Cours de l'institut Fourier

S. Y. Orevkov
M. G. Zaidenberg

Some Estimates for Plane Cuspidal Curves

Cours de l'institut Fourier, tome S24 (1993), p. 93-116
<http://www.numdam.org/item?id=CIF_1993__S24__93_0>

© Institut Fourier – Université de Grenoble, 1993, tous droits réservés.

L'accès aux archives de la collection « Cours de l'institut Fourier » implique l'accord avec les conditions générales d'utilisation (http://www.numdam.org/conditions). Toute utilisation commerciale ou impression systématique est constitutive d'une infraction pénale. Toute copie ou impression de ce fichier doit contenir la présente mention de copyright.

Numdam
Article numérisé dans le cadre du programme Numérisation de documents anciens mathématiques
http://www.numdam.org/

Journées Singulières et Jacobiennes
GRENOBLE
26–28 mai 1993 (93–116)

Some estimates for plane cuspidal curves

S.Y. Orevkov, M.G. Zaidenberg

Introduction

Let $\bar{D}$ be an irreducible curve in $\mathbf{P}^2 = \mathbf{P}^2_{\mathbf{C}}$ of degree d and of genus g. A classical question is what set of singularities can possess such a curve. A necessary condition on the set of singularities is given by the genus formula:

$$(d-1)(d-2) = 2g + \sum_{i=1}^{s}(\mu_i + r_i - 1), \tag{1}$$

where μ_i and r_i are respectively the Milnor number and the number of analytic branches at p_i (by $p_1, \dots, p_s$ we denote the singular points of $\bar{D}$). Of course, this condition is far from being sufficient.

One of the most powerful tools for obtaining other restrictions (see [**H**]) is applying various versions of the Bogomolov-Miyaoka-Yau (BMY) inequality. This paper is devoted to some computations that allow one to apply the BMY inequality in the following logarithmic form (see [**Miy**, Corollary 1.2]). Suppose that the logarithmic Kodaira dimension $\bar{\kappa}(\mathbf{P}^2 - \bar{D}) \geq 0$ (for instance, this is the case if $\bar{D}$ has more than one singular point, or $g \geq 1$ and $d \geq 4$; see [**W**]). Let $\sigma : V \to \mathbf{P}^2$ be the minimal resolution of the singularities of $\bar{D}$ and $D = \sigma^{-1}(\bar{D})$ is the reduced preimage of $\bar{D}$. Then

$$(K + D)^2 \leq 3e(\mathbf{P}^2 - \bar{D}) , \tag{2}$$

where $K = K_V$ is the canonical divisor and e is the Euler characteristic.

Using the genus formula (1) one can represent the right hand side of (2) as

$$e(\mathbf{P}^2 - \bar{D}) = (d^2 - 3d + 3) - \sum_{i=1}^{s} \mu_i . \tag{3}$$

After decomposing $\operatorname{Pic} V \otimes \mathbf{Q}$ into a direct sum of pairwise orthogonal summands, one of which corresponds to a generic line and the others correspond to singular points, one can represent the left hand side of (2) as

$$(K + D)^2 = (d-3)^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{s}(K_i + D_i)^2 , \tag{4}$$

where K_i resp. D_i are projections of K resp. D onto the summand generated by the irreducible components of the exceptional divisor over the singular point p_i. It is easily seen that $(K_i + D_i)^2$ depends only on the weighted graph of the minimal resolution of the singularity of $\bar{D}$ at p_i.

Combining (3) and (4), one can write (2) as

$$\sum_{i=1}^{s} \alpha_i \mu_i \leq d^2 - \frac{3}{2} d \, , \tag{5}$$

where $\alpha_i = 3/2 + (K_i + D_i)^2 / 2\mu_i$ are local characteristics of the singularities. One can easily show that $(K_i + D_i)^2 > -\mu_i$ (see Proposition 6.1 below) and hence, $\alpha_i > 1$.

In Theorem 6.2 below we prove that if $\bar{D}$ is analytically irreducible (one place) at p_i, then

$$\alpha_i \geq 1 + \frac{1}{2m_i} \, ,$$

where m_i is the multiplicity of $\bar{D}$ at p_i. Here equality holds iff $m_i = 2$. As a corollary we obtain

Theorem A. *Let $\bar{\kappa}(\mathbf{P}^2 - \bar{D}) \geq 0$. Suppose that $\bar{D}$ is a cuspidal curve. i.e. each singularity p_i of $\bar{D}$ is analytically irreducible (one place) and has multiplicity $m_i \leq m$, $i = 1, \ldots, s$. Then*

$$\sum_{i=1}^{s} (1 + \frac{1}{2m_i}) \mu_i \leq d^2 - \frac{3}{2} d \, ,$$

where the inequality is strict unless $m = 2$. In particular,

$$\sum_{i=1}^{s} \mu_i \leq \frac{2m}{2m+1} (d^2 - \frac{3}{2} d) \, .$$

Corollary B. *Under the assumptions of Theorem A*

$$g \geq \frac{d^2 - 3(m+1)d}{2(2m+1)} + 1 \, .$$

Remarks.

1. For $m = 3$ Theorem A was proved by Yoshihara [**Y1**] by the same method and his paper, as well as the question posed in [**LZ**], inspired us for this work. Similar results for $m = 3$ were obtained in [**Y2**] by a different method.

2. In [**MS**] it is proven that if $\bar{D}$ as above is rational, then $d < 3m$, which is better than the estimate $d \leq 3m + 1$ given by Corollary B. In this case Theorem A and the genus formula give

$$\sum_{i=1}^{s} \frac{\mu_i}{m_i} \leq 3d - 4 .$$

3. Inequality (2) can be strengthened using the Zariski decomposition $K_V + D = H + N$. One of the consequences of the result of [**KNS**] is that if $\bar{\kappa}(\mathbf{P}^2 - \bar{D}) = 2$, then $(K + D)^2$ in (2) can be replaced by H^2 (it is so, for instance, if $\bar{D}$ has at least three singular points; see [**W**]). Since $N^2 < 0$, we obtain a stronger inequality.

4. Projecting H onto the direct summands of $\operatorname{Pic} V \otimes \mathbf{Q}$, we may replace the local terms $(K_i + D_i)^2$ in (3) by H_i^2. It follows from Fujita's peeling theory [**F**] that if $\bar{D}$ satisfies some additional conditions, then the H_i also depend only on local properties of the singularities. An example of such conditions is given by Theorem 1.2 below.

5. We compute the $(K_i + D_i)^2$ and the H_i^2 in terms of discriminants of subgraphs of the resolution graph, and if the singularity is analytically irreducible, in terms of the Puiseux characteristic pairs. An analogue of Puiseux characteristic pairs for an analytically reducible singularity (more than one place) is a notion of a splice diagram introduced by Eisenbud and Neumann [**EN**] (see Remark 2.5). It turns out that the above H_i^2 (but not the $(K_i + D_i)^2$) are rational functions of the weights of the splice diagrams (we write them explicitly in Corollary 2.4). It is not evident *a priori*, because though the weighted graph of the minimal resolution (and hence, H_i^2)

is uniquely determined by the splice diagram, the process of its reconstruction is rather complicated (it involves solving several diophantine equations, developments into continuous fractions, etc.)

6. In fact, the proof of Theorem A does not use the Zariski decomposition, peeling theory (see Sect. 1), Fujita's theorem (Theorem 2.1) etc., and though the terms H_i and N_i are involved in the proofs, they have purely formal meaning and are used just because the formulas for them are convenient for computations. However, in the case when $\bar{\kappa}(\mathbf{P}^2 - \bar{D}) = 2$, using these formulas and Fujita's theorem one can obtain some stronger estimates (see Remark 3 above).

7. For instance, if $\bar{D}$ satisfies the hypothesis of Theorem 1.2 and all its singularities are ordinary cusps ($x^2 + y^3 +$ (higher terms) $= 0$), then $H_i^2 = -1/6$ and one can strengthen the estimates of Theorem A and Corollary B as

$$\sum \mu_i \le \frac{24}{35}(d^2 - \frac{3}{2}d) \quad and \quad g \ge \frac{11d^2 - 69d}{70} + 1 . \qquad (*)$$

Here the sum of the Milnor numbers is nothing but twice the number of cusps. Thus, if $g = 0$, then $d \le 5$ (this follows also from [**MS**]).

Note that the Plücker formula for the number of inflection points (see [**Wal**]) in the case when $\bar{D}$ has only ordinary cusps as singularities leads to the inequality $g \ge \frac{d^2-6d}{8} + 1$, which is better than (*) for $d \le 5$. In particular, it implies that $d \le 4$ for a rational cuspidal curve with ordinary cusps. (There exists a cuspidal quintic of genus 1 with 5 cusps; see [**G**] for an example of a real model.) The Plücker formula for the class of a curve gives $g \ge \frac{d^2-7d}{6} + 1$, which is better than (*) for $d \ge 19$.

8. Constructions of curves with many cusps, which give estimates from below, can be found, for instance, in [**H**], [**Sh1,2**]; see also [**Z**], [**D**], [**N**], [**U**], [**Wall1,2**] for examples of curves of small degrees.

9. F. Sakai [**Sa**] also proved (independently and earlier) Theorems 6.2 and A, using the same BMY-inequality and the computations from [**MS**]. Moreover, it is stated in [**Sa**] that they are true without the assumption of local analytic irreducibility (this was conjectured in [**OZ**] before that the

preprint of F. Sakai was kindly sent us by the author).

The main purpose of the paper is to express explicitely the local ingredients involved in the BMY inequality (2) in turms of the Puiseaux characteristic sequences of singular points. This is done in Sect. 5 and 6. In Sect.7 we show how to modify the local formulas for the case of a plane affine curve with one place at infinity.

This work was done partially when both authors stayed at the Max-Planck-Institut für Mathematik in Bonn and partially when they stayed at the Institut Fourier in Grenoble. The authors thank both these institutions for their hospitality.

1. Local peeling and Zariski's decomposition of $K + D$

Assuming that we deal with a minimal embedded resolution of singularities of a plane projective curve $\bar{D}$, denote by C the proper preimage of $\bar{D}$. Restricting our consideration over one singular point of $\bar{D}$, we get the following data:
$D = E \cup C$ a reduced curve with simple normal crossings on a smooth compact complex surface V, such that the dual graph of E is a rational tree (that means that it is a tree and all irreducible components of E are rational), the irreducible components of E are linearly independent in $\operatorname{Pic} V \otimes \mathbf{Q}$ and the intersection form of E is non-degenerate. We keep this assumptions untill the end of this section, where we return to our concrete situation, and so in Theorem 1.2 V is a smooth projective rational surface obtained by the above resolution of singularities.

As usual, the *dual graph of* E is a weighted graph Γ_E, whose vertices are the irreducible components of E, the edges are the intersection points and the weights are the self-intersection numbers. The *valency* of a vertex in a graph Γ is the number of incident edges. The vertex is said to be *an end, linear* or *branch point* (or *node*) *of* Γ, if its valency is $1, 2$ or > 2 respectively.

Besides the dual graph of E we also consider the *dual graph of* C *near* E. It is a partially weighted graph $\Gamma_{C,E}$, whose weighted part coincides with Γ_E and whose non-weighted vertices are the intersection points of E and C (recall that all intersections are transversal). Such a vertex is joined by an edge with that component of E, on which the corresponding intersection point lies. Example: if E and C are respectively a line and a conic in $\mathbf{P}^2$ in general position, then $\Gamma_{C,E}$ is a linear chain of three vertices, where the middle one has the weight $+1$.

A partially weighted graph Γ will be called *an extended weighted graph* if all its non-weighted vertices are ends. It is clear that the above $\Gamma_{C,E}$ satisfies this definition.

By definition, the *discriminant* $d(\Gamma)$ of a weighted graph Γ is $\det(-A)$, where A is the incidence matrix of Γ (the intersection matrix of E, if $\Gamma = \Gamma_E$). The discriminant of a partially weighted graph is defined to be the discriminant of its weighted part. The discriminant of an empty graph is $+1$.

A subgraph L of a partially weighted graph Γ is called *a twig* if all its vertices are weighted, all but one are linear in Γ, one vertex (which is called *a tip of* L) is an end of Γ and another end of L is incident to a branch point of Γ. This branch point is called the *root* of L (remark: $\mathrm{root}(L) \notin L$). A twig is said to be *admissible* if the weights of all its vertices are ≤ -2. In this case its intersection form is negatively definite. The *inductance* of a twig L is defined as

$$\mathrm{ind}\,(L) = d(L - \mathrm{tip}(L))/d(L).$$

Denote by $\mathrm{Vect}\,(E)$ the subspace of $\mathrm{Pic}\,V \otimes \mathbf{Q}$ spanned by the irreducible components of E, and let $\mathrm{pr}_E : \mathrm{Pic}\,V \otimes \mathbf{Q} \to \mathrm{Vect}\,(E)$ be the orthogonal projection (with respect to the intersection form). Denote: $C_E = \mathrm{pr}_E(C)$, $D_E = \mathrm{pr}_E(D)$ and $K_E = \mathrm{pr}_E(K_V)$, where K_V is the canonical divisor of V.

We assume that $\Gamma_{C,E}$ is *minimal*, i.e. it does not contain linear or end vertices weighted by -1.

By *a local peeling* (or *Fujita decomposition*) of $K + D$ near E we mean a decomposition $K_E + D_E = H_E + N_E$, where $\mathrm{supp}(N_E)$ coincides with the union of all twigs of $\Gamma_{C,E}$, and H_E is orthogonal to each irreducible component of N_E.

It is not difficult to prove that if all the twigs are admissible, then the decomposition is uniquely defined [cf. **Fu**, (6.12)]. Under the same assumption we have the following simple lemma.

Lemma 1.1 [**Fu**, (6.16)]. *$-N_E^2$ is equal to the sum of inductances of all twigs of $\Gamma_{C,E}$.*

Next we describe the relation of the local peeling with the Zariski decomposition of $K+D$ for the minimal resolution $\sigma : V \to \mathbf{P}^2$ of the singularities of $\bar{D}$, where $K = K_V$ and $D = \sigma^{-1}(\bar{D})$. Recall that the Zariski decomposition is the decomposition $K + D = H + N$, where H and N are $\mathbf{Q}$-divisors, N is effective and H is nef (i.e. $H \cdot F \geq 0$ for any irreducible curve F), and $H \cdot G = 0$ for any irreducible component G of N.

Let $p_1, ..., p_s$ be the singular points of $\bar{D}$ and C be the proper preimage of $\bar{D}$ in V. We denote also: $E^{(i)} = \sigma^{-1}(p_i)$, $L = \sigma^{-1}(\bar{L})$, where $\bar{L}$ is a generic line in $\mathbf{P}^2$. Note that the curve E considered above in this section coincides either with one of E_i or with L. Let $H + N$ be the Zariski decomposition of $K + D$ and let $H_i + N_i$ and $H_L + N_L$ be its local Fujita decomposition near $E^{(i)}$, $(i = 1, ..., s)$ and near L, respectively. Clearly, $H_L = (d-3)L$, $N_L = 0$.

As a corollary from [**Fu**, (6.20-6.24)] one can obtain the following

Theorem 1.2. *Suppose that*

i) $\bar{\kappa}(X) \geq 0$, *where* $X = \mathbf{P}^2 - \bar{D} = V - D$,

ii) the dual graph Γ_D *of* D *is minimal and either* $\bar{D}$ *is not rational or* Γ_D *has at least two branching points (it is so, for instance, when* $\bar{D}$ *has at least two cusps),*

iii) there is no (-1)*-curve* F *in* V *(i.e. smooth rational curve with selfintersection* $F^2 = -1$*) such that* F *is not contained in* D *and* $F \cdot D = 1 = F \cdot T$ *for some twig* T *of* D*, so that* F *meets* D *transversally at one point, which is a smooth point of* T.

Then $H = (d-3)L + \sum_i H_i$ *and* $N = \sum_i N_i$.

2. Computation of H_E^2 via discriminants of branches of the dual graph

All the notation from the previous section is preserved, so that $D = E \cup C$ is a reduced curve with simple normal crossings on a smooth compact surface V. Let $E_1, ..., E_n$ be irreducible components of E. Denote by $\mathrm{Vect}\,(E)^*$ the dual space to $\mathrm{Vect}\,(E)$ and let $\langle , \rangle : \mathrm{Vect}\,(E)^* \otimes \mathrm{Vect}\,(E) \to \mathbf{Q}$ be the natural pairing. Denote by $e^* = \{E_1^*, ..., E_n^*\}$ the base in $\mathrm{Vect}\,(E)^*$, dual to the base $e = \{E_1, ..., E_n\}$, i.e. $\langle E_i^*, E_j \rangle = \delta_{ij}$. Let $A_E : \mathrm{Vect}\,(E) \to \mathrm{Vect}\,(E)^*$ be the linear operator defined by the intersection form: $\langle A_E(D_1), D_2 \rangle = D_1 \cdot D_2$. So, the matrix of A_E in the bases e and e^* is just the intersection matrix of E. Recall that we assume Γ_E to be a rational tree and the intersection form to be non-degenerate on Vect (E); these are the only assumptions that we need in this section, so that V here can be an arbitrary smooth compact complex surface. Denote A_E^{-1} by $B_E = (b_{ij})$.

Since the graph Γ_E is a tree, for a given couple of vertices E_i and E_j, not necessary distinct, they are connected by the unique shortest path in Γ_E. Denote by Γ_{ij} the weighted graph obtained from Γ_E by deleting of this path together with the vertices E_i and E_j themselves and with all their incident edges. So, in general the graph Γ_{ij} is disconnected.

Proposition 2.1.

$$b_{ij} = -d(\Gamma_{ij})/d(\Gamma_E) .$$

Proof. Apply Cramer's inverse matrix formula. ○

Denote by ν_i and $\bar{\nu}_i$ $(i = 1, ..., n)$ the valencies of E_i in Γ_E and $\Gamma_{C,E}$ respectively.

Proposition 2.2

$$(i) \qquad A_E(K_E + E) = \textstyle\sum_i (\nu_i - 2)E_i^* .$$

$$(ii) \qquad A_E(C_E) = \textstyle\sum_i (\bar{\nu}_i - \nu_i)E_i^* .$$

$$(iii) \qquad A_E(K_E + D_E) = \textstyle\sum_i (\bar{\nu}_i - 2)E_i^* .$$

Proof. (i) For each E_i we have $\langle (K_E + E)^*, E_i\rangle = K_E \cdot E_i + E \cdot E_i = (K_E + E_i) \cdot E_i + \nu_i = -2 + \nu_i$.

(ii) By the definition $\bar{\nu}_i = \nu_i + C \cdot E_i$.

(iii) Add (i) and (ii). ○

For a branch point E_i of the graph $\Gamma_{C,E}$ put $c_i = \bar{\nu}_i - 2 - \sum 1/d(L)$, where the summation is over all twigs such that $\mathrm{root}(L) = E_i$.

Proposition 2.3. $A_E(H_E) = \sum_{\bar{\nu}_i > 2} c_i E_i^*$.

Proof. If $\bar{\nu}_i = 1$ then E_i belongs to some twig, and by the definition of local peeling $H_E \cdot E_i = 0$.

If $\bar{\nu}_i = 2$, then either E_i lies on a twig and then $H_E \cdot E_i = 0$, or E_i does not intersect any twig and then $E_i \cdot H_E = E_i \cdot (K_E + D_E) = \bar{\nu}_i - 2 = 0$.

If $\bar{\nu}_i > 2$, denote by $L_1, ..., L_k$ all twigs rooted by E_i, and let $E_{i_1}, ..., E_{i_k}$ be their vertices, incident with E_i. According to [**Fu**, (6.16)], the coefficient of E_{i_j} in N_E equals $1/d(L_j)$. Hence,

$$E_i \cdot H_E = E_i \cdot (K_E + D_E) - E_i \cdot N_E = (\bar{\nu}_i - 2) - \sum_{j=1}^{k} \frac{1}{d(L_j)} = c_i.$$

○

Corollary 2.4.
$$H_E^2 = \sum b_{ij} c_i c_j \,, \tag{6}$$
where the summation is over all pairs (i, j) such that $\bar{\nu}_i > 2$ and $\bar{\nu}_j > 2$.

Proof. Let $Y = A_E(H_E)$. Then $H_E^2 = \langle B_E Y, Y \rangle$. ○

Remark 2.5. One can see that (6) represents H_E^2 as a rational function of $d(\Gamma_E)$ and of the discriminants of the branches of $\Gamma_{C,E}$ at branch points (*a branch* of a graph Γ at a vertex v is a connected component of $\Gamma - v$). This rational function depends only on the topology of $\Gamma_{C,E}$.

In [**EN**] the notion of splice diagram was introduced. *A splice diagram* is a graph such that some of its ends are marked as arrowheads, all nodes have weights ± 1, and all ends of edges near nodes (more formally speaking, all pairs (n, e) where n is a node and e is an edge, incident to n) are weighted by integers. To each unimodular (with discriminant ± 1) extended weighted graph Γ corresponds a splice diagram Δ which is constructed from Γ as follows: Replace each linear chain of Γ by a single edge, weight all the nodes by the same integer $d(\Gamma)$ and weight each end of an edge at a node by the discriminant of the corresponding branch of Γ at the node. It is shown in

[EN] that if the intersection form of Γ is negative definite, then the minimal extended weighted graph is uniquely defined by the splice diagram.

For singularities of plane curves, the notion of a splice diagram is a generalization of the notion of Puiseux pairs (see Proposition 5.1). It is easy to see that the right hand side of (6) is a rational function of the weights of the splice diagram.

In the next simple lemma we use the following notation. Let $\bar{D}$ be an irreducible curve in $\mathbf{P}^2$, $p \in \mathbf{P}^2$ be one of the singular points of $\bar{D}$ and $\sigma : V \to \mathbf{P}^2$ be the minimal resolution of singularity of $\bar{D}$ at p. Let $D = \sigma^{-1}(\bar{D})$, $E = \sigma^{-1}(p)$, C be the proper preimage of $\bar{D}$ at V, K and $\bar{K}$ be the canonical divisors of V and $\mathbf{P}^2$ respectively. Let μ be the Milnor number of the singularity of $\bar{D}$ at p. We keep all other notation from this section.

Lemma 2.6.

$$\mu = 1 - C_E \cdot (K_E + C_E + E) = 1 - C_E \cdot (K_E + D_E)$$

Proof. Since $\sigma^*(\bar{D})$ resp. $\sigma^*(\bar{K})$ is orthogonal to Vect(E) and $C - \sigma^*(\bar{D}) \in$ Vect(E) resp. $K - \sigma^*(\bar{K}) \in Vect(E)$, we have

$$C = C_E + \sigma^*(\bar{D})$$

resp.

$$K = K_E + \sigma^*(\bar{K}) \ .$$

Let $p_1, \dots, p_s$ be the singular points of $\bar{D}$, μ_i be the Milnor number of $\bar{D}$ at p_i and r_i be the number of branches of $\bar{D}$ at p_i. Let $p = p_1$, $\mu = \mu_1$ and $r = r_1$. Put $M = \sum_{i=2}^{s}(\mu_i + r_i - 1)$. By the adjunction formula and the formula for arithmetic genus we have

$$C \cdot (C + K) = 2g - 2 + M$$

and

$$\bar{D} \cdot (\bar{K} + \bar{D}) = 2g - 2 + (\mu + r - 1) + M \ ,$$

where g is the genus of $\bar{D}$. Substitution from the equalities above gives

$$C \cdot (C + K) = C_E \cdot (C_E + K_E) + \bar{D} \cdot (\bar{D} + \bar{K}) .$$

This leads to the equality $\mu + r - 1 = -C_E \cdot (C_E + K_E)$. Since $r = C \cdot E = C_E \cdot E$, we obtain the desired result.
O
By the formulas from Proposition 2.2, used in the same way as in Corollary 2.4, we obtain

Corollary 2.7.

$$\mu = 1 - \langle B_E Y, Z \rangle = 1 - \sum_{i,j} b_{ij}(\bar{\nu}_i - 2)(\bar{\nu}_j - \nu_j) ,$$

where $Y = A_E(K_E + D_E)$, $Z = A_E(C_E)$.

Remarks 2.8. *a)* This Corollary provides us a formula for the Milnor number of the singularity in terms of the weights of the splice diagram.

b) By the projection formula, the statement of Lemma 2.6 is still valid if one assumes $\sigma : V \to \mathbf{P}^2$ to be the minimal resolution of all singularities of $\bar{D}$, not only at one singular point $p \in \bar{D}$.

3. Some lemmas on discriminants of graphs

The next two lemmas are well known.

Lemma 3.1. *Let L be a linear weighted graph with vertices $v_1, ..., v_k$ (v_1 and v_k being the ends of L). Then*

$$d(L - v_1)d(L - v_k) - d(L)d(L - v_1 - v_k) = 1 .$$

Proof. Use induction on the length of L and the recurrent formula:

$$d(L) = -w_1 d(L - v_1) - d(L - v_1 - v_2)\,,$$

where w_1 is the weight of v_1. ○

Lemma 3.2. *Let Γ be a weighted tree, and $[v_1v_2]$ an edge of Γ. Denote by Γ_1 and Γ_2 the components of $\Gamma - [v_1v_2]$, containing v_1 and v_2 respectively. Then*

$$d(\Gamma) = d(\Gamma_1)d(\Gamma_2) - d(\Gamma_1 - v_1)d(\Gamma_2 - v_2).$$

Lemma 3.3. *Let L be a linear extremal chain of Γ with vertices $v_1, \ldots, v_k$, such that v_k is an end of Γ and v_1 is connected with $\Gamma - L$ by the edge $[v_0v_1]$. Then*

$$d(\Gamma - L - v_0) = d(\Gamma - v_k)d(L) - d(\Gamma)d(L - v_k)\ .$$

Proof. Denote:

$$d = d(L)\,;\ d_0 = d(L - v_k)\,;\ d' = d(L - v_1)\,;\ d_0' = d(L - v_1 - v_k)\,;$$

$$\Delta = d(\Gamma)\,;\ \Delta_0 = d(\Gamma - v_k)\,;\ A = d(\Gamma - L)\,;\ A' = d(\Gamma - L - v_0)\ .$$

Then by lemma 3.2 applied to Γ and $\Gamma - v_k$ in the edge $[v_0v_1]$ we have that

$$\Delta = Ad - A'd';\ \Delta_0 = Ad_0 - A'd_0'\ .$$

Substracting the first equality multiplied by d_0 from the second one multiplied by d, we obtain

$$\Delta_0 d - \Delta d_0 = A'(d_0 d' - d d_0')\ .$$

Now, by Lemma 3.1 $d_0 d' - d d_0' = 1$.
○

Corollary 3.4. *If $d(L) \neq 0$ and $d(\Gamma) \neq 0$, then*

$$\frac{d(\Gamma - v_k)}{d(\Gamma)} = \frac{d(\Gamma - L - v_0)}{d(L)d(\Gamma)} + \operatorname{ind}(L)\ .$$

Corollary 3.5. *If $d(\Gamma) = 1$ and all the weights of L are ≤ -2, then*

$$d(\Gamma - v_k) = \lceil a \rceil; \qquad \operatorname{ind}(L) = \lceil a \rceil - a,$$

where $a = d(\Gamma - L - v_0)/d(L)$ and by $\lceil a \rceil$ is denoted the minimal integer greater than a.

4. The case of a contractible graph

We use here the notation from Sect.2 and 3, keeping the same assumptions as in Sect. 2. If the graph of E is contractible, i.e. if E can be blown down by a birational morphism $\sigma_E : V \to \bar{V}$ such that $(\sigma_E)|_{V-E}$ is an isomorphism and $\sigma_E(E)$ is a single smooth point on $\bar{V}$, then the formula for $(K_E + E)^2$ and hence, for H_E^2 can be essentially simplified: the summation over two indices can be replaced by a summation over a single index.

Proposition 4.1. *If E can be blown down to a smooth point, then*

$$(K_E + E)^2 = -2 - \sum_{i=1}^{n} b_{ii}(\nu_i - 2) . \tag{7}$$

Remark 4.2. Since the intersection form on $\operatorname{Vect}(E)$ is negative definite, all the b_{ii} are negative.

Proof. Since V can be obtained from $\bar{V}$ by means of successive blow-ups, we shall use the induction with respect to the number of irreducible components of E. If E is irreducible with $E^2 = -1$, it is clear that both sides of (7) are equal to -4. Now assume that the proposition is valid for a pair (V, E) and let us prove it for $(\tilde{V}, \tilde{E})$, where $\tilde{V}$ is the result of a blowing-up $\sigma : \tilde{V} \to V$ of a point p on E, and $\tilde{E} = \sigma^{-1}(E)$. Denote the irreducible components of E and $\tilde{E}$ by $E_1, ..., E_n$ and $\tilde{E}_0, ..., \tilde{E}_n$ respectively, where $\tilde{E}_i$ is the proper transform of E_i for $i \geq 1$ and $\tilde{E}_0 = \sigma^{-1}(p)$ is the exceptional curve of σ. Let $\tilde{K}_{\tilde{E}}, \tilde{B}_{\tilde{E}} = (\tilde{b}_{ij})$ etc. be given as before with (V, E) replaced by $(\tilde{V}, \tilde{E})$.

Observe that the blow-up changes both sides of (7) by the same quantity.

Indeed,

$$\tilde{K}_{\tilde{E}} = \sigma^*(K_E) + \tilde{E}_0, \quad \tilde{E} = \sigma^*(E) - (\tilde{\nu}_0 - 1)\tilde{E}_0 \,.$$

Hence,

$$\tilde{K}_{\tilde{E}} + \tilde{E} = \sigma^*(K_E + E) - (\tilde{\nu}_0 - 2)\tilde{E}_0 \,,$$

and since $\sigma^*(K_E + E)$ is orthogonal to $\tilde{E}_0$, we have that

$$(\tilde{K}_{\tilde{E}} + \tilde{E})^2 = (\sigma^*(K_E + E))^2 + (\tilde{\nu}_0 - 2)^2 \tilde{E}_0^2 = (K_E + E)^2 - (\tilde{\nu}_0 - 2)^2 \,.$$

Thus, $(K_E + E)^2$ decreases by 1 if p is a smooth point of E (case 1), and does not change if p is the intersection point of two components of E (case 2).

Now, let us see what happens with the right hand side of (7) in both cases.

Case 1. Without loss of generality we may assume that $p \in E_1$. Then we have: $\tilde{b}_{00} = b_{11} - 1$, $\tilde{b}_{ii} = b_{ii}$ for $i \geq 1$, $\tilde{\nu}_0 = 1$, $\tilde{\nu}_1 = \nu_1 + 1$, $\tilde{\nu}_i = \nu_i$ for $i \geq 2$. Indeed, to prove the first equality, it is enough to note that $-b_{00}$ is the determinant of the matrix $-A_E$ with $-a_{11}$ replaced by $-(a_{11} + 1)$, and the determinant of the complementary minor is exactly $-b_{11}$. The second equality is just the invariance of the discriminant under blowing up. The others equalities are trivial. Thus,

$$-\sum_{i=0}^{n} \tilde{b}_{ii}(\tilde{\nu}_i - 2) = (b_{11} - 1) - b_{11}(\nu_1 - 1) - \sum_{i=2}^{n} b_{ii}(\nu_i - 2) = -1 - \sum_{i=1}^{n} b_{ii}(\nu_i - 2) \,.$$

Case 2. Assume that $p = E_1 \cap E_2$. Then we have: $\tilde{b}_{ii} = b_{ii}$ for $i \geq 1$. $\tilde{\nu}_0 = 2$, $\tilde{\nu}_i = \nu_i$ for $i \geq 1$. (As above, the first equality is just the invariance of the discriminant under blowing up.) The invariance of the right hand side of (7) is a trivial consequence of these equalities.

$\bigcirc$

5. The analytically irreducible case: Computation of H_E^2 via Puiseux pairs

Let $\bar{C}$ be a germ of an analytically irreducible curve at the origin in $\mathbf{C}^2$, and let

$$x = t^m, \qquad y = a_n t^n + a_{n+1} t^{n+1} + \dots, \qquad a_n \neq 0,$$

be its local analytic parametrization. Put: $d_1 = m$, $m_1 = n$;

$$d_i = \gcd(d_{i-1}, m_{i-1}), \qquad m_i = \min\{ j \mid a_j \neq 0, d_i \nmid j \}, \ i > 1;$$

denote by h the integer such that $d_h \neq 1$, $d_{h+1} = 1$. Thus, m_i and d_i are defined for $i = 1, \dots, h$ and for $i = 1, \dots, h+1$ respectively, and

$$0 < m_1 < m_2 < \dots < m_h, \qquad m = d_1 > d_2 > \dots > d_{h+1} = 1 .$$

Let $q_1 = m_1$, $q_i = m_i - m_{i-1}$ for $i = 2, \dots, h$, and let

$$r_i = (q_1 d_1 + \dots + q_i d_i)/d_i, \ \ i = 1, \dots, h . \tag{8}$$

After changing the coordinates, if necessary, we may assume that $m < n$ and m does not divide n. Under these assumptions the sequence $(m; m_1, m_2, \dots, m_h)$ is uniquely defined and is called *the Puiseux characteristic sequence of the singularity of* $\bar{C}$ *at* 0 (see [A], [Mil]).

Now we shall describe the relations between the Puiseux characteristic sequence and the resolution graph. Let $\sigma : V \to \mathbf{C}^2$ be the minimal resolution of the singularity of the curve $\bar{C}$ at the origin, $E = \sigma^{-1}(0)$ and C be the proper transform of $\bar{C}$.

Proposition 5.1 (see [EN]). *a) The dual graph* $\Gamma_{C,E}$ *of* C *near* E *is the following:*



(here the edges mean linear chains of vertices of valency 2, which are not shown).

b) Denote by R_i, D_i and S_i the connected components of $\Gamma_{C,E}-E_{h+i}$ which are to the left, to the bottom and to the right of the node E_{h+i}, respectively. Denote by Q_i the linear chain between E_{h+i-1} and E_{h+i} (excluding E_{h+i-1} and E_{h+i}). Then

$$d(R_i)=\frac{r_i}{d_{i+1}},\quad d(D_i)=\frac{d_i}{d_{i+1}},\quad d(S_i)=1\,,\quad d(Q_i)=\frac{q_i}{d_{i+1}}\,.$$

Thus, the Eisenbud-Neumann splice diagram of $\Gamma_{C,E}$ is just the diagram in a) with weights at the edges near the node $E_i\,(i=h+1,\dots,2h)$ given by formulas in b) (see Remark 2.5). This explains why splice diagram can be considered as a generalization of Puiseux characteristic sequence.

Let μ be the Milnor number of the singularity of $\bar{C}$ at 0. Introduce for E and C the notation from Sect.2 and 3. Denote by $\lceil a\rceil$ the smallest integer greater than a.

Proposition 5.2.

$$i)\qquad \mu=1-d_1+\sum_{i=1}^{h}r_i\left(\frac{d_i}{d_{i+1}}-1\right)=1-d_1+\sum_{i=1}^{h}q_i(d_i-1)\,;$$

$$ii)\qquad 2\mu+H_E^2=-\frac{d_1}{r_1}+\sum_{i=1}^{h}\frac{r_i}{d_{i+1}}\left(\frac{d_i}{d_{i+1}}-\frac{d_{i+1}}{d_i}\right);\tag{9}$$

$$iii)\qquad N_E^2=\frac{d_1}{r_1}-\left\lceil\frac{d_1}{r_1}\right\rceil+\sum_{i=1}^{h}\left(\frac{r_i}{d_i}-\left\lceil\frac{r_i}{d_i}\right\rceil\right);$$

$$iv)\qquad 2\mu+(K_E+D_E)^2=-\left\lceil\frac{d_1}{r_1}\right\rceil+\sum_{i=1}^{h}\left(\frac{r_id_i}{d_{i+1}^2}-\left\lceil\frac{r_i}{d_i}\right\rceil\right).$$

Proof. Let the irreducible components of E with $\bar{\nu}_i \neq 2$ be noted as in the above diagram (recall that ν_i and $\bar{\nu}_i$ are the valencies of E_i in Γ_E and in $\Gamma_{C,E}$ respectively). Then $\nu_0 = ... = \nu_h = 1$, $\nu_{h+1} = ... = \nu_{2h-1} = 3$, $\nu_{2h} = 2$.

By Corollary 2.7

$$\mu = \sum_{i=0}^{h} b_{i,2h}(\bar{\nu}_i - 2) = 1 + b_{0,2h} + \sum_{i=1}^{h}(b_{i,2h} - b_{h+i,2h}) .$$

By Propositions 2.1 and 5.1 we have

$$b_{0,2h} = -\prod_{i=1}^{h} D_i = -d_1, \; b_{i,2h} - b_{h+i,2h} = R_i(D_i - 1) \prod_{i=j+1}^{h} D_j = r_i(\frac{d_i}{d_{i+1}} - 1) .$$

This gives the first equality in *i)*. The second one is obtained from this by using the expression for r_i and changing the order of double summation.

By Lemma 2.6 $\mu = 1 - C_E \cdot (K_E + C_E + E)$. Hence,

$$2\mu + H_E^2 = 2\mu + (K_E + C_E + E)^2 - N_E^2 = (K_E + E)^2 + 2 - C_E^2 - N_E^2 . \quad (10)$$

According to Proposition 4.1,

$$(K_E + E)^2 + 2 = -\sum_{i=1}^{n} b_{ii}(\nu_i - 2) = \sum_{i=1}^{h} b_{ii} - \sum_{i=h+1}^{2h-1} b_{ii} .$$

From Propositions 2.1 and 5.1 it follows that

$$b_{h+i,h+i} = -\frac{r_i}{d_{i+1}} \cdot \frac{d_i}{d_{i+1}}, \quad i = 1, ..., h .$$

Let $L_0, ..., L_h$ be the twigs of $\Gamma_{C,E}$, where E_i is the tip of L_i, (i.e. $L_i = D_i$ for $i = 1, ..., h$). By Propositions 2.1, 5.1 and Corollary 3.4 we have that

$$-b_{00} = \frac{d_1}{r_1} + \mathrm{ind}\,(L_0); \quad -b_{ii} = \frac{r_i}{d_i} + \mathrm{ind}\,(L_i), \quad i = 1, ..., h .$$

It is clear that $C_E \cdot E_i = \delta_{2h,i}$, i.e. $A_E(C_E) = E_{2h}^*$. Hence,

$$C_E^2 = \langle B_E E_{2h}^*, E_{2h}^* \rangle = b_{2h,2h} = -r_h d_h .$$

To complete the proof of *ii)* and *iii)* we put all these formulas into (10) and apply Lemma 1.1 and Corollary 3.5. *iv)* is the sum of *ii)* and *iii)*.
○

Remark that (9, *i)*) is equivalent to the formula for μ in [**Mil, p. 93**].

Corollary 5.3.

$$2\mu + H_E^2 = -\frac{d_1}{q_1} + \sum_{i=1}^{h} q_i\left(d_i - \frac{1}{d_i}\right) . \tag{11}$$

Proof. Put (8) into (9)*(ii)* and change the order of summation:

$$2\mu + H_E^2 = -\frac{d_1}{q_1} + \sum_{i=1}^{h}\sum_{j=1}^{i} \frac{q_j d_j}{d_i d_{i+1}}\left(\frac{d_i}{d_{i+1}} - \frac{d_{i+1}}{d_i}\right)$$

$$= -\frac{d_1}{q_1} + \sum_{j=1}^{h} q_j d_j \sum_{i=j}^{h}\left(\frac{1}{d_{i+1}^2} - \frac{1}{d_i^2}\right) = -\frac{d_1}{q_1} + \sum_{j=1}^{h} q_j d_j\left(1 - \frac{1}{d_j^2}\right) .$$

○

Corollary 5.4. *If the analytically irreducible singularity of* $\bar{C}$ *at* 0 *has only one Puiseux characteristic pair (i.e. if the above* m, n *are relatively prime), then*

$$-H_E^2 = (m-2)(n-2) + (m-n)^2/mn .$$

Indeed, in this case $\mu = (m-1)(n-1)$, see [**Mil**, p. 95], and $h = 1$, $d_1 = m$, $q_1 = m_1 = r_1 = n$.
○

6. Estimates of H_E^2 via the Milnor number and the multiplicity

The first estimate (Proposition 6.1 below) is quite elementary and in its proof we use nothing (except definitions) from the above part of the paper. This estimate holds for any singularity of a plane curve. The second estimate (Proposition 6.2 below) is stronger and is based on the computations involving the Puiseux characteristic sequence (see Sect.5). We prove the second estimate for irreducible singularities only.

Let $\bar{C}$ be a germ of a curve at the origin in $\mathbf{C}^2$ (not necessary analytically irreducible), and let $\sigma : V \to \mathbf{C}^2$, $E = \sigma^{-1}(0)$, be the minimal resolution of its singularity, $D = E + C$, where C is the proper transform of $\bar{C}$. We use the same notation as in Sect.2 and 3. Let μ be the Milnor number of $\bar{C}$ at 0.

Proposition 6.1.

$$-\mu < (K_E + D_E)^2 < H_E^2 \leq 0 \ .$$

Proof. The intersection form being negatively definite on $Vect(E)$, we have that $H_E^2 \leq 0$. Since $N_E^2 < 0$, it suffices to prove that $\mu + (K_E + D_E)^2 > 0$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \mu + (K_E + D_E)^2 &= 1 - C_E \cdot (K_E + D_E) + (K_E + D_E)^2 \\ &= (K_E + E)(K_E + C_E + E) + 1 \ . \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

Decomposing the minimal resolution of the singularity into a sequence of blow-ups, it suffices to prove that the right hand side of (12) does not decreases under a blow-up (as it was done in the proof of Proposition 4.1).

Let $\sigma : \tilde{V} \to V$, $\tilde{E} = \sigma^{-1}(E)$ be a blow-up at the point $p \in E$ with the exceptional curve $E_0 = \sigma^{-1}(p)$. Denote by $\tilde{C}$ the proper transform of C and by α and ν the multiplicities at p of C and E respectively. Then we have:

$$\tilde{C}_{\tilde{E}} = \sigma^*(C_E) - \alpha E_0 , \qquad \tilde{K}_{\tilde{E}} = \sigma^*(K_E) + E_0 , \qquad \tilde{E} = \sigma^*(E) - (\nu - 1)E_0 \ .$$

Hence,

$$(\tilde{K}_{\tilde{E}} + \tilde{E})(\tilde{K}_{\tilde{E}} + \tilde{E} + \tilde{C}_{\tilde{E}}) - (K_E + E)(K_E + E + C_E) = (\nu - 2)(\alpha + \nu - 2)E_0^2 \ .$$

Since $\nu = 1$ or 2, this difference is either 0 or $\alpha - 1$. But the resolution being minimal, all blow-ups are done at points of C. So, $\alpha \geq 1$.

○

In the sequel we assume that $\bar{C}$ is analytically irreducible at 0 and use the notation from Sect.5. Clearly, under the assumption that $m < n$, m is the multiplicity of $\bar{C}$ at the origin.

Theorem 6.2.

$$\mu + H_E^2 > \mu + (K_E + D_E)^2 \geq \mu/m \ ,$$

where equality holds if and only if $m = 2$.

Proof. Substracting (9, *i)*) from (11), we obtain

$$\mu + H_E^2 = d_1(1 - \frac{1}{q_1}) - 1 + \sum_{j=1}^{h} q_j(1 - \frac{1}{d_j}), \tag{13}$$

and hence

$$\mu + (K_E + D_E)^2 - \frac{\mu}{m} = d_1(1 - \frac{1}{q_1}) - \frac{1}{d_1} + N_E^2 + \sum_{j=1}^{h} q_j(1 - \frac{d_j}{d_1})(1 - \frac{1}{d_j}) \tag{14}$$

(recall, that $m = d_1$). It is clear that the last sum in (14) is positive.

Let, as above, L_i be the twig of $\Gamma_{C,E}$ with the tip E_i (see the diagram in Proposition 5.1). Since $\operatorname{ind}(L_i) < 1$, we have that

$$N_E^2 > -\operatorname{ind}(L_0) - h$$

and by Corollary 3.5

$$-\operatorname{ind}(L_0) - d_1/q_1 = -\lceil d_1/q_1 \rceil = -1 \ .$$

Thus, the expression in the right hand side of (14) is greater than $m - \frac{1}{m} - 1 - h$ (denote this quantity by a). Since $m = d_1$ and $d_i/d_{i+1} \geq 2$, we have that $h \leq \log_2 m$. Hence, $a > 0$ for $m \geq 4$. If $m = 3$, then $h = 1$ and $a = 2/3 > 0$.

To complete the proof, it remains to consider the case $m = 2$. In this case $q_1 = n$ is odd, hence, $\lceil n/m \rceil = \lceil n/2 \rceil = (n+1)/2$, $\mu = n - 1$, and by (14)

$$\mu + (K_E + D_E)^2 = \lceil n/2 \rceil - 1 = (n-1)/2 = \mu/2 \ .$$

○

Remark 6.3. The estimate in Theorem 6.2 is sharp in the following sense. For any positive integer m and for any $\epsilon > 0$ there exists a curve $\bar{C}$ with an analytically irreducible singularity at 0 of multiplicity m, such that

$$\mu + H_E^2 < (1+\epsilon)\mu/m \ .$$

Indeed, consider the curve $x^m = y^n$, where n is big enough and relatively prime with m.

7. Plane affine curves with one place at infinity

The Puiseux expansions of an analytically irreducible singularity is very similar to that of an affine curve with one place at infinity (see [**A**, **NR**]). All the formulas from Sect.5 can be easily modified for this case. These modifications are nothing but changing signs at several places. Here we just reproduce the answers, because the proofs are the same as in the former case.

Let $\bar{D}$ be the closure in $\mathbf{P}^2$ of an algebraic curve in $\mathbf{C}^2$ with one place at infinity. Denote by L the projective line at infinity (i.e. $\mathbf{C}^2 \cup L = \mathbf{P}^2$). Let $\sigma : V \to \mathbf{P}^2$ be the resolution of the singularity of $\bar{D}$ at infinity, $E = \sigma^{-1}(L)$, $D = \sigma^{-1}(\bar{D}) = C + E$, where C is the proper transform of $\bar{D}$.

As in Sect.5 we define the Puiseux characteristic sequence as follows. Let

$$x = t^{-m}, \qquad y = a_{-n}t^{-n} + a_{-n+1}t^{-n+1} + \dots, \qquad a_{-n} \neq 0\,,$$

be a local analytic parametrization of the branch of $\bar{D}$ with the center at L. Put $d_1 = m$, $m_1 = -n$, and define d_i, m_i, q_i, r_i, h by the same formulas as at the beginning of Sect.5. Then we have

$$m_1 < 0; \quad m_1 < m_2 < \dots < m_h; \quad d_1 > d_2 > \dots > d_{h+1} = 1\,,$$

and according to [**A**] and [**NR**, Corollary 6.4], $r_i < 0$ for $i = 1, \dots, h$.

Proposition 7.1. *The dual graph of C near E is the same as in Proposition 5.1. The discriminants of its subgraphs are:*

$$d(R_i) = -\frac{r_i}{d_{i+1}}, \quad d(D_i) = \frac{d_i}{d_{i+1}}, \quad d(S_i) = 1\,, \quad d(Q_i) = \frac{q_i}{d_{i+1}}\ .$$

Proposition 7.2. *Let the Milnor number of C at infinity be* $\mu_\infty = 2\pi_a(C) = C(C+K)+2$. *Then*

$$2\mu_\infty - H_E^2 = \frac{d_1}{r_1} - \sum_{i=1}^{h} \frac{r_i}{d_{i+1}}\left(\frac{d_i}{d_{i+1}} - \frac{d_{i+1}}{d_i}\right) .$$

REFERENCES

[A] S. S. Abhyankar, "Expansion technique in algebraic geometry", Tata Inst. Fund. Res., Bombay, 1977

[D] A. Degtyarev, *Isotopy classification of complex plane projective curves of degree 5*, Leningrad (St. Petersburg) Math. J. 1 (1989), 881-904

[EN] D. Eisenbud, W. D. Neumann, "Three-dimensional link theory and invariants of plane curve singularities". Ann.Math.Stud. 110, Princeton Univ. Press., Princeton 1985

[Fu] T. Fujita, *On the topology of non-complete algebraic surfaces*, J. Fac. Sci. Univ. Tokyo (Ser 1A), 29 (1982), 503–566

[G] D. A. Gudkov, *On the curve of 5th order with 5 cusps*, Func. Anal. Appl. 16 (1982), 201-202

[H] F. Hirzebruch, *Singularities of algebraic surfaces and characteristic numbers* , The Lefschetz Centennial Conf. Part.I (Mexico City 1984), Contemp.Math. 58 (1985), 141-155 Amer. Math. Soc., Providence

[KNS] R. Kobayashi, S. Nakamura, F. Sakai, *A numerical characterization of ball quotients for normal surfaces with branch loci*, Proc. Japan Acad. Ser. A Math.Sci. 65 (1989), 238–241

[LZ] V. Lin, M. Zaidenberg, *On the number of singular points of a plane affine algebraic curve* , Lecture Notes in Math. 1043 (1984), 662-663

[MS] T. Matsuoka, F. Sakai, *The degree of rational cuspidal curves* , Math. Ann. 285 (1989), 233-247

[Mil] J. Milnor, "Singular points of complex hypersurfaces", Ann.Math.Stud. 61, Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, 1968

[Miy] Y. Miyaoka, *The minimal number of quotient singularities on surfaces with given numerical invariants*, Math. Ann. 268 (1984), 159–171

[N] M. Namba, "Geometry of projective algebraic curves", M. Dekker, New York, Basel, 1984

[NR] W. Neumann, L. Rudolph, *Unfoldings in knot theory* , Math. Ann. 278 (1987), 409-439, *Corrigendum* , ibid. 282 (1988), 349-351

[OZ] S. Yu. Orevkov, M. G. Zaidenberg, *Some estimates for plane cuspidal curves*, Max-Planck-Institute of Mathematics, Bonn, Preprint MPI/92-63 (1992), 1-13

[Sa] F. Sakai, *Singularities of plane curves*, Preprint (1991), 1-10

[Sh1] E. Shustin, *Real plane algebraic curves with prescribed singularities*, Topology 32 (1993), 845-856

[Sh2] E. Shustin, *Real plane algebraic curves with many singularities*, Proc. Intern. Conf. Real Algebraic Geometry, Rennes, June 24-29, 1991, Lect. Notes Math. 1524, Springer, 1992, 389-401

[U] T. Urabe, *Singularities in a certain class of quartic surfaces and sextic curves and Dynkin graphs*, Canadian Math. Soc. Conf. Proc. 6 (1986), 477-497

[W] I. Wakabayashi, *On the logarithmic Kodaira dimension of the complement of a curve in* $\mathbf{P}^2$, Proc. Japan Acad. Ser. A Math.Sci. 54

(1978), 157–162

[Wal] R. J. Walker, "Algebraic curves", Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, 1950

[Wall1] C. T. C. Wall, *Geometry of quartic curves*, Europeen Singularity Project, Preprint No. 57, Liverpool (1994), 1-18

[Wall2] C. T. C. Wall, *Highly singular quintic curves*, Europeen Singularity Project, Preprint No. 58, Liverpool (1994), 1-36

[Y1] H. Yoshihara, *Plane curves whose singular points are cusps* , Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 103 (1988), 737–740

[Y2] H. Yoshihara, *Plane curves whose singular points are cusps and triple coverings of* $\mathbf{P}^2$, Manuscr. Math. 64 (1989), 169-187

[Z] M. G. Zeuthen, *Sur les différentes formes des courbes planes du quadrième ordre*, Math. Ann. (1893), 408-432

Stepan Orevkov

System Research Institute RAN
Moscou, Avtozavodskaja 23, Russie

e-mail: OREVKOV@IMPLAT.MSK.SU

Mikhail Zaidenberg

Université Grenoble I
Institut Fourier des Mathématiques
Laboratoire URA 188 associé au CNRS
BP 74
38402 St. Martin d'Hères–cédex
France

e-mail: ZAIDENBE@FOURIER.GRENET.FR