

On the value set of 1-forms for plane branches

MARCELO OSNAR RODRIGUES DE ABREU AND MARCELO ESCUDEIRO HERNANDES*†

August 2, 2021

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: 14H20 (primary), 32S10 (secondary)

keywords: Plane curves, Semigroup, Value set of 1-forms.

Abstract

The value semigroup Γ and the value set Λ of 1-forms are, respectively, a topological and an analytical invariant of a plane branch. Giving a plane branch \mathcal{C} with semigroup Γ there are a finitely number of distinct possible sets Λ_i according to the analytic class of \mathcal{C} . In this work we show that the value set of 1-forms Λ determines the semigroup Γ and we present an effective method to recover Γ by Λ . In particular, this allows us to decide if a subset of \mathbb{N} is a value set of 1-forms for a plane branch.

1 Introduction

For a plane branch \mathcal{C} given by $f = 0$ with $f \in \mathbb{C}\{x, y\}$ irreducible, the topological class is totally characterized by numerical invariants, for instance, by the characteristic exponents of a Puiseux parametrization $\varphi(t) \in \mathbb{C}\{t\} \times \mathbb{C}\{t\}$ or, equivalently, by the value semigroup $\Gamma_{\mathcal{C}} = \{\nu_f(h) := \text{ord}_t \varphi^*(h); h \in \mathbb{C}\{x, y\} \setminus \langle f \rangle\} \subseteq \mathbb{N}$, where $\varphi^*(h) = h(\varphi)$ (see [Z1]).

On the other hand, considering $\Omega^1 = \mathbb{C}\{x, y\}dx + \mathbb{C}\{x, y\}dy$ the $\mathbb{C}\{x, y\}$ -module of holomorphic 1-forms on \mathbb{C}^2 we have that $\Lambda_{\mathcal{C}} = \{\nu_f(\omega) := \text{ord}_t(t \cdot \varphi^*(\omega)); \varphi^*(\omega) \neq 0\}$ is an analytic invariant of \mathcal{C} and $\Gamma_{\mathcal{C}} \setminus \{0\} \subseteq \Lambda_{\mathcal{C}}$. Some classical results about holomorphic 1-forms on a complete intersection curve singularities and relations with other analytic invariants are summarized by Dimca and Greuel in [DG].

In [HH2], we find an algorithm to compute the set Λ for any irreducible curve plane or not. Such algorithm allows us to obtain all the possible set Λ for plane branches in a given topological class determined by a value semigroup Γ obtaining precisely the algebraic relations among the coefficients of a Puiseux parametrization in order to achieve a set Λ and it allows us describe parameterizations for such plane branches. In [D], Delorme consider such subject for plane branches with semigroup $\Gamma_{\mathcal{C}} = \langle v_0, v_1 \rangle$. In a more general situation, Alberich, Almirón and

*The first author was partially supported by CAPES and the second one by CNPq-Brazil.

†Corresponding author: Hernandes, M. E.; email: mehernandes@uem.br

Moyano-Fernández in [AAM] present a characterization for the value set of \mathcal{O} -modules $\mathcal{O} + z\mathcal{O}$ where \mathcal{O} is the local ring of a plane branch \mathcal{C} with semigroup $\Gamma_{\mathcal{C}} = \langle v_0, v_1 \rangle$.

Many authors have considered simultaneously the sets Γ and Λ to establish results. For instance, Carbonne in [C] introduce the equidifferentiability class of plane branches: two plane branches \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{D} are equidifferentiable if $\Gamma_{\mathcal{C}} = \Gamma_{\mathcal{D}}$ and $\Lambda_{\mathcal{C}} = \Lambda_{\mathcal{D}}$. In [HH3] and [HH4] is presented normal forms with respect to the analytic equivalence for plane branches with Γ and Λ fixed.

Plane branches with same value semigroup can admit distinct value set of 1-form. In this paper we show that the numerical set $\Lambda_{\mathcal{C}}$ allows us to recover the value semigroup of \mathcal{C} (see Theorem 3.7) that is false for space curves (see Example 3.8) and for plane curves with several branches (see Example 3.9). As a consequence, we obtain a method to decide if a subset $L \subset \mathbb{N}$ is a value set of 1-forms of a plane branch, that is, if $L = \Lambda_{\mathcal{C}}$ for some plane branch \mathcal{C} (see Algorithm 2).

Notice that, in particular, the notion of equidifferentiability of two plane branches \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{D} , by Carbonne, can be achieved just by the equality $\Lambda_{\mathcal{C}} = \Lambda_{\mathcal{D}}$ and to obtain the analytic normal form in [HH3] it is sufficient to fix the set $\Lambda_{\mathcal{C}}$.

2 Semigroup and value set of 1-forms

In this paper, we consider $\mathbb{N} = \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ and $\mathbb{C}\{x, y\}$ denotes the ring of analytic power series in the indeterminates x and y over the complex field \mathbb{C} .

Let \mathcal{C} be (a germ of) a plane branch, i.e. an irreducible plane curve, defined by $f = 0$ with $f \in \mathcal{M} := \langle x, y \rangle \subset \mathbb{C}\{x, y\}$ irreducible. We refer to [Z2] and [H] for details to this section.

We say that two plane branches \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{D} are topologically equivalent if there exist neighborhoods $V, U \subseteq (\mathbb{C}^2, 0)$ and a homeomorphism $\Phi : (\mathbb{C}^2, 0) \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}^2, 0)$ such that $\Phi(\mathcal{C} \cap V) = \mathcal{D} \cap U$. In addition, if Φ is an analytic isomorphism then we say that \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{D} are analytically equivalent. We can rewrite the analytic equivalence by $\mathbb{C}\{x, y\}$ -automorphism. Two curves given by $f = 0$ and $g = 0$ respectively, are analytically equivalent if and only if there exist an automorphism Ψ and a unit u of $\mathbb{C}\{x, y\}$ such that $\Psi(f) = u \cdot g$, or equivalent $\mathcal{O}_f := \frac{\mathbb{C}\{x, y\}}{\langle f \rangle} \simeq \frac{\mathbb{C}\{x, y\}}{\langle g \rangle} =: \mathcal{O}_g$ as \mathbb{C} -algebras.

Up to a linear automorphism $\Psi \in \text{Aut}(\mathbb{C}\{x, y\})$ and, by the Weierstrass Theorem Preparation, any plane curve is analytically equivalent to a curve defined by $f = y^n + \sum_{i=1}^n c_i(x)y^{n-i} \in \mathbb{C}\{x\}[y]$ where $n := \text{mult}(f)$, that is, $f \in \mathcal{M}^n \setminus \mathcal{M}^{n+1}$. The Newton-Puiseux theorem allows us to determine the roots of f . More explicitly, if $f \in \mathbb{C}\{x\}[y]$ is irreducible then we get $y = \sum_{i \geq n} a_i x^{\frac{i}{n}} \in \mathbb{C}\left\{x^{\frac{1}{n}}\right\}$ such that $f = \prod_{j=1}^n \left(y - \sum_{i \geq n} a_i (\zeta^j x^{\frac{1}{n}})^i\right)$ where $\zeta \in \mathbb{C}$ is a primitive n -th root of unity. We call $\varphi(t) := \left(t^n, \sum_{i \geq n} a_i t^i\right)$ a Puiseux parametrization of the plane branch defined by f .

The analytic equivalence of plane branches can also be translate in terms of the \mathcal{A} -equivalence of their parametrization, that is, \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{D} are analytical equivalent plane branches with parametriza-

tions $\varphi(t)$ and $\psi(t)$ respectively, if and only if there exist diffeomorphisms $\sigma \in \text{Diff}(\mathbb{C}^2, 0)$ and $\rho \in \text{Diff}(\mathbb{C}, 0)$ such that $\sigma \circ \varphi \circ \rho^{-1}(t) = \psi(t)$.

Given a Puiseux parametrization $\varphi(t) = (t^n, \sum_{i \geq n} a_i t^i)$ for a plane branch \mathcal{C} we define

$$\beta_0 := n =: e_0, \quad \beta_i := \min\{j; a_j \neq 0 \text{ and } e_{i-1} \nmid j\} \quad \text{and} \quad e_i = \gcd(e_{i-1}, \beta_i) \quad \text{for } i \geq 1.$$

There exists $g \geq 1$ such that $e_g = 1$ then we get $\beta_0 < \beta_1 < \dots < \beta_g$ and $1 = e_g < \dots < e_0$. The sequence $(\beta_i)_{i=0}^g$ is called the characteristic sequence and Zariski, in [Z1], shows that it determines and it is determined by the topological class of \mathcal{C} .

The topological class of a plane branch \mathcal{C} defined by $f \in \mathbb{C}\{x, y\}$ can also be characterized by others numerical data, for instance by the value semigroup. More explicitly, if $\varphi(t) = (t^n, y(t))$ is a Puiseux parametrization of \mathcal{C} then we have the exact sequence

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} \{0\} & \rightarrow & \langle f \rangle & \rightarrow & \mathbb{C}\{x, y\} & \xrightarrow{\varphi^*} & \mathbb{C}\{t^n, y(t)\} & \rightarrow & \{0\} \\ & & & & h & \mapsto & \varphi^*(h) := h(t^n, y(t)) & & \end{array}$$

and $\mathcal{O}_f \approx \mathbb{C}\{t^n, y(t)\} \subseteq \mathbb{C}\{t\}$. The value semigroup of \mathcal{C} is

$$\Gamma_{\mathcal{C}} = \left\{ \nu_f(h) := \text{ord}_t(\varphi^*(h)) = \dim_{\mathbb{C}} \frac{\mathbb{C}\{x, y\}}{\langle f, h \rangle}; h \in \mathbb{C}\{x, y\} \setminus \langle f \rangle \right\} \subseteq \mathbb{N}.$$

In fact, $\Gamma_{\mathcal{C}}$ is a numerical semigroup with minimal set of generators $\{v_0, v_1, \dots, v_g\}$ satisfying

$$v_0 := \beta_0, \quad v_i := n_{i-1}v_{i-1} + \beta_i - \beta_{i-1}, \quad \text{where } n_0 := 1, \quad n_i := \frac{e_{i-1}}{e_i} \quad \text{for } 1 \leq i \leq g. \quad (1)$$

Remark that $e_i = \gcd(v_0, \dots, v_i)$ for $0 \leq i \leq g$ we have that $\Gamma_{\mathcal{C}} = \langle v_0, \dots, v_g \rangle$ and the characteristic sequence $(\beta_i)_{i=0}^g$ are mutually determined (see [Z2]).

A monic polynomial $f_k \in \mathbb{C}\{x\}[y]$ of degree $n_0 \cdot \dots \cdot n_k = \frac{v_0}{e_k}$ with $0 \leq k < g$ is called a k -semiroot of f if $\nu_f(f_k) = v_{k+1}$. It follows that f_k is irreducible and the value semigroup associated to \mathcal{C}_{f_i} is $\Gamma_i = \langle \frac{v_0}{e_i}, \dots, \frac{v_i}{e_i} \rangle$ (see [P]).

Any set $\{\varphi^*(h_i); h_i \in \mathbb{C}\{x, y\}, i = 0, \dots, g\} \subseteq \mathbb{C}\{t\}$ such that $\nu_f(h_i) = v_i$ is called a (minimal) Standard Basis for \mathcal{O}_f . We can obtain a minimal Standard Basis for \mathcal{O}_f considering $\{x, f_k, 0 \leq k < g; f_k \text{ is a semiroot of } f\}$, by minimal polynomial of particular truncate of $\varphi(t)$ (see [Z2]) or by an algorithm presented in [HH2], for instance.

Given a value semigroup $\Gamma_{\mathcal{C}} = \langle v_0, \dots, v_g \rangle$ any integer $z \in \mathbb{Z}$ can be uniquely expressed as $z = \sum_{i=0}^g s_i v_i$ with $s_0 \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $0 \leq s_i < n_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq g$. Moreover, $z \in \Gamma_{\mathcal{C}}$ if and only if $s_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ (see Lemma 7.1, [H]). In particular, $\mu - 1 := \sum_{i=1}^g (n_i - 1)v_i - v_0 \notin \Gamma_{\mathcal{C}}$ and $\mu + \mathbb{N} \subseteq \Gamma_{\mathcal{C}}$. We call μ the conductor of $\Gamma_{\mathcal{C}}$.

Notice that, by the above properties, we have that $z \in \Gamma_{\mathcal{C}}$ if and only if $\mu - 1 - z \notin \Gamma_{\mathcal{C}}$, that is, $\Gamma_{\mathcal{C}}$ is a symmetric semigroup.

The following theorem characterizes the semigroup of a plane branch.

Theorem 2.1 (Bresinsky). *Given $0 < v_0 < \dots < v_g$ with $\gcd(v_0, \dots, v_g) = 1$ we put $n_0 = 1$ and $n_i = \frac{\gcd(v_0, \dots, v_{i-1})}{\gcd(v_0, \dots, v_i)}$ for $1 \leq i \leq g$. The semigroup $\langle v_0, \dots, v_g \rangle$ is a value semigroup of a plane branch if and only if $n_i \geq 2$ and $n_{i-1}v_{i-1} < v_i$ for all $1 \leq i \leq g$.*

PROOF: See Theorem 2 in [B]. ■

On the other hand analytic invariants for plane branches are not easy to compute. Some of them are related with the $\mathbb{C}\{x, y\}$ -module $\Omega^1 = \mathbb{C}\{x, y\}dx + \mathbb{C}\{x, y\}dy$.

Given a parametrization $\varphi(t) = (x(t), y(t))$ of a plane branch \mathcal{C} and $\omega = A(x, y)dx + B(x, y)dy \in \Omega^1$ we define $\varphi^*(\omega) := \varphi^*(A)x'(t) + \varphi^*(B)y'(t)$ where $x'(t)$ and $y'(t)$ denote the derivative of $x(t)$ and $y(t)$ respectively. In this way, we get the value set of 1-forms

$$\Lambda_{\mathcal{C}} = \{\nu_f(\omega) := \text{ord}_t(t \cdot \varphi^*(\omega)); \omega \in \Omega^1 \text{ and } \varphi^*(\omega) \neq 0\} \subset \mathbb{N}$$

that is an analytic invariant.

As $\nu_f(dh) = \nu_f(h)$ for any $h \in \mathcal{M}$ it follows that $\Gamma_{\mathcal{C}}^* := \Gamma_{\mathcal{C}} \setminus \{0\} \subseteq \Lambda_{\mathcal{C}}$ and it is immediate that $\Gamma_{\mathcal{C}} + \Lambda_{\mathcal{C}} \subseteq \Lambda_{\mathcal{C}}$, that is, $\Lambda_{\mathcal{C}}$ is a $\Gamma_{\mathcal{C}}$ -monomodule.

Carbonne, in [C], say that two plane branches \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{D} are equidifferentiable if $\Gamma_{\mathcal{C}} = \Gamma_{\mathcal{D}}$ and $\Lambda_{\mathcal{C}} = \Lambda_{\mathcal{D}}$. Two analytically equivalent plane curves are equidifferentiability and plane branches equidifferentiable are obviously topologically equivalent, but the converse are clearly false. In fact, we have the following result:

Theorem 2.2 (Hefez, Hernandes). *Let \mathcal{C} be a plane branch with value semigroup $\Gamma = \langle v_0, \dots, v_g \rangle$ and set of values of 1-forms Λ . If $\Lambda \setminus \Gamma \neq \emptyset$, then \mathcal{C} is analytically equivalent to a plane branch with parametrization*

$$\left(t^{v_0}, t^{v_1} + a_{\lambda} t^{\lambda} + \sum_{\substack{i > \lambda \\ i \notin \Lambda - v_0}} a_i t^i \right),$$

where $\lambda = \min(\Lambda \setminus \Gamma) - v_0$. Otherwise \mathcal{C} is analytically equivalent to a branch with parametrization (t^{v_0}, t^{v_1}) . Moreover, a branch parameterized by $(t^{v_0}, t^{v_1} + b_{\lambda} t^{\lambda} + \sum_{\lambda < i \notin \Lambda - v_0} b_i t^i)$ is analytically equivalent to \mathcal{C} if, and only if, there exists $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}^*$ such that $b_i = \alpha^{i-v_1} a_i$, for all i .

PROOF: See Theorem 2.1 in [HH3] or Theorem 1.3.17 in [HH4]. ■

Remark 2.3. *Notice that if $\Lambda_{\mathcal{C}} \setminus \Gamma_{\mathcal{C}} \neq \emptyset$ then $\min(\Lambda_{\mathcal{C}} \setminus \Gamma_{\mathcal{C}}) > v_1 + v_0$.*

We can compute the set $\Lambda_{\mathcal{C}}$ associated to a plane branch \mathcal{C} given by a parametrization $\varphi(t)$ using the Algorithm 4.10 presented in [HH2]. For commodity to the reader we summarize the main ingredients of the mentioned algorithm.

A minimal Standard Basis for $\varphi^*(\Omega^1)$ is a set $G = \{\varphi^*(\omega_i); \omega_i \in \Omega^1, 1 \leq i \leq s\} \subset \mathbb{C}\{t\}$ such that $\Lambda_{\mathcal{C}} = \bigcup_{i=1}^s (\varphi^*(\omega_i) + \Gamma_{\mathcal{C}})$ and $\varphi^*(\omega_i) \notin \varphi^*(\omega_j) + \Gamma_{\mathcal{C}}$ for $i \neq j$.

Let $\{\varphi^*(h_0), \dots, \varphi^*(h_g)\}$ be a minimal Standard Basis for \mathcal{O}_f and $\emptyset \neq K \subset \varphi^*(\Omega^1)$, we say that $\varphi^*(\omega_r)$ is a reduction of $\varphi^*(\omega) \in \varphi^*(\Omega^1)$ modulo K if there exist $a \in \mathbb{C}$, $\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_g \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\varphi^*(\omega_k) \in K$ such that

$$\omega_r = \omega - a \prod_{i=0}^g h_i^{\alpha_i} \omega_k, \quad \text{with } \nu_f(\omega_r) > \nu_f(\omega) \text{ or } \omega_r = 0.$$

We write $\varphi^*(\omega) \xrightarrow{K} \varphi^*(\omega_r)$ if $\varphi^*(\omega_r)$ is a final reduction of $\varphi^*(\omega)$ modulo K , that is, $\varphi^*(\omega_r)$ is obtained from $\varphi^*(\omega)$ through a chain (possibly infinite) of reductions, modulo K , and cannot be reduced further.

A minimal S -process of a pair of elements $\varphi^*(\omega_p), \varphi^*(\omega_q) \in \varphi^*(\Omega^1)$ is

$$\varphi^*(S(\omega_p, \omega_q)) = \varphi^* \left(a \prod_{i=0}^g h_i^{\alpha_i} \omega_p + b \prod_{i=0}^g h_i^{\gamma_i} \omega_q \right),$$

where $a, b \in \mathbb{C}$, $\nu_f(S(\omega_p, \omega_q)) > \nu_f(\prod_{i=0}^g h_i^{\alpha_i} \omega_p) = \nu_f(\prod_{i=0}^g h_i^{\gamma_i} \omega_q)$ and $(\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_g, \gamma_0, \dots, \gamma_g)$ is a minimal solution of the linear Diophantine equation $\sum_{i=0}^g v_i \alpha_i + \nu_f(\omega_q) = \sum_{i=0}^g v_i \gamma_i + \nu_f(\omega_p)$.

The following algorithm gives us Standard Bases for $\varphi^*(\Omega^1)$ (see Algorithm 4.10 in [HH2]):

Algorithm 1: Standard basis for $\varphi^*(\Omega^1)$:

Input: $H = \{h_j, j = 0, \dots, g\}$ a minimal Standard Basis for \mathcal{O}_f ;
Define: $G_0 = \emptyset$; $G_1 := \{\varphi^*(dh_j), j = 0, \dots, g\}$ and $i := 1$;
While $G_i \neq G_{i-1}$ **do**
 Compute $S := \{s; s \text{ is a minimal } S\text{-process of } G_i\}$;
 $R := \{r; s \xrightarrow{G_i} r \text{ and } r \neq 0, \forall s \in S\}$;
 Define: $G_{i+1} := G_i \cup R$;
 $i := i + 1$;
Output: $G = \cup_{i \geq 0} G_i$.

From any Standard Basis of $\varphi^*(\Omega^1)$ we can extract a minimal Standard Basis and consequently, we obtain the set $\Lambda_{\mathcal{C}}$. In addition, we can apply the above algorithm to the family of all plane branches with a fixed semigroup and consequently we obtain all possible value set of 1-forms for plane branches in a fixed topological class.

Example 2.4 ([HH1]). *Let $\Gamma = \langle 6, 9, 19 \rangle$ be a numerical semigroup, by Theorem 2.1 it is a value semigroup of plane branches. By (1) we get the characteristic sequence $\beta_0 = 6, \beta_1 = 9$ and $\beta_2 = 10$ and consequently any plane branch with semigroup Γ can be done by a parametrization $(t^6, t^9 + \sum_{i \geq 10} a_i t^i)$ with $a_{10} \neq 0$. In particular, $\text{ord}_t(t \cdot \varphi^*(2xdy - 3ydx)) = 10 = \min(\Lambda \setminus \Gamma) - 6$.*

As $\Gamma \setminus \{0\} \subset \Lambda$ for any possible set Λ , by Theorem 2.2, any plane branch in this topological class is analytically equivalent to a branch with parametrization

$$(t^6, t^9 + t^{10} + a_{11}t^{11} + a_{14}t^{14} + a_{17}t^{17} + a_{20}t^{20} + a_{23}t^{23} + a_{26}t^{26}).$$

Applying the Algorithm 1 we obtain:

<i>restrictions</i>	$\Lambda \setminus \Gamma$
$a_{11} \notin \{-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{29}{18}\}$	$\{16, 22, 26, 29, 32, 35, 41\}$
$a_{11} = \frac{29}{18}$	$\{16, 22, 26, 32, 35, 41\}$
$a_{11} = -\frac{1}{2}, \quad 1152a_{14}^2 - 769a_{14} + 1064a_{17} \neq 28$	$\{16, 22, 29, 32, 35, 41\}$
$a_{11} = -\frac{1}{2}, \quad 1152a_{14}^2 - 769a_{14} + 1064a_{17} = 28$	$\{16, 22, 29, 35, 41\}$

3 The characterization of the set Λ for plane branches

The aim of this section is to show that the value set $\Lambda_{\mathcal{C}}$ of 1-forms on a plane branch \mathcal{C} determines the value semigroup $\Gamma_{\mathcal{C}}$ and to present a method to decide if a subset $L \subset \mathbb{N}$ is a value set of 1-forms for some plane branch. As $\min(\Lambda_{\mathcal{C}}) = \min(\Gamma_{\mathcal{C}}^*) = v_0$ we have that $v_0 = 1$ if and only if $\Lambda_{\mathcal{C}} = \Gamma_{\mathcal{C}}^* = \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$. In what follows we assume that $v_0 > 1$.

First of all we present some arithmetic notions for a nonempty set $S \subseteq \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$.

Let S be a nonempty subset of $\mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$. We say that S admits a conductor s if $s - 1 \notin S$ and $s' \in S$ for every $s' \geq s$, or equivalently if $\mathbb{N} \setminus S$ is a finite set.

Definition 3.1. Given $\emptyset \neq S \subseteq \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$ we define

$$\mathbf{a}_0 := \min(S) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{a}_i := \min \left(S \setminus \bigcup_{j=0}^{i-1} (\mathbf{a}_j + \mathbb{N} \cdot \mathbf{a}_0) \right) \quad \text{for } i > 0.$$

As $\mathbf{a}_j \not\equiv \mathbf{a}_i \pmod{\mathbf{a}_0}$ for $i \neq j$ there exists $m < \mathbf{a}_0$ such $S \setminus \bigcup_{i=0}^m (\mathbf{a}_i + \mathbb{N} \cdot \mathbf{a}_0) = \emptyset$. The **Apéry set** of S is $Ap(S) = \{\mathbf{a}_i; 0 \leq i \leq m\}$.

If $Ap(S) = \{\mathbf{a}_0, \dots, \mathbf{a}_m\}$ then $m \leq \mathbf{a}_0 - 1$ and $S \subseteq \bigcup_{j=0}^m (\mathbf{a}_j + \mathbb{N} \cdot \mathbf{a}_0)$. We say that S is covered by $Ap(S)$ if $m = \mathbf{a}_0 - 1$ and $S = \bigcup_{j=0}^m (\mathbf{a}_j + \mathbb{N} \cdot \mathbf{a}_0)$.

Remark 3.2. If S is covered by $Ap(S)$ and $\mathbf{a}_* = \max(Ap(S))$ then S has conductor $\mathbf{a}_* - \mathbf{a}_0 + 1$. In fact, by definition $\mathbf{a}_* - \mathbf{a}_0 \notin S$ and for any $s > \mathbf{a}_* - \mathbf{a}_0$, as $\sharp Ap(S) = \mathbf{a}_0$ there exists $\mathbf{a}_j \in Ap(S)$ such that $\mathbf{a}_* - \mathbf{a}_0 < s = \mathbf{a}_j + k\mathbf{a}_0 \leq \mathbf{a}_* + k\mathbf{a}_0$, consequently $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $s \in \mathbf{a}_j + \mathbb{N} \cdot \mathbf{a}_0 \subseteq S$. The converse is false, for instance $S = \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0, 2\}$ admits conductor but it is not covered by $Ap(S)$.

Remark 3.3. For any plane branch \mathcal{C} the sets $\Gamma_{\mathcal{C}}^* = \Gamma_{\mathcal{C}} \setminus \{0\}$ and $\Lambda_{\mathcal{C}}$ are covered by their Apéry set. In fact, given $\Gamma_{\mathcal{C}} = \langle v_0, \dots, v_g \rangle$, by Proposition 7.11 in [H], we have that $Ap(\Gamma_{\mathcal{C}}^*) = \{v_0\} \cup \{\sum_{i=1}^g s_i v_i \neq 0; 0 \leq s_i < n_i\}$. Consequently, $\sharp Ap(\Gamma_{\mathcal{C}}^*) = \prod_{i=1}^g n_i = v_0$ and $\Gamma_{\mathcal{C}} = \{\sum_{i=1}^g s_i v_i + \mathbb{N} \cdot v_0; 0 \leq s_i < n_i\}$.

As $\Gamma_{\mathcal{C}}^* \subseteq \Lambda_{\mathcal{C}}$ we have that $Ap(\Lambda_{\mathcal{C}}) = \{\mathbf{b}_i := \mathbf{a}_i - k_i v_0; \mathbf{a}_i \in Ap(\Gamma_{\mathcal{C}}^*) \text{ for some } k_i \in \mathbb{N}\}$, so $\sharp Ap(\Lambda_{\mathcal{C}}) = \sharp Ap(\Gamma_{\mathcal{C}}^*) = v_0$. Notice that $\mathbf{b}_0 := \min(\Lambda_{\mathcal{C}}) = \mathbf{a}_0 = v_0$ and, by Remark 2.3, we must have $\mathbf{b}_1 := \mathbf{a}_1 = v_1$. As $\mathbb{N} \cdot v_0 + \Lambda_{\mathcal{C}} \subset \Gamma_{\mathcal{C}} + \Lambda_{\mathcal{C}} \subset \Lambda_{\mathcal{C}}$ it follows that $\Lambda_{\mathcal{C}} = \bigcup_{j=0}^{v_0-1} (\mathbf{b}_j + \mathbb{N} \cdot \mathbf{b}_0)$.

In what follows, for any subset $S \subseteq \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$ covered by its Apéry set $Ap(S) = \{\mathbf{a}_i; 0 \leq i < \mathbf{a}_0\}$ we put $\varepsilon_0 := \mathbf{a}_0, \eta_0 := 1$,

$$\varepsilon_i := \max\{\gcd(\varepsilon_{i-1}, \mathbf{a}_j); \mathbf{a}_j \in Ap(S) \text{ and } \varepsilon_{i-1} \nmid \mathbf{a}_j\} \quad \text{and} \quad \eta_i := \frac{\varepsilon_{i-1}}{\varepsilon_i} \quad \text{for } i \geq 1. \quad (2)$$

Notice that there exists $\varrho \leq \mathbf{a}_0$ such that $\varepsilon_{\varrho} = 1, \eta_i > 1$ for any $1 \leq i \leq \varrho$ and $\prod_{j=0}^i \eta_j = \frac{\varepsilon_0}{\varepsilon_i} = \sharp\{\mathbf{a} \in Ap(S); \varepsilon_i \mid \mathbf{a}\}$.

For $0 < i \leq \varrho$ we denote $Q_1 < \dots < Q_{\frac{\varepsilon_0}{\varepsilon_{i-1}}}$ the $\frac{\varepsilon_0}{\varepsilon_{i-1}}$ smallest elements in the set $\Delta_i = \{\mathbf{a} \in Ap(S); \varepsilon_i \mid \mathbf{a} \text{ and } \varepsilon_{i-1} \nmid \mathbf{a}\}$ and we put

$$B_0(S) := \{\mathbf{a}_0\} \quad \text{and} \quad B_i(S) := \left\{ Q_1, \dots, Q_{\frac{\varepsilon_0}{\varepsilon_{i-1}}} \right\} \quad \text{for } 1 \leq i \leq \varrho. \quad (3)$$

Remark 3.4. For $S = \Gamma_{\mathcal{C}}^*$ or $S = \Lambda_{\mathcal{C}}$ we have $\varepsilon_i = e_i$, $\eta_i = n_i$, $\varrho = g$, $B_0(S) = \{v_0\}$ and $B_1(S) = \{v_1\}$. In particular, for $\varepsilon_1 = e_1 = 1$ the sets $B_0(\Lambda_{\mathcal{C}})$ and $B_1(\Lambda_{\mathcal{C}})$ determine $\Gamma_{\mathcal{C}}$.

In addition, by the description of $Ap(\Gamma_{\mathcal{C}}^*)$ presented in Proposition 7.11 in [H] (see Remark 3.3) we have $B_i(\Gamma_{\mathcal{C}}^*) = \{v_i + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} s_j v_j; 0 \leq s_j < n_j\}$ for $1 \leq i \leq g$.

By the above remark we get $v_i = \min(B_i(\Gamma_{\mathcal{C}}^*))$ for $0 \leq i \leq g$. In that follows we will show that $v_i = \max(B_i(\Lambda_{\mathcal{C}}))$ where $0 \leq i \leq g$ for any set of value of 1-forms $\Lambda_{\mathcal{C}}$ associated to a plane branch \mathcal{C} , consequently the set $\Lambda_{\mathcal{C}}$ determines the value semigroup $\Gamma_{\mathcal{C}}$.

From now on we will assume that $\Lambda_{\mathcal{C}}$ is a value set of 1-form for some plane branch \mathcal{C} with value semigroup $\Gamma_{\mathcal{C}} = \langle v_0, \dots, v_g \rangle$ with $g \geq 2$.

Lemma 3.5. *There is no elements $v_i - kv_0$ in $\Lambda_{\mathcal{C}}$ with $k > 0$ and $0 \leq i \leq g$.*

PROOF: First of all, notice that $v_i - kv_0 \notin \Gamma_{\mathcal{C}}$ for any $k > 0$. By Remark 2.3, $\min(\Lambda_{\mathcal{C}} \setminus \Gamma_{\mathcal{C}}) > v_1 + v_0$ then we get the result for $i = 0$ and $i = 1$.

Consider $i \geq 2$, f_{i-1} a $(i-1)$ -semiroot with value semigroup Γ_{i-1} and value of 1-forms Λ_{i-1} associated to $\mathcal{C}_{f_{i-1}}$. Given $\delta \in \Lambda_{i-1} \setminus \Gamma_{i-1}$ we denote $\Theta_{i-1}(\delta) = \max\{\nu_{f_{i-1}}(B); \delta = \nu_{f_{i-1}}(Adx - Bdy)\}$, $L_{i-1}^1 = \{\delta \in \Lambda_{i-1} \setminus \Gamma_{i-1}; e_{i-1}(\delta - \Theta_{i-1}(\delta)) < \beta_i\}$ and $L_{i-1}^2 = \{\delta \in \Lambda_{i-1} \setminus \Gamma_{i-1}; e_{i-1}(\delta - \Theta_{i-1}(\delta)) > \beta_i\}$.

By Proposition 5.1 in [AH], we have that

$$\{\lambda \in \Lambda_{\mathcal{C}} \setminus \Gamma_{\mathcal{C}}; \lambda < v_i\} = \rho_{i-1}(\Lambda_{i-1} \setminus \Gamma_{i-1}) \dot{\cup} \{v_i - e_{i-1}\delta; 0 \neq \delta \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \Lambda_{i-1}\}, \quad (4)$$

where (see Proposition 4.7 in [AH])

$$\rho_{i-1}(\Lambda_{i-1} \setminus \Gamma_{i-1}) = e_{i-1}L_{i-1}^1 \dot{\cup} \left\{ v_i - e_{i-1} \left(\mu_{i-1} - 1 + \frac{v_0}{e_{i-1}} - \Theta_{i-1}(\delta) \right); \delta \in L_{i-1}^2 \right\}$$

and μ_{i-1} is the conductor of Γ_{i-1} .

Suppose that $v_i - kv_0 \in \rho_{i-1}(\Lambda_{i-1} \setminus \Gamma_{i-1})$. Notice that $e_{i-1} \nmid v_i - kv_0$, consequently $v_i - kv_0 \notin e_{i-1}L_{i-1}^1$. In addition, if $v_i - kv_0 = v_i - e_{i-1} \left(\mu_{i-1} - 1 + \frac{v_0}{e_{i-1}} - \Theta_{i-1}(\delta) \right)$ as $\Theta_{i-1}(\delta) \in \Gamma_{i-1}$ and Γ_{i-1} is a symmetric semigroup we have $(k-1)\frac{v_0}{e_{i-1}} = \mu_{i-1} - 1 - \Theta_{i-1}(\delta) \notin \Gamma_{i-1}$ that is an absurd.

If $v_i - kv_0 = v_i - e_{i-1}\delta$ then $\delta = k\frac{v_0}{e_{i-1}} \in \Gamma_{i-1} \setminus \{0\} \subseteq \Lambda_{i-1}$, so $v_i - kv_0 \notin \{v_i - e_{i-1}\delta; 0 \neq \delta \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \Lambda_{i-1}\}$.

Hence, $v_i - kv_0 \notin \Lambda_{\mathcal{C}}$ for $k > 0$ and $0 \leq i \leq g$. ■

Now we can describe some properties of $B_i(\Lambda_{\mathcal{C}})$ for $2 \leq i \leq g$.

Proposition 3.6. *For $2 \leq i \leq g$ we have that $v_i = \max(B_i(\Lambda_{\mathcal{C}}))$.*

PROOF: By Remark 3.3, we get $Ap(\Gamma_{\mathcal{C}}^*) = \{v_0\} \dot{\cup} \{\sum_{i=1}^g s_i v_i \neq 0; 0 \leq s_i < n_i\}$ and $Ap(\Lambda_{\mathcal{C}}) = \{\mathbf{b}_i := \mathbf{a}_i - k_i v_0; \mathbf{a}_i \in Ap(\Gamma_{\mathcal{C}}^*) \text{ for some } k \in \mathbb{N}\}$.

Denoting $\Delta_i := \{\alpha \in Ap(\Lambda_{\mathcal{C}}); e_i \mid \alpha \text{ and } e_{i-1} \nmid \alpha\}$, by the previous lemma we get $v_i \in \Delta_i$.

As $\min(\Lambda_{i-1}) = \frac{v_0}{e_{i-1}} = n_0 \cdots n_{i-1}$ it follows that $\left\{1, \dots, \frac{v_0}{e_{i-1}} - 1\right\} \subset \mathbb{N} \setminus \Lambda_{i-1}$ and by (4) we get $v_i - e_{i-1}\delta \in \Lambda_{\mathcal{C}} \setminus \Gamma_{\mathcal{C}}$ for $1 \leq \delta < \frac{v_0}{e_{i-1}}$. In addition, $v_i - e_{i-1}\delta_j \not\equiv v_i - e_{i-1}\delta_k \pmod{v_0}$ for $1 \leq \delta_k, \delta_j < n_0 \cdots n_{i-1}$ and $\delta_j \neq \delta_k$. Consequently,

$$\{v_i\} \cup \left\{v_i - e_{i-1}\delta - k_\delta v_0; \quad 1 \leq \delta < \frac{v_0}{e_{i-1}} \text{ and some } k_\delta \in \mathbb{N}\right\} \subset \{\mathbf{a} \in \Delta_i; \mathbf{a} \leq v_i\}.$$

On the other hand, if $\alpha \in \Delta_i$ with $\alpha < v_i$ as $v_i = \min\{\gamma \in \Gamma_{\mathcal{C}}; e_i \mid \gamma \text{ and } e_{i-1} \nmid \gamma\}$ it follows that $\alpha \in \Lambda_{\mathcal{C}} \setminus \Gamma_{\mathcal{C}}$ and by (4) we get $\alpha = v_i - e_{i-1}\gamma$ with $\gamma > 0$. As $\alpha = v_i - e_{i-1}\gamma \equiv v_i - e_{i-1}\delta \pmod{v_0}$ for some $1 \leq \delta < \frac{v_0}{e_{i-1}}$ we get

$$\{\mathbf{a} \in \Delta_i; \mathbf{a} \leq v_i\} = \{v_i\} \cup \left\{v_i - e_{i-1}\delta - k_\delta v_0; \quad 1 \leq \delta < \frac{v_0}{e_{i-1}} \text{ and some } k_\delta \in \mathbb{N}\right\} = B_i(\Lambda_{\mathcal{C}})$$

and hence $\max(B_i(\Lambda_{\mathcal{C}})) = v_i$ for all $2 \leq i \leq g$. ■

We can recover the semigroup $\Gamma_{\mathcal{C}}$ from the set $\Lambda_{\mathcal{C}}$ as we highlighted in the following result:

Theorem 3.7. *The value set of 1-forms $\Lambda_{\mathcal{C}}$ determines the value semigroup $\Gamma_{\mathcal{C}}$.*

PROOF: Given $\Lambda_{\mathcal{C}}$ we obtain $Ap(\Lambda_{\mathcal{C}})$ and we determine the sequences $(\varepsilon_i)_{i=0}^g$ and $(n_i)_{i=0}^g$ (see (2) and Remark 3.4). This allows us to determine $B_i(\Lambda_{\mathcal{C}})$ for $0 \leq i \leq g$.

As $B_0(\Lambda_{\mathcal{C}}) = \{v_0\}$, $B_1(\Lambda_{\mathcal{C}}) = \{v_1\}$ and by the above proposition, we get $v_i = \max(B_i(\Lambda_{\mathcal{C}}))$ for $0 \leq i \leq g$, that is, the minimal generators of $\Gamma_{\mathcal{C}}$. ■

As a consequence of the above arithmetic properties of the analytic invariant $\Lambda_{\mathcal{C}}$ we can conclude that if two plane branches have the same value set of 1-form then the branches have the same value semigroup. The following example illustrates that this property is false for space curves.

Example 3.8. *Consider the curves given by the parametrizations:*

$$\mathcal{C}_1 : \begin{cases} x = t^6 \\ y = t^{14} + t^{17} \\ z = t^{39} \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{C}_2 : \begin{cases} x = t^6 \\ y = t^{14} + t^{33} \\ z = t^{23}. \end{cases}$$

The corresponding associated value semigroup, computed by Algorithm 3.2 in [HH2] for instance, are $\Gamma_1 = \langle 6, 14, 39 \rangle$ and $\Gamma_2 = \langle 6, 14, 23 \rangle$.

On the other hand, computing the value set of 1-forms by Algorithm 4.10 in [HH2], we get $\nu(3xdy - 7ydx) = 23$ for \mathcal{C}_1 and $\nu(3xdy - 7ydx) = 39$ for \mathcal{C}_2 .

In this way, we obtain $\Lambda_1 = \Lambda_2 = \{0, 6, 12, 14, 18, 20, 23, 24, 26, 28, 29, 30, 32, 34 + \mathbb{N}\}$.

We can extend the value semigroup and the value set of 1-forms for plane curves with several branches. More explicitly, if $\mathcal{D} = \cup_{i=1}^r \mathcal{C}_i$ and $\varphi_i(t_i) = (x(t_i), y(t_i))$ denotes a parametrization of \mathcal{C}_i then

$$\Gamma_{\mathcal{D}} := \{(\text{ord}_{t_1}(\varphi_1^*(h)), \dots, \text{ord}_{t_r}(\varphi_r^*(h))); \quad h \in \mathbb{C}\{x, y\} \setminus \cup_{i=1}^r \langle f_i \rangle\} \quad \text{and}$$

$$\Lambda_{\mathcal{D}} := \{(ord_{t_1}(t_1 \cdot \varphi_1^*(\omega)), \dots, ord_{t_r}(t_r \cdot \varphi_r^*(\omega)))\}; \omega \in \Omega^1 \text{ and } \varphi_i^*(\omega) \neq 0, 1 \leq i \leq r\}.$$

In this situation, the Theorem 3.7 is not true for $r > 1$ as we can observe in the next example.

Example 3.9. Let $\mathcal{D}_\alpha = \mathcal{C}_1 \cup \mathcal{C}_2$ be a plane curve such that the branches are given by $f_1 = y^2 - 2x^2y - x^3 + x^4$ and $f_2 = y^2 - \alpha x^3$ with $\alpha \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$, or equivalently, given by the parametrizations $\varphi_1(t) = (t_1^2, t_1^3 + t_1^4)$ and $\varphi_2(t) = (t_2^2, \sqrt{\alpha} \cdot t_2^3)$.

We can obtain $\Gamma_{\mathcal{D}_\alpha}$ and $\Lambda_{\mathcal{D}_\alpha}$ by means algorithms in [CH], but we choose to describe explicitly the computations.

Any element $h \in \mathbb{C}\{x, y\}$ can be expressed by $h = q_1 \cdot f_1 + q_2 \cdot f_2 + A(x) \cdot y + B(x)$ and computing $(ord_{t_1}(\varphi_1(h)), ord_{t_2}(\varphi_2(h)))$ for any $h \in \mathbb{C}\{x, y\} \setminus \langle f_1 \rangle \cup \langle f_2 \rangle$ we get

$$\Gamma_{\mathcal{D}_\alpha} = \{(0, 0), (a, a); 2 \leq a \leq 7\} \cup \{(6, 6 + \mathbb{N}), (6 + \mathbb{N}, 6), (8, 8) + \mathbb{N}^2\} \text{ for } 0 \neq \alpha \neq 1 \text{ and}$$

$$\Gamma_{\mathcal{D}_1} = \{(0, 0), (a, a); 2 \leq a \leq 8\} \cup \{(7, 7 + \mathbb{N}), (7 + \mathbb{N}, 7), (9, 9) + \mathbb{N}^2\},$$

that is, $\Gamma_{\mathcal{D}_\alpha} \neq \Gamma_{\mathcal{D}_1}$ for $0 \neq \alpha \neq 1$.

Now, analyzing the values of 1-form we verify that the elements $(a, b) \in \Lambda_{\mathcal{D}_\alpha} \setminus \Gamma_{\mathcal{D}_\alpha}$ are such that $a, b \geq 6$.

Let us consider $\omega_1 = 3ydx - 2xdy, \omega_2 = \omega_1 + x^2dx \in \Omega^1$.

For $0 \neq \alpha \neq 1$ and for any $\gamma = 2i + 3j \in \langle 2, 3 \rangle$ the values of $df_2 + 3(1 - \alpha)\omega_1 + x^i y^j df_1$ and $df_1 + 3(1 - \alpha)\omega_2 + x^i y^j df_2$ are $(7, 6 + \gamma)$ and $(6 + \gamma, 7)$ respectively.

For $\alpha = 1$ and for any $\gamma = 2i + 3j \in \langle 2, 3 \rangle$, the 1-forms $\omega_1 + df_1, \omega_1 + x^i y^j \omega_2, \omega_2 + df_2, \omega_2 + x^i y^j \omega_1, x(\omega_1 + df_1), x(\omega_1 + x^i y^j \omega_2), x(\omega_2 + df_2)$ and $x(\omega_2 + x^i y^j \omega_1)$ give us the respective values $(6, 7), (6, 6 + \gamma), (7, 6), (6 + \gamma, 6), (8, 9), (8, 8 + \gamma), (9, 8)$ and $(8 + \gamma, 8)$.

In this way, we have $\Lambda_{\mathcal{D}_\alpha} = \{(2, 2), (3, 3), (4, 4), (5, 5), (6, 6) + \mathbb{N}^2\}$ for any $\alpha \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$.

Combining the previous result with Theorem 2.1 and the Algorithm 1 we have a method to verify if a subset $L \subseteq \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$ is a value set of 1-forms for some plane branch.

In fact, given $L \subseteq \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$ we compute $Ap(L)$, if L is not covered by $Ap(L)$ then, by Remark 3.3, $L \neq \Lambda_{\mathcal{C}}$ for any plane branch \mathcal{C} .

If L is covered by its Apéry set, then we compute the sequences $(\varepsilon_i)_{i=0}^{\varrho}, (\eta_i)_{i=0}^{\varrho}$ (see (2)) and the sets $B_i(L)$ for $0 \leq i \leq \varrho$ (see (3)).

Taking $u_i = \max(B_i(L))$, if $(u_i)_{i=0}^{\varrho}$ do not satisfy $\eta_i \geq 2$ and $\eta_{i-1}u_{i-1} < u_i$ for all $1 \leq i \leq \varrho$ then, by Theorem 2.1, the semigroup $G := \langle u_0, \dots, u_{\varrho} \rangle$ is not a value semigroup for any plane branch \mathcal{C} and, consequently by Theorem 3.7, L can not be a value set of 1-forms for any plane branch.

If the semigroup G satisfies the conditions of Theorem 2.1, that is, G is a value semigroup for some plane branch, then we compute all possible value sets $\Lambda_1, \dots, \Lambda_s$ of 1-forms associated to it by the Algorithm 1 and the set L will be a value set of 1-forms for some plane branch if and only if $L = \Lambda_j$ for some $1 \leq j \leq s$.

We summarize the above discussion in the following algorithm.

Algorithm 2:

Input: $L \subseteq \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$;
 Compute: $Ap(L)$;
 If L is not covered by $Ap(L)$
 Then L is not a value set for any plane branch;
 Else
 Compute: $\eta_i, B_i(L)$ and $u_i = \max(B_i(L))$ for $0 \leq i \leq \varrho$;
 If $\eta_i < 2$ or $\eta_{i-1}u_{i-1} \geq u_i$ for some $1 \leq i \leq \varrho$
 Then L is not a value set for any plane branch;
 Else
 Use Algorithm 1 to compute all possible Λ_j
 for branches with semigroup $\langle u_0, \dots, u_\varrho \rangle$;
 If $L = \Lambda_j$ for some j
 Then L is a value set for some plane branch;
 Else L is not a value set for any plane branch.

Let us illustrate the above algorithm with some examples.

Example 3.10. *Let us verify if the following are value set of 1-forms for some plane branch:*

$$\begin{aligned} L_1 &= \{6, 9, 12, 15, 16, 17, 18, 21, 22, 24, 25, 27 + \mathbb{N}\}, \\ L_2 &= \{6, 9, 12, 15, 16, 17, 18, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 27 + \mathbb{N}\}, \\ L_3 &= \{6, 9, 12, 15, 16, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 27 + \mathbb{N}\}, \\ L_4 &= \{6, 9, 12, 15, 16, 18, 19, 21, 22, 24, 25, 27 + \mathbb{N}\}. \end{aligned}$$

The respective Apéry set are: $Ap(L_1) = Ap(L_2) = \{6, 9, 16, 17, 25, 32\}$,

$$Ap(L_3) = \{6, 9, 16, 19, 23, 32\} \quad \text{and} \quad Ap(L_4) = \{6, 9, 16, 19, 29, 32\}.$$

The sets L_2, L_3 and L_4 are covered by their Apéry set, but L_1 is not covered by $Ap(L_1)$, because $23 \in 17 + \mathbb{N} \cdot 6$ but $23 \notin L_1$, so L_1 is not a value set of 1-forms for any plane branch.

We get $\varepsilon_0 = 6, \varepsilon_1 = 3, \varepsilon_2 = 1, \eta_0 = 1, \eta_1 = 2, \eta_2 = 3$ for L_i with $i = 2, 3, 4$,

$$B_0(L_2) = B_0(L_3) = B_0(L_4) = \{6\}, \quad B_1(L_2) = B_1(L_3) = B_1(L_4) = \{9\},$$

$$B_2(L_2) = \{16, 17\}, \quad B_2(L_3) = B_2(L_4) = \{16, 19\}.$$

The condition given in Theorem 2.1 is fulfill for L_3 and L_4 , but not for L_2 because $17 = \max(B_2(L_2)) < \eta_1 \cdot \max(B_1(L_2)) = 18$. Hence, L_2 is not a value set for any plane branch.

For L_3 and L_4 we get the value semigroup $\langle 6, 9, 19 \rangle$ and by Example 2.4 we verify that L_4 is a value set for any plane branch but the same is false for L_3 .

References

- [AAM] Alberich-Carramiñana, M.; Almirón, P. and Moyano-Fernández, J.-J., *Curve Singularities with one Puiseux Pair and Value Sets of Modules over Their Local Rings*. ArXiv: 2105.07943.
- [AH] Abreu, M. O. R. and Hernandes, M. E., *On the Analytic Invariants and Semiroots of Plane Branches*. ArXiv: 2104.11352.
- [B] Bresinsky, H., *Semigroups corresponding to algebroid branches in the plane*. Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society (32)2, 381-384 (1972).
- [C] Carbonne, P., *Sur le différentielles de torsion*. Journal of Algebra 202, 367-403 (1998).
- [CH] Carvalho, E. and Hernandes, M. E., *Standard Bases for fractional ideals of the local ring of algebroid curve*. Journal of Algebra 551, 342-361 (2020).
- [D] Delorme, C., *Sur les Modules des Singularités de Courbes Planes*. Bull. Soc. Math. France 106, 417-446 (1978).
- [DG] Dimca, A. and Greuel, G.-M., *On 1-forms on isolated complete intersection curve singularities*. Journal of Singularities 18, 114-118. (2018).
- [H] Hefez, A., *Irreducible plane curve singularities* in Real and Complex Singularities, Dekker Series of Lecture Notes in Pure and Applied Mathematics, V. 232, D. Mond and M. J. Saia, Editors (2003).
- [HH1] Hefez, A. and Hernandes, M. E., *Classification of algebroid plane curves with semigroup $\langle 6, 9, 19 \rangle$* . Communications in Algebra, 31(8), 3847-3861 (2003).
- [HH2] Hefez, A. and Hernandes, M. E., *Standard bases for local rings of branches and their modules of differentials*. J. Symbolic Comput. 42, 178-191 (2007).
- [HH3] Hefez, A. and Hernandes, M. E., *The analytic classification of plane branches*. Bull. London Math. Soc. 43(2), 289-298 (2011).
- [HH4] Hefez, A. and Hernandes, M. E., *The analytic classification of irreducible plane curve singularities* in Handbook of Geometry and Topology of Singularities II, J. L. C. Molina, L. D. Tráng and J. Seade, Editors. To appear.
- [P] Popescu-Pampu, P., *Approximate Roots*. Valuation theory and its applications, American Mathematical Society 33, (2003) 285-321.
- [Z1] Zariski, O., *Studies in Equisingularity I, II and III*. Amer. J. Math., (87), 507-536, 972-1006 (1965) and (90), 961-1023 (1970).
- [Z2] Zariski, O., *Le problème des modules pour les branches planes* (Hermann, Paris, 1986) (French); B. Lichtin, *The moduli problem for plane branches*, University Lecture Series 39 (American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2006) (English).

Abreu, M. O. R. Hernandes, M. E.
osnar@outlook.com *mehernandes@uem.br*

Universidade Estadual de Maringá

Maringá - Paraná - Brazil