UIDP/00297/2020 (Center for Mathematics and Applications).

1. INTRODUCTION

The main goal of implicitization is to obtain a representation of an algebraic variety as the zero set of Laurent polynomials from a parametrization representation given also by Laurent polynomials. In [11], B. Sturmfels characterizes implicitization as a fundamental operation in computational algebraic geometry and gives a general solution to the problem of implicitization in the hypersurface case. In this case, the implicitization procedure is usually done by using a theorem that characterizes a set, which contains the support of a Laurent polynomial defining the zero set, then it applies numerical linear algebra to compute the coefficients of the Laurent polynomial.

In this paper, we undertake implicitization in a Local Analytic Geometry context and our approach will be different from the previous one. Puiseux Theorem produces an algorithm to obtain a parametrization of the germ of an irreducible plane curve (see Section 8.3 of [1]), such parametrization contains topological information and one can associate a semigroup to the irreducible plane curve using such information. We present a procedure that reduces implicitization to an integer linear programming problem using the irreducible plane curve semigroup. The following example illustrates the importance and difficulties of the implicitization problem. Let us consider the germ of a plane curve Y with characteristic $(6; 8, 9)$. Then, by applying O. Zariski's techniques presented in [14], one obtains that the semigroup

of Y is generated by $\{6, 8, 25\}$ and the curve admits a short form parametrization of the type

$$(1) \quad x = t^6, y = t^8 + ct^9 + a_1t^{10} + a_2t^{11} + a_4t^{13} + a_{10}t^{19},$$

where $c \in \mathbb{C}^*$ and $a_i \in \mathbb{C}$, $i \in \{1, 2, 4, 10\}$. By Theorem 2.64 of [6], this short parametrization induces a unique equisingular deformation of the equation of Y . One way to obtain the equation associated to (1) is to use a computer algebra system for polynomial computations, for example *Singular* (see [3]), and apply elimination theory using Gröbner basis. The problem lies in the fact that this procedure has very high memory usage and can be hard to get results on a standard pc.

In Section 2 we introduce the basics about the germ of an irreducible quasi-ordinary hypersurface Y , namely characteristics exponents, semigroup and, in the case of plane curves, the connection between valuation and semigroup. In Theorem 3 we present a substitute to the conductor of the semigroup for the hypersurface case. We also present some results that will be needed later on.

From Section 3 onward we restrict ourselves to the case of plane curves. Following the reasoning of truncating a branch, with s characteristic exponents, made in the proof of Theorem 3.9 of [14], we introduce in Section 3 truncations ι_i , $i = 1, \dots, s$, of a parametrization and the induced valuations ϑ_{ι_i} . Since these truncations are polynomial, we apply a theorem of Tropical Geometry, Theorem 1.1 of [4], to obtain a polygon N_i that contains the support of a polynomial f_i such that $\iota_i^* f_i = 0$. We relate polygon N_i to the Newton polygon (in terms of Puiseux expansions) of $Y_i = \{f_i = 0\}$.

In Section 4 we present the main result, Theorem 8, which states the existence of polynomials f_i , $i \in \{0, \dots, s\}$, such that f_{i-1} is obtained from f_i , the support of f_i is contained in N_i and $\iota_i^* f_i = 0$. Furthermore, for $i = 1, \dots, s$, Theorem 8 gives a relation between $\vartheta_{\iota_j}(f_{i-1})$, $j = i, \dots, s$, and the generators of the semigroup of Y_j . These polynomials are unique up to multiplication by a constant. Corollary 9 states that $\{f_s = 0\}$ is a "good" approximation of a representative of Y . The polynomial f_s depends only of our choice for the truncation ι_s . We prove Theorem 8 by induction in Subsections 4.1 and 4.2. In Subsection 4.1, we prove the existence of the f_i 's, by doing a formal elimination procedure that gives us formal versions of the f_i 's and from these we prove the existence of the polynomials f_i 's. Subsection 4.2 is dedicated to the proof of the valuation part of the main result. Lemma 15 gives us relations between the valuations ϑ_{ι_i} . One important fact to obtain these relations is the decomposition given in statement (B) of Lemma 15 and also present in the proof of Theorem 3.9 of [14]. The valuations ϑ_{ι_i} are induced by polynomial parametrizations and therefore can be implemented on a computer.

Based upon step 2 made in the proof of statement (B) of Theorem 8, we give in Section 5 an algorithm to compute f_i from f_{i-1} . Whereas the elimination procedure used in step 2 was formal, now using the appropriate characterization of the polygon's N_i and the decomposition given in statement (B) of Lemma 15, Algorithm 1 gives us a finite elimination procedure whose computational complexity depends only on a integer linear programming problem. Namely, finding the points with non negative integers entries on a compact section of a hyperplane, whose normal vector is given by the generators of the semigroup associated to Y_i . Algorithm 1 also depends on computing valuations, but these computations are done only using the ϑ_{ι_i} 's. To finalize we give two examples comparing computing times between an implementation of Algorithm 1 and elimination using *Singular*.

The authors intend in the future to generalize the results of this paper to Quasi-Ordinary hypersurfaces.

2. SEMI-GROUP OF A QUASI-ORDINARY HYPERSURFACE

Let \mathbb{N}_0 [\mathbb{N}] be the set of non negative integers [positive integers] and $\mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}$ [$\mathbb{Q}_{>0}$] the set of non negative rationals [positive rationals]. We endow \mathbb{R}^n with the partial order

$$(2) \quad (a_1, \dots, a_n) \leq (b_1, \dots, b_n) \Leftrightarrow a_i \leq b_i, \forall i \in \{1, \dots, n\}.$$

If $(a_1, \dots, a_n) \leq (b_1, \dots, b_n)$ and $(a_1, \dots, a_n) \neq (b_1, \dots, b_n)$, we write $(a_1, \dots, a_n) < (b_1, \dots, b_n)$. Note that for $n = 1$ we have the usual order in \mathbb{R} .

Set $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$. For $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n) \in \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}^n$, set $|\alpha| = \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i$ and

$$(3) \quad x^\alpha = x_1^{\alpha_1} \cdots x_n^{\alpha_n}.$$

Let $f(x) = \sum_{|\alpha| \geq 0} a_\alpha x^\alpha \in \mathbb{C}[[x_1, \dots, x_n]]$. We define the *support of f* , and represent it by $\text{Supp}(f)$, as the set

$$\text{Supp}(f) = \{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^n : a_\alpha \neq 0\}.$$

By definition, the support of the null serie is the empty set. Write $f(x) = \sum_{i \geq m} f_i(x)$, where f_i is a homogenous polynomial of degree i for all $i \geq m$ and f_m is a non null polynomial. We define $\text{ord}(f)$, the *order of f* , as m . If $f \in \mathbb{C}\{x\}$ define $C_0(\{f(x) = 0\})$, the *tangent cone* of $\{f(x) = 0\}$, as the algebraic variety $\{f_m(x) = 0\}$. For a polynomial $g \in \mathbb{C}[x]$, denote the degree of g by $\text{deg}(g)$.

Set M as a complex manifold of dimension $n + 1$, $o \in M$ and Y an irreducible hypersurface of M . The germ of Y at o is *quasi-ordinary* if there is a system of local coordinates (x, y) centered at o such that the discriminant of Y with respect to the map $p(x, y) = x$ is contained in $\{x_1 \cdots x_n = 0\}$. From now on $Y = \{f(x, y) = 0\}$, $f \in \mathbb{C}\{x, y\}$, will denote the germ of an irreducible quasi-ordinary hypersurface at the origin. The roots of f are denominated *branches* of Y and are fractional power series in the ring $\mathbb{C}\{x_1^{1/k}, \dots, x_n^{1/k}\}$ (we will abbreviate this notation by $\mathbb{C}\{x^{1/k}\}$), for some positive integer k (see [9]). Let $\zeta(x^{1/k}) \in \mathbb{C}\{x^{1/k}\}$ be a branch of Y . There are $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_s \in \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}^n$ such that

$$C1) \quad \lambda_1 < \lambda_2 < \dots < \lambda_s;$$

$$C2) \quad \text{Set } M_0 = \mathbb{Z}^n \text{ and } M_i = M_0 + \mathbb{Z}^n \lambda_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, s. \text{ For all } i \in \{1, \dots, s\}, \\ \lambda_i \notin M_{i-1};$$

$$C3) \quad \text{ord}(f) = k = k_1 k_2 \dots k_s, \text{ where } k_i \text{ is the smallest positive integer such that } \\ k_i \lambda_i \in M_{i-1};$$

$$C4) \quad \text{For all } i \in \{1, \dots, s\}, \text{ the coefficient of } x^{\lambda_i} \text{ in } \zeta(x^{1/k}) \text{ is non null.}$$

$$C5) \quad \text{Let } \alpha \in \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}^n \setminus \{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_s\}. \text{ If the coefficient of } x^\alpha \text{ in } \zeta(x^{1/k}) \text{ is non null} \\ \text{then there is } i \in \{1, \dots, s\} \text{ such that } \alpha \in M_i. \text{ Furthermore, if } i \text{ is the} \\ \text{smallest element of } \{1, \dots, s\} \text{ such that } \alpha \in M_i \text{ then } \lambda_i < \alpha.$$

If $\xi(x^{1/k})$ is another branch of Y then $\xi(x^{1/k}) = \zeta(\theta x^{1/k})$, where θ is the k -th root of unity. We obtain all branches of Y by running through all k -th roots of unity. The rational n -uples $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_s$ are denominated *characteristic exponents of Y* (see Section 1 of [9]). Furthermore, if $\zeta \in \mathbb{C}\{x^{1/k}\}$ admits $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_s \in \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}^n$ that verify $C1)$, $C2)$, $C4)$ and $C5)$ then ζ is the branch of a quasi-ordinary hypersurface (see Proposition 1.5 of [9]). After a change of coordinates of the type

$$(4) \quad (x, y) \rightarrow (x, y - \varphi(x)), \quad \varphi \in \mathbb{C}\{x\},$$

we can assume that no branch of Y contains monomials with positive integer exponent and non null coefficient.

By default, zero will belong to all semigroups mentioned on this paper. Set $e_0 = 1$ and $e_i = k_i e_{i-1}$, $i = 1, \dots, s$. Note that $e_s = k$. Let u_1, \dots, u_n be the canonical basis of \mathbb{R}^n . For $i \in \{1, \dots, s\}$, set $\Gamma(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_i)$ as the semigroup generated by $e_i u_1, \dots, e_i u_n$,

$$(5) \quad \gamma_1^{(i)} = e_i \lambda_1 \text{ and } \gamma_{j+1}^{(i)} = k_j \gamma_j^{(i)} - e_i \lambda_j + e_j \lambda_{j+1} \text{ for } j = 1, \dots, i-1.$$

The set $\Gamma(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_i)$ is the semigroup of a quasi-ordinary surface with characteristic exponents $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_i$. We will also denote the generators $\gamma_1^{(s)}, \dots, \gamma_s^{(s)}$ of $\Gamma(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_s)$, the semigroup of Y , by, respectively, $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_s$. For $i = 1, \dots, s$, set $\Gamma_i(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_s)$ as the subsemigroup of $\Gamma(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_s)$ generated by $k u_1, \dots, k u_n$ and $\gamma_j^{(s)}$, $j = 1, \dots, i$. Next Proposition gives us a relation between $\Gamma_i(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_s)$ and $\Gamma(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_i)$.

Proposition 1. *For all $i = 1, \dots, s-1$,*

$$(6) \quad \Gamma_i(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_s) = \frac{e_s}{e_i} \Gamma(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_i).$$

Proof. We have immediately the following relations

$$e_s u_j = \frac{e_s}{e_i} (e_i u_j), \quad j = 0, 1, \dots, n,$$

$$\gamma_1^{(s)} = \frac{e_s}{e_i} (e_i \lambda_1) = \frac{e_s}{e_i} \gamma_1^{(i)},$$

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_{j+1}^{(s)} &= k_j \gamma_j^{(s)} - e_s \lambda_j + e_s \lambda_{j+1} = k_j \frac{e_s}{e_i} \gamma_j^{(i)} - \frac{e_s}{e_i} e_i \lambda_j + \frac{e_s}{e_i} e_i \lambda_{j+1} = \\ &= \frac{e_s}{e_i} \gamma_{j+1}^{(i)}, \quad j = 1, \dots, i-1. \end{aligned}$$

□

On Theorem 3, we prove the following: Let $\tilde{\Gamma}$ be the subgroup of \mathbb{Z}^n generated by $\Gamma(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_s)$, it exists $c \in \mathbb{N}_0^n$ such that

$$(7) \quad \forall a \in \tilde{\Gamma}, c \leq a \Rightarrow a \in \Gamma(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_s).$$

This results gives us a substitute for the conductor of the semigroup of a plane curve. The following Lemma is needed for the proof of Theorem 3.

Lemma 2. *The following statements hold.*

(A) *For $i = 0, \dots, s-1$,*

$$(8) \quad \gamma_{i+1} = k \lambda_{i+1} + \sum_{j=1}^i (k_j - 1) \gamma_j.$$

(B) *For all $i = 1, \dots, s$, $kM_i = k\mathbb{Z}^n + \sum_{j=1}^i \mathbb{Z}\gamma_j$.*

Proof. We will prove both statements by induction on i . We begin with statement (A). By (5),

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma_{i+1} &= k_i \gamma_i - k \lambda_i + k \lambda_{i+1} = (k_i - 1) \gamma_i + \gamma_i - k \lambda_i + k \lambda_{i+1} = \\ &= (k_i - 1) \gamma_i + k \lambda_i + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} (k_j - 1) \gamma_j - k \lambda_i + k \lambda_{i+1} = k \lambda_{i+1} + \sum_{j=1}^i (k_j - 1) \gamma_j.\end{aligned}$$

We now proceed to prove statement (B). Let $a \in k\mathbb{Z}^n + \sum_{j=1}^{i+1} \mathbb{Z}\gamma_j$. There exist integers α_j , $j = 1, \dots, n$, and β_j , $j = 1, \dots, i+1$ such that

$$(9) \quad a = \sum_{j=1}^n k \alpha_j u_j + \sum_{j=1}^{i+1} \beta_j \gamma_j.$$

Set $b = \sum_{j=1}^n k \alpha_j u_j + \sum_{j=1}^i \beta_j \gamma_j$. Applying equality (5), we obtain

$$a = b + \beta_{i+1} k_i \gamma_i - \beta_{i+1} k \lambda_i + \beta_{i+1} k \lambda_{i+1}.$$

By the induction hypothesis, since $b + \beta_{i+1} k_i \gamma_i \in k\mathbb{Z}^n + \sum_{j=1}^i \mathbb{Z}\gamma_j$, there is $\delta \in kM_i$ such that

$$a = \delta - \beta_{i+1} k \lambda_i + \beta_{i+1} k \lambda_{i+1}.$$

Hence $a \in kM_{i+1}$.

Assume now that $a \in kM_{i+1}$. Taking into account that from (5) we obtain the equality $k \lambda_{j+1} = k \lambda_j - k_j \gamma_j + \gamma_{j+1}$, the proof that $a \in k\mathbb{Z}^n + \sum_{j=1}^{i+1} \mathbb{Z}\gamma_j$ is similar to the previous one. \square

Theorem 3. *Let $i = 1, \dots, s$ and $a \in k\mathbb{Z}^n + \sum_{j=1}^i \mathbb{Z}\gamma_j$. There are integers α_j , $j = 1, \dots, n$, and β_j , $j = 1, \dots, i$, such that $0 \leq \beta_j \leq k_j - 1$ and $a = \sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_j k u_j + \sum_{j=1}^i \beta_j \gamma_j$. Furthermore, if $a \geq \sum_{j=1}^i (k_j - 1) \gamma_j$ then $\alpha_j \geq 0$ for all $j = 1, \dots, n$.*

Proof. We will prove the result by induction on i . There are integers α'_j , $j = 1, \dots, n$, and β'_j , $j = 1, \dots, i$ such that

$$(10) \quad a = \sum_{j=1}^n \alpha'_j k u_j + \sum_{j=1}^i \beta'_j \gamma_j.$$

Let ℓ be the integer such that $0 \leq \beta_i - \ell k_i < k_i$. We can rewrite (10) as

$$a = \sum_{j=1}^n \alpha'_j k u_j + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \beta'_j \gamma_j + (\beta'_i - \ell k_i) \gamma_i + \ell k_i \gamma_i.$$

By (8),

$$k_i \gamma_i = k_i k \lambda_i + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} k_i (k_j - 1) \gamma_j.$$

Since $k_i \lambda_i \in M_{i-1}$, by statement (B) of Lemma 2, $k(k_i \lambda_i) \in k\mathbb{Z}^n + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \mathbb{Z}\gamma_j$. Using the induction hypothesis, there are α_j , $j = 1, \dots, n$, and β_j , $j = 1, \dots, i-1$, such that $0 \leq \beta_j \leq k_j - 1$ and

$$\sum_{j=1}^n \alpha'_j k u_j + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \beta'_j \gamma_j + \ell k_i \gamma_i = \sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_j k u_j + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \beta_j \gamma_j.$$

Set $\beta_i = \beta'_i - \ell k_i$. Assume that

$$a = \sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_j k u_j + \sum_{j=1}^i \beta_j \gamma_j \geq \sum_{j=1}^i (k_j - 1) \gamma_j.$$

Hence

$$\sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_j k u_j \geq \sum_{j=1}^i (k_j - (\beta_j + 1)) \gamma_j.$$

Since $0 \leq \beta_j \leq k_j - 1$ and $k_j \geq 2$ for all $j = 1, \dots, i$, we conclude that $\alpha_j \geq 0$ for all $j = 1, \dots, n$. \square

In the following proposition we prove some useful properties. Statement (C) will play an important role in the proof of statement (A) of Theorem 8. Statement (D) will be used in the proof of Lemma 10.

Proposition 4. *For all $i = 1, \dots, s$, the following statements hold:*

$$(A) \sum_{\ell=1}^i (k_\ell - 1) \gamma_\ell = k_i \gamma_i - k \lambda_i;$$

$$(B) k_i \gamma_i > \sum_{\ell=1}^i (k_\ell - 1) \gamma_\ell;$$

$$(C) k_i \gamma_i \in \Gamma_{i-1}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_s), \text{ for all } i = 1, \dots, s;$$

$$(D) \text{ For } s \geq 2 \text{ and } i = 1, \dots, s,$$

$$e_{i-1} \gamma_s - e_{s-1} \gamma_i > 0.$$

Proof. By statement (A) of Lemma 2,

$$\sum_{\ell=1}^i (k_\ell - 1) \gamma_\ell = (k_i - 1) \gamma_i + \sum_{\ell=1}^{i-1} (k_\ell - 1) \gamma_\ell = (k_i - 1) \gamma_i + \gamma_i - k \lambda_i = k_i \gamma_i - k \lambda_i.$$

Statement (B) results immediately from statement (A).

We prove (C) by induction on i . By (5), the equality

$$k_{i+1} \gamma_{i+1} = k_{i+1} (k_i \gamma_i) - k_{i+1} (k \lambda_i) + k (k_{i+1} \lambda_{i+1})$$

holds. From the induction hypothesis, $k_i \gamma_i$ belongs to $\Gamma_{i-1}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_s)$, which is a subsemigroup of $\Gamma_i(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_s)$. Given that $k \lambda_i \in k M_i$, statement (B) of Lemma 2 implies that $k \lambda_i \in k \mathbb{Z}^n + \sum_{j=1}^i \mathbb{Z} \gamma_j$. Since $k_{i+1} \lambda_{i+1} \in M_i$, then once again by statement (B) of Lemma 2, we conclude that $k (k_{i+1} \lambda_{i+1}) \in k \mathbb{Z}^n + \sum_{j=1}^i \mathbb{Z} \gamma_j$. Hence $k_{i+1} \gamma_{i+1} \in k \mathbb{Z}^n + \sum_{j=1}^i \mathbb{Z} \gamma_j$. By statement (B),

$$k_{i+1} \gamma_{i+1} > \sum_{\ell=1}^{i+1} (k_\ell - 1) \gamma_\ell.$$

Furthermore, the inequality

$$\sum_{j=1}^{i+1} (k_j - 1) \gamma_j \geq \sum_{j=1}^i (k_j - 1) \gamma_j$$

holds trivially. Therefore, Theorem 3 allows us to conclude that $k_{i+1} \gamma_{i+1}$ belongs to the semigroup $\Gamma_i(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_s)$.

To prove statement (D) we rewrite the quantity $e_{i-1}\gamma_s - e_{s-1}\gamma_i$ in the following manner:

$$\begin{aligned}
 e_{i-1}\gamma_s - e_{s-1}\gamma_i &= e_{i-1}\gamma_s - e_{s-1}\gamma_i + \sum_{j=i+1}^{s-1} \frac{e_{i-1}}{e_{j-1}} e_{s-1}\gamma_j - \sum_{j=i+1}^{s-1} \frac{e_{i-1}}{e_{j-1}} e_{s-1}\gamma_j = \\
 &= \sum_{j=i+1}^s \frac{e_{i-1}}{e_{j-1}} e_{s-1}\gamma_j - \sum_{j=i}^{s-1} \frac{e_{i-1}}{e_{j-1}} e_{s-1}\gamma_j = \sum_{j=i+1}^s \frac{e_{i-1}}{e_{j-1}} e_{s-1}\gamma_j - \sum_{j=i+1}^s \frac{e_{i-1}}{e_{j-2}} e_{s-1}\gamma_{j-1} = \\
 &= \sum_{j=i+1}^s \frac{e_{i-1}}{e_{j-1}} e_{s-1} \left(\gamma_j - \frac{e_{j-1}}{e_{j-2}} \gamma_{j-1} \right) = \sum_{j=i+1}^s \frac{e_{i-1}}{e_{j-1}} e_{s-1} (\gamma_j - k_{j-1} \gamma_{j-1}).
 \end{aligned}$$

For all $i = 1, \dots, s$, by definition $k_i > 0$ which implies $e_i > 0$. Furthermore, from (5) we conclude that $\gamma_i - k_{i-1}\gamma_{i-1} > 0$. Therefore

$$\sum_{j=i+1}^s \frac{e_{i-1}}{e_{j-1}} e_{s-1} (\gamma_j - k_{j-1} \gamma_{j-1}) > 0.$$

□

For the rest of this paper we will assume that $n = 1$, so Y is the germ at the origin of an irreducible plane curve. The change of coordinates (4) allows us to assume that $C_0(Y) = \{y = 0\}$. The characteristic exponents of an irreducible plane curve are equisingularity invariants (see Theorem 21 of [1]). For the *Puiseux characteristic* version of the characteristic exponents see Section 3.1 of [12] and Section 3 of [14]. To a branch $\zeta(x^{1/k})$ of Y , we associate a parametrization ι of Y defined by $x = t^k$, $y = \zeta(t)$. By C4) and C5), we can write the parametrization ι as

$$(11) \quad x = t^k, \quad y = c_1 t^{k\lambda_1} + \varphi_1(t) + c_2 t^{k\lambda_2} + \varphi_2(t) + \dots + c_s t^{k\lambda_s} + \psi,$$

where

- (p1). $c_1, \dots, c_s \in \mathbb{C}^*$, $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_{s-1} \in (t)\mathbb{C}[t]$ and $\psi \in (t)\mathbb{C}\{t\}$;
- (p2). for all $i \in \{1, \dots, s-1\}$, $\text{ord}(\varphi_i) > k\lambda_i$ and $\text{Supp}(\varphi_i) \subset kM_i$. Furthermore $\text{ord}(\psi) > k\lambda_s$ and $\text{Supp}(\psi) \subset kM_s$;
- (p3). for all $i \in \{1, \dots, s-1\}$, $\deg(\varphi_i) < k\lambda_{i+1}$.

The parametrization ι induces a map $\vartheta_\iota : \mathbb{C}[[x, y]] \rightarrow \mathbb{N}_0^n \cup \{+\infty\}$ defined by

$$\vartheta_\iota(f) = \text{ord}(\iota^* f).$$

By convention, $\vartheta_\iota(0) = +\infty$. This map verifies

$$(12) \quad \vartheta_\iota(fg) = \vartheta_\iota(f) + \vartheta_\iota(g),$$

$$(13) \quad \vartheta_\iota(f+g) \geq \min\{\vartheta_\iota(f), \vartheta_\iota(g)\},$$

that is, ϑ_ι is a valuation. Zariski proved in Theorem 3.9 of [14] that

$$(14) \quad \vartheta_\iota(\mathbb{C}[[x, y]]) = \Gamma(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_s) \cup \{+\infty\}.$$

This equality will play an important role in Section 4.

3. NEWTON POLYTOPE OF THE EQUATION

Let ι be as in (11). Set $e_0 = 1$ and $e_i = k_i e_{i-1}$, $i = 1, \dots, s$ (see Section 2). For $i = 1, \dots, s$, define ι_i as the polynomial parametrization

$$(15) \quad x = t^{e_i}, y = c_1 t^{e_i \lambda_1} + \varphi_1(t^{e_i/k}) + \dots + c_i t^{e_i \lambda_i} + \varphi_i(t^{e_i/k}),$$

where $\text{Supp}(\varphi_s) \subseteq \text{Supp}(\psi)$. The parametrization ι_i , $i \in \{1, \dots, s\}$, is associated to a irreducible plane curve Y_i (see Proposition 1.5. of [9]) with characteristic exponents $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_i$, multiplicity e_i and branch

$$(16) \quad \zeta(x^{1/e_i}) = c_1 x^{\lambda_1} + \varphi_1(x^{1/e_i}) + \dots + c_i x^{\lambda_i} + \varphi_i(x^{1/e_i}).$$

Furthermore, by our choice of coordinates, $C_0(Y_i) = \{y = 0\}$. If one is interested in studying only the topology of Y then one can consider φ_s the null series.

By Theorem 1.1 of [4], for $i \in \{1, \dots, s\}$, there is $f_i \in (x, y)\mathbb{C}[x, y]$ such that $\iota_i^* f_i = 0$, that is, $Y_i = \{f_i(x, y) = 0\}$. Furthermore, Theorem 1.1 of [4] allows us to compute a set N_i such that $\text{Supp}(f_i) \subseteq N_i$.

For $h \in \mathbb{C}\{t\}$ and $a \in \mathbb{C}$, define $m_a(h)$ as the multiplicity of a as zero of h and $m_\infty(h) = -\deg(h)$. For $i = 1, \dots, s$, if φ_i is non null, define

$$\mu_i = \frac{1}{e_i} \deg(\varphi_i(t^{e_i/k})) \in M_i,$$

otherwise define $\mu_i = \lambda_i$.

Fix $i \in \{1, \dots, s\}$. Let a_j , $j = 1, \dots, \tau_i$, be the zeros of $t^{-e_i \lambda_1} \iota_i^* y$, which is a polynomial with non null independent term c_1 . Set $\kappa_j = m_{a_j}(t^{-e_i \lambda_1} \iota_i^* y) \neq 0$. Let

$$\vec{v}_0 = (m_0(\iota_i^* x), m_0(\iota_i^* y)) = (e_i, e_i \lambda_1),$$

$$\vec{v}_{a_j} = (m_{a_j}(\iota_i^* x), m_{a_j}(\iota_i^* y)) = (0, \kappa_j), j = 1, \dots, \tau_i,$$

and

$$\vec{v}_\infty = (m_\infty(\iota_i^* x), m_\infty(\iota_i^* y)) = (-e_i, -e_i \mu_i).$$

By construction

$$\sum_{j=1}^{\tau_i} \vec{v}_{a_j} = (0, e_i \mu_i - e_i \lambda_1).$$

As described in Section 1 of [4], we rotate the vectors \vec{v}_0 , \vec{v}_∞ and \vec{v}_{a_j} , $j = 1, \dots, \tau_i$ by 90 degrees clockwise and concatenating them following their directions counter-clockwise, obtaining a polytope B_i . To B_i we apply a translation such that the new polytope B_i is contained in the first quadrant and intersects the axis. Hence B_i is the convex hull of $\{(0, e_i), (e_i \lambda_1, 0), (e_i \mu_i, 0)\}$. Set

$$(17) \quad N_i = B_i \cap \mathbb{Z}^2 = \{(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathbb{N}_0^2 : k_1 \alpha + (k_1 \lambda_1) \beta \geq e_i (k_1 \lambda_1) \wedge e_i \alpha + (e_i \mu_i) \beta \leq e_i (e_i \mu_i)\}.$$

We give another useful characterization of the set N_i . Let $(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathbb{N}_0^2 \setminus \{(0, 0)\}$. we have

$$\text{Supp}(\iota_i^* x^\alpha y^\beta) = \left\{ e_i \alpha + \sum_{\ell=1}^{\beta} a_\ell : a_1, \dots, a_\beta \in \text{Supp}(\iota_i^* y) \right\}.$$

Hence

$$\min \text{Supp}(\iota_i^* x^\alpha y^\beta) = e_i \alpha + (e_i \lambda_1) \beta, \max \text{Supp}(\iota_i^* x^\alpha y^\beta) = e_i \alpha + (e_i \mu_i) \beta.$$

Therefore $(\alpha, \beta) \in N_i$ if and only if

$$(18) \quad \text{Supp}(\ell_i^* x^\alpha y^\beta) \subset [e_i(e_i \lambda_1), e_i(e_i \mu_i)]$$

Example 5. Let $c_\ell \in \mathbb{C}^*$, $\ell = 1, 2, 3$, and $\zeta = c_1 x^{3/2} + c_2 x^{5/3} + c_3 x^{23/12}$. Then ζ is a branch of an irreducible plane curve Y with characteristic exponents $\lambda_1 = 3/2$, $\lambda_2 = 5/3$ and $\lambda_3 = 23/12$. We have $k_1 = 2$ and $k_2 = 3$. Since

$$2\lambda_3 = 2\lambda_2 + \lambda_1 - 1 \in M_2$$

then $k_3 = 2$. The semigroup $\Gamma(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)$ is generated by $\{6, 9, 19\}$ and $\Gamma(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3)$ is generated by $\{12, 18, 38, 117\}$. We present N_2 and N_3 in figures (1) and (2), respectively.




FIGURE 1. N_2






FIGURE 2. N_3

Example 6. Let $c_\ell \in \mathbb{C}^*$, $\ell = 1, 2, 3$, and $\zeta = c_1 x^{3/2} + c_2 x^{5/2} + c_3 x^{8/3} + c_4 x^{10/3}$. We have

$$\frac{5}{2} = \frac{3}{2} + 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{10}{3} = 2 \frac{8}{3} - 2.$$

Then ζ is a branch of an irreducible plane curve Y with characteristic exponents $\lambda_1 = 3/2$ and $\lambda_2 = 8/3$. Furthermore, $k_1 = 2$ and $k_2 = 3$. The semigroup $\Gamma(\lambda_1)$ is generated by $\{2, 3\}$ and $\Gamma(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)$ is generated by $\{6, 9, 25\}$. We present N_1 and N_2 in figures (3) and (4), respectively.

FIGURE 3. N_1 FIGURE 4. N_2

Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$. We say that $g(x, y) = y^n + \sum_{\ell=0}^{n-1} a_\ell(x)y^\ell \in \mathbb{C}[[x]][y]$ is a *Weierstrass polynomial in the variable y* if $a_\ell(0) = 0$, for all $\ell \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}$. We call n the *degree* of g .

Let $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^2$ be the first quadrant of \mathbb{R}^2 . Let \tilde{N}_i be the *Newton polygon* of f_i , that is, the convex hull of the set

$$\text{Supp}(f_i) + \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^2.$$

This definition is the Local Analytic Geometry version of the Newton polytope of Tropical Geometry (See definition 1.1.3. of [10]). Since Y_i is irreducible, with multiplicity e_i and first characteristic exponent λ_1 , N_i and \tilde{N}_i share a compact face, namely the line segment that unites $(0, e_i)$ and $(0, e_i\lambda_1)$ (see Section 8.3 of [1]). Hence

$$(19) \quad \{(0, e_i), (e_i\lambda_1, 0)\} \subset \text{Supp}(f_i)$$

Furthermore, the point $(0, \beta)$ belongs to N_i if and only if $\beta = e_i$. Therefore, there are $a_\ell \in \mathbb{C}[x]$, $\ell \in \{0, \dots, e_i - 1\}$, and $a \in \mathbb{C}^*$ such that

$$(20) \quad f_i(x, y) = ay^{e_i} + \sum_{\ell=0}^{e_i-1} a_\ell(x)y^\ell$$

and, for all $\ell \in \{0, \dots, e_i - 1\}$, $a_\ell(0) = 0$. The notion of degree can be generalized as the greatest power of y that appears on $p \in \mathbb{C}[[x]][y]$ with non null coefficient. We will denote this notion of degree as $\deg_y(p)$. If $p(x, y)$ is the zero polynomial then we set $\deg_y(p) = +\infty$. After multiplying f_i by $1/a$, we can assume that $a = 1$ and f_i is a Weierstrass polynomial in the variable y of degree e_i . From now on, we will always assume that f_i is a Weierstrass polynomial.

4. MAIN RESULT

In this section we present our Main Theorem, Theorem 8. To highlight some key facts of the proof of Theorem 8, we will begin by presenting an example.

Example 7. *We return to Example 5. The parametrization ι is defined by*

$$x = t^{12}, y = c_1 t^{18} + c_2 t^{20} + c_3 t^{23}.$$

The induced parametrizations are

$$\iota_1 : x = t^2, y = c_1 t^3, \quad \iota_2 : x = t^6, y = c_1 t^9 + c_2 t^{10}$$

and ι_3 is the same as ι . Let $\delta_2(x, y) = -2c_2^3 y^3 x^5 - 6c_1^2 c_2^3 y x^8 + c_2^6 x^{10}$, $f_1(x, y) = y^2 - c_1^2 x^3$ and $f_2(x, y) = f_1^3(x, y) + \delta_2(x, y)$. Note that $\iota_1^ f_1 = 0$. We perform the Weierstrass division of δ_2 by f_1 elevated to the highest power such that its order is not bigger than the order of δ_2 , that is, we divide by f_1 and obtain*

$$\delta_2(x, y) = -2c_2^3 y x^5 f_1(x, y) - 8c_1^2 c_2^3 y x^8 + c_2^6 x^{10}.$$

In our case, the remainder of the division has order strictly lower than the order of f_1 . We will show that this decomposition is unique. A simple computation in Mathematica (see [13]) or Singular show us that $\vartheta_{\iota_2}(f_1) = 19$, $\iota_2^ f_2 = 0$,*

$$\vartheta_{\iota_2}(f_1^3) = \vartheta_{\iota_2}(-8c_1^2 c_2^3 y x^8 + c_2^6 x^{10}) < \vartheta_{\iota_2}(-2c_2^3 y x^5 f_1)$$

and $\vartheta_{\iota_3}(f_2) = 117$. On Section 5 we present an algorithm, based on the proof of Theorem 8, that allows us to obtain $f_2(x, y)$ from $f_1^3(x, y)$.

Let $w \in (x, y)\mathbb{C}\{x, y\}$, $C = \{w(x, y) = 0\}$ a curve and τ a parametrization induced by a branch of C (see (11)). We can also associate an ideal to the curve C in the ring $\mathbb{C}[[x, y]]$, the principal ideal generated by w in $\mathbb{C}[[x, y]]$, which we denote by $\mathcal{I}_C \mathbb{C}[[x, y]]$. Since $\mathbb{C}\{x, y\}$ is a subring of $\mathbb{C}[[x, y]]$ there is a canonical injection from $\mathcal{I}_C \mathbb{C}\{x, y\}$ to $\mathcal{I}_C \mathbb{C}[[x, y]]$. Let $h \in \mathbb{C}[[x, y]]$, then $h \in \mathcal{I}_C \mathbb{C}[[x, y]]$ if and only if h belongs to the kernel of the canonical homomorphism $\mathbb{C}[[x, y]] \rightarrow \mathbb{C}[[x, y]]/\mathcal{I}_C \mathbb{C}[[x, y]]$, which is equivalent to $\tau^* h = 0$.

Let ι be as in (11), ι_i and f_i , $i = 1, \dots, s$ as in Section 3. For $i \in \{1, \dots, s\}$, let $e_i, \gamma_1^{(i)}, \dots, \gamma_i^{(i)}$ be the generators of the semigroup $\Gamma(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_i)$ as in (5). Let $f_0(x, y) = y \in \mathbb{C}[x, y]$.

Theorem 8 (Main Theorem). *For all $i \in \{1, \dots, s\}$, the following statements hold:*

- (A) *There is $\delta_i \in \mathbb{C}[x, y]$ such that $\text{Supp}(\delta_i) \subset N_i \setminus \{(0, e_i)\}$ and $f_i(x, y) = f_{i-1}^{k_i}(x, y) + \delta_i(x, y)$.*

(B) For all $j \in \{i, \dots, s\}$, $\vartheta_{l_j}(f_{i-1}) = \gamma_i^{(j)}$ and $\vartheta_{l_j}(\partial_y f_{i-1}) = \gamma_i^{(j)} - e_j \lambda_i$.

Furthermore if g_i is a polynomial such that $\iota_i^* g_i = 0$ and $\text{Supp}(g_i) \subseteq N_i$ then there is a $a \in \mathbb{C}^*$ such that $g_i = a f_i$.

The proof of Theorem 8 is split into two subsections. We prove the existence of f_1 in Subsection 4.1 (step 1 of the proof of Theorem 8) and that statement (B) holds for f_1 in Subsection 4.2 (Lemma 13). For $i \in \{2, \dots, s\}$ we apply induction. The proof of the existence of f_i in the terms of statement (A) is done in Subsection 4.1, assuming that Theorem 8 holds up to $i - 1$. Then, assuming that statement (A) holds up to i and statement (B) holds up to $i - 1$, we prove statement (B) for f_i in Subsection 4.2. We also prove in Subsections 4.1 and 4.2 some results needed for the main proof. Lemma 15 will be particularly useful for the construction of the Algorithm presented in Section 5.

The following Corollary shows that we can extend f_s obtained in Theorem 8 to a representative of our plane curve. We can see f_s as an approximation of f . Of course the approximation is better the higher the degree of $\iota_s^* y$ is. We will not go into details in the proof of Corollary 9 as it repeats many of the reasoning's to be made in the proof of Theorem 8, statement (A), and we will present it at the end of Subsection 4.1.

Corollary 9. *Let $f \in \mathbb{C}\{x, y\}$, $Y = \{f(x, y) = 0\}$ be the germ of a plane curve, ι as in (11) and $f_s(x, y)$ as in Theorem 8. Then there is $\delta \in \mathbb{C}\{x, y\}$ such that $\vartheta_\iota(f_s) = \vartheta_\iota(\delta)$ and $f(x, y) = f_s(x, y) + \delta(x, y)$.*

4.1. Proof of Statement (A) of Theorem 8. The following two results are needed for the proof of statement (A) of Theorem 8.

Lemma 10. *Let $m(x_0, \dots, x_{i-1}) = \sum_{\ell=0}^{i-1} e_\ell x_\ell$ and*

$$\mathcal{R} = \{(x_0, \dots, x_{i-1}) \in \mathbb{R}^i : (x_0, \dots, x_{i-1}) \geq (0, \dots, 0) \wedge \sum_{\ell=0}^{i-1} \gamma_{\ell+1}^{(i)} x_\ell \geq k_i \gamma_i^{(i)}\}.$$

Then $m(\mathcal{R})$ admits minimum, equal to e_i , and this value is reached only at the point $(0, \dots, 0, k_i)$.

Proof. Note that $m(0, \dots, 0, k_i) = k_i e_{i-1} = e_i$. Let $(h_0, \dots, h_{i-1}) \in \mathbb{R}^i$ such that

$$(h_0, \dots, h_{i-1}) + (0, \dots, 0, k_i) \in \mathcal{R}.$$

Then $h_\ell \geq 0$, for all $\ell \in \{0, \dots, i-2\}$, $h_{i-1} + k_i \geq 0$ and

$$(21) \quad (h_{i-1} + k_i) \gamma_i^{(i)} + \sum_{\ell=0}^{i-2} \gamma_{\ell+1}^{(i)} x_\ell \geq k_i \gamma_i^{(i)}.$$

The inequality (21) is equivalent to

$$(22) \quad h_{i-1} \geq - \sum_{\ell=0}^{i-2} \frac{\gamma_{\ell+1}^{(i)}}{\gamma_i^{(i)}} h_\ell.$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} m(h_1, \dots, h_{i-2}, h_{i-1} + k_i) &= (h_{i-1} + k_i)e_{i-1} + \sum_{\ell=0}^{i-2} e_\ell h_\ell \geq \\ &\geq e_i - e_{i-1} \sum_{\ell=0}^{i-2} \frac{\gamma_{\ell+1}^{(i)}}{\gamma_i^{(i)}} h_\ell + \sum_{\ell=0}^{i-2} e_\ell h_\ell = e_i + \sum_{\ell=0}^{i-2} \left(e_\ell - \frac{\gamma_{\ell+1}^{(i)}}{\gamma_i^{(i)}} e_{i-1} \right) h_\ell. \end{aligned}$$

By statement (D) of Proposition 4, for all $\ell \in \{0, \dots, i-2\}$,

$$e_\ell - \frac{\gamma_{\ell+1}^{(i)}}{\gamma_i^{(i)}} e_{i-1} > 0.$$

Hence, if there is $\ell \in \{0, \dots, i-2\}$ such that $h_\ell > 0$, we conclude that

$$m(h_1, \dots, h_{i-2}, h_{i-1} + k_i) > e_i.$$

Assume that $h_1 = \dots = h_{i-2} = 0$. Then inequality (22) implies $h_{i-1} \geq 0$. If $h_{i-1} > 0$, we have

$$m(0, \dots, 0, h_{i-1} + k_i) = h_{i-1}e_{i-1} + e_i > e_i.$$

We conclude that the result holds. \square

Proposition 11. *Let $i \in \{1, \dots, s\}$ and $(w_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ be a sequence of elements of $\mathbb{C}[[x, y]]$ such that, for all $j \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $\vartheta_{\iota_i}(w_{j+1}) > \vartheta_{\iota_i}(w_j)$. Then*

$$\vartheta_{\iota_i} \left(\sum_{j \geq 0} w_j \right) = \vartheta_{\iota_i}(w_0).$$

Proof. Set $\kappa_j = \vartheta_{\iota_i}(w_j)$. By the definition of ϑ_{ι_i} , there is $u_j \in \mathbb{C}[[t]]$ such that $u_j(0) \neq 0$ and $\iota_i^* w_j = t^{\kappa_j} u_j(t)$. Then

$$\iota_i^* \sum_{j \geq 0} w_j = \sum_{j \geq 0} t^{\kappa_j} u_j(t) = t^{\kappa_0} \left(u_0(t) + \sum_{j \geq 1} t^{\kappa_j - \kappa_0} u_j(t) \right).$$

Set

$$\theta(t) = u_0(t) + \sum_{j \geq 1} t^{\kappa_j - \kappa_0} u_j(t)$$

Since $\kappa_{j+1} > \kappa_j$ then $\theta \in \mathbb{C}[[t]]$ and $\theta(0) = u_0(0) \neq 0$. Hence the result follows from the definition of ϑ_{ι_i} . \square

Proof of Statement (A) of Theorem 8. Step 1: Assume $i = 1$.

We have

$$(23) \quad \min_{(\alpha, \beta) \in N_1} \{\vartheta_{\iota_1}(x^\alpha y^\beta)\} = \min\{k_1 \alpha + (k_1 \lambda_1) \beta : (\alpha, \beta) \in N_1\} = k_1(k_1 \lambda_1)$$

and

$$\max_{(\alpha, \beta) \in N_1} \{\vartheta_{\iota_1}(x^\alpha y^\beta)\} = k_1(k_1 \mu_1).$$

The line segment

$$\mathcal{L} = \{(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathbb{N}_0^2 : k_1 \alpha + (k_1 \lambda_1) \beta = k_1(k_1 \lambda_1)\}$$

is a common face to N_1 and \tilde{N}_1 . Since k_1 is the smallest positive integer such that $k_1\lambda_1 \in \mathbb{Z}$ then the only integer points of \mathcal{L} are $(0, k_1)$ and $(k_1\lambda_1, 0)$. Hence there are $a_{\alpha, \beta} \in \mathbb{C}$, $(\alpha, \beta) \in N_1$, such that $a_{0, k_1}, a_{k_1\lambda_1, 0} \in \mathbb{C}^*$ and

$$f_1(x, y) = a_{0, k_1}y^{k_1} + a_{k_1\lambda_1, 0}x^{k_1\lambda_1} + \sum_{\ell=k_1(k_1\lambda_1)+1}^{k_1(k_1\mu_1)} \left(\sum_{\substack{k_1\alpha+(k_1\lambda_1)\beta=\ell \\ (\alpha, \beta) \in N_1}} a_{\alpha, \beta}x^\alpha y^\beta \right).$$

Equality $\iota_1^* f_1 = 0$ and (23) imply that

$$a_{0, k_1}c_1^{k_1} + a_{k_1\lambda_1, 0} = 0.$$

Choose $a_{0, k_1} = 1$ and $a_{k_1\lambda_1, 0} = -c_1^{k_1}$. Hence there is $\tilde{\delta}_1 \in \mathbb{C}[x, y]$ such that $\text{Supp}(\tilde{\delta}_1) \subset N_1 \setminus \mathcal{L}$, $\vartheta_{\iota_1}(\tilde{\delta}_1) > k_1(k_1\lambda_1)$ and

$$f_1(x, y) = y^{k_1} - c_1^{k_1}x^{k_1\lambda_1} + \tilde{\delta}_1(x, y).$$

Set $\delta_1(x, y) = -c_1^{k_1}x^{k_1\lambda_1} + \tilde{\delta}_1(x, y)$.

Let $i \in \{2, \dots, s-1\}$. Assume that Theorem 8 holds for $i-1$.

Step 2 (Formal elimination Process): We prove the existence of $\tilde{\delta}_i \in \mathbb{C}[[x, y]]$ such that $f_{i-1}^{k_i}(x, y) + \tilde{\delta}_i(x, y) \in \mathcal{I}_C \mathbb{C}[[x, y]]$.

Set $\tilde{f}_{i,0}(x, y) = f_{i-1}^{k_i}(x, y)$. By the induction hypothesis of statement (B) of Theorem 8,

$$(24) \quad \vartheta_{\iota_i}(\tilde{f}_{i,0}(x, y)) = k_i \gamma_i^{(i)}.$$

Furthermore, since $\text{ord}(f_{i-1}) = e_{i-1}$ and $C_0(Y_{i-1}) = \{y = 0\}$ then the order of $\tilde{f}_{i,0}(x, y)$ is e_i and $C_0(\{\tilde{f}_{i,0}(x, y) = 0\}) = \{y = 0\}$. We prove the existence of $\tilde{\delta}_i$ using a formal elimination process that starts with $\tilde{f}_{i,0}$.

Let $j \in \mathbb{N}_0$. If $j \neq 0$, assume that $I = \{1, \dots, j\}$ and that, for all $\ell \in I$, there are $\tilde{f}_{i,\ell}, \tilde{\delta}_{i,\ell} \in \mathbb{C}[[x, y]]$ such that

$$(25) \quad \text{ord}(\tilde{f}_{i,\ell}) = e_i, C_0(\{\tilde{f}_{i,\ell}(x, y) = 0\}) = \{y = 0\},$$

$$(26) \quad \vartheta_{\iota_i}(\tilde{f}_{i,\ell-1}) < \vartheta_{\iota_i}(\tilde{f}_{i,\ell}) \neq +\infty,$$

$$(27) \quad \tilde{f}_{i,\ell}(x, y) - \tilde{f}_{i,\ell-1}(x, y) = \tilde{\delta}_{i,\ell}(x, y) \text{ and } \vartheta_{\iota_i}(\tilde{\delta}_{i,\ell}) = \vartheta_{\iota_i}(\tilde{f}_{i,\ell-1}).$$

By (14), $\vartheta_{\iota_i}(\tilde{f}_{i,j}) \in \Gamma(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_i)$. Hence, by the induction hypothesis, there are non negative integers $\alpha^{(j+1)}, \beta_0^{(j+1)}, \dots, \beta_{i-1}^{(j+1)}$ such that

$$\vartheta_{\iota_i}(\tilde{f}_{i,j}) = \vartheta_{\iota_i} \left(x^{\alpha^{(j+1)}} f_0^{\beta_0^{(j+1)}} \dots f_{i-1}^{\beta_{i-1}^{(j+1)}} \right) = e_i \alpha^{(j+1)} + \sum_{\ell=0}^{i-1} \gamma_{\ell+1}^{(i)} \beta_\ell^{(j+1)}.$$

If $j = 0$ we will choose $\alpha^{(1)}, \beta_0^{(1)}, \dots, \beta_{i-1}^{(1)}$ such that $\beta_{i-1}^{(1)} = 0$. We can make this choice because of equality (24) and statement (C) of Proposition 4. Set $I = \{1, \dots, j, j+1\}$,

$$\tilde{\delta}_{i,j+1}(x, y) = x^{\alpha^{(1)}} f_0^{\beta_0^{(1)}}(x, y) \dots f_{i-2}^{\beta_{i-2}^{(1)}}(x, y)$$

and $\tilde{f}_{i,j+1}(x, y) = \tilde{f}_{i,j}(x, y) + a_{j+1}\tilde{\delta}_{i,j+1}(x, y)$, where $a_{j+1} \in \mathbb{C}$. We now prove that $a_{j+1} \in \mathbb{C}^*$ and that $\tilde{f}_{i,j+1}(x, y)$ is not the null function by showing that

$$(28) \quad \text{Supp}(\tilde{f}_{i,j+1}) \neq \emptyset.$$

Set $\kappa = \vartheta_{\iota_i}(\tilde{f}_{i,j}) = \vartheta_{\iota_i}(\tilde{\delta}_{i,j+1})$. There are $u, \theta \in \mathbb{C}[t]$ such that $u(0) \neq 0$, $\theta(0) \neq 0$, $\iota_i^* \tilde{f}_{i,j} = t^\kappa u(t)$ and $\iota_i^* \tilde{\delta}_{i,j+1} = t^\kappa \theta(t)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \iota_i^* \tilde{f}_{i,j+1} &= t^\kappa (u(t) + a_{j+1}\theta(t)) = \\ &= t^\kappa (u(0) + a_{j+1}\theta(0)) + t^\kappa (u(t) - u(0) + a_{j+1}(\theta(t) - \theta(0))). \end{aligned}$$

Note that $u(t) - u(0) + a_{j+1}(\theta(t) - \theta(0)) \in (t)$. Since $u(0)$ and $\theta(0)$ are non null, the equation $u(0) + a_{j+1}\theta(0) = 0$ has one solution with respect to a_{j+1} and the solution is non null. Choose a_{j+1} as that solution. Then

$$\vartheta_{\iota_i}(\tilde{f}_{i,j+1}) \geq \kappa + 1 > \vartheta_{\iota_i}(\tilde{f}_{i,j}).$$

Since $(0, e_i) \in \text{Supp}(\tilde{f}_{i,j})$, to prove (28) it suffices to prove that $(0, e_i) \notin \text{Supp}(\tilde{\delta}_{i,j+1})$. If $\alpha^{(j+1)} \neq 0$ then $\text{Supp}(\tilde{\delta}_{i,j+1}) \subseteq \{(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathbb{N}_0^2 : \alpha \neq 0\}$ and we conclude that $(0, e_i) \notin \text{Supp}(\tilde{\delta}_{i,j+1})$. Assume $\alpha^{(j+1)} = 0$. Set

$$(29) \quad m(\beta_0, \dots, \beta_{i-1}) = \sum_{\ell=0}^{i-1} e_\ell \beta_\ell$$

and

$$(30) \quad \mathcal{R} = \{(\beta_0, \dots, \beta_{i-1}) \in \mathbb{R}^i : (\beta_0, \dots, \beta_{i-1}) \geq (0, \dots, 0) \wedge \sum_{\ell=0}^{i-1} \gamma_{\ell+1}^{(i)} \beta_\ell \geq k_i \gamma_i^{(i)}\}.$$

Note that since $\text{ord}(f_\ell) = e_\ell$, the order of $\tilde{\delta}_{i,j+1}$ is $m(\beta_0^{(j+1)}, \dots, \beta_{i-1}^{(j+1)})$. If $j = 0$, Lemma 10 implies that

$$m(\beta_0^{(1)}, \dots, \beta_{i-2}^{(1)}, 0) > e_i.$$

If $j \neq 0$, inequality

$$\sum_{\ell=0}^{i-1} \gamma_{\ell+1}^{(i)} \beta_\ell^{(j+1)} = \vartheta_{\iota_i}(f_{i,j}) > k_i \gamma_i^{(i)}$$

and Lemma 10 imply that $m(\beta_0^{(j+1)}, \dots, \beta_{i-1}^{(j+1)}) > e_i$. We conclude on both cases that $(0, e_i) \notin \text{Supp}(\tilde{\delta}_{i,j+1})$, otherwise we would have $m(\beta_0^{(j+1)}, \dots, \beta_{i-1}^{(j+1)}) \leq e_i$.

If $\iota_i^* \tilde{f}_{i,j+1} = 0$ set $\tilde{f}_i(x, y) = \tilde{f}_{i,j+1}(x, y)$. If $\vartheta_{\iota_i}(\tilde{f}_{i,j+1}) \neq +\infty$, we iterate the procedure. If this procedure does not end in a finite number of steps, then $I = \mathbb{N}$ and

$$(31) \quad \tilde{f}_i(x, y) = f_{i-1}^{k_i}(x, y) + \sum_{\ell \geq 1} a_\ell \tilde{\delta}_{i,\ell}.$$

All that is left to prove is that in this case $\iota_i^* \tilde{f}_i = 0$. Let $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$. By (26), $(\vartheta_{\iota_i}(\tilde{f}_{i,j}))_{j \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ is a strictly increasing sequence of positive integers. Hence we can choose j large enough such that $\vartheta_{\iota_i}(\tilde{f}_{i,j}) > \ell$. By (27) we can rewrite equality (31) as

$$\tilde{f}_i(x, y) = \tilde{f}_{i,j}(x, y) + \sum_{\ell \geq j+1} a_\ell \tilde{\delta}_{i,\ell}.$$

Therefore

$$\vartheta_{\iota_i}(\tilde{f}_i) \geq \min \left\{ \vartheta_{\iota_i}(\tilde{f}_{i,j}), \vartheta_{\iota_i} \left(\sum_{\ell \geq j+1} a_\ell \tilde{\delta}_{i,\ell} \right) \right\}.$$

By (26) and (27), $(\vartheta_{\iota_i}(\tilde{\delta}_{i,j}))_{j \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ is also a strictly increasing sequence. Therefore, applying Proposition 11, we obtain

$$\vartheta_{\iota_i} \left(\sum_{\ell \geq j+1} a_\ell \tilde{\delta}_{i,\ell} \right) = \vartheta_{\iota_i}(\tilde{\delta}_{i,j+1}) = \vartheta_{\iota_i}(\tilde{f}_{i,j}).$$

Hence

$$\vartheta_{\iota_i}(\tilde{f}_i) \geq \vartheta_{\iota_i}(\tilde{f}_{i,j}) > \ell$$

and we conclude that $\vartheta_{\iota_i}(\tilde{f}_i) = +\infty$, that is, $\iota_i^* \tilde{f}_i = 0$. Set $\tilde{\delta}_i(x, y) = \sum_{\ell \in I} a_\ell \tilde{\delta}_{i,\ell}(x, y)$. As seen in the construction of the $\tilde{\delta}_{i,\ell}$'s, for all $\ell \in I$, $(0, e_i) \notin \text{Supp}(\tilde{\delta}_{i,j+1})$. Therefore $(0, e_i) \notin \text{Supp}(\tilde{\delta}_i)$.

Step 3: We prove the existence of $a \in \mathbb{C}^*$ and $\delta_i \in \mathbb{C}[x, y]$ such that $\text{Supp}(\delta_i) \subseteq N_i \setminus \{(0, e_i)\}$ and $f_i(x, y) = a f_{i-1}^{k_i}(x, y) + \delta_i(x, y)$.

Let $\tilde{f}_i(x, y) = f_{i-1}^{k_i}(x, y) + \tilde{\delta}_i(x, y)$ be as in step 2 and f_i as in Section 3. Since $\tilde{f}_i \in I_C \mathbb{C}[[x, y]] = (f_i) \mathbb{C}[[x, y]]$ then there is $u \in \mathbb{C}[[x, y]]$ such that

$$(32) \quad f_i(x, y) = u(x, y) \tilde{f}_i(x, y).$$

By construction $\text{ord}(\tilde{f}_i) = e_i$. As stated in Section 3, $\text{ord}(f_i) = e_i$. Therefore $\text{ord}(u) = 0$ and we conclude that u is a unit of $\mathbb{C}[[x, y]]$. Hence there is $a \in \mathbb{C}^*$ and $\varepsilon \in (x, y) \mathbb{C}[[x, y]]$ such that $u(x, y) = a + \varepsilon(x, y)$. We rewrite equality (32) as

$$f_i(x, y) = a f_{i-1}^{k_i}(x, y) + [a \tilde{\delta}_i(x, y) + \varepsilon(x, y)(f_{i-1}^{k_i}(x, y) + \tilde{\delta}_i(x, y))].$$

Set $\delta_i(x, y) = f_i(x, y) - a f_{i-1}^{k_i}(x, y)$. Since $f_i, f_{i-1}^{k_i} \in \mathbb{C}[x, y]$, we conclude that $\delta_i \in \mathbb{C}[x, y]$. To prove that $\text{Supp}(\delta_i) \subseteq N_i \setminus \{(0, e_i)\}$, given that $\text{Supp}(f_i) \subseteq N_i$, it suffices to prove that $\text{Supp}(f_{i-1}^{k_i}) \subseteq N_i$ and $\{(0, e_i)\} \notin \text{Supp}(\delta_i)$. The Multinomial formula implies

$$\text{Supp}(f_{i-1}^{k_i}) \subseteq \sum_{j=1}^{k_i} \text{Supp}(f_{i-1}).$$

By the induction hypothesis, $\text{Supp}(f_{i-1}) \subseteq N_{i-1}$, hence

$$\sum_{j=1}^{k_i} \text{Supp}(f_{i-1}) \subseteq \sum_{j=1}^{k_i} N_{i-1}.$$

Let $(\alpha_j, \beta_j) \in N_{i-1}$, $j = 1, \dots, k_i$. By (17), the inequality

$$(33) \quad k_1 \sum_{j=1}^{k_i} \alpha_j + (k_1 \lambda_1) \sum_{j=1}^{k_i} \beta_j = \sum_{j=1}^{k_i} (k_1 \alpha_j + (k_1 \lambda_1) \beta_j) \geq k_i e_{i-1} (k_1 \lambda_1) = e_i (k_1 \lambda_1)$$

and inequality

$$(34) \quad e_i \sum_{j=1}^{k_i} \alpha_j + (e_i \mu_{i-1}) \sum_{j=1}^{k_i} \beta_j = k_i \sum_{j=1}^{k_i} (e_{i-1} \alpha_j + (e_{i-1} \mu_{i-1}) \beta_j) \leq \\ \leq k_i^2 e_{i-1} (e_{i-1} \mu_{i-1}) = e_i (e_i \mu_{i-1})$$

hold. Set

$$\tilde{N}_i = \{(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathbb{N}_0^2 : k_1 \alpha + (k_1 \lambda_1) \beta \geq e_i (k_1 \lambda_1) \wedge e_i \alpha + (e_i \mu_{i-1}) \beta \leq e_i (e_i \mu_{i-1})\}.$$

Since $\mu_{i-1} < \mu_i$ then $\tilde{N}_i \subset N_i$. From inequalities (33) and (34) we conclude that

$$\sum_{j=1}^{k_i} N_{i-1} \subseteq \tilde{N}_i.$$

Note that $\text{Supp}(f_i) \subseteq N_i$ and $\varepsilon \in (x, y)\mathbb{C}[[x, y]]$ imply that $\{(0, e_i)\} \notin \text{Supp}(\varepsilon f_{i-1}^{k_i})$. Also, by construction, $\{(0, e_i)\} \notin \text{Supp}(a \tilde{\delta}_i)$. Therefore, taking into account the definition of δ_i , to prove that $\{(0, e_i)\} \notin \text{Supp}(\delta_i)$ it suffices to prove that $\{(0, e_i)\} \notin \text{Supp}(\varepsilon \tilde{\delta}_i)$. This fact results immediately that for all $\ell \in I$, as proved in the construction of $\tilde{\delta}_{i,\ell}$, if $\text{Supp}(\tilde{\delta}_{i,\ell}) \not\subseteq \{(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathbb{N}_0^2 : \alpha \neq 0\}$ then $\text{ord}(\tilde{\delta}_{i,\ell}) > e_i$.

Step 4: The polynomial f_i is unique up to multiplication by a non null constant. Let $g_i \in \mathbb{C}[x, y]$ such that $\iota_i^* g_i = 0$ and $\text{Supp}(g_i) \subseteq N_i$. Since $\mathcal{I}_{Y_i} \mathbb{C}\{x, y\} = (f_i) \mathbb{C}\{x, y\} = (g_i) \mathbb{C}\{x, y\}$, there is $a \in \mathbb{C}^*$ and $\varepsilon \in (x, y)\mathbb{C}\{x, y\}$ such that

$$(35) \quad g_i(x, y) = (a + \varepsilon(x, y)) f_i(x, y).$$

Assume ε non null. Let $n = \text{ord}(\varepsilon)$. There are $\theta \in (x, y)^{e_i+1} \mathbb{C}\{x, y\}$, $\varphi \in (x, y)^{n+1} \mathbb{C}\{x, y\}$ and a homogeneous polynomial $\tilde{\varepsilon}$ of order n , such that $f_i(x, y) = y^{e_i} + \theta(x, y)$ and $\varepsilon(x, y) = \tilde{\varepsilon}(x, y) + \varphi(x, y)$. We rewrite equality (35) as

$$g_i(x, y) = a f_i(x, y) + y^{e_i} \tilde{\varepsilon}(x, y) + y^{e_i} \varphi(x, y) + \theta(x, y) \varphi(x, y).$$

By definition $y^{e_i} \tilde{\varepsilon}$ is a homogenous polynomial of order $e_i + n$, $\text{ord}(y^{e_i} \varphi) = e_i + n + 1$ and $\text{ord}(\theta \varphi) = e_i + n + 2$. Then

$$\text{Supp}(y^{e_i} \tilde{\varepsilon}) \subseteq \text{Supp}(y^{e_i} \tilde{\varepsilon} + y^{e_i} \varphi + \theta \varphi)$$

The set $\text{Supp}(y^{e_i} \tilde{\varepsilon})$ is equal to

$$\{(0, e_i)\} + \text{Supp}(\tilde{\varepsilon})$$

and thus

$$N_i \cap \text{Supp}(y^{e_i} \tilde{\varepsilon}) = \emptyset.$$

Since $\text{Supp}(f_i) \subset N_i$, we conclude that

$$\text{Supp}(y^{e_i} \tilde{\varepsilon}) \subseteq \text{Supp}(g_i),$$

which contradicts the fact that $\text{Supp}(g_i) \subseteq N_i$. Therefore ε must be the null series. \square

Proof of Corollary 9. If $\iota^* f_s = 0$ then $\delta(x, y) = 0$ and the result is proved. Otherwise we repeat the formal elimination process of step 2 to obtain $\tilde{\delta} \in \mathbb{C}[[x, y]]$ such that $\iota^*(f_s + \tilde{\delta}) = 0$. Applying a similar reasoning made in step 3, we construct a $\delta \in \mathbb{C}\{x, y\}$ such that $f(x, y) = f_s(x, y) + \delta(x, y)$. \square

4.2. Proof of Statement (B) of Theorem 8. We shall denote the operator partial derivative with respect to the variable y as ∂_y .

Proposition 1 show us that there is a natural injective map $\Gamma(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{i-1})$ to $\Gamma(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_i)$ that maps n into $\frac{e_i}{e_{i-1}}n$. One can ask if there is such a map at valuation level, in the sense that, given $g \in \mathbb{C}[[x, y]]$, $\vartheta_{\iota_i}(g) = \frac{e_i}{e_{i-1}}\vartheta_{\iota_{i-1}}(g)$. The answer is not so simple as it can be seen in Example 7, where $\vartheta_{\iota_1}(f_2) = 19$, $\vartheta_{\iota_2}(f_2) = +\infty$ and $\vartheta_{\iota_3}(f_2) = 117$. We inspect some simple cases first. Let $g(x) \in \mathbb{C}[[x]]$. Then, for all $i \in \{1, \dots, s\}$ and $j \in \{i, \dots, s\}$,

$$(36) \quad \vartheta_{\iota_j}(g) = e_j \text{ord}(g) = \frac{e_j}{e_i} e_i \text{ord}(g) = \frac{e_j}{e_i} \vartheta_{\iota_i}(g).$$

For all $i \in \{1, \dots, s\}$, $j \in \{i, \dots, s\}$, $d \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $\ell \in \{0, \dots, d\}$,

$$(37) \quad \begin{aligned} \vartheta_{\iota_j}(\partial_y^\ell y^d) &= (d - \ell) \vartheta_{\iota_j}(y) = (d - \ell) \text{ord}(\iota_j^* y) = (d - \ell) e_j \lambda_1 = \\ &= (d - \ell) \frac{e_j}{e_i} e_i \lambda_1 = \frac{e_j}{e_i} \vartheta_{\iota_i}(\partial_y^\ell y^d). \end{aligned}$$

Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and U be an arbitrary small open disc of \mathbb{C} centered in zero. For $t \in U$, define the map $\chi_n(t) = t^n$. Let $g \in \mathbb{C}[[x, y]]$ and $h \in \mathbb{C}[[t]]$. Note that $\text{ord}(\chi_n^* h) = n \text{ord}(h)$ and if, for some $i \in \{1, \dots, s\}$, $\iota_i^* g = 0$ then $(\iota_i \circ \chi_n)^* g = 0$.

Lemma 12. *Let $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $a, b \in \mathbb{C}[[x]]$ and*

$$g(x, y) = \sum_{\ell=0}^n a_\ell(x) y^\ell \in \mathbb{C}[[x]][y]$$

such that $0 \leq n < e_1$ and $\deg_y(g) = n$. The following statements hold:

- (A) *If $\vartheta_{\iota_1}(ay^\alpha) = \vartheta_{\iota_1}(ay^\beta)$ then $\alpha - \beta$ is a multiple of e_1 .*
- (B) *There is one and only one $\tau_0 \in \{0, \dots, \deg_y(g)\}$ such that*

$$\vartheta_{\iota_1}(g) = \vartheta_{\iota_1}(a_{\tau_0}(x) y^{\tau_0}).$$

Furthermore, for all $j \in \{1, \dots, s\}$,

$$(38) \quad \vartheta_{\iota_j}(g) = \frac{e_j}{e_1} \vartheta_{\iota_1}(g)$$

and, if $\tau_0 \neq 0$ then

$$(39) \quad \vartheta_{\iota_j}(\partial_y g) = \vartheta_{\iota_j}(g) - e_j \lambda_1,$$

otherwise

$$(40) \quad \vartheta_{\iota_j}(\partial_y g) > \vartheta_{\iota_j}(g) - e_j \lambda_1.$$

- (C) *For all $j \in \{1, \dots, s\}$ and $\sigma \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$(41) \quad \vartheta_{\iota_j}(\partial_y^\sigma g) \geq \vartheta_{\iota_j}(g) - \sigma e_j \lambda_1.$$

Proof. We begin by proving statement (A). Equality (12) allows us to rewrite $\vartheta_{\iota_1}(ay^\alpha) = \vartheta_{\iota_1}(ay^\beta)$ as

$$(42) \quad \vartheta_{\iota_1}(a) + \alpha \vartheta_{\iota_1}(y) = \vartheta_{\iota_1}(b) + \beta \vartheta_{\iota_1}(y).$$

We can assume $\alpha \geq \beta$. Replacing $\vartheta_{\iota_1}(a)$, $\vartheta_{\iota_1}(b)$ and $\vartheta_{\iota_1}(y)$ by their respective values in (42), we obtain

$$(\alpha - \beta) e_1 \lambda_1 = e_1 \text{ord}(b) - e_1 \text{ord}(a).$$

Hence $\vartheta_{\iota_1}(ay^\alpha) = \vartheta_{\iota_1}(ay^\beta)$ if and only if $(\alpha - \beta)\lambda_1 = \text{ord}(b) - \text{ord}(a)$. Let q and $r \in \{0, \dots, e_1 - 1\}$ the unique non negative integers such that

$$\alpha - \beta = qe_1 + r.$$

Applying this equality in $(\alpha - \beta)\lambda_1 = \text{ord}(b) - \text{ord}(a)$, we obtain

$$(43) \quad r\lambda_1 = \text{ord}(b) - \text{ord}(a) - q(e_1\lambda_1) \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

Statement *C3*) (see Section 2) implies that (43) holds if and only if $r = 0$.

We now prove statement *(B)*. Assume that $n \neq 0$. Set

$$(44) \quad \rho_d = \min\{\vartheta_{\iota_1}(a_\ell y^\ell) : a_\ell \neq 0 \text{ and } \ell \in \{d, \dots, n\}\}, \quad d = 0, 1.$$

Since $n < e_1$, statement *(A)* implies that there is one and only one $\tau_d \in \{d, \dots, n\}$, $d = 0, 1$, such that

$$(45) \quad \vartheta_{\iota_1}(a_{\tau_d} y^{\tau_d}) = \rho_d.$$

Hence $\vartheta_{\iota_1}(g) = \rho_0$. If $\tau_0 \neq 0$ then $\tau_1 = \tau_0$, $\rho_1 = \rho_0$ and

$$(46) \quad \vartheta_{\iota_1}(\partial_y g) = \vartheta_{\iota_1}(a_{\tau_1} y^{\tau_1 - 1}) = \vartheta_{\iota_1}(a_{\tau_1}) + (\tau_1 - 1)e_1\lambda_1 = \rho_1 - e_1\lambda_1.$$

If $\tau_0 = 0$ then $\tau_1 > \tau_0$, $\rho_1 > \rho_0$ and

$$(47) \quad \vartheta_{\iota_1}(\partial_y g) = \rho_1 - e_1\lambda_1 > \rho_0 - e_1\lambda_1.$$

Equalities (36) and (37) imply that, for all $j \in \{1, \dots, s\}$ and $\ell \in \{0, \dots, n\}$,

$$\vartheta_{\iota_j}(a_\ell y^\ell) = \frac{e_j}{e_1} \vartheta_{\iota_1}(a_\ell y^\ell) \text{ and } \vartheta_{\iota_j}(\partial_y(a_\ell y^\ell)) = \frac{e_j}{e_1} \vartheta_{\iota_1}(\partial_y(a_\ell y^\ell)).$$

Hence

$$\vartheta_{\iota_j}(g) = \frac{e_j}{e_1} \rho_0 \text{ and } \vartheta_{\iota_j}(\partial_y g) = \frac{e_j}{e_1} (\rho_1 - e_1\lambda_1) = \frac{e_j}{e_1} \rho_1 - e_j\lambda_1.$$

Thus (38) and (39) hold. Under the condition of $\tau_0 = 0$, from inequality (47) we obtain that

$$\vartheta_{\iota_j}(\partial_y g) = \frac{e_j}{e_1} (\rho_1 - e_1\lambda_1) > \frac{e_j}{e_1} (\rho_0 - e_1\lambda_1) = \frac{e_j}{e_1} \rho_0 - e_j\lambda_1$$

and (40) is proven.

The proof of equality (38) still holds if $n = 0$. Inequality (40) holds trivially if $n = 0$.

We prove statement *(C)* by induction on $\sigma \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. Note that statement *(C)* for $\sigma = 1$ is proved in statement *(B)* and that, for $\sigma \geq n + 1$, inequality (41) holds trivially. Assume that $\sigma \in \{2, \dots, n\}$. Then $0 \leq \text{deg}_y(\partial_y^{\sigma-1} g) < n < e_1$ and by statement *(B)*,

$$\vartheta_{\iota_j}(\partial_y(\partial_y^{\sigma-1} g)) \geq \vartheta_{\iota_j}(\partial_y^{\sigma-1} g) - e_j\lambda_1.$$

By the induction hypothesis,

$$\vartheta_{\iota_j}(\partial_y^{\sigma-1} g) \geq \vartheta_{\iota_j}(g) - (\sigma - 1)e_j\lambda_1.$$

Thus

$$\vartheta_{\iota_j}(\partial_y(\partial_y^{\sigma-1} g)) \geq \vartheta_{\iota_j}(g) - \sigma e_j\lambda_1.$$

□

Lemma 13. *Assume that there is $\delta_1 \in \mathbb{C}[x, y]$ such that $\text{Supp}(\delta_1) \subset N_1 \setminus \{(0, e_1)\}$ and $f_1(x, y) = y^{e_1} + \delta_1(x, y)$. Then, for all $j \in \{2, \dots, s\}$, $\vartheta_{\iota_j}(f_1) = \gamma_2^{(j)}$ and $\vartheta_{\iota_j}(\partial_y f_1) = \gamma_2^{(j)} - e_j\lambda_2$.*

Proof. We remind the reader that $e_1 = k_1$. Let δ_1 be as in statement (A) of Theorem 8. We must have

$$(48) \quad \vartheta_{\iota_1}(\delta_1) = \vartheta_{\iota_1}(y^{e_1}),$$

otherwise $\vartheta_{\iota_1}(f_1) = \min\{\vartheta_{\iota_1}(\delta_1), \vartheta_{\iota_1}(y^{e_1})\} \neq +\infty$ which contradicts $\iota_1^* f_1 = 0$. Note that $\vartheta_{\iota_1}(y^{e_1}) = e_1 \gamma_1^{(1)}$. Write δ_1 as an element of $\mathbb{C}[x][y]$ and let $n = \deg_y(\delta_1)$. Then there is $a_\ell \in \mathbb{C}[x]$, $\ell \in \{0, \dots, n\}$, such that

$$\delta_1(x, y) = \sum_{\ell=0}^n a_\ell(x) y^\ell.$$

As $\text{Supp}(\delta_1) \subset N_1 \setminus \{(0, e_1)\}$ then $0 \leq n < e_1$. Thus by statement (B) of Lemma 12, set τ_0 the only element of $\{0, \dots, n\}$ such that $\vartheta_{\iota_1}(\delta_1) = \vartheta_{\iota_1}(a_{\tau_0} y^{\tau_0})$. Since $\vartheta_{\iota_1}(\delta_1) = \vartheta_{\iota_1}(y^{e_1})$, statement (A) of Lemma 12 implies that $e_1 - \tau_0$ is a multiple of e_1 . Given that $\tau_0 \in \{0, \dots, e_1 - 1\}$ then we must have $\tau_0 = 0$.

Let $j \in \{2, \dots, s\}$. Set

$$\epsilon_{1,j} = c_2 t^{e_j \lambda_2} + \varphi_2(t^{e_j/k}) + \dots + c_j t^{e_j \lambda_j} + \varphi_j(t^{e_j/k}).$$

Therefore

$$\iota_j^* x = (\iota_1 \circ \chi_{\frac{e_j}{e_1}})^* x \text{ and } \iota_j^* y = (\iota_1 \circ \chi_{\frac{e_j}{e_1}})^* y + \epsilon_{1,j}.$$

Note that $\text{ord}(\epsilon_{1,j}) = e_j \lambda_2$. By Taylor's formula,

$$(49) \quad \begin{aligned} \iota_j^* f_1 &= (\iota_1 \circ \chi_{\frac{e_j}{e_1}})^* f_1(x, y) + k_1 \epsilon_{1,j} (\iota_1 \circ \chi_{\frac{e_j}{e_1}})^* y^{k_1-1} + \\ &+ \sum_{\ell=2}^{e_1} \frac{k_1!}{(k_1 - \ell)! \ell!} \epsilon_{1,j}^\ell (\iota_1 \circ \chi_{\frac{e_j}{e_1}})^* y^{k_1-\ell} + \sum_{\ell=1}^n \frac{1}{\ell!} \epsilon_{1,j}^\ell (\iota_1 \circ \chi_{\frac{e_j}{e_1}})^* \partial_y^\ell \delta_1(x, y). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\iota_1^* f_1 = 0$ then

$$(50) \quad (\iota_1 \circ \chi_{\frac{e_j}{e_1}})^* f_1 = 0.$$

For all $\ell \in \{2, \dots, e_1\}$,

$$(51) \quad \begin{aligned} \text{ord} \left(\epsilon_{1,j}^\ell (\iota_1 \circ \chi_{\frac{e_j}{e_1}})^* y^{k_1-\ell} \right) - \text{ord} \left(\epsilon_{1,j} (\iota_1 \circ \chi_{\frac{e_j}{e_1}})^* y^{k_1-1} \right) &= \\ = \ell e_j \lambda_2 + \frac{e_j}{e_1} (k_1 - \ell) e_1 \lambda_1 - \left(e_j \lambda_2 + \frac{e_j}{e_1} (k_1 - 1) e_1 \lambda_1 \right) &= \\ = (\ell - 1) e_j (\lambda_2 - \lambda_1) > 0. \end{aligned}$$

Inequality (40) implies that

$$(52) \quad \vartheta_{\iota_j}(\partial_y^\ell \delta_1) > \vartheta_{\iota_j}(\delta_1) - \ell e_j \lambda_1 = (k_1 - \ell) e_j \lambda_1.$$

Therefore, for all $\ell \in \{1, \dots, n\}$,

$$(53) \quad \begin{aligned} \text{ord} \left(\epsilon_{1,j}^\ell (\iota_1 \circ \chi_{\frac{e_j}{e_1}})^* \partial_y^\ell \delta_1 \right) - \text{ord} \left(\epsilon_{1,j} (\iota_1 \circ \chi_{\frac{e_j}{e_1}})^* y^{k_1-1} \right) &> \\ > \ell e_j \lambda_2 + \frac{e_j}{e_1} (k_1 - \ell) e_1 \lambda_1 - \left(e_j \lambda_2 + \frac{e_j}{e_1} (k_1 - 1) e_1 \lambda_1 \right) &= \\ = (\ell - 1) e_j (\lambda_2 - \lambda_1) \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Applying equality (50) and inequalities (51), (53), we conclude that

$$\vartheta_{\iota_j}(f_1) = \text{ord}(\iota_j^* f_1) = \text{ord} \left(\epsilon_{1,j} (\iota_1 \circ \chi_{\frac{e_j}{e_1}})^* y^{k_1-1} \right) = e_j \lambda_2 + (k_1 - 1) \gamma_1^{(j)} = \gamma_2^{(j)}.$$

From (52) we obtain that

$$\vartheta_{\iota_j}(\partial_y \delta_1) > (k_1 - 1)e_j \lambda_1 = \vartheta_{\iota_j}(y^{k_1-1}).$$

Therefore,

$$\vartheta_{\iota_j}(\partial_y f_1) = \vartheta_{\iota_j}(y^{k_1-1}) = (k_1 - 1)\gamma_1^{(j)} = \gamma_2^{(j)} - e_j \lambda_2.$$

□

To prove a more general version of Lemma 12 we will need to apply the Weierstrass Division Algorithm, so we need to get (re)acquainted with the algorithm (see Theorem 6.2.6 of [7] and its proof for the formal version). We are only interested in the case where we divide $g \in \mathbb{C}[[x]][y]$ by a Weierstrass polynomial p with degree in y strictly smaller than the degree of g in y . Let $n = \deg_y(g)$, $m = \deg_y(p)$,

$$g(x, y) = \sum_{\ell=0}^n a_\ell(x)y^\ell \text{ and } p(x, y) = y^m + \sum_{\ell=0}^{m-1} b_\ell(x)y^\ell.$$

Set $w(x, y) = -\sum_{\ell=0}^{m-1} b_\ell(x)y^\ell$. Given $s(x, y) = \sum_{\ell \geq 0} c_\ell(x)y^\ell \in \mathbb{C}[[x]][[y]]$, define

$$h(s)(x, y) = \frac{1}{y^m} \sum_{\ell \geq m} c_\ell(x)y^\ell = \sum_{\ell \geq 0} c_{\ell+m}(x)y^\ell, \quad H(s)(x, y) = h(sw)(x, y)$$

and, for $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$, H^ℓ as H composed with itself ℓ times. Set

$$u(x, y) = h(g)(x, y) = \sum_{\ell=0}^{n-m} a_{\ell+m}(x)y^\ell.$$

The Weierstrass Division Algorithm tells us that there exist uniquely determined $q \in \mathbb{C}[[x, y]]$ and $r \in \mathbb{C}[[x]][y]$ such that $g(x, y) = q(x, y)p(x, y) + r(x, y)$ and $\deg_y(r) < m$. Furthermore

$$(54) \quad q(x, y) = u(x, y) + \sum_{\ell \geq 1} H^\ell(u)(x, y).$$

Proposition 14. *Let $p, g \in \mathbb{C}[[x]][y]$ such that p is a Weierstrass polynomial, $\deg_y(p) = m$ and $\deg_y(g) = n$. Assume that $n > m$. Then there exist uniquely determined $q \in \mathbb{C}[[x]][y]$ and $r \in \mathbb{C}[[x]][y]$ such that $g(x, y) = q(x, y)p(x, y) + r(x, y)$, $\deg_y(r) < m$ and $\deg_y(q) < n - m$. Furthermore, if g and p both belong to $\mathbb{C}[x][y]$ then $q \in \mathbb{C}[x][y]$.*

Proof. We divide g by p applying the Weierstrass Division Algorithm. Then there exist uniquely determined $q \in \mathbb{C}[[x, y]]$ and $r \in \mathbb{C}[[x]][y]$ such that $g(x, y) = q(x, y)p(x, y) + r(x, y)$, $\deg_y(r) < m$ and q is given by (54). By construction, $u, w \in \mathbb{C}[[x]][y]$, $\deg_y(u) \leq n - m$ and $\deg_y(w) \leq m - 1$. Then $h(uw) \in \mathbb{C}[[x]][y]$ and has degree in y at most $n - m + m - 1 - m = n - m - 1$. Iterating this reasoning, we conclude that there is $\tau \in \mathbb{N}_0$ such that

$$q = u + \sum_{\ell=1}^{\tau} H^\ell(u).$$

Note that by definition:

- (i) If $p \in \mathbb{C}[[x]][y]$ then $w \in \mathbb{C}[[x]][y]$ and if $p \in \mathbb{C}[x][y]$ then $w \in \mathbb{C}[x][y]$;
- (ii) If $g \in \mathbb{C}[[x]][y]$ then $u \in \mathbb{C}[[x]][y]$ and if $g \in \mathbb{C}[x][y]$ then $u \in \mathbb{C}[x][y]$.

Then if $p, g \in \mathbb{C}[[x]][y]$ then $h(uw) \in \mathbb{C}[[x]][y]$ and if $p, g \in \mathbb{C}[x][y]$ then $h(uw) \in \mathbb{C}[x][y]$. Thus, for all $\ell \in \{1, \dots, \tau\}$, if $p, g \in \mathbb{C}[[x]][y]$ then $H^\ell(u) \in \mathbb{C}[[x]][y]$ and if $p, g \in \mathbb{C}[x][y]$ then $H^\ell(u) \in \mathbb{C}[x][y]$. \square

For the following Lemma we assume statement (A) of Theorem 8 holds up to $i \in \{2, \dots, s\}$ and statement (B) of Theorem 8 holds up to $i - 1$. We remind the reader that $f_0(x, y) = y$. For $j \in \{1, \dots, s\}$, set $\Gamma_0(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_j)$ as the subsemigroup of $\Gamma(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_j)$ generated by e_j .

Lemma 15. *For all $i \in \{1, \dots, s - 1\}$ the following statements hold:*

- (A) *Let $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Let $a(x, y), b(x, y) \in \mathbb{C}[[x, y]]$ non null such that $\vartheta_{\iota_i}(a), \vartheta_{\iota_i}(b) \in \Gamma_{i-1}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_i)$. If $\vartheta_{\iota_i}(af_{i-1}^\alpha) = \vartheta_{\iota_i}(bf_{i-1}^\beta)$ then $\alpha - \beta$ is a multiple of k_i .*
- (B) *Let $g \in \mathbb{C}[[x]][y]$ non null such that $e_{i-1} \leq n < e_i$. Then there are uniquely determined $d \in \mathbb{N}$ and $a_\ell \in \mathbb{C}[[x]][y]$, $\ell \in \{0, \dots, d\}$, such that $d < k_1$,*

$$(55) \quad g(x, y) = \sum_{\ell=0}^d a_\ell(x, y) f_{i-1}^\ell(x, y),$$

$\vartheta_{\iota_i}(g) \in \Gamma(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_i)$ and, for $a_\ell \neq 0$, $\deg_y(a_\ell) < e_{i-1}$. Furthermore, for all $j \in \{i, \dots, s\}$ and $\sigma \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\vartheta_{\iota_j}(g) = \frac{e_j}{e_i} \vartheta_{\iota_i}(g) \text{ and } \vartheta_{\iota_j}(\partial_y^\sigma g) \geq \vartheta_{\iota_j}(g) - \sigma e_j \lambda_i.$$

Proof. We will prove the Lemma by induction on i . This Lemma for $i = 1$ has been proved in Lemma 12.

We begin by proving statement (A). We can assume $\alpha \geq \beta$. Equality $\vartheta_{\iota_i}(af_{i-1}^\alpha) = \vartheta_{\iota_i}(bf_{i-1}^\beta)$ is equivalent to

$$(56) \quad (\alpha - \beta)\gamma_i^{(i)} = \vartheta_{\iota_i}(b) - \vartheta_{\iota_i}(a).$$

Let q and $r \in \{0, \dots, k_i - 1\}$ be the unique non negative integers such that

$$(57) \quad \alpha - \beta = qk_i + r.$$

We apply (57) and (5) to (56) and obtain

$$(58) \quad e_i(r\lambda_i) = \vartheta_{\iota_i}(b) - \vartheta_{\iota_i}(a) - qe_i(k_i\lambda_i) - (\alpha - \beta)(k_{i-1}\gamma_{i-1}^{(i)} - e_i\lambda_{i-1}).$$

By hypothesis, $\vartheta_{\iota_i}(b) - \vartheta_{\iota_i}(a) \in e_i\mathbb{Z} + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \mathbb{Z}\gamma_j^{(i)}$. Statement C3) (see Section 2) and statement (B) of Lemma 2 tell us that $qe_i(k_i\lambda_i)$ and $e_i\lambda_{i-1}$ belong to $e_i\mathbb{Z} + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \mathbb{Z}\gamma_j^{(i)}$. From statement (C) of Proposition 4 we know that $k_{i-1}\gamma_{i-1}^{(i)} \in e_i\mathbb{N}_0 + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \mathbb{N}_0\gamma_j^{(i)}$. We conclude from (58) that $e_i(r\lambda_i) \in e_i\mathbb{Z} + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \mathbb{Z}\gamma_j^{(i)}$, which is equivalent, again by statement (B) of Lemma 2, to $r\lambda_i \in M_{i-1}$. Since $r \in \{0, \dots, k_i - 1\}$, statement C3) of Section 2 implies $r = 0$.

We now prove statement (B). Let $\deg_y(g) = n$ and d, p be the unique non negative integers such that $n = de_{i-1} + p$ and $p < e_{i-1}$. Since $e_{i-1} \leq n < e_i$ then $1 \leq d < k_i$. The fact that f_{i-1} is a Weierstrass polynomial with $\deg_y(f_{i-1}) = e_{i-1}$ and coefficients in $\mathbb{C}[x]$ implies that f_{i-1}^d is a Weierstrass polynomial with $\deg_y(f_{i-1}^d) = de_{i-1}$ and coefficients in $\mathbb{C}[x]$. By Proposition 14, there exist uniquely determined q and r of $\mathbb{C}[[x]][y]$ such that $g = qf_{i-1}^d + r$, $\deg_y(r) < de_{i-1}$ and $\deg_y(q) < n - de_{i-1} = p$. If $\deg_y(r) < e_{i-1}$ the result is proven. Otherwise we iterate the procedure dividing r by an adequate power of f_{i-1} . Since the degree of the remainder of the Weierstrass Division strictly decreases, the procedure ends after

a finite number of steps. Therefore, there are d and $a_\ell \in \mathbb{C}[[x]][y]$, $\ell \in \{0, \dots, d\}$, uniquely determined such that (55) holds and $\deg_y(a_\ell) < e_{i-1}$. By the induction hypothesis, for $a_\ell \neq 0$, there is $i_\ell \leq i-1$ such that $\vartheta_{i_\ell}(a_\ell) \in \Gamma(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{i_\ell})$. Furthermore,

$$\vartheta_{i_\ell}(a_\ell) \in \frac{e_i}{e_{i_\ell}} \Gamma(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{i_\ell}).$$

By Proposition 1,

$$\vartheta_{i_\ell}(a_\ell) \in \Gamma_{i_\ell}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{i_\ell}).$$

Since $i_\ell \leq i-1$ then $\Gamma_{i_\ell}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{i_\ell})$ is a subsemigroup of $\Gamma_{i-1}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_i)$ and we conclude that $\vartheta_{i_\ell}(a_\ell) \in \Gamma_{i-1}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_i)$.

Set

$$(59) \quad \rho = \min\{\vartheta_{i_\ell}(a_\ell f_{i-1}^\ell) : a_\ell \neq 0 \text{ and } \ell \in \{0, \dots, d\}\}.$$

Statement (A) implies that there is one and only one $\tau \in \{0, \dots, n\}$ such that

$$(60) \quad \vartheta_{i_\ell}(a_\tau f_{i-1}^\tau) = \rho.$$

Therefore $\vartheta_{i_\ell}(g) = \rho$. Since $\vartheta_{i_\ell}(a_\tau)$ belongs to $\Gamma_{i-1}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_i)$, which is a subsemigroup of $\Gamma(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_i)$, then

$$\vartheta_{i_\ell}(g) = \vartheta_{i_\ell}(a_\tau) + \tau \gamma_i^{(i)} \in \Gamma(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_i).$$

For all $j \in \{i, \dots, s\}$ and $\ell \in \{0, \dots, d\}$, the induction hypothesis implies that

$$\vartheta_{i_\ell}(a_\ell f_{i-1}^\ell) = \vartheta_{i_\ell}(a_\ell) + \ell \vartheta_{i_\ell}(f_{i-1}) = \frac{e_j}{e_{i_\ell}} \vartheta_{i_\ell}(a_\ell) + \ell \gamma_i^{(j)}.$$

Applying Proposition 1, we obtain that

$$\gamma_i^{(j)} = \frac{e_j}{e_i} \gamma_i^{(i)}.$$

We once again apply the induction hypothesis to conclude that

$$\frac{e_j}{e_{i_\ell}} \vartheta_{i_\ell}(a_\ell) = \frac{e_j}{e_i} \frac{e_i}{e_{i_\ell}} \vartheta_{i_\ell}(a_\ell) = \frac{e_j}{e_i} \vartheta_{i_\ell}(a_\ell).$$

Thus

$$\vartheta_{i_\ell}(a_\ell f_{i-1}^\ell) = \frac{e_j}{e_i} \vartheta_{i_\ell}(a_\ell) + \frac{e_j}{e_i} \ell \gamma_i^{(i)} = \frac{e_j}{e_i} \vartheta_{i_\ell}(a_\ell f_{i-1}^\ell).$$

We conclude that

$$\vartheta_{i_\ell}(g) = \frac{e_j}{e_i} \rho = \frac{e_j}{e_i} \vartheta_{i_\ell}(g).$$

Before we proceed, it will be useful to compute, for $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ and $j \in \{i, \dots, s\}$, $\vartheta_{i_\ell}(\partial_y f_{i-1}^\ell)$. By statement (B) of Theorem 8,

$$(61) \quad \begin{aligned} \vartheta_{i_\ell}(\partial_y f_{i-1}^\ell) &= \vartheta_{i_\ell}(f_{i-1}^{\ell-1}) + \vartheta_{i_\ell}(\partial_y f_{i-1}) = (\ell-1) \gamma_i^{(j)} + \gamma_i^{(j)} - e_j \lambda_i = \\ &= \vartheta_{i_\ell}(f_{i-1}^\ell) - e_j \lambda_i. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\sigma \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. We now prove the following inequality

$$(62) \quad \vartheta_{i_\ell}(\partial_y^\sigma g) \geq \vartheta_{i_\ell}(g) - \sigma e_j \lambda_i$$

by induction also on σ (we remind the reader that we are assuming that the Lemma holds up to $i-1$). Note that (62) holds trivially for $\ell \geq n+1$.

We start by proving inequality (62) with $\sigma = 1$. For $\ell \in \{0, \dots, d\}$, since $i_\ell \leq i-1$ and C1) holds then $\lambda_{i_\ell} \leq \lambda_{i-1} < \lambda_i$. By the induction hypothesis on i ,

$$(63) \quad \vartheta_{i_\ell}(\partial_y a_0) \geq \vartheta_{i_\ell}(a_0) - e_j \lambda_{i_0} > \frac{e_j}{e_i} \vartheta_{i_\ell}(a_0) - e_j \lambda_i \geq \frac{e_j}{e_i} \rho - e_j \lambda_i.$$

For $\ell \in \{1, \dots, d\}$, from the inequality

$$\begin{aligned} & \vartheta_{\iota_j}(f_{i-1}^\ell \partial_y a_\ell) - \vartheta_{\iota_j}(a_\ell \partial_y f_{i-1}^\ell) \geq \\ & \geq (\vartheta_{\iota_j}(f_{i-1}^\ell) + \vartheta_{\iota_j}(a_\ell) - e_j \lambda_{i_\ell}) - (\vartheta_{\iota_j}(a_\ell) + \vartheta_{\iota_j}(f_{i-1}^\ell) - e_j \lambda_i) = \\ & = e_j(\lambda_i - \lambda_{i_\ell}) > 0 \end{aligned}$$

we obtain that

$$(64) \quad \vartheta_{\iota_j}(\partial_y(a_\ell f_{i-1}^\ell)) = \vartheta_{\iota_j}(a_\ell \partial_y f_{i-1}^\ell) = \frac{e_j}{e_i} \vartheta_{\iota_i}(a_\ell f_{i-1}^\ell) - e_j \lambda_i \geq \frac{e_j}{e_i} \rho - e_j \lambda_i.$$

We conclude from inequalities (63) and (64) that

$$\vartheta_{\iota_j}(\partial_y g) \geq \frac{e_j}{e_i} \rho - e_j \lambda_i = \vartheta_{\iota_j}(g) - e_j \lambda_i.$$

Assume that $\sigma \in \{2, \dots, n - e_{i-1} + 1\}$. Then $\deg_y(\partial^{\ell-1} g) \geq e_{i-1}$. By the induction hypothesis on σ ,

$$\vartheta_{\iota_j}(\partial_y(\partial_y^{\sigma-1} g)) \geq \vartheta_{\iota_j}(\partial_y^{\sigma-1} g) - e_j \lambda_i \geq \vartheta_{\iota_j}(g) - \sigma e_j \lambda_i.$$

Assume now that $\sigma \in \{n - e_{i-1} + 2, \dots, n\}$. Set $\varsigma = n - e_{i-1} + 1$. Then $\deg_y(\partial^\varsigma g) < e_{i-1}$. By the induction hypothesis on i ,

$$\vartheta_{\iota_j}(\partial_y^{\sigma-\varsigma}(\partial_y^\varsigma g)) \geq \vartheta_{\iota_j}(\partial_y^\varsigma g) - (\sigma - \varsigma)e_j \lambda_{i-1} > \vartheta_{\iota_j}(\partial_y^\varsigma g) - (\sigma - \varsigma)e_j \lambda_i.$$

On the other hand, by the induction hypothesis on σ ,

$$\vartheta_{\iota_j}(\partial_y^\varsigma g) \geq \vartheta_{\iota_j}(g) - \varsigma e_j \lambda_i.$$

Thus

$$\vartheta_{\iota_j}(\partial_y^{\sigma-\varsigma}(\partial_y^\varsigma g)) \geq \vartheta_{\iota_j}(g) - \sigma e_j \lambda_i$$

□

We would like to call the attention of the reader to the following facts:

- R1) In statement (B) of Lemma 15, if we consider $g \in \mathbb{C}[x][y]$ then the a_ℓ 's in (55) are elements of $\mathbb{C}[x, y]$. In the proof of this statement, since f_{i-1} is also an element of $\mathbb{C}[x][y]$, Proposition 14 assures us that $q \in \mathbb{C}[x][y]$ and as a consequence $r \in \mathbb{C}[x][y]$.
- R2) Once we have determined f_1, \dots, f_{i-1} the decomposition (55) allows us, by induction, to write g uniquely as a linear combination of the type

$$\sum_{\ell=1}^{\tilde{d}} c_\ell x^{\alpha_\ell} y^{\beta_{0,\ell}}(x, y) f_1^{\beta_{1,\ell}}(x, y) \cdots f_{i-1}^{\beta_{i-1,\ell}}(x, y),$$

where $\tilde{d} \in \mathbb{N}$, $c_\ell \in \mathbb{C}^*$ and $(\alpha_\ell, \beta_{0,\ell}, \dots, \beta_{i-1,\ell}) \in \mathbb{N}_0^{i+1} \setminus \{(0, \dots, 0)\}$, for all $\ell \in \{1, \dots, \tilde{d}\}$.

Proof of statement (B) of the Main Theorem. Lemma 13 proves statement (B) of Theorem 8 for $i = 1$. Let $i \in \{2, \dots, s-1\}$. Assume that statement (A) of Theorem 8 holds up to i and statement (B) of Theorem 8 holds up to $i-1$. Then Lemma 15 holds up to $i-1$. Some computations made in the proof of Lemmas 12 and 15 are also useful for this proof, so we will make some references to them.

Let δ_i be as in statement (A) of Theorem 8 and $n = \deg_y(\delta_i)$. A similar reasoning to the one used to prove equality (48) allows us to conclude that

$$\vartheta_{\iota_i}(\delta_i) = k_i \gamma_i^{(i)} = \vartheta_{\iota_i}(f_{i-1}^{k_i}).$$

Since $\text{Supp}(\delta_i) \subset N_i \setminus \{(0, e_i)\}$ then $n < e_i$ and we can write

$$\delta_i(x, y) = \sum_{\ell=0}^d a_\ell(x, y) f_{i-1}^\ell(x, y)$$

as in statement (B) of Lemma 15. Note that if $n < e_{i-1}$ then $d = 0$. Let ρ be as in (59). Given that $\tau \in \{0, \dots, d\}$ and $d < k_i$, statement (A) of Lemma 15 implies that there is one and only one τ such that (60) holds. Furthermore, $\vartheta_{\iota_i}(\delta_i) = \rho$ which implies

$$\vartheta_{\iota_i}(a_\tau f_{i-1}^\tau) = \vartheta_{\iota_i}(f^{k_i}).$$

Hence, once again by statement (A) of Lemma 15, we conclude that $\tau = 0$. Let $j \in \{i+1, \dots, s\}$ and set

$$\epsilon_{i,j} = c_i t^{e_j \lambda_{i+1}} + \varphi_{i+1}(t^{e_j/k}) + \dots + c_j t^{e_j \lambda_j} + \varphi_j(t^{e_j/k}).$$

Therefore

$$\iota_j^* x = (\iota_i \circ \chi_{\frac{e_j}{e_i}})^* x \text{ and } \iota_j^* y = (\iota_i \circ \chi_{\frac{e_j}{e_i}})^* y + \epsilon_{i,j}.$$

By Taylor's formula,

$$(65) \quad \begin{aligned} \iota_j^* f_i &= (\iota_i \circ \chi_{\frac{e_j}{e_i}})^* f_i(x, y) + \epsilon_{i,j} (\iota_i \circ \chi_{\frac{e_j}{e_i}})^* \partial_y f_{i-1}^{k_i} + \\ &+ \sum_{\ell=2}^{e_i} \frac{1}{\ell!} \epsilon_{i,j}^\ell (\iota_i \circ \chi_{\frac{e_j}{e_i}})^* \partial_y^\ell f_{i-1}^{k_i} + \sum_{\ell=1}^n \frac{1}{\ell!} \epsilon_{i,j}^\ell (\iota_i \circ \chi_{\frac{e_j}{e_i}})^* \partial_y^\ell \delta_i(x, y). \end{aligned}$$

By construction $\iota_i^* f_i = 0$ which implies $(\iota_i \circ \chi_{\frac{e_j}{e_i}})^* f_i = 0$. Let us prove that

$$(66) \quad \text{ord}(\iota_j^* f_i) = \text{ord} \left(\epsilon_{i,j} (\iota_i \circ \chi_{\frac{e_j}{e_i}})^* \partial_y f_{i-1}^{k_i} \right).$$

To do so, it suffices to prove that, for all $\ell \in \{1, \dots, n\}$,

$$(67) \quad \text{ord} \left(\epsilon_{i,j}^\ell (\iota_i \circ \chi_{\frac{e_j}{e_i}})^* \partial_y^\ell \delta_i \right) > \text{ord} \left(\epsilon_{i,j} (\iota_i \circ \chi_{\frac{e_j}{e_i}})^* \partial_y f_{i-1}^{k_i} \right)$$

and that, for all $\ell \in \{2, \dots, e_i\}$,

$$(68) \quad \text{ord} \left(\epsilon_{i,j}^\ell (\iota_i \circ \chi_{\frac{e_j}{e_i}})^* \partial_y^\ell f_{i-1}^{k_i} \right) > \text{ord} \left(\epsilon_{i,j} (\iota_i \circ \chi_{\frac{e_j}{e_i}})^* \partial_y f_{i-1}^{k_i} \right)$$

We start by proving (67). Set $\bar{\delta}_i = \delta_i(x, y) - a_0(x, y)$. Then either $\bar{\delta}_i$ is null or verifies the conditions of statement (B) of Lemma 15. Furthermore $\deg_y(a_0) < e_{i-1}$. Let $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ and i_0 be the smallest non negative integer such that $\deg_y(a_0) < e_{i_0}$. Then $i_0 \leq i-1$ and, once again by statement (B) of Lemma 15, $\vartheta_{\iota_\sigma}(\partial_y^\ell a_0) \geq \vartheta_{\iota_\sigma}(a_0) - \ell e_\sigma \lambda_{i_0}$ for all $\sigma \in \{i, \dots, s\}$. Since $\lambda_{i_0} \leq \lambda_{i-1}$ and $\tau = 0$ then $\vartheta_{\iota_i}(a_0) - \ell e_i \lambda_{i_0} \geq k_i \gamma_i^{(i)} - \ell e_i \lambda_{i-1}$. Thus

$$(69) \quad \vartheta_{\iota_i}(\partial_y^\ell a_0) \geq k_i \gamma_i^{(i)} - \ell e_i \lambda_{i-1},$$

From (69) and (61), we conclude that

$$(70) \quad \begin{aligned} \text{ord} \left(\epsilon_{i,j}^\ell (\iota_i \circ \chi_{\frac{e_j}{e_i}})^* \partial_y^\ell a_0 \right) - \text{ord} \left(\epsilon_{i,j} (\iota_i \circ \chi_{\frac{e_j}{e_i}})^* \partial_y f_{i-1}^{k_i} \right) &\geq \\ &\geq \left(\ell e_j \lambda_{i+1} + \frac{e_j}{e_i} (k_i \gamma_i^{(i)} - \ell e_i \lambda_{i-1}) \right) - \left(e_j \lambda_{i+1} + \frac{e_j}{e_i} (k_i \gamma_i^{(i)} - e_i \lambda_i) \right) = \\ &= e_j ((\ell - 1)(\lambda_{i+1} - \lambda_{i-1}) + \lambda_i - \lambda_{i-1}) > 0. \end{aligned}$$

If $\bar{\delta}_i$ is non null then, for all $\sigma \in \{i, \dots, s\}$,

$$(71) \quad \vartheta_{\iota_\sigma}(\partial_y^\ell \bar{\delta}_i) \geq \vartheta_{\iota_\sigma}(\bar{\delta}_i) - \ell e_\sigma \lambda_i.$$

Furthermore, since $\tau = 0$, $\vartheta_{\iota_i}(\bar{\delta}_i) > \vartheta_{\iota_i}(a_0)$. Therefore

$$(72) \quad \vartheta_{\iota_i}(\partial_y^\ell \bar{\delta}_i) > k_i \gamma_i^{(i)} - \ell e_i \lambda_i.$$

Hence

$$(73) \quad \begin{aligned} & \text{ord} \left(\epsilon_{i,j}^\ell (\iota_i \circ \chi_{\frac{e_j}{e_i}})^* \partial_y^\ell \bar{\delta}_i \right) - \text{ord} \left(\epsilon_{i,j} (\iota_i \circ \chi_{\frac{e_j}{e_i}})^* \partial_y f_{i-1}^{k_i} \right) > \\ & > \left(\ell e_j \lambda_{i+1} + \frac{e_j}{e_i} (k_i \gamma_i^{(i)} - \ell e_i \lambda_i) \right) - \left(e_j \lambda_{i+1} + \frac{e_j}{e_i} (k_i \gamma_i^{(i)} - e_i \lambda_i) \right) = \\ & = e_j (\ell - 1) (\lambda_{i+1} - \lambda_i) \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Inequalities (70) and (73) imply that (67) holds.

Let $\ell \geq 2$. To prove (68), note that $\deg_y(\partial_y^\ell f_{i-1}^{k_i}) < e_i$ and that $\partial_y^\ell f_{i-1}^{k_i}$ verifies the conditions of statement (B) of Lemma 15. Using similar arguments to the ones used in the proof of inequality (72), we prove that

$$\vartheta_{\iota_i}(\partial_y^\ell f_{i-1}^{k_i}) \geq k_i \gamma_i^{(i)} - \ell e_i \lambda_i.$$

and consequently

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{ord} \left(\epsilon_{i,j}^\ell (\iota_i \circ \chi_{\frac{e_j}{e_i}})^* \partial_y^\ell f_{i-1}^{k_i} \right) - \text{ord} \left(\epsilon_{i,j} (\iota_i \circ \chi_{\frac{e_j}{e_i}})^* \partial_y f_{i-1}^{k_i} \right) \geq \\ & \geq e_j (\ell - 1) (\lambda_{i+1} - \lambda_i) > 0. \end{aligned}$$

Equality (66) allow us to conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \vartheta_{\iota_j}(f_i) &= \text{ord}(\iota_j^* f_i) = \text{ord} \left(\epsilon_{i,j} (\iota_i \circ \chi_{\frac{e_j}{e_i}})^* \partial_y f_{i-1}^{k_i} \right) = \\ & = e_j \lambda_{i+1} + \frac{e_j}{e_i} k_i \gamma_i^{(i)} - e_j \lambda_i = \frac{e_j}{e_i} (e_i \lambda_{i+1} + k_i \gamma_i^{(i)} - e_i \lambda_i) = \frac{e_j}{e_i} \gamma_{i+1}^{(i)}. \end{aligned}$$

By Proposition 1, $\frac{e_j}{e_i} \gamma_{i+1}^{(i)} = \gamma_{i+1}^{(j)}$. Hence $\vartheta_{\iota_j}(f_i) = \gamma_{i+1}^{(j)}$.

We now prove that $\vartheta_{\iota_j}(\partial_y f_i) = \gamma_{i+1}^{(j)} - e_j \lambda_{j+1}$. Let $\ell \in \{1, \dots, d\}$. If $\bar{\delta}_i$ is non null then, taking into account (71) and statement (B) of Lemma 15,

$$(74) \quad \vartheta_{\iota_j}(\partial_y^\ell \bar{\delta}_i) > \frac{e_j}{e_i} k_i \gamma_i^{(i)} - e_j \lambda_i.$$

Combining inequality (74) with (64) one obtains that

$$(75) \quad \vartheta_{\iota_j}(\partial_y^\ell \bar{\delta}_i) - \vartheta_{\iota_j}(\partial_y f_{i-1}^{k_i}) > 0.$$

From (69) we conclude that

$$(76) \quad \begin{aligned} \vartheta_{\iota_j}(\partial_y a_0) - \vartheta_{\iota_j}(\partial_y f_{i-1}^{k_i}) &\geq \frac{e_j}{e_i} k_i \gamma_i^{(i)} - e_j \lambda_{i-1} - \left(\frac{e_j}{e_i} k_i \gamma_i^{(i)} - e_j \lambda_i \right) = \\ & = e_j (\lambda_i - \lambda_{i-1}) > 0. \end{aligned}$$

Inequalities (75) and (76) imply that $\vartheta_{\iota_j}(\partial_y f_i) = \vartheta_{\iota_j}(\partial_y f_{i-1}^{k_i})$. Therefore

$$\vartheta_{\iota_j}(\partial_y f_i) = \frac{e_j}{e_i} k_i \gamma_i^{(i)} - e_j \lambda_i = k_i \gamma_i^{(j)} - e_j \lambda_i.$$

But, by (5), $k_i \gamma_i^{(j)} - e_j \lambda_i = \gamma_{i+1}^{(j)} - e_j \lambda_{j+1}$ and the result is proved. \square

5. COMPUTATIONAL APPLICATION

In this Section we present an algorithm, Algorithm 1, based on the proof of Theorem 8, to compute f_i . We also present two examples where we compare computing times between an implementation of this algorithm and elimination theory using Gröbner basis.

As input for this algorithm we need the polynomials f_0, \dots, f_{i-1} , the list CE_{i-1} of the characteristic exponents $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{i-1}$, the list SG_{i-1} of the generators of the semigroup associated to characteristic exponents CE_{i-1} , the parametrization ι_{i-1} given by x_{i-1} and y_{i-1} , the characteristic exponent λ_i , the positive integer k_i and the polynomial φ_i . We now explain the algorithm

Lines 1 to 6: We update the lists CE_{i-1} and SG_{i-1} . We compute ι_i and store it in x_i and y_i .

Lines 7 to 11: The list LS_i stores the degree of the polynomials $\iota_i^* x, \iota_i^* f_0, \dots, \iota_i^* f_{i-1}$. These degrees will play an important role in the elimination procedure. The lists VE and VC contain variables needed for future computations.

Lines 12 to 14: We initiate step 2 of the proof of Theorem 8. For control, j stores the number of iterations made so far and n the valuation we are currently applying to the elimination procedure. For information on how the algorithm is running, we decided to display the current valuation being eliminated.

Lines 15 to 16: We start a loop that will only end when we obtain g such that $\vartheta_{\iota_i}(g) = +\infty$. For line 15 we assume that we have access to a procedure, denoted by **intregion**, that computes all $(i + 1)$ -uples with entries positive integers, on a compact region of a hyperplane and we store those uples on the list E . The equality

$$VE \cdot SG_i == n$$

defines the hyperplane accordingly to the current valuation we are eliminating. The support of g must be contained in the set N_i . This fact is assured by the inequality

$$VE \cdot LS_i \leq SG_i(1) * \mathbf{Deg}(y_i(t))$$

which comes from characterization (18) of N_i . Hence this elimination algorithm is finite. The main computational complexity of this algorithm arises from the integer linear programming problem of obtaining the list E .

Lines 17 to 24: In this loop we compute the decomposition stated in remark R2) from the elements of the list E . We also update the list VC with the coefficients of the decomposition introduced in each cycle of the loop. In the first iteration of the **While** loop, $(0, \dots, k_i)$ is an element of E that we must not use.

Lines 25 to 30: We solve the linear homogeneous equation, with variables the elements of VC , obtained by requiring that the coefficient of t^n in $\iota_i^* g$ is zero. For computational reason we are assuming that solution of this linear homogeneous equation is given in rule form so we apply it to g .

For the following two examples, we implemented Algorithm 1 in *Mathematica* and compared the computational times with a elimination using Gröbner basis, with a global order, in *Singular*.

Example 16. *Let ζ be as in Example 6. Assume that f_1 is known. In the Mathematica implementation, it took roughly 3 seconds to compute f_2 . In Singular, after one hour, it still hadn't computed f_2 so the authors decided to terminate the computation. The authors decided to repeat the Singular session, now giving values to the coefficients of ζ , and obtained f_2 in roughly one second.*

Algorithm 1: Elimination Procedure

```

input :  $k_i, \lambda_i, \varphi_i, x_{i-1}, y_{i-1}, SG_{i-1}, CE_{i-1}, f_0, \dots, f_{i-1}$ 
output:  $f_i$ 

1 List  $CE_i = CE_{i-1} \cup \{\lambda_i\}$ ;
2 List  $SG_i = k_i \cdot SG_{i-1}$ ;
3 Int  $\gamma_i = k_i * SG_{i-1}(i) - SG_i(1) * CE_{i-1}(i-1) + SG_i(1) * \lambda_i$ ;
4 List  $SG_i = SG_{i-1} \cup \{\gamma_i\}$ ;
5 Poly  $x_i(t) = x_{i-1}(t^{k_i})$ ;
6 Poly  $y_i(t) = y_{i-1}(t^{k_i}) + c_i t^{SG_i(1)*\lambda_i} + \varphi_i(t)$ ;
7 List  $LS_i = \{SG_i(1), \text{Deg}(y_i(t))\}$ ;
8 for  $\ell = 1$  to  $i-1$  do
9 | List  $LS_i = LS_i \cup \{\text{Deg}(f_\ell(x_i(t), y_i(t)))\}$ 
10 end
11 List  $VE = \{\alpha, \beta_0, \dots, \beta_{i-1}\}$ ; List  $VC = \{\}$ ;
12 Poly  $g(x, y) = f_{i-1}^{k_i}(x, y)$ ;
13 Int  $j = 1$ ; Int  $n = \text{Ord}(g(x_i(t), y_i(t)))$ ;
14 Display( $n$ );
15 while  $n \neq +\infty$  do
16 | List  $E = \text{IntRegion}(VE \cdot SG_i == n \wedge VE \cdot LS_i \leq$ 
17 |    $SG_i(1) * \text{Deg}(y_i(t)) \wedge VE \geq \{0, \dots, 0\})$ ;
18 | for  $\ell = 1$  to  $\text{Length}(E)$  do
19 | | if  $j \neq 1$  then
20 | | | Poly  $g(x, y) = g(x, y) + e_{j,\ell} x^{E(\ell)(1)} \prod_{m=2}^{i+1} f_{m-2}^{E(\ell)(m)}$ 
21 | | else
22 | | | if  $E(\ell) \neq \{0, \dots, 0, k_i\}$  then
23 | | | | Poly  $g(x, y) = g(x, y) + e_{j,\ell} x^{E(\ell)(1)} \prod_{m=2}^{i+1} f_{m-2}^{E(\ell)(m)}$ 
24 | | | end
25 | | end
26 | | List  $VC = VC \cup \{e_{j,\ell}\}$ ;
27 | end
28 | Rule  $S = \text{LinSolve}(\text{Coef}(g(x_i(t), y_i(t)), n) == 0, VC)$ ;
29 | Poly  $g(x, y) = \text{ApplyRule}(S, g(x, y))$ ;
30 | Int  $n = \text{Ord}(g(x_i(t), y_i(t)))$ ;
31 | Int  $j = j + 1$ ;
32 | Display( $n$ );
33 end
Poly  $f_i(x, y) = g(x, y)$ ;

```

Example 17. Let $c_\ell \in \mathbb{C}^*$, $i = 1, 2, 3$ and $\zeta = c_1 x^{\frac{6}{5}} + c_2 x^{\frac{3}{2}} + c_3 x^{\frac{5}{3}}$. This branch has three characteristic exponents. Assume that f_1 and f_2 are known. In the Mathematica implementation, it took roughly 6 minutes and 33 seconds to compute f_3 . In Singular, after one hour, it still hadn't computed f_3 (even after assigning values to the coefficients) so the authors decided to terminate the computation.

REFERENCES

- [1] Brieskorn, E., Knörrer, H.: Plane Algebraic Curves. Birkhäuser Verlag, Switzerland (1986).
- [2] Cabral, J., Neto, O.: Microlocal versal deformations of the plane curves $y^k = x^n$. C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris, Ser. I 347, 1409–1414 (2009).
- [3] Decker, W., Greuel, G. -M., Pfister, G., Schönemann, H.: Singular 4-2-1 — A computer algebra system for polynomial computations. <http://www.singular.uni-kl.de> (2022)
- [4] D’Andrea, C., Sombra, M.: The Newton Polygon of a Rational Plane Curve. Math.Comput.Sci. 4,3–24 (2010).
- [5] González Pérez, P.: The semigroup of a quasi-ordinary hypersurface. J. Inst. Math. Jussieu 2(3), 383–399 (2003).
- [6] Greuel, G. -M., Lossen, C., Shustin, E.: Introduction to Singularities and Deformations. Springer, Heidelberg (2007).
- [7] Greuel, G. -M., Pfister, G.: A Singular Introduction to Commutative Algebra. Springer, Heidelberg (2008).
- [8] Jong, T., Pfister, G.: Local Analytic Geometry. Vieweg, Braunschweig/Wiesbaden (2000).
- [9] Lipman, J.: Quasi-ordinary singularities of embedded surfaces. Thesis (Ph. D.)-Harvard University, Massachusetts (1965).
- [10] Maclagan, D., Sturmfels, B.: Introduction to tropical geometry. Graduate Studies in Mathematics 161, American Mathematical Society, Rhode Island (2015)
- [11] Sturmfels, B., Tevelev, J., Yu, J.: The Newton polytope of the implicit equation. Moscow Math. J. 7, 327–346 (2007).
- [12] Wall, C.T.C.: Singular points of plane curves. London. Math. Soc., Students Texts 63, Cambridge University Press, New York (2004).
- [13] Wolfram Research, Inc.: Mathematica, Version 13.2. <https://www.wolfram.com/mathematica>, Champaign, IL (2022).
- [14] Zariski, O.: The Moduli Problem for Plane Branches. University Lecture Series 39, American Mathematical Society, Rhode Island (2006).