

THE IMAGE COMPLEXITY OF AN ANALYTIC MAP GERM

CEZAR JOIȚA AND MIHAI TIBĂR

ABSTRACT. The image of a holomorphic map germ is not necessarily locally open, and it is not always well-defined as a set germ. We find the structure of what becomes the image of a map germ when the target is a surface. We encode it as a decorated tree and we derive a complexity degree.

1. INTRODUCTION

The need of assuming that the image of an analytic map germ is well-defined *as a set germ* has been pointed out by John N. Mather in his fundamental study of the stratified structure of maps [Ma]. To see what this means, let $F : (X, \mathfrak{p}) \rightarrow (Y, y)$ be a non-constant complex analytic map germ between irreducible complex analytic set germs. Consider an embedding $(X, \mathfrak{p}) \subset (\mathbb{C}^N, 0)$, and the intersection $X \cap B_\varepsilon$ of some representative of X with a ball $B_\varepsilon \subset \mathbb{C}^N$ of small enough radius $\varepsilon > 0$ centred at 0. Then the map germ F has a well defined *local image* if and only if the germ at y of the set $F(B_\varepsilon \cap X)$ is independent of the radius ε . Map germs as simple as the blow-up $(x, z) \mapsto (x, xz)$ at the origin of \mathbb{C}^2 do not have a well defined local image.

This extends the notion of *locally open maps*, see e.g. [Hu]: the map F germ is locally open at y if for any radius $\varepsilon > 0$, the set $F(B_\varepsilon \cap X)$ contains $y \in Y$ as an interior point. For instance, a non-constant holomorphic function germ $f : (\mathbb{C}^n, 0) \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}, 0)$ is locally open, as a consequence of the Open Mapping Theorem. A criterion for the image of F to be locally open, which responds to Huckleberry's conjecture in [Hu], has been proved recently, see Remark 1.2 below.

Moreover, in the case $\dim_y Y = 2$, it has been proved in [JT] that if the image of F is a well defined set germ at y , then this is an *irreducible analytic set germ*, see Proposition 2.1 and §6.

The following natural question occurs:

(*) *If the image of $F : (X, \mathfrak{p}) \rightarrow (Y, y)$ is not well-defined as a set germ, then what is it? If one can still give a meaning to the “image of the map germ F ”, then what is the structure of this object?*

We propose here the following new definition.

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 14E18, 32B10, 32S45, 32C20.

Key words and phrases. set germs, analytic maps, arc spaces.

The authors acknowledge support of the project “Singularities and Applications” - CF 132/31.07.2023 funded by the European Union - NextGenerationEU - through Romania's National Recovery and Resilience Plan, and support by the grant CNRS-INSMI-IEA-329.

Let $\mathcal{A}_{X,\mathfrak{p}}$ denote the set of irreducible curve¹ germs $(C, \mathfrak{p}) \subset (X, \mathfrak{p})$. There is a well-defined mapping:

$$F_* : \mathcal{A}_{X,\mathfrak{p}} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_{Y,y}, \quad (C, \mathfrak{p}) \mapsto (F(C), y).$$

Definition 1.1 (*The image of F*).

Let (X, \mathfrak{p}) be an irreducible germ of an n -dimensional complex analytic space, $n \geq 2$ and let $F : (X, \mathfrak{p}) \rightarrow (Y, y)$ be a holomorphic map germ. We call *image of F* the subset of curve germs $F_*(\mathcal{A}_{X,\mathfrak{p}}) \subset \mathcal{A}_{Y,y}$.

Denoting by 0_y the degenerated curve germ at y , the map germ F is constant if and only if $F_*(\mathcal{A}_{X,\mathfrak{p}}) = 0_y$.

REMARK 1.2. The equality $F_*(\mathcal{A}_{X,\mathfrak{p}}) = \mathcal{A}_{Y,y}$ is equivalent to “ F has no gap curve” in the terminology of [JT, §3.2]. Therefore, by [JT, Theorem 3.5], the assertion “ F is open at y ” is equivalent to the equality $F_*(\mathcal{A}_{X,\mathfrak{p}}) = \mathcal{A}_{Y,y}$.

We answer the question (*) by finding an algorithmic way to describe $F_*(\mathcal{A}_{X,\mathfrak{p}})$ in case target space Y is a surface². We will see that the complexity of the image is encoded by a certain new type of decorated finite tree.

To give here a glance of how our approach works, we stick for now to the smooth case $(Y, y) = (\mathbb{C}^2, 0)$.

Let $\tau_1 : S_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^2$ be the blow-up at the origin, and let E_1 be the exceptional divisor. The set of the proper transforms by τ_1 of all curve germs in $\mathcal{I} := F_*(\mathcal{A}_{X,\mathfrak{p}})$ will be denoted by $\tau_1^*\mathcal{I}$. For some $\xi \in E_1$, let then

$$(\tau_1^*\mathcal{I})_\xi := \{\gamma \in \mathcal{A}_{S_1,\xi} \mid F_*(\gamma) \in \mathcal{I}\}.$$

We thus have the equality $\tau_1^*\mathcal{I} = \bigcup_{\xi \in E_1} (\tau_1^*\mathcal{I})_\xi$. A point $\xi \in E_1$ can be of one of the following 3 types only (see also the equivalent Definition 3.4):

- *determined-empty*, if $(\tau_1^*\mathcal{I})_\xi = 0_\xi$.
- *determined-full*, if $(\tau_1^*\mathcal{I})_\xi = \mathcal{A}_{S_1,\xi}$.
- *undetermined*, if $(\tau_1^*\mathcal{I})_\xi \neq 0_\xi$ and $(\tau_1^*\mathcal{I})_\xi \neq \mathcal{A}_{S_1,\xi}$.

These definitions make sense for any $\mathcal{I} \subset \mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{C}^2,0}$, however we will show in Lemma 3.5 and Lemma 3.6 that if \mathcal{I} is the image of a holomorphic map germ, then precisely one of the following two situations may occur:

(a) there are at most finitely many undetermined points in E_1 and all other points are determined-full; we then say that E_1 is *thick*,

or

(b) there exists one point $\xi_1 \in E_1$ such that any other point $\xi \in E_1 \setminus \{\xi_1\}$ is determined-empty; we then say that E_1 is *thin*.

In the second step we blow-up simultaneously at all undetermined points of E_1 , say by the map τ_2 . This map has finitely many exceptional divisors $E_{2,i}$, each of which is thick or thin. Similarly, in the 3rd step we blow-up simultaneously at all undetermined points of

¹We consider here curves as geometric objects, and not as arcs defined by given parametrisations.

²While the problem remains open for $\dim Y > 2$.

the exceptional divisors created at step 2, and we call τ_3 this blow-up map. We continue in this way, step-by-step. In §4 we show that after finitely many steps there are no more undetermined points, and therefore this process ends. The exceptional divisor \mathbb{E} of the total blow-up τ is a tree with thick and thin normal crossing branches.

1.1. Definition of the blossom tree \mathcal{B}_F .

Let

$$S = S^{(s)} \xrightarrow{\tau_s} S^{(s-1)} \xrightarrow{\tau_{s-1}} \dots \xrightarrow{\tau_1} \mathbb{C}^2$$

be a sequence of successive blow-ups τ_k , $k \in \overline{1, s}$, where τ_k , for $k > 1$, is the result of blowing up simultaneously all the undetermined points which occur on the exceptional divisors created at the step $k - 1$. By the finiteness result of §4 we may assume that the blow-up τ_s has no more undetermined points.

Let $\tau : (S, E) \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}^2, 0)$ denote the composition of the finite sequence of blow-ups, and let $\mathbb{E} := \cup_i E_i$ be the exceptional divisor, where each irreducible component E_i is isomorphic to \mathbb{P}^1 . At step k , the blow-up τ_k at finitely many points yields a number of irreducible exceptional divisors which become thick or thin. They preserve their names, i.e. “thick” or “thin”, until the end of the process.

For such a component $E_i \subset E$, we set:

$$\mathcal{E}_i^{\text{thick}} := \bigsqcup_{\xi \in E_i} \mathcal{A}_{S, \xi} \quad \text{or} \quad \mathcal{E}_i^{\text{thin}} := \bigsqcup_{\xi \in E_i} 0_\xi,$$

and call $\mathcal{E}_i^{\text{thick}}$ a *thick branch*, and $\mathcal{E}_i^{\text{thin}}$ a *thin branch*, respectively. We will also call *terminal* a thin branch which has a determined-full point, called *terminal point*. For a terminal point $\xi_j \in E$ we set:

$$\mathcal{P}_j := \mathcal{A}_{S, \xi_j}.$$

A terminal branch corresponds therefore to an exceptional divisor E_i which occurs at the last step of some sequence of ramified blow-ups. Such a “last step divisor” necessarily yields a thin branch (follows from the algorithm §3.2, see the footnote at Step 1).

The undetermined points for the non-terminal branches, or the terminal point of a terminal branch, will be called *special points*. The special point of a thin branch created at some step of the blow-up process occurs precisely at the intersection of the new divisor with the preceding divisor from which it grows. To each branch, one attaches a *label* containing the following information: (1). the place of each of its special points, and (2). the number of the step when it appears in the blow-up process.

The *blossom tree* \mathcal{B}_F associated with F is then, by definition, the collection of labelled thick and thin branches:

$$\mathcal{B}_F := \bigcup_i \mathcal{E}_i^{\text{thick}} \cup \bigcup_j \mathcal{E}_j^{\text{thin}}$$

except when the blow-up process yields a linear sequence of thin branches (thus without thick branches), in which case there is a unique³ terminal “thick” point with structure \mathcal{P} .

³A trivial example is the blow-up map $(x, y) \mapsto (x, xy)$, the blossom tree of which reduces to a thick point.

We then set by definition:

$$\mathcal{B}_F := \bigcup_j \mathcal{E}_j^{\text{thin}} \cup \mathcal{P}$$

The map $\tau : S \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^2$ restricts to map germs $\tau|_1 : (S, \xi) \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}^2, 0)$, for any $\xi \in E$, which induce maps $\tau_{1*} : \mathcal{A}_{S, \xi} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{C}^2, 0}$.

With these notations we may state our main result:

Theorem 1.3. *If $F : (X, \mathfrak{p}) \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}^2, 0)$ is a holomorphic map germ the image of which is not well-defined as a set germ, then there is a unique blossom tree \mathcal{B}_F such that:*

$$F_*(\mathcal{A}_{X, \mathfrak{p}}) = \tau_*(\mathcal{B}_F).$$

It follows from the construction that two holomorphic map germs having the same image generate the same blossom tree; in particular, we show that the blossom tree \mathcal{B}_F may be obtained from a map germ defined on $(\mathbb{C}^2, 0)$:

Theorem 1.4. *Let (X, \mathfrak{p}) be a complex irreducible space germ of dimension $n \geq 2$, and let $F = (f, g) : (X, \mathfrak{p}) \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}^2, 0)$ be a holomorphic map germ. Then there exists a holomorphic map germ $G : (\mathbb{C}^2, 0) \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}^2, 0)$ such that $G_*(\mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{C}^2, 0}) = F_*(\mathcal{A}_{X, \mathfrak{p}})$. In particular, \mathcal{B}_G coincides with \mathcal{B}_F .*

The proof of Theorem 1.3 is developed as an algorithm in §3. Its cornerstone is the finiteness of this algorithm, shown in §4, with conclusion formulated in §4.4.

Our Theorem 6.1 gives the extension of Theorem 1.3 to holomorphic map germs $F : (X, \mathfrak{p}) \rightarrow (Y, y)$, where (Y, y) is an irreducible surface germ. Our examples in §7 show several types of blossom trees, along with some details of our Algorithm 3.2 computations.

The above results allow us to introduce a complexity degree for the image, as follows. Let us first recall that for two irreducible curve germs $C_1, C_2 \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{C}^2, 0}$, one classically says that their *order of tangency* is $m \geq 0$ if, by blowing up successively, their proper images can be separated precisely after $m + 1$ blow-ups and no less. We denote this by

$$\text{tan}(C_1, C_2) = m.$$

In particular, C_1, C_2 have different tangent cones if and only if $\text{tan}(C_1, C_2) = 0$.

Definition 1.5 (Image complexity degree).

For some curve germ $C \in F_*(\mathcal{A}_{X, \mathfrak{p}}) \subset \mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{C}^2, 0}$, let us set:

$$\kappa_C(F) := \min \left\{ m \in \mathbb{N} \mid D \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{C}^2, 0}, \text{tan}(D, C) \geq m \implies D \in F_*(\mathcal{A}_{X, \mathfrak{p}}) \right\}.$$

We then define the *image complexity degree* of F as:

$$\kappa(F) := \max \left\{ \kappa_C(F) \mid C \in F_*(\mathcal{A}_{X, \mathfrak{p}}) \right\}.$$

We show by Theorem 4.7 that if the image of F is not well-defined as a set-germ, then $\kappa(F)$ is precisely the maximal length of chains of branches in the blossom tree \mathcal{B}_F .

2. WHEN THE LOCAL IMAGE IS A WELL-DEFINED SET GERM

Let $(X, \mathfrak{p}) \subset (\mathbb{C}^N, 0)$ be a complex irreducible space germ of dimension $n \geq 2$, and let $F : (X, \mathfrak{p}) \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}^2, 0)$ be a non-constant holomorphic map germ.

Let us first discuss the situation when F has a well-defined image as a set germ, and how this is characterized.

Proposition 2.1. [JT, Proposition 2.1] *If the image of F is a well defined set germ at the origin, then either $(\text{Im } F, 0) = (\mathbb{C}^2, 0)$ and thus $F_*(\mathcal{A}_{X,\mathfrak{p}}) = \mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{C}^2,0}$, or $(\text{Im } F, 0) = (C, 0)$ where $(C, 0) \subset (\mathbb{C}^2, 0)$ is an irreducible complex curve germ, and in this case $F_*(\mathcal{A}_{X,\mathfrak{p}})$ is a single element of $\mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{C}^2,0}$.*

Proof. This has been stated and proved in [JT] for $X = \mathbb{C}^N$, of course without the interpretation as $F_*(\mathcal{A}_{X,\mathfrak{p}})$ that we have just introduced above. In the case of a subspace $X \subset \mathbb{C}^N$, after replacing the balls $B_\varepsilon \subset \mathbb{C}^N$ centred at the origin by their intersections $X \cap B_\varepsilon$, the proof goes word by word as that in *loc.cit.* We may refer the reader to §6 for the more general setting where the target $(\mathbb{C}^2, 0)$ is replaced by an irreducible surface germ (Y, y) . \square

Proposition 2.2. *Let $F : (X, \mathfrak{p}) \rightarrow (Y, y)$ be a holomorphic map germ, where (X, \mathfrak{p}) and (Y, y) are complex irreducible space germs, such that $\dim(X) = n$ and $\dim(Y) = p$, $n \geq p \geq 1$. If the germ at x of the fibre $F^{-1}(y)$ has an irreducible component of dimension $n - p$, then F is locally open at y .*

Proof. Let $B \subset X$ be a small enough open neighbourhood of \mathfrak{p} where the holomorphic map F is defined. Let S be an irreducible component of the germ $(F^{-1}(y), \mathfrak{p})$, with $\dim_{\mathfrak{p}} S = n - p$. By repeatedly slicing with generic hyperplanes at \mathfrak{p} , one gets a closed irreducible analytic subset $Z \subset B$ of dimension p such that \mathfrak{p} is an isolated point of the intersection $Z \cap F^{-1}(y)$. By [GR, Proposition, page 63], it then follows that there exist an open neighbourhood U of \mathfrak{p} in Z and an open neighbourhood V of y in Y , such that $F(U) \subset V$ and that the induced map $F|_U : U \rightarrow V$ is finite. By the Open Mapping Theorem (cf [GR, page 107]), this implies that $F(U)$ is open. It follows that $F(B)$ is open, and since B may be arbitrarily small, we deduce that F is locally open at y . \square

Proposition 2.3. *Let (X, \mathfrak{p}) be an irreducible complex analytic set germ and let $F = (f, g) : (X, \mathfrak{p}) \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}^2, 0)$ be a nonconstant holomorphic map germ. Then the image of F is a curve germ if and only if $\text{rank Jac}(f, g) < 2$ on $\text{Reg } X$.*

Proof. Since the implication “ \Rightarrow ” is obvious, we will focus on the proof of “ \Leftarrow ”.

As before, we consider a suitable open neighbourhood $B \subset X$ of \mathfrak{p} where the holomorphic map F is defined, and some representatives of X and of its regular part $\text{Reg } X$. If $\text{rank}(f, g) \equiv 0$, it follows that (f, g) is constant on $\text{Reg } X$ which is connected, and hence it is constant on X , contrary to our assumption. We deduce that $\text{rank}(f, g) \equiv 1$ on an open dense subset $\Lambda \subset \text{Reg } X$. Then the rank theorem implies that $\dim_x(f, g)^{-1}(f(x), g(x)) = n - 1$, for any $x \in \Lambda$.

Actually one has the inequality $\dim_x(f, g)^{-1}(f(x), g(x)) \geq n - 1$ for any $x \in X$, due to the following result by Remmert:

Lemma 2.4. [Re, Satz 16] *Let $F : X \rightarrow Y$ be a holomorphic map between complex spaces. Then any $a \in X$ has a neighbourhood $U_a \subset X$ such that, for any $x \in U_a$, one has:*

$$\dim_x F^{-1}(F(x)) \leq \dim_a F^{-1}(F(a)).$$

□

However, one cannot have $\dim_a (f, g)^{-1}(f(x), g(x)) > n - 1$ for some $a \in X$, since this would contradict the fact that X is irreducible of dimension n , and that (f, g) is not constant. Consequently, the equality $\dim_x (f, g)^{-1}(f(x), g(x)) = n - 1$ holds for any $x \in X$ and not only for $x \in \text{Reg } X$.

To complete our proof, we only need the following classical result due to Remmert.

Lemma 2.5. [Re, Satz 18] *Let X and Y be complex spaces such that X is pure dimensional, and let $F : X \rightarrow Y$ be a holomorphic map. If $r = \dim_x F^{-1}(F(x))$ is independent of $x \in X$, then any point $a \in X$ has a fundamental system of neighbourhoods $\{U_i\}$ such that $f(U_i)$ is analytic at $F(a)$, of dimension $\dim X - r$.* □

We may apply Lemma 2.5 to our setting since the dimension $r = n - 1$ is independent of $x \in X$. This concludes the proof of Proposition 2.3. □

3. THE STRUCTURE OF $F_*(\mathcal{A}_{X, \mathfrak{p}})$

From now on we assume that the non-constant holomorphic map germ $F : (X, \mathfrak{p}) \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}^2, 0)$ does not have a well-defined image as a set germ. Let $F^{-1}(0) := \bigcup_{j=1}^k H_j$ be the decomposition into irreducible components, understood as space germs with reduced structure. It follows by Proposition 2.2 that $\dim H_j = n - 1$, where $n = \dim X$, thus all H_j are *divisors* as germs at $\mathfrak{p} \in X$.

We may assume without loss of generality that $\text{Sing}(X)$ does not contain any irreducible component of the central fibre $F^{-1}(0)$. This condition is achieved when replacing X by its normalisation. Indeed, composing F with the normalisation map does not change the image $F_*(\mathcal{A}_{X, \mathfrak{p}})$ since normalisation maps are locally open. The following equivalent condition will be needed in Lemma 3.1 and Definition 4.1:

$$(1) \quad \dim(\text{Sing}(X) \cap F^{-1}(0)) \leq n - 2.$$

3.1. The blow-up construction. Let $\tau_1 : \tilde{\mathbb{C}}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^2$ be the blow-up of $0 \in \mathbb{C}^2$, with its exceptional divisor denoted by E_1 . Let $W := X \times_{\mathbb{C}^2} \tilde{\mathbb{C}}^2$ be the fibered product, endowed with the projections $\text{pr}_1 : W \rightarrow X$, and $\text{pr}_2 : W \rightarrow \tilde{\mathbb{C}}^2$.

The restriction $\text{pr}_{1|} : \text{pr}_1^{-1}(X \setminus F^{-1}(0)) \rightarrow X \setminus F^{-1}(0)$ is a biholomorphism by construction. Let then X_1 denote the closure of $\text{pr}_1^{-1}(X \setminus F^{-1}(0))$ in W . By definition, X_1 is an irreducible component of W , while the other irreducible components are $H_j \times E_1$, for all

$j = 1, \dots, k$. Denoting by π_1 the restriction of pr_1 to X_1 , and by F_1 the restriction of pr_2 to X_1 , we obtain the following commutative diagram:

$$(2) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} X_1 & \xrightarrow{F_1} & \tilde{\mathbb{C}}^2 \\ \pi_1 \downarrow & & \downarrow \tau_1 \\ X & \xrightarrow{F} & \mathbb{C}^2, \end{array}$$

where π_1 is proper and surjective.

Let $\Sigma := \text{Sing } X \cup \text{Sing } \{f = 0\}^{\text{red}} \cup \text{Sing } \{g = 0\}^{\text{red}}$, where the notation Z^{red} means the reduced structure of the analytic space Z . By definition Σ is an analytic subset of X and does not contains any irreducible component of $F^{-1}(0)$.

Lemma 3.1. *The restriction*

$$\pi_{1|} : \pi_1^{-1} \left(X \setminus (F^{-1}(0) \cap \Sigma) \right) \rightarrow X \setminus (F^{-1}(0) \cap \Sigma)$$

is a biholomorphism.

Proof. The map $\pi_{1|} : \pi_1^{-1}(X \setminus F^{-1}(0)) \rightarrow X \setminus F^{-1}(0)$ is by definition a biholomorphism. What we need to prove in addition is that for any $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, and for any fixed point $x \in H_j \setminus \Sigma$, there exists a neighbourhood U_x of x in X such that $\pi_1 : \pi_1^{-1}(U_x) \rightarrow U_x$ is a biholomorphism.

Let $U' \subset \text{Reg } X \setminus \Sigma$ be a connected open neighbourhood of our fixed point x , such that $H_j \cap U' = \{\psi = 0\}$ for some holomorphic function $\psi \in \mathcal{O}(U')$, and that $f = \psi^p \tilde{f}$, $g = \psi^q \tilde{g}$ for some integers $p, q > 0$, where \tilde{f} and \tilde{g} have no zeroes on U' . We have the following local presentation:

$$U' \times_{\mathbb{C}^2} \tilde{\mathbb{C}}^2 = \left\{ (x, (u, v), [\zeta_0 : \zeta_1]) \in X \times \mathbb{C}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^1 \mid (f, g)(x) = (u, v), u\zeta_1 = v\zeta_0 \right\}.$$

In case $q \leq p$, we then get:

$$\pi_1^{-1}(U') = \left\{ (x, (u, v), [\zeta_0 : \zeta_1]) \in X \times \mathbb{C}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^1 \mid (f, g)(x) = (u, v), \psi^{p-q}(x) \tilde{f}(x) \zeta_1 = \tilde{g}(x) \zeta_0 \right\}.$$

This shows that the mapping:

$$(3) \quad U' \ni x \longmapsto \left(x, (f(x), g(x)), [\psi^{p-q}(x) \tilde{f}(x) : \tilde{g}(x)] \right)$$

is the holomorphic inverse of π_1 . Thus our claim holds for $U_x = U'$.

The case $p \leq q$ is completely similar. □

Lemma 3.1 has the following immediate consequence:

Corollary 3.2. *For any $j = 1 \dots, k$, the inverse image $\pi_1^{-1}(H_j)$ has a unique irreducible component \tilde{H}_j such that $\pi_1(\tilde{H}_j) = H_j$, and that $\tilde{H}_j \not\subset \text{Sing}(X_1)$.*

We will say that \tilde{H}_j is the proper transform of H_j by π_1 . □

Let us set the notation:

$$\mathcal{A}_{E_1} := \bigsqcup_{\xi \in E_1} \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{\mathbb{C}}^2, \xi}.$$

The next lemma shows that our desired image $F_*(\mathcal{A}_{X, \mathfrak{p}})$ of F is the push-forward by τ_1 of the subset $F_{1*}(\bigcup_{z \in \pi_1^{-1}(\mathfrak{p})} \mathcal{A}_{X_1, z})$ of \mathcal{A}_{E_1} .

Lemma 3.3. *The following equality holds:*

$$(\tau_1 \circ F_1)_* \left(\bigcup_{z \in \pi_1^{-1}(\mathfrak{p})} \mathcal{A}_{X_1, z} \right) = F_*(\mathcal{A}_{X, \mathfrak{p}}).$$

Proof. “ \subset ” follows from the commutativity of the diagram (2).

“ \supset ”. Working in the notations of curve germs, let $(\gamma, 0) \in F_*(\mathcal{A}_{X, \mathfrak{p}})$, with $(\gamma, 0) \neq 0_0$, and let $(C, p) \in \mathcal{A}_{X, \mathfrak{p}}$ such that $F(C) = \gamma$. Let $(\tilde{\gamma}, \xi)$ denote the proper transform of γ by the blow-up τ_1 , where ξ is a point of the exceptional divisor E_1 .

Then the fibered product $C \times_{\gamma} \tilde{\gamma}$ is a curve germ at $z := (\mathfrak{p}, \xi)$ and therefore it is an element of $\mathcal{A}_{X_1, z}$, whose image by $\tau_1 \circ F_1$ is precisely the curve germ $(\gamma, 0)$. \square

Since $X_1 \subset X \times_{\mathbb{C}^2} \tilde{\mathbb{C}}^2$ is an irreducible analytic subset, the intersection $X_1 \cap (\{\mathfrak{p}\} \times E_1) = \pi_1^{-1}(\mathfrak{p})$ consists of finitely many points, or it is of dimension 1 and therefore $\pi_1^{-1}(\mathfrak{p}) = \{\mathfrak{p}\} \times E_1$.

In order to distinguish between the images $F_{1*}(\mathcal{A}_{X_1, (\mathfrak{p}, \xi)}) \subset \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{\mathbb{C}}^2, \xi} \subset \mathcal{A}_{E_1}$ at the points ξ along E_1 , we introduce the following definition, which is equivalent to that given in §1:

Definition 3.4. A point $\xi \in E_1$ will be called:

- *determined-empty*, if $\xi \notin F_1(\pi_1^{-1}(\mathfrak{p}))$.
- *determined-full*, if $\xi \in F_1(\pi_1^{-1}(\mathfrak{p}))$ and $F_{1*}(\mathcal{A}_{X_1, (\mathfrak{p}, \xi)}) = \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{\mathbb{C}}^2, \xi}$.
- *undetermined*, if $\xi \in F_1(\pi_1^{-1}(\mathfrak{p}))$ and $F_{1*}(\mathcal{A}_{X_1, (\mathfrak{p}, \xi)}) \subsetneq \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{\mathbb{C}}^2, \xi}$.

We have denoted by $k > 0$ the number of irreducible components of $F^{-1}(0)$, that we have assumed to be all of dimension $(n - 1)$. We then have:

Lemma 3.5. *There are at most k undetermined points on E_1 .*

Proof. If $\xi \in E_1$ is an undetermined point then $F_1 : (X_1, (\mathfrak{p}, \xi)) \rightarrow (\tilde{\mathbb{C}}^2, \xi)$ is not open at ξ , and therefore by Proposition 2.2, all irreducible components of $F_1^{-1}(\xi)$ have dimension $n - 1$.

By definition, we have $F_1^{-1}(\xi) \subset \text{pr}_2^{-1}(\xi)$, and $\text{pr}_2^{-1}(\xi) = \{(x, \xi) \mid x \in X, F(x) = \tau_1(\xi) = 0\}$, thus:

$$F_1^{-1}(\xi) \subset \text{pr}_2^{-1}(\xi) = F^{-1}(0) \times \{\xi\} = \bigcup_{j=1}^k H_j \times \{\xi\}.$$

We deduce that there exists a subset $I_\xi \subset \{1, \dots, k\}$ such that $F_1^{-1}(\xi) = \bigcup_{j \in I_\xi} H_j \times \{\xi\}$, and in particular $H_j \times \{\xi\} \subset X_1$ for any $j \in I_\xi$. Combining with Corollary 3.2 and its notations, we get the equality $H_j \times \{\xi\} = \tilde{H}_j$, for any $j \in I_\xi$, where $\tilde{H}_j \subset X_1$ is the

unique component of $\pi_1^{-1}(H_j)$ which projects onto H_j . This equality also tells that if $\xi \neq \xi'$ are two undetermined points, then I_ξ and $I_{\xi'}$ are disjoint sets. Finally, since the disjoint union $\bigsqcup_{\xi} I_\xi$, over all undetermined points $\xi \in E_1$, is a subset of $\{1, \dots, k\}$, our claim follows. \square

Lemma 3.6. *If $\dim \pi_1^{-1}(\mathbf{p}) = 0$ then $\pi_1^{-1}(\mathbf{p})$ is precisely one single point.*

Proof. First, let us observe that $\pi_1^{-1}(\mathbf{p})$ is non-empty since F is a non-constant map. Next, let us assume by contradiction that $\pi_1^{-1}(\mathbf{p}) = \{(\mathbf{p}, \xi_1), \dots, (\mathbf{p}, \xi_m)\}$ with $m \geq 2$. We choose $V_1, \dots, V_m \subset X_1$ pairwise disjoint open neighbourhoods of these points, and a connected open neighbourhood $V \subset X$ of \mathbf{p} such that $\pi_1^{-1}(V) \subset \bigsqcup_{j=1}^m V_j$. The properness of π_1 insures the existence of such a neighbourhood V . Since V_i contains the point (\mathbf{p}, ξ_i) , it follows that $\pi_1^{-1}(V \setminus F^{-1}(0)) \cap V_j \neq \emptyset$ for $j = 1, \dots, m$. On the other hand, as (X, \mathbf{p}) is irreducible, the complement $V \setminus F^{-1}(0)$ is also connected. Since the restriction $\pi_{1|} : \pi_1^{-1}(V \setminus F^{-1}(0)) \rightarrow V \setminus F^{-1}(0)$ is an isomorphism (by the definition of the square diagram (2)), it follows that $\pi_1^{-1}(V \setminus F^{-1}(0))$ is also connected. This contradicts the fact that it is covered by the disjoint union of open sets $\bigsqcup_{j=1}^m V_j$, $m \geq 2$. \square

By the above results, we get the following definition that has been announced in §1:

Definition 3.7 (Thick and thin branches).

- (i). If $\dim \pi_1^{-1}(\mathbf{p}) = 0$, then all the points of E_1 are determined-empty except of *one single point* (cf Lemma 3.6), which is either undetermined or determined-full.

We say that E_1 yields a *thin branch* $\mathcal{E}_1^{\text{thin}} := \bigsqcup_{\xi \in E_1} 0_\xi$.

- (ii). If $\pi_1^{-1}(\mathbf{p}) = \{\mathbf{p}\} \times E_1$, then all the points of E_1 are determined-full except of finitely many, which are undetermined (cf Lemma 3.5). There is *at least one* such undetermined point; if none, then the image of F is open at $0 \in \mathbb{C}^2$.

We say that E_1 yields a *thick branch* $\mathcal{E}_1^{\text{thick}} := \bigsqcup_{\xi \in E_1} \mathcal{A}_{S, \xi}$.

3.2. The algorithm. Let $F : (X, \mathbf{p}) \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}^2, 0)$ be a non-constant map germ such that its image is not a well-defined set germ.

Step 1. We apply to F the above blow-up construction. We will use the following new notations: $S_0 := \mathbb{C}^2$, $S_1 := \tilde{\mathbb{C}}^2$. The following situations occur:

- If the exceptional divisor E_1 has no undetermined point, then E_1 yields a thin branch with a single determined-full point ξ , and all the other points are determined-empty. The algorithm stops at this branch, that we will call *a terminal branch*⁴. The image $F_*(\mathcal{A}_{X, \mathbf{p}})$ is completely determined by the push-down by τ_1 of this thin branch, since by Lemma 3.3:

$$F_*(\mathcal{A}_{X, \mathbf{p}}) = \tau_{1*}(\mathcal{A}_{\tilde{\mathbb{C}}^2, \xi}).$$

- If the exceptional divisor E_1 has a finite set of undetermined points (cf Lemma 3.5), let it be $\{\xi_1, \dots, \xi_\ell\}$, $\ell \geq 1$, then either E_1 supports a thick branch, or E_1 supports a thin branch and in this case $\ell = 1$.

⁴It follows that all terminal branches are thin.

We then apply the blow-up construction (i.e. diagram (2)) simultaneously to the following restrictions of F_1 as map germs:

$$F_{1|_r} : (X_1, (\mathfrak{p}, \xi_r)) \rightarrow (S_1, \xi_r), \quad \text{for } r = 1, \dots, \ell.$$

New exceptional divisors $E_{2,1}, \dots, E_{2,\ell}$ are created by these blow-up constructions, one for each point ξ_1, \dots, ξ_ℓ .

Step 2. We are now examining $E_{2,r}$, for $r = 1, \dots, \ell$. Only two cases may occur:

- If $E_{2,r}$ has no undetermined points, then the algorithm stops at this thin branch as a terminal branch, like in Step 1 above. Remark that the single determined-full point ξ of this thin branch occurs precisely at the intersection point of $E_{2,r}$ with the proper image of E_1 by the blow-up $\tau_{2,r}$ of the smooth surface germ (S_1, ξ_r) .
- If $E_{2,r}$ has undetermined points, then we continue as in Step 1 above with new blow-up constructions at those undermined points.

The result of the algorithm is a connected blossom tree \mathcal{B}_F with thick and thin branches, where the ramifications occur at the steps where the branches have more than one undetermined points. We shall prove in the next section that this tree \mathcal{B}_F is finite.

One then recovers the image $F_*(\mathcal{A}_{X,\mathfrak{p}})$ by pushing down the branches by the blow-up maps τ_m in the inverse order of the creation steps. To know in which order to do this, we may use either:

(1). the picture of \mathcal{B}_F as a tree with the two distinct types of branches, each one labelled by the step rank at which it is created,

or

(2). the dual diagram, where the thin branches are represented by the symbol \odot and the thick branches by the symbol \bullet , and each one labelled by the step rank at which it is created. From the divisor created at the first step (which can be a thin branch or a thick branch) leave several arrows (namely a number of $\#I_\xi \leq k$ arrows) pointing to the branches created at step 2, which are thick or thin; and so on.

In our examples we have chosen the dual diagram representation.

4. PROOF OF THE FINITENESS OF THE ALGORITHM

We will prove here by *reductio ad absurdum* that the algorithm is finite, in the hypothesis that $F = (f, g)$ does not have a well-defined image as a set germ.

Assuming the contrary means that the tree \mathcal{B}_F contains some infinite chain of branches, which corresponds to a chain of diagrams as follows:

$$(4) \quad \begin{array}{ccccc} \vdots & & \vdots & & \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\ \mathfrak{p}_{m+1} \in X_{m+1} & \xrightarrow{F_{m+1}} & S_{m+1} \ni \xi_{m+1} & \xrightarrow{\chi_{m+1}} & 0 \in \mathbb{C}^2 \\ \pi_{m+1} \downarrow & & \tau_{m+1} \downarrow & & \\ \mathfrak{p}_m \in X_m & \xrightarrow{F_m} & S_m \ni \xi_m & \xrightarrow{\chi_m} & 0 \in \mathbb{C}^2 \\ \pi_m \downarrow & & \tau_m \downarrow & & \\ \vdots & & \vdots & & \end{array}$$

where $\mathfrak{p}_m = (\mathfrak{p}_{m-1}, \xi_m)$ and ξ_m is one of the undetermined points $\xi_{m,s}$, for $s \in \{1, \dots, \ell_m\}$, and where τ_{m+1} denotes the blow-up of S_m at ξ_m .

Since ξ_m is undetermined, by definition the image of F_m is not open at ξ_m , and therefore all irreducible components of $F_m^{-1}(\xi_m)$ have dimension $n - 1$ (cf Proposition 2.2).

We have seen in the proof of Lemma 3.5 that the projection π_m establishes an injective correspondence between the set of irreducible components of $F_m^{-1}(\xi_m)$ and the set of irreducible components of $F_{m-1}^{-1}(\xi_{m-1})$ and so, step-by-step downwards by the successive projections π_{m-i} in diagram (4), an injective correspondence between the set of irreducible components of $F_m^{-1}(\xi_m)$ and the set of irreducible components of $F^{-1}(0) = \cup_{j=1}^k H_j$.

With these notations, let us define:

$$I^{(m)} := \{j \in \{1, \dots, k\} \mid H_j \text{ is the image of some component of } F_m^{-1}(\xi_m)\}.$$

We therefore have a decreasing sequence of non-empty subsets of indices:

$$I^{(m)} \subset I^{(m-1)} \subset \dots \subset I^{(0)} := \{1, \dots, k\}$$

which stabilises, i.e., there exists $m_0 \geq 0$ such that $I^{(m)} = I^{(m_0)}$ for all $m \geq m_0$.

For some fixed $j_0 \in \bigcap_{m \geq 1} I^{(m)}$, let us then denote by $H_{j_0}^{(m)}$ the unique irreducible component of $F_m^{-1}(\xi_m)$ which projects onto $H_{j_0} = H_{j_0}^{(0)}$ by the sequence of π_j in diagram (4). Modulo the identifications by the projections π_j , we then have:

$$(5) \quad H_{j_0} \simeq H_{j_0}^{(1)} \simeq \dots \simeq H_{j_0}^{(m)} \simeq \dots$$

4.1. Local orders along divisors. We choose a local coordinate system at ξ_m , i.e. on an open set $V \subset S_m$ containing ξ_m , such that ξ_m becomes the origin, and thus (S_m, ξ_m) identifies with $(\mathbb{C}^2, 0)$ through a chart map (which is denoted by χ_m in diagram (4), see also (6) for χ_{m+1}). In this local coordinate system one has $F_m = (f_m, g_m)$, and our divisor $H_{j_0}^{(m)}$ is an irreducible component of $(f_m, g_m)^{-1}(0)$.

Definition 4.1. Let $x \in H_{j_0}^{(m)} \setminus (\text{Sing } X_m \cup \text{Sing } H_{j_0}^{(m)})$, and remark that $H_{j_0}^{(m)} \setminus (\text{Sing } X_m \cup \text{Sing } H_{j_0}^{(m)})$ is not empty by (1). Let ψ be a holomorphic function which defines $H_{j_0}^{(m)}$ in some neighbourhood $U \subset X_m$ of x . One then writes $f_m = \psi^p \tilde{f}_m$, $g_m = \psi^q \tilde{g}_m$, with

$\tilde{f}_m|_{H_{j_0}^{(m)}} \not\equiv 0$ and $\tilde{g}_m|_{H_{j_0}^{(m)}} \not\equiv 0$. We say that $p := \text{ord}_{H_{j_0}^{(m)}} f_m$, and $q := \text{ord}_{H_{j_0}^{(m)}} g_m$. Let us also set:

$$\text{ord}_{H_{j_0}^{(m)}} F := \min\{p, q\}.$$

By standard arguments, $\text{ord}_{H_{j_0}^{(m)}} F$ does not depend on the choices, and it is invariant under local biholomorphisms, in particular independent of the charts.

Lemma 4.2. $\text{ord}_{H_{j_0}^{(m+1)}} F_{m+1} \leq \text{ord}_{H_{j_0}^{(m)}} F_m$.

Proof. For U as in Definition 4.1, let $U' \subset U$ be an open set such that $U' \setminus (\text{Sing } X_m \cup \text{Sing } H_{j_0}^{(m)}) \neq \emptyset$, and that $\tilde{f}(x) \neq 0$ and $\tilde{g}(x) \neq 0$ for all $x \in U'$. It follows from Lemma 3.1 that the restriction $\pi_{m+1}|_{\pi_{m+1}^{-1}(U')}$ is a biholomorphism onto U' .

Without loss of generality, we may suppose that $\text{ord}_{H_{j_0}^{(m)}} g_m = q \leq p = \text{ord}_{H_{j_0}^{(m)}} f_m$. Therefore $\text{ord}_{H_{j_0}^{(m)}} F_m = q$.

Let $V \subset S_m$ be the open set containing ξ_m defined in the beginning of §4.1. We have that $\tau_{m+1}^{-1}(V)$ is the blow-up of $V \subset S_m$ at 0, thus it can be written as

$$\tau_{m+1}^{-1}(V) = \left\{ ((u, v), [\lambda_0 : \lambda_1]) \in V \times \mathbb{P}^1 \mid u\lambda_1 = v\lambda_0 \right\}.$$

For $x \in U'$ we have:

$$(F_{m+1} \circ \pi_{m+1}^{-1})(x) = \left((f_m(x), g_m(x)), [\psi_m^{p-q}(x)\tilde{f}_m(x) : \tilde{g}_m(x)] \right).$$

Since by our assumption, $F_{m+1}|_{H_{j_0}^{(m+1)}} \equiv \xi_{m+1}$, and $H_{j_0}^{(m+1)}$ is the proper transform of $H_{j_0}^{(m)}$ by π_{m+1} , we get the identity $[\psi_m^{p-q}(x)\tilde{f}_m(x) : \tilde{g}_m(x)] \equiv [\alpha_0 : \alpha_1]$ on $U' \cap H_{j_0}^{(m)}$, where $\xi_{m+1} = ((0, 0), [\alpha_0 : \alpha_1])$, and $\alpha_1 \neq 0$ since \tilde{g}_m is not identically zero on $H_{j_0}^{(m)}$.

We will use the following local chart at the point $\xi_{m+1} = ((0, 0), [\frac{\alpha_0}{\alpha_1} : 1])$:

$$(6) \quad \tau_{m+1}^{-1}(V) \ni \left((u, v), [\lambda_0 : \lambda_1] \right) \xrightarrow{\chi_{m+1}} \left(\frac{\lambda_0}{\lambda_1} - \frac{\alpha_0}{\alpha_1}, v \right) \in \mathbb{C}^2,$$

which identifies ξ_{m+1} to the origin $(0, 0) \in \mathbb{C}^2$.

In this chart we then get:

$$(7) \quad (F_{m+1} \circ \pi_{m+1}^{-1})(x) = \left(\frac{\psi_m^{p-q}(x)\tilde{f}_m(x) - (\alpha_0/\alpha_1)\tilde{g}_m}{\tilde{g}_m}, \psi^q \tilde{g}_m \right),$$

and we conclude that $\text{ord}_{H_{j_0}^{(m)}} (F_{m+1} \circ \pi_{m+1}^{-1}) \leq q$. Therefore we have:

$$\text{ord}_{H_{j_0}^{(m+1)}} F_{m+1} \leq q = \text{ord}_{H_{j_0}^{(m)}} F_m,$$

which ends the proof of our lemma. \square

4.2. Stabilisation of the order. Lemma 4.2 implies that there exists a rank $m_0 > 0$ after which the order stabilises, namely:

$$\text{ord}_{H_{j_0}^{(m)}} F_m = \text{ord}_{H_{j_0}^{(m_0)}} F_{m_0}, \quad \forall m \geq m_0.$$

From now on we will fix the minimal integer m_0 with the above stability property, and we write the above results for $m = m_0$. Let us use the chart χ_{m_0} to write $\chi_{m_0} \circ F_{m_0} = (f_{m_0}, g_{m_0})$. We may assume, without loss of generality, that $\text{ord}_{H_{j_0}^{(m_0)}}(g_{m_0}) \leq \text{ord}_{H_{j_0}^{(m_0)}}(f_{m_0})$; we therefore also have $\text{ord}_{H_{j_0}^{(m_0)}}(F_{m_0}) = \text{ord}_{H_{j_0}^{(m_0)}}(g_{m_0})$.

By using the local charts χ_m defined at (6), let us set, for any $m \geq m_0$:

$$(8) \quad \mathcal{U}_m := (X_m \setminus g_m^{-1}(0)) \cup \left(\text{Reg } X_m \setminus \overline{g_m^{-1}(0) \setminus H_{j_0}^{(m)}} \right).$$

Under these notations, we state the following refinement of Lemma 3.1:

Lemma 4.3. *If $\text{ord}_{H_{j_0}^{(m_0)}}(g_{m_0}) \leq \text{ord}_{H_{j_0}^{(m_0)}}(f_{m_0})$, then the restriction*

$$\pi_{m_0+1} : \pi_{m_0+1}^{-1}(\mathcal{U}_{m_0}) \rightarrow \mathcal{U}_{m_0}$$

is a biholomorphism.

Proof. The proof of Lemma 3.1 holds for F_{m_0} instead of F , and shows that the map π_{m_0+1} is a biholomorphism on the set:

$$(9) \quad \pi_{m_0+1}^{-1} \left((X_{m_0} \setminus g_{m_0}^{-1}(0)) \cup \left(\text{Reg } X_{m_0} \setminus \overline{(f_{m_0}^{-1}(0) \setminus H_{j_0}^{(m_0)}) \cup g_{m_0}^{-1}(0) \setminus H_{j_0}^{(m_0)}} \right) \right).$$

Since $\text{ord}_{H_{j_0}^{(m_0)}}(g_{m_0}) \leq \text{ord}_{H_{j_0}^{(m_0)}}(f_{m_0})$, we are indeed in the situation “ $q \leq p$ ” considered in the proof of Lemma 3.1. Comparing the set in (9) with the set \mathcal{U}_{m_0} defined in (8), by following the proof of Lemma 3.1 we notice that the map (3) is well-defined and holomorphic if \tilde{g}_{m_0} has no zeroes on some small enough neighbourhood U_x of any fixed point x of the open set $\text{Reg } X_{m_0} \setminus \overline{g_{m_0}^{-1}(0) \setminus H_{j_0}^{(m_0)}}$, which is just the property of this set by definition. \square

We will tacitly use the chart χ_{m_0} defined on an open neighbourhood $V \subset S_{m_0}$ of ξ_{m_0} , as introduced in the beginning of §4.1. Let us set:

$$\Omega := \left((X_{m_0} \setminus g_{m_0}^{-1}(0)) \cup \left(\text{Reg } X_{(m_0)} \setminus \overline{g_{m_0}^{-1}(0) \setminus H_{j_0}^{(m_0)}} \right) \right) \cap F_{m_0}^{-1}(V),$$

The open set Ω is included in the set \mathcal{U}_{m_0} defined in Lemma 4.3, hence π_{m_0+1} is biholomorphic on $\pi_{m_0+1}^{-1}(\Omega)$.

Lemma 4.4. *Let $\xi_{m_0+1} = ((0, 0), [\gamma_1 : 1])$, where $\gamma_1 = \frac{\alpha_0}{\alpha_1}$. There exists a holomorphic function h_1 defined on Ω such that*

$$f_{m_0} = \gamma_1 g_{m_0} + h_1 g_{m_0}$$

and that $h_1|_{H_{j_0}^{(m_0)}} \equiv 0$.

Proof. For $m = m_0$, and by using the chart χ_{m_0+1} defined at (6), we have the presentation $F_{m_0+1} = (f_{m_0+1}, g_{m_0+1})$, and the equality (7) can be written on a neighbourhood U of $H_{j_0}^{(m_0)} \cap \Omega$ as:

$$(F_{m_0+1} \circ \pi_{m_0+1}^{-1})(x) = \left(\frac{f_{m_0}(x) - \gamma_1 g_{m_0}}{g_{m_0}}, g_{m_0} \right),$$

where :

$$(10) \quad f_{m_0+1} \circ \pi_{m_0+1}^{-1} = \frac{f_{m_0} - \gamma_1 g_{m_0}}{g_{m_0}} \quad \text{and} \quad g_{m_0+1} \circ \pi_{m_0+1}^{-1} = g_{m_0}$$

are holomorphic functions on U .

Moreover, the function $h_1 := \frac{f_{m_0} - \gamma_1 g_{m_0}}{g_{m_0}}$ is holomorphic on the entire Ω , since g_{m_0} has no zero on $\Omega \setminus H_{j_0}^{(m_0)}$. We then have the identity $f_{m_0} - \gamma_1 g_{m_0} = h_1 g_{m_0}$. We also get $h_1|_{H_{j_0}^{(m_0)}} \equiv 0$ since $f_{m_0+1} \equiv 0$ on $H_{j_0}^{(m_0+1)}$. \square

The identity $g_{m_0+1} \circ \pi_{m_0+1}^{-1} = g_{m_0}$ implies that $\text{ord}_{H_{j_0}^{(m_0)}}(g_{m_0}) = \text{ord}_{H_{j_0}^{(m_0+1)}}(g_{m_0+1})$. The definition of m_0 in the beginning of §4.2 tells that $\text{ord}_{H_{j_0}^{(m_0+1)}}(F_{m_0+1}) = \text{ord}_{H_{j_0}^{(m_0)}}(F_{m_0})$ and therefore $\text{ord}_{H_{j_0}^{(m_0+1)}}(F_{m_0+1}) = \text{ord}_{H_{j_0}^{(m_0+1)}}(g_{m_0+1})$.

For the sets \mathcal{U}_m defined in Lemma 4.3, by their construction we have:

$$\pi_{m_0+1}^{-1}(\mathcal{U}_{m_0}) = \mathcal{U}_{m_0+1},$$

and since

$$\text{ord}_{H_{j_0}^{(m_0+1)}}(g_{m_0+1}) \leq \text{ord}_{H_{j_0}^{(m_0+1)}}(f_{m_0+1}),$$

we get the following upper lever version of Lemma 4.3:

[Lemma 4.3] $_{m_0+1}$ *The restriction $\pi_{m_0+2}| : \pi_{m_0+2}^{-1}(\mathcal{U}_{m_0+1}) \rightarrow \mathcal{U}_{m_0+1}$ is a biholomorphism.*

which implies that the restriction:

$$\pi_{m_0+2}| : (\pi_{m_0+1} \circ \pi_{m_0+2})^{-1}(\Omega) \rightarrow \Omega$$

is a biholomorphism.

By using the local chart χ_{m_0+2} (defined at (6)) at some undetermined point $\xi_{m_0+2} \in S_{m_0+2}$, like we did before for S_{m_0+1} , we may write $F_{m_0+2} = (f_{m_0+2}, g_{m_0+2})$, where:

$$f_{m_0+2} = \frac{f_{m_0+1} \circ \pi_{m_0+2} - \gamma_2 (g_{m_0+1} \circ \pi_{m_0+2})}{g_{m_0+1} \circ \pi_{m_0+2}}, \quad g_{m_0+2} = g_{m_0+1} \circ \pi_{m_0+2}.$$

for some $\gamma_2 \in \mathbb{C}$ defined by the choice of ξ_{m_0+2} , and where $f_{m_0+2}|_{H_{j_0}^{(m_0+2)}} \equiv 0$ by (5).

By using the presentation (10) for f_{m_0+1} , we get:

$$(11) \quad \begin{cases} f_{m_0+2} = \frac{f_{m_0} - \gamma_1 g_{m_0} - \gamma_2 g_{m_0}^2}{g_{m_0}^2} \circ \pi_{m_0+1} \circ \pi_{m_0+2} \\ g_{m_0+2} = g_{m_0} \circ \pi_{m_0+1} \circ \pi_{m_0+2} \end{cases}$$

The identities (11) hold on a neighbourhood of $(\pi_{m_0+1} \circ \pi_{m_0+2})^{-1}(H_{j_0}^{(m_0)} \cap \Omega)$ and, as explained in the step before, the function $\frac{f_{m_0} - \gamma_1 g_{m_0} - \gamma_2 g_{m_0}^2}{g_{m_0}^2}$ is holomorphic on the entire set Ω .

Setting $h_2 := \frac{f_{m_0} - \gamma_1 g_{m_0} - \gamma_2 g_{m_0}^2}{g_{m_0}^2}$, the above relations (11) imply the following upgraded version of Lemma 4.4:

[Lemma 4.4]₂ $\exists \gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in \mathbb{C}$ and there is a holomorphic function $h_2 : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ such that $h_2|_{H_{j_0}^{(m_0)}} \equiv 0$ and that $f_{m_0} = \gamma_1 g_{m_0} + \gamma_2 g_{m_0}^2 + h_2 g_{m_0}^2$. \square

By induction, we thus get the higher upgraded version of Lemma 4.4, for any $s \geq 1$:

[Lemma 4.4]_s $\exists \gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_s \in \mathbb{C}$ and there is a holomorphic function $h_s : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ such that $h_s|_{H_{j_0}^{(m_0)}} \equiv 0$ and that $f_{m_0} = \gamma_1 g_{m_0} + \gamma_2 g_{m_0}^2 + \dots + \gamma_s g_{m_0}^s + h_s g_{m_0}^s$. \square

4.3. Concluding the proof.

Lemma 4.5. *Let M be a connected complex manifold, let $a \in M$, and let $f, g : (M, a) \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}, 0)$ be holomorphic function germs. We assume that there exists a sequence of complex numbers $\{\gamma_s\}_{s \geq 1}$ and a sequence of holomorphic functions $\{h_s\}_{s \geq 1}$ defined on an open neighbourhood $a \in \Omega \subset M$, $h_s : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, such that $h_s(0) = 0$, and $f = \gamma_1 g + \gamma_2 g^2 + \dots + \gamma_s g^s + h_s g^s$.*

Then $\text{rank Jac}(f, g) < 2$ on M .

Proof. We will show that under our assumptions we have $f = \theta \circ g$, where $\theta : (\mathbb{C}, 0) \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}, 0)$ is a holomorphic function germ.

Step 1. Let us show that the formal power series in one variable $\sum_{s=1}^{\infty} \gamma_s \lambda^s$, has a positive radius of convergence.

Let $\Lambda : (\mathbb{C}, 0) \rightarrow (M, a)$ be a holomorphic function germ such that $g \circ \Lambda \neq 0$. If $\text{ord}_0(g \circ \Lambda) = p$ for some $p \geq 1$, then, modulo a biholomorphic change of coordinates at $0 \in \mathbb{C}$, one may assume that $g \circ \Lambda(\lambda) = \lambda^p$.

With these conventions, one writes, for any $s \geq 1$:

$$\hat{f}(\lambda) = \gamma_1 \lambda^p + \gamma_2 \lambda^{2p} + \dots + \gamma_s \lambda^{sp} + \hat{h}_s(\lambda) \lambda^{sp}$$

where $\hat{f} := f \circ \Lambda$, and $\hat{h}_s := h_s \circ \Lambda$ with $\hat{h}_s(0) = 0$.

Let $D' \subset \mathbb{C}$ be a neighbourhood of the origin such that all the involved functions are holomorphic on D' , where by ‘‘all the involved functions’’ we mean precisely $\Lambda, \hat{f}, g \circ \Lambda$ and \hat{h}_s for all $s \geq 1$. Let $\overline{D}(0, r) \subset D'$ denote a disk of radius $r > 0$ centred at the origin, and set $\mu := \max(1, \sup\{|\hat{f}(\lambda)| ; \lambda \in \overline{D}(0, r)\})$.

Since $\gamma_j = \frac{1}{(jp)!} \hat{f}^{(jp)}(0)$ for any $j > 0$, the Cauchy inequalities imply that $|\gamma_j| \leq \frac{1}{r^{jp}} \mu$. Then we obtain $|\gamma_j|^{1/j} \leq \frac{1}{r^p} \mu^{1/j} \leq \frac{1}{r^p} \mu$, which shows that the series $\sum_{s=1}^{\infty} \gamma_s \lambda^s$ has a positive radius of convergence $\rho = 1 / \limsup_{j \geq 1} (|\gamma_j|^{1/j})$.

Step 2. By Step 1 we have proved the existence of some neighbourhood $D \subset \mathbb{C}$ of the origin where $\theta(\lambda) := \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \gamma_i \lambda^i$ is a holomorphic function.

It follows that $\theta \circ g$ is a holomorphic function on $g^{-1}(D)$. By our hypotheses, for any $s \geq 1$, the difference

$$f - \theta \circ g = h_s g^s - \sum_{l \geq s+1} \gamma_l g^l$$

is then a holomorphic function of order $\geq s$. Since the order of this difference is infinite, it is identically zero on $g^{-1}(D)$. Consequently, one must have the identity $f = \theta \circ g$ on $g^{-1}(D)$. And now, since $f = \theta \circ g$, we have $\text{rank Jac}(f, g) = \text{rank Jac}(\theta \circ g, g) < 2$ on $g^{-1}(D)$. Since M is connected, we get $\text{rank Jac}(f, g) < 2$ on M . \square

We apply Lemma 4.5 to the holomorphic functions f_{m_0}, g_{m_0} on $M := \text{Reg } X_{m_0}$; we deduce that $\text{rank Jac}(f_{m_0}, g_{m_0}) < 2$ on some open subset of $\text{Reg } X_{m_0}$. Since $\pi_1 \circ \dots \circ \pi_m$ is a biholomorphism on the preimage of $X \setminus F^{-1}(0)$, we obtain $\text{rank Jac}(f, g) < 2$ on some open subset of $\text{Reg } X$. Now since $\text{Reg } X$ is connected, due to the identity theorem we get that $\text{rank Jac}(f, g) < 2$ on $\text{Reg } X$. Then Proposition 2.3 implies that the image of F is a curve germ, which contradicts our original assumption that F does not have a well-defined image as a set germ.

This ends the proof of the finiteness of the algorithm. \square

4.4. Proof of Theorem 1.3. The algorithm at §3.2 shows how one associates a blossom tree \mathcal{B}_F with thick and thin branches to a map germ $F : (X, \mathfrak{p}) \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}^2, 0)$ which does not have a well-defined image as a set germ. The finiteness of this tree is proved all along the above Section 4. \square

As a supplement to Theorem 1.3, there is the following fact concerning our map germ $F : (X, \mathfrak{p}) \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}^2, 0)$, which follows from the above proof. Let τ_1, \dots, τ_s be the finite sequence of blow-ups needed in the algorithm until there are no more undetermined points, see also the notation used in §1.1. Let $\tau := \tau_s \circ \dots \circ \tau_1 : S \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^2$ denote the composed map, and let \mathbb{E} be its total exceptional divisor. Then:

Corollary 4.6. *A curve germ $(K, 0)$ is in the image $F_*(\mathcal{A}_{X, \mathfrak{p}})$ if and only if there is a point $q \in \mathbb{E}$ which belongs to a thick branch of the blossom tree \mathcal{B}_F , and a curve germ $(\tilde{K}, q) \subset (S, q)$, such that $\tau_*(\tilde{K}, q) = (K, 0)$.* \square

4.5. Blossom tree and the image complexity degree. From Definition 1.5, it follows that $\kappa(F)$ is equal to 0 if and only if $F_*(\mathcal{A}_{X, \mathfrak{p}}) = \mathcal{A}_{Y, y}$, and thus, by Remark 1.2, if and only if F is a locally open map. On the other hand, in this later case our Algorithm 3.2 does not start, and therefore the number of steps is 0.

In case the image of F is a curve germ $(C, 0)$, one may construct curve germs $(C_m, 0) \neq (C, 0)$ such that $\text{tan}(C_m, C) = m$ for any $m \gg 1$, and therefore one has $\kappa(F) = \infty$.

For all other situations, we have the following theorem.

Theorem 4.7. *If $F : (X, \mathfrak{p}) \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}^2, 0)$ is a non-constant holomorphic map germ the image of which is not well-defined as a set-germ, then $\kappa(F)$ is precisely the length of the maximal chain of branches in the blossom tree \mathcal{B}_F .*

Proof. The minimal number $s \geq 1$ of simultaneous blow-ups which compose the final map $\tau = \tau_s \circ \cdots \circ \tau_1$ of our above Algorithm 3.2 is equal, by definition, to the length of the longest (maximal) chain of branches in the blossom tree \mathcal{B}_F . Thus what we have to prove here is that the minimal number s of blow-ups is equal to $\kappa(F)$.

Let $C \in F_*(\mathcal{A}_{X,\mathfrak{p}})$. If $D \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{C}^2,0}$ is such that $\tan(C, D) \geq s$ then $\tau^*(C) \cap \tau^{-1}(0) = \tau^*(D) \cap \tau^{-1}(0)$. Since s is the last step of the algorithm, every point of $\tau^{-1}(0)$ must be determined, either full or empty. Thus, since $C \in F_*(\mathcal{A}_{X,\mathfrak{p}})$, it follows that $\tau^*(C) \cap \tau^{-1}(0)$ is determined-full, which implies that $D \in F_*(\mathcal{A}_{X,\mathfrak{p}})$. It then follows that $\kappa_C(F) \leq s$, and therefore $\kappa(F) \leq s$.

Let us now denote $\tilde{\tau} := \tau_{s-1} \circ \cdots \circ \tau_1$. Since the algorithm does not stop after $s - 1$ steps, it follows that $\tilde{\tau}^{-1}(0)$ contains at least an undetermined point, say $\xi \in \tilde{\tau}^{-1}(0)$. In this case there exist $\tilde{C}, \tilde{D} \in \mathcal{A}_{S_{s-1},\xi}$ (see Diagram (4) for the notation) such that $C := \tilde{\tau}_*(\tilde{C}) \in F_*(\mathcal{A}_{X,\mathfrak{p}})$ and $D := \tilde{\tau}_*(\tilde{D}) \notin F_*(\mathcal{A}_{X,\mathfrak{p}})$. On the other hand we have $\tan(C, D) \geq s - 1$, and this implies the strict inequality $\kappa_C(F) > s - 1$. We thus get $\kappa_C(F) \geq s$, which in turn implies $\kappa(F) \geq s$.

This ends our proof of the equality $s = \kappa(F)$. \square

5. PRODUCING THE SAME BLOSSOM TREE BY A MAP $(\mathbb{C}^2, 0) \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}^2, 0)$

Let $F = (f, g) : (X, \mathfrak{p}) \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}^2, 0)$ be a holomorphic map germ. We show here that there exists a holomorphic map germ $G : (\mathbb{C}^2, 0) \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}^2, 0)$ such that $G_*(\mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{C}^2,0}) = F_*(\mathcal{A}_{X,\mathfrak{p}})$.

By our finiteness proof, the ‘‘blossom tree algorithm’’ applied to F yields a finite sequence of blow-ups. As before, we denote by $\tau := \tau_r \circ \cdots \circ \tau_1 : S \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^2$ the composition of these blow-up maps, where S is the total space, and by $\mathbb{E} = \cup_j E_j \subset S$ the exceptional divisor of τ . We say that \mathbb{E} is the *skeleton* of our blossom tree \mathcal{B}_F .

Proof of Theorem 1.4. In case the image of F is well-defined as a set germ, then by Proposition 2.1, either F is locally open, in which case one can take G as the identity, or the image is an irreducible plane curve germ $(C, 0)$, and then it is the image of a map (f, g) deduced from a Puiseux expansion of C .

We will thus treat the situation when the image of F is not a set germ at $0 \in \mathbb{C}^2$.

Case 1. The tree \mathcal{B}_F has only thin branches.

At each blow-up there exists precisely one determined-full point along the exceptional divisor (all the others being determined-empty). This holds in particular for the last blow-up $\tau : S \rightarrow S_{k-1}$ with its exceptional divisor E_k . Let $\xi \in E_k$ be the corresponding determined-full point.

Since S is nonsingular, let $\iota : (\mathbb{C}^2, 0) \rightarrow (S, \xi)$ be a local biholomorphism. Then $G := \tau \circ \iota$ satisfies our claim.

Case 2. The tree \mathcal{B}_F has at least one thick branch.

If B denotes the union of all the components of \mathbb{E} which correspond to thick branches, then B is a 1-dimensional complex subspace of S , and it is a compact connected set. (The connectivity of B follows by the same argument that was used in the proof of Lemma 3.6.)

Our exceptional divisor $\mathbb{E} = \cup_{j=1}^R E_j \subset S$ satisfies the criterion by Grauert [Gr] and Mumford [Mu], namely the intersection matrix $[(E_i \cdot E_j)]_{i,j=1,\dots,k}$ is negative definite. It follows that the subset $B \subset E$ of exceptional divisors also has a negative definite matrix, and therefore by the the same criterion, B is exceptional. This means that there are a two-dimensional complex space Y , and a holomorphic map $\rho : S \rightarrow Y$ which contracts B to a point $y \in Y$, such that the restriction $S \setminus B \rightarrow Y \setminus \{y\}$ is a biholomorphism.

Since S is smooth and hence normal, it follows that Y is normal. We refer to [Gr] for the definitions and results concerning exceptional sets that we use here.

The surface Y contains the image by ρ of the difference $\overline{E \setminus B}$. This image consists of those components of \mathbb{E} corresponding to thin branches.

We define the map $\nu : (Y, y) \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}^2, 0)$ such that $\nu(\rho(\overline{E \setminus B})) = 0$, and that $\nu|_{Y \setminus \{y\}} = \tau \circ \rho^{-1}$. It then follows that $\nu \circ \rho = \tau$, and that ν is continuous on Y and holomorphic on $Y \setminus \{y\}$. Since Y is normal, we deduce that ν is holomorphic on Y .

Next, let us set the notation:

$$(12) \quad \mathcal{A}_{S,B} := \bigsqcup_{\xi \in B} \mathcal{A}_{S,\xi}.$$

We claim that the equality $\rho_*(\mathcal{A}_{S,B}) = \mathcal{A}_{Y,y}$ holds. Indeed, if $(C, y) \subset (Y, y)$ is some non-constant curve germ, then $\rho^{-1}(C) = C' \cup B$, where C' is the proper transform of C by ρ , a non-degenerated curve. If $C' \cap B = \{\xi\}$, then we have $\rho_*(C', \xi) = (C, y)$. Our claim is proved.

Now, since $\nu \circ \rho = \tau$ and $\rho_*(\mathcal{A}_{S,B}) = \mathcal{A}_{Y,y}$, we get $\nu_*(\mathcal{A}_{Y,y}) = F_*(\mathcal{A}_{X,\mathfrak{p}})$. It then remains to show that $\mathcal{A}_{Y,y}$ can be obtained as the image of a locally open map germ with target \mathbb{C}^2 . This is provided by the following result.

Theorem 5.1. [CJ] *If (Y, y) is the germ of an irreducible two-dimensional complex space, then there exists a locally open map $\omega : (\mathbb{C}^2, 0) \rightarrow (Y, y)$ if and only if there exists a resolution of (Y, y) such that all irreducible components of its exceptional divisor are rational.* \square

In our setting the map $\rho : S \rightarrow Y$ is a resolution of the surface germ (Y, y) and therefore Theorem 5.1 applies. We deduce that there exists a locally open map $\omega : (\mathbb{C}^2, 0) \rightarrow (Y, y)$, thus $G = \nu \circ \omega$ satisfies our claim. This ends the proof of Theorem 1.4.

6. EXTENSION TO A SINGULAR TARGET

Let us first go back to Proposition 2.1 which was stated for a map germ $F : (X, \mathfrak{p}) \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}^2, 0)$. Its proof (based on the proof of [JT, Proposition 2.1]), actually holds without modifications when we replace the target $(\mathbb{C}^2, 0)$ by an irreducible surface germ (Y, y) . Namely, we have the following statement: *if the image of F is a well defined set germ at the origin, then either $(\text{Im } F, y) = (Y, y)$ and therefore $F_*(\mathcal{A}_{X,\mathfrak{p}}) = \mathcal{A}_{Y,y}$, or $(\text{Im } F, y)$ is an irreducible complex curve germ, and in this case $F_*(\mathcal{A}_{X,\mathfrak{p}})$ is a single element of $\mathcal{A}_{Y,y}$.*

Let us now assume that the image of $F : (X, \mathfrak{p}) \rightarrow (Y, y)$ is not a well-defined set germ. We will extend our previous result on $F_*(\mathcal{A}_{X,\mathfrak{p}})$.

As before, let (X, \mathfrak{p}) be an irreducible n -dimensional complex analytic space germ, $n \geq 2$, and let (Y, y) be an irreducible germ of a singular surface.

Let $\mu_X : \hat{X} \rightarrow X$ and $\mu_Y : \hat{Y} \rightarrow Y$ be their normalizations. Since the image of F is not included in the germ of a curve and (X, \mathfrak{p}) is an irreducible germ, it follows that the pre-image by F of the non-normal locus of Y is a nowhere dense analytic subset of X .

Then [GR, Proposition, subsect. 3, sect. 4, ch. 8] implies that there is a holomorphic map $\hat{F} : \hat{X} \rightarrow \hat{Y}$ such that the following diagram is commutative:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \hat{X} & \xrightarrow{\hat{F}} & \hat{Y} \\ \mu_X \downarrow & & \downarrow \mu_Y \\ X & \xrightarrow{F} & Y \end{array}$$

Since the normalization maps are locally open, we have the equality $F_*(\mathcal{A}_{X, \mathfrak{p}}) = (\mu_Y)_*(\hat{F}_*(\mathcal{A}_{\hat{X}, \hat{\mathfrak{p}}}))$, where $\hat{\mathfrak{p}} = \mu_X^{-1}(\mathfrak{p})$, thus $F_*(\mathcal{A}_{X, \mathfrak{p}})$ determines $F_*(\mathcal{A}_{X, \mathfrak{p}})$.

Therefore we may, and will suppose in the following that Y is normal.

Let then $\tau_0 : \tilde{Y} \rightarrow Y$ be a desingularization, and let $L = \tau_0^{-1}(y)$ denote the “exceptional set” of τ_0 . Then L is compact by definition, and connected since Y is irreducible. It may have several irreducible components⁵.

We consider the fibered product $W := X \times_Y \tilde{Y}$ together with the two projections $\text{pr}_1 : W \rightarrow X$, and $\text{pr}_2 : W \rightarrow \tilde{Y}$. Let X_0 be the closure in W of $\text{pr}_1^{-1}(X \setminus F^{-1}(y))$. We denote $F_0 := (\text{pr}_2)_{|X_0}$, and $\pi_0 := (\text{pr}_1)_{|X_0}$. We then have the following commutative diagram:

$$(13) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} X_0 & \xrightarrow{F_0} & \tilde{Y} \\ \pi_0 \downarrow & & \downarrow \tau_0 \\ X & \xrightarrow{F} & Y \end{array}$$

The intersection $X_0 \cap (\{\mathfrak{p}\} \times L) = \pi_0^{-1}(\mathfrak{p})$ is a closed analytic subset of $\{\mathfrak{p}\} \times L$. We have that $X_0 \cap (\{\mathfrak{p}\} \times L)$ is connected and thus it is either a point or a connected union of irreducible components of $\{\mathfrak{p}\} \times L$.

Indeed, this connectivity claim is similar to what is shown in the proof of Lemma 3.6. More explicitly, supposing that $X_0 \cap (\{\mathfrak{p}\} \times L)$ is not connected, let K_1, \dots, K_m , be its connected components, where $m \geq 2$. Let then $V_1, \dots, V_m \subset X_0$ be pairwise disjoint open neighbourhoods of K_1, \dots, K_m , respectively. Let V be a connected open neighbourhood of \mathfrak{p} such that $\pi_0^{-1}(V) \subset \bigsqcup_{j=1}^m V_j$. The existence of V follows from the properness of π_0 . By construction, for any $j = 1, \dots, m$ the set $\pi_0^{-1}(V) \cap V_j$ is an open neighbourhood of K_j . Since $\pi_0^{-1}(F^{-1}(y))$ has codimension ≥ 1 in X_0 , the intersection of open sets $\pi_0^{-1}(V \setminus F^{-1}(y)) \cap V_j$ is non-empty. Moreover, as (X, \mathfrak{p}) is irreducible, the complement $V \setminus F^{-1}(y)$ is connected, and since the restriction $\pi_{01} : \pi_0^{-1}(V \setminus F^{-1}(y)) \rightarrow V \setminus F^{-1}(y)$ is a

⁵May be assumed nonsingular by passing to a good resolution, but we do not need this assumption here.

bi-holomorphism, it follows that $\pi_0^{-1}(V \setminus F^{-1}(y))$ is also connected, and this contradicts the fact that it is included in the disjoint union $\bigsqcup_{j=1}^m V_j$ of more than two open sets. Our claim is proved.

We continue our construction. An irreducible component L_1 of L is called *thick* if the inclusion $\{\mathfrak{p}\} \times L_1 \subset \pi_0^{-1}(\mathfrak{p})$ holds; it is called *thin* if this inclusion does not hold. As before, a point $\xi \in L$ is called:

- determined-empty, if $\xi \notin F_0(\pi_0^{-1}(\mathfrak{p}))$.
- determined-full, if $\xi \in F_0(\pi_0^{-1}(\mathfrak{p}))$ and $F_{0*}(\mathcal{A}_{X_0,(\mathfrak{p},\xi)}) = \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{Y},\xi}$.
- undetermined, if $\xi \in F_0(\pi_0^{-1}(\mathfrak{p}))$ and $F_{0*}(\mathcal{A}_{X_0,(\mathfrak{p},\xi)}) \subsetneq \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{Y},\xi}$.

By the same arguments as those used in the proof of Lemma 3.5, applied to diagram (13), one shows that the set of undetermined points is finite. Let then $\{\xi_1, \dots, \xi_r\} \subset L$ be the set of these undetermined points.

At this level we start to apply our Algorithm 3.2 to each map germ $F_0 : (X_0, (\mathfrak{p}, \xi_j)) \rightarrow (\tilde{Y}, \xi_j)$, where j runs from 1 to r . The result is a finite number of blossom trees $\mathcal{B}_{F_0, j}$, one for each point $\xi_j \in \{\xi_1, \dots, \xi_r\}$. We therefore have the exceptional divisor L of π_0 , with thick and thin components, on which grow r blossom trees. This building is a new blossom tree like structure; we will call it the “forest on L ” associated to F_0 , and denote it by \mathcal{B}_{F, π_0} .

If we apply the Algorithm 3.2 to the above named r points of L in a simultaneous manner, than we operate a finite number of simultaneous blow-ups at each blossom tree; let τ_j denote the total blow-up map at the step j . We obtain a finite sequence of blow-ups:

$$S^{(s)} \xrightarrow{\tau_s} S^{(s-1)} \xrightarrow{\tau_{s-1}} \dots \xrightarrow{\tau_1} \tilde{Y}$$

and a commutative diagram:

$$(14) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} X_s & \xrightarrow{F_s} & S^{(s)} \\ \pi_s \downarrow & & \downarrow \tau_s \\ X_0 & \xrightarrow{F_0} & \tilde{Y}. \end{array}$$

Setting $S := S^{(s)}$, and $\tau := \tau_1 \circ \dots \circ \tau_s$, we have proved the following:

Theorem 6.1. *Let (X, \mathfrak{p}) be an irreducible complex analytic set germ and $F : (X, \mathfrak{p}) \rightarrow (Y, y)$ be a holomorphic map germ such that the image of F is not a well-defined set germ. Then $F_*(\mathcal{A}_{X, \mathfrak{p}}) = (\tau \circ \tau_0)_*(\mathcal{B}_{F, \pi_0})$. \square*

REMARK 6.2. Let $B \subset S$ denote the union of the thick components of \mathcal{B}_{F, π_0} . Recalling our notation (12): $\mathcal{A}_{S, B} := \bigsqcup_{\xi \in B} \mathcal{A}_{S, \xi}$, we may give the similar remark as that stated as Corollary 4.6, namely:

A curve germ $(K, 0)$ is in the image $F_*(\mathcal{A}_{X, \mathfrak{p}})$ if and only if there is a point q on some *thick branch* of the blossom tree \mathcal{B}_{F, π_0} , and a curve germ $(\tilde{K}, q) \subset (S, q)$, such that $(\tau \circ \tau_0)_*(\tilde{K}, q) = (K, 0)$.

7. EXAMPLES

EXAMPLE 7.1. Let $X := \mathbb{C}^2$, and $F : (\mathbb{C}^2, 0) \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}^2, 0)$, $F(x, y) = (xy, y)$.

We blow-up the target \mathbb{C}^2 at the origin, with E_1 as its exceptional divisor.

$$\widetilde{\mathbb{C}^2} = \{(u, v, [\xi_0 : \xi_1]) : u\xi_1 = v\xi_0\} \subset \mathbb{C}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^1, \quad E_1 = \{(0, 0)\} \times \mathbb{P}^1.$$

We have $F^{-1}(0) = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{C}^2 \mid y = 0\}$. By our definition in §3.1:

$$X_1 = \text{closure}\{(x, y), (u, v), [\xi_0 : \xi_1]) \in \mathbb{C}^2 \times \mathbb{C}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^1 \mid u = xy, v = y, u\xi_1 = v\xi_0, y \neq 0\},$$

where the closure is taken in the fibered product space:

$$\{(x, y), (u, v), [\xi_0 : \xi_1]) \in \mathbb{C}^2 \times \mathbb{C}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^1 \mid u = xy, v = y, xy\xi_1 = y\xi_0\}.$$

Dividing out by $y \neq 0$ we get:

$$X_1 \subseteq \{(x, y), (u, v), [\xi_0 : \xi_1]) \in \mathbb{C}^2 \times \mathbb{C}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^1 \mid u = xy, v = y, x\xi_1 = \xi_0\},$$

which is actually an equality since the right hand side is nonsingular and connected. Next

$$\pi_1^{-1}(0, 0) = X_1 \cap \{x = 0, y = 0\} = \{(0, 0), (0, 0), [0 : 1]\}.$$

We get $F_1(\pi_1^{-1}(0, 0)) = ((0, 0), [0 : 1])$, which shows that all points in E_1 are determined-empty except of the point $[0 : 1]$. This means that E_1 is thin, and it remains to find the nature of $[0 : 1]$, i.e. what happens when we further blow-up at this point. In the chart

$$\widetilde{\mathbb{C}^2} = \{(u, v, [\xi_0 : \xi_1]) \mid u\xi_1 = v\xi_0, \xi_1 \neq 0\} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^2$$

we set coordinates $(\lambda, v) \in \mathbb{C}^2$, where $\lambda = \frac{\xi_0}{\xi_1}$, with inverse map $(\lambda, v) \mapsto (v\lambda, v, [\lambda : 1])$.

In these coordinates X_1 presents as

$$X_1 = \{(x, y), (u, v), \lambda) \in \mathbb{C}^2 \times \mathbb{C}^2 \times \mathbb{C} \mid u = xy, v = y, x = \lambda\},$$

has independent coordinates (λ, y) , and thus it is isomorphic to \mathbb{C}^2 . In these coordinates, F_1 (which is the restriction to X_1 of the projection $X \times \widetilde{\mathbb{C}^2} \rightarrow \widetilde{\mathbb{C}^2}$) reads as the identity $F_1(\lambda, y) = (\lambda, y)$. This shows that $[0 : 1]$ is determined-full. The dual graph of the blossom tree \mathcal{B}_F (cf §1.1) is then a dotted disk:

$$\odot^1$$

EXAMPLE 7.2. Let $X := \mathbb{C}^2$, and $F : (\mathbb{C}^2, 0) \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}^2, 0)$ $F(x, y) = (x^3y^3, x^2y)$.

By blowing-up the target \mathbb{C}^2 at 0, denoting by E_1 the exceptional divisor, we get that X_1 is the closure of the intersection:

$$\{((x, y), (u, v), [\xi_0 : \xi_1]) \in \mathbb{C}^2 \times \mathbb{C}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^1 \mid u = x^3y^3, v = x^2y, u\xi_1 = v\xi_0\} \cap \{xy \neq 0\}.$$

in the first set. We obtain the inclusion:

$$X_1 \subseteq \{((x, y), (u, v), [\xi_0 : \xi_1]) \in \mathbb{C}^2 \times \mathbb{C}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^1 \mid u = x^3y^3, v = x^2y, xy^2\xi_1 = \xi_0\},$$

which is actually an equality since the right hand side is non-singular and connected, hence irreducible.

Since π_1 is the restriction to X_1 of the projection to (x, y) , we get $\pi_1^{-1}(0, 0) = \{(0, 0), (0, 0), [0 : 1]\}$. This shows that E_1 is thin since all points of E_1 are determined-empty (in the terminology of Definition 3.4) with the exception of $[0 : 1]$. One has to study the situation at this point, as follows.

We work in the chart $\xi_1 \neq 0$ of \mathbb{P}^1 , with the coordinate function $\lambda = \xi_0/\xi_1$. Then $X_1 \cap \{\xi_1 \neq 0\} = \{(x, y, u, v, \lambda) \in \mathbb{C}^5 \mid u = x^3y^3, v = x^2y, xy^2 = \lambda\}$ which is isomorphic to \mathbb{C}^2 of coordinates (x, y) .

Recalling that F_1 is the restriction to X_1 of the projection to the coordinates $((u, v), [\xi_0 : \xi_1])$, by using the above charts and isomorphism, F_1 presents as $F_1(x, y) = (xy^2, x^2y)$. As a map germ $F_1 : (\mathbb{C}^2, 0) \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}^2, 0)$, this is not open at the origin of the target. We deduce that our point $\pi_1^{-1}(0, 0) \in E_1$ is undetermined.

We continue the algorithm by blowing-up the target of F_1 at this point. Let $E_2 = \{(0, 0)\} \times \mathbb{P}^1 \subset \{(\hat{u}, \hat{v}, [\hat{\xi}_0 : \hat{\xi}_1] \mid \hat{u}\hat{\xi}_1 = \hat{v}\hat{\xi}_0\}$ be the exceptional divisor of this new blow-up. We have $F_1^{-1}(0, 0) = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{C}^2 \mid xy = 0\}$, hence X_2 is the closure of the intersection:

$$\{((x, y), (\hat{u}, \hat{v}), [\xi_0 : \xi_1]) \in \mathbb{C}^2 \times \mathbb{C}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^1 \mid \hat{u} = xy^2, \hat{v} = x^2y, \hat{u}\hat{\xi}_1 = \hat{v}\hat{\xi}_0\} \cap \{xy \neq 0\}$$

in the first set.

By a couple of standard operations, we get the inclusion:

$$X_2 \subseteq \{((x, y), (\hat{u}, \hat{v}), [\hat{\xi}_0 : \hat{\xi}_1]) \in \mathbb{C}^2 \times \mathbb{C}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^1 \mid \hat{u} = xy^2, \hat{v} = x^2y, y\hat{\xi}_1 = x\hat{\xi}_0\}$$

which once again turns out to be an equality, since the right hand side is a connected nonsingular variety, thus irreducible.

We have $\pi_2^{-1}(0, 0) = \{(0, 0)\} \times \{(0, 0)\} \times \mathbb{P}^1$, thus E_2 is thick. Let us show that the point $[a : 1] \in E_2$ is determined-full for $a \neq 0$ and undetermined if $a = 0$.

In the chart $\hat{\xi}_1 \neq 0$ of \mathbb{P}^1 , with $\hat{\lambda} := \hat{\xi}_0/\hat{\xi}_1$, we get:


$$X_2 \cap \{\hat{\xi}_1 \neq 0\} = \{(x, y, \hat{u}, \hat{v}, \hat{\lambda}) \in \mathbb{C}^5 \mid \hat{u} = xy^2, \hat{v} = x^2y, y = x\hat{\lambda}\}$$

which is isomorphic to \mathbb{C}^2 with coordinates $(x, \hat{\lambda})$. We also consider the isomorphism of $\widetilde{\mathbb{C}^2} \cap \{\hat{\xi}_1 \neq 0\} = \{(\hat{u}, \hat{v}, [\hat{\xi}_0, \hat{\xi}_1] \mid \hat{u}\hat{\xi}_1 = \hat{v}\hat{\xi}_0, \hat{\xi}_1 \neq 0\} \simeq \mathbb{C}^2$ with \mathbb{C}^2 in coordinates $(\hat{\lambda}, \hat{v})$.

By using these coordinates, we now obtain the presentation: $F_2(x, \hat{\lambda}) = (\hat{\lambda}, x^3\hat{\lambda})$. As a map germ $(\mathbb{C}^2, (0, a)) \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}^2, (a, 0))$, this is open at $(a, 0)$ for any $a \neq 0$, but not open for $a = 0$. This ends the proof that $[0 : 1] \in E_2$ is the only undetermined point in this chart. Pursuing the study in the chart $\hat{\xi}_1 \neq 0$, we blow-up at $\xi = [0 : 1]$. By similar computations, we find $F_3 : (\mathbb{C}^2, (0, 0)) \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}^2, (0, 0))$, $F_3(x, \hat{\lambda}) = (\hat{\lambda}, x^3)$, which is an open map germ. This shows that the exceptional divisor E_3 is thin and it is a terminal branch.

Similar computations done in parallel in the other chart $\hat{\xi}_0 \neq 0$ show that $[1 : 0] \in E_2$ is the only undetermined point, and that after a new blow-up at this point we obtain a new exceptional divisor E'_3 which is thin and terminal.

We get the following picture of the dual graph of the blossom tree \mathcal{B}_F :



EXAMPLE 7.3. Let $X := \{(x, y, z) \in \mathbb{C}^3 \mid x^{n+1} = yz\}$, $F : (X, 0) \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}^2, 0)$, $F(x, y, z) = (x, y)$.

Testing with Proposition 2.1 we get the image of F is not well-defined as set germ since. Indeed F it is not locally open (since the line $(\mathbb{C} \times \{0\}, 0)$ is not in the image), and its image is not a curve (since the criterion of Proposition 2.3 does not hold). We then start to compute the blossom tree structure of $F_*(\mathcal{A}_{X,0})$.

We blow-up the target \mathbb{C}^2 at the origin, with E_1 as the exceptional divisor, and $F^{-1}(0, 0) = \{0\} \times \{0\} \times \mathbb{C}$. Hence X_1 is the closure of the following intersection:

$\{((x, y, z), (u, v), [\xi_0 : \xi_1]) \in \mathbb{C}^3 \times \mathbb{C}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^1 \mid x^{n+1} = yz, u = x, v = y, u\xi_1 = v\xi_0\} \cap \{(x, y) \neq (0, 0)\}$
in the first set.

By using standard algebraic manipulations and by taking $y \neq 0$ (since $y = 0$ implies $x = 0$) one shows the inclusion:

$$X_1 \subseteq \{((x, y, z), (u, v), [\xi_0 : \xi_1]) \in \mathbb{C}^3 \times \mathbb{C}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^1 \mid \\ x^{n+1} = yz, u = x, v = y, u\xi_1 = v\xi_0, z\xi_1^{n+1} = y^n\xi_0^{n+1}\}$$

and one can show that this last algebraic is irreducible, which tells that we actually have an equality. What is less easy here is to find the equations which define the above irreducible variety.

We see that $\pi_1^{-1}(0, 0, 0)$ is isomorphic to \mathbb{P}^1 , which means that E_1 is *thick*. Standard computations show that all points in $\{[\xi_0 : \xi_1] \mid \xi_1 \neq 0\}$ are determined-full. In the chart $\xi_0 \neq 0$ of coordinate $\lambda = \xi_1/\xi_0$, the component X_1 presents as:

$$\{((x, y, z), (u, v), \lambda) \in \mathbb{C}^3 \times \mathbb{C}^2 \times \mathbb{C} \mid x^{n+1} = yz, u = x, v = y, u\lambda = v, z\lambda^{n+1} = y^n\}$$

which, by projection in \mathbb{C}^4 and reduction, identifies to:

$$\{((x, y, z, \lambda) \in \mathbb{C}^4 \mid x^n = z\lambda, x\lambda = y\}$$

By another projection, this identifies in turn to the set $\{(x, z, \lambda) \mid x^n = z\lambda\} \subset \mathbb{C}^3$.

In the chart coordinates (u, λ) for $\widetilde{\mathbb{C}^2} = \{(u, v, [\xi_0 : \xi_1]) : u\xi_1 = v\xi_0\} \subset \mathbb{C}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^1$, the map F_1 presents as:

$$\{((x, z, \lambda) \in \mathbb{C}^3 \mid x^n = z\lambda\} \ni (x, z, \lambda) \mapsto (x, \lambda) \in \mathbb{C}^2$$

which is similar to F , namely one replaces the exponent $n + 1$ by n .

By iterating the above computations, the exponent drops by 1 at each step. At the last step we get the presentation:

$$F_n : (X_n, 0) \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}^2, 0), \quad F_n(x, y, z) = (x, y),$$

where $X_n = \{(x, y, z) \mid x = yz\}$. Since X_n is isomorphic to \mathbb{C}^2 via the projection $(x, y, z) \rightarrow (y, z)$, the map F_n identifies to $F_n(y, z) = (yz, z)$. By a new blow-up, this generates one thin divisor with a determined-full point (as in Example 7.1).

The dual graph of the blossom tree \mathcal{B}_F is therefore:

$$\bullet^1 \text{ --- } \bullet^2 \text{ --- } \dots \text{ --- } \bullet^n \text{ --- } \odot^{n+1}$$

EXAMPLE 7.4. Let $X = \{(x, y, z) \in \mathbb{C}^3 \mid x^{n+1} = y^n z\}$ for $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, $n \geq 1$, and $F : X \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^2$ given by $F(x, y, z) = (x, y)$. Notice first that the image of F is not well defined as a set germ, since (cf Propositions 2.1 and 2.3) it is neither locally open, nor a curve germ (because $\text{rank Jac}F$ is not less than 2 on $\text{Reg}X$).

We may then apply our algorithm. Despite the apparent similarity to the preceding example, we obtain a totally different shape for the dual graph of the blossom tree \mathcal{B}_F :

$$\bullet^1 \text{ --- } \odot^2$$

REFERENCES

- [CJ] M. Colțoiu, C. Joița, *On the parameterization of germs of two-dimensional singularities*. J. Geom. Anal. 25 (2015), no. 4, 2427-2435.
- [Gr] H. Grauert, *Über Modifikationen und exzeptionelle analytische Mengen*. Math. Ann. 146 (1962), 331-368.
- [GR] H. Grauert, R. Remmert, *Coherent analytic sheaves*. Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften, 265. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1984.
- [Hu] A.T. Huckleberry, *On local images of holomorphic mappings*. Ann. Sc. Norm. Sup. Pisa (3) 25 (1971), 447-467.
- [JT] C. Joița, M. Tibăr, *Images of analytic map germs*. Arkiv för Matematik 59 (2021), 345-358.
- [Ma] J.N. Mather, *Stratifications and mappings*. Dynamical systems (Proc. Sympos., Univ. Bahia, Salvador, 1971), pp. 195-232. Academic Press, New York, 1973.
- [Mu] D. Mumford, *The topology of normal singularities of an algebraic surface and a criterion for simplicity*. Publ. Math. IHES 9 (1961), 229-246.
- [Re] R. Remmert, *Projektionen analytischer Mengen*. Math. Ann. 130 (1956), 410-441.

INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS OF THE ROMANIAN ACADEMY, P.O. BOX 1-764, 014700 BUCHAREST, ROMANIA AND LABORATOIRE EUROPÉEN ASSOCIÉ CNRS FRANCO-ROUMAIN MATH-MODE
Email address: Cezar.Joita@imar.ro

UNIV. LILLE, CNRS, UMR 8524 – LABORATOIRE PAUL PAINLEVÉ, F-59000 LILLE, FRANCE
Email address: mihai-marius.tibar@univ-lille.fr