

# AUGMENTATIONS AND RULING POLYNOMIALS FOR LEGENDRIAN GRAPHS

BYUNG HEE AN, YOUNGJIN BAE, AND TAO SU

**ABSTRACT.** In this article, associated to a (bordered) Legendrian graph, we study and show the equivalence between two Legendrian isotopy invariants: augmentation number via point-counting over a finite field, for the augmentation variety of the associated Chekanov-Eliashberg differential graded algebra, and ruling polynomial via combinatorics of the decompositions of the associated front projection.

## CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Preliminaries	3
2.1. Bordered Legendrian graphs	3
2.2. Front and Lagrangian projections	4
3. Bordered DGA invariants for bordered Legendrian graphs	8
3.1. Preliminaries on DGAs	8
3.2. Bordered DGAs	11
3.3. Chekanov-Eliashberg DGAs for bordered Legendrian graphs	12
4. Augmentations	18
4.1. Augmentation varieties for border DGAs	18
4.2. Augmentation varieties with boundary conditions	21
4.3. Augmentation varieties for internal DGAs	23
5. Rulings	26
5.1. Resolution of vertices	26
5.2. Rulings for bordered Legendrian graphs	28
5.3. Augmentation numbers are ruling polynomials	30
Appendix A. Generalized stabilizations and Ekholm-Ng's (de)stabilizations	39
Appendix B. Complementary results on augmentations	42
B.1. Orbits of augmentation varieties for internal DGAs	42
B.2. Augmentations for elementary bordered Legendrian graphs with a vertex	47
B.3. Ruling decomposition for augmentation varieties of bordered Legendrian graphs	59
References	66

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The theory of Legendrian knots has been extremely fruitful. Classical Legendrian isotopy invariants include rotation numbers and Thurston-Bennequin numbers [14]. However, the much more powerful invariants are Chekanov-Eliashberg differential graded algebras (CE DGAs), which distinguish a pair of Legendrian knots with the same classical invariants [7]. The CE DGAs admit higher dimensional generalizations, known as Legendrian contact homology differential graded algebras (LCH DGAs), associated to any pairs of a Legendrian submanifold contained in a contact manifold. The LCH DGAs fit into the more general framework of symplectic field theory [10], and have a Morse-Floer-Fukaya theoretic definition in terms of counting of holomorphic disks. There is an advantage in the case of Legendrian knots contained in the standard contact three-space  $\mathbb{R}_{\text{std}}^3$ . That is, the LCH DGAs in this case also admit a combinatorial

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 57R17; Secondary: 57M15, 05C31.

*Key words and phrases.* Legendrian graphs, Chekanov-Eliashberg DGA, augmentation variety, ruling polynomial.

description [7, 12], allowing concrete computations. The LCH DGAs are Legendrian isotopy invariants, up to homotopy equivalence.

On the other hand, there are natural singular generalizations of Legendrian knots, i.e. singular Legendrian 1-dimensional submanifolds in contact 3-manifolds, called *Legendrian graphs* [22]. The motivation for studying these objects is quite natural. For example, they have already appeared in the proof of the Giroux correspondence [15, 11], a bijection between the set of oriented contact structures up to isotopy and the set of open book decompositions up to positive stabilization, on compact oriented 3-manifolds. Also, Legendrian graphs are used in [9] to show that the classical invariants are complete invariants for topologically trivial Legendrian knots. Recently, they also appear in the construction and study of Weinstein manifolds whose skeleton are singular, especially the arboreal type, see [19].

In this article, we study the Legendrian isotopy invariants of Legendrian graphs, or more generally, *bordered Legendrian graphs*. A bordered Legendrian graph  $\mathcal{T} = (T_L \rightarrow T \leftarrow T_R)$  with a Maslov potential  $\mu = (\mu_L, \mu, \mu_R)$  is a singular Legendrian 1-submanifold  $T$  in  $J^1\mathbf{U} \cong \mathbf{U} \times \mathbb{R}_{yz}^2$ , which is ‘transverse’ to the left and right boundaries  $\partial(J^1\mathbf{U})$  along the borders  $T_L$  and  $T_R$ , respectively. Here,  $\mathbf{U} \subset \mathbb{R}_x$  is a closed interval.

Similar to Legendrian knots, there are Legendrian isotopy invariants, the LCH DGAs

$$A^{\text{CE}}(\mathcal{T}, \mu) = \left( A^{\text{CE}}(T_L, \mu_L) \leftarrow A^{\text{CE}}(T, \mu) \rightarrow A^{\text{CE}}(T_R, \mu_R) \right)$$

for bordered Legendrian graphs  $(\mathcal{T}, \mu)$  defined combinatorially as in [1]. A standard way to extract numerical invariants from the LCH DGAs  $A^{\text{CE}}(\mathcal{T}, \mu)$  is via counting the ‘‘functor-of-points’’ for  $A^{\text{CE}}(\mathcal{T}, \mu)$  over a finite field  $\mathbb{F}_q$ . More specifically, for any base field  $\mathbb{K}$ , we consider the set of augmentations, i.e. DGA maps,  $\epsilon : A^{\text{CE}}(T, \mu) \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$  onto  $\mathbb{K}$  with zero differential, whose restrictions  $\epsilon_* : A^{\text{CE}}(T_*, \mu_*) \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$  for  $*$  = L and R are specified by boundary conditions. This defines an algebraic variety, called *augmentation variety* (with boundary conditions), whose normalized point-counting over  $\mathbb{F}_q$  defines a numerical Legendrian isotopy invariant, called the *augmentation number* and denoted by  $\text{aug}(\mathcal{T}, \mu; \rho_L, \rho_R; \mathbb{F}_q)$ .

Our main result in this article solves the question of counting the augmentation number. More precisely, we generalize the results in [17, 23] to show that the augmentation numbers are computed by ruling polynomials of  $(\mathcal{T}, \mu)$ , defined via the combinatorics of decompositions of the front projection  $\pi_{xz}(\mathcal{T})$  as follows:

**Main Theorem** (Theorem 5.3.17, Corollary 5.2.6). *For a bordered Legendrian graph  $\mathcal{T}$  with a Maslov potential  $\mu$ , let  $\rho_L \in \text{NR}(T_L, \mu_L)$  and  $\rho_R \in \text{NR}(T_R, \mu_R)$  be two boundary conditions, i.e., normal rulings. Then the following two Legendrian isotopy invariants coincide:*

$$\text{aug}(\mathcal{T}, \mu; \rho_L, \rho_R; \mathbb{F}_q) = q^{-\frac{d+\widehat{B}}{2}} z^{\widehat{B}} \langle \rho_L | R(\mathcal{T}, \mu; q, z) | \rho_R \rangle.$$

Here,  $\langle \rho_L | R(\mathcal{T}, \mu; q, z) | \rho_R \rangle \in \mathbb{Z}[q^{\pm \frac{1}{2}}, z^{\pm 1}]$  is the two-variable ruling polynomial for  $(\mathcal{T}, \mu)$  with boundary conditions  $(\rho_L, \rho_R)$ ,  $d := \max \deg_z \langle \rho_L | R(\mathcal{T}, \mu; z^2, z) | \rho_R \rangle$ . In the formula, we take  $z = q^{\frac{1}{2}} - q^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ , and

$$\widehat{B} := B + \sum_{v \in V(\mathcal{T})} \frac{\text{val}(v)}{2}$$

counts the number of ‘‘generalized’’ base points in  $T$ .

Moreover, the ruling polynomial satisfies the gluing property, that is, for the concatenation  $(\mathcal{T}, \mu) = (\mathcal{T}^1, \mu^1) \cdot (\mathcal{T}^2, \mu^2)$  of two bordered Legendrian graphs with Maslov potentials with  $(T_R^1, \mu_R^1) = (T_L^2, \mu_L^2)$ , we have

$$\langle \rho_L | R(\mathcal{T}, \mu; q, z) | \rho_R \rangle = \sum_{\rho \in \text{NR}(T_R^1, \mu_R^1)} \langle \rho_L | R(\mathcal{T}^1, \mu^1; q, z) | \rho \rangle \cdot \langle \rho | R(\mathcal{T}^2, \mu^2; q, z) | \rho_R \rangle.$$

By the second statement above, we tend to view the augmentation number  $\text{aug}(\mathcal{T}, \mu; \rho_L, \rho_R; \mathbb{F}_q)$  or the ruling polynomial  $\langle \rho_L | R(\mathcal{T}, \mu; q, z) | \rho_R \rangle$  as the Legendrian analogue of Jones polynomials [18] in topological knot theory, which is well-known to fit into a 3D TQFT. Hence, we may consider them interesting problems to build a ‘‘contact version of 3D TQFT’’ for Legendrian knots and graphs in contact 3-manifolds.

Another purpose of this article is to set up a foundation for our next article [4], in which we show the slogan ‘‘augmentations are sheaves’’ for Legendrian graphs that generalizes the case of Legendrian knots [20]. More specifically, for each closed interval  $\mathbf{U} \subset \mathbb{R}_x$  and  $M = \mathbf{U} \times \mathbb{R}_z$ , we first identify  $J^1\mathbf{U}$  with the contact submanifold  $T^{\infty, -}M$  of the co-sphere bundle  $T^{\infty}M$  which consists of covectors which are negative

in the  $z$ -directions. Now for a bordered Legendrian graph  $\mathcal{T}$  in  $J^1\mathbf{U}$  with a Maslov potential  $\mu$ , we define  $\mathcal{Sh}_{\mathcal{T},\mu}(M; \mathbb{K})$  to be the DG category of constructible sheaves on  $M$  with micro-support at infinity contained in  $\mathcal{T}$ , and define  $C_1(\mathcal{T}, \mu; \mathbb{K})$  to be the full subcategory of  $\mathcal{Sh}_{\mathcal{T},\mu}(M; \mathbb{K})$  whose objects are microlocal rank 1 sheaves with acyclic stalks for large enough  $|z|$ .

**Theorem 1.0.1.** [4] *There is a well-defined diagram of unital  $A_\infty$ -categories:*

$$\text{Aug}_+(\mathcal{T}, \mu; \mathbb{K}) := (\text{Aug}_+(T_L, \mu_L; \mathbb{K}) \leftarrow \text{Aug}_+(T, \mu; \mathbb{K}) \rightarrow \text{Aug}_+(T_R, \mu_R; \mathbb{K})),$$

where the objects of  $\text{Aug}_+(\mathcal{T}, \mu; \mathbb{K})$  are the (acyclic) augmentations of the LCH DGA  $A^{\text{CE}}(T, \mu)$ . The diagram is invariant under Legendrian isotopy up to  $A_\infty$ -equivalence. Moreover, there is an  $A_\infty$ -equivalence between the two diagrams of unital  $A_\infty$ -categories:

$$\text{Aug}_+(\mathcal{T}, \mu; \mathbb{K}) \xrightarrow{\cong} C_1(\mathcal{T}, \mu; \mathbb{K}).$$

Here,  $C_1(\mathcal{T}, \mu; \mathbb{K}) := (C_1(T_L, \mu_L; \mathbb{K}) \leftarrow C_1(T, \mu; \mathbb{K}) \rightarrow C_1(T_R, \mu_R; \mathbb{K}))$  is a diagram of DG-categories of constructible sheaves, with each category defined as above. In particular, when  $T = \Lambda \subset T^{\infty,-}M$  is a Legendrian graph, we get an  $A_\infty$ -equivalence  $\text{Aug}_+(\Lambda, \mu; \mathbb{K}) \xrightarrow{\cong} C_1(\Lambda, \mu; \mathbb{K})$ . Namely, the slogan “augmentations are sheaves” holds in the singular case.

As a consequence of Theorem 1.0.1, up to a normalization, our main theorem also gives the point-counting of the moduli space  $\mathcal{M}_1(\mathcal{T}, \mu; \mathbb{K})$  of sheaves in  $C_1(\mathcal{T}, \mu; \mathbb{K})$  (with boundary conditions) over a finite field  $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{F}_q$ . By a theorem of N. Katz [16, Appendix], this is also the same as giving the  $E$ -polynomial of  $\mathcal{M}_1(\mathcal{T}, \mu; \mathbb{C})$ . Notice that  $\mathcal{M}_1(\mathcal{T}, \mu; \mathbb{K})$  is an analogue of the wild character varieties over a punctured Riemann surface, the latter is well-known as the Betti moduli space in non-abelian Hodge theory, the study of which remains a central subject of current research (for example, see [16]). Thus, it would be interesting to explore the Hodge theory of  $\mathcal{M}_1(\mathcal{T}, \mu; \mathbb{K})$  as well. See also Remark 5.3.8 for more information.

**Organization.** The article is organized as follows. In Section 2, we give the basic backgrounds on bordered Legendrian graphs  $\mathcal{T} = (T_L \rightarrow T \leftarrow T_R)$  with a Maslov potential  $\mu = (\mu_L, \mu, \mu_R)$ . In Section 3, we introduce bordered LCH DGAs  $A^{\text{CE}}(\mathcal{T}, \mu) = (A^{\text{CE}}(T_L, \mu_L) \rightarrow A^{\text{CE}}(T, \mu) \leftarrow A^{\text{CE}}(T_R, \mu_R))$ . The key result in this section is to show the invariance of the diagrams of LCH DGAs for bordered Legendrian graphs, up to (generalized) stabilizations.

In Section 4, we introduce augmentations and augmentation varieties (with boundary conditions)  $\text{Aug}(\mathcal{T}, \mu; \epsilon_L, \rho_R; \mathbb{K})$  for the LCH DGAs  $A^{\text{CE}}(\mathcal{T}, \mu)$ . The normalized point-counting over a finite field  $\mathbb{F}_q$  of  $\text{Aug}(\mathcal{T}, \mu; \epsilon_L, \rho_R; \mathbb{F}_q)$  then defines the augmentation number  $\text{aug}(\mathcal{T}, \mu; \rho_L, \rho_R; \mathbb{F}_q)$ . The key ingredient in this section is to show the “invariance” of the augmentation varieties  $\text{Aug}(\mathcal{T}, \mu; \epsilon_L, \rho_R; \mathbb{K})$ , which implies the invariance of augmentation numbers  $\text{aug}(\mathcal{T}, \mu; \rho_L, \rho_R; \mathbb{F}_q)$ . Unlike the Legendrian knot case, this is not a trivial task, due to the involvement of generalized stabilization of LCH DGAs for (bordered) Legendrian graphs.

In Section 5, we introduce and show the invariance of normal rulings  $\mathbf{R}(\mathcal{T}, \mu; \rho_L, \rho_R)$  and ruling polynomials (with boundary conditions)  $\langle \rho_L | R(\mathcal{T}, \mu; q, z) | \rho_R \rangle$  for bordered Legendrian graphs  $(\mathcal{T}, \mu)$  with Maslov potentials. The gluing property of ruling polynomials will follow directly from the definition. We then show our main result that augmentation numbers are ruling polynomials up to a normalization. The proof is via a tangle approach as in [23].

**Acknowledgements.** We would like to thank RIMS in Japan, IBS-CGP in South Korea, and ENS Paris - CNRS in France for supporting the visits, where much of this project was developed. The first author is supported by IBS-R003-D1. The second author is supported by Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (JSPS) International Research Fellowship Program, and he thanks Research Institute for Mathematical Sciences, Kyoto University for its warm hospitality. The third author is supported by ANR-15-CE40-0007. He would like to thank Stéphane Guillermou for the invitation to visit CRM, Montreal, where part of this project was improved. In addition, he is grateful to Vivek Shende, David Nadler, and Lehnard Ng for the help in his early career.

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

**2.1. Bordered Legendrian graphs.** A graph is a finite regular one dimensional CW complex, whose 0-cells and closed 1-cells are called vertices and edges. For each vertex  $v$ , a *half-edge* at  $v$  is a small enough

restriction of an edge adjacent to  $v$ . Then as usual, the *valency* of  $v$  is the number of half-edges at  $v$  and denoted by  $\text{val}(v)$ .

A (*based*) *bordered graph*  $\Gamma = (V, V_L, V_R, B, E)$  of type  $(n_L, n_R)$  consists of the following data:

- the pair  $(V \sqcup V_L \sqcup V_R \sqcup B, E)$  defines a graph  $|\Gamma|$ ,
- each  $b \in B$  of  $|\Gamma|$  is bivalent, and
- two disjoint subsets  $V_L$  and  $V_R$  consist of  $n_L$  and  $n_R$  univalent vertices of  $|\Gamma|$ .

Elements in  $V, V_L, V_R, B$  and  $E$  will be called *vertices*, *left borders*, *right borders*, *base points* and *edges*, respectively. The *interior*  $\mathring{\Gamma}$  of  $\Gamma$  is define to be the complement of  $V_L \sqcup V_R$ .

**Notation 2.1.1.** In order to emphasize the border structures, we will denote the bordered graph  $\Gamma$  as

$$\Gamma = (\Gamma_L \rightarrow \Gamma \leftarrow \Gamma_R),$$

where  $\Gamma_L$  and  $\Gamma_R$  are defined by  $V_L$  and  $V_R$  by, respectively, and both arrows are inclusions.

From now on, we mean by a *graph* a bordered graph with empty borders ( $\emptyset \rightarrow \Gamma \leftarrow \emptyset$ ), which will be denoted simply by  $\Gamma$ .

For a closed interval  $U = [x_L, x_R] \subset \mathbb{R}_x$ , let the *bordered one-jet space*  $J^1U = (J^1U_L \rightarrow J^1U \leftarrow J^1U_R)$  be the one-jet space  $J^1U := (U \times \mathbb{R}_{yz}, dz - ydx) \subset J^1\mathbb{R}_x = (\mathbb{R}_{xyz}^3, dz - ydx)$  together with two contact submanifolds

$$J^1U_L := (\{x_L\} \times \mathbb{R}_z, dz) \quad \text{and} \quad J^1U_R := (\{x_R\} \times \mathbb{R}_z, dz).$$

**Definition 2.1.2** (bordered Legendrian graphs). A *bordered Legendrian graph*  $\mathcal{T} = (T_L \rightarrow T \leftarrow T_R)$  of a bordered graph  $\Gamma$  of type  $(n_L, n_R)$  in  $J^1U$  is defined as an embedding  $T : \Gamma \rightarrow J^1U$  such that

- (1)  $T$  is transverse to the boundary  $\partial J^1U = \partial U \times \mathbb{R}_{yz}$  and the restrictions on the interior  $\mathring{\Gamma}$  and both borders  $\Gamma_L$  and  $\Gamma_R$  are contained in  $J^1\mathring{U}$ ,  $J^1U_L$  and  $J^1U_R$ , respectively.

$$T \pitchfork \partial J^1U, \quad T_L := T(\Gamma_L) \subset J^1U_L, \quad T_R := T(\Gamma_R) \subset J^1U_R, \quad \mathring{T} := T(\mathring{\Gamma}) \subset J^1\mathring{U}.$$

- (2)  $T$  on edges are smooth Legendrian with boundary and pairwise non-tangent to each other at all vertices and base points, in particular, two edges adjacent to each base point form a smooth arc.

By labeling borders in  $T_L$  and  $T_R$  in top-to-bottom ways with respect to  $z$ -coordinates, we identify the left and right border  $T_L$  and  $T_R$  with the set  $[n_L] = \{1, \dots, n_L\}$  and  $[n_R] = \{1, \dots, n_R\}$ .

**2.2. Front and Lagrangian projections.** There are two projections for  $J^1\mathbb{R}_x \cong \mathbb{R}_{xyz}^3$ , called the *front* and *Lagrangian* projections  $\pi_{\text{fr}} : \mathbb{R}_{xyz}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{xz}^2$  and  $\pi_{\text{Lag}} : \mathbb{R}_{xyz}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{xy}^2$ , respectively.

**Definition 2.2.1** (Regular projections). For a bordered Legendrian graph  $\mathcal{T} = (T_L \rightarrow T \leftarrow T_R)$ , the *front* and *Lagrangian projections*  $\mathcal{T} = (T_L \rightarrow T \leftarrow T_R) := \pi_{\text{fr}}(\mathcal{T})$  and  $\mathcal{T}_{\text{Lag}} = (T_{\text{Lag},L} \rightarrow T_{\text{Lag}} \leftarrow T_{\text{Lag},R}) := \pi_{\text{Lag}}(\mathcal{T})$  are said to be *regular* if in their interiors,

- (1) there are only finitely many transverse double points, called *crossings*, and
- (2) no vertices, basepoints or *x-extreme points* are crossings,
- (3) each edge containing a *x-maximal* point must involve at least one vertex or a base point,

where a point in the interior  $\mathring{T}$  is said to be *x-maximal* or *x-minimal* if it is maximal or minimal with respect to the  $x$ -coordinate, and *x-extreme* if it is either *x-maximal* or *x-minimal*.<sup>1</sup>

A bordered Legendrian graph of type  $(0, 0)$  is called a *Legendrian graph* and we denote the sets of regular front and Lagrangian projections of non-bordered and bordered Legendrian graphs by  $\mathcal{LG}_{\text{fr}}, \mathcal{LG}_{\text{Lag}}$  and  $\mathcal{BLG}_{\text{fr}}, \mathcal{BLG}_{\text{Lag}}$ , respectively.

**Remark 2.2.2.** Due to the Legendrian condition, there are no vertical tangencies and no non-transverse double points in the front projection. Instead, it contains *cusps*, which is obviously, *x-extreme*.

**Notation 2.2.3.** The front and Lagrangian projection of  $T = T(\Gamma)$  with  $\Gamma = (V, V_L, V_R, B, E)$  will be denoted by  $T = (V, V_L, V_R, B, E)$  and  $T_{\text{Lag}} = (V_{\text{Lag}}, V_{\text{Lag},L}, V_{\text{Lag},R}, B_{\text{Lag}}, E_{\text{Lag}})$ , respectively.

For examples of regular and non-regular projection, see Figure 1. To avoid any confusion, we denote vertices and basepoints by small dots and bars, respectively.

<sup>1</sup>In the front projection, an *x-extreme* point is either a cusp or a vertex of type  $(0, n)$  or  $(n, 0)$ .





FIGURE 1. Regular and non-regular projections of bordered Legendrian graphs

**Definition 2.2.4** (Types and orientations). For a vertex  $v$  or a base point  $b$  of a bordered Legendrian graph, we say that it is of *type*  $(\ell, r)$  if there are  $\ell$  and  $r$  half-edges adjacent to  $v$  or  $b$  on the left and right, respectively. We label the set  $H_v := \{h_{v,1}, \dots, h_{v,m}\}$  of (small enough) half-edges in front and Lagrangian projections as follows:



In particular, each base point  $b \in B$  is assumed to be *oriented* from the half-edge  $h_{b,1}$  to  $h_{b,2}$  in the above convention.

**Example/Definition 2.2.5** (The trivial and vertex bordered Legendrian graphs). Let  $n \geq 1$ . The front projections of the trivial bordered Legendrian graph  $\mathcal{T}_n = (T_{n,L} \rightarrow T_n \leftarrow T_{n,R})$  of type  $(n, n)$  and the vertex bordered graphs  $\mathbf{0}_n = (\emptyset \rightarrow \mathbf{0}_n \leftarrow \mathbf{0}_{n,R})$  and  $\infty_n = (\infty_{n,L} \rightarrow \infty_n \leftarrow \emptyset)$  of type  $(0, n)$  and  $(n, 0)$  as depicted in Figure 1(c), whose left and right borders are points lying on the red lines at the left and right, respectively.

For convenience's sake, we define  $\mathcal{T}_0 = \mathbf{0}_0 = \infty_0 = (\emptyset \rightarrow \emptyset \leftarrow \emptyset)$ .

As usual, we say that two bordered Legendrian graphs  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  are *equivalent* if they are isotopic, that is, there exists a family of bordered Legendrian graphs

$$\mathcal{T}_t : \Gamma \times [0, 1] \rightarrow J^1 \mathbf{U}_t \subset J^1 \mathbb{R}_x, \quad \mathcal{T}_0 = \mathcal{T}, \quad \mathcal{T}_1 = \mathcal{T}'.$$

**Remark 2.2.6.** It is important to note that during the isotopy between two bordered Legendrian graphs, the ambient manifold  $J^1 \mathbf{U}_t$  may changes. For example, any translation along the  $x$ -axis will give us an equivalence.

In terms of projections, it is known that two front projections  $\mathcal{T}'$  and  $\mathcal{T}$  or two Lagrangian projections  $\mathcal{T}'_{\text{Lag}}$  and  $\mathcal{T}_{\text{Lag}}$  are projections of equivalent Legendrian graphs if and only if they can be connected by a sequence of front or Lagrangian *Reidemeister moves* depicted in Figures 2(a) or 2(b), respectively. One may refer [5, Proposition 4.2] or [3, Proposition 2.1].

**2.2.1. Maslov potentials for bordered Legendrian graphs.** We consider  $\mathbb{Z}$ -valued Maslov potentials on bordered Legendrian graphs as follows:

Let  $\mathcal{T} \in \mathcal{BLG}_{\text{fr}}$  and  $S = S(\mathcal{T}) \subset \mathring{T}$  be the set of  $x$ -extreme points in its interior. An  $\mathbb{Z}$ -valued *Maslov potential* of  $\mathcal{T}$  is a function  $\mu : R \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$  from the set  $R := \pi_0(T \setminus (V \cup S))$  of connected components of the complement of vertices and cusps such that for all  $s \in S \setminus V$ ,

$$\mu(s^+) - \mu(s^-) = 1 \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad (2.1)$$

where  $s^+$  (resp.  $s^-$ ) is the upper (resp. lower) strand near  $s$ .

For  $\mathcal{T}_{\text{Lag}} \in \mathcal{BLG}_{\text{Lag}}$ , let  $S_{\text{Lag}} = S(\mathcal{T}_{\text{Lag}}) \subset \mathring{T}_{\text{Lag}}$  be the set of  $x$ -extreme points. As before we define the set  $R_{\text{Lag}} := \pi_0(T_{\text{Lag}} \setminus (V_{\text{Lag}} \cup S_{\text{Lag}}))$  of connected components of the complement of vertices and  $x$ -extreme




FIGURE 2. Front and Lagrangian Reidemeister moves: Refelections are possible, the valency of vertex is arbitrary and the vertex can be replaced with a basepoint if it is bivalent.

points. Then an  $\mathbb{Z}$ -valued Maslov potential of  $T_{\text{Lag}}$  is a function  $\mu : R_{\text{Lag}} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$  satisfying the following condition: for each  $s \in S_{\text{Lag}} \setminus V_{\text{Lag}}$ ,

$$\mu(s^+) - \mu(s^-) = \begin{cases} 1 & s \text{ is } x\text{-minimal}; \\ -1 & s \text{ is } x\text{-maximal}. \end{cases} \quad (2.2)$$

Diagrammatically, the above definition is depicted in Figures 3(a) and 3(b).




FIGURE 3. Defining diagrams for Maslov potentials

Moreover, one can define  $\mu_L := \mu|_{T_L} : [n_L] \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$  and  $\mu_R := \mu|_{T_R} : [n_R] \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$  as the restrictions of  $\mu$  to the connected components containing  $T_L$  and  $T_R$ , respectively, under the canonical identifications  $T_L \cong [n_L]$  and  $T_R \cong [n_R]$ .

**Definition 2.2.7** (Maslov potentials for bordered Legendrian graphs). A Maslov potential for a bordered Legendrian graph  $\mathcal{T}$  is a triple  $\mu = (\mu_L, \mu, \mu_R)$  and we denote the category of front and Lagrangian projections of Legendrian graphs with Maslov potentials by  $\mathcal{BLG}_{\text{fr}}^\mu$  and  $\mathcal{BLG}_{\text{Lag}}^\mu$ , respectively.

**Example 2.2.8.** Recall the bordered Legendrian graphs  $\mathcal{T}_n$ ,  $\mathbf{0}_n$  and  $\infty_n$  defined in Example/Definition 2.2.5. Since they have no  $x$ -extreme points except for a vertex, there are no conditions for Maslov potentials. That is, any function  $\mu : [n] = \{1, \dots, n\} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$  can be realized as a Maslov potential for  $\mathcal{T}_n$ ,  $\mathbf{0}_n$  or  $\infty_n$ .

**Lemma 2.2.9.** [1, Theorem 2.21] Let  $(m) : \mathcal{T}'_{\text{Lag}} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_{\text{Lag}}$  be a Lagrangian Reidemeister move. Then it lifts to  $(m) : (\mathcal{T}'_{\text{Lag}}, \mu') \rightarrow (\mathcal{T}_{\text{Lag}}, \mu)$ . Namely, for given  $\mu'$ , there is a unique Maslov potential  $\mu$  on  $\mathcal{T}_{\text{Lag}}$  such that

$$(m)_* \mu' = \mu.$$



**Definition 2.2.10** (Restrictions of Maslov potentials on vertices). For each vertex  $v$  of type  $(\ell, r)$  with  $\ell + r = n$ , the set  $H_v$  of half-edges can be identified with  $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$  by Definition 2.2.4 and we denote the restriction  $\mu|_{H_v} : \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$  of a Maslov potential to  $H_v$  by  $\mu_v$ .

2.2.2. *Concatenations of bordered Legendrian graphs.* For  $i = 1, 2$ , let  $\mathcal{T}^i \in \mathcal{BLG}_{\text{fr}}$  be a front projection of type  $(n_L^i, n_R^i)$ . Suppose that  $n_R^1 = n_L^2$ . Then we can naturally define the *concatenation*  $\mathcal{T}_R^1 \cdot \mathcal{T}_L^2$  simply by concatenating and identifying  $T_R^1$  and  $T_L^2$ . The result  $T$  becomes a front projection of the bordered Legendrian graph whose left and right borders  $T_L := T_L^1$  and  $T_R := T_R^2$  come naturally from  $\mathcal{T}^1$  and  $\mathcal{T}^2$ , respectively.

*Remark 2.2.11.* It is important to note that we will not regard the points of concatenations as vertices of  $T$ . Therefore  $T$  has  $n$ -less edges than the disjoint union of  $T^1$  and  $T^2$ .

**Definition 2.2.12** (Closure). For  $\mathcal{T} \in \mathcal{BLG}_{\text{fr}}$  of type  $(n_L, n_R)$ , the *closure*  $\widehat{\mathcal{T}}$  is defined by the Legendrian graph obtained by the concatenation

$$\widehat{\mathcal{T}} := \mathbf{0}_{n_L} \cdot \mathcal{T} \cdot \infty_{n_R} \in \mathcal{LG}_{\text{fr}}$$

as depicted in Figure 4.




FIGURE 4. The closure of the front projection  $\mathcal{T}$

**Lemma 2.2.13.** *The closure  $\widehat{\cdot} : \mathcal{BLG}_{\text{fr}}^\mu \rightarrow \mathcal{LG}_{\text{fr}}^\mu$  is well-defined.*

*Proof.* It is obvious that for each  $(\mathcal{T}, \mu) \in \mathcal{BLG}_{\text{fr}}^\mu$ , there is a unique way to extend  $\mu$  on  $T$  to  $\widehat{\mu}$  on  $\widehat{T}$  by definition of the closure, which is well-defined since any function on  $[n]$  can be realized as a Maslov potential of  $\mathbf{0}_n$  or  $\infty_n$  as seen in Example 2.2.8.  $\square$

2.2.3. *Ng's resolution.* We introduce a combinatorial way, called the *Ng's resolution* to obtain a regular Lagrangian projection  $T_{\text{Lag}} \in \mathcal{LG}_{\text{Lag}}$  for given front projection  $T \in \mathcal{LG}_{\text{fr}}$  defining the equivalent Legendrian graphs.

*Remark 2.2.14.* This is an extension of the original Ng's resolution for Legendrian knots to Legendrian graphs.

**Definition 2.2.15** (Ng's resolution). [21, Definition 2.1] For  $T \in \mathcal{LG}_{\text{fr}}$ , the *Ng's resolution*  $\text{Res}^{\text{Ng}}(T)$  is a Lagrangian projection obtained by (combinatorially) replacing the local pieces as follows:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \prec \mapsto \cup, & \succ \mapsto \cap, & \times \mapsto \times, \end{array}$$

and for a vertex  $v$  of type  $(\ell, r)$ , we take a replacement as follows:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \begin{array}{c} h_{v,1} \\ h_{v,2} \\ \vdots \\ h_{v,\ell} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \text{---} v \text{---} \\ \text{---} v \text{---} \\ \text{---} v \text{---} \\ \text{---} v \text{---} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} h_{v,\ell+1} \\ \vdots \\ h_{v,\ell+r} \end{array} & \mapsto & \begin{array}{c} h_{v,1} \\ h_{v,2} \\ \vdots \\ h_{v,\ell} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \text{---} v \text{---} \\ \text{---} v \text{---} \\ \text{---} v \text{---} \\ \text{---} v \text{---} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} h_{v,\ell+1} \\ \vdots \\ h_{v,\ell+r} \end{array} \end{array}$$

In particular, a right cusp with a base point will be mapped as follows:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} & \mapsto & \text{---} \text{---} \end{array}$$

For example, let  $\mathcal{T} \in \mathcal{BLG}_{\text{fr}}$  be a front projection of a bordered Legendrian graph. Then the Ng's resolution of its closure look like a picture in Figure 5. Notice that there are  $\binom{n_R}{2}$  many additional crossings in  $\text{Res}^{\text{Ng}}(\widehat{\mathcal{T}})$  than  $\mathcal{T}$ , which came from the right closure  $\infty_{n_R}$ .





FIGURE 5. The Ng's resolution of the closure of  $\mathcal{T}$

**Lemma 2.2.16.** *The Ng's resolution  $\text{Res}^{\text{Ng}} : \mathcal{LG}_{\text{fr}}^{\mu} \rightarrow \mathcal{LG}_{\text{Lag}}^{\mu}$  is well-defined and preserves the equivalence.*

*In other words, each front Reidemeister move will be mapped to a sequence of Lagrangian Reidemeister moves with Maslov potentials.*

*Proof.* The well-definedness is obvious since the Ng's resolution is indeed defined as follows:



Moreover, it is not hard to check that the Ng's resolution for each of front Reidemeister moves and their inverses gives us an equivalence. See Figure 6.

Finally, by Lemma 2.2.9, we are done.  $\square$

### 3. BORDERED DGA INVARIANTS FOR BORDERED LEGENDRIAN GRAPHS

In this section, we will consider a *bordered Chekanov-Eliashberg's DGA* associated to each bordered Legendrian graph.

**3.1. Preliminaries on DGAs.** Throughout this paper, we mean by a *differential graded algebra* (DGA) a pair  $A = (A, \partial)$  of a unital associative graded free algebra  $A$  over the Laurent polynomial ring  $\mathbb{Z}[t_1^{\pm 1}, \dots, t_k^{\pm 1}]$  for some  $k \geq 0$ .

**Example/Definition 3.1.1** (Border DGAs). Let  $n \geq 1$  and  $\mu : [n] \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$  be a function. The *border DGA*  $A_n(\mu) = (A_n, \partial_n)$  is defined as follows:

- The graded algebra  $A_n := \mathbb{Z}\langle K_n \rangle$  is freely generated by the graded set  $K_n$ , where

$$K_n := \{k_{ab} \mid 1 \leq a < b \leq n\}, \quad |k_{ab}| := \mu(a) - \mu(b) - 1.$$

- The differential is given as

$$\partial_n(k_{ab}) := \sum_{a < c < b} (-1)^{|k_{ac}|-1} k_{ac} k_{cb}. \quad (3.1)$$

**Example/Definition 3.1.2** (Internal DGAs). Let  $\ell, r \geq 0$  with  $\ell + r = n \geq 1$  and  $\mu : \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$  be a function. The *internal DGA*  $I_{(\ell, r)}(\mu) = (I_{(\ell, r)}, \partial_n)$  of type  $(\ell, r)$  is defined as follows:

- The graded algebra  $I_{(\ell, r)} := \mathbb{Z}\langle \tilde{V}_{(\ell, r)} \rangle$  is freely generated over  $\mathbb{Z}$  by the graded set  $\tilde{V}_{(\ell, r)}$ , where

$$\tilde{V}_{(\ell, r)} := \{\xi_{a,i} \mid a \in \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}, i \geq 1\}, \quad |\xi_{a,i}| := \mu(a) - \mu(a+i) + (n(\ell, r, a, i) - 1),$$

where  $n(\ell, r, a, i)$  is the number defined as follows:<sup>2</sup>

$$n(\ell, r, a, i) := \sum_{j=a}^{a+i-1} n(\ell, r, j, 1), \quad n(\ell, r, a, 1) := \begin{cases} 2 & \ell r = 0, a = n; \\ 1 & \ell r \neq 0, a = r \text{ or } n; \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$






FIGURE 6. Ng's resolutions for front Reidemeister moves

Therefore for  $\ell_1 + \ell_2 = \ell$ , we have

$$|\xi_{a,\ell}| = |\xi_{a,\ell_1}| + |\xi_{a+\ell_1,\ell_2}| + 1$$

and moreover,  $|\xi_{a,n}| = 1$  for any  $a \in \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$ .

- The differential is given as

$$\partial_n(\xi_{a,i}) := \delta_{i,n} + \sum_{i_1+i_2=i} (-1)^{|\xi_{a,i_1}|-1} \xi_{a,i_1} \xi_{a+i_1,i_2}.$$

We will simply denote  $I_{(0,n)}(\mu)$  by  $I_n(\mu)$ .

*Remark 3.1.3.* For any  $l + r = n$  and  $\mu : \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ , there exists  $\mu'$  defined as  $\mu'(a) = \mu(a) + 1$  for  $a \leq \ell$  or  $\mu(a)$  for  $a > \ell$ , where  $I_{(\ell,r)}(\mu) \cong I_n(\mu')$ . Therefore all internal DGAs can be assumed to be of type  $(0, n)$  for some  $n > 0$ .

**Proposition 3.1.4.** *The assignment  $k_{ab} \mapsto \xi_{a,b-a}$  defines an inclusion  $A_n(\mu) \rightarrow I_n(\mu)$  between DGAs.*

*Proof.* This follows easily from the direct computation.  $\square$

**Definition 3.1.5** (DGA homotopies). Let  $f, g : A' \rightarrow A$  be two DGA morphisms. We say that  $f$  and  $g$  are *homotopic* via  $H$ , denoted by  $f \stackrel{H}{\simeq} g$  if there exists a DGA homotopy  $H : A \rightarrow A'$  which is an algebra homomorphism of degree 1 satisfying the following:

<sup>2</sup>The geometric description for the number  $n(\ell, r, a, i)$  will be given in Definition 3.3.1.

- $H$  is a chain homotopy:

$$f - g = \partial \circ H + H \circ \partial'. \quad (3.2)$$

- $H$  is a  $(f, g)$ -derivation: for all  $x, y \in A'$ ,

$$H(xy) = H(x)g(y) + (-1)^{|x|} f(x)H(y). \quad (3.3)$$

*Remark 3.1.6.* It is known that the homotopy relation becomes an equivalence relation, but this is not straightforward at all. See [13, Ch. 26].

Let us recall the notion of tame isomorphisms on DGAs.

**Definition 3.1.7** (Tame isomorphisms). Let  $A' = (A' = \mathbb{Z}\langle G \rangle, \partial')$  and  $A = (A = \mathbb{Z}\langle G \rangle, \partial)$  be DGAs. A DGA map  $f : A' \rightarrow A$  is called an *elementary isomorphism* if for some  $g \in G$ ,

$$f(h) = \begin{cases} g + u & \text{if } h = g \\ h & \text{if } h \neq g, \end{cases}$$

where  $u$  is a word in  $A$  not containing  $g$ .

A *tame isomorphism* is a composition of countably many (possibly finite) elementary isomorphisms.

**Definition 3.1.8** (Stabilizations [8, Definition 2.16]). For a DGA  $A = (A = \mathbb{Z}\langle G \rangle, \partial)$ , a *stabilization* of  $A$  is a DGA which is tame isomorphic to a DGA  $SA = (SA, \bar{\partial})$  obtained from  $A$  by adding a countably many (possibly finite) number of canceling pairs of generators  $\{\bar{e}^i, e^i \mid i \in I\}$  for some index set  $I$  so that

$$SA = \mathbb{Z}\langle G \amalg \{\bar{e}^i, e^i \mid i \in I\} \rangle, \quad |\bar{e}^i| = |e^i| + 1, \quad \bar{\partial}(\bar{e}^i) = e^i, \quad \bar{\partial}(e^i) = 0,$$

and for each  $\mathfrak{d} \in \mathbb{Z}$ , there are only finitely many  $\bar{e}^i$ 's and  $e^i$ 's of degree  $\mathfrak{d}$ .

For a stabilization  $A'$  of  $A$ , there are two natural DGA morphisms  $\pi : A' \rightarrow A$  and  $\iota : A \rightarrow A'$  defined as the canonical projection and inclusion

$$\pi(s) := \begin{cases} s & s \in A; \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad \iota(s) := s.$$

We introduce a special kind of a DGA operation called a *generalized stabilization* originally defined in [1] as follows:

**Definition 3.1.9** (Generalized stabilization). Let  $A = (A = \mathbb{Z}\langle G \rangle, \partial)$  be a DGA generated by the set  $G$  and  $\varphi : I_n(\mu) \rightarrow A$  be a DGA morphism for some  $\mu : \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ .

The  $\mathfrak{d}$ -th *positive* or *negative stabilization* of  $A$  with respect to  $\varphi$  is the DGA  $S_\varphi^{\mathfrak{d}\pm} A = (S_\varphi^{\mathfrak{d}\pm} A, \bar{\partial}^\pm)$  defined as follows: let  $v_{a,i} := \varphi(\xi_{a,i}) \in A$ .

- The graded algebra  $S_\varphi^{\mathfrak{d}} A$  is given as

$$S_\varphi^{\mathfrak{d}} A := \mathbb{Z}\langle G \amalg \{e^1, \dots, e^n\} \rangle, \quad |e^b| := \mathfrak{d} + \sum_{a < b} (|v_{a,1}| + 1).$$

- The differentials  $\bar{\partial}^\pm$  for  $e^b$  are given as

$$\bar{\partial}^+(e^b) := \sum_{a < b} (-1)^{|e^a|-1} e^a v_{a,b-a}, \quad \bar{\partial}^-(e^b) := \sum_{a < b} v_{n+1-b,b-a} e^a.$$

As observed in [1, Remark 3.8], the generalized stabilization is a composition of a stabilization and a destabilization. For the completeness, we will give a proof in Appendix A.

**Proposition 3.1.10.** [8, Appendix B.2] *There exists a DGA  $\widetilde{S}_\varphi^{\mathfrak{d}\pm} A$  which is a common stabilization of both  $A$  and  $S_\varphi^{\mathfrak{d}\pm} A$ .*

**3.2. Bordered DGAs.** We consider DGAs together with additional structures, called *bordered DGAs*.

**Definition 3.2.1** (Bordered DGAs). A *bordered DGA*  $\mathcal{A}$  of type  $(n_L, n_R)$  is a diagram

$$\mathcal{A} = \left( A_L \xrightarrow{\phi_L} A \xleftarrow{\phi_R} A_R \right)$$

consisting of DGAs  $A, A_L$  and  $A_R$ , and two DGA morphisms  $\phi_L : A_L \rightarrow A$  and  $\phi_R : A_R \rightarrow A$  such that

- (1)  $\phi_L$  is *injective*, and
- (2) for some  $\mu_L : [n_L] \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$  and  $\mu_R : [n_R] \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ ,

$$A_L \cong A_{n_L}(\mu_L) \quad \text{and} \quad A_R \cong A_{n_R}(\mu_R).$$

A *bordered quasi-morphism*  $\mathbf{f} : \mathcal{A}' \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$  between two bordered DGAs  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{A}'$  is a triple  $(f_L, f, f_R)$  of DGA morphisms such that in the following diagram, the left square is commutative and the right square is commutative *up to homotopy*

$$\mathbf{f} \downarrow = \left( \begin{array}{ccccc} \mathcal{A}' & & & & \\ \downarrow \mathbf{f} & & & & \\ \mathcal{A} & & & & \end{array} \right) = \left( \begin{array}{ccccc} A'_L & \xrightarrow{\phi'_L} & A' & \xleftarrow{\phi'_R} & A'_R \\ \downarrow f_L & & \downarrow f & \nearrow \exists H_R & \downarrow f_R \\ A_L & \xrightarrow{\phi_L} & A & \xleftarrow{\phi_R} & A_R \end{array} \right)$$

and a bordered quasi-morphism is a *bordered morphism* if the homotopy  $H_R$  is trivial, i.e., the squares above are strictly commutative.

Now we consider stabilizations of bordered DGAs as follows:

**Definition 3.2.2** (Stabilizations of bordered DGAs). for each bordered DGA  $\mathcal{A}$ , we say that a bordered DGA  $\mathcal{A}'$  of  $\mathcal{A}$  is said to be a (*weak*) *stabilization* if there exists a bordered morphism  $\pi = (\text{Id}_L, \pi, \text{Id}_R) : \mathcal{A}' \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$  such that  $\pi : A' \rightarrow A$  is the canonical projection, and a *strong stabilization* if it is a weak stabilization and there exists a bordered morphism  $\mathbf{i} = (\text{Id}, \iota, \text{Id})$  where  $\iota : A \rightarrow A'$  is the canonical inclusion.

As an example of (weak) stabilizations, we consider the mapping cylinder in the bordered setting as follows: let  $\mathcal{A} = \left( A_L \xrightarrow{\phi_L} A \xleftarrow{\phi_R} A_R \right)$  be a bordered DGA of type  $(n_L, n_R)$ . That is,

$$\begin{aligned} A &= (A, \partial), & A &= \mathbb{Z}\langle G \rangle, \\ A_L &= (A_L, \partial_L), & A_L &= \mathbb{Z}\langle K_L \rangle, & K_L &:= \{k_{a'b'} \mid 1 \leq a' < b' \leq n_L\}, \\ A_R &= (A_R, \partial_R), & A_R &= \mathbb{Z}\langle K_R \rangle, & K_R &:= \{k_{ab} \mid 1 \leq a < b \leq n_R\}. \end{aligned}$$

**Definition 3.2.3** (Mapping cylinders of bordered DGAs). The *mapping cylinder*  $\widehat{\mathcal{A}} := \left( A_L \xrightarrow{\widehat{\phi}_L} \widehat{A} \xleftarrow{\widehat{\phi}_R} A_R \right)$  of  $\mathcal{A}$  will be defined as follows:

- The DGA  $\widehat{A} = (\widehat{A}, \widehat{\partial})$  and its graded algebra  $\widehat{A}$  is defined as

$$\widehat{A} := \mathbb{Z}\langle G \amalg K_R \amalg \widehat{K}_R \rangle, \quad \widehat{K}_R := \left\{ \widehat{k}_{ab} \mid k_{ab} \in K_R \right\}, \quad \left| \widehat{k}_{ab} \right| := |k_{ab}| + 1.$$

- The differential  $\widehat{\partial}$  for each  $k_{ab}$  is the same as  $\partial_R(k_{ab})$  and for  $\widehat{k}_{ab}$  it is defined as

$$\widehat{\partial}(\widehat{k}_{ab}) := k_{ab} - \phi_R(k_{ab}) + \sum_{a < c < b} (-1)^{|\widehat{k}_{ac}|-1} \widehat{k}_{ac} \phi_R(k_{cb}) + k_{ac} \widehat{k}_{cb}. \quad (3.4)$$

- The morphism  $\widehat{\phi}_L$  is the composition of  $\phi_L$  and the canonical inclusion  $A \rightarrow \widehat{A}$ , and  $\widehat{\phi}_R$  is defined by  $\widehat{\phi}_R(k_{ab}) = k_{ab} \in \widehat{A}$ .

**Lemma 3.2.4.** The DGA  $\widehat{A}$  is a weak stabilization of  $A$  but not a strong stabilization.

*Proof.* Notice that in each differential  $\widehat{\partial}(\widehat{k}_{ab})$  there is one and only one generator  $k_{ab}$ . Therefore one may find a tame automorphism  $\Phi$  on  $\widehat{A}$  that sends  $\widehat{\partial}(\widehat{k}_{ab})$  to  $k_{ab}$  so that the DGA  $(\widehat{A}, \widehat{\partial}_\Phi)$  with the twisted differential becomes a stabilization of  $A$ .

Indeed, we have a canonical projection  $\widehat{\pi} : \widehat{\mathcal{A}} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$  which maps  $k_{ab} \mapsto \phi_R(k_{ab})$  and  $\widehat{k}_{ab} \mapsto 0$ . Then it gives us a strictly commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{c} \widehat{\mathcal{A}} \\ \downarrow \widehat{\pi} \\ \mathcal{A} \end{array} = \left( \begin{array}{ccccc} A_L & \xrightarrow{\widehat{\phi}_L} & \widehat{A} & \xleftarrow{\widehat{\phi}_R} & A_R \\ \parallel & & \downarrow \widehat{\pi} & & \parallel \\ A_L & \xrightarrow{\phi_L} & A & \xleftarrow{\phi_R} & A_R \end{array} \right), \quad (3.5)$$

and therefore it is a bordered morphism. However, the canonical inclusion  $\widehat{\mathbf{i}} : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \widehat{\mathcal{A}}$  makes the following diagram commutative up to homotopy

$$\begin{array}{c} \mathcal{A} \\ \downarrow \widehat{\mathbf{i}} \\ \widehat{\mathcal{A}} \end{array} = \left( \begin{array}{ccccc} A_L & \xrightarrow{\phi_L} & A & \xleftarrow{\phi_R} & A_R \\ \parallel & & \downarrow \widehat{\mathbf{i}} & \nearrow \exists \widehat{H}_R & \parallel \\ A_L & \xrightarrow{\widehat{\phi}_L} & \widehat{A} & \xleftarrow{\widehat{\phi}_R} & A_R \end{array} \right), \quad (3.6)$$

where the homotopy  $\widehat{H}_R$  is obviously defined as  $\widehat{H}_R(k_{ab}) := \widehat{k}_{ab}$ . Therefore it only gives us a quasi-morphism.  $\square$

On the other hand, we have the following general lemma.

**Lemma 3.2.5.** *Let  $f : K_R \rightarrow A$  be a function and  $\bar{f} : A_R \rightarrow A$  be an algebra homomorphism extending  $f$ . Then the endomorphism*

$$\widehat{\partial}(\widehat{k}_{ab}) := k_{ab} - f(k_{ab}) + \sum_{a < c < b} (-1)^{|\widehat{k}_{ac}|-1} \widehat{k}_{ac} f(k_{cb}) + k_{ac} \widehat{k}_{cb}$$

*defines a differential on  $\widehat{A}$ , i.e.,  $\widehat{\partial}^2 = 0$ , if and only if  $\bar{f}$  is a DGA morphism.*

*Proof.* It follows easily from the induction on  $b - a$  and the direct computation. We omit the proof.  $\square$

**3.3. Chekanov-Eliashberg DGAs for bordered Legendrian graphs.** Now we briefly review the construction of Chekanov-Eliashberg DGAs for Legendrian graphs with Maslov potentials.

Let  $T_{\text{Lag}} = (V_{\text{Lag}}, E_{\text{Lag}}, B_{\text{Lag}}) \in \mathcal{LG}_{\text{Lag}}$  be a Lagrangian projection of a Legendrian graph with a Maslov potential  $\mu$ . Then we consider two graded sets as follows:

- The set  $C_{\text{Lag}}$  of crossings in  $T_{\text{Lag}}$ , where for each  $c \in C_{\text{Lag}}$ , its grading is defined as

$$|c| := \mu(c^+) - \mu(c^-) \quad \text{if } c = \begin{array}{c} \diagup \\ \diagdown \end{array}, \quad \text{or} \quad |c| := \mu(c^+) - \mu(c^-) - 1 \quad \text{if } c = \begin{array}{c} \diagup \\ \diagdown \\ \diagup \end{array},$$

where  $c^+$  and  $c^-$  in  $R_{\text{Lag}} = T_{\text{Lag}} \setminus (V_{\text{Lag}} \sqcup S_{\text{Lag}})$  are components containing the upper and lower preimage of the crossing  $c$  with respect to the  $z$ -coordinate.

- The set  $\widetilde{V}_{\text{Lag}}$  of infinitely many generators from each vertex,

$$\widetilde{V}_{\text{Lag}} := \{v_{a,i} \mid a \in \mathbb{Z}/\text{val}(v)\mathbb{Z}, i \geq 1, v \in V_{\text{Lag}}\},$$

whose grading is defined as

$$|v_{a,i}| := \mu_v(h_{v,a}) - \mu_v(h_{v,a+i}) + (n(v, a, i) - 1), \quad (3.7)$$

where  $n(v, a, i) := n(\ell, r, a, i)$  is the number defined in Example 3.1.2.

Indeed, one can interpret each  $v_{a,i}$  geometrically as follows:

**Definition 3.3.1** (Vertex generators and spiral curves). Let  $v$  be a vertex of type  $(\ell, r)$ . Each  $v_{a,i}$  are called a *vertex generator* which may be regarded as a spiral curve  $\gamma(v, a, i)$  which starts from the  $a$ -th half-edge at the vertex  $v$  and rotates  $i$  sectors in a clockwise direction as depicted in Figure 7.




FIGURE 7. Examples of spiral curves

*Remark 3.3.2.* The number  $n(v, a, i)$  is the number of intersection between the  $y$ -axis and the spiral curve  $\gamma(v, a, i)$ . For examples, the spiral curves in Figure 7 give us the numbers  $n$  as

$$n(v, 2, 2) = 0, \quad n(v, 6, 4) = 1, \quad n(v, 7, 8) = 3.$$

Moreover, the following additivity holds for any  $a \in \mathbb{Z}/\text{val}(v)\mathbb{Z}$  and  $i_1 + i_2 = i$

$$n(v, a, i) = n(v, a, i_1) + n(v, a + i_1, i_2) \quad (3.8)$$

**Definition 3.3.3.** The graded algebra  $A^{\text{CE}}(T_{\text{Lag}}, \mu)$  is defined to be the unital associative algebra over the Laurent polynomial ring  $\mathbb{Z}[t_b, t_b^{-1} \mid b \in B_{\text{Lag}}]$ , which is freely generated by the graded set  $C_{\text{Lag}} \amalg \tilde{V}_{\text{Lag}}$ .

$$A^{\text{CE}}(T_{\text{Lag}}, \mu) := \mathbb{Z}[t_b, t_b^{-1} \mid b \in B_{\text{Lag}}] \langle C_{\text{Lag}} \amalg \tilde{V}_{\text{Lag}} \rangle.$$

The differential on  $\tilde{V}_{\text{Lag}}$  will be defined as the differential for the internal DGA. That is,

$$\partial(v_{a,i}) := \delta_{\text{val}(v),i} + \sum_{i_1+i_2=i} (-1)^{|v_{a,i_1}|+1} v_{a,i_1} v_{a+i_1,i_2}. \quad (3.9)$$

Then for each  $v$ , the DG-subalgebra  $I_v \subset A^{\text{CE}}(T_{\text{Lag}}, \mu)$  generated by  $v_{a,i}$ 's is isomorphic to an internal DGA

$$I_v \cong I_{(\ell,r)}(\mu_v), \quad (3.10)$$

under the identification  $\xi_{a,i} \mapsto v_{a,i}$ , where  $\mu_v$  is the restriction of  $\mu$  to the set of half-edges of  $v$ .

Let  $\Pi_t$  be a  $(t+1)$ -gon, and denote its boundary and vertices by  $\partial\Pi_t$  and  $V\Pi_t = \{\mathbf{x}_0, \dots, \mathbf{x}_t\}$ , respectively. The differential for each crossing  $c \in C$  are given by counting orientation preserving immersed polygons

$$f : (\Pi_t, \partial\Pi_t, V\Pi_t) \rightarrow (\mathbb{R}^2, T_{\text{Lag}}, C_{\text{Lag}} \amalg V_{\text{Lag}} \amalg B_{\text{Lag}}) \quad (3.11)$$

which satisfies the following conditions:

- near  $\mathbf{x}_0$ ,  $f$  passes a convex corner of  $c$  with positive Reeb sign in Figure 8(a);
- near  $\mathbf{x}_k$  for each  $k \geq 1$ ,  $f$  passes either a convex corner of a crossing with negative Reeb sign, a half space of a base point, or a vertex.




FIGURE 8. Reeb sign and orientation sign

For such a map  $f$  defined on  $\Pi_t$  with a vertex  $\mathbf{x} \in V\Pi_t$ , the *sign*  $\text{sgn}(f, \mathbf{x})$  of  $f$  at  $\mathbf{x}$  is the orientation sign defined as follows:

$$\text{sgn}(f, \mathbf{x}) = \begin{cases} \text{the sign in Figure 8(b)} & f(\mathbf{x}) \in C_{\text{Lag}}; \\ 1 & f(\mathbf{x}) \in V_{\text{Lag}}. \end{cases}$$

The *evaluation*  $\tilde{f}(\mathbf{x})$  of  $f$  at  $\mathbf{x}$  is given by

$$\tilde{f}(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{cases} \text{sgn}(f, \mathbf{x})c & \text{if } f(\mathbf{x}) = c \in C_{\text{Lag}}; \\ v_{a,j} & \text{if } f(\mathbf{x}) = v \in V_{\text{Lag}}, f \text{ occupies } j\text{-sectors from } h_{v,a} \text{ to } h_{v,a+j} \text{ near } \mathbf{x}; \\ t_b & f(\mathbf{x}) = b \in B_{\text{Lag}}, \text{ the orientation of } f \text{ matches with that of } b; \\ t_b^{-1} & f(\mathbf{x}) = b \in B_{\text{Lag}}, \text{ the orientation of } f \text{ does not matches with that of } b. \end{cases}$$

Here, we are using the orientation convention for each base point  $b$  as defined in Definition 2.2.4.

The grading  $|f|$  of  $f$  defined on  $\Pi_t$  is assigned by

$$|f| = |\tilde{f}(\mathbf{x}_0)| - \sum_{i=1}^t |\tilde{f}(\mathbf{x}_i)|.$$

For a crossing  $c \in C_{\text{Lag}}$ , consider the following moduli space

$$\mathcal{M}_t(c) := \{f \mid f \text{ is a map of (3.11), } f(\mathbf{x}_0) = c, |f| = 1\} / \text{Diff}^+(\Pi_t, \partial\Pi_t, V\Pi_t).$$

The differential  $\partial(c)$  of the DGA  $A^{\text{CE}}(T_{\text{Lag}}^\mu)$  is defined by

$$\partial(c) := \sum_{t \geq 0} \sum_{f \in \mathcal{M}_t(c)} \text{sgn}(f, \mathbf{x}_0) \tilde{f}(\mathbf{x}_1) \cdots \tilde{f}(\mathbf{x}_t).$$

**Definition 3.3.4** (LCH DGAs for Legendrian graphs). The *Legendrian contact homology DGA* (LCH DGA) or *Chekanov-Eliashberg DGA*  $A^{\text{CE}}(T_{\text{Lag}}, \mu)$  for a Legendrian graph  $T_{\text{Lag}}^\mu \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{Lag}}^\mu$  with a Maslov potential is defined as

$$A^{\text{CE}}(T_{\text{Lag}}, \mu) := \left( A^{\text{CE}}(T_{\text{Lag}}, \mu), \partial \right).$$

**Theorem 3.3.5.** [1, Theorem A, B and E] For a Legendrian graph  $(T_{\text{Lag}}, \mu) \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{Lag}}^\mu$  with a Maslov potential, the pair of the LCH DGA  $A^{\text{CE}}(T_{\text{Lag}}, \mu)$  and the set of its internal DG-subalgebras  $\{I_v \subset A^{\text{CE}}(T_{\text{Lag}}, \mu) \mid v \in V\}$  corresponding to vertices is invariant under the Reidemeister moves up to generalized stable-tame isomorphisms.

*Remark 3.3.6.* In [1], internal DG-subalgebras corresponding to vertices are called *peripheral structures*.

**Corollary 3.3.7.** Let  $(T'_{\text{Lag}}, \mu'), (T_{\text{Lag}}, \mu) \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{Lag}}^\mu$  be Lagrangian projections of two equivalent Legendrian graphs. Then there exists a zig-zag of stabilizations between two LCH DGAs  $A^{\text{CE}}(T'_{\text{Lag}}, \mu')$  and  $A^{\text{CE}}(T_{\text{Lag}}, \mu)$

$$A^{\text{CE}}(T'_{\text{Lag}}, \mu') \Longrightarrow A_0 \xrightarrow[\pi_1]{i_1} A_1 \xleftarrow[\pi'_1]{i'_1} \cdots \xleftarrow[\pi_{n-1}]{i_{n-1}} A_{n-1} \xrightarrow[\pi'_{n-1}]{i'_{n-1}} A_n \Longrightarrow A^{\text{CE}}(T_{\text{Lag}}, \mu).$$

*Proof.* It is known that up to tame isomorphisms, each Lagrangian Reidemeister move induces a DGA morphism which is either a canonical inclusion into or a projection from a (generalized) stabilization. Since a generalized stabilization is a zig-zag of stabilizations by Proposition 3.1.10, we are done.  $\square$

Now let  $(\mathcal{T}, \mu) \in \mathcal{BLG}_{\text{fr}}^\mu$  be a front projection of a bordered Legendrian graph with a Maslov potential. Then by Lemma 2.2.13, we have a Legendrian graph  $(\widehat{\mathcal{T}}, \widehat{\mu})$  with a Maslov potential. Let  $A^{\text{CE}}(\widehat{\mathcal{T}}, \widehat{\mu})$  be the Chekanov-Eliashberg's DGA for the Ng's resolution

$$A^{\text{CE}}(\widehat{\mathcal{T}}, \widehat{\mu}) = \left( A^{\text{CE}}(\widehat{\mathcal{T}}, \widehat{\mu}), \widehat{\partial} \right) := A^{\text{CE}}(\text{Res}^{\text{Ng}}(\widehat{\mathcal{T}}, \widehat{\mu}))$$

of the closure  $(\widehat{\mathcal{T}}, \widehat{\mu})$  as depicted in Figure 5. Clearly, it consists of three parts, where the left and the right parts corresponding to the resolutions of  $\mathbf{0}_{n_L}$  and  $\mathbf{\infty}_{n_R}$ , and we denote the middle part by  $\text{Res}^{\text{Ng}}(T)$ .

As mentioned earlier, there are  $\binom{n_R}{2}$  more crossings in  $\text{Res}^{\text{Ng}}(\widehat{\mathcal{T}})$ , which will be denoted by

$$\widehat{K}_R := \left\{ \widehat{k}_{ab} \mid 1 \leq a < b \leq n_R \right\}, \quad \left| \widehat{k}_{ab} \right| = |k_{ab}| + 1.$$

whose upper and lower strand corresponds to  $a$  and  $b$  in  $T_R$ , respectively.

For two vertices  $0$  and  $\infty$  coming from the closure, we define two subsets of vertex generators

$$K_L := \{k_{a'b'} = 0_{a', b'-a'} \mid 1 \leq a' < b' \leq n_L\} \quad \text{and} \quad K_R := \{k_{ab} = \infty_{a, b-a} \mid 1 \leq a < b \leq n_R\}.$$

Then by Proposition 3.1.4, the DG-subalgebras generated by  $k_{a'b'}$ 's and  $k_{ab}$ 's are isomorphic to border DGAs  $A_{n_L}(\mu_L)$  and  $A_{n_R}(\mu_R)$ , where  $\mu_L$  and  $\mu_R$  are the restriction of  $\mu$  to the left and right borders, respectively, as seen in Section 2.2.1.

**Lemma 3.3.8.** *The bordered DGA below is well-defined:*

$$\widehat{A}^{\text{CE}}(\mathcal{T}, \mu) := \left( A^{\text{CE}}(T_L, \mu_L) \xrightarrow{\widehat{\phi}_L} \widehat{A}^{\text{CE}}(T, \mu) \xleftarrow{\widehat{\phi}_R} A^{\text{CE}}(T_R, \mu_R) \right), \quad (3.12)$$

where

$$A^{\text{CE}}(T_L, \mu_L) := (\mathbb{Z}\langle K_L \rangle, \partial_L) \cong A_{n_L} \quad \text{and} \quad A^{\text{CE}}(T_R, \mu_R) := (\mathbb{Z}\langle K_R \rangle, \partial_R) \cong A_{n_R},$$

and  $\widehat{A}^{\text{CE}}(T, \mu)$  is the subalgebra of  $A^{\text{CE}}(\widehat{T}, \widehat{\mu})$  generated by

- all crossings and vertex generators in  $\text{Res}^{\text{Ng}}(T)$ ,
- all elements in the set  $\widehat{K}_R$ , and
- all  $k_{a'b'}$ 's and  $k_{ab}$ 's for  $1 \leq a' < b' < n_L$  and  $1 \leq a < b < n_R$ ,

and the maps  $\widehat{\phi}_L$  and  $\widehat{\phi}_R$  are the canonical inclusions.

*Proof.* Let  $f$  be an immersed polygon defined in (3.11) with  $f(\mathbf{x}_0) \in C(\mathcal{T})$ . Since two vertices 0 and  $\infty$  in  $\text{Res}^{\text{Ng}}(\widehat{T})$  faces the unbounded region which correspond to the sectors between  $h_{0,n_L}$  and  $h_{0,1}$  and between  $h_{\infty,n_R}$  and  $h_{\infty,1}$ , respectively, these unbounded regions are never covered by  $f$ .  $\square$

Furthermore, we have a smaller DG-subalgebra  $A^{\text{CE}}(T, \mu)$  as follows:

**Theorem 3.3.9.** *The DG-subalgebra  $A^{\text{CE}}(T, \mu)$  of  $\widehat{A}^{\text{CE}}(T, \mu)$  generated by  $K_L$  and both crossings and vertex generators in  $\text{Res}^{\text{Ng}}(T)$  is well-defined.*

*Proof.* Since the action of Reeb chords increases as we go to the right and we regard crossings  $\widehat{k}_{ab}$  have very large actions relative to the action of  $c$ , the map  $f$  never escape  $\text{Res}^{\text{Ng}}(T_{\text{tr}})$  to the right. Therefore no generators in  $K_R$  appear and we are done.  $\square$

**Corollary 3.3.10.** *The map  $\widehat{\phi}_L$  is the composition of the canonical inclusions  $\phi_L : A^{\text{CE}}(T_L, \mu_L) \rightarrow A^{\text{CE}}(T, \mu)$  and  $A^{\text{CE}}(T, \mu) \rightarrow \widehat{A}^{\text{CE}}(T, \mu)$ .*

*Proof.* This is a direct consequence of Lemma 3.3.8 and Theorem 3.3.9.  $\square$

Now let us focus on the differential  $\widehat{\partial}(\widehat{k}_{ab})$ . Indeed, there is a trichotomy on the moduli space  $\mathcal{M}_t(\widehat{k}_{ab})$  as follows:

- (1) disks hitting the vertex  $\infty$  have the contribution

$$(-1)^{|\widehat{k}_{ab}|-1} \left( k_{ab} + \sum_{a < c < b} \widehat{k}_{ac} k_{cb} \right),^3$$

- (2) disks not hitting  $\infty$  but hitting  $\widehat{k}_{cb}$  have the contribution

$$\sum_{a < c < b} g_{ac} \widehat{k}_{cb}$$

for some  $g_{ac} \in A^{\text{CE}}(T, \mu)$ ,

- (3) disks hitting neither  $\infty$  nor  $\widehat{k}_{cb}$  have the contribution denoted by  $g_{ab} \in A^{\text{CE}}(T, \mu)$ .

In summary, we have the following differential formula for  $\widehat{k}_{ab}$

$$\widehat{\partial}(\widehat{k}_{ab}) = (-1)^{|\widehat{k}_{ab}|-1} k_{ab} + g_{ab} + \sum_{a < c < b} (-1)^{|\widehat{k}_{ab}|-1} \widehat{k}_{ac} k_{cb} + g_{ac} \widehat{k}_{cb} \quad (3.13)$$

for some  $g_{ab} \in A^{\text{CE}}(T, \mu)$ . Notice that this formula is the same as the differential formula for the mapping cylinder given in 3.4 by replacing  $\widehat{k}_{ab}$  and  $g_{ab}$  with  $(-1)^{|\widehat{k}_{ab}|-1} \widehat{k}_{ab}$  and  $(-1)^{|\widehat{k}_{ab}|} g_{ab}$ . Therefore the assignment  $k_{ab} \mapsto \overline{g}_{ab}$  will define a DGA morphism by Lemma 3.2.5 since  $\widehat{\partial}^2 = 0$ .

Summarizing the above argument, we have the following theorem.

<sup>3</sup>The sign convention given in Figure 5 is used here.



**Theorem/Definition 3.3.11** (Well-definedness). *Let  $(\mathcal{T}, \mu) \in \mathcal{BLG}_{\text{fr}}^\mu$  be a bordered Legendrian graph with a Maslov potential. The bordered DGA*

$$A^{\text{CE}}(\mathcal{T}, \mu) := \left( A^{\text{CE}}(T_L, \mu_L) \xrightarrow{\phi_L} A^{\text{CE}}(T, \mu) \xleftarrow{\phi_R} A^{\text{CE}}(T_R, \mu_R) \right) \quad (3.14)$$

*is well-defined.*

*Proof.* The DGA  $A^{\text{CE}}(T, \mu)$  is well-defined by Theorem 3.3.9, and two morphisms are DGA maps by Corollary 3.3.10 and Lemma 3.2.5, and we are done.  $\square$

**Example 3.3.12** (DGAs for the trivial and vertex bordered Legendrian graphs). Let  $(\mathcal{T}_n, \mu) \in \mathcal{BLG}_{\text{fr}}^\mu$  be the front projection of the trivial bordered graph with  $n$  strands and with a Maslov potential  $\mu = (\mu, \mu, \mu)$  for a function  $\mu : [n] \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ . Then it is obvious that  $T_n$  has no generators except for those for the left border  $T_{n,L}$  and so is isomorphic to the border DGA  $A_n(\mu)$  defined in Example/Definition 3.1.1. Therefore the bordered LCH DGA for  $T_n$  is

$$A^{\text{CE}}(\mathcal{T}_n, \mu) = (A_n(\mu) \cong A_n(\mu) \cong A_n(\mu)).$$

On the other hand, for the bordered Legendrian graph  $(\mathbf{0}_n, \mu)$  with a Maslov potential  $\mu = (0, \mu, \mu)$  as shown in Example/Definition 2.2.5, the DGA  $A^{\text{CE}}(\mathbf{0}_n, \mu)$  is the same as the internal DGA  $I_n(\mu)$  since it has no left borders. Therefore the bordered LCH DGA for  $(\mathbf{0}_n, \mu)$  is

$$A^{\text{CE}}(\mathbf{0}_n, \mu) = (0 \rightarrow I_n(\mu) \leftarrow A_n(\mu_R)),$$

where the DGA morphism on the right is the inclusion described in Proposition 3.1.4.

As a corollary of Theorem/Definition 3.3.11, we have the following important observation.

**Proposition 3.3.13.** *Let  $(\mathcal{T}, \mu) \in \mathcal{BLG}_{\text{fr}}^\mu$ . Then the bordered DGA  $\widehat{A}^{\text{CE}}(\mathcal{T}, \mu)$  defined in (3.12) is the mapping cylinder of the bordered DGA  $A^{\text{CE}}(\mathcal{T}, \mu)$  defined in (3.14) in the sense of Definition 3.2.3.*

*Proof.* This follows obviously from the equation (3.13).  $\square$

**Theorem 3.3.14.** *For  $i = 1, 2$ , let  $(\mathcal{T}^i, \mu^i) \in \mathcal{BLG}_{\text{fr}}^\mu$  be two front projections of type  $(n_L^i, n_R^i)$ . Suppose that  $n := n_R^1 = n_L^2$  and  $\mu_n := \mu_R^1 = \mu_L^2$ . Then the bordered DGA for the concatenation  $(\mathcal{T}, \mu) := (\mathcal{T}^1, \mu^1) \cdot (\mathcal{T}^2, \mu^2)$  is given as follows:*

- the DGA  $A^{\text{CE}}(T, \mu)$  is defined to be the push-out of two DGA morphisms  $\phi_R^1$  and  $\phi_L^2$ ,

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A_n(\mu_n) & \xrightarrow{\phi_L^2} & A^{\text{CE}}(T^2, \mu^2) \\ \phi_R^1 \downarrow & & \downarrow i_{U^2V} \\ A^{\text{CE}}(T^1, \mu^1) & \xrightarrow{i_{V^1U}} & A^{\text{CE}}(T, \mu) \end{array}$$

- two border DGAs  $A^{\text{CE}}(T_L, \mu_L)$  and  $A^{\text{CE}}(T_R, \mu_R)$  and morphisms  $\phi_L$  and  $\phi_R$  are defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_L : A^{\text{CE}}(T_L, \mu_L) &:= A^{\text{CE}}(T_L^1, \mu_L^1) \xrightarrow{\phi_L^1} A^{\text{CE}}(T^1, \mu^1) \xrightarrow{i_{V^1U}} A^{\text{CE}}(T, \mu), \\ \phi_R : A^{\text{CE}}(T_R, \mu_R) &:= A^{\text{CE}}(T_R^2, \mu_R^1) \xrightarrow{\phi_R^2} A^{\text{CE}}(T^2, \mu^2) \xrightarrow{i_{U^2V}} A^{\text{CE}}(T, \mu). \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* This is essentially nothing but Theorem C in [1]. The generators for  $A^{\text{CE}}(T, \mu)$  come from those for  $A^{\text{CE}}(T^1, \mu^1)$  and  $A^{\text{CE}}(T^2, \mu^2)$ . For the differential of  $T$ , every immersed polygon  $f$  can be cut into two pieces along the original border  $T_R^1 = T_L^2$  so that the right part will give a generator in  $T_L^2$  while the left part will give the image under  $\phi_R^1$  for the corresponding generator in  $T_R^1$ . We omit the detail.  $\square$

For the rest of this section, we will prove the invariance of the bordered LCH DGAs.

**Theorem 3.3.15** (Invariance of bordered LCH DGAs). *The bordered LCH DGAs  $A^{\text{CE}}(\mathcal{T}, \mu)$  is invariant under Legendrian isotopy up to stablizations.*

*Moreover, for each  $(M) : (\mathcal{T}', \mu') \rightarrow (\mathcal{T}, \mu)$ , there is an induced bordered quasi-morphism*

$$(M)_* : A^{\text{CE}}(\mathcal{T}', \mu') \rightarrow A^{\text{CE}}(\mathcal{T}, \mu)$$

*such that two compositions  $(M)_* \circ (M^{-1})_*$  and  $(M^{-1})_* \circ (M)_*$  are homotopic to the identities.*

*Proof.* For convenience's sake, we denote the DGAs for these graphs as follows: for  $*$  = L, R or empty,

$$\begin{aligned} A'_* &:= A^{\text{CE}}(T'_*, \mu'_*), & \mathcal{A}' &:= \widehat{A}^{\text{CE}}(\mathcal{T}', \mu'), & \widehat{A}' &:= \widehat{A}^{\text{CE}}(T', \mu'), \\ A_* &:= A^{\text{CE}}(T_*, \mu_*), & \mathcal{A} &:= \widehat{A}^{\text{CE}}(\mathcal{T}, \mu), & \widehat{A} &:= \widehat{A}^{\text{CE}}(T, \mu). \end{aligned}$$

Due to Proposition 3.3.13, we have the following situation:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \mathcal{A}' & & A'_L & \xrightarrow{\phi'_L} & A' & \xleftarrow{\phi'_R} & A'_R \\ \uparrow \pi' & & \parallel & & \uparrow \pi' & & \parallel \\ \widehat{\mathcal{A}}' & & A'_L & \xrightarrow{\widehat{\phi}'_L} & \widehat{A}' & \xleftarrow{\widehat{\phi}'_R} & A'_R \\ \downarrow (M)_* & & \parallel & & \downarrow (M)_* & & \parallel \\ \widehat{\mathcal{A}} & & A_L & \xrightarrow{\widehat{\phi}_L} & \widehat{A} & \xleftarrow{\widehat{\phi}_R} & A_R \\ \downarrow \widehat{\pi} & & \parallel & & \downarrow \widehat{\pi} & & \parallel \\ \mathcal{A} & & A_L & \xrightarrow{\phi_L} & A & \xleftarrow{\phi_R} & A_R, \end{array} \quad (3.15)$$

where all squares in both upper and lower parts are commutative.

Let us regard  $(M) : \mathcal{T}' \rightarrow \mathcal{T}$  as the move  $(\widehat{M}) : \widehat{\mathcal{T}}' \rightarrow \widehat{\mathcal{T}}$ . By taking Ng's resolution, we have a sequence  $\text{Res}^{\text{Ng}}(\widehat{M})$  of Lagrangian Reidemeister moves between  $\text{Res}^{\text{Ng}}(\widehat{\mathcal{T}}')$  and  $\text{Res}^{\text{Ng}}(\widehat{\mathcal{T}})$  as seen in Lemma 2.2.16. Then Corollary 3.3.7 implies that we have a zig-zag of stabilizations as follows:

$$A' \xleftarrow{\widehat{\pi}'} \widehat{A}' = A_0 \xrightleftharpoons[\pi_1]{\iota'_1} A_1 \xrightleftharpoons[\pi'_1]{\iota'_1} \cdots \xrightleftharpoons[\pi_{n-1}]{\iota'_{n-1}} A_{n-1} \xrightleftharpoons[\pi'_{n-1}]{\iota'_{n-1}} A_n = \widehat{A} \xrightarrow{\widehat{\pi}} A.$$

It is important to note that all DGA morphisms in this zig-zag *preserve* two border DG-subalgebras since they are DG-subalgebras of the internal DG-subalgebras which are invariant as seen in Theorem 3.3.5. Therefore the above zig-zag induce the zig-zags of stabilizations between bordered DGAs  $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}'$  and  $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}$

$$\mathcal{A}' \xleftarrow{\widehat{\pi}'} \widehat{\mathcal{A}}' = \mathcal{A}_0 \xrightleftharpoons[\pi_1]{\mathbf{i}_1} \mathcal{A}_1 \xrightleftharpoons[\pi'_1]{\mathbf{i}'_1} \cdots \xrightleftharpoons[\pi_{n-1}]{\mathbf{i}_{n-1}} \mathcal{A}_{n-1} \xrightleftharpoons[\pi'_{n-1}]{\mathbf{i}'_{n-1}} \mathcal{A}_n = \widehat{\mathcal{A}} \xrightarrow{\widehat{\pi}} \mathcal{A},$$

where all DGAs in the middle are strong stabilizations while  $\widehat{\pi}'$  and  $\widehat{\pi}$  are weak stabilizations. Therefore the invariance up to stabilizations is proved.

In order to define the bordered DGA morphism  $(M)_* = (\text{Id}, (M)_*, \text{Id})$ , we use the bordered quasi-morphism  $\widehat{\mathbf{i}} : \mathcal{A}' \rightarrow \widehat{\mathcal{A}}'$  given as (3.6). Then we define the DGA morphism  $(M)_*$  as the composition

$$(M)_* := \widehat{\pi} \circ (\widehat{M})_* \circ \widehat{\mathbf{i}} : \mathcal{A}' \rightarrow \mathcal{A}, \quad (\widehat{M})_* = \text{Res}^{\text{Ng}}(\widehat{M})_* := \pi'_n \circ \mathbf{i}_{n-1} \circ \cdots \circ \mathbf{i}_1 : \widehat{\mathcal{A}}' \rightarrow \widehat{\mathcal{A}},$$

which makes the diagram below commutative up to homotopy

$$(M)_* \downarrow = \left( \begin{array}{ccccc} \mathcal{A}' & & A'_L & \xrightarrow{\phi'_L} & A' & \xleftarrow{\phi'_R} & A'_R \\ \parallel & & \parallel & & \downarrow (M)_* & & \parallel \\ \mathcal{A} & & A_L & \xrightarrow{\phi_L} & A & \xleftarrow{\phi_R} & A_R \end{array} \right)$$

where the homotopy  $H'_{R(M)}$  can be defined explicitly as

$$H'_{R(M)} := \widehat{\pi} \circ (M)_* \circ H'_R : A'_R \rightarrow A.$$

The last statement follows easily by choosing the sequence  $\text{Res}^{\text{Ng}}(M^{-1})$  of Lagrangian Reidemeister moves corresponding to each front Reidemeister move  $(M^{-1})$  as the inverse of the sequence  $\text{Res}^{\text{Ng}}(M)$ . Then two compositions  $(M)_* \circ (M^{-1})_*$  and  $(M^{-1})_* \circ (M)_*$  of induced maps will be compositions of morphisms which are either the identities or homotopic to the identity morphisms.  $\square$

## 4. AUGMENTATIONS

In this section, we introduce augmentation varieties (with boundary conditions) and augmentation numbers for bordered Legendrian graphs, and show their invariance. In addition, we consider two key examples: the augmentation varieties for a trivial bordered Legendrian graph and for a vertex.

**Definition 4.0.1** (Augmentation variety). Let  $A = (A, \partial)$  be a DGA. An *augmentation* of  $A$  over  $\mathbb{K}$  is a DGA morphism  $\epsilon : A \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$ , where  $\mathbb{K}$  is a field with the trivial differential, i.e.,

$$\epsilon \circ \partial \equiv 0, \quad (4.1)$$

and the (full) *augmentation variety* of  $A$  is then defined as

$$\widetilde{\text{Aug}}(A; \mathbb{K}) := \{\epsilon \mid \epsilon \text{ is an augmentation of } A \text{ over } \mathbb{K}\}.$$

We firstly introduce an equivalence relation  $\sim$  on the set of affine algebraic varieties over  $\mathbb{K}$ .

**Definition 4.0.2** (Equivalence of augmentation varieties). Let  $X$  any  $Y$  be two affine algebraic varieties over  $\mathbb{K}$ . We say that  $X$  and  $Y$  are *equivalent*, denoted by  $X \sim Y$  if they are isomorphic as affine algebraic varieties up to stabilizations, i.e., there exists  $m \geq 0$  and  $n \geq 0$  such that

$$X \times \mathbb{K}^m \cong Y \times \mathbb{K}^n.$$

**Lemma 4.0.3.** Let  $A'$  be a stabilization of  $A$ . Then two full augmentation varieties  $\widetilde{\text{Aug}}(A; \mathbb{K})$  and  $\widetilde{\text{Aug}}(A'; \mathbb{K})$  are equivalent.

*Proof.* This is obvious. Indeed, if  $A'$  has additional cancelling pairs  $\{\tilde{e}^i, e^i \mid i \in I\}$  as in Definition 3.1.8, then the augmentation variety  $\widetilde{\text{Aug}}(A'; \mathbb{K})$  is the product space

$$\widetilde{\text{Aug}}(A'; \mathbb{K}) \cong \widetilde{\text{Aug}}(A; \mathbb{K}) \times \mathbb{K}^N,$$

where  $N$  is the number of generators  $\tilde{e}^i$  of degree 0.  $\square$

**4.1. Augmentation varieties for border DGAs.** Let  $(\mathcal{T}_n, \mu) \in \mathcal{BLG}_{\text{fr}}^\mu$  be a front projection of the trivial bordered Legendrian graph consisting of  $n$  parallel strands with a Maslov potential  $\mu$  defined in Example/Definition 2.2.5. Recall that  $A^{\text{CE}}(\mathcal{T}_n, \mu) = (A_n(\mu) \cong A_n(\mu) \cong A_n(\mu))$  as seen in Example 3.3.12, where  $A_n(\mu) = (A_n(\mu), \partial_n)$  is generated by elements  $k_{ab}$ 's

$$A_n(\mu) = \mathbb{Z}\langle K_n \rangle, \quad K_n := \{k_{ab} \mid 1 \leq a < b \leq n\}, \quad |k_{ab}| = \mu(a) - \mu(b) - 1,$$

whose differential is given by

$$\partial_n(k_{ab}) = \sum_{a < c < b} (-1)^{|k_{ac}|+1} k_{ac} k_{cb}$$

as defined in Example/Definition 3.1.1.

Let us denote the augmentation variety for  $A_n(\mu)$  by  $\widetilde{\text{Aug}}(T_n, \mu; \mathbb{K})$ . Then by regarding  $\epsilon(k_{ab})$  as a variable  $x_{ab}$ , the augmentation variety of  $(T_n, \mu)$  is an affine algebraic variety

$$\widetilde{\text{Aug}}(T_n, \mu; \mathbb{K}) \cong \left\{ (x_{ab}) \in \mathbb{K}^{n(n-1)/2} \mid 1 \leq a < b \leq n, x_{ab} = 0 \text{ if } |k_{ab}| \neq 0, \sum_{a < c < b} x_{ac} x_{cb} = 0 \right\}.$$

**Definition 4.1.1** (Morse complex). Let  $\mu : [n] \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$  be a function. We define a decreasing filtration  $F^\bullet C_n$

$$C_n = F^0 C_n \supset F^1 C_n \supset \cdots \supset F^n C_n = \{0\}$$

of the free graded  $\mathbb{K}$ -module  $C_n = C_n(\mu)$  as follows:

$$F^a C_n := \bigoplus_{a < b \leq n} \mathbb{K}\langle e_b \rangle, \quad |e_b| := -\mu(b).^4$$

The group of  $\mathbb{K}$ -linear automorphisms on  $F^\bullet C_n$ , i.e., automorphisms on the graded  $\mathbb{K}$ -module  $C_n$  preserving the filtration, will be denoted by  $B(T_n, \mu; \mathbb{K})$ .

A *Morse complex*  $d \in \text{End}_{\mathbb{K}}(F^\bullet C_n)$  on  $F^\bullet C_n$  makes  $(C_n, d)$  a cochain complex and preserves the filtration, and a Morse complex  $d$  is said to be *acyclic* if the induced cohomology vanishes. We denote the

<sup>4</sup>The convention used here differs from [23, Def.4.4] by a negative sign, which is more convenient for our purpose in this article.

sets of all Morse complexes and all acyclic Morse complexes on  $F^\bullet C_n$  by  $\widetilde{\text{MC}}(T_n, \mu; \mathbb{K})$  and  $\text{MC}(T_n, \mu; \mathbb{K})$ , respectively.

*Remark 4.1.2.* As a matrix, each element in  $B(T_n, \mu; \mathbb{K})$  is upper-triangular with respect to the ordered bases  $\{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$  since it preserves the filtration.

**Definition 4.1.3.** We define  $\text{GNR}(T_n, \mu)$  to be the set of all involutions  $\rho$  on  $[n]$  such that for each  $a < b = \rho(a)$ ,

$$|k_{ab}| = 0 \quad \text{or equivalently,} \quad |e_a| = |e_b| - 1.$$

The subset consisting of involutions *without* fixed points will be denoted by  $\text{NR}(T_n, \mu)$ .

We'll see in the next section that  $\text{GNR}(T_n, \mu)$  is known as the set of *generalized normal rulings*, and  $\text{NR}(T_n, \mu)$  is the set of *normal rulings* of  $T_n, \mu$ .

**Lemma 4.1.4** ([23, Definition 4.4]). *There is a canonical identification*

$$\begin{aligned} \Xi : \widetilde{\text{Aug}}(T_n, \mu; \mathbb{K}) &\xrightarrow{\cong} \widetilde{\text{MC}}(T_n, \mu; \mathbb{K}) \\ \epsilon &\mapsto d = d(\epsilon), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$d(e_a) := \sum_{a < b} (-1)^{\mu(a)} \epsilon(k_{ab}) e_b.$$

Under this identification,  $B(T_n, \mu; \mathbb{K})$  acts on  $\widetilde{\text{MC}}(T_n, \mu; \mathbb{K})$  via conjugation: for each  $g \in B(T_n, \mu; \mathbb{K})$ ,

$$\Xi(g \cdot \epsilon) := g \cdot \Xi(\epsilon) = g \circ \Xi(\epsilon) \circ g^{-1}.$$

Moreover, we can say that an augmentation  $\epsilon$  is *acyclic* if so is  $\Xi(\epsilon)$  and we denote the subvariety of  $\widetilde{\text{Aug}}(T_n, \mu; \mathbb{K})$  of acyclic augmentations by  $\text{Aug}(T_n, \mu; \mathbb{K})$ , which can be identified with  $\text{MC}(T_n, \mu; \mathbb{K})$  by Lemma 4.1.4.

**Definition 4.1.5** (Canonical augmentations and differentials). For each involution  $\rho \in \text{GNR}(T_n, \mu)$ , the *canonical augmentation*  $\epsilon_\rho \in \widetilde{\text{Aug}}(T_n, \mu; \mathbb{K})$  and *differential*  $d_\rho \in \widetilde{\text{MC}}(T_n, \mu; \mathbb{K})$  are defined as

$$\epsilon_\rho(k_{ab}) := \begin{cases} 1 & a < b = \rho(a); \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad d_\rho(e_a) := \begin{cases} (-1)^{\mu(a)} e_b & a < b = \rho(a); \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

so that  $\Xi(\epsilon_\rho) = d_\rho$ .

The orbit of  $\epsilon_\rho$  under the action of  $B(T_n, \mu; \mathbb{K})$  will be denoted by

$$\text{Aug}^\rho(T_n, \mu; \mathbb{K}) := B(T_n, \mu; \mathbb{K}) \cdot \epsilon_\rho,$$

whose stabilizer subgroup will be denoted by  $\text{Stab}^\rho(T_n, \mu; \mathbb{K})$ .

Notice that each  $\rho \in \text{GNR}(T_n, \mu)$  defines a partition  $[n] = U_\rho \amalg H_\rho \amalg L_\rho$  together with a bijection  $\rho : U_\rho \xrightarrow{\cong} L_\rho$  satisfying that  $|k_{ab}| = 0$  for all  $a \in U_\rho < b = \rho(a) \in L_\rho$  and  $c = \rho(c)$  for all  $c \in H_\rho$ .

**Definition 4.1.6.** For each  $i \in [n]$ , we define

$$I(i) := \{j \in [n] \mid j > i, \mu(j) = \mu(i)\}.$$

For any fixed  $\rho \in \text{GNR}(T_n, \mu)$  and any  $i \in H_\rho$ , define  $\rho(i) = \infty$ . For any  $i \in U_\rho \amalg H_\rho$ , define

$$A_\rho(i) := \{j \in U_\rho \mid j \in I(i) \text{ and } \rho(j) < \rho(i)\}.$$

Now, define  $A_b(\rho) \in \mathbb{N}$  by

$$A_b(\rho) := \sum_{i \in U_\rho \amalg H_\rho} |A_\rho(i)| + \sum_{i \in L_\rho} |I(i)|.$$

**Lemma 4.1.7** ([23, Lem.4.5, 5.7 and Cor.5.8]). *Let  $\mu : [n] \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$  be a function as before.*

- (1) The group action of  $B(T_n, \mu; \mathbb{K})$  induces decompositions on  $\widetilde{\text{MC}}(T_n, \mu; \mathbb{K})$  and  $\text{MC}(T_n, \mu; \mathbb{K})$  into finitely many orbits

$$\widetilde{\text{MC}}(T_n, \mu; \mathbb{K}) = \coprod_{\rho \in \text{GNR}(T_n, \mu)} B(T_n, \mu; \mathbb{K}) \cdot d_\rho, \quad \text{MC}(T_n, \mu; \mathbb{K}) = \coprod_{\rho \in \text{NR}(T_n, \mu)} B(T_n, \mu; \mathbb{K}) \cdot d_\rho.$$

In particular, we have a decomposition of  $\text{Aug}(T_n, \mu; \mathbb{K})$  over the finite set  $\text{NR}(T_n, \mu)$

$$\text{Aug}(T_n, \mu; \mathbb{K}) = \coprod_{\rho \in \text{NR}(T_n, \mu)} \text{Aug}^\rho(T_n, \mu; \mathbb{K}),$$

- (2) For all  $\rho \in \text{GNR}(T_n, \mu)$ , the principal bundle

$$\pi_\rho : B(T_n, \mu; \mathbb{K}) \rightarrow B(T_n, \mu; \mathbb{K}) \cdot d_\rho$$

admits a canonical section  $\varphi_\rho$ . That is,  $\varphi_\rho(d) \cdot d_\rho = d$  for all  $d \in B(T_n, \mu; \mathbb{K}) \cdot d_\rho$ .

- (3) For all  $\rho \in \text{GNR}(T_n, \mu)$ , we have:

$$B(T_n, \mu; \mathbb{K}) \cdot d_\rho \cong (\mathbb{K}^\times)^{|L_\rho|} \times \mathbb{K}^{A_b(\rho)}. \quad (4.2)$$

*Remark 4.1.8.* Due to the result of Barannikov [6], for each Morse complex  $d$ , we have the Barannikov's normal form of  $d$  which is a canonical differential  $d_\rho$  for some  $\rho \in \text{GNR}(T_n, \mu)$  up to the action of  $B(T_n, \mu; \mathbb{K})$ . Indeed,  $d_\rho$  can be obtained as follows: we pick a first nontrivial element from  $(i, i+j)$  entry with the lexicographic order on  $(i, j)$  such as

$$(1, 2) \rightarrow (2, 3) \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow (1, 3) \rightarrow (2, 4) \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow (1, n)$$

and use it as a pivot to apply upward row operations and right column operations, where the entries to be cancelled out look like “L”-shape. After that, we pick the next pivot and do row and column operations to the corresponding “L”-shape as before until we have only pivot entries.

$$d_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \searrow & a & b \\ 0 & 0 & \mathbf{c} & d \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \rightarrow d_{\rho_1} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & \searrow & \mathbf{b}' \\ 0 & 0 & \mathbf{c} & \searrow \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \searrow \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad d_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \searrow & \mathbf{a} & b \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & d \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \searrow \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \rightarrow d_{\rho_2} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & \mathbf{a} & \searrow \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \mathbf{d} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

where

$$\rho_1 = \{\{1, 4\}, \{2, 3\}\} \quad \text{and} \quad \rho_2 = \{\{1, 3\}, \{2, 4\}\}.$$

Then there are exactly  $A_b(\rho)$ -many non-pivot positions lying in the “L”-shapes whose degrees are the same as of the pivot, which are cancelled during this process. For example above, we have two such entries at  $\{(1, 3), (2, 4)\}$  and only one entry  $\{(1, 4)\}$ , or equivalently,  $A_b(\rho_1) = 2$  and  $A_b(\rho_2) = 1$ , respectively.

All the detailed computations have been done in [23].

**Lemma 4.1.9.** Let  $\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2 \in \widetilde{\text{Aug}}(T_n, \mu; \mathbb{K})$  be two augmentations. Then a function  $h : K_n \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$  extends to a DGA homotopy between  $\epsilon_1$  and  $\epsilon_2$  if and only if

$$\Xi(\epsilon_1) = u \cdot \Xi(\epsilon_2),$$

where  $u$  is defined by

$$u(e_a) := e_a + \sum_{a < b} h(k_{ab})e_b.$$

*Proof.* It is not hard to check that  $h$  extends to a DGA homotopy from  $\epsilon_1$  to  $\epsilon_2$  if and only if

- $h(k_{ab}) = 0$  for all  $|k_{ab}| \neq -1$  and

- for all  $1 \leq a < b \leq n$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
 (\epsilon_2 - \epsilon_1)(k_{ab}) &= h \circ \partial(k_{ab}) \\
 &= \sum_{a < c < b} (-1)^{|k_{ac}|-1} h(k_{acb}) \\
 &= \sum_{a < c < b} (-1)^{|k_{ac}|-1} h(k_{ac}) \epsilon_1(k_{cb}) + (-1)^{|k_{ac}|} \epsilon_2(k_{ac}) h(k_{cb}) \\
 &= \sum_{a < c < b} (-1)^{\mu(a)-\mu(c)} (h(k_{ac}) \epsilon_1(k_{cb}) - \epsilon_2(k_{ac}) h(k_{cb})).
 \end{aligned}$$

Notice that as mentioned in Remark 4.1.2, the presentation matrix  $D_i = ((-1)^{\mu(a)} \epsilon_i(k_{ab}))$  for  $\Xi(\epsilon_i)$  is a strictly upper-triangular matrix.

Let  $H = (h(k_{ab}))$ . Then  $H$  is also strictly upper-triangular. Then we can rewrite the above condition as

$$D_2 - D_1 = HD_1 - D_2H \quad \text{or equivalently,} \quad D_2(I + H) = (I + H)D_1,$$

and again, it is equivalent to  $u \circ \Xi(\epsilon_2) = \Xi(\epsilon_1) \circ u$ .

Finally, by the definition of the action of  $u \in B(T_n, \mu; \mathbb{K})$ , this is the same as the condition  $\Xi(\epsilon_1) = u \cdot \Xi(\epsilon_2)$  as desired.  $\square$

As a consequence, we can say that two homotopic augmentations are in the same orbit.

**Corollary 4.1.10.** *Let  $\epsilon$  and  $\epsilon'$  be two homotopic augmentations. If  $\epsilon \in \text{Aug}^\rho(T_n, \mu; \mathbb{K})$ , then so is  $\epsilon'$ .*

**4.2. Augmentation varieties with boundary conditions.** Let  $(\mathcal{T}, \mu) \in \mathcal{BLG}_{\text{fr}}^\mu$  be a front projection of a bordered Legendrian graph of type  $(n_L, n_R)$ . Then we have a diagram of augmentation varieties

$$\widetilde{\text{Aug}}(\mathcal{T}, \mu; \mathbb{K}) = \left( \widetilde{\text{Aug}}(T_L, \mu_L; \mathbb{K}) \xleftarrow{\phi_L^*} \widetilde{\text{Aug}}(T, \mu; \mathbb{K}) \xrightarrow{\phi_R^*} \widetilde{\text{Aug}}(T_R, \mu_R; \mathbb{K}) \right), \quad (4.3)$$

where  $\widetilde{\text{Aug}}(T_*, \mu_*; \mathbb{K}) := \widetilde{\text{Aug}}(A^{\text{CE}}(T_*, \mu_*; \mathbb{K}))$  for  $*$  = L, R or empty.

**Proposition 4.2.1** (Gluing property of augmentation varieties). *Let  $(\mathcal{T}^i, \mu^i)$  be two bordered Legendrian graphs of type  $(n_L^i, n_R^i)$ , for  $i = 1, 2$ . Suppose that  $n := n_R^1 = n_L^2$  and  $\mu_n := \mu_R^1 = \mu_L^2$ . Then the augmentation variety for the concatenation  $(\mathcal{T}, \mu) := (\mathcal{T}^1, \mu^1) \cdot (\mathcal{T}^2, \mu^2)$  is given as follows:*

- the variety  $\widetilde{\text{Aug}}(T, \mu; \mathbb{K})$  is defined to be the fiber product of two induced maps  $(\phi_L^1)^*$  and  $(\phi_L^2)^*$ ,

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \widetilde{\text{Aug}}(T, \mu; \mathbb{K}) & \xrightarrow{i_{U^2U}^*} & \widetilde{\text{Aug}}(T^2, \mu^2; \mathbb{K}) \\
 \downarrow i_{U^1U}^* & & \downarrow (\phi_L^2)^* \\
 \widetilde{\text{Aug}}(T^1, \mu^1; \mathbb{K}) & \xrightarrow{(\phi_R^1)^*} & \widetilde{\text{Aug}}(T_n, \mu_n).
 \end{array}$$

- two border varieties  $\widetilde{\text{Aug}}(T_L, \mu_L; \mathbb{K})$  and  $\widetilde{\text{Aug}}(T_R, \mu_R; \mathbb{K})$  and morphisms  $\phi_L^*$  and  $\phi_R^*$  are defined as

$$\begin{aligned}
 \phi_L^* : \widetilde{\text{Aug}}(T, \mu; \mathbb{K}) &\xrightarrow{i_{U^1U}^*} \widetilde{\text{Aug}}(T^1, \mu^1; \mathbb{K}) \xrightarrow{(\phi_L^1)^*} \widetilde{\text{Aug}}(T_L^1, \mu_L^1; \mathbb{K}) = \widetilde{\text{Aug}}(T_L, \mu_L; \mathbb{K}) \\
 \phi_R^* : \widetilde{\text{Aug}}(T, \mu; \mathbb{K}) &\xrightarrow{i_{U^2U}^*} \widetilde{\text{Aug}}(T^2, \mu^2; \mathbb{K}) \xrightarrow{(\phi_R^2)^*} \widetilde{\text{Aug}}(T_R^2, \mu_R^2; \mathbb{K}) = \widetilde{\text{Aug}}(T_R, \mu_R; \mathbb{K}).
 \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* It follows directly from the definition of the augmentation variety and Theorem 3.3.14.  $\square$

Note that two augmentation varieties  $\widetilde{\text{Aug}}(T_L, \mu_L; \mathbb{K})$  and  $\widetilde{\text{Aug}}(T_R, \mu_R; \mathbb{K})$  are isomorphic to the augmentation varieties  $\widetilde{\text{Aug}}(T_{n_L}, \mu_L; \mathbb{K})$  and  $\widetilde{\text{Aug}}(T_{n_R}, \mu_R; \mathbb{K})$  of two trivial bordered Legendrian graphs  $(T_{n_L}, \mu_L)$  and  $(T_{n_R}, \mu_R)$ , which can be decomposed over the finite sets  $\text{GNR}(T_{n_L}, \mu_L)$  and  $\text{GNR}(T_{n_R}, \mu_R)$  by Lemma 4.1.7.

We will consider the augmentation varieties for bordered Legendrian graphs with constraints, called *boundary conditions*, and prove the invariance of augmentation varieties with boundary conditions.

**Definition 4.2.2** (Augmentation varieties with boundary conditions). Let  $(\mathcal{T}, \mu) \in \mathcal{BLG}_{\text{fr}}^\mu$ . For  $\rho_L \in \text{NR}(T_L, \mu_L)$ ,  $\rho_R \in \text{NR}(T_R, \mu_R)$  and  $\epsilon_L \in \text{Aug}(T_L, \mu_L; \rho_L; \mathbb{K})$ , we define subvarieties of  $\widehat{\text{Aug}}(T, \mu; \mathbb{K})$  as

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Aug}(\mathcal{T}, \mu; \epsilon_L, \rho_R; \mathbb{K}) &:= (\phi_L^*)^{-1}(\epsilon_L) \cap (\phi_R^*)^{-1}(\text{Aug}^{\rho_R}(T_R, \mu_R; \mathbb{K})) \\ &= \left\{ \left( \epsilon_L \xleftarrow{\phi_L^*} \epsilon \xrightarrow{\phi_R^*} \epsilon_R \right) \in \widehat{\text{Aug}}(T, \mu; \mathbb{K}) \mid \epsilon_R \in \text{Aug}^{\rho_R}(T_R, \mu_R; \mathbb{K}) \right\}; \\ \text{Aug}(\mathcal{T}, \mu; \rho_L, \rho_R; \mathbb{K}) &:= (\phi_L^*)^{-1}(\text{Aug}^{\rho_L}(T_L, \mu_L; \mathbb{K})) \cap (\phi_R^*)^{-1}(\text{Aug}^{\rho_R}(T_R, \mu_R; \mathbb{K})) \\ &= \left\{ \left( \epsilon_L \xleftarrow{\phi_L^*} \epsilon \xrightarrow{\phi_R^*} \epsilon_R \right) \in \widehat{\text{Aug}}(T, \mu; \mathbb{K}) \mid \epsilon_* \in \text{Aug}^{\rho_*}(T_*, \mu_*; \mathbb{K}), * = L \text{ or } R \right\} \end{aligned}$$

*Remark 4.2.3.* The augmentation-orbit and orbit-orbit boundary conditions are closed related, as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Aug}(\mathcal{T}, \mu; \rho_L, \rho_R; \mathbb{K}) &= \text{Aug}^{\rho_L}(T_L, \mu_L; \mathbb{K}) \times \text{Aug}(\mathcal{T}, \mu; \epsilon_L, \rho_R; \mathbb{K}) \\ &\cong \left( (\mathbb{K}^\times)^{n_L/2} \times \mathbb{K}^{A_b(\rho_L)} \right) \times \text{Aug}(\mathcal{T}, \mu; \epsilon_L, \rho_R; \mathbb{K}) \end{aligned}$$

See Proposition B.2.8 for more details. Thus we will see that the two definitions of augmentation varieties with boundary conditions lead to equivalent results *up to a normalization*.

**Theorem 4.2.4** (Invariance of augmentation varieties with boundary conditions). *Let  $(\mathcal{T}, \mu) \in \mathcal{BLG}_{\text{fr}}^\mu$  and  $\epsilon_L, \rho_L$  and  $\rho_R$  be as above. Then  $\text{Aug}(\mathcal{T}, \mu; \epsilon_L, \rho_R; \mathbb{K})$  and  $\text{Aug}(\mathcal{T}, \mu; \rho_L, \rho_R; \mathbb{K})$  are Legendrian isotopy invariants up to equivalence.*

*Proof.* It is enough to prove the invariance of the variety  $\text{Aug}(\mathcal{T}, \mu; \epsilon_L, \rho_R; \mathbb{K})$ , and we will follow the argument described in the proof of Theorem 3.3.15.

Let us first consider the mapping cylinder  $\widehat{A}^{\text{CE}}(\mathcal{T}, \mu)$  of  $A^{\text{CE}}(\mathcal{T}, \mu)$  defined in Lemma 3.3.8 and Proposition 3.3.13. Then the canonical inclusion  $\widehat{i}$  commutes with the structure morphisms  $\phi_R$  and  $\widehat{\phi}_R$  up to homotopy  $\widehat{H}_R$  which implies that there exists  $u \in B(T_{n_R}, \mu_R; \mathbb{K})$  that makes the following diagram commutative:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \widehat{\text{Aug}}(T_L, \mu_L; \mathbb{K}) & \xleftarrow{\phi_L^*} & \widehat{\text{Aug}}(T, \mu; \mathbb{K}) & \xrightarrow{\phi_R^*} & \widehat{\text{Aug}}(T_R, \mu_R; \mathbb{K}) \\ \parallel & & \uparrow \widehat{i}^* & & \uparrow \cong u \cdot (-) \\ \widehat{\text{Aug}}(T_L, \mu_L; \mathbb{K}) & \xleftarrow{\widehat{\phi}_L^*} & \widehat{\text{Aug}}(T, \mu; \mathbb{K}) & \xrightarrow{\widehat{\phi}_R^*} & \widehat{\text{Aug}}(T_R, \mu_R; \mathbb{K}) \end{array}$$

where  $\widehat{\text{Aug}}(T, \mu; \mathbb{K}) := \widehat{\text{Aug}}(\widehat{A}^{\text{CE}}(T, \mu); \mathbb{K})$ . We denote the corresponding subvariety with boundary conditions in  $\widehat{\text{Aug}}(T, \mu; \mathbb{K})$  by  $\widehat{\text{Aug}}(\mathcal{T}, \mu; \epsilon_L, \rho_R; \mathbb{K})$ .

$$\widehat{\text{Aug}}(\mathcal{T}, \mu; \epsilon_L, \rho_R; \mathbb{K}) := \left( \widehat{\phi}_L^* \right)^{-1}(\epsilon_L) \cap \left( \widehat{\phi}_R^* \right)^{-1}(\text{Aug}^{\rho_R}(T_R, \mu_R; \mathbb{K})).$$

By Lemma 3.2.5,  $\widehat{A}^{\text{CE}}(T, \mu)$  is isomorphic to a stabilization of  $A^{\text{CE}}(T, \mu)$  and the map  $\widehat{i}^*$  is the projection of the trivial vector bundle

$$\widehat{i}^* : \widehat{\text{Aug}}(T, \mu; \mathbb{K}) \cong \widehat{\text{Aug}}(T, \mu; \mathbb{K}) \times \mathbb{K}^N \rightarrow \widehat{\text{Aug}}(T, \mu; \mathbb{K}).$$

Here the number  $N$  is the number of generators  $\widehat{k}_{ab}$ 's of degree 0 in  $\widehat{A}^{\text{CE}}(T, \mu)$ . Hence for each  $\epsilon_R \in \text{Aug}(T_R, \mu_R; \mathbb{K})$ ,

$$\left( \widehat{\phi}_R^* \right)^{-1} \left( u^{-1} \cdot \epsilon_R \right) = \left( \phi_R^* \circ \widehat{i}^* \right)^{-1}(\epsilon_R) \cong \left( \phi_R^* \right)^{-1}(\epsilon_R) \times \mathbb{K}^N,$$

which implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\text{Aug}}(\mathcal{T}, \mu; \epsilon_L, \rho_R; \mathbb{K}) &= \left( \widehat{\phi}_L^* \right)^{-1}(\epsilon_L) \cap \left( \widehat{\phi}_R^* \right)^{-1}(\text{Aug}^{\rho_R}(T_R, \mu_R; \mathbb{K})) \\ &\cong \left( \left( \phi_L^* \right)^{-1}(\epsilon_L) \times \mathbb{K}^N \right) \cap \left( \left( \phi_R^* \right)^{-1}(\text{Aug}^{\rho_R}(T_R, \mu_R; \mathbb{K})) \times \mathbb{K}^N \right) \\ &= \text{Aug}(T, \mu; \epsilon_L, \rho_R; \mathbb{K}) \times \mathbb{K}^N. \end{aligned}$$



Obviously, this is a trivial vector bundle over  $\text{Aug}(\mathcal{T}, \mu; \epsilon_L, \rho_R; \mathbb{K})$  and therefore

$$\widehat{\text{Aug}}(\mathcal{T}, \mu; \epsilon_L, \rho_R; \mathbb{K}) \sim \text{Aug}(\mathcal{T}, \mu; \epsilon_L, \rho_R; \mathbb{K}).$$

The rest of the proof follows obviously from the fact that each front Reidemeister move induces a zig-zag sequence of stabilizations of bordered DGAs as discussed already in the proof of Theorem 3.3.15, where both inclusion and projection of each stabilization fixes both left and right border DGAs.  $\square$

**Definition 4.2.5** (Augmentation numbers). Let  $(\mathcal{T}, \mu) \in \mathcal{BLG}_{\text{fr}}^\mu$ . For  $\rho_L \in \text{NR}(T_L, \mu_L)$  and  $\rho_R \in \text{NR}(T_R, \mu_R)$  and a finite field  $\mathbb{F}_q$ , the *augmentation number* with boundary condition  $(\rho_L, \rho_R)$  for  $(\mathcal{T}, \mu)$  is the normalization of the number of  $\mathbb{F}_q$ -points in the augmentation variety  $\text{Aug}(\mathcal{T}, \mu; \epsilon_L, \rho_R; \mathbb{K})$

$$\text{aug}(\mathcal{T}, \mu; \rho_L, \rho_R; \mathbb{F}_q) := q^{-\dim_{\mathbb{K}} \text{Aug}(\mathcal{T}, \mu; \epsilon_L, \rho_R; \mathbb{K})} \# \text{Aug}(\mathcal{T}, \mu; \epsilon_L, \rho_R; \mathbb{F}_q),$$

where  $\epsilon_L = \epsilon_{\rho_L}$  is the canonical augmentation for  $\rho_L$ .

*Remark 4.2.6.* If we use  $\text{Aug}(\mathcal{T}, \mu; \rho_L, \rho_R; \mathbb{K})$  instead of  $\text{Aug}(\mathcal{T}, \mu; \epsilon_L, \rho_R; \mathbb{K})$ , then as seen in Remark 4.2.3,

$$\text{Aug}(\mathcal{T}, \mu; \rho_L, \rho_R; \mathbb{K}) \cong (\mathbb{K}^\times)^{n_L/2} \times \mathbb{K}^{A_b(\rho_L)} \times \text{Aug}(\mathcal{T}, \mu; \epsilon_L, \rho_R; \mathbb{K})$$

and therefore the following relation holds.

$$\begin{aligned} & q^{-\dim_{\mathbb{K}} \text{Aug}(\mathcal{T}, \mu; \rho_L, \rho_R; \mathbb{K})} \# \text{Aug}(\mathcal{T}, \mu; \rho_L, \rho_R; \mathbb{F}_q) \\ &= q^{-(n_L/2 + A_b(\rho_L)) - \dim_{\mathbb{K}} \text{Aug}(\mathcal{T}, \mu; \epsilon_L, \rho_R; \mathbb{K})} \# \left( (\mathbb{K}^\times)^{n_L/2} \times \mathbb{K}^{A_b(\rho_L)} \right) \# \text{Aug}(\mathcal{T}, \mu; \epsilon_L, \rho_R; \mathbb{F}_q) \\ &= q^{-(n_L/2 + A_b(\rho_L))} (q-1)^{n_L/2} q^{A_b(\rho_L)} \text{aug}(\mathcal{T}, \mu; \rho_L, \rho_R; \mathbb{F}_q) \\ &= \left( \frac{q-1}{q} \right)^{n_L/2} \text{aug}(\mathcal{T}, \mu; \rho_L, \rho_R; \mathbb{F}_q). \end{aligned}$$

As a consequence of Theorem 4.2.4, we obtain the following proposition.

**Proposition 4.2.7.** *The augmentation number  $\text{aug}(\mathcal{T}, \mu; \rho_L, \rho_R; \mathbb{F}_q)$  is a Legendrian isotopy invariant for  $(\mathcal{T}, \mu)$ .*

*Proof.* Recall the equivalence of algebraic varieties in Definition 4.0.2, that is,

$$X \sim Y \iff X \times \mathbb{K}^m \cong Y \times \mathbb{K}^n$$

for some  $m, n$ . Then the numbers of  $\mathbb{F}_q$  points and dimensions are

$$\begin{aligned} \#(X \times \mathbb{K}^m)(\mathbb{F}_q) &= \#X(\mathbb{F}_q) \cdot q^m & \dim_{\mathbb{K}}(X \times \mathbb{K}^m) &= \dim_{\mathbb{K}} X + m, \\ \#(Y \times \mathbb{K}^n)(\mathbb{F}_q) &= \#Y(\mathbb{F}_q) \cdot q^n, & \dim_{\mathbb{K}}(Y \times \mathbb{K}^n) &= \dim_{\mathbb{K}} Y + n. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore the normalizations of the numbers of  $\mathbb{F}_q$  points coincide

$$\begin{aligned} q^{-\dim_{\mathbb{K}} X} \#X(\mathbb{F}_q) &= q^{-\dim_{\mathbb{K}}(X \times \mathbb{K}^m)} \#(X \times \mathbb{K}^m)(\mathbb{F}_q) \\ &= q^{-\dim_{\mathbb{K}}(Y \times \mathbb{K}^n)} \#(Y \times \mathbb{K}^n)(\mathbb{F}_q) = q^{-\dim_{\mathbb{K}} Y} \#Y(\mathbb{F}_q). \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

**4.3. Augmentation varieties for internal DGAs.** The key example concerns the information near a vertex of a bordered Legendrian graph. Recall the construction of the DGA  $A^{\text{CE}}(\mathcal{T}, \mu)$ . As seen in the equation (3.10), for each vertex  $v$ , there is a DG-subalgebra of  $I_v \subset A^{\text{CE}}(\mathcal{T}, \mu)$ .

Let  $v$  be a vertex of type  $(\ell, r)$  with  $n = \ell + r$ , then  $I_v = (I_v, \partial_v) \cong I_{(\ell, r)}(\mu_v)$  is as follows:

$$I_v = \mathbb{Z}\langle v_{a,i} \mid 1 \leq a \leq n, i \geq 1 \rangle, \quad |v_{a,i}| = \mu_v(a) - \mu_v(a+i) + n(v, a, i) - 1,$$

where  $n(v, a, i)$  is defined in Section 3.3. Notice that among these infinitely many generators, there are only finitely many generators in each degree. Indeed, there exists  $N = N(\mu_v) \geq m$  such that  $|v_{a,i}| > 1$  for any  $a \in \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$  and  $i > N$ .

The differential  $\partial_v$  is defined by

$$\partial_v v_{a,i} := \delta_{i,n} + \sum_{i_1+i_2=i} (-1)^{|v_{a,i_1}|-1} v_{a,i_1} v_{a+i_1,i_2}.$$

As before, by regarding  $\epsilon(v_{a,i})$  as  $x_{a,i}$ , the augmentation variety at  $v$  is an affine algebraic variety

$$\widetilde{\text{Aug}}(v; \mathbb{K}) \cong \left\{ (x_{a,i}) \in \mathbb{K}^{nN} \left| a \in \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}, i \in [N], x_{a,i} = 0 \text{ if } |x_{a,i}| \neq 0, \sum_{i_1+i_2=i} x_{a,i_1} x_{a+i_1,i_2} = \delta_{i,n} \right. \right\},$$

which will be denoted by  $\text{Aug}(v; \mathbb{K})$ .

We introduce a Morse complex for a vertex as follows:

**Definition 4.3.1** (Morse complex at a vertex). Let  $\mathbb{K}[Z]$  be the graded polynomial ring in one variable  $Z$  with  $|Z| = 1$ . We define a free graded left  $\mathbb{K}[Z]$ -module

$$C_v := \mathbb{K}[Z]\langle e_1, \dots, e_n \rangle, \quad |e_a| := -\mu_v(a)$$

and a decreasing filtration

$$C_v \supset F^1 C_v \supset \dots \supset F^\ell C_v \supset Z \cdot F^{\ell+1} C_v \supset \dots \supset Z \cdot F^{\ell+r} C_v \supset Z^2 \cdot F^{n+1} C_v = Z^2 \cdot F^1 C_v$$

of  $C_v$  by free graded left  $\mathbb{K}$ -submodules such that for each  $a \in \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$ ,

$$F^a C_v := \mathbb{K}\langle e_a \rangle \oplus \bigoplus_{i>0} \mathbb{K}\langle Z^{n(v,a,i)} e_{a+i} \rangle.$$

The group of  $\mathbb{K}[Z]$ -superlinear automorphisms of  $C_v$  preserving  $F^\bullet$  will be denoted by  $B(v; \mathbb{K})$  and its unipotent subgroup will be denoted by  $U(v; \mathbb{K}) \subset B(v; \mathbb{K})$  consisting of automorphisms  $u \in B(v; \mathbb{K})$  such that  $\langle u(e_a), e_a \rangle = 1$  for all  $a \in \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$ .

We define  $\text{MC}(v; \mathbb{K})$  to be the set of all  $\mathbb{K}[Z]$ -superlinear endomorphisms  $d$  of degree 1 which preserves  $F^\bullet$  and satisfies  $d^2 + Z^2 = 0$ .

In the above definition, the pairing  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle : C_v \otimes C_v \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$  is  $\mathbb{K}$ -bilinear and satisfies  $\langle Z^i e_a, Z^j e_b \rangle := \delta_{i,j} \cdot \delta_{a,b}$ . Moreover, we assume that  $d \in \text{MC}(v; \mathbb{K})$  is super-commutative with  $Z$ . That is, for all  $x \in C_v$

$$d(Z \cdot x) = -Z \cdot d(x). \quad (4.4)$$

and therefore  $(d + Z)^2 = 0$  if and only if  $d^2 + Z^2 = 0$ .

*Remark 4.3.2.* A homogeneous  $\mathbb{K}[Z]$ -superlinear endomorphism  $d \in \text{End}(C_v)$  preserves  $F^\bullet$  if and only if  $d(e_a) \in F^a C_v$  for all  $a \in \mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z}$ , that is,

$$d(e_a) = c_{a,0} e_a + \sum_{i>0} c_{a,i} Z^{n(v,a,i)} e_{a+i}$$

for some  $c_{a,i} \in \mathbb{K}$ , with  $c_{a,0} = 0$  if  $|d| \neq 0$ .

**Lemma 4.3.3.** *There is a canonical identification*

$$\begin{aligned} \Xi_v : \text{Aug}(v; \mathbb{K}) &\xrightarrow{\cong} \text{MC}(v; \mathbb{K}); \\ \epsilon &\mapsto d = \Xi_v(\epsilon), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$d(e_a) = (-1)^{\mu_v(a)} \sum_{i>0} \epsilon(v_{a,i}) Z^{n(v,a,i)} e_{a+i}.$$

*Proof.* Since  $d = \Xi_v(\epsilon)$  is of the form in Remark 4.3.2, it preserves  $F^\bullet C_v$  and is of degree 1 since  $(-1)^{\mu_v(a)} \epsilon(v_{a,i}) e_{a+i} \neq 0$  only if  $|v_{a,i}| = 0$  and so

$$|d| = |Z^{n(v,a,i)} e_{a+i}| - |e_a| = \mu_v(a) - \mu_v(a+i) + n(v, a, i) = |v_{a,i}| + 1 = 1.$$

Moreover, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 d^2(e_a) &= d \left( \sum_{i_1 > 0} (-1)^{\mu_v(a)} \epsilon(v_{a,i_1}) Z^{n(v,a,i_1)} e_{a+i_1} \right) \\
 &= \sum_{i_1 > 0} (-1)^{\mu_v(a)+n(v,a,i_1)} \epsilon(v_{a,i_1}) Z^{n(v,a,i_1)} d(e_{a+i_1}) \quad (\text{by (4.4)}) \\
 &= \sum_{i_1 > 0} (-1)^{\mu_v(a)+n(v,a,i_1)} \epsilon(v_{a,i_1}) Z^{n(v,a,i_1)} \left( \sum_{i_2 > 0} (-1)^{\mu_v(a+i_1)} \epsilon(v_{a+i_1,i_2}) Z^{n(v,a+i_1,i_2)} e_{a+i_1+i_2} \right) \\
 &= \sum_{i_1, i_2 > 0} (-1)^{\mu_v(a)-\mu_v(a+i_1)+n(v,a,i_1)} \epsilon(v_{a,i_1} v_{a+i_1,i_2}) Z^{n(v,a,i_1+i_2)} e_{a+i_1+i_2} \quad (\text{by (3.8)}) \\
 &= \sum_{i > 0} Z^{n(v,a,i)} \sum_{i_1+i_2=i} (-1)^{|v_{a,i_1}|+1} \epsilon(v_{a,i_1} v_{a+i_1,i_2}) e_{a+i} \quad (\text{by (3.7)}) \\
 &= \sum_{i > 0} Z^{n(v,a,i)} ((\epsilon \circ \partial)(v_{a,i}) - \delta_{i,n}) e_{a+i} \quad (\text{by (3.9)}) \\
 &= -Z^2 e_a.
 \end{aligned}$$

The last equality holds by the defining equation of the augmentation (4.1) and we are done.  $\square$

From now on, we will always use the identification above. In particular, the algebraic group  $B(v; \mathbb{K})$  acts naturally on  $\text{Aug}(v; \mathbb{K})$  via conjugation.

**Definition 4.3.4** (Canonical augmentations and differentials at a vertex). Let us define as before the set  $\text{NR}(v)$  of all fixed-point-free involutions  $\rho$  on  $[n]$  satisfying that  $|v_{a,b-a}| = 0$  for all  $1 \leq a < b = \rho(a) \leq n$ .

For each involution  $\rho \in \text{NR}(v)$ , define the *canonical augmentation*  $\epsilon_\rho \in \text{Aug}(v; \mathbb{K})$  and *differential*  $d_\rho \in \text{MC}(v; \mathbb{K})$  as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \epsilon_\rho(v_{c,i}) &:= \begin{cases} 1 & 1 \leq a = c < b = a+i = \rho(a) \leq n; \\ 1 & 1 \leq a = b+i-n < c = b = \rho(a) \leq n; \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \\
 d_\rho(e_c) &:= \begin{cases} (-1)^{\mu_v(c)} Z^{n(v,a,b-a)} e_b & a = c < b = \rho(a); \\ (-1)^{\mu_v(c)} Z^{n(v,b,n+a-b)} e_a & a < c = b = \rho(a). \end{cases}
 \end{aligned}$$

We denote the orbit of  $\epsilon_\rho$  under the action of  $B(v; \mathbb{K})$  by

$$\text{Aug}^\rho(v; \mathbb{K}) := B(v; \mathbb{K}) \cdot \epsilon_\rho$$

and denote its stabilizer subgroup by  $\text{Stab}^\rho(v; \mathbb{K}) \subset B(v; \mathbb{K})$ .

As before, each  $\rho \in \text{NR}(v)$  defines a partition  $[n] = U_\rho \amalg L_\rho$ , together with a bijection  $\rho : U_\rho \xrightarrow{\cong} L_\rho$  such that  $a < b = \rho(a) \in L_\rho$  for any  $a \in U_\rho$ .

**Definition 4.3.5.** For any  $a \in [n]$ , let

$$I_v(a) := \{i > 0 \mid \mu(a) - \mu(a+i) - n(v,a,i) = 0, \text{ i.e., } |v_{a,i}| = 1\}$$

which is finite due to the degree reason.

For any  $a \in U_\rho$ , define

$$A_\rho(a) := \{b \in U \mid \rho(b) < \rho(a), \text{ and } b-a \in I_v(a)\}.$$

By definition, we have  $A_\rho(b) \subseteq A_\rho(a)$  for all  $b \in A_\rho(a)$ . Now, define  $A_v(\rho) \in \mathbb{N}$  by

$$A_v(\rho) := \sum_{a \in U} |A_\rho(a)| + \sum_{a \in L} |I_v(a)|.$$

Then we have the similar result to Lemma 4.1.7, which will be proved in Appendix B.1.

**Lemma 4.3.6.** *Let  $v$  be a vertex as above.*

- (1) There are decompositions of  $\text{Aug}(v; \mathbb{K})$  and  $\text{MC}(v; \mathbb{K})$  over the finite set  $\text{NR}(v)$

$$\text{Aug}(v; \mathbb{K}) = \coprod_{\rho \in \text{NR}(v)} \text{Aug}^\rho(v; \mathbb{K}) \quad \text{MC}(v; \mathbb{K}) = \coprod_{\rho \in \text{NR}(v)} B(v; \mathbb{K}) \cdot d_\rho$$

In particular,  $\text{Aug}(v; \mathbb{K}) = \emptyset$  if  $\text{val}(v)$  is odd.

- (2) For all  $\rho \in \text{NR}(v)$ , the  $\text{Stab}^\rho(v; \mathbb{K})$ -principal bundle

$$\pi_\rho : B(v; \mathbb{K}) \rightarrow B(v; \mathbb{K}) \cdot d_\rho$$

admits a natural algebraic section  $\varphi_\rho$ , i.e.  $\varphi_\rho(d) \cdot d_\rho = d$  for all  $d \in B(v; \mathbb{K}) \cdot d_\rho$ . In other words, we have a trivialization of  $\pi_\rho$ :

$$B(v; \mathbb{K}) \cong \text{Stab}^\rho(v; \mathbb{K}) \times B(v; \mathbb{K}) \cdot d_\rho$$

- (3) For all  $\rho \in \text{NR}(v)$ , we have:

$$B(v; \mathbb{K}) \cdot d_\rho \cong (\mathbb{K}^\times)^{\frac{\text{val}(v)}{2}} \times \mathbb{K}^{A_v(\rho)}. \quad (4.5)$$

## 5. RULINGS

In this section, we prove that augmentation numbers for (bordered) Legendrian graphs are computed by certain associated ruling polynomials.

**5.1. Resolution of vertices.** Let us recall from [2] the construction of ruling invariants for (bordered) Legendrian graphs. The key is to resolve a vertex  $v$  with respect to an involution  $\rho \in \text{NR}(v)$ . At first glance, this operation may look weird. However, there is a geometric intuition from the augmentation side. By studying the structure of the augmentation variety for an elementary bordered Legendrian graph with a single vertex, the operation of resolving the vertex arises naturally. See Remark 5.3.7.

Let  $(\mathcal{T}, \mu) \in \mathcal{BLG}_{\text{fr}}^\mu$  be a bordered Legendrian graph with Maslov potential  $\mu$  and  $v$  be a vertex of type  $(\ell, r)$  with  $\ell + r = n$ . We identify the set  $H_v$  of half-edges at  $v$  with  $[n]$  as defined in Definition 2.2.4.

Let  $\rho \in \text{NR}(v)$  be a fixed-point-free involution (or a *perfect matching*) on  $[n]$ . We first recall the construction of the *marked* bordered Legendrian graph  $(\mathcal{T}_{v,\rho}, M_{v,\rho})$ , which is the pair of the following:

- the bordered Legendrian link  $\mathcal{T}_{v,\rho}$  of type  $(\ell, r)$ , and
- the set  $M_{v,\rho}$  of *marking*, which is a subset of crossings in  $\mathcal{T}_{v,\rho}$ .

We first split  $[n]$  into the following three subsets

$$\begin{aligned} L_v(\rho) &= \{a \in [n] \mid a < \rho(a) \leq \ell\} = \{a_1^L < \dots < a_s^L\}; \\ B_v(\rho) &= \{a \in [n] \mid a \leq \ell < \rho(a)\} = \{a_1^B < \dots < a_t^B\}; \\ R_v(\rho) &= \{a \in [n] \mid \ell < a < \rho(a)\} = \{a_1^R < \dots < a_u^R\}. \end{aligned}$$

Then  $\ell = 2s + t$  and  $r = 2u + t$ .

**Example 5.1.1.** For example, let us assume that  $v$  of type  $(7, 5)$  and  $\rho$  is given as

$$\rho = \{(1, 10), (2, 5), (3, 7), (4, 8), (6, 11), (9, 12)\},$$


where  $(a, b) \in \rho$  means that  $a < b = \rho(a)$ . Then three sets above are defined as

$$L_v(\rho) = \{2, 3\}, \quad B_v(\rho) = \{1, 4, 6\}, \quad R_v(\rho) = \{9\}.$$

For each  $a_k^L \in L_v(\rho)$ , we assign a bordered Legendrian graph  $\mathcal{T}_{v,\rho}(a_k^L)$  of type  $(\ell - 2k, \ell - 2k - 2)$  for some  $k$  with one right cusp and several markings as depicted in Figure 9(a). By concatenating bordered Legendrian graphs  $\mathcal{T}_{v,\rho}(a_1^L), \dots, \mathcal{T}_{v,\rho}(a_s^L)$ , we obtain a bordered Legendrian graph  $(\mathcal{T}_{v,\rho}^L, M_{v,\rho}^L)$  of type  $(\ell, t)$  as depicted in Figure 9(b). By the same procedure, we assign a bordered Legendrian graph  $(\mathcal{T}_{v,\rho}^R, M_{v,\rho}^R)$  of type  $(t, r)$ .

From the pairing  $B_v(\rho)$ , we assign a braid  $\beta = \beta(\rho)$  with  $t$ -stands having minimal crossings. We regard  $\beta$  as a bordered Legendrian graph of type  $(t, t)$  consisting of  $t$  Legendrian arcs without self-intersection, cusps, and markings. Then the minimality means that any pair of strands make at most 1 crossing in its front projection.


Let  $\beta^c$  be a *right complement* of  $\beta$  satisfying  $\beta \cdot \beta^c = \Delta_b$ , where  $\Delta_b$  is the  $b$ -braid of half-twist, and  $\overline{\beta^c}$  is the mirror of  $\beta^c$ . We assume that all crossings in  $\beta^c$  and  $\overline{\beta^c}$  are marked. Then the middle part of the


 FIGURE 9. Two marked bordered Legendrian links  $(\mathcal{T}_{v,\rho}^L, M_{v,\rho}^L)$  and  $(\mathcal{T}_{v,\rho}^R, M_{v,\rho}^R)$ 

resolution  $(\mathcal{T}_\rho^B, M_\rho^B)$  will be defined to be the concatenation of three marked bordered Legendrian graphs  $\beta, \beta^c$  and  $\bar{\beta}^c$ .

$$(\mathcal{T}_{v,\rho}^B, M_{v,\rho}^B) := \beta \cdot \beta^c \cdot \bar{\beta}^c$$

See Figure 10(a).




Finally, the resolution of the vertex  $v$  with respect to an involution  $\rho \in \text{NR}(v)$  is a bordered Legendrian graph with markings  $(\mathcal{T}_{v,\rho}, M_{v,\rho})$  is defined by the concatenation

$$(\mathcal{T}_{v,\rho}, M_{v,\rho}) := (\mathcal{T}_{v,\rho}^L, M_{v,\rho}^L) \cdot (\mathcal{T}_{v,\rho}^B, M_{v,\rho}^B) \cdot (\mathcal{T}_{v,\rho}^R, M_{v,\rho}^R).$$

**Example 5.1.2** (cont.). The marked bordered Legendrian graph  $(\rho, M)$  is given by

$$(\mathcal{T}_{v,\rho}, M_{v,\rho}) = (\mathcal{T}_{v,\rho}^L, M_{v,\rho}^L) \cdot (\mathcal{T}_{v,\rho}^B, M_{v,\rho}^B) \cdot (\mathcal{T}_{v,\rho}^R, M_{v,\rho}^R) =$$

**Example 5.1.3.** Let  $\ell + r = 6$ , then there are 15 possible marked bordered Legendrian links for the vertex of type  $(\ell, r)$ . Especially when  $(\ell, r) = (3, 3)$  we have the following list of resolutions with markings without considering a Maslov potential:



**Definition 5.1.4** ( $\rho$ -resolutions). Let  $(\mathcal{T}, \mu) \in \mathcal{BLG}_{\text{fr}}^\mu$  and  $v$  be a vertex of  $T$  possibly with a set  $M$  of markings. For each  $\rho \in \text{NR}(v)$ , a  $\rho$ -resolution  $((\mathcal{T}_\rho, \mu_\rho), M_\rho)$  of  $((\mathcal{T}, \mu), M)$  at  $v$  is defined to be the tangle replacement of a small neighborhood of  $v$  with  $(\mathcal{T}_{v,\rho}, M_{v,\rho})$ . That is,  $M_\rho = M \amalg M_{v,\rho}$  and  $\mathcal{T}_\rho = (T_L \rightarrow T_\rho \leftarrow T_R)$ , where

$$T_\rho := (T \setminus U_v) \amalg \mathcal{T}_{v,\rho}.$$

Note that the Maslov potential  $\mu$  on  $\mathcal{T}$  inherits to the result  $\mathcal{T}_\rho$  of the tangle replacement because the construction of  $\mathcal{T}_{v,\rho}$  obeys the condition of a Maslov potential. Therefore the Maslov potential  $\mu_\rho$  on  $\mathcal{T}_\rho$  is well-defined.

**Example 5.1.5** (A Legendrian graph with 6-valent vertex). Let us consider the Legendrian graph  $\Lambda$  with a unique vertex  $v$  of valency 6 which consists of three Legendrian unknots intersecting at one vertex  $v$  as depicted in Figure 10.




FIGURE 10. A Legendrian graph with six-valent vertex

The Maslov potential  $\mu$  assigns 0 and 1 to the lower and the upper arcs, respectively. Note that all the half edges  $h_{v,i}$  near the vertex  $v$  has the Maslov potential  $\mu(h_{v,i}) = 0$ . As above, there are fifteen different involutions on  $[6]$ , see Example 5.1.3, but only six of them are possible due to Definition 4.1.3, as listed below:

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_v^1 &= \{(1, 6), (2, 5), (3, 4)\}, & \rho_v^2 &= \{(1, 6), (2, 4), (3, 5)\}, & \rho_v^3 &= \{(1, 5), (2, 6), (3, 4)\}, \\ \rho_v^4 &= \{(1, 4), (2, 5), (3, 6)\}, & \rho_v^5 &= \{(1, 5), (2, 4), (3, 6)\}, & \rho_v^6 &= \{(1, 4), (2, 6), (3, 5)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Then the corresponding resolutions are as depicted in Figure 11.




FIGURE 11. Resolutions for  $\Lambda$  in the front projection

**Definition 5.1.6.** Let  $(\mathcal{T}, \mu) \in \mathcal{BLG}_{\text{fr}}^\mu$  be a Legendrian graph with Maslov potential and possibly with marking  $M$ . We define the set  $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{T}, \mu)$  of all resolutions of  $\mathcal{T}$  as


$$\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{T}, \mu) := \prod_{v \in V} \text{NR}(v) = \{\Phi = (\rho_v) \mid \rho_v \in \text{NR}(v)\}.$$

For each  $\Phi = (\rho_{v_i}) \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{T}, \mu)$  and  $M \subset C(T)$ , we define the *full resolution* of  $((\mathcal{T}, \mu), M)$  with respect to  $\Phi$  by the pair  $((\mathcal{T}_\Phi, \mu_\Phi), M_\Phi)$  of

$$((\mathcal{T}_\Phi, \mu_\Phi), M_\Phi) := (\cdots ((((\mathcal{T}, \mu), M)_{\rho_{v_1}})_{\rho_{v_2}}) \cdots)_{\rho_{v_k}}$$

where  $V = \{v_1, \dots, v_k\}$ .

**5.2. Rulings for bordered Legendrian graphs.** Let  $(\mathcal{T}, \mu) \in \mathcal{BLG}_{\text{fr}}^\mu$  be a bordered Legendrian graph. For any subset  $N \subset C(T)$  of crossings, the *0-resolution* of  $\mathcal{T}$  along  $N$  is the bordered Legendrian graph  $\mathcal{T}_N = (T_L \rightarrow T_N \leftarrow T_R)$ , where  $T_N$  is obtained by replacing each crossing in  $N$  with the 0-resolution as follows:



Notice that when the crossings in  $N$  are of degree 0, then the Maslov potential  $\mu$  induces the Maslov potential  $\mu_N$  on  $\mathcal{T}_N$ .

**Definition 5.2.1** (Graded normal rulings of bordered Legendrian links with markings). Let


$$((\mathcal{T}, \mu), M) = \left( ((T_L, \mu_L), \emptyset) \xrightarrow{i_L} ((T, \mu), M) \xleftarrow{i_R} ((T_R, \mu_R), \emptyset) \right)$$

be a bordered Legendrian link with the set  $M$  of markings. For  $\rho_L \in \text{NR}(T_L, \mu_L)$  and  $\rho_R \in \text{NR}(T_R, \mu_R)$ , a ( $\mathbb{Z}$ -graded) normal ruling  $\rho$  of  $((\mathcal{T}, \mu), M)$  with respect to a boundary condition  $(\rho_L, \rho_R)$  is a pair  $(N, S_N)$  consisting of


- a subset  $N \subset C(T) \setminus M$  of crossings except markings, and
- a decomposition (or ruling surface)  $S_N$  of the 0-resolution  $\mathcal{T}_N$

satisfying the following:

- (1) Each  $c \in N$  is of degree 0.
- (2) The decomposition  $S_N$  of the 0-resolution  $\mathcal{T}_N$  consists of *eyes*, *left half-eyes*, *right half-eyes*, and *parallels* as follows:



- (3) At each  $c \in N$ , the decomposition  $S_N$  satisfies a *non-interlacing* condition, i.e., the only following decompositions are allowed near  $c \in N$ :



- (4) The induced involutions  $i_L^*(S_N)$  and  $i_R^*(S_N)$  at left and right borders from  $S_N$  will coincide with  $\rho_L$  and  $\rho_R$ , respectively.

$$i_L^*(S_N) = \rho_L,$$

$$i_R^*(S_N) = \rho_R.$$

We denote the set of normal ruling of  $((\mathcal{T}, \mu), M)$  with respect to  $(\rho_L, \rho_R)$  by  $\mathbf{R}((\mathcal{T}, \mu), M; \rho_L, \rho_R)$ .

**Definition 5.2.2** (Graded normal rulings of bordered Legendrian graphs). Let  $(\mathcal{T}, \mu) \in \mathcal{BLG}_{\text{fr}}^\mu$  be a bordered Legendrian graph and  $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{T}, \mu)$  be the set of full resolutions. For  $\rho_L \in \text{NR}(T_L, \mu_L)$  and  $\rho_R \in \text{NR}(T_R, \mu_R)$ , we define the set of  $\mathbb{Z}$ -graded normal ruling of  $((\mathcal{T}, \mu), \emptyset)$  with a boundary condition  $(\rho_L, \rho_R)$  by

$$\mathbf{R}(\mathcal{T}, \mu; \rho_L, \rho_R) := \bigsqcup_{\Phi \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{T}, \mu)} \mathbf{R}((\mathcal{T}_\Phi, \mu_\Phi), M_\Phi; \rho_L, \rho_R),$$

where  $((\mathcal{T}_\Phi, \mu_\Phi), M_\Phi) = ((\mathcal{T}, \mu), \emptyset)_\Phi$  is the result of the full resolution defined in Definition 5.1.6.

**Proposition 5.2.3** (Gluing property of normal rulings). Let  $(\mathcal{T}^1, \mu^1)$  and  $(\mathcal{T}^2, \mu^2)$  be bordered Legendrian graphs of type  $(n_L^i, n_R^i)$  and  $i = 1, 2$ . Suppose that  $n := n_R^1 = n_L^2$  and  $\mu := \mu_R^1 = \mu_L^2$  on  $[n]$ , then we have the following pull-back diagram: for  $(\mathcal{T}, \mu) = (\mathcal{T}^1, \mu^1) \cdot (\mathcal{T}^2, \mu^2)$ ,

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{R}(\mathcal{T}, \mu; \rho_L^1, \rho_R^2) & \dashrightarrow & \mathbf{R}(\mathcal{T}^2, \mu^2; \rho_L^2, \rho_R^2) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow i_L^* \\ \mathbf{R}(\mathcal{T}^1, \mu^1; \rho_L^1, \rho_R^1) & \xrightarrow{i_R^*} & \text{NR}(T_n, \mu) \end{array}$$

*Proof.* For each  $S_{N^1} \in \mathbf{R}(\mathcal{T}^1, \mu^1; \rho_L^1, \rho_R^1)$  and  $S_{N^2} \in \mathbf{R}(\mathcal{T}^2, \mu^2; \rho_L^2, \rho_R^2)$ , we can glue them in a canonical way if and only if  $\rho_R^1 = \rho_L^2$  in  $\text{NR}(T_n, \mu)$ . The maps from  $\mathbf{R}(\mathcal{T}, \mu; \rho_L^1, \rho_R^2)$  are defined by restrictions and the square satisfies the universal property.  $\square$

**Definition 5.2.4** (Ruling polynomial). Let  $(\mathcal{T}, \mu) \in \mathcal{BLG}_{\text{fr}}^\mu$  and  $\rho_L$  and  $\rho_R$  be as before. For each  $\Phi = (\rho_v)_{v \in V} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{T}, \mu)$  and normal ruling  $\rho \in \mathbf{R}((\mathcal{T}_\Phi, \mu_\Phi), M_\Phi; \rho_L, \rho_R)$ , let us define

$$A(\rho) := \sum_{v \in V} A_v(\rho_v) \quad \text{and} \quad \chi(\rho) := \chi(S_N) - \chi(i_R^* S_N)$$



and  $A_v(\rho_v)$  is defined in Lemma 4.3.6.

The weight  $w(\rho)$  of  $\rho = (N, S_N)$  is defined as

$$w(\rho) := q^{\frac{A(\rho)}{2}} z^{-\chi(\rho)} \quad (5.1)$$

and the ( $\mathbb{Z}$ -graded) ruling polynomial  $\langle \rho_L | R(\mathcal{T}, \mu; q, z) | \rho_R \rangle$  and  $R(\mathcal{T}, \mu; q, z)$  are defined by the weight sum as follows:

$$\langle \rho_L | R(\mathcal{T}, \mu; q, z) | \rho_R \rangle := \sum_{\rho} w(\rho), \quad R(\mathcal{T}, \mu; q, z) := \sum_{(\rho_L, \rho_R)} \langle \rho_L | R(\mathcal{T}, \mu; q, z) | \rho_R \rangle$$

where the sums run over all  $\rho \in \mathbf{R}(\mathcal{T}, \mu; \rho_L, \rho_R)$  and all  $(\rho_L, \rho_R) \in \text{NR}(T_L, \mu_L) \times \text{NR}(T_R, \mu_R)$ , respectively.

**Example 5.2.5.** Let us compute ruling polynomial for the Legendrian graph in Figure 10. For each  $\rho_v^i \in \text{NR}(v)$ , by direct computation from the definition in Lemma 4.3.6, we have  $A_v(\rho_v^i)$  as follows:

$$A_v(\rho_v^1) = 6, \quad A_v(\rho_v^2) = 5, \quad A_v(\rho_v^3) = 5, \quad A_v(\rho_v^4) = 3, \quad A_v(\rho_v^5) = 4, \quad A_v(\rho_v^6) = 4.$$

The corresponding ruling polynomial for each resolutions are

$$\begin{aligned} R(\Lambda_{\rho_v^1}; q, z) &= q^3(1 + z^{-2}), & R(\Lambda_{\rho_v^2}; q, z) &= q^{5/2}z^{-1}, & R(\Lambda_{\rho_v^3}; q, z) &= q^{5/2}z^{-1}; \\ R(\Lambda_{\rho_v^4}; q, z) &= q^{3/2}z^{-3}, & R(\Lambda_{\rho_v^5}; q, z) &= q^2z^{-2}, & R(\Lambda_{\rho_v^6}; q, z) &= q^2z^{-2}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence the ruling polynomial for the Legendrian graph  $\Lambda$  becomes

$$R(\Lambda; q, z) = q^3(1 + z^{-2}) + 2q^{5/2}z^{-1} + 2q^2z^{-2} + q^{3/2}z^{-3}.$$

**Corollary 5.2.6.** Let  $(\mathcal{T}, \mu) = (\mathcal{T}^1, \mu^1) \cdot (\mathcal{T}^2, \mu^2)$  for  $(\mathcal{T}^i, \mu^i)$  of type  $(n_L^i, n_R^i)$  and  $i = 1, 2$ . Then

$$\langle \rho_L | R(\mathcal{T}, \mu; q, z) | \rho_R \rangle = \sum_{\rho \in \text{NR}(T_n, \mu_n)} \langle \rho_L | R(\mathcal{T}^1, \mu^1; q, z) | \rho \rangle \cdot \langle \rho | R(\mathcal{T}^2, \mu^2; q, z) | \rho_R \rangle, \quad (5.2)$$

where  $n = n_R^1 = n_L^2$  and  $\mu = \mu_R^1 = \mu_L^2$ .

*Proof.* This is a direct consequence from the gluing property of the ruling in Proposition 5.2.3 and the definition of the ruling polynomial in Definition 5.2.4. Note that the weight data  $A(S_N)$  and  $\bar{\chi}(S_N)$  is additive under the gluing of ruling surfaces along the borders.  $\square$

**Example 5.2.7.** Recall the Legendrian graph  $\mathbf{0}_n$  with  $n$  even and let  $\mu$  be a Maslov potential of  $\mathbf{0}_n$ . Then for any  $\rho \in \text{NR}(T_n, \mu)$ , it defines a unique graded normal ruling  $S_N = S_N(\rho)$  consisting of  $\frac{n}{2}$  half-eyes. Therefore its Euler characteristic  $\chi(S_N)$  is exactly  $\frac{n}{2}$  and the weight  $w(S_N) = z^{\frac{n}{2} - \chi(S_N)} = 1$  for any  $\rho$ . Hence the total ruling polynomial  $R(\mathbf{0}_n, \mu)$  is the same as  $\# \text{NR}(T_n, \mu)$ .

**Theorem 5.2.8** (Invariance). [2] Let  $(\mathcal{T}, \mu) \in \mathcal{BLG}_{\text{fr}}^\mu$  and  $(\rho_L, \rho_R) \in \text{NR}(T_L, \mu_L) \times \text{NR}(T_R, \mu_R)$  be as before. Then the set of normal rulings  $\mathbf{R}(\mathcal{T}, \mu; \rho_L, \rho_R)$  is a Legendrian isotopy invariant up to bijections preserving  $\chi(\rho)$  and  $A_v(\rho)$ .

In particular, the polynomial  $\langle \rho_L | R(\mathcal{T}, \mu; q, z) | \rho_R \rangle$  is an invariant.

*Proof.* Note that for bordered Legendrian links, the invariance has been already given in [23, Lemma 2.9].

Let  $(\mathcal{T}, \mu)$  and  $(\mathcal{T}', \mu')$  be two bordered Legendrian graphs which differ by a Reidemeister move. Take boundary conditions  $(\rho_L, \rho_R) \in \text{NR}(T_L, \mu_L) \times \text{NR}(T_R, \mu_R)$ . In [2], there is a bijection between sets of rulings  $\mathbf{R}(\mathcal{T}, \mu; \rho_L, \rho_R)$  and  $\mathbf{R}(\mathcal{T}', \mu'; \rho_L, \rho_R)$  preserving the Euler characteristic  $\chi(\rho)$ . So it remains to show that  $A(\rho)$  is preserved. It is direct from the bijection in [2] and  $A(\rho)$  only depends on data  $\rho$  at vertices not switches. The weight  $z^{\chi(\rho)} q^{A(\rho)/2}$  for each  $\rho$  is preserved under that bijection. This proves the invariance theorem.  $\square$

**5.3. Augmentation numbers are ruling polynomials.** Let  $(\mathcal{T}, \mu) \in \mathcal{BLG}_{\text{fr}}^\mu$  be a bordered Legendrian graph of type  $(n_L, n_R)$  contained in  $[x_L, x_R] \times \mathbb{R}_z$  and let  $\rho_L \in \text{NR}(T_L, \mu_L)$  and  $\rho_R \in \text{NR}(T_R, \mu_R)$  be fixed.

**Definition 5.3.1** (Elementary bordered Legendrian graphs). An elementary bordered Legendrian graph  $(\mathcal{E} = (E_L \rightarrow E \leftarrow E_R), \tau) \in \mathcal{BLG}_{\text{fr}}^\mu$  contains several horizontal strands and either (i) only one left cusp, (ii) only one right cusp with a base point, (iii) only one crossing or (iv) only one vertex  $v$ .

**Assumption 5.3.2.** For the simplicity of the argument, throughout this section, let us assume that

- (1)  $n_L, n_R, \text{val}(v)$  for  $v \in V(T)$  are all even;
- (2) each right cusp has a base point;
- (3) each vertex  $v \in V(T)$  is of type  $(0, \text{val}(v))$ ;
- (4) each cusp, crossing and vertex has a different  $x$ -coordinate.

**Lemma 5.3.3.** *Let  $(\mathcal{E}, \tau)$  be an elementary bordered Legendrian graph satisfying the above assumption and  $(\sigma_L, \sigma_R) \in \text{NR}(E_L, \tau_L) \times \text{GNR}(E_R, \tau_R)$ . Then the set  $\mathbf{R}(\mathcal{E}, \tau; \sigma_L, \sigma_R)$  of normal rulings with boundary conditions is either empty or consisting of a unique normal ruling  $\sigma$ .*

*In particular, if  $\sigma_R \in \text{GNR}(E_R, \tau_R) \setminus \text{NR}(E_R, \tau_R)$ , then  $\mathbf{R}(\mathcal{E}, \tau; \sigma_L, \sigma_R)$  is empty.*

*Proof.* Suppose that  $\mathbf{R}(\mathcal{E}, \tau; \sigma_L, \sigma_R)$  is nonempty and contains  $\sigma$ . Then it can be easily checked that  $\sigma$  is uniquely determined by  $\sigma_L$  and  $\sigma_R$  for the cases (i), (ii) and (iii) in Definition 5.3.1. Finally, when  $\mathcal{E}$  contains a vertex of type  $(0, \text{val}(v))$ ,  $\sigma$  is again completely determined by boundary conditions since so is the resolution of the vertex  $v$ .  $\square$


*Remark 5.3.4.* One can consider the bordered Legendrian graph  $(\mathcal{E}, \tau)$  containing only one vertex of type  $(\ell, r)$ . In this case,  $\mathbf{R}(\mathcal{E}, \tau; \sigma_L, \sigma_R)$  may have several rulings.

Due to the fourth assumption above, we may cut  $(\mathcal{T}, \mu)$  into elementary pieces

$$(\mathcal{E}_i = (E_{i,L} \rightarrow E_i \leftarrow E_{i,R}), \tau_i) := (\mathcal{T}, \mu)|_{[x_{i-1}, x_i] \times \mathbb{R}_z}, \quad (\mathcal{T}, \mu) = (\mathcal{E}_1, \tau_1) \cdot \dots \cdot (\mathcal{E}_m, \tau_m)$$

along the vertical lines  $\{x_1, \dots, x_{m-1}\} \times \mathbb{R}_z$  for some  $x_L = x_0 < x_1 < \dots < x_{m-1} < x_m = x_R$ , where each vertical line contains no cusps, crossings, base points and vertices.

**Definition 5.3.5.** [23, Definition 2.4] Let  $(\mathcal{T}, \mu) \in \mathcal{BLG}_{\text{fr}}^\mu$  be a bordered Legendrian graph and  $\rho = (N, S_N) \in \mathbf{R}(\mathcal{T}, \mu; \rho_L, \rho_R)$  be a normal ruling. A crossing  $c$  is called a *return* (resp. *departure*) of  $\rho$  if the behavior of the ruling surface  $S_N$  is one of (resp. the vertical reflection of) the following:



Moreover, returns (resp. departures) of degree 0 are called *graded returns* (resp. *graded departures*) of the ruling  $\rho$ . Let us denote the number of graded returns (resp. graded departures) by  $r(\rho)$  (resp.  $d(\rho)$ ).

**Lemma 5.3.6.** *Let  $(\mathcal{E}, \tau) \in \mathcal{BLG}_{\text{fr}}^\mu$  be an elementary bordered Legendrian graph and  $(\sigma_L, \sigma_R) \in \text{NR}(E_L, \tau_L) \times \text{GNR}(E_R, \tau_R)$ . Then  $\mathbf{R}(\mathcal{E}, \tau; \sigma_L, \sigma_R)$  is non-empty if and only if so is  $\text{Aug}(\mathcal{E}, \tau; \epsilon_L, \sigma_R; \mathbb{K})$  for any  $\epsilon_L \in \text{Aug}^{\sigma_L}(E_L, \tau_L; \mathbb{K})$ . In this case, we have a unique ruling  $\sigma \in \mathbf{R}(\mathcal{E}, \tau; \sigma_L, \sigma_R)$  and*

$$\text{Aug}(\mathcal{E}, \tau; \epsilon_L, \sigma_R; \mathbb{K}) \cong (\mathbb{K}^\times)^{-\chi(\sigma) + \widehat{B}} \times \mathbb{K}^{r(\sigma) + A(\sigma)},$$

where


$$\widehat{B} = \#B(E) + \sum_{v \in V(E)} \frac{\text{val}(v)}{2}$$

and  $B(E)$  and  $V(E)$  are the sets of base points and vertices of  $E$ .

*In particular, it is independent of the choice of  $\epsilon_L$ .*

*Proof.* For elementary bordered Legendrian graphs containing left or right cusps, or a crossing, we refer to [23, Lemma 4.15] and we will focus on the case when  $\mathcal{E}$  is of type  $(n, n + \text{val}(v))$  and contains a vertex of

type  $(0, \text{val}(v))$  which looks as follows:



Let  $\sigma_v \in \text{GNR}(v) := \text{GNR}(v_R)$  be the restriction of  $\sigma_R$  on  $[\text{val}(v)] \cong \{j, \dots, j + \text{val}(v)\}$ . Since the LCH DGA  $A^{\text{CE}}(E, \tau) \cong A_L \amalg A_v$  is decomposed into two parts

$$A_L := \mathbb{Z}\langle k_{ab} \mid 1 \leq a < b \leq n \rangle \quad \text{and} \quad A_v := \mathbb{Z}\langle v_{a,i} \mid a \in \mathbb{Z}/\text{val}(v)\mathbb{Z}, i > 0 \rangle$$

and the augmentations for generators  $k_{ab}$  are given by  $\epsilon_L$ , we have the induced isomorphism

$$\text{Aug}(E; \epsilon_L, \sigma_R; \mathbb{K}) \xrightarrow{\cong} \text{Aug}^{\sigma_v}(v; \mathbb{K}).$$

Therefore  $\text{Aug}(E; \epsilon_L, \sigma_R; \mathbb{K})$  is non-empty if and only if so is  $\text{Aug}^{\sigma_v}(v; \mathbb{K})$ , i.e.,  $\sigma_v \in \text{NR}(v)$  and

$$\text{Aug}^{\sigma_v}(v; \mathbb{K}) \cong (\mathbb{K}^\times)^{\text{val}(v)/2} \times \mathbb{K}^{A_v(\sigma_v)}. \quad (\text{Lemma 4.3.6})$$

Moreover, the ruling  $\sigma_L$  and involution  $\sigma_v$  determine a ruling  $\sigma$  for  $(E, \tau)$  and *vice versa*, we are done.  $\square$

*Remark 5.3.7.* Though it is not trivial and need some more work, one can show a natural generalization of Lemma 5.3.6 for the case when a vertex  $v$  is of any type, as shown in Proposition B.3.9.

Let  $(E, \tau)$  be an elementary bordered Legendrian graph with a single vertex  $v$  of type  $(\ell, r)$ , then for any  $\epsilon_L \in \text{Aug}^{\rho_L}(E_L, \tau_L; \mathbb{K})$ , there is a natural decomposition via locally closed sub-varieties

$$\text{Aug}(E, \tau; \epsilon_L, \rho_R; \mathbb{K}) = \coprod_{\rho \in \mathbf{R}(E, \tau; \rho_L, \rho_R)} \text{Aug}^\rho(E, \tau; \epsilon_L, \rho_R; \mathbb{K}).$$

In addition,

$$\text{Aug}^\rho(E, \tau; \epsilon_L, \rho_R; \mathbb{K}) \cong (\mathbb{K}^\times)^{-\chi(\rho) + \widehat{B}} \times \mathbb{K}^{\widehat{r}(\rho) + A(\rho)}$$

where  $\widehat{r}(\rho)$  is defined in Proposition B.3.9.

The above statement comes up naturally by purely working with augmentations, hence provides the geometric intuition for defining normal rulings and ruling polynomials for (bordered) Legendrian graphs as seen before.

*Remark 5.3.8.* By Theorem 4.2.4, the mixed Hodge structure of the compactly supported cohomology  $H_c^*(\text{Aug}(\mathcal{T}, \mu; \epsilon_L, \rho_R; \mathbb{C}), \mathbb{Q})$  is also a Legendrian isotopy invariant up to a normalization and generalizes augmentation numbers. By a spectral sequence argument as in [24], one can also show that  $\text{Aug}(\mathcal{T}, \mu; \epsilon_L, \rho_R; \mathbb{C})$  is of Hodge type. This is similar to the Betti moduli space in non-abelian Hodge theory, which is well-known to have this property.

**Definition 5.3.9.** We denote for each  $1 \leq i \leq m$

$$(\mathcal{T}_i = (T_{i,L} \rightarrow T_i \leftarrow T_{i,R}), \mu_i) := (\mathcal{E}_1, \tau_1) \cdot (\mathcal{E}_2, \tau_2) \cdot \dots \cdot (\mathcal{E}_i, \tau_i).$$

For  $\rho \in \mathbf{R}(\mathcal{T}, \mu; \rho_L, \rho_R)$ , we define the varieties

$$\text{Aug}^\rho(\mathcal{T}, \mu; \epsilon_L; \mathbb{K}) := \text{Aug}_1(\epsilon_L, \rho_1) \times_{\text{Aug}_1^{\rho_1}} \dots \times_{\text{Aug}_{m-1}^{\rho_{m-1}}} \text{Aug}_m(\rho_{m-1}, \rho_R);$$

$$\text{Aug}^\rho(\mathcal{T}, \mu; \rho_L; \mathbb{K}) := \text{Aug}_1(\rho_L, \rho_1) \times_{\text{Aug}_1^{\rho_1}} \dots \times_{\text{Aug}_{m-1}^{\rho_{m-1}}} \text{Aug}_m(\rho_{m-1}, \rho_R),$$

where  $\rho_i := \rho|_{T_{i,R}}$  and

$$\text{Aug}_i(-, -) := \text{Aug}(\mathcal{E}_i, \mu_i; -, -; \mathbb{K}) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Aug}_i^{(-)} := \text{Aug}^{(-)}(T_{i,R}, \mu_{i,R}; \mathbb{K}).$$

As a consequence of Lemma 5.3.6, we obtain a partition of the augmentation variety as follows:

$$\text{Aug}(\mathcal{T}, \mu; \epsilon_L, \rho_R; \mathbb{K}) = \coprod_{\rho \in \mathbf{R}(\mathcal{T}, \mu; \rho_L, \rho_R)} \text{Aug}^\rho(\mathcal{T}, \mu; \epsilon_L; \mathbb{K}). \quad (5.3)$$

*Remark 5.3.10.* For a vertex of type  $(\ell, r)$ , we will use the following fact shown in Corollary B.2.5: For any augmentation  $\epsilon \in \text{Aug}(\mathcal{T}, \mu; \mathbb{K})$ , if  $\epsilon_L := \phi_L^*(\epsilon) \in \text{Aug}(T_L, \mu_L; \mathbb{K})$  is acyclic, then  $\epsilon_R := \phi_R^*(\epsilon)$  is acyclic as well.

**Lemma 5.3.11.** *For any  $\epsilon_L \in \text{Aug}^{\rho_L}(T_L, \mu_L; \mathbb{K})$ , we have*

$$\dim_{\mathbb{K}} \text{Aug}(\mathcal{T}, \mu; \epsilon_L, \rho_R; \mathbb{K}) = \max_{\rho} \{-\chi(\rho) + \widehat{B} + r(\rho) + A(\rho)\}$$

and therefore

$$\text{aug}(\mathcal{T}; \rho_L, \rho_R; \mathbb{F}_q) = q^{-\max_{\rho} \{-\chi(\rho) + \widehat{B} + r(\rho) + A(\rho)\}} \sum_{\rho} (q-1)^{-\chi(\rho) + \widehat{B}} q^{r(\rho) + A(\rho)}.$$

Here  $\rho$  runs over the set  $\mathbf{R}(\mathcal{T}, \mu; \rho_L, \rho_R)$ .

*Proof.* First consider the natural projection

$$P_m : \text{Aug}^\rho(\mathcal{T}_m, \mu_m; \epsilon_L; \mathbb{K}) \rightarrow \text{Aug}^{\rho|_{T_{m-1}}}(\mathcal{T}_{m-1}, \mu_{m-1}; \epsilon_L; \mathbb{K})$$

whose fiber is  $\text{Aug}(\mathcal{E}_m, \tau_m; \epsilon_{m-1}, \rho_m)$  for each  $\epsilon_{m-1} \in \text{Aug}^{\rho_{m-1}}(T_{m-1, R}, \mu_{m-1, R}; \mathbb{K})$ .

Lemma 5.3.6 implies that the fibers are independent of the choice of  $\epsilon_{m-1}$  and the following formulas:

$$\begin{aligned} \dim_{\mathbb{K}} \text{Aug}^\rho(\mathcal{T}_m, \mu_m; \epsilon_L; \mathbb{K}) &= \dim_{\mathbb{K}} \text{Aug}^{\rho|_{T_{m-1}}}(\mathcal{T}_{m-1}, \mu_{m-1}; \epsilon_L; \mathbb{K}) \\ &\quad - \chi(\rho|_{E_n}) + \widehat{B}(E_n) + r(\rho|_{E_n}) + A(\rho|_{E_n}); \\ \#\text{Aug}^\rho(\mathcal{T}_m, \mu_m; \epsilon_L; \mathbb{F}_q) &= (q-1)^{-\chi(\rho|_{E_m}) + \widehat{B}(E_m)} q^{r(\rho|_{E_m}) + A(\rho|_{E_m})} \#\text{Aug}^{\rho|_{T_{m-1}}}(\mathcal{T}_{m-1}, \mu_{m-1}; \epsilon_L; \mathbb{F}_q). \end{aligned}$$

By the inductive process, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \dim_{\mathbb{K}} \text{Aug}^\rho(\mathcal{T}, \mu; \epsilon_L; \mathbb{K}) &= -\chi(\rho) + \widehat{B} + r(\rho) + A(\rho) \quad \text{and} \\ \#\text{Aug}^\rho(\mathcal{T}, \mu; \epsilon_L; \mathbb{K}) &= (q-1)^{-\chi(\rho) + \widehat{B}} q^{r(\rho) + A(\rho)} \end{aligned}$$

since all indices  $\chi, \widehat{B}, r$  and  $A$  are additive under the concatenation. Then the conclusion directly follows from the partition of the augmentation variety given in (5.3).  $\square$

**Corollary 5.3.12.** *The following holds:*

$$\dim_{\mathbb{K}} \text{Aug}(\mathcal{T}, \mu; \epsilon_L, \rho_R) = \max_{\rho \in \mathbf{R}(\mathcal{T}, \mu; \rho_L, \rho_R)} \{-\chi(\rho) + \widehat{B} + r(\rho) + A(\rho)\}.$$

*Proof.* This is a direct consequence of the decomposition given in (5.3) and Lemma 5.3.11.  $\square$

Generalizing the result in [17, 23], we need the following lemma to prove the main theorem.

**Lemma 5.3.13.** *Suppose that each vertex  $v$  is at the bottom of the vertical line that contains  $v$ . For any  $\rho \in \mathbf{R}(\mathcal{T}, \mu; \rho_L, \rho_R)$ , the value*

$$-\chi(\rho) + 2r(\rho) + A(\rho)$$

is a constant and will be denoted by  $D = D(\mathcal{T}, \mu; \rho_L, \rho_R)$ .

*Proof.* Let us denote

$$c_R := \#(\text{right cusps of } T) \quad \text{and} \quad s(\rho) := \#(\text{switches of } \rho).$$

Recall that  $d(\rho)$  is the number of graded departures of  $\rho$  from Definition 5.3.5. Then  $\chi(\rho) = c_R - s(\rho)$  and hence

$$-\chi(\rho) + 2r(\rho) + A(\rho) = (s(\rho) + r(\rho) + d(\rho) - c_R) + r(\rho) + A(\rho) - d(\rho).$$

Note that  $s(\rho) + r(\rho) + d(\rho)$  is the number of crossings of the front diagram  $T$  and  $c_R$  also depends only on the front diagram. So it remains to show that  $r(\rho) + A(\rho) - d(\rho)$  is independent of the choice of ruling.

Assume that  $T \subset [x_0, x_1] \times \mathbb{R}_z$ , and take a normal ruling  $\rho \in \mathbf{R}(\mathcal{T}, \mu; \rho_L, \rho_R)$ . For each  $x \in [x_0, x_1]$  missing the crossings, cusps, and vertices, consider the restriction

$$\rho_x := \rho|_{\{x\} \times \mathbb{R}_z} \in \mathbf{NR}(T|_{\{x\} \times \mathbb{R}_z}, \mu|_{\{x\} \times \mathbb{R}_z}),$$

and  $A(x) := A_b(\rho_x)$  as in Definition 4.1.6. Note that  $A(x_0) = A_b(\rho_L)$  and  $A(x_1) = A_b(\rho_R)$ .

Let us look at the behavior of  $A(x)$  by increasing  $x \in [x_0, x_1]$ . It is direct from the definition of  $A(x)$  that it increases (resp. decreases) by 1 when  $x$  passes through a graded return (resp. a graded departure). There is no change when  $x$  passes switches and other crossings.

Now focus the change of  $A(x)$  when it passes through a vertex. Denote  $q \in [x_0, x_1]$  be a position of a vertex  $v$  of type  $(0, \text{val}(v))$ . Recall the corresponding definition  $A_v(\rho)$  from Definition 4.3.5 as follows:

Let  $\mu_v$  be the restriction of  $\mu$  to a neighborhood of  $v$ , then for any  $i \in I(v) = [\text{val}(v)]$ , we introduce

$$I_v(i) := \{j > 0 \mid |e_i| = |Z^{n(v_{i,j})} e_{i+j}|, \text{ i.e., } \mu_v(i) - \mu_v(i+j) + n(v_{i,j}) = 0\}.$$

For the induced restriction  $\rho_v \in \mathbf{NR}(v)$ , we obtain a partition  $I(v) = U_v \amalg L_v$  with a bijection  $\rho_v : U_v \xrightarrow{\cong} L_v$  as in Definition 4.3.4. For any  $i \in U_v$ , let us define

$$A_{v,\rho}(i) := \{j \in U_v \mid \rho_v(j) < \rho_v(i), \text{ and } j - i \in I_v(i)\}.$$

Now, define  $A_v(\rho) \in \mathbb{N}$  by

$$A_v(\rho) := \sum_{i \in U_v} |A_{v,\rho}(i)| + \sum_{i \in L_v} |I_v(i)|.$$

Now compare  $(I_v, \rho_v, A_v)$ ,  $(I_{q+\delta}, \rho_{q+\delta}, A_{q+\delta})$  for sufficiently small  $\delta > 0$ . Let  $T \cap \{x = q - \delta\} \cong [n_{q-\delta}]$ , then there is a canonical identification  $\iota_v : I(v) \cong [\text{val}(v)] \hookrightarrow [n_{q-\delta} + \text{val}(v)] \cong [n_{q+\delta}]$ . Moreover,  $\iota_v$  induces the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} U_v & \xleftarrow{\iota_v|_{U_v}} & U_{q+\delta} \\ \sim \downarrow \rho_v & & \sim \downarrow \rho_{q+\delta} \\ L_v & \xleftarrow{\iota_v|_{L_v}} & L_{q+\delta} \end{array}$$

Note that the image  $\iota_v(I(v))$  is consecutive. For the notational convenience, let us denote

$$\begin{aligned} I_{q-\delta} &= \{1, \dots, n_{q-\delta}\}; \\ I_{q+\delta} &= \{1, \dots, n_{q-\delta}\} \amalg \iota_v(I(v)) \cong [n_{q+\delta}]. \end{aligned}$$

Let  $I_*(i)$  be defined as in Definition 4.1.6, for  $* \in \{q \pm \delta\}$ . Then for  $i \in [n_*]$  and  $* \in \{q \pm \delta, v\}$ , we have

$$I_{q+\delta}(i) = \begin{cases} I_{q-\delta}(i) \amalg \iota_v(\{j \in I(v) \mid \mu(j) = \mu(i)\}) & \text{if } i \leq n_{q-\delta}; \\ (i + I_v(i - n_{q-\delta})) \cap [\text{val}(v)] & \text{if } i \in \iota_v(I(v)), \end{cases}$$

where  $i + S$  means  $\{i + s \mid s \in S\}$ . Note that the construction of  $I_{q+\delta}$  from  $I_{q-\delta}$  and  $I_v$  does not depend on the ruling  $\rho$ , depend only on  $\mu$  and  $\iota_v$ . This implies that

$$\sum_{i \in L_{q+\delta}} |I_{q+\delta}(i)| - \sum_{i \in L_{q-\delta}} |I_{q-\delta}(i)| = \sum_{i \in L_v} |I_v(i)| + C_v \quad (5.4)$$

and  $C_v = C_v(\mu)$  does not depend on the ruling  $\rho$ .

Note that  $\iota_v(I(v)) \subset [n]$  has a perfect matching with respect to a given ruling  $\rho_v$ . Then the definition of  $A_*(i)$  for  $i \in U_*$ ,  $* \in \{q \pm \delta, v\}$  conclude the following: For  $i \in U_{q+\delta}$ ,

$$|A_{q+\delta}(i)| = \begin{cases} |A_{q-\delta}(i)| & \text{if } i \leq n_{q-\delta}; \\ |A_v(i - n_{q-\delta})| & \text{if } i \geq n_{q-\delta}, \end{cases}$$

and we obtain

$$\sum_{i \in U_{q+\delta}} |A_{q+\delta}(i)| - \sum_{i \in U_{q-\delta}} |A_{q-\delta}(i)| = \sum_{i \in U_v} |A_v(i)|. \quad (5.5)$$

By combining (5.4) and (5.5), we have

$$A_{q+\delta}(\rho) - A_{q-\delta}(\rho) = A_v(\rho) + C_v$$

Basically we apply same strategy for left and right cusps, let  $c$  be a cusp with the  $x$ -coordinate  $p$ , then

$$A_{p+\delta}(\rho) - A_{p-\delta}(\rho) = C_c,$$

where the constant  $C_c$  depends only on  $(\mathcal{T}, \mu)$ , see [23, Proposition 4.22].

Now summing up all the equations which come from the crossings, cusps, and vertices. Then we have

$$A_b(\rho_R) - A_b(\rho_L) = A(x_1) - A(x_0) = r(\rho) - d(\rho) + \sum_{v \in V(T)} A_v(\rho) + \sum_{v \in V(T)} C_v + \sum_{\text{cusps}} C_c.$$

Since  $A_b(\rho_R) - A_b(\rho_L)$  is fixed and  $\sum_{v \in V(T)} C_v + \sum_{\text{cusps}} C_c$  independent of  $\rho$ , we conclude that  $r(\rho) - d(\rho) + A(\rho)$  is independent of the choice of the ruling  $\rho$ . This proves the lemma.  $\square$

*Remark 5.3.14.* With some more work, one can also show that, for any bordered Legendrian graph  $(\mathcal{T}, \mu)$ , the index  $-\chi(\rho) + 2\tilde{r}(\rho) + A(\rho)$  is a constant in  $\rho \in \mathbf{R}(\mathcal{T}, \mu; \rho_L, \rho_R)$ .

Now we consider the operations manipulating base points. There are essentially two operations on base points as depicted in Figure 12.

*Remark 5.3.15.* Note that the operation that moves a base point through a crossing below or above can be realized as a sequence of front Reidemeister moves and induces an isomorphism between LCH DGAs. Therefore their augmentation varieties and augmentation numbers coincide. See [23, Lemma 4.21] for detail.




FIGURE 12. Operations on base points

**Lemma 5.3.16.** Let  $d := \max \deg_z \langle \rho_L | R(\mathcal{T}, \mu; z^2, z) | \rho_R \rangle$  and

$$\widehat{B} := \#(\text{base points in } T) + \sum_{v \in V(T)} \frac{\text{val}(v)}{2}.$$

Then the normalized augmentation number

$$q^{\frac{d+\widehat{B}}{2}} z^{-\widehat{B}} \text{aug}(\mathcal{T}, \mu; \rho_L, \rho_R; \mathbb{F}_q) \Big|_{z=(q^{1/2}-q^{-1/2})}$$

is independent of the number and position of the base points on  $T$ .

In other words, it is invariant under the operations on base points described in Figure 12.

*Proof.* Notice that the numbers  $d$  and  $\sum_v \text{val}(v)/2$  are preserved under the operations on base points. Therefore we only need to concern  $q^{\frac{\widehat{B}}{2}} z^{-\widehat{B}}$  for the normalization, where  $B$  is the set of base points. Since both operations increase the number of base points by 1, the contribution of the additional base point in the normalization is precisely

$$q^{\frac{1}{2}} z^{-1} = \frac{q}{q-1}.$$

Therefore it suffices to show that for each operation  $(\mathcal{T}', \mu') \rightarrow (\mathcal{T}, \mu)$  on base points,

$$\text{Aug}(\mathcal{T}, \mu; \rho_L, \rho_R; \mathbb{K}) \cong \text{Aug}(\mathcal{T}', \mu'; \rho_L, \rho_R; \mathbb{K}) \times \mathbb{K}^\times$$

which induces the desired equality

$$\text{aug}(\mathcal{T}, \mu; \rho_L, \rho_R; \mathbb{K}) = \frac{q-1}{q} \text{Aug}(\mathcal{T}', \mu'; \rho_L, \rho_R; \mathbb{K}).$$

The base point-base point splitting operation  $(\mathcal{T}', \mu') \rightarrow (\mathcal{T}, \mu)$  induces a bordered DGA morphism  $\mathbf{f} : \mathcal{A}^{\text{CE}}(\mathcal{T}', \mu') \rightarrow \mathcal{A}^{\text{CE}}(\mathcal{T}, \mu)$  since it is a special case of the tangle replacement defined in [1]. Notice that two DGAs  $A^{\text{CE}}(T', \mu')$  and  $A^{\text{CE}}(T, \mu)$  have the same generating sets but over the different rings

$$\mathbb{Z}[t_b^{\pm 1} \mid b \in B'] \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{Z}[t_b^{\pm 1} \mid b \in B],$$

where  $B = (B' \setminus \{b\}) \amalg \{b', b''\}$ . Indeed, the DGA morphism  $f : A^{\text{CE}}(T', \mu') \rightarrow A^{\text{CE}}(T, \mu)$  maps  $t_b$  to  $t_{b'}t_{b''}$  and each occurrence of  $t_{b'}$  in any differential of  $A^{\text{CE}}(T, \mu)$  comes together with  $t_{b''}$  and *vice versa*. Therefore, their augmentation categories are as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Aug}(\mathcal{T}, \mu; \rho_L, \rho_R; \mathbb{K}) &\cong \text{Aug}(\mathcal{T}', \mu'; \rho_L, \rho_R; \mathbb{K}) \times \{(x_{b'}, x_{b''}) \in (\mathbb{K}^\times)^2 \mid x_{b'}x_{b''} = x_b\} \\ &\cong \text{Aug}(\mathcal{T}', \mu'; \rho_L, \rho_R; \mathbb{K}) \times \mathbb{K}^\times, \end{aligned}$$

where  $x_b, x_{b'}$  and  $x_{b''}$  are regarded as variables corresponding to the values of augmentations of  $t_b, t_{b'}$  and  $t_{b''}$ , respectively.

Now let  $(\mathcal{T}', \mu') \rightarrow (\mathcal{T}, \mu)$  be the vertex-base point splitting operation. Then as before, we have a bordered morphism  $\mathbf{f} : \mathcal{A}^{\text{CE}}(\mathcal{T}', \mu') \rightarrow \mathcal{A}^{\text{CE}}(\mathcal{T}, \mu)$  since it is another tangle replacement again, and moreover, two DGAs  $A^{\text{CE}}(T', \mu')$  and  $A^{\text{CE}}(T, \mu)$  only differ by the base rings

$$\mathbb{Z}[t_b^{\pm 1} \mid b \in B'] \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{Z}[t_b^{\pm 1} \mid b \in B],$$

where  $B = B' \amalg \{b\}$ . The DGA morphism  $f : A^{\text{CE}}(T', \mu') \rightarrow A^{\text{CE}}(T, \mu)$  sends all generators to the very corresponding generators except for the following vertex generators  $v_{a,i}$ :

- the vertex  $v$  is the vertex where the splitting happens;
- the half-edge  $h_{v,a}$  or  $h_{v,a+i}$  is the half-edge on where the additional base point  $b$  lies.

In this case,  $f$  maps  $v_{a,i}$  to either  $v_{a,i}t_b$  or  $t_b^{-1}v_{a,i}$ , and as before each occurrence of  $t_b$  in any differential of  $A^{\text{CE}}(T, \mu)$  comes together with such a vertex generator and *vice versa*.

In other words, whatever we have an augmentation  $\epsilon'$  for  $A^{\text{CE}}(T', \mu')$  and we assign a nonzero value  $x_b$  to  $t_b$ , by multiplying  $x_b^{-1}$  to each augmentation value for those vertex generators, we obtain an augmentation  $\epsilon$  for  $A^{\text{CE}}(T, \mu)$ . Conversely, for each augmentation  $\epsilon$  for  $A^{\text{CE}}(T, \mu)$ , by assigning the value  $\epsilon(v_{a,i}t_b)$  to  $v_{a,i}$ , we have an augmentation for  $A^{\text{CE}}(T', \mu')$ . It is obvious that these two constructions are inverses to each other up to the value of  $t_b$ . Therefore we have

$$\text{Aug}(\mathcal{T}, \mu; \rho_L, \rho_R; \mathbb{K}) \cong \text{Aug}(\mathcal{T}', \mu'; \rho_L, \rho_R; \mathbb{K}) \times \{x_b \in \mathbb{K}^\times\} \cong \text{Aug}(\mathcal{T}', \mu'; \rho_L, \rho_R; \mathbb{K}) \times \mathbb{K}^\times.$$

This completes the proof.  $\square$

**Theorem 5.3.17.** *The augmentation number and the ruling polynomial are related as follows:*

$$\text{aug}(\mathcal{T}, \mu; \rho_L, \rho_R; \mathbb{F}_q) = q^{-\frac{d+\widehat{B}}{2}} z^{\widehat{B}} \langle \rho_L | R(\mathcal{T}, \mu; q, z) | \rho_R \rangle,$$

where  $z = q^{\frac{1}{2}} - q^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ ,  $d := \max \deg_z \langle \rho_L | R(\mathcal{T}, \mu; z^2, z) | \rho_R \rangle$  and

$$\widehat{B} := \#(\text{base points in } T) + \sum_{v \in V(T)} \frac{\text{val}(v)}{2}.$$

*Proof.* Let us first show the statement for the special front diagram as described in Lemma 5.3.13. That is, we assume that each vertex  $v$  is at the bottom of the vertical line containing  $v$ .

Let us choose a normal ruling  $\rho_0 \in \mathbf{R}(\mathcal{T}, \mu; \rho_L, \rho_R)$  such that

$$\dim_{\mathbb{K}} \text{Aug}(\mathcal{T}, \mu; \epsilon_L, \rho_R; \mathbb{K}) = -\chi(\rho_0) + \widehat{B} + r(\rho_0) + A(\rho_0).$$

Then we claim that  $d = -\chi(\rho_0) + A(\rho_0)$ . By Corollary 5.3.12 and Lemma 5.3.13 imply that

$$\begin{aligned} D + \widehat{B} - r(\rho_0) &= -\chi(\rho_0) + \widehat{B} + r(\rho_0) + A(\rho_0) \\ &= \max_{\rho} \{-\chi(\rho) + \widehat{B} + r(\rho) + A(\rho)\} \\ &= \max_{\rho} \{D + \widehat{B} - r(\rho)\}. \end{aligned}$$

In other words,  $-r(\rho_0) = \min_{\rho} \{-r(\rho)\}$  since  $D$  and  $\widehat{B}$  are constant for any ruling. Hence by Definition 5.2.4,

$$d := \max_{\rho} \{-\chi(\rho) + A(\rho)\} = \max_{\rho} \{D - 2r(\rho)\} = D - 2r(\rho_0) = -\chi(\rho_0) + A(\rho_0). \quad (5.6)$$

On the other hand, by Lemma 5.3.13 again, we have

$$r(\rho) - r(\rho_0) = \frac{1}{2}(-\chi(\rho_0) + A(\rho_0) + \chi(\rho) - A(\rho)) = \frac{1}{2}(d + \chi(\rho) - A(\rho)) \quad (5.7)$$



and therefore we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{aug}(\mathcal{T}, \mu; \rho_L, \rho_R; \mathbb{F}_q) &= q^{\chi(\rho_0) - \widehat{B} - r(\rho_0) - A(\rho_0)} \sum_{\rho} (q-1)^{-\chi(\rho) + \widehat{B}} q^{r(\rho) + A(\rho)} && \text{(by Lemma 5.3.11)} \\
&= q^{-d - \widehat{B}} (q-1)^{\widehat{B}} \sum_{\rho} (q-1)^{-\chi(\rho)} q^{A(\rho)} q^{r(\rho) - r(\rho_0)} && \text{(by (5.6))} \\
&= q^{-d - \widehat{B}} (q-1)^{\widehat{B}} \sum_{\rho} (q-1)^{-\chi(\rho)} q^{A(\rho)} q^{\frac{1}{2}(d + \chi(\rho) - A(\rho))} && \text{(by (5.7))} \\
&= q^{-\frac{d + \widehat{B}}{2}} z^{\widehat{B}} \sum_{\rho} z^{-\chi(\rho)} q^{\frac{A(\rho)}{2}} && (z = q^{\frac{1}{2}} - q^{-\frac{1}{2}}) \\
&= q^{-\frac{d + \widehat{B}}{2}} z^{\widehat{B}} \langle \rho_L | R(\mathcal{T}, \mu; q, z) | \rho_R \rangle.
\end{aligned}$$

So we have the statement for the special front diagram of a bordered Legendrian graph. Note that the invariance of augmentation number and the ruling polynomial under Legendrian isotopy are already discussed in Proposition 4.2.7 and Theorem 5.2.8. This shows that the statement holds for general front diagrams.

The only remaining issue is about base points. The ruling polynomial  $\langle \rho_L | R(\mathcal{T}, \mu; q, z) | \rho_R \rangle$  has nothing to do with base points, and  $\text{aug}(\mathcal{T}, \mu; \rho_L, \rho_R; \mathbb{F}_q)$  depends on (the number of) base points. However, the normalized augmentation number in Lemma 5.3.16 is independent of the number and position of the base points on  $T$ . This prove the theorem.  $\square$

**Example 5.3.18** (Higher valency vertices). Recall Example 5.1.5. For the Legendrian graph  $\Lambda$  consisting of three Legendrian unknots intersecting at one vertex  $v$  of valency 6, which has six possible resolutions  $\rho_v^1, \dots, \rho_v^6$ .




FIGURE 13. Ng's resolution of  $\Lambda$  in Example 5.1.5

Let us compute the DGA  $A(\Lambda, \mu) = (A, \partial) := A^{\text{CE}}(\Lambda, \mu)$  for  $\text{Res}^{\text{Ng}}(\Lambda)$  equipped with Maslov potential  $\mu$ . The algebra is generated by the crossings and the vertex generators:

$$G = \{a_1, a_2, a_3, a_{1,2}, a_{2,3}, a_{1,3}\} \amalg \widetilde{V}, \quad A = \mathbb{Z}[t_1^{\pm 1}, t_2^{\pm 1}, t_3^{\pm 1}] \langle G \rangle$$

Note that  $|a_i| = 1$  for  $i = 1, 2, 3$  and let us list all generators of degree 0:

$$\begin{aligned}
&a_{1,2}, a_{2,3}, a_{1,3}; \\
&\nu_{1,3}, \nu_{1,4}, \nu_{1,5}, \nu_{2,2}, \nu_{2,3}, \nu_{2,4}, \nu_{3,1}, \nu_{3,2}, \nu_{3,3}; \\
&\nu_{4,3}, \nu_{4,4}, \nu_{4,5}, \nu_{5,2}, \nu_{5,3}, \nu_{5,4}, \nu_{6,1}, \nu_{6,2}, \nu_{6,3}.
\end{aligned}$$

The differential for the vertex generators are the same as before and for the crossings are as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial a_1 &= t_1 + a_{1,3}v_{3,1} + a_{1,2}v_{2,2} + v_{1,3}; \\
\partial a_2 &= t_2 + a_{2,3}v_{3,2} + v_{2,3} + (a_{2,3}v_{3,1} + v_{2,2})t_1^{-1}(a_1v_{4,1} + a_{1,3}v_{3,2} + a_{1,2}v_{2,3} + v_{1,4}); \\
\partial a_3 &= t_3 + v_{3,3} + v_{3,1}t_1^{-1}(a_1v_{4,2} + a_{1,3}v_{3,3} + a_{1,2}v_{2,4} + v_{1,5}) + v_{3,2}t_2^{-1}(a_2v_{5,1} + a_{2,3}v_{3,3} + v_{2,4}) \\
&\quad + v_{3,2}t_2^{-1}(a_{2,3}v_{3,1} + v_{2,2})t_1^{-1}(a_1v_{4,2} + a_{1,3}v_{3,3} + a_{1,2}v_{2,4} + v_{1,5}) \\
&\quad + v_{3,1}t_1^{-1}(a_1v_{4,1} + a_{1,3}v_{3,2} + a_{1,2}v_{2,3} + v_{1,4})t_2^{-1}(a_2v_{5,1} + a_{2,3}v_{3,3} + v_{2,4}) \\
&\quad + v_{3,1}t_1^{-1}(a_1v_{4,1} + a_{1,3}v_{3,2} + a_{1,2}v_{2,3} + v_{1,4})t_2^{-1}(a_{2,3}v_{3,1} + v_{2,2})t_1^{-1}(a_1v_{4,2} + a_{1,3}v_{3,3} + a_{1,2}v_{2,4} + v_{1,5}).
\end{aligned} \tag{5.8}$$

Now recall the rulings  $\rho_v^i$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, 6$  at the vertex  $v$  from Example 5.1.5 which induce fixed-point-free involutions on six-edges  $h_{v,i}$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, 6$  near the vertex  $v$ . Since there is a natural map

$$\pi_v : \text{Aug}(\Lambda, \mu; \mathbb{K}) \rightarrow \text{Aug}(v; \mathbb{K})$$

induced by the inclusion  $i_v : A(v) \rightarrow A(\Lambda, \mu)$ , let us investigate  $\text{Aug}(\Lambda, \mu; \mathbb{K})$  by the induced augmentation in  $\text{Aug}(v; \mathbb{K})$  with respect to the decomposition

$$\text{Aug}(v; \mathbb{K}) = \bigsqcup_{i=1}^6 \text{Aug}^{\rho_v^i}(v; \mathbb{K}),$$

and let us denote by  $\text{Aug}(\Lambda, \mu; \rho_v^i; \mathbb{K}) := \pi_v^{-1}(\text{Aug}^{\rho_v^i}(v; \mathbb{K}))$  and  $\text{Aug}(\Lambda, \mu; \epsilon^i; \mathbb{K}) := \pi_v^{-1}(\epsilon^i)$ .

For  $\rho_v^i = \{\{1, a_i\}, \{2, b_i\}, \{3, c_i\}\}$  and  $1 \leq i \leq 6$ , let us consider an (canonical) augmentation  $\epsilon_v^i \in \text{Aug}^{\rho_v^i}(v; \mathbb{K})$  satisfying

$$\epsilon_v^i(v_{k,\ell}) := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } (k, \ell) = (1, a_i - 1), (a_i, 7 - a_i), (2, b_i - 2), (b_i, 8 - b_i), (3, c_i - 3), (c_i, 9 - c_i); \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

For example, when  $\rho_v^1 = \{\{1, 6\}, \{2, 5\}, \{3, 4\}\}$ , the (canonical) augmentation  $\epsilon_v^1 \in \text{Aug}^{\rho_v^1}(v; \mathbb{K})$  becomes

$$\epsilon_v^1(g) := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } g = v_{1,5}, v_{2,3}, v_{3,1}, v_{4,5}, v_{5,3}, v_{6,1}; \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{5.9}$$

Now consider an augmentation  $\epsilon^1 \in \text{Aug}(\Lambda, \mu; \mathbb{K})$  extending  $\epsilon_v^1$ . Then  $\epsilon^1$  is determined by the value on  $a_{1,2}$ ,  $a_{2,3}$ ,  $a_{1,3}$ , and  $t_i$ ,  $i = 1, 2, 3$  which should satisfy the followings:

$$\begin{aligned}
\overline{t_1} + \overline{a_{1,3}} &= 0; \\
\overline{t_2} + 1 + \overline{a_{2,3}t_1^{-1}a_{1,2}} &= 0; \\
\overline{t_3} + \overline{t_1^{-1}} + \overline{t_1^{-1}a_{1,2}t_2^{-1}a_{2,3}t_1^{-1}} &= 0,
\end{aligned} \tag{5.10}$$

where  $\overline{g}$  means  $\epsilon^1(g)$  and the above induced from (5.8) by applying  $\epsilon^1$  and (5.9). Let us count the  $\mathbb{F}_q$ -points satisfying (5.10). There are  $(q-1)(2q-1)$  and  $(q-1)^2(q-2)$ -many  $\mathbb{F}_q$ -points when  $\overline{t_2} = -1$  and  $\overline{t_2} \neq -1$ , respectively. In total, we have

$$(q-1)(2q-1) + (q-1)^2(q-2) = (q-1)^3 + q(q-1).$$

Denote by  $(\widetilde{\Lambda}, \mu)$  the Legendrian graph obtained from  $(\Lambda, \mu)$  by adding an additional base point at each left half-edge of  $v$ . Then the map  $\pi_v : \text{Aug}(\widetilde{\Lambda}, \mu; \rho_v^i; \mathbb{K}) \rightarrow \text{Aug}^{\rho_v^i}(v; \mathbb{K})$  is a fiber bundle. For example, this follows from Corollary B.3.3. By a similar argument, one can also show the same holds for  $\Lambda$ . In particular, for any  $\epsilon^i \in \text{Aug}^{\rho_v^i}(\Lambda, \mu; \mathbb{K})$  with  $\pi_v(\epsilon^i) \in \text{Aug}^{\rho_v^i}(v; \mathbb{K})$ , we have

$$\# \left( \text{Aug}(\Lambda, \mu; \rho_v^i; \mathbb{F}_q) \right) = \# \left( \text{Aug}(\Lambda, \mu; \epsilon^i; \mathbb{F}_q) \right) \times \# \left( \text{Aug}^{\rho_v^i}(v; \mathbb{F}_q) \right).$$

Especially for  $\epsilon^1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \# \left( \text{Aug}(\Lambda, \mu; \rho_v^1; \mathbb{F}_q) \right) &= \# \left( \text{Aug}(\Lambda, \mu; \epsilon^1; \mathbb{F}_q) \right) \times \# \left( \text{Aug}^{\rho_v^1}(v; \mathbb{F}_q) \right) \\ &= \left( (q-1)^3 + q(q-1) \right) \times (q-1)^{\frac{\text{val}(v)}{2}} q^{A(\rho_v^1)} \\ &= \left( (q-1)^3 + q(q-1) \right) \times (q-1)^3 q^6. \end{aligned}$$

By a similar computation for  $\epsilon^i$ ,  $i = 2, \dots, 6$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \# \left( \text{Aug}(\Lambda, \mu; \rho_v^2; \mathbb{F}_q) \right) &= (q-1)^5 q^6, & \# \left( \text{Aug}(\Lambda, \mu; \rho_v^3; \mathbb{F}_q) \right) &= (q-1)^5 q^6; \\ \# \left( \text{Aug}(\Lambda, \mu; \rho_v^4; \mathbb{F}_q) \right) &= (q-1)^3 q^6, & \# \left( \text{Aug}(\Lambda, \mu; \rho_v^5; \mathbb{F}_q) \right) &= (q-1)^4 q^6; \\ \# \left( \text{Aug}(\Lambda, \mu; \rho_v^6; \mathbb{F}_q) \right) &= (q-1)^4 q^6. \end{aligned}$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \# \left( \text{Aug}(\Lambda; \mathbb{F}_q) \right) &= \left( (q-1)^3 + q(q-1) \right) \times (q-1)^3 q^6 + 2(q-1)^5 q^6 + 2(q-1)^4 q^6 + (q-1)^3 q^6; \\ \text{aug}(\Lambda; \mathbb{F}_q) &= \frac{\left( (q-1)^3 + q(q-1) \right) \times (q-1)^3 q^6 + 2(q-1)^5 q^6 + 2(q-1)^4 q^6 + (q-1)^3 q^6}{q^{12}}. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, recall from Example 5.2.5 that

$$R(\Lambda; q, z) = q^3(1 + z^{-2}) + 2q^{5/2}z^{-1} + 2q^2z^{-2} + q^{3/2}z^{-3}.$$

Note that  $d(\Lambda) = \max \deg_z R(\Lambda; z^2, z) = 6$ ,  $\widehat{B}(\Lambda) = \frac{\text{val}(v)}{2} + \#\{\text{base points}\} = 6$ . This implies

$$q^{-\frac{d+\widehat{B}}{2}} z^{\widehat{B}} R(\Lambda; q, z) = q^{-6} z^6 \left( q^3(1 + z^{-2}) + 2q^{5/2}z^{-1} + 2q^2z^{-2} + q^{3/2}z^{-3} \right).$$

Evaluate  $z = (q^{1/2} - q^{-1/2})$ , then it recovers  $\text{aug}(\Lambda; \mathbb{F}_q)$ . This verifies Theorem 5.3.17.

#### APPENDIX A. GENERALIZED STABILIZATIONS AND EKHOLM-NG'S (DE)STABILIZATIONS

Let  $A = (A = \mathbb{Z}\langle G \rangle, \partial)$  be a DGA and  $\varphi : I_{(\ell, m)}(\mu) \rightarrow A$  be a DGA inclusion for some  $m \geq 1$  and  $\mu : [m] \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ . We denote the image  $\varphi(\rho_{a,i})$  by  $v_{a,i}$ .

Then we define a DGA  $\widetilde{S}A^\pm = (\widetilde{S}A, \overline{\partial}^\pm)$  as follows: the underlying graded algebra  $\widetilde{S}A^\pm$  is generated by

$$\widetilde{S}A := \mathbb{Z} \langle G \amalg \{\tilde{e}^i, e^i \mid i \geq 1\} \rangle.$$

The gradings and differentials for newly added generators are defined as

$$|e^i| := \begin{cases} \mathfrak{d} & i = 1; \\ \mathfrak{d} + |v_{1,i-1}| + 1 & i > 1, \end{cases} \quad |\tilde{e}^i| := |e^i| + 1, \quad \overline{\partial}^\pm(\tilde{e}^i) := e^i, \quad \overline{\partial}^\pm(e^i) := 0.$$

Then it is obvious that  $\widetilde{S}A^\pm$  is a stabilization of  $A$  by cancelling pairs  $(\tilde{e}^i, e^i)$ .

Let us focus on the positive stabilization case first. Then we define a map  $\Phi^+ : \widetilde{S}A \rightarrow \widetilde{S}A$  between graded algebras defined as

$$\Phi^+(\tilde{e}^b) := \tilde{e}^b, \quad \Phi^+(e^b) := e^b + \sum_{a < b} (-1)^{|e^a|} \tilde{e}^a v_{a,b-a}.$$

*Remark A.0.1.* The map  $\Phi^+$  is indeed a tame isomorphism, which is a composition

$$\Phi^+ := \dots \circ f_{[2]}^+ \circ f_{[1]}^+ : \widetilde{S}A \rightarrow \widetilde{S}A$$

of infinite elementary isomorphisms  $\{f_{[b]}^+ : \widetilde{S}A \rightarrow \widetilde{S}A\}_{b \geq 1}$  such that  $f_{[b]}^+$  fixes all generators but  $e^b$  and

$$f_{[b]}^+ : e^b \mapsto e^b + \sum_{a < b} (-1)^{|e^a|} \tilde{e}^a v_{a,b-a}.$$

Note that the map  $\Phi^+$  does not depend on the order of compositions.

We denote the twisted differential of  $\bar{\partial}^+$  by  $\Phi^+$  by  $\bar{\partial}'^+$  and the DGA  $(\tilde{S}A, \bar{\partial}^+)$  by  $\tilde{S}A'^+$ .

$$\bar{\partial}'^+ := \Phi^+ \circ \bar{\partial}^+ \circ (\Phi^+)^{-1}, \quad \tilde{S}A'^+ := (\tilde{S}A^+, \bar{\partial}'^+).$$

Then by definition, we have a tame isomorphism between DGAs

$$\Phi^+ : \tilde{S}A^+ \rightarrow \tilde{S}A'^+.$$

**Lemma A.0.2.** *The following holds: for each  $b \geq 1$ ,*

$$\bar{\partial}'^+(e^b) = \begin{cases} \sum_{a < b} (-1)^{|e^a|-1} e^a v_{a,b-a} & b \leq m; \\ \bar{e}^{b-m} + \sum_{a < b} (-1)^{|e^a|-1} e^a v_{a,b-a} & b > m, \end{cases}$$

$$\bar{\partial}'^+(\bar{e}^b) = \Phi^+(e^b).$$

*Proof.* This follows from the direct computation: for each  $b \geq 1$ , it is obvious that

$$\bar{\partial}'^+(\bar{e}^b) = (\Phi^+ \circ \bar{\partial}^+ \circ (\Phi^+)^{-1})(\bar{e}^b) = (\Phi^+ \circ \bar{\partial}^+)(\bar{e}^b) = \Phi^+(e^b)$$

since  $\Phi^+$  fixes  $\bar{e}^b$ .

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\partial}'^+(e^b) &= (\Phi^+ \circ \bar{\partial}^+ \circ (\Phi^+)^{-1})(e^b) \\ &= (\Phi^+ \circ \bar{\partial}^+) \left( e^b - \sum_{a < b} (-1)^{|e^a|} \bar{e}^a v_{a,b-a} \right) \\ &= \Phi^+ \left( - \sum_{a < b} (-1)^{|e^a|} e^a v_{a,b-a} + \sum_{a < b} \bar{e}^a \bar{\partial}^+(v_{a,b-a}) \right) \\ &= \sum_{a < b} (-1)^{|e^a|-1} \Phi^+(e^a) v_{a,b-a} + \sum_{a < b} \bar{e}^a \left( \delta_{b-a,m} + \sum_{a < c < b} (-1)^{|v_{a,c-a}|-1} v_{a,c-a,b-a} \right) \\ &= \sum_{a < b} (-1)^{|e^a|-1} e^a v_{a,b-a} + \sum_{c < a < b} (-1)^{|e^a|-1+|e^c|} \bar{e}^c v_{c,a-c,b-a} \\ &\quad + \sum_{a < c < b} (-1)^{|v_{a,c-a}|-1} \bar{e}^a v_{a,c-a,b-a} + \sum_{a < b} \delta_{b-a,m} \bar{e}^a. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $|e^a| + |e^c| - 1 \equiv |v_{a,c-a}| \pmod{2}$ , the above expression is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{a < b} (-1)^{|e^a|-1} e^a v_{a,b-a} + \sum_{c < a < b} (-1)^{|v_{a,c-a}|} \bar{e}^c v_{c,a-c,b-a} \\ &+ \sum_{a < c < b} (-1)^{|v_{a,c-a}|-1} \bar{e}^a v_{a,c-a,b-a} + \sum_{a < b} \delta_{b-a,m} \bar{e}^a. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\sum_{a < b} \delta_{b-a,m} \bar{e}^a$  is either 0 if  $b \leq m$  and  $\bar{e}^{b-m}$  if  $b > m$ , we are done.  $\square$

Now we twist again the differential to obtain  $\bar{\partial}''^+$  via the tame isomorphism  $\Psi^+ : \tilde{S}A \rightarrow \tilde{S}A$  between graded algebras as follows:

$$\Psi^+(\bar{e}^b) := \bar{e}^b + \sum_{a < m+b} (-1)^{|e^a|} e^a v_{a,m+b-a}, \quad \Psi^+(e^b) := e^b, \quad \bar{\partial}''^+ := \Psi^+ \circ \bar{\partial}'^+ \circ (\Psi^+)^{-1}.$$

**Remark A.0.3.** As before,  $\Psi^+$  is a tame isomorphism which is a composition

$$\Psi^+ = \cdots \circ g_{[2]}^+ \circ g_{[1]}^+$$

of infinite elementary isomorphisms  $g_{[b]}^+ : \tilde{S}A \rightarrow \tilde{S}A$  which fix all generators but  $\bar{e}^b$  such that

$$g_{[b]}^+(\bar{e}^b) = \bar{e}^b + \sum_{a < m+b} (-1)^{|e^a|} e^a v_{a,m+b-a}.$$

As before, this does not depend on the order of compositions.

Then obviously, we have a tame isomorphism between DGAs

$$\Psi^+ : \widetilde{S}A'^+ \rightarrow \widetilde{S}A''^+.$$

**Lemma A.0.4.** *The following holds: for each  $b \geq 1$ ,*

$$\bar{\partial}''^+(e^b) = \begin{cases} \bar{\partial}'^+(e^b) & b \leq m; \\ \bar{e}^{b-m} & b > m, \end{cases} \quad \bar{\partial}''^+(\bar{e}^b) = 0.$$

*Proof.* This also follows from the direct computation: since  $\Psi^+$  fixes  $e^b$  for each  $b \geq 1$ , we have

$$\bar{\partial}''^+(e^b) = (\Psi^+ \circ \bar{\partial}'^+ \circ (\Psi^+)^{-1})(e^b) = (\Psi^+ \circ \bar{\partial}'^+)(e^b).$$

If  $b \leq m$ , then

$$\bar{\partial}''^+(e^b) = \Psi^+ \left( \sum_{a < b} (-1)^{|e^a|-1} e^a v_{a,b-a} \right) = \sum_{a < b} (-1)^{|e^a|-1} e^a v_{a,b-a},$$

and if  $b > m$ , then

$$\bar{\partial}''^+(e^b) = \Psi^+ \left( \bar{e}^{b-m} + \sum_{a < b} (-1)^{|e^a|-1} e^a v_{a,b-a} \right) = (\Psi^+ \circ (\Psi^+)^{-1})(\bar{e}^{b-m}) = \bar{e}^{b-m}$$

as desired.

This also implies the existence of anti-derivative of  $\bar{e}^b$  for each  $b \geq 1$ , which is precisely,  $e^{b+m}$ . Therefore, we have  $\bar{\partial}''^+(\bar{e}^b) = 0$  for all  $b \geq 1$ . Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\partial}''^+(\bar{e}^b) &= (\Psi^+ \circ \bar{\partial}'^+ \circ (\Psi^+)^{-1})(\bar{e}^b) \\ &= (\Psi^+ \circ \bar{\partial}'^+) \left( \bar{e}^b - \sum_{a < m+b} (-1)^{|e^a|} e^a v_{a,m+b-a} \right) \\ &= \Psi^+ \left( \Phi^+(e^b) + \sum_{a < m+b} (-1)^{|e^a|-1} \bar{\partial}'^+(e^a v_{a,m+b-a}) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Let us consider the inside first. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\Phi^+(e^b) + \sum_{a < m+b} (-1)^{|e^a|-1} \bar{\partial}'^+(e^a v_{a,m+b-a}) \\ &= e^b + \sum_{a < b} (-1)^{|e^a|} \bar{e}^a v_{a,b-a} + \sum_{a < m+b} (-1)^{|e^a|-1} \bar{\partial}'^+(e^a) v_{a,m+b-a} - \sum_{a < m+b} e^a \bar{\partial}'^+(v_{a,m+b-a}) \\ &= e^b + \sum_{a < b} (-1)^{|e^a|} \bar{e}^a v_{a,b-a} \\ &\quad + \sum_{c < a < m+b} (-1)^{|e^a|-1} \left( \delta_{a-c,m} \bar{e}^c + (-1)^{|e^c|-1} \bar{e}^c v_{c,a-c} \right) v_{a,m+b-a} \\ &\quad - \sum_{a < m+b} e^a \delta_{m+b-a,m} - \sum_{a < c < m+b} e^a (-1)^{|v_{a,c-a}|-1} v_{a,c-a,m+b-c}. \end{aligned}$$

Since we have

$$\sum_{a < m+b} e^a \delta_{m+b-a,m} = e^b \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{c < a < m+b} (-1)^{|e^a|} \delta_{a-c,m} \bar{e}^c = \sum_{m+1 \leq a < m+b} (-1)^{|e^a|} \bar{e}^{a-m},$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\cancel{e^b} + \sum_{a < b} (-1)^{|e^a|} \bar{e}^a v_{a,b-a} + \sum_{m+1 \leq a < m+b} (-1)^{|e^a|-1} \bar{e}^{a-m} v_{a,m+b-a} - \cancel{e^b} \\ &= \sum_{a < b} (-1)^{|e^a|} \bar{e}^a v_{a,b-a} + \sum_{a' < b} (-1)^{|e^{a'}|-1} \bar{e}^{a'} v_{a',b-a'}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality comes from that  $|e^{a+m}| = |e^a| + 2$  and  $v_{a,m+b-a} = v_{a',b-a'}$  for  $a = m + a'$ . We are done.  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition 3.1.10.* As mentioned earlier, the DGA  $\tilde{S}A^+ = (\tilde{S}A, \bar{\partial}^+)$  is a stabilization of  $A = (A, \partial)$ , where the cancelling pairs are  $(\tilde{e}^b, e^b)$  for  $b \geq 1$ .

On the other hand, the DGA  $\tilde{S}A^+$  is tame isomorphic to the twisted DGA  $\tilde{S}A''^+ = (\tilde{S}A, \bar{\partial}''^+)$  defined as above via

$$\Psi^+ \circ \Phi^+ : \tilde{S}A \rightarrow \tilde{S}A'',$$

which has infinite cancelling pairs  $(e^{m+b}, \tilde{e}^b)$  for  $b \geq 1$ . By cancelling out these pairs, what we have is isomorphic to the generalized stabilization  $S_\phi^{\mathfrak{d}^+}A$  by identifying  $e^b$  with  $e_b^+$  for  $b \in [m]$ .

For the generalized stabilization  $S_\phi^{\mathfrak{d}^-}A$ , we define tame isomorphisms  $\Phi^-$  and  $\Psi^-$  by using elementary isomorphisms  $f_{[b]}^-$  and  $g_{[b]}^-$  fixing all generators but  $e^b$  and  $\tilde{e}^b$  so that

$$\begin{aligned} f_{[b]}^-(e^b) &:= e^b + \sum_{a < b} (-1)^{|v_{m+1-b, b-a}|-1} v_{m+1-b, b-a} \tilde{e}^a, \\ g_{[b]}^-(\tilde{e}^a) &:= \tilde{e}^a + \sum_{a < b} v_{m+1-b, b-a} e^a. \end{aligned}$$

The rest of the proof is essentially the same as before and we omit the detail.  $\square$

## APPENDIX B. COMPLEMENTARY RESULTS ON AUGMENTATIONS

**B.1. Orbits of augmentation varieties for internal DGAs.** Let  $v$  be a vertex of type  $(\ell, r)$  with  $n = \ell + r$  as in Section 4.3, and  $\mu : I(v) = [n] \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$  be the Maslov potential. The main purpose of this subsection is to show Lemma 4.3.6: (1) follows immediately from Proposition/Definition B.1.1.(4) below; (2) and (3) are contained Lemma B.1.2.

Let us denote  $n(v_{i,j}) := n(v, i, j)$ .

**Proposition/Definition B.1.1.** *Let  $v$  be a  $n$ -valency vertex as above, with  $n$  even. Let  $d \in \text{MC}(v; \mathbb{K})$ .*

(1) *For each  $i \in \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$  and  $t \geq 0$ , an element  $x \in C_v$  is called  $(i, t)$ -admissible, if*

$$x = Z^t \left( c_0 e_i + \sum_{k > 0} c_k Z^{n(v_{i,k})} e_{i+k} \right),$$

*for some  $c_k \in \mathbb{K}$  with  $c_0 \in \mathbb{K}^*$ , and  $x$  is homogeneous. In particular,  $c_k \neq 0$  implies*

$$|e_i| = |Z^{n(v_{i,k})} e_{i+k}| \quad \text{and hence} \quad \mu(i) - \mu(i+k) + n(v_{i,k}) = 0.$$

*When  $t = 0$ , we simply say that  $x$  is  $i$ -admissible.*

*Notice that  $x$  is  $(i, t)$ -admissible if and only if  $x = Z^t y$ , with  $y$   $i$ -admissible.*

(2) *For any  $i$ -admissible  $x \in C_v$ , define  $\rho_d(x) := k$  if  $dx$  is  $(i+k, n(v_{i,k}))$ -admissible.*

(3) *For any  $i \in \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$ , define*

$$\rho_{[d]}(i) := \max\{\rho_d(x) \mid x \in C_v \text{ is } i\text{-admissible}\}.$$

*Then, we have:*

- (1) *For any  $i$ -admissible  $x$ ,  $\rho_d(x)$  is well-defined and  $0 < \rho_d(x) < n$ . In particular,  $0 < \rho_{[d]}(i) < n$ .*
- (2) *The set of  $(i, t)$ -admissible elements is preserved by the action of  $B(v; \mathbb{K})$ . Moreover, for any  $g \in B(v; \mathbb{K})$  and any  $i$ -admissible  $x$ , have*

$$\rho_d(x) = \rho_{g \cdot d}(g(x)).$$

*In particular,  $\rho_{[d]} = \rho_{[g \cdot d]}$ . That is,  $\rho_{[d]}$  depends only on the isomorphism class of  $d$ , i.e. the orbit  $B(v; \mathbb{K}) \cdot d$ .*

- (3) *If  $\rho_{[d]}(i) = k$ , then  $\rho_{[d]}(i+k) = n-k$ . In particular, each isomorphism class  $B(v; \mathbb{K}) \cdot d$  in  $\text{MC}(v; \mathbb{K})$  induces an involution  $\rho = \rho([d]) \in \text{NR}(v)$  such that*

$$\rho(i) = i + \rho_{[d]}(i) \pmod{n}.$$

- (4) *Each isomorphism class  $B(v; \mathbb{K}) \cdot d$  contains a unique canonical differential  $d_\rho$  with  $\rho = \rho([d])$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $x \in C_v$  be any  $i$ -admissible element. Say,

$$x = \sum_{k \geq 0} x_k Z^{n(v_{i,k})} e_{i+k}$$

for some  $x_k \in \mathbb{K}$  with  $x_0 \neq 0$ . Here, we use  $n(v_{i,0}) := 0$ . For any  $f \in \text{End}(C_v, F^\bullet)$ , i.e. a homogeneous  $\mathbb{K}[Z]$ -superlinear endomorphism, by Remark 4.3.2, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} f(x) &= \sum_{k \geq 0} x_k \sum_{j \geq 0} (-1)^{|f| \cdot n(v_{i,k})} Z^{n(v_{i,k})} \langle f(e_{i+k}), Z^{n(v_{i+k,j})} e_{i+k+j} \rangle Z^{n(v_{i+k,j})} e_{i+k+j} \\ &= \sum_{l \geq 0} \left( \sum_{0 \leq k \leq l} (-1)^{|f| \cdot n(v_{i,k})} x_k \langle f(e_{i+k}), Z^{n(v_{i+k,l-k})} e_{i+l} \rangle \right) Z^{n(v_{i,l})} e_{i+l} \\ &=: \sum_{l \geq 0} c_l(f) Z^{n(v_{i,l})} e_{i+l} \end{aligned}$$

where  $\langle f(e_a), Z^{n(v_{a,b})} e_{a+b} \rangle$  denotes the  $\mathbb{K}$ -coefficient of  $Z^{n(v_{a,b})} e_{a+b}$  in  $f(e_a)$ , and we have used the fact that  $f$  super-commutes with  $Z$ , and  $n(v_{i,k}) + n(v_{i+k,j}) = n(v_{i,k+j})$ .

*Proof of (1).* Take  $f := d$ , then  $\langle de_a, e_a \rangle = 0$  and  $dx = \sum_{l > 0} c_l(d) Z^{n(v_{i,l})} e_{i+l}$ . By a similar calculation, we obtain:

$$d^2 x = \sum_{j > 0} \left( \sum_{0 < l < j} (-1)^{n(v_{i,l})} c_l(d) \langle de_{i+l}, Z^{n(v_{i+l,j-l})} e_{i+j} \rangle \right) Z^{n(v_{i,j})} e_{i+j}$$

In particular,

$$\langle d^2 x, Z^2 e_i \rangle = \sum_{0 < l < n} (-1)^{n(v_{i,l})} c_l(d) \langle de_{i+l}, Z^{n(v_{i+l,j-l})} e_{i+j} \rangle = -x_0$$

is non-zero, as  $d^2 + Z^2 = 0$ . Let  $l_0 := \min\{l | c_l(d) \neq 0\}$ , then it follows that  $0 < l_0 < n$ . Moreover, by definition of  $l_0$ , we can rewrite

$$dx = Z^{n(v_{i,l_0})} \sum_{k \geq 0} c_{l_0+k}(d) Z^{n(v_{i+l_0,k})} e_{i+l_0+k},$$

with  $c_{l_0}(d) \neq 0$ . In other words,  $dx$  is  $(i + l_0, n(v_{i,l_0}))$ -admissible. Hence,  $\rho_d(x) = l_0$  is well-defined, and  $0 < \rho_d(x) < n$ . This shows (1).  $\square$

*Proof of (2).* For any  $g \in B(v; \mathbb{K})$  and any  $t \geq 0$ , we have

$$g(Z^t x) = Z^t g(x) = Z^t \sum_{l \geq 0} c_l(g) Z^{n(v_{i,l})} e_{i+l},$$

with  $c_0(g) = x_k \langle g(e_i), e_i \rangle \neq 0$ . That is,  $g(Z^t x)$  is  $(i, t)$ -admissible. Thus,  $g$  preserves the set of  $(i, t)$ -admissible elements. Moreover,  $dx$  is  $(i + k, n(v_{i,k}))$ -admissible if and only if  $(g \cdot d)(g(x)) = g \circ d(x)$  is. It follows that  $\rho_d(x) = \rho_{g \cdot d}(g(x))$  and hence  $\rho_{[d]}$  is well-defined. This shows (2).  $\square$

*Proof of (3).* If  $\rho_{[d]}(i) = k$ , then  $0 < k < n$ . By definition,  $k = \rho_{[d]}(i) = \rho_d(x)$  for some  $i$ -admissible  $x$ . In addition,  $dx = Z^{n(v_{i,k})} y$  for some  $(i + k)$ -admissible  $y$ . We then define  $g \in B(v; \mathbb{K})$  by

$$\begin{cases} g(e_p) = e_p, & \text{if } p \neq i, i + k; \\ g(x) = e_i; \\ g(y) = e_{i+k}. \end{cases}$$

Replacing  $d$  by  $g \cdot d$  and  $x$  by  $e_i$ , we obtain

$$x = e_i, \quad de_i = Z^{n(v_{i,k})} e_{i+k}.$$

It then follows from  $d^2 + Z^2 = 0$  that  $0 \leq n(v_{i,k}) \leq 2$ , and

$$\begin{aligned} de_{i+k} &= -(-1)^{n(v_{i,k})} Z^{2-n(v_{i,k})} e_i \\ &= -(-1)^{n(v_{i+k,n-k})} Z^{n(v_{i+k,n-k})} e_{i+k+(n-k)}, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that  $\rho_d(e_{i+k}) = n - k$ . This shows that  $\rho_{[d]}(i + k) \geq n - k$ .

Suppose  $\rho_{[d]}(i+k) = j > n-k$ . Then there exists a  $(i+k)$ -admissible element  $e'_{i+k}$ , such that  $de'_{i+k} = Z^{n(v_{i+k},j)}e'_{i+k+j}$  and  $e'_{i+k+j}$  is  $(i+k+j)$ -admissible. Again, by  $d^2 + Z^2 = 0$ , we must have

$$de'_{i+k+j} = -(-1)^{n(v_{i+k+j},n-j)}Z^{n(v_{i+k+j},n-j)}e'_{i+k}.$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & d(e_i + cZ^{n(v_{i,k+j-n})}e'_{i+k+j-n}) \\ &= Z^{n(v_{i,k})}e_{i+k} - c(-1)^{n(v_{i,k+j-n})+n(v_{i+k+j},n-j)}Z^{n(v_{i,k+j-n})+n(v_{i+k+j},n-j)}e'_{i+k} \\ &= Z^{n(v_{i,k})}(e_{i+k} - (-1)^{n(v_{i,k})}ce'_{i+k}) \end{aligned}$$

Since  $e'_{i+k}$  is  $(i+k)$ -admissible, can choose  $c \in \mathbb{K}^*$  so that

$$w := e_{i+k} - (-1)^{n(v_{i,k})}ce'_{i+k} = \sum_{l>k} *_l Z^{n(v_{i+k,l-k})}e_{i+l},$$

i.e.,  $w$  is not  $(i+k)$ -admissible. By assumption,

$$z := e_i + cZ^{n(v_{i,k+j-n})}e'_{i+k+j-n}$$

is  $i$ -admissible. Then by the choice of  $c$ ,  $dz = Z^{n(v_{i,k})}w$  is  $(i+l_0, n(v_{i,l_0}))$ -admissible for some  $l_0 > k$ . Hence,  $\rho_d(z) = l_0$ , which implies that  $\rho_{[d]}(i) \geq l_0 > k$ , a contradiction! Therefore, we must have  $\rho_{[d]}(i+k) = n-k$ , as desired. The remaining part of (3) now follows by a direct check of Definition 4.3.4.  $\square$

*Proof of (4).* Let  $\rho := \rho([d]) \in \text{NR}(v)$  be the involution induced by  $\rho_{[d]}$ . Notice that  $\rho$  is equivalent to a partition  $I(v) = \{1, 2, \dots, n\} = U \amalg L$  together with a bijection  $\rho : U \xrightarrow{\sim} L$  satisfying

$$\mu(i) - \mu(\rho(i)) - 1 + n(v_{i,\rho(i)-i}) = 0, \quad \text{for all } i \in U \text{ with } i < \rho(i).$$

For each  $i \in U$ , denote  $j := \rho(i)$ . By definition of  $\rho_{[d]}$ , there exists an  $i$ -admissible element  $e'_i \in C_v$  such that  $(-1)^{\mu(i)}de'_i = Z^{n(v_{i,\rho(i)-i})}e'_{\rho(i)}$ , where  $e'_{\rho(i)} \in C_v$  is  $\rho(i)$ -admissible. Then  $\{e'_p : 1 \leq p \leq n\}$  defines an element  $g \in B(v; \mathbb{K})$  by

$$g(e_p) := e'_p, \quad \text{for all } 1 \leq p \leq n.$$

It follows that, for all  $i \in U$ , have

$$(g^{-1} \cdot d)(e_i) = g^{-1} \circ d \circ g(g^{-1}(e'_i)) = g^{-1}((-1)^{\mu(i)}Z^{n(v_{i,\rho(i)-i})}e'_{\rho(i)}) = (-1)^{\mu(i)}Z^{n(v_{i,\rho(i)-i})}e_{\rho(i)}.$$

Then by the condition  $(g^{-1} \cdot d)^2 + Z^2 = 0$ , we see that  $g^{-1} \cdot d = d_\rho$ , the canonical differential associated to  $\rho$  as in Definition 4.3.4. In other words,  $d = g \cdot d_\rho$  and  $B(v; \mathbb{K}) \cdot d = B(v; \mathbb{K}) \cdot d_\rho$ . By construction,  $d_\rho$  is uniquely determined by  $\rho([d])$ , hence by  $B(v; \mathbb{K}) \cdot d$ . This shows (4).  $\square$

This proves the proposition.  $\square$

Similar to [23, Lem.5.7, Cor.5.8], we have

**Lemma B.1.2.** *Let  $v$  be a vertex as before and  $\rho \in \text{NR}(v)$ .*

- (1) *For any  $d \in B(v; \mathbb{K}) \cdot d_\rho$ , and any  $i \in U$ , there exists a unique  $i$ -admissible element in  $C_v$  of the form*

$$e'_i = e_i + \sum_{j \in A_\rho(i)} a_{j-i} Z^{n(v_{i,j-i})} e_j, \quad a_{j-i} \in \mathbb{K},$$

*such that  $de'_i$  is  $(\rho(i), n(v_{i,\rho(i)-i}))$ -admissible. Moreover,  $e'_i = e'_i(d)$  depends algebraically on  $d \in B(v; \mathbb{K}) \cdot d_\rho$ .*

- (2) *The  $\text{Stab}^\rho(v; \mathbb{K})$ -principal bundle*

$$\pi_\rho : B(v; \mathbb{K}) \rightarrow B(v; \mathbb{K}) \cdot d_\rho$$

*admits a natural algebraic section  $\varphi_\rho$ , i.e.  $\varphi_\rho(d) \cdot d_\rho = d$  for all  $d \in B(v; \mathbb{K}) \cdot d_\rho$ . In other words, we have a trivialization of  $\pi_\rho$ :*

$$B(v; \mathbb{K}) \cong \text{Stab}^\rho(v; \mathbb{K}) \times B(v; \mathbb{K}) \cdot d_\rho$$



(3) In addition, we have:

$$B(v; \mathbb{K}) \cdot d_\rho \cong (\mathbb{K}^*)^{\frac{n}{2}} \times \mathbb{K}^{A_v(\rho)} \quad (\text{B.1})$$

with  $A_v(\rho)$  given in Definition 4.3.5.

The proof is essentially the same as that in [23, Lem.5.7, Cor.5.8]. For completeness, we give the details.

*Proof of (1). Existence.* By Proposition/Definition B.1.1, for any  $i \in U$ , we have:

$$\rho(i) - i = \max\{\rho_d(x) \mid x \text{ is } i\text{-admissible}\}.$$

Hence, we can take an  $i$ -admissible element of the form

$$x = e_i + \sum_{j \in I_v(i)} a_j Z^{n(v_{i,j})} e_{i+j},$$

such that  $\rho_d(x) = \rho(i) - i$ , i.e.  $dx$  is  $(\rho(i), n(v_{i,\rho(i)-i}))$ -admissible.

Let us apply induction argument on

$$j = j(x_0) := \min\{j \mid j \in I_v(i) \setminus (A_\rho(i) - i) \text{ and } a_j = \langle x_0, Z^{n(v_{i,j})} e_{i+j} \rangle \neq 0\}.$$

*Inductive step 0:* If  $j = +\infty$ , i.e.,  $a_j = 0$  for all  $j \in I(i) \setminus (A_\rho(i) - i)$ , then  $e'_i = x$  is a desired element for (1).<sup>5</sup>

*Inductive step 1:* Otherwise, set  $x_0 = x$  and construct  $x_1$  by considering the following cases:

(i) If  $i + j > n$ , in particular,  $j > \rho(i) - i$ . Take

$$x_1 := x_0 - a_j Z^{n(v_{i,j})} e_{i+j}.$$

Then,  $x_1$  is  $i$ -admissible, and  $dx$  is still  $(\rho(i), n(v_{i,\rho(i)-i}))$ -admissible.

(ii) If  $i + j \leq n$ , i.e.  $i + j \in I(v)$ , then by definition of  $A_{\rho(i)}$ , either  $i + j \in L$ , or  $i + j \in U$  and  $\rho(i + j) > \rho(i)$ .

(ii-1) If  $i + j \in L$ , denote  $k := \rho^{-1}(i + j) \in U$ , then  $k < i + j$  and  $\rho_d(i + j) = n - (i + j - k)$ , by Proposition/Definition B.1.1. Hence, there exists an  $(i + j)$ -admissible element of the form

$$y_{i+j} = e_{i+j} + \sum_{l > j} *_l Z^{n(v_{i+j,l-j})} e_{i+l}$$

such that  $dy_{i+j} = (k, n(v_{i+j,n-(i+j-k)}))$ -admissible. It follows that  $x_1 = x_0 - a_j Z^{n(v_{i,j})} y_{i+j}$  is  $i$ -admissible and  $dx_1$  is still  $(\rho(i), n(v_{i,\rho(i)-i}))$ -admissible, but  $j(x_1) > j(x_0)$ .

(ii-2) If  $i + j \in U$  and  $\rho(i + j) > \rho(i)$ , then there exists a  $(i + j)$ -admissible element of the form

$$y_{i+j} = e_{i+j} + \sum_{l > j} *_l Z^{n(v_{i+j,l-j})} e_{i+l}$$

such that  $dy_{i+j}$  is  $(\rho(i + j), n(v_{i+j,\rho(i+j)-(i+j)}))$ -admissible. It follows again that  $x_1 = x_0 - a_j Z^{n(v_{i,j})} y_{i+j}$  is  $i$ -admissible and  $dx_1$  is still  $(\rho(i), n(v_{i,\rho(i)-i}))$ -admissible, but  $j(x_1) > j(x_0)$ .

*Inductive step 2:* If  $j(x_1) = \infty$ , then  $e'_i = x_1$  is a desired element for (1). Otherwise, replace  $x_0$  by  $x_1$  and repeat the procedure above. Inductively, for some sufficiently large  $N$ , we obtain in the end an  $i$ -admissible element of the form  $x_N = e_i + \sum_{j \in I_v(i)} a_j Z^{n(v_{i,j})} e_{i+j}$  such that  $dx_N$  is  $(\rho(i), n(v_{i,\rho(i)-i}))$ -admissible and  $j(x_N) = \infty$ . That is,  $e'_i := x_N$  is a desired element for (1). This shows the *existence*.

*Uniqueness.* We show the uniqueness by induction on  $|A_\rho(i)|$ . If  $A_\rho(i) = \emptyset$ , then  $e'_i = e_i$ , which is clearly unique. For the inductive procedure, assume the uniqueness holds when  $|A_\rho(i)| < k$ , and consider the case when  $|A_\rho(i)| = k$ . Let

$$e'_i = e_i + \sum_{j \in A_\rho(i)} a_{j-i} Z^{n(v_{i,j-i})} e_j$$

be any element satisfying (1). Since  $A_\rho(j) \subsetneq A_\rho(i)$  for all  $j \in A_\rho(i)$ , by induction we can rewrite

$$e'_i = e_i + \sum_{j \in A_\rho(i)} b_{j-i} Z^{n(v_{i,j-i})} e'_j.$$

<sup>5</sup>Here, we use the convention  $\min \emptyset := \infty$ .

Here, by the inductive hypothesis, for all  $j \in A_\rho(i)$ ,  $e'_j$  is the element in (1) for  $j$ , uniquely determined by  $d$ . We want to show the uniqueness of  $b_{j-i}$ 's.

Assume  $A_\rho(i) = \{i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_k\}$  and  $\rho(A_\rho(i)) = \{j_1 < j_2 < \dots < j_k\} \subset L$ . By definition of  $A_\rho(i)$ , we know  $\rho(i_l) < \rho(i)$  for all  $1 \leq l \leq k$ . By the conditions of (1),  $de'_i$  is  $(\rho(i), n(v_{i, \rho(i)-i}))$ -admissible, hence  $\langle de'_i, Z^{n(v_{i, \rho(i)-i})} e_{\rho(i_p)} \rangle = 0$  for all  $1 \leq p \leq k$ . That is, the following system of linear equations for  $\{b_{i_j-i}\}_{1 \leq j \leq k}$  holds:

$$(\epsilon_{p,q})_{p,q} (b_{i_q-i})_q = \left( -\langle Z^{n(v_{i, \rho(i_p)-i})} e_{\rho(i_p)}, de'_i \rangle \right)_p, \quad (\text{B.2})$$

where

$$\epsilon_{p,q} = \begin{cases} (-1)^{n(v_{i, i_q-i})} \langle Z^{n(v_{i_q, \rho(i_p)-i_q})} e_{\rho(i_p)}, de'_{i_q} \rangle & \text{if } i_q < \rho(i_p); \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (\text{B.3})$$

Denote  $i'_q := \rho^{-1}(j_q) \in \{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_k\}$ . Define

$$\epsilon'_{p,q} = \begin{cases} (-1)^{n(v_{i, i'_q-i})} \langle Z^{n(v_{i'_q, j_p-i'_q})} e_{j_p}, de'_{i'_q} \rangle & \text{if } i'_q < j_p; \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then the following two coefficient matrices are similar:

$$(\epsilon_{p,q})_{p,q} \sim (\epsilon'_{p,q})_{p,q}$$

And by definition,  $de'_{i'_q}$  is  $(j_q, n(v_{i'_q, j_q-i'_q}))$ -admissible, hence  $\langle Z^{n(i'_q, j_p-i'_q)} e_{j_p}, de'_{i'_q} \rangle = 0$  if  $p < q$  and  $\langle Z^{n(v_{i'_q, j_q-i'_q})} e_{j_q}, de'_{i'_q} \rangle \neq 0$ . Therefore, the square matrix  $(\epsilon'_{p,q})_{p,q}$  is lower triangular and invertible, then so is  $(\epsilon_{p,q})_{p,q}$ . It follows that

$$(b_{i_q-i})_q = (\epsilon_{p,q})_{p,q}^{-1} \left( -\langle Z^{n(v_{i, \rho(i_p)-i})} e_{\rho(i_p)}, de'_i \rangle \right)_p \quad (\text{B.4})$$

By induction,  $e'_{i_q}$ 's are uniquely determined by  $d$ , hence so is the right hand side. The uniqueness in (1) then follows. The previous equation also shows by induction that  $e'_i = e'_i(d)$  depends algebraically on  $d$ . This shows (1).  $\square$

*Proof of (2).* Take any  $j \in L$ , then there is  $i \in U$  such that  $j = \rho(i)$ . By (1),  $(-1)^{\mu(i)} de'_i = c_j Z^{n(v_{i, j-i})} e'_j$  for some  $c_j \in \mathbb{K}^*$  and some  $j$ -admissible element of the form

$$e'_j = e_j + \sum_{l>0} *_l Z^{n(v_{j, l})} e_{j+l}.$$

Then (1) shows that both  $c_j$  and  $e'_j$  are uniquely determined, and depend algebraically on  $d$ .

Now, define an unipotent isomorphism  $\varphi_0(d) \in U(v; \mathbb{K}) \subset B(v; \mathbb{K})$  by

$$\varphi_0(d)(e_i) := e'_i, \quad \text{for all } 1 \leq i \leq n.$$

It follows that  $\varphi_0 : B(v; \mathbb{K}) \cdot d_\rho \rightarrow U(v; \mathbb{K})$  defines a canonical algebraic map. Moreover, for any  $d \in B(v; \mathbb{K}) \cdot d_\rho$  and any  $i \in U$ , have

$$\begin{aligned} (\varphi_0(d)^{-1} \cdot d)(e_i) &= \varphi_0(d)^{-1} \circ d \circ \varphi_0(d)(e_i) = \varphi_0(d)^{-1} \circ d(e'_i) \\ &= c_{\rho(i)} \varphi_0(d)^{-1} ((-1)^{\mu(i)} Z^{n(v_{i, \rho(i)-i})} e'_{\rho(i)}) = c_{\rho(i)} (-1)^{\mu(i)} Z^{n(v_{i, \rho(i)-i})} e_{\rho(i)}. \end{aligned}$$

Now, for the canonical section of  $\pi_\rho : B(v; \mathbb{K}) \rightarrow B(v; \mathbb{K}) \cdot d_\rho$ , we simply take

$$\varphi_\rho(d) := D(d) \circ \varphi_0(d),$$

where

$$\begin{cases} D(d)(e'_i) := e'_i & \text{for } i \in U; \\ D(d)(e'_j) := c_j e'_j & \text{for } j \in L. \end{cases} \quad (\text{B.5})$$

It follows that  $(\varphi_\rho(d)^{-1} \cdot d)(e_i) = (-1)^{\mu(i)} Z^{n(v_{i, \rho(i)-i})} e_{\rho(i)} = d_\rho(e_i)$  for all  $i \in U$ . By the condition

$$((\varphi_\rho(d)^{-1} \cdot d)^2 + Z^2 = 0,$$

we then see that  $(\varphi_\rho(d)^{-1}) \cdot d = d_\rho$ , i.e.  $\varphi_\rho(d) \cdot d_\rho = d$ , as desired. This shows (2).  $\square$

*Proof of (3).* By (2), there is an identification between  $d \in B(v; \mathbb{K}) \cdot d_\rho$  and  $\varphi_\rho(d)$ , where  $\varphi_\rho$  is the canonical section of  $\pi_\rho : B(v; \mathbb{K}) \rightarrow B(v; \mathbb{K}) \cdot d_\rho$ . Use the notations in the proof of (2) above, the general form of  $\varphi_\rho(d)$  is  $\varphi_\rho(d) = D(d) \circ \varphi_0(d)$ , where

$$\begin{cases} \varphi_0(d)(e_i) = e'_i = e_i + \sum_{j \in A_\rho(i)} *_{ij} Z^{n(v_{i,j-i})} e_j, & \text{for } i \in U; \\ \varphi_0(d)(e_i) = e_i + \sum_{j \in I_v(i)} \star_{ij} Z^{n(v_{i,j})} e_{i+j}, & \text{for } i \in L. \end{cases}$$

Together with (B.5), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} B(v; \mathbb{K}) \cdot d_\rho &\cong \{(*_{ij})_{i,j} \mid i \in U, j \in A_\rho(i), *_{ij} \in \mathbb{K}\} \\ &\quad \times \{(\star_{ij})_{i,j} \mid i \in L, j \in I_v(i), \star_{ij} \in \mathbb{K}\} \\ &\quad \times \{(c_i)_i \mid i \in L, c_i \in \mathbb{K}^*\} \\ &\cong (\mathbb{K}^*)^{\frac{n}{2}} \times \mathbb{K}^{A_v(\rho)}. \end{aligned}$$

This shows (3).  $\square$

**B.2. Augmentations for elementary bordered Legendrian graphs with a vertex.** In this and the next subsection, we study the structure of the augmentation variety associated to any elementary bordered Legendrian graph with a vertex of general type, i.e. whose only singularity is a vertex of any type. In the end, generalizing [23, Thm.5.10], we'll see this leads naturally to a ruling decomposition for the augmentation variety associated to any bordered Legendrian graph, at least when we impose a base point at each right cusp, and at each left half-edge of any vertex.

Let  $(\mathcal{V}, \mu) \in \mathcal{BLG}_{\text{fr}}^\mu$  be an elementary bordered Legendrian graph in Definition 5.3.1 of type  $(n_L, n_R)$  containing a vertex  $v$  of type  $(\ell, r)$ . Let us impose a base point on each left-half edges of  $v$ . The borders and the additional base points are labelled from top to bottom, see Figure 14 (left). Consider Ng's resolution  $\text{Res}^{\text{Ng}}(\mathcal{V}) \in \mathcal{BLG}_{\text{Lag}}^\mu$  of  $\mathcal{V}$ . Note that there are  $\binom{\ell}{2}$ -many additional crossings induced from Ng's resolution. Let us label them as in Figure 14 (right).




FIGURE 14. Bordered Legendrian graph  $V$  and  $\text{Res}^{\text{Ng}}(V)$ .

**B.2.1. Augmentations for  $\mathcal{V}$ .** Recall the construction of DGA  $A = (A, \partial) := A^{\text{CE}}(V, \mu)$ . The algebra  $A$  is a unital associative algebra over  $\mathbb{Z}[t_i^{\pm 1} \mid 1 \leq i \leq \ell]$  freely generated by the left border generators, crossings, and vertex generators:

$$\begin{aligned} G &= \{a_{i,j} \mid 1 \leq i < j \leq n_L\} \amalg \{c_{i,j} \mid 1 \leq i < j \leq \ell\} \amalg \{v_{i,j} \mid i \in \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}, j > 0\}; \\ A &= \mathbb{Z}[t_i^{\pm 1} \mid 1 \leq i \leq \ell] \langle G \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

where  $t_i^{\pm 1}$  corresponds to the base point  $b_i$ . The grading is given by:

$$|t_i^{\pm 1}| = 0, \quad |a_{i,j}| = \mu_L(i) - \mu_L(j) - 1, \quad |c_{i,j}| = \mu(i) - \mu(j), \quad |v_{i,j}| = \mu(i) - \mu(j) - 1 + n(v_{i,j})$$

as in Section 4.3. By definition, the differential is given by  $\partial t_i^{\pm 1} = 0$  and

$$\begin{aligned} \partial a_{i,j} &= \sum_{i < k < j} (-1)^{|a_{i,k}|+1} a_{i,k} a_{k,j}, \\ \partial v_{i,j} &= \delta_{j,n} + \sum_{0 < k < j} (-1)^{|v_{i,k}|+1} v_{i,k} v_{i+k,j-k}, \\ \partial c_{p,q} &= t_p^{-\sigma_p} a_{k+p-1,k+q-1} t_q^{\sigma_q} + \sum_{p < o < q} t_p^{-\sigma_p} a_{k+p-1,k+o-1} t_o^{\sigma_o} c_{o,q} \\ &\quad + (-1)^{|c_{p,q}|+1} \left( v_{p,q-p} + \sum_{p < o < q} c_{p,o} v_{o,q-o} \right) \end{aligned}$$

where  $\sigma_i := (-1)^{\mu(i)}$ .

Then by Theorem/Definition 3.3.11, we have a diagram of DGAs

$$A(\mathcal{V}) := (A_L \xrightarrow{\phi_L} A \xleftarrow{\phi_R} A_R),$$

where  $\phi_L$  is the natural inclusion of the DG-subalgebra  $A_L$  generated by  $a_{i,j}$ 's, and

$$A_R = (\mathbb{Z}\langle b_{i,j} : 1 \leq i < j \leq n_R \rangle, \partial_R)$$

is the DGA generated by the right border generators as in Example/Definition 3.1.1. See, (3.13) for the construction of  $\phi_R$ .

Let  $A := (a_{i,j})_{1 \leq i,j \leq n_L}$  and  $B := (b_{i,j})_{1 \leq i,j \leq n_R}$  be the strictly upper-triangular matrix with entries  $a_{i,j}$ 's and  $b_{i,j}$ 's, with  $a_{i,i} = 0$  and  $b_{i,i} = 0$  for  $i \geq j$ , respectively. We write them in the following block matrices

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} A_{1,1} & A_{1,2} & A_{1,3} \\ 0 & A_{2,2} & A_{2,3} \\ 0 & 0 & A_{3,3} \end{pmatrix}, \quad B = \begin{pmatrix} B_{1,1} & B_{1,2} & B_{1,3} \\ 0 & B_{2,2} & B_{2,3} \\ 0 & 0 & B_{3,3} \end{pmatrix},$$

where  $A_{2,2} = (a_{k+p-1,k+q-1})_{1 \leq p,q \leq \ell}$  and  $B_{2,2} = (b_{k+p-1,k+q-1})_{1 \leq p,q \leq r}$ . The other  $A_{\bullet,\bullet}$ 's and  $B_{\bullet,\bullet}$ 's are defined in the same way.

Let  $\tilde{c}_{i,j} := (-1)^{|c_{i,j}|+1} c_{i,j}$  for the crossing generators  $\{c_{i,j} \mid 1 \leq i < j \leq \ell\}$ , and define

$$S := \text{Diag}(t_1^{\sigma_1}, \dots, t_\ell^{\sigma_\ell}), \quad C := (c_{p,q})_{1 \leq p,q \leq \ell}, \quad \tilde{C} := (\tilde{c}_{p,q})_{1 \leq p,q \leq \ell}.$$

Similarly define matrices  $V_{i,j}$ ,  $i \in \mathbb{Z}/2$ ,  $j \geq 0$  for the vertex generators  $\{v_{i,j} \mid i \in \mathbb{Z}/n, j > 0\}$  by

$$\begin{pmatrix} V_{1,2j} & V_{1,2j+1} \\ V_{2,2j} & V_{2,2j+1} \end{pmatrix} := \begin{pmatrix} (v_{p,jn+q-p})_{1 \leq p,q \leq \ell} & (v_{p,jn+\ell+q-p})_{1 \leq p \leq \ell, 1 \leq q \leq r} \\ (v_{\ell+p,jn+r+q-p})_{1 \leq p \leq r, 1 \leq q \leq \ell} & (v_{\ell+p,jn+q-p})_{1 \leq p,q \leq r} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then we have:

$$\phi_R(B) = \begin{pmatrix} A_{1,1} & A_{1,2}S(I+C)V_{1,1} & A_{1,3} + A_{1,2}S(I+C)V_{1,2} \left( \sum_{i \geq 0} \tilde{C}^i \right) S^{-1} A_{2,3} \\ 0 & V_{2,0} & V_{2,1} \left( \sum_{i \geq 0} \tilde{C}^i \right) S^{-1} A_{2,3} \\ 0 & 0 & A_{3,3} \end{pmatrix} \quad (\text{B.6})$$

Dualizing  $A(\mathcal{V})$ , we then obtain a diagram of augmentation varieties:

$$\text{Aug}(\mathcal{V}; \mathbb{K}) := \left( \text{Aug}(V_L; \mathbb{K}) \xleftarrow{r_L} \text{Aug}(V; \mathbb{K}) \xrightarrow{r_R} \text{Aug}(V_R; \mathbb{K}) \right)$$

Also, the inclusion  $i : I_v \hookrightarrow A$  of the DG-subalgebra  $I_v$  as in Section 4.3 induces a map

$$i^* : \text{Aug}(V; \mathbb{K}) \rightarrow \text{Aug}(v; \mathbb{K}).$$

**Lemma B.2.1.** *As in the above setup, any augmentation  $\epsilon \in \text{Aug}(V; \mathbb{K})$  is equivalent to the following:*

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon_L &:= \epsilon_L(\epsilon) \in \text{Aug}(V_L; \mathbb{K}), & \epsilon_v &:= i^*(\epsilon) \in \text{Aug}(v; \mathbb{K}); \\ \epsilon(c_{p,q}) &\in \mathbb{K}, 1 \leq p \leq \ell, & \epsilon(t_i) &\in \mathbb{K}^\times, 1 \leq i \leq \ell, \end{aligned}$$

satisfying  $\epsilon(c_{p,q}) = 0$  if  $|c_{p,q}| \neq 0$ , and for  $|c_{p,q}| = 1$  we have:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \epsilon(t_p^{-\sigma_p}) \epsilon_L(a_{k+p-1, k+q-1}) \epsilon(t_q^{\sigma_q}) + \sum_{p < o < q} \epsilon(t_p^{-\sigma_p}) \epsilon_L(a_{k+p-1, k+o-1}) \epsilon(t_o^{\sigma_o}) \epsilon(c_{o,q}) \\ &\quad + \epsilon_v(v_{p, q-p}) + \sum_{p < o < q} \epsilon(c_{p,o}) \epsilon_v(v_{o, q-o}). \end{aligned}$$

Equivalently,

$$\epsilon_L(A_{2,2}) \epsilon(S)(I + \epsilon(C)) = -\epsilon(S)(I + \epsilon(C)) \epsilon_v(V_{1,0}). \quad (\text{B.7})$$

**B.2.2. An identification via Morse complexes.** We'll see immediately that the condition for  $\epsilon(t_p^{\sigma_p})$  and  $\epsilon(c_{p,q})$  has a simple interpretation in terms of Morse complexes.

**Definition B.2.2.** Let  $(V, \mu)$  be a bordered Legendrian graph involving a single vertex  $v$ , and let  $\epsilon$  be any augmentation of  $A(V)$ . We make the following definitions:

(1) For the trivial tangle  $V_L$ , define

$$C_1(V_L) := \bigoplus_{1 \leq i < k} \mathbb{K} \cdot e_i^L, \quad C_2(V_L) := \bigoplus_{1 \leq p \leq \ell} \mathbb{K} \cdot e_{k+p-1}^L, \quad C_3(V_L) := \bigoplus_{k+\ell \leq j \leq n_L} \mathbb{K} \cdot e_j^L,$$

where the grading is given by  $|e_i^L| := -\mu_L(i)$  as usual. Recall that, by Definition 4.1.1, we have

$$C(V_L) \cong C_1(V_L) \oplus C_2(V_L) \oplus C_3(V_L).$$

Similarly define  $C_a(V_R)$  similarly for  $1 \leq a \leq 3$ , and we have  $C(V_R) \cong \bigoplus_{a=1}^3 C_a(V_R)$ .

Let us denote column vectors and diagonal matrices

$$\begin{aligned} \vec{e}^L &:= (e_1^L, \dots, e_{n_L}^L)^t, & \vec{e}^{L,1} &:= (e_1^L, \dots, e_{k-1}^L)^t; \\ \vec{e}^{L,2} &:= (e_k^L, \dots, e_{k+\ell-1}^L)^t, & \vec{e}^{L,3} &:= (e_{k+\ell}^L, \dots, e_{n_L}^L)^t; \\ (-1)^{\mu_L} &:= \text{Diag} \left( (-1)^{\mu_L(1)}, \dots, (-1)^{\mu_L(n_L)} \right), & (-1)^{\mu_{L,1}} &:= \text{Diag} \left( (-1)^{\mu_L(1)}, \dots, (-1)^{\mu_L(k-1)} \right); \\ (-1)^{\mu_{L,2}} &:= \text{Diag} \left( (-1)^{\mu_L(k)}, \dots, (-1)^{\mu_L(k+\ell-1)} \right), & (-1)^{\mu_{L,3}} &:= \text{Diag} \left( (-1)^{\mu_L(k+\ell)}, \dots, (-1)^{\mu_L(n_L)} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Define  $\vec{e}^{R,i}$ ,  $\vec{e}^R$  and  $(-1)^{\mu_{L,i}}$ ,  $(-1)^{\mu_R}$  similarly, with  $\ell, n_L$  replaced by  $r, n_R$  respectively.

(2) Let us define

$$\begin{aligned} d^L &:= d(\epsilon_L) = \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n_L} (-1)^{\mu_L(i)} \epsilon_L(a_{i,j}) e_j^L \otimes (e_i^L)^*; \\ d^R &:= d(\epsilon_R) = \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n_R} (-1)^{\mu_R(i)} \epsilon_R(a_{i,j}) e_j^R \otimes (e_i^R)^*. \end{aligned}$$

Equivalently, we have

$$d^L(\vec{e}^L) = (-1)^{\mu_L} \epsilon_L(A) \cdot \vec{e}^L, \quad d^R(\vec{e}^R) = (-1)^{\mu_R} \epsilon_R(A) \cdot \vec{e}^R,$$

where the right hand side is matrix multiplication. We can then denote:

$$d^L = \begin{pmatrix} d_{1,1}^L & 0 & 0 \\ d_{2,1}^L & d_{2,2}^L & 0 \\ d_{3,1}^L & d_{3,2}^L & d_{3,1}^L \end{pmatrix}, \quad d^R = \begin{pmatrix} d_{1,1}^R & 0 & 0 \\ d_{2,1}^R & d_{2,2}^R & 0 \\ d_{3,1}^R & d_{3,2}^R & d_{3,1}^R \end{pmatrix}$$

according to the decomposition  $C(V_L) \cong C_1(V_L) \oplus C_2(V_L) \oplus C_3(V_L)$ , and that of  $C(V_R)$ . Equivalently, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} d_{j,i}^L(\vec{e}^{L,i}) &= (-1)^{\mu_{L,i}} \epsilon_L(A_{i,j}) \cdot \vec{e}^{L,j} \\ d_{j,i}^R(\vec{e}^{R,i}) &= (-1)^{\mu_{R,i}} \epsilon_R(B_{i,j}) \cdot \vec{e}^{R,j} \end{aligned}$$

(3) For the vertex  $v$ , define

$$C(v_L) := \bigoplus_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} \mathbb{K} \cdot e_i^v, \quad C(v_R) := \bigoplus_{\ell+1 \leq i \leq \ell+r} \mathbb{K} \cdot e_i^v,$$

where  $|e_i^v| := -\mu(i)$ . Recall that, by Definition 4.3.1, we have

$$\overline{C}_v := C_v/(Z=0) \cong C(v_L) \oplus C(v_R).$$

Denote for  $i \in \mathbb{Z}/2$

$$\begin{cases} \vec{e}^{v,i} := (e_1^v, \dots, e_\ell^v)^t, & (-1)^{\mu_i} := \text{Diag} \left( (-1)^{\mu(1)}, \dots, (-1)^{\mu(\ell)} \right) & \text{if } i \text{ is odd;} \\ \vec{e}^{v,i} := (e_{\ell+1}^v, \dots, e_{\ell+r}^v)^t, & (-1)^{\mu_i} := \text{Diag} \left( (-1)^{\mu(\ell+1)}, \dots, (-1)^{\mu(\ell+r)} \right) & \text{if } i \text{ is even.} \end{cases}$$

(4) Let us define  $d^v := d(\epsilon_v)$  as in Lemma 4.3.3,

$$d^v = \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}, j > 0} (-1)^{\mu(i)} Z^{n(v_{i,j})} e_{i+j}^v \otimes (e_i^v)^*.$$

We can rewrite  $d^v$  as

$$d^v = \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}, j \geq 0} Z^j d_{i,j}^v$$

where  $d_{i,j}^v \in \text{Hom}^{1-j}(C(v_i), C(v_{i+j}))$  is given by

$$d_{i,j}^v(\vec{e}^{v,i}) = (-1)^{\mu_i} \epsilon_v(V_{i,j}) \cdot \vec{e}^{v,i+j}.$$

(5) We will always use the following *identifications*:

$$\begin{aligned} C(v_R) &\cong C_2(V_R) && \text{via } \vec{e}^{v,2} = \vec{e}^{R,2}, \\ C_i(V_L) &\cong C_i(V_R) && \text{via } \vec{e}^{L,i} = \vec{e}^{R,i}, \text{ for } i = 1, 3. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that the gradings are also preserved.

(6) Define  $g_C = g(\epsilon(S), \epsilon(C)) : C_2(V_L) \xrightarrow{\sim} C(v_L)$  by

$$(-1)^{\mu_{L,2}(k+i-1)} g_C(e_{k+i-1}^L) := \epsilon(t_i^{\sigma_i}) e_i^v + \sum_{i < j} \epsilon(t_i^{\sigma_i} c_{i,j}) e_j^v.$$

Equivalently, we have

$$g_C(\vec{e}^{L,2}) = (-1)^{\mu_{L,2}} \epsilon(S)(I + \epsilon(C)) \vec{e}^{v,1}.$$

Clearly,  $g_C \in B(C_2(V_L); \mathbb{K})$ , under the identification  $C_2(V_L) \cong C(v_L)$  via  $e_{k+p-1}^L = e_p^v$ .

*Remark B.2.3.* Now, observe that

$$\begin{aligned} (-1)^{\mu_{L,2}} \epsilon(S)(I + \epsilon(C)) &= \epsilon(S)(I + \epsilon(C))(-1)^{\mu_1}; \\ (-1)^{\mu_{L,2}} \epsilon_L(A_{2,2}) &= -\epsilon_L(A_{2,2})(-1)^{\mu_{L,2}}, \end{aligned}$$

then the equation (B.7) can be re-written as:

$$g_C \circ d_{2,2}^L = d_{1,0}^v \circ g_C \tag{B.8}$$

As a consequence, we obtain an identification

$$\text{Aug}(V; \mathbb{K}) \cong \text{MC}(V; \mathbb{K})$$

where  $\text{MC}(V; \mathbb{K})$  is the variety of triples  $(d^L, g_C, d^v)$  such that,  $d^L$  defines a Morse complex for  $V_L$ ,  $d^v$  defines a Morse complex for  $v$ , and Equation (B.8) holds with  $g_C \in B(C_2(V_L); \mathbb{K})$ .

**B.2.3. Induced morphisms between Morse complexes.** By definition,  $(d^L)^2 = 0$  is equivalent to

$$\begin{cases} (d_{i,i}^L)^2 = 0, & 1 \leq i \leq 3 \\ d_{2,2}^L \circ d_{2,1}^L + d_{2,1}^L \circ d_{1,1}^L = 0, \\ d_{3,3}^L \circ d_{3,2}^L + d_{3,2}^L \circ d_{2,2}^L = 0, \\ d_{3,2}^L \circ d_{2,1}^L + d_{3,1}^L \circ d_{1,1}^L + d_{3,3}^L \circ d_{3,1}^L = 0. \end{cases} \quad (\text{B.9})$$

Similarly for  $d^R$ . In addition, by a direct calculation,  $(d^V)^2 + Z^2 = 0$  is equivalent to

$$\sum_{j+k=m} (-1)^k d_{i+k,j}^V \circ d_{i,k}^V + \delta_{m,2} \text{Id} = 0 \quad (\text{B.10})$$

for all  $m \geq 0$ . In particular, it implies that:

$$\begin{cases} (d_{i,0}^V)^2 = 0, & i = 1, 2 \\ d_{1,1}^V \circ d_{1,0}^V - d_{2,0}^V \circ d_{1,1}^V = 0, \\ d_{2,1}^V \circ d_{2,0}^V - d_{1,0}^V \circ d_{2,1}^V = 0, \\ d_{1,2}^V \circ d_{1,0}^V + d_{1,0}^V \circ d_{1,2}^V - d_{2,1}^V \circ d_{1,1}^V + \text{Id} = 0, \\ d_{2,2}^V \circ d_{2,0}^V + d_{2,0}^V \circ d_{2,2}^V - d_{1,1}^V \circ d_{2,1}^V + \text{Id} = 0. \end{cases} \quad (\text{B.11})$$

On the other hand, by the formula (B.6) for  $t_R(B)$ , we obtain

$$\epsilon_R(B) = \begin{pmatrix} \epsilon(A_{1,1}) & \epsilon(A_{1,2})\epsilon(S+SC)\epsilon(V_{1,1}) & \epsilon(A_{1,3}) + \epsilon(A_{1,2})\epsilon(S+SC)\epsilon(V_{1,2})(\epsilon(S+SC))^{-1}\epsilon(A_{2,3}) \\ 0 & \epsilon(V_{2,0}) & \epsilon(V_{2,1})(\epsilon(S+SC))^{-1}\epsilon(A_{2,3}) \\ 0 & 0 & \epsilon(A_{3,3}) \end{pmatrix}$$

By the identifications in Definition B.2.2.(5), it follows that

$$\begin{pmatrix} d_{1,1}^R & 0 & 0 \\ d_{2,1}^R & d_{2,2}^R & 0 \\ d_{3,1}^R & d_{3,2}^R & d_{3,3}^R \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} d_{1,1}^L & 0 & 0 \\ \tilde{d}_{1,1}^V \circ d_{2,1}^L & d_{2,0}^V & 0 \\ d_{3,1}^L + d_{3,2}^L \circ \tilde{d}_{1,2}^V \circ d_{2,1}^L & d_{3,2}^L \circ \tilde{d}_{2,1}^V & d_{3,3}^L \end{pmatrix} \quad (\text{B.12})$$

where for all  $j \geq 0$ , we define

$$\begin{pmatrix} \tilde{d}_{1,2j}^V & \tilde{d}_{2,2j+1}^V \\ \tilde{d}_{1,2j+1}^V & \tilde{d}_{2,2j}^V \end{pmatrix} := \begin{pmatrix} g_C^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & \text{Id} \end{pmatrix} \circ \begin{pmatrix} d_{1,2j}^V & d_{2,2j+1}^V \\ d_{1,2j+1}^V & d_{2,2j}^V \end{pmatrix} \circ \begin{pmatrix} g_C & 0 \\ 0 & \text{Id} \end{pmatrix} \quad (\text{B.13})$$

**Proposition/Definition B.2.4.** Define  $C(V) := C(V_L) \oplus C(v_R)$ . Let  $\epsilon$  be any augmentation of  $\mathcal{A}(V)$ .

- (1) The equation (B.11) still holds with  $d_{i,j}^V$ 's replaced by  $\tilde{d}_{i,j}^V$ 's, and

$$d_{2,2}^L = \tilde{d}_{1,0}^V \quad (\text{B.14})$$

It follows that

$$\begin{cases} \tilde{d}_{1,1}^V = d_{1,1}^V \circ g_C : (C_2(V_L), d_{2,2}^L) \rightarrow (C(v_R), d_{2,0}^V) \\ \tilde{d}_{2,1}^V = g_C^{-1} \circ d_{2,1}^V : (C(v_R), d_{2,0}^V) \rightarrow (C_2(V_L), d_{2,2}^L) \end{cases}$$

are co-chain maps, and the last two equalities in (B.11) show that they are homotopy inverse to each other.

- (2) Define  $d^V = d^V(\epsilon) \in \text{End}(C(V))$  by

$$\begin{cases} d^V|_{C(V_L)} := d^L; \\ d^V|_{C(v_R)} := d_{2,0}^V + d_{3,2}^L \circ \tilde{d}_{2,1}^V. \end{cases} \quad (\text{B.15})$$

Then  $d^V$  defines a differential of degree 1, and we obtain a short exact sequence of complexes:

$$0 \rightarrow (C(V_L), d^L) \xrightarrow{\varphi_L} (C(V), d^V) \xrightarrow{q_2} (C(v_R), d_{2,0}^V) \rightarrow 0,$$

where  $\varphi_L$  is a canonical inclusion and  $q_2$  a canonical quotient.

(3) Define  $i_2 = i_2(\epsilon) : C_2(V_L) \hookrightarrow C(V)$  by

$$i_2 := \text{Id} - (\tilde{d}_{1,1}^V + d_{3,2}^L \circ \tilde{d}_{1,2}^V). \quad (\text{B.16})$$

Use the identifications in Definition B.2.2.(5), define a  $\mathbb{K}$ -linear map  $\varphi_R = \varphi_R(\epsilon) : C(V) \rightarrow C(V_R)$  by

$$\begin{cases} \varphi_R|_{C_1(V_L) \oplus C(v_R) \oplus C_3(V_L)} := \text{Id}; \\ \varphi_R|_{C_2(V_L)} := \tilde{d}_{1,1}^V + d_{3,2}^L \circ \tilde{d}_{1,2}^V. \end{cases} \quad (\text{B.17})$$

Then  $i_2 : (C_2(V_L), d_{2,2}^L) \hookrightarrow (C(V), d^V)$  and  $\varphi_R : (C(V), d^V) \rightarrow (C(V_R), d^R)$  are co-chain maps, and we obtain a short exact sequence of complexes:

$$0 \rightarrow (C_2(V_L), d_{2,2}^L) \xrightarrow{i_2} (C(V), d^V) \xrightarrow{\varphi_R} (C(V_R), d^R) \rightarrow 0$$

Moreover, the composition  $q_2 \circ i_2 : (C_2(V_L), d_{2,2}^L) \rightarrow (C(v_R), d_{2,0}^V)$  is a co-chain homotopy equivalence with homotopy inverse  $-\tilde{d}_{2,1}^V$ .

(4) Define a  $\mathbb{K}$ -linear map  $\psi_L : C(V) \rightarrow C(V_L)$  by

$$\begin{cases} \psi_L|_{C(V_L)} := \text{Id}; \\ \psi_L|_{C(v_R)} := \tilde{d}_{2,1}^V. \end{cases} \quad (\text{B.18})$$

Then  $\psi_L$  is a co-chain map, and  $\psi_L \circ \varphi_L = \text{Id}$ .

Define a  $\mathbb{K}$ -linear map  $\psi_R : C(V_R) \rightarrow C(V)$  by

$$\begin{cases} \psi_R|_{C_3(V_L)} := \text{id}; \\ \psi_R|_{C(v_R)} := \tilde{d}_{2,1}^V; \\ \psi_R|_{C_1(V_L)} := \text{id} + \tilde{d}_{1,2}^V \circ d_{2,1}^L. \end{cases} \quad (\text{B.19})$$

Then  $\psi_R$  is a co-chain map.

(5) Define  $\varphi := \varphi_R \circ \varphi_L : (C(V_L), d^L) \rightarrow (C(V_R), d^R)$  and  $\psi := \psi_L \circ \psi_R : (C(V_R), d^R) \rightarrow (C(V_L), d^L)$ . Define a  $\mathbb{K}$ -linear map  $h_L : C(V_L) \rightarrow C(V_L)$  of degree  $-1$  by

$$\begin{cases} h_L|_{C_1(V_L) \oplus C_3(V_L)} := 0; \\ h_L|_{C_2(V_L)} := \tilde{d}_{1,2}^V. \end{cases} \quad (\text{B.20})$$

Define a  $\mathbb{K}$ -linear map  $h_R : C(V_R) \rightarrow C(V_R)$  of degree  $-1$  by

$$\begin{cases} h_R|_{C_3(V_L)} := 0; \\ h_R|_{C(v_R)} := d_{2,2}^V + d_{3,2}^L \circ \tilde{d}_{2,3}^V; \\ h_R|_{C_1(V_L)} := (\tilde{d}_{1,3}^V + d_{3,2}^L \circ \tilde{d}_{1,4}^V) \circ d_{2,1}^L. \end{cases} \quad (\text{B.21})$$

Then we have

$$\begin{cases} \psi \circ \varphi - \text{Id} = d^L \circ h_L + h_L \circ d^L; \\ \varphi \circ \psi - \text{Id} = d^R \circ h_R + h_R \circ d^R. \end{cases} \quad (\text{B.22})$$

In particular,  $\varphi$  and  $\psi$  are co-chain homotopy equivalences and are homotopy inverse to each other.

*Proof.* (1). By a direct check, this follows immediately from the definition.

(2). The only nontrivial part is to show  $(d^V)^2 = 0$ . By definition of  $d^L$ , we have  $(d^L)^2 = 0$ . It suffices to show that, for all  $x \in C(v_R)$ , we have  $d^2(x) = 0$ . By definition, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} (d^V)^2(x) &= d^V(d_{2,0}^V(x)) + d^V(d_{3,2}^L \circ \tilde{d}_{2,1}^V(x)) \\ &= (d_{2,0}^V)^2(x) + d_{3,2}^L \circ \tilde{d}_{2,1}^V \circ d_{2,0}^V(x) + d_{3,3}^L \circ d_{3,2}^L \circ \tilde{d}_{2,1}^V(x) \\ &= d_{3,2}^L \circ d_{2,2}^L(\tilde{d}_{2,1}^V(x)) + d_{3,3}^L \circ d_{3,2}^L(\tilde{d}_{2,1}^V(x)) \\ &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

Here, in the second equality, we used (1), and in the third equality, we used Equation (B.9).

In fact, the above computation also shows that  $d_{3,2}^L \circ \tilde{d}_{2,1}^L : (C(v_R), d_{2,0}^V)[-1] \rightarrow (C(V_L), d^L)$  is a co-chain map, and  $(C(V), d^V) = \text{Cone}(d_{3,2}^L \circ \tilde{d}_{2,1}^L)$ .



(3). Firstly, we show  $i_2$  is a co-chain map. Clearly,  $i_2$  is of degree 0. In addition, for all  $x \in C_2(V_L)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 d^V \circ i_2(x) &= d^V(x - \tilde{d}_{1,1}^V(x) - d_{3,2}^L \circ \tilde{d}_{1,2}^V(x)) \\
 &= d_{2,2}^L(x) + d_{3,2}^L(x) - \tilde{d}_{2,0}^V \circ \tilde{d}_{1,1}^V(x) - d_{3,2}^L \circ \tilde{d}_{2,1}^V \circ \tilde{d}_{1,1}^V(x) - d_{3,3}^L \circ d_{3,2}^L \circ \tilde{d}_{1,2}^V(x) \\
 &= d_{2,2}^L(x) - \tilde{d}_{1,1}^V \circ d_{2,2}^L(x) + d_{3,2}^L \circ (id - \tilde{d}_{2,1}^V \circ \tilde{d}_{1,1}^V + \tilde{d}_{1,0}^V \circ \tilde{d}_{1,2}^V)(x) \\
 &= d_{2,2}^L(x) - \tilde{d}_{1,1}^V \circ d_{2,2}^L(x) - d_{3,2}^L \circ \tilde{d}_{1,2}^V \circ \tilde{d}_{1,0}^V(x) \\
 &= (Id - \tilde{d}_{1,1}^V - d_{3,2}^L \circ \tilde{d}_{1,2}^V) \circ d_{2,2}^L(x) \\
 &= i_2 \circ d_{2,2}^L(x)
 \end{aligned}$$

as desired. Here, in the third equality, we used the equation (B.9) and the fact that  $\tilde{d}_{1,1}^V$  is a co-chain map.

In the fourth and fifth equalities, we used the equation (B.11) and  $d_{2,2}^L = \tilde{d}_{1,0}^V$ .

Next, we show  $\varphi_R$  is a co-chain map. Clearly,  $\varphi_R$  is of degree 0. It suffices to show

$$\varphi|_{C(V_L)} = \varphi : (C(V_L), d^L) \rightarrow (C(V_R), d^R) \quad (\text{B.23})$$

is a co-chain map, and  $\varphi_R \circ d^V(x) = d^R \circ \varphi_R(x)$  for all  $x \in C(V_R)$ .

Use the decompositions  $C(V_L) = C_1(V_L) \oplus C_2(V_L) \oplus C_3(V_L)$  and  $C(V_R) = C_1(V_L) \oplus C(V_R) \oplus C_3(V_L)$ , we can write  $\varphi$  in a matrix form:

$$\varphi = \begin{pmatrix} \text{Id} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \tilde{d}_{1,1}^V & 0 \\ 0 & d_{3,2}^L \circ \tilde{d}_{1,2}^V & id \end{pmatrix}$$

It follows from Equation (B.12) that

$$\begin{aligned}
 d^R \circ \varphi &= \begin{pmatrix} d_{1,1}^L & 0 & 0 \\ \tilde{d}_{1,1}^V \circ d_{2,1}^L & d_{2,0}^V & 0 \\ d_{3,1}^L + d_{3,2}^L \circ \tilde{d}_{1,2}^V \circ d_{2,1}^L & d_{3,2}^L \circ \tilde{d}_{2,1}^V & d_{3,3}^L \end{pmatrix} \circ \begin{pmatrix} \text{Id} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \tilde{d}_{1,1}^V & 0 \\ 0 & d_{3,2}^L \circ \tilde{d}_{1,2}^V & \text{Id} \end{pmatrix} \\
 &= \begin{pmatrix} d_{1,1}^L & 0 & 0 \\ \tilde{d}_{1,1}^V \circ d_{2,1}^L & d_{2,0}^V \circ \tilde{d}_{1,1}^V & 0 \\ d_{3,1}^L + d_{3,2}^L \circ \tilde{d}_{1,2}^V \circ d_{2,1}^L & d_{3,2}^L \circ \tilde{d}_{2,1}^V \circ \tilde{d}_{1,1}^V + d_{3,3}^L \circ d_{3,2}^L \circ \tilde{d}_{1,2}^V & d_{3,3}^L \end{pmatrix} \\
 &= \begin{pmatrix} d_{1,1}^L & 0 & 0 \\ \tilde{d}_{1,1}^V \circ d_{2,1}^L & \tilde{d}_{1,1}^V \circ d_{2,2}^L & 0 \\ d_{3,1}^L + d_{3,2}^L \circ \tilde{d}_{1,2}^V \circ d_{2,1}^L & d_{3,2}^L \circ \tilde{d}_{2,1}^V \circ \tilde{d}_{1,1}^V - d_{3,2}^L \circ \tilde{d}_{1,0}^V \circ \tilde{d}_{1,2}^V & d_{3,3}^L \end{pmatrix} \\
 &= \begin{pmatrix} d_{1,1}^L & 0 & 0 \\ \tilde{d}_{1,1}^V \circ d_{2,1}^L & \tilde{d}_{1,1}^V \circ d_{2,2}^L & 0 \\ d_{3,1}^L + d_{3,2}^L \circ \tilde{d}_{1,2}^V \circ d_{2,1}^L & d_{3,2}^L + d_{3,2}^L \circ \tilde{d}_{1,2}^V \circ \tilde{d}_{1,0}^V & d_{3,3}^L \end{pmatrix} \\
 &= \begin{pmatrix} \text{Id} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \tilde{d}_{1,1}^V & 0 \\ 0 & d_{3,2}^L \circ \tilde{d}_{1,2}^V & \text{Id} \end{pmatrix} \circ \begin{pmatrix} d_{1,1}^L & 0 & 0 \\ d_{2,1}^L & d_{2,2}^L & 0 \\ d_{3,1}^L & d_{3,2}^L & d_{3,3}^L \end{pmatrix} \\
 &= \varphi \circ d^L.
 \end{aligned}$$

Here we've used Equation (B.9), Equation (B.11) for  $\tilde{d}_{i,j}^V$ , and (1) above. Besides, for all  $x \in C(V_R)$ , by Equation (B.12), we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \varphi_R \circ d^V(x) &= \varphi_R(d_{2,0}^V(x) + d_{3,2}^L \circ \tilde{d}_{2,1}^V(x)) \\
 &= d_{2,0}^V(x) + d_{3,2}^L \circ \tilde{d}_{1,1}^V(x) \\
 &= d^R(x) \\
 &= d^R \circ \varphi_R(x).
 \end{aligned}$$

This shows that  $\varphi_R$  is indeed a co-chain map.

Then, we show  $(\varphi_R, i_2)$  induces a short exact sequence of complexes. Clearly,  $i_2$  is injective and  $\varphi_R$  is surjective. In addition, by definition, for all  $x \in C_2(V_L)$ , we have:

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi_R \circ i_2(x) &= \varphi_R(x - \tilde{d}_{1,1}^V(x) - d_{3,2}^L \circ \tilde{d}_{1,2}^V(x)) \\ &= 0,\end{aligned}$$

and clearly we have  $\ker(\varphi_R) = \text{Image}(i_2)$ .

Finally, by definition, we have  $q_2 \circ i_2(x) = -\tilde{d}_{1,1}^V(x)$  for all  $x \in C_2(V_L)$ . By (1), it is a co-chain homotopy equivalence with homotopy inverse  $-\tilde{d}_{2,1}^V$ . This finishes the proof of (3).

(4). Clearly,  $\psi_L \circ \varphi_L = \text{Id}$ . To show  $\psi_L$  is a cochain map, it suffices to show that, for all  $x \in C_2(V_R)$ , we have  $\psi_L \circ d^V(x) = d^L \circ \psi_L(x)$ . Indeed, by definition, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}\psi_L \circ d^V(x) &= \psi_L(d_{2,0}^V(x) + d_{3,2}^L \circ \tilde{d}_{2,1}^V(x)) \\ &= \tilde{d}_{2,1}^V \circ d_{2,0}^V(x) + d_{3,2}^L \circ \tilde{d}_{2,1}^V(x) \\ &= d_{2,2}^L \circ \tilde{d}_{2,1}^V(x) + d_{3,2}^L \circ \tilde{d}_{2,1}^V(x) \\ &= d^L \circ \psi_L(x),\end{aligned}$$

as desired.

Next, we show  $\psi_R$  is a co-chain map. The only nontrivial parts are to show that, for all  $x \in C(V_R)$  or  $x \in C_1(V_L) \cong C_1(V_R)$ , we have  $\psi_R \circ d^R(x) = d^V \circ \psi_R(x)$ .

If  $x \in C(V_R)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}\psi_R \circ d^R(x) &= \psi_R(d_{2,0}^V(x) + d_{3,2}^L \circ \tilde{d}_{2,1}^V(x)) \\ &= \tilde{d}_{2,1}^V \circ d_{2,0}^V(x) + d_{3,2}^L \circ \tilde{d}_{2,1}^V(x) \\ &= d_{2,2}^L \circ \tilde{d}_{2,1}^V(x) + d_{3,2}^L \circ \tilde{d}_{2,1}^V(x) \\ &= d^V \circ \psi_R(x).\end{aligned}$$

If  $x \in C_1(V_L)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}\psi_R \circ d^R(x) &= \psi_R(d_{1,1}^L(x) + \tilde{d}_{1,1}^V \circ d_{2,1}^L(x) + d_{3,1}^L(x) + d_{3,2}^L \circ \tilde{d}_{1,2}^V \circ d_{2,1}^L(x)) \\ &= d_{1,1}^L(x) + \tilde{d}_{1,2}^V \circ d_{2,1}^L \circ d_{1,1}^L(x) + \tilde{d}_{2,1}^V \circ \tilde{d}_{1,1}^V \circ d_{2,1}^L(x) + d_{3,1}^L(x) + d_{3,2}^L \circ \tilde{d}_{1,2}^V \circ d_{2,1}^L(x) \\ &= d^V x - d_{2,1}^L(x) - \tilde{d}_{1,2}^V \circ \tilde{d}_{1,0}^V \circ d_{2,1}^L(x) + \tilde{d}_{2,1}^V \circ \tilde{d}_{1,1}^V \circ d_{2,1}^L(x) + d_{3,2}^L \circ \tilde{d}_{1,2}^V \circ d_{2,1}^L(x) \\ &= d^V x + \tilde{d}_{1,0}^V \circ \tilde{d}_{1,2}^V \circ d_{2,1}^L(x) + d_{3,2}^L \circ \tilde{d}_{1,2}^V \circ d_{2,1}^L(x) \\ &= d^V x + d^V \circ \tilde{d}_{1,2}^V \circ d_{2,1}^L(x) \\ &= d^V \circ \psi_R(x)\end{aligned}$$

as desired.

(5). Firstly, we show  $\psi \circ \varphi - \text{Id} = d^L \circ h_L + h_L \circ d^L$ . For all  $x \in C_3(V_L)$ , clearly we have  $\psi \circ \varphi(x) - x = 0 = d^L \circ h_L + h_L \circ d^L(x)$ . For all  $x \in C_2(V_L)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}\psi \circ \varphi(x) &= \psi(\tilde{d}_{1,1}^V(x) + d_{3,2}^L \circ \tilde{d}_{1,2}^V(x)) \\ &= \tilde{d}_{2,1}^V \circ \tilde{d}_{1,1}^V(x) + d_{3,2}^L \circ \tilde{d}_{1,2}^V(x) \\ &= (id + \tilde{d}_{1,2}^V \circ \tilde{d}_{1,0}^V + \tilde{d}_{1,0}^V \circ \tilde{d}_{1,2}^V)(x) + d_{3,2}^L \circ \tilde{d}_{1,2}^V(x) \\ &= x + h_L(d_{2,2}^L(x)) + d^L(\tilde{d}_{1,2}^V(x)) \\ &= x + h_L(d^L(x)) + d^L \circ h_L(x)\end{aligned}$$

Finally, for all  $x \in C_1(V_L)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}\psi \circ \varphi(x) - x &= \psi(x) - x = \tilde{d}_{1,2}^V \circ d_{2,1}^L(x) \\ &= h_L(d_{2,1}^L(x)) + h_L(d_{1,1}^L(x) + d_{3,1}^L(x)) + d^L \circ h_L(x) \\ &= h_L \circ d^L(x) + d^L \circ h_L(x)\end{aligned}$$

as desired.

Now, we show  $\varphi \circ \psi - \text{Id} = d^R \circ h_R + h_R \circ d^R$ . Clearly, for all  $x \in C_3(V_R) = C_3(V_L)$ , we have  $\varphi \circ \psi(x) - x = 0 = d^R \circ h_R(x) + h_R \circ d^R(x)$ . For all  $x \in C(v_R)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \varphi \circ \psi(x) - x &= \varphi(\tilde{d}_{2,1}^v(x)) = (\tilde{d}_{1,1}^v + d_{3,2}^L \circ \tilde{d}_{1,2}^v) \circ \tilde{d}_{2,1}^v(x) - x \\
 &= (\tilde{d}_{2,0}^v \circ \tilde{d}_{2,2}^v + \tilde{d}_{2,2}^v \circ \tilde{d}_{2,0}^v)(x) + d_{3,2}^L \circ \tilde{d}_{1,2}^v \circ \tilde{d}_{2,1}^v(x) \\
 &= d^R \circ d_{2,2}^v(x) - d_{3,2}^L \circ \tilde{d}_{2,1}^v \circ d_{2,2}^v(x) + d_{3,2}^L \circ \tilde{d}_{1,2}^v \circ \tilde{d}_{2,1}^v(x) + d_{2,2}^v \circ d_{2,0}^v(x) \\
 &= d^R \circ d_{2,2}^v(x) + d_{3,2}^L \circ (\tilde{d}_{2,3}^v \circ d_{2,0}^v - \tilde{d}_{1,0}^v \circ \tilde{d}_{2,3}^v)(x) + d_{2,2}^v \circ d_{2,0}^v(x) \\
 &= d^R \circ d_{2,2}^v(x) + d_{3,3}^L \circ d_{3,2}^L \circ \tilde{d}_{2,3}^v(x) + (d_{2,2}^v + d_{3,2}^L \circ \tilde{d}_{2,3}^v) \circ d_{2,0}^v(x) \\
 &= d^R \circ h_R(x) + h_R(d_{2,0}^v(x)) \\
 &= d^R \circ h_R(x) + h_R \circ d^R(x)
 \end{aligned}$$

Here, in the fourth equality we've used the identity

$$\tilde{d}_{2,3}^v \circ d_{2,0}^v - \tilde{d}_{1,2}^v \circ \tilde{d}_{2,1}^v + \tilde{d}_{2,1}^v \circ d_{2,2}^v - \tilde{d}_{1,0}^v \circ \tilde{d}_{2,3}^v = 0$$

from Equation (B.10) for  $\tilde{d}_{i,j}^v$ 's with  $m = 3$ . Finally, for all  $x \in C_1(V_R) = C_1(V_L)$ , let us show  $\varphi \circ \psi(x) - x = d^R \circ h_R(x) + h_R \circ d^R(x)$ . By Equation (B.12), observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
 h_R \circ d^R(x) &= h_R(d_{1,1}^L + \tilde{d}_{1,1}^v \circ d_{2,1}^L + d_{3,1}^L + d_{3,2}^L \circ \tilde{d}_{1,2}^v \circ d_{2,1}^L)(x) \\
 &= h_R \circ d_{1,1}^L(x) + h_R \circ \tilde{d}_{1,1}^v \circ d_{2,1}^L(x) \\
 &= h_R \circ d_{1,1}^L(x) + (d_{2,2}^v + d_{3,2}^L \circ \tilde{d}_{2,3}^v) \circ \tilde{d}_{1,1}^v \circ d_{2,1}^L(x)
 \end{aligned}$$

It suffices to show

$$\varphi \circ \psi(x) - x - (d_{2,2}^v + d_{3,2}^L \circ \tilde{d}_{2,3}^v) \circ \tilde{d}_{1,1}^v \circ d_{2,1}^L(x) = d^R \circ h_R(x) + h_R \circ d^R(x).$$

Indeed, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\varphi \circ \psi(x) - x - (d_{2,2}^v + d_{3,2}^L \circ \tilde{d}_{2,3}^v) \circ \tilde{d}_{1,1}^v \circ d_{2,1}^L(x) \\
 &= \varphi(x + \tilde{d}_{1,2}^v \circ d_{2,1}^L(x)) - x - (d_{2,2}^v + d_{3,2}^L \circ \tilde{d}_{2,3}^v) \circ \tilde{d}_{1,1}^v \circ d_{2,1}^L(x) \\
 &= (\tilde{d}_{1,1}^v + d_{3,2}^L \circ \tilde{d}_{1,2}^v) \circ \tilde{d}_{1,2}^v \circ d_{2,1}^L(x) - (d_{2,2}^v + d_{3,2}^L \circ \tilde{d}_{2,3}^v) \circ \tilde{d}_{1,1}^v \circ d_{2,1}^L(x) \\
 &= (\tilde{d}_{1,1}^v \circ \tilde{d}_{1,2}^v - d_{2,2}^v \circ \tilde{d}_{1,1}^v) \circ d_{2,1}^L(x) + d_{3,2}^L \circ (\tilde{d}_{1,2}^v \circ \tilde{d}_{1,2}^v - \tilde{d}_{2,3}^v \circ \tilde{d}_{1,1}^v) \circ d_{2,1}^L(x) \\
 &= (d_{2,0}^v \circ \tilde{d}_{1,3}^v - \tilde{d}_{1,3}^v \circ \tilde{d}_{1,0}^v) \circ d_{2,1}^L(x) + d_{3,2}^L \circ (-\tilde{d}_{1,4}^v \circ \tilde{d}_{1,0}^v + \tilde{d}_{2,1}^v \circ \tilde{d}_{1,3}^v - \tilde{d}_{1,0}^v \circ \tilde{d}_{1,4}^v) \circ d_{2,1}^L(x) \\
 &= (d_{2,0}^v + d_{3,2}^L \circ \tilde{d}_{2,1}^v) \circ \tilde{d}_{1,3}^v \circ d_{2,1}^L(x) + \tilde{d}_{1,3}^v \circ d_{2,1}^L \circ d_{1,1}^L(x) \\
 &\quad + d_{3,2}^L \circ \tilde{d}_{1,4}^v \circ d_{2,1}^L \circ d_{1,1}^L(x) + d_{3,3}^L \circ d_{3,2}^L \circ \tilde{d}_{1,4}^v \circ d_{2,1}^L(x) \\
 &= d^R \circ (\tilde{d}_{1,3}^v + d_{3,2}^L \circ \tilde{d}_{1,4}^v) \circ d_{2,1}^L(x) + (\tilde{d}_{1,3}^v + d_{3,2}^L \circ \tilde{d}_{1,4}^v) \circ d_{2,1}^L(d_{1,1}^L(x)) \\
 &= d^R \circ h_R(x) + h_R \circ d^R(x)
 \end{aligned}$$

as desired. Here, in the fourth equality, we've used the identities

$$\begin{cases} \tilde{d}_{1,3}^v \circ \tilde{d}_{1,0}^v - d_{2,2}^v \circ \tilde{d}_{1,1}^v + \tilde{d}_{1,1}^v \circ \tilde{d}_{1,2}^v - d_{2,0}^v \circ \tilde{d}_{1,3}^v = 0; \\ \tilde{d}_{1,4}^v \circ \tilde{d}_{1,0}^v - \tilde{d}_{2,3}^v \circ \tilde{d}_{1,1}^v + \tilde{d}_{1,2}^v \circ \tilde{d}_{1,2}^v - \tilde{d}_{2,1}^v \circ \tilde{d}_{1,3}^v + \tilde{d}_{1,0}^v \circ \tilde{d}_{1,4}^v = 0 \end{cases}$$

from Equation (B.10) for  $\tilde{d}_{i,j}^v$ 's with  $m = 3$  and 4 respectively. This finishes the proof of (5).  $\square$

**Corollary B.2.5.** *Let  $\mathcal{T} = (T_L \rightarrow T \leftarrow T_R)$  be a bordered Legendrian graph, and  $\epsilon \in \text{Aug}(\mathcal{T}; \mathbb{K})$  be an augmentation. In particular,  $\epsilon_L := \epsilon|_{T_L}$  is acyclic. Then  $\epsilon_R := \epsilon|_{T_R}$  is also acyclic.*

*Proof.* By [23, Cor.5.3], it suffices to prove the case when  $T = V$  is an bordered Legendrian graph involving a single vertex. But this is a direct corollary of (5) in the Proposition/Definition above, in which we showed  $\varphi$  is a co-chain homotopy equivalence, in particular a quasi-isomorphism.  $\square$

**B.2.4. A group action.** We use the notations in Definition 4.1.1 and Definition 4.3.1.

**Definition B.2.6.** Let  $B^L := B(V_L; \mathbb{K})$  and  $B^v := B(v; \mathbb{K})$  be the two automorphism groups associated to  $V_L$  and  $v$  respectively. For  $1 \leq i \leq 3$ , define  $B_{i,i}^L := B(C_i(V_L); \mathbb{K})$ . For  $i \in \mathbb{Z}/2$ , define  $B_{i,0}^v := B(C(v_i); \mathbb{K})$ , with  $v_i$ 's as in Definition B.2.2.(3). Notice that there is a canonical identification  $B_{2,2}^L \cong B_{1,0}^v$  if we identify  $C_2(V_L)$  with  $C(v_L)$  via  $e_{k+p-1}^L = e_p^v$ .

For any  $g^L \in B^L$ , similar to  $d^L$ , we can write  $g^L$  in a matrix form:

$$g^L := \begin{pmatrix} g_{1,1}^L & 0 & 0 \\ g_{2,1}^L & g_{2,2}^L & 0 \\ g_{3,1}^L & g_{3,2}^L & g_{3,3}^L \end{pmatrix}$$

Similarly, one can define  $B^R := B(V_R; \mathbb{K})$  and  $B_{i,i}^R$  for  $1 \leq i \leq 3$ . And, there are canonical identifications  $B_{i,i}^R \cong B_{i,i}^L$  for  $i = 1, 3$ , and  $B_{2,2}^R \cong B_{2,0}^v$ .

For any  $g^v \in B^v$ , similar to  $d^v$ , we can write  $g^v$  as:

$$g^v := \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}/2, j \geq 0} Z^j g_{i,j}^v$$

for some  $g_{i,j}^v \in \text{Hom}^{-j}(C(v_i), C(v_{i+j}))$ .

Denote  $B := B^L \times B^v$ . By the identification in Remark B.2.3, we can define a natural algebraic group action of  $B$  on  $\text{Aug}(V; \mathbb{K}) \cong \text{MC}(V; \mathbb{K})$  as follows: for any  $g = (g^L, g^v) \in B$  and any  $d = (d^L, g_C, d^v) \in \text{MC}(V; \mathbb{K})$ , we take

$$g \cdot d = (g \cdot d^L, g \cdot g_C, g \cdot d^v) := (g^L \cdot d^L, g_{1,0}^v \circ g_C \circ (g_{2,2}^L)^{-1}, g^v \cdot d^v)$$

Here,  $g^L \cdot d^L$  and  $g^v \cdot d^v$  are the group actions in Definition 4.1.1 and Definition 4.3.1 respectively. It is direct to check that  $g \cdot d$  satisfies the Equation (B.8). Hence, the group action is well-defined.

*Question:* Given any  $g \in B$ , when does this group action preserve the isomorphism class of  $d^R$ , i.e.  $(g \cdot d)^R = g^R \cdot d^R$  for some  $g^R = g^R(g, d) \in B^R$ ? The answer is the key to counting augmentations for  $V$ .

**Lemma B.2.7.** Let  $g \in B$ , and  $\epsilon$  (or  $d = (d^L, g_C, d^v)$ ) be any augmentation for  $\mathcal{A}(V)$ . We have:

- (1) If  $g = (g^L, g^v) \in B$ , with both of  $g^L$  and  $g^v$  block-diagonal. That is,  $g_{j,i}^L = 0$  if  $i < j$ , and  $g_{i,j}^v = 0$  if  $j > 0$ . Then  $(g \cdot d)^R = g^R \cdot d^R$  with  $g^R = g^R(g, d) := \text{Diag}(g_{1,1}^L, g_{2,0}^v, g_{3,3}^L)$ .
- (2) If  $g = (g^L, \text{Id}) \in B$ , with  $g_{i,i}^L = \text{Id}$ , and  $g_{j,i}^L = 0$  for all  $1 \leq i < j \leq 3$  unless  $(j, i) = (3, 2)$ . In particular,  $(g^{-1})_{i,i}^L = \text{Id}$ ,  $(g^{-1})_{3,2}^L = -g_{3,2}^L$ , and  $g_{j,i}^L = 0$  otherwise. Then  $(g \cdot d)^R = g^R \cdot d^R$  with  $g^R = g^R(g, d)$  given by

$$g^R := \begin{pmatrix} \text{Id} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \text{Id} & 0 \\ g_{3,2}^L \circ \tilde{d}_{1,2}^v \circ d_{2,1}^L & g_{3,2}^L \circ \tilde{d}_{2,1}^v & \text{Id} \end{pmatrix}$$

- (3) If  $g = (g^L, \text{Id}) \in B$ , with  $g_{i,i}^L = \text{Id}$ , and  $g_{j,i}^L = 0$  for all  $1 \leq i < j \leq 3$  unless  $(j, i) = (2, 1)$ . In particular,  $(g^{-1})_{i,i}^L = \text{Id}$ ,  $(g^{-1})_{2,1}^L = -g_{2,1}^L$ , and  $g_{j,i}^L = 0$  otherwise. Then  $(g \cdot d)^R = g^R \cdot d^R$  with  $g^R = g^R(g, d)$  given by

$$g^R := \begin{pmatrix} \text{Id} & 0 & 0 \\ \tilde{d}_{1,1}^v \circ g_{2,1}^L & \text{Id} & 0 \\ d_{3,2}^L \circ \tilde{d}_{1,2}^v \circ g_{2,1}^L & 0 & \text{Id} \end{pmatrix}$$

- (4) If  $g = (g^L, \text{Id}) \in B$ , with  $g_{i,i}^L = \text{Id}$ , and  $g_{j,i}^L = 0$  for all  $1 \leq i < j \leq 3$  unless  $(j, i) = (3, 1)$ . In particular,  $(g^{-1})_{i,i}^L = \text{Id}$ ,  $(g^{-1})_{3,1}^L = -g_{3,1}^L$ , and  $g_{j,i}^L = 0$  otherwise. Then  $(g \cdot d)^R = g^R \cdot d^R$  with  $g^R = g^R(g, d)$  given by

$$g^R := \begin{pmatrix} \text{Id} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \text{Id} & 0 \\ g_{3,1}^L & 0 & \text{Id} \end{pmatrix}$$

*Proof.* (1) If  $g = (g^L, g^V) \in B$ , with both of  $g^L$  and  $g^V$  *block-diagonal*. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \begin{pmatrix} (g \cdot d)_{1,1}^R & 0 & 0 \\ (g \cdot d)_{2,1}^R & (g \cdot d)_{2,2}^R & 0 \\ (g \cdot d)_{3,1}^R & (g \cdot d)_{3,2}^R & (g \cdot d)_{3,3}^R \end{pmatrix} \\
 &= \begin{pmatrix} (g \cdot d)_{1,1}^L & 0 & 0 \\ (\widetilde{g \cdot d})_{1,1}^V \circ (g \cdot d)_{2,1}^L & (g \cdot d)_{2,0}^V & 0 \\ (g \cdot d)_{3,1}^L + (g \cdot d)_{3,2}^L \circ (\widetilde{g \cdot d})_{1,2}^V \circ (g \cdot d)_{2,1}^L & (g \cdot d)_{3,2}^L \circ (\widetilde{g \cdot d})_{2,1}^V & (g \cdot d)_{3,3}^L \end{pmatrix} \\
 &= \begin{pmatrix} g_{1,1}^L \circ d_{1,1}^L \circ (g_{1,1}^L)^{-1} & 0 & 0 \\ g_{2,0}^V \circ (\widetilde{d}_{1,1}^V \circ d_{2,1}^L) \circ (g_{1,1}^L)^{-1} & g_{2,0}^V \circ d_{2,0}^V \circ (g_{2,0}^V)^{-1} & 0 \\ g_{3,3}^L \circ (d_{3,1}^L + d_{3,2}^L \circ \widetilde{d}_{1,2}^V \circ d_{2,1}^L) \circ (g_{1,1}^L)^{-1} & g_{3,3}^L \circ (d_{3,2}^L \circ \widetilde{d}_{2,1}^V) \circ (g_{2,0}^V)^{-1} & g_{3,3}^L \circ d_{3,3}^L \circ (g_{3,3}^L)^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \\
 &= \begin{pmatrix} g_{1,1}^L & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & g_{2,0}^V & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & g_{3,3}^L \end{pmatrix} \circ \begin{pmatrix} d_{1,1}^L & 0 & 0 \\ \widetilde{d}_{1,1}^V \circ d_{2,1}^L & d_{2,0}^V & 0 \\ d_{3,1}^L + d_{3,2}^L \circ \widetilde{d}_{1,2}^V \circ d_{2,1}^L & d_{3,2}^L \circ \widetilde{d}_{2,1}^V & d_{3,3}^L \end{pmatrix} \circ \begin{pmatrix} g_{1,1}^L & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & g_{2,0}^V & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & g_{3,3}^L \end{pmatrix}^{-1} \\
 &= \begin{pmatrix} g_{1,1}^L & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & g_{2,0}^V & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & g_{3,3}^L \end{pmatrix} \circ \begin{pmatrix} d_{1,1}^R & 0 & 0 \\ d_{2,1}^R & d_{2,2}^R & 0 \\ d_{3,1}^R & d_{3,2}^R & d_{3,3}^R \end{pmatrix} \circ \begin{pmatrix} g_{1,1}^L & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & g_{2,0}^V & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & g_{3,3}^L \end{pmatrix}^{-1} \\
 &= g^R \cdot d^R
 \end{aligned}$$

with  $g^R = g^R(g) = \text{Diag}(g_{1,1}^L, g_{2,0}^V, g_{3,3}^L) \in B^R$ , as desired.

(2) If  $g = (g^L, \text{Id}) \in B$ , with  $g_{i,i}^L = \text{Id}$ , and  $g_{j,i}^L = 0$  for all  $1 \leq i < j \leq 3$  unless  $(j, i) = (3, 2)$ . The only two nontrivial calculations are

$$\begin{aligned}
 (g \cdot d)_{3,1}^R &= (g \cdot d)_{3,1}^L + (g \cdot d)_{3,2}^L \circ (\widetilde{g \cdot d})_{1,2}^V \circ (g \cdot d)_{2,1}^L \\
 &= (d_{3,1}^L + g_{3,2}^L \circ d_{2,1}^L) + (d_{3,2}^L + g_{3,2}^L \circ d_{2,2}^L - d_{3,3}^L \circ g_{3,2}^L) \circ \widetilde{d}_{1,2}^V \circ d_{2,1}^L \\
 &= d_{3,1}^R + g_{3,2}^L \circ d_{2,1}^L + (g_{3,2}^L \circ \widetilde{d}_{1,0}^V - d_{3,3}^L \circ g_{3,2}^L) \circ \widetilde{d}_{1,2}^V \circ d_{2,1}^L \\
 &= d_{3,1}^R + g_{3,2}^L \circ (\widetilde{d}_{2,1}^V \circ \widetilde{d}_{1,1}^V - \widetilde{d}_{1,2}^V \circ \widetilde{d}_{1,0}^V) \circ d_{2,1}^L - d_{3,3}^L \circ g_{3,2}^L \circ \widetilde{d}_{1,2}^V \circ d_{2,1}^L \\
 &= d_{3,1}^R + g_{3,2}^L \circ \widetilde{d}_{2,1}^V \circ d_{2,1}^L + g_{3,2}^L \circ \widetilde{d}_{1,2}^V \circ d_{2,1}^L \circ d_{1,1}^L - d_{3,3}^R \circ g_{3,2}^L \circ \widetilde{d}_{1,2}^V \circ d_{2,1}^L \\
 &= d_{3,1}^R + g_{3,2}^L \circ \widetilde{d}_{2,1}^V \circ d_{2,1}^L + g_{3,2}^L \circ \widetilde{d}_{1,2}^V \circ d_{2,1}^L \circ d_{1,1}^R - d_{3,3}^R \circ g_{3,2}^L \circ \widetilde{d}_{1,2}^V \circ d_{2,1}^L \\
 &= d_{3,1}^R + g_{3,2}^R \circ d_{2,1}^R + g_{3,1}^R \circ d_{1,1}^R - d_{3,3}^R \circ g_{3,1}^R, \\
 (g \cdot d)_{3,2}^R &= (g \cdot d)_{3,2}^L \circ (\widetilde{g \cdot d})_{2,1}^V \\
 &= (d_{3,2}^L + g_{3,2}^L \circ d_{2,2}^L - d_{3,3}^L \circ g_{3,2}^L) \circ \widetilde{d}_{2,1}^V \\
 &= d_{3,2}^R + g_{3,2}^L \circ \widetilde{d}_{2,1}^V \circ d_{2,0}^V - d_{3,3}^R \circ g_{3,2}^L \circ \widetilde{d}_{2,1}^V \\
 &= d_{3,2}^R + g_{3,2}^R \circ d_{2,2}^R - d_{3,3}^R \circ g_{3,2}^R
 \end{aligned}$$

Otherwise, we have  $(g \cdot d)_{j,i}^R = d_{j,i}^R$ . It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \begin{pmatrix} (g \cdot d)_{1,1}^R & 0 & 0 \\ (g \cdot d)_{2,1}^R & (g \cdot d)_{2,2}^R & 0 \\ (g \cdot d)_{3,1}^R & (g \cdot d)_{3,2}^R & (g \cdot d)_{3,3}^R \end{pmatrix} \\
&= \begin{pmatrix} d_{1,1}^R & 0 & 0 \\ d_{2,1}^R & d_{2,2}^R & 0 \\ d_{3,1}^R + g_{3,2}^R \circ d_{2,1}^R + g_{3,1}^R \circ d_{1,1}^R - d_{3,3}^R \circ g_{3,1}^R & d_{3,2}^R + g_{3,2}^R \circ d_{2,2}^R - d_{3,3}^R \circ g_{3,2}^R & d_{3,3}^R \end{pmatrix} \\
&= \begin{pmatrix} \text{Id} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \text{Id} & 0 \\ g_{3,1}^R & g_{3,2}^R & \text{Id} \end{pmatrix} \circ \begin{pmatrix} d_{1,1}^R & 0 & 0 \\ d_{2,1}^R & d_{2,2}^R & 0 \\ d_{3,1}^R & d_{3,2}^R & d_{3,3}^R \end{pmatrix} \circ \begin{pmatrix} \text{Id} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \text{Id} & 0 \\ -g_{3,1}^R & -g_{3,2}^R & \text{Id} \end{pmatrix} \\
&= g^R \circ d^R \circ (g^R)^{-1}
\end{aligned}$$

as desired.

- (3) If  $g = (g^L, \text{Id}) \in B$ , with  $g_{i,i}^L = \text{Id}$ , and  $g_{j,i}^L = 0$  for all  $1 \leq i < j \leq 3$  unless  $(j, i) = (2, 1)$ . The only two nontrivial calculations are

$$\begin{aligned}
(g \cdot d)_{3,1}^R &= (g \cdot d)_{3,1}^L + (g \cdot d)_{3,2}^L \circ (\widetilde{g \cdot d})_{1,2}^v \circ (g \cdot d)_{2,1}^L \\
&= (d_{3,1}^L - d_{3,2}^L \circ g_{2,1}^L) + d_{3,2}^L \circ \widetilde{d}_{1,2}^v \circ (d_{2,1}^L + g_{2,1}^L \circ d_{1,1}^L - d_{2,2}^L \circ g_{2,1}^L) \\
&= d_{3,1}^R + (d_{3,2}^L \circ \widetilde{d}_{1,2}^v \circ g_{2,1}^L) \circ d_{1,1}^L + d_{3,2}^L \circ (\widetilde{d}_{1,0}^v \circ \widetilde{d}_{1,2}^v - \widetilde{d}_{2,1}^v \circ \widetilde{d}_{1,1}^v) \circ g_{2,1}^L \\
&= d_{3,1}^R + (d_{3,2}^L \circ \widetilde{d}_{1,2}^v \circ g_{2,1}^L) \circ d_{1,1}^L - d_{3,3}^L \circ (d_{3,2}^L \circ \widetilde{d}_{1,2}^v \circ g_{2,1}^L) - (d_{3,2}^L \circ \widetilde{d}_{2,1}^v) \circ (\widetilde{d}_{1,1}^v \circ g_{2,1}^L) \\
&= d_{3,1}^R + g_{3,1}^R \circ d_{1,1}^R - d_{3,3}^R \circ g_{3,1}^R - d_{3,2}^R \circ g_{2,1}^R, \\
(g \cdot d)_{2,1}^R &= (\widetilde{g \cdot d})_{1,1}^v \circ (g \cdot d)_{2,1}^L \\
&= \widetilde{d}_{1,1}^v \circ (d_{2,1}^L + g_{2,1}^L \circ d_{1,1}^L - d_{2,2}^L \circ g_{2,1}^L) \\
&= d_{2,1}^R + g_{2,1}^R \circ d_{1,1}^R - d_{2,0}^R \circ \widetilde{d}_{1,1}^v \circ g_{2,1}^L \\
&= d_{2,1}^R + g_{2,1}^R \circ d_{1,1}^R - d_{2,0}^R \circ g_{2,1}^R.
\end{aligned}$$

Otherwise, we have  $(g \cdot d)_{j,i}^R = d_{j,i}^R$ . It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
(g \cdot d)^R &= \begin{pmatrix} d_{1,1}^R & 0 & 0 \\ d_{2,1}^R + g_{2,1}^R \circ d_{1,1}^R - d_{2,0}^R \circ g_{2,1}^R & d_{2,2}^R & 0 \\ d_{3,1}^R + g_{3,1}^R \circ d_{1,1}^R - d_{3,3}^R \circ g_{3,1}^R - d_{3,2}^R \circ g_{2,1}^R & 0 & d_{3,3}^R \end{pmatrix} \\
&= \begin{pmatrix} \text{Id} & 0 & 0 \\ g_{2,1}^R & \text{Id} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \text{Id} \end{pmatrix} \circ \begin{pmatrix} d_{1,1}^R & 0 & 0 \\ d_{2,1}^R & d_{2,2}^R & 0 \\ d_{3,1}^R & d_{3,2}^R & d_{3,3}^R \end{pmatrix} \circ \begin{pmatrix} \text{Id} & 0 & 0 \\ -g_{2,1}^R & \text{Id} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \text{Id} \end{pmatrix} \\
&= g^R \circ d^R \circ (g^R)^{-1}
\end{aligned}$$

as desired.

- (4) If  $g = (g^L, \text{Id}) \in B$ , with  $g_{i,i}^L = \text{Id}$ , and  $g_{j,i}^L = 0$  for all  $1 \leq i < j \leq 3$  unless  $(j, i) = (3, 1)$ . The only nontrivial calculation is

$$\begin{aligned}
(g \cdot d)_{3,1}^R &= (g \cdot d)_{3,1}^L + (g \cdot d)_{3,2}^L \circ (\widetilde{g \cdot d})_{1,2}^v \circ (g \cdot d)_{2,1}^L \\
&= (d_{3,1}^L + g_{3,1}^L \circ d_{1,1}^L - d_{3,3}^L \circ g_{3,1}^L) + d_{3,2}^L \circ \widetilde{d}_{1,2}^v \circ d_{2,1}^L \\
&= d_{3,1}^R + g_{3,1}^R \circ d_{1,1}^R - d_{3,3}^R \circ g_{3,1}^R.
\end{aligned}$$

Otherwise, we have  $(g \cdot d)_{j,i}^R = d_{j,i}^R$ . It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} (g \cdot d)^R &= \begin{pmatrix} d_{1,1}^R & 0 & 0 \\ d_{2,1}^R & d_{2,2}^R & 0 \\ d_{3,1}^R + g_{3,1}^R \circ d_{1,1}^R - d_{3,3}^R \circ g_{3,1}^R & d_{3,2}^R & d_{3,3}^R \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} \text{Id} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \text{Id} & 0 \\ g_{3,1}^R & 0 & \text{Id} \end{pmatrix} \circ \begin{pmatrix} d_{1,1}^R & 0 & 0 \\ d_{2,1}^R & d_{2,2}^R & 0 \\ d_{3,1}^R & d_{3,2}^R & d_{3,3}^R \end{pmatrix} \circ \begin{pmatrix} \text{Id} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \text{Id} & 0 \\ -g_{3,1}^R & 0 & \text{Id} \end{pmatrix} \\ &= g^R \circ d^R \circ (g^R)^{-1} \end{aligned}$$

as desired.  $\square$

Regard  $B^L$  as a subgroup of  $B$  via the obvious inclusion. Recall Definition 4.2.2, we then have

**Proposition B.2.8.** *Let  $(\rho_L, \rho_R)$  be a pair of boundary conditions, with  $\rho_L \in \text{NR}(V_L)$  and  $\rho_R \in \text{NR}(V_R)$  respectively. Then the group action of  $B^L$  on  $\text{Aug}(V; \mathbb{K})$  preserves the sub-variety  $\text{Aug}(V, \rho_L, \rho_R; \mathbb{K})$ . Moreover, for any  $\epsilon_L \in \text{Aug}^{\rho_L}(V; \mathbb{K})$ , the augmentation variety with boundary conditions  $\text{Aug}(V, \epsilon_L, \rho_R; \mathbb{K})$  is independent of the choice of  $\epsilon_L$  in  $\text{Aug}^{\rho_L}(V; \mathbb{K})$  up to canonical isomorphism. And, we have a natural isomorphism*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Aug}(V, \rho_L, \rho_R; \mathbb{K}) &\cong \text{Aug}^{\rho_L}(V_L; \mathbb{K}) \times \text{Aug}(V, \epsilon_L, \rho_R; \mathbb{K}) \\ &\cong \mathbb{K}^{n_L/2} \times (\mathbb{K}^\times)^{A_b(\rho_L)} \times \text{Aug}(V, \epsilon_L, \rho_R; \mathbb{K}) \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* Any element  $g^L \in B^L \subset B$  can be written uniquely as a product  $g^L = g_4^L \circ g_3^L \circ g_2^L \circ g_1^L$  with  $g_i^L$  of the form as in Lemma B.2.7 (1). The rest follows immediately from Lemma B.2.7 and Lemma B.1.2.  $\square$

### B.3. Ruling decomposition for augmentation varieties of bordered Legendrian graphs.

**Definition B.3.1.** Use the notations in Definition 4.3.4 and Lemma 4.3.6, for any  $\rho_v \in \text{NR}(v)$ , define  $\text{Aug}(V, \epsilon_L, \rho_v, \rho_R; \mathbb{K})$  to be the sub-variety of  $\text{Aug}(V, \epsilon_L, \rho_R; \mathbb{K})$  whose augmentations  $d = (d^L, g_C, d^v)$  further satisfy  $d^v \in B^v \cdot d_{\rho_v}$ . Define  $\text{Aug}(V, \rho_L, \rho_v, \rho_R; \mathbb{K})$  similarly.

Then we have the following decomposition

$$\text{Aug}(V, \epsilon_L, \rho_R; \mathbb{K}) \cong \bigsqcup_{\rho \in \text{NR}(v)} \text{Aug}(V, \epsilon_L, \rho_v, \rho_R; \mathbb{K}) \quad (\text{B.24})$$

of  $\text{Aug}(V, \epsilon_L, \rho_R; \mathbb{K})$  into the set-theoretic disjoint union of locally closed sub-varieties. There is a similar decomposition of  $\text{Aug}(V, \rho_L, \rho_R; \mathbb{K})$ , and the previous isomorphism is compatible with the decompositions. That is, we have an induced natural isomorphism

$$\text{Aug}(V, \rho_L, \rho_v, \rho_R; \mathbb{K}) \cong \mathbb{K}^{n_L/2} \times (\mathbb{K}^\times)^{A_b(\rho_L)} \times \text{Aug}(V, \epsilon_L, \rho_v, \rho_R; \mathbb{K}).$$

By the result above, to count augmentations for  $\text{Aug}(V, \epsilon_L, \rho_R; \mathbb{K})$  or  $\text{Aug}(V, \epsilon_L, \rho_v, \rho_R; \mathbb{K})$ , we can now assume  $\epsilon_L = \epsilon_{\rho_L}$  is a fixed standard augmentation. Equivalently, the differential is  $d^L = h^L \cdot d_{\rho_L}$  for some diagonal element  $h^L \in B^L$ , and  $d_{\rho_L}$  is the canonical differential associated to  $\rho_L$  as in Definition 4.3.4.

Fix any augmentation  $\epsilon$  (or  $d = (d^L, g_C, d^v)$ ) of  $\mathcal{A}(V)$ , similar to  $\tilde{d}^v$ , define  $\tilde{g}^v \in B^v$  by

$$\begin{pmatrix} \tilde{g}_{1,2j}^v & \tilde{g}_{2,2j+1}^v \\ \tilde{g}_{1,2j+1}^v & \tilde{g}_{2,2j}^v \end{pmatrix} := \begin{pmatrix} g_C^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & \text{Id} \end{pmatrix} \circ \begin{pmatrix} g_{1,2j}^v & g_{2,2j+1}^v \\ g_{1,2j+1}^v & g_{2,2j}^v \end{pmatrix} \circ \begin{pmatrix} g_C & 0 \\ 0 & \text{Id} \end{pmatrix} \quad (\text{B.25})$$

**Lemma B.3.2.** *Let  $\epsilon$  (or  $d = (d^L, g_C, d^v)$ ) be any augmentation of  $\mathcal{A}(V)$  such that  $d^L$  is standard. Then for any  $g = (\text{Id}, g^v) \in B$ , we have:*

- (1) *If  $g_{i,0}^v = \text{Id}$ , and  $g_{i,j}^v = 0$  for all  $i \in \mathbb{Z}/2$  and  $j > 0$  unless  $(i, j) = (1, 1)$ . In particular,  $(g^{-1})_{i,0}^v = \text{Id}$ ,  $(g^{-1})_{1,1}^v = -g_{1,1}^v$ , and  $(g^{-1})_{i,j}^v = 0$  otherwise. Then  $(g \cdot d)^R = g^R \cdot d^R$  with  $g^R = g^R(g, d)$  given by*

$$g^R := \begin{pmatrix} \text{Id} & 0 & 0 \\ \tilde{g}_{1,1}^v \circ d_{2,1}^L & \text{Id} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \text{Id} \end{pmatrix}$$

- (2) If  $g_{i,0}^v = \text{Id}$ , and  $g_{i,j}^v = 0$  for all  $i \in \mathbb{Z}/2$  and  $j > 0$  unless  $(i, j) = (2, 1)$ . In particular,  $(g^{-1})_{i,0}^v = \text{Id}$ ,  $(g^{-1})_{2,1}^v = -g_{2,1}^v$ , and  $(g^{-1})_{i,j}^v = 0$  otherwise. Then  $(g \cdot d)^R = g^R \cdot d^R$  with  $g^R = g^R(g, d)$  given by

$$g^R := \begin{pmatrix} \text{Id} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \text{Id} & 0 \\ 0 & d_{3,2}^L \circ \widetilde{g}_{2,1}^v & \text{Id} \end{pmatrix}$$

- (3) If  $g_{i,0}^v = \text{Id}$ , and  $g_{i,j}^v = 0$  for all  $i \in \mathbb{Z}/2$  and  $j > 0$  unless  $(i, j) = (1, 2)$ . In particular,  $(g^{-1})_{i,0}^v = \text{Id}$ ,  $(g^{-1})_{1,2}^v = -g_{1,2}^v$ , and  $(g^{-1})_{i,j}^v = 0$  otherwise. Then  $(g \cdot d)^R = g^R \cdot d^R$  with  $g^R = g^R(g, d)$  given by

$$g^R := \begin{pmatrix} \text{Id} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \text{Id} & 0 \\ -d_{3,2}^L \circ \widetilde{g}_{1,2}^v \circ d_{2,1}^L & 0 & \text{Id} \end{pmatrix}$$

- (4) If  $g_{i,0}^v = \text{Id}$ ,  $g_{i,1}^v = 0$  for all  $i \in \mathbb{Z}/2$ , and  $g_{1,2}^v = 0$ . In particular,  $(g^{-1})_{i,0}^v = \text{Id}$ ,  $(g^{-1})_{i,1}^v = 0$ , and  $(g^{-1})_{1,2}^v = 0$ . Then  $(g \cdot d)^R = g^R \cdot d^R$  with  $g^R = \text{Id}$ .

*Proof.* Notice that if  $g = (\text{Id}, g^v)$  with  $g_{1,0}^v = \text{Id}$ , then  $g \cdot g_C = g_C$ , and we have  $\widetilde{g \cdot d}^v = \widetilde{g}^v \cdot \widetilde{d}^v$ .

(1). If  $g = (\text{Id}, g^v)$  with  $g_{i,0}^v = \text{Id}$ , and  $g_{i,j}^v = 0$  for all  $i \in \mathbb{Z}/2$  and  $j > 0$  unless  $(i, j) = (1, 1)$ , then  $\widetilde{g}^v$  is of the same form as  $g^v$ . The only two nontrivial calculations are

$$\begin{aligned} (g \cdot d)_{2,1}^R &= (\widetilde{g \cdot d})_{1,1}^v \circ (g \cdot d)_{2,1}^L \\ &= (\widetilde{d}_{1,1}^v + \widetilde{g}_{1,1}^v \circ \widetilde{d}_{1,0}^v - d_{2,0}^v \circ \widetilde{g}_{1,1}^v) \circ d_{2,1}^L \\ &= d_{2,1}^R - \widetilde{g}_{1,1}^v \circ d_{2,1}^L \circ d_{1,1}^L - d_{2,0}^v \circ \widetilde{g}_{1,1}^v \circ d_{2,1}^L \\ &= d_{2,1}^R + \widetilde{g}_{1,1}^v \circ d_{2,1}^L \circ d_{1,1}^L - d_{2,0}^v \circ \widetilde{g}_{1,1}^v \circ d_{2,1}^L \\ &= d_{2,1}^R + g_{2,1}^R \circ d_{1,1}^R - d_{2,2}^R \circ g_{2,1}^R \\ (g \cdot d)_{3,1}^R &= (g \cdot d)_{3,1}^L + (g \cdot d)_{3,2}^L \circ (\widetilde{g \cdot d})_{1,2}^v \circ (g \cdot d)_{2,1}^L \\ &= d_{3,1}^L + d_{3,2}^L \circ (\widetilde{d}_{1,2}^v - \widetilde{d}_{2,1}^v \circ \widetilde{g}_{1,1}^v) \circ d_{2,1}^L \\ &= d_{3,1}^R - d_{3,2}^R \circ (\widetilde{g}_{1,1}^v \circ d_{2,1}^L) \\ &= d_{3,1}^R - d_{3,2}^R \circ g_{2,1}^R \end{aligned}$$

Here, in the first equation we have used the fact that  $d^L$  is standard. In particular, it implies that  $d_{2,1}^L \circ d_{1,1}^L = 0$ . In all the other cases, we have  $(g \cdot d)_{j,i}^R = d_{j,i}^R$ . It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} (g \cdot d)^R &= \begin{pmatrix} d_{2,1}^R + g_{2,1}^R \circ d_{1,1}^R - d_{2,2}^R \circ g_{2,1}^R & 0 & 0 \\ d_{3,1}^R - d_{3,2}^R \circ g_{2,1}^R & d_{2,2}^R & 0 \\ d_{3,2}^R & 0 & \text{Id} \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} \text{Id} & 0 & 0 \\ g_{2,1}^R & \text{Id} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \text{Id} \end{pmatrix} \circ \begin{pmatrix} d_{1,1}^R & 0 & 0 \\ d_{2,1}^R & d_{2,2}^R & 0 \\ d_{3,1}^R & d_{3,2}^R & 0 \end{pmatrix} \circ \begin{pmatrix} \text{Id} & 0 & 0 \\ -g_{2,1}^R & \text{Id} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \text{Id} \end{pmatrix} \\ &= g^R \circ d^R \circ (g^R)^{-1} \end{aligned}$$

as desired.



(2). If  $g_{i,0}^v = \text{Id}$ , and  $g_{i,j}^v = 0$  for all  $i \in \mathbb{Z}/2$  and  $j > 0$  unless  $(i, j) = (2, 1)$ , then  $\widetilde{g}^v$  is of the same form as  $g^v$ . The only two nontrivial calculations are

$$\begin{aligned}
(g \cdot d)_{3,2}^R &= (g \cdot d)_{3,2}^L \circ (\widetilde{g \cdot d})_{2,1}^v \\
&= d_{3,2}^L \circ (d_{2,1}^v + \widetilde{g}_{2,1}^v \circ d_{2,0}^v - \widetilde{d}_{1,0}^v \circ \widetilde{g}_{2,1}^v) \\
&= d_{3,2}^R + (d_{3,2}^L \circ \widetilde{g}_{2,1}^v) \circ d_{2,0}^v + d_{3,3}^L \circ d_{3,2}^L \circ \widetilde{g}_{2,1}^v \\
&= d_{3,2}^R + (d_{3,2}^L \circ \widetilde{g}_{2,1}^v) \circ d_{2,0}^v - d_{3,3}^L \circ (d_{3,2}^L \circ \widetilde{g}_{2,1}^v) \\
&= d_{3,2}^R + g_{3,2}^R \circ d_{2,2}^R - d_{3,3}^R \circ g_{3,2}^R \\
(g \cdot d)_{3,1}^R &= (g \cdot d)_{3,1}^L + (g \cdot d)_{3,2}^L \circ (\widetilde{g \cdot d})_{1,2}^v \circ (g \cdot d)_{2,1}^L \\
&= d_{3,1}^L + d_{3,2}^L \circ (\widetilde{d}_{1,2}^v + \widetilde{g}_{2,1}^v \circ \widetilde{d}_{1,1}^v) \circ d_{2,1}^L \\
&= d_{3,1}^R + g_{3,2}^R \circ d_{2,1}^R
\end{aligned}$$

Here, in the first equation, we have used the fact that  $d^L$  is standard. In particular, it implies that  $d_{3,3}^L \circ d_{3,2}^L = 0$ .

In all the other cases, we have  $(g \cdot d)_{j,i}^R = d_{j,i}^R$ . It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
(g \cdot d)^R &= \begin{pmatrix} d_{1,1}^R & 0 & 0 \\ d_{2,1}^R & d_{2,2}^R & 0 \\ d_{3,1}^R + g_{3,2}^R \circ d_{2,1}^R & d_{3,2}^R + g_{3,2}^R \circ d_{2,2}^R - d_{3,3}^R \circ g_{3,2}^R & 0 \end{pmatrix} \\
&= \begin{pmatrix} \text{Id} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \text{Id} & 0 \\ 0 & g_{3,2}^R & \text{Id} \end{pmatrix} \circ \begin{pmatrix} d_{1,1}^R & 0 & 0 \\ d_{2,1}^R & d_{2,2}^R & 0 \\ d_{3,1}^R & d_{3,2}^R & 0 \end{pmatrix} \circ \begin{pmatrix} \text{Id} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \text{Id} & 0 \\ 0 & -g_{3,2}^R & \text{Id} \end{pmatrix} \\
&= g^R \circ d^R \circ (g^R)^{-1}
\end{aligned}$$

as desired.

(3). If  $g_{i,0}^v = \text{Id}$ , and  $g_{i,j}^v = 0$  for all  $i \in \mathbb{Z}/2$  and  $j > 0$  unless  $(i, j) = (1, 2)$ , then  $\widetilde{g}^v$  is of the same form as  $g^v$ . The only nontrivial calculation is

$$\begin{aligned}
(g \cdot d)_{3,1}^R &= (g \cdot d)_{3,1}^L + (g \cdot d)_{3,2}^L \circ (\widetilde{g \cdot d})_{1,2}^v \circ (g \cdot d)_{2,1}^L \\
&= d_{3,1}^L + d_{3,2}^L \circ (\widetilde{d}_{1,2}^v + \widetilde{g}_{1,2}^v \circ \widetilde{d}_{1,0}^v - \widetilde{d}_{1,0}^v \circ \widetilde{g}_{1,2}^v) \circ d_{2,1}^L \\
&= d_{3,1}^R - d_{3,2}^L \circ \widetilde{g}_{1,2}^v \circ d_{2,1}^L \circ d_{1,1}^L + d_{3,3}^L \circ d_{3,2}^L \circ \widetilde{g}_{1,2}^v \circ d_{2,1}^L \\
&= d_{3,1}^R + g_{3,1}^R \circ d_{1,1}^R - d_{3,3}^R \circ g_{3,1}^R.
\end{aligned}$$

In all the other cases, we have  $(g \cdot d)_{j,i}^R = d_{j,i}^R$ . It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
(g \cdot d)^R &= \begin{pmatrix} d_{1,1}^R & 0 & 0 \\ d_{2,1}^R & d_{2,2}^R & 0 \\ d_{3,1}^R + g_{3,1}^R \circ d_{1,1}^R - d_{3,3}^R \circ g_{3,1}^R & d_{3,2}^R & 0 \end{pmatrix} \\
&= \begin{pmatrix} \text{Id} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \text{Id} & 0 \\ g_{3,1}^R & 0 & \text{Id} \end{pmatrix} \circ \begin{pmatrix} d_{1,1}^R & 0 & 0 \\ d_{2,1}^R & d_{2,2}^R & 0 \\ d_{3,1}^R & d_{3,2}^R & 0 \end{pmatrix} \circ \begin{pmatrix} \text{Id} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \text{Id} & 0 \\ -g_{3,1}^R & 0 & \text{Id} \end{pmatrix} \\
&= g^R \circ d^R \circ (g^R)^{-1}
\end{aligned}$$

as desired.

(4). If  $g_{i,0}^v = \text{Id}$ ,  $g_{i,1}^v = 0$  for all  $i \in \mathbb{Z}/2$ , and  $g_{1,2}^v = 0$ , then  $\widetilde{g}^v$  is of the same form as  $g^v$ . By definition, it is direct to see that

$$\begin{aligned}
(g \cdot d)^R &= \begin{pmatrix} (g \cdot d)_{1,1}^R & 0 & 0 \\ (g \cdot d)_{2,1}^R & (g \cdot d)_{2,2}^R & 0 \\ (g \cdot d)_{3,1}^R & (g \cdot d)_{3,2}^R & (g \cdot d)_{3,3}^R \end{pmatrix} \\
&= \begin{pmatrix} (g \cdot d)_{1,1}^L & 0 & 0 \\ (g \cdot d)_{1,1}^v \circ (g \cdot d)_{2,1}^L & (g \cdot d)_{2,0}^v & 0 \\ (g \cdot d)_{3,1}^L + (g \cdot d)_{3,2}^L \circ (g \cdot d)_{1,2}^v \circ (g \cdot d)_{2,1}^L & (g \cdot d)_{3,2}^L \circ (g \cdot d)_{2,1}^v & (g \cdot d)_{3,3}^L \end{pmatrix} \\
&= \begin{pmatrix} d_{1,1}^L & 0 & 0 \\ \widetilde{d}_{1,1}^v \circ d_{2,1}^L & d_{2,0}^v & 0 \\ d_{3,1}^L + d_{3,2}^L \circ \widetilde{d}_{1,2}^v \circ d_{2,1}^L & d_{3,2}^L \circ \widetilde{d}_{2,1}^v & d_{3,3}^L \end{pmatrix} \\
&= d^R
\end{aligned}$$

as desired.

This finishes the proof of the lemma.  $\square$

**Corollary B.3.3.** *For any  $\epsilon_L \in \text{Aug}^{\rho_L}(V_L; \mathbb{K})$  which is standard, the group action of  $B^v$  on  $\text{Aug}(V, \epsilon_L, \rho_R; \mathbb{K})$  is well-defined, and preserves the sub-varieties  $\text{Aug}(V, \epsilon_L, \rho_v, \rho_R; \mathbb{K})$ .*

*Proof.* By linear algebra, any group element  $g = g^v \in B^v \subset B$  can be written uniquely as a product  $g^v = g_4^v \circ g_3^v \circ g_2^v \circ g_1^v \circ g_0^v$  with  $g_i^v$  of the form as in Lemma B.3.2.(i) for  $1 \leq i \leq 4$ , and  $g_0^v$  block-diagonal, i.e. of the form as in Lemma B.2.7.(1). Now, the result follows from Lemma B.2.7.(1) and Lemma B.3.2 above.  $\square$

Fix  $\epsilon_L$  (or  $d^L$ ) to be standard, define  $\text{Aug}^1(V, \epsilon_L, \rho_v, \rho_R; \mathbb{K})$  to be the subvariety of  $\text{Aug}(V, \epsilon_L, \rho_v, \rho_R; \mathbb{K})$  consisting of  $d = (d^L, g_C, d^v)$  with  $g_C = \text{Id}$ , hence  $d_{1,0}^v = g_C \circ d_{2,2}^L \circ g_C^{-1} = d_{2,2}^L$ . Clearly, we have a natural isomorphism

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Aug}(V, \epsilon_L, \rho_v, \rho_R; \mathbb{K}) &\cong \text{Aug}^1(V, \epsilon_L, \rho_v, \rho_R; \mathbb{K}) \times B_{1,0}^v \\
d = (d^L, g_C, d^v) &\mapsto ((d^L, id, \widetilde{d}^v), g_C)
\end{aligned} \tag{B.26}$$

For simplicity, we now assume  $d^L \cong d_{\rho_L}$  is the canonical augmentation. Notice that there are natural maps

$$r_L : \text{NR}(v) \rightarrow \text{GNR}(v_L), \quad r_R : \text{NR}(v) \rightarrow \text{GNR}(v_R)$$

such that

$$r_L(\rho_v)(i) := \begin{cases} \rho_v(i) & \text{if } 1 \leq i < \rho_v(i) \leq \ell; \\ i & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad r_R(\rho_v)(i) := \begin{cases} \rho_v(i) & \text{if } \ell + 1 \leq i < \rho_v(i) \leq \ell + r; \\ i & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then  $d_{1,0}^v = d_{2,2}^L$  is the canonical differential associated to  $\rho_v|_{v_L} = r_L(\rho_v)$ .

Define  $B_v^1$  to be the subgroup of  $B^v$  whose elements  $g^v$  satisfy  $g_{1,0}^v = id$ . Again, by the previous lemma, there is an induced group action of  $B_v^1$  on  $\text{Aug}^1(V, \epsilon_L, \rho_v, \rho_R; \mathbb{K})$ .

For each fixed  $\rho_v \in \text{NR}(v)$ , recall that  $\rho_v$  determines a partition  $I_v := \{1, 2, \dots, \ell + r\} = U(\rho_v) \amalg L(\rho_v)$ , together with a bijection  $\rho_v : U(\rho_v) \xrightarrow{\sim} L(\rho_v)$ , such that  $i < \rho_v(i)$  and  $|v_{i, \rho_v(i)-i}| = \mu(i) - \mu(\rho_v(i)) - 1 + n(v_{i, \rho_v(i)-j}) = 0$  for all  $i \in U(\rho_v)$ . For each  $i \in U(\rho_v)$ , define

$$\begin{aligned}
A^1(\rho_v, i) &:= \{j \in U(\rho_v) \mid i < j < \rho_v(j) < \rho_v(i), \rho_v(j) \leq \ell, \text{ and } \mu(j) = \mu(i)\}; \\
A^2(\rho_v, i) &:= \{j \in U(\rho_v) \mid i < j \leq \ell < \rho_v(j) < \rho_v(i), \text{ and } \mu(j) = \mu(i)\}; \\
A^3(\rho_v, i) &:= \{j \in U(\rho_v) \mid i < j < \rho_v(j) < \rho_v(i), j \geq \ell + 1, \text{ and } |v_{i, j-i}| + 1 = 0\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Then  $A_{\rho_v}(i) = A^1(\rho_v, i) \amalg A^2(\rho_v, i) \amalg A^3(\rho_v, i)$  by Definition 4.3.5. For each  $i \in L(\rho_v)$ , define

$$I(\rho_v, i) := \{j > 0 \mid i + j > \ell, \text{ and } |v_{i, j}| + 1 = 0, \text{ i.e. } |e_i| = |Z^{n(v_{i, j})} e_{i+j}|\}.$$

Define  $\text{Aug}^2(V, \epsilon_L, \rho_v, \rho_R; \mathbb{K})$  to be the sub-variety of  $\text{Aug}^1(V, \epsilon_L, \rho_v, \rho_R; \mathbb{K})$ , consisting of (“partially canonical”) augmentations  $d = (d^L, id, d_c^v)$  such that:

$$(-1)^{\mu(i)} d_c^v(e_i^v) = \begin{cases} e_{\rho_v(i)}^v & \text{if } 1 \leq i < \rho_v(i) \leq \ell \text{ or } \ell + 1 \leq i < \rho_v(i) \leq \ell + r; \\ Z \left( e_{\rho_v(i)}^v + \sum_{j \in A^2(\rho_v, i)} \epsilon_{ij} e_{\rho_v(j)}^v \right) & \text{if } 1 \leq i \leq \ell < \rho_v(i) \leq \ell + r, \end{cases} \quad (\text{B.27})$$

for some  $\epsilon_{ij} \in \mathbb{K}$ . Notice that the differential  $d_c^v \in \text{MC}(v; \mathbb{K})$  is uniquely determined by the conditions above, as the other values  $d_c^v(e_{\rho_v(i)}^v)$  are uniquely determined via  $(d_c^v)^2 + Z^2 = 0$ .

Define  $B(\rho_v; \mathbb{K})$  to be the subgroup of  $B_v^1$  whose elements  $g^v$  further satisfy:

- (1) for  $i \in U(\rho_v)$ , we have

$$g^v(e_i^v) = \begin{cases} e_i^v + Z \sum_{j \in A^3(\rho_v, i)} *_{i,j-i} e_j^v & \text{if } i \leq \ell; \\ e_i^v + \sum_{j \in A^3(\rho_v, i)} *_{i,j-i} e_j^v & \text{if } i \geq \ell + 1, \end{cases}$$

for some  $*_{i,j-i} \in \mathbb{K}$ ;

- (2) for  $i \in L(\rho_v)$ , we have

$$g^v(e_i^v) = *_{i,0} e_i^v + \sum_{j \in I(\rho_v, i)} *_{i,j} Z^{n(v_{i,j})} e_{i+j}^v$$

for some  $*_{i,0} \in \mathbb{K}^*$  and  $*_{i,j} \in \mathbb{K}$ .

One can check directly that this indeed defines a group.

**Lemma B.3.4.** *There is an natural isomorphism*

$$B(\rho_v; \mathbb{K}) \times \text{Aug}^2(V, \epsilon_L, \rho_v, \rho_R; \mathbb{K}) \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{Aug}^1(V, \epsilon_L, \rho_v, \rho_R; \mathbb{K})$$

$$(g^v, d_c = (d^L, \text{Id}, d_c^v)) \mapsto d = (d^L, \text{Id}, (g^v)^{-1} \cdot d_c^v).$$

*Proof.* The argument is similar to the proof of Lemma 4.3.6, and Lemma B.1.2. By the discussion above, the map is well-defined. For any  $d = (d^L, \text{Id}, d^v) \in \text{Aug}^1(V, \epsilon_L, \rho_v, \rho_R; \mathbb{K})$ , it suffices to show that there exists a unique pair  $(g^v, d_c)$  with  $g^v \in B(\rho_v; \mathbb{K})$  and  $d_c = (d^L, \text{Id}, d_c^v) \in \text{Aug}^2(V, \epsilon_L, \rho_v, \rho_R; \mathbb{K})$ , such that  $(g^v)^{-1} \cdot d_c^v = d^v$ . We will determine  $g^v$  by defining  $(e_i^v)'' = g^v(e_i^v)$  inductively.

By Lemma B.1.2.(1), for each  $i \in U(\rho_v)$ , there exists a unique  $i$ -admissible element in  $C_v$  of the form

$$(e_i^v)' = e_i^v + \sum_{j \in A_{\rho_v}(i)} a_{i,j-i} Z^{n(v_{i,j-i})} e_j^v, \quad a_{i,j-i} \in \mathbb{K},$$

such that  $d^v(e_i^v)'$  is  $(\rho_v(i), n(v_{i,\rho_v(i)-i}))$ -admissible. Denote  $d^v(e_i^v)' = Z^{n(v_{i,j-i})} (e_j^v)'$  with  $j := \rho_v(i)$ , then

$$(e_j^v)' = a_{j,0} e_j^v + \sum_{p \in I_v(j)} a_{j,p} Z^{n(v_{j,k})} e_{j+p}^v$$

for some  $a_{j,0} \in \mathbb{K}^\times$  and  $a_{j,p} \in \mathbb{K}$ , uniquely determined by  $d^v$ .

- (1) If  $i \geq \ell + 1$ , then  $A_{\rho_v}(i) = A^3(\rho_v, i)$  and  $I_v(\rho_v(i)) = I(\rho_v, \rho_v(i))$ . Define  $(e_i^v)'' := (e_i^v)'$  and  $(e_{\rho_v(i)}^v)'' := (e_{\rho_v(i)}^v)'$ , we have  $d^v(e_i^v)'' = (e_{\rho_v(i)}^v)''$ .

- (2) If  $i < \rho_v(i) \leq \ell$ , by the condition that  $d_{1,0}^v$  is standard, we have  $(e_i^v)' = e_i^v$  and

$$d^v(e_i^v)' = (e_{\rho_v(i)}^v)' = a_{\rho_v(i),0} e_{\rho_v(i)}^v + \sum_{p \in I(\rho_v, i)} a_{\rho_v(i),p} Z^{n(v_{\rho_v(i),p})} e_{\rho_v(i)+p}^v.$$

Define  $(e_i^v)'' := e_i^v$ , and  $(e_{\rho_v(i)}^v)'' := (e_{\rho_v(i)}^v)'$ , we have  $d^v(e_i^v)'' = (e_{\rho_v(i)}^v)''$ .

- (3) If  $i \leq \ell < \rho_v(i)$ , then  $I_v(i) = I(\rho_v, i)$ . Again by the condition  $d_{1,0}^v$  is standard, we have

$$(e_i^v)' = e_i^v + \sum_{j \in A^2(\rho_v, i) \amalg A^3(\rho_v, i)} a_{i,j-i} Z^{n(v_{i,j-i})} e_j^v.$$

If  $A^2(\rho_v, i) = \emptyset$ , define

$$(e_i^v)'' := (e_i^v)' = e_i^v + \sum_{j \in A^3(\rho_v, i)} a_{i,j-i} Z^{n(v_{i,j-i})} e_j^v$$

and  $(e_{\rho_v(i)}^v)'' := (e_{\rho_v(i)}^v)'$ , then we have  $d^v(e_i^v)'' = Z(e_{\rho_v(i)}^v)''$ . Otherwise, by induction, we can define  $(e_j^v)''$  and  $(e_{\rho_v(j)}^v)''$  for all  $j \in A^2(\rho_v, i)$ , such that

$$\begin{aligned} (e_j^v)'' &= e_j^v + Z \sum_{k \in A^3(\rho_v, j)} *_{j,k-j} e_k^v; \\ (e_{\rho_v(j)}^v)'' &= *_{j,0} e_{\rho_v(j)}^v + \sum_{k \in I(\rho_v, j)} *_{\rho_v(j),k} Z^{n(v_{\rho_v(j),k})} e_{\rho_v(j)+k}^v; \\ d^v((e_j^v)') &= Z \left( (e_{\rho_v(j)}^v)'' + \sum_{k \in A^2(\rho_v, j)} \epsilon_{j,k} (e_{\rho_v(k)}^v)'' \right), \end{aligned}$$

for some uniquely determined  $*_{j,0} \in \mathbb{K}^*$  and  $*_{j,p}, \epsilon_{j,k} \in \mathbb{K}$ . In addition, we can re-write uniquely

$$(e_i^v)' = e_i^v + \sum_{j \in A^2(\rho_v, i) \amalg A^3(\rho_v, i)} b_{i,j-i} Z^{n(v_{i,j-i})} (e_j^v)'', \quad b_{i,j-i} \in \mathbb{K}$$

Define  $(e_i^v)'' := e_i^v + \sum_{j \in A^3(\rho_v, i) \amalg b_{i,j-i}} Z(e_j^v)''$  and  $(e_{\rho_v(i)}^v)'' := (e_{\rho_v(i)}^v)'$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} d^v(e_i^v)'' &= d^v(e_i^v)' - d^v \left( \sum_{j \in A^2(\rho_v, i)} b_{i,j-i} (e_j^v)'' \right) \\ &= Z(e_{\rho_v(i)}^v)' - \sum_{j \in A^2(\rho_v, i)} b_{i,j-i} d^v(e_j^v)'' \\ &= Z((e_{\rho_v(i)}^v)')' + \sum_{p \in A^2(\rho_v, i)} \epsilon_{i,p} (e_p^v)'', \end{aligned}$$

for some uniquely determined  $\epsilon_{i,p} \in \mathbb{K}$ . Here, the last equality follows from the inductive hypothesis.

This finishes the construction of  $(e_i^v)''$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq \ell + r$ .

Now, define  $g^v$  via  $g^v(e_i^v) = (e_i^v)''$ . By the discussion above, we have  $g^v \in B(\rho_v; \mathbb{K})$ , and  $d_c^v := g^v \cdot d^v$  defines  $d_c := (d^\ell, \text{Id}, d_c^v) \in \text{Aug}^2(V, \epsilon_\ell, \rho_v, \rho_R; \mathbb{K})$  uniquely. This finishes the proof of the lemma.  $\square$

**B.3.1. Resolutions and normal rulings.** For our purpose later on in this section, we give an alternative definition of resolutions of a vertex and normal rulings for bordered Legendrian graphs.

For each fixed  $\rho_v \in \text{NR}(v)$ , recall that  $r_\ell(\rho_v) \in \text{GNR}(v_\ell)$  (resp.  $r_R(\rho_v) \in \text{GNR}(v_R)$ ) is an involution (or generalized normal ruling) for  $v_\ell$  (resp.  $v_R$ ) with possible fixed points. By Definition 4.1.6,  $r_\ell(\rho_v)$  determines a partition  $I(v_\ell) = \{1, 2, \dots, \ell\} = U(r_\ell(\rho_v)) \amalg L(r_\ell(\rho_v)) \amalg H(r_\ell(\rho_v))$ , together with a bijection  $r_\ell(\rho_v) : U(r_\ell(\rho_v)) \xrightarrow{\sim} L(r_\ell(\rho_v))$ . Similar statement applies to  $r_R(\rho_v)$  with  $I(v_\ell)$  replaced by  $I(v_R) = \{\ell + 1, \dots, \ell + r\}$ . Let  $\ell(\rho_v) = r(\rho_v) = |H(r_\ell(\rho_v))|$  be the number of fixed points of  $r_\ell(\rho_v)$  (equivalently,  $r_R(\rho_v)$ ). Then  $\ell - \ell(\rho_v)$  and  $r - r(\rho_v)$  are both even. Also,  $n_\ell - \ell = n_R - r$ .

**Definition B.3.5.** For each fixed  $\rho_v \in \text{NR}(v)$ , we define a Legendrian tangle (or bordered Legendrian link)  $V(\rho_v)$ , called a *resolution* of  $V$  with respect to  $\rho_v$ , as follows:

Define  $V_\ell(\rho_v)$  as a Legendrian tangle of type  $(n_\ell, n_\ell + \ell(\rho_v) - \ell)$  obtained from  $V_\ell$  such that, for all  $i \in U(r_\ell(\rho_v))$ , so  $1 \leq i < j := \rho_v(i) \leq \ell$ , connect the strands  $k + i - 1$  and  $k + j - 1$  of  $V_\ell$  by a right cusp. Then  $V_\ell(\rho_v)$  consists of  $\widehat{c}_R(\rho_v) = (\ell - \ell(\rho_v))$  right cusps and some additional crossings. We term these crossings as *markings*.

Say,  $H(r_\ell(\rho_v)) = \{h_1^\ell < \dots < h_{\ell(\rho_v)}^\ell\}$  and  $H(r_R(\rho_v)) = \{h_1^R < \dots < h_{r(\rho_v)}^R\}$ . Recall that  $\rho_v$  determines a bijection  $\rho_v : H(r_\ell(\rho_v)) \xrightarrow{\sim} H(r_R(\rho_v))$ , which can be represented by a positive braid  $\beta(\rho_v)$  with the minimal number of crossings. We can regard  $\beta(\rho_v)$  as a braid with  $n_\ell + \ell(\rho_v) - \ell$  strands, by adding  $k$  and  $n_\ell - \ell - k$

parallel strands from top and bottom respectively.

Define  $V_2(\rho_v)$  to be the Legendrian tangle of type  $(n_L + \ell(\rho_v) - \ell, n_L + \ell(\rho_v) - \ell = n_R + r(\rho_v) - r)$  obtained from  $(V_1(\rho_v))_R$  by adding the braid  $\beta(\rho_v)$  from the right hand side.

Define  $V_3(\rho_v)$  as a Legendrian tangle of type  $(n_R + r(\rho_v) - r, n_R)$  obtained from  $V_R$  as follows: for all  $\ell + i \in U(r_R(\rho_v))$ , so  $\ell + 1 \leq \ell + i < \ell + j := \rho_v(\ell + i) \leq \ell + r$ , connect the strands  $k + i - 1$  and  $k + j - 1$  of  $V_R$  by a left cusp. Then  $V_3(\rho_v)$  consists of  $(r - r(\rho_v))/2$  left cusps and some additional crossings. Again, we term these crossings as *markings*.

Finally, define  $V(\rho_v) := V_1(\rho_v) \circ V_2(\rho_v) \circ V_3(\rho_v)$  as the concatenation of the Legendrian tangles above. The Maslove potential of  $V(\rho_v)$  is induced from that of  $V$ . We impose a *base point* at each right cusp of  $V(\rho_v)$ .

The construction of  $V(\rho_v)$  is not unique, but the ambiguity is not essential.

**Definition B.3.6.** Define  $\text{NR}'(V(\rho_v), \rho_L, \rho_R) \subset \text{NR}(V(\rho_v), \rho_L, \rho_R)$  to be the set of  $\mathbb{Z}$ -graded normal rulings  $\rho'$  for  $V(\rho_v)$  such that

- (1)  $\rho'|_{(V(\rho_v))_L} = \rho_L, \rho'|_{(V(\rho_v))_R} = \rho_R$ ;
- (2) Any marking of  $V(\rho_v)$  is not a switch, i.e. all the switches of  $\rho'$  are contained in  $V_2(\rho_v)$ ;
- (3) Any two strands of  $(V_2(\rho_v))_L$  contained in  $H(r_L(\rho_v))$ , are not paired by  $\rho'|_{(V_2)_L} \in \text{NR}((V_2)_L)$ .

Define  $\text{NR}(V, \rho_L, \rho_R)$  to be the set of  $\rho = (\rho_v, \rho')$  such that  $\rho_v \in \text{NR}(v)$ , and  $\rho' \in \text{NR}'(V(\rho_v), \rho_L, \rho_R)$ . Any  $\rho \in \text{NR}(V, \rho_L, \rho_R)$  is called a *normal ruling* for  $V$ .

*Remark B.3.7.* The resolution  $V_{\rho_v}$  described in Definition 5.1.4 is different from the  $V(\rho_v)$  defined above. However, from the definition, there is a canonical identification  $\text{NR}'(V(\rho_v), \rho_L, \rho_R) \cong \mathbf{R}(V_{\rho_v}, M_{\rho_v}; \rho_L, \rho_R)$ , with the latter described in Definition 5.2.2. Hence, there is a canonical identification  $\text{NR}(V, \rho_L, \rho_R) \cong \mathbf{R}(V, \rho_L, \rho_R)$  between the set of normal rulings for  $V$  defined above, and that in Definition 5.2.2.

**B.3.2. Ruling decomposition.** Now, we have seen that  $\text{Aug}(V, \epsilon_L, \rho_v, \rho_R; \mathbb{K})$  is non-empty if and only if  $\text{Aug}^2(V, \epsilon_L, \rho_v, \rho_R; \mathbb{K})$  is non-empty. It suffices to determine the structure of  $\text{Aug}^2(V, \epsilon_L, \rho_v, \rho_R; \mathbb{K})$ .

Recall that there is a ruling decomposition [23, Thm.5.10] of the augmentation variety for  $V(\rho_v)$ :

$$\text{Aug}(V(\rho_v), \epsilon_L, \rho_R; \mathbb{K}) = \coprod_{\rho' \in \text{NR}(V(\rho_v); \rho_L, \rho_R)} \text{Aug}^{\rho'}(V(\rho_v), \epsilon_L, \rho_R; \mathbb{K})$$

with

$$\text{Aug}^{\rho'}(V(\rho_v), \epsilon_L, \rho_R; \mathbb{K}) \cong (\mathbb{K}^\times)^{-\chi(\rho') + B} \times \mathbb{K}^{r(\rho')}$$

Observe that the crossings of degree 0 (excluding the markings) are in one-to-one correspondence with the pairs of  $1 \leq i < j \leq \ell$  in  $U(\rho_v)$  such that  $\mu(i) = \mu(j)$  and  $\ell + 1 \leq \rho_v(j) < \rho_v(i) \leq \ell + r$ . Denote by  $z_{i,j}$  the corresponding generators of  $\mathcal{A}(V(\rho_v)) = \mathcal{A}(\text{Res}^{\text{Ng}}(V(\rho_v)))$ . Define a sub-variety  $\text{Aug}^2(V(\rho_v), \epsilon_L, \rho_R; \mathbb{K}) \subset \text{Aug}(V(\rho_v), \epsilon_L, \rho_R; \mathbb{K})$ , whose augmentations  $\epsilon$  satisfy

- (1)  $\epsilon(a) = 0$  if  $a$  is a marking in  $V(\rho_v)$ ;
- (2) The normal ruling determined by  $\epsilon|_{(V_2(\rho_v))_L}$  satisfies Definition B.3.6.(3). Equivalently, for any Reeb chord  $b$  connecting two strands of  $(V_2(\rho_v))_L$  contained in  $H(r_L(\rho_v))$ , we have  $\epsilon|_{(V_2(\rho_v))_L}(b) = 0$ .

For each  $\rho' \in \text{NR}'(V(\rho_v); \rho_L, \rho_R)$ , define  $\text{Aug}^{\rho', 2}(V(\rho_v), \epsilon_L, \rho_R) \subset \text{Aug}^{\rho'}(V(\rho_v), \epsilon_L, \rho_R; \mathbb{K})$  similarly, with  $\text{Aug}^{\rho'}(V(\rho_v), \epsilon_L, \rho_R; \mathbb{K})$  given in Definition 5.3.9.

**Lemma B.3.8.** *There is a natural identification*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Aug}^2(V, \epsilon_L, \rho_v, \rho_R; \mathbb{K}) &\cong \text{Aug}^2(V(\rho_v), \epsilon_L, \rho_R; \mathbb{K}) \\ d_C &= (d^L, \text{Id}, d_C^v) \mapsto (d^L, \epsilon(z_{i,j}) = -\epsilon_{i,j}) \end{aligned}$$

where  $\epsilon_{i,j}$  is defined by  $d_C^v$  as in Equation (B.27). And, we have a ruling decomposition:

$$\text{Aug}^2(V(\rho_v), \epsilon_L, \rho_R; \mathbb{K}) \cong \coprod_{\rho' \in \text{NR}'(V(\rho_v); \rho_L, \rho_R)} \text{Aug}^{\rho', 2}(V(\rho_v), \epsilon_L, \rho_R; \mathbb{K})$$

with

$$\text{Aug}^{\rho', 2}(V(\rho_v), \epsilon_L, \rho_R; \mathbb{K}) \cong (\mathbb{K}^\times)^{s(\rho')} \times \mathbb{K}^{r(\rho')}.$$

where  $s(\rho')$  is the number of switches, and  $r(\rho')$  is the number of  $\mathbb{Z}$ -graded returns (excluding the markings), of  $\rho'$  in  $V(\rho_v)$  as in Definition 5.3.5.

*Proof.* The first result follows from the identification between augmentations and Morse complexes [23, Lem.5.2]. What remains follows from the ruling decomposition [23, Thm5.10] for  $\text{Aug}(V(\rho_v), \epsilon_L, \rho_R; \mathbb{K})$ .  $\square$

Now, generalizing Lemma 5.3.6 (4), we have

**Proposition B.3.9.** *For any  $\epsilon_L \in \text{Aug}^{\rho_L}(V_L; \mathbb{K})$ , there is a natural decomposition*

$$\text{Aug}(V, \epsilon_L, \rho_R; \mathbb{K}) = \coprod_{\rho \in \text{NR}(V, \rho_L, \rho_R)} \text{Aug}^\rho(V, \epsilon_L, \rho_R; \mathbb{K})$$

over the finite set  $\text{NR}(V, \rho_L, \rho_R) (= \mathbf{R}(V; \rho_L, \rho_R))$ , and for all  $\rho = (\rho_v, \rho') \in \text{NR}(V, \rho_L, \rho_R)$ , we have

$$\text{Aug}^\rho(V, \epsilon_L, \rho_R; \mathbb{K}) \cong (\mathbb{K}^\times)^{-\chi(\rho)+\widehat{B}} \times \mathbb{K}^{\widehat{r}(\rho)+A(\rho)}$$

where  $\widehat{r}(\rho)$  is defined as follows: Let  $u(v)$  be the number of degree 0 crossings in Ng's resolution  $\text{Res}^{\text{Ng}}(v)$  of  $v$ . Let  $c(\rho')$  be the number of degree 0 crossings (excluding the markings) in  $V(\rho_v)$ . Define  $A_b(r_L(\rho_v))$  as in Definition 4.1.6. Define  $r(\rho')$  as in Lemma B.3.8. Then

$$\widehat{r}(\rho) := r(\rho') + u(v) - A_b(r_L(\rho_v)) - c(\rho')$$

*Proof.* By Equations (B.24), (B.26), Lemma B.3.4, and Lemma B.3.8, the proof is a direct calculation.  $\square$

**Remark B.3.10.** By combining with [23, Thm.5.10], the gluing property of augmentation varieties implies that, the above ruling decomposition for  $V$  generalizes directly to all bordered Legendrian graphs when we impose a base point at each right cusp and each left half-edge of a vertex.

## REFERENCES

- [1] B. H. An and Y. Bae. A Chekanov-Eliashberg algebra for Legendrian graphs. arXiv:1803.05717, 2018.
- [2] B. H. An, Y. Bae, and T. K  lm  n. Ruling invariants for Legendrian graphs. arxiv:1911.08668, 2019.
- [3] B. H. An, Y. Bae, and S. Kim. Legendrian singular links and singular connected sums. *J. Symplectic Geom.*, 16(4):885–930, 2018.
- [4] B. H. An, Y. Bae, and T. Su. Augmentations are sheaves for Legendrian graphs. In preparation, 2019.
- [5] S. Baader and M. Ishikawa. Legendrian graphs and quasipositive diagrams. *Ann. Fac. Sci. Toulouse Math.* (6), 18(2):285–305, 2009.
- [6] S. A. Barannikov. The framed Morse complex and its invariants. In *Singularities and bifurcations*, volume 21 of *Adv. Soviet Math.*, pages 93–115. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1994.
- [7] Y. Chekanov. Differential algebra of Legendrian links. *Invent. Math.*, 150(3):441–483, 2002.
- [8] T. Ekholm and L. Ng. Legendrian contact homology in the boundary of a subcritical Weinstein 4-manifold. *J. Differential Geom.*, 101(1):67–157, 2015.
- [9] Y. Eliashberg, M. Fraser, et al. Topologically trivial Legendrian knots. *Journal of Symplectic Geometry*, 7(2):77–127, 2009.
- [10] Y. Eliashberg, A. Givental, and H. Hofer. Introduction to symplectic field theory. In *Visions in mathematics*, pages 560–673. Springer, 2000.
- [11] J. B. Etnyre. Lectures on open book decompositions and contact structures. In *Floer homology, gauge theory, and low-dimensional topology*, volume 5 of *Clay Math. Proc.*, pages 103–141. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2006.
- [12] J. B. Etnyre, L. L. Ng, and J. M. Sabloff. Invariants of Legendrian knots and coherent orientations. *J. Symplectic Geom.*, 1(2):321–367, 2002.
- [13] Y. F  lix, S. Halperin, and J.-C. Thomas. *Rational homotopy theory*, volume 205 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2001.
- [14] H. Geiges. *An introduction to contact topology*, volume 109. Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- [15] E. Giroux. Contact geometry: from dimension three to higher dimensions. In *Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians (Beijing 2002)*, volume 405, page 414, 2002.
- [16] T. Hausel and F. Rodriguez-Villegas. Mixed Hodge polynomials of character varieties. *Inventiones mathematicae*, 174(3):555–624, 2008.
- [17] M. B. Henry and D. Rutherford. Ruling polynomials and augmentations over finite fields. *J. Topol.*, 8(1):1–37, 2015.
- [18] V. F. R. Jones. A polynomial invariant for knots via von Neumann algebras. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.)*, 12(1):103–111, 01 1985.
- [19] D. Nadler. Arboreal singularities. *Geom. Topol.*, 21(2):1231–1274, 2017.
- [20] L. Ng, D. Rutherford, V. Shende, S. Sivek, and E. Zaslow. Augmentations are sheaves. arxiv:1502.04939, 2015.
- [21] L. L. Ng. Computable Legendrian invariants. *Topology*, 42(1):55–82, 2003.
- [22] D. O’Donnol and E. Pavelescu. On Legendrian graphs. *Algebr. Geom. Topol.*, 12(3):1273–1299, 2012.
- [23] T. Su. Ruling polynomials and augmentations for Legendrian tangles. arXiv:1707.04948, 2017.
- [24] T. Su. *A Hodge-theoretic study of augmentation varieties associated to Legendrian knots/tangles*. PhD thesis, University of California, Berkeley, Summer 2018.

*E-mail address:* anbyhee@ibs.re.kr

CENTER FOR GEOMETRY AND PHYSICS, INSTITUTE FOR BASIC SCIENCE (IBS), POHANG 37673, KOREA

*E-mail address:* ybae@kurims.kyoto-u.ac.jp

RESEARCH INSTITUTE FOR MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, KYOTO UNIVERSITY, KYOTO 606-8317, JAPAN

*E-mail address:* taosu@dma.ens.fr

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, ÉCOLE NORMALE SUPÉRIEURE, PARIS, FRANCE