Ergod. Th. & Dynam. Sys. (2017), **37**, 1443–1479 © *Cambridge University Press, 2016*
doi:10.1017/etds.2015.123

Classification of regular dicritical foliations

GABRIEL CALSAMIGLIA† and YOHANN GENZMER‡

† *Instituto de Matemática, Universidade Federal Fluminense, Rua Mário Santos Braga s/n, 24020-140, Niterói, Brazil (e-mail: gabriel@mat.uff.br)*

‡ *I.M.T., Université Paul Sabatier, Toulouse, France (e-mail: yohann.genzmer@math.univ-toulouse.fr)*

(*Received* 9 *July* 2014 *and accepted in revised form* 28 *September* 2015)

Abstract. In this paper we give complete analytic invariants for the set of germs of holomorphic foliations in $(\mathbb{C}^2, 0)$ that become regular after a single blow-up. Some of the invariants describe the holonomy pseudogroup of the germ and are called transverse invariants. The other invariants lie in a finite dimensional complex vector space. Such singularities admit separatrices tangentially to any direction at the origin. When enough separatrices are leaves of a radial foliaton (a condition that can always be attained if the multiplicity of the germ at the origin is at most four) we are able to describe and realize all the analytical invariants geometrically and provide analytic normal forms. As a consequence, we prove that any two such germs sharing the same transverse invariants are conjugated by a very particular type of birational transformation. We also provide explicit examples of universal equisingular unfoldings of foliations that cannot be produced by unfolding functions. With these at hand we are able to explicitly parametrize families of analytically distinct foliations that share the same transverse invariants.

1. *Introduction*

In this paper, we deal with analytic invariants, normal forms and unfoldings of germs of holomorphic foliations in $(\mathbb{C}^2, 0)$. Two such foliations are said to be analytically equivalent if there exists a germ of biholomorphism of $(\mathbb{C}^2, 0)$ sending leaves of one to leaves of the other. There are two known invariants under this equivalence. On the one hand, there are the analytic invariants of the *holonomy pseudogroup* formed by holonomy maps associated to leafwise paths and transverse sections at the endpoints that are realized on any neighborhood of the origin. These maps are holomorphic as soon as the foliation is. On the other hand, we know from [**5**] that there is a non-empty set of separatrices through zero. These are leaves L such that $L \cup 0$ is a germ of an analytic curve at zero. When the union of all separatrices is an analytic curve, there are instances where the analytical class of these two objects determines the analytical class of the foliation. For example, for

https://doi.org/10.1017/etds.2015.123 Published online by Cambridge University Press

generic homogeneous foliations, namely, foliations whose separatrix set is a homogeneous curve and whose singularities after one blow-up are of hyperbolic type, the analytical class of the curve and of the projective holonomy representation determine the analytical type of the singularity (see [**11**] or [**6**]). In particular, foliations defined by holomorphic vector fields whose multiplicity at the origin is less than five and with generic first homogeneous term, fall in the previous case. When the foliation admits an infinite number of separatrices a natural question is to decide whether there exists some analytic subset contained in the separatrix set whose analytical class, together with the analytical class of the holonomy pseudogroup, determines the analytical class of the foliation.

A different approach to the problem of determining analytic invariants was taken by Mattei in the 80s (see [**12**]). In the spirit of Kodaira and Spencer's theory of deformations of complex structures on manifolds, he proved that any germ $\mathcal{F}$ of holomorphic foliation of $(\mathbb{C}^2, 0)$ can be unfolded to a *codimension one* germ of foliation $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}$ on $(\mathbb{C}^{2+\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{F})}, 0)$ in such a way that any other unfolding of $\mathcal{F}$ that preserves the singularity type of $\mathcal{F}$ is equivalent to one obtained from $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}$ in a unique manner by pullback. He calculated the dimension $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{F})$ of the base space of this *universal equisingular unfolding* of $\mathcal{F}$ and concluded that it is always finite and almost always positive. By construction, the deformation of $\mathcal{F}$ obtained by considering the foliations $\{\mathcal{F}_c : c \in (\mathbb{C}^{\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{F})}, 0)\}$ of $(\mathbb{C}^2, 0)$ obtained by restricting $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}$ to the fibers of the projection $(\mathbb{C}^{2+\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{F})}, 0) \to (\mathbb{C}^{\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{F})}, 0)$ has the same singularity type and holonomy pseudogroup for all parameters (up to equivalence), but are not analytically equivalent. The moduli of Mattei tell us in how many ways we can locally change the analytical class of the foliation without changing the holonomy pseudogroup. In the case of homogeneous foliations, these moduli are simply the relative position of the points in the tangent cone of the set of separatrices: actually, they characterize the analytical class of the separatrix set. In general, we are not able to interpret geometrically the other moduli of Mattei. Indeed, the construction of the latter is not explicit, producing the foliations by foliated surgery. To our knowledge, the only known explicit examples of such non-trivial unfoldings were obtained by unfolding germs of functions. In fact, examples of families of foliations with varying analytical class but constant analytical class of its separatrix sets can be constructed by unfolding functions (see [**7**]). For example, the foliation defined by the germ at zero of the function

$$f(x, y, z) = (1 + z)xy(x + y)(x - y)(x + 2y + y^2)$$

defines a non-trivial unfolding of the foliation $\mathcal{F} = \{f(x, y, 0) = \text{const.}\}$ that has the same separatrix set for all parameters $z \in (\mathbb{C}, 0)$.

Yet another approach has been taken in recent years by Ortiz *et al* (see [**14**–**16**]). Their strategy is, on the one hand, to find unique formal normal forms (up to formal transformations with identical linear part) for certain families of foliations and, on the other, to prove that formal analytical rigidity takes place in the generic cases. Hence the coefficients of the formal normal form turn out to be analytical invariants. This infinite number of parameters is then split into two subsets: one of them is infinite and contains the information on the holonomy pseudogroup and the other is finite and contains the rest of parameters. The number of parameters that is not associated to the holonomy pseudogroup coincides with the number of Mattei's parameters although it is not clear how the formal

https://doi.org/10.1017/etds.2015.123 Published online by Cambridge University Press

deformations obtained in the formal normal forms correspond to unfoldings in the sense of Mattei. Again, it is not clear what these parameters mean geometrically.

In this paper, we will give a description of a complete family of invariants, their geometric interpretation, analytic normal forms and unfoldings for a particular class of germs of foliations admitting an infinite number of separatrices: homogeneous dicritical foliations. A germ of foliation $\mathcal{F}$ is said to be homogeneous dicritical if it is regular after a single blow-up and there exists a germ of foliation $\mathcal{G}$ with radial linear part such that $\mathrm{Tang}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ is invariant. After one blow-up, $\mathcal{F}$ can be thought of as a local version of regular Riccati foliations around the exceptional divisor, where the role of the fibration is taken by $\mathcal{G}$. In the simplest case where there exist non-trivial equisingular unfoldings, that is, when the algebraic multiplicity is three, we will provide a parametrization of the set of analytic equivalence classes. In its parameter space the equivalence relation 'having the same transverse invariants' is described by the fibers of a natural projection. Most of our arguments will be geometric as given in §§2 and 4.

In §3 we will apply formal methods to try to generalize the claims of the homogeneous case to the set of regular dicritical foliations, that is, germs of foliations that are regular after a single blow-up.

2. *Homogeneous dicritical foliations*

In this section we will introduce the basic properties of foliations that are regular after a single blow-up and describe a complete family of geometric invariants for homogeneous dicritical foliations. They will allow us to provide analytic normal forms for the latter family.

2.1. *Germs that are regular after a single blow-up.*

The set of all germs of foliations that are regular after a single blow up will be denoted by $\mathcal{D}$. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we denote by $\mathcal{D}(n)$ the set of foliations in $\mathcal{D}$ whose algebraic multiplicity is $n+1$. In particular, the elements of $\mathcal{D}(0)$ have radial linear part and will be called radial foliations. By Poincaré's linearization theorem, every radial foliation is holomorphically linearizable.

Given $\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{D}$, the pullback foliation by the blow-up map, denoted by $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}$, must be generically transverse to the exceptional divisor E by the Camacho–Sad index theorem [**5**]. Thus, the foliations in $\mathcal{D}$ are *dicritical*: they have an infinite number of invariant curves. In fact, every leaf is a separatrix. We call them *regular dicritical foliations*. We can define the *tangency divisor* $T(\mathcal{F}) := \mathrm{Tang}(\mathcal{F}, E) \in \mathrm{div}(E)$ between $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}$ and E. It is an effective divisor defined on the curve E whose degree is n if and only if $\mathcal{F}$ belongs to $\mathcal{D}(n)$. Klughertz showed in [**9**] that two foliations $\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{F}' \in \mathcal{D}$ are topologically equivalent if and only if there exists a homeomorphism from E to E sending $T(\mathcal{F})$ to $T(\mathcal{F}')$ (i.e. they are topologically equivalent as divisors of E). Thus any partition of $n = n_1 + \cdots + n_k$ defines a topological class in $\mathcal{D}(n)$ formed by foliations $\mathcal{F}$ having $T(\mathcal{F}) = n_1 p_1 + \cdots + n_k p_k$ for some pairwise distinct points p_i in E—see Figure 1.

The *holonomy pseudogroup* of such a foliation is quite simple: for any $p \in |T(\mathcal{F})|$, we can consider a local primitive holomorphic first integral f of $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}$ around p with connected fibers. The levels of the restriction $f_{|E}$ describe sets of points that belong to the same connected component of the fiber of f. Since $f_{|E}$ is a holomorphic germ in one complex

https://doi.org/10.1017/etds.2015.123 Published online by Cambridge University Press




FIGURE 1. A foliation in $\mathcal{D}$ with three points in its divisor of tangency $T(\mathcal{F})$.

variable, it can be written as a power ψ^{r+1}, where r is the order of tangency between $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}$ and E at p, and ψ is a holomorphic germ of diffeomorphism. If θ_p denotes the rotation of angle $2\pi/(r+1)$, the germ $H(\mathcal{F}, p) := \psi^{-1} \circ \theta_p \circ \psi$ and any of its powers realizes a holonomy map around each point q sufficiently close to p: it is the holonomy associated to a path in $f^{-1}(f(q))$ joining q and $H(\mathcal{F}, p)(q)$ and the transverse section E at both the starting point and the endpoint. Even if we reduce the neighborhood where the fibers of f are connected, we can still find points where the map is realized by the holonomy of some leafwise path. Up to reducing the neighborhood where $\mathcal{F}$ is defined, two different $H(\mathcal{F}, p)$ cannot be composed so the only holonomy maps are powers of elements of $H(\mathcal{F}, p)$. Thus

$$H(\mathcal{F}) = \bigsqcup_{p \in T(\mathcal{F})} H(\mathcal{F}, p)$$

is the generating set of the holonomy pseudogroup of the germ $\mathcal{F}$ and we will call it the *holonomy* of $\mathcal{F}$. If $T(\mathcal{F})$ is equal to $n_1 p_1 + \cdots + n_k p_k$, the holonomy pseudogroup of $\mathcal{F}$ is a disjoint union of finite cyclic groups of orders $n_1 + 1, \ldots, n_k + 1$ and it determines the topological class of $\mathcal{F}$.

If $\mathcal{F}' = \phi(\mathcal{F})$ for a holomorphic equivalence ϕ, then by construction

$$H(\mathcal{F}') = \phi_{|E} \circ H(\mathcal{F}) \circ \phi_{|E}^{-1},$$

where $\phi_{|E}$ is the *global* holomorphic automorphism of $E \cong \mathbb{P}^1$ induced by ϕ. Thus the class of $H(\mathcal{F})$ modulo global automorphisms of E is an analytical invariant of $\mathcal{F}$ that we will denote by $H[\mathcal{F}]$ and call the *holonomy class* of $\mathcal{F}$. As we will see along this section, this invariant is not enough, in general, to determine the analytical class of the foliation as soon as the algebraic multiplicity is bigger than two.

2.2. *Invariants of homogeneous dicritical foliations.* A foliation $\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{D}$ is said to be homogeneous dicritical if there exists a radial foliation $\mathcal{G}$ such that $\mathrm{Tang}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ is *invariant* by $\mathcal{F}$ (and therefore also by $\mathcal{G}$). In this case, we say that $\mathcal{F}$ is homogeneous with respect to $\mathcal{G}$. In other words, up to a change of coordinates (one that linearizes $\mathcal{G}$) there exists a subset of separatrices that is a union of straight lines and supports the tangency set of

https://doi.org/10.1017/etds.2015.123 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the foliation with the radial foliation. The subset of $\mathcal{D}$ formed by homogeneous dicritical foliations will be denoted by $\mathcal{D}^h$ and its subset $\mathcal{D}^h(n) = \mathcal{D}(n) \cap \mathcal{D}^h$ is formed by those having multiplicity $n+1$ at the origin. The following are examples of elements in $\mathcal{D}^h(n)$ for $n \geq 1$.

(1) Consider homogeneous polynomials $R(x, y)$ and $Q(x, y)$ of degrees n and $n+2$, respectively, such that R and xQ are coprime. The germ of foliation defined by a holomorphic 1-form

$$\omega(x, y) = (R(x, y) + \cdots)(x\,dy - y\,dx) + Q(x, y)\,dx$$

in a neighborhood of $0 \in (\mathbb{C}^2, 0)$, is homogeneous with respect to $x\partial_x + y\partial_y$ and is thus contained in $\mathcal{D}^h(n)$.

(2) Consider a smooth rational curve C embedded in a complex surface S with self-intersection $(n+2)$. Suppose that S is bifoliated by a pair of regular *transverse* holomorphic foliations $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{G}$ and that $\mathcal{G}$ is transverse to C at all points. Note that, by Camacho–Sad's theorem (see [**5**]), the regularity condition and $C \cdot C > 0$, C cannot be invariant by $\mathcal{F}$. Then the blow-up of S at $n+3$ points in $C \backslash \mathrm{Tang}(\mathcal{F}, C)$ produces two foliations $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}$ around a (-1)-curve. By Grauert's theorem, the contraction of this curve produces a regular point in a complex surface, endowed with two singular foliations. By construction, the germ of foliation associated to the initial $\mathcal{F}$ is homogeneous with respect to the radial foliation associated to $\mathcal{G}$, and thus belongs to $\mathcal{D}^h(n)$.

As we will see throughout this section, every homogeneous dicritical foliation can be interpreted in the way described by these examples.

The holonomy class of a foliation in $\mathcal{D}$ does not characterize the analytical class of the foliation in general, but, in the homogeneous case, it characterizes the modulo class as a very particular family of birational maps.

THEOREM I. *Any homogeneous dicritical foliation $\mathcal{F}$ is equivalent to one obtained by blowing up a foliation $\mathcal{F}_S$ on a surface S as in example (2). The analytical class of $\mathcal{F}_S$ in a neighborhood of the rational curve is uniquely determined by $H[\mathcal{F}]$.*

If we consider that a *local birational tranformation* stands for a map composed of successive changes of coordinates, blow-ups and contractions of compactified regular separatices, as illustrated in Figure 2, we deduce the following corollary directly.

COROLLARY 1. *Any pair of homogeneous dicritical foliations sharing the same holonomy class are locally birationally conjugated.*

The proof is based on an idea of Loray (see [**10**]) of extending germs of foliations along some separatrix by compactifying the leaf to a rational curve in some foliated complex surface. The hypothesis on the homogeneity of the foliations will allow us to make adequate choices for the extended foliations.

Given a holomorphic regular foliation $\mathcal{F}$ around a non-invariant embedded curve C in a complex surface S, we define the tangency divisor $T(\mathcal{F}) = \mathrm{Tang}(\mathcal{F}, C)$, its holonomy $H(\mathcal{F}) = \bigsqcup_{p \in |T(\mathcal{F})|} H(\mathcal{F}, p)$ and the holonomy class $H[\mathcal{F}]$ as the class of $H(\mathcal{F})$ modulo automorphisms of C. The main observation that we will exploit in this section is that if

https://doi.org/10.1017/etds.2015.123 Published online by Cambridge University Press




FIGURE 2. Local birational transformations in $\mathcal{D}$.

$\mathcal{G}$ is another regular foliation around C such that $\mathrm{Tang}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ is invariant, then the blow-up of S at a point $q \in C \backslash \{|T(\mathcal{F})| \cup |T(\mathcal{G})|\}$ produces a pair $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}$, $\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}$ of (singular) foliations in a complex surface $\widetilde{S}$. Around the strict transform $\widetilde{C}$ of C, both foliations are regular and still satisfy that $\mathrm{Tang}(\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}, \widetilde{\mathcal{G}})$ is invariant. By construction, the leaf corresponding to the exceptional divisor lies in the tangency set between both foliations. This transformation does not touch $T(\mathcal{F})$ and $T(\mathcal{G})$, and, in particular, the holonomies of $\mathcal{F}$ (respectively, $\mathcal{G}$) and $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}$ (respectively, $\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}$) coincide. By construction, $\widetilde{C} \cdot \widetilde{C} = C \cdot C - 1$. Our strategy is to revert this construction, as illustrated in Figure 3: start with a pair of regular foliations around a curve, extend the foliations along their (invariant) locus of tangencies in such a way that we can contract the invariant curve and obtain a new pair of regular foliations around a curve with bigger self-intersection. Iterating this process, we end up with a pair of regular *transverse* foliations around some curve with big self-intersection. Secondly, we analyze the invariants of such pairs of transverse holomorphic foliations around curves that are not invariant for any of the foliations.

Proof of Theorem I. Given a foliation $\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{D}^h(n)$, we consider a radial foliation $\mathcal{G}$ such that

$$\mathrm{Tang}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}) = r_1 L_{p_1} + \cdots + r_k L_{p_k},$$

where L_{p_i} is the leaf of $\mathcal{F}$ through the point $p_i \in E \backslash |T(\mathcal{F})|$. By construction, we can find local coordinates (u, y) around each point p_i where $p_i = (0, 0)$, $E = \{y = 0\}$, $\mathcal{G} = \{du = 0\}$ and for some unit f, $\mathcal{F} = \{du + u^r f(u, y)\, dy = 0\}$. The next lemma shows that we can find local normalizing coordinates for the pair $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ around each point p_i.

LEMMA 2. *Let us consider the germs at* $(0, 0)$ *of the forms*

$$\omega_1 = du + u^r f(u, y)\, dy, \quad \omega_2 = du + u^r\, dy,$$

where $r \geq 1$ *and* f *is local unit. Then the induced germs of foliations are analytically conjugated by a conjugacy of the form* $(u, y) \mapsto (u, y(\cdots))$.

https://doi.org/10.1017/etds.2015.123 Published online by Cambridge University Press




FIGURE 3. Key construction.

Proof. Since the two forms are smooth and locally transverse, except along $u = 0$, and since we require the conjugacy to preserve each leaf of the fibration $\pi : (u, y) \mapsto u$, it is uniquely determined on a neighborhood of $(u, y) = (0, 0)$, deprived of $u = 0$. Thus, it is enough to show that this conjugacy and its inverse are bounded near $(0, 0)$ and apply Riemann's extension theorem to conclude that the extension is a biholomorphism.

Let us describe the conjugacy on a neighborhood of $(u, y) = (0, 0)$, deprived of $u = 0$. To do so, we will interpret its restriction to a fiber as a composition of two holonomy maps: the first ϕ_1^{-1} going from a fiber to $y = 0$ via ω_1 and the second ϕ_2 from $y = 0$ to the fiber via ω_2. To get bounds, we consider a point $(\alpha, 0)$ and follow the leaf of ω_1 until one reaches the fiber $\pi^{-1}(u)$. Denote by $(u, \phi(\alpha, u))$ the point reached. To compute ϕ, we consider the Cauchy system defined by

$$\begin{cases} y(0) = 0, \\ y'(t)u(t, \alpha)^r f(u(t, \alpha), y(t)) + u'(t, \alpha) = 0, \end{cases} \quad \text{where } u(t, \alpha) = (1 - t)\alpha + tu.$$

Obviously, one has $y(1) = \phi(\alpha, u)$. By using bounds on the unit when integrating the differential equation, it can be checked that there exist $M > 0$ such that $|\phi_2 \circ \phi_1^{-1}(y)| \leq M|y|$ for every $|y| < \varepsilon$. By using the same argument applied for the inverse, we find $M >$

https://doi.org/10.1017/etds.2015.123 Published online by Cambridge University Press

$m > 0$ such that

$$m|y| \leq |\phi_2 \circ \phi_1^{-1}(y)| \leq M|y| \quad \text{for every } |y| < \varepsilon. \qquad \square$$

Notice that if $r \neq s$ then

$$du + u^r\, dy, \quad du + u^s\, dy$$

cannot be conjugated by a conjugacy that preserves the fibration $(u, y) \mapsto u$.

Taking two germs of regular transverse foliations $(\mathcal{R}_1, \mathcal{R}_2)$ at a point p, if we consider the blow-up at p and denote by E_1 the exceptional divisor and by $\mathcal{R}_i^1$ the saturated foliation around E_1 obtained from $\mathcal{R}_i$, then we create a locus of tangency

$$\mathrm{Tang}(\mathcal{R}_1^1, \mathcal{R}_2^1) = E_1.$$

Blowing-up again a point in E_1 that is regular for both foliations, we obtain a second divisor E_2, two foliations $\mathcal{R}_1^2, \mathcal{R}_2^2$ satisfying $\mathrm{Tang}(\mathcal{R}_1^2, \mathcal{R}_2^2) = E_1 + 2E_2$. Inductively, we can produce a pair of foliations $(\mathcal{R}_1^r, \mathcal{R}_2^r)$ in a neighborhood of a chain of r rational curves $E_1, \ldots, E_r$ satisfying

$$\mathrm{Tang}(\mathcal{R}_1^r, \mathcal{R}_2^r) = E_1 + 2E_2 + \cdots + rE_r.$$

By construction, around any regular point $p \in E_r$ of the $\mathcal{R}_i^r$ we can find coordinates (u, y) where $p = (0, 0)$, $E_r = \{u = 0\}$, $\mathcal{R}_1^r$ is given by $du = 0$ and $\mathcal{R}_2^r$ by $du + u^r g(u, v)\, dy = 0$ for some unit g.

Coming back to our initial pair of foliations $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$, thanks to Lemma 2, we can glue the pair of foliations around each common separatrix L_{p_i} to a germ of $(\mathcal{R}_1^{r_i}, \mathcal{R}_2^{r_i})$ at a regular point on E_{r_i}. We thus obtain a pair of foliations around a divisor with $1 + r_1 + \cdots + r_k$ rational curves. The original foliation $\mathcal{F}$ is analytically equivalent to the restriction of this foliation to the neighborhood of the initial divisor E. The divisors that have been added can be now contracted as a whole using, inductively, the classical result of Castelnuovo (see [**2**]). Note that, by construction, each chain contracts to a regular point with a pair of regular *transverse* foliations. Since, at each step, we contract a component that cuts the original divisor E, we get, at the end of the contraction, a rational curve C embedded with self-intersection

$$-1 + (r_1 + \cdots + r_k) = -1 + (n + 3) = n + 2$$

in a complex surface S. In its neighborhood, we get two regular foliations $(\mathcal{F}_S, \mathcal{G}_S)$ that are transverse at all points of E. By construction, $\mathcal{G}_S$ is also transverse to E at all points. On the other hand, $\mathcal{F}_S$ has tangency divisor $T(\mathcal{F}_S) = T(\mathcal{F})$ and, since the contractions and blow-ups are done outside $|T(\mathcal{F})|$, the holonomy is preserved so

$$H(\mathcal{F}_S) = H(\mathcal{F}).$$

This proves the first part of the claim in Theorem I: $\mathcal{F}$ is analytically equivalent to a germ obtained from $\mathcal{F}_S$ by a sequence of blow-ups, a restriction and a contraction. $\square$

As for uniqueness of this model $(\mathcal{F}_S, \mathcal{G}_S)$, we have the following lemma.

https://doi.org/10.1017/etds.2015.123 Published online by Cambridge University Press

LEMMA 3. *If* $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ *is a pair of germs of regular foliations around a smooth rational curve* C *embedded in a complex surface with* $C \cdot C = n + 2 > 2$*, the degree of* $T(\mathcal{F})$ *is* n *and* $\mathcal{G}$ *is transverse to* C*, then the foliations* $\mathcal{F}$ *and* $\mathcal{G}$ *are transverse around* C*.*

Given another pair $(\mathcal{F}', \mathcal{G}')$ *with the same properties around a rational curve* C' *in a complex surface, there exists a biholomorphism between two neighborhoods sending the pair* $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ *to* $(\mathcal{F}', \mathcal{G}')$ *if and only if* $H[\mathcal{F}] = H[\mathcal{F}']$*.*

Proof. We choose an open covering $\{U_i\}$ of C in the surface, holomorphic vector fields v_i on U_i generating $\mathcal{F}$ and holomorphic 1-forms ω_i generating $\mathcal{G}$ in the neighborhood of C. On the intersection $U_i \cap U_j$,

$$v_i = \phi_{ij} v_j,$$
$$\omega_i = \psi_{ij} \omega_j,$$

where ϕ_{ij} and ψ_{ij} are cocycles representing, respectively, the line bundles $T^*_{\mathcal{F}}$ and $N_{\mathcal{G}}$. Therefore the contraction $\omega_i(v_i)$ is a section of $[T^*_{\mathcal{F}} \otimes N_{\mathcal{G}}]_C$ since

$$\omega_i(v_i) = \psi_{ij}\phi_{ij}\omega_j(v_j).$$

Now, this section vanishes along C at the point where, precisely, $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{G}$ are tangent, and thus

$$\mathrm{Tang}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}) = \deg[T^*_{\mathcal{F}} \otimes N_{\mathcal{G}}]_C = -T_{\mathcal{F}} \cdot C + N_{\mathcal{G}} \cdot C.$$

Brunella's formula in [**2**] yields

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Tang}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}) &= -C \cdot C + \mathrm{Tang}(\mathcal{F}, C) + \chi(C) + \mathrm{Tang}(\mathcal{G}, C)\\ &= -(n+2) + n + 2 + 0 = 0.\end{aligned}$$

Suppose Φ is a biholomorphism sending the pair $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ to the pair $(\mathcal{F}', \mathcal{G}')$. Then the restriction $\phi := \Phi_{|C}$ satisfies

$$\phi_* T(\mathcal{F}) = T(\mathcal{F}') \quad \text{and} \quad H(\mathcal{F}') = \phi \circ H(\mathcal{F}) \circ \phi^{-1}. \tag{1}$$

Reciprocally, suppose $\phi : C \to C'$ is a biholomorphism satisfying (1). Then ϕ tells us which leaf of $\mathcal{F}$ goes to which of $\mathcal{F}'$. On the other hand, ϕ also tells us which leaf of $\mathcal{G}$ goes to which of $\mathcal{G}'$. If a point p lies on the intersection of a leaf of $\mathcal{F}$ with a leaf of $\mathcal{G}$, then there is a unique point $\Phi(p)$ lying at the intersection of the corresponding leaves of $\mathcal{F}'$ and $\mathcal{G}'$, provided p is sufficiently close to C. By holomorphicity and transversality of the foliations, this extension Φ of ϕ to a neighborhood of C is a holomorphic bijection. It sends the pair $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ to $(\mathcal{F}', \mathcal{G}')$, by construction. □

From the previous arguments, we prove Corollary 1 by finding a biholomorphism between the models that we have just constructed. The resulting composition of biholomorphisms, contractions and blow-ups might have indeterminacies. They lie on an invariant set that contains the separatrices over points that are blown up to obtain one of the foliations, but not blown up to obtain the other. When all those points coincide, the birational map does not have indeterminacies and it extends to a biholomorphism.

To identify the analytical invariants other than the holonomy $H[\mathcal{F}]$, we proceed to describe the possible ways of obtaining the foliation, as in Theorem I. Recall that, for

https://doi.org/10.1017/etds.2015.123 Published online by Cambridge University Press

a homogeneous curve, the projective class of the projectivized tangent cone determines the analytical class of the curve. For a homogeneous dicritical foliation $\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{D}^h(n)$ we define

$$\mathrm{div}^h(\mathcal{F}) = \{\mathrm{Tang}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})_{|E} \in \mathrm{div}(E) : \mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{D}(0), \mathcal{F} \text{ is homogeneous with respect to } \mathcal{G}\}.$$

Since $\mathcal{F}$ might be homogeneous with respect to different radial foliations, it is a non-empty subset of the set of divisors in E. A straightforward calculation shows that all of them are of degree $n+3$. Each of them contains the information on the analytical class of a divisor supported on a *homogeneous* set of separatrices of $\mathcal{F}$.

THEOREM II. (Invariants in $\mathcal{D}^h$) *Let $\mathcal{F}_1 \in \mathcal{D}^h(n)$ and $\mathcal{F}_2$ be germs of a holomorphic foliation in $(\mathbb{C}^2, 0)$. Then there exists $\varphi \in \mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{C}^2, 0)$ such that $\varphi_*(\mathcal{F}_1) = \mathcal{F}_2$ if and only if $\mathcal{F}_2 \in \mathcal{D}^h(n)$, and there exists $\phi = \varphi_{|E} \in \mathrm{Aut}(E)$ such that:*

- *$H(\mathcal{F}_2) = \phi \circ H(\mathcal{F}_1) \circ \phi^{-1}$; and*
- *for some $D \in \mathrm{div}^h(\mathcal{F}_1)$ (and, a posteriori, for all), $\phi_*(D) \in \mathrm{div}^h(\mathcal{F}_2)$.*

Note that, in $\mathcal{D}^h$, all the invariants can be read on the exceptional divisor E. Thus, in the case of a homogeneous dicritical foliation, the equivalence class of the pair $(H(\mathcal{F}), S_D)$, where S_D is the divisor of leaves over an element $D \in \mathrm{div}^h(\mathcal{F})$, classifies the analytical class of the foliation. It is worth remarking that the homogeneous separatrix set $|S_D|$ is not enough for classification. The divisorial information is needed.

Proof of Theorem II. First, suppose that $\mathcal{F}_1 \in \mathcal{D}^h(n)$ and $\mathcal{F}_2$ are equivalent via $\varphi \in \mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{C}^2, 0)$. By blowing up the origin at both the source and target of φ, once, we get that the lift of φ extends to E as a biholomorphism in a neighborhood of E that sends the saturation of the pullback foliation $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}_1}$ to the pullback foliation $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}_2}$. In particular, $\mathcal{F}_2$ has no singular points. Denote the restriction of this biholomorphism to E by $\phi \in \mathrm{Aut}(E)$. By construction, the holonomies satisfy

$$\phi \circ H(\mathcal{F}_1) \circ \phi^{-1} = H(\mathcal{F}_2).$$

Moreover, if $D \in \mathrm{div}(\mathcal{F}_1)$, then there exists a radial foliation $\mathcal{G}_1$ such that $\mathrm{Tang}(\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{G}_1)$ is invariant by $\mathcal{F}_1$ and $D = \mathrm{Tang}(\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{G}_1)_{|E}$. By applying φ on both sides, we get $\mathrm{Tang}(\varphi_*(\mathcal{F}_1), \varphi_*(\mathcal{G}_1))$ invariant by $\mathcal{F}_2 = \varphi_*(\mathcal{F}_1)$ and $\phi_*(D) = \mathrm{Tang}(\varphi_*(\mathcal{F}_1), \varphi_*(\mathcal{G}_1))_{|E}$ and, since $\varphi_*(\mathcal{G}_1)$ is a radial foliation, $\phi_*(D) \in \mathrm{div}(\mathcal{F}_2)$.

Reciprocally, suppose ϕ exists as in the statement of the theorem. Let $\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2$ be radial foliations such that $S_i = \mathrm{Tang}(\mathcal{F}_i, \mathcal{G}_i)$ is invariant by $\mathcal{F}_i$ and

$$D = \mathrm{Tang}(\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{G}_1)_{|E} \quad \text{and} \quad \phi_*(D) = \mathrm{Tang}(\mathcal{F}_2, \mathcal{G}_2)_{|E}. \tag{2}$$

The extension φ of ϕ to the neighborhood is uniquely defined and holomorphic if we impose

$$\varphi_*(\mathcal{F}_1) = \mathcal{F}_2 \quad \text{and} \quad \varphi_*(\mathcal{G}_1) = \mathcal{G}_2.$$

Indeed, ϕ indicates which leaf of $\mathcal{F}_1$ goes to which of $\mathcal{F}_2$ and which leaf of $\mathcal{G}_1$ goes to which of $\mathcal{G}_2$. If $p \in E$ is a point where the germs of $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{G}$ are transverse foliations, the projections $\pi_{\mathcal{F}}, \pi_{\mathcal{G}}$ onto E along $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{G}$, respectively, form a coordinate chart $\Psi_{(\mathcal{F},\mathcal{G})} =$

https://doi.org/10.1017/etds.2015.123 Published online by Cambridge University Press




FIGURE 4. Construction of normal forms.

$(\pi_{\mathcal{F}}, \pi_{\mathcal{G}})$ around p. Thus $\Psi^{-1}_{(\mathcal{F}', \mathcal{G}')} \circ (\phi, \phi) \circ \Psi_{(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})}$ describes an equivalence between $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ and $(\mathcal{F}', \mathcal{G}')$ in the complement of S_1. By construction, it extends ϕ.

It can then be extended holomorphically to S_1 as a biholomorphism of a neighborhood of the exceptional divisor by using Lemma 2 to both pairs $(\mathcal{F}_i, \mathcal{G}_i)$ around S_i. Thus, after contracting the exceptional divisor, we get a biholomorphism in a neighborhood of $0 \in \mathbb{C}^2$. □

Note that Theorem II is also true for $\mathcal{F}_1 = \mathcal{F}_2$ so that it also gives the structure of the group of automorphisms of $\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{D}^h$.

2.3. *Normal forms of homogeneous dicritical foliations.* Next, we will use the previous results to construct normal forms in a geometric manner. Recall that a Weierstrass polynomial is a monic polynomial in $\mathbb{C}\{x\}[y]$.

THEOREM III. *(Normal forms in $\mathcal{D}^h$) Let $\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{D}^h(n)$ and suppose $D \in \operatorname{div}^h(\mathcal{F})$. Then there exist coordinates (x, y) of $(\mathbb{C}^2, 0)$ where $\mathcal{F}$ is represented by a form*

$$W(x, y)(x\,dy - y\,dx) + Q(x, y)\,dx \tag{3}$$

satisfying that W is a Weierstrass polynomial in y of degree and order n, Q is a homogeneous polynomial of degree $n+2$ such that $xQ = 0$ represents D, and $Q(1, y)$ is monic. With these conditions the form is unique up to a choice of affine coordinates in E and local biholomorphisms tangential to a homothety.

Once the divisor D and the coordinate on E are fixed, the Weierstrass polynomial in the normal form encodes the information on the holonomy of the associated foliation.

Proof of Theorem III. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be in $\mathcal{D}^h(n)$. Let $\mathcal{G}$ be a radial foliation satisfying that $\operatorname{Tang}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ is invariant by $\mathcal{F}$ and $\operatorname{Tang}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})_{|E} = D$. Consider coordinates (x, y) in which

https://doi.org/10.1017/etds.2015.123 Published online by Cambridge University Press

$\mathcal{G}$ is linear such that the direction $x = 0$ corresponds to a point in the support of D. In this situation, the foliations $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{G}$ are, respectively, given by 1-forms

$$A(x, y)(x\,dy - y\,dx) + B(x, y)\,dx \quad \text{and} \quad x\,dy - y\,dx,$$

where B is a homogeneous polynomial of degree $n + 2$ and A is holomorphic.

Now consider the blow-up of the origin given in local charts by $x = uv$ and $y = v$. In a neighborhood of the leaf $u = 0$, we have $\mathcal{G}$ given by $du = 0$ and $\mathcal{F}$ given by $a(u, v)\,du + u^k b(u, v)\,dv$, where a and b are some local units and $k \geq 1$. As we did in the proof of Theorem I, we will compactify the separatrix $u = 0$ for the pair $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ around it with a convenient model, by using Lemma 2. The convenient model is the blow-up at the origin of the pair of germs of regular holomorphic foliations in two variables $(z, w) \in \mathbb{C}^2$ defined by $dw = 0$ and $dw + w^{k-1}\,dz = 0$, respectively. Indeed, the exceptional divisor is then invariant for both foliations and the tangency order between the foliations along it is k. By using Lemma 2, we can glue a neighborhood of a regular point for both foliations of this new (-1)-curve C to the pair $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ along the chosen separatrix—see Figure 4. In this way, we obtain a complex bifoliated surface that is a neighborhood of a union of two (-1)-curves that intersect transversely at a point. This neighborhood is well known. Indeed, let us consider the surface S obtained by blowing up once the point $(z, x) = (0, 0)$ in $\mathbb{CP}(1) \times \mathbb{D}$. We denote by $U_{-1,-1}$ any neighborhood of the union of the total transform of the divisor $x = 0$. Notice that this divisor is the union of two smooth rational curves, each of self-intersection equal to -1, that is, two (-1)-curves intersecting at a point transversely.

LEMMA 4. *Let $\hat{C}$ be the union of two (-1)-curves embedded in a complex surface that intersect transversely at one point. Then there exists a neighborhood of $\hat{C}$ that is isomorphic to some $U_{-1,-1}$.*

Proof. Using a classical result of Castelnuovo (see [**2**]), one can contract one of the (-1)-curves to a point. Since the (-1)-curves meet transversally, the self-intersection of the image of the other (-1)-curve by the contraction map is zero. Now, the theorem of Savelev [**18**, **19**] ensures that there exists a biholomorphism from a neighborhood of this curve to $\mathbb{CP}(1) \times \mathbb{D}$ sending the curve to the divisor $x = 0$ and the contraction point p to $(0, 0)$. This isomorphism can be lifted to the blow-up of the source at p and that of the target at $(0, 0)$, which produces the desired isomorphism. □

Using Lemma 4, the above situation is isomorphic to a couple of foliations defined in the neighborhood surface of type $U_{-1,-1}$. If we contract the image of the curve C, we are led to a couple of foliations $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}$ defined on $\mathbb{CP}(1) \times \mathbb{D}$ such that $\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}$ is regular and transverse to the divisor $E_0 = \mathbb{CP}(1) \times \{0\}$. The foliation $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}$ is regular and generically transverse to E_0. The divisor of tangency $\mathrm{Tang}(\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}, E_0)$ coincides with $T(\mathcal{F})$ and the tangency locus $\mathrm{Tang}(\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}, \widetilde{\mathcal{G}})$ is invariant. We can choose coordinates (s, t) in $(\mathbb{C}, 0) \times \mathbb{P}^1$ such that $\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}$ is given by $dt = 0$ and $(0, \infty)$ is the point where the divisor was contracted. Since $\mathrm{Tang}(\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}, \widetilde{\mathcal{G}})$ is invariant by $\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}$ also, $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}$ is given by a form

$$\omega(s, t) = A(s, t)\,dt + Q(t)\,ds,$$

where Q is a polynomial that has its roots precisely at the common leaves of $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}$. Thus it has degree at most $n + 2$. On the other hand, the function $A(s, t)$ is holomorphic in (s, t)

https://doi.org/10.1017/etds.2015.123 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and polynomial when restricted to each fixed s. Since $A(0, t)$ is a polynomial of degree n, for each $s \in (\mathbb{C}, 0)$, there exists a constant $u(s) \in \mathbb{C}^*$ and a unique monic polynomial of degree n, $r(s, t) = t^n + \hat{a}_{n-1}(s)t^{n-1} + \cdots + \hat{a}_0(s)$, such that $A(s, t) = u(s)r(s, t)$. Indeed, all the components of the divisor of tangency between $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}$ and the fibration $ds = 0$ pass through the points $(0, t_i)$, where t_i is some root of $r(0, t) = 0$. By defining a new variable x by the relation $dx = ds/(u(s))$, the foliation $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}$ is represented in the (x, t) variables of $(\mathbb{C}, 0) \times \mathbb{P}^1$ by

$$(t^n + a_{n-1}(x)t^{n-1} + \cdots + a_0(x))\, dt + Q(t)\, dx \tag{4}$$

for some holomorphic germs $a_0, \ldots, a_{n-1} \in \mathbb{C}\{x\}$. Blowing up the point $(0, \infty)$ and contracting the strict transform of $0 \times \mathbb{P}^1$ which has self-intersection -1 corresponds, in this chart, to setting $t = y/x$. Multiplying the resulting expression by x^{n+2} gives a holomorphic germ of 1-form that has the desired form (3). This finishes the existence part of the statement in Theorem III.

We next show the uniqueness statement of Theorem III. Thanks to Theorem II, it suffices to show that two forms given in equation (4), that share the same component on dx and the same holonomy, have to be equal. We will prove this by a formal argument.

Let us denote by $\widehat{I}^{t_i}_{r_i+1}$ the set of formal series in $(t - t_i)$ that are formally conjugated to the rotation of angle $2\pi/(r_i + 1)$ around t_i, that is, series

$$h(t) = e^{(2\pi i)/(r_i+1)}(t - t_i) + \sum_{j\geq 2} h_{ij}(t - t_i)^j \quad \text{such that } h^{r_i+1} = \mathrm{Id}.$$

Let us consider a monic polynomial r of degree n, $r(t) = (t - t_1)^{r_1} \cdots (t - t_k)^{r_k}$ where $t_i \neq t_j$ if $i \neq j$. Now, choose a polynomial function $q(t, x) \in \mathbb{C}[[t, x]]$ such that $r(t)$ and $q(t, 0)$ have no common roots and define the set of formal 1-forms

$$\widehat{\Omega}_{r,q} = \{(r(t) + w(t, x))\, dt + q(t, x)\, dx : w \in x\mathbb{C}[[x]][t] \text{ satisfies } \deg_t w < n\}.$$

For each $\omega \in \widehat{\Omega}_{r,c}$ and $i = 1, \ldots, k$ define $h_i \in \widehat{I}^{t_i}_{r_i+1}$ to be the formal series in $(t - t_i)$ satisfying $\hat{f} \circ h = \hat{f}$ for some local formal first integral $\hat{f}$ of ω around t_i. In the case of convergent ω, it coincides with the series of the generator of $H(\mathcal{F}_\omega, t_i)$ and, in general, we call it the formal holonomy of the formal foliation $\mathcal{F}_\omega$.

LEMMA 5. *The map* $\mathrm{hol}_{r,q} : \widehat{\Omega}_{r,q} \to \widehat{I}^{t_1}_{r_1+1} \times \cdots \times \widehat{I}^{t_k}_{r_k+1}$ *defined by*

$$\mathrm{hol}_{r,q}(\omega) = (h_1, \ldots, h_k)$$

is a bijection.

Proof. First observe that for each $h \in \widehat{I}^{t_0}_r$ there exists a unique formal first integral, that is, a formal series $f(t)$ such that $f \circ h = f$ of the form

$$f(t) = (t - t_0)^r + \sum_{j\geq r+1} f_j(t - t_0)^j \quad \text{such that } f_j = 0 \quad \text{for all } j \equiv 0 \pmod r \tag{5}$$

that we will call *normalized*. Given $(h_1, \ldots, h_k) \in \widehat{I}^{t_1}_{r_1+1} \times \cdots \times \widehat{I}^{t_k}_{r_k+1}$ we want to find a unique $\omega \in \widehat{\Omega}_{r,q}$ satisfying $\mathrm{hol}_{r,q}(\omega) = (h_1, \ldots, h_k)$. If such ω exists, we can consider k formal local first integrals $f^j = \sum x^i f^j_i(t) \in \mathbb{C}[[x, t - t_j]]$ for the foliation near $t = t_j$ such that $f^j_0(t)$ is normalized, as defined above. Below, we are going to construct,

https://doi.org/10.1017/etds.2015.123 Published online by Cambridge University Press

inductively, ω and its k formal first integrals. By definition, around the point t_j,

$$0 \equiv \omega \wedge df^j = (r(t) + w(t, x))\left(\sum_{i\geq 1} i f_i^j(t)x^i\right) - q(t, x)\left(\sum_{i\geq 0} \frac{df_i^j}{dt}(t)x^i\right). \quad (6)$$

Evaluating (6) on $x = 0$, we get $r(t)f_1^j(t) = q(t, 0)(df_0^j/dt)(t)$. Since $r(t)$ and $(df_0^j/dt)(t)$ have the same order at $t = t_j$, f_1^j is a power series satisfying

$$f_1^j(t_j) \neq 0.$$

The coefficient of x in (6) is

$$0 \equiv r(t)2f_2^j(t) + w_1(t)f_1^j(t) - \cdots, \quad (7)$$

where the dots refer to terms depending only on f_0, f_1 and q. Now, since $(t - t_j)^{r_j}$ divides r and $f_1^j(t_j) \neq 0$, the values of $w_1(t_j), \ldots, (w_1)^{(r_j-1)}(t_j)$ do not depend on f_2, but only on f_0, f_1 and q. Adding up all the conditions, we find a polynomial of degree at most $n - 1$ determined by $n = \sum r_j$ conditions. Thus, there exists a unique possibility for w_1. As a consequence, we can define f_2^j for all j by using (7). By induction, suppose that $\{f_1^j, \ldots, f_l^j\}$ and $\{w_1, \ldots, w_{l-1}\}$ are defined. Let us construct f_{l+1}^j and w_l. The coefficient of x^l in (6) is given by

$$0 \equiv r(l + 1)f_{l+1}^j + w_l f_1^j + \cdots, \quad (8)$$

where the dots stand for an expression depending only on f_a^j and w_b with $a \leq l$ and $b \leq l - 1$. By considering equation (8) and its derivatives up to order r_j evaluated on t_j, we obtain n conditions on w_l that uniquely determine it. As a consequence, we define f_{l+1}^j for all j by using (8). This proves the induction step and thus the proposition. □

From this construction, it is clear that once we have chosen a divisor D and an affine coordinate t in the exceptional divisor E such that $t = \infty$ corresponds to the direction $x = 0$, we already get a unique polynomial Q provided that we impose that $Q(1, t)$ is monic. Applying Lemma 5, two foliations defined by normal forms $W_j(x, y)(x\,dy - y\,dx) + Q(x, y)\,dx$ for $j = 1, 2$ have the same holonomy if and only if they are equal. Hence the normal form with monic $Q(1, t)$ is unique up to the choices of D, the coordinate in E and equivalences that fix each point of E. This last type of equivalence corresponds, precisely, to the local biholomorphism having a linear part that is some multiple of the identity. □

In Lemma 5 we do not know whether the preimage of a holomorphic k-uple $(h_1, \ldots, h_k)$ by the map $\mathrm{hol}_{r,c}$ is convergent in full generality. For future reference, we state a particular case that will be useful.

PROPOSITION 6. *Let $n \geq 1$, $r(t) = t^n$ and $c(t) = t - 1$. The restriction of $\mathrm{hol}_{r,c}$ to the space $\Omega_{r,c}$ of convergent elements in $\widehat{\Omega}_{r,c}$ defines a bijection onto the space I_{n+1}^0 of convergent germs in $\widehat{I}_{n+1}^0$.*

https://doi.org/10.1017/etds.2015.123 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Proof. Let $h \in I^0_{n+1}$ be given. First, consider $\omega_0 = t^n\,dt + c(t)\,dx \in \Omega_{r,c}$. Since all germs at zero of order $n+1$ are locally conjugated, there exists a local diffeomeorphism $\varphi \in \mathrm{Diff}(\mathbb{C}, 0)$ such that $h = \varphi^{-1} \circ \mathrm{hol}(\omega_0) \circ \varphi$. Next, note that ω_0 can be extended to a foliation around the (-1)-curve $E_1 = \{x = 0\}$. On the chart (y, u), defined by $t = 1/u$ and $x = yu$, the foliation is defined by

$$\eta_0 = (-1 + uy\tilde{c}(u))\,du + (u^2\tilde{c}(u))\,dy, \tag{9}$$

where $\tilde{c}(u) = u^{n+1}c(1/u)$ is a polynomial. This foliation is, in turn, defined around the curve $E_2 = \{u = 0\}$ and it can also be extended to a foliation around a (-1)-curve containing $u = 0$. Indeed, it suffices to observe that η_0 is the blow-up at the regular point of $-du + u\tilde{c}(u)\,dv$ by the map $v = yu$. On the other hand, the radial foliation around E_1, defined by dt and du on respective charts, extends also to the neighborhood of the (-1)-curve E_2. In this way, we obtain a pair $(\mathcal{F}_0, \mathcal{G}_0)$ defined around $E_1 \cup E_2$. The tangency locus between both foliations is invariant by $\mathcal{F}_0$ (and also by $\mathcal{G}_0$).

Note that the change of coordinates between ω_0 and η_0 can be described geometrically as follows. It is the only equivalence that acts like $(0, t) \mapsto (1/t, 0) = (u, y)$ on a small annulus $\{0 < |t| < r\}$ and sends the foliation pair (ω_0, dt) to the foliation pair (η_0, du). If we choose a different gluing on the divisor, say, $(0, t) \mapsto (1/\varphi(t), 0)$, we can still extend to an equivalence, defined on a neighborhood of the annulus, by imposing that the pair (ω_0, dt) is sent to the pair (η_0, du). In this way we obtain a pair of foliations $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ around a union of two (-1)-curves that we still call E_1 and E_2, satisfying that $\mathrm{Tang}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ is invariant by $\mathcal{F}$ and intersects E_1 transversally at two different points $q_1 = E_2 \cap E_1$ and $q_2 \in E_1$. The divisor $\mathrm{Tang}(\mathcal{F}, E_1)$ has a unique point p in its support. By construction, in the unique coordinate $w : E_1 \to \mathbb{C}P^1$ for which $w(q_1) = 0$, $w(q_2) = 1$ and $w(p) = \infty$, two points $w_1, w_2 \in \{w \in E_1 : |w| \gg 1\}$ belong to the same leaf of $\mathcal{F}$ if and only if they belong to the same orbit of $1/h(1/w)$. In other words, the holonomy $H(\mathcal{F})$ measured in the coordinate $s = 1/w$ is precisely the series $h(s)$. Using Lemma 4, we get a pair of foliations $(\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{G}_1) \simeq (\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ defined on a neighborhood of $\{0\} \times \mathbb{CP}^1$ in $\mathbb{D} \times \mathbb{CP}^1$. Let (z, s) be some coordinates where the foliation $\mathcal{G}_1$ is defined by ds. In these coordinates, $\mathcal{F}_1$ is defined by a holomorphic 1-form $u(z)(s^n + b_{n-1}(z)s^{n-1} + \cdots + b_0(z))\,ds + (s-1)\,dz$, where u is a unit. After changing the z-coordinate by $x \in (\mathbb{C}, 0)$ satisfying $dx = dz/(u(z))$, the foliation $\mathcal{F}_1$ is defined by a holomorphic 1-form

$$\omega_1 = (s^n + a_{n-1}(x)s^{n-1} + \cdots + a_0(x))\,ds + (s-1)\,dx$$

for some $a_0, \ldots, a_{n-1} \in x\mathbb{C}\{x\}$. Blowing-up the point $(0, \infty) \in \mathbb{D} \times \mathbb{CP}^1$ does not change the expression of the normal form ω_1 whose holonomy is the holonomy of $\mathcal{F}$. □

2.4. *The spaces $\mathcal{D}^h(n)$.* In this section, we will analyze the sets $\mathrm{div}^h(\mathcal{F})$ for foliations $\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{D}$. The analysis will lead us to a complete description of the moduli spaces of homogeneous dicritical foliations of small algebraic multiplicity. We will provide analytic normal forms for these cases by applying Theorem III with appropriate choices of the topological class of the divisors $D \in \mathrm{div}^h(\mathcal{F})$ and coordinates in E.

For any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $A \subset E$, let $\mathrm{div}(E\backslash A)(k)$ denote the set of *positive* divisors in $E\backslash A$ of degree k. If $A = \emptyset$, this space is equivalent to the projectivization of the space of

https://doi.org/10.1017/etds.2015.123 Published online by Cambridge University Press

homogeneous polynomials in two variables of degree k, which has the structure of $\mathbb{P}^k$. Given $\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{D}(n)$, define

$$\operatorname{div}(\mathcal{F}) = \{\operatorname{Tang}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})_{|E} \in \operatorname{div} E(n+3) : \mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{D}(0)\}. \tag{10}$$

A straightforward calculation shows that it is a four-dimensional affine subvariety of $\operatorname{div} E(n+3)$, regardless of the value of n. By definition, it contains the (possibly empty) set $\operatorname{div}^h(\mathcal{F})$.

THEOREM IV. *The set $\mathcal{D}^h(n)$ is equal to $\mathcal{D}(n)$ if and only if $n \leq 3$. Moreover:*

(1) *if $\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{D}(1)$, then $\operatorname{div}^h(\mathcal{F}) = \operatorname{div}(\mathcal{F}) = \operatorname{div}(E \setminus |T(\mathcal{F})|)(4)$;*

(2) *if $\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{D}(2)$, then $\operatorname{div}^h(\mathcal{F}) = \operatorname{div}(\mathcal{F})$. Let $q(\mathcal{F}) \subset \operatorname{div}^h(\mathcal{F})$ be the set of divisors with a single point in its support:*
   - *if $T(\mathcal{F}) = p_1 + p_2$, then $|q(\mathcal{F})| = 5$; and*
   - *if $T(\mathcal{F}) = 2p_1$, then $|q(\mathcal{F})| = 1$;*

(3) *if $\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{D}(3)$, then $\operatorname{div}^h(\mathcal{F})$ is a quadric in $\operatorname{div}(\mathcal{F})$. The set $q(\mathcal{F})$ of divisors in $\operatorname{div}^h(\mathcal{F})$ with a point of order at least four in its support is non-empty and contains at most 24 elements:*
   - *if $T(\mathcal{F}) = p_1 + p_2 + p_3$, then, generically, $|q(\mathcal{F})| = 24$;*
   - *if $T(\mathcal{F}) = 2p_1 + p_2$, then, generically, $|q(\mathcal{F})| = 18$; and*
   - *if $T(\mathcal{F}) = 3p_1$, then, generically, $|q(\mathcal{F})| = 6$;*

(4) *the 1-form*
$$y^4(x\,dy - y\,dx) + x^6\,dx + y^7\,dy$$
defines a foliation in $\mathcal{D}(4) \setminus \mathcal{D}^h(4)$; and

(5) *for any $n \geq 5$ the 1-form*
$$y^n(x\,dy - y\,dx) + x^{n+2}\,dx + y^2x^{n+1}\,dy$$
defines a foliation in $\mathcal{D}(n) \setminus \mathcal{D}^h(n)$.

In the case of $\mathcal{D}(1)$ we get a result of Cerveau (see [**9**]) as a consequence of Theorems II and IV that improves the statement of Corollary 1.

COROLLARY 7. *Two foliations in $\mathcal{D}(1)$ are analytically equivalent if and only if they share the same holonomy class.*

Remark 8. From Theorem IV, we deduce that for $\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{D}^h(n)$ with $n \leq 3$, $\operatorname{div}^h(\mathcal{F}) \subset \operatorname{div} E(n+3)$ is an affine subvariety of positive dimension. The codimension of this subvariety is $(n(n-1))/2$, which is precisely the dimension $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{F})$ of the base space of the universal unfolding of $\mathcal{F}$ (see [**12**]). The deformation $\{\mathcal{F}_c\}_{c \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{F})},0}$ underlying a universal equisingular unfolding of $\mathcal{F}$ will be formed by homogeneous dicritical foliations. By using the argument in the proof with parameters, it is possible to show that there is a choice of divisors $D_c \in \operatorname{div}^h(\mathcal{F}_c)$ such that the germ of curve $c \mapsto D_c$ in $\operatorname{div}(E)(n+3)$ at $c = 0$ is holomorphic and transverse to $\operatorname{div}^h(\mathcal{F})$. In §4 we will see how this information can be used to explicitly find 1-forms defining unfoldings. In the case $n \geq 4$ we have that the base space of the universal equisingular unfolding is already bigger than the dimension of $\operatorname{div} E(n+3)$. This indicates that the universal unfolding of an element in $\mathcal{D}^h(n)$ with $n \geq 4$ needs to leave the locus of homogeneous dicritical foliations.

https://doi.org/10.1017/etds.2015.123 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Proof of Theorem IV. A germ of function h in $\mathbb{C}^2$ is quasi-homogeneous if and only if there exists a vector field X such that $X \cdot h = h$. In the same way, we obtain the following criterion for a foliation $\mathcal{F}$ to be in $\mathcal{D}^h$.

LEMMA 9. *Let ω be a convergent 1-form representing $\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{D}(n)$. Then $\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{D}^h(n)$ if and only if there exists a formal vector field $\hat{X}$ with radial linear part and a formal unit $\hat{u}$ such that*

$$\hat{X} \cdot \omega(\hat{X}) = \hat{u}\omega(\hat{X}). \tag{11}$$

Proof. Suppose that there exist $\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{D}(0)$ such that $\mathrm{Tang}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ is invariant by $\mathcal{F}$. Then, it is also invariant by $\mathcal{G}$. Now, let us consider X and ω to be any vector field and form that represent, respectively, $\mathcal{G}$ and $\mathcal{F}$. The contraction $\omega(X)$ is an equation of the tangency locus. Since it is invariant by X, the derivative $X \cdot \omega(X)$ can be holomorphically divided by $\omega(X)$, and thus there exists a function u such that

$$X \cdot \omega(X) = u\omega(X).$$

Looking at the multiplicity at zero of both components of the equality above ensures that u is a unit, that is, $u(0) \neq 0$. Here, X and u are convergent, and thus also formal. Conversely, if (11) has a formal solution, then $\omega(\hat{X})$ is the product of formal equations of convergent separatrices of $\mathcal{F}$. Thus there exist a formal unit $\hat{v}$ and a *convergent* equation $F = 0$ of separatrices of $\mathcal{F}$ such that

$$\omega(\hat{X}) = \hat{v}F.$$

This last equation has a formal solution $(\hat{X}, \hat{v})$. We deduce the existence of a convergent solution (X, v) to the above equation by Artin's theorem (see [**1**]), whose first jets coincide with those of $(\hat{X}, \hat{v})$. The convergent vector field X then satisfies equation (11) for some unit u. □

LEMMA 10. *Let ω be a 1-form representing $\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{D}(n)$. Suppose that there exist a vector field X and a unit u such that*

$$j^{2n+1}(X \cdot \omega(X) - u\omega(X)) = 0.$$

Then $\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{D}^h(n)$.

Proof. In the proof below, the notation $\square_i$ stands for the homogeneous component of degree i of the object $\square$. Suppose that there exist a vector field X and a unit u as in the Lemma. We are going to modify the component of degree $k+3$ of X and of degree $k+1$ of u so that

$$j^{n+3+k+1}(X \cdot \omega(X) - u\omega(X)) = 0.$$

That will ensure the existence, by induction, of a formal solution to the equation (11). Now, a straightforward computation shows that

$$(X \cdot \omega(X) - u\omega(X))_{n+3+k+1} = \omega_{n+1}(X_{k+3} + u_{k+1}X_2) + u_{k+1}\omega_{n+2}(X_1) + (\cdots). \tag{12}$$

Here the dots $(\cdots)$ stand for terms which depend only on components of u of degree strictly smaller than $k+1$ and of components of X of degree strictly smaller than $k+3$.

https://doi.org/10.1017/etds.2015.123 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Let us denote the component of degree k of X by $X_k = A_k\partial x + B_k\partial y$. From the equation above and using the notation $\omega = R_n(x\,dy - y\,dx) + P_{n+2}\,dx + Q_{n+2}\,dy + \cdots$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}&(X\cdot\omega(X) - u\omega(X))_{n+3+k+1}\\ &\quad = R_n(yA_{k+3} - xB_{k+3} + u_{k+1}(yA_2 - xB_2)) + u_{k+1}(xP_{n+2} + yQ_{n+2}) + (\cdots).\end{aligned}$$

This equation can always be made equal to zero provided that $n - 1 \le k + 1$: indeed, since R_n and $xP_{n+2} + yQ_{n+2}$ are relatively prime, applying Bézout's theorem in $\mathbb{C}[t]$, where $t = y/x$, to the relation above ensures the existence of a polynomial function $\tilde{u}$ of degree smaller than $n - 1$ and a polynomial function $\tilde{V}$ of degree smaller than $n + 3$ such that

$$\tilde{R}_n\tilde{V} + \tilde{u}(\tilde{P}_{n+2} + t\tilde{Q}_{n+2}) + (\tilde{\cdot}\,\tilde{\cdot}) = 0.$$

Since $n - 1 \le k + 1$ and $n + 3 \le k + 4$, it can be seen that one can find A_{k+3}, B_{k+3} and u_{k+1} such that equation (12) is satisfied. □

COROLLARY 11. *The subset* $\mathrm{div}^h(\mathcal{F})$ *is an algebraic subvariety of* $\mathrm{div}(\mathcal{F})$.

Now, we can give the proof of Theorem IV.

In what follows, we will use the notation introduced in the proof of Lemma 10 and denote the function $xP_{n+2} + yQ_{n+2}$ by S_{n+3}.

(1) For $n = 1$, consider any radial vector field X. Since the multiplicity of $\omega(X)$ is at least four,

$$j^3(X\cdot\omega(X) - u\omega(X)) = 0$$

for any unity u. Moreover, setting $u(0) = 4$ yields

$$j^4(X\cdot\omega(X) - u\omega(X)) = 0.$$

Thus, according to the proof of Lemma 10, for any radial vector field X, the tangent cone of $\omega(X)$ belongs to $\mathrm{div}^h(\mathcal{F})$. Now, using the notation of the proof of (10),

$$j^4(\omega(X)) = R_1(yA_2 - xB_2) + xP_3 + yQ_3,$$

whose projectivized tangent cone can be any element of $\mathrm{div}(E\backslash|T(\mathcal{F})|)(4)$ by appropriately choosing A_2 and B_2. Therefore,

$$\mathrm{div}^h(\mathcal{F}) = \mathrm{div}(E\backslash|T(\mathcal{F})|)(4).$$

Notice, also, that one can make the following argument for $n = 1$: any 4-uple of smooth invariant curves can be straightened to their tangential lines by a local biholomorphism. In the new coordinates, say, (x, y), these four lines are invariant for the radial vector field, $R = x\partial x + y\partial y$. Since the multiplicity of the tangency locus is equal to four, the tangency locus is exactly these four lines. Now, according to the above corollary, $\mathrm{div}^h(\mathcal{F})$ is closed in $\mathrm{div}(\mathcal{F})$, which gives the property.

(2) For $n = 2$, setting $u(0) = 5$ yields

$$j^5(X\cdot\omega(X) - u\omega(X)) = 0.$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/etds.2015.123 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The same argument as above ensures that any divisor in $\mathrm{div}(\mathcal{F})$ that is the tangent cone of some $\omega(X) = 0$, for some radial vector field X, belongs actually to $\mathrm{div}^h(\mathcal{F})$. Now the tangent cone of the tangency locus between $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{D}(0)$ is written as

$$(\omega(X))_5 = \underbrace{xP_4 + yQ_4}_{H_5} + R_2 \underbrace{(yA_2 - xB_2)}_{S_3} = 0.$$

This tangent cone reduces to a single multiple point if and only if there exist a unit u and $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$ such that

$$H_5 + R_2 S_3 = u(x + \alpha y)^5.$$

If $|T(\mathcal{F})|$ is a single point, up to some linear change of coordinates, we can suppose that $R_2 = y^2$. Thus, the relation above implies that

$$\begin{cases} u = H_5(1, 0), \\ \alpha = \dfrac{(H_5)_{4,1}}{5H_5(1, 0)}, \end{cases}$$

where $(H_5)_{4,1}$ is the coefficient of $x^4 y$ in S_5. If $|T(\mathcal{F})|$ consists of two distinct points, up to some change of coordinates, we can suppose that $R_2 = y(y - 1)$. In this case, the solutions are given by the system

$$\begin{cases} u = H_5(1, 0), \\ (1 + \alpha)^5 = \dfrac{H_5(1, 1)}{H_5(1, 0)}, \end{cases}$$

which has exactly five solutions for $H_5(1, 1) \neq 0$.

(3) For $n = 3$, following the previous lemma, it is enough to show that there exists a solution to

$$j^7(X \cdot \omega(X) - u\omega(X)) = 0. \tag{13}$$

We consider the following notation

$$\omega = R_3(x\,dy - y\,dx) + P_5\,dx + Q_5\,dy + P_6\,dx + Q_6\,dy + \cdots.$$

Below, we are only going to consider the generic case, that is, when R has three distinct points in its tangent cone

$$R = (y - \tau_1 x)(y - \tau_2 x)(y - \tau_3 x).$$

Notice that we can suppose that $\tau_1 \neq 0$. Up to some multiplication by a unit, we can, furthermore, suppose that the vector field X can be written as

$$X = x\partial x + y\partial y + A_2\partial x + \delta_4 x^2 \partial y + A_3 \partial x + B_3 \partial y,$$

where A_2 is written in a Lagrange form

$$A_2(x, y) = \delta_1 \frac{(y - \tau_2 x)(y - \tau_3 x)}{(\tau_1 - \tau_2)(\tau_1 - \tau_3)} + \delta_2 \frac{(y - \tau_1 x)(y - \tau_3 x)}{(\tau_2 - \tau_1)(\tau_2 - \tau_3)} + \delta_3 \frac{(y - \tau_1 x)(y - \tau_2 x)}{(\tau_3 - \tau_1)(\tau_3 - \tau_2)}.$$

Finally, we set $u = 6 + u_1 + \cdots$ where $u_1 = u_{10}x + u_{01}y$. Here, the unknown variables are the δ, the two coefficients of u_1 and the coefficient of A_3 and B_3. If we define $\omega(X) = H_6 + H_7 + \cdots$, the initial equation (13) is written as

$$H_7 + u_1 H_6 - A_2 \partial_x H_6 - \delta_4 x^2 \partial_y H_6 = 0. \tag{14}$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/etds.2015.123 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Now, since H_7 is written as

$$H_7 = xP_6 + yQ_6 + P_5A_2 + Q_5\delta_4 x^2 + R_3(yA_3 - xB_3)$$

and thus contains A_3 and B_3 as free and linear parameters, equation (14) has a solution if and only if the evaluation at each point $(1, \tau_i)$ of (14), which are the roots of R_3, yields zero. Thus, we are led to a system of three equations that are written as

$$\delta_i^2 \frac{\partial R_3}{\partial x}(1, \tau_i) + u_{10}S_6(1, \tau_i) + u_{01}\tau_i S_6(1, \tau_i) + L_i(\{\delta_j\}_{j=1\cdots 4}) = 0, \quad i = 1, 2, 3,$$

where the function L_i are linear functions of δ_1, δ_2 and δ_3 and quadratic in δ_4. The last two equations for $i = 2, 3$ can be seen as a linear system in u_{10} and u_{01} with determinant

$$\begin{vmatrix} S_6(1, \tau_2) & \tau_2 S_6(1, \tau_2) \\ S_6(1, \tau_3) & \tau_3 S_6(1, \tau_3) \end{vmatrix} = S_6(1, \tau_2)S_6(1, \tau_3)(\tau_2 - \tau_3),$$

which is not equal to zero because S_6 and R_3 have no common root and $\tau_2 \neq \tau_3$. Thus u_{10} and u_{01} can be substituted into the first equation which can be solved because the coefficient of the quadratic term δ_1^2 is equal to $(\partial R_3/\partial x)(1, \tau_1) \neq 0$. If R_3 has, for instance, a double root, say, τ_1, then the second equation is replaced by the partial derivative of (14) with respect to y applied to $(1, \tau_1)$, which has also to be zero. Then, the computations are much the same as above. In any case, the final equation is quadratic in the variables δ_i and thus $\mathrm{div}^h(\mathcal{F})$ is a quadric.

Now, a point of coordinates $(1, t)$ which is in the support of some $\mathrm{div}^h(\mathcal{F})$ is of multiplicity four if and only if

$$H_6^{(i)}(1, t) = 0, \quad i = 0, \ldots, 3.$$

Let us write

$$H_6(1, t) = S_6(1, t) + R_3(1, t)(\alpha_0 + \alpha_1 t + \alpha_2 t^2 + \alpha_3 t^3).$$

Notice that the coefficients α_i can be written linearly in terms of δ_i. The previous equations can be written as

$$\begin{cases} \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 t + \alpha_2 t^2 + \alpha_3 t^3 = -\left(\dfrac{S_6}{R_3}\right)(1, t), \\ \alpha_1 + 2\alpha_2 t + 3\alpha_3 t^2 = -\left(\dfrac{S_6}{R_3}\right)^{(1)}(1, t), \\ 2\alpha_2 + 6\alpha_3 t = -\left(\dfrac{S_6}{R_3}\right)^{(2)}(1, t), \\ 6\alpha_3 = -\left(\dfrac{S_6}{R_3}\right)^{(3)}(1, t). \end{cases}$$

Solving the following linear system, we express each coefficient α_i as a rational function of the variable t, which appears to be of degree zero: therefore,

$$\alpha_i = \frac{\cdots}{R_3^4},$$

where the dots stand for some polynomial function of degree at most 12. Now, if we substitute these expressions into the quadratic equation that defines $\mathrm{div}^h(\mathcal{F})$, we are led to

https://doi.org/10.1017/etds.2015.123 Published online by Cambridge University Press

a polynomial equation of degree at most 24. To check that generically this polynomial function has degree 24 and 24 distinct solutions, it is enough to exhibit an example satisfying these two conditions. Using some standard symbolic computation program, we can verify that for

$$\mathcal{F} : y(y^2 - x^2)(x\,dy - y\,dx) + (x^5 + y^5 + x^4 y)\,dx$$

the polynomial function is

$$\begin{aligned} &\tfrac{10}{3}t^{24} + 20\,t^{22} - \tfrac{20}{3}t^{21} - \tfrac{190}{3}t^{20} - \tfrac{5944}{3}t^{19} - 5898t^{18} - 9472t^{17} - \tfrac{22\,709}{3}t^{16} \\ &\quad - 3732t^{15} - 1008t^{14} - \tfrac{5948}{3}t^{13} - 2783t^{12} - \tfrac{8224}{3}t^{11} - 394t^{10} + \tfrac{4616}{3}t^9 \\ &\quad + 207t^8 - \tfrac{2188}{3}t^7 - \tfrac{40}{3}t^6 + 248t^5 + \tfrac{251}{3}t^4 + \tfrac{32}{3}t^3 - \tfrac{40}{3}t^2 - \tfrac{32}{3}t - \tfrac{2}{3}, \end{aligned}$$

which has no common factor with $t(t^2 - 1)$ and has only simple zeros.

Now, the same argument can be performed when $T(\mathcal{F})$ has a double or a triple point. Generically, the degree of the polynomial function obtained as above will be 18 for a double point and 6 for a triple point.

(4) For $n \geq 5$, an obstruction to solve the equation (11) appears, immediately, for the jet of order $n + 4$. Indeed, if we take $R = y^n$, $P_{n+2} = x^{n+2}$, $Q_{n+3} = y^2 x^{n+1}$ and $Q_{n+2} = P_{n+3} = 0$, then $\partial_x H_{n+3} = (n+2)x^{n+1} + y^n(\cdots)$ and $\partial_y H_{n+3} = y^{n-1}(\cdots)$. The equation of degree $n + 4$ becomes

$$\begin{aligned} -y^3 x^{n+1} &= A_2 x^{n+2} + y^n(\cdots) + A_2((n+2)x^{n+1} + y^n(\cdots)) \\ &\quad + B_2(y^{n-1}(\cdots)) + u_1(x^{n+3} + y^n(\cdots)), \end{aligned}$$

which has no solution if $n \geq 5$ since there is no term in $y^3 x^{n+1}$ in the right-hand side of the above equality. Thus $\mathcal{D}^h(n) \neq \mathcal{D}(n)$ for $n \geq 5$.

(5) For $n = 4$, we also have $\mathcal{D}^h(n) \neq \mathcal{D}(n)$ but, to produce a counterexample, we had to use a symbolic computer program again. Indeed, the obstruction appears only on the homogeneous term of degree $n + 5 = 9$, whereas it appears on the term of degree $n + 4$ for any n bigger than five. Actually, the following form

$$y^4(x\,dy - y\,dx) + x^6\,dx + y^7\,dy$$

does not belong to $\mathcal{D}^h(4)$ while it belongs to $\mathcal{D}(4)$. Although it is quite long, the verification presents no special difficulty.

Finally, we conjecture that, for $n \geq 4$, the space $\mathcal{D}^h(n)$ has strictly positive codimension in $\mathcal{D}(n)$. To support this claim, we remark that whether or not an element of $\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{D}(n)$ belongs to $\mathcal{D}^h(n)$ relies on four parameters of the affine space $\mathrm{div}(\mathcal{F})$ that must satisfy $(n(n-1))/2$ equations, as highlighted in [**7**]. For $n \geq 4$, there are more conditions than parameters. □

For small values of n, we can give a precise finite list of normal forms by using the choices of divisors of Theorem IV. This is the object of the following corollary.

We say that an element $(a_1(x), \ldots, a_m(x))$ in $\mathbb{C}\{x\}^m$ is normalized if it is $(0, \ldots, 0)$ or if the first $a_i(x) \neq 0$, with i as small as possible, has its first non-zero monomial with coefficient one.

https://doi.org/10.1017/etds.2015.123 Published online by Cambridge University Press

TABLE 1. Convergent normal forms.

$T(\mathcal{F})$	Normal form	Nr.
p	$(y + x^3 a(x))(x\,dy - y\,dx) + x^3\,dx$, $a \in \mathbb{C}\{x\}$ is normalized	1
$2p$	$(y^2 + b(x)x^2 y + a(x)x^3)(x\,dy - y\,dx) + x^4\,dx$, where $(a, b) \in \mathbb{C}\{x\}^2$ is normalized	1
$p_1 + p_2$	$(y(y - x) + b(x)x^2 y + a(x)x^3)(x\,dy - y\,dx) + x^4\,dx$, where $a, b \in \mathbb{C}\{x\}$	10
$3p$	$(y^3 + c(x)x^2 y^2 + b(x)x^3 y + a(x)x^5)(x\,dy - y\,dx) + (x + \lambda_1 y)(x + \lambda_2 y)x^3\,dx$, where $(a, b, c) \in \mathbb{C}\{x\}^3$ is normalized and $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \mathbb{C}$	≤ 6
$2p_1 + p_2$	$(y^2(y + x) + c(x)x^2 y^2 + b(x)x^3 y + a(x)x^5)(x\,dy - y\,dx) + (x + \lambda_1 y)(x + \lambda_2 y)x^3\,dx$, where $a, b, c \in \mathbb{C}\{x\}$ and $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \mathbb{C}\backslash\{1\}$	≤ 18
$p_1 + p_2 + p_3$	$(y(y^2 - x^2) + c(x)x^2 y^2 + b(x)x^3 y + a(x)x^4)(x\,dy - y\,dx) + (x + \lambda_1 y)(x + \lambda_2 y)(x + \lambda_3 y)^3\,d(x + \lambda_3 y)$, where $a, b, c \in \mathbb{C}\{x\}$ and $\{\lambda_i\} \subset \mathbb{C}\backslash\{1, -1\}$	≤ 144

COROLLARY 12. *For any $\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{D}(n)$ with $n \leq 3$, there exists a finite number of convergent normal forms characterizing the analytical class of $\mathcal{F}$. They are summarized in Table 1.*

When a normal form is non-unique, we can deduce all the equivalent normal forms from any one of them.

Proof. Recall that, in Theorem III, the locus $xQ(x, y) = 0$ is $\mathrm{Tang}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{R})$ and the locus $W(1, y) = 0$ corresponds to $T(\mathcal{F})$. For $n \leq 3$, we are able to construct a finite family of normal forms that characterizes the analytical class of a given $\mathcal{F}$. The finite family depends on a finite number of possible choices of the relative position of the points of $T(\mathcal{F})$, on the special (finite) choice of elements in $\mathrm{div}^h(\mathcal{F})$ given in Theorem IV and, when these are not enough, on some special choice of the series defining the holonomy.

(1) If $n = 1$, then $T(\mathcal{F}) = p$ for some p in E. One can choose coordinates (x, y) such that $y = 0$ corresponds to the direction defined by p and $x = 0$ corresponds to the direction defined by the point of order four in $\mathrm{div}^h(\mathcal{F})$. In these coordinates, Theorem III provides normal forms that can be written as

$$(y + x^2 a(x))(x\,dy - y\,dx) + x^3\,dx.$$

Now, if we apply an scaling $(x, y) \to (\lambda^2 x, \lambda^3 y)$, then the form is written as

$$(y + x^2 \lambda a(\lambda x))(x\,dy - y\,dx) + x^3\,dx.$$

Thus either $a = 0$ and the form admits a meromorphic first integral which is invariant by scaling, or $a \neq 0$ and one can normalize a. Having made all these normalizations, the normal form is then unique up to E-equivalence.

(2) If $n = 2$ and $T(\mathcal{F}) = 2p$, then one can choose for a point at ∞ the unique point of order four in $\mathrm{div}^h(\mathcal{F})$ whose existence is ensured by Theorem IV. As before, Theorem III provides normal forms of type

$$(y^2 + a(x)x^3 + b(x)x^2 y)(x\,dy - y\,dx) + x^4\,dx.$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/etds.2015.123 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Finally, either $a = b = 0$ or one can suppose that $(a(x), b(x))$ is normalized by scaling with $(x, y) \to (\lambda^3 x, \lambda^4 y)$. Again, having made all these normalizations, the normal form is then unique up to E-equivalence.

(3) If $n = 2$ and $T(\mathcal{F}) = p_1 + p_2$ then, there are five possible choices for a point of order four in $\mathrm{div}^h(\mathcal{F})$. Once one of these point is chosen to be at ∞, one can choose the coordinates of $T(\mathcal{F})$ to be $\{0, 1\}$ and there are exactly two different possibilities. Then Theorem 3 provides a normal form of type

$$(y(y - x) + a(x)x^3 + b(x)x^2 y)(x\,dy - y\,dx) + x^4\,dx.$$

Notice that, in this case, $(a(x), b(x))$ cannot be *a priori* normalized since no scaling leaves the configuration of the three points invariant. Thus, we obtain a set of ten normal forms which is unique up to E-equivalence.

(4) If $n = 3$ and $T(\mathcal{F}) = p_1 + p_2 + p_3$, then there exist at most 24 divisors in $\mathrm{div}^h(\mathcal{F})$ with a point of order four in its support. Let us choose one of these divisors and consider coordinates where the two points p_1 and p_2 are sent to 0 and 1 and the point of order four is at ∞. There are six such possible choices. Now Theorem III provides a normal form that can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}&(y(y - x)(y + \lambda_1 x) + a(x)x^4 + b(x)x^3 y + c(x)x^2 y^2)(x\,dy - y\,dx)\\&\quad + (x + \alpha y)(x + \beta y)x^3\,d(x),\end{aligned}$$

where $\lambda_1 \neq 0, -1$ and $\alpha, \beta \neq -1, \lambda_1$. Notice that (a, b, c) may not be normalized. Thus, we obtain a classifying list of at most $6 \times 24 = 144$ normal forms.

(5) If $n = 3$ and $T(\mathcal{F}) = 2p_1 + p_2$, then there exist at most 18 divisors in $\mathrm{div}^h(\mathcal{F})$ with a point of order four in its support. Choosing one of these points and coordinates where the latter is at ∞, the point of order two in $T(\mathcal{F})$ is zero, and the remaining point is one, Theorem III provides a normal form of the same type as before, given by

$$\begin{aligned}&(y^2(y - x) + a(x)x^4 + b(x)x^3 y + c(x)x^2 y^2)(x\,dy - y\,dx)\\&\quad + (x + \alpha y)(x + \beta y)x^3\,d(x),\end{aligned}$$

and thus is a classifying list of 18 normal forms.

(6) If $n = 3$ and $T(\mathcal{F}) = 3p$, then there exist at most six divisors in $\mathrm{div}^h(\mathcal{F})$ with a point of order four in its support. Letting ∞ be one of these points and $T(\mathcal{F})$ be zero leads to a normal form given by

$$(y^3 + a(x)x^4 + b(x)x^3 y + c(x)x^2 y^2)(x\,dy - y\,dx) + (x + \alpha y)(x + \beta y)x^3\,d(x).$$

Now, using a scaling $(x, y) \to (\lambda^4 x, \lambda^5 y)$, one can suppose that (a, b, c) is normalized. Finally, we obtain a classifying list of at most six normal forms. □

The convergent normal forms that we have obtained look quite similar to the formal normal forms constructed by Ortiz *et al* in [**14**] and the convergent normal forms in the case $n = 1$ (see [**15**]). The main difference is that we first choose a radial foliation with respect to which the given foliation is homogeneous. The convergence of its linearization map gives us the convergence of the normal forms.

https://doi.org/10.1017/etds.2015.123 Published online by Cambridge University Press

3. *Classification in* $\mathcal{D}$

As was seen in the previous section, the homogeneity hypothesis was a great help. Having a radial foliation that is well related to a given foliation allowed us, in particular, to find good coordinates. In general, we do not have such an object but some formal results based on the ideas coming from the homogeneous case can be used to determine general formal normal forms.

3.1. *Formal normal forms in* $\mathcal{D}(n)$. We start by generalizing the results in [**14**] to all of $\mathcal{D}$ with a slight change in the type of equivalences. Two formal vector fields V, $\widetilde{V}$ in $(\mathbb{C}^2, 0)$ are said to be *formally E-equivalent* $V \sim_0 \widetilde{V}$ if there exist a formal pair of power series $\phi(x, y) = (\lambda x + \cdots, \lambda y + \cdots)$ and a formal unit $u(x, y) = \mu + \cdots$ such that

$$\widetilde{V} = u \cdot \phi_*(V).$$

If the vector fields converge, ϕ is a formal equivalence between the induced foliations. If the equivalence ϕ converges, it sends leaves of V to leaves of V' and fixes every point of the exceptional divisor E. In this case we say that V and V' are E-equivalent and denote it by $V \sim_E V'$.

Let $n \geq 1$. For any W *formal* Weierstrass polynomial in y—a monic polynomial in $\mathbb{C}[[x]][y]$—of degree and order n and any family of complex numbers $(c_{ij}) \in \mathbb{C}^{(n(n-1))/2}$, we consider the formal foliation given by

$$\mathcal{F}_{W,(c_{ij})} := W(x, y)(x\,dy - y\,dx) + \left(x^{n-1} + \sum_{\substack{0 \leq i \leq n-2 \\ 0 \leq j \leq n-1 \\ i+j \geq n-1}} c_{ij} x^i y^j \right) x^3\,dx. \tag{15}$$

THEOREM V. (Formal normal forms in $\mathcal{D}(n)$) *Consider three distinct points* p_0, p_1, $p_\infty \in E$ *and* $n \geq 1$. *For any* $\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{D}(n)$ *such that* $p_0 \notin |T(\mathcal{F})|$, *there exist a formal conjugacy* $\Phi \in \widehat{\mathrm{Diff}}(\mathbb{C}^2, 0)$ *and a unique pair* $\{W, (c_{ij})\}$ *such that:*

- $D\Phi(p_0) = 0$, $D\Phi(p_1) = 1$ *and* $D\Phi(p_\infty) = \infty$; *and*
- $\Phi_* \mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_{W,(c_{ij})}$.

As a consequence of the above theorem, two formal normal forms $\mathcal{F}_{W,(c_{ij})}$ and $\mathcal{F}_{W',(c'_{ij})}$ are formally E-equivalent if and only if they are equal. On the other hand, we know from [**3**] that formal/analytic rigidity takes place in $\mathcal{D}$ so the formal invariants determine the analytic class.

The proof follows the lines of the proof of [**14**, Theorem 4] with the appropriate changes to generalize to foliations in $\mathcal{D}$. In that paper, the divisor $T(\mathcal{F})$ is assumed to have only simple points in its support, which is the generic case.

Proof. In the proof and whenever a system of coordinates (x, y) is given, the radial vector field $x\partial_x + y\partial_y$ will be denoted by $\mathcal{R}$. Its dual form $x\,dy - y\,dx$ is denoted by $\omega_{\mathcal{R}}$. For convenience, we are going to use the vector fields rather than the 1-forms. Moreover, $j^m(\square)$ and $\square_m$ stand, respectively, for the jet of order m and the component

https://doi.org/10.1017/etds.2015.123 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of homogeneous degree m of $\square$. In addition, a vector field V is said to have a *normalized* homogeneous term of degree $n+N \geq n+2$ that is written as

$$V_{n+N} = P\partial_x + Q\partial_y$$

if both $P(1, t)$ and $\omega_{\mathcal{R}}(V_{n+N})(1, t)$ have degree at most $n-1$ and the second has order at least N at zero.

Let (x, y) be coordinates such that $x = 0$, $y = x$ and $y = 0$ define the points p_0, p_1 and p_∞ in E, respectively, and $V = P\partial_x + Q\partial_y$ be the holomorphic vector field representing $\mathcal{F}$ such that P is a Weierstrass polynomial in y. Then $j^{n+1}(V) = R\mathcal{R}$ for a unique homogeneous polynomial $R(x, y)$ of degree $n \geq 1$ with $R(0, y) = y^n$. The regularity of the foliation after blow-up is equivalent to the fact that R has no common factors with $\omega_{\mathcal{R}}(V_{n+2}) = yP_{n+2} - xQ_{n+2}$.

After applying a transformation of type $\lambda\,\mathrm{Id}$ for some $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}^*$ and multiplying by an appropriate unit, we can suppose that $R(0, y) = y^n$ and $Q_{n+2}(x, 0) = x^{n+2}$. In what follows, all changes of coordinates will be tangential to the identity and all units will be equal to one at the origin. Thus R and $Q_{n+2}(x, 0)$ do not change along with the following changes of coordinates.

Next we are going to normalize, recursively, the homogeneous components of V. To do so, we will use of two types of change of coordinates. Below, we describe these changes of coordinates and compute how they affect the homogeneous components of V.

- If $\phi_N = (\alpha, \beta)$ is a homogeneous vector field of degree $N \geq 2$, and we consider the vector field $\widetilde{V} = \widetilde{P}\partial_x + \widetilde{Q}\partial_y$ obtained by pushing V by the transformation $\phi = \mathrm{Id} + \phi_N + \text{h.o.t.}$, then

$$j^{n+N}(\widetilde{P}) = j^{n+N}(P) + (N-1)R\alpha - x(\alpha\partial_x R + \beta\partial_y R), \tag{16}$$

$$j^{n+N+1}(\omega_{\mathcal{R}}(\widetilde{V})) = j^{n+N+1}(\omega_{\mathcal{R}}(V)) + (N-1)R\omega_{\mathcal{R}}(\phi_N). \tag{17}$$

- Moreover, if ϕ_N preserves the radial foliation, that is, there exists a homogeneous polynomial γ of degree $N-1$ such that $\alpha = x\gamma$ and $\beta = y\gamma$, then setting $\widetilde{V}^\gamma = (1-(N-1-n)\gamma)\widetilde{V}$ gives

$$j^{n+N}(\widetilde{P}^\gamma) = j^{n+N}(P) \tag{18}$$

$$j^{n+N+2}(\omega_{\mathcal{R}}(\widetilde{V}^\gamma)) = j^{n+N+2}(\omega_{\mathcal{R}}(V)) - N\gamma\omega_{\mathcal{R}}(V_{n+2}). \tag{19}$$

In particular, if V was normalized up to order $n+N$, then so is $\widetilde{V}^\gamma$.

We will consider a sequence of equivalent vector fields V^N, each normalized up to order $n+N$. Start with V and find a homogeneous vector field of degree $N = 2$, ϕ_2 such that the right-hand side of (17) becomes a polynomial of degree less than n. By dehomogenizing the equation, there is a unique possibility that $\omega_{\mathcal{R}}(\phi_2)$ will be given by Euclidean division in the ring $\mathbb{C}[t]$. The pushforward of V by $\mathrm{Id} + \phi_2$ gives a vector field $\widetilde{V}$ satisfying that $\omega_{\mathcal{R}}(\widetilde{V})$ is normalized up to order $n+2$. Let η be the unique homogeneous polynomial of degree $N-1$ such that $\widetilde{Q}(1, t) + \eta(1, t)R(1, t)$ is of degree less than n. Then $V^2 = (1-\eta)\widetilde{V}$ is normalized up to order $n+2$ and $V^2 \sim_0 V$. Suppose, for induction, that $N \geq 2$, V^N is normalized up to order $n+N$ and $V^N \sim_0 V$. Let us find a $V^{N+1} \sim_0 V^N$ normalized up to order $n+N+1$. The key ingredient for the induction is the following lemma.

https://doi.org/10.1017/etds.2015.123 Published online by Cambridge University Press

LEMMA 13. *Given a homogeneous polynomial H of degree $n+N+2$ in (x, y), there exist a unique polynomial q_{n+N+2} in the $\mathbb{C}$-vector space V generated by $y^j x^{n+2+N-j}$, for $j = N, \ldots, n-1$, and homogeneous polynomials A and B of degrees $N+2$ and $N-1$, respectively, such that*

$$H = q_{n+N+2} + AR + B\omega_{\mathcal{R}}(V_{n+2}).$$

Set $H = (\omega_{\mathcal{R}}(V^N))_{n+N+2}$ and apply the previous lemma to obtain A, B and q_{n+N+2}. Define $\gamma = B/N$. Then, defining $\widetilde{V}^\gamma$ as before, we get $j^{n+N+2}(\widetilde{V}^\gamma) = q_{n+N+2} + AR$ and $j^{n+N}(\widetilde{P}^\gamma) = j^{n+N}(P)$. Next, choose a homogeneous vector field ϕ_N of degree N such that $\omega_{\mathcal{R}}(\phi_N) = -A/(N+1)$. After applying $\mathrm{Id} + \phi_N$ to $\widetilde{V}^\gamma$ we obtain a vector field W^{N+1} with normalized

$$j^{n+N+2}(\omega_{\mathcal{R}}(W^{N+1})).$$

It remains to normalize the homogeneous term P of degree $n+N+1$ of the ∂_x-coordinate of W^{N+1}. We claim that x divides P and thus $P(1, t)$ has degree at most $n+N$. Indeed, by construction, x divides $(\omega_{\mathcal{R}}(W^{N+1}))_{n+N+2}$ and

$$W^{N+1}_{n+N+2} - \left(\frac{(\omega_{\mathcal{R}}(W^{N+1}))_{n+N+2}}{x}\right)\partial_y \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{R} \text{ are tangential vector fields.}$$

Therefore x divides P. By using Euclidean division in $\mathbb{C}[t]$, we can find a unique homogeneous polynomial $P_{N+1}(x, y)$ of degree $N+1$ such that $P_{N+1}(1, t)$ has degree at most $n-1$, and a homogeneous polynomial $C(x, y)$ of degree N such that $P = P_{N+1} + xRC$. The vector field $V^{N+1} = (1-C)W^{N+1}$ is normalized up to order $n+N+1$ and still in the same equivalence class.

The formal vector field V^∞ satisfying $j^N(V^\infty) = j^N(V^N)$ for all $N \geq 1$ is also formally equivalent to V^N and has all its homogenous terms normalized. Its dual form has the properties given in the statement of Theorem V. The uniqueness of the solutions for the coefficients in the Taylor series of V_∞ at each step of the normalization shows that the normal form is unique. Nevertheless, the formal equivalence between the vector field V and its normal form V_∞ is non-unique since the group of automorphisms of the foliation contains the exponential of uV for any unit u. This appears in the normalization process as the lack of uniqueness for the coefficients in the normalizing map. □

In [**14**] the authors consider the case of foliations $\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{D}(n)$ for which $T(\mathcal{F})$ has only simple points in its support, that is, where all tangencies between the foliation and the exceptional divisor are simple. They provide unique formal normal forms modulo formal conjugacies tangential to the identity. The unique normal forms that they obtain can also be written as $W(x, y)(x\,dy - y\,dx) + H(x, y)\,dx$, where $W \in \mathbb{C}[[x][y]$ is a formal Weierstrass polynomial and H is a polynomial whose coefficients lie in an open set of $\mathbb{C}^{((n(n-1))/2)+1}$. In our case, the coefficients of the polynomial H lie in an open set in $\mathbb{C}^{(n(n-1))/2}$. The difference in number of parameters comes from the fact that we are considering equivalences that are tangential to a homothety $\lambda\,\mathrm{Id}$, whereas in [**14**] the authors consider equivalences tangential to Id. In the case where $T(\mathcal{F}) = p$ the convergence of the normal form is proven by the same authors in [**15**]. The difference between the normal form obtained in Theorem V and the normal forms of [**15**] lies in the choice of radial foliation that is used to normalize.

https://doi.org/10.1017/etds.2015.123 Published online by Cambridge University Press

3.2. *The $\sim_E$-invariants.* Following Theorem V, we introduce an analytical invariant by extracting some information from the formal normal forms of a foliation $\mathcal{F}$. Given three distinct points $p_0,\ p_1,\ p_\infty \in E$ and any class of E-equivalence $[\mathcal{F}]$ such that $p_0 \notin |T(\mathcal{F})|$, we define its $\sim_E$-invariant as the data

$$\mathbf{c}[\mathcal{F}](p_0,\ p_1,\ p_\infty) := (c_{ij}) \in \mathbb{C}^{(n(n-1))/2}.$$

This invariant, together with the holonomy, provides a complete system of invariants for the E-equivalence in $\mathcal{D}$. This is the meaning of the following theorem.

THEOREM VI. ($\sim_E$-invariants) *$\mathcal{F}_1 \sim_E \mathcal{F}_2 \in \mathcal{D}$ if and only if $\mathcal{F}_1 \in \mathcal{D}$, $H(\mathcal{F}_1) = H(\mathcal{F}_2)$ and*

$$\mathbf{c}[\mathcal{F}_1](p_0,\ p_1,\ p_\infty) = \mathbf{c}[\mathcal{F}_2](p_0,\ p_1,\ p_\infty)$$

for some (and hence for every) choice of three distinct points $p_0,\ p_1,\ p_\infty \in E$.

As in the homogeneous case, Proposition 5 implies that the parameters (c_{ij}) are independent of the holonomy. If we knew that the normal form associated to a certain (convergent) holonomy class is convergent, we could deduce the convergence of the normal forms of Theorem V for holomorphic foliations.

Proof of Theorem VI. Consider two foliations $\mathcal{F}_1$ and $\mathcal{F}_2$ as in the statement of the theorem. Their associated formal normal forms are written as

$$\mathcal{F}_1 \hat{\sim}_E \underbrace{(R(x,\ y) + \cdots)}_{W_1}(x\,dy - y\,dx) + Q_1 x^3\,dx,$$
$$\mathcal{F}_2 \hat{\sim}_E \underbrace{(R(x,\ y) + \cdots)}_{W_2}(x\,dy - y\,dx) + Q_2 x^3\,dx.$$

Since $\mathbf{c}[\mathcal{F}_1](p_0,\ p_1,\ p_\infty) = \mathbf{c}[\mathcal{F}_2](p_0,\ p_1,\ p_\infty)$, they share the same second factor, that is,

$$Q_1 = Q_2.$$

Denote $r = R(1,\ t)$ and $q = Q_1(1,\ t)$. Lemma 5 ensures that the map $\mathrm{hol}_{r,q}$ is a bijection. Therefore, the equality $H(\mathcal{F}_1) = H(\mathcal{F}_2)$ implies that the terms W_1 and W_2 are also equal. Therefore, the foliations have the same normal forms and are formally equivalent. Now, following [**3**], they are also analytically equivalent. □

3.3. *Realization of $\sim_E$-invariants.* By giving a geometric interpretation of the $\sim_E$-invariants, we are able to proof a realization-like theorem.

Recall that, given $\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{D}(n)$, we defined

$$\mathrm{div}(\mathcal{F}) = \{\mathrm{Tang}(\mathcal{F},\ \mathcal{G})_{|E} \in \mathrm{div}\ E(n+3) : \mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{D}(0)\}. \tag{20}$$

By construction, $\mathrm{div}(\mathcal{F}) \subset \mathrm{div}(E \backslash |T(\mathcal{F})|)$. If $\mathcal{F}_1$ and $\mathcal{F}_2$ are E-equivalent then obviously $\mathrm{div}(\mathcal{F}_1) = \mathrm{div}(\mathcal{F}_2)$. There exists an equivalence relation $\sim_{T(\mathcal{F})}$ on $\mathrm{div}\ E(n+3)$ depending only on $T(\mathcal{F})$ whose classes correspond precisely to a subset of the form (20). Indeed, given a divisor

$$D = r_1 p_1 + \cdots + r_k p_k \in \mathrm{div}\ E(n)$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/etds.2015.123 Published online by Cambridge University Press

we say that two divisors $D_1, D_2 \in \operatorname{div} E(n+3)$ are D-equivalent, and we denote it by $D_1 \sim_D D_2$, if there exist homogeneous polynomials in two variables P_1, P_2 and R defining D_1, D_2 and D, respectively, satisfying that $P_2 = P_1 + RQ$ for some homogenoeus polynomial Q of degree three. On the other hand, we denote by $\operatorname{Rot}(D)$ the set of families $\{h_1, \dots, h_k\}$ where each $h_i : (E, p_i) \to (E, p_i)$ is a holomorphic germ locally conjugated to the rotation by angle $2\pi/(r_i + 1)$ and

$$\mathbf{E} = \bigcup_{D \in \operatorname{div} E} \mathbf{E}_D \text{ where } \mathbf{E}_D = \frac{\operatorname{div}(E \backslash |D|)(\deg(D) + 3)}{\sim_D} \times \operatorname{Rot}(D)$$

with its natural projection $\mathbf{E} \to \operatorname{div} E$. We get a natural map $\mathfrak{I} : \mathcal{D}/\sim_E \to \mathbf{E}$ given by

$$\mathfrak{I}([\mathcal{F}]) = ([\operatorname{div}(\mathcal{F})], H(\mathcal{F})) \in \mathbf{E}_{T(\mathcal{F})}$$

which is well defined since E-equivalences fix any point on E, where all invariants we deal with are computed.

THEOREM VII. *The map $\mathfrak{I}$ is onto. Its fiber over an element in $\mathbf{E}_D$ is biholomorphic to $\mathbb{C}^M$, where $M = \max(0, ((\deg D - 2)(\deg D - 1))/2)$.*

This theorem also proves that any invariant in Theorems II and VI are realized by some foliation in $\mathcal{D}$.

To describe the space $\mathcal{D}/\sim$ we just need to remark that there is a natural action of the group $GL(2, \mathbb{C})$ on $\mathcal{D}/\sim_E$ once we have chosen coordinates (x, y) in $(\mathbb{C}^2, 0)$. The action associates to each matrix the natural linear transformation in the two variables (x, y). The quotient is precisely $\mathcal{D}/\sim$. This action preserves fibers of $\mathfrak{I}$, and, actually, the map $\mathfrak{I}$ is equivariant with respect to the natural homomorphism $GL(2, \mathbb{C}) \to \operatorname{Aut}(E)$. Hence we can define a surjective map $\overline{\mathfrak{I}} : \mathcal{D}/\sim \to \mathbf{E}/\operatorname{Aut}(E)$ whose fibers are as in Theorem VII.

Proof. To prove that $\mathfrak{I}$ is onto, let $D = r_1 p_1 + \cdots + r_k p_k \in \operatorname{div} E(n)$ and

$$([D_1], \{h_1, \dots, h_k\}) \in \mathbf{E}_D$$

be given. Consider an affine coordinate $s \in \mathbb{C}$ in E containing all the points in the support of D and D_1. These divisors can be, respectively, represented by monic polynomials $r(s)$ and $q(s)$, and the 1-form $r(s)\,ds + q(s)\,dx$ defines an element such that

$$T(\mathcal{F}_0) = D$$
$$\operatorname{div}(\mathcal{F}_0) = [D_1].$$

We are going to do a surgery on $\mathcal{F}_0$ which will preserve the above relations but modify the holonomies, as expected. Consider the pair $(\mathcal{F}_0, \mathcal{G})$, where $\mathcal{G}$ is the radial foliation defined by $ds = 0$ in the given coordinates. On a small neighborhood U_i of $p_i \in E$, following Lemma 2, there exists a local biholomorphism ϕ_i sending the pair $(\mathcal{F}_0, \mathcal{G})_{|U_i}$ to the germ at $(0, 0)$ of the pair (ω_i, dt), where $\omega_i = t^{r_i}\,dt + (t-1)\,dx$. Define $\varphi_i = \phi_{i|E \cap U_i}$. To keep track of the divisors D and D_1 and change the holonomy, we do not touch the gluing on $E \cap U_i$ but we change the model foliation ω_i by an appropriate holomorphic model $\widetilde{\omega}_i \in \Omega_{r=t^{r_i},(t-1)}$, obtained from Proposition 6, that satisfies

$$h_i(s) = \varphi_i^{-1} \circ \operatorname{hol}_{r,t-1}(\widetilde{\omega}_i) \circ \varphi_i(s).$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/etds.2015.123 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Now, there exists a unique extension of φ_i to a saturated neighborhood V_i of an annulus $A_i \subset U_i \cap E$ that sends the pair $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})_{|V_i}$ to the pair of germs of foliations at $(0, 0)$, defined by $(\widetilde{\omega}_i, dt)$. After doing this at each point p_i, we obtain a pair of regular foliations $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ in a neighborhood of a (-1)-curve. The contraction of this curve produces a foliation $\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{D}^R$, $\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{D}(0)$, $T(\mathcal{F}) = D$, $\operatorname{div}(\mathcal{F}) = [D_1]$ and $H(\mathcal{F}) = (h_1, \ldots, h_k)$. Thus the map $\mathfrak{I}$ is onto.

It remains to prove that for each $D = r_1 p_1 + \cdots + r_k p_k \in \operatorname{div}(E)(n)$ and

$$\mathbf{e} = ([D_1], \{h_1, \ldots, h_k\}) \in \mathbf{E}_D$$

the fiber $\mathfrak{I}^{-1}(\mathbf{e})$ is biholomorphic to $\mathbb{C}^M$, where M is as in the statement of the theorem. Take coordinates (x, y) of $(\mathbb{C}^2, 0)$ such that $x = 0$ does not define a point in the support of D. By Theorem V, we can assign to each class in $\mathfrak{I}^{-1}(\mathbf{e})$ a unique formal one-form $W(x, y)(x\,dy - y\,dx) + Q(x, y)\,dx$. The homogeneous part of degree $n + 2$ of Q depends only on $[D_1]$ and thus is invariant in $\mathfrak{I}^{-1}(\mathbf{e})$. Now, the polynomial $Q - Q_{n+2}$ is written as

$$\sum_{\substack{0 \le i \le n-2 \\ 0 \le j \le n-1 \\ i+j \ge n}} c_{ij} x^{i+3} y^j$$

and thus defines a point (c_{ij}) in $\mathbb{C}^M$. This defines a map from $\mathfrak{I}^{-1}(\mathbf{e})$ to $\mathbb{C}^M$. Proposition 5 ensures that this map is injective.

Let us prove that it is also onto.

Let (c_{ij}) in $\mathbb{C}^M$ be given. By construction, the family of complex numbers (c_{ij}), the class of divisor $[D_1]$ and the set of holonomies $h = \{h_1, \ldots, h_k\}$ is,associated to a formal normal form of Theorem V. However, we are looking for a convergent foliation. The idea is basically the same as in Proposition 6. We are going to do a surgery on a polynomial form that is tangential to the formal normal form with an order as big as necessary. Indeed, using the construction of Theorem V it is easy to see that for any $N \gg 1$ there exists a foliation $\mathcal{F}_0$ defined by a *polynomial* normal form $\omega_0 = W_0(x, y)(x\,dy - y\,dx) + Q(x, y)\,dx$ satisfying that

$$j^N(H(\mathcal{F}_0)) = j^N(h).$$

After the blow-up $y = tx$, we consider the radial foliation $\mathcal{G}_0$ defined by $dt = 0$. On a neighborhood U_i of $p_i \in |D|$, there exists a unique biholomorphism onto a neighborhood of $(0, 0)$ in coordinates (z, t) sending $(0, t)$ to $(0, t)$ and the pair $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})_{|U_i}$ to the pair (ω_i^0, dt), where $\omega_i^0 = (t^{r_i} + a^0_{r_i-1}(z)t^{r_i-1} + \cdots + a_0^0(z))\,dt + (t-1)\,dz$ is the convergent 1-form of Proposition 6 that has the same holonomy h_i^0 as $\mathcal{F}_0$ at p_i. The convergent 1-form $\omega_i = (t^{r_i} + a_{r_i-1}(z)t^{r_i-1} + \cdots + a_0(z))\,dt + (t-1)\,dz$ for which $H(\mathcal{F}_{\omega_i}) = h_i$ satisfies that

$$\omega_i - \omega_i^0 = z^{N'} f(z, t)\,dt$$

for some big $N' \in \mathbb{N}$. In particular, this means that for each $0 < \varepsilon_i < |t_0| < r_i$ for some small ε_i and r_i, the holonomy germs $g_i^0, g_i : (\{t = t_0\}, 0) \to (E, t_0)$ of ω_i^0 and ω_i, respectively, are tangential with an order as big as necessary. In particular, $g_i^{-1} \circ g_i^0(z) - z$ has a zero of order N'' that is as big as necessary. The equivalence between $\mathcal{F}_{\omega_i^0}$ and $\mathcal{F}_{\omega_i}$

https://doi.org/10.1017/etds.2015.123 Published online by Cambridge University Press

in a neighborhood of the annulus can be written as

$$(z, t) \mapsto (z + z^{N^{(3)}}(\cdots), t) \tag{21}$$

for $N^{(3)}$ as big as necessary. We claim that the gluing of $\mathcal{F}_{0|(\widetilde{\mathbb{C}^2}, E)\setminus U_1\cup\cdots\cup U_k}$ with the models $\mathcal{F}_{\omega_i}$ via the gluing given in (21) defines an element in $\mathcal{F} \in \mathfrak{I}^{-1}(\mathbf{e})$ with the desired invariants. After the gluing, we get a pair $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ of foliations around a rational curve of self-intersection -1. Combining results from [**4**, **6**, **13**], we have the following lemma.

LEMMA 14. *Let* $\mathrm{Diff}_N(E, \mathcal{G})$ *be the sheaf over* E *of germs of automorphisms that are locally written* $(z, t) \mapsto (z + z^N(\cdots), t)$, *where* $z = 0$ *is a local equation of* E *and* $dt = 0$ *is the radial foliation* $\mathcal{G}$. *Then,*

$$H^1(E, \mathrm{Diff}_N(E, \mathcal{G})) = 0.$$

Let us give a sketch of the proof of the above lemma.

Proof. According to [**13**], it is enough to prove at a formal level that

$$H^1(E, \widehat{\mathrm{Diff}}_N(E, \mathcal{G})) = 0.$$

Let us consider $\{\phi_{ij}\}_{ij} \in Z^1(\widehat{\mathrm{Diff}}_N(E, \mathcal{G}), \{U_i\}_{i\in I})$ for some simply connected covering $\{U_i\}_{i\in I}$ of E. Taking a finer covering, if necessary, one can suppose that ϕ_{ij} is the flow at time one of some formal vector field $\hat{X}_{ij}$ tangential to the radial foliation. Since ϕ_{ij} is tangential at order N to Id, one can write, in adapted coordinates (z, t),

$$\hat{X}_{ij} = z^n A_{ij}(z, t)\frac{\partial}{\partial z}, \quad \phi_{ij} = e^{[1]\hat{X}_{ij}},$$

where A_{ij} is some formal function. Now, the cohomology group $H^1(E, \hat{\mathcal{O}})$ vanishes [**4**], so there exists a family of functions such that $A_{ij} = A_j - A_i$. As a consequence, there exists a family of vector fields $\{\hat{X}_i\}_{i\in I}$ vanishing at order N along E such that

$$\hat{X}_{ij} = \hat{X}_j - \hat{X}_i.$$

The Campbell–Hausdorff formula induces that

$$e^{[1]\hat{X}_i} \circ e^{[1]\hat{X}_{ij}} \circ (e^{[1]\hat{X}_j})^{-1} = e^{[1]\hat{Z}_{ij}},$$

where $\hat{Z}_{ij}$ is a formal vector field tangential to the radial foliation and vanishing at order $2n - 1$ along E. Applying this construction inductively, we obtain a zero-cocycle $\{\phi_i\}_{i\in I}$ in $\widehat{\mathrm{Diff}}_N(E, \mathcal{G})$ such that

$$\phi_i \circ e^{[1]\hat{X}_{ij}} \circ \phi_j^{-1} = \psi_{ij} \tag{22}$$

and ψ_{ij} is tangential to Id at an order p as big as necessary. Finally, following [**6**], for big enough m, the image of the natural map

$$H^1(E, \widehat{\mathrm{Diff}}_m(E, \mathcal{G})) \to H^1(E, \widehat{\mathrm{Diff}}_N(E, \mathcal{G}))$$

is trivial. Thus, one can write

$$\psi_{ij} = \psi_i^{-1}\psi_j, \tag{23}$$

where $\{\psi_i\}_{i\in I}$ is a zero-cocycle in $\widehat{\mathrm{Diff}}_N(E, \mathcal{G})$. Combining the relations (22) and (23) yields a trivialization of the initial cocycle. □

https://doi.org/10.1017/etds.2015.123 Published online by Cambridge University Press

This lemma implies, in particular, that one can choose a holomorphic 1-form ω representing $\mathcal{F}$ as tangential as necessary to ω_0. In particular, one can choose this order of tangency such that ω and ω_0 coincide up to order $2n$. Therefore, $\mathcal{F}$ has the desired invariants $(c_{ij}) \in \mathbb{C}^M$ and the map from $\mathfrak{I}^{-1}(\mathbf{e})$ to $\mathbb{C}^M$ is onto. □

4. *Examples of unfoldings in* $\mathcal{D}^h(n)$

In the light of Theorem I, we have a natural way of unfolding a dicritical homogeneous germ $\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{D}^h(n)$ in the space $\mathcal{D}^h(n)$ with base space of dimension $n+3$. Indeed, we can suppose $\mathcal{F}$ is obtained from $\mathcal{F}_S$ of Theorem I by a blow-up on some divisor $D = p_1 + \cdots + p_{n+3}$ on the exceptional curve. When two points p_i and p_j coincide, we interpret this by saying that we blow up twice at the same point. By considering an affine coordinate $z \in \mathbb{C}$ in the rational curve where p_i corresponds to $z_i \in \mathbb{C}$, and defining $p_i(c) = z_i + c_i$ for $c = (c_1, \ldots, c_{n+3}) \in (\mathbb{C}^{n+3}, 0)$, the foliations $\{\mathcal{F}_c : c \in (\mathbb{C}^{n+3}, 0)\}$, defined by blowing up $\mathcal{F}_S$ on the divisor $D(c) = p_1(c) + \cdots + p_{n+3}(c)$, form an equisingular unfolding of $\mathcal{F}$. Knowing $\mathrm{div}^h(\mathcal{F})$ and Theorem II allows us to decide which of the directions in this unfolding are non-trivial. For instance, in the cases $n = 2, 3$, this procedure, applied to the points of the special choices of topological class in $\mathrm{div}^h(\mathcal{F})$ of Corollary 12, produces universal equisingular unfoldings.

In fact, by this procedure we are able to give explicit examples of non-trivial unfoldings of a foliation without any special integrability properties. To our knowledge, they constitute the first such examples.

4.1. *Examples obtained by pulling back foliations admitting a meromorphic first integral.* We can provide some examples of universal equisingular unfoldings of elements in $\mathcal{D}$. Indeed, if $r(t)$ is a polynomial of degree n, the universal unfolding of the germ of foliation $\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{D}^h(n)$ defined by

$$\nu = x^{n+2}\, d\left(r\left(\frac{y}{x}\right) + x\right) \tag{24}$$

is given by pullback of ν via the rational map

$$\Lambda(x, y, (c_{ij})) = (x, y) \cdot \left(1 + \sum_{j=1, i<j}^{n-1} c_{ij} x^{i-j} y^j\right),$$

where $(c_{ij}) \in \mathbb{C}^{n(n-1)/2}$. Note that, for each fixed non-zero parameter (c_{ij}), Λ is an automorphism of each leaf of the radial foliation $x\partial_x + y\partial_y$, except for the leaf $x = 0$. To see that the resulting unfolding is equisingular and non-trivial in any direction in the parameter space, it suffices to remark that after blowing up via $y = tx$, the underlying deformation is written in dual form as

$$\left(r(t) + \sum_{j=1, i<j}^{n-1} j c_{ij} x^{i+1} t^{j-1}\right) dt + \left(1 + \sum_{j=1, i<j}^{n-1} (i+1) c_{ij} x^i t^{j-1}\right) dx.$$

Hence, for any fixed parameter, we have already one of the normal forms given in Theorem V. By uniqueness of the normal form, any two elements in this family belong to

https://doi.org/10.1017/etds.2015.123 Published online by Cambridge University Press

different classes of E-equivalence. Actually, the so-constructed unfolding turns out to be the *universal* unfolding of ν since the dimension of its space of unfoldings is $n(n-1)/2$. Notice that, unfortunately, such a procedure fails when the initial form ν is in normal form and has some other non-zero terms.

4.2. *Examples without any special integrability property.* Consider an element of $\mathcal{D}^h(n)$ defined by the 1-form

$$\omega = \underbrace{(R(x,\,y) + \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} a_i(x) y^i x^{n-i})}_{W(x,y)}(x\,dy - y\,dx) + Q(x,\,y)\,dx$$

as in the statement of Theorem III, where R is homogeneous of degree n and $a_i \in \mathbb{C}\{x\}$ with $a_i(0) = 0$. Then the 1-form in $(\mathbb{C}^2,\,0) \times \mathbb{C}^{n-1}$ defined by

$$\Omega = \left(R(x,\,y) + \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} a_i(x + \langle c,\,y\rangle) y^i x^{n-i}\right)(x\,dy - y\,dx) + Q(x,\,y)\,d(x + \langle c,\,y\rangle),$$

where $\langle c,\,y\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} c_i y^i$, defines a non-trivial equisingular unfolding of any foliation in $\mathcal{D}$ associated to $\Omega|_{c=c_0}$ for some $c_0 \in \mathbb{C}^{n-1}$ given by polynomials.

Notice that, if the initial 1-form ω is polynomial then the unfolding is also given by polynomials. In this way, we provide non-trivial deformations of global foliations in $\mathbb{CP}^2$ of constant topological type, a situation that is non-generic in the space of foliations of $\mathbb{CP}^2$ (see [**8**]).

Let us consider the rational map

$$\Lambda(x,\,y,\,c) = \left(1 + \frac{\langle c,\,y\rangle}{x}\right) \cdot (x,\,y),$$

where $\langle c,\,y\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} c_i y^i$.

The 1-form Ω in $\mathbb{C}^2 \times \mathbb{C}^{n-1}$ is the pullback of $\Omega|_{c=0} = \omega$ by Λ up to some multiplication by a meromorphic unit u. In particular, Ω is an integrable 1-form since we have

$$u^2 \Omega \wedge d\Omega = \Lambda^*(\Omega|_{c=0} \wedge \mathrm{d}\Omega|_{c=0}) = 0.$$

After the blow-up E of the singular locus $\{x = 0,\, y = 0\}$, Ω is written in the coordinates of the blow-up, $y = xt$, as

$$E^*\Omega = \left(R(1,\,t) + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} a_i(x + \langle c,\,tx\rangle) t^i\right) \mathrm{d}t + Q(1,\,t)\,d(x + \langle c,\,tx\rangle).$$

The induced foliation restricted to a fiber of $(x,\,y,\,c) \mapsto c$ over a point $c = (c_1,\,\ldots,\,c_{n-1})$, such that $1/c_1$ is not a root of $R(1,\,t) = 0$, lies in $\mathcal{D}(n)$. The tangency locus with the exceptional divisor $x = 0$ is equal $\{x = 0,\, t = t_i\}$, where t_i is a solution of $R(1,\,t) = 0$. Since the curves $\{x = 0,\, t = t_i\} = 0$ are contained in a invariant hypersurface of $E^*\Omega$, the 1-form Ω defines an equireducible unfolding of $\Omega|_{c=c_0}$ for any c_0 lying in the Zariski open set $U = \{c \in \mathbb{C}^{n-1} : c_1 t_i \neq 1,\, \forall t_i\}$.

https://doi.org/10.1017/etds.2015.123 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Suppose now that Ω is trivial along a certain smooth submanifold of the space of the parameter. Then there exists a germ of application

$$c : t \in \mathbb{C} \to (c_1(t), c_2(t), \ldots, c_p(t))$$

with $c(0) = 0$ and $c'(0) \neq (0, \ldots, 0)$ such that $\Omega|_{c(t)}$ is a trivial unfolding of one variable. Now $\Omega|_{c(t)}$ is written as

$$\left(R(x, y) + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} a_i(x + \langle c_i(t), y\rangle) y^i x^{n-i}\right)\omega_R + Q(x, y)\, d(x + \langle c_i(t), y\rangle)$$
$$= (\cdots)\omega_R + Q(x, y)\, dx + Q(x, y) \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} c_i(t) i y^{i-1}\, dy + \left(Q(x, y) \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} c_i'(t) y^i\right) dt.$$

Following [**12**], the triviality of $\Omega|_{c(t)}$ implies that the coefficient of dt belongs to the ideal generated by the coefficients of dx and dy. If there exists such a relation, we can evaluate it for $t = 0$ and find polynomial functions A and B such that

$$PQ = A(Q - yW) + xBW, \tag{25}$$

where $P(y) = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} c_i'(0) y^i$. Since, Q and W are relatively prime, there exists Δ such that $xB - yA = \Delta Q$ and thus $A = P - W\Delta$. Therefore, rewriting (25) yields

$$-yP - Q\Delta + yW\Delta + xB = 0. \tag{26}$$

Since the orders of Q and W at zero are $n + 2$ and n, evaluating the jet of order n of the above equality gives

$$-yP + x\ \mathrm{Jet}_n(B) = 0$$

and thus $P = 0$, which is impossible. This proves that the unfolding is non-trivial for $c_0 = 0$. To prove it for $c_0 \in U$, it suffices to remark that the jet n of equation (26) remains exactly the same if we impose $c(0) = c_0$ instead of $c_0(0) = 0$.

For generic function a_i, Ω does not admit any first integral that is multivalued and holomorphic on the complement of a countable union of analytic sets. In particular, it does not admit meromorphic or Liouvillian first integrals.

Indeed, suppose that $\mathcal{F}$ belongs to $\mathcal{D}(1)$ and admits a Louvillian first integral. After the blow-up and the restriction of this first integral to E, we can see that $h = H(\mathcal{F})$ admits a Louvillian first integral on E: that is, a non-constant multivalued holomorphic function f defined on the whole E such that, for at least one determination of $f \circ h$, one has $f \circ h = f$. We know that such a Liouvillian function admits at most a countable number of singularities, that is, homotopy classes of paths along which the analytical extension of the germ of function is impossible. Below, we produce an example of periodic map h such that any first Louvillian integral has an uncountable number of singularities. Any foliation admitting this germ h as holonomy will not admit a Liouvillian first integral.

LEMMA 15. *Let $D \subset \mathbb{C}$ be a region containing 0 and $h : D \to D$ a holomorphic mapping, $h(0) = 0$ and the germ at zero of h satisfies $h^{\circ n} = \mathrm{Id}$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Suppose that the set of singularities of h in ∂D has an accumulation point p and there exists a continuous extension of h to a neighborhood of p in ∂D satisfying $h(p) \in D$. Then any non-constant Louvillian first integral f of h that is defined and holomorphic on D has a singularity at p.*

https://doi.org/10.1017/etds.2015.123 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Proof. Let $\gamma : [0, 1] \to \overline{D}$ be a path that satisfies $\gamma^{-1}(D) = [0, 1)$, $\gamma(0) = 0$ and $\gamma(1)$ is a singularity of h. If a Louvillian first integral f admits analytic extension for some of its determination, and we denote its extension by f_γ and $\lim_{t\to 1} h(\gamma(t)) \in D$, then part of the graph of h is contained in the set

$$\{(x, y) \in \mathrm{dom}(f_\gamma) \times D : f(y) = f_\gamma(x)\}.$$

If $f'(h(\gamma(1))) \neq 0$, the implicit function theorem tells us that h extends analytically to $\gamma(1)$, which is not possible. Therefore, for every singularity $q \in \partial D$ of h, where h extends continuously and f analytically, one has $f'(h(q)) = 0$.

Finally, suppose that f extends analytically to p. There exists a continuous extension of h to a neighborhood of p in ∂D. Thus, given a sequence p_n of singularities of h that accumulate on p, $f'(h(p_n)) = 0$. The convergence of $h(p_n)$ to $h(p) \in D$ implies that f is constant, which is impossible. Hence p is a singularity for f. □

To finish, let us provide an example of such an h with curves of singularities. Let D be a simply connected plane region bounded by a Jordan curve of class $\mathcal{C}^1$. Suppose that ∂D is not analytic. Moreover, suppose that θ is the rotation of angle $2\pi/n$ centered at $p \in D$, then the intersection points of ∂D and $\theta(\partial D)$ are points of transversality between the curves. Let D_p be the connected component of $D \cap \theta(D)$ containing p and $A = \partial D_p \cap h^{-1}(D_p)$. Now, if $\varphi : \overline{\mathbb{D}} \to \overline{D}$ is the homeomorphic extension of Riemann's mapping theorem between $\mathbb{D}$, 0 and D, p to the boundaries given by Carathéodory's theorem, then the continuous map $h : \overline{D_0} \to \overline{D_0}$, defined by $h = \varphi^{-1} \circ \theta \circ \varphi$ on $D_0 = \varphi^{-1}(D_p)$, has order n at zero and singularities at each of the points of ∂D_0 (see [**17**, p. 628]). By construction, the values of the extension on $\mathcal{C} = \varphi^{-1}(A)$ belong to D_0. Thus, Lemma 15 guarantees that the points of $\mathcal{C}$ are singular for any germ of Louvillian first integral of h.

Actually, any non-constant Louvillian first integral of h will not be extendable to any point in $\mathcal{C}$. Hence, any foliation with holonomy h will not admit a Louvillian first integral.

4.3. *A parametrization of* $\mathcal{D}(2)/\sim$. The parameter space of the unfolding Ω of §4.2 is a Zariski open set of $\mathbb{C}^{n-1}$. We know from [**12**] that the base space of the universal unfolding of an element in $\mathcal{D}(n)$ has dimension $n(n-1)/2$, so the obtained unfolding is only part of it if $n > 2$. In the case of $n = 2$, both dimensions coincide.

The form

$$\Omega(x, y, c) = (y^2 + a(x)y(x + cy) + b(x))(x\,dy - y\,dx) + (x + cy)^4\,dx$$

can be pulled back by the biholomorphism

$$(x, y, c) \mapsto (x + cy, y, c)$$

to obtain

$$[y^2 + a(x - cy)yx + b(x)](x\,dy - y\,dx) + x^4\,d(x - cy).$$

Up to a sign on c, this form corresponds precisely to the one appearing in the previous section. Hence it is a non-trivial equisingular unfolding around each fixed parameter

$$c \in \mathbb{C}\backslash\{t : t^2 + a(0)t + b(0) = 0\}.$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/etds.2015.123 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Since the dimension of the base space of the obtained unfolding coincides with the dimension of the universal equisingular unfolding of $\mathcal{F}_c$, they are equivalent.

Let us analyze the analytic invariants of $\mathcal{F}_c$ along the parameter space. By construction, $H(\mathcal{F}_c) = H(\mathcal{F}_0)$ for all admissible c. The position of the divisors $q(\mathcal{F}_c)$, defined in the proof of Theorem IV, depend on c by a holomorphic (possibly multivalued) non-constant function that assumes any value in $\mathbb{C}\backslash|T(\mathcal{F}_0)|$. By Theorems II and IV, we cover all analytic classes of foliations in $\mathcal{D}(2)$ having the same holonomy $H(\mathcal{F}_0)$. Furthermore, any choice of rotations around points in E is realized as the holonomy of a normal form. Once we have a holomorphic germ in $\mathcal{D}(2)$ with given holonomy generators we can consider the coefficients a and b of one of its normal forms in Corollary 12 as $\mathcal{F}_0$.

Remark that the foliation induced by the form Ω extends to a holomorphic foliation $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}$ on $(\mathbb{C}^2, 0) \times \mathbb{P}^1$. The germ of this foliation at each point $(0, 0, c) \in \mathbb{C}^2 \times \mathbb{C}$ describes the universal equisingular unfolding of $\mathcal{F}_c$. Besides, all the analytic classes with fixed holonomy are realized along the parameter space $c \in \mathbb{C}$. We can think of $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}$ as a realization of all universal unfoldings of foliations with some fixed holonomy. The intersection of $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}$ with the fiber at $c = \infty$ is not an element in $\mathcal{D}$, but it is still a germ of foliation and it allows us to compactify the germs of foliations along the parameter space.

We deduce a parametrization of $\mathcal{D}(2)/\sim$ that is adapted to the equivalence relation *having the same holonomy class*. By considering the parameters $(a, b, c) \in \mathbb{C}\{x\}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^1$, the fibers of the projection $(a, b, c) \mapsto (a, b)$ parametrize equivalence classes. These restrictions of the parametrization are locally injective, in general, but not globally injective. As a consequence, up to changing coordinates, any two distinct germs in $\mathcal{D}(2)$ sharing the same holonomy class can be joined by a deformation underlying a non-trivial equisingular unfolding.

4.4. *Unfoldings versus deformations in* $\mathcal{D}$. In this section, we give some independent results which compare the unfoldings and the deformations of a foliation in $\mathcal{D}$. In general, it is very difficult to give a criterion that recognizes deformations that underlie an unfolding. However, for the class $\mathcal{D}$, it can be decided by the variation of the holonomy.

PROPOSITION 16. *Let* $\{\mathcal{F}_c\}_{c\in(\mathbb{C}^k,0)} \subset \mathcal{D}$ *be an analytic germ of deformation of* $\mathcal{F}_0$ *satisfying that* $H(\mathcal{F}_c) = H(\mathcal{F}_0)$ *for all* $c \in (\mathbb{C}^k, 0)$. *Then the given deformation underlies an equisingular unfolding of* $\mathcal{F}_0$ *on* $(\mathbb{C}^{2+k}, 0)$.

Proof. Let us provide a couple of open neighborhoods of some open sets in E satisfying that:

- $U_1 \cup U_2$ is a neighborhood of E; and
- on each U_j, there is an analytic family

$$\psi_c^j : U_j \to U_j$$

of biholomorphisms fixing every point of E and sending $\mathcal{F}_{0|U_j}$ to $\mathcal{F}_{c|U_j}$.

Doing so, the initial deformation will be a product on each $U_j \times (\mathbb{C}^k, 0)$ and, as highlighted in [**12**], will be correspond to an unfolding.

https://doi.org/10.1017/etds.2015.123 Published online by Cambridge University Press

LEMMA 17. *Given $\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{D}$, there exist two radial foliations $\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2 \in \mathcal{D}(0)$ such that*

$$|\mathrm{Tang}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}_1)_{|E}| \cap |\mathrm{Tang}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}_2)_{|E}| = \emptyset.$$

Proof. Up to some change of coordinates, we can suppose that

$$\omega(x, y) = R(x, y)(x\,dy - y\,dx) + P_{n+2}\,dx + Q_{n+2}\,dy + \cdots$$

representing $\mathcal{F}$ satisfies that the degree of $P_{n+2}(1, t) + tQ_{n+2}(1, t)$ is $n + 3$. Since, $R(1, t)$ and $P_{n+2}(1, t) + tQ_{n+2}(1, t)$ have no common roots, one can choose $\mathcal{G}_1 = x\partial_x + y\partial_y$ and $\mathcal{G}_2 = x\partial_x + (y + x^2)\partial_y$. □

Applying Lemma 17 to $\mathcal{F}_0$, we find a Jordan curve γ in E that separates $|\mathrm{Tang}(\mathcal{F}_0, \mathcal{G}_1)_{|E}|$ from $|\mathrm{Tang}(\mathcal{F}_0, \mathcal{G}_2)_{|E}|$ and we take U_1 to be an $\mathcal{F}_0$ saturated neighborhood of the disk in $E\backslash\gamma$ with no point in $|\mathrm{Tang}(\mathcal{F}_0, \mathcal{G}_1)_{|E}|$, and we take U_2 to be an $\mathcal{F}_0$ saturated neighborhood of the complementary disk. For sufficiently small $c \in (\mathbb{C}^k, 0)$, $\mathcal{F}_c$ and $\mathcal{G}_j$ are transverse on U_j. We can define the equivalence ψ_c^j on U_j by simply imposing $\psi^j_{c|E} = \mathrm{Id}$, $(\psi_c^j)_*(\mathcal{F}_0) = \mathcal{F}_c$ and $(\psi_c^j)_*(\mathcal{G}_j) = \mathcal{G}_j$. The analytic dependence of $\mathcal{F}_c$ along the parameter guarantees that the families ψ_c^j are analytic on $c \in (\mathbb{C}^k, 0)$. To prove that the unfolding is equisingular, we need to check that along the whole process of desingularization the leaves of the unfolding are transverse to the parameter fibration $(x, c) \mapsto c$. In the present case, note that a leaf of the unfolding is formed by the union of leaves of the deformation that sit over *the same* point in E, since we do not move the points in E along the construction. Thus the trace of a leaf of the unfolding on the divisor $E \times (\mathbb{C}^k, 0)$ is $p \times (\mathbb{C}^k, 0)$, which is regular and transverse to the fibration. □

Acknowledgements. The first author is supported by CNPq/Faperj; the second author supported by the ANR under the project ANR-13-JS01-0002-01. Both authors are supported by the Math-Amsud project DFH. We are thankful to G. Casale, J.-F. Mattei, L. Ortiz, E. Paul, E. Rosales, P. Sad, E. Salem and L. Teyssier for useful conversations on the subject of the paper.

REFERENCES

[1] M. Artin. On the solutions of analytic equations. *Invent. Math.* **5** (1968), 277–291.
[2] M. Brunella. *Birational Theory of Foliations (IMPA Monographs, 1)*. Springer, New York, 2015.
[3] G. Calsamiglia. Finite determinacy of dicritical singularities. *Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble)* **57**(2) (2007), 673–691.
[4] C. Camacho and H. Movasati. *Neighborhoods of Analytic Varieties (Monografias del IMCA, MI-35)*. IMCA, Lima, 2003.
[5] C. Camacho and P. Sad. Invariant varieties through singularities of vector fields. *Ann. of Math. (2)* **115** (1982), 579–595.
[6] Y. Genzmer. Analytical and formal classification of quasi-homogeneous foliations. *J. Differential Equation* **245**(6) (2008), 1656–1680.
[7] Y. Genzmer and E. Paul. Normal forms of foliations and curves defined by a function with generic tangent cone. *Mosc. Math. J.* (1) (2011), 41–72.

https://doi.org/10.1017/etds.2015.123 Published online by Cambridge University Press

[**8**] Yu. S. Ilyashenko. Topology of phase portraits of analytic differential equations on a complex projective plane. *Tr. Semin. im. I. G. Petrovskogo* **4** (1978), 83–136.
[**9**] M. Klughertz. Existence d'une intégrale première méromorphe pour des germes de feuilletages à feuilles fermées du plan complexe. *Topology* **2** (1992), 255–269.
[**10**] F. Loray. A preparation theorem for codimension-one foliations. *Ann. of Math (2)* **2** (2006), 709–722.
[**11**] D. Marin. Moduli spaces of germs of holomorphic foliations in the plane. *Comment. Math. Helv.* **78**(3) (2003), 518–539.
[**12**] J.-F. Mattei. Modules de feuilletages holomorphes singuliers. I. Équisingularité. *Invent. Math.* **103**(2) (1991), 297–325.
[**13**] J.-F. Mattei and E. Salem. Modules formels locaux de feuilletages holomorphes. *Preprint*, 2010.
[**14**] L. Ortiz, E. Rosales and S. Voronin. Rigidity theorems for generic holomorphic germs of dicritic foliations and vector fields in $(\mathbb{C}^2, 0)$. *Mosc. Math. J.* **5**(1) (2005), 171–206.
[**15**] L. Ortiz, E. Rosales and S. Voronin. Analytic normal forms of germs of holomorphic dicritic foliations. *Mosc. Math. J.* **8**(3) (2008), 521–545, 616.
[**16**] L. Ortiz, E. Rosales and S. Voronin. Thom's problem for degenerated singular points of holomorphic foliations in the plane. *Mosc. Math. J.* **12**(4) (2012), 825–862.
[**17**] R. Perez-Marco. Sur les dynamiques holomorphes non-linéarisables et une conjecture de V.I. Arnold. *Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Supér.* (4) **26**(5) (1993), 565–644.
[**18**] V. I. Savelev. Zero-type embedding of a sphere into complex surfaces. *Moscow Univ. Math. Bull.* **37** (1982), 34–39.
[**19**] T. Ueda. On the neighborhood of a compact complex curve with topologically trivial normal bundle. *Kyoto J. Math. Univ.* **22**(4) (1982/83), 583–607.

https://doi.org/10.1017/etds.2015.123 Published online by Cambridge University Press