

# Self-duality in quantum K-theory

Henry Liu

December 10, 2021

## Abstract

We describe an attempt to make quantum K-theory (of stable maps) more amenable to the self-duality/rigidity arguments of [14] in quasimap theory, by twisting the virtual structure sheaf. For  $\mathbb{P}^n$  this twist produces invariants which are self-dual rational functions, but asymptotic analysis shows this is no longer the case for general GKM manifolds such as flag varieties. Such analysis is done via an explicit combinatorial description of localization for quantum K-theory on GKM manifolds, and Givental's adelic characterization.

## 1 Introduction

A K-theory class  $\mathcal{F}$  is *self-dual* if

$$\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{G} - \hbar \mathcal{G}^\vee$$

for some K-theory class  $\mathcal{G}$ . A useful feature to demand from enumerative theories of curves is that their deformation theory can be made self-dual. This is the main feature of the theory of quasimaps to Nakajima quiver varieties [14], and implies that, up to some prefactors, K-theoretic integrals with no insertions over quasimap moduli all take the form <sup>1</sup>

$$\prod_i \frac{1 - \hbar w_i}{1 - w_i} \tag{1}$$

---

<sup>1</sup>In quasimap theory it is important that we integrate the *symmetrized* virtual structure sheaf  $\hat{\mathcal{O}}^{\text{vir}}$  instead of the unsymmetrized  $\mathcal{O}^{\text{vir}}$  (see [14, 1.3.7, 1.4.2, 3.2.7]). The latter will produce expressions of the form

$$\prod_i \frac{1 - \hbar w_i^{-1}}{1 - w_i},$$

which are manifestly not balanced. The twist described in section 3.2 is our way of compensating for this discrepancy.

for some equivariant weights  $w_i$ . Such rational functions are *bounded* in any equivariant limit  $w^\pm \rightarrow \infty$ , and we call them *balanced*.

In cohomology, a very useful observation is that an (equivariant) integral over a proper moduli is always a non-equivariant constant. In K-theory this is no longer true; the result is a Laurent *polynomial*  $p(\mathbf{x})$  in equivariant variables  $\mathbf{x}$ . However if in addition  $p(\mathbf{x})$  is bounded as  $\mathbf{x}^\pm \rightarrow \infty$ , then in fact  $p$  is constant. This is the case for invariants arising from self-dual deformation theories. In general, this phenomenon is called *rigidity*.

When rigidity arguments apply,  $p(\mathbf{x})$  can be computed in any equivariant limit  $x_i^\pm \rightarrow \infty$ , which dramatically simplifies localization formulas. For example, rigidity is the key tool in identifying  $q$ -difference operators for quasimap vertices as qKZ operators [14], and the computation of 1- and 2-leg K-theoretic vertices in Donaldson–Thomas theory [8].

We will investigate self-duality in quantum K-theory, i.e. K-theoretic Gromov–Witten theory, on the moduli of stable maps  $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,n}(X, d)$ , first defined in [12]. When  $X$  is a GKM manifold, equivariant localization provides a combinatorial description of K-theoretic descendant integrals

$$\chi \left( \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,n}(X, d), \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{\text{ev}_i^* \phi_i}{1 - q_i \mathcal{L}_i} \right).$$

Localization in K-theory has more combinatorial complexity than in cohomology. Section 2 reviews GKM manifolds and describes the combinatorial algorithm for localization in K-theory.

A given stable map  $f: C \rightarrow X$  has tangent-obstruction theory given by

$$T^{\text{vir}} := \chi(C, f^* T_X) - \chi(\Omega_C(D), \mathcal{O}_C),$$

which is evidently not self-dual. One can attempt to rectify this by computing invariants such as the J-function with some *insertion*  $\mathcal{F}$ , such that the result is a balanced rational function of the form (1) in every degree. Such an insertion is described in section 3.2. We call the modified J-function the *cotangent* J-function and show in section 3.3 that for  $X = \mathbb{P}^n$  it is self-dual.

Unfortunately, we show in section 3.4 that the cotangent J-function is unlikely to be balanced for general  $X$ , by analyzing its asymptotics in equivariant limits. The insertion defining the cotangent J-function is a twist of the insertion  $S_h^\bullet(R\pi_* \text{ev}^* \Omega_X)^\vee$  producing stable maps  $f: C \rightarrow T^*X$ . We suspect a further twist is necessary in general.

This project was initially suggested by Andrei Okounkov. The author wishes to thank him and Alexander Givental for many valuable discussions, and for reading a draft of this paper.

## 2 Virtual localization

Let  $X$  be a GKM manifold with action by a torus  $T$ . In this section, we describe (virtual) localization in K-theory for  $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,n}(X, d)$ . This description of course admits the straightforward generalization to  $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,n}(X, d)$ . However for genus  $g > 0$ , we do not know how to compute the K-theoretic vertex. The K-theoretic description should be compared to the cohomological description given in [13].

### 2.1 GKM graphs

Let  $n := \dim X$  and  $T = (\mathbb{C}^\times)^m$ . Following [6], associated to the GKM manifold  $X$  is its GKM graph  $(V, E)$ , where:

1. (vertices) the vertices  $V = V(X)$  are  $T$ -fixed points;
2. (edges) the edges  $E = E(X)$  are  $T$ -invariant  $\mathbb{P}^1$ 's;
3. (flags) pairs  $(e, v) \in E \times V$  with  $e$  incident to  $v$  are called flags, and  $E_v$  denotes all flags at  $v$ .

We will abuse notation and conflate graph-theoretic objects with the geometric objects they represent. For instance,  $N_{e/X}$  denotes the normal bundle in  $X$  of the  $\mathbb{P}^1$  represented by the edge  $e$ .

The GKM graph is decorated by the weight of the  $T$ -action on each edge, recorded in a weight function  $\mathbf{w}_X$ : for an edge  $e \in E_v$  incident to  $v$ ,

$$\mathbf{w}_X(e, v) \in K_T(\text{pt}) = \mathbb{Z}[a_1^\pm, \dots, a_m^\pm]$$

is the weight of the edge  $e$  at the vertex  $v$ . Weights must satisfy the following properties.

1. (GKM hypothesis) For every vertex  $v$ , any two distinct edges  $e, e' \in E_v$  have independent weights. In K-theory, independence of weights means  $\mathbf{w}_X(e, v) \neq \mathbf{w}_X(e', v)^s$  for any  $s \in \mathbb{R}$ .
2. Let the edge  $e$  connect vertices  $v, v'$ . Then:

- (a)  $\mathbf{w}_X(e, v') = \mathbf{w}_X(e, v)^{-1}$ ;
- (b) every edge  $f_i \in E_v$  pairs with an edge  $f'_i \in E_{v'}$  at the opposite vertex, such that

$$\mathbf{w}_X(f'_i, v') = \mathbf{w}_X(f_i, v) \mathbf{w}_X(e, v)^{a_i}$$


for some integer  $a_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Order the edges such that  $f_n = e$ , so that  $a_n = 2$ .

The second property corresponds to the decomposition  $N_{e/X} = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{n-1} \mathcal{O}_e(a_i)$  and  $T_e = \mathcal{O}_e(2)$ .

**Example 2.1** (Projective spaces). The GKM graph of  $\mathbb{P}^n$  is the  $n$ -simplex. Label the vertices from 1 to  $n$ . For an edge from  $i$  to  $j$  with  $i < j$ , the torus  $(\mathbb{C}^\times)^{n+1}$  acts with weight

$$a_{ij} := a_i/a_j.$$

**Example 2.2** (Full flag varieties). Let  $G$  be a semisimple Lie group with torus and Borel  $T \subset B \subset G$ . Then  $T$  acts on the (generalized) *flag variety*  $G/B$ , and  $T$ -fixed points biject with the Weyl group. For example, the GKM graph of the variety  $\mathrm{SL}_3/B$  of full flags in  $\mathbb{C}^3$  is



## 2.2 Kawasaki–Riemann–Roch

The key distinction between localization on orbifolds in K-theory vs in cohomology is that K-theory sees the geometry of twisted sectors, and cohomology does not. In other words, if  $\mathfrak{X}$  is an orbifold, we must distinguish between an actual pushforward  $\chi(\mathfrak{X}, \mathcal{E})$  and a pushforward  $\chi_{\mathrm{Sch}}(\mathfrak{X}, \mathcal{E})$  treating  $\mathfrak{X}$  as a scheme. The usual K-theoretic localization formula

$$\chi_{\mathrm{Sch}}(\mathfrak{X}, \mathcal{E}) = \sum_{F \subset \mathfrak{X}^T} \chi_{\mathrm{Sch}}(F, \mathcal{E}|_F \cdot S^\bullet(N_{F/\mathfrak{X}}^{\mathrm{vir}})^\vee)$$

will fail if we choose the latter. In cohomology, this is because of constant stacky factors like  $|\mathrm{Aut}|$ , but in K-theory the failure is much more dramatic.

**Example 2.3.** Let  $\mathfrak{X} = \mathbb{P}(m, 1)$  be a weighted projective line with an orbifold point at 0. A torus  $\mathbb{C}^\times$  acts with weight  $q^{1/m}$  around 0 and weight  $q^{-1}$  around  $\infty$ . Naively localizing gives

$$\chi_{\mathrm{Sch}}(\mathfrak{X}, \mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}) = \frac{1}{1 - q^{-1/m}} + \frac{1}{1 - q}.$$

This is not equal to the expected answer 1, and worse, involves fractional powers of  $q$ .

This failure occurred because we forgot the stacky nature of the fixed loci. Namely, the fixed point  $0 \in \mathbb{P}(m, 1)$  is actually a copy of  $B\mu_m$ . K-theoretic integrals over it must

involve taking  $\mu_m$ -invariants, like in Lefschetz's fixed point formula: if  $\zeta_m$  is a primitive  $m$ -th root of unity, then

$$\chi(B\mu_m, S^\bullet(N_{0/\mathfrak{X}})^\vee) = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} \frac{1}{1 - \zeta_m^k q^{-1/m}} = \frac{1}{1 - q^{-1}}. \quad (2)$$

In the example, if we put this together with the contribution at  $\infty$ , then we get the desired answer 1.

The general principle is encapsulated in a Riemann–Roch formula for Deligne–Mumford stacks. The idea, like in orbifold cohomology, is to work with the inertia stack  $I\mathfrak{X} = \bigsqcup_\mu \mathfrak{X}_\mu$ . Here  $\mathfrak{X}_\mu$  are the connected components, which we view as embedded in  $\mathfrak{X}$  with normal bundle  $N_{\mathfrak{X}_\mu/\mathfrak{X}}$ . For example, if  $\mathfrak{X} = [V/G]$  is a global quotient,

$$I[V/G] = \bigsqcup_{g \in \text{Conj}(G)} [V^g/C(g)],$$

where we range over conjugacy classes and  $C(g)$  is the centralizer of  $g$  in  $G$ . For simplicity, we define objects in this local case only. Each component  $\mathfrak{X}_\mu$  has a multiplicity

$$m_\mu := \ker(C(g) \rightarrow \text{Aut } V^g).$$

An orbi-bundle  $\mathcal{E}$  on  $[V^g/C(g)]$  decomposes into eigenbundles  $\mathcal{E} = \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} \mathcal{E}_k$  for the  $g$ -action, where  $m$  is the order of  $g$ . Define the virtual orbi-bundle

$$t_\mu(\mathcal{E}) := \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} \zeta_m^k \mathcal{E}_k. \quad (3)$$

**Theorem 1** ([7], [3]).

$$\chi(\mathfrak{X}, \mathcal{E}) = \sum_\mu \frac{1}{m_\mu} \chi_{\text{Sch}}(\mathfrak{X}_\mu, t_\mu(\mathcal{E}|_{\mathfrak{X}_\mu} \cdot S^\bullet(N_{\mathfrak{X}_\mu/\mathfrak{X}})^\vee)). \quad (4)$$

This is compatible with the virtual structure sheaf, i.e. with  $\mathcal{E} \otimes \mathcal{O}^{\text{vir}}$  on the lhs and  $N^{\text{vir}}$  on the rhs [15].

## 2.3 Fixed loci

We briefly review the combinatorics of  $T$ -fixed loci in  $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,n}(X, d)$  for cohomological localization. Since fixed loci in  $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,n}(X, d)$  can be non-trivial orbifolds in general, for K-theoretic localization the combinatorial data must be augmented by the data of twisted sectors.

**Definition 2.4** (Cohomological trees). Given a fixed locus  $F$ , pick a stable map  $f: (C, x) \rightarrow X$  in it and construct a decorated tree  $\Gamma$  as follows (cf. [2, section 9.2]).

1. The vertices  $V(\Gamma)$  represent *contracted* components of the source curve  $C$ , i.e. the connected components of  $f^{-1}(X^T)$ . Each vertex  $v \in V(\Gamma)$  is labeled by any marked points it carries.
2. The edges  $E(\Gamma)$  represent *uncontracted* components of  $C$ . Each edge  $e \in E(\Gamma)$  is labeled by the degree of the map  $f$  on it:

$$\deg e := \deg f|_e \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}.$$

In diagrams, to reduce clutter, we only label edges with their degree when  $\deg > 1$ .

We will conflate vertices and edges in  $\Gamma$  with their images in (the GKM graph of)  $X$ . In particular, in diagrams, vertices will be labeled by fixed points, in  $V(X)$ . If a vertex carries the  $i$ -th marked point, we label it with a  $\star_i$ .

**Example 2.5.** Consider  $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(\mathbb{P}^1, d)$ . We will only look at loci where the single marked point is at  $0 \in \mathbb{P}^1$ . The only degree 1 map  $C \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$  is the isomorphism, whose decorated tree is

$$\begin{array}{c} \star_1 \\ \bullet \text{---} \bullet \\ 0 \qquad \infty \end{array}.$$

In degree 2, there are three different decorated trees:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \begin{array}{c} \star_1 \quad 2 \\ \bullet \text{---} \bullet \\ 0 \qquad \infty \end{array} & \begin{array}{c} \star_1 \\ \bullet \text{---} \bullet \text{---} \bullet \\ 0 \qquad \infty \qquad 0 \end{array} & \begin{array}{c} \qquad \star_1 \\ \bullet \text{---} \bullet \text{---} \bullet \\ \infty \qquad 0 \qquad \infty \end{array} \end{array} \quad (5)$$

Note that there is a recursive structure. For a degree- $d$  tree, removing the marked vertex  $v$  and its incident edge(s) produces a (collection of) trees in lower degree, whose marked vertex is a neighbor of  $v$  and whose total degree is  $d$  minus the degree(s) of the incident edge(s). Conversely, all degree- $d$  trees arise this way. This provides a recursive enumeration of 1-pointed trees, as well as an important recursive structure in the J-function which we will see later.

Now we add stacky data. There are two kinds of automorphisms of  $\Gamma$ : a non-trivial  $\mu_d$  for an edge of degree  $d$ , and an actual (structural) graph automorphism  $S_k$  for every vertex with  $k$  isomorphic legs. These two types of automorphisms *cannot* be dealt with separately in localization, as we will see.

Suppose  $\Gamma$  consists of just a single edge of degree  $d$  with weight  $\mathbf{w}_X(e, v)$  in the target. Then  $\text{Aut } \Gamma = \mu_d$ . From the Kawasaki–Riemann–Roch formula (4), we see that in the  $k$ -th twisted sector of  $B\mu_d$ , the weight of the induced  $T$ -action on the edge in the source is effectively  $\zeta_d^k \mathbf{w}_X(e, v)^{1/\deg e}$ , living in a multiple cover of  $K_T(\text{pt})$ . Hence

the tree  $\Gamma$  splits into  $d$  different trees, for each of the  $d$  sectors. Instead of just labeling the edge by  $d$ , we add a subscript  $k$  to the  $d$ . For example,

$$\begin{array}{c} 2 \\ \bullet \text{---} \bullet \\ a \quad b \end{array} \rightsquigarrow \begin{array}{c} 2_0 \\ \bullet \text{---} \bullet \\ a \quad b \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} 2_1 \\ \bullet \text{---} \bullet \\ a \quad b \end{array}. \quad (6)$$

**Definition 2.6** (K-theoretic trees). A K-theoretic tree  $\Gamma$  has the following additional data.

1. Vertices with  $m$  groups of  $k_i$  isomorphic legs have non-trivial automorphism group

$$S_{\mathbf{k}} := S_{k_1} \times \cdots \times S_{k_m}.$$

This data is implicit in the diagram and not explicitly written.

2. Edges are labeled with their degree  $d$  and *sector*  $s$ , with sector written as a subscript, i.e.  $d_s$ . The weight of the edge in the source is

$$\mathbf{w}_{\Gamma}(e, v) := \zeta_d^s \mathbf{w}_X(e, v)^{1/d}.$$

So a cohomological tree with non-trivial edge degrees generates many K-theoretic trees.

It is important to write the new trees explicitly, because some new trees may have extra structural automorphisms. For example, there are degree-4 trees

$$\begin{array}{c} 2_0 \quad 2_0 \\ \bullet \text{---} \bullet \text{---} \bullet \\ b \quad a \quad b \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} 2_0 \quad 2_1 \\ \bullet \text{---} \bullet \text{---} \bullet \\ b \quad a \quad b \end{array}$$

where the first tree has a structural  $S_2$  automorphism and the second tree does not.

## 2.4 Edges

It remains to identify edge and vertex contributions to  $S^{\bullet} N_{\Gamma/X}^{\text{vir}}$  for a K-theoretic tree  $\Gamma$ . There is no additional K-theoretic complexity for edges once we work with K-theoretic trees, so we describe edge contributions first.

Edge contributions come from deformations of the map  $f$ , which are controlled by  $\chi(C, f^* T_X)$ . Let  $e \in E(\Gamma)$  be an edge from  $v$  to  $v'$ . Then each term  $\mathcal{O}_e(a_i)$  in its normal bundle arises from an edge  $f_i \in E_v(X)$ , and contributes to  $N_{\Gamma/\mathcal{M}}^{\text{vir}}$  the term

$$\chi(e, \mathcal{O}_e(a_i \deg e)) = \begin{cases} \sum_{k=0}^{a_i \deg e} \mathbf{w}_X(f_i, v) \mathbf{w}_{\Gamma}(e, v)^{-k} & a_i \geq 0 \\ \sum_{k=1}^{a_i \deg e - 1} \mathbf{w}_X(f_i, v) \mathbf{w}_{\Gamma}(e, v)^k & a_i < 0. \end{cases}$$

A similar computation holds for the tangent bundle  $\mathcal{O}_e(2)$ , which contains a single  $T$ -fixed weight 1. After applying  $S^\bullet$ , all cases unify if we introduce a *reduced*  $q$ -Pochhammer symbol

$$(x; q)_d^{\text{red}} := \frac{(x; q)_\infty^{\text{red}}}{(q^d x; q)_\infty^{\text{red}}}, \quad (x; q)_\infty^{\text{red}} := \prod_{\substack{k \geq 0 \\ q^k x \neq 1}} (1 - q^k x)$$

to manually remove the 1. Using this notation, the total contribution of the edge  $e$  is

$$\frac{1}{\deg e} \frac{1}{(\mathbf{w}_X(e, v); \mathbf{w}_\Gamma(e, v)^{-1})_{2 \deg e + 1}^{\text{red}}} \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} \frac{1}{(\mathbf{w}_X(f_i, v); \mathbf{w}_\Gamma(e, v)^{-1})_{a_i \deg e + 1}}. \quad (7)$$

The prefactor comes from averaging and is the same as the one in (4). For clarity, we separate the first term, coming from the tangent bundle, and the other terms, coming from the normal bundle.

## 2.5 Vertices

Vertex contributions to  $S^\bullet N_{\Gamma/X}^{\text{vir}}$  are more difficult. Suppose a vertex  $v \in V(\Gamma)$  has no marked points, but has groups of isomorphic legs

$$\Gamma_1 \cong \Gamma_2 \cong \cdots \cong \Gamma_{k_1}, \quad \Gamma_{k_1+1} \cong \cdots \cong \Gamma_{k_2}, \quad \dots, \quad \cdots \cong \Gamma_{k_r}.$$

Then there is a permutation action by

$$S_{\mathbf{k}} := S_{k_1} \times \cdots \times S_{k_r},$$

which means we must compute invariants over  $[\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,n}/S_{\mathbf{k}}]$  instead of over  $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,n}$ . In general, we can always put such permutation actions on marked points in  $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,n}(X, d)$ . This is Givental's permutation-equivariant quantum K-theory [4], which has invariants

$$\langle \mathcal{E} \rangle_{g,n,d}^{X, S_{\mathbf{k}}} := \chi([\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,n}(X, d)/S_n], \mathcal{E} \otimes \mathcal{O}^{\text{vir}})$$

for various sheaf insertions  $\mathcal{E}$ . For the purpose of describing virtual localization, we only need to understand the permutation-equivariant theory of a point,

$$\langle \mathcal{E} \rangle_{0,n}^{S_{\mathbf{k}}} := \langle \mathcal{E} \rangle_{0,n,d}^{\text{pt}, S_{\mathbf{k}}},$$

which are precisely the vertex contributions for appropriate insertions  $\mathcal{E}$ .

We first explicitly describe the necessary insertion  $\mathcal{E}$ . For simplicity, suppose there is only one group of  $k = k_1$  isomorphic legs, permuted by a single  $S_k$ , which are the first  $k$  out of  $n$  legs. Let

$$\gamma_1 = \cdots = \gamma_k, \quad \gamma_{k+1}, \dots, \gamma_n \in \text{Frac } K_T(\text{pt})$$



be the contributions of the  $n$  legs, which are of lower degree and therefore we can assume have been computed already. Let

$$w_i := \mathbf{w}_\Gamma(e_i, v)$$

be the weight of the  $i$ -th leg, connected to  $v$  by the edge  $e_i$ . The connection, geometrically, is a node, whose deformation is controlled by  $w_i \mathcal{L}_i$ . There are also terms  $(f|_v)^* T_X = T_v X$  arising from normalization of deformations of the map  $f$ . All together, the integral we must compute at the vertex is

$$\frac{1}{\wedge_{-1}^\bullet T_v X} \left\langle \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{\gamma_i \cdot \wedge_{-1}^\bullet T_v X}{1 - w_i \cdot \mathcal{L}_i} \right\rangle_{0,n}^{S_k} \quad (8)$$

(Compare with the vertex contributions in cohomology, e.g. in [13].) If there were no permutation action, then the numerator factors out of the integral and

$$\frac{1}{\wedge_{-1}^\bullet T_v X} \left\langle \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{\gamma_i \cdot \wedge_{-1}^\bullet T_v X}{1 - w_i \cdot \mathcal{L}_i} \right\rangle_{0,n} = (\wedge_{-1}^\bullet T_v X)^{n-1} \prod_{i=1}^n \gamma_i \cdot \left\langle \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{1 - w_i \cdot \mathcal{L}_i} \right\rangle_{0,n}. \quad (9)$$


Such non-permutation-equivariant integrals are the K-theoretic analogue of gravitational descendants, and have an explicit formula. (Note that, just as in the cohomological case, this formula continues to work for  $n = 1$  and  $n = 2$ , even though there is no actual integral at the vertex in those cases.)

**Proposition 2.7** ([10]).


$$\left\langle \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{1 - w_i \mathcal{L}_i} \right\rangle_{0,n} = \left( 1 + \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{w_i}{1 - w_i} \right)^{n-3} \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{1 - w_i}. \quad (10)$$

In the permutation-equivariant case, we must again keep in mind (4). Characters of the  $S_k$  action have different values on different permuted legs, and so it is important that we do *not* factor out the numerator like we did in (9).

**Example 2.8.** Consider  $[\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,3}/S_2]$ , where the  $S_2$  permutes the first two marked points. Up to isomorphism, there is only one tree in  $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,3}$ , which we draw as



When we integrate over  $[\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,3}/S_2]$ , this tree splits into two trees — one for the *unpermuted* sector, and one for the *permuted* sector:



The arrow indicates that there is a non-trivial cyclic permutation on the marked points 2, 3. This permutation is achieved via the map  $z \mapsto -z$ , and affects even the first marked point. For example,

$$\left\langle \frac{1}{1-q\mathcal{L}_1}, \frac{1-w}{1-t\mathcal{L}_2}, \frac{1-w}{1-t\mathcal{L}_3} \right\rangle_{0,3}^{S_2} = \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{(1-w)(1-w)}{(1-q)(1-t)(1-t)} + \frac{(1-w)(1+w)}{(1+q)(1-t)(1+t)} \right). \quad (11)$$


In general, the symmetrization arising from cyclically permuting  $r$  points can be written using Adams operations

$$\Psi^r(a_i) := a_i^r \in K_T(\text{pt}) = \mathbb{Z}[a_1^\pm, \dots, a_m^\pm].$$

For example, using the notation of (3), if  $\sigma$  contains a cycle of length  $r$ , i.e.  $r$  marked points on a single  $\mathbb{P}^1$  cyclically permuted, then

$$t_\sigma \left( \prod_{i=1}^r \frac{\gamma}{1-w\mathcal{L}_i} \times \dots \right) = \frac{\Psi^r(\gamma)}{1-w^r} \times \dots. \quad (12)$$

Every  $S_k$ -fixed tree is a collection of  $\mathbb{P}^1$ 's connected by nodes. For a given conjugacy class  $[\sigma]$  in  $S_k$ , some  $\mathbb{P}^1$ 's carry cyclically permuted marked points (corresponding to cycles in  $\sigma$ ), and some carry non-permuted marked points.



The invariants in the two cases decouple, and we now know how to handle both. In principle, this allows us to compute arbitrary vertex integrals, but is combinatorially complicated.

In practice, there is a less combinatorially-involved algorithm for permutation-equivariant vertices, arising from the adelic characterization (cf. Theorems 2, 3) of the *big* J-function of a point in [4, III, IX, X]. This algorithm involves recursively computing a change of parameters up to the desired degree. However, it is not amenable to taking limits in equivariant parameters, as we will do in Section 3.4. So we stick with the naive combinatorial description of the vertex.

## 2.6 Algorithm

To summarize, the contribution of a K-theoretic tree  $\Gamma$  to an invariant

$$\chi \left( \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,n}(X, d), \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{\text{ev}_i^* \phi_i}{1 - q_i \mathcal{L}_i} \right)$$

is computed recursively as follows. It is the product of two types of contributions: permutation-equivariant vertices, and usual vertices/edges.

Let  $V^{\text{perm}} \subset V(\Gamma)$  be the set of all vertices  $v$  fixed by all automorphisms, but which have a non-trivial number of isomorphic legs  $\{\Gamma_i\}_{i=1}^r$  where  $\Gamma_i$  appears  $k_i$  times. These are the vertices where we must use permutation-equivariant theory.

1. If  $k_i > 1$ , compute the contribution from  $\Gamma_i$  using this algorithm recursively, and call it  $\gamma_i$ .
2. If  $k_i = 1$ , so that the leg is not involved in any permutation action, set  $\gamma_i = 1$ . Contributions from such legs will be included later.

Let  $I \subset \{1, \dots, n\}$  be the set of marked points carried by  $v$ . Then the total contribution from  $v \in V^{\text{perm}}$  (cf. (8)) is

$$\frac{1}{\wedge_{-1}^\bullet T_v X} \left\langle \prod_{i=1}^r \left( \frac{\gamma_i \cdot \wedge_{-1}^\bullet T_v X}{1 - \mathbf{w}_\Gamma(e_i, v) \cdot \mathcal{L}} \right)^{k_i} \prod_{i \in I} \phi_i|_v \right\rangle_{0, \sum_{i=1}^r k_i + |I|}^{S_k}. \quad (13)$$

Let  $E^{\text{fixed}} \subset E(\Gamma)$  consist of all edges not moved by any automorphism, and let  $V^{\text{fixed}} \subset V(\Gamma)$  be vertices incident to such edges but not in  $V^{\text{perm}}$ . These are vertices and edges which are not involved in permutation-equivariant machinery, whose contributions we compute directly using (7) for edges  $e \in E^{\text{fixed}}$  and (9), (10) for vertices  $v \in V^{\text{fixed}}$ . (These edges include the unpermuted legs for vertices  $v \in V^{\text{perm}}$  above.)

The final value of the invariant is obtained by summing over all K-theoretic trees  $\Gamma$ .

### 3 J-function

The J-function is an integral over  $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(X, d)$ . The  $T$ -fixed loci here splits into different components where the single marked point is mapped to different fixed points  $v \in V(X)$ . Write this splitting as

$$\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(X, d)^T = \bigsqcup_{v \in V(X)} \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(X, d)_v.$$


**Definition 3.1.** Fix  $v \in V(X)$ . The (small) *J-function* at  $v$  is

$$J_{X,v}(q) := 1 + \sum_{d>0} \mathbf{z}^d J_{X,v}^{(d)}(q)$$

where the degree  $d$  term is

$$J_{X,v}^{(d)}(q) := \frac{\wedge_{-1}^\bullet T_v X}{1 - q} \chi \left( \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(X, d)_v, \frac{\mathcal{O}^{\text{vir}}}{1 - q\mathcal{L}} \right).$$

Our definition differs from the standard one, e.g. in [4], by the prefactors  $\wedge_{-1}^\bullet T_v X$  and  $1/(1-q)$ . These prefactors arise naturally in the interpretation of  $J_X$  via the graph space construction, where instead of considering maps  $f: \mathbb{P}^1 \rightarrow X$  of degree  $d$ , we consider their graphs, which are maps  $\Gamma_f: C \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1 \times X$  of bi-degree  $(1, d)$ .



Let  $\mathbb{C}_q^\times$  act on the target  $\mathbb{P}^1$  factor. By localization, the K-theoretic count of stable maps to graph space splits into two J-functions:

$$\chi(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,0}(\mathbb{P}^1 \times X, (1, d)), \mathcal{O}^{\text{vir}}) \propto \sum_{d_1+d_2=d} J_X^{(d_1)}(q) \times J_X^{(d_2)}(q^{-1}).$$

This idea was used very effectively in [5] to compute  $J_{\mathbb{P}^n}$ . The extra prefactors come from the deformation theory of the extra  $\mathbb{P}^1$  leg at the vertex corresponding to the marked point.

To compute the J-function, bluntly applying localization is not the best method. The J-function has structure that other generating functions of GW invariants do not have. To understand this structure, we must allow for an arbitrary number of additional marked points, each carrying some *input*.

**Definition 3.2.** Let  $\mathbf{t} = \sum_{m \geq 0} \mathbf{t}^{(m)} q^m$  with  $\mathbf{t}_m \in K_T(X)$ . The *big* J-function at  $v$  with *input*  $\mathbf{t}$  is

$$J_{X,v}^{(d)}(q \mid \mathbf{t}) := 1 + \frac{\mathbf{t}(q)}{1-q} + \sum_{d>0} z^d J_{X,v}^{(d)}(q \mid \mathbf{t}),$$

where the degree  $d$  term is

$$J_{X,v}^{(d)}(q \mid \mathbf{t}) = \frac{\wedge_{-1}^\bullet T_v X}{1-q} \sum_{n \geq 2} \chi \left( \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,n+1}(X, d)_v, \frac{\mathcal{O}^{\text{vir}}}{1-q\mathcal{L}_{n+1}} \prod_{i=1}^n \sum_{m \geq 0} \text{ev}_i^*(\mathbf{t}_i^{(m)}) \mathcal{L}_i^m \right).$$

We mostly care about the big J-function when  $X = \text{pt}$ , in which case we omit writing  $v$  and just write  $J_{\text{pt}}$ .

### 3.1 Adelic characterization

We review Givental's adelic characterization of the J-function, which is our primary method for computing J-functions. In localization, 1-pointed K-theoretic trees index fixed loci in the integral for the J-function. The marked point  $\star$  is either on a vertex of valency 1 or of valency  $> 1$ . These two cases produce different poles in  $q$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{array}{c} \star \\ \bullet \end{array} \xrightarrow{w} \cdots &= \frac{1}{1 - qw} \times \cdots \\ \begin{array}{c} \star \\ \bullet \end{array} \begin{array}{l} \nearrow \cdots \\ \xrightarrow{\quad} \cdots \\ \searrow \cdots \end{array} &= \frac{1}{1 - q} \times \cdots \end{aligned}$$

In the first case, we get a (simple) pole at  $q = w^{-1}$ . Let  $e$  denote the edge, connecting the marked vertex  $v$  with another vertex  $v'$ . If we remove  $v$  and  $e$  and mark  $v'$  instead, the resulting 1-pointed tree  $\Gamma'$  contributes to  $J_{X,v'}^{(d-m)}$ , where  $m := \deg(e)\beta(e)$ . Let  $w := \mathbf{w}_\Gamma(e, v)$  be the weight of the edge. Then

$$\text{Res}_{q=w^{-1}} J_{X,v}^{(d)}(q) \frac{dq}{q} = \mathbf{z}^m J_{X,v'}^{(d-m)}(w^{-1}) \cdot E \quad (14)$$

where  $E$  is the contribution of the edge  $e$  and vertex  $v$ . Explicitly (cf. (7)),

$$E = \frac{\wedge_{-1}^\bullet T_v X}{\deg e} \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{(\mathbf{w}_X(f_i, v); \mathbf{w}_\Gamma(e, v)^{-1})_{a_i \deg e + 1}^{\text{red}}}. \quad (15)$$

In the second case, we get poles (possibly non-simple) at  $q$  equal to roots of unity. Viewing the contributions of legs as inputs  $\mathbf{t}_i$ , the value of the entire graph is a permutation-equivariant vertex:

$$\text{Res}_{q=\zeta^{-1}} J_{X,v} \frac{dq}{q} = \left\langle \mathbf{t}_1(L), \dots, \mathbf{t}_m(L), \frac{1}{1 - q\mathcal{L}_{m+1}} \right\rangle_{0, m+1}^{S_k}. \quad (16)$$

View  $J_{X,v}$  as a meromorphic function of  $q$ . From these two cases, we see  $J_{X,v}$  can only have poles at  $q = \xi$  where  $\xi$  is a root of either 1 or some weight  $\mathbf{w}_X(e, v)$  for  $e \in E_v(X)$ . The two cases place constraints on residues at these poles. In addition, from the structure of virtual localization,  $J_{X,v}$  has no *regular* part and is therefore characterized by its residues at poles. The converse also holds.

**Theorem 2** (Adelic characterization, [4, III, IV]). *Suppose*

$$f(q) \in \text{Frac}(K_T(\text{pt}))[[\mathbf{z}]]$$

*has no regular part and has poles only at  $q$  equal to roots of unity or roots of weights of edges in  $E_v(X)$ . If in addition  $f$  satisfies (14) and (16) for some inputs  $\mathbf{t}_i$ , then  $f = J_{X,v}$ .*

For a given  $f$ , checking the recursion (14) is usually straightforward, though tedious. To check (16), we need a better computational handle on values of  $J_{\text{pt}}(q \mid \mathbf{t})$  for various inputs  $\mathbf{t}$ . This is supplied by the action of  $q$ -difference operators on the cone spanned by the  $J_{\text{pt}}(q \mid \mathbf{t})$ , as well as an initial value computation when  $\mathbf{t}$  is constant in  $q$ .

**Theorem 3** ( $D_q$ -module structure for  $X = \text{pt}$ , [4, I, IV]).

1. For  $\nu \in K_T(\text{pt})$ , the permutation-equivariant vertex is

$$J_{\text{pt}}(q \mid \nu) = \exp_q \left( \frac{\nu}{1-q} \right)$$

where  $\exp_q(x) := \sum_{n \geq 0} x^n / (q; q)_n$  is the  $q$ -exponential function.

2. If  $f = \sum_{d \geq 0} \mathbf{z}^d f_d$  arises as  $J_{\text{pt}}(q \mid \mathbf{t})$  for some inputs  $\mathbf{t}$ , then so do

$$\sum_{d \geq 0} \mathbf{z}^d f_d(\lambda q; q)_{\ell d}, \quad \sum_{d \geq 0} \mathbf{z}^d f_d \frac{1}{(\lambda q; q)_{\ell d}},$$

for any positive integer  $\ell$  and parameter  $\lambda$ .

## 3.2 Cotangent J-function

We now describe a sheaf insertion which makes the J-function more balanced.

**Definition 3.3.** The cotangent J-function  $\tilde{J}_X$  has terms

$$\tilde{J}_{X,v}^{(d)} \propto \chi \left( \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(X, d)_v, \frac{\mathcal{E}}{1 - q\mathcal{L}_1} \right)$$

where  $\mathcal{E}$  is the sheaf

$$\mathcal{E} := S_h^\bullet(-R\pi_* \text{ev}^* \Omega_X).$$

Note that GW theory with target  $T^*X$  can be described as GW theory with target  $X$  with insertion  $S^\bullet(-R\pi_* \text{ev}^* \Omega_X)^\vee$ , which is  $\mathcal{E}$  twisted by  $\det(-R\pi_* \text{ev}^* \Omega_X)$ .

The insertion  $\mathcal{E}$  contributes extra terms in localization. Over  $e \in E(\Gamma)$ , if there is a term  $\mathcal{O}_e(a)$  in  $T_e X$ , then there is a corresponding contribution from  $\mathcal{O}_e(-a)$  in  $\mathcal{E}$ . Hence the total contribution of the edge  $e$  is now

$$\frac{1}{\deg e} \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{(\hbar \mathbf{w}_X(f_i, v) \mathbf{w}_\Gamma(e, v)^{-1}; \mathbf{w}_\Gamma(e, v)^{-1})_{a_i \deg e - 1}}{(\mathbf{w}_X(f_i, v); \mathbf{w}_\Gamma(e, v)^{-1})_{a_i \deg e + 1}^{\text{red}}}. \quad (17)$$

Every vertex  $v \in V(\Gamma)$  also gains an extra factor

$$\mathcal{E}|_v = \wedge_{-\hbar}^\bullet T_v X.$$

**Example 3.4.** Let  $X = \mathbb{P}^1$ , with an action by  $\mathbb{C}^\times$  of weight  $t$ . We explicitly compute the  $d = 2$  term in the cotangent J-function at  $0 \in \mathbb{P}^1$  via localization. This term has contributions from four K-theoretic trees (cf. (5), (6)). For brevity, define

$$\{x_1, \dots, x_n\} := \prod (1 - x_i).$$

The four contributions are:

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{array}{c} \star \\ \bullet \text{---} \bullet \\ 0 \quad \infty \end{array}^{2_0} &= \frac{1}{2} \frac{\{\hbar t^{1/2}, \hbar, \hbar t^{-1/2}\} \{t^{-1/2}\}}{\{qt^{1/2}\} \{t, t^{1/2}, t^{-1/2}, t^{-1}\}} \\ \begin{array}{c} \star \\ \bullet \text{---} \bullet \\ 0 \quad \infty \end{array}^{2_1} &= \frac{1}{2} \frac{\{-\hbar t^{1/2}, \hbar, -\hbar t^{-1/2}\} \{-t^{-1/2}\}}{2 \{-qt^{1/2}\} \{t, -t^{1/2}, -t^{-1/2}, t^{-1}\}} \\ \begin{array}{c} \star \\ \bullet \text{---} \bullet \text{---} \bullet \\ 0 \quad \infty \quad 0 \end{array} &= \frac{\{\hbar\} \{\hbar t^{-1}, t^{-1}\} \{\hbar\} \{t\}}{\{qt\} \{t, t^{-1}\} \{t^{-2}\} \{t, t^{-1}\}} \\ \begin{array}{c} \star \\ \bullet \text{---} \bullet \text{---} \bullet \\ \infty \quad 0 \quad \infty \end{array} &= \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{\{t^{-1}\} \{\hbar\}}{\{t, t^{-1}\}} \frac{\{t^{-1}\} \{\hbar\}}{\{t, t^{-1}\}} \frac{\{\hbar t, t\}}{\{q, t, t\}} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{\{t^{-1}\} \{\hbar\}}{\{t, t^{-1}\}} \frac{\{-t^{-1}\} \{-\hbar\}}{\{-t, -t^{-1}\}} \frac{\{-\hbar t, -t\}}{\{-q, t, -t\}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

The expression for the last term comes from the simplest case of the permutation-equivariant vertex (11), over  $[\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,3}/S_2]$ . Summing up all these contributions gives

$$\widetilde{J}_{\mathbb{P}^1,0}^{(2)} = \frac{\{t, \hbar t\}}{\{q\}} \cdot \frac{\{\hbar, \hbar q, \hbar q t\}}{\{t, q t, q^2, q^2 t\}} = \frac{\{\hbar, \hbar t, \hbar q, \hbar q t\}}{\{q, q t, q^2, q^2 t\}}.$$

### 3.3 For projective space

Using the adelic characterization, we can explicitly compute the cotangent J-function for  $X = \mathbb{P}^n$ . Notation is from Example 2.1.

**Proposition 3.5.** *The cotangent J-function for  $\mathbb{P}^n$  at the vertex  $i$  is  $(1 - q)$  times the  $q$ -hypergeometric function*

$$I_i(q) := \sum_{d \geq 0} z^d \prod_{j=0}^n \frac{(\hbar \frac{a_i}{a_j}; q)_d}{(q \frac{a_i}{a_j}; q)_d}. \quad (18)$$

*Proof.* It is clear that  $I$  automatically satisfies the vertex condition (16) in the adelic characterization, purely because it is  $q$ -hypergeometric. It suffices then to verify the edge recursion (14) at the vertex  $v = 0$ ; the verification at all other vertices is the same up to a change of variables.

Let  $e \in E(\Gamma)$  be an edge connecting vertices 0 and  $k$ . Write  $t_i := a_0/a_i$  for brevity, so that  $\mathbf{w}_X(e, v) = t_k$ . In the target, this edge has tangent bundle  $\mathcal{O}(2)$  with linearization  $(t_k, t_k^{-1})$ , and normal bundles  $\mathcal{O}(1)$  with linearizations  $(t_i, t_i t_k^{-1})$  for all  $i \neq k$ . If it has degree  $m$ , then, using (17), its contribution is

$$\begin{aligned} E &= \frac{\prod_{i=1}^n \{t_i, \hbar t_i\}}{m} \frac{(\hbar t_k^{1-1/m}; t_k^{-1/m})_{2m-1}}{(t_k; t_k^{-1/m})_{2m+1}^{\text{red}}} \prod_{i \neq k} \frac{(\hbar t_i t_k^{-1/m}; t_k^{-1/m})_{m-1}}{(t_i; t_k^{-1/m})_{m+1}} \\ &= \frac{1}{m} \frac{(\hbar t_k; t_k^{-1/m})_m (\hbar; t_k^{-1/m})_m}{(t_k^{1-1/m}; t_k^{-1/m})_m^{\text{red}} (t_k^{-1/m}; t_k^{-1/m})_m} \prod_{i \neq k} \frac{(\hbar t_i; t_k^{-1/m})_m}{(t_i t_k^{-1/m}; t_k^{-1/m})_m}. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, the residue is

$$\text{Res}_{q=t_k^{-1/m}} I_0^{(d)}(q) \frac{dq}{q} = \frac{z^d}{m} \frac{(\hbar; t_k^{-1/m})_d}{(t_k^{-1/m}; t_k^{-1/m})_d} \frac{(\hbar t_k; t_k^{-1/m})_d}{(t_k^{1-1/m}; t_k^{-1/m})_d^{\text{red}}} \prod_{i \neq k} \frac{(\hbar t_i; t_k^{-1/m})_d}{(t_i t_k^{-1/m}; t_k^{-1/m})_d}.$$

If we split each  $q$ -Pochhammer as  $(x; q)_d = (x; q)_m (xq^m; q)_{d-m}$ , this is manifestly the product of  $E$  with

$$z^m I_k^{(d-m)}(t_k^{-1/m}) = z^d \frac{(\hbar; t_k^{-1/m})_{d-m} (\hbar t_k^{-1}; t_k^{-1/m})_{d-m}}{(t_k^{-1/m}; t_k^{-1/m})_{d-m} (t_k^{-1-1/m}; t_k^{-1/m})_{d-m}} \prod_{i \neq k} \frac{(\hbar t_i t_k^{-1}; t_k^{-1/m})_{d-m}}{(t_i t_k^{-1-1/m}; t_k^{-1/m})_{d-m}}.$$

Hence (14) is satisfied and we are done by adelic characterization.  $\square$

An important feature of  $I_i(q)$  is that it is *self-dual*. This means that it is of the form

$$\sum_{d \geq 0} z^d \prod_i \frac{(\hbar w_i; q)_d}{(q w_i; q)_d}$$

where the product is over some collection of equivariant weights  $\{w_i\}$ . We view the  $(\hbar w_i; q)_d$  in the numerator as “dual” to the  $(q w_i; q)_d$  in the denominator. Such rational functions are *bounded* as  $w_i^{\pm 1} \rightarrow \infty$ , which is the key technical tool in the K-theoretic calculations of [14].

In the limit  $\hbar \rightarrow 0$ , we recover the formula for  $J_{\mathbb{P}^n}$  in [11].

*Remark.* Givental points out that, if we take  $J_{\mathbb{P}^n}$  as known, then this result follows from a slight modification of the quantum Lefschetz theorem of [4, XI]. In general, the quantum Lefschetz theorem is concerned with obtaining  $J_{T^*X}$ , instead of  $\tilde{J}_X$ , from  $J_X$ . In the notation there, if we let  $\tilde{E}$  denote  $E := T^*X$  but with the twist of our cotangent J-function, then the relevant  $q$ -difference operator for the Kähler parameter  $z$  is of the form

$$\Gamma_{\tilde{E}} \sim \prod_{L \in E} \prod_{\ell \geq 0} \frac{1 - Lq^\ell}{1 - Lq^{D_L(d)z\partial_z} q^\ell}$$



where  $D_L(d) := -\langle c_1(L), d \rangle$  is the degree with respect to  $L$ . When applied to  $z^d$ , the operator produces the extra factors  $\prod_{L \in E} (L; q)_{D_L(d)}$ . For example, for  $X = \mathbb{P}^n$  we have  $T^*X = (n+1)\mathcal{O}(-1) - \mathcal{O}$ , so that the extra factors are (up to a constant  $(1 - \hbar)$  which can be neglected)

$$\prod_{j=0}^n (\hbar \mathcal{O}(-1)/a_j; q)_d.$$

These are precisely the extra factors in (18) (compared to  $J_{\mathbb{P}^n, i}$ ), once we restrict them to the  $i$ -th fixed point  $p_i$ , where  $\mathcal{O}(-1)|_{p_i} = a_i$ .

### 3.4 Equivariant infinities

For general GKM  $X$ , the cotangent J-function is not balanced. Balanced rational functions are bounded in all equivariant limits  $a_i^\pm \rightarrow \infty$ . We can compute asymptotics of  $\tilde{J}_{X,v}^{(d)}$  in such limits explicitly by analyzing the non-balanced parts of each contribution from a tree  $\Gamma$ . The analysis will show there exist equivariant limits where  $\tilde{J}_X^{(d)} \rightarrow \infty$ .

**Definition 3.6.** Given two rational functions  $f, g$  of equivariant variables, write

$$f \sim g$$

to mean that  $O(f) = O(g)$  in any equivariant limit  $a_i^\pm \rightarrow \infty$ .

Suppose  $\Gamma$  is a *chain* between two points, i.e. with only internal vertices of valency 2:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} \star & & & & & & \\ \bullet & \xrightarrow{w_1} & \bullet & \xrightarrow{w_2} & \cdots & \xrightarrow{w_{k-1}} & \bullet & \xrightarrow{w_k} & \bullet \\ p_1 & & p_2 & & & & p_k & & p_{k+1} \end{array}$$

Then we only need the edge recursion (14) to compute its contribution. Putting together (15) and (17), the contribution of an edge  $e$  from  $v$  to  $v'$  to the recursion is

$$E = \frac{\wedge_{-1}^\bullet T_v X \cdot \wedge_{-\hbar}^\bullet T_v X}{\deg e} \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{(\hbar \mathbf{w}_X(f_i, v) \mathbf{w}_\Gamma(e, v)^{-1}; \mathbf{w}_\Gamma(e, v)^{-1})_{a_i \deg e - 1}}{(\mathbf{w}_X(f_i, v); \mathbf{w}_\Gamma(e, v)^{-1})_{a_i \deg e + 1}^{\text{red}}}.$$

Using that

$$\begin{aligned} \wedge_{-\hbar}^\bullet T_v X &= \prod_{i=1}^n (1 - \hbar \mathbf{w}_X(f_i, v)) \\ \wedge_{-1}^\bullet T_{v'} X &= \prod_{i=1}^n (1 - \mathbf{w}_X(f_i, v) \mathbf{w}_\Gamma(e, v)^{-a_i \deg e}) \end{aligned}$$

we can rearrange  $E$  into a more suggestive form:

$$E = \frac{1}{\deg e} \frac{\wedge_{-h}^\bullet T_v X}{\wedge_{-1}^\bullet T_{v'} X} \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{(\hbar \mathbf{w}_X(f_i, v) \mathbf{w}_\Gamma(e, v)^{-1}; \mathbf{w}_\Gamma(e, v)^{-1})_{a_i \deg e - 1}}{(\mathbf{w}_X(f_i, v) \mathbf{w}_\Gamma(e, v)^{-1}; \mathbf{w}_\Gamma(e, v)^{-1})_{a_i \deg e - 1}^{\text{red}}}$$

The term in the product is balanced and contributes only a constant to any equivariant limit. Hence

$$E \sim \frac{\wedge_{-h}^\bullet T_v X}{\wedge_{-1}^\bullet T_{v'} X}.$$

A chain of such edges produces a balanced product of such terms except at the two endpoints of the chain:

$$\prod_{i=1}^k \frac{\wedge_{-h}^\bullet T_{p_i} X}{\wedge_{-1}^\bullet T_{p_{i+1}} X} \sim \frac{\wedge_{-h}^\bullet T_{p_1} X}{\wedge_{-1}^\bullet T_{p_{k+1}} X}.$$

**Proposition 3.7.** *The total contribution of the chain  $\Gamma$  is*


$$\Gamma \sim \frac{\wedge_{-h}^\bullet T_p X}{\wedge_{-1}^\bullet T_q X} \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{k-1} \frac{1}{1 - w_i^{-1} w_{i+1}} \cdot (1 - w_k^{-1}).$$

*Proof.* The only terms in  $\Gamma$  we have neglected are vertex contributions. These are the extra terms appearing above. For a vertex of valency 1 with (outgoing) edge of weight  $w$ , the contribution is  $(1 - w)$ . For a vertex of valency 2 with (outgoing) edges of weights  $w, w'$ , the contribution is  $1/(1 - ww')$ .  $\square$

Now suppose  $\Gamma$  is an arbitrary tree. This means we must take into account general permutation-equivariant vertices  $v$ . Such vertices are products of non-permuted terms, like in (10), and cyclically permuted terms, like in (12). Let  $w_i$  be weights of edges incident to  $v$ .

1. The first term in (10) is a sum of balanced terms and can be disregarded. Hence the non-permuted case effectively contributes  $\prod_i 1/(1 - w_i)$ .
2. For the purpose of asymptotics, Adams operations in (12) can be disregarded. Hence the cyclically permuted case also effectively contributes  $\prod_i 1/(1 - w_i)$ .

Diagrammatically, this means we can “unglue” vertices without affecting asymptotics:



Here  $\star_q$  reminds us there is a  $1/(1 - q\mathcal{L})$  insertion at the marked point, and  $\star_1$  means we have to set  $q = 1$ . This is so we don't forget about the  $\prod_i 1/(1 - w_i)$  and other contributions from the original vertex.

Systematically ungluing all vertices in the tree  $\Gamma$  produces a collection of chains, whose asymptotics we already analyzed. Each chain corresponds to a different leaf of  $\Gamma$ .

**Definition 3.8.** If  $v \in V(\Gamma)$  has incident edges of (outgoing) weights  $w_1, w_2, \dots$ , define

$$c(v) := \begin{cases} 1 - w_1 & \text{val}(v) = 1 \\ \frac{1}{1 - w_1 w_2} & \text{val}(v) = 2 \\ \prod_i \frac{1}{1 - w_i} & \text{val}(v) \geq 3. \end{cases}$$

**Theorem 4.** Suppose  $\Gamma$  has marked point  $p$  and leaves  $q_1, \dots, q_k \in V(X)$ . Then in any equivariant limit, the contribution of  $\Gamma$  is

$$\Gamma \sim \prod_{i=1}^k \frac{\wedge_{-\hbar} T_p X}{\wedge_{-1} T_{q_i} X} \prod_{v \in V(\Gamma)} c(v).$$

Note that in both Proposition 3.7 and Theorem 4, the main source of divergence is the numerator  $\wedge_{-\hbar} T_p X$ . In general, if  $\dim X > 1$ , there is no reason for trees with small numbers of vertices to have any contribution canceling this divergence.

In  $\mathbb{P}^n$ , individual trees  $\Gamma$  can have unbounded limits, but cancellation occurs in the sum over trees. This is because  $\mathbb{P}^n$  has Picard rank 1 and its GKM graph is a complete graph. Given a tree  $\Gamma$ , an edge from  $v$  to  $v'$  can be replaced by an edge from  $v$  to  $v''$  without changing the degree of  $\Gamma$ . This means a divergence is averaged out across all  $n$  vertices and cancels in the end, like in Lagrange interpolation.

Theorem 4 suggests it may be too much to hope for some more complicated insertion which makes each contribution  $\Gamma$  balanced but which still produces an interesting J-function.

### 3.5 For flag varieties

We can examine the results of the previous section in the case of  $X = \text{SL}_n/B$ , using the notation of Example 2.2.

**Example 3.9.** Let  $X = \text{SL}_3/B$ , which has Picard rank 2. Both  $d = (k, 0)$  and  $d = (0, k)$  are analogous to the case of  $X = \mathbb{P}^1$  and produce self-dual J-functions. The

first non-trivial degree is  $d = (1, 1)$ . There are four trees contributing to  $\tilde{J}_{X,e}^{(1,1)}$ :

$$\begin{array}{llll}
\begin{array}{c} \star \\ \bullet \\ e \end{array} \text{---} \bullet & (13) & \sim \frac{\{\hbar a_{12}, \hbar a_{13}, \hbar a_{23}\}}{\{q a_{13}, a_{12}^{-1}, a_{23}^{-1}\}} & \sim a_{13} \\
\begin{array}{c} \star \\ \bullet \\ e \end{array} \text{---} \bullet \text{---} \bullet & (12) \ (132) & \sim \frac{\{\hbar a_{12}, \hbar a_{13}\}}{\{q a_{12}, a_{12}^{-1}, a_{23}\}} & \sim a_{12} \\
\begin{array}{c} \star \\ \bullet \\ e \end{array} \text{---} \bullet \text{---} \bullet & (23) \ (123) & \sim \frac{\{\hbar a_{13}, \hbar a_{23}\}}{\{q a_{23}, a_{12}, a_{23}^{-1}\}} & \sim a_{23} \\
\bullet \text{---} \begin{array}{c} \star \\ \bullet \\ e \end{array} \text{---} \bullet & (23) \ e \ (12) & \sim \frac{\{\hbar a_{12}, \hbar a_{23}\}}{\{q, a_{12}, a_{23}\}} & \sim 1.
\end{array}$$

Hence  $\tilde{J}_{X,e}^{(1,1)}$  cannot be balanced.

For flag varieties in general, the cotangent J-function should be compared to the quasimap vertex for  $T^*(\mathrm{SL}_n/B)$  in the following way. This quasimap vertex was first explicitly computed in [1] as (up to constant factors):

$$V(\mathbf{z}) := \sum_{d_{i,j} \in C} \mathbf{z}^d \frac{\prod_{i=1}^{n-1} \prod_{j=1}^i \prod_{k=1}^i \frac{(\hbar a_{jk}; q)_{d_{i,j} - d_{i,k}}}{(q a_{jk}; q)_{d_{i,j} - d_{i,k}}} }{\prod_{i=1}^{n-1} \prod_{j=1}^i \prod_{k=1}^{i+1} \frac{(\hbar a_{jk}; q)_{d_{i,j} - d_{i+1,k}}}{(q a_{jk}; q)_{d_{i,j} - d_{i+1,k}}}} \quad (19)$$

where  $C$  imposes some stability conditions on the  $\{d_{i,j}\}$  and we set  $d_{n,j} = 0$ . Then [9] checks that  $V(q\mathbf{z}/\hbar)$  is an eigenfunction of the trigonometric Ruijsenaars–Schneider (tRS) system. In the limit  $\hbar \rightarrow 0$ , the tRS Hamiltonians become  $q$ -Toda Hamiltonians. But [5] shows that the J-function for  $G/B$  is a  $q$ -Toda eigenfunction. Since our cotangent J-function is a twist of the J-function for  $T^*(\mathrm{SL}_n/B)$ , it makes sense to try to compare it with the quasimap vertex.

An important observation is that  $V^{(d)}$  has a pole at  $q = 0$ . This pole becomes a zero in  $V(q\mathbf{z}/\hbar)$ . From the structure of localization,  $J^{(d)}$  and  $\tilde{J}^{(d)}$  cannot ever have zeros or poles at  $q = 0$ . This is problematic. However, computations suggest that residues at other poles of  $\tilde{J}^{(d)}$  match with those of  $V^{(d)}$ . In principle the edge recursion (14) can be checked explicitly. But we can no longer use Theorem 3 to check the vertex condition (16), because  $\tilde{J}^{(d)}$  is no longer of  $q$ -hypergeometric form. (Only  $\mathrm{SL}_2/B = \mathbb{P}^1$  and  $\mathrm{SL}_3/B$  have  $q$ -hypergeometric terms in their J-functions; the edge recursion is easily checked for the latter as well.)

## References

- [1] M. Bullimore, H.-C. Kim, and P. Koroteev. Defects and quantum Seiberg-Witten geometry. *J. High Energy Phys.*, (5):095, front matter+77, 2015.

- [2] D. A. Cox and S. Katz. *Mirror symmetry and algebraic geometry*, volume 68 of *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1999.
- [3] D. Edidin. Riemann-Roch for Deligne-Mumford stacks. In *A celebration of algebraic geometry*, volume 18 of *Clay Math. Proc.*, pages 241–266. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2013.
- [4] A. Givental. Permutation-equivariant quantum K-theory I–XI, 2015. Available at <https://math.berkeley.edu/~giventh/perm/perm.html>.
- [5] A. Givental and Y.-P. Lee. Quantum  $K$ -theory on flag manifolds, finite-difference Toda lattices and quantum groups. *Invent. Math.*, 151(1):193–219, 2003.
- [6] V. Guillemin and C. Zara. Equivariant de Rham theory and graphs. *Asian J. Math.*, 3(1):49–76, 1999. Sir Michael Atiyah: a great mathematician of the twentieth century.
- [7] T. Kawasaki. The Riemann-Roch theorem for complex  $V$ -manifolds. *Osaka J. Math.*, 16(1):151–159, 1979.
- [8] Ya. Kononov, A. Okounkov, and A. Osinenko. The 2-leg vertex in K-theoretic DT theory. 2019.
- [9] P. Koroteev and A. M. Zeitlin. qKZ/tRS Duality via Quantum K-Theoretic Counts. 2018.
- [10] Y.-P. Lee. A formula for Euler characteristics of tautological line bundles on the Deligne-Mumford moduli spaces. *Internat. Math. Res. Notices*, (8):393–400, 1997.
- [11] Y.-P. Lee. *Quantum K-theory*. ProQuest LLC, Ann Arbor, MI, 1999. Thesis (Ph.D.)—University of California, Berkeley.
- [12] Y.-P. Lee. Quantum  $K$ -theory. I. Foundations. *Duke Math. J.*, 121(3):389–424, 2004.
- [13] C.-C. M. Liu and A. Sheshmani. Equivariant Gromov-Witten invariants of algebraic GKM manifolds. *SIGMA Symmetry Integrability Geom. Methods Appl.*, 13:Paper No. 048, 21, 2017.
- [14] A. Okounkov. Lectures on K-theoretic computations in enumerative geometry. In *Geometry of moduli spaces and representation theory*, volume 24 of *IAS/Park City Math. Ser.*, pages 251–380. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2017.
- [15] V. Tonita. A virtual Kawasaki-Riemann-Roch formula. *Pacific J. Math.*, 268(1):249–255, 2014.