msp

Geometry & Topology 18 (2014) 1437–1483

A mirror theorem for the mirror quintic

YUAN-PIN LEE
MARK SHOEMAKER

The celebrated *Mirror theorem* states that the genus zero part of the A model (quantum cohomology, rational curves counting) of the Fermat quintic threefold is equivalent to the B model (complex deformation, variation of Hodge structure) of its mirror dual orbifold. In this article, we establish a mirror-dual statement. Namely, the *B model* of the Fermat quintic threefold is shown to be equivalent to the *A model* of its mirror, and hence establishes the mirror symmetry as a true duality.

14N35; 53D45

0 Introduction

0.1 Mirror theorem for the Fermat quintic threefold

Let M be the Fermat quintic threefold defined by

$$M := \{x_0^5 + x_1^5 + x_2^5 + x_3^5 + x_4^5 = 0\} \subset \mathbb{P}^4.$$

The Greene–Plesser [18] *mirror construction* gives the mirror *orbifold* as the quotient stack

$$\mathcal{W} := [M/\bar{G}],$$

where $\bar{G} \cong (\mathbb{Z}/5\mathbb{Z})^3$ is a (finite abelian) subgroup of the big torus of $\mathbb{P}^4$ acting via generators e_1, e_2, e_3:

$$\begin{aligned} e_1[x_0, x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4] &= [\zeta_5 x_0, x_1, x_2, x_3, \zeta_5^{-1} x_4] \\ e_2[x_0, x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4] &= [x_0, \zeta_5 x_1, x_2, x_3, \zeta_5^{-1} x_4] \\ e_3[x_0, x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4] &= [x_0, x_1, \zeta_5 x_2, x_3, \zeta_5^{-1} x_4] \end{aligned}$$

Assuming the validity of mirror symmetry for the mirror pair $(M, \mathcal{W})$, Candelas, de la Ossa, Green and Parks (CDGP) made the celebrated calculation which in particular predicted the number of rational curves in the Fermat quintic of any degree. This calculation was verified in full generality only after many years of works, involving many distinguished mathematicians and culminating in the proof by Givental [15] (as

Published: 7 July 2014 DOI: 10.2140/gt.2014.18.1437

well as Liu, Lian and Yau [22] and Bertram [3]). The mathematical proof of the CDGP Conjecture was termed the *Mirror theorem* for the Fermat quintic threefold.

In a way, what the Mirror theorem says is that the invariants from the complex deformations of $\mathcal{W}$ match those from the Kähler deformations of M, up to a change of variables termed the *mirror map*. In terms of Witten's terminology [25], the above mirror theorem states that the (genus 0) A model of M is equivalent to the B model of $\mathcal{W}$. This can be formulated in mathematical terms as saying that the genus zero Gromov–Witten theory (GWT), or quantum cohomology, on M is equal to the variation of Hodge structures (VHS) associated to the complex deformations of $\mathcal{W}$.

The complex deformation of Calabi and Yau is unobstructed by Bogomolov, Tian and Todorov. The dimension of the Kodaira–Spencer space can be identified as the Hodge number $h^{2,1}$ due to the Calabi–Yau property $K \cong \mathcal{O}$. In this case $h^{2,1}(\mathcal{W}) = 1$. CDGP chose the one-dimensional deformation family of hypersurfaces $\{\mathcal{W}_\psi\} = \{Q_\psi(x) = 0\} \subset [\mathbb{P}^4/\bar{G}]$, where

$$Q_\psi(x) = x_0^5 + x_1^5 + x_2^5 + x_3^5 + x_4^5 - \psi x_0 x_1 x_2 x_3 x_4. \tag{0.1.1}$$

Hence $\psi = \infty$ is the maximally degenerate moduli point. We note that it is often convenient to use $t = -5 \log \psi$ as the variable. By local Torelli for Calabi–Yau, the deformation is embedded into VHS, which then gives all information about the complex deformation. The Kähler deformation is given by genus zero GWT along the "small" variable t, which is the dual coordinate for the hyperplane class H.

We can rephrase the above in much more precise terms. Both genus zero GWT and VHS can be described by differential systems associated to flat connections. For GWT, it is the *Dubrovin connection*; for VHS the *Gauss–Manin* connection. The definitions can be found in Sections 1 and 4 respectively. Therefore, we can phrase the Mirror theorem for the Fermat quintic in the following form.

Theorem 6.6 *The fundamental solutions of the Gauss–Manin connection for $\mathcal{W}_t$ are equivalent, up to a mirror map, to the fundamental solutions of the Dubrovin connection for M, when restricted to $H^2(M)$.*

0.2 Mirror theorem for the mirror quintic

Theorem 6.6 can be stated suggestively as

$$A \text{ model of } M \equiv B \text{ model of } \mathcal{W}.$$

In order for the mirror symmetry to be a true duality, one will also have to show that

$$B \text{ model of } M \equiv A \text{ model of } \mathcal{W}.$$

This is the task (at the tree level) we set for ourselves in this paper.

The first thing we note is that $\mathcal{W}$ is an orbifold. Thus we must replace the singular cohomology by the Chen–Ruan cohomology and the usual GWT by the orbifold GWT. These are defined in Section 1.

Upon a closer look, however, there is a serious technical issue. In the B model of M, the Kodaira–Spencer space is of dimension 101 and the VHS of $H^3(M)$ is a system of rank 204, thus a calculation of the full Gauss–Manin connection for M is unfeasible. As a first step however, we choose a one-dimensional deformation family $\{M_t\}$ defined by the vanishing of (0.1.1), *reinterpreted as a family in* $\mathbb{P}^4$. Similarly, in the A model of $\mathcal{W}$, we have $h^{1,1}_{\mathrm{CR}}(\mathcal{W}) = 101$, where the subscript denotes Chen–Ruan cohomology. We choose the one-dimensional subspace of the complexified Kähler moduli spanned by the hyperplane class and call the coordinate t as before. These one-dimensional families are arguably *the most natural and the most important dimension*.

With these choices, the Gauss–Manin system for M still has rank 204, but over a one-dimensional base. The fundamental solution is a matrix of size 204 by 204 in one variable. The Dubrovin connection on $H^{\mathrm{even}}_{\mathrm{CR}}(\mathcal{W})$ likewise has the fundamental solution matrix of size 204 by 204. Here $204 = \dim H^{\mathrm{even}}_{\mathrm{CR}}(\mathcal{W})$.

The main result of this paper is the following theorem.

Theorem 6.8 *The fundamental solutions of the Gauss–Manin connection for $\{M_t\}$ are equivalent, up to a mirror map, to the fundamental solutions of the Dubrovin connection for $\mathcal{W}$ restricted to $t \in H^2(\mathcal{W})$.*

0.3 Outline of the paper

We have in mind the readership with diverse background. For convenience, we have included short introductions in Sections 1 and 4 to orbifold Gromov–Witten theory and the theory of variation of Hodge structures, recalling only facts pertinent to our presentation. Sections 2 and 3 present the A model calculation for $\mathcal{W}$. We first calculate the genus zero Gromov–Witten theory for $[\mathbb{P}^4/\bar{G}]$ in Section 2; we then calculate the genus zero Gromov–Witten theory for $\mathcal{W}$ in Section 3. In Section 5 we present a reformulation of the results from Doran, Greene and Judes [14], and summarize our B model calculation for M_t. In the last section, we prove our main result, showing the validity of the mirror-dual statement of the Mirror theorem. For the benefit of our dual readership, we include a derivation of Theorem 6.6 from the usual statement of the Mirror theorem.

A related result in a more general context is obtained by Iritani [21].

Acknowledgements The first author would like to thank his collaborators Professors H-W Lin and C-L Wang. In particular, he learned most of what little he knows about the Hodge theory from his collaborative projects with them. The first author is partially supported by the NSF.

The second author would like to thank his advisor, Professor Y Ruan, for his help and guidance over the years, and for first introducing him to this beautiful subject. He is also grateful to Professor R Cavalieri for many useful conversations. The second author was partially supported by NSF RTG grant DMS-0602191 and NSF grant DMS-0943832.

1 Quantum orbifold cohomology

In this section we give a brief review of Chen–Ruan cohomology and quantum orbifold cohomology, with the parallel goal of setting notation. A more detailed general review can be found by Coates, the first author, Corti and Tseng in [10].

Convention 1.1 We work in the algebraic category. The term *orbifold* means "smooth separated Deligne–Mumford stack of finite type over $\mathbb{C}$".

The various dimensions are complex dimensions. On the other hand, the degrees of cohomology are all in real/topological degrees.

Unless otherwise stated all cohomology groups have coefficients in $\mathbb{C}$.

1.1 Chen–Ruan cohomology groups

Let $\mathcal{X}$ be a stack. Its inertia stack $I\mathcal{X}$ is the fiber product

$$\begin{array}{ccc} I\mathcal{X} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{X} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \Delta \\ \mathcal{X} & \xrightarrow{\Delta} & \mathcal{X}\times\mathcal{X}, \end{array}$$

where Δ is the diagonal map. The fiber product is taken in the 2–category of stacks. One can think of a point of $I\mathcal{X}$ as a pair (x,g) where x is a point of $\mathcal{X}$ and $g\in \mathrm{Aut}_{\mathcal{X}}(x)$. There is an involution $I\colon I\mathcal{X}\to I\mathcal{X}$ which sends the point (x,g) to (x,g^{-1}). It is often convenient to call the components of $I\mathcal{X}$ for which $g\neq e$ the *twisted sectors*.

If $\mathcal{X}=[V/G]$ is a global quotient of a nonsingular variety V by a finite group G, $I\mathcal{X}$ takes a particularly simple form. Let S_G denote the set of conjugacy classes (g) in G, then

$$I[V/G]=\coprod_{(g)\in S_G}[V^g/C(g)].$$

The *Chen–Ruan orbifold cohomology groups* $H^*_{\mathrm{CR}}(X)$ [8] of a Deligne–Mumford stack $\mathcal{X}$ are the cohomology groups of its inertia stack

$$H^*_{\mathrm{CR}}(\mathcal{X}) := H^*(I\mathcal{X}).$$

Let (x, g) be a geometric point in a component $\mathcal{X}_i$ of $I\mathcal{X}$. By definition $g \in \mathrm{Aut}_{\mathcal{X}}(x)$. Let r be the order of g. Then the g–action on $T_x\mathcal{X}$ decomposes into eigenspaces

$$T_x\mathcal{X} = \bigoplus_{0 \le j < r} E_j,$$

where E_j is the subspace of $T_x\mathcal{X}$ where g acts by multiplication by $\exp(2\pi\sqrt{-1}\,j/r)$. Define the age of $\mathcal{X}_i$ to be

$$\mathrm{age}(\mathcal{X}_i) := \sum_{j=0}^{r-1} \frac{j}{r} \dim(E_j).$$

This is independent of the choice of geometric point $(x, g) \in \mathcal{X}_i$.

Let α be an element in $H^p(\mathcal{X}_i) \subset H^*(I\mathcal{X})$. Define the age-shifted degree of α to be

$$\deg_{\mathrm{CR}}(\alpha) := p + 2\,\mathrm{age}(\mathcal{X}_i).$$

This defines a grading on $H^*_{\mathrm{CR}}(\mathcal{X})$.

When $\mathcal{X}$ is compact the *orbifold Poincaré pairing* is defined by

$$(\alpha_1, \alpha_2)^{\mathcal{X}}_{\mathrm{CR}} := \int_{I\mathcal{X}} \alpha_1 \cup I^*(\alpha_2),$$

where α_1 and α_2 are elements of $H^*_{\mathrm{CR}}(\mathcal{X})$. It is easy to see that when α_1 and α_2 are homogeneous elements, $(\alpha_1, \alpha_2)_{\mathrm{CR}} \neq 0$ only if $\deg_{\mathrm{CR}}(\alpha_1) + \deg_{\mathrm{CR}}(\alpha_2) = 2\dim(\mathcal{X})$.

1.2 Orbifold Gromov–Witten theory

1.2.1 Orbifold Gromov–Witten invariants We follow the standard references by Chen and Ruan [7] and Abramovich, Graber and Vistoli [1] of orbifold Gromov–Witten theory.

Given an orbifold $\mathcal{X}$, there exists a moduli space $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,n}(\mathcal{X}, d)$ of stable maps from n–marked genus g prestable orbifold curves to $\mathcal{X}$ of degree $d \in H_2(\mathcal{X}; \mathbb{Q})$. Each source curve $(\mathcal{C}, p_1, \ldots, p_n)$ has nontrivial orbifold structure only at the nodes and marked points: at each (orbifold) marked point it is a cyclic quotient stack and at each node a *balanced* cyclic quotient, that is, étale locally isomorphic to

$$\left[\mathrm{Spec}\left(\frac{\mathbb{C}[x, y]}{(xy)}\right) \Big/ \mu_r\right],$$

where $\zeta \in \mu_r$ acts as $(x, y) \mapsto (\zeta x, \zeta^{-1} y)$. The maps are required to be representable at each node.

Each marked point p_i is étale locally isomorphic to $[\mathbb{C}/\mu_{r_i}]$. There is an induced homomorphism

$$\mu_{r_i} \to \mathrm{Aut}_{\mathcal{X}}(f(p_i)).$$

Maps in $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,n}(\mathcal{X}, d)$ are required be representable, which amounts to saying that these homomorphisms be injective. For each marked point p_i, one can associate a point (x_i, g_i) in $I\mathcal{X}$ where $x_i = f(p_i)$, and $g_i \in \mathrm{Aut}_{\mathcal{X}}(x_i)$ is the image of $\exp(2\pi\sqrt{-1}/r_i)$ under the induced homomorphism.

Given a family $\mathcal{C} \to S$ of marked orbifold curves, there may be nontrivial gerbe structure above the locus defined by the i^{th} marked point. For this reason there is generally not a well-defined map

$$\mathrm{ev}_i \colon \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,n}(\mathcal{X}, d) \to I\mathcal{X}.$$

However, as explained in [1] and [10, Section 2.2.2], it is still possible to define maps

$$\mathrm{ev}_i^* \colon H^*_{\mathrm{CR}}(\mathcal{X}) \to H^*(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,n}(\mathcal{X}, d))$$

which behave *as if the evaluation maps* ev_i *were well defined*.

Let X denote the coarse underlying space of the stack $\mathcal{X}$. There is a *reification map*

$$r \colon \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,n}(\mathcal{X}, d) \to \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,n}(X, d),$$

which forgets the orbifold structure of each map. For each marked point there is an associated line bundle, the i^{th} universal cotangent line bundle,

$$\begin{array}{c} L_i \\ \big\downarrow \\ \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,n}(X, d), \end{array}$$

with fiber $T^*_{p_i} C$ over $\{f \colon (C, p_1, \ldots, p_n) \to X\}$. We define the i^{th} ψ–class by $\psi_i := r^*(c_1(L_i))$.

As in the nonorbifold setting, there exists a virtual fundamental class $[\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,n}(\mathcal{X}, d)]^{\mathrm{vir}}$. *Orbifold Gromov–Witten invariants* for $\mathcal{X}$ are defined as integrals

$$\langle \alpha_1 \psi^{k_1}, \ldots, \alpha_n \psi^{k_n} \rangle^{\mathcal{X}}_{g,n,d} = \int_{[\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,n}(\mathcal{X},d)]^{\mathrm{vir}}} \prod_{i=1}^{n} \mathrm{ev}_i^*(\alpha_i) \psi_i^{k_i},$$

where $\alpha_i \in H^*_{\mathrm{CR}}(\mathcal{X})$.

Let $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,(g_1,\dots,g_n)}(\mathcal{X},d)$ denote the open and closed substack of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,n}(\mathcal{X},d)$ such that ev_i maps to a component $\mathcal{X}_{g_i}$ of $I\mathcal{X}$. The space $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,(g_1,\dots,g_n)}(\mathcal{X},d)$ has (complex) virtual dimension

$$n+(g-1)(\dim\mathcal{X}-3)+\langle c_1(T\mathcal{X}),d\rangle-\sum_{i=0}^{n}\operatorname{age}(\mathcal{X}_{g_i}). \tag{1.2.1}$$

In other words, for homogeneous classes $\alpha_i\in H^*(\mathcal{X}_{g_i})$ the Gromov–Witten invariants $\langle\alpha_1,\dots,\alpha_n\rangle^{\mathcal{X}}_{g,n,d}$ will vanish unless

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n}\deg_{\mathrm{CR}}(\alpha_i)=2\big(n+(g-1)(\dim\mathcal{X}-3)+\langle c_1(T\mathcal{X}),d\rangle\big).$$

1.2.2 Quantum cohomology and the Dubrovin connection Let $\{T_i\}_{i\in I}$ be a basis for $H^*_{\mathrm{CR}}(\mathcal{X})$ and $\{T^i\}_{i\in I}$ its dual basis. We can represent a general point in coordinates by

$$\mathbf{t}=\sum_i t^iT_i\in H^*_{\mathrm{CR}}(\mathcal{X}).$$

Gromov–Witten invariants allow us to define a family of product structures parameterized by $\mathbf{t}$ in a formal neighborhood of 0 in $H^*_{\mathrm{CR}}(\mathcal{X})$. The *(big) quantum product* $*_{\mathbf{t}}$ is defined as

$$\alpha_1*_{\mathbf{t}}\alpha_2:=\sum_d\sum_{n\geq0}\sum_i\frac{q^d}{n!}\langle\alpha_1,\alpha_2,T_i,\mathbf{t},\dots,\mathbf{t}\rangle^{\mathcal{X}}_{0,3+n,d}T^i, \tag{1.2.2}$$

where the first sum is over the effective curve classes of the Mori cone and the variables q^d are in an appropriate Novikov ring Λ used to guarantee formal convergence of the sum. The *WDVV equations* (see Cox and Katz [11, Section 8.2.3] and [7]) imply the associativity of the product. The *small quantum product* is defined by restricting the parameter of the quantum product to divisors $\mathbf{t}\in H^2(\mathcal{X})$ supported on the *nontwisted sector*.

One can interpret $*_{\mathbf{t}}$ as defining a product structure on the tangent bundle $TH^*_{\mathrm{CR}}(\mathcal{X};\Lambda)$, such that for a fixed $\mathbf{t}$ the quantum product defines a (Frobenius) algebra structure on $T_{\mathbf{t}}H^*_{\mathrm{CR}}(\mathcal{X};\Lambda)$. This can be rephrased in terms of the *Dubrovin connection*, defined by

$$\nabla^z_{\partial/\partial t^i}\Big(\sum_j a_jT_j\Big)=\sum_j\frac{\partial a_j}{\partial t^i}T_j-\frac{1}{z}\sum_j a_jT_i*_{\mathbf{t}}T_j.$$

This defines a z–family of connections on $TH^*_{\mathrm{CR}}(\mathcal{X};\Lambda)$.

Remark 1.2 Note that when $\mathbf{t}$, T_i and T_j are in $H^{\mathrm{even}}_{\mathrm{CR}}(\mathcal{X})$, a simple dimension count using (1.2.1) shows that $T_i *_{\mathbf{t}} T_j$ will be also be supported in even degree. Thus ∇^z restricts to a connection on $TH^{\mathrm{even}}_{\mathrm{CR}}(\mathcal{X};\Lambda)$. When restricted to $TH^{\mathrm{even}}_{\mathrm{CR}}(\mathcal{X};\Lambda)$, the quantum product is commutative.

Remark 1.3 For the purpose of this paper, we clarify here what we mean by "*A* model of $\mathcal{X}$". Let $H := H^{\mathrm{even}}_{\mathrm{CR}}(\mathcal{X};\Lambda)$. The (genus zero part of the) *A model of* $\mathcal{X}$ is the tangent bundle TH with its natural (flat) fiberwise pairing and the Dubrovin connection restricted to $H^{1,1}_{\mathrm{CR}}(\mathcal{X})$.

The commutativity and associativity of the quantum product implies that the Dubrovin connection is flat. The *topological recursion relations* allow us to explicitly describe solutions to ∇^z. Define

$$s_i(\mathbf{t},z) = T_i + \sum_d \sum_{n\geq 0} \sum_j \frac{q^d}{n!} \left\langle \frac{T_i}{z-\psi_1}, T^j, \mathbf{t}, \dots, \mathbf{t} \right\rangle^{\mathcal{X}}_{0,2+n,d} T_j, \tag{1.2.3}$$

where $1/(z-\psi_1)$ should be viewed as a power series in $1/z$. The sections s_i form a basis for the ∇^z–flat sections (see eg [11, Proposition 10.2.1] for the proof in the nonorbifold setting, the proof relies on the topological recursion relations, which also hold for orbifold targets by Tseng [24]). Thus we obtain a fundamental solution matrix $S = S(\mathbf{t},z) = (s_{ij})$ given by

$$s_{ij}(\mathbf{t},z) = (T_i, s_j)^{\mathcal{X}}_{\mathrm{CR}}. \tag{1.2.4}$$

If one restricts the base to divisors $\mathbf{t} \in H^2(\mathcal{X})$, the *divisor equation* [1, Theorem 8.3.1] allows a substantial simplification of the formula for s_i:

$$s_i(\mathbf{t},z)|_{\mathbf{t}\in H^2(\mathcal{X})} = e^{\mathbf{t}/z}\left(T_i + \sum_{d>0} \sum_j q^d e^{d\mathbf{t}} \left\langle \frac{T_i}{z-\psi_1}, T^j \right\rangle^{\mathcal{X}}_{0,2,d} T_j \right)$$

1.3 Generating functions

Given an orbifold $\mathcal{X}$, Givental's (big) J–function is the first row vector of the fundamental solution matrix, obtained by pairing the solution vectors of the Dubrovin connection with 1:

$$\begin{aligned} J^{\mathcal{X}}_{\mathrm{big}}(\mathbf{t},z) &:= \sum_i (s_i(\mathbf{t}),1)^{\mathcal{X}}_{\mathrm{CR}} T^i \\ &= 1 + \sum_d \sum_{n\geq 0} \sum_i \frac{q^d}{n!} \left\langle \frac{T_i}{z-\psi_1}, 1, \mathbf{t}, \dots, \mathbf{t} \right\rangle^{\mathcal{X}}_{0,2+n,d} T^i \\ &= 1 + \frac{\mathbf{t}}{z} + \sum_d \sum_{n\geq 0} \sum_i \frac{q^d}{n!} \left\langle \frac{T_i}{z(z-\psi_1)}, \mathbf{t}, \dots, \mathbf{t} \right\rangle^{\mathcal{X}}_{0,1+n,d} T^i \end{aligned}$$

The last equality follows from the *string equation*. It is also easy to see that the fundamental solution matrix $S(\mathbf{t}, z) = (s_{ij})$ of (1.2.4) is equal to $(T_j, z\nabla^z_{\partial/\partial t^i} J_{\text{big}})$. As such, J_{big} encodes all information about quantum cohomology.

However, the big J–function is often impossible to calculate directly. In the nonorbifold Gromov–Witten theory, when the cohomology is generated by divisors, the *small J–function* proves much more computable, while powerful enough to solve many problems; see eg Givental [15; 16]. The small J–function for a nonsingular *variety* X is a function on $\mathbf{t} \in H^2(X)$:

$$\begin{aligned} J^X_{\text{small}}(\mathbf{t}, z) &:= J^X_{\text{big}}(\mathbf{t}, z)|_{\mathbf{t}\in H^2(X)} \\ &= e^{\mathbf{t}/z}\left(1 + \sum_{d>0}\sum_i q^d e^{d\mathbf{t}}\left\langle \frac{T_i}{z-\psi_1}, 1\right\rangle^X_{0,2,d} T^i\right) \end{aligned}$$

In orbifold theory, however, the Chen–Ruan cohomology is never generated by divisors except for trivial cases, due to the presence of the twisted sectors. Therefore, the knowledge of the small J–function alone is often not enough to reconstruct significant information about the orbifold quantum cohomology. (Note however that in [10, Section 5] one way was found to circumvent this obstacle for weighted projective spaces.)

We propose the following definition of *small J–matrix for orbifolds*.

Definition 1.4 For $\mathbf{t} \in H^2(\mathcal{X})$, define $J^{\mathcal{X}}_g$ as the cohomology-valued function

$$\begin{aligned} J^{\mathcal{X}}_g(\mathbf{t}, z)|_{\mathbf{t}\in H^2(\mathcal{X})} &:= \sum_i (s_i(\mathbf{t})|_{\mathbf{t}\in H^2(X)}, \mathbb{1}_g)^{\mathcal{X}}_{\text{CR}} T^i \\ &= e^{\mathbf{t}/z}\left(\mathbb{1}_g + \sum_{d>0}\sum_i q^d e^{d\mathbf{t}}\left\langle \frac{T_i}{z-\psi_1}, \mathbb{1}_g\right\rangle^{\mathcal{X}}_{0,2,d} T^i\right), \end{aligned} \tag{1.3.1}$$

where $\mathbb{1}_g$ is the fundamental class on the component $\mathcal{X}_g$ of $I\mathcal{X}$.

The *small J–matrix* is the matrix-valued function

$$J^{\mathcal{X}}_{\text{small}}(\mathbf{t}, z) = [J^{\mathcal{X}}_{g,i}(\mathbf{t}, z)]_{g\in G, i\in I} = [(J^{\mathcal{X}}_g(\mathbf{t}, z), T_i)^{\mathcal{X}}_{\text{CR}}]_{g\in G, i\in I},$$

where G is the index set of the components of $I\mathcal{X}$, I the index for the basis $\{T_i\}_{i\in I}$ of $H^*_{\text{CR}}(\mathcal{X})$ and $J^{\mathcal{X}}_{g,i}(\mathbf{t}, z)$ the coefficient of T^i in $J^{\mathcal{X}}_g(\mathbf{t}, z)$.

Remark 1.5 We believe that the small J–matrix is the right replacement of the small J–function in the orbifold theory, for its computability and structural relevance.

Structurally (1.2.4) shows that one needs to specify "two-points" (ie a matrix) in the generating function in order to form the fundamental solutions of the Dubrovin

connection. Ideally, one would like to get the full $|I|\times|I|$ fundamental solution matrix $S = z\nabla J_{\text{big}}$ restricted to $\mathbf{t}\in H^2(\mathcal{X})$. This would give all information about the *small* quantum cohomology. Unfortunately, a direct computation of $S(\mathbf{t})|_{\mathbf{t}\in H^2(\mathcal{X})}$ is mostly out of reach in the orbifold theory.

In the (nonorbifold) case when $H^*(X)$ is generated by divisors, as shown by Givental, the small J–function is often enough to determine the essential information for small quantum cohomology. One can think of the small J–function as a a submatrix of size $1\times|I|$, indeed the first row vector, of S.

However, in the orbifold theory, the above matrix is not enough to determine useful information about small quantum cohomology except in the trivial cases. We believe that the smallest useful submatrix of S is the small J–matrix (of size $|G|\times|I|$) defined above. We will show that it is both computable and relevant to the structure of orbifold quantum cohomology. In this paper we are able to calculate the small J–matrix of the toric orbifold $\mathcal{Y} = [\mathbb{P}^4/\bar{G}]$, and we use a submatrix of the small J–matrix $J^{\mathcal{W}}_{\text{small}}$ to fully describe the solution matrix $S(\mathbf{t})|_{\mathbf{t}\in H^2(\mathcal{X})}$ of the mirror quintic $\mathcal{W}$.

2 The J–function of $[\mathbb{P}^4/\bar{G}]$

2.1 Inertia orbifold of $[\mathbb{P}^4/\bar{G}]$

Let $[x_0,x_1,x_2,x_3,x_4]$ be the homogeneous coordinates of $\mathbb{P}^4$. We denote

$$\zeta := \zeta_5 = e^{2\pi\sqrt{-1}/5}.$$

Let the group $\bar{G}\cong(\mathbb{Z}/5\mathbb{Z})^3$ be a (finite abelian) subgroup of the big torus of $\mathbb{P}^4$ acting via generators e_1,e_2,e_3:

$$\begin{aligned} e_1[x_0,x_1,x_2,x_3,x_4] &= [\zeta x_0,x_1,x_2,x_3,\zeta^{-1}x_4]\\ e_2[x_0,x_1,x_2,x_3,x_4] &= [x_0,\zeta x_1,x_2,x_3,\zeta^{-1}x_4]\\ e_3[x_0,x_1,x_2,x_3,x_4] &= [x_0,x_1,\zeta x_2,x_3,\zeta^{-1}x_4] \end{aligned} \tag{2.1.1}$$

Let $\mathcal{Y} = [\mathbb{P}^4/\bar{G}]$. As explained in Section 0 this orbifold plays an instrumental role in what follows so we give here a detailed presentation of its corresponding inertia orbifold.

The group $\bar{G}$ can be described alternatively as follows. Let

$$G := \left\{ (\zeta^{r_0}, \dots, \zeta^{r_4}) \;\middle|\; \sum_{i=0}^{4} r_i \equiv 0 \pmod 5 \right\},$$
$$\bar{G} \cong G/\langle(\zeta, \dots, \zeta)\rangle.$$

The $\bar{G}$–action on $\mathbb{P}^4$ comes from coordinatewise multiplication. By a slight abuse of notation, we will represent a group element $g \in G$ by the power of ζ in each coordinate:

$$G = \left\{ (r_0, \dots, r_4) \;\middle|\; \sum_{i=0}^{4} r_i \equiv 0 \pmod 5, \quad 0 \le r_i \le 4 \text{ for all } i \right\}$$

For an element $g \in G$, denote $[g]$ the corresponding element in $\bar{G}$.

Fix an element $\bar{g} \in \bar{G}$. Let $g = (r_0, \dots, r_4) \in G$ be such that $[g] = \bar{g}$. Define

$$I(g) := \{ j \in \{0, 1, 2, 3, 4\} \mid r_j = 0 \};$$

then

$$\mathbb{P}^4_g := \{x_j = 0\}_{j \notin I(g)} \subset \mathbb{P}^4$$

is a component of $(\mathbb{P}^4)^{\bar{g}}$. From this we see that each element $g \in G$ such that $[g] = \bar{g}$ corresponds to a connected component $\mathcal{Y}_g := [\mathbb{P}^4_g/\bar{G}]$ of $I\mathcal{Y}$. Note that if g has no coordinates equal to zero then $\mathbb{P}^4_g$ is empty, and so is $\mathcal{Y}_g$. This gives us a convenient way of indexing components of $I\mathcal{Y}$.

We summarize the above discussions in the following lemma.

Lemma 2.1 *We have*

$$I\mathcal{Y} = \coprod_{g \in S} \mathcal{Y}_g,$$

where

$$\mathcal{Y}_g = \{(x, [g]) \in I\mathcal{Y} \mid x \in [\mathbb{P}^4_g/\bar{G}]\}$$

is a connected component and S denotes the set of all $g = (r_0, \dots, r_4)$ such that at least one coordinate r_i is equal to 0.

Consequently, a convenient basis $\{T_i\}$ for $H^*_{\mathrm{CR}}(\mathcal{Y})$ is

$$\bigcup_{g \in S} \{\mathbb{1}_g, \mathbb{1}_g H, \dots, \mathbb{1}_g H^{\dim(\mathcal{Y}_g)}\}.$$

2.2 J–functions

Recalling a basic fact about global quotient orbifolds, a map of orbifolds $f\colon \mathcal{C}\to[\mathbb{P}^4/\bar{G}]$ can be identified with a principal $\bar{G}$–bundle C and a $\bar{G}$–equivariant map $\tilde{f}\colon C\to\mathbb{P}^4$ such that the following diagram commutes:[1]

$$\begin{array}{ccc} C & \xrightarrow{\tilde{f}} & \mathbb{P}^4 \\ {\scriptstyle \pi_C}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \pi_{\mathbb{P}^4}} \\ \mathcal{C} & \xrightarrow[f]{} & [\mathbb{P}^4/\bar{G}] \end{array} \tag{2.2.1}$$

Lemma 2.2 (i) *The map f is representable if and only if C is a nodal curve with each irreducible component a smooth variety.*

(ii) *There do not exist representable orbifold morphisms $f\colon \mathcal{C}\to\mathcal{Y}$ from a genus 0 orbifold curve $\mathcal{C}$ with only one orbifold marked point.*

Proof Part (i) follows immediately from the definition of representability.

Part (ii) follows from (i): In the case $\mathcal{C}$ is irreducible, this is because there do not exist smooth covers of genus 0 orbifold curves with only one point with nontrivial isotropy. An induction argument then shows that the same is true of reducible curves with only one orbifold marked point (we assume always that our nodes be balanced). □

Let H be the hyperplane class on $\mathbb{P}^4$. Let L be any fixed choice of line bundle on $\mathcal{Y}$ such that $\pi^*_{\mathbb{P}^4}(L)=H$. Even though there are as many as $|\bar{G}|$ choices of L, they are topologically equivalent and will serve the same purpose in our discussion. By (2.2.1), we have the following equality:

$$\int_{\mathcal{C}} f^*(L)=\frac{1}{125}\int_C \tilde{f}^*(H)$$

We define the degree of a map $f\colon \mathcal{C}\to\mathcal{Y}$ by

$$d:=\frac{1}{125}\int_C \tilde{f}^*(H).$$

Given $h=(r_0(h),\dots,r_4(h))$ and $g=(r_0(g),\dots,r_4(g))$ in G, this also allows us to determine necessary conditions on the triple (d,h,g) such that

$$\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,h,g}(\mathcal{Y},d):=\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,2}(\mathcal{Y},d)\cap \mathrm{ev}_1^{-1}(\mathbb{1}_h)\cap \mathrm{ev}_2^{-1}(\mathbb{1}_g)$$

is nonempty.

[1] Technically f is identified with an equivalence class of such objects.

Proposition 2.3 *The space $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,h,g}(\mathcal{Y},d)$ is nonempty only if*

(i) $[h]=[g]^{-1}$ *in* $\overline{G}$,

(ii) $r_i(h)+r_i(g)\equiv 5d \pmod 5$ *or equivalently* $\langle d\rangle = \langle (r_i(h)+r_i(g))/5\rangle$ *for* $0\le i\le 4$.

Proof We will first consider the case where the source curve is irreducible. Assume that there exists a map $\{f\colon \mathcal{C}\to\mathcal{Y}\}$ in $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,h,g}(\mathcal{Y},d)$ such that $\mathcal{C}$ is nonnodal. Consider the principal $\overline{G}$–bundle $\pi_C\colon C\to\mathcal{C}$. After choosing a generic base point $x\in\mathcal{C}$ and a point $\widetilde{x}$ in $\pi_C^{-1}(x)$, we obtain a homomorphism $\phi\colon \pi_1(\mathcal{C},x)\to\overline{G}$. We can specify generators ρ_1 and ρ_2 of $\pi_1(\mathcal{C},x)$ such that ρ_i is the class of loops wrapping once around p_i in the counterclockwise direction. Then $\phi(\rho_1)=[h]$ and $\phi(\rho_2)=[g]$. Because $\rho_1\cdot\rho_2=1$ in $\pi_1(\mathcal{C},x)$, it must be the case that $[h]\cdot[g]=1$ in $\overline{G}$. This proves (i) for $\mathcal{C}$ nonnodal.

Next we will show (ii) in the case where $\mathcal{C}$ is nonnodal. To see this, note that the only smooth connected cover of $\mathcal{C}$ is isomorphic to $\mathbb{P}^1$. This cover is of degree $r:=|[h]|$, so C must consist of $|\overline{G}|/r$ components, each isomorphic to $\mathbb{P}^1$. In the case $h=(0,0,0,0,0)$, this implies that C has 125 components and so d is an integer. Thus condition (ii) holds trivially.

If $h\neq(0,0,0,0,0)$, then $r=5$. First note that (i) implies that $r_i(h)+r_i(g) \pmod 5$ is the same for any i. Thus, we only need to prove the statement for one i. Let $C'\cong\mathbb{P}^1$ be one component of C and let

$$f':=\widetilde{f}|_{C'}\colon C'\to\mathbb{P}^4$$

be the $\langle[h]\rangle$–equivariant morphism which is induced from the $\overline{G}$–equivariant morphism $\widetilde{f}\colon C\to\mathbb{P}^4$. $(f')^*(\mathcal{O}(1))$ is a degree $5d$ line bundle on $C'=\mathbb{P}^1$. Therefore, any lifting of the torus action on $\mathbb{P}^1$ will have *weights* $(w,w+5d)$ at the fibers of the two fixed points. Call these two fixed points p_1' and p_2'. Since $\langle[h]\rangle$ is a subgroup of the torus, the *characters* of the $[h]$–action at the fibers of the two fixed points must be (ζ^w,ζ^{w+5d}), for some w in $\{0,\dots,4\}$.

Let $q_1:=f'(p_1')$ and $q_2:=f'(p_2')$. By assumption, $q_1\in\mathbb{P}^4_h$, $q_2\in\mathbb{P}^4_g$. Choose an $i\in I(h)$ and $j\in I(g)$ such that $i\neq j$, $x_i(q_1)\neq 0$ and $x_j(q_2)\neq 0$. The action of $[h]$ on the fiber over q_1 and q_2 can be chosen to be $(\zeta^{r_i(h)},\zeta^{-r_j(h)})$. By the above weight/character arguments,

$$r_i(h)-(-r_j(h))\equiv 5d \pmod 5.$$

Since $j\in I(g)$ and $i\in I(h)$,

$$r_j(h)=r_j(h)-r_i(h)=r_i(g)-r_j(g)=r_i(g),$$

so we can rewrite the above as $r_i(h) + r_i(g) \equiv 5d \pmod 5$.

The nodal case follows similarly. Consider a nodal curve $f\colon \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{Y}$. Let $\mathcal{C}_1, \dots, \mathcal{C}_n$ be the irreducible components connecting p_1 to p_2. It follows from Lemma 2.2, each of these components will have two orbifold points (at either nodes or marked points) and these will be the only points in $\mathcal{C}$ with nontrivial orbifold structure. The above calculation for irreducible components plus the condition that all nodes be balanced in this situation then implies the claim. □

Once condition (i) is satisfied, the degree of maps allowed is thus determined by the quantity

$$d(h,g) := \langle (r_i(h) + r_i(g))/5 \rangle.$$

Note that this number remains constant as i varies.

We will define generating functions related to the J–functions $J_g^{\mathcal{Y}}$ which isolate the 2–point invariants of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,h,g}(\mathcal{Y}, d)$. Let

$$\begin{aligned} S(d,h) &:= \{(b,k) \mid 0 < b \le d, 0 \le k \le 4, \langle b \rangle = r_k(h)/5\}, \\ c(d,h) &:= |S(d,h)|. \end{aligned}$$

Given $h, g \in G$ such that $[h] = [g]^{-1}$, define

$$Z_{h,g} := \sum_d Q^{c(d,h)} \sum_i \left\langle \frac{T_i^h}{z - \psi_1}, \mathbb{1}_g \right\rangle_{0,2,d}^{\mathcal{Y}} T_h^i,$$

where $\{T_i^h\}$ is a basis for $H^*(\mathcal{Y}_h)$ and $\{T_h^i\}$ is the dual basis under the Chen–Ruan orbifold pairing. (The motivation behind this choice of exponent for Q will become clear in what follows: it is chosen to simplify the recursion satisfied by our generating function.) Notice that by the above lemma, the only degrees which contribute to $Z_{h,g}$ are d such that $\langle d \rangle = d(h,g)$. Finally, let

$$Z_g := \mathbb{1}_g + \sum_{\{h \mid [h] = [g]^{-1}\}} Z_{h,g}.$$

Let $T = (\mathbb{C}^*)^5$ (or $\mathbb{C}^*$) act on $\mathbb{C}^5$ with (generic) weights $-\lambda_0, \dots, -\lambda_4$. This induces an action on $\mathbb{P}^4$ and $\mathcal{Y}$. Furthermore there is an induced T–action on the inertia orbifold $I\mathcal{Y}$ and on $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,2}(\mathcal{Y}, d)$. We will consider an equivariant analogue Z_g^T of Z_g defined by replacing the coefficients of Z_g with their equivariant counterparts:

$$Z_{h,g}^T := \sum_{d,i} Q^{c(d,h)} \left\langle \frac{T_i^h}{z - \psi_1}, \mathbb{1}_g \right\rangle_{0,2,d}^{\mathcal{Y},T} T_h^i, \quad Z_g^T := \mathbb{1}_g + \sum_{\{h \mid [h] = [g]^{-1}\}} Z_{h,g}^T,$$

where $\{T_i^h\}$ is now a basis of the equivariant cohomology $H_T^*(\mathcal{Y}_h)$.

Consider the cohomology valued functions

$$Y_{h,g}^T := \sum_{\{d|\langle d\rangle = d(h,g)\}} Q^{c(d,h)} \frac{\mathbb{1}_{h^{-1}}}{\prod_{(b,k)\in S(d,h)}(bz + H - \lambda_k)}, \tag{2.2.2}$$

where

$$h^{-1} := (-r_0(h), \dots, -r_4(h)) \pmod 5.$$

As with Z, let

$$Y_g^T := \mathbb{1}_g + \sum_{\{h|[h]=[g]^{-1}\}} Y_{h,g}^T. \tag{2.2.3}$$

Theorem 2.4 *We have the equality in equivariant cohomology*

$$Z_g^T = Y_g^T.$$

In particular, taking the nonequivariant limit, we conclude that $Z_g = Y_g$ (where Y_g is the nonequivariant limit $\lambda_i \mapsto 0$ of Y_g^T).

Remark 2.5 For those who are familiar with the computation of the small J–function for toric manifolds [16], the generating functions Z, as indicated above, play the role of the J–function. The hypergeometric-type functions Y then take the place of the I–function. Recall that one way of formulating the computation of genus zero GW invariants is to say that the J–function is equal to the I–function after a change of variables, called the *mirror map*. In the present case, the mirror map is trivial.

2.3 Proof of Theorem 2.4

The proof follows from a localization argument similar in spirit to that in [16]. The strategy is to apply the Localization Theorem (after inverting the equivariant characters $\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_4$ in the ring $H_{\mathrm{CR},T}^*(\mathcal{Y})$) on the equivariant generating functions to determine a recursion which is satisfied by Z_g^T. This recursion relation in fact determines Z_g^T up to the constant term in the Novikov variables. We then show that Y_g^T satisfies the same recursion. Since Z_g^T and Y_g^T have the same initial term and the same recursion relation, $Z_g^T = Y_g^T$. A good exposition for localization in orbifold Gromov–Witten theory appropriate for this article is Liu [23].

2.3.1 A lemma on $c(d,h)$ We will first give an interpretation of the seemingly strange exponents $c(d,h)$ in the definition of $Z_{h,g}$. This choice of exponents is used to simplify the recursion for Z_g^T.

Lemma 2.6 *Let*

$$m_d = \dim(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,h,g}(\mathcal{Y}, d)).$$

Then if $[h] = [g]^{-1}$ *and* $\langle d \rangle = d(h,g)$, *we have*

$$c(d,h) = m_d - \dim(\mathcal{Y}_h) + 1.$$

Proof The standard formula for virtual dimension gives

$$m_d = 5d + 3 - \operatorname{age}(h) - \operatorname{age}(g).$$

Note that for any presentation $g = (r_0(g), \dots, r_4(g))$, $\operatorname{age}(g) = \sum_{i=0}^{4} r_i(g)/5$. Because $[h] = [g]^{-1}$, we have that

$$r_i(g) - r_j(g) \equiv r_j(h) - r_i(h) \pmod 5.$$

This allows us to write

$$\frac{r_k(g)}{5} = \begin{cases} -r_k(h)/5 + d(h,g) & d(h,g) \geq r_k(h)/5, \\ 1 - r_k(h)/5 + d(h,g) & d(h,g) < r_k(h)/5, \end{cases}$$

which gives

$$\begin{aligned} m_d &= 5d + 3 - 5d(h,g) - \left|\{k \mid d(h,g) < r_k(h)/5\}\right| \\ &= 5\lfloor d \rfloor + \left|\{k \mid d(h,g) \geq r_k(h)/5\}\right| - 2. \end{aligned}$$

Now, for a fixed k,

$$\left|\{b \mid 0 \leq b \leq d, \langle b \rangle = r_k(h)/5\}\right| = \begin{cases} \lfloor d \rfloor & d(h,g) < r_k(h)/5, \\ 1 + \lfloor d \rfloor & d(h,g) \geq r_k(h)/5. \end{cases}$$

Summing over all k, we get that

$$m_d = \left|\{(b,k) \mid 0 \leq b \leq d, \quad 0 \leq k \leq 4, \quad \langle b \rangle = r_k(h)/5\}\right| - 2.$$

Finally,

$$\dim(\mathcal{Y}_g) = \left|\{k \mid 0 = r_k(h)/5\}\right| - 1,$$

which gives the desired equality. □

2.3.2 Setting up the localization The action of T on $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,h,g}(\mathcal{Y},d))$ allows us to reduce integrals on the moduli space to sums of integrals on the fixed point loci with respect to the torus action. As usual, this reduces us to considering integrals of certain graph sums (see Graber and Pandharipande [17]). The generating function Z_g^T consists of integrals where the first insertion is the pullback of a class on

$$\coprod_{\{h|[h]=[g]^{-1}\}} \mathcal{Y}_h.$$

We will now express Z_g in terms of a new basis for this space which interacts nicely with the localization procedure. For each coordinate $0 \le i \le 4$, i is in $I(h)$ for exactly one h in $\{h \mid [h]=[g]^{-1}\}$. (Recall that the presentations $h \in \{h \mid [h]=[g]^{-1}\}$ index the fixed point sets of $\mathbb{P}^4$ with respect to $[h]$). Then for $i \in I(h)$, let q_i be the T–fixed point of $\mathcal{Y}_h$ obtained by setting all coordinates $\{j \mid j \neq i\}$ equal to zero. Then, for $i \in I(h)$, let

$$\phi_i = \mathbb{1}_h \cdot \prod_{j \in I(h)-i} (H - \lambda_j).$$

If we pair Z_g^T with ϕ_i, we obtain the function

$$Z_{i,g}^T = \frac{\delta^{i,I(g)}}{125} + \sum_d Q^{c(d,h)} \left\langle \frac{\phi_i}{z-\psi_1}, \mathbb{1}_g \right\rangle_{0,2,d}^{\mathcal{Y},T}$$

where $\delta^{i,I(g)}$ equals 1 if $i \in I(g)$ and 0 otherwise. The fixed point set of $\mathcal{Y}_h$ consists of $\{q_j \mid j \in I(h)\}$. Note that under the inclusion $i_j\colon \{q_j\} \to \mathcal{Y}_h$, H pulls back to λ_j. Therefore $i_j^*(\phi_i) = 0$ unless $i = j$. From this we see that the coefficients of $Z_{i,g}^T$ consist of integrals over graphs such that the first marked point is mapped to q_i.

We divide the remaining graphs into *two types*: those in which the first marked point is on a contracted component, and those in which the first marked point is on a noncontracted component.

Claim 2.7 *There is no contribution from graphs of the first type.*

Proof The proof is a dimension count. We will show that the contributions from graphs of the first type must contain as a multiplicative factor integrals of the form $\int_M \Psi$ such that $\deg_{\mathbb{C}}(\Psi) > \dim(M)$, and hence the vanishing claim.

The complex degree of ϕ_i is $\dim(\mathcal{Y}_h)$, and so the invariant $\langle \phi_i \psi_1^k, \mathbb{1}_g\rangle_{0,2,d}^{\mathcal{Y},T}$ vanishes unless $k \geq m_d - \dim(\mathcal{Y}_h)$. Therefore we can simplify our expression for $Z_{i,g}^T$:

$$\begin{aligned} Z_{i,g}^T &= \frac{\delta^{i,I(g)}}{125} + \sum_d Q^{c(d,h)} \left\langle \frac{\phi_i}{z-\psi_1}, \mathbb{1}_g \right\rangle_{0,2,d}^{\mathcal{Y},T} \\ &= \frac{\delta^{i,I(g)}}{125} + \sum_d Q^{c(d,h)} \frac{1}{z} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \langle \phi_i (\psi_1/z)^k, \mathbb{1}_g\rangle_{0,2,d}^{\mathcal{Y},T} \\ &= \frac{\delta^{i,I(g)}}{125} + \sum_d Q^{c(d,h)} \frac{1}{z} \sum_{k=c(d,h)-1}^{\infty} \langle \phi_i (\psi_1/z)^k, \mathbb{1}_g\rangle_{0,2,d}^{\mathcal{Y},T} \\ &= \frac{\delta^{i,I(g)}}{125} + \sum_d \Big(\frac{Q}{z}\Big)^{c(d,h)} \left\langle \frac{\phi_i \psi_1^{c(d,h)-1}}{1-(\psi_1/z)}, \mathbb{1}_g \right\rangle_{0,2,d}^{\mathcal{Y},T} \end{aligned}$$

Here the third equality follows from Lemma 2.6.

Now consider a fixed point graph M_Γ such that p_1 is on a contracted component. At the level of virtual classes, we can write

$$[M_\Gamma] = F(\Gamma) \cdot \prod_k [M_{v_k}], \tag{2.3.1}$$

where each M_{v_k} represents a contracted component of the graph isomorphic to a component of $\overline{M}_{0,n}(B\mathbb{Z}_r, 0)$ and $F(\Gamma)$ is a factor determined by Γ. Let M_{v_0} be the component containing p_1. M_{v_0} contains at most 2 orbifold marked points, and the number of nonorbifold marked points is restricted by d. In particular, each nonorbifold marked point corresponds to a (nonorbifold) edge of the dual graph. Each of these edges must have degree at least 1, so if the total degree of the map is d, then there can be at most $\lfloor d \rfloor$ nontwisted marked points. Thus the dimension of M_{v_0} is at most $\lfloor d \rfloor - 1$. Now, the proof of Lemma 2.6 shows that

$$c(d,h) - 1 = 5\lfloor d \rfloor + \big|\{k \mid r_k(h)/5 \leq d(h,g)\}\big| - 2 - \dim(\mathcal{Y}_h).$$

But $\dim(\mathcal{Y}_h)$ is exactly $|\{k \mid r_k(h) = 0\}| - 1$, which implies that

$$c(d,h) - 1 \geq 5\lfloor d \rfloor - 1.$$

If $d \geq 1$, the above quantity is strictly greater than $\lfloor d \rfloor - 1$. Because there do not exist graphs such that p_1 is on a noncontracted component for $d < 1$, we have that for M_Γ, $c(d,h) - 1 \gneq \dim(M_{v_0})$. But $\psi_1^{c(d,I)-1}$ must therefore vanish on these graphs, proving the claim. □

2.3.3 Contributions from a graph of the second type Now we consider the contribution to $\langle \phi_i/(z-\psi_1), \mathbb{1}_g\rangle_{0,2,d}^{\mathcal{Y},T}$ from a particular graph Γ of the second type. In particular, we know that p_1 is on a contracted component. Call this component $\mathcal{C}_0$ and denote the rest of the graph Γ'. Γ' and $\mathcal{C}_0$ connect at a node p', which maps to some $q_k \in \mathcal{Y}$. Let d' be the degree of one connected component of the principal $\bar{G}$–bundle above $\mathcal{C}_0$. We know from Proposition 2.3 that $\langle d'\rangle = r_k(h)/5$. By identifying $p' \in \Gamma'$ as a marked point (replacing p_1 on $\mathcal{C}_0$), we can view $M_{\Gamma'}$ as a fixed point locus in $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,h',g}(\mathcal{Y}, d-d')$, where $[h]=[h']$, but $r_k(h')=0$. Our plan will be to express integrals on M_Γ in terms of integrals on $M_{\Gamma'}$, thus reducing the calculation to one involving maps of strictly smaller degree. This will give us a recursion.

The factor $F(\Gamma)$ in (2.3.1) is composed of three contributions: the automorphisms of the graph Γ itself, a contribution from each edge of Γ (the noncontracted components of curves in M_Γ) and a contribution from certain flags of Γ (the nodes of curves in M_Γ). The edge corresponding to $\mathcal{C}_0$ maps to the line $q_{ik} \cong \mathbb{P}^1/\bar{G}$ connecting q_i and q_k. (Note that the $\bar{G}$–action is a subgroup of the big torus $(\mathbb{C}^*)^4$ of $\mathbb{P}^4$, $\bar{G}$ naturally acts on $(\mathbb{C}^*)^4$ orbits.) The degree of the map upstairs is $5d'$. Thus there is a contribution of $1/(5d')$ to $F(\Gamma)$ from the automorphism of M_Γ coming from rotating the underlying curve. The edge also contributes a factor of $1/25$ due to the fact that q_{ik} is a $(\mathbb{Z}/5\mathbb{Z})^2$–gerbe. So the total contribution to $F(\Gamma)$ from the edge containing p_1 is $1/(125d')$. The contribution from the node p' is $125/r$. (Recall $r=|[h]|$, which is equal to the order of the isotropy at p'.) There will be an additional factor of r appearing when we examine deformations of M_Γ, thus canceling the r in the denominator. We finally arrive at the relation

$$[M_\Gamma] = F(\Gamma)\cdot \prod_{\text{vertices } v\in\Gamma} [M_v] = \frac{F(\Gamma')}{d'}\cdot \prod_{\text{vertices } v\in\Gamma'} [M_v] = \frac{1}{d'}[M_{\Gamma'}].$$

By examining the localization exact sequence (see [17]), we have the identity

$$e(N_\Gamma) = \frac{e(H^0(\mathcal{C}_0, f^*T\mathcal{Y})^m)(\text{node smoothing at } p')}{e(H^0(p', f^*T\mathcal{Y})^m)e(H^1(\mathcal{C}_0, f^*T\mathcal{Y})^m)e((H^0(\mathcal{C}_0, T\mathcal{C}_0)^m)} e(N_{\Gamma'}), \tag{2.3.2}$$

where e denotes the equivariant Euler class and as is standard we identify certain vector bundles with their fibers. Here the superscript m denotes the moving part of the vector bundle with respect to the torus action. Let us calculate the factors in (2.3.2).

Node smoothing at p' The node smoothing contributes a factor of

$$\left(\frac{\lambda_k-\lambda_i}{rd'} - \frac{\psi_1'}{r}\right) = \frac{1}{r}\left(\frac{\lambda_k-\lambda_i}{d'} - \psi_1'\right),$$

where ψ_1' is the ψ–class corresponding to p_1' on M_Γ'. This factor of r is what cancels with the previous factor mentioned above.

The equivariant Euler class $e(H^0(\mathcal{C}_0, T\mathcal{C}_0)^m)$ Let C be the principal $\bar{G}$–bundle over $\mathcal{C}_0$ induced from $f|_{\mathcal{C}_0}\colon \mathcal{C}_0 \to [\mathbb{P}^4/\bar{G}]$. As was argued in Proposition 2.3, C consists of $(|\bar{G}|/r)$ copies of $\mathbb{P}^1$. Let C_0 be one of these copies. Then C_0 is a principal $\langle[h]\rangle$–bundle over $\mathcal{C}_0$ and

$$H^0(\mathcal{C}_0, T\mathcal{C}_0) = H^0(C_0, TC_0)^{\langle[h]\rangle}.$$

The $\langle[h]\rangle$–invariant part of $H^0(C_0, TC_0)$ is one-dimensional. It is fixed by the torus action, thus the moving part of $H^0(\mathcal{C}_0, T\mathcal{C}_0)$ is trivial and $e(H^0(\mathcal{C}_0, T\mathcal{C}_0)^m) = 1$.

The equivariant Euler class $e(H^1(\mathcal{C}_0, f^*T\mathcal{Y})^m)$ Let C_0 be as in the previous paragraph. Then

$$H^1(\mathcal{C}_0, f^*T\mathcal{Y}) = H^1(C_0, \tilde{f}^*T\mathbb{P}^4)^{\langle[h]\rangle} = 0.$$

Therefore $e(H^1(\mathcal{C}_0, f^*T\mathcal{Y})^m) = 1$.

The equivariant Euler class $e(H^0(\mathcal{C}_0, f^*T\mathcal{Y})^m)$ To calculate this term, note that

$$H^0(\mathcal{C}_0, f^*T\mathcal{Y})^m \cong (H^0(C_0, \tilde{f}^*T\mathbb{P}^4)^{\langle[h]\rangle})^m.$$

We will look at the $\langle[h]\rangle$ invariant part of the short exact sequence

$$0 \to \mathbb{C} \to H^0(\mathcal{O}_{C_0}(rd')) \otimes V \to H^0(\tilde{f}^*T\mathbb{P}^4) \to 0,$$

where $\mathbb{P}^4 = \mathbb{P}(V)$ and $V \cong \mathbb{C}^5$. The exact sequence comes from the pullback of the Euler sequence for $\mathbb{P}^4$ to C_0. (Note that the degree of $\tilde{f}\colon C_0 \to \mathbb{P}^4$ is rd'.) The action of $[h]$ on the first term in the sequence is trivial.

Recall that $\mathbb{P}(V)$ has coordinates $[x_0, \dots, x_4]$. Let $[s, t]$ be homogeneous coordinates on $C_0 \cong \mathbb{P}^1$, such that the preimage of p_1 in C_0 is $[0, 1]$ and the preimage of p' in C_0 is $[1, 0]$. Then the middle term of the sequence is spanned by elements of the form $s^a t^b\, \partial/\partial x_l$ where $0 \le l \le 4$ and $a + b = rd'$. The action is given by

$$[h].\big(s^a t^b \tfrac{\partial}{\partial x_l}\big) = e^{2\pi\sqrt{-1}(-a+r_l(h))/r} s^a t^b \tfrac{\partial}{\partial x_l},$$

and so this summand is invariant under the $\langle[h]\rangle$–action if and only if $r_l(h)/r = \langle a/r\rangle$. The $\mathbb{C}^*$–action on this term has weight

$$(a/rd')\lambda_k + (b/rd')\lambda_i - \lambda_l,$$

so we finally arrive at

$$e(H^0(\mathcal{C}_0, f^*T\mathcal{Y})^m) = \prod_{\substack{\{(a,l)\mid 0\le a\le rd',\,0\le l\le 4,\,r_l(h)/r=\langle a/r\rangle\}\\ \setminus\{(0,i),(rd',k)\}}} \left(\frac{a}{rd'}\lambda_k + \frac{rd'-a}{rd'}\lambda_i - \lambda_l\right)$$

$$= \prod_{\substack{\{(a,l)\mid 0\le a\le rd',\,0\le l\le 4,\,r_l(h)/r=\langle a/r\rangle\}\\ \setminus\{(0,i),(rd',k)\}}} \left(a\left(\frac{\lambda_k-\lambda_i}{rd'}\right) + \lambda_i - \lambda_l\right).$$

The equivariant Euler class $e(H^0(p', f^*T\mathcal{Y})^m)$ Similarly, the node p' is isomorphic to $B\mathbb{Z}_r$ and each of the $|\bar{G}|/r$ points lying in the principal $\bar{G}$–bundle over p' is a principal $\langle[h]\rangle$–bundle over p'. Thus $H^0(p', f^*T\mathcal{Y})^m \cong ((T_{q_k}\mathbb{P}^n)^{\langle[h]\rangle})^m$ and

$$e(H^0(p', f^*T\mathcal{Y})^m) = \prod_{l\in I(h')\setminus\{k\}} (\lambda_k - \lambda_l).$$

Finally note that $\mathrm{ev}_1^*(\phi_i) = \prod_{l\in I(h)-i}(\lambda_i - \lambda_l)$. We can do one further simplification. On the graphs which we consider, namely those where p_1 is on a noncontracted component, ψ_1 restricts to $(\lambda_k-\lambda_i)/d'$. (In fact $e(T^*_{p_1}\mathcal{C}) \cong (\lambda_k-\lambda_i)/rd'$, but because we are following the convention that ψ–classes are pulled back from the reification, we must multiply this by a factor of r.)

These calculations plus (2.3.2) then give us the contribution to

$$\left\langle \frac{\phi_i \psi_1^{c(d,h)-1}}{1-\psi_1/z}, \mathbb{1}_g \right\rangle^{\mathcal{Y},T}_{0,2,d}$$

from the graph M_Γ:

$$\int_{[M_\Gamma]} \frac{\mathrm{ev}_1^*(\phi_i)\psi_1^{c(d,I)-1}}{e(N_\Gamma)(1-\psi_1/z)}$$

$$= \frac{((\lambda_k-\lambda_i)/d')^{c(d,I)-1}\prod_{l\in I(h)\setminus\{i\}}(\lambda_i-\lambda_l)e(H^1(\mathcal{C}_0, f^*T\mathcal{Y})^m)}{e(H^0(\mathcal{C}_0, f^*T\mathcal{Y})^m)(1-(\lambda_k-\lambda_i)/d'z)} \cdot \frac{1}{d'}\int_{[M'_\Gamma]} \frac{e(H^0(p', f^*T\mathcal{Y})^m)}{(\text{node smoothing at } p')e(N_{\Gamma'})}$$

$$= \frac{((\lambda_k-\lambda_i)/d')^{c(d,h)-1}\prod_{l\in I(h)\setminus\{i\}}(\lambda_i-\lambda_l)}{(d'-(\lambda_k-\lambda_i)/z)\prod_\alpha(a((\lambda_k-\lambda_i)/rd')+\lambda_i-\lambda_l)} \cdot \int_{[M_{\Gamma'}]} \frac{\prod_{l\in I(h')\setminus\{k\}}(\lambda_k-\lambda_l)}{((\lambda_k-\lambda_i)/d'-\psi_1)e(N_{\Gamma'})},$$

where $\alpha = \{(a,l)\mid 0\le a\le rd', 0\le l\le 4, r_l(h)/r = \langle a/r\rangle\}\setminus\{(0,i),(rd',k)\}$.

2.3.4 Recursion relations We will formulate the above computations into a recursion relation. The above computation simplifies to

$$\left(\left\langle \frac{\phi_i \psi_1^{c(d,h)-1}}{1-\psi_1/z}, \mathbb{1}_g \right\rangle_{0,2,d}^{\mathcal{Y},T}\right)_{M_\Gamma}$$
$$= C_{d'}^{i,k} \cdot \left(\frac{\lambda_k-\lambda_i}{d'}\right)^{c(d,h)-1-(c(d',h)-1)} \cdot \left(\left\langle \frac{\phi_k}{z-\psi_1}, \mathbb{1}_g \right\rangle_{0,2,d-d'}^{\mathcal{Y},T}\right)_{M_{\Gamma'}} \Bigg|_{z\mapsto(\lambda_k-\lambda_i)/d'}$$

where

$$C_{d'}^{i,k} = \frac{1}{\left(d'-\frac{\lambda_k-\lambda_i}{z}\right)\prod_{\{(a,l)\in S(d',h)\setminus\{(d',k)\}\}}\left(a+d'\left(\frac{\lambda_i-\lambda_l}{\lambda_k-\lambda_i}\right)\right)}$$

and $(-)_{M_\Gamma}$ means the contribution of the fixed component M_Γ to the expression in parentheses.

Due to the fact that $r_k(h)/5 = \langle d' \rangle$, one can check that

$$c(d,h) - c(d',h) = c(d-d',h');$$

see (2.3.4). We arrive at the expression:

$$C_{d'}^{i,k} \cdot (Q^{c(d-d',k)} \left\langle \frac{\phi_k}{z-\psi_1}, \mathbb{1}_g \right\rangle_{0,2,d-d'}^{\mathcal{Y},T})_{M_{\Gamma'}} \Bigg|_{z\mapsto(\lambda_k-\lambda_i)/d', Q\mapsto(\lambda_k-\lambda_i)/d'}$$

After summing over all possible graphs, we obtain the recursion:

$$Z_{i,g}^T = \frac{\delta^{i,I(g)}}{125} + \sum_{\{(d',k)|r_k(h)/5=\langle d'\rangle, k\neq i, d'\neq 0\}} \left(\frac{Q}{z}\right)^{c(d',h)} C_{d'}^{i,k} \cdot Z_{k,g}^T \Big|_{z\mapsto(\lambda_k-\lambda_i)/d', Q\mapsto(Q)/z^{\frac{\lambda_k-\lambda_i}{d'}}} \tag{2.3.3}$$

Although we have suppressed this in the notation, recall that in the above summand, h is the presentation such that ϕ_i is supported on $\mathcal{Y}_h$ $(i \in I(h))$.

We will now turn our attention to Y_g^T. Let us define the function $Y_{i,g}^T$ analogously to that of $Z_{i,g}^T$,

$$Y_{i,g}^T := (\phi_i, Y_g^T)_{\mathrm{CR}}^{\mathcal{Y}}.$$

For $i \in I(h)$,

$$Y_{i,g}^T = \frac{1}{125}\left(\delta^{i,I(g)} + \sum_{\langle d\rangle = d(h,g)} Q^{c(d,h)} \frac{1}{\prod_{(b,k)\in S(d,h)}(bz+\lambda_i-\lambda_k)}\right).$$

Claim 2.8 *We have that $Y_{i,g}^T$ satisfies the same recursion as $Z_{i,g}^T$ in* (2.3.3).

Proof Consider the summand of $Y^T_{i,g}$ of degree $c(d,h)$ in Q, which we will denote $(Y^T_{i,g})^{c(d,h)}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}(Y^T_{i,g})^{c(d,h)} &= \frac{1}{125}\Big(\frac{Q}{z}\Big)^{c(d,h)} \frac{1}{\prod_{(b,k)\in S(d,h)}(b+(\lambda_i-\lambda_k)/z)}\\ &= \frac{1}{125}\Big(\frac{Q}{z}\Big)^{c(d,h)} \sum_{\{(b,k)|r_k(h)/5=\langle b\rangle, k\neq i, b\neq 0\}} \frac{1}{(b+(\lambda_i-\lambda_k)/z)}\\ &\qquad\cdot \frac{1}{\prod_{(m,l)\in S(d,h)\setminus\{(b,k)\}}(b(\lambda_i-\lambda_l)/(\lambda_k-\lambda_i)+m)}\\ &= \frac{1}{125}\Big(\frac{Q}{z}\Big)^{c(d,h)} \sum_{\{(b,k)|r_k(h)/5=\langle b\rangle, k\neq i, b\neq 0\}}\\ &\qquad\Bigg(\frac{1/(b+(\lambda_i-\lambda_k)/z)}{\prod_{\{(m,l)\in S(d,h)\setminus\{(b,k)\}|m\le b\}}(b(\lambda_i-\lambda_l)/(\lambda_k-\lambda_i)+m)}\\ &\qquad\cdot \frac{1}{\prod_{\{(m,l)\in S(d,h)\setminus\{(b,k)\}|m>b\}}(b(\lambda_i-\lambda_l)/(\lambda_k-\lambda_i)+m)}\Bigg).\end{aligned}$$

The last product from above can be rewritten as

$$\prod_{(n,l)\in S(d-b,h')}\Big(n+b\frac{\lambda_k-\lambda_l}{\lambda_k-\lambda_i}\Big),$$

where h' is chosen such that $[h]=[h']$ and $k\in I(h')$. To see this note that if (b,k) and (m,l) are both in $S(d,h)$, then by definition $r_k(h)/5=\langle b\rangle$ and $r_l(h)/5=\langle m\rangle$. If $k\in I(h')$, then

$$\frac{r_l(h')}{5}=\frac{r_l(h')}{5}-\frac{r_k(h')}{5}\equiv\frac{r_l(h)}{5}-\frac{r_k(h)}{5}\equiv\langle m\rangle-\langle b\rangle\equiv\langle m-b\rangle \pmod 1.$$

In other words $r_l(h')/5=\langle m-b\rangle$. This proves that if $(b,k)\in S(d,h)$ and h' is chosen as above, then for pairs (m,l) with $b<m\le d$,

$$(m,l)\in S(d,h) \quad \text{if and only if} \quad (m-b,l)\in S(d-b,h'). \tag{2.3.4}$$

We arrive at the relation:

$$\begin{aligned}(Y^T_{i,g})^{c(d,h)} = \sum_{\{(b,k)|r_k(h)/5=\langle b\rangle, k\neq i, b\neq 0\}} &\Big(\frac{Q}{z}\Big)^{c(b,h)}\\ &\cdot C_b^{i,k}(Y^T_{k,g})^{c(d-b,h')}\Big|_{z\mapsto(\lambda_k-\lambda_i)/b,\,Q\mapsto\frac{Q}{z}(\lambda_k-\lambda_i)/b}\end{aligned}$$

We conclude that $Y^T_{i,g}$ satisfies the same recursion as $Z^T_{i,g}$. □

The recursion relation and initial conditions imply $Y^T_{i,g} = Z^T_{i,g}$. This completes the proof of Theorem 2.4. □

Remark 2.9 As a corollary one may easily obtain an explicit formula for the small J–matrix $J^{\mathcal{Y}}_{\text{small}}(t,z)$ by isolating coefficients of the various $Z^{\mathcal{Y}}_g$. We give an explicit expression for certain specified rows of $J^{\mathcal{Y}}_{\text{small}}(t,z)$ in Corollary 3.8.

3 The A model of the mirror quintic $\mathcal{W}$

3.1 Fermat quintic and its mirror

Let $M \subset \mathbb{P}^4$ be the Fermat quintic defined by the equation $Q_0(x) = x_0^5 + x_1^5 + x_2^5 + x_3^5 + x_4^5$,

$$M := \{Q_0(x) = 0\} \subset \mathbb{P}^4.$$

The Greene–Plesser *mirror construction* [18] gives the *mirror orbifold* as the quotient stack

$$\mathcal{W} := [M/\bar{G}].$$

Note that the $\bar{G}$–action on $\mathbb{P}^4$ (2.1.1) preserves the quintic equation $Q_0(x)$ and therefore induces an action on M. Equivalently,

$$\mathcal{W} = \{Q_0 = 0\} \subset \mathcal{Y} = [\mathbb{P}^4/\bar{G}]. \tag{3.1.1}$$

Remark 3.1 Since in this section we will only be interested in the Gromov–Witten theory (A model), which is deformation invariant, we will only speak of the mirror orbifold instead of the mirror family.

Recall in Lemma 2.1 the inertia orbifold of $\mathcal{Y} = [\mathbb{P}^4/\bar{G}]$ is indexed by $g \in G$. For a particular g, the dimension of $\mathcal{Y}_g$ is equal to $|\{j \mid r_j = 0\}| - 1$ and can be identified with a linear subspace of $\mathcal{Y}$. The age shift of $\mathcal{Y}_g$ is $\operatorname{age}(g) = \sum_{i=0}^4 r_i/5$.

The inertia orbifold of the mirror quintic $\mathcal{W}$ can be described by that of $\mathcal{Y}$. The mirror quintic $\mathcal{W}$ intersects nontrivially with $\mathcal{Y}_g$ exactly when $|\{j \mid r_j = 0\}| \geq 2$ (that is, $\dim \mathcal{Y}_g \geq 1$). Let

$$\bar{S} := \{g = (r_0, \dots, r_4) \in G \mid 2 \leq |\{j \mid r_j = 0\}|\}.$$

(Note that $\bar{S}$ contains $e = (0, \dots, 0)$.) Then

$$I\mathcal{W} = \coprod_{g \in \bar{S}} \mathcal{W}_g, \quad \mathcal{W}_g := \mathcal{W} \cap \mathcal{Y}_g.$$

All nontrivial intersections are transverse, so

$$\dim(\mathcal{W}_g) = \dim(\mathcal{Y}_g) - 1 = \big|\{j \mid r_j = 0\}\big| - 2.$$

It follows that the age shift of $\mathcal{W}_g$ is equal to the age shift of $\mathcal{Y}_g$. The cohomology of $\mathcal{W}$ is given by

$$H^*_{\mathrm{CR}}(\mathcal{W}) = \bigoplus_{g \in \bar{S}} H^{*-2\,\mathrm{age}(g)}(\mathcal{W}_g).$$

In the sequel, we will only be interested in the subring of $H^*_{\mathrm{CR}}(\mathcal{W})$ consisting of classes of even (real) degree. We will denote this ring as $H^{\mathrm{even}}_{\mathrm{CR}}(\mathcal{W})$. It can be checked via a direct calculation that if $i\colon \mathcal{W} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ is the inclusion,

$$H^{\mathrm{even}}_{\mathrm{CR}}(\mathcal{W}) = i^* H^*_{\mathrm{CR}}(\mathcal{Y}).$$

Convention 3.2 By a further abuse of notation, we will also denote by H the induced class on $\mathcal{W}$ pulled back from $\mathcal{Y}$.

A convenient basis $\{T_i\}$ for $H^{\mathrm{even}}_{\mathrm{CR}}(\mathcal{W})$ is

$$\bigcup_{g \in \bar{S}} \{\mathbb{1}_g, \mathbb{1}_g H, \dots, \mathbb{1}_g H^{\dim(\mathcal{W}_g)}\}. \tag{3.1.2}$$

We also note that $H^{\mathrm{even}}_{\mathrm{CR}}(\mathcal{W}) \subset H^*_{\mathrm{CR}}(\mathcal{W})$ is a self-dual subring with respect to the Poincaré pairing of $H^*_{\mathrm{CR}}(\mathcal{W})$. Furthermore, this basis is self-dual (up to a constant factor). Given $g = (r_0, \dots, r_4) \in S$, let

$$g^{-1} := (-r_0, \dots, -r_4) \pmod 5.$$

Then the Poincaré dual elements can be easily calculated:

$$(\mathbb{1}_g H^k)^\vee = 25(\mathbb{1}_{g^{-1}} H^{\dim(\mathcal{W}_g)-k})$$

3.2 The J–functions of $\mathcal{W}$

Convention 3.3 By the matrix J–function of $\mathcal{W}$, we will mean the matrix consisting of the collection of $H^{\mathrm{even}}_{\mathrm{CR}}(\mathcal{W})$–valued functions with variable $\mathbf{t} = tH$,

$$J^{\mathcal{W}}_g(t,z) := e^{tH/z}\left(\mathbb{1}_g + \sum_{d,i} q^d e^{dt} \left\langle \frac{T_i}{z - \psi_1}, \mathbb{1}_g \right\rangle^{\mathcal{W}}_{0,2,d} T^i\right), \tag{3.2.1}$$

where the basis $\{T_i\}$ is for $H^{\mathrm{even}}_{\mathrm{CR}}(\mathcal{W})$, as in (3.1.2). Here as in Section 2, by the degree d of a map $f\colon \mathcal{C}\to\mathcal{W}$ we mean

$$d := \int_{\mathcal{C}} f^*(H).$$

Note that if we extend the basis $\{T_i\}$ to full basis of $H^*_{\mathrm{CR}}(\mathcal{W})$, the classes of odd (real) degree will not contribute to $J_g^{\mathcal{W}}(t,z)$ and thus (3.2.1) is equal to the J_g–function of (1.3.1).

As has been shown in Proposition 2.3, for an orbicurve $\mathcal{C}$ with two marked points, the degree must be a multiple of $1/5$. Recall also from Proposition 2.3 that the only nonzero contribution to the terms in $J_g^{\mathcal{W}}$ comes from elements T_i supported on some $\mathcal{W}_h$ such that $[h]=[g^{-1}]$. From the definition of $\overline{S}$, it is required that

$$\big|\{j \mid r_j = 0\}\big| \geq 2, \quad \sum_j r_j \equiv 0 \pmod 5. \tag{3.2.2}$$

We will enumerate all possible cases.

It follows from the conditions (3.2.2) that $|\{j \mid r_j = 0\}|$ must be equal to 2, 3 or 5. That is, $\dim(\mathcal{W}_g)$ is equal to 0, 1 or 3.

If $\dim(\mathcal{W}_g)=3$, $g=e=(0,0,0,0,0)$ and $\mathbb{1}_e=1$. The only basis elements which contribute to $J_e^{\mathcal{W}}$ come from the nontwisted sector. We have

$$J_e^{\mathcal{W}}(t,z) = e^{tH/z}\bigg(1+\sum_{d>0} q^d e^{dt}\bigg\langle \frac{H^i}{z-\psi_1}, 1\bigg\rangle^{\mathcal{W}}_{0,2,d}(25H^{3-i})\bigg). \tag{3.2.3}$$

If $\dim(\mathcal{W}_g)=1$, then up to a permutation of the entries, $g=(0,0,0,r_1,r_2)$ with $r_1\neq r_2$. By definition of $\overline{S}$, other than g there is no $h\in\overline{S}$ such that $[h]=[g]$. Therefore, the two basis elements which contribute nontrivially to $J_g^{\mathcal{W}}$ are $\mathbb{1}_{g^{-1}}$ and $\mathbb{1}_{g^{-1}}H$. We arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} J_g^{\mathcal{W}}(t,z) = e^{tH/z}\bigg(\mathbb{1}_g + \sum_{d>0} q^d e^{dt}\bigg(\bigg\langle \frac{\mathbb{1}_{g^{-1}}}{z-\psi_1}, \mathbb{1}_g\bigg\rangle^{\mathcal{W}}_{0,2,d}(25\mathbb{1}_g H) \\ + \bigg\langle \frac{\mathbb{1}_{g^{-1}}H}{z-\psi_1}, \mathbb{1}_g\bigg\rangle^{\mathcal{W}}_{0,2,d}(25\mathbb{1}_g)\bigg)\bigg). \end{aligned} \tag{3.2.4}$$

If $\dim(\mathcal{W}_g)=0$, then up to a permutation of the entries, $g=(0,0,r_1,r_1,r_2)$, with $r_1\neq r_2$. There is only one other $g_1\in\overline{S}$ such that $[g_1]=[g]$, namely, that $g_1=(-r_1,-r_1,0,0,r_2-r_1)$ (mod 5). The two basis elements which contribute nontrivially to the invariants of $J_g^{\mathcal{W}}$ are $\mathbb{1}_{g^{-1}}$ and $\mathbb{1}_{(g_1)^{-1}}$. Thus we can express $J_g^{\mathcal{W}}(t,z)$

as

$$J_g^{\mathcal{W}}(t,z) = e^{tH/z}\Bigg(\mathbb{1}_g + \sum_{d>0} q^d e^{dt}\Bigg(\Bigg\langle \frac{\mathbb{1}_{g^{-1}}}{z-\psi_1}, \mathbb{1}_g\Bigg\rangle_{0,2,d}^{\mathcal{W}}(25\mathbb{1}_g) + \Bigg\langle \frac{\mathbb{1}_{(g_1)^{-1}}}{z-\psi_1}, \mathbb{1}_g\Bigg\rangle_{0,2,d}^{\mathcal{W}}(25\mathbb{1}_{g_1})\Bigg)\Bigg). \tag{3.2.5}$$

Thus for each twisted component $\mathcal{W}_g$, the J–function $J_g^{\mathcal{W}}$ has two components.

We will relate the functions $J_g^{\mathcal{W}}$ to certain hypergeometric functions, called I–functions. To start with, let us introduce "bundled-twisted" Gromov–Witten invariants. Let $E \to \mathcal{X}$ be a line bundle over the orbifold $\mathcal{X}$. Let $\mathbb{C}^*$ act with weight λ on the total space of E via multiplication in the fiber direction. We have the following diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & & E \\ & & \downarrow \\ \mathcal{C} & \xrightarrow{f} & \mathcal{X} \\ \downarrow \pi & & \\ \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,n}(\mathcal{X}, d) & & \end{array}$$

The E–twisted Gromov–Witten invariants are defined to be

$$\langle \alpha_1 \psi^{k_1}, \ldots, \alpha_n \psi^{k_n} \rangle_{0,n,d}^{\mathcal{X},\mathrm{tw}} = \int_{[\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,n}(\mathcal{X},d)]^{\mathrm{vir}}} \prod_{i=1}^{n} \mathrm{ev}_i^*(\alpha_i)\psi_i^{k_i} \cup e_{\mathbb{C}^*}(E_{0,n,d}),$$

where $E_{o,n,d} := \pi_* f^*(E)$ and $e_{\mathbb{C}^*}(E_{0,n,d})$ is the equivariant Euler class of the K–class. We can define a twisted pairing on $H_{\mathrm{CR}}^*(\mathcal{X};\Lambda)$ by

$$(\alpha_1, \alpha_2)_{\mathrm{CR}}^{\mathcal{X},\mathrm{tw}} = \int_{\mathcal{X}} \alpha_1 \cup I^*(\alpha_2) \cup e_{\mathbb{C}^*}(E).$$

With this, we can define a twisted J–function

$$J^{\mathcal{X},\mathrm{tw}}(\mathbf{t},z) = 1 + \mathbf{t}/z + \sum_d \sum_{n\geq 0} \sum_i \frac{q^d}{n!}\Bigg\langle \frac{T_i}{z-\psi_1}, 1, \mathbf{t}, \ldots, \mathbf{t}\Bigg\rangle_{0,2+k,d}^{\mathcal{X},\mathrm{tw}} T^i.$$

Here T_i is a basis for $H_{\mathrm{CR}}^*(\mathcal{X};\Lambda)$ and T^i is the dual basis with respect to the twisted pairing.

The twisted invariants are related to invariants on the hypersurface. In our case, $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{Y} = [\mathbb{P}^4/\bar{G}]$ and $E = \mathcal{O}(5) \to \mathcal{Y}$. It is easy to see that $E_{0,n,d} = R^0\pi_* f^*(\mathcal{O}(5))$

is a vector bundle. The embedding $i\colon \mathcal{W} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ induces a morphism $\iota\colon \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,n}(\mathcal{W}, d) \hookrightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,n}(\mathcal{Y}, d)$. As is shown by Cox, Katz and the first author in [12],[2]

$$\iota_*[\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,n}(\mathcal{W}, d)]^{\mathrm{vir}} = e(E_{0,n,d}) \cap [\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,n}(\mathcal{Y}, d)]^{\mathrm{vir}}. \tag{3.2.6}$$

This relates the twisted invariants on $\mathcal{Y}$ to the invariants on $\mathcal{W}$. Assume that $\mathbf{t}$ is restricted to $H^{\mathrm{even}}_{\mathrm{CR}}(\mathcal{Y})$, then by the projection formula,

$$J^{\mathcal{W}}(\mathbf{t}, z) = (i^* J^{\mathcal{Y}, tw}(\mathbf{t}, z))_{\lambda \mapsto 0},$$

where $\lambda \mapsto 0$ denotes the nonequivariant limit. In what follows we further restrict $\mathbf{t}$ to $H^2_{\mathrm{CR}}(\mathcal{Y})$. In our setting we may write an element of $H^2_{\mathrm{CR}}(\mathcal{Y})$ as

$$\mathbf{t} = tH + \sum_{\{g \mid \mathrm{age}(g)=1\}} t^g \mathbb{1}_g. \tag{3.2.7}$$

Write the J–function of $\mathcal{Y}$ as

$$J^{\mathcal{Y}}(\mathbf{t}) = \sum_d q^d J^{\mathcal{Y}}_d(\mathbf{t}).$$

For each d, define the modification factor

$$M_d^{E/\mathcal{Y}} := \prod_{m=1}^{5d} (5H + mz).$$

(Note that we have taken the $\lambda = 0$ limit in Coates, Corti, Iritani and Tseng [9].)

Definition 3.4 Define the *twisted I–function* by

$$I^E(\mathbf{t}) := \sum_d q^d M_d^{E/\mathcal{Y}} J^{\mathcal{Y}}_d(\mathbf{t}).$$

Write

$$\begin{aligned} I^E(\mathbf{t}, z) = I^E_e(t, z) &+ \frac{1}{z}\Bigg(\sum_{\{g \mid \mathrm{age}(g)=1\}} t^g I^E_g(t, z) \Bigg) \\ &+ \frac{1}{z}\Bigg(\sum_{\{g_1, g_2 \mid \mathrm{age}(g_i)=1\}} t^{g_1} t^{g_2} I^E_{g_1, g_2}(t, z) + \cdots \Bigg). \end{aligned} \tag{3.2.8}$$

For g such that $\mathrm{age}(g) \le 1$ (including $g = e$), define the A model hypergeometric functions

$$I^{\mathcal{A}}_g(t, z) = i^*(I^E_g(t, z)). \tag{3.2.9}$$

[2]That proof, given in the nonorbifold setting, can be readily modified to the orbifold setting when the bundle E is a pullback from the coarse moduli space of $\mathcal{Y}$.

Theorem 3.5 *Given $g = (r_0, \dots, r_4)$ such that the age shift of $\mathcal{W}_g$ is at most 1, there exist functions $F_0(t)$, $G_0(t)$ and $H_g(t)$, determined explicitly by $I_g^E(t,z)$ such that F_0 and H_g ($g \neq 0$) are invertible, and*

$$J_g^{\mathcal{W}}(\tau(t), z) = \frac{I_g^A(t,z)}{H_g(t)}, \quad \text{where } \tau(t) = \frac{G_0(t)}{F_0(t)}. \tag{3.2.10}$$

Remark 3.6 In the statement of the theorem, $F_0(t)$ and $G_0(t)$ do not depend on g, so the *mirror map* $t \mapsto \tau(t) = G_0(t)/F_0(t)$ is well defined.

3.3 Proof of Theorem 3.5

There are two key ingredients in the proof. The first one is the version of *quantum Lefschetz hyperplane theorem* (QLHT) for orbifolds proved in [9]. By (3.1.1), $\mathcal{W}$ is a hyperplane section of $\mathcal{Y}$ and hence $J^{\mathcal{W}}(\mathbf{t}, z)$ can be calculated by QLHT. Corollary 5.1 in [9] in particular implies the following.

Theorem 3.7 [9] *Let the setting be as above, with $E = \mathcal{O}(5) \to \mathcal{Y}$. Then*

$$I^E(\mathbf{t}, z) = F(\mathbf{t}) + \frac{G(\mathbf{t})}{z} + O(z^{-2}) \tag{3.3.1}$$

for some F and G with F scalar valued and invertible, and

$$J^{\mathcal{Y},\mathrm{tw}}(\tau(\mathbf{t}), z) = \frac{I^E(\mathbf{t}, z)}{F(\mathbf{t})}, \quad \text{where } \tau(\mathbf{t}) = \frac{G(\mathbf{t})}{F(\mathbf{t})}. \tag{3.3.2}$$

The second ingredient is the explicit formula of $J_g^{\mathcal{Y}}$ from Section 2. Note that we are only concerned with those g such that $i^*\mathbb{1}_g \neq 0$ and $\mathrm{age}(\mathbb{1}_g) \leq 1$. Therefore only those $J_g^{\mathcal{Y}}$ are listed. The following is a straightforward corollary of Theorem 2.4, (2.2.2) and (2.2.3) by equating the terms $Q^{c(d,h)}\mathbb{1}_{h^{-1}}H^k$ of Z_g with the terms $q^d e^{dt}\mathbb{1}_{h^{-1}}H^k$ of $J_g^{\mathcal{Y}}$.

Corollary 3.8 *The functions $J_g^{\mathcal{Y}}(t,z)$ are given by the following formulas.*

(i) *If $g = e = (0,0,0,0,0)$,*

$$J_e^{\mathcal{Y}} = e^{tH/z}\left(1 + \sum_{\langle d\rangle = 0} q^d e^{dt} \frac{1}{\prod_{0<b\leq d,\ \langle b\rangle = 0}(H + bz)^5}\right). \tag{3.3.3}$$

(ii) *If* $g=(0,0,0,r_1,r_2)$, *let* $g_1=(-r_1,-r_1,-r_1,0,r_2-r_1)\ (\mathrm{mod}\ 5)$ *and let* $g_2=(-r_2,-r_2,-r_2,r_1-r_2,0)\ (\mathrm{mod}\ 5)$. *Then*

$$\begin{aligned}(3.3.4)\quad J_g^Y = e^{tH/z}\mathbb{1}_g\Bigg(1+\sum_{\langle d\rangle=0}\Bigg(q^d e^{dt}\Big/\prod_{\substack{0<b\le d\\ \langle b\rangle=0}}(H+bz)^3 \\ \cdot\prod_{\substack{0<b\le d\\ \langle b\rangle=\langle r_2/5\rangle}}(H+bz)\prod_{\substack{0<b\le d\\ \langle b\rangle=\langle r_1/5\rangle}}(H+bz)\Bigg) \\ +e^{tH/z}\mathbb{1}_{g_1}\Bigg(\sum_{\langle d\rangle=\langle r_1/5\rangle}\Bigg(q^d e^{dt}\Big/\prod_{\substack{0<b\le d\\ \langle b\rangle=\langle r_1/5\rangle}}(H+bz)^3 \\ \cdot\prod_{\substack{0<b\le d\\ \langle b\rangle=0}}(H+bz)\prod_{\substack{0<b\le d\\ \langle b\rangle=\langle 2r_1/5\rangle}}(H+bz)\Bigg)\Bigg) \\ +e^{tH/z}\mathbb{1}_{g_2}\Bigg(\sum_{\langle d\rangle=\langle r_2/5\rangle}\Bigg(q^d e^{dt}\Big/\prod_{\substack{0<b\le d\\ \langle b\rangle=\langle r_2/5\rangle}}(H+bz)^3 \\ \cdot\prod_{\substack{0<b\le d\\ \langle b\rangle=\langle 2r_2/5\rangle}}(H+bz)\prod_{\substack{0<b\le d\\ \langle b\rangle=0}}(H+bz)\Bigg)\Bigg)\Bigg).\end{aligned}$$

(iii) *If* $g=(0,0,r_1,r_1,r_2)$, *then let* $g_1=(-r_1,-r_1,0,0,r_2-r_1)\ (\mathrm{mod}\ 5)$ *and let* $g_2=(-r_2,-r_2,r_1-r_2,r_1-r_2,0)\ (\mathrm{mod}\ 5)$. *Then*

$$\begin{aligned}(3.3.5)\quad J_g^Y = e^{tH/z}\mathbb{1}_g\Bigg(1+\sum_{\langle d\rangle=0}\Bigg(q^d e^{dt}\Big/\prod_{\substack{0<b\le d\\ \langle b\rangle=0}}(H+bz)^2 \\ \cdot\prod_{\substack{0<b\le d\\ \langle b\rangle=\langle 3r_2/5\rangle}}(H+bz)^2\prod_{\substack{0<b\le d\\ \langle b\rangle=\langle 2r_1/5\rangle}}(H+bz)\Bigg) \\ +e^{tH/z}\mathbb{1}_{g_1}\Bigg(\sum_{\langle d\rangle=\langle r_1/5\rangle}\Bigg(q^d e^{dt}\Big/\prod_{\substack{0<b\le d\\ \langle b\rangle=\langle r_1/5\rangle}}(H+bz)^2 \\ \cdot\prod_{\substack{0<b\le d\\ \langle b\rangle=0}}(H+bz)^2\prod_{\substack{0<b\le d\\ \langle b\rangle=\langle r_2/5\rangle}}(H+bz)\Bigg) \\ +e^{tH/z}\mathbb{1}_{g_2}\Bigg(\sum_{\langle d\rangle=\langle r_2/5\rangle}\Bigg(q^d e^{dt}\Big/\prod_{\substack{0<b\le d\\ \langle b\rangle=\langle r_2/5\rangle}}(H+bz)^2 \\ \cdot\prod_{\substack{0<b\le d\\ \langle b\rangle=\langle 2r_1/5\rangle}}(H+bz)^2\prod_{\substack{0<b\le d\\ \langle b\rangle=0}}(H+bz)\Bigg)\Bigg)\Bigg).\end{aligned}$$

In case (ii), up to permutation we have that $(r_1,r_2)=(2,3)$ *or* $(1,4)$. *Due to the age requirement, in case (iii) we have that only* $(r_1,r_2)=(1,3)$ *or* $(2,1)$ *are possible.*

Lemma 3.9 *There are scalar valued functions $F_0(t), G_0(t)$ and $G_g(t)$ for each g with* $\operatorname{age}(g) = 1$, *such that*

$$i^*(I^E(\mathbf{t}, z)) = F_0(t) + \frac{G_0(t)H}{z} + \sum_{\operatorname{age}(g)=1} \frac{t^g G_g(t)\mathbb{1}_g}{z} + R,$$

where R denotes the remainder, *consisting of terms with either the degrees in t^g greater than or equal to 2 or the degree in z^{-1} greater or equal to 2. In other words, if we write $G(\mathbf{t})$ from* (3.3.1) *as*

$$G(\mathbf{t}) = \bar{G}_0(\mathbf{t})H + \sum_g \bar{G}_g(\mathbf{t})\mathbb{1}_g$$

and denote by $O(2)$ the terms with the degrees in t^g greater or equal to 2, then

$$F(\mathbf{t}) = F_0(t) + O(2), \quad \bar{G}_0(\mathbf{t}) = G_0(t) + O(2), \quad \bar{G}_g(\mathbf{t}) = t^g G_g(t) + O(2).$$

Proof The proof of this lemma follows from Corollary 3.8 together with the following observations. First, in case (ii), $i^*(\mathbb{1}_{g_1}) = i^*(\mathbb{1}_{g_2}) = 0$ due to dimensional reasons. Similarly with $i^*(\mathbb{1}_{g_2}) = 0$ in case (iii). Secondly, in case (iii) the $\mathbb{1}_{g_1}$ term has higher z^{-1} power: The modification factor contributes terms of z^{5d} plus lower-order (in z) terms. $i^* J_g^{\mathcal{Y}}$ contributes $z^{-(5d+1)}$ plus higher order (in z^{-1}) terms. The combined contribution goes to the remainder R. □

With all this preparation, it is easy to prove Theorem 3.5.

Proof of Theorem 3.5 Start by pulling back the (3.3.2) to $\mathcal{W}$. Setting all $t^g = 0$ we get (3.2.10) for the case $g = e$ if we let $H_e = F_0$:

$$I_e^A(t) = i^* I_e^E(t) = i^* I^E(\mathbf{t})|_{\mathbf{t}=tH}$$

Here by $\mathbf{t} = tH$ we mean that setting all $t^g = 0$ in (3.2.7). In the case $g \neq e$, take the partial derivative of (3.3.2) with respect to t^g and then set all $t^g = 0$. Note that from (3.2.8), we have

$$I_g^A(t) = i^* I_g^E(t) = z\frac{\partial}{\partial t^g} i^* I^E(\mathbf{t})|_{\mathbf{t}=tH}.$$

By Lemma 3.9 all the "extra terms" vanish and (3.2.10) follows for $g \neq e$ after letting $H_g(t) = G_g(t)$. The proof is now complete. □

4 Periods and Picard–Fuchs equations

The theory of variation of Hodge structures (VHS) is closely related to the *B model* of a Calabi–Yau variety X, which encodes information about the deformations of

complex structures on X. By the local Torelli theorem for Calabi–Yau manifolds, the Kodaira–Spencer spaces inject to the tangent spaces of period domains and one can investigate the deformations of X via VHS, which can be described by a system of flat connections on cohomology vector bundles.

For the benefit of the readers who come from the GWT side of mirror symmetry, we give a brief and self-contained summary of the parts of VHS theory which are related to our work: the Gauss–Manin connection and the associated notions of the period matrix and Picard–Fuchs equations. For a more detailed introduction the reader may consult Griffiths [19; 20].

4.1 Gauss–Manin connections, periods and Picard–Fuchs equations

Over a smooth family of projective varieties $\pi\colon \mathscr{X} \to S$ of relative dimension n, we can consider the higher direct image sheaf (tensored with $\mathcal{O}_S$) on S,

$$R^n\pi_*\mathbb{C} \otimes \mathcal{O}_S.$$

The fiber over a point $t \in S$ of this sheaf is $H^n(X_t)$. This sheaf is locally free and is naturally endowed with a *flat* connection ∇^{GM}, the *Gauss–Manin* connection. It can be defined in terms of the flat sections given by the lattice $R^n\pi_*\mathbb{Z}$ in $R^n\pi_*\mathbb{C} \to S$, a *local system*. The Hodge filtration can be described fiberwise by

$$(\mathcal{F}^p)_t \cong \bigoplus_{a \geq p} H^{a,n-a}(X_t).$$

We will be particularly interested in the case when the base S is one-dimensional. Suppose now S is an open curve and the family π extends to a flat family over a proper curve $\overline{S}$. The vector bundle $R^n\pi_*\mathbb{C} \otimes \mathcal{O}_S$ extends to a vector bundle $\mathcal{H} \to \overline{S}$ whose fiber over t in S consists of the middle cohomology group $H^n(X_t)$. While it is not true that ∇^{GM} extends to a connection on all of $\mathcal{H}$, the singularities which arise are at worst a regular singularities; see Deligne [13]. This means that after choosing local coordinates, the connection matrix acquires at worst logarithmic poles at points of $\overline{S} \setminus S$. Nevertheless we may still speak of flat (multivalued) sections of ∇^{GM}, controlled by the monodromy.

Let $\{\gamma_i\}$ be a basis of $H_n(X_{t_0})$. Since $\pi\colon \mathscr{X} \to S$ is smooth, it is a locally trivial fibration and n–cycles γ_i can be extended to *locally constant* cycles $\gamma_i(t)$. Let ω_t be a (local) section of $\mathcal{H}$. The functions $\int_{\gamma_i(t)} \omega_t$ are called the *periods* and by the local constancy of $\gamma_i(t)$,

$$\frac{d}{dt}\left(\int_{\gamma_i(t)} \omega_t\right) = \int_{\gamma_i(t)} \nabla_t^{\mathrm{GM}} \omega(t).$$

The periods satisfy the *Picard–Fuchs equations*, defined as follows. Taking successive derivatives of ω_t with respect to the connection gives a sequence of sections

$$\omega_t, \nabla_t^{\mathrm{GM}}\omega_t, \dots, (\nabla_t^{\mathrm{GM}})^k\omega_t, \dots.$$

Because the rank of $\mathcal{H}$ is finite, for some k there will exist a relation between these sections of the form

$$(\nabla_t^{\mathrm{GM}})^k\omega_t + \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} f_i(t)(\nabla_t^{\mathrm{GW}})^i\omega_t = 0.$$

The corresponding differential equation

$$\Big(\Big(\frac{d}{dt}\Big)^k + \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} f_i(t)\Big(\frac{d}{dt}\Big)^i\Big)\Big(\int_{\gamma_i(t)}\omega_t\Big) = 0 \tag{4.1.1}$$

is the Picard–Fuchs equation for ω_t. The situation when the dimension of S is greater than one is essentially the same, but (4.1.1) is replaced by a PDE.

Let $\{\phi_i\}_{i\in I}$ be a basis of sections of $\mathcal{H}$. Then if $\{\gamma_i\}_{i\in I}$ is a basis of locally constant n–cycles, we can write the fundamental solution matrix of the Gauss–Manin connection in coordinates as

$$S = (s_{ij}), \quad \text{with } s_{ij} = \int_{\gamma_j}\phi_i.$$

With this choice of basis, we see that the i^{th} row of S gives the periods for the section ϕ_i.

Remark 4.1 In the literature, often (but not always) the term *periods* are reserved for the case when $\phi(t)$ is a holomorphic n–form, ie a section of $\mathcal{F}^n$, and Picard–Fuchs equations are defined only for periods in this restricted sense. Here, we choose to use these terms in the more general sense described above. Note, however, by the results of Bryant and Griffiths in [4], for Calabi–Yau threefolds the general Picard–Fuchs equations can be determined from the restricted ones.

Remark 4.2 Let U denote the Kuranishi space of the Calabi–Yau n–fold X. For the purpose of this paper, we use the term (genus zero part of the) *B model of X* to denote the vector bundle $\mathcal{H}\to U$ with the natural (flat) fiberwise pairing and the Gauss–Manin connection.

4.2 Griffiths–Dwork method

Let us assume now that the family X_t is a family of hypersurfaces defined by homogeneous polynomials Q_t of degree d in $\mathbb{P}^{n+1}$. In this case the *Griffiths–Dwork method* can be employed to explicitly calculate the Picard–Fuchs equations. We summarize the relevant results of [19] here.

The method relies on Griffiths' work in [19] showing that one can calculate the period integrals on X_t in terms of *rational* forms on $\mathbb{P}^{n+1}$. *For the time being, let us fix t and suppress it in the notation.* Griffiths first shows that in fact any class Ω in $H^{n+1}(\mathbb{P}^{n+1}\setminus X)$ can be represented in cohomology by a *rational* $(n+1)$–form. In particular, let Ω_0 be the canonical $(n+1)$–form on $\mathbb{P}^{n+1}$:

$$\Omega_0 = \sum_{i=0}^{n+1} (-1)^i x_i \, dx_0 \cdots \widehat{dx}_i \cdots dx_{n+1}$$

We can represent any class Ω by a rational form with poles along X,

$$\Omega = \frac{P(x)}{Q(x)^k}\Omega_0,$$

where $P(x)$ is a homogeneous polynomial of degree $kd-(n+2)$.

The rational $n+1$ forms are then related to regular n forms on X via the residue map. More precisely, let $A_k^n(X)$ denote the space of rational $(n+1)$–forms on $\mathbb{P}^{n+1}$ with poles of order at most k on X, and let

$$\mathcal{H}_k(X) := A_k^{n+1}(X)/dA_{k-1}^n(X).$$

This gives an obvious filtration

$$\mathcal{H}_1(X) \subset \mathcal{H}_2(X) \subset \cdots \subset \mathcal{H}_{n+1}(X) =: \mathcal{H}(X).$$

This description of rational forms interacts nicely with the Hodge filtration F^p of the *primitive classes*. Griffiths proves that the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} \mathcal{H}_1(X) & \subset & \mathcal{H}_2(X) & \subset & \cdots & \subset & \mathcal{H}_{n+1}(X) \\ {\scriptstyle \mathrm{Res}}\downarrow & & {\scriptstyle \mathrm{Res}}\downarrow & & & & {\scriptstyle \mathrm{Res}}\downarrow \\ F^n & \subset & F^{n-1} & \subset & \cdots & \subset & F^0 \end{array} \tag{4.2.1}$$

is commutative and that each vertical arrow is surjective. In particular, we have that $\mathcal{H}_{k+1}(X)/\mathcal{H}_k(X) \cong F^{n-k}/F^{n-k+1}$.

Now, for each n–cycle γ in $H_n(X)$, let

$$T\colon H_n(X) \to H_{n+1}(\mathbb{P}^{n+1}\setminus X)$$

be the *tube map*, where $T(\gamma)$ is a sufficiently small S^1–bundle around γ in $\mathbb{P}^{n+1}\setminus X$. Griffiths then shows that the tube map is *surjective* in general and also *injective when n is odd*.

Theorem 4.3 *All primitive classes on X can be represented as residues of rational forms on $\mathbb{P}^{n+1}$ with poles on X. This representation is unique when n is odd.*

This follows from the surjectivity/injectivity of Res and T, as well as the residue formula

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{T(\gamma)}\Omega=\int_{\gamma}\operatorname{Res}(\Omega).$$

Next Griffiths relates the rational forms to the Jacobian ring. Let

$$J(Q)=\langle \partial Q/\partial x_0,\dots,\partial Q/\partial x_{n+1}\rangle$$

be the Jacobian ideal of Q. The key relationship between rational forms is given by the formula [19, (4.5)]

$$\frac{\Omega_0}{Q(x)^k}\sum_{j=0}^{n+1}B_j(x)\frac{\partial Q(x)}{\partial x_j}=\frac{1}{k-1}\frac{\Omega_0}{Q(x)^{k-1}}\sum_{j=0}^{n+1}\frac{\partial B_i(x)}{\partial x_j}+d\phi, \tag{4.2.2}$$

where $\phi\in A^n_{k-1}$. Thus, the order of the pole of a form $(P(x)/Q(x)^k)\Omega_0$ can be lowered if and only if $P(x)$ is contained in $J(Q)$. By identifying $\operatorname{Res}((P(x)/Q(x)^k)\Omega_0)$ with the homogeneous polynomial P, one obtains the following theorem.

Theorem 4.4 *We have*

$$\mathbb{C}[x_0,\dots,x_{n+1}]_{dk-n-1}/J(Q)\cong F^{n-k}/F^{n+1-k}\subseteq PH^{n-k,k}(X). \tag{4.2.3}$$

The above allows us to explicitly calculate the Picard–Fuchs equations for certain families of forms ω_t on X_t. As before, let X_t be a family of hypersurfaces defined by degree d homogeneous polynomials Q_t. Then we can represent a family of forms as $\omega_t=\operatorname{Res}((P_t(x)/Q_t(x)^k)\Omega_0)$. Let γ_t be a locally constant n cycle as before, then

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\int_{\gamma_t}\omega_t&=\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\int_{\gamma_t}\operatorname{Res}\Big(\frac{P_t(x)}{Q_t(x)^k}\Omega_0\Big)\\&=\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\int_{T(\gamma_t)}\frac{P_t(x)}{Q_t(x)^k}\Omega_0\\&=\int_{T(\gamma_t)}\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\Big(\frac{P_t(x)}{Q_t(x)^k}\Omega_0\Big)\\&=\int_{\gamma_t}\operatorname{Res}\Big(\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\Big(\frac{P_t(x)}{Q_t(x)^k}\Omega_0\Big)\Big).\end{aligned}$$

The third equality follows because a small change in $T(\gamma(t))$ will not change its homology class. In other words, letting ∇^{GM} denote the Gauss–Manin connection,

$$\nabla_t^{\mathrm{GM}} \operatorname{Res}\Big(\frac{P_t(x)}{Q_t(x)^k}\Omega_0\Big) = \operatorname{Res}\Big(\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\Big(\frac{P_t(x)}{Q_t(x)^k}\Omega_0\Big)\Big),$$

allows one to obtain the Picard–Fuchs equations of ω_t via explicit calculations of the polynomials (in the Jacobian rings). An explicit example is given in the next section.

5 The B model of the Fermat quintic M

We now turn to the specific case of the Fermat quintic threefold M in $\mathbb{P}^4$. It has been shown (see eg Batyrev [2]) that the Hodge diamonds of M and $\mathcal{W}$ are mirror symmetric,

$$h^{p,q}(M) = h^{3-p,q}(\mathcal{W}).$$

In particular, the deformation family of $\mathcal{W}$ is one-dimensional while for M the deformation is 101–dimensional.

Recall in our study of the A model of $\mathcal{W}$, we restrict the Dubrovin connection (ie Frobenius structure) to the "small" parameter t corresponding to the hyperplane class H. In the following discussions of the complex moduli of M, we will also study the full period matrix for the Gauss–Manin connection, but restricted to a particular deformation parameter.

Let

$$Q_\psi(x) = x_0^5 + x_1^5 + x_2^5 + x_3^5 + x_4^5 - \psi x_0 x_1 x_2 x_3 x_4, \tag{5.0.4}$$

and define the family $M_\psi = \{Q_\psi(x) = 0\} \subset \mathbb{P}^4$.

5.1 Picard–Fuchs equations for M_ψ

In the specific case of the family M_ψ, there is a "diagrammatic technique", pioneered by Candelas, de la Ossa and Rodriguez-Villegas in [6] and refined in [14], which utilizes the symmetry of Q_ψ and P to simplify the bookkeeping.

The starting point is the (4.2.2). Consider the rational form

$$\omega_\psi = \frac{P(x)}{Q_\psi(x)^k}\Omega_0, \quad P(x) = x_0^{r_0}\cdots x_4^{r_4}, \quad \text{with } \sum_{i=0}^{4} r_i = 5(k-1).$$

Fix i between 0 and 4 and set $B_j = \delta_{ij} x_i P(x)$ for $0 \le j \le 4$. Noting that

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} Q_\psi(x) = 5x_j^4 - \psi x_0 \cdots \widehat{x}_j \cdots x_4,$$

and applying (4.2.2) with these choices of B_j (and k replaced by $k+1$), we arrive at

$$5\int_{T(\gamma)}\frac{(x_i^5)P}{Q_\psi^{k+1}}\Omega_0-\psi\int_{T(\gamma)}\frac{(x_0\cdots x_4)P}{Q_\psi^{k+1}}\Omega_0=\frac{1+r_i}{k}\int_{T(\gamma)}\frac{P}{Q_\psi^k}\Omega_0 \tag{5.1.1}$$

for any choice of cycle $\gamma\in H_n(X)$. Note, however, that there is a degenerate case in the above setting: In the case when $P(x)$ is independent of x_i, let $B_j=\delta_{ij}P(x)$. Then in (4.2.2) we get

$$5\int_{T(\gamma)}\frac{(x_i^4)P}{Q_\psi^{k+1}}\Omega_0-\psi\int_{T(\gamma)}\frac{(x_0\cdots\hat{x}_i\cdots x_4)P}{Q_\psi^{k+1}}\Omega_0=0. \tag{5.1.2}$$

We can interpret this equation as allowing $r_i=-1$ *in* (5.1.1).

Furthermore, $\partial/\partial\psi(Q_\psi)=-x_0\cdots x_4$ and so we have the relationship

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial\psi}\int_{T(\gamma)}\frac{P}{Q_\psi^k}\Omega_0=k\int_{T(\gamma)}\frac{(x_0\cdots x_4)P}{Q_\psi^{k+1}}\Omega_0. \tag{5.1.3}$$

The authors in [6; 14] apply (5.1.1), (5.1.2) and (5.1.3) recursively to get relations of the periods, hence the Picard–Fuchs equations. For convenience of bookkeeping, one can keep track of the polynomial $P(x)$ by its exponents $(r_0,\dots,r_4)$. (5.1.1) can be understood symbolically as a relation between $(r_0,\dots,r_4)$, $(r_0,\dots,r_i+5,\dots,r_4)$ and $(r_0+1,\dots,r_4+1)$.

Consider for example the case $P=1$ corresponding to $(0,\dots,0)$. Applying (5.1.3) four times, one may write the fourth derivative of $(0,\dots,0)$ as a multiple of $(4,\dots,4)$. This may then be related to $(5,5,5,5,0)$ by (5.1.2). Applying (5.1.1) to relate $(r_0,\dots,r_4)$ to a linear combination of $(r_0,\dots,r_i-5,\dots,r_4)$ and $(r_0+1,\dots,r_i-4,\dots,r_4+1)$ repeatedly, one can reduce to terms with $r_i\le 4$ for all i. In fact, eventually all terms will be of the form $\{(r,r,\dots,r)\}$ for $r=0,\dots,4$. This can be seen by noting that *none of* (5.1.1)*,* (5.1.1) *or* (5.1.3) *changes* $r_i-r_j \pmod 5$. Hence, we have found a relation between the fourth derivative of $(0,\dots,0)$ and $\{(r,\dots,r)\}$ for $r=0,\dots,4$. By (5.1.3), the various $(r,\dots,r)$ are r^{th} derivatives of $(0,\dots,0)$, and we obtain a fourth-order ODE in ψ for the period corresponding to $P=1$; see Table 1 below for the equation. Other cases can be computed similarly. These arguments can be illuminated by diagrams in [6; 14], hence the name *diagrammatic technique*.

Now we apply this method to calculate the Picard–Fuchs equations for the period integrals we are interested in. For every $g=(r_0,\dots,r_4)\in G$ (defined in Section 2.1), define

$$P_(x)=x_0^{r_0}\cdots x_4^{r_4}\quad\text{and}\quad k=\left(\sum_{i=0}^4\frac{r_i}{5}\right)+1=\operatorname{age}(g)+1.$$

We will consider specific families of the form

$$\omega_g(\psi) := \operatorname{Res}\left(\frac{\psi P_g(x)}{Q_\psi(x)^k}\Omega_0\right). \tag{5.1.4}$$

For our purposes, *it will be sufficient to consider families ω_g such that P_g satisfies* $\operatorname{age}(g) \le 1$ *(ie $\sum_{i=0}^4 r_i \le 5$) and at least two of the r_i equal* 0. We observe that other ω_g can be obtained from differentiations (5.1.3) or relations (5.1.1) and (5.1.2) from the listed ω_g. For example, $(1,1,1,1,1)$ is the derivative of $(0,0,0,0,0)$; $(1,1,1,2,0)$ is related to $(0,0,0,1,4)$ via

$$0 \equiv x_3\partial_{x_4}Q_\psi = x_3(x_4)^4 - \psi x_0x_1x_2(x_3)^2.$$

We remark that these conditions on g match the conditions on A model computation in Section 3 perfectly. In Claim 6.7 it is shown that the derivatives of these families generate all of $\mathcal{H}$.

Table 1 below gives the Picard–Fuchs equation satisfied by each of the above-mentioned forms. We label the forms by the corresponding 5–tuple $g = (r_0, \dots, r_4)$. Note that permuting the r_i does not effect the differential equation, so we do not distinguish between permutations. Here

$$t = -5\log(\psi).$$

type	Picard–Fuchs equation
(0,0,0,0,0)	$\left(\frac{d}{dt}\right)^4 - 5^5e^t\left(\frac{d}{dt}+\frac{1}{5}\right)\left(\frac{d}{dt}+\frac{2}{5}\right)\left(\frac{d}{dt}+\frac{3}{5}\right)\left(\frac{d}{dt}+\frac{4}{5}\right)$
(0,0,0,1,4)	$\left(\frac{d}{dt}\right)^2 - 5^5e^t\left(\frac{d}{dt}+2/5\right)\left(\frac{d}{dt}+\frac{3}{5}\right)$
(0,0,0,2,3)	$\left(\frac{d}{dt}\right)^2 - 5^5e^t\left(\frac{d}{dt}+\frac{1}{5}\right)\left(\frac{d}{dt}+\frac{4}{5}\right)$
(0,0,1,1,3)	$\left(\frac{d}{dt}\right)\left(\frac{d}{dt}-\frac{1}{5}\right) - 5^5e^t\left(\frac{d}{dt}+\frac{1}{5}\right)\left(\frac{d}{dt}+\frac{3}{5}\right)$
(0,0,2,2,1)	$\left(\frac{d}{dt}\right)\left(\frac{d}{dt}-\frac{2}{5}\right) - 5^5e^t\left(\frac{d}{dt}+\frac{1}{5}\right)\left(\frac{d}{dt}+\frac{2}{5}\right)$

Table 1: The Picard–Fuchs equations for forms ω_g

The same computation was done in [6; 14]. We note however that *there are several differences* between the period integrals we consider, and those of [14]. First, our family M_ψ differs from that in [14] by a factor of 5 in the first term. Second, the forms we consider (5.1.4) differ slightly from those considered in [14] by an extra factor of ψ in the numerator (see Remark 5.1). Finally, our final equations use different coordinates than in [14]. However the same methods used in their paper can easily be modified to obtain the formulas we present here.

Remark 5.1 The factor of ψ in the numerator of (5.1.4) might appear unnatural at the first glance, but it can be considered as a way to change the form of the Picard–Fuchs equation, as

$$\tfrac{d}{dt}e^{-t/5}f(t) = e^{-t/5}(-\tfrac{1}{5} + \tfrac{d}{dt})f(t).$$

In the comparison of the A model and B model this modification will simplify the I functions from both sides. It is also used in the Mirror theorem for the Fermat quintic.

5.2 The B model I–functions

We can solve the above Picard–Fuchs equations with hypergeometric series. As in Section 2, we will organize these solutions in the form of an I–function. For each of the above forms ω_g, I_g^B will be a function taking values in $H^*_{\mathrm{CR}}(\mathcal{W}) \cong H^*(I\mathcal{W})$, whose components give solutions to the corresponding Picard–Fuchs equation.

Proposition 5.2 *For the g listed in Table 1, the components of $I_g^B(t,1)$ give a basis of solutions to the Picard–Fuchs equations for ω_g, where $I_g^B(t,z)$ is given below.*

(i) *If $g = e = (0,0,0,0,0)$,*

$$I_e^B(t,z) = e^{tH/z}\Bigg(1 + \sum_{\langle d\rangle = 0} e^{dt}\frac{\prod_{1\le m\le 5d}(5H+mz)}{\prod_{\substack{0<b\le d\\ \langle b\rangle = 0}}(H+bz)^5}\Bigg). \tag{5.2.1}$$

(ii) *If $g = (0,0,0,r_1,r_2)$,*

$$I_g^B(t,z) = e^{tH/z}\mathbb{1}_g\Bigg(1 + \sum_{\langle d\rangle = 0} e^{dt} \cdot \frac{\prod_{1\le m\le 5d}(5H+mz)}{\prod_{\substack{0<b\le d\\ \langle b\rangle = 0}}(H+bz)^3 \prod_{\substack{0<b\le d\\ \langle b\rangle = \langle r_2/5\rangle}}(H+bz)\prod_{\substack{0<b\le d\\ \langle b\rangle = \langle r_1/5\rangle}}(H+bz)}\Bigg). \tag{5.2.2}$$

(iii) *If $g = (0,0,r_1,r_1,r_2)$, let $g_1 = (-r_1,-r_1,0,0,r_2-r_1) \pmod 5$. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} I_g^B(t,z) &= e^{tH/z}\mathbb{1}_g\Bigg(1 + \sum_{\langle d\rangle = 0} e^{dt}\Big(\prod_{1\le m\le 5d}(5H+mz) \Big/ \prod_{\substack{0<b\le d\\ \langle b\rangle = 0}}(H+bz)^2 \\ &\qquad \cdot \prod_{\substack{0<b\le d\\ \langle b\rangle = \langle 3r_2/5\rangle}}(H+bz)^2 \prod_{\substack{0<b\le d\\ \langle b\rangle = \langle 2r_1/5\rangle}}(H+bz)\Big)\Bigg) \\ &\quad + e^{tH/z}\mathbb{1}_{g_1}\Bigg(\sum_{\langle d\rangle = \langle r_1/5\rangle} e^{dt}\Big(\prod_{1\le m\le 5d}(5H+mz) \Big/ \prod_{\substack{0<b\le d\\ \langle b\rangle = \langle r_1/5\rangle}}(H+bz)^2 \\ &\qquad \cdot \prod_{\substack{0<b\le d\\ \langle b\rangle = 0}}(H+bz)^2 \prod_{\substack{0<b\le d\\ \langle b\rangle = \langle r_2/5\rangle}}(H+bz)\Big)\Bigg). \end{aligned} \tag{5.2.3}$$

Remark 5.3 Note that the functions $I_g^B(t,z)$ in equations (5.2.1), (5.2.2) and (5.2.3), are supported on spaces of dimension 3, 1 and 0 respectively (in particular, $H \equiv 0$ in (5.2.3)). So for each g, the number of components of $I_g^B(t,z)$ equals the order of the corresponding Picard–Fuchs equation as desired.

6 Mirror theorem for the mirror quintic: $A(\mathcal{W}) \equiv B(M)$

In this section, we will show the "mirror dual" version of (the mathematical version of) the *mirror conjecture* by Candelas, de la Ossa, Greene and Parkes [5]. More specifically, we will show that the A model of $\mathcal{W}$ is equivalent to the B model of M, up to a mirror map.

We start in Section 6.1 by stating a "classical" mirror theorem relating the GWT of $\mathcal{W}$ with the periods of M_ψ on the level of generating functions. This is exactly analogous to Givental's original formulation in [15]. In Section 6.2 we give a brief explanation of how Givental's original statement of the mirror theorem implies a full correspondence between the A model of M and the B model of $\mathcal{W}$ (at tree level). Finally in Section 6.3 we use similar methods as in Section 6.2 to prove a mirror theorem equating the A model of $\mathcal{W}$ to the B model of M.

6.1 A correspondence of generating functions

We will first show that the I–functions I_g^A of the A model of $\mathcal{W}$ (Definition 3.4) are identical to the I–functions I_g^B of the B model of M_ψ defined in Section 5.2.

Remark 6.1 Note that in the formula I_g^A, the Novikov variable q always appears next to e^t. There is therefore no harm in setting $q = 1$. We apply this specialization in what follows.

Proposition 6.2 *Suppose $g = (r_0, \dots, r_4) \in G$ satisfies the conditions* $\operatorname{age}(g) \leq 1$ *and that at least two of r_i's are equal to zero. We have an A–interpretation of g as parameterizing a component of $\mathcal{W}_g$ in $I\mathcal{W}$. We have also a B–interpretation of g in ω_g* (5.1.4) *where P_g denote the polynomial $x_0^{r_0} \cdots x_4^{r_4}$. Then*

$$I_g^A(t,z) = I_g^B(t,z).$$

Proof This follows from a direct comparison of formulas (3.3.3), (3.3.4) and (3.3.5) from Corollary 3.8 with formulas (5.2.1), (5.2.2) and (5.2.3) respectively. □

Combining Proposition 6.2 with Theorem 3.5, we conclude that some periods from VHS of M correspond to the Gromov–Witten invariants of $\mathcal{W}$.

Corollary 6.3 *For each $g = (r_0, \dots, r_4) \in G$ such that $\operatorname{age}(g) \leq 1$ and $\mathcal{W}_g$ is nonempty (ie at least two r_i vanish), we have*

$$J_g^{\mathcal{W}}(\tau(t), z) = \frac{I_g^B(t, z)}{H_g(t)}, \quad \text{where } \tau(t) = \frac{G_0(t)}{F_0(t)}.$$

In other words, under the mirror map

$$t \mapsto \tau = \frac{G_0(t)}{F_0(t)},$$

the periods of $\omega_g / H_g(t)$ are equal to the coefficients of $J_g^{\mathcal{W}}(\tau, 1)$.

This theorem should be viewed as an analogue of Givental's original mirror Theorem 6.4 stated below.

6.2 Mirror theorem for the Fermat quintic revisited

To obtain some insight into the full correspondence, we return to the "classical" mirror theorem for the Fermat quintic threefold. While this is not strictly necessary for the logical flow of the proof, we feel that it illuminates our approach in a simpler setting. We also strive to clarify certain points which are not entirely clear in the literature.

Let $J^M(t, z)$ denote the small J–function for M where t is the coordinate of $H^2(M)$ dual to the hyperplane class H. Let $\mathcal{W}_\psi$ denote the one-dimensional deformation family defined by the vanishing of Q_ψ (see (5.0.4)) in $\mathcal{Y}$:

$$\mathcal{W}_\psi := \{Q_\psi(x) = 0\} \subset \mathcal{Y} \tag{6.2.1}$$

Let

$$\omega = \operatorname{Res}\left(\frac{\psi \Omega_0}{Q_\psi(x)}\right).$$

As in Section 5 there exists an $H^*(M)$–valued I–function, $I^B_{\mathcal{W}_\psi}(t, z)$, such that the components of $I^B_{\mathcal{W}_\psi}(t, 1)$ give a basis of solutions for the Picard–Fuchs equations for ω_ψ, where $t = -5 \log \psi$.

Theorem 6.4 (Mirror theorem [15; 22; 3]) *There exist explicitly determined functions $F(t)$ and $G(t)$, such that F is invertible, and*

$$J^M(\tau(t), z) = \frac{I^B_{\mathcal{W}_\psi}(t, z)}{F(t)}, \quad \text{where } \tau(t) = \frac{G(t)}{F(t)}.$$

We will show how Theorem 6.4 implies a correspondence between the fundamental solution matrix of the Dubrovin connection for M and that of the Gauss–Manin connection for $\mathcal{W}_\psi$. In order to emphasize the symmetry between the A model and B model, we will denote the respective pairings as $(-,-)^A$ and $(-,-)^B$.

Let

$$s = \psi^{-5},$$

and consider the flat family $\mathcal{W}_s$ over $S = \operatorname{Spec}(\mathbb{C}[s])$. Then if we let $t = \log(s)$, $I^B_{\mathcal{W}_s} = I^B_{\mathcal{W}_\psi}$. In the Calabi–Yau case, the H expansion of I^B always occurs in the form of a function of H/z, in particular $I^B_{\mathcal{W}_s}$ is homogeneous of degree zero if one sets $\deg(z) = 2$. The same is true of J^M. Thus, one may set $z = 1$ without loss of information. $I^B_{\mathcal{W}_s}(t,1)$ gives a basis of solutions for the Picard–Fuchs equations of ω. In other words after an appropriate choice of basis $\{s^B_0(t), \dots, s^B_3(t)\}$ of solutions of ∇^{GM},

$$(s^B_i(t), \omega)^B = I^B_i(t,1),$$

where $I^B_i(t,z)$ is the H^i coefficient of $I^B_{\mathcal{W}_s}(t,z)$.

By the same argument, if we choose an appropriate basis $\{s^A_0(\tau), \dots, s^A_3(\tau)\}$ of solutions for ∇^z, Section 1 shows that the coefficients $J^M_i(\tau,1)$ of the function $J^M(\tau,1)$ give us the functions

$$(s^A_i(\tau), 1)^A = J^M_i(\tau,1).$$

Thus we can interpret Theorem 6.4 as saying that after choosing correct bases of flat sections and applying the mirror map

$$t \mapsto \tau = \frac{G(t)}{F(t)},$$

we have the equality

$$(s^B_i(t), \omega/F(t))^B = \frac{I_i(t,1)}{F(t)} = J_i(\tau,1) = (s^A_i(\tau), 1)^A.$$

To show the full correspondence between the solution matrix for the Dubrovin connection for M and the solution matrix of the Gauss–Manin connection on S, we must find a basis $\phi_0, \dots, \phi_3$ of sections of $\mathcal{H}$ and a basis $T_0, \dots, T_3$ of sections of $H^{\mathrm{even}}(M)$ such that for all i and j,

$$(s^B_i, \phi_j)^B = (s^A_i, T_j)^A. \tag{6.2.2}$$

As one might expect, we set $\phi_0 = \omega/F(t)$ and $T_0 = 1$.

Claim 6.5 *We have that*

$$\phi_j = (\nabla_t^{\mathrm{GM}})^j \phi_0, \quad 0 \le j \le 3,$$

gives a basis of sections for $\mathcal{H}$.

Proof This follows from standard Hodge theory for Calabi–Yau threefolds, but in this case can be explicitly calculated as

$$\begin{aligned}(6.2.3)\qquad \nabla_t^{\mathrm{GM}}\phi_0 &= \frac{d}{dt}\Big(\frac{1}{F(t)}\Big)\omega + \frac{1}{F(t)}\nabla_t^{\mathrm{GM}}\omega \\ &= -\frac{F'(t)}{F(t)}\phi_0 + \frac{1}{F(t)}\operatorname{Res}\left(\frac{d}{dt}\frac{\psi\Omega_0}{Q_\psi}\right) \\ &= -\frac{F'(t)}{F(t)}\phi_0 + \frac{1}{F(t)}\operatorname{Res}\left(s\frac{d}{ds}\frac{\psi\Omega_0}{Q_\psi}\right) \\ &= -\frac{F'(t)}{F(t)}\phi_0 + \frac{1}{F(t)}\operatorname{Res}\left(\frac{-\psi}{5}\frac{d}{d\psi}\frac{\psi\Omega_0}{Q_\psi}\right) \\ &= -\frac{F'(t)}{F(t)}\phi_0 + \frac{-\psi}{5F(t)}\operatorname{Res}\left(\frac{\Omega_0}{Q_\psi} + \frac{x_0\cdots x_4}{Q_\psi^2}\Omega_0\right).\end{aligned}$$

Because of the last term in the above sum, the image of $(\nabla_t^{\mathrm{GM}})\phi_0$ in $\mathcal{F}^2/\mathcal{F}^3$ is nonzero by (4.2.3). Similarly, the image of $(\nabla_t^{\mathrm{GM}})^j\phi_0$ in $\mathcal{F}^{3-j}/\mathcal{F}^{3+1-j}$ for $1 \le j \le 3$ is nonzero, thus the sections $\phi_0, \dots, \phi_3$ must be linearly independent. □

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}(6.2.4)\qquad (s_i^B, \phi_1)^B = (s_i^B, \nabla_t^{\mathrm{GM}}\phi_0)^B = \tfrac{\partial}{\partial t}(s_i^B, \phi_0)^B &= \tfrac{\partial}{\partial t}(s_i^A, T_0)^A \\ &= (\tfrac{\partial\tau}{\partial t})\tfrac{\partial}{\partial\tau}(s_i^A, T_0)^A \\ &= (s_i^A, (\tfrac{\partial\tau}{\partial t})\nabla_\tau^z T_0)^A.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, if we set

$$T_1 = \tfrac{\partial(G/F)}{\partial t}\nabla_\tau^z T_0$$

we have the relationship

$$(s_i^B, \phi_1)^B = (s_i^A, T_1)^A.$$

If we similarly set

$$T_k = \tfrac{\partial(G/F)}{\partial t}\nabla_\tau^z T_{k-1},$$

(6.2.2) follows.

This shows that after identifying the section ϕ_i with T_i, the mirror map lifts to an isomorphism of vector bundles and the connection is preserved. Indeed, the fundamental solution of the Gauss–Manin connection is a 4 by 4 matrix, where 4 is the rank of $H^3(\mathcal{W})$. On the other hand, the fundamental solution of the Dubrovin connection is also a 4 by 4 matrix, where 4 is the rank of $H^{\text{even}}(M)$. We recall that the J–function can be thought of as the first row vectors of the fundamental solution matrix, as discussed in Section 1. The above discussion shows that we can extend the correspondence between the first row of the fundamental solution to the full fundamental solution.

We summarize the above in the following theorem.

Theorem 6.6 *The fundamental solutions of the Gauss–Manin connection for $\mathcal{W}_s$ are equivalent, up to a mirror map, to the fundamental solutions of the Dubrovin connection for M, when restricted to $H^2(M)$.*

6.3 Mirror theorem for the mirror quintic

In this subsection, we will extend the partial correspondence in Section 6.1 between the periods of M_ψ and the A model of $\mathcal{W}$ to the full (tree level) correspondence, generalizing the ideas in Section 6.2.

Similar to the above, consider the flat family M_s over $S = \operatorname{Spec}(\mathbb{C}[s])$ defined by (5.0.4), where $s = e^t = \psi^{-5}$. Corollary 6.3 states that some periods of M_s correspond to Gromov–Witten invariants on $\mathcal{W}$. We would like to extend this result to all periods.

First, we must choose a basis of sections of $\mathcal{H} \to S$. Let ω_e denote the holomorphic family of (3,0)-forms corresponding to $g = e = (0, \dots, 0)$ in (5.1.4). It is no longer true that derivatives of $\omega_e / F_0(t)$ with respect to the Gauss–Manin connection generate a basis of sections of $\mathcal{H}$, thus it becomes necessary to consider the other forms ω_g satisfying the conditions formulated in Corollary 6.3. Namely, let $\phi_e = \omega / F_0(t)$ and let $\phi_g = \omega_g / H_g(t)$ where g satisfies $\operatorname{age}(g) = 1$. Consider the set of sections

$$\{\phi_0, \nabla_t^{\mathrm{GM}}\phi_0, (\nabla_t^{\mathrm{GM}})^2\phi_0, (\nabla_t^{\mathrm{GM}})^3\phi_0\} \cup \{\phi_g, \nabla_t^{\mathrm{GM}}\phi_g\}.$$

Claim 6.7 *These forms comprise a basis of the Hodge bundle $\mathcal{H}$.*

Proof The proof is similar to that of Claim 6.5. We note that in the last four rows in Table 1, corresponding to age one type, the dimensions are $20, 20, 30$ and 30. Thus $|\{\phi_g\}| = 100$, and there are exactly 204 forms in the above set. One can check via (4.2.3) and another argument like in (6.2.3) that these sections are in fact linearly independent. □

Then, as in (6.2.4), we have that the periods of $(\nabla_t^{\mathrm{GM}})^k\phi_0$ correspond to the derivatives $(d/dt)^k J_e^{\mathcal{W}}(\tau,1)$, and the periods of $\nabla_t^{\mathrm{GM}}\phi_g$ correspond to $(d/dt)J_g^{\mathcal{W}}(\tau,1)$.

Let $T_0=1$ and $T_k=(\partial(G_0/F_0)/\partial t)\nabla_\tau^z T_{k-1}$ for $0\le k\le 3$. Let $T_g=\mathbb{1}_g$ and $T_g'=(\partial(G_0/F_0)/\partial t)\nabla_\tau^z\mathbb{1}_g$. Then if we choose the correct basis of flat sections $\{s_i^B\}$ and $\{s_i^A\}$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}(s_i^B,(\nabla_t^{\mathrm{GM}})^k\phi_0)^B&=(s_i^A,T_k)^A,\\ (s_i^B,\phi_g)^B&=(s_i^A,T_g)^A,\\ (s_i^B,\nabla_t^{\mathrm{GM}}\phi_g)^B&=(s_i^A,T_g')^A.\end{aligned}$$

This implies that the set

$$\{T_0,T_1,T_2,T_3\}\cup\{T_g,T_g'\}$$

is a basis of $TH_{\mathrm{CR}}^{\mathrm{even}}(\mathcal{W})$, and that with these choices of bases the solution matrices for the two respective connections are identical after the mirror transformation. Thus we obtain the full correspondence.

In terms of the language of Theorem 6.6, we can formulate our final result in the following form. On the side of the A model of $\mathcal{W}$, let t be the dual coordinate of H; on the side of B model of M_s, let $t=\log(s)$. Then we have the following.

Theorem 6.8 *The fundamental solutions of the Gauss–Manin connection ∇_t^{GM} for M_s are equivalent, up to a mirror map, to the fundamental solutions of the Dubrovin connection ∇_t^z for $\mathcal{W}$ restricted to $tH\in H^2(\mathcal{W})$.*

Remark 6.9 Even though the base direction is constrained to one dimension instead of the full 101–dimension deformation space, our fundamental solutions are full 204 by 204 matrices, as both ranks of $H^3(M)$ and $H^{\mathrm{even}}(\mathcal{W})$ are 204.

References

[1] **D Abramovich**, **T Graber**, **A Vistoli**, *Gromov–Witten theory of Deligne–Mumford stacks*, Amer. J. Math. 130 (2008) 1337–1398 MRMR2450211

[2] **V V Batyrev**, *Dual polyhedra and mirror symmetry for Calabi–Yau hypersurfaces in toric varieties*, J. Algebraic Geom. 3 (1994) 493–535 MR1269718

[3] **A Bertram**, *Another way to enumerate rational curves with torus actions*, Invent. Math. 142 (2000) 487–512 MR1804158

[4] **R L Bryant**, **P A Griffiths**, *Some observations on the infinitesimal period relations for regular threefolds with trivial canonical bundle*, from "Arithmetic and geometry, Vol. II" (M Artin, J Tate, editors), Progr. Math. 36, Birkhäuser, Boston (1983) 77–102 MR717607

[5] **P Candelas**, **X C de la Ossa**, **P S Green**, **L Parkes**, *A pair of Calabi–Yau manifolds as an exactly soluble superconformal theory*, Nuclear Phys. B 359 (1991) 21–74 MR1115626

[6] **P Candelas**, **X de la Ossa**, **F Rodriguez-Villegas**, *Calabi–Yau manifolds over finite fields, I* arXiv:hep-th/0012233

[7] **W Chen**, **Y Ruan**, *Orbifold Gromov–Witten theory*, from "Orbifolds in mathematics and physics" (A Adem, J Morava, Y Ruan, editors), Contemp. Math. 310, Amer. Math. Soc. (2002) 25–85 MR1950941

[8] **W Chen**, **Y Ruan**, *A new cohomology theory of orbifold*, Comm. Math. Phys. 248 (2004) 1–31 MR2104605

[9] **T Coates**, **A Corti**, **H Iritani**, **H-H Tseng**, *Computing genus-zero twisted Gromov–Witten invariants*, Duke Math. J. 147 (2009) 377–438 MR2510741

[10] **T Coates**, **Y-P Lee**, **A Corti**, **H-H Tseng**, *The quantum orbifold cohomology of weighted projective spaces*, Acta Math. 202 (2009) 139–193 MR2506749

[11] **D A Cox**, **S Katz**, *Mirror symmetry and algebraic geometry*, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs 68, Amer. Math. Soc. (1999) MR1677117

[12] **D A Cox**, **S Katz**, **Y-P Lee**, *Virtual fundamental classes of zero loci*, from "Advances in algebraic geometry motivated by physics" (E Previato, editor), Contemp. Math. 276, Amer. Math. Soc. (2001) 157–166 MR1837116

[13] **P Deligne**, *Équations différentielles à points singuliers réguliers*, Lecture Notes in Math. 163, Springer (1970) MR0417174

[14] **C Doran**, **B Greene**, **S Judes**, *Families of quintic Calabi–Yau* 3*–folds with discrete symmetries*, Comm. Math. Phys. 280 (2008) 675–725 MR2399610

[15] **A B Givental**, *Equivariant Gromov–Witten invariants*, Internat. Math. Res. Notices (1996) 613–663 MR1408320

[16] **A B Givental**, *A mirror theorem for toric complete intersections*, from "Topological field theory, primitive forms and related topics" (M Kashiwara, A Matsuo, K Saito, I Satake, editors), Progr. Math. 160, Birkhäuser (1998) 141–175 MR1653024

[17] **T Graber**, **R Pandharipande**, *Localization of virtual classes*, Invent. Math. 135 (1999) 487–518 MR1666787

[18] **B R Greene**, **M R Plesser**, *Duality in Calabi–Yau moduli space*, Nuclear Phys. B 338 (1990) 15–37 MR1059831

[19] **P A Griffiths**, *On the periods of certain rational integrals, I, II*, Ann. of Math. 90 (1969) 496–541 MR0260733

[20] **P A Griffiths** (editor), *Topics in transcendental algebraic geometry*, Annals of Mathematics Studies 106, Princeton Univ. Press (1984) MR756842

[21] **H Iritani**, *Quantum cohomology and periods*, Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) 61 (2011) 2909–2958 MR3112512

[22] **B H Lian**, **K Liu**, **S-T Yau**, *Mirror principle, I*, Asian J. Math. 1 (1997) 729–763 MR1621573

[23] **C-C M Liu**, *Localization in Gromov–Witten theory and orbifold Gromov–Witten theory*, from "Handbook of Moduli, Vol. II", Adv. Lect. Math. 25, Int. Press (2013) 353–425

[24] **H-H Tseng**, *Orbifold quantum Riemann–Roch, Lefschetz and Serre*, Geom. Topol. 14 (2010) 1–81 MR2578300

[25] **E Witten**, *Mirror manifolds and topological field theory*, from "Essays on mirror manifolds" (S-T Yau, editor), Int. Press (1992) 120–158 MR1191422

Department of Mathematics, University of Utah
155 S 1400 E Room 233, Salt Lake City, UT 84112-0090, USA

yplee@math.utah.edu, markshoe@math.utah.edu

http://www.math.utah.edu/~yplee/, http://www.math.utah.edu/~markshoe/

Proposed: Jim Bryan Received: 5 November 2013
Seconded: Richard Thomas, Yasha Eliashberg Accepted: 17 January 2014