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# GEOMETRIC DESINGULARIZATION OF CURVES IN MANIFOLDS *) **) 

## STANISEAW EOJASIEWICZ

## 1. Introduction

The article does not pretend to any originality. In the literature there exists a number of descriptions of desingularizations in the case of curves. Deciding for this description the author think it is worth looking in details into this fascinating topic in an easily accessible case, namely - in the effects of multi blowings-up for curves in manifolds and for coherent sheaves on 2 -dimensional manifolds.

All the needed facts from analytic geometry can be find in the author's books [L1], [L2].

$$
\text { 2. The canonical blowing-up of } \mathbb{C}^{n} \text { at } 0
$$

The blow-up of $\mathbb{C}^{n}$ at 0 is

$$
\Pi=\Pi_{n}=\{(z, \lambda): z \in \lambda\} \subset \mathbb{C}^{n} \times \mathbb{P}, \quad \mathbb{P}=\mathbb{P}_{n-1}
$$

Taking the inverse atlas for $\mathbb{C}^{n} \times \mathbb{P}$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \gamma_{k}: \mathbb{C}^{n} \times \mathbb{C}^{n-1} \ni\left(z, w_{(k)}\right) \mapsto \\
& \left(z, \mathbb{C}\left(w_{1}, \ldots, \frac{1}{(k)}, \ldots, w_{n}\right)\right) \in \mathbb{C}^{n} \times\left\{\mathbb{P} \backslash \mathbb{P}\left(\left\{z_{k}=0\right\}\right)\right)=G_{k}, k=1, \ldots, n,
\end{aligned}
$$

[^0]

The idea of the Łojasiewicz inequality - to compare the value of an analytic function $f$ at a point $x$ to the distance of $x$ to the zero-set $V(f)$


Locally
$|f(x)| \geqslant C(\operatorname{dist}(x, V(f)))^{\alpha}$

Remark 1. The inequality does not hold in $C^{\infty}$ class.
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Remark 4. We consider the following variant of the Łojasiewicz inequality.

- $f:\left(\mathbb{C}^{n}, 0\right) \rightarrow(\mathbb{C}, 0)$ - a holomorphic function defined in a neighborhood of $0 \in \mathbb{C}^{n}$ satisfying $f(0)=0$,
- $f:\left(\mathbb{C}^{n}, 0\right) \rightarrow(\mathbb{C}, 0)$ - a holomorphic function defined in a neighborhood of $0 \in \mathbb{C}^{n}$ satisfying $f(0)=0$,
- $f$ possesses an isolated critical point at 0 , ie., $\nabla f(0)=0$, $\nabla f(z) \neq 0$ for $z \ll 1$.
- $f:\left(\mathbb{C}^{n}, 0\right) \rightarrow(\mathbb{C}, 0)$ - a holomorphic function defined in a neighborhood of $0 \in \mathbb{C}^{n}$ satisfying $f(0)=0$,
- $f$ possesses an isolated critical point at 0 , ie., $\nabla f(0)=0$, $\nabla f(z) \neq 0$ for $z \ll 1$.
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We will consider also a slight general setting:
Let $F=\left(F_{1}, \ldots, F_{m}\right):\left(\mathbb{C}^{n}, 0\right) \rightarrow\left(\mathbb{C}^{m}, 0\right), m \geqslant n$, be a holomorphic mapping in a neighborhood of $0 \in \mathbb{C}^{n}$ possessing an isolated zero at $0 \in \mathbb{C}^{n}$.

In the sequel $F$ denotes a finite mapping and $f$ - an isolated singularity.

Remark. Any fact concerning a finite mapping $F$ holds also for the gradient mapping $\nabla f=\left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial z_{1}}, \ldots, \frac{\partial f}{\partial z_{n}}\right)$.

Let $\theta>0$. Consider the inequality

$$
C|z|^{\theta} \leqslant|F(z)|,
$$

where $C>0$ is a certain constant and $|z| \ll 1$.
The optimal $\theta$ in the above inequality (that is the smallest one) is called the Eojasiewicz exponent and denoted by

Let $\theta>0$. Consider the inequality

$$
C|z|^{\theta} \leqslant|F(z)|,
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where $C>0$ is a certain constant and $|z| \ll 1$.
The optimal $\theta$ in the above inequality (that is the smallest one) is called the Eojasiewicz exponent and denoted by

Example. Let $F:=\left(z_{2}^{3}+z_{1}^{2}, z_{1} z_{2}^{2}\right)$. Then $\ell(F)=\frac{7}{2}>\operatorname{ord} F=2$.
For a singularity $f$ we define its Eojasiewicz exponent $1(f)$ as

$$
\not(f):=屯(\nabla f) .
$$

- There exist effective methods of computation of Ł (eg. using PŁoski's characteristic polynomial or Groebner bases) but they are computationally expensive.


## How to compute the exponent? General methods

- There exist effective methods of computation of Ł (eg. using PŁoski's characteristic polynomial or Groebner bases) but they are computationally expensive.
- In the -dimensional case there exists another useful way.

Namely, for $F=\left(F_{1}, F_{2}\right)$ we have

$$
\left.屯(F)=\max _{\varphi \cdot V\left(F_{1} \cdot F_{2}\right)}\right) \operatorname{ord} F_{\circ} \varphi,
$$

so it is enough to find (finitely many!) parametrizations $\varphi:(\mathbb{C}, 0) \rightarrow\left(\mathbb{C}^{2}, 0\right)$ of the curve $F_{1} \cdot F_{2}=0$ (Chadzyński \& Krasiński '88).
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- A certain positive result of this kind: for $F=\left(F_{1}, \ldots, F_{m}\right)$ : $\left(\mathbb{C}^{n}, 0\right) \rightarrow\left(\mathbb{C}^{m}, 0\right)$ we have (Chadzyński \& Krasiński '98)

$$
屯(F)=\max _{\varphi \cdot V\left(F_{1} \cdot F_{2} \cdots \cdot F_{m}\right)} \frac{\operatorname{ord} F \circ \varphi}{\operatorname{ord} \varphi} .
$$

- The above result does not extend to dimension $n \geqslant 3$ :
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- A certain positive result of this kind: for $F=\left(F_{1}, \ldots, F_{m}\right)$ : $\left(\mathbb{C}^{n}, 0\right) \rightarrow\left(\mathbb{C}^{m}, 0\right)$ we have (Chadzyński \& Krasiński '98)

$$
屯(F)=\max _{\varphi \in V\left(F_{1} \cdot F_{2} \cdots \cdots F_{m}\right)} \frac{\operatorname{ord} F \circ \varphi}{\operatorname{ord} \varphi} .
$$

(This result is not very useful in practice because one must test infinitely many parametrizations $\varphi$.)

## CONJECTURE I $-\nmid(f)$ on „coordinate polar curves
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Let $f:\left(\mathbb{C}^{n}, 0\right) \rightarrow(\mathbb{C}, 0)$ be an isolated singularity. Then

$$
\not(f)=\max _{\varphi \in U_{i=1}^{n} V\left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial z_{1}}, \ldots, \frac{\partial f}{\partial z_{i}}, \ldots, \frac{\partial f}{\partial z_{n}}\right)}\left(\frac{\operatorname{ord} \nabla f \circ \varphi}{\operatorname{ord} \varphi}\right) .
$$

## CONJECTURE I

- We are not aware of any counterexample to this.
- Below, we will give many examples in its favor. A fast one:

Example. For $f(x, y, z):=x^{2} z+y z^{2}+y^{3} z+(2 y+3) x^{2} y^{4}$ we have $\nvdash(f)=6$ and this exponent is achieved on the parametrization $\varphi(t):=\left(-t^{3} \cdot \sqrt{1-6 t^{4}+4 t^{6}},-t^{2},-3 \cdot t^{8}+2 \cdot t^{10}\right) \in V\left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial x}, \frac{\partial f}{\partial z}\right)$.

## (Semi-)Quasihomogeneous functions

Let $f:\left(\mathbb{C}^{n}, 0\right) \rightarrow(\mathbb{C}, 0)$ be a holomorphic function. We shall say:

- $f$ is quasihomogeneous of type shortly: $\mathrm{QH}\left(d ; l_{1}, \ldots, l_{n}\right.$, if $d, l_{1}, \ldots, l_{n} \in\left(Q>0, l_{1} / d, \ldots, l_{n} / d \in(0,1 / 2]\right.$ and for all monomials $z^{a}=z_{1}^{a_{1}} \cdot \ldots \cdot z_{n}^{a_{n}}$ appearing in $f$ with a non-zero coefficient we have $a_{1} l_{1}+\ldots+a_{n} l_{n}=d$
The numbers $l_{1}, \ldots, l_{n}$ are weights. The number $d$ is the weighted degree of the polynomial $f$.
- $f$ is semiquasihomogeneous of type shortly: $\mathrm{SQH}\left(d ; l_{1}, \ldots, l_{n}\right)$ if $f=f_{d}+f_{d+1}+\ldots$, where $f_{i} \in \mathrm{QH}(i$; $\left.l_{1}, \ldots, l_{n}\right)$ and $f_{d}$ is an isolated singularity

Let $f:=\left(x z+y^{5}\right)+x^{3}$. Then $f \in \operatorname{SQH}\left(1 ; \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{5}, \frac{1}{2}\right)$.
Example

The following theorem holds (Krasiński, Oleksik \& Płoski '09 for $n \leqslant 3$; Brzostowski '14 and Abderrahmane '15 for general $n)$ :

Let $f \in \mathrm{QH}\left(1 ; l_{1}, \ldots, l_{n}\right)$ be an isolated singularity. Put

Then

$$
\not(f)=\frac{1}{l_{\text {min }}}-1
$$

Theorem

The following theorem holds (Krasiński, Oleksik \& Płoski ’09 for $n \leqslant 3$; Brzostowski '14 and Abderrahmane '15 for general $n)$ :

Let $f \in \mathrm{QH}\left(1 ; l_{1}, \ldots, l_{n}\right)$ be an isolated singularity. Put Then

$$
\not(f)=\frac{1}{l_{\min }}-1
$$

Theorem

- The above theorem holds also for SQH functions.


## The formula for $¥(f)$ for SQH functions

The following theorem holds (Krasiński, Oleksik \& Płoski '09 for $n \leqslant 3$; Brzostowski '14 and Abderrahmane ' 15 for general $n)$ :

Let $f \in \mathrm{QH}\left(1 ; l_{1}, \ldots, l_{n}\right)$ be an isolated singularity. Put $l_{\min }:=\min \left\{l_{1}, \ldots, l_{n}\right\}$. Then

$$
\not(f)=\frac{1}{l_{\text {min }}}-1 .
$$

## Theorem

- The above theorem holds also for SQH functions.
- $\not(f)$ is achieved on coordinate polar curves, confirming I CONJECTURE in this case.
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## Precisely:

If $f$ and $g$ are two singularities (isolated) $\mathscr{B}$-topologically equivalent i.e. $g=f \circ \Phi$, where $\Phi:\left(\mathbb{C}^{n}, 0\right) \rightarrow\left(\mathbb{C}^{n}, 0\right)$ is a homeomorphism, then $\not(f)=\nsupseteq(g)$.

## Conjecture II — $\ddagger(f)$ as an invariant

An intuitive reason to believe this: is connected with the topology of the singularity; for, the number $\lfloor\ell(f)\rfloor+1$ is the degree of $C^{0}-\mathscr{B}$-determinacy of the germ $f$ in $\mathscr{O}_{n}$ (Chang \& Lu '73, Teissier '77, Bochnak \& Kucharz '79).
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An intuitive reason to believe this: is connected with the topology of the singularity; for, the number $\lfloor\ell(f)\rfloor+1$ is the degree of $C^{0}$ - $\mathscr{B}$-determinacy of the germ $f$ in $\mathcal{O}_{n}$ (Chang \& Lu '73, Teissier '77, Bochnak \& Kucharz '79).

Thus, if ord $(f-g)>\lfloor\not(f)\rfloor+1$, then $g$ is $\mathscr{B}$-topologically equivalent to $f$; moreover, for such $f$ and $g$ we have $\nmid f)=\nvdash(g)$ by Płoski's lemma so the conjecture holds in this important case.

Results confirming this conjecture:

- dimension 2 (Teissier '77); in this case, one can provide a formula for $\not(f)$ in terms of so-called characteristic sequences of the branches of the curve $\{f=0\}$ and their intersection multiplicities (Płoski '01)
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Results confirming this conjecture:

- dimension 2 (Teissier ${ }^{9} 77$ ); in this case, one can provide a formula for $\not(f)$ in terms of so-called characteristic sequences of the branches of the curve $\{f=0\}$ and their intersection multiplicities (Płoski '01)
- SQH singularities of 3 variables (Krasiński, Oleksik \& Płoski '09)
- If $f, g:\left(\mathbb{C}^{n}, 0\right) \rightarrow(\mathbb{C}, 0)$ are two isolated hypersurface singularities that are $\mathscr{B}$ - $\mathscr{L}$-bi-Lipschitz equivalent, that is $g=\Psi \circ f \circ \Phi$, where $\Phi:\left(\mathbb{C}^{n}, 0\right) \rightarrow\left(\mathbb{C}^{n}, 0\right), \Psi:(\mathbb{C}, 0) \rightarrow(\mathbb{C}, 0)$ are bi-Lipschitz homeomorphisms, then $\not(f)=\nsupseteq(g)$ (Bivià-Ausina \& Fukui '17).

A weaker form of CONJECTURE II is:
(Teissier '77) If $\left(f_{s}\right)$ is a topologically trivial (holomorphic) deformation of a singularity $f_{0}$, then for small $s \in \mathbb{C}$.

A weaker form of Conjecture II is:
(Teissier '77) If $\left(f_{s}\right)$ is a topologically trivial (holomorphic) deformation of a singularity $f_{0}$, then $l\left(f_{s}\right)=1\left(f_{0}\right)$ for small $s \in \mathbb{C}$.

## CONJECTURE II'

In this direction, we have, for a of the germ $f_{0}$ :

- $\nmid\left(f_{s}\right) \geqslant \ngtr\left(f_{0}\right)$ (Teissier '77, Płoski '10); this is so-called „lower semicontinuity" of the Łojasiewicz exponent,

A weaker form of CONJECTURE II is:
(Teissier '77) If ( $f_{s}$ ) is a topologically trivial (holomorphic) deformation of a singularity $f_{0}$, then $l\left(f_{s}\right)=l\left(f_{0}\right)$ for small $s \in \mathbb{C}$.

## Conjecture II'

In this direction, we have, for a of the germ $f_{0}$ :

- $\nmid\left(f_{s}\right) \geqslant \ngtr\left(f_{0}\right)$ (Teissier '77, Płoski'10); this is so-called „lower semicontinuity" of the Łojasiewicz exponent,
- $\mathfrak{l}\left(f_{s}\right)=\nsupseteq\left(f_{0}\right)$ for an SQH function $f_{0}$ (S. Brzostowski. '14).
- If for a holomorphic family $\left\{f_{s}(z)\right\}$ of isolated hypersurface singularities we assume a somewhat stronger triviality than the topological one, namely that it satisfies Teissier's condition (c), then
(Teissier '77).
- If for a holomorphic family $\left\{f_{s}(z)\right\}$ of isolated hypersurface singularities we assume a somewhat stronger triviality than the topological one, namely that it satisfies Teissier's condition (c), then $\left(f_{s}\right)=1\left(f_{0}\right)$ (Teissier '77).
Here, condition (c) means that for the family $\left\{f_{s}\right\}$ we have:

$$
\frac{\partial f_{s}(z)}{\partial s} \epsilon \overline{\left(z_{1}, \ldots, z_{n}\right) \cdot\left(\nabla_{z} f_{s}(z)\right)},
$$

where, as before, the bar " "" designates integral closure of an ideal (in the ring $\mathcal{O}_{n+1} \simeq \mathbb{C}\left\{s, z_{1}, \ldots, z_{n}\right\}$ ). Relaxing the above requirement on $\left\{f_{s}\right\}$ to alent to $\mu$-constancy of the family (cf. Greuel '86).

One can also ask: and what about families of mappings with constant intersection multiplicity? There is the following answer (Płoski '10 for full intersections; Rodak, Różycki \& Spodzieja '16 in general):

If $\left(F_{s}\right)$ is a deformation of a map-germ $F:\left(\mathbb{C}^{n}, 0\right) \rightarrow\left(\mathbb{C}^{m}, 0\right)$ having constant intersection multiplicity for small s, then Ł $\left(F_{s}\right) \geqslant €\left(F_{0}\right)$.

## The exponent in a family of mappings

One can also ask: and what about families of mappings with constant intersection multiplicity? There is the following answer (Płoski '10 for full intersections; Rodak, Różycki \& Spodzieja '16 in general):
If $\left(F_{s}\right)$ is a deformation of a map-germ $F:\left(\mathbb{C}^{n}, 0\right) \rightarrow\left(\mathbb{C}^{m}, 0\right)$ having constant intersection multiplicity for small s, then Ł $\left(F_{s}\right) \geqslant €\left(F_{0}\right)$.

## Theorem

In general, however, the above inequality may be strict:
Example. (Mc Neal \& Némethi '05) Let $F_{s}\left(z_{1}, z_{2}\right):=\left(s z_{1}+\right.$ $\left.z_{1}^{2}+z_{2}^{2}, z_{1}^{2}-z_{2}^{5}\right):\left(\mathbb{C}^{2}, 0\right) \rightarrow\left(\mathbb{C}^{2}, 0\right)$. Then $£\left(F_{s}\right)=4>2=屯\left(F_{0}\right)$, although $e\left(F_{s}\right)=e\left(F_{0}\right)$.

## Conjecture III — the non-degenerate case

One of the most important numerical invariant of an isolated singularity is its Milnor number $\mu(f)$. It is a topological invariant of $f$.
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One of the most important numerical invariant of an isolated singularity is its Milnor number $\mu(f)$. It is a topological invariant of $f$.
(Kushnirenko '76) gave an effective formula for $\mu(f)$ in terms of the Newton polyhedron (diagram) of $f$ in the case $f$ is non-degenerate.
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## Conjecture III - a starting point

Brzostowski '19 proved "first-half" of the Conjecture III.
Iff $, g:\left(\mathbb{C}^{n}, 0\right) \rightarrow(\mathbb{C}, 0)$ are Kushnirenko non-degenerate isolated singularities with the same Newton diagrams, then $ł(f)=ł(g)$.

## Theorem

The "second-half" is to find the formula for $孔(f)$.

- Loosely speaking, this theorem follows from the fact that, after some preparations, we can join $f$ and $g$ by a piecewise linear curve (in the space of coefficients) along which, locally, we have Teissier's condition (c) satisfied.
- Hence, $\ngtr(f)=\neq(g)$.


## Conjecture III in dimension 3

We have the following theorem
If $f:\left(\mathbb{C}^{3}, 0\right) \rightarrow(\mathbb{C}, 0)$ is a Kushnirenko non-degenerate isolated surface singularity, then

$$
\not(f)=\max _{S-\text { relevant facets }} m(S)-1,
$$

provided the set of relevant facets is non-empty. Brzostowski, Krasiński, \& Oleksik '20

- There is also a direct formula for $\ddagger$ if the set of relevant facets happens to be empty.
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Conjecture II’In each class the value of $\ddagger$ is one and the same regardless of the value of the parameters

Conjecture IIIThe value of the exponents can be read off the Newton diagram (for $n=3$ ) as predicted above

## Modality 0

|  | Class | Formula | $\mu$ | $\neq$ | Zeroes of | Parametrization | Why |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | $A_{k}$ | $x^{k+1}$ | $k$ | $k$ | - | $[x=t]$ | 1 var. |
| 2 | $D_{k}$ | $x^{2} y+y^{k-1}$ | $k$ | $k-2$ | $\frac{\partial}{\partial x}$ | $[x=0, y=t]$ | 2 var. |
| 3 | $E_{6}$ | $y^{4}+x^{3}$ | 6 | 3 | $\frac{\partial}{\partial x}$ | $[x=y=t]$ | 2 var. |
| 4 | $E_{7}$ | $x y^{3}+x^{3}$ | 7 | $\frac{7}{2}$ | $\frac{\partial}{\partial x}$ | $\left[x=3 t^{3}, y=-3 t^{2}\right]$ | 2 var. |
| 5 | $E_{8}$ | $y^{5}+x^{3}$ | 8 | 4 | $\frac{\partial}{\partial x}$ | $[x=0, y=t]$ | 2 var. |

## Arnold's zoo - the value of 1 vs. the hypotheses

## Modality 1

|  | Class | Formula | $\mu$ | $\neq$ | Zeroes of | Parametrization | Why |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6 | $P_{8}$ | $a x y z+x^{3}+y^{3}+z^{3}$ | 8 | 2 | $\frac{\partial}{\partial x}, \frac{\partial}{\partial y}$ | $[x=0, y=0, z=t]$ | qh |
| 7 | $X_{9}$ | $a x^{2} y^{2}+x^{4}+y^{4}$ | 9 | 3 | $\frac{\partial}{\partial x}$ | $[x=0, y=t]$ | 2 var. |
| 8 | $J_{10}$ | $y^{6}+a x^{2} y^{2}+x^{3}$ | 10 | 5 | $\frac{\partial}{\partial x}$ | $[x=0, y=t]$ | 2 var. |
| $9^{*}$ | $T_{p, q, r}$ | $x^{p}+y^{q}+z^{r}+a x y z$ | $p+q$ <br> $+r-1$ | $r-1$ | $\frac{\partial}{\partial x}, \frac{\partial}{\partial y}$ | $[x=0, y=0, z=t]$ | ndg. |
| 10 | $E_{12}$ | $a x y^{5}+y^{7}+x^{3}$ | 12 | 6 | $\frac{\partial}{\partial x}$ | $\left[x=9 a^{3} t^{5}, y=-3 a t^{2}\right]$ | 2 var. |
| 11 | $E_{13}$ | $a y^{8}+x y^{5}+x^{3}$ | 13 | $\frac{13}{2}$ | $\frac{\partial}{\partial x}$ | $\left[x=-9 t^{5}, y=-3 t^{2}\right]$ | 2 var. |
| 12 | $E_{14}$ | $a x y^{6}+y^{8}+x^{3}$ | 14 | 7 | $\frac{\partial}{\partial x}$ | $\left[x=\sqrt{\frac{-a}{3}} t^{3}, y=t\right]$ | 2 var. |
| 13 | $Z_{11}$ | $a x y^{4}+y^{5}+x^{3} y$ | 11 | 4 | $\frac{\partial}{\partial x}$ | $\left[x=3 a^{2} t^{3}, y=-3 a t^{2}\right]$ | 2 var. |
| 14 | $Z_{12}$ | $a x^{2} y^{3}+x y^{4}+x^{3} y$ | 12 | $\frac{9}{2}$ | $\frac{\partial}{\partial x}$ | $\left[x=-3 \frac{t^{3}}{2 a t+1}, y=-3 \frac{t^{2}}{2 a t+1}\right]$ | 2 var. |

$9^{*}$. For $\max (p, q, r)=r$. Here $\frac{1}{p}+\frac{1}{q}+\frac{1}{r}<1$.

## Arnold's zoo - the value of 1 vs. the hypotheses

## Modality 1 (cont.)

|  | Class | Formula | $\mu$ | $\neq$ | Zeroes of | Parametrization | Why |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 15 | $Z_{13}$ | $a x y^{5}+y^{6}+x^{3} y$ | 13 | 5 | $\frac{\partial}{\partial x}$ | $\left[x=\sqrt{\frac{-a}{3}} t^{2}, y=t\right]$ | 2 var. |
| 16 | $W_{12}$ | $a x^{2} y^{3}+y^{5}+x^{4}$ | 12 | 4 | $\frac{\partial}{\partial x}$ | $[x=0, y=t]$ | 2 var. |
| 17 | $W_{13}$ | $a y^{6}+x y^{4}+x^{4}$ | 13 | $\frac{13}{3}$ | $\frac{\partial}{\partial x}$ | $\left[x=-4 t^{4}, y=4 t^{3}\right]$ | 2 var. |
| 18 | $Q_{10}$ | $a x y^{3}+y^{4}+x^{3}+y z^{2}$ | 10 | 3 | $\frac{\partial}{\partial x}, \frac{\partial}{\partial z}$ | $\left[x=3 \sqrt{a} t^{3}, y=-3 t^{2}, z=0\right]$ | sqh |
| 19 | $Q_{11}$ | $a z^{5}+x z^{3}+x^{3}+y^{2} z$ | 11 | $\frac{7}{2}$ | $\frac{\partial}{\partial x}, \frac{\partial}{\partial y}$ | $\left[x=3 t^{3}, y=0, z=-3 t^{2}\right]$ | sqh |
| 20 | $Q_{12}$ | $a x y^{4}+y^{5}+x^{3}+y z^{2}$ | 12 | 4 | $\frac{\partial}{\partial x}, \frac{\partial}{\partial z}$ | $\left[x=-\sqrt{\frac{-a}{3}} t^{2}, y=t, z=0\right]$ | sqh |
| 21 | $S_{11}$ | $a x^{3} z+x^{4}+x z^{2}+y^{2} z$ | 11 | 3 | $\frac{\partial}{\partial y}, \frac{\partial}{\partial z}$ | $\left[x=2 t, y=0, z=-2 a t^{2}\right]$ | sqh |
| 22 | $S_{12}$ | $a z^{5}+x z^{3}+x^{2} y+y^{2} z$ | 12 | $\frac{10}{3}$ | $\frac{\partial}{\partial x}, \frac{\partial}{\partial y}$ | $\left[x=16 t^{4}, y=16 t^{5}, z=-8 t^{3}\right]$ | sqh |
| 23 | $U_{12}$ | $a x y z^{2}+z^{4}+x^{3}+y^{3}$ | 12 | 3 | $\frac{\partial}{\partial x}, \frac{\partial}{\partial y}$ | $[x=0, y=0, z=t]$ | sqh |

## Arnold's zoo — the value of $\ddagger$ vs. the hypotheses

## Modality 2

|  | Class | Formula | $\mu$ | 1 | Zeroes of | Parametrization | Why |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 24 | $J_{3,0}$ | $c x y^{7}+y^{9}+b x^{2} y^{3}+x^{3}$ | 16 | 8 | $\frac{\partial}{\partial x}$ | $\begin{array}{r} {\left[x=-128 \frac{b^{7} t^{3}}{(c t+3)}, y=4 \frac{b^{2} t}{(c t+3)^{2}}\right] \text { for } b \neq 0} \\ {\left[x=27 \sqrt{c} t^{7}, y=-3 t^{2}\right] \text { for } b=0} \end{array}$ | 2 var. |
| 25 | $\boldsymbol{J}_{3, p}$ | $x^{3}+x^{2} y^{3}+\boldsymbol{a} y^{9+p}$ | $16+p$ | $8+p$ | $\frac{\partial}{\partial x}$ | $[x=0, y=t]$ | 2 var. |
| 26 | $Z_{1,0}$ | $c x y^{6}+y^{7}+d x^{2} y^{3}+x^{3} y$ | 15 | 6 | $\frac{\partial}{\partial x}$ | $\begin{array}{r} {\left[x=3 t^{2}(9 c t-2 d)^{3}, y=-3 t(9 c t-2 d)\right]} \\ \text { for } c \neq 0 \vee d \neq 0 \\ {[x=0, y=t] \text { for } c=0 \wedge d=0} \end{array}$ | 2 var. |
| 27 | $Z_{1, p}$ | $x^{3} y+x^{2} y^{3}+\boldsymbol{a} y^{7+p}$ | $15+p$ | $6+p$ | $\frac{\partial}{\partial x}$ | $[x=0, y=t]$ | 2 var. |
| 28 | $W_{1,0}$ | $x^{4}+\boldsymbol{a} x^{2} y^{3}+y^{6}$ | 15 | 5 | $\frac{\partial}{\partial x}$ | $[x=0, y=t]$ | 2 var. |
| 29 | $W_{1, p}$ | $x^{4}+x^{2} y^{3}+\boldsymbol{a} y^{6+p}$ | $15+p$ | $5+p$ | $\frac{\partial}{\partial x}$ | $[x=0, y=t]$ | 2 var. |
| 30 | $W_{1,2 q-1}^{\#}$ | $\left(y^{3}+x^{2}\right)^{2}+\boldsymbol{a} x y^{4+q}$ | $14+2 q$ | $\frac{9}{2}+q$ | $\frac{\partial}{\partial x}$ | $\left[x=t^{3}+\frac{1}{8} a_{0} t^{2 q+2}+\ldots, y=-t^{2}\right]$ | 2 var. |
| 31 | $W_{1,2 q}^{\#}$ | $\left(y^{3}+x^{2}\right)^{2}+\boldsymbol{a} x^{2} y^{3+q}$ | $15+2 q$ | $5+q$ | $\frac{\partial}{\partial x}$ | $\left[x=t^{3}+\frac{1}{4} a_{0}(-1)^{q} t^{2 q+3}+\ldots, y=-t^{2}\right]$ | 2 var. |

Here $\boldsymbol{a}:=\left(a_{0}+a_{1} y\right), p, q>0$.

## Arnold's zoo — the value of 1 vs. the hypotheses

## Modality 2 (cont.); here $\boldsymbol{a}:=\left(a_{0}+a_{1} y\right), p, q>0$

| Class | Formula | $\mu$ |  | Zer. | Parametrization |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $Q_{2,0}$ | $x^{3}+y z^{2}+a x^{2} y^{2}+x y^{4}$ | 14 | 5 | $\frac{2}{x^{2}} \cdot \overline{2}$ |  |  |
| $Q_{2, p}$ | $x^{3}+y z^{2}+x^{2} y^{2}+a y^{6+p}$ | 14+p | ${ }^{5+p}$ |  | $[x=0, y=t, z=0]$ |  |
| $S_{1,0}$ | $x^{2} z+y z^{2}+y^{5}+a y^{3} z$ | 14 | 4 |  | $x=0, y=t, z=-\frac{1}{2} a_{1} t^{3}-\frac{1}{2} a^{2}$ |  |
| $S_{1, p}$ | $x^{2} z+y z^{2}$ | 14 | 4+p |  | [ $x=0, y=t, z=0]$ |  |
| ${ }_{36} S_{1,2 q-1}^{\#}$ | $x^{2} z+y z^{2}+y^{3} z+a x y^{3}+q$ |  | +q |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{2 q}$ |  |  | 4+q | $q \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \frac{\partial}{\partial y}$ | $\begin{array}{r} {\left[x=-t^{3} \sqrt{1+2 a_{0}(-1)^{1+q} t^{2 q}+2 a_{1}(-1) q^{2 q+2}, y=-t^{2}},\right.} \\ z=(-1)^{q}\left(-a_{0} t^{2 q+4}+a_{1} t^{2 q+6}\right] \end{array}$ |  |
| $U_{1,0}$ | $x^{3}+x z^{2}+x y^{3}+a y^{3} z$ | 14 | $\frac{7}{2}$ | $\left.\frac{\partial}{\partial x^{2}} \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \right\rvert\,$ | $\begin{array}{r} {\left[y=\left(\frac{-1}{6}+\frac{1}{6}\right) t^{2}, x=\left(\frac{-1}{12} a_{0}^{2}+\frac{1}{18}-\frac{1}{18} \eta\right) t^{3} z=\frac{-1}{12} a_{0}(-1+n) t^{3}\right]} \\ \text { for } \eta=\sqrt{-3} a_{0}^{2}+1 \text { and } a_{0}^{2}+1 / 3 \end{array}$ |  |
| $U_{1,2 q-1}$ | $x^{3}+x z^{2}+x y^{3}+a y^{1+q} z^{2}$ |  |  | $\frac{\partial}{2 x} \frac{\partial}{2 z}$ | $\left[\begin{array}{l}{\left[x=(-1)^{q}\left(a_{0} t^{2 q+2}-a_{1} t^{2 q+4}\right), y=t^{2}\right.} \\ z=-t^{3} \sqrt{\left.1-3 a_{0}^{4} t^{4-2}+6 a_{0} a_{1} 1^{4 q}-3 a_{1}^{2} 1^{4 q+2}\right]}\end{array}\right.$ |  |
| $U_{1,2}$ | $x^{3}+x z^{2}+x y^{3}+a y^{3}+$ |  |  |  |  |  |

## Arnold's $z 00$ - the value of $\ddagger$ vs. the hypotheses

## Modality 2 (cont.); here $\boldsymbol{a}:=\left(a_{0}+a_{1} y\right)$

|  | Class | Formula | $\mu$ | ł | Zeroes of | Parametrization | Why |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 41 | $E_{18}$ | $x^{3}+y^{10}+\boldsymbol{a x} y^{7}$ | 18 | 9 | $\frac{\partial}{\partial x}$ | $\begin{array}{r} {\left[x=-\frac{a_{0}^{4} 7^{2}}{\left(a_{1} t^{2}+3\right)^{4}}, y=-\frac{a_{0} t^{2}}{a_{1} t^{2}+3}\right] \text { for } a_{0} \neq 0} \\ {\left[x=\frac{1}{3} \sqrt{\left.-3 a_{1} t^{4}, y=t\right] \text { for } a_{0}=0}\right.} \end{array}$ | 2 var . |
| 42 | E | $x^{3}+x y^{7}+\boldsymbol{a} y^{11}$ | 19 | $\frac{19}{2}$ | $\frac{\partial}{\partial x}$ | $\left[x=\frac{1}{81} t^{7}, y=-\frac{1}{3} t^{2}\right]$ | 2 var . |
| 43 | $E_{20}$ | $x^{3}+y^{11}+\boldsymbol{a x} y^{8}$ | 20 | 10 | $\frac{\partial}{\partial x}$ | $\left[x=\frac{1}{3} \sqrt{-3 a_{1} t-3 a_{0} t^{4}, y=t}\right]$ | 2var. |
| 44 | $Z_{17}$ | $x^{3} y+y^{8}+\boldsymbol{a x} y^{6}$ | 17 | 7 | $\frac{\partial}{\partial x}$ | $\left[x=\frac{1}{3} \sqrt{\left.-3 a_{1} t^{2}+3 a_{0} t^{5}, y=-t^{2}\right]}\right.$ | 2 var . |
| 45 | $Z_{18}$ | $x^{3} y+x y^{6}+\boldsymbol{a} y^{9}$ | 18 | $\frac{15}{2}$ | $\frac{\partial}{\partial x}$ | $\left[x=9 t^{5}, y=-3 t^{2}\right]$ | 2 var . |
| 46 | $Z_{19}$ | $x^{3} y+y^{9}+\boldsymbol{a x} y^{7}$ | 19 | 8 | $\frac{\partial}{\partial x}$ | $\left[x=-\frac{1}{3} \sqrt{3 a_{1} t^{2}-3 a_{0} t^{6}, y=-t^{2}}\right]$ | 2var. |
| 47 | $W_{17}$ | $x^{4}+x y^{5}+\boldsymbol{a} y^{7}$ | 17 | $\frac{17}{3}$ | $\frac{\partial}{\partial x}$ | $\left[x=-2 t^{5}, y=2 t^{3}\right]$ | 2 var . |
| 48 | $W_{18}$ | $x^{4}+y^{7}+\boldsymbol{a} x^{2} y^{4}$ | 18 | 6 | $\frac{\partial}{\partial x}$ | $[x=0, y=t]$ | 2 var . |

## Arnold's zoo - the value of $\ddagger$ vs. the hypotheses

## Modality 2 (cont.); here $\boldsymbol{a}:=\left(a_{0}+a_{1} y\right)$

|  | Class | Formula | $\mu$ | ł | Zeroes of | Parametrization | Why |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 49 | $Q_{16}$ | $x^{3}+y z^{2}+y^{7}+\boldsymbol{a x} y^{5}$ | 16 | 6 | $\frac{\partial}{\partial x}, \frac{\partial}{\partial z}$ | $\left[x=-\frac{a_{0}^{3} t^{5}}{\left(a_{1} t^{5}+3\right)^{3}}, y=-\frac{a_{0} t^{2}}{a^{2}}, z=0\right]$ for $a_{0} \neq 0$ <br> $\left[y=t, x=\sqrt{\left.-\frac{1}{3} a_{1} t^{3}, z=0\right]}\right.$ for $a_{0}=0$ | sqh |
| 50 | $Q_{17}$ | $x^{3}+y z^{2}+x y^{5}+\boldsymbol{a y} y^{8}$ | 17 | $\frac{13}{2}$ | $\frac{\partial}{\partial x}, \frac{\partial}{\partial z}$ | $\left[y=-\frac{1}{3} t^{2}, x=-\frac{1}{27} t^{5}, z=0\right]$ | sqh |
| 51 | $Q_{18}$ | $x^{3}+y z^{2}+y^{8}+\boldsymbol{a x y} y^{6}$ | 18 | 7 | $\frac{\partial}{\partial x}, \frac{\partial}{\partial z}$ | $\left[x=\frac{1}{3} \sqrt{\left.-3 a_{0}-3 a_{1} t t^{3}, y=t, z=0\right]}\right.$ | sqh |
| 52 | $S_{16}$ | $x^{2} z+y z^{2}+x y^{4}+\boldsymbol{a y} y^{6}$ | 16 | $\frac{14}{3}$ | $\frac{\partial}{\partial x}, \frac{\partial}{\partial z}$ | $\left[x=t^{5}, y=t^{3}, z=-\frac{1}{2} t^{7}\right]$ | sqh |
| 53 | $S_{17}$ | $x^{2} z+y z^{2}+y^{6}+\boldsymbol{a y ^ { 4 } z}$ | 17 | 5 | $\frac{\partial}{\partial x}, \frac{\partial}{\partial z}$ | $\left[x=0, y=t, z=-\frac{1}{2} a_{0} t^{3}-\frac{1}{2} a_{1} t^{4}\right]$ | sqh |
| 54 | $U_{16}$ | $x^{3}+x z^{2}+y^{5}+\boldsymbol{a x ^ { 2 } y ^ { 2 }}$ | 16 | 4 | $\frac{\partial}{\partial x}, \frac{\partial}{\partial z}$ | $[x=0, y=t, z=0]$ | sqh |

## Arnold's zoo - the value of $\ddagger$ vs. the hypotheses

## Modality $k$ - 1

|  | Class | Formula | $\mu$ | 1 | Zer. | Parametrization | Why |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 55 | $\boldsymbol{J}_{k, 0}$ | $x^{3}+b x^{2} y^{k}+y^{3 k}+\left(\sum_{j=0}^{k-3} c_{j} y^{j}\right) x y^{2 k+1}$ | $6 k-2$ | $3 k-1$ | $\frac{\partial}{\partial x}$ | $\left[x=\frac{1}{3}\left(-b+\sqrt{b^{2}-3 \sum_{j=0}^{k-3} c_{j} t^{j+1}}\right) t^{k}, y=t\right]$ | 2var. |
| 56 | $\boldsymbol{J}_{k, i}$ | $x^{3}+x^{2} y^{k}+\left(\sum_{j=0}^{k-2} a_{j} y^{j}\right) y^{3 k+i}$ | $6 k+i-2$ | $3 k+i-1$ | $\frac{\partial}{\partial x}$ | $[x=0, y=t]$ | 2var. |
| 57 | $\boldsymbol{E}_{6 k}$ | $x^{3}+y^{3 k+1}+\left(\sum_{j=0}^{k-2} a_{j} y^{j}\right) x y^{2 k+1}$ | $6 k$ | $3 k$ | $\frac{\partial}{\partial x}$ | $\left[x=\frac{\sqrt{3}}{3} \sqrt{-\sum_{j=0}^{k-2} a_{j} t^{2 j}} t^{2 k+1}, y=t^{2}\right]$ | 2var. |
| 58 | $\boldsymbol{E}_{6 k+1}$ | $x^{3}+x y^{2 k+1}+\left(\sum_{j=0}^{k-2} a_{j} y^{j}\right) y^{3 k+2}$ | $6 k+1$ | $3 k+\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{\partial}{\partial x}$ | $\left[x=\frac{1}{3} i \sqrt{3} t^{2 k+1}, y=t^{2}\right]$ | 2var. |
| 59 | $\boldsymbol{E}_{6 k+2}$ | $x^{3}+y^{3 k+2}+\left(\sum_{j=0}^{k-2} a_{j} y^{j}\right) x y^{2 k+2}$ | $6 k+2$ | $3 k+1$ | $\frac{\partial}{\partial x}$ | $\left[x=\frac{\sqrt{3}}{3} \sqrt{-\sum_{j=0}^{k-2} a_{j} t^{2 j}} t^{2 k+2}, y=t^{2}\right]$ | 2var. |

## Thanks!

## Thanks for your attention!
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