

# PETERSON-LAM-SHIMOZONO'S THEOREM IS AN AFFINE ANALOGUE OF QUANTUM CHEVALLEY FORMULA

CHI HONG CHOW

**ABSTRACT.** We give a new proof of an unpublished theorem of Peterson, proved previously by Lam-Shimozono, which identifies explicitly the structure constants for the multiplications of Schubert classes in the  $T$ -equivariant quantum cohomology  $QH_T(G/P)$  of any flag variety  $G/P$  with the  $T$ -equivariant Pontryagin homology  $H^T(Gr_G)$  of the affine Grassmannian  $Gr_G$ , where  $G$  is any simple complex Lie group. Our approach is to construct an  $H_T(pt)$ -algebra homomorphism by Gromov-Witten theory and show that it is equal to Peterson's map. More precisely, the map is defined via Savelyev's generalized Seidel representations which can be interpreted as certain Gromov-Witten invariants with input  $H^T(Gr_G) \otimes QH_T(G/P)$ . We determine these invariants completely, in a way similar to how Fulton-Woodward did in their proof of quantum Chevalley formula.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Let  $G$  be a simple and simply connected complex Lie group. The quantum Schubert calculus (resp. affine Schubert calculus) studies the algebra structure on the  $T$ -equivariant quantum cohomology  $QH_T(G/B)$  of the flag variety  $G/B$  (resp. the  $T$ -equivariant Pontryagin homology  $H^T(Gr_G)$  of the affine Grassmannian  $Gr_G$ ) in terms of the quantum Schubert classes  $\{q^\mu \sigma_v\}_{(\mu,v) \in Q^\vee \times W}$  (resp. the affine Schubert classes  $\{\xi_{wt_\lambda}\}_{wt_\lambda \in W_{af}^-}$ ). An unpublished theorem of Peterson [12], proved by Lam-Shimozono [8], states that these two calculi are equivalent:

**Theorem 1.1.** *The map*

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi &: H^T(Gr_G) &\rightarrow & QH_T(G/B) \\ &\xi_{wt_\lambda} &\mapsto & q^\lambda \sigma_w \end{aligned}$$

*is an  $H_T(pt)$ -algebra homomorphism.*

The proof given by Lam-Shimozono is algebraic and combinatorial. In this paper, we present a geometric proof by taking  $\Phi$  to be the algebro-geometric version of the map constructed by Savelyev [14] who generalized Seidel representations [17] from 0-cycles in  $Gr_G$  to higher dimensional ones, and showing this map to have the desired form.

In the same paper, Lam-Shimozono proved the parabolic version of Theorem 1.1 (call it Theorem P). We will prove Theorem P as well. Since even stating it requires a lot of Lie-theoretic notations, we postpone the statement to Section 4.4 where we prove the Borel and parabolic cases simultaneously.

**Remark 1.2.** Our computation of Savelyev's map  $\Phi_0$  makes use of a specific geometric model of  $Gr_G$  due to Pressley-Segal [13] (see Section 2.3). This model has already been used by Savelyev in his partial computation [15, 16]. In [15], he proved that for any  $wt_\lambda \in W_{af}^-$  where  $w$  is the *longest element*,  $\Phi_0(\xi_{wt_\lambda})$  is equal to  $q^\lambda \sigma_w$  plus some higher terms with respect to an *action functional* on the space of sections of Hamiltonian fibrations.

**Remark 1.3.** The proof of Lam-Shimozono relies on Mihalcea's equivariant quantum Chevalley formula [11] which generalizes Fulton-Woodward's non-equivariant one [5]. Although we do not

apply this formula directly, we do apply the key idea of its proof which has already been used in the non-equivariant version: the Morse-Smale property for the (opposite) Schubert cells in  $G/P$  which implies that the moduli spaces for all two-pointed Gromov-Witten invariants are simultaneously regular and  $T$ -equivariant, making the counting of elements possible. See Section 4.2 for our parallel arguments.

**Remark 1.4.** Another unpublished theorem of Peterson asserts the existence of an explicit formula expressing the structure constants for  $QH_T(G/P)$  in terms of those for  $QH_T(G/B)$ . Woodward [18] proved the non-equivariant version and Huang-Li [7] proved that Theorem P implies the equivariant version formally. Since Lam-Shimozono's proof of Theorem P relies on the non-equivariant version, it is natural to ask whether there is a more direct proof of the equivariant one. This paper answers this question: our proof of Theorem P is completely independent of this formula so that we can apply Huang-Li's result to obtain it.

**Remark 1.5.** It is the main emphasis of Savelyev that his map is linked to the geometry of the *Hamiltonian group* of  $G/P$ . See [2] for the precise consequences of our computation.

**Remark 1.6.** The only reason for assuming  $G$  to be simply connected is to simplify the presentation and highlight our key arguments. It is straightforward to extend our arguments to the general case. Notice that one has to enlarge the ring of quantum parameters for  $QH_T(G/P)$  from  $\mathbb{Q}[Q^\vee/Q_P^\vee]$  to  $\mathbb{Q}[P^\vee/Q_P^\vee]$  where  $P^\vee$  is the coweight lattice.

#### IDEA OF PROOF

Following the book of Pressley-Segal [13], we consider the group  $\Omega K$  of based loops in a maximal compact subgroup  $K$  of  $G$ . The Gram-Schmidt orthogonalization implies that  $\Omega K \simeq \mathcal{G}/\mathcal{G}^0$  where  $\mathcal{G}$  is the group of free loops in  $G$  and  $\mathcal{G}^0$  is the subgroup of  $\mathcal{G}$  consisting of loops which are well-defined at  $z = 0$ . This justifies that  $\Omega K$  is the affine Grassmannian in the holomorphic category. It is also well-known that  $\Omega K$  is the classifying space of isomorphism classes of holomorphic principal  $G$ -bundles over  $\mathbb{P}^1 \times M$  with a trivialization over  $(\mathbb{P}^1 \setminus \{0\}) \times M$  where  $M$  is any test object in the category of complex manifolds. The universal family induces a fibration  $\pi : P(G/P) \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1 \times \Omega K$  with fibers isomorphic to  $G/P$ .

Define

$$\overline{\mathcal{M}} := \bigcup_{\phi \in \Omega K} \overline{\mathcal{M}}_\phi$$

where each  $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_\phi$  is the Deligne-Mumford stack which compactifies the moduli space of holomorphic sections in  $P(G/P)|_{\mathbb{P}^1 \times \{\phi\}}$ . Denote by  $\Pi : \overline{\mathcal{M}} \rightarrow \Omega K$  the map sending a stable map in  $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_\phi$  to  $\phi$ , and by  $\text{ev} : \overline{\mathcal{M}} \rightarrow G/P$  the evaluation map at a fixed point in  $\mathbb{P}^1 \setminus \{0\}$ . The Savelyev-Seidel morphism is defined to be

$$\Phi := \text{ev}_* \circ \Pi^*.$$

To compute  $\Phi$ , we consider any Schubert variety  $\overline{X}_{G/P}(v)$  in  $G/P$  and affine Schubert variety  $\overline{X}_{\Omega K}(wt_\lambda)$  in  $\Omega K$ . The key observation is that the intersection

$$\overline{\mathcal{M}}(wt_\lambda, v) := \Pi^{-1} \left( \overline{X}_{\Omega K}(wt_\lambda) \right) \cap \text{ev}^{-1} \left( \overline{X}_{G/P}(v) \right)$$

is reduced, locally irreducible and of expected dimension<sup>1</sup>. It follows that the  $T$ -equivariant integral of 1 over  $\overline{\mathcal{M}}(wt_\lambda, v)$  is equal to the number of elements whose expected dimension is equal to

<sup>1</sup>In our proof, we actually replace the (affine) Schubert varieties with their Bott-Samelson resolutions and show that the intersection is smooth.

0. Since these elements are necessarily  $T$ -invariant, their classification, which implies the result immediately, is possible.

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

**2.1. Some notations.** Let  $G$  be a simple and simply-connected complex Lie group and  $T \subset G$  a maximal torus. Put  $\mathfrak{g} := \text{Lie}(G)$  and  $\mathfrak{h} := \text{Lie}(T)$ . Denote by  $R$  the set of roots associated to the pair  $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h})$ . Recall we have the root space decomposition

$$\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{h} \oplus \bigoplus_{\alpha \in R} \mathfrak{g}_\alpha$$

where each  $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha$  is a one-dimensional eigenspace with respect to the adjoint action of  $\mathfrak{h}$ . Denote by  $W$  the Weyl group. Fix a fundamental system  $\{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r\}$  of  $R$ . The elements of this set are called simple roots. Define  $R^+ \subset R$  to be the set of positive roots spanned by the simple roots. We have two particular Borel subgroups  $B^-$  and  $B^+$  of  $G$  containing  $T$  with Lie algebra equal to  $\bigoplus_{\alpha \in -R^+} \mathfrak{g}_\alpha$  and  $\bigoplus_{\alpha \in R^+} \mathfrak{g}_\alpha$  respectively.

What we have just defined have affine analogues. We will define them whenever we need. At this stage, we define the affine Weyl group  $W_{af} := W \ltimes Q^\vee$  where  $Q^\vee := \text{Span}_{\mathbb{Z}}\{\alpha^\vee \mid \alpha \in R\} \subset \mathfrak{h}$  is the lattice spanned by the coroots, and the affine simple roots  $\tilde{\alpha}_0, \dots, \tilde{\alpha}_r$  which are affine linear functions on  $\mathfrak{h}$  defined by  $\tilde{\alpha}_0 := -\alpha_0 + 1$  and  $\tilde{\alpha}_i := \alpha_i$  for  $i = 1, \dots, r$ , where  $\alpha_0$  is the highest positive root (which is unique since  $G$  is simple). Recall  $W_{af}$  acts naturally on  $\mathfrak{h}$ :  $W$  acts on it by the Weyl group action and every  $\lambda \in Q^\vee$  acts by the translation  $t_\lambda : x \mapsto x + \lambda$ .

**2.2. Flag varieties.** A *flag variety* is a homogeneous space  $G/P$  where  $P$  is any parabolic subgroup containing  $B^+$ . Define  $R_P$  to be the set of roots of  $P$  and  $R_P^+ := R_P \cap R^+$ . We have

$$\text{Lie}(P) = \text{Lie}(B^+) \oplus \bigoplus_{\alpha \in -R_P^+} \mathfrak{g}_\alpha.$$

Denote by  $W_P$  the Weyl group of  $P$  and by  $W^P$  the set of minimal length coset representatives in  $W/W_P$ . For any  $v \in W^P$ , define  $y_v := vP \in G/P$ . Then  $\{y_v\}_{v \in W^P}$  is the set of  $T$ -fixed points of  $G/P$ . We have the (*opposite*) *Schubert cell*

$$X_{G/P}^\pm(v) := B^\pm \cdot y_v \subset G/P$$

and the *Schubert class*

$$\sigma_v := \text{PD} \left[ \overline{X_{G/P}^-(v)} \right] \in H_T(G/P),$$

where  $H_T(G/P)$  is the *equivariant cohomology* of  $G/P$ . It is well-known that  $\{\sigma_v\}_{v \in W^P}$  forms an  $H_T(pt)$ -basis of  $H_T(G/P)$ .

In the proof of our main theorem, we have to choose a smooth  $B^+$ -equivariant representative of  $\left[ \overline{X_{G/P}^+(v)} \right]$ . Since  $\overline{X_{G/P}^+(v)}$  is singular, we consider its *Bott-Samelson resolution* which is a map

$$f_{G/P,v} : P_{\alpha_{i_1}} \times_{B^+} \cdots \times_{B^+} P_{\alpha_{i_{\ell(v)}}} / B^+ \rightarrow G/P$$

sending  $[g_1 : \cdots : g_{\ell(v)}]$  to  $g_1 \cdots g_{\ell(v)} P$ , where each  $P_{\alpha_i} \supset B^+$  is the minimal parabolic subgroup associated to the simple root  $\alpha_i$  and  $(i_1, \dots, i_{\ell(v)})$  is a reduced word decomposition of  $v$ . Strictly speaking,  $f_{G/P,v}$  depends on the word but we will not emphasize the choice, since the pushforward of the fundamental class under  $f_{G/P,v}$  is equal to  $\left[ \overline{X_{G/P}^+(v)} \right]$  which is independent of it.

The *equivariant quantum cohomology*  $QH_T(G/P)$  is defined to be  $H_T(G/P) \otimes \mathbb{Q}[\pi_2(G/P)]$  with quantum multiplication  $\star$  given by three-pointed genus zero  $T$ -equivariant Gromov-Witten

invariants on  $G/P$ . Notice that  $\pi_2(G/P) \simeq Q^\vee/Q_P^\vee$ , where  $Q_P^\vee := \text{Span}_{\mathbb{Z}}\{\alpha^\vee \mid \alpha \in R_P\}$ . An explicit isomorphism is defined as the dual of the composition of three isomorphisms:

$$(Q^\vee/Q_P^\vee)^* \xrightarrow{\rho \mapsto \mathcal{L}_\rho} \text{Pic}(G/P) \xrightarrow{c_1} H_2(G/P) \simeq \pi_2(G/P)^*.$$

Here,  $\mathcal{L}_\rho$  is the line bundle  $G \times_P \mathbb{C}_{-\rho}$  where  $\mathbb{C}_{-\rho}$  is the one-dimensional representation of weight  $-\rho$  and  $P$  acts on  $\mathbb{C}_{-\rho}$  by forgetting the semi-simple and unipotent parts. Under this isomorphism, the cone spanned by the simple coroots in  $R^+ \setminus R_P^+$  corresponds to the Mori cone. The presence of the minus sign in  $\mathbb{C}_{-\rho}$  is due to the convention  $B^+ \subset P$  (but not  $B^- \subset P$ ).

**2.3. Affine Grassmannian.** There are many geometric models for the affine Grassmannian  $Gr_G$ . In this paper, we work with the one given in [13].

Fix a maximal compact subgroup  $K$  of  $G$ . Define  $\Omega K$  to be the space of *polynomial based loops* in  $K$  and  $\mathcal{G} := LG$  to be the space of *polynomial free loops* in  $G$ . They are infinite-dimensional Lie groups over  $\mathbb{R}$  and  $\mathbb{C}$  respectively. We will consider three subgroups of  $\mathcal{G}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}^0 &:= \left\{ \phi \in \mathcal{G} \mid \lim_{z \rightarrow 0} \phi(z) \text{ exists} \right\} \\ \mathcal{G}^\infty &:= \left\{ \phi \in \mathcal{G} \mid \lim_{z \rightarrow \infty} \phi(z) \text{ exists} \right\} \\ \mathcal{B}^{0,-} &:= \left\{ \phi \in \mathcal{G}^0 \mid \phi(0) \in B^- \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

**Remark 2.1.** Strictly speaking, we must complete every infinite dimensional manifold to one with a reasonable structure. However, this formal procedure, described in Appendix A, will not force us to modify any of the arguments for the proof of the main theorem. The reason is that the proof only relies on certain spaces which are free group quotients of infinite dimensional manifolds by finite codimensional Lie groups. It can be checked that the amounts of things added to these manifolds and Lie groups for the completion are the same so that they cancel each other in the quotient.

The following theorem justifies that  $\Omega K$  is the affine Grassmannian.

**Theorem 2.2.** [13] *There exists a  $K$ -equivariant diffeomorphism  $\Omega K \simeq \mathcal{G}/\mathcal{G}^0$ .*

Here  $K$  acts on  $\Omega K$  by conjugation and on  $\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{G}^0$  by the canonical left action where elements of  $K$  are regarded as constant loops in  $G$ . It follows that  $\Omega K$  is endowed with a holomorphic structure such that the  $K$ -action extends to a holomorphic  $\mathcal{G}$ -action.

Let  $\mu \in Q^\vee$ . The restriction of the corresponding cocharacter of  $T$  to the unit circle is an element of  $\Omega K$  which we denote by  $x_\mu$ . It is easy to see that  $\{x_\mu\}_{\mu \in Q^\vee}$  is the set of  $T$ -fixed points of  $\Omega K$ . Denote by  $W_{af}^-$  the set of minimal length coset representatives in  $W_{af}/W$ . For any  $wt_\lambda \in W_{af}^-$ , define the *affine Schubert cell*

$$X_{\Omega K}(wt_\lambda) := \mathcal{B}^{0,-} \cdot x_{w(\lambda)} \subset \Omega K$$

and the *affine Schubert class*

$$\xi_{wt_\lambda} := \left[ \overline{X_{\Omega K}(wt_\lambda)} \right] \in H^T(\Omega K),$$

where  $H^T(\Omega K)$  is the *equivariant homology* of  $\Omega K$ . As in the case of  $G/P$ , we will consider the Bott-Samelson resolution of the singular variety  $\overline{X_{\Omega K}(wt_\lambda)}$ :

$$f_{\Omega K, wt_\lambda} : \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\alpha}_{i_1}} \times_{\mathcal{B}^{0,-}} \cdots \times_{\mathcal{B}^{0,-}} \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\alpha}_{\ell(wt_\lambda)}} / \mathcal{B}^{0,-} \rightarrow \Omega K$$

where each  $\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\alpha}_i}$  is the minimal parabolic subgroup associated to the affine simple root  $\tilde{\alpha}_i$ , i.e.

$$\mathrm{Lie}(\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\alpha}_i}) := \begin{cases} \mathrm{Lie}(\mathcal{B}^{0,-}) \oplus z^{-1}\mathfrak{g}_{-\alpha_0} & i = 0 \\ \mathrm{Lie}(\mathcal{B}^{0,-}) \oplus \mathfrak{g}_{\alpha_i} & i = 1, \dots, r, \end{cases}$$

and  $(i_1, \dots, i_{\ell(wt_\lambda)})$  is a reduced word decomposition of  $wt_\lambda$ .

It is well-known that  $\{\xi_{wt_\lambda}\}_{wt_\lambda \in W_{af}^-}$  forms an  $H_T(pt)$ -basis of  $H^T(\Omega K)$ . There is also another useful basis  $\{\eta_\mu\}_{\mu \in Q^\vee}$ , the *localization basis*, defined by

$$\eta_\mu := (x_\mu)_*[pt] \in H^T(\Omega K)$$

where  $x_\mu : pt \rightarrow \Omega K$  is the  $T$ -equivariant map sending  $pt$  to the  $T$ -fixed point  $x_\mu$ . However, it is only a basis over  $\mathrm{Frac}(H_T(pt))$ , the field of fractions of  $H_T(pt)$ .

Finally, observe that  $\Omega K$  is a real Lie group and equivariant homology is defined in the topological category. It follows that the group product on  $\Omega K$  induces an  $H_T(pt)$ -algebra structure  $\bullet$ , called the *Pontryagin product*, on  $H^T(\Omega K)$ . This structure is particularly simple when it is expressed in terms of the localization basis:

$$\eta_{\mu_1} \bullet \eta_{\mu_2} = \eta_{\mu_1 + \mu_2}, \quad \mu_1, \mu_2 \in Q^\vee.$$

### 3. A HIGHER DIMENSIONAL GENERALIZATION OF SEIDEL REPRESENTATIONS

3.1. **A  $G/P$ -fibration over  $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \Omega K$ .** Define  $\widetilde{P(G/P)}$  to be the pushout of the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbb{C} \times \mathcal{G} \times G/P & & \mathbb{C} \times \mathcal{G} \times G/P \\ & \swarrow \text{inclusion} & \nearrow (z, \phi, y) \mapsto (z^{-1}, \phi, \phi(z) \cdot y) \\ & \mathbb{C}^\times \times \mathcal{G} \times G/P & \end{array}$$

We call the left (resp. right) copy of  $\mathbb{C} \times \mathcal{G} \times G/P$  the *0-chart* (resp.  *$\infty$ -chart*). There is a map

$$\tilde{\pi} : \widetilde{P(G/P)} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathcal{G}$$

defined by forgetting the  $G/P$ -factor in each of the charts. Notice that  $\tilde{\pi}$  is a  $G/P$ -fibration. By an abuse of notation, we also call the corresponding charts of  $\mathbb{P}^1$  the *0-chart* and  *$\infty$ -chart* respectively.

There are commuting left  $\mathcal{G}^\infty$ - and right  $\mathcal{G}^0$ -actions on  $\widetilde{P(G/P)}$  defined by

$$\psi^\infty \cdot (z, \phi, y) \cdot \psi^0 := \begin{cases} (z, \psi^\infty \phi \psi^0, \psi^0(z)^{-1} \cdot y) & \text{in 0-chart} \\ (z, \psi^\infty \phi \psi^0, \psi^\infty(z^{-1}) \cdot y) & \text{in } \infty\text{-chart} \end{cases}$$

for any  $\psi^0 \in \mathcal{G}^0$  and  $\psi^\infty \in \mathcal{G}^\infty$ . It is clear that each of these actions is free and  $\tilde{\pi}$  is equivariant where the action on  $\mathbb{P}^1$  is assumed to be trivial.

#### Definition 3.1.

(1) Define

$$P(G/P) := \widetilde{P(G/P)} / \mathcal{G}^0$$

and

$$\pi : P(G/P) \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1 \times (\mathcal{G} / \mathcal{G}^0)$$

to be the map induced by  $\tilde{\pi}$ .

(2) For any map  $f : \Gamma \rightarrow \mathcal{G}/\mathcal{G}^0$ , define

$$P_f(G/P) := (\mathbb{P}^1 \times \Gamma) \times_{(\text{id} \times f, \pi)} P(G/P)$$

and

$$\pi_f : P_f(G/P) \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1 \times \Gamma$$

to be the map induced by  $\pi$ .

The following facts are clear:

- (1) The left  $\mathcal{G}^\infty$ -action on  $\widetilde{P(G/P)}$  induces a left  $\mathcal{G}^\infty$ -action on  $P(G/P)$ .
- (2)  $\pi$  is a  $\mathcal{G}^\infty$ -equivariant  $G/P$ -fibration.
- (3) The  $\infty$ -chart of  $P(G/P)$  induces an open embedding  $\mathbb{C} \times (\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{G}^0) \times G/P \hookrightarrow P(G/P)$ . We call it the  $\infty$ -chart of  $P(G/P)$ . We also define the  $\infty$ -chart of  $P_f(G/P)$  similarly.
- (4) If there exists a subgroup  $H$  of  $\mathcal{G}^\infty$  such that  $H$  acts on  $\Gamma$  and  $f$  is  $H$ -equivariant, then  $H$  acts on  $P_f(G/P)$  naturally and  $\pi_f$  is  $H$ -equivariant.

**Lemma 3.2.** *Suppose  $\Gamma$  is a finite-dimensional smooth projective variety and  $f : \Gamma \rightarrow \mathcal{G}/\mathcal{G}^0$  is a holomorphic map. Then  $P_f(G/P)$  is a smooth projective variety.*

*Proof.* It is clear that  $P_f(G/P)$  is a smooth compact complex manifold. To show it is projective, take a  $G$ -equivariant ample line bundle  $\mathcal{L}_{G/P}$  on  $G/P$  and an ample line bundle  $\mathcal{L}_\Gamma$  on  $\Gamma$ . Then  $\mathcal{L}_{G/P}$  induces a line bundle  $\mathcal{L}$  on  $P_f(G/P)$  which restricts to  $\mathcal{L}_{G/P}$  in every fiber of  $\pi_f$ . One checks easily that the line bundle  $\mathcal{L} \otimes \pi_f^*(\mathcal{L}_\Gamma \boxtimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(1))^{\otimes N}$  is ample for sufficiently large  $N$ .  $\square$

**Remark 3.3.** If  $f : pt \rightarrow \Omega K \simeq \mathcal{G}/\mathcal{G}^0$  is a map such that  $f(pt) = x_\mu$  is a  $T$ -fixed point, then the fibration  $P_f(G/P)$  can also be defined as the pushout of the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbb{C} \times G/P & & \mathbb{C} \times G/P \\ & \swarrow \text{inclusion} & \nearrow (z, y) \mapsto (z^{-1}, x_\mu(z) \cdot y) \\ & \mathbb{C}^\times \times G/P & \end{array}$$

Indeed, the map from  $\widetilde{P(G/P)}|_{\mathbb{P}^1 \times (x_\mu \mathcal{G}^0)}$  to this space defined by

$$\begin{cases} (z, x_\mu \phi, y) \mapsto (z, \phi(z) \cdot y) & \text{in 0-chart} \\ (z, x_\mu \phi, y) \mapsto (z, y) & \text{in } \infty\text{-chart} \end{cases}$$

descends to the desired  $T$ -equivariant isomorphism.

The rest of this subsection is a preparation for the next where we discuss Gromov-Witten invariants on  $P_f(G/P)$ . For any  $\phi \in \Omega K \simeq \mathcal{G}/\mathcal{G}^0$ , denote by  $P_\phi(G/P)$  the restriction of  $P(G/P)$  to  $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \{\phi\}$ . Observe that  $P_\phi(G/P)$  is a topologically trivial  $G/P$ -fibration over  $\mathbb{P}^1$ . Indeed, since  $G$  is assumed to be simply connected,  $\Omega K$  is connected so that  $\phi$  and the identity loop can be connected by a continuous path in  $\Omega K$ . Any such path gives rise to a trivialization of  $P_\phi(G/P)$ , and hence an isomorphism  $\pi_2(G/P) \xrightarrow{\sim} \pi_2^{\text{section}}(P_\phi(G/P))$  where  $\pi_2^{\text{section}}(P_\phi(G/P))$  is the set of classes in  $\pi_2(P_\phi(G/P))$  which are represented by sections of  $P_\phi(G/P)$ . Moreover, since  $\pi_2(G) = 0$ , any two paths give rise to homotopic trivializations, and hence the same isomorphism.

Let  $f : \Gamma \rightarrow \Omega K$  be a map. Fix  $\gamma \in \Gamma$ . Consider the composition

$$\pi_2(G/P) \xrightarrow{\sim} \pi_2^{\text{section}}(P_{f(\gamma)}(G/P)) \rightarrow \pi_2(P_f(G/P)) \quad (3.1)$$

where the first map is the isomorphism in the last paragraph and the second is induced by the inclusion. Later on, we will simply denote by  $\tilde{\beta}$  the image of any  $\beta \in \pi_2(G/P)$  under the map (3.1). We believe this will not cause any confusion.

**Lemma 3.4.** *The map (3.1) is injective.*

*Proof.* Since any two classes in  $\pi_2^{\text{section}}(P_{f(\gamma)}(G/P))$  differ by a fiber class, it suffices to show that every non-zero fiber class does not vanish when it is placed in  $\pi_2(P_f(G/P))$ . This follows from the line bundle construction given in the proof of Lemma 3.2 and the facts that  $\pi_2(G/P)$  is torsion-free and every line bundle on  $G/P$  can be  $G$ -linearized.  $\square$

**3.2. Parametrized Gromov-Witten invariants.** Let  $f : \Gamma \rightarrow \Omega K$  be a  $T$ -equivariant holomorphic map where  $\Gamma$  is a smooth projective variety with a  $T$ -action. Recall  $P_f(G/P)$  admits a natural  $T$ -action. Let  $k \geq 1$  be an integer. Fix  $k$  (not necessarily distinct) points  $z_1, \dots, z_k$  in the  $\infty$ -chart of  $\mathbb{P}^1$ . Define  $D_i := \pi_f^{-1}(\{z_i\} \times \Gamma)$  where  $\pi_f : P_f(G/P) \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1 \times \Gamma$  is defined in Definition 3.1. Then  $D_i$  is a smooth  $T$ -invariant divisor of  $P_f(G/P)$  and canonically isomorphic to  $\Gamma \times G/P$  via the  $\infty$ -chart of  $P_f(G/P)$ . Denote by  $\text{pr}_i : D_i \rightarrow G/P$  the projection map which is  $T$ -equivariant. Recall the isomorphism (3.1) which we have denoted by  $\beta \mapsto \tilde{\beta}$ .

We now give the algebro-geometric analogue of the invariants defined in [14].

**Definition 3.5.** Let  $\beta \in \pi_2(G/P)$ . Given a  $k$ -tuple  $\vec{\alpha} = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k)$  of classes in  $H_T(G/P)$ . Define

$$\text{PGW}(\vec{\alpha})_{f,\beta} := \int_{[\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,k}(P_f(G/P), \tilde{\beta})]^{vir}} \prod_{i=1}^k \text{ev}_i^*(\iota_{D_i})_* (\text{pr}_i)^* \alpha_i \in H_T(pt)$$

where

- (i)  $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,k}(P_f(G/P), \tilde{\beta})$  is the Deligne-Mumford moduli stack of genus zero stable maps and  $[\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,k}(P_f(G/P), \tilde{\beta})]^{vir}$  is the  $T$ -equivariant virtual fundamental class;
- (ii)  $\text{ev}_i : \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,k}(P_f(G/P), \tilde{\beta}) \rightarrow P_f(G/P)$  is the evaluation map at the  $i$ -th marked point of the domain curve; and
- (iii)  $\iota_{D_i} : D_i \hookrightarrow P_f(G/P)$  is the inclusion map.

**Remark 3.6.** Suppose  $f = x_\mu$  is a  $T$ -fixed point. Recall there is another construction of  $P_f(G/P)$  given in Remark 3.3. This allows us to remove the condition that  $z_1, \dots, z_k$  lie in the  $\infty$ -chart of  $\mathbb{P}^1$ . Indeed, each of the charts of  $\mathbb{P}^1$  gives rise to an identification of the fiber of  $P_f(G/P)$  over any point of this chart with  $G/P$ , and over the intersection of these charts, these identifications differ by a factor belonging to  $T$ . Notice that the ambiguity due to this factor vanishes in  $H_T(G/P)$ .

**Lemma 3.7.** *If  $f : pt \rightarrow \Omega K$  is the identity loop so that  $P_f(G/P) \simeq \mathbb{P}^1 \times G/P$ , then*

$$\text{PGW}(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3)_{f,\beta} = \text{GW}(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3)_\beta$$

for any  $\beta \in \pi_2(G/P)$  and classes  $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3 \in H_T(G/P)$ , where  $\text{GW}(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3)_\beta$  is the ordinary genus zero  $T$ -equivariant Gromov-Witten invariant on  $G/P$ .

*Proof.* Fix three distinct points  $z_1, z_2, z_3$  of  $\mathbb{P}^1$  and define  $D_i := \{z_i\} \times G/P \subset \mathbb{P}^1 \times G/P$ . The projection map  $\mathbb{P}^1 \times G/P \rightarrow G/P$  induces a  $T$ -equivariant isomorphism  $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,3}(\mathbb{P}^1 \times G/P, ([\mathbb{P}^1], \beta)) \times_{\text{ev}} (\prod_{i=1}^3 D_i) \xrightarrow{\sim} \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,3}(G/P, \beta)$  of smooth stacks. The rest of the proof is clear.  $\square$

**3.3. Construction of the  $H_T(pt)$ -algebra homomorphism.** Put  $R := H_T(pt)$ . Recall there are two  $\text{Frac}(R)$ -bases of  $H^T(\Omega K) \otimes_R \text{Frac}(R)$ , the affine Schubert basis  $\{\xi_{wt_\lambda}\}_{wt_\lambda \in W_{af}^-}$  and the localization basis  $\{\eta_\mu\}_{\mu \in Q^\vee}$ . They are represented by the Bott-Samelson cycles  $f_{\Omega K, wt_\lambda}$  and the  $T$ -fixed points  $x_\mu$  respectively. Notice that the first basis is also an  $R$ -basis of  $H^T(\Omega K)$ . Fix an  $R$ -basis  $\{e_i\}_{i \in I}$  of  $H_T(G/P)$  and denote by  $\{g^{ij}\}_{i,j \in I}$  the inverse of the matrix  $\{\int_{G/P} e_i \cup e_j\}_{i,j \in I}$ . Of course, we can take  $\{e_i\}_{i \in I}$  to be the Schubert basis  $\{\sigma_v\}_{v \in W^P}$  but it is not necessary at this stage.

**Definition 3.8.**

(1) Define an  $R$ -linear map

$$\Phi : H^T(\Omega K) \rightarrow QH_T(G/P)$$

by

$$\Phi(\xi_{wt_\lambda}) := \sum_{i,j \in I} \sum_{\beta \in \pi_2(G/P)} q^\beta g^{ij} \text{PGW}(e_i)_{f_{\Omega K, wt_\lambda}, \beta} e_j$$

for any  $wt_\lambda \in W_{af}^-$ .

(2) Define a  $\text{Frac}(R)$ -linear map

$$\Phi' : H^T(\Omega K) \otimes_R \text{Frac}(R) \rightarrow QH_T(G/P) \otimes_R \text{Frac}(R)$$

by

$$\Phi'(\eta_\mu) := \sum_{i,j \in I} \sum_{\beta \in \pi_2(G/P)} q^\beta g^{ij} \text{PGW}(e_i)_{x_\mu, \beta} e_j$$

for any  $\mu \in Q^\vee$ .

The map  $\Phi$  is called the *Savelyev-Seidel homomorphism*.

**Lemma 3.9.**  $\Phi = \Phi'|_{H^T(\Omega K)}$ .

**Lemma 3.10.**  $\Phi'$  is an  $H_T(pt)$ -algebra homomorphism.

*Proof of Lemma 3.9.* Let  $wt_\lambda \in W_{af}^-$ . For simplicity, put  $f := f_{\Omega K, wt_\lambda}$  and denote by  $\Gamma$  the domain of  $f$ . For any  $\gamma \in \Gamma^T$ , write  $f(\gamma) = x_{\mu_\gamma}$  where  $\mu_\gamma \in Q^\vee$ . By classical localization formula,

$$\xi_{wt_\lambda} = \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma^T} \frac{1}{e(T_\gamma \Gamma)} \eta_{\mu_\gamma}.$$

Fix a point  $z$  in the  $\infty$ -chart of  $\mathbb{P}^1$  and define  $D := \pi_f^{-1}(\{z\} \times \mathbb{P}^1)$  and denote by  $\text{pr} : D \rightarrow G/P$  the canonical projection as before. We have, for any  $\alpha \in H_T(G/P)$ ,

$$\int_{G/P} \Phi(\xi_{wt_\lambda}) \cup \alpha = \sum_{\beta \in \pi_2(G/P)} q^\beta \int_{[\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(P_f(G/P), \tilde{\beta})]^{vir}} \text{ev}^*(\iota_D)_* \text{pr}^* \alpha. \quad (3.2)$$

For simplicity, put  $\overline{\mathcal{M}} := \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(P_f(G/P), \tilde{\beta})$  and  $\overline{\mathcal{M}}^T$  its  $T$ -fixed locus. Then

$$\overline{\mathcal{M}}^T = \bigcup_{\gamma \in \Gamma^T} \overline{\mathcal{M}}_\gamma^T$$

where  $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_\gamma^T$  is the  $T$ -fixed locus of  $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_\gamma := \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(P_{f|_{\{\gamma\}}}(G/P), \tilde{\beta})$ . Denote by  $J$  (resp.  $J_\gamma$ ) the set of components of  $\overline{\mathcal{M}}^T$  (resp.  $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_\gamma^T$ ). It is straightforward to show that for any  $\gamma \in \Gamma^T$  and  $F \in J_\gamma$ ,



$e(\mathcal{N}_{F/\mathcal{M}}^{vir}) = e(\mathcal{N}_{F/\mathcal{M}_\gamma}^{vir})e(T_\gamma\Gamma)$ . By applying the virtual localization formula [6] twice, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{[\mathcal{M}]^{vir}} \text{ev}^*(\iota_D)_*(\text{pr})^*\alpha &= \sum_{F \in J} \int_{[F]^{vir}} \frac{\iota_F^* \text{ev}^*(\iota_D)_*(\text{pr})^*\alpha}{e(\mathcal{N}_{F/\mathcal{M}}^{vir})} \\ &= \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \frac{1}{e(T_\gamma\Gamma)} \sum_{F \in J_\gamma} \int_{[F]^{vir}} \frac{\iota_F^* \text{ev}^*(\iota_D)_*(\text{pr})^*\alpha}{e(\mathcal{N}_{F/\mathcal{M}_\gamma}^{vir})} \\ &= \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \frac{1}{e(T_\gamma\Gamma)} \int_{[\mathcal{M}_\gamma]^{vir}} \text{ev}^*(\iota_{D_\gamma})_*(\text{pr})^*\alpha \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

where  $D_\gamma := D \cap P_{f|\{\gamma\}}(G/P)$ . Since  $P_{f|\{\gamma\}}(G/P) \simeq P_{x_{\mu_\gamma}}(G/P)$ , (3.2) and (3.3) give

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{G/P} \Phi(\xi_{wt_\lambda}) \cup \alpha &= \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \frac{1}{e(T_\gamma\Gamma)} \int_{G/P} \Phi'(\eta_{\mu_\gamma}) \cup \alpha \\ &= \int_{G/P} \Phi' \left( \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \frac{1}{e(T_\gamma\Gamma)} \eta_{\mu_\gamma} \right) \cup \alpha \\ &= \int_{G/P} \Phi'(\xi_{wt_\lambda}) \cup \alpha. \end{aligned}$$

The proof is complete.  $\square$

The proof of Lemma 3.10 is based on the following PGW-version of the splitting axiom.

**Lemma 3.11.** *For any  $\mu_1, \mu_2 \in Q^\vee$ ,  $\beta \in \pi_2(G/P)$  and tuples  $\vec{\alpha}^{(1)} = (\alpha_1^{(1)}, \dots, \alpha_{k_1}^{(1)})$ ,  $\vec{\alpha}^{(2)} = (\alpha_1^{(2)}, \dots, \alpha_{k_2}^{(2)})$  of elements of  $H_T(G/P)$ , we have*

$$\text{PGW}(\vec{\alpha}^{(1)}, \vec{\alpha}^{(2)})_{x_{\mu_1+\mu_2}, \beta} = \sum_{i,j \in I} \sum_{\beta = \beta_1 + \beta_2} g^{ij} \text{PGW}(\vec{\alpha}^{(1)}, e_i)_{x_{\mu_1}, \beta_1} \text{PGW}(\vec{\alpha}^{(2)}, e_j)_{x_{\mu_2}, \beta_2}.$$

In particular, if the tuple  $\vec{\alpha}^{(1)}$  is empty, i.e.  $k_1 = 0$ , then we have

$$\text{PGW}(\vec{\alpha}^{(2)})_{x_{\mu_1+\mu_2}, \beta} = \sum_{\beta = \beta_1 + \beta_2} \text{PGW}(\vec{\alpha}^{(2)}, \Phi'_{\beta_1}(\eta_{\mu_1}))_{x_{\mu_2}, \beta_2}$$

where  $\Phi'_\beta$  is the coefficient of  $q^\beta$  in  $\Phi'$ .

*Proof of Lemma 3.10.* We have, for any  $\beta \in \pi_2(G/P)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi'_\beta(\eta_{\mu_1} \cdot \eta_{\mu_2}) &= \Phi'_\beta(\eta_{\mu_1+\mu_2}) \\ &= \sum_{i,j \in I} g^{ij} \text{PGW}(e_i)_{x_{\mu_1+\mu_2}, \beta} e_j \\ &= \sum_{i,j \in I} \sum_{\beta = \beta_1 + \beta_2} g^{ij} \text{PGW}(e_i, \Phi'_{\beta_1}(\eta_{\mu_1}))_{x_{\mu_2}, \beta_2} \\ &= \sum_{i,j \in I} \sum_{\beta = \beta_1 + \beta_{21} + \beta_{22}} g^{ij} \text{PGW}(e_i, \Phi'_{\beta_1}(\eta_{\mu_1}), \Phi'_{\beta_{21}}(\eta_{\mu_2}))_{x_{\mu=0}, \beta_{22}} \\ &= \sum_{\beta = \beta_1 + \beta_{21} + \beta_{22}} g^{ij} \text{GW}(e_i, \Phi'_{\beta_1}(\eta_{\mu_1}), \Phi'_{\beta_{21}}(\eta_{\mu_2}))_{\beta_{22}}. \end{aligned}$$

Here, the first two equalities follow from the definitions, the next two from Lemma 3.11 and the last from Lemma 3.7. Notice that the last term is equal to the coefficient of  $q^\beta$  in  $\Phi'(\eta_{\mu_1}) \star \Phi'(\eta_{\mu_2})$  where  $\star$  is the quantum cup product. The proof is complete.  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 3.11.* For simplicity, we will denote  $P_{x_\mu}(G/P)$  by  $P_{x_\mu}$ .

**Step 1: constructing a degeneration of  $P_{x_{\mu_1+\mu_2}}$ .** Consider the surface  $S := \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$  and a rational map  $r : S \dashrightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$  sending  $([z_0 : z_1], [w_0 : w_1])$  to  $[z_0 w_1 : z_1 w_0]$ . Blow up  $S$  at the two points of indeterminacy  $([0 : 1], [0 : 1])$  and  $([1 : 0], [1 : 0])$ . Denote by  $b : \tilde{S} \rightarrow S$  the blow-up map and  $\tilde{r} : \tilde{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$  the morphism induced by  $r$ .

For each pair  $(i, j)$  where  $i, j \in \{0, 1\}$ , take a copy of  $\mathbb{C}^2 \times G/P$  and call it  $Y_{ij}$ . Define  $P'_{x_{\mu_1}, x_{\mu_2}}$  by gluing the four spaces  $Y_{ij}$  via the rational maps

$$Y_{ij} \rightarrow Y_{i'j'} : (z, w, y) \mapsto (z^{\epsilon_{ii'}}, w^{\epsilon_{jj'}}, x_{\mu_1}^{1-\delta_{ii'}}(z)x_{\mu_2}^{1-\delta_{jj'}}(w) \cdot y)$$

where  $\delta_{ab}$  is the Kronecker function, and  $\epsilon_{ab} = 1$  if  $a = b$  and  $\epsilon_{ab} = -1$  otherwise. There is a natural map  $\pi' : P'_{x_{\mu_1}, x_{\mu_2}} \rightarrow S$  defined by forgetting the  $G/P$ -factor in each of the charts  $Y_{ij}$ . It is a  $G/P$ -fibration. Moreover, there is a natural  $T$ -action on  $P'_{x_{\mu_1}, x_{\mu_2}}$  preserving every fiber of  $\pi'$ .

Define  $P_{x_{\mu_1}, x_{\mu_2}} := \tilde{S} \times_{(b, \pi')} P'_{x_{\mu_1}, x_{\mu_2}}$  and  $\pi$  to be the map induced by  $\pi'$ . Then  $\pi$  is a  $G/P$ -fibration and the  $T$ -action on  $P'_{x_{\mu_1}, x_{\mu_2}}$  induces a  $T$ -action on  $P_{x_{\mu_1}, x_{\mu_2}}$ .

The composition  $\tilde{r} \circ \pi$  is a degeneration. Indeed, one checks easily that the fiber of this map over any point  $[u : v] \in \mathbb{P}^1$  with  $uv \neq 0$  is isomorphic to  $P_{x_{\mu_1+\mu_2}}$ , and the fibers over the remaining points  $[1 : 0]$  and  $[0 : 1]$  are singular varieties each of which is a union of  $P_{x_{\mu_1}}$  and  $P_{x_{\mu_2}}$  intersecting each other along a common fiber with respect to the fibration  $P_{x_{\mu_i}} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$ .

**Step 2: applying the degeneration formula.** We apply the degeneration formula [9, 10] to the degeneration  $\tilde{r} \circ \pi$  with respect to a fixed singular fiber. Before stating the formula for our case, we introduce some notations.

- (1) Denote by  $j_{sm}$  the inclusion of a smooth fiber  $\simeq P_{x_{\mu_1+\mu_2}}$  of  $\tilde{r} \circ \pi$  into  $P_{x_{\mu_1}, x_{\mu_2}}$ , and by  $j_1$  (resp.  $j_2$ ) the inclusion of the component  $\simeq P_{x_{\mu_1}}$  (resp.  $\simeq P_{x_{\mu_2}}$ ) of the singular fiber of  $\tilde{r} \circ \pi$  into  $P_{x_{\mu_1}, x_{\mu_2}}$ .
- (2) Denote by  $E_1$  and  $E_2$  the exceptional divisors with respect to the blow-up map  $b$  corresponding to  $([0 : 1], [0 : 1])$  and  $([1 : 0], [1 : 0])$  respectively. Define  $D_i := \pi^{-1}(E_i)$ . We have  $D_i \simeq E_i \times G/P$ . Denote by  $\text{pr}_i : D_i \rightarrow G/P$  the canonical projection and put  $\vec{\alpha}^{(i)} := (\iota_{D_i})_*(\text{pr}_i)^*\vec{\alpha}^{(i)}$ .
- (3) Let  $X$  be a smooth projective variety and  $D$  a smooth divisor of  $X$ . Recall a *topological type* for the pair  $(X, D)$  is a quadruple  $\Gamma = (g, n, \beta, \mu)$  where  $g$  is the genus,  $n$  is the number of ordinary marked points,  $\beta$  is a curve class in  $X$  and  $\mu = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_\rho) \in (\mathbb{Z}_{>0})^\rho$  is a partition of the intersection number  $\beta \cdot D$ .
- (4) For  $i = 1, 2$ , define  $F_i \subset P_{x_{\mu_i}}$  to be the divisor along which the two components of the singular fiber of  $\tilde{r} \circ \pi$  intersect. For any  $\beta_i \in \pi_2(G/P)$ , define  $\Gamma_{\beta_i}$  to be the topological type for  $(P_{x_{\mu_i}}, F_i)$  for which  $g = 0$ ,  $n = k_i$ ,  $\beta = \tilde{\beta}_i$  (see (3.1)) and  $\mu = (1)$  (notice  $\tilde{\beta}_i \cdot F_i = 1$ ).
- (5) Recall the *relative Gromov-Witten invariant*  $GW(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n | \gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_\rho)_\Gamma^{(X, D)}$  defined in [9, 10], where  $\Gamma = (g, n, \beta, \mu)$  is a topological type for  $(X, D)$ ,  $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n \in H^*(X)$  and  $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_\rho \in H^*(D)$ <sup>2</sup>. In our situation, we will consider its  $T$ -equivariant version which is well-defined, since  $F_i$  is a  $T$ -invariant divisor.

<sup>2</sup>The superscript  $\bullet$  in the usual convention is dropped since no disconnected topological type will arise in our situation.

The degeneration formula for our situation reads:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & GW(j_{sm}^* \vec{\alpha}^{(1)}, j_{sm}^* \vec{\alpha}^{(2)})_{\tilde{\beta}}^{P_{x_{\mu_1+\mu_2}}} \\
 &= \sum_{i,j \in I} \sum_{\beta = \beta_1 + \beta_2} g^{ij} GW(j_1^* \vec{\alpha}^{(1)} | e_i)_{\Gamma_{\beta_1}}^{(P_{x_{\mu_1}}, F_1)} GW(j_2^* \vec{\alpha}^{(2)} | e_j)_{\Gamma_{\beta_2}}^{(P_{x_{\mu_2}}, F_2)}. \tag{3.4}
 \end{aligned}$$

Of course, (3.4) is not the general form of the degeneration formula but the form derived from it by making a number of simplifications. They are:

- (a) Since the genus of the LHS of (3.4) is zero, we have  $g = 0$  for any topological type which arises in the degeneration formula.
- (b) Since  $j_1^* \vec{\alpha}^{(2)} = j_2^* \vec{\alpha}^{(1)} = 0$ , the  $k_1 + k_2$  ordinary marked points must be split in the way described in (3.4).
- (c) By projecting the curve classes in  $P_{x_{\mu_1}, x_{\mu_2}}$  into  $\tilde{S}$ , we see that every class in  $\pi_2^{section}(P_{x_{\mu_1+\mu_2}})$  must be split into two classes, with one in  $\pi_2^{section}(P_{x_{\mu_1}})$  and the other in  $\pi_2^{section}(P_{x_{\mu_2}})$ , at the singular fiber of  $\tilde{r} \circ \pi$ . One can show that this splitting corresponds to addition in  $\pi_2(G/P)$  via the isomorphism (3.1). See the proof of Lemma 4.2.
- (d) Since for each  $i = 1, 2$  and  $\beta_i \in \pi_2(G/P)$ ,  $\tilde{\beta}_i \cdot F_i = 1$ , the partition  $\mu$  as part of the data for any topological type which arises in the degeneration formula must be equal to (1).
- (e) By (d), the factor  $\prod_{i=1}^p \mu_i / |\text{Aut}(\mu)|$  which appears in the general form of the degeneration formula is equal to 1.

The result now follows from (3.4) and Lemma 3.12 below which says that the relative Gromov-Witten invariants for our case are equal to parametrized Gromov-Witten invariants.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.12.** *Let  $\mu \in Q^\vee$ . Define  $X := P_{x_\mu}(G/P)$  and  $D$  to be a fiber of  $P_{x_\mu}(G/P)$ . We have*

$$GW((\iota_D)_* \vec{\alpha} | \gamma)_{\Gamma_\beta}^{(X, D)} = GW((\iota_D)_* \vec{\alpha}, (\iota_D)_* \gamma)_{\tilde{\beta}}^X$$

for any tuple  $\alpha$  of classes in  $H_T(D)$ ,  $\beta \in \pi_2(G/P)$  and  $\gamma \in H_T(D)$ , where  $\Gamma_\beta$  is the topological type defined in the proof of Proposition 3.11.

*Proof.* It suffices to prove the following: Take  $X' := \mathbb{P}^1 \times G/P$  and  $D' := \{0\} \times G/P$ . Define also  $D'' := \{\infty\} \times G/P$ . Then for any  $\alpha \in H_T(D'')$ ,

$$\sum_{i,j \in I} g^{ij} GW((\iota_{D''})_* \alpha | e_i)_{\Gamma_\beta}^{(X', D')} e_j = \begin{cases} \alpha & \beta = 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}. \tag{3.5}$$

Indeed, the result then follows from (3.5) and (3.4) applied to the splitting  $\mu = \mu + 0$ .

To prove (3.5), notice that the moduli stack  $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{\Gamma_\beta}(X', D')$  of relative stable morphisms defined in [9, 10] is regular. The proof is similar to the one for the regularity of  $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,n}(G/P, \beta)$ . Moreover, the evaluation map  $F : \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{\Gamma_\beta}(X', D') \times_{\text{ev}} D'' \rightarrow D' \times D''$  at both the ordinary and relative marked points is  $G$ -equivariant. By an argument of Fulton-Woodward [5], the preimage  $F^{-1}(\overline{X_{G/P}^+(v_1)} \times \overline{X_{G/P}^-(v_2)})$  is reduced, locally irreducible and of pure dimension, for any  $v_1, v_2 \in W^P$ . Hence, the  $T$ -equivariant integral of 1 over this space is zero unless the dimension is zero, in which case the integral is equal to the number of elements of this space, and these elements must lie in the top stratum. This happens only when  $\beta = 0$ , since there is an extra  $\mathbb{C}^\times$ -symmetry on  $X'$  coming from the  $\mathbb{P}^1$ -factor. The rest of the proof is now clear.  $\square$

## 4. PROOF OF THE MAIN THEOREM

In this section, a moduli stack is said to be *regular* if it is smooth and of expected dimension. All stable maps are assumed to have genus zero.

**4.1. The  $T$ -invariant sections.** Let  $\mu \in Q^\vee$ . Recall (Remark 3.3)  $P_{x_\mu}(G/P)$  is the pushout of

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbb{C} \times G/P & & \mathbb{C} \times G/P \\ & \swarrow \text{inclusion} & \nearrow (z, y) \mapsto (z^{-1}, x_\mu(z) \cdot y) \\ & \mathbb{C}^\times \times G/P & \end{array}$$

It follows that giving a section of  $P_{x_\mu}(G/P)$  amounts to giving a pair of maps  $u_0, u_\infty : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow G/P$  satisfying  $u_\infty(z^{-1}) = x_\mu(z) \cdot u_0(z)$  for any  $z \in \mathbb{C}^\times$ . Since  $T$  acts on  $P_{x_\mu}(G/P)$  by acting on the  $G/P$ -factor in each chart, a section is  $T$ -invariant if and only if the images of  $u_0$  and  $u_\infty$  lie in  $(G/P)^T = \{y_v\}_{v \in W^P}$ . Therefore, for any  $v \in W^P$ , there is precisely one  $T$ -invariant section  $u_{\mu, v}$ . Explicitly,

$$u_{\mu, v}(z) \equiv (z, y_v)$$

for any  $z$  lying in the 0-chart or  $\infty$ -chart of  $\mathbb{P}^1$ .

Let  $T^v$  denote the vertical tangent bundle of the fibration  $P_{x_\mu}(G/P) \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$ .

**Lemma 4.1.** *We have*

$$u_{\mu, v}^* T^v \simeq \bigoplus_{\alpha \in -v(R^+ \setminus R_P^+)} \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(-\alpha(\mu)).$$

*Proof.* It is straightforward. Notice that the tangent space  $T_{y_v}(G/P)$  is isomorphic, as representations of  $T$ , to  $\bigoplus_{\alpha \in -v(R^+ \setminus R_P^+)} \mathbb{C}_\alpha$ .  $\square$

Recall the isomorphisms  $\pi_2(G/P) \simeq Q^\vee/Q_P^\vee$  and  $\pi_2(G/P) \simeq \pi_2^{\text{section}}(P_{x_\mu}(G/P))$  defined in Section 2.2 and 3.1 respectively.

**Lemma 4.2.** *Let  $v \in W^P$ . Under the above isomorphisms, the class  $[u_{\mu, v}] \in \pi_2^{\text{section}}(P_{x_\mu}(G/P))$  is identified with  $v^{-1}(\mu) + Q_P^\vee \in Q^\vee/Q_P^\vee$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\lambda + Q_P^\vee \in Q^\vee/Q_P^\vee$  correspond to  $[u_{\mu, v}]$ . Let  $\rho \in (Q^\vee/Q_P^\vee)^*$ . The  $G$ -equivariant line bundle  $\mathcal{L}_\rho$  on  $G/P$  defined in Section 2.2 induces a line bundle  $\mathcal{L}'_\rho$  on  $P_{x_\mu}(G/P)$ . Since  $\mathcal{L}'_\rho$  extends to a line bundle on  $P(G/P)$ ,  $\rho(\lambda)$  is equal to the degree of  $u_{\mu, v}^* \mathcal{L}'_\rho$  which is easily seen to be  $\rho(v^{-1}(\mu))$ . Since  $\rho$  is arbitrary, we conclude  $\lambda \in v^{-1}(\mu) + Q_P^\vee$ .  $\square$

**4.2. Regularity of the moduli.** Recall the key reason for  $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0, n}(G/P, \beta)$  to be regular is that  $G/P$  is *convex*, i.e.

$$H^1(C; u^*T(G/P)) = 0 \tag{4.1}$$

for any morphism  $u : C \rightarrow G/P$  where  $C$  is a genus zero nodal curve. Surprisingly,  $P_{f_{\Omega K, wt_\lambda}}(G/P)$  also satisfies this property, provided the classes represented by the morphisms in question are equal to  $\tilde{\beta}$  for some  $\beta \in \pi_2(G/P)$ . The goal of this subsection is to prove this fact. First, we show that it suffices to verify (4.1) for a smaller class of  $u$ .

In what follows,  $C$  always denotes a genus zero nodal curve.

**Definition 4.3.** Let  $X$  be a variety with a  $T$ -action ( $T$  is always the maximal torus). A morphism  $u : C \rightarrow X$  is said to be  $T$ -invariant if for any  $t \in T$  there exists an automorphism  $\phi : C \rightarrow C$  such that  $t \cdot u = u \circ \phi$ .

**Lemma 4.4.** Let  $X$  be a smooth projective variety with a  $T$ -action and  $\beta \in \pi_2(X)$ . Suppose for any  $T$ -invariant morphism  $u : C \rightarrow X$  representing  $\beta$ , we have  $H^1(C; u^*TX) = 0$ . Then the same is true for any morphism representing  $\beta$ .

*Proof.* For a given morphism, choose  $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$  such that it becomes stable after adding  $n$  marked points to its domain. Let  $\overline{M} := \overline{M}_{0,n}(X, \beta)$  be the coarse moduli space of stable maps to  $X$  with  $n$  marked points and representing  $\beta$ . This space is constructed and proved to be projective in [4]. Denote by  $V$  the set of  $[u] \in \overline{M}$  such that  $H^1(C; u^*TX) = 0$ . Then  $T$  preserves  $V$ , and hence its complement  $\overline{M} \setminus V$ . Let us assume for a while  $V$  is open so that  $\overline{M} \setminus V$  is closed. Suppose  $\overline{M} \setminus V \neq \emptyset$ . By Borel fixed-point theorem,  $\overline{M} \setminus V$  contains a  $T$ -fixed point  $[u_0]$ . It follows that  $u_0$  is  $T$ -invariant and  $H^1(C_0; u_0^*TX) \neq 0$ , in contradiction to our assumption stated in the lemma. Therefore,  $\overline{M} = V$ , as desired.

It remains to verify that  $V$  is open. Recall [4]  $\overline{M}$  is a union of open subschemes each of which is a finite group quotient of the fine moduli  $U$  of stable maps to  $X$  with stable domains, representing  $\beta$  and satisfying a condition depending on a fixed set of generic Cartier divisors on  $X$ . For each  $U$ , consider its universal family  $\pi : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow U$  and evaluation map  $\text{ev} : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow X$ . Since  $\pi$  is flat and  $\text{ev}^*TX$  is locally free, the set  $U'$  of  $x \in U$  for which  $H^1(\mathcal{C}_x; \text{ev}^*TX|_{\mathcal{C}_x}) = 0$  is open, by the semi-continuity theorem. Then  $U'$  descends to an open subset of  $V$ . The proof is complete by varying  $U$  and taking the union of  $U'$ .  $\square$

Define a subgroup  $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathcal{G}^0$  by

$$\mathcal{K} := \{\phi \in \mathcal{G}^0 \mid \phi(0) = e\}.$$

**Proposition 4.5.** Let  $\Gamma$  be a smooth projective variety with a  $T$ -action such that  $\Gamma^T$  is discrete. Let  $f : \Gamma \rightarrow \Omega K$  be a  $T$ -equivariant holomorphic map. Suppose for any  $\gamma \in \Gamma^T$ , the image of the differential  $Df_\gamma$  of  $f$  at  $\gamma$  contains the tangent space  $T_{f(\gamma)}(\mathcal{K} \cdot f(\gamma))$  of the  $\mathcal{K}$ -orbit through  $f(\gamma)$ . Then for any  $\beta \in \pi_2(G/P)$  and morphism  $u : C \rightarrow P_f(G/P)$  representing  $\tilde{\beta}$ , we have  $H^1(C; u^*TP_f(G/P)) = 0$ . In particular, the moduli space  $\overline{M}_{0,k}(P_f(G/P), \tilde{\beta})$  is regular for any  $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ .

*Proof.* By Lemma 4.4, it suffices to verify  $H^1 = 0$  for  $T$ -invariant morphisms. Every such morphism must land in  $P_{f|\{\gamma\}}(G/P)$  for some  $\gamma \in \Gamma^T$ . Moreover, the domain curve  $C$  can be expressed as the union  $C_0 \cup C_1$  such that  $u|_{C_0}$  is a  $T$ -invariant section after a reparametrization of the domain and  $u|_{C_1}$  is a finite disjoint union of  $T$ -invariant morphisms each of which lands in a fiber of  $P_{f|\{\gamma\}}(G/P)$ .

We first deal with the case where  $C_1$  is absent. Write  $f(\gamma) = x_\mu$  where  $\mu \in Q^\vee$ . Notice that  $P_{f|\{\gamma\}}(G/P) \simeq P_{x_\mu}(G/P)$ . By the discussion in Section 4.1, we have  $u = u_{\mu,v}$  for some  $v \in W^P$ . We have to show

$$H^1(\mathbb{P}^1; u_{\mu,v}^*TP_f(G/P)) = 0.$$

Denote by  $\mathcal{E}$  the kernel of the differential map  $TP_f(G/P) \rightarrow (\text{pr}_{\mathbb{P}^1} \circ \pi_f)^*T\mathbb{P}^1$ , where  $\text{pr}_{\mathbb{P}^1} : \mathbb{P}^1 \times \Gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$  is the projection. Put  $\mathcal{F} := u_{\mu,v}^*\mathcal{E}$ . Since  $H^1(\mathbb{P}^1; T\mathbb{P}^1) = 0$ , it suffices to verify  $H^1(\mathbb{P}^1; \mathcal{F}) = 0$ . Define  $\mathcal{E}' := \mathcal{E}|_{P_{f|\{\gamma\}}(G/P)} \cap TP_{f|\{\gamma\}}(G/P)$  and  $\mathcal{F}' := u_{\mu,v}^*\mathcal{E}'$ . We have the short exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{F}' \rightarrow \mathcal{F} \rightarrow T_\gamma\Gamma \rightarrow 0$$

where the map  $\mathcal{F} \rightarrow T_\gamma\Gamma$  is given by the projection. By looking at the associated long exact sequence, it suffices to show

$$\dim H^1(\mathbb{P}^1; \mathcal{F}') \leq \dim \operatorname{coker}(H^0(\mathbb{P}^1; \mathcal{F}) \rightarrow T_\gamma\Gamma).$$

(The inequality will automatically become an equality.)

It is straightforward to see that  $\mathcal{F}$  is defined by a transition matrix of the form

$$\begin{bmatrix} A(z) & B(z) \\ 0 & \operatorname{id} \end{bmatrix}$$

where  $A(z) : T_{y_v}(G/P) \rightarrow T_{y_v}(G/P)$  and  $B(z) : T_\gamma\Gamma \rightarrow T_{y_v}(G/P)$  are linear maps described as follows. We have the isomorphisms

$$T_{y_v}(G/P) \simeq \bigoplus_{\alpha \in R_v} \mathfrak{g}_\alpha \quad \text{and} \quad T_{x_\mu}(\Omega K) \simeq \bigoplus_{(\alpha, k) \in R_\mu} z^k \mathfrak{g}_\alpha$$

where

$$R_v := -v(R^+ \setminus R_P^+) \quad \text{and} \quad R_\mu := \{(\alpha, k) \in R \times \mathbb{Z} \mid k < \alpha(\mu)\}.$$

Denote by  $\operatorname{pr}_{(\alpha, k)}$  the composition

$$T_{x_\mu}(\Omega K) \xrightarrow{\operatorname{pr}} z^k \mathfrak{g}_\alpha \xrightarrow{z^{-k} \cdot -} \mathfrak{g}_\alpha.$$

Then, we have<sup>3</sup>

$$\begin{aligned} A(z)|_{\mathfrak{g}_\alpha} &= z^{\alpha(\mu)} \operatorname{id}_{\mathfrak{g}_\alpha} \\ B(z) &= \sum_{\substack{(\alpha, k) \in R_\mu \\ \alpha \in R_v}} z^k \operatorname{pr}_{(\alpha, k)} \circ Df_\gamma. \end{aligned}$$

We determine  $H^0(\mathbb{P}^1; \mathcal{F})$ . Every element of this vector space is given by a pair of holomorphic functions

$$u_1 : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow T_{y_v}(G/P) \quad \text{and} \quad u_2 : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow T_\gamma\Gamma$$

such that the holomorphic functions

$$A(z)u_1(z) + B(z)u_2(z) \quad \text{and} \quad u_2(z)$$

have removable singularities at  $z = \infty$ . It is clear that  $u_2(z) \equiv \zeta$  for some constant  $\zeta \in T_\gamma\Gamma$ . Write  $u_1(z) = \sum_{\alpha \in R_v} u_{1, \alpha}(z)$  where  $u_{1, \alpha} : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}_\alpha$  is holomorphic. The above condition for the first function is equivalent, given  $u_2(z) \equiv \zeta$ , to the condition that for any  $\alpha \in R_v$ , the holomorphic function

$$z^{\alpha(\mu)} u_{1, \alpha}(z) + \sum_{\substack{k \in \mathbb{Z} \\ (\alpha, k) \in R_\mu}} z^k \operatorname{pr}_{(\alpha, k)} \circ Df_\gamma(\zeta) \tag{4.2}$$

has removable singularities at  $z = \infty$ . Since  $(\alpha, k) \in R_\mu \iff \alpha(\mu) > k$  by definition, the two terms in (4.2) cannot cancel each other. Therefore, the last condition implies that for any  $(\alpha, k) \in R_\mu$  with  $\alpha \in R_v$  and  $k > 0$ , we have  $\operatorname{pr}_{(\alpha, k)} \circ Df_\gamma(\zeta) = 0$ .

Define  $h$  to be the composition

$$T_\gamma\Gamma \xrightarrow{Df_\gamma} T_{x_\mu}(\Omega K) \rightarrow \bigoplus_{\substack{(\alpha, k) \in R_\mu \\ \alpha \in R_v, k > 0}} z^k \mathfrak{g}_\alpha$$

<sup>3</sup>The purpose of introducing  $\operatorname{pr}_{(\alpha, k)}$  is to distinguish two different meanings the symbol  $z$  may have: when we say  $z^k \mathfrak{g}_\alpha$  is a direct summand of  $T_{x_\mu}(\Omega K)$ ,  $z$  is a *formal variable*; when we describe  $B(z)$ , it is a *complex number*.

where the second map is the canonical projection. The last paragraph implies that the composition

$$H^0(\mathbb{P}^1; \mathcal{F}) \rightarrow T_\gamma \Gamma \xrightarrow{h} \bigoplus_{\substack{(\alpha, k) \in R_\mu \\ \alpha \in R_v, k > 0}} z^k \mathfrak{g}_\alpha \quad (4.3)$$

is zero. Observe that the rightmost vector space of (4.3) is a subspace of  $T_{x_\mu}(\mathcal{K} \cdot x_\mu)$  which is contained in the image of  $Df_\gamma$  by assumption. It follows that  $h$  is surjective, and hence

$$\#\{(\alpha, k) \in R_\mu \mid \alpha \in R_v, k > 0\} \leq \dim \operatorname{coker}(H^0(\mathbb{P}^1; \mathcal{F}) \rightarrow T_\gamma \Gamma). \quad (4.4)$$

On the other hand, we have  $\mathcal{F}' \simeq \bigoplus_{\alpha \in R_v} \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(-\alpha(\mu))$  (Lemma 4.1), and hence

$$\dim H^1(\mathbb{P}^1; \mathcal{F}') = \#\{(\alpha, k) \in R_v \times \mathbb{Z} \mid \alpha(\mu) > k > 0\}$$

which is easily seen to be equal to the LHS of (4.4). This completes the proof for the case where  $C_1$  is absent.

We now deal with the general case. By the normalization sequence (e.g. [3]), it suffices to show

- (1)  $H^1(C_0; u^*TP_f(G/P)|_{C_0}) = H^1(C_1; u^*TP_f(G/P)|_{C_1}) = 0$ ; and
- (2) the evaluation map  $H^0(C_1; u^*TP_f(G/P)|_{C_1}) \rightarrow \bigoplus_i T_{p_i}P_f(G/P)$  at the intersection points  $p_i$  of  $C_0$  and  $C_1$  is surjective.

We have proved  $H^1(C_0; u^*TP_f(G/P)|_{C_0}) = 0$ . Observe that  $u^*TP_f(G/P)|_{C_1}$  is an extension of a trivial bundle by  $(u|_{C_1})^*T(G/P)$ . The rest of the statements then follow from the well-known fact that  $T(G/P)$  is globally generated which implies  $H^1(C_1; u^*T(G/P)|_{C_1}) = 0$ . The proof of Proposition 4.5 is complete.  $\square$

Let  $wt_\lambda \in W_{af}^-$ . Let  $f := f_{\Omega K, wt_\lambda}$  be the Bott-Samelson resolution fixed in Section 2.3. Notice that the domain  $\Gamma$  of  $f$  admits a  $\mathcal{B}^{0,-}$ -action for which  $f$  is  $\mathcal{B}^{0,-}$ -equivariant. Since  $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathcal{B}^{0,-}$ , it follows that the condition in Proposition 4.5 is satisfied, and hence  $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(P_f(G/P), \tilde{\beta})$  is regular for any  $\beta \in \pi_2(G/P)$ . Fix a point  $z$  in the  $\infty$ -chart of  $\mathbb{P}^1$  and put  $D := \pi_f^{-1}(\{z\} \times \Gamma)$ . The  $\infty$ -chart of  $P_f(G/P)$  gives us a projection map  $\operatorname{pr} : D \rightarrow G/P$ . It is easy to see that the fiber product  $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(P_f(G/P), \tilde{\beta}) \times_{(\operatorname{ev}, \iota_D)} D$  is regular as well. Observe that the action of  $B^- \subset \mathcal{B}^{0,-}$  on  $\Gamma$  lifts to an action on  $P_f(G/P)$  (since  $B^- \subset \mathcal{G}^\infty$ ), and hence an action on  $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(P_f(G/P), \tilde{\beta})$ . Since  $D$  is  $B^-$ -invariant,  $B^-$  acts on  $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(P_f(G/P), \tilde{\beta}) \times_{(\operatorname{ev}, \iota_D)} D$  and the map  $\operatorname{pr} \circ \operatorname{ev} : \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(P_f(G/P), \tilde{\beta}) \times_{(\operatorname{ev}, \iota_D)} D \rightarrow G/P$  is  $B^-$ -equivariant.

Now let  $v \in W^P$  and  $f' := f_{G/P, v}$  be the Bott-Samelson resolution in Section 2.2. Then the domain  $\Gamma'$  of  $f'$  admits a  $B^+$ -action for which  $f'$  is  $B^+$ -equivariant. Since every  $B^-$ -orbit in  $G/P$  intersects every  $B^+$ -orbit in  $G/P$  transversely (see [5, Section 7] for a proof), it follows that  $\operatorname{pr} \circ \operatorname{ev}$  is transverse to  $f'$ , and hence the stack defined below is regular.

**Definition 4.6.** Define

$$\overline{\mathcal{M}}(wt_\lambda, v, \beta) := \left( \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,1}(P_f(G/P), \tilde{\beta}) \times_{(\operatorname{ev}, \iota_D)} D \right) \times_{(\operatorname{pr} \circ \operatorname{ev}, f')} \Gamma'.$$

Notice that there is still a  $T$ -action on  $\overline{\mathcal{M}}(wt_\lambda, v, \beta)$ , since  $T = B^- \cap B^+$ .

### 4.3. The zero-dimensional components.

**Proposition 4.7.** *Let  $wt_\lambda \in W_{af}^-$ ,  $v \in W^P$  and  $\beta \in \pi_2(G/P) \simeq Q^\vee/Q_P^\vee$ . Suppose the stack  $\overline{\mathcal{M}} := \overline{\mathcal{M}}(wt_\lambda, v, \beta)$  defined in Definition 4.6 is non-empty. Then  $\dim \overline{\mathcal{M}} = 0$  if and only if*

$v \in wW_P$ ,  $\beta = \lambda + Q_P^\vee$  and the following set of conditions, which we denote by  $C(wt_\lambda)$ , holds:

$$\begin{cases} \alpha \in (-wR_P^+) \cap R^+ & \implies \alpha(w(\lambda)) = 1 \\ \alpha \in (-wR_P^+) \cap (-R^+) & \implies \alpha(w(\lambda)) = 0 \end{cases} .$$

In this case,  $\overline{\mathcal{M}} = \{u_{w(\lambda),v}\}$ .

*Proof.* Suppose  $\dim \overline{\mathcal{M}} = 0$ . Then every element  $u$  of  $\overline{\mathcal{M}}$  is a  $T$ -fixed point, and hence its domain  $C$  can be expressed as the union  $C_0 \cup C_1$  such that  $u|_{C_0} = u_{\mu',v'}$  is a  $T$ -invariant section after a reparametrization of the domain and  $u|_{C_1}$  is a finite disjoint union of  $T$ -invariant stable maps to the fibers of  $P_{x_{\mu'}}(G/P)$ . We further decompose  $C_1$  into  $C_2 \cup C_3$  where  $C_2$  is the component containing the marked point and  $C_3$  is the union of other components. Notice that  $u|_{C_2}$  must hit  $\overline{X_{G/P}^+(v)}$  at a  $T$ -fixed point  $y_{v''}$  for some  $v'' \in W^P$ . Write  $\mu' = w'(\lambda')$  where  $w't_{\lambda'} \in W_{af}^-$ . Notice that  $\overline{X_{\Omega K}(w't_{\lambda'})} \subseteq \overline{X_{\Omega K}(wt_\lambda)}$  and  $\overline{X_{G/P}^+(v'')} \subseteq \overline{X_{G/P}^+(v)}$ . It follows that

$$\dim \overline{\mathcal{M}}(w't_{\lambda'}, v'', \beta) = \ell(w't_{\lambda'}) + \ell(v'') + c_1(\beta) \leq \ell(wt_\lambda) + \ell(v) + c_1(\beta) = \dim \overline{\mathcal{M}} = 0$$

(where  $c_1(\beta) := \langle \beta, c_1(T(G/P)) \rangle$ ), and the equality holds if and only if  $w't_{\lambda'} = wt_\lambda$  and  $v'' = v$ . In fact, the equality must hold, since  $\overline{\mathcal{M}}(w't_{\lambda'}, v'', \beta)$  is regular by Proposition 4.5.

By a similar argument,  $C_3$  does not exist. (Otherwise, the regular curve  $u|_{C_0 \cup C_2}$  will have negative expected dimension.) The case for  $C_2$  is again similar. To see this, denote by  $\beta_0$  and  $\beta_2$  the classes represented by  $u|_{C_0}$  and  $u|_{C_2}$  respectively. If  $\beta_2 \neq 0$ , then  $(u|_{C_0}, u|_{C_2})$  is an element of the product stack

$$\overline{\mathcal{M}}(wt_\lambda, v', \beta) \times \left( \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,2}(G/P, \beta_2) \times_{\mathbf{ev}} \left( \overline{X_{G/P}^+(v)} \times \overline{X_{G/P}^-(v')} \right) \right)$$

which has expected dimension

$$\begin{aligned} & (\ell(wt_\lambda) + \ell(v') + c_1(\beta_0)) + (\ell(v) - \ell(v') + c_1(\beta_2) - 1) \\ &= \ell(wt_\lambda) + \ell(v) + c_1(\beta) - 1 \\ &= -1, \end{aligned}$$

a contradiction. It follows that  $C_2$  does not exist either, and hence  $v = v'$ .

To finish the proof, we need the following explicit formulae for the terms  $\ell(wt_\lambda)$ ,  $\ell(v)$  and  $c_1(u_{w(\lambda),v}^* T^v)$  where  $T^v$  is the vertical tangent bundle of the fibration  $P_{x_{w(\lambda)}}(G/P) \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$ . To formulate them, pick a regular dominant element  $a \in \mathfrak{h}_{\mathbb{R}} := Q^\vee \otimes \mathbb{R}$  which is sufficiently close to the origin and a dominant element  $b \in \mathfrak{h}_{\mathbb{R}}$  which determines the parabolic type of  $P$ , i.e.  $\alpha_i(b) = 0$  if  $\alpha_i \in R_P^+$  and  $\alpha_i(b) > 0$  otherwise. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \ell(wt_\lambda) &= \sum_{\alpha(w(\lambda)-a)>0} [\alpha(w(\lambda) - a)] & (4.5) \\ \ell(v) &= - \sum_{\alpha(v \cdot b) < 0} [\alpha(-a)] \\ c_1(u_{w(\lambda),v}^* T^v) &= - \sum_{\alpha(v \cdot b) < 0} \alpha(w(\lambda)) \end{aligned}$$

where the summations are taken over  $\alpha \in R$  satisfying the stated conditions. The first formula will be proved below, the second is obvious, and the last follows from Lemma 4.1. Summing up these



equations and using the assumption  $\dim \overline{\mathcal{M}} = 0$ , we obtain

$$\sum_{\alpha(w(\lambda)-a)>0} [\alpha(w(\lambda)-a)] - \sum_{\alpha(v \cdot b)<0} [\alpha(w(\lambda)-a)] = 0.$$

The last equation can be written as

$$\sum_{\alpha(w(\lambda)-a)>0} (1 - A(\alpha, v)) [\alpha(w(\lambda)-a)] + B(\alpha, v) = 0 \quad (4.6)$$

where

$$A(\alpha, v) := \begin{cases} -1 & \alpha(v \cdot b) > 0 \\ 0 & \alpha(v \cdot b) = 0 \\ 1 & \alpha(v \cdot b) < 0 \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad B(\alpha, v) := \begin{cases} 0 & \alpha(v \cdot b) \leq 0 \\ 1 & \alpha(v \cdot b) > 0 \end{cases}.$$

Observe that each of the summands of the LHS of (4.6) is non-negative. It follows that they are all equal to 0. This holds precisely when the following conditions are satisfied:

$$\begin{cases} \alpha \in v(R^+ \setminus R_P^+) \implies \alpha \in wR^+ \\ \alpha \in vR_P \cap (-wR^+) \cap R^+ \implies \alpha(w(\lambda)) = 1 \\ \alpha \in vR_P \cap (-wR^+) \cap (-R^+) \implies \alpha(w(\lambda)) = 0 \end{cases}.$$

Here, we have used the assumption  $wt_\lambda \in W_{af}^-$  which implies  $-w(\lambda) + a \in w\mathring{\Delta}$  where  $\mathring{\Delta}$  is the interior of the dominant chamber. Notice that the first condition is equivalent to  $v \in wW_P$ , and the conjunction of the other two is equivalent, given the first condition, to  $C(wt_\lambda)$ , since  $vR_P \cap (-wR^+) = -wR_P^+$  if  $v \in wW_P$ . By Lemma 4.2 and the fact that every element of  $W_P$  descends to the identity in the quotient  $Q^\vee/Q_P^\vee$ , we have  $\beta = [u_{w(\lambda),v}] = v^{-1}w(\lambda) + Q_P^\vee = \lambda + Q_P^\vee$ . This proves one direction of Proposition 4.7. The other direction is clear.  $\square$

*Proof of formula (4.5).* Denote by  $\Delta_0$  the dominant alcove. Since  $wt_\lambda$  is a minimal length coset representative, the line segment joining  $w(\lambda)$  and  $a$  intersects the interior of  $wt_\lambda(\Delta_0)$ . Therefore,  $\ell(wt_\lambda)$  is equal to the number of affine walls intersecting the interior of this line segment which is easily seen to be the RHS of (4.5).  $\square$

**4.4. The final step.** Following [8], we define  $(W^P)_{af}$  to be the set of  $wt_\lambda \in W_{af}$  such that the following conditions hold:

$$\begin{cases} \alpha \in R_P^+ \cap (-w^{-1}R^+) \implies \alpha(\lambda) = -1 \\ \alpha \in R_P^+ \cap w^{-1}R^+ \implies \alpha(\lambda) = 0 \end{cases}.$$

**Theorem 4.8.** (Parabolic version of Theorem 1.1) *The  $H_T(pt)$ -algebra homomorphism  $\Phi$  defined in Definition 3.8 satisfies*

$$\Phi(\xi_{wt_\lambda}) = \begin{cases} q^{\lambda+Q_P^\vee} \sigma_{\tilde{w}} & wt_\lambda \in (W^P)_{af} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

for any  $wt_\lambda \in W_{af}^-$ , where  $\tilde{w} \in W^P$  is the minimal length representative of the coset  $wW_P$ .

*Proof.* Write  $\Phi(\xi_{wt_\lambda}) = \sum_{v \in W^P} \sum_{\beta \in \pi_2(G/P)} q^\beta c_{\beta,v} \sigma_v$ . By definition,  $c_{\beta,v} = \int_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}(wt_\lambda, v, \beta)} 1 \in H_T(pt)$  which is zero unless  $\overline{\mathcal{M}}(wt_\lambda, v, \beta)$  is non-empty and zero-dimensional. By Proposition 4.7, it is equivalent to  $v \in wW_P$ ,  $\beta = \lambda + Q_P^\vee$  and the condition  $C(wt_\lambda)$ , and in this case  $c_{\beta,v} = 1$ . It remains to show that  $C(wt_\lambda)$  is equivalent to the condition in the definition of  $(W^P)_{af}$ . This simply follows from replacing  $\alpha$  in the latter condition with  $-w^{-1}\alpha$ .  $\square$

## APPENDIX A. AN ISSUE ABOUT INFINITE DIMENSIONAL MANIFOLDS

We may follow Pressley-Segal [13] who define  $\mathcal{G}$  to be the space of smooth maps from  $S^1$  to  $G$  which is a Fréchet Lie group in the  $C^\infty$ -topology. Other groups are defined similarly. The references therein will make everything rigorous.

Alternatively, we can define  $\mathcal{G}$  to be the space of continuous maps from the annulus  $A := \{\frac{1}{2} \leq |z| \leq 2\} \subset \mathbb{C}$  to  $G$  which are holomorphic in the interior of  $A$ . Then  $\mathcal{G}$  is an analytic Banach Lie group in the  $C^0$ -topology. Denote by  $D_0$  (resp.  $D_\infty$ ) the closed disk containing 0 (resp.  $\infty$ ) whose boundary is equal to the larger (resp. smaller) boundary circle of  $A$  (so that  $D_0^{-1} = D_\infty$  and  $A = D_0 \cap D_\infty$ ). Define  $\mathcal{G}^0$  (resp.  $\mathcal{G}^\infty$ ) to be the space of continuous maps from  $D_0$  (resp.  $D_\infty$ ) to  $G$  which are holomorphic in the interior of  $D_0$  (resp.  $D_\infty$ ). Again,  $\mathcal{G}^0$  and  $\mathcal{G}^\infty$  are analytic Banach Lie groups in the  $C^0$ -topology. Notice that the evaluation maps  $\mathcal{G} \times \mathring{A} \rightarrow G$ ,  $\mathcal{G}^0 \times \mathring{D}_0 \rightarrow G$  and  $\mathcal{G}^\infty \times \mathring{D}_\infty \rightarrow G$  are analytic. Moreover,  $\mathcal{G}^0$  and  $\mathcal{G}^\infty$  are subgroups of  $\mathcal{G}$  in the sense of [1]. The first claim simply follows from Cauchy's integral formula. For the second, we look at the Laurent series associated to any element of  $\text{Lie}(\mathcal{G})$ , and get  $\text{Lie}(\mathcal{G}) = \text{Lie}(\mathcal{G}^0) + \text{Lie}(\mathcal{G}^\infty)$ . Since  $\text{Lie}(\mathcal{G}^0) \cap \text{Lie}(\mathcal{G}^\infty) \simeq \mathfrak{g}$  is finite dimensional, each of  $\text{Lie}(\mathcal{G}^0)$  and  $\text{Lie}(\mathcal{G}^\infty)$  has a *topological complement* in  $\text{Lie}(\mathcal{G})$ .

It is straightforward to define the corresponding Borel subgroup  $\mathcal{B}^{0,-}$  and minimal parabolic subgroups  $\mathcal{P}_{\check{\alpha}_i}$  (see Section 2.3). The constructions of the Bott-Samelson varieties  $\mathcal{P}_{\check{\alpha}_{i_1}} \times_{\mathcal{B}^{0,-}} \cdots \times_{\mathcal{B}^{0,-}} \mathcal{P}_{\check{\alpha}_{i_\ell(wt_\lambda)}} / \mathcal{B}^{0,-}$  (Section 2.3) and the  $G/P$ -fibration  $P(G/P)$  over  $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathcal{G}/\mathcal{G}^0$  (Section 3.1) now become rigorous: they are realized as some proper free group quotients of analytic Banach manifolds by analytic Banach Lie groups. See [1, §1 no. 5 Proposition 10]. Of course, when defining  $P(G/P)$ , we have to glue two copies of  $\mathring{D}_0 \times \mathcal{G} \times G/P$  instead of  $\mathbb{C} \times \mathcal{G} \times G/P$ .

## REFERENCES

- [1] N. Bourbaki: *Eléments de Mathématique, Groupes et Algèbres de Lie*, chapitre 3. Masson, Paris (1981).
- [2] C.H. Chow: Quantum characteristic classes, moment correspondences and Hamiltonian groups of coadjoint orbits. Preprint (2021). [arXiv:2107.08576](https://arxiv.org/abs/2107.08576).
- [3] D. Cox, S. Katz: *Mirror symmetry and algebraic geometry*. Mathematical surveys and monographs **68**. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI (1999).
- [4] W. Fulton, R. Pandharipande: Notes on stable maps and quantum cohomology. Proc. Sympos. Pure Math. **62**, 45-96. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI (1997).
- [5] W. Fulton, C. Woodward: On the quantum product of Schubert classes. J. Algebraic Geom. **13**(4), 641-661 (2004).
- [6] T. Graber, R. Pandharipande: Localization of virtual fundamental classes. Invent. Math. **135**(2), 487-518 (1999).
- [7] Y. Huang, C. Li: On equivariant quantum Schubert calculus for  $G/P$ . J. Algebra **441**, 21-56 (2015).
- [8] T. Lam, M. Shimozono: Quantum cohomology of  $G/P$  and homology of affine Grassmannian. Acta Math. **204**(1), 49-90 (2010).
- [9] J. Li: Stable morphisms to singular schemes and relative stable morphisms. J. Differ. Geom. **57**, 509-578 (2001).
- [10] J. Li: A degeneration formula of GW-invariants. J. Differ. Geom. **60**, 199-293 (2002).
- [11] L. Mihalcea: On equivariant quantum cohomology of homogeneous spaces: Chevalley formulae and algorithms. Duke Math. J. **140**(2), 321-350 (2007).

- [12] D. Peterson: Quantum cohomology of  $G/P$ . Lecture notes, M.I.T., Spring 1997.
- [13] A. Pressley, G. Segal: Loop groups. Oxford mathematical monographs. Oxford University Press (1986).
- [14] Y. Savelyev: Quantum characteristic classes and the Hofer metric. *Geom. Topol.* **12**, 2277-2326 (2008).
- [15] Y. Savelyev: Virtual Morse theory on  $\Omega Ham(M, \omega)$ . *J. Differ. Geom.* **84**, 409-425 (2010).
- [16] Y. Savelyev: Bott periodicity and stable quantum classes. *Selecta Math. (N.S.)* **19**, 439-460 (2013).
- [17] P. Seidel:  $\pi_1$  of symplectic automorphism groups and invertibles in quantum homology rings. *Geom. Funct. Anal.* **7**, 1046-1095 (1997).
- [18] C. Woodward: On D. Peterson's comparison formula for Gromov-Witten invariants of  $G/P$ . *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **133**(6), 1601-1609 (2005).

THE INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES AND DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, THE CHINESE UNIVERSITY OF HONG KONG, SHATIN, HONG KONG

*Email address:* chchow@math.cuhk.edu.hk