

# ON A CANONICAL POLYNOMIAL FOR LINKS OF ELLIPTIC SINGULARITIES

TAMÁS LÁSZLÓ

ABSTRACT. Given an elliptic normal surface singularity with a rational homology sphere link, we prove that the associated elliptic sequence can be determined from the exponents of a canonical polynomial constructed from the topological Poincaré series of the link. Furthermore, we study the topology of extensions of elliptic singularities and prove that certain good extensions, defined in this article, can be characterized by a natural recursive formula for the corresponding canonical polynomials.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Classification of normal surface singularities and investigation of their analytic invariants via topological data is a classical research theme in singularity theory. In this type of research the fundamental cycles (ie. special divisors supported on the exceptional set of a fixed resolution space) play a crucial role since they can identify important analytical and topological properties of the singularity.

The first results of this type can be attributed to the Artin-Laufer program, initiated by the work of Artin [A62, A66] by characterizing topologically the rational singularities, using a special cycle  $Z_{min}$ . This is called now the minimal cycle or Artin's fundamental cycle. Then Laufer [La72, La77] extended these ideas to the case of elliptic singularities, introduced by Wagreich [Wa70]. He defined the class of minimally elliptic singularities and showed that they can be characterized topologically. These are the Gorenstein singularities with geometric genus  $p_g = 1$ .

He also noticed that 'more complicated' elliptic singularities (eg. having  $p_g = 1$  without the Gorenstein condition, or Gorenstein elliptic singularities with  $p_g \geq 2$ ) cannot be characterized topologically since one can construct examples of pairs of singularities with the same topology, but different geometric genus. Later, further investigations on elliptic singularities were also given by Yau [Y79, Y80]. Motivated by Yau's results, Némethi showed in [N99a] that in fact, for Gorenstein singularities with rational homology sphere link the Artin-Laufer program can be continued and the elliptic case was clarified completely.

In many of the above results, the main topological invariant, which guides most of the properties of elliptic singularities is the *elliptic sequence*.

The first versions of the elliptic sequence was introduced by Laufer and Yau. Recently, the work of Nagy and Némethi [NN18, NN19] constructed another elliptic sequence which differs from the Yau's sequence only for non-numerically Gorenstein singularities and capture the failure of this property in a different way.

The aim of the present work is to show how the elliptic sequence can be extracted from the exponents of certain Poincaré series associated with the topology of the singularity. The motivation is two folded: on one hand we hope for a generalization of such sequences for more

---

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. Primary. 32S05, 32S25, 32S50, 57K31 Secondary. 14B05, 14J80.

*Key words and phrases*. Normal surface singularities, links of singularities, plumbing graphs, rational homology spheres, Poincaré series, elliptic singularities, elliptic sequence, canonical polynomial.

complicated singularities by using the interpretation given by this manuscript. On the other hand, the present work highlights what kind of information the Poincaré series can encode.

1.2. In order to provide some details regarding the results of the present article, we will introduce the following terminology.

Let  $(X, o)$  be a normal surface singularity and we will assume that its link  $M$  is a rational homology sphere (denoted by  $\mathbb{Q}HS^3$ ). We fix a good resolution  $\pi : \tilde{X} \rightarrow X$  of  $X$ , which means that the exceptional divisor  $E := \pi^{-1}(o)$  is a simple normal-crossing divisor, and let  $\Gamma$  be its dual resolution graph with set of vertices  $\mathcal{V}$ .

Consider the usual combinatorial package of the resolution (for a more detailed discussion see section 2.1):  $\cup_{v \in \mathcal{V}} E_v$  is the decomposition of  $E$  into irreducible components,  $L = H_2(\tilde{X}, \mathbb{Z}) = \mathbb{Z}\langle E_v \rangle_v$  is the lattice associated with  $\pi$ , or with  $\Gamma$ , endowed with the negative definite intersection form  $(E_v, E_w)_{v,w}$ . We identify the dual lattice  $L'$  with those rational cycles  $l' \in L \otimes \mathbb{Q}$  for which  $(l', l) \in \mathbb{Z}$  for any  $l \in L$ . Then  $L'/L$  is the finite group  $H_1(\partial\tilde{X}, \mathbb{Z})$  ( $\partial\tilde{X} = M$ ), which will be denoted by  $H$ . We set  $[l']$  for the class of  $l' \in L'$  in  $H$ . Given two cycles  $l'_i = \sum_v l'_{i,v} E_v \in L' \subset L \otimes \mathbb{Q}$  ( $i \in \{1, 2\}$ ) one defines a natural partial ordering:  $l'_1 \geq l'_2$  if and only if  $l'_{1,v} \geq l'_{2,v}$  for any  $v \in \mathcal{V}$ . Let  $Z_K \in L'$  be the anti-canonical cycle associated with  $\Gamma$  (cf. (2.1.2)) and set the (anti)dual basis  $\{E_v^*\}$  for  $L'$ .

Using these cycles one defines the rational function  $\prod_{v \in \mathcal{V}} (1 - \mathbf{t}^{E_v^*})^{\delta_v - 2}$ , where  $\delta_v$  is the valency of the vertex  $v$  in  $\Gamma$ , and  $\mathbf{t}^{l'} := \prod_v t_v^{l'_{i,v}}$  where  $l' = \sum_v l'_v E_v$ . Its Taylor expansion at the origin  $Z(\mathbf{t}) = \sum_{l' \in L'} z(l') \mathbf{t}^{l'}$  is called the *topological Poincaré series* associated with  $\Gamma$ .

The theory of topological Poincaré series was started with the work of Campillo, Delgado and Gusein-Zade (see eg. [CDG03, CDGZ04, CDGZ08, CDGZ13] and the references therein) and Némethi [N08]. In the last decade several developments have been made regarding its applications, cf. [N11, N12, LN14, LNN17, LSz16, LSz17, LNN19, CMLN21a, CMLN20, CMLN21b].

The series  $Z(\mathbf{t})$  decomposes as  $\sum_{h \in H} Z_h(\mathbf{t})$ , where  $Z_h(\mathbf{t}) := \sum_{[l']=h} z(l') \mathbf{t}^{l'}$ . Furthermore, for any subset  $I \subset \mathcal{V}$  we consider the reduced series  $Z_h(\mathbf{t}_I) := Z_h(\mathbf{t})|_{t_i=1, i \notin I}$ . Then for any  $h \in H$  and  $I \subset \mathcal{V}$ , the recent articles [LSz16, LSz17, LNN19] developed a unique decomposition  $Z_h(\mathbf{t}_I) = P_{h,I}(\mathbf{t}_I) + Z_{h,I}^{neg}(\mathbf{t}_I)$ , guided by the following properties.

$P_{h,I}(\mathbf{t}_I)$  is a Laurent polynomial with non-negative exponents with respect to the above defined partial ordering, and  $Z_{h,I}^{neg}(\mathbf{t}_I)$  is a rational function with negative degree in all variables. Furthermore, the sum of the coefficients of  $P_{h,I}$ , denoted by  $P_{h,I}(\mathbf{1})$ , must be equal to the periodic constant of  $Z_{h,I}$  (see 2.5 for definition), measuring the regularity of the series. In fact, this measurement in the case  $I = \mathcal{V}$  provides us the normalized Seiberg–Witten invariants of the 3-manifold  $M$  associated with the corresponding *spin<sup>c</sup>*-structures indexed by the group elements  $h \in H$ , cf. [Lim00, N05, N11]. This invariant is realized for smaller sets  $I \subset \mathcal{V}$  as well thanks to certain reduction procedures, see [LN14, LN15].

In particular, associated with  $h = 0$  the corresponding polynomial  $P_0(\mathbf{t})$  is called the *canonical polynomial*. (The index  $I = \mathcal{V}$  is omitted from the notation for simplicity.)

The canonical polynomial can be thought as the analog of the Alexander polynomial associated with knots/links in  $S^3$ . In fact, one applies the procedure to the Poincaré series associated with a plane curve singularity as well, in which case the Alexander polynomial of the singularity appears in the decomposition, see eg. [CDG03] and [LNN19, Section 5.4].

1.3. Now, let  $(X, o)$  be an elliptic singularity with  $\mathbb{Q}HS^3$  link, and we assume that the minimal resolution is a good resolution. Note that by a result of Yau [Y80] there are very few pathological cases for which the minimal and the minimal good resolution are not coincide. For these cases the

results of the present article can be adapted easily to the level of the minimal good resolution, therefore we will omit it from our discussion.

We consider the elliptic sequence defined by Nagy and Némethi [NN18]. It is a sequence of subgraphs  $\{B_j\}_{j=-1}^m$ , where  $B_{-1} := \Gamma$  and  $B_m$  is the support of the minimal elliptic cycle associated with the resolution, see 3.2.1. We say that the length of the sequence is  $m + 1$ . One also associates to this sequence a sequence of special cycles  $\{C_j\}_{j=-1}^m$  which play a crucial role in our study.

One knows by [NN19] (see also [N08b]) that the length of the elliptic sequence equals to the canonical Seiberg–Witten invariant of the link of the singularity, hence it can be viewed as the sum of coefficients  $P_0(\mathbf{1})$  of the canonical polynomial. This result motivates the research of the present manuscript.

First of all, we study the role of the exponents of the canonical polynomial which was hidden and mysterious before the current work. Namely, we prove that the exponents of  $P_0$  completely determine the elliptic sequence  $\{B_j, C_j\}$ . Conversely, by knowing the elliptic sequence we give an algorithm on the graph which generates all the exponents of the polynomial.

Furthermore, we are interested how the canonical polynomials of two elliptic singularities are related whenever one of them is an extension of the other. In this context we define the *good extensions* which can be characterized by a simple recursive formula for the corresponding canonical polynomials.

1.4. The structure of the article is as follows. Section 2 presents the necessary ingredients and preliminaries regarding the topology of normal surface singularities, Seiberg–Witten invariants, Poincaré series and the canonical polynomial constructed from it. Section 3 is a short introduction to the theory of elliptic singularities with a high emphasis on the Nagy–Némethi elliptic sequence. Section 4 contains one of the main result of the article and discusses how the (exponents of) canonical polynomial determines the elliptic sequence. We illustrate our result on detailed examples as well. In section 5 we discuss some technical machinery which shows how the exponents project if we consider elliptic subgraphs of a given elliptic graph. Then in section 6 we study extensions of elliptic graphs and their corresponding exponents. As a result we define the good extensions which, in some sense, ‘behaves’ nicely amongst all the elliptic extensions. Finally, section 7 characterizes the good extensions via a simple and natural recursive formula for the corresponding canonical polynomials.

## 2. PRELIMINARIES: INVARIANTS OF NORMAL SURFACE SINGULARITIES

### 2.1. Plumbing/resolution graphs.

2.1.1. We fix a connected plumbing graph  $\Gamma$  whose associated intersection matrix is negative definite. We denote the corresponding oriented plumbed 3–manifold by  $M = M(\Gamma)$ . Any such  $M(\Gamma)$  is the link of a complex normal surface singularity  $(X, o)$ , which has a resolution  $\tilde{X} \rightarrow X$  with resolution graph  $\Gamma$  (see e.g. [N99b]), and the complex analytic smooth surface  $\tilde{X}$  as a smooth manifold is the plumbed 4–manifold associated with  $\Gamma$ , with boundary  $\partial\tilde{X} = M$ .

In this article we always assume that  $M$  is a *rational homology sphere*, equivalently,  $\Gamma$  is a tree with all genus decorations zero.

We will use the notation  $\mathcal{V}$  for the set of vertices of  $\Gamma$ ,  $\delta_v$  for the valency of a vertex  $v$ ,  $\mathcal{N}$  for the set of nodes (vertices with  $\delta_v \geq 3$ ), and  $\mathcal{E}$  for the set of end–vertices (ie. vertices with  $\delta_v = 1$ ).

The second homology  $L := H_2(\tilde{X}, \mathbb{Z})$  of  $\tilde{X}$  is a lattice, freely generated by the classes of 2–spheres  $\{E_v\}_{v \in \mathcal{V}}$ , with a negative definite intersection form  $(, )$ . We set the notation  $e_v := (E_v, E_v)$ . Furthermore,  $H^2(\tilde{X}, \mathbb{Z})$  can be identified with the dual lattice  $L' := \text{Hom}_{\mathbb{Z}}(L, \mathbb{Z}) =$

$\{l' \in L \otimes \mathbb{Q} : (l', L) \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ .  $L'$  is generated by the (anti)dual classes  $\{E_v^*\}_{v \in \mathcal{V}}$  defined by  $(E_v^*, E_w) = -\delta_{vw}$ , the opposite of the Kronecker symbol. One has the inclusions  $L \subset L' \subset L \otimes \mathbb{Q} =: L_{\mathbb{Q}}$  and the intersection form extends to  $L_{\mathbb{Q}}$ . Furthermore,  $H_1(M, \mathbb{Z}) \simeq L'/L$ , which will be denoted in the sequel by  $H$ .

The elements of  $L'$  will be called *cycles*. For a cycle  $l' = \sum_v l'_v E_v$  we define its support  $|l'| := \{v \in \mathcal{V} : l'_v \neq 0\}$  and write  $[l']$  for its class in  $H$ .

**2.1.2.  $H$ -representatives and the Lipman cone.** For  $l'_1, l'_2 \in L'$  with  $l'_i = \sum_v l'_{i,v} E_v$  ( $i = \{1, 2\}$ ) one considers a partial order relation  $l'_1 \geq l'_2$  defined coordinatewise by  $l'_{1,v} \geq l'_{2,v}$  for all  $v \in \mathcal{V}$ . In particular, we say that  $l'$  is an effective cycle if  $l' \geq 0$ . We set also  $\min\{l'_1, l'_2\} := \sum_v \min\{l'_{1,v}, l'_{2,v}\} E_v$  and analogously  $\min\{F\}$  for a finite subset  $F \subset L'$ . We will also use the notation  $l'_1 \prec l'_2$  if  $l'_{1,v} < l'_{2,v}$  for all  $v \in \mathcal{V}$ . (Note that  $\not\prec$  differs from  $\prec$ .)

The lattice  $L'$  admits a partition parametrized by the group  $H$ , where for any  $h \in H$  one sets

$$(2.1.1) \quad L'_h = \{l' \in L' \mid [l'] = h\} \subset L'.$$

Note that  $L'_0 = L$ . Given an  $h \in H$  one can define  $r_h := \sum_v l'_v E_v \in L'_h$  as the unique element of  $L'_h$  such that  $0 \leq l'_v < 1$ .

We define the rational Lipman cone by

$$\mathcal{S}_{\mathbb{Q}} := \{l' \in L_{\mathbb{Q}} \mid (l', E_v) \leq 0 \text{ for all } v \in \mathcal{V}\},$$

which is a cone generated over  $\mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}$  by  $E_v^*$ . Define  $\mathcal{S}' := \mathcal{S}_{\mathbb{Q}} \cap L'$  as the semigroup (monoid) of anti-nef cycles of  $L'$ ; it is generated over  $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$  by the cycles  $E_v^*$ . Since  $\{E_v^*\}_v$  have positive entries,  $\mathcal{S}_{\mathbb{Q}} \setminus \{0\}$  is in the open first quadrant.

The Lipman cone  $\mathcal{S}'$  also admits a natural equivariant partition indexed by  $H$  by  $\mathcal{S}'_h = \mathcal{S}' \cap L'_h$ . Furthermore, we have the following properties:

- (a) if  $l'_1, l'_2 \in \mathcal{S}'_h$  then  $l'_2 - l'_1 \in L$  and  $\min\{l'_1, l'_2\} \in \mathcal{S}'_h$ ;
- (b) for any  $s \in L'$  the set  $\{l' \in \mathcal{S}' \mid l' \not\prec s\}$  is finite;
- (c) for any  $h \in H$  there exists a unique *minimal cycle*  $s_h := \min\{\mathcal{S}'_h\} \in \mathcal{S}'_h$  (cf. 2.1.3);

**2.1.3. Generalized Laufer's algorithm.** [La72],[N05, Lemma 7.4] We fix  $h \in H$ . Then for any  $l' \in L'_h$  there exists a unique minimal element  $s(l') \in \mathcal{S}'_h$  satisfying  $s(l') \geq l'$  which can be obtained by the following algorithm. Set  $x_0 := l'$ . Then one constructs a computation sequence  $\{x_i\}_i$  as follows. If  $x_i$  is already constructed and  $x_i \notin \mathcal{S}'$  then there exists some  $E_{v_i}$  such that  $(x_i, E_{v_i}) > 0$ . Then take  $x_{i+1} := x_i + E_{v_i}$  (for some choice of  $E_{v_i}$ ). Then the procedure after finitely many steps stops, say at  $x_t$ , and necessarily  $x_t = s(l')$ .

In particular, if we start with  $l' = E_v$  with an arbitrarily chosen  $v \in \mathcal{V}$  then  $s(l') = \min\{\mathcal{S}' \setminus \{0\}\}$  is the *minimal (or Artin's fundamental) cycle*  $Z_{\min} \in L$  of the singularity [A62, A66, La72]. In this special case, the above algorithm is called the '*Laufer algorithm targeting  $Z_{\min}$* '.

In fact  $s(r_h) = s_h$  and  $r_h \leq s_h$ , however, in general  $r_h \neq s_h$ . Note that this fact does not contradict the minimality of  $s_h$  in  $\mathcal{S}'_h$  since  $r_h$  might not sit in  $\mathcal{S}'_h$ .

**2.1.4.** We consider the anti-canonical cycle  $Z_K \in L'$  defined by the adjunction formulae  $(Z_K, E_v) = e_v + 2$  for all  $v$ . Then one can define the Riemann–Roch function by  $\chi : L' \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}$ ,  $\chi(l') := -(l', l' - Z_K)/2$ .

The singularity  $(X, o)$ , or its topological type is called *numerically Gorenstein* if  $Z_K \in L$ . Note that the  $Z_K \in L$  property is independent of the resolution, since  $Z_K \in L$  if and only if the line bundle  $\Omega_{X \setminus \{o\}}^2$  of holomorphic 2-forms on  $X \setminus \{o\}$  is topologically trivial, see e.g. [D78].  $(X, o)$  is called *Gorenstein* if  $Z_K \in L$  and  $\Omega_{\bar{X}}^2$  (the sheaf of holomorphic 2-forms) is isomorphic

to  $\mathcal{O}_{\tilde{X}}(-Z_K)$  (or, equivalently, if the line bundle  $\Omega_{\tilde{X}\setminus\{o\}}^2$  is holomorphically trivial). Note that from the adjunction formulae one follows the following expression

$$(2.1.2) \quad Z_K - E = \sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}} (\delta_v - 2) E_v^*,$$

where we denote  $E := \sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}} E_v$ .

**2.2. Rational singularities.** Recall that a singularity  $(X, o)$  is rational if its geometric genus  $p_g(X, o) = \dim H^1(\tilde{X}, \mathcal{O}_{\tilde{X}}) = 0$ . This vanishing was characterized topologically by Artin [A62, A66] and Laufer [La72] in terms of the graph:  $(X, o)$  is rational if and only if  $\chi(l) > 0$  for any  $l \in L_{>0}$ , or equivalently,  $\chi(Z_{min}) = 1$ . We also say that a negative definite plumbing graph is a *rational graph* if it is the resolution graph of a rational singularity.

Note that the above combinatorial properties characterizing a rational graph are also equivalent with the fact that along the Laufer algorithm targeting  $Z_{min}$  the  $\chi$  function is constant, or equivalently, at every step in the algorithm one has  $(x_i, E_{v_i}) = 1$ . In fact, this implies that all the vertices of a rational graph satisfy the following inequality:

$$(2.2.1) \quad -e_v \geq \delta_v - 1.$$

**2.3. The topological Poincaré series.** Let  $\mathbb{Z}[[L']]$  be the  $\mathbb{Z}$ -module consisting of the  $\mathbb{Z}$ -linear combinations of the monomials  $\mathbf{t}^{l'} := \prod_{v \in \mathcal{V}} t_v^{l'_v}$ , where  $l' = \sum_v l'_v E_v \in L'$ . Then the *multivariable topological Poincaré series*  $Z(\mathbf{t}) = \sum_{l' \in L'} z(l') \mathbf{t}^{l'} \in \mathbb{Z}[[L']]$  is the Taylor expansion at the origin of the rational ‘zeta-function’

$$(2.3.1) \quad \prod_{v \in \mathcal{V}} (1 - \mathbf{t}^{E_v^*})^{\delta_v - 2},$$

where  $\mathbf{t}^{l'} := \prod_{v \in \mathcal{V}} t_v^{l'_v}$  for any  $l' = \sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}} l'_v E_v \in L'$ , cf. [CDGZ04, CDGZ08, N08]. For simplicity, in this article we will use the same notation  $Z(\mathbf{t})$  for both the above rational function and its Taylor expansion as well.

The expression (2.3.1) shows that  $Z(\mathbf{t})$  is supported in the Lipman cone  $\mathcal{S}'$ . Moreover, the exponents are expressed as  $l' = \sum_{v \in \mathcal{N} \cup \mathcal{E}} l_v^* E_v^*$  for some  $l_v^* \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$  satisfying  $0 \leq l_v^* \leq \delta_v - 2$  for every  $v \in \mathcal{N}$ . This expression gives the following coefficients

$$(2.3.2) \quad z(l') = \prod_{v \in \mathcal{N}} (-1)^{l_v^*} \binom{\delta_v - 2}{l_v^*}.$$

The topological Poincaré series decomposes as  $Z(\mathbf{t}) = \sum_{h \in H} Z_h(\mathbf{t})$ , where  $Z_h(\mathbf{t}) = \sum_{[l']_h} z(l') \mathbf{t}^{l'}$ , and we will use the following notation for the supports:

$$Supp(Z_h) = \{l' \in \mathcal{S}'_h : z(l') \neq 0\} \subset \mathcal{S}'_h.$$

Note that, however the first exponent of  $Z_0$  is always  $l' = 0$  (the ‘vertex’ of  $\mathcal{S}'_0$ ), in the case of  $h \neq 0$  the minimal element  $s_h$  of  $\mathcal{S}'_h$  might not be in  $Supp(Z_h)$  as shown by the following example.

**Example 2.3.3.** Let  $\Gamma$  be a star-shaped graph with 4 vertices with the associated base elements  $\{E_i\}_{i=1}^4$ . Consider the following decorations:  $E_1^2 = -3$  for the central vertex and  $E_i^2 = -2$  for the other vertices. Then one computes that  $r_{[2E_1^*]} = (1/3)E_1 + (2/3)E_2 + (2/3)E_3 + (2/3)E_4$  and  $s_{[2E_1^*]} = r_{[2E_1^*]} + E_1 = 2E_1^*$ . Hence, by the above discussion,  $s_{[2E_1^*]}$  is not in the support of  $Z_{[2E_1^*]}$ .

**2.4. Counting functions and periodic constants of multivariable series.** In this section we need to adopt the setting of the previous sections in a slightly more general context as follows.

Let  $L$  be a lattice freely generated by base elements  $\{E_v\}_{v \in \mathcal{V}}$ ,  $L'$  is an overlattice of the same rank (not necessarily dual of  $L$ ), and we set  $H := L'/L$ , a finite abelian group. We define the partial ordering on  $L'$  as in section 2.1.2.

Consider a multivariable series  $S(\mathbf{t}) = \sum_{l' \in L'} a(l') \mathbf{t}^{l'} \in \mathbb{Z}[[L']]$ , let  $\text{Supp}(S) := \{l' \in L' : a(l') \neq 0\}$  be the support of the series and we assume that for any  $x \in L'$

$$(2.4.1) \quad \{l' \in \text{Supp}(S) \mid l' \not\preceq x\} \text{ is finite.}$$

For any subset of vertices  $\emptyset \neq I \subset \mathcal{V}$  we can define the projection of  $L'$  via the map  $\text{pr}_I : L_{\mathbb{Q}} \rightarrow \bigoplus_{v \in I} \mathbb{Q}\langle E_v \rangle$  as  $L'_I = \text{pr}_I(L')$ , and one can consider multivariable series in the  $\mathbb{Z}$ -module  $\mathbb{Z}[[L'_I]]$ . For example, if  $S(\mathbf{t}) \in \mathbb{Z}[[L']]$  then  $S(\mathbf{t}_I) := S(\mathbf{t})|_{t_v=1, v \notin I}$  is called the *reduced series*, which is an element of  $\mathbb{Z}[[L'_I]]$ . In the sequel we use the notation  $l'_I = l'|_I := \text{pr}_I(l')$  and  $\mathbf{t}'_I := \mathbf{t}^{l'}|_{t_v=1, v \notin I}$  for any  $l' \in L'$ . Each coefficient  $a_I(x)$  of  $S(\mathbf{t}_I)$  is obtained as a summation of certain coefficients  $a(y)$  of  $S(\mathbf{t})$ , where  $y$  runs over  $\{l' \in \text{Supp}(S) \mid l'_I = x\}$  (this is a finite sum by (2.4.1)). Moreover,  $S(\mathbf{t}_I)$  satisfies a similar finiteness property as (2.4.1) in the variables  $\mathbf{t}_I$ .

We can consider the unique decomposition  $S(\mathbf{t}) = \sum_h S_h(\mathbf{t})$ , where  $S_h(\mathbf{t}) := \sum_{[l']=h} a(l') \mathbf{t}^{l'}$ . We have to emphasize here that the  $H$ -decomposition of the reduced series  $S(\mathbf{t}_I)$  is not well defined. That is, the reduced series  $S_h(\mathbf{t})|_{t_v=1, v \notin I}$  cannot be recovered from  $S(\mathbf{t}_I)$  in general, since the class of  $l'$  cannot be recovered from  $l'_I$ . Hence, the notation  $S_h(\mathbf{t}_I)$ , defined as  $S_h(\mathbf{t})|_{t_v=1, v \notin I}$ , is not ambiguous, but requires certain caution.

**2.4.1. Counting functions of coefficients.** Given a multivariable series  $A(\mathbf{t}_I) \in \mathbb{Z}[[L'_I]]$  (eg.  $A(\mathbf{t}_I) = S(\mathbf{t}_I)$  or  $A(\mathbf{t}_I) = S_h(\mathbf{t}_I)$  for  $h \in H$ ) the *counting function* of its coefficients is defined as follows:

$$(2.4.2) \quad Q(A(\mathbf{t}_I)) : L'_I \longrightarrow \mathbb{Z}, \quad x_I \mapsto \sum_{l'_I \preceq x_I} a(l'_I).$$

It is well defined whenever  $A(\mathbf{t}_I)$  satisfies the finiteness condition (2.4.1). If  $A(\mathbf{t}_I) = S_h(\mathbf{t}_I)$  then  $Q(A(\mathbf{t}_I))$  will also be denoted by  $Q_{h,I}^{(S)}$ . In this case,  $Q(S(\mathbf{t}_I)) = \sum_{h \in H} Q_{h,I}^{(S)}$ , and it can be extended to  $x \in L'$  via the projection  $L' \rightarrow L'_I$  as  $Q_{h,I}^{(S)}(x) = Q_{h,I}^{(S)}(x_I)$ .

**2.4.2. Periodic constants of multivariable series.** Now, for a fixed  $h \in H$ , let  $S_h(\mathbf{t})$  be the  $h$ -part of a series  $S(\mathbf{t}) \in \mathbb{Z}[[L']]$  satisfying the finiteness condition (2.4.1). Let  $\mathcal{K} \subset L' \otimes \mathbb{R}$  be a real closed cone whose affine closure is top dimensional. Assume that there exist  $l'_* \in \mathcal{K}$  and a finite index sublattice  $\tilde{L}$  of  $L$  and a quasi-polynomial  $\mathfrak{Q}_{h,\mathcal{V}}^{\mathcal{K},(S)}(x)$  defined on  $\tilde{L}$  such that

$$(2.4.3) \quad \mathfrak{Q}_{h,\mathcal{V}}^{\mathcal{K},(S)}(l) = Q_{h,\mathcal{V}}^{(S)}(r_h + l)$$

whenever  $l \in (l'_* + \mathcal{K}) \cap \tilde{L}$  ( $r_h \in L'$  is defined similarly as in 2.1.2). Then we say that the counting function  $Q_{h,\mathcal{V}}^{(S)}$  (or just  $S_h(\mathbf{t})$ ) admits a *quasi-polynomial* in  $\mathcal{K}$ , namely  $\tilde{L} \ni l \mapsto \mathfrak{Q}_{h,\mathcal{V}}^{\mathcal{K},(S)}(l)$ . In this case, we can define the *periodic constant* ([LN14]) of  $S_h(\mathbf{t})$  associated with  $\mathcal{K}$  by

$$(2.4.4) \quad \text{pc}^{\mathcal{K}}(S_h(\mathbf{t})) := \mathfrak{Q}_{h,\mathcal{V}}^{\mathcal{K},(S)}(0) \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

The number  $\text{pc}^{\mathcal{K}}(S_h(\mathbf{t}))$  is independent of the choice of  $l'_*$  and of the finite index sublattice  $\tilde{L} \subset L$ .

Given any  $I \subset \mathcal{V}$  the natural group homomorphism  $\text{pr}_I : L' \rightarrow L'_I$  preserves the lattices  $L \rightarrow L_I$  and hence it induces a homomorphism  $H \rightarrow H_I := L'_I/L_I$ , denoted by  $h \mapsto h_I$ . However, note that even if  $L'$  is the dual of  $L$  associated with a form  $(\cdot, \cdot)$ ,  $L'_I$  usually is not a dual lattice of  $L_I$ , it is just an overlattice. This fact motivates the general setup of the present

subsection. Hence, one can define again the periodic constant associated with the reduced series  $S_h(\mathbf{t}_I)$  by exchanging  $\mathcal{V}$  (resp.  $\mathbf{t}, r_h$ ) by  $I$  (resp.  $\mathbf{t}_I, (r_h)_I$ ).

We note that periodic constants for one-variable series was defined by Némethi and Okuma in [O08, NO09], the multivariable case was developed in [LN14]. More details and examples can also be found in [N08, N11, LSz16].

## 2.5. Periodic constants of the topological Poincaré series.

2.5.1. In this section we specify the concepts of the previous sections 2.4.1 and 2.4.2 to the topological Poincaré series  $Z_h(\mathbf{t})$ , and recall some results emphasizing that they encode important topological invariants of the link.

Since the positivity of the dual base elements  $E_v^*$  implies that for any  $x \in L'$  the set  $\{l' \in \text{Supp}(Z_h) : l' \neq x\}$  is finite,  $Z_h(\mathbf{t}_I)$  ( $\emptyset \neq I \subset \mathcal{V}$ ) satisfies the finiteness condition (2.4.1), hence the corresponding counting functions are well-defined. For simplicity, throughout the paper we will use the simplified notation  $Q_{h,I}(x) := Q_{h,I}^{(Z)}(x)$  for the counting function of  $Z_h(\mathbf{t}_I)$ , in particular we write  $Q_h(x) := Q_{h,\mathcal{V}}^{(Z)}(x)$ , if there is no danger of ambiguity.

In [N11] it has been shown that for any  $l' \in Z_K + \text{int}(\mathcal{S}')$  (where  $\text{int}(\mathcal{S}') = \mathbb{Z}_{>0}\langle E_v^* \rangle_{v \in \mathcal{V}}$ ) the counting function of  $Z_h(\mathbf{t})$  has the form

$$(2.5.1) \quad Q_h(l') = \chi(l') - \chi(r_h) + \mathfrak{sw}_h^{\text{norm}}(M),$$

where  $\mathfrak{sw}_h^{\text{norm}}(M)$  denotes the *normalized Seiberg–Witten invariant* of the link  $M$  indexed by  $h \in H$ . In particular, for  $h = 0$   $\mathfrak{sw}_0^{\text{norm}}(M)$  is called the canonical Seiberg–Witten invariant of  $M$ .

Therefore,  $Z_h(\mathbf{t})$  admits the (quasi)polynomial

$$(2.5.2) \quad \mathfrak{Q}_h(l) = \chi(l + r_h) - \chi(r_h) + \mathfrak{sw}_h^{\text{norm}}(M)$$

in the cone  $\mathcal{S}'_{\mathbb{R}} := \mathcal{S}' \otimes \mathbb{R}$  and

$$\text{pc}^{\mathcal{S}'_{\mathbb{R}}}(Z_h(\mathbf{t})) = \mathfrak{sw}_h^{\text{norm}}(M).$$

**Remark 2.5.3.** (1) Note that if  $M$  is the link of a rational singularity, then the Seiberg–Witten invariant has the following form:  $\mathfrak{sw}_h^{\text{norm}}(M) = \chi(r_h) - \chi(s_h)$ , cf. [N08, LN14]. In particular,  $\mathfrak{sw}_0^{\text{norm}}(M) = 0$ .

(2) We also emphasize that the normalized Seiberg–Witten invariant appears as the ‘Euler characteristic’ of several (co)homology theories associated with the link, such as lattice cohomology and Heegaard Floer homology. This also supports the above vanishing of the canonical Seiberg–Witten invariant, since the simplest manifolds (having the simplest homology) from the viewpoint of these theories are the negative definite L-spaces, or, equivalently, the links of rational singularities.

For more details about the Seiberg–Witten invariants of links of singularities we refer to [N05, N11, LN14, LNN17].

2.5.2. **Surgery formulae.** Motivated by the previous interpretation, for Seiberg–Witten invariants of links of normal surface singularities, [LNN17] developed a surgery type formula. Here we state only the  $h = 0$  case which will be used in the sequel. For the general case we invite the reader to consult with [LNN17].

Let  $I \subset \mathcal{V}$  be an arbitrary non-empty subset of  $\mathcal{V}$  as before, write  $\mathcal{V} \setminus I$  as the union of full connected subgraphs  $\cup_i \Gamma_i$  and denote by  $M(\Gamma_i)$  the corresponding plumbed 3-manifold

associated with  $\Gamma_i$ . Then the surgery formula is as follows:

$$(2.5.4) \quad \mathfrak{sw}_0^{\text{norm}}(M) - \sum_i \mathfrak{sw}_0^{\text{norm}}(M(\Gamma_i)) = \text{pc}^{\text{pr}_I(\mathcal{S}_{\mathbb{R}})}(Z_0(\mathbf{t}_I)).$$

## 2.6. Polynomials from the topological Poincaré series.

**2.6.1. Short history and motivation.** First, we consider a one-variable rational function  $z(t) = B(t)/A(t)$  with  $A(t) = \prod_{i=1}^n (1 - t^{a_i})$  and  $a_i > 0$ . In [BN10, 7.0.2] it was observed that any such function has a unique decomposition of the form  $z(t) = P(t) + z^{\text{neg}}(t)$ , where  $P(t)$  is a polynomial (with non-negative exponents) and  $z^{\text{neg}}(t)$  is a rational function of negative degree. Furthermore,  $z(t)$  admits a periodic constant (associated with the Taylor expansion of  $z$  and the cone  $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ ), which equals  $P(1)$ . This decomposition, called the *polynomial - negative degree part decomposition*, can be established using the Euclidean division algorithm.  $P$  is called the *polynomial part* while the rational function  $z^{\text{neg}}$  is the *negative degree part* of the series/rational function.

Using this decomposition, applied in the geometric context  $z(t) = Z_h(t_{\{v_0\}})$ , the Seiberg–Witten invariant can be calculated inductively using surgery formulae from [LNN17] (cf. (2.5.4) for case  $h = 0$ ).

The multivariable generalization is much more subtle. The complete answer was clarified in [LNN19] using certain duality of the counting functions, however, the construction of the decomposition by Euclidean division algorithm was already given in [LSz17]. Here we take the duality approach of [LNN19] as a definition.

**2.6.2. The polynomial part of  $Z_h(\mathbf{t}_I)$ : definition by duality.** Assume again that we are in the situation of a plumbing graph and its associated topological Poincaré series  $Z(\mathbf{t})$ . Fix  $h \in H$  and a subset  $\emptyset \neq I \subset \mathcal{V}$ , and write the expression  $\mathbf{t}_I^{Z_K - E} Z_{[Z_K] - h}(\mathbf{t}_I^{-1})$  as  $\sum_{l' \in Z_K - E - S'} w(l') \mathbf{t}_I^{l'}$ , where  $[l'] = h$  automatically whenever  $w(l') \neq 0$ . Then we define the polynomial

$$(2.6.1) \quad P_{h,I}(\mathbf{t}_I) := \sum_{l' \in Z_K - E - S'} w(l') \mathbf{t}_I^{l'}$$

and also the series  $Z_{h,I}^{\text{neg}}(\mathbf{t}_I) := \sum_{l' \in Z_K - E - S'} w(l') \mathbf{t}_I^{l'}$ . Set also the notation  $P_{h,I}(\mathbf{1}) := P_{h,I}(\mathbf{t}_I)|_{t_i=1, \forall i}$ .

Then one proves the following results.

**Theorem 2.6.2** ([LNN19]). (a) *There is a unique decomposition  $Z_h(\mathbf{t}_I) = P_{h,I}(\mathbf{t}_I) + Z_{h,I}^{\text{neg}}(\mathbf{t}_I)$  satisfying the following properties: (i)  $P_{h,I}(\mathbf{t}_I)$  is a finite sum (Laurent polynomial) with non-negative exponents; (ii)  $Z_{h,I}^{\text{neg}}(\mathbf{t}_I)$  is a rational function with negative degree in all variables.*

(b)  $P_{h,I}(\mathbf{1}) = Q_{[Z_K] - h, I}(Z_K - r_h) = \text{pc}^{\pi_I(\mathcal{S}_{\mathbb{R}})}(Z_h(\mathbf{t}_I))$ .

In particular, for  $I = \mathcal{V}$  we get

$$P_h(\mathbf{1}) = \mathfrak{sw}_h^{\text{norm}}(M).$$

(For the ease of the presentation, in this case we will always omit the upper index  $\mathcal{V}$  and simply write  $P_h(\mathbf{t})$  for the polynomial associated with  $Z_h$ .) On the other hand, in the case of  $h = 0$  part (b) of the above theorem specializes to

$$(2.6.3) \quad \text{pc}^{\pi_I(\mathcal{S}'_{\mathbb{R}})}(Z_0(\mathbf{t}_I)) = Q_{[Z_K], I}(Z_K) \quad \text{for any } I \subset \mathcal{V}.$$

**Definition 2.6.4.** For  $h = 0$ ,  $P_0(\mathbf{t})$  is called the *canonical polynomial* associated with  $\Gamma$ .

Sometimes is more convenient to consider the *dual polynomials* given by truncation of the series  $Z_{[Z_K]-h}(\mathbf{t}_I)$  as follows.

$$(2.6.5) \quad \check{P}_{h,I}(\mathbf{t}_I) := \sum_{\substack{[l']=[Z_K]-h \\ l'_I \neq (Z_K-E)_I}} z(l') \mathbf{t}'_I.$$

Then using the defining identity (2.6.1) one has

$$(2.6.6) \quad P_{h,I}(\mathbf{t}_I) = \mathbf{t}_I^{Z_K-E} \check{P}_{h,I}(\mathbf{t}_I^{-1}).$$

For more details regarding plumbing graphs, plumbed manifolds, Seiberg–Witten invariants and their relations with normal surface singularities see eg. [BN10, EN85, N99b, N11, Nic04, NN02, N05, N07]; for Poincaré series see also [CDG03, CDGZ04, CDGZ08, CDGZ13, CHR03, N08].

### 3. ELLIPTIC SINGULARITIES AND THEIR ELLIPTIC SEQUENCES

**3.1. Elliptic singularities.** [La77, Wa70] Recall that a normal surface singularity  $(X, o)$  is *elliptic* if  $\min_{l \in L_{>0}} \chi(l) = 0$ , or equivalently,  $\chi(Z_{min}) = 0$  where  $Z_{min}$  is the minimal cycle as defined in section 2.1.3. In this case, we say that the dual resolution graph  $\Gamma$  is an elliptic graph. It is known that if we decrease the decorations (Euler numbers), or we take a full subgraph of an elliptic graph, then we get either elliptic or a rational graph.

One defines the minimally elliptic cycle  $C$  [La77, N99a] satisfying the conditions  $\chi(C) = 0$  and  $\chi(l) > 0$  for any  $0 < l < C$ . It is unique with these properties, and if  $\chi(l) = 0$  ( $l \in L$ ) then necessarily  $C \leq l$ . In particular,  $C \leq Z_{min}$ . Moreover, if  $|C|$  is the support of the minimal elliptic cycle (cf. 2.1), then the uniqueness implies that the connected components of  $\Gamma \setminus |C|$  are rational graphs. In particular, any connected subgraph of  $\Gamma \setminus |C|$  is rational.

If we assume further, that  $\Gamma$  is the minimal resolution, then  $Z_K \in \mathcal{S}'$ . Hence, in the numerically Gorenstein case we have

$$C \leq Z_{min} \leq Z_K.$$

In particular, those singularities which satisfy on the minimal resolution the equalities  $C = Z_{min} = Z_K$  are called *minimally elliptic*. They were introduced by Laufer in [La77] and can be characterized by the properties  $p_g = 1$  and  $(X, o)$  is Gorenstein. For more details we refer to [La77, N99a, N99b].

We emphasize that for any elliptic singularity  $|C|$  supports a resolution graph of a minimally elliptic singularity.

**3.2. Elliptic sequences.** *In the sequel we always assume that the minimal resolution of the elliptic singularity  $(X, o)$  is also good.* Hence, in this article an elliptic graph  $\Gamma$  will be the dual resolution graph of such a resolution.

Note that since the link of  $(X, o)$  is assumed to be a rational homology sphere, by a result of Yau [Y80] the difference between the minimal and the minimal good resolution is rather small. More precisely, they differ only for a pathological family (see [Y80, Prop 2.2]) which can be discussed separately.

The geometry of an elliptic singularity is guided by the arithmetics of the *elliptic sequence* which is defined from the combinatorics of the resolution graph. The first version was defined by Laufer and Yau, the general definition for the non-numerically Gorenstein case can be found in [Y79, Y80]. Recently, Nagy and Némethi in [NN18] have constructed another sequence highly emphasizing the possible non-integrality of the anti-canonical cycle in the general case.

The two sequences differ only for non-numerically Gorenstein graphs and completely coincide for numerically Gorenstein ones, see eg. [NN19, Example 3.4.3]. More details and comparisons of the elliptic sequences can be found in [N99a, N99b, O05, NN18, NN19].

For the purpose of this article, we will only recall and discuss the properties of the second sequence given by [NN18]. In the sequel we will refer to it as the *NN-elliptic sequence*.

**3.2.1. Construction and properties of the NN-elliptic sequence.** Let  $\Gamma$  be an elliptic graph as specified in the previous section, ie. the minimal resolution graph of an elliptic singularity  $(X, o)$  which is also good.

The elliptic sequence consists of a sequence of cycles  $\{Z_{B_j}\}_{j=-1}^m$ , or a sequence of connected subgraphs  $\{B_j\}_{j=-1}^m$ , where  $Z_{B_j}$  is the ‘minimal’ cycle associated with  $B_j$ .  $\{B_j\}_{j=-1}^m$  are defined inductively as follows.

By the minimality of the resolution  $Z_K \in \mathcal{S}'$  and  $Z_K \geq s_{[Z_K]}$ . Moreover, since the graph is not rational, we have  $Z_K > s_{[Z_K]}$  by [NN18, Lemma 2.1.4]. Therefore, as a ‘pre-step’ of the construction one sets the following:

$$B_{-1} := \Gamma, \quad Z_{B_{-1}} := s_{[Z_K]} \quad \text{and} \quad B_0 := |Z_K - s_{[Z_K]}|.$$

Then, one proves that if  $Z_K \in L' \setminus L$  then  $|C| \subset B_0 \subsetneq \Gamma$ ,  $B_0$  is connected and supports a numerically Gorenstein elliptic topological type with canonical cycle  $Z_K - s_{[Z_K]}$ . Moreover, any numerical Gorenstein subgraph is contained in  $B_0$ , which means, in particular, that  $B_0$  is the largest numerically Gorenstein subgraph of  $\Gamma$ , cf. [NN19, Prop. 3.4.4].

By taking  $Z_{B_0}$  to be the minimal cycle of  $B_0$ , one has  $C \leq Z_{B_0} \leq Z_K - s_{Z_K}$ . If  $Z_{B_0} = Z_K - s_{[Z_K]}$  then we stop and  $m = 0$ . Otherwise one takes  $B_1 := |Z_K - s_{[Z_K]} - Z_{B_0}|$ . One verifies that  $|C| \subseteq B_1 \subsetneq B_0$ ,  $B_1$  is connected, and it is a numerically Gorenstein elliptic graph with anti-canonical cycle  $Z_K - s_{[Z_K]} - Z_{B_0}$ . Then we set  $Z_{B_1} := Z_{\min}(B_1)$  and one gets  $C \leq Z_{B_1} \leq Z_K - s_{[Z_K]} - Z_{B_0}$ . If  $Z_{B_1} = Z_K - s_{[Z_K]} - Z_{B_0}$ , then we stop,  $m = 1$ . Otherwise, we define  $B_2 := |Z_K - s_{[Z_K]} - Z_{B_0} - Z_{B_1}|$  and repeat the inductive argument. After finite steps we get  $Z_{B_m} = Z_K - s_{[Z_K]} - Z_{B_0} - \dots - Z_{B_{m-1}}$ , hence the minimal cycle and the canonical cycle on  $B_m$  coincide. This means that  $B_m$  supports a minimally elliptic singularity with  $Z_{B_m} = C$ .

We say that the elliptic sequence  $\{Z_{B_j}\}_{j=-1}^m$  has length  $m + 1$  with ‘pre-term’  $Z_{B_{-1}} = s_{Z_K} \in L'_{[Z_K]}$ .

**Remark 3.2.1.** In particular, if  $\Gamma$  is a numerically Gorenstein elliptic graph then  $s_{[Z_K]} = 0$ , hence  $Z_{B_{-1}} = 0$ ,  $B_0 = \Gamma$  and the algorithm starts with constructing the numerically Gorenstein subgraph  $B_1$ . Therefore, the pre-step can be avoided in this case.

**3.3. The cycles  $C_j$  and  $C'_j$ .** Using the elliptic sequence, it is convenient to define the following cycles:

$$(3.3.1) \quad C_j = \sum_{i=-1}^j Z_{B_i} \in L'_{[Z_K]} \quad \text{and} \quad C'_j = \sum_{i=j}^m Z_{B_i} \quad (-1 \leq j \leq m).$$

By these notations,  $C_{-1} = s_{[Z_K]}$ ,  $C'_m = C$  and  $C_m = C'_{-1} = Z_K$ .

We will rather use the sequence of cycles  $\{C_j\}_{j=-1}^m$  instead of the minimal cycles, since they hide a ‘geometric’ universal property which will be crucial in this article.

Before we recall this property, let us summarize the properties of the elliptic sequence and its associated cycles in the following lemma.

**Lemma 3.3.2.** (a)  $B_{-1} = \Gamma$ ,  $B_0 = |Z_K - s_{[Z_K]}|$ ,  $B_1 = |Z_K - s_{[Z_K]} - Z_{B_0}|$ ,  $\dots$ ,  $B_m = |C|$ ; each  $B_j$  is connected and the inclusions  $B_{j+1} \subset B_j$  are strict for any  $j \geq 0$ . For  $j = -1$  one has

$B_0 \subset B_{-1}$  whenever  $Z_K \notin L$ , otherwise  $B_0 = B_{-1}$ . Furthermore,  $Z_{B_{-1}} = s_{[Z_K]} \in L'_{[Z_K]}$  and the other cycles  $Z_{B_0} \supset Z_{B_1} \supset \cdots \supset Z_{B_m} = C$  are integral.

(b)  $(E_v, Z_{B_j}) = 0$  for any  $E_v \subset B_{j+1}$  and  $-1 \leq j \leq m$ . In particular,  $(Z_{B_i}, Z_{B_j}) = (C_i, Z_{B_j}) = 0$  for all  $-1 \leq i < j \leq m$ .

(c)  $Z_K = \sum_{i=-1}^m Z_{B_i}$ .

(d)  $(E_v, C'_j) = (E_v, Z_K)$  for any  $E_v \subset |C'_j|$ . In other words,  $C'_j = Z_K^{B_j}$ , where  $Z_K^{B_j}$  is the anti-canonical cycle of the graph  $|C'_j| = B_j$ . Furthermore,  $\chi(Z_{B_j}) = \chi(C_j) = \chi(C'_j) = 0$ .

(e)  $C_j \in \mathcal{S}'$ .

$$(f) (C_j, E_v) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } v \in \mathcal{V}(B_{j+1}) \\ e_v + 2 & \text{if } v \in \mathcal{V}(\Gamma \setminus B_{j+1}) \text{ and } (E_{B_{j+1}}, E_v) = 0. \\ e_v + 1 & \text{if } v \in \mathcal{V}(\Gamma \setminus B_{j+1}) \text{ and } (E_{B_{j+1}}, E_v) = 1 \end{cases}$$

*Proof.* (a)-(d) follows from [N99a, 2.11](numerically Gorenstein case) and [NN18, Lemma 3.2.3]. The proof of (e) can be found in [NN19, Lemma 3.3.1].

(f) If  $v \in \mathcal{V}(B_{j+1})$  the statement follows from (b). Assume now that  $v \in \mathcal{V}(\Gamma \setminus B_{j+1})$ . Note that we have  $Z_K - C_j = Z_K^{B_{j+1}}$ , hence  $(C_j, E_v) = e_v + 2 - (Z_K^{B_{j+1}}, E_v)$ . Therefore, we get  $(C_j, E_v) = e_v + 2$  whenever  $(E_{B_{j+1}}, E_v) = 0$ .

The case  $(E_{B_{j+1}}, E_v) = 1$  will be a consequence of Lemma 6.1.1, see Corollary 6.1.4.  $\square$

**Remark 3.3.3.** It is worth to mention that in the case of the minimal resolution of a (non-numerically Gorenstein) elliptic singularity, the minimal cycle  $s_{[Z_K]} \in L'_{[Z_K]}$  can be calculated by the explicit formula  $s_{[Z_K]} = Z_K - Z_K^{B_0}$ . However, in general, it is determined only algorithmically by the generalized Laufer's algorithm, cf. section 2.1.3.

The crucial fact regarding the cycles  $C_j$ , which will be the base of the study in this article, is that they are the only cycles in  $\mathcal{S}'_{[Z_K]}$  which are below the anti-canonical cycle  $Z_K$ . We recall this result from [NN18].

**Lemma 3.3.4.** [NN18, Lemma 3.3.1]

Assume that  $l' \in \mathcal{S}'_{[Z_K]}$  and  $l' \leq Z_K$ . Then  $l' \in \{C_{-1}, C_0, \dots, C_m\}$ .

This also means that the elliptic sequence  $\{B_j\}$  has some geometric universal property which can be formulated as follows:

**Corollary 3.3.5.** Any numerically Gorenstein connected subgraph of the elliptic graph  $\Gamma$  must be one of the  $B_j$  for  $j \geq 0$ .

**3.4. The canonical Seiberg–Witten invariant for elliptic singularity links.** We recall the main result of [NN19] which identifies the canonical Seiberg–Witten invariant of an elliptic singularity link with the length of the elliptic sequence:

**Theorem 3.4.1.**  $\text{sw}_0^{\text{norm}}(M(\Gamma)) = m + 1$ .

#### 4. THE SHAPE OF THE CANONICAL POLYNOMIAL FOR ELLIPTIC SINGULARITIES

We fix an elliptic graph  $\Gamma$  and we will use all the notations from the previous sections. Associated with  $\Gamma$  we consider the canonical polynomial  $P_0 := \sum_{\ell \in L} w(\ell) \mathbf{t}^\ell$  defined in section 2.6.2. Define its support  $\text{Supp}(P_0) \subset L$  as the finite set of exponents  $\ell \in L$  for which  $w(\ell) \neq 0$ .

#### 4.1. The structure of the exponents.

4.1.1. For any exponent  $\ell = \sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}} \ell_v E_v \in \text{Supp}(P_0)$  we associate the following subset of vertices

$$(4.1.1) \quad \mathcal{V}^{<0}(\ell) := \{v \in \mathcal{V} : \ell_v < 0\}.$$

Note that by (2.6.1)  $\ell$  satisfies  $\ell \not\leq 0$ , hence

$$(4.1.2) \quad \mathcal{V}^{<0}(\ell) \subsetneq \mathcal{V} =: \mathcal{V}(B_{-1}) \text{ is a proper subset.}$$

Since by the duality (2.6.6) one knows that  $\ell \in Z_K - E - \mathcal{S}'_{[Z_K]}$ , we consider the unique decomposition

$$(4.1.3) \quad \ell = Z_K - E - l' - \sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}^{<0}(\ell)} m_v E_v \text{ satisfying the following properties:}$$

$$(1) \ l' \leq Z_K, \quad (2) \ (Z_K - l')|_{\mathcal{V}^{<0}(\ell)} = 0|_{\mathcal{V}^{<0}(\ell)} \quad \text{and} \quad (3) \ m_v \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}.$$

**Definition 4.1.4.** For any exponent  $\ell \in \text{Supp}(P_0)$  the unique cycle  $l' \in L'_{[Z_K]}$  from (4.1.3) will be called *the associated cycle of  $\ell$* .

We will also set the notation  $\check{\ell} := l' + \sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}^{<0}(\ell)} m_v E_v \in \text{Supp}(\check{P}_0)$  and call  $\check{\ell}$  the *dual exponent associated with  $\ell$* , where  $\text{Supp}(\check{P}_0)$  denotes the set of the exponents of the dual polynomial  $\check{P}_0(\mathbf{t})$  obtained by truncation of the series  $Z_{[Z_K]}(\mathbf{t})$  (cf. (2.6.6) and (2.6.5)), ie. they are elements from  $\text{Supp}(Z_{[Z_K]})$  and satisfy  $\check{\ell} \not\leq Z_K$ .

4.1.2. In the next result we prove that in the case of an elliptic graph the set of associated cycles are exactly  $\{C_j\}$  provided by the NN-elliptic sequence.

**Theorem 4.1.5.** *If  $l' \in L'$  is the associated cycle of an exponent  $\ell \in \text{Supp}(P_0)$ , then*

- (1)  $l' \in \{C_{-1}, C_0, \dots, C_{m-1}\}$ ;
- (2)  $\mathcal{V}^{<0}(\ell) = \Gamma \setminus B_{j+1}$  for any  $\ell \in \text{Supp}_j(P_0)$ , where we denote by  $\text{Supp}_j(P_0)$  the subset of those exponents whose associated cycle is  $C_j$ .

*Proof.* (1) Since  $[l'] = [Z_K]$  and  $l' \leq Z_K$  by construction, in order to apply Lemma 3.3.4 we only have to show that  $l' \in \mathcal{S}'$ , ie.  $(l', E_{v'}) \leq 0$  for any  $v' \in \mathcal{V}$ .

First of all, in the case  $v' \notin \mathcal{V}^{<0}(\ell)$  we have  $(E_{v'}, \sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}^{<0}(\ell)} m_v E_v) \geq 0$ . Then, together with the fact that  $l' + \sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}^{<0}(\ell)} m_v E_v \in \mathcal{S}'$  one deduces the following inequalities

$$(l', E_{v'}) \leq -(E_{v'}, \sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}^{<0}(\ell)} m_v E_v) \leq 0.$$

For  $v' \in \mathcal{V}^{<0}(\ell)$ , first we decompose  $(l', E_{v'})$  in the following way:

$$(l', E_{v'}) = (l'|_{\mathcal{V} \setminus \mathcal{V}^{<0}(\ell)}, E_{v'}) + (l'|_{\mathcal{V}^{<0}(\ell)}, E_{v'}).$$

Then, (4.1.3)(2) gives  $(l'|_{\mathcal{V}^{<0}(\ell)}, E_{v'}) = (Z_K|_{\mathcal{V}^{<0}(\ell)}, E_{v'})$ . Moreover (4.1.3)(1) and the assumption  $v' \in \mathcal{V}^{<0}(\ell)$  imply  $(l'|_{\mathcal{V} \setminus \mathcal{V}^{<0}(\ell)}, E_{v'}) \leq (Z_K|_{\mathcal{V} \setminus \mathcal{V}^{<0}(\ell)}, E_{v'})$ . Therefore, one gets  $(l', E_{v'}) \leq (Z_K, E_{v'}) \leq 0$  where the last inequality is implied by the minimality of the resolution, cf. sect. 3.1. This proves  $l' \in \mathcal{S}'$ .

Hence by applying Lemma 3.3.4 we deduce that  $l' \in \{C_{-1}, C_0, \dots, C_{m-1}\}$ .

Note that  $C_m$  does not appear in our list by the properness of the subset  $\mathcal{V}^{<0}(\ell)$ , ie. there exists  $v \in \mathcal{V} \setminus \mathcal{V}^{<0}(\ell)$  such that  $l'_v < Z_{K,v}$  ( $E_v$ -coefficient of  $Z_K$ ), see (4.1.2).

(2) Lemma 3.3.2(d) says that for any  $j \in \{-1, 0, \dots, m-1\}$   $C'_{j+1} = Z_K - C_j$  is the canonical cycle on its support  $B_{j+1}$ . Then, by using the definition (4.1.1) of  $\mathcal{V}^{<0}(\ell)$  and the decomposition  $\ell = Z_K - C_j - E - \sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}^{<0}(\ell)} m_v E_v$  with its properties from (4.1.3), the result follows.  $\square$

**Corollary 4.1.6.** *For any  $\ell \in \text{Supp}_j(P_0)$  ( $j \in \{-1, \dots, m-1\}$ ) one has  $\ell|_{B_{j+1}} \geq 0$  and  $\ell|_{\Gamma \setminus B_{j+1}} < 0$ .*

We emphasize that Theorem 4.1.5 induces the following decomposition:

$$\text{Supp}(P_0) = \sqcup_{j=-1}^{m-1} \text{Supp}_j(P_0).$$

Similarly, one writes  $\check{\text{Supp}}(\check{P}_0) = \sqcup_{j=-1}^{m-1} \check{\text{Supp}}_j(\check{P}_0)$ . On the other hand, the dual exponent associated with  $\ell \in \text{Supp}_j(P_0)$  is expressed uniquely as

$$\check{\ell} = C_j + \sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}(\Gamma \setminus B_{j+1})} m_v E_v$$

for some  $m_v \geq 0$ . Moreover, it satisfies  $(\check{\ell}, E_v) = 0$  for any  $v \in \mathcal{V}(B_{j+1})$ . Indeed, if we assume  $(\check{\ell}, E_v) \neq 0$  then the facts  $\check{\ell}|_{B_{j+1}} = C_j|_{B_{j+1}}$  and  $(C_j, E_v) = 0$  for any  $v \in \mathcal{V}(B_{j+1})$  (Lemma 3.3.2(f)), and the positivity of  $m_v$  imply that  $(\check{\ell}, E_v) > 0$ , which contradicts to  $\check{\ell} \in S'$ .

Regarding the coefficients  $m_v$  we can prove the following.

**Proposition 4.1.7.** *If  $m_v \neq 0$  then  $v \in \mathcal{V}(\Gamma \setminus B_{j+1})$  is not adjacent to  $B_{j+1}$ .*


*Proof.* For every  $v' \in \mathcal{V}(B_{j+1})$  we have  $(\check{\ell}, E_{v'}) = \sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}(\Gamma \setminus B_{j+1})} m_v \cdot (E_v, E_{v'})$  by the previous discussion. Moreover, one has  $(\check{\ell}, E_{v'}) \leq 0$  since the series  $Z_{[Z_K]}(\mathbf{t})$  is supported on  $S'$ , which implies the result.  $\square$

**Remark 4.1.8.** The geometric interpretation of the above property is as follows: assume that the elliptic graph  $\Gamma$  is numerically Gorenstein. In this case, by [N99a] for a Gorenstein singularity  $(X, 0)$  supported on  $\Gamma$  there exists  $f_j \in H^0(\check{X}, \mathcal{O}(-C_j))$ , such that for any  $E_v \subset B_{j+1}$  the vanishing order of  $f_j$  along  $E_v$  is the multiplicity of  $C_j$  at  $E_v$ . In other words, if  $\text{div}_E(f_j) = C_j + l_j$  is the divisor of  $f_j$  supported on  $E$  then the support of  $l_j$  does not contain any  $E_v$  from  $B_{j+1}$ . Moreover, one can also conclude that it contains no  $E_v$  which intersects  $B_{j+1}$  nontrivially, cf. [NN18, 3.3.8].

In the next section we will prove that necessarily  $\text{Supp}_j(P_0) \neq \emptyset$  for all  $j$ . This means that the elliptic sequence  $\{B_j\}$  and the cycles  $\{C_j\}$  can be read off completely from the canonical polynomial  $P_0(\mathbf{t})$ .

At the same time, note that  $C_j$  might not be in  $\text{Supp}(Z_{[Z_K]})$ , hence  $Z_K - E - C_j$  is not necessarily an exponent of  $P_0(\mathbf{t})$ . For example, when the elliptic graph is numerically Gorenstein we have automatically  $\text{Supp}_{-1}(P_0) = \{Z_K - E\}$  since the first exponent of  $Z_0(\mathbf{t})$  is always  $l' = 0$ . However, for non-numerically Gorenstein graphs this is not anymore true: the following example illustrates this behaviour by showing that  $Z_K - E - s_{[Z_K]} \notin \text{Supp}_{-1}(P_0)$ .

**Example 4.1.9.** We consider the elliptic graph from Figure 1. Then the cycles  $Z_K$  and  $s_{[Z_K]}$  are the followings.






FIGURE 1. A non-numerically Gorenstein graph

One can write  $s_{[Z_K]} = E_1^* + 2E_2^*$ . Since its  $E_2^*$ -coefficient is greater than  $\delta_2 - 2 = 1$  (where  $\delta_2$  is the valency of the vertex associated with  $E_2$ ),  $C_{-1} := s_{[Z_K]}$  does not appear in  $\text{Supp}(Z_{[Z_K]})$ . Therefore  $Z_K - E - s_{[Z_K]} \notin \text{Supp}_{-1}(P_0)$ . Nevertheless, by Theorem 4.1.5 and Proposition 4.1.7,  $s_{[Z_K]}$  can be enlarged to a dual exponent  $\check{\ell} = s_{[Z_K]} + m_{21}E_{21} + m_{22}E_{22}$  associated with an exponent from  $\text{Supp}_{-1}(P_0)$ . Our claim (which will be supported later) is that the ‘only’ possibilities are as follows:  $\check{\ell}_1 = s_{[Z_K]} + E_{21} = E_1^* + E_2^* + 2E_{21}^*$ ,  $\check{\ell}_2 = s_{[Z_K]} + E_{22} = E_1^* + E_2^* + 2E_{22}^*$ ,  $\check{\ell}_3 = s_{[Z_K]} + 2E_{21} = E_1^* + 4E_{21}^*$ ,  $\check{\ell}_4 = s_{[Z_K]} + E_{21} + E_{22} = E_1^* + 2E_{21}^* + 2E_{22}^*$ ,  $\check{\ell}_5 = s_{[Z_K]} + 2E_{22} = E_1^* + 4E_{22}^*$ .

**4.2. Counting coefficients of the canonical polynomial and its consequences.** Consider the coefficients  $w(\ell)$  corresponding to the exponents  $\ell \in \text{Supp}(P_0)$  in the canonical polynomial  $P_0(\mathbf{t})$ . These are the coefficients  $z(\check{\ell})$  of the series  $Z_{[Z_K]}(\mathbf{t})$ .

Then, the first key observation of this section is that counting coefficients corresponding to the exponents in  $\text{Supp}_j(P_0)$  is very special. Namely, we prove the following.

**Lemma 4.2.1.**

- (a) For every  $j \in \{0, \dots, m\}$  and  $-1 \leq i < j$  one has the identity

$$Q_{[Z_K], B_i \setminus B_j}(Z_K) = j.$$

In particular,  $Q_{[Z_K], \Gamma \setminus B_j}(Z_K) = j$ .

- (b)  $\sum_{\ell \in \text{Supp}_j(P_0)} w(\ell) = 1$  for any  $-1 \leq j \leq m - 1$ .

*Proof.* (a) Following section 2.5.2 and equation (2.6.3), the counting function  $Q_{[Z_K], B_i \setminus B_j}(Z_K)$  can be expressed via the surgery formula of the canonical Seiberg–Witten invariant as follows. Let  $\mathcal{I} = B_i \setminus B_j$  and denote by  $\{\Gamma_k\}_k$  the connected components of the subgraph  $\Gamma \setminus (B_i \setminus B_j)$ . Then, the surgery formula (2.5.4) reads as

$$(4.2.2) \quad Q_{[Z_K], B_i \setminus B_j}(Z_K) = \mathfrak{sw}_0^{\text{norm}}(M(\Gamma)) - \sum_k \mathfrak{sw}_0^{\text{norm}}(M(\Gamma_k)).$$

One of the connected components is  $B_j$  and the others are rational graphs by section 3.1. Moreover, by Theorem 3.4.1 one has  $\mathfrak{sw}_0^{\text{norm}}(M(\Gamma)) = m + 1$  and  $\mathfrak{sw}_0^{\text{norm}}(M(B_j)) = m + 1 - j$ , while for the rational graphs we have always  $\mathfrak{sw}_0^{\text{norm}} = 0$ , see Remark 2.5.3(1). Thus, one implies that  $Q_{[Z_K], B_i \setminus B_j}(Z_K) = j$ .

(b) By definition  $Q_{[Z_K], \Gamma \setminus B_{j+2}}(Z_K) = \sum_{l' \in \mathcal{S}'_{[Z_K]}, l' |_{\Gamma \setminus B_{j+2}} \neq Z_K |_{\Gamma \setminus B_{j+2}}} z(l')$ . Therefore, for any  $l'$  contributing in the previous sum one has  $\ell = Z_K - E - l' \in \text{Supp}(P_0)$  since there exists

$v \in \Gamma \setminus B_{j+2}$  with  $l_v \geq 0$ . Moreover, Corollary 4.1.6 implies that

$$Q_{[Z_K], \Gamma \setminus B_{j+2}}(Z_K) = \sum_{t=-1}^j \sum_{\ell \in \text{Supp}_t(P_0)} w(\ell).$$

Hence, using (a) one can conclude with the following expression:

$$\sum_{\ell \in \text{Supp}_j(P_0)} w(\ell) = Q_{[Z_K], \Gamma \setminus B_{j+2}}(Z_K) - Q_{[Z_K], \Gamma \setminus B_{j+1}}(Z_K) = 1.$$

□

**Example 4.2.3.** In the case of Example 4.1.9 one calculates by (2.3.2) the coefficients of the dual exponents, or, equivalently, of the exponents in  $\text{Supp}_{-1}(P_0)$ :  $z(\check{\ell}_1) = z(\check{\ell}_2) = (-1) \cdot \binom{1}{1} = -1$ ,  $z(\check{\ell}_3) = z(\check{\ell}_4) = z(\check{\ell}_5) = 1$ . Thus, we have  $\sum_{\ell \in \text{Supp}_{-1}(P_0)} w(\ell) = 1$ .

As we have already announced in the previous section, Lemma 4.2.1(b) deduces immediately the following:

**Corollary 4.2.4.**  $\text{Supp}_j(P_0) \neq \emptyset$  for every  $-1 \leq j \leq m-1$ .

This ensures that

(4.2.5) *the polynomial  $P_0$  completely determines the elliptic sequence  $\{B_j; C_j\}_j$ ,*

except maybe  $C_{-1}$ , see Example 4.2.7 and Remark 4.2.8 after therein.


Note that, however  $P_0(\mathbf{t})$  might be complicated, we can get a simplified shape if we reduce it to the variables associated with the support of the minimally elliptic cycle  $|C|$ . Namely, we have the following result.

**Theorem 4.2.6.** *For any elliptic graph one has*

$$P_0(\mathbf{t}_{|C|}) = \sum_{j=-1}^{m-1} \mathbf{t}_{|C|}^{Z_K - E - C_j}.$$

*Proof.* Since  $|C| \subseteq B_{j+1}$  for any  $j \in \{-1, \dots, m-1\}$ , Theorem 4.1.5 implies that for any exponent  $\ell \in \text{Supp}_j(P_0)$  one has  $\ell|_{|C|} = (Z_K - E - C_j)|_{|C|}$ . Moreover, the coefficient of  $(Z_K - E - C_j)|_{|C|}$  in  $P_0(\mathbf{t}_{|C|})$  is given by the sum of all the coefficients of the exponents from  $\text{Supp}_j(P_0)$ , which equals 1 by Lemma 4.2.1(b). □

**Example 4.2.7.** We consider the following graph.



For simplicity, a cycle  $l' = \sum_{i=1}^{10} l'_i E_i$  will be represented by the vector  $(l'_1, \dots, l'_{10})$ . The canonical polynomial associated with this graph is as follows (calculations were performed by

using [Maple]):

$$\begin{aligned}
 P_0(\mathbf{t}) = & \mathbf{t}^{(1,3,1,3,1,1,1,0,0,0)} - 2\mathbf{t}^{(0,1,0,1,0,0,-1,-1,-2,-1)} + \mathbf{t}^{(0,1,0,1,0,0,-1,-1,-2,-1)} \\
 & + \mathbf{t}^{(0,1,0,1,0,0,-1,-1,-2,-2)} - 2\mathbf{t}^{(0,1,0,1,0,0,-1,-1,-1,-2)} + \mathbf{t}^{(0,1,0,1,0,0,-1,-1,-1,-3)} \\
 & + \mathbf{t}^{(0,1,0,1,0,0,-1,-2,-2,-1)} + \mathbf{t}^{(0,1,0,1,0,0,-1,-1,-1,-1)} + \mathbf{t}^{(0,1,0,1,0,0,-1,-2,-1,-2)} \\
 & + \mathbf{t}^{(0,1,0,1,0,0,-1,-1,-3,-1)} + \mathbf{t}^{(0,1,0,1,0,0,-1,-3,-1,-1)} - 2\mathbf{t}^{(0,1,0,1,0,0,-1,-2,-1,-1)}.
 \end{aligned}$$

One can see that there is an exponent  $\ell = (1, 3, 1, 3, 1, 1, 1, 0, 0, 0)$  such that  $\ell \geq 0$ . This implies that  $\Gamma \setminus B_0 = \emptyset$  by Corollary 4.1.6 and the graph is numerically Gorenstein. Moreover, we get  $Z_K = (2, 4, 2, 4, 2, 2, 2, 1, 1, 1)$ .

For all the other exponents one has  $\ell|_{E_i} < 0$  for every  $i \in \{7, 8, 9, 10\}$ . Hence this is the index set for the vertices of  $\Gamma \setminus B_1$ , and all these exponents are belong to  $Supp_0(P_0)$ . The associated cycle of these exponents is  $C_0$  which can be calculated by using the properties

$$Z_K|_{\Gamma \setminus B_1} = C_0|_{\Gamma \setminus B_1} \text{ and } C_0|_{B_1} = (Z_K - E - \ell)|_{B_1}$$

for any  $\ell \in Supp_0(P_0)$ . Thus we get  $C_0 = (1, 2, 1, 2, 1, 1, 2, 1, 1, 1)$ .

Since there are no ‘other type’ of exponents we conclude that the subgraph  $B_1$  is minimally elliptic and it ends the elliptic sequence.


**Remark 4.2.8.** Similarly, in the non-numerically Gorenstein case all the subgraphs  $\{B_j\}_{j=-1}^m$  and cycles  $C_j$  except  $C_{-1} = s_{[Z_K]}$  can be determined from the canonical polynomial. Only the difference  $Z_K - s_{[Z_K]}$  is determined by the exponents appearing in  $Supp_{-1}(P_0)$ ;  $Z_K$  and  $s_{[Z_K]}$  can not be seen directly from the exponents.

Now, it is natural and interesting to ask the reverse of (4.2.5):

*how can the exponents (or the canonical polynomial) be constructed from the elliptic sequence and cycles  $C_j$ ?*

Before starting the study of this problem, we would like to emphasize that, as it will be shown in the next example, it is easy to construct graphs (even numerically Gorenstein ones) for which the elliptic sequence and the corresponding cycles are the same, but the polynomials are different.

**Example 4.2.9.** Let us consider the following numerically Gorenstein elliptic graph  $\Gamma$ :



The elliptic sequence consists of  $B_0$  and  $B_1$  as it is illustrated on the picture. One calculates that  $C_0 = Z_{B_0} = 2E_{v_0}^* + E_{v_1}^* + E_{v_2}^*$  which is, in fact, not a dual exponent associated with an exponent from  $Supp_0(P_0)$ . Hence a dual exponent has the form of  $\check{\ell} = C_0 + \sum_{i=1}^4 m_{v_i} E_{v_i} \in Supp(Z_0)$  with not all  $m_{v_i}$  are zero. For example, we look at  $\check{\ell} = C_0 + E_{v_1}^* + E_{v_3}^* + E_{v_4}^* = E_{v_0}^* + 2E_{v_1}^* + E_{v_3}^* + E_{v_4}^*$ .

Now, we change slightly the graph  $\Gamma$  by modifying the decoration of  $v_2$  to  $-2$ . Then this new graph  $\Gamma_{new}$  is elliptic with the same elliptic sequence. However,  $\check{\ell} = C_0 + E_{v_1} + E_{v_3} + E_{v_4}$  is not a dual exponent of  $\Gamma_{new}$ , since in this case  $\check{\ell} \notin \mathcal{S}'(\Gamma_{new})$ .

**Remark 4.2.10.** One can also construct families of elliptic graphs for which not only the elliptic sequences, but also the canonical polynomials agree.

## 5. PROJECTIONS OF THE EXPONENTS

**5.1. The index of the extension.** In this section we will extend the notations and introduce  $P_0^{\Gamma'}(\mathbf{t})$ ,  $L(\Gamma')$ ,  $L'(\Gamma')$ ,  $l^{\Gamma'}$  etc., where it is needed to specify the associated graph for the corresponding objects. We will also adopt all the settings from the previous sections.

Let  $\Gamma' \subset \Gamma$  be two elliptic graphs and we consider the projection/restriction map

$$(5.1.1) \quad \begin{aligned} \pi_{(\Gamma', \Gamma)} : L(\Gamma) &\longrightarrow L(\Gamma') \\ \ell &\longmapsto \ell|_{\Gamma'}. \end{aligned}$$

In the sequel, we will study how does the map  $\pi_{(\Gamma', \Gamma)}$  behave on the set of exponents of the canonical polynomial  $P_0^\Gamma$  associated with  $\Gamma$ .

Let  $\{B_j^\Gamma\}$  be the NN-elliptic sequence of  $\Gamma$  together with the cycles  $C_j^\Gamma \in \mathcal{S}'_{[Z_K^\Gamma]}$ , where  $Z_K^\Gamma$  is the anti-canonical cycle associated with  $\Gamma$ . Since an exponent  $\ell \in \text{Supp}_j(P_0^\Gamma)$  can be written uniquely as  $\ell = Z_K^\Gamma - E^\Gamma - C_j^\Gamma - \sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}(\Gamma \setminus B_{j+1}^\Gamma)} m_v E_v$  for some  $m_v \geq 0$ , its image equals with

$$(5.1.2) \quad \pi_{(\Gamma', \Gamma)}(\ell) = \ell|_{\Gamma'} = (Z_K^\Gamma - C_j^\Gamma)|_{\Gamma'} - E^{\Gamma'} - \sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}(\Gamma' \setminus B_{j+1}^{\Gamma'})} m_v E_v.$$

Consider also the NN-elliptic sequence  $\{B_t^{\Gamma'}, C_t^{\Gamma'}\}$  of  $\Gamma'$ . Then, by the universal property Corollary 3.3.5 follows that any of the numerical Gorenstein subgraphs  $B_t^{\Gamma'}$  for  $t \geq 0$  must be equal to one of the  $B_i^\Gamma$  for some  $i \geq 0$ . In particular, there exists an  $i_{(\Gamma', \Gamma)} \geq 0$ , called the *index of extension*, such that

$$(5.1.3) \quad B_{i_{(\Gamma', \Gamma)}}^\Gamma \subseteq \Gamma' \subset B_{i_{(\Gamma', \Gamma)}-1}^\Gamma,$$

and  $\{B_{-1}^{\Gamma'} = \Gamma', B_{i_{(\Gamma', \Gamma)}}^\Gamma, B_{i_{(\Gamma', \Gamma)}+1}^\Gamma, \dots, B_m^\Gamma\}$  is exactly the elliptic sequence of  $\Gamma'$ . Therefore, we are interested to consider those exponents  $\ell \in \text{Supp}_j(P_0^\Gamma)$  for which  $j \geq i_{(\Gamma', \Gamma)} - 1$ . In this case, the canonical cycle on  $B_{j+1}^\Gamma \subset B_{i_{(\Gamma', \Gamma)}}^\Gamma$  is expressed as  $Z_K^{B_{j+1}^\Gamma} = Z_K^\Gamma - C_j^\Gamma = Z_K^{\Gamma'} - C_{j-i_{(\Gamma', \Gamma)}}^{\Gamma'}$ . Hence, according to (5.1.2),

$$(5.1.4) \quad \pi_{(\Gamma', \Gamma)}(\ell) = Z_K^{\Gamma'} - E^{\Gamma'} - C_{j-i_{(\Gamma', \Gamma)}}^{\Gamma'} - \sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}(\Gamma' \setminus B_{j-i_{(\Gamma', \Gamma)}+1}^{\Gamma'})} m_v E_v,$$

using also the identification  $B_{j+1}^\Gamma = B_{j-i_{(\Gamma', \Gamma)}+1}^{\Gamma'}$ .

In the followings, *we will prove that with certain conditions*,  $\pi_{(\Gamma', \Gamma)}(\ell)$  will be an exponent of  $\Gamma'$  belonging to  $\text{Supp}_{j-i_{(\Gamma', \Gamma)}}(P_0^{\Gamma'})$ .

**5.2. The ‘dualized’ map  $\tilde{\pi}_{(\Gamma', \Gamma)}$ .** It will be useful to introduce the ‘dualized’ of  $\pi_{(\Gamma', \Gamma)}$  defined by  $\tilde{\pi}_{(\Gamma', \Gamma)} : L'(\Gamma)_{[Z_K^\Gamma]} \rightarrow L'(\Gamma')_{[Z_K^{\Gamma}]}$ ,  $\tilde{\pi}_{(\Gamma', \Gamma)}(l') := Z_K^{\Gamma'} - E^{\Gamma'} - \pi_{(\Gamma', \Gamma)}(Z_K^\Gamma - E^\Gamma - l')$ , and understand its behaviour on the set of dual exponents  $\text{Supp}_j(\check{P}_0^\Gamma)$  for  $j \geq i_{(\Gamma', \Gamma)} - 1$ . For this reason, we make first the following preparation.

5.2.1. In general, we consider any good resolution graph  $\Gamma$  and fix a subset  $I \subset \mathcal{V}$  of its vertices. The set of vertices  $\mathcal{V} \setminus I$  determines the connected full subgraphs  $\{\Gamma_k\}_k$  with vertices  $\mathcal{V}(\Gamma_k)$ , i.e.  $\cup_k \mathcal{V}(\Gamma_k) = \mathcal{V} \setminus I$ . We associate with any  $\Gamma_k$  the lattices  $L(\Gamma_k)$  and  $L'(\Gamma_k)$  as well, endowed with the corresponding intersection forms.

Then for each  $k$  one considers the inclusion operator  $j_k : L(\Gamma_k) \rightarrow L(\Gamma)$ ,  $E_v^{\Gamma_k} \mapsto E_v^\Gamma$ , identifying naturally the corresponding  $E$ -base elements. This preserves the intersection forms.

Let  $j_k^* : L'(\Gamma) \rightarrow L'(\Gamma_k)$  be the dual operator, defined by  $j_k^*(E_v^{*\Gamma}) = E_v^{*\Gamma_k}$  if  $v \in \mathcal{V}(\Gamma_k)$ , and  $j_k^*(E_v^{*\Gamma}) = 0$  otherwise. Note that  $j_k^*(E_v^\Gamma) = E_v^{\Gamma_k}$  for any  $v \in \mathcal{V}(\Gamma_k)$ . Then we have the projection formula

$$(5.2.1) \quad (j_k^*(l'), \ell)_{\Gamma_k} = (l', j_k(\ell))_\Gamma$$

for any  $l' \in L'(\Gamma)$  and  $\ell \in L(\Gamma_k)$ , which also implies that

$$(5.2.2) \quad j_k^*(Z_K^\Gamma) = Z_K^{\Gamma_k}.$$

Similarly, the next formula holds for the corresponding minimal cycles  $s_h$  as well:

**Lemma 5.2.3** ([LSz16]). *For any  $h \in H$  one has  $j_k^*(s_h^\Gamma) = s_{[j_k^*(s_h^\Gamma)]}^{\Gamma_k} \in L'(\Gamma_k)$ .*

5.2.2. **Description of  $\tilde{\pi}_{(\Gamma', \Gamma)}|_{\text{Supp}_j(\check{P}_0^\Gamma)}$ .** Let  $\check{\ell} = C_j^\Gamma + \sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}(\Gamma \setminus B_{j+1}^\Gamma)} m_v E_v \in \text{Supp}_j(\check{P}_0^\Gamma)$  be a dual exponent for some  $j \geq i_{(\Gamma', \Gamma)} - 1$ . Then, by (5.1.4) one has

$$(5.2.4) \quad \tilde{\pi}_{(\Gamma', \Gamma)}(\check{\ell}) = C_{j-i_{(\Gamma', \Gamma)}}^{\Gamma'} + \sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}(\Gamma' \setminus B_{j-i_{(\Gamma', \Gamma)}+1}^{\Gamma'})} m_v E_v.$$

On the other hand, the dual operator  $j_{\Gamma'}^*$ , from section 5.2.1 develops the concrete relationship between the cycles  $C_j^\Gamma$  and  $C_{j-i_{(\Gamma', \Gamma)}}^{\Gamma'}$  as follows.

**Lemma 5.2.5.**  $j_{\Gamma'}^*(C_j^\Gamma) = C_{j-i_{(\Gamma', \Gamma)}}^{\Gamma'}$  for any  $j \geq i_{(\Gamma', \Gamma)} - 1$ .

*Proof.* Since  $Z_K^\Gamma - C_j^\Gamma = Z_K^{B_{j+1}^\Gamma}$  is supported on  $B_{j+1}^\Gamma \subset B_{i_{(\Gamma', \Gamma)}}^\Gamma \subset \Gamma'$ , it follows that  $j_{\Gamma'}^*(Z_K^{B_{j+1}^\Gamma}) = Z_K^{B_{j+1}^\Gamma} = j_{\Gamma'}^*(Z_K^\Gamma) - j_{\Gamma'}^*(C_j^\Gamma)$ . Furthermore, by (5.2.2) we get  $j_{\Gamma'}^*(C_j^\Gamma) = Z_K^{\Gamma'} - Z_K^{B_{j+1}^\Gamma}$ . This, composed with the identity  $Z_K^{B_{j+1}^\Gamma} = Z_K^{\Gamma'} - C_{j-i_{(\Gamma', \Gamma)}}^{\Gamma'}$ , implies that  $j_{\Gamma'}^*(C_j^\Gamma) = C_{j-i_{(\Gamma', \Gamma)}}^{\Gamma'}$ .  $\square$

Next, we define the following subsets of vertices:  $\partial_\Gamma(\Gamma')$  is the set of vertices of  $\Gamma'$  which are connected by an edge to  $\Gamma \setminus \Gamma'$  in  $\Gamma$ . Similarly,  $\partial_{\Gamma'}(\Gamma)$  denotes the set of vertices  $v \in \mathcal{V}(\Gamma \setminus \Gamma')$  which are connected to  $\Gamma'$ . Since both  $\Gamma'$  and  $\Gamma$  are connected and trees,  $\partial_{\Gamma'}(\Gamma)$  can be decomposed into  $\sqcup_{v \in \partial_\Gamma(\Gamma')} \partial_{\Gamma'}(\Gamma)_v$ , where  $\partial_{\Gamma'}(\Gamma)_v$  contains all the neighbours of  $v$  in  $\Gamma \setminus \Gamma'$ . Then, by 5.2.1 we know that  $j_{\Gamma'}^*(E_u) = 0$  for any  $u \in \mathcal{V}(\Gamma \setminus \Gamma') \setminus \partial_{\Gamma'}(\Gamma)$ , while  $j_{\Gamma'}^*(E_u) = -E_v^*$  for any  $u \in \partial_{\Gamma'}(\Gamma)_v$  and  $v \in \partial_\Gamma(\Gamma')$ . Therefore, a straightforward calculation implies that for any  $\check{\ell} = C_j^\Gamma + \sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}(\Gamma \setminus B_{j+1}^\Gamma)} m_v E_v$  we have

$$(5.2.6) \quad \tilde{\pi}_{(\Gamma', \Gamma)}(\check{\ell}) = j_{\Gamma'}^*(\check{\ell}) + \sum_{v \in \partial_\Gamma(\Gamma')} \left( \sum_{u \in \partial_{\Gamma'}(\Gamma)_v} m_u \right) \cdot E_v^*.$$

This description of  $\tilde{\pi}_{(\Gamma', \Gamma)}$  and the projection formula (5.2.1) immediately gives us the following identities.

**Lemma 5.2.7.** *For any  $j \geq i_{(\Gamma', \Gamma)} - 1$  and  $\check{\ell} \in \text{Supp}_j(\check{P}_0^\Gamma)$  one has*

- (1)  $(\tilde{\pi}_{(\Gamma', \Gamma)}(\check{\ell}), E_v)_{\Gamma'} = (\check{\ell}, E_v)_\Gamma$  for  $v \in \mathcal{V}(\Gamma') \setminus \partial_\Gamma(\Gamma')$  and
- (2)  $(\tilde{\pi}_{(\Gamma', \Gamma)}(\check{\ell}), E_v)_{\Gamma'} = (\check{\ell}, E_v)_\Gamma - \sum_{u \in \partial_{\Gamma'}(\Gamma)_v} m_u$  for every  $v \in \partial_\Gamma(\Gamma')$ .

**Theorem 5.2.8.** *If every  $v \in \partial_\Gamma(\Gamma')$  is an end-vertex of  $\Gamma'$ , then  $\pi_{(\Gamma',\Gamma)}(\ell) \in \text{Supp}_{j-i_{(\Gamma',\Gamma)}}(P_0^{\Gamma'})$  whenever  $\ell \in \text{Supp}_j(P_0^\Gamma)$  ( $j \geq i_{(\Gamma',\Gamma)} - 1$ ).*

*Proof.* Let  $\ell \in \text{Supp}_j(P_0^\Gamma)$  (for some  $j \geq i_{(\Gamma',\Gamma)} - 1$ ) be an exponent of  $\Gamma$  and  $\check{\ell} = C_j^\Gamma + \sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}(\Gamma \setminus B_{j+1}^\Gamma)} m_v E_v$  be its dual exponent. We have to show that  $\check{\pi}_{(\Gamma',\Gamma)}(\check{\ell})$  is a dual exponent of  $\Gamma'$ , that is an exponent of  $Z_{[Z_K^{\Gamma'}]}$  and satisfies  $\check{\pi}_{(\Gamma',\Gamma)}(\check{\ell}) \not\prec Z_K^{\Gamma'}$ , where  $Z_{[Z_K^{\Gamma'}]}$  is the  $[Z_K^{\Gamma'}]$ -part of the topological Poincaré series associated with  $\Gamma'$ .

The latter is immediate from the identities (5.2.4) and  $Z_K^{\Gamma'} - C_{j-i_{(\Gamma',\Gamma)}}^{\Gamma'} = Z_K^{B_{j-i_{(\Gamma',\Gamma)}}^{\Gamma'}+1}$ . On the other hand, we know that  $\check{\pi}_{(\Gamma',\Gamma)}(\check{\ell}) \in \text{Supp}(Z_{[Z_K^{\Gamma'}]})$  if and only if  $\check{\pi}_{(\Gamma',\Gamma)}(\check{\ell}) \in \mathcal{S}'_{[Z_K^{\Gamma'}]}$  and for every node  $v \in \mathcal{V}(\Gamma')$  of  $\Gamma'$  (ie. with valency  $\delta_v^{\Gamma'} \geq 3$ ) the inequality  $-(\check{\pi}_{(\Gamma',\Gamma)}(\check{\ell}), E_v) \leq \delta_v^{\Gamma'} - 2$  is satisfied.

By assumption one has  $\check{\ell} \in \mathcal{S}'_{[Z_K^\Gamma]}$  and  $-(\check{\ell}, E_v) \leq \delta_v^\Gamma - 2$  for every  $v \in \mathcal{V}(\Gamma)$  with  $\delta_v^\Gamma \geq 3$ . Therefore, Lemma 5.2.7 implies that  $(\check{\pi}_{(\Gamma',\Gamma)}(\check{\ell}), E_v)_{\Gamma'} \leq (\check{\ell}, E_v)_\Gamma \leq 0$  for any  $v \in \mathcal{V}(\Gamma')$ , hence  $\check{\pi}_{(\Gamma',\Gamma)}(\check{\ell}) \in \mathcal{S}'_{[Z_K^{\Gamma'}]}$ . Moreover, by the assumption on  $\partial_\Gamma(\Gamma')$  and Lemma 5.2.7(1), for every node  $v$  of  $\Gamma'$  we have  $-(\check{\pi}_{(\Gamma',\Gamma)}(\check{\ell}), E_v)_{\Gamma'} = -(\check{\ell}, E_v)_\Gamma \leq \delta_v^{\Gamma'} - 2$ , since in this case  $\delta_v^{\Gamma'} = \delta_v^\Gamma$ .  $\square$

## 6. EXTENSIONS OF ELLIPTIC GRAPHS AND THEIR EXPONENTS

**6.1. Small extensions of elliptic graphs.** In the following lemma we recall and slightly extend the statement of [NN18, Lemma 3.2.7] regarding the possible extensions of elliptic graphs.

**Lemma 6.1.1.** *Let  $\Gamma$  be an elliptic graph and  $\{B_j\}_{j=-1}^m$  the NN-elliptic sequence. Assume that  $\Gamma$  can be extended to a new elliptic graph  $\Gamma_{new}$  by attaching new vertices  $v_1, \dots, v_s$  to a fixed vertex  $v_0 \in \mathcal{V}(\Gamma)$ . Then*

- (a)  $v_0 \in \mathcal{V}(B_{-1} \setminus B_1)$ ,
- (b)  $E_{v_0}$ -multiplicity of  $Z_{min}^\Gamma$  is 1 and
- (c)  $(Z_{min}^\Gamma, E_{v_0})_\Gamma \leq 1 - s$ .

Furthermore, if  $v_0 \in \mathcal{V}(B_0 \setminus B_1)$  then  $v_0$  is an end-vertex of  $B_0$ .

*Proof.* Suppose that  $v_0 \in B_1$ . Then the  $E_{v_0}$ -multiplicity of the cycle  $Z_{B_0} + Z_{B_1}$ , denoted by  $m_{v_0}(Z_{B_0} + Z_{B_1})$ , is at least 2 and  $\chi_\Gamma(Z_{B_0} + Z_{B_1}) = 0$  is implied by Lemma 3.3.2. Hence  $\chi_{\Gamma_{new}}(Z_{B_0} + Z_{B_1} + E_{v_i}) < 0$  for all  $i \in \{1, \dots, s\}$  which contradicts to the ellipticity of  $\Gamma_{new}$ . Hence  $v_0 \in \mathcal{V}(B_{-1} \setminus B_1)$ .

Consider the Laufer computation sequence  $\{z_i\}_{i=0}^n$  of  $Z_{min}^\Gamma$  in  $\Gamma$  (ie.  $z_n = Z_{min}^\Gamma$ ). This can be extended in  $\Gamma_{new}$  to a Laufer computation sequence  $(\dagger) z_0, \dots, Z_{min}^\Gamma, z_{n+1}, \dots, Z_{min}^{\Gamma_{new}}$  targeting  $Z_{min}^{\Gamma_{new}}$ . Since  $(Z_{min}^\Gamma, E_v)_{\Gamma_{new}} = (Z_{min}^\Gamma, E_v)_\Gamma \leq 0$  for any  $v \in \mathcal{V}(\Gamma)$  and  $(Z_{min}^\Gamma, E_{v_i})_{\Gamma_{new}} = m_{v_0}(Z_{min}^\Gamma) > 0$ , part of the  $(\dagger)$  computation sequence can be chosen in such a way that

$$(6.1.2) \quad z_{n+t} = Z_{min}^\Gamma + \sum_{j=1}^t E_{v_j} \quad \text{for } 1 \leq t \leq s.$$

On the other hand, we know that  $\chi_{\Gamma_{new}}(Z_{min}^\Gamma) = \chi_{\Gamma_{new}}(Z_{min}^{\Gamma_{new}}) = 0$  and  $\chi_{\Gamma_{new}}$  is decreasing along the sequence  $(\dagger)$ . Hence for any  $t \geq n$  we must have  $(z_t, E_{v(t)})_{\Gamma_{new}} = 1$  where  $z_{t+1} = z_t + E_{v(t)}$ .

In particular,  $m_{v_0}(Z_{min}^\Gamma) = 1$  which proves (b), and we get the inequality  $(z_{n+s}, E_{v(n+s)})_{\Gamma_{new}} \leq 1$  too.

Moreover, if the new decorations associated with  $v_i$  are  $e_i$ , then (b) shows that for any  $i \in \{1, \dots, s\}$   $(z_{n+s}, E_{v_i})_{\Gamma_{new}} = e_{v_i} + 1$ , which is strictly negative. Therefore, the only candidate for  $E_{v(n+s)}$  would be  $E_{v_0}$  and we get  $(z_{n+s}, E_{v_0})_{\Gamma_{new}} \leq 1$ , or, equivalently,  $(Z_{min}^\Gamma, E_{v_0})_\Gamma \leq 1 - s$ , thereby proving (c).

Now, assume  $v_0 \in \mathcal{V}(B_0 \setminus B_1)$ . Then  $(Z_{B_0}, E_{v_i})_{\Gamma_{new}} = m_{v_0}(Z_{B_0}) \geq 1$  for any  $i \in \{1, \dots, s\}$ . Moreover, the facts  $\chi_{\Gamma_{new}}(Z_{B_0}) = 0$  and  $\chi_{\Gamma_{new}}(Z_{B_0} + E_{v_i}) \geq 0$  imply  $m_{v_0}(Z_{B_0}) = 1$ , which gives also the equality  $m_{v_0}(Z_K^{B_0}) = 1$  since  $v_0 \in \mathcal{V}(B_0 \setminus B_1)$ . This shows that  $v_0$  must be an end-vertex of  $B_0$ . Indeed, by the adjunction formula  $v_0$  is either an end-vertex of  $B_0$  or it has two neighbours in  $B_0$  both with multiplicity 1 in  $Z_K^{B_0}$ . But the last case would generate by repeating the argument an infinite string, all with multiplicity one, which cannot happen.  $\square$

**Definition 6.1.3.** For the ease of terminology, in the sequel such an extension of an elliptic graph, appearing in the above Lemma 6.1.1, will be called *small extension*.

**Corollary 6.1.4** (Part of Lemma 3.3.2 (f)). *Let  $\Gamma$  be an elliptic graph,  $\{B_j\}_{j=-1}^m$  its associated NN-elliptic sequence and  $C_j$  the corresponding cycles. Then in the case  $v \in \mathcal{V}(\Gamma \setminus B_{j+1})$  and  $(E_{B_{j+1}}, E_v) = 1$  one has  $(C_j, E_v) = e_v + 1$ .*

*Proof.* As we have seen in the proof of Lemma 3.3.2 one has the identity  $(C_j, E_v) = e_v + 2 - (Z_K^{B_{j+1}}, E_v)$ . Note that, by assumption the numerically Gorenstein elliptic graph  $B_{j+1}$  has a small extension by attaching to it the vertex  $v$ . We denote the neighbour of  $v$  in  $B_{j+1}$  by  $v_0$ . Then, by the end of the proof of Lemma 6.1.1 we know that  $(Z_K^{B_{j+1}}, E_v) = m_{v_0}(Z_K^{B_{j+1}}) = 1$ .  $\square$

## 6.2. Extensions of the (dual) exponents.

6.2.1. We consider a small extension  $\Gamma \subset \Gamma_{new}$  as in Lemma 6.1.1. Then the main question guiding this section is the following:

*how can an exponent of  $\Gamma$  be “extended” to an exponent of  $\Gamma_{new}$ ?*

In the present situation we have  $\partial_{\Gamma_{new}}(\Gamma) = \{v_0\}$  and the index  $i(\Gamma, \Gamma_{new})$  is either 1 or 0. Indeed, if  $\Gamma_{new}$  is numerically Gorenstein then  $B_0^\Gamma = B_1^{\Gamma_{new}} \subseteq \Gamma \subset B_0^{\Gamma_{new}} = \Gamma_{new}$ , hence by (5.1.3)  $i(\Gamma, \Gamma_{new}) = 1$ . If  $\Gamma_{new}$  is not a numerically Gorenstein graph then  $i(\Gamma, \Gamma_{new}) = 0$  is implied by the inclusions  $B_0^{\Gamma_{new}} = B_0^\Gamma \subseteq \Gamma \subset B_{-1}^{\Gamma_{new}}$ .

Now assume  $v_0$  is an end-vertex of  $\Gamma$ .

By Theorem 5.2.8 we can consider the (restriction of the) dualized map  $\tilde{\pi}_{(\Gamma, \Gamma_{new})} : \text{Supp}(\check{P}_0^{\Gamma_{new}}) \rightarrow \text{Supp}(\check{P}_0^\Gamma)$  having the property

$$\tilde{\pi}_{(\Gamma, \Gamma_{new})}(\text{Supp}_j(\check{P}_0^{\Gamma_{new}})) \subset \text{Supp}_{j-i(\Gamma, \Gamma_{new})}(\check{P}_0^\Gamma).$$

Let  $\check{\ell} = C_j^\Gamma + \sum_{\Gamma \setminus B_{j+1}^\Gamma} m_v E_v \in \text{Supp}_j(\check{P}_0^\Gamma)$  be a dual exponent of  $\Gamma$  and assume that  $\tilde{\pi}_{(\Gamma, \Gamma_{new})}^{-1}(\check{\ell}) \neq \emptyset$ . Thus, there exist dual cycles  $\check{\ell}_{new} \in \tilde{\pi}_{(\Gamma, \Gamma_{new})}^{-1}(\check{\ell}) \subset \text{Supp}_{j+i(\Gamma, \Gamma_{new})}(\check{P}_0^{\Gamma_{new}})$  of  $\Gamma_{new}$  which can be written as

$$\check{\ell}_{new} = C_{j+i(\Gamma, \Gamma_{new})}^{\Gamma_{new}} + \sum_{\Gamma \setminus B_{j+1}^\Gamma} m_v E_v + \sum_{i=1}^s m_i E_{v_i}$$

for some  $m_i \geq 0$ . In the followings, we will determine all these possible extensions  $\check{\ell}_{new} \in \check{\pi}_{(\Gamma, \Gamma_{new})}^{-1}(\check{\ell})$ .

**6.2.2. An algorithm for generating the extensions.** First of all, associated with  $\check{\ell}$  we construct the cycle  $\ell' := C_{j+i(\Gamma, \Gamma_{new})}^{\Gamma_{new}} + \sum_{\Gamma \setminus B_{j+1}^{\Gamma}} m_v E_v \in L'(\Gamma_{new})$ . Note that since all  $\check{\ell}_{new} \in \mathcal{S}'_{[Z_K^{\Gamma_{new}}]}$ , it follows that  $\ell' \leq s(\ell') \leq \check{\ell}_{new}$ , where  $s(\ell')$  is given by the generalized Laufer algorithm starting from  $\ell'$ , cf. 2.1.3. Moreover, the integral cycles  $s(\ell') - \ell'$  and  $\check{\ell}_{new} - s(\ell')$  are both supported on the vertices  $\{v_1, \dots, v_s\}$ . On the other hand, we also have the following identity

$$(6.2.1) \quad (\ell', E_w)_{\Gamma_{new}} = (\check{\ell}, E_w)_{\Gamma} \text{ for any } w \in \mathcal{V}(\Gamma).$$

Indeed, by the projection formula (5.2.1) and Lemma 5.2.5 one writes

$$(\ell', E_w)_{\Gamma_{new}} = (j_{\Gamma}^*(C_{j+i(\Gamma, \Gamma_{new})}^{\Gamma_{new}}), E_w)_{\Gamma} + \sum_{\Gamma \setminus B_{j+1}^{\Gamma}} m_v (E_v, E_w)_{\Gamma} = (\check{\ell}, E_w)_{\Gamma}.$$

Then, based on the above discussion, we construct the following computation sequences  $\{x_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  which determine all the cycles in  $\check{\pi}_{(\Gamma, \Gamma_{new})}^{-1}(\check{\ell})$  (provided that is not empty).

**Step I.** We start with the above constructed cycle  $x_0 := \ell' \in L'(\Gamma_{new})$  associated with  $\check{\ell}$ . If  $\ell' \notin \mathcal{S}'_{Z_K^{\Gamma_{new}}}$  then we proceed with the generalized Laufer algorithm in order to find  $x_{t_0} = s(\ell')$ .

We emphasize that, by the assumption  $\check{\pi}_{(\Gamma, \Gamma_{new})}^{-1}(\check{\ell}) \neq \emptyset$ , the property  $|s(\ell') - \ell'| \subset \Gamma_{new} \setminus \Gamma$  must be satisfied. This implies that  $(s(\ell'), E_v)_{\Gamma_{new}} = (\check{\ell}, E_v)_{\Gamma}$  for any  $v \in \mathcal{V}(\Gamma \setminus v_0)$  and  $(\check{\ell}, E_{v_0})_{\Gamma} = (\ell', E_{v_0})_{\Gamma_{new}} \leq (s(\ell'), E_{v_0})_{\Gamma_{new}} \leq 0$ . Therefore,  $s(\ell')$  is either a dual exponent of  $\Gamma_{new}$  or this property might fails exactly at the vertex  $v_0$ . In any case, in the next step we will modify  $s(\ell')$  in order to find all the possibilities.

**Step II.** Note that  $\delta_{v_0}^{\Gamma_{new}} = s + 1$ , hence a dual exponent  $\check{\ell}_{new}$  satisfies  $0 \leq -(\check{\ell}_{new}, E_{v_0}) \leq s - 1$ . Therefore, for any integer  $N$  in the interval

$$N \in [-(s(\ell'), E_{v_0}) - s + 1, -(s(\ell'), E_{v_0})] \cap \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0},$$

and its partitions  $\sum_{i=1}^s m_i = N$  for some  $m_i \geq 0$  we associate the cycles

$$(6.2.2) \quad \check{\ell}_{new}(N; m_1, \dots, m_s) := s(\ell') + \sum_{i=1}^s m_i E_{v_i}$$

Then the claim, implied by the previous discussions, is that the cycles  $\check{\ell}_{new}(N; m_1, \dots, m_s)$  given by the different choices and partitions of  $N$  provide the dual exponents in  $\check{\pi}_{(\Gamma, \Gamma_{new})}^{-1}(\check{\ell})$ . In particular, if the interval contains  $N = 0$ , then this choice gives  $s(\ell')$  as a dual exponent in this case.

**6.2.3. An example for non-extendable exponents.** Let  $\Gamma \subset \Gamma_{new}$  be the small extension shown in Figure 2 and consider the dual exponent  $\check{\ell} = C_1^{\Gamma} + E_9 + 2E_{14} + E_{16} + 4E_{15}$  from  $Supp(P_0^{\Gamma})$ . One can check that  $\check{\ell} = E_7^* + E_{11}^* + E_{14}^*$ , hence  $(\check{\ell}, E_{16})_{\Gamma} = 0$ , a property which will be crucial regarding its non-extendability. Then we run the algorithm from section 6.2.2 in order to find the possible extensions of  $\check{\ell}$  to  $\Gamma_{new}$ .

Since  $\Gamma$  is numerically Gorenstein, one follows that  $i(\Gamma, \Gamma_{new}) = 0$ . Hence, the starting point of the algorithm will be the cycle  $\ell' = C_1^{\Gamma_{new}} + E_9 + 2E_{14} + E_{16} + 4E_{15}$  associated with  $\check{\ell}$ . Since  $C_1^{\Gamma_{new}} = s_{[Z_K^{\Gamma_{new}}]}^{\Gamma_{new}} + C_1^{\Gamma}$  and  $s_{[Z_K^{\Gamma_{new}}]}^{\Gamma_{new}} = E_{17}^*$  in this case, a calculation shows that  $\ell' = \sum_{j=1}^{17} \ell'_j E_j$  is as follows:



Therefore,  $z(\check{\ell}_{new}) = z(\check{\ell}) \cdot z_{v_0}(\check{\ell}_{new})$ , where

$$(6.3.3) \quad z_{v_0}(\check{\ell}_{new}) = (-1)^{-(\check{\ell}_{new}, E_{v_0})_{\Gamma_{new}}} \cdot \binom{s-1}{-(\check{\ell}_{new}, E_{v_0})_{\Gamma_{new}}}$$

is the contribution of  $v_0$  to  $z(\check{\ell}_{new})$ . This reduces (6.3.2) to the following identity:

$$(6.3.4) \quad \sum_{\check{\ell}_{new} \in \check{\pi}_{(\Gamma, \Gamma_{new})}^{-1}(\check{\ell})} z_{v_0}(\check{\ell}_{new}) = 1.$$

Consider the cycles  $\ell', s(\ell') \in L'(\Gamma_{new})$  associated with  $\check{\ell}$  by the algorithm developed in section 6.2.1. We have also proved that  $(s(\ell'), E_v)_{\Gamma_{new}} = (\check{\ell}, E_v)_\Gamma$  for every  $v \in \mathcal{V} \setminus v_0$ . In the case of  $v_0$ , we set the notation  $m := -(s(\ell'), E_{v_0})_{\Gamma_{new}}$  for simplicity. Then, by (6.2.2) the extensions are given by  $\check{\ell}_{new}(N, m_i) = s(\ell') + \sum_{i=1}^s m_i E_{v_i}$  for all possible  $m_i \geq 0$  such that  $\sum_{i=1}^s m_i = N$  and  $N \in [m-s+1, m] \cap \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ . Hence, for fixed  $N$  and  $m_i$ , (6.3.3) reads as

$$z_{v_0}(\check{\ell}_{new}(N, m_i)) = (-1)^{m-N} \cdot \binom{s-1}{m-N}.$$

On the other hand, the number of partitions  $\sum_{i=1}^s m_i = N$  for a fixed  $N$  is counted by the Ehrhart polynomial  $\mathcal{L}_{\Delta_{s-1}}(N)$  of the standard  $(s-1)$ -simplex  $\Delta_{s-1}$ , whose explicit expression is given by  $\mathcal{L}_{\Delta_{s-1}}(N) = \binom{N+s-1}{s-1}$ , see [BR15, Theorem 2.2] for more details. This implies that (6.3.4) is equivalent with the identity

$$\sum_{N \in [m-s+1, m] \cap \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}} (-1)^{m-N} \cdot \binom{s-1}{m-N} \cdot \binom{N+s-1}{s-1} = 1,$$

which can be deduced by part (a) of the following lemma.  $\square$

**Lemma 6.3.5.** (a) For any non-negative integers  $d, m \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$  one has

$$S_{d,m} = \sum_{i=0}^{\min\{d,m\}} (-1)^i \cdot \binom{d}{i} \cdot \binom{m+d-i}{d} = 1.$$

(b) Assume  $m \leq d$ . Then


$$S'_{d,m} = \sum_{i=0}^m (-1)^i \cdot \binom{d}{i} \cdot \binom{m+d-i-1}{d-1} = 0.$$

*Proof.* By using the binomial expression  $\binom{p}{r} = \binom{p-1}{r} + \binom{p-1}{r-1}$ ,  $p > r$  consequently, it can be proved that  $S_{d,m} = S_{d,m-1} + S_{d-1,m} - S_{d-1,m-1}$ . Then, in case (a) one can proceed easily by induction. Using again the same binomial expression, (b) follows from (a).  $\square$

**6.4. Counting coefficients of non-extendable exponents.** Let  $\Gamma_0 \subset \Gamma_1 \subset \Gamma_2$  be elliptic graphs such that for all  $i \in \{0, 1\}$  the extensions  $\Gamma_i \subset \Gamma_{i+1}$  are small and the vertices of  $\Gamma_{i+1} \setminus \Gamma_i$  are attached to an end-vertex of  $\Gamma_i$ .

We fix a dual exponent  $\check{\ell}$  of  $\Gamma_0$ . Assume that  $\check{\ell}$  can be extended to  $\Gamma_2$ , ie.  $\check{\pi}_{(\Gamma_0, \Gamma_2)}^{-1}(\check{\ell}) \neq \emptyset$ . Since by definition one gets  $\check{\pi}_{(\Gamma_0, \Gamma_2)} = \check{\pi}_{(\Gamma_0, \Gamma_1)} \circ \check{\pi}_{(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2)}$ , it implies that  $\check{\ell}$  is extendable to  $\Gamma_1$  as well, and there exists at least one extension of  $\check{\ell}$  on  $\Gamma_1$  which must be extendable to  $\Gamma_2$ . On the other hand, there might exist extensions of  $\check{\ell}$  on  $\Gamma_1$  which are non-extendable to  $\Gamma_2$ . Their set will be denoted by

$$\check{\pi}_{(\Gamma_0, \Gamma_1)}^{-1}(\check{\ell})_{ne} \subset \check{\pi}_{(\Gamma_0, \Gamma_1)}^{-1}(\check{\ell}).$$


 FIGURE 3. The two cases for  $\Gamma_0 \subset \Gamma_1 \subset \Gamma_2$ .

The aim of this subsection is to prove the following identity regarding the sum of the coefficients of these non-extendable exponents.

**Theorem 6.4.1.**

$$(6.4.2) \quad \sum_{\check{\ell}_1 \in \check{\pi}_{(\Gamma_0, \Gamma_1)}^{-1}(\check{\ell})_{ne}} z(\check{\ell}_1) = 0.$$

*Proof.* If  $\check{\pi}_{(\Gamma_0, \Gamma_1)}^{-1}(\check{\ell})_{ne} = \emptyset$  then we set the above sum to be zero and the theorem is automatically true. Therefore we can assume that there exists an extension  $\check{\ell}_1 \in \check{\pi}_{(\Gamma_0, \Gamma_1)}^{-1}(\check{\ell})_{ne} \subset \text{Supp}(\check{P}_0^{\Gamma_1})$  of  $\check{\ell}$  such that  $\check{\pi}_{(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2)}^{-1}(\check{\ell}_1) = \emptyset$ . If we associate with  $\check{\ell}_1$  the cycles  $\ell', s(\ell') \in L'(\Gamma_2)$  according to the algorithm 6.2.2, then our assumption implies that  $|s(\ell') - \ell'| \not\subseteq \Gamma_2 \setminus \Gamma_1$ . Indeed, otherwise step II. of 6.2.2 would find an element in  $\check{\pi}_{(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2)}^{-1}(\check{\ell}_1)$ .

Next, we analyze the generalized Laufer computation sequence targeting  $s(\ell')$  in more details.

Note that  $\Gamma_2$  is constructed from  $\Gamma_1$  by attaching new vertices  $v_{21}, \dots, v_{2s_2}$  to an end-vertex of  $\Gamma_1$ . Since  $(\ell', E_w)_{\Gamma_2} = (\check{\ell}_1, E_w)_{\Gamma_1} \leq 0$  for every  $w \in \mathcal{V}(\Gamma_1)$ , we must have  $(\ell', E_{v_{2j}})_{\Gamma_2} > 0$  for some  $j \in \{1, \dots, s_2\}$ , otherwise  $\ell' = s(\ell')$  would be an extension of  $\check{\ell}_1$ . Hence, we can choose the generalized Laufer computation sequence  $(\{x_t\}_{t \geq 0}, x_0 := \ell')$  in such a way that after some steps we reach a cycle  $x_{t_1} = \ell' + \sum_{j=1}^{s_2} m_j E_{v_{2j}}$  for some  $m_j \geq 0$ , where  $(x_{t_1}, E_{v_{2j}})_{\Gamma_2} \leq 0$  for any  $j$ . Then, by our assumption, the algorithm turns back to the end-vertex of  $\Gamma_1$  to which the vertices  $v_{2j}$  are connected. As illustrated by Figure 3, we have two cases depending whether this end-vertex belongs to  $\Gamma_0$  or not.

First we look at case (B). By the previous argument we have  $(x_{t_1}, E_{v_2})_{\Gamma_2} > 0$  and the algorithm proceeds with  $x_{t_1+1} = x_{t_1} + E_{v_2}$ , which means that  $\check{\ell}_1$  does not extend to  $\Gamma_2$ . On the other hand, if we consider any other extension  $\check{\ell}'_1$  of  $\check{\ell}$ , one knows by Lemma 5.2.7 that in this case  $(\check{\ell}'_1, E_{v_2})_{\Gamma_1} = (\check{\ell}_1, E_{v_2})_{\Gamma_1} = (\check{\ell}, E_{v_2})_{\Gamma_0}$ . Therefore, the generalized Laufer computation sequence used in the algorithm 6.2.2 for the extension of  $\check{\ell}'_1$  to  $\Gamma_2$  can be chosen in the same way and has the same properties as in the case of  $\check{\ell}_1$ , which implies that  $\check{\ell}'_1$  cannot be extended to  $\Gamma_2$  either. This contradicts to the assumption, hence we must have  $\check{\pi}_{(\Gamma_0, \Gamma_1)}^{-1}(\check{\ell})_{ne} = \emptyset$  for case (B).

In case (A), first we set the notation  $n := -(\check{\ell}_1, E_{v_{11}})_{\Gamma_1} = -(\ell', E_{v_{11}})_{\Gamma_2}$ . The assumption that  $\check{\ell} = \check{\pi}_{(\Gamma_0, \Gamma_1)}^{-1}(\check{\ell}_1)$  can be extended to  $\Gamma_2$  implies that  $N_1 := -(\check{\ell}_1, E_{v_0})_{\Gamma_1} > 0$  and there exists another extension of  $\check{\ell}$  greater or equal to  $\check{\ell}_1 + tE_{v_{11}}$  for some  $t > 0$ , which will be extendable

to  $\Gamma_2$ . Moreover, since  $\check{\ell}_1$  is a dual exponent and the valency of  $v_{11}$  is  $s_1 + 1$ , we have that  $N_1 \in (0, s_1 - 1]$ . By changing  $\check{\ell}_1$  if needed, we may assume that  $N_1$  of  $\check{\ell}_1$  is the maximal amongst all those extensions  $\check{\ell}'_1$  which are non-extendable to  $\Gamma_2$  and  $-(\check{\ell}'_1, E_{v_{11}})_{\Gamma_1} = n$  is fixed. Then, associated with  $n$  all these dual exponents can be constructed as follows:

$$\check{\ell}_1(N; n_2, \dots, n_{s_1}) = \check{\ell}_1 + \sum_{j=2}^{s_1} n_j E_{v_{1j}}$$

such that  $\sum_{j=2}^{s_1} n_j = N$  for  $N \leq N_1$ . In particular, one has  $\check{\ell}_1(0; 0, \dots, 0) = \check{\ell}_1$ .

By 5.2.7 we have  $(\check{\ell}_1(N; n_2, \dots, n_{s_1}), E_v)_{\Gamma_1} = (\check{\ell}, E_v)_{\Gamma_0}$  for every  $v \in \mathcal{V}(\Gamma_0) \setminus v_{11}$ . Therefore, the coefficients in the series  $Z_{[\mathbb{Z}_K^{\Gamma_1}]}$  of the dual exponents  $\check{\ell}_1(N; n_2, \dots, n_{s_1})$  are expressed as

$$z(\check{\ell}_1(N; n_2, \dots, n_{s_1})) = z(\check{\ell}) \cdot (-1)^{N_1 - N} \binom{s_1 - 1}{N_1 - N}.$$

Hence, if we count all these coefficients we can write

$$(6.4.3) \quad S(n) := \sum_{\substack{0 \leq N \leq N_1 \\ \sum_{j=2}^{s_1} n_j = N}} z(\check{\ell}_1(N; n_2, \dots, n_{s_1})) = z(\check{\ell}) \cdot \sum_{\substack{0 \leq N \leq N_1 \\ \sum_{j=2}^{s_1} n_j = N}} (-1)^{N_1 - N} \binom{s_1 - 1}{N_1 - N}.$$

Similarly as in the proof of Theorem 6.3.1, the number of partitions  $(n_2, \dots, n_{s_1})$  of  $N$  is expressed by the Ehrhart polynomial  $\mathcal{L}_{\Delta_{s_1-2}}(N)$  of the standard  $(s_1 - 2)$ -simplex  $\Delta_{s_1-2}$ , which is  $\mathcal{L}_{\Delta_{s_1-2}}(N) = \binom{N+s_1-2}{s_1-2}$ , cf. [BR15]. This implies that

$$S(n) = z(\check{\ell}) \cdot \sum_{N=0}^{N_1} (-1)^{N_1 - N} \binom{s_1 - 1}{N_1 - N} \binom{N + s_1 - 2}{s_1 - 2}.$$

Since the summation in the above expression vanishes by Lemma 6.3.5, we get  $S(n) = 0$ .

Finally, followed by the above discussion one writes

$$\sum_{\check{\ell}_1 \in \check{\pi}_{(\Gamma_0, \Gamma_1)}^{-1}(\check{\ell})_{n_e}} z(\check{\ell}_1) = \sum_{\text{all possible } n} S(n) = 0$$

which proves the result. □

**6.5. General case and good extensions.** Following the concepts and notations of section 6, we consider two elliptic graphs  $\Gamma' \subset \Gamma$ . As before we assume that

$$(6.5.1) \quad \text{every } v \in \partial_{\Gamma}(\Gamma') \text{ is an end-vertex of } \Gamma'.$$

Recall that in this case Theorem 5.2.8 applies and for any exponent  $\ell \in \text{Supp}_j(P_0^{\Gamma})$  such that  $j \geq i_{(\Gamma', \Gamma)} - 1$ , where  $i_{(\Gamma', \Gamma)}$  is the index of the extension (cf. (5.1.3)), we get  $\pi_{(\Gamma', \Gamma)}(\ell) \in \text{Supp}_{j-i_{(\Gamma', \Gamma)}}(P_0^{\Gamma'})$ .

Now, let  $\ell' \in \text{Supp}_j(P_0^{\Gamma'})$  be an exponent of  $\Gamma'$  and *assume that  $\ell'$  can be extended to  $\Gamma$* . That is  $\emptyset \neq \pi_{(\Gamma', \Gamma)}^{-1}(\ell') \subset \text{Supp}_{j+i_{(\Gamma', \Gamma)}}(P_0^{\Gamma})$ . Then, using the results of section 7 we can prove the following identity.

**Theorem 6.5.2.** *For an extension  $\Gamma' \subset \Gamma$  as above and an exponent  $\ell' \in \text{Supp}_j(P_0^{\Gamma'})$  which is extendable to  $\Gamma$  one has*

$$\sum_{\ell \in \pi_{(\Gamma', \Gamma)}^{-1}(\ell') \neq \emptyset} w(\ell) = w(\ell'),$$

where  $w(\cdot)$  denotes the coefficient of the exponent in the canonical polynomial associated with the corresponding graph.

**Remark 6.5.3.** Note that in ‘dual’ terms, the identity from Theorem 6.5.2 is equivalent with

$$\sum_{\check{\ell} \in \check{\pi}_{(\Gamma', \Gamma)}^{-1}(\check{\ell}') \neq \emptyset} z(\check{\ell}) = z(\check{\ell}'),$$

where  $\check{\ell}'$  (resp.  $\check{\ell}$ ) is the dual exponent of  $\ell'$  (resp.  $\ell$ ).

*Proof of Theorem 6.5.2.* First of all, we note that one can construct a sequence of small extensions such that  $\Gamma' = \Gamma_0 \subset \Gamma_1 \subset \dots \subset \Gamma_n = \Gamma$  for some  $n \geq 0$  and  $\Gamma_{i+1} \setminus \Gamma_i$  is attached to an end-vertex of  $\Gamma_i$ , for all  $i$ .

Accordingly, the projection map  $\pi_{(\Gamma', \Gamma)}$  can be decomposed as  $\pi_{(\Gamma', \Gamma)} = \pi_{(\Gamma_0, \Gamma_1)} \circ \dots \circ \pi_{(\Gamma_{n-1}, \Gamma_n)}$ , hence for the dualized map one also writes  $\check{\pi}_{(\Gamma', \Gamma)} = \check{\pi}_{(\Gamma_0, \Gamma_1)} \circ \dots \circ \check{\pi}_{(\Gamma_{n-1}, \Gamma_n)}$ .

Continuing to use the dual terms in the present proof, let  $\check{\ell}' \in \text{Supp}(\check{P}_0^{\Gamma'})$  be a dual exponent of  $\Gamma'$  which is extendable to  $\Gamma$ . For any  $i \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}$  the set of extensions of  $\check{\ell}'$  to  $\Gamma_i$  decomposes into

$$\emptyset \neq \check{\pi}_{(\Gamma', \Gamma_i)}^{-1}(\check{\ell}') = \check{\pi}_{(\Gamma', \Gamma_i)}^{-1}(\check{\ell}')_e \sqcup \check{\pi}_{(\Gamma', \Gamma_i)}^{-1}(\check{\ell}')_{ne},$$

where the elements of  $\check{\pi}_{(\Gamma', \Gamma_i)}^{-1}(\check{\ell}')_e \neq \emptyset$  are extendable to  $\Gamma_{i+1}$ , while the dual exponents in  $\check{\pi}_{(\Gamma', \Gamma_i)}^{-1}(\check{\ell}')_{ne}$  can not be further extended.

By Theorem 6.4.1 it follows that

$$(6.5.4) \quad \sum_{\check{\ell} \in \check{\pi}_{(\Gamma', \Gamma_i)}^{-1}(\check{\ell}')_{ne}} z(\check{\ell}) = 0$$

since one expresses  $\check{\pi}_{(\Gamma', \Gamma_i)}^{-1}(\check{\ell}')_{ne} = \cup_{\check{\ell}_{\Gamma_{i-1}} \in \check{\pi}_{(\Gamma', \Gamma_{i-1})}^{-1}(\check{\ell}')} \check{\pi}_{(\Gamma_{i-1}, \Gamma_i)}^{-1}(\check{\ell}_{\Gamma_{i-1}})_{ne}$ . Moreover, this implies the following identities

$$(6.5.5) \quad \sum_{\check{\ell}_{\Gamma_{i+1}} \in \check{\pi}_{(\Gamma', \Gamma_{i+1})}^{-1}(\check{\ell}')} z(\check{\ell}_{\Gamma_{i+1}}) = \sum_{\check{\ell}_{\Gamma_i} \in \check{\pi}_{(\Gamma', \Gamma_i)}^{-1}(\check{\ell}')} \sum_{\check{\ell} \in \check{\pi}_{(\Gamma_i, \Gamma_{i+1})}^{-1}(\check{\ell}_{\Gamma_i})} z(\check{\ell})$$

$$\stackrel{\text{Thm. 6.3.1}}{=} \sum_{\check{\ell}_{\Gamma_i} \in \check{\pi}_{(\Gamma', \Gamma_i)}^{-1}(\check{\ell}')_e} z(\check{\ell}_{\Gamma_i}) \stackrel{(6.5.4)}{=} \sum_{\check{\ell}_{\Gamma_i} \in \check{\pi}_{(\Gamma', \Gamma_i)}^{-1}(\check{\ell}')_e} z(\check{\ell}_{\Gamma_i}).$$

Hence, an induction argument finishes the proof.  $\square$

**Remark 6.5.6.** Let  $\Gamma$  be an elliptic graph and consider its NN-elliptic sequence  $\{B_j, C_j\}_{j=-1}^m$ . In particular, we look at the extension  $B_{j+1} \subset \Gamma$ . Since  $B_{j+1}$  is numerically Gorenstein, every  $v \in \partial_\Gamma(B_{j+1})$  is an end-vertex of  $B_{j+1}$ . Moreover, the only exponent in  $\text{Supp}_{-1}(P_0^{B_{j+1}})$  is  $Z_K^{B_{j+1}} - E^{B_{j+1}}$  with coefficient 1. This extends to  $\Gamma$  via the exponents from  $\text{Supp}_j(P_0^\Gamma)$ . Hence, Theorem 6.5.2 gives  $\sum_{\ell \in \text{Supp}_j(P_0^\Gamma)} w(\ell) = 1$ . Note that this way we get back the statement of Lemma 4.2.1(b), and one can think of Theorem 6.5.2 as a refinement of it.

**Definition 6.5.7.** We say that  $\Gamma' \subset \Gamma$  is a *good extension* if every  $\ell' \in \text{Supp}(P_0^{\Gamma'})$  can be extended to an exponent of  $\Gamma$ .

**Example 6.5.8.** Let  $\Gamma$  be an elliptic graph and  $\{B_j; C_j\}_{j=-1}^m$  its NN-elliptic sequence. Then the extension  $B_m \subset \Gamma$  is always good. Indeed, the only exponent of the minimal elliptic graph  $B_m$  is  $Z_K^{B_m} - E^{B_m} = C - E^{B_m}$  which can be realized as the projection of any of the exponents from  $\text{Supp}_{m-1}(P_0^\Gamma)$ .

## 7. GOOD EXTENSIONS AND A RECURSIVITY FOR CANONICAL POLYNOMIALS

In this section we will characterize the good extensions with a certain recursivity for the canonical polynomials.

7.1. Let  $\Gamma$  be an elliptic graph,  $\{B_j; C_j\}_{j=-1}^m$  its associated NN-elliptic sequence and let  $P_0^\Gamma(\mathbf{t}) = \sum_{\ell} w(\ell) \mathbf{t}^\ell$  be its canonical polynomial. Then for any  $i \in \{0, \dots, m\}$  we define the following truncated polynomials:

$$(7.1.1) \quad \mathcal{F}_i P_0^\Gamma(\mathbf{t}) := \sum_{\substack{\ell \in \text{Supp}(P_0^\Gamma) \\ \ell_{\Gamma \setminus B_i} < 0}} w(\ell) \mathbf{t}^\ell.$$

(One can also set  $\mathcal{F}_{-1} P_0^\Gamma(\mathbf{t}) := P_0^\Gamma(\mathbf{t})$  for convenience.)

By Corollary 4.1.6, this means that for a fixed  $i \geq 0$ ,  $\mathcal{F}_i P_0^\Gamma$  consists of the monomials with exponents  $\ell \in \text{Supp}_j(P_0^\Gamma)$  where  $i - 1 \leq j \leq m - 1$ . In particular, this implies that

$$(7.1.2) \quad \mathcal{F}_0 P_0^\Gamma(\mathbf{t}) = P_0^\Gamma.$$

Now, we consider an elliptic extension  $\Gamma' \subset \Gamma$  which satisfies condition (6.5.1), ie.  $\Gamma \setminus \Gamma'$  is attached to  $\Gamma'$  through end-vertices of  $\Gamma'$ . Then we prove the following result.

**Theorem 7.1.3.** *The extension  $\Gamma' \subset \Gamma$  is good if and only if the corresponding canonical polynomials satisfy the following identity:*

$$\mathcal{F}_{i_{(\Gamma', \Gamma)}} P_0^\Gamma(\mathbf{t}_{\Gamma'}) = P_0^{\Gamma'}(\mathbf{t}),$$

where  $i_{(\Gamma', \Gamma)}$  denotes the index of the extension as in section 5.1.

*Proof.* First of all, note that the identity implies that any exponent of  $P_0^{\Gamma'}$  is realized in  $P_0^\Gamma(\mathbf{t}_{\Gamma'})$  as the projection of at least one exponent of  $\Gamma$ , hence the extension is good.

Conversely, assume  $\Gamma' \subset \Gamma$  is a good extension. Then by Theorem 5.2.8 the map

$$\pi_{(\Gamma', \Gamma)}|_{\text{Supp}_j(P_0^\Gamma)} : \text{Supp}_j(P_0^\Gamma) \rightarrow \text{Supp}_{j-i_{(\Gamma', \Gamma)}}(P_0^{\Gamma'})$$

is well defined and surjective for any  $j \geq i_{(\Gamma', \Gamma)} - 1$ . Hence, the extensions of the exponents of  $P_0^{\Gamma'}$  to  $\Gamma$  are the exponents in the set  $\cup_{j \geq i_{(\Gamma', \Gamma)} - 1} \text{Supp}_j(P_0^\Gamma)$ . Thus, in order to compare the two canonical polynomials, one has to consider only those monomials in  $P_0^\Gamma$  which are exactly in the truncated part  $\mathcal{F}_{i_{(\Gamma', \Gamma)}} P_0^\Gamma$ .

On the other hand, for any  $\ell' \in \text{Supp}(P_0^{\Gamma'})$  we have proved in Theorem 6.5.2 that

$$\sum_{\ell \in \pi_{(\Gamma', \Gamma)}^{-1}(\ell')} w(\ell) = w(\ell').$$

This implies that the sum of monomials  $\sum_{\ell \in \pi_{(\Gamma', \Gamma)}^{-1}(\ell')} w(\ell) \mathbf{t}_\Gamma^\ell$  in  $\mathcal{F}_{i_{(\Gamma', \Gamma)}} P_0^\Gamma$  reduced to the variables of the vertices of  $\Gamma'$  gives exactly the monomial  $w(\ell') \mathbf{t}_{\Gamma'}^{\ell'}$  in  $P_0^{\Gamma'}$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 7.1.4.** *Let  $\{B_j; C_j\}_{j=-1}^m$  be the NN-elliptic sequence of some  $\Gamma$ . If  $B_j \subset \Gamma$  is a good extension, then*

$$\mathcal{F}_j P_0^\Gamma(\mathbf{t}_{B_j}) = P_0^{B_j}(\mathbf{t}).$$

**Remark 7.1.5.** (1) In particular, if  $B_0 \subset \Gamma$  is good, then Corollary 7.1.4 and (7.1.2) imply that the canonical polynomial of  $\Gamma$  reduced to the vertices of  $B_0$  is the same as the canonical polynomial of  $B_0$ , ie.  $P_0^\Gamma(\mathbf{t}_{B_0}) = P_0^{B_0}(\mathbf{t})$ .

(2) Note that for  $j = m$  one deduces the equality  $\mathcal{F}_m P_0^\Gamma(\mathbf{t}_{B_m}) = P_0^{B_m}(\mathbf{t}) = \mathbf{t}^{C-E}$ , where  $B_m = |C|$  is the support of the minimal elliptic cycle  $C$ . (See also Theorem 4.2.6.)

**7.2. An example.** Let  $\Gamma$  be the subgraph of the elliptic graph considered in Figure 2, generated by the vertices  $\{E_i\}_{i=1}^{12}$  and the corresponding edges. Then  $\Gamma$  is non-numerically Gorenstein and its NN-elliptic sequence consists of the following subgraphs:

$$B_{-1}^\Gamma = \Gamma \supset B_0^\Gamma = \langle E_i \rangle_{i=1}^{10} \supset B_1^\Gamma = \langle E_i \rangle_{i=1}^6,$$

where  $\langle \cdot \rangle$  denotes the subgraph generated by the corresponding vertices.

These informations can also be extracted from the canonical polynomial of  $\Gamma$  which is as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} P_0^\Gamma(\mathbf{t}) = & \mathbf{t}^{(1,3,1,3,1,1,1,0,0,0,-1,-3)} - 2\mathbf{t}^{(0,1,0,1,0,0,-1,-1,-2,-1,-1,-2)} + \mathbf{t}^{(0,1,0,1,0,0,-1,-1,-2,-2,-3,-7)} \\ & - 2\mathbf{t}^{(0,1,0,1,0,0,-1,-1,-1,-2,-3,-7)} + \mathbf{t}^{(0,1,0,1,0,0,-1,-1,-1,-3,-5,-12)} \\ & + \mathbf{t}^{(0,1,0,1,0,0,-1,-2,-2,-1,-1,-2)} + \mathbf{t}^{(0,1,0,1,0,0,-1,-1,-1,-1,-1,-2)} \\ & + \mathbf{t}^{(0,1,0,1,0,0,-1,-2,-1,-2,-3,-7)} + \mathbf{t}^{(0,1,0,1,0,0,-1,-1,-3,-1,-1,-2)} \\ & + \mathbf{t}^{(0,1,0,1,0,0,-1,-3,-1,-1,-1,-2)} - 2\mathbf{t}^{(0,1,0,1,0,0,-1,-2,-1,-1,-1,-2)}. \end{aligned}$$

In the case of the extension  $B_0^\Gamma \subset \Gamma$  we have  $i_{(B_0^\Gamma, \Gamma)} = 0$ . Moreover, since  $B_0^\Gamma$  is the graph for which we have calculated the canonical polynomial in Example 4.2.7, one can see that  $P_0^\Gamma(\mathbf{t}_{B_0^\Gamma}) = P_0^{B_0^\Gamma}(\mathbf{t})$ , which says that the extension  $B_0^\Gamma \subset \Gamma$  is good.

## REFERENCES

- [A62] Artin, M.: Some numerical criteria for contractibility of curves on algebraic surfaces. *Amer. J. of Math.*, **84**, 485-496, 1962.
- [A66] Artin, M.: On isolated rational singularities of surfaces. *Amer. J. of Math.*, **88**, 129-136, 1966.
- [BN10] Braun, G. and Némethi, A.: Surgery formula for Seiberg–Witten invariants of negative definite plumbed 3-manifolds, *J. für die reine und ang. Math.* **638** (2010), 189–208.
- [BR15] Beck, M. and Robins, S.: Computing the continuous discretely (second edition), *Undergraduate Texts in Mathematics*, Springer, New York (2015).
- [CDG03] Campillo, A., Delgado, F. and Gusein-Zade, S.M.: The Alexander polynomial of a plane curve singularity via the ring of functions on it, *Duke Math J.* **117** (2003), no. 1, 125–156.
- [CDGZ04] Campillo, A., Delgado, F. and Gusein-Zade, S. M.: Poincaré series of a rational surface singularity, *Invent. Math.* **155** (2004), no. 1, 41–53.
- [CDGZ08] Campillo, A., Delgado, F. and Gusein-Zade, S. M.: Universal abelian covers of rational surface singularities and multi-index filtrations, *Funk. Anal. i Prilozhen.* **42** (2008), no. 2, 3–10.
- [CDGZ13] Campillo, A., Delgado, F. and Gusein-Zade, S. M.: Equivariant Poincaré series of filtrations, *Rev. Mat. Complut.* **26** (2013), no. 1, 241–251.

- [CHR03] Cutkosky, S. D., Herzog, J. and Reguera, A.: Poincaré series of resolutions of surface singularities, *Trans. of the AMS* **356** (2003), no. 5, 1833–1874.
- [CMLN21a] Cogolludo-Agustín, J.I., László, T., Martín-Morales, J. and Némethi, A.: Delta invariant of curves on rational surfaces I. An analytic approach, *Commun. Contemp. Math.* (2021), <https://doi.org/10.1142/S0219199721500528>.
- [CMLN20] Cogolludo-Agustín, J.I., László, T., Martín-Morales, J. and Némethi, A.: The delta invariant of curves on rational surfaces II. Poincaré series and topological aspects, arXiv:2003.07110 [math.GT] (2020).
- [CMLN21b] Cogolludo-Agustín, J.I., László, T., Martín-Morales, J. and Némethi, A.: Local invariants of minimal generic curves on rational surfaces, arXiv:2005.10155 [math.AG], to appear in Contemporary Math. (2021).
- [D78] Durfee, A.H.: The signature of smoothings of complex surface singularities, *Math. Ann.* **232** (1978), no. 1, 85–98.
- [EN85] Eisenbud, D. and Neumann, W.: Three-dimensional link theory and invariants of plane curve singularities, *Princeton Univ. Press* (1985).
- [La72] Laufer, H.B.: On rational singularities, *Amer. J. of Math.*, **94**, 597–608, 1972.
- [La77] Laufer, H.B.: On minimally elliptic singularities, *Amer. J. of Math.*, **99**, 1257–1295, 1977.
- [LN14] László, T. and Némethi, A.: Ehrhart theory of polytopes and Seiberg–Witten invariants of plumbed 3-manifolds, *Geometry and Topology* **18** (2014), no. 2, 717–778.
- [LN15] László, T. and Némethi, A.: Reduction theorem for lattice cohomology, *Int. Math. Res. Notices* **11** (2015), 2938–2985.
- [LNN17] László, T., Nagy, J. and Némethi, A.: Surgery formulae for the Seiberg–Witten invariant of plumbed 3-manifold, *Rev Mat Complut* (2020) **33**:197–230.
- [LNN19] László, T., Nagy, J. and Némethi, A.: Combinatorial duality for Poincaré series, polytopes and invariants of plumbed 3-manifolds, *Selecta Math* (2019) 25:21, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00029-019-0468-9>.
- [LSz16] László, T. and Szilágyi, Zs.: On Poincaré series associated with links of normal surface singularities, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **372** (2019), no. 9, 6403–6436. MR 4024526.
- [LSz17] László, T. and Szilágyi, Zs.: Némethi’s division algorithm for zeta-functions of plumbed 3-manifolds, *arXiv:1708.01093 [math.GT]* (2017).
- [Lim00] Lim, Y.: Seiberg–Witten invariants for 3-manifolds in the case  $b_1 = 0$  or 1, *Pacific J. of Math.* **195** (2000), no. 1, 179–204.
- [Maple] Maplesoft, a division of Waterloo Maple Inc.: Maple, <https://hadoop.apache.org> ver. 2019, Waterloo, Ontario, 2019.
- [NN18] Nagy, J., Némethi, A.: The Abel map for surface singularities III. Elliptic germs, *arXiv:1902.07493 [math.AG]*.
- [NN19] Nagy, J., Némethi, A.: On the topology of elliptic singularities, *arXiv:1901.06224 [math.AG]*.
- [N99a] Némethi, A.: “Weakly” Elliptic Gorenstein singularities of surfaces, *Inventiones math.*, **137**, 145–167 (1999).
- [N99b] Némethi, A.: Five lectures on normal surface singularities, lectures at the Summer School in *Low dimensional topology* Budapest, Hungary, 1998; Bolyai Society Math. Studies **8** (1999), 269–351.
- [N05] Némethi, A.: On the Ozsváth–Szabó invariant of negative definite plumbed 3-manifolds, *Geometry and Topology* **9** (2005), 991–1042.
- [N07] Némethi, A.: Graded roots and singularities, *Singularities in geometry and topology*, World Sci. Publ., Hackensack, NJ (2007), 394–463.
- [N08] Némethi, A.: Poincaré series associated with surface singularities, in *Singularities I*, 271–297, *Contemp. Math.* **474**, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence RI, 2008.
- [N08b] Némethi, A.: Lattice cohomology of normal surface singularities, *Publ. of RIMS, Kyoto University* **44** (2) (2008), 507–543.
- [N11] Némethi, A.: The Seiberg–Witten invariants of negative definite plumbed 3-manifolds, *J. Eur. Math. Soc.* **13** (2011), 959–974.

- [N12] Némethi, A.: The cohomology of line bundles of splice-quotient singularities, *Advances in Math.* **229** 4 (2012), 2503–2524.
- [NN02] Némethi, A. and Nicolaescu, L.I.: Seiberg–Witten invariants and surface singularities, *Geometry and Topology* **6** (2002), 269–328.
- [NO09] Némethi, A. and Okuma, T.: On the Casson invariant conjecture of Neumann–Wahl, *Journal of Algebraic Geometry* **18** (2009), 135–149.
- [Nic04] Nicolaescu, L.: Seiberg–Witten invariants of rational homology 3–spheres, *Comm. in Cont. Math.* **6** no. 6 (2004), 833–866.
- [O05] Okuma, T.: Numerical Gorenstein elliptic singularities, *Mathematische Zeitschrift* 249 (2005), Issue 1, 31–62.
- [O08] Okuma, T.: The geometric genus of splice-quotient singularities, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **360** 12 (2008), 6643–6659.
- [Wa70] Wagreich, Ph.: Elliptic singularities of surfaces, *Amer. J. of Math.*, **92** (1970), 419–454.
- [Y79] Yau, S. S.-T.: On strongly elliptic singularities, *Amer. J. of Math.*, **101** (1979), 855–884.
- [Y80] Yau, S. S.-T.: On maximally elliptic singularities, *Transactions of the AMS*, **257** Number 2 (1980), 269–329.

BABEȘ-BOLYAI UNIVERSITY, FACULTY OF MATHEMATICS AND COMPUTER SCIENCE,  
STR. MIHAIL KOGĂLNICEANU NR. 1, 400084 CLUJ-NAPOCA, ROMANIA  
Email address: laszlo.tamas@math.ubbcluj.ro