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Abstract. We introduce the concept of good Saito basis for a plane curve and we explore it to obtain a formula for the minimal Tjurina number in a topological class. In particular, we give a lower bound for the Tjurina number in terms of the Milnor number that allow us to present a positive answer for a question of Dimca and Greuel.
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1. Introduction.

Let \( S : \{ f = 0 \} \) be a germ of an irreducible analytic plane curve. An important analytic invariant of \( S \) is the Tjurina number \( \tau(S) = \dim \mathbb{C} \frac{\mathcal{C}(x,y)}{J(f)} \) where \( J(f) \) denotes the Jacobian ideal of \( f \).

In general, the computation of \( \tau(S) \) is not easy. For instance, we can obtain it considering a Gröbner basis for the ideal \( (f) + J(f) \), or alternatively, it is possible to compute \( \tau \) by the dimension of \( J(f) : (f) \) (see Theorem 1 in [7]) that is related with the \( \mathbb{C}\{x,y\} \)-module \( \Omega^1(S) \) of all germs of 1-holomorphic forms \( \omega \in \mathbb{C}\{x,y\}dx + \mathbb{C}\{x,y\}dy \) such that \( f \) divides \( \omega \wedge df \). More precisely, according to K. Saito [9], \( \Omega^1(S) \) is freely generated by two elements \( \{\omega_1, \omega_2\} \). It will be shown that \( \tau(S) \) can be expressed from, among other invariants, the codimension of the ideal \( (g_1, g_2) \) where \( \omega_i \wedge df = g_i f dx \wedge dy \).

If \( L \) denotes a topological class of a plane curve - for instance, given by the characteristic exponents \( \beta_0, \beta_1 \) - then the Milnor number \( \mu = \dim \mathbb{C} \frac{\mathcal{C}(x,y)}{J(f)} \) is constant for any \( S : \{ f = 0 \} \in L \) and \( \tau_{\text{min}} \leq \tau(S) \leq \mu \). Generically, an element \( S \in L \) is such that \( \tau(S) = \tau_{\text{min}} \), so \( \tau_{\text{min}} \) can be express using the topological data that characterizes \( L \). Delorme in [2], presented a formula to compute the generic dimension \( d(\beta_0, \beta_1) \) of the moduli space for an irreducible plane curve with characteristic exponents \( (\beta_0, \beta_1) \). As \( d(2, \beta_1) = 0 \) and \( d(\beta_0, \beta_1) = \frac{(\beta_0-3)(\beta_1-3)}{2} + \left\lfloor \frac{\beta_0}{\beta_1} \right\rfloor - 1 - \mu + \tau_{\text{min}} \) (see [2]) we can compute the minimal Tjurina number for this topological class. On the other hand, Peraire in [8] developed an algorithm to compute \( \tau_{\text{min}} \) by means of a flag of \( J(f) \).

This work has been partially supported by the Réseau de Coopération France-Brésil. M. E. Hernandes was also partially supported by CNPq.
In this paper we present a way to express the difference $\mu - \tau$ for a singular irreducible plane curve $S$ when $\Omega^1(S)$ admits a basis $\{\omega_1, \omega_2\}$ of special kind, that we call a good Saito basis (see Definition 2).

More specifically, we present a formula (see Theorem 11) to compute the difference between $\mu(S) - \tau(S)$ and $\mu(\tilde{S}) - \tau(\tilde{S})$ where $\tilde{S}$ denotes the strict transform of $S$. If $S$ is generic in $L$, then, according to [5], $S$ admits a good basis and this fact allows us to obtain a formula to compute $\tau_{\min}$ in $L$ by the sole topological data: the sequence of multiplicities in the canonical resolution or the characteristic exponents for instance. In particular, for irreducible plane curves, we are able to present a lower bound for the minimum Tjurina number in $L$ in terms of the Milnor number that allow us to give an affirmative answer to a question of Dimca and Greuel [4] about the inequality $4\tau > 3\mu$ and obtained simultaneously by Alberich-Carramiñana et al. in [1] published in ArXiv a few days before the first version of this paper.

The paper is organized as follows. In the section 2 we present some general properties of a Saito basis. The concept of a good Saito basis is introduced in the section 3 and its properties as well. The section 4 is devoted to the formula for the minimal Tjurina number, a lower bound for the Tjurina number using the Milnor number and consequently an answer to the Dimca-Greuel question.

2. The Saito basis.

Let $S : \{f = 0\}$ be a germ of an analytic plane curve and consider the $\mathbb{C}\{x, y\}$-module $\Omega^1(S)$ of all germs of 1-holomorphic forms $\omega \in \mathbb{C}\{x, y\}dx + \mathbb{C}\{x, y\}dy$ such that $f$ divides $\omega \wedge df$. It is equivalent to require that the foliation induced by $\omega$ lets invariant $S$. Saito in [9] shows that $\Omega^1(S)$ is a free module of rank 2 and a basis of $\Omega^1(S)$ is called a Saito basis.

It is not trivial to obtain a Saito basis, but there is a simple criterion to verify if $\{\omega_1, \omega_2\}$ is a basis for $\Omega^1(S)$ (see Theorem, page 270 in [9]).

**Theorem** (Saito criterion). The set $\{\omega_1, \omega_2\}$ is a Saito basis for $S : \{f = 0\}$ if and only if $\omega_1 \wedge \omega_2 = u f dx \wedge dy$, where $u$ is a unit in $\mathbb{C}\{x, y\}$.

This criterion can be interpreted as follows: $\{\omega_1, \omega_2\}$ is a basis for $\Omega^1(S)$ if the tangency locus between the two forms reduces to $S$.

Below, we present some examples of Saito basis for $S : \{f = 0\}$. All of them will illustrate, in the sequel, various sensitivities of the Saito basis with respect to small perturbations of the curve $S$. In the whole article, we will keep the same numbering of the examples for the convenience of the reader.

**Example** (1). The simplest case is when $f = y^p - x^q$, that is $S_1 : \{f = 0\}$ is quasi-homogeneous. In fact, if $\omega_1 = q y dx - px dy$ and $\omega_2 = df$, then

$$\omega_1 \wedge \omega_2 = pq f dx \wedge dy$$

and $\{\omega_1, \omega_2\}$ is a basis for $\Omega^1(S_1)$. 

Example (2). If \( f = y^5 - x^6 + x^4y^3 \) then \( S_2 : \{ f = 0 \} \) is topologically quasi-homogeneous, that is, \( S_2 \) presents characteristic exponents \((5,6)\), but not analytically equivalent to \( y^5 - x^6 = 0 \). One can show that the set \( \{ \omega_1, \omega_2 \} \) where
\[
\begin{align*}
\omega_1 &= \left(-6xy + \frac{16}{15}x^3y^2 - \frac{8}{5}xy^5\right)dx + \left(5x^2 + \frac{4}{3}y^3 + \frac{4}{5}x^2y^4\right)dy \\
\omega_2 &= \left(-6y^2 + \frac{8}{5}x^4 - \frac{12}{5}x^2y^3\right)dx + \left(5xy + \frac{6}{5}x^3y^2\right)dy 
\end{align*}
\]
satisfy \( \omega_1 \wedge \omega_2 = 8f dx \wedge dy \), so \( \{ \omega_1, \omega_2 \} \) is a Saito basis for \( \Omega^1(S_2) \).

Example (3). The curve \( S_3 : \{ f = 0 \} \) with \( f = y^5 - x^{11} + x^6y^3 \) is topologically equivalent to the any curve with characteristic exponents \((5,11)\) and its strict transform is \( S_2 \). The set \( \{ \omega_1, \omega_2 \} \) where
\[
\begin{align*}
\omega_1 &= \left(605y^2 + 198xy^3 - 88x^6\right)dx - \left(275xy + 66x^2y^2\right)dy \\
\omega_2 &= \left(605x^2y + 150x^5y^2\right)dx - \left(40y^3 + 275x^5 + 90x^6y\right)dy 
\end{align*}
\]
satisfy \( \omega_1 \wedge \omega_2 = (-24200 - 7920xy)f dx \wedge dy \), so \( \{ \omega_1, \omega_2 \} \) is a Saito basis for \( \Omega^1(S_3) \).

Example (4). The class of curve with characteristic exponents the form \((n, n+1)\) has been extensively studied by Zariski [11]. The curve \( S_4 \) given by
\[
f = y^7 - x^8 - 7x^6y^2 - \frac{147}{8}x^4y^4
\]
that, belongs to the latter class, will be shown of a peculiar interest. The forms
\[
\begin{align*}
\omega_1 &= \left(8x^2y - \frac{147}{8}x^4 - \frac{3087}{4}x^2y^2 - \frac{21609}{16}y^4\right)dx + \\
&\quad + \left(-7x^3 + \frac{7}{4}xy^2 + \frac{64827}{64}xy^3 + \frac{5145}{8}x^3y\right)dy \\
\omega_2 &= \left(8xy^2 + \frac{1029}{8}x^3y\right)dx + \left(-7x^2y + \frac{7}{4}y^3 - \frac{1029}{8}x^4\right)dy.
\end{align*}
\]
produce a Saito basis for \( \Omega^1(S_4) \) because \( \omega_1 \wedge \omega_2 = -\frac{151263}{64}f dx \wedge dy \).

Given a 1-form \( \omega = Adx + Bdy \) we denote by \( \nu(\omega) = \min\{\nu(A), \nu(B)\} \) its algebraic multiplicity, where \( \nu(H) \) indicates the multiplicity of \( H \in \mathbb{C}\{x, y\} \) at \((0,0) \in \mathbb{C}^2 \).

Among all the possible basis \( \{ \omega_1, \omega_2 \} \) for \( \Omega^1(S) \) we choose some that maximizes the sum \( \nu(\omega_1) + \nu(\omega_2) \) that, following the Saito criterion, cannot be bigger than \( \nu = \nu(f) = \nu(S) \). For such basis we denote
\[
\nu_1 := \nu(\omega_1) \quad \nu_2 := \nu(\omega_2).
\]
The following result is immediate and identify a new analytical invariant of \( S \).

Proposition 1. The couple \((\nu_1, \nu_2)\), up to order, is an analytical invariant of \( S \).

Remark that the pair \((\nu_1, \nu_2)\) is not a topological invariant. For instance, following the examples above, for \( S_1 \) with \( p = 5 \) and \( q = 6 \) we have \((\nu_1, \nu_2) = (1,4)\). But the curve \( S_3 \) which is topological equivalent to \( S_1 \) has corresponding pair of multiplicities \((2,2)\).
From now on, we consider $S : \{ f = 0 \}$ singular and irreducible (a plane branch) with a Saito basis $\{ \Omega, \omega_2 \}$ such that $\omega_i = A_i dx + B_i dy$. In particular, we have

$$(2.1) \quad A_1 B_2 - A_2 B_1 = u f \quad \text{and} \quad A_i \frac{\partial f}{\partial y} - B_i \frac{\partial f}{\partial x} = g_i f$$

where $u(0,0) \neq 0$ and $g_i \in \mathbb{C}\{x,y\}$ is called the cofactor of $\omega_i$.

Applying a generic linear change of coordinates if necessary, we can suppose that for $i = 1,2$, one has $\nu(A_i) = \nu(B_i) = \nu_i$ and in this coordinates $(x,y)$ the tangent cone of $f$, i.e. its $\nu$-jet, is $f^{(\nu)} = (y + \epsilon x)^{\nu}$.

**Example (1).** Consider the irreducible curve $S_1$. Suppose by symmetry that $p < q$, we have $\nu(A_1) = \nu(B_1) = \nu_1 = 1$ but $q - 1 = \nu(A_2) > p - 1 = \nu(B_2) = \nu_2$. Consider the change of coordinates $T(x,y) = (x, y - \epsilon x)$ with $\epsilon \neq 0$ we obtain $f_1 = T^*(f) = (y - \epsilon x)^p - x^q$ and the Saito basis $\eta_1 = T^*(\Omega_1)$ and $df_1$

$$\eta_1 = (q(y - \epsilon x) + p x)dx - px dy$$

$$df_1 = (-p(y - \epsilon x)^{q-1} - qx^{q-1})dx + p(y - \epsilon x)^{p-1} dy$$

satisfying the above condition. In addition, $\eta_1 \wedge df_1 = pq f_1 dx \wedge dy$, that is, $g_1 = pq$ and $g_1 = 0$.

**Example (2).** For the curve $S_2$, we have

$$\Omega_1 \wedge df = (-30x - 8xy^3) f dx \wedge dy \quad \text{and} \quad \Omega_2 \wedge df = (-30y - 12x^2 y^2) f dx \wedge dy,$$

that is, $g_1 = -30x - 8xy^3$ and $g_2 = -30y - 12x^2 y^2$.

**Example (3).** Considering the curve $S_3$, we have $\nu(A_1) = \nu(B_1) = 2$ but $5 = \nu(A_2) > \nu(B_2) = 3$. By the change of coordinates $T(x,y) = (x, x + y)$ we obtain $f_1 = T^*(f) = (y + x)^5 - x^{11} + x^6(y + x)^3$ and $\eta_1 = T^*(\Omega_1) = (A_1 + B_1) dx + B dy$ with $\nu(A_1 + B_1) = \nu(B_1) = 2$ and $\nu(A_2 + B_2) = \nu(B_2) = 3$. In addition,

$$\eta_1 \wedge df = (3025(x + y) + 990x(y + x)^2) f_1 dx \wedge dy$$

$$\eta_2 \wedge df = (3025x^4 + 990x^5(y + x)) f_1 dx \wedge dy,$$

consequently, $g_1 = 3025(x + y) + 990x(y + x)^2$ and $g_2 = 3025x^4 + 990x^5(y + x)$.

**Example (4).** Finally, for $S_4$ we find

$$\Omega_1 \wedge df = \left( 56x^2 - \frac{151263}{16} y^3 - \frac{21609}{4} x^2 y \right) f dx \wedge dy$$

$$\Omega_2 \wedge df = (56xy + 1029x^3) f dx \wedge dy.$$

Notice that any generator $\omega_i$ in a Saito basis $\{ \omega_1, \omega_2 \}$ has an isolated singularity, that is, gcd($A_i, B_i$) = 1. In addition, by (2.1), we have that $\nu(g_i) \geq \nu_i - 1$.

3. **Good Saito basis and the Tjurina number for $S$.**

As we mentioned before, given a Saito basis $\{ \Omega, \omega_2 \}$ for $\Omega^1(S)$ we get $\nu_1 + \nu_2 \leq \nu$. In [2], the first author shows the following theorem:

**Theorem** (Generic Basis Theorem). In a fixed topological class $L$, generically any curve $S$ admits a Saito basis satisfying
Proposition 4. If $S$ admits a good basis $\{\omega_1, \omega_2\}$ then
\[
i(S) = \min \{i(\omega_1), i(\omega_2)\}.
\]
Proof. By Saito criterion, one has $\omega_1 \wedge \omega_2 = uf$ with $u(0,0) \neq 0$. Since $\nu_1 + \nu_2 = \nu$, one has $\omega_1^{(\nu_1)} \wedge \omega_2^{(\nu_2)} \neq 0$, where $\omega_i^{(\nu_i)} = A_i^{\nu_i}dx + B_i^{\nu_i}dy$. In particular, both forms $\omega_1$ and $\omega_2$ cannot be dicritical and therefore $\min \{i(\omega_1), i(\omega_2)\} < \infty$.

Now, consider any form $\omega = P_1\omega_1 + P_2\omega_2 \in \Omega^1(S)$ with $P_i \in \mathbb{C}\{x,y\}$ and $m_i = \nu(P_i)$. Since $P_1^{(m_1)}\omega_1^{(\nu_1)} + P_2^{(m_2)}\omega_2^{(\nu_2)}$ cannot identically vanish, it is the homogeneous part of smallest degree of $\omega$. Therefore

$$i(\omega) = \nu_{g_1} - \varepsilon \left( P_1^{(m_1)}(1, y_1)(A_1^{(\nu_1)}(1, y_1) + y_1B_1^{(\nu_1)}(1, y_1)) + P_2^{(m_2)}(1, y_1)(A_2^{(\nu_2)}(1, y_1) + y_1B_2^{(\nu_2)}(1, y_1)) \right) \geq \min \{i(\omega_1), i(\omega_2)\}.$$

In the previous section, we remark that for an element $\omega_i$ in a Saito basis we get $\nu(g_i) \geq \nu_i - 1$ and $i(\omega_i) \leq \nu(\omega_i) + 1$. For good basis it is possible to obtain the following result.

**Lemma 5.** Given a good basis $\{\omega_1, \omega_2\}$ for $S$, if $\nu(g_i) \geq \nu_i$ then $i(\omega_i) = \nu_i + 1$.

Proof. By symmetry let us consider $i = 1$ and suppose that $\nu(g_1) \geq \nu_1$. The $(\nu_1 - 1 + \nu)$-jet of

$$A_1 \frac{\partial f}{\partial y} - B_1 \frac{\partial f}{\partial x} = g_1f \quad \text{is} \quad A_1^{(\nu_1)}(y + \varepsilon x)^{\nu_1 - 1} - B_1^{(\nu_1)}(y + \varepsilon x)^{\nu_1 - 1} = 0,$$

thus $A_1^{(\nu_1)} = \epsilon B_1^{(\nu_1)}$. On the other hand the $\nu$-jet of $A_1B_2 - A_2B_1 = uf$ where $u(0,0) \neq 0$ reduces to

$$A_1^{(\nu_1)}B_2^{(\nu_2)} - A_2^{(\nu_2)}B_1^{(\nu_1)} = B_1^{(\nu_1)} \left( \epsilon B_2^{(\nu_2)} - A_2^{(\nu_2)} \right) = u(0,0) (y + \varepsilon x)^{\nu}.$$

Thus, there exists some constant $c \neq 0$ such that $B_1^{(\nu_1)} = c(y + \varepsilon x)^{\nu_1}$. Therefore, $\omega_1$ can be written

$$\omega_1 = \frac{c}{\nu_1 + 1} \left( (y + \varepsilon x)^{\nu_1 + 1} \right) + \text{h.o.t.}$$

thus $i(\omega_1) = \nu_1 + 1$.

Notice that the above proof ensures that the inequality $\nu(g_i) \geq \nu_i$ cannot hold for both elements in a good basis. Moreover, given a good basis for $\Omega^1(S)$ we can always get a good basis with some nice properties. To do this we present the following lemmas.

**Lemma 6.** If $\Omega^1(S)$ admits a good basis $\{\omega_1, \omega_2\}$, then we can suppose that

$$i(\omega_1) = i(S) \quad \text{and} \quad \nu(g_1) = \nu_1 - 1.$$

Proof. By symmetry we can suppose that $i(\omega_1) = i(S)$.

**Case 1.** If $i(\omega_2) = i(\omega_1)$, then, as mentioned above, for $i = 1$ or 2, one has $\nu(g_i) = \nu_i - 1$. Switching maybe the two forms, we can suppose that $\omega_1$ satisfies the conclusion of the lemma.

**Case 2.** Suppose now that $i(\omega_1) < i(\omega_2)$.

**Subcase 2.a** if $\nu_1 \leq \nu_2$, we consider, the family $\{\omega_1, \overline{\omega_2}\}$, where $\overline{\omega_2} = \omega_2 + \varepsilon x^{\nu_2 - \nu_1}\omega_1$.
and \( c \in \mathbb{C} \). For a generic value of \( c \), we still have a good basis for \( S \). Moreover, the \( \nu_2 \)-jet of \( \overline{\nu_2} \) is
\[
\left( A_2^{(\nu_2)} + c x^{\nu_2 - \nu_1} A_1^{(\nu_1)} \right) dx + \left( B_2^{(\nu_2)} + c x^{\nu_2 - \nu_1} B_1^{(\nu_1)} \right) dy.
\]
Thus, to evaluate its index, one writes
\[
i(\overline{\nu_2}) = \nu_y = i \left( A_2^{(\nu_2)} (1, y) + c A_1^{(\nu_1)} (1, y) + y \left( B_2^{(\nu_2)} (1, y) + c B_1^{(\nu_1)} (1, y) \right) \right)
= \nu_y = i \left( A_2^{(\nu_2)} (1, y) + y B_2^{(\nu_2)} (1, y) + c \left( A_1^{(\nu_1)} (1, y) + y B_1^{(\nu_1)} (1, y) \right) \right) = i(\omega_1).
\]
Thus we are led to the previous case (1).

**Subcase 2.b.** Finally, if \( \nu_1 > \nu_2 \), suppose that \( \nu(g_1) \geq \nu_1 \), then by Lemma 5 we have \( i(\omega_1) = \nu_1 + 1 \). Consequently \( i(\omega_1) > \nu_2 + 1 \) and then \( i(\omega_2) > \nu_2 + 1 \). If \( \omega_2 \) is not dicritical, the inequality above leads to a contradiction, thus \( \omega_2 \) is dicritical. Therefore, it can be seen that \( \nu(g_2) = \nu_2 - 1 \). Let us consider now \( \overline{\omega_1} = \omega_1 + x^{\nu_1 - \nu_2} \omega_2 \). Then, the family \( \{\overline{\omega_1}, \omega_2\} \) is still a good basis and one has
\[
\begin{align*}
\overline{\omega_1} & \cap df = \overline{\gamma_1} f dx \cap dy \quad \text{with} \quad \nu(\overline{\gamma_1}) = \nu_1 - 1 \\
i(\overline{\omega_1}) & = i(\omega_1) = i(S).
\end{align*}
\]
\( \square \)

In addition, from a basis for \( \Omega^1(S) \) we can get a basis satisfying the following lemma.

**Lemma 7.** Given a basis \( \{\omega_1, \omega_2\} \) for \( \Omega^1(S) \) with \( i(\omega_1) \leq i(\omega_2) \) we can suppose that
\[
\gcd \left( B_i, \frac{\partial f}{\partial y} \right) = 1, \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2.
\]

**Proof.** Suppose that \( H = \gcd \left( B_1, B_2, \frac{\partial f}{\partial y} \right) \). Since by (2.1) \( A_1 B_2 - A_2 B_1 = uf, \) \( H \) would divide \( f \). As \( \frac{\partial f}{\partial y} \) and \( f \) are relatively prime, we get
\[
\gcd \left( B_1, B_2, \frac{\partial f}{\partial y} \right) = 1.
\]

Now consider the family \( \{\overline{\omega_1}, \omega_2\} \) where \( P_i \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{x, y\} \) with \( \nu(P_i) \gg 1 \). Note that for \( P_i \) of algebraic multiplicity big enough, the forms
\[
\begin{align*}
\overline{\omega_1} & = (A_1 + P_1 A_2) dx + (B_1 + P_1 B_2) dy = \overline{\alpha_1} dx + \overline{\alpha_2} dy \\
\omega_2 & = (A_2 + P_2 A_1) dx + (B_2 + P_2 B_1) dy = \alpha_2 dx + \alpha_2 dy
\end{align*}
\]
satisfy \( \nu(\overline{\omega_1}) = \nu(\overline{A_1}) = \nu_1 \), and \( i(\omega_1) = i(\overline{\omega_1}) \leq i(\overline{\omega_2}) \).

Moreover, \( \{\overline{\omega_1}, \overline{\omega_2}\} \) is a basis for \( \Omega^1(S) \). Now the relation (3.1) ensures that for a generic choice of the \( P_i \)'s, \( i = 1, 2 \) - in the sense of Krull -, one has
\[
\gcd \left( \overline{B_i}, \frac{\partial f}{\partial y} \right) = 1.
\]
\( \square \)

As a consequence we obtain the following.
Corollary 8. For any basis \{\omega_1, \omega_2\} for \(\Omega^1(S)\) satisfying the previous Lemma we have

\[ \gcd(B_i, g_i) = \gcd\left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial y}, g_i\right) = 1. \]

Proof. As \(A_i \frac{\partial f}{\partial y} - B_i \frac{\partial f}{\partial x} = g_i f\), if \(1 \neq H = \gcd(B_i, g_i)\) then \(H\) must divide \(A_i \frac{\partial f}{\partial y}\). By the previous lemma, \(\gcd(B_i, \frac{\partial f}{\partial y}) = 1\) so \(H\) divides \(A_i\), a contradiction because \(\omega_i\) has an isolated singularity.

Suppose \(H' = \gcd\left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial y}, g_i\right)\), so \(H'\) divides \(B_i \frac{\partial f}{\partial x}\). As \(\gcd\left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial y}, \frac{\partial f}{\partial x}\right) = \gcd(B_i, g_i) = 1\), we must have \(H' = 1\). \(\square\)

In particular, the above lemma allow us to consider a good Saito basis \{\omega_1, \omega_2\} with \(i(S) = i(\omega_1)\) and \(\gcd\left(B_i, \frac{\partial f}{\partial y}\right) = \gcd(B_i, g_i) = \gcd\left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial y}, g_i\right) = 1\).

Lemma 9. If \(S : \{f = 0\}\) admits a good basis satisfying the previous conditions, then the intersection of the tangent cone of

\(\begin{align*}
\text{(1)} & \quad g_1 \text{ and } g_2, \\
\text{(2)} & \quad B_i \text{ and } g_i, \text{ for } i = 1, 2, \\
\text{(3)} & \quad B_i \text{ and } \frac{\partial f}{\partial y}, \text{ for } i = 1, 2
\end{align*}\)

is empty or equal to \(y + \epsilon x = 0\).

Proof. The \(\nu\)-jet of (2.1) is

\(A_1^{(\nu_1)} B_2^{(\nu_2)} - A_2^{(\nu_2)} B_1^{(\nu_1)} = c (y + \epsilon x)^\nu.\)

where \(c \neq 0\) and \(\epsilon \in \mathbb{C}\). Now, for \(i = 1, 2\), both following relations \(A_i^{(\nu_i)} - \epsilon B_i^{(\nu_i)} = 0\) cannot be true all together since it would yield a contradiction with the relation (3.2). Suppose the relation above is not true for at least \(i = 1\), then the cofactor relations ensures that

\(A_1^{(\nu_1)} - \epsilon B_1^{(\nu_1)} = g_1^{(\nu(g_1))} (y + \epsilon x).\)

Combining the above relations yields

\(g_1^{(\nu(g_1))} B_2^{(\nu_2)} - g_2^{(\nu(g_2))} B_1^{(\nu_1)} = c \nu (y + \epsilon x)^{\nu - 1}, \text{ or } g_1^{(\nu(g_1))} B_2^{(\nu_2)} = c \nu (y + \epsilon x)^{\nu - 1}\)

from which is derived (1) and (2). The point (3) follows from the fact that the tangent cone of \(\frac{\partial f}{\partial y}\) and \(f\) are the same. \(\square\)

In what follows we denote by \(I_p(G, H)\) the intersection multiplicity of \(G, H \in \mathbb{C}\{x, y\}\) at the point \(P \in \mathbb{C}^2\). If \(P = (0, 0)\) then we write \(I(G, H) := I_p(G, H)\), that is, \(I(G, H) = \dim \mathbb{C}\{x, y\}/\mathbb{C}\{x, y\}\).

An important topological invariant for \(S : \{f = 0\}\) is the Milnor number \(\mu\) which can be computed by

\(\mu := I \left( \frac{\partial f}{\partial y}, \frac{\partial f}{\partial x} \right) = \sum_{i=1}^N \nu_{(i)} (\nu_{(i)} - 1)\).
where \( \nu(i): i = 1, \ldots, N \) denote the sequence of multiplicities in the canonical resolution of \( S \). In addition, by Zariski (see (2.4) in [11]), we have

\[
I \left( \frac{\partial f}{\partial y} \right) = \mu + \nu - 1. 
\]

Combining the Lemma 6 and the above result we can obtain an expression for \( I(g_1, g_2) \).

**Lemma 10.** If \( g_1 \) and \( g_1 \) are the cofactors for a good basis for \( \Omega_1(S) \), then \( I(g_1, g_2) \) is finite and

\[
I(g_1, g_2) = I \left( \frac{\partial f}{\partial y}, B_1 \right) - I(B_1, g_1) - \nu + 1.
\]

**Proof.** By Lemma 6 we have \( \nu(g_1) = \nu_1 - 1 < \nu \). As \( f \) is irreducible it follows that \( \gcd(f, g_1) = 1 \) and \( I \left( \frac{\partial f}{\partial y}, g_1 \right) < \infty \). So, from (2.1) that

\[
I \left( \frac{\partial f}{\partial y}, g_1 \right) = I \left( A_1 B_2 \frac{\partial f}{\partial y} - A_2 B_1 \frac{\partial f}{\partial y}, g_1 \right) = I \left( B_1 B_2 \frac{\partial f}{\partial x} - A_2 B_1 \frac{\partial f}{\partial y}, g_1 \right) = I(B_1 g_2 f, g_1).
\]

Hence,

\[
I(g_1, g_2) = I \left( \frac{\partial f}{\partial y}, g_1 \right) - I(B_1, g_1).
\]

The Corollary 8 insures that \( \frac{\partial f}{\partial y} \) and \( g_1 \) are coprime. So, by (3.5) and using (3.4) we obtain

\[
I \left( \frac{\partial f}{\partial y}, g_1 \right) = I \left( \frac{\partial f}{\partial y}, g_1 \right) + I \left( \frac{\partial f}{\partial y}, f \right) - I \left( \frac{\partial f}{\partial y}, f \right) - I(B_1, g_1)
\]

\[
= I \left( \frac{\partial f}{\partial y}, g_1 \right) - I \left( \frac{\partial f}{\partial y}, f \right) - I(B_1, g_1)
\]

\[
= I \left( \frac{\partial f}{\partial y}, A_1 \frac{\partial f}{\partial y} - B_1 \frac{\partial f}{\partial x} \right) - (\mu + \nu - 1) - I(B_1, g_1)
\]

\[
= I \left( \frac{\partial f}{\partial y}, B_1 \right) - \nu + 1 - I(B_1, g_1).
\]

\[\square\]

Let us consider the Tjurina number \( \tau \) of a plane curve \( S \): \( \{ f = 0 \} \), that is,

\[
\tau := \dim_{\mathbb{C}} \mathbb{C}[x, y] / \left( f, \frac{\partial f}{\partial y}, \frac{\partial f}{\partial x} \right).
\]

Zariski (see Theorem 1 in [11]) considered the torsion submodule \( T \Omega^1_{\mathcal{O}/\mathcal{C}} \) of the Kähler differential module \( \Omega^1_{\mathcal{O}/\mathcal{C}} \) over \( \mathcal{O} = \mathbb{C}[x, y] / (f) \) and he showed that \( \tau = \dim_{\mathbb{C}} T \Omega^1_{\mathcal{O}/\mathcal{C}} \). On the other hand, Michler (Theorem 1 in [12]) proved that \( T \Omega^1_{\mathcal{O}/\mathcal{C}} \) is isomorphic as \( \mathcal{O} \)-module, to \( \left( \frac{\partial f}{\partial y}, \frac{\partial f}{\partial x} : (f) \right) \). As \( \left( \frac{\partial f}{\partial y}, \frac{\partial f}{\partial x} : (f) \right) : (f) \) is precisely the cofactor ideal of \( S \), that is, \( (g_1, g_2) \), one has

\[
\tau = \dim_{\mathbb{C}} \left( \frac{\partial f}{\partial y}, \frac{\partial f}{\partial x} : (f) \right) = \dim_{\mathbb{C}} \mathbb{C}[x, y] / \left( \frac{\partial f}{\partial y}, \frac{\partial f}{\partial x} : (f), (g_1, g_2) \right) = \mu - I(g_1, g_2),
\]
that is, \[ \mu - \tau = I(g_1, g_2). \]

Denoting \( \bar{\mu} \) the Milnor number of \( \bar{S} \) we provide in the next theorem a precise relation between \( \mu - \tau \) and \( \bar{\mu} - \bar{\tau} \) by means of the analytic invariants we have introduced previously for curves that admit a good basis.

**Theorem 11.** If \( S \) admits a good basis, then
\[ \mu - \tau = \bar{\mu} - \bar{\tau} + (\nu_1 - 1)(\nu_2 - 1) + i(S) - 1. \]

**Proof.** By symmetry, one can suppose \( i(S) = \min\{i(\omega_1), i(\omega_2)\} = i(\omega_1). \) By Lemma \( \Box \) and the Max-Noether formula one has,
\[ \mu - \tau = I(g_1, g_2) = I_{(0, -\epsilon)}(\bar{g}_1, \bar{g}_2) + \nu(g_1)\nu(g_2), \]

where \( \bar{H} := E^*(H) \) and \( E \) denotes the standard blowing-up of the origin in \( \mathbb{C}^2. \)

In addition, the previous lemma and Lemma \( \Box \) yield
\[ I(g_1, g_2) = I(\frac{\partial f}{\partial y}, B_1) - I(B_1, g_1) + \nu + 1. \]

If \( \tilde{\omega}_i = \frac{E'_{i\omega}}{x^{\nu_i}}, \) then the Saito criterion yields \( x^{\nu_1}\tilde{\omega}_1 \wedge x^{\nu_2}\tilde{\omega}_2 = \tilde{u}x^{\nu}\tilde{f}x \, dx \wedge dy. \) Since we have a good basis, that is, \( \nu_1 + \nu_2 = \nu, \) one has \( \tilde{\omega}_1 \wedge \tilde{\omega}_2 = uf\tilde{f}x \, dx \wedge dy. \) Locally around \( (0, -\epsilon) \) for \( i = 1, 2 \) we have
\[ \tilde{\omega}_i = (A_i^{\nu_i}(1, y) + yB_i^{\nu_i}(1, y) + x(\cdots)) \, dx + x(B_i^{\nu_i}(1, y) + (\cdots)) \, dy. \]

We notice that the form
\[ \overline{\omega}_2 = \frac{1}{x} \left( \tilde{\omega}_2 - \frac{A_i^{\nu_2}(1, y) + yB_i^{\nu_2}(1, y)}{A_i^{\nu_1}(1, y) + yB_i^{\nu_1}(1, y)} \tilde{\omega}_1 \right) \]

is holomorphic at \( (0, -\epsilon) \) and \( \{\tilde{\omega}_1, \overline{\omega}_2\} \) is a Saito basis for \( \tilde{S} : \{\tilde{f} = 0\}. \) A computation shows that the cofactor associated to \( \tilde{\omega}_1 \) is written \( g'_1 = \bar{g}_1 + \nu \bar{B}_1. \) Moreover, one has \( \tilde{\omega}_1 = \left( \bar{A}_1 + x\bar{B}_1 \right) \, dx + x\bar{B}_1 \, dy = A' \, dx + B' \, dy. \) Now,
\[ (A_i^{\nu_1}(1, y) + yB_i^{\nu_1}(1, y) + x(\cdots)) \frac{\partial \tilde{f}}{\partial y} - x\bar{B}_1 \frac{\partial \tilde{f}}{\partial x} = g'_1 \tilde{f}. \]

If \( x \) divides \( g'_1 \) then \( \tilde{\omega}_1 \) would be dicritical and this is not possible. Therefore,
\[ I_{(0, -\epsilon)}(x, g'_1, \tilde{f}) = I_{(0, -\epsilon)}(A_i^{\nu_i}(1, y) + yB_i^{\nu_i}(1, y), x) + I_{(0, -\epsilon)}(x, \frac{\partial \tilde{f}}{\partial y}), \]

and, by Corollary \( \Box \) \( I_{(0, -\epsilon)}(x, g'_1) = i(\omega_1) = 1 = i(S) - 1. \)

Notice that \( \bar{B}_1 \) and \( g'_1 \) cannot have a common divisor, since it would be a common divisor of \( \bar{g}_1 \) and \( \bar{B}_1 \) that is impossible by Lemma \( \Box \) So,
\[ I_{(0, -\epsilon)}(\bar{B}_1, \bar{g}_1) = I_{(0, -\epsilon)}(x\bar{B}_1, g'_1) - i(S) + 1 = I_{(0, -\epsilon)}(\bar{B}_1, g'_1) - i(S) + 1. \]
Moreover,

\[ I_{(0,-\varepsilon)} \left( \frac{\partial \tilde{f}}{\partial y}, \tilde{B}_1 \right) = I_{(0,-\varepsilon)} \left( \frac{\partial \tilde{f}}{\partial y}, B'_1 \right) - I_{(0,-\varepsilon)} \left( \frac{\partial \tilde{f}}{\partial y}, x \right) \]

\[ = I_{(0,-\varepsilon)} \left( \frac{\partial \tilde{f}}{\partial y}, B'_1 \right) - I_{(0,-\varepsilon)} \left( f, x \right) + 1. \]

So, as \( \frac{\partial \tilde{f}}{\partial y} = \frac{\partial f}{\partial y} \) and combining all the above relation yields

\[ \mu - \tau = I_{(0,-\varepsilon)} \left( \frac{\partial \tilde{f}}{\partial y}, B'_1 \right) - I_{(0,-\varepsilon)} \left( f, x \right) + 1 - \left( I_{y=-\varepsilon} \left( B'_1, g'_1 \right) - i(S) + 1 \right) \]

\[ + \nu \left( \frac{\partial f}{\partial y} \right) \nu (B_1) - \nu (B_1) \nu (g_1) - \nu + 1 \]

\[ = I_{(0,-\varepsilon)} \left( g'_1, g'_2 \right) + (\nu - 1) \nu_1 - \nu_1 \nu (g_1) - \nu + i(S). \]

As \( I_{(0,-\varepsilon)} \left( g'_1, g'_2 \right) = \tilde{\mu} - \tilde{\tau} \) and \( \nu (g_1) = \nu_1 - 1 \), we obtain finally

\[ \mu - \tau = \tilde{\mu} - \tilde{\tau} + (\nu_1 - 1) (\nu_2 - 1) + i(S) - 1. \]

\[ \square \]

Let us analyze the examples previously considered.

**Example (1).** For \( S_1 \) we have a good basis with \( \nu_1 = 1, \nu_2 = p - 1 \) and \( i(S_1) = 1 \), then \( \mu - \tau = 0 \) as classically known.

**Example (2).** Notice that for \( S_2 \) we have \( i(S_2) = i(\omega_1) = 1, \nu_1 = \nu_2 = 2 \) and \( \tilde{S}_3 \) is regular, so \( \tilde{\mu} - \tilde{\tau} = 0 \). In this way,

\[ 1 = I(g_1, g_2) = \mu - \tau = 0 + (2 - 1)(2 - 1) + 1 - 1. \]

So, the formula in the previous theorem holds although \( S_2 \) does not admit any good basis.

**Example (3).** For \( S_3 \) we get \( i(S_4) = i(\omega_1) = 2, \nu_1 = 2, \nu_2 = 3 \) and \( \tilde{S}_3 \) is analytically equivalent to \( S_2 \), so \( \tilde{\mu} - \tilde{\tau} = 1 \). In this way,

\[ 4 = I(g_1, g_2) = \mu - \tau = 1 + (2 - 1)(3 - 1) + 2 - 1. \]

**Example (4).** As we presented above, \( S_4 \) does not have a good basis. We have \( i(S_4) = i(\omega_1) = 1, \nu_1 = \nu_2 = 3 \) and \( \tilde{\mu} - \tilde{\tau} = 0 \), but in this case,

\[ 5 = I(g_1, g_2) = \mu - \tau \neq 4 = 0 + (3 - 1)(3 - 1) + 1 - 1. \]

A more detailed analysis shows that Lemma \( \square \) is not valid in this case because the intersection of the tangent cone of \( g_1 \) and \( g_1 \) is \( x = 0 \) that is distinct to the tangent cone \( y = 0 \) of \( S_4 \).
4. THE MINIMAL TJURINA NUMBER AND THE DIMCA-GREUEL QUESTION FOR PLANE BRANCHES.

Given a curve $S$, we denote by $L = L(S)$ its topological class. Although the Milnor number is constant in $L$, the same is not true for the Tjurina number $\tau(S)$. On the other hand, as $\tau(S)$ is upper semicontinuous, the minimum value $\tau_{\text{min}}$ for curves in $L$ is achieved generically and it should be computed by the sole topological data (see Chapitre III, Appendice of [11] by Teissier).

For a topological class $L$ given by characteristic exponents $(\beta_0, \beta_1)$, Delorme in [3] presented a formula for the dimension of the generic component of the Moduli space that allow us to compute $\tau_{\text{min}}$. For an arbitrary topological class, Peraire (see [8]) presented an algorithm to compute $\tau_{\text{min}}$ using flag of the Jacobian ideal.

In this section, using the last theorem and results of [5], we give an alternative method to compute $\tau_{\text{min}}$ in a fixed topological class $L$ and as a bonus we are able to answer a question of Dimca-Greuel for the irreducible plane curves.

If $S$ admits a good basis we can not insure that the same is valid for $\tilde{S}$ (see Example (3)). However, this property is true generically.

**Theorem 12.** Let $L$ the topological class of plane branch given by the characteristic exponents $(\beta_0, \beta_1, \ldots, \beta_s)$, $\tau_{\text{min}}$ the minimal Tjurina number in $L$ and $\tilde{\tau}_{\text{min}}$ the minimal Tjurina number in $\tilde{L}$. If $S$ is generic in $L$, then

\begin{equation}
\mu - \tau_{\text{min}} = \tilde{\mu} - \tilde{\tau}_{\text{min}} + \left( \left\lfloor \frac{\beta_0}{2} \right\rfloor - 1 \right) \left( \beta_0 - \left\lfloor \frac{\beta_0}{2} \right\rfloor - 1 \right) + i(S) - 1.
\end{equation}

Moreover, if $n = \left\lceil \frac{\beta_1}{\beta_1 - \beta_0} \right\rceil$, then $i(S) = \left\lceil \frac{\beta_0}{2} \right\rceil + 1 - p_1(S)$, where $p_1(S)$ can be computed in the following way:

- if $\beta_0$ is even then $p_1(S) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } n = 2 \\
1 & \text{if } \beta_1 \text{ is even} \\
\frac{n - 1}{2} & \text{if } \beta_1 \text{ is odd and } n \text{ odd} \\
\frac{n - 2}{2} & \text{if } \beta_1 \text{ is odd and } n \text{ is even} \end{cases}$

- if $\beta_0$ is odd then $p_1(S) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } n = 2 \\
1 & \text{if } \beta_1 \text{ is odd} \\
\frac{n - 3}{2} & \text{if } \beta_1 \text{ is even and } n \text{ odd} \\
\frac{n - 2}{2} & \text{if } \beta_1 \text{ is even and } n \text{ is even} \end{cases}$

**Proof.** Suppose that $\beta_0 = \nu(S)$ is even. According to the Generic Basis Theorem, $S$ admits a good basis $\{\omega'_1, \omega'_2\}$ with $\nu(\omega'_1) = \nu(\omega'_2) = \frac{\beta_0}{2}$. For generic $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in \mathbb{C}$, $\{\omega_1 = \omega'_1 + \alpha_2 \omega'_2, \omega_2 = \omega'_2 + \alpha_1 \omega'_1\}$ remain a good basis with $\nu_1 = \nu_2 = \frac{\beta_0}{2}$ and $i(\omega_1) = i(\omega_2)$.

Now, according to [3] - using the notations of the mentioned paper, it refers to
the case \( \delta_1 = 0 \) and \( \delta_2 = 1 \) - we obtain \( \nu_1 + 1 = \frac{\beta_0}{2} + 1 = \sum_{q \in P_1} \text{Ind}(\mathcal{F}, C, q) = i(\omega_1) + p_1(S) \), that is,

\[
i(S) = i(\omega_1) = \nu_1 + 1 - p_1(S) = \frac{\beta_0}{2} + 1 - p_1(S) = \left[ \frac{\beta_0}{2} \right] + 1 - p_1(S)
\]

where \( p_1(S) \) is described in [5].

Now, suppose \( \beta_0 \) is odd and let \( \{\omega'_1, \omega'_2\} \) be a Saito basis for \( S \cup l \) with \( l \) a generic line that without loss of generality can be considered \( x = 0 \). As \( \nu(S \cup l) \) is even, by the same above argument, we can suppose that

\[
\nu(\omega'_1) = \nu(\omega'_2) = \frac{\beta_0 + 1}{2} = \left[ \frac{\beta_0}{2} \right] + 1 \quad \text{and} \quad i(S \cup l) = i(\omega'_1) = i(\omega'_2).
\]

Denoting \( \omega'_1 = (a_1(y) + x(\cdots)) \, dx + x(\cdots) \, dy \) and considering generic \( \alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in \mathbb{C} \) we obtain a good Saito basis \( \{\omega'_1 = \omega_1 + \alpha_2 \omega'_2, \omega_2 = \omega'_2 + \omega_1 \} \) such that

\[
\nu(a_1(y) + \alpha_2 a_2(y)) = \nu(a_2(y) + \alpha_1 a_1(y)),
\]

\[
i(\omega'_1) = i(\omega'_2) = i(\omega_2) \quad \text{and} \quad \nu(\omega_1) = \nu(\omega'_1) = \nu(\omega'_2) = \nu(\omega_2).
\]

Now the family

\[
\left\{ \omega_1, \frac{1}{x} \left( \omega_2 - \frac{a_2(y) + \alpha_1 a_1(y)}{a_1(y) + \alpha_2 a_2(y)} \omega_1 \right) \right\}
\]

is a good Saito basis for \( S \). Finally, since \( i \left( \frac{1}{x} \left( \omega_2 - \frac{a_2(y) + \alpha_1 a_1(y)}{a_1(y) + \alpha_2 a_2(y)} \omega_1 \right) \right) \geq i(\omega_1) \), one has \( i(S) = i(\omega_1) \). By the description of \( p_1(S \cup l) \) given in [5] - using the notations of the article, it refers to the case \( \delta_1 = 1 \) and \( \delta_2 = 1 \) - we get

\[
i(S) = i(\omega_1) = \frac{\nu(S) + 1}{2} - p_1(S) = \left[ \frac{\beta_0}{2} \right] + 1 - p_1(S).
\]

Thus, the proof of the formula is a consequence of Theorem 14 noticing that by the Generic Basis Theorem we have \( \nu_1 = \left[ \frac{\beta_0}{2} \right] \) and \( \nu_2 = \beta_0 - \left[ \frac{\beta_0}{2} \right] \).

**Example (5).** In [8], Peraire computed the minimum Tjurina number for the topological class whose characteristic exponents are \( (9, 12, 17) \). After five blowing-ups, we obtain a curve with multiplicity 2. The corresponding characteristic exponents of the sequence of blown-up curves are \( (3, 14), (3, 11), (3, 8), (3, 5), (2, 3) \). Applying inductively the formula (4.1), one accumulates contribution to the difference \( \mu - \tau_{\min} \). Actually, it can be seen that the respective contributions are \( 15, 1, 1, 0, 0 \). Thus \( \tau_{\min} = \mu - 18 = 98 - 18 = 80 \) which coincides with the computation of Peraire.

The last theorem allow us obtain a formula to compute the minimum Tjurina number in a topological class using the multiplicity sequence.

**Corollary 13.** Let \( L \) a topological class of a singular plane branch determined by the multiplicity sequence \( \nu_{(1)}, \nu_{(2)}, \ldots, \nu_{(N)}, \nu_{(N+1)} = 1, \ldots \). The minimal Tjurina number achieved in \( L \) is

\[
\tau_{\min} = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left( \nu_{(i)}^2 + \left[ \frac{\nu_{(i)}}{2} \right] \left( \left[ \frac{\nu_{(i)}}{2} \right] - \nu_{(i)} - 1 \right) - 1 + p_1(S_{(i)}) \right)
\]

where \( S_{(i)} \) denote the curve with multiplicity \( \nu_{(i)} \) in the canonical resolution process for a generic curve in \( L \).
Proof. Applying inductively the formula presented in the last theorem and using that \( i(S(i)) = \left\lceil \frac{2\nu(i)}{3} \right\rceil + 1 - p_1(S(i)) \) yields

\[
\tau_{\text{min}} = \mu - \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left( \left\lceil \frac{\nu(i)}{2} \right\rceil - 1 \right) \left( \nu(i) - \left\lfloor \frac{\nu(i)}{2} \right\rfloor - 1 \right) - (i(S(i)) - 1)
\]

\[= \mu + \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left( \left\lceil \frac{\nu(i)}{2} \right\rceil \left( \left\lfloor \frac{\nu(i)}{2} \right\rfloor - \nu(i) - 1 \right) + \nu(i) - 1 + p_1(S(i)) \right).
\]

As \( \mu = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \nu(i) \left( \nu(i) - 1 \right) \), we get the proof. \( \square \)

In [4], Dimca and Greuel present an interesting question about the Tjurina number for curves in a given topological class \( L \). More specifically, they ask if \( 4\tau(S) > 3\mu(S) \) for any curve in \( L \).

As the Tjurina number is semicontinuous in \( L \) and we have obtained a formula for the \( \tau_{\text{min}} \), we are able to give a lower bound for the Tjurina number in terms of the Milnor number and it answered positively the previous question for the irreducible case.

**Corollary 14.** Let \( S \) be a singular irreducible plane curve. Then

\[\tau(S) \geq \frac{3}{4}\mu(S) + \frac{\sqrt{1 + 4\mu(S)} - 1}{8}\]

In particular, \( 4\tau(S) > 3\mu(S) \).

Proof. We denote \( \mu = \mu(S) \). It is sufficient to show the inequality for the \( \tau_{\text{min}} \).

By [12], the relation below holds

\[4\tau_{\text{min}} - 3\mu = \mu + 4 \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left( \left\lceil \frac{\nu(i)}{2} \right\rceil \left( \left\lfloor \frac{\nu(i)}{2} \right\rfloor - \nu(i) - 1 \right) + \nu(i) - 1 + p_1(\nu(i)) \right).
\]

Now, using that \( \mu = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \nu(i) \left( \nu(i) - 1 \right) \) and \( 4 \left\lceil \frac{\nu(i)}{2} \right\rceil \left( \left\lfloor \frac{\nu(i)}{2} \right\rfloor - \nu(i) - 1 \right) = -\nu_i^2 - 2\nu_i + \delta_i \) with \( \delta_i = 0 \) if \( \nu_i \) is even and \( \delta_i = 3 \) if \( \nu_i \) is odd, we obtain

\[4\tau_{\text{min}} - 3\mu = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left( \nu(i) + \delta_i + 4(p_1(S(i)) - 1) \right).
\]

Now, by Theorem [12] we have that:

- if \( \nu(i) \) is even, then \( p_1(S) \geq 1 \) and \( \nu(i) + 0 + 4(p_1(\nu(i)) - 1) \geq \nu(i) \),
- if \( \nu(i) \) is odd, then \( p_1(S) \geq 0 \) and \( \nu(i) + 3 + 4(p_1(\nu(i)) - 1) \geq \nu(i) - 1 \).

So, the following inequality follows

\[4\tau_{\text{min}} - 3\mu \geq \sum_{i=1}^{N} (\nu(i) - 1).
\]

(4.3)
As \( \mu = \sum_{i=1}^{N} (\nu(i) - 1)^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{N} (\nu(i) - 1) \) we get \( 4\tau_{\text{min}} - 3\mu \geq \mu - \sum_{i=1}^{N} (\nu(i) - 1)^2 \).

Using (4.3), that is,

\[
-(4\tau_{\text{min}} - 3\mu)^2 \leq - \left( \sum_{i=1}^{N} (\nu(i) - 1) \right)^2 \leq - \sum_{i=1}^{N} (\nu(i) - 1)^2,
\]

we obtain \( 4\tau_{\text{min}} - 3\mu \geq \mu - (4\tau_{\text{min}} - 3\mu)^2 \) and consequently

\[
\tau(S) \geq \tau_{\text{min}} \geq \frac{3}{4} \mu + \left( \frac{-1 + \sqrt{1 + 4\mu}}{8} \right).
\]

\[\square\]

**Example (6).** Let us consider the topological class \( L \) determined by the characteristic exponents \((141, 142)\). The Milnor number for any curve in \( L \) is \( \mu = (141 - 1)(142 - 1) = 19740 \). Using the lower bound presented in the last result we obtain \( \tau_{\text{min}} \geq 14840 \). For this topological class it follows by the Delorme result (cf. [3]) that \( \tau_{\text{min}} = 14910 \).

While we submit the first version of this paper to Arxiv, we discover that, at the same time, a positive answer for the Dimca-Greuel question was obtained by Alberich-Carramiñana et al. and published in Arxiv [1] a few days before. Although the methods are a bit different, the key ingredient is still the formula for the generic dimension of the moduli space obtained in [5].
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