

# Tropical curves in abelian surfaces III: pearl diagrams and multiple cover formulas

Thomas Blomme

## ABSTRACT

This paper is the third installment in a series of papers devoted to the computation of enumerative invariants of abelian surfaces through the tropical approach. We develop a pearl diagram algorithm similar to the floor diagram algorithm used in toric surfaces that concretely solves the tropical problem.

These diagrams can be used to prove specific cases of Oberdieck's multiple cover formula that reduce the computation of invariants for non-primitive classes to the primitive case, getting rid of all diagram considerations and providing short explicit formulas. The latter can be used to prove the quasi-modularity of generating series of classical invariants, and the polynomiality of coefficients of fixed codegree in the refined invariants.

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>2</b>
1.1	Preliminaries and problem setting . . . . .	2
1.2	Results . . . . .	4
1.3	Structure of the paper . . . . .	7
<b>2</b>	<b>Little toolbox</b>	<b>8</b>
2.1	A small digression on the arithmetic convolution . . . . .	8
2.2	About quasi-modular forms . . . . .	8
<b>3</b>	<b>Tropical tori, tropical curves, enumeration and multiplicities</b>	<b>10</b>
3.1	Tropical tori and tropical curves . . . . .	10
3.2	Enumerative problems and invariants . . . . .	12
<b>4</b>	<b>From tropical curves to pearl diagrams</b>	<b>14</b>
4.1	Abstract marked pearl diagrams . . . . .	15
4.2	Stretching in abelian surfaces . . . . .	16
4.3	Pearl diagrams associated to tropical curves . . . . .	18
<b>5</b>	<b>From Pearl diagrams to tropical curves: curves passing through <math>g</math> points</b>	<b>22</b>
5.1	Recovering the tropical curves . . . . .	22
5.2	Recovering the invariants . . . . .	26
5.3	The multiple cover formulas . . . . .	31
<b>6</b>	<b>From Pearl diagrams to tropical curves in a linear system</b>	<b>33</b>
6.1	Recovering the tropical curves . . . . .	33

6.2	Recovering the invariants . . . . .	36
6.3	The multiple cover formulas . . . . .	38
<b>7</b>	<b>Computations and regularity results</b>	<b>40</b>
7.1	Computation in the primitive case . . . . .	40
7.2	Quasi-modularity of generating series . . . . .	41
7.3	Polynomiality of the coefficients of the refined invariants . . . . .	42
	<b>References</b>	<b>44</b>

## 1. Introduction

### 1.1 Preliminaries and problem setting

1.1.1 *Abelian surfaces.* A complex torus is constructed as a quotient of the algebraic torus  $N_{\mathbb{C}^*} = N \otimes \mathbb{C}^*$ , where  $N$  is a lattice, by a second lattice  $\Lambda \subset N_{\mathbb{C}^*}$ . A complex torus is called an *abelian surface* if it can be endowed with the choice of a positive line bundle. This condition on the complex torus is known as *Riemann bilinear relation* and are explained in [17]. Abelian surfaces are a family of complex manifolds that appear in many places throughout algebraic geometry, which justifies their study.

The tropical counterparts, called *tropical abelian surfaces*, are real tori  $N_{\mathbb{R}}/\Lambda$ , obtained by quotienting a real vector space  $N_{\mathbb{R}}$  containing a lattice  $N$ , by a second lattice  $\Lambda \subset N_{\mathbb{R}}$ , such that the result can also be endowed with a positive line bundle. This condition can be expressed in term of the inclusion  $\Lambda \subset N_{\mathbb{R}}$ . Taking basis of  $N$  and  $\Lambda$ , let  $S$  be the matrix of the inclusion  $\Lambda \rightarrow N_{\mathbb{R}}$ , the condition amounts to the existence of  $C \in \Lambda \otimes N$ , viewed as a matrix  $\Lambda^* \rightarrow N$ , such that  $CS^T$  is a symmetric matrix.

1.1.2 *Curves in abelian surfaces.* One way to understand a complex manifold is to study the curves that it contains. To do this, one can count the curves of fixed degree and genus that satisfy given conditions, for instance passing through given points. In the case of the projective plane, one can count degree  $d$  and genus  $g$  curves passing through  $3d - 1 + g$  points. In the complex case, the answer happens only to depend on the nature of the constraints and not on the geometric choice of the constraints. In some cases, these invariants coincide with Gromov-Witten invariants.

For abelian surfaces, we count curves of genus  $g$  realizing the class  $C$  passing through  $g$  points, where  $C$  is a  $2 \times 2$  integer matrix that can be assumed to be diagonal with positive entries. The result does not depend on the choice of the points nor the abelian surface as long as it contains curves in the class  $C$ . These invariants are denoted  $\mathcal{N}_{g,C}$ . They are considered in [11] and [12]. Moreover, it is possible not to fixed the homology class  $C$  but rather the linear system to which the curves belong. This amounts to fix a line bundle  $\mathcal{L}$  and look for curves that are zero-locus of sections of  $\mathcal{L}$ . As the Picard group of an abelian surface is of dimension 2 (it is in fact given by the dual torus), fixing the linear system is a codimension 2 condition. Thus, we can count the number of genus  $g$  curves in a fixed linear system passing through  $g - 2$  points in general position. We also get an invariant denoted this time by  $\mathcal{N}_{g,C}^{FLS}$ .

1.1.3 *The tropical approach.* As the number of curves of a fixed degree and genus does not depend on the choice of the constraints, it is possible to try to compute this number by choosing the constraints in a degenerated way, called the *tropical limit*. This approach was first implemented in the case of toric surfaces by G. Mikhalkin [24]. Close to the tropical limit, complex

solutions to the enumerative problem break into several pieces whose structure is encoded in a *tropical curve*, which is sufficient to recover the complex curves. The main result of [24] is the *correspondence theorem*: the count of complex curves solution to the enumerative problem is equal to the number of tropical solutions, provided the latter are counted with a suitable multiplicity. The correspondence theorem has since been generalized to different settings with various techniques [33][28][34][23].

One of the latest generalizations of the correspondence theorem is presented in [27]. Using the log-geometry techniques from the correspondence theorem by T. Nishinou and B. Siebert [28], T. Nishinou gives a correspondence theorem for complex curves of genus  $g$  passing through  $g$  points in general position inside an abelian surface, thus getting out of the toric picture. His correspondence theorem yields a tropical way of computing the invariant  $\mathcal{N}_{g,C}$ . The multiplicity provided by [27] is computed in the first paper of this series: if  $h : \Gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{T}A$  is a tropical curve passing through  $g$  points, its multiplicity is equal to  $\delta_\Gamma m_\Gamma$ , where  $\delta_\Gamma$  is the gcd of the weights of the edges of the tropical curve  $\Gamma$ , and  $m_\Gamma$  is the usual product of vertex multiplicities, as presented in [24].

The correspondence theorem from [27] is generalized in the second paper of the series to work for the enumerative problem consisting in counting the genus  $g$  curves in a fixed linear system that pass through  $g - 2$  points in general position, so that one gets the invariant  $\mathcal{N}_{g,C}^{FLS}$ . The multiplicity of a tropical curve  $h : \Gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{T}A$  is now of the form  $\delta_\Gamma \Lambda_\Gamma^\Sigma m_\Gamma$ , where  $\delta_\Gamma$  and  $m_\Gamma$  are as before, and  $\Lambda_\Gamma^\Sigma$  is the index of the lattice spanned by the unmarked loops of  $\Gamma$  inside  $H_1(\mathbb{T}A, \mathbb{Z})$ . See section 3 or the second paper for more details.

**1.1.4 Refined invariants.** Correspondence theorems in tropical geometry provide multiplicities to tropical curves so that their counts yields complex invariants. In our case, we have two multiplicities, one for each of the enumerative problems, so that the counts of solutions using each of them give the invariants  $\mathcal{N}_{g,C}$  and  $\mathcal{N}_{g,C}^{FLS}$ . The multiplicities provided by [24] as well as the above multiplicities are products over the vertices of the tropical curves. In [3], F. Block and L. Göttsche proposed to replace the vertex multiplicities by their quantum analog:

$$\prod_V m_V \text{ is replaced by } \prod_V (q^{m_V/2} - q^{-m_V/2}) \in \mathbb{Z}[q^{\pm 1/2}].$$

This yields a refined multiplicity which is Laurent polynomial in a new variable  $q$ . Surprisingly, the refined count is still invariant. This was proven by I. Itenberg and G. Mikhalkin [19] in the toric setting. Several interpretations of these tropical invariants in the classical setting have been provided, but they remain quite mysterious. See [7] and [25].

The abelian surface case is the content of the first and second papers of the series. Counting curves passing through  $g$  points, we prove that the counts using multiplicities  $m_\Gamma = \prod m_V$  and  $\delta_\Gamma m_\Gamma$  are invariants. The corresponding invariant counts are denoted by  $M_{g,C}$  and  $N_{g,C}$ . Each of these multiplicities is refined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \prod_V m_V \text{ is replaced by } & \prod_V (q^{m_V/2} - q^{-m_V/2}) \in \mathbb{Z}[q^{\pm 1/2}], \\ \delta_\Gamma \prod_V m_V \text{ is replaced by } & \sum_{k|\delta_\Gamma} k^{2g-2} \varphi(k) \prod_V (q^{m_V/2k} - q^{-m_V/2k}) \in \mathbb{Z}[q^{\pm 1/2}], \end{aligned}$$

where  $\varphi$  is the Euler function. Notice that the second refinement is not the one used in the previous papers, but its invariance follows from the other invariance results. The justification of

such a weird refinement will be clear after the cover formulas. The corresponding invariant counts are denoted by  $BG_{g,C}$  and  $R_{g,C}$  respectively. The counts for curves in a fixed linear system are also invariants and we just add a FLS to denote the invariants.

1.1.5 *Explicit computations and floor diagrams.* The use of a correspondence theorem only reduces a complex problem to a tropical one. The latter still needs to be resolved in order to get concrete values, or prove some regularity statements. The same paradigm that reduces the complex setting to the tropical one can be applied here: by choosing the constraints in a degenerated way, the tropical curves break into several pieces whose structure can be encoded in an object called *diagram*, and the number of solutions encoded in a diagram can be recovered with the only knowledge of the diagram.

This approach has been implemented for counting degree  $d$  and genus  $g$  curves passing through  $3d - 1 + g$  points in  $\mathbb{C}P^2$  (as well as several other toric surfaces) by E. Brugallé and G. Mikhakin [8][9]. It was used to prove several regularity statements, see for instance [26]. The *floor diagram algorithm* in toric surfaces relies on the fact that it is possible to “project” the problem onto a line, reducing the enumeration of tropical curves to the enumeration of some specific tropical covers of the line. Tropical covers are maps between graphs that satisfy a balancing condition. They were studied in [13] and [14]. Floor diagrams have since been generalized to other settings, see for instance [2].

In our problem, it is not possible to project the constraints onto a line, but it is possible to project them onto a circle. We obtain *circular diagrams*. Such diagrams were already introduced in [5] and [6] to count covers of elliptic curves and curves in the trivial line bundle over an elliptic curve. In this paper, we have similar diagrams whose enumeration with different multiplicities give the desired invariants. However, their main interests consists in proving the multiple cover formulas. After that, one can completely forget about the diagrams.

*Remark 1.1.* Floor diagrams also carry a relation to operators on Fock spaces that has been studied by Y. Cooper and R. Pandharipande [15]. Fock spaces can for instance be used to compute generating series of Hurwitz numbers and Gromov-Witten invariants of toric surfaces. This is done by expressing the Gromov-Witten invariants as matrix elements of operators on a Fock space. In the setting of circular diagrams such as in [6], it is possible to express the invariants as the trace of an operator on the Fock space, as done in [15] for Gromov-Witten invariants of the trivial line bundle over an elliptic curve. We do not prove that such an approach is possible in our case although there might be one. ♦

## 1.2 Results

1.2.1 *Pearl diagram algorithm.* The first contribution of the present paper is to provide a concrete algorithm that solves each of the tropical enumerative problems in a suitably chosen situation: the abelian surface as well as the point constraints are chosen in a stretched way. This choice reduces each tropical enumerative problem to an enumeration of finite graphs mapped to a circle with some additional data.

In the case of primitive classes, the enumeration of pearl diagrams is completely straightforward and they allow one to recover the explicit expressions for the invariants that were already proved in [11].

The pearl diagrams have two drawbacks. First, their enumeration outside the primitive case

is considerably more difficult. Furthermore, the multiplicities that we need to use to count pearl diagrams do not have easy short expressions. In total, there are a lot of diagrams to count, and those have complicated multiplicities. For these reasons, there is probably no way to briefly present the algorithm and we thus refer to the rest of the paper. See section 4.1 for definition of pearl diagrams, and to Theorem 5.12 and 6.8 for the multiplicities to use.

The good news is that, surprisingly, the two drawbacks previously mentioned cancel each other: it is possible to compute the invariants without having to know how pearl diagrams work.

**1.2.2 Multiple cover formulas.** The pearl diagrams have a *bidegree*  $(d_1, d_2)$ , and their enumeration is made over the pearl diagrams of a fixed bidegree. The main interesting property is that pearl diagrams of bidegree  $(d_1, d_2)$  can be used to enumerate curves in a class  $\begin{pmatrix} d_1 & a \\ 0 & d_2 \end{pmatrix}$  for any choice of  $a$ . Of course, this enumeration is made using different multiplicities. As the counts are known to depend only on the equivalence class of  $\begin{pmatrix} d_1 & a \\ 0 & d_2 \end{pmatrix}$ , we get surprising identities. For instance, taking  $a = 1$ , we get that the count of bidegree  $(d_1, d_2)$  pearl diagrams (of which there are many) with some suitable multiplicity for which we have an explicit formula yields the count  $N_{g,C}$  for the class  $C = \begin{pmatrix} d_1 & 1 \\ 0 & d_2 \end{pmatrix} \simeq \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & d_1 d_2 \end{pmatrix}$ . The latter is thus the primitive count for which we already know an easy expression. The miracle lies in the small convolution formula that relates the multiplicities used to recover the counts in the classes  $\begin{pmatrix} d_1 & 1 \\ 0 & d_2 \end{pmatrix}$  and  $\begin{pmatrix} d_1 & 0 \\ 0 & d_2 \end{pmatrix}$  respectively. We thus derive the following formulas that enable an effective computation of all the invariants.

**THEOREM. 5.13** *We have the following multiple cover formulas*

$$\begin{aligned}
 (i) \quad M_{g, \begin{pmatrix} d_1 & 0 \\ 0 & d_2 \end{pmatrix}} &= \sum_{k|\gcd(d_1, d_2)} k^{4g-4} N_{g, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & d_1 d_2 / k^2 \end{pmatrix}}, \\
 (ii) \quad N_{g, \begin{pmatrix} d_1 & 0 \\ 0 & d_2 \end{pmatrix}} &= \sum_{k|\gcd(d_1, d_2)} k^{4g-3} N_{g, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & d_1 d_2 / k^2 \end{pmatrix}}, \\
 (iii) \quad BG_{g, \begin{pmatrix} d_1 & 0 \\ 0 & d_2 \end{pmatrix}} &= \sum_{k|\gcd(d_1, d_2)} k^{2g-2} BG_{g, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & d_1 d_2 / k^2 \end{pmatrix}} (q^k). \\
 (iv) \quad R_{g, \begin{pmatrix} d_1 & 0 \\ 0 & d_2 \end{pmatrix}} &= \sum_{k|\gcd(d_1, d_2)} k^{2g-1} R_{g, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & d_1 d_2 / k^2 \end{pmatrix}} (q^k).
 \end{aligned}$$

*Remark 1.2.* Theorem 6.9 gives analog results for invariants in a fixed linear system. ◆

The above multiple cover formulas (ii) is a particular case of the more general Oberdieck's multiple cover formula conjectured by G. Oberdieck in [29]. The formula is as follows.

**CONJECTURE. 5.1[29]** *Let  $\alpha$  be a tautological class in the cohomology ring  $H^*(\mathcal{M}_{g,n})$  and  $\gamma_i \in H^*(\mathbb{C}A, \mathbb{R})$  be arbitrary insertions, where  $\mathbb{C}A$  is an abelian surface. Then, one has*

$$\langle \alpha; \gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n \rangle_{g,C}^{\mathbb{C}A} = \sum_{k|C} k^{3g-3+n-\deg \alpha} \langle \alpha; \varphi_k(\gamma_1), \dots, \varphi_k(\gamma_n) \rangle_{g, \varphi_k(C/k)}^{\mathbb{C}A_k},$$

where  $\varphi_k : H^*(\mathbb{C}A, \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow H^*(\mathbb{C}A_k, \mathbb{R})$  is a morphism of algebra that preserves the canonical element and takes  $C/k$  to a primitive curve class of the same norm.

As it deals with every cohomology class, this formula is very general, and is compatible with expressions for the invariants computed in [12]. Oberdieck's multiple cover formula was conjectured following the multiple cover formulas for reduced Gromov-Witten invariants of K3 surfaces, which have a slightly more ancient history. The  $g = 0$  multiple cover formula for K3

surfaces goes back to Aspinwall-Morrison and Yau-Zaslow in the 90's and was finally proven in [21]. The multiple cover formula with a  $\lambda$ -class insertion goes back to Katz-Klemm-Vafa [20] and was proven by R. Pandharipande and R. Thomas [31]. Using the latter families of examples, G. Oberdieck and R. Pandharipande proposed in [30] a multiple cover formula for K3 surfaces, which is proven for the divisibility 2 case in [1] by Y. Bae and T-H. Buelles.

Taking  $\alpha = 1$ ,  $n = g$  and every  $\gamma_i$  to be a point insertion, we get formula (ii) in Theorem 5.13. The tropical considerations and pearl diagrams proving Theorem 5.13 and the correspondence theorem are thus enough to prove this particular case of Oberdieck's multiple cover formula.

*1.2.3 Relation to other Gromov-Witten invariants.* In the toric case, P. Bousseau proved in [7] that the tropical refined invariants are related to the Gromov-Witten invariants with insertions of  $\lambda$ -classes. The correspondence is as follows: setting  $q = e^{iu}$  and expanding in  $u$  the refined invariant  $BG_{g_0,d}(q)$  for genus  $g_0$  degree  $d$  curves in the projective plane yields the series of Gromov-Witten invariants with  $3d - 1 + g_0$  point insertions and a  $\lambda_{g-g_0}$  class insertion.

The Gromov-Witten invariants for curves in a fixed linear system, point insertions and a unique  $\lambda$ -class have already been computed in [12] for primitive classes. They also coincide with the refined invariants  $R_{g,(1,n)}^{FLS}(q)$  through the change of variable  $q = e^{iu}$ . This suggests that [7] can be generalized to the realm of abelian surfaces. Then, the tropical cover formula for refined invariants should be equivalent to the multiple cover formula for Gromov-Witten invariants with insertions of  $\lambda$ -classes. The multiple cover formula predicted by G. Oberdieck with  $\alpha$  being a  $\lambda$ -class and the  $\gamma_i$  still being point insertions are exactly the multiple cover formula (iv) from theorem 5.13 (without FLS) and 6.9 (if FLS). This suggests that the generalization of P. Bousseau's result [7] to the abelian surface case should use the refinement  $\sum_{k|\delta_\Gamma} k^{2g_0-2} \varphi(k) \prod_V (q^{m_V/2k} - q^{-m_V/2k})$  of  $\delta_\Gamma \prod m_V$  rather than the naive refinement  $\delta_\Gamma \prod (q^{m_V/2} - q^{-m_V/2})$  used in the first and second paper.

*Remark 1.3.* In the case of curves in a fixed linear system without point insertions, the Gromov-Witten invariants with a  $\lambda$ -class have been computed for any class in [12]. This is compatible with the multiple cover formula.  $\blacklozenge$

*1.2.4 Regularity results* Using the multiple cover formulas, it is possible to prove the following regularity results. The first is about the generating series of the invariants. Let  $g$  and  $d$  be fixed positive integers. We consider the generating series for the invariants  $N_{g,(d,dn)}$  and  $N_{g,(d,dn)}^{FLS}$ :

$$F_{g,d}(y) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} N_{g,(d,dn)} y^n,$$

$$F_{g,d}^{FLS}(y) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} N_{g,(d,dn)}^{FLS} y^n.$$

The generating series  $F_{g,1}$  and  $F_{g,1}^{FLS}$  have already been computed in the previous section. As they are a polynomial in  $DG_2(y)$ , with  $G_2$  the first Eisenstein series and  $D = y \frac{d}{dy}$ , they are quasi-modular forms. Quasi-modularity is a desirable property since it for instance allows for a strong control of the coefficients. We generalize this result to the generating series for the non-primitive case.

**THEOREM. 7.3** *The series  $F_{g,d}$  and  $F_{g,d}^{FLS}$  are quasi-modular forms for some finite index subgroup of  $SL_2(\mathbb{Z})$  containing  $\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$  and they have the following expressions:*

$$F_{g,d}(e^{2i\pi\tau}) = g \sum_{\substack{k|d \\ 0 \leq l < k^2}} \left(\frac{d}{k}\right)^{4g-3} (DG_2(e^{2i\pi(\tau+l)/k^2}))^{g-1},$$

$$F_{g,d}^{FLS}(e^{2i\pi\tau}) = \sum_{\substack{k|d \\ 0 \leq l < k^2}} \left(\frac{d}{k}\right)^{4g-1} (DG_2(e^{2i\pi(\tau+l)/k^2}))^{g-2} D^2 G_2(e^{2i\pi(\tau+l)/k^2}).$$

Then, we prove an analog of the result of E. Brugallé and A. Puentes [10]. They prove a polynomiality statement for the refined invariants of toric surfaces for which we have a floor diagram algorithm. In the case of the projective plane, the result is as follows: for any  $g$  and  $p$ , the coefficients of codegree  $p$   $\langle BG_{g,d}(q) \rangle_p$  of the refined invariant  $BG_{g,d}(q)$  is a polynomial in  $d$  for  $d$  big enough. We prove the following.

**THEOREM. 7.8** *The coefficient  $\langle R_{g,(d_1,d_2)} \rangle_p$  of codegree  $p$  in  $R_{g,(d_1,d_2)}$  is a polynomial in  $d_1 d_2$  for  $n > \max(g-1, 2p)$ .*

The result from [10] is similar to the conjecture from L. Göttsche [16] (proved in [35] and [22]) asserting that the number of curves with a prescribed number of nodes  $\delta$  in a linear system  $L$  on a surface  $S$  passing through a given number of points is a polynomial. The difference is now that the genus is fixed rather than the number of nodes. Furthermore, Göttsche's conjecture asserts more: the polynomial is in some sense universal as it only depends on the numbers  $c_2(S)$ ,  $K_S^2$ ,  $L^2$  and  $L \cdot K_S$  of the pair  $(S, L)$ . The obtained polynomials are known as *node polynomials*. Such an universality property for polynomials from [10] remains out of reach due to a lack of definition of the refined invariants in a general setting. Expanding the range of examples could contribute to checking such a universality.

### 1.3 Structure of the paper

The paper is organized as follows. The second section is independent of the rest of the paper and contains considerations on the arithmetic convolution, and some generalities on quasi-modular forms. The third section gathers result from the first and second paper to recall the definition of the invariants that we compute. Fourth section contains the definition of pearl diagrams and how to get them out of tropical curves. Fifth and sixth section deal the reverse direction for each of the enumerative problem: how to recover tropical curves out of a pearl diagram, and using them to prove the multiple cover formulas. In the last section, we recover the expression of the invariants for primitive classes using tropical geometry, prove the quasi-modularity of the generating series and polynomiality for coefficients of refined invariants.

*Acknowledgments.* The author is grateful to R. Pandharipande and G. Oberdieck for pointing out the existence of Oberdieck's multiple cover formula as well as helpful discussions on the matter. The author also thanks Ilia Itenberg for reviewing a first version of the paper. Research is supported in part by the SNSF grant 204125.

## 2. Little toolbox

### 2.1 A small digression on the arithmetic convolution

At several different points of the papers, we need variations on the classical arithmetic convolution. We now recall its definition. The classical *arithmetic convolution* is defined as follows: let  $u, v : \mathbb{N}^* \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be functions, we then set

$$(u * v)_\delta = \sum_{k|\delta} u_k v_{\delta/k}.$$

This an associative operation, with neutral element the Dirac function  $\delta_0$  that takes value 1 at 1 and 0 elsewhere. A function is invertible if and only if its value at 1 is non-zero. We say that a function  $u$  is multiplicative if whenever  $\gcd(x, y) = 1$  we have  $u(xy) = u(x)u(y)$ . Such a function needs only to be defined on powers of prime numbers. The set of multiplicative functions is stable by convolution. We introduce the following multiplicative functions:

- the sum of divisors  $\sigma_1(\delta) = \sum_{d|\delta} d$ , and in particular  $\sigma_1(p^r) = \frac{p^{r+1}-1}{p-1}$ ,
- the power functions  $\epsilon_m(\delta) = \delta^m$ , in particular  $\epsilon_0 = 1$  and  $\epsilon_1 = \text{id}$ ,
- the Euler function  $\varphi(\delta) = \sum_{\gcd(d,\delta)=1} 1$ , and in particular  $\varphi(p^r) = p^{r-1}(p-1)$ , but also  $\sum_{k|\delta} \varphi(k) = \delta$ .

The arithmetic convolution admits the following deformation. If we now consider functions  $U, V : \mathbb{N}^* \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}[q^{\pm 1/2}]$  with value in the ring of Laurent polynomials, we set:

$$(U * V)_\delta(q) = \sum_{k|\delta} U_k(q) V_{\delta/k}(q^k).$$

This operation is not commutative anymore, but keeps being associative. This deformation restricts to the usual arithmetic convolution on the set of constant polynomials.

We finish with a last variant of the arithmetic convolution, which is more like a module structure on some rings of functions. Let  $X$  be a set endowed with an action of the multiplicative monoid  $\mathbb{N}^*$ . In the paper,  $X$  is taken to be the set of curve classes, or the set of pearl diagrams. We say that an element  $x \in X$  is divisible by  $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$  if there is a  $x'$  such that  $x = n \cdot x'$ . We assume that each element of  $x$  has only a finite number of divisors, and that the maps  $x \rightarrow n \cdot x$  are injective, so that we can speak of  $x/n$  if  $n|x$ . Let  $u : \mathbb{N}^* \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be an arithmetic function, and  $F : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a function defined on  $X$ . We define the convolution  $u * F : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  of  $u$  with  $F$  as follows:

$$(u * F)(x) = \sum_{n|x} u(n) F(x/n).$$

This multiplication is associative in the sense that  $(u * v) * F = u * (v * F)$ . We proceed similarly if the codomain is  $\mathbb{Z}[q^{\pm 1/2}]$  rather than  $\mathbb{R}$  to deform the convolution: if  $F : X \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}[q^{\pm 1/2}]$ ,

$$(u * F)(x)(q) = \sum_{n|x} u(n) F(x/n)(q^n).$$

### 2.2 About quasi-modular forms

We here give some elementary results about quasi-modular forms and we refer to the litterature for a more complete introduction on the subject. See for instance [32] or [18].



2.2.1 *Modular forms for  $SL_2(\mathbb{Z})$ .* Modular forms are functions on the Poincaré half-plane  $\mathbb{H} = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : \Im z > 0\}$  that satisfy some transformation property under the action of  $SL_2(\mathbb{Z})$  by homography. The latter are maps of the form  $\tau \mapsto \frac{a\tau+b}{c\tau+d}$ . More precisely, a function  $f : \mathbb{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  is a modular form of weight  $2k$  if for any  $\begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} \in SL_2(\mathbb{Z})$  we have

$$f\left(\frac{a\tau+b}{c\tau+d}\right) = (c\tau+d)^{2k} f(\tau),$$

and is bounded as  $\Im \tau$  goes to  $\infty$ . As these functions are 1-periodic, setting  $y = e^{2i\pi\tau}$ , they can be expressed as series in this new variable  $y$ . It can be shown that modular forms for  $SL_2(\mathbb{Z})$  are homogeneous polynomials in the Eisenstein series  $G_4(y)$  and  $G_6(y)$ .

2.2.2 *Quasi-modular forms for  $SL_2(\mathbb{Z})$ .* Quasi-modular forms are functions that satisfy a different transformation law under the action of  $SL_2(\mathbb{Z})$ . It can be shown that quasi-modular forms are exactly the polynomials in the Eisenstein series  $G_2$ ,  $G_4$  and  $G_6$ . Moreover, they form a ring which is stable by the differential operator  $D = y \frac{d}{dy}$ . Quasi-modularity is a desirable property since it allows for a rather strong control of the coefficients. For instance, they are at most of polynomial growth.

2.2.3 *Modularity for congruence subgroups.* The above considerations generalize as follows: the transformation law may only be satisfied for a finite index subgroup  $G$  of  $SL_2(\mathbb{Z})$ , in which case we say that the function  $f$  is a (quasi-)modular form for  $G$ . Examples of such subgroups are provided by the congruence subgroups:

$$\Gamma(N) = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} \in SL_2(\mathbb{Z}) \mid \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} \equiv \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \pmod{N} \right\}.$$

Conversely, for a given function  $f$  that is quasi-modular for some subgroup of  $SL_2(\mathbb{Z})$ , we denote by  $\Gamma(f)$  the maximal subgroup of matrices that satisfy the law transformation.

2.2.4 *Constructing new quasi-modular forms out of old ones.* We have the following lemma which tells how affine transformations affect the modular group.

LEMMA 2.1. *Let  $f$  be a (quasi-)modular form for some subgroup  $\Gamma(f)$  of  $SL_2(\mathbb{Z})$ . Then for any choice of  $(r, s) \in \mathbb{Q}^* \times \mathbb{Q}$ , the function  $g(\tau) = f(r\tau + s)$  is (quasi-)modular and  $\Gamma(g)$  contains  $\begin{pmatrix} 1/r & -s/r \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \Gamma(f) \begin{pmatrix} r & s \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \cap SL_2(\mathbb{Z})$ .*

*Proof.* We prove the result for modular forms. The result for quasi-modular forms is obtained with the same manipulations. Assume  $f$  is a modular form for  $\Gamma(f)$  of weight  $2k$ . We have the following equality in  $SL_2(\mathbb{R})$ :

$$\begin{pmatrix} r & s \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1/r & -s/r \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} a + \frac{r}{s}c & rb + s(d-a) - \frac{s^2}{r}c \\ \frac{c}{r} & d - \frac{s}{r}c \end{pmatrix}.$$

If  $\begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} \in \begin{pmatrix} 1/r & -s/r \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \Gamma(f) \begin{pmatrix} r & s \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ , then the above product lies in  $\Gamma(f)$  and we can apply the

modular transformation law for  $f$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
 g\left(\frac{a\tau + b}{c\tau + d}\right) &= f\left(r\frac{a\tau + b}{c\tau + d} + s\right) \\
 &= f\left(\begin{pmatrix} r & s \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1/r & -s/r \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \cdot (r\tau + s)\right) \\
 &= \left(\frac{c}{r}(r\tau + s) + d - \frac{s}{r}c\right)^{2k} f(r\tau + s) \\
 &= (c\tau + d)^{2k} g(\tau).
 \end{aligned}$$

Thus,  $g$  is a modular form of weight  $2k$  and its modular group contains the elements of the above subgroup.  $\square$

### 3. Tropical tori, tropical curves, enumeration and multiplicities

This section is a short reminder of the results proven in the first and second paper, destined to make the present paper self-contained.

#### 3.1 Tropical tori and tropical curves

3.1.1 *Tropical tori.* Let  $N$  be a rank 2 lattice, and  $N_{\mathbb{R}} = N \otimes \mathbb{R}$  the associated vector space. Let  $\Lambda \subset N_{\mathbb{R}}$  be a rank 2 lattice, and  $S : \Lambda \hookrightarrow N_{\mathbb{R}}$  be the inclusion.

DEFINITION 3.1. The quotient  $\mathbb{T}A = N_{\mathbb{R}}/\Lambda$  is called a tropical torus.

3.1.2 *Tropical curves.* An *abstract tropical curve* is a metric graph  $\Gamma$ . It is *irreducible* if  $\Gamma$  is connected. The *genus* of an irreducible abstract tropical curve is its first Betti number. The valency of a vertex is the number of adjacent edges.

DEFINITION 3.2. Let  $\mathbb{T}A = N_{\mathbb{R}}/\Lambda$  be a tropical torus. A parametrized tropical curve inside  $\mathbb{T}A$  is a map  $h : \Gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{T}A$  where  $\Gamma$  is an abstract tropical curve such that:

- The map  $h$  is affine with slope in  $N$  on each edge of  $\Gamma$ . The slope on an edge  $e$  is of the form  $w_e u_e$  where  $w_e \in \mathbb{N}$  is called the weight of the edge, and  $u_e \in N$  is some primitive vector.
- The map  $h$  is balanced: at each vertex  $V$ , one has  $\sum_{e \ni V} w_e u_e = 0$ .

The genus of the parametrized curve is the genus of  $\Gamma$ . Its degree is the class it realizes inside the tropical homology group  $H_{1,1}(\mathbb{T}A) \simeq \Lambda \otimes N$ .

Choosing basis of  $\lambda$  and  $N$ , the degree is represented by a  $2 \times 2$  matrix. We have the following propositions that give a concrete way to compute the degree of a parametrized tropical curve, and give a condition on the existence of tropical curves of a given class  $C$  in the tropical torus  $\mathbb{T}A$ .

PROPOSITION 3.3. *Let  $h : \Gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{T}A$  be a parametrized tropical curve. Its degree  $C \in \Lambda \otimes N$ , viewed as a map  $\Lambda^* \rightarrow N$  corresponds to the matrix that maps an element  $\lambda^*$  of  $\Lambda^*$  to the sum of the slopes of the edges oriented so that they intersect positively a path Poincaré dual to  $\lambda^*$ .*

Concretely, taking a fundamental domain for  $\mathbb{T}A$ , the columns of the matrix  $C$  are obtained by adding the slopes of the edges intersecting the right side and top side of the parallelogram respectively.




FIGURE 1. Three examples of tropical curves in tropical tori of respective degrees  $\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ ,  $\begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 3 \end{pmatrix}$  and  $\begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ .

PROPOSITION 3.4. *A class  $C \in \Lambda \otimes N$  is realizable by curves in  $\mathbb{T}A$  if and only if the matrix  $CS^T$  is symmetric.*

The enumeration of curves solution to the enumerative problems that we consider only involves *simple* tropical curves, whose definition we now recall.

DEFINITION 3.5. A parametrized tropical curve  $h : \Gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{T}A$  is *simple* if  $\Gamma$  is trivalent and  $h$  is an immersion.

PROPOSITION 3.6. *The dimension of the deformation space of a simple tropical curve of genus  $g$  is  $g$ . If the curve is not simple, the dimension is strictly less.*

3.1.3 *Multiplicities.* We define the following quantities for a simple tropical curve  $h : \Gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{T}A$ :

- Its gcd  $\delta_\Gamma = \gcd_e w_e$ , which is the gcd of the weights of the edges. If  $\delta_\Gamma = 1$ , the curve is called *primitive*. If  $\delta_\Gamma \neq 1$ , the curve can be written as a  $\delta_\Gamma$  times a primitive curve. In particular, the set of tropical curves is endowed with a  $\mathbb{N}^*$  action and we can use definitions from section 2.1.
- Its usual multiplicity is  $m_\Gamma = \prod_V m_V$ , where the product is over the trivalent vertices of  $\Gamma$ , and  $m_V = |\det(a_V, b_V)|$  is the determinant of two out of the three outgoing edges. If the curve has gcd  $\delta_\Gamma$ .
- Its usual refined multiplicity is  $m_\Gamma^q = \prod_V (q^{m_V/2} - q^{-m_V/2}) \in \mathbb{Z}[q^{\pm 1/2}]$ , obtained by replacing the vertex multiplicities by their quantum analog. It is a Laurent polynomial. This is the multiplicity used in the first and second papers of the series, up to the denominator  $(q^{1/2} - q^{-1/2})^{2g-2}$ .
- Its second refined multiplicity:

$$M_\Gamma = \sum_{k|\delta_\Gamma} k^{2g-2} \varphi(k) m_\Gamma^q(q^{1/k}),$$

where  $\varphi$  is the Euler function. This multiplicity is not used in the first and second paper but is going to be more useful. See Remark 3.7 below.

- If  $\Sigma \subset \Gamma$  is a subgraph of genus 2, let  $\Lambda_\Sigma^\Sigma$  be the index of  $H_1(\Sigma, \mathbb{Z})$  inside  $H_1(\mathbb{T}A, \mathbb{Z}) \simeq \Lambda$ , obtained by taking the determinant inside  $\Lambda$  between two loops of  $\Sigma$ .

*Remark 3.7.* In the first and second papers, up to the denominator  $(q^{1/2} - q^{-1/2})^{2g-2}$ , we use the usual refined multiplicity  $m_\Gamma^q$ , obtained by replacing the vertex multiplicities by their quantum analogs. Due to the lack of presence of  $\delta_\Gamma$ , this multiplicity does not specialize to the complex multiplicity  $\delta_\Gamma m_\Gamma$  provided by the correspondence theorem. To get a multiplicity that refines the complex multiplicity, in the first paper, we take  $\delta_\Gamma m_\Gamma^q$ . For reasons due to the cover formula, we prefer here to use the second refined multiplicity as a refinement of the complex multiplicity  $\delta_\Gamma m_\Gamma$ . It indeed specialize to  $\delta_\Gamma m_\Gamma$  when  $q$  goes to 1 since  $\sum_{k|\delta} \varphi(k) = \delta$ . Notice that both multiplicities coincide if the curve is primitive.  $\blacklozenge$

**3.1.4 Tropical curves and linear systems.** A tropical curve inside an abelian surface defines a tropical line bundle  $\mathcal{O}(\Gamma)$ , which is an element of the Picard group of  $\mathbb{T}A$ . The Picard group inserts in the following short exact sequence:

$$0 \rightarrow \Lambda_{\mathbb{R}}^*/M \rightarrow \text{Pic}\mathbb{T}A \rightarrow \text{Im } c_1 \rightarrow 0,$$

where  $\text{Im } c_1$  is the set of matrices  $c : \Lambda \rightarrow M$  such that  $S^T c$  is symmetric. Two curves realizing the same homology class define a line bundle  $\mathcal{O}(\Gamma_1 - \Gamma_2)$  in  $\Lambda_{\mathbb{R}}^*/M$ . We say that two tropical curves belong to the same linear system if this line bundle  $\mathcal{O}(\Gamma_1 - \Gamma_2)$  is the trivial line bundle. In other terms,  $\Gamma_1 - \Gamma_2$  is the divisor of some piecewise affine function on  $\mathbb{T}A$ . We have the following characterization proved in the second paper, which relates the linear system to the curves.

**PROPOSITION 3.8.** *Let  $\Gamma_1$  and  $\Gamma_2$  be curves in  $\mathbb{T}A$  realizing the same class  $C$ , and that are lifted to get periodic curves inside  $N_{\mathbb{R}}$ . Assume  $0 \notin \Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2$ . Let  $f$  be the element of  $\Lambda_{\mathbb{R}}^*$  that maps  $\lambda \in \Lambda$  to the sum of the moments of the edges intersected by any path between 0 and  $\lambda \in N_{\mathbb{R}}$ . The divisor  $\Gamma_1 - \Gamma_2$  realizes the class of  $f$  in  $\Lambda_{\mathbb{R}}^*/M$ .*

*Remark 3.9.* Recall that the *moment* of an oriented edge  $e$  of slope  $w_e u_e$  inside  $N_{\mathbb{R}}$  is the evaluation of the linear form  $\det(w_e u_e, -)$  at any of its points.  $\blacklozenge$

## 3.2 Enumerative problems and invariants

We now recall the enumerative problems and the corresponding invariants.

**3.2.1 Curves passing through  $g$  points.** The first enumerative problem is to count genus  $g$  curves in a class  $C \in \Lambda \otimes N$  that pass through a generic configuration  $\mathcal{P}$  of  $g$  points inside  $\mathbb{T}A$ . We have the following counts that, according to the first paper, do not depend on the choice of the point configuration  $\mathcal{P}$  nor the abelian surface  $\mathbb{T}A$ , as long as these choices are generic:

$$\begin{aligned} N_{g,C,k} &= \sum_{\substack{\Gamma \supset \mathcal{P} \\ \delta_\Gamma = k}} m_\Gamma, & BG_{g,C,k} &= \sum_{\substack{\Gamma \supset \mathcal{P} \\ \delta_\Gamma = k}} m_\Gamma^q, \\ M_{g,C} &= \sum_{\Gamma \supset \mathcal{P}} m_\Gamma, & BG_{g,C} &= \sum_{\Gamma \supset \mathcal{P}} m_\Gamma^q, \\ N_{g,C} &= \sum_{\Gamma \supset \mathcal{P}} \delta_\Gamma m_\Gamma, & R_{g,C} &= \sum_{\Gamma \supset \mathcal{P}} M_\Gamma. \end{aligned}$$

The tropical curves passing through a generic configuration of points  $\mathcal{P}$  are simple, so that the counts over the solutions are well-defined. Moreover, if  $h : \Gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{T}A$  is any solution, the complement of  $\mathcal{P}$  in  $\Gamma$  is without cycle. Furthermore, the representation of  $C$  as a  $2 \times 2$  matrix depends on the choice of basis of  $N$  and  $\Lambda$ . Thus, equivalent matrix yield the same invariants.

*Remark 3.10.* The definition of the refined count  $R_{g,C}$  differs from the definition in the first paper since we use the second refined multiplicity  $M_\Gamma$  as a refinement of the complex multiplicity rather than the naive refinement  $\delta_\Gamma m_\Gamma^q$ . For a fixed value of the gcd of the curve, the multiplicity  $M_\Gamma$  depends linearly on  $m_\Gamma^q$ . Thus, the invariance for the counts of genus  $g$  curves passing through  $\mathcal{P}$  with multiplicity  $M_\Gamma$  is implied by the invariance for counts of curves with a fixed gcd.  $\blacklozenge$

A genus  $g$  curve in a class  $C$  that has gcd equal to  $k$  can be written as  $k$  times a primitive curve in the class  $C/k$ : there is a bijection between the set of genus  $g$  tropical curves of gcd  $k|C$  in the class  $C$  passing through  $\mathcal{P}$ , and the set of genus  $g$  tropical curve of gcd 1 in the class  $C/k$ . Multiplying a curve by  $k$  has the effect of multiplying its usual multiplicity by  $k^{2(2g-2)}$ , as its number of vertices is equal to  $2g - 2$ .

PROPOSITION 3.11. *We get the following identities:*

$$\begin{aligned} N_{g,C,k} &= k^{4g-4} N_{g,C/k,1}, & BG_{g,C,k} &= BG_{g,C/k,1}(q^{k^2}), \\ M_{g,C} &= \epsilon_{4g-4} * N_{g,C,1}, & BG_{g,C} &= \sum_{k|C} BG_{g,C/k,1}(q^{k^2}), \\ N_{g,C} &= \epsilon_{4g-3} * N_{g,C,1}, & R_{g,C} &= \sum_{lk|C} k^{2g-2} \varphi(k) BG_{g,C/kl,1}(q^{kl^2}), \end{aligned}$$

where the last two rows are interpreted as equalities between functions defined on the set of curve classes, and the convolution is introduced in section 2.1.

*Proof.* Equalities on the first row follow from the homogeneity relation of multiplicities  $m_\Gamma$  and  $M_\Gamma$ , and the last two rows are obtained adding the homogeneity relations for all the divisors of  $C$ , which is precisely the convolution of the functions. Only the last is obtained differently:

$$\begin{aligned} R_{g,C} &= \sum_{\delta|C} \sum_{\Gamma:\delta_\Gamma=\delta} \sum_{k|\delta} k^{2g-2} \varphi(k) m_\Gamma(q^{1/k}) \\ &= \sum_{\delta|C} \sum_{\Gamma:\delta_\Gamma=1} \sum_{k|\delta} k^{2g-2} \varphi(k) m_\Gamma(q^{\delta^2/k}) \\ &= \sum_{\delta|C} \sum_{k|\delta} k^{2g-2} \varphi(k) BG_{g,C/\delta,1}(q^{\delta^2/k}) \\ &= \sum_{lk|C} k^{2g-2} \varphi(k) BG_{g,C/kl,1}(q^{kl^2}). \end{aligned}$$

$\square$

*Remark 3.12.* The count  $N_{g,C}$  is equal to the complex number  $\mathcal{N}_{g,C}$  of genus  $g$  curves in the class  $C$  passing through a generic configuration of  $g$  points.  $\blacklozenge$

**3.2.2 Curves in a fixed linear system.** The second enumerative problem is to count genus  $g$  curves in a class in a fixed linear system that pass through a generic configuration  $\mathcal{P}$  of  $g-2$  points inside  $\mathbb{T}A$ . If  $h : \Gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{T}A$  is a solution, then, the tropical curve is simple and the complement of the marked points retracts on a subgraph of genus 2 that we denote by  $\Sigma$ . We have the following counts that, according to the second paper, do not depend on the choice of the point configuration  $\mathcal{P}$ , the linear system, nor the abelian surface  $\mathbb{T}A$ , as long as these choices are generic:

$$\begin{aligned}
 N_{g,C,k}^{FLS} &= \sum_{\substack{\Gamma \supset \mathcal{P} \\ \delta_\Gamma = k}} \Lambda_\Gamma^\Sigma m_\Gamma, & BG_{g,C,k}^{FLS} &= \sum_{\substack{\Gamma \supset \mathcal{P} \\ \delta_\Gamma = k}} \Lambda_\Gamma^\Sigma m_\Gamma^q, \\
 M_{g,C}^{FLS} &= \sum_{\Gamma \supset \mathcal{P}} \Lambda_\Gamma^\Sigma m_\Gamma, & BG_{g,C}^{FLS} &= \sum_{\Gamma \supset \mathcal{P}} \Lambda_\Gamma^\Sigma m_\Gamma^q, \\
 N_{g,C}^{FLS} &= \sum_{\Gamma \supset \mathcal{P}} \delta_\Gamma \Lambda_\Gamma^\Sigma m_\Gamma, & R_{g,C}^{FLS} &= \sum_{\Gamma \supset \mathcal{P}} \Lambda_\Gamma^\Sigma M_\Gamma.
 \end{aligned}$$

*Remark 3.13.* As in the case of curves passing through  $g$  points, we use the second refined multiplicity  $\Lambda_\Gamma^\Sigma M_\Gamma$  as a refinement of the complex multiplicity  $\delta_\Gamma \Lambda_\Gamma^\Sigma m_\Gamma$  rather than the naive refinement  $\delta_\Gamma \Lambda_\Gamma^\Sigma m_\Gamma^q$ . The invariance using the second refined multiplicity follows from its relation to the usual one.  $\blacklozenge$

A curve  $\Gamma$  of genus  $g$  in the class  $C$  and  $\gcd k$  is obtained multiplying by  $k$  a curve of  $\gcd 1$  in the class  $C/k$ . If  $\Gamma$  belongs to a fixed linear system  $\mathcal{L}$ , the curve  $\Gamma/k$  belongs to one of the  $k^2$  linear system  $\mathcal{L}_0$  such that  $\mathcal{L}_0^{\otimes k} = \mathcal{L}$ . This is due to the fact that the group  $\text{Pic} \mathbb{T}A$  has torsion.

**PROPOSITION 3.14.** *We have the following relations between the invariants*

$$\begin{aligned}
 N_{g,C,k}^{FLS} &= k^{4g-2} N_{g,C/k,1}, & BG_{g,C,k}^{FLS} &= k^2 BG_{g,C/k,1}(q^{k^2}), \\
 M_{g,C}^{FLS} &= \epsilon_{4g-2} * N_{g,C,1}^{FLS}, & BG_{g,C}^{FLS} &= \sum_{k|C} k^2 BG_{g,C/k,1}^{FLS}(q^{k^2}), \\
 N_{g,C}^{FLS} &= \epsilon_{4g-1} * N_{g,C,1}^{FLS}, & R_{g,C}^{FLS} &= \sum_{kl|C} k^{2g} \varphi(k) BG_{g,C/kl,1}^{FLS}(q^{kl^2}).
 \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* This is proved similarly as Proposition 3.11. The first row comes from the homogeneity relations for  $m_\Gamma$  and  $m_\Gamma^q$  respectively. They differ from the case of curve passing through  $g$  points by a  $k^2$  due to the discrepancy caused by the  $k$ -torsion in the linear system condition. The identities in the last two rows have to be interpreted as equalities between functions defined on the set of curve classes and the convolution from section 2.1. They are obtained by adding the homogeneity relations of the first row for divisors of the class  $C$ .  $\square$

*Remark 3.15.* The count  $N_{g,C}^{FLS}$  is equal to the complex number  $\mathcal{N}_{g,C}^{FLS}$  of genus  $g$  curves in a fixed linear system in the class  $C$ , and passing through a generic configuration of  $g-2$  points.  $\blacklozenge$

#### 4. From tropical curves to pearl diagrams

An explicit computation of the previously introduced invariants can be achieved by solving the tropical enumerative problem for a specific choice of the constraints, *i.e.* the tropical torus  $\mathbb{T}A$  and point configuration  $\mathcal{P}$  inside  $\mathbb{T}A$ . Such a computation is possible if the constraints are chosen in a *stretched* way. Tropical curves can then be encoded in a *pearl diagram*. These diagrams allow one to easily recover the explicit formulas from [11] for primitive classes. For non-primitive classes, the enumeration of the pearl diagrams appears to be quite an ordeal. Fortunately, as the diagrams can be used to encode curves for different classes  $C$  at the same time, their existence allows one to prove surprising equalities leading to the proof of *cover formulas*. The latter enable a far more efficient computation of the invariants, reducing the computation to the primitive case.

The technicalities following from the fact of choosing constraints in a stretched way are very similar to [4]. We proceed as follows.

- First, we define an abstract pearl diagram with a marking. As they are designed to encode tropical curves of a specific shape, their definition might become clearer after reading the section corresponding to the next point.
- Then, we explain how to get a pearl diagram from a tropical curve, and prove that if the constraints are chosen in a stretched way, the solutions to our enumerative problems all admit a pearl decomposition.
- Last, we give the multiplicities to count the pearl diagrams so that their counts yield the previous enumerative invariants. This step consists in recovering the tropical curves encoded in a pearl diagram. We postpone the proof to the next section.

#### 4.1 Abstract marked pearl diagrams

4.1.1 *Pearl diagrams.* The pearl diagrams are similar to floor diagrams from [4]. A small difference is that the stretching is now in the horizontal direction, a bigger difference is that the direction of stretching now loops over itself. To some extent, the diagrams that we consider are more related to the pearly diagrams from [6], as they possess a cyclic nature: they are mapped to a circle rather than to a line. That is why we name them *pearl diagrams* rather than floor diagrams as usual.

DEFINITION 4.1. A *pearl diagram*  $\mathfrak{D}$  is an oriented weighted graph with a map to the circle  $S^1$  satisfying the following requirements:

- (a) the edges have a weight  $w_e \in \mathbb{N}^*$ ,
- (b) a vertex  $\mathfrak{p}$ , called a *pearl*, has a weight  $d_{\mathfrak{p}} \in \mathbb{N}^*$ ,
- (c) the map to  $S^1$  respects the orientation,
- (d) for each pearl  $\mathfrak{p}$ , the sum of the weights of the edges coming at  $\mathfrak{p}$  is equal to the sum of the weights of the edges leaving  $\mathfrak{p}$ , *i.e.* its divergence is 0.

The condition (c) and (d) imply that the map  $\mathfrak{D} \rightarrow S^1$  is a tropical cover in the sense of [6]: it is a map between graphs that satisfy the balancing condition. The *genus* of a pearl diagram  $\mathfrak{D}$  is

$$g(\mathfrak{D}) = b_1(\mathfrak{D}) + |V(\mathfrak{D})|.$$

In other words, the vertices are considered to have genus 1. This choice is so that the genus matches the genus of the tropical curves that a pearl diagram encodes. A pearl diagram is said to be of bidegree  $(d_1, d_2)$  if  $d_1$  is the degree of the tropical cover  $\mathfrak{D} \rightarrow S^1$ , and  $d_2 = \sum_{\mathfrak{p} \in V(\mathfrak{D})} d_{\mathfrak{p}}$  is the sum of the weights of the pearls. Similarly to the case of curves, we also define the gcd  $\delta_{\mathfrak{D}}$  of a diagram  $\mathfrak{D}$  to be the gcd of the weights of the edges and weights of the pearls. A diagram is said to be *primitive* if its gcd is 1. Otherwise, it is possible to write it  $\delta_{\mathfrak{D}}\mathfrak{D}'$ , where  $\mathfrak{D}'$  is a primitive diagram. The set of diagram is also endowed with an action of the monoid  $\mathbb{N}^*$ , so that the convolution from section 2.1 applies for functions defined on the set of diagrams.

4.1.2 *Markings of pearl diagrams.* We now mark the pearl diagrams with points, which correspond the the marking of a tropical curve induced by the point configuration  $\mathcal{P}$ . We have two possible type of markings corresponding to the two enumerative problems that we consider. We call them *P*-marking (*P* for Point) and *L*-marking (*L* for Linear as in linear system).




FIGURE 2. Examples of  $P$ -marked pearl diagrams. The first is of genus 4 and degree  $(3, 3)$ , the second genus 5 degree  $(2, 6)$ , and the third genus 5 degree  $(2, 3)$ .

DEFINITION 4.2. Let  $\mathfrak{D}$  be a pearl diagram of genus  $g$ . A  $P$ -marking of  $\mathfrak{D}$  is a map  $\mathfrak{m} : \llbracket 1; g \rrbracket \rightarrow \mathfrak{D}$  such that:

- (a) each edge is marked by at most one point,
- (b) each pearl is marked by exactly one point,
- (c) the complement of the edges marked by a point is connected (and thus without cycle),
- (d) the map from  $\mathfrak{D}$  to  $S^1$  sends the marking in the cyclic order  $1 < 2 < \dots < g < 1$  on  $S^1$ .

DEFINITION 4.3. Let  $\mathfrak{D}$  be a pearl diagram of genus  $g$ . A  $L$ -marking of  $\mathfrak{D}$  is a map  $\mathfrak{m} : \llbracket 1; g-2 \rrbracket \rightarrow \mathfrak{D}$  such that:

- (a) each edge is marked by at most one point,
- (b) all the pearls except one are marked by exactly one point, and we add a formal  $\infty$  marking on the unmarked pearl,
- (c) the complement of the edges marked by a point is connected, and the homology class in  $H_1(S^1, \mathbb{Z})$  realized by the unique cycle that it contains is non-trivial,
- (d) the map from  $\mathfrak{D}$  to  $S^1$  sends the marking in the cyclic order  $1 < 2 < \dots < g-2 < \infty < 1$  on  $S^1$ .

*Example 4.4.* On Figure 2 are depicted several example of pearl diagrams with a  $P$ -marking. As the enumeration of pearl diagrams is quite complicated, there will be no examples of computation using their enumeration. Instead, we use abstractly the diagrams to prove the cover formula that explicitly computes the invariants. This example is here to give a mind picture of how to imagine a pearl diagram.  $\diamond$

## 4.2 Stretching in abelian surfaces

4.2.1 *Complex setting for primitive classes.* In [11], the authors compute the complex invariants  $\mathcal{N}_{g,C}$  for a primitive class  $C$ . As the answer does not depend on the chosen abelian surface, they choose an abelian surface that is a product of two generic elliptic curves  $E_1 \times E_2$ , and then compute the invariants for the class  $[E_1] + n[E_2]$ , corresponding to the matrix  $C = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & n \end{pmatrix}$ . The computation is made possible by the fact that the complex curves  $\mathcal{C}$  of genus  $g$  that pass through  $g$  points have a very special form: the projection on the first factor gives a degree 1 map from  $\mathcal{C}$  to  $E_1$ . Thus, the curves are reducible and they are union of a fiber of the projection to  $E_2$  (that projects one to one onto  $E_1$ ), and several covers of the fibers of the projection to  $E_1$ . The degree



$n$  has to be split among the various components. We get

$$\mathcal{N}_{g, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & n \end{pmatrix}} = g \sum_{a_1 + \dots + a_{g-1} = n} \prod_{i=1}^{g-1} a_i \sigma_1(a_i),$$

$$\mathcal{N}_{g, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & n \end{pmatrix}}^{FLS} = \sum_{a_1 + \dots + a_{g-2} + a_\infty = n} a_\infty^2 \sigma_1(a_\infty) \prod_{i=1}^{g-2} a_i \sigma_1(a_i).$$

4.2.2 *Tropical setting for primitive classes.* Tropically, looking at a product of tropical elliptic curves means that we look at a rectangle  $[0; L] \times [0; l]$ , with pairs of opposite edges glued together, with the lattice structure induced by  $\mathbb{Z}^2 \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ . In other words, the map  $S : \Lambda \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2 \simeq N_{\mathbb{R}}$  is diagonal in the canonical basis. The computation of [11] translates to the tropical setting: the curves in the class  $[E_1] + n[E_2]$  are of the form of Figure 3 (a): one has a horizontal curve and several vertical fibers with a splitting of  $n$  among the different components. Accounting for the different possible covers of the vertical fibers, it is possible to recover the formula from [11]. However, the method does not apply for the classes  $d_1[E_1] + d_2[E_2]$  since solutions are not necessarily a union of elliptic curves. Moreover, the curves solution are reducible and not trivalent, which is not suitable for computing the refined invariants for a generic abelian surface  $\mathbb{T}A$ . This prevents from extending the method and also find an expression for the refined invariants.




FIGURE 3. A tropical curve realizing the class  $(1, 6)$  admitting a pearl decomposition.

4.2.3 *Tropical setting for non-primitive classes.* One way to handle the problems brought by the choice of “rectangular” abelian surface is to choose  $L \gg l$  and then slightly deform the abelian surfaces, so that the class  $d_1[E_1] + d_2[E_2]$  stays realizable. Taking a basis of  $\Lambda$  and  $N$ , it means choosing the matrix of the inclusion  $S : \Lambda \rightarrow N_{\mathbb{R}}$  of the form  $\begin{pmatrix} L & d_1 \varepsilon \\ d_2 \varepsilon & l \end{pmatrix}$  with  $L \gg l \gg \varepsilon$ . The torus  $\mathbb{T}A$  is represented by an hexagon which is a slight deformation of the rectangle  $[0; L] \times [0; l]$ , with pairs of opposite sides glued together. This is represented on Figure 3 (b).

The previous discussion applies for the class  $C = \begin{pmatrix} d_1 & 0 \\ 0 & d_2 \end{pmatrix}$ . It is also possible to deal with the




FIGURE 4. A tropical torus associated to the matrix  $\begin{pmatrix} L & la/d_2 \\ 0 & l \end{pmatrix}$  and a small deformation.

classes of the form  $C = \begin{pmatrix} d_1 & a \\ 0 & d_2 \end{pmatrix}$  for some non-zero top-right coefficient. We care specifically for the particular cases where  $a$  is equal to 0 or 1. The matrices  $S$  satisfying  $CS^T$  being symmetric are of the form

$$\begin{pmatrix} L & la/d_2 \\ 0 & l \end{pmatrix} + \varepsilon \begin{pmatrix} 0 & d_1 \\ d_2 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

If  $\varepsilon = 0$ , the corresponding abelian surface can be seen as the gluing of a rectangle as depicted on Figure 4 (a). Changing  $\varepsilon$  means slightly deforming the rectangle into an hexagon whose opposite edges are glued together.

DEFINITION 4.5. Let  $C = \begin{pmatrix} d_1 & a \\ 0 & d_2 \end{pmatrix}$  be a fixed class.

- A tropical abelian surface with polarization  $C$  is *stretched* if  $S : \Lambda \rightarrow N_{\mathbb{R}}$  of the form  $\begin{pmatrix} L & la/d_2 + d_1\varepsilon \\ d_2\varepsilon & l \end{pmatrix}$ , with  $L \gg l \gg \varepsilon$ .
- A point configuration  $\mathcal{P}$  of  $g$  points inside a stretched tropical abelian surface is *stretched* if the difference between the horizontal coordinates is far bigger than  $l$ . If the coordinates of the points are  $(x_i, y_i)$  inside the hexagon, it means

$$L, |x_i - x_j| \gg l \gg \varepsilon.$$

- A point configuration  $\mathcal{P}$  of  $g - 2$  points inside a stretched tropical abelian surface is *doubly stretched* if the difference between the horizontal coordinates is far bigger than  $l$ , and far smaller than  $L$ :

$$L \gg |x_i - x_j| \gg l \gg \varepsilon.$$

*Remark 4.6.* By “horizontal coordinate”, we mean that the points are chosen in a common fundamental domain, and we consider their coordinate inside the circle  $\mathbb{R}/L\mathbb{Z}$ . In other words, points are spread along the horizontal direction.  $\blacklozenge$

### 4.3 Pearl diagrams associated to tropical curves

We now explain how to get a pearl diagram from a tropical curve passing through a stretched configuration. The reverse way, how to recover the tropical curves encoded by a pearl diagram, is postponed to the next section. The point is that from a curve in the class  $\begin{pmatrix} d_1 & a \\ 0 & d_2 \end{pmatrix}$ , one gets a pearl diagram of bidegree  $(d_1, d_2)$ . Conversely, from a pearl diagram of bidegree  $(d_1, d_2)$ , one can reconstruct curves in the class  $\begin{pmatrix} d_1 & a \\ 0 & d_2 \end{pmatrix}$  for every fixed choice of  $a$ . The use of diagrams then allows to relate the counts for the classes  $\begin{pmatrix} d_1 & 0 \\ 0 & d_2 \end{pmatrix}$  and  $\begin{pmatrix} d_1 & 1 \\ 0 & d_2 \end{pmatrix}$ , the latter being equivalent to the class  $\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & d_1d_2 \end{pmatrix}$ .

For what follows, we choose basis of  $N$  and  $\Lambda$ , a class  $C$  which is in triangular form  $\begin{pmatrix} d_1 & a \\ 0 & d_2 \end{pmatrix}$ , and we assume that the tropical abelian surface  $\mathbb{T}A$  and the point configuration  $\mathcal{P}$  are both stretched (resp. doubly stretched) for the problem of curves passing through  $g$  points (resp. curves in a fixed linear system).

**4.3.1 Preliminary lemmas.** As in [4], the following two lemmas play a crucial role in proving that the tropical curves passing through a stretched configuration of points admit a pearl decomposition.

**LEMMA 4.7.** *Let  $h : \Gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{T}A$  be a parametrized tropical curve in the class  $C$ . Then the slope of the edges of  $(\Gamma, h)$  can only take a finite number of values.*

*Proof.* We have in  $\mathbb{T}A$  a preferred genus 2 curve  $\Gamma_0$  in the class  $C$ , well-defined up to translation. Let  $u_1$  and  $u_2$  be the slopes of two of its edges. Consider a curve  $h : \Gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{T}A$  in the class  $C$  and let  $u$  be the slope of one of its edges  $e$ . Translating  $\Gamma_0$  so that it intersects  $e$ , we get that  $|\det(u_1, u)|$  and  $|\det(u_2, u)|$  are both bounded by the intersection number  $C \cdot C$ . Thus,  $u \in N$  can only take a finite number of values.  $\square$

**LEMMA 4.8.** *Let  $h : \Gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{T}A$  be a parametrized tropical curve realizing the class  $C$  in the stretched torus  $\mathbb{T}A$ . Then the length of a non-horizontal edge is bounded by a constant that only depends on  $C$  and  $l$ .*

*Proof.* Consider again the preferred curve  $\Gamma_0$  from the proof of the previous lemma. It has an horizontal edge  $e_0$ . Let  $h : \Gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{T}A$  be a curve in the class  $C$  and let  $e$  be a non-horizontal edge of  $\Gamma$ . If the length of  $\Gamma$  was too big, it would give too many intersection points between  $\Gamma$  and  $\Gamma_0$ , looping around the vertical direction. Namely, let  $u_e = (a, b)$  the slope of  $h$  on  $e$ , and  $l_e$  its length. We have at least  $\frac{|b|l_e}{l}$  intersection points. Thus, as  $|b| \geq 1$ , we have  $l_e \leq l(C \cdot C)$ .  $\square$

**4.3.2 Diagram associated to a tropical curve.** Let  $h : \Gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{T}A$  be a genus  $g$  parametrized tropical curve in the class  $C$  passing through a stretched configuration of  $g$  points  $\mathcal{P}$ . We now describe how to get a marked pearl diagram from  $(\Gamma, h)$ . A component of the complement of the horizontal edges is called a *pearl*.

- The *pearl diagram*  $\mathfrak{D}$  of  $\Gamma$  is the graph whose vertices are the pearls, and two pearls are linked by an edge if an horizontal edge of  $\Gamma$  links both pearls.
- The weight  $w_e$  of an edge is its weight as an edge of  $\Gamma$ , *i.e.* the lattice length of the slope of  $h$  on it.
- The degree  $d_{\mathfrak{p}}$  of a pearl is its intersection number with the class  $\lambda_1 \otimes e_1$  inside  $\mathbb{T}A$ .
- The map to  $S^1$  is obtained from the projection on the first coordinate, and the orientation of the edges is chosen so that the map to  $S^1$  preserves the orientation.

*Remark 4.9.* Notice that a single pearl  $\mathfrak{p}$  does not represent a cycle in  $H_{1,1}(\mathbb{T}A)$  since the removing from horizontal edges prevents the balancing condition from being satisfied. Nevertheless, as the balancing condition is satisfied up to the horizontal direction  $e_1$ , the intersection between a pearl and  $\lambda_1 \otimes e_1$  is well-defined. This is why we only get a number instead of a vector.  $\blacklozenge$

*Example 4.10.* On Figure 5 we can see a tropical curve admitting a pearl decomposition and the corresponding pearl diagram.  $\diamond$




FIGURE 5. Example of a tropical curve and the associated pearl diagram.

The marked points of the point configuration  $\mathcal{P}$  induce a map  $\mathfrak{m} : \llbracket 1; p \rrbracket \rightarrow \mathfrak{D}$ , where  $p = g$  or  $g - 2$  is the number of marked points: a point is mapped to a pearl (resp. an edge) of  $\mathfrak{D}$  if it is mapped to the corresponding pearl (resp. elevator) of  $\Gamma$ . We now show that the obtained diagrams satisfy the requirements of the definition of a pearl diagram, that it is of genus  $g$  and bidegree  $(d_1, d_2)$ , and that  $\mathfrak{m}$  is a  $P$ -marking or a  $L$ -marking of  $\mathfrak{D}$ .

**4.3.3 Curves passing through  $g$  points.** The following proposition describes the shape of the tropical curves solution to the enumerative problem and proves that the pearl diagram obtained from the curve is indeed a pearl diagram of the right genus and bidegree.

**PROPOSITION 4.11.** *Let  $\Gamma$  be a genus  $g$  parametrized tropical curve in the class  $\begin{pmatrix} d_1 & a \\ 0 & d_2 \end{pmatrix}$  passing through the stretched configuration  $\mathcal{P}$  of  $g$  points. Let  $(\mathfrak{D}, \mathfrak{m})$  be the diagram obtained from  $h : \Gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{T}A$ , and  $\mathfrak{m}$  the marking induced by  $\mathcal{P}$ . We have the following:*

- (i) the pearls weights satisfy  $\sum_{\mathfrak{p}} d_{\mathfrak{p}} = d_2$ ,
- (ii) for each pearl  $\mathfrak{p}$  of  $\Gamma$ , the divergence is equal to 0,
- (iii) the degree of the map to  $S^1$  is  $d_1$ ,
- (iv) each elevator contains at most one marked point,
- (v) each pearl contains exactly one marked point,
- (vi) the pearls have genus 1, and they are homeomorphic to a circle.
- (vii) the genus satisfies  $g(\mathfrak{D}) = g$ ,
- (viii) the complement of the marked elevators is connected.

In particular  $\mathfrak{D}$  is a pearl diagram and  $\mathfrak{m}$  is a  $P$ -marking on it.

*Proof.* The proof is similar to the corresponding proof of [4].

- (i) The complement of the elevators in  $\mathbb{T}A$  is connected. Choose a path  $\gamma$  in the class  $\lambda_1$ . We get a path that realizes the class  $e_1 \otimes \lambda_1$ , whose intersection with  $\Gamma$  is  $d_2$ . The intersection of the path with a pearl is by definition its weight  $d_{\mathfrak{p}}$ . The elevators do not contribute to the intersection as they are directed by  $e_1$ . Thus, we have  $\sum_{\mathfrak{p}} d_{\mathfrak{p}} = d_2$ .
- (ii) The balancing condition ensures that the divergence of a pearl is equal to 0.
- (iii) We proceed similarly to (i) considering this time the intersection with a path in the class  $e_2 \otimes \lambda_2$  not intersecting any pearl.
- (iv) As  $\mathcal{P}$  is chosen generically, an elevator cannot contain more than one marked point.
- (v) If a pearl contained no marked point, it would be possible to translate it in the horizontal direction, leading to a 1-parameter family of curves passing through  $\mathcal{P}$ , contradicting the genericity assumption on  $\mathcal{P}$ . The two lemmas ensure that the slope of non-horizontal edges

is bounded, and the length of such edges is also bounded. Thus, as the configuration  $\mathcal{P}$  is stretched, it is not possible to pass from one point to another only passing through non-horizontal edges. Hence, pearls contain at most one marked point.

- (vi) If a pearl was of genus higher than 2, as it contains exactly one marked point, the complement of the marked points in  $\Gamma$  would contain a cycle. Hence, the genus of a pearl is 0 or 1. The genus cannot be 0, otherwise by balancing condition, all the edges in the pearl would have horizontal slope. Similarly, no edge of a pearl can be disconnecting, otherwise the balancing condition would also lead to a horizontal slope.
- (vii) As the pearls are of genus 1, we have that  $b_1(\mathfrak{D}) + |V(\mathfrak{D})| = g$ .
- (viii) As the complement of  $\mathcal{P}$  in  $\Gamma$  is connected (and without cycles), it is also true for  $\mathfrak{D}$ : the marked points on the pearls only cut the cycles hidden in the pearls.

□

4.3.4 *Curves in a linear system.* The following proposition is analog to Proposition 4.11 for the case of curves in a linear system.

PROPOSITION 4.12. *Let  $\Gamma$  be a genus  $g$  parametrized tropical curve in the class  $\begin{pmatrix} d_1 & a \\ 0 & d_2 \end{pmatrix}$  and fixed linear system passing through the doubly stretched configuration  $\mathcal{P}$  of  $g - 2$  points. Let  $(\mathfrak{D}, \mathfrak{m})$  be the diagram obtained from  $h : \Gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{T}A$ , and  $\mathfrak{m}$  the marking induced by  $\mathcal{P}$ . We have the following:*

- (i) *the pearls weights satisfy  $\sum_{\mathfrak{p}} d_{\mathfrak{p}} = d_2$ ,*
- (ii) *for each pearl  $\mathfrak{p}$  of  $\Gamma$ , the divergence is equal to 0,*
- (iii) *the degree of the map to  $S^1$  is  $d_1$ ,*
- (iv) *each elevator contains at most one marked point,*
- (v) *the pearls have genus 1, they are homeomorphic to a circle, every pearl except one is marked, and the unmarked pearl lies in the region between the marked points labelled  $g - 2$  and 1,*
- (vi) *the genus satisfies  $g(\mathfrak{D}) = g$ ,*
- (vii) *the complement of the marked elevators is connected and contains exactly one cycle whose projection to  $S^1$  realizes a non-zero homology class inside  $H_1(S^1, \mathbb{Z})$ .*

*In particular  $\mathfrak{D}$  is a pearl diagram and  $\mathfrak{m}$  is a  $L$ -marking on it.*

Remark 4.13. The cycle in the complement of the marked points plays a role analog to the genus 2 graph  $\Sigma$  on which  $\Gamma \setminus \mathcal{P}$  retracts. Similarly to the notation  $\Lambda_{\Gamma}^{\Sigma}$ , we denote by  $\Lambda_{\mathfrak{D}}^{\mathfrak{m}}$  the class realized by the cycle inside  $H_1(S^1, \mathbb{Z})$ . ♦

*Proof.* The proof of (i), (ii), (iii), (iv) and (vi) is identical to the Proposition 5.2. We only treat the remaining points.

- (v) The boundary of the hexagon  $\Gamma_0$  with suitable weights is a genus 2 curve inside  $\mathbb{T}A$ . Choose a path in  $\mathbb{T}A$  realizing the homology class  $\lambda_1$ . The linear system conditions implies that the divisor  $\Gamma - \Gamma_0$ , is represented by an element of  $M \subset \Lambda_{\mathbb{R}}^*$ . Thus, the sum of the moments of the edges intersected by the path is 0 mod  $L$ . If all the pearls are in the zone  $[0; \max x_i]$ , this is not possible since  $0 < \sum d_{\mathfrak{p}} x_i \ll L$ . Thus, there is at least one pearl whose first coordinate is of size comparable with  $L$ . That pearl cannot be marked since there is no point of  $\mathcal{P}$  in this zone. Moreover, if there was another unmarked pearl, it would be possible to translate

them horizontally without changing the linear system, contradicting the genericity of the constraints. Thus, every other pearl is marked.

A pearl cannot be of genus higher than 2 otherwise it would contain a contractible cycle. It cannot be of genus 0 nor have disconnecting edges by balancing condition either.

- (vii) The type of the marking comes from the shape of the tropical solutions: the complement of the marked points retracts on a genus 2 subgraph  $\Sigma$  whose loops span a rank 2 lattice inside  $H_1(\mathbb{T}A)$ . The subgraph  $\Sigma$  contains the unmarked pearl, and it has to contain an additional loop going around the horizontal direction at least once.

□

*Remark 4.14.* A tropical curve in the class  $\begin{pmatrix} d_1 & a \\ 0 & d_2 \end{pmatrix}$  yields a pearl diagram of bidegree  $(d_1, d_2)$ . It is not possible to recover  $a$  from the diagram: it comes as the sum of the horizontal coordinates of the edges intersected by an horizontal loops. The edges contributing to this sum are hidden inside the pearls, and the diagram data is not enough to recover them. In fact, as the abelian surface comes with a choice of polarization, it already knows what kind of curves it is allowed to contain: to some extent, one could say that the choice of the surface and the pair  $(d_1, d_2)$  already know the value of  $a$ . ♦

## 5. From Pearl diagrams to tropical curves: curves passing through $g$ points

This section is comprised of three steps. The first section is quite technical and consists in recovering the set of tropical curves encoded in a fixed pearl diagram. With this data, in the next section, we derive different multiplicities for the pearl diagrams, so that their count using these multiplicities give the desired invariants. Last, we use these formulas to prove multiple cover formulas which give a far more efficient way to compute the invariants.

### 5.1 Recovering the tropical curves

The technical part at the core of the computations is given by Proposition 5.2. It recovers the tropical curves in a class  $\begin{pmatrix} d_1 & a \\ 0 & d_2 \end{pmatrix}$  encoded by a fixed marked diagram  $\mathfrak{D}$ .

*Remark 5.1.* A pearl diagram  $\mathfrak{D}$  of bidegree  $(d_1, d_2)$  has a gcd: the gcd of the edge weights  $w_e$  and the pearl degrees  $d_p$ . For a fixed  $a$ , the diagram encodes tropical curves in a class  $\begin{pmatrix} d_1 & a \\ 0 & d_2 \end{pmatrix}$ . The same diagrams can be used for different values of  $a$ . These curves also have a gcd that necessarily divides the gcd of  $\mathfrak{D}$ , but might not be equal or take any value. For instance, if  $a = 1$ , all the curves are primitive although the diagram might not be. ♦

**PROPOSITION 5.2.** *Let  $\mathfrak{D}$  be a fixed  $P$ -marked diagram. Let  $(k_p)$  be a family such that  $k_p | d_p$  for each pearl  $p$ . Each such choice is called loop data. If  $\gcd(w_e, k_p)$  divides  $a$ , the diagram gives a number of genus  $g$  tropical curves in the class  $\begin{pmatrix} d_1 & a \\ 0 & d_2 \end{pmatrix}$  and passing through the stretched configuration  $\mathcal{P}$  equal to*

$$\gcd(w_e, k_p) \prod_p k_p^{\text{val}_p - 1} \prod_{e \in E_{um}} w_e,$$

where  $E_{um}$  is the set of unmarked edges of  $\mathfrak{D}$ . Moreover, the classical and refined multiplicities  $m_\Gamma$  and  $m_\Gamma^q$  of these curves are all the same and their respective values are

$$m_\Gamma = \prod_p \left( \frac{d_p}{k_p} \right)^{\text{val}_p} \prod_e w_e^2 \text{ and } m_\Gamma^q = \prod_p \prod_{e \ni p} \left[ \frac{d_p}{k_p} w_e \right]_-,$$

where we have set  $[\alpha]_- = q^{\alpha/2} - q^{-\alpha/2}$ . If  $\gcd(w_e, k_p)$  does not divide  $a$ , the number of curves is 0.

*Remark 5.3.* The loop data  $k_p$  corresponds to the number of rounds that the pearl  $p$  makes around the vertical direction.  $\blacklozenge$

*Remark 5.4.* Notice that the pearl diagram approach does not allow to easily recover the gcd of the tropical curves encoded in the diagram. Some of the curves might be primitive, but maybe not all of them. This a priori justifies the use of the usual refined multiplicity  $m_\Gamma^q$  since we do not have a grasp on the gcd of the curves. The count of solutions using the complex multiplicity  $\delta_\Gamma m_\Gamma$  or the second refined multiplicity  $M_\Gamma$  can be recovered by making a disjunction over the value of gcd. It is the content of the next section.  $\blacklozenge$

*Idea of proof.* To recover curves from a  $P$ -marked pearl diagram  $\mathfrak{D}$ , one proceeds as follows.

- First, each pearl is a circle that goes around the vertical direction, realizing some class  $k_p \lambda_2$ , where  $k_p | d_p$ . It can thus be lifted under a degree  $k_p$  cover that makes only one round around the vertical direction.
- Then, the complement of the marked edges inside  $\mathfrak{D}$  is a tree. The position of each marked edge is fixed by a point constraint, and we can thus prune this tree to recover the curve. This step is analog to what happens in [4]. For a pearl all of whose adjacent edges but one are fixed, the pearl is recovered as follows. One chooses lifts of the edges under the covering map of degree  $k_p$  that makes the pearl do only one round, as in [4]. Using Menelaus relation between the edges, this determines the position of the remaining edge  $e$  up to  $w_e$ -torsion. Accounting for deck transformations and lift of the marked point on the pearl, there are  $k_p^{\text{val}_p - 1}$  lifting possibilities. Finishing the pruning, we arrive at a last step which is one of the following two points.
- Either we have to glue the two ends of an edge whose positions have been determined by the two adjacent pearls. The fact that  $C$  is realizable ensures that the two ends have the same moment, *i.e.* the same coordinate up to torsion. Hence, they might not share the same position if the weight is not 1.
- Or, we have to find a pearl all of whose adjacent edges are fixed. The fact that the class  $C$  is realizable ensures that it is possible to find a pearl completing the curve, ensuring that the Menelaus condition is satisfied mod  $l$ . However, when choosing lifts under the degree  $k_p$ -cover, the Menelaus relation has to be satisfied mod  $k_p l$ , so the lifts might not be chosen independently, and it might not be possible to choose them at all.

The last steps of the algorithm suggest that all the lifts should be chosen simultaneously. Such an information is contained in a map between real tori that we consider at the beginning of the proof.  $\square$

*Proof. Step A: formulation of the problem.* Let  $g_0 = b_1(\mathfrak{D})$  be the genus of the underlying graph to the pearl diagram  $\mathfrak{D}$ . As every pearl is marked and  $g = g_0 + |V(\mathfrak{D})|$ , there are  $g_0$  marked edges. Recovering the tropical curves is done using the following map: for an edge  $e$ , oriented so that the map to  $S^1$  preserves the orientation, let  $e_+$  and  $e_-$  be the pearls at its extremities,

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} : \bigoplus_e \mathbb{R}/k_{e_-} \mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbb{R}/k_{e_+} \mathbb{Z} &\longrightarrow \bigoplus_e \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \oplus \bigoplus_1^{g_0} \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \oplus \bigoplus_p \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \\ (x_e^-, x_e^+)_e &\longmapsto \left( (x_e^+ - x_e^-), (x_{e_i}^+)_i, \left( \frac{1}{k_p} \sum_{e \ni p} \pm w_e x_e^\pm \right)_p \right). \end{aligned}$$

The domain is comprised of summands corresponding to the vertical positions of the edges  $e$  of  $\mathfrak{D}$  in a fixed hexagonal fundamental domain for  $\mathbb{T}A$ , in the degree  $k_p$  covers of the adjacent pearls. The codomain is comprised of three terms:

- The first term is here to ensure that it is possible to glue the two ends of an edge: vertical position are the same. For an edge  $e$  of  $\mathfrak{D}$ , let  $d_e$  be the number of times that it intersects the boundary of the fundamental domain. The gluing amounts to the following condition:

$$x_e^+ - x_e^- = d_e d_2 \varepsilon.$$

- The second term is the vertical position of the edges containing a marked point: their position is fixed by the marked point.
- The last term ensures that the Menelaus condition is satisfied and that it is indeed possible to find a pearl with the chosen positions of edges. As the vertical position  $x_e^\pm$  are taken in  $\mathbb{R}/k_p l \mathbb{Z}$ , the sum divided by  $k_p$  is well-defined inside  $\mathbb{R}/l \mathbb{Z}$ . If we are looking for curves in the class  $C = \begin{pmatrix} d_1 & a \\ 0 & d_2 \end{pmatrix}$ , for a pearl of degree  $d_p$ , the Menelaus relation is as follows:

$$\frac{1}{k_p} \sum_{e \ni p} \pm w_e x_e^\pm \equiv \frac{d_p}{k_p} \left( \frac{a}{d_2} l + d_1 \varepsilon \right) \quad [l].$$

Thus, the number of tropical curves encoded in the diagram is equal to the number of preimages of a point  $\left( (d_e d_2 \varepsilon), (y_i), \left( \frac{d_p}{k_p} \left( \frac{a}{d_2} l + d_1 \varepsilon \right) \right) \right)$ , where  $(y_i)$  are chosen generically. To do this, we have to determine if this point lies in the image of the map, and what is the number of preimages of a point in the image.

**Step B: Image of the map  $\Phi_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}}$  between tori.** The map  $\Phi_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}}$  can be written  $\Phi \otimes \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$  where  $\Phi$  is the following lattice map

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi : \bigoplus_e \mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbb{Z} &\longrightarrow \bigoplus_e \mathbb{Z} \oplus \bigoplus_1^{g_0} \mathbb{Z} \oplus \bigoplus_p \mathbb{Z} \\ (x_e^-, x_e^+)_e &\longmapsto \left( (k_{e_+} x_e^+ - k_{e_-} x_e^-), (k_{e_i} x_{e_i}^+)_i, \left( \sum_{e \ni p} \pm w_e x_e^\pm \right)_p \right). \end{aligned}$$

In fact,  $\Phi_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}}$  is a map between two real tori, and  $\Phi$  is the map between their first homology groups. The domain has rank  $2|E(\mathfrak{D})|$  while the codomain has rank  $|E(\mathfrak{D})| + g_0 + |V(\mathfrak{D})|$ . The difference is  $g_0 + |V(\mathfrak{D})| - |E(\mathfrak{D})| = 1$ . It means that this map cannot be surjective. There is indeed a relation between the first and third coordinates of the image: let us consider the morphism

$$\psi : ((y_e), (y_i), (\mu_p)) \in (\mathbb{R}/l \mathbb{Z})^{|E(\mathfrak{D})| + g_0 + |V(\mathfrak{D})|} \longmapsto - \sum_e \frac{w_e}{\gcd(w_e, k_p)} y_e + \sum_p \frac{k_p}{\gcd(w_e, k_p)} \mu_p \in \mathbb{R}/l \mathbb{Z}.$$

We have that  $\text{Im } \Phi_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \subset \ker \psi$ . Geometrically, it means the following: interpreting  $y_e$  as flows on the graph, the sum of the flows on the edges is equal to the sum of the divergence at the pearls. As  $\psi$  is primitive, its kernel is a subtorus of  $(\mathbb{R}/l \mathbb{Z})^{|E(\mathfrak{D})| + g_0 + |V(\mathfrak{D})|}$ . Thus, as  $\Phi_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}}$  is a group morphism, we have equality. To determine if  $\left( (d_e d_2 \varepsilon), (y_i), \left( \frac{d_p}{k_p} \left( \frac{a}{d_2} l + d_1 \varepsilon \right) \right) \right)$  belongs to



Im  $\Phi_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}}$ , we just have to check that its image under  $\psi$  is 0:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \psi\left((d_e d_2 \varepsilon), (y_i), \left(\frac{d_p}{k_p} \left(\frac{a}{d_2} l + d_1 \varepsilon\right)\right)\right) \\
 & \equiv - \sum_e \frac{w_e}{\gcd(w_e, k_p)} d_e d_2 \varepsilon + \sum_p \frac{k_p}{\gcd(w_e, k_p)} \frac{d_p}{k_p} \left(\frac{a}{d_2} l + d_1 \varepsilon\right) \quad [l] \\
 & \equiv - \frac{d_1 d_2 \varepsilon}{\gcd(w_e, k_p)} + \frac{a}{\gcd(w_e, k_p)} l + \frac{d_2 d_1 \varepsilon}{\gcd(w_e, k_p)} \quad [l] \\
 & \equiv \frac{a}{\gcd(w_e, k_p)} l \quad [l].
 \end{aligned}$$

Thus, there are curves in the class  $\begin{pmatrix} d_1 & a \\ 0 & d_2 \end{pmatrix}$  is and only if  $\gcd(w_e, k_p) | a$ .

**Step C: degree of  $\Phi_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}}$ .** The map  $\Phi_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}}$  between real tori is a cover of its image. The number of preimages of an element, *i.e.* the degree of the cover, equals to the integral length of the generator of the image of  $\Lambda^{\text{top}} \mathbb{Z}^{2|E(\mathfrak{D})|}$ . The latter is obtained by taking the gcd of the maximal minors of the matrix of  $\Phi$  that we now compute. The complement of the marked edges inside  $\mathfrak{D}$  is a tree. The non-zero minors are obtained by deleting a row corresponding to an edge of  $\mathfrak{D}$  or a pearl of  $\mathfrak{D}$ . The computation of the corresponding minor is then carried out as explained above by pruning the tree with a source chosen to be the forgotten edge or pearl. Before carrying out the computation, let us replace the block

$$\begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline 0 & k_{e_+} \\ \hline -k_{e_-} & k_{e_+} \\ \hline \end{array} \text{ corresponding to a marked edge, by } \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline 0 & k_{e_+} \\ \hline -k_{e_-} & 0 \\ \hline \end{array},$$

where rows correspond to the evaluation at the marked point and the edge. This is done by adding one row to the other. Geometrically, it amounts to cut the diagram at the marked edge and replace it by two half-edges both of whose position are evaluated by  $\Phi$ . We obtain a tree  $\mathcal{T}$ . Let us now choose a minor. We then alternate applications of the steps 1 and 2 below. If the minor obtained by forgetting an edge (*resp.* a pearl), we finish by applying the third step (*resp.* fourth).

- 1) First, we develop with respect to each pair of rows corresponding to a marked edge (only  $2g_0 - 1$  rows if we are considering a minor associated to one of these rows). The elements in the above blocks are the only non-zero elements in these rows. Thus, we can develop and this multiplies the determinant by a product of  $k_p$  for each leaf of the tree  $\mathcal{T}$ . We have pruned the leafs of the tree.
- 2) Then, we continue by pruning the pearls. If a pearl  $\mathfrak{p}$  is now a leaf of the tree (after the first step of pruning), there is a unique adjacent edge, denoted by  $e_p$ . The only non-zero element in the row relative to  $\mathfrak{p}$  is  $w_{e_p}$ , since the columns where we had non-zero terms have been deleted in the previous step. As this is the only non-zero element in the row, we can develop with respect to the row. This multiplies the determinant by  $w_{e_p}$ . Then, the row corresponding to  $e_p$  has a unique non-zero element and we are back to the first step.
- 3) During the process, we get  $\prod_p k_p^{\text{val}_p - 1}$  and  $\prod_{e \in E_{um}} w_e$ . If the forgotten row corresponds to an edge,  $e_0$  of weight  $w_{e_0}$ , the last two steps are pruning of the adjacent pearls. Thus, we get

$$w_{e_0} \prod_p k_p^{\text{val}_p - 1} \prod_{e \in E_{um}} w_e.$$

Notice that  $w_{e_0}$  appears twice if the edge is unmarked, because the pruning process comes from the two sides of the edge, and only once for a marked edge, since it corresponds to a leaf of  $\mathcal{T}$ .

- 4) If we are left with a pearl  $\mathfrak{p}_0$  all of whose adjacent edges have to be pruned, applying the first step yields  $k_{\mathfrak{p}_0}^{\text{valp}_0}$  and there is nothing left in the minor. Its value is thus

$$k_{\mathfrak{p}_0} \prod_{\mathfrak{p}} k_{\mathfrak{p}}^{\text{valp}-1} \prod_{e \in E_{um}} w_e.$$

In the end, taking the gcd, we get the result

$$\gcd(w_e, k_{\mathfrak{p}}) \prod_{\mathfrak{p}} k_{\mathfrak{p}}^{\text{valp}-1} \prod_{e \in E_{um}} w_e.$$

To get the number of tropical curves, one has to divide by the deck transformations at each pearl since translation by a torsion element yields the same tropical curve, but we also have to account for the position of the marked point located on each pearl, that can have  $k_{\mathfrak{p}}$  different values. Both cancel each other. Therefore, the above formula gives the right result.

**Step D: multiplicities of the tropical curves.** To finish, we deal with the multiplicities of the tropical curve encoded by the diagram. A vertex adjacent to an edge of weight  $w_e$  and belonging to a pearl with cover of degree  $k_{\mathfrak{p}}$  has multiplicity  $m_V = \frac{d_{\mathfrak{p}}}{k_{\mathfrak{p}}} w_e$ . The multiplicity  $m_{\Gamma}$  and  $m_{\Gamma}^q$  follow.  $\square$

*Remark 5.5.* The computation of the number of tropical curves encoded by the diagram looks like the computation of the complex multiplicity of a tropical curve inside an abelian surface because in both cases we need to take the gcd of the minors of an application. In a sense, that is because in both situation we are trying to put phases (*i.e.* elements of a circle  $S^1$ ) on the edges of a graph so that a Menelaus type relation is satisfied. In the tropical curve setting, these are complex numbers that encode the position of the nodes dual to the edges of the tropical curve. In the case of pearl diagrams, the phases correspond to the second coordinates inside the tropical abelian surface.  $\blacklozenge$

## 5.2 Recovering the invariants

5.2.1 *First diagram multiplicities.* For a diagram  $\mathfrak{D}$ , let  $m_a(\mathfrak{D})$  and  $M_a(\mathfrak{D})$  be the counts of curves in the class  $\begin{pmatrix} d_1 & a \\ 0 & d_2 \end{pmatrix}$  encoded in  $\mathfrak{D}$  with multiplicities  $m_{\Gamma}$  and  $m_{\Gamma}^q$  respectively. Following Proposition 5.2, we have the following.

COROLLARY 5.6. *One has*

$$m_a(\mathfrak{D}) = \sum_{\substack{k_{\mathfrak{p}} | d_{\mathfrak{p}} \\ \gcd(w_e, k_{\mathfrak{p}}) | a}} \gcd(k_{\mathfrak{p}}, w_e) \prod_{\mathfrak{p}} d_{\mathfrak{p}}^{\text{valp}-1} \frac{d_{\mathfrak{p}}}{k_{\mathfrak{p}}} \prod_e w_e^{2/3},$$

$$M_a(\mathfrak{D}) = \sum_{\substack{k_{\mathfrak{p}} | d_{\mathfrak{p}} \\ \gcd(w_e, k_{\mathfrak{p}}) | a}} \prod_{\mathfrak{p}} k_{\mathfrak{p}}^{\text{valp}-1} \left( \prod_{e \ni \mathfrak{p}} \left[ \frac{d_{\mathfrak{p}}}{k_{\mathfrak{p}}} w_e \right]_- \right) \prod_{e \in E_{um}} w_e,$$

where the “2/3” means 2 if the edge is marked, and 3 if unmarked. In particular, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 m_0(\mathfrak{D}) &= \sum_{k_p | d_p} \gcd(k_p, w_e) \prod_p d_p^{\text{val}_p - 1} \frac{d_p}{k_p} \prod_e w_e^{2/3}, \\
 M_0(\mathfrak{D}) &= \sum_{k_p | d_p} \gcd(w_e, k_p) \prod_p k_p^{\text{val}_p - 1} \left( \prod_{e \ni p} \left[ \frac{d_p}{k_p} w_e \right]_- \right) \prod_{e \in E_{um}} w_e. \\
 m_1(\mathfrak{D}) &= \sum_{\substack{k_p | d_p \\ \gcd(w_e, k_p) = 1}} \prod_p d_p^{\text{val}_p - 1} \frac{d_p}{k_p} \prod_e w_e^{2/3}, \\
 M_1(\mathfrak{D}) &= \sum_{\substack{k_p | d_p \\ \gcd(w_e, k_p) = 1}} \prod_p k_p^{\text{val}_p - 1} \left( \prod_{e \ni p} \left[ \frac{d_p}{k_p} w_e \right]_- \right) \prod_{e \in E_{um}} w_e.
 \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* The formula for  $m_a$  is obtained by making the sum over all loop data that contribute solutions of the product between the common multiplicity  $m_\Gamma$  of the tropical curves and their number. We then set  $a = 0$  or  $a = 1$  to get the specific formulas. We proceed similarly for  $M_a(\mathfrak{D})$ .  $\square$

**5.2.2 Auxiliary multiplicities.** The presence of a gcd makes the computation of the sums in the above proposition quite difficult. To help us give compact expressions of these multiplicities, we introduce the following auxiliary multiplicities where we fix the value of  $\gcd(w_e, k_p)$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
 \omega(\mathfrak{D}) &= \sum_{k_p | d_p} \prod_p d_p^{\text{val}_p - 1} \frac{d_p}{k_p} \prod_e w_e^{2/3}, & \Omega(\mathfrak{D}) &= \sum_{k_p | d_p} \prod_p k_p^{\text{val}_p - 1} \prod_{e \ni p} \left[ \frac{d_p}{k_p} w_e \right]_- \prod_{e \in E_{um}} w_e, \\
 \omega_k(\mathfrak{D}) &= \sum_{\substack{k_p | d_p \\ \gcd(w_e, k_p) = k}} \prod_p d_p^{\text{val}_p - 1} \frac{d_p}{k_p} \prod_e w_e^{2/3}, & \Omega_k(\mathfrak{D}) &= \sum_{\substack{k_p | d_p \\ \gcd(w_e, k_p) = k}} \prod_p k_p^{\text{val}_p - 1} \prod_{e \ni p} \left[ \frac{d_p}{k_p} w_e \right]_- \prod_{e \in E_{um}} w_e.
 \end{aligned}$$

*Remark 5.7.* These expressions do not have an enumerative interpretation in terms of counts of tropical curves encoded in the diagram  $\mathfrak{D}$ . Only  $\omega_1 = m_1$  and  $\Omega_1 = M_1$  correspond to the counts of curve in the class  $\begin{pmatrix} d_1 & 1 \\ 0 & d_2 \end{pmatrix}$ .  $\blacklozenge$

The following proposition relates these various multiplicities through the arithmetic convolution.

**PROPOSITION 5.8.** *We have the following expression:*

$$\omega(\mathfrak{D}) = \prod_p d_p^{\text{val}_p - 1} \sigma_1(d_p) \prod_e w_e^{2/3}, \quad \Omega(\mathfrak{D}) = \prod_p \left( \sum_{k | d_p} k^{\text{val}_p - 1} \prod_{e \ni p} \left[ \frac{d_p}{k} w_e \right]_- \right) \prod_{e \in E_{um}} w_e,$$

and identities:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \omega_k(\mathfrak{D}) &= k^{4g-5}\omega_1(\mathfrak{D}/k), & \Omega_k(\mathfrak{D}) &= k^{2g-3}\Omega_1(\mathfrak{D}/k)(q^k), \\
 \omega &= \epsilon_{4g-5} * \omega_1, & \Omega &= \epsilon_{2g-3} * \Omega_1, \\
 m_0 &= \epsilon_{4g-4} * \omega_1, & M_0 &= \epsilon_{2g-2} * \Omega_1,
 \end{aligned}$$

where the last two rows are equalities between functions on the set of diagrams, and the convolution is made over the divisors of a diagram, as explained in section 2.1.

*Proof.*    ◦ The first two identities are obtained by factorizing the  $\sum_{k_p|d_p}$  as a product over all the pearls  $\mathfrak{p}$ .

- The homogeneity relations are obtained as follows: if the loop data  $(k_p)$  has gcd with  $(w_e)$  equal to  $k$ , then we can write  $k_p = k\widehat{k}_p$ ,  $d_p = k\widehat{d}_p$  and  $w_e = k\widehat{w}_e$ , and we now have  $\gcd(\widehat{w}_e, \widehat{k}_p) = 1$ . As we have all divided by  $k$ , the the sum is over the loop data with gcd 1 for the diagram  $\mathfrak{D}/k$ . We just have to determine the power of  $k$  that comes out of the sum. Let  $(V, E)$  be the underlying graph to the diagram  $\mathfrak{D}$ . It has genus  $g_0$  and the complement of marked edges is connected without cycles, so that we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 |E| - |V| &= g_0 - 1, \\
 g_0 + |V| &= g, \\
 |E| - |E_{um}| &= g_0.
 \end{aligned}$$

We deduce that the exponent that comes out of a multiplication by  $k$  for  $\omega_k$  and  $\Omega_k$  are respectively

$$\begin{aligned}
 \sum_{\mathfrak{p}} (\text{val } \mathfrak{p} - 1) + |E_{um}| + 2|E| &= 4g - 5, \\
 \sum_{\mathfrak{p}} (\text{val } \mathfrak{p} - 1) + |E_{um}| &= 2g - 3.
 \end{aligned}$$

Hence,  $\omega_k(\mathfrak{D}) = k^{4g-5}\omega_1(\mathfrak{D}/k)$  and  $\Omega_k(\mathfrak{D}) = k^{2g-3}\Omega_1(\mathfrak{D}/k)(q^k)$ .

- Identities on the last two rows follow from a writing of the sums of  $\omega$ ,  $m_0$ ,  $\Omega$  and  $M_0$  in terms of the value of  $\gcd(w_e, k_p)$  and the homogeneity relation proven above:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \omega(\mathfrak{D}) &= \sum_{k|\mathfrak{D}} \omega_k(\mathfrak{D}) = \sum_{k|\mathfrak{D}} k^{4g-5}\omega_1(\mathfrak{D}/k) = \epsilon_{4g-5} * \omega_1(\mathfrak{D}), \\
 m_0(\mathfrak{D}) &= \sum_{k|\mathfrak{D}} k\omega_k(\mathfrak{D}) = \sum_{k|\mathfrak{D}} k^{4g-4}\omega_1(\mathfrak{D}/k) = \epsilon_{4g-4} * \omega_1(\mathfrak{D}), \\
 \Omega(\mathfrak{D}) &= \sum_{k|\mathfrak{D}} \Omega_k(\mathfrak{D}) = \sum_{k|\mathfrak{D}} k^{2g-3}\Omega_1(\mathfrak{D}/k)(q^k) = \epsilon_{2g-3} * \Omega_1(\mathfrak{D}), \\
 M_0(\mathfrak{D}) &= \sum_{k|\mathfrak{D}} k\Omega_k(\mathfrak{D}) = \sum_{k|\mathfrak{D}} k^{2g-2}\Omega_1(\mathfrak{D}/k)(q^k) = \epsilon_{2g-2} * \Omega_1(\mathfrak{D}).
 \end{aligned}$$

□

5.2.3 *Final multiplicities.* Using the homogeneity of the curve multiplicities, we have already seen the following convolution relations between the invariants counts of tropical curves, where the invariants are seen as functions on the set of curve classes:

$$M_{g,C} = \epsilon_{4g-4} * N_{g,C,1}, \quad N_{g,C} = \epsilon_{4g-3} * N_{g,C,1},$$

where the convolution is made over the divisors of the class  $C$ . As these relations come from a bijection between tropical curves, they can be passed to the level of diagrams, and be extended to the refined case. Let  $\mu$  (resp.  $\Upsilon$ ) be the count of curves in the diagram  $\mathfrak{D}$  using multiplicity  $\delta_\Gamma m_\Gamma$  (resp.  $M_\Gamma$ ). Similarly, let  $\mu_1$  (resp.  $\Upsilon_1$ ) be the count of *primitive* curves in the diagram  $\mathfrak{D}$  using multiplicity  $\delta_\Gamma m_\Gamma (= m_\Gamma)$  (resp.  $M_\Gamma (= m_\Gamma^q)$ ).

PROPOSITION 5.9. *We have the following identities:*

$$\begin{aligned} m_0 &= \epsilon_{4g-4} * \mu_1, & M_0(\mathfrak{D}) &= \sum_{k|\mathfrak{D}} \Upsilon_1(\mathfrak{D}/k)(q^{k^2}), \\ \mu &= \epsilon_{4g-3} * \mu_1, & \Upsilon &= (\epsilon_{2g-2}\varphi) * M_0. \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* A marked diagram  $\mathfrak{D}$  encodes a set  $\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{D})$  of tropical curves in the class  $\begin{pmatrix} d_1 & 0 \\ 0 & d_2 \end{pmatrix}$ . The count of these curves using the multiplicities  $m_\Gamma$  is by definition  $m_0(\mathfrak{D})$ , while their count using multiplicity  $m_\Gamma^q$  gives  $M_0(\mathfrak{D})$ . We can group together the tropical curves according to the value of their gcd: if  $\mathcal{C}_k(\mathfrak{D})$  denotes the subset of curves with gcd  $k$ , we have

$$m_0(\mathfrak{D}) = \sum_{k|\mathfrak{D}} \sum_{\Gamma \in \mathcal{C}_k(\mathfrak{D})} m_\Gamma, \quad M_0(\mathfrak{D}) = \sum_{k|\mathfrak{D}} \sum_{\Gamma \in \mathcal{C}_k(\mathfrak{D})} m_\Gamma^q.$$

Using the fact that  $m_{k\Gamma} = k^{4g-4} m_\Gamma$  and  $m_{k\Gamma}^q = m_\Gamma^q(q^{k^2})$ , we get

$$m_0(\mathfrak{D}) = \sum_{k|\mathfrak{D}} k^{4g-4} \sum_{\Gamma \in \mathcal{C}_1(\mathfrak{D}/k)} m_\Gamma, \quad M_0(\mathfrak{D}) = \sum_{k|\mathfrak{D}} \sum_{\Gamma \in \mathcal{C}_1(\mathfrak{D}/k)} m_\Gamma^q(q^{k^2}),$$

which give identities on the first row. The first identity on second row is proven same as the

identity for  $m_0$  multiplying by  $k$  the multiplicity. Concerning the last identity, one has:

$$\begin{aligned}
 (\epsilon_{2g-2}\varphi) * M_0(\mathfrak{D}) &= \sum_{k|\mathfrak{D}} k^{2g-2} \varphi(k) \left( \sum_{\Gamma \in \mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{D}/k)} m_{\Gamma}^q \right) (q^k) \\
 &= \sum_{k|\mathfrak{D}} k^{2g-2} \varphi(k) \left( \sum_{l|\mathfrak{D}/k} \sum_{\Gamma \in \mathcal{C}_l(\mathfrak{D}/k)} m_{\Gamma}^q \right) (q^k) \\
 &= \sum_{k|\mathfrak{D}} k^{2g-2} \varphi(k) \sum_{l|\mathfrak{D}/k} \sum_{\Gamma \in \mathcal{C}_1(\mathfrak{D}/kl)} m_{\Gamma}^q (q^{kl^2}) \\
 &= \sum_{\delta|\mathfrak{D}} \sum_{k|\delta} k^{2g-2} \varphi(k) \sum_{\Gamma \in \mathcal{C}_1(\mathfrak{D}/\delta)} m_{\Gamma}^q (q^{\delta^2/k}) \quad \text{with } \delta = kl \\
 &= \sum_{\delta|\mathfrak{D}} \sum_{\Gamma \in \mathcal{C}_{\delta}(\mathfrak{D})} \sum_{k|\delta} k^{2g-2} \varphi(k) m_{\Gamma}^q (q^{1/k}) \\
 &= \sum_{\Gamma \in \mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{D})} M_{\Gamma}.
 \end{aligned}$$

□

Making the sum over the genus  $g$  bidegree  $(d_1, d_2)$  diagrams, we get the following.

COROLLARY 5.10. *One has:*

$$\begin{aligned}
 M_{g,C} &= \epsilon_{4g-4} * N_{g,C,1}, & BG_{g,C} &= \sum_{k|C} BG_{g,C/k,1}(q^{k^2}), \\
 N_{g,C} &= \epsilon_{4g-3} * N_{g,C,1}, & R_{g,C} &= (\epsilon_{2g-2}\varphi) * BG_{g,C}.
 \end{aligned}$$

These relations mean that in the classical case as well as in the refined case, the knowing of one family of invariants is sufficient to determine the others.

*Remark 5.11.* From the above identities, we have simultaneously

$$m_0 = \epsilon_{4g-4} * m_1 \text{ and } m_0 = \epsilon_{4g-4} * \mu_1.$$

We thus deduce that  $m_1 = \mu_1$ , identity that may appear as a miracle because making the sum over all diagrams, it asserts that the count of *primitive* curves in an arbitrary class  $\begin{pmatrix} d_1 & 0 \\ 0 & d_2 \end{pmatrix}$  is equal to the number of curves of curves in the primitive class having same square:  $\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & d_1 d_2 \end{pmatrix}$ . In particular, it only depends on  $d_1 d_2$  and not on the divisibility of the class. ♦

We now give the main statement concerning the enumeration of curves via the diagrams.

THEOREM 5.12. *We have the following table giving a correspondence between the multiplicity with which to count the  $P$ -marked diagrams of genus  $g$  and bidegree  $(d_1, d_2)$ , and the invariants that their count give:*

Multiplicity	Invariant computed	Multiplicity	Invariant computed
$m_0$	$M_{g, \begin{pmatrix} d_1 & 0 \\ 0 & d_2 \end{pmatrix}}$	$M_0$	$BG_{g, \begin{pmatrix} d_1 & 0 \\ 0 & d_2 \end{pmatrix}}$
$m_1 (= \mu_1 = \omega_1)$	$M_{g, \begin{pmatrix} d_1 & 1 \\ 0 & d_2 \end{pmatrix}}$	$M_1$	$BG_{g, \begin{pmatrix} d_1 & 1 \\ 0 & d_2 \end{pmatrix}}$
$m_a$	$M_{g, \begin{pmatrix} d_1 & a \\ 0 & d_2 \end{pmatrix}}$	$M_a$	$BG_{g, \begin{pmatrix} d_1 & a \\ 0 & d_2 \end{pmatrix}}$
$\mu_1 (= m_1 = \omega_1)$	$N_{g, \begin{pmatrix} d_1 & 0 \\ 0 & d_2 \end{pmatrix}, 1}$	$\Upsilon_1$	$BG_{g, \begin{pmatrix} d_1 & 0 \\ 0 & d_2 \end{pmatrix}, 1}$
$\mu$	$N_{g, \begin{pmatrix} d_1 & 0 \\ 0 & d_2 \end{pmatrix}}$	$\Upsilon$	$R_{g, \begin{pmatrix} d_1 & 0 \\ 0 & d_2 \end{pmatrix}}$

*Proof.* The theorem follows from the previous discussion.  $\square$

### 5.3 The multiple cover formulas

5.3.1 *Tropical multiple cover formulas.* The diagram multiplicities give an algorithm to compute the invariants. However, the numerous relations between these multiplicities allow one to prove *multiple cover formulas* which once proven provide a far more effective algorithm for the computation of the invariants. One can thus forget about all the diagram considerations.

THEOREM 5.13. *We have the following multiple cover formulas*

$$\begin{aligned}
 (i) \quad M_{g, \begin{pmatrix} d_1 & 0 \\ 0 & d_2 \end{pmatrix}} &= \sum_{k|\gcd(d_1, d_2)} k^{4g-4} N_{g, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & d_1 d_2 / k^2 \end{pmatrix}}, \\
 (ii) \quad N_{g, \begin{pmatrix} d_1 & 0 \\ 0 & d_2 \end{pmatrix}} &= \sum_{k|\gcd(d_1, d_2)} k^{4g-3} N_{g, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & d_1 d_2 / k^2 \end{pmatrix}}, \\
 (iii) \quad BG_{g, \begin{pmatrix} d_1 & 0 \\ 0 & d_2 \end{pmatrix}} &= \sum_{k|\gcd(d_1, d_2)} k^{2g-2} BG_{g, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & d_1 d_2 / k^2 \end{pmatrix}}(q^k). \\
 (iv) \quad R_{g, \begin{pmatrix} d_1 & 0 \\ 0 & d_2 \end{pmatrix}} &= \sum_{k|\gcd(d_1, d_2)} k^{2g-1} R_{g, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & d_1 d_2 / k^2 \end{pmatrix}}(q^k).
 \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* (i) The first formula is obtained by making the sum over all diagrams of the identity  $m_0 = \epsilon_{4g-4} * m_1$ , which is true since  $m_1 = \omega_1$ . On the left side we get  $M_{g, \begin{pmatrix} d_1 & 0 \\ 0 & d_2 \end{pmatrix}}$  and on the right side  $N_{g, \begin{pmatrix} d_1/k & 1 \\ 0 & d_2/k \end{pmatrix}}$  for each summand in the convolution.

(ii) The second formula follows from the identity  $\mu_1 = m_1$ , which are both equal to  $\omega_1$ . The number of primitive curves  $N_{g, \begin{pmatrix} d_1 & 0 \\ 0 & d_2 \end{pmatrix}, 1}$  in the class  $\begin{pmatrix} d_1 & 0 \\ 0 & d_2 \end{pmatrix}$  is thus equal to  $N_{g, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & d_1 d_2 \end{pmatrix}}$ . The identity  $N_{g, C} = \epsilon_{4g-3} * N_{g, C, 1}$  yields the desired relation.

(iii) As  $M_1 = \Omega_1$ , the relation  $M_0 = \epsilon_{2g-2} * \Omega_1$  summed over all the pearl diagrams can already been interpreted as a multiple cover formula.

(iv) Last, following Proposition 5.9, one has the relation  $\Upsilon = (\epsilon_{2g-2}\varphi) * M_0$  among diagram multiplicities. Thus, one has

$$\Upsilon = (\epsilon_{2g-2}\varphi) * \epsilon_{2g-2} * M_1.$$

Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} (\epsilon_{2g-2}\varphi) * \epsilon_{2g-2}(d) &= \sum_{k|d} k^{2g-2} \varphi(k) \left(\frac{d}{k}\right)^{2g-2} \\ &= d^{2g-2} \sum_{k|d} \varphi(k) \\ &= d^{2g-1}. \end{aligned}$$

As multiplicity  $\Upsilon$  yields  $R_{g,C}$  and  $M_1$  yield the count for the primitive class, the sum over all pearl diagrams gives the second refined multiple cover formula. □

*Remark 5.14.* The refined invariants introduced in the first paper using the refined multiplicity  $\delta_\Gamma m_\Gamma^q$  can also be recovered by convoluting the previous functions. However, they do not satisfy such an easy cover formula. ◆

**5.3.2 Complex multiple cover formulas.** The multiple cover formulas proven in Theorem 5.13 are a particular case of the general multiple cover formula which is conjectured by G. Oberdieck in [29]. Oberdieck's formula has the following form.

**CONJECTURE 5.1.** *Let  $C$  be a curve class,  $\alpha$  be a tautological class on the moduli space of curves  $\mathcal{M}_{g,n}$  (a  $\psi$ -class or a  $\lambda$ -class for instance) and  $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n$  be cycles in an abelian surface such that  $g + n = \sum \deg \gamma_i + \deg \alpha$ . Then,*

$$\langle \alpha; \gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n \rangle_{g,C} = \sum_{k|C} k^{3g-3+n-\deg \alpha} \langle \alpha; \gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n \rangle_{g,(C/k)_{\text{prim}}},$$

where  $(C/k)_{\text{prim}}$  is a primitive class which has the same square as  $C/k$ , and the bracket denotes reduced Gromov-Witten invariants.

See [29] or [12] for more details. Namely, if  $C = \begin{pmatrix} d_1 & 0 \\ 0 & d_2 \end{pmatrix}$ , then  $(C/k)_{\text{prim}} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & d_1 d_2 / k^2 \end{pmatrix}$ . If we take  $\alpha = 1$ ,  $n = g$  and the  $\gamma_i$  to be point insertions, the multiple cover formula is equivalent to the relation (ii) in Theorem 5.13. We have thus prove the multiple cover formula for point insertions.

According to [7], the tropical refined invariants are related to the Gromov-Witten invariants with insertion of  $\lambda$ -classes, which are the Chern classes of the Hodge bundle. In the cover formula, we now take  $n = g_0$ ,  $g_0$  point insertions, and  $\alpha = \lambda_{g-g_0}$ . The multiple cover formula from [29] makes the following prediction:

$$\langle \lambda_{g-g_0}; \text{pt}^{g_0} \rangle_{g,C} = \sum_{k|C} k^{2g-3+2g_0} \langle \lambda_{g-g_0}; \text{pt}^{g_0} \rangle_{g,(C/k)_{\text{prim}}}.$$

For a fixed choice of  $C$  and  $g_0$ , let

$$\mathcal{R}_{g_0,C} = \sum_{g \geq g_0} \langle \lambda_{g-g_0}; \text{pt}^{g_0} \rangle_{g,C} u^{2g-2},$$

which is the generating series of the Gromov-Witten invariants with point insertions and a  $\lambda$ -class. Its first term is  $N_{g_0,C} u^{2g_0-2}$ . Multiplying by  $u^{2g-2}$  and making a sum over all  $g \geq g_0$  of



multiple cover relations, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{R}_{g_0, C}(u) &= \sum_{g \geq g_0} \sum_{k|C} k^{2g_0-1} \langle \lambda_{g-g_0}; \text{pt}^{g_0} \rangle_{g, (C/k)_{\text{prim}}} (ku)^{2g-2} \\ &= \sum_{k|C} k^{2g_0-1} \mathcal{R}_{g_0, (C/k)_{\text{prim}}}(ku).\end{aligned}$$

The generating series  $\mathcal{R}_{g_0, C}$  have been computed in [12] for primitive classes. It is possible to check that if  $C$  is a primitive class, we have in fact

$$\mathcal{R}_{g_0, C}(u) = (-1)^{g_0-1} R_{g_0, C}(q),$$

where  $q = e^{iu}$  is the same change of variable that occurs in [7]. The multiple cover formula is thus equivalent to the refined tropical multiple cover formula (iv) from Theorem 5.13. Thus, the multiple cover formula for invariants with a  $\lambda$ -class insertion is proven by Theorem 5.13 if we have the following conjecture analog to the main theorem of [7].

CONJECTURE 5.2. *Through the change of variable  $q = e^{iu}$ , one has*

$$\mathcal{R}_{g_0, C} = (-1)^{g_0-1} R_{g_0, C}(q).$$

## 6. From Pearl diagrams to tropical curves in a linear system

The statements in the case of curves in a linear system follow the exact same steps. Thus, we skip some of the details and refer to the previous section for more.

### 6.1 Recovering the tropical curves

PROPOSITION 6.1. *Let  $\mathfrak{D}$  be a  $L$ -marked pearl diagram of genus  $g$  and bidegree  $(d_1, d_2)$ . Let  $\Lambda_{\mathfrak{D}}^m \in \mathbb{N}^*$  be the class realized in  $H_1(S^1, \mathbb{Z})$  by the unique cycle in the complement of the marked points. Let  $k_{\mathfrak{p}}|d_{\mathfrak{p}}$  be a choice of loop data. If  $\gcd(w_e, k_{\mathfrak{p}})$  divides  $a$ , the diagram gives a number of genus  $g$  tropical curves in the class  $\begin{pmatrix} d_1 & a \\ 0 & d_2 \end{pmatrix}$  and fixed linear system passing through the stretched configuration  $\mathcal{P}$  equal to*

$$\gcd(w_e, k_{\mathfrak{p}}) \Lambda_{\mathfrak{D}}^m d_{\mathfrak{p}\infty} \frac{1}{k_{\mathfrak{p}\infty}} \prod_{\mathfrak{p}} k_{\mathfrak{p}}^{\text{val}_{\mathfrak{p}}-1} \prod_{e \in E_{um}} w_e.$$

Moreover, for each one of them, one has

$$\Lambda_{\Gamma}^{\Sigma} = \Lambda_{\mathfrak{D}}^m k_{\mathfrak{p}\infty}, \quad m_{\Gamma} = \prod_{\mathfrak{p}} \left( \frac{d_{\mathfrak{p}}}{k_{\mathfrak{p}}} \right)^{\text{val}_{\mathfrak{p}}} \prod_e w_e^2 \quad \text{and} \quad m_{\Gamma}^q = \prod_{\mathfrak{p}} \prod_{e \ni \mathfrak{p}} \left\lfloor \frac{d_{\mathfrak{p}}}{k_{\mathfrak{p}}} w_e \right\rfloor_-.$$

If  $\gcd(w_e, k_{\mathfrak{p}})$  does not divide  $a$ , there are no curve encoded by the diagram.

*Proof.* We proceed similarly as in the case for diagrams with  $P$ -marking to compute the number of tropical curves encoded in a diagram with a  $L$ -marking. Let  $\mathfrak{D}$  be a pearl diagram with a  $L$ -marking. For each pearl  $\mathfrak{p}$  of degree  $d_{\mathfrak{p}}$ , choose  $k_{\mathfrak{p}}|d_{\mathfrak{p}}$ , the number of rounds that the cycle in the pearl does.

**Step A: introduction of a lattice map.** The tropical curves encoded by  $\mathfrak{D}$  are determined

by the following map between real tori, playing the analog of  $\Phi_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} : \bigoplus_e \mathbb{R}/k_{e_-} \mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbb{R}/k_{e_+} \mathbb{Z} &\longrightarrow \bigoplus_e \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \oplus \bigoplus_1^{g_0-1} \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \oplus \bigoplus_p \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \\ (x_e^-, x_e^+)_e &\longmapsto \left( (x_e^+ - x_e^-), (x_{e_i}^+)_i, \left( \frac{1}{k_p} \sum_{e \ni p} \pm w_e x_e^\pm \right)_p, \sum_e w_e x_e^+ \right). \end{aligned}$$

As before, the domain corresponds to the position of the edges in the degree  $k_p$  cover associated to both adjacent pearls. The codomain corresponds to gluing of half-edges, marked point conditions, Menelaus relations for each pearl, and the linear system condition. This new last condition is obtained as follows. The linear system condition imposes two constraints:

- The first is on the sum of the moments of the edges intersected by a loop going in the horizontal direction. It says that the unmarked pearl  $\mathfrak{p}_\infty$  has  $d_{\mathfrak{p}_\infty}$  possible positions.
- The second is on the sum of the moments of the edges intersected by a loop going in the vertical direction. As the curves have a pearl decomposition, we can assume that this loop only intersects horizontal edges. For each intersected edge, we choose one of the adjacent pearls to measure its position, and we then make the sum of the moments.

The map  $\Psi_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}}$  is obtained from a map between lattices  $\Psi$  whose codomain has rank exactly one more as the rank of its domain. We want to determine the number of preimages of a point  $\mathbf{y} = \left( (d_e d_2 \varepsilon), (y_i), \left( \frac{d_p}{k_p} \left( \frac{a}{d_2} l + d_1 \varepsilon \right) \right), 0 \right)$ .

**Step B: Image of the map  $\Psi_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}}$  between tori.** As in the case of curves passing through  $g$  points, the image of  $\Psi_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}}$  is the kernel of the morphism  $\psi$ , and we get that  $\mathbf{y}$  is in the image of  $\Psi_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}}$  if and only if  $\gcd(w_e, k_p)$  divides  $a$ .

**Step C: degree of  $\Psi_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}}$ .** We now compute the number of tropical curves encoded in a  $L$ -marked diagram for a fixed choice of loop data. Notice that the unmarked pearl  $\mathfrak{p}_\infty$  has  $d_{\mathfrak{p}_\infty}$  possible positions because of the linear system condition. Up to multiplication by  $d_{\mathfrak{p}_\infty}$ , the number of tropical curves is given by the gcd of the minors of the lattice map  $\Psi$  associated to  $\Psi_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi : \bigoplus_e \mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbb{Z} &\longrightarrow \bigoplus_e \mathbb{Z} \oplus \bigoplus_1^{g_0-1} \mathbb{Z} \oplus \bigoplus_p \mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbb{Z} \\ (x_e^-, x_e^+)_e &\longmapsto \left( (k_{e_+} x_e^+ - k_{e_-} x_e^-), (k_{e_{i+}} x_{e_i}^+)_i, \left( \sum_{e \ni p} \pm w_e x_e^\pm \right)_p, \sum_e w_e k_{e_+} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Notice that if an edge goes around the horizontal direction several times, it might contribute several times to the last component of  $\Psi$ . Before starting, we do some little modifications to simplify the computation of the minors.

- We replace the block corresponding to a marked edge

$$\begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline 0 & k_{e_+} \\ \hline -k_{e_-} & k_{e_+} \\ \hline \end{array} \text{ by } \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline 0 & k_{e_+} \\ \hline -k_{e_-} & 0 \\ \hline \end{array},$$

using a row operation. This amounts to cut open the diagram at each marked point, and replace the marked edge by two half-edges with a point condition on each of them. The resulting graph contains a unique cycle, and branches attached to it, whose leaves have point condition. It is not a tree, but we still denote it by  $\mathcal{T}$ .

- The last row of  $\Psi$  comes from the intersection between a loop and several edges. The following operations, that can be seen as deforming the loop in its homology class, allow one to change the intersected edges.

- 1) Adding  $w_e$  times the row corresponding to an edge  $e$  intersected by the loop amounts to change the pearl that we use as coordinate for the edge.

- 2) Adding the row corresponding to a pearl amounts to make a loop pass around a pearl and trade an intersection point with an edge to one with every other edge adjacent to the pearl.

This way, adding a suitable linear combination of the first rows, we can assume that the loop only intersects a unique specified edge of  $\mathcal{T}$ 's cycle, and leafs of the branches of  $\mathcal{T}$ . These are thus the only coordinates having a non-zero coefficient in the last row.

- As  $\psi$  does not involve the last coordinate, the minor corresponding to the last row is 0, and this is not affected by the above modifications of the matrix.

The computation of the minors is now carried out through the same pruning algorithm. Let  $e_0$  be an edge (resp.  $e_0$  half-edge associated to a leaf, resp.  $\mathfrak{p}_0$  be a pearl), and consider the associated minor of  $\Psi$ . We proceed as in Step C of the proof of Proposition 5.2, alternating the steps 1) and 2) below, and concluding with step 3)4). The only difference is that the first iteration of step 2) is preceded by a unique application of step 2.0) to cut open the cycle of  $\mathcal{T}$ , developing with respect to the last row of the minor.

- 1) First, we develop with respect to the leafs of  $\mathcal{T}$ .
- 2.0) We can develop with respect to the last row. By assumption, the only non-zero elements from the last row come from the preferred edge in the cycle, and leafs of the branches. The columns corresponding to the leafs have all been deleted in the first step, unless we are considering the minor associated to one of the leafs, where there is another non-zero element in the row.
  - In the first case, we have the block whose columns correspond to the vertical position of half-edges, and rows are the last row (from linear system condition) and the row coming from the gluing condition of the two half-edges:

$$\begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline -k_{e_-} & k_{e_+} \\ \hline 0 & \Lambda_{\mathfrak{D}}^{\mathfrak{m}} w_e k_{e_+} \\ \hline \end{array},$$

since there are  $\Lambda_{\mathfrak{D}}^{\mathfrak{m}}$  intersection points each contributing  $w_e k_{e_+}$ . The edge plays the role of a marked edge, and it contributes  $\Lambda_{\mathfrak{D}}^{\mathfrak{m}} w_e k_{e_+} k_{e_-}$  to the determinant, after we cut it open.

- In the second case, where we consider the minor associated to one of the marked half-edges, we have a second non-zero term in the row. Fortunately, the associated cofactor is 0 for the following reasons. The morphism  $\psi$  gives a relation between the rows of  $\Psi$ , that involves coordinates associated to edge gluing, marked edges, and pearls Menelaus condition. When we consider the cofactor associated to the element in the last row and column from the marked half-edge, deleting the corresponding column amounts to put its coordinate equal to 0. The associated codomain coordinate can be deleted in the expression of  $\psi$ . Thus, we still get a non-trivial relation among the rows, and the cofactor is 0.

Now that the graph  $\mathcal{T}$  has been cut in its unique cycle, it becomes a tree.

- 2) We develop with respect to the pearls all of whose adjacent edges are fixed.
- 3)4) In the end, we get the following determinant:  $\Lambda_{\mathfrak{D}}^{\mathfrak{m}} w_{e_0} \prod_e w_e \prod_{\mathfrak{p}} k_{\mathfrak{p}}^{\text{val}_{\mathfrak{p}}-1}$  for an edge  $e_0$ , and  $\Lambda_{\mathfrak{D}}^{\mathfrak{m}} k_{\mathfrak{p}_0} \prod_e w_e \prod_{\mathfrak{p}} k_{\mathfrak{p}}^{\text{val}_{\mathfrak{p}}-1}$  for a pearl  $\mathfrak{p}_0$ . In both cases, the product is over the unmarked edges.

In total, we get that the gcd of the minors is equal to

$$\gcd(w_e, k_p) \Lambda_{\mathfrak{D}}^m \prod_{e \in E_{um}} w_e \prod_{\mathfrak{p}} k_p^{\text{val}_{\mathfrak{p}}-1}.$$

However, this time, we have to divide by the deck transformations of the unmarked pearl  $\mathfrak{p}_{\infty}$  since there is no marked point to distinguish the lifts that differ from a torsion element on this one.

**Step D: multiplicities of the tropical curves.** To conclude, we deal with the multiplicities of the tropical curves. As in the case of curves passing through  $g$  points, each vertex has multiplicity  $\frac{d_p}{k_p} w_e$ , yielding the formulas. Moreover, the graph  $\Sigma$  on which each curve retracts is provided by the unmarked pearl  $\mathfrak{p}_{\infty}$ , that contains a unique cycle realizing the class  $k_{\mathfrak{p}_{\infty}} \lambda_2$ , and the unique cycle of the complement of marked edges in the diagram  $\mathfrak{D}$ , realizing the class  $\Lambda_{\mathfrak{D}}^m$  inside  $H_1(S^1, \mathbb{Z})$ . We then have  $\Lambda_{\Gamma}^{\Sigma} = \Lambda_{\mathfrak{D}}^m k_{\mathfrak{p}_{\infty}}$ .  $\square$

## 6.2 Recovering the invariants

6.2.1 *First diagram multiplicities.* For a diagram  $\mathfrak{D}$ , let  $m_a^{FLS}(\mathfrak{D})$  and  $M_a^{FLS}(\mathfrak{D})$  be the count of curves in the class  $\begin{pmatrix} d_1 & a \\ 0 & d_2 \end{pmatrix}$  encoded in  $\mathfrak{D}$  with multiplicities  $\Lambda_{\Gamma}^{\Sigma} m_{\Gamma}$  and  $\Lambda_{\Gamma}^{\Sigma} m_{\Gamma}^q$  respectively. Following Proposition 6.1, we have the following.

COROLLARY 6.2. *One has*

$$\begin{aligned} m_a^{FLS}(\mathfrak{D}) &= \sum_{\substack{k_p | d_p \\ \gcd(w_e, k_p) | a}} \gcd(k_p, w_e) (\Lambda_{\mathfrak{D}}^m)^2 d_{\mathfrak{p}_{\infty}} \prod_{\mathfrak{p}} d_p^{\text{val}_{\mathfrak{p}}-1} \frac{d_p}{k_p} \prod_e w_e^{2/3}, \\ M_a^{FLS}(\mathfrak{D}) &= \sum_{\substack{k_p | d_p \\ \gcd(w_e, k_p) | a}} \gcd(k_p, w_e) (\Lambda_{\mathfrak{D}}^m)^2 d_{\mathfrak{p}_{\infty}} \prod_{\mathfrak{p}} k_p^{\text{val}_{\mathfrak{p}}-1} \left( \prod_{e \ni \mathfrak{p}} \left[ \frac{d_p}{k_p} w_e \right]_{-} \right) \prod_{e \in E_{um}} w_e. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, we have

$$\begin{aligned} m_0^{FLS}(\mathfrak{D}) &= \sum_{k_p | d_p} \gcd(k_p, w_e) (\Lambda_{\mathfrak{D}}^m)^2 d_{\mathfrak{p}_{\infty}} \prod_{\mathfrak{p}} d_p^{\text{val}_{\mathfrak{p}}-1} \frac{d_p}{k_p} \prod_e w_e^{2/3}, \\ M_0^{FLS}(\mathfrak{D}) &= \sum_{k_p | d_p} \gcd(k_p, w_e) (\Lambda_{\mathfrak{D}}^m)^2 d_{\mathfrak{p}_{\infty}} \prod_{\mathfrak{p}} k_p^{\text{val}_{\mathfrak{p}}-1} \left( \prod_{e \ni \mathfrak{p}} \left[ \frac{d_p}{k_p} w_e \right]_{-} \right) \prod_{e \in E_{um}} w_e, \\ m_1^{FLS}(\mathfrak{D}) &= \sum_{\substack{k_p | d_p \\ \gcd(w_e, k_p) = 1}} \gcd(k_p, w_e) (\Lambda_{\mathfrak{D}}^m)^2 d_{\mathfrak{p}_{\infty}} \prod_{\mathfrak{p}} d_p^{\text{val}_{\mathfrak{p}}-1} \frac{d_p}{k_p} \prod_e w_e^{2/3}, \\ M_1^{FLS}(\mathfrak{D}) &= \sum_{\substack{k_p | d_p \\ \gcd(w_e, k_p) = 1}} \gcd(k_p, w_e) (\Lambda_{\mathfrak{D}}^m)^2 d_{\mathfrak{p}_{\infty}} \prod_{\mathfrak{p}} k_p^{\text{val}_{\mathfrak{p}}-1} \left( \prod_{e \ni \mathfrak{p}} \left[ \frac{d_p}{k_p} w_e \right]_{-} \right) \prod_{e \in E_{um}} w_e. \end{aligned}$$

*Remark 6.3.* As in the case of curves passing through  $g$  points, the diagram do not enable an easy recovering of the gcd of the encoded curves, and we thus use the usual refined multiplicity  $m_{\Gamma}^q$  rather than  $M_{\Gamma}$ .  $\blacklozenge$

6.2.2 *Auxiliary multiplicities.* We introduce the auxiliary counts:

$$\begin{aligned}\omega^{FLS}(\mathfrak{D}) &= \sum_{k_p | d_p} (\Lambda_{\mathfrak{D}}^m)^2 d_{p\infty} \prod_p d_p^{\text{val}_p - 1} \frac{d_p}{k_p} \prod_e w_e^{2/3}, \\ \omega_k^{FLS}(\mathfrak{D}) &= \sum_{\substack{k_p | d_p \\ \gcd(w_e, k_p) = k}} (\Lambda_{\mathfrak{D}}^m)^2 d_{p\infty} \prod_p d_p^{\text{val}_p - 1} \frac{d_p}{k_p} \prod_e w_e^{2/3}, \\ \Omega^{FLS}(\mathfrak{D}) &= \sum_{k_p | d_p} (\Lambda_{\mathfrak{D}}^m)^2 d_{p\infty} \prod_p k_p^{\text{val}_p - 1} \prod_{e \ni p} \left[ \frac{d_p}{k_p} w_e \right]_- \prod_{e \in E_{um}} w_e, \\ \Omega_k^{FLS}(\mathfrak{D}) &= \sum_{\substack{k_p | d_p \\ \gcd(w_e, k_p) = k}} (\Lambda_{\mathfrak{D}}^m)^2 d_{p\infty} \prod_p k_p^{\text{val}_p - 1} \prod_{e \ni p} \left[ \frac{d_p}{k_p} w_e \right]_- \prod_{e \in E_{um}} w_e.\end{aligned}$$

Only the formulas  $\omega_1^{FLS} = m_1^{FLS}$  and  $\Omega_1^{FLS} = M_1^{FLS}$  have an enumerative interpretation as a count of curves, the other are just computation additives.

PROPOSITION 6.4. *Factorizing the products, we have the following expressions:*

$$\begin{aligned}\omega^{FLS}(\mathfrak{D}) &= (\Lambda_{\mathfrak{D}}^m)^2 d_{p\infty} \prod_p d_p^{\text{val}_p - 1} \sigma_1(d_p) \prod_e w_e^{2/3}, \\ \Omega^{FLS}(\mathfrak{D}) &= (\Lambda_{\mathfrak{D}}^m)^2 d_{p\infty} \prod_p \left( \sum_{k | d_p} k^{\text{val}_p - 1} \prod_{e \ni p} \left[ \frac{d_p}{k} w_e \right]_- \right) \prod_{e \in E_{um}} w_e,\end{aligned}$$

along with the following identities:

$$\begin{aligned}\omega_k^{FLS}(\mathfrak{D}) &= k^{4g-3} \omega_1(\mathfrak{D}/k), & \Omega_k^{FLS}(\mathfrak{D}) &= k^{2g-1} \Omega_1^{FLS}(\mathfrak{D}/k)(q^k), \\ \omega^{FLS} &= \epsilon_{4g-3} * \omega_1^{FLS}, & \Omega^{FLS} &= \epsilon_{2g-1} * \Omega_1^{FLS}, \\ m_0^{FLS} &= \epsilon_{4g-2} * \omega_1^{FLS}, & M_0^{FLS} &= \epsilon_{2g} * \Omega_1^{FLS},\end{aligned}$$

where the last two rows are convolutions on the set of functions on diagrams.

*Proof.* Only the homogeneity relation has a slightly different proof in this case: if  $(V, E)$  is the underlying graph to the diagram  $\mathfrak{D}$ , as there are  $g_0 - 1$  marked edges, we have this time

$$\begin{cases} |E| - |V| = g_0 - 1, \\ g_0 + |V| = g, \\ |E| - |E_{um}| = g_0 - 1, \end{cases},$$

and thus

$$\begin{aligned}1 + \sum_p (\text{val}_p - 1) + |E_{um}| + 2|E| &= 4g - 3, \\ 1 + \sum_p (\text{val}_p - 1) + |E_{um}| &= 2g - 1.\end{aligned}$$

The other relations are proved as in the case of curves passing through  $g$  points.  $\square$

6.2.3 *Final multiplicities.* Using the homogeneity of the curve multiplicities, we have the following relations between the refined invariants for counts of tropical curves in a fixed linear

system:

$$M_{g,C}^{FLS} = \epsilon_{4g-2} * N_{g,C,1}^{FLS}, \quad N_{g,C}^{FLS} = \epsilon_{4g-1} * N_{g,C,1}^{FLS},$$

where the convolution is made over the divisors of the class  $C$ . The above equalities come from a bijection at the level of the tropical curves and can be passed to the pearl diagram level and have refined analogs. Let  $\mu^{FLS}$  (resp.  $\Upsilon^{FLS}$ ) be the count of curves in the diagram  $\mathfrak{D}$  using multiplicity  $\delta_\Gamma \Lambda_\Gamma^\Sigma m_\Gamma$  (resp.  $\Lambda_\Gamma^\Sigma M_\Gamma$ ). Similarly, let  $\mu_1^{FLS}$  (resp.  $\Upsilon_1^{FLS}$ ) be the count of *primitive* curves in the diagram  $\mathfrak{D}$  using the same multiplicity.

PROPOSITION 6.5. *We have the following identities:*

$$\begin{aligned} m_0^{FLS} &= \epsilon_{4g-2} * \mu_1^{FLS}, & M_0^{FLS}(\mathfrak{D}) &= \sum_{k|\mathfrak{D}} k^2 \Upsilon_1^{FLS}(\mathfrak{D}/k)(q^{k^2}), \\ \mu^{FLS}(\mathfrak{D}) &= \epsilon_{4g-1} * \mu_1^{FLS}(\mathfrak{D}), & \Upsilon^{FLS} &= (\epsilon_{2g}\varphi) * M_0^{FLS}. \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* The proof is verbatim to the case of curves passing through  $g$  points.  $\square$

Making the sum over all the genus  $g$  bidegree  $(d_1, d_2)$  pearl diagrams, we get the following.

COROLLARY 6.6. *One has*

$$\begin{aligned} M_{g,C}^{FLS} &= \epsilon_{4g-2} * N_{g,C,1}, & BG_{g,C}^{FLS} &= \sum_{k|C} BG_{g,C/k,1}(q^{k^2}), \\ N_{g,C}^{FLS} &= \epsilon_{4g-1} * N_{g,C,1}, & R_{g,C}^{FLS} &= (\epsilon_{2g}\varphi) * BG_{g,C}. \end{aligned}$$

Remark 6.7. As in the  $g$  point case, we have a miraculous identity  $\mu_1^{FLS} = m_1^{FLS} (= \omega_1^{FLS})$  that asserts that the number of primitive curve solution of the problem in a class  $C$  does not depend on the divisibility of the class: it is equal to the number for a primitive class.  $\blacklozenge$

THEOREM 6.8. *We have the following table giving a correspondence between the multiplicity with which we count the  $L$ -marked diagrams of genus  $g$  and bidegree  $(d_1, d_2)$ , and the invariants that their count give:*

Multiplicity	Invariant computed	Multiplicity	Invariant computed
$m_0^{FLS}$	$M_{g, \binom{d_1}{0} \binom{0}{d_2}}^{FLS}$	$M_0^{FLS}$	$BG_{g, \binom{d_1}{0} \binom{0}{d_2}}^{FLS}$
$m_1^{FLS} (= \mu_1^{FLS})$	$M_{g, \binom{d_1}{0} \binom{1}{d_2}}^{FLS}$	$M_1^{FLS}$	$BG_{g, \binom{d_1}{0} \binom{1}{d_2}}^{FLS}$
$m_a^{FLS}$	$M_{g, \binom{d_1}{0} \binom{a}{d_2}}^{FLS}$	$M_a^{FLS}$	$BG_{g, \binom{d_1}{0} \binom{a}{d_2}}^{FLS}$
$\mu_1^{FLS} (= m_1^{FLS})$	$N_{g, \binom{d_1}{0} \binom{0}{d_2}, 1}^{FLS}$	$\Upsilon_1^{FLS}$	$BG_{g, \binom{d_1}{0} \binom{0}{d_2}, 1}^{FLS}$
$\mu^{FLS}$	$N_{g, \binom{d_1}{0} \binom{0}{d_2}}^{FLS}$	$\Upsilon^{FLS}$	$R_{g, \binom{d_1}{0} \binom{0}{d_2}}^{FLS}$

### 6.3 The multiple cover formulas

6.3.1 *Tropical multiple cover formulas.* From the identities between the pearl diagram multiplicities, we deduce the following cover formulas.

THEOREM 6.9. *We have the following multiple cover formulas:*

$$\begin{aligned}
 (i) \quad M_{g, \begin{pmatrix} d_1 & 0 \\ 0 & d_2 \end{pmatrix}}^{FLS} &= \sum_{k|\gcd(d_1, d_2)} k^{4g-2} N_{g, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & d_1 d_2 / k^2 \end{pmatrix}}^{FLS}, \\
 (ii) \quad N_{g, \begin{pmatrix} d_1 & 0 \\ 0 & d_2 \end{pmatrix}}^{FLS} &= \sum_{k|\gcd(d_1, d_2)} k^{4g-1} N_{g, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & d_1 d_2 / k^2 \end{pmatrix}}^{FLS}, \\
 (iii) \quad BG_{g, \begin{pmatrix} d_1 & 0 \\ 0 & d_2 \end{pmatrix}}^{FLS} &= \sum_{k|\gcd(d_1, d_2)} k^{2g} BG_{g, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & d_1 d_2 / k^2 \end{pmatrix}}^{FLS} (q^k), \\
 (iv) \quad R_{g, \begin{pmatrix} d_1 & 0 \\ 0 & d_2 \end{pmatrix}}^{FLS} &= \sum_{k|\gcd(d_1, d_2)} k^{2g+1} R_{g, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & d_1 d_2 / k^2 \end{pmatrix}}^{FLS} (q^k).
 \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* (i) As we have  $m_1^{FLS} = \omega_1^{FLS}$ , the identity is obtained by making the sum over all diagrams of the identity  $m_0^{FLS} = \epsilon_{4g-2} * m_1^{FLS}$ .

(ii) As we have  $\mu_1^{FLS} = m_1^{FLS}$ , which are both equal to  $\omega_1^{FLS}$ , the relation  $\mu^{FLS} = \epsilon_{4g-1} * m_1^{FLS}$  provides the result by making the sum over all pearl diagrams yields the relation.

(iii) As  $M_1^{FLS} = \Omega_1^{FLS}$ , the identity  $M_0 = \epsilon_{2g} * M_1^{FLS}$  yields the relation by making the sum over all diagrams.

(iv) The last formula is obtained as in the  $g$  points case.  $\square$

6.3.2 *Complex multiple cover formulas.* In [11], it is proven that the linear system condition can be replaced by four insertions of 1-cycles whose classes form a basis of the homology of  $\mathbb{C}A$ . Taking  $n = g + 2$ ,  $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_{g-2}$  to be points and the four remaining cycles to be such a basis, the multiple cover formula predicts

$$\mathcal{N}_{g, \begin{pmatrix} d_1 & 0 \\ 0 & d_2 \end{pmatrix}}^{FLS} = \sum_{k|\gcd(d_1, d_2)} k^{4g-1} \mathcal{N}_{g, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & d_1 d_2 / k^2 \end{pmatrix}}^{FLS}.$$

By the correspondence theorem asserting that  $N_{g, C}^{FLS} = \mathcal{N}_{g, C}^{FLS}$ , it is equivalent to relation (ii) in Theorem 6.9, which proves the multiple cover formula for this particular case.

We now insert a  $\lambda$ -class, and take  $g_0 - 2$  point insertions, and four 1-cycle insertions forming a basis of the first homology group. The multiple cover formula from [29] predicts

$$\langle \lambda_{g-g_0}; \text{pt}^{g_0-2} \rangle_{g, C}^{FLS} = \sum_{k|C} k^{2g-1+2g_0} \langle \lambda_{g-g_0}; \text{pt}^{g_0-2} \rangle_{g, (C/k)_{\text{prim}}}^{FLS}.$$

For a fixed choice of  $C$  and  $g_0$ , let

$$\mathcal{R}_{g_0, C}^{FLS} = \sum_{g \geq g_0} \langle \lambda_{g-g_0}; \text{pt}^{g_0-2} \rangle_{g, C}^{FLS} u^{2g-2},$$

which is the generating series of the Gromov-Witten invariants with point insertions and a  $\lambda$ -class. Its first term is  $N_{g_0, C}^{FLS} u^{2g_0-2}$ . As in the point case, the multiple cover formula predicts

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathcal{R}_{g_0, C}^{FLS}(u) &= \sum_{g \geq g_0} \sum_{k|C} k^{2g_0+1} \langle \lambda_{g-g_0}; \text{pt}^{g_0} \rangle_{g, (C/k)_{\text{prim}}}^{FLS} (ku)^{2g-2} \\
 &= \sum_{k|C} k^{2g_0+1} \mathcal{R}_{g_0, (C/k)_{\text{prim}}}^{FLS}(ku).
 \end{aligned}$$

The generating series  $\mathcal{R}_{g_0, C}^{FLS}$  have been computed in [12] for primitive classes and for any class if  $g_0 = 2$ . It is possible to check that if  $C$  is a primitive class, we have in fact

$$\mathcal{R}_{g_0, C}^{FLS}(u) = (-1)^{g_0-1} R_{g_0, C}(q),$$

where  $q = e^{iu}$  is the same change of variable that occurs in [7]. The same is true for any  $C$  if  $g_0 = 2$ . The multiple cover formula is thus equivalent to the refined tropical multiple cover formula (iv) from Theorem 5.13. Thus, the multiple cover formula for invariants with a  $\lambda$ -class insertion is proven by Theorem 5.13 if the following conjecture analog to the main theorem of [7] is true.

CONJECTURE 6.1. *Through the change of variable  $q = e^{iu}$ , one has*

$$\mathcal{R}_{g_0, C}^{FLS} = (-1)^{g_0-1} R_{g_0, C}^{FLS}(q).$$

## 7. Computations and regularity results

### 7.1 Computation in the primitive case

7.1.1 *Explicit formulas for the primitive invariants.* To compute the enumerative invariants, the multiple cover formula reduces their computation to the primitive classes. The generating series of the invariants  $N_{g, \binom{1 \ 0}{0 \ n}}$  and  $N_{g, \binom{1 \ 0}{0 \ n}}^{FLS}$  have already be computed in [11]. The result can be recovered using the pearl diagrams since the pearl diagram of bidegree  $(1, n)$  are especially simple.

PROPOSITION 7.1. *We have*

$$\begin{aligned} N_{g, \binom{1 \ 0}{0 \ n}} &= g \sum_{a_1 + \dots + a_{g-1} = n} \prod_{i=1}^{g-1} a_i \sigma_1(a_i), \\ R_{g, \binom{1 \ 0}{0 \ n}} &= g \sum_{a_1 + \dots + a_{g-1} = n} \prod_{i=1}^{g-1} \left( \sum_{k|a_i} \frac{a_i}{k_i} [k_i]_-^2 \right), \\ N_{g, \binom{1 \ 0}{0 \ n}}^{FLS} &= \sum_{a_1 + \dots + a_{g-1} = n} a_{g-1} \prod_{i=1}^{g-1} a_i \sigma_1(a_i), \\ R_{g, \binom{1 \ 0}{0 \ n}}^{FLS} &= \sum_{a_1 + \dots + a_{g-1} = n} a_{g-1} \prod_{i=1}^{g-1} \left( \sum_{k|a_i} \frac{a_i}{k_i} [k_i]_-^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* The pearl diagram of bidegree  $(1, n)$  and genus  $g$  are of the following form: they are a circle with  $g - 1$  pearls on it, and the sum of their degrees is  $n$ . If the diagram has a  $P$ -marking, one of the  $g$  points lie on an edge. Thus, we make  $g$  times the sum over the partitions of  $n$  in  $g - 1$  parts of the diagram multiplicities. The diagram being primitive, the latter are provided by the formulas for  $\omega$  and  $\Omega$ . If the diagram has a  $L$ -marking,  $g - 2$  pearls are marked and the last one is free. The counts are obtained by making the sum over the partition of  $n$  into  $g - 1$  parts of the diagram multiplicities, which are this time provided by the formula for  $\omega^{FLS}$  and  $\Omega^{FLS}$  respectively.  $\square$

*Remark 7.2.* Concretely, the tropical curves are as follows: an horizontal edge that meets  $g - 1$  loops that each make a certain number of loops around the vertical direction.  $\blacklozenge$



7.1.2 *Generating series of the classical primitive invariants.* If we denote by  $G_2(y) = -\frac{1}{24} + \sum_1^\infty \sigma_1(n)y^n$  the first Eisenstein series and  $D$  the differential operator  $y\frac{d}{dy}$ , the generating series of the classical invariants are

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_1^\infty N_{g, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & n \end{pmatrix}} y^n &= g(DG_2(y))^{g-1}, \\ \sum_1^\infty N_{g, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & n \end{pmatrix}}^{FLS} y^n &= (DG_2(y))^{g-2} D^2 G_2(y). \end{aligned}$$

We have recovered the expressions from [11].

7.1.3 *Generating series of the refined primitive invariants.* Setting

$$S(q, y) = \sum_{n=1}^\infty \sum_{k|n} \frac{n}{k} [k]_-^2 y^n,$$

where  $[k]_-^2 = q^k - 2 + q^{-k}$ , we get that the generating series of the refined invariants in the primitive case are

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_1^\infty R_{g, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & n \end{pmatrix}} y^n &= gS(q, y)^{g-1}, \\ \sum_1^\infty R_{g, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & n \end{pmatrix}}^{FLS} y^n &= S(q, y)^{g-2} y \frac{d}{dy} (S(q, y)). \end{aligned}$$

We recover the expressions of [12] that give the generating series of the Gromov-Witten invariants in a fixed linear system with point insertion and a  $\lambda$ -class insertion, suggesting that in this situation as well the refined invariants have a close relation to these specific Gromov-Witten invariants.

## 7.2 Quasi-modularity of generating series

Let  $g$  and  $d$  be fixed positive integers. We consider the generating series for the invariants  $N_{g, (d, dn)}$  and  $N_{g, (d, dn)}^{FLS}$ :

$$F_{g,d}(y) = \sum_{n=1}^\infty N_{g, (d, dn)} y^n,$$

$$F_{g,d}^{FLS}(y) = \sum_{n=1}^\infty N_{g, (d, dn)}^{FLS} y^n.$$

The generating series  $F_{g,1}$  and  $F_{g,1}^{FLS}$  have already been computed in the previous section. As they are a polynomial in  $DG_2(y)$ , they are quasi-modular forms for  $SL_2(\mathbb{Z})$ . We generalize this result to the generating series for the non-primitive case.

**THEOREM 7.3.** *The series  $F_{g,d}$  and  $F_{g,d}^{FLS}$  are quasi-modular forms for some finite index subgroup*

of  $SL_2(\mathbb{Z})$  containing  $\begin{pmatrix} 1 & \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$  and they have the following expressions:

$$F_{g,d}(e^{2i\pi\tau}) = g \sum_{\substack{k|d \\ 0 \leq l < k^2}} \left(\frac{d}{k}\right)^{4g-3} (DG_2(e^{2i\pi(\tau+l)/k^2}))^{g-1},$$

$$F_{g,d}^{FLS}(e^{2i\pi\tau}) = \sum_{\substack{k|d \\ 0 \leq l < k^2}} \left(\frac{d}{k}\right)^{4g-1} (DG_2(e^{2i\pi(\tau+l)/k^2}))^{g-2} D^2 G_2(e^{2i\pi(\tau+l)/k^2}).$$

*Proof.* Taking the generating series of the invariants, the multiple cover formula (ii) from Theorem 5.13 gives that

$$F_{g,d}(y) = \sum_{k|d} \left(\frac{d}{k}\right)^{4g-3} \sum_1^\infty N_{g,(1,k^2n)} y^n.$$

Thus, we need to compute the partial generating series of  $F_{g,1}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{0 \leq l < k^2} F_{g,1} \left(\frac{\tau+l}{k^2}\right) &= \sum_{0 \leq l < k^2} \sum_{n=1}^\infty N_{g,(1,n)} e^{2i\pi \frac{n}{k^2}(\tau+l)} \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^\infty N_{g,(1,k^2n)} e^{2i\pi n\tau}. \end{aligned}$$

Making the sum over divisors  $k$  of  $d$  and replacing  $F_{g,1}$  by its expression yields the desired formula. Moreover, it shows that the function is 1-periodic. According to lemma 2.1, the functions on the left are quasi-modular forms for some subgroup of  $SL_2(\mathbb{Z})$ . Intersecting their modular groups over the divisors  $k$  of  $d$  proves that the sum is also quasi-modular. Thus, so is  $F_{g,d}$ . The fixed linear system case is treated similarly.  $\square$

*Remark 7.4.* It is also possible to see the quasi-modularity of the generating series without using the multiple cover formula: the multiplicity formula  $\omega$  for pearl diagrams is easily seen to be the coefficients of some quasi-modular form. Then, the lemma 2.1 on the modular groups ensures that the operations that recover the right contributions of the pearl diagrams preserve the quasi-modularity up to a change of modular group. The approach of the cover formula has the advantage of providing a short explicit formula, avoiding the enumerations of pearl diagrams, and we immediately get the modular group.  $\blacklozenge$

### 7.3 Polynomiality of the coefficients of the refined invariants

We now investigate the refined invariants.

**7.3.1 Degree and leading term.** The explicit formulas from section 7.1 easily yield the following.

**PROPOSITION 7.5.** *The refined invariant  $R_{g,(1,n)}(q)$  is of degree  $n$ . Its leading coefficient is  $g \binom{n+g-2}{g-2}$ .*

*Proof.* The polynomial  $\sum_{k|a} k \left[\frac{a}{k}\right]_-^2$  is of degree  $a$  and its leading term is 1. Thus, the formula

for  $R_{g,(1,n)}$  asserts that it is of degree  $n$  and its leading term is equal to  $g$  times the number of partitions of  $n$  into  $g - 1$  parts.  $\square$

*Remark 7.6.* The computation is similar for the fixed linear system case. The only difference is that the leading term is now

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{a_1+\dots+a_{g-1}=n} a_{g-1} &= \sum_{a_{g-1}=1}^{n-(g-2)} a_{g-1} \sum_{a_1+\dots+a_{g-2}=n-a_{g-1}} 1 \\ &= \sum_{l=1}^{n-g+2} l \binom{n-l+g-3}{g-3}. \end{aligned}$$

It is also a polynomial in  $n$  for any choice of  $g$ .  $\blacklozenge$

**COROLLARY 7.7.** *The refined invariant  $R_{g,(d_1,d_2)}(q)$  is of degree  $d_1d_2$ . Its leading coefficient is  $g \binom{d_1d_2+g-2}{g-2}$ .*

*Proof.* From the multiple cover formula (iii) and (iv) in Theorem 5.13, we can see that the only term from the cover formula which contributes is  $R_{g,(1,d_1d_2)}$ .  $\square$

**7.3.2 Coefficients of fixed codegree.** In [10], E. Brugallé and A. Puentes prove the following regularity result for the refined invariants of specific toric surfaces. For simplicity, we state it for the projective plane. If we cancel the denominators in the Block-Göttsche multiplicities, the refined invariant  $BG_{g,d}(q)$  is a (anti-)symmetric Laurent polynomial of degree  $d^2/2$ . For a fixed  $p$  and  $g$ , the coefficient in  $q^{d^2/2-p}$  is asymptotically a polynomial in  $d$ . Moreover, they give explicit bounds for the domain on which the coefficient is a polynomial. We here prove a similar result for the coefficients of our invariants  $R_{g,C}$ .

**THEOREM 7.8.** *The coefficient  $\langle R_{g,(d_1,d_2)} \rangle_p$  of codegree  $p$  in  $R_{g,(d_1,d_2)}$  is a polynomial in  $d_1d_2$  for  $d_1d_2 > \max(g-1, 2p)$ .*

*Proof.* The formula for  $R_{g,(1,n)}$  is a sum over the partitions  $a_1 + \dots + a_{g-1}$  of  $n$  of a product of polynomials each only having terms of degree  $\pm a_i/k_i$  and 0 for every divisor  $k_i$  of  $a_i$ . Each term is of degree  $n$ . Thus, to get a term of codegree  $p$ , we need to dispatch the codegree  $p$  among the terms of each product:

$$\langle R_{g,(1,n)} \rangle_p = g \sum_{a_1+\dots+a_{g-1}=n} \sum_{p_1+\dots+p_{g-1}=p} \prod_{i=1}^{g-1} \left\langle \sum_{k|a_i} k \left[ \frac{a_i}{k} \right]_{-}^2 \right\rangle_{p_i},$$

where  $p_i$  are between 0 and  $p$ . For each  $a_i$  and  $k|a_i$  bigger than 1, we have  $\frac{a_i}{k_i} \leq \frac{a_i}{2}$ . Thus, if  $a_i > 2p$ , the polynomial  $\sum_{k|a_i} k \left[ \frac{a_i}{k} \right]_{-}^2$  has no term of codegree between 1 and  $p$ , and the corresponding term in the product is 0. Therefore, for each choice of  $p_1 + \dots + p_{g-1} = p$ , we have a finite number of possibilities for the choice  $a_i$  with  $p_i \neq 0$ . Then, the remaining choice for the other  $a_i$  is the number of partitions of  $n - \sum_{p_i \neq 0} a_i$ . The latter is a polynomial in  $n$ , given as some binomial coefficient.

In the non-primitive case, it is a consequence of the multiple cover formula from Theorem

5.13. It asserts that

$$R_{g,(d_1,d_2)} = \sum_{k|\gcd(d_1,d_2)} k^{2g-1} R_{g,(1,d_1 d_2/k^2)}(q^k).$$

The term in the sum is of degree  $\frac{d_1 d_2}{k}$ . Thus, if  $d_1 d_2 > 2p$ , only the  $k = 1$  term contributes to the codegree  $p$  coefficient since none of the other terms has a sufficiently big degree.  $\square$

*Example 7.9.* Let us compute the coefficients of codegree 1 and 2 for  $R_{g,(1,n)}$ . The leading term has already be computed. For the coefficient of codegree 1, we can have  $a_i = 1$  or 2 for exactly one  $i$ , since they are the only polynomials  $\sum_{k|a} k(q^{a/k} - 2 + q^{-a/k})$  with a non-zero codegree 1 term. Thus, the coefficient is

$$\begin{aligned} \langle R_{g,(1,n)} \rangle_1 &= g(g-1) \binom{n-1+g-3}{g-3} (-2) + g(g-1) \binom{n-2+g-3}{g-3} 2 \\ &= -2g(g-1) \binom{n+g-5}{g-4} \end{aligned}$$

For the coefficient of codegree 2, we now have more possibilities:

- We have one  $a_i = 1$  and take the codegree 2 coefficient,
- We have one  $a_i = 2$  and take the codegree 2 coefficient,
- We have two  $a_i$  equal to 1 where we take the codegree 1 coefficient,
- We have two  $a_i$  equal to 2 where we take the codegree 1 coefficient,
- We have one  $a_i$  equal to 1 and one equal to 2 where we take the codegree 1 coefficient.

We thus get the following formula:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle R_{g,(1,n)} \rangle_2 &= g(g-1) \binom{n-1+g-3}{g-3} (1) + g(g-1) \binom{n-2+g-3}{g-3} (-3) + g \frac{(g-1)(g-2)}{2} \binom{n-2+g-4}{g-4} (-2)^2 \\ &\quad + g \frac{(g-1)(g-2)}{2} \binom{n-4+g-4}{g-4} 2^2 + g(g-1)(g-2) \binom{n-3+g-4}{g-4} (-2)2. \\ &= g(g-1) \left( \binom{n+g-4}{g-3} - 3 \binom{n+g-5}{g-3} \right) + 2g(g-1)(g-2) \binom{n+g-8}{g-6}. \end{aligned}$$

$\diamond$

## References

- 1 Younghan Bae and Tim-Henrik Buelles. Curves on K3 surfaces in divisibility 2. In *Forum of mathematics, Sigma*, volume 9. Cambridge University Press, 2021.
- 2 Florian Block and Lothar Göttsche. Fock spaces and refined severi degrees. *International Mathematics Research Notices*, 2016(21):6553–6580, 2016.
- 3 Florian Block and Lothar Göttsche. Refined curve counting with tropical geometry. *Compositio Mathematica*, 152(1):115–151, 2016.
- 4 Thomas Blomme. Floor diagrams and enumerative invariants of line bundles over an elliptic curve. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.05439*, 2021.
- 5 Janko Böhm, Christoph Goldner, and Hannah Markwig. Tropical mirror symmetry in dimension one. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1809.10659*, 2018.
- 6 Janko Böhm, Christoph Goldner, and Hannah Markwig. Counts of (tropical) curves in  $E \times \mathbb{P}^1$  and Feynman integrals. *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré D*, 2020.

- 7 Pierrick Bousseau. Tropical refined curve counting from higher genera and lambda classes. *Inventiones mathematicae*, 215(1):1–79, 2019.
- 8 Erwan Brugallé and Grigory Mikhalkin. Enumeration of curves via floor diagrams. *Comptes Rendus Mathématique*, 345(6):329–334, 2007.
- 9 Erwan Brugallé and Grigory Mikhalkin. Floor decompositions of tropical curves: the planar case. *arXiv preprint arXiv:0812.3354*, 2008.
- 10 Erwan Brugallé and Andrés Jaramillo Puentes. Polynomiality properties of tropical refined invariants. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2011.12668*, 2020.
- 11 Jim Bryan and Naichung Conan Leung. Generating functions for the number of curves on abelian surfaces. *Duke mathematical journal*, 99(2):311–328, 1999.
- 12 Jim Bryan, Georg Oberdieck, Rahul Pandharipande, and Qizheng Yin. Curve counting on abelian surfaces and threefolds. *Algebraic Geometry*, 5(4):398–463, 2018.
- 13 Lucia Caporaso. Gonality of algebraic curves and graphs. In *Algebraic and complex geometry*, pages 77–108. Springer, 2014.
- 14 Renzo Cavalieri, Paul Johnson, and Hannah Markwig. Tropical Hurwitz numbers. *Journal of Algebraic Combinatorics*, 32(2):241–265, 2010.
- 15 Yaim Cooper and Rahul Pandharipande. A Fock space approach to Sseveri degrees. *Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society*, 114(3):476–494, 2017.
- 16 Lothar Göttsche. A conjectural generating function for numbers of curves on surfaces. *Communications in mathematical physics*, 196(3):523–533, 1998.
- 17 Phillip Griffiths and Joseph Harris. *Principles of algebraic geometry*. John Wiley & Sons, 2014.
- 18 Robert C Gunning. Lectures on modular forms.(am-48), volume 48. In *Lectures on Modular Forms.(AM-48), Volume 48*. Princeton University Press, 2016.
- 19 Iliia Itenberg and Grigory Mikhalkin. On Block–Göttsche multiplicities for planar tropical curves. *International Mathematics Research Notices*, 2013(23):5289–5320, 2013.
- 20 Sheldon Katz, Albrecht Klemm, and Cumrun Vafa. M-theory, topological strings and spinning black holes. *arXiv preprint hep-th/9910181*, 1999.
- 21 Albrecht Klemm, Daveshe Maulik, Rahul Pandharipande, and Emanuel Scheidegger. Noether-Lefschetz theory and the Yau-Zaslow conjecture. *Journal of the American Mathematical Society*, 23(4):1013–1040, 2010.
- 22 Martijn Kool, Vivek Shende, and Richard P Thomas. A short proof of the göttsche conjecture. *Geometry & Topology*, 15(1):397–406, 2011.
- 23 Travis Mandel and Helge Ruddat. Descendant log gromov-witten invariants for toric varieties and tropical curves. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 373(2):1109–1152, 2020.
- 24 Grigory Mikhalkin. Enumerative tropical algebraic geometry in  $\mathbb{R}^2$ . *Journal of the American Mathematical Society*, 18(2):313–377, 2005.
- 25 Grigory Mikhalkin. Quantum indices and refined enumeration of real plane curves. *Acta Mathematica*, 219(1):135–180, 2017.
- 26 Grigory Mikhalkin and Sergey Fomin. Labeled floor diagrams for plane curves. *Journal of the European Mathematical Society*, 12(6):1453–1496, 2010.

- 27 Takeo Nishinou. Realization of tropical curves in abelian surfaces. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.16148*, 2020.
- 28 Takeo Nishinou and Bernd Siebert. Toric degenerations of toric varieties and tropical curves. *Duke Mathematical Journal*, 135(1):1–51, 2006.
- 29 Georg Oberdieck. Gromov–Witten theory and Noether–Lefschetz theory for holomorphic-symplectic varieties. In *Forum of Mathematics, Sigma*, volume 10. Cambridge University Press, 2022.
- 30 Georg Oberdieck and Rahul Pandharipande. Curve counting on  $K3 \times E$ , the Igusa cusp form  $\chi_{10}$ , and descendent integration. In *K3 surfaces and their moduli*, pages 245–278. Springer, 2016.
- 31 Rahul Pandharipande and Richard P Thomas. The Katz–Klemm–Vafa conjecture for surfaces. In *Forum of Mathematics, Pi*, volume 4. Cambridge University Press, 2016.
- 32 Jean-Pierre Serre. *Cours d’arithmétique*, volume 2. Presses universitaires de France, 1970.
- 33 Eugenii Shustin. A tropical approach to enumerative geometry. *St. Petersburg Mathematical Journal*, 17(2):343–375, 2006.
- 34 Ilya Tyomkin. Tropical geometry and correspondence theorems via toric stacks. *Mathematische Annalen*, 353(3):945–995, 2012.
- 35 Yu-Jong Tzeng. *A proof of the Göttsche-Yau-Zaslow formula*. Stanford University, 2010.

Thomas Blomme