

THE MUTATION COMPATIBILITY OF THE SL_3 QUANTUM TRACE MAPS FOR SURFACES

HYUN KYU KIM


ABSTRACT. Fock-Goncharov's moduli spaces $\mathcal{X}_{\mathrm{PGL}_3, \mathfrak{S}}$ of framed PGL_3 -local systems on punctured surfaces \mathfrak{S} provide prominent examples of cluster \mathcal{X} -varieties and higher Teichmüller spaces. In a previous paper of the author (arXiv:2011.14765), the so-called SL_3 quantum trace map is constructed for each triangulable punctured surface \mathfrak{S} and its ideal triangulation Δ , as a homomorphism from the stated SL_3 -skein algebra of the surface to a quantum torus algebra that deforms the ring of Laurent polynomials in the cube-roots of the cluster coordinate variables for the cluster \mathcal{X} -chart for $\mathcal{X}_{\mathrm{PGL}_3, \mathfrak{S}}$ associated to Δ . We develop quantum mutation maps between special subalgebras of the cube-root quantum torus algebras for different triangulations, and show that the SL_3 quantum trace maps are compatible under these quantum mutation maps. As a result, the quantum SL_3 - PGL_3 duality map constructed in the previous paper is shown to be independent of the choice of an ideal triangulation.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
1.1. Overview and the basic setup	1
2. SL_3 quantum trace maps	7
2.1. Surfaces and triangulations	7
2.2. SL_3 -skein algebras and SL_3 -laminations	9
2.3. PGL_3 Fock-Goncharov algebras for surfaces	10
2.4. SL_3 quantum trace maps	11
3. Quantum coordinate change for flips of ideal triangulations	13
3.1. Classical cluster \mathcal{X} -mutations	14
3.2. Quantum mutations for \mathcal{X} -seeds and for Fock-Goncharov algebras	16
3.3. The balanced algebras, and the quantum coordinate change maps for them	17
4. The quantum compatibility under changes of triangulations	25
4.1. The base case: crossingless arcs over an ideal quadrilateral	25
4.2. The classical compatibility statement and the Weyl-ordering	26
4.3. Checking the quantum Laurent property	29
5. Consequences and conjectures	35
5.1. The compatibility of the quantum SL_3 - PGL_3 duality maps under changes of triangulations	35
5.2. Future perspectives	38
References	38

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Overview and the basic setup. Let \mathfrak{S} be a *generalized marked surface* (or a *decorated surface*), obtained from a compact oriented smooth real surface $\bar{\mathfrak{S}}$ with possibly-empty boundary by removing a non-empty finite set of points called *marked points*, where we choose at least one marked point from each boundary component of $\bar{\mathfrak{S}}$. So each component of the boundary of \mathfrak{S} is diffeomorphic to an open interval; we call it a *boundary arc* of \mathfrak{S} . A marked point in the interior of $\bar{\mathfrak{S}}$ is called a *puncture* of \mathfrak{S} . If $\partial\bar{\mathfrak{S}} = \emptyset$, \mathfrak{S} is called a *punctured surface*. Let G be a split reductive algebraic group over \mathbb{Q} , such as SL_m or PGL_m , $m \geq 2$. The moduli space $\mathcal{L}_{G, \mathfrak{S}}$ of G -local systems on \mathfrak{S} has been a central object of study in many areas of mathematics and physics. Some enhanced versions $\mathcal{A}_{G, \mathfrak{S}}$, $\mathcal{X}_{G, \mathfrak{S}}$ and $\mathcal{P}_{G, \mathfrak{S}}$ of G -local systems with certain kinds of boundary data are defined and studied by Fock-Goncharov [FG06] and Goncharov-Shen [GS19]; $\mathcal{X}_{G, \mathfrak{S}}$ and $\mathcal{P}_{G, \mathfrak{S}}$ are equipped with Poisson structures, and coincide with each other in the case when \mathfrak{S} is a punctured surface [S20]. One of the crucial properties of these enhanced moduli stacks is that they have structures of *cluster varieties* [FG06] [GS19], which first appeared in early 2000's and are gaining more interests especially these days, where these moduli spaces associated to surfaces and algebraic groups form a very important class of examples.

FIGURE 1. m -triangulation quiver, for one triangle

Here we focus on $\mathcal{A}_{\text{SL}_m, \mathfrak{S}}$, $\mathcal{X}_{\text{PGL}_m, \mathfrak{S}}$ and $\mathcal{P}_{\text{PGL}_m, \mathfrak{S}}$. Let us recall the quivers relevant to the cluster variety structures on them. Choose an *ideal triangulation* Δ of \mathfrak{S} , i.e. a mutually disjoint collection of simple paths in \mathfrak{S} running between marked points, called *ideal arcs*, dividing \mathfrak{S} into *ideal triangles*, which are regions bounded by three ideal arcs. We assume that the valence of Δ at each puncture of \mathfrak{S} is at least three. For each ideal triangle of Δ , consider the quiver as in Fig.1 depending on m , and glue them throughout the surface to obtain a single quiver, called the *m -triangulation quiver* $Q_\Delta^{[m]}$ for Δ ; we mainly deal with $m = 3$ only, so $Q_\Delta^{[3]}$ will be denoted by Q_Δ in the main text. Here, the dashed arrow means a ‘half’ arrow. For any quiver Q , denote the set of all nodes of Q by $\mathcal{V}(Q)$, and its *signed adjacency matrix* by $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_Q$, which is a $\mathcal{V}(Q) \times \mathcal{V}(Q)$ matrix whose entries ε_{vw} are defined as

$$\varepsilon_{vw} = \#(\text{arrows from } v \text{ to } w) - \#(\text{arrows from } w \text{ to } v), \quad v, w \in \mathcal{V}(Q).$$

It is known that there exist birational maps [FG06] [GS19]

$$\mathcal{A}_{\text{SL}_m, \mathfrak{S}} \dashrightarrow (\mathbb{G}_m)^{\mathcal{V}(Q)} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{P}_{\text{PGL}_m, \mathfrak{S}} \dashrightarrow (\mathbb{G}_m)^{\mathcal{V}(Q)},$$

called *cluster \mathcal{A} - and \mathcal{X} -charts* for Δ , respectively. The transition maps between two such charts for different ideal triangulations are given by compositions of certain sequences of *cluster \mathcal{A} - and \mathcal{X} -mutation* formulas. Let us elaborate a little more. Given a cluster \mathcal{A} -chart with the underlying quiver Q , with the cluster \mathcal{A} -coordinate variables A_v for the nodes v of Q , through the *mutation* μ_u at the node u one obtains another cluster \mathcal{A} -chart with the quiver $\mu_u(Q) = Q'$ s.t. $\mathcal{V}(Q') = \mathcal{V}(Q)$ whose signed adjacency matrix ε' is given by the *quiver mutation formula*

$$\varepsilon'_{vw} = \begin{cases} -\varepsilon_{vw} & \text{if } u \in \{v, w\}, \\ \varepsilon_{vw} + \frac{1}{2}(\varepsilon_{vu}|\varepsilon_{uw}| + |\varepsilon_{vu}|\varepsilon_{uw}) & \text{if } u \notin \{v, w\}, \end{cases}$$

and with the cluster \mathcal{A} -variables A'_v for $v \in \mathcal{V}(Q') = \mathcal{V}(Q)$ given by the *cluster \mathcal{A} -mutation* formulas

$$A'_v = \begin{cases} A_v & \text{if } v \neq u \\ A_v^{-1}(\prod_{w \in \mathcal{V}(Q)} A_w^{[\varepsilon_{wu}]_+} + \prod_{w \in \mathcal{V}(Q)} A_w^{[-\varepsilon_{wu}]_+}) & \text{if } v = u, \end{cases}$$

where $[\sim]_+$ is the *positive part*, i.e. $[a]_+ = a$ if $a \geq 0$ and $[a]_+ = 0$ if $a < 0$. Similarly, a cluster \mathcal{X} -chart with the quiver Q and the cluster \mathcal{X} -variables X_v , $v \in \mathcal{V}(Q)$, transforms via the mutation μ_u at the node u to a cluster \mathcal{X} -chart with the quiver $\mu_u(Q) = Q'$ and the cluster \mathcal{X} -variables X'_v given by

$$(1.1) \quad X'_v = \begin{cases} X_u^{-1} & \text{if } v = u, \\ X_v(1 + X_u^{-\text{sgn}(\varepsilon_{vu})})^{-\varepsilon_{vu}} & \text{if } v \neq u, \end{cases}$$

where $\text{sgn}(\sim)$ is the sign, i.e. $\text{sgn}(a) = 1$ if $a > 0$ and $\text{sgn}(a) = -1$ if $a < 0$. For the current situation for the m -triangulation quivers, note that when the ideal triangulations Δ and Δ' of \mathfrak{S} is related by a *flip* at an arc, i.e. differs exactly by one arc, it is known that the m -triangulation quivers $Q_\Delta^{[m]}$ and $Q_{\Delta'}^{[m]}$ are related by a certain sequence of m^2 number of mutations. When e.g. $m = 3$, first mutate $Q_\Delta^{[3]}$ at the two nodes lying in the arc of Δ that is to be flipped, then mutate at the two nodes lying in the interiors of the two triangles of Δ having the to-be-flipped arc as a side, to land in $Q_{\Delta'}^{[3]}$. The cluster \mathcal{A} -charts of $\mathcal{A}_{\text{SL}_m, \mathfrak{S}}$ for Δ and Δ' are related by the composition of the cluster \mathcal{A} -mutations for this same sequence of m^2 mutations, and the cluster \mathcal{X} -charts of $\mathcal{P}_{\text{PGL}_m, \mathfrak{S}}$ for Δ and Δ' by the composition of the cluster \mathcal{X} -mutations for the same mutation sequence. Moreover, $\mathcal{P}_{\text{PGL}_m, \mathfrak{S}}$ is equipped with a canonical Poisson structure, given on each cluster \mathcal{X} -chart for an ideal triangulation Δ by

$$\{X_v, X_w\} = \varepsilon_{vw} X_v X_w, \quad \forall v, w \in \mathcal{V}(Q_\Delta^{[m]}).$$

One major line of research is on the quantization of the Poisson moduli space $\mathcal{P}_{\text{PGL}_m, \mathfrak{S}}$, or more precisely, its cluster \mathcal{X} -variety structure. One first needs to construct a corresponding *quantum cluster \mathcal{X} -variety*, as a ‘non-commutative scheme’. There is such a formulation by Fock-Goncharov on a general cluster \mathcal{X} -variety.

For each (classical) cluster \mathcal{X} -chart Γ , with the underlying quiver Q , consider the *Fock-Goncharov algebra* \mathcal{X}_Γ^q defined as the associative algebra over $\mathbb{Z}[q^{\pm 1/2}]$ defined by

$$\text{generators : } \widehat{X}_v^{\pm 1}, v \in \mathcal{V}(Q), \quad \text{relations : } \widehat{X}_v \widehat{X}_w = q^{2\varepsilon_{vw}} \widehat{X}_w \widehat{X}_v, \quad \forall v, w \in \mathcal{V}(Q).$$

This non-commutative algebra, which is an example of a quantum torus algebra, is what deforms the classical ring of functions on the chart Γ , namely the Laurent polynomial ring $\mathbb{Z}[\{X_v^{\pm 1} \mid v \in \mathcal{V}(Q)\}]$, in the direction of the above Poisson structure. For a mutation $\mu_u : \Gamma \rightsquigarrow \Gamma' = \mu_u(\Gamma)$, one would associate a *quantum mutation map* between the skew-fields of fractions of the Fock-Goncharov algebras

$$\mu_{\Gamma\Gamma'}^q = \mu_u^q : \text{Frac}(\mathcal{X}_{\Gamma'}^q) \rightarrow \text{Frac}(\mathcal{X}_\Gamma^q)$$

so that it recovers the classical mutation formula as $q \rightarrow 1$, and that these satisfy the consistency relations satisfied by their classical counterparts; namely, $\mu_u^q \mu_u^q = \text{id}$ should hold for each initial cluster \mathcal{X} -chart Γ , $\mu_u^q \mu_v^q \mu_u^q \mu_v^q = \text{id}$ when $\varepsilon_{uv} = 0$, and $\mu_u^q \mu_v^q \mu_u^q \mu_v^q = P_{(uv)}$ when $\varepsilon_{uv} = \pm 1$, where $P_{(uv)}$ stands for the label exchange $u \leftrightarrow v$. Such quantum mutation maps are found [FG09b], constituting a version of a quantum cluster \mathcal{X} -variety. In particular, the quantum isomorphism $\mu_{\Gamma\Gamma'}^q : \text{Frac}(\mathcal{X}_{\Gamma'}^q) \rightarrow \text{Frac}(\mathcal{X}_\Gamma^q)$ can be constructed for each pair of cluster \mathcal{X} -charts Γ and Γ' in a consistent manner, by composing those for the mutations connecting Γ and Γ' . For the case of $\mathcal{P}_{\text{PGL}_m, \mathfrak{S}}$, denote by

$$(1.2) \quad \Phi_{\Delta\Delta'}^q := \mu_{\Gamma_\Delta\Gamma_{\Delta'}}^q : \text{Frac}(\mathcal{X}_{\Gamma_{\Delta'}}^q) \rightarrow \text{Frac}(\mathcal{X}_{\Gamma_\Delta}^q)$$

the quantum isomorphism for the cluster \mathcal{X} -charts Γ_Δ and $\Gamma_{\Delta'}$ for $\mathcal{P}_{\text{PGL}_m, \mathfrak{S}}$ for two ideal triangulations Δ and Δ' of \mathfrak{S} .

What is not much emphasized in the literature is the problem of constructing a *deformation quantization map*, which is a map connecting the classical cluster \mathcal{X} -variety and the corresponding quantum cluster \mathcal{X} -variety. More precisely, it is an assignment to each ‘quantizable’ classical observable function a corresponding quantum observable. One first needs to decide which classical functions to quantize, and the natural candidates would be the *universally Laurent* functions, i.e. the functions that are Laurent in all cluster \mathcal{X} -charts. In our case of $\mathcal{P}_{\text{PGL}_m, \mathfrak{S}}$, these form the ring $\mathcal{O}_{\text{cl}}(\mathcal{P}_{\text{PGL}_m, \mathfrak{S}})$, which is proved in [S20] to equal the ring $\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{P}_{\text{PGL}_m, \mathfrak{S}})$ of regular functions on $\mathcal{P}_{\text{PGL}_m, \mathfrak{S}}$. Then a deformation quantization map would be a map

$$\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{P}_{\text{PGL}_m, \mathfrak{S}}) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}^q(\mathcal{P}_{\text{PGL}_m, \mathfrak{S}})$$

satisfying some conditions, where $\mathcal{O}^q(\mathcal{P}_{\text{PGL}_m, \mathfrak{S}})$ stands for the ring of all quantum universally Laurent elements, i.e. the intersection of all quantum Laurent polynomial rings $\mathcal{X}_\Gamma^q \subset \text{Frac}(\mathcal{X}_\Gamma^q)$, where $\text{Frac}(\mathcal{X}_\Gamma^q)$ for different Γ ’s are identified via the quantum mutation maps $\mu_{\Gamma\Gamma'}^q$ in a consistent manner. One standard approach would be to first establish a Fock-Goncharov duality map

$$\mathbb{I} : \mathcal{A}_{\text{SL}_m, \mathfrak{S}}(\mathbb{Z}^t) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{P}_{\text{PGL}_m, \mathfrak{S}})$$

whose image forms a basis of $\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{P}_{\text{PGL}_m, \mathfrak{S}})$, enumerated by the set $\mathcal{A}_{\text{SL}_m, \mathfrak{S}}(\mathbb{Z}^t)$ of \mathbb{Z}^t -points of $\mathcal{A}_{\text{SL}_m, \mathfrak{S}}$, where \mathbb{Z}^t is the *semi-field of tropical integers*, and also a quantum duality map

$$\mathbb{I}^q : \mathcal{A}_{\text{SL}_m, \mathfrak{S}}(\mathbb{Z}^t) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}^q(\mathcal{P}_{\text{PGL}_m, \mathfrak{S}}),$$

which deforms \mathbb{I} . Then one would construct a deformation quantization map by sending each basis element $\mathbb{I}(\ell)$ for $\ell \in \mathcal{A}_{\text{SL}_m, \mathfrak{S}}(\mathbb{Z}^t)$ to the element $\mathbb{I}^q(\ell)$.

The setting of $m = 2$ is referred to as the quantum Teichmüller theory; for punctured surfaces \mathfrak{S} , a classical duality map \mathbb{I} is constructed by Fock-Goncharov [FG06], and a quantum duality map \mathbb{I}^q by Allegretti and the author [AK17], based on Bonahon-Wong’s SL_2 quantum trace map [BW11]. These constructions heavily use geometry and topology of the surface \mathfrak{S} . For other $m \geq 2$, and in fact for a much more general class of cluster \mathcal{X} -varieties, a duality map \mathbb{I} is constructed by Gross-Hacking-Keel-Kontsevich [GHKK18] [GS18], and a quantum duality map \mathbb{I}^q by Davison-Mandel [DM19]. These general constructions are very powerful, but lack geometric intuition on surface geometry, and are notoriously difficult to compute. A geometric and straightforward-to-compute duality map for $m = 3$ in the case of punctured surfaces \mathfrak{S} is constructed by the author in [K20]. Moreover, in [K20], an SL_3 *quantum trace map* is developed, and is used to construct a quantum duality map too. More precisely, as for the quantum duality maps, for each ideal triangulation Δ of a triangulable punctured surface \mathfrak{S} , a map

$$(1.3) \quad \mathbb{I}_\Delta^q : \mathcal{A}_{\text{SL}_3, \mathfrak{S}}(\mathbb{Z}^t) \rightarrow \mathcal{X}_\Delta^q$$

is constructed, and several nice properties are proved. One of the most important and fundamental properties for these \mathbb{I}_Δ^q is the compatibility under the change of ideal triangulations. This compatibility, which was not

proved and merely left as a conjecture in [K20], is the major motivation of, as well as the major consequence of, the main theorem of the present paper.

Theorem 1.1 (main application: mutation compatibility of $\mathrm{SL}_3\text{-PGL}_3$ quantum duality map). *Let \mathfrak{S} be a triangulable punctured surface. For any two ideal triangulations Δ and Δ' of \mathfrak{S} , the $\mathrm{SL}_3\text{-PGL}_3$ quantum duality maps in eq.(1.3) for Δ and Δ' , constructed in [K20], are related by the quantum coordinate change map $\Phi_{\Delta\Delta'}^q$, i.e.*

$$\mathbb{I}_{\Delta}^q = \Phi_{\Delta\Delta'}^q \circ \mathbb{I}_{\Delta'}^q$$

A reader whose primary area is the theory of cluster varieties can just regard this theorem as the principal result of the present paper.

We now describe a more general statement, which we shall formulate as the actual main theorem. We first need to introduce another hero of the story, namely the $\mathrm{SL}_3\text{-skein algebra}$. For a generalized marked surface \mathfrak{S} , consider the 3d manifold $\mathfrak{S} \times \mathbf{I}$ called the *thickened surface* of \mathfrak{S} , where

$$\mathbf{I} = (-1, 1)$$

is the open interval in \mathbb{R} whose elements are called *elevations*. Each boundary arc of \mathfrak{S} corresponds to a *boundary wall* $b \times \mathbf{I}$. Let $\mathring{\mathfrak{S}} = \mathfrak{S} \setminus \partial\mathfrak{S}$. An $\mathrm{SL}_3\text{-web}$ W in $\mathfrak{S} \times \mathbf{I}$ (Def.2.10) is a disjoint union of oriented simple loops in $\mathring{\mathfrak{S}} \times \mathbf{I}$, oriented edges in $\mathring{\mathfrak{S}} \times \mathbf{I}$ ending at boundary walls, and oriented 3-valent graphs in $\mathring{\mathfrak{S}} \times \mathbf{I}$ which may have endpoints at boundary walls, such that W meets boundary walls transversally at 1-valent endpoints, the endpoints of W lying in each boundary wall have mutually distinct elevations, and each 3-valent vertex is either a source or a sink. Also, W is equipped with a *framing*, i.e. a continuous choice of a vector in $T_x(\mathfrak{S} \times \mathbf{I}) \setminus T_x W$ at each $x \in W$, such that the framing at each endpoint and 3-valent vertex is *upward vertical*, i.e. is parallel to \mathbf{I} and pointing toward 1. A *state* of W is a map $s : \partial W \rightarrow \{1, 2, 3\}$, and (W, s) is called a *stated $\mathrm{SL}_3\text{-web}$* . A (*reduced*) *stated $\mathrm{SL}_3\text{-skein algebra}$* $\mathcal{S}_s^\omega(\mathfrak{S}; \mathbb{Z})_{\text{red}}$ (Def.2.11) is defined as the free $\mathbb{Z}[\omega^{\pm 1/2}]$ -module freely spanned by all isotopy classes of stated $\mathrm{SL}_3\text{-webs}$ in $\mathfrak{S} \times \mathbf{I}$, mod out by the $\mathrm{SL}_3\text{-skein relations}$ in Fig.2 and the *boundary relations* in Fig.3, where ω is related to q as

$$(1.4) \quad q = \omega^9 = (\omega^{1/2})^{18}$$

and the index-inversion $(r_1(\varepsilon), r_2(\varepsilon))$ for $\varepsilon \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ is given by

$$(1.5) \quad (r_1(1), r_2(1)) = (1, 2), \quad (r_1(2), r_2(2)) = (1, 3), \quad (r_1(3), r_2(3)) = (2, 3).$$

The product of the $\mathcal{S}_s^\omega(\mathfrak{S}; \mathbb{Z})_{\text{red}}$ is defined by superposition, i.e. $[W_1, s_1] \cdot [W_2, s_2] = [W_1 \cup W_2, s_1 \cup s_2]$ when $W_1 \subset \mathfrak{S} \times (0, 1)$ and $W_2 \subset \mathfrak{S} \times (-1, 0)$, where $[W, s]$ denotes the element of $\mathcal{S}_s^\omega(\mathfrak{S}; \mathbb{Z})_{\text{red}}$ represented by the stated $\mathrm{SL}_3\text{-web}$ (W, s) ; we stack the former on top of the latter.




FIGURE 2. $\mathrm{SL}_3\text{-skein relations}$, drawn locally (\emptyset means empty) in \mathfrak{S} , with the framing pointing toward the eyes of the reader; the regions bounded by a loop, a 2-gon, or a 4-gon in (S1), (S2), (S3) are contractible, and $[n]_q = \frac{q^n - q^{-n}}{q - q^{-1}} \in \mathbb{Z}[q^{\pm 1}]$

When \mathfrak{S} is a punctured surface, the above definition greatly simplifies, for an $\mathrm{SL}_3\text{-web}$ cannot have endpoints; in particular, there is no need to consider the boundary relations, and $\mathcal{S}_s^\omega(\mathfrak{S}; \mathbb{Z})_{\text{red}}$ can be viewed as just an $\mathrm{SL}_3\text{-skein algebra}$ $\mathcal{S}^\omega(\mathfrak{S}; \mathbb{Z})$. It is known from [S01] [S05] that $\mathcal{S}^\omega(\mathfrak{S}; \mathbb{Z})$ is a quantum algebra deforming $\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{SL}_3, \mathfrak{S}})$, the coordinate ring of the SL_3 -character variety. Similarly for the SL_2 case, the $\mathrm{SL}_3\text{-skein algebras}$ play a crucial role in the cluster-variety-theoretic study of the moduli spaces $\mathcal{A}_{\mathrm{SL}_3, \mathfrak{S}}$ and $\mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{PGL}_3, \mathfrak{S}}$, where the bridge to the world of cluster varieties is the family of maps

$$\mathrm{Tr}_{\Delta}^\omega = \mathrm{Tr}_{\Delta; \mathfrak{S}}^\omega : \mathcal{S}_s^\omega(\mathfrak{S}; \mathbb{Z})_{\text{red}} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}_{\Delta}^\omega,$$




FIGURE 3. Boundary relations for stated SL_3 -skeins (horizontal blue line is boundary); the endpoints in the figure are consecutive in the elevation ordering for that boundary component (i.e. \nexists other endpoint with elevation in between these), and $x \prec y$ means y has the higher elevation than x

called the SL_3 quantum trace maps (Thm.2.18) associated to each triangulable generalized marked surface \mathfrak{S} and an ideal triangulation Δ , where $\mathcal{Z}_\Delta^\omega$ is a cube-root version of the Fock-Goncharov algebra, namely a $\mathbb{Z}[\omega^{\pm 1/2}]$ -algebra defined by

$$\text{generators : } \hat{Z}_v^{\pm 1}, v \in \mathcal{V}(Q_\Delta^{[3]}), \quad \text{relations : } \hat{Z}_v \hat{Z}_w = \omega^{2\varepsilon_{vw}} \hat{Z}_w \hat{Z}_v, \quad \forall v, w \in \mathcal{V}(Q_\Delta^{[3]}),$$

into which the usual Fock-Goncharov algebra \mathcal{X}_Δ^q embeds as

$$\hat{X}_v \hookrightarrow \hat{Z}_v^3, \quad \forall v \in \mathcal{V}(Q_\Delta^{[3]}).$$

The SL_3 quantum trace maps are constructed in [K20] as an SL_3 analog of Bonahon-Wong's SL_2 quantum trace [BW11]. The motivating property is that it deforms the classical map $\mathcal{S}^1(\mathfrak{S}; \mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{L}_{SL_3, \mathfrak{S}})$ in a certain sense; in particular, Tr_Δ^1 should yield the *trace-of-monodromy* functions along oriented loops. Another characterizing property is the *cutting/gluing axiom*: for a generalized marked surface \mathfrak{S} equipped with triangulation Δ , by cutting \mathfrak{S} along an ideal arc e of Δ one gets a generalized marked surface \mathfrak{S}_e with the triangulation Δ_e , and the SL_3 quantum trace maps satisfy (Thm.2.18(QT1))

$$(1.6) \quad i_{\Delta, \Delta_e} \text{Tr}_{\Delta, \mathfrak{S}}^\omega([W, s]) = \sum_{s_e} \text{Tr}_{\Delta_e, \mathfrak{S}_e}^\omega([W_e, s_e]),$$

where $i_{\Delta, \Delta_e} : \mathcal{Z}_\Delta^\omega \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}_{\Delta_e}^\omega$ is naturally induced by the cutting, the SL_3 -web W_e in $\mathfrak{S}_e \times \mathbf{I}$ is obtained by an SL_3 -web W in $\mathfrak{S} \times \mathbf{I}$ by the cutting, and the sum is over all states s_e of W_e that are compatible with s , i.e. $s_e(x) = s(x)$ for endpoints x of W_e coming from that of W and $s_e(x_1) = s_e(x_2)$ if x_1, x_2 are endpoints of W_e coming from a same point of $W \cap (e \times \mathbf{I})$. Although several favorable properties of the SL_3 quantum trace maps are shown and used crucially in [K20], there is one fundamental property that was just conjectured but not proved in [K20], namely, the compatibility under the change of ideal triangulations, which is the main theorem of the present paper.

The first major step toward this compatibility statement is to find a sensible formulation of it, which is already non-trivial because the values of the SL_3 quantum trace maps are Laurent polynomials in the cube-root variables \hat{Z}_v 's, instead of the usual quantum cluster \mathcal{X} -variables \hat{X}_v 's. The transformation formulas for the latter variables \hat{X}_v under the quantum mutation maps μ_u^q are certain non-commutative rational formulas deforming eq.(1.1) (see Def.3.5); in general, one cannot expect that each \hat{Z}_v would transform by rational formulas. It is only some subalgebra of $\text{Frac}(\mathcal{Z}^\omega)$ generated by the monomials $\prod_v \hat{Z}_v^{\alpha_v}$ in \hat{Z}_v (with any chosen product order) whose powers $\alpha_v \in \mathbb{Z}$ satisfy certain congruence condition that does transform via rational formulas, and we find such a special subalgebra in the present paper. This condition, as well as the subalgebra, is dubbed *balanced*, as they are the SL_3 analog of Hiatt's balancedness condition for SL_2 [H10] [BW11], used for Bonahon-Wong's SL_2 quantum trace [BW11]. The description of the SL_3 balancedness condition is much more complicated than that of SL_2 , and is inspired by the characterizing properties of the values of the *tropical coordinates* of SL_3 -laminations in \mathfrak{S} [DS20a] [K20].

Definition 1.2 (Def.3.9; [K20]). *Let Δ be an ideal triangulation of a triangulable generalized marked surface \mathfrak{S} . An element $(a_v)_{v \in \mathcal{V}(Q_\Delta^{[3]})} \in (\frac{1}{3}\mathbb{Z})^{\mathcal{V}(Q_\Delta^{[3]})}$ is said to be Δ -balanced if for each ideal triangle t of Δ , the following holds: denoting the sides of t by e_1, e_2, e_3 (with $e_4 := e_1$), and the nodes of $Q_\Delta^{[3]}$ lying in t by $v_{e_\alpha, 1}, v_{e_\alpha, 2}$ (for $\alpha = 1, 2, 3$), and v_t as in Fig.4, one has*

- (1) the numbers $\sum_{\alpha=1}^3 a_{v_{e_{\alpha},1}}$ and $\sum_{\alpha=1}^3 a_{v_{e_{\alpha},2}}$ belong to \mathbb{Z} ;
- (2) for each $\alpha = 1, 2, 3$, the number $a_{v_{e_{\alpha},1}} + a_{v_{e_{\alpha},2}}$ belongs to \mathbb{Z} ;
- (3) for each $\alpha = 1, 2, 3$, the number $-a_{v_t} + a_{v_{e_{\alpha},2}} + a_{v_{e_{\alpha+1},1}}$ belongs to \mathbb{Z} .




FIGURE 4. Labels of the nodes of a 3-triangulation quiver in a triangle

Definition 1.3 (Def.3.11–3.12). *Let Δ and \mathfrak{S} be as above. The Δ -balanced cube-root Fock-Goncharov algebra $\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_{\Delta}^{\omega}$ is the subalgebra of $\mathcal{Z}_{\Delta}^{\omega}$ spanned by the monomials $\prod_v \widehat{X}_v^{a_v} = \prod_v \widehat{Z}_v^{3a_v}$ with the powers forming a Δ -balanced element $(a_v)_v \in (\frac{1}{3}\mathbb{Z})^{\nu(Q_{\Delta}^{[3]})}$. The Δ -balanced fraction algebra for Δ is the subalgebra $\widehat{\text{Frac}}(\mathcal{Z}_{\Delta}^{\omega})$ of the skew-field $\text{Frac}(\mathcal{Z}_{\Delta}^{\omega})$ consisting of all elements that can be written as PQ^{-1} with $P \in \widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_{\Delta}^{\omega}$ and $Q \in \mathcal{X}_{\Delta}^q \setminus \{0\}$.*

In fact, one can identify $\widehat{\text{Frac}}(\mathcal{Z}_{\Delta}^{\omega})$ with the skew-field $\text{Frac}(\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_{\Delta}^{\omega})$ (Lem.3.13).

We show that the quantum mutation maps eq.(1.2) can be extended to these balanced fraction algebras.

Proposition 1.4 (the balanced cube-root version of quantum coordinate change maps; §3.3). *Let \mathfrak{S} be a triangulable generalized marked surface. There is a family of algebra isomorphisms between the balanced fraction algebras*

$$\Theta_{\Delta\Delta'}^{\omega} : \widehat{\text{Frac}}(\mathcal{Z}_{\Delta'}^{\omega}) \rightarrow \widehat{\text{Frac}}(\mathcal{Z}_{\Delta}^{\omega})$$

defined for each pair of ideal triangulations Δ and Δ' , that extend the maps $\Phi_{\Delta\Delta'}^q$, that recover the classical coordinate change maps as $\omega^{1/2} \rightarrow 1$, and that satisfy the consistency $\Theta_{\Delta\Delta''}^{\omega} = \Theta_{\Delta\Delta'}^{\omega} \Theta_{\Delta'\Delta''}^{\omega}$.

The formula for $\Theta_{\Delta\Delta'}^{\omega}$ is directly inspired by $\Phi_{\Delta\Delta'}^q$, and one needs to carefully check that, when applying $\Theta_{\Delta\Delta'}^{\omega}$, the elements stay being Laurent in \widehat{Z}_v 's at each step, which would be due to the balancedness condition. Then, to show the consistency relations we resort to the known results on identities of classical and quantum cluster mutations, such as [FG06] [KN11].

We can now state the main result of the present paper, which was conjectured in [K20] and also partially in an earlier work of Douglas [D21].

Theorem 1.5 (main theorem, Thm.4.1: the mutation compatibility of the SL_3 quantum trace). *Let \mathfrak{S} be a triangulable generalized marked surface. For any two ideal triangulations Δ and Δ' of \mathfrak{S} , the SL_3 quantum trace maps for Δ and Δ' of [K20] are related by the balanced quantum coordinate change map $\Theta_{\Delta\Delta'}^{\omega}$, i.e.*

$$\text{Tr}_{\Delta}^{\omega} = \Theta_{\Delta\Delta'}^{\omega} \circ \text{Tr}_{\Delta'}^{\omega}$$

To prove this, we first establish the compatibility of the balanced coordinate change maps $\Theta_{\Delta\Delta'}^{\omega}$ with the cutting maps i_{Δ,Δ_e} , and then using the cutting/gluing property in eq.(1.6) we reduce the situation to the case when \mathfrak{S} is a quadrilateral. Then, in fact we also use the cutting/gluing property of $\text{Tr}_{\Delta}^{\omega}$ with respect to an ideal arc isotopic to a boundary arc e , so that e cuts out a *biangle* (Def.2.2). For that situation one needs to deal with the *biangle* SL_3 quantum trace (Prop.2.19), defined for a biangle, which is related to the Reshetikhin-Turaev invariants of tangles associated to the standard 3d representation of $\mathcal{U}_q(\mathfrak{sl}_3)$ [RT90]. Anyhow, such a version of the cutting/gluing property (Prop.2.19(BQT3)) is also shown in [K20, §5], which allows us to push the 3-valent vertices of an SL_3 -web living over a quadrilateral to the biangles attached to the boundary arcs, and so we should now just check the above theorem for simple oriented edges living over a quadrilateral surface (§4.1). Still, a direct computational check would be quite involved, and we use several tricks to reduce the amount of the computations (§4.2–4.3). Namely, we use the equivariance of $\text{Tr}_{\Delta}^{\omega}$ under the elevation-reversing map on $\mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\omega}(\mathfrak{S}; \mathbb{Z})_{\text{red}}$ and the $*$ -structure on $\mathcal{Z}_{\Delta}^{\omega}$, together with observations on $*$ -invariant monomials of $\mathcal{Z}_{\Delta}^{\omega}$, so that what remains to check is whether $\text{Tr}_{\Delta}^{\omega}([W, s])$ stays being Laurent in the cube-root quantum variables after each (balanced cube-root) mutation at a special node, which we verify carefully. One comment on the proof of Thm.1.1 is that we need a little more than Thm.1.5, as a peripheral loop surrounding a puncture is dealt with differently in the construction of the quantum duality map \mathbb{I}_{Δ}^q in eq.(1.3); namely, only the positive-power term of the value of the SL_3 quantum trace map is used. We also develop this necessary version of Thm.1.5 for this setting in Prop.5.2, whose proof is not immediate either;

for example, we used a result of a previous joint work of the author with Cho, Kim and Oh [CKKO20] to choose a special elevation orderings on the oriented edges over each triangle.

As mentioned above, perhaps the most interesting and important consequence of the main theorem, Thm.1.5, is Thm.1.1 which is about the quantum duality map for the space $\mathcal{X}_{\mathrm{PGL}_3, \mathfrak{S}}$ for a punctured surface \mathfrak{S} . However, we expect that Thm.1.5 would also serve as the first step toward a much wider range of future research topics. One prominent example would be to develop a representation theory for various versions of the SL_3 -skein algebras. This would be difficult to do directly, but now one has a consistent way of relating these algebras with the various versions of Fock-Goncharov algebras, which are quantum torus algebras and hence admit a straightforward representation theory. Thus one might seek for the SL_3 analogs of Bonahon-Wong's series of works on the similar topic for SL_2 (see e.g. the first one [BW16]), which might also find applications in 3d topological quantum field theories or 2d conformal field theories.

Acknowledgments. This work was supported by the National Research Foundation of Korea(NRF) grant funded by the Korea government(MSIT) (No. 2020R1C1C1A01011151).

2. SL_3 QUANTUM TRACE MAPS

In the present section, we recall the SL_3 quantum trace maps from [K20], as well as basic necessary notions from references therein.

2.1. Surfaces and triangulations.

Definition 2.1 ([L17] [L18]). A generalized marked surface (Σ, \mathcal{P}) is a pair of a compact oriented smooth surface Σ with possibly-empty boundary $\partial\Sigma$ and a non-empty finite subset \mathcal{P} of Σ , such that each component of $\partial\Sigma$ contains at least one point of \mathcal{P} . Elements of \mathcal{P} are called the marked points, and the elements of \mathcal{P} not lying in $\partial\Sigma$ are called the punctures. When $\partial\Sigma = \emptyset$, we say that (Σ, \mathcal{P}) is a punctured surface.

For a given generalized marked surface (Σ, \mathcal{P}) , we often let

$$\mathfrak{S} = \Sigma \setminus \mathcal{P},$$

and identify it with the data (Σ, \mathcal{P}) , e.g. we refer to \mathfrak{S} as a generalized marked surface. Let

$$\partial\mathfrak{S} = (\partial\Sigma) \setminus \mathcal{P}, \quad \mathring{\mathfrak{S}} = \mathfrak{S} \setminus \partial\mathfrak{S}.$$

A basic ingredient is an *ideal triangulation* of a surface \mathfrak{S} .

Definition 2.2 ([L17] [L18]). Let (Σ, \mathcal{P}) be a generalized marked surface, and $\mathfrak{S} = \Sigma \setminus \mathcal{P}$.

- An ideal arc in \mathfrak{S} is the image of an immersion $\alpha : [0, 1] \rightarrow \Sigma$ such that $\alpha(\{0, 1\}) \subset \mathcal{P}$ and $\alpha|_{(0,1)}$ is an embedding into \mathfrak{S} . Call $\alpha((0, 1))$ the interior of this ideal arc. Two ideal arcs are isotopic if they are isotopic within the class of ideal arcs. An ideal arc is called a boundary arc if it lies in $\partial\Sigma$. An ideal arc is called an internal arc if its interior lies in $\mathring{\mathfrak{S}}$.
- The generalized marked surface \mathfrak{S} is said to be triangulable if it is none of the following:
 - monogon, i.e. a closed disc with a single marked point on the boundary,
 - biangle, i.e. a closed disc with two marked points on the boundary,
 - sphere with less than three punctures.
- An ideal triangulation of a triangulable generalized marked surface \mathfrak{S} is a collection Δ of ideal arcs of \mathfrak{S} s.t.
 - no arc of Δ bounds a disc whose interior is in \mathfrak{S} ;
 - no two arcs of Δ are isotopic or intersect each other in \mathfrak{S} ;
 - Δ is maximal among the collections satisfying the above two conditions.

We often identify two ideal triangulations if their members are simultaneously isotopic.

We assume that each constituent arc isotopic to a boundary arc is a boundary arc.

An ideal triangulation Δ of \mathfrak{S} divide \mathfrak{S} into regions called (*ideal*) triangles of Δ , each of which is bounded by three ideal arcs, called the sides of this triangle, counted with multiplicity. In fact, we only want to deal with the following class of ideal triangulations.

Definition 2.3 ([FG06]). An ideal triangulation Δ of a triangulable generalized marked surface $\mathfrak{S} = \Sigma \setminus \mathcal{P}$ is regular if for each puncture p of (Σ, \mathcal{P}) , the valence of Δ at p is at least 3.

In the present paper, by an ideal triangulation we always mean a regular one.

In particular, by a *triangulable* generalized marked surface \mathfrak{S} we mean a surface that admits a regular ideal triangulation. For example, for the cases of punctured surfaces \mathfrak{S} , we only need to exclude the sphere with three punctures, as shown in [K20, Lem2.5]. For the cases of generalized marked surfaces with boundary, we should exclude some more, like the punctured biangle, i.e. a closed disc with two marked points on the boundary and one puncture in the interior, which is a surface denoted by \odot in [GS19] [S20]; in fact, one important future research question, which we believe wouldn't be too difficult, is to extend the results of [K20] and the present paper to such surfaces like \odot ; see [K20, Rem.2.7].

Basic constructions will depend on the choice of an ideal triangulation of a surface, and the heart of the matter is to keep track of what happens if we use a different ideal triangulation. One standard approach in the literature is to deal with the ‘generators’ of all possible changes of ideal triangulations, i.e. the following elementary changes.

Definition 2.4. *Two ideal triangulations of a same generalized marked surface are said to be related by a flip at an arc if, considered up to simultaneous isotopy, they differ precisely by one internal arc.*

When Δ and Δ' are related by a flip at an arc, there is a natural bijection between Δ and Δ' ; each arc of Δ and the corresponding arc of Δ' are then denoted by a same symbol. In particular, we would use a same symbol for the flipped arc of Δ and that for Δ' , although they are actually different as ideal arcs. Say, if the flipped arc is denoted by i , then we say Δ and Δ' are related by the flip at the arc i . We also say that Δ' is obtained from Δ by the flip move Φ_i , and write

$$\Delta' = \Phi_i(\Delta).$$

A change of ideal triangulations is an ordered pair (Δ, Δ') of ideal triangulations, which we often denote by $\Delta \rightsquigarrow \Delta'$. In case Δ and Δ' are related by a flip at an arc i , we denote this change by Φ_i .

Lemma 2.5. *Any two ideal triangulations Δ and Δ' are connected by a finite sequence of flips. That is, $\Delta' = \Phi_{i_n} \cdots \Phi_{i_2} \Phi_{i_1}(\Delta)$.*

This lemma is well-known for ideal triangulations without the regular assumption in Def.2.3; see e.g. [FST08] and references therein. If we restrict ourselves to regular ideal triangulations, we believe that the above lemma can be shown using the same arguments in the proof of [L-F09, Cor.6.7]. The flips satisfy some algebraic relations; that is, sometimes when one applies a certain sequence of flips to a certain ideal triangulation, one gets back the same ideal triangulation. We find it convenient to first recall a well-known *signed adjacency matrix* for Δ , which is a $|\Delta| \times |\Delta|$ integer matrix that encodes certain combinatorics of Δ . For each ideal triangle t of Δ , if its sides are e_1, e_2, e_3 appearing clockwise in this order, then we say that e_{i+1} is the *clockwise next* one to e_i (with $e_4 := e_1$).

Definition 2.6 (see e.g. [FST08] and references therein). *Let Δ be an ideal triangulation of a triangulable generalized marked surface. The signed adjacency matrix $(b_{ij})_{i,j}$ of the triangulation Δ is the integer $\Delta \times \Delta$ matrix defined as*

$$b_{ij} = \sum_t b_{ij}(t)$$

where the sum is over all ideal triangles t of Δ , and

$$b_{ij}(t) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } i, j \text{ appear as sides of } t \text{ and } i \text{ is the clockwise next one to } j, \\ -1 & \text{if } i, j \text{ appear as sides of } t \text{ and } j \text{ is the clockwise next one to } i, \\ 0 & \text{if at least one of } i, j \text{ is not a side of } t. \end{cases}$$

Remark 2.7. *In fact, (b_{ij}) is the signed adjacency matrix for the 2-triangulation quiver $Q_\Delta^{[2]}$ which appeared in the introduction.*

Lemma 2.8 (classical consistency relations for flips of ideal triangulations). *Fix a triangulable generalized marked surface \mathfrak{S} . The flips Φ_i of ideal triangulations of \mathfrak{S} satisfy the following relations:*

- (1) $\Phi_i \Phi_i = \text{id}$ when applied to any ideal triangulation;
- (2) $\Phi_i \Phi_j \Phi_i \Phi_j = \text{id}$ when applied to an ideal triangulation Δ with $b_{ij} = 0$;
- (3) $\Phi_i \Phi_j \Phi_i \Phi_j \Phi_i = P_{(ij)}$ when applied to an ideal triangulation Δ with $b_{ij} = \pm 1$, where $P_{(ij)}$ is the label exchange $i \leftrightarrow j$.

Proposition 2.9 (the completeness of the flip relations). *Any algebraic relation among flips is a consequence of the above. That is, any sequence of flips that starts and ends at a same ideal triangulation can be transformed to the empty sequence of flips by applying a finite number of the above three types of relations.*

Both of these statements are well known; see e.g. [FST08] and references therein. We note that, if we drop the condition of Def.2.3 and moreover allow ‘tagged’ ideal triangulations of [FST08], then there are relations of flips that are not consequences of the above; see [FST08] [KY20].

2.2. SL_3 -skein algebras and SL_3 -laminations.

Definition 2.10 ([S05] [FS20] [H20] [K20, Def.5.1]). *Let (Σ, \mathcal{P}) be a generalized marked surface, and $\mathfrak{S} = \Sigma \setminus \mathcal{P}$. Let*

$$\mathbf{I} := (-1, 1)$$

be the open interval in \mathbb{R} , and let $\mathfrak{S} \times \mathbf{I}$ be the thickening of \mathfrak{S} , or a thickened surface. For a point $(x, t) \in \mathfrak{S} \times \mathbf{I}$, the \mathbf{I} -coordinate t is called the elevation of (x, t) . If $(x, t) \in A \times \mathbf{I}$ for some subset $A \subset \mathfrak{S}$, we say (x, t) lies over A . For each boundary arc b of \mathfrak{S} , the corresponding boundary component $b \times \mathbf{I}$ of $\mathfrak{S} \times \mathbf{I}$ is called a boundary wall.

An SL_3 -web W in $\mathfrak{S} \times \mathbf{I}$ consists of

- *a finite subset of $(\partial\mathfrak{S}) \times \mathbf{I}$, whose elements are called the external vertices or the endpoints of W , where we denote by ∂W the set of all endpoints of W ;*
- *a finite subset of $\mathfrak{S} \times \mathbf{I}$, whose elements are called the internal vertices of W ;*
- *a finite set of oriented smooth simple non-closed curves in $\mathfrak{S} \times \mathbf{I}$ ending at external or internal vertices of W , whose elements are called the (oriented) edges of W ;*
- *a finite set of oriented smooth simple closed curves in $\mathfrak{S} \times \mathbf{I}$, whose elements are called the (oriented) loops of W ;*
- *a framing on $W = \text{union of constituent edges and loops}$, i.e. a continuous choice of an element of $T_x(\mathfrak{S} \times \mathbf{I}) \setminus T_x W$ for each point x ,*

subject to the following conditions:

- *each external vertex is 1-valent, and W meets a boundary wall transversally at an external vertex;*
- *each internal vertex is either a 3-valent sink or a 3-valent source;*
- *there is no self-intersection of W except possibly at the 3-valent internal vertices;*
- *the framing at each external or internal vertex is upward vertical, i.e. is parallel to the \mathbf{I} factor and points toward 1;*
- *for each boundary wall $b \times \mathbf{I}$, the endpoints of W lying in $b \times \mathbf{I}$ have mutually distinct elevations.*

An isotopy of SL_3 -webs in $\mathfrak{S} \times \mathbf{I}$ is an isotopy within the class of SL_3 -webs in $\mathfrak{S} \times \mathbf{I}$.

Definition 2.11 ([S05] [FS20] [H20] [K20, Def.5.3]). *Let \mathfrak{S} be a generalized marked surface.*

- *A state of an SL_3 -web W in $\mathfrak{S} \times \mathbf{I}$ is a map $s : \partial W \rightarrow \{1, 2, 3\}$. A pair (W, s) is called a stated SL_3 -web in $\mathfrak{S} \times \mathbf{I}$.*
- *Let \mathcal{R} be a commutative ring with unity. The stated SL_3 -skein algebra $\mathcal{S}_s^\omega(\mathfrak{S}; \mathcal{R})$ is the free $\mathcal{R}[\omega^{\pm 1/2}]$ -module with the set of all isotopy classes of stated SL_3 -webs in $\mathfrak{S} \times \mathbf{I}$ as a free basis, mod out by the SL_3 -skein relations in Fig.2, with eq.(1.4) in mind.*
- *The reduced stated SL_3 -skein algebra $\mathcal{S}_s^\omega(\mathfrak{S}; \mathcal{R})_{\text{red}}$ is the quotient of $\mathcal{S}_s^\omega(\mathfrak{S}; \mathcal{R})$ by the boundary relations in Fig.3, with eq.(1.5) in mind; in the pictures, x and x_i are labels of endpoints, each picture is assumed to carry a respective state which is usually written as s . The element of $\mathcal{S}_s^\omega(\mathfrak{S}; \mathcal{R})_{\text{red}}$ (and that of $\mathcal{S}_s^\omega(\mathfrak{S}; \mathcal{R})$) represented by a stated SL_3 -web (W, s) in $\mathfrak{S} \times \mathbf{I}$ is denoted by $[W, s]$.*
- *The multiplication in $\mathcal{S}_s^\omega(\mathfrak{S}; \mathcal{R})_{\text{red}}$ (and that in $\mathcal{S}_s^\omega(\mathfrak{S}; \mathcal{R})$) is given by superposition; i.e. $[W, s] \cdot [W', s'] = [W \cup W', s \cup s']$ when $W \subset \mathfrak{S} \times (0, 1)$ and $W' \subset \mathfrak{S} \times (-1, 0)$.*

The main object of study of the present paper is the SL_3 quantum trace map which is to be reviewed at the end of the present section; the domain of this map is the reduced stated SL_3 -skein algebra $\mathcal{S}_s^\omega(\mathfrak{S}; \mathbb{Z})_{\text{red}}$.

Frohman and Sikora [FS20] found a basis of $\mathcal{S}_s^\omega(\mathfrak{S}; \mathcal{R})_{\text{red}}$ consisting of *reduced non-elliptic* SL_3 -webs, and constructed a coordinate system for such SL_3 -webs; in fact, their algebra $\mathcal{S}_s^\omega(\mathfrak{S}; \mathcal{R})_{\text{red}}$ is defined with somewhat different boundary relations than the above, which are used in [K20] as a modified version of the ones

in [H20]. These basic SL_3 -webs have no *crossings* and have upward vertical framing everywhere, hence can be projected down to \mathfrak{S} via the projection map




$$(2.1) \quad \pi : \mathfrak{S} \times \mathbf{I} \rightarrow \mathfrak{S}$$

and viewed as objects living in the surface \mathfrak{S} . Generalizing these reduced non-elliptic SL_3 -webs living in a surface \mathfrak{S} , the notion of SL_3 -laminations in \mathfrak{S} is defined and studied in [K20], and a coordinate system on them is established in [K20] based on Douglas-Sun's coordinates [DS20a] which are certain modification of Frohman-Sikora's coordinates [FS20]. We review these in a concise manner.

Definition 2.12 (modified from [K96] [SW07] [FS20]). *Let \mathfrak{S} be a generalized marked surface. Let W be an SL_3 -web in $\mathfrak{S} \times \mathbf{I}$, such that*

- (NE1) *the framing is upward vertical everywhere;*
- (NE2) *W has no crossing, in the sense that the restriction $\pi|_W : W \rightarrow \pi(W)$ of the projection π to W is one-to-one;*
- (NE3) *in $\pi(W)$ there is no contractible region bounded by a loop, a 2-gon or a 4-gon, as appearing in (S1)–(S3) of Fig.2;*

The projection $\pi(W)$ in \mathfrak{S} is called a non-elliptic SL_3 -web in the surface \mathfrak{S} . If furthermore the condition

- (NE4) *in $\pi(W)$ there is no boundary 2-gon , 3-gon , or 4-gon ,*

is satisfied, then $\pi(W)$ is said to be reduced. An isotopy of non-elliptic SL_3 -webs in \mathfrak{S} means an isotopy within the class of non-elliptic SL_3 -webs in \mathfrak{S} .

Definition 2.13 ([K20]). *Let \mathfrak{S} be a generalized marked surface.*

- *A simple loop in \mathfrak{S} is called a peripheral loop if it bounds a region in \mathfrak{S} diffeomorphic to a disc with one puncture in the interior; if the corresponding puncture is $p \in \mathcal{P}$, we say that this peripheral loop surrounds p . A peripheral arc in \mathfrak{S} is a simple curve in \mathfrak{S} that ends at points of $\partial\mathfrak{S}$ and bounds a region in \mathfrak{S} diffeomorphic to an upper half-disc with one puncture on the boundary. Peripheral loops and peripheral arcs are called peripheral curves.*

An SL_3 -lamination ℓ in \mathfrak{S} is a reduced non-elliptic web $W = W(\ell)$ in \mathfrak{S} equipped with integer weights on the components, subject to the following conditions and equivalence relation:

- (L1) *the weight of each component of W containing an internal 3-valent vertex is 1;*
- (L2) *the weight of each component of W that is not a peripheral curve is non-negative;*
- (L3) *an SL_3 -lamination containing a component of weight zero is equivalent to the SL_3 -lamination with this component removed;*
- (L4) *an SL_3 -lamination with two of its components being homotopic with weights a and b is equivalent to the SL_3 -lamination with one of these components removed and the other having weight $a + b$.*

Let $\mathcal{A}_L(\mathfrak{S}; \mathbb{Z})$ be the set of all SL_3 -laminations in \mathfrak{S} .

A statement about a coordinate system on $\mathcal{A}_L(\mathfrak{S}; \mathbb{Z})$ is postponed until §3.3.

2.3. PGL_3 Fock-Goncharov algebras for surfaces. A quiver Q consists of a set $\mathcal{V}(Q)$ of nodes and a set $\mathcal{E}(Q)$ of arrows between the nodes, where an arrow is an ordered pair (v, w) of nodes, depicted in pictures as $\overset{v}{\circ} \xrightarrow{w} \overset{w}{\circ}$. The signed adjacency matrix of a quiver Q is the $\mathcal{V}(Q) \times \mathcal{V}(Q)$ matrix $\varepsilon_Q = \varepsilon$ whose (v, w) -th entry is

$$\varepsilon_{vw} = \varepsilon_{v,w} = (\text{number of arrows from } v \text{ to } w) - (\text{number of arrows from } w \text{ to } v).$$

If a quiver Q' can be obtained from a quiver Q by deleting a cycle of length 1 or 2, we say Q and Q' are equivalent; this generates an equivalence relation on the set of all quivers. The set of equivalence classes of all quivers for a fixed set of nodes \mathcal{V} is in bijection with the set of all skew-symmetric $\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}$ integer matrices.

Let's consider a generalized quiver Q based on a set \mathcal{V} of nodes, which correspond to skew-symmetric $\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}$ matrices with entries in $\frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}$. This can be thought of as a collection of half-arrows $\overset{v}{\circ} \dashrightarrow \overset{w}{\circ}$, so that the signed adjacency matrix is given by

$$\varepsilon_{vw} = \frac{1}{2}(\text{number of half-arrows from } v \text{ to } w) - \frac{1}{2}(\text{number of half-arrows from } w \text{ to } v).$$

In practice, one can define a generalized quiver as a collection of half-arrows and (usual solid) arrows, and consider an equivalence relation generated by the move deleting a cycle of half-arrows of length 1 or 2, and the move replacing two half-arrows from v to w by an (usual solid) arrow from v to w .

We will identify two (generalized) quivers if they are equivalent, unless there is a confusion.

Definition 2.14. Let Δ be an ideal triangulation of a triangulable generalized marked surface \mathfrak{S} . The (extended) 3-triangulation quiver Q_Δ is a generalized quiver defined as follows. The set of nodes $\mathcal{V}(Q_\Delta)$ is realized as a subset of \mathfrak{S} , consisting of one point in the interior of each ideal triangle of Δ and two points lying in the interior of each ideal arc of Δ . The generalized quiver $Q_\Delta = Q_\Delta^{[3]}$ is obtained by gluing (i.e. taking the union of) all the generalized quivers defined for the ideal triangles of Δ as in Fig.1. Denote by $\varepsilon_\Delta = \varepsilon$ the signed adjacency matrix for Q_Δ .

The following is a quantum algebra of Fock-Goncharov-Shen's (cluster) Poisson moduli space $\mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{PGL}_3, \mathfrak{S}}$ [FG06] [GS19], and its cube-root version. This algebra can be viewed merely as an example of a quantum torus algebra.

Definition 2.15. Let Δ be an ideal triangulation of a triangulable generalized marked surface. Let the Fock-Goncharov algebra \mathcal{X}_Δ^q for Δ be the free associative $\mathbb{Z}[q^{\pm 1/2}]$ -algebra generated by $\{\hat{X}_v^{\pm 1} \mid v \in \mathcal{V}(Q_\Delta)\}$ mod out by the relations

$$\hat{X}_v \hat{X}_w = q^{2\varepsilon_{vw}} \hat{X}_w \hat{X}_v, \quad \forall v, w \in \mathcal{V}(Q_\Delta).$$

The cube-root Fock-Goncharov algebra $\mathcal{Z}_\Delta^\omega$ for Δ is the free associative $\mathbb{Z}[\omega^{\pm 1/2}]$ -algebra generated by $\{\hat{Z}_v^{\pm 1} \mid v \in \mathcal{V}(Q_\Delta)\}$ mod out by the relations

$$\hat{Z}_v \hat{Z}_w = \omega^{2\varepsilon_{vw}} \hat{Z}_w \hat{Z}_v, \quad \forall v, w \in \mathcal{V}(Q_\Delta),$$

which the Fock-Goncharov algebra \mathcal{X}_Δ^q for Δ embeds as

$$\mathcal{X}_\Delta^q \hookrightarrow \mathcal{Z}_\Delta^\omega : \hat{X}_v \mapsto \hat{Z}_v^3, \quad \forall v \in \mathcal{V}(Q_\Delta), \quad q^{1/2} \mapsto \omega^{9/2}.$$

One convenient technical tool used in the present paper is the following famous notion.

Definition 2.16. Let Δ be an ideal triangulation of a triangulable generalized marked surface, and let $\mathcal{Z}_\Delta^\omega$ be the corresponding cube-root Fock-Goncharov algebra. Enumerate the elements of $\mathcal{V}(Q_\Delta)$ as v_1, v_2, \dots, v_N , according to any chosen ordering. A Weyl-ordered Laurent monomial in $\mathcal{Z}_\Delta^\omega$ is an element of the form

$$[\prod_{v \in \mathcal{V}(Q_\Delta)} \hat{X}_v^{\alpha_v/3}]_{\mathrm{Weyl}} = [\prod_{v \in \mathcal{V}(Q_\Delta)} \hat{Z}_v^{\alpha_v}]_{\mathrm{Weyl}} := \omega^{-\sum_{i < j} \varepsilon_{ij} \alpha_{v_i} \alpha_{v_j}} \hat{Z}_{v_1}^{\alpha_{v_1}} \dots \hat{Z}_{v_N}^{\alpha_{v_N}}$$

for some $(\alpha_v)_v \in \mathbb{Z}^{\mathcal{V}(Q_\Delta)}$.

Let $\hat{f} \in \mathcal{Z}_\Delta^\omega$. Express \hat{f} as sum of the terms of the form $\epsilon \omega^m \hat{Z}_{v_1}^{\alpha_{v_1}} \dots \hat{Z}_{v_N}^{\alpha_{v_N}}$ for some $\epsilon \in \{1, -1\}$ and $m \in \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}$; replacing each such term by $\epsilon [\hat{Z}_{v_1}^{\alpha_{v_1}} \dots \hat{Z}_{v_N}^{\alpha_{v_N}}]_{\mathrm{Weyl}}$, denote by $[\hat{f}]_{\mathrm{Weyl}} \in \mathcal{Z}_\Delta^\omega$ the resulting sum of these replaced terms. Call $[\hat{f}]_{\mathrm{Weyl}}$ the (term-by-term) Weyl-ordering of f . Such an element $[\hat{f}]_{\mathrm{Weyl}}$ of $\mathcal{Z}_\Delta^\omega$ is called a (term-by-term) Weyl-ordered Laurent polynomial in $\mathcal{Z}_\Delta^\omega$.

For a matrix $\widehat{\mathbf{M}}$ with entries in $\mathcal{Z}_\Delta^\omega$, denote by $[\widehat{\mathbf{M}}]_{\mathrm{Weyl}}$ the matrix obtained by replacing each entry of $\widehat{\mathbf{M}}$ by its (term-by-term) Weyl-ordering.

In particular, it is easy to see that the Weyl-ordered Laurent monomial is independent of the choice of ordering on $\mathcal{V}(Q_\Delta)$, and that $[\hat{f}]_{\mathrm{Weyl}}$ depends only on \hat{f} but not on the choice of an expression of \hat{f} as a Laurent polynomial.

2.4. SL_3 quantum trace maps. Both the SL_3 -skein algebra and the PGL_3 Fock-Goncharov algebra could be viewed as certain versions of the quantum algebras for the Poisson moduli space $\mathcal{X}_{\mathrm{PGL}_3, \mathfrak{S}}$ or $\mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{PGL}_3, \mathfrak{S}}$. The main object of study of the present paper, the SL_3 quantum trace map [K20], is a map that connects these two algebras. Its characteristic property is the compatibility under the cutting and gluing of the surfaces. We first recall the process of cutting.

Definition 2.17 (cutting process; see e.g. [K20, Lem.5.6]). Let \mathfrak{S} be a generalized marked surface. Let e be an ideal arc of \mathfrak{S} whose interior lies in the interior of \mathfrak{S} . Denote by \mathfrak{S}_e the generalized marked surface obtained from \mathfrak{S} by cutting along e , which is uniquely determined up to isomorphism. Let $g_e : \mathfrak{S}_e \rightarrow \mathfrak{S}$ be the gluing map.

If Δ is an ideal triangulation of \mathfrak{S} containing e as one of the members, then the cutting process yields an ideal triangulation $\Delta_e := g_e^{-1}(\Delta_e)$ of \mathfrak{S}_e .

Let W be an SL_3 -web in $\mathfrak{S} \times \mathbf{I}$ that meets $e \times \mathbf{I}$ transversally, where the intersection points of $e \times \mathbf{I}$ have mutually distinct elevations, and the framing at these intersections are upward vertical. Then let $W_e := (g_e \times \mathrm{id})^{-1}(W)$ be the SL_3 -web in $\mathfrak{S}_e \times \mathbf{I}$ obtained from W by the cutting process along e . A state s_e of W_e

is said to be compatible with a state s of W if $s_e(x) = s(g_e(x))$ for all $x \in \partial W_e \cap (g_e \times \text{id})^{-1}(\partial W)$ and $s_e(x_1) = s_e(x_2)$ for all $x_1, x_2 \in \partial W_e \cap (g_e \times \text{id})(e \times \mathbf{I})$ such that $s_e(x_1) = s_e(x_2)$.

Denote by $g_e : \mathcal{V}(Q_{\Delta_e}) \rightarrow \mathcal{V}(Q_\Delta)$ be the corresponding map between the nodes of the 3-triangulation quivers. Define the induced cutting map between the cube-root Fock-Goncharov algebras

$$i_{\Delta, \Delta_e} : \mathcal{Z}_\Delta^\omega \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}_{\Delta_e}^\omega$$

to be the $\mathbb{Z}[\omega^{\pm 1/2}]$ -algebra map given on the generators as

$$i_{\Delta, \Delta_e}(\hat{Z}_v) = \prod_{w \in \mathcal{V}(Q_{\Delta_e}) \cap g_e^{-1}(v)} \hat{Z}_w, \quad \forall v \in \mathcal{V}(Q_\Delta),$$

and likewise on their inverses.

Note that $g_e^{-1}(v)$ has a single element unless $v \in \mathcal{V}(Q_\Delta)$ is one of the two nodes lying in e , in which case $g_e^{-1}(v)$ has two elements; in this case, for $v_1, v_2 \in \mathcal{V}(Q_{\Delta_e}) \cap g_e^{-1}(v)$, we have $\hat{Z}_{v_1} \hat{Z}_{v_2} = \hat{Z}_{v_2} \hat{Z}_{v_1}$ in $\mathcal{Z}_{\Delta_e}^\omega$, so the product expression $\prod_{w \in \mathcal{V}(Q_{\Delta_e}) \cap g_e^{-1}(v)} \hat{Z}_w$ makes sense.

Theorem 2.18 ([K20, Thm.1.27, Thm.5.8]). *There exists a family of $\mathbb{Z}[\omega^{\pm 1/2}]$ -algebra homomorphisms*

$$\text{Tr}_\Delta^\omega = \text{Tr}_{\Delta; \mathfrak{S}}^\omega : \mathcal{S}_s^\omega(\mathfrak{S}; \mathbb{Z})_{\text{red}} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}_\Delta^\omega,$$

called the SL_3 quantum trace maps, defined for each triangulable generalized marked surface \mathfrak{S} and an ideal triangulation Δ of \mathfrak{S} , such that

(QT1) (*cutting/gluing*) *Let (W, s) be a stated SL_3 -web in $\mathfrak{S} \times \mathbf{I}$, and e an internal arc of Δ . Let \mathfrak{S}_e, Δ_e and $W_e \subset \mathfrak{S}_e \times \mathbf{I}$ be obtained from \mathfrak{S}, Δ and $W \subset \mathfrak{S} \times \mathbf{I}$ by cutting along e as in Def.2.17. Then*

$$(2.2) \quad i_{\Delta, \Delta_e} \text{Tr}_{\Delta; \mathfrak{S}}^\omega([W, s]) = \sum_{s_e} \text{Tr}_{\Delta_e; \mathfrak{S}_e}^\omega([W_e, s_e]),$$

where the sum is over all states s_e of W_e that are compatible with s in the sense as in Def.2.17, and the cutting map i_{Δ, Δ_e} is as in Def.2.17.

(QT2) (*values of oriented edges over a triangle*) *Let (W, s) be a stated SL_3 -web in $t \times \mathbf{I}$, where t is a triangle, viewed as a generalized marked surface with a unique ideal triangulation Δ . Denote the sides of t by e_1, e_2, e_3 (with $e_4 = e_1$), and the nodes of Q_Δ by $v_{e_\alpha, 1}, v_{e_\alpha, 2}, v_t$ (for $\alpha = 1, 2, 3$) as in Fig.4.*

(QT2-1) *If W consists of a single left-turn oriented edge in $t \times \mathbf{I}$, i.e. a crossingless SL_3 -web with upward vertical framing consisting of a single oriented edge, with the initial point x lying over e_α and the terminal point lying over $e_{\alpha+1}$, then $\text{Tr}_{\Delta; t}^\omega([W, s])$ is the $(s(x), s(y))$ -th entry of the following 3×3 matrix with entries in $\mathcal{Z}_\Delta^\omega$:*

$$(2.3) \quad \left[\begin{pmatrix} \hat{Z}_{v_{e_\alpha, 2}} \hat{Z}_{v_{e_\alpha, 1}}^2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \hat{Z}_{v_{e_\alpha, 2}} \hat{Z}_{v_{e_\alpha, 1}}^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \hat{Z}_{v_{e_\alpha, 2}}^{-2} \hat{Z}_{v_{e_\alpha, 1}}^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \hat{Z}_{v_t}^2 & \hat{Z}_{v_t}^2 + \hat{Z}_{v_t}^{-1} & \hat{Z}_{v_t}^{-1} \\ 0 & \hat{Z}_{v_t}^{-1} & \hat{Z}_{v_t}^{-1} \\ 0 & 0 & \hat{Z}_{v_t}^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \hat{Z}_{v_{e_{\alpha+1}, 1}} \hat{Z}_{v_{e_{\alpha+1}, 2}}^2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \hat{Z}_{v_{e_{\alpha+1}, 1}} \hat{Z}_{v_{e_{\alpha+1}, 2}}^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \hat{Z}_{v_{e_{\alpha+1}, 1}}^{-2} \hat{Z}_{v_{e_{\alpha+1}, 2}}^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \right]_{\text{Weyl}}$$

(QT2-2) *If W consists of a single right-turn oriented edge in $t \times \mathbf{I}$, i.e. a single crossingless oriented edge from $x \in e_{\alpha+1} \times \mathbf{I}$ to $y \in e_\alpha \times \mathbf{I}$, then $\text{Tr}_{\Delta; t}^\omega([W, s])$ is the $(s(x), s(y))$ -th entry of*

$$\left[\begin{pmatrix} \hat{Z}_{v_{e_{\alpha+1}, 2}} \hat{Z}_{v_{e_{\alpha+1}, 1}}^2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \hat{Z}_{v_{e_{\alpha+1}, 2}} \hat{Z}_{v_{e_{\alpha+1}, 1}}^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \hat{Z}_{v_{e_{\alpha+1}, 2}}^{-2} \hat{Z}_{v_{e_{\alpha+1}, 1}}^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \hat{Z}_{v_t} & 0 & 0 \\ \hat{Z}_{v_t} & \hat{Z}_{v_t} & 0 \\ \hat{Z}_{v_t} & \hat{Z}_{v_t} + \hat{Z}_{v_t}^{-2} & \hat{Z}_{v_t}^{-2} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \hat{Z}_{v_{e_\alpha, 1}} \hat{Z}_{v_{e_\alpha, 2}}^2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \hat{Z}_{v_{e_\alpha, 1}} \hat{Z}_{v_{e_\alpha, 2}}^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \hat{Z}_{v_{e_\alpha, 1}}^{-2} \hat{Z}_{v_{e_\alpha, 2}}^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \right]_{\text{Weyl}}$$

The SL_3 quantum trace map, which can be viewed as the SL_3 version of Bonahon-Wong's SL_2 quantum trace map [BW11], is supposed to be a quantum deformed version of the SL_3 classical trace map, whose value at an oriented loop is the 'trace-of-monodromy function' on the space $\mathcal{X}_{\text{PGL}_3, \mathfrak{S}}$ along that loop. The values on the basic cases (QT2-1)–(QT2-2), which already appeared in [D21], are natural candidates for these cases, deforming the corresponding classical monodromy matrices of Fock-Goncharov [FG06], or more precisely, the suitably normalized versions. By the cutting/gluing property (QT1), the values of the SL_3 quantum trace maps for a surface \mathfrak{S} are completely determined by the values for the triangle t , viewed as a standalone generalized marked surface. However, the above version of Thm.2.18 doesn't tell us how to compute the values of $\text{Tr}_{\Delta; t}^\omega([W, s])$ for all SL_3 -webs W in $t \times \mathbf{I}$. In [K20], what is crucially used in the proof of the above Thm.2.18 as well as in the computation of the values is the biangle analog of the SL_3 quantum trace map.

Proposition 2.19 ([K20, Prop.5.26 and §5]). *Let B be a biangle, viewed as a generalized marked surface, diffeomorphic to a closed disc with two marked points on the boundary and no puncture in the interior. There exists a $\mathbb{Z}[\omega^{\pm 1/2}]$ -algebra homomorphism*

$$\mathrm{Tr}_B^\omega : \mathcal{S}_s^\omega(B; \mathbb{Z})_{\mathrm{red}} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}[\omega^{\pm 1/2}],$$

called the biangle SL_3 quantum trace map, satisfying the following.

(BQT1) *The cutting/gluing property for each internal ideal arc e in B connecting the two marked points of B holds:*

$$\mathrm{Tr}_B^\omega([W, s]) = \sum_{s_1, s_2} \mathrm{Tr}_{B_1}^\omega([W_1, s_1]) \mathrm{Tr}_{B_2}^\omega([W_2, s_2]),$$

where cutting B along e yields $B_e = B_1 \sqcup B_2$, with W cut into $W_e = W_1 \sqcup W_2$, and the sum is over all states s_1, s_2 such that the state $s_e := s_1 \sqcup s_2$ of $W_e = W_1 \sqcup W_2$ are compatible with s in the sense of Def.2.17.

(BQT2) *When W consists of a single crossingless oriented edge connecting the two boundary walls of $B \times \mathbf{I}$,*

$$\mathrm{Tr}_B^\omega([W, s]) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } s \text{ assigns the same state values to the two endpoints of } W, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

(BQT3) *Let \mathfrak{S} be a triangulable generalized marked surface, and e an internal ideal arc of \mathfrak{S} isotopic to a boundary arc b , so that cutting \mathfrak{S} along e yields $\mathfrak{S}_e = \mathfrak{S}_0 \sqcup B$ with B being a biangle and \mathfrak{S}_0 being isomorphic to \mathfrak{S} . Let Δ be an ideal triangulation of \mathfrak{S} not meeting the interior of e . Let Δ_0 be the ideal triangulation of \mathfrak{S}_0 obtained from \mathfrak{S} by replacing b by e . For an SL_3 -web W in $\mathfrak{S} \times \mathbf{I}$ such that the cutting process along e yields a well-defined SL_3 -web $W_e = W_0 \sqcup W_B$ in $\mathfrak{S}_e \times \mathbf{I} = (\mathfrak{S}_0 \times \mathbf{I}) \sqcup (B \times \mathbf{I})$, one has*

$$\mathrm{Tr}_{\Delta; \mathfrak{S}}^\omega([W, s]) = \sum_{s_0, s_B} \mathrm{Tr}_{\Delta_0; \mathfrak{S}_0}^\omega([W_0, s_0]) \mathrm{Tr}_B^\omega([W_B, s_B]),$$

where the sum is over all states s_0 and s_B of W_0 and W_B constituting a state $s_e := s_0 \sqcup s_B$ of W_e that is compatible with s in the sense of Def.2.17, and the algebras $\mathcal{Z}_\Delta^\omega$ and $\mathcal{Z}_{\Delta_0}^\omega$ are naturally being identified.

It is the property (BQT3) that yields a ‘state-sum formula’ [K20, §5.3] for the SL_3 quantum trace $\mathrm{Tr}_{\Delta; \mathfrak{S}}^\omega$ for a triangulable generalized marked surface. Namely, consider a *split ideal triangulation* $\hat{\Delta}$ of Δ , obtained by adding one ideal arc e' per each arc e of Δ so that e' is isotopic to e and $\hat{\Delta}$ is still a collection of arcs that do not meet each other in their interiors. So, an arc of Δ now becomes two parallel arcs, forming a biangle. Cutting along all internal arcs of $\hat{\Delta}$ yield bunch of triangles and biangles. Before performing this cutting, one isotopes W so that the complexities, e.g. the 3-valent vertices, are pushed to biangles. Then the cutting/gluing properties let us compute $\mathrm{Tr}_{\Delta; \mathfrak{S}}^\omega$ in terms of Tr_t^ω for triangles t and Tr_B^ω for biangles B . One could have isotoped W so that the pieces of W living over each triangle is one of (QT2-1)–(QT2-2). Then the hard computation should be done over the biangles, which are relatively easier than triangles. Note that the biangle SL_3 quantum trace can be viewed either as an incarnation of the Reshetikhin-Turaev invariant for tangles associated to the standard 3d representation of the quantum group $\mathcal{U}_q(\mathfrak{sl}_3)$ [RT90], or as the counit of the quantum group $\mathcal{O}_q(\mathrm{SL}_3)$ [H20]; see [K20] for more details. Anyhow, the state-sum formula provides one algorithmic way of computing the values of the SL_3 quantum trace, and at the same time a way of proving the very existence of the SL_3 quantum trace maps. However, we will only make a mild use of this state-sum formula for $\hat{\Delta}$ in the present paper.

Some nice favorable properties of the SL_3 quantum trace maps $\mathrm{Tr}_\Delta^\omega$ are proved in [K20], but there are still more to be proved. Among the remaining, probably the most important property is the ‘naturality’ under the mapping class group action, i.e. the independence on the choice of ideal triangulations Δ . The present paper undertakes the task of properly formulating and proving this property.

3. QUANTUM COORDINATE CHANGE FOR FLIPS OF IDEAL TRIANGULATIONS

Per change of ideal triangulations $\Delta \rightsquigarrow \Delta'$ of a triangulable generalized marked surface, we investigate the quantum coordinate change maps between various versions of the Fock-Goncharov quantum algebras associated to Δ and Δ' . This is the first necessary step toward the main result of the present paper, and can be viewed as the SL_3 analog of Hiatt’s result on the square-root version of the quantum mutation maps for SL_2 [H10] [S20].

3.1. Classical cluster \mathcal{X} -mutations. We begin by reviewing the classical setting of [FG06] [FG09a]. Let \mathcal{V} be any fixed nonempty finite set, and let

$$\mathcal{F} = \mathbb{Q}(\{X_v^\circ \mid v \in \mathcal{V}\})$$

be the field of rational functions on algebraically independent variables enumerated by \mathcal{V} ; we refer to \mathcal{F} as the *ambient field*. The set \mathcal{V} will play a role of the set of nodes of the generalized quivers to be considered, so the elements of \mathcal{V} are called nodes. Choose any subset \mathcal{V}_{fr} of \mathcal{V} ; the elements of \mathcal{V}_{fr} are called the *frozen* nodes. With these choices, a *cluster \mathcal{X} -seed* (or, just a *seed*) is defined as a pair $\Gamma = (Q, (X_v)_{v \in \mathcal{V}})$, where Q is a generalized quiver whose set of nodes $\mathcal{V}(Q)$ is \mathcal{V} , whose signed adjacency matrix is denoted by ε , sometimes called the *exchange matrix* of the seed, and X_v 's are elements of \mathcal{F} such that $\{X_v\}_{v \in \mathcal{V}}$ is a transcendence basis of \mathcal{F} over \mathbb{Q} , called the *cluster \mathcal{X} -variables* of the seed. We require ε_{vw} to be integers unless both v and w are frozen. For any non-frozen node k of Q , i.e. $k \in \mathcal{V} \setminus \mathcal{V}_{\text{fr}}$, one defines a process of *mutation* μ_k at the node k , which transforms the seed Γ into another seed $\mu_k(\Gamma)$. Denoting by $\mu_k(\Gamma) = \Gamma' = (Q', (X'_v)_{v \in \mathcal{V}})$, the generalized quiver Q' is defined by the following *quiver mutation* formula for its signed adjacency matrix ε' :

$$\varepsilon'_{vw} = \begin{cases} -\varepsilon_{vw} & \text{if } k \in \{v, w\}, \\ \varepsilon_{vw} + \frac{1}{2}(\varepsilon_{vk}|\varepsilon_{kw}| + |\varepsilon_{vk}|\varepsilon_{kw}) & \text{if } k \notin \{v, w\}, \end{cases}$$

and the variables X'_v for Γ' are defined as elements of \mathcal{F} given by the following *cluster \mathcal{X} -mutation* formula

$$X'_v = \begin{cases} X_k^{-1} & \text{if } v = k, \\ X_v(1 + X_k^{-\text{sgn}(\varepsilon_{vk})})^{-\varepsilon_{vk}} & \text{if } v \neq k, \end{cases}$$

where $\text{sgn}(\sim) \in \{1, -1\}$ denotes the sign. Another way of transforming a seed $\Gamma = (Q, (X_v)_{v \in \mathcal{V}})$ into a new seed is the *seed automorphism* P_σ associated to a permutation σ of the set \mathcal{V} . The new seed $P_\sigma(\Gamma) = \Gamma' = (Q', (X'_v)_{v \in \mathcal{V}})$ is given by

$$\varepsilon'_{\sigma(v)\sigma(w)} = \varepsilon_{vw}, \quad X'_{\sigma(v)} = X_v.$$

One can apply the mutations and seed automorphisms repeatedly. In general, one begins with one cluster \mathcal{X} -seed, referred to as an *initial* cluster \mathcal{X} -seed, and considers only those cluster \mathcal{X} -seeds connected to the initial one by (finite) sequences of mutations and seed automorphisms. The quivers appearing in these seeds are said to be *mutation-equivalent* to each other. Note that there can be two different seeds that have the same underlying quiver.


Let \mathfrak{S} be a triangulable generalized marked surface. To each ideal triangulation Δ of \mathfrak{S} is associated the seed $\Gamma_\Delta = (Q_\Delta, (X_v)_{v \in \mathcal{V}(Q_\Delta)})$, where Q_Δ is the 3-triangulation quiver for Δ defined in Def.2.14, whose signed adjacency matrix is denoted by $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_\Delta$. The set $\mathcal{V}(Q_\Delta)_{\text{fr}}$ of frozen nodes is defined to be the subset of $\mathcal{V}(Q_\Delta)$ consisting of the nodes of Q_Δ lying in the boundary arcs of \mathfrak{S} . A crucial aspect is of course the relationship between the seeds associated to different ideal triangulations. Suppose $\Delta \rightsquigarrow \Delta'$ is a flip at an arc. It is known [FG06] that the corresponding 3-triangulation quivers Q_Δ and $Q_{\Delta'}$ are related by a sequence of four mutations; namely, starting from Q_Δ , first mutate at the two nodes lying in the arc being flipped (in an arbitrary order), then mutate at the two nodes lying in the interiors of the two triangles having this flipped arc as a side (in an arbitrary order). If we denote the nodes of Q_Δ appearing in the two triangles having this flipped arc as a side as v_1, v_2, \dots, v_{12} as in Fig.5, where some of these nodes may be identical nodes depending on the situation, then one can write

$$Q_{\Delta'} = \mu_{v_{12}}\mu_{v_7}\mu_{v_4}\mu_{v_3}Q_\Delta,$$

as seen in Fig.5. This mutation sequence also naturally yield an identification between $\mathcal{V}(Q_\Delta)$ and $\mathcal{V}(Q_{\Delta'})$. Now, not only the quivers, but also the variables should be related under this mutation sequence. That is to say, one could view the situation as starting from the seed Γ_Δ , and defining a new seed $\Gamma_{\Delta'}$ by

$$\Gamma_{\Delta'} := \mu_{v_{12}}\mu_{v_7}\mu_{v_4}\mu_{v_3}\Gamma_\Delta.$$

The original formulation of [FG06] is to construct a rational coordinate system for the moduli space $\mathcal{X}_{\text{PGL}_3, \mathfrak{S}}$ per each ideal triangulation Δ , so that a coordinate function is associated to each node of Q_Δ , and to show that the coordinate systems for ideal triangulations Δ and Δ' differing by a flip are related by the coordinate change formula given by the composition of the above particular sequence of \mathcal{X} -mutations. Here we are being more abstract. One thing to keep in mind in the abstract setting is that if two seeds are connected by a sequence of mutations and seed automorphisms, and if the composition of the corresponding coordinate change maps for the variables is the identity map, then we identify the two seeds. A consequence of the

FIGURE 5. The sequence of four mutations for a flip at an edge, transforming Q_{Δ} to $Q_{\Delta'}$

above original geometric formulation of [FG06] is that the consistency relations for flips of triangulations in Lem.2.8 also hold for the above abstract setting.

Lemma 3.1 (classical consistency relations for flips, for 3-triangulation quivers and seeds). *For each flip $\Delta \rightsquigarrow \Delta'$ of ideal triangulations of a triangulable generalized marked surface \mathfrak{S} at an internal arc i of Δ , where the nodes are denoted as above, denote by*

$$\Phi_{\Delta\Delta'} = \Phi_i := \mu_{v_{12}}\mu_{v_7}\mu_{v_4}\mu_{v_3},$$

which can be applied to generalized quivers or to cluster \mathcal{X} -seeds, so that in particular, $Q_{\Delta'} = \Phi_i(Q_{\Delta})$ and $\Gamma_{\Delta'} = \Phi_i(\Gamma_{\Delta})$. Then, Φ_i 's satisfy the following relations, when applied to the 3-triangulation quiver Q_{Δ} or to the cluster \mathcal{X} -seed Γ_{Δ} for an initial triangulation Δ satisfying the respective conditions:

- (1) $\Phi_i\Phi_i = \text{id}$, for any internal arc i of any triangulation Δ ;
- (2) $\Phi_i\Phi_j\Phi_i\Phi_j = \text{id}$, if the internal arcs i and j of Δ satisfy $b_{ij} = 0$;
- (3) $\Phi_i\Phi_j\Phi_i\Phi_j = \mathbf{P}_{\sigma_{ij}^{[3]}}$, if the internal arcs i and j of Δ satisfy $b_{ij} = \pm 1$, where $\sigma_{ij}^{[3]}$ is a suitable permutation which permutes the seven nodes involved in the mutations in the left hand side and fixes all other nodes. ■

It is not hard to write down the permutation $\sigma_{ij}^{[3]}$ explicitly, once one chooses node labels; we leave it as an exercise. A more basic well-known result is about the consistency relations for mutations.

Lemma 3.2 (classical consistency relations for mutations of \mathcal{X} -seeds). *The mutations μ_v 's of quivers and cluster \mathcal{X} -seeds satisfy:*

- (1) $\mu_v\mu_v = \text{id}$ for any non-frozen node v , applied to any seed Γ ;
- (2) $\mu_v\mu_w\mu_v\mu_w = \text{id}$, when applied to a seed Γ such that $\varepsilon_{vw} = 0$;
- (3) $\mu_v\mu_w\mu_v\mu_w = P_{(vw)}$, when applied to a seed Γ such that $\varepsilon_{vw} = \pm 1$, where (vw) stands for the permutation of the nodes that exchanges v and w and fixes all other nodes. ■

As of now, the proof of Lem.3.1 relies on the geometry of the moduli space $\mathcal{X}_{\text{PGL}_3, \mathfrak{S}}$ [FG06] (or $\mathcal{P}_{\text{PGL}_3, \mathfrak{S}}$ [GS19]). One can try to prove it directly using the more basic algebraic lemma, i.e. Lem.3.2. For example, the left hand side of the item (1) of Lem.3.1, when applied to Δ , can be written as

$$(\mu_{v_4}\mu_{v_3}\mu_{v_7}\mu_{v_{12}})(\mu_{v_{12}}\mu_{v_7}\mu_{v_4}\mu_{v_3})$$

which one can prove to equal id , with the help of the items (1) and (2) of Lem.3.2. Similarly, the item (2) of Lem.3.1 can be shown using the item (2) of Lem.3.2. Showing the item (3) of Lem.3.1 would be more involved, and we leave this as an exercise to the readers.

3.2. Quantum mutations for \mathcal{X} -seeds and for Fock-Goncharov algebras. For the quantum setting, here we first review known constructions established in [FG06] [FG09b] [BZ05], restricted and adapted to the setting of the present paper.

First, for a general cluster \mathcal{X} -variety setting. To a cluster \mathcal{X} -seed $\Gamma = (Q, (X_v)_{v \in \mathcal{V}})$, associate the Fock-Goncharov algebra \mathcal{X}_Γ^q as in Def.2.15, namely \mathcal{X}_Γ^q is the $\mathbb{Z}[q^{\pm 1/2}]$ -algebra generated by $\{\widehat{X}_v^{\pm 1} \mid v \in \mathcal{V}\}$ mod out by the relations

$$\widehat{X}_v \widehat{X}_w = q^{2\varepsilon_{vw}} \widehat{X}_w \widehat{X}_v, \quad \forall v, w \in \mathcal{V},$$

where ε is the signed adjacency matrix for Q . So this algebra is an example of the so-called (generalized) quantum torus algebras, which are known to satisfy the (right) Ore conditions [C95], i.e. $P(\mathcal{X}_\Gamma^q \setminus \{0\}) \cap Q\mathcal{X}_\Gamma^q \neq \emptyset$ for each $P, Q \in \mathcal{X}_\Gamma^q$ with $Q \neq 0$, hence the skew-field of (right) fractions $\text{Frac}(\mathcal{X}_\Gamma^q)$, makes sense. An element of $\text{Frac}(\mathcal{X}_\Gamma^q)$ is represented by a formal expression of the form PQ^{-1} , with $P, Q \in \mathcal{X}_\Gamma^q$, $Q \neq 0$, where two such expressions $P_1Q_1^{-1}$ and $P_2Q_2^{-1}$ represent the same element of $\text{Frac}(\mathcal{X}_\Gamma^q)$ if there exists nonzero $S_1, S_2 \in \mathcal{X}_\Gamma^q$ such that $P_1S_1 = P_2S_2$ and $Q_1S_1 = Q_2S_2$. Product of two such expressions can be expressed again in the form PQ^{-1} , by algebraic manipulations using the defining commutation relations of \mathcal{X}_Γ^q . We now recall the quantum mutation map associated to a mutation of classical \mathcal{X} -seeds. Before giving the formula for this map, it is useful to recall the following crucial ingredient.

Definition 3.3 (compact quantum dilogarithm [FaKa]). *The quantum dilogarithm for a quantum parameter q is the function*

$$\Psi^q(x) = \prod_{n=0}^{\infty} (1 + q^{2n+1}x)^{-1}$$

One way of understanding this function is to view it as a formal series. One can also view it as a meromorphic function on the complex plane, when q is a complex number s.t. $|q| < 1$. Anyhow, its characteristic property is the difference equation

$$\Psi^q(q^2x) = (1 + qx)\Psi^q(x),$$

which is clear at least in a formal sense. This much is what we will use about Ψ^q in a heuristic manner, and we do not try to make rigorous proofs out of these formal manipulations. It is useful to define:

Definition 3.4 (rational ratio of quantum dilogarithm). *For $\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}$, define*

$$F^q(x; \alpha) := \Psi^q(q^{2\alpha}x) \Psi^q(x)^{-1}$$

formally. More precisely, $F^q(x; \alpha)$ is defined as the rational expression in x and q given by

$$(3.1) \quad F^q(x; \alpha) := \prod_{r=1}^{|\alpha|} (1 + q^{(2r-1)\text{sgn}(\alpha)}x)^{\text{sgn}(\alpha)}.$$

In particular, from now on, one can forget about the quantum dilogarithm and just remember eq.(3.1). We now describe Fock-Goncharov's quantum mutation formula.

Definition 3.5 (quantum \mathcal{X} -mutation for Fock-Goncharov algebras; [FG09a] [FG09b]). *To a mutation $\Gamma \rightsquigarrow \Gamma' = \mu_k(\Gamma)$ of cluster \mathcal{X} -seeds, define the quantum mutation map as the algebra homomorphism between the skew-fields of fractions*

$$\mu_{\Delta\Delta'}^q = \mu_k^q : \text{Frac}(\mathcal{X}_{\Gamma'}^q) \rightarrow \text{Frac}(\mathcal{X}_\Gamma^q)$$

as the composition

$$\mu_k^q = \mu_k^{\sharp q} \circ \mu'_k,$$

where the monomial part

$$\mu'_k : \text{Frac}(\mathcal{X}_{\Gamma'}^q) \rightarrow \text{Frac}(\mathcal{X}_\Gamma^q)$$

is given on the generators by

$$\mu'_k(\widehat{X}'_v) = \begin{cases} \widehat{X}_k^{-1} & \text{if } v = k, \\ [\widehat{X}_v \widehat{X}_k^{\varepsilon_{vk}+}]_{\text{Weyl}} & \text{if } v \neq k, \end{cases}$$

where ε is the exchange matrix for Γ , and the automorphism part

$$\mu_k^{\sharp q} : \text{Frac}(\mathcal{X}_\Gamma^q) \rightarrow \text{Frac}(\mathcal{X}_\Gamma^q)$$

is given formally as the conjugation by the expression $\Psi^q(\widehat{X}_k)$

$$\mu_k^{\sharp q} = \text{Ad}_{\Psi^q(\widehat{X}_k)};$$

more precisely, $\mu_k^{\sharp q}$ is given on each generator as

$$\mu_k^{\sharp q}(\widehat{X}_v) = \widehat{X}_v \cdot F^q(\widehat{X}_k; \varepsilon_{kv}),$$

where F^q is as in eq.(3.1).

To a seed automorphism $\Gamma \rightsquigarrow \Gamma' = P_\sigma(\Gamma)$, define the quantum seed automorphism as

$$P_\sigma : \mathrm{Frac}(\mathcal{X}_{\Gamma'}^q) \rightarrow \mathrm{Frac}(\mathcal{X}_\Gamma^q), \quad \widehat{X}'_{\sigma(v)} \mapsto \widehat{X}_v, \quad \forall v \in \mathcal{V}.$$

Of course, the most basic property of μ_k^q and P_σ is that they recover the classical mutation and seed automorphism formulas μ_k and P_σ as we put $q = 1$ and remove hats from the generators \widehat{X}_v . More importantly, they satisfy the quantum counterparts of the consistency relations of the classical mutations as in Lem.3.2:

Proposition 3.6 ([BZ05] [FG09a, §3.3]). *The quantum mutations μ_v^q 's satisfy the following, when applied to $\mathrm{Frac}(\mathcal{X}_\Gamma^q)$ for an initial seed Γ satisfying the respective conditions:*

- (1) $\mu_v^q \mu_v^q = \mathrm{id}$ for any non-frozen node v , for any seed Γ ;
- (2) $\mu_v^q \mu_w^q \mu_v^q \mu_w^q = \mathrm{id}$, when $\varepsilon_{vw} = 0$ in Γ ;
- (3) $\mu_v^q \mu_w^q \mu_v^q \mu_w^q = P_{(vw)}$, when $\varepsilon_{vw} = \pm 1$ in Γ . ■

We now apply the quantum mutation construction to our setting, namely for the cluster \mathcal{X} -seeds Γ_Δ for $\mathcal{X}_{\mathrm{PGL}_3, \mathfrak{S}}$, or $\mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{PGL}_3, \mathfrak{S}}$, associated to an ideal triangulation Δ of \mathfrak{S} .

Definition 3.7 (quantum coordinate change map for cluster \mathcal{X} -charts for a flip). *For each flip $\Delta \rightsquigarrow \Delta'$ of ideal triangulations of a triangulable generalized marked surface \mathfrak{S} at an internal arc i of Δ , where the nodes of the 3-triangulation quivers Q_Δ and $Q_{\Delta'}$ are denoted as in §3.1, define the quantum coordinate change map*

$$\Phi_{\Delta\Delta'}^q = \Phi_i^q : \mathrm{Frac}(\mathcal{X}_{\Delta'}^q) \rightarrow \mathrm{Frac}(\mathcal{X}_\Delta^q)$$

between the skew-fields of fractions of the Fock-Goncharov algebras (Def.2.15) as

$$(3.2) \quad \Phi_i^q := \mu_{v_3}^q \mu_{v_4}^q \mu_{v_7}^q \mu_{v_{12}}^q.$$

The reason why the order of composition of the four quantum mutations looks reversed from that in the classical setting is that each quantum mutation μ_v^q is written in a contravariant manner, for it is a deformation of the pullback map μ_v^* of the classical mutation birational map μ_v . That is, the classical mutation sequence $\mu_{v_{12}} \mu_{v_7} \mu_{v_4} \mu_{v_3}$ can be applied to a quiver, a seed, or the split algebraic torus for a seed, while the pullback maps on the (coordinate) functions should be written as $\mu_{v_3}^* \mu_{v_4}^* \mu_{v_7}^* \mu_{v_{12}}^*$, and the above Φ_i^q is a deformation of this last composition.

One can naturally expect that the quantum counterpart of the consistency relations of the flips, i.e. Lem.3.2, should hold.

Proposition 3.8 (quantum consistency relations for flips of triangulations for $\mathcal{X}_{\mathrm{PGL}_3, \mathfrak{S}}$). *For a triangulable generalized marked surface \mathfrak{S} , the quantum coordinate change maps μ_i^q associated to flips at arcs i of triangulations satisfy the following relations, when applied to the initial seed Γ_Δ for a triangulation Δ of \mathfrak{S} satisfying the respective conditions:*

- (1) $\Phi_i^q \Phi_i^q = \mathrm{id}$, for any internal arc i of any triangulation Δ ;
- (2) $\Phi_i^q \Phi_j^q \Phi_i^q \Phi_j^q = \mathrm{id}$, if the internal arcs i and j of Δ satisfy $b_{ij} = 0$;
- (3) $\Phi_i^q \Phi_j^q \Phi_i^q \Phi_j^q = \mathbf{P}_{\sigma_{ij}^{[3]}}$, if the internal arcs i and j of Δ satisfy $b_{ij} = \pm 1$, where $\sigma_{ij}^{[3]}$ is as in Lem.3.1(3).

Proof. It is proved in [KN11] that a relation satisfied by classical cluster \mathcal{X} -mutations is also satisfied by the corresponding quantum cluster \mathcal{X} -mutations. Since the classical relations hold by Lem.3.2, we are done. ■

3.3. The balanced algebras, and the quantum coordinate change maps for them. In the present subsection we introduce main technical definitions of the present paper.

Let Δ be an ideal triangulation of a triangulable generalized marked surface \mathfrak{S} , and (W, s) a stated SL_3 -web in $\mathfrak{S} \times \mathbf{I}$. In general, the value $\mathrm{Tr}_\Delta^\omega([W, s])$ of the SL_3 quantum trace lies in $\mathcal{Z}_\Delta^\omega$, i.e. is a Laurent polynomial in the variables \widehat{Z}_v 's, $v \in \mathcal{V}(Q_\Delta)$, instead of lying in \mathcal{X}_Δ^q , i.e. being a Laurent polynomial in $\widehat{X}_v = \widehat{Z}_v^3$'s. Suppose $\Delta \rightsquigarrow \Delta'$ is a flip at an arc. The main purpose of the present paper is to show that the SL_3 quantum trace values $\mathrm{Tr}_\Delta^\omega([W, s])$ and $\mathrm{Tr}_{\Delta'}^\omega([W, s])$ are related by a suitable quantum mutation map. So far, the only known quantum mutation map is $\Phi_{\Delta\Delta'}^q : \mathrm{Frac}(\mathcal{X}_{\Delta'}^q) \rightarrow \mathrm{Frac}(\mathcal{X}_\Delta^q)$, which tells us how the variables \widehat{X}_v , $v \in \mathcal{V}(Q_{\Delta'})$,

are related to the variables \widehat{X}_v , $v \in \mathcal{V}(Q_\Delta)$. Hence, one needs first to establish a quantum mutation map for the cube-root variables \widehat{Z}'_v and \widehat{Z}_v . Similarly as in the SL_2 case [H10] [BW11] [S20], one can find a (quantum) rational formula only between certain subalgebras of the skew-fields of fractions $\text{Frac}(\mathcal{Z}_\Delta^\omega)$ and $\text{Frac}(\mathcal{Z}_\Delta^\omega)$. So, the very first step is to identify these special subalgebras. Following the terminology for the known constructions for the SL_2 case [H10] [BW11], we dub these subalgebras as *balanced* subalgebras. The SL_3 version of the balancedness condition comes from that of the *tropical coordinate* system [K20] on the set $\mathcal{A}_L(\mathfrak{S}; \mathbb{Z})$ of all SL_3 -laminations in \mathfrak{S} . Note that in the current version (ver.3) of [K20], the balancedness condition is incorrectly written, and will be corrected in the updated version as follows.

Definition 3.9 (from [K20, Prop.3.30]). *Let Δ be an ideal triangulation of a triangulable generalized marked surface \mathfrak{S} . An element $(a_v)_{v \in \mathcal{V}(Q_\Delta)} \in (\frac{1}{3}\mathbb{Z})^{\mathcal{V}(Q_\Delta)}$ is said to be Δ -balanced if for each triangle t of Δ , the following hold: denoting by e_1, e_2, e_3 the sides of t in the clockwise order (with $e_4 = e_1$), by $v_{e_\alpha,1}, v_{e_\alpha,2}$ the nodes of Q_Δ lying in e_α so that $v_{e_\alpha,1} \rightarrow v_{e_\alpha,2}$ matches the clockwise orientation of the boundary of t , and by v_t the node of Q_Δ lying in the interior of t , as in Fig.4,*

- (BE1) *the numbers $\sum_{\alpha=1}^3 a_{v_{e_\alpha,1}}$ and $\sum_{\alpha=1}^3 a_{v_{e_\alpha,2}}$ belong to \mathbb{Z} ;*
- (BE2) *$\forall \alpha = 1, 2, 3$, the number $a_{v_{e_\alpha,1}} + a_{v_{e_\alpha,2}}$ belongs to \mathbb{Z} ;*
- (BE3) *$\forall \alpha = 1, 2, 3$, the number $-a_{v_t} + a_{v_{e_\alpha,1}} + a_{v_{e_{\alpha+1},1}}$ (or the number $a_{v_t} + a_{v_{e_\alpha,1}} + a_{v_{e_{\alpha+1},2}}$) belongs to \mathbb{Z} .*

Proposition 3.10 ([K20, Prop.3.30]). *Let Δ be an ideal triangulation of a triangulable generalized marked surface \mathfrak{S} . There exists an injective map*

$$\mathbf{a}_\Delta : \mathcal{A}_L(\mathfrak{S}; \mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow (\frac{1}{3}\mathbb{Z})^{\mathcal{V}(Q_\Delta)}, \quad \ell \mapsto (a_v(\ell))_{v \in \mathcal{V}(Q_\Delta)},$$

called the tropical coordinate system on the set $\mathcal{A}_L(\mathfrak{S}; \mathbb{Z})$ of all SL_3 -laminations in \mathfrak{S} , satisfying favorable properties. Moreover, \mathbf{a}_Δ is a bijection onto the set of all Δ -balanced elements of $(\frac{1}{3}\mathbb{Z})^{\mathcal{V}(Q_\Delta)}$.

We say that $a_v(\ell) \in \frac{1}{3}\mathbb{Z}$ is the tropical coordinate of the SL_3 -lamination ℓ at the node v of the 3-triangulation quiver Q_Δ .

The following definition and the next one constitute the first main technical definition introduced in the present paper.

Definition 3.11. *Let Δ be an ideal triangulation of a triangulable generalized marked surface \mathfrak{S} . A \mathcal{Z} -Laurent monomial for Δ is an element of $\mathcal{Z}_\Delta^\omega$ the form*

$$\epsilon \omega^m [\prod_{v \in \mathcal{V}(Q_\Delta)} \widehat{X}_v^{a_v}]_{\text{Weyl}} = \epsilon \omega^m [\prod_{v \in \mathcal{V}(Q_\Delta)} \widehat{Z}_v^{3a_v}]_{\text{Weyl}}$$

for some $\epsilon \in \{1, -1\}$, $m \in \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}$ and $(a_v)_{v \in \mathcal{V}(Q_\Delta)} \in (\frac{1}{3}\mathbb{Z})^{\mathcal{V}(Q_\Delta)}$.

We say that a \mathcal{Z} -Laurent monomial $\epsilon \omega^m [\prod_{v \in \mathcal{V}(Q_\Delta)} \widehat{X}_v^{a_v}]_{\text{Weyl}}$ for Δ is an \mathcal{X} -Laurent monomial for Δ if it belongs to $\mathcal{X}_\Delta^q \subset \mathcal{Z}_\Delta^\omega$, i.e. if $m \in \frac{9}{2}\mathbb{Z}$ and $a_v \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\forall v \in \mathcal{V}(Q_\Delta)$ (sometimes we do not require $m \in \frac{9}{2}\mathbb{Z}$).

We say that a \mathcal{Z} -Laurent monomial $\epsilon \omega^m [\prod_{v \in \mathcal{V}(Q_\Delta)} \widehat{X}_v^{a_v}]_{\text{Weyl}}$ for Δ is Δ -balanced if $(a_v)_{v \in \mathcal{V}(Q_\Delta)}$ is a Δ -balanced element of $(\frac{1}{3}\mathbb{Z})^{\mathcal{V}(Q_\Delta)}$.

A (finite) sum of \mathcal{Z} -Laurent monomials for Δ is called a \mathcal{Z} -Laurent polynomial for Δ , and a sum of \mathcal{X} -Laurent monomials for Δ an \mathcal{X} -Laurent polynomial for Δ . A \mathcal{Z} -Laurent polynomial for Δ is said to be Δ -balanced if it can be expressed as a sum of Δ -balanced \mathcal{Z} -Laurent monomials for Δ .

Let the Δ -balanced cube-root Fock-Goncharov algebra $\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_\Delta^\omega$ for Δ be the subset of $\mathcal{Z}_\Delta^\omega$ consisting of all Δ -balanced \mathcal{Z} -Laurent polynomials for Δ .

It is easy to observe that

$$\mathcal{X}_\Delta^q \subset \widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_\Delta^\omega.$$

Since $\mathcal{Z}_\Delta^\omega$ is an example of a quantum torus algebra, it satisfies the (right) Ore condition, hence the skew-field of (right) fractions $\text{Frac}(\mathcal{Z}_\Delta^\omega)$ makes sense.

Definition 3.12. *Let Δ be an ideal triangulation of a triangulable generalized marked surface. Let the Δ -balanced fraction (cube-root Fock-Goncharov) algebra $\widehat{\text{Frac}}(\mathcal{Z}_\Delta^\omega)$ for Δ be the subset of $\text{Frac}(\mathcal{Z}_\Delta^\omega)$ consisting of all elements that can be expressed as PQ^{-1} with $P \in \widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_\Delta^\omega \subset \mathcal{Z}_\Delta^\omega$ and $Q \in \mathcal{X}_\Delta^q \subset \mathcal{Z}_\Delta^\omega$ s.t. $Q \neq 0$.*

One can observe that $\widehat{\text{Frac}}(\mathcal{Z}_\Delta^\omega)$ is a subalgebra of $\text{Frac}(\mathcal{Z}_\Delta^\omega)$, and contains $\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_\Delta^\omega$ and $\text{Frac}(\mathcal{X}_\Delta^q)$ as subalgebras. As a matter of fact, almost verbatim argument of [KLS18, Rem.3.11] shows the following:

Lemma 3.13. $\widehat{\text{Frac}}(\mathcal{Z}_\Delta^\omega)$ is a skew-field, and coincides with the skew-field of fractions $\text{Frac}(\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_\Delta^\omega)$ of $\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_\Delta^\omega$, where $\text{Frac}(\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_\Delta^\omega)$ is naturally viewed as a subalgebra of $\text{Frac}(\mathcal{Z}_\Delta^\omega)$. ■

The definition of the balancedness is inspired by the following important basic statement.

Proposition 3.14 (values of the SL_3 quantum trace are Δ -balanced). *Let Δ be an ideal triangulation of a triangulable generalized marked surface \mathfrak{S} , and (W, s) be a stated SL_3 -web in $\mathfrak{S} \times \mathbf{I}$. Then the value $\text{Tr}_\Delta^\omega([W, s])$ of the SL_3 quantum trace is a Δ -balanced \mathcal{Z} -Laurent polynomial for Δ , i.e.*

$$\text{Tr}_\Delta^\omega([W, s]) \in \widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_\Delta^\omega \subset \mathcal{Z}_\Delta^\omega.$$

Prop.3.14 is not stated in [K20], but easily follows from the following highest-term statement, which is proved in [K20, Prop.5.80] for non-elliptic SL_3 -webs without endpoints and played a crucial role in that whole paper. Almost verbatim proof of [K20, Prop.5.80] yields the following version for a generalized marked surface, possibly with boundary.

Proposition 3.15 (the highest term of the SL_3 quantum trace value; [K20, Prop.5.80]). *Let Δ be an ideal triangulation of a triangulable generalized marked surface, and (W, s) a stated SL_3 -web in $\mathfrak{S} \times \mathbf{I}$, such that W has upward-vertical framing everywhere, $\pi(W)$ is a reduced non-elliptic SL_3 -web in \mathfrak{S} (with π in eq.(2.1)), and s assigns 1 to all endpoints. Then $\text{Tr}_\Delta^\omega([W, s]) \in \mathcal{Z}_\Delta^\omega$ can be written as a sum of \mathcal{Z} -Laurent monomials for Δ , such that $\omega^m [\prod_v \widehat{X}_v^{a_v(\pi(W))}]_{\text{Weyl}}$, for some $m \in \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}$, is the unique \mathcal{Z} -Laurent monomial of the highest preorder induced by the powers of the \mathcal{Z} -Laurent monomials, where $a_v(\pi(W))$ is the tropical coordinate at v of $\pi(W)$ viewed as a SL_3 -lamination equipped with the weight 1 on all components. That is, for any other \mathcal{Z} -Laurent monomial $\epsilon' \omega^{m'} [\prod_v \widehat{X}_v^{b_v}]_{\text{Weyl}}$ appearing in $\text{Tr}_\Delta^\omega([W, s])$, we have $a_v(\pi(W)) \geq b_v$ for all $v \in \mathcal{V}(Q_\Delta)$, with at least one of these inequalities being strict. Moreover, if W has no endpoints, then $m = 0$. ■*

It is convenient also to have the following:

Proposition 3.16 (congruence of terms of the SL_3 quantum trace value; [K20, Prop.5.76]). *Any two terms $\epsilon' \omega^{m'} [\prod_v \widehat{X}_v^{b_v}]_{\text{Weyl}}$ and $\epsilon'' \omega^{m''} [\prod_v \widehat{X}_v^{b'_v}]_{\text{Weyl}}$ of $\text{Tr}_\Delta^\omega([W, s])$ appearing in Prop.3.15 satisfies $b_v - b'_v \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\forall v \in \mathcal{V}(Q_\Delta)$; this holds for any state s of W .*

Using arguments e.g. as in the proof of [K20, Prop.5.82], one can show:

Proposition 3.17. $b_v - a_v(\pi(W)) \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\forall v \in \mathcal{V}(Q_\Delta)$, for a any state s for the above W . ■

Proof of Prop.3.14. With the help of the SL_3 skein relations and isotopy, we see that $\text{Tr}_\Delta^\omega([W, s])$ can be expressed as a $\mathbb{Z}[\omega^{\pm 1/2}]$ -linear combination of $\text{Tr}_\Delta^\omega([W', s'])$ with W' satisfying the conditions of Prop.3.15. By Prop.3.15, Prop.3.17, Prop.3.10, and a simple observation on the Δ -balancedness condition that this condition is preserved by shifts by elements of $\mathbb{Z}^{\mathcal{V}(Q_\Delta)}$, it follows that all the terms of $\text{Tr}_\Delta^\omega([W', s'])$, hence those of $\text{Tr}_\Delta^\omega([W, s])$ also, are Δ -balanced. ■

We will now extend the quantum coordinate change map $\Phi_i^q = \mu_{v_3}^q \mu_{v_7}^q \mu_{v_4}^q \mu_{v_{12}}^q$ in eq.(3.2) of Def.3.7 to the balanced fraction algebras. Note that $\Phi_i = \mu_{v_{12}} \mu_{v_7} \mu_{v_4} \mu_{v_3}$ connects the seed Γ_Δ for the triangulation Δ to the seed $\Gamma_{\Delta'}$ for the triangulation Δ' . For convenience, we name the intermediate seeds as follows

$$\Gamma_\Delta = \Gamma_{\Delta(0)} \xrightarrow{\mu_{v_3}} \Gamma_{\Delta(1)} \xrightarrow{\mu_{v_4}} \Gamma_{\Delta(2)} \xrightarrow{\mu_{v_7}} \Gamma_{\Delta(3)} \xrightarrow{\mu_{v_{12}}} \Gamma_{\Delta(4)} = \Gamma_{\Delta'}$$

So, for $r = 0, 1, 2, 3, 4$, $\Delta^{(r)}$ is just a formal symbol for the seed denoted by $\Gamma_{\Delta(r)}$, not necessarily representing an ideal triangulation; we may view $\Delta^{(r)}$ as an ‘imaginary’ ideal triangulation, to which a generalized quiver $Q_{\Delta^{(r)}}$ is associated, whose signed adjacency matrix is denoted by $\varepsilon^{(r)}$:

$$\Delta = \Delta^{(0)} \xrightarrow{\mu_{v_3}} \Delta^{(1)} \xrightarrow{\mu_{v_4}} \Delta^{(2)} \xrightarrow{\mu_{v_7}} \Delta^{(3)} \xrightarrow{\mu_{v_{12}}} \Delta^{(4)} = \Delta'$$

This notation is reflected already in Fig.5. We first define the cube-root versions of the monomial transformations.

Definition 3.18. For $r = 1, 2, 3, 4$, let $v^{(r)} := v_3, v_4, v_7, v_{12}$, respectively, so that the seed $\Gamma_{\Delta^{(r)}}$ is obtained from $\Gamma_{\Delta^{(r-1)}}$ by the mutation $\mu_{v^{(r)}}$. Denote by $\mathcal{Z}_{\Delta^{(r)}}^\omega$ the cube-root Fock-Goncharov algebra, generated by $\{\widehat{Z}_v^{\pm 1} \mid v \in \mathcal{V}(Q_{\Delta^{(r)}})\}$ over $\mathbb{Z}[\omega^{\pm 1/2}]$ mod out by the relations $\widehat{Z}_v \widehat{Z}_w = \omega^{2\varepsilon_{vw}^{(r)}} \widehat{Z}_w \widehat{Z}_v$, $\forall v, w \in \mathcal{V}(Q_{\Delta^{(r)}})$, where the Fock-Goncharov algebra $\mathcal{X}_{\Delta^{(r)}}^q$ embeds into as $\widehat{X}_v \mapsto \widehat{Z}_v^3$.

Define the cube-root monomial transformation

$$\nu'_{v^{(r)}} : \mathcal{Z}_{\Delta^{(r)}}^\omega \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}_{\Delta^{(r-1)}}^\omega$$

as the $\mathbb{Z}[\omega^{\pm 1/2}]$ -algebra homomorphism s.t.

$$\nu'_{v^{(r)}}(\widehat{Z}_v^{(r)}) = \begin{cases} (\widehat{Z}_{v^{(r)}}^{(r-1)})^{-1} & \text{if } v = v^{(r)}, \\ \left[\widehat{Z}_v^{(r-1)} (\widehat{Z}_{v^{(r)}}^{(r-1)})^{[\varepsilon_{v,v^{(r)}}^{(r-1)}]_+} \right]_{\text{Weyl}} & \text{if } v \neq v^{(r)}. \end{cases}$$

Let

$$\nu'_{v^{(r)}} : \text{Frac}(\mathcal{Z}_{\Delta^{(r)}}^\omega) \rightarrow \text{Frac}(\mathcal{Z}_{\Delta^{(r-1)}}^\omega)$$

be the unique extension to a map of skew-fields.

The following is easy to check directly.

Lemma 3.19. *Each $\nu'_{v^{(r)}}$ is an isomorphism.* ■

The goal is to define the cube-root version $\nu_{v^{(r)}}^\omega$ of the quantum mutation $\mu_{v^{(r)}}^q$ as the composition

$$\nu_{v^{(r)}}^\omega = \nu_{v^{(r)}}^{\sharp\omega} \circ \nu'_{v^{(r)}} : \text{a subset of } \text{Frac}(\mathcal{Z}_{\Delta^{(r)}}^\omega) \rightarrow \text{a subset of } \text{Frac}(\mathcal{Z}_{\Delta^{(r-1)}}^\omega),$$

where

$$\nu_{v^{(r)}}^{\sharp\omega} = \text{Ad}_{\Psi^q(\widehat{X}_{v^{(r)}}^{(r-1)})} : \text{a subset of } \text{Frac}(\mathcal{Z}_{\Delta^{(r-1)}}^\omega) \rightarrow \text{a subset of } \text{Frac}(\mathcal{Z}_{\Delta^{(r-1)}}^\omega)$$

is the conjugation by the formal expression $\Psi^q(\widehat{X}_{v^{(r)}}^{(r-1)})$ in terms of the quantum dilogarithm, just like $\mu_{v^{(r)}}^q$. One of the major tasks to be done is to find a natural subset of $\text{Frac}(\mathcal{Z}_{\Delta^{(r)}}^\omega)$, $r = 0, 1, 2, 3, 4$, such that $\nu_{v^{(r)}}^\omega$ is well-defined. For $r = 0$ and $r = 4$, we already have candidates, namely the balanced fraction algebras $\widehat{\text{Frac}}(\mathcal{Z}_\Delta^\omega)$ and $\widehat{\text{Frac}}(\mathcal{Z}_{\Delta'}^\omega)$. Instead of finding and justifying the best candidates for the intermediate seeds $\Delta^{(r)}$, $r = 1, 2, 3$, we will be content with a model where the maps $\nu_{v^{(r)}}^\omega$ are well-defined, which is a bare minimum for the purpose of the present paper.

The following technical lemma is the crucial part of this bare minimum condition.

Lemma 3.20. *For $r = 1, 2, 3, 4$, let $v^{(r)} = v_3, v_4, v_7, v_{12}$ respectively. Let $(a'_v)_v = (a_v^{(4)})_v \in (\frac{1}{3}\mathbb{Z})^{\mathcal{V}(Q_{\Delta'})}$ be a Δ' -balanced element. Recursively define $(a_v^{(r-1)})_v \in (\frac{1}{3}\mathbb{Z})^{\mathcal{V}(Q_{\Delta^{(r-1)}})}$ for $r = 4, 3, 2, 1$ as*

$$(3.3) \quad a_v^{(r-1)} = \begin{cases} -a_{v^{(r)}}^{(r)} + \sum_{w \in \mathcal{V}[\varepsilon_{w,v^{(r)}}^{(r-1)}]_+} a_w^{(r)}, & \text{if } v = v^{(r)}, \\ a_v^{(r)} & \text{if } v \neq v^{(r)}. \end{cases}$$

Then

$$(3.4) \quad \alpha^{(r)} := \sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}(Q_{\Delta^{(r-1)}})} \varepsilon_{v^{(r)},v}^{(r-1)} a_v^{(r-1)} \in \frac{1}{3}\mathbb{Z}$$

belongs to \mathbb{Z} , for $r = 1, 2, 3, 4$.

Proof. With the node names as in Fig.5, denote by $a_{v_j}^{(r)}$ by $a_j^{(r)}$, and $\varepsilon_{v_j v_k}^{(r)}$ by $\varepsilon_{jk}^{(r)}$. Let's compute $(a_v^{(r-1)})_v$ for $r = 4, 3, 2, 1$ in terms of $(a'_v)_v$. For $r = 4$, note that $v^{(4)} = v_{12}$, and from Fig.5 that

$$\varepsilon_{3,12}^{(3)} = \varepsilon_{10,12}^{(3)} = -1, \quad \varepsilon_{4,12}^{(3)} = \varepsilon_{9,12}^{(3)} = 1, \quad \varepsilon_{j,12}^{(3)} = 0, \quad \forall j \notin \{3, 4, 9, 10\},$$

hence

$$a_{12}^{(3)} = -a'_{12} + a'_4 + a'_9, \quad a_j^{(3)} = a'_j, \quad \forall j \neq 12.$$

For $r = 3$, $v^{(3)} = v_7$, and from Fig.5 we have

$$\varepsilon_{1,7}^{(2)} = \varepsilon_{4,7}^{(2)} = -1, \quad \varepsilon_{3,7}^{(2)} = \varepsilon_{6,7}^{(2)} = 1, \quad \varepsilon_{j,7}^{(2)} = 0, \quad \forall j \notin \{1, 3, 4, 6\},$$

hence

$$a_7^{(2)} = -a_7^{(3)} + a_3^{(3)} + a_6^{(3)} = -a'_7 + a'_3 + a'_6, \quad a_{12}^{(2)} = a_{12}^{(3)} = -a'_{12} + a'_4 + a'_9, \\ a_j^{(2)} = a_j^{(3)} = a'_j, \quad \forall j \notin \{7, 12\}.$$

For $r = 2$, $v^{(2)} = v_4$, and from Fig.5 we have

$$\varepsilon_{5,4}^{(1)} = \varepsilon_{12,4}^{(1)} = 1, \quad \varepsilon_{7,4}^{(1)} = \varepsilon_{11,4}^{(1)} = -1, \quad \varepsilon_{j,4}^{(1)} = 0, \quad \forall j \notin \{5, 7, 11, 12\},$$

hence

$$\begin{aligned} a_4^{(1)} &= -a_4^{(2)} + a_5^{(2)} + a_{12}^{(2)} = -a'_4 + a'_5 + (-a'_{12} + a'_4 + a'_9) = a'_5 + a'_9 - a'_{12}, \\ a_7^{(1)} &= a_7^{(2)} = -a'_7 + a'_3 + a'_6, \quad a_{12}^{(1)} = a_{12}^{(2)} = -a'_{12} + a'_4 + a'_9, \quad a_j^{(1)} = a_j^{(2)} = a'_j, \quad \forall j \notin \{4, 7, 12\}. \end{aligned}$$

For $r = 1$, $v^{(1)} = v_3$, and from Fig.5 we have

$$\varepsilon_{2,3}^{(0)} = \varepsilon_{12,3}^{(0)} = -1, \quad \varepsilon_{7,3}^{(0)} = \varepsilon_{8,3}^{(0)} = 1, \quad \varepsilon_{j,3}^{(0)} = 0, \quad \forall j \notin \{2, 7, 8, 12\}.$$

hence

$$\begin{aligned} a_3^{(0)} &= -a_3^{(1)} + a_7^{(1)} + a_8^{(1)} = -a'_3 + (-a'_7 + a'_3 + a'_6) + a'_8 = -a'_7 + a'_6 + a'_8, \\ a_4^{(0)} &= a_4^{(1)} = a'_5 + a'_9 - a'_{12}, \quad a_7^{(0)} = a_7^{(1)} = -a'_7 + a'_3 + a'_6, \quad a_{12}^{(0)} = a_{12}^{(1)} = -a'_{12} + a'_4 + a'_9, \\ a_j^{(0)} &= a_j^{(1)} = a'_j, \quad \forall j \notin \{3, 4, 7, 12\}. \end{aligned}$$

In view of Fig.5, the Δ' -balancedness condition of $(a'_v)_v$ for the two triangles of Δ' having the flipped arc as a side says that the following numbers are integers:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(BE1):} \quad & b_1 := a'_1 + a'_8 + a'_{12}, \quad b_2 := a'_2 + a'_9 + a'_7, \quad b_3 := a'_5 + a'_7 + a'_{10}, \quad b_4 := a'_6 + a'_{12} + a'_{11}, \\ \text{(BE2):} \quad & b_5 := a'_1 + a'_2, \quad b_6 := a'_8 + a'_9, \quad b_7 := a'_7 + a'_{12}, \quad b_8 := a'_{10} + a'_{11}, \quad b_9 := a'_5 + a'_6, \\ \text{(BE3):} \quad & b_{10} := -a'_3 + a'_2 + a'_8, \quad b_{11} := -a'_3 + a'_9 + a'_{12}, \quad b_{12} := -a'_3 + a'_7 + a'_1, \\ & b_{13} := -a'_4 + a'_6 + a'_7, \quad b_{14} := -a'_4 + a'_{12} + a'_{10}, \quad b_{15} := -a'_4 + a'_{11} + a'_5. \end{aligned}$$

For $r = 1, 2, 3, 4$, let

$$\alpha_r := \alpha_{v^{(r)}; \Delta^{(r-1)}}((a_v^{(r-1)})_v) := \sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}(Q_{\Delta^{(r-1)}})} \varepsilon_{v^{(r)}, v}^{(r-1)} a_v^{(r-1)}$$

We now have to show that $\alpha_r \in \frac{1}{3}\mathbb{Z}$ are integers for $r = 1, 2, 3, 4$. Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_4 &= a_3^{(3)} + a_{10}^{(3)} - a_4^{(3)} - a_9^{(3)} = a'_3 + a'_{10} - a'_4 - a'_9 = -b_{11} + b_{14} \in \mathbb{Z}, \\ \alpha_3 &= a_1^{(2)} + a_4^{(2)} - a_3^{(2)} - a_6^{(2)} = a'_1 + a'_4 - a'_3 - a'_6 = b_{12} - b_{13} \in \mathbb{Z}, \\ \alpha_2 &= -a_5^{(1)} - a_{12}^{(1)} + a_7^{(1)} + a_{11}^{(1)} = -a'_5 - (-a'_{12} + a'_4 + a'_9) + (-a'_7 + a'_3 + a'_6) + a'_{11} \\ &= -b_3 + b_4 - b_{11} + b_{14} \in \mathbb{Z}, \\ \alpha_1 &= a_2^{(0)} + a_{12}^{(0)} - a_7^{(0)} - a_8^{(0)} = a'_2 + (-a'_{12} + a'_4 + a'_9) - (-a'_7 + a'_3 + a'_6) - a'_8 \\ &= -b_1 + b_2 + b_{12} - b_{13} \in \mathbb{Z}. \quad \blacksquare \end{aligned}$$

Consider applying the conjugation $\text{Ad}_{\Psi^q(\widehat{X}_{v^{(r)}}^{(r-1)})}$ to a Weyl-ordered \mathcal{Z} -Laurent monomial for $\Delta^{(r-1)}$

$$[\prod_v (\widehat{X}_v^{(r-1)})^{a_v^{(r-1)}}]_{\text{Weyl}} \in \mathcal{Z}_{\Delta^{(r-1)}}^\omega \subset \text{Frac}(\mathcal{Z}_{\Delta^{(r-1)}}^\omega)$$

for some $(a_v^{(r-1)})_v \in (\frac{1}{3}\mathbb{Z})^{\mathcal{V}(Q_{\Delta^{(r-1)}})}$, not necessarily the specific one defined as in Lem.3.20. Defining $\alpha^{(r)} \in \frac{1}{3}\mathbb{Z}$ by the formula eq.(3.4), since

$$\widehat{X}_{v^{(r)}}^{(r-1)} [\prod_v (\widehat{X}_v^{(r-1)})^{a_v^{(r-1)}}]_{\text{Weyl}} = q^{2\alpha^{(r)}} [\prod_v (\widehat{X}_v^{(r-1)})^{a_v^{(r-1)}}]_{\text{Weyl}} \widehat{X}_{v^{(r)}}^{(r-1)},$$

we have, at least formally,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Ad}_{\Psi^q(\widehat{X}_{v^{(r)}}^{(r-1)})}([\prod_v (\widehat{X}_v^{(r-1)})^{a_v^{(r-1)}}]_{\text{Weyl}}) &= \Psi^q(\widehat{X}_{v^{(r)}}^{(r-1)}) [\prod_v (\widehat{X}_v^{(r-1)})^{a_v^{(r-1)}}]_{\text{Weyl}} (\Psi^q(\widehat{X}_{v^{(r)}}^{(r-1)}))^{-1} \\ &= [\prod_v (\widehat{X}_v^{(r-1)})^{a_v^{(r-1)}}]_{\text{Weyl}} \Psi^q(q^{2\alpha^{(r)}} \widehat{X}_{v^{(r)}}^{(r-1)}) (\Psi^q(\widehat{X}_{v^{(r)}}^{(r-1)}))^{-1} \\ &= [\prod_v (\widehat{X}_v^{(r-1)})^{a_v^{(r-1)}}]_{\text{Weyl}} F^q(\widehat{X}_{v^{(r)}}^{(r-1)}; \alpha^{(r)}). \end{aligned}$$

In order for the last resulting expression to make sense, we must have $\alpha^{(r)} \in \mathbb{Z}$. This inspires the following definition.

Definition 3.21. Let Γ be any seed, where the set of nodes of the underlying quiver is denoted by \mathcal{V} , and the signed adjacency matrix by ε . Denote by the quantum cluster \mathcal{X} -variable for each node $v \in \mathcal{V}$ by \widehat{X}_v . Let $u \in \mathcal{V}$. A \mathcal{Z} -Laurent monomial $\epsilon \omega^m [\prod_{v \in \mathcal{V}} (\widehat{X}_v)^{c_v}]_{\text{Weyl}}$ for Γ , with $\epsilon \in \{1, -1\}$, $m \in \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}$, $(c_v)_v \in (\frac{1}{3}\mathbb{Z})^{\mathcal{V}}$ is said to be (Γ, u) -balanced if $\alpha := \sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}} \varepsilon_{uv} c_v \in \frac{1}{3}\mathbb{Z}$ belongs to \mathbb{Z} . A \mathcal{Z} -Laurent polynomial for Γ is (Γ, u) -balanced if it is a sum of (Γ, u) -balanced \mathcal{Z} -Laurent monomials.

The (Γ, u) -balanced fraction algebra for Γ is defined as the subset $\widehat{\text{Frac}}_u(\mathcal{Z}_\Gamma^\omega)$ of $\text{Frac}(\mathcal{Z}_\Gamma^\omega)$ consisting of all elements of the form PQ^{-1} with P being a (Γ, u) -balanced \mathcal{Z} -Laurent polynomial for Γ and $Q \in \mathcal{X}_\Gamma^q \subset \mathcal{Z}_\Gamma^\omega$ s.t. $Q \neq 0$.

Define the balanced (cube-root) quantum mutation map associated to the mutation $\Gamma \xrightarrow{\mu_u} \mu_u(\Gamma) = \Gamma'$ as the map

$$\nu_u^\omega : \widehat{\text{Frac}}_u(\mathcal{Z}_{\Gamma'}^\omega) \rightarrow \text{Frac}(\mathcal{Z}_\Gamma^\omega)$$

defined as

$$\nu_u^\omega := \nu_u^{\sharp\omega} \circ \nu'_u$$

where ν'_u is the restriction of the skew-field map

$$\nu'_u : \text{Frac}(\mathcal{Z}_{\Gamma'}^\omega) \rightarrow \text{Frac}(\mathcal{Z}_\Gamma^\omega)$$

given on the Weyl-ordered \mathcal{Z} -Laurent monomials as

$$(3.5) \quad \nu'_u(\widehat{Z}'_v) = \begin{cases} \widehat{Z}_u^{-1} & \text{if } v = u \\ \left[\widehat{Z}_v \widehat{Z}_u^{[\varepsilon_{vu}]_+} \right]_{\text{Weyl}} & \text{if } v \neq u, \end{cases}$$

and $\nu_u^{\sharp\omega}$ is given by

$$\nu_u^{\sharp\omega} := \text{Ad}_{\Psi^q(\widehat{X}_u)},$$

or more precisely, given on the (Γ, u) -balanced monomials as

$$(3.6) \quad \nu_u^{\sharp\omega}([\prod_v \widehat{X}_v^{c_v}]_{\text{Weyl}}) = ([\prod_v \widehat{X}_v^{c_v}]_{\text{Weyl}}) \cdot F^q(\widehat{X}_u; \alpha),$$

where $\alpha = \sum_v \varepsilon_{uv} c_v$.

Lemma 3.22. Above ν_u^ω is well-defined.

Proof. The only thing to check is whether a (Γ', u) -balanced \mathcal{Z} -Laurent monomial $[\prod_v (\widehat{X}'_v)^{c'_v}]_{\text{Weyl}}$ is sent by ν'_u to a (Γ, u) -balanced \mathcal{Z} -Laurent monomial. Note $\nu'_u([\prod_v (\widehat{X}'_v)^{c'_v}]_{\text{Weyl}}) = [\prod_v (\widehat{X}_v)^{c_v}]_{\text{Weyl}}$, where $c_v = c'_v$ for all $v \neq u$. If $[\prod_v (\widehat{X}'_v)^{c'_v}]_{\text{Weyl}}$ is (Γ', u) -balanced, then $\sum_v \varepsilon'_{uv} c'_v \in \mathbb{Z}$. Since $\varepsilon'_{uv} = -\varepsilon_{uv}$ and $\varepsilon'_{uu} = 0$, it follows that $\sum_{v \neq u} \varepsilon_{uv} c'_v \in \mathbb{Z}$. Note $\sum_v \varepsilon_{uv} c_v = \sum_{v \neq u} \varepsilon_{uv} c_v = \sum_{v \neq u} \varepsilon_{uv} c'_v \in \mathbb{Z}$, hence the image $[\prod_v (\widehat{X}_v)^{c_v}]_{\text{Weyl}}$ is (Γ, u) -balanced, as desired. ■

Now, maybe it's helpful to write ν'_u as

$$\nu'_u : \widehat{\text{Frac}}_u(\mathcal{Z}_{\Gamma'}^\omega) \rightarrow \widehat{\text{Frac}}_u(\mathcal{Z}_\Gamma^\omega)$$

Remark 3.23. This subset $\widehat{\text{Frac}}_u(\mathcal{Z}_\Gamma^\omega)$ of $\text{Frac}(\mathcal{Z}_\Gamma^\omega)$ is sufficient for the purpose of the present paper. However, one may seek for the most natural subset of $\text{Frac}(\mathcal{Z}_\Gamma^\omega)$, e.g. on which the balanced cube-root quantum mutation can be applied at all possible nodes. For the seed $\Gamma = \Gamma_\Delta$ associated to an ideal triangulation Δ , our candidate is the Δ -balanced fraction algebra $\widehat{\text{Frac}}(\mathcal{Z}_\Delta^\omega)$, based on the Δ -balancedness condition on the powers $(a_v)_v$ of the Laurent monomials. We suggest that, for a general seed Γ , connected to the triangulation seeds Γ_Δ by mutations, a ' Γ -balancedness' condition on $(a_v)_v \in (\frac{1}{3}\mathbb{Z})^{\mathcal{V}}$ should be defined by applying the tropical versions of the cluster \mathcal{A} -mutations to the Δ -balanced elements of Γ_Δ . In the present paper, we shall not verify whether this is indeed a good choice of a subset of $\text{Frac}(\mathcal{Z}_\Delta^\omega)$.

The following definition is the second main definition of the present paper.

Definition 3.24 (balanced cube-root quantum coordinate change map for a flip). Let Δ and Δ' be ideal triangulations of a triangulable generalized marked surface \mathfrak{S} that differ by a flip at an arc i , with notations as in §3.1. Define the balanced (cube-root) quantum coordinate change map between the balanced fraction algebras

$$\Theta_{\Delta\Delta'}^\omega = \Theta_i^\omega : \widehat{\text{Frac}}(\mathcal{Z}_{\Delta'}^\omega) \rightarrow \widehat{\text{Frac}}(\mathcal{Z}_\Delta^\omega)$$

as

$$\Theta_{\Delta\Delta'}^\omega := \nu_{v_3}^\omega \nu_{v_4}^\omega \nu_{v_7}^\omega \nu_{v_{12}}^\omega.$$

Lemma 3.25. *The above $\Theta_{\Delta\Delta'}^\omega$ is a well-defined map from $\widehat{\text{Frac}}(\mathcal{Z}_{\Delta'}^\omega)$ to $\text{Frac}(\mathcal{Z}_{\Delta}^\omega)$.*

Proof. It suffices to show that $\Theta_{\Delta\Delta'}^\omega$ is well-defined on a Δ' -balanced \mathcal{Z} -Laurent monomial $[\prod_v (\widehat{X}_v')^{a'_v}]_{\text{Weyl}}$, i.e. for a Δ' -balanced element $(a'_v)_v$ of $(\frac{1}{3}\mathbb{Z})^{\mathcal{V}(\mathcal{Q}_{\Delta'})}$. Let $(a_v^{(4)})_v = (a'_v)_v$, and define $(a_v^{(r-1)})_v$ for $r = 4, 3, 2, 1$ recursively as

$$\nu'_{v(r)}([\prod_v (\widehat{X}_v^{(r)})^{a_v^{(r)}}]_{\text{Weyl}}) = [\prod_v (\widehat{X}_v^{(r-1)})^{a_v^{(r-1)}}]_{\text{Weyl}}$$

where $v^{(r)} = v_3, v_4, v_7, v_{12}$ for $r = 1, 2, 3, 4$. From eq.(3.5), one observes that these are given by the recursive formulas in eq.(3.3). Then, in view of Def.3.21, one notices that Lem.3.20 is precisely saying that $[\prod_v (\widehat{X}_v^{(r-1)})^{a_v^{(r-1)}}]_{\text{Weyl}}$ is $(\Gamma_{\Delta(r-1)}, v^{(r)})$ -balanced. As in the proof of Lem.3.22, this is exactly what we need for each $\nu_{v(r)}^\omega$ to be well-defined. ■

What is not clear at the moment is whether the image of $\Theta_{\Delta\Delta'}^\omega$ lies in $\widehat{\text{Frac}}(\mathcal{Z}_{\Delta}^\omega) \subset \text{Frac}(\mathcal{Z}_{\Delta}^\omega)$; this will in fact be obtained as one consequence of the main result of the present paper, i.e. Thm.4.1, together with Prop.3.14 applied to Δ' .

The following is easily observed.

Lemma 3.26. *Above map $\Theta_{\Delta\Delta'}^\omega$ extends $\Phi_{\Delta\Delta'}^q : \text{Frac}(\mathcal{X}_{\Delta'}^q) \rightarrow \text{Frac}(\mathcal{X}_{\Delta}^q)$ of Def.3.7.* ■

Note that the defining formulas of the balanced quantum mutation $\nu_v^\omega = \nu_v^{\#q} \circ \nu'_v$ at a node v is essentially identical to the usual quantum mutation $\mu_v^q = \mu_v^{\#q} \circ \mu'_v$, as ν'_v is a monomial transformation of the \mathcal{Z} -Laurent monomials extending the monomial transformation μ'_v of the \mathcal{X} -Laurent monomials, while both $\nu_v^{\#q}$ and $\mu_v^{\#q}$ are given by conjugation by the same formal expression $\Psi^q(\widehat{X}_v)$. What is tricky about the balanced quantum mutations ν_v^ω is to keep track of the domain and codomain algebras, so that conjugation by an expression like $\Psi^q(\widehat{X}_v)$ yield quantum rational expressions at each step. Anyways, because of this similarity of the formulas of ν_v^ω and those of μ_v^q , the proof in [KN11] [K21] of the consistency relations for the quantum mutations μ_v^q apply almost verbatim to the proof of those for the corresponding balanced quantum mutations ν_v^ω .

Proposition 3.27. *The consistency relations satisfied by the quantum mutations μ_v^q and the quantum coordinate change maps Φ_i^q for flips are satisfied by the balanced counterparts ν_v^ω and Θ_i^ω , whenever the relations make sense.* ■

For example,

$$(3.7) \quad \nu_v^\omega \nu_v^\omega = \text{id}$$

holds, when understood on appropriate domains and codomains.

As a consequence of Prop.3.27, one obtains a balanced quantum coordinate change map $\Theta_{\Delta\Delta'}^\omega : \widehat{\text{Frac}}(\mathcal{Z}_{\Delta'}^\omega) \rightarrow \widehat{\text{Frac}}(\mathcal{Z}_{\Delta}^\omega)$ for each change of ideal triangulations $\Delta \rightsquigarrow \Delta'$, i.e. for each pair of ideal triangulations Δ and Δ' , not just for flips. Namely, since any two ideal triangulations Δ and Δ' are connected by a finite sequence of flips, one can find a sequence of ideal triangulations $\Delta = \Delta_0, \Delta_1, \dots, \Delta_n = \Delta'$, so that each $\Delta_{i-1} \rightsquigarrow \Delta_i$ is a flip. Then define

$$\Theta_{\Delta\Delta'}^\omega = \Theta_{\Delta_0\Delta_n}^\omega := \Theta_{\Delta_0\Delta_1}^\omega \circ \Theta_{\Delta_1\Delta_2}^\omega \circ \dots \circ \Theta_{\Delta_{n-1}\Delta_n}^\omega.$$

Prop.3.27 and Prop.2.9 guarantee that the resulting map depends only on the initial and the terminal triangulations Δ, Δ' and not on the choice of the decomposition $\Delta_0, \Delta_1, \dots, \Delta_n$.

Another important property of the balanced quantum coordinate change map $\Theta_{\Delta\Delta'}^\omega$ is its compatibility with the cutting map i_{Δ, Δ_e} which appeared in Def.2.17.

Proposition 3.28 (compatibility of the balanced quantum coordinate change under cutting). *Let Δ be an ideal triangulation of a triangulable generalized marked surface \mathfrak{S} , and e be an internal arc of Δ . Let \mathfrak{S}_e be the generalized marked surface obtained from \mathfrak{S} by cutting along e , and let Δ_e be the triangulation of \mathfrak{S}_e obtained from Δ by cutting along e (Def.2.17).*

- (1) *The image of $\widehat{\text{Frac}}(\mathcal{Z}_{\Delta}^\omega) \subset \text{Frac}(\mathcal{Z}_{\Delta}^\omega)$ under the cutting map $i_{\Delta, \Delta_e} : \text{Frac}(\mathcal{Z}_{\Delta}^\omega) \rightarrow \text{Frac}(\mathcal{Z}_{\Delta_e}^\omega)$, which extends $i_{\Delta, \Delta_e} : \mathcal{Z}_{\Delta}^\omega \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}_{\Delta_e}^\omega$ (Def.2.17), lies in $\widehat{\text{Frac}}(\mathcal{Z}_{\Delta_e}^\omega) \subset \text{Frac}(\mathcal{Z}_{\Delta_e}^\omega)$.*
- (2) *Suppose Δ' is another ideal triangulation of \mathfrak{S} such that e is an internal arc of Δ' and that Δ and Δ' are connected by a finite sequence of flips at arcs other than e . Let Δ'_e be the ideal triangulation of \mathfrak{S}_e obtained from Δ' by cutting along e . Then*

$$i_{\Delta', \Delta'_e} \circ \Theta_{\Delta\Delta'}^\omega = \Theta_{\Delta_e \Delta'_e}^\omega \circ i_{\Delta, \Delta_e} : \widehat{\text{Frac}}(\mathcal{Z}_{\Delta}^\omega) \rightarrow \widehat{\text{Frac}}(\mathcal{Z}_{\Delta'_e}^\omega)$$

Proof. (1) The balancedness condition on the powers $(a_v)_v \in (\frac{1}{3}\mathbb{Z})^\mathcal{V}$ of the \mathcal{Z} -Laurent monomials $[\prod_v \widehat{X}_v^{a_v}]_{\text{Weyl}}$ is described for each triangle. By the definition of i_{Δ, Δ_e} , one can see that the powers of the variables for the nodes living in a triangle t of Δ are the same as those for the corresponding triangle of Δ_e . Hence, one can see that the Δ -balancedness of $[\prod_v \widehat{X}_v^{a_v}]_{\text{Weyl}}$ implies the Δ_e -balancedness of the image $i_{\Delta, \Delta_e}[\prod_v \widehat{X}_v^{a_v}]_{\text{Weyl}}$.

(2) It suffices to show this for a flip (by Lem.2.5 and Prop.3.27), and it suffices to show the compatibility of each balanced quantum mutation $\nu_{v(r)}^\omega$.

For each $r = 0, 1, 2, 3, 4$, denote the quantum cluster \mathcal{X} -variables for $\Delta_e^{(r)}$ by $\widehat{Y}_v^{(r)}$ per each node v of $Q_{\Delta_e^{(r)}}$. Let v_1, v_2 be the nodes of $Q_{\Delta^{(r)}}$ lying in e . Let v'_1, v''_1 be the nodes of $Q_{\Delta_e^{(r)}}$ corresponding to v_1 , and v'_2, v''_2 corresponding to v_2 , so that v'_1, v'_2 lie in a same boundary arc of \mathfrak{S}_e , while v''_1, v''_2 on another boundary arc of \mathfrak{S}_e . Other than these nodes, there is a bijection between the nodes of $Q_{\Delta^{(r)}}$ and those of $Q_{\Delta_e^{(r)}}$. Let $g^{(r)} : \mathcal{V}(Q_{\Delta_e^{(r)}}) \rightarrow \mathcal{V}(Q_{\Delta^{(r)}})$ be the gluing map of the nodes, i.e. $g^{(r)}(v'_1) = g^{(r)}(v''_1) = v_1$, $g^{(r)}(v'_2) = g^{(r)}(v''_2) = v_2$, $g^{(r)}(v) = v$, $\forall v \notin \{v'_1, v''_1, v'_2, v''_2\}$. Then the cutting map $i_{\Delta^{(r)}, \Delta_e^{(r)}}$ sends a $(\Delta^{(r)}, v^{(r)})$ -balanced \mathcal{Z} -Laurent monomial $[\prod_{v \in \mathcal{V}(Q_{\Delta^{(r)}})} (\widehat{X}_v^{(r)})^{a_v^{(r)}}]_{\text{Weyl}} \in \widehat{\text{Frac}}_{v(r)}(\mathcal{Z}_{\Delta^{(r)}}^\omega)$ to

$$(3.8) \quad i_{\Delta^{(r)}, \Delta_e^{(r)}}[\prod_{v \in \mathcal{V}(Q_{\Delta^{(r)}})} (\widehat{X}_v^{(r)})^{a_v^{(r)}}]_{\text{Weyl}} = [\prod_{v \in \mathcal{V}(Q_{\Delta_e^{(r)}})} (\widehat{Y}_v^{(r)})^{a_{g^{(r)}(v)}^{(r)}}]_{\text{Weyl}}.$$

Let's now show

$$(3.9) \quad i_{\Delta^{(r-1)}, \Delta_e^{(r-1)}} \circ \nu_{v(r)}^\omega = \nu_{v(r)}^\omega \circ i_{\Delta^{(r)}, \Delta_e^{(r)}} : \widehat{\text{Frac}}_{v(r)}(\mathcal{Z}_{\Delta^{(r)}}^\omega) \rightarrow \widehat{\text{Frac}}_{v(r)}(\mathcal{Z}_{\Delta_e^{(r-1)}}^\omega)$$

Consider the left hand side of eq.(3.9) first. Let $[\prod_{v \in \mathcal{V}(Q_{\Delta^{(r)}})} (\widehat{X}_v^{(r)})^{a_v^{(r)}}]_{\text{Weyl}} \in \widehat{\text{Frac}}_{v(r)}(\mathcal{Z}_{\Delta^{(r)}}^\omega)$ be a $(\Delta^{(r)}, v^{(r)})$ -balanced \mathcal{Z} -Laurent monomial. This is sent by $\nu_{v(r)}^\omega$ to

$$[\prod_{v \in \mathcal{V}(Q_{\Delta^{(r-1)}})} (\widehat{X}_v^{(r-1)})^{a_v^{(r-1)}}]_{\text{Weyl}} F^q(\widehat{X}_{v(r)}^{(r-1)}; \alpha^{(r)})$$

where $(a_v^{(r-1)})_v$ is given in eq.(3.3) and $\alpha^{(r)}$ in eq.(3.4); in turn, this is sent via $i_{\Delta^{(r-1)}, \Delta_e^{(r-1)}}$ to

$$[\prod_{v \in \mathcal{V}(Q_{\Delta_e^{(r-1)}})} (\widehat{Y}_v^{(r-1)})^{a_{g^{(r-1)}(v)}^{(r-1)}}]_{\text{Weyl}} F^q(\widehat{Y}_{v(r)}^{(r-1)}; \alpha^{(r)}).$$

For the right hand side of eq.(3.9), first, note that $[\prod_{v \in \mathcal{V}(Q_{\Delta^{(r)}})} (\widehat{X}_v^{(r)})^{a_v^{(r)}}]_{\text{Weyl}} \in \widehat{\text{Frac}}_{v(r)}(\mathcal{Z}_{\Delta^{(r)}}^\omega)$ is sent via $i_{\Delta^{(r)}, \Delta_e^{(r)}}$ to the element as in eq.(3.8). In the meantime, the signed adjacency matrices $\varepsilon_e^{(r)}$ for $Q_{\Delta_e^{(r)}}$ and $\varepsilon^{(r)}$ for $Q_{\Delta^{(r)}}$ are related by

$$(3.10) \quad \varepsilon_{vw}^{(r)} = \sum_{v' \in (g^{(r)})^{-1}(v), w' \in (g^{(r)})^{-1}(w)} (\varepsilon_e^{(r)})_{v'w'}, \quad \forall v, w \in \mathcal{V}(Q_{\Delta^{(r)}}).$$

One observation is that, unless $\{v, w\} = \{v_1, v_2\}$, there is no cancellation occurring in the right hand side of the above sum; that is, if $\{v, w\} \neq \{v_1, v_2\}$ we have

$$(3.11) \quad \text{sgn}(\varepsilon_{vw}^{(r)}) = \text{sgn}(\varepsilon_e^{(r)})_{v'w'} \quad \text{for all } v' \in (g^{(r)})^{-1}(v) \text{ and } w' \in (g^{(r)})^{-1}(w).$$

Note that for this sign coherence to hold, we need to use the regularity condition on the ideal triangulation (Def.2.3). Observe now

$$\nu_{v(r)}'[\prod_{v \in \mathcal{V}(Q_{\Delta_e^{(r)}})} (\widehat{Y}_v^{(r)})^{a_{g^{(r)}(v)}^{(r)}}]_{\text{Weyl}} = [\prod_{v \in \mathcal{V}(Q_{\Delta_e^{(r-1)}})} (\widehat{Y}_v^{(r-1)})^{b_v^{(r-1)}}]_{\text{Weyl}},$$

where, similarly as in eq.(3.3), $(b_v^{(r-1)})_v$ is given by

$$b_v^{(r-1)} = \begin{cases} -a_{v(r)}^{(r)} + \sum_{w \in \mathcal{V}(Q_{\Delta_e^{(r-1)}})} [(\varepsilon_e^{(r-1)})_{w, v(r)}] + a_{g^{(r)}(w)}^{(r)}, & \text{if } v = v(r), \\ a_{g^{(r)}(v)}^{(r)} & \text{if } v \neq v(r). \end{cases}$$

We claim

$$b_v^{(r-1)} = a_{g^{(r-1)}(v)}^{(r-1)}.$$

For $v \neq v^{(r)}$ this is clear, and for $v = v^{(r)}$ this follows from eq.(3.10) and eq.(3.11). Now, applying $\nu_{v(r)}^{\#\omega}$, we obtain

$$[\prod_{v \in \mathcal{V}(Q_{\Delta_e^{(r-1)}})} (\widehat{Y}_v^{(r-1)})^{a_{g^{(r-1)}(v)}^{(r-1)}}]_{\text{Weyl}} F^q(\widehat{Y}_{v(r)}^{(r-1)}; \alpha_e^{(r)}),$$

where, in view of Def.3.21, $\alpha_e^{(r)}$ this time is defined as

$$\alpha_e^{(r)} = \sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}(Q_{\Delta_e^{(r-1)}})} (\varepsilon_e^{(r-1)})_{v^{(r)},v} a_{g^{(r-1)}(v)}^{(r-1)},$$

which equals $\alpha^{(r)}$ of eq.(3.4), in view of eq.(3.10). Hence eq.(3.9) is proved, as desired. \blacksquare

4. THE QUANTUM COMPATIBILITY UNDER CHANGES OF TRIANGULATIONS

Here comes the main statement of the present paper.

Theorem 4.1 (main theorem; the compatibility of SL_3 quantum trace under changes of triangulations). *Let Δ and Δ' be ideal triangulations of a triangulable generalized marked surface \mathfrak{S} . Let (W, s) be a stated SL_3 -web in $\mathfrak{S} \times \mathbf{I}$. Then the values under the SL_3 quantum trace maps of $[W, s] \in \mathcal{S}_s^\omega(\mathfrak{S}; \mathbb{Z})_{\text{red}}$ are compatible under the balanced quantum coordinate change map $\Theta_{\Delta, \Delta'}^\omega$, defined in Def.3.24, i.e.*

$$\Theta_{\Delta, \Delta'}^\omega(\text{Tr}_{\Delta'}^\omega([W, s])) = \text{Tr}_\Delta^\omega([W, s]).$$

The present section is devoted to the proof of this theorem. In view of Lem.2.5 and Prop.3.27, it suffices to prove this in the case when Δ and Δ' are related by a flip at an arc.

4.1. The base case: crossingless arcs over an ideal quadrilateral. Let e be the internal arc of Δ that is being flipped, i.e. the only arc of Δ that is not an arc of Δ' . Let the two triangles of Δ having e as a side be t and u . Collect all the sides of t and u that are not e or boundary arcs of \mathfrak{S} , and let this collection be E . So the number of members of E is one of 0, 1, 2, 3 and 4. The surface obtained from \mathfrak{S} by cutting along all arcs of E is a disjoint union of a quadrilateral \mathcal{Q} and a surface \mathfrak{S}_E . Note that \mathfrak{S}_E may also be disconnected, and even be empty in case \mathfrak{S} was already a quadrilateral. Here, by a quadrilateral we mean a generalized marked surface of genus zero with one boundary component, with four marked points on the boundary and no marked point in the interior. By the cutting process (Def.2.17), Δ yields triangulations $\Delta_{\mathcal{Q}}$ and Δ_E for \mathcal{Q} and \mathfrak{S}_E respectively, while Δ' yields $\Delta'_{\mathcal{Q}}$ and Δ'_E for \mathcal{Q} and \mathfrak{S}_E . Note that Δ_E and Δ'_E coincide with each other, while $\Delta_{\mathcal{Q}}$ and $\Delta'_{\mathcal{Q}}$ differ by a flip. Suppose that an SL_3 -web (W, s) in $\mathfrak{S} \times \mathbf{I}$ meet $E \times \mathbf{I}$ transversally, and moreover that $W \cap (\mathcal{Q} \times \mathbf{I})$ and $W \cap (\mathfrak{S}_E \times \mathbf{I})$ are SL_3 -webs in $\mathcal{Q} \times \mathbf{I}$ and in $\mathfrak{S}_E \times \mathbf{I}$ respectively; if not, (W, s) can be isotoped in $\mathfrak{S} \times \mathbf{I}$ to satisfy this condition. By the cutting/gluing property of the SL_3 quantum trace maps (Thm.2.18(QT1)), one has

$$\begin{aligned} i_E(\text{Tr}_{\Delta; \mathfrak{S}}^\omega([W, s])) &= \sum_{s_{\mathcal{Q}}, s_E} \text{Tr}_{\Delta_{\mathcal{Q}}; \mathcal{Q}}^\omega([W \cap (\mathcal{Q} \times \mathbf{I}), s_{\mathcal{Q}}]) \otimes \text{Tr}_{\Delta_E; \mathfrak{S}_E}^\omega([W \cap (\mathfrak{S}_E \times \mathbf{I}), s_E]), \\ i'_E(\text{Tr}_{\Delta'; \mathfrak{S}}^\omega([W, s])) &= \sum_{s_{\mathcal{Q}}, s_E} \text{Tr}_{\Delta'_{\mathcal{Q}}; \mathcal{Q}}^\omega([W \cap (\mathcal{Q} \times \mathbf{I}), s_{\mathcal{Q}}]) \otimes \text{Tr}_{\Delta'_E; \mathfrak{S}_E}^\omega([W \cap (\mathfrak{S}_E \times \mathbf{I}), s_E]), \end{aligned}$$

where i_E and i'_E are natural embeddings

$$\begin{aligned} i_E : \mathcal{Z}_\Delta^\omega &\rightarrow \mathcal{Z}_{\Delta_{\mathcal{Q}} \sqcup \Delta_E}^\omega \cong \mathcal{Z}_{\Delta_{\mathcal{Q}}}^\omega \otimes \mathcal{Z}_{\Delta_E}^\omega, \\ i'_E : \mathcal{Z}_{\Delta'}^\omega &\rightarrow \mathcal{Z}_{\Delta'_{\mathcal{Q}} \sqcup \Delta'_E}^\omega \cong \mathcal{Z}_{\Delta'_{\mathcal{Q}}}^\omega \otimes \mathcal{Z}_{\Delta'_E}^\omega, \end{aligned}$$

and the sums are over all states $s_{\mathcal{Q}}$ and s_E of the SL_3 -webs $W \cap (\mathcal{Q} \times \mathbf{I})$ in $\mathcal{Q} \times \mathbf{I}$ and $W \cap (\mathfrak{S}_E \times \mathbf{I})$ in $\mathfrak{S}_E \times \mathbf{I}$ that constitute states $s_{\mathcal{Q}} \sqcup s_E$ that are compatible with s in the sense of Def.2.17. By Prop.3.28, which is the compatibility of the quantum mutation maps $\Theta_{\Delta, \Delta'}^\omega$ under the cutting maps along ideal arcs, one observes

$$i_E \circ \Theta_{\Delta, \Delta'}^\omega = (\Theta_{\Delta_{\mathcal{Q}}, \Delta'_{\mathcal{Q}}}^\omega \otimes \underbrace{\Theta_{\Delta_E, \Delta'_E}^\omega}_{=\text{id}}) \circ i'_E : \widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_{\Delta'}^\omega \rightarrow \widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_{\Delta_{\mathcal{Q}}}^\omega \otimes \widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_{\Delta_E}^\omega.$$

It then suffices to show

$$\text{Tr}_{\Delta_{\mathcal{Q}}; \mathcal{Q}}^\omega([W \cap (\mathcal{Q} \times \mathbf{I}), s_{\mathcal{Q}}]) = \Theta_{\Delta_{\mathcal{Q}}, \Delta'_{\mathcal{Q}}}^\omega \text{Tr}_{\Delta'_{\mathcal{Q}}; \mathcal{Q}}^\omega([W \cap (\mathcal{Q} \times \mathbf{I}), s_{\mathcal{Q}}]).$$

Thus, we could assume from the beginning that the entire surface \mathfrak{S} is just a quadrilateral \mathcal{Q} .

Fatten each of the four boundary arcs of the quadrilateral $\mathfrak{S} = \mathcal{Q}$ to a biangle, by choosing an ideal arc isotopic to each boundary arc. Let B_1, B_2, B_3, B_4 be these biangles. Cutting \mathcal{Q} along these four ideal arcs yields a disjoint union B_1, B_2, B_3, B_4 , and a quadrilateral, which we denote by \mathcal{Q}_0 . Suppose (W, s) is a stated SL_3 -web in $\mathcal{Q} \times \mathbf{I}$, and suppose that $W \cap (B_i \times \mathbf{I})$, $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$, and $W \cap (\mathcal{Q}_0 \times \mathbf{I})$ are SL_3 -webs in $B_i \times \mathbf{I}$, $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$, and in $\mathcal{Q}_0 \times \mathbf{I}$, respectively. Let Δ and Δ' be two distinct ideal triangulations of \mathcal{Q} , which are

related by a flip. Let Δ_0 and Δ'_0 be the ideal triangulation of \mathcal{Q}_0 induced by the cutting process. By the cutting/gluing property of the SL_3 quantum trace maps (Prop.2.19(BQT1)), we have

$$\begin{aligned} i_{\Delta, \Delta_0} \mathrm{Tr}_{\Delta, \mathcal{Q}}^\omega([W, s]) &= \sum_{s_1, s_2, s_3, s_4, s_0} (\prod_{i=1}^4 \mathrm{Tr}_{B_i}^\omega([W \cap (B_i \times \mathbf{I}), s_i])) \mathrm{Tr}_{\Delta_0, \mathcal{Q}_0}^\omega([W \cap (\mathcal{Q}_0 \times \mathbf{I}), s_0]), \\ i_{\Delta', \Delta'_0} \mathrm{Tr}_{\Delta', \mathcal{Q}}^\omega([W, s]) &= \sum_{s_1, s_2, s_3, s_4, s_0} (\prod_{i=1}^4 \mathrm{Tr}_{B_i}^\omega([W \cap (B_i \times \mathbf{I}), s_i])) \mathrm{Tr}_{\Delta'_0, \mathcal{Q}_0}^\omega([W \cap (\mathcal{Q}_0 \times \mathbf{I}), s_0]) \end{aligned}$$

where i_{Δ, Δ_0} and i_{Δ', Δ'_0} are natural isomorphisms

$$i_{\Delta, \Delta_0} : \mathcal{Z}_\Delta^\omega \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}_{\Delta_0}^\omega, \quad i_{\Delta', \Delta'_0} : \mathcal{Z}_{\Delta'}^\omega \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}_{\Delta'_0}^\omega,$$

and the sums are over all states that constitute states compatible with s in the sense of Def.2.17. Observing

$$i_{\Delta, \Delta_0} \circ \Theta_{\Delta, \Delta'}^\omega = \Theta_{\Delta_0, \Delta'_0}^\omega \circ i_{\Delta', \Delta'_0} : \widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_\Delta^\omega \rightarrow \widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_{\Delta_0}^\omega$$

it suffices to show

$$\mathrm{Tr}_{\Delta_0, \mathcal{Q}_0}^\omega([W \cap (\mathcal{Q}_0 \times \mathbf{I}), s_0]) = \Theta_{\Delta_0, \Delta'_0}^\omega \mathrm{Tr}_{\Delta'_0, \mathcal{Q}_0}^\omega([W \cap (\mathcal{Q}_0 \times \mathbf{I}), s_0]).$$

The advantage we get by this cutting process is as follows. In the beginning, we do not assume anything about the SL_3 -web W in $\mathcal{Q} \times \mathbf{I}$. Then, by isotopy, one can push complicated parts of W , e.g. all 3-valent vertices, to the biangles B_1, B_2, B_3, B_4 , and also apply ‘vertical’ isotopy, so that W is ‘nice’ over \mathcal{Q}_0 in the following sense; in the language of [K20], W_0 would be in a ‘good’ position, and in fact in a ‘gool’ position.

Lemma 4.2. *One can isotope W so that $W_0 := W \cap (\mathcal{Q}_0 \times \mathbf{I})$ satisfies the following:*

- (1) W_0 has no crossing or 3-valent vertex;
- (2) each component of W_0 is at a constant elevation equipped with upward vertical framing, and the elevations of the components of W_0 are mutually distinct;
- (3) each component of the part of W_0 lying over each of the ideal triangles of Δ_0 and Δ'_0 is a left-turn or a right-turn oriented edge (as in Thm.2.18(QT2)). ■

So, in the end, what remains to check is the equality

$$(4.1) \quad \mathrm{Tr}_{\Delta, \mathcal{Q}}^\omega([W, s]) = \Theta_{\Delta, \Delta'}^\omega \mathrm{Tr}_{\Delta', \mathcal{Q}}^\omega([W, s]),$$

when Δ and Δ' are ideal triangulations of a quadrilateral surface \mathcal{Q} , and W is one of the two basic cases:

- (BC1) W is a constant elevation lift of a corner arc of \mathcal{Q} , i.e. the projection $\pi(W)$ in \mathfrak{S} is a simple oriented edge connecting two adjacent boundary arcs of \mathcal{Q} , or
- (BC2) the projection $\pi(W)$ is a simple oriented edge crossing the internal arc of Δ and that of Δ' , i.e. $\pi(W)$ connects two boundary arcs of \mathcal{Q} that are not adjacent.

One can check these cases by direct computation, which isn’t impossible. But we will try an approach that minimizes the amount of computations, which is also more enlightening, as shall be seen.

4.2. The classical compatibility statement and the Weyl-ordering. Our strategy is to use the Weyl-ordering, and hence a basic step is to establish the classical counterpart statement for Thm.4.1:

Proposition 4.3 (the compatibility of the SL_3 classical trace under flips). *Let Δ and Δ' be ideal triangulations of a triangulable generalized marked surface \mathfrak{S} . Let (W, s) be a stated SL_3 -web in $\mathfrak{S} \times \mathbf{I}$. Then the values under the SL_3 quantum trace maps of $[W, s] \in \mathcal{S}_s^\omega(\mathfrak{S}; \mathbb{Z})_{\mathrm{red}}$ in the case when $\omega^{1/2} = 1$ are compatible under the coordinate change map, i.e.*

$$\Theta_{\Delta, \Delta'}^1(\mathrm{Tr}_{\Delta'}^1([W, s])) = \mathrm{Tr}_\Delta^1([W, s]).$$

Note that, by $\Theta_{\Delta, \Delta'}^1$, we mean the limit of $\Theta_{\Delta, \Delta'}^\omega$, as $\omega^{1/2} \rightarrow 1$. This Prop.4.3 is proven in [K20, Cor.5.70] in the case when \mathfrak{S} is a punctured surface. Essentially the same proof applies for the case when \mathfrak{S} is a generalized marked surface.

Proof of Prop.4.3. By the argument of §4.1, it suffices to prove this when \mathfrak{S} is a quadrilateral and W falls into one of the cases (BC1) and (BC2). For these cases, one can verify the equality by direct computations. Here we provide a proof using arguments in [K20]. Suppose the state s assigns $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2 \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ to the initial and the terminal endpoints of W ; then $\mathrm{Tr}_\Delta^1([W, s])$ is the $(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2)$ -th entry of the normalized monodromy matrix \mathbf{M}_W associated to W , which is a product of normalized basic monodromy matrices associated to small pieces of W , as described in [K20, §4.2]; see (MM1)–(MM3) of [K20, §4.2] for the basic monodromy matrices. Note that $\mathbf{M}_{W; \Delta}$ is a 3×3 matrix whose entries are in \mathcal{Z}_Δ^1 , having determinant 1; i.e. $\mathbf{M}_{W; \Delta} \in \mathrm{SL}_3(\mathcal{Z}_\Delta^1)$. Likewise, $\mathrm{Tr}_{\Delta'}^1([W, s])$ is the $(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2)$ -th entry of the normalized monodromy matrix $\mathbf{M}_{W; \Delta'} \in \mathrm{SL}_3(\mathcal{Z}_{\Delta'}^1)$. By inspection

of the entries, especially of the $(1,1)$ -th entries which are monomials of the highest partial ordering (and whose degrees are given by the tropical coordinates of the SL_3 -laminations $\pi(W)$; see e.g. [K20, Fig.5]), one observes that $\mathbf{M}_{W;\Delta} \in \mathrm{SL}_3(\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_\Delta^1)$ and $\mathbf{M}_{W;\Delta'} \in \mathrm{SL}_3(\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_{\Delta'}^1)$. Meanwhile, as noted in [K20, §4.2], observe that these monodromy matrices $\mathbf{M}_{W;\Delta}$ and $\mathbf{M}_{W;\Delta'}$ are normalized versions of Fock-Goncharov's unnormalized monodromy matrices $\widetilde{\mathbf{M}}_{W;\Delta} \in \mathrm{GL}_3(\mathcal{X}_\Delta^1)$ and $\widetilde{\mathbf{M}}_{W;\Delta'} \in \mathrm{GL}_3(\mathcal{X}_{\Delta'}^1)$, appearing in [FG06]. Observe also that in [FG06], it is shown that $\widetilde{\mathbf{M}}_{W;\Delta}$ and $\widetilde{\mathbf{M}}_{W;\Delta'}$, viewed as elements of the projective transformations $\mathrm{PGL}_3(\mathcal{X}_\Delta^1)$ and $\mathrm{PGL}_3(\mathcal{X}_{\Delta'}^1)$, are related to each other by the composition $\mu_{v_3}^1 \mu_{v_4}^1 \mu_{v_7}^1 \mu_{v_{12}}^1$ of the sequence of four (usual) classical \mathcal{X} -mutations which appeared in §3. Viewing the \mathcal{X} -coordinates X_v 's and X_v' 's as real-valued functions (on the set $\mathcal{X}_{\mathrm{PGL}_3, \mathfrak{S}}(\mathbb{R})$ of \mathbb{R} -points of the moduli stack $\mathcal{X}_{\mathrm{PGL}_3, \mathfrak{S}}$), one can view Z_v 's and Z_v' 's as unique real-valued cube-roots of X_v 's and X_v' 's. Now, as in [K20, §4.2], from the fact that the projection $\mathrm{SL}_3(\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow \mathrm{PGL}_3(\mathbb{R})$ is bijective, one can deduce that the normalized matrices $\mathbf{M}_{W;\Delta}$ and $\mathbf{M}_{W;\Delta'}$ are related by the composition $\mu_{v_3}^1 \mu_{v_4}^1 \mu_{v_7}^1 \mu_{v_{12}}^1$ of the four cluster \mathcal{X} -mutations. More precisely, this last statement is about the evaluations at \mathbb{R} . One can finish the proof by observing that the mutation formulas for the balanced subalgebras, in case $\omega = 1$, when evaluated at \mathbb{R} , is compatible with the evaluation of the usual cluster \mathcal{X} -mutation. ■

Then, in order to prove the sought-for equality eq.(4.1), we will use the following fact:

Lemma 4.4. *When W is one of (BC1) and (BC2) living in $\mathfrak{S} \times \mathbf{I}$, where $\mathfrak{S} = \mathcal{Q}$ is a quadrilateral, and if Δ and Δ' are distinct ideal triangulations of \mathcal{Q} , the values $\mathrm{Tr}_{\Delta; \mathcal{Q}}^\omega([W, s])$ and $\mathrm{Tr}_{\Delta'; \mathcal{Q}}^\omega([W, s])$ of the SL_3 quantum traces are Weyl-ordered Laurent polynomials (Def.2.16) in $\mathcal{Z}_\Delta^\omega$ and $\mathcal{Z}_{\Delta'}^\omega$, respectively.*

This follows from the following two useful facts:

Proposition 4.5 (elevation reversing and $*$ -structure [K20, Prop.5.25]). *Let Δ be an ideal triangulation of a triangulable generalized marked surface \mathfrak{S} . Then*

$$\mathrm{Tr}_\Delta^\omega \circ \mathbf{r} = * \circ \mathrm{Tr}_\Delta^\omega,$$

where

$$\mathbf{r} : \mathcal{S}_s^\omega(\mathfrak{S}; \mathbb{Z})_{\mathrm{red}} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_s^\omega(\mathfrak{S}; \mathbb{Z})_{\mathrm{red}}$$

is the elevation-reversing map, defined as the \mathbb{Z} -linear map sending $\omega^{\pm 1/2}$ to $\omega^{\mp 1/2}$ and $[W, s]$ to $[W', s']$, where W' is obtained from W by reversing the elevation of all points, i.e. replacing each point $(x, t) \in \mathfrak{S} \times \mathbf{I}$ by $(x, -t)$, and $s'(x, -t) = s(x, t)$, and

$$* : \mathcal{Z}_\Delta^\omega \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}_\Delta^\omega, \quad u \mapsto u^*,$$

is the $*$ -map, defined as the \mathbb{Z} -linear ring anti-homomorphism sending $\omega^{\pm 1/2}$ to $\omega^{\mp 1/2}$ and each generator $\widehat{Z}_v^{\pm 1}$ to itself $\widehat{Z}_v^{\pm 1}$.

Lemma 4.6. *A \mathcal{Z} -Laurent monomial $\epsilon \omega^m [\prod_v \widehat{X}_v^{a_v}]_{\mathrm{Weyl}}$ for Δ (Def.3.11), where $\epsilon \in \{1, -1\}$, $m \in \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}$ and $(a_v)_{v \in \mathcal{V}(Q_\Delta)} \in (\frac{1}{3}\mathbb{Z})^{\mathcal{V}(Q_\Delta)}$, is fixed by the $*$ -map if and only if $m = 0$.*

A \mathcal{Z} -Laurent polynomial for Δ is said to be multiplicity-free if it can be written as a sum of \mathcal{Z} -Laurent monomials so that no two appearing Laurent monomials $\epsilon \omega^m [\prod_v \widehat{Z}_v^{a_v}]_{\mathrm{Weyl}}$ and $\epsilon' \omega^{m'} [\prod_v \widehat{Z}_v^{a'_v}]_{\mathrm{Weyl}}$ have the same degrees $a_v = a'_v$, $\forall v$. A multiplicity-free \mathcal{Z} -Laurent polynomial for Δ is fixed by the $*$ -map if and only if each of its terms is fixed by the $*$ -map, i.e. it is a term-by-term Weyl-ordered \mathcal{Z} -Laurent polynomial. ■

Lem.4.6 is well-known, and is easily verified. Note that when W is one of (BC1) and (BC2) living in $\mathcal{Q} \times \mathbf{I}$, the element $[W, s]$ of $\mathcal{S}_s^\omega(\mathcal{Q})_{\mathrm{red}}$ is fixed by the elevation-reversing map \mathbf{r} , and hence $\mathrm{Tr}_{\Delta; \mathcal{Q}}^\omega([W, s]) \in \mathcal{Z}_\Delta^\omega$ and $\mathrm{Tr}_{\Delta'; \mathcal{Q}}^\omega([W, s]) \in \mathcal{Z}_{\Delta'}^\omega$ are fixed by the $*$ -maps. So, if one can show that $\mathrm{Tr}_{\Delta; \mathcal{Q}}^\omega([W, s])$ and $\mathrm{Tr}_{\Delta'; \mathcal{Q}}^\omega([W, s])$ are multiplicity-free \mathcal{Z} -Laurent polynomials, then from Lem.4.6 it follows that they are term-by-term Weyl-ordered \mathcal{Z} -Laurent polynomials. In turn, it is easy to observe that a Weyl-ordered \mathcal{Z} -Laurent polynomial is completely determined by its *classicalization*.

Definition 4.7. *Let Δ be an ideal triangulation of a triangulable generalized marked surface \mathfrak{S} . Consider the cube-root Fock-Goncharov algebra $\mathcal{Z}_\Delta^\omega$ for $\omega^{1/2} = 1$. Denote the generators of \mathcal{Z}_Δ^1 by $Z_v^{\pm 1}$, $v \in \mathcal{V}(Q_\Delta)$, i.e. without the hats. Denote the generators of $\mathcal{X}_\Delta^1 \subset \mathcal{Z}_\Delta^1$ by $X_v^{\pm 1}$, $v \in \mathcal{V}(Q_\Delta)$. The classicalization map*

$$\mathrm{cl}_\Delta^\omega : \mathcal{Z}_\Delta^\omega \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}_\Delta^1$$

is defined as the unique ring homomorphism sending $\omega^{\pm 1/2}$ to 1 and each $\hat{Z}_v^{\pm 1}$ to $Z_v^{\pm 1}$. Define the Weyl-ordering quantization map

$$\text{Wl}_\Delta^\omega : \mathcal{Z}_\Delta^1 \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}_\Delta^\omega$$

as the unique \mathbb{Z} -linear map sending each \mathcal{Z} -Laurent monomial to its corresponding Weyl-ordered \mathcal{Z} -Laurent monomial

$$\text{Wl}_\Delta^\omega(\prod_v X_v^{a_v}) = [\prod_v \hat{X}_v^{a_v}]_{\text{Weyl}}, \quad \forall (a_v)_v \in (\frac{1}{3}\mathbb{Z})^{\mathcal{V}(\mathcal{Q}_\Delta)}$$

So an element of $\mathcal{Z}_\Delta^\omega$ is a term-by-term Weyl-ordered Laurent polynomial iff it is in the image of Wl_Δ^ω . Meanwhile, $\text{cl}_\Delta^\omega \circ \text{Wl}_\Delta^\omega = \text{id}$ obviously holds. Hence $\text{Wl}_\Delta^\omega \circ \text{cl}_\Delta^\omega \circ \text{Wl}_\Delta^\omega = \text{Wl}_\Delta^\omega$, and therefore $\text{Wl}_\Delta^\omega \circ \text{cl}_\Delta^\omega = \text{id}$ holds when applied to term-by-term Weyl-ordered \mathcal{Z} -Laurent polynomials.

Lemma 4.8. *A term-by-term Weyl-ordered \mathcal{Z} -Laurent polynomial $\hat{f} \in \mathcal{Z}_\Delta^\omega$ for Δ is completely determined by its classicalization $\text{cl}_\Delta^\omega(\hat{f}) = f \in \mathcal{Z}_\Delta^1$. That is, if \hat{f} and \hat{g} are term-by-term Weyl-ordered \mathcal{Z} -Laurent polynomials in $\mathcal{Z}_\Delta^\omega$ such that $\text{cl}_\Delta^\omega(\hat{f}) = \text{cl}_\Delta^\omega(\hat{g})$, then $\hat{f} = \hat{g}$. ■*

So the strategy is as follows.

Step 1. Show that $\text{Tr}_{\Delta;\mathcal{Q}}^\omega([W, s])$ is a multiplicity-free \mathcal{Z} -Laurent polynomial.

Step 2. Show that $\Theta_{\Delta\Delta'}^\omega(\text{Tr}_{\Delta';\mathcal{Q}}^\omega([W, s]))$ is a multiplicity-free \mathcal{Z} -Laurent polynomial.

Step 3. Show that $\Theta_{\Delta\Delta'}^\omega(\text{Tr}_{\Delta';\mathcal{Q}}^\omega([W, s]))$ is fixed by the $*$ -map.

Step 4. Show that $\text{Tr}_{\Delta;\mathcal{Q}}^\omega([W, s])$ and $\Theta_{\Delta\Delta'}^\omega(\text{Tr}_{\Delta';\mathcal{Q}}^\omega([W, s]))$ have same classicalizations.

From Steps 1–3 it would follow that $\text{Tr}_{\Delta;\mathcal{Q}}^\omega([W, s])$ and $\Theta_{\Delta\Delta'}^\omega(\text{Tr}_{\Delta';\mathcal{Q}}^\omega([W, s]))$ are both $*$ -invariant multiplicity-free \mathcal{Z} -Laurent polynomials for Δ , hence are term-by-term Weyl-ordered \mathcal{Z} -Laurent polynomials. Then, from Step 4 and Lem.4.8 it would follow that they are equal, as desired in eq.(4.1). Then, by the arguments in §4.1, this would finish the proof of the sought-for Thm.4.1.

Among the four steps, the least straightforward is Step 2. Note that $\Theta_{\Delta\Delta'}^\omega(\text{Tr}_{\Delta';\mathcal{Q}}^\omega([W, s]))$ is a priori an element of $\text{Frac}(\mathcal{Z}_\Delta^\omega)$. We must first show that it is Laurent, i.e. belongs to $\mathcal{Z}_\Delta^\omega \subset \text{Frac}(\mathcal{Z}_\Delta^\omega)$. Then we should also show that it is a multiplicity-free Laurent polynomial. To do this, one could just directly compute the values of

$$\Theta_{\Delta\Delta'}^\omega(\text{Tr}_{\Delta';\mathcal{Q}}^\omega([W, s])) = \nu_{v_3}^\omega \nu_{v_4}^\omega \nu_{v_7}^\omega \nu_{v_{12}}^\omega (\text{Tr}_{\Delta';\mathcal{Q}}^\omega([W, s])) \in \text{Frac}(\mathcal{Z}_\Delta^\omega)$$

and check the desired properties. In order to minimize the amount of computations, we split the four mutations into two and suggest the following modified steps; first, recall from §3.3 the notations for the intermediate cluster \mathcal{X} -seeds connecting the seeds for Δ and Δ' .

Step 1'. Show that $\nu_{v_4}^\omega \nu_{v_3}^\omega (\text{Tr}_{\Delta;\mathcal{Q}}^\omega([W, s])) \in \text{Frac}(\mathcal{Z}_{\Delta(2)}^\omega)$ lies in $\mathcal{Z}_{\Delta(2)}^\omega$ (i.e. is Laurent) and is a multiplicity-free \mathcal{Z} -Laurent polynomial in $\mathcal{Z}_{\Delta(2)}^\omega$.

Step 2'. Show that $\nu_{v_7}^\omega \nu_{v_{12}}^\omega (\text{Tr}_{\Delta';\mathcal{Q}}^\omega([W, s])) \in \text{Frac}(\mathcal{Z}_{\Delta(2)}^\omega)$ lies in $\mathcal{Z}_{\Delta(2)}^\omega$ (i.e. is Laurent) and is a multiplicity-free \mathcal{Z} -Laurent polynomial in $\mathcal{Z}_{\Delta(2)}^\omega$.

Step 3'. Show that $\nu_{v_4}^\omega \nu_{v_3}^\omega (\text{Tr}_{\Delta;\mathcal{Q}}^\omega([W, s]))$ and $\nu_{v_7}^\omega \nu_{v_{12}}^\omega (\text{Tr}_{\Delta';\mathcal{Q}}^\omega([W, s]))$ are fixed by the $*$ -map.

Step 4'. Show that $\nu_{v_4}^\omega \nu_{v_3}^\omega (\text{Tr}_{\Delta;\mathcal{Q}}^\omega([W, s]))$ and $\nu_{v_7}^\omega \nu_{v_{12}}^\omega (\text{Tr}_{\Delta';\mathcal{Q}}^\omega([W, s]))$ have the same classicalizations.

Notice that Steps 1' and 2' together correspond to Steps 1 and 2 which were previously suggested. In fact, observe that the situation for $\nu_{v_4}^\omega \nu_{v_3}^\omega \text{Tr}_{\Delta;\mathcal{Q}}^\omega$ and that for $\nu_{v_7}^\omega \nu_{v_{12}}^\omega \text{Tr}_{\Delta';\mathcal{Q}}^\omega$ are symmetric; namely, after the SL_3 quantum trace for an ideal triangulation of \mathcal{Q} , we mutate at the two nodes lying in the unique internal arc of this ideal triangulation. Because of this symmetry, if we check Step 1' for all cases of W as in Fig.6, then Step 2' is automatically satisfied. It seems that this much of the computation is unavoidable, and we perform this computational check for Step 1' in the following subsection, which we refer to as checking the quantum Laurent property.




FIGURE 6. Six cases of SL_3 -webs W over a quadrilateral \mathcal{Q}

Steps 3' and 4' are relatively easy, so we do them here now.

Step 3'. We know $\text{Tr}_{\Delta;\mathcal{Q}}^\omega([W, s])$ is fixed by the $*$ -map. So it is enough to show:

Lemma 4.9. *For $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$, the map $\nu_{v(i)}^\omega$ preserves the $*$ -structures.*

Proof. Note $\nu_{v(i)}^\omega = \nu_{v(i)}^{\sharp\omega} \circ \nu'_{v(i)}$. From Def.3.18 (and Def.3.21), note that $\nu'_{v(i)}$ sends a Weyl-ordered \mathcal{Z} -Laurent monomial to a Weyl-ordered \mathcal{Z} -Laurent monomial. Since a Weyl-ordered $\Delta^{(i)}$ -balanced monomial is fixed by the $*$ -map and since Weyl-ordered $\Delta^{(i)}$ -balanced monomials span $\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_{\Delta^{(i)}}^\omega$, it follows that $\nu'_{v(i)}$ preserves the $*$ -structure. As for $\nu_{v(i)}^{\sharp\omega}$, it suffices to show that the right hand side of eq.(3.6) is fixed by the $*$ -map. With α as in eq.(3.4), observe

$$\begin{aligned} (\text{right hand side of eq.(3.6)})^* &= \left(\prod_{r=1}^{|\alpha|} (1 + q^{(2r-1)\text{sgn}(\alpha)} \widehat{X}_v^{(i-1)})^{\text{sgn}(\alpha)} \right)^* \cdot \left([\prod_v (\widehat{X}_v^{(i-1)})^{a_v}]_{\text{Weyl}} \right)^* \\ &= \left(\prod_{r=1}^{|\alpha|} (1 + q^{-(2r-1)\text{sgn}(\alpha)} \widehat{X}_v^{(i-1)})^{\text{sgn}(\alpha)} \right) \cdot \left([\prod_v (\widehat{X}_v^{(i-1)})^{a_v}]_{\text{Weyl}} \right) \\ &= \left([\prod_v (\widehat{X}_v^{(i-1)})^{a_v}]_{\text{Weyl}} \right) \cdot \left(\prod_{r=1}^{|\alpha|} (1 + q^{-(2r-1)\text{sgn}(\alpha)} q^{2\alpha} \widehat{X}_v^{(i-1)})^{\text{sgn}(\alpha)} \right) \\ &= \left([\prod_v (\widehat{X}_v^{(i-1)})^{a_v}]_{\text{Weyl}} \right) \cdot \left(\prod_{r=1}^{|\alpha|} (1 + q^{(2r-1)\text{sgn}(\alpha)} \widehat{X}_v^{(i-1)})^{\text{sgn}(\alpha)} \right) \end{aligned}$$

which equals the right hand side of eq.(3.6) again, as desired. So both $\nu'_{v(i)}$ and $\nu_{v(i)}^{\sharp\omega}$ preserve $*$ -structures, and hence so does $\nu_{v(i)}^\omega$. ■

Step 4'. In view of eq.(3.7), it is equivalent to showing Step 4, which was proved in Prop.4.3.

4.3. Checking the quantum Laurent property. It remains to do Step 1' of the previous subsection, for all cases of W as in Fig.6. For this task, we make of use the following convenient way of dealing with the Weyl-ordered Laurent monomials by introducing the log variables.

Definition 4.10. *Let Δ be an ideal triangulation of a triangulable generalized marked surface. Let \mathcal{H}_Δ be a free \mathbb{Z} -module with the symbols $\{\widehat{z}_v \mid v \in \mathcal{V}(Q_\Delta)\} \cup \{\frac{1}{18}\mathbf{c}\}$, as a free basis, equipped with a skew-symmetric bilinear form $[\cdot, \cdot]$ s.t.*

$$[\widehat{z}_v, \widehat{z}_w] = 2\varepsilon_{vw} \cdot \frac{1}{18}\mathbf{c}, \quad [\frac{1}{18}\mathbf{c}, \widehat{z}_v] = 0, \quad \forall v, w \in \mathcal{V}(Q_\Delta).$$

Define

$$\widehat{x}_v := 3\widehat{z}_v, \quad \forall v \in \mathcal{V}(Q_\Delta),$$

so that $\frac{1}{3}\widehat{x}_v$ means \widehat{z}_v . Meanwhile, \mathbf{c} denotes $18 \cdot (\frac{1}{18}\mathbf{c})$. Define the exponential map

$$\exp : \mathcal{H}_\Delta \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}_\Delta^\omega, \quad \widehat{z} \mapsto \exp(\widehat{z}) =: e^{\widehat{z}}$$

as

$$\exp(\alpha \cdot \frac{1}{18}\mathbf{c} + \sum_v a_v \widehat{x}_v) := \omega^{\alpha/2} [\prod_v \widehat{X}_v^{a_v}]_{\text{Weyl}}.$$

For example, $e^{\mathbf{c}} = q$, $e^{\widehat{z}_v} = \widehat{Z}_v$, $e^{\widehat{x}_v} = \widehat{X}_v$. We find it useful to have the following well-known fact.

Lemma 4.11 (Baker-Campbell-Hausdorff (BCH) formula). *For $\widehat{x}, \widehat{y} \in \mathcal{H}_\Delta$,*

$$\exp(\widehat{x}) \exp(\widehat{y}) = e^{\frac{1}{2}[\widehat{x}, \widehat{y}]} \exp(\widehat{x} + \widehat{y}). \quad \blacksquare$$

Step 1' (and Step 2'). Before the actual checking, we study the images of $\nu_{v_4}^\omega \nu_{v_3}^\omega$ of arbitrary Δ -balanced Weyl-ordered \mathcal{Z} -Laurent monomials $\exp(\sum_{j=1}^{12} a_j \widehat{x}_j^{(0)})$ in $\mathcal{Z}_\Delta^\omega = \mathcal{Z}_{\Delta^{(0)}}^\omega$. Denote the entries of the exchange matrix $\varepsilon_{v_j v_k}^{(i)}$ for the seed $\Delta^{(i)}$ by $\varepsilon_{j,k}^{(i)}$, for $j, k \in \{1, \dots, 12\}$. Then

$$\varepsilon_{3,7}^{(1)} = \varepsilon_{3,8}^{(1)} = 1, \quad \varepsilon_{3,2}^{(1)} = \varepsilon_{3,12}^{(1)} = -1, \quad \varepsilon_{3,j}^{(1)} = 0, \quad \forall j \notin \{2, 7, 8, 12\}.$$

For $(a_{v_j})_{j=1}^{12} \in (\frac{1}{3}\mathbb{Z})^{12}$, denote a_{v_j} by a_j . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \nu'_{v_3}(\exp(\sum_{j=1}^{12} a_j \widehat{x}_j^{(0)})) &= \exp((-a_3 + \sum_{j \neq 3} [\varepsilon_{j,3}^{(1)} + a_j] \widehat{x}_3^{(1)} + \sum_{j \neq 3} a_j \widehat{x}_j^{(1)}) \\ &= \exp((-a_3 + a_2 + a_{12}) \widehat{x}_3^{(1)} + \sum_{j \neq 3} a_j \widehat{x}_j^{(1)}) =: \exp(\sum_{j=1}^{12} a_j^{(1)} \widehat{x}_j^{(1)}) \end{aligned}$$

That is, we are defining $a_j^{(1)}$ as

$$a_3^{(1)} = -a_3 + a_2 + a_{12}, \quad a_j^{(1)} = a_j, \quad \forall j \neq 3.$$

Note

$$\alpha := \alpha_{v_3; \Delta^{(1)}}((a_j^{(1)})_{j=1}^{12}) = \sum_{j=1}^{12} \varepsilon_{3,j}^{(1)} a_j^{(1)} = a_7^{(1)} + a_8^{(1)} - a_2^{(1)} - a_{12}^{(1)} = a_7 + a_8 - a_2 - a_{12}$$

So, in case $\alpha \in \frac{1}{3}\mathbb{Z}$ belongs to \mathbb{Z} , we have

$$\begin{aligned}\nu_{v_3}^\omega(\exp(\sum_{j=1}^{12} a_j \hat{x}_j^{(0)})) &= \nu_{v_3}^{\sharp\omega} \nu'_{v_3}(\exp(\sum_{j=1}^{12} a_j \hat{x}_j^{(0)})) = \nu_{v_3}^{\sharp\omega}(\exp(\sum_{j=1}^{12} a_j^{(1)} \hat{x}_j^{(1)})) \\ &= \exp(\sum_{j=1}^{12} a_j^{(1)} \hat{x}_j^{(1)}) F^q(\hat{X}_3^{(1)}; \alpha),\end{aligned}$$

where F^q is as in eq.(3.1). Now we apply $\nu_{v_4}^\omega = \nu_{v_4}^{\sharp\omega} \nu'_{v_4}$. Note

$$\varepsilon_{4,5}^{(2)} = \varepsilon_{4,12}^{(2)} = 1, \quad \varepsilon_{4,7}^{(2)} = \varepsilon_{4,11}^{(2)} = -1, \quad \varepsilon_{4,j}^{(2)} = 0, \quad \forall j \notin \{5, 7, 11, 12\},$$

so

$$\begin{aligned}\nu'_{v_4}(\exp(\sum_{j=1}^{12} a_j^{(1)} \hat{x}_j^{(1)})) &= \exp((-a_4^{(1)} + \sum_{j \neq 4} [\varepsilon_{j,4}^{(2)}] + a_j^{(1)}) \hat{x}_4^{(2)} + \sum_{j \neq 4} a_j^{(1)} \hat{x}_j^{(2)}) \\ &= \exp((-a_4^{(1)} + a_7^{(1)} + a_{11}^{(1)}) \hat{x}_4^{(2)} + \sum_{j \neq 4} a_j^{(1)} \hat{x}_j^{(2)}) =: \exp(\sum_{j=1}^{12} a_j^{(2)} \hat{x}_j^{(2)}).\end{aligned}$$

That is, we are defining $a_j^{(2)}$ as

$$a_4^{(2)} = -a_4^{(1)} + a_7^{(1)} + a_{11}^{(1)} = -a_4 + a_7 + a_{11}, \quad a_3^{(2)} = a_3^{(1)} = -a_3 + a_2 + a_{12}, \quad a_j^{(2)} = a_j^{(1)} = a_j, \quad \forall j \neq 3, 4.$$

Note

$$\alpha' := \alpha_{v_4; \Delta^{(2)}}((a_j^{(2)})_{j=1}^{12}) = \sum_{j=1}^{12} \varepsilon_{4,j}^{(2)} a_j^{(2)} = a_5^{(2)} + a_{12}^{(2)} - a_7^{(2)} - a_{11}^{(2)} = a_5 + a_{12} - a_7 - a_{11}.$$

So, in case $\alpha' \in \frac{1}{3}\mathbb{Z}$ belongs to \mathbb{Z} , we have

$$\begin{aligned}\nu_{v_4}^\omega(\exp(\sum_{j=1}^{12} a_j^{(1)} \hat{x}_j^{(1)})) &= \nu_{v_4}^{\sharp\omega} \nu'_{v_4}(\exp(\sum_{j=1}^{12} a_j^{(1)} \hat{x}_j^{(1)})) = \nu_{v_4}^{\sharp\omega}(\exp(\sum_{j=1}^{12} a_j^{(2)} \hat{x}_j^{(2)})) \\ &= (\exp(\sum_{j=1}^{12} a_j^{(2)} \hat{x}_j^{(2)})) F^q(\hat{X}_4^{(2)}; \alpha').\end{aligned}$$

Meanwhile, note that

$$\nu_{v_4}^\omega(\hat{X}_3^{(1)}) = \nu_{v_4}^{\sharp\omega} \nu'_{v_4}(\hat{X}_3^{(1)}) = \nu_{v_4}^{\sharp\omega}(\hat{X}_3^{(2)}) = \hat{X}_3^{(2)}.$$

Since $F^q(\hat{X}_3^{(1)}; \alpha)$ is a rational expression in $\hat{X}_3^{(1)}$, one has $\nu_{v_4}^\omega(F^q(\hat{X}_3^{(1)}; \alpha)) = F^q(\hat{X}_3^{(2)}; \alpha)$. So

$$\begin{aligned}\nu_{v_4}^\omega \nu_{v_3}^\omega(\exp(\sum_{j=1}^{12} a_j \hat{x}_j^{(0)})) &= \nu_{v_4}^\omega \left(\exp(\sum_{j=1}^{12} a_j^{(1)} \hat{x}_j^{(1)}) F^q(\hat{X}_3^{(1)}; \alpha) \right) \\ &= (\exp(\sum_{j=1}^{12} a_j^{(2)} \hat{x}_j^{(2)})) F^q(\hat{X}_4^{(2)}; \alpha') F^q(\hat{X}_3^{(2)}; \alpha).\end{aligned}$$

We summarize this as a lemma:

Lemma 4.12. For $(a_{v_j})_{j=1}^{12} \in (\frac{1}{3}\mathbb{Z})^{12}$ such that

$$\alpha := a_7 + a_8 - a_2 - a_{12} \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha' := a_5 + a_{12} - a_7 - a_{11} \quad \text{both belong to } \mathbb{Z},$$

one has

$$(4.2) \quad \nu_{v_4}^\omega \nu_{v_3}^\omega(\exp(\sum_{j=1}^{12} a_j \hat{x}_j^{(0)})) = (\exp(\sum_{j=1}^{12} a_j^{(2)} \hat{x}_j^{(2)})) F^q(\hat{X}_4^{(2)}; \alpha') F^q(\hat{X}_3^{(2)}; \alpha),$$

where F^q is as in eq.(3.1). \blacksquare

Now we apply this lemma to the actual cases to check.

Suppose s assigns the state values $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2 \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ to the initial and the terminal endpoints of W . We would sometimes write s as the pair $(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2)$.

Case ①. $\text{Tr}_\Delta^\omega([W, s])$ is the image under the map Wl_Δ^ω (Def.4.7) of the $(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2)$ -th entry of the classical matrix

$$\begin{aligned}& \begin{pmatrix} Z_6 Z_5^2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & Z_6 Z_5^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & Z_6^{-2} Z_5^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} Z_7^2 & Z_7^2 + Z_7^{-1} & Z_7^{-1} \\ 0 & Z_7^{-1} & Z_7^{-1} \\ 0 & 0 & Z_7^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} Z_1 Z_2^2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & Z_1 Z_2^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & Z_1^{-2} Z_2^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} Z_6 Z_5^2 Z_7^2 Z_1 Z_2^2 & Z_6 Z_5^2 Z_7^2 Z_1 Z_2^{-1} + Z_6 Z_5^2 Z_7^{-1} Z_1 Z_2^{-1} & Z_6 Z_5^2 Z_7^{-1} Z_1^{-2} Z_2^{-1} \\ 0 & Z_6 Z_5^{-1} Z_7^{-1} Z_1 Z_2^{-1} & Z_6 Z_5^{-1} Z_7^{-1} Z_1^{-2} Z_2^{-1} \\ 0 & 0 & Z_6^{-2} Z_5^{-1} Z_7^{-1} Z_1^{-2} Z_2^{-1} \end{pmatrix}\end{aligned}$$

By inspection, $\text{Tr}_\Delta^\omega([W, s])$ is a Weyl-ordered multiplicity-free \mathcal{Z} -Laurent polynomial for Δ , each Laurent monomial term being of the form

$$\text{Wl}_\Delta^\omega(X_6^{a_6} X_5^{a_5} X_7^{a_7} X_1^{a_1} X_2^{a_2}) = \exp(\sum_{j=1}^{12} a_j \hat{x}_j)$$

with $(a_j)_{j=1}^{12} \in (\frac{1}{3}\mathbb{Z})^{12}$ and $a_j = 0$ if $j \notin \{6, 5, 7, 1, 2\}$. By Prop.3.14, $(a_j)_{j=1}^{12} \in (\frac{1}{3}\mathbb{Z})^{12}$ is Δ -balanced, which one can directly check easily in this case. For each of these \mathcal{Z} -Laurent monomials that are not manifestly

zero, we record a_5, a_7, a_2 , $\alpha = a_7 - a_2$ and $\alpha' = a_5 - a_7$ in the following table; in the first row, $(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2)$ stands for the $(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2)$ -th entry, and $(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2)_k$ the k -th term of the $(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2)$ -th entry.

	(1, 1)	(1, 2) ₁	(1, 2) ₂	(1, 3)	(2, 2)	(2, 3)	(3, 3)
a_5	2/3	2/3	2/3	2/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3
a_7	2/3	2/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3
a_2	2/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3
α	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
α'	0	0	1	1	0	0	0

Therefore, for each column, since $\alpha, \alpha' \in \{0, 1\}$, we see that $F^q(\hat{X}_4^{(2)}; \alpha') F^q(\hat{X}_3^{(2)}; \alpha)$ is a multiplicity-free Laurent polynomial in the variables $\hat{X}_4^{(2)}$ and $\hat{X}_3^{(2)}$, in view of eq.(3.1). Hence the right hand side of eq.(4.2) is a multiplicity-free \mathcal{Z} -Laurent polynomial in $\mathcal{Z}_{\Delta^{(2)}}^\omega$, as desired.

Case ②. $\text{Tr}_\Delta^\omega([W, s])$ is the image under the map Wl_Δ^ω of the $(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2)$ -th entry of the classical matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} Z_2 Z_1^2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & Z_2 Z_1^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & Z_2^{-2} Z_1^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} Z_7 & 0 & 0 \\ Z_7 & Z_7 & 0 \\ Z_7 & Z_7 + Z_7^{-2} & Z_7^{-2} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} Z_5 Z_6^2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & Z_5 Z_6^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & Z_5^{-2} Z_6^{-1} \end{pmatrix}$$

So, by inspection, $\text{Tr}_\Delta^\omega([W, s])$ is a Weyl-ordered multiplicity-free \mathcal{Z} -Laurent polynomial for Δ , each Laurent monomial being of the form $\exp(\sum_{j=1}^{12} a_j \hat{x}_j)$ with $(a_j)_{j=1}^{12} \in (\frac{1}{3}\mathbb{Z})^{12}$, where $a_j = 0$ when $j \notin \{2, 1, 7, 5, 6\}$. For nonzero Laurent monomials, we record a_2, a_7, a_5 , $\alpha = a_7 - a_2$ and $\alpha' = a_5 - a_7$.

	(1, 1)	(2, 1)	(2, 2)	(3, 1)	(3, 2) ₁	(3, 2) ₂	(3, 3)
a_2	1/3	1/3	1/3	-2/3	-2/3	-2/3	-2/3
a_7	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	-2/3	-2/3
a_5	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	-2/3
α	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
α'	0	0	0	0	0	1	0

Again, since $\alpha, \alpha' \in \{0, 1\}$, it follows that the right hand side of eq.(4.2) is a multiplicity-free \mathcal{Z} -Laurent polynomial in $\mathcal{Z}_{\Delta^{(2)}}^\omega$, as desired.

Case ③. $\text{Tr}_\Delta^\omega([W, s])$ is the image under the map Wl_Δ^ω of the $(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2)$ -th entry of the classical matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} Z_2 Z_1^2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & Z_2 Z_1^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & Z_2^{-2} Z_1^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} Z_7^2 & Z_7^2 + Z_7^{-1} & Z_7^{-1} \\ 0 & Z_7^{-1} & Z_7^{-1} \\ 0 & 0 & Z_7^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} Z_3 Z_4^2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & Z_3 Z_4^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & Z_3^{-2} Z_4^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} Z_{12}^2 & Z_{12}^2 + Z_{12}^{-1} & Z_{12}^{-1} \\ 0 & Z_{12}^{-1} & Z_{12}^{-1} \\ 0 & 0 & Z_{12}^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} Z_8 Z_9^2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & Z_8 Z_9^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & Z_8^{-2} Z_9^{-1} \end{pmatrix}$$

where the product of the underlined middle three matrices is

$$\begin{pmatrix} Z_7^2 Z_3 Z_4^2 Z_{12}^2 & Z_7^2 Z_3 Z_4^2 (Z_{12}^2 + Z_{12}^{-1}) + (Z_7^2 + Z_7^{-1}) Z_3 Z_4^{-1} Z_{12}^{-1} & (Z_7^2 Z_3 Z_4^2 + (Z_7^2 + Z_7^{-1}) Z_3 Z_4^{-1} + Z_7^{-1} Z_3^{-2} Z_4^{-1}) Z_{12}^{-1} \\ 0 & Z_7^{-1} Z_3 Z_4^{-1} Z_{12}^{-1} & Z_7^{-1} (Z_3 Z_4^{-1} + Z_3^{-2} Z_4^{-1}) Z_{12}^{-1} \\ 0 & 0 & Z_7^{-1} Z_3^{-2} Z_4^{-1} Z_{12}^{-1} \end{pmatrix}$$

So, by inspection, $\text{Tr}_\Delta^\omega([W, s])$ is a Weyl-ordered multiplicity-free \mathcal{Z} -Laurent polynomial for Δ , each Laurent monomial begin of the form $\exp(\sum_{j=1}^{12} a_j \hat{x}_j)$ with $(a_j)_{j=1}^{12} \in (\frac{1}{3}\mathbb{Z})^{12}$, where $a_j = 0$ when $j \notin \{2, 1, 7, 3, 4, 12, 8, 9\}$. We record the nonzero a_j 's, $\alpha = a_7 + a_8 - a_2 - a_{12}$ and $\alpha' = a_{12} - a_7$.

	(1, 1)	(1, 2) ₁	(1, 2) ₂	(1, 2) ₃	(1, 2) ₄	(1, 3) ₁	(1, 3) ₂	(1, 3) ₃	(1, 3) ₄	(2, 2)	(2, 3) ₁	(2, 3) ₂	(3, 3)
a_2	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	-2/3
a_1	2/3	2/3	2/3	2/3	2/3	2/3	2/3	2/3	2/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3
a_7	2/3	2/3	2/3	2/3	-1/3	2/3	2/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3
a_3	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	-2/3	1/3	1/3	-2/3	-2/3
a_4	2/3	2/3	2/3	-1/3	-1/3	2/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3
a_{12}	2/3	2/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3
a_8	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	-2/3	-2/3	-2/3	-2/3	1/3	-2/3	-2/3	-2/3
a_9	2/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3
α	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	-1	-1	0	-1	-1	0
α'	0	0	-1	-1	0	-1	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0

For the entries (1, 1), (2, 2) and (3, 3), we have $\alpha = \alpha' = 0$, hence $F^q(\hat{X}_4^{(2)}; \alpha') F^q(\hat{X}_3^{(2)}; \alpha) = 1$, and therefore the right hand side of eq.(4.2) is a \mathcal{Z} -Laurent monomial in $\mathcal{Z}_{\Delta^{(2)}}^\omega$. We have $\alpha' = -1$ for (1, 2)₂ and (1, 2)₃, which represent the second and the third terms $\exp(\sum_{j=1}^{12} a_j \hat{x}_j^{(0)})$ of (1, 2)-th entry $\text{Tr}_\Delta^\omega([W, (1, 2)])$; in the corresponding two columns in the above table, the only difference is a_4 . We compute the sum of two

corresponding terms $\nu'_{v_4} \nu'_{v_3} \exp(\sum_{j=1}^{12} a_j \hat{x}_j^{(0)}) = \exp(\sum_{j=1}^{12} a_j^{(2)} \hat{x}_j^{(2)})$; using $a_4^{(2)} = -a_4 + a_7 + a_{11} = -a_4 + a_7$, $a_3^{(2)} = -a_3 + a_2 + a_{12}$, $a_j^{(2)} = a_j$, $\forall j \neq 3, 4$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \exp(0\hat{x}_4^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_3^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_2^{(2)} + \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_1^{(2)} + \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_7^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_{12}^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_8^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_9^{(2)}) \\ & + \exp(\hat{x}_4^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_3^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_2^{(2)} + \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_1^{(2)} + \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_7^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_{12}^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_8^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_9^{(2)}) \\ & = \exp(-\frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_3^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_2^{(2)} + \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_1^{(2)} + \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_7^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_{12}^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_8^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_9^{(2)}) (1 + e^{-c} \exp(\hat{x}_4^{(2)})) \end{aligned}$$

where we used the BCH formula (Lem.4.11), and

$$[-\frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_3^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_2^{(2)} + \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_1^{(2)} + \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_7^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_{12}^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_8^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_9^{(2)}, \hat{x}_4^{(2)}] = 2(\frac{2}{3}\varepsilon_{7,4}^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\varepsilon_{12,4}^{(2)})\mathbf{c} = 2(\frac{2}{3} + \frac{1}{3})\mathbf{c} = 2\mathbf{c}.$$

Note

$$1 + e^{-c} \exp(\hat{x}_4^{(2)}) = 1 + q^{-1} \hat{X}_4^{(2)} = (F^q(\hat{X}_4^{(2)}; -1))^{-1}$$

This means that

$$(\text{sum of terms } \exp(\sum_{j=1}^{12} a_j^{(2)} \hat{x}_j^{(2)}) \text{ for the second and third terms of } \text{Tr}_\Delta^\omega([W, (1, 2)])) \cdot F^q(\hat{X}_4^{(2)}; -1)$$

is a \mathcal{Z} -Laurent monomial. So, in view of eq.(4.2), it follows that $\nu_{v_4}^\omega \nu_{v_3}^\omega (\text{Tr}_\Delta^\omega([W, (1, 2)]))$ is a \mathcal{Z} -Laurent polynomial. It is easy to check by inspection that this is multiplicity-free.

We do likewise for $(1, 3)_1$ and $(1, 3)_2$; the two columns in the above table differ only at a_4 . The sum of $\exp(\sum_{j=1}^{12} a_j^{(2)} \hat{x}_j^{(2)})$ for these two terms is

$$\begin{aligned} & \exp(0\hat{x}_4^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_3^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_2^{(2)} + \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_1^{(2)} + \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_7^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_{12}^{(2)} - \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_8^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_9^{(2)}) \\ & + \exp(\hat{x}_4^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_3^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_2^{(2)} + \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_1^{(2)} + \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_7^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_{12}^{(2)} - \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_8^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_9^{(2)}) \\ & = \exp(-\frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_3^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_2^{(2)} + \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_1^{(2)} + \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_7^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_{12}^{(2)} - \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_8^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_9^{(2)}) (1 + e^{-c} \exp(\hat{x}_4^{(2)})) \end{aligned}$$

by a similar computation as before; note especially that the difference between this situation and that of the $(1, 2)_2$ - $(1, 2)_3$ situation is just the coefficient of $\hat{x}_8^{(2)}$. So

$$(\text{sum of terms } \exp(\sum_{j=1}^{12} a_j^{(2)} \hat{x}_j^{(2)}) \text{ for the first and the second terms of } \text{Tr}_\Delta^\omega([W, (1, 3)])) \cdot F^q(\hat{X}_4^{(2)}; -1)$$

is a \mathcal{Z} -Laurent monomial. Let's now investigate $(1, 3)_3$ and $(1, 3)_4$. The only difference of these two columns is at a_3 . The sum of $\exp(\sum_{j=1}^{12} a_j^{(2)} \hat{x}_j^{(2)})$ for these two is

$$\begin{aligned} & \exp(0\hat{x}_4^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_3^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_2^{(2)} + \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_1^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_7^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_{12}^{(2)} - \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_8^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_9^{(2)}) \\ & + \exp(0\hat{x}_4^{(2)} + \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_3^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_2^{(2)} + \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_1^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_7^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_{12}^{(2)} - \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_8^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_9^{(2)}) \\ & = \exp(-\frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_3^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_2^{(2)} + \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_1^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_7^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_{12}^{(2)} - \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_8^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_9^{(2)}) (1 + e^{-c} \exp(\hat{x}_3^{(2)})) \end{aligned}$$

where we used the BCH formula (Lem.4.11) and

$$\begin{aligned} [-\frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_3^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_2^{(2)} + \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_1^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_7^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_{12}^{(2)} - \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_8^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_9^{(2)}, \hat{x}_3^{(2)}] &= 2(\frac{1}{3}\varepsilon_{2,3}^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\varepsilon_{7,3}^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\varepsilon_{12,3}^{(2)} - \frac{2}{3}\varepsilon_{8,3}^{(2)})\mathbf{c} \\ &= 2(\frac{1}{3} + \frac{1}{3} - \frac{1}{3} + \frac{2}{3})\mathbf{c} = 2\mathbf{c} \end{aligned}$$

Since $1 + e^{-c} \exp(\hat{x}_3^{(2)}) = 1 + q^{-1} \hat{X}_3^{(2)} = (F^q(\hat{X}_3^{(2)}; -1))^{-1}$ it follows that

$$(\text{sum of terms } \exp(\sum_{j=1}^{12} a_j^{(2)} \hat{x}_j^{(2)}) \text{ for the third and the fourth terms of } \text{Tr}_\Delta^\omega([W, (1, 3)])) \cdot F^q(\hat{X}_3^{(2)}; -1)$$

is a \mathcal{Z} -Laurent monomial. Combining, in view of eq.(4.2), we conclude that $\nu_{v_4}^\omega \nu_{v_3}^\omega (\text{Tr}_\Delta^\omega([W, (1, 3)]))$ is a \mathcal{Z} -Laurent polynomial, having two terms. It is easy to check by inspection that this is multiplicity-free.

Lastly, we investigate $(2, 3)_1$ and $(2, 3)_2$; the only difference of the two columns in the table is at a_3 . The sum of $\exp(\sum_{j=1}^{12} a_j^{(2)} \hat{x}_j^{(2)})$ for these two is

$$\begin{aligned} & \exp(0\hat{x}_4^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_3^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_2^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_1^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_7^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_{12}^{(2)} - \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_8^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_9^{(2)}) \\ & + \exp(0\hat{x}_4^{(2)} + \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_3^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_2^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_1^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_7^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_{12}^{(2)} - \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_8^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_9^{(2)}) \\ & = \exp(-\frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_3^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_2^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_1^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_7^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_{12}^{(2)} - \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_8^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_9^{(2)}) (1 + e^{-c} \exp(\hat{x}_3^{(2)})) \end{aligned}$$

by a similar computation as in the $(1, 3)_3$ - $(1, 3)_4$ case, which differ from the current situation just at the coefficient of $\hat{x}_1^{(2)}$. So $\nu_{v_4}^\omega \nu_{v_3}^\omega (\text{Tr}_\Delta^\omega([W, (2, 3)]))$ is a \mathcal{Z} -Laurent monomial, hence is a multiplicity-free \mathcal{Z} -Laurent polynomial, as desired.

Case ④. The flow of logic for the remaining cases 4, 5 and 6 will be similar. So, from now on, we will reduce the amount of explanation. Note that $\text{Tr}_\Delta^\omega([W, s])$ is the image under Wl_Δ^ω of the $(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2)$ -th entry of the classical matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} Z_9 Z_8^2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & Z_9 Z_8^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & Z_9^{-2} Z_8^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} Z_{12} & 0 & 0 \\ Z_{12} & Z_{12} & 0 \\ Z_{12} & Z_{12} + Z_{12}^{-2} & Z_{12}^{-2} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} Z_4 Z_3^2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & Z_4 Z_3^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & Z_4^{-2} Z_3^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} Z_7 & 0 & 0 \\ Z_7 & Z_7 & 0 \\ Z_7 & Z_7 + Z_7^{-2} & Z_7^{-2} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} Z_1 Z_2^2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & Z_1 Z_2^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & Z_1^{-2} Z_2^{-1} \end{pmatrix}$$

where the product of the underlined middle three matrices is

$$\begin{pmatrix} Z_{12} Z_4 Z_3^2 Z_7 & 0 & 0 \\ Z_{12} Z_4 (Z_3^2 + Z_3^{-1}) Z_7 & Z_{12} Z_4 Z_3^{-1} Z_7 & 0 \\ (Z_{12} Z_4 Z_3^2 + (Z_{12} + Z_{12}^{-2}) Z_4 Z_3^{-1} + Z_{12}^{-2} Z_4^{-2} Z_3^{-1}) Z_7 & (Z_{12} + Z_{12}^{-2}) Z_4 Z_3^{-1} Z_7 + Z_{12}^{-2} Z_4^{-2} Z_3^{-1} (Z_7 + Z_7^{-2}) & Z_{12}^{-2} Z_4^{-2} Z_3^{-1} Z_7^{-2} \end{pmatrix}$$

The table of terms $\exp(\sum_{j=1}^{12} a_j \hat{x}_j)$ for $\text{Tr}_\Delta^\omega([W, s])$, together with $\alpha = a_7 + a_8 - a_2 - a_{12}$ and $\alpha' = a_{12} - a_7$, are recorded as before:

	$(1, 1)$	$(2, 1)_1$	$(2, 1)_2$	$(2, 2)$	$(3, 1)_1$	$(3, 1)_2$	$(3, 1)_3$	$(3, 1)_4$	$(3, 2)_1$	$(3, 2)_2$	$(3, 2)_3$	$(3, 2)_4$	$(3, 3)$
a_9	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	-2/3	-2/3	-2/3	-2/3	-2/3	-2/3	-2/3	-2/3	-2/3
a_8	2/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3
a_{12}	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	-2/3	-2/3	1/3	-2/3	-2/3	-2/3	-2/3
a_4	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	-2/3	1/3	1/3	-2/3	-2/3	-2/3
a_3	2/3	2/3	-1/3	-1/3	2/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3
a_7	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	-2/3	-2/3
a_1	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	-2/3
a_2	2/3	2/3	2/3	-1/3	2/3	2/3	2/3	2/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3
α	0	-1	-1	0	-1	-1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
α'	0	0	0	0	0	0	-1	-1	0	-1	-1	0	0

We should focus only on the cases when α or α' is negative. The sum of the relevant terms $\exp(\sum_{j=1}^{12} a_j^{(2)} \hat{x}_j^{(2)})$ for such cases are:

$$\begin{aligned} (2, 1)_1, (2, 1)_2 : & \exp(0\hat{x}_4^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_3^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_9^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_8^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_{12}^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_7^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_1^{(2)} + \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_2^{(2)}) \\ & + \exp(0\hat{x}_4^{(2)} + \frac{4}{3}\hat{x}_3^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_9^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_8^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_{12}^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_7^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_1^{(2)} + \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_2^{(2)}) \\ & = \exp(\frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_3^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_9^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_8^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_{12}^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_7^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_1^{(2)} + \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_2^{(2)}) (1 + e^{-c} \exp(\hat{x}_3^{(2)})), \\ (3, 1)_1, (3, 1)_2 : & \exp(0\hat{x}_4^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_3^{(2)} - \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_9^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_8^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_{12}^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_7^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_1^{(2)} + \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_2^{(2)}) \\ & + \exp(0\hat{x}_4^{(2)} + \frac{4}{3}\hat{x}_3^{(2)} - \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_9^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_8^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_{12}^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_7^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_1^{(2)} + \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_2^{(2)}) \\ & = \exp(\frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_3^{(2)} - \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_9^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_8^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_{12}^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_7^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_1^{(2)} + \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_2^{(2)}) (1 + e^{-c} \exp(\hat{x}_3^{(2)})), \\ (3, 1)_3, (3, 1)_4 : & \exp(0\hat{x}_4^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_3^{(2)} - \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_9^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_8^{(2)} - \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_{12}^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_7^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_1^{(2)} + \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_2^{(2)}) \\ & + \exp(\hat{x}_4^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_3^{(2)} - \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_9^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_8^{(2)} - \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_{12}^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_7^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_1^{(2)} + \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_2^{(2)}) \\ & = \exp(\frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_3^{(2)} - \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_9^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_8^{(2)} - \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_{12}^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_7^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_1^{(2)} + \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_2^{(2)}) (1 + e^{-c} \exp(\hat{x}_4^{(2)})), \\ (3, 2)_2, (3, 2)_3 : & \exp(0\hat{x}_4^{(2)} - \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_3^{(2)} - \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_9^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_8^{(2)} - \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_{12}^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_7^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_1^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_2^{(2)}) \\ & + \exp(\hat{x}_4^{(2)} - \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_3^{(2)} - \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_9^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_8^{(2)} - \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_{12}^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_7^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_1^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_2^{(2)}) \\ & = \exp(-\frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_3^{(2)} - \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_9^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_8^{(2)} - \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_{12}^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_7^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_1^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_2^{(2)}) (1 + e^{-c} \exp(\hat{x}_4^{(2)})). \end{aligned}$$

So, in view of eq.(4.2), for each $s = (\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2)$, we verified that $\nu_{v_4}^\omega \nu_{v_3}^\omega (\text{Tr}_\Delta^\omega([W, (\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2)]))$ is a \mathcal{Z} -Laurent polynomial. One can see by inspection that they are multiplicity-free.

Case ⑤. Note that $\text{Tr}_\Delta^\omega([W, s])$ is the image under Wl_Δ^ω of the $(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2)$ -th entry of the classical matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} Z_2 Z_1^2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & Z_2 Z_1^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & Z_2^{-2} Z_1^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} Z_7^2 & Z_7^2 + Z_7^{-1} & Z_7^{-1} \\ 0 & Z_7^{-1} & Z_7^{-1} \\ 0 & 0 & Z_7^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} Z_3 Z_4^2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & Z_3 Z_4^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & Z_3^{-2} Z_4^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} Z_{12} & 0 & 0 \\ Z_{12} & Z_{12} & 0 \\ Z_{12} & Z_{12} + Z_{12}^{-2} & Z_{12}^{-2} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} Z_{10} Z_{11}^2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & Z_{10} Z_{11}^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & Z_{10}^{-2} Z_{11}^{-1} \end{pmatrix}$$

where the product of the underlined middle three matrices is

$$\begin{pmatrix} (Z_7^2 Z_3 Z_4^2 + (Z_7^2 + Z_7^{-1}) Z_3 Z_4^{-1} + Z_7^{-1} Z_3^{-2} Z_4^{-1}) Z_{12} & (Z_7^2 + Z_7^{-1}) Z_3 Z_4^{-1} Z_{12} + Z_7^{-1} Z_3^{-2} Z_4^{-1} (Z_{12} + Z_{12}^{-2}) & Z_7^{-1} Z_3^{-2} Z_4^{-1} Z_{12}^{-2} \\ (Z_7^{-1} Z_3 Z_4^{-1} + Z_7^{-1} Z_3^{-2} Z_4^{-1}) Z_{12} & Z_7^{-1} Z_3 Z_4^{-1} Z_{12} + Z_7^{-1} Z_3^{-2} Z_4^{-1} (Z_{12} + Z_{12}^{-2}) & Z_7^{-1} Z_3^{-2} Z_4^{-1} Z_{12}^{-2} \\ Z_7^{-1} Z_3^{-2} Z_4^{-1} Z_{12} & Z_7^{-1} Z_3^{-2} Z_4^{-1} (Z_{12} + Z_{12}^{-2}) & Z_7^{-1} Z_3^{-2} Z_4^{-1} Z_{12}^{-2} \end{pmatrix}$$

The table of terms $\exp(\sum_{j=1}^{12} a_j \hat{x}_j)$ for $\text{Tr}_\Delta^\omega([W, s])$, together with $\alpha = a_7 + a_8 - a_2 - a_{12} = a_7 - a_2 - a_{12}$ and $\alpha' = a_5 + a_{12} - a_7 - a_{11} = a_{12} - a_7 - a_{11}$, are recorded as before:

	(1,1) ₁	(1,1) ₂	(1,1) ₃	(1,1) ₄	(1,2) ₁	(1,2) ₂	(1,2) ₃	(1,2) ₄	(1,3)	(2,1) ₁	(2,1) ₂	(2,2) ₁	(2,2) ₂	(2,2) ₃	(2,3)	(3,1)	(3,2) ₁	(3,2) ₂	(3,3)
a_2	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	-2/3	-2/3	-2/3	-2/3
a_1	2/3	2/3	2/3	2/3	2/3	2/3	2/3	2/3	2/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3
a_7	2/3	2/3	-1/3	-1/3	2/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3
a_3	1/3	1/3	1/3	-2/3	1/3	1/3	-2/3	-2/3	-2/3	1/3	-2/3	1/3	-2/3	-2/3	-2/3	-2/3	-2/3	-2/3	-2/3
a_4	2/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3
a_{12}	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	-2/3	-2/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	-2/3	-2/3	1/3	1/3	-2/3	-2/3
a_{10}	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	-2/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	-2/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	-2/3
a_{11}	2/3	2/3	2/3	2/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	2/3	2/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	2/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3
α	0	0	-1	-1	0	-1	-1	0	0	-1	-1	-1	-1	0	0	0	0	1	1
α'	-1	-1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0

We focus only on the cases when α or α' is negative. The sum of the relevant terms $\exp(\sum_{j=1}^{12} a_j^{(2)} \hat{x}_j^{(2)})$ for such cases are:

$$\begin{aligned} (1,1)_1, (1,1)_2 : & \exp\left(\frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_4^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_3^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_2^{(2)} + \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_1^{(2)} + \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_7^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_{12}^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_{10}^{(2)} + \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_{11}^{(2)}\right) \\ & + \exp\left(\frac{5}{3}\hat{x}_4^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_3^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_2^{(2)} + \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_1^{(2)} + \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_7^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_{12}^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_{10}^{(2)} + \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_{11}^{(2)}\right) \\ & = \exp\left(\frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_4^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_3^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_2^{(2)} + \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_1^{(2)} + \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_7^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_{12}^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_{10}^{(2)} + \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_{11}^{(2)}\right) (1 + e^{-c} \exp(\hat{x}_4^{(2)})), \\ (1,1)_3, (1,1)_4 : & \exp\left(\frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_4^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_3^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_2^{(2)} + \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_1^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_7^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_{12}^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_{10}^{(2)} + \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_{11}^{(2)}\right) \\ & + \exp\left(\frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_4^{(2)} + \frac{4}{3}\hat{x}_3^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_2^{(2)} + \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_1^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_7^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_{12}^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_{10}^{(2)} + \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_{11}^{(2)}\right) \\ & = \exp\left(\frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_4^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_3^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_2^{(2)} + \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_1^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_7^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_{12}^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_{10}^{(2)} + \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_{11}^{(2)}\right) (1 + e^{-c} \exp(\hat{x}_3^{(2)})), \\ (1,2)_2, (1,2)_3 : & \exp\left(-\frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_4^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_3^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_2^{(2)} + \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_1^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_7^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_{12}^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_{10}^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_{11}^{(2)}\right) \\ & + \exp\left(-\frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_4^{(2)} + \frac{4}{3}\hat{x}_3^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_2^{(2)} + \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_1^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_7^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_{12}^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_{10}^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_{11}^{(2)}\right) \\ & = \exp\left(-\frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_4^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_3^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_2^{(2)} + \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_1^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_7^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_{12}^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_{10}^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_{11}^{(2)}\right) (1 + e^{-c} \exp(\hat{x}_3^{(2)})), \\ (2,1)_1, (2,1)_2 : & \exp\left(\frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_4^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_3^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_2^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_1^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_7^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_{12}^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_{10}^{(2)} + \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_{11}^{(2)}\right) \\ & + \exp\left(\frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_4^{(2)} + \frac{4}{3}\hat{x}_3^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_2^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_1^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_7^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_{12}^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_{10}^{(2)} + \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_{11}^{(2)}\right) \\ & = \exp\left(\frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_4^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_3^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_2^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_1^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_7^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_{12}^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_{10}^{(2)} + \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_{11}^{(2)}\right) (1 + e^{-c} \exp(\hat{x}_3^{(2)})), \\ (2,2)_1, (2,2)_2 : & \exp\left(-\frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_4^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_3^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_2^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_1^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_7^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_{12}^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_{10}^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_{11}^{(2)}\right) \\ & + \exp\left(-\frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_4^{(2)} + \frac{4}{3}\hat{x}_3^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_2^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_1^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_7^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_{12}^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_{10}^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_{11}^{(2)}\right) \\ & = \exp\left(-\frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_4^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_3^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_2^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_1^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_7^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_{12}^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_{10}^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_{11}^{(2)}\right) (1 + e^{-c} \exp(\hat{x}_3^{(2)})). \end{aligned}$$

So, in view of eq.(4.2), for each $s = (\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2)$, we verified that $\nu_{v_4}^\omega \nu_{v_3}^\omega (\text{Tr}_\Delta^\omega([W, (\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2)]))$ is a \mathcal{Z} -Laurent polynomial. One can see by inspection that they are multiplicity-free.

Case ⑥. Note that $\text{Tr}_\Delta^\omega([W, s])$ is the image under Wl_Δ^ω of the $(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2)$ -th entry of the classical matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} Z_6 Z_5^2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & Z_6 Z_5^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & Z_6^{-2} Z_5^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} Z_7 & 0 & 0 \\ Z_7 & Z_7 & 0 \\ Z_7 & Z_7 + Z_7^{-2} & Z_7^{-2} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} Z_3 Z_4^2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & Z_3 Z_4^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & Z_3^{-2} Z_4^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} Z_{12}^2 & Z_{12}^2 + Z_{12}^{-1} & Z_{12}^{-1} \\ 0 & Z_{12}^{-1} & Z_{12}^{-1} \\ 0 & 0 & Z_{12}^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} Z_8 Z_9^2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & Z_8 Z_9^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & Z_8^{-2} Z_9^{-1} \end{pmatrix}$$

where the product of the underlined middle three matrices is

$$\begin{pmatrix} Z_7 Z_3 Z_4^2 Z_{12}^2 & Z_7 Z_3 Z_4^2 (Z_{12}^2 + Z_{12}^{-1}) & Z_7 Z_3 Z_4^2 Z_{12}^{-1} \\ Z_7 Z_3 Z_4^2 Z_{12}^2 & Z_7 Z_3 Z_4^2 (Z_{12}^2 + Z_{12}^{-1}) + Z_7 Z_3 Z_4^{-1} Z_{12}^{-1} & (Z_7 Z_3 Z_4^2 + Z_7 Z_3 Z_4^{-1}) Z_{12}^{-1} \\ Z_7 Z_3 Z_4^2 Z_{12}^2 & Z_7 Z_3 Z_4^2 (Z_{12}^2 + Z_{12}^{-1}) + (Z_7 + Z_7^{-2}) Z_3 Z_4^{-1} Z_{12}^{-1} & (Z_7 Z_3 Z_4^2 + (Z_7 + Z_7^{-2}) Z_3 Z_4^{-1} + Z_7^{-2} Z_3^{-2} Z_4^{-1}) Z_{12}^{-1} \end{pmatrix}$$

The table of terms $\exp(\sum_{j=1}^{12} a_j \hat{x}_j)$ for $\text{Tr}_\Delta^\omega([W, s])$, together with $\alpha = a_7 + a_8 - a_2 - a_{12} = a_7 + a_8 - a_{12}$ and $\alpha' = a_5 + a_{12} - a_7 - a_{11} = a_5 + a_{12} - a_7$, are recorded as before:

	(1,1)	(1,2) ₁	(1,2) ₂	(1,3)	(2,1)	(2,2) ₁	(2,2) ₂	(2,2) ₃	(2,3) ₁	(2,3) ₂	(3,1)	(3,2) ₁	(3,2) ₂	(3,2) ₃	(3,2) ₄	(3,3) ₁	(3,3) ₂	(3,3) ₃	(3,3) ₄
a_6	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	-2/3	-2/3	-2/3	-2/3	-2/3	-2/3	-2/3	-2/3	-2/3
a_5	2/3	2/3	2/3	2/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3
a_7	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	-2/3	1/3	1/3	-2/3	-2/3
a_3	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	-2/3
a_4	2/3	2/3	2/3	2/3	2/3	2/3	2/3	-1/3	2/3	-1/3	2/3	2/3	2/3	-1/3	-1/3	2/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3
a_{12}	2/3	2/3	-1/3	-1/3	2/3	2/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	2/3	2/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3
a_8	1/3	1/3	1/3	-2/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	-2/3	-2/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	-2/3	-2/3	-2/3	-2/3
a_9	2/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	2/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	2/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3	-1/3
α	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	-1	-1
α'	1	1	0	0	0	0	-1	-1	-1	-1	0	0	-1	-1	0	-1	-1	0	0

We focus only on the cases when α or α' is negative. The sum of the relevant terms $\exp(\sum_{j=1}^{12} a_j^{(2)} \hat{x}_j^{(2)})$ for such cases are:

$$\begin{aligned}
(2,2)_2, (2,2)_3 : & \exp(-\frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_4^{(2)} - \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_3^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_6^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_5^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_7^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_{12}^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_8^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_9^{(2)}) \\
& + \exp(\frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_4^{(2)} - \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_3^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_6^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_5^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_7^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_{12}^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_8^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_9^{(2)}) \\
& = \exp(-\frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_4^{(2)} - \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_3^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_6^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_5^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_7^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_{12}^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_8^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_9^{(2)}) (1 + e^{-c} \exp(\hat{x}_4^{(2)})), \\
(2,3)_1, (2,3)_2 : & \exp(-\frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_4^{(2)} - \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_3^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_6^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_5^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_7^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_{12}^{(2)} - \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_8^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_9^{(2)}) \\
& \exp(\frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_4^{(2)} - \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_3^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_6^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_5^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_7^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_{12}^{(2)} - \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_8^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_9^{(2)}) \\
& = \exp(-\frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_4^{(2)} - \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_3^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_6^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_5^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_7^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_{12}^{(2)} - \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_8^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_9^{(2)}) (1 + e^{-c} \exp(\hat{x}_4^{(2)})), \\
(3,2)_2, (3,2)_3 : & \exp(-\frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_4^{(2)} - \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_3^{(2)} - \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_6^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_5^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_7^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_{12}^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_8^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_9^{(2)}) \\
& + \exp(\frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_4^{(2)} - \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_3^{(2)} - \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_6^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_5^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_7^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_{12}^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_8^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_9^{(2)}) \\
& = \exp(-\frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_4^{(2)} - \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_3^{(2)} - \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_6^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_5^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_7^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_{12}^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_8^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_9^{(2)}) (1 + e^{-c} \exp(\hat{x}_4^{(2)})), \\
(3,3)_1, (3,3)_2 : & \exp(-\frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_4^{(2)} - \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_3^{(2)} - \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_6^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_5^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_7^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_{12}^{(2)} - \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_8^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_9^{(2)}) \\
& + \exp(\frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_4^{(2)} - \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_3^{(2)} - \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_6^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_5^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_7^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_{12}^{(2)} - \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_8^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_9^{(2)}) \\
& = \exp(-\frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_4^{(2)} - \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_3^{(2)} - \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_6^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_5^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_7^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_{12}^{(2)} - \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_8^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_9^{(2)}) (1 + e^{-c} \exp(\hat{x}_4^{(2)})), \\
(3,3)_3, (3,3)_4 : & \exp(-\frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_4^{(2)} - \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_3^{(2)} - \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_6^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_5^{(2)} - \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_7^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_{12}^{(2)} - \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_8^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_9^{(2)}) \\
& + \exp(-\frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_4^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_3^{(2)} - \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_6^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_5^{(2)} - \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_7^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_{12}^{(2)} - \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_8^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_9^{(2)}) \\
& = \exp(-\frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_4^{(2)} - \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_3^{(2)} - \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_6^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_5^{(2)} - \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_7^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_{12}^{(2)} - \frac{2}{3}\hat{x}_8^{(2)} - \frac{1}{3}\hat{x}_9^{(2)}) (1 + e^{-c} \exp(\hat{x}_3^{(2)})).
\end{aligned}$$

So, in view of eq.(4.2), for each $s = (\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2)$, we verified that $\nu_{v_4}^\omega \nu_{v_3}^\omega (\text{Tr}_\Delta^\omega([W, (\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2)]))$ is a \mathcal{Z} -Laurent polynomial. One can see by inspection that they are multiplicity-free.

This finishes Step 1' (hence also Step 2') of the previous subsection, and therefore completes our proof of Thm.4.1, the main theorem of the present paper. \blacksquare

5. CONSEQUENCES AND CONJECTURES

5.1. The compatibility of the quantum SL_3 -PGL $_3$ duality maps under changes of triangulations.

The main consequence and motivation of our main theorem, Thm.4.1, is the compatibility of the quantum SL_3 -PGL $_3$ duality map of [K20] under a change of ideal triangulation $\Delta \rightsquigarrow \Delta'$.

Theorem 5.1 (the compatibility of the quantum duality map under changes of triangulations). *Let \mathfrak{S} be a triangulable punctured surface. The family of quantum SL_3 -PGL $_3$ duality maps*

$$\mathbb{I}_\Delta^q : \mathcal{A}_{SL_3, \mathfrak{S}}(\mathbb{Z}^t) \rightarrow \mathcal{X}_\Delta^q$$

constructed in [K20, Thm.1.28, Thm.5.83] for each ideal triangulation Δ of \mathfrak{S} is compatible under the quantum coordinate change maps associated to changes of ideal triangulations. That is, if Δ and Δ' are ideal

triangulations of \mathfrak{S} , and $\Phi_{\Delta\Delta'}^q : \text{Frac}(\mathcal{X}_{\Delta'}^q) \rightarrow \text{Frac}(\mathcal{X}_{\Delta}^q)$ is the corresponding quantum coordinate change map (Def.3.7), then

$$\mathbb{I}_{\Delta}^q(\ell) = \Phi_{\Delta\Delta'}^q(\mathbb{I}_{\Delta'}^q(\ell)), \quad \forall \ell \in \mathcal{A}_{\text{SL}_3, \mathfrak{S}}(\mathbb{Z}^t).$$

We briefly recall from the construction in [K20] of this map \mathbb{I}_{Δ}^q . First, recall that in [K20] it is shown that $\mathcal{A}_{\text{SL}_3, \mathfrak{S}}(\mathbb{Z}^t)$ is in bijection with the set of all SL_3 -laminations ℓ in \mathfrak{S} that are *congruent*, i.e. all tropical coordinates $\mathbf{a}_v(\ell) \in \frac{1}{3}\mathbb{Z}$, $v \in \mathcal{V}(Q_{\Delta})$, are integers. For such an ℓ , write $\ell = \ell_1 \cup \ell_2 \cup \dots \cup \ell_n$, where each ℓ_i is represented by a single component SL_3 -web W_i in \mathfrak{S} , with weight k_i . If W_i is not a peripheral loop, then let $\mathbb{I}_{\Delta}^q(\ell_i) := (\text{Tr}_{\Delta}^{\omega}([W_i, \emptyset]))^{k_i}$, where \widehat{W}_i is a lift of W_i in $\mathfrak{S} \times \mathbf{I}$ at a constant elevation with upward vertical framing. If W_i is a peripheral loop, let $\mathbb{I}_{\Delta}^q(\ell_i) := [\prod_v \widehat{X}_v^{\mathbf{a}_v(\ell_i)}]_{\text{Weyl}}$. Finally, let $\mathbb{I}_{\Delta}^q(\ell) = \mathbb{I}_{\Delta}^q(\ell_1) \cdots \mathbb{I}_{\Delta}^q(\ell_n)$.

So Thm.4.1 is not sufficient to yield Thm.5.1, because of the peripheral loops; we need slightly more:

Proposition 5.2. *Let Δ be an ideal triangulation of a triangulable generalized marked surface \mathfrak{S} that has at least one puncture. Let W be a constant-elevation (with upward vertical framing) lift in $\mathfrak{S} \times \mathbf{I}$ of an oriented peripheral loop in \mathfrak{S} surrounding a puncture.*

- (1) $\text{Tr}_{\Delta}^{\omega}([W, \emptyset])$ is a sum of three positive Weyl-ordered balanced Laurent monomials in $\mathcal{Z}_{\Delta}^{\omega}$;
- (2) Among the three Laurent monomial terms of $\text{Tr}_{\Delta}^{\omega}([W, \emptyset]) \in \mathcal{Z}_{\Delta}^{\omega}$, the Laurent monomial of the highest partial ordering is $[\prod_{v \in \mathcal{V}(Q_{\Delta})} \widehat{X}_v^{\mathbf{a}_v(\pi(W))}]_{\text{Weyl}}$.
- (3) For any other ideal triangulation Δ' , one has

$$[\prod_{v \in \mathcal{V}(Q_{\Delta})} \widehat{X}_v^{\mathbf{a}_v(\pi(W))}]_{\text{Weyl}} = \Theta_{\Delta\Delta'}^{\omega}([\prod_{v \in \mathcal{V}(Q_{\Delta'})} (\widehat{X}'_v)^{\mathbf{a}'_v(\pi(W))}]_{\text{Weyl}}),$$

where $\mathbf{a}'_v(\pi(W))$ denote the tropical coordinates of $\pi(W)$ in terms of Δ' .

Proof of Prop.5.2. First, one can isotope W , within the class of constant-elevation SL_3 -webs in $\mathfrak{S} \times \mathbf{I}$, so that W meets $\Delta \times \mathbf{I}$ in a minimal number. Then, $\Delta \times \mathbf{I}$ divides W into left or right turn oriented edges living over triangles of Δ , where these arcs are either all left turns or all right turns (see e.g. [K20, Lem.4.11]). Assume that they are all left turns. The case of the all-right-turn can be taken care of with only a slight modification of the argument. Consider a split ideal triangulation $\widehat{\Delta}$ for Δ (as explained immediately after Prop.2.19), and assume that W still meets $\widehat{\Delta} \times \mathbf{I}$ in a minimal number, so that for each biangle B of $\widehat{\Delta}$, $W \cap (B \times \mathbf{I})$ consists of ‘parallel’ arcs (i.e. non-intersecting simple arcs at a same elevation). Apply a vertical isotopy to W , so that for each triangle \widehat{t} of $\widehat{\Delta}$, each of the components of $W \cap (\widehat{t} \times \mathbf{I})$ is at a constant elevation at all times throughout the isotopy, and that in the end, for each triangle \widehat{t} of $\widehat{\Delta}$, the components of $W \cap (\widehat{t} \times \mathbf{I})$ are at mutually distinct elevations. So, W would be in a ‘good position’ with respect to $\widehat{\Delta}$, and in fact in a ‘gool position’, in the sense used in [K20, §5.3]. Still, for each biangle B of $\widehat{\Delta}$, the projection of $W \cap (B \times \mathbf{I})$ in \mathfrak{S} consists of parallel arcs in B (i.e. non-intersecting simple arcs in B connecting the two sides of B), but a component of $W \cap (B \times \mathbf{I})$ may not be at a constant elevation. In fact, what matters is the ordering of the elevations of the components of $W \cap (\widehat{t} \times \mathbf{I})$ for each triangle \widehat{t} . Let t and u be two triangles of Δ sharing a side, so that the corresponding triangles \widehat{t} and \widehat{u} of $\widehat{\Delta}$ ‘share’ a common biangle B . We say that the ordering of components of the part of W living over \widehat{t} is *compatible* with that for \widehat{u} at this biangle B , if the ordering of elevations of the endpoints of $W \cap (\widehat{t} \times \mathbf{I})$ lying over a side of B and that of the endpoints of $W \cap (\widehat{u} \times \mathbf{I})$ lying over the other side of B correspond to each other by the connectedness relation by the arcs of $W \cap (B \times \mathbf{I})$. That is to say, the SL_3 -web $W \cap (B \times \mathbf{I})$ in $B \times \mathbf{I}$ can be isotoped by a vertical isotopy within the class of the SL_3 -webs in $B \times \mathbf{I}$ so that the components of $W \cap (B \times \mathbf{I})$ span mutually distinct elevation intervals. Another way to put it is that the element $[W \cap (B \times \mathbf{I})]$ of the SL_3 -skein algebra $\mathcal{S}^{\omega}(B)$ is given by the product of its constituent edges, each of which connects the two sides of B . It is proved in [CKKO20, Thm.1.2] that the ordering of elevations of the components of $W \cap (\widehat{t} \times \mathbf{I})$ for each triangle \widehat{t} can be chosen so that the above compatibility holds at all biangles of $\widehat{\Delta}$. Let’s use such an elevation ordering for each triangle \widehat{t} .

Consider the *junctures* $W \cap (\widehat{\Delta} \times \mathbf{I})$, and a *juncture-state* $J : W \cap (\widehat{\Delta} \times \mathbf{I}) \rightarrow \{1, 2, 3\}$. First, the state-sum formula of [K20, §5.3] yields

$$(5.1) \quad \text{Tr}_{\Delta}^{\omega}([W, \emptyset]) = \sum_J (\prod_B \text{Tr}_B^{\omega}([W \cap (B \times \mathbf{I}), J])) (\prod_{\widehat{t}} \text{Tr}_{\widehat{t}}^{\omega}([W \cap (\widehat{t} \times \mathbf{I}), J]))$$

where the sum is over all juncture-states J , the product \prod_B is over all biangles B of $\widehat{\Delta}$, and the product $\prod_{\widehat{t}}$ is over all triangles \widehat{t} of $\widehat{\Delta}$. Since W was put into a good (or a gool) position, for each \widehat{t} , $\text{Tr}_{\widehat{t}}^{\omega}([W \cap (\widehat{t} \times \mathbf{I}), J])$ is a product of $\text{Tr}_{\widehat{t}}^{\omega}([W_{\widehat{t};i}, J])$, where $W_{\widehat{t};1}, W_{\widehat{t};2}, \dots$ are components of $W \cap (\widehat{t} \times \mathbf{I})$, each of which is a left turn edge over \widehat{t} . Because of the elevation compatibility at each biangle B , we see that $\text{Tr}_B^{\omega}([W \cap (B \times \mathbf{I}), J])$ is a

product of $\mathrm{Tr}_B^\omega([W_{B;j}, J])$, where $W_{B;1}, W_{B;2}, \dots$ are components of $W \cap (B \times \mathbf{I})$, each of which is a simple edge over B connecting the two boundary walls of B . For each component $W_{B;j}$, by Prop.2.19(BQT2),

$$(5.2) \quad \mathrm{Tr}_B^\omega([W_{B;j}, J]) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } J \text{ assigns the same state values to the two endpoints of } W_{B;j}, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Lemma 5.3. *A juncture-state $J : W \cap (\widehat{\Delta} \times \mathbf{I}) \rightarrow \{1, 2, 3\}$ has a nonzero contribution to the sum in eq.(5.1) if and only if J is a constant juncture-state, i.e. assigns the same value to all junctures.*

This is essentially because the value of each $\mathrm{Tr}_t^\omega([W_{t;i}, J])$ equals the $(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2)$ -th entry of the matrix in eq.(2.3) of by Thm.2.18(QT2), where this matrix is upper triangular. The $(1, 1)$ -th entry is of the highest partial ordering, so the constant juncture-state with value 1 yields the highest term of $\mathrm{Tr}_\Delta^\omega([W, \emptyset])$. By the proof of [K20, Prop.4.15], which is the classical counterpart of the items (1) and (2) of the current proposition, we then obtain the items (1) and (2). In general, the quantum situation is more subtle and complicated than the classical situation, as the values of the biangle SL_3 quantum trace Tr_B^ω could be complicated, as they are essentially a Reshetikhin-Turaev invariant for the standard 3d representation of $\mathcal{U}_q(\mathfrak{sl}_3)$ [RT90], involving R-matrices. Here, the elevation compatibility of [CKKO20] allowed us to avoid such a complicated computation.

For the item (3), it suffices to show the statement in the case when $\Delta \rightsquigarrow \Delta'$ is a flip at an arc k . Let e be an arc of Δ that is different from k and that meets the peripheral loop $\pi(W)$. Suppose W is isotoped so that it satisfies the nice properties with respect to a split ideal triangulation $\widehat{\Delta}$ of Δ as above, i.e. in a good position and having the elevation ordering compatibility at biangles. Cut along e ; let \mathfrak{S}_e be the resulting surface, Δ_e and Δ'_e be the triangulations of \mathfrak{S}_e induced from Δ and Δ' , W_e be the SL_3 -web in \mathfrak{S}_E , obtained by this cutting process. Pick one point x in $W \cap (e \times \mathbf{I})$ (there can be two such points), and let x_1 and x_2 be the endpoints of W_e corresponding to x . For a state $s_e : \partial W_e \rightarrow \{1, 2, 3\}$ of W_e that is compatible with the original state $s : \partial W \rightarrow \{1, 2, 3\}$ of W , it must be that $s_e(x_1) = s_e(x_2)$. For each $\varepsilon \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, denote by $(\varepsilon, \varepsilon)$ the state s_e that assigns ε to x_1 and x_2 . By the cutting/gluing property (Thm.2.18(QT1)) we have

$$i_{\Delta, \Delta_e} \mathrm{Tr}_\Delta^\omega([W, \emptyset]) = \sum_{\varepsilon=1}^3 \mathrm{Tr}_{\Delta_e}^\omega([W_e, (\varepsilon, \varepsilon)]),$$

and in view of the relationship between the above equation and the state-sum formula for $\mathrm{Tr}_\Delta^\omega([W, \emptyset])$ in eq.(5.1), one can observe that the summand in eq.(5.1) corresponding to the constant juncture-state J with value ε is sent via i_{Δ, Δ_e} to the term $\mathrm{Tr}_{\Delta_e}^\omega([W_e, (\varepsilon, \varepsilon)])$ on the right hand side. Likewise for Δ' . Hence we have

$$i_{\Delta, \Delta_e} ([\mathrm{Tr}_\Delta^\omega([W, \emptyset])]_{\mathrm{high}}) = \mathrm{Tr}_{\Delta_e}^\omega([W_e, (1, 1)]), \quad i_{\Delta', \Delta'_e} ([\mathrm{Tr}_{\Delta'}^\omega([W, \emptyset])]_{\mathrm{high}}) = \mathrm{Tr}_{\Delta'_e}^\omega([W_e, (1, 1)]).$$

Note now (in the balanced fraction algebras)

$$\begin{aligned} i_{\Delta, \Delta_e} (\Theta_{\Delta \Delta'}^\omega [\mathrm{Tr}_{\Delta'}^\omega([W, \emptyset])]_{\mathrm{high}}) &= \Theta_{\Delta_e \Delta'_e}^\omega i_{\Delta', \Delta'_e} ([\mathrm{Tr}_{\Delta'}^\omega([W, \emptyset])]_{\mathrm{high}}) \quad (\because \text{Prop.3.28}) \\ &= \Theta_{\Delta_e \Delta'_e}^\omega \mathrm{Tr}_{\Delta'_e}^\omega([W_e, (1, 1)]) \\ &= \mathrm{Tr}_{\Delta_e}^\omega([W_e, (1, 1)]) \quad (\because \text{Thm.4.1}) \\ &= i_{\Delta, \Delta_e} ([\mathrm{Tr}_\Delta^\omega([W, \emptyset])]_{\mathrm{high}}). \end{aligned}$$

Hence it follows that $\Theta_{\Delta \Delta'}^\omega [\mathrm{Tr}_{\Delta'}^\omega([W, \emptyset])]_{\mathrm{high}} = [\mathrm{Tr}_\Delta^\omega([W, \emptyset])]_{\mathrm{high}}$. \blacksquare

Remark 5.4. *The proof of Prop.5.2 also yields an analogous result for peripheral arcs (Def.2.13) in \mathfrak{S} .*

Now, for a triangulable punctured surface \mathfrak{S} , by the construction of the quantum duality map \mathbb{I}_Δ^q , Thm.4.1 and Prop.5.2 together imply Thm.5.1. Thus, the quantum duality maps \mathbb{I}_Δ^q for all ideal triangulations Δ of a triangulable punctured surface \mathfrak{S} can be viewed as constituting a single quantum duality map

$$\mathbb{I}^q : \mathcal{A}_{\mathrm{SL}_3, \mathfrak{S}}(\mathbb{Z}^t) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathrm{tri}}^q(\mathcal{X}_{\mathrm{PGL}_3, \mathfrak{S}}),$$

where $\mathcal{O}_{\mathrm{tri}}^q(\mathcal{X}_{\mathrm{PGL}_3, \mathfrak{S}})$ stands for the ring of all elements that are quantum \mathcal{X} -Laurent for all triangulations Δ , i.e. the rings

$$\mathcal{O}_\Delta^q(\mathcal{X}_{\mathrm{PGL}_3, \mathfrak{S}}) := \bigcap_{\Delta'} \Phi_{\Delta \Delta'}^q(\mathcal{X}_{\Delta'}^q) \subset \mathcal{X}_\Delta^q \subset \mathrm{Frac}(\mathcal{X}_\Delta^q),$$

where $\bigcap_{\Delta'}$ is over all ideal triangulations Δ' ; note that $\mathcal{O}_\Delta^q(\mathcal{X}_{\mathrm{PGL}_3, \mathfrak{S}})$ for different triangulations are isomorphically identified through the (restrictions of) the maps $\Phi_{\Delta \Delta'}^q$. Recall the classical SL_3 - PGL_3 duality map

$$\mathbb{I} : \mathcal{A}_{\mathrm{SL}_3, \mathfrak{S}}(\mathbb{Z}^t) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{X}_{\mathrm{PGL}_3, \mathfrak{S}})$$

constructed in [K20], whose image forms a basis of $\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{X}_{\mathrm{PGL}_3, \mathfrak{S}})$. Sending each basis element $\mathbb{I}(\ell) \in \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{X}_{\mathrm{PGL}_3, \mathfrak{S}})$ to $\mathbb{I}^q(\ell) \in \mathcal{O}_{\mathrm{tri}}^q(\mathcal{X}_{\mathrm{PGL}_3, \mathfrak{S}})$, one obtains a deformation quantization map

$$\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{X}_{\mathrm{PGL}_3, \mathfrak{S}}) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathrm{tri}}^q(\mathcal{X}_{\mathrm{PGL}_3, \mathfrak{S}})$$

for the (Poisson) moduli space $\mathcal{X}_{\mathrm{PGL}_3, \mathfrak{S}}$ for a triangulable punctured surface \mathfrak{S} .

5.2. Future perspectives. We list some conjectures that are not mentioned in the introduction.

Conjecture 5.5. *Let \mathfrak{S} be a triangulable punctured surface. For each congruent SL_3 -lamination $\ell \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathrm{SL}_3, \mathfrak{S}}(\mathbb{Z}^t)$, the element $\mathbb{I}^q(\ell) \in \mathcal{O}_{\mathrm{tri}}^q(\mathcal{X}_{\mathrm{PGL}_3, \mathfrak{S}})$ belongs to $\mathcal{O}_{\mathrm{cl}}^q(\mathcal{X}_{\mathrm{PGL}_3, \mathfrak{S}})$, i.e. is quantum \mathcal{X} -Laurent for all cluster \mathcal{X} -seeds for $\mathcal{X}_{\mathrm{PGL}_3, \mathfrak{S}}$, not just for the seeds corresponding to ideal triangulations of \mathfrak{S} .*

In the present paper, we had a glimpse of Conjecture 5.5. Namely, our proof shows that this quantum Laurent property holds for the cluster \mathcal{X} -seeds sitting ‘in between’ the seeds for the ideal triangulations. Recall that the values $\mathrm{Tr}_{\Delta}^{\omega}([W, s])$ of the SL_3 -quantum trace stay being quantum \mathcal{Z} -Laurent in all the intermediate seeds connecting two ideal triangulations Δ and Δ' related by a flip. A priori, this does not guarantee the \mathcal{Z} -Laurentness of \mathcal{X} -Laurentness for all possible seeds. One possible expectation is that a quantum version of [S20, Lem.2.2] [GHK15, Thm.3.9] would hold, which would say that if a quantum \mathcal{X} -Laurent element for any chosen seed stays quantum \mathcal{X} -Laurent after all possible single mutations from this seed, then this element is universally quantum \mathcal{X} -Laurent. Then, what would remain to show is whether \mathbb{I}_{Δ}^q stays Laurent after mutating at a node lying in the interior of a triangle. Another direction of research related to Conjecture 5.5 is to extend the results of the present paper, as well as those of [K20], so that they incorporate more general kinds of ideal triangulations without the regularity assumption (Def.2.3), and flips among them; in particular, we would allow self-folded triangles, and maybe we should also take into consideration the ‘tagged’ ideal triangulations [FST08].

Since $\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{X}_{\mathrm{PGL}_3, \mathfrak{S}})$ coincides with the ring $\mathcal{O}_{\mathrm{cl}}(\mathcal{X}_{\mathrm{PGL}_3, \mathfrak{S}}) \cong \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{X}_{|Q_{\Delta}|})$ of all rational functions on $\mathcal{X}_{\mathrm{PGL}_3, \mathfrak{S}}$ that are regular (i.e. Laurent) for all cluster \mathcal{X} -seeds ([S20, Thm.1.1]), once one has Conjecture 5.5 then one can write the deformation quantization map as

$$\mathcal{O}_{\mathrm{cl}}(\mathcal{X}_{\mathrm{PGL}_3, \mathfrak{S}}) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathrm{cl}}^q(\mathcal{X}_{\mathrm{PGL}_3, \mathfrak{S}})$$

or solely in terms of the cluster \mathcal{X} -variety $\mathcal{X}_{|Q_{\Delta}|}$ associated to the mutation-equivalence class $|Q_{\Delta}|$ of the quiver Q_{Δ}

$$\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{X}_{|Q_{\Delta}|}) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}^q(\mathcal{X}_{|Q_{\Delta}|}).$$

After having Conjecture 5.5, the natural next step is:

Conjecture 5.6. *Let \mathfrak{S} be a triangulable punctured surface. The elements $\mathbb{I}^q(\ell)$, $\ell \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathrm{SL}_3, \mathfrak{S}}(\mathbb{Z}^t)$, form a basis of $\mathcal{O}_{\mathrm{cl}}^q(\mathcal{X}_{\mathrm{PGL}_3, \mathfrak{S}})$.*

A natural approach to the above conjecture is to try to compare the elements $\mathbb{I}^q(\ell)$ with the quantum theta basis functions of Davison-Mandel [DM19]; this approach is already mentioned in [K20], but an important tool for it that was missing in [K20] is precisely the main result of the present paper, Thm.4.1.

REFERENCES

- [AK17] D.G.L. Allegretti and H. Kim, *A duality map for quantum cluster varieties from surfaces*, Adv. Math. **306** (2017), 1164–1208. arXiv:1509.01567
- [BZ05] A. Berenstein and A. Zelevinsky, *Quantum cluster algebras*, Adv. Math. **195**(2) (2005) 405-455. arXiv:math.QA/0404446
- [BW11] F. Bonahon and H. Wong, *Quantum traces for representations of surface groups in $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{C})$* , Geom. Topol. **15** (2011), 1569–1615. arXiv:1003.5250
- [BW16] F. Bonahon and H. Wong, *Representations of the Kauffman bracket skein algebra I: invariants and miraculous cancellations*, Invent. Math. **204** (2016) 195–243. arXiv:1206.1638
- [CKKO20] S. Cho, H. Kim, H. Kim and D. Oh, *Laurent positivity of quantized canonical bases for quantum cluster varieties from surfaces*, Commun. Math. Phys. **373** (2020), 655-705. arXiv:1710.06217
- [C95] P.M. Cohn, *Skew Fields: Theory of General Division Rings*, Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications **57**, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1995.
- [DM19] B. Davison and T. Mandel, *Strong positivity for quantum theta bases of quantum cluster algebras*, arXiv:1910.12915
- [D21] D.C. Douglas, *Quantum traces for $\mathrm{SL}_n(\mathbb{C})$: the case $n = 3$* , arXiv:2101.06817
- [DS20a] D.C. Douglas and Z. Sun, *Tropical Fock-Goncharov coordinates for SL_3 -webs on surfaces I: construction*, arXiv:2011.01768
- [FaKa] L. D. Faddeev and R. M. Kashaev, *Quantum dilogarithm*, Modern Phys. Lett. **A9** (1994) 427–434
- [FG06] V.V. Fock and A.B. Goncharov, *Moduli spaces of local systems and higher Teichmüller theory*, Publ. Math. Inst. Hautes Études Sci. **103** (2006), 1–211. arXiv:math/0311149v4

- [FG09a] V.V. Fock and A.B. Goncharov, *Cluster ensembles, quantization and the dilogarithm*, Annales scientifiques de l'École Normale Supérieure, Serie 4, vol. **42**(6) (2009), 865–930.
- [FG09b] V. V. Fock and A. B. Goncharov, *The quantum dilogarithm and representations of the quantum cluster varieties*, Invent. Math. **175**(2) (2009) 223–286.
- [FST08] S. Fomin, M. Shapiro and D. Thurston, *Cluster algebras and triangulated surfaces. Part I: cluster complexes*, Acta Math. **201**(1) (2008), 83–146. arXiv:math/0608367
- [FS20] C. Frohman and A. Sikora, *$SU(3)$ -skein algebras and webs on surfaces*, arXiv:2002.08151
- [GS18] A.B. Goncharov and L. Shen, *Donaldson-Thomas transformations of moduli spaces of G -local systems*, Adv. Math. **327** (2018), 225–348. arXiv:1602.06479
- [GS19] A.B. Goncharov L. Shen, *Quantum geometry of moduli spaces of local systems and representation theory*, arXiv:1904.10491
- [GHK15] M. Gross, P. Hacking, and S. Keel, *Birational geometry of cluster algebras*, Algebraic Geometry **2**(2) (2015), 137–175. arXiv:1309.2573
- [GHKK18] M. Gross, P. Hacking, S. Keel, and M. Kontsevich, *Canonical bases for cluster algebras*, J. Am. Math. Soc. **31** no.2 (2018), 497–608. arXiv:1411.1394
- [H10] C. Hiatt, *Quantum traces in quantum Teichmüller theory*, Algebr. Geom. Topol. **10**(3) (2010), 1245–1283. arXiv:0809.5118
- [H20] V. Higgins, *Triangular decomposition of SL_3 skein algebras*, arXiv:2008.09419
- [KN11] R.M. Kashaev and T. Nakanishi, *Classical and quantum dilogarithm identities*, SIGMA Symmetry Integrability Geom. Methods Appl. **7** (2011), Paper 102, 29 pages. arXiv:1104.4630
- [K20] H. Kim, *SL_3 -laminations as bases for PGL_3 cluster varieties for surfaces*, arXiv:2011.14765v3
- [K21] H. Kim, *Phase constants in the Fock-Goncharov quantum cluster varieties*, Anal. Math. Phys. **11**, 2 (2021). arXiv:1602.00797
- [KLS18] H. Kim, T.T.Q. Lê and M. Son, *SL_2 quantum trace in quantum Teichmüller theory via writhe*, arXiv:1812.11628
- [KY20] H. Kim and M. Yamazaki, *Comments on exchange graphs in cluster algebras*, Exp. Math. **29**(1) (2020), 79–100. arXiv:1612.00145
- [K96] G. Kuperberg, *Spiders for Rank 2 Lie Algebras*, Commun. Math. Phys. **180** (1996), 109–151. arXiv:q-alg/9712003
- [L-F09] D. Labardini-Fragoso, *Quivers with potentials associated to triangulated surfaces, part II: arc representations*, arXiv:math.RT/0909.4100
- [L17] T.T.Q. Lê, *Quantum Teichmüller spaces and quantum trace map*, J. Inst. Math. Jussieu (2017), 1–43. arXiv:1511.06054
- [L18] T.T.Q. Lê, *Triangular decomposition of skein algebras*, Quantum Topol. **9** (2018), 591–632. arXiv:1609.04987
- [RT90] N.Y. Reshetikhin and V.G. Turaev, *Ribbon graphs and their invariants derived from quantum groups*, Commun. Math. Phys. **127**(1) (1990), 1–26.
- [S20] L. Shen, *Duals of semisimple Poisson-Lie groups and cluster theory of moduli spaces of G -local systems*, to appear in Int. Math. Res. Notices. arXiv:2003.07901
- [S01] A.S. Sikora, *SL_n -character varieties as spaces of graphs*, T. Am. Math. Soc. **35** no.7 (2001), 2773–2804. arXiv:math/9806016
- [S05] A.S. Sikora, *Skein theory for $SU(n)$ -quantum invariants*, Alg. Geom. Topol. **5** (2005), 865–897. arXiv:math/0407299
- [SW07] A.S. Sikora and B.W. Westbury, *Confluence theory of graphs*, Alg. Geom. Topol. **7** (2007), 439–478. arXiv:math/0609832
- [S20] M. Son, *Quantum coordinate change map for Chekhov-Fock square root algebras*, Master's thesis, Ewha Womans University, 2020.

Email address: `hyunkyukim@ewha.ac.kr`, `hyunkyu87@gmail.com`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, EWha WOMANS UNIVERSITY, 52 EWHAYEODAE-GIL, SEODAEMUN-GU, SEOUL 03760, REPUBLIC OF KOREA