A PROOF OF N. TAKAHASHI’S CONJECTURE ON GENUS ZERO GROMOV-WITTEN THEORY OF \((\mathbb{P}^2, E)\)

PIERRICK BOUSSEAU

Abstract. We prove N. Takahashi’s conjecture on genus 0 Gromov-Witten theory of \(\mathbb{P}^2\) relative to a smooth cubic. Using the fact that the same scattering diagram arises in the tropical computation of the relevant Gromov-Witten invariants by Gabele, and in the description of the wall-crossing behavior of coherent sheaves on \(\mathbb{P}^2\), we reduce N. Takahashi’s conjecture to a known statement about moduli spaces of Gieseker semistable sheaves of dimension 1 on \(\mathbb{P}^2\).
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Figure 1. First steps of the scattering diagram $S(\mathcal{O}_{cl}^{in})$. Figure due to Tim Gabele [Gab19].
0. Introduction

0.1. Relative Gromov-Witten theory of \((\mathbb{P}^2, E)\). Let \(E\) be a smooth cubic curve in the complex projective plane \(\mathbb{P}^2\). For every positive integer \(d\), we consider degree \(d\) rational curves in \(\mathbb{P}^2\) intersecting \(E\) in a unique point. The space of degree \(d\) rational curves in \(\mathbb{P}^2\) is of dimension \(3d - 1\). On the other hand, a generic degree \(d\) curve intersects \(E\) in \(3d\) points, so imposing a unique intersection point should impose \(3d - 1\) conditions. Thus, we expect to have a well-posed enumerative problem.

We can use Gromov-Witten theory to give a precise version of the question. Let \(\overline{M}_0(\mathbb{P}^2/E, d)\) be the moduli space of genus 0 degree \(d\) stable maps to \(\mathbb{P}^2\) relative to \(E\), with maximal contact order with \(E\) in a unique point. The moduli space \(\overline{M}_0(\mathbb{P}^2/E, d)\) is a proper Deligne-Mumford stack, admitting a virtual fundamental class of dimension zero:

\[
\left[\overline{M}_0(\mathbb{P}^2/E, d)\right]^{\text{virt}} \in A_0(\overline{M}_0(\mathbb{P}^2/E, d), \mathbb{Q}).
\]

We denote

\[
N_{0,d}^{\mathbb{P}^2/E} = \int_{\overline{M}_0(\mathbb{P}^2/E, d)}^{\text{virt}} 1 \in \mathbb{Q},
\]

the corresponding relative genus 0 Gromov-Witten invariant of \((\mathbb{P}^2, E)\).

The main advantage of the Gromov-Witten definition over a more naive enumerative definition is that \(N_{0,d}^{\mathbb{P}^2/E}\) is independent of the specific choice of \(E\). This follows by general deformation invariance in Gromov-Witten theory. The main drawback of the Gromov-Witten definition is that the moduli space \(\overline{M}_0(\mathbb{P}^2/E, d)\) is in general of positive dimension and contains stable maps which are very far from being immersions. In particular, the invariants \(N_{0,d}^{\mathbb{P}^2/E}\) are in general non-integers and their direct geometric meaning is unclear. Nevertheless, a general theme in Gromov-Witten theory is that it is often possible to reorganize Gromov-Witten invariants to form so-called BPS counts which are integers, are sometimes more geometrically meaningful, and often have better properties that the original Gromov-Witten invariants.

We define relative BPS counts \(n_{0,d}^{\mathbb{P}^2/E}\) by the formula

\[
(-1)^{d-1} N_{0,d}^{\mathbb{P}^2/E} = \sum_{k|d} \frac{1}{k^2} n_{0,k}^{\mathbb{P}^2/E}.
\]

According to the local-relative correspondence of [vGGR19], we have \(n_{0,d}^{\mathbb{P}^2/E} = 3dn_{0,d}^{\mathcal{O}}\), where \(n_{0,d}^{\mathcal{O}}\) is the genus 0 Gopakumar-Vafa invariant of local \(\mathbb{P}^2\) defined through Gromov-Witten theory. According to Appendix A of [CMT18], we have \(n_{0,d}^{K_{\mathbb{P}^2}} = (-1)^{d-1} e(M_{d,1})\), where \(e(-)\) is the topological Euler characteristic and \(M_{d,1}\) is the moduli space of Gieseker semistable sheaves on \(\mathbb{P}^2\) supported on degree \(d\) curves and with Euler characteristic 1. Finally, it is known [ESm93, Bea95, Mar07] that \(M_{d,1}\) has no odd cohomology and so \(e(M_{d,1}) \in \mathbb{N}\). We conclude that \(n_{0,d}^{\mathbb{P}^2/E}\) is an integer of sign \((-1)^{d-1}\): this justifies the BPS terminology. The genus 0 Gromov-Witten invariants of local \(\mathbb{P}^2\) can be computed by torus localization and the answer can be expressed in the framework of local mirror.
symmetry \cite{CKYZ99}. Thus, the relative Gromov-Witten invariants $N_{0,d}^{\mathbb{P}^2/E}$ are in some sense “known”.

0.2. Main result: contributions of the various contact points. The heart of the present paper concerns the BPS structure underlying some more refined version of the invariants $N_{0,d}^{\mathbb{P}^2/E}$ taking into account the position of the contact point with $E$.

We fix $p_0$ one of the 9 flex points of $E$. Let $L_{p_0}$ be the line tangent to $E$ at $p_0$. If $C$ is a degree $d$ rational curve in $\mathbb{P}^2$, meeting $E$ in a unique point $p$, then the cycle $C - dL_{p_0}$ intersects $E$ in the cycle $3dp - 3dp_0 = 3d(p - p_0)$. As the cycle $C - dL_0$ has degree 0, it is linearly equivalent to 0 (as $H^1(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}) = 0$), and so the cycle $3d(p - p_0)$ is linearly equivalent to zero in $E$.

Thus, if we denote $\text{ev}: \overline{M}_0(\mathbb{P}^2/E, d) \to E$ the evaluation at the contact point with $E$, and if $p$ is in the image of $\text{ev}$, then $p - p_0$ is necessarily a $(3d)$-torsion point of the group $\text{Pic}^0(E)$ of degree 0 cycles on $E$ up to linear equivalence. It follows that we have a decomposition

$$\overline{M}_0(\mathbb{P}^2/E, d) = \bigsqcup_{p \in P_d} \overline{M}_0(\mathbb{P}^2/E, d)_p,$$

where the disjoint union is over the set $P_d$ of $(3d)^2$ points $p$ of $E$ such that $p - p_0$ is a $(3d)$-torsion point in $\text{Pic}^0(E)$. The set $P_d$ is independent of the choice of the flex point $p_0$. Indeed, if $p'_0$ is another flex point, then $p_0 - p'_0$ is 3-torsion and in particular $(3d)$-torsion in $\text{Pic}^0(E)$.

For every $p \in P_d$, we denote

$$[\overline{M}_0(\mathbb{P}^2/E, d)_p]^{\text{virt}} \in A_0(\overline{M}_0(\mathbb{P}^2/E, d)_p, \mathbb{Q})$$

the restriction of $[\overline{M}_0(\mathbb{P}^2/E, d)]^{\text{virt}}$ to $\overline{M}_0(\mathbb{P}^2/E, d)$, and we define

$$N_{0,d}^{\mathbb{P}^2/E,p} := \int_{[\overline{M}_0(\mathbb{P}^2/E, d)_p]^{\text{virt}}} 1 \in \mathbb{Q}.$$

By definition, we have the equality

$$N_{0,d}^{\mathbb{P}^2/E} = \sum_{p \in P_d} N_{0,d}^{\mathbb{P}^2/E,p}.$$

The main question we wish to address is how the numbers $N_{0,d}^{\mathbb{P}^2/E,p}$ depend on the point $p$ in $P_d$. It is not an obvious question as for different points $p \in P_d$, the geometry of multiple cover contributions to $N_{0,d}^{\mathbb{P}^2/E,p}$ can be quite different. For example, if $d = 2$ and $p \in P_2$ is such that $p \notin P_1$, then $\overline{M}_0(\mathbb{P}^2/E, d)_p$ is a single point and $N_{0,2}^{\mathbb{P}^2/E,p} = 1$. But if $p \in P_2$ is such that $p \in P_1$, i.e. if $p$ is a flex point, then contributions come from double covers of the tangent line to $E$ at $p$, so $\overline{M}_0(\mathbb{P}^2/E, d)_p$ and the virtual class are non-trivial, and one finds after some computation (see Proposition 6.1 of \cite{GPS10}) that $N_{0,2}^{\mathbb{P}^2/E} = \frac{3}{4}$.

We introduce some notations in order to make some systematic study of this phenomenon. For $p \in \bigcup_{d \geq 1} P_d$, we denote $d(p)$ the smallest integer $d \geq 1$ such that $p \in P_d$. The points $p \in P_d$ with $d(p) = d$ are “primitive” in the sense that they do not belong to any $P_k$ with $k < d$ and so are the “simplest” from the point of view of multiple covers in Gromov-Witten theory. By contrast, the points $p \in P_d$ with $d(p) = 1$ are exactly the 9
flex points of $E$, which contribute to Gromov-Witten invariants in every degree $d \geq 1$, and so are the most “complicated” from the point of view of multiple covers.

By a monodromy argument (see Lemma [1.2]), we can show that $N_{0,d}^{2/E,p}$ only depends on $p \in P_d$ through $d(p) = k$. Thus, for every positive integer $d$ and for every positive integer $k$ dividing $d$, we denote $N_{0,d}^{2/E,k}$ for the common value of the invariants $N_{0,d}^{2/E,p}$, with $p \in P_d$ such that $d(p) = k$.

The question on the dependence of the point of contact is now reduced to the question of the dependence on $k$ of the invariants $N_{0,d}^{2/E,k}$. This question is completely solved by the following Theorem 0.1, expressing the general invariants $N_{0,d}^{2/E,k}$ in terms of the “primitive” ones $N_{0,d}^{2/E,d'}$.

**Theorem 0.1.** For every positive integer $d$ and for every positive integer $k$ dividing $d$, we have

$$(-1)^{d-1}N_{0,d}^{2/E,k} = \sum_{d' \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}} \frac{1}{(d/d')^2} (-1)^{d'-1}N_{0,d'}^{2/E,d'}.$$ 

According to point (1) of Proposition 4.20 of [CGK18b], the “primitive invariants” $N_{0,d}^{2/E,d'}$ are positive integers (the corresponding moduli space is the union of finitely many possibly nonreduced points, each contributing its length to the Gromov-Witten count). Thus, Theorem 0.1 also expresses the BPS structure underlying the Gromov-Witten invariants $N_{0,d}^{2/E}$.

We can now rephrase Theorem 0.1.

**Theorem 0.2.** For every positive integer $d$, the relative BPS invariant $\Omega_{d,k}^{2/E}$ is independent of $k$, i.e. we have

$$\Omega_{d,k}^{2/E} = \Omega_{d,k'}^{2/E}$$

for every $k$ and $k'$ positive integers.

By Theorem 0.2, it makes sense to simply denote $\Omega_{d,k}^{2/E}$ for $\Omega_{d,k}^{2/E}$ for any $k \geq 1$. As we have $\Omega_{d}^{2/E} = (-1)^{d-1}N_{0,d}^{2/E,d}$ and we know that $N_{0,d}^{2/E,d}$ is a positive integer, it follows that $\Omega_{d}^{2/E}$ is an integer of sign $(-1)^{d-1}$.
We give below a table of the relative BPS numbers $\Omega_{d}^{P^2/E}$ for $d \leq 10$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$d$</th>
<th>$\Omega_{d}^{P^2/E}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>-92840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1027737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>-12000405</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Invariants $\Omega_{d}^{P^2/E}$ for $d \leq 10$

**Example:** The simplest non-trivial case of Theorem 0.1 is obtained for $d = 2$ and $k = 1$. In such case, Theorem 0.1 states that

$$-N_{0,2}^{P^2/E,1} = -N_{0,2}^{P^2/E,2} + \frac{1}{4}N_{0,1}^{P^2/E,1}.$$ 

If one knows that $N_{0,1}^{P^2/E,1} = 1$ and $N_{0,2}^{P^2/E,2} = 1$, we get that one should have

$$N_{0,2}^{P^2/E,1} = 1 - \frac{1}{4} = \frac{3}{4},$$

which is indeed correct.

0.3. **Comments on Theorem 0.1.**

- Theorem 0.1 is an addition to the relatively short list of questions in Gromov-Witten theory which can be fully solved despite the presence of contracted components and multiple covers.
- The study of the numbers $N_{d}^{P^2/E,k}$ was initiated by N. Takahashi in [Tak96] and [Tak01]. In particular, a version of Theorem 0.1 appears as conjecture in [Tak96] (see Conjecture 1.6). Exactly Theorem 0.1 is the specialization to $P^2$ of Conjecture 1.3 of [CvGKT18b]. The general context for Conjecture 1.3 of [CvGKT18b] is a pair $(S, D)$ where $S$ is a del Pezzo surface and $D$ is a smooth anticanonical divisor on $S$. One might expect to generalize [Gab19] and [Bou19a] from $(P^2, E)$ to $(S, D)$ in order to prove the full Conjecture 1.3 of [CvGKT18b]. We keep the question open for the present paper.
- N. Takahashi’s conjecture, under the form of Theorem 0.1 can be viewed as an analogue for $(P^2, E)$ of the imprimitive case of the Yau-Zaslow conjecture for genus 0 Gromov-Witten theory of K3 surfaces. This analogy was already clear in [Tak96]. Despite the fact that $(P^2, E)$ might seem to be an easier geometry than a K3 surface, the imprimitive case of genus 0 of the Yau-Zaslow conjecture for K3...
surfaces was first proved around 10 years ago [KMPS10] (and an all genus version was obtained in [PT16]), whereas our Theorem 0.1 gives the first proof of N. Takahashi’s conjecture for \((\mathbb{P}^2, E)\). Naively trying to extend the proof [KMPS10] from K3 surfaces to the log K3 surface \((\mathbb{P}^2, E)\), we encounter an obstacle (the need to consider nodal \(E\) and then the possibility for rational curves to fall into such \(E\)) which has not yet been overcome.

- In Section 5.2, we present a conjectural higher genus version of Theorem 0.1.
- We defined above relative BPS invariants \(\Omega_{\mathbb{P}^2/E,0,d}^{p^2/E}\) of \((\mathbb{P}^2, E)\) by the formula
  \[
  (-1)^{d-1} N_{0,d}^{p^2/E} = \sum_{\substack{d' \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1} \\kappa|d'} \\kappa|d'}} \frac{1}{(d/d')^2} \Omega_{d',k}^{p^2/E}.
  \]
  This definition matches the definition of log BPS invariants used in [Bou18] and (up to a sign \((-1)^{d-1}\)) in [CvGKT18b]. But, given the multiple cover formula of Proposition 6.1 of [GPS10], one might be tempted, as done in [GPS10] [vGWZ13] [Gab19], to call relative BPS invariants the numbers \(n_{\mathbb{P}^2/E,0,d}^{p^2/E}\) defined by
  \[
  N_{0,d}^{p^2/E} = \sum_{\substack{d' \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1} \\kappa|d'} \\kappa|d'}} \frac{1}{(d/d')^2} \left((d/d')(3d'-1) - 1\right) n_{d',k}^{p^2/E}.
  \]
  It is proved in [vGWZ13] that the integrality of the invariants \(\Omega_{d,k}^{p^2/E}\) is equivalent to the integrality of the invariants \(n_{0,d}^{p^2/E}\), and that the matrix comparing the two set of invariants has a natural interpretation in terms of Donaldson-Thomas invariants of some specific quivers. We think that the invariants \(\Omega_{d,k}^{p^2/E}\) are more fundamental because only for them Theorem 0.2 takes such simple form. In general, the invariants \(n_{d,k}^{p^2/E}\) depend on \(k\). For example, we have \(n_{2,1}^{p^2/E} = 0\) and \(n_{2,2}^{p^2/E} = 1\) (see Table 7.1 of [Gab19] for more examples). One can of course express Theorem 0.2 in terms of the invariants \(n_{d,k}^{p^2/E}\), but the resulting formula is more complicated that the simple statement that the invariants \(\Omega_{d,k}^{p^2/E}\) do not depend on \(k\).

0.4. Structure of the proof of Theorem 0.1. Our proof of Theorem 0.2 goes via a connection with moduli spaces of dimension 1 Gieseker semistable sheaves on \(\mathbb{P}^2\).

We refer to [HL10] as general reference on Gieseker semistable sheaves. For every \(d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}\) and \(\chi \in \mathbb{Z}\), we denote \(M_{d,\chi}\) the moduli space of S-equivalence classes of Gieseker semistable sheaves on \(\mathbb{P}^2\), supported on curves of degree \(d\) and of Euler characteristic \(\chi\). It is known [LP93] that, for every \(d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}\) and \(\chi \in \mathbb{Z}\), \(M_{d,\chi}\) is a nonempty integral normal projective variety of dimension \(d^2 + 1\). If \(d\) and \(\chi\) are coprime, then \(M_{d,\chi}\) is smooth. But in general, \(M_{d,\chi}\) is singular.

Nevertheless, the intersection cohomology groups \(IH^j(M_{d,\chi}, \mathbb{Q})\) behave as well as cohomology of a smooth projective variety. We denote \(Ie(M_{d,\chi})\) the corresponding intersection
topological Euler characteristic. According to Corollary 6.3 of [Bou19a], the intersection Euler characteristic is positive: 
\[ Ie(M_{d,\chi}) \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0} \]. For every \( d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1} \) and \( \chi \in \mathbb{Z} \), we define 
\[ \Omega_{d,\chi}^{\mathbb{P}^2} := (-1)^{\dim M_{d,\chi}} Ie(M_{d,\chi}) \in \mathbb{Z} . \]

We will prove that the invariants \( \Omega_{d,\chi}^{\mathbb{P}^2} \) are the Joyce-Song Donaldson-Thomas invariants for dimension 1 sheaves of local \( \mathbb{P}^2 \) [JS12]. The general conjecture of Joyce-Song (Conjecture 6.20 of [JS12]) on the dependence with the Euler characteristic is known, by combination of [MNOP06] [Tod12] [Kon06] (Appendix A of [CMT18]). This implies:

**Theorem 0.3.** The intersection Euler characteristics \( Ie(M_{d,\chi}) \) are independent of \( \chi \), i.e. for every \( d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1} \) and \( \chi, \chi' \in \mathbb{Z} \), we have 
\[ \Omega_{d,\chi}^{\mathbb{P}^2} = \Omega_{d,\chi'}^{\mathbb{P}^2} . \]

Theorem 0.3 is formally similar to the rephrasing of Theorem 0.1 given by Theorem 0.2. It is not a coincidence: Theorem 0.2 is an immediate consequence of the following Theorem 0.4 whose proof uses Theorem 0.3.

**Theorem 0.4.** For every positive integers \( d \) and \( k \), we have 
\[ \Omega_{d,k}^{\mathbb{P}^2/E} = \frac{1}{3d} \Omega_{d,1}^{\mathbb{P}^2} . \]

Theorem 0.4 gives a connection between two distinct worlds: relative Gromov-Witten theory of \( (\mathbb{P}^2, E) \) and moduli spaces of dimension 1 sheaves on \( \mathbb{P}^2 \). As such, Theorem 0.4 is the key result of the present paper. Theorem 0.4 will be proved by combination of the main result of [Gab19] with the main result of [Bou19a].

In [Gab19], Gabele considers a normal crossing degeneration of \( (\mathbb{P}^2, E) \) and applies the formalism of log Gromov-Witten theory [GS13] [Che14] [AC14] [ACGS17] to compute the invariants \( N_{0,d}^{\mathbb{P}^2/E,k} \) in terms of the special fiber, and then in terms of the tropicalization \( B \) of the special fiber. The main result of [Gab19] computes the Gromov-Witten invariants \( N_{0,d}^{\mathbb{P}^2/E,k} \) in terms of a wall-structure \( S \) on \( B \). This wall-structure previously appeared in Example 2.4 of [CPS10], in the context of mirror symmetry for \( (\mathbb{P}^2, E) \). The correspondence result of [Gab19] was expected from the point of view of mirror symmetry.

In [Bou19a], we prove that a scattering diagram \( S(\mathcal{D}_{cl}^{in}) \) can be used to algorithmically compute the intersection Euler characteristic of the moduli spaces of Gieseker semistable sheaves on \( \mathbb{P}^2 \), and so in particular the invariants \( \Omega_{d,\chi}^{\mathbb{P}^2} \). We will prove Theorem 0.4 by showing that the wall-structure \( S \) of [Gab19] is simply related to the scattering diagram \( S(\mathcal{D}_{cl}^{in}) \) of [Bou19a], and then using Theorem 0.3 on the sheaf side.

Even if the main topics might seem distinct, the present paper is really a follow-up of [Bou19a]. In particular, in the main body of the text, we will use freely the notions and notations introduced in [Bou19a].

**Analogy with [GPS10] and [GP10].** In [GPS10], Gross-Pandharipande-Siebert proved a tropical correspondence theorem between some local scattering diagrams in \( \mathbb{R}^2 \) and log Gromov-Witten invariants of log Calabi-Yau surfaces \( (Y, D) \) with \( D \) a cycle of rational curves. By combination with the work of Reineke [Rei11] [Rei10] on wall-crossing for
Donaldson-Thomas invariants of quivers, they obtained a correspondence between log Gromov-Witten invariants of some log Calabi-Yau surfaces and Donaldson-Thomas invariants of some acyclic quivers. The story has been extended and generalized in various directions, see [GP10] [RW13] [RSW12] [FS15] [Bou19b] [Bou18].

One should think of the present paper as being an analogue of this story: the pair $(Y,D)$ with $D$ a cycle of rational curves being replaced by the pair $(\mathbb{P}^2,E)$ with $E$ a smooth genus 1 curve, the representations of the acyclic quivers being replaced by the objects of $\text{D}^b(\mathbb{P}^2)$, the tropical correspondence theorem of [GPS10] being replaced by the tropical correspondence theorem of [Gab19], and the work of Reineke [Rei11] [ Rei10] being replaced by [Bou19a]. In fact, it is an analogue but with one level of difficulty up: the scattering diagram $S(D_{\text{in}})$ consists in infinitely many local scatterings, and the category $\text{D}^b(\mathbb{P}^2)$ is much richer than the category of representations of an acyclic quiver. In some sense, our story is build from infinitely many local pieces, each one being exactly of the same nature as [GPS10] [GP10].

0.5. Applications. We state some immediate applications of Theorem 0.1.

According to Theorem 0.1, each of the $(3d)^2$ points in $P_d$ has the same BPS contributions $\Omega_{\mathbb{P}^2/E}$. Thus, we obtain:

**Theorem 0.5.** For every positive integer $d$, we have $n_{0,2}^{\mathbb{P}^2/E} = (3d)^2 \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^2/E}$.  

As we reviewed in Section 0.1 we have $n_{0,2}^{\mathbb{P}^2/E} = 3dn_{0,2}^{K_{2,2}}$, so:

**Theorem 0.6.** For every positive integer $d$, we have $n_{0,2}^{K_{2,2}} = 3d\Omega_{\mathbb{P}^2/E}$.

We also recalled in Section 0.1 that $n_{0,2}^{K_{2,2}} = (-1)^{d-1}e(M_{d,1})$. In particular, we get the following result, which can be stated without any reference to Gromov-Witten theory:

**Theorem 0.7.** For every positive integer $d$, the topological Euler characteristic $e(M_{d,1})$ is divisible by $3d$.

**Remarks:**

- This divisibility was previously experimentally observed for small values of $d$, and conjectured to hold in general in [CvGKT18a].
- Theorem 0.7 is a quite elementary looking statement on the topology of some classical family of algebraic varieties [LP93]. But our proof is not so elementary, relying in an essential way on some back and forth interaction with Gromov-Witten theory. We don’t know a simpler proof.
- In fact, a more general divisibility statement, at the level of Poincaré polynomials, has been observed for small values of $d$, and conjectured to hold in general in [CvGKT18a] (Conjecture 4.15): for every $d \geq 1$, the Poincaré polynomial $P(M_{d,1})(q)$ of $M_{d,1}$ should be divisible by $[3d]_q = \sum_{k=0}^{3d-1} q^k$. For $q = 1$, this Conjecture specializes to Theorem 0.7. Our proof of Theorem 0.7 relies on relating $e(M_{d,1})$ with some genus 0 Gromov-Witten question and the integrality comes from the essentially enumerative nature of this Gromov-Witten question. In Theorem 5.4, we will see that it is also possible to relate the Poincaré polynomial
$P(M_{d,1})(q)$ to Gromov-Witten theory, but to an all genus question, very far from being enumerative, and it is unclear how this could help to prove the divisibility conjecture for $P(M_{d,1})(q)$.

0.6. **Further results.** We will also give a new proof of the specialization to $\mathbb{P}^2$ of the local-relative correspondence of [vGGR19] (see Theorem 5.1), a partially conjectural higher genus version of Theorem 0.1 (see Section 5.2), and a conjectural connection with real Gromov-Witten theory of $K_{\mathbb{P}^2}$ (see Section 5.3). We refer to Section 5 for detailed statements.

0.7. **Plan of the paper.** In Section 1 we prove Lemma 1.2 using a monodromy argument. In Section 2 we prove Theorem 0.3 on dimension 1 sheaves on $\mathbb{P}^2$. In Section 3 we compare the scattering diagram $S(\mathcal{D}_{d)}^\text{cl}$ of [Bou19a] with the wall-structure $S$ of [CPS10]. In Section 4 we combine the previous results with [Bou19a] and [Gab19] to prove Theorem 0.4. Recall that Theorem 0.4 implies all the results stated in the Introduction. In Section 5 we discuss further results, including the compatibility with the local-relative correspondence, and partially conjectural results on higher genus and real Gromov-Witten theory. In Section 6 we end with some heuristic conceptual explanation, based on a combination of hyperkähler rotation and mirror symmetry, for the main connection unraveled in this paper between sheaf counting on $\mathbb{P}^2$ and relative Gromov-Witten theory of $(\mathbb{P}^2, E)$.
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1. **MONODROMY ARGUMENT**

In this Section, we prove Lemma 1.2, which was used in the Introduction to reduce the dependence on $p$ of the invariants $N^{\mathbb{P}^2/E,p}$ to a dependence on $d(p)$.

For every $p \in P_d$ and $p_0$ a flex point of $E$, we denote $\text{ord}(p - p_0)$ the order of $p - p_0$ in the group $\text{Pic}^0(E)[3d]$ of $(3d)$-torsion points of $\text{Pic}^0(E)$

**Lemma 1.1.** For every positive integer $d$, for every $p \in P_d$, and for every flex point $p_0$ of $E$, we have:

- If 3 divides $d(p)$, then $\text{ord}(p - p_0) = 3d(p)$.
- If 3 does not divide $d(p)$, then $\text{ord}(p - p_0) = 3d(p)$ or $\text{ord}(p - p_0) = d(p)$.

**Proof.** We have $p \in P_{d(p)}$, so $p - p_0$ is $(3d(p))$-torsion, so $\text{ord}(p - p_0)$ divides $3d(p)$. If $\text{ord}(p - p_0) = 3d(p)$, we are done.
Lemma 1.2. For every positive integer $d$, the rational number $N^{\mathbb{P}^2/E, p}_{0, d}$ only depends on the point $p \in P_d$ through the integer $d(p)$.

Proof. We fix a positive integer $d$ and two points $p, p' \in P_d$ such that $d(p) = d(p')$. We have to show that $N^{\mathbb{P}^2/E, p}_{0, d} = N^{\mathbb{P}^2/E, p'}_{0, d}$.

We show below that there exists a flex point $p_0$ of $E$ such that $\text{ord}(p - p_0) = \text{ord}(p' - p_0)$.

This will be enough: the monodromy of the family of smooth cubics $E$ in $\mathbb{P}^2$ maps surjectively to $SL(2, \mathbb{Z})$ acting on $\text{Pic}^0(E)[3d] = (\mathbb{Z}/(3d))^2$, and so if $\text{ord}(p - p_0) = \text{ord}(p' - p_0)$, $p$ and $p'$ can be related by monodromy and so the result follows from deformation invariance of relative Gromov-Witten theory.

We first choose $p_0$ any flex point of $E$. If $3$ divides $d(p) = d(p')$, then by Lemma 1.1 $\text{ord}(p - p_0) = 3d(p) = 3d(p') = \text{ord}(p - p_0)$ and we are done.

If $3$ does not divide $d(p) = d(p')$ and $\text{ord}(p - p_0) = \text{ord}(p' - p_0)$, then we are also done. So, by Lemma 1.1 and up to exchanging $p$ and $p'$, we can assume that $3$ does not divide $d(p) = d(p')$, $\text{ord}(p - p_0) = 3d(p)$ and $\text{ord}(p' - p_0) = d(p)$. Then $d(p)(p - p_0)$ is nonzero 3-torsion. If $t$ is nonzero 3-torsion, then $d(p)t$ is also nonzero 3-torsion as $3$ does not divide $d(p)$. So if $t_1$ and $t_2$ are both nonzero 3-torsion, with $d(p)t_1 = d(p)t_2$, then $t_1 = t_2$. It follows that there exists $t$ nonzero 3-torsion such that $d(p)t = -d(p)(p - p_0)$, and so $\text{ord}(p - p_0 + t) = 3d(p)$ and $\text{ord}(p' - p_0 + t) = 3d(p)$. So it is enough to replace $p_0$ by $p_0 - t$. □

Remark: Lemma 1.2 is a variant of Lemma 4.12 of [CvGKT18b]. In particular, the idea to use the freedom in the choice of the flex point comes from there.

2. Dimension 1 sheaves on $\mathbb{P}^2$

In this Section, we prove Theorem 2.1 stated as Theorem 1.3 in the Introduction.

Let $M_{d, \chi}$ be the moduli space of $S$-equivalence classes of Gieseker semistable sheaves on $\mathbb{P}^2$ supported on curves of degree $d$ and with Euler characteristic 1. It is known [LP93] that, for every $d \in \mathbb{Z}_{>1}$ and $\chi \in \mathbb{Z}$, the moduli space $M_{d, \chi}$ is a nonempty integral normal projective of dimension $d^2 + 1$. If $d$ and $\chi$ are coprime, then $M_{d, \chi}$ is smooth. But in general, $M_{d, \chi}$ is singular.

Nevertheless, the intersection cohomology groups $IH^j(M_{d, \chi}, \mathbb{Q})$ behave as well as cohomology of a smooth projective variety. We denote $Ib_{2j}(M_{d, \chi})$ the corresponding intersection Betti numbers and $Ie(M_{d, \chi})$ the corresponding intersection topological Euler characteristic. According to Corollary 6.3 of [Bon19a], the odd degree part of intersection cohomology of $M_{d, \chi}$ vanishes: $Ib_{2k+1}(M_{d, \chi}) = 0$, and so $Ie(M_{d, \chi}) \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$.

For every $d \in \mathbb{Z}_{>1}$ and $\chi \in \mathbb{Z}$, we define

$$\Omega^{\mathbb{P}^2}_{d, \chi}(q^{1/2}) := (-q^{1/2})^{-\dim M_{d, \chi}} \sum_{p=0}^{\dim M_{d, \chi}} Ib_{2p}(M_{d, \chi})q^{p} \in \mathbb{Z}[q^{1/2}]$$
and  
\[ \Omega_{d,\chi}^{\mathbb{P}^2} := \Omega_{d,\chi}^{\mathbb{P}^2}(q^{\frac{1}{2}}) = (-1)^{\dim M_{d,\chi}} I_e(M_{d,\chi}) = (-1)^{d-1} I_e(M_{d,\chi}) \in \mathbb{Z}. \]

**Theorem 2.1.** The intersection Euler characteristics  
\[ I_e(M_{d,\chi}) \]  
are independent of  \( \chi \), i.e. for every  \( d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1} \) and  \( \chi, \chi' \in \mathbb{Z} \), we have  
\[ \Omega_{d,\chi}^{\mathbb{P}^2} = \Omega_{d,\chi'}^{\mathbb{P}^2}. \]

We also state an analogue Conjecture for intersection Betti numbers.

**Conjecture 2.2.** The intersection Betti numbers  
\[ I_b^j(M_{d,\chi}) \]  
are independent of  \( \chi \), i.e. for every  \( d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1} \),  \( \chi, \chi' \in \mathbb{Z} \), we have  
\[ \Omega_{d,\chi}^{\mathbb{P}^2}(q^{\frac{1}{2}}) = \Omega_{d,\chi'}^{\mathbb{P}^2}(q^{\frac{1}{2}}). \]

**Remark:** Tensoring by  \( \mathcal{O}(1) \) and Serre duality imply that the moduli spaces  \( M_{d,\chi} \) and  \( M_{d,\chi'} \) are isomorphic if  \( \chi = \pm \chi' \mod d \). But if  \( d \geq 3 \) and  \( \chi \neq \chi' \mod d \), then the algebraic varieties  \( M_{d,\chi} \) and  \( M_{d,\chi'} \) are not isomorphic (see Theorem 8.1 of [Woo13]), which is why Theorem 2.1 and Conjecture 2.2 are not obvious.

The proof of Theorem 2.1 takes the remaining part of Section 2. Using the framework of [Mei15], we first prove in Proposition 2.3 that the intersection Euler characteristics  \( I_e^+(0,d,\chi) \) are simply related to the Joyce-Song [JS12] Donaldson-Thomas invariants of the local Calabi-Yau 3-fold \( K_{\mathbb{P}^2} \) total space of the canonical line bundle  \( \mathcal{O}(-3) \) of \( \mathbb{P}^2 \). This reduces Theorem 2.1 to a general conjecture of Joyce-Song (Conjecture 6.20 of [JS12]) about Donaldson-Thomas invariants for dimension 1 sheaves on Calabi-Yau 3-folds. Then, it remains to explain that this conjecture is known in the special case of  \( K_{\mathbb{P}^2} \), which is done in Proposition 2.4 by combination of [MNOP06] [Tod12] [Kon06].

Let  \( \text{Coh}_{\leq 1}(K_{\mathbb{P}^2}) \) be the abelian category of coherent sheaves on  \( K_{\mathbb{P}^2} \) supported in dimension less or equal to 1. We have  \( K_0(\text{Coh}_{\leq 1}(K_{\mathbb{P}^2})) \cong \mathbb{Z}^2 \),  \( E \mapsto (d(E), \chi(E)) \). The map  \( \mathbb{Z}:K_0(\text{Coh}_{\leq 1}(K_{\mathbb{P}^2})) \to \mathbb{C}, (d, \chi) \mapsto Z_{d,\chi} := -\chi + id \) defines a stability condition on  \( \text{Coh}_{\leq 1}(K_{\mathbb{P}^2}) \). The notions of stability and semistability on  \( \text{Coh}_{\leq 1}(K_{\mathbb{P}^2}) \) coincide with Gieseker stability and semistability. In this context, Joyce-Song (see Section 6.4 of [JS12] and also Sections 4.4 and 4.5 of [Tod12]) define some rational Donaldson-Thomas invariants  
\[ \overline{\Omega}_{d,\chi}^{\mathbb{P}^2} \in \mathbb{Q}, \]
(denoted  \( DT_{(0,0,\beta,k)} \) in [JS12] and  \( N_{n,\beta} \) in [Tod12]).

**Proposition 2.3.** For every  \( d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1} \) and  \( \chi \in \mathbb{Z} \), we have the equality  
\[ \overline{\Omega}_{d,\chi}^{\mathbb{P}^2} = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}} \frac{1}{k^2} \Omega_{\frac{d}{k},\frac{\chi}{k}}^{\mathbb{P}^2}, \]
i.e. using the Möbius inversion formula,
\[ \Omega_{d,\chi}^{\mathbb{P}^2} = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}} \frac{\mu(k)}{k^2} \overline{\Omega}_{\frac{d}{k},\frac{\chi}{k}}^{\mathbb{P}^2}, \]
where  \( \mu \) is the Möbius function.
Proof. As we have $\text{Hom}(E, E \otimes K_{\mathbb{P}^2}) = 0$ for every Gieseker semistable sheaf $E$ on $\mathbb{P}^2$ not supported in dimension 0, the Gieseker semistable sheaves on $K_{\mathbb{P}^2}$ not supported in dimension 0 are necessarily scheme-theoretically supported on the zero section $K_{\mathbb{P}^2}$. It follows that, for every $d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ and $\chi \in \mathbb{Z}$, the moduli spaces $M_{d, \chi}$ and moduli stacks $\mathcal{M}_{d, \chi}$ of Gieseker semistable sheaves on $\mathbb{P}^2$ are also the moduli spaces and moduli stacks of $Z$-semistable objects of $\text{Coh}_{\leq 1}(K_{\mathbb{P}^2})$. As we have $\text{Ext}^2(E, E) = 0$ for every Gieseker semistable sheaf $E$ on $\mathbb{P}^2$ not supported in dimension 0, the moduli stack $\mathcal{M}_{d, \chi}$ is smooth for every $d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ and $\chi \in \mathbb{Z}$ and so its Behrend function is constant equal to $(-1)^{\dim \mathcal{M}_{d, \chi}}$. Remark that the sheaves supported in dimension 0 are exactly those for which $Z_{d, \chi} \in \mathbb{R}_{\leq 0}$, i.e. $\frac{1}{\pi} \text{Arg} Z_{d, \chi} = 1$.

The definition of the rational Donaldson-Thomas invariants $\Omega_{d, \chi}^{\mathbb{P}^2}$ in [JS12] uses the motivic Hall algebra of $\text{Coh}_{\leq 1}(K_{\mathbb{P}^2})$. Using the analogue of Lemma 3.12 of [Bou19a] to go from the motivic Hall algebra to numerical identities, we can rewrite this definition as follows. The symmetrized virtual Poincaré rational functions $\tilde{b}(\mathcal{M}_{d, \chi})(q^{\frac{1}{\chi}})$ are defined according to Section 3.3 of [Bou19a]. There exists a unique set of $\tilde{\Omega}_{d, \chi}(q^{\frac{1}{\chi}}) \in \mathbb{Z}(q^{\frac{1}{\chi}})$, $d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$, $\chi \in \mathbb{Z}$, such that, for every $\phi \in (0, 1)$, we have the equality of power series

$$1 + \sum_{d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}, \chi \in \mathbb{Z}} \tilde{b}(\mathcal{M}_{d, \chi})(q^{\frac{1}{\chi}})z^{0, d, \chi} = \exp \left(- \sum_{d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}, \chi \in \mathbb{Z}} \frac{\Omega_{d, \chi}^{\mathbb{P}^2}(q^{\frac{1}{\chi}})}{q^{\frac{1}{\chi}} - q^{-\frac{1}{\chi}}} z^{0, -\ell d} \right).$$

Then the non-trivial result of [JS12] is the existence of the limit

$$\Omega_{d, \chi}^{\mathbb{P}^2} := \lim_{q^{\frac{1}{\chi}} \to 1} \tilde{\Omega}_{d, \chi}^{\mathbb{P}^2}(q^{\frac{1}{\chi}}) \in \mathbb{Q}.$$

On the other hand, let $\text{Coh}_{\leq 1}(K_{\mathbb{P}^2})((\phi))$ be the abelian subcategory of $\text{Coh}_{\leq 1}(K_{\mathbb{P}^2})$ whose objects are 0 and the nonzero Gieseker semistable objects with $\frac{1}{\pi} \text{Arg} Z = \phi$. As in Lemma 3.6 of [Bou19a], we check that the abelian category $\text{Coh}_{\leq 1}(K_{\mathbb{P}^2})((\phi))$ satisfies the technical conditions required to apply Theorem 1.1 of [Mei15]. Applying Theorem 1.1 of [Mei15], we obtain

$$1 + \sum_{d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}, \chi \in \mathbb{Z}} \tilde{b}(\mathcal{M}_{d, \chi})(q^{\frac{1}{\chi}})z^{0, d, \chi} = \exp \left(- \sum_{d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}, \chi \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} \frac{1}{\ell} \Omega_{d, \chi}^{\mathbb{P}^2}(q^{\frac{1}{\chi}})z^{0, -\ell d} \right).$$

Comparing the previous inequalities, we obtain that, for every $d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ and $\chi \in \mathbb{Z}$, we have

$$\Omega_{d, \chi}^{\mathbb{P}^2}(q^{\frac{1}{\chi}}) = \sum_{k \in \text{div}(d, \chi)} \frac{1}{k} q^{\frac{1}{\chi}} - q^{-\frac{1}{\chi}} \Omega_{d, \chi}^{\mathbb{P}^2}(q^{\frac{1}{\chi}}),$$

and so, taking the limit $q^{\frac{1}{\chi}} \to 1$, we get

$$\Omega_{d, \chi}^{\mathbb{P}^2} = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}} \frac{1}{k^2} \Omega_{d, \chi}^{\mathbb{P}^2}(q^{\frac{1}{\chi}}).$$
as desired.

Remark that the above use of Theorem 1.1 of [Mei15] gives a more direct proof of the existence of the limit
\[
\lim_{q^2 \to 1} \Omega_{d,\chi}^{q^2}(q^2),
\]
and so our result is in fact logically independent of the hard content of [JST12].

\[\square\]

**Proposition 2.4.** For every \( d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}, \chi, \chi' \in \mathbb{Z} \), we have
\[
\Omega_{d,\chi}^{q^2} = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}} \frac{1}{k^2} \Omega_{d,\chi_k}^{q^2}.
\]

**Proof.** Proposition 2.4 is the specialization to \( K_{P^2} \) of a general conjecture about dimension 1 sheaf counting of Calabi-Yau 3-folds: see Conjecture 6.20 of [JST12] and Conjecture 6.3 of [Tod12]. It has been proved by Toda (Theorem 6.4 of [Tod12]) by wall-crossing in the derived category that this conjecture is equivalent to the strong rationality conjecture for stable pair invariants (see Conjecture 3.14 of [PT09] and Conjecture 6.2 of [Tod12]). Given the Gromov-Witten/Donaldson-Thomas correspondence, proved in [MNOP06] for toric Calabi-Yau 3-folds, and so in particular for \( K_{P^2} \), the strong rationality conjecture for stable pair invariants for \( K_{P^2} \) is equivalent to the vanishing \( n_{r,d}^{K_{P^2}} = 0 \) for fixed \( d \) and \( r \gg 0 \) of the Gopakumar-Vafa invariants of \( K_{P^2} \) defined through Gromov-Witten theory. By a study of the explicit formulas coming from the topological vertex formalism, this vanishing has been proved by Konishi in [Kon06].

\[\square\]

**Remarks:**

- The sequence of arguments used in the proof of Proposition 2.4 is also reviewed in Appendix A of [CMT18].
- Theorem 2.1 follows from the combination of Proposition 2.3 and Proposition 2.4.
- The only obstruction to generalize the above arguments to prove Conjecture 2.2 is contained in the use of the Gromov-Witten/Donaldson-Thomas correspondence in the proof of Proposition 2.4 as there is no obvious Gromov-Witten analogue of the refined Donaldson-Thomas invariants \( \Omega_{d,\chi}(q^2) \). One might imagine that a proof of the refined version of the strong rationality conjecture for refined stable pair invariants of \( K_{P^2} \) could follow from a direct study of an appropriate version of the refined topological vertex. We postpone such study to some future work.

3. **Comparison of \( S(\mathfrak{X}_{cl}^{in}) \) with the wall-structure of [CPS10]**

In this Section, we compare the scattering diagram \( S(\mathfrak{X}_{cl}^{in}) \) introduced in [Bou19a] with a specific consistent structure \( S \), in the sense of [GS11], introduced in Example 2.4 of [CPS10]. We use freely the notions and notations introduced in [Bou19a].

In Example 2.4 of [CPS10], an integral affine manifold with singularities \( B \), an integral polyhedral decomposition \( \mathcal{P} \) of \( B \), and a multivalued \( \mathcal{P} \)-piecewise affine function \( \varphi_{CPS} \) on
B are introduced. One can describe B as the complement in $\mathbb{R}^2$ of the three cones

$$(1/2, 1/2) + \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}(1, 0) \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}(0, 1),$$

$$(-1/2, 0) + \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}(0, 1) \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}(-1, -1),$$

$$(0, -1/2) + \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}(-1, -0) \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}(1, 0),$$

with:

- Identification of $(1/2, 1/2) + \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}(1, 0)$ with $(1/2, 1/2) + \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}(0, 1)$, and gluing of the integral affine structure from $(1/2, 1/2) + \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}(1, 0)$ to $(1/2, 1/2) + \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ by

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 2 \end{pmatrix} \in SL(2, \mathbb{Z}).$$

- Identification of $(-1/2, 0) + \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}(1, 0)$ with $(-1/2, 0) + \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}(-1, -1)$, and gluing of the integral affine structure from $(-1/2, 0) + \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}(1, 0)$ to $(-1/2, 0) + \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}(-1, -1)$ by

$$\begin{pmatrix} 3 & -1 \\ 4 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \in SL(2, \mathbb{Z}).$$

- Identification of $(0, -1/2) + \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}(-1, -1)$ with $(0, -1/2) + \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}(1, 0)$ and gluing of the integral affine structure from $(0, -1/2) + \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}(-1, -1)$ to $(0, -1/2) + \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}(1, 0)$ by

$$\begin{pmatrix} 3 & -4 \\ 1 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \in SL(2, \mathbb{Z}).$$

The integral affine structure is smooth on the complement $B_0$ of the three singular points $(1/2, 1/2), (-1/2, 0), (0, -1/2)$. Each singularity is simple in the sense that the monodromy around it is conjugated with

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

in $GL(2, \mathbb{Z})$. The total monodromy around an anticlockwise loop encircling the three singularities is

$$\begin{pmatrix} 3 & -4 \\ 1 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 3 & -1 \\ 4 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 9 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$
of $\bar{P}_0$, $\bar{P}_{(1/2,1/2)}$, $\bar{P}_{(-1/2,0)}$, $\bar{P}_{(0,-1/2)}$ respectively. A representative of $\varphi_{\text{CPS}}$ can be defined by

- $\varphi_{\text{CPS}} = 0$ in restriction to $\bar{P}_0$.
- $\varphi_{\text{CPS}} = -(x + y - 1)$ in restriction to $\bar{P}_{(1/2,1/2)}$.
- $\varphi_{\text{CPS}} = (-2x + y - 1)$ in restriction to $\bar{P}_{(-1/2,0)}$.
- $\varphi_{\text{CPS}} = -(x - 2y - 1)$ in restriction to $\bar{P}_{(0,-1/2)}$.

We fix this representative of $\varphi_{\text{CPS}}$ in what follows.

The triple $(B, \mathcal{P}, \varphi_{\text{CPS}})$ naturally appears as tropicalization of a degeneration of the pair $(\mathbb{P}^2, E)$, see Section 1 of [Gab19].

We now explain how to compare $(B, \mathcal{P}, \varphi_{\text{CPS}})$ with $U$ and $\varphi$ of Section 1 of [Bou19a].

**Definition 3.1.** For every $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, we denote $\bar{C}_n$ the band in $\mathbb{R}^2$ delimited by the line segment $[(n-1/2, -n(n-1)/2), (n+1/2, -n(n+1)/2)]$, and the half-lines $(n-1/2, -n(n-1)/2) + \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}(0,1)$ and $(n+1/2, -n(n+1)/2) + \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}(0,1)$.

For every $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, we denote $C_n$ the interior of $\bar{C}_n$. Finally, we denote $\bar{C} := \cup_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \bar{C}_n$.

We have $\bar{C} \subset \bar{U}$. Indeed, $\bar{C}$ is the subset of $\bar{U}$ delimited below by the sequence of line segments $\cup_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} [(\bar{C}_n^+ | \cup \bar{C}_n^-)]$ (see Definition 1.25 of [Bou19a]). We endow $\bar{C}$ with the integral affine structure induced by the lattice $\mathbb{Z} + \mathbb{Z}\frac{1}{2} \subset \mathbb{R}^2$. We denote $\mathcal{P}_\bar{C}$ the integral polyhedral decomposition of $\bar{C}$ whose two-dimensional faces are given by the $C_n$, $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. We denote $\varphi_{\bar{C}}$ the $\mathcal{P}_\bar{C}$-piecewise affine function on $\bar{C}$ whose restriction to $\bar{C}_n$ is given by

$$\varphi_{\bar{C}} = -nx - y + \frac{n^2}{2},$$

for every $n \in \mathbb{Z}$.

**Figure:** $(\bar{C}, \mathcal{P}_\bar{C})$.

\footnote{Recall, see footnote in Definition 1.14 of [Bou19a], that there is a sign difference in our conventions for the function $\varphi$ with respect to [GS11] [Gro11] [CPS10] [Gab19].}
Lemma 3.2. The universal cover of $B - P_0$ is isomorphic to $\bar{C}$ as integral affine manifold. Under such isomorphism, the lift to the universal cover of the integral polyhedral decomposition $\mathcal{P}$ restricted to $B - P_0$ is the integral polyhedral decomposition $\mathcal{P}_{\bar{C}}$ of $\bar{C}$, and the lift to the universal cover of the $\varphi_{CPS}$ restricted to $B - P_0$ is $\varphi_{\bar{C}}$.

Proof. This follows directly by elementary computations from the explicit descriptions of $(B, \mathcal{P}, \varphi_{CPS})$ and $(\bar{C}, \mathcal{P}_{\bar{C}}, \varphi_{\bar{C}})$ given above. □

Applying the general algorithm of [GS11][Gro11], a consistent structure $\mathcal{S}$ on $(B, \mathcal{P}, \varphi_{CPS})$ is defined in [CPS10]. It is proved in Section 5 of [Gab19] that $\mathcal{S}$ is entirely supported on $B - P_0$, and so can be lifted to its universal cover. By Lemma 3.2, we get a consistent structure $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}$ on $(\bar{C}, \mathcal{P}_{\bar{C}}, \varphi_{\bar{C}})$. The initial rays of $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}$, see Definition 5.10 of [Gab19], come out from the lifts of the singularities of the affine structure on $B$, which are exactly the points $s_n, n \in \mathbb{Z}$, of Section 1.3 of [Bou19a]. The directions of these initial rays are the lifts of the monodromy invariant directions around the singularities, which are exactly the directions $m_n^-$ and $m_n^+, n \in \mathbb{Z}$, of Section 1.3 of [Bou19a]. Finally, from

$$\exp \left( \sum_{\ell \geq 1} \ell \frac{(-1)^{\ell-1}}{\ell^2} z^{\ell m} \right) = 1 + z^{m},$$

we get that the automorphisms attached to the initial rays of $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}$ coincide with the automorphisms of the automorphisms attached to the initial rays of the scattering diagram $\mathcal{D}_{cl}^{in}$ defined in Section 1.4 of [Bou19a]. By uniqueness of the consistent completion, we get the equality

$$\tilde{\mathcal{S}} = S(\mathcal{D}_{cl}^{in}).$$

More precisely, there is additional point to discuss in order to really make sense of this equality. In the algorithm of [GS11] constructing $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}$ from its initial data, the local steps are local scattering diagrams in the sense of Section 1.1 of [Bou19a] if, at a point $\sigma$, one uses as function $\varphi: M \to \mathbb{R}$ the function $d_\sigma \varphi_{\bar{C}}$, differential of $\varphi_{\bar{C}}$ at the point $\sigma$, i.e. $(a, b) \mapsto -an - b$ if $\sigma \in C_n$ (and $(a, b) \mapsto \min(-an - b, -a(n + 1) - b)$ if $\sigma$ belongs to the intersection of $C_n$ and $C_{n+1}$). On the other hand, the scattering diagrams of Section 1.2
of [Bon19a] are defined as having local scattering diagrams at a point $\sigma$ defined using the function $\varphi_\sigma \colon (a, b) \mapsto -ax - b$ if $\sigma = (x, y)$. So $\hat{S}$ is not a priori a scattering diagram in the sense of Section 1.2 of [Bon19a] and $S(D_{cl}^{in})$ is not a priori a consistent structure in the sense of [GS11]. But the only practical role of the functions $d_{\sigma} \varphi_{C}$ and $\varphi_{\sigma}$ is to act as a “regulator” in computations of the local scattering diagrams (through the insertion of $t^{p_{\sigma}(m)}$ and the expansion according to $t$-powers). As the collection of functions $\sigma \mapsto d_{\sigma} \varphi_{C}$ is a piecewise constant approximation of the continuous family $\sigma \mapsto \varphi_{\sigma}$ (we have indeed $n - \frac{1}{2} \leq x \leq n + \frac{1}{2}$ if $n \in \mathbb{C}_{n}$), it follows that if the initial rays of $\hat{S}$ and $S(D_{cl}^{in})$ coincide, then all the rays of $\hat{S}$ and $S(D_{cl}^{in})$ coincide: exactly the same computations are done at each local scattering, only the orders in $t$ at which the computations are done are slightly different due to the small difference between $x$ and $n$ if $x \in \mathbb{C}_{n}$. So, we conclude that $\hat{S}$ and $S(D_{cl}^{in})$ have the same rays, so $\hat{S}$ can be viewed as a scattering diagram in the sense of Section 1.2 of [Bon19a], $S(D_{cl}^{in})$ can be viewed as a consistent structure in the sense of [GS11], and the equality $\hat{S} = S(D_{cl}^{in})$ makes sense either way.

Remark: The reason why we defined scattering diagrams in Section 1.2 of [Bon19a] using the real family of functions $\sigma \mapsto \varphi_{\sigma}$ and not the piecewise constant family $\sigma \mapsto d_{\sigma} \varphi_{C}$, is that only the former is natural from the point of view of the scattering diagram $\mathcal{D}^{cl}_{S}$ defined in Section 2 of [Bon19a] in terms of stability conditions: if $\gamma$ is a $\sigma$-semistable object, then, by definition of a stability condition, we know that $\text{Im } \mathbb{Z}_{\gamma} > 0$, which is equivalent to $-ax - b > 0$ if $m_{\gamma} = (a, b)$ and $\sigma = (x, y)$. It is not clear a priori why, for $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $n - \frac{1}{2} \leq x \leq n + \frac{1}{2}$, one should have $-an - b > 0$ (which is stronger that $-ax - b > 0$ if $x < n$ and $a < 0$ or if $x > n$ and $a > 0$). At the end of the day, once we know by Theorem 5.2 of [Bon19a] that $\mathcal{D}^{cl}_{\mathbb{P}^{2}} = S(D_{cl}^{in})$, and that $S(D_{cl}^{in}) = \hat{S}$, we get that this is indeed true, but it was not obvious a priori.

A short way to phrase the issue is that, from the point of view of stability conditions, the lines $x = n$ or the polyhedral decomposition $\mathcal{P}_{\hat{S}}$ have no particular signification, whereas they have a clear meaning from the point of view of [GS11] ($\mathcal{P}$ appears as dual intersection complex of the special fiber of the degeneration of $(\mathbb{P}^{2}, E)$ constructed in Section 1 of [Gab19]).

Remark: $\hat{S}$ being defined as lift to the universal cover of $S$ on $B - P_0$, there is a natural action of $\pi_{1}(B - P_0) \approx \mathbb{Z}$ on $\hat{S}$. On the other hand, we have a symmetry $\psi(1)$ of $S(D_{cl}^{in})$ (see Section 1.5 of [Bon19a]). Under the identification $\hat{S} = S(D_{cl}^{in})$, the (correctly chosen) generator of $\pi_{1}(B - P_0) \approx \mathbb{Z}$ acts as $\psi(1)^{3}$. The action of $\psi(1)$ itself is related to a $\mathbb{Z}/3$ symmetry of $\hat{S}$.

By Lemma 3.2, we can identify the universal cover of $B - \tilde{P}_0$ with a subset of $U$, and so, using Proposition 2.14 of [Bon19a], we can view the universal cover of $B - P_0$ as a subset of $\text{Stab}(\mathbb{P}^{2})$. In fact, stability conditions on $\text{D}^{b}(\mathbb{P}^{2})$ corresponding to points of $U$ can also be viewed a stability conditions on $\text{D}^{b}_{0}(K_{\mathbb{P}^{2}})$. Thus, we can view the universal cover of $B - P_0$ as embedded in the space $\text{Stab}_{0}(K_{\mathbb{P}^{2}})$ of Bridgeland stability conditions on $\text{D}^{b}_{0}(K_{\mathbb{P}^{2}})$. It is natural to ask if the universal cover of $B_{0}$, and not just of $B_{0} - P_{0}$, can be embedded in $\text{Stab}_{0}(K_{\mathbb{P}^{2}})$ in a similar way. We will see below, using Section 9 of [BM19], that there exists an embedding of $U$ in $\text{Stab}_{0}(K_{\mathbb{P}^{2}})$, which is different from the one given by Proposition 2.14 of [Bon19a], and such that the corresponding embedding
of the universal cover of $B - \bar{P}_0$ in \text{Stab}(K_{p^2})$ naturally extends to an embedding of the universal cover of $B_0$ in \text{Stab}(K_{p^2})$.

Following Section 9 of \cite{BM11}, we denote $\mathcal{M}_{\Gamma_1(3)} = (\mathbb{C} - \mu_3)/\mu_3$ the moduli space of elliptic curves with $\Gamma_1(3)$ level structure. We can view $\mathcal{M}_{\Gamma_1(3)}$ as $\mathbb{P}^1$ with the points $z = 0$ and $z = -\frac{1}{27}$ removed, and a stacky $\mathbb{Z}/3$ point at $z = \infty$. The fundamental group of $\mathcal{M}_{\Gamma_1(3)}$ is $\Gamma_1(3)$. We denote $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{\Gamma_1(3)}$ the universal cover of $\mathcal{M}_{\Gamma_1(3)}$, and $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{\Gamma_1(3)}^{(3)} = \mathbb{C} - \mu_3$, 3 to 1 cover of $\mathcal{M}_{\Gamma_1(3)}$. Equation (22) of \cite{BM11} defines holomorphic functions $a(z)$ and $b(z)$ on $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{\Gamma_1(3)}$, which are periods relevant for mirror symmetry for $K_{p^2}$. Using $\text{Re} \ a(z)$ and $3 \text{Re} \ b(z)$ as local integral affine coordinates, we view $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{\Gamma_1(3)}^{(3)}$ as an integral affine manifold.

**Proposition 3.3.** The multivalued map $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{\Gamma_1(3)}^{(3)} \to \mathbb{R}^2$, $z \mapsto (\text{Re} \ a(z), 3 \text{Re} \ b(z))$ induces an isomorphism of integral affine manifolds $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{\Gamma_1(3)}^{(3)} \cong B_0$.

**Proof.** We denote $C \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ the interior of $\tilde{C}$. We use Lemma 3.2 to identify the universal cover of $B - \bar{P}_0$ with $C$ and we choose a fundamental domain $D$ of $B - \bar{P}_0$ in $C$. Using the monodromy transformation of $(a(z), b(z))$ around $z = 0$, we see that

$$\{z \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{\Gamma_1(3)} | (\text{Re} \ a(z), 3 \text{Re} \ b(z)) \in D\} \to D$$

descends to an isomorphism

$$\{z \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{\Gamma_1(3)}^{(3)} | (\text{Re} \ a(z), 3 \text{Re} \ b(z)) \in D\} \cong D.$$

Using the explicit descriptions of $a(z)$ and $b(z)$, one checks that $z \mapsto (\text{Re} \ a(z), 3 \text{Re} \ b(z))$ maps the three points $z = -\frac{1}{27}$ on the boundary $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{\Gamma_1(3)}^{(3)}$ to exactly the three points on the boundary of $D$ corresponding to the three singular points of the integral affine structure on $B$. To conclude, it is enough to check that the explicit monodromies of $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{\Gamma_1(3)}^{(3)}$ and $B_0$ match. \hfill $\Box$

Theorem 9.3 of \cite{BM11} gives an embedding of $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{\Gamma_1(3)}$, and so, by Proposition 3.3 of the universal cover of $B_0$, in \text{Stab}_0(K_{p^2})$.

The corresponding embedding of $U$ is different from the one of Proposition 2.14 of \cite{Bou19a}: the real part of the central charges is the same but the imaginary part is different. As the scattering diagram $\Sigma_{u,v}$ is defined in terms of the vanishing of the real part of the central charge, it is very likely that all our arguments, and in particular Theorem 5.9 of \cite{Bou19a}, should remain valid using the embedding of $U$ in \text{Stab}_0(K_{p^2})$ given by Theorem 9.3 of \cite{BM11} instead of the one given by Proposition 2.14 of \cite{Bou19a}.

In fact, from the conceptual point of view of mirror symmetry, the embedding of Theorem 9.3 of \cite{BM11} is the “right one”: it is the one extending to the universal cover of the global stringy Kähler moduli space $\mathcal{M}_{\Gamma_1(3)}$ of $K_{p^2}$, and so the one relevant for physics (see Section 0.4.3 of \cite{Bou19a}). In particular, our heuristic conceptual explanation for Theorem 5.9 of \cite{Bou19a} given in Section 6 really applies to the embedding of Theorem 9.3 of \cite{BM11}. The use of the embedding of Proposition 2.14 of \cite{Bou19a} in the \cite{Bou19a} is motivated by the fact that it is simply related to the standard upper half-plane already.
studied in the literature, and by the related fact that it is easier to deal with polynomials than with hypergeometric functions.

4. Proof of the main result

In this Section, we prove Theorem 4.10 stated as Theorem 0.4 in the Introduction. Recall that Theorem 0.4 implies all the results stated in the Introduction. We use freely the notions and notations introduced in [Bou19a].

We focus on the unbounded vertical rays in $S(\mathcal{O}_{\text{cl}}^{\text{in}})$. The following Lemma 4.1 shows that they correspond, from the point of view of $\mathcal{D}_{\text{cl}}^{\mathbb{P}^2}$, to dimension 1 sheaves. For a given degree $d$, the corresponding unbounded vertical rays are indexed by the Euler characteristic $\chi$.

**Lemma 4.1.** Let $d$ be a positive integer. For every unbounded ray $\delta$ of $S(\mathcal{O}_{\text{cl}}^{\text{in}})$ of class $m_\delta = (0, -d)$, there exists (a unique) $\chi \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $|\delta|$ is contained in the vertical line of equation

$$x = \frac{1}{d} \left( \chi - \frac{3}{2} \right).$$

Moreover, for every $d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ and $\chi \in \mathbb{Z}$, there exists a unique unbounded ray in $S(\mathcal{O}_{\text{cl}}^{\text{in}})$, that we denote $\delta_{d, \chi}$, of class $m_{\delta_{d, \chi}} = (0, -d)$ and contained in the vertical line of equation

$$x = \frac{1}{d} \left( \chi - \frac{3}{2} \right).$$

**Proof.** By Theorem 5.9 of [Bou19a], a ray of $S(\mathcal{O}_{\text{cl}}^{\text{in}})$ is a ray of $\mathcal{D}_{u,v}^{\mathbb{P}^2}$, so of the form $\delta_{\gamma,j}$ for some $\gamma = (r, d, \chi) \in \Gamma$ and $j \in J_\gamma$, contained in the line of equation $ry + dx + r + \frac{3}{2}d - \chi = 0$. If $\delta$ is of class $m_\delta = (0, -d)$, it means that $r = 0$, and so $|\delta|$ is contained of the line of equation $dx + \frac{3}{2}d - \chi = 0$.

The fact that there exists a ray $\delta_{d, \chi}$ as in the statement of Lemma 4.1 follows from the fact that, for every $d \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\chi \in \mathbb{Z}$, the moduli space $M_{d, \chi}$ of Gieseker semistable degree $d$ dimension 1 sheaves on $\mathbb{P}^2$ of holomorphic Euler characteristic $\chi$ is nonempty, and so, by Corollary 6.3 of [Bou19a], $\text{Pic}^+(M_{d, \chi}) \neq 0$. $\square$

**Remark:** One can give an alternative proof of the first part of Lemma 4.1: As reviewed in the Introduction, the image of $\text{ev} : \overline{M}_0(\mathbb{P}^2/E, d) \to E$ is contained in $P_d$. By the main result of [Gab19], one can think of the unbounded rays of $S$ as being tropicalization of (degenerating families of) elements of $\overline{M}_0(\mathbb{P}^2/E, d)$. On the other hand, Section 6 of [Gab19] relates torsion points of $E$ to torsion points on the “circle at infinity” in $B$. Finally, using the equality $\tilde{S} = S(\mathcal{O}_{\text{cl}}^{\text{in}})$ of Section 3 we get exactly the first part of Lemma 4.1.

Theorem 4.2 expresses the functions $H_{\delta_{d, \chi}}$ attached to the unbounded vertical rays $\delta_{d, \chi}$ in $S(\mathcal{O}_{u,v}^{\text{cl}})$ in terms of the invariants of moduli spaces of dimension 1 sheaves introduced in Section 2.
Theorem 4.2. For every \(d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}\) and \(\chi \in \mathbb{Z}\), we have
\[
H_{d,\chi} = (-1)^{d-1} \left( \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}} \frac{1}{k^2} \Omega_{d,\chi}^2 \right) z^{(0, -d)}.
\]

Proof. By Theorem 5.9 of [Bou19a], we have \(S(\mathfrak{D}_{\text{cl}}^m) = \mathfrak{D}_{\text{cl}}^2\), and so, by Definition 2.22 of [Bou19a], as \((-1)^{(\gamma, \gamma)} = (-1)^d\) for \(\gamma = (0, d, \chi)\), we have
\[
H_{d,\chi} = (-1)^{d-1} \left( \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}} \frac{1}{k^2} \Omega_{d,\chi}^2 \right) z^{(0, -d)}.
\]

On the other hand, by Theorem 2.1, we have \(\Omega_{d,\chi}^2 = \Omega_{d,\chi}^2\) for every \(\chi \in \mathbb{Z}\). \qed

In Theorem 4.7 below, we express using the main result of [Gab19] the functions \(H_{d,\chi}\) attached to the unbounded vertical rays \(\delta_{d,\chi}\) in \(S(\mathfrak{D}_{u,v})\) in terms of the relative Gromov-Witten invariants \(N_{0,d}^{2}/E,k\) introduced in the Introduction. We first introduce some notations which are necessary to state Theorem 4.7.

Definition 4.3. Let \(G\) be an abelian group and let \(x\) be an element of \(G\) of finite order divisible by 3. We denote \(d(x)\) the smallest positive integer such that \((3d(x))x = 0\) in \(G\).

Remark: Taking \(G = \text{Pic}^0(E)\), we see that the above notation is compatible with the notation \(d(p)\) for \(p \in \cup_{d=1} P_d\) introduced in the Introduction.

Definition 4.4. For every \(\ell \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}\), we denote \(r_{\ell}\) the number of elements \(x \in \mathbb{Z}/(3\ell)\) such that \(d(x) = \ell\).

Remark: For every \(\ell \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}\), and for every \(d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}\) multiple of \(\ell\), \(r_{\ell}\) is also the number of elements \(x \in \mathbb{Z}/(3d)\) such that \(d(x) = \ell\).

Definition 4.5. For every \(k, \ell \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}\), we denote \(s_{k,\ell}\) the number of \(\ell\)-\(\text{torsion}\) elements \(\ell_{d,\chi}\) in \(\mathbb{Z}/(3k)\) such that \(d(x) = k\) and \(d(a) = \ell\).

Definition 4.6. For every \(d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}\) and \(\chi \in \mathbb{Z}\), we denote \(\ell_{d,\chi}\) the smallest \(\ell \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}\) such that \(\ell_{d,\chi} \in \mathbb{Z}\), i.e. \(\ell_{d,\chi} = \frac{d}{\gcd(d,\chi)}\).

Theorem 4.7. For every \(d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}\) and \(\chi \in \mathbb{Z}\), we have
\[
H_{d,\chi} = \left( \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}} \frac{s_{k,\ell_{d,\chi}}}{r_{\ell_{d,\chi}}} N_{0,d}^{2}/E,k \right) z^{(0, -d)}.
\]

Proof. This is the main result of [Gab19]. More precisely, the main result of [Gab19] is a tropical correspondence theorem computing the Gromov-Witten invariants \(N_{0,d}^{2}/E,k\) in
terms of the consistent structure $\mathcal{S}$ of Example 2.4 of [CPS10]. It remains to use the equality $S(\mathcal{D}_{cl^+}) = \hat{S}$ of Section 3 to conclude.

The precise form of the formula proved in [Gab19] comes from a study of the tropicalization of the torsion points of $E$ into torsion points of the “circle at infinity” of the integral affine manifold with singularities $B$ on which $\mathcal{S}$ lives. We refer to Section 6 of [Gab19] for details. Under the equality $S(\mathcal{D}_{cl^+}) = \hat{S}$, these torsion points on the circle at infinity in $B$ become the intersection of the vertical lines $d_{d,\chi}$ with the horizontal line at infinity in $U$. □

Recall that we introduced the notations $\Omega_{d,k}^{\mathfrak{p}_1^2/E}$ and $\Omega_{d,k}^{\mathfrak{p}_2^2/E}$ in the Introduction.

**Theorem 4.8.** For every $d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ and $\chi \in \mathbb{Z}$, we have

$$
\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}} \frac{1}{k^2} \Omega_{d,\chi k}^{\mathfrak{p}_1^2/E} = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}} \frac{1}{k^2} \Omega_{d,\chi k}^{\mathfrak{p}_2^2/E}.
$$

**Proof.** It is the result of the combination of Theorem 4.2 and Theorem 4.7. □

**Remark:** The key point making Theorem 4.8 possible is that the unbounded vertical rays $d_{d,\chi}$ have two completely different interpretations. From the sheaf point of view, they correspond to degree $d$ dimension 1 sheaves of Euler characteristic $\chi$. From the Gromov-Witten point of view, they correspond to degree $d$ curves with tropicalization of the contact point with $E$ determined by $\chi$.

**Lemma 4.9.** For every $d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ and $\chi \in \mathbb{Z}$, we have

$$
\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}} \frac{1}{k^2} \Omega_{d,\chi k}^{\mathfrak{p}_2^2/E} = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}} \frac{1}{k^2} \Omega_{d,\chi k}^{\mathfrak{p}_1^2/E}.
$$

**Proof.** It is a simple rewriting. Indeed, by Definition 4.6, $d = \ell_{d,\chi} \gcd(d, \chi)$, so if $k \mid (d, \chi)$, then $k \mid \gcd(d, \chi)$ and so $d' := \frac{d}{k}$ satisfies $\ell_{d,\chi} \mid d'$, and conversely. □

**Theorem 4.10.** For every $d, k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$, we have

$$
\Omega_{d,k}^{\mathfrak{p}_2^2/E} = \frac{1}{3d} \Omega_{d,1}^{\mathfrak{p}_2^2/E}.
$$

**Proof.** Using Lemma 4.9 to rewrite Theorem 4.8, we obtain

$$
\sum_{d' \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}} \frac{1}{(d/d')^2} \Omega_{d',1}^{\mathfrak{p}_2^2/E} = \sum_{d' \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}} \frac{1}{(d/d')^2} \Omega_{d',k}^{\mathfrak{p}_2^2/E}.
$$

so

$$
\sum_{d' \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}} \frac{1}{(d/d')^2} \Omega_{d',1}^{\mathfrak{p}_2^2/E} = \sum_{d' \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}} \frac{1}{(d/d')^2} \Omega_{d',k}^{\mathfrak{p}_2^2/E}.
$$

This formula gives a recursive way to uniquely determine the invariants $\Omega_{d,k}^{\mathfrak{p}_2^2/E}$. So, in order to show that $\Omega_{d,k}^{\mathfrak{p}_2^2/E} = \frac{1}{3d} \Omega_{d,1}^{\mathfrak{p}_2^2/E}$, it is enough to show that this formula is the solution
to the above set of recursive equations. So it is enough to show that
\[
\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}} \frac{s_{k, \ell_{d,x}}}{r_{\ell_{d,x}}} = 3d'.
\]
But
\[
\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}} \frac{s_{k, \ell_{d,x}}}{r_{\ell_{d,x}}}
\]
is the number of \(x = (a, b) \in \mathbb{Z}/(3d') \times \mathbb{Z}/(3d')\) with \(d(a) = \ell_{d,x}\). By the remark following Definition 4.4, \(r_{\ell_{d,x}}\) is the number of \(a \in \mathbb{Z}/(3d')\) such that \(d(a) = \ell_{d,x}\). Thus,
\[
\frac{1}{r_{\ell_{d,x}}} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}} \frac{s_{k, \ell_{d,x}}}{r_{\ell_{d,x}}}
\]
is the number of \(x = (a, b) \in \mathbb{Z}/(3d') \times \mathbb{Z}/(3d')\) with a given \(a\), which is indeed \(3d'\). \(\square\)

5. FURTHER RESULTS

In Section 5.1, we use Theorem 4.10 to give a new proof of the local-relative correspondence of [vGGR19] in the case of \(\mathbb{P}^2\). In Section 5.2, we relate higher genus relative Gromov-Witten invariants of \((\mathbb{P}^2, E)\) and Poincaré polynomials of moduli spaces of dimension 1 sheaves on \(\mathbb{P}^2\), and we discuss a conjectural higher genus version of Theorem 0.1. In Section 5.3, we discuss a conjectural connection with real Gromov-Witten theory.

5.1. Compatibility with the local-relative correspondence. Recall from the Introduction that, once we know Theorem 0.1, we denote \(\Omega_{d}^{\mathbb{P}^2/E}\) for \(\Omega_{d,k}^{\mathbb{P}^2/E}\). Thus, we can rewrite Theorem 4.10 as
\[
\Omega_{d}^{\mathbb{P}^2/E} = \frac{1}{3d} \Omega_{d,1}^{\mathbb{P}^2}.
\]
We can use this result to give a new proof of the local-relative correspondence of [vGGR19].

**Theorem 5.1.** For every positive integer \(d\), we have
\[
N_{0,d}^{\mathbb{P}^2/E} = (-1)^{d-1} 3d N_{0,d}^{K_{\mathbb{P}^2}}.
\]

**Proof.** For every positive integer \(d\), we have
\[
N_{0,d}^{\mathbb{P}^2/E} = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}} \left| P_{d,k} \right| N_{0,d}^{\mathbb{P}^2/E,k} = (-1)^{d-1} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}} \left| P_{d,k} \right| \sum_{d' \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}} \frac{1}{(d/d')^2} \Omega_{d'}^{\mathbb{P}^2/E}
\]
\[
= (-1)^{d-1} \sum_{d' \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}} \frac{1}{(d/d')^2} \Omega_{d'}^{\mathbb{P}^2/E} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}} \left| P_{d,k} \right|,
\]
where \(\left| P_{d,k} \right|\) is the cardinal of \(P_{d,k}\), i.e. the number of \(p \in P_d\) with \(d(p) = k\). We have
\[
\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}} \left| P_{d,k} \right| = (3d')^2,
\]
so
\[ N_{0,d}^{\mathbb{P}^2/E} = (-1)^{d-1} \sum_{d' \mid d} \frac{(3d')^2}{(d/d')^2} \Omega_{d'}^{\mathbb{P}^2/E}. \]

Using that \((3d')\Omega_{d'}^{\mathbb{P}^2/E} = \Omega_{d',1}^{\mathbb{P}^2}\), we get
\[ N_{0,d}^{\mathbb{P}^2/E} = (-1)^{d-1} \sum_{d' \mid d} \frac{3d'}{(d/d')^2} \Omega_{d',1}^{\mathbb{P}^2} = (-1)^{d-1} 3d \sum_{d' \mid d} \frac{1}{(d/d')^3} \Omega_{d',1}^{\mathbb{P}^2}. \]

On the other hand, we have
\[ N_{0,d}^{K_{\mathbb{P}^2}} = \sum_{d' \mid d} \frac{1}{(d/d')^2} n_{0,d'}^{K_{\mathbb{P}^2}}, \]
where \(n_{0,d}^{K_{\mathbb{P}^2}}\) is the genus 0 degree \(d\) Gopakumar-Vafa invariant of \(K_{\mathbb{P}^2}\) defined through Gromov-Witten theory. Finally, by the arguments reviewed in the proof of Proposition 2.3 including in particular the Gromov-Witten/Donaldson-Thomas correspondence, we have, see Corollary A.7 of [CMT18], that Katz’s conjecture (Conjecture 2.3 of [Kat08]) is true for \(K_{\mathbb{P}^2}\), i.e. that for every positive integer \(d\),
\[ n_{0,d}^{K_{\mathbb{P}^2}} = \Omega_{d,1}^{\mathbb{P}^2}. \]
and this concludes the proof. □

**Remark:** Our proof of Theorem 5.1 is quite complicated, using essentially the full content of the present paper. In particular, this proof contains a long detour through sheaf counting, whereas the simple degeneration argument of [vGGR19] gives directly a proof staying in Gromov-Witten theory. Nevertheless, we stress that the two proofs are logically independent, and combining them, we get a full circle of relations whose consistency can be appreciated:
5.2. **Higher genus and refinement.** In this Section, we introduce higher genus version of the genus 0 relative Gromov-Witten invariants of \((\mathbb{P}^2, E)\) and we state a conjectural higher genus version of Theorem 0.1.

For every positive integer \(g\) and nonnegative integer \(d\), let \(\overline{M}_g(\mathbb{P}^2/E, d)\) be the moduli space of genus \(g\) degree \(d\) stable maps to \(\mathbb{P}^2\) relative to \(E\), with maximal contact order with \(E\) in a unique point. The moduli space \(\overline{M}_g(\mathbb{P}^2/E, d)\) is a proper Deligne-Mumford stack, admitting a virtual fundamental class of dimension \(g\). The invariants \(\overline{M}_g(\mathbb{P}^2/E, d)\) are analogue to the higher genus Gromov-Witten invariants of K3 surfaces involved in the Katz-Klemm-Vafa conjecture (denoted \(R_{g,3}\) in [MPT10]).

As in the Introduction, if we denote \(\operatorname{ev} : \overline{M}_g(\mathbb{P}^2/E, d) \to E\) the evaluation at the contact point with \(E\), and if \(p\) is in the image of \(\operatorname{ev}\), then \(p-p_0\) is necessarily a \((3d)\)-torsion point of the group \(\operatorname{Pic}^0(E)\) of degree 0 cycles on \(E\) up to linear equivalence. Thus, we can define higher genus versions \(N_{g,d,E,p}^{\mathbb{P}^2/E}\) of the genus 0 invariants \(N_{0,d,E,p}^{\mathbb{P}^2/E}\), \(p \in P_d\). The higher genus analogue of Lemma 1.2 holds (the proof does not use the genus 0 assumption), and so we can define higher genus versions \(N_{g,d,E,k}^{\mathbb{P}^2/E}\) of the genus 0 invariants \(N_{0,d,E,k}^{\mathbb{P}^2/E}\).

**Conjecture 5.2.** For every positive integer \(d\) and for every positive integer \(k\) dividing \(d\), we have the equality

\[
(-1)^{d-1} \sum_{g \geq 0} N_{g,d,E,k}^{\mathbb{P}^2/E} h^{2g-1} = \sum_{d' \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0} \atop k \mid d'} \frac{1}{(d'/d)} (-1)^{d'-1} \sum_{g \geq 0} N_{g,d',E,d'}^{\mathbb{P}^2/E} ((d/d') h)^{2g-1}
\]

in \(\mathbb{Q}[[h]]\).

**Remark:** The leading order in \(h\) of Conjecture 5.2 is Theorem 0.1.

We define, for every positive integers \(d\) and \(k\):

\[
\Omega_{d,k}^{\mathbb{P}^2/E}(h) := (-1)^{d-1} (2 \sin(h/2)) \left( \sum_{g \geq 0} N_{g,d,E,k}^{\mathbb{P}^2/E} h^{2g-1} \right) \in \mathbb{Q}[[h]].
\]

There exists a unique collection of \(\Omega_{d,k}^{\mathbb{P}^2/E}(h) \in \mathbb{Q}[[h]]\), indexed by \(d \geq 1\) and \(k \geq 1\), such that

\[
\Omega_{d,k}^{\mathbb{P}^2/E}(h) = \sum_{d' \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0} \atop k \mid d'} \frac{1}{(d'/d)} \frac{2 \sin(h/2)}{2 \sin((d/d') h/2)} \Omega_{d',k}^{\mathbb{P}^2/E} ((d/d') h).
\]

Indeed, this relation can be inverted by the Möbius inversion formula.

Thus, we can rephrase Conjecture 5.2 as:
Conjecture 5.3. For every positive integer \(d\), \(\Omega_{d,k}^{\mathcal{P}_d,\omega}(h)\) is independent of \(k\), i.e. we have
\[
\Omega_{d,k}^{\mathcal{P}_d,\omega}(h) = \Omega_{d,k'}^{\mathcal{P}_d,\omega}(h)
\]
for every \(k, k' \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}\).

Recall from Definition 4.6 that, for every \(d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}\) and \(\chi \in \mathbb{Z}\), we denote \(\ell_{d,\chi} = \frac{d}{\gcd(d,\chi)}\).

Theorem 5.4. For every \(d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}\) and \(\chi \in \mathbb{Z}\), we have the equality
\[
\Omega_{d,\chi}^{\mathcal{P}_d,\omega}(q^{\frac{h}{2}}) = \frac{1}{3d} \Omega_{d,\ell_{d,\chi}}^{\mathcal{P}_d,\omega}(h)
\]
after the change of variables
\[
q = e^{ih} = \sum_{n \geq 1} \frac{(ih)^n}{n!}.
\]

Proof. We follow the logic of the proof of Theorem 4.10, replacing \(\mathcal{O}^{\mathcal{D}_d,\omega}(\mathcal{H})\) by \(S(\mathcal{D}_d^{\mathcal{P}_d})\). We denote \(\mathcal{D}_d^{\omega,\chi}\) the natural analogue for \(S(\mathcal{D}_d^{\mathcal{P}_d})\) of \(\mathcal{D}_d^{\omega}\) for \(S(\mathcal{D}_d^{\mathcal{P}_d})\) (see Definition 4.1).

According to Theorem 5.11 of [Bou19a], for every \(d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}\) and \(\chi \in \mathbb{Z}\), we have
\[
H_{\mathcal{D}_d^{\omega,\chi}} = (-1)^{d-1} \left( \sum_{k(\ell_{d,\chi})} \frac{1}{k} \frac{1}{q^{\frac{h}{2}} - q^{-\frac{h}{2}}} \Omega_{d,\ell_{d,\chi}}^{\mathcal{P}_d,\omega}(q^{\ell_{d,\chi}}) \right) z^{(0,-d)}.
\]

The main result of [Gab19] has a natural higher genus version (with the same proof, using [Bou18] in place of [GPS10]): for every \(d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}\) and \(\chi \in \mathbb{Z}\), we have, after the change of variables \(q = e^{ih}\),
\[
H_{\mathcal{D}_d^{\omega,\chi}} = (-i) \left( \sum_{k(\ell_{d,\chi})} \left( \sum_{r(\ell_{d,\chi}) k(\ell_{d,\chi})} \Omega_{d,\ell_{d,\chi}}^{\mathcal{P}_d,\omega}(q^{\ell_{d,\chi}}) \right) z^{(0,-d)} \right).
\]

We conclude by combining the two previous formulas for \(H_{\mathcal{D}_d^{\omega,\chi}}\) as in the proof of Theorem 4.10.

□

Corollary 5.5. For every \(d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}\) and \(k \in \mathbb{Z}\), \(\Omega_{d,k}^{\mathcal{P}_d,\omega}(\hbar)\) is the power series expansion in \(\hbar\) of a Laurent polynomial in \(q^{\frac{h}{2}}\), where \(q = e^{ih}\).

For every \(d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}\) and \(k \in \mathbb{Z}\), \(\Omega_{d,k}^{\mathcal{P}_d,\omega}(\hbar)\) is the power series expansion in \(\hbar\) of a rational function in \(q^{\frac{h}{2}}\), where \(q = e^{ih}\).

Proof. The result for \(\Omega_{d,k}^{\mathcal{P}_d,\omega}(\hbar)\) follows directly from Theorem 5.4 as \(\Omega_{d,k}^{\mathcal{P}_d,\omega}(q^{\frac{h}{2}}) \in \mathbb{Z}[q^{\pm \frac{1}{2}}].\)

The result for \(\Omega_{d,k}^{\mathcal{P}_d,\omega}(\hbar)\) follows from the result for \(\Omega_{d,k}^{\mathcal{P}_d,\omega}(h)\) by the formula
\[
\Omega_{d,k}^{\mathcal{P}_d,\omega}(\hbar) = \sum_{d' \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}} \frac{1}{d'd'} \frac{q^{\frac{h}{2}} - q^{-\frac{h}{2}}}{q^{-\frac{(d')^2}{2}} - q^{-\frac{d'^2}{2}}} \Omega_{d',k}^{\mathcal{P}_d,\omega}((d'/d)\hbar).
\]

□
Corollary 5.6. Conjecture 2.2, i.e. the independence of $\Omega_{d,\chi}^{P^2}(q^{\frac{1}{2}})$ with respect to $\chi$, implies Conjecture 5.2, i.e. the independence of $\Omega_{d,k}^{P^2}(\mathbb{R})$ with respect to $k$.

Proof. This follows directly from Theorem 5.4. □

Corollary 5.7. Conjecture 2.2, i.e. the independence of $\Omega_{d,\chi}^{P^2}(q^{\frac{1}{2}})$ with respect to $\chi$, implies Conjecture 8.3 of [Bou18].

Proof. This follows directly from Theorem 5.4. □

5.3. Real Gromov-Witten theory. As $K_{P^2}$ is toric, $K_{P^2}$ has a natural real structure, whose real locus $K_{P^2}^{\mathbb{R}}$ is the real projective plane $\mathbb{RP}^2$ in restriction to $P^2$. Arguing as in [PSW08], we can define genus 0 degree $d$ real Gromov-Witten invariants of $K_{P^2}$:

$$N_{K_{P^2}^{\mathbb{R}}}, d_0 \in \mathbb{Q}.$$ 

We have $N_{K_{P^2}^{\mathbb{R}}}, d_0 = 0$ if $d$ is even, and we choose the Spin structure on $\mathbb{RP}^2$ involved in the definition of $N_{K_{P^2}^{\mathbb{R}}}, d_0$ such that $N_{K_{P^2}^{\mathbb{R}}}, d_0 = 1$ (a different choice changes the invariants $N_{K_{P^2}^{\mathbb{R}}}, d_0$ by a global sign independent of $d$). We define genus 0 degree $d$ real Gopakumar-Vafa invariants $n_{K_{P^2}^{\mathbb{R}}}, d_0$ by: $n_{K_{P^2}^{\mathbb{R}}}, d_0 = 0$ if $d$ is even, and by

$$N_{K_{P^2}^{\mathbb{R}}}, d_0 = \sum_{k \geq 1} \frac{1}{k!} n_{K_{P^2}^{\mathbb{R}}}, d_0, \quad$$

for every $d$ odd.

We recall from Section 6.2 of [Bou19a] that, for every positive integer $d$, the moduli space $M_{d,1}$ has a natural real structure and we denote $M_{d,1}(\mathbb{R})$ its real locus. In particular, $M_{d,1}(\mathbb{R})$ is a smooth compact manifold, and we denote $e(M_{d,1}(\mathbb{R})) \in \mathbb{Z}$ its topological Euler characteristic.

Conjecture 5.8. For every positive integer $d$, we have

$$n_{K_{P^2}^{\mathbb{R}}}, d_0 = (-1)^{\frac{d-1}{2}} e(M_{d,1}(\mathbb{R})).$$

Remark:

- By Corollary A.7 of [CMT18], Katz’s conjecture (Conjecture 2.3 of [Kat08]) is true for $K_{P^2}$, i.e. we have $n_{K_{P^2}^{\mathbb{R}}}, d_0 = (-1)^{d-1} e(M_{d,1})$, where $n_{K_{P^2}^{\mathbb{R}}}, d_0$ is the genus 0 degree $d$ (complex) Gopakumar-Vafa invariant defined in terms of genus 0 Gromov-Witten theory of $K_{P^2}$, and where $e(M_{d,1})$ is the (complex) topological Euler characteristic of $M_{d,1}$. Thus, Conjecture 5.8 is a natural real analogue of Katz’s conjecture for $K_{P^2}$. Despite this clear analogy, Conjecture 5.8 does not seem to appear in the literature.

- Conjecture 5.8 is related to the main theme of the present paper because, by Theorem 6.4 of [Bou19a], the real Euler characteristic $e(M_{d,1}(\mathbb{R}))$ is the specialization at $q = -1$ of the Poincaré polynomial $P(M_{d,1})(q)$ of $M_{d,1}$, which can be computed from the scattering diagram $\mathfrak{D}_{u,v}^{\mathbb{R}} = S(\mathfrak{D}_{u,v}^{\mathbb{R}})$ by Section 6.1 of [Bou19a]. Thus,
we can rephrase Conjecture 5.8 as the statement that the real Gopakumar-Vafa invariant \( n_{0,d}^{K_{\mathbb{P}^2}} \) can be computed by the specialization at \( q = -1 \) of the invariants computed by the scattering diagram \( S(\mathcal{D}^{\text{in}}_{u,v}) \), which are essentially \( q \)-refined tropical invariants in the tropicalization of \( (\mathbb{P}^2, E) \) (see Section 3). This statement is analogue to the fact that, in the setting of real toric surfaces with point insertions, Welschinger’s counts of genus 0 real curves can be computed by the specialization \( q = -1 \) of the block-Göttsche \( q \)-refined count of tropical curves in \( \mathbb{R}^2 \). Thus, a natural strategy to prove Conjecture 5.8 would be to relate \( n_{0,d}^{K_{\mathbb{P}^2},\mathbb{R}} \) to some kind of real version of the Gromov-Witten theory of the pair \((\mathbb{P}^2, E)\), and then to prove a real version of the tropical correspondence theorem of [Gab19]. The relevant tools of real Gromov-Witten theory do not seem to be developed enough yet, and so we leave this question open.

- Conjecture 5.8 is true for \( d \) even for almost trivial reasons: we have \( n_{0,d}^{K_{\mathbb{P}^2},\mathbb{R}} = 0 \), and as \( \dim M_{d,1} = d^2 + 1 \) is odd, we also have \( e(M_{d,1}(\mathbb{R})) = P(M_{d,1}(-1) = 0 \) by Poincaré duality.

- In low degrees, the real Gopakumar-Vafa invariants \( n_{0,d}^{K_{\mathbb{P}^2},\mathbb{R}} \) have been computed by some real topological vertex arguments in the physics paper [KW09]. Assuming that these arguments can be made completely rigorous, which is likely but apparently not yet done\(^2\), we can compare the explicit results of Table 2 on page 33 for \( n_{0,d}^{K_{\mathbb{P}^2},\mathbb{R}} \) in low degrees, with explicit computations of \( e(M_{d,1}(\mathbb{R})) = P(M_{d,1}(-1), \) which can be done using either the known computations of \( P(M_{d,1})(q) \) in the literature ([CM14] for \((d, \chi) = (4,1)\), [CC16] [Yua14] [Mai13] for \((d, \chi) = (5,1)\), [CC15] for \((d, \chi) = (6,1)\), and Table 2 of [HKPK13] for physics predictions for \( d \leq 7 \) ), or using our scattering algorithm. We have checked this way that Conjecture 5.8 holds for \( d \leq 7 \).

6. SOME HEURISTIC EXPLANATION

As in the rest of the paper, we consider \( E \) a smooth cubic in the complex projective plane \( \mathbb{P}^2 \). We denote \( V \) the complement of \( E \) in \( \mathbb{P}^2 \). As \( E \) is an anticanonical divisor of \( \mathbb{P}^2 \), the noncompact surface \( V \) is naturally holomorphic symplectic.

In this Section, we give an heuristic conceptual explanation for Theorem 5.9 of [Bou19a], i.e. the equality \( \mathcal{D}_{u,v}^{\mathbb{P}^2} = S(\mathcal{D}^{\text{in}}_{u,v}) \), where \( S(\mathcal{D}^{\text{in}}_{u,v}) \) is viewed in tropical terms as in Section 3. The thing we need to understand is why the space where \( S(\mathcal{D}^{\text{in}}_{u,v}) \) lives, which by Section 3 is a tropical version of \((\mathbb{P}^2, E)\), and so morally (in some appropriate tropical limit) the base of a Strominger-Yau-Zaslow torus fibration on \( V \), should be identified with the space where \( \mathcal{D}_{u,v}^{\mathbb{P}^2} \) lives, which is a space of stability conditions on \( D_0^b(K_{\mathbb{P}^2}) \). Furthermore, we would like to understand why the holomorphic curves in the Strominger-Yau-Zaslow fibration of \( V \), described tropically by \( S(\mathcal{D}^{\text{in}}_{u,v}) \), should be related to Bridgeland semistable objects in \( D_0^b(K_{\mathbb{P}^2}) \), whose wall-crossing behavior is described by \( \mathcal{D}_{u,v}^{\mathbb{P}^2} \). Our heuristic explanation will have three steps:

\(^2\)I thank Penka Georgieva for a discussion of this point.
6.1. **Hyperkähler rotation for** $V$. It was recently shown [CJL19] that $V$ admits an hyperkähler metric and a special Lagrangian torus fibration $\pi: V \to B \simeq \mathbb{R}^2$, with three singular fibers. Tropicalization of holomorphic curves in $V$ naturally live in $B$ (after tropical limit). It is also shown in [CJL19] that, after hyperkähler rotation, this torus fibration becomes an elliptic fibration $\pi: M \to B \simeq \mathbb{C}$, which is the fiberwise compactified mirror of $\mathbb{P}^2$ (see Section 3.1 of [AKO06]). In other words, despite being very different as algebraic complex manifolds ($V$ is affine whereas $M$ admits a structure of elliptic fibration), $V$ and $M$ are diffeomorphic and there exists an hyperkähler metric which is compatible with both complex structures. In order keep the exposition short, we suppress the discussion of the exact match of parameters (there is in fact a family of hyperkähler metrics, and the mirror of $\mathbb{P}^2$ has complex and Kähler moduli).

Under hyperkähler rotation, holomorphic curves in $U$ with boundary on torus fibers of the Lagrangian torus fibration become open special Lagrangian submanifolds in $M$ with boundary on fibers of the elliptic fibration. More precisely, the special Lagrangians submanifolds obtained in that way are special Lagrangian submanifolds of a given specific phase.

6.2. **Suspension from dimension 2 to dimension 3.** We refer to [Sei10] for the topic of suspension in symplectic geometry. For every $t \in B \simeq \mathbb{C}$ away from critical values of $\pi$, we define a noncompact Calabi-Yau 3-fold $Y_t$ by the equation $uv = \pi - t$. The 3-fold $Y_t$ is a fibration in affine quadrics over the surface $M$, degenerate over the fiber $\pi^{-1}(t)$ in $M$. By suspension, the open special Lagrangians in $M$ with boundary on the fiber $\pi^{-1}(t)$ of the elliptic fibration lift to closed special Lagrangians in $Y_t$.

The parameter $t \in B$ is a complex moduli of the Calabi-Yau 3-fold $Y_t$. From a symplectic point of view, $Y_t$ is independent of $t$, and we denote $F(Y)$ the corresponding compact Fukaya category. It is a general expectation [The01, TY02, Joy15] that a choice of complex structure should define a Bridgeland stability condition on $F(Y)$, with stable objects related to special Lagrangian submanifolds. So, we should be able to view $B$ as a space of Bridgeland stability conditions on $F(Y)$. For $t \in B$, the closed special Lagrangian submanifolds obtained by suspension of open special Lagrangian submanifolds in $M$ with boundary on the fiber $\pi^{-1}(t)$ should be $t$-stable objects of $F(Y)$. Furthermore, the phase of the central charge should be related to the phase as special Lagrangian.

6.3. **Mirror symmetry for** $K_{\mathbb{P}^2}$. The last point is to remark that the noncompact Calabi-Yau 3-fold $Y_t$ is mirror to the noncompact Calabi-Yau 3-fold $K_{\mathbb{P}^2}$, see [Sei10, CPU16]. In particular, we have $F(Y) = D^b_c(K_{\mathbb{P}^2})$, where $D^b_c(K_{\mathbb{P}^2})$ is the derived category of compactly supported sheaves on $K_{\mathbb{P}^2}$. We have $D^b_c(K_{\mathbb{P}^2}) \subset D^b_c(K_{\mathbb{P}^2})$. Thus, $B$ should be identified with a space of stability conditions on $D^b_c(K_{\mathbb{P}^2})$. Furthermore, for every $t \in B$, counts of special Lagrangians in $Y_t$ should coincide with counts of $t$-stable objects in $D^b_c(K_{\mathbb{P}^2})$. 
6.4. **Conclusion.** Combining the previous steps, starting with an holomorphic curve in $V = \mathbb{P}^2 - E$ with boundary on $\pi^{-1}(t)$, we get an open special Lagrangian submanifold in $M$ with boundary on $\pi^{-1}(t)$, then a closed special Lagrangian submanifold in $Y_t$, and finally a $t$-stable object in $D^b_c(K_{\mathbb{P}^2})$. The special Lagrangians submanifolds obtained from holomorphic curves by hyperkähler rotation have a specific phase, and so the resulting $t$-stable objects in $D^b_c(K_{\mathbb{P}^2})$ have a central charge of specific phase. This explains why $\mathcal{D}_{u,v}$ is defined in terms of existence of semistable objects with a central charge of specific phase (more precisely, purely imaginary).

It is an heuristic explanation and not a proof for the following reasons:

- Directly constructing Bridgeland stability conditions on Fukaya categories such as $F(Y)$ is quite non-trivial.
- Even assuming that as we can directly prove the existence of the expected Bridgeland stability conditions on $F(Y)$, one should prove that in the hyperkähler rotation step, the virtual counts of holomorphic discs given by Gromov-Witten theory coincide with the virtual counts of special Lagrangians given by applying Donaldson-Thomas theory to $F(Y)$. At the higher genus/refined level, as in Section 5.2 one should understand why counts of higher genus open curves coincide after the change of variables $q = e^{i\hbar}$ with the refined Donaldson-Thomas invariants extracted from the moduli spaces of special Lagrangians. The difficulty is in the virtual aspect of both sides (e.g. curves in Gromov-Witten theory are far from embedded in general). A non-trivial indication for such correspondence is the known fact [BP08][HRV08][CDP14] that higher genus Gromov-Witten invariants of a local curve $\Sigma$ are related through the change of variables $q = e^{i\hbar}$ to the weight polynomials of the $GL_n$ character varieties of $\Sigma$ (moduli spaces of $GL_n$ local systems on $\Sigma$ should be thought as local contributions of $\Sigma$ to the Fukaya category), but a general argument seems to be lacking.
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