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#### Abstract

We propose the Volume Conjecture for the relative Reshetikhin-Turaev invariants of a closed oriented 3-manifold with a colored framed link inside it whose asymptotic behavior is related to the volume and the Chern-Simons invariant of the hyperbolic cone metric on the manifold with singular locus the link and cone angles determined by the coloring. We prove the conjecture in the case that the ambient 3 -manifold is obtained by doing an integral surgery along some components of a fundamental shadow link and the complement of the link in the ambient manifold is homeomorphic to the fundamental shadow link complement, for sufficiently small cone angles. Together with Costantino and Thurston's result that all compact oriented 3 -manifolds with toroidal or empty boundary can be obtained by doing an integral surgery along some components of a suitable fundamental shadow link, this provides a possible approach of solving Chen-Yang's Volume Conjecture for the ReshetikhinTuraev invariants of closed oriented hyperbolic 3-manifolds. We also introduce a family of topological operations (the change of pair operations) that connect all pairs of a closed oriented 3-manifold and a framed link inside it that have homeomorphic complements, which correspond to doing the partial discrete Fourier transforms to the corresponding relative Reshetikhin-Turaev invariants. As an application, we find a Poisson Summation Formula for the discrete Fourier transforms.


## 1 Introduction

We propose the Volume Conjecture for the relative Reshetikhin-Turaev invariants of a closed oriented 3 -manifold with a colored framed link inside it whose asymptotic behavior is related to the volume and the Chern-Simons invariant of the hyperbolic cone metric on the manifold with singular locus the link and cone angles determined by the coloring. See Conjecture 1.1, and Sections 2.1 and 2.2 for a review of the relative Reshetikhin-Turaev invariants and the hyperbolic cone manifolds.

We prove the conjecture in the case that the ambient 3 -manifold is obtained by doing an integral surgery along some components of a fundamental shadow link and the complement of the link in the ambient manifold is homeomorphic to the fundamental shadow link complement, for sufficiently small cone angles. See Theorem 1.2, and Section 2.4 for a review of the fundamental shadow links. A result of Costantino and Thurston [10] shows that all compact oriented 3 -manifolds with toroidal or empty boundary can be obtained by doing an integral surgery along some components of a suitable fundamental shadow link. On the other hand, it is expected that hyperbolic cone metrics interpolate the complete cusped hyperbolic metric on the 3-manifold with toroidal boundary and the smooth hyperbolic metric on the Dehn-filled 3 -manifold, corresponding to the colors running from $\frac{r-1}{2}$ to 0 or $r-2$. Therefore, if one can push the cone angles in Theorem 1.2 from sufficiently small all the way up to $2 \pi$, then one proves the Volume Conjecture for the Reshetikhin-Turaev invariants of closed oriented hyperbolic 3-manifolds proposed by Chen and the second author [6].

This thus suggests a possible approach of solving Chen-Yang's Volume Conjecture. In [45], we prove Conjecture 1.1 for all pairs $(M, K)$ such that $M \backslash K$ is homeomorphic to the figure- 8 knot complement in $S^{3}$ with all possible cone angles, showing the plausibility of this new approach.

We also introduce a family of the change of pair operations (see Section 1.2) that connect all pairs of a closed oriented 3 -manifold and a framed link inside it that have homeomorphic complements, which correspond to doing the partial discrete Fourier transforms (see Section (1.3) to the corresponding relative Reshetikhin-Turaev invariants. As an application, we find a Poisson Summation formula for the discrete Fourier transforms (see Formula 1.1)).

### 1.1 Volume Conjecture for the relative Reshetikhin-Turaev invariants

Conjecture 1.1. Let $M$ be a closed oriented 3-manifold and let $L$ be a framed hyperbolic link in $M$ with $n$ components. For an odd integer $r \geqslant 3$, let $\mathbf{m}=\left(m_{1}, \ldots, m_{n}\right)$ and let $\mathrm{RT}_{r}(M, L, \mathbf{m})$ be the $r$-th relative Reshetikhin-Turaev invariant of $M$ with $L$ colored by $\mathbf{m}$ and evaluated at the root of unity $q=e^{\frac{2 \pi \sqrt{-1}}{r}}$. For a sequence $\mathbf{m}^{(r)}=\left(m_{1}^{(r)}, \ldots, m_{n}^{(r)}\right)$, let

$$
\theta_{k}=\left|2 \pi-\lim _{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{4 \pi m_{k}^{(r)}}{r}\right|
$$

and let $\theta=\left(\theta_{1}, \ldots, \theta_{n}\right)$. If $M_{L_{\theta}}$ is a hyperbolic cone manifold consisting of $M$ and a hyperbolic cone metric on $M$ with singular locus $L$ and cone angles $\theta$, then

$$
\lim _{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{4 \pi}{r} \log \operatorname{RT}_{r}\left(M, L, \mathbf{m}^{(r)}\right)=\operatorname{Vol}\left(M_{L_{\theta}}\right)+\sqrt{-1} \mathrm{CS}\left(M_{L_{\theta}}\right) \quad \bmod \sqrt{-1} \pi^{2} \mathbb{Z}
$$

where $r$ varies over all positive odd integers.
We note that if $M=S^{3}$, then Conjecture 1.1 covers Kashaev's Volume Conjecture for the colored Jones polynomials of hyperbolic links [20, 25, 26, 12] and its generalization [27], at the root of unity $q=e^{\frac{2 \pi \sqrt{ }-1}{r}}$. See also [16] and [8, Section 4.2] for a discussion of the values at the root $q=e^{\frac{\pi \sqrt{ }-1}{r}}$. If the framed link $L=\emptyset$ or the coloring $\mathbf{m}=\mathbf{0}$ or $\mathbf{r}-\mathbf{2}$, then Conjecture 1.1 covers Chen-Yang's Volume Conjecture for the Reshetikhin-Turaev invariants of closed oriented hyperbolic 3-manifolds.

The main result of this paper is the following Theorem 1.2 (see also Theorem 3.1 for a more precise statement), where the change of pair operation is described in the next section.

Theorem 1.2. Conjecture 1.1 is true for all pairs $(M, L)$ obtained by doing a change of pair operation from the pair $\left(M_{c}, L_{F S L}\right)$ with sufficiently small cone angles, where $M_{c}=\#^{c+1}\left(S^{2} \times S^{1}\right)$ and $L_{F S L}$ is a fundamental shadow link in $M_{c}$.

As a consequence of Theorem 1.2, we prove the Generalized Volume Conjecture [27, 16] for the colored Jones polynomials of the universal families of links respectively considered by Purcell [31], van der Veen [41] and Kumar [22]. See Proposition 6.2 and Theorems 6.3 and 6.5 for more details.

### 1.2 The change of pair operations

Let $M$ be a closed oriented 3-manifold and let $L$ be a framed link in $M$. In this section, we introduce a topological operation that changes the pair $(M, L)$ with out changing the complement $M \backslash L$, and show that these operations connect all such pairs that have homeomorphic complements.

Suppose $L=L_{1} \cup \cdots \cup L_{n}$. For each component $L_{i}:[0,1] \times S^{1} \rightarrow M$ of $L$, we call $L_{i}\left(\{0\} \times S^{1}\right) \subset$ $M$ the core curve of $L_{i}$ and $L_{i}\left(\{1\} \times S^{1}\right) \subset M$ the parallel copy. Let $(I, J)$ be a partition of $\{1, \ldots, n\}$, $L_{I}=\cup_{i \in I} L_{i}$ and $L_{J}=\cup_{j \in J} L_{j}$. For each $i \in I$, let $L_{i}^{*}$ be the framed knot in $M \backslash L$ whose core curve is isotopic to the meridian of the tubular neighborhood of $L_{i}$, and let $L_{I}^{*}=\cup_{i \in I} L_{i}^{*}$. Let $M^{*}$ be the closed 3 -manifold obtained from $M$ by doing the surgery along $L_{I}$ and let $L^{*}$ be the framed link obtained from


Figure 1: $M$ is obtained from $S^{3}$ by the surgery along $L^{\prime}$, and $L=L_{1} \cup L_{2} .(I, J)=(\{1\},\{2\}) . M^{*}$ is obtained from $M$ by doing the surgery along $L_{1}$, hence is obtained from $S^{3}$ by doing the surgery along $L^{\prime} \cup L_{1}$; and $L^{*}=L_{1}^{*} \cup L_{2}$.
$L$ by replacing $L_{I}$ by $L_{I}^{*}$, ie., $M^{*}=M_{L_{I}}$ and $L^{*}=L_{I}^{*} \cup L_{J}$. The change of pair operation $T_{\left(L_{I} ; L_{I}^{*}\right)}$ is defined by sending $(M, L)$ to $\left(M^{*}, L^{*}\right)$. See Figure 1 .

By the way it is chosen, the core curve of each $L_{i}^{*}$ intersects the parallel copy of $L_{i}$ once, hence in $M^{*}$ the core curve of each $L_{i}^{*}$ is isotopic to the core of the filled in solid torus of the surgery along $L_{i}$. As a consequence, we have

Proposition 1.3. If $\left(M^{*}, L^{*}\right)$ is obtained form $(M, L)$ be doing a change of pair operation, then $M^{*} \backslash L^{*}$ is homeomorphic to $M \backslash L$.

Conversely, if $\left(M^{*}, L^{*}\right)$ is a pair such that $M^{*} \backslash L^{*}$ is homeomorphic to $M \backslash L$, then $M^{*}$ is obtained from $M$ by doing a rational Dehn-surgery along some components $L_{I}$ of $L$. By e.g. [35, p. 273], $M^{*}$ can be obtained from $M$ by doing an integral surgery along a framed link $L^{\prime}$ obtained from $L_{I}$ by iteratively linking in framed unknots, corresponding to doing a sequence of the change of pair operations. As a consequence, we have

Proposition 1.4. Every two pairs $(M, L)$ and $\left(M^{*}, L^{*}\right)$ such that $M \backslash L$ is homeomorphic to $M^{*} \backslash L^{*}$ are related by a sequence of the change of pairs operations.

### 1.3 Relationship with discrete Fourier transform

In the computation of the relative Reshetikhin-Turaev invariants, the change of pair operation corresponds to replacing the coloring $\mathbf{m}_{I}$ on $L_{I}$ by the Kirby colorings $\Omega_{r}$ and cabling $L_{I}^{*}$ by the Chebyshev polynomials corresponding to the new coloring $\mathbf{n}_{I}$, sending $\mathrm{RT}_{r}(M, L, \mathbf{m})$ to $\mathrm{RT}_{r}\left(M^{*}, L^{*},\left(\mathbf{n}_{I}, \mathbf{m}_{J}\right)\right)$, where $\mathbf{m}_{J}$ is the coloring on $L_{J}$. See Section 2.1 for a review of the relative Reshetikhin-Turaev invariants and Figure 2 for an example.

These operations pictorially represent the discrete Fourier transforms. See [1] for the original definition and [2] for an exposition in the language of skein theory. To be more precise, let $\mathrm{I}_{r}=\{1,2, \ldots, r-$ $2\}$ and $\mu_{r}=\frac{\sqrt{2} \sin \frac{\pi}{r}}{\sqrt{r}}$ in the $S U(2)$ theory and at $q=e^{\frac{\pi \sqrt{ }-1}{r}}$, and let $\mathrm{I}_{r}=\{0,2, \ldots, r-3\}$ and $\mu_{r}=\frac{2 \sin \frac{2 \pi}{r}}{\sqrt{r}}$ in the $S O(3)$ theory and at $q=e^{\frac{2 \pi \sqrt{-1}}{r}}$. Let

$$
f: I_{r}^{n} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}
$$


$\operatorname{RT}_{\mathrm{r}}\left(\mathrm{M}, \mathrm{L},\left(\mathrm{m}_{1}, \mathrm{~m}_{2}\right)\right)$

$\mathrm{RT}_{\mathrm{r}}\left(\mathrm{M}^{*}, \mathrm{~L}^{*},\left(\mathrm{n}_{1}, \mathrm{~m}_{2}\right)\right)$

Figure 2: For the computation of $\operatorname{RT}_{r}\left(M, L,\left(m_{1}, m_{2}\right)\right)$ on the left, $L^{\prime}$ is cabled by the Kirby coloring $\Omega_{r}$ and $L_{1}$ and $L_{2}$ are respectively cabled by the Chebyshev polynomials $e_{m_{1}}$ and $e_{m_{2}}$. For $\operatorname{RT}_{r}\left(M^{*}, L^{*},\left(n_{1}, m_{2}\right)\right)$ on the right, $L^{\prime}$ and $L_{1}$ are cabled by $\Omega_{r}, L_{1}^{*}$ is cabled by $e_{n_{1}}$ and $L_{2}$ is cabled by $e_{m_{2}}$. The framings are omitted in the Figure.
be a complex valued function on $\mathrm{I}_{r}^{n}$ for some positive integer $n$. Let $(I, J)$ be a partition of $\{1, \ldots, n\}$ and let $\mathbf{n}_{I}=\left(n_{i}\right)_{i \in I}$ be a $|I|$-tuple of elements of $\mathrm{I}_{r}$. Then the $\mathbf{n}_{I}$-th partial discrete Fourier coefficient of $f$ is the function

$$
\widehat{f}\left(\mathbf{n}_{I}\right): \mathrm{I}_{r}^{J} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}
$$

defined for all $\mathbf{m}_{J}$ in $\mathrm{I}_{r}^{J}$ by

$$
\widehat{f}\left(\mathbf{n}_{I}\right)\left(\mathbf{m}_{J}\right)=\mu_{r}^{|I|} \sum_{\mathbf{m}_{I}} \prod_{i \in I} \mathrm{H}\left(m_{i}, n_{i}\right) f\left(\mathbf{m}_{I}, \mathbf{m}_{J}\right),
$$

where the sum is over all $|I|$-tuples $\mathbf{m}_{I}=\left(m_{i}\right)_{i \in I}$ of elements of $\mathrm{I}_{r}$, and

$$
\mathrm{H}(m, n)=(-1)^{m+n} \frac{q^{(m+1)(n+1)}-q^{-(m+1)(n+1)}}{q-q^{-1}} .
$$

Since the coefficients $\mathrm{H}\left(m_{i}, n_{i}\right)$ above are exactly the coefficients of the following skein-theoretical computation

$$
\left\langle<\frac{Q^{\Omega_{\mathrm{r}}}}{\mathrm{n}} \mathrm{n}\right\rangle=\mu_{r} \sum_{m \in \mathrm{I}_{r}} \mathrm{H}(m, n)\langle\mid \mathrm{m}\rangle,
$$

the relative Reshetikhin-Turaev invariants $\operatorname{RT}_{r}\left(M^{*}, L^{*},\left(\mathbf{n}_{I}, \mathbf{m}_{J}\right)\right)$ of the pair $\left(M^{*}, L^{*}\right)$ obtained from ( $M, L$ ) by a change of pair operation $T_{\left(L_{I} ; L_{I}^{*}\right)}$ is up to scalar the value at $\mathbf{m}_{J}$ of the $\mathbf{n}_{I}$-th partial discrete Fourier coefficient of the function $\mathrm{RT}_{r}\left(M, L,,_{-}\right): \mathrm{I}_{r}^{n} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$. The scalar is a power of $q$ depending on the framings of $L_{I}^{*}$.

It is proved in [12, 4] that Turaev-Viro invariant of the complement $M \backslash L$ can be computed by the relative Reshetikhin-Turaev invariants of the pair $(M, L)$.
Proposition 1.5 ([[12, 4]).

$$
\mathrm{TV}_{r}(M \backslash L)=c \sum_{\mathbf{m}}\left|\mathrm{RT}_{r}(M, L, \mathbf{m})\right|^{2},
$$

where the sum is over all multi-elements $\mathbf{m}$ of $\mathrm{I}_{r}$, and the constant c equals 1 in the $\operatorname{SU}(2)$ theory and equals $2^{\text {rank } H_{2}\left(M \backslash L, \mathbb{Z}_{2}\right)}$ in the $S O(3)$ theory.

By Proposition 1.3, if $\left(M^{*}, L^{*}\right)$ and $(M, L)$ differ by a change of pair operation, then $M \backslash L$ and $M^{*} \backslash L^{*}$ are homeomorphic to each other. As a consequence, we have

## Proposition 1.6.

$$
\sum_{\mathbf{m}}\left|\mathrm{RT}_{r}(M, L, \mathbf{m})\right|^{2}=\sum_{\mathbf{n}}\left|\mathrm{RT}_{r}\left(M^{*}, L^{*}, \mathbf{n}\right)\right|^{2},
$$

where the sums are over all multi-elements $\mathbf{m}$ and $\mathbf{n}$ of $\mathrm{I}_{r}$.
Propositions $1.3,1.4,1.5$ and 1.6 together provide infinitely many different ways to compute the Turaev-Viro invariants of $M \backslash L$, all of which are up to scalar related by a sequence of partial discrete Fourier transforms. It is hopeful that among these different expressions, some are suitable for the purpose of solving the Volume Conjecture for the Turaev-Viro invariants.

Finally, as a special case, let $f=\mathrm{RT}_{r}\left(M, L,,^{\prime}\right): \mathrm{I}_{r}^{n} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ for a pair $(M, L)$, and suppose that $I=\{1, \ldots, n\}$ and all the framings of $L_{I}^{*}$ are zero and $\left(M^{*}, L^{*}\right)$ is obtained from $(M, L)$ by $T_{\left(L_{I}, L_{I}^{*}\right)}$. Then $\mathrm{RT}_{r}\left(M^{*}, L^{*}, \mathbf{n}\right)=\widehat{f}(\mathbf{n})$ is the $\mathbf{n}$-th (full) discrete Fourier coefficient of $f$. As a consequence of Proposition 1.6, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{\mathbf{m}}|f(\mathbf{m})|^{2}=\sum_{\mathbf{n}}|\widehat{f}(\mathbf{n})|^{2}, \tag{1.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\mathbf{m}$ and $\mathbf{n}$ are over all multi-elements of $\mathrm{I}_{r}$. This could be considered as a Poisson Summation Formula for the discrete Fourier transforms. (See also [2] for an asymptotic version of the Poisson Summation Formula in the setting of Yokota invariants for colored planar graphs.)

### 1.4 Outline of the proof

We follow the guideline of Ohtsuki's method. In Proposition 3.5, we compute the relative ReshetikhinTuraev invariants of $(M, L)$ writing them as a sum of values of a holomorphic function $f_{r}$ at integer points. The function $f_{r}$ comes from Faddeev's quantum dilogarithm function. Using Poisson Summation Formula, we in Proposition 3.7 write the invariants as a sum of the Fourier coefficients of $f_{r}$ computed in Propositions 3.6. In Proposition 5.2 we show that the critical value of the functions in the leading Fourier coefficients has real part the volume and imaginary part the Chern-Simons invariant. The key observation there is a relationship between the asymptotics of quantum $6 j$-symbols and the NeumannZagier potential function (Proposition 4.1), which is of interest in its own right. Then we estimate the leading Fourier coefficients in Sections 5.3 using the Saddle Point Method (Proposition 5.1). Finally, we estimate the non-leading Fourier coefficients and the error term respectively in Sections 5.4 and 5.5 showing that they are neglectable, and prove Theorem 3.1 in Section 5.6 .
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## 2 Preliminaries

### 2.1 Relative Reshetikhin-Turaev invariants

In this article we will follow the skein theoretical approach of the Reshetikhin-Turaev invariants [5, 23] and focus on the $S O(3)$-theory and the values at the root of unity $q=e^{\frac{2 \pi \sqrt{-1}}{r}}$ for odd integers $r \geqslant 3$.

A framed link in an oriented 3-manifold $M$ is a smooth embedding $L$ of a disjoint union of finitely many thickened circles $\mathrm{S}^{1} \times[0, \epsilon]$, for some $\epsilon>0$, into $M$. The Kauffman bracket skein module $\mathrm{K}_{r}(M)$ of $M$ is the $\mathbb{C}$-module generated by the isotopic classes of framed links in $M$ modulo the follow two relations:
(1) Kauffman Bracket Skein Relation:

(2) Framing Relation: $L \cup \bigcirc=\left(-e^{\frac{2 \pi \sqrt{-1}}{r}}-e^{-\frac{2 \pi \sqrt{-1}}{r}}\right) L$.

There is a canonical isomorphism

$$
\left\rangle: \mathrm{K}_{r}\left(\mathrm{~S}^{3}\right) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}\right.
$$

defined by sending the empty link to 1 . The image $\langle L\rangle$ of the framed link $L$ is called the Kauffman bracket of $L$.

Let $\mathrm{K}_{r}(A \times[0,1])$ be the Kauffman bracket skein module of the product of an annulus $A$ with a closed interval. For any link diagram $D$ in $\mathbb{R}^{2}$ with $k$ ordered components and $b_{1}, \ldots, b_{k} \in \mathrm{~K}_{r}(A \times[0,1])$, let

$$
\left\langle b_{1}, \ldots, b_{k}\right\rangle_{D}
$$

be the complex number obtained by cabling $b_{1}, \ldots, b_{k}$ along the components of $D$ considered as a element of $K_{r}\left(\mathrm{~S}^{3}\right)$ then taking the Kauffman bracket $\rangle$.

On $\mathrm{K}_{r}(A \times[0,1])$ there is a commutative multiplication induced by the juxtaposition of annuli, making it a $\mathbb{C}$-algebra; and as a $\mathbb{C}$-algebra $\mathrm{K}_{r}(A \times[0,1]) \cong \mathbb{C}[z]$, where $z$ is the core curve of $A$. For an integer $n \geqslant 0$, let $e_{n}(z)$ be the $n$-th Chebyshev polynomial defined recursively by $e_{0}(z)=1, e_{1}(z)=z$ and $e_{n}(z)=z e_{n-1}(z)-e_{n-2}(z)$. Let $\mathrm{I}_{r}=\{0,2, \ldots, r-3\}$ be the set of even integers in between 0 and $r-2$. Then the Kirby coloring $\Omega_{r} \in \mathrm{~K}_{r}(A \times[0,1])$ is defined by

$$
\Omega_{r}=\mu_{r} \sum_{n \in \mathrm{I}_{r}}[n+1] e_{n},
$$

where

$$
\mu_{r}=\frac{2 \sin \frac{2 \pi}{r}}{\sqrt{r}}
$$

and $[n]$ is the quantum integer defined by

$$
[n]=\frac{e^{\frac{2 n \pi \sqrt{ }-1}{r}}-e^{-\frac{2 n \pi \sqrt{-1}}{r}}}{e^{\frac{2 \pi \sqrt{ }-1}{r}}-e^{-\frac{2 \pi \sqrt{-1}}{r}}} .
$$

Let $M$ be a closed oriented 3-manifold and let $L$ be a framed link in $M$ with $n$ components. Suppose $M$ is obtained from $S^{3}$ by doing a surgery along a framed link $L^{\prime}, D\left(L^{\prime}\right)$ is a standard diagram of $L^{\prime}$ (ie, the blackboard framing of $D\left(L^{\prime}\right)$ coincides with the framing of $\left.L^{\prime}\right)$. Then $L$ adds extra components to $D\left(L^{\prime}\right)$ forming a linking diagram $D\left(L \cup L^{\prime}\right)$ with $D(L)$ and $D\left(L^{\prime}\right)$ linking in possibly a complicated way. Let $U_{+}$be the diagram of the unknot with framing $1, \sigma\left(L^{\prime}\right)$ be the signature of the linking matrix of $L^{\prime}$ and $\mathbf{m}=\left(m_{1}, \ldots, m_{n}\right)$ be a multi-elements of $I_{r}$. Then the $r$-th relative Reshetikhin-Turaev invariant of $M$ with $L$ colored by $\mathbf{m}$ is defined as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{RT}_{r}(M, L, \mathbf{m})=\mu_{r}\left\langle e_{m_{1}}, \ldots, e_{m_{n}}, \Omega_{r}, \ldots, \Omega_{r}\right\rangle_{D\left(L \cup L^{\prime}\right)}\left\langle\Omega_{r}\right\rangle_{U_{+}}^{-\sigma\left(L^{\prime}\right)} \tag{2.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Note that if $L=\emptyset$ or $m_{1}=\cdots=m_{n}=0$, then $\mathrm{RT}_{r}(M, L, \mathbf{m})=\mathrm{RT}_{r}(M)$, the $r$-th ReshetikhinTuraev invariant of $M$; and if $M=S^{3}$, then $\mathrm{RT}_{r}(M, L, \mathbf{m})=\mu_{r} \mathrm{~J}_{\mathbf{m}, L}\left(q^{2}\right)$, the value of the $\mathbf{m}$-th unnormalized colored Jones polynomial of $L$ at $t=q^{2}$.

### 2.2 Hyperbolic cone manifolds

According to [7], a 3-dimensional hyperbolic cone-manifold is a 3-manifold $M$, which can be triangulated so that the link of each simplex is piecewise linear homeomorphic to a standard sphere and $M$ is equipped with a complete path metric such that the restriction of the metric to each simplex is isometric to a hyperbolic geodesic simplex. The singular locus $L$ of a cone-manifold $M$ consists of the points with no neighborhood isometric to a ball in a Riemannian manifold. It follows that
(1) $L$ is a link in $M$ such that each component is a closed geodesic.
(2) At each point of $L$ there is a cone angle $\theta$ which is the sum of dihedral angles of 3 -simplices containing the point.
(3) The restriction of the metric on $M \backslash L$ is a smooth hyperbolic metric, but is incomplete if $L \neq \emptyset$.

Hodgson-Kerckhoff [18] proved that hyperbolic cone metrics on $M$ with singular locus $L$ are locally parametrized by the cone angles provided all the cone angles are less than or equal to $2 \pi$, and Kojima [21] proved that hyperbolic cone manifolds $(M, L)$ are globally rigid provided all the cone angles are less than or equal to $\pi$. It is expected to be globally rigid if all the cone angles are less than or equal to $2 \pi$.

Given a 3 -manifold $N$ with boundary a union of tori $T_{1}, \ldots, T_{n}$, a choice of generators ( $u_{i}, v_{i}$ ) for each $\pi_{1}\left(T_{i}\right)$ and pairs of relatively prime integers $\left(p_{i}, q_{i}\right)$, one can do the $\left(\frac{p_{1}}{q_{1}}, \ldots, \frac{p_{k}}{q_{k}}\right)$-Dehn filling on $N$ by attaching a solid torus to each $T_{i}$ so that $p_{i} u_{i}+q_{i} v_{i}$ bounds a disk. If $\mathrm{H}\left(u_{i}\right)$ and $\mathrm{H}\left(v_{i}\right)$ are respectively the logarithmic holonomy for $u_{i}$ and $v_{i}$, then a solution to

$$
\begin{equation*}
p_{i} \mathrm{H}\left(u_{i}\right)+q_{i} \mathrm{H}\left(v_{i}\right)=\sqrt{-1} \theta_{i} \tag{2.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

near the complete structure gives a cone-manifold structure on the resulting manifold $M$ with the cone angle $\theta_{i}$ along the core curve $L_{i}$ of the solid torus attached to $T_{i}$; it is a smooth structure if $\theta_{1}=\cdots=$ $\theta_{n}=2 \pi$.

In this setting, the Chern-Simons invariant for a hyperbolic cone manifold ( $M, L$ ) can be defined by using the Neumann-Zagier potential function [28]. To do this, we need a framing on each component, namely, a choice of a curve $\gamma_{i}$ on $T_{i}$ that is isotopic to the core curve $L_{i}$ of the solid torus attached to $T_{i}$. We choose the orientation of $\gamma_{i}$ so that $\left(p_{i} u_{i}+q_{i} v_{i}\right) \cdot \gamma_{i}=1$. Then we consider the following function

$$
\frac{\Phi\left(\mathrm{H}\left(u_{1}\right), \ldots, \mathrm{H}\left(u_{n}\right)\right)}{\sqrt{-1}}-\sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\mathrm{H}\left(u_{i}\right) \mathrm{H}\left(v_{i}\right)}{4 \sqrt{-1}}+\sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\theta_{i} \mathrm{H}\left(\gamma_{i}\right)}{4},
$$

where $\Phi$ is the Neumann-Zagier potential function (see [28]) defined on the deformation space of hyperbolic structures on $M \backslash L$ parametrized by the holonomy of the meridians $\left\{\mathrm{H}\left(u_{i}\right)\right\}$, characterized by

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{l}
\frac{\partial \Phi\left(\mathrm{H}\left(u_{1}\right), \ldots, \mathrm{H}\left(u_{n}\right)\right)}{\partial \mathrm{H}\left(u_{i}\right)}=\frac{\mathrm{H}\left(v_{i}\right)}{2},  \tag{2.3}\\
\Phi(0, \ldots, 0)=\sqrt{-1}(\operatorname{Vol}(M \backslash L)+\sqrt{-1} \mathrm{CS}(M \backslash L)) \quad \bmod \pi^{2} \mathbb{Z}
\end{array}\right.
$$

where $M \backslash L$ is with the complete hyperbolic metric. Another important feature of $\Phi$ is that it is even in each of its variables $\mathrm{H}\left(u_{i}\right)$.

Following the argument in [28, Sections $4 \& 5$ ], one can prove that if the cone angles of components of $L$ are $\theta_{1}, \ldots, \theta_{n}$, then

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{Vol}\left(M_{L_{\theta}}\right)=\operatorname{Re}\left(\frac{\Phi\left(\mathrm{H}\left(u_{1}\right), \ldots, \mathrm{H}\left(u_{n}\right)\right)}{\sqrt{-1}}-\sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\mathrm{H}\left(u_{i}\right) \mathrm{H}\left(v_{i}\right)}{4 \sqrt{-1}}+\sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\theta_{i} \mathrm{H}\left(\gamma_{i}\right)}{4}\right) . \tag{2.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Indeed, in this case, one can replace the $2 \pi$ in Equations (33) (34) and (35) of [28] by $\theta_{i}$, and as a consequence can replace the $\frac{\pi}{2}$ in Equations (45), (46) and (48) by $\frac{\theta_{i}}{4}$, proving the result.

In [46], Yoshida proved that when $\theta_{1}=\cdots=\theta_{n}=2 \pi$,
$\operatorname{Vol}(M)+\sqrt{-1} \operatorname{CS}(M)=\frac{\Phi\left(\mathrm{H}\left(u_{1}\right), \ldots, \mathrm{H}\left(u_{n}\right)\right)}{\sqrt{-1}}-\sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\mathrm{H}\left(u_{i}\right) \mathrm{H}\left(v_{i}\right)}{4 \sqrt{-1}}+\sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\theta_{i} \mathrm{H}\left(\gamma_{i}\right)}{4} \quad \bmod \sqrt{-1} \pi^{2} \mathbb{Z}$.
Therefore, we can make the following
Definition 2.1. The Chern-Simons invariant of a hyperbolic cone manifold $M_{L_{\theta}}$ with a choice of the framing $\left(\gamma_{1}, \ldots, \gamma_{n}\right)$ is defined as

$$
\mathrm{CS}\left(M_{L_{\theta}}\right)=\operatorname{Im}\left(\frac{\Phi\left(\mathrm{H}\left(u_{1}\right), \ldots, \mathrm{H}\left(u_{n}\right)\right)}{\sqrt{-1}}-\sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\mathrm{H}\left(u_{i}\right) \mathrm{H}\left(v_{i}\right)}{4 \sqrt{-1}}+\sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\theta_{i} \mathrm{H}\left(\gamma_{i}\right)}{4}\right) \quad \bmod \pi^{2} \mathbb{Z} .
$$

Then together with (2.4), we have
$\operatorname{Vol}\left(M_{L_{\theta}}\right)+\sqrt{-1} \operatorname{CS}\left(M_{L_{\theta}}\right)=\frac{\Phi\left(\mathrm{H}\left(u_{1}\right), \ldots, \mathrm{H}\left(u_{n}\right)\right)}{\sqrt{-1}}-\sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\mathrm{H}\left(u_{i}\right) \mathrm{H}\left(v_{i}\right)}{4 \sqrt{-1}}+\sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\theta_{i} \mathrm{H}\left(\gamma_{i}\right)}{4} \quad \bmod \sqrt{-1} \pi^{2} \mathbb{Z}$.

Remark 2.2. It is an interesting question to find a direct geometric definition of the Chern-Simons invariants for hyperbolic cone manifolds.

### 2.3 Quantum 6j-symbols

A triple $\left(m_{1}, m_{2}, m_{3}\right)$ of even integers in $\{0,2, \ldots, r-3\}$ is $r$-admissible if
(1) $m_{i}+m_{j}-m_{k} \geqslant 0$ for $\{i, j, k\}=\{1,2,3\}$,
(2) $m_{1}+m_{2}+m_{3} \leqslant 2(r-2)$.

For an $r$-admissible triple $\left(m_{1}, m_{2}, m_{3}\right)$, define

$$
\Delta\left(m_{1}, m_{2}, m_{3}\right)=\sqrt{\frac{\left[\frac{m_{1}+m_{2}-m_{3}}{2}\right]!\left[\frac{m_{2}+m_{3}-m_{1}}{2}\right]!\left[\frac{m_{3}+m_{1}-m_{2}}{2}\right]!}{\left[\frac{m_{1}+m_{2}+m_{3}}{2}+1\right]!}}
$$

with the convention that $\sqrt{x}=\sqrt{|x|} \sqrt{-1}$ when the real number $x$ is negative.
A 6-tuple $\left(m_{1}, \ldots, m_{6}\right)$ is $r$-admissible if the triples $\left(m_{1}, m_{2}, m_{3}\right),\left(m_{1}, m_{5}, m_{6}\right),\left(m_{2}, m_{4}, m_{6}\right)$ and $\left(m_{3}, m_{4}, m_{5}\right)$ are $r$-admissible

Definition 2.3. The quantum $6 j$-symbol of an $r$-admissible 6 -tuple $\left(m_{1}, \ldots, m_{6}\right)$ is

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left|\begin{array}{lll}
m_{1} & m_{2} & m_{3} \\
m_{4} & m_{5} & m_{6}
\end{array}\right|= & =\sqrt{-1}-\sum_{i=1}^{6} m_{i} \Delta\left(m_{1}, m_{2}, m_{3}\right) \Delta\left(m_{1}, m_{5}, m_{6}\right) \Delta\left(m_{2}, m_{4}, m_{6}\right) \Delta\left(m_{3}, m_{4}, m_{5}\right) \\
& { }^{\min \left\{Q_{1}, Q_{2}, Q_{3}\right\}} \\
& k=\frac{(-1)^{k}[k+1]!}{} \sum^{k}\left\{\begin{array}{l}
\text { axx }\left\{T_{1}, T_{2}, T_{3}, T_{4}\right\}
\end{array}\right]\left[k-T_{1}\right]!\left[k-T_{2}\right]!\left[k-T_{3}\right]!\left[k-T_{4}\right]!\left[Q_{1}-k\right]!\left[Q_{2}-k\right]!\left[Q_{3}-k\right]!
\end{aligned},
$$

where $T_{1}=\frac{m_{1}+m_{2}+m_{3}}{2}, T_{2}=\frac{m_{1}+m_{5}+m_{6}}{2}, T_{3}=\frac{m_{2}+m_{4}+m_{6}}{2}$ and $T_{4}=\frac{m_{3}+m_{4}+m_{5}}{2}, Q_{1}=\frac{m_{1}+m_{2}+m_{4}+m_{5}}{2}$, $Q_{2}=\frac{m_{1}+m_{3}+m_{4}{ }^{2}+m_{6}}{2}$ and $Q_{3}=\frac{m_{2}{ }^{2}+m_{3}+m_{5}+m_{6}}{2}$.

Here we recall a classical result of Costantino [8] which was originally stated at the root of unity $q=e^{\frac{\pi \sqrt{ }-1}{r}}$. At the root of unity $q=e^{\frac{2 \pi \sqrt{ }-1}{r}}$, see [4] Appendix] for a detailed proof.

Theorem $2.4([8])$. Let $\left\{\left(m_{1}^{(r)}, \ldots, m_{6}^{(r)}\right)\right\}$ be a sequence of $r$-admissible 6 -tuples, and let

$$
\theta_{i}=\left|\pi-\lim _{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{2 \pi m_{i}^{(r)}}{r}\right| .
$$

If $\theta_{1}, \ldots, \theta_{6}$ are the dihedral angles of a truncated hyperideal tetrahedron $\Delta$, then as $r$ varies over all the odd integers

$$
\lim _{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{2 \pi}{r} \log \left|\begin{array}{lll}
m_{1}^{(r)} & m_{2}^{(r)} & m_{3}^{(r)} \\
m_{4}^{(r)} & m_{5}^{(r)} & m_{6}^{(r)}
\end{array}\right|_{q=e^{\frac{2 \pi \sqrt{ }-1}{r}}}=\operatorname{Vol}(\Delta)
$$

Closely related, a triple $\left(\alpha_{1}, \alpha_{2}, \alpha_{3}\right) \in[0,2 \pi]^{3}$ is admissible if
(1) $\alpha_{i}+\alpha_{j}-\alpha_{k} \geqslant 0$ for $\{i, j, k\}=\{1,2,3\}$,
(2) $\alpha_{i}+\alpha_{j}+\alpha_{k} \leqslant 4 \pi$.

A 6 -tuple $\left(\alpha_{1}, \ldots, \alpha_{6}\right) \in[0,2 \pi]^{6}$ is admissible if the triples $\{1,2,3\},\{1,5,6\},\{2,4,6\}$ and $\{3,4,5\}$ are admissible.

### 2.4 Fundamental shadow links

In this section we recall the construction and basic properties of the fundamental shadow links. The building blocks for the fundamental shadow links are truncated tetrahedra as in the left of Figure 3 . If we take $c$ building blocks $\Delta_{1}, \ldots, \Delta_{c}$ and glue them together along the triangles of truncation, we obtain a (possibly non-orientable) handlebody of genus $c+1$ with a link in its boundary consisting of the edges of the building blocks, such as in the right of Figure 3. By taking the orientable double (the orientable double covering with the boundary quotient out by the deck involution) of this handlebody, we obtain a link $L_{\mathrm{FSL}}$ inside $M_{c}=\#^{c+1}\left(S^{2} \times S^{1}\right)$. We call a link obtained this way a fundamental shadow link, and its complement in $M_{c}$ a fundamental shadow link complement.


Figure 3: The handlebody on the right is obtained from the truncated tetrahedron on the left by identifying the triangles on the top and the bottom by a horizontal reflection and the triangles on the left and the right by a vertical reflection.

The fundamental importance of the family of the fundamental shadow links is the following.
Theorem 2.5 ([10]). Any compact oriented 3 -manifold with toroidal or empty boundary can be obtained from a suitable fundamental shadow link complement by doing an integral Dehn-filling to some of the boundary components.

A hyperbolic cone metric on $M_{c}$ with singular locus $L_{\mathrm{FSL}}$ and with sufficiently small cone angles $\theta_{1}, \ldots, \theta_{n}$ can be constructed as follows. For each $s \in\{1, \ldots, c\}$, let $e_{s_{1}}, \ldots, e_{s_{6}}$ be the edges of the building block $\Delta_{s}$, and $\theta_{s_{j}}$ be the cone angle of the component of $L$ containing $e_{s_{j}}$. If $\theta_{i}$ 's are sufficiently small, then $\left\{\frac{\theta_{s_{1}}}{2}, \ldots, \frac{\theta_{s_{6}}}{2}\right\}$ for the set of dihedral angles of a truncated hyperideal tetrahedron, by abuse of notation still denoted by $\Delta_{s}$. Then the hyperbolic cone manifold $M_{c}$ with singular locus $L_{\mathrm{FSL}}$ and cone angles $\theta_{1}, \ldots, \theta_{n}$ is obtained by glueing $\Delta_{s}$ 's together along isometries of the triangles of truncation, and taking the double. In this metric, the logarithmic holonomy of the meridian $u_{i}$ of the tubular neighborhood $N\left(L_{i}\right)$ of $L_{i}$ satisfies

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{H}\left(u_{i}\right)=\sqrt{-1} \theta_{i} . \tag{2.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Let $l_{i}$ be the length of the closed geodesic $L_{i}$. Since the manifold comes from taking double, we can choose a longitude $v_{i}$ on the boundary of $N\left(L_{i}\right)$ with $u_{i} \cdot v_{i}=1$ and with the logarithmic holomony satisfying

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{H}\left(v_{i}\right)=-l_{i} . \tag{2.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

In this way, a framing on $L_{i}$ gives an integer $p_{i}$ in the way that the parallel copy of $L_{i}$ on $N\left(L_{i}\right)$ is isotopic to the curve representing $p_{i} u_{i}+v_{i}$.

Proposition 2.6 ([8, 9$])$. If $L_{F S L}=L_{1} \cup \cdots \cup L_{n} \subset M_{c}$ is a framed fundamental shadow link with framing $p_{i}$ on $L_{i}$, and $\mathbf{m}=\left(m_{1}, \ldots, m_{n}\right)$ is a coloring of its components with even integers in $\{0,2, \ldots, r-3\}$, then

$$
\operatorname{RT}_{\mathrm{r}}\left(M_{c}, L_{F S L}, \mathbf{m}\right)=\left(\frac{2 \sin \frac{2 \pi}{r}}{\sqrt{r}}\right)^{-c} \prod_{i=1}^{n} q^{\frac{p_{i} m_{i}\left(m_{i}+2\right)}{2}} \prod_{s=1}^{c}\left|\begin{array}{lll}
m_{s_{1}} & m_{s_{2}} & m_{s_{3}} \\
m_{s_{4}} & m_{s_{5}} & m_{s_{6}}
\end{array}\right|
$$

where $m_{s_{1}}, \ldots, m_{s_{6}}$ are the colors of the edges of the building block $\Delta_{s}$ inherited from the color $\mathbf{m}$ on $L_{F S L}$.

Together with Theorem 2.4 and the construction of the hyperbolic cone structure, we see that Conjecture 1.1 is true for ( $M_{c}, L_{\mathrm{FSL}}$ ) with sufficiently small cone angles. This was first proved by Costantino in [8] at the root of unity $q=e^{\frac{\pi \sqrt{-1}}{r}}$.

### 2.5 Dilogarithm and quantum dilogarithm functions

Let $\log : \mathbb{C} \backslash(-\infty, 0] \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be the standard logarithm function defined by

$$
\log z=\log |z|+\sqrt{-1} \arg z
$$

with $-\pi<\arg z<\pi$.
The dilogarithm function $\mathrm{Li}_{2}: \mathbb{C} \backslash(1, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is defined by

$$
\operatorname{Li}_{2}(z)=-\int_{0}^{z} \frac{\log (1-u)}{u} d u
$$

where the integral is along any path in $\mathbb{C} \backslash(1, \infty)$ connecting 0 and $z$, which is holomorphic in $\mathbb{C} \backslash[1, \infty)$ and continuous in $\mathbb{C} \backslash(1, \infty)$.

The dilogarithm function satisfies the follow properties (see eg. Zagier [47]).

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{Li}_{2}\left(\frac{1}{z}\right)=-\mathrm{Li}_{2}(z)-\frac{\pi^{2}}{6}-\frac{1}{2}(\log (-z))^{2} \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

(2) In the unit disk $\{z \in \mathbb{C}||z|<1\}$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{Li}_{2}(z)=\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{z^{n}}{n^{2}} \tag{2.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

(3) On the unit circle $\left\{z=e^{2 \sqrt{-1} \theta} \mid 0 \leqslant \theta \leqslant \pi\right\}$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{Li}_{2}\left(e^{2 \sqrt{-1} \theta}\right)=\frac{\pi^{2}}{6}+\theta(\theta-\pi)+2 \sqrt{-1} \Lambda(\theta) \tag{2.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

Here $\Lambda: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is the Lobachevsky function defined by

$$
\Lambda(\theta)=-\int_{0}^{\theta} \log |2 \sin t| d t
$$

which is an odd function of period $\pi$. See eg. Thurston's notes [37, Chapter 7].
The following variant of Faddeev's quantum dilogarithm functions [13, 14] will play a key role in the proof of the main result. Let $r \geqslant 3$ be an odd integer. Then the following contour integral

$$
\begin{equation*}
\varphi_{r}(z)=\frac{4 \pi \sqrt{-1}}{r} \int_{\Omega} \frac{e^{(2 z-\pi) x}}{4 x \sinh (\pi x) \sinh \left(\frac{2 \pi x}{r}\right)} d x \tag{2.11}
\end{equation*}
$$

defines a holomorphic function on the domain

$$
\left\{z \in \mathbb{C} \left\lvert\,-\frac{\pi}{r}<\operatorname{Re} z<\pi+\frac{\pi}{r}\right.\right\},
$$

where the contour is

$$
\Omega=(-\infty,-\epsilon] \cup\{z \in \mathbb{C}| | z \mid=\epsilon, \operatorname{Im} z>0\} \cup[\epsilon, \infty)
$$

for some $\epsilon \in(0,1)$. Note that the integrand has poles at $n \sqrt{-1}, n \in \mathbb{Z}$, and the choice of $\Omega$ is to avoid the pole at 0 .

The function $\varphi_{r}(z)$ satisfies the following fundamental properties, whose proof can be found in [44, Section 2.3].
Lemma 2.7. (1) For $z \in \mathbb{C}$ with $0<\operatorname{Re} z<\pi$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
1-e^{2 \sqrt{-1} z}=e^{\frac{r}{4 \pi \sqrt{-1}}\left(\varphi_{r}\left(z-\frac{\pi}{r}\right)-\varphi_{r}\left(z+\frac{\pi}{r}\right)\right)} . \tag{2.12}
\end{equation*}
$$

(2) For $z \in \mathbb{C}$ with $-\frac{\pi}{r}<\operatorname{Re} z<\frac{\pi}{r}$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
1+e^{r \sqrt{-1} z}=e^{\frac{r}{4 \pi \sqrt{-1}}}\left(\varphi_{r}(z)-\varphi_{r}(z+\pi)\right) . \tag{2.13}
\end{equation*}
$$

Using 2.12 and 2.13, for $z \in \mathbb{C}$ with $\pi+\frac{2(n-1) \pi}{r}<\operatorname{Re} z<\pi+\frac{2 n \pi}{r}$, we can define $\varphi_{r}(z)$ inductively by the relation

$$
\begin{equation*}
\prod_{k=1}^{n}\left(1-e^{2 \sqrt{-1}\left(z-\frac{(2 k-1) \pi}{r}\right)}\right)=e^{\frac{r}{4 \pi \sqrt{-1}}\left(\varphi_{r}\left(z-\frac{2 n \pi}{r}\right)-\varphi_{r}(z)\right)} \tag{2.14}
\end{equation*}
$$

extending $\varphi_{r}(z)$ to a meromorphic function on $\mathbb{C}$. The poles of $\varphi_{r}(z)$ have the form $(a+1) \pi+\frac{b \pi}{r}$ or $-a \pi-\frac{b \pi}{r}$ for all nonnegative integer $a$ and positive odd integer $b$.

Let $q=e^{\frac{2 \pi \sqrt{ }-1}{r}}$, and let

$$
(q)_{n}=\prod_{k=1}^{n}\left(1-q^{2 k}\right)
$$

Lemma 2.8. (1) For $0 \leqslant n \leqslant r-2$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
(q)_{n}=e^{\frac{r}{4 \pi \sqrt{-1}}}\left(\varphi_{r}\left(\frac{\pi}{r}\right)-\varphi_{r}\left(\frac{2 \pi n}{r}+\frac{\pi}{r}\right)\right) . \tag{2.15}
\end{equation*}
$$

(2) For $\frac{r-1}{2} \leqslant n \leqslant r-2$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
(q)_{n}=2 e^{\frac{r}{4 \pi \sqrt{-1}}}\left(\varphi_{r}\left(\frac{\pi}{r}\right)-\varphi_{r}\left(\frac{2 \pi n}{r}+\frac{\pi}{r}-\pi\right)\right) . \tag{2.16}
\end{equation*}
$$

We consider 2.16) because there are poles in $(\pi, 2 \pi)$, and to avoid the poles we move the variables to $(0, \pi)$ by subtracting $\pi$.

Since

$$
\{n\}!=(-1)^{n} q^{-\frac{n(n+1)}{2}}(q)_{n}
$$

as a consequence of Lemma 2.8, we have
Lemma 2.9. (1) For $0 \leqslant n \leqslant r-2$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\{n\}!=e^{\frac{r}{4 \pi \sqrt{-1}}}\left(-2 \pi\left(\frac{2 \pi n}{r}\right)+\left(\frac{2 \pi}{r}\right)^{2}\left(n^{2}+n\right)+\varphi_{r}\left(\frac{\pi}{r}\right)-\varphi_{r}\left(\frac{2 \pi n}{r}+\frac{\pi}{r}\right)\right) . \tag{2.17}
\end{equation*}
$$

(2) For $\frac{r-1}{2} \leqslant n \leqslant r-2$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\{n\}!=2 e^{\frac{r}{4 \pi \sqrt{-1}}}\left(-2 \pi\left(\frac{2 \pi n}{r}\right)+\left(\frac{2 \pi}{r}\right)^{2}\left(n^{2}+n\right)+\varphi_{r}\left(\frac{\pi}{r}\right)-\varphi_{r}\left(\frac{2 \pi n}{r}+\frac{\pi}{r}-\pi\right)\right) . \tag{2.18}
\end{equation*}
$$

The function $\varphi_{r}(z)$ and the dilogarithm function are closely related as follows.
Lemma 2.10. (1) For every $z$ with $0<\operatorname{Re} z<\pi$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\varphi_{r}(z)=\operatorname{Li}_{2}\left(e^{2 \sqrt{-1} z}\right)+\frac{2 \pi^{2} e^{2 \sqrt{-1} z}}{3\left(1-e^{2 \sqrt{-1} z}\right)} \frac{1}{r^{2}}+O\left(\frac{1}{r^{4}}\right) \tag{2.19}
\end{equation*}
$$

(2) For every $z$ with $0<\operatorname{Re} z<\pi$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\varphi_{r}^{\prime}(z)=-2 \sqrt{-1} \log \left(1-e^{2 \sqrt{-1} z}\right)+O\left(\frac{1}{r^{2}}\right) \tag{2.20}
\end{equation*}
$$

(3) [30] Formula (8)(9)]

$$
\varphi_{r}\left(\frac{\pi}{r}\right)=\mathrm{Li}_{2}(1)+\frac{2 \pi \sqrt{-1}}{r} \log \left(\frac{r}{2}\right)-\frac{\pi^{2}}{r}+O\left(\frac{1}{r^{2}}\right) .
$$

## 3 Computation of the relative Reshetikhin-Turaev invariants

The goal of this section is to compute the relative Reshetikhin-Turaev invariants of ( $M, L$ ). In Proposition 3.5, we write the invariants as a sum of values of a fixed holomorphic function at the integer points. The holomorphic function comes from Faddeev's quantum dilogarithm function. Using the Poisson Summation Formula, we in Proposition 3.7 write the invariants as a sum of the Fourier coefficients of the holomorphic function, which is computed in Propositions 3.6.

Let $L_{\mathrm{FSL}}=L_{1} \cup \cdots \cup L_{n}$ be a fundamental shadow link in $M_{c}=\#^{c+1}\left(S^{2} \times S^{1}\right)$, and let $L^{\prime} \subset S^{3}$ be the disjoint union of $c+1$ unknots with the 0 -framings by doing surgery along which we get $M_{c}$. Let $(I, J)$ be a partition of $\{1, \ldots, n\}$, and let $(M, L)$ be the pair obtained from $\left(M_{c}, L_{\mathrm{FSL}}\right)$ by doing a change of pair operation $T_{\left(L_{I} ; L_{I}^{*}\right)}$ as introduced in Section 1.2, ie., $M=\left(M_{c}\right)_{L_{I}}$ and $L=L_{I}^{*} \cup L_{J}$, where $L_{I}^{*}=\cup_{i \in I} L_{i}^{*}$ and $L_{i}^{*}$ is the framed unknot in $M_{c} \backslash L_{\mathrm{FSL}}$ with the core curve isotopic to the meridian of the tubular neighborhood of $L_{i}$. Let $\mathbf{n}_{I}$ be a coloring of $L_{I}^{*}$ and let $\mathbf{m}_{J}$ be a coloring of $L_{J}$. Then Theorem 1.2 can be rephrased as follows.

Theorem 3.1. For $i \in I$, let

$$
\theta_{i}=\left|2 \pi-\lim _{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{4 \pi n_{i}}{r}\right| ;
$$

and for $j \in J$, let

$$
\theta_{j}=\left|2 \pi-\lim _{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{4 \pi m_{j}}{r}\right| .
$$

Let $\theta=\left(\theta_{1}, \ldots, \theta_{n}\right)$ and let $M_{L_{\theta}}$ be the hyperbolic cone manifold consisting of $M$ and a hyperbolic cone metric on $M$ with singular locus $L$ and cone angles $\theta$. Then there exists an $\epsilon>0$ such that if all the cone angles $\theta_{k}$ are less than $\epsilon$, then as $r$ varies over all the odd integers

$$
\lim _{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{4 \pi}{r} \log \operatorname{RT}_{r}\left(M, L,\left(\mathbf{n}_{I}, \mathbf{m}_{J}\right)\right)=\operatorname{Vol}\left(M_{L_{\theta}}\right)+\sqrt{-1} \mathrm{CS}\left(M_{L_{\theta}}\right) \quad \bmod \sqrt{-1} \pi^{2} \mathbb{Z}
$$

The goal of the rest of this paper is to prove Theorem 3.1
Suppose $L_{i}^{*}$ has the framing $q_{i}$ and $L_{i}$ has the framing $p_{i}$ for each $i \in I$, and $L_{j}$ has the framing $p_{j}$ for each $j \in J$. Then the $r$-th relative Reshetikin-Turaev invariant of $M$ with $L$ colored by $\left(\mathbf{n}_{I}, \mathbf{m}_{J}\right)$ can be computed as

$$
\begin{align*}
\operatorname{RT}_{r}\left(M, L,\left(\mathbf{n}_{I}, \mathbf{m}_{J}\right)\right)= & \left(\frac{2 \sin \frac{2 \pi}{r}}{\sqrt{r}}\right)^{|I|-c} e^{-\sigma\left(L^{\prime} \cup L_{I}\right)\left(-\frac{3}{r}-\frac{r+1}{4}\right) \sqrt{-1} \pi} \prod_{i \in I} q^{\frac{q_{i} n_{i}\left(n_{i}+2\right)}{2}} \prod_{j \in J} q^{\frac{p_{j} m_{j}\left(m_{j}+2\right)}{2}} \\
& \sum_{\mathbf{m}_{I}} \prod_{i \in I} q^{\frac{p_{i} m_{i}\left(m_{i}+2\right)}{2}}\left[\left(m_{i}+1\right)\left(n_{i}+1\right)\right] \prod_{s=1}^{c}\left|\begin{array}{lll}
m_{s_{1}} & m_{s_{2}} & m_{s_{3}} \\
m_{s_{4}} & m_{s_{5}} & m_{s_{6}}
\end{array}\right|, \tag{3.1}
\end{align*}
$$

where the sum is over all multi-even integers $\mathbf{m}_{I}=\left(m_{i}\right)_{i \in I}$ in $\{0,2, \ldots, r-3\}$, and $m_{s_{1}}, \ldots, m_{s_{6}}$ are the colors of the edges of the building block $\Delta_{s}$ inherited from the colors on $L_{\mathrm{FSL}}$.

In the rest of this section, we aim to write $\mathrm{RT}_{r}\left(M, L,\left(\mathbf{n}_{I} ; \mathbf{m}_{J}\right)\right)$ into a sum of integrals using the Poisson Summation Formula. This requires writing the invariant into the sum of the values of a fixed holomorphic function. To this end, we look at the a single quantum $6 j$-symbol first.

Definition 3.2. An r-admissible 6-tuple $\left(m_{1}, \ldots, m_{6}\right)$ is of the hyperideal type iffor $\{i, j, k\}=\{1,2,3\}$, $\{1,5,6\},\{2,4,6\}$ and $\{3,4,5\}$,
(1) $0 \leqslant m_{i}+m_{j}-m_{k}<r-2$,
(2) $r-2 \leqslant m_{i}+m_{j}+m_{k} \leqslant 2(r-2)$,

Definition 3.3. A 6-tuple $\left(\alpha_{1}, \ldots, \alpha_{6}\right) \in[0,2 \pi]^{6}$ is of the hyperideal type if for $\{i, j, k\}=\{1,2,3\}$, $\{1,5,6\},\{2,4,6\}$ and $\{3,4,5\}$,
(1) $0 \leqslant \alpha_{i}+\alpha_{j}-\alpha_{k} \leqslant 2 \pi$,
(2) $2 \pi \leqslant \alpha_{i}+\alpha_{j}+\alpha_{k} \leqslant 4 \pi$.

We notice that the six numbers $\left|\alpha_{1}-\pi\right|, \ldots,\left|\alpha_{6}-\pi\right|$ are the dihedral angles of an ideal or a hyperideal tetrahedron if and only if $\left(\alpha_{1}, \ldots, \alpha_{6}\right)$ is of the hyperideal type.

As a consequence of Lemma 2.9 we have

Proposition 3.4. The quantum $6 j$-symbol at the root of unity $q=e^{\frac{2 \pi \sqrt{-1}}{r}}$ can be computed as

$$
\left|\begin{array}{lll}
m_{1} & m_{2} & m_{3} \\
m_{4} & m_{5} & m_{6}
\end{array}\right|=\frac{1}{2\{1\}} \sum_{k=\max \left\{T_{1}, T_{2}, T_{3}, T_{4}\right\}}^{\min \left\{Q_{1}, Q_{2}, Q_{3}, r-2\right\}} e^{\frac{r}{4 \pi \sqrt{-1}} U_{r}\left(\frac{2 \pi m_{1}}{r}, \ldots, \frac{2 \pi m_{6}}{r}, \frac{2 \pi k}{r}\right)},
$$

where $U_{r}$ is defined as follows. If $\left(m_{1}, \ldots, m_{6}\right)$ is of hyperideal type, then

$$
\begin{align*}
U_{r}\left(\alpha_{1}, \ldots, \alpha_{6}, \xi\right)= & \pi^{2}-\left(\frac{2 \pi}{r}\right)^{2}+\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{4} \sum_{j=1}^{3}\left(\eta_{j}-\tau_{i}\right)^{2}-\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{4}\left(\tau_{i}+\frac{2 \pi}{r}-\pi\right)^{2} \\
& +\left(\xi+\frac{2 \pi}{r}-\pi\right)^{2}-\sum_{i=1}^{4}\left(\xi-\tau_{i}\right)^{2}-\sum_{j=1}^{3}\left(\eta_{j}-\xi\right)^{2} \\
& -2 \varphi_{r}\left(\frac{\pi}{r}\right)-\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{4} \sum_{j=1}^{3} \varphi_{r}\left(\eta_{j}-\tau_{i}+\frac{\pi}{r}\right)+\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{4} \varphi_{r}\left(\tau_{i}-\pi+\frac{3 \pi}{r}\right)  \tag{3.2}\\
& -\varphi_{r}\left(\xi-\pi+\frac{3 \pi}{r}\right)+\sum_{i=1}^{4} \varphi_{r}\left(\xi-\tau_{i}+\frac{\pi}{r}\right)+\sum_{j=1}^{3} \varphi_{r}\left(\eta_{j}-\xi+\frac{\pi}{r}\right),
\end{align*}
$$

where $\tau_{1}=\frac{\alpha_{1}+\alpha_{2}+\alpha_{3}}{2}, \tau_{2}=\frac{\alpha_{1}+\alpha_{5}+\alpha_{6}}{2}, \tau_{3}=\frac{\alpha_{2}+\alpha_{4}+\alpha_{6}}{2}$ and $\tau_{4}=\frac{\alpha_{3}+\alpha_{4}+\alpha_{5}}{2}, \eta_{1}=\frac{\alpha_{1}+\alpha_{2}+\alpha_{4}+\alpha_{5}}{2}$, $\eta_{2}=\frac{\alpha_{1}+\alpha_{3}+\alpha_{4}+\alpha_{6}}{2}$ and $\eta_{3}=\frac{\alpha_{2}+\alpha_{3}+\alpha_{5}+\alpha_{6}}{2}$. If $\left(m_{1}, \ldots, m_{6}\right)$ is not of the hyperideal type, then $U_{r}$ will be changed according to Lemma 2.9 .

As a consequence, we have

## Proposition 3.5.

$$
\operatorname{RT}_{r}\left(M, L,\left(\mathbf{n}_{I}, \mathbf{m}_{J}\right)\right)=\kappa_{r} \sum_{\mathbf{m}_{I}, \mathbf{k}}\left(\sum_{\epsilon_{I}} g_{r}^{\epsilon_{I}}\left(\mathbf{m}_{I}, \mathbf{k}\right)\right),
$$

where

$$
\kappa_{r}=\frac{2^{|I|-2 c}}{\{1\}^{c}}\left(\frac{\sin \frac{2 \pi}{r}}{\sqrt{r}}\right)^{|I|-c} e^{\left(-\sigma\left(L^{\prime} \cup L_{I}\right)\left(-\frac{3}{r}-\frac{r+1}{4}\right)-\frac{r}{4}\left(\sum_{i \in I} q_{i}+\sum_{i=1}^{n} p_{i}+2|I|\right)\right) \sqrt{-1} \pi},
$$

$\epsilon_{I}=\left(\epsilon_{i}\right)_{i \in I} \in\{1,-1\}^{I}$ runs over all multi-signs, $\mathbf{m}_{I}=\left(m_{i}\right)_{i \in I}$ runs over all multi-even integers in $\{0,2, \ldots, r-3\}$ so that for each $s \in\{1, \ldots, c\}$ the triples $\left(m_{s_{1}}, m_{s_{2}}, m_{s_{3}}\right),\left(m_{s_{1}}, m_{s_{5}}, m_{s_{6}}\right)$, $\left(m_{s_{2}}, m_{s_{4}}, m_{s_{6}}\right)$ and ( $m_{s_{3}}, m_{s_{4}}, m_{s_{5}}$ ) are r-adminssible, and $\mathbf{k}=\left(k_{1}, \ldots, k_{c}\right)$ runs over all multiintegers with each $k_{s}$ lying in between $\max \left\{T_{s_{i}}\right\}$ and $\min \left\{Q_{s_{j}}, r-2\right\}$, with

$$
g_{r}^{\epsilon_{I}}\left(\mathbf{m}_{I}, \mathbf{k}\right)=e^{\frac{2 \pi \sqrt{-1}}{r}}\left(\sum_{i \in I} q_{i} n_{i}+\sum_{i=1}^{n} p_{i} m_{i}+\sum_{i \in I} \epsilon_{i}\left(m_{i}+n_{i}+1\right)\right)+\frac{r}{4 \pi \sqrt{-1}} \mathcal{W}_{r}^{\epsilon_{I}}\left(\frac{2 \pi \mathbf{m}_{I}}{r}, \frac{2 \pi \mathbf{k}}{r}\right)
$$

where $\frac{2 \pi \mathbf{m}_{I}}{r}=\left(\frac{2 \pi m_{i}}{r}\right)_{i \in I}, \frac{2 \pi \mathbf{k}}{r}=\left(\frac{2 \pi k_{1}}{r}, \ldots, \frac{2 \pi k_{c}}{r}\right)$, and

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{W}_{r}^{\epsilon_{I}}\left(\alpha_{I}, \xi\right)= & -\sum_{i \in I} q_{i}\left(\beta_{i}-\pi\right)^{2}-\sum_{j \in J} p_{j}\left(\alpha_{j}-\pi\right)^{2} \\
& -\sum_{i \in I} p_{i}\left(\alpha_{i}-\pi\right)^{2}-\sum_{i \in I} 2 \epsilon_{i}\left(\alpha_{i}-\pi\right)\left(\beta_{i}-\pi\right)+\sum_{s=1}^{c} U_{r}\left(\alpha_{s_{1}}, \ldots, \alpha_{s_{6}}, \xi_{s}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

with $\beta_{i}=\frac{2 \pi n_{i}}{r}$ for $i \in I$ and $\alpha_{j}=\frac{2 \pi m_{j}}{r}$ for $j \in J$.

Proof. We have

$$
\begin{gathered}
q^{\frac{n(n+2)}{2}}=\left(e^{\frac{\pi \sqrt{-1}}{4}}\right)^{-r} q^{\frac{1}{2}\left(n-\frac{r}{2}\right)^{2}+n} \\
q^{(m+1)(n+1)}=\left(e^{\frac{\pi \sqrt{-1}}{2}}\right)^{-r} q^{\left(m-\frac{r}{2}\right)\left(n-\frac{r}{2}\right)+m+n+1}
\end{gathered}
$$

and

$$
q^{-(m+1)(n+1)}=-\left(e^{\frac{\pi \sqrt{-1}}{2}}\right)^{-r} q^{-\left(m-\frac{r}{2}\right)\left(n-\frac{r}{2}\right)-m-n-1}
$$

Then the result follows from (3.1) and Proposition 3.4.
We notice that the summation in Proposition 3.5 is finite, and to use the Poisson Summation Formula, we need an infinite sum over integral points. To this end, we consider the following regions and a bump function over them.

Let $\beta_{i}=\frac{2 \pi n_{i}}{r}$ for $i \in I, \alpha_{i}=\frac{2 \pi m_{i}}{r}$ for $i=1, \ldots, n, \xi_{s}=\frac{2 \pi k_{s}}{r}$ for $s=1, \ldots, c, \tau_{s_{i}}=\frac{2 \pi T_{s_{i}}}{r}$ for $i=1, \ldots, 4$, and $\eta_{s_{j}}=\frac{2 \pi Q_{s_{j}}}{r}$ for $j=1,2,3$. For a fixed $\left(\alpha_{j}\right)_{j \in J}$, let $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{A}}=\left\{\left(\alpha_{I}, \xi\right) \in \mathbb{R}^{|I|+c} \mid\left(\alpha_{s_{1}}, \ldots, \alpha_{s_{6}}\right)\right.$ is admissible, $\left.\max \left\{\tau_{s_{i}}\right\} \leqslant \xi_{s} \leqslant \min \left\{\eta_{s_{j}}, 2 \pi\right\}, s=1, \ldots, c\right\}$. and let

$$
\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{H}}=\left\{\left(\alpha_{I}, \xi\right) \in \mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{A}} \mid\left(\alpha_{s_{1}}, \ldots, \alpha_{s_{6}}\right) \text { is of the hyperideal type, } s=1, \ldots, c\right\} .
$$

For a sufficiently small $\delta>0$, let

$$
\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{H}}^{\delta}=\left\{\left(\alpha_{I}, \xi\right) \in \mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{H}} \mid d\left(\left(\alpha_{I}, \xi\right), \partial \mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{H}}\right)<\delta\right\},
$$

where $d$ is the Euclidean distance on $\mathbb{R}^{n}$. Let $\psi: \mathbb{R}^{I I \mid+c} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the $C^{\infty}$-smooth bump function supported on $\left(\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{H}}, \mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{H}}^{\delta}\right)$, ie,

$$
\left\{\begin{aligned}
\psi\left(\alpha_{I}, \xi\right)=1, & \left(\alpha_{I}, \xi\right) \in \overline{\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{H}}^{\delta}} \\
0<\psi\left(\alpha_{I}, \xi\right)<1, & \left(\alpha_{I}, \xi\right) \in \mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{H}} \backslash \overline{\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{H}}^{\delta}} \\
\psi\left(\alpha_{I}, \xi\right)=0, & \left(\alpha_{I}, \xi\right) \notin \mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{H}},
\end{aligned}\right.
$$

and let

$$
f_{r}^{\epsilon_{I}}\left(\mathbf{m}_{I}, \mathbf{k}\right)=\psi\left(\frac{2 \pi \mathbf{m}_{I}}{r}, \frac{2 \pi \mathbf{k}}{r}\right) g_{r}^{\epsilon_{I}}\left(\mathbf{m}_{I}, \mathbf{k}\right) .
$$

In Proposition 3.5, $\mathbf{m}_{I}$ runs over multi-even integers. On the other hand, to use the Poisson Summation Formula, we need a sum over all multi-integers. For this purpose, we for each $i \in I$ let $m_{i}=2 m_{i}^{\prime}$ and let $\mathbf{m}_{I}^{\prime}=\left(m_{i}^{\prime}\right)_{i \in I}$. Then by Proposition 3.5 .

$$
\operatorname{RT}_{r}\left(M, L,\left(\mathbf{n}_{I}, \mathbf{m}_{J}\right)\right)=\kappa_{r} \sum_{\left(\mathbf{m}_{I}^{\prime}, \mathbf{k}\right) \in \mathbb{Z}|I|+c}\left(\sum_{\epsilon_{I} \in\{1,-1\}^{I}} f_{r}^{\epsilon_{I}}\left(2 \mathbf{m}_{I}^{\prime}, \mathbf{k}\right)\right)+\text { error term } .
$$

Let

$$
f_{r}=\sum_{\epsilon_{I} \in\{1,-1\}^{I}} f_{r}^{\epsilon_{I}}
$$

Then

$$
\mathrm{RT}_{r}\left(M, L,\left(\mathbf{n}_{I}, \mathbf{m}_{J}\right)\right)=\kappa_{r} \sum_{\left(\mathbf{m}_{I}^{\prime}, \mathbf{k}\right) \in \mathbb{Z}^{I I \mid+c}} f_{r}\left(2 \mathbf{m}_{I}^{\prime}, \mathbf{k}\right)+\text { error term } .
$$

Since $f_{r}$ is $C^{\infty}$-smooth and equals zero out of $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{H}}$, it is in the Schwartz space on $\mathbb{R}^{|I|+c}$. Then by the Poisson Summation Formula (see e.g. [36, Theorem 3.1]),

$$
\sum_{\left(\mathbf{m}_{I}^{\prime}, \mathbf{k}\right) \in \mathbb{Z}|I|+c} f_{r}\left(2 \mathbf{m}_{I}^{\prime}, \mathbf{k}\right)=\sum_{\left(\mathbf{a}_{I}, \mathbf{b}\right) \in \mathbb{Z}|I|+c} \widehat{f}_{r}\left(\mathbf{a}_{I}, \mathbf{b}\right),
$$

where $\mathbf{a}_{I}=\left(a_{i}\right)_{i \in I} \in \mathbb{Z}^{I}, \mathbf{b}=\left(b_{1}, \ldots, b_{c}\right) \in \mathbb{Z}^{c}$ and $\widehat{f}_{r}\left(\mathbf{a}_{I}, \mathbf{b}\right)$ is the ( $\left.\mathbf{a}_{I}, \mathbf{b}\right)$-th Fourier coefficient of $f_{r}$ defined by

$$
\widehat{f}_{r}\left(\mathbf{a}_{I}, \mathbf{b}\right)=\int_{\mathbb{R}^{|I|+c}} f_{r}\left(\mathbf{m}_{I}^{\prime}, \mathbf{k}\right) e^{\sum_{i \in I} 2 \pi \sqrt{-1} a_{i} m_{i}^{\prime}+\sum_{s=1}^{c} 2 \pi \sqrt{-1} b_{s} k_{s}} d \mathbf{m}_{I}^{\prime} d \mathbf{k}
$$

where $d \mathbf{m}_{I}^{\prime} d \mathbf{k}=\prod_{i \in I} d m_{i}^{\prime} \prod_{s=1}^{c} d k_{s}$.
By a change of variable, and by changing $2 m_{i}^{\prime}$ back to $m_{i}$, the Fourier coefficients can be computed as

## Proposition 3.6.

$$
\widehat{f}_{r}\left(\mathbf{a}_{I}, \mathbf{b}\right)=\sum_{\epsilon_{I} \in\{1,-1\}^{I}} \widehat{f_{r}^{\epsilon_{I}}}\left(\mathbf{a}_{I}, \mathbf{b}\right)
$$

with

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \widehat{f_{r}^{\epsilon I}}\left(\mathbf{a}_{I}, \mathbf{b}\right)=\frac{r^{|I|+c}}{2^{2|I|+c} \cdot \pi^{|I|+c}} \int_{\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{H}}} \psi\left(\alpha_{I}, \xi\right) e^{\left(\sum_{i \in I} q_{i} \beta_{i}+\sum_{i=1}^{n} p_{i} \alpha_{i}+\sum_{i \in I} \epsilon_{i}\left(\alpha_{i}+\beta_{i}+\frac{2 \pi}{r}\right)\right) \sqrt{-1}} \\
& \cdot e^{\frac{r}{4 \pi \sqrt{-1}}}\left(\mathcal{W}_{r}^{\epsilon}\left(\alpha_{I}, \xi\right)-\sum_{i \in I} 2 \pi a_{i} \alpha_{i}-\sum_{s=1}^{c} 4 \pi b_{s} \xi_{s}\right) \\
& d \alpha_{I} d \xi,
\end{aligned}
$$

where $d \alpha_{I} d \xi=\prod_{i \in I} d \alpha_{i} \prod_{s=1}^{c} d \xi_{s}$, and

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{W}_{r}^{\epsilon_{I}}\left(\alpha_{I}, \xi\right)= & -\sum_{i \in I} q_{i}\left(\beta_{i}-\pi\right)^{2}-\sum_{j \in J} p_{j}\left(\alpha_{j}-\pi\right)^{2} \\
& -\sum_{i \in I} p_{i}\left(\alpha_{i}-\pi\right)^{2}-\sum_{i \in I} 2 \epsilon_{i}\left(\alpha_{i}-\pi\right)\left(\beta_{i}-\pi\right)+\sum_{s=1}^{c} U_{r}\left(\alpha_{s_{1}}, \ldots, \alpha_{s_{6}}, \xi_{s}\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

## Proposition 3.7.

$$
\operatorname{RT}_{r}\left(M, L,\left(\mathbf{n}_{I}, \mathbf{m}_{J}\right)\right)=\kappa_{r} \sum_{\left(\mathbf{a}_{I}, \mathbf{b}\right) \in \mathbb{Z} I I+c} \widehat{f}_{r}\left(\mathbf{a}_{I}, \mathbf{b}\right)+\text { error term } .
$$

We will estimate the leading Fourier coefficients, the non-leading Fourier coefficients and the error term respectively in Sections 5.3, 5.4 and 5.5, and prove Theorem 3.1 in Section 5.6

## 4 Relationship with the Neumann-Zagier potential function

The goal of this section is to show the relationship between $\mathcal{W}_{r}^{\epsilon_{I}}$ and the Neumann-Zagier potential function [28] of the fundamental shadow link complement $M_{c} \backslash L_{\mathrm{FSL}}$. To this end, we need to first look at the function $U$ coming from a single $6 j$-symbol, and to recall its relationship with the volume of a truncated hyperideal tetrahedron.

By Lemma 2.10, $\mathcal{W}_{r}^{\epsilon_{I}}$ is approximated by the holomorphic function $\mathcal{W}^{\epsilon_{I}}$ defined below, which will play an important role later. (The approximation will be specified in the proof of Proposition 5.5) The function $\mathcal{W}^{\epsilon_{I}}$ is defined by

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{W}^{\epsilon_{I}}\left(\alpha_{I}, \xi\right)= & -\sum_{i \in I} q_{i}\left(\beta_{i}-\pi\right)^{2}-\sum_{j \in J} p_{j}\left(\alpha_{j}-\pi\right)^{2} \\
& -\sum_{i \in I} p_{i}\left(\alpha_{i}-\pi\right)^{2}-\sum_{i \in I} 2 \epsilon_{i}\left(\alpha_{i}-\pi\right)\left(\beta_{i}-\pi\right)+\sum_{s=1}^{c} U\left(\alpha_{s_{1}}, \ldots, \alpha_{s_{6}}, \xi_{s}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

with $U$ defined by

$$
\begin{align*}
U\left(\alpha_{1}, \ldots, \alpha_{6}, \xi\right)= & \pi^{2}+\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{4} \sum_{j=1}^{3}\left(\eta_{j}-\tau_{i}\right)^{2}-\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{4}\left(\tau_{i}-\pi\right)^{2} \\
& +(\xi-\pi)^{2}-\sum_{i=1}^{4}\left(\xi-\tau_{i}\right)^{2}-\sum_{j=1}^{3}\left(\eta_{j}-\xi\right)^{2} \\
& -2 L i_{2}(1)-\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{4} \sum_{j=1}^{3} L i_{2}\left(e^{2 i\left(\eta_{j}-\tau_{i}\right)}\right)+\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{4} L i_{2}\left(e^{2 i\left(\tau_{i}-\pi\right)}\right)  \tag{4.1}\\
& -L i_{2}\left(e^{2 i(\xi-\pi)}\right)+\sum_{i=1}^{4} L i_{2}\left(e^{2 i\left(\xi-\tau_{i}\right)}\right)+\sum_{j=1}^{3} L i_{2}\left(e^{2 i\left(\eta_{j}-\xi\right)}\right)
\end{align*}
$$

We note that $U$ defines a holomorphic function on the region
$\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{H}, \mathbb{C}}=\left\{(\alpha, \xi) \in \mathbb{C}^{7} \mid \operatorname{Re}(\alpha)\right.$ is of the hyperideal type, $\left.\max \left\{\operatorname{Re}\left(\tau_{i}\right)\right\} \leqslant \operatorname{Re}(\xi) \leqslant \min \left\{\operatorname{Re}\left(\eta_{j}\right), 2 \pi\right\}\right\}$ where $\alpha=\left(\alpha_{1}, \ldots, \alpha_{6}\right)$ and $\operatorname{Re}(\alpha)=\left(\operatorname{Re}\left(\alpha_{1}\right), \ldots, \operatorname{Re}\left(\alpha_{6}\right)\right)$; and $\mathcal{W}^{\epsilon_{I}}$ is continuous on

$$
\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{H}, \mathbb{C}}=\left\{\left(\alpha_{I}, \xi_{1}\right) \in \mathbb{C}^{|I|+c} \mid\left(\operatorname{Re}\left(\alpha_{I}\right), \operatorname{Re}(\xi)\right) \in \mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{H}}\right\}
$$

and for any $\delta>0$ is analytic on

$$
\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{H}, \mathbb{C}}^{\delta}=\left\{\left(\alpha_{I}, \xi_{1}\right) \in \mathbb{C}^{|I|+c} \mid\left(\operatorname{Re}\left(\alpha_{I}\right), \operatorname{Re}(\xi)\right) \in \mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{H}}^{\delta}\right\},
$$

where $\operatorname{Re}\left(\alpha_{I}\right)=\left(\operatorname{Re}\left(\alpha_{i}\right)\right)_{i \in I}$ and $\operatorname{Re}(\xi)=\left(\operatorname{Re}\left(\xi_{1}\right), \ldots, \operatorname{Re}\left(\xi_{c}\right)\right)$.
Let

$$
\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{H}}=\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{H}, \mathrm{C}} \cap \mathbb{R}^{7} .
$$

Then by 2.10 , for $\left(\alpha_{1}, \ldots, \alpha_{6}, \xi\right) \in \mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{H}}$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
U\left(\alpha_{1}, \ldots, \alpha_{6}, \xi\right)=2 \pi^{2}+2 \sqrt{-1} V\left(\alpha_{1}, \ldots, \alpha_{6}, \xi\right) \tag{4.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

for $V: \mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{H}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$
\begin{align*}
V\left(\alpha_{1}, \ldots, \alpha_{6}, \xi\right)= & \delta\left(\alpha_{1}, \alpha_{2}, \alpha_{3}\right)+\delta\left(\alpha_{1}, \alpha_{5}, \alpha_{6}\right)+\delta\left(\alpha_{2}, \alpha_{4}, \alpha_{6}\right)+\delta\left(\alpha_{3}, \alpha_{4}, \alpha_{5}\right) \\
& -\Lambda(\xi)+\sum_{i=1}^{4} \Lambda\left(\xi-\tau_{i}\right)+\sum_{j=1}^{3} \Lambda\left(\eta_{j}-\xi\right) \tag{4.3}
\end{align*}
$$

where $\delta$ is defined by

$$
\delta(x, y, z)=-\frac{1}{2} \Lambda\left(\frac{x+y-z}{2}\right)-\frac{1}{2} \Lambda\left(\frac{y+z-x}{2}\right)-\frac{1}{2} \Lambda\left(\frac{z+x-y}{2}\right)+\frac{1}{2} \Lambda\left(\frac{x+y+z}{2}\right) .
$$

A result of Costantino [8] shows that for each $\alpha=\left(\alpha_{1}, \ldots, \alpha_{6}\right)$ of the hyperideal type, there exists a unique $\xi(\alpha)$ so that $(\alpha, \xi(\alpha)) \in \mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{H}}$ and

$$
\left.\frac{\partial V(\alpha, \xi)}{\partial \xi}\right|_{\xi=\xi(\alpha)}=0
$$

Indeed, he proves that for each $\alpha, V$ is strictly concave down in $\xi$ with derivatives $\pm \infty$ at the boundary points of the interval of $\xi$, hence there is a unique critical point $\xi(\alpha)$ at which $V$ achieves the absolute maximum. Moreover, by using the Murakami-Yano formula [27, 40] he shows that

$$
\begin{equation*}
V(\alpha, \xi(\alpha))=\operatorname{Vol}\left(\Delta_{|\alpha-\pi|}\right) \tag{4.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

the volume of the ideal or the truncated hyperideal tetrahedron with dihedral angles $\left|\alpha_{1}-\pi\right|, \ldots,\left|\alpha_{6}-\pi\right|$. Let $l_{1}, \ldots, l_{6}$ be the lengths of the edges of $\Delta_{|\alpha-\pi|}$, and let $u_{i}=2 \sqrt{-1}\left|\alpha_{i}-\pi\right|$ for $i \in\{1, \ldots, 6\}$. Then by the Schläfi formula, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{\partial U(\alpha, \xi(\alpha))}{\partial u_{i}}=-\frac{l_{i}}{2} . \tag{4.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

For $\alpha=\left(\alpha_{1}, \ldots, \alpha_{6}\right) \in \mathbb{C}^{6}$ such that $\left(\operatorname{Re}\left(\alpha_{1}\right), \ldots, \operatorname{Re}\left(\alpha_{6}\right)\right)$ is of the hyperideal type, we let $\xi(\alpha)$ be such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left.\frac{\partial U(\alpha, \xi)}{\partial \xi}\right|_{\xi=\xi(\alpha)}=0 \tag{4.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Following the idea of [27], see also [3], it is proved that $e^{-2 \sqrt{-1 \xi}(\alpha)}$ satisfies a concrete quadratic equation. Therefore, for each such $\alpha$, there is at most one $\xi(\alpha)$ such that $(\alpha, \xi(\alpha)) \in \mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{H}, \mathbb{C}}$. At this point, we do not know whether $(\alpha, \xi(\alpha)) \in \mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{H}, \mathbb{C}}$ for all such $\alpha$, but in the next section we will show that it is the case if all $\operatorname{Re}\left(\alpha_{1}\right), \ldots, \operatorname{Re}\left(\alpha_{6}\right)$ are sufficiently close to $\pi$.

For $s \in\{1, \ldots, c\}$, let $\alpha_{s}=\left(\alpha_{s_{1}}, \ldots, \alpha_{s_{6}}\right)$. For a fixed $\alpha_{J}=\left(\alpha_{j}\right)_{j \in J}$, define the following function

$$
\mathcal{U}\left(\alpha_{I}\right)=\sum_{s=1}^{c} U\left(\alpha_{s}, \xi\left(\alpha_{s}\right)\right)
$$

for all $\alpha_{I}$ such that $\left(\alpha_{s}, \xi\left(\alpha_{s}\right)\right) \in \mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{H}, \mathbb{C}}$ for all $s \in\{1, \ldots, c\}$.
The next proposition shows that with an appropriate choice of the meridians and longitudes, the value of $\mathcal{U}$ coincides with the value of the Neumann-Zagier potential function [28] defined on a neighborhood of the complete structure in the deformation space of $M_{c} \backslash L_{\text {FSL }}$.

Proposition 4.1. For each component $T_{i}$ of the boundary of $M_{c} \backslash L_{F S L}$, choose the basis $\left(u_{i}, v_{i}\right)$ of $\pi_{1}\left(T_{i}\right)$ as in (2.6) and (2.7), and let $\Phi$ be the Neumann-Zagier potential function characterized by

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{l}
\frac{\partial \Phi\left(\mathrm{H}\left(u_{1}\right), \ldots, \mathrm{H}\left(u_{n}\right)\right)}{\partial \mathrm{H}\left(u_{i}\right)}=\frac{\mathrm{H}\left(v_{i}\right)}{2},  \tag{4.7}\\
\Phi(0, \ldots, 0)=\sqrt{-1}\left(\operatorname{Vol}\left(M_{c} \backslash L_{F S L}\right)+\sqrt{-1} \mathrm{CS}\left(M_{c} \backslash L_{F S L}\right)\right) \quad \bmod \pi^{2} \mathbb{Z},
\end{array}\right.
$$

where $M_{c} \backslash L_{F S L}$ is with the complete hyperbolic metric. If $\mathrm{H}\left(u_{i}\right)= \pm 2 \sqrt{-1}\left(\alpha_{i}-\pi\right)$ for each $i \in$ $\{1, \ldots, n\}$, then

$$
\mathcal{U}\left(\alpha_{I}\right)=2 c \pi^{2}+\Phi\left(\mathrm{H}\left(u_{1}\right), \ldots, \mathrm{H}\left(u_{n}\right)\right)
$$

Proof. We assume that $\mathrm{H}\left(u_{i}\right)=2 \sqrt{-1}\left(\alpha_{i}-\pi\right)$, and the case $\mathrm{H}\left(u_{i}\right)=-2 \sqrt{-1}\left(\alpha_{i}-\pi\right)$ follows from the fact that $\Phi$ is even in its variables.

From the construction of $L_{\mathrm{FSL}}$ in Section 2.4, the component $L_{i}=\cup e_{s_{j}}$, where $e_{s_{j}}$ is the $j$-th edge of the building block $\Delta_{s}$ for $s$ coming from a subset $S$ of $\{1, \ldots, c\}$ and $j$ coming from a subset of $\{1, \ldots, 6\}$ depending on $s$. Let $l_{i}$ be the lengths of $L_{i}$ and let $l_{s_{j}}$ be the length of $e_{s_{j}}$ for each $s_{j}$. Then by (2.6), 2.7) and 4.5), we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{\partial \mathcal{U}\left(\alpha_{I}\right)}{\partial \mathrm{H}\left(u_{i}\right)}=\sum_{s \in S} \frac{\partial U\left(\alpha_{s}, \xi\left(\alpha_{s}\right)\right)}{\partial \mathrm{H}\left(u_{i}\right)}=\sum_{s_{j}}-\frac{l_{s_{j}}}{2}=-\frac{l_{i}}{2}=\frac{\mathrm{H}\left(v_{i}\right)}{2} \tag{4.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

This means $\frac{\partial \mathcal{U}}{\partial \mathrm{H}\left(u_{i}\right)}$ and $\frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial \mathrm{H}\left(u_{i}\right)}$ coincide for purely imaginary variables for each $i \in I$. Then by Lemma 4.2 below, $\frac{\partial \mathcal{U}}{\partial \mathrm{H}\left(u_{i}\right)}$ and $\frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial \mathrm{H}\left(u_{i}\right)}$ coincide, verifying the first equality of 4.7 .

For the second equality of 4.7 , we have $\mathcal{U}(\pi, \ldots, \pi)=2 c \pi^{2}+2 c v_{8} \sqrt{-1}$, where $v_{8}$ is the volume of the regular ideal octahedron. Since $\operatorname{Vol}\left(M_{c} \backslash L_{\mathrm{FSL}}\right)=2 c v_{8}$ and $\operatorname{CS}\left(M_{c} \backslash L_{\mathrm{FSL}}\right)=0$, we have

$$
\mathcal{U}(\pi, \ldots, \pi)=2 c \pi^{2}+\Phi(0, \ldots, 0)
$$

Lemma 4.2. Suppose $D$ is a domain of $\mathbb{C}^{n}$ and $F_{1}$ and $F_{2}$ are two holomorphic functions on $D$. If $F_{1}$ and $F_{2}$ coincide on $D \cap(\sqrt{-1} \mathbb{R})^{n}$, then $F_{1}$ and $F_{2}$ coincide on $D$.

Proof. We use induction on $n$. If $n=1$, then the result follows from the Identity Theorem of a single variable analytic function. Now suppose the result is true for $n \leqslant k$. For each fixed $\left(z_{2}, \ldots, z_{k}\right) \in$ $(\sqrt{-1} \mathbb{R})^{k-1}$, by the assumption of the lemma, we have $F_{1}\left(z_{1}, z_{2}, \ldots, z_{k}\right)=F_{2}\left(z_{1}, z_{2}, \ldots, z_{k}\right)$ for any purely imaginary $z_{1}$. Then by the single variable case $F_{1}\left(z_{1}, z_{2}, \ldots, z_{k}\right)=F_{2}\left(z_{1}, z_{2}, \ldots, z_{k}\right)$ for any complex $z_{1}$. This equality can also be understood as for any fixed complex $z_{1}, F_{1}\left(z_{1}, z_{2}, \ldots, z_{k}\right)=$ $F_{2}\left(z_{1}, z_{2}, \ldots, z_{k}\right)$ for all purely imaginary $\left(z_{2}, \ldots, z_{k}\right)$. Then by the reduction hypothesis, we have $F_{1}\left(z_{1}, z_{2}, \ldots, z_{k}\right)=F_{2}\left(z_{1}, z_{2}, \ldots, z_{k}\right)$ for all $\left(z_{2}, \ldots, z_{k}\right)$.

## 5 Asymptotics

The goal of this section is to prove Theorem 3.1. The main tool we use is Proposition 5.1, which is a generalization of the standard Saddle Point Approximation [29]. For the readers' convenience, we include a proof of Proposition 5.1 in Appendix A.

Proposition 5.1. Let $D_{\mathbf{z}}$ be a region in $\mathbb{C}^{n}$ and let $D_{\mathbf{a}}$ be a region in $\mathbb{R}^{k}$. Let $f(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{a})$ and $g(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{a})$ be complex valued functions on $D_{\mathbf{z}} \times D_{\mathbf{a}}$ which are holomorphic in $\mathbf{z}$ and smooth in $\mathbf{a}$. For each positive integer $r$, let $f_{r}(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{a})$ be a complex valued function on $D_{\mathbf{z}} \times D_{\mathbf{a}}$ holomorphic in $\mathbf{z}$ and smooth in $\mathbf{a}$. For a fixed $\mathbf{a} \in D_{\mathbf{a}}$, let $f^{\mathbf{a}}, g^{\mathbf{a}}$ and $f_{r}^{\mathbf{a}}$ be the holomorphic functions on $D_{\mathbf{z}}$ defined by $f^{\mathbf{a}}(\mathbf{z})=f(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{a})$, $g^{\mathbf{a}}(\mathbf{z})=g(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{a})$ and $f_{r}^{\mathbf{a}}(\mathbf{z})=f_{r}(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{a})$. Suppose $\left\{\mathbf{a}_{r}\right\}$ is a convergent sequence in $D_{\mathbf{a}}$ with $\lim _{r} \mathbf{a}_{r}=\mathbf{a}_{0}$, $f_{r}^{\mathbf{a}_{r}}$ is of the form

$$
f_{r}^{\mathbf{a}_{r}}(\mathbf{z})=f^{\mathbf{a}_{r}}(\mathbf{z})+\frac{v_{r}\left(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{a}_{r}\right)}{r^{2}}
$$

$\left\{S_{r}\right\}$ is a sequence of embedded real n-dimensional closed disks in $D_{\mathrm{z}}$ sharing the same boundary, and $\mathbf{c}_{r}$ is a point on $S_{r}$. Suppose $\left\{\mathbf{c}_{r}\right\}$ is convergent in $D_{\mathbf{z}}$ with $\lim _{r} \mathbf{c}_{r}=\mathbf{c}_{0}$. If and for each $r$
(1) $\mathbf{c}_{r}$ is a critical point of $f^{\mathbf{a}_{r}}$ in $D_{\mathbf{z}}$,
(2) $\operatorname{Re} f^{\mathbf{a}_{r}}\left(\mathbf{c}_{r}\right)>\operatorname{Re} f^{\mathbf{a}_{r}}(\mathbf{z})$ for all $\mathbf{z} \in S \backslash\left\{\mathbf{c}_{r}\right\}$,
(3) the Hessian matrix $\operatorname{Hess}\left(f^{\mathbf{a}_{r}}\right)$ of $f^{\mathbf{a}_{r}}$ at $\mathbf{c}_{r}$ is non-singular
(4) $\left|g^{\mathbf{a}_{r}}\left(\mathbf{c}_{r}\right)\right|$ is bounded from below by a positive constant independent of $r$,
(5) $\left|v_{r}\left(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{a}_{r}\right)\right|$ is bounded from above by a constant independent of $r$ on $D_{\mathbf{z}}$, and
(6) the Hessian matrix $\operatorname{Hess}\left(f^{\mathrm{a}_{0}}\right)$ of $f^{\mathrm{a}_{0}}$ at $\mathbf{c}_{0}$ is non-singular,
then

$$
\int_{S_{r}} g^{\mathbf{a}_{r}}(\mathbf{z}) e^{r f_{r}^{\mathbf{a}_{r}}(\mathbf{z})} d \mathbf{z}=\left(\frac{2 \pi}{r}\right)^{\frac{n}{2}} \frac{g^{\mathbf{a}_{r}\left(\mathbf{c}_{r}\right)}}{\sqrt{-\operatorname{det} \operatorname{Hess}\left(f^{\mathbf{a}_{r}}\right)\left(\mathbf{c}_{r}\right)}} e^{r f^{\mathbf{a}_{r}\left(\mathbf{c}_{r}\right)}}\left(1+O\left(\frac{1}{r}\right)\right)
$$

In the rest of this paper, we assume that $\theta_{1}, \ldots, \theta_{n}$ are sufficiently close to 0 , or equivalently, $\left\{\beta_{i}\right\}_{i \in I}$ and $\left\{\alpha_{j}\right\}_{j \in J}$ are sufficiently close to $\pi$. In the special case that $\beta_{i}=\alpha_{j}=\pi$ for all $i \in I$ and $j \in J$, a direct computation shows that $\xi(\pi, \ldots, \pi)=\frac{7 \pi}{4}$. For $\delta>0$, we denote by $\mathrm{D}_{\delta, \mathrm{C}}$ the $L^{1} \delta$-neighborhood of $\left(\pi, \ldots, \pi, \frac{7 \pi}{4}, \ldots, \frac{7 \pi}{4}\right)$ in $\mathbb{C}^{|I|+c}$, that is

$$
\mathrm{D}_{\delta, \mathbb{C}}=\left\{\left(\alpha_{I}, \xi\right) \in \mathbb{C}^{|I|+c} \left\lvert\, d_{L^{1}}\left(\left(\alpha_{I}, \xi_{1}\right),\left(\pi, \ldots, \pi, \frac{7 \pi}{4}, \ldots, \frac{7 \pi}{4}\right)\right)<\delta\right.\right\},
$$

where $d_{L^{1}}$ is the real $L^{1}$-norm on $\mathbb{C}^{n}$ defined by

$$
d_{L^{1}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})=\max _{i \in\{1, \ldots, n\}}\left\{\left|\operatorname{Re}\left(x_{i}\right)-\operatorname{Re}\left(y_{i}\right)\right|,\left|\operatorname{Im}\left(x_{i}\right)-\operatorname{Im}\left(y_{i}\right)\right|\right\},
$$

where $\mathbf{x}=\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right)$ and $\mathbf{y}=\left(y_{1}, \ldots, y_{n}\right)$. We will also consider the region

$$
\mathrm{D}_{\delta}=\mathrm{D}_{\delta, \mathbb{C}} \cap \mathbb{R}^{|I|+c} .
$$

### 5.1 Critical points and critical values of $\mathcal{W}^{\epsilon_{I}}$

Suppose $\left\{\beta_{i}\right\}_{i \in I}$ and $\left\{\alpha_{j}\right\}_{j \in J}$ are sufficiently close to $\pi$. For $i \in I$, let $\theta_{i}=2\left|\beta_{i}-\pi\right|$, and let $\mu_{i}=1$ if $\beta_{i} \geqslant \pi$ and let $\mu_{i}=-1$ if $\beta_{i} \leqslant \pi$ so that $\mu_{i} \theta_{i}=2\left(\beta_{i}-\pi\right)$.

Proposition 5.2. For each $i \in I$, let $\mathrm{H}\left(u_{i}\right)$ be the logarithmic holonomy of $u_{i}$ of the hyperbolic cone manifold $M_{L_{\theta}}$ and let

$$
\begin{equation*}
\alpha_{i}=\pi+\frac{\epsilon_{i} \mu_{i} \sqrt{-1}}{2} \mathrm{H}\left(u_{i}\right) . \tag{5.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

For $s \in\{1, \ldots, c\}$, let $\alpha_{s}=\left(\alpha_{s_{1}}, \ldots, \alpha_{s_{6}}\right)$ and let $\xi\left(\alpha_{s}\right)$ be as defined in (4.6). Then $\mathcal{W}^{\epsilon_{I}}$ has a critical point

$$
z^{\epsilon_{I}}=\left(\left(\alpha_{i}\right)_{i \in I},\left(\xi\left(\alpha_{s}\right)\right)_{s=1}^{c}\right)
$$

in $\mathrm{D}_{\delta, \mathbb{C}}$ with critical value

$$
2 c \pi^{2}+\sqrt{-1}\left(\operatorname{Vol}\left(M_{L_{\theta}}\right)+\sqrt{-1} \operatorname{CS}\left(M_{L_{\theta}}\right)\right) .
$$

Proof. For $i \in I$, if $\theta_{i}$ is sufficiently close to 0 , then the come metric is sufficiently close to the complete metric. As a consequence, $\mathrm{H}\left(u_{i}\right)$ is sufficiently close to 0 , and hence $\alpha_{i}$ is sufficiently close to $\pi$. Then by the continuity of $\xi\left(\alpha_{s}\right), z^{\epsilon_{I}} \in \mathrm{D}_{\delta, \mathbb{C}}$ for sufficiently small $\theta_{1}, \ldots, \theta_{n}$.

For any $\left(\alpha_{i}\right)_{i \in I}$ such that $\left(\alpha_{I},\left(\xi\left(\alpha_{s}\right)_{s=1}^{c}\right) \in \mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{H}, \mathrm{C}}\right.$, and for $s \in\{1, \ldots, c\}$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left.\frac{\partial \mathcal{W}^{\epsilon_{I}}}{\partial \xi_{s}}\right|_{\left(\left(\alpha_{i}\right)_{i \in I},\left(\xi\left(\alpha_{s}\right)\right)_{s=1}^{c}\right)}=\left.\frac{\partial U\left(\alpha_{s}\right)}{\partial \xi_{s}}\right|_{\xi\left(\alpha_{s}\right)}=0 . \tag{5.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

In particular, for each $s \in\{1, \ldots, c\}$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left.\frac{\partial \mathcal{W}^{\epsilon_{I}}}{\partial \xi_{s}}\right|_{z^{\epsilon_{I}}}=0 \tag{5.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

By the Chain Rule, for each $s \in\{1, \ldots, c\}$ and $i \in I$,

$$
\left.\frac{\partial U\left(\alpha_{s}, \xi\left(\alpha_{s}\right)\right)}{\partial \alpha_{i}}\right|_{\alpha_{s}}=\left.\frac{\partial U}{\partial \alpha_{i}}\right|_{\left(\alpha_{s}, \xi\left(\alpha_{s}\right)\right)}+\left.\left.\frac{\partial U}{\partial \xi}\right|_{\left(\alpha_{s}, \xi\left(\alpha_{s}\right)\right)} \cdot \frac{\partial \xi\left(\alpha_{s}\right)}{\partial \alpha_{i}}\right|_{\alpha_{s}}=\left.\frac{\partial U}{\partial \alpha_{i}}\right|_{\left(\alpha_{s}, \xi\left(\alpha_{s}\right)\right)},
$$

hence

$$
\left.\frac{\partial\left(\sum_{s=1}^{c} U\left(\alpha_{s}, \xi_{s}\right)\right)}{\partial \alpha_{i}}\right|_{z^{\epsilon} I}=\left.\frac{\partial \mathcal{U}}{\partial \alpha_{i}}\right|_{\alpha_{I}}=-\epsilon_{i} \mu_{i} \sqrt{-1} \mathrm{H}\left(v_{i}\right),
$$

where the last equation comes from (4.8) and (5.1). As a consequence, for each $i \in I$, we have

$$
\begin{align*}
\left.\frac{\partial \mathcal{W}^{\epsilon_{I}}}{\partial \alpha_{i}}\right|_{z^{\epsilon_{I}}} & =-2 p_{i}\left(\alpha_{i}-\pi\right)-2 \epsilon_{i}\left(\beta_{i}-\pi\right)+\left.\frac{\partial \mathcal{U}}{\partial \alpha_{i}}\right|_{\alpha_{I}}  \tag{5.4}\\
& =-\epsilon_{i} \mu_{i} \sqrt{-1}\left(p_{i} \mathrm{H}\left(u_{i}\right)-\sqrt{-1} \theta_{i}+\mathrm{H}\left(v_{i}\right)\right)=0,
\end{align*}
$$

where the last equality comes from the $\left(p_{i}, 1\right)$-Dehn filling equation 2.2 with the cone angle $\theta_{i}$. Equations $(5.3)$ and $(5.4)$ show that $z^{\epsilon_{I}}$ is a critical point of $\mathcal{W}^{\epsilon_{I}}$.

To compute the critical value, by Proposition 4.1, we first have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathcal{U}\left(\alpha_{I}\right)=2 c \pi^{2}+\Phi\left(\mathrm{H}\left(u_{1}\right), \ldots, \mathrm{H}\left(u_{n}\right)\right) \tag{5.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\alpha_{I}=\left(\alpha_{i}\right)_{i \in I}=\left(\pi+\frac{\epsilon_{i} \mu_{i} \sqrt{-1}}{2} \mathrm{H}\left(u_{i}\right)\right)_{i \in I}$.
For each $i \in I$, let $\gamma_{i}=-u_{i}+q_{i}\left(p_{i} u_{i}+v_{i}\right)$ so that it is the curve on the boundary of a tubular neighborhood of $L_{i}^{*}$ that is isotopic to $L_{i}^{*}$ given by the framing $q_{i}$ of $L_{i}^{*}$ and with the orientation so that $\left(p_{i} u_{i}+v_{i}\right) \cdot \gamma_{i}=1$. Then we have $\theta_{i}=2 \mu_{i}\left(\beta_{i}-\pi\right), \mathrm{H}\left(u_{i}\right)=-2 \epsilon_{i} \mu_{i} \sqrt{-1}\left(\alpha_{i}-\pi\right)$,

$$
\mathrm{H}\left(v_{i}\right)=\sqrt{-1} \theta_{i}-p_{i} \mathrm{H}\left(u_{i}\right)=2 \mu_{i} \sqrt{-1}\left(\beta_{i}-\pi\right)+2 p_{i} \epsilon_{i} \mu_{i} \sqrt{-1}\left(\alpha_{i}-\pi\right)
$$

and

$$
\mathrm{H}(\gamma)=-\mathrm{H}\left(u_{i}\right)+q_{i}\left(p_{i} \mathrm{H}\left(u_{i}\right)+\mathrm{H}\left(v_{i}\right)\right)=2 \epsilon_{i} \mu_{i} \sqrt{-1}\left(\alpha_{i}-\pi\right)+2 q_{i} \mu_{i} \sqrt{-1}\left(\beta_{i}-\pi\right) .
$$

As a consequence, we have

$$
\begin{align*}
& -\sum_{i \in I} \frac{\mathrm{H}\left(u_{i}\right) \mathrm{H}\left(v_{i}\right)}{4}+\sum_{i \in I} \frac{\sqrt{-1} \theta_{i} \mathrm{H}\left(\gamma_{i}\right)}{4}  \tag{5.6}\\
= & -\sum_{i \in I} q_{i}\left(\beta_{i}-\pi\right)^{2}-\sum_{i \in I} p_{i}\left(\alpha_{i}-\pi\right)^{2}-\sum_{i \in I} 2 \epsilon_{i}\left(\alpha_{i}-\pi\right)\left(\beta_{i}-\pi\right) .
\end{align*}
$$

For each $j \in J$, let $\gamma_{j}=p_{j} u_{j}+v_{j}$ so that it is the curve on the boundary of a tubular neighborhood of $L_{j}$ that is isotopic to $L_{j}$ given by the framing $p_{j}$ of $L_{j}$ and with the orientation so that $u_{j} \cdot \gamma_{j}=1$. Then we have $\theta_{j}=2\left|\alpha_{j}-\pi\right|, \mathrm{H}\left(u_{j}\right)=2 \sqrt{-1}\left|\alpha_{j}-\pi\right|, \mathrm{H}\left(v_{j}\right)=-l_{j}$ and

$$
\mathrm{H}\left(\gamma_{j}\right)=p_{j} \mathrm{H}\left(u_{j}\right)+\mathrm{H}\left(v_{j}\right)=2 p_{j} \sqrt{-1}\left|\alpha_{j}-\pi\right|-l_{j} .
$$

As a consequence, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
-\sum_{j \in J} \frac{\mathrm{H}\left(u_{j}\right) \mathrm{H}\left(v_{j}\right)}{4}+\sum_{j \in J} \frac{\sqrt{-1} \theta_{j} \mathrm{H}\left(\gamma_{j}\right)}{4}=\sum_{j \in J}-p_{j}\left(\alpha_{j}-\pi\right)^{2} . \tag{5.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

Putting (5.5), (5.6), (5.7) and (2.5) together , we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{W}^{\epsilon_{I}}\left(z^{\epsilon_{I}}\right) & =\mathcal{U}\left(\alpha_{I}\right)-\sum_{i \in I} q_{i}\left(\beta_{i}-\pi\right)^{2}-\sum_{i=1}^{n} p_{i}\left(\alpha_{i}-\pi\right)^{2}-\sum_{i \in I} 2 \epsilon_{i}\left(\alpha_{i}-\pi\right)\left(\beta_{i}-\pi\right) \\
& =2 c \pi^{2}+\Phi\left(\mathrm{H}\left(u_{1}\right), \ldots, \mathrm{H}\left(u_{n}\right)\right)-\sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\mathrm{H}\left(u_{i}\right) \mathrm{H}\left(v_{i}\right)}{4}+\sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\sqrt{-1} \theta_{i} \mathrm{H}\left(\gamma_{i}\right)}{4} \\
& =2 c \pi^{2}+\sqrt{-1}\left(\operatorname{Vol}\left(M_{L_{\theta}}\right)+\sqrt{-1} \operatorname{CS}\left(M_{L_{\theta}}\right)\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

### 5.2 Convexity of $\mathcal{W}^{\epsilon_{I}}$

Proposition 5.3. There exists a $\delta_{0}>0$ such that if all $\left\{\alpha_{j}\right\}_{j \in J}$ are in $\left(\pi-\delta_{0}, \pi+\delta_{0}\right)$, then for any $\epsilon_{I}$, $\operatorname{Im} \mathcal{W}^{\epsilon_{I}}\left(\alpha_{I}, \xi\right)$ is strictly concave down in $\left\{\operatorname{Re}\left(\alpha_{i}\right)\right\}_{i \in I}$ and $\left\{\operatorname{Re}\left(\xi_{s}\right)\right\}_{s=1}^{c}$, and is strictly concave up in $\left\{\operatorname{Im}\left(\alpha_{i}\right)\right\}_{i \in I}$ and $\left\{\operatorname{Im}\left(\xi_{s}\right)\right\}_{s=1}^{c}$ on $\mathrm{D}_{\delta_{0}, \mathrm{C}}$.
Proof. We first consider the special case $\left\{\alpha_{i}\right\}_{i \in I}$ and $\left\{\xi_{s}\right\}_{s=1}^{c}$ are real. In this case,

$$
\operatorname{Im} \mathcal{W}^{\epsilon_{I}}\left(\alpha_{I}, \xi\right)=\sum_{s=1}^{c} 2 V\left(\alpha_{s_{1}}, \ldots, \alpha_{s_{6}}, \xi_{s}\right)
$$

with $V$ defined in (4.3).
At $\left(\pi, \ldots, \pi, \frac{7 \pi}{4}\right)$, we have $\frac{\partial^{2} \operatorname{Im} V}{\partial \alpha_{s_{i}}^{2}}=-2$ for $s_{i} \in I \cap\left\{s_{1}, \ldots, s_{6}\right\}, \frac{\partial^{2} V}{\partial \alpha_{s_{i}} \alpha_{s_{j}}}=-1$ for $s_{i} \neq s_{j}$ in $I \cap\left\{s_{1}, \ldots, s_{6}\right\}, \frac{\partial^{2} \operatorname{Im} V}{\partial \alpha_{s_{i}} \xi_{s}}=2$ for $s_{i} \in I \cap\left\{s_{1}, \ldots, s_{6}\right\}$ and $\frac{\partial^{2} \operatorname{Im} V}{\partial \xi_{s}^{2}}=-8$. Then a direct computation shows that, at $\left(\pi, \ldots, \pi, \frac{7 \pi}{4}\right)$, the Hessian matrix of $\operatorname{Im} V$ in $\left\{\operatorname{Re}\left(\alpha_{i}\right)\right\}_{i \in I \cap\left\{s_{1}, \ldots, s_{6}\right\}}$ and $\operatorname{Re}\left(\xi_{s}\right)$ is negative definite. As a consequence, the Hessian matrix of $\operatorname{Im} \mathcal{W}^{\epsilon_{I}}$ in $\left\{\operatorname{Re}\left(\alpha_{i}\right)\right\}_{i \in I}$ and $\left\{\operatorname{Re}\left(\xi_{s}\right)\right\}_{s=1}^{c}$ is negative definite at $\left(\pi, \ldots, \pi, \frac{7 \pi}{4}, \ldots, \frac{7 \pi}{4}\right)$.

Then by the continuity, there exists a sufficiently small $\delta_{0}>0$ such that for all $\left\{\alpha_{j}\right\}_{j \in J}$ in $\left(\pi-\delta_{0}, \pi+\right.$ $\left.\delta_{0}\right)$ and $\left(\alpha_{I}, \xi\right) \in \mathrm{D}_{\delta_{0}, \mathbb{C}}$, the Hessian matrix of $\operatorname{Im} \mathcal{W}^{\epsilon_{I}}$ with respect to $\left\{\operatorname{Re}\left(\alpha_{i}\right)\right\}_{i \in I}$ and $\left\{\operatorname{Re}\left(\xi_{s}\right)\right\}_{s=1}^{c}$ is still negative definite, implying that $\operatorname{Im} \mathcal{W}^{\epsilon_{I}}$ is strictly concave down in $\left\{\operatorname{Re}\left(\alpha_{i}\right)\right\}_{i \in I}$ and $\left\{\operatorname{Re}\left(\xi_{s}\right)\right\}_{s=1}^{c}$ on $\mathrm{D}_{\delta_{0}, \mathrm{C}}$. Since $\mathcal{W}^{\epsilon_{I}}$ is holomorphic, $\operatorname{Im} \mathcal{W}^{\epsilon_{I}}$ is strictly concave up in $\left\{\operatorname{Im}\left(\alpha_{i}\right)\right\}_{i \in I}$ and $\left\{\operatorname{Im}\left(\xi_{s}\right)\right\}_{s=1}^{c}$ on $\mathrm{D}_{\delta_{0}, \mathrm{C}}$.

Proposition 5.4. If all $\left\{\alpha_{j}\right\}_{j \in J}$ are in $\left(\pi-\delta_{0}, \pi+\delta_{0}\right)$, then the Hessian matrix $\operatorname{Hessi}^{\mathcal{W}_{I}}$ of $\mathcal{W}^{\epsilon_{I}}$ with respect to $\left\{\alpha_{i}\right\}_{i \in I}$ and $\left\{\xi_{s}\right\}_{s=1}^{c}$ is non-singular on $\mathrm{D}_{\delta_{0}, \mathbb{C}}$.
Proof. By Proposition 5.3, the real part of the Hess $\mathcal{W}^{\epsilon_{I}}$ is negative definite. Then by [24, Lemma], it is nonsingular.

### 5.3 Asymptotics of the leading Fourier coefficients

Proposition 5.5. Suppose $\left\{\beta_{i}\right\}_{i \in I}$ and $\left\{\alpha_{j}\right\}_{j \in J}$ are in $\{\pi-\epsilon, \pi+\epsilon\}$ for a sufficiently small $\epsilon>0$. For $\epsilon_{I} \in\{1,-1\}^{I}$, let $z^{\epsilon_{I}}$ be the critical point of $\mathcal{W}^{\epsilon_{I}}$ described in Proposition 5.2 Then

$$
\widehat{f_{r}^{\epsilon_{I}}}(0, \ldots, 0)=\frac{C^{\epsilon_{I}}\left(z^{\epsilon_{I}}\right)}{\sqrt{-\operatorname{det} \operatorname{Hess} \mathcal{W}^{\epsilon_{I}}\left(z^{\epsilon_{I}}\right)}} e^{\frac{r}{4 \pi}\left(\operatorname{Vol}\left(M_{L_{\theta}}\right)+\sqrt{-1} \operatorname{CS}\left(M_{L_{\theta}}\right)\right)}\left(1+O\left(\frac{1}{r}\right)\right)
$$

where each $C^{\epsilon_{I}}\left(z^{\epsilon_{I}}\right)$ depends continuously on $\left\{\beta_{i}\right\}_{i \in I}$ and $\left\{\alpha_{j}\right\}_{j \in J}$; and when $\beta_{i}=\alpha_{j}=\pi$,

$$
C^{\epsilon_{I}}\left(z^{\epsilon_{I}}\right)=(-1)^{\sum_{i \in I} q_{i}+\sum_{i=1}^{n} p_{i}+c} \frac{r^{\frac{|I|-c}{2}}}{2^{\frac{3|I|+c}{2}} \pi^{\frac{|I|+c}{2}}} .
$$

For the proof of Proposition 5.5 , we need the following lemma.
Lemma 5.6. For each $\epsilon_{I} \in\{1,-1\}^{I}$ and any fixed $\left\{\alpha_{j}\right\}_{j \in J}$,

$$
\max _{\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{H}}} \operatorname{Im} \mathcal{W}^{\epsilon_{I}} \leqslant \operatorname{Im} \mathcal{W}^{\epsilon_{I}}\left(\pi, \ldots, \pi, \frac{7 \pi}{4}, \ldots, \frac{7 \pi}{4}\right)=2 c v_{8}
$$

where $v_{8}$ is the volume of the regular ideal octahedron, and the equality holds if and only if $\alpha_{1}=\cdots=$ $\alpha_{n}=\pi$ and $\xi_{1}=\cdots=\xi_{c}=\frac{7 \pi}{4}$.

Proof. On $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{H}}$, we have

$$
\operatorname{Im} \mathcal{W}^{\epsilon_{I}}\left(\alpha_{I}, \xi\right)=\sum_{s=1}^{c} 2 V\left(\alpha_{s_{1}}, \ldots, \alpha_{s_{6}}, \xi_{s}\right)
$$

for $V$ defined in (4.3). Then the result is a consequence of the result of Costantino [8] and the MurakamiYano formula [27] (see Ushijima [40] for the case of hyperideal tetrahedra). Indeed, by [8], for a fixed $\alpha=\left(\alpha_{1}, \ldots, \alpha_{6}\right)$ of the hyperideal type, the function $f(\xi)$ defined by $f(\xi)=V(\alpha, \xi)$ is strictly concave down and the unique maximum point $\xi(\alpha)$ exists and lies in $\left(\max \left\{\tau_{i}\right\}, \min \left\{\eta_{j}, 2 \pi\right\}\right)$, ie, $(\alpha, \xi(\alpha)) \in \mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{H}}$. Then by [40], $V(\alpha, \xi(\alpha))=\operatorname{Vol}\left(\Delta_{|\alpha-\pi|}\right)$, the volume of the truncated hyperideal tetrahedron $\Delta_{|\alpha-\pi|}$ with dihedral angles $\left|\alpha_{1}-\pi\right|, \ldots,\left|\alpha_{6}-\pi\right|$. Since $\xi(\pi, \ldots, \pi)=\frac{7 \pi}{4}$ and the regular ideal cctahedron $\Delta_{(0, \ldots, 0)}$ has the maximum volume among all the truncated hyperideal tetrahedra, $V\left(\pi, \ldots, \pi, \frac{7 \pi}{4}\right)=v_{8}=\operatorname{Vol}\left(\Delta_{(0, \ldots, 0)}\right) \geqslant \operatorname{Vol}\left(\Delta_{|\alpha-\pi|}\right)=V(\alpha, \xi(\alpha)) \geqslant V(\alpha, \xi)$ for any $(\alpha, \xi) \in \mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{H}}$.

For the equality part, suppose $\left(\alpha_{I}, \xi\right) \neq\left(\pi, \ldots, \pi, \frac{7 \pi}{4}, \ldots, \frac{7 \pi}{4}\right)$. If $\left(\alpha_{s_{1}}, \ldots, \alpha_{s_{6}}\right) \neq(\pi, \ldots, \pi)$ for some $s \in\{1, \ldots, c\}$, then $\operatorname{Im} \mathcal{W}^{\epsilon_{I}}\left(\alpha_{I}, \xi\right) \leqslant 2 \operatorname{Vol}\left(\Delta_{|\alpha-\pi|}\right)+2(c-1) v_{8}<2 c v_{8}$. If $\left(\alpha_{I}\right)=(\pi, \ldots, \pi)$ but $\xi_{s} \neq \frac{7 \pi}{4}$ for some $s \in\{1, \ldots, c\}$, then the strict concavity of $f(\xi)$ implies that $\operatorname{Im}^{\mathcal{W}^{\epsilon_{I}}}(\pi, \ldots, \pi, \xi)<$ $\operatorname{Im} \mathcal{W}^{\epsilon_{I}}\left(\pi, \ldots, \pi, \frac{7 \pi}{4}, \ldots, \frac{7 \pi}{4}\right)=2 c v_{8}$.

Proof of Proposition 5.5. Let $\delta_{0}>0$ be as in Proposition 5.3. By Lemma 5.3. Proposition 5.6 and the compactness of $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{H}} \backslash \mathrm{D}_{\delta_{0}}$,

$$
2 c v_{8}>\max _{\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{H}} \backslash \mathrm{D}_{\delta_{0}}} \operatorname{Im} \mathcal{W}^{\epsilon_{I}} .
$$

By Proposition 5.2 and continuity, if $\left\{\beta_{i}\right\}_{i \in I}$ and $\left\{\alpha_{j}\right\}_{j \in J}$ are sufficiently close to $\pi$, then the critical point $z^{\epsilon_{I}}$ of $\mathcal{W}^{\epsilon_{I}}$ as in Proposition 5.2 lies in $\mathrm{D}_{\delta_{0}, \mathbb{C}}$, and $\operatorname{Im} \mathcal{W}^{\epsilon_{I}}\left(z^{\epsilon_{I}}\right)=\operatorname{Vol}\left(M_{L_{\theta}}\right)$ is sufficiently close to $2 c v_{8}$ so that

$$
\operatorname{Im} \mathcal{W}^{\epsilon_{I}}\left(z^{\epsilon_{I}}\right)>\max _{\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{H}} \backslash \mathrm{D}_{\delta_{0}}} \operatorname{Im} \mathcal{W}^{\epsilon_{I}} .
$$

Therefore, we only need to estimate the integral on $\mathrm{D}_{\delta_{0}}$. To do this, we consider as drawn in Figure 4 the surface $S^{\epsilon_{I}}=S_{\text {top }}^{\epsilon_{I}} \cup S_{\text {side }}^{\epsilon_{I}}$ in $\overline{\mathrm{D}_{\delta_{0}, \mathrm{C}}}$, where

$$
S_{\text {top }}^{\epsilon_{I}}=\left\{\left(\alpha_{I}, \xi\right) \in \mathrm{D}_{\delta_{0}, \mathbb{C}} \mid\left(\left(\operatorname{Im}\left(\alpha_{I}\right)\right), \operatorname{Im}(\xi)\right)=\operatorname{Im}\left(z^{\epsilon_{I}}\right)\right\}
$$

and

$$
S_{\text {side }}^{\epsilon_{I}}=\left\{\left(\alpha_{I}, \xi\right)+t \sqrt{-1} \operatorname{Im}\left(z^{\epsilon_{I}}\right) \mid\left(\alpha_{I}, \xi\right) \in \partial \mathrm{D}_{\delta_{0}}, t \in[0,1]\right\} .
$$

By analyticity, the integral remains the same if we deform the domain from $\mathrm{D}_{\delta_{0}}$ to $S^{\epsilon_{I}}$.
By Proposition 5.3. $\operatorname{Im} \mathcal{W}^{\epsilon_{I}}$ is concave down on $S_{\text {top }}^{\epsilon_{I}}$. Since $z^{\epsilon_{I}}$ is the critical points of $\operatorname{Im} \mathcal{W}^{\epsilon_{I}}$, it is the only absolute maximum on $S_{\text {top }}^{\epsilon_{I}}$.

On the side $S_{\text {side }}^{\epsilon_{I}}$, for each $\left(\alpha_{I}, \xi\right) \in \partial \mathrm{D}_{\delta_{0}}$, we consider the function

$$
g_{\left(\alpha_{I}, \xi\right)}^{\epsilon_{I}}(t)=\operatorname{Im} \mathcal{W}^{\epsilon_{I}}\left(\left(\alpha_{I}, \xi\right)+t \sqrt{-1} \operatorname{Im}\left(z^{\epsilon_{I}}\right)\right)
$$



Figure 4: The deformed surface $S^{\epsilon_{I}}$
on $[0,1]$. By Lemma $5.3 . g_{\left(\alpha_{I}, \xi\right)}^{\epsilon_{I}}(t)$ is concave up for any $\left(\alpha_{I}, \xi\right) \in \partial \mathrm{D}_{\delta_{0}}$. As a consequence, $g_{\left(\alpha_{I}, \xi\right)}^{\epsilon_{I}}(t) \leqslant$ $\left.\max \left\{g_{\left(\alpha_{I}, \xi\right)}^{\epsilon_{I}}(0), g_{\left(\alpha_{I}, \xi\right)}^{\epsilon_{I}} 1\right)\right\}$. Now by the previous two steps, since $\left(\alpha_{I}, \xi\right) \in \partial \mathrm{D}_{\delta_{0}}$,

$$
g_{\left(\alpha_{I}, \xi\right)}^{\epsilon_{I}}(0)=\operatorname{Im} \mathcal{W}^{\epsilon_{I}}\left(\alpha_{I}, \xi\right)<\operatorname{Im} \mathcal{W}^{\epsilon_{I}}\left(z^{\epsilon_{I}}\right) ;
$$

and since $\left(\alpha_{I}, \xi\right)+\sqrt{-1} \operatorname{Im}\left(z^{\epsilon_{I}}\right) \in S_{\text {top }}^{\epsilon_{I}}$,

$$
g_{\left(\alpha_{I}, \xi\right)}^{\epsilon_{I}}(0)=\operatorname{Im} \mathcal{W}^{\epsilon_{I}}\left(\left(\alpha_{I}, \xi\right)+\sqrt{-1} \operatorname{Im}\left(z^{\epsilon_{I}}\right)\right)<\operatorname{Im} \mathcal{N}^{\epsilon_{I}}\left(z^{\epsilon_{I}}\right) .
$$

As a consequence,

$$
\operatorname{Im} \mathcal{W}^{\epsilon_{I}}\left(z^{\epsilon_{I}}\right)>\max _{S_{\text {side }}^{\epsilon_{I}}} \operatorname{Im} \mathcal{W}^{\epsilon_{I}} .
$$

Therefore, we proved that $z^{\epsilon_{I}}$ is the unique maximum point of $\operatorname{Im} \mathcal{W}^{\epsilon_{I}}$ on $S^{\epsilon_{I}} \cup\left(\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{H}} \backslash \mathrm{D}_{\delta_{0}}\right)$, and $\mathcal{W}^{\epsilon_{I}}$ has critical value $2 c \pi^{2}+\sqrt{-1}\left(\operatorname{Vol}\left(M_{L_{\theta}}\right)+\sqrt{-1} \operatorname{Vol}\left(M_{L_{\theta}}\right)\right)$ at $z^{\epsilon_{I}}$.

By Proposition 5.4, $\operatorname{det} \operatorname{Hess} \mathcal{W}^{\epsilon_{I}}\left(z^{\epsilon_{I}}\right) \neq 0$.
Finally, we estimate the difference between $\mathcal{W}_{r}^{\epsilon_{I}}$ and $\mathcal{W}^{\epsilon_{I}}$. By Lemma 2.10, (3), we have

$$
\varphi_{r}\left(\frac{\pi}{r}\right)=\mathrm{Li}_{2}(1)+\frac{2 \pi \sqrt{-1}}{r} \log \left(\frac{r}{2}\right)-\frac{\pi^{2}}{r}+O\left(\frac{1}{r^{2}}\right) ;
$$

and for $z$ with $0<\operatorname{Rez}<\pi$ we have

$$
\varphi_{r}\left(z+\frac{k \pi}{r}\right)=\varphi_{r}(z)+\varphi_{r}^{\prime}(z) \frac{k \pi}{r}+O\left(\frac{1}{r^{2}}\right) .
$$

Then by Lemma 2.10, in $\left\{\left(\alpha_{I}, \xi\right) \in \overline{\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{H}, \mathrm{C}}^{\delta}}\left|\left|\operatorname{Im}\left(\alpha_{i}\right)\right|<L\right.\right.$ for $i \in I,\left|\operatorname{Im}\left(\xi_{s}\right)\right|<L$ for $\left.s \in\{1, \ldots, c\}\right\}$ for some $L>0$,

$$
\mathcal{W}_{r}^{\epsilon_{I}}\left(\alpha_{I}, \xi\right)=\mathcal{W}^{\epsilon_{I}}\left(\alpha_{I}, \xi\right)-\frac{4 c \pi \sqrt{-1}}{r} \log \left(\frac{r}{2}\right)+\frac{4 \pi \sqrt{-1} \kappa\left(\alpha_{I}, \xi\right)}{r}+\frac{\nu_{r}\left(\alpha_{I}, \xi\right)}{r^{2}},
$$

with

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \kappa\left(\alpha_{I}, \xi\right) \\
= & \sum_{s=1}^{c}\left(\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{4} \sqrt{-1} \tau_{s_{i}}-\sqrt{-1} \xi_{s}-\sqrt{-1} \pi-\frac{\sqrt{-1} \pi}{2}\right. \\
& +\frac{1}{4} \sum_{i=1}^{4} \sum_{j=1}^{3} \log \left(1-e^{2 \sqrt{-1}\left(\eta_{s_{j}}-\tau_{s_{i}}\right)}\right)-\frac{3}{4} \sum_{i=1}^{4} \log \left(1-e^{2 \sqrt{-1}\left(\tau_{s_{i}}-\pi\right)}\right) \\
& \left.+\frac{3}{2} \log \left(1-e^{2 \sqrt{-1}\left(\xi_{s}-\pi\right)}\right)-\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{4} \log \left(1-e^{2 \sqrt{-1}\left(\xi_{s}-\tau_{s_{i}}\right)}\right)-\frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^{3} \log \left(1-e^{2 \sqrt{-1}\left(\eta_{s_{j}}-\xi_{s}\right)}\right)\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

and $\left|\nu_{r}\left(\alpha_{I}, \xi\right)\right|$ bounded from above by a constant independent of $r$. Then

$$
\begin{aligned}
& e^{\left(\sum_{i \in I} q_{i} \beta_{i}+\sum_{i=1}^{n} p_{i} \alpha_{i}+\sum_{i \in I} \epsilon_{i}\left(\alpha_{i}+\beta_{i}+\frac{2 \pi}{r}\right)\right) \sqrt{-1}+\frac{r}{4 \pi \sqrt{-1}} \mathcal{W}_{r}^{\epsilon}\left(\alpha_{I}, \xi\right)} \\
= & \left(\frac{r}{2}\right)^{-c} e^{\left(\sum_{i \in I} q_{i} \beta_{i}+\sum_{i=1}^{n} p_{i} \alpha_{i}+\sum_{i \in I} \epsilon_{i}\left(\alpha_{i}+\beta_{i}\right)\right) \sqrt{-1}+\kappa\left(\alpha_{I}, \xi\right)} \cdot e^{\frac{r}{4 \pi \sqrt{-1}}\left(\mathcal{W}^{\epsilon} I\left(\alpha_{I}, \xi\right)+\frac{\nu_{r}\left(\alpha_{I}, \xi\right)-\sum_{i \in I} \epsilon_{i} 8 \pi^{2}}{r^{2}}\right)} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Now let $D_{\mathbf{z}}=\left\{\left(\alpha_{I}, \xi\right) \in \overline{\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{H}, \mathbb{C}}^{\delta}}| | \operatorname{Im}\left(\alpha_{i}\right) \mid<L\right.$ for $i \in I,\left|\operatorname{Im}\left(\xi_{s}\right)\right|<L$ for $\left.s \in\{1, \ldots, c\}\right\}$ for some $L>0$. Let $\mathbf{a}_{r}=\left(\left(\beta_{i}\right)_{i \in I},\left(\alpha_{j}\right)_{j \in J}\right)$ (recall that $\beta_{i}=\frac{2 \pi n_{i}}{r}$ and $\alpha_{j}=\frac{2 \pi m_{j}}{r}$ depends on $r), f^{\mathbf{a}_{r}}\left(\alpha_{I}, \xi\right)=\mathcal{W}^{\epsilon_{I}}\left(\alpha_{I}, \xi\right), g^{\mathbf{a}_{r}}\left(\alpha_{I}, \xi\right)=\psi\left(\alpha_{I}, \xi\right) e^{\left(\sum_{i \in I} q_{i} \beta_{i}+\sum_{i=1}^{n} p_{i} \alpha_{i}+\sum_{i \in I} \epsilon_{i}\left(\alpha_{i}+\beta_{i}\right)\right) \sqrt{-1}+\kappa\left(\alpha_{I}, \xi\right)}$, $f_{r}^{\mathbf{a}_{r}}\left(\alpha_{I}, \xi\right)=\mathcal{W}_{r}^{\epsilon_{I}}\left(\alpha_{I}, \xi\right)+\frac{4 c \pi \sqrt{-1}}{r} \log \left(\frac{r}{2}\right), v_{r}\left(\alpha_{I}, \xi\right)=\nu_{r}\left(\alpha_{I}, \xi\right)-\sum_{i \in I} \epsilon_{i} 8 \pi^{2}, S_{r}=S^{\epsilon_{I}} \cup\left(\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{H}} \backslash \mathrm{D}_{\delta_{0}}\right)$ and $z^{\epsilon_{I}}$ is the critical point of $f$ in $D$. Then all the conditions of Proposition 5.1 are satisfied with and the result follows.

When $\beta_{i}=\alpha_{j}=\pi$, a direct computation shows that

$$
\begin{aligned}
C^{\epsilon_{I}}\left(z^{\epsilon_{I}}\right) & =\frac{r^{|I|+c}}{2^{2|I|+c} \pi^{|I|+c}}\left(\frac{2 \pi}{r}\right)^{\frac{|I|+c}{2}}\left(\frac{r}{2}\right)^{-c} g\left(\pi, \ldots, \pi, \frac{7 \pi}{4}, \ldots, \frac{7 \pi}{4}\right) \\
& =(-1)^{\sum_{i \in I} q_{i}+\sum_{i=1}^{n} p_{i}+c} \frac{r^{\frac{|I|-c}{2}}}{2^{\frac{3|I|+c}{2}} \pi^{\frac{|I|+c}{2}}} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Corollary 5.7. If $\epsilon>0$ is sufficiently small and all $\left\{\beta_{i}\right\}_{i \in I}$ and $\left\{\alpha_{j}\right\}_{j \in J}$ are in $\{\pi-\epsilon, \pi+\epsilon\}$, then

$$
\sum_{\epsilon_{I} \in\{1,-1\}^{I}} \frac{C^{\epsilon_{I}}\left(z^{\epsilon_{I}}\right)}{\sqrt{-\operatorname{det} \operatorname{Hess}^{\mathcal{W}} \mathcal{W}^{\epsilon_{I}}\left(z^{\epsilon_{I}}\right)}} \neq 0
$$

Proof. If $\beta_{i}=\alpha_{j}=\pi$ for all $i \in I$ and $j \in J$, then all $z^{\epsilon_{I}}=\left(\pi, \ldots, \pi, \frac{7 \pi}{4}, \frac{7 \pi}{4}\right)$ and all $\mathcal{W}^{\epsilon_{I}}$ are the same functions. As a consequence, all the $C^{\epsilon_{I}}\left(z^{\epsilon_{I}}\right)$ 's and all Hessian determinants det $\operatorname{Hess} \mathcal{W}^{\epsilon_{I}}\left(z^{\epsilon_{I}}\right)^{\prime}$ s are the same at this point, imply that the sum is not equal to zero. Then by continuity, if $\epsilon$ is small enough, then the sum remains none zero.

Remark 5.8. We suspect that all $C^{\epsilon_{I}}\left(z^{\epsilon_{I}}\right)$ 's and all $\operatorname{det} \operatorname{Hess}^{\mathcal{W}} \mathcal{W}^{\epsilon_{I}}\left(z^{\epsilon_{I}}\right)$ 's are always the same for any given $\left\{\beta_{i}\right\}_{i \in I}$ and $\left\{\alpha_{j}\right\}_{j \in J}$.

### 5.4 Estimate of the other Fourier coefficients

Proposition 5.9. Suppose $\left\{\beta_{i}\right\}_{i \in I}$ and $\left\{\alpha_{j}\right\}_{j \in J}$ are in $\{\pi-\epsilon, \pi+\epsilon\}$ for a sufficiently small $\epsilon>0$. If $\left(\mathbf{a}_{I}, \mathbf{b}\right) \neq(0, \ldots, 0)$, then

$$
\left|\widehat{f_{r}^{\epsilon}}\left(\mathbf{a}_{I}, \mathbf{b}\right)\right|<O\left(e^{\frac{r}{4 \pi}\left(\operatorname{Vol}\left(M_{L_{\theta}}\right)-\epsilon^{\prime}\right)}\right)
$$

for some $\epsilon^{\prime}>0$.
Proof. Recall that if $\beta_{i}=\alpha_{j}=\pi$ for all $i \in I$ and $j \in J$, then the total derivatieve

$$
D \mathcal{W}^{\epsilon_{I}}\left(\pi, \ldots, \pi, \frac{7 \pi}{4}, \ldots, \frac{7 \pi}{4}\right)=(0, \ldots, 0) .
$$

Hence there exists a $\delta_{1}>0$ and an $\epsilon>0$ such that if $\left\{\beta_{i}\right\}_{i \in I}$ and $\left\{\alpha_{j}\right\}_{j \in J}$ are in $\{\pi-\epsilon, \pi+\epsilon\}$, then for all $\left(\alpha_{I}, \xi\right) \in D_{\delta_{1}, \mathbb{C}}$ and for any unit vector $\mathbf{u}=\left(\left(u_{i}\right)_{i \in I},\left(w_{s}\right)_{s=1}^{c}\right) \in \mathbb{R}^{|I|+c}$, the directional derivatives

$$
\left|D_{\mathbf{u}} \operatorname{Im} \mathcal{W}^{\epsilon_{I}}\left(\alpha_{I}, \xi\right)\right|=\left|\sum_{i \in I} u_{i} \frac{\partial \operatorname{Im} \mathcal{W}^{\epsilon_{I}}}{\partial \operatorname{Im}\left(\alpha_{i}\right)}+\sum_{s=1}^{c} w_{s} \frac{\partial \operatorname{Im} \mathcal{W}^{\epsilon_{I}}}{\partial \operatorname{Im}\left(\xi_{s}\right)}\right|<\frac{2 \pi-\epsilon^{\prime \prime}}{2 \sqrt{2|I|+2 c}}
$$

for some $\epsilon^{\prime \prime}>0$.
On $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{H}}$, we have

$$
\operatorname{Im}\left(\mathcal{W}^{\epsilon_{I}}\left(\alpha_{I}, \xi\right)-\sum_{i \in I} 2 \pi a_{i} \alpha_{i}-\sum_{s=1}^{c} 4 \pi b_{s} \xi_{s}\right)=\operatorname{Im} \mathcal{W}^{\epsilon_{I}}\left(\alpha_{I}, \xi\right)
$$

Then by Lemma 5.3. Proposition 5.6 and the compactness of $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{H}} \backslash \mathrm{D}_{\delta_{1}}$,

$$
2 c v_{8}>\max _{\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{H}} \backslash \mathrm{D}_{\delta_{1}}} \operatorname{Im}\left(\mathcal{W}^{\epsilon_{I}}\left(\alpha_{I}, \xi\right)-\sum_{i \in I} 2 \pi a_{i} \alpha_{i}-\sum_{s=1}^{c} 4 \pi b_{s} \xi_{s}\right)+\epsilon^{\prime \prime \prime}
$$

for some $\epsilon^{\prime \prime \prime}>0$. By Proposition 5.2 and continuity, if $\left\{\beta_{i}\right\}_{i \in I}$ and $\left\{\alpha_{j}\right\}_{j \in J}$ are sufficiently close to $\pi$, then the critical point $z^{\epsilon_{I}}$ of $\mathcal{W}^{\epsilon_{I}}$ as in Proposition 5.2 lies in $\mathrm{D}_{\delta_{1}, \mathbb{C}}$, and $\operatorname{Im} \mathcal{W}^{\epsilon_{I}}\left(z^{\epsilon_{I}}\right)=\operatorname{Vol}\left(M_{L_{\theta}}\right)$ is sufficiently close to $2 c v_{8}$ so that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{Im} \mathcal{W}^{\epsilon_{I}}\left(z^{\epsilon_{I}}\right)>\max _{\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{H}} \backslash \mathrm{D}_{\delta_{1}}} \operatorname{Im}\left(\mathcal{W}^{\epsilon_{I}}\left(\alpha_{I}, \xi\right)-\sum_{i \in I} 2 \pi a_{i} \alpha_{i}-\sum_{s=1}^{c} 4 \pi b_{s} \xi_{s}\right)+\epsilon^{\prime \prime \prime} \tag{5.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

Therefore, we only need to estimate the integral on $\mathrm{D}_{\delta_{1}}$.
If $\left(\mathbf{a}_{I}, \mathbf{b}\right) \neq(0, \ldots, 0)$, then there is at least one of $\left\{a_{i}\right\}_{i \in I}$ or $\left\{b_{s}\right\}_{s=1}^{c}$ that is nonzero. Without loss of generality, assume that $a_{1} \neq 0$.

If $a_{1}>0$, then consider the surface $S^{+}=S_{\text {top }}^{+} \cup S_{\text {side }}^{+}$in $\overline{\mathrm{D}_{\delta_{1}, \mathrm{C}}}$ where

$$
S_{\mathrm{top}}^{+}=\left\{\left(\alpha_{I}, \xi\right) \in \mathrm{D}_{\delta_{1}, \mathrm{C}} \mid\left(\operatorname{Im}\left(\alpha_{I}\right), \operatorname{Im}(\xi)\right)=\left(\delta_{1}, 0, \ldots, 0\right)\right\}
$$

and

$$
S_{\text {side }}^{+}=\left\{\left(\alpha_{I}, \xi\right)+\left(t \sqrt{-1} \delta_{1}, 0, \ldots, 0\right) \mid\left(\alpha_{I}, \xi\right) \in \partial \mathrm{D}_{\delta_{1}}, t \in[0,1]\right\} .
$$

On the top, for any $\left(\alpha_{I}, \xi\right) \in S_{\text {top }}^{+}$, by the Mean Value Theorem,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left|\operatorname{Im} \mathcal{W}^{\epsilon_{I}}\left(z^{\epsilon_{I}}\right)-\operatorname{Im} \mathcal{W}^{\epsilon_{I}}\left(\alpha_{I}, \xi\right)\right| & =\left|D_{\mathbf{u}} \operatorname{Im} \mathcal{W}^{\epsilon_{I}}(z)\right| \cdot\left\|z^{\epsilon_{I}}-\left(\alpha_{I}, \xi\right)\right\| \\
& <\frac{2 \pi-\epsilon^{\prime \prime}}{2 \sqrt{2|I|+2 c}} \cdot 2 \sqrt{2|I|+2 c} \delta_{1} \\
& =2 \pi \delta_{1}-\epsilon^{\prime \prime} \delta_{1},
\end{aligned}
$$

where $z$ is some point on the line segment connecting $z^{\epsilon_{I}}$ and $\left(\alpha_{I}, \xi\right), \mathbf{u}=\frac{z^{\epsilon} I-\left(\alpha_{I}, \xi\right)}{\left\|z^{\epsilon} I-\left(\alpha_{I}, \xi\right)\right\|}$ and $2 \sqrt{2|I|+2 c} \delta_{1}$ is the diameter of $\mathrm{D}_{\delta_{1}, \mathbb{C}}$. Then

$$
\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{Im}\left(\mathcal{W}^{\epsilon_{I}}\left(\alpha_{I}, \xi\right)-\sum_{i \in I} 2 \pi a_{i} \alpha_{i}-\sum_{s=1}^{c} 4 \pi b_{s} \xi_{s}\right) & =\operatorname{Im} \mathcal{W}^{\epsilon_{I}}\left(\alpha_{I}, \xi\right)-2 \pi a_{1} \delta_{1} \\
& <\operatorname{Im} \mathcal{W}^{\epsilon_{I}}\left(z^{\epsilon_{I}}\right)+2 \pi \delta_{1}-\epsilon^{\prime \prime} \delta_{1}-2 \pi \delta_{1} \\
& =\operatorname{Im} \mathcal{W}^{\epsilon_{I}}\left(z^{\epsilon_{I}}\right)-\epsilon^{\prime \prime} \delta_{1}
\end{aligned}
$$

On the side, for any point $\left(\alpha_{I}, \xi\right)+\left(t \sqrt{-1} \delta_{1}, 0, \ldots, 0\right) \in S_{\text {side }}^{+}$, by the Mean Value Theorem again, we have

$$
\left|\operatorname{Im} \mathcal{W}^{\epsilon_{I}}\left(\left(\alpha_{I}, \xi\right)+\left(t \sqrt{-1} \delta_{1}, 0, \ldots, 0\right)\right)-\operatorname{Im} \mathcal{W}^{\epsilon_{I}}\left(\alpha_{I}, \xi\right)\right|<\frac{2 \pi-\epsilon^{\prime \prime}}{2 \sqrt{2|I|+2 c}} t \delta_{1}
$$

Then

$$
\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{Im} \mathcal{W}^{\epsilon_{I}}\left(\left(\alpha_{I}, \xi\right)+\left(t \sqrt{-1} \delta_{1}, 0, \ldots, 0\right)\right)-2 \pi a_{1} t \delta_{1} & <\operatorname{Im} \mathcal{W}^{\epsilon_{I}}\left(\alpha_{I}, \xi\right)+\frac{2 \pi-\epsilon^{\prime \prime}}{2 \sqrt{2|I|+2 c}} t \delta_{1}-2 \pi t \delta_{1} \\
& <\operatorname{Im} \mathcal{W}^{\epsilon_{I}}\left(\alpha_{I}, \xi\right) \\
& <\operatorname{Im} \mathcal{W}^{\epsilon_{I}}\left(z^{\epsilon_{I}}\right)-\epsilon^{\prime \prime \prime}
\end{aligned}
$$

where the last inequality comes from that $\left(\alpha_{I}, \xi\right) \in \partial \mathrm{D}_{\delta_{1}} \subset \mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{H}} \backslash \mathrm{D}_{\delta_{1}}$ and 5.8).
Now let $\epsilon^{\prime}=\min \left\{\epsilon^{\prime \prime} \delta_{1}, \epsilon^{\prime \prime \prime}\right\}$, then on $S^{+} \cup\left(\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{H}} \backslash \mathrm{D}_{\delta_{1}}\right)$,

$$
\operatorname{Im}\left(\mathcal{W}^{\epsilon_{I}}\left(\alpha_{I}, \xi\right)-\sum_{i \in I} 2 \pi a_{i} \alpha_{i}-\sum_{s=1}^{c} 4 \pi b_{s} \xi_{s}\right)<\operatorname{Im} \mathcal{W}^{\epsilon_{I}}\left(z^{\epsilon_{I}}\right)-\epsilon^{\prime}
$$

and the result follows.
If $a_{1}<0$, then we consider the surface $S^{-}=S_{\text {top }}^{-} \cup S_{\text {side }}^{-}$in $\overline{\mathrm{D}_{\delta_{1}, \mathbb{C}}}$ where

$$
S_{\mathrm{top}}^{-}=\left\{\left(\alpha_{I}, \xi\right) \in \mathrm{D}_{\delta_{1}, \mathbb{C}} \mid\left(\operatorname{Im}\left(\alpha_{I}\right), \operatorname{Im}(\xi)\right)=\left(-\delta_{1}, 0, \ldots, 0\right)\right\}
$$

and

$$
S_{\text {side }}^{-}=\left\{\left(\alpha_{I}, \xi\right)-\left(t \sqrt{-1} \delta_{1}, 0, \ldots, 0\right) \mid\left(\alpha_{I}, \xi\right) \in \partial \mathrm{D}_{\delta_{1}}, t \in[0,1]\right\}
$$

Then the same estimate as in the previous case proves that on $S^{-} \cup\left(\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{H}} \backslash \mathrm{D}_{\delta_{1}}\right)$,

$$
\operatorname{Im}\left(\mathcal{W}^{\epsilon_{I}}\left(\alpha_{I}, \xi\right)-\sum_{i \in I} 2 \pi a_{i} \alpha_{i}-\sum_{s=1}^{c} 4 \pi b_{s} \xi_{s}\right)<\operatorname{Im} \mathcal{W}^{\epsilon_{I}}\left(z^{\epsilon_{I}}\right)-\epsilon^{\prime}
$$

from which the result follows.

### 5.5 Estimate of the error term

The goal of this section is to estimate the error term in Proposition 3.7.
Proposition 5.10. Suppose $\left\{\alpha_{j}\right\}_{j \in J}$ are in $\{\pi-\epsilon, \pi+\epsilon\}$ for a sufficiently small $\epsilon>0$. Then the error term in Proposition 3.7 is less than $O\left(e^{\frac{r}{4 \pi}\left(\operatorname{Vol}\left(M_{L_{\theta}}\right)-\epsilon^{\prime}\right)}\right)$ for some $\epsilon^{\prime}>0$.

For the proof we need the following estimate, which first appeared in [15, Proposition 8.2] for $q=$ $e^{\frac{\pi \sqrt{-1}}{r}}$, and for the root $q=e^{\frac{2 \pi \sqrt{-1}}{r}}$ in [11, Proposition 4.1].

Lemma 5.11. For any integer $0<n<r$ and at $q=e^{\frac{2 \pi \sqrt{-1}}{r}}$,

$$
\log |\{n\}!|=-\frac{r}{2 \pi} \Lambda\left(\frac{2 n \pi}{r}\right)+O(\log (r))
$$

Proof of Proposition 5.10. For a fixed $\alpha_{J}=\left(\alpha_{j}\right)_{j \in J}$, let

$$
M_{\alpha_{J}}=\max \left\{\sum_{s=1}^{c} 2 V\left(\alpha_{s_{1}}, \ldots, \alpha_{s_{6}}, \xi_{s}\right) \mid\left(\alpha_{I}, \xi\right) \in \partial \mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{H}} \cup\left(\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{A}} \backslash \mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{H}}\right)\right\}
$$

where $V$ is as defined in (4.3). We note that if $\beta_{i}=\alpha_{j}=\pi$ for all $i \in I$ and $j \in J$, the $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{H}}=\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{A}}$ and $\partial \mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{H}} \cup\left(\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{A}} \backslash \mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{H}}\right)=\partial \mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{H}}$. Then By Lemma 5.6 .

$$
M_{\pi, \ldots, \pi}<2 c v_{8}
$$

and by continuity, if $\epsilon$ is sufficiently small, then

$$
M_{\alpha_{J}}<\operatorname{Vol}\left(M_{L_{\theta}}\right)
$$

for all $\left\{\alpha_{j}\right\}_{j \in J}$ in $\{\pi-\epsilon, \pi+\epsilon\}$.
Now by Lemma 5.11 and the continuity, for $\epsilon^{\prime}=\frac{\operatorname{Vol}\left(M_{L_{\theta}}\right)-M_{\alpha_{J}}}{2}$, we can choose a sufficiently small $\delta>0$ so that if $\left(\frac{2 \pi \mathbf{m}_{I}}{r}, \frac{2 \pi \mathbf{k}}{r}\right) \notin \mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{H}}^{\delta}$, then

$$
\left|g_{r}^{\epsilon_{I}}\left(\mathbf{m}_{I}, \mathbf{k}\right)\right|<O\left(e^{\frac{r}{4 \pi}\left(M_{\alpha_{J}}+\epsilon^{\prime}\right)}\right)=O\left(e^{\frac{r}{4 \pi}\left(\operatorname{Vol}\left(M_{L_{\theta}}\right)-\epsilon^{\prime}\right)}\right) .
$$

Let $\psi$ be the bump function supported on $\left(\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{H}}, \mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{H}}^{\delta}\right)$. Then the error term in Proposition 3.7 is less than $O\left(e^{\frac{r}{4 \pi}\left(\operatorname{Vol}\left(M_{L_{\theta}}\right)-\epsilon^{\prime}\right)}\right)$.

### 5.6 Proof of Theorem 3.1

Proof of Theorem 3.1 Let $\epsilon>0$ be sufficiently small so that the conditions of Propositions 5.5, 5.9 and 5.10 and of Corollary 5.7 are satisfied, and suppose $\left\{\beta_{i}\right\}_{i \in I}$ and $\left\{\alpha_{j}\right\}_{j \in J}$ are all in $(\pi-\epsilon, \pi+\epsilon)$. By Propositions 3.6, 3.7, 5.5, 5.9 and 5.10, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \operatorname{RT}_{r}\left(M, L,\left(\mathbf{n}_{I}, \mathbf{m}_{J}\right)\right) \\
= & \kappa_{r}\left(\sum_{\epsilon_{I} \in\{1,-1\}^{I}} \widehat{f_{r}^{\epsilon_{I}}}(0, \ldots, 0)\right)\left(1+O\left(e^{\frac{r}{2 \pi}\left(-\epsilon^{\prime}\right)}\right)\right) \\
= & \kappa_{r}\left(\sum_{\epsilon_{I} \in\{1,-1\}^{I}} \frac{C^{\epsilon_{I}}\left(z^{\epsilon_{I}}\right)}{\sqrt{-\operatorname{det} \operatorname{Hess} \mathcal{W}^{\epsilon_{I}}\left(z^{\epsilon_{I}}\right)}}\right) e^{\frac{r}{4 \pi \sqrt{-1}}}\left(2 c \pi^{2}+\sqrt{-1}\left(\operatorname{Vol}\left(M_{L_{\theta}}\right)+\sqrt{-1} \operatorname{CS}\left(M_{L_{\theta}}\right)\right)\right)
\end{aligned}\left(1+O\left(\frac{1}{r}\right)\right) . .
$$

By Proposition 3.5, we have

$$
\lim _{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{4 \pi}{r} \log \kappa_{r}=\left(\sigma\left(L^{\prime} \cap L_{I}\right)-\sum_{i \in I} q_{i}-\sum_{i=1}^{n} p_{i}-2|I|\right) \sqrt{-1} \pi^{2} ;
$$

and by Corollary 5.7, we have

$$
\sum_{\epsilon_{I} \in\{1,-1\}^{I}} \frac{C^{\epsilon_{I}}\left(z^{\epsilon_{I}}\right)}{\sqrt{-\operatorname{det} \operatorname{Hess} \mathcal{W}^{\epsilon_{I}}\left(z^{\epsilon_{I}}\right)}} \neq 0
$$

and hence

$$
\lim _{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{4 \pi}{r} \log \left(\sum_{\epsilon_{I} \in\{1,-1\}^{I}} \frac{C^{\epsilon_{I}}\left(z^{\epsilon_{I}}\right)}{\sqrt{-\operatorname{det} \operatorname{Hess}^{\epsilon^{\epsilon}}\left(z^{\epsilon_{I}}\right)}}\right)=0 .
$$

Therefore,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \lim _{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{4 \pi}{r} \log \operatorname{RT}_{r}\left(M, L,\left(\mathbf{n}_{I}, \mathbf{m}_{J}\right)\right) \\
= & \left(\sigma\left(L^{\prime} \cap L_{I}\right)-\sum_{i \in I} q_{i}-\sum_{i=1}^{n} p_{i}-2|I|\right) \sqrt{-1} \pi^{2}-2 c \sqrt{-1} \pi^{2}+\operatorname{Vol}\left(M_{L_{\theta}}\right)+\sqrt{-1} \operatorname{CS}\left(M_{L_{\theta}}\right) \\
= & \operatorname{Vol}\left(M_{L_{\theta}}\right)+\sqrt{-1} \operatorname{CS}\left(M_{L_{\theta}}\right) \quad \bmod \sqrt{-1} \pi^{2} \mathbb{Z},
\end{aligned}
$$

which completes the proof.

## 6 Some concrete examples

The goal of this section is to show that several important families of links have complements homeomorphic to fundamental shadow link complements $M_{c} \backslash L_{\mathrm{FSL}}$, and are obtained from ( $M_{c}, L_{\mathrm{FSL}}$ ) by doing a change of pair operation, including the twisted octahedral fully augmented links considered by Purcell [31] and van der Veen [41], and the family $\mathcal{U}$ considered by Kumar [22, Theorem 4.1]. As a consequence, Conjecture [1.1] the Volume Conjecture for the Turaev-Viro invariants [6] and the Generalized Volume Conjecture [27, 16] hold, and the answer to [12, Question 1.7] is positive, for these families of examples. See Theorems 6.1, 6.3 and 6.5 . It is worth mentioning that both the family of the twisted octahedral fully augmented links and the family $\mathcal{U}$ are universal families in the sense that every link in $S^{3}$ is a sublink of a member of these families.

We first look at the twisted octahedral fully augmented links. Following the construction in [41], we start with a trivalent graph $T$ that is homomorphic to the 1 -skeleton of a Euclidean tetrahedron as shown on the left of Figure 5. and apply a sequence of the triangle move as show on the right of Figure 55 to get a trivalent graph $G$.


Figure 5
Then we color some edges of $G$ by red in a way that each vertex is adjacent to exactly one red edge. Such a coloring of the red edges always exists because for the initial graph $T$ we can color any pair of the opposite edges by red, and then for each triangle move, we color the new edge opposite to the red edge in the old graph by red. See Figure 6


Figure 6

For each choice of the red edges of $G$, we can construct a link in $S^{3}$ as follows. As shown in Figure 7. we first circulate each red edge by a trivial loop (the belt). Then we replace each red edge by a pair of


Figure 7
arcs parallel to it and connect the ends of the two arcs respectively to the edges of $G$ that are originally adjacent to the red edge. Finally, we do a certain number of (possibly half) twists to each pair of parallel arcs. In this way, we get a twisted octahedral fully augmented link in $S^{3}$. See Figure 8 for a concrete example starting from the trivalent graph $T$.


Figure 8
The twisted octahedral fully augmented links were also described in [31] using the dual nerve of the graph. Namely, we start with the graph $T$ and consider its dual nerve, which is a graph $T^{*}$ homeomorphic to $T$ with triangular faces. After doing a sequence of the central subdivisions of the faces, we get a graph $G^{*}$ with triangular faces. Then we choose a collection of red edges such that each triangular face contains exactly one red edge. Finally we consider the dual graph $G$ of $G^{*}$ and color the dual edge of the red edges of $G^{*}$ by red, and change the red as shown in Figure 7. In this way, we obtain a link in $S^{3}$. Since the triangle move is dual to the central subdivision (see Figure 9), the links constructed in this way are exactly the twisted octahedral fully augmented links.


Figure 9
In [41], van der Veen prove that the complement of a twisted octahedral fully augmented link is homeomorphic to some fundamental shadow link complement. Together with the result of [4], we have
Theorem 6.1 ([41, 4]). Suppose $L$ is a framed twisted octahedral fully augmented link in $S^{3}$. Then as $r$ varies over all odd integers,

$$
\lim _{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{2 \pi}{r} \log \mathrm{TV}_{r}\left(S^{3} \backslash L\right)=\operatorname{Vol}\left(S^{3} \backslash L\right)
$$

The main observation of this section is the following Proposition 6.2, which is a refinement of the result of [41].

Proposition 6.2. Let $L$ be a framed twisted octahedral fully augmented link. Then $\left(S^{3}, L\right)$ is obtained from ( $M_{c}, L_{F S L}$ ) by doing a change of pair operation, where $M_{c}=\#^{c+1} S^{2} \times S^{1}$ for some positive integer $c$ and $L_{F S L} \subset M_{c}$ is a fundamental shadow link. As a consequence of Proposition 1.3. $S^{3} \backslash L$ is homeomorphic to $M_{c} \backslash L_{F S L}$.

Proof. Suppose $L=L_{1} \cup \cdots \cup L_{n}$. Let $I$ be the subset of $\{1, \ldots, n\}$ such that $\left\{L_{i}\right\}_{i \in I}$ are the belt components of $L$, and let $L_{I}=\cup_{i \in I} L_{i}$. Let $J=\{1, \ldots, n\} \backslash I$, and let $L_{J}=\cup_{j \in J} L_{j}$. Recall that each $L_{i}$ corresponds to an red edge of the graph $G$ which splits into two parallel arcs with a number of twits. Later we will prove the result in two steps. In Step 1 we consider the case that there is no twist or only a half-twists for each $i \in I$. In Step 2 we consider the general case.

We first observe that $L_{J}$ lies in a tubular neighborhood of the 1-skeleton of a truncated polyhedron $P_{G}$ in $S^{3}$ obtained by gluing truncated tetrahedra together along the triangles of truncation. Indeed, we can regard the initial trivalent graph $T$ as the set of edges of a truncated tetrahedron (see Figure 10), and regard a triangular move as attaching another truncated tetrahedron along the triangle of truncation (see Figure 11).


Figure 10: In a truncated polyhedron, we only consider the intersection of two faces as an edge, and do not consider the intersection of a face and a triangle of truncation as an edge.


Figure 11
In this way, we obtain a truncated polyhedron $P_{G}$ in $\mathbb{R}^{3} \subset S^{3}$, and the edges of the graph $G$ correspond to the edges of $P_{G}$. As shown in Figure 12, the two parallel arcs from splitting the red edge can be drawn in a tubular neighborhood of the red arc. See Figure 13 for a concrete example.


Figure 12


Figure 13

Step 1. Suppose in the construction of $L$ there is no twist or only a half twist for each pair of arcs from splitting the red edges. For each $i \in I$, we let $L_{i}^{\prime}$ be $L_{i}$ with the 0 -framing which is possibly different from the original framing of $L_{i}$, and let $L_{i}^{*}$ be the framed trivial loop around $L_{i}$ with the 0 -framing. Let $L_{I}^{\prime}=\cup_{i \in I} L_{i}^{\prime}$. We first claim that by doing the change of pair operation $T\left(L_{I}^{\prime} ; L_{I}^{*}\right)$ to the pair $\left(S^{3}, L\right)$ we get the pair $\left(M_{|I|}, L_{\mathrm{FSL}}\right)$, where $M_{|I|}=\#^{|I|}\left(S^{2} \times S^{1}\right)$ and $L_{\mathrm{FSL}}$ is a fundamental shadow link in $M_{|I|}$. See Figure 14


Figure 14
Indeed, let $N_{I}=\cup_{i \in I} N\left(L_{i}\right)$ be the union of the tubular neighborhoods of the belts $\left\{L_{i}\right\}_{i \in I}$. Then $S^{3} \backslash N_{I}$ is a handlebody $H_{|I|}$ of genus $|I|, L_{I}^{*} \cup L_{J}$ is a link in $H_{|I|}$, and doing 0 -surgeries along $\left\{L_{i}\right\}_{i \in I}$ is the same as taking the double of $H_{|I|}$, which is homeomorphic to $M_{|I|}$. On the other hand, the handlebody $H_{|I|}$ can also be considered as obtained from the polyhedron $P_{G}$ by gluing the two triangles of truncation at the end of each red edge via the orientation reversing affine homeomorphism identifying the two end points of the red edge.

If there is no twist for all pairs of arcs from splitting the red edges, then the link $L_{I}^{*} \cup L_{J}$ corresponds to the link $L_{\mathrm{FSL}}$ consisting of the union of the edges of $P_{G}$. From the construction in Section 2.4, $L_{\mathrm{FSL}}$ in the double of $H_{|I|}$ is a fundamental shadow link in $M_{|I|}$. See Figure 15 for a concrete example.


Figure 15
If there is a half twist on the pair of arcs from splitting red edge $e_{i}$ circulated by $L_{i}$, for some $i \in I$, then we glue the two triangles of truncation at the end of $e_{i}$ via the orientation preserving affine home-
omorphism identifying the two end points $e_{i}$. In this way, we obtain a non-orientable handlebody $H_{|I|}^{\prime}$ whose orientable double is homeomorphic to $M_{|I|}$, and the link $L_{I}^{*} \cup L_{J}$ corresponds to the link $L_{\mathrm{FSL}}$ consisting of the union of the edges of $P_{G}$, which is a fundamental shadow link in $M_{|I|}$.

For each $i \in I$, we let $L_{i}^{* *}$ be the framed trivial loop around $L_{i}^{*}$ with the same framing as that of $L_{i}$. Then we claim that $\left(S^{3}, L\right)$ can be obtained from $\left(M_{|I|}, L_{\mathrm{FSL}}\right)$ by doing the change of pair operation $T\left(L_{I}^{*}, L_{I}^{* *}\right)$, proving the result in Case 1. See Figure 16 .


Figure 16
This could be seen by the following the second Kirby Moves (handle slides) which do not change the pair. For each $i \in I$, we first slide $L_{i}^{* *}$ over $L_{i}^{\prime}$ as in Figure 17 to get a framed trivial loop isotopic to $L_{i}$. Suppose $L_{j}$ and $L_{j^{\prime}}$ (with $j$ possibly the same as $j^{\prime}$ ) are the components of $L$ circulated by $L_{i}$. Then we


Figure 17
slide $L_{j}$ and $L_{j^{\prime}}$ over $L_{i}^{*}$ as in Figure 18 so that $L_{i}^{\prime} \cup L_{i}^{*}$ is a Hopf link with 0 -framings unlinked with the rest of $L$. Doing these operations for each $i \in I$, we get the original link $L$ in the 3 -manifold obtained from $S^{3}$ by doing a surgery along the disjoint union of $|I|$ Hopf links with 0 -framings, which is still $S^{3}$.


Figure 18
Step 2. Suppose in the construction of $L$, the pair of arcs from splitting the red edge circulated by $L_{i}$ is twisted $p_{i}$ times or $p_{i}$ and a half times. Let ( $M_{|I|}, L_{\mathrm{FSL}}$ ) be the fundamental shadow link constructed in Step 1. For each $i \in I$, let $L_{i}^{* \prime}$ be $L_{i}^{*}$ with the $\left(-p_{i}\right)$-framing, and let $L_{I}^{* \prime}=\cup_{i \in I} L_{i}^{* \prime}$. Still let $L_{i}^{* *}$ be the
framed trivial loop around $L_{i}^{*}$ with the same framing as that of $L_{i}$. We claim that $\left(S^{3}, L\right)$ can be obtained from $\left(M_{|I|}, L_{\mathrm{FSL}}\right)$ by doing the change of pair operation $T\left(L_{I}^{* \prime}, L_{I}^{* *}\right)$, proving the result in Case 2.

Similar to Case 1, we first slide $L_{i}^{* *}$ over $L_{i}^{\prime}$ as in Figure 19 to get a framed trivial loop isotopic to $L_{i}$. By e.g. [35, p. 273], since $L_{i}^{* \prime}$ is a trivial loop around $L_{i}^{\prime}$ and


Figure 19

$$
\frac{1}{p_{i}}=0-\frac{1}{-p_{i}}
$$

doing the surgery along the union of $L_{i}^{\prime}$ and $L_{i}^{* \prime}$ respectively with framings 0 and $\left(-p_{i}\right)$ is equivalent to doing a $\frac{1}{p_{i}}$-surgery along a loop isotopic to $L_{i}$, which is the same as doing $p_{i}$ full twists along the strip circulated by $L_{i}$. See Figure 20. This completes the proof.


Figure 20

By Theorem 3.1, Propositions 6.2 and the relationship between the Resherikhin-Turaev invarints and the colored Jones polynomials that

$$
\mathrm{RT}_{r}\left(S^{3}, L, \mathbf{m}\right)=\mu_{r} \mathrm{~J}_{\mathbf{m}, L}\left(q^{2}\right)
$$

we have
Theorem 6.3. Suppose $L$ is a framed twisted octahedral fully augmented with $n$ components. For a sequence $\mathbf{m}^{(r)}=\left(m_{1}^{(r)}, \ldots, m_{n}^{(r)}\right)$ of colorings of $L$, let

$$
\theta_{k}=\left|2 \pi-\lim _{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{4 \pi m_{k}^{(r)}}{r}\right|
$$

and let $\theta=\left(\theta_{1}, \ldots, \theta_{n}\right)$. If all the $\theta_{i}$ 's are sufficiently small, then

$$
\lim _{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{4 \pi}{r} \log \mathrm{~J}_{L, \mathbf{m}^{(r)}}\left(e^{\frac{4 \pi i}{r}}\right)=\operatorname{Vol}\left(S_{L_{\theta}}^{3}\right)+\sqrt{-1} \mathrm{CS}\left(S_{L_{\theta}}^{3}\right) \quad \bmod \sqrt{-1} \pi^{2} \mathbb{Z}
$$

where $r$ varies over all odd integers.

Next, we consider the universal family $\mathcal{U}$ of links in $S^{3}$ considered by Kumar [22] whose complements are homeomorphic to some fundamental shadow link complements. Together with the result of [4], he proved that Chen-Yang's Volume Conjecture for the Turaev-Viro invariants is true for the complements of these families of links. The way he found the fundamental shadow links is essentially by doing a change of pair operation along the belt components of the links. Then by the same argument in Step 1 of the proof of Proposition6.2, we have

Proposition 6.4. Let $L$ be a framed link in $\mathcal{U}$ of [22]]. Then $\left(S^{3}, L\right)$ is obtained from $\left(M_{c}, L_{F S L}\right)$ by doing a change of pair operation.

As a consequence of Theorem 3.1 and Proposition 6.4, we have
Theorem 6.5. Suppose $L$ is a framed link of $n$ components which is a member of $\mathcal{U}$ of [22]]. For a sequence $\mathbf{m}^{(r)}=\left(m_{1}^{(r)}, \ldots, m_{n}^{(r)}\right)$ of colorings of $L$, let

$$
\theta_{k}=\left|2 \pi-\lim _{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{4 \pi m_{k}^{(r)}}{r}\right|
$$

and let $\theta=\left(\theta_{1}, \ldots, \theta_{n}\right)$. If all the $\theta_{i}$ 's are sufficiently small, then

$$
\lim _{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{4 \pi}{r} \log \mathrm{~J}_{L, \mathbf{m}^{(r)}}\left(e^{\frac{4 \pi i}{r}}\right)=\operatorname{Vol}\left(S_{L_{\theta}}^{3}\right)+\sqrt{-1} \mathrm{CS}\left(S_{L_{\theta}}^{3}\right) \quad \bmod \sqrt{-1} \pi^{2} \mathbb{Z}
$$

where $r$ varies over all odd integers.
Remark 6.6. The proof of Proposition 6.2 essentially provides an algorithm of constructing a fundamental shadow link from a given twisted octahedral fully augmented link or a given element of $\mathcal{U}$. In [41], van der Veen for each link $L$ in $S^{3}$ provided an algorithm of constructing a twisted octahedral fully augmented link $L^{\prime}$ such that $S^{3} \backslash L$ is obtained from $S^{3} \backslash L^{\prime}$ by $\frac{1}{0}$-filling suitable boundary components. In [22], Kumar for each link $L$ in $S^{3}$ considered as the closure of a braid provided an algorithm of constructing a link $L^{\prime}$ in $\mathcal{U}$ such that $S^{3} \backslash L$ is obtained from $S^{3} \backslash L^{\prime}$ by $\frac{1}{0}$-filling suitable boundary components. Therefore, together with Propositions 6.2 and 6.4 , we for each $L$ in $S^{3}$ have two algorithms of constructing a fundamental shadow link $L_{\mathrm{FSL}}$ in $M_{c}$ such that $S^{3} \backslash L$ is obtained from $M_{c} \backslash L_{\mathrm{FSL}}$ by filling suitable boundary components. It is an interesting question to know whether the universal families of the twisted octahedral fully augmented links and $\mathcal{U}$ are actually the same family.

## A A proof of Proposition 5.1

The goal of this appendix is to prove Proposition5.1. We need the following two Lemmas whose proof are included at the end of the appendix.

Lemma A.1. For any $\epsilon>0$, there exists $a \delta>0$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{-\epsilon}^{\epsilon} e^{-r z^{2}} d z=\sqrt{\frac{\pi}{r}}+O\left(e^{-\delta r}\right) \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

and
(2)

$$
\int_{-\epsilon}^{\epsilon} z^{2} e^{-r z^{2}} d z=\frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{r^{3}}}+O\left(e^{-\delta r}\right)
$$

Lemma A.2. (Complex Morse Lemma) Let $D_{\mathbf{z}}$ be a region in $\mathbb{C}^{n}$, let $D_{\mathrm{a}}$ be a region in $\mathbb{R}^{k}$, and let $f: D_{\mathbf{z}} \times D_{\mathbf{a}} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be a complex valued function that is holomorphic in $\mathbf{z} \in D_{\mathbf{z}}$ and smooth in $\mathbf{a} \in D_{\mathbf{a}}$. For $\mathbf{a} \in D_{\mathbf{a}}$, let $f^{\mathbf{a}}: D_{\mathbf{z}} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be the function defined by $f^{\mathbf{a}}(\mathbf{z})=f(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{a})$. Suppose for each $\mathbf{a} \in D_{\mathbf{a}}$, $f^{\mathbf{a}}$ has a non-degenerate critical point $c_{\mathbf{a}}$ which smoothly depends on $\mathbf{a}$. Then for each $\mathbf{a}_{0} \in D_{\mathbf{a}}$, there exists an open set $V \subset \mathbb{C}^{n}$ containing $\mathbf{0}$, an open set $A \subset D_{\mathbf{a}}$ containing $\mathbf{a}_{0}$, and a smooth function $\psi: V \times A \rightarrow D_{\mathbf{z}}$ such that, if we denote $\psi^{\mathbf{a}}(\mathbf{Z})=\psi(\mathbf{Z}, \mathbf{a})$, then for each $\mathbf{a} \in D_{\mathbf{a}}, \mathbf{z}=\psi^{\mathbf{a}}(\mathbf{Z})$ is a holomorphic change of variable on $V$ such that

$$
\begin{gathered}
\psi^{\mathbf{a}}(\mathbf{0})=\mathbf{c}_{\mathbf{a}} \\
f^{\mathbf{a}}\left(\psi^{\mathbf{a}}(\mathbf{Z})\right)=f^{\mathbf{a}}\left(\mathbf{c}_{\mathbf{a}}\right)-Z_{1}^{2}-\cdots-Z_{n}^{2},
\end{gathered}
$$

and

$$
\operatorname{det}\left(D\left(\psi^{\mathbf{a}}\right)(\mathbf{0})\right)=\frac{2^{\frac{n}{2}}}{\sqrt{-\operatorname{det} \operatorname{Hess}\left(f^{\mathbf{a}}\right)\left(\mathbf{c}_{\mathbf{a}}\right)}}
$$

Proof of Proposition 5.1] We write $\mathbf{z}=\left(z_{1}, \ldots, z_{n}\right) \in \mathbb{C}^{n}, \mathbf{Z}=\left(Z_{1}, \ldots, Z_{n}\right) \in \mathbb{C}^{n}, \mathbf{W}=\left(W_{1}, \ldots, W_{n}\right) \in$ $\mathbb{C}^{n}, d \mathbf{z}=d z_{1} \ldots d z_{n}$ and $\mathbf{0}=(0, \ldots, 0) \in \mathbb{C}^{n}$.

We first consider the special case $\mathbf{c}_{r}=\mathbf{0}, S_{r}=[-\epsilon, \epsilon]^{n} \subset \mathbb{R}^{n} \subset \mathbb{C}^{n}$, and

$$
f^{\mathbf{a}_{r}}(\mathbf{z})=-\sum_{i=1}^{n} z_{i}^{2}
$$

for each $r$. In this case, let

$$
\sigma_{r}^{\mathbf{a}_{r}}(\mathbf{z})=v_{r}\left(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{a}_{r}\right) \int_{0}^{1} e^{\frac{v_{r}\left(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{a}_{r}\right)}{r}} d s
$$

Then we can write

$$
e^{\frac{v_{r}\left(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{a}_{r}\right)}{r}}=1+\frac{\sigma_{r}^{\mathbf{a}_{r}}(\mathbf{z})}{r},
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
g^{\mathbf{a}_{r}}(\mathbf{z}) e^{r f_{r}^{\mathbf{a}_{r}}(\mathbf{z})}=g^{\mathbf{a}_{r}}(\mathbf{z}) e^{r f^{\mathbf{a}_{r}(\mathbf{z})}}+\frac{1}{r} g^{\mathbf{a}_{r}}(\mathbf{z}) \sigma_{r}^{\mathbf{a}_{r}}(\mathbf{z}) e^{r f^{\mathbf{a}_{r}(\mathbf{z})}} \tag{A.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since $\left|v_{r}\left(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{a}_{r}\right)\right|<M$ for some $M>0$ independent of $r$,

$$
\left|\sigma_{r}^{\mathbf{a}_{r}}(\mathbf{z})\right|<M \int_{0}^{1} e^{\frac{M}{r} s} d s=M\left(\frac{e^{\frac{M}{r}}-1}{\frac{M}{r}}\right)<2 M .
$$

Since $\left\{\alpha_{r}\right\}$ is convergent and $g$ is smooth in a, if $M$ is big enough, then $\left|g^{\mathbf{a}_{r}}(\mathbf{z})\right|<M$ for all $z \in S_{r}=$ $[-\epsilon, \epsilon]^{n}$ for $r$ large enough. By Lemma A.1 (1), we have

$$
\begin{align*}
\left|\int_{S_{r}} \frac{1}{r} g^{\mathbf{a}_{r}}(\mathbf{z}) \sigma_{r}(\mathbf{z}) e^{r f^{\mathbf{a}_{r}(\mathbf{z})}}\right| & <\frac{2 M^{2}}{r} \int_{S_{r}} e^{r f^{\mathbf{a}_{r}(\mathbf{z})}} d \mathbf{z}  \tag{A.2}\\
& =\frac{2 M^{2}}{r}\left(\frac{\pi}{r}\right)^{\frac{n}{2}}+O\left(e^{-\delta r}\right)=O\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{r^{n+2}}}\right) .
\end{align*}
$$

By the Taylor Theorem, we have

$$
g^{\mathbf{a}_{r}}(\mathbf{z})=g^{\mathbf{a}_{r}}(\mathbf{0})+\sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\partial}{\partial z_{i}} g^{\mathbf{a}_{r}}(\mathbf{0}) z_{i}+\sum_{i \neq j} \frac{\partial^{2}}{\partial z_{i} z_{j}} g^{\mathbf{a}_{r}}(\mathbf{0}) z_{i} z_{j}+\sum_{i=1}^{n} h_{i}^{\mathbf{a}_{r}}(\mathbf{z}) z_{i}^{2}
$$

for some holomorphic functions $h_{i}^{\mathbf{a}_{r}}(\mathbf{z}), i=1, \ldots, n$, on $D$. Then by Lemma A.1 (1), we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{S_{r}} g^{\mathbf{a}_{r}}(\mathbf{0}) e^{r f^{\mathbf{a}_{r}(\mathbf{z})}} d \mathbf{z}=g^{\mathbf{a}_{r}}(\mathbf{0})\left(\frac{\pi}{r}\right)^{\frac{n}{2}}+O\left(\frac{1}{r}\right) \tag{A.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since each $z_{i} e^{-r z_{i}^{2}}$ is odd, we have

$$
\int_{-\epsilon}^{\epsilon} z_{i} e^{-r z_{i}^{2}} d z_{i}=0
$$

As a consequence, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{-\epsilon}^{\epsilon} \frac{\partial}{\partial z_{i}} g^{\mathbf{a}_{r}}(\mathbf{0}) z_{i} e^{r f^{\mathbf{a}_{r}(\mathbf{z})}} d \mathbf{z}=0 \tag{A.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

for each $i$, and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{-\epsilon}^{\epsilon} \frac{\partial^{2}}{\partial z_{i} z_{j}} g^{\mathbf{a}_{r}}(\mathbf{0}) z_{i} z_{j} e^{r f^{\mathbf{a}_{r}(\mathbf{z})}} d \mathbf{z}=0 \tag{A.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

for each $i \neq j$. Since $\left\{\mathbf{a}_{r}\right\}$ is convergent and $h_{i}^{\alpha}$ is smooth in $\mathbf{a}$, if $M$ is big enough, then $\left|h_{\mathbf{a}_{r}, i}(\mathbf{z})\right|<M$ for all $\mathbf{z} \in S_{r}, i \in\{1, \ldots, n\}$ for $r$ large enough. By Lemma A. 1 we have for each $i \in\{1, \ldots, n\}$

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\int_{S_{r}} h_{i}^{\mathbf{a}_{r}}(\mathbf{z}) z_{i}^{2} e^{r f^{\mathbf{a}_{r}}(\mathbf{z})} d \mathbf{z}\right|<M\left(\int_{-\epsilon}^{\epsilon} z_{i}^{2} e^{-r z_{i}^{2}} d z_{i}\right) \prod_{j \neq i}\left(\int_{-\epsilon}^{\epsilon} e^{-r z_{j}^{2}} d z_{j}\right)=O\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{r^{n+2}}}\right) . \tag{A.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Putting (A.3), (A.4), (A.5) and (A.6) together, we have the result for this special case.
For the general case, by assumption (6) of Proposition 5.1, for a sufficiently close to $\mathbf{a}_{0}, f^{\text {a }}$ has a unique non-degenerate critical point $\mathbf{c}_{\mathbf{a}}$ in a sufficiently small neighborhood of $\mathbf{c}_{0}$. Then we can apply Lemma A. 2 to the function $f$ and $\mathbf{a}_{0}$. Let $V, A$ and $\psi$ respectively be the two open sets and the change of variable function as described in Lemma A.2. For $r$ sufficiently large, let

$$
U_{r}=\psi^{\mathbf{a}_{r}}\left(\prod_{i=1}^{n}\left\{Z_{i} \in \mathbb{C} \mid-\epsilon<\operatorname{Re}\left(Z_{i}\right)<\epsilon,-\epsilon<\operatorname{Im}\left(Z_{i}\right)<\epsilon\right\}\right)
$$

for some sufficiently small $\epsilon>0$. Let $\operatorname{Vol}\left(S_{r} \backslash U_{r}\right)$ be the Euclidean volume of $S_{r} \backslash U_{r}$. By the compactness of $S_{r} \backslash U_{r}$ and by assumptions (2), (4) and (5) of Proposition 5.1, there exist constants $M>0$ and $\delta>0$ independent of $r$ such that $\left|g^{\mathbf{a}_{r}}(\mathbf{z})\right|<M, \operatorname{Vol}\left(S_{r} \backslash U_{r}\right)<M$ and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{Re} f_{r}^{\mathbf{a}_{r}}(\mathbf{z})<\operatorname{Re} f^{\mathbf{a}_{r}}\left(\mathbf{c}_{r}\right)-\delta \tag{A.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

on $S_{r} \backslash U$ for $r$ large enough. Then

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\int_{S_{r} \backslash U} g^{\mathbf{a}_{r}}(\mathbf{z}) e^{r f_{r}^{\mathbf{a}_{r}(\mathbf{z}}} d \mathbf{z}\right|<M^{2}\left(e^{r\left(\operatorname{Re}^{\left.\mathbf{a}_{r}(\mathbf{z})\left(\mathbf{c}_{r}\right)-\delta\right)}\right.}\right)=O\left(e^{r\left(\operatorname{Re}^{\left.\mathbf{a}_{r}(\mathbf{z})\left(\mathbf{c}_{r}\right)-\delta\right)}\right.}\right) \tag{A.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

In Figure 21 below, the shaded region is where $\operatorname{Re}\left(-\sum_{i=1}^{n} Z_{i}^{2}\right)<0$. For each $\mathbf{a}_{r}$, in $\overline{\left(\psi^{\mathbf{a}_{r}}\right)^{-1}\left(U_{r}\right)}$ there is a homotopy $H_{r}$ from $\overline{\left(\psi^{\mathbf{a}_{r}}\right)^{-1}\left(S_{r} \cap U_{r}\right)}$ to $[-\epsilon, \epsilon]^{n} \subset \mathbb{R}^{n}$ defined by "pushing everything down" to the real part. Let $S_{r}^{\prime}=H_{r}\left(\partial\left(\psi^{\mathbf{a}_{r}}\right)^{-1}\left(S_{r} \cap U_{r}\right) \times[0,1]\right)$. Then $\overline{\left(\psi^{\mathbf{a}_{r}}\right)^{-1}\left(S_{r} \cap U_{r}\right)}$ is homotopic to $S_{r}^{\prime} \cup[-\epsilon, \epsilon]^{n}$. Then by analyticity,

$$
\begin{align*}
& \int_{S_{r} \cap U} g^{\mathbf{a}_{r}}(\mathbf{z}) e^{r f_{r}^{\mathbf{a}_{r}}(\mathbf{z})} d \mathbf{z} \\
= & \int_{\left(\psi^{\mathbf{a}_{r}}\right)^{-1}\left(S_{r} \cap U\right)} g^{\mathbf{a}_{r}}\left(\psi^{\mathbf{a}_{r}}(\mathbf{Z})\right) \operatorname{det} \mathrm{D}\left(\psi^{\mathbf{a}_{r}}(\mathbf{Z})\right) e^{r f_{r}^{\mathbf{a}_{r}}\left(\psi^{\mathbf{a}_{r}}(\mathbf{Z})\right)} d \mathbf{Z} \\
= & \int_{S_{r}^{\prime}} g^{\mathbf{a}_{r}}\left(\psi^{\mathbf{a}_{r}}(\mathbf{Z})\right) \operatorname{det} \mathrm{D}\left(\psi^{\mathbf{a}_{r}}(\mathbf{Z})\right) e^{r f_{r}^{\mathbf{a}_{r}}\left(\psi^{\mathbf{a}_{r}}(\mathbf{Z})\right)} d \mathbf{Z}+\int_{[-\epsilon, \epsilon] n} g^{\mathbf{a}_{r}}(\psi(\mathbf{Z})) \operatorname{det} \mathrm{D}\left(\psi^{\mathbf{a}_{r}}(\mathbf{Z})\right) e^{r f_{r}^{\mathbf{a}_{r}}\left(\psi^{\mathbf{a}_{r}}(\mathbf{Z})\right)} d \mathbf{Z} . \tag{A.9}
\end{align*}
$$
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Since $\psi^{\mathbf{a}_{r}}\left(S^{\prime}\right) \subset S_{r} \backslash U_{r}$, by A.7)

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{S_{r}^{\prime}} g^{\mathbf{a}_{r}}\left(\psi^{\mathbf{a}_{r}}(\mathbf{Z})\right) \operatorname{det} \mathrm{D}\left(\psi^{\mathbf{a}_{r}}(\mathbf{Z})\right) e^{r f_{r}^{\mathbf{a}_{r}}\left(\psi^{\mathbf{a}_{r}}(\mathbf{Z})\right)} d \mathbf{Z}=\int_{\psi^{\mathbf{a}_{r}}\left(S_{r}^{\prime}\right)} g^{\mathbf{a}_{r}}(\mathbf{z}) e^{r f_{r}^{\mathbf{a}_{r}}(\mathbf{z})} d \mathbf{z}=O\left(e^{r\left(\operatorname{Re}^{\left.\mathbf{a}_{r}\left(\mathbf{c}_{r}\right)-\delta\right)}\right.}\right) ; \tag{A.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

and by the special case

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \int_{[-\epsilon, \epsilon]^{n}} g^{\mathbf{a}_{r}}\left(\psi^{\mathbf{a}_{r}}(\mathbf{Z})\right) \operatorname{det} \mathrm{D}\left(\psi^{\mathbf{a}_{r}}(\mathbf{Z})\right) e^{r f_{r}^{\mathbf{a}_{r}}\left(\psi^{\mathbf{a}_{r}}(\mathbf{Z})\right)} d \mathbf{Z} \\
= & \left.e^{r f^{\mathbf{a}_{r}\left(\mathbf{c}_{r}\right)}} \int_{[-\epsilon, \epsilon]^{n}} g^{\mathbf{a}_{r}}\left(\psi^{\mathbf{a}_{r}}(\mathbf{Z})\right) \operatorname{det} \mathrm{D}\left(\psi^{\mathbf{a}_{r}}(\mathbf{Z})\right) e^{r\left(-\sum_{i=1}^{n} Z_{i}^{2}+\frac{v_{r}\left(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{a}_{r}\right)}{r^{2}}\right.}\right) d \mathbf{Z} \\
= & e^{r f^{\mathbf{a}_{r}\left(\mathbf{c}_{r}\right)} g^{\mathbf{a}_{r}}\left(\psi^{\mathbf{a}_{r}}(\mathbf{0})\right) \operatorname{det} \mathrm{D}\left(\psi^{\mathbf{a}_{r}}(\mathbf{0})\right)\left(\frac{\pi}{r}\right)^{\frac{n}{2}}\left(1+O\left(\frac{1}{r}\right)\right)} \\
= & \left(\frac{2 \pi}{r}\right)^{\frac{n}{2}} \frac{g^{\mathbf{a}_{r}}\left(\mathbf{c}_{r}\right)}{\sqrt{-\operatorname{det} \operatorname{Hess}\left(f^{\mathbf{a}_{r}}\right)\left(\mathbf{c}_{r}\right)}} e^{\left.r f^{\mathbf{a}_{r}\left(\mathbf{c}_{r}\right.}\right)}\left(1+O\left(\frac{1}{r}\right)\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Together with (A.8), A.9) and A.10), we have the result.
Proof of Lemma A.1 For (1), we have

$$
\int_{-\epsilon}^{\epsilon} e^{-r z^{2}} d z=\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-r z^{2}} d z-\int_{-\infty}^{-\epsilon} e^{-r z^{2}} d z-\int_{\epsilon}^{\infty} e^{-r z^{2}} d z
$$

where the first term

$$
\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-r z^{2}} d z=\sqrt{\frac{\pi}{r}}
$$

is a Gaussian integral, and the other two terms

$$
\int_{-\infty}^{-\epsilon} e^{-r z^{2}} d z=\int_{\epsilon}^{\infty} e^{-r z^{2}} d z \leqslant \int_{\epsilon}^{\infty} e^{-r \epsilon z} d z=\frac{e^{-r \epsilon^{2}}}{r \epsilon}=O\left(e^{-\delta r}\right)
$$

For (2), by integration by parts, we have

$$
\int_{-\epsilon}^{\epsilon} e^{-r z^{2}} d z=\left.z e^{-r z^{2}}\right|_{-\epsilon} ^{\epsilon}+2 r \int_{-\epsilon}^{\epsilon} z^{2} e^{-r z^{2}} d z
$$

hence by (1)

$$
\int_{-\epsilon}^{\epsilon} z^{2} e^{-r z^{2}} d z=\frac{1}{2 r}\left(\int_{-\epsilon}^{\epsilon} e^{-r z^{2}} d z-2 \epsilon e^{-r \epsilon^{2}}\right)=\frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{r^{3}}}+O\left(e^{-\delta r}\right) .
$$

Proof of Lemma A.2 By doing the linear transformation $(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{a}) \mapsto\left(\mathbf{z}+\mathbf{c}_{\mathbf{a}}, \mathbf{a}\right)$, we may assume that that $\mathbf{c}_{\mathbf{a}}=\mathbf{0}$ for all $\mathbf{a} \in D_{\mathbf{a}}$. Then by the Taylor Theorem, for each $\mathbf{a} \in D_{\mathbf{a}}$ and $\mathbf{z} \in D_{\mathbf{z}}$, we can write

$$
f^{\mathbf{a}}(\mathbf{z})=f^{\mathbf{a}}(\mathbf{0})+\sum_{i=1}^{n} z_{i} b_{i}^{\mathbf{a}}(\mathbf{z})
$$

for some holomorphic functions $b_{i}^{\mathbf{a}}, i=1, \ldots, n$. Since $\mathbf{0}$ is a critical point of $f^{\text {a }}$, we have

$$
b_{i}^{\mathbf{a}}(\mathbf{0})=\frac{\partial}{\partial z_{i}} f^{\mathbf{a}}(\mathbf{0})=0 .
$$

As a result, by Taylor theorem again, we can write

$$
f^{\mathbf{a}}(\mathbf{z})=f^{\mathbf{a}}(\mathbf{0})+\sum_{i=1}^{n} z_{i} b_{i}^{\mathbf{a}}(\mathbf{z})=f^{\mathbf{a}}(\mathbf{0})+\sum_{i, j=1}^{n} z_{i} z_{j} h_{i j}^{\mathbf{a}}(\mathbf{z})
$$

for some holomorphic functions $h_{i j}^{\mathbf{a}}, i, j=1, \ldots, n$. Since

$$
\sum_{i, j=1}^{n} z_{i} z_{j} h_{i j}^{\mathbf{a}}(\mathbf{z})=\sum_{i, j=1}^{n} z_{i} z_{j}\left(\frac{h_{i j}^{\mathbf{a}}(\mathbf{z})+h_{j i}^{\mathbf{a}}(\mathbf{z})}{2}\right),
$$

we may assume that $h_{i j}^{\mathbf{a}}$ is symmetric in $i$ and $j$. Since $\mathbf{0}$ is a non-degenerate critical point of $f^{\text {a }}$, and

$$
\frac{\partial^{2}}{\partial z_{i} z_{j}} f^{\mathbf{a}}(\mathbf{0})=2 h_{i j}^{\mathbf{a}}(\mathbf{0})
$$

we have $\operatorname{det}\left(h_{i j}^{\mathbf{a}}(\mathbf{0})\right) \neq 0$.
Next, suppose for some $m$ with $0 \leqslant m \leqslant n$, there exist an open set $V_{m} \subset \mathbb{C}^{n}$ containing $\mathbf{0}$, an open set $A_{m} \subset D_{\mathbf{a}}$ containing $\mathbf{a}_{0}$, and a smooth function $\psi_{m}: V_{m} \times A_{m} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{n}$ such that, if we denote $\psi_{m}^{\mathbf{a}}(\mathbf{Z})=\psi_{m}(\mathbf{Z}, \mathbf{a})$, then $\psi_{m}^{\mathbf{a}}$ gives a holomorphic change of variable with

$$
f^{\mathbf{a}}\left(\psi_{m}^{\mathbf{a}}(\mathbf{Z})\right)=f^{\mathbf{a}}(\mathbf{0})-Z_{1}^{2}-\cdots-Z_{m-1}^{2}+\sum_{i, j=m}^{n} Z_{i} Z_{j} H_{m, i j}^{\mathbf{a}}(\mathbf{Z}),
$$

where $H_{m, i j}^{\mathbf{a}}(\mathbf{Z})$ is holomorphic in $\mathbf{Z}$ and symmetric in $i$ and $j$. Based on this, we are going to find an open set $V_{m+1}$ of $\mathbb{C}^{n}$ containing $\mathbf{0}$, an open set $A_{m+1} \subset A_{m}$ containing a a , and a smooth function $\psi_{m+1}: V_{m+1} \times A_{m+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{n}$ such that, if we denote $\psi_{m+1}^{\mathbf{a}}(\mathbf{Z})=\psi_{m+1}(\mathbf{Z}, \mathbf{a})$, then $\psi_{m+1}^{\mathbf{a}}$ gives a holomorphic change of variable with

$$
f^{\mathbf{a}}\left(\psi_{m+1}^{\mathbf{a}}(\mathbf{Z})\right)=f^{\mathbf{a}}(\mathbf{0})-Z_{1}^{2}-\cdots-Z_{m}^{2}+\sum_{i, j=m+1}^{n} Z_{i} Z_{j} H_{m+1, i j}^{\mathbf{a}}(\mathbf{Z})
$$

for some holomorphic functions $H_{m+1, i j}^{\mathbf{a}}(\mathbf{Z})$ that are symmetric in $i$ and $j$.
To do so, we by the Chain Rule have

$$
\frac{\partial^{2} f^{\mathbf{a}}}{\partial Z_{i} Z_{j}}\left(\psi_{m}^{\mathbf{a}}(\mathbf{0})\right)=\left(D \psi_{m}^{\mathbf{a}}(\mathbf{0})\right)^{T}\left(\frac{\partial^{2} f^{\mathbf{a}}}{\partial z_{i} z_{j}}(\mathbf{0})\right)\left(D \psi_{m}^{\mathbf{a}}(\mathbf{0})\right)
$$

where $D \psi_{m}^{\mathbf{a}}(\mathbf{0})$ is the Jacobian matrix of $\psi_{m}^{\mathbf{a}}$ at $\mathbf{0}$. Thus, we have

$$
2^{m-1} \operatorname{det}\left(2 H_{m, i j}^{\mathbf{a}}(\mathbf{0})\right)=\operatorname{det}\left(\frac{\partial^{2} f^{\mathbf{a}}}{\partial Z_{i} Z_{j}}\left(\psi_{m}^{\mathbf{a}}(\mathbf{0})\right)\right) \neq 0
$$

implying that $\left(H_{m, i j}^{\mathbf{a}}(\mathbf{0})\right)$ is a $(n-m+1) \times(n-m+1)$ non-singular matrix. Therefore, there exists $k \geqslant m$ such that $H_{m, k m}^{\mathbf{a}}(\mathbf{0}) \neq 0$. Reordering the variables if necessary, we may assume that $H_{m, m m}^{\mathbf{a}}(\mathbf{0}) \neq 0$. By continuity of $H_{m, m m}^{\mathbf{a}}(\mathbf{Z})$ in $\mathbf{Z}$ and $\mathbf{a}$, there exists an open set $V_{m}^{\prime} \subset V_{m}$ containing $\mathbf{0}$ and an open set $A_{m}^{\prime} \subset A_{m}$ containing $\mathbf{a}_{0}$ such that $H_{m, m m}^{\mathbf{a}}(\mathbf{0}) \neq 0$ for all $(\mathbf{Z}, \mathbf{a}) \in V_{m}^{\prime} \times A_{m}^{\prime}$. Then we can let

$$
\widetilde{H}_{m, i j}^{\mathrm{a}}(\mathbf{Z})=\frac{H_{m, i j}^{\mathrm{a}}(\mathbf{Z})}{H_{m, m m}^{\mathrm{a}}(\mathbf{Z})}
$$

and have

$$
\begin{aligned}
f^{\mathbf{a}}\left(\psi_{m}^{\mathbf{a}}(\mathbf{Z})\right)= & f^{\mathbf{a}}(\mathbf{0})-Z_{1}^{2}-\cdots-Z_{m-1}^{2}+\sum_{i, j=m}^{n} Z_{i} Z_{j} H_{m, i j}^{\mathbf{a}}(\mathbf{Z}) \\
= & f^{\mathbf{a}}(\mathbf{0})-Z_{1}^{2}-\cdots-Z_{m-1}^{2}+H_{m, m m}^{\mathbf{a}}(\mathbf{Z}) \sum_{i, j=m}^{n} Z_{i} Z_{j} \widetilde{H}_{m, i j}^{\mathbf{a}}(\mathbf{Z}) \\
= & f^{\mathbf{a}}(\mathbf{0})-Z_{1}^{2}-\cdots-Z_{m-1}^{2}+H_{m, m m}^{\mathbf{a}}(\mathbf{Z})\left(Z_{m}+\sum_{j=m+1}^{n} Z_{j} \widetilde{H}_{m, m j}^{\mathbf{a}}(\mathbf{Z})\right)^{2} \\
& -H_{m, m m}^{\mathbf{a}}(\mathbf{Z})\left[\left(\sum_{j=m+1}^{n} Z_{j} \widetilde{H}_{m, m j}^{\mathbf{a}}(\mathbf{Z})\right)^{2}+\sum_{i, j=m+1}^{n} Z_{i} Z_{j} \widetilde{H}_{m, i j}^{\mathbf{a}}(\mathbf{Z})\right] .
\end{aligned}
$$

Define $\mathbf{W}=\mathbf{W}(\mathbf{Z})$ by

$$
W_{l}=Z_{l}
$$

for $l \neq m$, and

$$
W_{m}=\sqrt{-H_{m, m m}^{\mathbf{a}}(\mathbf{Z})}\left(Z_{m}+\sum_{j=m+1}^{n} Z_{j} \widetilde{H}_{m, m j}^{\mathbf{a}}(\mathbf{Z})\right)
$$

We note that

$$
\frac{\partial W_{l}}{\partial Z_{k}}(\mathbf{0})=\delta_{l, k}
$$

for $l \neq m$, and

$$
\frac{\partial W_{m}}{\partial Z_{k}}(\mathbf{0})=\sqrt{-H_{m m}^{\mathbf{a}}(\mathbf{0})}\left(\delta_{m, k}+\sum_{j=m+1}^{n} \delta_{j, k} \widetilde{H}_{m, m j}^{\mathrm{a}}(\mathbf{0})\right) .
$$

Then the Jacobian matrix $D W(\mathbf{0})$ is an upper triangular matrix with the $(m, m)$-th entry $\sqrt{-H_{m, m m}^{\mathbf{a}}(\mathbf{0})} \neq$ 0 and all the other diagonal entries 1 , hence $\operatorname{det} D W(\mathbf{0}) \neq 0$.

Now consider the map $G: V_{m}^{\prime} \times A_{m}^{\prime} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{n} \times \mathbb{R}^{k}$ defined by

$$
G(\mathbf{Z}, \mathbf{a})=(\mathbf{W}(\mathbf{Z}), \mathbf{a}) .
$$

Then the Jacobian matrix $D G\left(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{a}_{0}\right)$ is of the form

$$
D G\left(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{a}_{0}\right)=\left(\begin{array}{cc}
D W(\mathbf{0}) & * \\
0 & I_{k}
\end{array}\right)
$$

where $I_{k}$ is the $k \times k$ identity matrix. Moreover, $\operatorname{det}\left(D G\left(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{a}_{0}\right)\right)=\operatorname{det}(D W(\mathbf{0})) \neq 0$. Thus, by the Inverse Function Theorem, there exists an open set $V_{m}^{\prime \prime} \subset V_{m}^{\prime}$ and an open subset with compact closure $A_{m+1} \subset A_{m}^{\prime}$ containing a a such that $G: V_{m}^{\prime \prime} \times A_{m+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{n} \times A_{m}$ is a diffeomorphism to its image. By slightly shrinking $A_{m+1}$ if necessary, $G\left(V_{m}^{\prime \prime} \times A_{m+1}\right)$ contains an open subset of the form $V_{m+1} \times A_{m+1}$. For each $\mathbf{a} \in A_{m+1}$, let $\psi_{m+1}^{\mathbf{a}}=\psi_{m}^{\mathbf{a}} \circ \mathbf{W}^{-1}: V_{m+1} \rightarrow D_{\mathbf{z}}$. Then we have

$$
f^{\mathbf{a}}\left(\psi_{m+1}^{\mathbf{a}}(\mathbf{W})\right)=f^{\mathbf{a}}(\mathbf{0})-W_{1}^{2}-\cdots-W_{m}^{2}+\sum_{i, j=m+1}^{n} W_{i} W_{j} H_{m+1, i j}^{\mathbf{a}}(\mathbf{W})
$$

for some holomorphic functions $H_{m+1, i j}^{\mathbf{a}}(\mathbf{Z})$ that are symmetric in $i$ and $j$.
Inductively doing the above procedure on $m$, and letting $V=V_{n}, A=A_{n}$ and $\psi^{\mathbf{a}}=\psi_{n}^{\mathbf{a}}$, we prove the result. Moreover, by the Chain Rule, we have

$$
\left.\operatorname{Hess}\left(f^{\mathbf{a}} \circ \psi^{\mathbf{a}}\right)(\mathbf{0})\right)=\left(D \psi^{\mathbf{a}}(\mathbf{0})\right)^{T}\left(\operatorname{Hess}\left(f^{\mathbf{a}}\right)(\mathbf{0})\right)\left(D \psi^{\mathbf{a}}(\mathbf{0})\right) .
$$

Since $\operatorname{Hess}\left(f^{\mathbf{a}} \circ \psi^{\mathbf{a}}\right)(\mathbf{0})$ is equal to the negative of the $n \times n$ identity matrix, by taking the determinant on both sides, we get

$$
\operatorname{det}\left(D\left(\psi^{\mathbf{a}}\right)(\mathbf{0})\right)=\frac{2^{\frac{n}{2}}}{\sqrt{-\operatorname{det} \operatorname{Hess}\left(f^{\mathbf{a}}\right)(\mathbf{0})}}
$$
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