



Deposited via The University of Sheffield.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/id/eprint/152157/>

Version: Published Version

Article:

Brini, A. (2020) E8 spectral curves. Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society, 121 (4). pp. 954-1032. ISSN: 0024-6115

<https://doi.org/10.1112/plms.12331>

Reuse

This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) licence. This licence allows you to distribute, remix, tweak, and build upon the work, even commercially, as long as you credit the authors for the original work. More information and the full terms of the licence here:

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/>

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



E_8 spectral curves

Andrea Brini

ABSTRACT

I provide an explicit construction of spectral curves for the affine E_8 relativistic Toda chain. Their closed-form expression is obtained by determining the full set of character relations in the representation ring of E_8 for the exterior algebra of the adjoint representation; this is in turn employed to provide an explicit construction of both integrals of motion and the action-angle map for the resulting integrable system. I consider two main areas of applications of these constructions. On the one hand, I consider the resulting family of spectral curves in the context of the correspondences between Toda systems, five-dimensional Seiberg–Witten theory, Gromov–Witten theory of orbifolds of the resolved conifold, and Chern–Simons theory to establish a version of the B-model Gopakumar–Vafa correspondence for the sl_N Lê–Murakami–Ohtsuki invariant of the Poincaré integral homology sphere to all orders in $1/N$. On the other, I consider a degenerate version of the spectral curves and prove a one-dimensional Landau–Ginzburg mirror theorem for the Frobenius manifold structure on the space of orbits of the extended affine Weyl group of type E_8 introduced by Dubrovin–Zhang (equivalently, the orbifold quantum cohomology of the type- E_8 polynomial CP^1 orbifold). This leads to closed-form expressions for the flat coordinates of the Saito metric, the prepotential, and a higher genus mirror theorem based on the Chekhov–Eynard–Orantin recursion. I will also show how the constructions of the paper lead to a generalisation of a conjecture of Norbury–Scott to ADE \mathbb{P}^1 -orbifolds, and a mirror of the Dubrovin–Zhang construction for all Weyl groups and choices of marked roots.

Contents

1. Introduction	954
2. The E_8 and \widehat{E}_8 relativistic Toda chain	959
3. Action-angle variables and the preferred Prym–Tyurin	969
4. Application I: gauge theory and Toda	981
5. Application II: the \widehat{E}_8 Frobenius manifold	1004
Appendix A. Proof of Proposition 3.1	1019
Appendix B. Some formulas for the \mathfrak{e}_8 and $\mathfrak{e}_8^{(1)}$ root system	1021
Appendix C. $\wedge^\bullet \mathfrak{e}_8$ and relations in $R(E_8)$: an overview of the results of [23]	1026
References	1028

1. Introduction

Spectral curves have been the subject of considerable study in a variety of contexts. These are moduli spaces \mathcal{S} of complex projective curves endowed with a distinguished pair of meromorphic Abelian differentials and a marked symplectic subring of their first homology

Received 5 December 2017; revised 21 November 2019; published online 19 May 2020.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification* 14H70, 37K10, 53D45, 57M27, 81R12 (primary).

This research was partially supported by the ERC Consolidator grant no. 682603 (PI: T. Coates) and, for the revised version of the manuscript, the EPSRC Fellowship grant no. EP/S003657/2.

[Correction added on 26 May 2020, after first online publication: the page numbers of this article were initially incorrect online and were corrected prior to the issue being completed.]

© 2020 The Authors. *Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society* is copyright © London Mathematical Society. This is an open access article under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) License, which permits use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

group; such data define (one or more) families of flat connections on the tangent bundle of the smooth part of moduli space. In particular, a Frobenius manifold structure on the base of the family, a dispersionless integrable hierarchy on its loop space, and the genus zero part of a semi-simple CohFT are then naturally defined in terms of periods of the aforementioned differentials over the marked cycles; a canonical reconstruction of the dispersive deformation (respectively, the higher genera of the CohFT) is furthermore determined by \mathcal{S} through the topological recursion of [50].

The one-line summary of this paper is that I offer two constructions (related to Points (II) and (IV)) and two isomorphisms (related to Points (III), (V) and (VI)) in the context of spectral curves with exceptional gauge symmetry of type E₈.

1.1. Context

Spectral curves are abundant in several problems in enumerative geometry and mathematical physics. In particular:

- (I) in the spectral theory of finite-gap solutions of the KP/Toda hierarchy, spectral curves arise as the (normalised, compactified) affine curve in \mathbb{C}^2 given by the vanishing locus of the Burchnell–Chaundy polynomial ensuring commutativity of the operators generating two distinguished flows of the hierarchy; the marked Abelian differentials here are just the differentials of the two coordinate projections onto the plane. In this case, to each smooth point in moduli space with fibre a smooth Riemann surface Γ there corresponds a canonical theta-function solution of the hierarchy depending on $g(\Gamma)$ times, and the associated dynamics is encoded into a linear flow on the Jacobian of the curve;
- (II) in many important cases, this type of linear flow on a Jacobian (or, more generally, a principally polarised Abelian subvariety thereof, singled out by the marked basis of 1-cycles on the curve) is a manifestation of the Liouville–Arnold dynamics of an auxiliary, finite-dimensional integrable system. Coordinates in moduli space correspond to Cauchy data, that is, initial values of involutive Hamiltonians/action variables, and flow parameters are given by linear coordinates on the associated torus;
- (III) all the action has hitherto taken place at a fixed fibre over a point in moduli space; however additional structures emerge once moduli are varied by considering secular (adiabatic) deformations of the integrals of motions via the Whitham averaging method. This defines a dynamics on moduli space which is itself integrable and admits a τ -function; remarkably, the logarithm of the τ -function satisfies the big phase-space version of Witten–Dijkgraaf–Verlinde–Verlinde (WDVV) equations, and its restriction to initial data/small phase space defines an almost Frobenius manifold structure on the moduli space;
- (IV) from the point of view of four-dimensional supersymmetric gauge theories with eight supercharges, the appearance of WDVV equations for the Whitham τ -function is equivalent to the constraints of rigid special Kähler geometry on the effective prepotential; such equivalence is indeed realised by presenting the Coulomb branch of the theory as a moduli space of spectral curves, the marked differentials giving rise to the Seiberg–Witten 1-form, the BPS central charge as the period mapping on the marked homology sublattice, and the prepotential as the logarithm of the Whitham τ -function;
- (V) in several cases, the Picard–Fuchs equations satisfied by the periods of the SW differential are a reduction of the Gelfand–Kapranov–Zelevinsky (GKZ) hypergeometric system for a toric Calabi–Yau variety, whose quantum cohomology is then isomorphic to the Frobenius manifold structure on the moduli of spectral curves. What is more, spectral curve mirrors open the way to include higher genus Gromov–Witten invariants

in the picture through the Chekhov–Eynard–Orantin topological recursion: a universal calculus of residues on the fibres of the family \mathcal{S} , which is recursively determined by the spectral data. This provides simultaneously a definition of a higher genus topological B-model on a curve, a higher genus version of local mirror symmetry, and a dispersive deformation of the quasi-linear hierarchy obtained by the averaging procedure;

- (VI) in some cases, spectral curves may also be related to multi-matrix models and topological gauge theories (particularly Chern–Simons theory) in a formal $1/N$ expansion: for fixed 't Hooft parameters, the generating function of single-trace insertion of the gauge field in the planar limit cuts out a plane curve in \mathbb{C}^2 . The asymptotic analysis of the matrix model/gauge theory then falls squarely within the above set-up: the formal solution of the Ward identities of the model dictates that the planar free energy is calculated by the special Kähler geometry relations for the associated spectral curve, and the full $1/N$ expansion of connected multi-trace correlators is computed by the topological recursion.

A paradigmatic example is given by the spectral curves arising as the vanishing locus for the characteristic polynomial of the Lax matrix for the periodic Toda chain with $N + 1$ particles. In this case (I) coincides with the theory of N -gap solutions of the Toda hierarchy, which has a counterpart (II) in the Mumford–van Moerbeke algebro-geometric integration of the Toda chain by way of a flow on the Jacobian of the curves. In turn, this gives a Landau–Ginzburg picture for an (almost) Frobenius manifold structure (III), which is associated to the Seiberg–Witten solution of $\mathcal{N} = 2$ pure $SU(N + 1)$ gauge theory (IV). The relativistic deformation of the system relates the Frobenius manifold above to the quantum cohomology (V) of a family of toric Calabi–Yau threefolds (for $N = 1$, this is $K_{\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1}$), which encodes the planar limit of $SU(M)$ Chern–Simons–Witten invariants on lens spaces $L(N + 1, 1)$ in (VI).

1.2. What this paper is about

A wide body of literature has been devoted in the last two decades to further generalising at least part of this web of relations to a wider arena (for example, quiver gauge theories). A somewhat orthogonal direction, and one where the whole of (I)–(VI) have a concrete generalisation, is to consider the Lie-algebraic extension of the Toda hierarchy and its relativistic counterpart to arbitrary root systems R associated to semi-simple Lie algebras, the standard case corresponding to $R = A_N$. Constructions and proofs of the relations above have been available for quite a while for (II)–(IV) and more recently for (V)–(VI), in complete generality except for one egregious example: $R = E_8$, whose complexity has put it out of reach of previous treatments in the literature. This paper fills the gap in this exceptional case and provides, as an upshot, a series of novel applications of Toda spectral curves which may be of interest for geometers and mathematical physicists alike. As was mentioned, the aim of the paper is to provide two main constructions, and prove two isomorphisms, as follows.

Construction 1. The first construction gives a closed-form expression for arbitrary moduli of the family of curves associated to the relativistic Toda chain of type \widehat{E}_8 for its sole quasi-minuscule representation — the adjoint. This is achieved in two steps: by determining the dependence of the regular fundamental characters of the Lax matrix on the spectral parameter, and by subsequently computing the polynomial character relations in the representation ring of E_8 (viewed as a polynomial ring over the fundamental characters) corresponding to the exterior powers of the adjoint representation. The last step, which is of independent representation theoretic interest, is of significant computational complexity and is solved by a reduction to an equivalent large-sized linear problem which is amenable to an efficient solution by distributed computation. This is beyond the scope of this paper and will find a detailed description in [23]: I herein limit myself to announce and condense




FIGURE 1. Duality web for the B-model on Toda spectral curves.

the ideas of [23] into the two-page summary given in Appendix C, and accompany this paper with a *Mathematica* package[†] containing the solution thus achieved. As an immediate spin-off I obtain the generating function of the integrable model (in the language of [56]) as a function of the basic involutive Hamiltonians attached to the fundamental weights, and a family of spectral curves as its vanishing locus. In the process, this yields a canonical set of integrals of motion in involution in cluster variables and in Darboux coordinates for the integrable system on a special double Bruhat cell of the coextended Poisson–Lie loop group $\widehat{E}_8^\#$, which, by analogy with the case of \widehat{A} -series, I call ‘the relativistic \widehat{E}_8 Toda chain’, and whose dynamics is solved completely by the preceding construction.

Construction 2. The previous construction gives the first element in the description of the spectral curve — a family of plane complex algebraic curves, which are themselves integrals of motion. The next step determines the three remaining characters in the play, namely the two marked Abelian differentials and the distinguished sublattice of the first homology of the curves; this goes hand in hand with the construction of appropriate action–angle variables for the system. I identify the phase space of the Toda system with a fibration over the Cartan torus of E_8 (times \mathbb{C}^*) by Abelian varieties, which are Prym–Tyurin subtori of the spectral curve Jacobian. These are selected by the curve geometry itself, due to an argument going back to Kanev [69], and the Liouville–Arnold flows linearise on them. The Hamiltonian structure inherited from the embedding of the system into a Poisson–Lie–Bruhat cell translates into a canonical choice of symplectic form on the universal family of Prym–Tyurins, and it pins down (up to canonical transformation) a marked pair of Abelian third kind differentials on the curves.

Altogether, the family of curves, the marked 1-forms, and the choice of preferred cycles lead to the assignment of a set of *Dubrovin–Krichever data* (Definition 3.1) to the family of spectral curves. Armed with this, I turn to some of the uses of Toda spectral curves in the context of Figure 1.

Isomorphism 1. Toda spectral curves have long been proposed to encode the Seiberg–Witten solution of $\mathcal{N} = 2$ pure gluodynamics in four-dimensional Minkowski space [60, 86], as well as of its higher dimensional $\mathcal{N} = 1$ parent theory on $\mathbb{R}^4 \times S^1$ [95] in the relativistic case. From the physics point of view, Constructions 1 and 2 provide the Seiberg–Witten solution

[†]This is available at <http://tiny.cc/E8SpecCurve>. Part of the complexity is reflected in the size of the compressed data containing the final solution (~180 Mb — should the reader wish to have a closer look at this, they should be aware that this unpacks to binary files and a *Mathematica* notebook that are collectively almost 1 GB of data).

for minimal, five-dimensional supersymmetric E_8 Yang–Mills theory on $\mathbb{R}^4 \times S^1$; and as the latter should be related to (twisted) curve counts on an orbifold of the resolved conifold $Y = \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(-1) \oplus \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(-1)$ by the action of the binary icosahedral group $\tilde{\mathbb{I}}$, the same construction provides a conjectural one-dimensional mirror construction for the orbifold Gromov–Witten theory of these targets, as well as to its large N Chern–Simons dual theory on the Poincaré sphere $S^3/\tilde{\mathbb{I}} \simeq \Sigma(2, 3, 5)$ [3, 15, 59, 100]. I do not pursue here the proof of either the bottom horizontal (SW/integrable systems correspondence) or the diagonal (mirror symmetry) arrow in the diagram of Figure 1, although it is highlighted in the text how having access to the global solution on its Coulomb branch allows to study particular degeneration limits of the solution corresponding to superconformal (maximally Argyres–Douglas) points where mutually non-local dyons pop up in the massless spectrum, and limiting versions of mirror symmetry for the Toda curves in Isomorphism 2 are also considered. What I do prove instead is a version of the vertical arrow: namely, that the Chern–Simons/Reshetikhin–Turaev–Witten invariant of $\Sigma(2, 3, 5)$ restricted to the trivial flat connection (the Lê–Murakami–Ohtsuki invariant), as well as the quantum invariants of fibre knots therein in the same limit and for arbitrary colourings, are computed to all orders in $1/N$ from the Chekhov–Eynard–Orantin topological recursion on a suitable subfamily of \widehat{E}_8 relativistic Toda spectral curves. The strategy resorts to studying the trigonometric eigenvalue model associated to the LMO invariant of the Poincaré sphere at large N and to prove that the planar resolvent is one of the meromorphic coordinate projections of a plane curve in $(\mathbb{C}^*)^2$, which is in turn shown to be the affine part of the spectral curve of the \widehat{E}_8 relativistic Toda chain.

Isomorphism 2. I further consider two meaningful operations that can be performed on the spectral curve set-up of Constructions 1 and 2. The first is to take a degeneration limit to the leaf where the natural Casimir function of the affine Toda chain goes to zero; this corresponds to the restriction to degree 0 orbifold invariants on the top-right corner of Figure 1, and to the perturbative limit of the five-dimensional prepotentials of the bottom-right corner. The second is to replace one of the marked Abelian integrals with their exponential; this is a version of Dubrovin’s notion of (almost) duality of Frobenius manifolds [42].

I conjecture and prove that the resulting spectral curve provides a one-dimensional Landau–Ginzburg mirror for the Frobenius manifold structure constructed on orbits of the extended affine Weyl group of type E_8 by Dubrovin and Zhang [44]. Their construction depends on a choice of simple root, and the canonical choice they take matches with the Frobenius manifold structure on the Hurwitz space determined by our global spectral curve. This opens the way to formulate a precise conjecture for how the general case, encompassing general choices of simple roots in the Dubrovin–Zhang construction, should receive an analogous description in terms of Toda spectral curves for the corresponding Poisson–Lie group and twists thereof by the action of a Type I symmetry of WDVV (in the language of [40]). Restricting to simply laced Lie algebras, this gives a mirror theorem for the quantum cohomology of ADE orbifolds of \mathbb{P}^1 : our genus zero mirror statement then lifts to an all-genus statement by virtue of the equivalence of the topological recursion with Givental’s quantisation for R-calibrated Frobenius manifolds. This provides a version, for the ADE series, of statements by Norbury–Scott [47, 53, 97] for the Gromov–Witten theory of \mathbb{P}^1 .

1.3. Structure of the paper and relation to other work

The two constructions and two isomorphisms above will find their place in Section 2–5, respectively. The main novel results of the paper are structured in the following logical progression.

- Claim 2.3 (which is Theorem 2.4 in the companion paper [23]) and Lemma 2.2 provide the explicit form of relativistic \widehat{E}_8 Toda spectral curves of Construction 1.

- Theorems 3.3, 3.4 and 3.6 establish the linearisation of the flows on the canonical Prym–Tyurin fibration over the family of Toda spectral curves, as well as their Hamiltonian nature, completing Construction 2.
- Theorem 4.8 proves the weak B-model Gopakumar–Vafa correspondence for the Poincaré sphere in Isomorphism 1.
- Conjecture 5.8 and Theorem 5.5 provide, respectively, a uniform construction of Landau–Ginzburg mirrors of the Dubrovin–Zhang Frobenius manifolds associated to orbits of extended affine Weyl groups in all cases, and a proof for the type E₈ group and the canonical marked node, which is Isomorphism 2.

Some facets of the problems addressed here have surfaced with a different angle in previous works in the literature, and in order to make the text self-contained we review as necessary the links with their methodology at the beginning of each section. The input datum of our Construction 1 is the Lax formalism with spectral parameter of Fock–Marshakov in [56], which is the starting point of our reduction of the computation of spectral curves to a problem in Lie theory. Construction 2, while new for relativistic systems of type other than \widehat{A}_n , owes an intellectual debt to the classical ideology of [38, 61, 69, 88, 118] in the non-relativistic case, and to the construction of algebro-geometric symplectic forms of [36, 76], both of which are shown in this paper to be adaptable to the relativistic setting at hand. Isomorphism 1 concludes a program initiated in my joint work with Borot [15] to prove the B-model Gopakumar–Vafa correspondence for Clifford–Klein 3-manifolds by treating the central missing case of the Poincaré sphere, and furthermore completes it to the full higher genus theory by proving that the Chern–Simons planar two-point function agrees with the symmetrised Bergmann recursion kernel on the Toda curves, thereby establishing the equality of initial data for the Chekhov–Eynard–Orantin recursion on the two sides of the correspondence. The previous state of the art in the construction of mirrors for Dubrovin–Zhang Frobenius manifolds in type other than A_n was given by [43], where a version of Isomorphism 2 is given by an entirely different route for extended affine Weyl groups associated to Spin(n, \mathbb{C}) and Sp(n, \mathbb{C}) groups. Our construction instead provides a general method which is applicable uniformly to all simple, simply connected Lie groups, including exceptional cases and all choices of marked roots, recovers as a particular case [43, 44] by restricting to Dynkin types A, B, C, and D, and is shown in particular to yield the correct mirror for the most exceptional case of E₈. More details for the other exceptional groups will appear in [29].

I have tried to give a self-contained exposition of the material in each of Sections 2–5, and to a good extent the reader interested in a particular angle of the story may read them independently (in particular Sections 4 and 5).

2. The E₈ and \widehat{E}_8 relativistic Toda chain

I will provide a succinct, but rather complete account of the construction of Lax pairs for the relativistic Toda chain for both the finite and affine E₈ root system. This is mostly to fix notation and key concepts for the discussion to follow, and there is virtually no new material here until Section 2.4. I refer the reader to [56, 99, 106, 115, 119] for more context, references, and further discussion. I will subsequently move to the explicit construction of spectral curves and the action-angle map for the affine E₈ chain in Sections 2.4 and 3.

2.1. Notation

I will start by fixing some basic notation for the foregoing discussion; in doing so I will endeavour to avoid the uncontrolled proliferation of subscripts ‘8’ related to E₈ throughout the text, and stick to generic symbols instead (such as \mathcal{G} for the E₈ Lie group, \mathfrak{g} for its Lie algebra, and so




FIGURE 2 (colour online). The Dynkin diagrams of type E_8 and, superimposed in red, type $E_8^{(1)}$; roots are labelled following Dynkin’s convention (left to right, bottom to top). The numbers in blue are the Dynkin labels for each vertex — for the non-affine roots, these are the components of the highest root in the α -basis.

on). I wish to make clear from the outset though that whilst many aspects of the discussion are general, the focus of this section is on E_8 alone; the attentive reader will note that some of its properties, such as simply lacedness, or triviality of the centre, are implicitly assumed in the formulas to follow.

Let then $\mathfrak{g} \triangleq \mathfrak{e}_8$ denote the complex simple Lie algebra corresponding to the Dynkin diagram of type E_8 (Figure 2). I will write $\mathcal{G} = \exp \mathfrak{g}$ for the corresponding simply connected complex Lie group, $\mathcal{T} = \exp \mathfrak{h}$ for the maximal torus (the exponential of the Cartan algebra $\mathfrak{h} \subset \mathfrak{g}$), and $\mathcal{W} = N_{\mathcal{T}}/\mathcal{T}$ for the Weyl group. I will also write $\Pi = \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_8\}$ for the set of simple roots (see, for example, (B.1)), and $\Delta, \Delta^*, \Delta^{(0)}, \Delta^{\pm}$ to indicate, respectively, the full root system, the non-vanishing roots, the zero roots, and the negative/positive roots; the choice of splitting Δ^{\pm} determines accordingly Borel subgroups \mathcal{B}^{\pm} intersecting at \mathcal{T} . Each Borel realises \mathcal{G} as a disjoint union of double cosets $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{B}^{\pm} \mathcal{W} \mathcal{B}^{\pm} = \coprod_{w \in \mathcal{W}} \mathcal{B}^{\pm} w \mathcal{B}^{\pm} = \coprod_{(w_+, w_-) \in \mathcal{W} \times \mathcal{W}} (\mathcal{B}^+ w_+ \mathcal{B}^+ \cap \mathcal{B}^- w_- \mathcal{B}^-) =: \coprod_{(w_+, w_-) \in \mathcal{W} \times \mathcal{W}} \mathcal{C}_{w_+, w_-}$, the double Bruhat cells of \mathcal{G} . The Euclidean vector space $(\text{span}_{\mathbb{R}} \Pi; \langle, \rangle) \subset \mathfrak{h}^*$ is a vector subspace of \mathfrak{h}^* with an inner product structure $\langle \beta, \gamma \rangle$ given by the dual of the Killing form; in particular, $\langle \alpha_i, \alpha_j \rangle \triangleq \mathcal{C}_{i,j}^{\mathfrak{g}}$ is the Cartan matrix (B.3). For a weight λ in the lattice $\Lambda_w(\mathcal{G}) \triangleq \{\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^* | \langle \lambda, \alpha \rangle \in \mathbb{Z}\}$, I will write $\mathcal{W}_{\lambda} = \text{Stab}_{\lambda} \mathcal{W}$ for the parabolic subgroup stabilised by λ ; the action of \mathcal{W} on weights is the restriction of the coadjoint action on \mathfrak{h}^* ; since $Z(\mathcal{G}) = e$ in our case, the weight lattice is isomorphic to the root lattice $\Lambda_r(\mathcal{G}) = \mathbb{Z}\langle \Pi \rangle \simeq \Lambda_w(\mathcal{G})$. Corresponding to the choice of Π , Chevalley generators $\{(h_i \in \mathfrak{h}, e_{\pm i} \in \text{Lie}(\mathcal{B}^{\pm}) | i \in \Pi)\}$ for \mathfrak{g} will be chosen satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} [h_i, h_j] &= 0, \\ [h_i, e_j] &= \text{sgn}(j) \delta_{i|j} e_j, \\ [e_i, e_{-i}] &= \text{sgn}(i) \mathcal{C}_{ij}^{\mathfrak{g}} h_j, \\ (\text{ade}_i)^{1-\mathcal{C}_{ij}^{\mathfrak{g}}} e_j &= 0 \quad \text{for } i + j \neq 0. \end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

Accordingly, the corresponding time- t flows on \mathcal{G} lead to Chevalley generators $H_i(t) = \exp t h_i$, $E_i(t) = \exp t e_i$ for the Lie group. Finally, I denote by $R(\mathcal{G})$ the representation ring of \mathcal{G} , namely the free Abelian group of virtual representations of \mathcal{G} (that is, formal differences), with ring structure given by the tensor product; this is a polynomial ring $\mathbb{Z}[\omega]$ over the integers with generators given by the irreducible \mathcal{G} -modules having $\omega_i \in \Lambda_w(\mathcal{G})$ as their highest weights, where $\langle \omega_i, \alpha_j \rangle = \delta_{ij}$.

Most of the notions (and notation) above carries through to the setting of the Kac–Moody group[†] $\widehat{\mathcal{G}} = \exp \mathfrak{g}^{(1)}$, where $\mathfrak{g}^{(1)} \simeq \mathfrak{g} \otimes \mathbb{C}[\lambda, \lambda^{-1}] \oplus \mathbb{C}c$ is the (necessarily untwisted, for $\mathfrak{g} \simeq \mathfrak{e}_8$)

[†]It should be noted that, while in (2.1) passing from h_i to $h'_i = \sum \mathcal{C}_{ij}^{\mathfrak{g}} h_j$ is an isomorphism of Lie algebras, the same is not true in the affine setting as the Cartan matrix is then degenerate. Our discussion below sticks to

affine Lie algebra corresponding to \mathfrak{e}_8 . In this case we adjoin the highest (affine) root α_0 as in (B.2), leading to the Dynkin diagram and Cartan matrix in Figure 2 and (B.4). Elements $g \in \widehat{\mathcal{G}}$ are linear q -differential polynomials in the spectral parameter λ ; namely, $g = M(\lambda)q^{\lambda\partial\lambda}$, with the pointwise multiplication rule leading to

$$g_1g_2 = M_1(\lambda)M_2(q_1\lambda) (q_1q_2)^{\lambda\partial\lambda}. \tag{2.2}$$

The Chevalley generators for the simple Lie group \mathcal{G} are then lifted to $\widehat{H_i(q)} \triangleq H_i(q)q^{\mathfrak{d}_i\lambda\partial\lambda}$, with \mathfrak{d}_i the Dynkin labels as in Figure 2, and extended to include $(H_0, E_0, E_{\bar{0}})$, where

$$H_0(q) = q^{\lambda\partial\lambda}, \quad E_0 = \exp(\lambda e_0), \quad E_{\bar{0}} = \exp(e_{\bar{0}}/\lambda) \tag{2.3}$$

with $e_0 \in \text{Lie}(\mathcal{B}^+)$ and $e_{\bar{0}} \in \text{Lie}(\mathcal{B}^-)$ the Lie algebra generators corresponding to the highest (lowest) roots, that is, the only non-vanishing iterated commutators of order $h(\mathfrak{g}) = 30$ of $e_i (e_{\bar{i}})$, $i = 1, \dots, 8$.

2.2. Kinematics

Consider now the 16-dimensional symplectic algebraic torus

$$\mathcal{P} \simeq ((\mathbb{C}_x^*)^8 \times (\mathbb{C}_y^*)^8, \{, \}_{\mathcal{G}})$$

with Poisson bracket

$$\{x_i, y_j\}_{\mathcal{G}} = \mathcal{C}_{ij}^{\mathfrak{g}} x_i y_j. \tag{2.4}$$

Semi-simplicity of \mathcal{G} amounts to the non-degeneracy of the bracket, so that \mathcal{P} is symplectic.

There is an injective morphism from \mathcal{P} to a distinguished Bruhat cell of \mathcal{G} , as follows. Note first that \mathcal{G} carries an adjoint action by the Cartan torus \mathcal{T} which obviously preserves the Borels, and therefore, descends to an action on the double cosets of the Bruhat decomposition. Consider now Weyl group elements $w_+ = w_- = \bar{w}$ where \bar{w} is the ordered product of the eight simple reflections in \mathcal{W} . The corresponding cell $\mathcal{P}^{\text{Toda}} \triangleq \mathcal{C}_{\bar{w}, \bar{w}} \subset \mathcal{G}/\mathcal{T}$ has dimension 16 [56], and it inherits a symplectic structure from \mathcal{G} , as I now describe. Recall that the latter carries a Poisson structure given by the canonical Belavin–Drinfeld–Olive–Turok solution of the classical Yang–Baxter equation [11, 98]:

$$\{g_1 \otimes g_2\}_{\text{PL}} = \frac{1}{2}[r, g_1g_2], \tag{2.5}$$

with $r \in \mathfrak{g} \otimes \mathfrak{g}$ given by

$$r = \sum_{i \in \Pi} h_i \otimes h_i + \sum_{\alpha \in \Delta^+} e_{\alpha} \otimes e_{-\alpha}. \tag{2.6}$$

Since \mathcal{T} is a trivial Poisson submanifold, $\mathcal{P}^{\text{Toda}}$ inherits a Poisson structure from the parent Poisson–Lie group. Consider now the (Lax) map

$$L_{x,y} : \begin{array}{l} \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}^{\text{Toda}} \\ (x, y) \rightarrow \prod_{i=1}^8 H_i(x_i)E_iH_i(y_i)E_{-i}. \end{array} \tag{2.7}$$

Then the following proposition holds.

the Lie algebra relations as written in (2.1), rather than their more common dualised form; in the affine setting, this substantial difference leads to the centrally coextended loop group instead of the more familiar central extension in Kac–Moody theory. In [56], this is stressed by employing the notation $G^{\#}$ for the co-extended group; as I make clear from the outset in (2.1) what side of the duality I am sitting on, I somewhat abuse notation and denote $\widehat{\mathcal{G}}$ the resulting Poisson–Lie group.

PROPOSITION 2.1 (Fock–Goncharov [55]). *L is an algebraic Poisson embedding into an open subset of $\mathcal{P}^{\text{Toda}}$.*

Similar considerations apply to the affine case. In $(\mathbb{C}^*)^{18} \simeq (\mathbb{C}_x^*)^9 \times (\mathbb{C}_y^*)^9$ with exponentiated linear coordinates $(x_0, x_1, \dots, x_8; y_0, y_1, \dots, y_8)$ and log-constant Poisson bracket

$$\{x_i, y_j\}_{\widehat{\mathcal{G}}} = \mathcal{C}_{ij}^{\mathfrak{g}^{(1)}} x_i y_j, \tag{2.8}$$

consider the hypersurface $\widehat{\mathcal{P}} \triangleq \mathbb{V}(\prod_{i=0}^8 (x_i y_i)^{\mathfrak{d}_i} - 1)$, where $\{\mathfrak{d}_i\}_i$ are the Dynkin labels of Figure 2. Since $\text{Ker } \mathcal{C}^{\mathfrak{g}^{(1)}} = 1$, $\widehat{\mathcal{P}}$ is not symplectic anymore, unlike the simple Lie group case above; in particular, the regular function

$$\mathcal{O}(\widehat{\mathcal{P}}) \ni \aleph \triangleq \prod_{i=0}^8 x_i^{\mathfrak{d}_i} = \prod_{i=0}^8 y_i^{-\mathfrak{d}_i} \tag{2.9}$$

is a Casimir of the bracket (2.8), and it foliates $\widehat{\mathcal{P}}$ symplectically. As before, there is a double coset decomposition of $\widehat{\mathcal{G}}$ indexed by pairs of elements of the affine Weyl group $\widehat{\mathcal{W}}$, and a distinguished cell $\mathcal{C}_{\bar{w}, \bar{w}}$ labelled by the element \bar{w} corresponding to the longest cyclically irreducible word in the generators of $\widehat{\mathcal{W}}$. Projecting to trivial central (co)extension

$$\widehat{\mathcal{G}} \ni g = M(\lambda) q^{\lambda \partial_\lambda} \xrightarrow{\pi} M(\lambda) \in \text{Loop}(\mathcal{G}) \tag{2.10}$$

induces a Poisson structure on the projections of the cells \mathcal{C}_{w_+, w_-} (and in particular $\mathcal{C}_{\bar{w}, \bar{w}}$), as well as their quotients $\mathcal{C}_{w_+, w_-} / \text{Ad } \mathcal{T}$ by the adjoint action of the Cartan torus, upon lifting to the loop group the Poisson–Lie structure of the non-dynamical *r*-matrix (2.5). I will write $\widehat{\mathcal{P}}^{\text{Toda}} \triangleq \pi(\mathcal{C}_{\bar{w}, \bar{w}}) / \text{Ad } \mathcal{T}$ for the resulting Poisson manifold; and we have now that [56]

$$\dim_{\mathbb{C}} \mathcal{P}^{\text{Toda}} = 2 \text{ length}(\bar{w}) - 1 = 2 \times 9 - 1 = 17.$$

Consider now the morphism

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{L}_{x,y}(\lambda) &: \widehat{\mathcal{P}} &\rightarrow & \widehat{\mathcal{P}}^{\text{Toda}} \\ (x, y) &\rightarrow & \prod_{i=0}^8 \widehat{H}_i(x_i) \widehat{E}_i \widehat{H}_i(y_i) \widehat{E}_{-i}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.11}$$

It is instructive to work out explicitly the form of the loop group element corresponding to $\widehat{L}_{x,y}$; we have

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{L}_{x,y}(\lambda) &= \prod_{i=0}^8 \widehat{H}_i(x_i) \widehat{E}_i \widehat{H}_i(y_i) \widehat{E}_{-i} \\ &= E_0(\lambda/y_0) E_{\bar{0}}(\lambda) \left[\prod_{i=0}^8 (x_i y_i)^{\mathfrak{d}_i} \right]^{\lambda \partial_\lambda} \prod_{i=1}^8 H_i(x_i) E_i H_i(y_i) E_{-i} \\ &= E_0(\lambda/y_0) E_{\bar{0}}(\lambda) \prod_{i=1}^8 H_i(x_i) E_i H_i(y_i) E_{-i}, \end{aligned} \tag{2.12}$$

where in moving from the first to the second line we have expanded $g \in \widehat{\mathcal{G}}$ as a linear *q*-differential operator and grouped together all the multiplicative *q*-shifts, and then used that $\prod_{i=0}^8 (x_i y_i)^{\mathfrak{d}_i} = 1$ on $\widehat{\mathcal{P}}$, which gives indeed an element with trivial co-extension. The same line of reasoning of Proposition 2.1 shows that \widehat{L} is a Poisson monomorphism.

2.3. Dynamics

For functions $H_1, H_2 \in \mathcal{O}(\widehat{\mathcal{P}}^{\text{Toda}})$, the Poisson bracket (2.5) reads, explicitly,

$$\{H_1, H_2\}_{\text{PL}} = -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{\alpha \in \Delta^+} [L_{e_\alpha} H_1 R_{e_{-\alpha}} H_2 - (1 \leftrightarrow 2)], \tag{2.13}$$

where L_X (respectively, R_X) denotes the left (respectively, right) invariant vector field generated by $X \in T_e G \simeq \mathfrak{g}$. Then a complete system of involutive Hamiltonians for (2.5) on \mathcal{G} , and any Poisson Ad-invariant submanifold such as $\mathcal{P}^{\text{Toda}}$, is given by Ad-invariant functions on the group, or equivalently, Weyl-invariant functions on \mathcal{T} . This is a subring of $\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{P}^{\text{Toda}})$ generated by the regular fundamental characters

$$H_i(g) = \chi_{\rho_i}(g), \quad i = 1, \dots, 8, \tag{2.14}$$

where ρ_i is the irreducible representation having the i th fundamental weight ω_i as its highest weight. In the affine case the same statements hold, with the addition of the central Casimir \aleph in (2.9). The Lax maps (2.7), (2.11) then pull back this integrable dynamics to the respective tori \mathcal{P} and $\widehat{\mathcal{P}}$. Fixing a faithful representation $\rho \in R(\mathcal{G})$ (say, the adjoint), the same dynamics on $\mathcal{P}^{\text{Toda}}$ and $\widehat{\mathcal{P}}^{\text{Toda}}$ takes the form of isospectral flows [7, Sections 3.2 and 3.3]:

$$\frac{\partial \rho(L)}{\partial t_i} = \{\rho(L), H_i(L)\}_{\text{PL}} = [\rho(L), (P_i(\rho(L)))_+] \tag{2.15}$$

$$\frac{\partial \rho(\widehat{L})}{\partial t_i} = \{\widehat{\rho(L)}, H_i(\widehat{L})\}_{\text{PL}} = [\widehat{\rho(L)}, (P_i(\widehat{\rho(L)}))_+], \tag{2.16}$$

where $P_i \in \mathbb{C}[x]$ is the expression of the Weyl-invariant Laurent polynomial $\chi_{\omega_i} \in \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{T})^{\mathcal{W}}$ in terms of power sums of the eigenvalues of $\rho(g)$, and $()_+ : \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}^+$ denotes the projection to the positive Borel.

2.4. The spectral curve

We henceforth consider the affine case only. Since (2.16) is isospectral, all functions of the spectrum $\sigma(\rho(\widehat{L}))$ of $\rho(\widehat{L})$ are integrals of motion. A central role in our discussion will be played by the spectral invariants constructed out of elementary symmetric polynomials in the eigenvalues of \widehat{L} , for the case in which $\rho = \mathfrak{g}$ is the adjoint representation, that is, is the minimal-dimensional non-trivial irreducible representation of \mathcal{G} . I write

$$\Xi_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mu, \lambda) \triangleq \det_{\mathfrak{g}} \left(\widehat{L}(\lambda) - \mu \mathbf{1} \right) \tag{2.17}$$

for the characteristic polynomial of \widehat{L} in the adjoint, thought of as a 2-parameter family of maps $\Xi_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mu, \lambda) : \widehat{\mathcal{P}} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$. It is clear by (2.16) that $\Xi_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mu, \lambda)$ is an integral of motion for all (μ, λ) , and so is therefore the plane curve in \mathbb{A}^2 given by its vanishing locus $\mathbb{V}(\Xi_{\mathfrak{g}})$.

We will be interested in expanding out the flow invariant (2.17) as an explicit polynomial function of the basic integrals of motion (2.14). I will do so in two steps: by determining the dependence of (2.14) on the spectral parameter when $g = \widehat{L}(\lambda)$ in (2.12) and (2.14), and by computing the dependence of $\Xi_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mu, \lambda)$ on the basic invariants (2.14). We have first the following.

LEMMA 2.2. $H_i(\widehat{L})$, $i = 1, \dots, 8$ are Laurent polynomials in λ , which are constant except for $i = 3$. In particular, there exist functions $u_i \in \mathcal{O}(\widehat{\mathcal{P}})$ such that

$$H_i(\widehat{L}) = u_i(x, y) - \delta_{i,3} \left(\lambda' + \frac{\aleph^2}{\lambda'} \right) \tag{2.18}$$

with $\partial_{x_0} u_i(x, y) = \partial_{y_0} u_i(x, y) = 0$ and $\lambda' = \lambda y_0 \aleph^2$.

Proof sketch. The proof follows from a lengthy but straightforward calculation from (2.12). Since we are looking at the adjoint representation, explicit matrix expressions for the Chevalley generators (2.1) can be computed by systematically reading off the structure constants in (2.1), the full set of which for all the $\dim \mathfrak{g} = 248$ generators of the algebra is determined from the canonical assignment of signs to so-called extra-special pairs of roots reflecting the ordering of simple roots within Π (see [35] for details). The resulting 248×248 matrix in (2.12), with coefficients depending on (λ, x, y) , is moderately sparse, which allows to compute power sums of its eigenvalues efficiently. We can then show from a direct calculation that (2.18) holds for $i = 3, \dots, 7$ the relations in $R(\mathcal{G})$

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{\omega_7} &= \mathfrak{g}, & \rho_{\omega_6} &= \wedge^2 \mathfrak{g} \ominus \mathfrak{g}, & \rho_{\omega_5} &= \wedge^3 \mathfrak{g} \ominus \rho_{\omega_6} \oplus \wedge^2 \mathfrak{g} \ominus \mathfrak{g} \otimes \mathfrak{g} \\ \rho_{\omega_4} &= \wedge^4 \mathfrak{g} \ominus \rho_{\omega_6} \otimes \mathfrak{g} \oplus \rho_{\omega_6}, & \rho_{\omega_3} &= \wedge^5 \mathfrak{g} \oplus \rho_{\omega_5} \otimes (\mathbf{1} \ominus \mathfrak{g}) \ominus \text{Sym}^3 \mathfrak{g} \end{aligned} \tag{2.19}$$

which are an easy consequence of the decomposition into irreducibles of $\wedge^n \mathfrak{g}$, $\text{Sym}^n \mathfrak{g}$, and their tensor powers for $n \leq 5$,[†] and the use of Newton identities relating power sum polynomials (that is, traces of powers) to elementary/complete symmetric polynomials (that is, antisymmetric/symmetric traces). A little more work is required to show that u_i is constant for $i = 1, 2, 8$; this uses the more complicated character relations (2.25)–(2.26) of Appendix C. The final result is (2.18). \square

It is immediately seen from (2.18) that $u_i(x, y)$ are involutive, independent integrals of motion; they are equal to the fundamental Hamiltonians (2.14) for $i \neq 3$, and for $i = 3$ they are a $\mathbb{C}[\lambda, \lambda^{-1}]$ linear combination of H_3 and the Casimir \aleph . Denote now by $\mathcal{U} = \vec{u}(\widehat{\mathcal{P}}) \subset \mathbb{C}^8$ the image of $\widehat{\mathcal{P}}$ under the map $\vec{u} = (u_i)_i : \widehat{\mathcal{P}} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^8$. It is clear from (2.17) and (2.18) that $\Xi_{\mathfrak{g}} : \widehat{\mathcal{P}} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}[\lambda', \aleph^2 \lambda^{-1}, \mu]$ factors through \vec{u} and a map $\mathfrak{p} = \sum_k (-)^k \mathfrak{p}_k : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}[\lambda', \aleph^2 \lambda'^{-1}, \mu]$ given by the decomposition of the characteristic polynomial into fundamental characters:

$$\begin{aligned} \Xi_{\mathfrak{g}}(\lambda, \mu) &= \sum_{k=0}^{248} (-\mu)^k \chi_{\wedge^k \mathfrak{g}} \widehat{L}_{x,y}(\lambda) \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{124} (-)^k \mathfrak{p}_k(u_1, u_2, u_3 + (\lambda' + \aleph^2/\lambda'), u_4, \dots, u_8) (\mu^k + \mu^{248-k}), \end{aligned} \tag{2.20}$$

where the reality of the adjoint representation has been used. Here \mathfrak{p}_k is the polynomial relation of formal characters

$$\chi_{\wedge^k \mathfrak{g}} = \mathfrak{p}_k(\chi_{\omega_1}, \dots, \chi_{\omega_8}) \in \mathbb{Z}[\chi_{\omega_1}, \dots, \chi_{\omega_8}] \simeq R(\mathcal{G}) \tag{2.21}$$

evaluated at the group element \widehat{L} . For fixed $(u_i)_i \in \mathcal{U}$ and $\aleph \in \mathbb{C}$, the vanishing locus $\mathbb{V}(\Xi_{\mathfrak{g}})$ of the characteristic polynomial is a complex algebraic curve in \mathbb{C}^2 ; I shall write $\mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{g}} \triangleq \mathcal{U} \times \mathbb{A}^1$ for the variety of parameters this polynomial will depend on. Even though \mathfrak{g} is irreducible, the curve $\mathbb{V}(\Xi_{\mathfrak{g}})$ is reducible since $\Xi_{\mathfrak{g}}$ is. Indeed, conjugating \widehat{L} to an element $\exp l \in \mathcal{T}$ in the Cartan torus, $l \in \mathfrak{h}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Xi_{\mathfrak{g}}(\lambda, \mu) &= \det_{\mathfrak{g}} \left(\widehat{L} - \mu \mathbf{1} \right) = \prod_{\alpha \in \Delta} (\exp(\alpha(l)) - \mu) \\ &= (\mu - 1)^8 \prod_{\alpha \in \Delta_+} (\exp(\alpha(l)) - \mu)(\exp(-\alpha(l)) - \mu). \end{aligned} \tag{2.22}$$

For a general representation ρ , we would obtain as many irreducible components as the number of Weyl orbits in the weight system. When $\rho = \mathfrak{g}$, and for this case alone, we have only one

[†]We used Sage for the decomposition of the plethysms, and LieART for that of the tensor powers.

non-trivial orbit, as well as eight trivial orbits corresponding to the zero roots. I will factor out the trivial component corresponding to zero roots by writing $\Xi_{\mathfrak{g},\text{red}} = \Xi_{\mathfrak{g}}/(\mu - 1)^8$.

DEFINITION 2.1. For $(u, \aleph) \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{g}}$, let $\Gamma_{(u, \aleph)}$ be the normalisation of the projective closure of $\text{Spec}(\mathbb{C}[\lambda, \mu]/\langle \Xi_{\mathfrak{g},\text{red}} \rangle)$. We call the corresponding family of plane curves $\pi : \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{g}} \rightarrow \mathcal{U} \times \mathbb{C}$,

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \Gamma_{u, \aleph} & \hookrightarrow & \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{g}} \xrightarrow{(\lambda, \mu)} \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1 \\
 P_i \uparrow \downarrow & & \Sigma_i \uparrow \downarrow \pi \\
 (u, \aleph) & \xrightarrow{\text{pt}} & \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{g}}
 \end{array} \tag{2.23}$$

the family of spectral curves of the \widehat{E}_8 relativistic Toda chain in the adjoint representation. In (2.23), P_i are the points added in the compactification of $\mathbb{V}(\Xi_{\mathfrak{g},\text{red}})$ (see Remark 2.5 and Table 1) and Σ_i are the sections marking them.

As is known in the more familiar setting of $\widehat{\mathcal{G}} = \widehat{\mathfrak{sl}}_N$, and as we will discuss in Section 3, spectral curves are a key ingredient in the integration of the Toda flows. Knowledge of the spectral curves is encoded into knowledge of the character relations (2.21), which grant access to the explicit form of the polynomial $\Xi_{\mathfrak{g},\text{red}}$ to spectral curves for arbitrary moduli (u, \aleph) : the description of the spectral curves is then reduced to the purely representation-theoretic problem of determining these relations.

In view of this, denote $\theta_{\bullet} \triangleq \chi_{\rho_{\omega_{\bullet}}}$, $\phi_{\bullet} \triangleq \chi_{\Lambda^{\bullet}}_{\mathfrak{g}}$. What we are looking for are explicit polynomials

$$\mathfrak{p}_k(\theta) = \sum_{I \in M} n_{I,k} \prod_{j=1}^8 \theta_j^{d_j^{(I)}}, \tag{2.24}$$

where the index I runs over a suitable finite set $M \ni (d_1^{(I)}, \dots, d_8^{(I)})$, $M \subset \mathbb{N}^8$, and $n_{I,k} \in \mathbb{Z}$. Since what we are ultimately interested in is the reduced characteristic curve $\Gamma_{u, \aleph}$, it suffices to compute $\{n_{I,k}\}$ (and hence \mathfrak{p}_k) for $k \leq 120$.

CLAIM 2.3 [23]. We determine $\{n_{I,k} \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ for all $I \in M$, $k \leq 120$.

TABLE 1. Points at infinity in Γ'_u . I indicate the value of their x -projection, their degree of ramification in y , and the order of the poles of y in the second, third, and fourth column, respectively. Here $\phi = (\sqrt{5} + 1)/2$ is the golden ratio.

i	$x(P'_i)$	$e_y(P'_i)$	$-\text{ord}_y P'_i$
1	-2	1	1
2	-1	1	3
3	$-\phi$	1	5
4	ϕ^{-1}	1	5
5	∞	1	5
6	∞	1	6
7	∞	1	10
8	∞	1	10
9	∞	2	15
10	∞	1	15
11	∞	1	15
12	∞	1	30

This is the result of a series of computer-assisted calculations, of independent interest and whose details will appear elsewhere [23], but for which I provide a fairly comprehensive summary in Appendix C. For the sake of example, we obtain for the first few values of k ,

$$p_6 = \theta_7\theta_1^2 - \theta_1^3 - \theta_6\theta_1^2 - \theta_1^2 + 2\theta_7^2\theta_1 + 2\theta_2\theta_1 - \theta_4\theta_1 + \theta_5\theta_1 - \theta_6\theta_1 + \theta_6\theta_7\theta_1 - 2\theta_7\theta_1 - \theta_8\theta_1 - \theta_6^2 + \theta_6\theta_7^2 - \theta_7^2 - \theta_3 + \theta_2\theta_6 + \theta_5\theta_6 + \theta_2\theta_7 + \theta_4\theta_7 - 2\theta_6\theta_7 + \theta_2\theta_8 - \theta_6\theta_8 - \theta_7\theta_8, \quad (2.25)$$

$$p_7 = \theta_7^4 + 2\theta_1\theta_7^3 - 4\theta_7^3 + \theta_1^2\theta_7^2 - 6\theta_1\theta_7^2 + 2\theta_2\theta_7^2 + 2\theta_5\theta_7^2 - 2\theta_6\theta_7^2 + \theta_7^2 - 2\theta_1^3\theta_7 - \theta_1^2\theta_7 + 4\theta_1\theta_7 + 4\theta_1\theta_2\theta_7 - \theta_3\theta_7 + \theta_4\theta_7 + 2\theta_1\theta_5\theta_7 - 4\theta_5\theta_7 + \theta_1\theta_6\theta_7 + 4\theta_6\theta_7 - \theta_1\theta_8\theta_7 - \theta_6\theta_8\theta_7 + \theta_1^3 + 2\theta_1^2 + \theta_2^2 + \theta_5^2 + \theta_1\theta_6^2 + \theta_6^2 + \theta_1\theta_8^2 + \theta_1 - \theta_1\theta_2 - 2\theta_1\theta_3 - \theta_3 + \theta_1\theta_4 + \theta_4 - 2\theta_1^2\theta_5 + 2\theta_2\theta_5 - \theta_5 + 2\theta_1^2\theta_6 + 3\theta_1\theta_6 - \theta_2\theta_6 + \theta_4\theta_6 - 2\theta_5\theta_6 + \theta_6 - \theta_1^2\theta_8 - \theta_1\theta_8 + \theta_2\theta_8 - 2\theta_2\theta_7 - \theta_8\theta_7 + 2\theta_7 - \theta_4\theta_8 - \theta_1\theta_6\theta_8 - 3\theta_1\theta_5 \quad (2.26)$$

$$p_8 = \theta_8 - \theta_1^4 - \theta_6\theta_1^3 + 2\theta_7^2\theta_1^2 + 3\theta_2\theta_1^2 - \theta_4\theta_1^2 + \theta_5\theta_1^2 + \theta_6\theta_1^2 - \theta_7\theta_1^2 - 2\theta_7\theta_8\theta_1^2 - 2\theta_7^3\theta_1 + \theta_6^2\theta_1 + 3\theta_6\theta_7^2\theta_1 - 3\theta_3\theta_1 + 2\theta_4\theta_1 - \theta_5\theta_1 + 2\theta_2\theta_6\theta_1 + \theta_5\theta_6\theta_1 + 2\theta_6\theta_1 + 2\theta_2\theta_7\theta_1 + \theta_4\theta_7\theta_1 + 2\theta_6\theta_7\theta_1 + 5\theta_7\theta_1 + \theta_7^2\theta_8\theta_1 + \theta_2\theta_8\theta_1 - 2\theta_5\theta_8\theta_1 - 3\theta_7\theta_8\theta_1 + \theta_8\theta_1 - 2\theta_7^4 + \theta_6\theta_7^3 + \theta_7^3 - 2\theta_5^2 + \theta_6^2 - \theta_2\theta_7^2 + 2\theta_4\theta_7^2 - 4\theta_5\theta_7^2 + 3\theta_7^2 - \theta_8^2 + \theta_2 + \theta_3 + \theta_2\theta_4 - \theta_4 - 2\theta_2\theta_5 - 2\theta_3\theta_6 + \theta_4\theta_6 - \theta_5\theta_6 + \theta_6^2\theta_7 + \theta_2\theta_7 - 3\theta_3\theta_7 + \theta_5\theta_7 + 2\theta_2\theta_6\theta_7 + \theta_5\theta_6\theta_7 + \theta_6\theta_7 - 2\theta_7 - \theta_2\theta_8 - 3\theta_3\theta_8 + 2\theta_4\theta_8 - 3\theta_5\theta_8 + 2\theta_6\theta_8 + 3\theta_2\theta_7\theta_8 + 2\theta_6\theta_7\theta_8 + 4\theta_7\theta_8, - \theta_7^2\theta_1 + 2\theta_4\theta_5 + 2\theta_5 - 3\theta_5\theta_7\theta_1 + \theta_8^3 - \theta_2^2 - 4\theta_7^2\theta_8 \quad (2.27)$$

$$p_9 = 2\theta_1^2\theta_7^3 - 2\theta_7^4 - 7\theta_1\theta_7^3 - 3\theta_6\theta_7^3 + 4\theta_7^3 - 2\theta_1^3\theta_7^2 - \theta_1^2\theta_7^2 + \theta_6^2\theta_7^2 + \theta_8^2\theta_7^2 + 10\theta_1\theta_7^2 + 4\theta_1\theta_2\theta_7^2 - 2\theta_3\theta_7^2 + \theta_4\theta_7^2 + 2\theta_1\theta_5\theta_7^2 - 5\theta_5\theta_7^2 + 2\theta_1\theta_6\theta_7^2 + 2\theta_6\theta_7^2 + \theta_6\theta_8\theta_7^2 - \theta_8\theta_7^2 - 2\theta_7^2 + 2\theta_1^3\theta_7 + \theta_1^2\theta_7 + \theta_2^2\theta_7 + 2\theta_1\theta_6^2\theta_7 + 6\theta_6^2\theta_7 + \theta_1\theta_8^2\theta_7 - 2\theta_8^2\theta_7 - \theta_1\theta_7 - 3\theta_1\theta_2\theta_7 + 5\theta_2\theta_7 - 4\theta_1\theta_3\theta_7 + 2\theta_3\theta_7 + 2\theta_1\theta_4\theta_7 - 2\theta_1^2\theta_5\theta_7 - 6\theta_1\theta_5\theta_7 + 2\theta_2\theta_5\theta_7 + 5\theta_5\theta_7 + \theta_1^2\theta_6\theta_7 + 5\theta_1\theta_6\theta_7 + 2\theta_2\theta_6\theta_7 + 3\theta_4\theta_6\theta_7 - 4\theta_5\theta_6\theta_7 + 4\theta_6\theta_7 - 2\theta_1\theta_8\theta_7 + \theta_4\theta_8\theta_7 - 2\theta_5\theta_8\theta_7 - 2\theta_1\theta_6\theta_8\theta_7 - \theta_6\theta_8\theta_7 + \theta_8\theta_7 - \theta_1^3 + 2\theta_6^3 + 2\theta_4^2 - \theta_5^2 + 2\theta_1\theta_6^2 + \theta_2\theta_6^2 + 3\theta_6^2 - \theta_1\theta_8^2 + \theta_2\theta_8^2 + \theta_5\theta_8^2 + 2\theta_1\theta_2 + \theta_2 + \theta_1^2\theta_3 + \theta_1\theta_3 - 2\theta_2\theta_3 - \theta_1\theta_4 - 2\theta_2\theta_4 - \theta_4 + \theta_1^2\theta_5 + 2\theta_1\theta_5 - 2\theta_2\theta_5 - 3\theta_3\theta_5 - \theta_1^2\theta_6 + \theta_1\theta_6 + \theta_1\theta_2\theta_6 + 4\theta_2\theta_6 - 2\theta_3\theta_6 + \theta_1\theta_4\theta_6 - \theta_4\theta_6 - 2\theta_1\theta_5\theta_6 + \theta_5\theta_6 + \theta_6 - \theta_1^3\theta_8 + 2\theta_1\theta_2\theta_8 - \theta_3\theta_8 - 2\theta_1\theta_4\theta_8 + \theta_4\theta_8 + \theta_1\theta_5\theta_8 - \theta_1^2\theta_6\theta_8 + \theta_2\theta_6\theta_8 - \theta_5\theta_6\theta_8 - \theta_1^2 + \theta_1^2\theta_4 - 4\theta_2\theta_7^2 - \theta_4\theta_7. \quad (2.28)$$

2.4.1. *Genus, ramification points and points at infinity.* The curves $\Gamma_{u, \aleph}$ have two obvious involutions, coming from the $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ symmetry (2.20) of the reduced characteristic polynomial $\Xi_{g, \text{red}}$,

$$\Xi_{g, \text{red}}(\lambda', \mu) = \Xi_{g, \text{red}}(\aleph/\lambda', \mu), \quad \Xi_{g, \text{red}}(\lambda', \mu) = \mu^{240} \Xi_{g, \text{red}}(\lambda', 1/\mu). \quad (2.29)$$




FIGURE 3 (colour online). The Newton polygon of $\Xi''_{g,\text{red}}$ (in red); blue spots depict monomials in $\Xi''_{g,\text{red}}$ with non-zero coefficients; the purple cross marks the vanishing of the coefficient of $x^{101}y^3$ on the boundary of the polygon.

This realises $\Gamma_{u,\aleph} \xrightarrow{y} \Gamma'_{u,\aleph} \xrightarrow{x} \Gamma''_{u,\aleph}$, where $x = \mu + \mu^{-1}$, $y = \lambda + \aleph\lambda^{-1}$, as a branched fourfold cover of a curve $\Gamma''_{u,\aleph} \triangleq \{\Xi''_{g,\text{red}}(y, x) = 0\}$, so that

$$\Xi_{g,\text{red}}(\lambda', \mu) =: \mu^{120} \Xi''_{g,\text{red}}\left(\lambda' + \frac{\aleph}{\lambda'}, \mu + \frac{1}{\mu}\right). \tag{2.30}$$

We see from (2.20) and (C.2) that $\deg_y \Xi''_{g,\text{red}}(y, x) = 9$, $\deg_x \Xi''_{g,\text{red}} = 120$. The Newton polygon of $\Xi''_{g,\text{red}}$ is depicted in Figure 3. By way of example, some of the simplest coefficients on the boundary are given by

$$[y^9] \Xi''_{g,\text{red}} = (x + 1)^3(x + 2)(-1 + x + x^2)^5, \tag{2.31}$$

$$\left\{ [x^{\deg_x} [y^i] \Xi''_{g,\text{red}}] \Xi''_{g,\text{red}} \right\}_{i=0}^8 = \{1, -1, -1, -3u_7 - 5, 1, 2, 1, -2, 1\}. \tag{2.32}$$

Let us now compute the genus of Γ''_u , Γ'_u and $\Gamma_{u,\aleph}$.

PROPOSITION 2.4. We have, for generic $(u, \aleph) \in \mathcal{B}_g$,

$$g(\Gamma''_u) = 61, \quad g(\Gamma'_u) = 128, \quad g(\Gamma_{u,\aleph}) = 495. \tag{2.33}$$

Proof. Since Lemma 2.2 and Claim 2.3 determine the polynomial $\Xi''_{g,\text{red}}$ completely, the calculation of the genus can be turned into an explicit calculation of discriminants of $\Xi''_{g,\text{red}}$; and because $\deg_y \Xi''_{g,\text{red}} \ll \deg_x \Xi''_{g,\text{red}}$, it is much easier to start from the y -discriminant. This is computed to be

$$\text{Discr}_y \Xi''_{g,\text{red}} = (x + 2)^4 \Delta_1(x) \Delta_2(x)^2 \Delta_3(x)^2, \tag{2.34}$$

where $\deg \Delta_1 = 133$, $\deg \Delta_2 = 215$ and $\deg \Delta_3 = 392$. Call r_i^k , $i = 1, 2, 3$, $k = 1, \dots, \deg \Delta_i$ the roots of Δ_i . We can verify directly by substitution into $\Xi''_{g,\text{red}}$ that the roots $x = r_2^k$ and $x = r_3^k$ correspond to images on the x -line of exactly one point with $\partial_y \Xi''_g = 0$, which is always

an ordinary double point. Similarly, we get that the roots $x = -2$ and $x = r_1^k$ correspond in all cases to degree 2 ramification points; there are four of them lying over $x = -2$. On the desingularised projective curve Γ''_u , the nodes are resolved into pairs of unramified points; and Puiseux expansions of $\Xi''_{\mathfrak{g},\text{red}}$ at infinity show that we have one extra point with degree 2 ramification above $x = \infty$ (see below). By Riemann–Hurwitz, this gives

$$g(\Gamma''_u) = 1 - \deg_y \Xi''_{\mathfrak{g},\text{red}} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{P|\text{d}x(P)=0} e_x(P) = 1 - 9 + \frac{133 + 1 + 4}{2} = 61. \tag{2.35}$$

The genera of the branched double covers $x : \Gamma'_u \rightarrow \Gamma''_u, y : \Gamma_{u,\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow \Gamma'_u$ follow from an elementary Riemann–Hurwitz calculation. \square

REMARK 2.5. It can readily be deduced from (2.31) that the smooth completion Γ''_u is obtained topologically by adding 12 points at infinity P''_i ; their relevant properties are shown in Table 1. Their preimages in Γ'_u and $\Gamma_{u,\mathbb{N}}$ will be labelled P'_k and P_j , respectively, $k = 1, \dots, 23$ (note that P''_1 is a branch point of $x : \Gamma'_u \rightarrow \Gamma''_u$), $j = 1, \dots, 46$.

2.5. *Spectral versus parabolic versus cameral cover*

The construction of $\Gamma_{u,\mathbb{N}}$ as the non-trivial irreducible component of the vanishing locus of (2.17)–(2.22) realises it as a ‘curve of eigenvalues’: it is a branched cover of the space of spectral parameters $\lambda \in \mathbb{P}^1 \setminus \{0, \infty\}$ of the Lax matrix $\widehat{L}_{x,y}(\lambda)$; the fibre over a λ -unramified point is given by the eigenvalues μ_α of $\widehat{L}_{x,y}(\lambda)$ that are different from 1. By (2.22), each sheet μ_α is labelled by a non-trivial root $\alpha \in \Delta^*$, and there is an action of the Weyl group \mathcal{W} on $\Gamma_{u,\mathbb{N}}$ given by the interchange of sheets corresponding to the Coxeter action of \mathcal{W} on the root space Δ .

Away from the ramification locus, this structure can be understood as follows. Let

$$\mathcal{G}^{\text{red}} = \{g \in \mathcal{G} \mid \dim_{\mathbb{C}} C_{\mathcal{G}}(g) = \text{rank } \mathcal{G} = 8\}$$

be the Zariski open set of regular elements of \mathcal{G} ; I will similarly append a superscript \mathcal{T}^{red} for the regular elements of \mathcal{T} . Then the projection

$$\begin{aligned} \pi : \mathcal{G}/\mathcal{T} \times \mathcal{T}^{\text{red}} &\rightarrow \mathcal{G}^{\text{red}} \\ (g\mathcal{T}, t) &\rightarrow \text{Ad}_g t \end{aligned} \tag{2.36}$$

is a principal \mathcal{W} -bundle on \mathcal{G}^{red} , the fibre over a regular element g' being $N_{\mathcal{T}}/\mathcal{T} \simeq \mathcal{W}$. We can pull this back via $\widehat{L}_{x,y}$ to a \mathcal{W} -bundle

$$\Theta_{x,y} \triangleq \widehat{L}_{x,y}^*(\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{T} \times \mathcal{T}^{\text{red}})$$

over $\mathbb{P}^1 \setminus D$, where $D = \widehat{L}_{x,y}^{-1}(\mathcal{G} \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\text{red}})$. This is a regular \mathcal{W} -cover and each weight $\omega \in \Lambda_{\mathcal{W}}(\mathcal{G})$ determines a subcover $\Theta_{x,y}^\omega \simeq \Theta_{x,y}/\mathcal{W}_\omega$, where we quotient by the action of the stabiliser of ω by deck transformations. Write $\overline{\Theta}_{x,y}$ and $\overline{\Theta}_{x,y}^\omega$ for the pull-back to $\mathbb{C}^* \simeq \mathbb{P}^1 \setminus \{0, \infty\}$ of the closure of (2.36) in $\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{T} \times \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}$. As in [38], we call $\overline{\Theta}_{x,y}$ (respectively, $\overline{\Theta}_{x,y}^\omega$) the *cameral* (respectively, the ω -*parabolic*) cover associated to $\widehat{L}_{x,y}$.

Note that when $\omega = \omega_7 = \alpha_0$ is the highest weight of the adjoint representation, that is, the highest (affine) root α_0 , $\mathcal{W}/\mathcal{W}_{\alpha_0}$ is set-theoretically the root system of \mathfrak{g} , minus the set of zero roots; the residual \mathcal{W} action is just the restriction to Δ of the Coxeter action on \mathfrak{h}^* . In particular, we have that $\overline{\Theta}_{x,y}^\omega$ is a degree $|\mathcal{W}/\mathcal{W}_{\alpha_0}| = |\text{Weyl}(\mathfrak{e}_8)/\text{Weyl}(\mathfrak{e}_7)| = \frac{696\,729\,600}{2\,903\,040} = 240$ branched cover of \mathbb{P}^1 , with sheets labelled by non-zero roots $\alpha \in \Delta^*$.

PROPOSITION 2.6. *There is a birational map $\iota : \Gamma_{u,\mathbb{N}} \dashrightarrow \overline{\Theta}_{x,y}^{\omega_7}$ given by an isomorphism*

$$\begin{aligned} \iota : \Gamma_{u,\mathbb{N}} \setminus \{\text{d}\mu = 0\} &\xrightarrow{\sim} \overline{\Theta}_{x,y}^{\omega_7} \\ (\lambda, \mu_\alpha(\lambda)) &\rightarrow (\lambda, \alpha) \end{aligned} \tag{2.37}$$

away from the ramification locus of the λ -projection.

Proof. The proof is nearly verbatim the same as that of [87, Theorem 13]. □

From the proposition, we learn that a possible source of ramification $\lambda : \Gamma_{u,\aleph} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$ comes from the spectral values λ such that $\widehat{L}_{x,y}(\lambda)$ is an irregular element of \mathcal{G} ; and from (2.22), we see that this happens if and only if $\alpha(l) = 0$ for some $\alpha \in \Delta$.

PROPOSITION 2.7. *For generic (u, \aleph) , there are exactly 18 values of λ ,*

$$b_i^\pm \triangleq \lambda(Q_i^\pm), \quad i = 1, \dots, 9, \tag{2.38}$$

such that $\widehat{L}_{x,y}(\lambda)$ is irregular, that is, $\alpha(\log \widehat{L}_{x,y}(\lambda)) = 0$ for some $\alpha \in \Delta$. Furthermore, $\alpha \in \Pi$ is a simple root in each of these cases.

Proof. To see this, look at the base curve Γ''_u . It is obvious that $\Xi_{\mathfrak{g},\text{red}}$ has only double zeroes at $x = 2$, since $\Xi_{\mathfrak{g}}$ has only double zeroes at $\mu = 1$ as roots come in (positive/negative) pairs in (2.22). For each of the nine points

$$\{Q''_i\}_{i=1}^9 \triangleq x^{-1}(2) \subset \Gamma''_u,$$

we compute from Lemma 2.2 and Claim 2.3 that

$$e_x(Q''_i) = 28 \tag{2.39}$$

for all i . Calling $\alpha_i \in \Delta^+$ the positive root such that $\alpha_i \cdot l(\lambda(Q_i)) = 0$, we see from (2.22) that

$$e_x(Q''_i) = \text{card}\{\beta \in \Delta^+ \mid \beta - \alpha_i \in \Delta^+\}. \tag{2.40}$$

It can be immediately verified that the right-hand side is less than or equal to 28, with equality if and only if α_i is simple. It is also clear that there are no other points of ramification in the affine part of the curve[†]; indeed, from Table 1, we have that $e_x(\infty) = 120 - 12 = 108$, and from (2.33) we see that

$$60 = g(\Gamma''_u) - 1 = -\text{deg}_x \Xi''_{\mathfrak{g},\text{red}} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{dx(P)=0} e_x(P) = -120 + \frac{9 \times 28 + 108}{2}. \tag{2.41}$$

As the covering map $x : \Gamma'_u \rightarrow \Gamma''_u$ is ramified at $x = 2$, and $y : \Gamma_{u,\aleph} \rightarrow \Gamma'_u$ is generically unramified therein for generic \aleph , we have two preimages $Q_{i,\pm}$ on $\Gamma_{u,\aleph}$ for each $Q''_i \in \Gamma''_u$. □

3. Action-angle variables and the preferred Prym–Tyurin

Since (2.14) are a complete set of Hamiltonians in involution on the leaves of the foliation of $\widehat{\mathcal{P}}$ by level sets of \aleph , the compact fibres of the map $(u, \aleph) : \widehat{\mathcal{P}} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^9$ are isomorphic to a rank(\mathfrak{g}) = eight-dimensional torus by the (holomorphic) Liouville–Arnold–Moser theorem. A central feature of integrable systems of the form (2.16) is an algebraic characterisation of their Liouville–Arnold dynamics, the torus in question being an Abelian subvariety of the Jacobian of $\Gamma_{u,\aleph}$.

I determine in this section the action-angle integration explicitly for the \widehat{E}_8 relativistic Toda chain, which results in endowing \mathcal{S}_g with extra data [39, 75], as per the following.

DEFINITION 3.1. We call Dubrovin–Krichever data a n -tuple $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2, \mathcal{D}, \Lambda, \Lambda^L)$, with

[†]In principle, from (2.22), this would be the case if $\alpha(l(\lambda)) = \beta(l(\lambda))$ for $\alpha - \beta \notin \Delta$, leading to a double zero at $\mu \neq 1$ in (2.22), which we cannot *a priori* rule out without appealing to (2.33) and (2.39) as we do below.

- $\pi : \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ a family of (smooth, proper) curves over an n -dimensional variety \mathcal{B} ;
- \mathcal{D} a smooth normal crossing divisor intersecting the fibres of π transversally;
- meromorphic sections $\mathcal{E}_i \in H^0(\mathcal{F}, \omega_{\mathcal{F}/\mathcal{B}}(\log \mathcal{D}))$ of the relative canonical sheaf having logarithmic poles along \mathcal{D} ;
- (Λ^L, Λ) a locally constant choice of a marked subring Λ of the first homology of the fibres, and a Lagrangian sublattice Λ^L thereof.

Definition 3.1 isolates the extra data attached to spectral curves that were identified in [39, 75] (see also [40, 76]) to provide the basic ingredients for the construction of a Frobenius manifold structure on \mathcal{B} and a dispersionless integrable dynamics on its loop space given by the Whitham deformation of the isospectral flows (2.16); the logarithm of those τ -functions respects the type of constraints that arise in theory with eight global supersymmetries (rigid special Kähler geometry). These will be key aspects of the story to be discussed in Sections 4 and 5; in the language of [39], when the pull-back of \mathcal{E}_1 to the fibres of the family is exact, the associated potential is the superpotential of the Frobenius manifold, and \mathcal{E}_2 its associated primitive differential. Now, Claim 2.3 and Definition 2.1 gave us $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{g}}$, $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{g}}$ already. We will see, following [76], how the remaining ingredients are determined by the Hamiltonian dynamics of (2.16): this will culminate with the content of Theorem 3.6. I wish to add from the outset that the process leading up to Theorem 3.6 relies on both common lore and results in the literature that are established and known to the *cognoscenti* at least for the non-relativistic limit; the gist of this section is to unify several of these scattered ideas and adapt them to the setting at hand. For the sake of completeness, I strived to provide precise pointers to places in the literature where similar arguments have been employed.

3.1. Algebraic action-angle integration

From now until the end of this section, I will be sitting at a generic point $(x, y) \in \widehat{\mathcal{P}}$, and correspondingly, smooth moduli point $(u, \mathfrak{N}) \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{g}}$. As is the case for the ordinary periodic Toda chain with N particles, and for initial data specified by (u, \mathfrak{N}) , the compact orbits of (2.16) are geometrically encoded into a linear flow on the Jacobian variety $\text{Pic}^{(0)}(\Gamma_{u, \mathfrak{N}})$ [2, 61, 74, 118]; I recall here why this is the case. The eigenvalue problem[†] at time- t ,

$$\widehat{L}_{x,y}(\lambda)\Psi_{x,y} = \mu\Psi_{x,y} \tag{3.1}$$

with $x = x(\vec{t})$, $y = y(\vec{t})$, endows the spectral curve with an eigenvector line bundle $\mathcal{L}_{x,y} \rightarrow \Gamma_{u, \mathfrak{N}}$ and a section $\Psi : \Gamma_{u, \mathfrak{N}} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_{x,y}$ given as follows. We have an eigenspace morphism

$$\mathcal{E}_{x,y} : \Gamma_{u, \mathfrak{N}} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^{\dim \mathfrak{g} - 1} = \mathbb{P}^{247} \tag{3.2}$$

that, away from ramification points of the $\lambda : \Gamma_{u, \mathfrak{N}} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$ projection, assigns to a point $(\lambda, \mu) \in \Gamma_{u, \mathfrak{N}}$ the (time-dependent) eigenline of (3.1) with eigenvalue μ ; this in fact extends to a locally free rank one sheaf on the whole of $\Gamma_{u, \mathfrak{N}}$ [7, Ch. 5, II Proposition, p. 131]. We write

$$\mathcal{L}_{x,y} \triangleq \mathcal{E}_{x,y}^* \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^{247}}(1) \in \text{Pic}(\Gamma_{u, \mathfrak{N}}) \tag{3.3}$$

for the pull-back of the hyperplane bundle on $\mathbb{P}^{\dim \mathfrak{g} - 1}$ via the eigenline map $\mathcal{E}_{x,y}$, and fix (non-canonically) a section of the latter by

$$\Psi_j(\lambda, \mu_i(\lambda)) = \frac{\Delta_{j1}(\widehat{L}_{x,y}(\lambda) - \mu_i(\lambda))}{\Delta_{11}(\widehat{L}_{x,y}(\lambda) - \mu_i(\lambda))}, \tag{3.4}$$

[†]For ease of notation, and since we have fixed $\rho = \mathfrak{g}$ in the previous section, I am dropping here any reference to the representation ρ of the Lax operator.

where $\mu_i(\lambda) = \exp(\alpha_i(l(\lambda)))$ (cf. (2.22)) and we denote by $\Delta_{ij}(M)$ the (i, j) th minor of a matrix M . As t and $x(t), y(t)$ vary, so will $\mathcal{L}_{x(t),y(t)}$, and

$$\mathcal{B}_{x,y}(t) \triangleq \mathcal{L}_{x,y}(t) \otimes \mathcal{L}_{x,y}^*(0) \in \text{Pic}^{(0)}(\Gamma_{u,\mathbb{N}}) \simeq \frac{H^1(\Gamma_{u,\mathbb{N}}, \mathcal{O})}{H^2(\Gamma_{u,\mathbb{N}}, \mathbb{Z})} \tag{3.5}$$

is a time-dependent degree 0 line bundle on $\Gamma_{u,\mathbb{N}}$.

The flows (2.16) thus determine a flow $t \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_{x(t),y(t)}$ in the Jacobian of $\Gamma_{u,\mathbb{N}}$, which is actually linear in Cartesian coordinates for the torus $\text{Pic}^{(0)}(\Gamma_{u,\mathbb{N}})$. Indeed, let $\{\omega_k\}_k$ be a basis for the \mathbb{C} -vector space of holomorphic differentials on $\Gamma_{u,\mathbb{N}}$, $\mathbb{C}\langle\{\omega_k\}_k\rangle = H^1(\Gamma_{u,\mathbb{N}}, \mathcal{O})$, and let

$$\begin{aligned} \psi : \text{Sym}^g \Gamma_{u,\mathbb{N}} &\rightarrow \text{Pic}^{(0)}(\Gamma_{u,\mathbb{N}}) \\ (\gamma_1 + \dots + \gamma_g) &\rightarrow \sum_{i=1}^g \mathcal{A}(p_i) \end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

be the surjective, degree 1 morphism from the g th-symmetric power of $\Gamma_{u,\mathbb{N}}$ to its Jacobian, given by taking the Abel sums of g unordered points on $\Gamma_{u,\mathbb{N}}$; here

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A} : \Gamma_{u,\mathbb{N}} &\rightarrow \text{Pic}^{(0)}(\Gamma_{u,\mathbb{N}}) \\ \gamma &\rightarrow \left(\int^\gamma d\omega_1, \dots, \int^\gamma d\omega_g \right) \end{aligned} \tag{3.7}$$

denotes the Abel map for some fixed choice of base point. Writing

$$\text{Sym}^g \ni \gamma(t) = (\gamma_1(t), \dots, \gamma_g(t)) = \psi^{-1}(\mathcal{B}_{x(t),y(t)})$$

for the inverse of $\mathcal{B}_{x(t),y(t)}$, which is unique for generic time t by Jacobi's theorem, we have that [118, Theorem 4]

$$\Omega_{ik} \triangleq \frac{\partial}{\partial t_i} \sum_{j=1}^g \int^{\gamma_j(t)} \omega_k = \sum_{p \in \lambda^{-1}(0) \cup \lambda^{-1}(\infty)} \text{Res}_p \left[\omega_k P_i(\widehat{L}_{x,y}(\lambda)) \right] \quad \forall k = 1, \dots, g. \tag{3.8}$$

The left-hand side is the derivative of the flow on the Jacobian (its angular frequencies) in the chart on $\text{Pic}^{(0)}(\Gamma_{u,\mathbb{N}})$ determined by the linear coordinates $H^1(\Gamma_{u,\mathbb{N}}, \mathcal{O})$ with respect to the chosen basis $\{\omega_k\}_k$. The right-hand side shows that this is independent of time, and hence the flow is linear in these coordinates, since ω_k and $P_i(\widehat{L}_{x,y}(\lambda))$ are: the former since it only feels the dynamical phase-space variables $\{x_i, y_i\}_{i=0}^8$ in $\widehat{L}_{x,y}(\lambda)$ via $\Gamma_{u,\mathbb{N}}$, itself an integral of motion, and the latter by (2.16).

3.2. The Kanev–McDaniel–Smolinsky correspondence

The story above is common to a large variety of systems (the Zakharov–Shabat systems with spectral-parameter-dependent Lax pairs), and the \widehat{E}_8 relativistic Toda fits entirely into this scheme. In particular, in the better known examples of the periodic relativistic and non-relativistic Toda chain with N -particles (that is, $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{sl}_N; \rho = \square$ in (2.16)), where the spectral curves have genus $g = N - 1$, the action-angle map $\{x_i, y_i\} \rightarrow (\Gamma_{u,\mathbb{N}}, \mathcal{L}_{x,y})$ gives a family of rank $\mathfrak{g} = N - 1$ commuting flows on their $N - 1$ -dimensional Jacobian. A question that does not arise in these ordinary examples, however, is the following: in our case, we have way more angles than we have actions, as the genus of the spectral curve is much higher than the rank of $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{e}_8$. Indeed, the Jacobian is 495-complex dimensional in our case by (2.33); but the (compact) orbits of (2.33) only span an eight-dimensional Abelian subvariety of the Jacobian.

How do we single out this subvariety geometrically? In the non-relativistic case, pinning down the dynamical subtorus from the geometry of the spectral curve has been the subject

of intense study since the early studies of Adler and van Moerbeke [2] for $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{b}_n, \mathfrak{c}_n, \mathfrak{d}_n, \mathfrak{g}_2$, and the fundamental works of Kanev [69], Donagi [38] and McDaniel–Smolinsky [88, 89] in greater generality. We now work out how these ideas can be applied to our case as well.

Recall from Proposition 2.6 that we have a \mathcal{W} -action on $\Gamma_{u,\mathbb{N}}$ by deck transformations given by

$$\begin{aligned} \phi &: \mathcal{W} \times \Gamma_{u,\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow \Gamma_{u,\mathbb{N}} \\ (w, \lambda, \mu_\alpha(\lambda)) &\rightarrow (\lambda, \mu_{w(\alpha)}(\lambda)) \end{aligned} \tag{3.9}$$

which is just the residual action of the vertical transformations on the cameral cover. Write $\phi_w \triangleq \phi(w, -) \in \text{Aut}(\Gamma_{u,\mathbb{N}})$ for the automorphism corresponding to $w \in \mathcal{W}$. Extending by linearity, ϕ_w induces an action on $\text{Div}(\Gamma_{u,\mathbb{N}})$ which obviously descends to give actions on the Picard group $\text{Pic}(\Gamma_{u,\mathbb{N}})$, the Jacobian $\text{Pic}^{(0)}(\Gamma_{u,\mathbb{N}}) \simeq \text{Jac}(\Gamma_{u,\mathbb{N}})$ (since ϕ_w is compatible with degree and linear equivalence), and the \mathbb{C} -space of holomorphic 1-forms $H^1(\Gamma_{u,\mathbb{N}}, \mathcal{O})$. At the divisorial level we have furthermore an action of the group ring

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi &: \mathbb{Z}[\mathcal{W}] \times \text{Div}(\Gamma_{u,\mathbb{N}}) \rightarrow \text{Div}(\Gamma_{u,\mathbb{N}}), \\ \left(\sum_i a_i w_i, \sum_j b_j (\lambda_j, \mu_\alpha(\lambda_j)) \right) &\rightarrow \sum_{i,j} a_i b_j (\lambda_j, \mu_{w_i(\alpha)}(\lambda_j)). \end{aligned} \tag{3.10}$$

Recall from Proposition 2.6 that, since the group of deck transformations of the cover $\Gamma_{u,\mathbb{N}} \setminus \{d\mu = 0\}$ is isomorphic to the Coxeter action of \mathcal{W} on the root space $\Delta \simeq \mathcal{W}/\mathcal{W}_{\alpha_0}$, the map (3.10) factors through the coset projection map $\mathcal{W} \rightarrow \Delta$, that is,

$$\varphi(w, -) = |\mathcal{W}_{\alpha_0}| \sum_{\alpha \in \Delta} \tilde{a}_\alpha w_\alpha, \tag{3.11}$$

for some $\{\tilde{a}_\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}\}_{\alpha \in \Delta}$. Restrict now to elements $\varphi(w, -) \in \mathbb{Z}[\mathcal{W}]$ such that $\varphi(w, -) : \mathbb{Z}[\mathcal{W}] \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}[\text{Aut}(\Gamma_{u,\mathbb{N}})]$ is a ring homomorphism. Then the action (3.10) is the pull-back of an action of the maximal subgroup of $\mathbb{Z}[\Delta]$ which respects the product structure induced from $\mathbb{Z}[\mathcal{W}]$: this is the Hecke ring $H(\mathcal{W}, \mathcal{W}_{\alpha_0}) \simeq \mathbb{Z}[\mathcal{W}_{\alpha_0} \setminus \mathcal{W}/\mathcal{W}_{\alpha_0}] \simeq \mathbb{Z}[\Delta]^{\mathcal{W}_{\alpha_0}}$. Its additive structure is given by the free \mathbb{Z} -module structure on the space of double cosets of \mathcal{W} by \mathcal{W}_{α_0} , and its product is defined as the push-forward[†] of the product on $\mathbb{Z}[\mathcal{W}]$. In practical terms, this forces the integers a_α in the sum over roots in Δ^* (that is, right cosets of $\mathcal{W}/\mathcal{W}_{\alpha_0}$) to be constant over left cosets $\mathcal{W}_{\alpha_0} \setminus \mathcal{W}$ in (3.11).

The Weyl-symmetry action is the key to single out the Liouville–Arnold algebraic torus that is home to the flows (2.16). We first start from the following.

DEFINITION 3.2. Let $\mathcal{D} \in \text{Div}(\Gamma \times \Gamma)$ be a self-correspondence of a smooth projective irreducible curve Γ and let $\mathcal{C} \in \text{End}(\Gamma)$ be the map

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C} &: \text{Jac}(\Gamma) \rightarrow \text{Jac}(\Gamma) \\ \gamma &\rightarrow (p_2)_*(p_1^*(\gamma) \cdot \mathcal{D}), \end{aligned} \tag{3.12}$$

where p_i denotes the projection to the i th factor in $\Gamma \times \Gamma$. The Abelian subvariety

$$\text{PT}_{\mathcal{C}}(\Gamma) \triangleq (\text{id} - \mathcal{C})\text{Jac}(\Gamma) \tag{3.13}$$

[†]That is, the image under the double-quotient projection of the product of the pull-back functions on \mathcal{W} , which is well defined on the double quotient even when \mathcal{W}_{α_0} is not normal, as in our case.

is called a Prym–Tyurin variety if and only if

$$(\text{id} - \mathcal{C})(\text{id} - \mathcal{C} - q_{\mathcal{C}}) = 0 \tag{3.14}$$

for $q_{\mathcal{C}} \in \mathbb{Z}$, $q_{\mathcal{C}} \geq 2$.

By (3.14), the tangent fibre at the identity $T_e(\text{Jac}(\Gamma))$ splits into eigenspaces $T_e(\text{Jac}(\Gamma)) = \mathfrak{t}_{\text{PT}} \oplus \mathfrak{t}_{\text{PT}}^{\vee}$ of \mathcal{C} with eigenvalues 1 and $1 - q_{\mathcal{C}}$. Because $q_{\mathcal{C}} \in \mathbb{Z}$, these exponentiate to subtori $\mathcal{T}_{\text{PT}} = \exp \mathfrak{t}_{\text{PT}}$, $\mathcal{T}_{\text{PT}}^{\vee} = \exp \mathfrak{t}_{\text{PT}}^{\vee}$, with $\mathcal{T}_{\text{PT}} = \text{PT}_{\mathcal{C}}(\Gamma)$, such that $\text{Jac}(\Gamma) = \mathcal{T}_{\text{PT}} \times \mathcal{T}_{\text{PT}}^{\vee}$. In particular, in terms of the linear spaces $V_{\text{PT}} \simeq \widetilde{\mathcal{T}_{\text{PT}}}$, $V_{\text{PT}}^{\vee} \simeq \widetilde{\mathcal{T}_{\text{PT}}^{\vee}}$ which are the universal covers of the two factor tori, we have

$$\text{PT}_{\mathcal{C}}(\Gamma) \simeq V_{\text{PT}}/\Lambda_{\text{PT}}, \tag{3.15}$$

where $\Lambda_{\text{PT}} = H_1(\Gamma, \mathbb{Z}) \cap V_{\text{PT}}$. Furthermore [69], there is a natural principal polarisation Ξ on $\text{PT}_{\mathcal{C}}(\Gamma)$ given by the restriction of the Riemann form Θ on $H^1(\Gamma, \mathcal{O}) \simeq V_{\text{PT}} \oplus V_{\text{PT}}^{\vee}$ to V_{PT} ; we have $\Theta = q_{\mathcal{C}}\Xi$, with Ξ unimodular on Λ_{PT} . In particular, $\text{id} - \mathcal{C}$ acts as a projector on the space of 1-holomorphic differentials, and, dually, 1-homology cycles on Γ , such that

- the projection selects a symplectic vector space $V_{\text{PT}} \subset H_1(\Gamma, \mathcal{O})$ and dual subring $\Lambda_{\text{PT}} \in H_1(\Gamma, \mathbb{Z})$; 1-forms in V_{PT} have zero periods on cycles in $\Lambda_{\text{PT}}^{\vee}$;
- bases $\{\omega_1, \dots, \omega_{\dim V_{\text{PT}}}\}$, $\{(A_i, B_i)\}_{i=1}^{\dim V_{\text{PT}}}$ can be chosen such that the corresponding matrix minors of the period matrix of Γ satisfy

$$\int_{A_j} \omega_i = q_{\mathcal{C}} \delta_{ij}, \quad \int_{B_j} \omega_i = \tau_{ij} \tag{3.16}$$

with τ_{ij} non-degenerate positive definite.

There is a canonical element of $H(\mathcal{W}, \mathcal{W}_{\alpha_0})$ which has particular importance for us, and which will eventually act as a projector on a distinguished Prym–Turin subvariety of $\text{Jac}(\Gamma_{u, \mathbb{N}})$. This is the Kanev–McDaniel–Smolinsky self-correspondence[†] [69, 88, 89]

$$\mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{g}} \triangleq \sum_{w \in \mathcal{W}/\mathcal{W}_{\alpha_0}} \langle w^{-1}(\alpha_0), \alpha_0 \rangle w. \tag{3.17}$$

I summarise here some of its key properties, some of which are easily verifiable from the definition (3.17), with others having been worked out in meticulous detail in [88, Sections 3–5]. Some further explicit results that are relevant to our case, but that did not fit in the discussion of [88], are presented below.

PROPOSITION 3.1. *In the root space $(\mathfrak{h}^*, \langle, \rangle)$ consider the hyperplanes*

$$\mathbf{H}_i = \{\beta \in \mathfrak{h}^* \mid \langle \beta, \alpha_0 = i \rangle\}. \tag{3.18}$$

Then, set-theoretically, $\mathcal{W}_{\alpha_0} \setminus \mathcal{W}/\mathcal{W}_{\alpha_0} \simeq \{\delta_i \triangleq \mathbf{H}_i \cap \Delta\}_{i=-2}^2$. Letting $\mathcal{W} \xrightarrow{\pi_1} \mathcal{W}/\mathcal{W}_{\alpha_0} \xrightarrow{\pi_2} \mathcal{W}_{\alpha_0} \setminus \mathcal{W}/\mathcal{W}_{\alpha_0}$ be the projection to the double coset space and $\{s_i\}_{i=-2}^2 = \pi_2(\Delta)$, we furthermore have

$$\mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{g}} = \pi_2^* \left[\sum_{\delta_i \in \mathcal{W}_{\alpha_0} \setminus \mathcal{W}/\mathcal{W}_{\alpha_0}} i s_i \in H(\mathcal{W}, \mathcal{W}_{\alpha_0}) \right]. \tag{3.19}$$

[†]This has also been considered in the gauge theory literature, implicitly in [65, 86] and more diffusely in [83].

Proof. The fact that $\mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{g}} \in \mathbb{Z}[\Delta]^{\mathcal{W}_{\alpha_0}} = H(\mathcal{W}, \mathcal{W}_{\alpha_0})$ follows immediately from its definition in (3.17) and the constancy of $\langle w^{-1}(\alpha_0), \alpha_0 \rangle$ on left cosets. The rest of the proof follows from explicit identification of the elements of $H(\mathcal{W}, \mathcal{W}_{\alpha_0})$ in terms of the hyperplanes of (3.18), and evaluation of (3.17) on them. The proof is somewhat lengthy and the reader may find the details in Appendix A. \square

COROLLARY 3.2. $\mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{g}}$ satisfies the quadratic equation in $H(\mathcal{W}, \mathcal{W}_{\alpha_0})$ with integral roots

$$\mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{g}}^2 = q_{\mathfrak{g}} \mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{g}} \tag{3.20}$$

with

$$q_{\mathfrak{g}} = 60. \tag{3.21}$$

In particular, the correspondence $\mathcal{C} = 1 - \mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{g}}$ defines a Prym–Tyurin variety $\text{PT}_{1-\mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{g}}}(\Gamma_{u, \mathbb{N}}) \subset \text{Jac}(\Gamma_{u, \mathbb{N}})$.

Proof. This is a straightforward calculation from equation (3.19). \square

In the following, I will simply write $\text{PT}(\Gamma_{u, \mathbb{N}})$, dropping the $1 - \mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{g}}$ subscript which will be implicitly assumed.

The main statement about $\text{PT}(\Gamma_{u, \mathbb{N}})$ is the subject of the next theorem. Note that this bears a large intellectual debt to previous work in [69, 89]; the modest contribution of this paper is a combination of the results of this and the previous section with [69, 89] to prove that the Liouville–Arnold torus (the image of the flows (2.16) on the Jacobian) is indeed isomorphic to the full Kanev–McDaniel–Smolinsky Prym–Tyurin, rather than being just a closed subvariety thereof.

THEOREM 3.3. The flows (2.16), (3.8) of the \widehat{E}_8 relativistic Toda chain linearise on the Prym–Tyurin variety $\text{PT}(\Gamma_{u, \mathbb{N}})$ and they fill it for generic initial data (u, \mathbb{N}) .

Proof. The linearisation of the flows on $\text{PT}(\Gamma_{u, \mathbb{N}})$ amounts to say that

$$\sum_{p \in \lambda^{-1}\{0, \infty\}} \text{Res}_p \left[\omega P_i(\widehat{L_{x,y}}(\lambda)) \right] \neq 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{g}}^* \omega = \omega \tag{3.22}$$

in (3.8). This is essentially the content of [69, Theorem 8.5] and especially [89, Theorem 29], to which the reader is referred. The latter paper greatly relaxes an assumption on the spectral dependence of $\widehat{L_{x,y}}(\lambda)$ [69, Condition 8.4] which renders incompatible [69, Theorem 8.5] with (2.12); this restriction is entirely lifted in [89, Theorem 29], where the fact that (2.12) depends rationally on λ is sufficient for our purposes. While [69, 89] deal with the non-relativistic counterpart of the system (2.16), it is easy to convince oneself that replacing their Lie-algebraic setting with the Lie-group arena we are playing in in this paper amounts to a purely notational redefinition of \mathfrak{g} to \mathcal{G} in the arguments leading up to [89, Theorem 29].

Since the first part of the statement has been settled in [89], I now move on to prove that the Prym–Tyurin is the Liouville–Arnold torus. Denoting $\phi_t^{(i)} : \widehat{\mathcal{P}} \rightarrow \widehat{\mathcal{P}}$ be the time- t flow of (2.16), and for fixed $(x, y) \in \widehat{\mathcal{P}}$, the above proves that

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_{t_1}^{(1)} \cdots \phi_{t_8}^{(8)} : \mathbb{P}^1 \times \cdots \times \mathbb{P}^1 &\rightarrow \widehat{\mathcal{P}} \\ (x, y) &\rightarrow (x(\vec{t}), y(\vec{t})) \end{aligned} \tag{3.23}$$

subjects to an eight-dimensional subtorus of $\text{PT}(\Gamma_{u, \mathbb{N}})$. To see the resulting torus is the Prym–Tyurin, we use the dimension formula of [88, Theorem 17]. Let $C_{\star} \triangleq \mathbb{P}^1 \setminus \{b_i^{\pm}\}_{i=1}^9$,

$\mathfrak{M} : \pi_1(C_*) \rightarrow \mathcal{W}$ be the Galois map of the spectral cover $\Gamma_{u,\mathbb{N}}$, and for $P \in \Gamma_{u,\mathbb{N}}$ write $S^{(P)}$ for the stabiliser of P in the group of deck transformations of $\Gamma_{u,\mathbb{N}}$, and \mathfrak{h}_P^* for the fixed point eigenspace of $S^{(P)} \subset \mathcal{W}$. Then [88, Theorem 17]

$$\dim_{\mathbb{C}} \text{PT}(\Gamma_{u,\mathbb{N}}) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\lambda(p)|d\mu(p)=0} (8 - \dim_{\mathbb{C}} \mathfrak{h}_p^*) - 8 + \langle \mathfrak{h}, \mathbb{C}[\mathcal{W}/\mathfrak{M}(\pi_1(\mathbb{P}_*^1))] \rangle, \tag{3.24}$$

where one representative p is chosen in each fibre of $\lambda : \Gamma_{u,\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$. In our case, $\mathfrak{M}(\pi_1(\mathbb{P}_*^1)) = \mathcal{W}$ by Proposition 2.6 and the fact that the α_0 -parabolic cover is irreducible (hence a connected covering space of \mathbb{P}^1), so the last term vanishes. Then

$$\dim_{\mathbb{C}} \text{PT}(\Gamma_{u,\mathbb{N}}) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1,\dots,9,j=\pm} (8 - \dim_{\mathbb{C}} \mathfrak{h}_{Q_{i,j}}^*) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=\pm} (8 - \dim_{\mathbb{C}} \mathfrak{h}_{Q_{\infty,j}}^*) - 8 \tag{3.25}$$

where $Q_{i,j=\pm}$ are the ramification points of the λ -projection as in Proposition 2.7. Since $\alpha_{k(i)} \cdot \mu(Q_{i,\pm}) = 0$ for some permutation $k : \{1, \dots, 8\} \rightarrow \{1, \dots, 8\}$, the deck transformations in $S^{(Q_{i,\pm})}$ are simple reflections that stabilise the hyperplane orthogonal to the root $\alpha_{k(i)}$, so that $\dim_{\mathbb{C}} \mathfrak{h}_{Q_{i,j}}^* = 7$. As far as $Q_{\infty,\pm}$ are concerned, the deck transformation associated to a simple loop around them corresponds to the product of the Coxeter element of \mathcal{W} times a simple root, as this is the lift under the projection to the base curve of a loop around all branch points on the affine part of the curve[†]. Then $\dim_{\mathbb{C}} \mathfrak{h}_{Q_{\infty,j}}^* = 1$, $\dim_{\mathbb{C}} \text{PT}(\Gamma_{u,\mathbb{N}}) = 8$, and the flows (3.23) surject on the latter. \square

An explicit construction of Kanev’s Prym–Tyurin $\text{PT}(\Gamma_{u,\mathbb{N}})$, after [86, Section 3], can be given as follows. With reference to Figure 4, let γ_i^{\pm} be a simple counterclockwise loop around the branch point b_i^{\pm} . I will similarly write γ_0^- (respectively, γ_0^+) for analogous loops around $\lambda = 0$ (respectively, $\lambda = \infty$). For $\alpha \in \Delta^*$ and $i = 1, \dots, 8$, I define $C_i^{\alpha}, D_i^{\alpha} \in C^1(\Gamma_{u,\mathbb{N}}, \mathbb{Z})$ to be the lifts of the contours in red (respectively, in blue) to the cover $\Gamma_{u,\mathbb{N}}$, where we fix arbitrarily a base point $r \in \gamma_i^{\pm}$ and we look at the path in $\Gamma_{u,\mathbb{N}}$ lying over γ_i^{\pm} with starting point on the λ -preimage of r labelled by α . In other words,

$$\begin{aligned} C_i^{\alpha} &\triangleq \lambda_{\sigma_i(\alpha)}^{-1}(\gamma_i^+) \cdot \lambda_{\alpha}^{-1}(\gamma_0^-), \\ D_i^{\alpha} &\triangleq \lambda_{\sigma_i(\alpha)}^{-1}(\gamma_i^+) \cdot \lambda_{\alpha}^{-1}(\gamma_i^-). \end{aligned} \tag{3.26}$$

Let now

$$A_i \triangleq \frac{1}{q_{\mathfrak{g}}} (\mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{g}})_* C_i^{\alpha_0}, \quad B_i \triangleq \frac{1}{2} (\mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{g}})_* D_i^{\alpha_0}, \tag{3.27}$$

where the normalisation factor for A_i, B_i will be justified momentarily. Note that $A_i, B_i \in Z_1(\Gamma_{u,\mathbb{N}}, \mathbb{Q})$ are closed paths on the cover: every summand C_i^{α} and D_i^{α} is indeed always accompanied by a return path $C_i^{\sigma_i(\alpha)}$ and $D_i^{\sigma_i(\alpha)}$, which has opposite weight in (3.27). Denoting by the same letters A_i, B_i their conjugacy classes in homology, we identify $H_1(\Gamma_{u,\mathbb{N}}, \mathbb{Q}) \supset \Lambda_{\text{PT}} \triangleq \mathbb{Z}\langle \{A_i, B_i\}_{i=1}^8 \rangle$. If $\{\omega_1, \dots, \omega_8\}$ is any choice of 1-holomorphic differentials such that $\dim \mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{g}}^* \mathbb{C}\langle \omega_1, \dots, \omega_8 \rangle = 8$, then

$$\text{PT}(\Gamma_{u,\mathbb{N}}) = \frac{\mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{g}}^* \mathbb{C}\langle \omega_1, \dots, \omega_8 \rangle}{\mathbb{Z}\langle \{A_i, B_i\}_{i=1}^8 \rangle} \tag{3.28}$$

[†]The root in question is the one that is repeated in the sequence $\{k(i)\}_{i=1}^9$. There could be more of them in principle, but this would be in contrast with $\mathfrak{M}(\pi_1(\mathbb{P}_*^1)) = \mathcal{W}$; equivalently, *a posteriori*, this would lead to $\dim_{\mathbb{C}} \text{PT}(\Gamma_{u,\mathbb{N}}) < 8$, contradicting the independence of the flows (2.16), which in turn is a consequence of the algebraic independence of the fundamental characters θ_i in $R(G)$.




FIGURE 4 (colour online). Contours on $\mathbb{P}_*^1 = \mathbb{C}^* \setminus \{b_i^\pm\}_{i=1}^9$. Projections of the A- and B-cycles are depicted in red and blue, respectively.

by construction. It is instructive to compute the intersection index of the cycles (3.27): we have, from (3.26), that

$$(A_i, B_j) = \frac{1}{2q_g} \sum_{\beta, \gamma \in \Delta^*} (C_i^\beta, D_j^\gamma) = \frac{\delta_{ij}}{2q_g} \sum_{\beta, \gamma \in \Delta^*} \delta_{\beta\gamma} \langle \alpha_0, \beta \rangle^2 = \delta_{ij}, \tag{3.29}$$

$$(A_i, A_j) = (B_i, B_j) = 0, \tag{3.30}$$

so that they are a symplectic basis for Λ_{PT} ; the normalisation factor (3.27) has been chosen to ensure both that this is so and to render the period integrals on $\{A_i, B_i\}$ compatible with the usual form of special geometry relations.

3.3. Hamiltonian structure and the spectral curve differential

The fact that the isospectral flows (2.16) turn into straight-line motions on $\text{PT}(\Gamma_{u, \mathbb{N}})$ is the largest bit in the proof of the algebraic complete integrability of the \widehat{E}_8 relativistic Toda. We conclude it now by working out in detail a choice of Darboux coordinates $\{S_i, \vartheta^i\}_{i=1}^8$, with $\vartheta^i \in S^1$, such that the Hamiltonians (2.18) are functions of S_i alone. In the process, this will complete the construction of the Dubrovin–Krichever data of Definition 3.1.

Composing the surjection (3.17) with the Abel–Jacobi map gives an Abel–Prym–Tyurin map

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_{\text{PT}} : \Gamma_{u, \mathbb{N}} &\rightarrow \text{PT}(\Gamma_{u, \mathbb{N}}) \\ p &\rightarrow \mathcal{P}_g \cdot \mathcal{A}(p). \end{aligned} \tag{3.31}$$

Since $\text{PT}(\Gamma_{u,\aleph})$ is principally polarised, an analogue of the Jacobi theorem holds for \mathcal{A}_{PT} [68, Lemma 2.1], and the Abel–Prym–Tyurin map (3.31) is an embedding of $\Gamma_{u,\aleph}$ into $\text{PT}(\Gamma_{u,\aleph})$ as a $q_{\mathfrak{g}} = 60$ -multiple of its minimal curve $\frac{\Xi^7}{\Upsilon^1}$. Then, taking Abel sums of 8 points on $\Gamma_{u,\aleph}$ and projecting their image to PT ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_{\text{PT}} : \text{Sym}^8 \Gamma_{u,\aleph} &\rightarrow \text{PT}(\Gamma_{u,\aleph}) \\ (\gamma_1 + \cdots + \gamma_8) &\rightarrow (\mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{g}})_* \sum_{i=1}^8 \mathcal{A}(\gamma_i) \end{aligned} \tag{3.32}$$

gives a finite, degree $q_{\mathfrak{g}}^8 = 2^{16}3^85^8$ surjective morphism[†] from the eight-fold symmetric product of $\Gamma_{u,\aleph}$ to $\text{PT}(\Gamma_{u,\aleph})$ which maps the fundamental class $[\text{Sym}^8(\Gamma_{u,\aleph})] \rightarrow q_{\mathfrak{g}}^8[\text{PT}(\Gamma_{u,\aleph})]$ to $q_{\mathfrak{g}}^8$ the fundamental class of the Prym–Tyurin. The fibre $\mathcal{A}_{\text{PT}}^{-1}(\xi)$ of a point $\xi \in \text{PT}(\Gamma_{u,\aleph})$ is given by $q_{\mathfrak{g}}^8$ unordered 8-tuples of points $\gamma_1 + \cdots + \gamma_8$ on $\Gamma_{u,\aleph}$ satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} \xi &= \mathcal{A}_{\text{PT}} \left(\sum_i \gamma_i \right) = (\mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{g}})_* \sum_{i=1}^8 \mathcal{A}(\gamma_i) = (\mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{g}})_* \sum_{i=1}^8 \left(\int^{\gamma_i} d\omega_1, \dots, \int^{\gamma_i} d\omega_{495} \right), \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^8 \left(\int^{\mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\gamma_i)} d\omega_1, \dots, \int^{\mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\gamma_i)} d\omega_{495} \right), \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^8 \left(\int^{\gamma_i} \mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{g}}^* d\omega_1, \dots, \int^{\gamma_i} \mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{g}}^* d\omega_{495} \right). \end{aligned} \tag{3.33}$$

Let us now reconsider the action-angle map $\{x_i, y_i\} \rightarrow (\Gamma_{u,\aleph}, \mathcal{B}_{x,y})$ of (2.18), (3.5) and (3.8) in light of Theorem 3.3. By the above reasoning, the flows $(x(t), y(t))$ are encoded into the motion of $\mathcal{B}_{x,y}(t)$, or equivalently, any of the preimages $\mathcal{A}_{\text{PT}}^{-1}\mathcal{B}(t) = (\gamma_1(t) + \cdots + \gamma_8(t))$. I want to study the motion in terms of the latter, and argue that the Cartesian projections of γ_i provide logarithmic Darboux coordinates for (2.5). I begin with the following.

THEOREM 3.4. *Write ω_{PL} for the symplectic 2-form on an \aleph -leaf of $\mathcal{P}_{\text{Totda}}$ and let $\delta : \Omega^\bullet(\widehat{\mathcal{P}}) \rightarrow \Omega^{\bullet+1}(\widehat{\mathcal{P}})$ denote exterior differentiation on $\widehat{\mathcal{P}}$. Then*

$$\omega_{\text{PL}} = \mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{g}}^* \sum_{i=1}^8 \frac{\delta\mu(\gamma_i)}{\mu(\gamma_i)} \wedge \frac{\delta\lambda(\gamma_i)}{\lambda(\gamma_i)}. \tag{3.34}$$

Proof. Recall that (see, for example, [7, Section 3.3]) any Lax system of the type (2.16) with rational spectral parameter and with $L(\lambda) \in \mathfrak{g}$ can be interpreted as a flow on a coadjoint orbit of \mathfrak{g}^* which is Hamiltonian with respect to the Kostant–Kirillov bracket. More in detail, the pull-back of the Kostant–Kirillov symplectic 2-form reads [7, Sections 3.3, 5.9, and 14.2]

$$\omega_{\text{KK}} = \frac{1}{2 \dim \mathfrak{g}} \sum_{\lambda_k=0,\infty} \text{Res}_{\lambda_k} \text{Tr}((A_k)_- g_k^{-1} \delta g_k \wedge g_k^{-1} \delta g_k), \tag{3.35}$$

where we diagonalise[‡]. $L(\lambda) = g_k^{-1} A_k g_k$ locally around the poles at $\lambda = 0, \infty$, we denote $M_-(\lambda_0)$ the projection to the Laurent tail around $\lambda = \lambda_0$, and δ indicates exterior differentiation on $\widehat{\mathcal{P}}$. This can be rewritten in terms of the Baker–Akhiezer eigenvector line bundle

[†]I slightly abuse notation here and call it with the same symbol of (3.31).

[‡]Note that the eigenvalue 1 of $\widehat{L}_{x,y}(\lambda)$ has full geometric multiplicity 8, and the other eigenvalues are all distinct when λ is in a punctured neighbourhood of 0 or ∞ .

(3.3) and its marked section (3.4) as an instance of the Krichever–Phong universal symplectic form ω_{KP} [36, 76]. Let $\Psi = (\Psi_j)$ be the 248×248 matrix whose j^{th} column is the normalised eigenvector (3.4). Then [36, Section 5]

$$\omega_{\text{KK}} = \omega_{\text{KP}}^{(1)} \triangleq \frac{1}{\dim \mathfrak{g}} \sum_{\lambda_k=0, \infty} \text{Res}_{\lambda_k} \text{Tr} \left(\Psi_{x,y}^{-1} \delta \widehat{L_{x,y}} \wedge \delta \Psi_{x,y} \right) d\lambda, \tag{3.36}$$

where $d : \Omega(\mathbb{P}^1) \rightarrow \Omega(\mathbb{P}^1)$ is the exterior differential on the spectral parameter space.

This is pretty close to what need, and it would recover the results of obtained in [1] in a related context, but it actually requires two extra tweaks to get the symplectic form we are after, ω_{PL} . First off, as explained in [7, Section 6.5], if we are interested in the r -matrix solution (2.6) for the Toda lattice, what we need to consider is rather a version $\omega_{\text{KP}}^{(1)}$ of the universal symplectic form which is logarithmic in λ , that is,

$$\omega_{\text{KP}}^{(1)} \triangleq \frac{1}{\dim \mathfrak{g}} \sum_{\lambda_k=0, \infty} \text{Res}_{\lambda_k} \text{Tr} \left(\Psi_{x,y}^{-1} \delta \widehat{L_{x,y}} \wedge \delta \Psi_{x,y} \right) \frac{d\lambda}{\lambda}. \tag{3.37}$$

Secondly and more importantly, since we are dealing with an integrable system on a Poisson–Lie Kac–Moody *group*, rather than a Lie algebra, ω_{PL} is given by a different[†] Poisson bracket, as explained in [36, Section 5.3]. This is the logarithmic Krichever–Phong Poisson bracket $\omega_{\text{KP}}^{(2)}$

$$\omega_{\text{PL}} = \omega_{\text{KP}}^{(2)} \triangleq \frac{1}{\dim \mathfrak{g}} \sum_{\lambda_k=0, \infty} \text{Res}_{\lambda_k} \text{Tr} \left(\Psi_{x,y}^{-1} \widehat{L_{x,y}}^{-1} \delta \widehat{L_{x,y}} \wedge \delta \Psi_{x,y} \right) \frac{d\lambda}{\lambda}. \tag{3.38}$$

The calculation of the residues of (3.38) is straightforward (see [7, Section 5.9] for a completely analogous calculation in the context of the Kostant–Kirillov form (3.35)). From the general theory of Baker–Akhiezer functions[‡] and (3.8), $\ln \Psi_{x,y}$ has simple poles, with residue equal to the identity, at a divisor $D(t) \in \text{Div}(\Gamma_{u,\mathbb{N}})$ such that

$$\frac{\mathcal{A}(D(t)) - \mathcal{A}(D(0))}{t} = \sum_{p \in \lambda^{-1}(0) \cup \lambda^{-1}(\infty)} \text{Res}_p \left[\omega_k P_i(\widehat{L_{x,y}}(\lambda)) \right], \tag{3.39}$$

and by Theorem 3.3, the left-hand side is actually in the Prym–Tyurin variety $\text{PT}(\Gamma_{u,\mathbb{N}})$. This means that $\Psi_{x(t),y(t)}$ has simple poles at $(\mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{g}})_*(\gamma_1(t) + \dots + \gamma_8(t))$ for some $\gamma = \gamma_1(t) + \dots + \gamma_8(t) \in \text{Sym}^8(\Gamma_{u,\mathbb{N}})$; different γ have the same image under $(\mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{g}})_*$. Write

$$\sum r_k \epsilon_k \triangleq \gamma = \sum_{i,\alpha} \langle w(\alpha_0), \alpha_0 \rangle w_* \gamma_i \tag{3.40}$$

for some $r_k \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\epsilon_k \in \Gamma_{u,\mathbb{N}}$. Near ϵ_k we have then

$$\delta \Psi_{x,y} = \frac{\Psi \delta \lambda(\epsilon_k)}{\lambda - \lambda(\epsilon_k)} (1 + \mathcal{O}(\lambda - \lambda(\epsilon_k))). \tag{3.41}$$

It turns out that the rest of the expression (3.38) is regular at ϵ_k . Indeed, exterior differentiation of the eigenvalue equation (3.1) yields

$$\delta \left[\ln \widehat{L_{x,y}} - \ln \mu \Psi_{x,y} \right] = \left(\widehat{L_{x,y}} \right)^{-1} \delta \widehat{L_{x,y}} - \frac{\delta \mu}{\mu} \Psi_{x,y} - \ln \mu \delta \Psi_{x,y} = 0. \tag{3.42}$$

[†]But, non-trivially, compatible: the resulting system is then bi-Hamiltonian.

[‡]See, for example, the discussion in [77, Section 2].

Multiplying by $(\lambda\Psi_{x,y})^{-1}$ and exploiting the fact that $\Psi_{x,y}^{-1}(\widehat{L}_{x,y} - \mu) = 0$ for the dual section of $\mathcal{L}_{x,y}$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{Res}_{\lambda(\epsilon_k)} \operatorname{Tr} \left(\Psi_{x,y}^{-1} \widehat{L}_{x,y}^{-1} \delta \widehat{L}_{x,y} \wedge \delta \Psi_{x,y} \right) \frac{\delta \lambda}{\lambda} &= \operatorname{Res}_{\lambda(\epsilon_k)} \operatorname{Tr} \left(\Psi_{x,y}^{-1} \widehat{L}_{x,y}^{-1} \delta \widehat{L}_{x,y} \Psi_{x,y} \right) \wedge \frac{\delta \lambda(\epsilon_k)}{\lambda - \lambda(\epsilon_k)} \frac{d\lambda}{\lambda}, \\ &= \operatorname{Tr} \left(\Psi_{x,y}^{-1} \widehat{L}_{x,y}^{-1} \delta \widehat{L}_{x,y} \Psi_{x,y} \right) \wedge \frac{\delta \lambda(\epsilon_k)}{\lambda(\epsilon_k)}, \\ &= 248 \delta \ln \mu(\epsilon_k) \wedge \delta \ln \lambda(\epsilon_k). \end{aligned} \tag{3.43}$$

Swapping orientation in the contour giving the sum over residues (3.38) amounts to picking up residues over the affine part of $\Gamma_{u,\aleph} \setminus \lambda^{-1}(0)$. We have two possible contributions here: one is the sum over residues at the Baker–Akhiezer poles ϵ_k that we have just computed. Another is given by the branch points of the λ projection, since $\det \Psi_{x,y}(b_i^\pm) = \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{\lambda - b_i^\pm})$: hence both $\Psi_{x,y}^{-1}$ and $\delta|_{\lambda=\text{const}} \Psi_{x,y}$ develop a (simple) pole there. Whilst the residues are individually non-zero, their sum vanishes: it is a simple observation that adding a contribution of the form

$$\Delta_{\text{KP}} = \sum_{\lambda_k=0,\infty} \operatorname{Res}_{\lambda_k} \operatorname{Tr} \left(\Psi_{x,y}^{-1} \delta \ln \mu \Psi_{x,y} \right) \wedge \frac{\delta \lambda}{\lambda} \tag{3.44}$$

to (3.38) exactly offsets the aforementioned non-vanishing residues at the branch points, and it has opposite residues at $\lambda = 0$ and ∞ . Taking into account sign changes and summing over poles, images of the Weyl action as in (3.40), and preimages of the Abel–Prym–Tyurin map returns (3.34). \square

We are now ready to write down explicitly the action-angle integration variables for the system. Let $\pi^{\text{sym}} : \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{g}}^{\text{sym}} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{g}}$ be the family of Abelian varieties obtained by replacing $\Gamma_{u,\aleph}$ with its eightfold symmetric product in the top left corner of (2.23); this is a $q_{\mathfrak{g}}^8$ -cover of $\widehat{\mathcal{P}}$. Let $\mathcal{D}_{\mathfrak{g}} \in \operatorname{Div} \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{g}}$ be the sum of $\Sigma_i(\mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{g}})$ in (2.23).

On the open set where the Prym–Tyurin does not degenerate,

$$\mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{g}}^{\text{reg}} \triangleq \{(u, \aleph) \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{g}} \mid \dim_{\mathbb{C}} \operatorname{PT}(\Gamma_{u,\aleph}) = 8\} \tag{3.45}$$

introduce the (vertical) 1-forms on $\mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{g}}^{\text{sym}}$ written, on a bundle chart $((u, \aleph); (\gamma_i)_i)$, as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L} &\triangleq \sum_{i=1}^8 \frac{d\lambda(\gamma_i)}{\lambda(\gamma_i)} \in \omega_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{g}}^{\text{sym}}/\mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{g}}}(\mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{g}}^{\text{reg}}), \\ \mathcal{M} &\triangleq \sum_{i=1}^8 \frac{d\mu(\gamma_i)}{\mu(\gamma_i)} \in \omega_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{g}}^{\text{sym}}/\mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{g}}}(\mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{g}}^{\text{reg}}), \\ d\mathcal{S} &\triangleq \sum_{i=1}^8 d\sigma(\gamma_i) \triangleq \sum_{i=1}^8 \log \mu(\gamma_i) \frac{d\lambda(\gamma_i)}{\lambda(\gamma_i)} \in \omega_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{g}}^{\text{sym}}/\mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{g}}}(\mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{g}}^{\text{reg}}). \end{aligned} \tag{3.46}$$

The same notation $d\mathcal{S}$ and $d\sigma$ will indicate the pull-backs to fibres $\operatorname{Sym}^8(\Gamma_{u,\aleph})$ and $\Gamma_{u,\aleph}$ of the respective families; in (3.46) $d\sigma$ is an arbitrary choice of branch of the log-meromorphic differential $\log \mu d \log \lambda$ on $\Gamma_{u,\aleph}$. Note that

$$\omega_{\text{PL}} = \omega_{\text{KP}}^{(1)} = \mathcal{D}_{\mathfrak{g}}^* \mathcal{M} \wedge \mathcal{L}.$$

LEMMA 3.5. *We have that*

$$\frac{\partial d\sigma}{\partial u_i} \in H^0(\Gamma_{u,\aleph}, \Omega^1) \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, 8, \tag{3.47}$$

where the moduli derivative in (3.47) is taken at fixed $\mu : \Gamma_{u,\aleph} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$.

Proof. By definition,

$$d\kappa_i \triangleq \frac{\partial d\sigma}{\partial u_i} = -\frac{\partial_{u_i} \lambda d\mu}{\lambda \mu} = -\frac{\lambda^9 \partial_{u_i} \Xi_{\mathfrak{g},\text{red}} d\mu}{\partial_\lambda (\lambda^9 \Xi_{\mathfrak{g},\text{red}}) \lambda \mu}. \tag{3.48}$$

Recall that, for a generic polynomial $P(x, y)$, the 1-forms

$$d\omega_{ij} = \frac{x^{i-1} y^{j-1} dx}{\partial_y P}$$

with (i, j) in the strict interior of the Newton polygon of $P(x, y)$ are holomorphic 1-forms on $\{P(x, y) = 0\}$. The expression (3.48) is a linear combination of terms that are exactly of this form: note that the doubly logarithmic form of $d\sigma$ in (3.46) is crucial to ensure the presence of the product $\lambda \mu$ at the denominator which makes this statement true. However $\lambda^9 \Xi_{\mathfrak{g},\text{red}}$ is highly non-generic, and by the way $\Gamma_{u,\aleph}$ was introduced in Definition 2.1 the 1-forms in (3.48) may still have simple poles with opposite residues at the strict transform of the nodes in (2.34). A direct computation however shows that

$$\frac{\partial \Xi_{\mathfrak{g},\text{red}}}{\partial u_i}(p) = 0 \quad \text{if } d\mu(p) = 0, \quad \mu(p) + \frac{1}{\mu(p)} = r_i^k, i = 2, 3, \tag{3.49}$$

which entails the vanishing of the residues on the normalisation, and thus $d\kappa_j \in H^1(\Gamma_{u,\aleph}, \mathcal{O}) \forall j = 1, \dots, 8$. □

As a consequence, an algebraic Liouville–Arnold-type statement can be made as follows. Locally on $\Gamma_{u,\aleph}$ and its eightfold symmetric product, consider the Abelian integral

$$\sigma(p) = \int^p d\sigma \tag{3.50}$$

and correspondingly $\mathcal{S}(p_i) = \sum_i \sigma(p_i)$. Define the A_i -periods of $d\sigma$ as

$$\alpha_i \triangleq \oint_{A_i} d\sigma. \tag{3.51}$$

By Corollary 3.2 and Theorem 3.4, these are phase-space areas (action variables) for the angular motion on $\text{PT}(\Gamma_{u,\aleph})$. Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_i &= \oint_{A_i} d\sigma = \frac{1}{q_{\mathfrak{g}}} \oint_{(\mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{g}})_*(A_i)} d\sigma \\ &= \frac{1}{q_{\mathfrak{g}}} \oint_{A_i} \mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{g}}^* d\sigma = \frac{1}{q_{\mathfrak{g}}} \oint_{D^2 | \partial D^2 = A_i} \omega_{\text{PL}}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.52}$$

Define the normalised basis of holomorphic 1-forms

$$d\vartheta_i = \sum_j \left(\frac{\partial \alpha}{\partial u} \right)_{ij}^{-1} d\kappa_j \in H^1(\Gamma_{u,\aleph}, \mathcal{O}), \tag{3.53}$$

so that $\oint_{A_j} d\vartheta_i = \delta_{ij}$. This is the normalised \mathbb{C} -basis of the vector space V_- of $\mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{g}}$ -invariant forms on $\Gamma_{u,\aleph}$ with respect to our choice of A and B cycles in (3.27).

THEOREM 3.6. *We have*

$$\omega_{\text{PL}} = \frac{1}{q_{\mathfrak{g}}} \sum_{i=1}^8 du_i \wedge d\kappa_i = \frac{1}{q_{\mathfrak{g}}} \sum_{i=1}^8 d\alpha_i \wedge d\vartheta_i \tag{3.54}$$

and in the action-angle coordinates $(\alpha_i, \vartheta_i)_{i=1}^8$ the flows (2.16), (3.8) are Hamiltonian with respect to ω_{PL} , with Hamiltonian $u_i = u_i(\alpha)$. In particular, the angular frequencies in (3.8) are given by the Jacobian

$$\Omega_{ij} = \left(\frac{\partial \alpha}{\partial u} \right)_{ij}^{-1}. \tag{3.55}$$

Proof. The statement just follows from writing down the symplectic change-of-variables given by looking at \mathcal{S} as a type II generating function of canonical transformation, first in u and then in α ,

$$\mu(\gamma_i) = \exp(\lambda(\gamma_i) \partial_{\lambda(\gamma_i)} \mathcal{S}), \quad \kappa_i = \frac{\partial \mathcal{S}}{\partial u_i} = \int d\kappa_i, \quad \vartheta_i = \frac{\partial \mathcal{S}}{\partial \alpha_i} = \int d\theta_i, \tag{3.56}$$

and use of Lemma 3.5. □

Keeping in mind the discussion below Definition 3.1, the constructions of this section bestow on \mathcal{S}_g a canonical choice of Dubrovin–Krichever data as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F} &\longleftrightarrow \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{g}} \\ \mathcal{B} &\longleftrightarrow \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{g}} \\ \mathcal{D} &\longleftrightarrow \sum_i \Sigma_i(\mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{g}}) \\ \mathcal{E}_1 &\longleftrightarrow \mathcal{L} \longleftrightarrow \frac{d\lambda}{\lambda} \\ \mathcal{E}_2 &\longleftrightarrow \mathcal{M} \longleftrightarrow \frac{d\mu}{\mu} \\ \Lambda &\longleftrightarrow \Lambda_{\text{PT}} \end{aligned} \tag{3.57}$$

which is complete but for the choice of the Lagrangian sublattice Λ^L . The latter is left unspecified by the Toda dynamics, and, in the applications of the next two sections its choice will vary depending on the circumstances.

4. Application I: gauge theory and Toda

I will now consider the first application of the constructions of the previous two sections: this will culminate with a proof of a B-model version of the Gopakumar–Vafa correspondence for the Poincaré homology sphere. For the sake of completeness, I will set the stage by recalling all the necessary ingredients of Figure 1; the reader familiar with them may skip directly to Section 4.2.

4.1. Seiberg–Witten, Gromov–Witten and Chern–Simons

4.1.1. *Gauge theory.* From the physics point of view, the first object of interest for us is the minimal supersymmetric five-dimensional gauge theory on the product $M_5 = \mathbb{R}^4 \times S^1_R$ of four-dimensional Minkowski space times a circle of radius R with gauge group the compact

real form $E_8^{\mathbb{R}}$. On shell, and at $R \rightarrow \infty$, its gauge/matter content consists of one $E_8^{\mathbb{R}}$ vector multiplet (A, λ, φ) with real scalar φ , gluino λ , and gauge field A ; upon compactification this is enriched by an extra scalar ϑ , which is the Wilson loop around the fifth-dimensional S_R^1 . The infrared dynamics of the compactified theory is characterised by a dynamical holomorphic scale in four dimensions Λ_4 [101, 108], which is (perturbatively) a renormalisation group invariant. For generic vacua parametrised by $R \in \mathbb{R}^+$ and the complexified scalar vev $\phi = \langle \varphi + i\theta \rangle$, and assuming that the latter is much higher than the non-perturbative scale $|\phi| \gg \Lambda_4$, the massless modes are those of a theory of $\text{rank}_{\mathfrak{e}_8} = 8$ weakly coupled photons in four dimensions, whose Wilsonian effective action is given by integrating out both perturbative (electric) and non-perturbative (dyonic) contributions of BPS saturated Kaluza–Klein states. This is expressed (up to two derivatives in the $U(1)$ gauge superfield strengths W_α^i , and in four-dimensional $\mathcal{N} = 1$ superspace coordinates (x, θ)) by the Wilsonian effective Lagrangian

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{4\pi} \text{Im} \left[\int d^4\theta \frac{\partial F_0^{\text{SYM}}}{\partial A_i} \bar{A}^i + \frac{1}{2} \int d^2\theta \frac{\partial^2 F_0^{\text{SYM}}}{\partial A_i \partial A_j} W_\alpha^i \bar{W}^{\alpha,j} \right], \tag{4.1}$$

which is entirely encoded by the prepotential F_0^{SYM} ; in particular, the Hessian $\frac{\partial^2 F_0^{\text{SYM}}}{\partial A_i \partial A_j}$ returns the gauge coupling matrix for the low-energy photons.

Mathematically, this gauge theory prepotential should coincide with the equivariant limit of a suitable generating function of instanton numbers. Let $\text{Bun}_k(\mathcal{G})$ be the moduli space of principal E_8 -bundles on the projective compactification $\mathbb{P}^2 \simeq \mathbb{C}^2 \cup \mathbb{P}_\infty^1$ of $\mathbb{R}^4 \simeq \mathbb{C}^2$ with second Chern class k , which I assume to be positive in the following; here ‘framed’ means that we fix a trivialisation of the projective line at infinity. $\text{Bun}_k(\mathcal{G})$ is an irreducible smooth quasi-affine variety of dimension $2h(\mathfrak{g})k = 60k$, and it admits an irreducible, affine partial compactification given by the Uhlenbeck stratification

$$\mathcal{U}_k(\mathcal{G}) = \text{Bun}_k(\mathcal{G}) \sqcup (\text{Bun}_{k-1}(\mathcal{G}) \times \mathbb{C}^2) \sqcup (\text{Bun}_{k-2}(\mathcal{G}) \times \text{Sym}^2 \mathbb{C}^2) \cdots \sqcup (\text{Sym}^k \mathbb{C}^2). \tag{4.2}$$

There is an algebraic $\mathbb{T} \times (\mathbb{C}^*)^2 \simeq (\mathbb{C}^*)^{10}$ torus action on $\text{Bun}_k(\mathcal{G})$, where the two factors act by scaling the trivialisation at infinity and the linear coordinates of \mathbb{C}^2 , respectively, and which extends to the whole of $\mathcal{U}_k(\mathcal{G})$ [22], and leads to a ten-dimensional torus action on the vector space $H^0(\mathcal{U}_k(\mathcal{G}), \mathcal{O})$ of regular functions on $\mathcal{U}_k(\mathcal{G})$. Denoting the characters of $\mathbb{T} \times (\mathbb{C}^*)^2$ by μ , the latter decomposes

$$H^0(\mathcal{U}_k(\mathcal{G}), \mathcal{O}) = \bigoplus_{\mu} (H^0(\mathcal{U}_k(\mathcal{G}), \mathcal{O}))_{\mu} \tag{4.3}$$

as a direct sum of weight spaces which are, non-trivially, finite-dimensional over \mathbb{C} (see, for example, [93]). Let $a_i = c_1(\mathbb{L}_i)$, $i = 1, \dots, 8$ for the first Chern class of the dual of the i th tautological line bundle $\mathbb{L}_i \rightarrow B\mathcal{T}$, and likewise write $\epsilon_{1,2} = c_1(\mathbb{L}_{1,2})$ for the equivariant parameters of the right (spacetime) $(\mathbb{C}^*)^2$ factor in $\mathbb{T} \times (\mathbb{C}^*)^2 \curvearrowright \mathcal{U}_k(\mathcal{G})$. The instanton partition function of the five-dimensional gauge theory[†] is then defined to be the Hilbert sum

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{G}}^{\text{inst}}(a_1, \dots, a_8; \epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, Q) \\ = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^+} \left(QR^{q_{\mathfrak{g}}} e^{-q_{\mathfrak{g}} R(\epsilon_1 + \epsilon_2)/2} \right)^n \sum_{\mu} \dim_{\mathbb{C}} (H^0(\mathcal{U}_k(\mathcal{G}), \mathcal{O}))_{\mu} \exp[\mu \cdot (\vec{a}, \vec{\epsilon})]. \end{aligned} \tag{4.4}$$

[†]Physically this should be thought to be in an Ω -background, with equivariant parameters (ϵ_1, ϵ_2) corresponding to the torus weights of the $(\mathbb{C}^*)^2$ factor acting on \mathbb{C}^2 above.

The prepotential (4.1) is recovered as the sum of the non-equivariant limit of $\epsilon_1 \epsilon_2 \ln \mathcal{Z}_G^{\text{inst}}$, which is well defined [92, 94], plus a classical + one-loop perturbative contribution. Namely,

$$F_0^{\text{SYM}} \triangleq F_{\text{cl}} + F_{1\text{-loop}} + F_{\text{inst}}, \tag{4.5}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} F_{\text{cl}} &= \frac{\tau_{ij} a_i a_j}{2}, \\ F_{1\text{-loop}} &= \sum_{\alpha \in \Delta^*} \left[\frac{(\alpha \cdot a)^2 \log(R\Lambda_4)}{2} - (\alpha \cdot a)^3 \frac{R}{12} + \text{Li}_3(e^{-R\alpha \cdot a}) \right], \\ F_{\text{inst}} &= \lim_{\epsilon_i \rightarrow 0} \epsilon_1 \epsilon_2 \log \mathcal{Z}_G^{\text{inst}}(a_1, \dots, a_8; \epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, \Lambda_4), \end{aligned} \tag{4.6}$$

where τ is the bare gauge coupling matrix. In the following, I am going to measure energies in units of Λ_4 and thus set $\Lambda_4 = 1$; the dependence on Λ_4 can be restored by appropriate rescaling of the dimensionful quantities a_i and $1/R$.

4.1.2. *Topological strings.* It has long been argued that the prepotential (4.6) might also be regarded as the generating function of genus zero Gromov–Witten invariants on a suitable non-compact Calabi–Yau threefold [70, 79]. Let

$$X = \text{Tot}(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}^{\oplus 2}(-1)) = \{(A, v) \in \text{Mat}(2, \mathbb{C}) \times \mathbb{P}^1 \mid Av = 0\} \tag{4.7}$$

be the minimal toric resolution of the singular quadric $\det A = 0$ in \mathbb{A}^4 ; columns of A give trivialisations of $\mathcal{O}(-1)$ over the North/South affine patches of \mathbb{P}^1 . Any $\Gamma \triangleleft \text{SL}_2(\mathbb{C})$, $|\Gamma| < \infty$ gives an action $\Gamma \circlearrowleft X$ by left multiplication, $(\gamma \in \Gamma, A) \rightarrow \gamma \cdot A$, which is trivial on the canonical bundle of X , and covers the trivial action on the base \mathbb{P}^1 . The quotient space is thus a singular Calabi–Yau fibration over \mathbb{P}^1 by surface singularities of the same ADE type of Γ [104]; and type E₈ corresponds to taking $\Gamma \simeq \mathbb{I}$ the binary icosahedral group (see Appendix B.2).

There are two distinguished chambers in the stringy Kähler moduli space of $\mathcal{X} \triangleq [X/\mathbb{I}]$ that are of importance in our discussion. One is the large radius chamber: in this case we take the minimal crepant resolution $\pi : Y \rightarrow X/\mathbb{I}$, which corresponds to fibrewise resolving the E₈ singularities on a chain of rational curves whose intersection matrix equates $-\mathcal{C}_{ij}^g$ [104]. In particular, $H_2(Y, \mathbb{Z}) = \mathbb{Z}\langle H; E_1, \dots, E_8 \rangle$, where H (respectively, E_i) is the pull-back to Y from the base \mathbb{P}^1 (respectively, the blow-up \mathbb{C}^2/\mathbb{I} of the fibre singularity) of the fundamental class of the base curve (respectively, of the class of the i th exceptional curve). The Gromov–Witten potential of Y is the generating sum

$$\begin{aligned} F^{\text{GW}}(Y; \epsilon; t_B, t_1, \dots, t_8) &= \sum_{d \in H_2(Y, \mathbb{Z}), g \in \mathbb{Z}^+} \epsilon^{2g-2} e^{-d \cdot t} N_{g,d}^Y \\ &= \sum_{g \in \mathbb{Z}^+} \epsilon^{2g-2} F_g^{\text{GW}}(Y; t_B, t_1, \dots, t_8), \end{aligned} \tag{4.8}$$

where

$$N_{g,d}^Y = \int_{[\mathcal{M}_g(Y,d)]^{\text{vir}}} 1 \tag{4.9}$$

is the genus g , degree d Gromov–Witten invariant of Y , and we write $d = d_B[H] + d_1[E_1] + \dots + d_8[E_8]$ for the degrees of stable maps from \mathbb{P}^1 to Y . Owing to the non-compactness of Y , what is really meant by $N_{g,d}^Y$ is a sum of degrees of the localised virtual fundamental classes at the fixed loci with respect to a suitable \mathbb{C}^* action: note that Y supports a rank two torus

action given by a diagonal scaling the fibres (which commutes with Γ , and with respect to which the resolution map π is equivariant) and a \mathbb{C}^* rotation of the base \mathbb{P}^1 . In particular we can always cut out a 1-torus action which is trivial on K_Y (the equivariantly Calabi–Yau case) by tuning the weights of the two factors appropriately, and this is the choice that is picked[†] in (4.9). Furthermore, natural Lagrangian A-branes $L \hookrightarrow Y$ and a counting theory of open stable maps can be constructed (at least operatively) via localisation [15, 25, 71]; in a vein similar to (4.8)–(4.9), one defines

$$W_{g,h}^{GW}(Y, L; \lambda; t_B, t_1, \dots, t_8, \lambda) = \sum_{d \in H_2(Y, L, \mathbb{Z})} \sum_{w_1, \dots, w_h \in H_1(L, \mathbb{Z})} e^{-d \cdot t} \prod_i \lambda_i^{w_i} N_{g,h,d,w}^{Y,L}, \quad (4.10)$$

where

$$N_{g,h,d,w}^{Y,L} = \int_{[\mathcal{M}_{g,h}(Y, L, d, w)]^{\text{virt}}} 1 \quad (4.11)$$

is the genus g , h -holed open Gromov–Witten invariant of (X, L) of relative degree d and winding numbers $\{w_i\}_{i=1}^h$, $\partial d = \sum w_i$.

The relation of these curve-counting generating functions and the instanton prepotentials of the previous section is given by the so-called *geometric engineering of gauge theories*, a (partial) statement of which can be given as follows.

CLAIM 4.1 [70,79]. *The genus zero Gromov–Witten potential of Y equates the five-dimensional gauge theory prepotential/instanton generating function*

$$F_0^{\text{SYM}}(R, a_1, \dots, a_8) = F_0^Y(t_B, t_1, \dots, t_8) + \text{cubic} \quad (4.12)$$

under the identification

$$a_i = t_i R, \quad R = e^{-t_B/4}. \quad (4.13)$$

Claim 4.1 has an extension to higher genera wherein gravitational corrections to F_0^{SYM} are considered [5, 12], or equivalently, the gauge theory is placed in the Ω -background (without taking the limit (4.6)) and one restricts to the self-dual background $\epsilon_1 = -\epsilon_2 = \epsilon$ [96]. The open string potentials (4.10) have similarly a counterpart in terms of surface operators in the gauge theory [4, 73].

The second chamber is the orbifold chamber: here we consider the stack quotient $\mathcal{X} = [\mathcal{O}(-1)^{\oplus 2}/\mathbb{I}]$, which has a \mathbb{P}^1 worth of \mathbb{I} -stacky points. Open and closed Gromov–Witten invariants of \mathcal{X} can be defined, if only computationally, along the same lines as before by virtual localisation on moduli of twisted stable maps [25]; I refer the reader to [15, Sections 3.3 and 3.4] where this is more amply discussed.

4.1.3. *Chern–Simons theory.* The previous Calabi–Yau geometry has been argued in [15], following the earlier work [3], to be related to the large N limit of $U(N)$ Chern–Simons theory on the Poincaré sphere. This is a real 3-manifold Σ obtained from $S^2 \times S^1$ after rational surgery with exponents $1/2$, $1/3$ and $1/5$ on a 3-component unlink wrapping the fibre direction of $S^1 \times S^2 \rightarrow S^2$, and it is the only \mathbb{Z} -homology sphere, other than S^3 , to have a finite fundamental group. Equivalently, it can be realised as the quotient $S^3/\mathbb{I} \simeq \mathbb{R}\mathbb{P}^3/\mathbb{I}$ of the three-sphere by the left-action of the binary icosahedral group [121].

I will very succinctly present the statement we are after, referring the reader to the beautiful review [85] or the presentation of [15] for more details. Let $k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, \mathcal{A} a smooth gauge

[†]This is the choice that is picked, for toric targets, by the topological vertex; this is consistent with the fact that, by the equivariant CY condition, this is a rational number (rather than an element of $H_{BC^*}(\text{pt}, \mathbb{Q})$).

connection on the trivial $U(N)$ bundle on Σ . The $U(N)$ Chern–Simons partition function of Σ at level k is the functional integral

$$Z_{\text{CS}}(\Sigma, k, N) = \langle 1 \rangle_{\text{CS}} = \int_{\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G}} [\mathcal{D}\mathcal{A}] \exp\left(\frac{ik}{2\pi} \text{CS}[\mathcal{A}]\right), \tag{4.14}$$

$$\text{CS}[\mathcal{A}] = \int_{\Sigma} \text{Tr}_{\square} \left(\mathcal{A} \wedge d\mathcal{A} + \frac{2}{3} \mathcal{A}^3 \right), \tag{4.15}$$

where (4.15) is the Chern–Simons action. For $\mathcal{K} \hookrightarrow \Sigma$ a link in Σ and $\rho \in R(U(N))$, we will also consider the expectation value under the measure (4.14)–(4.15) of the ρ -character of the holonomy around \mathcal{K} ,

$$W_{\text{CS}}(\Sigma, \mathcal{K}, k, N, \rho) = \frac{\langle \text{Tr}_{\rho} \text{Hol}_{\mathcal{K}}(A) \rangle_{\text{CS}}}{Z_{\text{CS}}} = Z_{\text{CS}}^{-1} \int_{\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G}} [\mathcal{D}\mathcal{A}] \exp\left(\frac{ik}{2\pi} \text{CS}[\mathcal{A}]\right) \text{Tr}_{\rho} \text{Hol}_{\mathcal{K}}(A). \tag{4.16}$$

Equations (4.14)–(4.16) were proposed by Witten [120] to be smooth[†] invariants of Σ and (Σ, \mathcal{K}) , reflecting the near metric independence of (4.14) at the quantum level [105]; when Σ is replaced by S^3 , (4.16) is the HOMFLY polynomial of \mathcal{K} coloured in the representation ρ .

We will be looking at (4.14) in two ways, which are both essentially disentangled with the question of giving a rigorous treatment of the path integral (4.14). One is in Gaussian perturbation theory at large N , where we take (4.14) as a formal expansion in ribbon graphs [85, 116]. Writing

$$g_{\text{YM}} = \frac{2\pi i}{k + N}, \quad t = g_{\text{YM}} N, \tag{4.17}$$

the perturbative free energy takes the form

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}^{\text{CS}}(\Sigma, g_{\text{YM}}, t) &= \ln Z^{\text{CS}}(\Sigma, k, N) \\ &= \sum_{g \geq 0} \mathcal{F}_g^{\text{CS}}(\Sigma, t) g_{\text{YM}}^{2g-2} \in g_{\text{YM}}^{-2} \mathbb{Q}[[t, g_{\text{YM}}^2]]. \end{aligned} \tag{4.18}$$

Similarly, for $h > 0$, $l \in \mathbb{N}^h$ and $\mathcal{K} \in \Sigma$ a link in Σ , we get for the connected Chern–Simons average of a Wilson loop around \mathcal{K} that

$$\begin{aligned} W_{\text{CS}}^{(h)}(\Sigma, \mathcal{K}, k, N, \{\lambda_i\}_{i=1}^h) &\triangleq \sum_{l \in \mathbb{N}^h} \prod_i \lambda_i^{l_i} \frac{1}{|l|!} \frac{\partial^{|l|} \log \left\langle e^{\sum_i q_i \text{Tr}(\text{Hol}_{\mathcal{K}}(A))^i} \right\rangle_{\text{CS}}}{\partial q_1^{l_1} \dots \partial q_s^{l_s}} \Bigg|_{q_i=0}, \\ &= \sum_{g \geq 0} W_{g,h}(\Sigma, \mathcal{K}, t, \{\lambda_i\}) g_{\text{YM}}^{2g-2+h} \in g_{\text{YM}}^{h-2} \mathbb{Q}[[t, g_{\text{YM}}^2]]. \end{aligned} \tag{4.19}$$

The second way of looking at (4.18) and (4.19) comes from their independent mathematical life as the $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_N)$ Reshetikhin–Turaev–Witten invariants of Σ and $\mathcal{K} \hookrightarrow \Sigma$, respectively [105]. Recall that Σ has a Hopf-like realisation as a circle bundle over the orbifold projective line $\mathbb{P}_{2,3,5}^1$ with three orbifold points with isotropy group $\mathbb{Z}_{s(n)}$, with $s(1) = 2$, $s(2) = 3$, $s(3) = 5$. I will write $s = \prod_i s(i) = 30$, and $\mathcal{K}_n \simeq S^1$ for the knots wrapping the exceptional fibre labelled by n . Then the Reshetikhin–Turaev–Witten (RTW) invariants of Σ and (Σ, \mathcal{K}_n) can be computed explicitly from a rational surgery formula [63] (or equivalently, Witten’s surgery prescription

[†]More precisely, Z_{CS} is only invariant under diffeomorphisms of Σ that preserve a given framing of its tangent bundle, and changes in a definite way under change-of-framing; the same applies for W_{CS} and a choice of framing on \mathcal{K} . In the following I implicitly work in canonical framing for both Σ and \mathcal{K} ; also the change of framing will not affect the large N behaviours of \mathcal{F}_{CS} but for a constant in t , $\mathcal{O}(N^0)$ (unstable) term.

for Chern–Simons vevs [120]), leading to closed-form expressions for (4.18) and (4.19) alike in terms of Weyl-group sums [84]. Denote by \mathcal{F}_l the set of dominant weights ω of $SU(N)$ such that, if $\omega = \sum a_i \omega_i$ in terms of the fundamental weights ω_i , then $\sum_i a_i < l$. Then,

$$Z_{CS}(\Sigma, k, N) = \mathcal{N}(\Sigma) \sum_{\beta \in \mathcal{F}_{k+N}} \frac{1}{\prod_{\alpha > 0} \sin\left(\frac{\pi \beta \cdot \alpha}{k+N}\right)} \prod_{i=1}^3 \sum_{f_i \in \Lambda_r / \mathfrak{s}(i)\Lambda_r} \sum_{w_i \in \mathcal{S}_N} \epsilon(w_i) \times \exp\left\{ \frac{i\pi}{(k+N)\mathfrak{s}(i)} \left(-\beta^2 - 2\beta((k+N)f_i + w(\rho)) + ((k+N)f_i + w(\rho))^2 \right) \right\}, \tag{4.20}$$

where ρ is the Weyl vector of \mathfrak{sl}_N , $\rho = \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \omega_i$, Λ_r is the \mathfrak{sl}_N root lattice, and $\mathcal{N}(\Sigma)$ is an explicit multiplicative factor involving the surgery data and the Casson–Walker–Lescop invariant of Σ . A similar expression holds for the (un-normalised) Chern–Simons vevs of the Wilson loops around fibre knots: this is obtained by replacing $\rho \rightarrow \rho + \Lambda$ for Λ a dominant weight in (4.18), after which (4.19) can be recovered by expressing the representation-basis colouring by the connected power sum colouring of (4.19), and powers multiple of \mathfrak{s}_i for $i = 1, 2, 3$ single out the holonomies around the i th exceptional fibre (see [15, 17] and the discussion of Section 4.2.1).

Two remarks are in order about (4.20). Firstly, unlike (4.18)–(4.19), (4.20) is an exact expression at finite N ; among its virtues however, as first emphasised in [84], is the possibility to express it as a matrix-like integral, and thus use standard asymptotic methods in random matrix theory to study its large N , finite t regime: this fact will be used extensively in the next section. Secondly, as pointed out in [84] and further confirmed in [10, 13] by a functional integral analysis, the sum over f_i in (4.20) may be interpreted as a sum over critical points of the Chern–Simons functional (4.15),

$$\text{Crit}_{CS}^N = \{A \in \text{Conn}(\Sigma, U(N)) | F_A = 0\} = \text{Hom}(\pi_1(\Sigma), U(N))/U(N) \tag{4.21}$$

namely, flat $U(N)$ -connections on Σ ; this is a finite set at finite N since $|\pi_1(\Sigma)| < \infty$. In the monodromy representation of the latter equality in (4.21), these can be labelled by integers (f_0, f_1, \dots, f_8) satisfying

$$\sum_i \mathfrak{d}_i f_i = N, \tag{4.22}$$

where \mathfrak{d}_i , $i = 0, \dots, 8$ is the dimension of the i th irreducible representation of $\pi_1(\Sigma) = \tilde{\mathbb{I}}$ (see Table B2; equivalently, the i th Dynkin label in Figure 2), the trivial connection contribution to (4.20) being given by $f_i = 0$, $i > 0$. The latter is the exponentially dominant summand in the limit $g_{YM} \rightarrow 0$, as the classical Chern–Simons functional attains there its minimum value (equal to zero), and it leads to a quantum invariant of 3-manifolds in its own right: this is the *Lê–Murakami–Ohtsuki* (LMO) invariant, which is a derivation of the universal Vassiliev–Kontsevich invariant by taking its Kirby-move-invariant part [80].

In landmark papers by Gopakumar and Vafa [59] and Ooguri–Vafa [100], it was proposed that the large N expansion of the Chern–Simons invariants of S^3 and $\mathcal{K} = \mathbb{O}$ yield the genus expansion of the topological A-model on the resolved conifold $X = \mathcal{O}(-1) \oplus \mathcal{O}(-1) \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$. Following in this direction and that of its generalisation of [3] for lens spaces[†], it was proposed amongst other things in [15] that the large N limit of the connected averages (4.18) and (4.19) should be interpreted (respectively) as the generating functions of closed and open

[†]Some of these arguments require extra care when one considers non- $SU(2)$ quotients of the three-sphere; see, for example, [28].

Gromov–Witten invariants (4.8) and (4.10) of the orbifold-of-the-conifold \mathcal{X} , as I now recall. Let $\text{Crit}_{\text{CS}}^\infty = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \text{Crit}_{\text{CS}}^N$ be the direct limit of the finite critical point sets (4.21) with respect to the composition of morphisms of sets induced by $U(N) \hookrightarrow U(N+1)$. A point in $\text{Crit}_{\text{CS}}^\infty$ consists of a flat background $[A]_{\mathfrak{t}}$ parameterised by $\mathfrak{t}_i \triangleq N_i g_{\text{YM}}$ for $i \in \{0, \dots, 8\}$. Write now $\mathcal{F}_g(\Sigma, \mathfrak{t})$ and $\mathcal{W}_{g,n}(\Sigma, \mathfrak{t}; \vec{x})$ for the contribution of each $[A]_{\mathfrak{t}}$ at large N to the perturbative free energies and correlators of $U(N)$ Chern–Simons theory (4.18) and (4.19).

CLAIM 4.2 [15]. *There is an affine linear change-of-variables $(\tau, t_B) = \mathcal{L}(\mathfrak{t})$ such that*

$$F_g^{\text{CS}}(\Sigma, \mathfrak{t}) = F_g^{\text{GW}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}(\mathfrak{t})), \quad W_{g,h}^{\text{CS}}(\Sigma, \mathcal{K}; \mathfrak{t}, \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_h) = W_{g,h}^{\text{GW}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{L}(\mathfrak{t}); \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_h). \tag{4.23}$$

Consequently, the LMO contribution to the Chern–Simons free energy ($f_i = 0$ for $i > 0$) is obtained as the corresponding restriction of GW potentials:

$$F_g^{\text{CS}}(\Sigma, \mathfrak{t}_i = \mathfrak{t}_0 \delta_{i0}) = F_g^{\text{GW}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}(\mathfrak{t})) \Big|_{\mathfrak{t}_i = \mathfrak{t}_0 \delta_{i0}},$$

$$W_{g,h}^{\text{CS}}(\Sigma, \mathfrak{t}_i = \mathfrak{t}_0 \delta_{i0}, \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_h) = W_{g,h}^{\text{GW}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{L}(\mathfrak{t}); \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_h) \Big|_{\mathfrak{t}_i = \mathfrak{t}_0 \delta_{i0}}. \tag{4.24}$$

I will refer to (4.23) and (4.24) as, respectively, the *strong* and *weak A-model Gopakumar–Vafa correspondence* for Σ .

4.1.4. *Toda spectral curves and the topological recursion.* A major point of the foregoing discussion is to argue that there exist completions of the Dubrovin–Krichever data (3.57) of the E₈ relativistic Toda spectral curves in the form Lagrangian sublattices $\Lambda_{\text{PT}}^L \subset \Lambda_{\text{PT}}$ leading to the existence of genus zero prepotentials F_0^{Toda} from rigid special Kähler geometry relations[†] on \mathcal{B}_g , as well as higher genus open/closed potentials $F_g^{\text{Toda}}, W_{g,h}^{\text{Toda}}$ from the Chekhov–Eynard–Orantin topological recursion [50], which are purported to be the all-genus solutions of the open/closed topological B-model with \mathcal{S}_g as its target geometry [19]. Following completely analogous statements [3, 19, 52, 62, 95] for the $SU(N)$ case, and in [15] for ADE types other than E₈, it will be proposed that the open and closed B-model theory on the relativistic Toda spectral curves \mathcal{S}_g with Dubrovin–Krichever data specified by (3.57) give in one go the Seiberg–Witten solution of the five-dimensional E₈ gauge theory in a self-dual Ω -background, the mirror theory of the A-model on (Y, L) and $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$, and a large- N dual of Chern–Simons theory on Σ .

For definiteness, let us put again ourselves at a generic moduli point (u, \aleph) . The first step to define a prepotential from the assignment (3.57) to \mathcal{S}_g is to consider periods of $d\sigma = \log \mu d \log \lambda$ on Λ_{PT} [39, 75, 114]. At genus zero, define

$$\Pi_{A_i}(d\sigma) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \alpha_i = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{A_i} d\sigma, \quad \Pi_{B_i}(d\sigma) = \frac{1}{2} \oint_{B_i} d\sigma, \tag{4.25}$$

for the set of $(A_i, B_i)_{i=1}^8$ cycles generating the \mathcal{P}_g -invariant part of $H_1(\Gamma_{u,\aleph}, \mathbb{Z})$. I am first of all going to fix $\Lambda_{\text{PT}}^L \triangleq \mathbb{Z}\langle\{A_i\}_i\rangle$; what this means is that, locally around $a_i = \infty$, the A-periods (4.25) will define a map

$$a_i : \mathcal{B}_g \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$$

$$(u, \aleph) \rightarrow \Pi_{A_i}(d\sigma), \tag{4.26}$$

[†]This type of relations, which condense the fact there exists a prepotential for the periods on the mirror curve, have different names and tasks in different communities: in gauge theory, they are a manifestation of $\mathcal{N} = 2$ super-Ward identities; and in Whitham theory, they codify the existence of a τ -structure for the underlying hierarchy.

with the B-periods (4.25) being further subject to the *rigid special Kähler relations* [39, 75, 114]

$$\Pi_{B_i}(\mathrm{d}\sigma) = \frac{\partial F^{\mathrm{Toda}}}{\partial a_i} \tag{4.27}$$

for a locally defined analytic function $F^{\mathrm{Toda}}(a)$ in a punctured neighbourhood of $a_i = \infty$.

CONJECTURE 4.3. We have

$$F_0^{\mathrm{Toda}} = F_0^{\mathrm{SYM}} = F_0^{\mathrm{Y}} \tag{4.28}$$

locally around $a_i = \infty = t_i$, under the identifications of (4.13), and after setting $\aleph = R = e^{-t_B/4}$. Furthermore, let $\tilde{A}_i \triangleq -B_i$, $\tilde{B}_i \triangleq A_i$ and define

$$\tilde{a}_i \triangleq \frac{1}{2\pi i} \Pi_{\tilde{A}_i}(\mathrm{d}\sigma), \quad \frac{\partial \tilde{F}_0^{\mathrm{Toda}}}{\partial a_i} \triangleq \frac{1}{2} \Pi_{\tilde{B}_i}(\mathrm{d}\sigma). \tag{4.29}$$

Then there exist linear change-of-variables $\tilde{a} = \mathcal{L}_1(\tau) = \mathcal{L}_2(\mathfrak{t})$ such that

$$\tilde{F}_0^{\mathrm{Toda}}(\tilde{a}) = F_0^{\mathrm{Xi}}(\mathcal{L}_1^{-1}\tau) = F_0^{\mathrm{CS}}(\mathcal{L}_2^{-1}\mathfrak{t}). \tag{4.30}$$

For the reader familiar with Figure 1 in the $SU(N)$ case, this is all by and large expected provided we show that our choice of A and B cycles in (3.29)–(3.30) reflects the corresponding choice of SW cycles in the weakly coupled (electric) duality frame in the gauge theory, and of mirror B-model cycles for the smooth chamber in the stringy Kähler moduli space of Y : that would justify the first part of the claim, with the second following by composing with the S -duality transformation $(A_i, B_i) \rightarrow (\tilde{A}_i, \tilde{B}_i)$ to the orbifold/Chern–Simons chamber. For the first bit, I re-introduce Λ_4 everywhere on the gauge theory side by dimension counting and take the limit $\Lambda_4 \rightarrow 0$ holding fixed a_i and R , which corresponds to switching off the non-perturbative part of (4.5). At the level of the Toda chain variables this is $\aleph \rightarrow 0$ with u_i kept fixed. Recall that the branch points b_i^\pm of $\lambda : \Gamma_{u, \aleph}$ come in pairs related by

$$b_i^- = \frac{\aleph}{b_i^+}. \tag{4.31}$$

In particular, in the degeneration limit $\aleph \rightarrow 0$, where $\Gamma_{u,0} \simeq \Gamma'_{u,0}$, the branch points b_i^- in Figure 4 all collapse to zero, and therefore, the contours C_i^α are given by the difference of the lifts to the sheet labelled by α and $\sigma_i(\alpha)$ of a simple loop around the origin in the λ -plane. In other words, and in terms of the Cartan torus element $\exp(l)$ in (2.22), we find

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\aleph \rightarrow 0} \oint_{A_i} \mathrm{d}\sigma &= \lim_{\aleph \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{2q_{\mathfrak{g}}} \sum_{\alpha \in \Delta^*} \langle \alpha, \alpha_i \rangle \oint_{C_i^\alpha} \log \mu \frac{\mathrm{d}\lambda}{\lambda}, \\ &= \frac{1}{2q_{\mathfrak{g}}} \sum_{\alpha \in \Delta^*} \langle \alpha, \alpha_i \rangle \oint_{\lambda=0} \lim_{\aleph \rightarrow 0} \frac{(\sigma_i(\alpha)(l) - \alpha(l)) \mathrm{d}\lambda}{\lambda}, \\ &= \frac{1}{2q_{\mathfrak{g}}} \sum_{\alpha \in \Delta^*} (\langle \alpha, \alpha_i \rangle)^2 \alpha_i(l)|_{\aleph=\lambda=0} = \alpha_i(l)|_{\aleph=\lambda=0}, \end{aligned} \tag{4.32}$$

where we have used (see [69, 83])

$$\frac{1}{2q_{\mathfrak{g}}} \sum_{\alpha \in \Delta^*} (\langle \alpha, \alpha_i \rangle)^2 = 1. \tag{4.33}$$

The right-hand side of (4.32) is just the semi-classical Higgs vev $(a_i)_{\Lambda_4=0}$ for the complexified scalar $\phi = \varphi + i\vartheta$ [86]. This pins down A_i as the correct choice of an electric cycle for

the i th $U(1)$ factor in the IR theory, with logarithmic monodromy around the weakly coupled/maximally unipotent monodromy point $a_i = \infty$, and B_i (up to monodromy) as their doubly logarithmic counterpart.

The identifications in (4.3) pave the way to an extension to the higher genus theory upon appealing to the remodelled-B-model recursive scheme of [19]. Let Ψ be a sublattice of $H_1(\Gamma_{u,N}, \mathbb{Z})$ containing $\{A_i\}_i$ which is maximally isotropic with respect to the intersection pairing. Denote by $B^{\text{Toda}} \in H^0(\text{Sym}^2 \Gamma_{u,N} \setminus \Delta(\Gamma_{u,N}), \mathcal{K}_{\Gamma_{u,N}}^{\boxtimes 2})$ the unique (up to scale) meromorphic bidifferential on $\Gamma_{u,N}$ with double pole on the diagonal $\Delta(\Gamma_{u,N})$, vanishing residues thereon, and vanishing periods on all cycles $C \in \Psi$; we fix the scaling ambiguity by imposing the coefficient of the double pole to be 1 in the local coordinate patch given by the λ projection. I further write

$$B^{\text{Toda}}(p, q) \triangleq \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{g}}^* E_{\Psi}(p, q) \tag{4.34}$$

whose definition, by the nature of $(\mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{g}})_*$ as a projection on $\text{PT}(\Gamma_{u,N})$, is independent of the choice of the particular Lagrangian extension $\Psi \supset \Lambda_{\text{PT}}$. Further write, for $\lambda(q)$ locally near b_i^{\pm} ,

$$\mathcal{K}_{0,2}^{\text{Toda}}(p, q) \triangleq \frac{1}{2} \frac{\int_{q'=\bar{q}}^q B^{\text{Toda}}(p, q')}{\log \mu(\bar{q}) - \log \mu(q)}, \tag{4.35}$$

where locally around each ramification point $\lambda^{-1}(b_i^{\pm})$, \bar{q} is the local deck transformation $\mu(q) = \alpha \cdot l \rightarrow \alpha \cdot l + \langle \alpha_i, \alpha \rangle \alpha_i \cdot l$. We call B^{Toda} and $\mathcal{K}^{\text{Toda}}$, respectively, the *symmetrised Bergmann kernel and recursion kernel for the DK data* (3.57).

REMARK 4.4. In terms of the Dubrovin–Krichever data (3.57), note that the family of differentials B^{Toda} is determined by $\mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{g}}$ and $\Lambda_{\text{PT}}^L \subset \Lambda_{\text{PT}}$ alone – that is, by the curves themselves, the invariant periods Λ_{PT} , and the specific marking of the ‘A’ cycles in Λ_{PT}^L to be those with vanishing periods for B^{Toda} . On the other hand, $\mathcal{K}^{\text{Toda}}$ feels on top of that the specific choice of relative differential $\mathcal{M} \leftrightarrow d \ln \mu$ in (3.57), which is reflected by the presence of the logarithm of the universal map μ to \mathbb{P}^1 of (2.23) in the denominator of (4.35). The further choice of $\mathcal{L} \leftrightarrow d \ln \lambda$ will play a role momentarily in the definition of the topological recursion.

DEFINITION 4.1. For $g, h \in \mathbb{N}$, $2g - 2 + h > 0$, the Chekhov–Eynard–Orantin generating functions [33, 50] for the Toda spectral curve $\mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{g}}$ with DK data (3.57) are recursively defined as

$$W_{0,2}^{\text{Toda}}(p, q) \triangleq \frac{B^{\text{Toda}}(p, q)}{dpdq} - \frac{\lambda'(p)\lambda'(q)}{(\lambda(p) - \lambda(q))^2}, \tag{4.36}$$

$$\begin{aligned} W_{g,h+1}^{\text{Toda}}(p_0, p_1, \dots, p_h) &= \sum_{b_i^{\pm}} \text{Res}_{\lambda(p)=b_i^{\pm}} \mathcal{K}_{0,2}^{\text{Toda}}(p_0, p) \left(W_{g-1,h+2}^{\text{Toda}}(p, \bar{p}, p_1, \dots, p_h) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_{l=0}^g \sum'_{J \subset H} W_{g-l,|J|+1}^{\text{Toda}}(p, p_J) W_{(l),|H|-|J|+1}^{\text{Toda}}(\bar{p}, p_{H \setminus J}) \right), \end{aligned} \tag{4.37}$$

where $I \cup J = \{p_1, \dots, p_h\}$, $I \cap J = \emptyset$, and \sum' denotes omission of the terms $(h, I) = (0, \emptyset)$ and (g, J) . Furthermore, for $g > 0$ we define the higher genus-free energies

$$\begin{aligned} F_1^{\text{Toda}} &\triangleq \frac{1}{2} \left[-\log \tau_{\text{KK}}(\Xi_{\mathfrak{g},\text{red}}) + \frac{1}{12} \log \det \Omega \right], \\ F_g^{\text{Toda}} &\triangleq \frac{1}{2-2g} \sum_{b_i^{\pm}} \text{Res}_{\lambda(p)=b_i^{\pm}} \sigma(p) W_{g,1}^{\text{Toda}}, \end{aligned} \tag{4.38}$$

where τ_{KK} is the Kokotov–Korotkin τ -function of the branched cover $\Xi_{\mathfrak{g},\text{red}}$ [72], Ω is the Jacobian matrix of angular frequencies (3.55), and σ is the Poincaré action (3.50).

Equation (4.37) is the celebrated topological recursion of [50], which inductively defines generating functions $\{W_{g,h}^{\text{Toda}}\}_{g,h}$ purely in terms of the Dubrovin–Krichever data (3.57). The root motivation of Definition 4.1, which arose in the formal study of random matrix models, is that the generating functions thus constructed provide a solution of Virasoro constraints whenever the spectral curve set-up arises as the genus zero solution of the planar loop equation for the 1-point function; it was put forward in [19], and further elaborated upon in [37], that the very same recursion solves \mathcal{W} -algebra constraints for the open/closed Kodaira–Spencer theory of gravity/holomorphic Chern–Simons theory on local Calabi–Yau threefolds of the form

$$\nu\xi = \Phi(\lambda, \mu),$$

with B-branes wrapping either of the lines $\nu = 0$ or $\xi = 0$. We follow the same path of [15, 19] by setting $\Phi = \Xi_{\mathfrak{g},\text{red}}$, taking (4.37)–(4.38) as the *definition* of the higher genus/open string completion of the Toda prepotential (4.27), and submit the following.

CONJECTURE 4.5. We have

$$F_g^{\text{Toda}} = F_g^{\text{SYM}} = F_g^{\text{GW}} \tag{4.39}$$

locally around $a_i = \infty = t_i$ and under the same identifications of (4.3); here we defined the gravitational correction

$$F_g^{\text{SYM}} = [\epsilon^{2g}]F^{\text{SYM}}(\epsilon, -\epsilon), \tag{4.40}$$

as the $\mathcal{O}((\epsilon_1 = -\epsilon_2)^{2g})$ coefficient in an expansion of the Ω background around the flat space limit. Furthermore, denote by $(\widetilde{W}_{g,h}, \widetilde{F}_g)$ the Toda/CEO generating functions obtained upon applying (4.37)–(4.38) to the Toda spectral curves with zero \tilde{A}_i -period normalisation for (4.34) and (4.35). Then, with the same notation as in (4.3), we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{F}_g^{\text{Toda}}(\tilde{a}) &= F_g^{\text{GW}}(\mathcal{X}; \mathcal{L}_1^{-1}t) = F_g^{\text{CS}}(\mathcal{L}_2^{-1}\mathfrak{t}), \\ \widetilde{W}_{g,h}^{\text{Toda}}(\tilde{a}, \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_h) &= W_{g,h}^{\text{GW}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}; \mathcal{L}_1^{-1}t, \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_h) = W_{g,h}^{\text{CS}}(\mathcal{L}_2^{-1}\mathfrak{t}, \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_h), \end{aligned} \tag{4.41}$$

where we have identified $\lambda_i = \lambda(p_i)$.

As in claim 4.2, I will refer to the equality of Toda and Chern–Simons generating functions as the *strong/weak B-model Gopakumar–Vafa correspondence* for Σ , according to whether the restriction to the trivial connection $\mathfrak{t}_i = t_0\delta_{i0}$ is taken or not.

REMARK 4.6. The two claims above are slightly asymmetrical between Y and \mathcal{X} in that they do not include the open string sector in the latter. On the GW side, exactly by the same token as for the orbifold chamber and in keeping with the toric cases [19], the same type of statement should hold, namely that the topological recursion potentials $W_{g,h}^{\text{Toda}}$ equate to $W_{g,h}^{Y,L}$; for the gauge theory, the extension one is after requires the introduction to surface defects in the gauge theory [4, 73]. I do not further discuss these here, and refer the reader to [15, 73] for more details.

4.2. On the Gopakumar–Vafa correspondence for the Poincaré sphere

After much conjecturing I will prove at least one of the correspondences of the previous section. In the next section, I will show that the weak version of the B-model Gopakumar–Vafa correspondence holds for all genera, colourings, and degrees of expansion in the ‘t Hooft parameter.

4.2.1. LMO invariants and matrix models. I will set

$$\begin{aligned}
 F_g^{\text{LMO}}(\Sigma; \tau) &= F_g^{\text{CS}}(\Sigma; \mathfrak{t}_i = \tau \delta_{i0}, x) \\
 W_{g,h}^{\text{LMO}}(\Sigma, \mathcal{K}; \tau, \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_h) &= W_{g,h}^{\text{CS}}(\Sigma, \mathcal{K}; \mathfrak{t}_i = \tau \delta_{i0}, \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_h)
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{4.42}$$

to designate the LMO contribution ($f_i = 0$) to the Chern–Simons partition function (4.20) of Σ , and quantum invariants of the fibre knot \mathcal{K} , respectively; similarly I will use Z^{LMO} for the restricted partition function. The first step to relate the latter to spectral curves, as in [3], is to re-write (4.20) as a matrix model as first pointed out in [84] (see also [8, 13]): this follows from taking a Gaussian integral representation of the exponential in (4.20) and using Weyl’s denominator formula. The upshot [84] is that the restriction of (4.20) to its summand at $f_i = 0$ is the total mass of an eigenvalue model

$$Z_{\text{LMO}}(\Sigma, k, N) = \mathcal{N}(\Sigma) \mathbb{E}_{d\mu}(1) = \mathcal{N}(\Sigma) \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} d\mu,
 \tag{4.43}$$

with measure given by a Gaussian 1-body potential, and a trigonometric Coulomb 2-body interaction,

$$d\mu \triangleq d^N \kappa \prod_{i < j} \frac{\prod_{l=1}^3 \sinh \frac{\kappa_i - \kappa_j}{2s(l)}}{\sinh \frac{\kappa_i - \kappa_j}{2}} e^{-\frac{N\kappa \cdot \kappa}{2\tau}},
 \tag{4.44}$$

with $\tau = g_{\text{YM}} N$, $g_{\text{YM}} = 2\pi i(k + N)^{-1}$. The integral of (4.43) is by fiat a convergent matrix (eigenvalue) model, and it takes the form of a perturbation of the ordinary (gauged) Gaussian matrix model by double-trace insertions, owing to the sinh-type 2-body interaction of the eigenvalues (see [3, Section 6]). The Chern–Simons knot invariants (4.19) are similarly computed as

$$W_h^{\text{LMO}}(\Sigma, \mathcal{K}, k, N, \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_h) = \mathbb{E}_{d\mu}^{\text{conn}} \left(\prod_{i=1}^h \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{x_i}{x_i - e^{\kappa_i}} \right),
 \tag{4.45}$$

where the coefficients of degree k_i in λ_i , for $k_i = (30/s(l))j_i$ and $j_i \in \mathbb{Z}$, gives the perturbative quantum invariant (in colouring given by the j th connected power sum) of the knot going along the fibre of order $s(l)$ in \mathfrak{s} , $l = 1, 2, 3$.

This type of eigenvalue measures falls squarely under the class of N -dimensional eigenvalue models considered in [18], for which the authors rigorously prove that a topological expansion of the form (4.18) and (4.19) applies to the asymptotic expansion of (4.43) and (4.45), respectively. What is more, in [16] the authors prove that the topological recursion (4.37)–(4.38) with initial data for the induction given by

$$W_{0,1}^{\text{LMO}}(x) \triangleq \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \mathbb{E}_{d\mu} \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{x}{x - e^{\kappa_i}} \right),
 \tag{4.46}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 W_{0,2}^{\text{LMO}}(x_1, x_2) \triangleq & \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left[\mathbb{E}_{\text{d}\mu} \left(\sum_{i_1, i_2=1}^N \frac{x_1 x_2}{(x_1 - e^{\kappa_{i_1}})(x_2 - e^{\kappa_{i_2}})} \right) \right. \\
 & \left. - \mathbb{E}_{\text{d}\mu} \left(\sum_{i_1=1}^N \frac{x_1}{x_1 - e^{\kappa_{i_1}}} \right) \mathbb{E}_{\text{d}\mu} \left(\sum_{i_2=1}^N \frac{x_2}{x_2 - e^{\kappa_{i_2}}} \right) \right] \tag{4.47}
 \end{aligned}$$

computes the all-order, higher genus, all-colourings quantum invariants of fibre knots \mathcal{K} . As is typical in most settings where the topological recursion applies, the planar two point function (4.47) can be written as a section $W_{0,2}^{\text{CS}} \in K_{\Gamma_{\text{LMO}}}^{\boxtimes 2}(\text{Sym}^2 \Gamma_{\tau}^{\text{LMO}} \setminus \Delta(\Gamma_{\tau}^{\text{LMO}}))$ on the double symmetric product (minus the diagonal) of the smooth completion $\Gamma_{\tau}^{\text{LMO}}$ of the algebraic[†] plane curve $y = W_{0,1}^{\text{LMO}}(x)$: the *LMO spectral curve*. A strategy to determine the family of Riemann surfaces $\Gamma_{\tau}^{\text{LMO}}$ as the base parameter τ is varied was put forward in the extensive analysis of Chern–Simons-type matrix models of [17], and is summarised in the next section.

4.2.2. *The planar solution, after Borot–Eynard.* The LMO spectral curve can be expressed as the solution of the singular integral equation describing the equilibrium density for the eigenvalues in (4.43) [17]. Introduce the density distribution

$$\varrho(x) \triangleq \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \mathbb{E}_{\text{d}\mu} \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \delta(x - e^{\kappa_i}) \right). \tag{4.48}$$

As in the case of the Wigner distribution, Borot–Eynard in [17] prove that, for $\tau \in \mathbb{R}^+$, the large N eigenvalue density $\varrho \in C_c^0(\mathbb{R})$ is a continuous function with compact support $\mathcal{C}_{\varrho} = [-b(\tau), b(\tau)]$ given by a single segment, symmetric around the origin, at whose ends $\pm b(\tau)\varrho$ has square-root vanishing, $\varrho = \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{x \pm b(\tau)})$. Furthermore, by (4.43), ϱ satisfies the saddle-point equation

$$\frac{\kappa}{\tau} = \sum_{l=1}^3 \text{pv} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \varrho(\kappa') \left[\coth \frac{\kappa - \kappa'}{2s(l)} - \coth \frac{\kappa - \kappa'}{2} \right]. \tag{4.49}$$

By the Plémely lemma, this is equivalent to a Riemann–Hilbert problem for the planar 1-point function (4.46),

$$\begin{aligned}
 W_{0,1}^{\text{LMO}}(x + i0) + W_{0,1}^{\text{LMO}}(x - i0) - \sum_{\ell=1}^s W_{0,1}^{\text{LMO}}(\zeta^{\ell} x) + \sum_{m=1}^3 \sum_{\ell_m=1}^{s/s(m)-1} W_{0,1}^{\text{LMO}}(\zeta_{s/s(m)}^{\ell_m} x) \\
 = (s^2/\kappa) \ln x + s \tag{4.50}
 \end{aligned}$$

with ζ_k a primitive k th root of unity; note that $W_{0,1}^{\text{LMO}}(x)$ has a cut for $x \in \mathcal{C}_{\varrho} \triangleq \text{supp} \varrho$, with jump equal to $2\pi i \varrho$. Following [27], and setting

$$c \triangleq \exp(\tau/2s). \tag{4.51}$$

the exponentiated resolvent

$$\mathcal{Y}(x) \triangleq -cx \exp \left(\frac{\tau W_{0,1}^{\text{LMO}}(x)}{s^2} \right) \tag{4.52}$$

[†]From the discussion above this does not need to be more than just analytic; it turns however that $e^y = e^{W_{0,1}^{\text{CS}}(x)}$ is algebraic, as follows from the proof of [17, Proposition 1.1], and as we will review in Section 4.2.2.

is holomorphic on $\mathbb{C} \setminus \mathcal{C}_\varrho$, it asymptotes to

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Y}(x) &\sim -cx, & x = 0, \\ \mathcal{Y}(x) &\sim -c^{-1}x, & x = \infty, \end{aligned} \tag{4.53}$$

and further satisfies

$$\mathcal{Y}(x + i0)\mathcal{Y}(x - i0) \left[\prod_{\ell=1}^{s-1} \mathcal{Y}(\zeta_s^\ell x) \right]^{-1} \times \prod_{m=1}^3 \left[\prod_{\ell_m=1}^{s/s(m)-1} \mathcal{Y}(\zeta_{s/s(m)}^{\ell_m} x) \right] = 1. \tag{4.54}$$

Furthermore, the \mathbb{Z}_2 -symmetry $\{\kappa_i \rightarrow -\kappa_i\}$ of (4.43) entails that

$$\mathcal{Y}(x)\mathcal{Y}(1/x) = 1. \tag{4.55}$$

Every time we cross the cut \mathcal{C}_ϱ , the exponentiated resolvent is subject to the monodromy transformation (4.54). An approach to solve the monodromy problem (4.54) together the asymptotic conditions at 0 and ∞ was systematically developed in [17] following in the direction of [27], and it goes as follows. Fix $v \in \mathbb{Z}^s$ and let

$$\mathcal{Y}_v(x) \triangleq \prod_{j=0}^{s-1} [\mathcal{Y}(\zeta_s^j x)]^{v_j}. \tag{4.56}$$

Here $\mathcal{Y}_v(x)$ inherits a cut on the rotation $\mathcal{C}_\varrho^{(j)} = \zeta_s^{-j}\mathcal{C}_\varrho$ for all j such that $v_j \neq 0$; in particular, the jump on each of these cuts returns the spectral density ϱ , and thus $W_{0,1}^{\text{LMO}}(x)$.

By definition, $\mathcal{Y}_v(x)$ is a single-valued function on the universal cover $\widehat{\Gamma}$ of $\mathbb{P}^1 \setminus \{\zeta_s^j b^\pm(\tau)\}_{j=1}^s$. We want to ask whether there is a clever choice of v such that this factors through a *finite-degree* covering map $\Gamma_{\text{LMO}} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$ branched at $\{\zeta_s^j b^\pm(\tau)\}_{j=1}^s$ such that $\mathcal{Y}_v(x)$ is single-valued on Γ_{LMO} . This was answered in the affirmative in [17], as follows. A direct consequence of (4.54), as in the study of the torus knots matrix model of [27], is that the change-of-sheet transition given by crossing the cut $\mathcal{C}_\varrho^{(j)}$ results in a lattice automorphism $T_j \in \text{GL}(s, \mathbb{Z})$ such that

$$\mathcal{Y}_v(x + i0) = \mathcal{Y}_{T_j(v)}(x - i0). \tag{4.57}$$

The monodromy group of the local system determined by $\mathcal{Y}_v(x)$ is then (a subgroup of) the group of lattice transformations T_j for $j = 0, \dots, (s - 1)$. This is beautifully characterised by the following.

PROPOSITION 4.7 [17]. *There is a \mathbb{Z} -linear monomorphism*

$$\iota : \Lambda_r \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^s \tag{4.58}$$

embedding $\Lambda_r(\mathfrak{e}_8)$ as a rank 8 sublattice of \mathbb{Z}^s . Its image $\iota(\Lambda_r)$ is invariant under the $\{T_j\}_j$ -action, and the pull-back of the monodromy (4.54) to Λ_r is isomorphic to the Coxeter action of $\mathcal{W} = \text{Weyl}(\mathfrak{e}_8)$.

By Proposition 4.7, picking v to lie in $\iota(\Lambda_r)$ does exactly the trick of returning a finite-degree covering of the complex line by the affine curve

$$y : \mathbb{V} \left[\prod_{\varpi \in \iota(\mathcal{W})v} (y - \mathcal{Y}_\varpi(x)) \right] \rightarrow \mathbb{A}^1, \tag{4.59}$$

with sheets labelled by elements of a \mathcal{W} -orbit on Λ_r . Our freedom in the choice of the initial element v in the orbit is given by the number of semi-simple, 7-vertex Dynkin subdiagrams of the black part of Figure 2 [57], which classify the stabilisers of any given element in the orbit; in other words, by the choice of a fundamental weight ω_i of \mathfrak{g} . The natural choice here is to pick the minimal orbit, corresponding to the largest stabilising group, by choosing to delete the node α_7 in Figure 2, so that $v = \omega_7 = \alpha_0$: in this case, obviously, $\mathcal{W}v = \Delta^*$, the set of non-zero roots. I refer the reader to Appendix B.1 for further details on the orbit, and give the following.

DEFINITION 4.2. We call the normalisation of the closure in $\mathbb{C}P^2$ of (4.59) with $v = \iota(\alpha_0)$ the LMO curve of type E_8 .

This places us in the same set-up of the Toda spectral curves of Sections 2.4 and 2.5 (see in particular (2.22) and definition 2.1), by realising the LMO curve as a curve of eigenvalues for a \mathcal{G} -valued Lax operator with rational spectral parameter; at this stage, of course, it is still unclear whether this rational dependence has anything to do with that of (2.12). The upshot of the discussion above is that there exists a degree 240, monic polynomial $\mathcal{P}_{\alpha_0} \in \mathbb{C}[x, y]$ with y -roots given exactly by the branches of the \mathbb{Z}_5 -symmetrised, exponentiated resolvent $\mathcal{Y}(x)$:

$$\mathcal{P}_{\alpha_0}(x, y) = \prod_{\alpha \in \Delta^*}^{240} (y - \mathcal{Y}_{\varpi_\alpha}(x)), \tag{4.60}$$

where we wrote $\varpi_\alpha \triangleq \iota(\alpha)$. As we point out in Appendix B.1, the rescaling $x \rightarrow \zeta_5^{-1}x$ corresponds to an action on \mathbb{Z}^5 given by the image of the action of the Coxeter element on Λ_r , under which the orbit Δ^* is obviously invariant. The resulting \mathbb{Z}_5 -symmetry implies that $\mathcal{P}_{\alpha_0}(x, y)$ is in fact a polynomial in $\lambda = x^5$, and we define

$$\Xi^{\text{LMO}}(\lambda, \mu) \triangleq \mathcal{P}_{\alpha_0}(\lambda^{1/5}, \mu) \in \mathbb{C}[\lambda, \mu]. \tag{4.61}$$

Vanishing of Ξ^{LMO} defines a family $\pi : \mathcal{S}_{\text{LMO}} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_{\text{LMO}} \simeq \mathbb{A}^1$ algebraically varying over a one-dimensional base \mathcal{B}_{LMO} parametrised by the 't Hooft parameter τ ; the same picture of (2.23) then holds over this smaller dimensional base.

4.2.3. *Hunting down the Toda curves.* We are now ready to show the weak B-model Gopakumar–Vafa correspondence, conjecture 4.5. This will follow from establishing that the LMO spectral curves are a subfamily of Toda curves with canonical Dubrovin–Krichever data matching with (3.57).

THEOREM 4.8. *There exists an embedding*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}_{\text{LMO}} &\hookrightarrow \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{g}} \\ \tau &\longrightarrow (u(c), \mathfrak{N}(c)), \end{aligned} \tag{4.62}$$

such that

$$\mathcal{S}_{\text{LMO}} = \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{g}} \times_{\mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{g}}} \mathcal{B}_{\text{LMO}}. \tag{4.63}$$

Explicitly, this is realised by the existence of algebraic maps $u_i = u_i(c)$, $\mathfrak{N} = c^{-q_{\mathfrak{g}}}$ such that

$$\Xi_{\text{LMO}} = \Xi_{\mathfrak{g}, \text{red}} \Big|_{u=u(c), \mathfrak{N}=-c^{-q_{\mathfrak{g}}}}. \tag{4.64}$$

Furthermore, the full $1/N$ asymptotic expansion of (4.45) is computed by the topological recursion (4.37)–(4.38) with induction data (4.46)–(4.47), and the $\mathcal{O}(\prod_i x_i^{k_i})$ coefficients with $k_i = (\mathfrak{s}/\mathfrak{s}(m))j_i$, $j_i \in \mathbb{Z}$, $m = 1, 2, 3$, return the $1/N$ expansion of the perturbative quantum

invariants of the knot \mathcal{K}_m going along the singular fibre of order $s(m)$ with colouring given by the virtual connected power sum representation specified by $\{j_i\}$.

Proof. The statement of the first part of the theorem condenses what were called ‘Step A’ and ‘Step B’ in the construction of LMO spectral curves that was offered in our previous paper [15], where we stated that Step B was too complex to be feasibly completed. I am going to show how the stumbling blocks we found there can be overcome here.

Let me first recall the strategy of [15]. As in [27], the first thing we do is to use the asymptotic conditions (4.53) for the un-symmetrised resolvent on the physical sheet (the eigenvalue plane), to read off the asymptotics of the symmetrised resolvent $\mathcal{Y}_{\iota(\alpha)}$ on the sheet labelled by α . Let $\varpi = (\varpi_j)_j = \iota(\alpha)$ as displayed in Table B1, and further write

$$n_0(\varpi) \triangleq \sum_{j=1}^s \varpi_j, \quad n_1(v) = \sum_{j=1}^{s-1} j\varpi_j. \tag{4.65}$$

Then, from (4.53), we have

$$x \rightarrow 0, \quad \mathcal{Y}_{\varpi}(x) \sim (-cx)^{n_0(\varpi)} \zeta_s^{n_1(\varpi)}, \tag{4.66}$$

$$x \rightarrow \infty, \quad \mathcal{Y}_{\varpi}(x) \sim (-x/c)^{n_0(\varpi)} \zeta_s^{n_1(\varpi)}, \tag{4.67}$$

which in one shot gives both the Puiseux slopes of the Newton polygon of \mathcal{P}_{α_0} as $(\pm 1, n_0(\varpi))$, and the coefficients of its boundary lattice points up to scale; in view of the comparison with $\Xi_{g, \text{red}}$ we set the normalisation for the latter by fixing the coefficient of y^0 to be equal to one. Taking into account the symmetries of \mathcal{P}_{α_0} and plugging in the data of Table B1 on the minimal orbit, this is seen to return exactly the Newton polygon and the boundary coefficients of $\Xi_{g, \text{red}}$ (see Figure 3).

The remaining part is to prove the existence of the map $u_i(c)$ such that all the interior coefficients match as well. As was done in [15], I set out to prove it by working out the constraints due to the global nature of \mathcal{Y} as a meromorphic function on $\Gamma_{\tau}^{\text{LMO}}$. Write

$$\frac{\tau}{s^2} W(x) = \sum_{k \geq 1} \mathbf{m}_k x^{k+1}, \tag{4.68}$$

for the expansion of the 1-point function (4.46) in terms of the planar moments

$$\mathbf{m}_k = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_{d\mu} \left(\sum_{i=1}^N e^{k\lambda_i} \right). \tag{4.69}$$

Then, by (4.52) and (4.54), we have that

$$\mathcal{Y}_{\varpi_{\alpha}}(x) = (-cx)^{n_0(\varpi_{\alpha})} s_a^{n_1(\varpi_{\alpha})} \exp \left[\sum_{k>0} \mathbf{m}_{k-1} (\widehat{\varpi}_{\alpha})_{k \bmod s} x^k \right], \tag{4.70}$$

where, as in [15], we wrote

$$(\widehat{\varpi}_{\alpha})_k \triangleq \sum_{j=0}^{s-1} \zeta_s^{jk} (\varpi_{\alpha})_j. \tag{4.71}$$

for the discrete Fourier transform of ϖ_α . There are only eight Fourier modes that are non-vanishing; these are[†]

$$\exists \alpha | (\widehat{\varpi_\alpha})_k \neq 0 \Rightarrow k \in \{6, 10, 12, 15, 18, 20, 24, 30\} =: \mathfrak{k}. \tag{4.72}$$

In particular, the only moments \mathbf{m}_k that may be found when Taylor-expanding \mathcal{Y} at one of the preimages of $x = 0$ satisfy

$$(k + 1) \bmod s \in \mathfrak{k}.$$

Consider now inserting the Taylor expansion (4.70) into the right-hand side (4.60). Without any further constraints on the surviving momenta \mathbf{m}_k , we have no guarantee *a priori* that (4.70) is indeed (a) the Taylor expansion of a branch of an algebraic function and (b) that it gives the roots of a polynomial \mathcal{P}_{α_0} as presented in (4.60). This means that if we expand up to power $\mathcal{O}(x^{L+1})$ the product

$$\prod_{\alpha \in \Delta^*}^{240} (y - \mathcal{Y}_{\varpi_\alpha}(x)) = \sum_{i=1}^L B_i(y)x^i + \mathcal{O}(x^{L+1}) \tag{4.73}$$

then the polynomial $\sum_{i=1}^L B_i(y)x^i$ may well have non-vanishing coefficients outside the Newton polygon of \mathcal{P}^{LMO} ; imposing that these are zero, and that those at the boundary return the slope coefficients of (4.66) and (4.67), gives a set of algebraic conditions on $\{\mathbf{m}_k\}_{k \bmod s \in \mathfrak{k}}$. In [15] we pointed out that the complexity of the calculations to solve for these conditions is unworkable if taken at face value, and refrained to pursue their solution; however I am going to show here that it is possible to carve out a subsystem of these equations which pins down uniquely an 8-parameter family of solutions, provides a solution to *all* these constraints for arbitrary L , and simultaneously leads exactly to the full family of Toda spectral curves (2.20)–(2.22). Take

$$L = 540 = \deg_x \Xi_{\mathfrak{g}, \text{red}}(\mu, x^{q_{\mathfrak{g}}}) = q_{\mathfrak{g}} \deg_\lambda \Xi_{\mathfrak{g}, \text{red}}(\mu, \lambda)$$

and expand (4.70) up to L . Plugging this into (4.60) and equating to zero leads to an algebraic equation for each coefficient of $x^m y^n$ with (m, n) once we impose that $\Xi_{\text{LMO}}(\lambda, \mu) = \lambda^{18} \Xi_{\text{LMO}}(\lambda^{-1}, \mu)$. Consider now the subsystem of equations given by (m, n) in the region

$$\mathfrak{v} \triangleq \{(m, n) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 | 1 \leq n \leq 10, 1 \leq m \leq [L - 6n, s]\} \tag{4.74}$$

depicted in Figure 5: imposing that $B_n(y) = B_{L-n}(y)$ for the list of exponents in \mathfrak{v} gives an algebraic system of 165 equations for the 144 moments \mathbf{m}_k , $L > k \in \mathfrak{k}$. Recall that the planar moments $\mathbf{m}_k(c)$ are analytic in c around $c = 1$ [18, 84] (that is, small 't Hooft parameter), and they vanish in that limit

$$\mathbf{m}_k(c) = \sum_{n \geq 1} \mathbf{m}_k^{(n)}(c - 1)^n. \tag{4.75}$$

Since the constraints on \mathbf{m}_k are analytic, we can solve them order by order in a Taylor expansion around $c = 1$. It easy to figure out from (4.70) that, at $\mathcal{O}(c - 1)^n$, we find a linear inhomogeneous system of the form

$$\mathcal{A} \mathbf{m}^{(n)} = \mathcal{B}_n \tag{4.76}$$

with \mathcal{A} independent of n , $\mathcal{B}_1 = 0$, and \mathcal{B}_n a polynomial in $\mathbf{m}_k^{(m)}$ for $m < n$. From the explicit form of \mathcal{A} we calculate that $\dim \text{Ker } \mathcal{A} = 8$; the solutions of the system (4.76) must then take the form

$$\mathbf{m}_k^{(n)}(c) = \mathbf{m}_k \left(\left\{ \mathbf{m}_l^{(m)} \right\}_{l \in \mathfrak{k}, m \leq n} \right) \tag{4.77}$$

[†]In [15], versions 1 and 2, these were erroneously listed as being in the complement of the right-hand side of (4.72).




FIGURE 5 (colour online). Points in \mathbb{Z}^2 corresponding to the region \mathfrak{v} of non-vanishing coefficients of the Taylor expansion of $\mathcal{Y}_{\varpi_\alpha}$ around zero; those indicated with a purple cross lie outside the Newton polygon of Ξ_{LMO} .

and they are *uniquely determined* by solving recursively (4.76) order by order in n . A priori, the Taylor coefficients $\mathfrak{m}_{l+1 \in \mathfrak{k}}^{(m)}$ of the basic moments $\mathfrak{m}_5, \mathfrak{m}_9, \mathfrak{m}_{11}, \mathfrak{m}_{14}, \mathfrak{m}_{17}, \mathfrak{m}_{19}, \mathfrak{m}_{23}$ and \mathfrak{m}_{29} are subject to two further sets of closed conditions: the first stems from imposing that the inhomogeneous system (4.76) has solutions for $n > 1$ (that is, $\dim \text{Ker}[\mathcal{A}|\mathcal{B}_n] = 9$), and the second from coefficients of the expansion (4.73) which are outside of the region \mathfrak{v} : this may lead to the solution manifold of (4.76) having positive codimension in $\mathbb{C}\langle \mathfrak{m}_{l+1 \in \mathfrak{k}}^{(m)} \rangle$. This is however not the case: let us impose that

$$[\lambda^9 \mu^i] \Xi_{\text{LMO}}(\lambda, \mu) = \mathfrak{p}_i(u_1, \dots, u_8), \quad i = 1, \dots, 120. \tag{4.78}$$

where \mathfrak{p}_i are the decomposition of the antisymmetric characters defined as in (2.21), (2.24) and Claim 2.3. (4.78) gives invertible polynomial maps $\mathfrak{m}_l \in c^{a_l} \mathbb{C}[u_1, \dots, u_8]$; for $l + 1 \in \mathfrak{k}$ we find

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{m}_5 &= \frac{c^6}{30}(u_7 + 2), & \mathfrak{m}_9 &= \frac{c^{10}}{30}(u_1 + 2u_7 + 3), & \mathfrak{m}_{11} &= \frac{c^{12}}{300}(-3u_7^2 + 38u_7 + 20u_1 + 10u_6 + 38), \\ \mathfrak{m}_{14} &= \frac{c^{15}}{30}(5u_1 + 2u_6 + 8u_7 + u_8 + 7), \\ \mathfrak{m}_{17} &= \frac{c^{18}}{2250} \left(7u_7^3 + 117u_7^2 + 90u_1u_7 - 30u_6u_7 + 1284u_7 + 855u_1 + 75u_5 + 315u_6 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + 225u_8 + 1031 \right), \\ \mathfrak{m}_{19} &= -\frac{c^{20}}{180} (u_1^2 - 26u_7u_1 - 114u_1 - 26u_7^2 - 6u_2 - 12u_5 - 48u_6 - 180u_7 - 30u_8 - 129), \\ \mathfrak{m}_{23} &= \frac{c^{24}}{15\,000} \left(60u_6u_7^2 - 11u_7^4 - 88u_7^3 - 80u_1u_7^2 + 12\,686u_7^2 + 12\,280u_1u_7 - 100u_5u_7 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + 2240u_6u_7 + 1200u_8u_7 + 45\,448u_7 + 1300u_1^2 - 50u_6^2 + 27\,880u_1 + 1000u_2 + 500u_4 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + 2800u_5 + 800u_1u_6 + 10\,740u_6 + 7400u_8 + 28\,374 \right), \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbf{m}_{29} = & \frac{c^{30}}{30} \left(14u_7^3 + 16u_1u_7^2 + 233u_7^2 + 3u_1^2u_7 + 238u_1u_7 + 2u_2u_7 + 7u_5u_7 + 65u_6u_7 + 35u_8u_7 \right. \\
 & + 499u_7 + 44u_1^2 + 3u_6^2 + 287u_1 + 9u_2 + u_3 + 2u_4 + 2u_1u_5 + 23u_5 + 29u_1u_6 + 108u_6 \\
 & \left. + 11u_1u_8 + 3u_6u_8 + 65u_8 + 259 \right), \tag{4.79}
 \end{aligned}$$

which are easily seen to have polynomial inverses $u_k \in \mathbb{C}[\{\mathbf{m}_l\}_l; c^{-1}]$. As we know that $\Xi_{\mathfrak{g},\text{red}}$ and Ξ_{LMO} share the same Newton polygon with the same boundary coefficients by (2.31), (2.32) and Table 1, postulating (4.78) is the same as giving an 8-parameter family of polynomial solutions of the constraints (4.78) which furthermore satisfies all our constraints $B_n(y) = B_{L-n}(y)$ for all $n \in [[0, 18]]$. The first part of the claim, (4.64), follows then from the uniqueness of the solution of (4.78) above.

To prove the second part, we show that the two-point functions (4.36) and (4.47) coincide. We have just shown that $\Xi_{\mathfrak{g},\text{red}} = \Xi_{\text{LMO}}$ under the change-of-variables (4.79), and we know that the symmetrised Bergmann kernel of (4.34) is completely determined by $\Gamma_{u,\mathbb{N}}$ and the choice of \tilde{A}_i cycles in Conjecture 4.5: by its definition in (4.34), it is the unique bidifferential on $\Gamma_{u,\mathbb{N}}$ with vanishing \tilde{A} -periods and double poles with zero residues at the 240×240 components of the image of the diagonal in $\Gamma_{u,\mathbb{N}}^{[2]}$ under the correspondence $\mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{g}} \times \mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{g}}$, the coefficients of the double poles being specified by (3.17) in terms of a 240×240 matrix of integers B_{ij}^{Toda} . As was proved in [17], the regularised two-point function,

$$\frac{B_{\text{LMO}}(p, q)}{\text{d}p\text{d}q} \triangleq W_{0,2}^{\text{LMO}}(p, q) + \frac{\lambda'(p)\lambda'(q)}{(\lambda(p) - \lambda(q))^2}, \tag{4.80}$$

has precisely the same properties: its matrix of singularities in [17, Section 6.6.3] can be shown to coincide with B_{ij}^{Toda} above, and the vanishing of the \tilde{A} -periods can be proven exactly as in the case of the ordinary Hermitian 1-matrix model to be a consequence of the planar loop equation for the 2-point function [51]; we conclude by uniqueness that

$$W_{0,2}^{\text{LMO}} = W_{0,2}^{\text{Toda}} \tag{4.81}$$

under the identification (4.79). This suffices to reach the conclusion of the second part of the claim: on the Toda side, the higher generating functions satisfy the topological recursion relations (4.37)–(4.38) by definition[†]. On the LMO side, the higher generating functions (4.43)–(4.45) fall within the class of integrals studied in [16], for which the authors prove that the Chekhov–Eynard–Orantin recursion determines the ribbon graph expansion in $1/N$ via (4.37)–(4.38). Since both sides satisfy the recursion, the recursion kernels coincide from (4.81), and so do the initial data $W_{0,1}$ and $W_{0,2}$, the statement of the theorem follows by induction on (g, h) . \square

REMARK 4.9. The proof of the existence of the embedding $\mathcal{B}_{\text{LMO}} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{g}}$ is only constructive up to the point where the fibres of the LMO family are shown to be determined by the planar moments, and in turn by the Toda Hamiltonians and Casimirs via (4.79). Providing explicit algebraic equations for the restriction $u_i(c)$ to the codimension 8 locus \mathcal{B}_{LMO} is however a separate problem. It is worth pointing out that a direct way of calculating the restriction exists

[†]From a physics point of view, a first-principles heuristic argument to prove straight from the Kodaira–Spencer theory of gravity that these are genuine open/closed B-model amplitudes may be found in [37]. Also note that, as Y is non-toric, it momentarily lies outside the scope of existing proofs of the remodelling-the-B-model approach of [19], which rely either on the existence of a topological vertex formalism [52] or of a torus action on the target with zero-dimensional fixed loci [54]. I nonetheless believe these obstructions to be merely of a technical nature.

in perturbation theory around $c = 1$ using the Gaussian perturbation theory methods of [84], which allow to determine $\mathbf{m}_k^{(n)}$ for arbitrary order in n ; it would be however desirable to present a closed-form algebraic solution by alternative methods, such as the one provided for spherical 3-manifolds of type D in [17] and type E₆ in [15].

4.3. Some degeneration limits

To conclude this section, I will highlight three degeneration limits of the E₈ relativistic Toda spectral curves which have a neat geometrical interpretation on each of the other three corners of Figure 1. This is summarised in the following table, and discussed in detail in the next three sections.

4.3.1. *Limits I: the maximal Argyres–Douglas point and geometry.* I am gonna start with the case in which we set

$$\aleph = 1, \quad u_1 = 1, \quad u_2 = 3 = u_4 = u_6 = -u_5, \quad u_7 = u_8 = -2. \tag{4.82}$$

In terms of the LMO variables (4.79), this corresponds to $c = 1$, $\mathbf{m}_i = 0$ for all i : this is the limit of zero 't Hooft coupling of the measure (4.44), in which the support of the eigenvalue density shrinks to a point. In this limit the \mathcal{Y} -branches of the LMO curve are given by the slope asymptotics of (4.66), which is in turn entirely encoded by the orbit data of Table B1. From (4.73) and Table B1, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \Xi_{\mathfrak{g},\text{red}}(\lambda, \mu) \Big|_{u(m=0), \aleph=1} &= (\mu + 1)^2 (\mu^2 + \mu + 1)^3 (\mu^4 + \mu^3 + \mu^2 + \mu + 1)^5 (\lambda + \mu^5) (\lambda \mu^5 + 1) \\ &\quad \times (\lambda \mu^6 - 1) (\lambda - \mu^{10})^2 (\lambda \mu^{10} - 1)^2 (\lambda^2 - \mu^{15}) (\lambda + \mu^{15})^2 (\lambda \mu^{15} + 1)^2 \\ &\quad \times (\lambda^2 \mu^{15} - 1) (\lambda - \mu^{30}) (\lambda \mu^{30} - 1) (\lambda - \mu^6). \end{aligned} \tag{4.83}$$

I will call (4.83) the *super-singular limit* of the E₈ Toda curves: in this limit, $\text{Spec} \mathbb{C}[\lambda, \mu] / \langle \Xi_{\mathfrak{g},\text{red}} \rangle$ is a reducible, non-reduced scheme with the radicals of its 19 distinct non-reduced components given by lines or plane cusps. In particular, denoting by ${}^h\Xi$ the homogenisation of Ξ , the Picard group of the corresponding reduced scheme is trivial,

$$\text{Pic}^{(0,\dots,0)} \left(\text{Proj} \frac{\mathbb{C}[\lambda, \mu, \nu]}{\sqrt{\langle {}^h\Xi_{\mathfrak{g},\text{red}} \rangle}} \right) \simeq 0, \tag{4.84}$$

the resolution of singularities $\Gamma_{u(\mu=0),1}$ is a disjoint union of 19 \mathbb{P}^1 's, and the whole Prym–Tyurin $\text{PT}(\Gamma_{u_{\mu=0},1})$ collapses to a point in the super-singular limit. This is more tangibly visualised by what happens to Figure 4 when we approach (4.82): since $\aleph = 1$, the branch points of the λ -projection satisfy $b_i^+ b_i^- = 1$ from (4.31), and from Proposition 2.6 and the discussion that follows it, they correspond to $\alpha_i(l) = 0$ for some simple root $\alpha \in \Pi$. The corresponding ramification points on the curve are then at $\mu = \exp(\alpha_i(l)) = 1$, and substituting into (4.83) we get

$$\Xi_{\mathfrak{g},\text{red}}(\lambda, 1) \Big|_{u(m=0), \aleph=1} = 337\,500 (\lambda - 1)^8 (\lambda + 1)^{10}, \tag{4.85}$$

which means that the branch points collide together in four pairs with $b_i^+ = b_- = 1$, and five with $b_i^+ = b_- = -1$. It is immediate to see that the A/\tilde{B} -periods of $d\sigma$ vanish in the limit (as the corresponding cycles shrink), as do the B/\tilde{A} periods upon performing the elementary cycle integration explicitly.

This degeneration limit should have a meaningful physical counterpart in the dynamics of the corresponding compactified 5d theory at this particular point on its Coulomb branch, and in particular it should correspond to the UV fixed point of [66, Section 7 and 8] (see also the recent works [67, 122]). I will not pursue the details here, but I will give some comments

on the resulting A- and B-model geometries, and on the broad type of physics implications it might lead to. The first comment is on the geometrical character of (4.83): it is clearly expected that singularities in the Wilsonian 4d action should arise from vanishing cycles in the family of Seiberg–Witten curves [110], and in turn from the development of nodes as we approach its discriminant; and furthermore, more exotic phenomena related typically related to superconformal symmetry arise whenever these vanishing cycles have non-trivial intersection [6], leading to the appearance in the low-energy spectrum of mutually non-local BPS solitons, and cusp-like singularities in the SW geometry (see [111] for a review). Equation (4.83) provides a limiting version of this phenomenon whereby *all SW periods vanish*[†]. I will refer to (4.83) as the *maximal Argyres–Douglas point* of the E_8 gauge theory, and as in the more classical cases of Argyres–Douglas theories, it presents several hallmarks of a theory at a superconformal fixed point. Besides the vanishing of the central charges of its BPS saturated states, we see that the way we reach the super-singular vacuum is akin to the mechanism of [66, 109] to engineer fixed points from five-dimensional gauge theories: since the engineering dimension of the five-dimensional gauge coupling $1/g_{\text{YM}}^{(5)}$ is that of mass, the theory is non-renormalisable and quantising it requires a cut-off; in the M -theoretic version [66, 79] of the geometric engineering of [70], this is naturally given in terms of the inverse of the radius of the 11th-dimensional circle R in (4.13). Considerations about brane dynamics in [109] allow to conclude that the limit in which the bare gauge coupling diverges leads to a sensible quantum field theory at an RG fixed point with enhanced global symmetry; and note that, under the identifications (4.13), setting the Casimir $\aleph = 1$ amounts to taking precisely that limit. Indeed, upon reintroducing the four-dimensional scale Λ_4 and identifying $\Lambda_{\text{UV}} = 1/R$ as the cut-off scale, the second equality in (4.13) reads

$$\aleph = \frac{\Lambda_4}{\Lambda_{\text{UV}}} = e^{-t_{\text{B}}/4}. \tag{4.86}$$

Recall that $\Lambda_4 = \Lambda_{\text{UV}} e^{-\frac{1}{g_{\text{UV}}}}$, the RG invariant scale in four dimensions; the Seiberg limit $g_{\text{UV}} \rightarrow \infty$ for the fixed point theory is given then by $\aleph = 1$, with the vanishing of the masses of BPS modes being realised by (4.82).

In light of Theorem 4.8, there is an A-model/Gromov–Witten take on this as well, which also allows us to reconnect the above to the work of [66, 122]. Let us put ourselves in the appropriate duality frame for (4.82)–(4.83), which corresponds to the choice of \tilde{A}_i as the cycles whose $d\sigma$ -periods serve as flat coordinates around (4.82). By claim 4.1 this corresponds to the maximally singular chamber in the extended Kähler moduli space of Y given by the orbifold GW theory of \mathcal{X} . Note first that $\aleph = 1$ corresponds to the shrinking limit of the Kähler volume of the base \mathbb{P}^1 , $t_{\text{B}} = 0$. Furthermore, as remarked in our earlier paper [15], the Bryan–Graber crepant resolution conjecture [30] for the E_8 singularity prescribes that the orbifold point in its stringy Kähler moduli space should be given by a vector $\text{OP} \in \mathfrak{h}^* \simeq H_2(\widehat{\mathbb{C}^2/\tilde{\mathbb{I}}}, \mathbb{Z})$ such that

$$\tau_i(\text{OP}) = \left(\frac{2\pi i \alpha_0}{|\tilde{\mathbb{I}}|} \right)_i = \frac{\pi i \mathfrak{d}_i}{15} \tag{4.87}$$

the second equality being taken with respect to the root basis for \mathfrak{h}^* . The values (4.82) for the Toda Hamiltonians correspond exactly to the values of the fundamental traces of a Cartan

[†]There is no room for cusp-like singularities like this in the simpler setting of pure $SU(2)$ $\mathcal{N} = 2$ pure Yang–Mills with SW curve $y^2 = (x^2 - u)^2 - \Lambda_4^4$, unless we put ourselves in the physically degenerate situation where we sit at the point of classically unbroken gauge symmetry $u = 0$ and take the classical limit $\Lambda_4 \rightarrow 0$: the theory is then *classical* pure $\mathcal{N} = 2$ gluodynamics, where we have essentially imposed by *fiat* to discard the quantum corrections that give a gapped vacuum and the breaking of superconformal symmetry.

torus element corresponding to (4.87): (4.83) is then the spectral curve mirror of the A-model at the E₈-orbifold-of-the-conifold singularity, that is, the tip of the Kähler cone of Y .

The above, together with the constructions in Sections 2 and 3 provides some preliminary take, in this specific E₈ case, to a few of the questions raised at the end of [122] regarding the Seiberg–Witten geometry, Coulomb branch and prepotential of 5d SCFT corresponding to Gorenstein singularities. A detailed study and the determination of some of the relevant quantities for the 5d SCFT (such as the superconformal index) is left for future study, and will be pursued elsewhere.

4.3.2. *Limits II: orbifold quantum cohomology of the E₈ singularity.* Since the correspondence of the left vertical line of Figure 1 was shown to hold in the context of Theorem 4.8, I will offer here some calculations giving plausibility (other than the expectation from the underlying physics) for the lower horizontal and the diagonal arrow in the diagram. This will be done in a second interesting limit, given by taking $\aleph \rightarrow 0$ while keeping all the other parameters finite (but possibly large). By (4.13) and (4.3), this corresponds to a partial decompactification limit in which we send the Kähler parameter of the base \mathbb{P}^1 in $Y \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$ to infinity; the resulting A-model theory has thus the resolution of the threefold transverse E₈ singularity $\widehat{\mathbb{C}^2/\tilde{\mathbb{I}}} \times \mathbb{C}$ as its target, or equivalently, by [30], the orbifold $[\mathbb{C}^2/\tilde{\mathbb{I}} \times \mathbb{C}]$ upon analytic continuation in the Kähler parameters. Accordingly, on the gauge theory side, this corresponds to sending $\Lambda_4 \rightarrow 0$ while keeping the classical order parameters u_i constant, and it singles out the perturbative part in the prepotential (4.5). And finally, in the Toda context, this type of limit was considered in [21, 78] for the non-relativistic type A chain, where it was shown to recover, after a suitable change-of-variables, the non-periodic Toda chain.

To bolster the claim, let me show that special geometry on the space of E₈ Toda curves does indeed reproduce correctly the degree 0 part of the genus zero GW potential[†] of $\widehat{\mathbb{C}^2/\tilde{\mathbb{I}}} \times \mathbb{C}$ in the sector where we have at least one insertion of $\mathbf{1}_Y$: by the string equation, this is the tt -metric on the Frobenius manifold $QH(\widehat{\mathbb{C}^2/\tilde{\mathbb{I}}} \times \mathbb{C}) \simeq QH(\widehat{\mathbb{C}^2/\tilde{\mathbb{I}}})$ (see Section 5.1.1 for more details on this). As vector spaces, we have

$$QH(\widehat{\mathbb{C}^2/\tilde{\mathbb{I}}}) = H(\widehat{\mathbb{C}^2/\tilde{\mathbb{I}}}) = H^0(\widehat{\mathbb{C}^2/\tilde{\mathbb{I}}}) \oplus H^2(\widehat{\mathbb{C}^2/\tilde{\mathbb{I}}}) \simeq \mathbb{C} \oplus \mathfrak{h}.$$

Let us use linear coordinates $\{l_i\}_{i=0}^8$ for the decomposition in the last two equalities, where we write $H(\widehat{\mathbb{C}^2/\tilde{\mathbb{I}}}) \ni v = l_0 \mathbf{1}_Y \oplus_i l_i [E_i]$, with E_i the i^{th} exceptional curve in the canonical resolution of singularities $\pi : \widehat{\mathbb{C}^2/\tilde{\mathbb{I}}} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^2/\tilde{\mathbb{I}}$, and likewise $\{l_i\}_{i=1}^8$ in the second isomorphism are taken with respect to the α -basis of \mathfrak{h}^* . On the GW side, the McKay correspondence implies that

$$\eta_{ij} = (E_i, E_j)_Y = -\mathcal{C}_{ij}^g. \tag{4.88}$$

On the other hand, by (4.25)–(4.27) (see [40, Lecture 5], and Section 5.1.1), the tt -metric on the Frobenius manifold on the base of the family of Toda spectral curves is

$$\eta_{ij} = - \sum_{d\mu(p)=0} \text{Res}_p \frac{\partial_{l_i} \mu \partial_{l_j} \mu}{\mu \partial_\lambda \mu} \frac{d\lambda}{q_g \lambda^2}, \tag{4.89}$$

where, in the language of [40, Lecture 5; 45] and as will be reviewed more in detail in Sections 5.1.1 and 5.1.3, we view the family of Toda spectral curves as a closed set in a Hurwitz space with μ , $\ln \mu$ and $d \ln \lambda$ identified with the covering map, the superpotential, and the prime form, respectively, (see Section 5.1.3); this identification follows straight from the special Kähler relations (4.25). The argument of the residue has poles at $\partial_\lambda \mu = 0$, $\lambda, \mu = 0, \infty$.

[†]Physically, this is $g_s \rightarrow 0$, $\alpha' \rightarrow 0$.

Swapping sign and orientation in the contour integral we pick up the residues at the poles and zeroes of λ and μ . Let me start from the zeroes of λ . Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \Xi_{\mathfrak{g},\text{red}}(0, \mu) \Big|_{\mathfrak{N}=0} &= \Xi'_{\mathfrak{g},\text{red}}(0, \mu) = \prod_{\alpha \in \Delta^*} (\mu - e^{\alpha \cdot l}) \\ &= \prod_{\alpha \in \Delta^*} (\mu - e^{\sum_j \alpha^{[j]} l_j}), \end{aligned} \quad (4.90)$$

so that $\lambda = 0$ amounts to $\mu = e^{\sum_j \alpha^{[j]} l_j}$ for some non-zero root α . Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Res}_{\mu=e^{\sum_j \alpha^{[j]} l_j}} \frac{\partial_{l_i} \mu}{\mu} \frac{\partial_{l_j} \mu}{\partial_{\lambda} \mu} \frac{d\lambda}{q_{\mathfrak{g}} \lambda} & \quad (4.91) \\ &= -\text{Res}_{\mu=e^{\sum_j \alpha^{[j]} l_j}} \frac{\partial_{l_i} \lambda}{\lambda} \frac{\partial_{l_j} \lambda}{\partial_{\mu} \lambda} \frac{d\mu}{q_{\mathfrak{g}} \mu^2} \\ &= -\frac{\partial_{l_i} \Xi'_{\mathfrak{g},\text{red}} \partial_{l_j} \Xi'_{\mathfrak{g},\text{red}}}{q_{\mathfrak{g}} \mu^2 (\partial_{\mu} \Xi'_{\mathfrak{g},\text{red}})^2} \Big|_{\mu=e^{\sum_j \alpha^{[j]} l_j}} \\ &= -\frac{e^{2 \sum_j \alpha^{[j]} l_j} \alpha^{[i]} \alpha^{[j]} \prod_{\beta, \gamma \neq \alpha} (e^{\sum_j \alpha^{[j]} l_j} - e^{\sum_j \beta_j l_j}) (e^{\sum_j \alpha^{[j]} l_j} - e^{\sum_j \gamma_j l_j})}{q_{\mathfrak{g}} e^{2 \sum_j \alpha^{[j]} l_j} \prod_{\beta, \gamma \neq \alpha} (e^{\sum_j \alpha^{[j]} l_j} - e^{\sum_j \beta_j l_j}) (e^{\sum_j \alpha^{[j]} l_j} - e^{\sum_j \gamma_j l_j})} \\ &= -\frac{\alpha^{[i]} \alpha^{[j]}}{q_{\mathfrak{g}}}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.91)$$

where we have used the ‘thermodynamic identity’[†] of [40, Lemma 4.6] to switch $\mu \leftrightarrow \lambda$ at the cost of a swap of sign in the first line, the implicit function theorem for the derivatives $\partial_{\bullet} \lambda$ in the second line, and finally (4.90). It is easy to see that the poles at $\mu = 0, \infty$ have vanishing residues; summing over the preimages of $\lambda = 0$ then gives

$$\eta_{ij} = \sum_{\lambda(p)=0} \text{Res}_p \frac{\partial_{l_i} \mu}{\mu} \frac{\partial_{l_j} \mu}{\partial_{\lambda} \mu} \frac{d\lambda}{q_{\mathfrak{g}} \lambda^2} = -\sum_{\alpha \in \Delta^*} \frac{\alpha^{[i]} \alpha^{[j]}}{q_{\mathfrak{g}}} = -\mathcal{C}_{ij}^{\mathfrak{g}}, \quad (4.92)$$

where we used [83, Appendix E]

$$\sum_{\alpha \in \Delta^*} \langle \alpha, \alpha_i \rangle \langle \alpha, \alpha_j \rangle = q_{\mathfrak{g}} \mathcal{C}_{ij}^{\mathfrak{g}}, \quad (4.93)$$

and we find precise agreement with (4.88). The calculation of the Frobenius product (namely, the 3-point function $\partial_{ijk}^3 F \eta^{il}$)

$$c_{ijk} = \sum_{\substack{p \in \Gamma'_{u(t),0} \\ d\mu(p)=0}} \text{Res}_p \frac{\partial_{l_i} \mu}{\mu} \frac{\partial_{l_j} \mu}{\partial_{\lambda} \mu} \frac{\partial_{l_k} \mu}{q_{\mathfrak{g}} \lambda^2} \frac{d\lambda}{q_{\mathfrak{g}} \lambda^2} \quad (4.94)$$

is slightly more involved due to the necessity to expand the integrand in (4.91) to higher order at $\lambda = 0$; in other words, and unsurprisingly, the product does depend on the expression

[†]Namely, the fact that the exchange $\mu \leftrightarrow \lambda$ is an anticanonical transformation of the symplectic algebraic torus $((\mathbb{C}^*)^2, d \ln \mu \wedge d \ln \lambda)$ the curve $\mathbb{V}(\Xi_{\mathfrak{g},\text{red}})$ embeds into, leading to $F \rightarrow -F$ in the expression of the Frobenius prepotential, and thus $\eta \rightarrow -\eta$.

of the higher order terms in λ of $\Xi_{\mathfrak{g},\text{red}}$, unlike η_{ij} for which all we needed to know was $\Xi_{\mathfrak{g},\text{red}}(\lambda = 0, \mu)$ in (4.90). Let us content ourselves with noting, however, that by the same token of the preceding calculation for η_{ij} , the right-hand side of (4.94) is necessarily a rational function in exponentiated flat variables t_j : this is in keeping with the trilogarithmic nature of the 1-loop correction (4.6), whose triple derivatives have precisely such functional dependence on the flat variables a_j .

4.3.3. *Limits III: the 4d/non-relativistic limit.* The last limit we consider involves the fibres of $\pi : \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{g}} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{g}}$. We take

$$\mu = e^{\epsilon\chi}, \quad \mathfrak{l}(\lambda) \rightarrow \epsilon \mathfrak{l}(\lambda) \tag{4.95}$$

and take the $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ limit while holding χ , λ and \mathfrak{l} fixed; note that rescaling the Cartan torus representative $\mathfrak{l}(\lambda)$ of the conjugacy class of $\widehat{L}_{x,y}$ and taking $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ corresponds to the limits in row III of Table 2 at the level of u_i and \mathfrak{N} . Then (2.22) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon^{-d_{\mathfrak{g}}}\Xi_{\mathfrak{g}}(\lambda, \mu) &= \epsilon^{-d_{\mathfrak{g}}}(\mu - 1)^{\mathfrak{s}} \prod_{\alpha \in \Delta^*} (e^{\alpha \cdot \mathfrak{l}} - \mu) = \chi^{\mathfrak{s}} \prod_{\alpha \in \Delta^*} (\alpha \cdot \mathfrak{l} - \chi) + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon), \\ &= \det_{\mathfrak{g}} \left(\log \widehat{L}_{x,y} - \chi 1 \right) + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon) \end{aligned} \tag{4.96}$$

so in this limit the curve $\mathbb{V}(\Xi_{\mathfrak{g}}(\lambda, \mu))$ degenerates to the spectral curve of the family of Lie-algebra elements $\log \widehat{L}_{x,y}$. These coincide with the spectral-parameter-dependent Lax operators of the \widehat{E}_8 non-relativistic Toda chain [14], to which (2.7) reduce upon taking $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. As the picture of (4.96) as a curve-of-eigenvalues carries through to this setting[†], so does the construction of the preferred Prym–Tyurin; on the other hand, the $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ degenerate limit of Theorem 3.4, which amounts in its proof to pick up the Lie-algebraic Krichever–Poisson bracket $\omega_{\text{KP}}^{(1)}$, leads to a non-relativistic spectral differential of the form

$$d\sigma_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \rightarrow \chi \frac{d\lambda}{q_{\mathfrak{g}}\lambda}. \tag{4.97}$$

As the non-relativistic limit is equivalent to the shrinking limit of the five-dimensional circle in $\mathbb{R}^4 \times S^1$, the corresponding limit on the gauge theory side leads to pure E₈ $\mathcal{N} = 2$ super Yang–Mills theory in four dimensions, with (4.97) being the appropriate Seiberg–Witten differential in that limit. Then Claim 2.3 solves the problem of giving an explicit Seiberg–Witten curve for this theory; it is instructive to present what the polynomial (4.96) looks like more in detail. We have

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \epsilon^{-d_{\mathfrak{g}}}\Xi_{\mathfrak{g}}(\lambda, \mu) = \chi^{\mathfrak{s}} \sum_{i=0}^{120} \mathfrak{q}_{120-k}(v_1, \dots, v_8) \chi^{2k}, \tag{4.98}$$

where the $\chi \rightarrow -\chi$ parity operation reflects the reality of \mathfrak{g} , and v_1, \dots, v_8 is a set of generators of $\mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{h}]^{\mathcal{W}}$. Taking the power sum basis $v_1 = \text{Tr}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{l}^2)$, $v_i = \text{Tr}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{l}^{2i+6})$, we get

$$\mathfrak{q}_0 = 1, \quad \mathfrak{q}_1 = -\frac{v_1}{2}, \quad \mathfrak{q}_2 = -\frac{7}{40}v_1, \quad \mathfrak{q}_3 = -\frac{49}{240}v_1, \quad \mathfrak{q}_4 = -\frac{1697}{9600}v_1 - \frac{v_2}{8}, \dots \tag{4.99}$$

[†]A more accurate way of putting it would be to point out that the original setting of [38, 69, 88, 89] dealt precisely with Lie algebra-valued systems of this type; since \mathcal{G} is simply laced, the construction of the PT variety dates back to [69]; and since $\log \widehat{L}_{x,y}$ depends rationally on λ , Theorem 29 of [38] applies despite \mathfrak{g} not being minuscule.

5. Application II: the \widehat{E}_8 Frobenius manifold

5.1. Dubrovin–Zhang Frobenius manifolds and Hurwitz spaces

5.1.1. *Generalities on Frobenius manifolds.* I gather here the basic definitions about Frobenius manifolds for the appropriate degree of generality that is needed here. The reader is referred to the classical monograph [40] for more details.

DEFINITION 5.1. An n -dimensional complex manifold X is a semi-simple Frobenius manifold if it supports a pair (η, \star) , with η a non-degenerate, holomorphic symmetric $(0, 2)$ -tensor with flat Levi-Civita connection ∇ , and a commutative, associative, unital, fibrewise \mathcal{O}_X -algebra structure on TX satisfying

Compatibility:

$$\eta(A \star B, C) = \eta(A, B \star C) \quad \forall A, B, C \in \mathcal{X}(X). \tag{5.1}$$

Flatness: the 1-parameter family of connections

$$\nabla_A^{(\hbar)} B \triangleq \nabla_A B + \hbar A \star B \quad \hbar \in \mathbb{C} \tag{5.2}$$

is flat identically in $\hbar \in \mathbb{C}$.

String equation: the unit vector field $e \in \mathcal{X}(X)$ for the product \star is ∇ -parallel,

$$\nabla e = 0 .$$

Conformality: there exists a vector field $E \in \mathcal{X}(X)$ such that $\nabla E \in \Gamma(\text{End}(TX))$ is diagonalisable, ∇ -parallel, and the family of connections equation (5.2) extends to a holomorphic connection $\nabla^{(\hbar)}$ on $X \times \mathbb{C}^*$ by

$$\nabla^{(\hbar)} \frac{\partial}{\partial \hbar} = 0 \tag{5.3}$$

$$\nabla_{\partial/\partial \hbar}^{(\hbar)} A = \frac{\partial}{\partial \hbar} A + E \star A - \frac{1}{\hbar} \widehat{\mu} A, \tag{5.4}$$

where $\widehat{\mu}$ is the traceless part of $-\nabla E$.

Semi-simplicity: the product law $\star|_x$ on the tangent fibres $T_x X$ has no nilpotent elements for generic $x \in X$.

DEFINITION 5.2. X is a semi-simple Frobenius manifold if and only if there exists an open set X_0 , a coordinate chart t^1, \dots, t^n on X_0 , and a regular function $F \in \mathcal{O}(X_0)$ called the Frobenius prepotential such that, defining $c_{ijk} \triangleq \partial_{ijk}^3 F$, we have

TABLE 2. Notable degeneration limits of the Toda spectral curves.

Limit	\aleph	u_1	u_2	u_3	u_4	u_5	u_6	u_7	u_8
I	1	1	3	0	3	-3	3	-2	-2
II	0	$\gg 1$	$\gg 1$	$\gg 1$	$\gg 1$	$\gg 1$	$\gg 1$	$\gg 1$	$\gg 1$
III	$\mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$	$\dim \rho_{\omega_1} + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2)$	$\dim \rho_{\omega_2} + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2)$	$\dim \rho_{\omega_3} + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2)$	$\dim \rho_{\omega_4} + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2)$	$\dim \rho_{\omega_5} + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2)$	$\dim \rho_{\omega_6} + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2)$	$\dim \rho_{\omega_7} + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2)$	$\dim \rho_{\omega_8} + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2)$
Limit		5D gauge theory			GW target			CS	
I		Maximal Argyres–Douglas SCFT			$\widetilde{\mathbb{I}}$ -orbifold of the singular conifold			Zero 't Hooft limit	
II		Perturbative limit			$\widehat{\mathbb{C}^2/\widetilde{\mathbb{I}}} \times \mathbb{C}$?	
III		4D limit			?			?	

- (1) $\partial_{1jk}^3 F = \eta_{jk} = \text{const}$, $\det \eta \neq 0$;
- (2) letting $\eta^{ij} = (\eta^{-1})_{ij}$ and summing over repeated indices, the Witten–Dijkgraaf–Verlinde–Verlinde equations hold:

$$c_{ijk}\eta^{kl}c_{lmn} = c_{imk}\eta^{kl}c_{ljn} \quad \forall i, j, m, n; \tag{5.5}$$

- (3) there exists a linear vector field and numbers d_i, r_i, d_F

$$E = \sum_i d_i t^i \partial_i + \sum_{i|d_i=0} r^i \partial_i \in \mathcal{X}(X_0) \tag{5.6}$$

such that

$$\mathcal{L}_E F = d_F F + \text{quadratic in } t; \tag{5.7}$$

- (4) there is a positive codimension subset $X_0^* \subset X_0$ and coordinates u^1, \dots, u^n on $X_0 \setminus X_0^*$ such that for all m

$$\partial_i u^m \eta^{ij} c_{jkl} = \partial_k u^m \partial_l u^m. \tag{5.8}$$

Upon defining $\partial_{t_i} \star \partial_{t_j} = \eta^{kl} c_{lij} \partial_{t_k}$, $e = \partial_{t_1}$ the latter definition is easily seen to be equivalent to the previous one. Point (1) ensures non-degeneracy of the metric[†] η , its flatness and the String equation; Point (2) and the fact that the structure constants come from a potential function implies the restricted flatness condition, with the extension due to conformality coming from Point (3); and Point (4) establishes that ∂_{u_i} are idempotents of the \star product on $X_0 \setminus X_0^*$; the reverse implications can be worked out similarly [41].

The Conformality property has an important consequence, related to the existence of a bi-Hamiltonian structure on the loop space of the X . Define a second metric g by

$$g(E \star A, B) = \eta(A, B) \tag{5.9}$$

which makes sense on all tangent fibres $T_p X$ where E is in the group of units of $\star|_p$. In flat coordinates t_i , this reads

$$g_{ij} = E^k c_{kij}. \tag{5.10}$$

A central result in the theory of Frobenius manifolds is that this second metric is flat, and that it forms a non-trivial[‡] flat pencil of metrics with η , namely $g + \lambda \eta$ is a flat metric $\forall \lambda \in \mathbb{C}$. Knowledge of the second metric in flat coordinates for the first is sufficient to reconstruct the full prepotential: indeed, the induced metric on the cotangent bundle (the *intersection form*) reads

$$g^{\alpha\beta} = (2 - d_F + d_\alpha + d_\beta) \eta^{\alpha\lambda} \eta^{\beta\mu} \partial_{\lambda,\mu}^2 F \tag{5.11}$$

from which the Hessian of the prepotential can be read off.

5.1.2. *Extended affine Weyl groups and Frobenius manifolds.* A classical construction of Dubrovin [40, Lecture 4], proved to be complete in [64], gives a classification of all Frobenius manifolds with *polynomial* prepotential: these are in bijection with the finite Euclidean reflection groups (Coxeter groups). I will recall briefly here their construction in the case in which the group is a Weyl group \mathcal{W} of a simple Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} of dimension $d_{\mathfrak{g}}$. Let $(\mathfrak{h}, \langle, \rangle)$ be the Cartan subalgebra with \langle, \rangle being the \mathbb{C} -linear extension of the Euclidean inner product given by the Cartan–Killing form, and let $\{x_i\}_i$ be orthonormal coordinates on $(\mathfrak{h}^*, \langle, \rangle)$. It is well

[†]As is customary in the subject, I use the word ‘metric’ without assuming any positivity of the symmetric bilinear form η .

[‡]That is, it does not share a flat coordinate frame with η .

known [20] that the \mathcal{W} -invariant part $S(\mathfrak{h}^*)^\mathcal{W}$ of the polynomial algebra $S(\mathfrak{h}^*) = H^0(\mathfrak{h}, \mathcal{O})$ is a graded polynomial ring in $r_{\mathfrak{g}} = \dim_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathfrak{h})$ homogeneous variables $y_1, \dots, y_{r_{\mathfrak{g}}}$; the degrees of the basic invariants $d_i \triangleq \deg_x y_i$, which are distinct and ordered so that $d_i > d_{i+1}$, are the Coxeter exponents of the Weyl group[†]; also $d_1 = h(\mathfrak{g}) = \frac{\dim_{\mathbb{C}} \mathfrak{g}}{\text{rank } \mathfrak{g}} - 1$, the Coxeter number. Let now

$$\text{Discr}_{\mathcal{W}}(\mathfrak{h}) = \text{Spec} \frac{\mathbb{C}[x_1, \dots, x_{r_{\mathfrak{g}}}]}{\langle \{\alpha_i \cdot x\}_{i=1}^{r_{\mathfrak{g}}} \rangle} = \bigcup_i H_i, \tag{5.12}$$

where H_i are root hyperplanes in \mathfrak{h} : the open set

$$\mathfrak{h}^{\text{reg}} \triangleq \mathfrak{h} \setminus \text{Discr}_{\mathcal{W}}(\mathfrak{h}) \tag{5.13}$$

is the set of regular Cartan algebra elements (that is, $\text{Stab}_{\mathcal{W}}(h) = e$ for $h \in \mathfrak{h}^{\text{reg}}$). We will be interested in the unstable and stable quotients

$$\begin{aligned} X_{\mathfrak{g}}^{\text{us}} &\triangleq \mathfrak{h}/\mathcal{W} = \text{Spec} \mathbb{C}[x_1, \dots, x_{r_{\mathfrak{g}}}]^{\mathcal{W}} = \text{Spec} \mathbb{C}[y_1, \dots, y_{r_{\mathfrak{g}}}], \\ X_{\mathfrak{g}}^{\text{st}} &\triangleq \mathfrak{h} // \mathcal{W} = \mathfrak{h}^{\text{reg}} / \mathcal{W} = \text{Spec} (\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{h}}(\mathfrak{h}^{\text{reg}}))^{\mathcal{W}}. \end{aligned} \tag{5.14}$$

Note that $\pi : \mathfrak{h}^{\text{reg}} \rightarrow X_{\mathfrak{g}}^{\text{st}}$ is a regular cover (a principal \mathcal{W} -bundle) of $X_{\mathfrak{g}}^{\text{st}}$, and linear coordinates on $\mathfrak{h}^{\text{reg}}$ can serve as a set of local coordinates on X^{st} .

Dubrovin constructs a polynomial Frobenius structure on $X_{\mathfrak{g}}^{\text{st}}$ as follows. First off, the Coxeter exponents are used to define a vector field

$$E \triangleq \frac{1}{d_1} \sum_i x^i \partial_{x_i} = \partial_{y_1} + \sum_{i=1}^{r_{\mathfrak{g}}} \frac{d_i}{d_1} \partial_{y_i}. \tag{5.15}$$

Also, view the Cartan–Killing pairing on \mathfrak{h} as giving a flat metric ξ on $T\mathfrak{h}$, that is, $\xi(\partial_{x_i}, \partial_{x_j}) = \delta_{ij}$. If $V = \pi^{-1}(U) = V_1 \sqcup \dots \sqcup V_{r_{\mathfrak{g}}}$ for $U \subset X_{\mathfrak{g}}^{\text{st}}$, and for $i = 1, \dots, |\mathcal{W}|$, let $\sigma_i : U \rightarrow \mathfrak{h}^{\text{reg}}$ be a section of $\pi : V \rightarrow U$ lifting U isomorphically to the i th sheet of the cover, so that $\sigma_i(U) \simeq V_i$, and define

$$g \triangleq (\sigma_i)^* \xi. \tag{5.16}$$

By the Weyl invariance of ξ and $\{y_j\}_j$, it is immediately seen that g defines a well-defined pairing on $T^*X_{\mathfrak{g}}^{\text{st}}$ (that is, the right-hand side is invariant under deck transformations of the cover $\mathfrak{h}^{\text{reg}}$, see [40, Lemma 4.1]). Armed with this, a Frobenius structure with unit ∂_{y_1} , Euler vector field E , intersection form g and flat pairing $\eta = \mathcal{L}_{\partial_{y_1}} g$ is defined on $X_{\mathfrak{g}}^{\text{st}}$ upon proving that $g + \lambda \eta$ thus defined give a flat pencil of metrics on $T^*X_{\mathfrak{g}}^{\text{st}}$ [40, Theorem 4.1]. In the same paper, it is further proved that such Frobenius structure is polynomial in flat coordinates for η , semi-simple, and unique given (e, E, g) .

In a subsequent paper [44], Dubrovin–Zhang consider a group theory version of the above construction, as follows. Fix a node $\bar{i} \in \{1, \dots, r_{\mathfrak{g}}\}$ in the Dynkin diagram of \mathfrak{g} , and let $\alpha_{\bar{i}}, \omega_{\bar{i}}$ be the corresponding simple root and fundamental weight. The \mathcal{W} -action on \mathfrak{h} can be lifted to an action of the affine Weyl group $\widehat{\mathcal{W}} \simeq \mathcal{W} \rtimes \Lambda_r(\mathcal{G})$ by affine transformations on \mathfrak{h} ,

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{w} : \widehat{\mathcal{W}} \times \mathfrak{h} &\longrightarrow \mathfrak{h} \\ ((w, \alpha), l) &\longrightarrow w(l) + \alpha, \end{aligned} \tag{5.17}$$

[†]A parallel and somewhat more common convention is to call $d_i - 1$ the exponents of the group (the eigenvalue of a Coxeter element), rather than the degrees d_i themselves.

which is further covered by a $\widetilde{\mathcal{W}}_i \triangleq \widehat{\mathcal{W}} \rtimes \mathbb{Z}$ -action on $\mathfrak{h} \times \mathbb{C}$ given by

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{w} : \widetilde{\mathcal{W}}_i \times \mathfrak{h} \times \mathbb{C} &\longrightarrow \mathfrak{h} \times \mathbb{C} \\ ((w, \alpha, r_{\mathfrak{g}}), (l, v)) &\longrightarrow (w(l) + \alpha + r_{\mathfrak{g}}\omega_{\tilde{i}}, x_{r_{\mathfrak{g}}+1} - r_{\mathfrak{g}}). \end{aligned} \tag{5.18}$$

$\widetilde{\mathcal{W}}_i$ is called *the extended affine Weyl group* with marked root $\alpha_{\tilde{i}}$. In [44], the authors give a characterisation of the ring of invariants of $\widetilde{\mathcal{W}}_i$, which may be reformulated as follows. Set $\mathfrak{g} = e^{2\pi i l} \in \mathcal{G}$ and let $u_i = \chi_{\rho_i}(\mathfrak{g})$ be as in (2.14) the regular fundamental characters of \mathfrak{g} ; also define $d_j \triangleq \langle \omega_j, \omega_{\tilde{i}} \rangle$. Then[†][44, Theorem 1.1],

$$\mathbb{C}[t_1, \dots, t_{r_{\mathfrak{g}}}; t_{r_{\mathfrak{g}}+1}]^{\widetilde{\mathcal{W}}_i} \simeq \mathbb{C}[e^{2\pi i d_1 t_{r_{\mathfrak{g}}+1}} u_1, \dots, e^{2\pi i d_{r_{\mathfrak{g}}} t_{r_{\mathfrak{g}}+1}} u_{r_{\mathfrak{g}}}; u_{r_{\mathfrak{g}}+1} e^{2\pi i t_{r_{\mathfrak{g}}+1}}]. \tag{5.21}$$

As before, define

$$\widetilde{X}_{\mathfrak{g}, \tilde{i}}^{\text{us}} \triangleq \text{Spec} \mathbb{C}[u_1, \dots, u_{r_{\mathfrak{g}}+1}] \simeq (\mathfrak{h} \times \mathbb{C}) / \widetilde{\mathcal{W}}_i \simeq \mathcal{T} / \mathcal{W} \times \mathbb{C}^* \tag{5.22}$$

$$\widetilde{X}_{\mathfrak{g}, \tilde{i}}^{\text{st}} \triangleq (\mathfrak{h}^{\text{reg}} \times \mathbb{C}) // \widetilde{\mathcal{W}}_i = \text{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{h} \times \mathbb{C}}(\mathfrak{h}^{\text{reg}} \times \mathbb{C}))^{\widetilde{\mathcal{W}}_i} \simeq \mathcal{T}^{\text{reg}} / \mathcal{W} \times \mathbb{C}^* \tag{5.23}$$

with $\mathcal{T}^{\text{reg}} = \exp(\mathfrak{h}^{\text{reg}})$ and $\mathcal{T}^{\text{reg}} / \mathcal{W}$ being the set of regular elements of \mathcal{T} and regular conjugacy classes of \mathcal{G} , respectively. A Frobenius structure polynomial in $u_1, \dots, u_{r_{\mathfrak{g}}+1}$ can be constructed along the same lines as for the classical case of finite Coxeter groups: adding a further linear coordinate $x_{r_{\mathfrak{g}}+1}$ for the right summand in $\mathfrak{h} \oplus \mathbb{C}$, we define a metric ξ with signature $(r_{\mathfrak{g}}, 1)$ on $\mathfrak{h} \times \mathbb{C}$ by orthogonal extension of $4\pi^2$ times the Cartan–Killing pairing on \mathfrak{h} , and normalising $\|\partial_{x_{r_{\mathfrak{g}}+1}}\|^2 = -4\pi^2$:

$$\xi(\partial_{x_i}, \partial_{x_j}) = \begin{cases} 4\pi^2 \delta_{ij}, & i, j < r_{\mathfrak{g}} + 1, \\ -4\pi^2, & i = j = r_{\mathfrak{g}} + 1, \\ 0 & \text{else.} \end{cases} \tag{5.24}$$

Exactly as in the previous discussion of the finite Weyl groups, we have a \mathcal{W} -principal bundle

$$\begin{array}{c} \mathcal{T}^{\text{reg}} \times \mathbb{C}^* \\ \tilde{\sigma}_i \left(\begin{array}{c} \uparrow \\ \downarrow u \\ \downarrow \\ \widetilde{X}_{\mathfrak{g}, \tilde{i}}^{\text{st}} \end{array} \right. \end{array} \tag{5.25}$$

with sections $\tilde{\sigma}_i$, $i = 1, \dots, |\mathcal{W}|$ defined as before. Then the following theorem holds [44, Theorem 2.1]:

[†]The reader familiar with [44] will note the slight difference between what we call u_i here and the basic Laurent polynomial invariants \tilde{y}_i in [44], the latter being defined as the Weyl-orbit sums

$$\tilde{y}_i(t) \triangleq e^{2\pi i d_1 t_{r_{\mathfrak{g}}+1}} \sum_{w \in \mathcal{W}} e^{2\pi i \langle w(\omega_i), t \rangle}. \tag{5.19}$$

It is immediate from the definition that there exists a linear, triangular change-of-variables with rational coefficients

$$u_i = \sum_j \frac{\text{Mult}_{\rho \omega_i}(\omega_j)}{|\mathcal{W}_{\omega_j}|} \tilde{y}_j(t) + \text{Mult}_{\rho \omega_i}(0), \tag{5.20}$$

with $\text{Mult}_{\rho}(\omega)$ being the multiplicity of $\omega \in \Lambda_w$ in the weight system of $\rho \in R(\mathcal{G})$, so that [44, Theorem 1.1] holds as in (5.21).

THEOREM 5.1. *There is a unique semi-simple Frobenius manifold structure $(\widetilde{X}_{g,\bar{i}}^{\text{st}}, e, E, \xi, g, \star)$ on $\widetilde{X}_{g,\bar{i}}^{\text{st}}$ such that*

- (1) *in flat coordinates $t^1, \dots, t^{r_g}, t^{r_g+1}$ for ξ , the prepotential is polynomial in t^1, \dots, t^{r_g} and $e^{t^{r_g+1}}$;*
- (2) *$e = \partial_{u_{\bar{i}}} = \partial_{\bar{i}}$;*
- (3) *$E = \frac{1}{2\pi i d_{\bar{i}}} \partial_{x_{r_g+1}} = \sum_j \frac{d_j}{d_{\bar{i}}} t^j \partial_{t_j} + \frac{1}{d_{\bar{i}}} \partial_{t^{r_g+1}}$;*
- (4) *$g = \widetilde{\sigma}_{\bar{i}}^* \xi$.*

5.1.3. Hurwitz spaces and Frobenius manifolds. As was already hinted at in Section 4.3.2, a further source of semi-simple Frobenius manifolds is given by Hurwitz spaces [40, Lecture 5]. For $r \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $\mathbf{m} \in \mathbb{N}_0^r$, these are moduli spaces $\mathcal{H}_{g,\mathbf{m}} = \mathcal{M}_g(\mathbb{P}^1, \mathbf{m})$ of isomorphism classes of degree $|\mathbf{m}|$ covers λ of the complex projective line by a smooth genus g curve C_g , with marked ramification profile over ∞ specified by \mathbf{m} ; in other words, λ is a meromorphic function on C_g with pole divisor $(\lambda)_- = -\sum_i \mathbf{m}_i P_i$ for points $P_i \in C_g$, $i = 1, \dots, r$. Denoting as in definition 2.1 by π , λ and Σ_i , respectively, the universal family, the universal map, and the sections marking the i th point in $(\lambda)_-$, this is

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 C_g & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \mathcal{C} \xrightarrow{\lambda} \mathbb{P}^1 \\
 \uparrow P_i & \downarrow & \uparrow \Sigma_i \downarrow \pi \\
 & & [\lambda] \xrightarrow{\text{pt}} \mathcal{H}
 \end{array} \tag{5.26}$$

As a result, $\mathcal{H}_{g,\mathbf{m}}$ is a reduced, irreducible complex variety with $\dim_{\mathbb{C}} \mathcal{H}_{g,\mathbf{m}} = 2g + \sum_i \mathbf{m}_i + r - 1$, which is typically smooth (that is, so long as the ramification profile is incompatible with automorphisms of the cover).

Dubrovin provides in [40] a systematic way of constructing a semi-simple Frobenius manifold structure on $\mathcal{H}_{g,\mathbf{m}}$, for which I here provide a simplified account. As in Section 2.4, let $d = d_{\pi}$ denote the relative differential with respect to the universal family (namely, the differential in the fibre direction), and let $p_i^{\text{cr}} \in C_g \simeq \pi^{-1}([\lambda])$ be the critical points $d\lambda = 0$ of the universal map (that is, the ramification points of the cover). By the Riemann existence theorem, the critical values

$$\mathbf{u}^i = \lambda(p_i^{\text{cr}}) \tag{5.27}$$

are local coordinates on $\mathcal{H}_{g,\mathbf{m}}$ away from the discriminant $\mathbf{u}^i = \mathbf{u}^j$. We then locally define an $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{H}_{g,\mathbf{m}}}$ -algebra structure on the space of vector fields $\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{H}_{g,\mathbf{m}})$ by imposing that the coordinate vector fields $\partial_{\mathbf{u}^i}$ are idempotents for it:

$$\partial_{\mathbf{u}^i} \star \partial_{\mathbf{u}^j} = \delta_{ij} \partial_{\mathbf{u}^i}. \tag{5.28}$$

The algebra is obviously unital with unit $e = \sum_i \partial_{\mathbf{u}^i}$; a linear (in these coordinates) vector field E is further defined as $\sum_i \mathbf{u}^i \partial_{\mathbf{u}^i}$. The one missing ingredient in the definition of a Frobenius manifold is a flat pairing of the vector fields, which is provided by specifying some auxiliary data. Let then $\phi \in \Omega_C^1(\log(\lambda))$ be an exact meromorphic one form having simple poles[†] at the support of $(\lambda)_-$ with constant residues; the pair (λ, ϕ) are called, respectively, *superpotential*

[†]Exactness and simplicity of the poles can be disposed of by looking instead at suitably normalised Abelian differentials with respect to a chosen symplectic basis of 1-homology circles on C_g ; a fuller discussion, with a classification of the five types of differentials that are compatible with the existence of flat structures on the resulting Frobenius manifold, is given in the discussion preceding [40, Theorem 5.1]. The generality considered here however suits our purposes in the next section.

and the *primitive differential* of $\mathcal{H}_{g,m}$. A non-degenerate symmetric pairing $\eta(X, Y)$ for vector fields $X, Y \in \mathcal{X}(\mathcal{H}_{g,m})$ is defined by

$$\eta(X, Y) \triangleq \sum_i \operatorname{Res}_{p_i^{\text{cr}}} \frac{X(\lambda)Y(\lambda)}{d\lambda} \phi^2, \tag{5.29}$$

where, for p locally around p_i^{cr} , the Lie derivatives $X(\lambda), Y(\lambda)$ are taken at constant $\mu(p) = \int^p \phi$. It turns out that η thus defined is flat, compatible with \star , with E being linear in flat coordinates, and it further satisfies

$$\eta(X, Y \star Z) = \sum_i \operatorname{Res}_{p_i^{\text{cr}}} \frac{X(\lambda)Y(\lambda)Z(\lambda)}{d\mu d\lambda} \phi^2, \tag{5.30}$$

$$g(X, Y) = \sum_i \operatorname{Res}_{p_i^{\text{cr}}} \frac{X(\log \lambda)Y(\log \lambda)}{d \log \lambda} \phi^2. \tag{5.31}$$

REMARK 5.2. There is a direct link between the prepotential of the Frobenius manifold structure above on $\mathcal{H}_{g,m}$ and the special Kähler prepotential of families of spectral curves (see (4.27) in the Toda case), whenever the latter is given by moduli of a generic cover of the line with ramification profile \mathbf{m} : the two things coincide upon identifying the superpotential and primitive Abelian integral (λ, μ) on the Hurwitz space side with the marked meromorphic functions (λ, μ) on the spectral curve end [40, 75]. It is a common situation, however, that the λ -projection is highly non-generic: the Toda spectral curves of Section 2.4.1 are an obvious example in this sense. One might still ask, however, what type of geometric conditions ensure that a semi-simple, conformal Frobenius manifold structure exists on the base of the family $\mathcal{B} \xrightarrow{\iota} \mathcal{H}_{g,m}$: an obvious sufficient condition is that, away from the discriminant and locally on an open set $\Omega \subset \mathcal{H}_{g,m}$ with a chart $\mathfrak{t} : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{\dim \mathcal{H}_{g,m}}$ given by flat coordinates for η ,

- (1) \mathcal{B} embeds as a linear subspace of $H \subset \mathbb{C}^{\dim \mathcal{H}_{g,m}}$;
- (2) $H \simeq T_0 H \simeq \mathbb{C}\langle e \rangle \oplus H'$ contains the line through e ;
- (3) the minor corresponding to the restriction to H of the Gram matrix of η is non-vanishing.

In this case, (5.29)–(5.30) define a semi-simple, conformal Frobenius manifold structure with flat identity on the base \mathcal{B} of the family of spectral curves, with all ingredients obtained being projected down from the parent Frobenius manifold. We will see in the next section that the family of \widehat{E}_8 Toda spectral curves falls precisely within this class.

5.2. A one-dimensional LG mirror theorem

5.2.1. *Saito coordinates.* I will now elaborate on the previous theorem 5.2 in the case of the degenerate limit $\mathfrak{N} \rightarrow 0$ of the family of Toda curves over $\mathcal{U} \times \mathbb{C}$. Recall from Section 2.4.1 that there is an intermediate branched double cover $\Gamma'_u \simeq \Gamma_{u,0}$ of the base curve Γ''_u , defined as

$$\Gamma'_u = \mathbb{V} \left[\overline{\Xi''_{\mathfrak{g},\text{red}} \left(\mu + \frac{1}{\mu}, \lambda \right)} \right]. \tag{5.32}$$

For future convenience, rescale $\lambda \rightarrow \frac{\lambda}{u_0}$ in the following. Looking at λ as our marked covering map gives, by (2.33) and Table 1, we have an embedding of

$$\iota : X_{\mathfrak{g}}^{\text{Toda}} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{H}_{g,m} \tag{5.33}$$

of $X_{\mathfrak{g}}^{\text{Toda}} \simeq \mathbb{C}_{u_0} \times \mathcal{U}$ into the Hurwitz space $\mathcal{H}_{g,m}$ with $g = 128$ and, letting $\varepsilon_k = e^{2\pi i/k}$,

$$m = \left(\underbrace{2}_{\mu=-1}, \underbrace{3, 3}_{\mu=\varepsilon_3^j \neq 1}, \underbrace{5, 5, 5, 5}_{\mu=\varepsilon_5^j \neq 1}, \underbrace{5, 6, 10, 10, 15, 15, 15, 30}_{\mu=0}, \underbrace{5, 6, 10, 10, 15, 15, 15, 30}_{\mu=\infty} \right). \quad (5.34)$$

Mindful of theorem 5.2 I am going to declare (λ, ϕ) with $\phi \triangleq d \ln \mu$ to be the superpotential and primary differential and proceed to examine the pull-back of η to $\mathbb{C}_{u_0} \times \mathcal{U}$. An important point to stress here is that *this will not be a repetition of what was done in Section 4.3.2*: in that case, we were looking at (5.29) with $\log \lambda$ as the superpotential (up to $\mu \leftrightarrow \lambda, F \leftrightarrow -F$); this means that the computation leading up to the flat metric (4.92) was rather computing *the intersection form* g of $X_{\mathfrak{g}}^{\text{Toda}}$, by (5.31). The relation between the Frobenius manifold structure on X^{Toda} defined by (5.29)–(5.31) and $QH(\widehat{\mathbb{C}/\mathbb{I}})$ is indeed a non-trivial instance of Dubrovin’s notion of almost duality of Frobenius manifolds [42], with the almost dual product being given by (4.94).

LEMMA 5.3. *Let $X, Y \in \mathcal{X}(X_{\mathfrak{g}}^{\text{Toda}})$ be holomorphic vector fields on $X_{\mathfrak{g}}^{\text{Toda}}$. Then (5.29) defines a flat non-degenerate pairing on $TX_{\mathfrak{g}}^{\text{Toda}}$, with flat coordinates given by*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{t}_0(u) &= \frac{\ln u_0}{30}, \\ \mathfrak{t}_i(u) &= M_i \mathfrak{m}_i(c = u_0^{1/30}, u_1, \dots, u_8), \quad i > 0, \end{aligned} \quad (5.35)$$

where $\{\mathfrak{m}_i\}_i$ are the planar moments (4.79) and $M_i \in \mathbb{C}$. Furthermore, the metric has constant antidiagonal form in these coordinates.

Proof. As in Section 4.3.2, let us reverse orientation in the residue formula (5.29) and pick up residues on $\Gamma'_u \setminus \{b_i^{\text{cr}}\}_i$; these are all located at the poles P_i of λ . As in [40], I define local coordinates ν_i centred around P_i such that $\lambda = \nu_i^{-m_i} + \mathcal{O}(1)$, as well as functions \mathfrak{r}_i^j with $(i, j) \in \mathbf{R} = \{(k, l) | 1 \leq k \leq 23 = l(m), 1 \leq j \leq m_i\}$ by

$$\mathfrak{r}_i^j \triangleq \begin{cases} \text{pv} \int_{P_8}^{P_i} \frac{d\mu}{\mu} & \text{for } j = 0 \\ \text{Res}_{P_i} \nu_i^j \text{pv} \ln \mu d\lambda & \text{for } j = 1, \dots, m_i - 1, \\ \text{Res}_{P_i} \lambda \frac{d\mu}{\mu} & \text{for } j = m_i, \end{cases} \quad (5.36)$$

and where

$$\text{pv} \ln \mu(P_i) = \text{pv} \int_{P_8}^{P_i} \frac{d\mu}{\mu}.$$

Here P_8 , in the numbering of marked points of (5.34), is the lowest (fifth) order pole of λ at $\mu = 0$. A remarkable fact, that can be proven straightforwardly from the Puiseux expansion of λ near P_i using (2.20)–(2.24) and Claim 2.3, is that \mathfrak{r}_i^j is in all cases a multiple of one of the planar moments (4.79):

$$\mathfrak{r}_i^j(u) = \mathcal{N}_i^j \mathfrak{t}_{\ell(i,j)}(u) \quad (5.37)$$

for some map of finite sets $\ell : \mathbf{R} \rightarrow [[0, 8]]$ and complex constants $\mathcal{N}_i^j \in \mathbb{C}$. For $0 < j < m_i$ the result is collected in Table 3, where we denoted

$$\begin{aligned} v_1 &= 5 - \sqrt{5} - i\sqrt{10 + 2\sqrt{5}}, & v_2 &= -5 - \sqrt{5} + i\sqrt{10 - 2\sqrt{5}}, \\ v_3 &= \left(1 + i\sqrt{5 + 2\sqrt{5}}\right)v_1/2, & v_4 &= -(-1)^{3/5}v_1. \end{aligned}$$

We furthermore have $r_i^0 = 0$ and $r_i^{m_i} = 0$ for $\mu(P_i) \neq 0, \infty$, and $r_i^0 = 1 = -r_i^{m_i} = -r_{i+8}^0 = r_{i+8}^{m_i}$ for $\mu(P_i) = 0$. It turns out that (5.37) suffices to prove constancy of η in the coordinate chart given by \mathbf{t}_i above; indeed, from (5.36) and Table 3 we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \eta(\partial_{\mathbf{t}_i}, \partial_{\mathbf{t}_j}) &= - \sum_l \operatorname{Res}_{P_l} \frac{\partial_{\mathbf{t}_i} \lambda \partial_{\mathbf{t}_j} \lambda}{\mu \partial_\mu \lambda} d\mu, = - \sum_l \operatorname{Res}_{P_l} \frac{\partial_{\mathbf{t}_i} \ln \mu d\lambda \partial_{\mathbf{t}_j} \ln \mu d\lambda}{d\lambda} \\ &= - \sum_l \sum_{k=0}^{m_l} \partial_{\mathbf{t}_i} \mathbf{r}_l^k \partial_{\mathbf{t}_j} \mathbf{r}_l^{m_l-k} = - \sum_i \sum_{k=0}^{m_i} \delta_{i, \ell(l, k)} \delta_{j, \ell(l, m_l-k)} \mathcal{N}_l^k \mathcal{N}_l^{m_l-k} \\ &= \delta_{i, 8-j} \eta_i, \end{aligned} \tag{5.38}$$

for numbers η_i , so that the Gram matrix of η is constant and antidiagonal in these coordinates. These can be scaled away by an appropriate rescaling of M_i in the definition of \mathbf{t}_i in (5.35). \square

TABLE 3. Residues (5.36) in terms of the planar moments (4.79); poles of λ not appearing in the table are related to those listed above by $\mu \rightarrow 1/\mu$ and a sign-flip in the residue.

i	j	$\ell(i, j)$	\mathcal{N}_i^j	i	j	$\ell(i, j)$	\mathcal{N}_i^j	i	j	$\ell(i, j)$	\mathcal{N}_i^j
1	1	5	i	10	5	3	$-\frac{5\sqrt[3]{-1}}{2}$	13	6	4	$\frac{3\phi}{10}$
2	1	3	$-\frac{\sqrt[3]{-1}}{\sqrt{3}}$	10	6	4	$\frac{3}{20}(-1)^{2/5}$	13	9	6	$-\frac{\phi}{25}$
2	2	7	$\frac{(-1)^{5/6}}{6\sqrt{3}}$	10	9	6	$\frac{1}{50}(-1)^{3/5}$	13	10	7	$-\frac{5}{6}$
4	1	2	$\frac{v_1}{20}$	10	10	7	$\frac{5}{12}(-1)^{2/3}$	13	12	8	$-\frac{3}{500\phi}$
4	2	4	$\frac{v_2}{200}$	10	12	8	$\frac{3(-1)^{4/5}}{1000}$	13	else	—	0
4	3	6	$\frac{v_3}{1500}$	10	else	—	0	14	3	2	-3ϕ
4	4	8	$\frac{u_4}{10\,000}$	11	2	2	$-2\sqrt[5]{-1}\phi$	14	5	3	-5
5	1	2	$-\frac{v_3}{20}$	11	4	4	$\frac{(-1)^{2/5}}{5\phi}$	14	6	4	$-\frac{3}{10\phi}$
5	2	4	$\frac{v_1}{200}$	11	5	5	$5i$	14	9	6	$\frac{1}{25\phi}$
5	3	6	$\frac{u_4}{1500}$	11	6	6	$\frac{2(-1)^{3/5}}{75\phi}$	14	10	7	$-\frac{5}{6}$
5	4	8	$-\frac{v_2}{10\,000}$	11	8	8	$-\frac{(-1)^{4/5}\phi}{250}$	14	12	8	$\frac{3\phi}{500}$
8	1	2	1	11	else	—	0	14	else	—	0
8	2	4	$-\frac{1}{10}$	12	2	2	$\frac{2\sqrt[5]{-1}}{\phi}$	15	6	2	$-6\sqrt[5]{-1}$
8	3	6	$\frac{1}{75}$	12	4	4	$-\frac{(-1)^{2/5}\phi}{5}$	15	10	3	$-10\sqrt[3]{-1}$
8	4	8	$-\frac{1}{500}$	12	5	5	$5i$	15	12	4	$-\frac{3(-1)^{2/5}}{5}$
9	2	3	$2\sqrt[3]{-1}$	12	6	6	$-\frac{2(-1)^{3/5}}{75}\phi$	15	15	5	$-15i$
9	3	5	$-3i$	12	8	8	$\frac{(-1)^{4/5}}{250\phi}$	15	18	6	$-\frac{2(-1)^{3/5}}{25}$
9	4	7	$-\frac{(-1)^{2/3}}{3}$	12	else	—	0	15	20	7	$\frac{5(-1)^{2/3}}{3}$
9	else	—	0	13	3	2	$\frac{3}{\phi}$	15	24	8	$-\frac{3(-1)^{4/5}}{250}$
10	3	2	$\frac{3\sqrt[5]{-1}}{2}$	13	5	3	-5	15	else	—	0

Before we carry on to examine the product structure on $X_{\mathfrak{g}}^{\text{Toda}}$ let us first check that the unit e and Euler vector field E satisfy indeed the String Equation and (part of the) Conformality properties of definition 5.1 by verifying that $\nabla e = 0$, $\nabla \nabla E = 0$ with $\nabla = \nabla^{(\eta)}$. It is easy to verify the following.

PROPOSITION 5.4.

$$e = \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{t}_8}, \quad E = \sum_j \frac{d_j}{d_8} t^j \partial_{t_j} + \frac{1}{d_8} \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{t}_0}, \tag{5.39}$$

with

$$d_1 = 6, \quad d_2 = 10, \quad d_3 = 12, \quad d_4 = 15, \quad d_5 = 18, \quad d_6 = 20, \quad d_7 = 24, \quad d_8 = 30. \tag{5.40}$$

Proof. The easiest way to see this is to realise that, by their definition in the Hurwitz space setting, e and E generate an affine subgroup of $\text{PSL}(2, \mathbb{Z})$ on the target \mathbb{P}^1 in (5.26) by

$$\mathcal{L}_e \lambda = \text{const}, \quad \mathcal{L}_E \lambda = \lambda. \tag{5.41}$$

Now, recall first of all that in the natural Hurwitz (B-model) coordinates u_i , a shift in u_3 keeping all other variables fixed gives a constant shift in λ/u_0 by (2.2) with $\lambda \rightarrow \lambda/u_0$ and $\aleph \rightarrow 0$, as we are considering here. Moreover, from (4.79) we see that in flat coordinates for η , and since $\partial_{t_i} u_j = \delta_{j3} e^{-t_0} \mathbf{t}_8$, a constant shift in \mathbf{t}_8 leaving all other flat coordinates constant gives a constant shift in the rescaled $\lambda \rightarrow \lambda/u_0$:

$$\frac{\partial \lambda}{\partial \mathbf{t}_8} = \text{const}. \tag{5.42}$$

Then $L_e \lambda \propto L_{\partial_{\mathbf{t}_8}} \lambda$, from which we deduce $e \propto \partial_{\mathbf{t}_8}$ as there is no continuous symmetry on λ that holds up identically in μ ; the proportionality can be turned into an equality upon appropriate choice of M_8 , which gives in any case an isomorphism of Frobenius manifolds. As far as the Euler vector field is concerned, recall similarly that a rescaling in u_0 at constant u_i gives a rescaling of λ with the same scaling factor, so that $E = u_0 \partial_{u_0}$. Writing down $u_0 \partial_{u_0}$ in flat coordinates using (5.36) and (4.79) concludes the proof. \square

5.2.2. *The mirror theorem.* Let us now dig deeper into the Frobenius manifold structure of $X_{\mathfrak{g}}^{\text{Toda}}$. By (5.11), the \star -structure on $TX_{\mathfrak{g}}^{\text{Toda}}$ can be retrieved from knowledge of the intersection form g in flat coordinates for η ; whilst theoretically this would only require the calculation of a Jacobian from the flat coordinates for g in Section 4.3.2 to (5.35), such calculation is however unviable due to the difficulty in inverting the Laurent polynomials $u_i(t)$. We proceed instead from an analysis of (5.30), and prove the following.

THEOREM 5.5. *There is an isomorphism of Frobenius manifolds*

$$\tilde{X}_{\mathfrak{g},3}^{\text{us}} \simeq X_{\mathfrak{g}}^{\text{Toda}}. \tag{5.43}$$

Proof. We have already come a long way proving (5.43): by Proposition 5.4 the pairs (e, E) match on the nose already, since $d_i = \langle \omega_j, \omega_3 \rangle$ by (5.40). Also, by (4.88) and since

$$\begin{aligned} g_{k0} &= - \sum_{\lambda(p)=\infty} \text{Res}_p \frac{\partial_{x_k} \lambda}{q_{\mathfrak{g}} \mu^2 \partial_{\mu} \lambda} d\mu = 0, \\ g_{00} &= - \sum_{\lambda(p)=\infty} \text{Res}_p \frac{\lambda}{q_{\mathfrak{g}} \mu^2 \partial_{\mu} \lambda} d\mu = \frac{1}{q_{\mathfrak{g}}} \sum_{\lambda(p)=\infty} \text{ord}_p \lambda = \frac{107}{900}, \end{aligned} \tag{5.44}$$

so do the two intersection forms up to a linear change-of-variables. By Theorem 5.1, the remaining and largest bit in the proof resides then in the proof of the polynomiality of the \star -product in flat coordinates (5.35), which I am now going to show. This would be achieved once we show that

$$c_{i,j,k} = \sum_i \text{Res}_{b_i^\pm} \frac{\partial_{t_i} \lambda d\mu \partial_{t_j} \lambda d\mu \partial_{t_k} \lambda d\mu}{q_8 \mu^2 d\mu d\lambda} \in \mathbb{C}[t_1, \dots, t_8, e^{t_0}] \tag{5.45}$$

for all i, j, k . As in the proof of Lemma 5.3, because of the difficulty in controlling the moduli dependence of b_i^\pm in either u_i or t_i , we turn the contour around and pick up residues in the complement of $\{b_i^\pm\}$. However, one major difference here with the case of the calculation of η is that not only do poles of λ contribute, but also the 240 ramification points of the μ -projection q_i (counted with multiplicity) satisfying either $\mu(q_i) = -1$ or $\{\mu(q_i) + \mu^{-1}(q_i) = r_1^k j_{k=1}^{133}\}$ (see (2.34)), whose dependence on u_i is even more involved. Indeed, near one of those points, the superpotential behaves like

$$\lambda(p) = \lambda_0(t) + \lambda_1(t) \sqrt{\mu - q_i} + \mathcal{O}(\mu - q_i), \tag{5.46}$$

and therefore the moduli derivatives of λ at $\mu = \text{const}$ which appear in (5.45) develop a simple pole as soon as $\partial_{t_i} \lambda_1 \neq 0$. This leads to a non-vanishing contribution to the residue as the triple pole resulting from them in (5.45) is now, unlike for η , only partially offset by the vanishing of $d\mu$ and $1/\partial_\mu \lambda$ at the branch points. It is a straightforward calculation to check that these contributions do contribute, but are best avoided calculating directly as their moduli dependence is intractable. Luckily, there is a workaround to do precisely so, as follows. Instead of (5.45), consider the 3-point function in *B-model* coordinates $\tilde{u}_0 = \ln u_0, \tilde{u}_1 = u_1, \dots, \tilde{u}_8 = u_8$,

$$\tilde{c}_{i,j,k} = - \sum_{d\mu(p)=0 \text{ or } \lambda(p)=\infty} \text{Res}_p \frac{\partial_{u_i} \lambda d\mu \partial_{u_j} \lambda d\mu \partial_{u_k} \lambda d\mu}{q_8 \mu^2 d\mu d\lambda} \tag{5.47}$$

sticking to the case $i = 0$ to begin with. Now, $\partial_{\tilde{u}_0}$ is the Euler vector field, $\partial_{\tilde{u}_0} \lambda = \lambda$, and we have $\partial_{\tilde{u}_0} \lambda_1 = 0$ at all ramification points of μ : this means that the problematic residues at $d\mu = 0$ give individually vanishing contributions to (5.47), unlike for the flat 3-point functions $c_{0,i,j}$. For this restricted set of correlators and in this particular set of coordinates, the only contribution to the LG formula (5.47) may come from the poles P_i : here, a direct calculation from the Puiseux expansion of λ at its pole divisor immediately shows that the Puiseux coefficients of λ are polynomial in u_0, u_1, \dots, u_8 at $\mu = 0, \infty$. Furthermore, while the Puiseux coefficients at $\mu = -1, \mu^3 = 1$ and $\mu^5 = 1$ are only Laurent polynomials in t_i with denominators given by powers of t_4, t_2 and t_1 , respectively, these powers turn out to delicately cancel from the final answer in (5.47). All in all, we find

$$\tilde{c}_{0,j,k} = \in \mathbb{Q}[e^{u_0/30}, u_1, \dots, u_8]. \tag{5.48}$$

To consider the case $i > 0$ in (5.47), we use the WDVV equation in these coordinates:

$$\tilde{c}_{ijk} \tilde{\eta}^{kl} \tilde{c}_{lmn} = \tilde{c}_{imk} \tilde{\eta}^{kl} \tilde{c}_{ijn}. \tag{5.49}$$

Setting $n = 0$, and letting i, j, m go for the ride, (5.49) gives a linear inhomogeneous system with unknowns $\tilde{c}_{ijk}, i > 0$ with coefficients being given by (complicated) polynomials in $e^{u_0/30}, u_1, \dots, u_8$ with rational coefficients. One way to circumvent the complexity of solving it explicitly is as follows: firstly, it is immediate to prove that the system has maximal rank, which is an open condition, by evaluating the coefficients at a generic moduli point, so that \tilde{c}_{ijk} are uniquely determined rational functions in $e^{u_0/30}, u_1, \dots, u_8$. To check that the solution is indeed polynomial, we just plug a general polynomial ansatz into (5.49) satisfying the degree conditions of Proposition 5.4 and solve for its coefficients, and find that such an ansatz does

indeed solve (5.49). The claim follows by uniqueness, the polynomiality of the inverse of (4.79), and Theorem 5.1. \square

One immediate bonus of Theorem 5.5, and a further vindication of taking great pains to give a closed-form calculation of the mirror in Claim 2.3, is that both the Saito–Sekiguchi–Yano coordinates (4.79) and the prepotential of $\widetilde{X}_{\mathfrak{g},3}$, for which an explicit form was unavailable to date[†], can now be computed straightforwardly: the reader may find an expression for the latter in Appendix B.3. A further bonus is a mirror theorem for the Gromov–Witten theory of the polynomial \mathbb{P}^1 -orbifold of type E_8 [107, 123].

COROLLARY 5.6. *Let $C_{\mathfrak{g}} \simeq \mathbb{P}_{2,3,5}$ denote the orbifold base of the Seifert fibration of the Poincaré sphere Σ (see Section 4.1.3). Then,*

$$QH_{\text{orb}}(C_{\mathfrak{g}}) \simeq X_{\mathfrak{g}}^{\text{Toda}} \tag{5.50}$$

as Frobenius manifolds.

This follows from composing the isomorphism $QH_{\text{orb}}(C_{\mathfrak{g}}) \simeq \widetilde{X}_{\mathfrak{g},3}$ (see [107]) with Theorem 5.5.

REMARK 5.7. In [107], a different type of mirror theorem was proved in terms of a polynomial three-dimensional Landau–Ginzburg model; it would be interesting to deduce directly a relation between the two mirror pictures, along the lines of what was done in a related context in [82]. As in [82], the two mirror pictures have complementary virtues: the threefold mirror of [107] has a considerably simpler form than the Toda/spectral curve mirror. On the other hand, having a spectral curve mirror pays off two important dividends: firstly, at genus zero, the calculation of flat coordinates for the Dubrovin connection (5.2) is simplified down to one-dimensional (as opposed to three-dimensional) oscillating integrals. Furthermore, and more remarkably, Givental’s formalism and the topological recursion might allow one to foray into the higher genus theory, recursively to all genera. This second aspect of the story will indeed be the subject of Section 5.4.

5.3. General mirrors for Dubrovin–Zhang Frobenius manifolds

There is a fairly compelling picture emerging from Theorem 5.5 and the constructions of Sections 2 and 3 relating the Dubrovin–Zhang Frobenius manifolds of Section 5.1.2 to relativistic Toda spectral curves. I am going to propose here what the most general form of the conjecture should be. For this section only, the symbols \mathfrak{g} , \mathfrak{h} , $\mathcal{G} = \exp(\mathfrak{g})$, $\mathcal{T} = \exp(\mathfrak{t})$, \mathcal{W} will refer to an arbitrary simple, not necessarily simply laced, complex Lie algebra, the corresponding Cartan subalgebra, simple simply connected complex Lie group, Cartan torus and Weyl group. As in Section 2, let $\rho \in R(\mathcal{G})$ be an irreducible representation of \mathcal{G} and for $\mathfrak{g} \in \mathcal{G}$ consider the characteristic polynomial

$$\Xi_{\rho}(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_{r_{\mathfrak{g}}}; \mu) = \det_{\rho}(\mu \mathbf{1} - \mathfrak{g}) = \sum_{k=0}^{\dim \rho} \mu^{\dim \rho - k} \mathfrak{p}_k(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_{r_{\mathfrak{g}}}) \in \mathbb{Z}[\theta, \mu], \tag{5.51}$$

with $\mathfrak{p}_k \in \mathbb{Z}[\theta]$ and θ_i defined as in Section 2.4. Recall that Ξ_{ρ} reduces to a product over Weyl orbits W_i^{ρ}

$$\Xi_{\rho}(\theta; \mu) = \prod_k \Xi_{\rho}^{(k)}(\theta; \mu) = \prod_k \prod_{j=1}^{|W_k^{\rho}|} \left(\mu - e^{\omega_j^{(k)} \cdot l} \right), \tag{5.52}$$

[†]This is a private communication from Boris Dubrovin and Youjin Zhang.

where e^l with $[e^l] = [\mathfrak{g}]$ is any conjugacy class representative in the Cartan torus, and $l \in \mathfrak{h}$; for example, when $\rho = \mathfrak{g}$, we have two factors $\Xi_\rho^{(0)} = (\mu - 1)^{r_\mathfrak{g}}$ ($W_0^\mathfrak{g} = \Delta^{(0)}$) and $\Xi_{\mathfrak{g},\text{red}} \triangleq \Xi_\rho^{(1)}$ irreducible of degree $d_\mathfrak{g} - r_\mathfrak{g}$ ($W_1^\mathfrak{g} = \Delta^+ \cup \Delta^-$); this was the case we considered for $\mathcal{G} = E_8$. In general, let \bar{k} be any integer in the product over k in (5.52) such that $W_{\bar{k}}^\rho$ is non-trivial and define $\Xi_{\rho,\text{red}} \triangleq \Xi_\rho^{(\bar{k})}$. Fixing $\alpha_{\bar{i}} \in \Pi$ a simple root, write

$$\Gamma_u^{(\bar{i})} = \mathbb{V} \left(\overline{\Xi_{\rho,\text{red}} \left(\theta_j = u_j - \delta_{\bar{i}j} \frac{\lambda}{u_0} \right)} \right), \tag{5.53}$$

where the overline sign once again indicates taking the normalisation of the projective closure, and letting $\omega_1^{(\bar{k})}$ be the dominant weight in $W_{\bar{k}}^\rho$, denote

$$q_{\rho,\bar{k}} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^{|W_{\bar{k}}^\rho|} \langle \omega_j^{(\bar{i})}, \omega_1^{(\bar{i})} \rangle^2. \tag{5.54}$$

Finally, writing $X_{\mathfrak{g},\bar{i}}^{\text{Toda}} = \mathbb{C}^* \times (\mathbb{C}^*)^{r_\mathfrak{g}}$ for the $r_\mathfrak{g} + 1$ -dimensional torus with coordinates $(u_0; u_1, \dots, u_{r_\mathfrak{g}})$, define pairings (η, g) and product structure $\partial_{u_i} \star \partial_{u_j}$ on $TX_{\mathfrak{g},\bar{i}}^{\text{Toda}}$ by

$$\eta(\partial_{u_i}, \partial_{u_j}) = \sum_l \text{Res}_{p_l^{\text{cr}}} \frac{\partial_{u_i} \lambda \partial_{u_j} \lambda}{q_{\rho,\bar{k}} \mu^2 \partial_\mu \lambda} d\mu, \tag{5.55}$$

$$\eta(\partial_{u_i}, \partial_{u_j} \star \partial_{u_k}) = \sum_l \text{Res}_{p_l^{\text{cr}}} \frac{\partial_{u_i} \lambda \partial_{u_j} \lambda \partial_{u_k} \lambda}{q_{\rho,\bar{k}} \mu^2 \partial_\mu \lambda} d\mu, \tag{5.56}$$

$$g(\partial_{u_i}, \partial_{u_j}) = \sum_l \text{Res}_{p_l^{\text{cr}}} \frac{\partial_{u_i} \lambda \partial_{u_j} \lambda \partial_{u_k} \lambda}{q_{\rho,\bar{k}} \mu^2 \partial_\mu \lambda} d\mu, \tag{5.57}$$

where $\{p_l^{\text{cr}}\}_l$ are the ramification points of $\lambda : \Gamma_u^{(\bar{i})} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$.

CONJECTURE 5.8 (Mirror symmetry for DZ Frobenius manifolds). The Landau–Ginzburg formulas (5.55)–(5.57) define a semi-simple, conformal Frobenius manifold $(X_{\mathfrak{g},\bar{i}}^{\text{Toda}}, \eta, e, E, \star)$, which is independent of the choice of irreducible representation ρ and non-trivial Weyl orbit $W_{\bar{k}}^\rho$. In particular, (5.55) and (5.57) define flat non-degenerate metrics on $TX_{\mathfrak{g},\bar{i}}^{\text{Toda}}$, and the identity and Euler vector fields read, in curved coordinates $u_0, \dots, u_{r_\mathfrak{g}}$,

$$e = u_0^{-1} \partial_{u_{\bar{i}}}, \quad E = u_0 \partial_{u_0}. \tag{5.58}$$

Moreover,

$$X_{\mathfrak{g},\bar{i}}^{\text{Toda}} \simeq \tilde{X}_{\mathfrak{g},\bar{i}}. \tag{5.59}$$

There is a fair amount of circumstantial evidence in favour of the validity of the mirror conjecture in the form and generality proposed.

(1) Firstly, the independence on the choice of representation should be a consequence of the work of [87–89] on the ‘hierarchy’ of Jacobians of spectral curves for the periodic Toda lattice and associated, isomorphic preferred Prym–Tyurins. The very same calculation of Section 4.3.2 of the intersection form (5.57) in this case does indeed show that the sum-of-residues in different representations and Weyl orbits $(\rho, \bar{k}), (\rho', \bar{k}')$ coincide up to an overall factor of $q_{\rho,\bar{k}}/q_{\rho',\bar{k}'}$, which in (5.55)–(5.57) is accounted for by the explicit inclusion of $q_{\rho,\bar{k}}$ at the denominator.

(2) Isomorphisms of the type (5.59) have already appeared in the literature, and they all fit in the framework of Conjecture 5.8. In their original paper [44], Dubrovin–Zhang formulate a mirror theorem for the A-series which is indeed the specialisation of Conjecture 5.8 to $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{sl}_N$ and $\rho = \square = \rho_{\omega_1}$ the fundamental representation. Their mirror theorem was extended to the other classical Lie algebras $\mathfrak{b}_N, \mathfrak{c}_N$ and \mathfrak{d}_N by the same authors with Strachan and Zuo in [43]:

the Toda mirrors of Conjecture 5.8 specialise to their LG models for $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{so}_{2N+1}$, \mathfrak{sp}_N and \mathfrak{so}_{2N} with ρ being in all cases the defining vector representation $\rho = \rho_{\omega_1}$.

(3) At the opposite end of the simple Lie algebra spectrum, Theorem 5.5 gives an affirmative answer to Conjecture 5.8 for the most exceptional example of $\mathcal{G} = E_8$; it is only natural to speculate that the missing exceptional cases should fit in as well.

(4) Some further indication that Conjecture 5.8 should hold true comes from the study of Seiberg–Witten curves in the same limit considered for Section 4.3.3, together with $\Lambda_4 \rightarrow 0$. It was speculated already in [82] that the perturbative limit of 4d SW curves with ADE gauge group should be related to ADE topological Landau–Ginzburg models (and hence the finite Coxeter Frobenius manifolds of (5.14)) via an operation foreshadowing the notion of almost duality in [42]; this was further elaborated upon in [49] for $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{e}_6$, and [48] for $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{e}_7$.

(5) Finally, our way of accommodating the extra datum of the choice of simple root $\alpha_{\bar{i}}$ is not only consistent with the results [43], but also with the general idea that these Frobenius manifolds should be related to each other by a Type I symmetry of WDVV (a Legendre-type transformation) in the language of [40, Appendix B]. Indeed, different choices of fundamental characters u_i shifting the value of the superpotential correspond precisely to a symmetry of WDVV where the new unit vector field is one of the old non-unital coordinate vector fields. This parallels precisely the general construction of [43, 44].

It should be noted that, away from the classical ABCD series and the exceptional case G_2 , $\Gamma_u^{(\bar{i})}$ is typically not a rational curve, not even for the ‘minimal’ case in which $\alpha_{\bar{i}}$ is chosen as the root corresponding to the attaching node of the external root in the Dynkin diagram, and ρ is a minimal non-trivial irreducible representation. For the time being, I will content myself to provide some data on the exceptional cases in Table 4, and defer a proof of Conjecture 5.8 to a separate publication.

5.4. Polynomial \mathbb{P}^1 -orbifolds at higher genus

As a final application, I restrict my attention to \mathcal{G} being simply laced. In this case, Conjecture 5.8 and [107] would imply the following.

CONJECTURE 5.9. With notation as in Conjecture 5.8, let \bar{i} be an arbitrary node of the Dynkin diagram for \mathfrak{g} of type A , or the node corresponding to the highest dimensional fundamental representation[†] for type D and E :

$$\bar{i} = \begin{cases} i = 1, \dots, n, & \mathfrak{g} = A_n \\ n - 2, & \mathfrak{g} = D_n \\ 3, & \mathfrak{g} = E_n \end{cases} \tag{5.60}$$

Then,

$$X_{\mathfrak{g}, \bar{i}}^{\text{Toda}} \simeq QH_{\text{orb}}(C_{\mathfrak{g}}), \tag{5.61}$$

where $C_{\mathfrak{g}}$ is the polynomial \mathbb{P}^1 -orbifold of type \mathfrak{g} :

$$C_{\mathfrak{g}} = \begin{cases} \mathbb{P}(\bar{i}, n - \bar{i} + 1), & \mathfrak{g} = A_n \\ \mathbb{P}(2, 2, n - 2) & \mathfrak{g} = D_n \\ \mathbb{P}(2, 3, n - 3) & \mathfrak{g} = E_n \end{cases} \tag{5.62}$$

There are two noteworthy implications of such a statement. The first is that the LG model of the previous section would provide a dispersionless Lax formalism for the integrable hierarchy of topological type on the loop space of the Frobenius manifold $QH_{\text{orb}}(C_{\mathfrak{g}})$ [40, Lecture 6];

[†]Equivalently, this is the attaching node of the external root(s) in the Dynkin diagram.

for type A, this is well known to be the extended bi-graded Toda hierarchy of [31] (see also [91]), and for all ADE types, a construction was put forward in [90] for these hierarchies in the form of Hirota quadratic equations. The zero-dispersion Lax formulation of the hierarchy could be a key to relate such remarkable, yet obscure hierarchy to a well-understood parent $2 + 1$ hierarchy such as two-dimensional Toda, as was done in a closely related context in [24]. A more direct consequence is a Givental-style, genus-zero-controls-higher-genus statement, as follows. On the Gromov–Witten side, and as a vector space, the Chen–Ruan cohomology of $C_{\mathfrak{g}}$ is the cohomology of the inertia stack $IC_{\mathfrak{g}}$ [34, 123], which is generated by the identity class $\phi_{r_{\mathfrak{g}}} \triangleq \mathbf{1}_0$, the Kähler class $\phi_0 \triangleq p$, and twisted cohomology classes concentrated at the stacky points of $C_{\mathfrak{g}}$,

$$\phi_{\nu(i,r)} \triangleq \mathbf{1}_{(\frac{i}{s_r}, r)} \in H^{(\frac{i}{s_r}, r)}(C_{\mathfrak{g}}) \simeq H(B\mathbb{Z}_{s_r}), \quad i = 1, \dots, r - 1, \tag{5.63}$$

where $r = 1, 2$ for type A and $r = 1, 2, 3$ for type D and E label the orbifold points of $C_{\mathfrak{g}}$, s_r is the order of the respective isotropy groups, we label components of the $IC_{\mathfrak{g}}$ by $(\frac{i}{r}, s_r)$, and $\nu(i, r)$ is a choice of a map to $[[1, r_{\mathfrak{g}}]]$ increasingly sorting the sets of pairs (i, r) by the value of i/s_r .[†] Define now the genus g full-descendent Gromov–Witten potential of $C_{\mathfrak{g}}$ as the formal power series

$$\mathcal{F}_g^{C_{\mathfrak{g}}} = \sum_{n \geq 0} \sum_{d \in \text{Eff}(C_{\mathfrak{g}})} \sum_{\substack{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n \\ k_1, \dots, k_n}} \frac{\prod_{i=1}^n t_{\alpha_i, k_i}}{n!} \langle \tau_{k_1}(\phi_{\alpha_1}) \dots \tau_{k_n}(\phi_{\alpha_n}) \rangle_{g, n, d}^{C_{\mathfrak{g}}}, \tag{5.64}$$

where $\text{Eff}(C_{\mathfrak{g}}) \subset H^2(C_{\mathfrak{g}}, \mathbb{Z})/H_{\text{tor}}^2(C_{\mathfrak{g}}, \mathbb{Z})$ is the set of degrees of twisted stable maps to $C_{\mathfrak{g}}$, and the usual correlator notation for multi-point descendent Gromov–Witten invariants was employed,

$$\langle \tau_{k_1}(\phi_{\alpha_1}) \dots \tau_{k_n}(\phi_{\alpha_n}) \rangle_{g, n, d}^{C_{\mathfrak{g}}} \triangleq \int_{[\mathcal{M}_{g, n}(C_{\mathfrak{g}}, d)]^{\text{vir}}} \prod_{i=1}^n \text{ev}_i^* \phi_{\alpha_i} \psi_i^{k_i}. \tag{5.65}$$

Since $QH(C_{\mathfrak{g}})$ is semi-simple, the Givental–Teleman Reconstruction theorem applies [117]. I will refer the reader to [26, 58, 81] for the relevant background material, context, and detailed explanations of origin and inner workings of the formula; symbolically and somewhat crudely, this is, for a general target X with semi-simple quantum cohomology,

$$\exp \left(\sum_g \epsilon^{2g-2} \mathcal{F}_g^X(t) \right) = \widehat{S_{\text{GW}, X}^{-1}} \widehat{\psi_{\text{GW}, X}} \widehat{R_{\text{GW}, X}} \prod_{i=1}^{r_{\mathfrak{g}}+1} \tau_{\text{KdV}}(u), \tag{5.66}$$

where the *calibrations* $S_{\text{GW}, X}$ and $R_{\text{GW}, X}$ are elements of the linear symplectic loop group of $QH(X) \otimes \mathbb{C}[[\hbar, \hbar^{-1}]]$ given by flat coordinate frames for the restricted Dubrovin connection to the internal direction of the Frobenius manifold (5.2), which are, respectively, analytic in \hbar and formal in $1/\hbar$. The hat symbol signifies normal-ordered quantisation of the corresponding linear symplectomorphism (namely, an exponentiated quantised quadratic Hamiltonian), $\psi_{\text{GW}, X}$ is the Jacobian matrix of the change-of-variables from flat to normalised canonical frame, and τ_{KdV} is the Witten–Kontsevich Kortweg–de-Vries τ -function, that is, the exponentiated generating function of GW invariants of the point. The essence of (5.66) is that there exists a judicious composition of explicit, exponentiated quadratic differential operators in $t_{\alpha, k}$ and changes of variables $u_k^{(i)} \rightarrow t_{\alpha, k}$ from the k^{th} KdV time of the i^{th} τ -function in (5.66) which returns the full-descendent, all-genus GW partition function of X . In our specific case $X = C_{\mathfrak{g}}$

[†]For the case $\mathfrak{g} = \epsilon_8$, since $\text{gcd}(2, 3, 5) = 1$, there is no ambiguity in the choice of ν , and the choice of labelling of ϕ_{α} here was made to match that of the Saito vector fields $\partial_{\tau_{\alpha}}$ of Lemma 5.3: up to scale, we have $\phi_{\alpha} = \partial_{\tau_{\alpha}}$, $\partial_{\tau_0} = p$, $\partial_{\tau_3} = \mathbf{1}_0$, $\partial_{\tau_1} = \mathbf{1}_{(\frac{1}{5}, 3)}$, $\partial_{\tau_2} = \mathbf{1}_{(\frac{1}{3}, 2)}$, $\partial_{\tau_3} = \mathbf{1}_{(\frac{2}{5}, 3)}$, $\partial_{\tau_4} = \mathbf{1}_{(\frac{1}{2}, 1)}$, $\partial_{\tau_5} = \mathbf{1}_{(\frac{3}{5}, 3)}$, $\partial_{\tau_6} = \mathbf{1}_{(\frac{2}{3}, 2)}$, $\partial_{\tau_7} = \mathbf{1}_{(\frac{4}{5}, 2)}$.

(and in general, whenever we consider non-equivariant GW invariants), by the Conformality axiom of definition 5.1, both $\widehat{S}_{\text{GW},X}$ and $\widehat{R}_{\text{GW},X}$ are determined by the Frobenius manifold structure of $QH(X)$ alone, without any further input [117]: the grading condition given by the flatness in the \mathbb{C}_\hbar^* direction of the Dubrovin connection fixes uniquely the normalisation of the canonical flat frames S and R at $\hbar = 0, \infty$, respectively. For reference, the R -action on the Witten–Kontsevich τ -functions gives the *ancestor potential* in the normalised canonical frame

$$\exp\left(\sum_g \epsilon^{2g-2} \mathcal{A}_g^X(t)\right) \triangleq \widehat{R}_{\text{GW},X} \prod_{i=1}^{r_{\mathfrak{g}}+1} \tau_{\text{KdV}}(u) \tag{5.67}$$

to which the descendent generating function (5.66) is related by a linear change of variables (via ψ) and a triangular transformation of the full set of time variables (via S^{-1}); see [81, Chapter 2].

On the Toda/spectral curve side, a similar higher genus reconstruction theorem exists in light of its realisation as a Frobenius submanifold of a Hurwitz space: this is, as in Section 4.1.4, the Chekhov–Eynard–Orantin (CEO) topological recursion procedure, giving a sequence $(F_g^{\text{CEO}}(\mathcal{S}), W_{g,h}^{\text{CEO}}(\mathcal{S}))$ of generating functions (4.37) and (4.38) specified by the Dubrovin–Krichever data of Definition 3.1. Having proved, or taking for granted the isomorphism of the underlying Frobenius manifolds as in Conjecture 5.8, it is natural to ask whether the two higher genus theories are related at all. A precise answer comes from the work of [47], where the authors show that there exists an explicit change of variables $t_{\alpha,k} \rightarrow v_{i,j}$ and an R -calibration of the Hurwitz space Frobenius (sub)manifold associated to $\mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{g}}$ such that

$$\exp\left(\epsilon^{2g-2} \sum_{g,d} W^{\text{CEO}}(\mathcal{S})_{g,d}(v)\right) = \widehat{R}_{\text{CEO}}(\mathcal{S}) \prod_{i=1}^{r_{\mathfrak{g}}+1} \tau_{\text{KdV}}(u), \tag{5.68}$$

where the independent variables $v_{i,j}$ on the left-hand side are obtained from the arguments of the CEO multi-differentials upon expansion around the i th branch point of the spectral curve (see [47, Theorem 4.1] and the discussion preceding it for the exact details). In other words, the topological recursion reconstructs the *ancestor potential* of a two-dimensional semi-simple cohomological field theory, with R -calibration $R_{\text{CEO}}(\mathcal{S})$ entirely specified by the spectral curve geometry via a suitable Laplace transform of the Bergman kernel. One upshot of this is that, up to a further change-of-variables and a (non-trivial) shift by a quadratic term, (5.68) can be put in the form of (5.66).

So, in a situation where \mathcal{S}_X is a spectral curve mirror to X , we have two identical reconstruction theorems for the higher genus ancestor potential starting from genus zero CohFT data, both being unambiguously specified in terms of R -actions $R_{\text{GW},X}$ and $R_{\text{CEO}}(\mathcal{S}_X)$. If these agree, then the full higher genus potentials agree, and the higher genus ancestor invariants of X are computed by the topological recursion on \mathcal{S}_X by (5.68). Happily, it is a result of

TABLE 4. Degree and genera of minimal spectral curve (putative) mirrors of $\widetilde{X}_{\mathfrak{g},\bar{i}}$ for the exceptional series EFG; for simplicity I only indicate the genus for the original choice of marked node \bar{i} in [44, Table I].

\mathcal{G}	ρ	\bar{k}	$q_{\rho,\bar{k}}$	$\dim \rho$	$\deg_{\mu} \Xi_{\rho,\text{red}}$	$\deg_{u_j} \Xi_{\rho,\text{red}}$	$g(\Gamma_u^{(\bar{i})})$
E ₆	ρ_{ω_1}	1	6	27	27	5, 3, 2, 3, 5, 3	5
E ₇	ρ_{ω_6}	6	12	56	56	6, 4, 3, 4, 5, 10, 6	33
E ₈	ρ_{ω_7}	7	60	248	240	23, 13, 9, 11, 14, 19, 29, 17	128
F ₄	ρ_{ω_4}	4	6	26	24	3, 2, 3, 5	4
G ₂	ρ_{ω_1}	1	6	7	7	2, 1	0

Shramchenko that in non-equivariant GW theory this is always precisely the case [112] (see also [46, Theorem 7]):

$$R_{\text{GW},X} = R_{\text{CEO}}(\mathcal{S}_X). \tag{5.69}$$

In other words, the R -calibration $R_{\text{CEO}}(\mathcal{S}_X)$, which is uniquely specified by the Bergmann kernel of a family of spectral curves \mathcal{S}_X whose prepotential coincides with the genus zero GW potential of a projective variety[†] X , coincides with the R -calibration $R_{\text{GW},X}$ uniquely picked by the de Rham grading in the (non-equivariant) quantum cohomology of X . We get to the following.

COROLLARY 5.10. *Suppose that Conjecture 5.8 holds. Then the ancestor higher genus potential of C_g equates to the higher genus topological recursion potential*

$$\mathcal{A}_g^{C_g} = \sum_h W_{g,h}^{\mathcal{S}_g} \tag{5.70}$$

up to the change-of-variables of [47, Theorem 4.1].

In particular, such all-genus full-ancestor statements hold in type A by [44, Theorem 3.1], type D by [43, Theorem 5.6] and type E₈ by Theorem 5.5. The two remaining exceptional cases can be treated along the same lines of Theorem 5.5, and far more easily than the case of E₈, and are left as an exercise to the reader.

REMARK 5.11 (On an ADE Norbury–Scott theorem). For the case of the Gromov–Witten theory of \mathbb{P}^1 , it was proposed by Norbury–Scott in [97], supported by a low-genus proof and a heuristic all-genus argument, and later proved in full generality by the authors of [47] using (5.68), that the residue at infinity of the CEO differentials $W_{g,n}^{\mathcal{S}_g}$ gives the n -point, genus g stationary GW invariant of \mathbb{P}^1 ,

$$\prod_{j=1}^n \text{Res}_{z_j=\infty} \frac{z_j^{m_j+1}}{(m_j+1)!} W_{g,n}^{\text{ Toda}}(z_1, \dots, z_n) = (-)^n \left\langle \prod_{i=1}^n \tau_{m_i}(p) \right\rangle. \tag{5.71}$$

I fully expect that a completely analogous ADE orbifold version of (5.71), which allows for a very efficient way to compute GW invariants at higher genera, would hold for all polynomial \mathbb{P}^1 -orbifolds. For types A and D, where the curve is rational, the statement of (5.71) would probably carry forth verbatim, with the right-hand side being given by n -pointed, non-stationary, untwisted GW invariants. For type E, it will perhaps be necessary to sum over all branches above ∞ (8, in the case of E₈) to obtain the desired result. I also expect that in type D and E, poles of λ at finite μ will presumably compute twisted invariants, with twisted insertions being labelled by the location of the poles. In particular, in type E₈, the poles at $\frac{\ln \mu}{2\pi i} \in \{1/5, 1/3, 2/5, 1/2, 3/5, 1/3, 4/5\}$ should correspond to insertions of $\mathbf{1}_{i/s_r, r}$ for the corresponding value of i/s_r .

Appendix A. Proof of Proposition 3.1

I am going to prove Proposition 3.1 by first establishing the following.

LEMMA A.1. *The number of double cosets of \mathcal{W} by \mathcal{W}_{α_0} is*

$$|\mathcal{W}_{\alpha_0} \backslash \mathcal{W} / \mathcal{W}_{\alpha_0}| = 5. \tag{A.1}$$

[†]More generally, a Gorenstein orbifold with projective coarse moduli space.

Proof. The order of the double coset space $\mathcal{W}_{\alpha_0} \backslash \mathcal{W} / \mathcal{W}_{\alpha_0}$ is the square norm of the character of the trivial representation of \mathcal{W}_{α_0} , induced up to \mathcal{W} [113, Ex. 7.77a],

$$|\mathcal{W}_{\alpha_0} \backslash \mathcal{W} / \mathcal{W}_{\alpha_0}| = \left\langle \text{ind}_{\mathcal{W}_{\alpha_0}}^{\mathcal{W}} 1, \text{ind}_{\mathcal{W}_{\alpha_0}}^{\mathcal{W}} 1 \right\rangle. \tag{A.2}$$

Now, $\text{ind}_{\mathcal{W}_{\alpha_0}}^{\mathcal{W}} 1$ is just the permutation representation $\mathbb{C}\langle \Delta^* \rangle$ on the free vector space on the set of non-zero roots $\Delta^* \simeq \mathcal{W} / \mathcal{W}_{\alpha_0}$. Suppose that

$$\mathbb{C}\langle \Delta^* \rangle = \bigoplus m_i R_i \tag{A.3}$$

for irreducible representations $R_i \in R(\mathcal{W})$ and $m_i \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then, by (A.2),

$$|\mathcal{W}_{\alpha_0} \backslash \mathcal{W} / \mathcal{W}_{\alpha_0}| = \sum_i m_i^2. \tag{A.4}$$

The multiplicity of R_i in $\mathbb{C}\langle \Delta^* \rangle$ is easily computed as follows. Let $c \in \mathcal{W}$ and $[c]$ its conjugacy class. Then its $\mathbb{C}\langle \Delta^* \rangle$ -character

$$\chi_{\mathbb{C}\langle \Delta^* \rangle}([c]) = \dim_{\mathbb{C}} \{v \in \mathfrak{h}^* \mid cv = v\} \tag{A.5}$$

is equal to the dimension of the eigenspace of fixed points of c . In the standard labelling [32, 102] of conjugacy classes of $\mathcal{W} = \text{Weyl}(\mathfrak{e}_8)$, we compute the right-hand side of (A.5) to be

$$\chi_{\mathbb{C}\langle \Delta^* \rangle}([c]) = \begin{cases} 2 & [c] \in \{2b, 4c, 6a, 12a, 4e, 4g, 30b, 10d, 6m, 3d, 24c, \\ & 6s, 18c, 6x, 12n, 7a, 14a, 6y, 6z, 6ab\}, \\ 4 & [c] \in \{4h, 2e, 10b, 30c, 6i, 30d, 12p, 12r\}, \\ 6 & [c] \in \{8c, 4b, 8e, 6c, 2c, 12h, 8h, 6q, 14b, 12q\}, \\ 8 & [c] \in \{4d, 4m\}, \\ 12 & [c] \in \{12f, 2f, 5a, 6g, 10e\}, \\ 14 & [c] = 12m, \\ 20 & [c] = 18d, \\ 24 & [c] \in \{8a, 24b, 20b\}, \\ 26 & [c] = 6b, \\ 30 & [c] = 12d, \\ 40 & [c] = 6h, \\ 60 & [c] = 12e, \\ 72 & [c] = 4f, \\ 126 & [c] = 6e, \\ 240 & [c] = 1a, \\ 0 & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

From (A.6), we obtain[†]

$$\begin{aligned} m_i &= \langle \chi_{R_i}, \chi_{\mathbb{C}\langle \Delta^* \rangle} \rangle \\ &= \begin{cases} 1 & R_i \in \{1_+ \simeq 1, 8_+ \simeq \mathfrak{h}^*, 35_-, 84_-, 112_+\}, \\ 0 & \text{else,} \end{cases} \end{aligned} \tag{A.6}$$

from which the claim follows. □

[†]Irreducible representations of \mathcal{W} have been labelled as $\dim R_{\text{sgn} \chi_R(8a)}$. A rather standard use in the literature is to label irreducible representations of exceptional Weyl groups by how they are stored in the GAP library; for reference, here the summands in the decomposition (A.6) would be called X.1 (trivial), X.3 (Coxeter), X.8, X.15 and X.16.

Proposition 3.1 is an easy consequence of the Lemma A.1: by \mathcal{W}_{α_0} -invariance, (3.17) defines an element of the Hecke ring, and it is immediately seen to assume exactly five constant values $-2, -1, 0, 1, 2$ on the hyperplanes H_i , which are then in bijection with the elements of $H(\mathcal{W}, \mathcal{W}_{\alpha_0})$.

Appendix B. *Some formulas for the \mathfrak{e}_8 and $\mathfrak{e}_8^{(1)}$ root system*

I gather here some reference material for the finite and affine E₈ root systems. Let $\{e_i\}$, $i = 1, \dots, 8$ be an orthonormal basis for \mathbb{R}^8 . The simple roots $\{\alpha_i\}$, $i = 1, \dots, 8$ have components in this basis given by

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_1 &= (\frac{1}{2}, -\frac{1}{2}, -\frac{1}{2}, -\frac{1}{2}, -\frac{1}{2}, -\frac{1}{2}, -\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}), \\ \alpha_2 &= (0, 0, 0, 0, 0, -1, 1, 0), \\ \alpha_3 &= (0, 0, 0, 0, -1, 1, 0, 0), \\ \alpha_4 &= (0, 0, 0, -1, 1, 0, 0, 0), \\ \alpha_5 &= (0, 0, -1, 1, 0, 0, 0, 0), \\ \alpha_6 &= (1, 1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0), \\ \alpha_7 &= (0, -1, 1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0), \\ \alpha_8 &= (-1, 1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0). \end{aligned} \tag{B.1}$$

The affine root system is obtained from (B.1) upon adding the affine root

$$\alpha_0 = (0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, -1, -1). \tag{B.2}$$

The respective Cartan matrices are given, from (B.1)–(B.2), by

$$\mathcal{C}^{\mathfrak{e}_8} = \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & 2 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 2 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 2 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 2 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 2 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & -1 & 2 & -1 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 2 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{B.3}$$

$$\mathcal{C}^{\mathfrak{e}_8^{(1)}} = \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 & 2 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 2 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 2 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 2 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 2 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & -1 & 2 & -1 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 2 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{B.4}$$

The resulting simple Lie algebra for \mathfrak{e}_8 has rank 8 and dimension 240. In the α -basis, (B.1), the affine root (B.2) reads

$$\alpha_0 = \sum_i \mathfrak{d}_i \alpha_i = 2\alpha_1 + 4\alpha_2 + 6\alpha_3 + 5\alpha_4 + 4\alpha_5 + 3\alpha_6 + 2\alpha_7 + 3\alpha_8. \tag{B.5}$$

Since $\det \mathcal{C}^{\mathfrak{e}_8} = 1$, we have $\Lambda_r(\mathfrak{e}_8) \simeq \Lambda_w(\mathfrak{e}_8)$.

B.1. *On the minimal orbit of \mathcal{W} .* I group here the details of the minimal orbit of \mathcal{W} in $\Lambda_r \subset \mathbb{Z}^s$ generated by the adjoint weight ω_7 , in terms of 240 vectors in a $s = 30$ -dimensional lattice. Since the orbit is in bijection with the set of non-zero roots of \mathfrak{g} , ω is in the orbit if and only if $-\omega$ is; also the cyclic shift of the components in \mathbb{Z}^s corresponds to the action of the Coxeter element on the orbit, which is thus preserved if we send $\omega \rightarrow (\omega_{j+1 \bmod s})_j$. The resulting $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_{30}$ action breaks up the orbit into suborbits, representatives for which are displayed[†] in Table B1.

B.2. *The binary icosahedral group $\tilde{\mathbb{I}}$.* The binary icosahedral group $\tilde{\mathbb{I}}$ is the preimage of the symmetry group of a regular icosahedron in \mathbb{E}^3 by the degree 2 covering map $SU(2) \rightarrow SO(3)$. It has a presentation as the group generated by the unit quaternions

$$s = \frac{1}{2}(1 + i + j + k), \quad t = \frac{1}{2}(\phi + \phi^{-1} + i + j), \tag{B.6}$$

whose full set of relations is $s^3 = t^5 = (st)^2$. The resulting group $\tilde{\mathbb{I}}$ has order 120, exponent 60, and class order 9. Its character table is given in Table B2.

B.3. *The prepotential of $\tilde{X}_{e_8,3}$.*

$$\begin{aligned} F_{\tilde{X}_{e_8,3}} = & -\frac{7t_1^{10}}{135\,000\,000} + \frac{521e^{6t_0}t_1^9}{2\,700\,000} + \frac{5117e^{12t_0}t_1^8}{100\,000} + \frac{e^{2t_0}t_2t_1^8}{300\,000} + \frac{7t_3t_1^8}{15\,000\,000} + \frac{243}{250}e^{18t_0}t_1^7 \\ & + \frac{136e^{8t_0}t_2t_1^7}{1875} + \frac{67e^{6t_0}t_3t_1^7}{75\,000} + \frac{e^{3t_0}t_4t_1^7}{1875} - \frac{t_5t_1^7}{3\,937\,500} + \frac{1954}{375}e^{24t_0}t_1^6 + \frac{7}{600}e^{4t_0}t_2^2t_1^6 \\ & - \frac{13t_3^2t_1^6}{7\,500\,000} + \frac{2401}{750}e^{14t_0}t_2t_1^6 + \frac{2151e^{12t_0}t_3t_1^6}{25\,000} + \frac{e^{2t_0}t_2t_3t_1^6}{25\,000} + \frac{243}{500}e^{9t_0}t_4t_1^6 + \frac{19e^{6t_0}t_5t_1^6}{56\,250} \\ & - \frac{e^{4t_0}t_6t_1^6}{1000} + \frac{t_7t_1^6}{18\,750\,000} + 12e^{30t_0}t_1^5 + \frac{43}{12}e^{10t_0}t_2^2t_1^5 + \frac{71e^{6t_0}t_3^2t_1^5}{50\,000} \\ & + \frac{43}{2}e^{20t_0}t_2t_1^5 + \frac{189}{250}e^{18t_0}t_3t_1^5 + \frac{4}{25}e^{8t_0}t_2t_3t_1^5 + 7e^{15t_0}t_4t_1^5 \\ & + \frac{1}{2}e^{5t_0}t_2t_4t_1^5 + \frac{1}{250}e^{3t_0}t_3t_4t_1^5 + \frac{67e^{12t_0}t_5t_1^5}{6250} + \frac{e^{2t_0}t_2t_5t_1^5}{18\,750} + \frac{11t_3t_5t_1^5}{4\,687\,500} \\ & - \frac{1}{12}e^{10t_0}t_6t_1^5 + \frac{e^{6t_0}t_7t_1^5}{25\,000} + \frac{159}{10}e^{36t_0}t_1^4 + \frac{117}{100}e^{6t_0}t_2^3t_1^4 + \frac{7t_3^3t_1^4}{2\,500\,000} + \frac{592}{15}e^{16t_0}t_2^2t_1^4 \\ & + \frac{2557e^{12t_0}t_3^2t_1^4}{50\,000} + \frac{7e^{2t_0}t_2t_3^2t_1^4}{50\,000} + \frac{88}{25}e^{6t_0}t_4^2t_1^4 - \frac{t_5^2t_1^4}{703\,125} + \frac{507}{10}e^{26t_0}t_2t_1^4 + \frac{229}{125}e^{24t_0}t_3t_1^4 \\ & + \frac{23}{600}e^{4t_0}t_2^2t_3t_1^4 + \frac{343}{125}e^{14t_0}t_2t_3t_1^4 + \frac{98}{5}e^{21t_0}t_4t_1^4 + \frac{1}{300}e^{t_0}t_2^2t_4t_1^4 + \frac{1331}{50}e^{11t_0}t_2t_4t_1^4 \\ & + \frac{459}{500}e^{9t_0}t_3t_4t_1^4 + \frac{9}{250}e^{18t_0}t_5t_1^4 + \frac{76e^{8t_0}t_2t_5t_1^4}{1875} + \frac{11e^{6t_0}t_3t_5t_1^4}{9375} + \frac{17e^{3t_0}t_4t_5t_1^4}{3750} \\ & - \frac{4}{15}e^{16t_0}t_6t_1^4 - \frac{27}{100}e^{6t_0}t_2t_6t_1^4 - \frac{19e^{4t_0}t_3t_6t_1^4}{3000} - \frac{1}{300}e^{t_0}t_4t_6t_1^4 + \frac{e^{12t_0}t_7t_1^4}{25\,000} + \frac{e^{2t_0}t_2t_7t_1^4}{25\,000} \end{aligned}$$

[†]The entries in the seventh and eighth columns of row $(\omega)_7$, as well as those of the 26th and 27th columns of row $(\omega)_{11}$ correct four typos in the table of [15, Appendix F.1].

$$\begin{aligned}
& -\frac{\mathbf{t}_3\mathbf{t}_7\mathbf{t}_1^4}{1\,250\,000} + 10e^{42\mathbf{t}_0}\mathbf{t}_1^3 + \frac{1}{45}e^{2\mathbf{t}_0}\mathbf{t}_2^4\mathbf{t}_1^3 + \frac{159}{5}e^{12\mathbf{t}_0}\mathbf{t}_2^3\mathbf{t}_1^3 + \frac{19e^{6\mathbf{t}_0}\mathbf{t}_3^3\mathbf{t}_1^3}{25\,000} + \frac{484}{5}e^{22\mathbf{t}_0}\mathbf{t}_2^2\mathbf{t}_1^3 \\
& + \frac{9}{50}e^{18\mathbf{t}_0}\mathbf{t}_3^2\mathbf{t}_1^3 + \frac{54}{625}e^{8\mathbf{t}_0}\mathbf{t}_2\mathbf{t}_3^2\mathbf{t}_1^3 + \frac{248}{5}e^{12\mathbf{t}_0}\mathbf{t}_4^2\mathbf{t}_1^3 + \frac{4}{5}e^{2\mathbf{t}_0}\mathbf{t}_2\mathbf{t}_4^2\mathbf{t}_1^3 + \frac{2e^{6\mathbf{t}_0}\mathbf{t}_5^2\mathbf{t}_1^3}{5625} + \frac{1}{45}e^{2\mathbf{t}_0}\mathbf{t}_6^2\mathbf{t}_1^3 \\
& + 48e^{32\mathbf{t}_0}\mathbf{t}_2\mathbf{t}_1^3 + 2e^{30\mathbf{t}_0}\mathbf{t}_3\mathbf{t}_1^3 + \frac{19}{6}e^{10\mathbf{t}_0}\mathbf{t}_2^2\mathbf{t}_3\mathbf{t}_1^3 + 9e^{20\mathbf{t}_0}\mathbf{t}_2\mathbf{t}_3\mathbf{t}_1^3 + 18e^{27\mathbf{t}_0}\mathbf{t}_4\mathbf{t}_1^3 + \frac{343}{15}e^{7\mathbf{t}_0}\mathbf{t}_2^2\mathbf{t}_4\mathbf{t}_1^3 \\
& + \frac{4}{625}e^{3\mathbf{t}_0}\mathbf{t}_3^2\mathbf{t}_4\mathbf{t}_1^3 + \frac{578}{5}e^{17\mathbf{t}_0}\mathbf{t}_2\mathbf{t}_4\mathbf{t}_1^3 + 6e^{15\mathbf{t}_0}\mathbf{t}_3\mathbf{t}_4\mathbf{t}_1^3 + e^{5\mathbf{t}_0}\mathbf{t}_2\mathbf{t}_3\mathbf{t}_4\mathbf{t}_1^3 + \frac{4}{375}e^{24\mathbf{t}_0}\mathbf{t}_5\mathbf{t}_1^3 \\
& + \frac{7}{375}e^{4\mathbf{t}_0}\mathbf{t}_2^2\mathbf{t}_5\mathbf{t}_1^3 - \frac{\mathbf{t}_3^2\mathbf{t}_5\mathbf{t}_1^3}{187\,500} + \frac{98}{375}e^{14\mathbf{t}_0}\mathbf{t}_2\mathbf{t}_5\mathbf{t}_1^3 + \frac{51e^{12\mathbf{t}_0}\mathbf{t}_3\mathbf{t}_5\mathbf{t}_1^3}{3125} + \frac{e^{2\mathbf{t}_0}\mathbf{t}_2\mathbf{t}_3\mathbf{t}_5\mathbf{t}_1^3}{3125} \\
& + \frac{36}{125}e^{9\mathbf{t}_0}\mathbf{t}_4\mathbf{t}_5\mathbf{t}_1^3 - \frac{2}{45}e^{2\mathbf{t}_0}\mathbf{t}_2^2\mathbf{t}_6\mathbf{t}_1^3 - 3e^{12\mathbf{t}_0}\mathbf{t}_2\mathbf{t}_6\mathbf{t}_1^3 - \frac{1}{6}e^{10\mathbf{t}_0}\mathbf{t}_3\mathbf{t}_6\mathbf{t}_1^3 - \frac{49}{15}e^{7\mathbf{t}_0}\mathbf{t}_4\mathbf{t}_6\mathbf{t}_1^3 \\
& - \frac{1}{125}e^{4\mathbf{t}_0}\mathbf{t}_5\mathbf{t}_6\mathbf{t}_1^3 + \frac{2}{625}e^{8\mathbf{t}_0}\mathbf{t}_2\mathbf{t}_7\mathbf{t}_1^3 + \frac{3e^{6\mathbf{t}_0}\mathbf{t}_3\mathbf{t}_7\mathbf{t}_1^3}{12\,500} + \frac{53e^{12\mathbf{t}_0}\mathbf{t}_3^4}{100\,000} + 90e^{9\mathbf{t}_0}\mathbf{t}_2^3\mathbf{t}_4\mathbf{t}_1 \\
& + \frac{2}{625}e^{3\mathbf{t}_0}\mathbf{t}_4\mathbf{t}_7\mathbf{t}_1^3 + \frac{\mathbf{t}_5\mathbf{t}_7\mathbf{t}_1^3}{468\,750} + \frac{15}{2}e^{48\mathbf{t}_0}\mathbf{t}_1^2 + \frac{34}{3}e^{8\mathbf{t}_0}\mathbf{t}_2^4\mathbf{t}_1^2 - \frac{9\mathbf{t}_3^4\mathbf{t}_1^2}{5\,000\,000} + 99e^{18\mathbf{t}_0}\mathbf{t}_2^3\mathbf{t}_1^2 \\
& + \frac{153e^{12\mathbf{t}_0}\mathbf{t}_3^3\mathbf{t}_1^2}{25\,000} + \frac{3e^{2\mathbf{t}_0}\mathbf{t}_2\mathbf{t}_3^3\mathbf{t}_1^2}{25\,000} + 6e^{3\mathbf{t}_0}\mathbf{t}_4^3\mathbf{t}_1^2 + 105e^{28\mathbf{t}_0}\mathbf{t}_2^2\mathbf{t}_1^2 + \frac{81}{250}e^{24\mathbf{t}_0}\mathbf{t}_3^2\mathbf{t}_1^2 + \frac{29e^{4\mathbf{t}_0}\mathbf{t}_2^2\mathbf{t}_3^2\mathbf{t}_1^2}{1000} \\
& + \frac{147}{250}e^{14\mathbf{t}_0}\mathbf{t}_2\mathbf{t}_3^2\mathbf{t}_1^2 + 108e^{18\mathbf{t}_0}\mathbf{t}_4^2\mathbf{t}_1^2 + 96e^{8\mathbf{t}_0}\mathbf{t}_2\mathbf{t}_4^2\mathbf{t}_1^2 + \frac{78}{25}e^{6\mathbf{t}_0}\mathbf{t}_3\mathbf{t}_4^2\mathbf{t}_1^2 + \frac{9e^{12\mathbf{t}_0}\mathbf{t}_5^2\mathbf{t}_1^2}{3125} \\
& + \frac{2e^{2\mathbf{t}_0}\mathbf{t}_2\mathbf{t}_5^2\mathbf{t}_1^2}{9375} + \frac{\mathbf{t}_3\mathbf{t}_5^2\mathbf{t}_1^2}{234\,375} + \frac{5}{6}e^{8\mathbf{t}_0}\mathbf{t}_6^2\mathbf{t}_1^2 - \frac{3\mathbf{t}_7^2\mathbf{t}_1^2}{1\,250\,000} + 30e^{38\mathbf{t}_0}\mathbf{t}_2\mathbf{t}_1^2 + \frac{3}{5}e^{36\mathbf{t}_0}\mathbf{t}_3\mathbf{t}_1^2 \\
& + \frac{56}{5}e^{16\mathbf{t}_0}\mathbf{t}_2^2\mathbf{t}_3\mathbf{t}_1^2 + \frac{39}{5}e^{26\mathbf{t}_0}\mathbf{t}_2\mathbf{t}_3\mathbf{t}_1^2 + 3e^{3\mathbf{t}_0}\mathbf{t}_2^3\mathbf{t}_4\mathbf{t}_1^2 + 169e^{13\mathbf{t}_0}\mathbf{t}_2^2\mathbf{t}_4\mathbf{t}_1^2 + \frac{27}{100}e^{9\mathbf{t}_0}\mathbf{t}_2^2\mathbf{t}_4\mathbf{t}_1^2 \\
& + 138e^{23\mathbf{t}_0}\mathbf{t}_2\mathbf{t}_4\mathbf{t}_1^2 + \frac{42}{5}e^{21\mathbf{t}_0}\mathbf{t}_3\mathbf{t}_4\mathbf{t}_1^2 + \frac{1}{50}e^{\mathbf{t}_0}\mathbf{t}_2^2\mathbf{t}_3\mathbf{t}_4\mathbf{t}_1^2 + \frac{363}{25}e^{11\mathbf{t}_0}\mathbf{t}_2\mathbf{t}_3\mathbf{t}_4\mathbf{t}_1^2 \\
& + \frac{7}{15}e^{10\mathbf{t}_0}\mathbf{t}_2^2\mathbf{t}_5\mathbf{t}_1^2 + \frac{e^{6\mathbf{t}_0}\mathbf{t}_3^2\mathbf{t}_5\mathbf{t}_1^2}{1250} + \frac{2}{5}e^{20\mathbf{t}_0}\mathbf{t}_2\mathbf{t}_5\mathbf{t}_1^2 + \frac{3}{125}e^{18\mathbf{t}_0}\mathbf{t}_3\mathbf{t}_5\mathbf{t}_1^2 + \frac{4}{125}e^{8\mathbf{t}_0}\mathbf{t}_2\mathbf{t}_3\mathbf{t}_5\mathbf{t}_1^2 \\
& + \frac{4}{5}e^{15\mathbf{t}_0}\mathbf{t}_4\mathbf{t}_5\mathbf{t}_1^2 + \frac{2}{5}e^{5\mathbf{t}_0}\mathbf{t}_2\mathbf{t}_4\mathbf{t}_5\mathbf{t}_1^2 + \frac{1}{125}e^{3\mathbf{t}_0}\mathbf{t}_3\mathbf{t}_4\mathbf{t}_5\mathbf{t}_1^2 - \frac{14}{3}e^{8\mathbf{t}_0}\mathbf{t}_2^2\mathbf{t}_6\mathbf{t}_1^2 - \frac{1}{200}e^{4\mathbf{t}_0}\mathbf{t}_3^2\mathbf{t}_6\mathbf{t}_1^2 \\
& - 3e^{18\mathbf{t}_0}\mathbf{t}_2\mathbf{t}_6\mathbf{t}_1^2 - \frac{2}{5}e^{16\mathbf{t}_0}\mathbf{t}_3\mathbf{t}_6\mathbf{t}_1^2 - \frac{21}{50}e^{6\mathbf{t}_0}\mathbf{t}_2\mathbf{t}_3\mathbf{t}_6\mathbf{t}_1^2 - 13e^{13\mathbf{t}_0}\mathbf{t}_4\mathbf{t}_6\mathbf{t}_1^2 - 3e^{3\mathbf{t}_0}\mathbf{t}_2\mathbf{t}_4\mathbf{t}_6\mathbf{t}_1^2 \\
& - \frac{1}{50}e^{\mathbf{t}_0}\mathbf{t}_3\mathbf{t}_4\mathbf{t}_6\mathbf{t}_1^2 - \frac{1}{15}e^{10\mathbf{t}_0}\mathbf{t}_5\mathbf{t}_6\mathbf{t}_1^2 + \frac{3}{500}e^{4\mathbf{t}_0}\mathbf{t}_2^2\mathbf{t}_7\mathbf{t}_1^2 + \frac{3\mathbf{t}_3^2\mathbf{t}_7\mathbf{t}_1^2}{1\,250\,000} - \frac{1}{50}e^{6\mathbf{t}_0}\mathbf{t}_2\mathbf{t}_6\mathbf{t}_7 \\
& + \frac{3e^{12\mathbf{t}_0}\mathbf{t}_3\mathbf{t}_7\mathbf{t}_1^2}{12\,500} + \frac{3e^{2\mathbf{t}_0}\mathbf{t}_2\mathbf{t}_3\mathbf{t}_7\mathbf{t}_1^2}{12\,500} + \frac{e^{12\mathbf{t}_0}\mathbf{t}_3^2\mathbf{t}_5\mathbf{t}_1}{6250} + \frac{51}{50}e^{6\mathbf{t}_0}\mathbf{t}_2^3\mathbf{t}_3\mathbf{t}_1^2 + \frac{1}{50}e^{\mathbf{t}_0}\mathbf{t}_2^2\mathbf{t}_4\mathbf{t}_7 \\
& + \frac{9}{250}e^{9\mathbf{t}_0}\mathbf{t}_4\mathbf{t}_7\mathbf{t}_1^2 + \frac{e^{6\mathbf{t}_0}\mathbf{t}_5\mathbf{t}_7\mathbf{t}_1^2}{3125} - \frac{3}{500}e^{4\mathbf{t}_0}\mathbf{t}_6\mathbf{t}_7\mathbf{t}_1^2 + \frac{5}{6}e^{4\mathbf{t}_0}\mathbf{t}_2^5\mathbf{t}_1 + \frac{245}{6}e^{14\mathbf{t}_0}\mathbf{t}_2^4\mathbf{t}_1 + \frac{3e^{6\mathbf{t}_0}\mathbf{t}_3^4\mathbf{t}_1}{100\,000}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + 60e^{24t_0}t_2^3t_1 + \frac{3}{250}e^{18t_0}t_3^3t_1 + \frac{9}{625}e^{8t_0}t_2t_3^3t_1 + 60e^{9t_0}t_4^3t_1 - \frac{2t_5^3t_1}{2109375} + 30e^{34t_0}t_2^2t_1 \\
& + \frac{7}{20}e^{10t_0}t_2^2t_3^2t_1 + \frac{3}{10}e^{20t_0}t_2t_3^2t_1 + 60e^{24t_0}t_4^2t_1 + 40e^{4t_0}t_2^2t_4^2t_1 + 210e^{14t_0}t_2t_4^2t_1 \\
& + \frac{42}{5}e^{12t_0}t_3t_4^2t_1 + \frac{6}{5}e^{2t_0}t_2t_3t_4^2t_1 + \frac{4e^{8t_0}t_2t_5^2t_1}{1875} + \frac{2e^{6t_0}t_3t_5^2t_1}{9375} + 6e^{27t_0}t_3t_4t_1 \\
& + \frac{4e^{3t_0}t_4t_5^2t_1}{1875} + \frac{5}{6}e^{14t_0}t_6^2t_1 + \frac{5}{6}e^{4t_0}t_2t_6^2t_1 + \frac{1}{30}e^{2t_0}t_3t_6^2t_1 + 80e^{15t_0}t_2^3t_4 \\
& + \frac{3e^{6t_0}t_7^2t_1}{25000} + \frac{1}{30}e^{2t_0}t_4^2t_3t_1 + \frac{41}{5}e^{12t_0}t_2^3t_3t_1 + \frac{66}{5}e^{22t_0}t_2^2t_3t_1 + 6e^{32t_0}t_2t_3t_1 \\
& + \frac{3e^{3t_0}t_3^3t_4t_1}{1250} + 190e^{19t_0}t_2^2t_4t_1 + \frac{3}{5}e^{15t_0}t_3^2t_4t_1 + \frac{3}{10}e^{5t_0}t_2t_3^2t_4t_1 + 60e^{29t_0}t_2t_4t_1 \\
& + \frac{49}{5}e^{7t_0}t_2^2t_3t_4t_1 + \frac{102}{5}e^{17t_0}t_2t_3t_4t_1 + \frac{4}{25}e^{6t_0}t_2^3t_5t_1 + \frac{t_3^3t_5t_1}{312500} + \frac{8}{15}e^{16t_0}t_2^2t_5t_1 \\
& + \frac{e^{2t_0}t_2t_3^2t_5t_1}{6250} + \frac{14}{25}e^{6t_0}t_4^2t_5t_1 + \frac{2}{125}e^{24t_0}t_3t_5t_1 + \frac{7}{375}e^{4t_0}t_2^2t_3t_5t_1 + \frac{14}{125}e^{14t_0}t_2t_3t_5t_1 \\
& + \frac{4}{5}e^{21t_0}t_4t_5t_1 + \frac{2}{75}e^{t_0}t_2^2t_4t_5t_1 + \frac{44}{25}e^{11t_0}t_2t_4t_5t_1 + \frac{12}{125}e^{9t_0}t_3t_4t_5t_1 - \frac{5}{3}e^{4t_0}t_2^3t_6t_1 \\
& - \frac{35}{3}e^{14t_0}t_2^2t_6t_1 - \frac{1}{20}e^{10t_0}t_2^2t_6t_1 - 10e^{4t_0}t_4^2t_6t_1 - \frac{1}{15}e^{2t_0}t_2^2t_3t_6t_1 - e^{12t_0}t_2t_3t_6t_1 \\
& - 10e^{19t_0}t_4t_6t_1 - 30e^{9t_0}t_2t_4t_6t_1 - \frac{7}{5}e^{7t_0}t_3t_4t_6t_1 - \frac{2}{15}e^{16t_0}t_5t_6t_1 - \frac{4}{25}e^{6t_0}t_2t_5t_6t_1 \\
& - \frac{1}{375}e^{4t_0}t_3t_5t_6t_1 - \frac{2}{75}e^{t_0}t_4t_5t_6t_1 + \frac{1}{50}e^{10t_0}t_2^2t_7t_1 + \frac{3e^{6t_0}t_3^2t_7t_1}{25000} + \frac{3}{625}e^{8t_0}t_2t_3t_7t_1 \\
& + \frac{3}{25}e^{5t_0}t_2t_4t_7t_1 + \frac{3}{625}e^{3t_0}t_3t_4t_7t_1 + \frac{e^{12t_0}t_5t_7t_1}{3125} + \frac{e^{2t_0}t_2t_5t_7t_1}{3125} - \frac{t_3t_5t_7t_1}{156250} \\
& - \frac{1}{50}e^{10t_0}t_6t_7t_1 + \frac{3}{125}t_7t_8t_1 + e^{60t_0} - \frac{t_2^6}{324} + \frac{23}{3}e^{10t_0}t_2^5 + \frac{t_3^5}{5000000} + \frac{185}{6}e^{20t_0}t_2^4 \\
& + \frac{3e^{2t_0}t_2t_3^4}{100000} - \frac{5t_4^4}{8} + 20e^{30t_0}t_2^3 + \frac{e^{4t_0}t_2^2t_3^3}{1000} + 20e^{15t_0}t_4^3 + 60e^{5t_0}t_2t_4^3 + 2e^{3t_0}t_3t_4^3 \\
& - \frac{5t_6^3}{324}15e^{40t_0}t_2^2 + \frac{1}{10}e^{36t_0}t_2^2 + \frac{11}{100}e^{6t_0}t_2^3t_3^2 + \frac{3}{5}e^{16t_0}t_2^2t_3^2 + \frac{3}{10}e^{26t_0}t_2t_3^2 + 30e^{30t_0}t_2^2t_4 \\
& + 130e^{10t_0}t_2^2t_4^2\frac{9}{25}e^{6t_0}t_3^2t_4^2 + 60e^{20t_0}t_2t_4^2 + 6e^{18t_0}t_3t_4^2 + 12e^{8t_0}t_2t_3t_4^2 + \frac{1}{375}e^{24t_0}t_5^2 \\
& - \frac{t_3^2t_5^2}{468750} + \frac{2}{375}e^{14t_0}t_2t_5^2 + \frac{5}{6}e^{20t_0}t_6^2 - \frac{5}{108}t_2^2t_6^2 + \frac{5}{3}e^{10t_0}t_2t_6^2 + \frac{5}{3}e^{5t_0}t_4t_6^2 + \frac{1}{90}e^{2t_0}t_5t_6^2 \\
& + \frac{3e^{12t_0}t_7^2}{25000} + \frac{3e^{2t_0}t_2t_7^2}{25000} + \frac{3t_3t_7^2}{1250000} + 30t_0t_8^2 + e^{8t_0}t_2^4t_3 + 3e^{18t_0}t_2^3t_3 + \frac{35}{3}e^{5t_0}t_2^4t_4 \\
& + \frac{3}{500}e^{9t_0}t_3^3t_4 + 60e^{25t_0}t_2^2t_4 + \frac{1}{100}e^{t_0}t_2^2t_3^2t_4 + \frac{33}{50}e^{11t_0}t_2t_3^2t_4 + e^{3t_0}t_2^3t_3t_4
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 &+ 6e^{23t_0}t_2t_3t_4 + \frac{1}{90}e^{2t_0}t_2^4t_5 + \frac{2}{5}e^{12t_0}t_2^3t_5 + \frac{2}{5}e^{22t_0}t_2^2t_5 + \frac{1}{250}e^{18t_0}t_3^2t_5 \\
 &+ \frac{4}{5}e^{12t_0}t_4^2t_5 + \frac{2}{5}e^{2t_0}t_2t_4^2t_5 + \frac{1}{75}e^{10t_0}t_2^2t_3t_5 + \frac{14}{15}e^{7t_0}t_2^2t_4t_5 + \frac{e^{3t_0}t_3^2t_4t_5}{1250} \\
 &+ \frac{2}{25}e^{5t_0}t_2t_3t_4t_5 - \frac{5}{324}t_2^4t_6 - \frac{10}{3}e^{10t_0}t_2^3t_6 - \frac{e^{4t_0}t_3^3t_6}{1000} - \frac{5}{3}e^{20t_0}t_2^2t_6 - \frac{1}{100}e^{6t_0}t_2t_3^2t_6 \\
 &- 10e^{10t_0}t_4^2t_6 - e^{8t_0}t_2^2t_3t_6 - e^{18t_0}t_2t_3t_6 - \frac{40}{3}e^{5t_0}t_2^2t_4t_6 - \frac{1}{100}e^{t_0}t_3^2t_4t_6 - 20e^{15t_0}t_2t_4t_6 \\
 &- e^{13t_0}t_3t_4t_6 - e^{3t_0}t_2t_3t_4t_6 - \frac{1}{45}e^{2t_0}t_2^2t_5t_6 - \frac{1}{75}e^{10t_0}t_3t_5t_6 - \frac{2}{15}e^{7t_0}t_4t_5t_6 \\
 &- \frac{t_3^3t_7}{1\,250\,000} + \frac{3e^{12t_0}t_2^3t_7}{25\,000} + \frac{3e^{2t_0}t_2t_3^2t_7}{25\,000} + \frac{3}{25}e^{6t_0}t_4^2t_7 + \frac{t_5^2t_7}{468\,750} + \frac{1}{500}e^{4t_0}t_2^2t_3t_7 \\
 &+ \frac{3}{25}e^{11t_0}t_2t_4t_7 + \frac{3}{250}e^{9t_0}t_3t_4t_7 + \frac{1}{625}e^{8t_0}t_2t_5t_7 + \frac{1}{625}e^{3t_0}t_4t_5t_7 \\
 &- \frac{1}{500}e^{4t_0}t_3t_6t_7 - \frac{1}{50}e^{t_0}t_4t_6t_7 + 15t_4^2t_8 + \frac{2}{125}t_3t_5t_8 - \frac{10}{3}t_2t_6t_8 + \frac{1}{375}e^{4t_0}t_2^2t_5^2 \\
 &+ \frac{2e^{6t_0}t_5^3}{84\,375} + \frac{1}{50}e^{6t_0}t_2^3t_7 + \frac{3}{625}e^{8t_0}t_2t_3^2t_5 + 13e^{13t_0}t_2^2t_3t_4 + \frac{4}{5}e^{17t_0}t_2t_4t_5. \tag{B.7}
 \end{aligned}$$

TABLE B.1. $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_{30}$ suborbits of the minimal orbit of \mathcal{W} .

n_0	± 6	± 5	± 4	± 3	± 3	± 2	± 2	± 1	0	0	0	0
card	10	12	30	20	20	30	30	60	10	10	6	2
$(\omega)_1$	1	-1	-1	-1	1	-1	1	2	-1	1	1	1
$(\omega)_2$	0	1	1	1	-1	1	-1	-1	0	0	-1	-1
$(\omega)_3$	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	-1	0	1
$(\omega)_4$	0	0	0	1	-1	-1	1	0	0	0	1	-1
$(\omega)_5$	0	0	1	-1	1	0	-1	0	1	0	-1	1
$(\omega)_6$	1	1	-1	0	0	0	1	0	-1	1	0	-1
$(\omega)_7$	0	-1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1
$(\omega)_8$	0	1	1	1	0	1	-1	-1	0	-1	-1	-1
$(\omega)_9$	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
$(\omega)_{10}$	0	0	0	0	0	-1	0	0	1	0	1	-1
$(\omega)_{11}$	1	0	0	-1	1	0	0	1	-1	1	-1	1
$(\omega)_{12}$	0	1	0	1	-1	1	0	-1	0	0	0	-1
$(\omega)_{13}$	0	-1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	-1	1	1
$(\omega)_{14}$	0	1	1	1	-1	0	0	-1	0	0	-1	-1
$(\omega)_{15}$	0	0	0	-1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
$(\omega)_{16}$	1	0	-1	0	0	-1	1	1	-1	1	1	-1
$(\omega)_{17}$	0	0	1	0	0	1	-1	0	0	0	-1	1
$(\omega)_{18}$	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	-1	0	-1	0	-1
$(\omega)_{19}$	0	-1	0	0	0	-1	1	1	0	0	1	1
$(\omega)_{20}$	0	1	1	0	0	0	-1	-1	1	0	-1	-1
$(\omega)_{21}$	1	0	-1	-1	1	0	1	1	-1	1	0	1
$(\omega)_{22}$	0	0	0	1	-1	0	0	0	0	0	1	-1
$(\omega)_{23}$	0	0	1	0	1	1	-1	0	0	-1	-1	1
$(\omega)_{24}$	0	1	0	1	-1	0	1	-1	0	0	0	-1
$(\omega)_{25}$	0	-1	0	-1	1	-1	0	1	1	0	1	1
$(\omega)_{26}$	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	-1	1	-1	-1
$(\omega)_{27}$	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
$(\omega)_{28}$	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	-1	1	-1
$(\omega)_{29}$	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-1	1
$(\omega)_{30}$	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	-1	1	0	0	-1

TABLE B.2. The character table of $\tilde{\Gamma}$. Conjugacy classes $[g]$ are denoted by their order and sign of the $SU(2)$ character χ_1 as $||[g]||_{\chi_1([g])}$.

	1_1	1_{-1}	30_1	20_1	20_{-1}	12_ϕ	$12_{\phi^{-1}}$	$12_{-\phi}$	$12_{-\phi^{-1}}$
χ_{id}	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
χ_1	2	-2	0	1	-1	ϕ	ϕ^{-1}	$-\phi$	$-\phi^{-1}$
χ_2	4	-4	0	-1	1	1	-1	-1	1
χ_3	6	-6	0	0	0	-1	1	1	-1
χ_5	4	4	0	1	1	-1	-1	-1	-1
χ_6	3	3	-1	0	0	$-\phi^{-1}$	ϕ	$-\phi^{-1}$	ϕ
χ_4	5	5	1	-1	-1	0	0	0	0
χ_7	2	-2	0	1	-1	$-\phi^{-1}$	$-\phi$	ϕ^{-1}	ϕ
χ_8	3	3	-1	0	0	ϕ	$-\phi^{-1}$	ϕ	$-\phi^{-1}$

Appendix C. $\wedge^\bullet \mathfrak{e}_8$ and relations in $R(E_8)$: an overview of the results of [23]

I provide here a summary of the computer-aided proof of Claim 2.3. In principle, a direct approach to the determination of $\{\mathfrak{p}_k\}$ is as follows:

- (1) decompose $\wedge^k \mathfrak{g} = \oplus R_i^{(k)}$ into irreducibles;
- (2) letting $\lambda_j = \sum_{i=1}^8 m_{i,j} \omega_j$ be the highest weight of $R_j^{(k)}$, consider the tensor product decomposition of $\otimes_i \rho(m_{i,j} \omega_j)$: this will contain $R_j^{(k)}$ as a summand (with coefficient 1), plus extra terms;
- (3) iterate the operation until all virtual summands (possibly with negative coefficients) have been replaced by tensor products of fundamental representations; taking the character and summing over j gives \mathfrak{p}_k .

This however turns out to be computationally unfeasible already for $k \sim 7$; not only is the decomposition of $\wedge^k \mathfrak{g}$ a daunting (and still unsolved, see however [9, 103]) task; the decomposition into irreducibles of even simple products such as $\rho_{\omega_3} \otimes \rho_{\omega_3}$ would take hundreds of Gigabytes of RAM to compute. Instead, we proceed as follows.

(1) For a given Cartan torus element $\exp(l) \in \mathcal{T}$ with $l = \sum_i l_i \alpha_i^* \in \mathfrak{h}$, we can compute explicit Laurent polynomials $\theta_j(\exp(l)) \in \mathbb{Z}[(e^{l_i})_i, (e^{-l_i})_i]$, $\phi_k(l) \in \mathbb{Z}[(e^{l_i})_i, (e^{-l_i})_i]$ for $i = 1, \dots, 8$ and $k = 1, \dots, 120$ from the sole knowledge of the weight systems of ρ_{ω_i} with $i = 1, 7, 8$, which have manageably small cardinality 2401, 241 and 26 401, respectively, (not taking into account weight multiplicities): for θ_i with $3 \leq i \leq 7$ and all ϕ_k this follows from using Newton's identities applied to the power sums $\theta_7(\exp(kl))$, and then use of (2.19); θ_2 is similarly computed from θ_j with $j = 1, 7, 8$ by the Adams operation on θ_1 :

$$\theta_1(\exp(2l)) = \theta_2(\exp(l)) - \theta_1(\exp l) + \theta_7(\exp l)\theta_1(\exp l) - \theta_8(\exp l). \tag{C.1}$$

(2) We may then impose *a priori* constraints on the exponents $d_j^{(I)}$ appearing by inspection of the weight systems as well as on the dimensions of the tensor powers appearing on the monomials of the right-hand side of (2.24). We find

$$\left\{ \max_{I \in M} d_j^{(I)} \right\}_{j=1}^8 = \{23, 13, 9, 11, 14, 19, 29, 17\}, \quad \max_{I \in M} \prod_{j=1}^8 (\dim \rho_{\omega_j})^{d_j^{(I)}} = 1.25366 \times 10^{96}. \tag{C.2}$$

This truncates the sum on the right-hand side to a finite, if large ($|M| = \mathcal{O}(10^6)$), number of monomials.

(3) In principle, imposing the identity of polynomials $\phi_k = \mathbf{p}_k(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_8)$ determines uniquely all $n_{I,k}$; however the range of sum and the complexity of the polynomials involved renders this entirely unwieldy. A more sensible alternative is to solve (2.24) for $n_{I,k}$ by sampling the relation (2.24) at $|M|$ random generic points $\exp(l) \in \mathbb{Q}^8$ of the torus[†], leading to a generically non-singular $|M| \times |M|$ linear system with rational entries for $n_{I,k}$, which can be solved exactly. Due to the sheer size of the monomial set and the density of the resulting linear system, however, this is unfeasible both for memory and time constraints.

(4) There is however a non-generic choice of sampling points which, with some preparation, does the trick of reducing the problem to a large number of smaller problems of manageable size. First we subdivide the monomial set M into slices $M_n = h^{-1}(n)$, $n = 0, \dots, 8$ given by level sets of the function

$$h(d^{(I)} \in M) = \sum_i \zeta(d_j^{(I)}), \quad \zeta(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } x = 0, \\ 1 & \text{if } x > 0. \end{cases} \quad (\text{C.3})$$

It is clear then that sampling $\exp(l)$ at values such that $\theta_i(\exp(l)) = 0$ except for n values of i truncates the right-hand side of (2.24) to one of $\binom{8}{n}$ subsets of M_n . The strategy here is to solve numerically for $\{\theta_i = u_i\}$ with some $u_i \in \mathbb{Q} + I\mathbb{Q}$; there is a clever choice of the sampling set here such that with sufficient floating point precision, we obtain a reliable – and in fact exact, with suitable analytical bounds – rounding to rational expressions for both the left-hand side and the right-hand side of (2.24), for all values of k . This simultaneously bypasses the ill-conditioning problem for (2.24), since we can then use exact arithmetic methods to solve it, and moreover breaks it up into subsystems of size in the range $\mathcal{O}(10) - \mathcal{O}(10^4)$.

(5) The latter point is not satisfactory yet since in the worst case scenario we deal with dense rational matrices of rank in the tens of thousands. However there is a refinement of the sets M_k by considering a further slicing by one (or more) of the $d_j^{(I)}$ (that is, level sets of the projections $p_j(d^{(I)} \in M) = d_j^{(I)}$); these refined monomial sets are just selected by taking derivatives of (2.24) with respect to θ_j of order $d_j^{(I)}$. Since we have closed-form expressions for ϕ_k and θ_j as functions of e^{l_i} , these can be computed using Faa' di Bruno type formulas; while the complexity of the latter grows factorially, it turns out that derivative slicings of order up to five are both computable in finite time, compatible with the rounding of ϕ_k with $8 \times$ machine precision, and they allow to break up the size of the resulting linear systems down to a maximum[‡] of $\mathcal{O}(4 \times 10^3)$.

(6) We are then left with a large number ($\mathcal{O}(3.10^3)$) of relatively small linear systems and a large ($\mathcal{O}(3.10^5)$) number of sampling points to evaluate ϕ_k , θ_i , and their derivatives in l_j ; this would lead to a total runtime in the hundreds of months (about 120). However the numerical inversion, evaluation and calculation of derivatives at one sampling point is independent from that at another; this means that the calculation can be easily distributed over several CPU cores just by segmentation of the sampling set. Similar considerations apply, *mutatis mutandis*, to the solution of the linear subsystems. With $N \simeq 75$ processor cores[§], the absolute runtime gets reduced to about six weeks.

[†]One might in principle pick generic, numerical random values with fixed precision and then hope to get an accurate integer truncation for the resulting $n_{I,k} \in \mathbb{Z}$. Such hope is however misplaced, as the resulting numerical matrix of monomial values (a matrix minor of a multi-variate Vandermonde matrix) is extremely ill-conditioned and leads to uncontrollable numerical errors.

[‡]A linear system of this rank, for the type of Vandermonde-type matrices we consider, required typically around 90 GB of RAM and half a day to terminate when solved using exact arithmetic (in our case, p -adic expansions and Dixon's method).

[§]In my specific case, this involved an average of about nine entry-level 64-bit cluster machines with dual 4-core CPUs.

The full result of the calculation is available at <http://tiny.cc/E8SpecCurve>, and the original C source code is available upon request.

It should be noted that, despite the innocent-looking appearance of (2.25)–(2.28), both the number of terms and the size of the coefficients grow extremely quickly with k . The monomial set M turns out to have cardinality $|M| = 949\,468$, with the matrix $n_{I,k}$ growing more and more dense for high k up to a maximum of 949 256 non-zero coefficients for $k = 118$, and $\max_{I,k} n_{I,k} \simeq 1.7025 \times 10^{10}$, $\min_{I,k} n_{I,k} \simeq -1.5403 \times 10^{10}$.

Acknowledgements. I would like to thank G. Bonelli, G. Borot, A. D’Andrea, B. Dubrovin, N. Orantin, N. Pagani, P. Rossi, A. Tanzini, Y. Zhang for discussions and correspondence on some of the topics touched upon in this paper, and H. Braden for bringing [87–89] to my attention during a talk at SISSA in 2015. For the calculations of Appendix C and [23], I have availed myself of cluster computing facilities at the Université de Montpellier (Omega departmental cluster at IMAG, and the HPC@LR centre Thau/Muse inter-faculty cluster) and the compute cluster of the Department of Mathematics at Imperial College London. I am grateful to B. Chapuisat and especially A. Thomas for their continuous support and patience whilst these computations were carried out.

References

1. M. R. ADAMS, J. P. HARNAD and J. HURTUBISE, ‘Darboux coordinates and Liouville–Arnold integration in loop algebras’, *Comm. Math. Phys.* 155 (1993) 385–413.
2. M. ADLER and P. VAN MOERBEKE, ‘Completely integrable systems, Euclidean Lie algebras, and curves’, *Adv. Math.* 38 (1980) 267–317.
3. M. AGANAGIC, A. KLEMM, M. MARINO and C. VAFA, ‘Matrix model as a mirror of Chern–Simons theory’, *J. High Energy Phys.* 2 (2004) 010.
4. L. F. ALDAY, D. GAIOTTO, S. GUKOV, Y. TACHIKAWA and H. VERLINDE, ‘Loop and surface operators in $N = 2$ gauge theory and Liouville modular geometry’, *J. High Energy Phys.* 1 (2010) 113.
5. I. ANTONIADIS, E. GAVA, K. S. NARAIN and T. R. TAYLOR, ‘Topological amplitudes in string theory’, *Nuclear Phys. B* 413 (1994) 162–184.
6. P. C. ARGYRES and M. R. DOUGLAS, ‘New phenomena in $SU(3)$ supersymmetric gauge theory’, *Nuclear Phys. B* 448 (1995) 93–126.
7. O. BABELON, D. BERNARD and M. TALON, ‘Introduction to classical integrable systems’, *Cambridge monographs on mathematical physics* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2003).
8. D. BAR-NATAN and R. LAWRENCE, ‘A rational surgery formula for the LMO invariant’, *Israel J. Math.* 140 (2004) 29–60.
9. Y. BAZLOV, ‘Graded multiplicities in the exterior algebra’, *Adv. Math.* 158 (2001) 129–153.
10. C. BEASLEY and E. WITTEN, ‘Non-Abelian localization for Chern–Simons theory’, *J. Differential Geom.* 70 (2005) 183–323.
11. A. A. BELAVIN and V. G. DRINFEL’D, ‘Solutions of the classical Yang–Baxter equation for simple Lie algebras’, *Funktsional. Anal. i Prilozhen.* 16 (1982) 1–29, 96.
12. M. BERSHADSKY, S. CECOTTI, H. OOGURI and C. VAFA, ‘Kodaira–Spencer theory of gravity and exact results for quantum string amplitudes’, *Comm. Math. Phys.* 165 (1994) 311–428.
13. M. BLAU and G. THOMPSON, ‘Chern–Simons theory on Seifert 3-manifolds’, *J. High Energy Phys.* 9 (2013) 033.
14. O. I. BOGOYAVLENSKY, ‘On perturbations of the periodic Toda lattice’, *Comm. Math. Phys.* 51 (1976) 201–209.
15. G. BOROT and A. BRINI, ‘Chern–Simons theory on spherical Seifert manifolds, topological strings and integrable systems’, *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.* 22 (2018) 305–394.
16. G. BOROT, B. EYNARD and N. ORANTIN, ‘Abstract loop equations, topological recursion and new applications’, *Commun. Number Theory Phys.* 09 (2015) 51–187.
17. G. BOROT, B. EYNARD and A. WEISSE, ‘Root systems, spectral curves, and analysis of a Chern–Simons matrix model for Seifert fibered spaces’, *Selecta Math.* 23 (2017) 915–1025.
18. G. BOROT, A. GUIONNET and K. K. KOZLOWSKI, ‘Large- N asymptotic expansion for mean field models with Coulomb gas interaction’, *Int. Math. Res. Not.* 20 (2015) 10451–10524.
19. V. BOUCHARD, A. KLEMM, M. MARIÑO and S. PASQUETTI, ‘Remodeling the B-model’, *Comm. Math. Phys.* 287 (2009) 117–178.
20. N. BOURBAKI, *Éléments de mathématique. Fasc. XXXVII. Groupes et algèbres de Lie. Chapitre II: Algèbres de Lie libres. Chapitre III: Groupes de Lie*, Actuelles Scientifiques et Industrielles 1349 (Hermann, Paris, 1972).
21. H. W. BRADEN and A. MARSHAKOV, ‘Singular phases of Seiberg–Witten integrable systems: weak and strong coupling’, *Nuclear Phys. B* 595 (2001) 417–466.

22. A. BRAVERMAN, M. FINKELBERG and D. GAITSGORY, ‘Uhlenbeck spaces via affine Lie algebras’, *Progr. Math.* 244 (2006) 17–135.
23. A. BRINI, ‘Exterior powers of the adjoint representation and the Weyl ring of E_8 ’, *J. Algebra* (2019), <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jalgebra.2020.01.020>.
24. A. BRINI, G. CARLET, S. ROMANO and P. ROSSI, ‘Rational reductions of the 2D-Toda hierarchy and mirror symmetry’, *J. Eur. Math. Soc.* 19 (2017) 835–880.
25. A. BRINI and R. CAVALIERI, ‘Open orbifold Gromov–Witten invariants of $[\mathbb{C}^3/\mathbb{Z}_n]$: localization and mirror symmetry’, *Selecta Math.* 17 (2011) 879–933.
26. A. BRINI, R. CAVALIERI and D. ROSS, ‘Crepant resolutions and open strings’, *J. reine angew. Math.* 755 (2019) 191–245.
27. A. BRINI, B. EYNARD and M. MARINO, ‘Torus knots and mirror symmetry’, *Ann. Henri Poincaré* 13 (2012) 1873–1910.
28. A. BRINI, L. GRIGUOLO, D. SEMINARA and A. TANZINI, ‘Chern-Simons theory on $L(p, q)$ lens spaces and Gopakumar–Vafa duality’, *J. Geom. Phys.* 60 (2010) 417–429.
29. A. BRINI and K. VAN GEMST, ‘Mirror symmetry for orbits of extended affine Weyl groups’ (2020), to appear.
30. J. BRYAN and T. GRABER, ‘The crepant resolution conjecture’, *Proc. Sympos. Pure Math.* 80 (2009) 23–42.
31. G. CARLET, ‘The extended bigraded Toda hierarchy’, *J. Phys. A* 39 (2006) 9411–9435.
32. R. W. CARTER, *Finite groups of Lie type: conjugacy classes and complex characters* (John Wiley & Sons, Chichester, 1993), Reprint of the 1985 edition.
33. L. CHEKHOV and B. EYNARD, ‘Hermitean matrix model free energy: Feynman graph technique for all genera’, *J. High Energy Phys.* 3 (2006) 014.
34. W. CHEN and Y. RUAN, ‘Orbifold Gromov–Witten theory’, *Contemp. Math.* 310 (2002) 25–85.
35. A. M. COHEN, S. H. MURRAY and D. E. TAYLOR, ‘Computing in groups of Lie type’, *Math. Comp.* 73 (2004) 1477–1498.
36. E. D’HOKER, I. M. KRICHEVER and D. H. PHONG, ‘Seiberg–Witten theory, symplectic forms, and Hamiltonian theory of solitons’, *Adv. Lect. Math.* 1 (2008) 124–177.
37. R. DIJKGRAAF and C. VAFA, ‘Two-dimensional Kodaira–Spencer theory and three-dimensional Chern–Simons gravity’, Preprint, arXiv:0711.1932.
38. R. DONAGI, ‘Spectral covers’, *Math. Sci. Res. Inst. Publ.* 28 (1995) 65–86.
39. B. DUBROVIN, ‘Hamiltonian formalism of Whitham type hierarchies and topological Landau–Ginsburg models’, *Comm. Math. Phys.* 145 (1992) 195–207.
40. B. DUBROVIN, ‘Geometry of 2D topological field theories, in “Integrable systems and quantum groups” (Montecatini Terme, 1993)’, *Lecture Notes in Math.* 1620 (1994) 120–348.
41. B. DUBROVIN, ‘Painlevé transcendents and two-dimensional topological field theory’, *The Painlevé property*, CRM Series in Mathematical Physics (ed. R. Conte; Springer, New York, 1999) 287–412.
42. B. DUBROVIN, ‘On almost duality for Frobenius manifolds, in “Geometry, topology, and mathematical physics”’, *Amer. Math. Soc. Transl. Ser. 2* 212 (2004) 75–132.
43. B. DUBROVIN, I. A. B. STRACHAN, Y. ZHANG and D. ZUO, ‘Extended affine Weyl groups of BCD type, Frobenius manifolds and their Landau–Ginzburg superpotentials’, *Adv. Math.* 351 (2019) 897–946.
44. B. DUBROVIN and Y. ZHANG, ‘Extended affine Weyl groups and Frobenius manifolds’, *Compos. Math.* 111 (1998) 167–219.
45. P. DUNIN-BARKOWSKI, P. NORBURY, N. ORANTIN, A. POPOLITOV and S. SHADRIN, ‘Dubrovin’s superpotential as a global spectral curve’, *J. Inst. Math. Jussieu* (2017) 1–49, <https://doi.org/10.1017/S147474801700007X>.
46. P. DUNIN-BARKOWSKI, P. NORBURY, N. ORANTIN, A. POPOLITOV and S. SHADRIN, ‘Primary invariants of Hurwitz Frobenius manifolds’, *Topological recursion and its influence in analysis, geometry, and topology* (American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2018) 297–332.
47. P. DUNIN-BARKOWSKI, N. ORANTIN, S. SHADRIN and L. SPITZ, ‘Identification of the Givental formula with the spectral curve topological recursion procedure’, *Comm. Math. Phys.* 328 (2014) 669–700.
48. T. EGUCHI, N. P. WARNER and S-K. YANG, ‘ADE singularities and coset models’, *Nuclear Phys. B* 607 (2001) 3–37.
49. T. EGUCHI and S-K. YANG, ‘A New description of the E_6 singularity’, *Phys. Lett.* B394 (1997) 315–322.
50. B. EYNARD and N. ORANTIN, ‘Invariants of algebraic curves and topological expansion’, *Commun. Number Theory Phys.* 1 (2007) 347–452.
51. B. EYNARD and N. ORANTIN, ‘Topological recursion in enumerative geometry and random matrices’, *J. Phys. A* 42 (2009), <https://iopscience.iop.org/article/10.1088/1751-8113/42/29/293001>.
52. B. EYNARD and N. ORANTIN, ‘Computation of open Gromov–Witten invariants for toric Calabi–Yau 3-folds by topological recursion, a proof of the BKMP conjecture’, *Comm. Math. Phys.* 337 (2015) 483–567.
53. B. FANG, C.-C. M. LIU and Z. ZONG, ‘The Eynard–Orantin recursion and equivariant mirror symmetry for the projective line’, *Geom. Topol.* 21 (2017) 2049–2092.
54. B. FANG, C.-C. M. LIU and Z. ZONG, ‘On the remodeling conjecture for toric Calabi–Yau 3-orbifolds’, *J. Am. Math. Soc.* 33 (2020) 135–222.
55. V. V. FOCK and A. B. GONCHAROV, ‘Cluster \mathcal{X} -varieties, amalgamation, and Poisson–Lie groups’, *Progr. Math.* 253 (2006) 27–68.

56. V. V. FOCK and A. MARSHAKOV, 'Loop groups, custers, dimers and integrable systems', *Geometry and quantization of moduli spaces*, Advanced Courses in Mathematics. CRM Barcelona (Springer, Cham, 2016) 1–65.
57. M. GECK and G. PFEIFFER, *Characters of finite Coxeter groups and Iwahori–Hecke algebras*, London Mathematical Society Monographs. New Series 21 (Oxford University Press, New York, 2000).
58. A. B. GIVENTAL, 'Gromov–Witten invariants and quantization of quadratic Hamiltonians', *Mosc. Math. J.* 1 (2001) 551–568, 645.
59. R. GOPAKUMAR and C. VAFA, 'On the gauge theory/geometry correspondence', *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.* 3 (1999) 1415–1443.
60. A. GORSKY, I. KRICHEVER, A. MARSHAKOV, A. MIRONOV and A. MOROZOV, 'Integrability and Seiberg–Witten exact solution', *Phys. Lett.* B355 (1995) 466–474.
61. P. A. GRIFFITHS, 'Linearizing flows and a cohomological interpretation of Lax equations', *Amer. J. Math.* 107 (1985) 1445–1484 (1986).
62. N. HALMAGYI and V. YASNOV, 'The spectral curve of the lens space matrix model', *J. High Energy Phys.* 11 (2009) 104.
63. S. K. HANSEN, 'Reshetikhin–Turaev invariants of Seifert 3-manifolds and a rational surgery formula', *Algebr. Geom. Topol.* 1 (2001) 627–686.
64. C. HERTLING, *Frobenius manifolds and moduli spaces for singularities*, Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics 151 (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2002).
65. T. J. HOLLOWOOD, 'Strong coupling $N = 2$ gauge theory with arbitrary gauge group', *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.* 2 (1998) 335–355.
66. K. A. INTRILIGATOR, D. R. MORRISON and N. SEIBERG, 'Five-dimensional supersymmetric gauge theories and degenerations of Calabi–Yau spaces', *Nuclear Phys. B* 497 (1997) 56–100.
67. P. JEFFERSON, H.-C. KIM, C. VAFA and G. ZAFRIR, 'Towards classification of 5d SCFTs: single gauge node', Preprint, arXiv:1705.05836.
68. S.-Y. JOW, A. SAUVAGET and H. ZELACI, 'On the principally polarized abelian varieties that contain m -minimal curves', *Matematiche (Catania)* 72 (2017) 87–98.
69. V. KANEV, 'Spectral curves, simple Lie algebras, and Prym–Tjurin varieties', *Proc. Sympos. Pure Math.* 49 (1989) 627–645.
70. S. H. KATZ, A. KLEMM and C. VAFA, 'Geometric engineering of quantum field theories', *Nuclear Phys. B* 497 (1997) 173–195.
71. S. H. KATZ and C.-C. M. LIU, 'Enumerative geometry of stable maps with Lagrangian boundary conditions and multiple covers of the disc', *Geom. Topol. Monogr.* 8 (2002) 1–47.
72. A. KOKOTOV and D. KOROTKIN, 'Isomonodromic tau-function of Hurwitz Frobenius manifolds and its applications', *Int. Math. Res. Not.* 2006 (2006), <https://doi.org/10.1155/IMRN/2006/18746>.
73. C. KOZCAZ, S. PASQUETTI and N. WYLLARD, 'A & B model approaches to surface operators and Toda theories', *J. High Energy Phys.* 8 (2010) 042.
74. I. KRICHEVER, 'An algebraic-geometric construction of the Zaharov–šabat equations and their periodic solutions', *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR* 227 (1976) 291–294.
75. I. KRICHEVER, 'The tau function of the universal Whitham hierarchy, matrix models and topological field theories', *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* 47 (1994) 437.
76. I. KRICHEVER and D. PHONG, 'Symplectic forms in the theory of solitons', *Surv. Differ. Geom.* 4 (1998) 239–313.
77. I. KRICHEVER and T. SHIOTA, 'Soliton equations and the Riemann–Schottky problem', *Adv. Lect. Math.* 25 (2013) 205–258.
78. I. KRICHEVER and K. L. VANINSKY, 'The periodic and open Toda lattice', *Mirror symmetry. IV* (Montreal, 2000), *Studies in Advanced Mathematics* 33 (American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2002) 139–158.
79. A. E. LAWRENCE and N. NEKRASOV, 'Instanton sums and five-dimensional gauge theories', *Nuclear Phys. B* 513 (1998) 239–265.
80. T. Q. LE, J. MURAKAMI and T. OHTSUKI, 'On a universal perturbative invariant of 3-manifolds', *Topology* 37(3) (1998) 539–574.
81. Y.-P. LEE and R. PANDHARIPANDE, 'Frobenius manifolds, Gromov–Witten theory, and Virasoro constraints, part II', Preprint, available at <https://people.math.ethz.ch/~rahul/Part2.ps> (2004).
82. W. LERCHE and N. P. WARNER, 'Exceptional SW geometry from ALE fibrations', *Phys. Lett.* B423 (1998) 79–86.
83. P. LONGHI and C. Y. PARK, 'ADE spectral networks', *J. High Energy Phys.* 8 (2016) 87.
84. M. MARINO, 'Chern–Simons theory, matrix integrals, and perturbative three-manifold invariants', *Comm. Math. Phys.* 253 (2004) 25–49.
85. M. MARINO, 'Chern–Simons theory, matrix models, and topological strings', *Internat. Ser. Monogr. Phys.* 131 (2005) 1–197.
86. E. J. MARTINEC and N. P. WARNER, 'Integrable systems and supersymmetric gauge theory', *Nuclear Phys. B* 459 (1996) 97–112.
87. A. MCDANIEL and L. SMOLINSKY, 'A Lie-theoretic Galois theory for the spectral curves of an integrable system. I', *Comm. Math. Phys.* 149 (1992) 127–148.
88. A. MCDANIEL and L. SMOLINSKY, 'A Lie-theoretic Galois theory for the spectral curves of an integrable system. II', *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 349 (1997) 713–746.

89. A. MCDANIEL and L. SMOLINSKY, ‘Lax equations, weight lattices, and Prym–Tjurin varieties’, *Acta Math.* 181 (1998) 283–305.
90. T. MILANOV, Y. SHEN and H.-H. TSENG, ‘Gromov–Witten theory of Fano orbifold curves and ADE–Toda hierarchies’, *Geom. Topol.* 20 (2016) 2135–2218.
91. T. MILANOV and H.-H. TSENG, ‘The spaces of Laurent polynomials, Gromov–Witten theory of \mathbb{P}^1 -orbifolds, and integrable hierarchies’, *J. reine angew. Math.* 622 (2008) 189–235.
92. H. NAKAJIMA and K. YOSHIOKA, ‘Lectures on instanton counting’, *CRM Proc. Lecture Notes* 38 (2004) 31–101.
93. H. NAKAJIMA and K. YOSHIOKA, ‘Instanton counting on blowup. I’, *Invent. Math.* 162 (2005) 313–355.
94. H. NAKAJIMA and K. YOSHIOKA, ‘Instanton counting on blowup. II. K -theoretic partition function’, *Transform. Groups* 10 (2005) 489–519.
95. N. NEKRASOV, ‘Five dimensional gauge theories and relativistic integrable systems’, *Nuclear Phys. B* 531 (1998) 323–344.
96. N. NEKRASOV, ‘Seiberg–Witten prepotential from instanton counting’, *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.* 7 (2003) 831–864.
97. P. NORBURY and N. SCOTT, ‘Gromov–Witten invariants of \mathbb{P}^1 and Eynard–Orantin invariants’, *Geom. Topol.* 18 (2014) 1865–1910.
98. D. I. OLIVE and N. TUROK, ‘Algebraic structure of Toda systems’, *Nuclear Phys. B* 220 (1983) 491–507.
99. M. A. OLSHANETSKY and A. M. PERELOMOV, ‘Classical integrable finite dimensional systems related to Lie algebras’, *Phys. Rep.* 71 (1981) 313.
100. H. OOGURI and C. VAFA, ‘Knot invariants and topological strings’, *Nuclear Phys. B* 577 (2000) 419–438.
101. M. E. PESKIN, ‘Duality in supersymmetric Yang–Mills theory’, *Fields, strings and duality*, Proceedings of TASI’96 (Stanford Linear Accelerator Center, Menlo Park, CA, 1997) 729–809.
102. G. PFEIFFER, ‘Character tables of Weyl groups in GAP’, *Bayreuth. Math. Schr.* 47 (1994) 165–222.
103. M. REEDER, ‘Exterior powers of the adjoint representation’, *Canad. J. Math.* 49 (1997) 133–159.
104. M. REID, ‘La correspondance de McKay’, *Astérisque* 276 (2002) 53–72.
105. N. RESHETIKHIN and V. G. TURAEV, ‘Invariants of three manifolds via link polynomials and quantum groups’, *Invent. Math.* 103 (1991) 547–597.
106. A. G. REYMAN and M. A. SEMENOV-TIAN-SHANSKY, ‘Reduction of Hamiltonian systems, affine Lie algebras and Lax equations’, *Invent. Math.* 54 (1979) 81–100.
107. P. ROSSI, ‘Gromov–Witten theory of orbicurves, the space of tri-polynomials and symplectic field theory of Seifert fibrations’, *Math. Ann.* 348 (2010) 265–287.
108. N. SEIBERG, ‘Exact results on the space of vacua of four-dimensional SUSY gauge theories’, *Phys. Rev. D* 49 (1994) 6857–6863.
109. N. SEIBERG, ‘Five-dimensional SUSY field theories, nontrivial fixed points and string dynamics’, *Phys. Lett. B* 388 (1996) 753–760.
110. N. SEIBERG and E. WITTEN, ‘Electric-magnetic duality, monopole condensation, and confinement in $N = 2$ supersymmetric Yang–Mills theory’, *Nuclear Phys. B* 426 (1994) 19–52.
111. J. S. SEO, ‘Singularity structure of $\mathcal{N} = 2$ supersymmetric Yang–Mills theories’, *Internat. J. Modern Phys. A* 28 (2013), <https://doi.org/10.1142/S0217751X13300299>.
112. V. SHRAMCHENKO, ‘Riemann–Hilbert problem associated to Frobenius manifold structures on Hurwitz spaces: irregular singularity’, *Duke Math. J.* 144 (2008) 1–52.
113. R. P. STANLEY, *Enumerative combinatorics*, vol. 2, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics 62 (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1999), With a foreword by Gian-Carlo Rota and appendix 1 by Sergey Fomin.
114. A. STROMINGER, ‘Special geometry’, *Comm. Math. Phys.* 133 (1990) 163–180.
115. Y. B. SURIS, *The problem of integrable discretization: Hamiltonian approach*, Progress in Mathematics 219 (Birkhäuser, Basel, 2003).
116. G. ’t Hooft, ‘A planar diagram theory for strong interactions’, *Nuclear Phys. B* 72 (1974) 461.
117. C. TELEMAN, ‘The structure of 2D semi-simple field theories’, *Invent. Math.* 188 (2012) 525–588.
118. P. VAN MOERBEKE and D. MUMFORD, ‘The spectrum of difference operators and algebraic curves’, *Acta Math.* 143 (1979) 93–154.
119. H. WILLIAMS, ‘Double Bruhat cells in Kac–Moody groups and integrable systems’, *Lett. Math. Phys.* 103 (2013) 389–419.
120. E. WITTEN, ‘Quantum field theory and the Jones polynomial’, *Comm. Math. Phys.* 121 (1989) 351.
121. J. A. WOLF, *Spaces of constant curvature* (McGraw-Hill, New York, 1967).
122. D. XIE and S.-T. YAU, ‘Three dimensional canonical singularity and five dimensional $\mathcal{N} = 1$ SCFT’, *J. High Energy Phys.* 6 (2017) 134.
123. E. ZASLOW, ‘Dynkin diagrams of $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^1$ orbifolds’, *Nuclear Phys. B* 415 (1994) 155–174.

*Andrea Brini
Department of Mathematics
Imperial College London
180 Queen's Gate
London SW7 2AZ
United Kingdom*

*School of Mathematics and Statistics
University of Sheffield
Hounsfield Road
Sheffield S3 7RH
United Kingdom*

and

*On leave from: CNRS, IMAG
University of Montpellier
Montpellier 34095
France*

a.brini@sheffield.ac.uk