

QUINTIC PERIODS AND STABILITY CONDITIONS VIA HOMOLOGICAL MIRROR SYMMETRY

SO OKADA

ABSTRACT. For the Fermat Calabi-Yau threefold and the theory of stability conditions [Bri07], there have been two mathematical aims given by physical reasoning. One is that we should define stability conditions by central charges of quintic periods [Hos04, Kon12, KonSoi13], which extend the Gamma class [KKP, Iri09, Iri11]. The other is that for well-motivated stability conditions on a derived Fukaya-type category, each stable object should be a Lagrangian [ThoYau].

We answer affirmatively to these aims with the simplest homological mirror symmetry (HMS for short) of the Fermat Calabi-Yau threefold [Oka09, FutUed] and stability conditions of Bridgeland type, which we introduce. With HMS, we naturally obtain stability conditions of Bridgeland type by the monodromy around the Gepner point.

As consequences, we obtain bases of quintic periods and the mirror map [CdGP] categorically, wall-crossings by quintic periods, and a quasimodular form [KanZag] attached to quintic periods by motivic Donaldson-Thomas invariants [KonSoi08]. The quasimodular form is of the quantum dilogarithm and of a mock modular form [Zag06].

1. INTRODUCTION

In this article, the Fermat Calabi-Yau threefold defined by $0 = x_1^5 + x_2^5 + \cdots + x_5^5$ in \mathbb{P}^4 over the complex number \mathbb{C} is said to be the quintic and denoted by X . The quintic is the central manifold in the seminal paper of the mirror symmetry [CdGP]. Let $G \cong \mathbb{Z}_5^5 / \mathbb{Z}_5$ act on coordinates of \mathbb{P}^4 as multiplications by $\xi = \exp(\frac{2\pi i}{5})$.

For the following *Picard-Fuchs equation*:

$$\left(x \frac{d}{dx}\right)^4 - 5^5 x \left(x \frac{d}{dx} + \frac{4}{5}\right) \left(x \frac{d}{dx} + \frac{3}{5}\right) \left(x \frac{d}{dx} + \frac{2}{5}\right) \left(x \frac{d}{dx} + \frac{1}{5}\right) = 0,$$

we work on its solutions, which we call *quintic periods* and are not of the quintic but of its mirror family as periods of holomorphic 3-forms. We look at regular singular points of the Picard-Fuchs equation called the large complex structure limit and the Gepner point (the orbifold point) corresponding to $x = 0$ and $x = \infty$.

In the following, we explain that with an application in the theory of modular forms and periods, HMS gives certain categorification of quintic periods by stable Lagrangians and wall-crossings of stability conditions of Bridgeland type.

For periods of Picard-Fuchs equations and an introduction to the mirror symmetry, the reader can consult [Mor] (cf. [KonZag, Section 2]).

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. Primary 53D37, 14L24, 32G20, 11F11.

Key words and phrases. Mirror symmetry, periods, stability conditions, modular forms.

This project was in part supported by JSPS Grant-in-Aid #23740012.

1.1. Backgrounds. HMS was introduced by Kontsevich [Kon95] to give a categorical understanding of the mirror symmetry. HMS asserts derived equivalences of Fukaya-type categories and categories of coherent sheaves for two models in topological string theory [Wit]. HMS is an expanding subject [BDFKK] and is considered as a natural framework to work on for *all types of varieties* [Orl11]. However, the original motivation on quintic periods themselves has not been fully pursued, partly because several numerical predictions of [CdGP, BCOV] have been proved [Giv, LLY, Zin] with sophisticated methods on equations.

The notion of stability conditions [Bri07] is categorical. It is based on Mumford's stabilities and Douglas' Π -stabilities in topological string theory [Dou01, Dou02]. We have expected that for a derived Fukaya-type category and well-motivated stability conditions, each object is uniquely decomposed into certain minimal Lagrangians as stable objects (cf. [DHKK, the table in p3]). This is due to an original motivation of the notion of stability conditions [ThoYau]. This can be readily achieved for certain derived Fukaya-Seidel categories [Sei00, Sei01, Sei08], say, for ADE singularities. However, we would like to use central charges of quintic periods, since this is based on the mirror symmetry.

As for the application, there have been a number of attempts to attach a quasi-modular or modular form to quintic periods [Mov], due to its intrinsic difficulty [Zag12]. We attach a quasimodular form to quintic periods by stability conditions of Bridgeland type and motivic Donaldson-Thomas invariants [KonSoi08], using the monodromy around the Gepner point. In mathematics and physics, it is natural to seek a modular property of the generating function of geometric invariants of semistable objects.

1.2. Stability conditions of Bridgeland type. We use *central charges*, which are linear functions from the Grothendieck group of a triangulated category to \mathbb{C} . In Section 3.1, we slightly relax the notion of stability conditions for central charges of quintic periods, which we recall in Equation 1.1, on the heart of bounded t -structure and introduce the notion of stability conditions of Bridgeland type.

Let us recall that a stability condition of [Bri07] refines a heart of a bounded t -structure, since, up to isomorphisms, each non-zero object of the heart is uniquely decomposed into semistable objects, indexed by real numbers called *phases*. We have Jordan-Hölder decompositions of semistable objects of a phase by stable objects of the phase, by assuming the local-finiteness in *loc cite*. The local-finiteness easily holds for stability conditions of Bridgeland type discussed in this article.

In the following, for simplicity, we call hearts of bounded t -structures as hearts and stability conditions of Bridgeland type, which also refine hearts, as stability conditions. To specify stability conditions of *loc cite*, we call them Bridgeland stability conditions.

1.3. Our claims:

- By stability conditions of central charges of quintic periods in Theorems 1.1 and 1.2, HMS gives a categorical understanding of the mirror symmetry;
- To prove Theorems 1.1 and 1.2, we simply compute quintic periods asymptotically by the monodromy around the Gepner point. This is distinct from previous proofs of numerical predictions of the mirror symmetry;

- For the original motivation of HMS, we prove any of our statements without the mirror symmetry in the sense of correspondences between Kähler and complex moduli spaces.

For the quasimodular form in Theorem 1.6, we put discussions in Sections 1.6 and 5. Before explaining other consequences of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2, let us briefly recall the mirror symmetry as follows.

In the mirror symmetry [CdGP, Giv, LLY], we work to explain algebro-geometric properties of the quintic by quintic periods. More precisely, the most well-known equation in the mirror symmetry [CdGP], which predicts to give numbers of rational curves on a family of the quintic by quintic periods near the large complex structure limit, turns out wrong even if Clemens conjecture is true as observed by Pandharipande [CoxKat]. However, by Gromov-Witten invariants (“virtual” numbers of rational curves), for which we have an axiomatic formulation [KonMan], the equation has been justified [Giv, LLY] by sophisticated methods. The famous generalization of the numerical prediction has been obtained in [BCOV, Zin].

We have that quintic periods indeed explain non-trivial algebro-geometric properties of the quintic, as we have wall-crossings of stability conditions of the quintic given by quintic periods. In Corollaries 1.3 and 1.4, an analytic continuation of quintic periods and quotients of quintic periods give *wall-crossings of second kind* [KonSoi08] as tiltings [HRS] of the heart given by the Koszul Ext algebra of algebro-geometric stable objects of the quintic.

Above corollaries can be seen as resulting from certain categorification of quintic periods. In particular, in Corollary 4.3, we have bases of quintic periods by central charges of algebro-geometric stable objects, which are isomorphic to Lagrangian vanishing cycles. Let us recall that for numerical predictions of [CdGP, BCOV, Giv, LLY, Zin], the mirror map, which is a quotient of quintic periods as in Equation 1.2, is of the utmost importance for investigating the mirror symmetry. By perturbing stability conditions of Theorem 1.1 into ones of Lemma 4.1, we obtain the mirror map in Corollary 1.5. We put Remark 4.2 on numerical predictions of *loc cite*.

1.4. The role of HMS in this article. What HMS in the simplest form gives are algebro-geometric objects or Lagrangians, by which we construct a derived equivalence via the heart of the extension-closed full subcategory of the objects. On such a heart, we prove that central charges of quintic periods near the large complex structure limit and the Gepner point give stability conditions in Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 as per the aims in the abstract.

1.5. Theorems and corollaries. Let F be the function $x_1^5 + \dots + x_5^5 : \mathbb{C}^5 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ and $\text{FS}(F)$ be the derived Fukaya-Seidel category of F defined by Lagrangian vanishing cycles in the zero locus of a morsification of F .

Let us recall the following famous hypergeometric series:

$$\omega(x, p) = \sum_{n \geq 0} \frac{\Gamma(1 + 5(n + p))}{\Gamma(1 + (n + p))^5} x^{n+p}.$$

For each object $E \in \text{D}^b(\text{Coh } X)$, the nilpotent element J of the second cohomology class of the quintic, and $[1 : x] \in \mathbb{P}^1$, central charges of quintic periods $Z_x(E)$ [Hos00, Hos04] are defined as follows:

$$(1.1) \quad Z_x(E) = \int_X \text{ch}(F) w(x, \frac{J}{2\pi i}) \text{Todd } X.$$

We obtain quintic periods as central charges of objects. For each object $E \in D_G^b(\text{Coh } X)$, we define $Z_x(E)$ with Equation 1.1 by forgetting the equivariance. As explained in [HorRom, Section 8.2.2], $\frac{\Gamma(1+5\frac{J}{2\pi i})}{\Gamma(1+\frac{J}{2\pi i})^5} \text{Todd } X$ of $w(x, \frac{J}{2\pi i}) \text{Todd } X$ is the *Gamma class* of X [KKP, Iri09, Iri11].

The following two theorems are almost identical, but we put them separately for our later discussions. By $\text{mod } A_3^{\otimes 5}$, we denote the category of representations of the quiver $A_3^{\otimes 5}$, which is recalled in Section 2. Near the large complex structure limit, we have the following theorem.

Theorem 1.1. *For $D_G^b(\text{Coh } X) \cong D^b(\text{mod } A_3^{\otimes 5}) \cong \text{FS}(F)$, the heart $\text{mod } A_3^{\otimes 5}$, and central charges Z_x of quintic periods near the large complex structure limit $x = 0$, we have stability conditions on the heart such that each stable object is isomorphic to a Lagrangian vanishing cycle and an equivariant coherent sheaf of the Beilinson basis with a shift.*

Near the Gepner point, we have the following theorem.

Theorem 1.2. *For $D_G^b(\text{Coh } X) \cong D^b(\text{mod } A_3^{\otimes 5}) \cong \text{FS}(F)$, the heart $\text{mod } A_3^{\otimes 5}$, and central charges Z_x of quintic periods near the Gepner point $x = \infty$, we have stability conditions on the heart such that each stable object is isomorphic to a Lagrangian vanishing cycle and an equivariant coherent sheaf of the Beilinson basis with a shift.*

As its explicit forms recalled in the proofs of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2, we have period vectors $\Pi_B(x)$ and $\Pi_B^\infty(x)$ consisting of quintic periods near the large complex structure limit and the Gepner point and we have the connection matrix N for the analytic continuation such that $\Pi_B(x) = N\Pi_B^\infty(x)$.

On stability conditions, we have dilation and rotation given by multiplications on central charges [Oka06a]. For example, gauge freedom [KleThe] gives multiplications on central charges. This gives wall-crossings of second kind for free.

On numerical predictions of the mirror symmetry, stability conditions of Theorem 1.1 are important. However, stability conditions in Theorem 1.2 give wall-crossings as follows.

Corollary 1.3. *Stability conditions in Theorem 1.2 deform into ones in Theorem 1.1 with wall-crossings of second kind, which are different from ones of dilation and rotation.*

Though we are taking components of period vectors simply as some complex functions as per the last claim in Section 1.3, but under the mirror symmetry, quotients $\frac{\Pi_B(x)[i]}{\Pi_B(x)[1]}$ of the components are coordinates of complexified Kähler classes of the quintic. So, the following corollary is exactly as expected by the mirror symmetry and the theory of Bridgeland stability conditions.

Corollary 1.4. *For stability conditions in Theorem 1.1, quotients $\frac{\Pi_B(x)[i]}{\Pi_B(x)[1]}$ give wall-crossings of second kind, which are different from ones of dilation and rotation.*

In Corollary 1.4, we would like to clarify how quotients of quintic periods give non-trivial properties of stability conditions, but Corollary 1.4 can be a part of Corollary 1.3, if we include local deformation.

Let us discuss the mirror map $t(x)[\text{CdGP}]$:

$$(1.2) \quad t(x) = \frac{\Pi_B(x)[2]}{\Pi_B(x)[1]}.$$

We define stability conditions, which are, by Lemma 4.1, asymptotically the same as ones in Theorem 1.1. We also call these stability conditions as stability conditions near the large complex structure limit. We have the following corollary.

Corollary 1.5. *For stability conditions near the large complex structure limit in Lemma 4.1, by dilation and rotation with the quintic period $w(x,0)$, the sum of distinct central charges of stable objects is the mirror map.*

1.6. An application in the theory of modular forms and periods. For a stability condition of $D_G^b(\text{Coh } X)$, let us define an object of $D^b(\text{Coh } X)$ to be stable if its equivariant object of $D_G^b(\text{Coh } X)$ is stable. Then, for stability conditions in Theorems 1.1 and 1.2, we obtain a stable spherical object [SeiTho] of a 3-Calabi-Yau category $D^b(\text{Coh } X)$ and motivic Donaldson-Thomas invariants of the quantum dilogarithm [FadKas, KonSoi08, Kel, Qiu].

Though generally expected, attaching a quasimodular or modular form to quintic periods has its intrinsic difficulty, since monodromy actions on quintic periods are not compatible with ones of the modular group [Zag12]. However, for motivic Donaldson-Thomas invariants, we have the motivic variable q .

For $q = e^{2\pi i\tau}$, let $G_2(\tau)$ be the second Eisenstein series defined as follows:

$$G_2(\tau) = (2\pi i)^2 \left(-\frac{1}{24} + \sum_{m,r>0} mq^{mr} \right),$$

which is a quasimodular form [KanZag] and a mock modular form [Zag06]. As an analog of [MelOka, Theorem 1.5] for Calabi-Yau surfaces such as K3 surfaces and the cotangent bundle of \mathbb{P}^1 , we have the following.

Theorem 1.6. *For each stability condition of central charges of quintic periods in Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 and Lemma 4.1, motivic Donaldson-Thomas invariants of each stable object of $D^b(\text{Coh } X)$ give the quasimodular form $G_2(\frac{\tau}{2}) - G_2(\tau)$.*

1.7. Relations to existing works. With complexified Kähler classes under the correspondences in the last claim in Section 1.3, Douglas [Dou02, Section 4] argued that approximations of central charges of periods near the large complex structure limit are given by Mukai vectors (cf. [HonOku, Appendix E]), by which Bridgeland found the profound application [Bri08] for K3 surfaces. Along this line but without $\sqrt{\text{Todd } X}$ as explained in [BMT, Section 1.4], constructing Bridgeland stability conditions for the quintic has been a significant conjecture [BMT, BBMT].

For non-projective cases, central charges of the Gel'fand-Kapranov-Zelevinski system (GKZ for short) system of the A_1 singularity [Hos04] and Bridgeland stability conditions for the cotangent bundle of \mathbb{P}^1 [Tho, Bri05, Oka06b] have already been discussed in [Tho]. We have its HMS [IUU]. For the cotangent bundle and a closely related case, in Section 6, we confirm analogs of our statements for the quintic. For the local \mathbb{P}^2 [BayMac, CCG], though its HMS is still a conjecture, similar statements are expected to hold by Lagrangians.

For the quintic, there are other HMS with Novikov rings [NohUed, She]. We have deformations of stability conditions whose parameter is of the Novikov rings and is of solutions of the Picard-Fuchs equation.

Though we mainly focus on the quintic for its significance in the mirror symmetry, we expect that similar statements hold for other Fermat Calabi-Yau varieties by HMS [Oka09, FutUed] and suitable central charges.

2. HMS

Let A_n be the type- A Dynkin quiver with $n + 1$ vertices and one-way arrows. Let us recall the following HMS [Oka09, FutUed]:

$$(2.1) \quad D_G^b(\text{Coh } X) \cong D^b(\text{mod } A_3^{\otimes 5}) \cong \text{FS}(F).$$

In this article, vertices of the quiver $A_3^{\otimes 5}$ are indexed by tuples $s = \{s_1, s_2, s_3, s_4, s_5\}$ for $0 \leq s_i \leq 3$ such that the source and sink vertices are indexed by $\{0, 0, 0, 0, 0\}$ and $\{3, 3, 3, 3, 3\}$. We have commuting relations on arrows of the quiver $A_3^{\otimes 5}$ such that the composition of arrows $s \rightarrow s' \rightarrow s''$ for $s'_i = s_i + 1$ and $s''_j = s'_j + 1$ and $1 \leq i, j \leq 5$ is equal to that of $s \rightarrow s''' \rightarrow s''$ for $s'''_j = s_j + 1$ and $s''_i = s'''_i + 1$. For vertices s of $\sum s_i \leq 2$, we have the following partial figure of the quiver $A_3^{\otimes 5}$.




FIGURE 1. The partial figure of the quiver $A_3^{\otimes 5}$

For each vertex s , the simple representation of $\text{mod } A_3^{\otimes 5}$ with the one-dimensional complex vector space at the vertex is also denoted by s .

The reader can consult [Aur] for an introduction to Fukaya-type categories. We have a morsification of $x_i^5 : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ by A'Campo as discussed in [Sei01] and its products [AKO]. For such a morsification of F , which we keep taking in the following, simple representations of $\text{mod } A_3^{\otimes 5}$ and their Ext-algebra correspond to Lagrangian vanishing cycles in the regular zero locus of the morsification and their Lagrangian Floer theory in the formulation of Fukaya-Seidel categories. This is not very difficult to see, since the Ext algebra is formal as a Koszul algebra [ConGoe]. The Ext algebra of simple representations of the quiver A_3 is Koszul and tensor products of Koszul algebras are Koszul [Zac].

Let us recall that for $D^b(\text{Coh } X)$, we have the autoequivalence τ of the monodromy around the Gepner point; namely, for the spherical twist $T_{\mathcal{O}_X}$ of \mathcal{O}_X [SeiTho] and each object $E \in D^b(\text{Coh } X)$, we have

$$(2.2) \quad \tau(E) \cong \mathcal{O}(1) \otimes T_{\mathcal{O}_X}(E)$$

and $\tau^5 \cong [2]$.

For the n -th exterior product of the cotangent bundle of \mathbb{P}^4 restricted to the quintic, denoted by Ω^n , we have that $\mathcal{O}_X[3], \tau(\mathcal{O}_X[3]) \cong \mathcal{O}_X(1)[1], \tau^2(\mathcal{O}_X[3]) \cong \Omega(2)[2], \tau^3(\mathcal{O}_X[3]) \cong \Omega^2(3)[3], \tau^4(\mathcal{O}_X[3]) \cong \Omega^3(4)[4]$ [Asp]. Objects $\tau^i(\mathcal{O}_X)[-i]$ are the Beilinson basis of $D^b(\text{Coh } X)$. With Ext^1 arrows and the dashed arrow indicating $[-2]$, we have the following quintic quiver [DGJT]:




FIGURE 2. Quintic quiver

By the Koszul duality, the Ext-algebra of simple representations of $\text{mod } A_3^{\otimes 5}$ is anti-commutative. In terms of the tensor product of graded matrix factorizations of $x_i^5 : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ for $1 \leq i \leq 5$ [Orl09, KST], taking advantages of computations in [ADD], we see that we have objects corresponding to simple representations of $\text{mod } A_3^{\otimes 5}$. Then, by forgetting the multi-grading (G equivariance) of the tensor product, simple representations s give objects $\tau^{-\sum s_i}(\mathcal{O}_X)$ in the category of graded matrix factorizations of F [Orl09]. Let us mention that τ coincides with the grade shift of the category of graded matrix factorizations of F .

3. STABILITY CONDITIONS

Let \mathbf{H} be the union of the upper-half plane and the negative real line not including the zero. Let us recall that if the central charge of each non-zero object of the category of representations of a quiver is in \mathbf{H} , we always have a Bridgeland stability condition on the category.

We formulate a notion of stability conditions for cases when central charges of non-zero objects of an abelian category are not necessarily in \mathbf{H} . For us, this reflects the fact that for non-zero objects of the heart in Theorems 1.1 and 1.2, we have quintic periods which are asymptotically some several powers of $\frac{\log(x)}{2\pi i}$; this is not the case of Remark 6.1.

With our formulation of stability conditions, when central charges of non-zero objects are not contained in \mathbf{H} , in general, it is highly non-trivial that whether we have a stability condition even on the category of representations of a quiver.

From [Bri07], let us recall that to give a Bridgeland stability condition on a triangulated category for a given family of semistable objects is equivalent to give a heart of the triangulated category and a central charge on the heart with the Harder-Narasimhan property recalled in the following.

Definition 3.1. For a triangulated category \mathcal{T} and the Grothendieck group $K(\mathcal{T})$, a stability condition consists of a heart \mathcal{A} of the triangulated category \mathcal{T} and a central charge $Z \in \text{Hom}_{\mathbb{Z}}(K(\mathcal{T}), \mathbb{C})$ with the following:

- (1) We have *semistable objects* $Q \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $Z(Q) = m(Q) \exp(\phi_Q i)$ for some *masses* $m(Q) > 0$ and *phases* $\phi_Q \in \mathbb{R}$.
- (2) If $\text{Ext}^1(Q, Q') \not\cong 0$ for semistable objects $Q, Q' \in \mathcal{A}$, then $|\phi_Q - \phi_{Q'}| < \pi$.
- (3) If $\phi_{Q'} > \phi_Q$, then $\text{Hom}(Q', Q) \cong 0$.
- (4) For each nonzero object $E \in \mathcal{A}$, we have semistable objects $Q_i \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $\phi_{Q_{i+1}} > \phi_{Q_i}$ with the following filtration by short exact sequences:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccccc}
 0 = E_n & \longrightarrow & E_{n-1} & \longrightarrow & E_{n-2} & \longrightarrow & \dots & \longrightarrow & E_1 & \longrightarrow & E_0 = E \\
 & & \searrow & & \searrow & & & & \searrow & & \searrow \\
 & & Q_{n-1} & & Q_{n-2} & & & & Q_1 & & Q_0
 \end{array}$$

For each phase, semistable objects which can not be obtained by non-trivial extensions of semistable objects of the phase are called *stable*. The above filtration is called *the Harder-Narasimhan filtration* of the object E and having such filtrations for non-zero objects of the heart, originally for central charges of semistable objects in \mathbf{H} , is called the Harder-Narasimhan property of the central charge on the heart.

By the third and the fourth conditions in Definition 3.1, we have the uniqueness of Harder-Narasimhan filtrations of each non-zero object up to isomorphisms [GKR].

Remark 3.2. For a stability condition on a heart \mathcal{A} , we have tiltings of the heart \mathcal{A} as in *loc cite*. For each $\phi \in \mathbb{R}$, we have the heart \mathcal{A}_ϕ^σ as the extension-closed full subcategory of \mathcal{T} consisting of semistable objects $Q'' \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $\phi_{Q''} > \phi$ and objects $Q''[1]$ of semistable objects $Q'' \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $\phi_{Q''} \leq \phi$.

For Bridgeland stability conditions, the second condition in Definition 3.1 holds automatically for a heart. It is a simple condition to restrict orders of possible phases of semistable objects for a given central charge. Even when do not have Bridgeland stability conditions, we still have tiltings of certain stability conditions such as of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2.

Proposition 3.3. *Let us assume that for a stability condition σ of a heart \mathcal{A} , a central charge Z , phases ϕ_Q^σ , and semistable objects $Q, Q' \in \mathcal{A}$, we have $\text{Ext}^2(Q, Q') \cong 0$ for $\phi_Q^\sigma > \phi_{Q'}^\sigma$ and $\text{Hom}(Q, Q') \cong 0$ for $\phi_Q^\sigma < \phi_{Q'}^\sigma$. In addition, let us assume that phases are bounded. Then, we have a stability condition σ' on the tilted heart \mathcal{A}_ϕ^σ (in the notation of Remark 3.2) for each $\phi \in \mathbb{R}$ with the central charge Z and semistable objects $Q \in \mathcal{A}_\phi^\sigma$ for semistable objects $Q \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $\phi_Q^\sigma > \phi$ and semistable objects $Q[1] \in \mathcal{A}_\phi^\sigma$ for semistable objects $Q \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $\phi_Q^\sigma \leq \phi$.*

Proof. Notice that for semistable objects $Q, Q' \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $\phi_Q^\sigma > \phi_{Q'}^\sigma$, we have $\text{Ext}^1(Q, Q'[1]) \cong \text{Ext}^2(Q, Q') \cong 0$ and $\text{Ext}^1(Q'[1], Q) \cong 0$ by the first assumption. We take phases $\phi_{Q[1]}^{\sigma'}$ of $Q[1] \in \mathcal{A}_\phi^\sigma$ for semistable objects $Q \in \mathcal{A}$ so that $\phi_{Q[1]}^{\sigma'} = \phi_Q^\sigma + (2n+1)\pi$ for some $n \geq 0$ and the range of phases $\phi_{Q[1]}^{\sigma'}$ do not overlap with that of phases $\phi_Q^{\sigma'}$ of other semistable objects of $Q \in \mathcal{A}_\phi^\sigma$. \square

We assume $K(\mathcal{T})$ is of a finite rank; if not, we replace $K(\mathcal{T})$ with its some quotient of a finite rank such as numerical Grothendieck groups [Bri07]. We consider

deformation of central charges in the space $\text{Hom}_{\mathbb{Z}}(K(\mathcal{T}), \mathbb{C})$, which has the standard topology by the finiteness of $K(\mathcal{T})$, and deformation of stability conditions.

For a stability condition on a heart \mathcal{A} and an interval (a, b) , let $\mathcal{P}(a, b)$ be the extension-closed full subcategory of the heart \mathcal{A} consisting of semistable objects E such that $\phi_E \in (a, b)$.

Remark 3.4. With a care on the second condition in Definition 3.1, deformation theory of [Bri07] on Bridgeland stability conditions on a heart naturally extends to our cases. We assume the local-finiteness in *loc cite*. In addition, we assume that for each phase ϕ_Q of a semistable object Q of a heart \mathcal{A} , we have $\epsilon_{\phi_Q} > 0$ with the following condition: for phases $\phi_Q, \phi_{Q'}$ of semistable objects Q, Q' of the heart \mathcal{A} and objects $E \in \mathcal{P}(\phi_Q - \epsilon_{\phi_Q}, \phi_Q + \epsilon_{\phi_Q})$ and $E' \in \mathcal{P}(\phi_{Q'} - \epsilon_{\phi_{Q'}}, \phi_{Q'} + \epsilon_{\phi_{Q'}})$, if $\text{Ext}^1(E, E') \neq 0$ then $|\phi_Q - \phi_{Q'}| + \epsilon_{\phi_Q} + \epsilon_{\phi_{Q'}} < \pi$. Both assumptions easily hold for stability conditions in Theorems 1.1 and 1.2. For a small open interval contained in $(\phi - \epsilon_{\phi}, \phi + \epsilon_{\phi})$ of some phase ϕ of a semistable object, we consider deformation of central charges such that central charges of semistable objects whose phases are in the interval stay in the interval. Moreover, we can take small non-overlapping open intervals such that each of them contained in $(\phi - \epsilon_{\phi}, \phi + \epsilon_{\phi})$ of some phase ϕ of a semistable object and consider simultaneous deformations of central charges. On the extension-closed full subcategory consisting of semistable objects of phases in the interval, we apply the deformation theory of *loc cite*.

In Remark 3.4, we put deformation of stability conditions on a heart. However, even when we do not have Bridgeland stability conditions, under the assumptions of Proposition 3.3, we can tilt the heart with stability conditions and work on deformations of stability conditions on the tilted heart. For stability conditions in Theorems 1.1 and 1.2, we put discussions on their specific deformations in Remarks 4.4 and 4.5.

For our later reference, let us put the following lemma on wall-crossings of second kind for certain deformation of stability conditions, which involve no change of orders of semistable objects but with deformation of central charges.

Lemma 3.5. *For a heart \mathcal{A} , let us assume that we have stability conditions σ, σ' with central charges Z and Z' and phase $\phi^{\sigma}, \phi^{\sigma'}$. In addition, let us assume that for σ, σ' , we have the same collection of semistable objects such that for semistable objects Q_1, Q_2 , we have $\phi_{Q_1}^{\sigma'} < \phi_{Q_2}^{\sigma'}$ if and only if $\phi_{Q_1}^{\sigma} < \phi_{Q_2}^{\sigma}$. Then, for some ϕ and a semistable object Q such that $\phi_Q^{\sigma} < \phi < \phi_Q^{\sigma'}$, we have a non-trivial wall-crossing of second kind between σ and σ' .*

Proof. In the notation of Remark 3.2, hearts $\mathcal{A}_{\phi}^{\sigma}$ and $\mathcal{A}_{\phi}^{\sigma'}$ differ. \square

4. STATEMENTS AND PROOFS

For each simple representation s of the heart $\text{mod } A_3^{\otimes 5}$ and $[1 : x] \in \mathbb{P}^1$, by the definition of Equation 1.1 and HMS of Equation 2.1, we have the following:

$$Z_x(s) = Z_x(\tau^{-\sum s_i}(\mathcal{O}_X)).$$

Let us recall that near the large complex structure limit and the Gepner point, we have quintic periods such that they have finite radii of convergence and make period vectors $\Pi_B(x)$ and $\Pi_B^{\infty}(x)$.

Let us prove Theorem 1.1.

Proof. Let us recall quintic periods in the form of [Hos00, Example 1] as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} w^{(0)}(x) &= w(x, 0), \\ w^{(1)}(x) &= \frac{1}{2\pi i} \frac{\partial}{\partial p} w(x, p) \Big|_{p=0}, \\ w^{(2)}(x) &= \frac{1}{2!(2\pi i)^2} 5 \frac{\partial^2}{\partial p^2} w(x, p) \Big|_{p=0} + \frac{11}{2} \frac{1}{2\pi i} \frac{\partial}{\partial p} w(x, p) \Big|_{p=0}, \\ w^{(3)}(x) &= -\frac{1}{3!(2\pi i)^3} 5 \frac{\partial^3}{\partial p^3} w(x, p) \Big|_{p=0} - \frac{1}{2\pi i} \frac{50}{12} \frac{\partial}{\partial p} w(x, p) \Big|_{p=0}. \end{aligned}$$

Then we have the period vector around the large complex structure limit $\Pi_B(x) = {}^t(w^{(0)}(x), w^{(1)}(x), w^{(2)}(x), w^{(3)}(x))$. For the monodromy around the Gepner point, on $\Pi_B(x)$, in the form of [Hos00, Example 4], we have the following monodromy matrix:

$$M_\infty = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & -1 \\ -1 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ -3 & -5 & 1 & 3 \\ 5 & -8 & 1 & -4 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Notice that M_∞ corresponds to τ^{-1} , since for monodromy matrices M_0 and M_1 corresponding to $T_{\mathcal{O}_X}$ and $\otimes \mathcal{O}_1$ in *loc cite*, we have that $M_1 M_0 = M_\infty^{-1}$ corresponds to τ (cf. [Hor, Section 4.2]).

We have $\Pi_B^\infty(x)[4] = Z_x(\mathcal{O}_X)$.

For $0 < x \ll 1$, we have

$$\Pi_B(x) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 + O(x) \\ \frac{\log(x)}{2\pi i} + O(x) \\ \frac{5}{2} \left(\frac{\log(x)}{2\pi i} \right)^2 + O(\log(x)) \\ -\frac{5}{6} \left(\frac{\log(x)}{2\pi i} \right)^3 + O(\log(x)) \end{pmatrix}^1.$$

For $\Pi_B(x)' := {}^t(0, 0, m_1, m_0) = {}^t(0, 0, -\frac{5}{8\pi^2} \log(x)^2, -\frac{5i}{48\pi^3} \log(x)^3)$, we have the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_B^\infty(x)'[4] &= m_0, \\ M_\infty \Pi_B^\infty(x)'[4] &= m_1 - 4m_0, \\ M_\infty^2 \Pi_B^\infty(x)'[4] &= -3m_1 + 6m_0, \\ M_\infty^3 \Pi_B^\infty(x)'[4] &= 3m_1 - 4m_0, \\ M_\infty^4 \Pi_B^\infty(x)'[4] &= -m_1 + m_0. \end{aligned}$$

So comparing ratios of coefficients, for $0 < x \ll 1$, we can take the difference $a_i = \text{Arg}(M_\infty^{i+1} \Pi_B(x)[4]) - \text{Arg}(M_\infty^i \Pi_B(x)[4])$ to be

$$\pi > a_0 > a_1 > a_2 > a_3 > 0$$

with each a_i being close to π .

Let us take simple representations s of the heart $\text{mod } A_3^{\otimes 5}$ as stable objects and let angles of $Z_x(s)$ be their phases in the increasing way approximately by π as $\sum a_i$ increases.

¹Numbers $\frac{5}{2}$ and $-\frac{5}{6}$ are in Equation 5.5 in [CdGP] and Equation 5.4 in [KleThe] up to a constant.

It is clear from the standard theory of quiver representations that these stable objects with their self-direct sums taken as semistable objects give stability conditions. It is clear that the second condition in Definition 3.1 holds, since $\text{Ext}^1(s, s') \not\cong 0$ only when we have an arrow $s \rightarrow s'$. \square

Even if we weaken the second condition in Definition 3.1 to be $\phi_Q - \phi_{Q'} < \pi$ for semistable objects $Q, Q' \in \mathcal{A}$ with $\text{Ext}^1(Q, Q') \not\cong 0$ (and weaken the second assumption in Remark 3.4 with the inequality $\phi_Q - \phi_{Q'} + \epsilon_{\phi_Q} + \epsilon_{\phi_{Q'}} < \pi$), a stability condition at the large complex structure limit would not exist, unless we take dilation and rotation. For small x , $F_i = |M_\infty^i \Pi(x)[4]|$ go to infinitely large at similar rates. Let us mention that for central charges $\Pi(x)[1]$, which are of a skyscraper sheaf of the quintic, $\frac{|\Pi(x)[1]|}{F_i}$ goes to zero as $x \rightarrow 0$.

Let us prove Theorem 1.2.

Proof. For $k = 1, \dots, 5$ and $j = 0, 1, \dots, 4$, let us recall quintic periods in the form of [Hos00, Example 4] as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\omega}_k(x) &= -\frac{1}{5} \frac{1}{(2\pi i)^4} \sum_{N=0}^{\infty} \frac{\Gamma(N + \frac{k}{5})^5}{\Gamma(5N + k)} x^{-N - \frac{k}{5}}, \\ \omega_j^\infty(x) &= \sum_{k=1}^5 (1 - \xi^k)^4 \xi^{kj} \tilde{\omega}_k(x).\end{aligned}$$

Then $\Pi_B^\infty(x) = {}^t(\omega_0^\infty(x), \omega_1^\infty(x), \omega_2^\infty(x), \omega_4^\infty(x))$ is a period vector around the Gepner point.

In *loc cite*, we have the following connection matrix

$$N = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -\frac{2}{5} & \frac{2}{5} & \frac{1}{5} & -\frac{1}{5} \\ -\frac{2^2}{5} & \frac{1}{5} & \frac{3}{5} & -\frac{8}{5} \\ 1 & -1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

such that $N\Pi_B^\infty(x)[4] = Z_x(\mathcal{O}_X)$ and the monodromy matrix of the period vector around the Gepner point as follows:

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ -1 & -1 & -1 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

By changing the variable $x \mapsto x^{-5}$, $\omega_j^\infty(x) = \omega_0^\infty(\xi^j x)$. Up to a common constant factor on each $\omega_j^\infty(x)$, first-order approximations of $\omega_j^\infty(x)$ for $0 < x \ll 1$ are $\xi^j x$. For $\Pi_B^\infty(x)' := {}^t(x, \xi x, \xi^2 x, \xi^4 x)$, we have

$$NM^i \Pi_B^\infty(x)'[4] = \xi^i (1 - \xi)x.$$

So for $0 < x \ll 1$, we can take

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Arg}(N\Pi_B^\infty(x)[4]) &< \text{Arg}(NM\Pi_B^\infty(x)[4]) < \\ \text{Arg}(NM^2\Pi_B^\infty(x)[4]) &< \text{Arg}(NM^3\Pi_B^\infty(x)[4]) < \\ \text{Arg}(NM^4\Pi_B^\infty(x)[4]) &< \text{Arg}(N\Pi_B^\infty(x)[4]) + 2\pi\end{aligned}$$

with each difference close to $\frac{2\pi}{5}$.

Let our stable objects be simple representations s of the heart $\text{mod } A_3^{\otimes 5}$ and their phases be angles of $Z_x(s)$ in the increasing way approximately by $\frac{2\pi}{5}$ as $\sum a_i$ increases. \square

A stability condition at the Gepner point would not exist, unless we take dilation and rotation. Masses of central charges of simple representations s go to zero as $x \rightarrow \infty$. The notion of stability conditions whose central charges have the pentagon symmetry has been discussed in [Oka09, Tod].

For simple representations s^i such that $\sum_j s_j^i = i$, we have the following figures of central charges near the large complex structure limit and the Gepner point by direct computations of quintic periods for $x = 10^{10}$ and $x = 10^{-10}$.




FIGURE 3. Central charges near the large complex structure limit




FIGURE 4. Central charges near the Gepner point

Let us prove Corollary 1.3.

Proof. From phases of central charges of stable objects in the proofs of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2, we can deform central charges so that we have desired phases and masses of stable objects. By Lemma 3.5, we have wall-crossings of second kind, which are different from ones of dilation and rotation. \square

Let us prove Corollary 1.4.

Proof. From the proof of Theorem 1.1, by Lemma 3.5, deforming quintic periods near the large complex structure limit by letting $x \mapsto 0$ for $x > 0$ give wall-crossings of second kind, which are different from ones of dilation and rotation. \square

As mentioned in the introduction, near the large complex structure limit, let us define central charges Z'_x as follows:

$$Z'_x(s) = M^{-\sum s_i} \Pi_B(x)[4] + \frac{\Pi_B(x)[2]}{5}.$$

We have the following lemma in order.

Lemma 4.1. *For $D_G^b(\text{Coh } X) \cong D^b(\text{mod } A_3^{\otimes 5}) \cong \text{FS}(F)$, the heart $\text{mod } A_3^{\otimes 5}$, and central charges Z'_x near the large complex structure limit $x = 0$, we have stability conditions on the heart such that each stable object is isomorphic to a Lagrangian vanishing cycle and an equivariant coherent sheaf of the Beilinson basis with a shift. These stability conditions are asymptotically the same as ones in Theorem 1.1.*

Proof. From the proof of Theorem 1.1, it is clear that adding $\frac{\Pi_B(x)[2]}{5}$ does not change asymptotics of $\Pi_B(x)$ near the large complex structure limit. \square

Let us prove Corollary 1.5.

Proof. Let $S(x)$ be the sum of distinct central charges of stable objects. Then $\sum_{i=0}^4 M_\infty^i = 0$. By rotation and dilation with the quintic period $w(x, 0) = \Pi_B(x)[1]$, we obtain the mirror map $t(x) = \frac{S(x)}{w(x, 0)}$. \square

Remark 4.2. Before putting a remark on numerical predictions of [CdGP, BCOV, Giv, LLY, Zin] at the end of this paragraph, from [Zin, Appendix B] let us recall the following. In [CdGP], for the variable $q = e^{2\pi it}$, Lambert expansions of the normalized Yukawa coupling $Y(q) = \frac{5}{(1-5^5x)w(x,0)^2} \left(\frac{q}{x} \frac{dx}{dq}\right)^3$ give the numerical prediction, which is proved in [Giv, LLY]. In [BCOV], by ψ of $x = (5\psi)^{-5}$, Lambert expansions of $\partial_t F_1(\psi)$ of the generalized index $F_1(\psi) = \ln \left(\left(\frac{\psi}{w(5\psi^{-5}, 0)} \right)^{\frac{62}{3}} (1 - \psi^5)^{-\frac{1}{6}} \frac{d\psi}{dt} \right)$ give the numerical prediction, which is proved in [Zin]. Notice that, since we know asymptotics and linearity of quintic periods, among quintic periods, $w(x, 0)$ can be specified geometrically by the space of stability condition of Lemma 4.1; in fact, for $S(x)$ in the proof of Corollary 1.5, $w(x, 0)$ is the quintic period such that the exponential function of the quotient of $2\pi i S(x)$ by the quintic period is asymptotically the parameter x of the space. So, up to changes of variables of x , t , and $w(x, 0)$ by elementary functions, categorical and geometric interpretations of factors of $Y(q)$ or $e^{F_1(\psi)}$ are given by the space of stability conditions of Lemma 4.1, which are given by HMS.

We have spaces of stability conditions in a general setting in Remark 3.4. For stability conditions of $D_G^b(\text{Coh } X)$, let us prove the following.

Corollary 4.3. *Near the Gepner point and the large complex structure limit, we have one-parameter subspaces of stability conditions of $D_G^b(\text{Coh } X)$ such that any four of distinct central charges of stable objects give a basis of quintic periods.*

Proof. Period vectors $\Pi_B^\infty(x)$ and $\Pi_B(x)$ give bases of solutions of the Picard-Fuchs equation. So the assertion follows from constructions of stability conditions in Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 and Lemma 4.1. \square

To be able to deform stability conditions in a certain way, in general we have to deal with highly non-trivial problems to carefully look into distributions of central charges of stable objects.

For the quiver $A_3^{\otimes 5}$ and central charges of quintic periods, we have not seen *wall-crossings of first kind* [KonSoi08], which is a disappearance of a stable object by a deformation of central charges. Compared to this case, we have a wall-crossing of first kind as explained in Remark 6.5.

Remark 4.4. Stability conditions in Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 and in Lemma 4.1 deform into Bridgeland stability conditions only with wall-crossings of second kind, by deforming central charges of stable objects into \mathbf{H} without changing their orders.

Remark 4.5. Since we can deform a stability condition into Bridgeland stability conditions as in Remark 4.4, by known results on Bridgeland stability conditions, we expect that we can deform stability conditions of Theorem 1.1 and 1.2 on the heart $\text{mod } A_3^{\otimes 5}$ into stability conditions of central charges of quintic periods on a heart $\mathcal{A} \cong \text{mod } A_3^{\otimes 5}$ such that the heart \mathcal{A} consists of the object corresponding to a non-source vertex s of the heart $\text{mod } A_3^{\otimes 5}$ as the object corresponding to the source vertex of the heart \mathcal{A} . This would lead to further understanding of the *Teichmüller theory* discussed by Aspinwall-Douglas [AspDou], since by forgetting the equivariance, we can obtain the object corresponding to the vertex s by applying τ^{-i} for some $i > 0$ on the object corresponding to the source vertex of the heart $\text{mod } A_3^{\otimes 5}$. Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 and the *mirror conjecture* in [Kon95] are local in nature. Let us mention that by Proposition 3.3, we can tilt hearts with stability conditions without first passing to Bridgeland stability conditions.

5. A QUASIMODULAR FORM ON QUINTIC PERIODS

Let us prove Theorem 1.6. We recall that for a stability condition of $D_G^b(\text{Coh } X)$, we have defined an object of $D^b(\text{Coh } X)$ to be stable if its equivariant object in $D_G^b(\text{Coh } X)$ is stable.

Geometrically, in the following, we obtain a quasimodular form essentially by counting a single point, which is the moduli space of a spherical object, with multiplicities in a 3-Calabi-Yau category.

Proof. We obtain a stable spherical object in $D^b(\text{Coh } X)$, since each object $\tau^i(\mathcal{O}_X)$ is spherical. For the Ext algebra of direct sums of the stable spherical object and the motivic parameter q , we have the quantum dilogarithm [KonSoi08, Kel]:

$$\mathbf{E}(q^{\frac{1}{2}}, z) = \sum_{m \geq 0} \frac{(-q^{\frac{1}{2}})^{m^2}}{(q^m - 1) \cdots (q^m - q^{m-1})} z^m$$

(with the change of the variable $q^{\frac{1}{2}}$ in *loc cite* into $-q^{\frac{1}{2}}$).

As in [MelOka], by taking the formal logarithm of the quantum dilogarithm with respect to the variable z , we have

$$\log_z \mathbf{E}(q^{\frac{1}{2}}, z) = \sum_{m > 0} \frac{1}{m} \frac{q^{\frac{m}{2}}}{1 - q^m} z^m = \sum_{m, r > 0} \frac{1}{m} (q^{\frac{mr}{2}} - q^{mr}) z^m.$$

Let $q = \exp(2\pi i\tau)$ and $z = \exp(2\pi i\tau')$. By differentiating $\log_z \mathbf{E}(q^{\frac{1}{2}}, z)$ twice with respect to the variable τ' , we obtain

$$\left. \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \tau'^2} \log_z \mathbf{E}(q^{\frac{1}{2}}, z) \right|_{z=1} = G_2\left(\frac{\tau}{2}\right) - G_2(\tau),$$

which is a quasimodular form [KanZag]. \square

By the proof of Theorem 1.6, the quasimodularity in Theorem 1.6 is a non-trivial property of the quantum dilogarithm. As in [KonSoi08, Kel, Qiu], the well-known quantum pentagon identity of the quantum dilogarithm explains the wall-crossing

of first kind of mod A_1 in Section 6.2 and so of full extension-closed subcategories of mod $A_3^{\otimes 5}$ isomorphic to mod A_1 .

Let us mention that we can recover the quantum dilogarithm from the generating function $\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \tau^2} \log_z \mathbf{E}(q^{\frac{1}{2}}, z)$ by taking integrations with respect to the variable τ' with appropriate boundary values and the formal exponential function with respect to the variable z .

The variable τ is conjectured to be Ω -background of field theories of \mathbb{R}^4 (a toric parameter of Nekrasov's partition functions a.k.a. graviphoton background) [DimGuk, Kan].

Notice that we do not have 2 in front of $G_2(\tau)$ in Theorem 1.6 so that we have a modular form $G_2(\frac{\tau}{2}) - 2G_2(\tau)$. However, for a modular form on quintic periods, let $J(\tau) = G_2(\frac{\tau}{2}) - G_2(\tau)$ for the quasimodular form in Theorem 1.6. Then, measuring the failure for $J(\tau)$ to be modular by taking $K(\tau) = \frac{1}{\tau^2} J(-\frac{1}{\tau}) - J(\tau)$, we have $K(\tau + 2) - K(\tau) \simeq 0$ for $|\tau| \gg 0$ and $\frac{1}{(i\tau)^2} K(-\frac{1}{\tau}) - K(\tau) = 0$. This is because we have $\frac{1}{\tau^2} G_2(-\frac{1}{\tau}) = G_2(\tau) - \frac{\pi i}{\tau}$ and $G_2(\tau + 1) = G_2(\tau)$ [Zag08].

The quasimodular form $J(\tau)$ is essentially obtained in the discussion of [Oka09, Section 3.2] for a spherical object. The point of Theorem 1.6 is to attach a quasimodular form to quintic periods, using the monodromy around the Gepner point.

6. THE GKZ SYSTEM OF THE A_1 SINGULARITY

Let us discuss the GKZ system of A_1 singularity $\mathbb{C}^2/\mathbb{Z}_2$. For $a_i \in \mathbb{C}$, $x = \frac{a_1 a_3}{a_2^2}$, polynomials $a_1 + a_2 W + a_3 W^2$, and its roots $\beta_0(x)$ and $\beta_1(x)$, let us put the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \varpi_0(x) &= 1, \\ \varpi_1(x) &= \frac{\log \beta_0(x) - \log \beta_1(x)}{2\pi i}. \end{aligned}$$

By [Hos04, Proposition 4.4], $\varpi_0(x)$ and $\varpi_1(x)$ give a basis of solutions of the GKZ system of the A_1 singularity, and near the large complex structure limit $x = 0$, $\varpi_1(x)$ can be written as a hypergeometric series. By [Hos04, Section 3], $\varpi_0(x)$ and $\varpi_1(x)$ give a basis of central charges of the GKZ system of the A_1 singularity. For simplicity, we say A_1 periods for solutions of the GKZ system of the A_1 singularity.

The GKZ system of the A_1 singularity and its solutions are closely related to K. Saito's differential equations and primitive forms of the A_1 singularity [Hos04, Propositions 4.1 and 4.2].

6.1. Doubled Kronecker-quiver case. For the cotangent bundle of \mathbb{P}^1 , denoted by $T^*\mathbb{P}^1$, let $D_{\mathbb{P}^1}^b(\text{Coh } T^*\mathbb{P}^1)$ be the full subcategory of $D^b(\text{Coh } T^*\mathbb{P}^1)$ consisting of objects supported over $\mathbb{P}^1 \xrightarrow{i} T^*\mathbb{P}^1$. Let us mention that $T^*\mathbb{P}^1$ can be obtained by the minimal resolution of the A_1 singularity.

Let us recall the doubled Kronecker quiver K , which has two vertices, two parallel arrows a, b , and two more inverse arrows a', b' with commuting relations $b'a = a'b$ and $ba' = ab'$. We have the following figure:




FIGURE 5. Doubled Kronecker quiver (with the commuting relations)

Let $\text{mod}^{nil} K$ be the category of nilpotent representations of the doubled Kronecker quiver, which is a heart of $D_{\mathbb{P}^1}^b(\text{Coh } T^*\mathbb{P}^1)$ [CraHol].

We have Bridgeland stability conditions on $\text{mod}^{nil} K$ for any non-zero central charges of simple representations, which are isomorphic to objects $i_*\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(-1)$ and $i_*\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(-2)[1]$.

For a point $y \in \mathbb{P}^1$, let central charges of A_1 periods, denoted by $Z_x^{A_1}$, be defined as follows [Hos04, Section 3]:

$$\begin{aligned} Z_x^{A_1}(i_*\mathcal{O}_y) &= \varpi_0(x), \\ Z_x^{A_1}(i_*\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(-1)) &= \varpi_1(x). \end{aligned}$$

Near the large complex structure limit, $\varpi_1(x)$ is asymptotically $\frac{\log(x)}{2\pi i}$.

Remark 6.1. For A_1 periods, we can just take Bridgeland stability conditions, since for objects of the heart $\text{mod}^{nil} K$, we do not have A_1 periods which are asymptotically some several powers of $\frac{\log(x)}{2\pi i}$.

As an analog of Corollary 1.4, we have the following proposition.

Proposition 6.2. *For Bridgeland stability conditions on the heart $\text{mod}^{nil} K$ of $D_{\mathbb{P}^1}^b(T^*\mathbb{P}^1)$ of central charges $Z_x^{A_1}$ of A_1 periods, A_1 periods give wall-crossings of the second kind, which are different from ones of dilation and rotation.*

Proof. The central charge of the object $i_*\mathcal{O}_y$ for a point y is already fixed. So, the assertion follows by Lemma 3.5. \square

By HMS [IUU] (in particular the proof of [IUU, Theorem 28]), in an affine manifold in the formulation of Fukaya categories of [IUU], simple representations correspond to Lagrangian spheres.

The mirror map is defined as $e^{2\pi i\varpi_1(x)}$. As an analog of Corollary 1.5, we have the following proposition.

Proposition 6.3. *For Bridgeland stability conditions on the heart $\text{mod}^{nil} K$ of $D_{\mathbb{P}^1}^b(T^*\mathbb{P}^1)$ of central charges $Z_x^{A_1}$ of A_1 periods, by dilation and rotation with the A_1 period $\varpi_1(x)$, the sum of central charges of Lagrangian simple objects gives the mirror map.*

Proof. We have $\varpi_1(x)Z_x^{A_1}(i_*\mathcal{O}_y) = \varpi_1(x)$ and take the exponential function. \square

As an analog of Corollary 4.3, we have the following proposition.

Proposition 6.4. *For Bridgeland stability conditions of $D_{\mathbb{P}^1}^b(T^*\mathbb{P}^1)$, we have an one-parameter subspace such that central charges of Lagrangian simple objects of the heart $\text{mod}^{nil} K$ give a basis of A_1 periods.*

Proof. For central charges of $Z_x^{A_1}$ of A_1 periods, we have $\varpi_1(x)$ and $1 - \varpi_1(x)$ for simple representations of $\text{mod}^{nil} K$. \square

We have autoequivalences on $D_{\mathbb{P}^1}^b(\text{Coh } T^*\mathbb{P}^1)$ [IshUeh] which give monodromy actions of the GKZ system [dFS]. In particular, we have the automorphism of the doubled Kronecker quiver, which we denote by M . Up to monodromy actions, A_1 periods are given by central charges of A_1 periods.

Remark 6.5. Unlike for the quiver $A_3^{\otimes 5}$ and central charges of quintic periods, the automorphism M for the doubled Kronecker quiver and central charges of A_1 periods is non-trivial. In particular, as the disappearance of the stable object $i_*\mathcal{O}_y$ or $M(i_*\mathcal{O}_y)$ for a point $y \in \mathbb{P}^1$, we have the wall-crossing of first kind.

6.2. A_1 -quiver case. For the function $W^3 : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, denoted by H , we have the derived Fukaya-Seidel category $\text{FS}(H)$, which is given by a morsification of H such as $a_1 + a_2W + a_3W^2 + W^3 - V^2$ for $a_i \in \mathbb{C}$. A heart of $\text{FS}(H)$ is isomorphic to $\text{mod } A_1$.

As in Section 2, we have a morsification of H by A'Campo, which is of elliptic curves. For such a morsification of H , which we keep taking in the following, simple representations of $\text{mod } A_1$ correspond to Lagrangian vanishing cycles in the zero locus of the morsification in the formulation of Fukaya-Seidel categories.

On $\text{mod } A_1$, we have Bridgeland stability conditions for any non-zero central charges of simple representations as in Section 6.1. Central charges of A_1 periods can be regarded as central charges of $\text{mod } A_1$, by embedding the quiver A_1 into the doubled Kronecker quiver K . For Bridgeland stability conditions on $\text{mod } A_1$, let us call simple representations as Lagrangian stable objects.

Let us recall that from [Orl09, Example 2.9], for the ring $A = \frac{\mathbb{C}[x]}{x^3}$, we have the graded category of the singularity $D_{Sg}^{gr}(A)$, which is an algebro-geometric derived category, such that we have

$$D_{Sg}^{gr}(A) \cong D^b(\text{mod } A_1) \cong \text{FS}(H).$$

For analogs of Corollaries 1.4, 1.5, and 4.3, in Propositions 6.2, 6.3, and 6.4, we simply replace $\text{mod}^{nil} K$ and $D_{\mathbb{P}^1}^b(\text{Coh } T^*\mathbb{P}^1)$ with $\text{mod } A_1$ and $D_{Sg}^{gr}(A)$. Let t be the non-simple irreducible representation of $\text{mod } A_1$. For their proofs, in $K(\text{mod}^{nil} K)$, the class of the embedded representation of the representation t is that of the object $i_*\mathcal{O}_y$ for a point $y \in \mathbb{P}^1$. So, we simply replace the object $i_*\mathcal{O}_y$ by the representation t in the proofs of Propositions 6.2, 6.3, and 6.4.

We have analogs of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 for the quiver A_1 by taking central charges of A_1 periods for an embedding of the A_1 quiver into the doubled Kronecker quiver K . Also, as in Section 6.1, we have the wall-crossing of first kind by A_1 periods.

7. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author thanks Professors S. Galkin, K. Gomi, D. Honda, S. Hosono, M. Kashiwara, M. Kontsevich, H. Nakajima, R. Ohkawa, K. Ueda, and S. Yanagida for their helpful discussions.

REFERENCES

- [ADD] S. K. Ashok, E. Dell'Aquila, and D.-E. Diaconescu, *Fractional branes in Landau-Ginzburg orbifolds*, Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. 8 (2004), no. 3, 461–513.

- [Asp] P. S. Aspinwall, *Landau-Ginzburg to Calabi-Yau dictionary for D-branes*, J. Math. Phys. 48 (2007), no. 8, 082304, 18 pp.
- [AspDou] P. S. Aspinwall and M. R. Douglas, *D-brane stability and monodromy*, J. High Energy Phys. 2002, no. 5, no. 31, 35 pp.
- [Aur] D. Auroux, *A beginner's introduction to Fukaya categories*, arXiv:1301.7056.
- [AKO] D. Auroux, L. Katzarkov, and D. Orlov, *Mirror symmetry for weighted projective planes and their noncommutative deformations*, Ann. of Math. (2) 167 (2008), no. 3, 867–943.
- [BayMac] A. Bayer and E. Macrì, *The space of stability conditions on the local projective plane*, Duke Math. J. 160 (2011), no. 2, 263–322.
- [BMT] A. Bayer, E. Macrì, and Y. Toda, *Bridgeland Stability conditions on threefolds I: Bogomolov-Gieseker type inequalities*, arXiv:1103.5010.
- [BBMT] A. Bayer, A. Bertram, E. Macrì, and Y. Toda, *Bridgeland Stability conditions on threefolds II: An application to Fujita's conjecture*, arXiv:1106.3430.
- [Bei] A. A. Beilinson, *Coherent sheaves on \mathbb{P}^n and problems of linear algebra*, Funct. Anal. Appl. 12, 214–216 (1978).
- [BCOV] M. Bershadsky, S. Cecotti, H. Ooguri, and C. Vafa, *Holomorphic Anomalies in Topological Field Theories*, Nuclear Phys. B 405 (1993), no. 2-3, 279–304.
- [BDFKK] M. Ballard, C. Diemer, D. Favero, L. Katzarkov, and G. Kerr, *The Mori Program and Non-Fano Toric Homological Mirror Symmetry*, arXiv:1302.0803.
- [Bri05] T. Bridgeland, *t-structures on some local Calabi-Yau varieties*, J. Algebra 289 (2005), no. 2, 453–483.
- [Bri07] T. Bridgeland, *Stability conditions on triangulated categories*, Ann. of Math. (2) 166 (2007), no. 2, 317–345.
- [Bri08] T. Bridgeland, *Stability conditions on K3 surfaces*, Duke Math. J. 141 (2008), no. 2, 241–291.
- [CCG] S. L. Cacciatori, M. Compagnoni, and S. Guerra, *The Physical Mirror Equivalence for the Local \mathbb{P}^2* , arXiv:1301.4437.
- [ConGoe] A. Conner and P. Goetz, *A_∞ -algebra structures associated to \mathcal{K}_2 algebras*, J. Algebra 337 (2011), 63–81.
- [CoxKat] D. A. Cox and S. Katz, *Mirror symmetry and algebraic geometry*, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, 68. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1999. xxii+469 pp.
- [CraHol] W. Crawley-Boevey and M. P. Holland, *Noncommutative deformations of Kleinian singularities*, Duke Math. J. 92 (1998), no. 3, 605–635.
- [CdGP] P. Candelas, X. C. de la Ossa, P. S. Green, and L. Parkes, *A pair of Calabi-Yau manifolds as an exactly soluble superconformal theory*, Nuclear Physics B359(1991) 21–74.
- [dFS] X. C. de la Ossa, B. Florea, and H. Skarke, *D-branes on noncompact Calabi-Yau manifolds: K-theory and monodromy*, Nuclear Phys. B 644 (2002), no. 1-2, 170–200.
- [DimGuk] T. Dimofte and S. Gukov, *Refined, motivic, and quantum*, Lett. Math. Phys. (2010) 91:1–27.
- [Dou01] M. R. Douglas, *D-branes, categories and $N=1$ supersymmetry*, Strings, branes, and M-theory. J. Math. Phys. 42 (2001), no. 7, 2818–2843.
- [Dou02] M. R. Douglas, *Dirichlet branes, homological mirror symmetry, and stability*, Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians, Vol. III (Beijing, 2002), 395–408, Higher Ed. Press, Beijing, 2002.
- [DGJT] M. R. Douglas, S. Govindarajan, T. Jayaraman, and A. Tomasiello, *D-branes on Calabi-Yau manifolds and superpotentials*, Comm. Math. Phys. 248 (2004), no. 1, 85–118.
- [DHKK] G. Dimitrov, F. Haiden, L. Katzarkov, and M. Kontsevich, *Dynamical Systems and Categories*, arXiv:1307.8418v1.
- [FadKas] L. D. Faddeev and R. M. Kashaev, *Quantum dilogarithm*, Modern Phys. Lett. A 9 (1994), no. 5, 427–434.
- [FutUed] M. Futaki and K. Ueda, *Homological mirror symmetry for Brieskorn-Pham singularities*, Selecta Math. (N.S.) 17 (2011), no. 2, 435–452.
- [Giv] A. Givental, *Equivariant Gromov-Witten invariants*, Internat. Math. Res. Notices 1996, no. 13, 613–663.
- [GKR] A. Gorodentsev, S. Kuleshov and A. Rudakov, *t-stabilities and t-structures on triangulated categories*, (Russian) Izv. Ross. Akad. Nauk Ser. Mat. 68 (2004), no. 4, 117–150 (English version).
- [HRS] D. Happel, I. Reiten, and S. O. Smalø, *Tilting in abelian categories and quasitilted algebras*, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. 120 (1996), no. 575, viii+ 88 pp.

- [Hor] R. Horja, *Hypergeometric functions and mirror symmetry in toric varieties*, arXiv:math/9912109.
- [HonOku] D. Honda and T. Okuda, *Exact results for boundaries and domain walls in 2d supersymmetric theories*, arXiv:1308.2217.
- [HorRom] K. Hori and M. Romo, *Exact Results In Two-Dimensional (2,2) Supersymmetric Gauge Theories With Boundary*, arXiv:1308.2438.
- [Hos00] S. Hosono, *Local mirror symmetry and type IIA monodromy of Calabi-Yau manifolds*, Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. 4 (2000), no. 2, 335–376.
- [Hos04] S. Hosono, *Central charges, symplectic forms, and hypergeometric series in local mirror symmetry*, Mirror symmetry. V, 405–439, AMS/IP Stud. Adv. Math., 38, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2006.
- [Iri09] H. Iritani, *An integral structure in quantum cohomology and mirror symmetry for toric orbifolds*, Adv. Math. 222 (2009), no. 3, 1016–1079.
- [Iri11] H. Iritani, *Quantum Cohomology and Periods*, arXiv:1101.4512.
- [IshUed] A. Ishii and K. Ueda, *A note on derived categories of Fermat varieties*, EMS Series of Congress Reports 2012.
- [IUU] A. Ishii, K. Ueda, and H. Uehara, *Stability conditions on A_n -singularities*, J. Differential Geom. 84 (2010), no. 1, 87–126.
- [IshUeh] A. Ishii and H. Uehara, *Autoequivalences of derived categories on the minimal resolutions of A_n -singularities on surfaces*, J. Differential Geom. 71 (2005), no. 3, 385–435.
- [KST] H. Kajiuura, K. Saito, and A. Takahashi, *Matrix factorization and representations of quivers. II. Type ADE case*, Adv. Math. 211 (2007), no. 1, 327–362.
- [Kan] H. Kanno, *Instanton Partition Function in “Omega” Background and Plane Partitions*, a lecture at Rikkyo University, <http://www.rikkyo.ne.jp/grp/itp/data/2010/string/kanno.pdf>, 2010.
- [KanZag] M. Kaneko and D. Zagier, *A generalized Jacobi theta function and quasimodular forms. In: The moduli space of curves* (Texel Island, 1994), 165–172, Progr. Math., 129, Birkhäuser Boston, Boston, MA (1995).
- [KKP] L. Katzarkov, M. Kontsevich and T. Pantev, *Hodge theoretic aspects of mirror symmetry*, arXiv:0806.0107.
- [Kel] B. Keller, *On cluster theory and quantum dilogarithm identities*, Representations of algebras and related topics, 85–116, EMS Ser. Congr. Rep., Eur. Math. Soc., Zrich, 2011.
- [KleThe] A. Klemm and S. Theisen, *Considerations of one-modulus Calabi-Yau compactifications: Picard-Fuchs equations, Kähler potentials and mirror maps*, Nuclear Phys. B 389 (1993), no. 1, 153–180.
- [Kon95] M. Kontsevich, *Homological algebra of mirror symmetry*, Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians, Vol. 1, 2 (Zürich, 1994), 120–139, Birkhäuser, Basel, 1995.
- [Kon12] M. Kontsevich, a lecture at U. of Lille, http://www.dailymotion.com/video/xpx1pv_maxim-kontsevich-lille-bridgeland-stability_tech, 2012.
- [KonSoi08] M. Kontsevich and Y. Soibelman, *Stability structures, motivic Donaldson-Thomas invariants and cluster transformations*, arXiv:0811.2435.
- [KonSoi13] M. Kontsevich and Y. Soibelman, *Wall-crossing structures in Donaldson-Thomas invariants, integrable systems and Mirror Symmetry*, arXiv:1303.3253.
- [KonMan] M. Kontsevich and Yu. Manin, *Gromov-Witten classes, quantum cohomology, and enumerative geometry*, Comm. Math. Phys. 164 (1994), no. 3, 525–562.
- [KonZag] M. Kontsevich and D. Zagier, *Periods*, Mathematics unlimited2001 and beyond, 771–808, Springer, Berlin, 2001.
- [LLY] B. H. Lian, K. Liu, and S.-T. Yau, *Mirror principle. I*, Asian J. Math. 1 (1997), no. 4, 729–763.
- [MelOka] A. Mellit and S. Okada, *Joyce invariants for K3 surfaces and mock theta functions*, Commun. Number Theory Phys. (2009) Vol 3 Num 4 p.655–676.
- [Mor] D. R. Morrison, *Picard-Fuchs equations and mirror maps for hypersurfaces*, Essays on mirror manifolds, 241–264, Int. Press, Hong Kong, 1992.
- [Mov] H. Movasati, *Modular-type functions attached to mirror quintic Calabi-Yau varieties*, arXiv:1111.0537.
- [NohUed] Y. Nohara and K. Ueda, *Homological mirror symmetry for the quintic 3-fold*, Geom. Topol. 16 (2012), no. 4, 1967–2001.
- [Oka06a] S. Okada, *Stability manifold of \mathbb{P}^1* , J. Algebraic Geom. 15 (2006), no. 3, 487–505.

- [Oka06b] S. Okada, *On stability manifolds of Calabi-Yau surfaces*, Int. Math. Res. Not. (2006), Art. ID 58743, 16.
- [Oka09] S. Okada, *Homological mirror symmetry of Fermat polynomials*, arXiv:0910.2014v3.
- [Ori09] D. Orlov, *Derived categories of coherent sheaves and triangulated categories of singularities*, Algebra, arithmetic, and geometry: in honor of Yu. I. Manin Vol. II, 503–531, Progr. Math., 270, Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 2009.
- [Ori11] D. Orlov, *Landau-Ginzburg models, D-branes, and mirror symmetry*, arXiv:1111.2962v1.
- [Qiu] Y. Qiu, *Stability conditions and quantum dilogarithm identities for Dynkin quivers*, arXiv:1111.1010.
- [Sei00] P. Seidel, *Vanishing cycles and mutation*, European Congress of Mathematics Vol II (Barcelona 2000), Progr. Math. 202, Birkhäuser, 2001, pp. 65–85.
- [Sei01] P. Seidel, *More about vanishing cycles and mutation*, Symplectic geometry and mirror symmetry (Seoul, 2000), 429–465, World Sci. Publ., River Edge, NJ, 2001.
- [Sei08] P. Seidel, *Fukaya categories and Picard-Lefschetz theory*, Zürich Lectures in Advanced Mathematics, Eur. Math. Soc., Zürich, 2008.
- [SeiTho] P. Seidel and R. P. Thomas, *Braid group actions on derived categories of coherent sheaves*, Duke Math. J. 108 (2001), no.1, 37–108.
- [She] N. Sheridan, *Homological Mirror Symmetry for Calabi-Yau hypersurfaces in projective space*, arXiv:1111.0632.
- [Tho] R. P. Thomas, *Stability conditions and the braid group*, Comm. Anal. Geom. 14 (2006), no. 1, 135–161.
- [ThoYau] R. P. Thomas and S.-T. Yau, *Special Lagrangians, stable bundles and mean curvature flow*, Comm. Anal. Geom. 10 (2002), no. 5, 1075–1113.
- [Tod] Y. Toda, *Gepner type stability conditions on graded matrix factorizations*, arXiv:1302.6293.
- [Wit] E. Witten, *Mirror manifolds and topological field theory*, Essays on mirror manifolds, 120–158, Int. Press, Hong Kong, 1992.
- [Zac] D. Zacharia, *Ext and Koszul algebra*, <http://altenua.udea.edu.co/heragis/ExKoszulAlgZacharia.pdf>.
- [Zag06] D. Zagier, *Ramanujan’s mock theta functions and their applications*, Séminaire Bourbaki, 60^{ème} année, 2006–2007, n^o 986.
- [Zag08] D. Zagier, *Elliptic modular forms and their applications*, 1-2-3 of modular forms, 1–103, Universitext, Springer, Berlin, 2008.
- [Zag12] D. Zagier, *Modular forms, periods, and differential equations*, a lecture at IHES, http://www.dailymotion.com/video/xwglc0_modular-forms-periods-and-differential-equations.tech, 2012.
- [Zin] A. Zinger, *The reduced genus 1 Gromov-Witten invariants of Calabi-Yau hypersurfaces*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. 22 (2009), no. 3, 691–737.

OYAMA NATIONAL COLLEGE OF TECHNOLOGY, OYAMA TOCHIGI, JAPAN 323-0806
E-mail address: okada@oyama-ct.ac.jp