

A critical point analysis of Landau–Ginzburg potentials with bulk in Gelfand–Cetlin systems

Yunhyung Cho, Yoosik Kim, and Yong-Geun Oh

Abstract. Using the bulk-deformation of Floer cohomology by Schubert cycles and non-Archimedean analysis of Fukaya–Oh–Ohta–Ono’s bulk-deformed potential function, we prove that every complete flag manifold $\mathrm{Fl}(n)$ ($n \geq 3$) with a monotone Kirillov–Kostant–Souriau symplectic form carries a continuum of non-displaceable Lagrangian tori which degenerates to a non-torus fiber in the Hausdorff limit. In particular, the Lagrangian S^3 -fiber in $\mathrm{Fl}(3)$ is non-displaceable, answering the question of which was raised by Nohara–Ueda who computed its Floer cohomology to be vanishing.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Lagrangian Floer theory on Gelfand–Cetlin systems	3
3. Decompositions of the gradient of potential function	9
4. Solvability of split leading term equation	18
5. Calculation of potential function deformed by Schubert cycles	26
References	29

1. Introduction

This article is a sequel to Part I of [CKO17]. Here we focus on detecting non-displaceable Lagrangian fibers of the Gelfand–Cetlin systems. We abbreviate ‘Gelfand–Cetlin’ by writing ‘GC’ and so on.

Lagrangian Floer theory on GC systems was firstly studied by Nishinou, Nohara, and Ueda [NNU10]. They proved that the Lagrangian GC torus fiber at the center of the GC polytope is non-displaceable. To show it, they calculated the potential function by constructing a toric degeneration from a GC system to a toric moment map and finding a weak bounding cochain such that the deformed Floer cohomology is non-vanishing. The GC system admits non-torus Lagrangian GC fibers at the lower dimensional strata of the GC polytope, which make Floer theory of the system more interesting and challenging. Using non-abelian symmetry or discrete symmetry, particular fibers of limited cases of Grassmannians have been investigated in [EL15, NU16, EL19].

Motivated by those works, the present authors systematically studied topological/geometrical type of GC fibers and provided a complete classification thereof in terms of the combinatorial ladder diagram in [CKO17]. In this paper, we discuss non-displaceable GC fibers on complete flag manifolds equipped with monotone Kirillov–Kostant–Souriau symplectic forms (KKS forms).

Let $\lambda = (\lambda_1 > \lambda_2 > \cdots > \lambda_n)$ be a decreasing sequence of real numbers so that the co-adjoint orbit \mathcal{O}_λ is diffeomorphic to a complete flag manifold $\mathrm{Fl}(n)$. When the KKS form ω_λ is *monotone*, we shall show non-displaceability of certain torus fibers and non-torus fibers. First, we describe putative positions of non-displaceable fibers. By scaling ω_λ if necessary, we may assume that

$$(1.1) \quad \lambda = (\lambda_i := n - 2i + 1 \mid i = 1, \dots, n),$$

The first named author was supported by the National Research Foundation of Korea(NRF) grant funded by the Korea government(MSIP; Ministry of Science, ICT & Future Planning) (NRF-2017R1C1B5018168). The second named author is supported by the Simons Collaboration Grant on Homological Mirror Symmetry and Applications. The third named author is supported by the IBS project IBS-R003-D1.

which is the case where $[\omega_\lambda] = c_1(T\mathcal{O}_\lambda)$. In this case, the GC polytope Δ_λ is a reflexive polytope so that it admits a unique lattice point in its interior, see [BCFKvS00, Corollary 2.2.4]. Each Lagrangian face, a face containing Lagrangian fibers in its relative interior, admits a unique point satisfying certain Bohr–Sommerfeld condition, at which a monotone Lagrangian fiber is located [CK19]. A candidate is a line segment connecting the center of the polytope and the position of a monotone Lagrangian fiber (in the case of monotone complete flag manifolds).

To verify a non-torus Lagrangian fiber is non-displaceable, a family of Lagrangian tori whose Hausdorff limit is the non-torus fiber will be taken into account. Once we show that the tori are non-displaceable, we then obtain non-displaceability of the non-torus Lagrangian fiber.

We start from the simplest case where the co-adjoint orbit \mathcal{O}_λ of a sequence $\lambda = (\lambda_1 > \lambda_2 > \lambda_3)$. In this case, Pabiniak investigated displaceable GC fibers.

Theorem 1.1 ([Pab15]). *For $\lambda = (\lambda_1 > \lambda_2 > \lambda_3)$, let $(\mathcal{O}_\lambda, \omega_\lambda)$ be as above.*

- (1) *If ω_λ is not monotone, all the fibers but one over the center are displaceable.*
- (2) *If ω_λ is monotone, all the fibers but those over the line segment*

$$(1.2) \quad I := \{(u_{1,1}, u_{1,2}, u_{2,1}) = (0, a - t, -a + t) \in \mathbb{R}^3 : 0 \leq t \leq a\}$$

are displaceable where $2a = \lambda_1 - \lambda_2$. Observe the line segment I is the red line in Figure 1.




FIGURE 1. The positions of non-displaceable GC Lagrangian fibers in $\text{Fl}(3)$.

Note that the line segment I connects the center $(0, a, -a)$ of the GC polytope Δ_λ and the position $(0, 0, 0)$ of the Lagrangian 3-sphere.

The following theorem asserts every GC fiber in the family $\{\Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{u}) \mid \mathbf{u} \in I\}$ is indeed non-displaceable. Thus, together with Theorem 1.1, our result provides the complete classification of displaceable and non-displaceable Lagrangian GC fibers when ω_λ is monotone.

Theorem A (Theorem 2.9). *Let $\lambda = (\lambda_1 = 2 > \lambda_2 = 0 > \lambda_3 = -2)$ and consider the co-adjoint orbit $(\mathcal{O}_\lambda, \omega_\lambda)$. Then the fiber over a point $\mathbf{u} \in \Delta_\lambda$ is non-displaceable if and only if $\mathbf{u} \in I$ where*

$$(1.3) \quad I := \{(u_{1,1}, u_{1,2}, u_{2,1}) = (0, 1 - t, -1 + t) \in \mathbb{R}^3 \mid 0 \leq t \leq 1\}$$

In particular, the Lagrangian 3-sphere $\Phi_\lambda^{-1}(0, 0, 0)$ is non-displaceable.

Remark 1.2. Nohara and Ueda [NU16] calculated a Floer cohomology of the Lagrangian 3-sphere $\Phi_\lambda^{-1}(0, 0, 0)$, which turns out to be zero over the Novikov field Λ and hence non-displaceability of the fiber remained open. Theorem A resolves the question showing that it is non-displaceable.

Next, we deal with a general case for an arbitrary positive integer $n \geq 4$ where λ is given as in (1.1). In this case, the GC polytope Δ_λ is a reflexive polytope whose center is

$$(u_{i,j} := j - i \mid i + j \leq n) \in \Delta_\lambda \subset \mathbb{R}^{n(n-1)/2}.$$

Consider the face f_m of Δ_λ defined by

$$\{u_{i,j} = u_{i,j+1} \mid 1 \leq i \leq m, 1 \leq j \leq m-1\} \cup \{u_{i+1,j} = u_{i,j} \mid 1 \leq i \leq m-1, 1 \leq j \leq m\}$$

for any integer m satisfying $2 \leq m \leq \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$. Note that there are $(\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor - 1)$ such faces in Δ_λ .

The candidates for non-displaceable Lagrangian fibers are the fibers over the line segment $I_m \subset \Delta_\lambda$ connecting the center of Δ_λ and the center of f_m for each $m \geq 2$. Explicitly, the line segment I_m is parameterized by $\{I_m(t) \in \Delta_\lambda \mid 0 \leq t \leq 1\}$ where

$$(1.4) \quad I_m(t) := \begin{cases} u_{i,j}(t) = (j - i) - (j - i)t & \text{if } \max(i, j) \leq m \\ u_{i,j}(t) = (j - i) & \text{if } \max(i, j) > m. \end{cases}$$

We denote by $L_m(t)$ the Lagrangian GC fiber over the point $I_m(t)$, that is $L_m(t) := \Phi_\lambda^{-1}(I_m(t))$. The following is the main theorem of the present paper.

Theorem B (Theorem 4.18). *Let $\lambda = (\lambda_i := n - 2i + 1 \mid i = 1, \dots, n)$ be an n -tuple of real numbers for an arbitrary integer $n \geq 4$. Consider the co-adjoint orbit $(\mathcal{O}_\lambda, \omega_\lambda)$. Then each Gelfand–Cetlin fiber $L_m(t)$ is non-displaceable Lagrangian for every $2 \leq m \leq \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$.*

The main ingredient of the proof of the theorem is a careful non-Archimedean (or T -adic) analysis of the critical point equation of the bulk-deformed potential in the spirit of [FOOO11, FOOO12, KLS19] generalizing the analysis from the toric to the Gelfand–Cetlin system.

Example 1.3. A monotone complete flag manifold $\text{Fl}(7)$ admits (at least) two line segments I_2 and I_3 in the GC polytope over which the fibers are non-displaceable as depicted in Figure 2. Particularly, it has non-displaceable Lagrangian fibers diffeomorphic to $U(2) \times T^{17}$ and $U(3) \times T^{12}$.




FIGURE 2. Positions of non-displaceable Lagrangian GC fibers in $\text{Fl}(7)$.

Remark 1.4. The third named author with Fukaya, Ohta, and Ono [FOOO11] found a continuum of non-displaceable torus fibers on some compact toric manifolds including a non-monotone toric blowup of \mathbb{CP}^2 at two points, see also Woodward [Woo11]. Using the degeneration models, they also produced a continuum of non-displaceable Lagrangian tori on $\mathbb{CP}^1 \times \mathbb{CP}^1$ and the cubic surface respectively in [FOOO12] and [FOOO19]. Vianna [Via18] also showed a continuum of non-displaceable tori in $(\mathbb{CP}^1)^{2n}$. Sun [Sun17] found non-displaceable Lagrangian tori near a chain of Lagrangian two-spheres in a closed symplectic four manifold and del Pezzo surfaces.

2. Lagrangian Floer theory on Gelfand–Cetlin systems

In this section, after briefly recalling Lagrangian Floer theory and its deformation developed by the third named author with Fukaya, Ohta, and Ono in a general context, we review the work of Nishinou, Nohara, and Ueda about the calculation of the potential function of a GC system. Then, using the combinatorial description of Schubert cycles in complete flag manifolds by Kogan, we will compute the potential function deformed by a combination of Schubert cycles of codimension two as a Laurent series. Finally, combining those ingredients, we give the proof of Theorem A.

2.1. Potential functions of Gelfand–Cetlin systems

We begin by setting up the notations.

- $\Lambda := \{ \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} a_i T^{\lambda_i} \mid a_i \in \mathbb{C}, \lambda_i \in \mathbb{R}, \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_i = \infty \}$
- $\mathfrak{v}_T: \Lambda \setminus \{0\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad \mathfrak{v}_T \left(\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} a_j T^{\lambda_j} \right) := \inf_j \{ \lambda_j \mid a_j \neq 0 \}$
- $\Lambda_0 := \mathfrak{v}_T^{-1}[0, \infty) \cup \{0\} = \{ \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} a_i T^{\lambda_i} \in \Lambda \mid \lambda_i \geq 0 \}$
- $\Lambda_+ := \mathfrak{v}_T^{-1}(0, \infty) \cup \{0\} = \{ \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} a_i T^{\lambda_i} \in \Lambda \mid \lambda_i > 0 \}$
- $\Lambda_U := \Lambda_0 \setminus \Lambda_+ = \{ \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} a_i T^{\lambda_i} \in \Lambda_0 \mid \mathfrak{v}_T \left(\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} a_i T^{\lambda_i} \right) = 0 \}.$

For a relatively spin closed Lagrangian submanifold L in a closed symplectic manifold (X, ω) , by the work of Fukaya [Fuk10], one can associate an A_∞ -algebra $\{\mathfrak{m}_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ on the Λ_0 -valued de Rham complex of L . Following the procedure in [FOOO09a], the constructed A_∞ -algebra can be converted into the canonical model on $H^\bullet(L; \Lambda_0)$.

A solution $b \in H^1(L; \Lambda_+)$ of the (weak) Maurer–Cartan equation

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \mathfrak{m}_k(b^{\otimes k}) \equiv 0 \pmod{\text{PD}[L]}$$

is called a (weak) bounding cochain. The value of the potential function W at a bounding cochain b is assigned to be the multiple of the Poincaré dual $\text{PD}[L]$ of L . Namely, we solve

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \mathfrak{m}_k(b^{\otimes k}) = W(b) \cdot \text{PD}[L], \text{ with } W(b) \in \Lambda_0.$$

Since $\text{PD}[L]$ is the strict unit of the A_∞ -algebra (on the de Rham model), the deformed map \mathfrak{m}_1^b defined by

$$\mathfrak{m}_1^b(h) := \sum_{l,k} \mathfrak{m}_{l+k+1}(b^{\otimes l}, h, b^{\otimes k})$$

becomes a differential and thus its cohomology (deformed by b) over Λ_0 is defined. Let

- $HF((L, b); \Lambda_0) := \text{Ker}(\mathfrak{m}_1^b) / \text{Im}(\mathfrak{m}_1^b)$
- $HF((L, b); \Lambda) := HF((L, b); \Lambda_0) \otimes_{\Lambda_0} \Lambda$.

The reader is referred to [FOOO09b, FOOO10, FOOO11, FOOO16] for details.

Now, we restrict to the case of a Lagrangian GC torus fiber $\Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{u})$ in a co-adjoint orbit \mathcal{O}_λ . As a deformation of the action of the Borel subgroup, Kogan and Miller [KM05] realized the toric degeneration of a flag manifold given by Gonciulea–Lakshmibai [GL96]. Using the degeneration of a (partial) flag manifold to the GC toric variety, Nishinou–Nohara–Ueda constructed a degeneration of the GC system of \mathcal{O}_λ to the moment map of the toric variety.

Theorem 2.1 (Theorem 1.2 in [NNU10]). *For any non-increasing sequence $\lambda = (\lambda_1 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_n)$, there exists a toric degeneration of the Gelfand–Cetlin system Φ_λ on the co-adjoint orbit $(\mathcal{O}_\lambda, \omega_\lambda)$ in the following sense.*

- (1) *There is a flat family $f: \mathcal{X} \rightarrow I = [0, 1]$ of algebraic varieties and a two form $\tilde{\omega}$ on \mathcal{X} such that*
 - (a) $X_0 := f^{-1}(0)$ *is the toric variety associated with the Gelfand–Cetlin polytope Δ_λ and $\omega_0 := \tilde{\omega}|_{X_0}$ is a torus-invariant Kähler form.*
 - (b) $X_1 := f^{-1}(1)$ *is the co-adjoint orbit \mathcal{O}_λ and $\omega_1 = \tilde{\omega}|_{X_1}$ is the Kirillov–Kostant–Souriau symplectic form ω_λ .*
- (2) *There is a family $\{\Phi_t \mid X_t \rightarrow \Delta_\lambda\}_{0 \leq t \leq 1}$ of completely integrable systems such that Φ_0 is the moment map for the torus action on X_0 and Φ_1 is the Gelfand–Cetlin system.*
- (3) *Let $\Delta_\lambda^{\text{sm}} := \Delta_\lambda \setminus \Phi_0(\text{Sing}(X_0))$ and $X_t^{\text{sm}} := \Phi_t^{-1}(\Delta_\lambda^{\text{sm}})$ where $\text{Sing}(X_0)$ is the set of singular points of X_0 . Then there exists a flow ϕ_t on \mathcal{X} such that for each $0 \leq t \leq s$, the restricted flow $\phi_t|_{X_s^{\text{sm}}}: X_s^{\text{sm}} \rightarrow X_{s-t}^{\text{sm}}$ respects the symplectic structures and the complete integrable systems:*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} (X_s^{\text{sm}}, \omega_s) & \xrightarrow{\phi_t|_{X_s^{\text{sm}}}} & (X_{s-t}^{\text{sm}}, \omega_{s-t}) \\ & \searrow \Phi_s & \swarrow \Phi_{s-t} \\ & \Delta_\lambda^{\text{sm}} & \end{array}$$

Let $\phi'_s: X_s \rightarrow X_0$ be a (continuous) extension of the flow $\phi_s: X_s^{\text{sm}} \rightarrow X_0^{\text{sm}}$ in Theorem 2.1 ([NNU10, Section 8]). The extended map ϕ'_s transports Floer theory data from the toric moment map to a nearby integrable system. As the deformation in Theorem 2.1 is a family of Fano varieties and the GC toric variety admits a small resolution at the singular loci, any holomorphic discs bounded by L intersecting the loci collapsing to the singular loci of X_0 must have the Maslov index strictly greater than two so that such discs do *not* contribute to the potential

function. Furthermore, because the Fredholm regularity is an open condition, the holomorphic discs of Maslov index two intersecting the toric divisor in the toric variety X_0 give rise to regular holomorphic discs at X_s for sufficiently small s . Set $X := X_s$ and let L be any Lagrangian torus fiber of $\Phi_s: X_s \rightarrow \Delta_\lambda$. Combining those with the results of Cho–Oh [CO06], Nishinou–Nohara–Ueda proved the followings.

- (1) Each Lagrangian torus fiber L does not bound any non-constant holomorphic discs whose classes are of Maslov index less than or equal to zero.
- (2) Every class $\beta \in \pi_2(X, L)$ of Maslov index two is Fredholm regular.
- (3) There is a one-to-one correspondence between the holomorphic discs of Maslov index two bounded by a Lagrangian GC torus fiber and the facets of GC polytope.
- (4) For each class β of Maslov index 2, the open Gromov–Witten invariant n_β , which counts the holomorphic discs passing through a generic point in L and representing β , is 1.

The above conditions imply that every 1-cochain in $H^1(L; \Lambda_0)$ is a weak bounding cochain and hence the potential function can be defined on $H^1(L; \Lambda_0)$. To extend deformation space from $H^1(L; \Lambda_+)$ to $H^1(L; \Lambda_0)$, one twists Floer theory by the holonomy of flat non-unitary line bundles as in [Cho08]. Then the potential function is expressed as

$$(2.1) \quad W(L; b) = \sum_{\beta} n_{\beta} \cdot \exp(\partial\beta \cap b) T^{\omega(\beta)/2\pi}$$

where the summation is taken over all homotopy classes in $\pi_2(X, L)$ of Maslov index two.

Setting

$$(2.2) \quad \Gamma(n) = \{(i, j) \mid 2 \leq i + j \leq n\},$$

we fix the basis $\{\gamma_{i,j} \mid (i, j) \in \Gamma(n)\}$ for $H^1(L; \mathbb{Z})$ dual to the basis for $H_1(L, \mathbb{Z})$ consisting of the orbits generated by periodic Hamiltonians $\{u_{i,j} \mid (i, j) \in \Gamma(n)\}$ in [GS83]. A 1-cochain $b \in H^1(L; \Lambda_0)$ is expressed as the linear combination $\sum_{(i,j) \in \Gamma(n)} x_{i,j} \cdot \gamma_{i,j}$ and take the exponential variables

$$(2.3) \quad y_{i,j} := e^{x_{i,j}}.$$

Then the potential function can be expressed as a Laurent polynomial $W(\mathbf{y})$ with respect to $\{y_{i,j} \mid (i, j) \in \Gamma(n)\}$. Setting $u_{i,n+1-i} := \lambda_i$, keep in mind that Δ_λ is defined by

$$\left\{ (u_{i,j}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n(n-1)/2} \mid u_{i,j+1} - u_{i,j} \geq 0, u_{i,j} - u_{i+1,j} \geq 0 \right\}.$$

Theorem 2.2 (Theorem 10.1 in [NNU10]). *Consider the Lagrangian torus L over a point $(u_{i,j} \mid (i, j) \in \Gamma(n))$ and set $u_{i,n+1-i} := \lambda_i$. Then the potential function on L is given by*

$$(2.4) \quad W(L; \mathbf{y}) = \sum_{(i,j)} \left(\frac{y_{i,j+1}}{y_{i,j}} T^{u_{i,j+1} - u_{i,j}} + \frac{y_{i,j}}{y_{i+1,j}} T^{u_{i,j} - u_{i+1,j}} \right).$$

For t with $0 \leq t < 1$, we can arrange the potential function of the fibers $L_m(t)$ over $I_m(t)$ as

$$(2.5) \quad \begin{aligned} W(L_m(t); \mathbf{y}) = & \left(\sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^{m-1} \frac{y_{i,j+1}}{y_{i,j}} + \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{y_{i,j}}{y_{i+1,j}} \right) T^{1-t} \\ & + \left(\sum_{\max(i,j) \geq m+1} \left(\frac{y_{i,j+1}}{y_{i,j}} + \frac{y_{i,j}}{y_{i+1,j}} \right) \right) T^1 + \left(\sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \left(\frac{y_{m-i,m+1}}{y_{m-i,m}} + \frac{y_{m,m-i}}{y_{m+1,m-i}} \right) \right) T^{1+it} \end{aligned}$$

For simplicity, we frequently omit $L_m(t)$ in $W(L_m(t); \mathbf{y})$ if $L_m(t)$ is clear in the context.

2.2. Bulk-deformations by Schubert cycles

We shall apply Lagrangian Floer theory deformed by ambient cycles of a symplectic manifold, developed in [FOOO09b, FOOO11]. We will exploit the cycles of the form

$$\mathbf{b} := \sum_{j=1}^B \mathbf{b}_j \cdot \mathcal{D}_j,$$

where each \mathcal{D}_j is a cycle of degree two not intersecting L . The deformed potential function is denoted by W^b .

We first recall from [FOOO11] the formula for the potential function of a torus fiber L deformed by a combination of toric divisors \mathcal{D}_j , $\mathbf{b} := \sum_{j=1}^B \mathbf{b}_j \cdot \mathcal{D}_j$, in a compact toric manifold X .

Theorem 2.3 ([FOOO11]). *The bulk-deformed potential function, also called the potential function with bulk, is*

$$(2.6) \quad W^b(L; b) = \sum_{\beta} n_{\beta} \cdot \exp \left(\sum_{j=1}^B (\beta \cap \mathcal{D}_j) \mathbf{b}_j \right) \exp(\partial \beta \cap b) T^{\omega(\beta)/2\pi}.$$

where the summation is taken over all homotopy classes in $\pi_2(X, L)$ of Maslov index two.

In the derivation of this in [FOOO11], the smoothness and the T^m -invariance of the relevant ambient cycles are used. Since Schubert cycles that we will use are neither smooth nor T^n -invariant in general, we will provide details of the proof of this theorem for the current GC case modifying the arguments used in the proof of [FOOO11, Proposition 4.7] similarly as done in [NNU10, Section 9], see Section 5. The upshot is that we still have the same formula for the potential function with bulk in the current GC case, see (5.8). Again by taking the system of exponential coordinates in (2.3), W^b in (5.8) becomes a Laurent polynomial with respect to $\{y_{i,j} \mid (i, j) \in \Gamma(n)\}$.

Theorem 2.4 (Section 8 in [FOOO11]). *If the bulk-deformed potential function $W^b(L; \mathbf{y})$ admits a critical point \mathbf{y} whose components are in Λ_U , then L is non-displaceable.*

In his thesis [Kog00], Kogan found an expression of a Schubert cycle in terms of a certain union of the inverse images of faces in the GC system of a complete flag manifold, see also Kogan–Miller [KM05]. Due to presence of non-torus fibers in [CKO17], the inverse image of a *single* face might have boundary so that it does *not* form a cycle. What he proved is that a certain combination of faces can form a cycle because the boundaries are cancelled out.

We review the result in terms of ladder diagrams. A facet in a GC polytope is called *horizontal* (resp. *vertical*) if it is given by $u_{i,j} = u_{i+1,j}$ (resp. $u_{i,j+1} = u_{i,j}$). Let $P_{i,i+1}^{\text{hor}}$ (resp. $P_{j+1,j}^{\text{ver}}$) be the union of horizontal (resp. vertical) facets between the i -th column and the $(i+1)$ -th column (resp. the $(j+1)$ -th row and the j -th row). That is,

$$P_{i,i+1}^{\text{hor}} := \bigcup_{s=1}^{n-i} \{u_{i,s} = u_{i+1,s}\}, \quad P_{j+1,j}^{\text{ver}} := \bigcup_{r=1}^{n-j} \{u_{r,j+1} = u_{r,j}\}$$

for $1 \leq i, j \leq n-1$ where $\{u_{\bullet,\bullet} = u_{\bullet,\bullet}\}$ denotes the facet given by the equation inside. Let

$$(2.7) \quad \mathcal{D}_{i,i+1}^{\text{hor}} := \Phi_{\lambda}^{-1}(P_{i,i+1}^{\text{hor}}), \quad \mathcal{D}_{j+1,j}^{\text{ver}} := \Phi_{\lambda}^{-1}(P_{j+1,j}^{\text{ver}}),$$

which are respectively called a *horizontal* and *vertical Schubert cycle* (of degree two). (See Theorem 2.6 below.)

Example 2.5. Consider the co-adjoint orbit $\mathcal{O}_{\lambda} \simeq \text{Fl}(6)$ where $\lambda = (5, 3, 1, -1, -3, -5)$. $P_{4,5}^{\text{hor}}$ is the union of two horizontal facets $P_{4,5}^{\text{hor}} = \{u_{4,2} = -3\} \cup \{u_{4,1} = u_{5,1}\}$ as in Figure 3 and $P_{4,3}^{\text{ver}}$ is the union of three vertical facets $P_{4,3}^{\text{ver}} = \{1 = u_{3,3}\} \cup \{u_{2,4} = u_{2,3}\} \cup \{u_{1,4} = u_{1,3}\}$ as in Figure 3.




FIGURE 3. $P_{4,5}^{\text{hor}}$ and $P_{4,3}^{\text{ver}}$ in $\text{Fl}(6)$

From the combinatorial process in [Kog00, KM05], we observe that the Schubert varieties associated with the simple transpositions with a complex codimension one are corresponding to either unions of horizontal facets or unions of vertical facets. The opposite Schubert varieties are corresponding to the other [KM05, Remark 9].

Theorem 2.6 (Theorem 2.3.1 in [Kog00], Theorem 8 in [KM05]). *The inverse image $\mathcal{D}_{\bullet, \bullet+1}^{\text{hor}}$ (or $\mathcal{D}_{\bullet+1, \bullet}^{\text{ver}}$) represents an (or opposite) Schubert cycle of degree two.*

Now, we apply (5.8), which is a counterpart of (2.3), to calculate the bulk-deformed potential function. Using the one-to-one correspondence in the property (3) in Section 2.1, let $\beta_{i+1,j}^{i,j}$ (resp. $\beta_{i,j}^{i,j+1}$) be the homotopy class in $\pi_2(\mathcal{O}_\lambda, L)$ represented by a holomorphic disc intersecting the facet $u_{i,j} = u_{i+1,j}$ (resp. $u_{i,j+1} = u_{i,j}$) once.

Lemma 2.7. *Let \mathcal{D} be either a horizontal or a vertical Schubert cycle in X_s . Then we have*

$$\beta_{i+1,j}^{i,j} \cap \mathcal{D} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \mathcal{D} = \mathcal{D}_{i,i+1}^{\text{hor}} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad \beta_{i,j}^{i,j+1} \cap \mathcal{D} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \mathcal{D} = \mathcal{D}_{j+1,j}^{\text{ver}} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Proof. Let $\phi'_s: X_s \rightarrow X_0$ be a (continuous) extension of the flow $\phi_s: X_s^{\text{sm}} \rightarrow X_0^{\text{sm}}$ in Theorem 2.1, see [NNU10, Section 8]. Let $\varphi: (\mathbb{D}, \partial\mathbb{D}) \rightarrow (X_s, L_s)$ be a holomorphic disc in the class $\beta_{i+1,j}^{i,j}$ of Maslov index two for example. We then have a (topological) disc $\phi'_s \circ \varphi: (\mathbb{D}, \partial\mathbb{D}) \rightarrow (X_s, L_s) \rightarrow (X_0, L_0)$, representing $(\phi'_s)_* \beta_{i+1,j}^{i,j}$. Note that there exists a holomorphic disc φ_0 by [CO06] in the class $(\phi'_s)_* \beta_{i+1,j}^{i,j} = [\phi'_s \circ \varphi]$. Meanwhile, by our choice of \mathcal{D} , $\phi'_s(\mathcal{D})$ is the union of the components over either $P_{i,i+1}^{\text{hor}}$ or $P_{j+1,j}^{\text{ver}}$. Since the flow ϕ'_s gives rise to a symplectomorphism from X_s^{sm} to X_0^{sm} and the image of the disc φ is contained in X_s^{sm} , the (local) intersection number should be preserved through the flow ϕ'_s . To calculate the intersection number, we consider a small resolution $p: \tilde{X}_0 \rightarrow X_0$. Because the intersection happens only outside the singular loci of X_0 , we can lift the divisor and the disc φ_0 to $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_0$ and $\tilde{\varphi}_0$ in \tilde{X}_0 without any change of the intersection number. Then we have

$$\beta_{i+1,j}^{i,j} \cap \mathcal{D} = [\varphi] \cap \mathcal{D} = [\tilde{\varphi}_0] \cap \tilde{\mathcal{D}}_0,$$

which completes the proof. \square

We take

$$(2.8) \quad \mathbf{b} := \sum_i \mathbf{b}_{i,i+1}^{\text{hor}} \cdot \varphi'_{1-s}(\mathcal{D}_{i,i+1}^{\text{hor}}) + \sum_j \mathbf{b}_{j+1,j}^{\text{ver}} \cdot \varphi'_{1-s}(\mathcal{D}_{j+1,j}^{\text{ver}})$$

where $\mathbf{b}_{i,i+1}^{\text{hor}}, \mathbf{b}_{j+1,j}^{\text{ver}} \in \Lambda_0$ and $\varphi'_{1-s}: X_1 \rightarrow X_s$. By abuse of notation for simplicity, we denote $\varphi'_{1-s}(\mathcal{D}_{i,i+1}^{\text{hor}})$ (resp. $\varphi'_{1-s}(\mathcal{D}_{j+1,j}^{\text{ver}})$) by $\mathcal{D}_{i,i+1}^{\text{hor}}$ (resp. $\mathcal{D}_{j+1,j}^{\text{ver}}$). By the homotopy invariance of the A_∞ -structures, we calculate the (bulk-deformed) Floer cohomology of $L_{m,s}(t)$ in X_s for s sufficiently close to 0. In particular, non-displaceability of $L_m(t)$ can be achieved as long as the Floer cohomology of $L_{m,s}(t)$ is non-zero. Whenever turning on a bulk-deformation, this process passing to $L_{m,s}(t)$ and $\varphi'_{1-s}(\mathcal{D})$ in X_s will be taken into consideration. Also, depending on the position t of a Lagrangian torus $L_m(\cdot)$, we need to consider different $\mathbf{b}_{i,i+1}^{\text{hor}}$ and $\mathbf{b}_{j+1,j}^{\text{ver}}$.

Corollary 2.8. *Taking a bulk-deformation parameter as in (2.8), the deformed potential function is expressed as*

$$(2.9) \quad W^{\mathbf{b}}(L; \mathbf{y}) = \sum_{(i,j)} \left(\exp(\mathbf{b}_{i,i+1}^{\text{hor}}) \frac{y_{i,j}}{y_{i+1,j}} T^{u_{i,j}-u_{i+1,j}} + \exp(\mathbf{b}_{j+1,j}^{\text{ver}}) \frac{y_{i,j+1}}{y_{i,j}} T^{u_{i,j+1}-u_{i,j}} \right).$$

Let

$$c_{i,i+1}^{\text{hor}} := \exp(\mathbf{b}_{i,i+1}^{\text{hor}}), \quad c_{j+1,j}^{\text{ver}} := \exp(\mathbf{b}_{j+1,j}^{\text{ver}}).$$

By definition, they lie in Λ_U . With this notation, the logarithmic derivative of the bulk-deformed potential becomes

$$(2.10) \quad \begin{aligned} y_{i,j} \frac{\partial W^{\mathbf{b}}}{\partial y_{i,j}}(\mathbf{y}) &= -c_{j+1,j}^{\text{ver}} \frac{y_{i,j+1}}{y_{i,j}} T^{u_{i,j+1}-u_{i,j}} - c_{i-1,i}^{\text{hor}} \frac{y_{i-1,j}}{y_{i,j}} T^{u_{i-1,j}-u_{i,j}} \\ &\quad + c_{i,i+1}^{\text{hor}} \frac{y_{i,j}}{y_{i+1,j}} T^{u_{i,j}-u_{i+1,j}} + c_{j,j-1}^{\text{ver}} \cdot \frac{y_{i,j}}{y_{i,j-1}} T^{u_{i,j}-u_{i,j-1}} \end{aligned}$$

2.3. Non-displaceable Gelfand–Cetlin fibers in $\text{Fl}(3)$

In this section, the case of $\text{Fl}(3)$ will be discussed in details. The following theorem will be proven as a warmup towards the general theorem.

Theorem 2.9 (Theorem A). *Let $\lambda = (\lambda_1 = 2 > \lambda_2 = 0 > \lambda_3 = -2)$. Consider the co-adjoint orbit \mathcal{O}_λ , a complete flag manifold $\text{Fl}(3)$ equipped with the monotone Kirillov–Kostant–Souriau symplectic form ω_λ . Then the Gelfand–Cetlin fiber over a point $\mathbf{u} \in \Delta_\lambda$ is non-displaceable if and only if $\mathbf{u} \in I$ where*

$$(2.11) \quad I := \{(u_{1,1}, u_{1,2}, u_{2,1}) = (0, 1-t, -1+t) \in \mathbb{R}^3 \mid 0 \leq t \leq 1\}$$

In particular, the Lagrangian 3-sphere $\Phi_\lambda^{-1}(0, 0, 0)$ is non-displaceable.

To deform Floer theory, we employ a combination of the vertical and horizontal divisors in (2.7) any of which do *not* intersect the torus fibers. Let

$$(2.12) \quad \mathbf{b} = \mathbf{b}_{2,1}^{\text{ver}} \cdot \mathcal{D}_{2,1}^{\text{ver}} + \mathbf{b}_{1,2}^{\text{hor}} \cdot \mathcal{D}_{1,2}^{\text{hor}} + \mathbf{b}_{3,2}^{\text{ver}} \cdot \mathcal{D}_{3,2}^{\text{ver}} + \mathbf{b}_{2,3}^{\text{hor}} \cdot \mathcal{D}_{2,3}^{\text{hor}}.$$

For the proof of Theorem 2.9, we need the following topological fact.

Proposition 2.10. *Let $\Phi: X \rightarrow \Delta \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a completely integrable system such that Φ is proper. If there exists a sequence $\{\mathbf{u}_i \mid i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ such that*

- (1) *Each $\Phi^{-1}(\mathbf{u}_i)$ is non-displaceable.*
- (2) *The sequence \mathbf{u}_i converges to some point \mathbf{u}_∞ in Δ .*

then $\Phi^{-1}(\mathbf{u}_\infty)$ is also non-displaceable.

Proof. For a contradiction, suppose that $\Phi^{-1}(\mathbf{u}_\infty)$ is displaceable. There is a Hamiltonian diffeomorphism ϕ and an open set U containing $\Phi^{-1}(\mathbf{u}_\infty)$ in X such that $\phi(U) \cap U = \emptyset$. For each i , there exists a point $x_i \in \Phi^{-1}(\mathbf{u}_i)$ such that $x_i \notin U$ since $\Phi^{-1}(\mathbf{u}_i)$ is non-displaceable. It implies that any subsequence of $\{x_i\}$ cannot converge to a point in U . On the other hand, passing to a subsequence, we may assume that x_i converges to x_∞ for some $x_\infty \in X$ since Φ is proper. By the continuity of Φ , we then have

$$\mathbf{u}_\infty = \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{u}_i = \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \Phi(x_i) = \Phi(x_\infty).$$

It leads to a contradiction that $x_\infty \in \Phi^{-1}(\mathbf{u}_\infty) \subset U$. □

We now start the proof of Theorem 2.9.

Proof of Theorem 2.9. For any fixed t with $0 \leq t < 1$, let $L(t)$ be the Lagrangian torus fiber over $(0, 1-t, -1+t) \in I$ in (2.11). Let $L_s(t)$ be the fiber corresponding to $L(t)$ in X_s via a toric degeneration of completely integrable systems in Theorem 2.1. By taking $s > 0$ sufficiently close to 0, the potential function of $L_s(t)$ can be arranged as

$$W(\mathbf{y}) = \left(\frac{y_{1,2}}{y_{1,1}} + \frac{y_{1,1}}{y_{2,1}} + y_{1,2} + \frac{1}{y_{2,1}} \right) T^{1-t} + \left(\frac{1}{y_{1,2}} + y_{2,1} \right) T^{1+t}.$$

We use a combination of Schubert cycles in (2.8) (or equivalently (2.12)) to deform the potential function. A strategy we take is to postpone determining bulk-deformation parameters. Namely, we start with a tentative parameter, determine solutions for \mathbf{y} first, and then adjust the parameter to make the chosen \mathbf{y} a critical point.

Take a *tentative* bulk-parameter $\mathbf{b}' := \mathbf{b}_{2,1}^{\text{ver}} \cdot \mathcal{D}_{2,1}^{\text{ver}}$ such that $\exp(\mathbf{b}_{2,1}^{\text{ver}}) = 1 + T^{2t}$, i.e.,

$$\mathbf{b}_{2,1}^{\text{ver}} = T^{2t} - \frac{1}{2}T^{4t} + \cdots \in \Lambda_+.$$

By Corollary 2.8, the potential function is deformed into

$$W^{\mathbf{b}'}(\mathbf{y}) = \left(\frac{y_{1,2}}{y_{1,1}} + \frac{y_{1,1}}{y_{2,1}} + y_{1,2} + \frac{1}{y_{2,1}} \right) T^{1-t} + \left(\frac{y_{1,2}}{y_{1,1}} + \frac{1}{y_{2,1}} + \frac{1}{y_{1,2}} + y_{2,1} \right) T^{1+t},$$

whose logarithmic derivatives are

$$\begin{cases} y_{1,1} \frac{\partial W^{\mathbf{b}'}}{\partial y_{1,1}}(\mathbf{y}) = \left(-\frac{y_{1,2}}{y_{1,1}} + \frac{y_{1,1}}{y_{2,1}} \right) T^{1-t} + \left(-\frac{y_{1,2}}{y_{1,1}} \right) T^{1+t} \\ y_{1,2} \frac{\partial W^{\mathbf{b}'}}{\partial y_{1,2}}(\mathbf{y}) = \left(\frac{y_{1,2}}{y_{1,1}} + y_{1,2} \right) T^{1-t} + \left(\frac{y_{1,2}}{y_{1,1}} - \frac{1}{y_{1,2}} \right) T^{1+t} \\ y_{2,1} \frac{\partial W^{\mathbf{b}'}}{\partial y_{2,1}}(\mathbf{y}) = \left(-\frac{y_{1,1}}{y_{2,1}} - \frac{1}{y_{2,1}} \right) T^{1-t} + \left(-\frac{1}{y_{2,1}} + y_{2,1} \right) T^{1+t}. \end{cases}$$

We set $y_{1,2} = 1, y_{2,1} = 1$ and take $y_{1,1}$ as the solution of $(y_{1,1})^2 = 1 + T^{2t}$ satisfying $y_{1,1} \equiv -1 \pmod{T^{>0}}$. It is easy to see that $y_{1,1} \frac{\partial W^{\mathbf{b}'}}{\partial y_{1,1}}(\mathbf{y}) = 0$. Note that $y_{1,1}$ is of the form $y_{1,1} \equiv -1 - \frac{1}{2}T^{2t} \pmod{T^{>2t}}$.

We now adjust a bulk-deformation parameter from \mathbf{b}' to \mathbf{b} in order for the chosen $(y_{1,1}, y_{1,2}, y_{2,1})$ to be a critical point of $W^{\mathbf{b}}$. Let

$$\mathbf{b} := \mathbf{b}' + \mathbf{b}_{3,2}^{\text{ver}} \cdot \mathcal{D}_{3,2}^{\text{ver}} + \mathbf{b}_{2,3}^{\text{hor}} \cdot \mathcal{D}_{2,3}^{\text{hor}}.$$

Since $\mathcal{D}_{3,2}^{\text{ver}}$ and $\mathcal{D}_{2,3}^{\text{hor}}$ do not intersect the discs of Maslov index 2 emanating from $\mathcal{D}_{2,1}^{\text{ver}}$ and $\mathcal{D}_{1,2}^{\text{hor}}$ in $\pi_2(\mathcal{O}_\lambda, \Phi_\lambda^{-1}(t))$, we have

$$y_{1,1} \frac{\partial W^{\mathbf{b}}}{\partial y_{1,1}}(\mathbf{y}) = y_{1,1} \frac{\partial W^{\mathbf{b}'}}{\partial y_{1,1}}(\mathbf{y}).$$

Plugging the chosen $y_{i,j}$'s, we have

$$\begin{cases} y_{1,2} \frac{\partial W^{\mathbf{b}}}{\partial y_{1,2}}(\mathbf{y}) = \left(-\frac{1}{2} - \exp(\mathbf{b}_{3,2}^{\text{ver}}) \right) T^{1+t} + h^{(1,2)} \cdot T^{1+t} \\ y_{2,1} \frac{\partial W^{\mathbf{b}}}{\partial y_{2,1}}(\mathbf{y}) = \left(-\frac{1}{2} + \exp(\mathbf{b}_{2,3}^{\text{hor}}) \right) T^{1+t} + h^{(2,1)} \cdot T^{1+t}. \end{cases}$$

for some constant $h^{(1,2)}, h^{(2,1)} \in \Lambda_+$. By choosing $\mathbf{b}_{3,2}^{\text{ver}}, \mathbf{b}_{2,3}^{\text{hor}} \in \Lambda_0$ such that $\exp(\mathbf{b}_{3,2}^{\text{ver}}) = -\frac{1}{2} + h^{(1,2)}$ and $\exp(\mathbf{b}_{2,3}^{\text{hor}}) = \frac{1}{2} - h^{(2,1)}$, we can make $W^{\mathbf{b}}(\mathbf{y})$ admit a critical point. By Theorem 2.4, $L_s(t)$ has a non-vanishing (bulk-)deformed Floer cohomology. By the Hamiltonian invariance of A_∞ -structures, so does $L(t)$ and therefore it is non-displaceable.

In sum, each torus fiber over the line segment in (2.11) is non-displaceable. Furthermore, Proposition 2.10 yields non-displaceability of the Lagrangian 3-sphere. \square

3. Decompositions of the gradient of potential function

In this section, in order to prove Theorem B, we introduce *the split leading term equation* of the potential function in (2.5), which is the analogue of *the leading term equation* in [FOOO10, FOOO11]. We discuss the relation between its solvability and non-triviality of Floer cohomology under a certain choice of a bulk-deformation.

3.1. Outline of Section 3 and 4

Thanks to Theorem 2.4, the proof of Theorem B boils down to finding a bulk-deformation parameter \mathbf{b} such that the bulk-deformed potential function $W^{\mathbf{b}}$ admits a critical point. Section 3 and 4 will be occupied to discuss how to determine them.

Before giving the outline, we start with explaining why this process is non-trivial by pointing out the differences from the toric case. In the toric case, the (generalized) leading term equation was introduced to detect non-displaceable toric fibers effectively in [FOOO11, Section 11]. Roughly speaking, it consists of the initial terms of the gradient of a (bulk-deformed) potential function with respect to a suitable choice of exponential variables. It is proven therein that there always exists a bulk parameter \mathbf{b} so that the complex solution becomes a critical point of $W^{\mathbf{b}}$ if the leading term equation admits a solution whose components are non-zero. Indeed, the locations where the leading term equation is solvable are characterized by the intersection of certain tropicalizations in [KLS19]. The key features for proving the above statements are as follows. First, there is a one-to-one correspondence between the *honest* holomorphic discs bounded by

a torus fiber of Maslov index 2 and the facets of the moment polytope. Second, the pre-image of each facet represents a cycle of degree 2. Thus, all terms corresponding to the facets can be independently controlled.

In the GC system, the inverse image of a single facet is *not* a cycle in general because of the appearance of non-torus fibers at the boundary. We need to take into account a particular union of facets to represent a cycle of degree 2. The terms of W *cannot* be independently controlled if taking such a cycle for a bulk-deformation. Nonetheless, for the family of Lagrangian tori $L_m(t)$ over (1.4) in $\mathcal{O}_\lambda \simeq \text{Fl}(n)$ with the monotone symplectic form ω_λ , we shall show the existence of a bulk-deformation parameter \mathbf{b} and a critical point associated to \mathbf{b} .

In Section 3, we introduce the *split leading term equation*, see Definition 3.2. We then demonstrate how to determine a bulk-deformation parameter and promote a solution of the split leading term equation to a critical point of the bulk-deformed potential function once a solution of the split leading term equation is given. In Section 4, we show that the split leading term equation always admits a solution. One might think the situation looks somewhat similar to that of Bernstein-Kushnirenko [Ber75, Kus76] which, however, treats the *generic* system of Laurent polynomial equations while the system in our situation does not have much freedom. For a given fixed system of multi-variable equations finding a solution is not simple at all even with the aid of a computer. Yet, guided by the ladder diagrams decorated by the exponential variables and using the freedom in the choice of *seeds* (see Section 4.1) which provides some freedom of changing the coefficients of the equations, we are able to show the existence of a solution for the system of our current interest.

A brief description of our procedure of solving the critical point equation is now in order. Let m be any fixed integer with $2 \leq m \leq \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$ and $B(m)$ be the sub-diagram consisting of $(m \times m)$ lower-left unit boxes in the ladder diagram $\Gamma(n)$ of $\text{Fl}(n)$. The diagrams $\Gamma(n)$ and $B(m)$ are often regarded as collections of double indices as follows:

$$(3.1) \quad \begin{aligned} \Gamma(n) &= \{(i, j) \mid 2 \leq i + j \leq n\} \\ B(m) &= \{(i, j) \mid 1 \leq i, j \leq m\}. \end{aligned}$$

Recalling (2.5), the potential function of $L_m(t)$ is rearranged into several groups in terms of the energy filtration. The valuation of $\partial_{(i,j)} W(\mathbf{y})$ for $(i, j) \in B(m)$ is $(1 - t)$ and that of $\partial_{(i,j)} W(\mathbf{y})$ for $(i, j) \in \Gamma(n) \setminus B(m)$ is 1.

Decomposing the gradient of the potential function deformed by \mathbf{b} in (2.8) into two pieces along the boundary of $B(m)$, we determine a critical point in the following steps.

- (1) Find a solution $(y_{i,j}^{\mathbb{C}} \in \mathbb{C}^*)$ of the system of the equations $\partial_{(i,j)} W^{\mathbf{b}}(\mathbf{y}) \equiv 0 \pmod{T^{>1}}$ in $(\Gamma(n) \setminus B(m)) \cup \{(m, m)\}$ and equations relating the variables adjacent to $B(m)$ in Section 4.
- (2) Find a solution $(y_{i,j}^{\mathbb{C}} \in \mathbb{C}^*)$ of $\partial_{(i,j)} W^{\mathbf{b}}(\mathbf{y}) \equiv 0 \pmod{T^{>1-t}}$ in $B(m)$ in Section 3.3.
- (3) Find a solution $(y_{i,j} \in \Lambda_U)$ of $\partial_{(i,j)} W^{\mathbf{b}}(\mathbf{y}) = 0$ in $B(m)$ such that $y_{i,j} \equiv y_{i,j}^{\mathbb{C}} \pmod{T^{>0}}$ in Section 3.4.
- (4) Find a solution $(y_{i,j} \in \Lambda_U)$ of $\partial_{(i,j)} W^{\mathbf{b}}(\mathbf{y}) = 0$ in $\Gamma(n) \setminus B(m)$ such that $y_{i,j} \equiv y_{i,j}^{\mathbb{C}} \pmod{T^{>0}}$ in Section 3.5.

The *split leading term equation* (See Definition 3.2) arises in the first step (1).

Example 3.1. In the co-adjoint orbit \mathcal{O}_λ where $\lambda = (5, 3, 1, -1, -3, -5)$, the potential function of $L_2(t)$ is

$$W(L_2(t); \mathbf{y}) = \left(\frac{y_{1,2}}{y_{1,1}} + \frac{y_{1,1}}{y_{2,1}} + \frac{y_{1,2}}{y_{2,2}} + \frac{y_{2,2}}{y_{2,1}} \right) T^{1-t} + \left(\frac{y_{1,4}}{y_{1,3}} + \frac{y_{1,3}}{y_{2,3}} + \dots \right) T^1 + \left(\frac{y_{1,3}}{y_{1,2}} + \frac{y_{2,1}}{y_{3,1}} \right) T^{1+t}.$$

In this example, the valuation of partial derivatives of W jumps along the red line in Figure 4.

Turning on bulk-deformation, it follows from (2.10) that any solution complex number $y_{i,j} \in \mathbb{C}^*$ of the split leading term equation has to satisfy the system

$$(3.2) \quad \begin{cases} -c_{2,1}^{\text{ver}} \cdot \frac{y_{1,2}}{y_{1,1}} + c_{1,2}^{\text{hor}} \cdot \frac{y_{1,1}}{y_{2,1}} = 0, & c_{2,1}^{\text{ver}} \cdot \frac{y_{1,2}}{y_{1,1}} + c_{1,2}^{\text{hor}} \cdot \frac{y_{1,2}}{y_{2,2}} = 0, \\ -c_{1,2}^{\text{hor}} \cdot \frac{y_{1,1}}{y_{2,1}} - c_{2,1}^{\text{ver}} \cdot \frac{y_{2,2}}{y_{2,1}} = 0, & -c_{1,2}^{\text{hor}} \cdot \frac{y_{1,2}}{y_{2,2}} + c_{2,1}^{\text{ver}} \cdot \frac{y_{2,2}}{y_{2,1}} = 0, \end{cases}$$

and

$$(3.3) \quad \begin{cases} -c_{4-i+1,4-i}^{\text{ver}} \frac{y_{i,4-i+1}}{y_{i,4-i}} + c_{i,i+1}^{\text{hor}} \frac{y_{i,5-i}}{y_{i+1,5-i}} = 0 & \text{for } i = 1, \dots, 3, \\ -c_{5-i+1,5-i}^{\text{ver}} \frac{y_{i,5-i+1}}{y_{i,5-i}} - c_{i-1,i}^{\text{hor}} \frac{y_{i-1,5-i}}{y_{i,5-i}} + c_{5-i,5-i-1}^{\text{ver}} \frac{y_{i,5-i}}{y_{i,5-i-1}} + c_{i,i+1}^{\text{hor}} \cdot \frac{y_{i,4-i}}{y_{i+1,4-i}} = 0 & \text{for } i = 1, \dots, 4, \\ -c_{6-i+1,6-i}^{\text{ver}} \frac{1}{y_{i,6-i}} - c_{i-1,i}^{\text{hor}} \frac{y_{i-1,6-i}}{y_{i,6-i}} + c_{6-i,6-i-1}^{\text{ver}} \frac{y_{i,6-i}}{y_{i,6-i-1}} + c_{i,i+1}^{\text{hor}} y_{i,5-i} = 0 & \text{for } i = 1, \dots, 5. \end{cases}$$

The equations (3.2) and (3.3) come from the leading parts of the partial derivatives inside $B(2)$ and of the partial derivatives inside $\Gamma(6) \setminus B(2) \cup \{(2,2)\}$, respectively. Solving (3.2) corresponds to the step (2) and solving (3.3) corresponds to the step (1). In the rest of this section, assuming that the split leading term equation is solvable, we explain how to complete the remaining steps.




FIGURE 4. Decomposition of the gradient of the potential function in $\text{Fl}(6)$.

3.2. Split leading term equations

Let $\lambda = (\lambda_i := n - 2i + 1 \mid i = 1, \dots, n)$ be an n -tuple of real numbers for an arbitrary integer $n \geq 4$. Consider the co-adjoint orbit \mathcal{O}_λ , a complete flag manifold $\text{Fl}(n)$ equipped with the monotone form ω_λ . Fix the one parameter family of Lagrangian GC tori $L_m(t)$ over $I_m(t)$ for $0 \leq t < 1$ in \mathcal{O}_λ as in (1.4).

We define the split leading term equation arising from the potential function of $L_m(t)$. Let

$$k := \lceil n/2 \rceil,$$

that is $n = 2k - 1$ or $2k$. We denote

$$(3.4) \quad f_{(i,j)}^{\mathbf{b}}(\mathbf{y}) := \partial_{(i,j)} W(\mathbf{y}) \cdot T^{-\nu} \quad \text{where } \nu := \mathbf{v}(\partial_{(i,j)} W(\mathbf{y})).$$

We also denote $f_{(i,j)} := f_{(i,j)}^{\mathbf{b}}$ when $\mathbf{b} = 0$. For our purpose, it will suffice to take a bulk-deformation parameter of the type:

$$(3.5) \quad \mathbf{b} := \sum_{i \geq k} \mathbf{b}_{i,i+1}^{\text{hor}} \cdot \mathcal{D}_{i,i+1}^{\text{hor}} + \sum_{j \geq k} \mathbf{b}_{j+1,j}^{\text{ver}} \cdot \mathcal{D}_{j+1,j}^{\text{ver}}.$$

Note that horizontal (resp. vertical) facets in (3.5) are supported outside of the maximal diagonal (of $(k \times k)$ -size) embedded in $\Gamma(n)$. Therefore we have

$$\begin{cases} c_{i,i+1}^{\text{hor}} := \exp(\mathbf{b}_{i,i+1}^{\text{hor}} = 0) = 1 & \text{for } i < k, \\ c_{j+1,j}^{\text{ver}} := \exp(\mathbf{b}_{j+1,j}^{\text{ver}} = 0) = 1 & \text{for } j < k. \end{cases}$$

Definition 3.2. Let $2 \leq m \leq k$ be given. The *split leading term equation* (abbreviated as *SLT-equation*) of $\Gamma(n)$ associated with $B(m)$ is the system of the \mathbb{C} -valued equations given by

$$(3.6) \quad \begin{cases} \ell_{(i,j)}^{\mathbf{b},m}(\mathbf{y}) = 0 & \text{for all } (i,j) \in \Gamma(n) \\ \ell_{(l)}^m(\mathbf{y}) = 0 & \text{for all } l \text{ with } 1 \leq l \leq m \end{cases}$$

where we define

$$(3.7) \quad \ell_{(i,j)}^{\mathbf{b},m}(\mathbf{y}) := -c_{j+1,j}^{\text{ver}} \cdot \frac{y_{i,j+1}}{y_{i,j}} - c_{i-1,i}^{\text{hor}} \cdot \frac{y_{i-1,j}}{y_{i,j}} + c_{i,i+1}^{\text{hor}} \cdot \frac{y_{i,j}}{y_{i+1,j}} + c_{j,j-1}^{\text{ver}} \cdot \frac{y_{i,j}}{y_{i,j-1}},$$

$$(3.8) \quad \ell_{(l)}^m(\mathbf{y}) := (-1)^{m+1-l} \cdot \frac{y_{l,m+1}}{y_{m,m}} + \frac{y_{m,m}}{y_{m+1,l}}.$$

Here we split the system into two, one on $B(m)$ and the other outside $B(m)$, with the following constraints:

(1) For $\ell_{(i,j)}^{b,m}(\mathbf{y}) = 0$ with $(i, j) \in B(m)$, we set

$$(3.9) \quad \begin{cases} y_{m,s} := 0 & \text{for } s > m \\ y_{r,m} := \infty & \text{for } r > m. \end{cases}$$

(2) For $\ell_{(i,j)}^{b,m}(\mathbf{y}) = 0$ with $(i, j) \in \Gamma(n) \setminus B(m)$, we set

$$(3.10) \quad \begin{cases} y_{r,m} := \infty & \text{for } r < m, \quad y_{m,s} := 0 & \text{for } s < m \\ y_{\bullet,0} := \infty, \quad y_{0,\bullet} := 0, \quad y_{s,n+1-s} := 1 & \text{for } 1 \leq s \leq n \end{cases}$$

We explain the implication of the above constraints in writing the SLT-equation of $\Gamma(n)$ associated with $B(m)$. Cutting the boxes $B(m) \setminus \{(m, m)\}$ off from the diagram $\Gamma(n)$, we have decomposed blocks as in Figure 4.

For an index $(i, j) \in B(m)$, ignoring the terms containing the variables not in $B(m)$, $\ell_{(i,j)}^{b,m}(\mathbf{y})$ consists of the initial terms of the logarithmic derivative of W^b . Also, for an index $(i, j) \in \Gamma(n) \setminus B(m)$, ignoring the terms containing the variables within $B(m) \setminus \{(m, m)\}$, $\ell_{(i,j)}^{b,m}(\mathbf{y})$ consists of the initial terms of the logarithmic derivative of W^b whose formula is in (2.10). In addition to them, we solve the equation $\ell_{(i)}^m(\mathbf{y}) = 0$ for the diagonal variables $y_{s,n+1-s}$ adjacent to $B(m)$. It will be explained in (3.23) why the latter equation occurs.

Now introduce the following linear orders on $\Gamma(n)$.

Definition 3.3. We say $(i, j) \prec_{\text{hor}} (i', j')$ on $\Gamma(n)$ if one of the following alternatives holds

- (1) $i + j < i' + j'$,
- (2) $i + j = i' + j'$ and $i < i'$.

We also similarly define \prec_{ver} by replacing $i < i'$ by $j < j'$ in (2) above.

Existence of a solution for the SLT-equation (3.6) will guarantee that the assumption of the following lemma holds. We will repeatedly employ it in order to promote a solution in \mathbb{C}^* to that in Λ_U for the critical point equation of the (bulk-deformed) potential function.

Lemma 3.4. Suppose we are given $y_{i-1,j} \in \Lambda_U \cup \{0\}$, $y_{i,j-1} \in \Lambda_U \cup \{\infty\}$ and $y_{i,j}, y_{i,j+1}$. If there is a non-zero complex solution $y_{i+1,j}^{\mathbb{C}}$ of $\ell_{(i,j)}^{b,m}(\mathbf{y}) = 0 \pmod{T^{>0}}$ for some $c_{j+1,j}^{\text{ver}}, c_{i-1,i}^{\text{hor}}, c_{i,i+1}^{\text{hor}}$ and $c_{j,j-1}^{\text{ver}}$ in Λ_U , then $\ell_{(i,j)}^{b,m}(\mathbf{y}) = 0$ has a unique solution $y_{i+1,j} \in \Lambda_U$ such that $y_{i+1,j} \equiv y_{i+1,j}^{\mathbb{C}} \pmod{T^{>0}}$. The same holds by changing the role of $y_{i+1,j}$ and $y_{i,j+1}$.

Proof. We observe that $(i+1, j)$ is the maximal with respect to the order \prec_{hor} among the 4 points $(i-1, j)$, $(i, j-1)$, $(i, j+1)$, $(i+1, j)$. Then the proof immediately follows from the equation $\ell_{(i,j)}^{b,m}(\mathbf{y}) = 0$. It shows that $y_{i+1,j}$ can be expressed as a rational function in the other variables by the formula (3.7). \square




FIGURE 5. Graphical description of Lemma 3.4.

The following lemma is also an immediate consequence of the valuation analysis of the equation $\ell_{(i,j)}^{b,m}(\mathbf{y}) = 0$.

Lemma 3.5. If in addition to the assumption of Lemma 3.4 we assume

- $c_{j+1,j}^{\text{ver}}, c_{i-1,i}^{\text{hor}}, c_{i,i+1}^{\text{hor}}$ and $c_{j,j-1}^{\text{ver}}$ are non-zero complex numbers
- $\mathbf{v}_T(y_{i,j} - y_{i,j}^{\mathbb{C}}), \mathbf{v}_T(y_{i-1,j} - y_{i-1,j}^{\mathbb{C}})$ and $\mathbf{v}_T(y_{i,j-1} - y_{i,j-1}^{\mathbb{C}}) > \lambda$.

Then $\mathbf{v}_T(y_{i+1,j}) = \lambda$ if and only if $\mathbf{v}_T(y_{i,j+1}) = \lambda$.

Now we ready to state the main theorem of this section.

Theorem 3.6. *If there exist non-zero complex numbers $c_{i,i+1}^{\text{hor},\mathbb{C}}$ and $c_{j+1,j}^{\text{ver},\mathbb{C}}$ ($i, j \geq k$) for which the SLT-equation (3.6) admits a solution*

$$\mathbf{y}^{\mathbb{C}} := (y_{i,j}^{\mathbb{C}} \in \mathbb{C}^* \mid (i, j) \in \Gamma(n) \setminus B(m) \cup \{(m, m)\}),$$

then there exists a bulk-deformation \mathbf{b} (depending on m and t) of the form (3.5) such that

- (1) The bulk-deformed potential $W^{\mathbf{b}}(\mathbf{y})$ has a critical point $(y_{i,j} \in \Lambda_U \mid (i, j) \in \Gamma(n))$ satisfying

$$y_{i,j}^{\mathbb{C}} \equiv y_{i,j} \pmod{T^{>0}} \quad \text{for } (i, j) \in \Gamma(n) \setminus B(m) \cup \{(m, m)\}.$$

- (2) Also, $\exp(\mathbf{b}_{i,i+1}^{\text{hor}}) \equiv c_{i,i+1}^{\text{hor},\mathbb{C}}, \exp(\mathbf{b}_{j+1,j}^{\text{ver}}) \equiv c_{j+1,j}^{\text{ver},\mathbb{C}} \pmod{T^{>0}}.$

3.3. Solving SLT-equation with $\mathbf{b} = 0$ within $B(m)$

The goal of the section is to find a “symmetric” complex solution of

$$(3.11) \quad \ell_{(i,j)}^{0,m}(\mathbf{y}) = -\frac{y_{i,j+1}}{y_{i,j}} - \frac{y_{i-1,j}}{y_{i,j}} + \frac{y_{i,j}}{y_{i+1,j}} + \frac{y_{i,j}}{y_{i,j-1}} = 0 \quad \text{for all } (i, j) \in B(m).$$

Notice that with the choice we made in (3.5), $\mathbf{b}_{i,i+1}^{\text{hor}} = 0$ (resp. $\mathbf{b}_{j+1,j}^{\text{ver}} = 0$) for $i < k$ (resp. $j < k$). This in turn implies $\ell_{(i,j)}^{\mathbf{b},m}(\mathbf{y})$ given in (3.7) actually coincides with $\ell_{(i,j)}^{0,m}(\mathbf{y})$ for $(i, j) \in B(m)$.

Lemma 3.7. *Let $\mathbf{y}^{\mathbb{C}} := (y_{i,j}^{\mathbb{C}} \in \mathbb{C}^* \mid (i, j) \in B(m))$ be a solution of (3.11). Then*

$$\widetilde{y_{i,j}^{\mathbb{C}}} := c \cdot y_{i,j}^{\mathbb{C}} \quad \text{for } (i, j) \in B(m)$$

is also a solution of (3.11) for any non-zero complex number c .

Proof. The lemma immediately follows from $\ell_{(i,j)}^{0,m}(\mathbf{y}) = \ell_{(i,j)}^{0,m}(c \cdot \mathbf{y})$. \square

Lemma 3.8. *There exists a solution $\mathbf{y}^{\mathbb{C}} := (y_{i,j}^{\mathbb{C}} \in \mathbb{C}^* \mid i + j \leq m + 1)$ of the system of equations*

$$(3.12) \quad \ell_{(i,j)}^{0,m}(\mathbf{y}) = 0 \quad \text{for } i + j \leq m$$

such that it is symmetric in that

$$(3.13) \quad y_{i,j}^{\mathbb{C}} = (y_{j,i}^{\mathbb{C}})^{-1}.$$

Proof. It is straightforward to check

$$(3.14) \quad y_{i,j}^{\mathbb{C}} := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{for } i = j \\ \prod_{r=0}^{j-i-1} (2i + 2r) & \text{for } i < j \\ \prod_{r=0}^{i-j-1} (2j + 2r)^{-1} & \text{for } i > j \end{cases}$$

is a symmetric solution for (3.12). \square

We are ready to prove the existence of a symmetric solution in the sense of (3.13).

Proposition 3.9. *There exists a symmetric solution $\mathbf{y}^{\mathbb{C}} := (y_{i,j}^{\mathbb{C}} \in \mathbb{C}^* \mid (i, j) \in B(m))$ of (3.11) satisfying $y_{i,i}^{\mathbb{C}} = \pm 1$ for all $1 \leq i \leq m$.*

Proof. We start with a solution $y_{i,j}^{\mathbb{C}} \in \mathbb{C}^*$ for $i + j \leq m + 1$ given in Lemma 3.8. By the choice, it satisfies $y_{i,i}^{\mathbb{C}} = 1$ for all i with $2i \leq m$. For the remaining indices (i, j) with $i + j > m + 1$, we put

$$(3.15) \quad y_{i,j}^{\mathbb{C}} := (-1)^{i+j-m-1} y_{m+1-j, m+1-i}^{\mathbb{C}}.$$

We now show that this choice gives rise to a solution for (3.11).

For $(i, j) \in B(m)$ with $i + j \geq m + 2$, it is straightforward to check

$$\ell_{(i,j)}^{0,m}(\mathbf{y}^{\mathbb{C}}) = -\ell_{(m+1-j, m+1-i)}^{0,m}(\mathbf{y}^{\mathbb{C}}) = 0$$

from the choice made in Lemma 3.8 for $i + j \leq m + 1$. For the indices (i, j) with $i + j = m + 1$, the definition (3.15) implies $y_{i,j+1}^{\mathbb{C}} = -y_{i-1,j}^{\mathbb{C}}$ and hence

$$\ell_{(i,j)}^{0,m}(\mathbf{y}^{\mathbb{C}}) = -\frac{y_{i,j+1}^{\mathbb{C}}}{y_{i,j}^{\mathbb{C}}} - \frac{y_{i-1,j}^{\mathbb{C}}}{y_{i,j}^{\mathbb{C}}} + \frac{y_{i,j}^{\mathbb{C}}}{y_{i+1,j}^{\mathbb{C}}} + \frac{y_{i,j}^{\mathbb{C}}}{y_{i,j-1}^{\mathbb{C}}} = \frac{y_{i-1,j}^{\mathbb{C}}}{y_{i,j}^{\mathbb{C}}} - \frac{y_{i-1,j}^{\mathbb{C}}}{y_{i,j}^{\mathbb{C}}} + \frac{y_{i,j}^{\mathbb{C}}}{y_{i+1,j}^{\mathbb{C}}} - \frac{y_{i,j}^{\mathbb{C}}}{y_{i+1,j}^{\mathbb{C}}} = 0.$$

The symmetry (3.13) for (i, j) with $i + j \leq m + 1$ and the definition (3.15) also immediately imply the symmetry of the solution and $y_{i,i} = \pm 1$ for all $1 \leq i \leq m$. \square

Corollary 3.10. *For any $c \in \mathbb{C}^*$, there is a solution $\mathbf{y}^{\mathbb{C}} := (y_{i,j}^{\mathbb{C}} \in \mathbb{C}^* \mid (i, j) \in B(m))$ of (3.11) such that*

- (1) $y_{i,j}^{\mathbb{C}} \cdot y_{j,i}^{\mathbb{C}} = c^2$.
- (2) $y_{m,m}^{\mathbb{C}} = c$
- (3) $y_{i,i}^{\mathbb{C}} = \pm c$ for any $1 \leq i < m$.

Proof. The component $y_{m,m}^{\mathbb{C}}$ of a solution from Proposition 3.9 is either 1 or -1 . By multiplying by $\pm c$ to the solution found therein and using Lemma 3.7, we produce another solution that satisfy (1), (2) and (3). \square

3.4. Determination of \mathbf{y} inside $B(m)$

Hypothesis 3.11. *We assume that the SLT-equation of $\Gamma(n)$ associated with $B(m)$ has a solution for some non-zero complex numbers $c_{i,i+1}^{\text{hor}, \mathbb{C}}$'s and $c_{j+1,j}^{\text{ver}, \mathbb{C}}$'s for $i, j \geq k = \lceil n/2 \rceil$.*

Consider the variables

$$(3.16) \quad y_{m,m}^{\mathbb{C}} \text{ and } y_{i,m+1}^{\mathbb{C}} \text{ with } 1 \leq i \leq m$$

where $y_{i,j}^{\mathbb{C}} \in \mathbb{C}^*$ is the (i, j) -th component of a solution of the SLT-equation. In order to emphasize that (3.16) has been pre-determined, we denote the values by

$$(3.17) \quad d_{i,j} := y_{i,j}^{\mathbb{C}}, \quad (i, j) = (m, m) \text{ or } (i, m+1) \text{ with } 1 \leq i \leq m.$$

Setting it as the initial part for a solution and using Lemma 3.4, we promote it to a solution of (3.7) over Λ_U in the increasing order of $(i, j) \in B(m)$ with respect to the order \prec_{hor} . For a pictorial outline of this section, see Figure 6.




FIGURE 6. Pictorial outline of Section 3.4.

Step 1. $(i, j) \in B(m)$ with $i + j \leq m + 1$: We begin by taking $y_{i,j} := y_{i,j}^{\mathbb{C}} \in \mathbb{C}^* \subset \Lambda_U$ where $(y_{i,j}^{\mathbb{C}} \mid (i, j) \in B(m))$ is a solution satisfying $y_{m,m}^{\mathbb{C}} = d_{m,m}$ from Corollary 3.10 for all (i, j) with $i + j \leq m + 1$.

Step 2. $(i, j) \in B(m)$ with $m + 2 \leq i + j \leq 2m$: We first compute

$$\partial_{(i,j)} W(\mathbf{y}) = \left(-\frac{y_{j-1,m}}{y_{j,m}} + \frac{y_{j,m}}{y_{j+1,m}} + \frac{y_{j,m}}{y_{j,m-1}} \right) T^{1-t} + \left(-\frac{y_{j,m+1}}{y_{j,m}} \right) T^{1+(m-j)t}$$

from which we have

$$\nu = \mathbf{v}(\partial_{(i,j)} W(\mathbf{y})) = 1 - t.$$

Then by definition of $f_{(j,m)}$ in (3.4) with $\mathbf{b} = 0$, we have

$$f_{(j,m)}(\mathbf{y}) = \left(-\frac{y_{j-1,m}}{y_{j,m}} + \frac{y_{j,m}}{y_{j+1,m}} + \frac{y_{j,m}}{y_{j,m-1}} \right) + \left(-\frac{y_{j,m+1}}{y_{j,m}} \right) T^{(m-j+1)t}.$$

For an index j with $1 \leq j < m$, we decompose $f_{(j,m)}(\mathbf{y})$:

$$f_{(j,m)}(\mathbf{y}) = h_{(j,m)}^{(1)}(\mathbf{y}) + h_{(j,m)}^{(2)}(\mathbf{y}) T^{(m-j+1)t}$$

where

$$\begin{cases} h_{(j,m)}^{(1)}(\mathbf{y}) := \left(-\frac{y_{j-1,m}}{y_{j,m}} + \frac{y_{j,m}}{y_{j+1,m}} + \frac{y_{j,m}}{y_{j,m-1}} \right) + \left(-a_j \frac{y_{j,m}}{y_{j+1,m}} - a_j \frac{y_{j,m}}{y_{j,m-1}} \right) T^{(m-j+1)t} \\ h_{(j,m)}^{(2)}(\mathbf{y}) := -\frac{y_{j,m+1}}{y_{j,m}} + a_j \frac{y_{j,m}}{y_{j+1,m}} + a_j \frac{y_{j,m}}{y_{j,m-1}}. \end{cases}$$

Here we recall $y_{0,m} \equiv 0$ from (3.10). This term appears only for the case $j = 1$.

We will solve $f_{(j,i)}(\mathbf{y}) = 0$ on $B(m)$ inductively in the increasing order of \prec_{hor} . For this purpose, we utilize the following sufficient conditional equation.

Lemma 3.12. *A solution of the system*

$$(3.18) \quad \begin{cases} h_{(j,m)}^{(1)}(\mathbf{y}) = 0 \\ h_{(j,m)}^{(2)}(\mathbf{y}) - a_j \cdot f_{(j,m)}(\mathbf{y}) = -\frac{y_{j,m+1}}{y_{j,m}} + a_j \left(\frac{y_{j-1,m}}{y_{j,m}} + \frac{y_{j,m+1}}{y_{j,m}} T^{(m-j+1)t} \right) = 0 \end{cases}$$

is also a solution of $f_{(j,m)}(\mathbf{y}) = 0$.

Proof. The proof is omitted. \square

As the first step of the induction, suppose that we are given a solution $(y_{r,s} \in \Lambda_U \mid (r,s) \in B(m), r+s \leq m+j)$ of $f_{(r,s)}(\mathbf{y}) = 0$ for all $(r,s) \in B(m)$ and $r+s \leq m+j$ such that

$$\mathbf{v}_T(y_{r,s} - y_{r,s}^{\mathbb{C}}) \geq (m-j+2)t$$

as the induction hypothesis. Since each $y_{r,s}^{\mathbb{C}}$ is non-zero by our choice in (3.14), we derive

$$y_{i,j}^{\mathbb{C}} \neq 0 \text{ for all } (i,j) \in B(m)$$

from Corollary 3.10. Therefore we have $y_{j-1,m}^{\mathbb{C}}/y_{j,m}^{\mathbb{C}} \neq 0$ for $j \geq 2$ in particular. Furthermore thanks to the second equation of (3.18), the equation

$$\begin{cases} h_{(j,m)}^{(2)}(\mathbf{y}) - a_j \cdot f_{(j,m)}(\mathbf{y}) = 0 \\ y_{j,m+1} = d_{j,m+1} \end{cases}$$

uniquely determines an element $a_j \in \Lambda_U$. Then the equation $h_{(j,m)}^{(1)}(\mathbf{y}) = 0$ gives rise to

$$\frac{y_{j,m}^{\mathbb{C}}}{y_{j+1,m}} \left(1 - a_j T^{(m-j+1)t} \right) \equiv \left(\frac{y_{j-1,m}^{\mathbb{C}}}{y_{j,m}^{\mathbb{C}}} - \frac{y_{j,m}^{\mathbb{C}}}{y_{j,m-1}^{\mathbb{C}}} \right) + a_j \frac{y_{j-1,m}^{\mathbb{C}}}{y_{j,m}^{\mathbb{C}}} T^{(m-j+1)t} \pmod{T^{>(m-j+1)t}}.$$

Recall that $y_{r,s}^{\mathbb{C}}$'s arising from Corollary 3.10 are non-zero and satisfy

$$(3.19) \quad \ell_{(j,m)}^{0,m}(\mathbf{y}^{\mathbb{C}}) = -\frac{y_{j-1,m}^{\mathbb{C}}}{y_{j,m}^{\mathbb{C}}} + \frac{y_{j,m}^{\mathbb{C}}}{y_{j+1,m}^{\mathbb{C}}} + \frac{y_{j,m}^{\mathbb{C}}}{y_{j,m-1}^{\mathbb{C}}} = 0.$$

Therefore $y_{j+1,m} \in \Lambda_U$ is uniquely determined by induction with respect to $y_{i,\ell}^{\mathbb{C}}$'s with $i+\ell \leq j+m$ and satisfies

$$\mathbf{v}_T(y_{j+1,m} - y_{j+1,m}^{\mathbb{C}}) = (m-j+1)t.$$

Next as the second step of the induction along each diagonal, suppose that

$$\{(y_{r,s} \in \Lambda_U) \mid (r,s) \in B(m), (r,s) \prec_{\text{hor}} (i+j, m-i+1)\}$$

are given, and satisfies

$$\mathbf{v}_T(y_{r,s} - y_{r,s}^{\mathbb{C}}) = (m-j+1)t$$

for (r, s) with $r + s = m + j + 1$. We will then determine for $(r, s) = (i + j + 1, m - i)$ therefrom. By Lemma 3.4 and 3.5, the equation $f_{(r, s-1)}(\mathbf{y}) = 0$ uniquely determines $y_{r+1, s-1} \in \Lambda_U$ so that

$$(3.20) \quad \mathbf{v}_T(y_{r+1, s-1} - y_{r+1, s-1}^{\mathbb{C}}) = (m - j + 1)t.$$

In order to find $y_{m+1, j}$, we convert $f_{(m, j)}(\mathbf{y}) = 0$ into $h_{(m, j)}^{(2)}(\mathbf{y}) = 0$ by inserting the previously determined $y_{i, j}$'s. For $0 \leq i + j \leq m - 1$, thanks to (3.20), we may set

$$(3.21) \quad y_{r+1, s-1} \equiv y_{r+1, s-1}^{\mathbb{C}} + A_{r-j} \cdot T^{(m-j+1)t} \pmod{T^{>(m-j+1)t}}$$

where $A_{r-j} \in \mathbb{C}^*$ for all $r \leq i + j$.

Lemma 3.13. *A recurrence relation for A_i 's to satisfy is given by*

$$\begin{cases} A_0 &= -a_j \cdot \frac{(y_{j+1, m}^{\mathbb{C}})^2}{(y_{j, m}^{\mathbb{C}})^2} \cdot y_{j-1, m}^{\mathbb{C}} \\ A_i &= -\frac{(y_{i+j+1, m-i}^{\mathbb{C}})^2}{(y_{i+j, m-i}^{\mathbb{C}})^2} A_{i-1}. \end{cases}$$

Proof. This follows from a straightforward valuation analysis on $\partial_{(i+j, m-i)} W(\mathbf{y}) = 0$ with the insertion of (3.21) into \mathbf{y} for $(r, s) = (i + j + 1, m - i)$. \square

Using Lemma 3.13, (3.15), (3.19) with $(r + 1, s - 1) = (m + 1, j)$ and (3.21), we derive

$$\begin{aligned} f_{(m, j)}(\mathbf{y}) &= \left(-\frac{y_{m, j+1}}{y_{m, j}} - \frac{y_{m-1, j}}{y_{m, j}} + \frac{y_{m, j}}{y_{m, j-1}} \right) + \frac{y_{m, j}}{y_{m+1, j}} T^{(m-j+1)t} \\ &\equiv \left(-\frac{y_{m, j+1}^{\mathbb{C}}}{y_{m, j}^{\mathbb{C}}} - \frac{y_{m-1, j}^{\mathbb{C}}}{y_{m, j}^{\mathbb{C}}} + \frac{y_{m, j}^{\mathbb{C}}}{y_{m, j-1}^{\mathbb{C}}} \right) + \left(-\frac{A_{m-j}}{y_{m, j-1}^{\mathbb{C}}} + \frac{y_{m, j}^{\mathbb{C}}}{y_{m+1, j}^{\mathbb{C}}} \right) T^{(m-j+1)t} \\ &\equiv \left(-\frac{A_{m-j}}{y_{m, j-1}^{\mathbb{C}}} + \frac{y_{m, j}^{\mathbb{C}}}{y_{m+1, j}^{\mathbb{C}}} \right) T^{(m-j+1)t} \end{aligned}$$

modulo $T^{>(m-j+1)t}$. By applying Lemma 3.13 iteratively following the increasing order of \prec_{hor} , we further see the last formula becomes

$$-\frac{A_{m-j}}{y_{m, j-1}^{\mathbb{C}}} + \frac{y_{m, j}^{\mathbb{C}}}{y_{m+1, j}^{\mathbb{C}}} = (-1)^{m-j+1} a_j \frac{y_{m, j}^{\mathbb{C}}}{y_{m, j-1}^{\mathbb{C}}} + \frac{y_{m, j}^{\mathbb{C}}}{y_{m+1, j}^{\mathbb{C}}}.$$

Combining the above discussion, we have derived

$$(3.22) \quad h_{(m, j)}^{(2)}(\mathbf{y}) = y_{m, j}^{\mathbb{C}} \left((-1)^{m-j+1} a_j \frac{1}{y_{m, j-1}^{\mathbb{C}}} + \frac{1}{y_{m+1, j}^{\mathbb{C}}} \right) + k_{(m, j)}^{(2)}(a_1, \dots, a_j) = 0.$$

for some $k_{(m, j)}^{(2)}(a_1, \dots, a_j) \in \Lambda_+$.

We then derive from this and (3.8) Corollary 3.10 (1)

$$(3.23) \quad y_{m+1, j} \equiv (-1)^{m-j} \frac{y_{m, j-1}}{a_j} \equiv (-1)^{m-j} \frac{(d_{m, m})^2}{a_j \cdot y_{j-1, m}} \equiv (-1)^{m-j} \frac{(d_{m, m})^2}{y_{j, m+1}} \pmod{T^{>0}},$$

which explains why the equation $\ell_{(j)}^m(\mathbf{y}) = 0$ in the system (3.6) appears. In other words, (3.8) provides a sufficient condition to solve $y_{m+1, j}$ over Λ_U in (3.22).

Finally, we convert $f_{(m, m)}(\mathbf{y}) = 0$ into $h_{(m, m)}^{(2)}(\mathbf{y}) = 0$ as follows. Inserting $y_{m-1, m}, y_{m, m}, y_{m, m-1}$ and $y_{m, m+1} = d_{m, m+1}$ into $f_{(m, m)}(\mathbf{y}) = 0$, we derive

$$(3.24) \quad h_{(m, m)}^{(2)}(\mathbf{y}) = \left(-\frac{y_{m, m+1}}{y_{m, m}^{\mathbb{C}}} + \frac{y_{m, m}^{\mathbb{C}}}{y_{m+1, m}} \right) + k_{(m, m)}^{(2)}(\mathbf{a}) = 0$$

for some $k_{(m, m)}^{(2)}(\mathbf{a}) \in \Lambda_+$. We obtain

$$y_{m+1, m} \equiv \frac{(y_{m, m})^2}{y_{m, m+1}} \pmod{T^{>0}}$$

and determine $y_{m+1, m}$ in Λ_U .

We summarize the above discussion into the following.

Proposition 3.14. *For any tuple $(d_{m,m}, d_{1,m+1}, \dots, d_{m,m+1})$ of non-zero complex numbers, we can find $y_{i,j} \in \Lambda_U$ for all $(i,j) \in B(m)$ and $(i, m+1), (m+1, i)$ with $1 \leq i \leq m$ so that they satisfy*

- (1) $y_{m,m} \equiv d_{m,m} \pmod{T^{>0}},$
- (2) $y_{i,m+1} = d_{i,m+1}$ for each $i = 1, \dots, m,$
- (3) $f_{(i,j)}(\mathbf{y}) = 0$ for $(i,j) \in B(m),$
- (4) $(-1)^{m+1-l} \frac{y_{l,m+1}}{y_{m,m}} + \frac{y_{m,m}}{y_{m+1,l}} \equiv 0 \pmod{T^{>0}}.$

3.5. Solving for $(\mathbf{b}; \mathbf{y})$ outside $B(m)$

In this section, we discuss how to determine a bulk-deformation parameter \mathbf{b} in (3.5) from $c_{i+1,i}^{\text{ver}, \mathbb{C}}, s$ and $c_{j,j+1}^{\text{hor}, \mathbb{C}}, s$ and extend it to a solution over Λ_U from $y_{i,j}^{\mathbb{C}}$'s under the following hypothesis.

Hypothesis 3.15. *Suppose the hypothesis of Theorem 3.6, i.e., that we are given a complex solution $(y_{i,j}^{\mathbb{C}} \in \mathbb{C}^* \mid (i,j) \in \Gamma(n) \setminus B(m) \cup \{(m,m)\})$ for (3.6) together with non-zero complex numbers $c_{i+1,i}^{\text{ver}, \mathbb{C}}, s$ and $c_{j,j+1}^{\text{hor}, \mathbb{C}}, s$.*

In the setup of (3.10), to apply Lemma 3.4, we rewrite the equation $\ell_{(i,j)}^{\mathbf{b},m}(\mathbf{y}) = 0$ into

$$(3.25) \quad \begin{cases} c_{i,i+1}^{\text{hor}} \cdot \frac{1}{y_{i+1,j}} = h_{(i,j)}^{\mathbf{b},m}(\mathbf{y}) & \text{if } i \geq j \\ c_{j+1,j}^{\text{ver}} \cdot y_{i,j+1} = h_{(i,j)}^{\mathbf{b},m}(\mathbf{y}) & \text{if } i < j \end{cases}$$

where

$$(3.26) \quad h_{(i,j)}^{\mathbf{b},m}(\mathbf{y}) := \begin{cases} -c_{j,j-1}^{\text{ver}} \cdot \frac{1}{y_{i,j-1}} + \frac{1}{(y_{i,j})^2} (c_{j+1,j}^{\text{ver}} \cdot y_{i,j+1} + c_{i-1,i}^{\text{hor}} \cdot y_{i-1,j}) & \text{if } i \geq j \\ -c_{i-1,i}^{\text{hor}} \cdot y_{i-1,j} + (y_{i,j})^2 \left(c_{i,i+1}^{\text{hor}} \cdot \frac{1}{y_{i+1,j}} + c_{j,j-1}^{\text{ver}} \cdot \frac{1}{y_{i,j-1}} \right) & \text{if } i < j. \end{cases}$$

As one can see, both sides of (3.25) depend on bulk-parameters.

Now, we introduce a new coordinate system $(z_{i,j} \mid (i,j) \in \Gamma(n) \setminus B(m) \cup \{(m,m)\})$ with respect to which the system of equations $h_{(i,j)}^{\mathbf{b},m}(\mathbf{y}) = 0$, does *not* depend on the choice of a bulk-deformation parameter \mathbf{b} for those (i,j) satisfying $i+j < n$. We set

$$(3.27) \quad \begin{cases} z_{i+1,\bullet} := \left(\prod_{r=k}^i c_{r,r+1}^{\text{hor}} \right)^{-1} y_{i+1,\bullet} & \text{if } i \geq k \\ z_{\bullet,j+1} := \left(\prod_{r=k}^j c_{r+1,r}^{\text{ver}} \right) y_{\bullet,j+1} & \text{if } j \geq k \\ z_{i,j} := y_{i,j} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

where $k = \lceil n/2 \rceil$. Setting that the product over the empty set to be 1 such as in $\prod_{r=k}^{k-1} c_{r+1,r}^{\text{ver}} = 1$, the same inductive isolation procedure applied to $h_{(i,j)}^{\mathbf{b},m}(\mathbf{y}) = 0$ under this coordinate system leads us to the following Laurent polynomials:

$$(3.28) \quad k_{(i,j)}^{\mathbf{b},m}(\mathbf{z}) := \begin{cases} -\frac{1}{z_{i,j-1}} + \frac{1}{(z_{i,j})^2} (z_{i,j+1} + z_{i-1,j}) & \left(= \frac{1}{z_{i+1,j}} \right) & \text{if } i \geq j, i+j < n \\ -z_{i-1,j} + (z_{i,j})^2 \left(\frac{1}{z_{i+1,j}} + \frac{1}{z_{i,j-1}} \right) & (= z_{i,j+1}) & \text{if } i < j, i+j < n \\ -\frac{1}{z_{i,j-1}} + \frac{1}{(z_{i,j})^2} \left(\left(\prod_{r=k}^{i-1} c_{r,r+1}^{\text{hor}} \right)^{-1} + z_{i-1,j} \right) \left(= \prod_{r=k}^i c_{r,r+1}^{\text{hor}} \right) & & \text{if } i \geq j, i+j = n \\ -z_{i-1,j} + (z_{i,j})^2 \left(\left(\prod_{r=k}^{j-1} c_{r+1,r}^{\text{ver}} \right) + \frac{1}{z_{i,j-1}} \right) \left(= \prod_{r=k}^j c_{r+1,r}^{\text{ver}} \right) & & \text{if } i < j, i+j = n. \end{cases}$$

Here the variables inside the parentheses are the isolated variable to be determined by $k_{(i,j)}^{\mathbf{b},m}(\mathbf{z})$, respectively. Observe the following:

- For any (i, j) with $i + j < n$, (3.28) does *not* involve any bulk-parameters.
- A solution $(y_{i,j} \in \Lambda_U)$ of (3.25) exists if and only if a solution $(z_{i,j} \in \Lambda_U)$ exists.

Assume $m < \lceil n/2 \rceil =: k$. We will separately deal with the case where $m = \lceil n/2 \rceil$ later on. Let

$$(3.29) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}_{\text{seed}} := & \{(m, m)\} \cup \{(s, m+1) \in \Gamma(n) \mid 1 \leq s \leq m\} \\ & \cup \{(m+1, m+1), (m+1, m+2), \dots, (m+r, m+r), (m+r, m+r+1), \dots, (k, k)\} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$(3.30) \quad \mathcal{I}_{\text{initial}} := \mathcal{I}_{\text{seed}} \setminus \{(m, m)\}.$$

We start by taking $z_{i,j} = y_{i,j} := y_{i,j}^{\mathbb{C}}$ for $(i, j) \in \mathcal{I}_{\text{initial}}$ by (3.27) and fixing a complex solution from Corollary 3.10 such that $c = y_{m,m}^{\mathbb{C}}$ within $B(m)$. When extending a complex solution to that a solution over Λ_U , we shall have $z_{i,j} = y_{i,j} \in \mathbb{C}^*$ for any $(i, j) \in \mathcal{I}_{\text{initial}}$, while $y_{m,m} = c + \dots \in \Lambda_U$.

Remark 3.16. We will define a *seed* in Definition 4.1 to generate a solution candidate for the SLT-equation. (3.29) is the collection of indices where the corresponding variables will be chosen as the initial step.

By the argument in Section 3.4, the chosen element $z_{1,m+1} \in \mathbb{C}^*$ determines $z_{i+1,m-i+1} = y_{i+1,m-i+1} \in \Lambda_U$ for $1 \leq i \leq m$. In particular, we have $z_{m+1,1} = y_{m+1,1} \in \Lambda_U$. We then proceed to the next diagonal given by $i + j = m + 3$. Moreover, we find $z_{i,j} = y_{i,j}$ in Λ_U for (i, j) with $i \leq m + 1$ and $j \leq m + 1$ in the diagonal satisfying (3.23). Applying Lemma 3.4 to (3.28), we determine the other variables $z_{i,j} \in \Lambda_U$ in the diagonal $i + j = m + 3$. Namely, starting from $z_{2,m+1} \in \mathbb{C}^*$ and $z_{m+1,2} \in \Lambda_U$ determined in Section 3.4, we solve $z_{1,m+2} (\prec_{\text{hor}} z_{2,m+1})$ and $z_{m+2,1} (\prec_{\text{ver}} z_{m+1,2})$. Notice that Lemma 3.4 is applicable because of the existence of a complex solution of the SLT-equation. Proceeding inductively, we obtain a solution $(z_{i,j} \in \Lambda_U \mid (i, j) \in \Gamma(n))$ for the system (3.28) of equations over $(i, j) \in \Gamma(n-1)$. Finally, we solve $c_{r,r+1}^{\text{hor}}$ and $c_{r+1,r}^{\text{ver}}$ to make the equations (3.28) over (i, j) with $i + j = n$ hold. Thus, Theorem 3.6 is now verified when $m < \lceil n/2 \rceil$.

In this case when $n = 2k$ and $m = k$, we shall take $c = 1$ for $y_{m,m}^{\mathbb{C}}$. Corollary 3.10 will give us the initial parts $y_{i,j}^{\mathbb{C}}$'s of $y_{i,j}$'s for $(i, j) \in B(m)$. We then follow Section 3.4 to extend to $z_{i,j} = y_{i,j}$'s over Λ_U in $B(m)$. If one uses both $\mathfrak{b}_{m+1,m}^{\text{ver}}$ and $\mathfrak{b}_{m,m+1}^{\text{hor}}$ to deform $f_{(m,m)} = 0$, then we have two extra variables $c_{m+1,m}^{\text{ver}}$ and $c_{m,m+1}^{\text{hor}}$ in $f_{(m,m)}^{\mathfrak{b}} = 0$. For our convenience, we choose $\mathfrak{b}_{m,m+1}^{\text{hor}} = 0$. Now, we need to take $\mathfrak{b}_{m+1,m}^{\text{ver}}$ so that $f_{(m,m)}^{\mathfrak{b}} = 0$. It yields that $1 = c_{m+1,m}^{\text{ver}, \mathbb{C}} = \exp(\mathfrak{b}_{m+1,m}^{\text{ver}}) \pmod{T^{>0}}$. After fixing $\mathfrak{b}_{m+1,m}^{\text{ver}} \in \Lambda_+$, we obtain $z_{\bullet, m+1} = y_{\bullet, m+1}$ by solving $h_{(\bullet, m)}^{\mathfrak{b}, (2)} = 0$ where

$$\begin{aligned} h_{(1, m)}^{\mathfrak{b}, (2)}(\mathbf{y}) &:= -\exp(\mathfrak{b}_{m+1, m}^{\text{ver}}) \frac{y_{1, m+1}}{y_{1, m}} + a_1 \frac{y_{1, m}}{y_{1, m-1}} = 0 \\ h_{(j, m)}^{\mathfrak{b}, (2)}(\mathbf{y}) &:= -\exp(\mathfrak{b}_{m+1, m}^{\text{ver}}) \frac{y_{j, m+1}}{y_{j, m}} + a_j \left(\frac{y_{j, m}}{y_{j+1, m}} + \frac{y_{j, m}}{y_{j, m-1}} \right) = 0 \quad \text{for } j > 2. \end{aligned}$$

The remaining steps are similar.

4. Solvability of split leading term equation

This section aims to verify the assumption for Theorem 3.6 when the SLT-equation (3.6) comes from the line segment $I_m \subset \Delta_\lambda$ in (1.4). To find its solution, we introduce the notion of *seed* generating a candidate for the solution and prove that there exists a “good” choice of seeds such that the candidate is indeed a solution.

4.1. Seeds

Recall the definitions $\Gamma(n)$ and $B(m)$ from (3.1). Consider a nested sequence of fields of rational functions:

$$(4.1) \quad \mathbb{C} \subset \mathbb{C}(\mathbf{y}_{(1)}) \subset \mathbb{C}(\mathbf{y}_{(2)}) \subset \dots \subset \mathbb{C}(\mathbf{y}_{(n)})$$

where $\mathbb{C}(\mathbf{y}_{(n)})$ is filtered by the variables in the diagonals of $\Gamma(n)$. Set

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{C}(\mathbf{y}_{(r)}) &:= \mathbb{C}(\{(i, j) \in \Gamma(n) \setminus (B(m) \setminus \{y_{m,m}\}) \mid (i, j) \prec_{\text{hor}} (2r, 1)\}) \\ &= \mathbb{C}\left(\bigcup_{s=2}^r \{y_{1,s-1}, \dots, y_{s-1,1}\} \setminus (B(m) \setminus \{y_{m,m}\})\right).\end{aligned}$$

Such a filtration will be called the *diagonal filtration associated to* $\Gamma(n)$ and $B(m)$. Notice that the Laurent polynomials appearing in (LHS) of (3.6) are actually of the following types.

$$\ell_{(i,j)}^{b,m}(\mathbf{y}) \in \mathbb{C}(\mathbf{y}_{(i+j+1)}), \quad \ell_{(l)}^m(\mathbf{y}) \in \mathbb{C}(\mathbf{y}_{(l+m+1)} \cup \{y_{m,m}\}).$$

We begin by the definition of a seed.

Definition 4.1. A seed of $\Gamma(n)$ associated with $B(m)$ consists of the two data $(\mathcal{I}, \mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{I}})$.

- An $(n-m)$ -tuple \mathcal{I} of double indices

$$\mathcal{I} = \{(m, m), (i_1, j_1), \dots, (i_{n-m-1}, j_{n-m-1})\} \subset \{(m, m)\} \cup (\Gamma(n) \setminus B(m))$$

such that one index (i_k, j_k) is selected from each diagonal not intersecting $B(m)$.

- An $(n-m)$ -tuple $\mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{I}}$ of elements in Λ_U indexed by the elements of \mathcal{I} .

We are particularly interested in the seeds $(\mathcal{I}, \mathbf{d})$ of the form

- $\mathcal{I} := \mathcal{I}_{\text{seed}}$ in (3.29).
- $\mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{I}}$ is a tuple of *non-zero real* numbers.

Let $\mathbf{y}_{\mathcal{I}}$ denote the components of \mathbf{y} associated with the set \mathcal{I} of indices. Namely,

$$(4.2) \quad \mathbf{y}_{\mathcal{I}} := (y_{m,m}, y_{i_1,j_1}, \dots, y_{i_{n-m-1},j_{n-m-1}}).$$

Then, as the initial step, we take $\mathbf{y}_{\mathcal{I}} := \mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{I}}$. So, the double indices designate the places in which the components of $\mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{I}}$ are plugged. Since \mathcal{I} is always taken to be $\mathcal{I}_{\text{seed}}$, \mathcal{I} will be often omitted from now on. We instead set $d_{i,j}$ to denote the component of $\mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{I}}$ corresponding to (i, j) .

We shall determine a solution of the SLT-equation recursively from a seed according to the order \prec_{hor} (or \prec_{ver}) and the diagonal filtration (4.1). By the SLT-equation and Lemma 3.4 over the field of complex numbers, $\mathbf{y}_{(r)}$, $y_{m,m}$ and one datum of a seed (4.2) in the diagonal $i+j = r+1$ in $\mathbf{y}_{(r+1)} \setminus \mathbf{y}_{(r)}$ generate the other variables in the diagonal with a suitable choice of complex numbers

$$\mathbf{c} := (c_{k,k+1}^{\text{hor}}, \dots, c_{n-1,n}^{\text{hor}}, c_{k+1,k}^{\text{ver}}, \dots, c_{n,n-1}^{\text{ver}}).$$

Namely, we isolate and express one undetermined variable in terms of the already determined variables for the remaining $y_{i,j}$'s and \mathbf{c} inductively over the order \prec_{hor} (or \prec_{ver}) by rewriting the SLT-equation. However, the undetermined variable might be *zero* or *undefined* which should be avoided. A *good* choice of seed, we call a *generic* seed, will do this purpose.

Now we provide the precise meaning of what we mean by a generic seed. In the setup of (3.10), we rewrite $\ell_{(i,j)}^{b,m}(\mathbf{y}) = 0$ into (3.26). We first note that (3.26) involves only the variables $y_{(r,s)}$ such that $(r, s) \prec_{\text{hor}} (i+1, j)$ (resp. $(r, s) \prec_{\text{ver}} (i, j+1)$) for $i \geq j$ (resp. for $i < j$). Therefore we can determine $y_{(i+1,j)}$ (resp. $y_{(i,j+1)}$) if $i \geq j$ (resp. if $i < j$), *as long as the value of $h_{(i,j)}^{b,m}(\mathbf{y}) \neq 0$ or is undefined, i.e., provided*

$$(4.3) \quad \mathbf{y} \notin \text{Zero}(h_{(i,j)}^{b,m}) \cup \text{Pole}(h_{(i,j)}^{b,m}).$$

Definition 4.2. A seed $(\mathcal{I}, \mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{I}})$ is called *generic* if the seed $\mathbf{y}_{\mathcal{I}} = \mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{I}}$ generates inductive solutions $y_{(r,s)}$ for $(r, s) \prec_{\text{hor}} (i+1, j)$ (resp. $(r, s) \prec_{\text{ver}} (i, j+1)$) such that

$$(4.4) \quad h_{(i,j)}^{b,m}(\mathbf{y}) \neq 0 \pmod{T^{>0}}$$

for all (i, j) with $i \geq j$ (resp. for all (i, j) with $i < j$).

Example 4.3. A straightforward calculation asserts that the tuples

- (1) $\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{I}_{\text{seed}} = ((2, 2), (1, 3), (2, 3), (3, 3), (3, 4))$
- (2) $\mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{I}} = (-1, 1, 1, -1, 1)$

form a generic seed of $\Gamma(7)$ to $B(2)$. The tuples

- (1) $\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{I}_{\text{seed}} = ((2, 2), (1, 3), (2, 3), (3, 3), (3, 4))$
- (2) $\mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{I}} = (-1, 1, 1, 1, 1)$

form a seed of $\Gamma(7)$ to $B(2)$, but not a generic seed because $h_{(1,5)}^{\mathbf{b},m=2}(\mathbf{y}) = 0$.

The main proposition of this section is the following existence of a generic seed, whose proof will be occupied by the rest of this section.

Proposition 4.4. *For each $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ where $2 \leq m \leq k = \lceil n/2 \rceil$, a generic seed of $\Gamma(n)$ associated to $B(m)$ exists.*

As a corollary, we assert solvability of the SLT-equation.

Corollary 4.5. *The SLT-equation of $\Gamma(n)$ associated with $B(m)$ has a solution each component of which is a non-zero complex number.*

Proof. Assume that a seed has the property (4.4), the remaining $y_{i,j}$'s and a sequence \mathbf{c} are (uniquely) determined in \mathbb{C}^* by the exactly same process as in Section 3.5. \square

4.2. Pre-generic elements

We again exploit the coordinate system $\{z_{i,j} \mid (i,j) \in \Gamma(n) \setminus B(m) \cup \{(m,m)\}\}$ in (3.27). Recall the system of rational functions in (3.28).

We have the following lemma.

Lemma 4.6. *$k_{(i,j)}^{\mathbf{b},m}(\mathbf{z}) \neq 0$ if and only if $h_{(i,j)}^{\mathbf{b},m}(\mathbf{y}) \neq 0$ for $(i,j) \in \Gamma(n) \setminus B(m)$.*

Proof. Under the coordinate change (3.27), (3.26) is converted into (3.28). \square

When $m < k = \lceil n/2 \rceil$, since $\mathcal{I} \subset B(k)$ and $\mathbf{y}_{\mathcal{I}} = \mathbf{z}_{\mathcal{I}}$ by (3.27), we may insert $\mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{I}}$ into $\mathbf{z}_{\mathcal{I}}$ as the starting point. For the case $m = k$, we have taken $c_{m,m+1}^{\text{hor},\mathbb{C}} = 1$ and $c_{m+1,m}^{\text{ver},\mathbb{C}} = 1$ and hence $\mathbf{z}_{\mathcal{I}} = \mathbf{y}_{\mathcal{I}} = \mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{I}}$ as well. As in (4.1), consider the diagonal filtration of the field of rational functions (with respect to z)

$$\mathbb{C} \subset \mathbb{C}(\mathbf{z}_{(1)}) \subset \mathbb{C}(\mathbf{z}_{(2)}) \subset \cdots \subset \mathbb{C}(\mathbf{z}_{(n)})$$

where

$$\mathbf{z}_{(r)} := \bigcup_{s=2}^r \{z_{1,s-1}, \dots, z_{s-1,1}\} \setminus \left(\mathbf{z}_{B(m)} \setminus \{z_{m,m}\} \right) \text{ and } \mathbf{z}_{B(m)} = \{z_{i,j} \mid (i,j) \in B(m)\}.$$

Choosing one component in a diagonal generically, we can make the first two equations of (3.28) non-zero because of the following lemma. Let $(r,s) \in B(m) \setminus \{(m,m)\}$ be given. Denote by $X(i)$ the rational function obtained by successive composition of $k_{(j,k)}^{\mathbf{b},m}$ for all $(j,k) \prec_{\text{hor}}(r,s)$. If the above mentioned inductive determination does not meet an obstruction, its value corresponding at \mathbf{y} is supposed to determine the value of $z_{r-i,s+i}$. We only show the case for $i > 0$ since the case where $i < 0$ similar.

Proposition 4.7. *The rational function $X(i)$ is a non-constant fractional linear map of $z_{(r,s)}$ in coefficients $\mathbb{C}(\mathbf{z}_{(r+s-1)})$.*

Proof. By (3.28), we derive a recurrence relation for $X(i)$'s of the form

$$(4.5) \quad X(i) = [i] + \frac{[i, i-1]}{X(i-1)}$$

where

$$(4.6) \quad [i] := -z_{r-i-1,s+i} + \frac{(z_{r-i,s+i-1})^2}{z_{r-i,s+i-2}}, \quad [i, i-1] := (z_{r-i,s+i-1})^2.$$

We note that $[i], [i, i-1] \in \mathbb{C}(\mathbf{z}_{(r+s-1)})$, while $X(i) \in \mathbb{C}(\mathbf{z}_{(r+s)})$ for all i .

Composing (4.5) several times, $X(i)$ is expressed as a continued fraction in terms of $X(0) = z_{r,s}$. If we set the initial condition $A(0) = 1, B(0) = 0$, we can express $X(i)$ as

$$(4.7) \quad X(i) = \frac{A(i) \cdot X(0) + B(i)}{A(i-1) \cdot X(0) + B(i-1)}$$

for the elements $A(i), B(i) \in \mathbb{C}(\mathbf{z}_{(r+s-1)})$. Thus, we have $X(i) \in \mathbb{C}(\mathbf{z}_{(r+s-1)})(z_{r,s})$.

To show that every $X(i)$ is *non-constant* with respect to $X(0) = z_{(r,s)}$, we investigate properties of $A(i)$'s and $B(i)$'s. By the induction, we obtain the following lemma.

Lemma 4.8. *Consider $\{i, i-1, \dots, 1, 0\}$. Let $\mathcal{P}_{A(i)}$ be the partitions of $\{i, i-1, \dots, 1\}$ into one single number or two consecutive numbers and $\mathcal{P}_{B(i)}$ the partitions of $\{i, i-1, \dots, 1, 0\}$ into one single or two consecutive numbers containing the subset $[1, 0]$. Then*

$$A(i) = \sum_{I \in \mathcal{P}_{A(i)}} [I] \text{ and } B(i) = \sum_{I \in \mathcal{P}_{B(i)}} [I],$$

For instance, $A(3)$ and $B(3)$ are expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} A(3) &= [3][2][1] + [3][2, 1] + [3, 2][1], \\ B(3) &= [3][2][1, 0] + [3, 2][1, 0]. \end{aligned}$$

Corollary 4.9.

$$\begin{aligned} A(i) &= [i] \cdot A(i-1) + [i, i-1] \cdot A(i-2) \\ B(i) &= [i] \cdot B(i-1) + [i, i-1] \cdot B(i-2). \end{aligned}$$

Note that $X(0)$ and $X(1)$ are non-constant Laurent polynomials with respect to $X(0) = z_{r,s}$. Suppose to the contrary that $X(i)$ is a constant function with the value C and all $X(j)$'s for all $j < i$ are non-constant rational functions of $X(0) (= z_{r,s})$.

Suppose $X(i) \equiv C$. By recalling $A(i), B(i) \in \mathbb{C}(\mathbf{z}_{(r+s-1)})$ and substituting the values $z_{r,s} = 0, 1$ into (4.7) respectively, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} C \cdot A(i-1) &= A(i) = [i] \cdot A(i-1) + [i, i-1] \cdot A(i-2) \\ C \cdot B(i-1) &= B(i) = [i] \cdot B(i-1) + [i, i-1] \cdot B(i-2). \end{aligned}$$

Then $(C - [i]) \cdot A(i-1) = [i, i-1] \cdot A(i-2)$.

We claim that $C - [i]$ is a non-zero rational function contained in $\mathbb{C}(\mathbf{z}_{(r+s-1)})$. Otherwise we would have $A(i-2) = B(i-2) = 0$ because $[i, i-1] = (z_{r-i, s+i-1})^2 \neq 0$. It would yield that $X(i-2) \equiv 0$, contradicting to the assumption that $X(i-2)$ is not constant with respect to $z_{r,s}$. We then have

$$\begin{aligned} A(i-1) &= C' \cdot A(i-2) \\ B(i-1) &= C' \cdot B(i-2) \end{aligned}$$

where $C' = [i, i-1]/(C - [i]) \in \mathbb{C}(\mathbf{z}_{(r+s-1)})$. Then we deduce $X(i-1) = C'$ which is constant with respect to $z_{r,s}$, a contradiction to the standing hypothesis. This finishes the proof of the proposition. \square

Corollary 4.10. *Suppose that the set $\mathbf{z}_{(r+s-1)}$ is determined. There exists a non-zero real number $d_{r,s}$ such that if we set $z_{r,s} = d_{r,s}$, then we achieve*

$$(4.8) \quad k_{(i,j)}^{\mathbf{b},m}(\mathbf{z}) \neq 0$$

for all (i, j) 's satisfying $i + j = r + s - 1$.

Proof. Since each $X(i)$ is a non-constant fractional linear map of $z_{r,s}$, there are only finitely many $z_{r,s}$'s making $z_{r-i, s+i}$ zero or not defined. Avoid these values when choosing $d_{r,s}$. \square

Definition 4.11. Suppose the set $\mathbf{z}_{(r+s-1)}$ is given. For an index $(r, s) \in \Gamma(n) \setminus B(m)$, an element $d_{r,s}$ in a seed is said to be *pre-generic with respect to $\mathbf{z}_{(r+s-1)}$* if (4.8) holds for any $(i, j) \in \Gamma(r+s) \setminus (B(m) \cup \Gamma(r+s-1))$.

For the later purpose, we prove the following property of the pre-generic elements.

Lemma 4.12. *Let $m < k$. Assume that $\mathbf{z}_{(s+m)}$ are previously determined. Suppose that we are given a seed*

$$\{d_{m,m}\} \cup \{d_{s,m+1} \in \mathbb{C}^* \mid 1 \leq s \leq m\}$$

such that for each s $d_{s,m+1}$ is pre-generic with respect to a choice of $d_{m,m}$ and $d_{i,m+1}$ with $1 \leq i \leq s-1$. Then, regardless of a choice of non-zero $d_{m,m}$, the same $d_{s,m+1}$ remains to be pre-generic as long as we do not change $d_{1,m+1}, \dots, d_{s-1,m+1}$.

Proof. If $m < k$, we see $y_{i,j} = z_{i,j}$ for $(i,j) \in B(m)$ by (3.27). We will prove

$$(4.9) \quad z_{j,i+1} = (-1)^{i+j} \cdot \frac{(d_{m,m})^2}{z_{i+1,j}}$$

by the induction over the order \prec_{ver} . Recall from (3.8) that

$$z_{m+1,i} = (-1)^{i+(m+1)-1} \cdot \frac{(d_{m,m})^2}{z_{i,m+1}},$$

which provides the initial step for the induction. Next suppose that (4.9) holds for all $(r,s) \prec_{ver} (j,i+1)$. Then we observe that all 4 sub-indices are smaller than $(j,i+1)$ appearing in the equation

$$(4.10) \quad -\frac{z_{i,j+1}}{z_{i,j}} - \frac{z_{i-1,j}}{z_{i,j}} + \frac{z_{i,j}}{z_{i+1,j}} + \frac{z_{i,j}}{z_{i,j-1}} = 0.$$

By the induction hypothesis, we substitute (4.9) therein, we derive

$$0 = k_{i,j}^{b,m}(\mathbf{z}) = \frac{z_{j,i}}{z_{j+1,i}} + \frac{z_{j,i}}{z_{j,i-1}} + (-1)^{i+j-1} \frac{(d_{m,m})^2}{z_{i+1,j} \cdot z_{j,i}} - \frac{z_{j-1,i}}{z_{j,i}}.$$

Then by a back-substitution of (4.10) therein, we obtain

$$\frac{z_{j,i+1}}{z_{j,i}} + (-1)^{i+j-1} \frac{(d_{m,m})^2}{z_{i+1,j} z_{j,i}} = 0$$

which is equivalent to

$$z_{j,i+1} = (-1)^{i+j} \cdot \frac{(d_{m,m})^2}{z_{i+1,j}}.$$

Therefore, $k_{(i,j)}^{b,m}(\mathbf{z}) \neq 0$ if and only if $k_{(j,i)}^{b,m}(\mathbf{z}) \neq 0$. Hence, Lemma 4.12 follows. \square

4.3. Generic seeds

Applying Corollary 4.10, we make the first two expressions in (3.28) non-zero by generically choosing the value of one entry of each diagonal. To make the last two terms of (3.28) non-zero at the same time, we need to carefully adjust this choice we have made. We recall $k := \lceil n/2 \rceil$. Depending on the parity of n , either $n = 2k-1$ or $n = 2k$. We consider the two cases separately.

Case 1. $n = 2k-1$. We need several lemmas.

Lemma 4.13. *Assume that $\mathbf{z}_{(n-2)}$ is given. Suppose that either $d_{k-1,k-1} = -1$ is pre-generic or $k-1 = m$. Then there is a real number $d_{k-1,k-1}$ (sufficiently close to -1 , but not equal to -1) and a non-zero real number $d_{k-1,k}$ such that if $z_{k-1,k-1} = d_{k-1,k-1}$ and $z_{k-1,k} = d_{k-1,k}$,*

$$(4.11) \quad k_{(i,j)}^{b,m}(\mathbf{z}) \neq 0 \pmod{T^{>0}}$$

for all (i,j) with $i+j = n-1$ and $i+j = n$.

Note that $k_{(i,j)}^{b,m}(\mathbf{z})$'s for (i,j) with $i+j = n$ provide the last two expressions of (3.28).

Proof. Assuming that $d_{k-1,k-1} = -1$ is pre-generic, by definition, every $z_{i,n-1-i}$ is defined and becomes non-zero if we set $z_{k-1,k-1} = d_{k-1,k-1} = -1$. By Corollary 4.10, we can choose and fix a pre-generic element $d_{k-1,k}$ for $z_{k-1,k}$ so that the entries $z_{i,n-i}$'s are also determined.

We emphasize that $d_{k-1,k-1} = -1$ is *never* being a component of a generic seed because of the following reason. It is straightforward to see that the equations $\ell_{(i,j)}^{b,m}(\mathbf{y}) = 0$ in terms of \mathbf{z}

for (i, j) 's with $i + j \geq n$ and $i < j$ read

$$(4.12) \quad \begin{cases} \prod_{r=k}^k c_{r+1,r}^{\text{ver}} = -z_{k-2,k} + (z_{k-1,k})^2 \left(1 + \frac{1}{z_{k-1,k-1}}\right), \\ \prod_{r=k}^{k+1} c_{r+1,r}^{\text{ver}} = -z_{k-3,k+1} + (z_{k-2,k+1})^2 \left(\left(\prod_{r=k}^k c_{r+1,r}^{\text{ver}}\right)^{-1} + \frac{1}{z_{k-2,k}}\right), \\ \dots \\ \prod_{r=k}^{n-2} c_{r+1,r}^{\text{ver}} = -z_{1,n-2} + (z_{2,n-2})^2 \left(\left(\prod_{r=k}^{n-3} c_{r+1,r}^{\text{ver}}\right)^{-1} + \frac{1}{z_{2,n-3}}\right), \\ \prod_{r=k}^{n-1} c_{r+1,r}^{\text{ver}} = -(z_{1,n-1})^2 \left(\left(\prod_{r=k}^{n-2} c_{r+1,r}^{\text{ver}}\right)^{-1} + \frac{1}{z_{1,n-2}}\right). \end{cases}$$

If one chooses $z_{k-1,k-1} = d_{k-1,k-1} = -1$, then we obtain

$$\prod_{r=k}^j c_{r+1,r}^{\text{ver}} = -z_{n-j-1,j}$$

from (4.12) for $j = k, k+1, \dots, n-2$ and

$$(4.13) \quad k_{(1,n-1)}^{\text{b},m}(\mathbf{z}) = \prod_{r=k}^{n-1} c_{r+1,r}^{\text{ver}} = 0.$$

Thus, the seed $\mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{I}}$ is *not* generic. Nevertheless, we claim that there exists a choice of $d_{k-1,k-1}$ not equal to -1 but close to -1 so that (4.11) is satisfied.

Note that the fixed $d_{k,k-1}$ remains to be pre-generic even if we perturb the value $z_{k-1,k-1}$ from -1 with sufficiently small amount. This is because the expression $k_{(i,j)}^{\text{b},m}(\mathbf{z})$ for each index (i, j) with $i + j = n - 1$ is a continuous function with respect to $z_{k-1,k-1}$ at -1 after inserting $d_{k,k-1}$ into $z_{k,k-1}$. Also, by Proposition 4.7, there exists a dense set of pre-generic elements for $d_{k-1,k-1}$. Therefore, (4.11) is satisfied for $i + j = n - 1$.

Also, we observe that as $z_{k-1,k-1} \rightarrow -1$, because of (3.28) and (4.12), $k_{(n-j,j)}^{\text{b},m}(\mathbf{z}) \rightarrow -z_{n-j-1,j}$ when $j \geq k$. Because $-z_{n-j-1,j} \neq 0$ for j with $k \leq j < n - 1$, we still have $k_{(n-j,j)}^{\text{b},m}(\mathbf{z}) \neq 0$ for j with $k \leq j < n - 1$ if $d_{k-1,k-1}$ is sufficiently close to -1 . Finally, we claim that $k_{(1,n-1)}^{\text{b},m}(\mathbf{z}) \neq 0$ if $z_{k-1,k-1} \neq -1$ so that the issue in (4.13) is solved. From (4.12) and $z_{k-1,k-1} \neq -1$, it follows

$$c_{k+1,k}^{\text{ver}} \neq -z_{k-2,k}.$$

Proceeding inductively, we deduce $k_{(1,n-1)}^{\text{b},m}(\mathbf{z}) \neq 0$ from (4.12). The discussion on the part where $j < k$ is omitted because the argument is symmetrical. Consequently, we may choose a generic $d_{k-1,k-1}$ sufficiently close to -1 so that (4.11) holds for all (i, j) with $i + j = n - 1$ and $i + j = n$.

It remains to take care of the case where $k - 1 = m$. $(k - 1, k - 1) = (m, m)$ is contained in the box $B(m)$ so that $d_{k-1,k-1}$ can be freely chosen by Corollary 3.10. Thus, the exactly same argument can be applied as above. \square

By applying a similar argument, we can prove the following lemma.

Lemma 4.14. *Suppose that either $d_{i,i} = \pm 1$ is pre-generic for $i > m$ or $i = m$. There is a real number $d_{i,i}$ (sufficiently close to ± 1 , but not equal to ± 1) and a non-zero real number $d_{i,i+1}$ so that $d_{i+1,i+1} = \mp 1$ becomes pre-generic.*

We now ready to start the proof of Proposition 4.4 for the case where $n = 2k - 1$ and $m < k := \lceil n/2 \rceil$.

Proof of Proposition 4.4. We start with a tentative choice of $d_{m,m} = \pm 1$. Choosing pre-generic elements from $d_{1,m+1} := z_{1,m+1}$ to $d_{m-1,m+1} := z_{m-1,m+1}$, we find $\mathbf{z}_{(2m)}$ so that (4.11) is satisfied for each index (i, j) with $i + j \leq 2m - 1$. Due to Lemma 4.14, we may select $d_{m,m}$ sufficiently close to ± 1 and $d_{m,m+1}$ so that $d_{m+1,m+1} = \mp 1$ becomes pre-generic. Because of Lemma 4.12, note that $d_{1,m+1}, \dots, d_{m,m+1}$ remain to be pre-generic even if we choose another $d_{m,m}$. Moreover, applying Lemma 4.14 repeatedly, we assert that $d_{k-1,k-1} = -1$ is also pre-generic by suitably choosing $d_{\bullet,\bullet}$. Hence, we have (4.11) for all indices (i, j) 's with $i + j \leq n - 2$. Finally, Lemma 4.13

says that there is $d_{k-1,k-1}$ and $d_{k,k-1}$ such that (4.11) holds for $i+j = n-1, n$. Thus, we have just found a generic seed. \square

Case 2. $n = 2k$ and $m < k$. Modifying the proofs of Lemma 4.13 and Lemma 4.14, we can prove the following.

Lemma 4.15. *Assume that $\mathbf{z}_{(n-2)}$ is given. Suppose that $d_{k-1,k} = -1$ is pre-generic. Then there are a real number $d_{k-1,k}$ (sufficiently close to -1 , but not equal to -1) and a non-zero real number $d_{k,k}$ such that if $z_{k-1,k} = d_{k-1,k}$ and $z_{k,k} = d_{k,k}$,*

$$k_{(i,j)}^{b,m}(\mathbf{z}) \neq 0 \pmod{T^{>0}}$$

for all (i, j) with $i+j = n-1$ and $i+j = n$.

Suppose that $d_{i-1,i} = \pm 1$ is pre-generic for $i \geq m+1$. There are a real number $d_{i-1,i}$ (sufficiently close to ± 1) and a non-zero real number $d_{i,i}$ so that $d_{i,i+1} = \mp 1$ becomes pre-generic.

Also, we need the lemma, which serves as the starting point to obtain the desired $d_{\bullet,\bullet}$'s.

Lemma 4.16. $d_{m,m+1} = \pm 1$ can be pre-generic.

Proof. As in Lemma 3.8, one sees that

$$(4.14) \quad \tilde{z}_{i,m+j} := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{for } i = j \\ \prod_{r=0}^{j-i-1} (2i+2r) & \text{for } i < j \\ \prod_{r=0}^{i-j-1} (2j+2r)^{-1} & \text{for } i > j \end{cases}$$

is a solution of $\ell_{(i,j)}^{b,m}(\mathbf{y}) = 0$ under the coordinate change (3.27) for $m+i+j < n$. Also, by Lemma 3.7, so is

$$(4.15) \quad z_{i,m+j} := a \cdot \tilde{z}_{i,m+j}$$

for any non-zero complex number a . Selecting

$$a := \prod_{r=0}^{m-2} (2+2r),$$

$d_{m,m+1} = z_{m,m+1}$ becomes 1. Because of Lemma 4.12, no matter what we choose any non-zero complex number $d_{m,m}$, $d_{m,m+1}$ is pre-generic (with respect to the previous determined $\mathbf{z}_{(2m)}$). \square

Proof of Proposition 4.4 (continued). Combining Lemma 4.15 and Lemma 4.16, we conclude Proposition 4.4 for the case where $n = 2k$ and $m < k$. \square

Case 3. $n = 2k$ and $m = k$. In this case, we have taken $d_{m,m} = 1$. Because of Lemma 3.8, note that

$$(4.16) \quad \tilde{z}_{i,m+j} := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{for } i = j \\ \prod_{r=0}^{j-i-1} (2i+2r) & \text{for } i < j \\ \prod_{r=0}^{i-j-1} (2j+2r)^{-1} & \text{for } i > j \end{cases}, \quad \tilde{z}_{m+i,j} := \begin{cases} (-1)^{m+i+j-1} & \text{for } i = j \\ (-1)^{m+i+j-1} \prod_{r=0}^{i-j-1} (2j+2r)^{-1} & \text{for } i > j \\ (-1)^{m+i+j-1} \prod_{r=0}^{j-i-1} (2i+2r) & \text{for } i < j \end{cases}$$

respectively form a solution of $\ell_{(i,m+j)}^{b,m}(\mathbf{y}) = 0$ and $\ell_{(m+i,j)}^{b,m}(\mathbf{y}) = 0$ for $m+i+j < n$. Also, our choice makes $\ell_{(i)}^m(\mathbf{y}) = 0$ in (3.8) because $c_{m+1,m}^{\text{ver}} = 1$ and $c_{m,m+1}^{\text{hor}} = 1$.

Furthermore,

$$(4.17) \quad z_{i,m+j} := a \cdot \tilde{z}_{i,m+j}, \quad z_{m+i,j} := a^{-1} \cdot \tilde{z}_{m+i,j}$$

are also solutions for any non-zero complex number a . Thus, we have a one-parameter family of solutions. Then the expressions $k_{(i,m+j)}^{\mathbf{b},m}(\mathbf{z})$ and $k_{(m+i,j)}^{\mathbf{b},m}(\mathbf{z})$ with $i+j=n$ can be considered as a function with respect to a .

Because of Lemma 4.15, it suffices to deal with the starting point.

Lemma 4.17. *There exists a choice of the variable a such that*

$$(4.18) \quad k_{(m-i,m+i)}^{\mathbf{b},m}(\mathbf{z}) \neq 0 \text{ and } k_{(m+i,m-i)}^{\mathbf{b},m}(\mathbf{z}) \neq 0 \pmod{T^{>0}}$$

in (3.28).

Proof. We claim that $k_{(m-i,m+i)}^{\mathbf{b},m}(\mathbf{z})/z_{m-i,m+i}$ is a non-constant rational function w.r.t. a . For $i \geq 1$, we observe

$$\frac{k_{(m-i,m+i)}^{\mathbf{b},m}(\mathbf{z})}{z_{m-i,m+i}} = -\frac{z_{m-2,m+1}}{z_{m-1,m+1}} + z_{m-1,m+1} = -(2m-4) + a \cdot \left(\prod_{r=0}^{m-3} (2+2r)^{-1} \right)$$

is a non-constant linear function with respect to a . By the induction hypothesis, assume that

$$\frac{k_{(m-i,m+i)}^{\mathbf{b},m}(\mathbf{z})}{z_{m-i,m+i}} := \frac{P_i(a)}{Q_i(a)}$$

is a non-constant rational function with respect to a . Then, we see

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{k_{(m-i-1,m+i+1)}^{\mathbf{b},m}(\mathbf{z})}{z_{m-i-1,m+i+1}} &= \left(-\frac{z_{m-i-2,m+i+1}}{z_{m-i-1,m+i+1}} + \frac{z_{m-i-1,m+i+1}}{z_{m-i-1,m+i}} \right) + \frac{z_{m-i-1,m+i+1}}{k_{(m-i,m+i)}^{\mathbf{b},m}(\mathbf{z})} \\ &= \left(-\frac{\tilde{z}_{m-i-2,m+i+1}}{\tilde{z}_{m-i-1,m+i+1}} + \frac{\tilde{z}_{m-i-1,m+i+1}}{\tilde{z}_{m-i-1,m+i}} \right) + \frac{\tilde{z}_{m-i-1,m+i+1}}{\tilde{z}_{m-i,m+i}} \cdot \frac{Q_i(a)}{P_i(a)}, \end{aligned}$$

which is also a non-constant rational function. Similarly, one can see that $k_{(m-i,m+i)}^{\mathbf{b},m}(\mathbf{z})$ is also a non-constant rational function for $i \geq 1$. Thus, (4.18) is established if choosing a generically. \square

We are ready to prove Proposition 4.4 for the case where $n = 2k$ and $m = k := \lceil n/2 \rceil$.

Proof of Proposition 4.4 (continued). By Lemma 4.17, we choose $d_{i,m+1} := a \cdot \tilde{z}_{i,m+1}$ from (4.17) as a generic seed. It complete the proof. \square

4.4. Proof of Theorem B

Finally, we are ready to prove the following main theorem.

Theorem 4.18 (Theorem B). *Let $\lambda = \{\lambda_i := n - 2i + 1 \mid i = 1, \dots, n\}$ be an n -tuple of real numbers for an arbitrary integer $n \geq 4$. Consider the co-adjoint orbit \mathcal{O}_λ , a complete flag manifold $\text{Fl}(n)$ equipped with the monotone Kirillov–Kostant–Souriau symplectic form ω_λ . Then each Gelfand–Cetlin fiber $L_m(t)$ is non-displaceable Lagrangian for every $2 \leq m \leq \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$.*

In particular, there exists a family of non-displaceable non-torus Lagrangian fibers

$$\left\{ L_m(1) \mid 2 \leq m \leq \left\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \right\rfloor, m \in \mathbb{Z} \right\}$$

where $L_m(1)$ is diffeomorphic to $U(m) \times T^{\frac{n(n-1)}{2} - m^2}$.

Proof. By Corollary 4.5, the SLT-equation (3.6) has a desired solution for some nonzero complex numbers $c_{i+1,i}^{\text{ver},\mathbb{C}}$'s and $c_{j,j+1}^{\text{hor},\mathbb{C}}$'s ($i, j \geq k$). Theorem 3.6 ensures that for each Lagrangian torus $L_m(t)$ ($0 \leq t < 1$), there exists a suitable bulk-deformation parameter \mathbf{b} of the form (2.8) so that $W^{\mathbf{b}}$ admits a critical point. By Theorem 2.4, each GC torus fiber $L_m(t)$ for $0 \leq t < 1$ is non-displaceable. Furthermore, Lemma 2.10 imply that $L_m(1)$ is non-displaceable. \square

5. Calculation of potential function deformed by Schubert cycles

Since the main steps of the derivation of (5.8) are the same as that of the proof of [FOOO11, Proposition 4.7] given in Section 7 therein, we will only explain modifications we need to make to apply them to the current GC case. Also for the purpose of proving the counter part of Theorem 2.3 in the present paper, the facts that a Fano manifold X_ϵ has a toric degeneration and that we have only to consider codimension two cycles also help us to simplify the study of holomorphic discs contributing to the potential functions. We closely follow [NNU10, Section 9].

Let L be a Lagrangian submanifold in a symplectic manifold X . Let $\mathcal{M}_{k+1;\ell}(X, L; \beta)$ denote the moduli space of stable maps in the class $\beta \in \pi_2(X, L)$ from a bordered Riemann surface Σ of genus zero with $(k+1)$ marked points $\{z_s\}_{s=0}^k$ on the boundary $\partial\Sigma$ respecting the counter-clockwise orientation and ℓ marked points $\{z_r^+\}_{r=1}^\ell$ at the interior of Σ . It naturally comes with two types of evaluation maps, at the i -th boundary marked point

$$(5.1) \quad \text{ev}_i: \mathcal{M}_{k+1;\ell}(X, L; \beta) \rightarrow L; \quad \text{ev}_i([\varphi: \Sigma \rightarrow X, \{z_s\}_{s=0}^{k+1}, \{z_r^+\}_{r=1}^\ell]) = \varphi(z_i)$$

and at the j -th interior marked point

$$(5.2) \quad \text{ev}_j^{\text{int}}: \mathcal{M}_{k+1;\ell}(X, L; \beta) \rightarrow X; \quad \text{ev}_j^{\text{int}}([\varphi: \Sigma \rightarrow X, \{z_s\}_{s=0}^{k+1}, \{z_r^+\}_{r=1}^\ell]) = \varphi(z_j^+).$$

Set $\mathcal{M}_{k+1}(X, L; \beta) := \mathcal{M}_{k+1;\ell=0}(X, L; \beta)$, the moduli space without interior marked points and let

$$\mathbf{ev}_+ := (\text{ev}_1, \dots, \text{ev}_k).$$

Recall that an A_∞ -structure with the operators

$$\mathbf{m}_k = \sum_{\beta} \mathbf{m}_{k,\beta} \cdot T^{\omega(\beta)/2\pi}, \quad \mathbf{m}_{k,\beta}(b_1, \dots, b_k) := (\text{ev}_0)! (\mathbf{ev}_+)^*(\pi_1^* b_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \pi_k^* b_k)$$

on the de Rham complex $\Omega(L)$ is defined via a smooth correspondence.

$$(5.3) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} & \mathcal{M}_{k+1}(X, L; \beta) & \\ \text{ev}_+ \swarrow & & \searrow \text{ev}_0 \\ L^k & & L \end{array}$$

where $\pi_i: L^k \rightarrow L$ denotes the projection to the i -th copy of L . For a general symplectic manifold, one should choose a system of compatible Kuranishi structures and CF-perturbations on $\mathcal{M}_{k+1;\ell}(X, L; \beta)$'s in order to apply the above smooth correspondence, see [Fuk10, FOOO15, FOOO17] for the details of construction. For a Lagrangian toric fiber L in a $2n$ -dimensional toric manifold, by constructing a system of compatible T^n -equivariant Kuranishi structures and multi-sections, the smooth correspondence can be applied without adding an auxiliary space for perturbing multi-sections to make it submersive, [FOOO11, Section 12]. It is because ev_0 is submersive by the T^n -equivariance.

We now recall the computation of the potential function of a torus fiber $L_\epsilon \subset X_\epsilon$ in [NNU10]. They were able to exploit the presence of toric degeneration of X_ϵ to X_0 in their computation the explanation of which is now in order. For the study of holomorphic discs in X_0 which is not smooth, they used the following notion in Nishinou–Siebert [NS06].

Definition 5.1 (Definition 4.1 in [NS06]). A holomorphic curve in a toric variety X is called *torically transverse* if it is disjoint from all toric strata of codimension greater than one. A stable map $\varphi: \Sigma \rightarrow X$ is *torically transverse* if $\varphi(\Sigma) \subset X$ is torically transverse and $\varphi^{-1}(\text{Int } X) \subset \Sigma$ is dense. Here, $\text{Int } X$ is the complement of the toric divisors in X .

We denote by $S_0 := \text{Sing}(X_0)$ the singular locus of X_0 . Using the classification result [CO06] of holomorphic discs attached to a Lagrangian toric fiber in a smooth toric manifold and the property of the small resolution, Nishinou–Nohara–Ueda [NNU10] proved the following.

Lemma 5.2 (Proposition 9.5 and Lemma 9.15 in [NNU10]). *Any holomorphic disc $\varphi: (\mathbb{D}^2, \partial\mathbb{D}^2) \rightarrow (X_0, L_0)$ can be deformed into a holomorphic disc with the same boundary condition that is torically transverse. Furthermore the moduli space $\mathcal{M}_1(X_0, L_0; \beta)$ is empty if the Maslov index of β is less than two.*

Lemma 5.3 (Lemma 9.9 in [NNU10]). *There is a small neighborhood W_0 of the singular locus $S_0 \subset X_0$ such that no holomorphic discs of Maslov index two intersect W_0 .*

Now let $\phi'_\epsilon: X_\epsilon \rightarrow X_0$ be a (continuous) extension of the flow $\phi_\epsilon: X_\epsilon^{\text{sm}} \rightarrow X_0^{\text{sm}}$ given in Theorem 2.1 ([NNU10, Section 8]). The following is the key proposition which relates the above mentioned holomorphic discs in (X_0, L_0) to those of (X_ϵ, L_ϵ) .

Proposition 5.4 (Proposition 9.16 in [NNU10]). *For any $\beta \in \pi_2(X_0, L_0)$ of Maslov index two, there is a positive real numbers $0 < \epsilon \leq 1$ and a diffeomorphism*

$$\psi: \mathcal{M}_1(X_0, L_0; \beta) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_1(X_\epsilon, L_\epsilon; \beta)$$

such that the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} H_*(\mathcal{M}_1(X_0, L_0; \beta)) & \xrightarrow{(\text{ev}_0)_*} & H_*(L_0) \\ \psi_* \downarrow & & \downarrow (\phi_\epsilon)_*^{-1} \\ H_*(\mathcal{M}_1(X_\epsilon, L_\epsilon; \beta)) & \xrightarrow{(\text{ev}_0)_*} & H_*(L_\epsilon) \end{array}$$

is commutative.

Lemma 5.5 (Lemma 9.22 in [NNU10]). *Let $W_\epsilon := (\phi'_\epsilon)^{-1}(W_0)$. There exists $\epsilon_0 > 0$ such that for all $0 < \epsilon \leq \epsilon_0$, any holomorphic curve bounded by L_ϵ in a class of Maslov index two does not intersect W_ϵ .*

We now combine the diffeomorphism $\psi: \mathcal{M}_1(X_0, L_0; \beta) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_1(X_\epsilon, L_\epsilon; \beta)$ and $\phi'_\epsilon: X_0 \rightarrow X_\epsilon$ to define an isomorphism between the following two correspondences

$$(5.4) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{M}_{k+1}(X_0, L_0; \beta) & & \mathcal{M}_{k+1}(X_\epsilon, L_\epsilon; \beta) \\ \swarrow \text{ev}_+ & \searrow \text{ev}_0 & \swarrow \text{ev}_+ \quad \searrow \text{ev}_0 \\ L_0^k & & L_\epsilon^k \end{array} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{M}_{k+1}(X_\epsilon, L_\epsilon; \beta) & & \mathcal{M}_{k+1}(X_0, L_0; \beta) \\ \swarrow \text{ev}_+ & \searrow \text{ev}_0 & \swarrow \text{ev}_+ \quad \searrow \text{ev}_0 \\ L_\epsilon^k & & L_0^k \end{array} .$$

Although they did not explicitly mention a choice of compatible systems of Kuranishi structures or perturbations, Nishinou–Nohara–Ueda [NNU10] essentially constructed an A_∞ -structure on $L_\epsilon \subset X_\epsilon$ and computed its potential function in the same way as on a Fano toric manifolds [CO06, FOOO10] using Proposition 5.4 and Lemma 5.5. Thus, they were able to take advantage of properties of T^n -equivariant perturbation in a toric manifold, an open submanifold of a toric variety X_0 . We denote the corresponding compatible system of multi-sections by $\mathfrak{s} = \mathfrak{s}_{k+1, \beta}$, see [FOOO10, FOOO11] for the meaning of this notation.

Next we need to involve bulk deformations for our purpose of a construction of continuum of non-displaceable Lagrangian tori in X , whose construction is now in order. Denote $\mathcal{A}_{GS}^2(\mathbb{Z})$ by the free abelian group generated by the horizontal & vertical Schubert cycles of codimension two

$$(5.5) \quad \{\mathcal{D}_{i, i+1}^{\text{hor}} \mid 1 \leq i \leq n-1\} \cup \{\mathcal{D}_{j+1, j}^{\text{ver}} \mid 1 \leq j \leq n-1\}.$$

Since $L \cap \mathcal{D}_{i, i+1}^{\text{hor}} = \emptyset = L \cap \mathcal{D}_{j+1, j}^{\text{ver}}$ for any i, j , the cap product of $\beta \in \pi_2(X, L)$ with any element thereof is well-defined. Putting $\mathcal{A}_{GS}^2(\Lambda_0) := \mathcal{A}_{GS}^2(\mathbb{Z}) \otimes \Lambda_0$, any element $\mathfrak{b} \in \mathcal{A}_{GS}^2(\Lambda_0)$ can be expressed as

$$(5.6) \quad \mathfrak{b} = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \mathfrak{b}_{i, i+1}^{\text{hor}} \mathcal{D}_{i, i+1}^{\text{hor}} + \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \mathfrak{b}_{j+1, j}^{\text{ver}} \mathcal{D}_{j+1, j}^{\text{ver}}$$

where $\mathfrak{b}_{i, i+1}^{\text{hor}}, \mathfrak{b}_{j+1, j}^{\text{ver}} \in \Lambda_0$. We formally denote

$$(5.7) \quad \beta \cap \mathfrak{b} = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \mathfrak{b}_{i, i+1}^{\text{hor}} (\beta \cap \mathcal{D}_{i, i+1}^{\text{hor}}) + \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \mathfrak{b}_{j+1, j}^{\text{ver}} (\beta \cap \mathcal{D}_{j+1, j}^{\text{ver}}).$$

For simplicity, let us fix an enumeration $\{\mathcal{D}_j \mid j = 1, \dots, B\}$ of the elements in (5.5) where $B = 2(n-2)$ and set \mathfrak{b}_j to be the coefficient corresponding to \mathcal{D}_j in (5.6).

The following is the statement of the counterpart of Theorem 2.3.

Theorem 5.6. *Let $\mathbf{b} \in \mathcal{A}_{GS}^2(\Lambda_0)$ and let L_ε be a torus Lagrangian fiber in X_ε . Then the bulk-deformed potential function is written as*

$$(5.8) \quad W^{\mathbf{b}}(L_\varepsilon; b) = \sum_{\beta} n_{\beta} \cdot \exp(\beta \cap \mathbf{b}) \cdot \exp(\partial\beta \cap b) T^{\omega(\beta)/2\pi}.$$

where the summation is taken over all homotopy classes in $\pi_2(X_\varepsilon, L_\varepsilon)$ of Maslov index two.

The remaining part of this section is reserved for the proof of Theorem 5.6.

For a Lagrangian submanifold L of X , denote by

$$ev_i^{\text{int}}: \mathcal{M}_{k+1;\ell}^{\text{main}}(L, \beta) \rightarrow X$$

the evaluation map at the i -th interior marked point for $i = 1, \dots, \ell$. We put $\underline{B} = \{1, \dots, B\}$ and denote the set of all maps $\mathbf{p}: \{1, \dots, \ell\} \rightarrow \underline{B}$ by $Map(\ell, \underline{B})$. We write $|\mathbf{p}| = \ell$ if $\mathbf{p} \in Map(\ell, \underline{B})$. We define a fiber product

$$(5.9) \quad \mathcal{M}_{k+1;\ell}^{\text{main}}(L, \beta; \mathbf{p}) = \mathcal{M}_{k+1;\ell}^{\text{main}}(L, \beta)_{(ev_1^{\text{int}}, \dots, ev_\ell^{\text{int}})} \times_{X^\ell} \prod_{i=1}^{\ell} \mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{p}(i)}$$

and consider the evaluation maps

$$ev_i: \mathcal{M}_{k+1;\ell}^{\text{main}}(L, \beta; \mathbf{p}) \rightarrow L \text{ by } ev_i((\Sigma, \varphi, \{z_i^+\}, \{z_i\})) = \varphi(z_i).$$

Note the image of a Schubert horizontal or vertical cycle is (a union of) components of the toric divisor via the map ϕ'_ε so that \mathcal{D}_j can be regarded as the (union of) components of toric divisors corresponding to Schubert horizontal or vertical cycles. Also, by Proposition 5.4 and Lemma 5.5, the holomorphic discs of Maslov index two intersect at the smooth locus of cycles. For a toric fiber L_0 in X_0 , there is a system $\mathfrak{s} = \{\mathfrak{s}_{k+1,\beta;\mathbf{p}}\}$ of T^n -equivariant multi-sections on the moduli spaces $\mathcal{M}_{k+1,l}(X_0, L_0; \beta; \mathbf{p})$ for all classes β with $\mu(\beta) = 2$ in [FOOO11, Lemma 6.5].

As in the correspondence in (5.4), applying a smooth correspondence into

$$(5.10) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} & \mathcal{M}_{k+1,l}(X_\varepsilon, L_\varepsilon; \beta; \mathbf{p}) & \\ \text{ev}_+ \swarrow & & \searrow \text{ev}_0 \\ L^k & & L \end{array}$$

we define

$$\mathbf{q}_{k,\ell;\beta}(\mathbf{p}; b^{\otimes k}) := (\text{ev}_0)! (\text{ev}_+^*(\pi_1^* b \otimes \dots \otimes \pi_k^* b)).$$

Since X_ε is Fano, Lemma 5.2 and $L \cap \mathcal{D}_{i,i+1}^{\text{hor}} = \emptyset = L \cap \mathcal{D}_{j+1,j}^{\text{ver}}$ yield that $\mathcal{M}_{k+1;\ell}(X_\varepsilon, L_\varepsilon, \beta; \mathbf{p})$ empty if one of the following is satisfied.

$$(5.11) \quad (1) \mu(\beta) < 0, \quad (2) \mu(\beta) = 0 \text{ and } \beta \neq 0, \quad (3) \beta = 0 \text{ and } l > 0.$$

Because of the compatibility of the forgetful map forgetting the boundary marked points, see [Fuk10, Section 5],

$$(5.12) \quad \mathbf{q}_{k,\ell;\beta}(\mathbf{p}; b^{\otimes k}) = \frac{1}{k!} (\partial\beta \cap b)^k \cdot \mathbf{q}_{0,\ell;\beta}(\mathbf{p}; 1).$$

Since any moduli spaces satisfying one of the conditions in (5.11) are empty, $\mathbf{q}_{0,\ell;\beta}(\mathbf{p}; 1)$ represents a cycle, yielding L_ε is weakly unobstructed with respect to \mathbf{b} in (5.6). Passing to the canonical model [FOOO09b, FOOO09a], we obtain

$$(5.13) \quad \mathbf{q}_{0,\ell;\beta}(\mathbf{p}; 1) = n_\beta(\mathbf{p}) \cdot \text{PD}[L]$$

for some $n_\beta(\mathbf{p}) \in \mathbb{Q}$. As a consequence, we obtain every 1-cochain is a weak bounding cochain with respect to \mathbf{b} . In particular, the potential function with bulk is defined on $H^1(L_\varepsilon; \Lambda_+)$.

Under our situation, $n_\beta(\mathbf{p})$ is well-defined. Especially when $\dim \mathcal{D}_\bullet = 2n - 2$, $\mu(\beta) = 2$, we recall that this is precisely the situation where the divisor axiom of the Gromov-Witten theory

applies, see [CK99, p.193] and [FOOO11, Lemma 9.2]. In particular, we can calculate $n_\beta(\mathbf{p})$ in the homology level and therefore

$$(5.14) \quad n_\beta(\mathbf{p}) = n_\beta \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{|\mathbf{p}|} (\beta \cap \mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{p}(i)}).$$

Following [FOOO11, Section 7] and using (5.12), (5.13), (5.14) and (5.7), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \mathbf{m}_k^{\mathbf{b}}(b^{\otimes k}) &:= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \sum_{\beta; \mu(\beta)=2} \frac{1}{\ell!} \mathbf{q}_{k, \ell; \beta}(\mathbf{b}^{\otimes \ell}; b^{\otimes k}) T^{\omega(\beta)/2\pi} \\ &= \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \sum_{\mathbf{p}; |\mathbf{p}|=\ell} \sum_{\beta; \mu(\beta)=2} \exp(\partial\beta \cap b) \cdot \frac{1}{\ell!} \mathbf{b}^{\mathbf{p}} \mathbf{q}_{0, \ell; \beta}(\mathbf{p}; 1) T^{\omega(\beta)/2\pi} \\ &= \sum_{\beta; \mu(\beta)=2} \left(\sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \sum_{\mathbf{p}; |\mathbf{p}|=\ell} \exp(\partial\beta \cap b) \cdot \frac{1}{\ell!} \mathbf{b}^{\mathbf{p}} n_\beta(\mathbf{p}) \right) T^{\omega(\beta)/2\pi} \cdot PD[L] \\ &= \sum_{\beta; \mu(\beta)=2} n_\beta \cdot \left(\sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\ell!} \sum_{\mathbf{p}; |\mathbf{p}|=\ell} \prod_{i=1}^{|\mathbf{p}|} \mathbf{b}_{\mathbf{p}(i)}(\beta \cap \mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{p}(i)}) \right) \cdot \exp(\partial\beta \cap b) \cdot T^{\omega(\beta)/2\pi} \cdot PD[L] \\ &= \sum_{\beta; \mu(\beta)=2} n_\beta \cdot \exp(\beta \cap \mathbf{b}) \cdot \exp(\partial\beta \cap b) \cdot T^{\omega(\beta)/2\pi} \cdot PD[L] \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{b}^{\mathbf{p}} = \prod_{i=1}^{\ell} \mathbf{b}_{\mathbf{p}(i)}$. Finally, incorporating with deformation of non-unitary flat line bundle by Cho [Cho08], we extend the domain of the bulk-deformed potential to $H^1(L_\varepsilon; \Lambda_0)$. This completes the proof of Theorem 5.6.

References

- [BCFKvS00] Victor V. Batyrev, Ionuț Ciocan-Fontanine, Bumsig Kim, and Duco van Straten, *Mirror symmetry and toric degenerations of partial flag manifolds*, Acta Math. **184** (2000), no. 1, 1–39.
- [Ber75] David N. Bernstein, *The number of roots of a system of equations*, Funct. Anal. Appl. **9** (1975), 183–185.
- [Cho08] Cheol-Hyun Cho, *Non-displaceable Lagrangian submanifolds and Floer cohomology with non-unitary line bundle*, J. Geom. Phys. **58** (2008), no. 11, 1465–1476.
- [CK99] David A. Cox and Sheldon Katz, *Mirror symmetry and algebraic geometry*, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, vol. 68, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1999.
- [CK19] Yunhyung Cho and Yoosik Kim, *Monotone Lagrangians in Flag Varieties*, International Mathematics Research Notices (2019).
- [CKO17] Yunhyung Cho, Yoosik Kim, and Yong-Geun Oh, *Lagrangian fibers of Gelfand-Cetlin systems*, preprint arXiv:1704.07213 (2017).
- [CO06] Cheol-Hyun Cho and Yong-Geun Oh, *Floer cohomology and disc instantons of Lagrangian torus fibers in Fano toric manifolds*, Asian J. Math. **10** (2006), no. 4, 773–814.
- [EL15] Jonathan David Evans and Yankı Lekili, *Floer cohomology of the Chiang Lagrangian*, Selecta Math. (N.S.) **21** (2015), no. 4, 1361–1404.
- [EL19] Jonathan David Evans and Yankı Lekili, *Generating the Fukaya categories of Hamiltonian G-manifolds*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **32** (2019), no. 1, 119–162.
- [FOOO09a] Kenji Fukaya, Yong-Geun Oh, Hiroshi Ohta, and Kaoru Ono, *Canonical models of filtered A_∞ -algebras and Morse complexes*, New perspectives and challenges in symplectic field theory, CRM Proc. Lecture Notes, vol. 49, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2009, pp. 201–227.
- [FOOO09b] ———, *Lagrangian intersection Floer theory: anomaly and obstruction. Part I and Part II*, AMS/IP Studies in Advanced Mathematics, vol. 46, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI; International Press, Somerville, MA, 2009.
- [FOOO10] ———, *Lagrangian Floer theory on compact toric manifolds. I*, Duke Math. J. **151** (2010), no. 1, 23–174.
- [FOOO11] ———, *Lagrangian Floer theory on compact toric manifolds II: bulk deformations*, Selecta Math. (N.S.) **17** (2011), no. 3, 609–711.
- [FOOO12] ———, *Toric degeneration and nondisplaceable Lagrangian tori in $S^2 \times S^2$* , Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN (2012), no. 13, 2942–2993.

- [FOOO15] ———, *Kuranishi structure, pseudo-holomorphic curve, and virtual fundamental chain: Part 1.*, preprint arXiv:1503.07631 (2015).
- [FOOO16] ———, *Lagrangian Floer theory and mirror symmetry on compact toric manifolds*, *Astérisque* (2016), no. 376, vi+340.
- [FOOO17] ———, *Kuranishi structure, pseudo-holomorphic curve, and virtual fundamental chain: Part 2.*, preprint arXiv:1704.01848 (2017).
- [FOOO19] ———, *Spectral invariants with bulk, quasi-morphisms and Lagrangian Floer theory*, *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.* **260** (2019), no. 1254, x+266.
- [Fuk10] Kenji Fukaya, *Cyclic symmetry and adic convergence in Lagrangian Floer theory*, *Kyoto J. Math.* **50** (2010), no. 3, 521–590.
- [GL96] N. Gonciulea and V. Lakshmibai, *Degenerations of flag and Schubert varieties to toric varieties*, *Transform. Groups* **1** (1996), no. 3, 215–248.
- [GS83] V. Guillemin and S. Sternberg, *The Gel’fand-Cetlin system and quantization of the complex flag manifolds*, *J. Funct. Anal.* **52** (1983), no. 1, 106–128.
- [KLS19] Yoosik Kim, Jaeho Lee, and Fumihiko Sanda, *Detecting non-displaceable toric fibers on compact toric manifolds via tropicalizations*, *Internat. J. Math.* **30** (2019), no. 1, 1950003, 40.
- [KM05] Mikhail Kogan and Ezra Miller, *Toric degeneration of Schubert varieties and Gelfand-Tsetlin polytopes*, *Adv. Math.* **193** (2005), no. 1, 1–17.
- [Kog00] Mikhail Kogan, *Schubert geometry of flag varieties and Gelfand-Cetlin theory*, ProQuest LLC, Ann Arbor, MI, 2000, Thesis (Ph.D.)—Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- [Kus76] Anatoli G. Kushnirenko, *Polydres de newton et nombres de milnor*, *Inventiones Mathematicae* **32** (1976), no. 1, 131.
- [NNU10] Takeo Nishinou, Yuichi Nohara, and Kazushi Ueda, *Toric degenerations of Gelfand-Cetlin systems and potential functions*, *Adv. Math.* **224** (2010), no. 2, 648–706.
- [NS06] Takeo Nishinou and Bernd Siebert, *Toric degenerations of toric varieties and tropical curves*, *Duke Math. J.* **135** (2006), no. 1, 1–51.
- [NU16] Yuichi Nohara and Kazushi Ueda, *Floer cohomologies of non-torus fibers of the Gelfand-Cetlin system*, *J. Symplectic Geom.* **14** (2016), no. 4, 1251–1293.
- [Pab15] Milena Pabiniak, *Displacing (Lagrangian) submanifolds in the manifolds of full flags*, *Adv. Geom.* **15** (2015), no. 1, 101–108.
- [Sun17] Yuhan Sun, *A_n -type surface singularity and nondisplaceable Lagrangian tori.*, preprint arXiv:1710.11221 (2017).
- [Via18] Renato Vianna, *Continuum families of non-displaceable Lagrangian tori in $(\mathbb{C}P^1)^{2m}$* , *J. Symplectic Geom.* **16** (2018), no. 3, 857–883.
- [Woo11] Christopher T. Woodward, *Gauged Floer theory of toric moment fibers*, *Geom. Funct. Anal.* **21** (2011), no. 3, 680–749.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS EDUCATION, SUNGKYUNKWAN UNIVERSITY, SEOUL, REPUBLIC OF KOREA
E-mail address: yunhyung@skku.edu

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, BRANDEIS UNIVERSITY, WALTHAM, USA AND CENTER OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES AND APPLICATIONS, HARVARD UNIVERSITY, CAMBRIDGE, USA
E-mail address: yoosik@brandeis.edu, yoosik@cmsa.fas.harvard.edu

CENTER FOR GEOMETRY AND PHYSICS, INSTITUTE FOR BASIC SCIENCE (IBS), POHANG, REPUBLIC OF KOREA, AND DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, POSTECH, POHANG, REPUBLIC OF KOREA
E-mail address: yongoh1@postech.ac.kr