Isomonodromic deformations along a stratum of the coalescence locus
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Abstract: We consider deformations of a differential system with Poincaré rank 1 at infinity and Fuchsian singularity at zero along a stratum of a coalescence locus. We give necessary and sufficient conditions for the deformation to be strongly isomonodromic, both as an explicit Pfaffian system (integrable deformation) and as a non-linear system of PDEs on the residue matrix \( A \) at the Fuchsian singularity. This construction is complementary to that of [10]. For the specific system here considered, the results generalize those of [20], by giving up the generic conditions, and those of [3], by giving up the Lidskii generic assumption. The importance of the case here considered originates from its possible implications in the study of strata of Dubrovin-Frobenius manifolds and \( F \)-manifolds.
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Notation. For an \( n \times n \) matrix \( A_k \), we denote the matrix entries by either \((A_k)_{ij}\) or \( A_{ij}^{(k)} \), where \( i,j \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \). We can partition \( A_k \) into \( s^2 \) blocks of dimension \( p_a \times p_b \), where \( a,b = 1, \ldots, s \) and \( p_1 + \ldots + p_s = n \). The block labelled by \( a,b \), of dimension \( p_a \times p_b \) will be denoted by \( A_{[a,b]}^{(k)} \).
1 Introduction

In the work [10], and in the related [9, 14, 15, 16, 17], we have studied an \( n \times n \) matrix differential system of the shape (1.1) below, with an irregular singularity at \( z = \infty \) and a Fuchsian one at \( z = 0 \), whose leading term at \( z \rightarrow \infty \) is a diagonal matrix \( \Lambda = \text{diag}(u_1, \ldots, u_n) \), whose eigenvalues vary in a polydisc of \( \mathbb{C}^n \). The polydisc contains a coalescence locus, where some eigenvalues merge, namely \( u_j = u_k \) for some \( j \neq k \). For this system, we have proved that a monodromy preserving deformation theory can be well defined (in an analytic way) with constant monodromy data on the whole polydisc, including the coalescence locus. This result, which generalizes the theory of Jimbo, Miwa and Ueno [20], is possible if the vanishing conditions \( A_{jk} \not= 0 \) hold when \( u_j = u_k \not= 0 \).

In this paper, we consider an \( n \)-dimensional differential system

\[
\frac{dY}{dz} = \left( \Lambda + \frac{A(\lambda)}{z} \right) Y, \quad \lambda = (\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_s) \in \mathbb{D} \subset \mathbb{C}^s,
\]

where \( \mathbb{D} \) is a polydisc and

\[
\Lambda = \lambda_1 I_{p_1} \oplus \cdots \oplus \lambda_s I_{p_s} := \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_1, \lambda_2, \ldots, \lambda_2, \ldots, \lambda_s, \ldots, \lambda_s)
\]

\[
I_{p_j} = p_j-\text{dimensional identity matrix, } p_1 + \cdots + p_s = n.
\]

We can think of \( \lambda \) as the parameters varying within a stratum of a coalescence locus, specified by \( p_1, \ldots, p_s \). We would like to establish the full isomonodromy deformation theory within this stratum.

The deformation considered here is complementary to that of [10], because it occurs within the prefixed stratum, while in [10] the deformation takes place in a domain containing the coalescence set, the latter being included in the range of deformation under specific vanishing conditions on \( A \). The problem of the present paper is therefore different from [10]: here \( A \) will be any matrix and we do not suppose that the entries of \( A \) corresponding to equal eigenvalues of \( \Lambda \) are zero. The deformation theory that we will develop cannot be deduced either from [10] or [20]. This problem deserves to be studied, because it may occur in specific cases of interest, for example in the study of sub-strata of Dubrovin-Frobenius manifolds or F-manifolds [12, 19, 24, 25].

In the sequel, it will be convenient to partition \( A \) into blocks \( A_{[i,j]}, i, j = 1, \ldots, s \), of dimension \( p_i \times p_j \), inherited from \( \Lambda \). We will work in the following analytic setting.

Assumption 1.

- The polydisc \( \mathbb{D} \) is sufficiently small so that, as \( \lambda \) varies in \( \mathbb{D} \), the Stokes rays defined in (1.2) below do not cross the half-lines \( \arg z = \tau + k\pi, k \in \mathbb{Z} \), where \( \tau \in \mathbb{R} \) is fixed, and called an admissible direction.

- \( A(\lambda) \) is holomorphic in \( \mathbb{D} \).

The Stokes rays in the assumption are the rays in the universal covering \( \mathcal{R} \) of \( \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0, \infty\} \) defined by

\[
\Re((\lambda_i - \lambda_j)z) = 0, \quad \Im((\lambda_i - \lambda_j)z) < 0, \quad z \in \mathcal{R}.
\]
In this paper, we establish the necessary and sufficient conditions for (1.1) to be strongly isomonodromic on the polydisc $\mathbb{D}$. The notion of “strong isomonodromy” is implicit in the seminal paper [20], meaning that all essential monodromy data (monodromy exponents, connection matrices, Stokes matrices) are independent of $\lambda$. The adjective “strong” was introduced in [14], to point out that a system may just be “weakly” isomonodromic, namely with constant monodromy matrices, but with possibly non-constant essential monodromy data.

In the isomonodromy theory of [20], several assumptions are made to assure that the differential system is generic: the eigenvalues of $A$ are not allowed to differ by integers (so $A$ is in particular diagonalizable), and $\Lambda$ has pairwise distinct eigenvalues.

In the paper [3], the isomonodromy deformation theory has been extended to rational connection with both Fuchsian and irregular singularities of any Poincaré rank, without several of the assumptions of [20]. The residue matrices at the Fuchsian singularities are not subject to restrictions, while the leading matrix at an irregular singularity can have any Jordan form, but with a prefixed Jordan type $\lambda_1^{n_1}\lambda_2^{n_2}\ldots\lambda_K^{n_K}$ (in a notation due to Arnol’d [2]). For example, in case of (1.1), the Jordan type is prefixed to be

$$\begin{bmatrix}
\lambda_1 & \cdots & \lambda_1 & \lambda_2 & \cdots & \lambda_2 & \cdots & \lambda_s & \cdots & \lambda_s
\end{bmatrix}$$

Besides the prefixed Jordan type, another important assumption of [3] is that the next subleading matrix (in our case $A$) at an irregular singularity must be Lidskii generic, according to definition 2.1 in [3]. In our case, this means that each diagonal block of $A$ (with block partition inherited from $\Lambda$) must have distinct and nonzero eigenvalues. Theorem 5.3 of [3] states that the deformation is isomonodromic (preserving a set of monodromy data, which include the Stokes matrices) if and only if a class of fundamental matrix solutions satisfy a certain Pfaffian system. This result generalizes theorem 3.1 of [20]. Moreover, [3] studies the generalization of the isomonodromic $\tau$-function.

As mentioned in the beginning, an extension of the isomonodromy deformation theory has been achieved in [10] for a system such as (1.1) when the Jordan type of the leading matrix $\Lambda$ changes within a polydisc of $\mathbb{C}^n$. In [10], $A$ is any, while

$$\Lambda = \text{diag}(u_1, \ldots, u_n)$$

has $n$ eigenvalues $u = (u_1, \ldots, u_n)$ varying in a polydisc containing a coalescence locus where $u_j = u_k$ for some $j \neq k$. The extension of [10] can be done under the condition that the entries $A_{jk}(u) \to 0$ for $u_j - u_k \to 0$ at coalescence locus is approached.

In this paper, the deformation parameters $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_s)$ are assumed to vary inside a stratum of the coalescence locus, namely $\Lambda$ has $s < n$ eigenvalues varying in the polydisc $\mathbb{D}$ specified before. In this sense, the Jordan type (1.3) of $\Lambda$ is fixed, as in [3]. Nevertheless, we drop any assumption on $A$, and we do not assume Lidskii generic conditions.

We mention that in [8] isomondormy deformations are defined for a system of type (1.1), with coefficients in the Lie algebra of an arbitrary complex algebraic group $G$. In the specific case we consider here the coefficients are $n \times n$ complex matrices, so that $G = GL_n(\mathbb{C})$. In this case, the assumptions of [8] require that $\Lambda$ is diagonal\(^1\) with a prefixed Jordan type (1.3),

\[^1\text{[8]}\text{ requires that } \Lambda \text{ is diagonalizable, so one can work in the base where it is diagonal.}\]
invariant by the deformation \( \lambda \), and the corresponding diagonal blocks of \( A \) are zero. It is to be noticed that the assumption \( A_{[k,k]} = 0, \forall k = 1, \ldots, s \) implies that theorem 3.3 and remark 3.3 of [8] for \( G = GL_n(\mathbb{C}) \) are immediately deducible from the main theorem of [10], starting from \( \Lambda = \text{diag}(u_1, \ldots, u_n) \) and considering the coalescence

\[
u = (u_1, \ldots, u_n) \mapsto (\lambda_1 \ldots \lambda_1 \lambda_2 \ldots \lambda_2 \ldots \lambda_s \ldots \lambda_s).
\]

In the present paper, no assumptions on the diagonal blocks \( A_{[k,k]} \) will be made, so that our results are not deducible from or reducible to theorem 3.3 and remark 3.3 of [8] (which, as said, are obtainable from the results of [10], which are complementary to the present paper).

It is also to be mentioned that the notion of isomonodromy in definition 3.2 of [8] requires that only the Stokes matrices are constant, while here we require constancy of a more stringent set of monodromy data, including the monodromy exponents and the central connection matrix.

**Results**

The main results of the paper are Theorems 6.1 and 6.2. Preliminarily to them, in Theorem 3.1 some results in the weakly isomonodromic case are given: system (1.1) is weakly isomonodromic with an isomonodromic fundamental matrix solution in Levelt form at \( z = 0 \) if and only if the latter satisfies a Pfaffian system whose \( \lambda \)-components are holomorphic in \( \mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{D} \). In this case, the monodromy exponents at \( z = 0 \) are constant. This fact is mainly based on [27].

Theorem 6.1 states that system (1.1) is strongly isomonodromic if and only if a fundamental matrix solution at \( z = 0 \) in Levelt form and the canonical solutions at \( z = \infty \) (defined in the paper) all satisfy the integrable Pfaffian system

\[
dY = \left( \Lambda + \frac{A}{z} \right) dz + \sum_{j=1}^s \left( zE_{p_j} + \tilde{\omega}_j(\lambda) \right) d\lambda_j Y,
\]

with

\[
\tilde{\omega}_j(\lambda) = \omega_j(\lambda) + \frac{\partial T(\lambda)}{\partial \lambda_j} \cdot T(\lambda)^{-1},
\]

where \( E_{p_j} := \partial \Lambda / \partial \lambda_j \), the matrix coefficients \( \omega_j(\lambda) \) are holomorphic in \( \mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{D} \) and univocally given in formula (6.2), while the block-diagonal matrix \( T = T_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus T_s \) is holomorphic invertible in \( \mathbb{D} \) and reduces to Jordan form the block-diagonal part of \( A(\lambda) \), namely

\[
T_k(\lambda)^{-1} A_{[k,k]}(\lambda) T_k(\lambda) = J_k.
\]

The second part of Theorem 6.1 also says that in the strong isomonodromic case, \( A \) satisfies the non-linear system

\[
dA = \left[ \sum_{j=1}^n \tilde{\omega}_j(\lambda) d\lambda_j, A \right]. \tag{1.4}
\]

The above (1.4) predicts that the block-diagonal part

\[
A_{[1,1]} \oplus \cdots \oplus A_{[s,s]}
\]
is constant. In particular, it has a constant Jordan form $J_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus J_s$. This fact is not immediately obvious and will be proved in the paper. It implies that isomonodromy deformations with constant $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{T}_0$ are always allowed, and in such case
\[
\tilde{\omega}_j(\lambda) = \omega_j(\lambda).
\]
All the other possible isomonodromic deformations are obtained with
\[
\mathcal{T}(\lambda) = \mathcal{T}_0 \mathcal{B}(\lambda),
\]
for any $\mathcal{B}(\lambda) = \mathcal{B}_1(\lambda) \oplus \cdots \oplus \mathcal{B}_s(\lambda)$ satisfying
\[
[\mathcal{B}_k(\lambda), J_k] = 0, \quad k = 1, \ldots, s.
\]
Therefore, for a given $A_0$ at $\lambda = \lambda_0 \in \mathbb{D}$, let $\mathcal{T}_0$ be the block-diagonal matrix such that
\[
\mathcal{T}_0^{-1} \cdot (A^{(0)}_{[1,1]} \oplus \cdots \oplus A^{(0)}_{[s,s]}) \cdot \mathcal{T}_0 = J_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus J_s.
\]
Then, there are several possible strong isomonodromy deformations $A(\lambda)$, having the same constant block-diagonal part $A^{(0)}_{[1,1]} \oplus \cdots \oplus A^{(0)}_{[s,s]}$, but different off-diagonal blocks $A_{i,j}(\lambda), 1 \leq i \neq j \leq s$, obeying equation (1.4) with the possible choices of $\mathcal{T}(\lambda) = \mathcal{T}_0 \mathcal{B}(\lambda)$. These different deformations are equivalent, since they are related by a $\lambda$-dependent gauge transformation, as will be explained after Theorem 6.1.

In the 3-dimensional case, when the only non-trivial case is $\Lambda = \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_2)$ (up to permutations), the existence of the above freedom in the coefficients $\tilde{\omega}_j$ implies the existence of the isomonodromy deformation with constant $A$. See Section 7.

Theorem 6.2 is the converse to the second part of Theorem 6.1. It says that system (1.1) is strongly isomonodromic if $A$ is not partially resonant (Definition 4.1) and satisfies the Frobenius integrable system (1.4), with
\[
\tilde{\omega}_j(\lambda) = \omega_j(\lambda) + \frac{\partial \Sigma(\lambda)}{\partial \lambda_j} \Sigma(\lambda)^{-1},
\]
where $\Sigma(\lambda)$ is a block-diagonal matrix holomorphically invertible on $\mathbb{D}$, which is arbitrary except for the integrability of (1.4).

The above theorems 6.1 and 6.2 generalize to the non-generic case (1.1) the strategy and the results of [20].

To conclude, we would like to make two general comments. The first is that the main difficulty to generalize [20] to non generic cases is to find a suitable representation for a class of fundamental matrix solutions (like the Levelt form at a Fuchsian singularity and the solutions having a canonical asymptotics in Stokes sectors), and especially to deal with the change of that representation when the Jordan type of the leading matrix at an irregular singularity changes, namely some eigenvalues merge. To our knowledge, this is an extremely difficult problem, which is far from being solved. In the literature, we either find attempts to deal with coalescences of eigenvalues with a change of Jordan type, but with suitable analyticity and semisimplicity.
assumptions, such as in the work [10], or the Jordan types are fixed such as in [3] and in the present paper.

The second comment is that there are two approaches in order to describe isomonodromy deformations of a differential system

\[ \frac{dY}{dz} = A(z, \lambda)Y, \tag{1.5} \]

where \( A(z, \lambda) \) is rational in \( z \) and analytic in a domain of \( \lambda \) (such as \( \mathbb{D} \) here). One approach starts by proving the existence of fundamental matrix solutions of (1.5), holomorphic in the deformation parameters (under certain assumptions) in the \( \lambda \)-domain, and characterized by a certain canonical form, such as Levelt form at Fuchsian singularities and canonical asymptotics at irregular ones. Then, one must show that these solutions satisfy a Pfaffian system

\[ dY = \omega Y, \tag{1.6} \]

with a specific \( \omega(z, \lambda) \), possibly determined by \( A(z, \lambda) \), if and only if the deformation is isomonodromic, namely preserves a certain class of monodromy data (such as monodromy matrices or essential monodromy data of the above mentioned solutions). This is the approach approach of [20] and the approach we mainly follow in our paper.

The other approach starts by assuming that we are given a Pfaffian system (1.6), satisfying the Frobenius integrability condition \( d\omega = \omega \wedge \omega \), and such that the \( dz \) component of \( \omega \) gives a differential system (1.5), namely

\[ \omega(z, \lambda)|_{\lambda \text{ fixed}} = A(z, \lambda)dz. \]

This implies that the monodromy matrices of a fundamental matrix solution \( Y(z, \lambda) \) of (1.6) are constant, so that system (1.5) is weakly isomonodromic. Then, this approach proceeds by showing if, depending on the specific \( \omega(z, \lambda) \), the Pfaffian system admits fundamental matrix solutions with a canonical structure, whose corresponding essential monodromy data are constant. This is, for example, the approach of [5, 6, 7, 27].

2 Preliminaries

It is a standard result [26, 1] that, for each fixed \( \lambda \), system (1.1) admits a fundamental solution with Levelt form at \( z = 0 \):

\[ Y^{(0)}(z, \lambda) := G^{(0)}(\lambda)\hat{Y}^{(0)}(z, \lambda)z^{D^{(0)}}z^{L^{(0)}(\lambda)}, \tag{2.1} \]

\[ J^{(0)} = D^{(0)} + S^{(0)}, \quad L^{(0)} = S^{(0)} + R^{(0)}, \]

where:

\[ \hat{Y}^{(0)}(z, \lambda) = I + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} F^{(0)}_k(\lambda)z^k \quad \text{is convergent for finite } |z|; \tag{2.2} \]
the matrix $J^{(0)}(\lambda)$ is a Jordan form of $A(\lambda)$; $D^{(0)}$ is diagonal with integer entries $d_1^{(0)}, ..., d_n^{(0)}$; the eigenvalues $\mu_1(\lambda), \cdots, \mu_n(\lambda)$ of $A(\lambda)$ are decomposed as $\mu_j(\lambda) = d_j^{(0)} + \rho_j^{(0)}(\lambda)$, with $0 \leq \Re \rho_j^{(0)} < 1$; $\text{diag}(S^{(0)}) = \text{diag}(\rho_1^{(0)}, ..., \rho_n^{(0)})$; the matrix $R^{(0)}$ is nilpotent, with entries 

$$(R^{(0)}(\lambda))_{ij} \neq 0 \text{ only if } \mu_i(\lambda) - \mu_j(\lambda) \in \mathbb{N}\setminus\{0\}.$$ 

The invertible matrix $G^{(0)}$ puts $A$ in Jordan form. In general, the dependence of $Y^{(0)}$ on $\lambda$ is not holomorphic in $\mathbb{D}$.

**Assumption 2.** $A(\lambda)$ is holomorphically similar to a Jordan form $J^{(0)}(\lambda)$ in $\mathbb{D}$, namely $G^{(0)}(\lambda)$ is holomorphically invertible and

$$J^{(0)}(\lambda) = G^{(0)}(\lambda)^{-1} A(\lambda) G^{(0)}(\lambda).$$

The matrix $A(\lambda)$ is said to be resonant at $\lambda \in \mathbb{D}$ if there exist $i \neq j \in \{1, ..., n\}$ such that $\mu_i(\lambda) - \mu_j(\lambda) \in \mathbb{Z}\setminus\{0\}$. If the eigenvalues do not depend on $\lambda$ in $\mathbb{D}$, we simply say that $A$ is resonant.

If there are no resonances, Assumption 2 guarantees that $Y^{(0)}$ can be taken holomorphic on $\mathcal{R} \times \mathbb{D}$. Otherwise, in addition to Assumption 2 we need to require that if $\mu_i(\lambda) - \mu_j(\lambda) = \ell_{ij} \in \mathbb{Z}\setminus\{0\}$ for some $\lambda$, then the resonance persists all over $\mathbb{D}$, namely

$$\mu_i(\lambda) - \mu_j(\lambda) = \ell_{ij} \in \mathbb{Z}\setminus\{0\} \quad \forall \lambda \in \mathbb{D}. \quad (2.3)$$

Then, holomorphy of (2.1) follows from the standard formal computation of a solution in Levelt form. The reason for (2.3) is that if it does not hold, then $R^{(0)}(\lambda)$ may have an extremely wild behaviour in $\lambda$.

## 3 Weak isomonodromic deformations

**Lemma 3.1 (Isospectrality).** Let $A(u)$ be holomorphic on $\mathbb{D}$. If (1.1) has for each $\lambda \in \mathbb{D}$ a fundamental matrix solution $Y(z; \lambda)$ whose monodromy $Y(z; \lambda) \longrightarrow Y(ze^{2\pi i}; \lambda) = Y(z; \lambda)M$, is the same for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{D}$ (i.e. $M$ is constant), then the eigenvalues of $A(\lambda)$ are constant on $\mathbb{D}$.

In particular, (2.3) holds in case of resonances. If moreover Assumption 2 holds, then a Levelt form $Y^{(0)}$ is holomorphic on $\mathcal{R} \times \mathbb{D}$.

Notice that in Lemma 3.1 it is not assumed that $Y(z; \lambda)$ depends holomorphically on $\lambda$.

**Proof.** There exists for each $\lambda$ an invertible connection matrix $C(\lambda)$ such that

$$Y(z; \lambda) = Y^{(0)}(z; \lambda)C(\lambda) = G^{(0)}(\lambda)\tilde{Y}^{(0)}(z, \lambda)z^{D^{(0)}(\lambda)}z^{L^{(0)}(\lambda)}C(\lambda).$$

By assumption, $M = C(\lambda)^{-1}e^{2\pi i L^{(0)}(\lambda)}C(\lambda)$ does not depend on $\lambda$, so the eigenvalues $\rho_j^{(0)}$ of $L^{(0)}$ are constant. Since $A(\lambda)$ is holomorphic, its eigenvalues $\mu_j(\lambda) = d_j^{(0)} + \rho_j^{(0)}$ are continuous. It follows that both the integers $d_j^{(0)}$ and the eigenvalues $\mu_j$ are constant. Clearly, (2.3) holds, so that holomorphy follows from the standard formal computation of (2.1) and (2.2). \qed
Definition 3.1. **System (1.1) is weakly isomonodromic in** $\mathbb{D}$ **if there exists a fundamental matrix solution** $Y^{\text{hol}}(z, \lambda)$ **depending holomorphically on** $(z, \lambda) \in \mathcal{R} \times \mathbb{D}$, **with** $\lambda$-independent monodromy matrix $M$, **defined by**

$$Y^{\text{hol}}(z, \lambda) \mapsto Y^{\text{hol}}(z, \lambda)M, \quad z \mapsto e^{2\pi i}.$$ 

**Proposition 3.1.** Let $A(u)$ be holomorphic in $\mathbb{D}$. **System (2.1) is weakly isomonodromic in** $\mathbb{D}$ **if and only if it is the z-component of an integrable Pfaffian system**

$$dY = \omega(z, \lambda)Y, \quad \omega(z, \lambda) = \left( \Lambda + \frac{A}{z} \right) dz + \sum_{j=1}^{s} \omega_j(z, \lambda) d\lambda_j. \quad (3.1)$$

with $\omega(z, \lambda)$ holomorphic in $\mathbb{C}\{0,\infty\} \times \mathbb{D}$, **satisfying the integrability condition**

$$dw = \omega \wedge \omega.$$ 

The proof is standard.

**Theorem 3.1.** Let $A(u)$ be holomorphic in $\mathbb{D}$. **System (1.1) is weakly isomonodromic in** $\mathbb{D}$ **with holomorphic fundamental matrix solution** $Y^{\text{hol}}$ **coinciding with a fundamental solution in Levelt form** $Y^{(0)}$, **if and only if**

the coefficients $\omega_j(z, \lambda)$ **are holomorphic in** $\mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{D}$.

In this case, the following facts hold.

- $D^{(0)}$ and $L^{(0)}$ **are constant**, or equivalently $J^{(0)}$ and $R^{(0)}$ **are constant**.
- $A(\lambda)$ **is holomorphically similar to** $J^{(0)}$ **through** $G^{(0)}(\lambda)$, **which is a fundamental matrix solution of**

$$dG = \sum_{j=1}^{s} \omega_j(0, \lambda) d\lambda_j G.$$ 

Notice that $\omega_j(z, \lambda)$ **may have isolated singularity in** $z = \infty$. The requirement $Y^{\text{hol}} = Y^{(0)}$ is equivalent to the requirement that $Y^{\text{hol}} = Y^{(0)}C$, **for** $C$ **constant invertible matrix**.

A remark on Assumption 2, which is not explicitly written in the statement of Theorem 3.1, is in order. **If (1.1) is weakly isomonodromic in** $\mathbb{D}$ **and we assume that a holomorphic fundamental matrix solution is** $Y^{(0)}$, **then Assumption 2 is a necessary condition, so it is automatically assumed by requiring that** $Y^{(0)}$ **is holomorphic**. Conversely, **if the coefficients** $\omega_j(z, \lambda)$ **are holomorphic in** $\mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{D}$, **then it follows from Proposition 3.2 below that** $A(\lambda)$ **is holomorphically similar to** $J^{(0)}$, **namely Assumption 2 is satisfied**.
3.1 Proof of Theorem 3.1

Theorem 3.1 follows from Propositions 3.2 and 3.3 below.

By its definition $D^{(0)}$ is locally constant (independent of $\lambda$) on subsets of $\mathbb{D}$. If it is not globally constant on $\mathbb{D}$ it is discontinuous, so that its differential $dD^{(0)}$ is not well defined. We will sometimes write $dD^{(0)} = 0$ with abuse of notation to shortly mean that $D^{(0)}$ is constant on the whole $\mathbb{D}$.

**Proposition 3.2.** Let $A(u)$ be holomorphic in $\mathbb{D}$ and let (1.1) be the $z$-component of an integrable Pfaffian system (3.1) whose coefficients $\omega_j(z, \lambda)$ are holomorphic in $\mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{D}$. Then, there is a fundamental matrix solution $Y^{(0)}(z, \lambda)$ of (3.1) in Levelt form (2.1), with

$$dD^{(0)} = dL^{(0)} = 0, \quad \text{or equivalently} \quad dJ^{(0)} = dR^{(0)} = 0. \quad (3.2)$$

Moreover, the matrix $A(\lambda)$ is holomorphically similar to $J^{(0)}$ through $G^{(0)}(\lambda)$, which is a fundamental matrix solution of

$$dG = \sum_{j=1}^{a} \omega_j(0, \lambda)d\lambda_j \ G.$$  

*Proof.* Proposition 3.2 is a particular case of the main results of [27] on fundamental matrix solutions of Pfaffian systems at a logarithmic (Fuchsian) singularity. □

The converse of the above is the following

**Proposition 3.3.** Let $A(u)$ be holomorphic in $\mathbb{D}$ and let Assumption 2 hold.

a) Suppose that (1.1) is weakly isomonodromic. If there is a fundamental matrix solution of (3.1) in Levelt form $Y^{(0)}(z, \lambda)$, then the coefficients $\omega_j(z, \lambda)$ of (3.1) are holomorphic in $\mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{D}$ and (3.2) holds.

b) Conversely, if system (1.1) has a fundamental solution $Y^{(0)}(z, \lambda)$ in Levelt form (2.1) such that (3.2) holds, then the system is weakly isomonodromic, and the corresponding Pfaffian system (3.1) has coefficients $\omega_j(z, \lambda)$ holomorphic in $\mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{D}$.

In both cases a) and b), $G^{(0)}$ is a fundamental matrix solution of

$$dG = \sum_{j=1}^{a} \omega_j(0, \lambda)d\lambda_j \ G.$$  

*Proof.* a) Being (1.1) weakly isomonodromic, there is an isomonodromic $Y^{\text{hol}}(z, \lambda)$, with constant monodromy matrix $M$, satisfying (3.1). By Lemma 3.1, a solution $Y^{(0)}(z, \lambda)$ of (1.1) exists holomorphic in $\mathcal{R} \times \mathbb{D}$, with

$$D^{(0)} \text{ constant.}$$
By the assumption in a), $Y(0)$ also satisfies (3.1). Being solutions of (1.1), $Y^{\text{hol}}$ and $Y(0)$ are related by a holomorphic connection matrix $C(\lambda)$:
\[
Y^{\text{hol}}(z, \lambda) = Y(0)(z, \lambda)C(\lambda).
\]
Since both $dY^{\text{hol}} = \omega Y^{\text{hol}}$ and $dY(0) = \omega Y(0)$ hold, then
\[
dC = 0.
\]
Let us rewrite
\[
Y^{\text{hol}}(z, \lambda) = Y(0)(z, \lambda)C = G^{(0)}(\lambda)Y(0)(z, \lambda)z^{D^{(0)}(0) - 1}Cz^{L^{(0)}(0)},
\]
\[
L^{(0)}(\lambda) := C^{-1} L^{(0)}(\lambda) C.
\]
Since $dM = d(\exp\{2\pi i L^{(0)}\}) = 0$ by assumption, we have $dL^{(0)} = 0$, and then
\[
dL^{(0)} = 0.
\]
Therefore, we find
\[
\omega = dY^{\text{hol}} \cdot (Y^{\text{hol}})^{-1} = dY(0) \cdot (Y(0))^{-1}
\]
\[
= d(G^{(0)}Y(0)) \cdot (G^{(0)}Y(0))^{-1} + G^{(0)}Y(0) \frac{D^{(0)}(0) + z^{D^{(0)}(0)} L^{(0)}(0) z^{-D^{(0)}(0)}}{z} (G^{(0)}Y(0))^{-1} dz
\]
Now, the definition of $D^{(0)}$ and $L^{(0)}$ implies that $D^{(0)} + z^{D^{(0)}(0)} L^{(0)}(0) z^{-D^{(0)}(0)}$ is holomorphic at $z = 0$ and
\[
\lim_{z \to 0} (D^{(0)} + z^{D^{(0)}(0)} L^{(0)}(0) z^{-D^{(0)}(0)}) = J^{(0)},
\]
so that
\[
\omega = dG^{(0)} \cdot (G^{(0)})^{-1} + \text{reg}(z, \lambda) + \left( A(\lambda) \frac{1}{z} + \text{reg}_1(z, \lambda) \right) dz.
\]
Here
\[
\text{reg}(z, \lambda) = O(z), \text{ for } z \to 0
\]
is a 1-form in $dz$ and $d\lambda_1, ..., d\lambda_s$, holomorphic in $\mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{D}$. Moreover, $\text{reg}_1(z, \lambda)$ is a holomorphic matrix in $\mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{D}$ with behaviour
\[
\text{reg}_1(z, \lambda) = O(1), \text{ for } z \to 0.
\]
We conclude that
\[
\omega = \sum_{j=1}^{s} \omega_j(z, \lambda) d\lambda_j + \left( A(\lambda) \frac{1}{z} + \text{reg}_1(z, \lambda) \right) dz,
\]
where both $\text{reg}_1(z, \lambda)$ and the matrices $\omega_j(z, \lambda)$ are holomorphic in $\mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{D}$, of order $O(1)$ for $z \to 0$. In particular,
\[
dG^{(0)} \cdot (G^{(0)})^{-1} = \sum_{j=1}^{s} \omega_j(0, z) d\lambda_j.
\]
b) Suppose that $dD(0) = dL(0) = 0$, so that for $z \mapsto ze^{2\pi i}$ the monodromy $Y^{(0)} \mapsto Y^{(0)}e^{2\pi i L(0)}$ is constant. This implies that Lemma 3.1 holds, so that $Y^{(0)}(z, \lambda)$ is holomorphic in $\mathcal{R} \times \mathbb{D}$. We prove that $Y^{(0)}$ satisfies a Pfaffian system. We define

$$\omega(z, \lambda) := dY^{(0)}(z, \lambda) \cdot (Y^{(0)}(z, \lambda))^{-1}.$$ 

This is single valued with respect to $z$, because the monodromy of $Y^{(0)}$ is constant. The structure of $\omega(z, \lambda) = \omega_0(z, \lambda)dz + \sum_{j=1}^s \omega_j(z, \lambda) d\lambda_j$ is computable from (2.1):

$$dY^{(0)} \cdot (Y^{(0)})^{-1} =$$

$$= dG^{(0)} \cdot G^{(0)} + G^{(0)} d\hat{Y}^{(0)} \cdot (G^{(0)} \hat{Y}^{(0)})^{-1} + G^{(0)} \hat{Y}^{(0)} \frac{D^{(0)} + z^{-D^{(0)}} L^{(0)} z^{-D^{(0)}} (G^{(0)} \hat{Y}^{(0)})^{-1}}{z}$$

$$= dG^{(0)} \cdot G^{(0)} + \text{reg}(z, \lambda) + \left( \frac{A_1}{z} + \text{reg}_1(z, \lambda) \right) dz.$$ 

In the last step, we have used (2.2) and (3.3). Here $\text{reg}(z, \lambda)$ stands for a matrix valued $1$-form in the $d\lambda_j$’s, holomorphic in $\mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{D}$, and of order $O(z) \to 0$ as $z \to 0$, while $\text{reg}_1(z, \lambda)$ is a matrix holomorphic in $\mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{D}$ of order $O(1)$ as $z \to 0$ (and we know that it must be $\Lambda$). In conclusion, we have found that

$$\sum_{j=1}^s \omega_j(z, \lambda) d\lambda_j := dG^{(0)} \cdot G^{(0)} + \text{reg}(z, \lambda),$$

and in particular $dG^{(0)} \cdot (G^{(0)})^{-1} = \sum_{j=1}^s \omega_j(0, \lambda) d\lambda_j$. 

\[\Box\]

4 Canonical solutions of (1.1) at $z = \infty$

Let us partition $A$ in blocks $A_{[i, j]}$, $i, j = 1, \ldots, s$, of dimension $p_i \times p_j$, inherited from $\Lambda$. Let

$$\mathcal{T}(\lambda) = \mathcal{T}_1(\lambda) \oplus \cdots \oplus \mathcal{T}_s(\lambda),$$

be a block diagonal matrix such that

$$\mathcal{T}_k(\lambda)^{-1} A_{[k, k]}(\lambda) \mathcal{T}_k(\lambda) = J_k(\lambda) \quad \text{Jordan form, } \quad k = 1, \ldots, s. \quad (4.1)$$

It has structure $\mathcal{T}_k(\lambda) = \mathcal{T}_k^0(\lambda) \mathcal{B}_k(\lambda)$, where $\mathcal{T}_k^0(\lambda)$ is a chosen matrix satisfying (4.1) and $\mathcal{B}_k(\lambda)$ is any matrix such that $[\mathcal{B}_k, J_k] = 0$.

Assumption 3. $A_{[1, 1]}(\lambda) \oplus \cdots \oplus A_{[s, s]}(\lambda)$ is holomorphically reducible to Jordan form

$$J(\lambda) = J_1(\lambda) \oplus \cdots \oplus J_s(\lambda).$$

This means that each $\mathcal{T}_k(\lambda)$ is holomorphic on $\mathbb{D}$, and so is each $J_k(\lambda)$.

We can arrange each $J_k$ into $h_k \leq p_k$ Jordan blocks $J_{1(k)}^{(k)}$, ..., $J_{h_k(k)}^{(k)}$

$$J_k = J_{1(k)}^{(k)} \oplus \cdots \oplus J_{h_k(k)}^{(k)}. \quad (4.2)$$
Each block $J_j^{(k)}$, $1 \leq j \leq h_k$, has dimension $r_j \times r_j$, with $r_j \geq 1$, $r_1 + \cdots + r_h = p_k$. Each $J_j^{(k)}$ has only one eigenvalue $\mu_j^{(k)}$, with structure,

$$J_j^{(k)}(\lambda) = \mu_j^{(k)}(\lambda)I_{r_j} + H_{r_j}, \quad I_{r_j} = r_j \times r_j \text{ identity matrix},$$

$$H_{r_j} = 0 \text{ if } r_j = 1, \quad H_{r_j} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & \cdots & \cdots & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & \ddots & \ddots & \cdots & \cdots & \ddots & \ddots \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots \\ 0 & 1 & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots \end{bmatrix} \text{ if } r_j \geq 2.$$  

Note that $\mu_1^{(k)}, \ldots, \mu_{h_k}^{(k)}$ are not necessarily distinct. The decomposition $\mu_j^{(k)} = d_j^{(k)} + \rho_j^{(k)}$, with $d_j^{(k)} \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $0 \leq \Re \rho_j^{(k)} < 1$, induces the decomposition

$$J_k = D_k + S_k, \quad k = 1, \ldots, s. \quad (4.3)$$

where $D_k$ is diagonal with eigenvalues $d_j^{(k)}$ and $S_k$ is Jordan with eigenvalues $\rho_j^{(k)}$. We let

$$D := D_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus D_s, \quad S := S_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus S_s \quad \text{so that } J = D + S.$$

If Assumption 3 holds, the gauge

$$Y(z, \lambda) = T(\lambda) \hat{X}(z, \lambda)$$

transforms system (1.1) into

$$\frac{d\hat{X}}{dz} = \left( \Lambda + \frac{A(\lambda)}{z} \right) \hat{X}, \quad A := T^{-1}AT \equiv \begin{pmatrix} J_1 & A_{[1,2]} & \cdots & A_{[1,s]} \\ A_{[2,1]} & J_2 & \cdots & A_{[2,s]} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ A_{[s,1]} & A_{[s,2]} & \cdots & J_s \end{pmatrix} \quad (4.4)$$

We can then apply to (4.4) the computations of section 4.1 of [10], which allow to find formal solutions of (1.1) depending holomorphically on $\lambda \in \mathbb{D}$, with structure

$$Y_F(z, \lambda) = T(\lambda) \left( I + \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} F_j(\lambda) z^{-j} \right) z^D(\lambda) z^L(\lambda) e^{\Lambda z}. \quad (4.5)$$

Here

$$L := L_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus L_s, \quad L_k := S_k + R_k, \quad R_k \text{ is nilpotent}. \quad (4.6)$$

Each $R_k$ has possibly non zero blocks

$$[R_k]_{\text{block } a,b} \neq 0 \quad \text{only if} \quad \mu_b^{(k)}(\lambda) - \mu_a^{(k)}(\lambda) = \ell_{ba} \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}, \quad a \neq b = 1, \ldots, h_k. \quad (4.7)$$

The diagonal matrix $D(\lambda)$ is locally constant, from its very definition, and may have discrete jumps as $\lambda$ varies in $\mathbb{D}$. The computation of the $F_k(\lambda)$ and $R = R_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus R_s$ follows exactly the procedure of proposition 4.1 of [10].
In case there are no resonances in $A_{[k,k]}(\lambda)$, then $R_k(\lambda) = 0$. If there are no resonances in all the blocks $A_{[k,k]}$, $\forall k = 1, \ldots, s$, then
\[ R = 0 \quad \implies \quad L(\lambda) = S(\lambda), \]
and
\[ Y_F(z, \lambda) = T(\lambda)(I + \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} F_j(\lambda)z^{-j})z^{D(\lambda)}e^{\lambda z} = T(\lambda)(I + \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} F_j(\lambda)z^{-j})z^{J(\lambda)}e^{\lambda z}. \]

Then, by Assumption 3, $Y_F(z, \lambda)$ depends holomorphically on $\lambda$.

In case of resonance of some $A_{[k,k]}$, a sufficient condition for the $F_j(\lambda)$'s and $L(\lambda)$ to depend holomorphically on $\lambda$ is that when it happens that $\mu_{p_{kq}}(\lambda) = \ell_{ba} \in \mathbb{N}\setminus\{0\}$ for some value of $\lambda$, then the resonance persists all over $\mathbb{D}$, namely
\[ \mu_{b_{kq}}(\lambda) - \mu_{a_{kq}}(\lambda) = \ell_{ba} \in \mathbb{N}\setminus\{0\} \quad \forall \lambda \in \mathbb{D}. \quad (4.8) \]

In this case, being $D$ locally constant in $\mathbb{D}$, $Y_F(z, \lambda)$ locally depends holomorphically on $\lambda$.

**Definition 4.1.** In the terminology introduced in [22], if there exists $k$ such that $A_{[k,k]}$ is resonant, we say that $A$ has a partial resonance.

A formal solution with given $T$, $L$, $D$ and $\Lambda$ is uniquely determined only if all the matrices $A_{[1,1]}(\lambda), \ldots, A_{[s,s]}(\lambda)$ are non-resonant (see corollary 4.1 of [10]).

**Remark 4.1.** In case $\Lambda = \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_n)$ has pairwise distinct eigenvalues, then
\[ Y_F(z, \lambda) = T(\lambda)(I + \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} F_j(\lambda)z^{-j})z^{\text{diag}(A(\lambda))}e^{\lambda z}, \]
and $T(\lambda)$ is an arbitrary invertible diagonal matrix. One can choose it to be the identity matrix.

**Stokes Matrices**

Consider an admissible direction $\tau$ as in Assumption 1 and the following $\lambda$-independent sectors in $\mathcal{R}$
\[ \mathcal{S}_\nu : \quad (\tau + (\nu - 1)\pi) - \delta < \arg z < (\tau + \nu \pi) + \delta, \quad \nu \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad \delta > 0. \]

If Assumption 1 holds, there is a sufficiently small $\delta$ such that $\mathcal{S}_\nu \cap \mathcal{S}_{\nu+1}$ does not contain Stokes rays as $\lambda$ varies in $\mathbb{D}$. From [23], we know that to a prefixed formal solution $Y_F(z, \lambda)$ there correspond actual solutions satisfying
\[ Y_\nu(z, \lambda) = T(\lambda)\tilde{Y}_\nu(z, \lambda)z^{D(\lambda)}e^{\lambda z}, \quad (4.9) \]
\[ \tilde{Y}_\nu(z, \lambda) \sim I + \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} F_j(\lambda)z^{-j}, \quad z \to \infty \text{ in } \mathcal{S}_\nu. \quad (4.10) \]
For short, we will improperly write

\[ Y_\nu(z, \lambda) \sim Y_F(z, \lambda), \quad z \to \infty \text{ in } S_\nu. \]

They are uniquely determined by the above asymptotic behaviour (as proved in theorem 6.2 of [10]). When Assumption 3 and (4.8) hold, they are holomorphic in \( \mathcal{R} \times \mathbb{D} \). In this case, holomorphic Stokes matrices \( S_\nu(\lambda) \) are defined by

\[ Y_{\nu+1}(z, \lambda) = Y_\nu(z, \lambda)S_\nu(\lambda). \]

## 5 More on the Levelt form

This technical section introduces some details on fundamental matrix solutions in Levelt form, needed especially for the proof in Appendix 2.

Consider a \( N \times N \) system \( Y' = A(z)Y \), such that \( A(z) \) has a Fuchsian singularity in \( z = a \), for \( a \in \mathbb{C} \), or in \( z = \infty \). The residue matrix of \( A(z) \) at \( z = a \) (or \( z = \infty \)) has a Jordan form

\[ J = J_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus J_r, \]

with

\[ J_j = \mu_j I_{m_j} + H_{m_j}, \quad m_1 + \cdots + m_r = N, \]

\[ H_{m_j} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \]

if \( m_j \geq 2 \).

We can arrange the Jordan form so that the eigenvalues \( \mu_1, \ldots, \mu_r \) of \( J \) have real parts forming a non-increasing sequence if \( z = a \) is the singularity:

\[ \Re \mu_1 \geq \Re \mu_2 \geq \cdots \geq \Re \mu_r; \tag{5.1} \]

or a non-decreasing sequence in case \( z = \infty \) is the singularity:

\[ \Re \mu_1 \leq \Re \mu_2 \leq \cdots \leq \Re \mu_r. \tag{5.2} \]

We also write \( \mu_j = \rho_j + d_j \), with \( 0 \leq \Re \rho_i < 1 \) and \( d_j \in \mathbb{Z} \), and

\[ J = D + S, \]

where \( D \) is the diagonal matrix of integers \( d_j \).

The differential system can be reduced to normal form by a standard procedure [26], and this allows to find a fundamental matrix solution in Levelt form

\[ Y(z) = \mathcal{G}(\zeta)\zeta^D \zeta^L, \]

where \( \zeta = z - a \) if \( a \) is the singularity, or \( \zeta = z \) if \( \infty \) is the singularity. Here, \( \mathcal{G}(\zeta) \) is holomorphic at \( z = a \) (or at \( z = \infty \)). In case the matrix coefficient of the differential system is holomorphic
only in a sector centered at the singularity, and admits there an asymptotic expansion, then \( G(\zeta) \) is holomorphic in that sector, with asymptotic expansion there [26]. Moreover, the monodromy exponent \( L \) is

\[
L = S + R,
\]

where the matrix \( R \) is nilpotent and obtained by the formal computation of the normal form.

Consider the block partition of \( R \) inherited from \( J \). For the singularity \( z = a \), it possibly has a non-trivial block in position \((i, j)\), with \( 1 \leq i \neq j \leq r \), if \( \mu_i - \mu_j = d_i - d_j \geq 1 \) is integer. For the singularity \( z = \infty \), \( R \) possibly has a non-trivial block in position \((j, i)\) if \( \mu_i - \mu_j = d_i - d_j \geq 1 \) is integer. It follows from the ordering (5.1) or (5.2) that \( R \) only has possibly non zero blocks in the upper triangular part of its block partition (\( R \) is upper triangular if \( J \) is diagonal). The diagonal blocks of \( R \) are zero (the diagonal is zero if \( J \) is diagonal).

**Examples.** The solution (2.1) is an example for \( a = 0 \). The solutions \( Y_\nu(z, \lambda) \) in (4.9) contains the matrix factor \( T(\lambda)Y_\nu(z, \lambda)z^{D(\lambda)}z^{L(\lambda)} \), which is an example with \( \zeta = z \) and \( G(\zeta) \) holomorphic at \( z = \infty \) in a sector \( S_\nu \): indeed, it is a fundamental solution in Levelt form for the Fuchsian system (4.1) at \( z = \infty \) of the paper [10].

Notice once more that, with the given ordering (5.1) or (5.2), for \( 1 \leq i < j \leq r \) we have \( \mu_i \neq \mu_j \) and \( \rho_i = \rho_j \) whenever \( \mu_i - \mu_j = d_i - d_j \neq 0 \) is a non-zero integer, and correspondingly \( R \) possibly has a non-zero block in position \((i, j)\). Therefore, possibly acting by a permutation \( L \mapsto P^{-1}LP \) if necessary (which means changing \( Y \mapsto YP \) by a permutation matrix \( P \)), we can always do the above construction in such a way that \( L \) admits another partition into blocks

\[
L = L_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus L_\ell, \quad \text{with} \quad \ell \leq r,
\]

where each block \( L_q \) is upper triangular, it has only one eigenvalue \( \sigma_q \) equal to some \( \rho_i = \rho_j = \ldots \) from the set \( \{\rho_1, \ldots, \rho_r\} \), satisfying \( 0 \leq \Re \sigma_q < 1 \), and \( \sigma_p \neq \sigma_q \) for \( 1 \leq p \neq q \leq \ell \), and the corresponding diagonal matrix \( D \) of integer parts of the eigenvalues of \( J \) is split into blocks \( D = D_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus D_\ell \), with

\[
D_q = \text{diag}(d_{q,1}, d_{q,2}, \ldots), \quad q = 1, \ldots, \ell,
\]

where for each \( q \) the integers form a non-increasing finite sequence

\[
d_{q,1} \geq d_{q,2} \geq \ldots
\]

in case the singularity is \( z = a \); or a non-decreasing finite sequence

\[
d_{q,1} \leq d_{q,2} \leq \ldots
\]

in case \( z = \infty \) is the singularity. We can therefore rewrite

\[
L = S + R, \quad \text{with} \quad S = S_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus S_\ell, \quad R = R_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus R_\ell.
\]

Each block \( L_q \), \( 1 \leq q \leq \ell \), consists of sub-blocks, according to the structure (for some integer \( k_q \)):

\[
L_q = S_q + R_q, \quad S_q = \begin{pmatrix} S_1^{(q)} & \cdots & S_2^{(q)} & \cdots & S_{k_q}^{(q)} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ S_1^{(q)} & \cdots & S_2^{(q)} & \cdots & S_{k_q}^{(q)} \end{pmatrix}, \quad R_q = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & * & * & * \\ 0 & * & * & \ddots \end{pmatrix},
\] (5.3)
where each matrix $S^{(q)}_i$ is a Jordan matrix with the same eigenvalue $\sigma_p$ on the diagonal and 1’s on the second upper diagonal:

$$
S^{(q)}_i = \begin{pmatrix}
\sigma_q & 1 & 0 & 0 \\
\sigma_q & 1 & 0 & 0 \\
& & 1 & 0 \\
& & & \sigma_q
\end{pmatrix}, \quad i = 1, 2, ..., k_q;
$$

while in $R_q$ the 0 are zero diagonal blocks (corresponding to the blocks $S^{(q)}_i$), and each * is an off-diagonal block which is possibly non zero (now the block partition of $R_q$ in (5.3) is inherited from that of $S_q$).

One can also decompose the above $L$ as

$$
L = \Sigma + N, \quad \Sigma \text{ diagonal and } N \text{ nilpotent},
$$

with

$$
\Sigma = \sigma_1 I_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus \sigma_\ell I_\ell, \quad N = N_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus N_\ell.
$$

Here $I_1, ..., I_\ell$ are identity matrices, each $I_q$ having the dimension of $L_q$. It follows that

$$
[\Sigma, N] = 0.
$$

Therefore,

$$
z^D_z L = z^D_z z^\Sigma z^N = z^\Delta z^N,
$$

where

$$
\Delta := D + \Sigma
$$

is a diagonal matrix, whose eigenvalues are the eigenvalues of $J$. The above properties allow to write

$$
z^\Delta z^N = z^\Delta \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{N^k}{k!} (\ln z)^k \quad \text{finite sum},
$$

where $\infty$ depends on the order of nilpotency of $N$.

A Levelt form can be always chosen so that $D$ and $L$ (and so $S$ and $R$) satisfy all the above properties. This can always be achieved by a permutation matrix $P$, by changing a fundamental matrix solution in Levelt form $Y$ to another fundamental solution $YP$ with Levelt form having the desired properties. In Appendix 2, we will need the above choice of Levelt form.

### 6 Strong Isomonodromy Deformations

We introduce a (central) connection matrix $C_0(\lambda)$ by

$$
Y_0(z, \lambda) = Y^{(0)}(z, \lambda) C_0(\lambda),
$$

where $Y_0(z, \lambda)$ is (4.9) with $\nu = 0$, and $Y^{(0)}(z, \lambda)$ is in Levelt form at $z = 0$. Notice that $Y_\nu = Y^{(0)} C_0 S_0 \cdots S_{\nu-1}$. 
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Definition 6.1. Let Assumption 1 hold and let system (1.1) be weakly isomonodromic in \( \mathbb{D} \) with holomorphic fundamental matrix solution \( Y_{\text{hol}} = Y^{(0)} \) in Levelt form, so that Theorem 3.1 holds, Assumption 2 is satisfied and the essential monodromy data
\[
L^{(0)}, \quad D^{(0)} \quad \text{are constant.}
\]

If also Assumption 3 holds, system (1.1) is said to be strongly isomonodromic on \( \mathbb{D} \) when also the remaining essential monodromy data are constant, namely
\[
dS_\nu = 0, \quad dL = 0, \quad D \text{ is constant}, \quad dC_0 = 0.
\]

Remark 6.1. For a strongly isomonodromic system, the relations (4.8), if any, are satisfied by definition, so that the fundamental matrices \( Y_{\nu}(z, \lambda) \) are holomorphic on \( \mathcal{R} \times \mathbb{D} \).

Let \( E_{p_j} := \partial \Lambda / \partial \lambda_j \) be the matrix with blocks \( E^{[p_j]}_{[a,b]} = \delta_{a_j} \delta_{b_j} I_{p_j} \), for \( a, b, j = 1, \ldots, s \) (i.e. all entries are zero, except for diagonal blocks \( I_{p_j} \)).

Theorem 6.1.

Part I. System (1.1) is strongly isomonodromic in \( \mathbb{D} \) if and only if the fundamental matrix solutions \( Y^{(0)}(z, \lambda) \) and \( Y_{\nu}(z, \lambda) \) satisfy for every \( \nu \in \mathbb{Z} \) the integrable Pfaffian system (3.1) of the specific form
\[
dY = \omega(z, \lambda)Y, \quad \omega(z, \lambda) = \left( \Lambda + \frac{A}{z} \right) dz + \sum_{j=1}^s \left( zE_{p_j} + \tilde{\omega}_j(\lambda) \right) d\lambda_j, \quad (6.1)
\]
where
\[
\tilde{\omega}_j(\lambda) = \omega_j(\lambda) + \frac{\partial \mathcal{T}(\lambda)}{\partial \lambda_j} \cdot \mathcal{T}(\lambda)^{-1},
\]
and \( \omega_j(\lambda) \) has blocks
\[
\omega^{(j)}_{[a,b]}(\lambda) = 0, \quad \omega^{(j)}_{[a,b]}(\lambda) = \frac{A_{[a,b]}(\lambda) (\delta_{a_j} - \delta_{b_j})}{\lambda_a - \lambda_b}, \quad a \neq b = 1, \ldots, s, \quad (6.2)
\]
while
\[
\mathcal{T}(\lambda) = \mathcal{T}_1(\lambda) \oplus \cdots \oplus \mathcal{T}_s(\lambda)
\]
is a matrix reducing to Jordan form the diagonal blocks of \( A \) as in (4.1).

Strong isomonodromy deformations with constant \( \mathcal{T} \) are allowed. In this case,
\[
\tilde{\omega}_j(\lambda) = \omega_j(\lambda).
\]

Part II. If system (1.1) is strongly isomonodromic in \( \mathbb{D} \), then
\[
\frac{\partial A}{\partial \lambda_j} = [\tilde{\omega}_j(u), A], \quad j = 1, \ldots, s. \quad (6.3)
\]

In particular, the block-diagonal part of \( A \) is constant, namely
\[
\frac{\partial A_{[1,1]}}{\partial \lambda} = \frac{\partial A_{[2,2]}}{\partial \lambda} \cdots = \frac{\partial A_{[s,s]}}{\partial \lambda} = 0,
\]
and so are the Jordan forms \( J_k \) in (4.1).
Before we prove the theorem, some comments are in order.

For a strong isomonodromy deformation, PART II says that the diagonal blocks of $A$ are constant. This means that $A_{[1,1]} \oplus \cdots \oplus A_{[s,s]}$ can be reduced to Jordan form by a constant block-diagonal matrix $T_0$. If $T = T_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus T_s$ is another matrix satisfying (4.1), but not constant, then it has the structure

$$T(\lambda) = T_0 \mathfrak{B}(\lambda), \quad \mathfrak{B}(\lambda) = \mathfrak{B}_1(\lambda) \oplus \cdots \oplus \mathfrak{B}_s(\lambda), \quad \text{with} \quad [\mathfrak{B}_j(\lambda), J_j] = 0.$$

The isomonodromic fundamental matrix solutions $Y_\nu(z, \lambda)$ which satisfy the Pfaffian system (6.1) have structure (4.9) with constant $T = T_0$ if and only if system (6.1) is the specific case with $\tilde{\omega}_j(\lambda) = \omega_j(\lambda)$. Otherwise, another $T(\lambda) = T_0 \mathfrak{B}(\lambda)$ appears in the solutions $Y_\nu(z, \lambda)$. We can say the same in a different way. If a differential system

$$\frac{dY}{dz} = \left( \Lambda_0 + \frac{A_0}{z} \right) Y$$

is given at $\lambda = \lambda_0$, where $\Lambda_0$ has repeated eigenvalues, then it can have different isomonodromy deformations (6.1), differing by the specific $\sum_j \tilde{\omega}_j(\lambda)d\lambda_j$. For all these deformations, the diagonal blocks are constant and equal to those of $A_0$, but the off-diagonal blocks of $A(\lambda)$ are different for different deformations, satisfying different non-linear differential equations (6.3), with different possibilities for the matrix coefficients $\tilde{\omega}_j$ depending on the choice of $T(\lambda)$. This fact allows, in case $n = 3$ and $s = 2$, to have isomonodromy deformations with constant $A$. This will be sketched in Section 7.

The different isomonodromy deformations are related by a $\lambda$-dependent gauge transformation. Suppose that $Y$ satisfies (6.1) with matrices $A$ and $\tilde{\omega}_j(\lambda) = \omega_j(\lambda) + \partial_j T \cdot T^{-1}$, where $\omega_j$ is in (6.2). Namely,

$$dY = \left[ \left( \Lambda + \frac{A}{z} \right) dz + \sum_{j=1}^s \left( zE_{p_j} + \omega_j \right) d\lambda_j + dT \cdot T^{-1} \right] Y.$$

The $Y_\nu$ have a certain $T$. Consider the gauge

$$Y = S(\lambda) \hat{Y}, \quad S = S_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus S_s, \quad \det S \neq 0.$$

Then

$$d\hat{Y} = \left[ \left( \Lambda + \frac{S^{-1}AS}{z} \right) dz + \sum_{j=1}^s \left( zE_{p_j} + S^{-1}\omega_jS \right) d\lambda_j + S^{-1}(dT \cdot T^{-1})S - S^{-1}dS \right] \hat{Y}.$$

Now, if $\hat{T}$ is another matrix Jordanizing the block-diagonal part of $A$, let us choose

$$S(\lambda) = T(\lambda) \cdot \hat{T}^{-1}(\lambda)$$

Thus, a simple computation yields $S^{-1}(dT \cdot T^{-1})S - S^{-1}dS = d\hat{T} \cdot \hat{T}^{-1}$, so that $\hat{Y}$ satisfies system (6.1) of the form

$$d\hat{Y} = \left[ \left( \Lambda + \frac{\hat{A}}{z} \right) dz + \sum_{j=1}^s \left( zE_{p_j} + \tilde{\omega}_j \right) d\lambda_j + d\hat{T} \cdot \hat{T}^{-1} \right] \hat{Y}.$$
\[
\hat{A} := \hat{T}(T^{-1} A T) \hat{T}^{-1}, \quad \hat{\omega}_j = \hat{T}(T^{-1} \omega_j T) \hat{T}^{-1}.
\]
(6.4)

Notice that \(\hat{\omega}_j\) is the same as in definition (6.2) with \(A\) replaced by \(\hat{A}\) (the block-diagonal part is the same). In this case, the \(\hat{Y}_\nu = \hat{T} T^{-1} Y_\nu\) display \(\hat{T}\) in their asymptotic representation.

**Remark 6.2.** Suppose that we have a deformation with every \(\hat{\omega}_j = \omega_j\), namely \(T\) is constant. Formula (6.2), or equivalently \(\omega_j(\lambda) = [T F_1(\lambda) T^{-1}, E_{p_j}]\) (see Appendix 1), immediately implies that
\[
\sum_{j=1}^s \omega_j(\lambda) = 0, \quad \text{so that} \quad \sum_{j=1}^s \frac{\partial A}{\partial \lambda_j} = 0.
\]
Therefore, \(A\) depends on the differences of eigenvalues, for example \(\lambda_j - \lambda_1, \ j = 2, \ldots, s:\)
\[
A = A(\lambda_2 - \lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_s - \lambda_1).
\]

Moreover, let us write (4.9) as
\[
Y_\nu(z, \lambda) = H_\nu(z, \lambda) e^{Az} \quad \text{with} \quad H_\nu := \hat{T} \hat{Y}_\nu z^D z^L.
\]

Then \(\frac{\partial H_\nu e^{Az}}{\partial \lambda_j} = \frac{\partial H_\nu e^{Az}}{\partial \lambda_j} + H_\nu \cdot z E_{p_j} e^{Az}\). Since \(Y_\nu\) satisfies (6.1) with \(\hat{\omega}_j = \omega_j\), we also have
\[
\frac{\partial H_\nu e^{Az}}{\partial \lambda_j} = (z E_{p_j} + \omega_j(\lambda)) H_\nu e^{Az}.
\]
Thus,
\[
\frac{\partial H_\nu}{\partial \lambda_j} = z[E_{p_j}, H_\nu] + \omega_j(\lambda) H_\nu, \quad \implies \quad \sum_{j=1}^s \frac{\partial H_\nu}{\partial \lambda_j} = 0,
\]
so that \(H_\nu = H_\nu(z; \lambda_2 - \lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_s - \lambda_1)\). Notice also that \(z^D z^L\) commutes with \(E_{p_j}\) and that in the strong isomonodromic case \(dT = dD = dL = 0\), so that we also obtain
\[
\frac{\partial \hat{Y}_\nu}{\partial \lambda_j} = z[E_{p_j}, \hat{Y}_\nu] + \omega_j(\lambda) \hat{Y}_\nu, \quad \implies \quad \sum_{j=1}^s \frac{\partial \hat{Y}_\nu}{\partial \lambda_j} = 0,
\]
In conclusion:
\[
Y_\nu(z, \lambda) = \hat{T} \hat{Y}_\nu(z; \lambda_2 - \lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_s - \lambda_1) \ z^D z^L \ e^{Az}.
\]

**********************

**Proof of Theorem 6.1.** Let system (1.1) be strongly isomonodromic in \(\mathbb{D}\) (Definition 6.1), so that \(Y^{\text{hol}} = Y^{(0)}\) in Levelt form is holomorphic, and by Assumption 3 all the \(Y_\nu\) are holomorphic. Thus, we can take differentials. We define
\[
\omega(z, \lambda) := dY^{(0)} \cdot (Y^{(0)})^{-1} = \left. dY_0 \cdot (Y_0)^{-1} \right|_{dC^{(0)} = 0} = \left. dY_\nu \cdot (Y_\nu)^{-1} \right|_{dS_\nu = 0}, \quad \forall \nu \in \mathbb{Z}.
\]
This is single valued for the counter-clockwise loop \(z \mapsto ze^{2\pi i}\), because the monodromy \(e^{2\pi i L^{(0)}}\) of \(Y^{(0)}\) and the monodromy \(e^{2\pi i L(S_\nu, S_{\nu+1})^{-1}}\) of \(Y_\nu\) are constant. Its singularities may only be located at \(z = 0, \infty\). We find the structure of \(\omega\) at \(z = 0\) and \(z = \infty\) respectively.
Structure at $z = 0$. Let us decompose the differential as $d = dz + d\lambda$, the former being the component on $dz$, the latter on $d\lambda_1, \ldots, d\lambda_s$. Firstly, we compute

$$
d_z Y^{(0)} \cdot (Y^{(0)})^{-1} = G^{(0)} d_z \hat{Y}^{(0)} \cdot (\hat{Y}^{(0)})^{-1} + G^{(0)} \hat{Y}^{(0)} \frac{D^{(0)} + z D^{(0)} L z^{-D^{(0)}}}{z} (G^{(0)} \hat{Y}^{(0)})^{-1} dz
$$

where we have used (3.3). Here, $\text{reg}_1(z, \lambda)$ is holomorphic for $z \in \mathbb{C}$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{D}$. Then, we compute

$$
d_\lambda Y^{(0)} \cdot (Y^{(0)})^{-1} = d_\lambda G^{(0)} \cdot (G^{(0)})^{-1} + G^{(0)} d_\lambda \hat{Y}^{(0)} \cdot (\hat{Y}^{(0)})^{-1} (G^{(0)})^{-1}
$$

where $\text{reg}(z, \lambda)$ is holomorphic for $z \in \mathbb{C}$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{D}$.

Structure at $z = \infty$. Firstly, we compute

$$
d_z Y_\nu \cdot Y_\nu^{-1} = T d_z \hat{Y}_\nu \cdot \hat{Y}_\nu^{-1} T^{-1} + \left( T \hat{Y}_\nu \frac{D + z D L z^{-D} \hat{Y}_\nu^{-1} T^{-1}}{z} + T \hat{Y}_\nu z D z L \Lambda z^{-L} z^{-D} \hat{Y}_\nu^{-1} T^{-1} \right) dz.
$$

Due to the block structure of $D$ and $L$ and diagonality of $\Lambda$, we have $z^D z^L \Lambda z^{-L} z^{-D} = \Lambda$, while by (4.3), (4.6), (4.7) we have $(D + z D L z^{-D})/z = J/z + O(z^{-2})$. Hence,

$$
d_z Y_\nu \cdot Y_\nu^{-1} = \left( \Lambda + \widehat{\text{reg}}(z^{-1}, \lambda) \right) dz, \quad \widehat{\text{reg}}(z^{-1}, \lambda) = O \left( \frac{1}{z} \right) \to 0, \quad z \to \infty,
$$

being $\widehat{\text{reg}}(1/z, \lambda)$ analytic for $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{D}$. Then, we compute

$$
d_\lambda Y_\nu \cdot Y_\nu^{-1} = d_\lambda T \cdot T^{-1} + T d_\lambda \hat{Y}_\nu \cdot \hat{Y}_\nu^{-1} T^{-1} + z \cdot T \hat{Y}_\nu z D z L d\Lambda z^{-L} z^{-D} (T \hat{Y}_\nu)^{-1}.
$$

As before, from the diagonality of $d\Lambda$ we receive $z^D z^L d\Lambda z^{-L} z^{-D} = d\Lambda$, so that

$$
d_\lambda Y_\nu \cdot Y_\nu^{-1} = d_\lambda T \cdot T + z d\Lambda + T [F_1, d\Lambda] T^{-1} + \widehat{\text{reg}}(z^{-1}, \lambda),
$$

where $\widehat{\text{reg}}(z^{-1}, \lambda)$ is a 1-form in $d\lambda_1, \ldots, d\lambda_n$, analytic for $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{D}$, with behaviour

$$
\widehat{\text{reg}}(z^{-1}, \lambda) = O \left( \frac{1}{z} \right) \to 0, \quad z \to \infty,
$$

Notice that $d\Lambda = E_{p_1} d\lambda_1 + \cdots + E_{p_s} d\lambda_s$. By Liouville theorem and the above behaviours at $z = 0, \infty$ we conclude that

$$
\omega = \left( \Lambda + \frac{A}{z} \right) dz + \sum_{j=1}^s \left( z E_{p_j} + [T F_1 T^{-1}, E_{p_j}] + \frac{\partial T}{\partial \lambda_j} T^{-1} \right) d\lambda_j. \quad (6.5)
$$

It remains to show that $[T F_1(\lambda) T^{-1}, E_{p_j}]$ equals (6.2). This will be done in Appendix 1.
The fact that deformations with $T$ constant are possible, so that $\partial T/\partial \lambda_j = 0$, is proved below after Lemma 6.1.

- Conversely, we assume that all the fundamental matrices $Y^{(0)}$ and $Y_\nu$, $\nu \in \mathbb{Z}$, of system (1.1) also satisfy

$$dY = \left[ \left( \Lambda + \frac{A}{z} \right) dz + \sum_{j=1}^s \left( zE_{pj} + \tilde{\omega}_j(\lambda) \right) d\lambda_j \right]Y,$$

with holomorphic $\tilde{\omega}_j(\lambda)$ and $A(\lambda)$. In particular, this means that $dY^{(0)} \cdot (Y^{(0)})^{-1}$ and $dY_\nu \cdot Y_\nu^{-1}$ depend homomorphically on $\lambda$.

Since $\omega$ has Fuchsian singularity at $z = 0$, by Proposition 3.2 we know that indeed it has holomorphic solution $Y^{(0)}$ in Levelt form, and $^2$

$$D^{(0)}, \quad L^{(0)} \quad \text{are constant.}$$

The fact that $dC_0 = dS_\nu = 0$ is straightforward. Indeed, since all fundamental solutions satisfy $dY = \omega Y$, we have

$$dY_\nu + Y_\nu^{-1} = dY_\nu \cdot Y_\nu^{-1} \iff dS_\nu = 0.$$

$$dY_0 \cdot Y_0^{-1} = dY^{(0)} \cdot (Y^{(0)})^{-1} \iff dC_0 = 0.$$

Finally, we show that $D$ and $L$ are constant. Recall from Section 5 that we can write $Y_\nu = T \hat{Y}_\nu z^\Delta z^N$, with diagonal $\Delta$ and nilpotent $N$. By assumption

$$\sum_{j=1}^s \left( zE_{pj} + \tilde{\omega}_j(\lambda) \right) d\lambda_j = d\lambda Y_\nu \cdot Y_\nu^{-1} = d\Lambda \cdot T^{-1} + T d\lambda \hat{Y}_\nu \cdot \hat{Y}_\nu^{-1} T^{-1} +$$

$$+ T \hat{Y}_\nu \left( \ln z d\Delta + z^\Delta \sum_{k=1}^\infty \frac{dN_k}{k!} (\ln z)^k z^{-N} z^{-\Delta} \right) (T \hat{Y}_\nu)^{-1} +$$

$$+ z \cdot T \hat{Y}_\nu d\lambda (T \hat{Y}_\nu)^{-1}.$$

Since logarithmic terms cannot occur, necessarily $d\Delta = dN = 0$, so that $D$ and $L$ are constant. From the dominant terms at $z = \infty$ in the above computation we receive

$$\tilde{\omega}_j(\lambda) = [TF_1 T^{-1}, E_{pj}] + \frac{\partial T}{\partial \lambda_j} T^{-1}.$$

Then, from Appendix 1, we re-express $[TF_1 T^{-1}, E_{pj}]$ to get (6.2).

---

$^2$This can also be seen directly by taking

$$d\lambda Y^{(0)} \cdot (Y^{(0)})^{-1} = d\lambda (G^{(0)} \hat{Y}^{(0)}) \cdot (G^{(0)} \hat{Y}^{(0)})^{-1} +$$

$$+(G^{(0)} Y^{(0)}) \left( d\Delta^{(0)} \ln z + z^{\Delta^{(0)}} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{d(N^{(0)})}{k!} (\ln z)^k z^{-N^{(0)}} z^{-\Delta^{(0)}} \right) (G^{(0)} Y^{(0)})^{-1}.$$

Since $\omega$ does not contain terms in $\ln z$, it follows that $d\Delta^{(0)} = dN^{(0)} = 0$, so that $D^{(0)}$ and $L^{(0)}$ are constant. Here, $\Delta^{(0)}$ and $N^{(0)}$ are the analogous of $\Delta$ and $N$ in (5.4).
PART II. Suppose the system is strongly isomonodromic. By PART I, the matrices $Y_{0}$ and $Y_{\nu}$ solve a Pfaffian system $dY = \omega Y$ where $\omega$ has structure

$$\omega = \left( \Lambda + \frac{A}{z} \right) dz + \sum_{j=1}^{s} \left( zE_{pj} + \tilde{\omega}_{j}(\lambda) \right) d\lambda_{j}. $$

We write for short

$$\omega = \sum_{\alpha=0}^{s} \varphi_{\alpha}(x) dx^{\alpha}, \quad (x^{0}, x^{1}, ..., x^{s}) := (z, \lambda_{1}, ..., \lambda_{s}).$$

Thus, $\omega$ is integrable, i.e. $d\omega = \omega \wedge \omega$, which explicitly is

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x^{\alpha}} \varphi_{\beta} \varphi_{\alpha} = \frac{\partial}{\partial x^{\beta}} \varphi_{\alpha} \varphi_{\beta}, \quad \alpha \neq \beta = 0, 1, ..., s, \quad (6.6)$$

For $\beta = 0$ and $\alpha = j \in \{1, ..., s\}$, (6.6) is

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda_{j}} \left( \Lambda + \frac{A}{z} \right) + \left( \Lambda + \frac{A}{z} \right) \left( zE_{pj} + \tilde{\omega}_{j}(\lambda) \right) = \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \left( zE_{pj} + \tilde{\omega}_{j}(\lambda) \right) \left( \Lambda + \frac{A}{z} \right).$$

Expanding, we see that the equality is true if and only if the coefficients of $z^{-1}$ and $z^{0}$ are respectively equal, namely

$$\frac{\partial A}{\partial \lambda_{j}} = [\tilde{\omega}_{j}(\lambda), A], \quad (6.7)$$

$$[\Lambda, \tilde{\omega}_{j}(\lambda)] = [E_{pj}, A]. \quad (6.8)$$

The equations (6.8) have general solution

$$[\tilde{\omega}_{j}(\lambda)]_{\text{block } a,a \text{ arbitrary}}, \quad [\tilde{\omega}_{j}(\lambda)]_{\text{block } a,b} = \frac{A_{a,b}(\lambda) (\delta_{aj} - \delta_{bj})}{\lambda_{a} - \lambda_{b}}, \quad a \neq b = 1, ..., s.$$ 

Thus, 

$$\tilde{\omega}_{j}(\lambda) = \omega_{j}(\lambda) + D_{j}(\lambda), \quad (6.9)$$

where $\omega_{j}(\lambda)$ is (6.2), while $D_{j}(\lambda)$ is an arbitrary block-diagonal matrix, which in our case must be

$$D_{j} = \frac{\partial T}{\partial \lambda_{j}} \cdot T^{-1}.$$

The integrability condition (6.6) for $\alpha = k$, $\beta = j$, with $j \neq k \in \{1, ..., s\}$ is

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda_{k}} \left( zE_{pj} + \tilde{\omega}_{j}(\lambda) \right) + \left( zE_{pj} + \tilde{\omega}_{j}(\lambda) \right) \left( zE_{pk} + \tilde{\omega}_{k}(\lambda) \right) = \text{the same with } j, k \text{ exchanged}$$

This is true if and only if

$$[E_{pj}, \tilde{\omega}_{k}(\lambda)] = [E_{pk}, \tilde{\omega}_{j}(\lambda)], \quad (6.10)$$

$$\frac{\partial \tilde{\omega}_{j}(\lambda)}{\partial \lambda_{k}} + \tilde{\omega}_{k}(\lambda) \tilde{\omega}_{j}(\lambda) = \frac{\partial \tilde{\omega}_{k}(\lambda)}{\partial \lambda_{j}} + \tilde{\omega}_{k}(\lambda) \tilde{\omega}_{j}(\lambda). \quad (6.11)$$
The equalities (6.10) are automatically satisfied by (6.9), while (6.11) is the Frobenius integrability condition of (6.7). Notice that the block-diagonal part of (6.11) is
\[ B_D j p \lambda q B D k p \lambda q \]
and admits in particular the holomorphic solution \( D_j = \partial T / \partial \lambda_j \cdot T^{-1} \) for some holomorphic \( T(\lambda) = T_1(\lambda) \oplus \cdots \oplus T_s(\lambda) \), in accordance with the required structure (6.5), which necessarily holds in case of strong isomonodromic deformations.

Let \( A_{[k,k]} \) denote as usual a diagonal-block of \( A \), and let \( D^{(j)}_{[k,k]} \) be a diagonal-block of \( D \), \( k = 1, \ldots, s \). The block diagonal part of (6.7) now reduces to
\[ \frac{\partial A_{[k,k]}}{\partial \lambda_j} = [D_{[k,k]}^{(j)}, A_{[k,k]}]. \] (6.12)

To proceed, we need the following Lemma, proved in Appendix 2.

**Lemma 6.1.** Let \( T = T_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus T_s \) be a matrix yielding a Jordan form
\[ J = J_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus J_s = T^{-1} \left( A_{[1,1]} \oplus \cdots \oplus A_{[s,s]} \right) T, \]
where each \( J_k \) is as in (4.2). If the deformation is strongly isomonodromic, then
\[ \left[ T^{-1} \frac{\partial T_k}{\partial \lambda_j}, J_k \right] = 0, \quad \forall k = 1, \ldots, s, \]
so that \( \left[ T^{-1} \frac{\partial T}{\partial \lambda_j}, J \right] = 0. \)

In case of strong isomonodromic deformation, we have \( D_j = \partial T / \partial \lambda_j \cdot T^{-1} \). Using Lemma 6.1 and (6.12), we find that \( A_{[1,1]}, \ldots, A_{[s,s]} \) are constant. Indeed
\[ \frac{\partial A_{[k,k]}}{\partial \lambda_j} = [D_{[k,k]}^{(j)}, A_{[k,k]}] \]
\[ = \frac{\partial T_k}{\partial \lambda_j} T_k^{-1} A_{[k,k]} - A_{[k,k]} \frac{\partial T_k}{\partial \lambda_j} T_k^{-1} \]
\[ = \frac{\partial T_k}{\partial \lambda_j} J_k T_k^{-1} - T_k J_k \left( T_k^{-1} \frac{\partial T_k}{\partial \lambda_j} T_k^{-1} \right) T_k^{-1} \]
\[ = \text{Lemma 6.1} \frac{\partial T_k}{\partial \lambda_j} J_k T_k^{-1} - T_k T_k^{-1} \frac{\partial T_k}{\partial \lambda_j} J_k T_k^{-1} = 0. \]

This proves PART II.

Finally, by the constancy of the diagonal blocks of \( A \) for a strong isomonodromy deformation whichever is \( T \), it is possible to consider deformations with \( T \) constant. In this case, the corresponding Pfaffian system (6.1) has \( \tilde{\omega}_j(\lambda) = \omega_j(\lambda) \) as in (6.2).

We state the converse of Part II of Theorem 6.1. Recall that the solutions of \( [A, \tilde{\omega}_j] = [E_{p_j}, A] \) are
\[ \tilde{\omega}_j(\lambda) = \omega_j(\lambda) + D_j(\lambda) \] (6.13)
where $\omega_j(\lambda)$ is (6.2) and
\[
D_j = D^{(j)}_{[1,1]} \oplus \cdots \oplus D^{(j)}_{[s,s]} \quad \text{arbitrary block-diagonal matrix.}
\]  

(6.14)

Let
\[
D(\lambda) := \sum_{j=1}^{n} D_j(\lambda)d\lambda_j.
\]  

(6.15)

\begin{center}
\textbf{Theorem 6.2.} Let A and $\tilde{\omega}_1, \ldots, \tilde{\omega}_1$ satisfy the system
\end{center}
\[
\begin{align*}
[\Lambda, \tilde{\omega}_j] &= [E_{p_j}, A] \quad \text{(6.16)} \\
\frac{dA}{dz} &= [\sum_{j=1}^{n} (\tilde{\omega}_j(\lambda)d\lambda_j, A)] \quad \text{(6.17)}
\end{align*}
\]

where (6.17) is assumed to be Frobenius integrable. Then, the following facts hold.

1. The connection
\[
\omega(z, \lambda) = \left( \Lambda + \frac{A}{z} \right) dz + \sum_{j=1}^{s} \left( zE_{p_j} + \tilde{\omega}_j(\lambda) \right) d\lambda_j.
\]  

(6.18)

with matrices (6.13), (6.2), (6.14) is integrable.\(^3\) The Pfaffian system $dY = \omega Y$ has a fundamental matrix solution $Y(0)(z, \lambda)$ in Levelt form (2.1), with constant exponents as in (3.2).

2. Let $\mathcal{S}(\lambda) = \mathcal{S}_1(\lambda) \oplus \cdots \oplus \mathcal{S}_s(\lambda)$ be an arbitrary block-diagonal and holomorphically invertible matrix. The choice
\[
D(\lambda) = d\mathcal{S}(\lambda) \cdot \mathcal{S}(\lambda)^{-1},
\]

for (6.14)-(6.15) is consistent with the integrability of (6.17). With this choice, Assumption 3 holds and
\[
Q(\lambda) := A_{[1,1]}(\lambda) \oplus \cdots \oplus A_{[s,s]}(\lambda)
\]  

(6.19)

admits constant Jordan form $J = J_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus J_s = TQT^{-1}$, where $T(\lambda)$ is a holomorphic invertible solution of
\[
dT = D(\lambda)T.
\]  

(6.20)

3. Let the choice of $D$ at 2. above be made. If there are no partial resonances (i.e. all the blocks $A_{[k,k]}$, $k = 1, \ldots, s$, are non-resonant), then every $Y_\nu(z, \lambda)$ in (4.9) with $T$ as in point 2. above satisfies
\[
dY_\nu = \omega(z, \lambda)Y_\nu,
\]

so that system (1.1) is strongly isomonodromic.

\begin{center}
\textbf{Remark 6.3.} We can choose $D = 0$, so that at point 2. $T$ is constant.
\end{center}
Remark 6.4. From the proof, we will see that if the choice at 2. is made, for every $\nu \in \mathbb{Z}$ there exists a holomorphic matrix valued one-form $K_\nu(\lambda)$ such that each $Y_\nu(z, \lambda)$ in (4.9), with $T$ as at point 2., satisfies the system

$$dY_\nu = \omega(z, \lambda)Y_\nu + Y_\nu K_\nu(\lambda);$$

If all the blocks $A_{[k,k]}$, $k = 1, \ldots, s$ are non-resonant, then $K_\nu = 0$.

Corollary 6.1. If $\Lambda$ has pairwise distinct eigenvalues, system is strongly isomonodromic if and only if (6.16)-(6.17) are satisfied.

Proof. At point 3. the non-resonance condition always holds if $\Lambda$ has pairwise distinct eigenvalues $\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_n$, so that $A_{[k,k]} = A_{kk}$, $k = 1, \ldots, n$. \qed

Proof of Theorem 6.2.

1. Equations (6.10) are satisfied by the structure of the $\hat{\omega}_j$ as in (6.13). The integrability of (6.17) is (6.11). Now, (6.10), (6.11), (6.16), (6.16) are the Frobenius integrability conditions of (6.18). The last statement at point 1. is proved by Proposition 3.2.

2. The block-diagonal part of the integrability condition (6.11) for (6.17) is

$$\frac{\partial D_j(\lambda)}{\partial \lambda_k} + D_j(\lambda)D_k(\lambda) = \frac{\partial D_k(\lambda)}{\partial \lambda_j} + D_k(\lambda)D_j(\lambda), \quad j, k = 1, \ldots, s. \quad (6.21)$$

For an arbitrary holomorphic invertible matrix $T_{p\lambda q} = T_{1p\lambda q} \cdots T_{sp\lambda q}$, we can choose a holomorphic solution $D = \sum_j D_j d\lambda_j$ of (6.21) to be

$$D(\lambda) = d\Sigma(\lambda) \cdot \Sigma^{-1}(\lambda).$$

For this choice, the linear Pfaffian system (6.20) is Frobenius integrable, and any fundamental matrix solution is $T(\lambda) = \Xi(\lambda)T_0$, for an invertible constant matrix $T_0 = T_{10} \cdots T_{s0}$. Take any such $T(\lambda)$. Using (6.20) and $Q$ defined in (6.19), we receive

$$d(T^{-1}QT) = T^{-1}(dQ + [Q, D])T.$$

Now, the blocks of (6.17) are

$$\frac{\partial A_{[a,b]}}{\partial \lambda_j} = \sum_{c=1}^s \left( \omega^{(j)}_{[a,c]} A_{[c,b]} - A_{[a,c]} \omega^{(j)}_{[c,b]} \right) + D^{(j)}_{a} A_{[a,b]} - A_{[a,b]} D^{(j)}_{b}. \quad (6.22)$$

For $a = b$, the structure (6.2) implies that

$$\sum_{c=1}^s \left( \omega^{(j)}_{[a,c]} A_{[c,a]} - A_{[a,c]} \omega^{(j)}_{[c,a]} \right) = 0, \quad \Rightarrow \quad \frac{\partial A_{[a,a]}}{\partial \lambda_j} = [D^{(j)}_{a}, A_{[a,a]}],$$

namely

$$dQ = [D, Q].$$
Consequently, 
\[ d(T^{-1}QT) = 0. \]
So, \( T^{-1}QT \) is constant. Therefore, there is another constant invertible matrix \( \tilde{T}_0 \) such that \( T(\lambda) = T(\lambda)\tilde{T}_0 \) is holomorphic invertible and satisfies
\[ T^{-1}(\lambda)Q(\lambda)T(\lambda) = J \quad \text{Jordan constant.} \]

3. Since Assumption 3 holds by point 2. and \( J \) is constant, there are fundamental matrices \( Y_\nu(z, \lambda) \) as in (4.9) satisfying
\[ \frac{dY_\nu}{dz} = \left( \Lambda + \frac{A(\lambda)}{z} \right) Y_\nu, \]
which are holomorphic in \( \mathcal{R}(\mathbb{C}\setminus\{0, \infty\}) \times \mathbb{D} \). Therefore,
\[ \varphi_\nu(z, \lambda) := d_\lambda Y_\nu - \sum_{j=1}^s (zE_{p_j} + \tilde{\omega}_j) d\lambda_j Y_\nu, \]
is well defined, where \( d_\lambda \) is the differential w.r.t. \( \lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_s \). Using \( d_\lambda \hat{\partial}_z = \hat{\partial}_zd_\lambda \) and (6.17) we obtain
\[ \frac{\hat{\partial}_z \varphi_\nu}{\hat{\partial}_z} = \left( \Lambda + \frac{A(\lambda)}{z} \right) \varphi_\nu + \sum_{j=1}^s \left( [A, E_{p_j}] + [\Lambda, \tilde{\omega}_j] \right) d\lambda_j Y_\nu. \]
By (6.16), the above reduces to
\[ \frac{\hat{\partial}_z \varphi_\nu}{\hat{\partial}_z} = \left( \Lambda + \frac{A(\lambda)}{z} \right) \varphi_\nu. \]
Therefore, there is on \( \mathbb{D} \) a holomorphic matrix 1-form \( K_\nu(\lambda) \) (not necessarily invertible) such that
\[ \varphi_\nu = Y_\nu K_\nu. \]
We rewrite (4.9) with the specific Levelt form as in Section 5:
\[ Y_\nu(z, \lambda) = T(\lambda)\hat{Y}_\nu(z, \lambda)z^\Delta z^N(\lambda)e^{\Lambda z}. \]

From point 2. (constancy of \( J \)) we know already that \( \Delta \) is constant. Nevertheless, we will indicate \( d\Delta \) in the following, also if it is zero. We compute the structure of
\[ K_\nu = Y_\nu^{-1}d_\lambda Y_\nu - Y_\nu^{-1}\sum_{j=1}^s (zE_{p_j} + \tilde{\omega}_j) d\lambda_j Y_\nu. \]
We have
\[ Y_\nu^{-1}d_\lambda Y_\nu =
\]
\[ = e^{-\Lambda z}\left( z^{-N}z^{-\Delta}(T\hat{Y}_\nu)^{-1}d_\lambda(T\hat{Y}_\nu)z^\Delta z^N + z^{-N}d\Delta \ln z + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{dN}{k!}(\ln z)^k z^N + zd\lambda \right) \right) e^{\Lambda z}. \]
Notice that $d\Delta = \sum_j E_{p_j} d\lambda_j$, so that
\[
e^{\lambda z} K_\nu e^{-\lambda z} = z^{-N} z^{-\Delta} \left[ (T\hat{Y}_\nu)^{-1} \left( d\lambda (T\hat{Y}_\nu) - \sum_j (z E_{p_j} + \hat{\omega}_j) d\lambda_j T\hat{Y}_\nu \right) \right] z^\Delta z^N
\]
\[+ z^{-N} \left( d\Delta \ln z + \sum_{k=1}^\infty \frac{dN_k}{k!} \left( \ln z \right)^k \right) z^N + \sum_j z E_{p_j} d\lambda_j.
\]
Notice that $[\Delta, d\Delta] = 0$ (also in case $d\Delta \neq 0$, because $\Delta$ is diagonal), and recall that $[\Delta, \Lambda] = [\Delta, d\Lambda] = 0$ and $[N, \Lambda] = [N, d\Lambda] = 0$, so that
\[
z^\Delta z^N e^{\lambda z} K_\nu e^{-\lambda z} z^{-N} z^{-\Delta} = (T\hat{Y}_\nu)^{-1} \left( d\lambda (T\hat{Y}_\nu) - \sum_j (z E_{p_j} + \hat{\omega}_j) d\lambda_j T\hat{Y}_\nu \right) +
\[+ d\Delta \ln z + z^\Delta \left( \sum_{k=1}^\infty \frac{dN_k}{k!} \left( \ln z \right)^k \right) z^{-\Delta} + \sum_j z E_{p_j} d\lambda_j.
\]
The asymptotic expansion (4.10) holds in a sector $S_\nu$ of amplitude greater than $\pi$. In such a sector, we obtain
\[
z^\Delta z^N e^{\lambda z} K_\nu e^{-\lambda z} z^{-N} z^{-\Delta} = - \sum_j z E_{p_j} d\lambda_j + T^{-1} dT + T^{-1} \left( \sum_j [TF_1 T^{-1}, E_{p_j}] d\lambda_j \right) T +
\[+ \sum_j \omega_j d\lambda_j + \sum_j z E_{p_j} d\lambda_j +
\[+ d\Delta \ln z + z^\Delta \left( \sum_{k=1}^\infty \frac{dN_k}{k!} \left( \ln z \right)^k \right) z^{-\Delta} + O \left( \frac{1}{z} \right).
\]
From Appendix 1, we have $\sum_j [TF_1 T^{-1}, E_{p_j}] d\lambda_j = \sum_j \omega_j d\lambda_j$. By the assumption at point 2, we have $dT = D(\lambda) T$. Therefore
\[
z^\Delta z^N e^{\lambda z} K_\nu e^{-\lambda z} z^{-N} z^{-\Delta} = d\Delta \ln z + z^\Delta \left( \sum_{k=1}^\infty \frac{dN_k}{k!} \left( \ln z \right)^k \right) z^{-\Delta} + O \left( \frac{1}{z} \right).
\]
The off-diagonal blocks of the r.h.s. are of order $O(1/z)$, because $N$ and $\Delta$ are block-diagonal. The l.h.s is
\[
e^{(\lambda_a - \lambda_b) z} z^{N_{[a,a]} + N_{[b,b]}} z^{-\Delta_a} z^{-\Delta_b}, \quad a \neq b = 1, \ldots, s.
\]
Since $e^{(\lambda_a - \lambda_b) z}$ diverges exponentially in a subsector of $S_\nu$, while the r.h.s. does not, necessarily
\[K^{(\nu)}_{[a,b]} = 0, \quad a \neq b = 1, \ldots, s.
\]
The diagonal blocks are
\[
z^\Delta z^{N_{[a,a]}} K^{(\nu)}_{[a,a]} z^{-N_{[a,a]}} z^{-\Delta_a} = d\Delta_a \ln z + z^{\Delta_a} \left( \sum_{k=1}^\infty \frac{dN^{[a,a]}_k}{k!} \left( \ln z \right)^k \right) z^{-\Delta_a} + O \left( \frac{1}{z} \right).
\]
Figure 1: The structure of the sub-blocks $K_q$ of $K^{(\nu)}_{[a,a]}$ corresponding to $N_q$, $D_q$ of figure 3 and $\Sigma_q = \sigma_q I_q$. They are split into sub-blocks.

Namely
\[
z^{\Delta_a} K^{(\nu)}_{[a,a]} z^{-\Delta_a} + z^{\Delta_a} ([N_{[a,a]}, K^{(\nu)}_{[a,a]}]) \ln z + \text{ terms in } (\ln z)^r \text{ with } r \geq 2) z^{-\Delta_a} =
\]
\[
= d\Delta_a \ln z + z^{\Delta_a} (dN_{[a,a]} \ln z + \text{ terms in } (\ln z)^r, r \geq 2) z^{-\Delta_a} + O(1/z).
\]

Therefore, it is necessary that
\[
z^{\Delta_a} K^{(\nu)}_{[a,a]} z^{-\Delta_a} = O(1/z).
\]

Recall that $\Delta = D + \Sigma$. Proceeding as in Appendix 2, we see that $N_{[a,a]}$ has diagonal block structure, and correspondingly so has $K^{(\nu)}_{[a,a]}$. Let for simplicity $K := K^{(\nu)}_{[a,a]}$ for a fixed $a$. Then $K = K_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus K_\ell$, as in Appendix 2. Since the integer diagonal entries in $D_q$, $q = 1, \ldots, \ell$ are an increasing sequence as in figure 3, each diagonal sub-block $K_q$ has structure as in figure 1.

In case of no resonance in $A_{[a,a]}$, then $D_q = d_q I_q$ in figure 3, where $d_q$ is integer and $I_q$ is an identity matrix of suitable dimension. Thus, the diagonal sub-blocks of (6.22) reduce to
\[
K_q = O(1/z), \quad q = 1, \ldots, \ell.
\]

This implies that $K^{(\nu)}_{[a,a]} = 0$. \qed

7 A remark on the 3-dimensional case

Let $n = 3$. The isomonodromy problem of the case with no coalescences, namely $\Lambda = \text{diag}(u_1, u_2, u_3)$, $u_i \neq u_j$, is highly transcendental. For example, for a specific choice of $A$, the isomonodromy deformation equations (1.4) are equivalent to the sixth Painlevé equation [18, 13, 21, 4, 11]. When coalescences occur, the problem is that of the critical behaviour of the transcendents at the fixed singularities of the sixth Painlevé equation.
On the opposite side, there is the trivial case \( \Lambda = \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \lambda_1, \lambda_1) \). All the fundamental matrix solutions of system (1.1) are

\[
Y(z, \lambda_1) = e^{z \lambda_1} z^{\Lambda} C(\lambda_1), \quad \det C(\lambda_1) \neq 0.
\]

The system is isomonodromic if and only if \( A \) is constant.

The only non-trivial case we need to consider along a stratum of the coalescence locus is, up to permutation,

\[
\frac{dY}{dz} = \left( \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \lambda_2 \end{pmatrix} + \frac{A}{z} \right) Y.
\]

The gauge \( Y = e^{\lambda_2 z} \tilde{Y} \) and the change of variable \( \zeta = x z \) yield

\[
\frac{d\tilde{Y}}{d\zeta} = \left( \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \frac{A}{z} \right) \tilde{Y}, \quad x := \lambda_1 - \lambda_2.
\]

For a constant \( A \), the above admits fundamental matrix solutions with constant essential monodromy data. Thus, the fundamental matrix solutions of the starting system also have constant data, if \( x \) varies in a sufficiently small domain away from \( x = 0 \). Therefore, the starting system is strongly isomonodromic.

We can obtain this result also from the point of view of Theorem 6.1. Since the diagonal blocks \( A_{[1,1]} = A_{11} \) and \( A_{[2,2]} \) are always constant in the isomonodromic case, we are allowed to consider an isomonodromic deformation with

\[
\mathcal{T}(\lambda) = \mathcal{T}_0 \mathfrak{B}(\lambda), \quad \mathfrak{B}(\lambda) = \mathfrak{B}_1(\lambda) \oplus \mathfrak{B}_2(\lambda), \quad \text{with} \quad [\mathfrak{B}_j(\lambda), J_j] = 0, \quad j = 1, 2,
\]

where \( \mathcal{T}_0 \) is constant. We can also choose \( \mathfrak{B}(\lambda) \equiv \mathfrak{B}(\lambda_1 - \lambda_2) \). This implies that

\[
\frac{\partial \mathcal{T}}{\partial \lambda_2} = - \frac{\partial \mathcal{T}}{\partial \lambda_1}.
\]

Moreover

\[
\omega_1 = \frac{1}{\lambda_1 - \lambda_2} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & A_{12} & A_{13} \\ A_{21} & 0 & 0 \\ A_{31} & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \omega_2 = -\omega_1.
\]

Since \( \tilde{\omega}_1 + \tilde{\omega}_2 = 0 \), the same arguments of Remark 6.2 imply that

\[
A = A(x), \quad x = \lambda_1 - \lambda_2,
\]

so that \( \omega_j = \omega_j(x) \). Therefore, the gauge \( Y = e^{\lambda_2 z} \tilde{Y} \) transforms the Pfaffian system (6.1) into

\[
d\tilde{Y} = \left\{ \left[ \begin{pmatrix} x & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \frac{A}{z} \right] dz + \left( z E_1 + \tilde{\omega}_1(x) \right) dx \right\} \tilde{Y}, \quad \tilde{\omega}_1(x) = \omega_1(x) + \frac{dT(x)}{dx} \mathcal{T}(x)^{-1},
\]

where \( E_1 = \text{diag}(1,0,0) \). Its integrability condition (6.3) reduces to

\[
\frac{dA}{dx} = \left[ \omega_1(x) + \frac{dT(x)}{dx} \mathcal{T}(x)^{-1}, A \right].
\]
Now, a suitable choice of $\mathcal{T}(x)$ can be made such that

$$
\left[ \omega_1(x) + \frac{d\mathcal{T}(x)}{dx} \mathcal{T}(x)^{-1}, A \right] = 0.
$$

(7.2)

This choice of $\mathcal{T}$ is obtained by setting $A = A_0$ constant, calculating by linear algebra a constant $\mathcal{T}_0$ which Jordanizes $A_{11}^{(0)} \oplus A_{[2,2]}^{(0)}$:

$$
\mathcal{T}_0^{-1}(A_{11}^{(0)} \oplus A_{[2,2]}^{(0)}) \mathcal{T}_0 = J_1 \oplus J_2,
$$

and the general $\mathfrak{B}(x)$ such that $[\mathfrak{B}_j(x), J_j] = 0$. The so obtained $\mathcal{T}(x) = \mathcal{T}_0 \mathfrak{B}(x)$ must be substituted into (7.2), which can be solved as a system of differential equations for the entries of $\mathfrak{B}(x)$.

**Example.** We consider for simplicity the case when $A_{11} = A_{22} = A_{33} = 0$, so that

$$
A = \begin{pmatrix}
0 & A_{12} & A_{13} \\
A_{21} & 0 & A_{23} \\
A_{31} & A_{32} & 0
\end{pmatrix}.
$$

We also suppose that $A_{23}A_{32} \neq 0$, so that the block $A_{[2,2]}$ is diagonalizable, with eigenvalues $\pm \sqrt{A_{32}A_{23}}$. Recall that $A_{23}$ and $A_{32}$ are always constant. Thus, the most general form for $\mathcal{T}(x)$ is

$$
\mathcal{T}(x) = \mathcal{T}_0^{\text{particular}} \cdot \mathfrak{B}(x) = \begin{pmatrix}
1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & \frac{A_{23}}{\sqrt{A_{32}A_{23}}} & - \frac{A_{23}}{\sqrt{A_{32}A_{23}}} \\
0 & \frac{A_{32}}{\sqrt{A_{32}A_{23}}} & \frac{A_{32}}{\sqrt{A_{32}A_{23}}}
\end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix}
a(x) & 0 & 0 \\
0 & b(x) & 0 \\
0 & 0 & c(x)
\end{pmatrix},
$$

(7.3)

where $\mathcal{T}_0^{\text{particular}}$ is a particular choice for a constant matrix diagonalizing the block-diagonal part of $A$. Equation (7.2) has solution

$$
b(x) = b_0 x^\mu a(x), \quad c(x) = c_0 x^{-\mu} a(x), \quad b_0, c_0 \in \mathbb{C}\setminus\{0\}, \quad \mu := \sqrt{A_{32}A_{23}}.
$$

(7.4)

With this choice of $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{T}(x)$, equation (7.1) becomes

$$
\frac{dA}{dx} = 0 \implies A = A_0 \text{ is constant}.
$$

(7.5)

Notice that this introduces $(A_0)_{12}, (A_0)_{13}, (A_0)_{21}, (A_0)_{31}$ as integration constants. If instead we choose

$$
\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{T}_0 := \begin{pmatrix}
1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & \frac{A_{23}}{\sqrt{A_{23}A_{32}}} & - \frac{A_{23}}{\sqrt{A_{23}A_{32}}} \\
0 & \frac{A_{32}}{\sqrt{A_{23}A_{32}}} & \frac{A_{32}}{\sqrt{A_{23}A_{32}}}
\end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix}
a_0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & b_0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & c_0
\end{pmatrix} \text{ constant},
$$

(7.6)

then we obtain a non-constant $A(x)$. Indeed, now $A$ must satisfy

$$
\frac{dA(x)}{dx} = [\omega_1(x), A(x)] = \begin{pmatrix}
0 & \frac{A_{32}}{x} A_{13}(x) & \frac{A_{23}}{x} A_{12}(x) \\
-\frac{A_{23}}{x} A_{31}(x) & 0 & 0 \\
-\frac{A_{32}}{x} A_{21}(x) & 0 & 0
\end{pmatrix}.
$$
Since $A_{23}$ and $A_{32}$ are constant, the above is a linear system with Fuchsian singularity at $x = 0$, with general solution

$$A_{12}(x) = c_1 x^\mu + c_2 x^{-\mu}, \quad A_{13}(x) = \frac{A_{23}}{A_{32}}(c_1 x^\mu - c_2 x^{-\mu}),$$

$$A_{21}(x) = c_3 x^\mu + c_4 x^{-\mu}, \quad A_{31}(x) = -\frac{A_{32}}{A_{23}}(c_3 x^\mu - c_4 x^{-\mu}).$$

Here, $c_1, c_2, c_3, c_4$ are integration constants. It is a computation to check that the above $A(x)$ is

$$A(x) = \mathcal{T}_0(\mathcal{T}^{-1}(x)A_0\mathcal{T}(x))\mathcal{T}_0^{-1},$$

as predicted by the discussion leading to (6.4), where $A_0$ is (7.5), $\mathcal{T}_0$ is (7.6) and $\mathcal{T}(x)$ is (7.3) with the functions (7.4).

8 Appendix 1. On the expression of $\omega_j(\lambda)$

In the proof of PART I of Theorem 6.1, we have obtained

$$\omega_j(\lambda) = [\mathcal{T}F_1(\lambda)\mathcal{T}^{-1}, E_{p_k}], \quad (8.1)$$

where $\mathcal{T}$ and $F_1$ appear in a formal solution $Y_F(z, \lambda)$ given in (4.5). We know that $\mathcal{T}$ is not unique (its freedom is explained right after formula (4.1)), so that $A$ in (4.4) is not uniquely determined. The computations of section 4.1 of [10], Proposition 4.1, yield the off-diagonal blocks

$$F^{(1)}_{[i,j]} = \frac{A_{[i,j]}}{\lambda_j - \lambda_i}, \quad 1 \leq i \neq j \leq s. \quad (8.2)$$

They suffice to evaluate (8.1), since the diagonal blocks do not contribute. Indeed, if we partition a matrix $M$ according to the 9-blocks structure of $E_{p_k}$:

$$E_{p_k} = \frac{\partial \Lambda}{\partial \lambda_k} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & I_{p_k} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \implies M = \begin{pmatrix} M_{[1,1]} & M_{[1,2]} & M_{[1,3]} \\ M_{[2,1]} & M_{[2,2]} & M_{[2,3]} \\ M_{[3,1]} & M_{[3,2]} & M_{[3,3]} \end{pmatrix},$$

then

$$[M, E_{p_k}] = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & M_{[1,2]} & 0 \\ -M_{[2,1]} & 0 & -M_{[2,3]} \\ 0 & M_{[3,2]} & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (8.3)$$

From the definition of $A$ in (4.4) and (8.2) we receive

$$F^{(1)}_{[i,j]} = \frac{\mathcal{T}_i^{-1}A_{[i,j]}\mathcal{T}_j}{\lambda_j - \lambda_i},$$

so that

$$(\mathcal{T}F_1\mathcal{T}^{-1})_{[i,j]} = \mathcal{T}_iF^{(1)}_{[i,j]}\mathcal{T}_j^{-1} = \frac{A_{[i,j]}}{\lambda_j - \lambda_i}.$$ 

Finally, using the above and (8.3), we see that the blocks of (8.1) are

$$[\mathcal{T}F_1(\lambda)\mathcal{T}^{-1}, E_{p_k}]_{[a,a]} = 0, \quad [\mathcal{T}F_1(\lambda)\mathcal{T}^{-1}, E_{p_k}]_{[a,b]} = \frac{A_{[a,b]}(\lambda) (\delta_{ak} - \delta_{bk})}{\lambda_a - \lambda_b}, \quad a \neq b.$$
9 Appendix 2. Proof of Lemma 6.1

We consider the Jordan form \( J = J_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus J_s \) of \( A_{[1,1]} \oplus \cdots \oplus A_{[s,s]} \) and the corresponding \( L = L_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus L_s \). We prove that if the deformation is strongly isomonodromic, then

\[
\left[ T_k^{-1} \frac{\partial T_k}{\partial \lambda_j} , L_k \right] = \left[ T_k^{-1} \frac{\partial T_k}{\partial \lambda_j} , J_k \right] = 0, \quad \forall k = 1, \ldots, s.
\]

For a strong isomonodromy deformation, \( J \) and \( R \), and equivalently \( D \) and \( L \), are constant. The factor \( z^D z^L \) in each

\[
Y_\nu(z, \lambda) = \mathcal{T}(\lambda) \hat{Y}_\nu(z, \lambda) z^D z^L e^{z\Lambda}
\]
corresponds to a fundamental solution in Levelt form for the system (4.1) of [10], which has a Fuchsian singularity in \( z = \infty \). Up to a permutation, we can always assume that the matrices \( Y_\nu(z, \lambda) \) are taken so that \( z^D z^L \) satisfies the properties of Section 5 (to which we refer for notations). Therefore, following Section 5, we can write

\[
Y_\nu(z, \lambda) = \mathcal{T}(\lambda) \hat{Y}_\nu(z, \lambda) z^{D+\Sigma} z^N e^{z\Lambda}.
\]

**Step 1.** First, we show that

\[
[T(\lambda)^{-1} dT(\lambda), D + \Sigma] = 0 \quad (9.1)
\]

\[
[T(\lambda)^{-1} dT(\lambda), N] = 0 \quad (9.2)
\]

In order to prove (9.1)-(9.2), let

\[
\mathcal{Y}_\nu(z, \lambda) := \mathcal{T}(\lambda) Y_\nu(z, \lambda) \mathcal{T}(\lambda)^{-1}, \quad \hat{\mathcal{Y}}_\nu(z, \lambda) := \mathcal{T}(\lambda) \hat{Y}_\nu(z, \lambda) \mathcal{T}(\lambda)^{-1}
\]

and

\[
\mathcal{D}(\lambda) := \mathcal{T}(\lambda)(D + \Sigma) \mathcal{T}(\lambda)^{-1}, \quad \mathcal{N}(\lambda) := \mathcal{T}(\lambda) N \mathcal{T}(\lambda)^{-1}
\]

Then, we have

\[
Y_\nu(z, \lambda) = \hat{\mathcal{Y}}_\nu(z, \lambda) z^{\mathcal{D}(\lambda)} z^{\mathcal{N}(\lambda)} e^{z\Lambda} \mathcal{T}(\lambda) = \mathcal{Y}_\nu(z, \lambda) \mathcal{T}(\lambda),
\]

\[
\hat{\mathcal{Y}}_\nu(z, \lambda) \sim I + \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{T}(\lambda) F_j(\lambda) \mathcal{T}(\lambda)^{-1} z^{-j}, \quad z \to \infty \text{ in } \mathcal{S}_\nu.
\]

Let \( d_\lambda \) be the differential w.r.t. \( \lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_s \). From (6.5),

\[
\sum_{j=1}^{s} \left( z E_{p_j} + \omega_j(\lambda) \right) d\lambda_j + dT \cdot \mathcal{T}^{-1} = d_\lambda Y_\nu(z, \lambda) \cdot Y_\nu(z, \lambda)^{-1}
\]

The right hand-side is

\[
d_\lambda \mathcal{Y}_\nu \cdot \mathcal{Y}_\nu^{-1} + \mathcal{Y}_\nu \cdot dT \cdot \mathcal{T}^{-1} \mathcal{Y}_\nu^{-1}
\]

\[\text{One can take a permutation matrix } P, \text{ which does not change } \Lambda \text{ because it permutes indexes inside the same block, which yields } \mathcal{T} P(\mathcal{T}^{-1} \hat{Y}_\nu P) z^{p^{-1} D_P} z^{p^{-1} L_P} e^{z\Lambda} \text{ with the desired properties of Section 5.}\]
\[ \begin{aligned}
= d_D \hat{\nu}_\nu \cdot \hat{\nu}_\nu^{-1} + \hat{\nu}_\nu \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{d(D^m)}{m!} (\ln z)^m z^{-D} \hat{\nu}_\nu^{-1} + \hat{\nu}_\nu z^D \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{d(N^k)}{k!} (\ln z)^k z^{-N} z^{-D} \hat{\nu}_\nu^{-1} + \\
+ z \hat{\nu}_\nu z^D z^m d\Lambda z^{-N} z^{-D} \hat{\nu}_\nu^{-1} + \hat{\nu}_\nu z^D z^m e^{\Lambda z} dT \cdot T^{-1} e^{-\Lambda z} z^{-N} z^{-D} \hat{\nu}_\nu^{-1}
\end{aligned} \]

\[ = d_D \hat{\nu}_\nu \cdot \hat{\nu}_\nu^{-1} + \hat{\nu}_\nu \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{d(D^m)}{m!} (\ln z)^m z^{-D} \hat{\nu}_\nu^{-1} + \hat{\nu}_\nu z^D \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{d(N^k)}{k!} (\ln z)^k z^{-N} z^{-D} \hat{\nu}_\nu^{-1} + \\
+ z \hat{\nu}_\nu d\Lambda \hat{\nu}_\nu^{-1} + \hat{\nu}_\nu z^D z^m dT \cdot T^{-1} z^{-N} z^{-D} \hat{\nu}_\nu^{-1}. \tag{9.3} \]

In the last step, we have used the fact that \( e^{\Lambda z} \) commutes with \( dT \cdot T^{-1} \), \( D \) and \( N \), due to the block structure. The absence of logarithmic singularities in \( \sum_{j=1}^{s} (zE_{p_j} + \omega_j(\lambda))d\lambda_j + dT \cdot T^{-1} \) requires that

\[ dD = d\left( T(\lambda)(D + \Sigma)T(\lambda)^{-1} \right) = 0, \quad dN = d\left( T(\lambda)NT(\lambda)^{-1} \right) = 0 \]

Since \( d(D + \Sigma) = dN = 0 \) for the strong isomonodromy deformation, the above conditions are satisfied if and only if (9.1) and (9.2) respectively hold. In this way, also the last term in (9.3), namely

\[ \hat{\nu}_\nu z^D z^m dT \cdot T^{-1} z^{-N} z^{-D} \hat{\nu}_\nu^{-1} = \hat{\nu}_\nu z^{D+\Sigma} z^N T^{-1} dT z^{-N} z^{-D} e^{\Lambda z} \hat{\nu}_\nu^{-1}, \]

does not contain logarithmic singularities when (9.1)-(9.2) hold, because it reduces to

\[ \hat{\nu}_\nu dT \cdot T^{-1} \hat{\nu}_\nu^{-1} = dT \cdot T^{-1} + O(1/z). \]

Notice that the above behaviour is in agreement with \( \sum_{j=1}^{s} (zE_{p_j} + \omega_j(\lambda))d\lambda_j + dT \cdot T^{-1} \).

**Step 2.** The relations (9.1)-(9.2) can be written for the individual blocks inherited from \( L = L_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus L_s \) and \( T = T_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus T_s \). It suffices to consider a single block with label \( k \).

As already explained, up to a \( Y_\nu \longrightarrow Y_\nu P \) given by a suitable permutation matrix \( P \), we assume that for each block \( L_k, k = 1, \ldots, s \), the Levelt structure explained in Section 5 applies. See figure 2.

We consider the problem at the level of a single block with label \( k \). In order to avoid a proliferation of indices, from now on \( J, \ell, D, \Sigma, N \) will respectively stand for \( J_{k}, L_k, R_k, S_k, D_k, \Sigma_k \) and \( N_k \). We will take the label \( k \) only for \( T_k \), in order not to confuse it with the full \( T \). To them, the structures of Section 5 apply. Now, we have \( L = L_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus L_\ell \) for some \( \ell \), and

\[ \Sigma = \sigma_1 I_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus \sigma_\ell I_\ell, \]

with eigenvalues \( \sigma_q \) (with real part in \([0,1])\). Hence, since \( D \) is diagonal, (9.1) for the block \( k \) of \( T^{-1} dT \) gives

\[ [T_k^{-1} dT_k, D + \Sigma] = 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad T_k = T_1^{(k)} \oplus \cdots \oplus T_\ell^{(k)}. \]

Now, \( D = D_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus D_\ell \), and \( N = N_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus N_\ell \). Notice that

\[ [(T_q^{(k)})^{-1} dT_q^{(k)}, D_q + \Sigma_q] = 0. \tag{9.4} \]
Figure 2: Structure of the blocks $L_k$ of $L$. Here, $\Sigma_k$ is diagonal and $N_k$ is nilpotent.

\[
L = \begin{pmatrix}
0 & L_k & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0
\end{pmatrix} = \Sigma + N
\]

\[
L_k = \begin{pmatrix}
\ast & 0 & \ast \\
0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0
\end{pmatrix} = \Sigma_k + N_k
\]

$\Sigma_k = \begin{pmatrix}
0 & \ast & \ast \\
0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0
\end{pmatrix}$

Figure 3: The structure of the sub-blocks $\mathcal{N}_q$ and $\mathcal{D}_q$ of $\mathcal{N}$ and $\mathcal{D}$ (that is, of a certain $N_k$ and $D_k$), corresponding to $\Sigma_q = \sigma_q I_q$.
Each $N_q$ ($q = 1, \ldots, \ell$) is upper triangular, it has zeros on the diagonal, and its diagonal blocks are elementary Jordan sub-blocks with 1’s on the second upper diagonal, as in figure 3. Accordingly, $D_q$, which is diagonal with a non decreasing sequence of integer eigenvalues, has sub-blocks with the same eigenvalue corresponding to a Jordan sub-block in $N_q$, as in figure 3.

The above facts and (9.4) imply that $(T_q^{(k)})^{-1}dT_q^{(k)}$ is divided into sub-blocks as $\Sigma_q + D_q$, where the only non-zero sub-blocks are the block-diagonal part, as in Figure 4.

If follows that $[T_k(\lambda)^{-1}dT_k(\lambda), N] = 0$ (from (9.2)) reduces to

$$[(T_q^{(k)})^{-1}dT_q^{(k)}, N_q] = 0,$$

(9.5)

Let $M_q := (T_q^{(k)})^{-1}dT_q^{(k)}$, and let $M^{(q)}_{[a,b]} = M^{(q)}_{[a,a]} \delta_{ab}$ be a sub-block. From (9.5) we receive

$$M^{(q)}_{[a,a]}N^{(q)}_{[a,b]} - N^{(q)}_{[a,b]}M^{(q)}_{[b,b]} = 0.$$

In particular

$$M^{(q)}_{[a,a]}N^{(q)}_{[a,a]} - N^{(q)}_{[a,a]}M^{(q)}_{[a,a]} = 0,$$

which means that $M_q$ commutes with the block-diagonal matrix $N^{(q)}_{[1,1]} \oplus N^{(q)}_{[2,2]} \oplus \cdots \oplus N^{(q)}_{[\ell,\ell]}$ (= Jordan matrix obtained from the diagonal sub-blocks of $N_q$ in the left part of figure 3).

Now, observe that $D_q + \Sigma_q + (N^{(q)}_{[1,1]} \oplus N^{(q)}_{[2,2]} \oplus \cdots) = J_q$. Since $M_q$ also commutes with $D_q + \Sigma_q$, we conclude that it commutes with $J_q$, namely

$$[(T_q^{(k)})^{-1}dT_q^{(k)}, J_q] = 0.$$

Therefore,

$$[(T_k)^{-1}dT_k, J] = 0.$$

Coming back to the original notations, the above is $[(T_k)^{-1}dT_k, J_k] = 0$. This is what we wanted to prove. $\Box$
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