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Abstract
These are my live-texed notes for the Fall 2018 student enumerative geometry seminar on the GW/DT correspondence. These notes have known omissions in the earlier talks. Let me know when you find errors or typos. I’m sure there are plenty.
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1 GW theory

1.1 Sep 11 (Melissa): Hodge/Hurwitz numbers and ELSV

Today we prove the ELSV formula, relating Hodge integrals with Hurwitz numbers.

Definition 1.1. A Hodge integral is an integral over \( \bar{M}_{g,n} \) of the form

\[
\int_{[\bar{M}_{g,n}]} \psi_1^{j_1} \cdots \psi_n^{j_n} \lambda_1^{k_1} \cdots \lambda_g^{k_g}.
\]
Theorem 1.4 (ELSV formula). These can be explicitly evaluated via Burnside’s formula.

Definition 1.3. The Hurwitz numbers \( H_{g,\mu} \) count the number of such ramified covers for given \( \mu \). We know \(|\mu| := \sum \mu_i = d\), i.e. \( \mu \) is a partition of \( d \), and we write \( \ell(\mu) := n \) for the length.

Remark. By Riemann–Hurwitz,

\[
2 - 2g = \chi(C) = d\chi(\mathbb{P}^1) + R = 2d - r - (d + n),
\]

so that there are a total of \( r = 2g - 2 + d + n = 2g - 2 + |\mu| + \ell(\mu) \) ramification points.

Remark. The monodromy around a simple branch point gives a transposition of two out of \( d \) sheets. Hence the simple Hurwitz number is

\[
H_{g,\mu} = \frac{1}{\# G_{\mu}} \left\{ \sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_r, \sigma_\infty \in S_d : \sigma_1 \cdots \sigma_r \sigma_\infty = 1 \ (\text{connectedness}) \ (\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_r) \text{ acts transitively on } \{1, \ldots, d\} \right\}
\]

Here \( G_{\mu} \) is the conjugacy class of the cycle class of \( \mu \), and \( \# G_{\mu} := \mu_1 \cdots \mu_n | \text{Aut}(\mu)| \), where \( \text{Aut}(\mu) \) is non-trivial if there are identical numbers \( \mu_i = \mu_{i+1} = \cdots \) in the partition.

Definition 1.3. The disconnected Hurwitz numbers \( H_{g,\mu}^* \) are exactly the same as above, but without the connectedness requirement. Both can be put into generating functions

\[
\sum_g H_{g,\mu} \lambda^{2g-2+\ell(\mu)}, \quad \sum_g H_{g,\mu}^* \lambda^{2g-2+\ell(\mu)}.
\]

These can be explicitly evaluated via Burnside’s formula.

Theorem 1.4 (ELSV formula).

\[
H_{g,\mu} = \frac{2g - 2 + |\mu| + \ell(\mu)}{|\text{Aut}(\mu)|} \prod_{i=1}^{\ell(\mu)} \mu_i^{\ell(\mu)} \int_{\mathcal{M}_{g,n}} 1 - \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 - \cdots + (-1)^g \lambda_g \prod_{i=1}^{\ell(\mu)} (1 - \mu_i \psi_i).
\]

Remark. The idea is to set up the moduli of relative stable maps, and then do localization. We will define the moduli only for \((\mathbb{P}^1, \infty)\).

Definition 1.5. The moduli of relative stable maps to \((\mathbb{P}^1, \infty)\) is given as follows.

1. Define the moduli space \( \mathcal{M}_g(\mathbb{P}^1, \mu) \) of

\[
f: (C, x_1, \ldots, x_n) \xrightarrow{\deg d} \mathbb{P}^1
\]

where \( f^{-1}(\infty) = \mu_1 x_1 + \cdots + \mu_n x_n \) and \( C \) is smooth of genus \( g \).
2. Define the compactification $\tilde{M}_g(\mathbb{P}^1, \mu)$ of 

$$ f: (C, x_1, \ldots, x_n) \to \mathbb{P}^1[m] $$

by allowing $C$ to become nodal, and $\mathbb{P}^1[m]$ denotes attaching $m$ extra $\mathbb{P}^1$ to the original $\mathbb{P}^1$. Let $q'_i$ denote nodes in the $\mathbb{P}^1[m]$. Require compatibility conditions:

(a) $f_i: C_i \to \mathbb{P}^1$ is degree $d = |\mu|$ where $C_i$ is the preimage of the $i$-th $\mathbb{P}^1$;

(b) $f^{-1}(q'_m) = \mu_1 x_1 + \cdots + \mu_n x_n$;

(c) (predeformable) $f^{-1}(q'_i)$ is a union of nodes in $C$ with the same contact order (so that we can simultaneously smooth nodes in the target and the source);

(d) (stability) $\text{Aut}(f)$ is finite.

A homomorphism of two such relative stable maps is a commuting square

$$
\begin{array}{ccc}
(C, x_1, \ldots, x_n) & \xrightarrow{f} & \mathbb{P}^1[m] \\
\phi \downarrow & & \downarrow \phi \in (C')^m \\
(C', x'_1, \ldots, x'_n) & \xrightarrow{f'} & \mathbb{P}^1[m]
\end{array}
$$

where $\psi$ can re-parameterize the extra $\mathbb{P}^1$. (The number $m$ is bounded by stability once we fix $g$ and $\mu$.)

The compactification is the moduli of relative stable maps. It is a proper DM stack with perfect obstruction theory.

**Definition 1.6.** There is a **branch morphism** extending the usual one for smooth projective varieties

$$
\text{Br}: \tilde{M}_g(\mathbb{P}^1, \mu) \to \text{Sym}^r \mathbb{P}^1 \cong \mathbb{P}^r,
$$

$$
[f: (C, x_1, \ldots, x_n) \to \mathbb{P}^1[m]] \mapsto \sum \text{Br}(f_i) + \sum (2g(B_i) - 2)[f(B_i)] + f_\ast N,
$$

where in the normalization $\tilde{C} \to \mathbb{P}^1$ of $C \to \mathbb{P}^1$:

1. $f_i: A_i \to D$ are maps of uncontracted components;

2. $B_i \subset \tilde{C}$ are contracted components;

3. $N$ is the divisor consisting of the nodes in $C$.

Hence the Hurwitz number $H_{g,\mu}$ is the degree of $\text{Br}$:

$$
H_{g,\mu} = \frac{1}{|\text{Aut}(\mu)|} \deg(\text{Br}: \tilde{M}_g(\mathbb{P}^1, \mu) \to \mathbb{P}^r)
= \frac{1}{|\text{Aut}(\mu)|} \int_{[\tilde{M}_g(\mathbb{P}^1, \mu)]^{\text{vir}}} \text{Br}^\ast(H')
$$

since $H' = \text{PD}(\text{pt})$.

### 1.2 Sep 18 (Melissa): ELSV formula

Last time we identified Hurwitz numbers $H_{g,\mu}$ with the degree of a branch morphism. Today we will compute this via localization. First, a brief review of localization.
**Definition 1.7.** Let $G$ be a Lie group and $EG$ be a contractible topological space with free $G$-action. The **classifying space** of $G$ is $BG := EG/G$, defined up to homotopy equivalence. If $X$ is a topological space with continuous $G$-action, then we can form the associated $X$-bundle

$$X_G := EG \times_G X,$$

called the **homotopy orbit space**, with projection $\pi : X_G \to BG$. The **$G$-equivariant cohomology** $H^*_G(X, R) := H^*(X_G, R)$ for any coefficient ring $R$.

**Example 1.8.** If $G$ acts on $X$ freely, then

$$H^*_G(X, R) = H^*(X_G, R) = H^*(X/G, R)$$

since $X_G$ is homotopic to $X/G$ by contractibility of $EG$. If $G$ acts on $X$ trivially, then

$$H^*_G(X, R) = H^*(X \times BG, R) = H^*(X, R) \otimes_R H^*(BG, R).$$

**Remark.** In general, because of

$$\pi^* : H^*(BG) \to H^*(X_G),$$

the $G$-equivariant cohomology of any space is always a $H^*_G(pt)$-module. There is also an inclusion $i : X \to X_G$ which induces

$$i^* : H^*(X_G) \to H^*(X),$$

the specialization to non-equivariant cohomology; this is well-defined because all fibers are homotopic.

**Example 1.9.** For $G = \mathbb{C}^*$, we see that it acts freely on $\mathbb{C}^\infty - \{0\}$. Hence

$$BC^* = (\mathbb{C}^\infty - \{0\})/\mathbb{C}^* = \mathbb{C}^\infty := \lim_{N \to \infty} \mathbb{CP}^N.$$ The equivariant cohomology is

$$H^*(BC^*, Z) = \lim_{N \to \infty} H^*(\mathbb{CP}^N, Z) = \lim_{N \to \infty} Z[u]/u^{N+1} = Z[u].$$

Here $u := c_1(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{CP}^N}(-1)).$

**Definition 1.10.** Let $V \to X$ be a $G$-equivariant complex vector bundle of rank $r$. Then $V_G \to X_G$ is still a vector bundle of rank $r$. The **$G$-equivariant Chern class** of $V$ is

$$c^G_k(V) := c_k(V_G) \in H^{2k}(X_G, Z) = H^{2k}_G(X, Z).$$

**Example 1.11.** Let $\mathbb{C}^*$ act on $\mathbb{C}$ via the standard weight, i.e.

$$\mathbb{C}^* \to GL(1, \mathbb{C}), \quad t \mapsto t.$$ This gives a $\mathbb{C}^*$-equivariant line bundle $\mathcal{L}_t$. On $BC^*$, this is

$$\mathcal{L}_t = \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{CP}^\infty}(-1) \to \mathbb{CP}^\infty = BC^*.$$ We see that $c^G_1(\mathcal{L}_t) = u.$

**Example 1.12.** The standard action of $\mathbb{C}^*$ on $\mathbb{P}^1$ induces an action on $\mathbb{P}^r = \text{Sym}^r \mathbb{P}^1$ given by

$$t \cdot [a_0 : \cdots : a_r] := [a_0 : t^{-1}a_1 : t^{-2}a_2 : \cdots : t^{-r}a_r].$$

The two fixed points $q_0, q_1 \in \mathbb{P}^1$ induce fixed points

$$\mathbb{P}^r \ni p_i := \{a_j = 0 \forall j \neq i\} \leftrightarrow iq_0 + (r-i)q_1 \in \text{Sym}^r \mathbb{P}^1.$$
Remark. If $X$ is a compact complex manifold of dimension $n$, then there is a pushforward induced by $\pi: X_G \to BG$:

$$\pi_*: H^*_G(X) \to H^*_G(pt), \quad \alpha \mapsto \int_{[X]} \alpha.$$ 

Suppose $G = \mathbb{C}^*$ for simplicity. Then this pushforward commutes with specialization to non-equivariant cohomology:

$$
\begin{array}{ccc}
H^*_G(X) & \longrightarrow & H^*_{2n}(pt) \\
\downarrow_{u \to 0} & & \downarrow_{u \to 0} \\
H^*(X) & \longrightarrow & H^{*+2n}(pt)
\end{array}
$$

Example 1.13. Let $D_i := \{a_i = 0\} \subset \mathbb{P}^r$ be a $T$-invariant divisor, and there are $r + 1$ of them. We know $\text{PD}(D_i) = c_1(O_{\mathbb{P}^r}(D_i)) = H \in H^2(\mathbb{P}^r, \mathbb{Z})$. The cohomology $H^*(\mathbb{P}^r, \mathbb{Z}) = \mathbb{Z}[H]/\langle H^{r+1}\rangle$ is saying $D_1 \cdots D_r = 0$. But equivariantly,

$$H_i := \text{PD}_{\mathbb{C}^*}(D_i) = c_1^G(O_{\mathbb{P}^r}(D_i)) \in H^2_{\mathbb{C}^*}(\mathbb{P}^r, \mathbb{Z}),$$

and $H_0|_{p_0} = 0 \in H^2_{\mathbb{C}^*}(pt) = Zu$ and

$$H_i|_{p_0} = -iu.$$

Hence $H_i = H_0 - iu$, and

$$H^*_{\mathbb{C}^*}(\mathbb{P}^r, \mathbb{Z}) = \mathbb{Z}[H, u]/\prod_{i=0}^r(H_0 - iu).$$

Back to our situation: we want to compute

$$|\text{Aut}(\mu)|H_{g,\mu} = \int_{[\tilde{M}_g(\mathbb{P}^1, \mu)]^\text{vir}} \text{Br}^*(H^r).$$

We can do this equivariantly, by the equivariant lift of $H^r$ coming from the example above:

$$\int_{[\tilde{M}_g(\mathbb{P}^1, \mu)]^\text{vir}} \text{Br}^*(H^r) = \int_{[\tilde{M}_g(\mathbb{P}^1, \mu)]^\text{vir}} \text{Br}^* \prod_{i=0}^{r-1}(H_0 - iu).$$

We need to identify fixed points in order to apply equivariant localization. The branch morphism $\text{Br}$ is $\mathbb{C}^*$-equivariant, so that

$$\text{Br}: \tilde{M}_g(\mathbb{P}^1, \mu)^{\mathbb{C}^*} \to (\mathbb{P}^r)^{\mathbb{C}^*} = \{p_0, p_1, \ldots, p_r\}$$

where as we identified earlier, $p_i = ig_0 + (r - i)q_1$. Define $F_i := \text{Br}^{-1}(p_i)$. By localization,

$$|\text{Aut}(\mu)|H_{g,\mu} = \sum_{j=0}^r \int_{[F_j]^\text{vir}} i_j^* \text{Br}^* \prod_{i=0}^{r-1}(H_0 - iu)/e^{\text{vir}(N_{F_j}})$$

But over $p_j$, we have $\prod_{i=0}^{r-1}(H_0 - iu)|_{p_j} = 0$ unless $j = r$. Hence

$$|\text{Aut}(\mu)|H_{g,\mu} = \int_{[F_r]^\text{vir}} \frac{r!u^r}{e^{\text{vir}(N_{F_r})}}.$$ 

It suffices now to identify the fixed locus $\xi \in F_r \subset \tilde{M}_g(\mathbb{P}^1, \mu)$ such that $\text{Br}(\xi) = rq_1$. 
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1.3 Sep 25 (Melissa): Resolved conifold

Let $X$ be the total space of $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(-1) \oplus \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(-1)$, called the **resolved conifold**. It is a non-compact toric CY3. Let

$$i_0: \mathbb{P}^1 \to X$$

denote the inclusion of the zero section. Let $\overline{f}$ denote the inclusion of the zero section. Let $\bar{f}$ sequence of $\mathbb{C}$.

For any $g \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ and $d \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, define the genus $g$ degree $d$ GW invariant of the resolved conifold is defined by

$$N_{g,d} := \deg[\mathcal{M}_g(X,d)]^{\text{vir}} = \int_{[\mathcal{M}_g(\mathbb{P}^1,d)]^{\text{vir}}} e(V_{g,d}) \in \mathbb{Q}.$$

What is $V_{g,d}$? It should measure the difference of the deformations of a map to $\mathbb{P}^1$ vs a map to $X$. Given $[f: C \to X] \in \mathcal{M}_g(X,d)$, the tangent space $T^1_{\xi}$ and the obstruction space $T^2_{\xi}$ fit into the following exact sequence of $\mathbb{C}$-vector spaces:

$$0 \to \text{Aut}(C) \to \text{Def}(f) \to T^1_{\xi} \to \text{Def}(C) \to \text{Obs}(f) \to T^2_{\xi} \to 0$$

where:

1. $\text{Aut}(C) := \text{Ext}^0(\Omega_C, \mathcal{O}_C)$ is infinitesimal automorphisms of the domain $C$ (when $C$ is smooth, this is just the space $H^0(C, T_C)$ of vector fields);
2. $\text{Def}(C) := \text{Ext}^1(\Omega_C, \mathcal{O}_C)$ is infinitesimal deformations of the domain $C$ (when $C$ is smooth, this is just $H^1(C, T_C)$, which is first-order deformations of complex structures);
3. $\text{Def}(f) := H^0(C, f^*T_X)$ is infinitesimal deformations of the map $f$ with fixed domain curve $C$;
4. $\text{Obs}(f) := H^1(C, f^*T_X)$ is infinitesimal obstructions to such deformations.

Imagine now we do the same thing for $\mathbb{P}^1$. Then the only difference in the tangent-obstruction theory is the difference between $f^*T_X$ and $f^*T_{\mathbb{P}^1}$:

$$f^*T_X = f^*T_{\mathbb{P}^1} \oplus f^*(\mathcal{O}(-1) \oplus \mathcal{O}(-1)).$$

Hence we have a splitting $H^i(C, f^*T_X) = H^i(C, f^*T_{\mathbb{P}^1}) \oplus H^i(C, f^*(\mathcal{O}(-1) \oplus \mathcal{O}(-1)))$. Since $H^0$ vanishes, the excess $H^1(C, f^*(\mathcal{O}(-1) \oplus \mathcal{O}(-1)))$ over each point $\xi$ glue to form a vector bundle over $\mathcal{M}_g(\mathbb{P}^1, d)$, and this vector bundle is precisely $V_{g,d}$.
Definition 1.14. Define the generating series

\[ F(u, v) := \sum_{d>0} \sum_{g \geq 0} N_{g,d} v^d u^{2g-2}. \]

We will compute \( F(u, v) \) by virtual localization. Let \( \mathbb{C}^* \) act on \( \mathbb{P}^1 \) by \( t \cdot [x : y] := [tx : y] \). Call \( 0 = [0 : 1] \) and \( \infty = [1 : 0] \). Then \( T_0 \mathbb{P}^1 = \mathbb{C}_u \) and \( T_\infty \mathbb{P}^1 = \mathbb{C}_{-u} \). Lift the \( \mathbb{C}^* \)-action to \( O_{\mathbb{P}^1}(-1) \oplus O_{\mathbb{P}^1}(-1) \). There are many possible linearizations; for every \( a, b \in \mathbb{Z} \) we can choose weights

\[
\begin{align*}
\mathcal{O}(-1) & \quad \mathbb{C}_{zu} \quad \mathbb{C}_{(a+1)u} \\
\mathcal{O}(-1) & \quad \mathbb{C}_{bu} \quad \mathbb{C}_{(b+1)u}
\end{align*}
\]

But it turns out the most convenient one is \( a = -1 \) and \( b = 0 \). So we get a full \( \mathbb{C}^* \)-action on \( \mathcal{M}_g(\mathbb{P}^1, d) \) and \( V_{g,d} \) is equivariant with respect to this action. Hence we can apply equivariant localization. We need to identify fixed components, i.e. components in \( \bar{\mathcal{M}} \) and \( V \).

Definition 1.15. Given \( \xi = [f : C \to \mathbb{P}^1] \in \mathcal{M}_g(\mathbb{P}^1, d)^{\mathbb{C}^*} \), we can associate to it a decorated graph as follows:

1. (vertices) for each connected component \( C_v \) of \( f^{-1}(\{0, \infty\}) \), associate a vertex \( v \in V(\Gamma) \);
2. (edges) for each connected component \( O_e \cong \mathbb{C}^* \) of \( f^{-1}(\mathbb{P}^1 - \{0, \infty\}) \), associate an edge \( e \in E(\Gamma) \), and let \( C_e := O_e \cong \mathbb{P}^1 \);
3. (flags) \( F(\Gamma) := \{(e, v) \in E(\Gamma) \times V(\Gamma) : v \in e\} \);
4. (genus) label each vertex with its arithmetic genus \( \bar{g} : V(\Gamma) \to \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \), mapping \( C_v \) to its arithmetic genus;
5. (degree) label each edge with its degree \( \bar{d} : E(\Gamma) \to \mathbb{Z}_{>0} \), so that \( f|_{C_e} : \mathbb{P}^1 \to \mathbb{P}^1 \) is a degree \( d \) cover;
6. (marking) label each vertex with its marked points \( \bar{f} : V(\Gamma) \to \{\text{subset of \{1, \ldots, n\}}\} \).

Note that the total degree is \( d = \sum_{e \in E(\Gamma)} d_e \) and the total genus is \( g = \sum_{v \in V(\Gamma)} g_v + b_1(\Gamma) \) where \( b_1(\Gamma) \) is the first Betti number of the graph. Define the following subsets.

1. (stable vertices) \( V^s(\Gamma) := \{v \in V(\Gamma) : C_v \) is stable\}.

Let \( G_g(\mathbb{P}^1, d) \) be the set of such decorated graphs. (For each \( g, d \) clearly there are finitely many such graphs.)

These decorated graphs index fixed components. The structure of the fixed component associated to \((\Gamma, \bar{f}, \bar{g}, \bar{d})\) is

\[ F_\Gamma := [(\prod_{v \in V_s(\Gamma)} \mathcal{M}_{g_v, n_v})/A_\Gamma] \]

where \( A_\Gamma \) is the stabilizer of the whole fixed component. It fits into a SES

\[ 1 \to \prod_{e \in E(\Gamma)} \mathbb{Z}/d_e \mathbb{Z} \to A_\Gamma \to \text{Aut}(\bar{\Gamma}) \to 1. \]

Lemma 1.16. If \( \Gamma \) contains a vertex with valency \( n_v > 1 \), then the restriction of \( e_{\mathbb{C}^*}(V_{g,d}) \) to the locus \( F_\Gamma \) is zero.

Proof sketch. This arises from our convenient choice of linearization as follows. By normalization exact sequence, check that if there are any nodes of valency greater than 1, we will get zero weights and \( e_{\mathbb{C}^*}(V_{g,d}) = 0 \).
Hence the only remaining graph with (possibly) non-zero contribution is from $\Gamma$ with a single edge of degree $d$, from a vertex of genus $g_1$ to a vertex of genus $g_2$. Its normal bundle $N^\text{vir}_\xi = T^{1,m}_\xi - T^{2,m}_\xi$ is the moving part in the tangent-obstruction sequence

$$0 \to \langle B_1 := \text{Aut}(C) \rangle \to \langle B_2 := \text{Def}(f) \rangle \to T^1_\xi \to \langle B_4 := \text{Def}(C) \rangle \to \langle B_5 := \text{Obs}(f) \rangle \to T^2_\xi \to 0.$$ 

It remains to evaluate the weights of each term:

1. $B_1 = \text{Aut}(C_0, y_1, y_2) = H^0(C_0, TC_0(-y_1 - y_2)) = B^f_1$ because the only vector field fixing 0 and $\infty$ is $z \partial_z$, with trivial weight;

2. $B^\text{vir}_1 = T_y C_0 \otimes T_y C_1 \oplus T_y C_2$, where note that $C_1$ is a $d$-fold cover of $\mathbb{P}^1$ so that $(T_y C_1)^{\otimes d} = T_y \mathbb{P}^1$;

3. We will continue next time!

### 1.4 Oct 02 (Melissa): Resolved conifold II

**Theorem 1.17.** We have

$$\sum_{g \geq 0} N^g d u^{2g-2} = \frac{1}{d(2 \sin(du/2))^2}.$$ 

**Remark.** On the GW side, we expand near $u = 0$. Hence we have

$$Z^\prime_{GW} = \exp \sum_{d=1}^\infty \frac{v^d}{d(2 \sin du/2)^2}.$$ 

We use $u^{-x}$ so that the series behaves nicely under degeneration.

**Definition 1.18.** Recall that fixed components $\xi = [f: C \to \mathbb{P}^1] \in \bar{\mathcal{M}}_{g, d}(\mathbb{P}^1, \mathbb{C}^*)$ correspond to decorated graphs $(\Gamma := (\Gamma, f, g, d)$ as follows.

1. (Vertices) For each connected component $C_v \in f^{-1}(\{0, \infty\})$, we associate a vertex $v \in V(\Gamma)$. Define two labels on vertices:
   
   (a) $\bar{f}(v) := f(C_v)$, i.e. the label is either 0 or $\infty$;
   
   (b) $\bar{g}(v)$ is the genus of $C_v$ (or 0 if $C_v$ is a point).

   Let $V_0(\Gamma), V_\infty(\Gamma)$ be all vertices sitting over 0 and $\infty$ respectively.

2. (Edges) For each connected component $O_e \cong \mathbb{C}^*$ of $f^{-1}(\mathbb{P}^1 \setminus \{0, \infty\})$, associate an edge $e \in E(\Gamma)$. Define the label on edges $\bar{e}: E(\Gamma) \to \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ giving the degree of $f|_{O_e}$. Write $C_e := \bar{O}_e \cong \mathbb{P}^1$.

3. (Flags) Define $F(\Gamma) := \{(e, v) : v \in e\}$. Also, define $E_v := \{e : v \in e\} \subset E(\Gamma)$ to be all edges incident to $v$, and let $n_v := |E_v|$ be the valency of $v$. Hence

$$2g_v - 2 + n_v > 0.$$ 

Write $V(\Gamma) = V^I(\Gamma) \sqcup V^{II}(\Gamma) \sqcup V^*(\Gamma)$ where

$$V^I(\Gamma) = \{v : (g_v, n_v) = (0, 1)\}$$

$$V^{II}(\Gamma) = \{v : (g_v, n_v) = (0, 2)\}$$

$$V^*(\Gamma) = \{v : C_v \text{ is a curve}\}.$$ 

Similarly, write $F^*$ to mean flags which involve stable vertices.
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Do a partial normalization, at the nodes in \( F^s(\Gamma) \sqcup V^{II}(\Gamma) \). Given a labeled graph \( \Gamma \), write

\[
\mathcal{M}_{\Gamma} := \prod_{v \in V^{s}(\Gamma)} \tilde{\mathcal{M}}_{g_v,n_v}, \quad F_{\Gamma} := [\mathcal{M}_{\Gamma}/A_{\Gamma}].
\]

**Lemma 1.19.** We have

\[
[F_{\Gamma}]_{\text{vir}} = \frac{1}{|A_{\Gamma}|}(i_{\Gamma})_*[\mathcal{M}_{\Gamma}], \quad [\mathcal{M}_{\Gamma}] = \prod_{v \in V^{s}(\Gamma)} [\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_{g_v,n_v}].
\]

**Remark.** By virtual localization, it follows that

\[
N_{g,d} = \sum_{\Gamma \in G_g(\Gamma,d)} I_{\Gamma}, \quad I_{\Gamma} := \frac{1}{|A_{\Gamma}|} \int_{[\mathcal{M}_{\Gamma}]_{\text{vir}}} i_{\Gamma}^* \frac{e_{\mathcal{C}^*}(V_{g,d})|F_{\Gamma}}{e_{\mathcal{C}^*}(N_{\Gamma}^\text{vir})}.
\]

We will do the virtual normal bundle now.

Take a point \( \xi = [f:C \to \mathbb{P}^1] \in F_{\Gamma} \). We get an exact sequence

\[
0 \to \text{Ext}^0(\Omega_C,\mathcal{O}_C) \to H^0(C,f^*\mathbb{P}^1) \to T^1_\xi \to \text{Ext}^1(\Omega_C,\mathcal{O}_C) \to H^1(C,f^*\mathbb{P}^1) \to T^2_\xi \to 0.
\]

We call the terms \( B_1, B_2, B_3, B_5 \) for short. Hence the virtual normal bundle is the difference of the moving parts, i.e. parts with non-trivial weight:

\[
(N_{\Gamma}^\text{vir})_\xi = T_{1,m}^1 - T_{2,m}^2.
\]

Hence

\[
\frac{1}{e_{\mathcal{C}^*}(N_{\Gamma}^\text{vir})} = \frac{e_{\mathcal{C}^*}(B_{1,m}^m)\cdot e_{\mathcal{C}^*}(B_{2,m}^m)}{e_{\mathcal{C}^*}(B_{1}^m)\cdot e_{\mathcal{C}^*}(B_{1}^m)}.
\]

So we just have to identify the weights of each piece \( B_{1,m}^m \). These details are in Melissa’s “Equivariant Gromov-Witten Invariants of Algebraic GKM Manifolds” paper, applied to \( X = \mathbb{P}^1 \).

We go into some detail about the vanishing for the obstruction bundle \( \mathcal{O}(-1) \oplus \mathcal{O}(-1) \), by request. The most general linearization is

\[
0 = [0:1] \quad \infty = [1:0]
\]

\[
\mathcal{O}(-1) \quad \mathcal{C}_{au} \quad \mathcal{C}_{(a+1)u}.
\]

\[
\mathcal{O}(-1) \quad \mathcal{C}_{bu} \quad \mathcal{C}_{(b+1)u}
\]

By normalization exact sequence, we get

\[
0 \to H^0(C,f^*\mathcal{O}(-1)) \to \bigoplus_{v \in V^s} H^0(C_v) \oplus \bigoplus_{e \in E} H^0(C_e) \to (\mathcal{C}_{au})_{F_v^1} \oplus (\mathcal{C}_{au})_{F_v^2} \oplus (\mathcal{C}_{(a+1)u})_{F_v^2} \oplus (\mathcal{C}_{(a+1)u})_{F_v^2}
\]

\[
\to H^1(C,f^*\mathcal{O}(-1)) \to \bigoplus_{v \in V^s} H^1(C_v) \oplus \bigoplus_{e \in E} H^1(C_e) \to 0.
\]

This will give an Euler class

\[
e_{\mathcal{C}^*}(V_{g,d}) = \prod_{v \in V^s(\Gamma)} \Lambda^V_{g_v}(au)\Lambda^V_{g_v}(bu)((au)(bu))^{n_v-1}
\]

\[
\prod_{v \in V^s(\Gamma)} \Lambda^V_{g_v}((a+1)u)\Lambda^V_{g_v}((b+1)u)(((a+1)u)((b+1)u))^{n_v-1}
\]

\[
\prod_{e \in E} \frac{d_e-1}{d_e} (a+b)^{d_e-1} (a+1)^{d_e-1} (b+1)^{d_e-1}.
\]
This vanishes when \( a = 0 \) and \( b = -1 \) for any vertex, stable or unstable, whenever there are vertices with \( n_v > 1 \). This is why only the graph
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\circ \quad d \\
\downarrow \\
g_1 \\
\downarrow \\
g_2
\end{array}
\]
contributes, where \( g_1 + g_2 = g \). The contribution of the \( g_1 \) vertex (over 0) is of the form
\[
\Lambda^\vee_{g_1}(u) \Lambda^\vee_{g_1}(0) \Lambda^\vee_{g_1}(-1) / (u/d - \psi_1)
\]
and similarly for the \( g_2 \) vertex (over \( \infty \)). Let
\[
b_g := \begin{cases} 
1 & g = 0 \\
\int_{\lambda_{g-1}} \lambda_g & g > 0 
\end{cases}
\]
so that
\[
N_{g,d} = \sum_{g_1+g_2=g} \frac{1}{d} \int_{\lambda_{g_1}} \lambda_{g_1} u^{2g_1} \int_{\lambda_{g_2}} \lambda_{g_2} (-u)^{2g_2} (\frac{d-1}{d})^2 u^{2d-2} (-1)^{d-1} / (u/d - \psi_1 u/d - \psi_1)
\]
Putting everything into a generating function, we get
\[
\sum_{g \geq 0} N_{g,d} u^{2g-2} = \frac{1}{u^2 d^3} \left( \sum_{g \geq 0} b_g (du)^{2g} \right)^2.
\]
From the Faber–Pandharipande evaluation of Hodge integrals, we know
\[
\sum_{g \geq 0} b_g t^{2g} = \frac{\sin(t/2)}{t/2},
\]
Simplifying gives the desired theorem from the beginning of today’s lecture.

1.5 Oct 09 (Melissa): Relative GW theory

Let’s quickly review the tangent-obstruction theory for (absolute) GW theory. This is to prepare for the tangent-obstruction theory in relative GW theory. Fix \( X \) a non-singular projective variety over \( \mathbb{C} \) and \( \beta \in H_2(X,\mathbb{Z}) \) an effective curve class. Let
\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\mathcal{C} & \xrightarrow{\tilde{f}} & X \\
\downarrow \pi & & \downarrow \\
\mathcal{M}_{g,n}(X,\beta)
\end{array}
\]
where \( \pi: \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{M}_{g,n} \) is the universal domain and \( \tilde{f}: \mathcal{C} \to X \) is the universal map. We can also consider the forgetful map
\[
q: \mathcal{M}_{g,n}(X,\beta) \to \mathfrak{M}_{g,n}^{\text{pre}}
\]
to the Artin stack of prestable curves of genus \( g \) with \( n \) marked points. At the point \( \xi = [(C, x_1, \ldots, x_n)] \in \mathfrak{M}_{g,n}^{\text{pre}} \), we have
\[
\text{Lie} \text{Aut}(\xi) = \text{Ext}^0(\Omega_C(D), \mathcal{O}_C), \quad \text{Def}(\xi) = \text{Ext}^1(\Omega_C(D), \mathcal{O}_C)
\]
where \( D := x_1 + \cdots + x_n \). Inside \( \mathfrak{M}_{g,n}^{\text{pre}} \) sits the proper smooth DM stack \( \mathcal{M}_{g,n} \) of stable curves, which inherits this tangent-obstruction theory. Hence to compute the virtual dimension of \( \mathcal{M}_{g,n}(X,\beta) \), we can first compute \( \text{vdim} \mathcal{M}_{g,n} = 3g - 3 + n \), and then say
\[
\text{vdim} \mathcal{M}_{g,n}(X,\beta) = 3g - 3 + n + (\text{relative dimension of } q).
\]
But the relative tangent-obstruction theory for \( q \) is 
\[
\text{Def}(f) - \text{Obs}(f) = H^0(C, f^*T_X) - H^1(C, f^*T_X) = \chi(C, f^*T_X).
\]
Putting this all together, we get
\[
v\dim \bar{M}_{g,n}(X, \beta) = \int_\beta c_1(T_X) + (\dim X - 3)(1 - g) + n.
\]
Now we do this in the relative case.

**Definition 1.20.** Let \( X \) be a non-singular projective variety over \( \mathbb{C} \), with a smooth divisor \( D \subset X \). Fix an effective curve class \( \beta \in H^2(X, \mathbb{Z}) \) such that \( \beta \cdot D := \int_\beta c_1(O(D)) \geq 0 \). Let \( \mu = \mu_1 \geq \cdots \geq \mu_\ell > 0 \) be a partition of \( \beta \cdot D \). Define the moduli space of relative stable maps \( \bar{M}_{g,n}(X/D, \beta, \mu) \) to parametrize objects
\[
f: (C, x_1, \ldots, x_n, y_1, \ldots, y_\ell) \to X[k] := X \cup_{D_0} \Delta_1 \cup_{D_1} \cdots \cup_{D_k} \Delta_k = D_k
\]
where \( \Delta_i := \mathbb{P}(N_{D/X} \oplus O) \) and \( D_i \cong D \) for \( i = 0, 1, \ldots, k \), such that \( f^{-1}(D_k) = \sum_{i=1}^\ell \mu_i y_i \). Again we have a universal domain and universal target

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\mathcal{C} & \xrightarrow{f} & \mathcal{T} \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \pi \\
\bar{M}_{g,n}(X/D, \beta, \mu) & \xrightarrow{\pi} & \mathcal{B}
\end{array}
\]

To understand what the universal target \( \mathcal{B} \) is, look at \( X := \operatorname{lim}[\mathcal{X}[k]/\mathbb{G}_m^k] \) mapping to \( B := \operatorname{lim}[\mathbb{A}^k/\mathbb{G}_m^k] \), where \( \mathcal{X}[k] \) is constructed as follows.

1. Set \( \mathcal{X}[1] := \operatorname{Bl}_{D \times 0}(X \times \mathbb{A}^1) \). When \( t = 0 \in \mathbb{A}^1 \), we get \( X \cup_{D_0} \Delta \), and otherwise we just get \( (X, D) \). There is a \( \mathbb{G}_m \)-action acting on the \( \mathbb{A}^1 \), giving
\[
[\mathcal{X}[1]/\mathbb{G}_m] \to [\mathbb{A}^1/\mathbb{G}_m]
\]
and we are supposed to view \( [\mathbb{A}^1/\mathbb{G}_m] \) as the moduli corresponding to the total space \( [\mathcal{X}[1]/\mathbb{G}_m] \).

2. Set \( \mathcal{X}[2] := \operatorname{Bl}_{D[1] \times \mathbb{A}^1}(\mathcal{X}[1] \times \mathbb{A}^1) \). Now there are two parameters \( t = (t_1, t_2) \), and when \( t_1 = t_2 = 0 \) we get \( X[2] \). There is now a \( \mathbb{G}_m^2 \)-action, and we get
\[
[\mathcal{X}[2]/\mathbb{G}_m^2] \to [\mathbb{A}^2/\mathbb{G}_m^2].
\]

3. Continue in a similar fashion.

The universal target \( \mathcal{T} \) is formed by pullback of \( \mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{B} \) to \( \mathcal{M} \), i.e.

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\mathcal{T} & \xrightarrow{\pi} & \mathcal{X} \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
\bar{M}_{g,n}(X/D, \beta, \mu) & \xrightarrow{\pi} & \mathcal{B}
\end{array}
\]
is Cartesian.
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Now let’s describe the tangent-obstruction theory for $\tilde{M}_{g,n}(X/D,\beta,\mu)$. Fix $\xi := [f: (C, D_x, D_y) \to X]$ where $D_x$ is the marked points on the domain and $D_y$ is marked points intersecting with $D$. Then we get

$$0 \to \operatorname{Ext}^0(\Omega(C(D_x + D_y), O_C) \to H^0(C, f^*\Omega_X(\log D)) \to T^\xi_0$$

$$\to \operatorname{Ext}^1(\Omega(C(D_x + D_y), O_C) \to H^1(C, f^*\Omega_X(\log D)) \to T^\xi_1 \to 0.$$  

Here the two terms $H^i(C, f^*\Omega_X(\log D))$ are the relative tangent-obstruction theory for the map $q$ at the point $\xi$. If there were no log $D$, then this would just be $f^*T_X$. But the log $D$ requires the section to vanish to some degree: if $z_1, \ldots, z_N$ are local coordinates on $X$ with $D = \{z_N = 0\}$, then locally

$$\Omega_X(\log D) = \langle dz_1, \ldots, dz_{N-1}, \frac{dz_N}{z_N} = d\log(z_N)\rangle.$$  

It follows that

$$\operatorname{vdim} \tilde{M}_{g,n}(X/D,\beta,\mu) = 3g - 3 + n + \ell + \chi(C, f^*\Omega_X(\log D))\rangle.$$  

But $\Omega_X(\log D)$ is a vector bundle over $C$ of degree $\int_{\beta} c_1(T_X) - \beta \cdot D$ and rank dim $X$. Putting this all together, we get the following.

**Proposition 1.21.** The virtual dimension of the moduli of relative stable maps is

$$\operatorname{vdim} \tilde{M}_{g,n}(X/D,\beta,\mu) = (\int_{\beta} c_1(T_X) + (\dim X - 3)(1 - g) + n + (\ell - \beta \cdot D)).$$  

We see that the second term is new, and can also be written as $\ell - \sum_{i=1}^\ell \mu_i$. View this as the codimension arising from the relative condition. In the generic case $\mu = (1, \ldots, 1)$, there is no codimension.

Now in the general case of $\xi := [f: (C, D_x, D_y) \to X[k]]$, we need the more general exact sequence

$$0 \to H^0(C, f^*\Omega_X[k](\log D_k)) \to \bigoplus_{m=0}^{r-1} H^0_{\text{et}}(R_m) \to H^0(D)$$

$$\to H^1(C, f^*\Omega_X[k](\log D_k)) \to \bigoplus_{m=0}^{r-1} H^1_{\text{et}}(R_m) \to H^1(D) \to 0.$$  

What is $H^i_{\text{et}}(R_m)$? Think: it is supposed to be the deformation theory of $q$ which is “compatible” with the smoothing of nodes in the domain at $D$. Over each $D_i$ there are line bundles $L_i := N_{D_i/\Delta_i} \otimes N_{D_i/\Delta_{i+1}}$. Define

$$H^0_{\text{et}}(R_i) := \bigoplus_{q \in f^{-1}(D_i)} O_{D_t}$$

$$H^1_{\text{et}}(R_i) := H^0(D_t, L_i)^{\otimes n_i}/\Delta, \quad n_i := \#f^{-1}(D_i).$$  

Here $\Delta$ is the diagonal. We can view $R_i$ as the ramification divisor at $D_i$.

Now let’s look at gluing formulas. Take a simple degeneration $Y \to \mathbb{A}^1$, with:

$$Y_t = Y, \quad Y_0 = X_1 \sqcup_D X_2.$$  

When we look at $\tilde{M}_{g,n}(Y_t, \beta)$, think of $\beta$ as an element of $\operatorname{Hom}(\operatorname{Pic}(Y), \mathbb{Z})$, because now in general we can have monodromy when we go around 0. This is in general coarser than $H_2$. There is a cobordism argument that says that in Chow,

$$[\tilde{M}_{g,n}(Y_0, \beta)]_{\text{vir}} = [\tilde{M}_{g,n}(Y_t, \beta)]_{\text{vir}}, \quad \forall t \neq 0.$$  

The rhs is GW invariants on $Y = Y_t$. The lhs can be expressed using the relative moduli $\tilde{M}_{g,n}(X_t/D, \beta, \mu)$ as follows. To write the formula, it is more convenient to do the disconnected invariants $\tilde{M}_{g,n}^*(\ldots)$, because
if we break a curve it may become disconnected. Let $\beta_1 + \beta_2 = \beta$ and $\mu_1 \geq \cdots \geq \mu_\ell > 0$ be a partition of $\beta \cdot D$. There are evaluation maps which fit into a square

$$
\begin{array}{ccc}
\mathcal{M}_1 \times D^\ell \mathcal{M}_2 & \longrightarrow & \check{\mathcal{M}}^\bullet_{g,n}(X/D, \beta_2, \mu) =: \mathcal{M}_2 \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \text{ev} \\
\mathcal{M}_1 := \check{\mathcal{M}}^\bullet_{g,n}(X/D, \beta_1, \mu) & \longrightarrow & D^\ell \text{ev}
\end{array}
$$

Let $\Delta: D^\ell \to D^{2\ell}$ be the diagonal. Then we have another diagram

$$
\begin{array}{ccc}
\mathcal{M}_1 \times D^\ell \mathcal{M}_2 & \longrightarrow & D^\ell \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \Delta \\
\mathcal{M}_1 \times \mathcal{M}_2 & \longrightarrow & D^\ell \times D^\ell \\
\text{ev} \times \text{ev} & \longrightarrow & D^\ell \times D^\ell
\end{array}
$$

with $[\mathcal{M}_1 \times D^\ell \mathcal{M}_2]^{\text{vir}} = \Delta^\ell ([\mathcal{M}_1]^{\text{vir}} \times [\mathcal{M}_2]^{\text{vir}})$. Hence we have an equality

$$
[\check{\mathcal{M}}^\bullet_{g,n}(Y_0, \beta)]^{\text{vir}} = \sum_{\mu \vdash \beta \cdot D = \beta_1 \cdot D} \frac{\mu_1 \cdots \mu_\ell}{\text{Aut}(\mu)} \check{\mathcal{M}}_{g_1,n_1}(X_1/D, \beta_1, \mu) \times D^\ell \check{\mathcal{M}}_{g_2,n_2}(X_2/D, \beta_2, \mu)^{\text{vir}}
$$

for $g_1 + g_2 = g$ and $\beta_1 + \beta_2 = \beta$.

### 1.6 Oct 16 (Henry): The GW local curves TQFT

All manifolds are oriented, and we work over $\mathbb{C}$. Given a manifold $Y$, denote by $-Y$ the same manifold with opposite orientation. (We also assume our QFTs are anomaly-free.)

**Definition 1.22.** A $(n+1)$-dimensional TQFT is a symmetric monoidal functor

$$
Z: (n+1)\text{Cob} \to \text{Vect}_\mathbb{C}
$$

from the category of cobordisms to the category of vector spaces. Concretely, this means the following data.

1. Associated to each closed $n$-dimensional manifold $Y$ is a vector space $\mathcal{H}_Y$ called the (quantum) state space satisfying:
   - (gluing) $\mathcal{H}_\emptyset = \mathbb{C}$ and $\mathcal{H}_{Y_1 \sqcup Y_2} = \mathcal{H}_{Y_1} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{Y_2}$;
   - (orientation) $\mathcal{H}_{-Y} = \mathcal{H}_Y^*$.
   - (functoriality) if $f: Y \to Y'$ is a diffeomorphism, then there is an induced isomorphism $f_*: \mathcal{H}_Y \to \mathcal{H}_{Y'}$.

2. Associated to each compact $(d+1)$-dimensional manifold $X$ is an element $Z_X \in \mathcal{H}_\partial X$ called the partition function. To work with $Z_X$ it helps to imagine $\mathcal{H}_\partial X$ as the collection of functions on “boundary conditions” on $X$, and $Z_X$ as a function that takes a boundary condition and spits out the number of states satisfying that boundary condition on $\partial X$. This assignment must satisfy the following.
   - (Functoriality) if $f: X \to X'$ is a diffeomorphism with $\partial f: \partial X \to \partial X'$, then $(\partial f)_* Z_X = Z_{X'}$. (This is why we say the theory is “topological”.)
   - (Gluing) Suppose $X = X_1 \sqcup_Y X_2$, i.e. $X$ is obtained by gluing $(d+1)$-folds $X_1$ and $X_2$ along a common boundary $Y$.

$$
Z_X = \text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}_Y}(Z_{X_1} \otimes Z_{X_2})
$$
Think: \( Z_{X_i} \) counts how many states on \( X_i \) satisfy a given boundary condition \( Q \in \mathcal{H}_Y \) on \( Y \), so if \( \{Q_i\} \) is a basis for \( \mathcal{H}_Y \), then
\[
\#(\text{states in } X) = \sum_i \#(\text{states in } X_1 \text{ satisfying } Q_i) \cdot \#(\text{states in } X_2 \text{ satisfying } Q_i),
\]
which is exactly the formula above.

In \((1+1)\) dimensions, TQFTs have a structure that we can really get our hands on. The key idea is that any compact orientable surface \( S \) with boundary and genus zero looks like this:

![Diagram of a compact orientable surface with boundary](image)

This is because the boundary \( \partial S \) is a closed 1-manifold, which is always a disjoint union of a finite number of circles \( S^1 \). So the only state space we need to consider is \( \mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_{S^1} \), associated to “incoming” circles, and its dual \( \mathcal{H}^* = \mathcal{H}_{-S^1} \), associated to “outgoing” circles, which have the opposite orientation. A surface \( S \) with \( m \) incoming circles and \( n \) outgoing circles will correspond to a map
\[
\mathcal{H}^{\otimes m} \to \mathcal{H}^{\otimes n}.
\]

**Example 1.23.** The following is an inner product \( \langle -, - \rangle : \mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H} \to \mathbb{C} \) and a multiplication operator \( m(-, -) : \mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{H} \):

![Diagram of an inner product and multiplication operator](image)

**Example 1.24 (Identity map).** Consider the cylinder
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\includegraphics[width=0.1\textwidth]{cylinder1.png} \\
\end{array} := Z_C : \mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{H}.
\]

Usually we restrict our state space \( \mathcal{H} \) so that \( Z_C \) is surjective. Then
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\includegraphics[width=0.1\textwidth]{cylinder2.png} \\
\end{array} = \begin{array}{c}
\includegraphics[width=0.1\textwidth]{cylinder3.png}
\end{array}.
\]

Hence \( Z_C = Z_C \circ Z_C \). Idempotents are the identity on their image, so \( Z_C = \text{id} : \mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{H} \).

**Proposition 1.25 (2d TQFT = Frobenius algebra).** \( \mathcal{H} \) with \( \langle -, - \rangle \) and \( m(-, -) \) has the structure of a Frobenius algebra:

1. it is a commutative and associative algebra, with unit \( D^2 = \begin{array}{c}
\includegraphics[width=0.1\textwidth]{unit.png}
\end{array} \in \mathcal{H} \);
2. multiplication is compatible with the non-degenerate inner product, i.e. \( \langle ab, c \rangle = \langle a, bc \rangle \).

**Proof.** The diagrammatic proof of associativity is as follows:

![Diagram of associativity proof](image)

This uses the diffeomorphism invariance of the partition function. The others are left as an exercise. \( \square \)
Remark. Clearly we don’t have to map to $\text{Vect}_k$; we can do $\text{Mod}_R$ for any commutative unital ring $R$. Later we will take $R = \mathbb{Q}(t_1, t_2)((u))$.

Remark. The following are equivalent:

1. $\mathcal{H} = \mathbb{C} \oplus \cdots \oplus \mathbb{C}$ is a semisimple algebra;
2. $\mathcal{H}$ has an idempotent basis $\{e_i\}$ (with dual basis $\{e^i\}$ using $\langle -, - \rangle$);
3. $\langle -, - \rangle$ is a non-degenerate inner product.

Semisimplicity is a very important structural result: it means we can piece together partition functions for whole surfaces using partition functions of pieces, as follows.

**Proposition 1.26.** For a semisimple 2-TQFT, let $\lambda_i := \langle e_i, e_i \rangle$ be its structure constants. Then

$$Z_{\Sigma_g} = \sum_i \lambda_i^{1-g}.$$ 

**Proof.** Do a pair of pants decomposition of $\Sigma_g$:

We need to compute the two pieces we don’t know yet.

1. Compute the value of $\ell \in \mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}$ as follows. It arises from dualizing the second factor in $\text{id} = \sum_i e_i \otimes e^i \in \mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}^*$ where $\{e^i := e_i/\langle e_i, e_i \rangle\}$ is the dual basis to $e_i$. This means

$$\ell = \sum_i e_i \otimes \frac{e_i}{\langle e_i, e_i \rangle} \in \mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}.$$ 

2. Using this, we compute

$$\ell = \left[ x \mapsto \sum_i (xe_i) \otimes \frac{e_i}{\langle e_i, e_i \rangle} \right]: \mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}.$$ 

To get $Z_{\Sigma_g}$, compose all the pieces in the pairs of pants decomposition from left to right. Recalling that $e_i e_j = 0$ for $i \neq j$, we get

$$\sum_i e_i \otimes e_i \mapsto \sum_i e_i \lambda_i \mapsto \sum_i e_i \otimes e_i / \lambda_i \mapsto \sum_i e_i / \lambda_i^2 \mapsto \cdots \mapsto \sum_i e_i / \lambda_i^g \mapsto \sum_i \lambda_i.$$ 

Hence the final result is $Z_{\Sigma_g} = \sum_i \lambda_i^{1-g}$, as desired. 
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Definition 1.27. The local curve case for GW involves the following data:

1. a smooth irreducible projective curve $X$ of genus $g$;
2. a rank-2 bundle $N := L_1 \oplus L_2$ over $X$, of degrees or level $(k_1, k_2)$;
3. a possibly disconnected source curve $C$ of genus $h$ whose image has degree $\beta$.

Let $T^2$ act on $N$ with equivariant parameters $t_1, t_2$, so that

$$[\bar{\mathcal{M}}^\bullet_h(N, d[X])^T]^\text{vir} = [\bar{\mathcal{M}}^\bullet_h(X, d)]^\text{vir}.$$ 

Here $(-)^\bullet$ denotes disconnected invariants. By localization we can define:

1. the reduced GW partition function

$$Z'_d(N) := \sum_{h \in \mathbb{Z}} u^{2h-2} \int_{[\bar{\mathcal{M}}^\bullet_h(X, d)]^\text{vir}} e(-R^\bullet \pi_* f^*(L_1 \oplus L_2)) \in \mathbb{Q}(t_1, t_2)((u));$$

2. the GW generating function

$$GW_d(g; k_1, k_2) := u^{d(2-2g+k_1+k_2)} Z'_d(N) \in \mathbb{Q}(t_1, t_2)((u)).$$

We pick the exponent of $u$ so that it suffices to do the split case. This is because every vector bundle $\mathcal{E}$ on a curve has a filtration by line bundles: twist so that $\mathcal{E}(u)$ is globally generated, but a generic global section has zero locus of dimension $\dim X - \rank \mathcal{E} < 0$, so

$$0 \to \mathcal{O}_X \to \mathcal{E}(u) \to \mathcal{F} \to 0$$

and we can induct. In K-theory this means $\mathcal{E}$ is a positive linear combination of line bundles. This is not true in higher dimension: $T^2 = 2\mathcal{O}(1) - \mathcal{O}$ requires that negative term. Now within each extension of line bundles, we can “deform the Ext class”, i.e. form a universal family over $X \times \text{Ext}^1(L_2, L_1)$ to make it trivial, and we are done.

Remark. Write down the dependence of $GW_d(g; k_1 k_2)$ on its variables, to get rid of the sum over $h$ (by dimension axiom).

1. To make the dependence on $t_1, t_2$ clear, define

$$GW_{d,b_1,b_2}^h(g; k_1, k_2) := \int_{[\bar{\mathcal{M}}^\bullet_h(X, d)]^\text{vir}} c_{b_1}(-R^\bullet \pi_* f^* L_1) c_{b_2}(-R^\bullet \pi_* f^* L_2),$$

so that the total $GW_d(g; k_1, k_2)$ is a sum over $b_1, b_2$ of these pieces. The nice thing about these pieces is $t_1, t_2$ pull out of them as follows.

(a) The degree of $t_1$ in $c_{b_1}$ is

$$\rank(-R^\bullet \pi_* f^* L_1) - b_1 = -\chi(C, f^* L_1) - b_1 = -(\deg f^* L_1 + 1 - h) - b_1 = h - 1 - d k_1 - b_1.$$ 

(b) We don’t want a dependence on the genus $h$ of the source curve, because that will vary. Compute the virtual dimension

$$b_1 + b_2 = \text{vdim } \mathcal{M}^\bullet_h(X, d) = (\dim X - 3)(1 - h) + \int_{d[X]} c_1(T_X) = 2h - 2 + d \deg T_X = 2h - 2 + d(2 - 2g).$$

Hence $h - 1 = (1/2)(b_1 + b_2) + d(g - 1)$. 
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It follows that the exponent of $t_1$ is $(1/2)(b_2 - b_1) + d(g - 1 - k_1)$.

2. The variable $u$ indexes the quantity

$$2h - 2 + \int_{[d|X]} c_1(T_N) = 2h - 2 + d(2 - 2g + k_1 + k_2) = b_1 + b_2 + d(k_1 + k_2).$$

In total, we have

$$GW_d(g; k_1, k_2) = u^{d(k_1 + k_2)} t_1^{d(g - 1 - k_1)} t_2^{d(g - 1 - k_2)} \sum_{b_1, b_2 = 0}^{\infty} u^{b_1 + b_2} t_1^{\frac{1}{2}(b_2 - b_1)} t_2^{\frac{1}{2}(b_1 - b_2)} GW_d^{b_1, b_2}(g; k_1, k_2).$$

This will be super helpful later, because it suffices to compute the number $GW_d^{b_1, b_2}(g; k_1, k_2)$, and insert $t_1, t_2$ manually.

**Definition 1.28.** Let $\mathcal{M}_h(X, \lambda^1, \ldots, \lambda^r)$ be the moduli of **relative stable maps** to a curve $X$ of genus $g$, with prescribed ramification profiles $\lambda^1, \ldots, \lambda^r$ (all partitions of $d$) at given points $x_1, \ldots, x_r \in X$. Melissa showed us that for one ramification, the codimension of $\mathcal{M}_h(X, \lambda)$ is

$$|\lambda| - \ell(\lambda) = d - \ell(\lambda),$$

so that the codimension for multiple ramifications is

$$\text{co dim} \mathcal{M}_h(X, \lambda^1, \ldots, \lambda^r) = \delta := \sum_{i=1}^{r} (d - \ell(\lambda^i)).$$

As with the absolute case, we can shift $Z'(N)_{\lambda^1, \ldots, \lambda^r}$ by $u^{d(2g + k_1 + k_2 - r)} + \sum_{i=1}^{r} \ell(\lambda^i)$ so that

$$GW(g; k_1, k_2)_{\lambda^1, \ldots, \lambda^r} := u^{d(k_1 + k_2)} t_1^{d(g - 1 - k_1)} t_2^{d(g - 1 - k_2)} \sum_{b_1, b_2 = 0}^{\infty} u^{b_1 + b_2} t_1^{\frac{1}{2}(b_2 - b_1)} t_2^{\frac{1}{2}(b_1 - b_2 + \delta)} GW_d^{b_1, b_2}(g; k_1, k_2).$$

The idea now is to make a 2-TQFT out of the partition functions $GW(g; k_1, k_2)_{\lambda^1, \ldots, \lambda^r}$, where each incoming/outgoing state is a ramification condition $\lambda^i$. This means we need some prescription for turning incomings into outgoings, i.e. for dualizing. The factor we use is whatever makes the glueing formula work.

**Definition 1.29.** To raise indices, use $\delta(\lambda)(t_1 t_2)^{\ell(\lambda)}$, i.e. define

$$GW(g; k_1, k_2)_{\mu^1 \ldots \mu^t} := GW(g; k_1, k_2)_{\mu^1 \ldots \mu^t} \prod_{i=1}^{t} \delta(\nu^i)(t_1 t_2)^{\ell(\nu^i)}.$$

**Theorem 1.30.** For $g = g' + g''$ and $k_i = k'_i + k''_i$,

$$GW(g; k_1, k_2)_{\mu^1 \ldots \mu^t} = \sum_{\lambda \vdash d} GW(g'; k'_1, k'_2)^{\lambda} GW(g''; k''_1, k''_2)_{\nu^1 \ldots \nu^t},$$

and

$$GW(g; k_1, k_2)_{\mu^1 \ldots \mu^t} = \sum_{\lambda \vdash d} GW(g - 1; k_1, k_2)^{\lambda} GW(g; k_1, k_2)_{\mu^1 \ldots \mu^t, \lambda}.$$

**Proof.** We prove a simpler case:

$$GW(g; k_1, k_2) = \sum_{\lambda \vdash d} GW(g'; k'_1, k'_2)^{\lambda} GW(g''; k''_1, k''_2) \delta(\lambda)(t_1 t_2)^{\ell(\lambda)}.$$
Theorem 1.33. GW
Topologically, vector bundles are classified by degree and rank, so it suffices to label

\[ \tilde{\mathcal{M}}_{g,n}^*(Y,\beta) \]

which corresponds to degenerations of type \( \mu = \lambda \) (in the sum). We already see all the factors except \( (t_1 t_2)^\ell(\lambda) \). This factor comes from the integrand

\[ e(-R^* \pi_* f^*(L_1 \oplus L_2)) \]

as follows. If we degenerate the target and source

\[ X = X' \cup X'' \]

\[ \mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}' \cup \mathcal{C}'' \]

the line bundles \( L_1, L_2 \) must split with degrees \( k_1 = k'_1 + k''_1 \) and \( k_2 = k'_2 + k''_2 \), and for each line bundle \( L_i \) there is a normalization sequence

\[ 0 \to f^*(L_i)|_C \to f^*(L_i)|_{C'} \oplus f^*(L_i)|_{C''} \to f^*(L_i)|_{C' \cap C''} \to 0. \]

But \( |C' \cap C''| = \ell(\lambda) \), and this last term is trivial with weight \( t_i \). Hence

\[ -R^* \pi_* f^*(L_1|_{C'} \oplus L_2|_{C''}) + (t_1 t_2)^\ell(\lambda) = -R^* \pi_* f^*(L_1 \oplus L_2)|_C. \]

Level and genus add, which is why \( u \) behaves fine in gluing too. \( \square \)

1.7 Oct 23 (Henry): Local curve computations

Definition 1.31. Let \( 2\text{Cob}^{L_1,L_2} \) enrich \( 2\text{Cob} \) by asking morphisms \( Y_1 \to Y_2 \) to be equivalence classes of triples \((W,L_1,L_2)\) where:

1. \( W \) is a cobordism from \( Y_1 \) to \( Y_2 \);
2. \( L_1,L_2 \) are line bundles on \( W \) trivialized on \( \partial W \).

Topologically, vector bundles are classified by degree and rank, so it suffices to label \( W \) with the level \((k_1,k_2)\) of \((L_1,L_2)\).

Definition 1.32. Let \( R := \mathbb{Q}(t_1, t_2)((u)) \), and define the \( R \)-valued 2-TQFT

\[ GW : 2\text{Cob}^{L_1,L_2} \to \text{Mod}_R \]

by the data of:

1. the state space \( GW(S^1) := H := \bigoplus_{\lambda \vdash d} \text{Re}_\lambda; \)
2. the morphisms

\[ e_{\eta^1} \otimes \cdots e_{\eta^t} \mapsto \sum_{\mu^1,\ldots,\mu^t \vdash d} GW(g; k_1, k_2)^{\mu^1 \cdots \mu^t} e_{\mu^1} \otimes \cdots \otimes e_{\mu^t} \]

associated to a genus \( g \) cobordism from \( s \) inputs to \( t \) outputs of level \((k_1,k_2)\).

Theorem 1.33. \( GW \) is a well-defined functor, and is uniquely determined by its value on

\[ \begin{pmatrix} 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} (0,0) \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} (0,0) \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} (0,0) \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} (0,0) \end{pmatrix} \]
Proof. Everything follows from gluing laws. The only thing we really have to check is that the tube is sent to the identity morphism, i.e. that

\[ GW(0; 0, 0)_{\mu}^\nu = \delta_{\mu}^\nu. \]

We will check this later. \( \Box \)

We will show \( GW \) is a semisimple 2-TQFT by showing it in level 0, i.e. for \( GW(g; 0, 0) \). This is the part of the theory which gives classical contributions. Then we lift to the whole TQFT by the following lemma.

**Lemma 1.34** (TQFT Nakayama lemma). Let \((R, m)\) be a complete local ring, and let \( A \) be a Frobenius algebra over \( R \). Suppose \( A \) is a free \( R \)-module and \( A/mA \) is a semisimple Frobenius algebra over \( R/m \). Then \( A \) is semisimple (over \( R \)).

**Proof.** Since \( A/mA \) is semisimple, pick an idempotent basis represented by elements \( e_1, \ldots, e_n \in A \), i.e.

\[ e_i^2 - e_i \in m, \quad e_i e_j \in \forall i \neq j, \]

and by the regular Nakayama lemma, \( \{ e_i \} \) is a basis for \( A \). We modify it inductively so that it is idempotent mod \( m^k \). Suppose we had the relations for \( m^k \) instead of \( m \). Then define

\[ b_i := e_i^2 - e_i \in m^k, \quad e_i' = e_i + b_i(1 - 2e_i)^{-1}. \]

Note that \( 1 - 2e_i \) is invertible only because \( R \) is complete. We picked it so that terms cancel out in

\[ (e_i')^2 - e_i' = e_i^2 - e_i + (2e_i b_i - b_i)(1 - 2e_i)^{-1} + b_i^2(1 - 2e_i)^{-2} = b_i^2(1 - 2e_i)^{-2} \in m^{2k}. \]

Also, \( e_i' e_j' \in m^{k+1} \) just by checking all the terms are. Hence we can inductively construct an idempotent basis \( \{ e_i^{(k)} \} \) for \( A/m^{k+1}A \) for every \( k \). By completeness again, there exists \( \tilde{e}_i \in A \) with \( \tilde{e}_i = e_i^{(k)} \mod m^{k+1} \) for all \( k \). This is the idempotent basis we want. \( \Box \)

**Proposition 1.35.** Let \( \tilde{R} := \mathbb{Q}(t_1^{1/2}, t_2^{1/2})(u) \). Then the level \((0, 0)\) sector of \( GW \) in degree \( d \) is semisimple over \( \tilde{R} \).

**Proof.** Since \( m = (u) \), the structure constants of multiplication in the Frobenius algebra are given by the pair of pants structure constants \( GW(0; 0, 0)_{\alpha \beta \gamma} |_{u=0} \). Hence we care only about \( b_1 = b_2 = 0 \). Recall that \( b_1 + b_2 = \text{vdim} \), so here expected dimension is 0. Hence

\[ GW(0; 0, 0)_{\gamma |_{u=0}} = \mathbb{Z}(\gamma)(t_1 t_2)_{(\gamma)}GW(0; 0, 0)_{\alpha \beta \gamma} |_{u=0} = \mathbb{Z}(\gamma)(t_1 t_2)^{\frac{1}{2}(d - \ell(\alpha) - \ell(\beta) + \ell(\gamma))} H^{\mathbb{Z}_1}_d(\alpha, \beta, \gamma) \]

where \( H^{\mathbb{Z}_1}_d \) is a Hurwitz number. These we know how to compute by Burnside’s formula

\[ H^{\mathbb{Z}_1}_d(\alpha, \beta, \gamma) = \sum_{\rho \vdash d} \frac{\dim \rho \chi^{\rho}_{\alpha} \chi^{\rho}_{\beta} \chi^{\rho}_{\gamma}}{\dim \rho \beta(\alpha) \beta(\beta) \beta(\gamma)}. \]

Hence we have an explicit formula for the structure constants. The resulting Frobenius algebra is (up to \( t_1 t_2 \)) Yang–Mills with finite gauge group \( S_d \) and is well-known to be semisimple. We can actually explicitly write an idempotent basis

\[ v_{\rho} := \frac{\dim \rho}{d!} \sum_{\alpha} t_1^{(1/2)} t_2^{(1/2)} \chi^{\rho}_{\alpha} \chi^{\rho}_{\alpha} \chi^{\rho}_{\alpha}. \]

This requires the extension to \( \tilde{R} \). \( \Box \)
Corollary 1.36. There are universal series \( \lambda_{\rho}, \eta_{\rho} \in \tilde{R} \) indexed by partitions \( \rho \) such that

\[
GW_d(g; k_1, k_2) = \sum_{\rho \vdash d} \lambda_{\rho}^{1-g} \eta_{\rho}^{-k_1} \bar{\eta}_{\rho}^{-k_2}
\]

where bar means swapping \( t_1 \) and \( t_2 \).

Proof. Same proof as earlier, except we have series \( \eta_{\rho} \) associated to the level adding operator \((0,0)\). \( \square \)

Example 1.37 (Level \((0,0)\) tube). This is given by the series

\[
F \left( \begin{array}{c}
(0,0) \\
\end{array} \right) := GW(0; 0, 0)_{\lambda, \mu} = \begin{cases} 
\frac{1}{t_{\lambda}(t_1 t_2)^{\ell(\lambda)}} & \lambda = \mu \\
0 & \lambda \neq \mu
\end{cases}
\]

as follows. For connected domains, the only contribution to \( GW(0; 0, 0)_{\alpha, \beta} \) can be from degree-\( d \) covers \( \mathbb{P}^1 \to \mathbb{P}^1 \), because of the following.

1. Since the \( L_i \) are trivial,

\[
c(-R^* \pi_* f^* L_i) = c(R^1 \pi_* \mathcal{O}_{\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_h} - R^0 \pi_* \mathcal{O}_{\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_h}) = c(\mathcal{E}^\vee)/1,
\]

and hence the terms in \( GW(0; 0, 0)_{\alpha, \beta} \) are

\[
\int_{[\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_h(\mathbb{P}^1, \alpha, \beta)]^{vir}} c_{b_1}(\mathcal{E}^\vee) c_{b_2}(\mathcal{E}^\vee).
\]

2. Do a dimension count: \( \text{vdim} \tilde{\mathcal{M}}_h(\mathbb{P}^1, \alpha, \beta) = 2h - 2 + \ell(\alpha) + \ell(\beta) \), but \( \mathcal{E}^\vee \) is rank \( h \) and hence the integrand is dimension at most \( 2h \). Hence \( \ell(\alpha) = \ell(\beta) = 1 \) and \( b_1 = b_2 = h \). But Mumford’s relation says

\[
c_h(\mathcal{E}^\vee)^2 = 0 \quad \forall h > 0.
\]

Hence \( h = 0 \) as well, i.e. we have a totally ramified \( \mathbb{P}^1 \to \mathbb{P}^1 \).

Disconnected maps which contribute must therefore be a disjoint union of totally ramified covers. Such maps are isolated in moduli and have automorphism group of order \( 3(\alpha) \), i.e.

\[
GW^{b_1, b_2}(0; 0, 0)_{\alpha, \beta} = \begin{cases} 
1/3(\alpha) & b_1 = b_2 = 0, \alpha = \beta \\
0 & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}
\]

which gives the desired expression for the tube.

Example 1.38 (Level \((0,0)\) cap). This is given by the series

\[
F \left( \begin{array}{c}
(0,0) \\
\end{array} \right) := GW(0; 0, 0)_{\lambda} = \begin{cases} 
\frac{1}{d(\ell(t_1 t_2)^{\ell(\lambda)})} & \lambda = (1^d) \\
0 & \lambda \neq (1^d)
\end{cases}
\]

as follows. Now \( \text{vdim} \tilde{\mathcal{M}}_h(\mathbb{P}^1, \lambda) = 2h - 2 + d + \ell(\lambda) \), and we require \( d = \ell(\lambda) = 1 \). Then \( h = 0 \) by Mumford’s relation. Hence we can only have isomorphisms \( \mathbb{P}^1 \xrightarrow{\lambda} \mathbb{P}^1 \). Accounting for disconnected covers, we get \( d \) copies of isomorphisms, i.e. \( \lambda = (1^d) \), with \( S_d \) automorphism group.

Example 1.39 (Level \((-1,0)\) cap). This is given by the series

\[
F \left( \begin{array}{c}
(-1,0) \\
\end{array} \right) := GW(0; -1, 0)_{\lambda} = (-1)^{\ell(\lambda)} (-t_2)^{-\ell(\lambda)} \frac{1}{\delta(\lambda)} \prod_{i=1}^{\ell(\lambda)} \left( 2 \sin \frac{\lambda_i u}{2} \right)^{-1}
\]

as follows. Again do the connected case. Look at the terms of the integrand:
1. $-R^*\pi_*f^*\mathcal{O}(-1)$ has fibers $-H^*(C, \mathcal{O}_C(-d))$, which by Riemann–Roch is rank $-(d + 1 - h)$;

2. $-R^*\pi_*f^*\mathcal{O}$ has fibers $-H^*(C, \mathcal{O}_C)$, whose Chern class (up to a trivial factor) is just $c(E)$.

So by the usual inequalities, we require $\ell(\lambda) = 1$, i.e. $\lambda = (d)$ and $b_1 = h - 1 + d$ and $b_2 = h$. Compute

$$\int_{[\overline{M}_{h,1}(\mathbb{P}^1, d)]^{vir}} e(-R^*\pi_*ev^*\mathcal{O}(-1)) e(-R^*\pi_*ev^*\mathcal{O})$$

via $\mathbb{C}^*_q$-localization for the usual action of $\mathbb{C}^*_q$ on $\mathbb{P}^1$. Pick the linearization $(-1, 0)$ and $(0, 0)$ on $\mathcal{O}(-1)$ and $\mathcal{O}$ respectively, so that:

1. there is a unique vertex over $\infty$ because of the ramification profile $(d)$, and it has genus $0$ because it carries the class $c_g(v)(E \vee)^2$, which vanishes unless $g(v) = 0$;

2. the vertex over $\infty$ cannot have valence $> 1$, using our choice of linearization as in the proof of Aspinwall–Morrison; (note that we can only run this argument for $\mathcal{O}(-1)$ because $\mathcal{O}$ has non-trivial $H^0$, in the LES induced from normalization exact sequence)

3. the vertex at $0$ must be of genus $h$ for the total genus to be $h$;

4. the vertex at $\infty$ is rigid, i.e. gives no contributions at all to the integral, because it cannot be deformed within this moduli space.

Hence the only contribution is from a graph of the form $\begin{array}{c}
\circ \\
\downarrow \\
\circ \\
\hline \\
\circ \end{array} \frac{d}{h} \frac{1}{0}$. We compute its contribution via $\mathbb{C}^*_q$-localization.

1. The vertex contribution is done in the Faber–Pandharipande linear Hodge integral calculation. From the genus-$h$ vertex at $0$ we get

$$\int_{\overline{M}_{h,1}} (-1)^h\Lambda(q)(-1)^h\Lambda(0) \cdot \frac{(-1)^h\Lambda(-q)}{q/d - \psi},$$

where $\Lambda(q)\Lambda(0)$ comes from $e(-E_{-1})e(-E)$. (Here $E_{-1}$ is $E$ with linearization $-1$, coming from $\mathcal{O}(-1)$ term.)

2. To be continued.

1.8 Oct 30 (Henry): Cap and pants

We continue the $(-1, 0)$ cap computation from last time. The edge contribution from the single graph

$$\begin{array}{c}
\circ \\
\downarrow \\
\circ \\
\hline \\
\circ \end{array} \frac{d}{h} \frac{1}{0}$$

is as follows. Both deformations of the map and the integrand contribution involve weights of sections $H^*(\mathbb{P}^1, f^*\mathcal{O}(k))$, so we care only about what the linearization is at $0$ and $\infty$. Note however that we cannot deform the map at the degenerate vertex $\infty$.

1. (Denominator) From the linearization $(1, 0)$ of $T_{\mathbb{P}^1}(-\infty)$ (because we can’t deform the degenerate vertex at $\infty$), we get weights $kq/d$ for $k \in \{0, \ldots, d\} - \{0\}$. The product is $d!(q/d)^d$.

2. (Numerator) From the linearization $(-1, 0)$ of $\mathcal{O}(-1)$, we get weights $kq/d$ for $k \in \{-1, \ldots, -(d-1)\}$. The product is $(-1)^{d-1}(d-1)!(q/d)^{d-1}$. 
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Collecting everything together and using Mumford’s relation, the total contribution is a sum over \( h \) of the terms

\[
\frac{1}{d} \int_{\mathcal{M}_{h,1}} (-1)^{h} q^{2h} \frac{(-1)^{b} c_{h}(\mathcal{E})}{q^{a} - \psi} \left( \frac{(-1)^{d-1}(d-1)!}{q} \frac{d^{d-1}}{d^{d}} \right) = \frac{1}{d} \int_{\mathcal{M}_{h,1}} q^{2h} c_{h}(\mathcal{E}) \left( \frac{\psi^{2h-2}}{q^{2h-1}} \right) \left( \frac{(-1)^{d-1}d^{2h-2}}{q} \right) = \frac{1}{d} \int_{\mathcal{M}_{h,1}} c_{h}(\mathcal{E}) \psi^{2h-2}.
\]

(Note that all the \( q \)'s cancel, as they should!) This is a linear Hodge integral, and can be evaluated via Faber–Pandharipande’s formula

\[
\sum_{h \geq 0} (du)^{2h} \int_{\mathcal{M}_{h,1}} \psi^{2h-2} = \frac{du/2}{\sin(du/2)}.
\]

Plugging this into the explicit expression for \( GW(g; k_{1}, k_{2})_{\lambda} \), we get the desired result. For example:

1. since \( \delta = d - 1 \) and \( b_{1} = h - 1 + d \) and \( b_{2} = h \), we see that \( (1/2)(b_{2} - b_{1} + \delta) = 0 \) and \( d(g - 1 - k_{2}) + (1/2)(b_{1} - b_{2} + \delta) = -1 \);

2. disconnected invariants are products of \( \ell(\lambda) \) connected invariants, so in total we have \( t_{2}^{-\ell(\lambda)} \).

This finishes the \((-1, 0)\) cap computation.

The pair of pants is hard, because now there are no dimensionality arguments:

\[
\text{vdim } \mathcal{M}_{h}(\mathbb{P}^{1}, \lambda, \mu, \nu) = 2h - 2 - d + \ell(\lambda) + \ell(\mu) + \ell(\nu),
\]

so now the contributions even from connected sources is complicated. However for small cases, we still have dimensionality arguments. We will compute a modified version of \( GW(-) \) called \( GW^{\ast}(-) \); it involves a prefactor which will make the GW/DT correspondence hold on the nose:

\[
GW^{\ast}(-) = (-1)^{d(2-2g+k_{1}+k_{2})-\delta} GW(-).
\]

This requires us to make a modification to the (inverse of the) metric, which is now \( \mathfrak{g}(\nu)(-t_{1}t_{2})^{\ell(\nu)} \), i.e. there is an extra minus sign.

**Example 1.40** \((GW^{\ast}(0; 0, 0,(d),(d),(2))). \) Let \((2)\) denote \((2, 1^{d-2})\). In this case, we have \( \text{vdim} = 2h - 1 \) but the integrand is \( c_{h}(\mathcal{E}^{\nu})c_{b_{2}}(\mathcal{E}^{\nu}) \), so the only two possibilities are

\[
(b_{1}, b_{2}) = (h, h - 1), \quad (b_{1}, b_{2}) = (h - 1, h).
\]

So it suffices to compute \( \int_{\mathcal{M}_{h}([\mathbb{P}^{1}, (d), (d), (2)])}^{\text{vir}} \rho^{\ast}(-\lambda_{h}\lambda_{h-1}) \) where \( \lambda_{k} \in \mathcal{M}_{h,2} \) and

\[
\rho: \mathcal{M}_{h}([\mathbb{P}^{1}, (d), (d), (2)]) \to \mathcal{M}_{h,2}
\]

takes a relative stable map to the domain marked with the two totally ramified points. We use this to reduce to integrals over \( \mathcal{M}_{h,2} \) by computing

\[
\rho_{\ast}([\mathcal{M}_{h}([\mathbb{P}^{1}, (d), (d), (2)])]^{\text{vir}} = 2h[\bar{H}_{d}] + B
\]

where \( H_{d} \subset \mathcal{M}_{h,2} \) is the image of \( \rho \) on the smooth locus and \( \bar{H}_{d} \subset \mathcal{M}_{h,2} \) is the closure, and \( B \) is some cycle on the boundary which we can neglect, as follows.

1. Note that \( \mathcal{M}_{h}([\mathbb{P}^{1}, (d), (d), (2)]) \) is unobstructed and hence the virtual class is the usual fundamental class. On the open locus, let \( H_{d} \subset \mathcal{M}_{h,2} \) be the image of \( \rho \). Then

\[
\rho: \mathcal{M}_{h}([\mathbb{P}^{1}, (d), (d), (2)]) \to H_{d}
\]
is a proper degree $2h$ cover, because by Riemann–Hurwitz there are $R' = 2h$ other ramification points, and we can choose which one is the one we call $(2)$. (Here $2h - 2 = d(-2) + (d - 1) + (d - 1)$.) Hence

$$
\rho_* [\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_h(\mathbb{P}^1, (d), (d), (2))]^{vir} = 2h[\tilde{H}_d] + B
$$

where $B$ is supported on $\rho(\partial\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_h(\mathbb{P}^1, (d), (d), (2)))$.

2. Let $\epsilon: \tilde{\mathcal{M}}_{h,2} \to \tilde{\mathcal{M}}_{h,1}$ be the forgetful map. Then actually

$$
\rho(\partial\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_h(\mathbb{P}^1, (d), (d), (2))) \subset \epsilon^{-1}(\partial\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_{h,1}).
$$

This is because we know the image lies in $\partial\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_{h,2}$, but the only stratum there (i.e. singular curve with 2 marked points) that does not come from $\partial\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_{h,1}$ (i.e. singular curve with 1 marked point) must have one $\mathbb{P}^1$ component holding both marked points, which contracts onto the main component of genus $h$ when we forget one marked point. Such a component is not a valid source curve in the compactification of relative stable maps. Now to disregard $B$, use that

$$
\lambda_h \lambda_{h-1} |_{\partial\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_{h,n}} = 0.
$$

This is because there are two kinds of components in $\partial\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_g$, and it suffices to verify $\lambda_g \lambda_{g-1} = 0$ on both.

(a) (\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_{g-1,2}) Here there is a surjection $i^*\mathcal{E}_g \to \mathcal{O}$ given by taking residue at one of the marked points. Hence $c_g(\mathcal{E}_g) = 0$.

(b) (\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_{h,1} \times \tilde{\mathcal{M}}_{g=1,h}) Here $i^*\mathcal{E}_g$ factors as $p^*_1\mathcal{E}_h \oplus p^*_2\mathcal{E}_{g-h}$, so

$$
i^*\lambda_g = p^*_1\lambda_h p^*_2\lambda_{g-h}
$$

$$
i^*\lambda_{g-1} = p^*_1\lambda_h p^*_2\lambda_{g-h-1} + p^*_1\lambda_{h-1} p^*_2\lambda_{g-h}.
$$

Use the vanishing $\lambda^2_h = \lambda^2_{g-h} = 0$.

Collecting all this together, we get

$$
GW^*(0; 0, 0)(d), (d), (2) = \int_{t_1t_2} \frac{t_1 + t_2}{t_1 t_2} \sum_{h\geq 1} u^{2h-1} c_h(d), \quad c_h(d) := 2h \int_{[\tilde{H}_d]} \lambda_h \lambda_{h-1}.
$$

The next step is to reduce to the $d = 2$ case and explicitly compute on the hyperelliptic locus.

1. $H_d$ is the locus of curves $(C, x_1, x_2)$ with $\mathcal{O}(x_1 - x_2) \in \text{Pic}^0(C)$ being a non-trivial $d$-torsion point. In other words, if $\mathcal{P} \to \mathbb{P}^1 \to \mathcal{M}_{h,2}$ is the universal Picard bundle with section $s: (C, x_1, x_2) \to \mathcal{O}_C(x_1 - x_2)$, then

$$
[H_d] = \pi_* (s_* \mathcal{M}_{h,2} \cap P_d) \in A_*(M_{h,2})
$$

where $P_d$ is the locus of non-zero $d$-torsion points.

2. A result of Looijenga says given any family of abelian varieties $A \to S$, the class of the locus of $d$-torsion points is a multiple of the zero section in Chow. Hence

$$
\frac{1}{d^{2h} - 1} [P_d] = [0] = \frac{1}{2^{2h} - 1} [P_2]
$$

and this descends to $c_h(d) = (d^{2h} - 1)/(2^{2h} - 1) c_h(2)$. Hence we have reduced to $d = 2$. This case is easy, because $[\tilde{H}_2]$ relates to the hyperelliptic locus $\tilde{H} \subset \tilde{\mathcal{M}}_h$ almost by definition.
1. The extra data in $\bar{H}_2$ is which two of the Weierstrass points we choose to call $(2)$. By Riemann–Hurwitz, $2h - 2 = -2 \cdot 2 + r$, so there are $r = 2h + 2$ Weierstrass points, i.e.

$$(\tilde{M}_{h,2} \to \tilde{M}_h)^* [\bar{H}_2] = (2h + 2)(2h + 1)[\bar{H}] .$$

2. Use Faber–Pandharipande’s evaluation of $\text{ch}(E)$ on the hyperelliptic locus $\bar{H} \subset \tilde{M}_h$ to get

$$GW^*(0; 0, 0)_{(2),(2),(2)} = \frac{i t_1 + t_2}{t_1 t_2} \tan \frac{u}{2} \mu$$

From this, we get $c_h(2)$, which gives $c_h(d)$, and therefore the general expression

$$GW^*(0; 0, 0)_{(d),(d),(2)} = \frac{i t_1 + t_2}{t_1 t_2} \left( d \cot \frac{du}{2} - \cot \frac{u}{2} \right) .$$

**Remark.** It will be helpful to rewrite this with $q := -e^{iu}$ as

$$GW^*(0; 0, 0)_{(d),(d),(2)} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{t_1 + t_2}{t_1 t_2} \left( q (-q)^d + 1 + (-q) + 1 \right) .$$

**Theorem 1.41** (Bryan–Faber–Okounkov–Pandharipande reconstruction result). *The pair of pants series $GW^*(0; 0, 0)_{\lambda, \mu, \nu}$ can be uniquely reconstructed from $GW^*(0; 0, 0)_{(d),(d),(2)}$, lower degree series of level $(0, 0)$, and Hurwitz numbers of $\mathbb{P}^1 \to \mathbb{P}^1$. *

**Proof.** We show uniqueness. Idea: write an invertible linear system of equations for $GW^*(0; 0, 0)_{\lambda, \mu, \nu}$ whose coefficients are matrix elements of $GW^*(0; 0, 0)_{\mu, \nu}$; let

$$\langle \lambda | M_2 | \mu \rangle := (-1)^{\lambda} |GW^*(0; 0, 0)_{\lambda, \mu, \nu}| \delta_{|\lambda|, |\mu|}$$

be these matrix elements. In Fock space formalism, it is easy to express disconnected invariants in terms of connected ones:

$$-M_2 \propto \sum_{k > 0} GW^*(0; 0, 0)_{(k),(2),(k)} \alpha_k + \sum_{k,l > 0} \left( GW^*(0; 0, 0)_{(k+l),(2),(k,l)} \right)_{u=0} \alpha_k \alpha_l \alpha_k \alpha_l$$

This is because there are two types of contributions. The virtual dimension is $2h - 2 - d + \ell(\mu) + \ell(\nu) + d - 1 = 2h - 3 + \ell(\mu) + \ell(\nu)$.

1. (Quantum contribution) If $\ell(\mu) + \ell(\nu) = 2$ then $\ell(\mu) = \ell(\nu) = 1$ and we are necessarily in the case of connected invariants $GW^*(0; 0, 0)_{(d),(d)}$.

2. (Classical contribution) Otherwise $\ell(\mu) + \ell(\nu) = 3$ and we need contributions from $c_h(E)^2$, which as usual vanishes unless $h = 0$. This is the classical contribution, i.e. at $u = 0$, from Hurwitz numbers. Recall that

$$GW(0; 0, 0)_{\alpha, \beta} |_{u=0} = 3(\gamma)(t_1 t_2)^{\frac{1}{2}(d - \ell(\alpha) - \ell(\beta) + \ell(\gamma))} H_d^\gamma(\alpha, \beta, \gamma)$$

and the Hurwitz number controls what happens when a transposition hits another partition: it can either merge two cycles, or split a cycle into two.

The desired linear system arises as follows. Let $(2)^r$ denote $r$ copies of $(2)$. Then for partitions $\mu, \nu \vdash d$, we can get ramification $(\mu, (2)^r, \nu)$ in two ways:

1. glue $r$ copies of $(\alpha, (2), \beta)$;

2. glue the unknown $(\mu, \gamma, \nu)$ to $(\gamma, (2)^r)$, where we know

$$GW^*(0; 0, 0)_{(2)^r, \gamma} = GW^*(0; 0, 0)_{(2)^r, \gamma}^{(1^d)} GW^*(0; 0, 0)_{(1^d)}$$

because of the explicit expression for the $(0, 0)$ cap.
The equality we get is
\[ \langle \mu | M^2_r | \nu \rangle \propto \sum_{\gamma \vdash d} GW^* (0; 0, 0)_{\mu \gamma \nu} \langle \gamma | M^2_r | (1^d) \rangle. \]

This ranges over all \( r \), and we need to show the resulting system (for fixed \( \mu, \nu \)) is non-singular, over the field \( \mathbb{Q}(t_1, t_2, q) \) where the coefficients live (by our explicit formula).

1. Note that \( M^2 \) as an operator has distinct eigenvalues, because in the limit \( t_1 t_2 = 0 \) it is upper triangular with linearly independent entries on the diagonal. If \( F_d \subset F \) is spanned by vectors of degree \( d \), then it follows that the idempotents of the Frobenius algebra are eigenvectors of \( M^2 | F_d \). This is by picking eigenvectors \( \{v_j\} \) and looking at quantum multiplication \( * \), which gives
\[ v_i * v_i = \sum a_j v_j \implies v_i * v_i = a_i v_i \]
by applying \( M^2 \) to both sides as follows:
\[ \sum \lambda_i a_j v_j = \lambda_i v_i * v_i = M^2 v_i * v_i = \sum a_j M^2 v_j = \sum \lambda_j a_j v_j, \]
but the \( v_j \) are linearly independent so \( \lambda_i = \lambda_j \). But eigenvalues are also distinct, so there can be only one \( j \) on the rhs.

2. Check that \( |(1^d)\rangle \) is the unit in the Frobenius algebra. This is because (up to checking prefactors) of the \( (0, 0) \) cap being non-zero only for \( \lambda = \langle (1^d) \rangle \), so
\[ |\mu\rangle \times |(1^d)\rangle = |\mu\rangle. \]
But the unit is the sum of all idempotents, and \( M^2 \) has distinct eigenvalues. Hence \( \{M^2_r | (1^d)\rangle \}_{r \geq 0} \) spans \( F_d \). So the linear system of equations we got must be non-singular. Explicitly, the system is of the form \( v_r \cdot x = \langle \mu | M^2_r | \nu \rangle \) ranging over all \( r \), where \( v_r = M^2_r | (1^d)\rangle \); because they span, solutions are unique. \( \square \)

2 DT theory

2.1 Sep 12 (Clara): GW/DT for local CY toric surfaces

Let \( X \) be a nonsingular projective CY3.

**Definition 2.1** (GW side). Let \( N_{g,\beta} := \int_{[M_g(X,\beta)]^{vir}} 1 \) be GW invariants, and put them into a generating function
\[ F'_{GW}(X, u, v) := \sum_{g \geq 0} \sum_{\beta \neq 0} N_{g,\beta} u^{2g-2} v^{\beta}. \]
Note that we exclude constant maps. The **reduced GW partition function** is
\[ Z'_{GW}(X, u, v) := \exp F'_{GW}(X, u, v). \]

**Definition 2.2** (DT side). Given a 1-dimensional subscheme \( Z \), let \( Z' \) be the purely 1-dimensional part \([Z'] = \beta \in H_2(X, Z)\). Let
\[ I_n(X, \beta) := \{ Z \text{ at most } 1\text{-dim} : \chi(O_Z) = n, [Z'] = \beta \} \]
and define DT invariants $D_{n, \beta} := \int_{[\mathcal{I}_n(X, \beta)]^{\text{vir}}} 1$. For example, if $\beta = 0$, we recover $I_n(X, 0) = \text{Hilb}^n(X)$.

Define the generating function

$$Z_{\text{DT}}(X, q, v) := \sum_{\beta} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} D_{n, \beta} q^n v^\beta.$$ 

We exclude constant maps by quotienting. The **reduced DT partition function** is

$$Z'_{\text{DT}}(X, q, v) := \frac{Z_{\text{DT}}(X, q, v)}{Z_{\text{DT}}(X, \beta_0)}$$

where $Z_{\text{DT}}(X, \beta_0) := \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} D_{n, 0} q^n$.

**Conjecture 2.3.** The change of variables $e^{iu} = -q$ equates reduced partition functions, i.e.

$$Z'_{\text{GW}}(X, u, v) = Z'_{\text{DT}}(X, -e^{iu}, v).$$

We want to understand virtual localization over $I_n(X, \beta)$. Let’s first do $I_n(X, 0) = \text{Hilb}^n(X)$. Given $I \in I_n(X, 0)$, we have $\dim \mathbb{C}[x, y, z]/I = n$ as a $\mathbb{C}$-vector space. For example, for $I = (x^3, y^2, z^2, xy, xz, yz)$, we have $I \in \text{Hilb}^5(X)$.

For $\beta \neq 0$, we need an infinite number of boxes so that we have a curve, i.e. $\mathbb{C}[x, y, z]/I$ is no longer a finite-dimensional vector space. For example, $\mathbb{C}[x, y, z]/(y, z)$ is a line, and corresponds to an infinite row of boxes along the $x$-axis.

Locally around a fixed point $x_0$, the ideal sheaf gives a 3D partition

$$\pi_\alpha := \{(k_1, k_2, k_3) : \prod x_i^{k_i} \notin I_\alpha\}.$$ 

For each leg, asymptotically the 2d partition stays the same, and we define

$$\lambda_{\alpha \beta} := \{(k_2, k_3) : \forall k_1, \prod x_i^{k_i} \notin I_\alpha\}.$$ 

So instead of specifying ideals as fixed points of our moduli space, we specify configurations of boxes around vertices and edges. Specifically, we specify:

1. a 2-dimensional partition $\lambda_{\alpha \beta}$ for each edge;

2. a 3-dimensional partition $\pi_\alpha$ for each vertex, so that its three asymptotics agree with the specified 2d partitions for the three edges.

**Definition 2.4.** Let $\pi_\alpha$ be a vertex partition. Define its size by

$$|\pi_\alpha| := \#\{\pi_\alpha \cap [0, \ldots, N]^3\} - (N + 1) \sum_i |\lambda_{\alpha \beta}_i|, \quad N \gg 0.$$ 

We will now apply virtual localization to do the integral:

$$\int_{[I_n(X, \beta)]^{\text{vir}}} 1 = \sum_{[I] \in I_n(X, \beta)^T} \int_{[I]} \frac{e(E_1^m)}{e(E_2^m)}.$$ 

Here $e$ is the equivariant Euler class, i.e. product of weights, and $m$ stands for “moving part” i.e. non-trivial weights. For us, the perfect obstruction theory is $E_i := \text{Ext}^i(I, I)$. We will compute weights of

$$\text{Ext}^1(I, I) - \text{Ext}^2(I, I).$$
For $X$ toric, $H^i(X, \mathcal{O}_X) = 0$ for $i > 0$. We also have

$$\Ext^3(I, I) = 0, \quad \Ext^0(\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{O}) - \Ext^0(I, I) = 0,$$

so that we can write

$$\Ext^3(I, I) - \Ext^2(I, I) = \chi(\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{O}) - \chi(I, I).$$

This is better: we can use the Čech cover coming from fixed points to compute these Euler characteristics. By local-to-global Ext and then passing to the Čech complex,

$$\chi(I, I) = \sum_{i=0}^3 \Ext^i(I, I) = \sum_{i,j=0}^3 (-1)^{i+j} H^i(\Ext^j(I, I)) = \sum_{i,j=0}^3 (-1)^{i+j} \chi^i(\Ext^j(I, I)).$$

For us, $\chi^2(\Ext^j(I, I)) = 0$.

Hence we can now explicitly identify the weights of the virtual tangent space, as

$$T = \left( \bigoplus \Gamma(U_\alpha) - \sum \chi^i(\Ext^j(I, I)) \right) - \left( \bigoplus \Gamma(U_{\alpha\beta}) - \sum \chi^i(\Ext^j(I, I)) \right)$$

Here $U_\alpha = \Spec \mathbb{C}[x_1, x_2, x_3]$ and $U_{\alpha\beta} = \Spec \mathbb{C}[x_1^{\pm 1}, x_2, x_3]$. The first line is the vertex contribution, and the second line is the edge contribution.

Let $R := \mathbb{C}[x_1, x_2, x_3]$. We need to compute $R - \sum (-1)^i \Ext^i(I_\alpha, I_\alpha)$. This requires taking a $T$-equivariant free resolution of $I_\alpha$

$$0 \to F_j \to F_{j-1} \to \cdots \to F_0 \to I_\alpha \to 0, \quad F_j = \bigoplus R(d_{ij}).$$

Here $d_{ij} \in \mathbb{Z}^3$ and $R(d_{ij}) := x_1^{k_1_i} x_2^{k_2_j} x_3^{k_3} R$, so that its contribution to the Euler class is

$$\frac{1}{(1 - t_1)(1 - t_2)(1 - t_3)}.$$ 

The total contribution of $I_\alpha$ is therefore

$$\text{tr}I_\alpha = \frac{P_\alpha(t_1, t_2, t_3)}{(1 - t_1)(1 - t_2)(1 - t_3)}, \quad P_\alpha(t_1, t_2, t_3) := \sum (-1)^i t^{d_{ij}}.$$ 

We also have the contribution from the actual vertex

$$Q_\alpha = \text{tr}_{R/I_\alpha}(t_1, t_2, t_3) = \sum_{(k_1, k_2, k_3) \in \pi_\alpha} t_1^{k_1} t_2^{k_2} t_3^{k_3}$$

which by the SES $0 \to I_\alpha \to R \to R/I_\alpha \to 0$ satisfies

$$Q_\alpha = \text{tr}_R - \text{tr}I_\alpha = \frac{1 + P_\alpha(t_1, t_2, t_3)}{(1 - t_1)(1 - t_2)(1 - t_3)}.$$ 

(Note that $P_\alpha$ begins at the $-1$ term of the resolution, and contains the extra minus sign.) So now we know what $P_\alpha$ is. We can compute

$$\sum (-1)^i \Ext^i(I_\alpha, I_\alpha) = \sum_{i,j,k,l} (-1)^{i+k} R(-d_{ij} + d_{kl}) = \sum (-1)^i R(-d_{ij}) \sum (-1)^k R(d_{kl})$$

$$= \frac{P_\alpha(t_1, t_2, t_3) P_\alpha(t_1^{-1}, t_2^{-1}, t_3^{-1})}{(1 - t_1)(1 - t_2)(1 - t_3)}.$$ 
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Collecting all this and rewriting in terms of $Q$, we get
\[
\text{tr}_{R - \chi(I_\alpha,I_\alpha)} = Q_\alpha - \frac{\bar{Q}_\alpha}{t_1 t_2 t_3} + Q_\alpha \frac{(1 - t_1)(1 - t_2)(1 - t_3)}{t_1 t_2 t_3}.
\]

Here $\bar{Q}$ means we plug in $t_i^{-1}$ instead of $t_i$.

2.2  Sep 19 (Clara): DT for local CY toric surfaces

First, a quick recap of what we were doing. We were computing DT invariants for smooth toric CY3s:
\[
D_{n,\beta} = \int_{[\mathcal{X}(x,\beta)]^\text{vir}} 1 = \sum_{[I]} \frac{e(\text{Ext}^2(I, I))}{e(\text{Ext}^1(I, I))},
\]
So we needed the virtual character of $\text{Ext}^2(I, I) - \text{Ext}^1(I, I)$. We wanted to compute this on a Čech cover given by vertices and edges:
\[
\bigoplus_\alpha (\Gamma(U_\alpha) - \sum (-1)^i \Gamma(U_\alpha, \mathcal{E}xt^i(I, I))) - \bigoplus_{\alpha,\beta} (\Gamma(U_{\alpha\beta}) - \sum (-1)^i \Gamma(U_{\alpha\beta}, \mathcal{E}xt^i(I, I))).
\]
Last time we computed the first term and rewrote it purely in terms of the partition sitting at the vertex $\alpha$:
\[
\text{tr}(\Gamma(U_\alpha)) - \sum (-1)^i \Gamma(U_\alpha, \mathcal{E}xt^i(I, I))) = F_\alpha := Q_\alpha - \frac{\bar{Q}_\alpha}{t_1 t_2 t_3} - \frac{Q_\alpha \bar{Q}_\alpha (1 - t_1)(1 - t_2)(1 - t_3)}{t_1 t_2 t_3}.
\]
Today we will do the edge computation. Here $U_{\alpha\beta} = U_\alpha \cap U_\beta$, so the ring is $R := \Gamma(U_{\alpha\beta}) = \mathbb{C}[x_1^{\pm 1}, x_2, x_3]$. Hence
\[
\text{tr} R = \frac{\delta(t_1)}{(1 - t_2)(1 - t_3)}, \quad \delta(t_1) := \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} t_i^1.
\]
If we play the same game as for the edge, we can write
\[
Q_{\alpha\beta} := \sum_{(k_2, k_3) \in \lambda_{\alpha\beta}} t_2^{k_2} t_3^{k_3}
\]
and then the virtual character is
\[
\text{tr}(R - \chi(I_{\alpha\beta}, I_{\alpha\beta})) = \delta(t_1) F_{\alpha\beta}, \quad F_{\alpha\beta} := -Q_{\alpha\beta} - \frac{\bar{Q}_{\alpha\beta}}{t_2 t_3} + Q_{\alpha\beta} \bar{Q}_{\alpha\beta} \frac{(1 - t_2)(1 - t_3)}{t_2 t_3}.
\]

We want to split the vertex and edge contributions in such a way so that we get Laurent polynomials in the end.

The first step is to write a new vertex. The vertex $x_\alpha$ receives contributions from $F_{\alpha\beta}$, for $i = 1, 2, 3$. Pull apart
\[
\text{tr}(R - \chi(I_{\alpha\beta}, I_{\alpha\beta})) = \frac{F_{\alpha\beta}}{1 - t_1} + \frac{t_1^{-1} F_{\alpha\beta}}{1 - t_1^{-1}}.
\]
Hence define the new vertex term
\[
V_\alpha := F_\alpha + \sum_{i=1}^3 \frac{F_{\alpha\beta}}{1 - t_i}.
\]

**Lemma 2.5.** $V_\alpha$ is a Laurent polynomial.

**Proof.** The character coming from the vertex is
\[
Q_\alpha = \frac{Q_{\alpha\beta_1}}{1 - t_1} + \frac{Q_{\alpha\beta_2}}{1 - t_2} + \frac{Q_{\alpha\beta_3}}{1 - t_3} + \text{polynomial}.
\]

Plugging this into $V_\alpha$, we get the cancellations we need. 

28
What’s left to account for:

1. (negative terms) $t_1^{-1}F_{\alpha\beta}/(1 - t_1^{-1})$;

2. (overcounting) each edge has been plugged into two different vertices.

Take $C_{\alpha\beta} \cong \mathbb{P}^1$, which has normal bundle

$$N_{C_{\alpha\beta}/X} = \mathcal{O}(m_{\alpha\beta}) \oplus \mathcal{O}(m'_{\alpha\beta}).$$

Hence the transition functions look like

$$(t_1, t_2, t_3) \mapsto (t_1, t_2 t_1^{-m_{\alpha\beta}}, t_3 t_1^{-m'_{\alpha\beta}}),$$

and the double contributions per edge are given exactly by this change of variables. Hence define

$$E_{\alpha\beta} := \frac{t_1^{-1}F_{\alpha\beta} - F_{\alpha\beta}(t_2 t_1^{-m_{\alpha\beta}}, t_3 t_1^{-m'_{\alpha\beta}})}{1 - t_1^{-1}}.$$

This $E_{\alpha\beta}$ has no poles in $t_1$ because it is regular at $t_1 = 1$. Hence it is a Laurent polynomial.

Let’s apply this to local CY3 surfaces. Start with a non-singular projective toric surface $S$, and take the total space of the canonical $K_S$. Do a toric compactification $\mathbb{P}(K_S \oplus 1)$. The DT invariants we define are

$$Z'_{\text{DT}}(S, q)_{\beta} := \frac{Z_{\text{DT}}(X, q)_{\beta}}{Z_{\text{DT}}(X, q)_0}, \quad \beta \in H_2(S, \mathbb{Z}).$$

Let $D := X \setminus K_S$ be the divisor at infinity. Then if $I \in I_\alpha(X, \beta)^T$, there can be only a bunch of closed points on $D$, and there is a purely 1-dimensional $Z' \subset S$. Split $I = \xi \mathbb{Z} \alpha$, and we split off the zero-dimensional contributions from $D$:

$$Z'_{\text{DT}}(S, q)_{\beta} = \sum_n q^n \sum I \in I_\alpha(K_S, \beta) e(\text{Ext}^*) \sum_I q^n \sum I \in I_\alpha(\alpha, \beta) e(\text{Ext}^*).$$

Pass to a 2d subtorus $\{t_1 t_2 t_3 = 1\}$ preserving the CY form. Upshot: equivariant Serre duality

$$\text{Ext}^1(I, I)_0 = \text{Ext}^2(I, I)'_{0}(t_1 t_2 t_3)^{\pm 1}$$

becomes simpler. So instead of computing $\text{Ext}^2 - \text{Ext}^1$, we can just count the number of minus signs. We do this by writing

$$\text{Ext}^2 - \text{Ext}^1 = V^+ + V^-$$

such that $V^+|_{t_1 t_2 t_3 = 1} = -V^-$. We will write

$$V^+ = \sum V^+_{\alpha} + \sum E^+_{\alpha\beta}.$$

In general, there are many ways to do this splitting. But there are nice splittings that enable us to count minus signs easily.

Suppose that $I_\alpha$ at $x_\alpha$ is actually a finite 3d partition, i.e. in

$$V_\alpha = F_\alpha + \sum \frac{F_{\alpha\beta}}{1 - t_i},$$

the second term is zero. So it suffices to split

$$F_\alpha = Q_\alpha - \bar{Q}_\alpha t_1^{-1} t_2^{-1} t_3^{-1} - Q_\alpha \bar{Q}_\alpha (1 - t_1^{-1})(1 - t_2^{-1})(1 - t_3^{-1}).$$
Let \( \bar{F}_\alpha \) be the reduced generating function which we stick into correlators \( \langle \rangle \). Then

\[
\bar{F}_\alpha = \frac{Q_\alpha}{t_1t_2t_3} - Q_\alpha \tilde{Q}_\alpha ((t_1t_2t_3)^{-1} + t_3^{-1} + t_2^{-1} + t_1^{-1}).
\]

We are left with determining the parity of \( V^+_\alpha(1,1,1) \) and \( E^+_{\alpha\beta}(1,1,1) \). A computation with the splittings shows

\[
V^+_\alpha(1,1,1) \equiv |\pi_\alpha| \mod 2
\]

\[
E^+_{\alpha\beta}(1,1,1) \equiv f(\alpha, \beta) + m_{\alpha\beta}|\lambda_{\alpha\beta}| \mod 2.
\]

In total,

\[
e(\text{Ext}^2) = e(\text{Ext}^1) = (-1)^{\chi(O_Y) + \sum_{\alpha\beta} m_{\alpha\beta}|\lambda_{\alpha\beta}|}.
\]

### 2.3 Sep 26 (Ivan): MNOP2

MNOP2 modifies the GW/DT correspondence from MNOP1 in two ways: with insertions and with the relative theory.

**Definition 2.6 (GW side insertions).** So far we have considered Hodge integrals

\[
\int_{[\bar{M}_{g,r}(X,\beta)]^\text{vir}} \prod_{i=1}^r \psi_i^{k_i}
\]

possibly with \( \lambda_i \). Let \( \text{ev}_i : \bar{M}_{g,r}(X,\beta) \to X \) be evaluation at the \( i \)-th marked point. Denote by

\[
\tau_k(\gamma_i) := \psi_i^k \text{ev}_i^*(\gamma_i), \quad \gamma_i \in H^*(X,\mathbb{Q}),
\]

which we stick into correlators \( \langle \tau_{k_1}(\gamma_1) \cdots \tau_{k_r}(\gamma_r) \rangle \). Call:

1. \( \tau_0(-) \) a primary field;
2. \( \tau_{>0}(-) \) a descendant field.

Let \( \bar{M}'_{g,r}(X,\beta) \) be the moduli of maps from *possibly disconnected* stable curves with no collapsed connected components. Note that \( g \) for us means \( g := 1 - \chi(O_C) \), even when \( C \) is disconnected. We use this to define the **reduced generating function**

\[
Z_{GW}(X; u) = \sum_{g \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{r=1}^\infty \langle \prod_{i=1}^r \tau_{k_i}(\gamma_i) \rangle'_{g,\beta} u^{2g-2}.
\]

**Remark.** The sum in \( g \in \mathbb{Z} \) is bounded from below, i.e. for \( g \ll 0 \) there are no contributions, because we fixed \( \beta \) and no connected components are collapsed.

**Definition 2.7 (DT side insertions).** Let \( X \) be a non-singular projective 3-fold and \( I \) an ideal sheaf on \( X \). Then \( I \) fits into

\[
0 \to I \to \mathcal{O}_X \to \mathcal{O}_Y \to 0
\]

where \( Y \subset X \) is the subscheme associated to \( I \). Let \( I_n(X,\beta) \) denote the moduli of ideal sheaves with \( [Y] = \beta \) and \( \chi(O_Y) = n \). Let \( \mathcal{I} \) denote the universal ideal sheaf on \( I_n(X,\beta) \times X \). Note that \( \mathcal{I} \) has a finite resolution by locally free sheaves, so \( \text{ch}_\alpha \mathcal{I} \) is well-defined. Define homology operations for \( \gamma \in H^t(X,\mathbb{Z}) \) as

\[
\text{ch}_{k+2}(\gamma) : H_*(I_n(X,\beta),\mathbb{Q}) \to H_{*+2k+2-t}(I_n(X,\beta),\mathbb{Q})
\]

\[
\xi \mapsto \pi_1*(\text{ch}_{k+2}(\mathcal{I}) \cdot \pi_2^*(\gamma) \cap \pi_1^*(\xi)).
\]
(Here we compute the dimension shift as $+ \dim X - \ell - 2k - 4 = -2k + 2 - \ell$.) For example, if we take $k = 0$, we get only integration over $\operatorname{supp} I$. The invariants are

$$\langle \tilde{\tau}_{k_1}(\gamma_1) \cdots \tilde{\tau}_{k_r}(\gamma_r) \rangle_{n, \beta} := \int_{[I_n(X, \beta)]^\text{vir}} \prod_{i=1}^r (-1)^{k_i+1} \operatorname{ch}_{k_i+2}(\gamma_i)$$

$$:= (\pm 1) \operatorname{ch}_{k_i+2}(\gamma_i) \circ \cdots \circ \operatorname{ch}_{k_r+2}(\gamma_r)[I_n(X, \beta)]^\text{vir}.$$

Define the generating function

$$Z_{DT}(X; q \prod_{i=1}^r \tilde{\tau}_{k_i}(\gamma_i))_\beta := \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \langle \prod_{i=1}^r \tilde{\tau}_{k_i}(\gamma_i) \rangle_{n, \beta} q^n.$$

The reduced partition function is

$$Z'_{DT}(X, q \prod \cdots)_\beta := \frac{Z_{DT}(X; q \prod \cdots)_\beta}{Z_{DT}(X; q \prod \cdots)_0}.$$

Remark. Note that

$$\vdim I_n(X, \beta) = \int_\beta c_1(T_X), \quad \vdim \mathcal{M}_{g,r}(X, \beta) = \int_\beta c_1(T_X) + r.$$

So later if we want to compare descendants, the insertions we make have to satisfy certain degree requirements on both sides. This is partially why we take $\operatorname{ch}_{k_i+2}$ instead of $\operatorname{ch}_{k_i}$.

There are a few conjectures in MNOP2.

1. (Degree 0) For $\beta = 0$,

$$Z_{DT}(X; q)_0 = M(-q)^{\int_X c_1(T_X \otimes K_X)}$$

where $M(q) := \prod_{n \geq 0} (1 - q^n)^{-n}$ is the MacMahon function. This is known in the toric case by the computation from MNOP1, and the case for general 3-folds follows from the cobordism argument of Levine–Pandharipande.

2. (Rationality) $Z'_{DT}(X; q \prod \cdots)$ is a rational function. This is known in the toric CY3 case.

3. (Primary fields) After the change of variables $e^{iu} = -q$,

$$(-iu)^d Z'_{GW}(X; u \prod_{i=1}^r \tau_0(\gamma_i))_\beta = (-q)^{d/2} Z'_{DT}(X; q \prod_{i=1}^r \tilde{\tau}_0(\gamma_i))_\beta.$$

4. (Descendant fields) The two sets

$$Z'_{GW, \beta} := \{(-iu)^{d-\sum k_i} Z'_{GW}(X; u \prod \tilde{\tau}_k(\gamma_i))_\beta\}$$

$$Z'_{DT, \beta} := \{(-q)^{d/2} Z'_{DT}(X; q \prod \tilde{\tau}_k(\gamma_i))_\beta\}$$

have the same linear span, and there is a transition matrix expressing the functions in one in terms of the other such that:

(a) it is upper triangular with 1’s along the diagonal;
(b) it has universal coefficients depending only on classical multiplication in $X$.

This has been checked in the toric case.
**Definition 2.8 (Relative GW).** Let \( X \) be a non-singular projective 3-fold with \( S \subset X \) a non-singular divisor. Let \( \beta \in H_2(X, \mathbb{Z}) \) be such that \( \int_{\beta}[S] \geq 0 \) and let \( \mu \) be a partition of it. Define the moduli of stable relative maps

\[
\mathcal{M}_{g,r}(X/S, \beta, \mu)
\]

of stable relative maps \( C \to X[k] \) with possibly disconnected domain and relative multiplicities \( \mu \). Think: whenever we get non-transverse intersection with \( S \), blow up to get copies of \( \Delta := \mathbb{P}(O_S \oplus N_{S/X}) \), whose divisors at infinity form a sequence \( S = S_0, S_1, \ldots, S_k \).

A cohomologically weighted partition is an unordered set

\[
\eta := \{(\eta_1, \delta_1), \ldots, (\eta_s, \delta_s)\}
\]

where \( \eta_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0} \) and \( \delta_i \in H^*(S, \mathbb{Q}) \). Let \( \vec{\eta} \) denote the underlying partition. Using them, define relative GW invariants as

\[
\langle \tau_{k_1}(\gamma_1) \cdots \tau_{k_r}(\gamma_r) \mid \eta \rangle := \frac{1}{|\text{Aut}(\eta)|} \int_{[\mathcal{M}_{g,r}(X/S, \beta, \vec{\eta})]^{\text{vir}}} \prod_{i=1}^r \psi_{k_i}^* \text{ev}_i^* (\gamma_i) \prod_{j=1}^s \tilde{\text{ev}}_j^* (\delta_j)
\]

where \( \tilde{\text{ev}}_j \) is evaluation at pre-images of \( S_k \).

**2.4 Oct 03 (Ivan): MNOP2 II**

Let \( X \) be non-singular projective threefold. Fix a non-singular divisor \( S \subset X \). We first define relative DT theory.

**Definition 2.9.** We say \( I \) is an ideal sheaf on \( X \) relative to \( S \) if

\[
I \otimes O_X O_S \to O_X \otimes O_S
\]

is injective. (This disallows whole components of \( I \) from lying in \( S \).) From such an \( I \) we construct an element of \( \text{Hilb}(S, \int_{\beta}[S]) \).

**Remark.** Being relative is an open condition on ideal sheaves, but we want a proper moduli space. To make our space proper, consider degenerations of the target space

\[
X[k] := X \cup_D \Delta \cup_D \cdots \cup_D \Delta
\]

where \( \Delta := \mathbb{P}(N_{D/X} \oplus O_D) \).

**Definition 2.10.** An ideal sheaf \( I \) on \( X[k] \) is predeformable if for every singular divisor \( S_l \subset X[k] \) (i.e. the divisor connecting \( \Delta_{l-1} \) and \( \Delta_l \)), the induced map

\[
I \otimes O_{X[k]} O_{S_l} \to O_{X[k]} \otimes O_{X[k]} O_{S_l}
\]

is injective. In other words, if \( Y_{l-1} \) and \( Y_l \) are the subschemes associated to \( I \) on \( \Delta_{l-1} \) and \( \Delta_l \), then

\[
Y_{l-1} \cap S_l = Y_l \cap S_l
\]

are equal scheme-theoretically.

**Definition 2.11.** An isomorphism of ideal sheaves \( I_1, I_2 \) on \( X[k_1], X[k_2] \) is an isomorphism is an isomorphism \( \sigma: X[k_1] \xrightarrow{\sim} X[k_2] \) fixing the original copy of \( X \) such that:

1. \( \sigma^* O_{X[k_2]} \xrightarrow{\sim} O_{X[k_1]} \) is the identity map;
2. \( \sigma^* I_2 \xrightarrow{\sim} I_1 \) is an isomorphism.
In particular, note that $k_1 = k_2$ necessarily. We say $I$ is **stable** if $\text{Aut} I$ is finite.

**Definition 2.12** (Relative DT theory). Let $I_n(X/S, \beta)$ be the **moduli space** of stable predeformable relative ideal sheaves on all possible degenerations $X[k]$ relative to $S_k$, such that

$$\chi(O_Y) = n, \quad \pi_4[Y] = \beta \in H_2(X, \mathbb{Z})$$

where $\pi: X[k] \to X$ is the collapsing map.

**Theorem 2.13.** This space $I_n(X/S, \beta)$ is complete DM stack with canonical perfect obstruction theory, and universal ideal sheaf $\mathcal{Y}$.

**Definition 2.14.** Let $\epsilon: I_n(X/S, \beta) \to \text{Hilb}(S, f_\beta[S])$ be the natural map. Then $\epsilon^*$ gives relative conditions on $I_n(X/S, \beta)$. Hence relative DT invariants are of the form

$$\langle \tilde{\tau}_{k_1}(\gamma_1) \cdots \tilde{\tau}_{k_r}(\gamma_r) | \eta \rangle_{n, \beta} := \int_{[I_n(X/S, \beta)]_{\text{vir}}} \prod_{i=1}^r \text{ch}_{k_i+2}(\mathcal{Y})(\gamma_i) \epsilon^* \eta$$

where $\eta \in H^*(\text{Hilb}(S, f_\beta[S]))$.

**Remark.** Recall that $H^*(\text{Hilb}(S), \mathbb{Q})$ has basis

$$e_\eta := P_{\eta_1}(\delta_1) \cdots P_{\eta_k}(\delta_k) \cdot 1$$

where $\eta$ is a partition, and $P_{\eta_i}(\delta_i)$ are correspondences which insert $\eta_i$ points with class $\delta_i \in H^*(S, \mathbb{Q})$. Last time we called an unordered set $\{((\eta_i, \delta_i))\}$ a cohomology-weighted partition.

Goal: for toric $X$, compute the degree-0 parts $Z_{\text{DT}}(X, \eta)_0$, i.e. $\beta = 0$. In particular, we have no relative insertions from $\text{Hilb}(S, 0) = \text{pt}$. Recall that $(\mathbb{C}^*)^3$ acts on $\mathbb{C}^3$ by standard component-wise multiplication, and the origin has tangent weights $t_1^{-1}, t_2^{-1}, t_3^{-1}$. For every 3d partition $\pi$, we introduced the equivariant vertex

$$V_\pi = Q_\pi - \frac{\bar{Q}_\pi}{t_1 t_2 t_3} + Q_\pi \bar{Q}_\pi \frac{(1-t_1)(1-t_2)(1-t_3)}{t_1 t_2 t_3}$$

where

$$Q_\pi(t_1, t_2, t_3) := \sum_{(k_1, k_2, k_3) \in \pi} t_1^{k_1} t_2^{k_2} t_3^{k_3}$$

is the character of the partition $\pi$, and

$$\bar{Q}_\pi(t_1, t_2, t_3) := Q_\pi(t_1^{-1}, t_2^{-1}, t_3^{-1}).$$

**Definition 2.15.** Introduce the **equivariant measure** with three parameters $s_1, s_2, s_3$

$$w(\pi) := \prod_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^3} (k_1 s_1 + k_2 s_2 + k_3 s_3)^{-v_\pi(k)}$$

where $v_\pi(k)$ is the coefficient of $t_1^{k_1} t_2^{k_2} t_3^{k_3}$ in $V(\pi)$. This is useful because then the partition function is

$$W(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3) = \sum_{\pi \text{ with legs } \bar{\lambda}} w(\pi) q^{|ar{\pi}|}.$$

**Remark.** We observe a few properties.

1. The $q$-coefficients of $W(0, 0, 0)$ are rational functions in $s_1, s_2, s_3$. This is because we sum finitely many rational functions.
2. $V_2(1, 1, 1) = 0$, so actually $\sum_k v_k(\pi) = 0$ for any $\pi$. Hence $q$-coefficients of $W(\emptyset, \emptyset, \emptyset)$ are degree 0 rational functions.

3. $W(\emptyset, \emptyset, \emptyset)$ is symmetric in $s_1, s_2, s_3$.

4. $\log W(\emptyset, \emptyset, \emptyset)|_{s_1+s_2+s_3=0} = M(-q)$, because Clara computed last time that $V_\pi|_{s_1+s_2+s_3=0} = (-1)^{|\pi|}$ and we know $M(q)$ is the generating function for finite 3d partitions.

To compute $W(\emptyset, \emptyset, \emptyset)$, consider a special geometry where it is a part. Specifically, look at $X := \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{C}^2$ with weights $s_1, s_2, s_3$, and fix the smooth divisor $S := \infty \times \mathbb{C}^2$. We want to compute $Z_{\text{DT}}^T(X/S, q).$

**Lemma 2.16.** The $q$-coefficients of $Z_{\text{DT}}^T(X/S, q)$ are rational functions in $s_1, s_2, s_3$ with poles in $s_2, s_3$ only.

**Proof.** Construct a proper morphism

$$j: I_n(X/S, 0) \to \text{Sym}^n(X) \to \text{Sym}^n(\mathbb{C}^2) \to \bigoplus_{i=1}^n \mathbb{C}^2$$

where the last map is given by

$$\{(x_i, y_i)\} \mapsto ((p_i(x), p_i(y)))_{i=1}^n$$

where $p_i$ are power sums. So we can compute

$$\int_{[I_n(X/S, 0)]^{\text{vir}}} 1 = \int_{\bigoplus_{i=1}^n \mathbb{C}^2} j_*[I_n(X/S, 0)]^{\text{vir}}.$$ 

But the $k$-th copy of $\mathbb{C}^2$ has a unique fixed point of weights $-ks_2, -ks_3$. Hence localization shows there are poles only in $s_2, s_3$. \hfill \square

Localization gives two types of contributions: points over $0 \in \mathbb{P}^1$ and points over $\infty \in \mathbb{P}^1$. Hence write

$$Z_{\text{DT}}^T(X/S, q)_0 = W_0 \cdot W_\infty.$$ 

We know $W_0 = W(\emptyset, \emptyset, \emptyset)$, but $W_\infty$ has contributions from the relative part.

### 2.5 Oct 10 (Ivan): MNOP2 III

Today we will do the computation of zero-degree contributions in relative DT for toric varieties. The way to do it is to consider a geometry with two fixed points: one on the divisor, one not. Specifically, take $T := (\mathbb{C}^*)^3$ acting on $X := \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{A}^2$, with weight $-s_1$ on $T_0 \mathbb{P}^1$ and $-s_2, -s_3$ on $T_0 \mathbb{A}^2$.

Recall that $W_0$ is the partition function for all zero-dimensional sheaves supported at $(0, 0) \in \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{A}^2$. This is what we previously called $W(\emptyset, \emptyset, \emptyset)$. The new thing involves the torus-fixed divisor $D := \{\infty\} \times \mathbb{A}^2 \subset X$; we want to compute $Z_{\text{DT}}^T(X/D, q)$. This, by localization, has contributions from $T$-fixed schemes supported at $(0, 0)$ and $D$ (in its bubblings). So

$$Z_{\text{DT}}^T(X/D, q)_0 = W_0 \cdot W_\infty.$$ 

Recall that $W_0 = W(\emptyset, \emptyset, \emptyset)$ is a power series in $q$ with rational coefficients of degree 0, symmetric in $s_1, s_2, s_3$, and we showed $W_0|_{s_1+s_2+s_3=0} = M(-q)$. We had a lemma last time that says $Z_{\text{DT}}^T(X/D, q)_0$ has monomial poles in $s_2, s_3$.

To compute $W_\infty$, we need rubber theory. What is rubber theory? Recall that the moduli in relative DT involves bubbles $R \sqcup_D R \sqcup_D \cdots \sqcup_D R$. In our case, $R = \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{A}^2$. The contribution to $W_\infty$ is only from the moduli space $I$ of all sheaves which are only supported on the bubbles. The space $I$ has a description similar to that of relative DT. The difference is that on each $\Delta$, there is a $\mathbb{G}_m$-action. Hence

$$I := I_n \subseteq I_n(R/(S_0 \cup S_\infty), 0)^\sim$$
where $S_0$ and $S_∞$ are the two divisors at $0, ∞ ∈ P^1$, and the $\sim$ means we identify by $G_m$ on every $P^1$. There is still an action by $C^*_s × C^*_s$ on the $A^2$ factor.

Question: what is the relation between $I_\sim^\sim$ and $W_∞$? Note that $I_\sim^\sim ↪ I_\sim$ with codimension 1 (where here by $I_\sim$ we mean the part contributing to $W_∞$). The normal direction is given by deforming the node attaching the rubber to the original $P^1$, i.e. it has Euler class $s_1 - ψ_0$ where $ψ_0 = c_1(L_0)$. (Here the 0 is at the start of the rubber pieces, i.e. the $∞$ of the original $P^1$.) Hence

$$W_∞ = 1 + \sum_{n≥1} q^n \int_{[I_\sim^\sim]_{vir}} \frac{1}{s_1 - ψ_0}.$$ If it weren’t for this insertion, $W_∞$ would be a series in only $s_2, s_3$. We want to relate $W_∞$ with the simpler

$$F_∞ = \sum_{n≥0} q^n \int_{[I_\sim^\sim]_{vir}} 1.$$ We know $F_∞$ is a power series in $q$ with rational coefficients in $s_2, s_3$ only.

**Lemma 2.17.** We have

$$W_∞ = \exp(\frac{1}{s_1} F_∞).$$

**Proof.** First expand $W_∞$ in powers of $ψ_0$, to get

$$W_∞ = 1 + \sum_{ℓ≥0} \frac{1}{s_1^{ℓ+1}} F_∞,ℓ$$

where $F_∞,ℓ = \sum_{n≥1} q^n \int_{[I_\sim^\sim]_{vir}} ψ_0^ℓ$. There is a topological recursion relation between the $F_∞,ℓ$ as follows. On $I_\sim^\sim$ we have the universal target and universal family/subscheme

$$\begin{align*}
\mathcal{Y}_n \to \mathcal{R} & \quad π \\
I_\sim^\sim & \quad \pi
\end{align*}$$

We have $π_*[\mathcal{Y}_n]_{vir} = n[I_\sim^\sim]_{vir}$ because $\mathcal{Y}_n → I_\sim^\sim$ is finite flat of degree $n$ by definition of the universal family. Rewriting in terms of $F_∞,ℓ$,

$$q \frac{d}{dq} F_∞,ℓ = \sum_{n≥1} q^n \int_{[\mathcal{Y}_n]_{vir}} ψ_0^ℓ.$$ Using the topological recursion (see lemma below)

$$q \frac{d}{dq} F_∞,ℓ = F_∞,ℓ-1 q \frac{d}{dq} F_∞,0,$$

we check that the unique solution is

$$F_∞,ℓ = \frac{F_∞,ℓ+1}{(ℓ+1)!}.$$ Hence plugging back in we get $W_∞ = \exp(\frac{1}{s_1} F_∞)$.

**Lemma 2.18 (Topological recursion).** We have

$$q \frac{d}{dq} F_∞,ℓ = F_∞,ℓ-1 q \frac{d}{dq} F_∞,0,$$

which in terms of integrals is

$$\int_{[\mathcal{Y}_n]_{vir}} ψ_0^ℓ = \sum_{n_1+n_2=n} \int_{[I_{n_1}]_{vir}} ψ_0^{ℓ-1} \int_{[\mathcal{Y}_{n_2}]_{vir}} 1.$$
Proof sketch. A generic point of \( \mathcal{R} \) looks like a whole bunch of points on one component \( \mathbb{P}^1 \times A^2 \), along with one more point \( r \). We can rigidify with respect to the \( G_m \) action by setting \( r = 1 \). Explicitly, the point \( r \) lets us write a section of \( L_0 \), by picking a coordinate \( z \) such that \( z(0) = 0 \), \( z(\infty) = \infty \), and \( z(0) = 1 \), and then the section of \( L_0 \) we get is \( dz \). As \( r \to \infty \), we see that \( dz \to 0 \). Hence zeros of the section are given by bubbled components with 0, \( r \), \( \infty \), i.e. the divisor in the moduli space

\[
D_{n_1, n_2} := \left\{ \frac{0}{r} + \infty + \text{degenerations} \right\}.
\]

Then \( \psi_0 = c_1(L_0) = \sum_{n_1 + n_2 = n} D_{n_1, n_2} \). Note that

\[
D_{n_1, n_2} \cong I_{n_1}^* \times R_{n_2}
\]

because the point \( r \) is on the second component. Hence (??)

\[
[Y_n]_{\text{vir}} |_{D_{n_1, n_2}} = [I_{n_1}^*]_{\text{vir}} \times [Y_{n_2}]_{\text{vir}}.
\]

Putting this all together and integrating,

\[
\int_{[Y_n]_{\text{vir}}} \psi_0^\ell = \int_{[Y_n]_{\text{vir}}} \psi_0^\ell \cdot \psi_0^{\ell - 1} = \sum_{n_1 + n_2 = n} \int_{[Y_n]_{\text{vir}} |_{D_{n_1, n_2}}} \psi_0^{\ell - 1} = \sum_{n_1 + n_2 = n} \int_{[I_{n_1}^*]_{\text{vir}}} \psi_0^{\ell - 1} \int_{[Y_{n_2}]_{\text{vir}}} 1.
\]

The last equality comes from the (??) equality of virtual classes. \( \square \)

Let’s return to \( Z_{\text{DT}}^T(X/D, q) = W_0 W_\infty \). Then

\[
\log W_0 = \log Z - \log W_\infty = \log Z - \frac{1}{s_1} F_{\infty},
\]

where \( F_{\infty} \) depends only on \( s_2, s_3 \). Hence all \( q \)-coefficient of \( \log W_0 \) is of the form

\[
\frac{1}{s_1} \frac{p_1(s_1, s_2, s_3)}{p_2(s_2, s_3)}, \quad \deg p_1 = \deg p_2 + 1.
\]

By symmetry of \( W_0 \) in \( s_1, s_2, s_3 \), it follows that all \( q \)-coefficients of \( \log W_0 \) are of the form

\[
\frac{p(s_1, s_2, s_3)}{s_1 s_2 s_3}, \quad \deg p = 3.
\]

Lemma 2.19 (Combinatorial lemma). \( (s_1 + s_2) \) divides \( p(s_1, s_2, s_3) \).

Then by symmetry, \( (s_1 + s_3) \) and \( (s_2 + s_3) \) also divide \( p \). It follows that the \( q \)-coefficients of \( \log W_0 \) are of the form

\[
\text{constant} \cdot \frac{(s_1 + s_2)(s_1 + s_3)(s_2 + s_3)}{s_1 s_2 s_3}.
\]

So for some power series \( F_0(q) \),

\[
\log W_0 = \frac{(s_1 + s_2)(s_1 + s_3)(s_2 + s_3)}{s_1 s_2 s_3} F_0(q).
\]
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But recall that $\log Z_{DT}$ has poles in $s_2, s_3$ only. Hence $\log W_\infty$ must be the $s_1$-pole part of $\log W_0$, which we can just compute to be

$$\log W_\infty = \frac{s_2 + s_3}{s_1} F_0(q).$$

It remains to compute $F_0(q)$. We know $\log W_0 |_{s_1 + s_2 + s_3 = 0} = \log M(-q)$, and we can plug our expression for $\log W_0$ into here to get

$$F_0(q) = -\log M(-q).$$

Hence we get explicit expressions for $W_0$ and $W_\infty$.

**Corollary 2.20.** $Z_{DT}(X, q)_0 = M(-q)I_x c_3(T_X \otimes K_X)$.

*Proof.* Taking logs,

$$\log Z_{DT}(X, q)_0 = \sum_{\alpha \text{-fixed}} \left( \frac{(s_1^2 + s_2^2)(s_1^2 + s_3^2)(s_2^2 + s_3^2)}{(-s_1^2)(-s_2^2)(-s_3^2)} \right) \log M(-q).$$

This prefactor is exactly the localization contribution from $\int_x c_3(T_X \otimes K_X)$. \hfill $\square$

**Corollary 2.21.** $Z_{DT}(X/D, q)_0 = M(-q)I_x c_3(T_X(-\log D) \otimes K_X(-\log D))$.

*Proof.* The prefactors are a little different for points in $W_\infty$. \hfill $\square$

### 2.6 Oct 17 (Anton): DT local curves

Let $C$ be a non-singular projective curve. Let $N \to C$ be a rank 2 bundle; let $N$ also denote the total space, which is a 3-fold. To do relative theory, we need to pick a divisor. Pick points $p_1, \ldots, p_n \in C$, and let our divisor $S = \bigcup N_{p_i}$ be the union of fibers over these points.

**Theorem 2.22** (Main result). GW/DT correspondence holds for local curves.

Consider $I^r_n(N, d)$. If $N$ is indecomposable, then there is only a 1-dimensional torus acting on $N$. But every indecomposable bundle is deformation equivalent to a split bundle, and there is a 2-dimensional torus acting on $N = L_1 \oplus L_2$. The relative space $I_n(N/S, d)$ has maps

$$\epsilon_i: I_n(N/S, d) \to \text{Hilb}(N_{p_i}, d).$$

The cohomology of $\text{Hilb}(N_{p_i}, d)$ has the Nakajima basis, labeled by partitions.

**Definition 2.23.** Define the partition functions

$$Z(N/S)_{d, \eta^1, \ldots, \eta^r} := \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} q^n \int e(N^{vir})^x.$$

Let $Z'$ denote reduced invariants. The notation will be

$$Z(g; k_1, k_2)_{\eta^1, \ldots, \eta^r}$$

for genus $g$ curve $C$ and line bundles of degree $k_1$ and $k_2$. To abbreviate gluing terms, introduce new functions

$$DT(g; k_1, k_2)_{\eta^1, \ldots, \eta^r} := q^{-d(1-g)} Z(g; k_1, k_2)_{\eta^1, \ldots, \eta^r}.$$

To raise indices, use

$$DT(g; k_1, k_2)_{\nu^1, \ldots, \nu^r} := DT(g; k_1, k_2)_{\nu^1, \ldots, \nu^r, \eta^1, \ldots, \eta^r} \prod \Delta_d(\nu^j, \nu^j)$$

where $\Delta$ is the inverse of the intersection form

$$\int C_\mu \cup C_\nu = (t_1 t_2)^{-\ell(\mu)} \frac{(-1)^{d-\ell(\mu)}}{\delta(\mu)} \delta_{\mu, \nu}.$$
Remark. The gluing matrix is diagonal in cohomology, but is more complicated in K-theory.

**Proposition 2.24** (Degeneration formulas). For $g = g' + g''$ and $k_i = k_i' + k_i''$,

$$DT(g; k_1, k_2)_{\mu, \ldots, \nu} = \sum_{\gamma} DT(g'; k_1', k_2')_{\gamma, \ldots, \mu} DT(g''; k_1'', k_2'')_{\nu, \ldots, \gamma} DT(g; 1, k_1, k_2)_{\mu, \ldots, \nu}.$$  

Using the degeneration formula, it suffices to compute

$$DT(0; 0, 0)_\lambda, \quad DT(0; 0, 0)_{\lambda\mu}, \quad DT(0; 0, 0)_{\lambda\mu\nu}, \quad DT(0; 0, -1)_\lambda.$$  

**Lemma 2.25** ($(0, 0)$ tube). $DT(0; 0, 0)_\mu = \delta^\lambda_\mu$.

**Proof.** First step: show this is true modulo $q$. These $q$-constant terms just come from the intersection form. Second step: apply the degeneration formula to the tube itself to get

$$DT(0; 0, 0) = DT(0; 0, 0)^2.$$  

Since the $q$-constant terms are invertible, $DT(0; 0, 0)$ is invertible, and it follows that $DT(0, 0, 0) = 1$. □

**Lemma 2.26** ($(0, 0)$ cap).

$$DT(0; 0, 0)_{\lambda} = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{d(t_1 t_2)^{\lambda}} & \lambda = (1^d) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

**Proof.** Idea: look at the compactified $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^2$ geometry, and do a dimension count. Then use localization, in which one of the pieces will be the cap. □

**Corollary 2.27.** We can always add or remove $(1^d)$ insertions.

**Proof.** $DT_{\mu\nu} = \sum_\gamma DT_{\mu\nu}^{\gamma} DT_{\gamma}$. But the cap is non-zero only for $\gamma = (1^d)$. Hence

$$DT^{(1^d)}_{\mu\nu} \propto DT_{\mu\nu}.$$  

Now we have to compute $DT_{\lambda\mu\nu}$. A standard reconstruction theorem (which we will see for GW) shows $DT_{\lambda\mu\nu}$ can be reconstructed from $DT_{\lambda,(2),\nu}$. To compute this, we need descendant insertions $\sigma_k(\gamma)$.

**Definition 2.28.** Introduce bracket notation

$$\langle \sigma_{k_1}(\gamma_1) \cdots \sigma_{k_s}(\gamma_s) \rangle := \int \prod_{i=1}^s ch_{\kappa_i+2}(\gamma_i) e(\ldots)$$

We write things like

$$\langle \sigma_{k_1}(\gamma_1) \cdots \sigma_{k_s}(\gamma_s) | \nu_1, \ldots, \nu^n \rangle^N_{n,d}, \quad \langle \mu | \sigma_{k_1}(\gamma_1) \cdots \sigma_{k_s}(\gamma_s) | \nu \rangle^N_{n,d}$$

for relative conditions. If we omit the $N$, it means we take level $(0,0)$ theory, i.e. $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^2$. If we omit the $n$, we sum over $n$ with $\sum_n q^n$.

Define an operator $M_\sigma$ by $\langle \mu | M_\sigma | \nu \rangle = q^{-d} \langle \mu - \sigma_1(F) | \nu \rangle$ where $F = [N_z]$ is the fiber over $z \in \mathbb{P}^1$. The thing we want to compute is closely related to $M_\sigma$. This is because of the degeneration formula

$$\langle \mu | - \sigma_1(F) | \nu \rangle = \sum_\gamma DT(0; 0, 0)^{(1^d)}_{\mu\nu} q^{-d} \langle \gamma | - \sigma_1(F) \rangle = DT^{(1^d)}(0; 0, 0)_{\mu\nu} q^{-d} \langle 1^d \rangle | - \sigma_1(F) \rangle + DT^{(2)}(0; 0, 0)_{\mu\nu} q^{-d} \langle 2 \rangle | - \sigma_1(F) \rangle.$$  

Here we use that $\langle \gamma | - \sigma_1(F) \rangle = 0$ unless $\gamma = (1^d)$ or $(2)$.  
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1. (First term) We can just remove \((1^d)\) to get the tube and use \(\langle (1^d) | - \sigma_1(F) \rangle = \langle (1^d) | - \sigma_1(F) | (1^d) \rangle\) to relate it back to the operator \(M_\sigma\).

2. (Second term) This involves the term \(\text{DT}(0; 0, 0)_{\mu \nu}^{(2)}\) which we want to compute, and \(\langle (2) | - \sigma_1(F) \rangle = \langle (2) | - \sigma_1(F) | (1^d) \rangle\).

It follows that once we figure out \(M_\sigma\), we know \(\text{DT}(0; 0, 0)_{\mu \nu}^{(2)}\). It turns out that if we write \(M_\sigma := (t_1 + t_2) \sum_{k > 0} k \frac{(q)^k}{k - 1} - \alpha_k \alpha_k + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k, l > 0} (t_1 t_2 \alpha_{k+l} \alpha_{-k} \alpha_{-l} - \alpha_{-k-l} \alpha_k \alpha_l)\) then we have

\[M_\sigma = M - (t_1 + t_2) \varphi(q) \text{id}, \quad \varphi(q) := q \frac{d}{dq} \log M(-q).\]

The proof that this is the correct expression for \(M_\sigma\) is quite involved.

**Definition 2.29. Fock space** is generated by a vacuum vector \(v_\emptyset\) by the free action of creation and annihilation operators \(\alpha_{-k}\) and \(\alpha_k\) for \(k > 0\). A natural basis is given by

\[|\mu\rangle := \frac{1}{z(\mu)} \prod_i \alpha_{-\mu_i} v_\emptyset.\]

The defining relations for the creation/annihilation operators are

\[[\alpha_k, \alpha_l] = k \delta_{k+l}\]

and annihilation operators kill the vacuum, i.e. \(\alpha_k v_\emptyset = 0\) for \(k > 0\).

In this basis for Fock space, the first term of \(M\) is diagonal, and is the only place where we have a \(q\)-dependence. The second term is off-diagonal, coming from either killing two rows and adding one or adding two rows and killing one.

**Lemma 2.30** ((0, -1) cap).

\[\text{DT}(0; -1, 0)_\lambda = \frac{1}{\gamma(\sigma) (t_1 t_2 \gamma(\lambda))} \prod \frac{1}{1 - (-q) \lambda}.\]

**Proof.** See lemma 27.

\[\square\]

### 2.7 Oct 24 (Shuai): Local curve computations

The setup is as usual: a curve \(C\) with rank-2 split vector bundle on it. We have:

1. the absolute theory \(\text{DT}(g; k_1, k_2)\), but we will write the geometry explicitly, like \(\text{DT}(\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{C}^2)\);

2. the relative theory \(\text{DT}(g; k_1, k_2)_\Sigma\), e.g. \(\text{DT}(\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{C}^2)_{0,0,0,\ldots}\).

We already know that in the associated TQFT, we only need to compute the genus-0 tube, caps, and pair of pants, because of pair of pants decompositions like

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\includegraphics[width=0.2\textwidth]{tube.png} \\
\cdots \\
\includegraphics[width=0.2\textwidth]{pants.png}
\end{array}
\]
We need the DT degeneration formulas for this:

\[
DT(g; k_1, k_2) = \sum_{\lambda} DT(g_1; k_1', k_2') DT(g_2; k_1'', k_2'')^\lambda
\]

\[
DT(g; k_1, k_2)_\mu = \sum_{\lambda} DT(g_1; k_1', k_2')_{\mu\lambda} DT(g_2; k_1'', k_2'')^\lambda.
\]

Here, to raise indices, we have

\[
DT(g; k_1, k_2)^\lambda := DT(g; k_1, k_2)_\lambda \Delta_d(\lambda, \lambda)
\]

where \(\Delta_d(\mu, \nu) := \delta_{\mu, \nu} (t_1 t_2)^{-\ell(\mu)} (-1)^{d - \ell(\mu)} / \Delta(\mu)\) is the inverse of the intersection product on \(\text{Hilb}(\mathbb{C}^2)\).

First, how do we compute the Euler characteristic of the sheaf associated to a configuration of boxes, e.g. two 3d partitions \(\pi, \pi'\) at 0, \(\infty\) and a 2d partition \(\lambda\) along the infinite leg? Recall that in Clara’s talks, we saw the normalized volume \(|\cdot|\) of a (possibly-infinite) 3d partition. Euler characteristic is motivic, so for the 2d intersection pairing \(\Delta\) on \(\text{Hilb}(\mathbb{C}^2)\),

\[
\chi = \chi(\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{C}^2) + \chi(|\pi| + |\pi'|) = |\lambda| + |\pi| + |\pi'|.
\]

In general, for a genus \(g\) curve, we will get \(|\lambda|(1 - g)\) instead of \(|\lambda|\). This explains all the appearances of \(d(1 - g)\) in the paper.

The key takeaway is that the smallest Euler characteristic we can get is \(d(1 - g)\). In the definition of DT partition function, we shifted by \(q^{-d(1 - g)}\) to make the minimal case the \(q\)-constant term. **Remark** (Classical contribution). We have an isomorphism

\[
I_d(\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{C}^2, d) \cong \text{Hilb}^d(\mathbb{C}^2).
\]

Because of this isomorphism, we know the inner product on the DT TQFT corresponds to exactly the intersection pairing \(\Delta\) on \(\text{Hilb}^d(\mathbb{C}^2)\). This is why we use \(\Delta\) to raise/lower indices. Consequently, this makes the tube into the identity, as desired.

**Proposition 2.31.** The level \((0, 0)\) cap is computed by

\[
DT(0; 0, 0)_{\lambda} = \frac{q^{-d}}{(t_1 t_2)^{\ell(\lambda)}} \langle |\lambda[0]\rangle \langle |0\rangle \rangle
\]

\[
= \frac{q^{-d}}{(t_1 t_2)^{\ell(\lambda)}} \frac{1}{d!} \langle |\lambda[0]\rangle \langle |0\rangle \rangle^d
\]

\[
= \frac{q^{-d}}{(t_1 t_2)^{\ell(\lambda)}} \frac{1}{d!} q^d.
\]

where the second (and following) equality is non-zero only for \(\lambda = (1^d)\).

**Proof.** The first equality comes from shifting the whole Nakajima basis to the one supported at the point \([0] = t_1 t_2 \in H^4_T\). Then by linearity,

\[
\frac{1}{(t_1 t_2)^{\ell(\lambda)}} \langle |\lambda[0]\rangle \rangle = \langle |0\rangle \rangle.
\]

The rest of the expression is the definition of DT partition function.

To show that only \(\lambda = (1^d)\) contributes, we do a dimension count. Recall that

\[
\text{vdim} I_n(\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{C}^2 / \mathbb{C}^2_{\infty}, d) = 2d.
\]

The dimension of the cycle defined by \(\lambda\) is \(|\lambda| + \ell(\lambda)\), i.e. we need \(|\lambda| + \ell(\lambda) = 2d\) for non-zero contribution. Hence \(\ell(\lambda) = d\) and \(\lambda = (1^d)\).

For this special partition, we have a factorization as follows. Compactify \(\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{C}^2\) to get \(\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^2\). Idea: the absolute theory on \(\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^2\) can be computed in two different ways, to give the factorization identity in
the third equality. Put a torus action $t_1, t_2$ on fibers $\mathbb{P}^2$ and $s$ on $\mathbb{P}^1$ at 0. How do we specify the relative condition $\lambda = (1^d)$ on the additional fixed points $A, B$ over the fiber at $\infty \in \mathbb{P}^1$? We get

$$\langle \mid 1[0], \ldots, 1[0] \rangle_{d \text{ copies}} = \langle \lambda \rangle \langle \mid -t_1, t_2 \rangle \langle \mid 0 \rangle_{t_1, t_2}$$

where we put the $\emptyset$ relative condition at the extra points $A, B$ at $\infty$ because we don’t want our original curve to hit the infinity divisor in the fibers.

\[ \square \]

2.8 Oct 31 (Shuai): Pair of pants

First goal: reduce everything to the quantum multiplication by the divisor $c_1(\mathcal{O}/I) = -(2, 1^{d-2})$. Define three operators.

1. Let $M$ be the explicit operator

$$M := (t_1 + t_2) \sum_{k>0} \frac{k (-q)^k + 1}{2} \alpha_k \alpha_k + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k,l>0} (t_1 t_2 \alpha_k \alpha_l - \alpha_k \alpha_l)$$

and then define $M* := M - (t_1 + t_2) \Phi(q)$ where $\Phi(q) := \left( \frac{d}{dq} \right) \log Q$ where $Q$ is the generating function for 3d partitions.

2. Define the operator $M_\sigma$ by

$$\langle \mu | M_\sigma | \nu \rangle := \langle \mu | -\sigma(F) | \nu \rangle.$$

3. Define the operator $M_D$ by

$$\langle \mu | M_D | \nu \rangle := DT(0|0,0)_{\lambda,D,\nu}.$$

We want to compare these three operators. The strategy is to argue we can focus on only a few special matrix elements.

1. (Only need terms close to the diagonal) Prove a vanishing theorem

$$|\ell(\mu) - \ell(\nu)| > 1 \implies \langle \mu | -\sigma(F) | \nu \rangle = 0.$$

2. (Off-diagonal terms are rational numbers) Prove another vanishing theorem

$$|\ell(\mu) - \ell(\nu)| = 1 \implies \langle \mu | -\sigma(F) | \nu \rangle_{n,d} = 0, \forall n > d,$$

i.e. the invariants are really just rational numbers.

3. (Only need certain on-diagonal terms) Prove the additivity property

$$\frac{\langle \mu | M_\sigma | \mu \rangle}{\langle \mu | \mu \rangle} = \sum q^{\mid |\mu| - \mu_i} \frac{\langle \mu_i | M_\sigma | \mu_i \rangle}{\langle \mu_i | \mu_i \rangle}.$$

The next step is to compute these special matrix elements of $M_\sigma$.

5. To compute $M_\sigma$ we can use any basis we want, but for the computation of $M_\sigma$ we would like to work in the fixed point basis $J^\mu$ instead of the Nakajima basis $|\mu\rangle$. In this basis, we have relations

$$\langle J^{(d)} | M_\sigma | J^{(d-1,1)} \rangle_n = (n-d) \langle J^{(d)} | J^{(d-1,1)} \rangle_{n}^\sim = (n-d) \langle J^{(d)} | J^{(d-1,1)} \rangle_{\text{Hilb}(\mathbb{C}^2)}^{\text{Hilb}(\mathbb{C}^2)}.$$
6. Compute the low-degree term
\[ (\mu | M_\sigma | \mu)_n = (t_1 + t_2)^n / t_1^n \mod (t_1 + t_2)^2. \]

The computation \( \langle J(d) | M_\sigma | J(d-1,1) \rangle \) contains a contribution \( \langle d | M_\sigma | d \rangle \). By matching the low-degree terms, it therefore suffices to show \( \langle J(d) | M_\sigma | J(d-1,1) \rangle \) matches with \( \langle J(d) | M_\sigma | J(d-1,1) \rangle \).

**Proposition 2.32.** \( M_\sigma = M_* \).

**Proof sketch.** Check that the \( q = 0 \), \( \langle 0 | M_\sigma | 0 \rangle \) and \( \langle 1 | M_\sigma | 1 \rangle \) terms match. We can explicitly compute the \( M_* \) matrix elements and show they match the following computations.

1. \((q = 0 \text{ term})\) This means \( n = d \), i.e. our moduli space is \( I_d(\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{C}^2, d) = \text{Hilb}(\mathbb{C}^2, d) \). Then by a computation via an explicit resolution of \( I \),

\[ M_\sigma(q = 0) := \pi_1(\text{ch}_3(I) \pi_1^+(1) \pi_2^+(\{N_0\})) = D - \frac{t_1 + t_2}{2} d \text{id}. \]

This is the classical part.

2. \((\langle 0 | M_\sigma | 0 \rangle)\) Degenerate to get something like

\[ \langle 0 | - \sigma_1(F) | 0 \rangle = \frac{\langle \sigma_1(F) | 0 \rangle}{\langle 0 | 0 \rangle}. \]

We know how to compute the top by moving the fiber class to 0 or \( \infty \), and then using the equivariant vertex measure \( W(\theta, 0, 0) \) at some specialization of weights, from MNOP2. The denominator are the usual degree-0 terms.

3. \((\langle 1 | M_\sigma | 1 \rangle)\) Degenerate again to get a similar formula. In the numerator we therefore need to compute a special case of the 1-legged vertex \( W(1, \emptyset, \emptyset) \) at some specialization of weights. Then we get

\[ - \frac{t_1 + t_2 - q}{2} (1 + q) - (t_1 + t_2) \Phi(q) \]

as expected.

Once we show the following computation, we will be done, because we have checked the equality for \( q = 0 \).

**Proposition 2.33.** \( \langle J(d) | M_* - M_\sigma(q = 0) | J(d-1,1) \rangle = \langle J(d) | M_* - M_\sigma(q = 0) | J(d-1,1) \rangle \).

**Proof.** First show using some representation theory that

\[ J^\lambda := \frac{(-1)^{\| \lambda \|} \lambda!}{\dim \lambda} \sum \chi_\mu^\lambda t_1^{\ell(\mu)} | \mu \rangle \mod t_1 + t_2. \]

In the two cases \( (d) \) and \( (d-1,1) \), this becomes very simple.

1. \( \chi^d \) is the trivial representation.

2. \( \chi^{d-1} \) is the fundamental representation \( \{ x \in \mathbb{C}^n : x_1 + \cdots + x_n = 0 \} \).

Since the intersection pairing on \( \text{Hilb}(\mathbb{C}^2, d) \) is diagonal, we get

\[ \langle J(d) | M_* - M_\sigma(0) | J(d-1,1) \rangle \equiv (-1)^n (t_1 + t_2)^n = \frac{t_1^n (d!)^2}{d - 1} \langle \chi^{(d-1,1)}, F \rangle_{L^2(S_n)} \mod t_1 + t_2 \]

where

\[ F := -|\mu| q \left[ \frac{q}{1 - q} - \sum_{i=1}^{\ell(\mu)} \frac{(-q)^{\mu_i}}{1 - (-q)^{\mu_i}} \right]. \]

To be continued...