

THE SAITO VECTOR FIELD OF A GERM OF COMPLEX PLANE CURVE.

YOHANN GENZMER

ABSTRACT. In this article, we prove that an algorithm introduced by the author in a previous work and giving the generic dimension of the moduli space of a germ of curve in the complex plane that is the union of smooth curves, can be used identically to find this dimension for any kind of germ of plane curve.

1. INTRODUCTION.

Saito vector field. Let C be a germ of curve in the complex plane $(\mathbb{C}^2, 0)$. The curve is given by the 0-level of an holomorphic reduced function $f : (\mathbb{C}^2, 0) \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}, 0)$. The Saito module is by definition, the module $\text{Der}(\log C)$ of germ of vector fields X tangent to C , i.e.,

$$X \cdot f \in (f),$$

where $X \cdot f$ is the result of the application of X to f seen as the derivation. Naturally, this module contains a lot of informations on the curve. Of particular interest are the valuations of its elements and the so called Saito number of C , that is,

$$\mathfrak{s}_C = \min_{X \in \text{Der}(\log C)} \nu(X).$$

This number is clearly an analytical invariant of C . Nevertheless, it is not a topological invariant of the curve : for instance, if C is the union of 5 straight lines then the radial vector field is tangent and thus, $\mathfrak{s}_C = 1$. But for a generic perturbation of C that leaves invariant its topological type, it can be seen that $\mathfrak{s}_C = 2$. In [7], we proved the following upper bound that holds along the topological class $\text{Top}(C)$ of C

$$(1.1) \quad \max_{c \in \text{Top}(C)} \mathfrak{s}_C = \left\lfloor \frac{\nu(C)}{2} \right\rfloor \text{ or } \frac{\nu(C)}{2} - 1$$

depending on C being *radial* or not. A vector field X tangent to C whose valuation reaches the Saito number is said *optimal*. In the present article, we are interesting in the topology of an optimal vector field for a curve $c \in \text{Top}(C)$ which realizes the upper bound (1.1). Such a generic vector field will be said *Saito* for C . As it is highlighted in [6], some invariants associated to the topology of the Saito vector field of C allows us to produce an algorithm for the computation of the generic dimension of the moduli space of C .

Generic dimension of the moduli space of C . The problem of the determination of the number of moduli of a germ of complex plane curve was addressed by Oscar Zariski in his famous notes [24], where he focused on the case of a curve with only one irreducible component. The *number of moduli* refers to the number of analytical invariants that remain once the topological class of S is given. The topological classification of an irreducible curve S is well known and relies on a semi-group of integers extensively studied by Zariski himself in the 70s. However, at this time, even in the case of an irreducible curve, the analytical classification was a widely opened question. Since then, a lot of progress has been made, and, up to our knowledge, the initial problem has been considerably investigated in the combination of the works of A. Hefez, M. Hernandez and M. E. Hernandez [10, 11, 12, 13].


In [6], the author constructed an algorithm to compute the generic dimension of the moduli space of a germ of complex curve C and proved that this algorithm yields the desired dimension under the assumption that C is an union of smooth curves. In [5], it was established that the same algorithm still works if C is irreducible. The goal of this article is to prove that this algorithm provides the expected dimension in any case.

If C is a germ of curve in the complex plane, we consider $\text{Mod}(C)$ the quotient of the set of curves topologically equivalent to C by the action of the local conjugacies $\text{Diff}(\mathbb{C}^2, 0)$. In [7] following ideas of Ebey [2], we identify $\text{Mod}(C)$ to the quotient of a constructible subset of some finite dimension complex vector space by the action of an algebraic connected group of finite dimension. This identification allows us to consider the generic dimension of this quotient. The mention algorithm intends to compute this dimension from primitive topological invariants of C . The approach is as follows :

- (1) for $c \in \text{Mod}(C)$, c being generic, the dimension of the cohomological space $H^1(D, \Theta)$ where D is the exceptional divisor of the desingularization process of c and Θ the sheaf over D of vector field tangent to D and the strict transform of c , is equal to the generic dimension of $\text{Mod}(C)$.
- (2) for any curve c , the module $\text{Der}(\log c)$ known since K. Saito [20] to be freely generated by two vector fields X_1 and X_2 . One of them reaches the Saito number of c .
- (3) when c is generic, the topology of a generic vector field reaching the Saito number of c can be described and is somehow unique.
- (4) from this description, one can compute the dimension of $H^1(D_0, \Theta)$ where D_0 is the exceptional divisor of the first blowing-up appearing in the process of desingularization of c , initiating a computation of the dimension of the whole $H^1(D, \Theta)$ inductively along the process of blowing-ups.

The main result of this article focuses on the claim (3) among these above and can be expressed as follows :

Theorem. *Let C be a germ of curve in $(\mathbb{C}^2, 0)$ generic in its moduli space. Let X be Saito for C . Let \mathbb{A} be the dual tree of the desingularization process E of C . We number a vertex s of \mathbb{A} by the number of singular points of the strict transform X^E along s . We color a vertex in white if s is invariant by X^E , otherwise we color it in black. Then, the colored numbered tree \mathbb{A} depends only on the topological class of C .*


 FIGURE 2.1. Inductive construction of the partial order \leq on \mathbb{A} .

The article is divided in two sections : the first can be read independently. It focuses on a combinatorial result on trees. However, this result will be a key element to describe the topology of the generic vector field tangent to a generic curve C , that is the main goal of the second section.

2. SAITO DICRITICITY OF AN ORDERED NUMBERED TREE.

Let \mathbb{A} be a tree. We can endow \mathbb{A} with a partial order \leq defined following an inductive description of \mathbb{A} : starting from a single vertex r , if (\mathbb{A}, \leq) is defined, one can add a vertex to \mathbb{A} following one of the two next rules

- (1) a vertex s and an edge from s to a single vertex c are added to \mathbb{A} . The order \leq is extended to $\mathbb{A} \cup \{s\}$ setting $s \geq c$.
- (2) a vertex s is added to \mathbb{A} deleting an edge from c to c' and adding two edges from s to c and from s to c' . The order is extended setting $s \geq c$ and $s \geq c'$.

The vertex r is the minimal element of (\mathbb{A}, \leq) and is called the *root* of \mathbb{A} . In the sequel, in general, we will make no distinction between \mathbb{A} and the set of vertices of \mathbb{A} .

We will denote by $n = (n_c)_{c \in \mathbb{A}}$ a numbering of the vertices of \mathbb{A} by non negative integers. We will also consider an element $\Delta = (\Delta_c)_{c \in \mathbb{A}}$ in $\{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{A}}$. The latter is called a *dicriticality* for \mathbb{A} . It induces a coloring of the tree \mathbb{A} : if $\Delta_c = 1$ the vertex c is colored in white, if not, it is colored in black.

Finally, the notation $\begin{bmatrix} a \\ b \\ c \end{bmatrix}$ stands for the the following :

$$\begin{bmatrix} a \\ b \\ c \end{bmatrix} = \begin{cases} a & \text{if } c \text{ is even} \\ b & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

Definition 1. In what follows, c stands for a vertex of \mathbb{A} .

- (1) We denote by \mathbf{p}_c the set of parents of c that is the set of predecessors of c for the partial order \leq . Notice that $\mathbf{p}_r = \emptyset$; in any other cases, \mathbf{p}_c contains one or two elements.
- (1) Following [22], fixing a numbering $\{1, \dots, N\}$ of the vertices such that $i \in \mathbf{p}_j \implies i \leq j$, we consider the proximity matrix \mathbb{P} of (\mathbb{A}, \leq) defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_{i,i} &= 1 \\ \mathbb{P}_{i,j} &= -1 \text{ if } i \in \mathbf{p}_j \text{ .} \\ \mathbb{P}_{i,j} &= 0 \text{ else.} \end{aligned}$$

It is an upper triangular invertible matrix.

- (2) If n is numbering of \mathbb{A} , then $c \cdot n$ is the numbering defined by

$$(c \cdot n)_c = n_c + 1$$

and $(c \cdot n)_{c'} = n_{c'}$ if $c' \neq c$.

- (3) In what follows, \mathbf{v}_c denotes *the set of neighbours of c* in \mathbb{A} , that is the set of vertices of \mathbb{A} connected to c .
- (4) We called *the multiplicity of c* in \mathbb{A} the positive integer, denoted by ρ_c obtained inductively as follows : $\rho_r = 1$, and if $c \neq r$ then

$$\rho_c = \sum_{c' \in \mathbf{p}_c} \rho_{c'}.$$

- (5) We denote by δ_c the number of parents c' of c such that $\Delta_{c'} = 1$. In particular, this number depends not only on \mathbb{A} but also on a dicriticality Δ .
- (6) We called *the valuation of c* the number denoted by ν_c^n and defined by the matrix relation

$$(\nu_c^n)_{c \in \mathbb{A}} = \mathbb{P}^{-1} (n_c)_{c \in \mathbb{A}}.$$

In particular, from [22], it follows that

$$\nu_r^n = \sum_{c \in \mathbb{A}} \rho_c n_c$$

- (7) The *square index* of c is defined by

$$\square_c = \frac{\delta_c}{2} - \left\lfloor \frac{\Delta_c}{\nu_c^n - \delta_c} \right\rfloor.$$

- (8) If c and c' belong to \mathbb{A} , we defined *the acces tree* from c to c' the minimal subgraph of \mathbb{A} that from c , leads to c' respecting the order \leq . It is denoted by

$${}_c \mathbb{A}_{c'}.$$

If $c = r$ is the root of \mathbb{A} , then it is simply denoted by

$$\mathbb{A}_{c'}.$$

If $\rho_{c'} = 1$ then the access tree $\mathbb{A}_{c'}$ is a totally ordered linear chain of vertices whose multiplicities are equal to 1 as in Figure 2.2. The proximity matrix of this sub-graph is written

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & -1 & & & \\ & 1 & -1 & & \\ & & \ddots & -1 & \\ & & & & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$




FIGURE 2.2. Acces tree from r to c' with $\rho_{c'} = 1$.




FIGURE 2.3. An ordered tree, its numbering and its dicriticality.

- (9) We denote by $\epsilon = (\epsilon_c)_{c \in \mathbb{A}}$ the family of integers defined by the following matrix relation

$$(\epsilon_c)_{c \in \mathbb{A}} = \mathbb{P} \left(\frac{1}{2} (\nu_c^n)_{c \in \mathbb{A}} - (\square_c)_{c \in \mathbb{A}} \right) = \left(\frac{n_c}{2} \right)_{c \in \mathbb{A}} - \mathbb{P} ((\square_c)_{c \in \mathbb{A}}).$$

This uple of integers is called *the configuration associated to the dicriticality* Δ .

Example 2. Let us consider the tree represented in Figure (2.3).

In this example, the proximity matrix is written

$$\mathbb{P} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -1 & -1 & -1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

The numbering is $n = (0, 2, 1, 2)$ and is represented in Figure (2.3) by dots attached to the vertices. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{p}_1 &= \emptyset, \quad \mathfrak{p}_2 = \{1\}, \quad \mathfrak{p}_3 = \{1\}, \quad \mathfrak{p}_4 = \{1, 3\} \\ \mathfrak{v}_1 &= \{2, 4\}, \quad \mathfrak{v}_2 = \{1\}, \quad \mathfrak{v}_4 = \{1, 3\}, \quad \mathfrak{v}_3 = \{4\}. \end{aligned}$$

The partial order induced on \mathbb{A} by the rules of construction is

$$1 \leq 2, \quad 1 \leq 3 \leq 4.$$

The multiplicities are

$$\rho_1 = 1, \quad \rho_2 = 1, \quad \rho_3 = 1, \quad \rho_4 = 2.$$

Given the numbering n , the valuations are

$$\begin{pmatrix} \nu_1 \\ \nu_2 \\ \nu_3 \\ \nu_4 \end{pmatrix} = \mathbb{P}^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 2 \\ 1 \\ 2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 2 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 2 \\ 1 \\ 2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 7 \\ 2 \\ 3 \\ 2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Now, assuming the dicriticality is $\Delta = (1, 0, 1, 0)$ as in the figure, we obtain

$$\delta_1 = 0, \quad \delta_2 = 1, \quad \delta_3 = 1, \quad \delta_4 = 2$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\square_1 &= \frac{0}{2} - \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ \frac{1}{2} \\ 7-0 \end{bmatrix} = -\frac{1}{2}, \quad \square_2 = \frac{1}{2} - \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ \frac{1}{2} \\ 2-1 \end{bmatrix} = 0 \\ \square_3 &= \frac{1}{2} - \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ \frac{1}{2} \\ 3-1 \end{bmatrix} = -\frac{1}{2}, \quad \square_4 = \frac{2}{2} - \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ \frac{1}{2} \\ 2-2 \end{bmatrix} = 1.\end{aligned}$$

Finally, the configuration ϵ is computed as follows

$$\begin{pmatrix} \epsilon_1 \\ \epsilon_2 \\ \epsilon_3 \\ \epsilon_4 \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 2 \\ 1 \\ 2 \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -1 & -1 & -1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{1}{2} \\ 0 \\ -\frac{1}{2} \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ 2 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

As it can be seen in the previous example, from any dicriticality Δ , one can compute a configuration ϵ following Definition 1.9. However, adding some constraints yields a unicity type result.

Theorem 3. *Consider a numbering n of \mathbb{A} .*

- (1) *There exists a unique dicriticality, denoted by $\Delta^n = (\Delta_c^n)_{c \in \mathbb{A}}$ such that the associated configuration ϵ^n satisfies the following relations*
 - (a) *if $\Delta_c^n = 0$, then $\epsilon_c^n \geq 2 - \sum_{c' \in \mathbf{v}_c} \Delta_{c'}^n$*
 - (b) *if $\Delta_c^n = 1$, then $\epsilon_c^n \geq n_c$.*

Such a dicriticality is said admissible and is called the Saito dicriticality of \mathbb{A} numbered by n . The exponent n appearing on any data in the sequel will mean that these data are associated to the Saito dicriticality for a given numbering n .

- (2) *We define by ${}^n_{\mathbb{A}}\Theta_c^{01}$ the following invariant*

$${}^n_{\mathbb{A}}\Theta_c^{01} = \sum_{s \in \mathbb{A}_c} \square_s^n + \square_s^{c \cdot n}.$$

If $\rho_c = 1$ then we obtain

$$(2.1) \quad {}^n_{\mathbb{A}}\Theta_c^{01} = -\Delta_{c_1}^n - \frac{|\mathbb{A}_{c_1}|}{2}$$

where $|\star|$ denotes the number of vertices in the subtree \star .

- (3) *Let $c_0, c_1 \in \mathbb{A}$. We define by ${}^n_{\mathbb{A}}\Theta_{c_0, c_1}^{02}$ and ${}^n_{\mathbb{A}}\Theta_{c_0, c_1}^{11}$ the following invariants*

$${}^n_{\mathbb{A}}\Theta_{c_0, c_1}^{02} = \sum_{s \in \mathbb{A}_{c_1}} \square_s^n + \square_s^{c_1 \cdot c_0 \cdot n}$$

$${}^n_{\mathbb{A}}\Theta_{c_0, c_1}^{11} = \sum_{s \in \mathbb{A}_{c_1}} \square_s^{c_0 \cdot n} + \square_s^{c_1 \cdot n}.$$

If c_0 and c_1 satisfy both $\rho_{c_0} = \rho_{c_1} = 1$ then we have

$$(2.2) \quad {}^n_{\mathbb{A}}\Theta_{c_0, c_1}^{02} = \pm \frac{1}{2} - \Delta_{c_1}^n - \frac{|\mathbb{A}_{c_1}|}{2}$$

$$(2.3) \quad {}^n_{\mathbb{A}}\Theta_{c_0, c_1}^{11} = \pm \frac{1}{2} - \Delta_{c_1}^n - \frac{|\mathbb{A}_{c_1}|}{2}$$

| | ν_r | $\nu_{m_c^+}$ | | ν_r | $\nu_{m_c^+}$ |
|--|---------|---------------|--|---------|---------------|
| | odd | even | | odd | odd |
| | even | odd | | even | even |
| | even | even | | even | odd |
| | odd | odd | | odd | even |

TABLE 1. The valuations ν_r and $\nu_{m_c^+}$ along a mixed branch.

| $ \mathbb{A}_c > 1$ | ν_r | | $ \mathbb{A}_c = 1$ | ν_r |
|----------------------|------------|--|----------------------|---------|
| | odd | | odd | |
| | even | | even | |
| | impossible | | impossible | |
| | impossible | | | |

TABLE 2. The valuation ν_r along a pure mixed branch.

- (4) Let c be a vertex of \mathbb{A} such that $\rho_c = 1$. We say that the access tree \mathbb{A}_c starts with a mixed branch if there exists a vertex $m_c \in \mathbb{A}_c$ maximal for this property such that for any $s \in \mathbb{A}_{m_c}$, one has


$$\Delta_s^n + \Delta_s^{c \cdot n} = 1.$$

It may happen that $m_c = c$. If not, let us denote by m_c^+ the vertex of \mathbb{A} which succeeds m_c in \mathbb{A}_c . Depending on the type the mixed branch, Table (1) presents some properties of the valuations ν_r and $\nu_{m_c^+}$. In this table, a picture such as represents the two Saito dicriticities along \mathbb{A}_c respectively, above for the numbering c and below for the numbering $c \cdot n$. Besides, if $m_c = c$, Table (2) presents properties on the valuations ν_r depending also on the type of what is called in that case a pure mixed branch.

- (5) Finally, for each connected component \mathbb{K} of the sub-graph $\mathbb{A} \setminus \{c \in \mathbb{A} \mid \Delta_c^n = 0\}$, there exists $c \in \mathbb{K}$ with $\epsilon_c^n > 0$.

Property (1) of Theorem 3 has already been proved in [6] for the particular case of a tree \mathbb{A} for which $\rho_c = 1$ for any $c \in \mathbb{A}$.

Example 4. Let us consider the *cuspidal tree*, that is the tree in Figure 2.4 numbered by $n_1 = n_2 = 0$ and $n_3 = 1$. The order is defined by the relations $1 \leq 2$ and $1 \leq 3$.


 FIGURE 2.4. The *cusp* tree and its Saito dicriticality

| $\Delta = (\Delta_1, \Delta_2, \Delta_3)$ | $\epsilon = (\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, \epsilon_3)$ |
|-------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|
| 0, 0, 0 | $\langle -1 \rangle, 0, 1$ |
| 0, 0, 1 | $\langle -1 \rangle, 0, 1$ |
| 0, 1, 0 | $\langle 0 \rangle, 1, 1$ |
| 0, 1, 1 | $\langle -1 \rangle, 0, 1$ |
| 1, 0, 0 | 2, $\langle 0 \rangle, 0$ |
| 1, 0, 1 | 2, $\langle 0 \rangle, 1$ |
| 1, 1, 0 | 1, 1, 0 |
| 1, 1, 1 | 1, 1, $\langle 0 \rangle$ |

 TABLE 3. Dicriticalities and configurations for the cusp tree numbered by $(0, 0, 1)$.

The proximity matrix is

$$\mathbb{P} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -1 & -1 \\ 0 & 1 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

Figure 2.4 presents also the associated Saito dicriticality represented by the coloring. Table (3) shows the various configurations obtained from the $8 = 2^3$ possible dicriticalities on \mathbb{A} . For each configuration, we highlight by the notation $\langle \cdot \rangle$ a part of the configuration that violates one of the admissibility conditions. At the end, the unique and thus Saito dicriticality that satisfies all the three admissibility conditions is $(1, 1, 0)$ for which

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon_1 = 1 &\geq 0, \quad \Delta_1 = 1 \\ \epsilon_2 = 1 &\geq 0, \quad \Delta_2 = 1 \\ \epsilon_3 = 0 &\geq 2 - \Delta_1 - \Delta_2, \quad \Delta_3 = 0. \end{aligned}$$


Notice that, 1 and 2 are two components of $\mathbb{A} \setminus \{3\}$ for which $\epsilon_1 > 0$ and $\epsilon_2 > 0$, as predicted by the property (5) of Theorem 3.

Example 5. Suppose that \mathbb{A} is a tree reduced to two vertices. Its proximity matrix is

$$\mathbb{P} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Figure 2.5 presents the Saito dicriticality $\Delta = (\star, \star) \in \{0, 1\}^2$ depending on the values n_1 and n_2 .

Let $c \in \mathbb{A}$. Along the row associated to c in the matrix \mathbb{P} , any occurrence of a coefficient -1 corresponds to a vertex that belongs to the access tree from r to v


 FIGURE 2.5. Unique admissible choice of $\Delta = (\Delta_1, \Delta_2)$.

for some v in the neighborhood \mathfrak{v}_r . This remark leads to the following expression of ϵ_c that is going to be used extensively in the sequel,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \epsilon_c &= \frac{n_c}{2} - \square_c + \sum_{v \in \mathfrak{v}_c} \sum_{s \in {}_c\mathbb{A}_v \setminus \{c\}} \square_s. \\
 (2.4) \quad &= \frac{n_c}{2} - \frac{\delta_c}{2} + \left\lfloor \frac{\Delta_c}{\frac{1}{2}} \right\rfloor + \sum_{v \in \mathfrak{v}_c} \sum_{s \in {}_c\mathbb{A}_v \setminus \{c\}} \frac{\delta_s}{2} - \left\lfloor \frac{\Delta_s}{\nu_s^n - \delta_s} \right\rfloor.
 \end{aligned}$$

Proof of Theorem 3. The proof is, as a whole, an induction on the number of vertices in \mathbb{A} .

Suppose that $|\mathbb{A}| = 1$. The proximity matrix is $\mathbb{P} = (1)$ and the numbering $n = (n_r)$. In view of (2.4), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
 \epsilon_r &= \frac{n_r}{2} - \square_r = \frac{n_r}{2} - \left(\frac{\delta_r}{2} - \left\lfloor \frac{\Delta_r}{\nu_r^n - \delta_r} \right\rfloor \right) \\
 &= \frac{n_r}{2} + \left\lfloor \frac{\Delta_r}{\frac{1}{2}} \right\rfloor
 \end{aligned}$$

since $\delta_r = 0$ and $\nu_r^n = n_r$. Suppose $n_r = 0, 1$ or 2 . Then it can be seen that $\Delta_r = 0$ is not admissible, since it would impose that $\epsilon_r \geq 2$, which is not true. However, if $\Delta_r = 1$, for $n_r = 0, 1$ or 2 , we have respectively $\epsilon_r = 1, 1$ and 2 that always satisfies $\epsilon_r \geq n_r$. Thus for $n_r = 0, 1$ or 2 , the Saito dicriticality is defined by $\Delta_r^{n_r} = 1$. To the contrary, if $n_r \geq 3$ then

$$\epsilon_r \leq \frac{n_r}{2} + 1 < n_r$$

thus $\Delta_r = 1$ is not an admissible dicriticality. However, $\Delta_r^{n_r} = 0$ is admissible since

$$\epsilon_r = \frac{n_r}{2} + \left\lfloor \frac{0}{\frac{1}{2}} \right\rfloor \geq 2,$$

which concludes the proof of the property (1) for $|\mathbb{A}| = 1$.

Now consider property (2) and the invariant ${}^n_{\mathbb{A}}\Theta_r^{01}$. By specifying the definition, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} {}^n_{\mathbb{A}}\Theta_r^{01} &= \square_r^n + \square_r^{r \cdot n} \\ &= \frac{\delta_r^n}{2} - \left[\begin{array}{c} \Delta_r^n \\ \frac{1}{2} \\ n_r - \delta_r^n \end{array} \right] + \frac{\delta_r^{r \cdot n}}{2} - \left[\begin{array}{c} \Delta_r^{r \cdot n} \\ \frac{1}{2} \\ \nu_r^{r \cdot n} - \delta_r^n \end{array} \right] \end{aligned}$$

Notice that $\delta_r^n = \delta_r^{r \cdot n} = 0$, $\nu_r^n = n_r$ and $\nu_r^{r \cdot n} = n_r + 1$. Consequently, this gives

$${}^n_{\mathbb{A}}\Theta_r^{01} = - \left[\begin{array}{c} \Delta_r^n \\ \frac{1}{2} \\ n_r \end{array} \right] - \left[\begin{array}{c} \Delta_r^{r \cdot n} \\ \frac{1}{2} \\ n_r + 1 \end{array} \right] = -\frac{1}{2} - \left[\begin{array}{c} \Delta_r^n \\ \Delta_r^{r \cdot n} \\ n_r \end{array} \right]$$

If $n_r = 0$ or 1 then $\Delta_r^n = \Delta_r^{r \cdot n} = 1$ and thus the invariant is written

$${}^n_{\mathbb{A}}\Theta_r^{01} = -\frac{3}{2} = -\frac{|\mathbb{A}_r|}{2} - \Delta_r^n.$$

If $n_r \geq 3$ then $\Delta_r^n = \Delta_r^{r \cdot n} = 0$ which induces

$${}^n_{\mathbb{A}}\Theta_r^{01} = -\frac{1}{2} = -\frac{|\mathbb{A}_r|}{2} - \Delta_r^n.$$

Finally, if $n_r = 2$ then $\Delta_r^n = 1$ and $\Delta_r^{r \cdot n} = 0$ and hence $\left[\begin{array}{c} \Delta_r^n \\ \Delta_r^{r \cdot n} \\ n_r \end{array} \right] = 1$. Therefore, it

follows

$${}^n_{\mathbb{A}}\Theta_r^{01} = -\frac{3}{2} = -\frac{|\mathbb{A}_r|}{2} - \Delta_r^n.$$

Consequently, formula (2.1) is true for $|\mathbb{A}| = 1$. Now, the invariant ${}^n_{\mathbb{A}}\Theta_{r,r}^{02}$ is written

$${}^n_{\mathbb{A}}\Theta_{r,r}^{02} = \square_r^n + \square_r^{r \cdot r \cdot n} = - \left[\begin{array}{c} \Delta_r^n \\ \frac{1}{2} \\ n_r \end{array} \right] - \left[\begin{array}{c} \Delta_r^{r \cdot r \cdot n} \\ \frac{1}{2} \\ n_r + 2 \end{array} \right] = - \left[\begin{array}{c} \Delta_r^n + \Delta_r^{r \cdot r \cdot n} \\ 1 \\ n_r \end{array} \right].$$

If $n_r = 0$ then it reduces to

$$- \left[\begin{array}{c} \Delta_r^n + \Delta_r^{r \cdot r \cdot n} \\ 1 \\ n_r \end{array} \right] = -2 = -\frac{1}{2} - \frac{|\mathbb{A}_r|}{2} - \Delta_r^n.$$

If $n_r = 1, 2$ then we obtain

$$- \left[\begin{array}{c} \Delta_r^n + \Delta_r^{r \cdot r \cdot n} \\ 1 \\ n_r \end{array} \right] = -1 = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{|\mathbb{A}_r|}{2} - \Delta_r^n.$$

Finally, if $n_r \geq 3$, then we get

$$- \left[\begin{array}{c} \Delta_r^n + \Delta_r^{r \cdot r \cdot n} \\ 1 \\ n_r \end{array} \right] = - \left[\begin{array}{c} 0 \\ 1 \\ n_r \end{array} \right] = \pm \frac{1}{2} - \frac{|\mathbb{A}_r|}{2} - \Delta_r^n,$$

thus formula (2.2) holds. We continue in this fashion obtaining the invariant ${}^n_{\mathbb{A}}\Theta_{r,r}^{11}$,

$${}^n_{\mathbb{A}}\Theta_{r,r}^{11} = \square_r^{r \cdot n} + \square_r^{r \cdot n} = - \left[\begin{array}{c} 2\Delta_r^{r \cdot n} \\ 1 \\ n_r + 1 \end{array} \right].$$

If $n_r = 0, 1, 2$ then $\pm \frac{1}{2} - \frac{|\mathbb{A}_r|}{2} - \Delta_r^n = -2$ or -1 . This implies (2.3). If $n_r \geq 3$, then we get

$$-\begin{vmatrix} 2\Delta_r^{r \cdot n} \\ 1 \\ n_r+1 \end{vmatrix} = -\begin{vmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \\ n_r+1 \end{vmatrix} = \pm \frac{1}{2} - \frac{|\mathbb{A}_r|}{2} - \Delta_r^n,$$

which completes the proof of formula (2.3). For $|\mathbb{A}| = 1$, there are only pure mixed branches of length one. It is enough to refer to the computations above to obtain the following correspondance : for $\mathbb{A} = \{r\}$, we get

$$\frac{n = (n_r) \quad 0 \quad 1 \quad 2 \quad \geq 3}{\Delta_r^n \quad 1 \quad 1 \quad 1 \quad 0},$$

which ensures the properties in Table 4. To conclude the case $|\mathbb{A}| = 1$, we observe that property (5) follows from the computations of ϵ_r^n for $n_r = 0, 1$ and 2.

Now, we are going to prove inductively property (1) from properties (1) and (2). Let us consider the $|\mathbf{v}_r|$ graphs obtained as the connected components of $\mathbb{A} \setminus \{r\}$. We index these graphs by \mathbf{v}_r itself by denoting each connected component \mathbb{A}^c for $c \in \mathbf{v}_r$. Each tree \mathbb{A}^c inherits an order from the one of \mathbb{A} . Let us consider two different numberings of each component \mathbb{A}^c , $c \in \mathbf{v}_r$. In the sequel, we refer to these two different numbered trees by the notation $\mathbb{A}^{\star, \nu}$ with $\star = 0$ or 1.

- $\star = 0$, $\mathbb{A}^{0,c} = \mathbb{A}^c$ numbered by the integer $n^0 = (n_s^0)_{s \in \mathbb{A}^{0,c}}$ with $n_s^0 = n_s$ for $s \in \mathbb{A}^{0,c}$.
- $\star = 1$, $\mathbb{A}^{1,c} = \mathbb{A}^c$ but numbered by the integer $n^1 = (n_s^1)_{s \in \mathbb{A}^{1,c}}$ with $n_s^1 = n_s$ for $c \neq s \in \mathbb{A}^{1,c}$, and $n_c^1 = n_c + 1$.

Note that by construction the tree \mathbb{A} is obtained by gluing the family of trees $(\mathbb{A}^{\star,c})_{c \in \mathbf{v}_r}$ with $\star = 0$ or 1 along the vertex r adding an edge between each vertex c and the root r . Each vertex s belongs exactly to one of the trees $\mathbb{A}^{\star,c}$. Applying property (1) to each numbered tree $\mathbb{A}^{\star,c}$, we obtain a family of dicriticities $\Delta^{\star,c}$, that consists in the family of unique Saito dicriticities of the numbered trees $\mathbb{A}^{\star,c}$. As a result, we can define two new distinct dicriticities on the whole tree \mathbb{A} induced by the $\Delta^{\star,c}$, $c \in \mathbf{v}_r$ the following way :

- $\Delta^1, \Delta_r^1 = 1$ and for any $s \neq r$ $\Delta_s^1 = \Delta_s^{1,c}$ if $s \in \mathbb{A}^{1,c}$.
- $\Delta^0, \Delta_r^0 = 0$ and for any $s \neq r$ $\Delta_s^0 = \Delta_s^{0,c}$ if $s \in \mathbb{A}^{0,c}$.

We claim that both dicriticities Δ^0 or Δ^1 satisfy the admissibility conditions for the vertices $s \in \mathbb{A} \setminus \{r\}$. Indeed, let us denote $\star^{\star,c}$ the combinatorial datas resulting from property (1) applied to each numbered tree $\mathbb{A}^{\star,c}$. We also denote simply by \star^0 or \star^1 the combinatorial datas associated respectively to the dicriticities Δ^0 or Δ^1 .

Let us focus first on the dicricity Δ^1 . For $c \in \mathbf{v}_r$ and $s \in \mathbb{A}^{1,c}$, we get

$$(2.5) \quad \begin{aligned} & \text{if } s \notin \mathbb{A}_c^{1,c} \setminus \{r\}, \quad \nu_s^{1,c} = \nu_s^1, \quad \delta_s^{1,c} = \delta_s^1 \\ & \text{if } s \in \mathbb{A}_c^{1,c} \setminus \{r\}, \quad \nu_s^{1,c} = \nu_s^1 + 1, \quad \delta_s^{1,c} = \delta_s^1 - 1 \end{aligned}$$

Note that in any case, $\nu_s^{1,c} - \delta_s^{1,c}$ and $\nu_s^1 - \delta_s^1$ have the same parity. If $s \notin \mathbb{A}_c^{1,c} \setminus \{r\}$, relations (2.5) combined with the construction of Δ^1 ensures that $\epsilon_s^{1,c} = \epsilon_s^1$.

If $s \in \mathbb{A}^{1,c} \setminus \{r\}$ and $s \neq c$ then we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\epsilon_s^{1,c} &= \frac{n_s}{2} - \square_s^{1,c} + \sum_{v \in \mathbf{v}_s} \sum_{u \in {}_s\mathbb{A}_v \setminus \{s\}} \square_u^{1,c} \\
&= \frac{n_s}{2} - \square_s^{1,c} + \square_c^{1,c} + \sum_{v \in \mathbf{v}_s} \sum_{u \neq c \in {}_s\mathbb{A}_v \setminus \{s\}} \square_u^{1,c} \\
&= \frac{n_s}{2} - \frac{-1 + \delta_s^1}{2} + \left\lfloor \frac{\Delta_s^1}{\frac{1}{2}} \right\rfloor + \frac{-1 + \delta_c^1}{2} - \left\lfloor \frac{\Delta_c^1}{\frac{1}{2}} \right\rfloor + \sum_{v \in \mathbf{v}_s} \sum_{u \neq c \in {}_s\mathbb{A}_v \setminus \{s\}} \square_u^{1,c} \\
&= \frac{n_s}{2} - \frac{\delta_s^1}{2} + \left\lfloor \frac{\Delta_s^1}{\frac{1}{2}} \right\rfloor + \frac{\delta_c^1}{2} - \left\lfloor \frac{\Delta_c^1}{\frac{1}{2}} \right\rfloor + \sum_{v \in \mathbf{v}_s} \sum_{u \neq c \in {}_s\mathbb{A}_v \setminus \{s\}} \square_u^1 \\
&= \epsilon_s^1.
\end{aligned}$$

If $s = c$, it follows from the numbering of $\mathbb{A}^{1,c}$ that

$$\begin{aligned}
\epsilon_c^{1,c} &= \frac{n_c + 1}{2} - \square_c^{1,c} + \sum_{v \in \mathbf{v}_c} \sum_{u \in {}_c\mathbb{A}_v \setminus \{s\}} \square_u^{1,c} \\
&= \frac{n_c + 1}{2} - \frac{\delta_c^{1,c}}{2} + \left\lfloor \frac{\Delta_c^{1,c}}{\frac{1}{2}} \right\rfloor + \sum_{v \in \mathbf{v}_c} \sum_{u \in {}_c\mathbb{A}_v \setminus \{c\}} \square_u^{1,c} \\
&= \frac{n_c + 1}{2} - \frac{-1 + \delta_c^1}{2} + \left\lfloor \frac{\Delta_c^1}{\frac{1}{2}} \right\rfloor + \sum_{v \in \mathbf{v}_c} \sum_{u \in {}_c\mathbb{A}_v \setminus \{c\}} \square_u^1 \\
&= \epsilon_c^1 + 1.
\end{aligned}$$

Since the configuration $(\epsilon^{1,c})_s$ is admissible for $\mathbb{A}^{1,c}$, ϵ_s^1 satisfies the admissibility conditions for $s \neq c$. For $s = c$, if $\Delta_c^1 = 1$ then we get the following inequality

$$\epsilon_c^1 = \epsilon_c^{1,c} - 1 \geq n_c^1 + 1 - 1 \geq n_c^1,$$

and if $\Delta_c^1 = 0$ then the relation becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
\epsilon_c^1 &= \epsilon_c^{1,c} - 1 \geq \left(2 - \sum_{s \in \mathbf{v}_c \setminus \{c\}} \Delta_s^{1,c} \right) - 1 \\
&\geq \left(2 - \sum_{s \in \mathbf{v}_c \setminus \{c\}} \Delta_s^1 \right) - \Delta_r^1 \\
&\geq 2 - \sum_{s \in \mathbf{v}_c} \Delta_s^1.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, in any case, the configuration ϵ^1 is admissible for $s \neq r$. Using much the same computations, we can prove that ϵ^0 is also admissible for $s \neq r$.

However, we are going to prove that exactly one dicriticality among Δ^0 and Δ^1 satisfies the admissibility condition for $s = r$. Indeed, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon_r^0 + \epsilon_r^1 &= \frac{n_r}{2} - \square_r^0 + \left(\sum_{v \in \mathbf{v}_r} \sum_{s \in \mathbb{A}_v \setminus \{r\}} \square_s^0 \right) + \frac{n_r}{2} - \square_r^1 + \left(\sum_{v \in \mathbf{v}_c} \sum_{s \in {}_c\mathbb{A}_v \setminus \{c\}} \square_s^1 \right) \\ &= n_r + \left[\frac{0}{\nu_r} \right] + \left[\frac{1}{\nu_r} \right] + \sum_{v \in \mathbf{v}_r} \sum_{s \in \mathbb{A}_v \setminus \{r\}} \square_s^0 + \square_s^1 \\ &= n_r + 1 + \sum_{v \in \mathbf{v}_r} \sum_{s \in \mathbb{A}_v \setminus \{r\}} \square_s^0 + \square_s^1. \end{aligned}$$

Now, if $v \in \mathbf{v}_r$ and $s \in {}_r\mathbb{A}_v \setminus \{r\}$ one has

$$\square_s^0 + \square_s^1 = \frac{\delta_s^0}{2} - \left[\frac{\Delta_s^0}{\frac{1}{2}} \right]_{\nu_s^0 - \delta_s^0} + \frac{\delta_s^1}{2} - \left[\frac{\Delta_s^1}{\frac{1}{2}} \right]_{\nu_s^1 - \delta_s^1}$$

The construction of Δ^* and the relations (2.5) force

$$\square_s^0 + \square_s^1 = \frac{1}{2} + \square_s^{0,s} + \square_s^{1,s}$$

which leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon_r^0 + \epsilon_r^1 &= n_r + 1 + \sum_{v \in \mathbf{v}_r} \sum_{s \in \mathbb{A}_v \setminus \{r\}} \frac{1}{2} + \square_s^{0,s} + \square_s^{1,s} \\ &= n_r + 1 + \sum_{v \in \mathbf{v}_r} \frac{|\mathbb{A}_v \setminus \{r\}|}{2} + {}_{\mathbb{A}^{0,v}}\Theta_v^{01} \end{aligned}$$

Notice that in the tree $\mathbb{A}^{0,\nu}$ the vertex ν is of multiplicity 1. Property (2) gives the relation

$${}_{\mathbb{A}^{0,\nu}}\Theta_\nu^{01} = -\frac{|\mathbb{A}_v \setminus \{r\}|}{2} - \Delta_v^0.$$

and the sum $\epsilon_r^0 + \epsilon_r^1$ reduces to

$$\epsilon_r^0 + \epsilon_r^1 = n_r + 1 - \sum_{v \in \mathbf{v}_r} \Delta_v^0.$$

Finally, the above equality ensures that one of the two conditions

$$\epsilon_r^1 \geq n_r \quad \text{or} \quad \epsilon_r^0 \geq 2 - \sum_{v \in \mathbf{v}_r} \Delta_v^0$$

holds but not both. As a consequence, either Δ^1 or Δ^0 is admissible for $s = r$, but not both. That concludes the proof of property (1) for the tree \mathbb{A} .

Now, we are going to prove property (2) inductively from properties (1), (2) and (4). Suppose first that the Saito dicriticalities respectively associated to n and $c \cdot n$

start with $\begin{array}{c} \circ \\ \circ \\ \circ \end{array}$, then the invariant ${}^n\Theta_c^{01}$ is written

$$\begin{aligned}
{}^n\Theta_c^{01} &= \sum_{s \in \mathbb{A}_c} \square_s^n + \square_s^{c \cdot n} \\
&= \square_r^n + \square_r^{c \cdot n} + \sum_{s \in \mathbb{A}_c, s \neq r} \square_s^n + \square_s^{c \cdot n} \\
&= - \left[\begin{array}{c} 1 \\ \frac{1}{2} \\ \nu_r^n \end{array} \right] - \left[\begin{array}{c} 1 \\ \frac{1}{2} \\ \nu_{r^+}^{n+1} \end{array} \right] + \underbrace{\frac{\delta_{r^+}^n + \delta_{r^+}^{c \cdot n}}{2}}_{=1} - \left(\frac{\delta_{r^+}^n}{2} + \frac{\delta_{r^+}^{c \cdot n}}{2} \right) + \sum_{s \in \mathbb{A}_c, s \neq r} \square_s^n + \square_s^{c \cdot n} \\
&= -\frac{1}{2} - \left(\frac{\delta_{r^+}^n}{2} + \frac{\delta_{r^+}^{c \cdot n}}{2} \right) + \sum_{s \in \mathbb{A}_c, s \neq r} \square_s^n + \square_s^{c \cdot n}
\end{aligned}$$

where r^+ is the successor of r in the branch \mathbb{A}_c . Consider the tree \mathbb{A}^{r^+} connected component of r^+ in $\mathbb{A} \setminus \{r\}$. The inherited order of \mathbb{A}^{r^+} makes of r^+ its root. Let s_0 be the vertex in the neighborhood \mathfrak{v}_r of r in \mathbb{A} such that $s_0 \geq r^+$. Note that from the unicity statement of property (1) inductively applied to \mathbb{A}^{r^+} , the dicriticality of \mathbb{A}^{r^+} inherited from the Saito dicriticality of \mathbb{A} numbered by n is the Saito dicriticality of \mathbb{A}^{r^+} numbered by the numbering inherited from the $s_0 \cdot n$. Applying inductively property (2) to the tree \mathbb{A}^{r^+} , we get

$$\begin{aligned}
- \left(\frac{\delta_{r^+}^n}{2} + \frac{\delta_{r^+}^{c \cdot n}}{2} \right) + \sum_{s \in \mathbb{A}_c, s \neq r} \square_s^n + \square_s^{c \cdot n} &= \sum_{s \in \mathbb{A}^{r^+}_c} \square_s^{s_0 \cdot n} + \square_s^{c \cdot s_0 \cdot n} \\
&= {}^{s_0 \cdot n}\Theta_c^{01} \\
&= -\frac{|\mathbb{A}_c| - 1}{2} - \Delta_c^{s_0 \cdot n}.
\end{aligned}$$

Combining the two above relations, we are lead to

$${}^n\Theta_c^{01} = -\frac{1}{2} - \frac{|\mathbb{A}_c| - 1}{2} - \Delta_c^{s_0 \cdot n} = -\frac{|\mathbb{A}_c|}{2} - \Delta_c^n,$$

which is property (2). Now, if the Saito dicriticalities associated to n and $c \cdot n$ start with $\begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ \bullet \\ \bullet \end{array}$, then the invariant ${}^n\Theta_c^{01}$ becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
{}^n\Theta_c^{01} &= \sum_{s \in \mathbb{A}_c} \square_s^n + \square_s^{c \cdot n} \\
&= \square_r^n + \square_r^{c \cdot n} + \sum_{s \in \mathbb{A}_c, s \neq r} \square_s^n + \square_s^{c \cdot n} \\
&= - \left[\begin{array}{c} 0 \\ \frac{1}{2} \\ \nu_r^n \end{array} \right] - \left[\begin{array}{c} 0 \\ \frac{1}{2} \\ \nu_{r^+}^{n+1} \end{array} \right] + \underbrace{\frac{\delta_{r^+}^n + \delta_{r^+}^{c \cdot n}}{2}}_{=0} - \left(\frac{\delta_{r^+}^n}{2} + \frac{\delta_{r^+}^{c \cdot n}}{2} \right) + \sum_{s \in \mathbb{A}_c, s \neq r} \square_s^n + \square_s^{c \cdot n} \\
&= -\frac{1}{2} - \left(\frac{\delta_{r^+}^n}{2} + \frac{\delta_{r^+}^{c \cdot n}}{2} \right) + \sum_{s \in \mathbb{A}_c, s \neq r} \square_s^n + \square_s^{c \cdot n}
\end{aligned}$$

As above, applying inductively property (2) yields

$$\begin{aligned} -\left(\frac{\delta_{r^+}^n}{2} + \frac{\delta_{r^+}^{c \cdot n}}{2}\right) + \sum_{s \in \mathbb{A}_c, s \neq r} \square_s^n + \square_s^{c \cdot n} &= \sum_{s \in \mathbb{A}^{r^+}_c} \square_s^n + \square_s^{c \cdot n} \\ &= {}_c^r \Theta_c^{01}. \\ &= -\frac{|\mathbb{A}_c| - 1}{2} - \Delta_c^n. \end{aligned}$$

As before, the two above relations lead to

$${}_c^r \Theta_c^{01} = -\frac{1}{2} - \frac{|\mathbb{A}_c| - 1}{2} - \Delta_c^n = -\Delta_c^n - \frac{|\mathbb{A}_c|}{2},$$

which is the desired property. We now turn to the case in which the Saito dicriticities associated to n and $c \cdot n$ start with $\circ \cdots \circ$. Hence, we are in the presence of a mixed or pure mixed branch. Suppose first that $|\mathbb{A}_c| = 1$. In that case, the branch is pure and the invariant ${}_c^r \Theta_c^{01}$ reduces to

$${}_c^r \Theta_c^{01} = -\left[\begin{array}{c} \Delta_r^n \\ \frac{1}{2} \\ \nu_r^n \end{array} \right] - \left[\begin{array}{c} \Delta_r^{r \cdot n} \\ \frac{1}{2} \\ \nu_r^{r \cdot n} \end{array} \right] = -\left[\begin{array}{c} 1 \\ \frac{1}{2} \\ \nu_r^n \end{array} \right] - \left[\begin{array}{c} 0 \\ \frac{1}{2} \\ \nu_r^n + 1 \end{array} \right].$$

From Table 4, we get

$${}_c^r \Theta_c^{01} = -1 - \frac{1}{2} = -\frac{|\mathbb{A}_c|}{2} - \Delta_c^n.$$

Suppose now that $|\mathbb{A}_c| \geq 2$. In that case, along the mixed branch, the nature of the square index allows us to simplify the expression of the invariant ${}_c^r \Theta_c^{01}$. Suppose that s and s' are consecutive vertices $s \leq s'$ in \mathbb{A}_c with

$$(2.6) \quad \Delta_\star^n + \Delta_\star^{c \cdot n} = 1, \quad \star = s, s'.$$

Then, evaluating the square indices at s' yields

$$\square_{s'}^n + \square_{s'}^{c \cdot n} = \frac{\delta_{s'}^n}{2} + \frac{\delta_{s'}^{c \cdot n}}{2} - \left[\begin{array}{c} \Delta_{s'}^n \\ \frac{1}{2} \\ \nu_{s'}^n - \delta_{s'}^n \end{array} \right] - \left[\begin{array}{c} \Delta_{s'}^{c \cdot n} \\ \frac{1}{2} \\ \nu_{s'}^{c \cdot n} - \delta_{s'}^{c \cdot n} \end{array} \right].$$

Now, according to the relations (2.6) one has $\delta_{s'}^n + \delta_{s'}^{c \cdot n} = 1$, hence we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \square_{s'}^n + \square_{s'}^{c \cdot n} &= \frac{1}{2} - \left[\begin{array}{c} \Delta_{s'}^n \\ \frac{1}{2} \\ \nu_{s'}^n - \delta_{s'}^n \end{array} \right] - \left[\begin{array}{c} 1 - \Delta_{s'}^n \\ \frac{1}{2} \\ \nu_{s'}^n + 1 - \delta_{s'}^n - 1 \end{array} \right]. \\ (2.7) \quad \square_{s'}^n + \square_{s'}^{c \cdot n} &= -\frac{1}{2} \end{aligned}$$

Let us focus now on a mixed branch is of type $\bullet \cdots \circ \cdots \circ$. Let m_c be the last vertex of the branch \mathbb{A}_c where the mixing property (2.6) holds. Using the

simplification (2.7), we obtain the following expression

$$\begin{aligned}
{}_{\mathbb{A}}\Theta_c^{01} &= \sum_{s \in \mathbb{A}_c} \square_s^n + \square_s^{c \cdot n} \\
&= \square_r^n + \square_r^{c \cdot n} + \sum_{s \in \mathbb{A}_{m_c} \setminus \{r\}} \square_s^n + \square_s^{c \cdot n} + \square_{m_c^+}^n + \square_{m_c^+}^{c \cdot n} + \sum_{s > m_c^+, s \in \mathbb{A}_c} \square_s^n + \square_s^{c \cdot n} \\
&= - \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ \frac{1}{2} \\ \nu_r \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ \frac{1}{2} \\ \nu_r + 1 \end{bmatrix} - \frac{|\mathbb{A}_{m_c}| - 1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} - \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ \frac{1}{2} \\ \nu_{m_c^+} - 1 \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ \frac{1}{2} \\ \nu_{m_c^+} + 1 \end{bmatrix} + 1 + \square_{\mathbb{A}_{m_c^+}}^{s_0 \cdot n} \Theta_c^{01}
\end{aligned}$$


where $\mathbb{A}_{m_c^+}$ is the subtree of \mathbb{A} whose root is m_c^+ and s_0 is the vertex in \mathfrak{v}_r such that $s_0 \geq m_c^+$. Following Table 1, we are lead to

$$\begin{aligned}
{}_{\mathbb{A}}\Theta_c^{01} &= -\frac{1}{2} - 1 - \frac{|\mathbb{A}_{m_c}| - 1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} - 1 + 1 + \square_{\mathbb{A}_{m_c^+}}^{s_0 \cdot n} \Theta_c^{01} \\
&= -\frac{1}{2} - \frac{|\mathbb{A}_{m_c}|}{2} + \square_{\mathbb{A}_{m_c^+}}^{s_0 \cdot n} \Theta_c^{01}.
\end{aligned}$$

Applying inductively property (2), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
{}_{\mathbb{A}}\Theta_c^{01} &= -\frac{1}{2} - \frac{|\mathbb{A}_{m_c}|}{2} - \frac{|\mathbb{A}_{m_c^+}|}{2} - \Delta_c^n \\
&= -\frac{|\mathbb{A}_c|}{2} - \Delta_c^n,
\end{aligned}$$

which is Property (2).

Suppose now the mixed branch is pure of type . Then the invariant ${}_{\mathbb{A}}\Theta_c^{01}$ is written

$$\begin{aligned}
{}_{\mathbb{A}}\Theta_c^{01} &= \sum_{s \in \mathbb{A}_c} \square_s^n + \square_s^{c \cdot n} = \square_r^n + \square_r^{c \cdot n} + \left(\sum_{s \in \mathbb{A}_{m_c} \setminus \{r\}} \square_s^n + \square_s^{c \cdot n} \right) \\
&= - \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ \frac{1}{2} \\ \nu_r \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ \frac{1}{2} \\ \nu_r + 1 \end{bmatrix} - \frac{|\mathbb{A}_{m_c}| - 1}{2}.
\end{aligned}$$

According to Table (1), ν_r is even. Thus

$${}_{\mathbb{A}}\Theta_c^{01} = -1 - \frac{|\mathbb{A}_{m_c}|}{2} = -\Delta_c^n - \frac{|\mathbb{A}_{m_c}|}{2}$$

which is still property (2). Any other type of mixed or pure mixed branch can be treated exactly the same way.

Now, we will prove inductively property (3) from properties (2) and (3). In the branch \mathbb{A}_{c_1} , we denote by r^+ the successor of r . Moreover, we denote by $d \in \mathfrak{v}_r$ such that $d \geq r^+$. Depending on how start the Saito dicriticality of \mathbb{A} numbered respectively by n and $c_0 \cdot c \cdot n$, below, we expand the expression of the invariant ${}_{\mathbb{A}}\Theta_{c_0, c_1}^{02}$.




$$\begin{aligned}
{}_{\mathbb{A}}^n \Theta_{c_0, c_1}^{02} &= \square_r^n + \square_r^{c_0 \cdot c_1 \cdot n} + \sum_{s \in \mathbb{A}_{c_1} \setminus \{r\}} \square_s^n + \square_s^{c_0 \cdot c_1 \cdot n} \\
&= - \left[\begin{array}{c} 1 \\ \frac{1}{2} \\ \nu_r \end{array} \right] - \left[\begin{array}{c} 1 \\ \frac{1}{2} \\ \nu_r + 2 \end{array} \right] + \sum_{s \in \mathbb{A}_{c_1} \setminus \{r\}} \square_s^{d \cdot n} + \square_s^{c_1 \cdot d \cdot n} \\
&= - \left[\begin{array}{c} 1 \\ \frac{1}{2} \\ \nu_r \end{array} \right] - \left[\begin{array}{c} 1 \\ \frac{1}{2} \\ \nu_r + 2 \end{array} \right] + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} + {}_{\mathbb{A}^{r^+}} \Theta_{c_1}^{01} \\
&= - \left[\begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 0 \\ \nu_r \end{array} \right] + {}_{\mathbb{A}^{r^+}} \Theta_{c_1}^{01} \\
&= - \left[\begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 0 \\ \nu_r \end{array} \right] - \Delta_{c_1}^n - \frac{|\mathbb{A}_{c_1}| - 1}{2} = \left[\begin{array}{c} -\frac{1}{2} \\ \frac{1}{2} \\ \nu_r \end{array} \right] - \Delta_{c_1}^n - \frac{|\mathbb{A}_{c_1}|}{2}.
\end{aligned}$$



$$\begin{aligned}
{}_{\mathbb{A}}^n \Theta_{c_0, c_1}^{02} &= \square_r^n + \square_r^{c_0 \cdot c_1 \cdot n} + \sum_{s \in \mathbb{A}_{c_1} \setminus \{r\}} \square_s^n + \square_s^{c_0 \cdot c_1 \cdot n} \\
&= - \left[\begin{array}{c} 1 \\ \frac{1}{2} \\ \nu_r \end{array} \right] - \left[\begin{array}{c} 0 \\ \frac{1}{2} \\ \nu_r + 2 \end{array} \right] + \sum_{s \in \mathbb{A}_{c_1} \setminus \{r\}} \square_s^{d \cdot n} + \square_s^{c_1 \cdot n} \\
&= - \left[\begin{array}{c} 1 \\ \frac{1}{2} \\ \nu_r \end{array} \right] - \left[\begin{array}{c} 0 \\ \frac{1}{2} \\ \nu_r + 2 \end{array} \right] + \frac{1}{2} + {}_{\mathbb{A}^{r^+}} \Theta_{d, c_1}^{11} \\
&= -\frac{1}{2} + {}_{\mathbb{A}^{r^+}} \Theta_{d, c_1}^{11} \\
&= -\frac{1}{2} \pm \frac{1}{2} - \Delta_c^n - \frac{|\mathbb{A}_c| - 1}{2} = \pm \frac{1}{2} - \Delta_c^n - \frac{|\mathbb{A}_c|}{2}.
\end{aligned}$$



$$\begin{aligned}
{}_{\mathbb{A}}^n \Theta_{c_0, c_1}^{02} &= \square_r^n + \square_r^{c_0 \cdot c_1 \cdot n} + \sum_{s \in \mathbb{A}_{c_1} \setminus \{r\}} \square_s^n + \square_s^{c_0 \cdot c_1 \cdot n} \\
&= - \left[\begin{array}{c} 0 \\ \frac{1}{2} \\ \nu_r \end{array} \right] - \left[\begin{array}{c} 0 \\ \frac{1}{2} \\ \nu_r + 2 \end{array} \right] + \sum_{s \in \mathbb{A}_{c_1} \setminus \{r\}} \square_s^n + \square_s^{c_1 \cdot n} \\
&= - \left[\begin{array}{c} 0 \\ \frac{1}{2} \\ \nu_r \end{array} \right] - \left[\begin{array}{c} 0 \\ \frac{1}{2} \\ \nu_r + 2 \end{array} \right] + {}_{\mathbb{A}^{r^+}} \Theta_{c_1}^{01} \\
&= - \left[\begin{array}{c} 0 \\ 1 \\ \nu_r \end{array} \right] - \Delta_{c_1}^n - \frac{|\mathbb{A}_{c_1}| - 1}{2} \\
&= \left[\begin{array}{c} \frac{1}{2} \\ -\frac{1}{2} \\ \nu_r \end{array} \right] - \Delta_{c_1}^n - \frac{|\mathbb{A}_{c_1}|}{2}.
\end{aligned}$$

FIGURE 2.6. Mixed branch stopping from being mixed at the N^{th} vertex.

$$\begin{aligned}
\bullet \circ \dots & \\
{}^n \Theta_{c_0, c_1}^{02} &= \square_r^n + \square_r^{c_0 \cdot c_1 \cdot n} + \sum_{s \in \mathbb{A}_{c_1} \setminus \{r\}} \square_s^n + \square_s^{c_0 \cdot c_1 \cdot n} \\
&= - \left[\begin{array}{c} 0 \\ \frac{1}{2} \\ \nu_r \end{array} \right] - \left[\begin{array}{c} 1 \\ \frac{1}{2} \\ \nu_{r+2} \end{array} \right] + \sum_{s \in \mathbb{A}_{c_1} \setminus \{r\}} \square_s^n + \square_s^{c_1 \cdot d \cdot n} \\
&= - \left[\begin{array}{c} 0 \\ \frac{1}{2} \\ \nu_r \end{array} \right] - \left[\begin{array}{c} 1 \\ \frac{1}{2} \\ \nu_{r+2} \end{array} \right] + \frac{1}{2} + {}^n \Theta_{d, c_1}^{02} \\
&= -\frac{1}{2} \pm \frac{1}{2} - \Delta_{c_1}^n - \frac{|\mathbb{A}_{c_1}| - 1}{2} = \pm \frac{1}{2} - \Delta_{c_1}^n - \frac{|\mathbb{A}_{c_1}|}{2}.
\end{aligned}$$

That concludes the proof of Property (3) for the invariant ${}^n \Theta_{c_0, c_1}^{02}$. The case of the invariant ${}^n \Theta_{c_0, c_1}^{11}$ is obtained much the same way.

To prove inductively property (4) as a consequence of all previous properties, we consider a mixed branch of any type as in Figure 2.6. In the sequel, the vertex is designated by its position k in the branch $k = 1, \dots$. The N^{th} is the first for which the mixing property does not hold.

Let us denote by ϵ_k^* , $\star = n, c \cdot n$ the configuration of the k^{th} vertices of the branch. Since the configuration is supposed to be admissible, summing the two inequalities associated to the admissibility conditions of Theorem 3, we get

$$\epsilon_k^n + \epsilon_k^{c \cdot n} \geq n_k + 2 - \sum_{s \in \mathbf{v}_k} \Delta_s^{\sigma_{k,n}}$$

where $\sigma_{k,n} = n$ if $\Delta_k^n = 0$, else $\sigma_{k,n} = c \cdot n$. Therefore,

$$(2.8) \quad \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} \epsilon_k^n + \epsilon_k^{c \cdot n} \geq 2(N-1) + \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} n_k - \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} \sum_{s \in \mathbf{v}_k} \Delta_s^{\sigma_{k,n}}.$$

Now, we want to estimate the expression in the left of the above inequality. Suppose first that $k = 2, \dots, N-2$. Notice that in this situation $\delta_k^* = \Delta_{k-1}^*$, hence

$$\begin{aligned}
\epsilon_k^n + \epsilon_k^{c \cdot n} &= \frac{n_k}{2} - \frac{\Delta_{k-1}^n}{2} + \left[\begin{array}{c} \Delta_k^n \\ \frac{1}{2} \\ \nu_k^n - \Delta_{k-1}^n \end{array} \right] + \sum_{s \in \mathbf{v}_k} \sum_{u \in {}_k \mathbb{A}_s \setminus \{k\}} \square_u^n \\
&+ \frac{n_k}{2} - \frac{\Delta_{k-1}^{c \cdot n}}{2} + \left[\begin{array}{c} \Delta_k^{c \cdot n} \\ \frac{1}{2} \\ \nu_k^{c \cdot n} - \Delta_{k-1}^{c \cdot n} \end{array} \right] + \sum_{s \in \mathbf{v}_k} \sum_{u \in {}_k \mathbb{A}_s \setminus \{k\}} \square_u^{c \cdot n} \\
&= n_k + \frac{1}{2} + \sum_{s \in \mathbf{v}_k} \sum_{u \in {}_k \mathbb{A}_s \setminus \{k\}} \square_u^n + \square_u^{c \cdot n}
\end{aligned}$$

Let us denote by k^- and k^+ the vertices in \mathfrak{v}_k such that $k^- \geq (k-1)$, $k^- \neq k-1$ and $k^+ \geq (k+1)$ for the order \leq on the tree. Notice that k^- may not exist and k^+ may be equal to $k+1$.

From the previous expressions we obtain,

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon_k^n + \epsilon_k^{c \cdot n} &= n_k + \frac{1}{2} + \sum_{s \in \mathfrak{v}_k \setminus \{k^-, k^+\}} \sum_{u \in {}_k\mathbb{A}_s \setminus \{k\}} \square_u^n + \square_u^{c \cdot n} \\ &+ \sum_{u \in {}_k\mathbb{A}_{k^-} \setminus \{k\}} \square_u^n + \square_u^{c \cdot n} \\ &+ \sum_{u \in {}_k\mathbb{A}_{k^+} \setminus \{k\}} \square_u^n + \square_u^{c \cdot n}. \end{aligned}$$

For $s \in \mathfrak{v}_k \setminus \{k^-, k^+\}$, we are lead to

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{u \in {}_k\mathbb{A}_s \setminus \{k\}} \square_u^n + \square_u^{c \cdot n} &= \frac{|{}_k\mathbb{A}_s \setminus \{k\}|}{2} + \sum_{u \in {}_k\mathbb{A}_s \setminus \{k\}} \square_u^n + \square_u^{s \cdot n} \\ &= \frac{|{}_k\mathbb{A}_s \setminus \{k\}|}{2} + \mathbb{A}^k \Theta_s^{01}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, according to Property (2), it

$$\sum_{u \in {}_k\mathbb{A}_s \setminus \{k\}} \square_u^n + \square_u^{c \cdot n} = -\Delta_s^{\sigma_{k,n}}.$$

In the same way, we find

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{u \in {}_k\mathbb{A}_{k^-} \setminus \{k\}} \square_u^n + \square_u^{c \cdot n} &= \frac{1}{2} + \frac{|{}_k\mathbb{A}_{k^-} \setminus \{k\}|}{2} + \sum_{u \in {}_k\mathbb{A}_{k^-} \setminus \{k\}} \square_u^a + \square_u^b \\ &= \frac{1}{2} + \frac{|{}_k\mathbb{A}_{k^-} \setminus \{k\}|}{2} + \begin{cases} \mathbb{A}^k \Theta_{k,k^-}^{02} & \text{or} \\ \mathbb{A}^k \Theta_{k,k^-}^{11} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\{a, b\} = \begin{cases} \{n, k \cdot k^- \cdot n\} \\ \{k \cdot n, k^- \cdot n\} \end{cases} \text{ if } (\Delta_{k-1}^n, \Delta_{k-1}^n) = \begin{cases} (0, 0) & \text{or } (1, 1) \\ (0, 1) & \text{or } (1, 0) \end{cases}$$

Thus, property (2) ensures that

$$\sum_{u \in {}_k\mathbb{A}_{k^-} \setminus \{k\}} \square_u^n + \square_u^{c \cdot n} = \frac{1}{2} \pm \frac{1}{2} - \Delta_{k^-}^{\sigma_{k,n}}.$$

In the same way, one can prove that

$$\sum_{u \in {}_k\mathbb{A}_{k^+} \setminus \{k\}} \square_u^n + \square_u^{c \cdot n} = \pm \frac{1}{2} - \Delta_{k^+}^{\sigma_{k,n}}.$$

Finally, for $k \in \{2, \dots, N-2\}$

$$(2.9) \quad \epsilon_k^n + \epsilon_k^{c \cdot n} = n_k + \frac{1}{2} \pm \frac{1}{2} + \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} \pm \frac{1}{2} & \text{if } k^- \text{ exists} \\ 0 & \text{else} \end{cases} - \sum_{s \in \mathfrak{v}_k} \Delta_s^{\sigma_{k,n}}$$

For $k = 1$ the computation is slightly different but we obtain

$$(2.10) \quad \epsilon_1^n + \epsilon_1^{c \cdot n} = n_1 + \frac{1}{2} + \left[\begin{array}{c} \Delta_1^n \\ \Delta_1^{c \cdot n} \\ \nu_1 \end{array} \pm \frac{1}{2} - \sum_{s \in \mathfrak{v}_1} \Delta_s^{\sigma_1, n} \right].$$

Finally for $k = N - 1$, we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon_{N-1}^n + \epsilon_{N-1}^{c \cdot n} &= \frac{n_{N-1}}{2} - \frac{\Delta_{N-2}^n}{2} + \left[\begin{array}{c} \Delta_{N-1}^n \\ \frac{1}{2} \\ \nu_N^n - \Delta_{N-2}^n \end{array} + \frac{n_{N-1}}{2} - \frac{\Delta_{N-2}^{c \cdot n}}{2} + \left[\begin{array}{c} \Delta_{N-1}^{c \cdot n} \\ \frac{1}{2} \\ \nu_N^{c \cdot n} - \Delta_{N-2}^{c \cdot n} \end{array} \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + \sum_{s \in \mathfrak{v}_{N-1}} \sum_{u \in_{N-1} \mathbb{A}_s \setminus \{N-1\}} \square_u^n + \square_u^{c \cdot n} \right. \right. \\ &= n_{N-1} + \frac{1}{2} + \sum_{u \in_{(N-1)} \mathbb{A}_{(N-1)^+} \setminus \{(N-1)\}} \square_u^n + \square_u^{c \cdot n} \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_{s \in \mathfrak{v}_{N-1}, s \neq (N-1)^+} \sum_{u \in_{N-1} \mathbb{A}_s \setminus \{N-1\}} \square_u^n + \square_u^{c \cdot n} \right. \end{aligned}$$

Now, we focus on the last term of the above sum : we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{u \in_{N-1} \mathbb{A}_{(N-1)^+} \setminus \{N-1\}} \square_u^n + \square_u^{c \cdot n} &= \frac{\Delta_{N-1}^n}{2} + \frac{\Delta_{N-1}^{c \cdot n}}{2} - \left[\begin{array}{c} \Delta_N^n \\ \frac{1}{2} \\ \nu_N^n - \Delta_{N-1}^n \end{array} - \left[\begin{array}{c} \Delta_N^{c \cdot n} \\ \frac{1}{2} \\ \nu_N^{c \cdot n} - \Delta_{N-1}^{c \cdot n} \end{array} \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + \frac{\Delta_N^n}{2} + \frac{\Delta_N^{c \cdot n}}{2} \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. - \left(\frac{\Delta_N^n}{2} + \frac{\Delta_N^{c \cdot n}}{2} \right) + \sum_{u \in_{(N-1)} \mathbb{A}_{(N-1)^+} \setminus \{(N-1)\}, u \neq N} \square_u^n + \square_u^{c \cdot n} \right. \right. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\Delta_N^n = \Delta_N^{c \cdot n}$, $\nu_N^n = \nu_N^{c \cdot n} - 1$ and $\Delta_{N-1}^n + \Delta_{N-1}^{c \cdot n} = 1$, we are lead to the expression

$$\sum_{u \in_{N-1} \mathbb{A}_{(N-1)^+} \setminus \{N-1\}} \square_u^n + \square_u^{c \cdot n} = \frac{1}{2} - \left[\begin{array}{c} \Delta_N^n \\ 1 - \Delta_N^n \\ \nu_N - \Delta_{N-1}^n \end{array} - \Delta_{(N-1)^+}^{\sigma_{(N-1)}, n} \right]$$

Finally, we find

$$(2.11) \quad \begin{aligned} \epsilon_{N-1}^n + \epsilon_{N-1}^{c \cdot n} &= n_{N-1} + 1 - \left[\begin{array}{c} \Delta_N^n \\ 1 - \Delta_N^n \\ \nu_N - \Delta_{N-1}^n \end{array} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} \pm \frac{1}{2} & \text{if } (N-1)^- \text{ exists} \\ 0 & \text{else} \end{cases} - \sum_{s \in \mathfrak{v}_{N-1}} \Delta_s^{\sigma_{N-1}, n} \right. \end{aligned}$$

Summing the equations (2.9), (2.10) and (2.11) yields

$$\sum_{k=1}^{N-1} \epsilon_k^n + \epsilon_k^{c \cdot n} = \left[\begin{array}{c} \Delta_1^n \\ \Delta_1^{c \cdot n} \\ \nu_1 \end{array} - \left[\begin{array}{c} \Delta_N^n \\ 1 - \Delta_N^n \\ \nu_N - \Delta_{N-1}^n \end{array} \right. + \underbrace{(\dots)}_{\text{at most } 2N-3} + \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} n_k - \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} \sum_{s \in \mathfrak{v}_k} \Delta_s^{\sigma_k, n} \right.$$

Combining with the inequality (2.8), we obtain

$$\left[\begin{array}{c} \Delta_1^n \\ \Delta_1^{c \cdot n} \\ \nu_1 \end{array} \right] - \left[\begin{array}{c} \Delta_N^n \\ 1 - \Delta_N^n \\ \nu_N - \Delta_{N-1}^n \end{array} \right] \geq 1.$$

This inequality induces all the properties presented in Table 1.

To prove the statements in Table 2, we add one white component at the end of each pure mixed branches, providing thus standard mixed branches. Numbering the vertices of these branches $1, \dots, N, N+1$, the $N+1^{\text{th}}$ being the added one and setting $n_{N+1} = 0$, we obtain two mixed branches numbered respectively by n and $(N+1) \cdot n$ whose dicriticities are Saito. Thus, the computations performed for mixed branches yield

$$\left[\begin{array}{c} \Delta_1^n \\ \Delta_1^{c \cdot n} \\ \nu_1 \end{array} \right] - \left[\begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 - \Delta_N^n \end{array} \right] \geq 1.$$

Thus if $\Delta_N^n = 0$ the above inequality is impossible ; that excludes the two last cases of Table (2). If $\Delta_N^n = 1$, then the inequality reduces to

$$\left[\begin{array}{c} \Delta_1^n \\ \Delta_1^{c \cdot n} \\ \nu_1 \end{array} \right] \geq 1,$$

which implies the two first cases of the table. Finally, suppose that the mixed branch is reduced to a single couple of vertices and starts with \bullet . Assume that ν_r^n is even. We can write,

$$\epsilon_r^n = \frac{n_r}{2} + \left[\begin{array}{c} 0 \\ \frac{1}{2} \\ \nu_r^n \end{array} \right] + \sum_{v \in \mathbf{v}_c} \square_v.$$

Hence, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon_r^n + 1 &= \frac{n_r + 1}{2} + \left[\begin{array}{c} 0 \\ \frac{1}{2} \\ \nu_r^{n+1} \end{array} \right] + \sum_{v \in \mathbf{v}_c} \square_v. \\ &= \frac{n_r + 1}{2} + \left[\begin{array}{c} 0 \\ \frac{1}{2} \\ \nu_r^{r \cdot n} \end{array} \right] + \sum_{v \in \mathbf{v}_c} \square_v. \end{aligned}$$

Since, ϵ^n is the configuration of the Saito dicriticity for the numbering n , we get

$$\epsilon_r^n \geq 2 - \sum_{s \in \mathbf{v}_r} \Delta_s^n$$

and consequently,

$$\epsilon_r^n + 1 \geq 2 - \sum_{s \in \mathbf{v}_r} \Delta_s^n.$$

Therefore, the dicriticity Δ^n keeps on being Saito for the tree \mathbb{A} numbered by $r \cdot n$. Since, this dicriticity is unique, we get $\Delta_r^{r \cdot n} = 1$ which contradicts the hypothesis of a mixed branch. Finally, ν_r^n has to be odd. In the same way, suppose the mixed branch is reduced to \circ and ν_r^n is odd. The arguments are the same as above and

from the following computations

$$\begin{aligned}\epsilon_r^n &= \frac{n_r}{2} + \left\lfloor \frac{1}{\nu_r^n} \right\rfloor + \sum_{v \in \mathbf{v}_c} \square_v \geq n_r \\ \epsilon_r^n + 1 &= \frac{n_r + 1}{2} + \left\lfloor \frac{1}{\nu_r^{r \cdot n}} \right\rfloor + \sum_{v \in \mathbf{v}_c} \square_v \geq n_r + 1\end{aligned}$$

we get a contradiction. Hence, ν_r^n is even. This concludes the proof of property (4).

It remains to prove property (5). Let \mathbb{K} be the connected component of r in the sub-graph $\mathbb{A} \setminus \{c \in \mathbb{A} \mid \Delta_c^n = 0\}$. If $\mathbb{K} = \emptyset$, the property is proved by induction on $|\mathbb{A}|$. If not, suppose that there exists $s \in \mathbb{K}$ such that $n_s > 0$. Then, since $\Delta_s^n = 1$, the admissibility condition ensures that $\epsilon_s^n \geq n_s > 0$ which is the property. Finally, we suppose that for any $s \in \mathbb{K}$, $n_s = 0$. Assume also that for any $s \in \mathbb{K}$, $\epsilon_s^n = 0$. For any $s \in \mathbf{v}_r$, we consider $k_s \in \mathbb{A}_s$ the minimal vertex such that ${}_{k_s}\mathbb{A}_s$ is in \mathbb{K} . Now, one can write

$$\begin{aligned}(2.12) \quad 0 = \epsilon_r^n &= -\square_r + \sum_{v \in \mathbf{v}_r} \sum_{s \in \mathbb{A}_v \setminus \{r\}} \square_s^n \\ &= \left\lfloor \frac{1}{\nu_r^n} \right\rfloor + \sum_{v \in \mathbf{v}_r} \sum_{s \in \mathbb{A}_{k_v^{-1}} \setminus \{r\}} \square_s^n \\ &\quad + \sum_{v \in \mathbf{v}_r} \sum_{s \in \mathbb{A}_v \setminus \{r\}} \square_s^n\end{aligned}$$

Now, extracting the intermediary sum in the expression above yields

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{\mathbb{A}_{k_v^{-1}} \setminus \{r\}} \square_s^n &= \sum_{\mathbb{A}_{k_v^{-1}} \setminus \{r\}} \frac{\delta_s^n}{2} - \left\lfloor \frac{\Delta_s^n}{\star} \right\rfloor \\ &= \sum_{\mathbb{A}_{k_v^{-1}} \setminus \{r\}} \frac{\delta_s^n}{2} - \sum_{\mathbb{A}_{k_v^{-1}} \setminus \{r\}} \left\lfloor \frac{\Delta_s^n}{\star} \right\rfloor \\ &= \frac{\delta_{r^+}^n}{2} + \sum_{\mathbb{A}_{k_v^{-1}} \setminus \{r, r^+\}} \frac{\delta_s^n}{2} - \sum_{\mathbb{A}_{k_v^{-1}} \setminus \{r\}} \left\lfloor \frac{\Delta_s^n}{\star} \right\rfloor \\ &= \frac{\delta_{r^+}^n}{2} + \sum_{\mathbb{A}_{k_v^{-2}} \setminus \{r\}} \frac{\delta_{s^+}^n}{2} - \left(\sum_{\mathbb{A}_{k_v^{-2}} \setminus \{r\}} \left\lfloor \frac{\Delta_s^n}{\star} \right\rfloor \right) - \left\lfloor \frac{\Delta_{k_v^{-1}}^n}{\star} \right\rfloor.\end{aligned}$$

where r^+ is the successor of r in \mathbb{A}_v , k_v^{-i} the predecessor of k_v^{-i+1} . Since $\Delta_r^n = 1$, $\delta_{r^+}^n = 1$ and $\delta_{s^+}^n = 1 + \Delta_s^n$. Hence, we obtain

$$(2.13) \quad \sum_{r \mathbb{A}_{k_v^{-1}} \setminus \{r\}} \square_s^n = \underbrace{\frac{1}{2} - \left\lfloor \frac{\Delta_{k_v^{-1}}^n}{\star} \right\rfloor}_A + \underbrace{\sum_{r \mathbb{A}_{k_v^{-2}} \setminus \{r\}} \left\lfloor \frac{\frac{1 - \Delta_s^n}{2}}{\frac{\Delta_s^n}{2}} \right\rfloor}_{\geq 0}.$$

Now, since $k_v \in \mathbb{K}$, then

$$0 = \epsilon_{k_v}^n = -\square_{k_v}^n + \sum_{v \in \mathfrak{v}_{k_v}} \sum_{s \in {}_{k_v}\mathbb{A}_v \setminus \{k_v\}} \square_s^n.$$

Therefore

$$\square_{k_v}^n = \sum_{v \in \mathfrak{v}_{k_v}} \sum_{s \in {}_{k_v}\mathbb{A}_v \setminus \{k_v\}} \square_s^n.$$

If $\Delta_{k_v^{-1}}^n = 0$ then, in expression (2.13) $A = \frac{1}{2} - \left[\begin{array}{c} \Delta_{k_v^{-1}}^n \\ \frac{1}{2} \\ \star \end{array} \right] \geq 0$. If $\Delta_{k_v^{-1}}^n = 1$, then by

construction of k_v , $k_v^{-1} \notin \mathfrak{v}_{k_v}$. In the latter case, there exists $s \in \mathfrak{v}_{k_v}$ and $c \in {}_{k_v}\mathbb{A}_s$ with $\mathfrak{p}_c = \{k_v, k_v^{-1}\}$. Thus

$$\delta_c = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2}$$

which comes to compensate the fact that in relation (2.13), A might be equal to $\frac{-1}{2}$. Finally, if $s \in {}_{k_v}\mathbb{A}_v \setminus \{r\}$, $s \neq k_v$ then as before,

$$\square_s^n = \sum_{v \in \mathfrak{v}_s} \sum_{u \in {}_s\mathbb{A}_v \setminus \{s\}} \square_u^n.$$

Doing so step by step, from (2.12), we are lead to an expression of the form

$$0 = \left[\begin{array}{c} 1 \\ \frac{1}{2} \\ \nu_r^n \end{array} \right] + \underbrace{(\dots)}_{\geq 0}$$

which is impossible. That concludes the proof of property (5) and, at the same time, the proof of Theorem 3. \square

3. SAITO FOLIATIONS OF A GERM OF CURVE AND ITS DEFORMATION.

The $\mathcal{O}_{(\mathbb{C}^2, 0)}$ -module $\text{Der}(\log C)$ of germs of vector fields tangent to a germ of curve $C \subset (\mathbb{C}^2, 0)$ has been introduced as a particular case of a far more general object by K. Saito in [20]. From now on, we are interesting in the valuations of the vector fields in this module, for the standard valuation ν defined by

$$\nu(a\partial_x + b\partial_y) = \min(\nu(a), \nu(b)), \quad a, b \in \mathbb{C}\{x, y\},$$

where

$$\nu\left(\sum_{i,j} a_{ij}x^i y^j\right) = \min_{a_{ij} \neq 0} \{i + j\}.$$

In particular, we define *the number of Saito of C* by

$$\mathfrak{s}_C = \min_{X \in \text{Der}(\log C)} \nu(X)$$

A vector field tangent to C is said *optimal* if its valuation is equal to the Saito number of C .

Let π be the blowing-up of the singular point of C . At any singular point s of the total transform $\pi^{-1}(C)$, the strict transform X^π of X leaves invariant the strict transform C^π and maybe the exceptional divisor of π . When the latter occurs, X is said *non dicritical*. Otherwise, it is said *dicritical*. The vector field X^π may not be optimal for the germ of C^π at s although X is optimal for C . When the optimality

property is preserved along the desingularization process of C , we said that X is *Saito* for C . More precisely, we consider the following inductive definition :

Definition 6. X is *Saito* for C when X is optimal for C and when X^π is Saito for each germ of $D \cup C^\pi$ at any of its singular points where

- $D = \pi^{-1}(0)$ if X is not dicritical,
- $D = \emptyset$, otherwise.

To initiate the definition, we require that if C is regular, then $\nu(X) = 0$ and if C is the union of two transversal regular curves, then $\nu(X) = 1$.

The goal of the current section is to prove the existence of a curve C' topologically equivalent to C that admits a Saito foliation. To do so, we are going to construct a foliation using gluing techniques described in [15]. The elementary pieces of this gluing are semi-local models for Saito foliations introduced just below. The result of the first section will provide a global data prescribing the gluing. The obtained foliation will be studied from the point of view of deformations and the curve C' will be found as an invariant curve of a generic deformation of the constructed foliation.

3.1. Semi-local models for Saito foliations. First, let us describe the two families of semi-local models for Saito foliations. These models are said to be semi-local because they are defined in the neighborhood of a compact divisor embedded in a surface.

Let \mathcal{M}_p be the germ of neighborhood of the divisor, given locally by $x_1 = 0$ and $y_2 = 0$, in the dimension 2 manifold defined by the disjoint union of two charts

$$(\mathbb{C}^2, (x_1, y_1)) \amalg (\mathbb{C}^2, (x_2, y_2))$$

with the identification $y_2 = y_1^p x_1$ $x_2 = \frac{1}{y_1}$, $p \geq 0$. The divisor $\{x_1 = y_2 = 0\}$ is a regular rational compact curve embedded in \mathcal{M}_p with negative self-intersection equal to $-p$.

3.1.1. The dicritical model. The manifold \mathcal{M}_p can be foliated by the foliation $\mathcal{R}_{p,N}$ given in coordinates (x_1, y_1) by the 1-form

$$(3.1) \quad dx_1 + \prod_{i=1}^N (y_1 - i) dy_1.$$

This foliation is transverse to the compact divisor except at the points given in coordinates (x_1, y_1) by $(0, i)$, $i = 1, \dots, N$ where it is tangent at order 1. Using the changes of coordinates from (x_1, y_1) to (x_2, y_2) , we can see that the foliation is regular and transverse to the compact divisor at $+\infty$. Note that we have

$$\sum_{p \in \{x_1=0\}} \text{Tan}(\mathcal{R}_{p,N}, \{x_1 = 0\}, p) = N$$

where Tan is an index introduced in particular in [14].




FIGURE 3.1. Local models for Saito foliations.

3.1.2. *The non dicritical model.* The manifold \mathcal{M}_p can also be foliated by a foliation given by the 1-form $\mathcal{G}_{p,N,\Lambda}$, $\Lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_N)$ written in the coordinates (x_1, y_1)

$$(3.2) \quad \frac{dx_1}{x_1} + \sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i \frac{dy_1}{y_1 - i}.$$

with the following condition, known as the Camacho-Sad relation [1],

$$(3.3) \quad \sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i = p.$$

This foliation leaves invariant the divisor $x_1 = 0$ and the relation above ensure that it is regular at $+\infty$. By construction, for any i , we get

$$\text{CS}(\mathcal{G}, \{x_1 = 0\}, i) = \lambda_i.$$

where CS is the so-called Camacho-Sad index [1]. Moreover, it follows that

$$\sum_{p \in \{x_1=0\}} \text{Ind}(\mathcal{R}_{p,N}, \{x_1 = 0\}, p) = N$$

where Ind is the second index introduced in [14].

Figure 3.1 presents the topology of \mathcal{R} and \mathcal{G} .

3.2. **Gluing local models.** Let E be the process of desingularization of C . Let \mathbb{A} be the dual tree of the exceptional divisor $E^{-1}(0)$. The map E is a composition of elementary blowing-ups that we denote

$$E = \bigcirc_{s \in \mathbb{A}} E_s.$$

Here E_s is the elementary blowing-up whose exceptional divisor is the component s . For any c , the notation \star_c^E will refer to the germ at the point leading to the component c of the strict transform of \star by the sub-process $\bigcirc_{s \in \mathbb{A}_c \setminus \{c\}} E_s$ where \mathbb{A}_c is the access tree from r to c , as defined in the previous section.

For a germ of vector field X (or its associated germ of foliation \mathcal{F}) and $s \in \mathbb{A}$, we will set Δ_s^X (or \mathcal{F}) = 1 if X_s^E is non dicritical, otherwise, $\Delta_s^X = 0$. It defines a dicriticality on \mathbb{A} .

Proposition 7. *There exists C' topologically equivalent to C such that there exists $X \in \text{Der}(\log C')$ satisfying the following : for any $s \in \mathbb{A}$*

$$\nu(X_s^E) = \frac{\nu(C_s^E) + \delta_s^X}{2} - \begin{cases} 1 - \Delta_s^X \\ \frac{1}{2} \\ \nu(C_s^E) + \delta_s^X \end{cases}$$

Proof. The process E of desingularization of C induces an numbered ordered tree \mathbb{A} as defined in the previous section. The tree \mathbb{A} is the dual tree of the exceptional divisor of E ; the order is the one induced by the process it-self; the numbering n is setting as follows: n_s is equal to the number of component of the strict transform C^E attached to s . Consider the associated Saito dicriticality Δ^n and configuration ϵ^n given by Theorem 3.

Using a result of A.-L. Neto [15] of construction of singular foliations in dimension 2 from elementary elements, we are going to construct a foliation from the data of Δ^n and ϵ^n by gluing semi-local models. The matrix \mathbb{P} being the proximity matrix of \mathbb{A} it is known that $\mathbb{P}^t \mathbb{P}$ is the intersection matrix I of $E^{-1}(0)$ embedded in its neighborhood [22].

To $s \in \mathbb{A}$ with $\Delta_s^n = 1$, we associate the semi-local model $\mathcal{G}_{I_{s,s}, \epsilon_s^n + |\{c \in \mathbf{v}_s, \Delta_c^n = 1\}|, \Lambda_s}$ where

$$\Lambda_s = \left(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{\epsilon_s^n}, \lambda_{s,c_1}, \dots, \lambda_{s,c_{|\{c \in \mathbf{v}_s, \Delta_c^n = 1\}|}} \right) /$$

The only obstruction for such a semi-local construction is the Camacho-Sad relation

$$(3.4) \quad \sum_{i=1}^{\epsilon_s^n} \lambda_i + \sum_{i \in \{c \in \mathbf{v}_s, \Delta_c^n = 1\}} \lambda_{s,i} = -I_{s,s}$$

To $s \in \mathbb{A}$ with $\Delta_s^n = 0$, we associate the semi-local model

$$\mathcal{R}_{I_{s,s}, \epsilon_s^n - 2 + \sum_{c \in \mathbf{v}_s} \Delta_c^n}$$

Since Δ^n is the Saito dicriticality, the admissibility condition yields the inequality

$$\epsilon_s^n - 2 + \sum_{c \in \mathbf{v}_s} \Delta_c^n \geq 0,$$

so that, the definition of the model does make sense.

From [15], all these semi-local models can be glued together by gluing maps following the edges of \mathbb{A} provided that at any intersection point of two components s and s' with $\Delta_s^n = \Delta_{s'}^n = 1$, the following relation is satisfied

$$(3.5) \quad \lambda_{s,s'} \cdot \lambda_{s',s} = 1.$$

Property (5) of Theorem 3 ensures that, along any connected component \mathbb{K} of $\mathbb{A} \setminus \{s \in \mathbb{A} \mid \Delta_s^n = 1\}$, no incompatibility will occur between the relations (3.4) and (3.5). Indeed, along \mathbb{K} the number of induced relations is

$$\#\text{vertices}(\mathbb{K}) + \#\text{edges}(\mathbb{K}).$$

However, the number of variables involved in the mentioned relations is

$$\sum_{s \in \mathbb{K}} \epsilon_s^n + |\{c \in \mathbf{v}_s, \Delta_c^n = 1\}|.$$

Following Property (5) the above number of variables satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{s \in \mathbb{K}} \epsilon_s^n + |\{c \in \mathbf{v}_s, \Delta_c^n = 1\}| &\geq 1 + \sum_{s \in \mathbb{K}} |\{c \in \mathbf{v}_s, \Delta_c^n = 1\}| = 2\#\text{vertices}(\mathbb{K}) - 1 \\ &\geq \#\text{vertices}(\mathbb{K}) + \#\text{edges}(\mathbb{K}) \end{aligned}$$

since $\#\text{vertices}(\mathbb{K}) = \#\text{edges}(\mathbb{K}) + 1$. Therefore the system of equations, union of (3.4) and (3.5), has always a solution. Note that these solutions can be chosen to be rational numbers.

The gluing leads to a foliation defined in a neighborhood of a compact divisor \mathcal{D} , union of $|\mathbb{A}|$ regular rational curves, with same intersection matrix as the one of the exceptional divisor of E . According to a classical result of H. Grauert [9], the neighborhood of \mathcal{D} is analytically equivalent to the neighborhood of the exceptional divisor of some blowing-up process E' with same dual graph as E . The latter neighborhood is foliated by a foliation \mathcal{F}' that can be contracted by E' in a foliation \mathcal{F} .

For any component $s \in \mathbb{A}$, either $\Delta_s^n = 0$ and \mathcal{F}' is generically transverse to s . Then, we choose arbitrarily n_s regular and transverse invariant curves attached to s . Or $\Delta_s^n = 1$ and \mathcal{F}' locally given by (3.2) leaves invariant at least n_s regular and transverse curves attached to s : indeed, Δ^n being Saito, we have $\epsilon_s^n \geq n_s$. The union of all these curves yields a curve C' whose desingularization process has for numbered dual graph the tree \mathbb{A} . Since the number of component of the strict transform by E of C' has exactly n_s components attached to s , C' and C are topologically equivalent [23]. In the sequel, for the sake of simplicity, we denote C' simple by C . According to [14, Theorem 3], we have

$$\nu(\mathcal{F}) + 1 = \sum_{s \in \mathbb{A}} \rho_s \times \begin{cases} -|\{c \in \mathbf{v}_s, \Delta_c^n = 1\}| + \sum_{p \in s} \text{Ind}(\mathcal{F}^E, s, p) & \text{if } \Delta_s^n = 1 \\ 2 - |\{c \in \mathbf{v}_s, \Delta_c^n = 1\}| + \sum_{p \in s} \text{Tan}(\mathcal{F}^E, s, p) & \text{if } \Delta_s^n = 0 \end{cases}$$

In our construction, the definition of the semi-local models induces the relations

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{p \in s} \text{Ind}(\mathcal{F}^E, s, p) &= \epsilon_s^n + |\{c \in \mathbf{v}_s, \Delta_c^n = 1\}| \\ \sum_{p \in s} \text{Tan}(\mathcal{F}^E, s, p) &= \epsilon_s^n - 2 + |\{c \in \mathbf{v}_s, \Delta_c^n = 1\}|. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, by construction for any $s \in \mathbb{A}$, we find

$$\Delta_s^n = \Delta_s^{\mathcal{F}}, \quad \delta_s^n = \delta_s^{\mathcal{F}}.$$

Thus, since the configuration ϵ^n satisfies the system (9) of Theorem 3, the valuation of \mathcal{F} can be expressed as follows

$$\nu(\mathcal{F}) = \sum_{s \in \mathbb{A}} \rho_s \epsilon_s^n = \frac{\nu_1^n}{2} - \left[\begin{array}{c} 1 - \Delta_1^n \\ \frac{1}{2} \\ \nu_1^n \end{array} \right] = \frac{\nu(C)}{2} - \left[\begin{array}{c} 1 - \Delta_1^{\mathcal{F}} \\ \frac{1}{2} \\ \nu(C) \end{array} \right].$$

Doing the same remark along the whole process of blowing-ups of C , we obtain, for any $s \in \mathbb{A}$,

$$(3.6) \quad \nu(\mathcal{F}_s^E) = \frac{\nu(C_s^E) + \delta_s^{\mathcal{F}}}{2} - \left[\begin{array}{c} 1 - \Delta_s^{\mathcal{F}} \\ \frac{1}{2} \\ \nu(C_s^E) + \delta_s^{\mathcal{F}} \end{array} \right]$$

□

3.3. Deformation of \mathcal{F} . In the previous section, we obtained a foliation \mathcal{F} leaving invariant a curve C whose valuations satisfy the relations described in Proposition 7. However, we cannot still claim that a vector field X defining \mathcal{F} is neither optimal nor Saito, since the curve C could be *special* in its moduli space and admit a tangent vector field with small valuations. In order to overcome this difficulty, we are going to prove that \mathcal{F} can be put in a deformation *weakly equisingular* that follows a deformation of toward generic elements of $\text{Mod}(C)$, for which lower bound for

Saito numbers is known. To implement this strategy, we will gather material from [4, 5, 7, 3, 8].

Theorem 8. *There exists C' in the moduli space of C such that C' admits a Saito vector field X further satisfying for any $s \in \mathbb{A}$*

$$\nu(X_s^E) = \frac{\nu(C_s^E) + \delta_s^X}{2} - \begin{cases} 1 - \Delta_s^X \\ \frac{1}{2} \\ \nu(C_s^E) + \delta_s^X \end{cases}$$

Proof. Let E be the desingularization process of C . Denote by Ω the volume form

$$\Omega = E^*(dx \wedge dy).$$

Let \mathfrak{X} be the global vector field $\mathfrak{X} = E^*\left(\frac{X}{f}\right)$ where X is a vector field defining \mathcal{F} and f is a balanced equation of the separatrices of X , as introduced in [3, Definition 1.2]. Following [5, Proposition 18], we associate to \mathfrak{X} the following divisor

$$(3.7) \quad D_{\mathfrak{X}} = 2\left((f=0)^E - (f=\infty)^E\right) - C^E + \overline{D}$$

defined in the total space of E . Here, \overline{D} is the union of components of D invariant by \mathfrak{X} . Let us consider \mathbb{F} the sheaf based upon D of \mathcal{O} -modules of vector fields tangent to the foliation given by \mathfrak{X} and Θ the sheaf based on D of vector fields tangent to $E^{-1}(C)$. In [8, Theorem 1.6], Gomez-Mont exhibited the existence of an exact sequence in cohomology written

$$(3.8) \quad \mathbb{H}^1(D, \mathbb{F}) \rightarrow H^1(D, \Theta) \rightarrow H^1\left(D, \text{Hom}\left(\mathbb{F}, \frac{\Theta}{\mathbb{F}}\right)\right).$$

The space $\mathbb{H}^1(D, \mathbb{F})$ is identified with the space of infinitesimal deformations of \mathcal{F} ; the space $H^1(D, \Theta)$ is identified with the space of infinitesimal deformations of C . Now, the sheaf \mathbb{F} is locally free of rank 1. Thus, a section α of $\text{Hom}\left(\mathbb{F}, \frac{\Theta}{\mathbb{F}}\right)$ is completely determined by the image of E^*X or, equivalently by the image of \mathfrak{X} . By construction, \mathcal{F} is of *second kind* as defined in [3]. The relations established in [3, Lemme 2.1] are written in our context

$$\nu_s(i_{E^*X}\Omega) = \nu_s(E^*f) + \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } s \text{ is invariant by } E^*X \\ 0 & \text{if not} \end{cases}$$

where i stands for the inner product. It can be seen that, as a consequence, the morphism of sheaves defined by

$$\text{Hom}\left(\mathbb{F}, \frac{\Theta}{\mathbb{F}}\right) \rightarrow \Omega^2(D_{\mathfrak{X}}), \quad \alpha \mapsto i_{\alpha(\mathfrak{X})}\Omega \wedge i_{\mathfrak{X}}\Omega$$

is an isomorphism of sheaves : here, $\Omega^2(D_{\mathfrak{X}})$ is the sheaf over D of 2-forms η for which the divisor $(\eta) = (\eta=0) - (\eta=\infty)$ satisfies

$$(\eta) \geq -D_{\mathfrak{X}}.$$

Moreover, in [5, Proposition 18], it is proved that, provided that the relations (3.6) are satisfied, we have

$$H^1(D, \Omega^2(D_{\mathfrak{X}})) = 0.$$

Thus, the exact sequence (3.8) reduces to

$$(3.9) \quad \mathbb{H}^1(D, \mathcal{F}) \rightarrow H^1(D, \Theta) \rightarrow 0.$$

Since D is of dimension 1 and can be covered with Stein open sets with no 3 by 3 intersections [21, 16, Definition 1.2.4], the coherence of the involved sheaves ensures that for any $k \geq 2$, we have

$$H^k(D, \Theta) = H^k(D, \mathbb{F}) = 0.$$

Now consider an analytical deformation C_t , $t \in (\mathbb{C}, 0)$ with $C_0 = C$ such that for all $t \neq 0$, C_t belongs to *the generic component* of its moduli space, as defined in [7, Theorem 3]. Using some techniques similar as these developed in [4, Proposition 2.2] for unfoldings of foliations and adapted to general deformations and starting from the exact sequence (3.9), we obtain a deformation of foliations \mathcal{F}_t , $t \in (\mathbb{C}, 0)$, $\mathcal{F}_0 = \mathcal{F}$ such that for any t , \mathcal{F}_t leaves invariant C_t . This deformation is *weakly equisingular*, in the sense that, the family of numbered dual trees of the family of processes of desingularizations of \mathcal{F}_t is constant equal to the numbered tree \mathbb{A} . In particular, the valuations $\nu\left((\mathcal{F}_t)_s^E\right)$ at any $s \in \mathbb{A}$ satisfy ,

$$\forall t \in (\mathbb{C}, 0), \nu\left((\mathcal{F}_t)_s^E\right) = \nu\left(\mathcal{F}_s^E\right).$$

Now, if c is generic in the moduli space then, according to [7, Theorem 4], for any X in $\text{Der}(\log c)$, the following lower bound holds

$$\forall s \in \mathbb{A}, \nu\left(X_s^E\right) \geq \frac{\nu\left(c_s^E\right) + \delta_s^X}{2} - \left\lfloor \begin{array}{c} 1 - \Delta_s^X \\ \frac{1}{2} \\ \nu\left(c_s^E\right) + \delta_s^X \end{array} \right\rfloor.$$

Thus, for any $t \neq 0$, the foliation \mathcal{F}_t - or a vector field X_t defining \mathcal{F}_t - leaves invariant a curve C_t topologically equivalent to $C_0 = C$ that is optimal for C_t and keeps on being optimal along the desingularization process of C_t , that means precisely, is Saito for C_t . \square

3.4. Generic dimension of the moduli space $\text{Mod}(C)$. According to [17, Theorem 4.2], the generic dimension of the moduli space of C is equal to $\dim \mathbb{H}^1(D, \Theta)$ when C is chosen generic in its moduli space. The results of this section and these of [7] ensure that this dimension can be computed from the topological datas associated to a Saito foliation for a generic element in the topological class of C . In [6], an algorithm is given to compute this topological datas when C is an union of regular curve. This article implies that the same algorithm still provides this topological datas in the general case. We implemented, among other procedures this algorithm on Sage 9.* - or Python 3 -. See the routine *Courbes.Planes* following the link

<https://perso.math.univ-toulouse.fr/genzmer/>

4. EXAMPLES

Example 9 (*The Saito foliation of the double cusp*). The double cusp is the curve C defined by

$$(y^2 + x^3)(y^2 - x^3) = 0.$$

It is a curve with 0-dimensional moduli space. Its desingularization E consists in five elementary blowing-ups

$$E = \bigcirc_{i=0}^4 E_i.$$




FIGURE 4.1. Saito dicriticities of the double cusp.

The Saito dicricity of C is given in Figure 4.1. The number on each vertex allows us to identify the order on the tree defined by

$$0 \leq 1, 0 \leq 2, 1 \leq 4, 2 \leq 3.$$

The dots encode the configuration. Here, the configuration associated to the Saito dicricity is

$$\epsilon_0 = \epsilon_1 = \epsilon_2 = 1, \quad \epsilon_3 = \epsilon_4 = 0.$$

It can be seen, by computing its desingularization, that the vector field X defined by

$$\begin{aligned} X = & \left(\frac{9}{5}x^3y - x^2y^2 + y^3 - \frac{4}{5}x^2 + xy \right) \partial_x \\ & + \left(\frac{6}{5}x^2y^2 - \frac{3}{2}xy^3 - \frac{5}{6}x^3 - \frac{6}{5}xy + \frac{2}{3}y^2 \right) \partial_y \end{aligned}$$

is Saito for the double cusp. Indeed, it is tangent to C and non dicritical. Its valuation satisfies

$$2 = \frac{\nu(C) + 1}{2} - \left[\begin{array}{c} 1 - 1 \\ \frac{1}{2} \\ 4 \end{array} \right].$$

After one blowing-up, it has three singularities along the exceptional divisor given in the coordinates $(y = y_1, x = y_1x_1)$ by

$$s_1 = (0, 0), \quad s_3 = \left(0, -\frac{6}{5} \right) \quad \text{and} \quad s_2 = (0, \infty).$$

The singularity s_3 is reduced : the quotient of the eigenvalues of E_0^*X at s_2 is actually equal to 5. At s_1 and s_3 , E_0^*X is of valuation 1 which satisfies

$$1 = \frac{\nu(C_{s_1}^E) + 1}{2} - \left[\begin{array}{c} 1 - 1 \\ \frac{1}{2} \\ 2 \end{array} \right] = \frac{\nu(C_{s_3}^E) + 1}{2} - \left[\begin{array}{c} 1 - 1 \\ \frac{1}{2} \\ 2 \end{array} \right].$$

After blowing-up s_1 , the vector field $(E_0 \circ E_1)^*X$ has two singularities along the new exceptional divisor. One is reduced with positive and rational quotient of the eigenvalues. The other is radial, that is, its linear part is locally in coordinates written $x\partial_x + y\partial_y$. The same occurs at s_3 . At the radial singularities s_5 and s_6 which are dicritical, one has

$$1 = \frac{\nu(C_{s_5 \text{ or } s_6}^E) + 2}{2} - \left[\begin{array}{c} 1 - 0 \\ \frac{1}{2} \\ 3 \end{array} \right].$$

As a consequence, X is indeed Saito for C .

Example 10 (*Generic dimension of the moduli space of the union of r cusps of type $(2,3)$*). In [13], the authors give a formula for the generic dimension of the moduli space of the curve

$$\mathcal{C}_r = \left\{ \prod_{i=1}^r (y^2 + a_i x^3) = 0 \right\}$$

where $a_i \neq a_j \neq 0$ for $i \neq j$. When r is even, this dimension happens to be equal to

$$(4.1) \quad \frac{(r-1)(3r-5)+1}{2}.$$

Let us illustrate how our algorithm works in this situation. The proximity matrix of the \mathcal{C}_r is

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & -1 & -1 \\ 0 & 1 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

and the numbering of \mathbb{A} is $(0,0,r)$. The Saito dicriticality is equal to $(1,1,0)$ and the associated configuration is $(2,1,\frac{r}{2})$. After one blowing-up, according to [7, Proposition 4], we get

$$\dim H^1(D_1, \Theta) = \frac{(r-1)(r-2)}{2} + \frac{(r-1)(r-2)}{2} = (r-1)(r-2).$$

Now, after one blowing-up the curve $D_1 \cup \mathcal{C}_r^{E_1}$ is given in local coordinates $y = y_1 x_1$ by

$$x_1 \prod_{i=1}^r (y_1^2 + a_i x_1) = 0.$$

The proximity matrix of the desingularization of the latter curve is now

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & -1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

and the numbering $(0, r+1)$. The Saito dicriticality is equal to $(1,0)$ and the associated configuration is $(1, \frac{r}{2})$. Thus, we obtain

$$\dim H^1(D_2, \Theta) = \frac{(\frac{r}{2}-1)(\frac{r}{2}-2)}{2} + \frac{\frac{r}{2}(\frac{r}{2}-1)}{2}.$$

Finally, after one more blowing-up the curve $D_1 \cup D_2 \cup \mathcal{C}_r^{E_2}$ is given by

$$x_2 y_2 \prod_{i=1}^r (y_2 + a_i x_2).$$

The proximity matrix reduces to (1) and the numbering to $(r+2)$. The Saito dicriticality is just (0) and the configuration $(\frac{r}{2}+1)$. Thus, still following [7, Proposition 4], one has

$$\dim H^1(D_3, \Theta) = \frac{(\frac{r}{2}-1)(\frac{r}{2}-2)}{2} + \frac{\frac{r}{2}(\frac{r}{2}-1)}{2} + r - 1.$$

Adding the above dimensions leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \dim H^1(D, \Theta) &= (r-1)(r-2) + \frac{\left(\frac{r}{2}-1\right)\left(\frac{r}{2}-2\right)}{2} + \frac{\frac{r}{2}\left(\frac{r}{2}-1\right)}{2} \\ &\quad + \frac{\left(\frac{r}{2}-1\right)\left(\frac{r}{2}-2\right)}{2} + \frac{\frac{r}{2}\left(\frac{r}{2}-1\right)}{2} + r-1 \\ &= \frac{(r-1)(3r-5)+1}{2} \end{aligned}$$

which is confirmed by the formula (4.1).

Example 11 (*Generic Tjurina number of a curve.*). The algorithm defined above allows us to provide immediately a computation of the generic Tjurina number, that is, the dimension of the quotient of $\mathbb{C}\{x, y\}$ by the Tjurina ideal of C , i.e. $(f, \partial_x f, \partial_y f)$ where f is an equation of C . Let E be the desingularization process of C . Above the exceptional divisor D of E , we consider the sheaves T_{df} and T_f of vector fields tangent respectively to the foliation E^*df and $E^{-1}(f^{-1}(0))$. The following sequence of sheaves

$$0 \rightarrow T_{df} \rightarrow T_f \xrightarrow{E^*df(\cdot)} (f \circ E) \mathcal{O}_D \rightarrow 0$$

is exact [18]. The associated long exact sequence in cohomology is written

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \rightarrow H^0(D, T_{df}) \rightarrow H^0(D, T_f) \rightarrow H^0(D, (f \circ E) \mathcal{O}_D) \\ \rightarrow H^1(D, T_{df}) \rightarrow H^1(D, T_f) \rightarrow 0 \end{aligned}$$

since $H^1(D, (f \circ E) \mathcal{O}_D) = 0$. Now, we can identify the global sections of the above sheaves :

$$\begin{aligned} H^0(D, (f \circ E) \mathcal{O}_D) &= (f) \\ H^0(D, T_f) &= \{X \text{ vector field} \mid X \cdot f \in (f)\} \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the following sequence is exact

$$0 \rightarrow \frac{(f)}{\{X \cdot f \mid X \text{ tangent to } f=0\}} \rightarrow H^1(D, T_{df}) \rightarrow H^1(D, T_f) \rightarrow 0.$$

Now, it can be seen that

$$\frac{(f)}{\{X \cdot f \mid X \text{ tangent to } f=0\}} \simeq \frac{(f, \text{Jac}f)}{\text{Jac}f}.$$

The previous short exact sequence ensures that

$$\dim H^1(D, T_f) - \dim H^1(D, T_{df}) + \dim \frac{(f, \text{Jac}f)}{\text{Jac}f} = 0$$

which can be also written

$$\tau(C) = \mu(C) - \delta(C) + \dim H^1(D, T_f)$$

where $\mu(C)$ is the Milnor number of C and $\delta(C)$ its modularity [16]. Now, if C is chosen generic in its moduli space, we obtain

$$\tau_{\text{gen}}(C) = \mu(C) - \delta(C) + \dim_{\text{gen}} \mathbb{M}(C).$$

Since the Milnor number and the modularity can be computed from the numbered tree of C , the formula above yields an algorithm to compute the generic Tjurina number of C - which happens to be also the minimal Tjurina number.

As an example, the curve given by the following parametrization $C = (t^9, t^{12} + t^{17})$ has been studied by Peraire [19] and she found

$$\tau_{\text{gen}}(C) = 80.$$

It can be seen that

$$\mu(C) = 98 \text{ and } \delta(C) = 29.$$

Our algorithm provides the generic dimension of the moduli space and we find

$$\dim_{\text{gen}} \mathbb{M}(C) = 11,$$

which confirms the result of Peraire.

REFERENCES

- [1] C. Camacho and P. Sad. Invariant varieties through singularities of holomorphic vector fields. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 115(3):579–595, 1982.
- [2] S. Ebey. The classification of singular points of algebraic curves. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 118:454–471, 1965.
- [3] Y. Genzmer. Rigidity for dicritical germ of foliation in \mathbb{C}^2 . *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN*, (19):Art. ID rnm072, 14, 2007.
- [4] Y. Genzmer. Construction of foliations with prescribed separatrix. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, 28(3):817–842, 2008.
- [5] Y. Genzmer. Dimension of the Moduli Space of a Germ of Curve in \mathbb{C}^2 . *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN*, (5):3805–3859, 2022.
- [6] Y. Genzmer. Number of moduli for a union of smooth curves in \mathbb{C}^2 . *J. Symb. Comput.*, 113:148–170, 2022.
- [7] Y. Genzmer. The Saito module and the moduli of a germ of curve in $(\mathbb{C}^2, 0)$. *Accepted in Annales de l'institut Fourier*, arXiv 2009.09194, 2023.
- [8] X. Gómez-Mont. The transverse dynamics of a holomorphic flow. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 127(1):49–92, 1988.
- [9] H. Grauert. Ein Theorem der analytischen Garbentheorie und die Modulräume komplexer Strukturen. *Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math.*, (5):233–292, 1960.
- [10] A. Hefez and M. E. Hernandes. Analytic classification of plane branches up to multiplicity 4. *J. Symbolic Comput.*, 44(6):626–634, 2009.
- [11] A. Hefez and M. E. Hernandes. The analytic classification of plane branches. *Bull. Lond. Math. Soc.*, 43(2):289–298, 2011.
- [12] A. Hefez and M. E. Hernandes. Algorithms for the implementation of the analytic classification of plane branches. *J. Symbolic Comput.*, 50:308–313, 2013.
- [13] M.E. Hernandes and M.E.R. Hernandes. The analytic classification of plane curves. *arXiv*, 2010.04874, 2023.
- [14] C. Hertling. Formules pour la multiplicité et le nombre de Milnor d'un feuilletage sur $(\mathbb{C}^2, 0)$. *Ann. Fac. Sci. Toulouse Math. (6)*, 9(4):655–670, 2000.
- [15] A. Lins Neto. Construction of singular holomorphic vector fields and foliations in dimension two. *J. Differential Geom.*, 26(1):1–31, 1987.
- [16] J.-F. Mattei. Modules de feuilletages holomorphes singuliers. I. Équisingularité. *Invent. Math.*, 103(2):297–325, 1991.
- [17] J.-F. Mattei. Quasi-homogénéité et équiréductibilité de feuilletages holomorphes en dimension deux. *Astérisque*, (261):xix, 253–276, 2000. Géométrie complexe et systèmes dynamiques (Orsay, 1995).
- [18] J.-F. Mattei and E. Salem. Complete systems of topological and analytical invariants for a generic foliation of $(\mathbb{C}^2, 0)$. *Math. Res. Lett.*, 4(1):131–141, 1997.
- [19] R. Peraire. Tjurina number of a generic irreducible curve singularity. *Journal of Algebra*, 196(1):114–157, 1997.
- [20] K. Saito. Theory of logarithmic differential forms and logarithmic vector fields. *J. Fac. Sci. Univ. Tokyo Sect. IA Math.*, 27(2):265–291, 1980.
- [21] Y.T. Siu. Every Stein subvariety admits a Stein neighborhood. *Invent. Math.*, 38(1):89–100, 1976/77.

- [22] C. T. C. Wall. *Singular points of plane curves*, volume 63 of *London Mathematical Society Student Texts*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2004.
- [23] O. Zariski. On the Topology of Algebroid Singularities. *Amer. J. Math.*, 54(3):453–465, 1932.
- [24] O. Zariski. *Le problème des modules pour les branches planes*. Hermann, Paris, second edition, 1986. Course given at the Centre de Mathématiques de l'École Polytechnique, Paris, October–November 1973, With an appendix by Bernard Teissier.