

*Dedicated to the memory of Yuri Ivanovich Manin*

## ZETA-POLYNOMIALS, SUPERPOLYNOMIALS, DAHA AND PLANE CURVE SINGULARITIES

IVAN CHEREDNIK <sup>†</sup>

ABSTRACT. We begin with modular form periods, a focal point of several Yuri Manin’s works. The similarity is discussed between the corresponding zeta-polynomials and superpolynomials of algebraic links, closely related to Khovanov-Rozansky polynomials. We focus on DAHA superpolynomials and motivic ones, defined via compactified Jacobians of plane curve singularities and their counterparts in arbitrary ranks; the non-unibranch construction is new. They conjecturally coincide with the corresponding generalizations of  $L$ -functions and satisfy the Riemann Hypothesis in some sectors of the parameters. Presumably, the motivic ones can be interpreted as certain partition functions of the Landau-Ginzburg model associated with plane curve singularities; RH for them is remarkably similar to the Lee-Yang circle theorem for Ising models. A  $q, t$ -deformation of the Witten index is obtained as an application. General perspectives of the motivic theory of isolated curve and surface singularities are discussed, including possible implications in number theory. Also, we introduce super-analogs of  $\rho_{ab}$ -invariants and discuss super-deformations of the Riemann’s zeta. Among other topics: Verlinde algebras and the topological vertex.

*Key words:* double affine Hecke algebras; Macdonald polynomials; Verlinde algebras; triangular groups; Mostow groups; linear rigidity; Deligne-Simpson problem; knot invariants; HOMFLY-PT polynomials; iterated torus links; Seifert manifolds; Lens spaces; Alexander polynomials; Khovanov-Rozansky homology; rho-invariants; compactified Jacobians; affine Springer fibers; plane curve singularities; compactified Jacobians; theta-functions; Hasse-Weil zeta functions; Riemann’s zeta function; Dirichlet L-functions; Riemann hypothesis; modular forms; Iwasawa theory; Landau-Ginzburg models; Ising models; Witten index; topological vertex

MSC (2010): 11F67, 11R23, 11S40, 14H20, 14H50, 20C08, 33D52, 57M27

---

<sup>†</sup> February 18, 2024. Partially supported by NSF grant DMS-1901796.

## CONTENTS

1. MODULAR FORM PERIODS	3
1.1. <b>Manin, my teacher</b>	3
1.2. <b>Modular periods</b>	3
1.3. <b>Using DAHA</b>	4
1.4. <b>Zeta-polynomials</b>	5
2. BASIC DAHA THEORY	5
2.1. <b>Main definitions.</b>	5
2.2. <b>Polynomial representation</b>	7
2.3. <b>Refined Verlinde algebras</b>	9
2.4. <b>The Galois action</b>	10
3. KNOT INVARIANTS VIA DAHA	11
3.1. <b>DAHA-Jones polynomials</b>	11
3.2. <b>The case of trefoil</b>	13
3.3. <b>Iterated links</b>	14
3.4. <b>Superduality and RH</b>	17
4. PLANE CURVE SINGULARITIES	21
4.1. <b>Basic facts</b>	21
4.2. <b>Compactified Jacobians</b>	23
4.3. <b>Motivic superpolynomials</b>	26
4.4. <b>Some examples</b>	31
5. ZETAS FOR SINGULARITIES	33
5.1. <b>Generalizing Galkin's zeta</b>	33
5.2. <b>The passage to links</b>	35
5.3. <b>Quasi-rho-invariants</b>	37
6. ON PHYSICS CONNECTIONS	39
6.1. <b>Lee-Yang theorem</b>	40
6.2. <b>Landau-Ginzburg models</b>	41
6.3. <b>Refined Witten index</b>	42
6.4. <b><math>S</math>-duality</b>	43
7. ZETA-FUNCTIONS AS INVARIANTS	44
7.1. <b>The first figure</b>	44
7.2. <b>The second figure</b>	46
7.3. <b>Sharp <math>q</math>-zeta</b>	52
7.4. <b>Strong polynomial count</b>	55

## 1. MODULAR FORM PERIODS

1.1. **Manin, my teacher.** In 1965-67, Yuri Ivanovich Manin and Ernest Borisovich Vinberg delivered special courses at Moscow School no 2 for senior students. This is when I met Yu.I. With some stretch, I can say that Manin and Vinberg were my high school teachers and Vasilii Iskovskikh and Victor Kac were our tutors (teaching assistants of Yu.I. and E.B).

Our regular relations with Yu.I. began about 1968, when he took me as his student at Moscow State University. My first assignment was reading Serre's "Corps locaux"; I learned Herbrand theory (the higher ramification), but cannot say the same about French.

Let me omit 50 years and go to 2017, the Arbeitstagung devoted to his 80th birthday. It was a great meeting! Yu.I. and Ksenia Glebovna were terrific hosts, many people were around, a perfect view of Rein from their apartment etc.

Mostly we discussed anything but mathematics, though something came up: *zeta-polynomials*, certain combinations of modular form periods satisfying Riemann Hypothesis, predicted by Manin.

My talk was mostly about DAHA *superpolynomials*  $\mathcal{H}(q, t, a)$  for *double affine Hecke algebras*. Superpolynomials have several interpretations; the major one is via *Khovanov-Rozansky triply graded homology*.

This direction is in progress. Conjecturally, topological superpolynomials, those from the BPS states (SCFT), DAHA superpolynomials, motivic ones and  $L$ -functions of plane curve singularities coincide (when these theories overlap). I will focus on the latter three below; this note is introductory, with very few names and references.

1.2. **Modular periods.** Let us begin with Manin's well-known paper "*Periods of parabolic forms and  $p$ -adic Hecke series*" (1973). Basically, you consider a parabolic (cusp) form  $\Phi(z)$  of even weight  $w$  and calculate its *periods*  $r_k(\Phi) = \int_0^{i\infty} \Phi(z)z^k dz$  for  $0 \leq k \leq w - 2$ . Then the ratios of  $r_k$  for even  $k$  or those for odd  $k$  are rational numbers, which can be calculated (Manin's theorem).

For instance, such  $\Phi$  are proportional to  $\Delta = e^{2\pi iz} \prod_{n=1}^{\infty} (1 - e^{2\pi inz})^{24}$  for  $w = 12$ . Then  $r_2/r_0 = -\frac{2^2 3^4 5}{691}$ ,  $r_3/r_1 = -\frac{2^4 3}{5^2}$ , etc. We note a relation to the Ramanujan's  $\tau(n) = \sigma_{11} \pmod{691}$  (1916); Manin reproved it.

The periods are essentially the values  $L_{\Phi}(s)$  of the corresponding  $L$ -function for integer  $s$  inside the critical strip. This can be extended to

$L_\Phi(s, \chi) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \chi(n) \lambda_n n^{-s}$  for suitable Dirichlet characters  $\chi$  if  $\Phi$  is an eigenfunction of the Hecke operators  $T_n$  with eigenvalues  $\lambda_n$ .

The second part of his paper was on the  $p$ -adic extrapolations of the ratios of the periods, which is closely related to the *Kubota-Leopoldt  $p$ -adic zeta function* and *eigenvarieties*. Concerning the origins of this direction, let me mention at least Barry Mazur and Nicholas Katz.

The periods are generally for any paths  $\gamma[0, \iota\infty]$  for  $\gamma \in SL(2, \mathbb{Z})$ , but  $[0, \iota\infty]$  is sufficient due to the modularity of  $\Phi$ . However, more general paths do occur in the Manin's paper in process of calculations.

The  $p$ -adic extrapolations and the Kubota-Leopoldt zeta (1964) are closely related to the *Iwasawa invariants* of  $\Gamma$ -extensions due to Mazur and Wiles in full generality. The examples of  $\Gamma$ -extensions are some towers of cyclotomic fields, where we monitor the class numbers. Following Mazur, the Iwasawa invariants are parallel to the *Alexander polynomials*. The covers of the  $S^3 \setminus K$  for knots  $K$  in their theory are similar to  $\Gamma$ -extensions; those of  $\mathbb{P}^2$  minus the corresponding plane curve singularity are sufficient for algebraic  $K$  due to Libgober and others.

The Alexander polynomials are  $\mathcal{H}(q = t, t, a = -1)$  for the DAHA superpolynomials  $\mathcal{H}$ , and there is a relation to  $\rho(q, t)$ , refined *quasi- $\rho$ -invariants* introduced and discussed below (for algebraic knots).

**1.3. Using DAHA.** The modular periods and DAHA are quite different theories, but there is a clear common denominator: the action of  $SL(2, \mathbb{Z})$ . The main feature of DAHA is that it provides a universal formalization of *Fourier transforms* and the action of (projective)  $SL(2, \mathbb{Z})$  in algebra, harmonic analysis and physics.

To be more exact, DAHA serve the theories with the Fourier transform and the Gaussian, where the latter is an eigenfunction of the former. The classical Fourier transform, its  $q$ -counterparts, the Hankel transform and the Verlinde  $S, T$ -operators are basic examples. DAHA is a universal (flat) deformation of the Heisenberg and Weyl algebras, so its role in Fourier analysis is not surprising.

Moreover, it appeared that DAHA provides invariants of iterated torus links. This is not very surprising because the *Verlinde algebras* are closely connected with the invariants of links and 3-folds. In DAHA theory, these algebras become *perfect quotients* of the polynomial representations. Hopefully, DAHA and the theory of modular forms and  $L$ -functions can eventually merge into one, but this will require efforts.

Number theory already provided some framework for quite a bunch of similar directions, which is hardly accidental. Let me quote from the Manin's paper: "... any points of contact with concrete number-theoretical facts, whether old or new, take on especial significance. They discipline the imagination, and they provide a breathing space and the opportunity to evaluate the stunning beauty of past discoveries." This is very much applicable now to the relations between number theory and physics (in both directions).

**1.4. Zeta-polynomials.** Next, in his "*Local zeta factors and geometries under Spec  $\mathbb{Z}$* " (2014), Yu.I. conjectured that a certain combination of  $L_\Phi(1), \dots, L_\Phi(w-1)$  is a *zeta-polynomial*: satisfies the functional equation  $s \mapsto 1-s$  and the Riemann Hypothesis. This was fully confirmed for  $w \geq 4$  by Ken Ono, Larry Rolin and Florian Sprung in their paper "*Zeta-polynomials for modular form periods*" (2016).

Let  $M_\Phi(m) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{j=0}^{w-2} \left(\frac{\sqrt{N}}{2\pi}\right)^{j+1} \frac{L_\Phi(j+1)}{(w-2-j)!} j^m$  for a  $\Gamma_0(N)$ -modular  $\Phi$ . Then their zeta-polynomial  $Z_\Phi(s)$  is a linear combination of  $M_\Phi(m)$  for  $m = 0, \dots, w-2$  with the coefficients given in terms of Stirling polynomials of the 1st kind and the Fernando Rodriguez-Villegas transform. Manin used the latter too. There is a relation of zeta-polynomials to the Bloch-Kato Conjecture, which is a Galois cohomological interpretation of the periods, and related advanced number-theoretical problems.

What is important for us is that there is some "canonical" way to combine the modular periods in a zeta-polynomial, which resembles very much the theory of Witten-Reshetikhin-Turaev invariants of 3-folds invariants and their relations to knot invariants. DAHA invariants are "canonical" combinations of basic coinvariants in a similar way.

There are various connections of the *WRT-invariants* with modular forms. Let us at least mention "*Quantum invariants, modular forms, and lattice points II*" (K.Hikami, 2006). A challenge is to connect the inequalities  $0 \leq k \leq w-2$  with those in *Verlinde algebras*, more exactly with the range of Macdonald polynomials in *perfect DAHA modules* at roots of unity, but this is fully open at the moment.

## 2. BASIC DAHA THEORY

**2.1. Main definitions.** DAHA, denoted by  $\mathcal{H}$ , were initially introduced to complete the theory of Knizhnik-Zamolodchikov equations

and Quantum Many Body Problem. It is a universal flat deformation of  $\mathcal{W}$ , the Weyl algebra extended by the Weyl group  $W$ ; this is for any reducible reduced root systems  $R$  (in this note). The projective  $SL(2, \mathbb{Z})$  due to Steinberg acts in  $\mathcal{H}$ . This is actually the braid group  $B_3$ ; the notation will be  $\widetilde{SL(2, \mathbb{Z})}$ .

For  $A_1$ ,  $\mathcal{H}$  is generated by  $X^{\pm 1}, Y^{\pm 1}, T$  subject to group relations  $TXTX = 1 = TY^{-1}TY^{-1}, Y^{-1}X^{-1}YXT^2 = q^{-1/2}$  and the quadratic one  $(T - t^{1/2})(T + t^{-1/2}) = 1$ . The action of the  $\widetilde{SL(2, \mathbb{Z})}$  is:

$$\tau_+ : Y \mapsto q^{-\frac{1}{4}}XY, X \mapsto X, T \mapsto T, \tau_- : X \mapsto q^{\frac{1}{4}}YX, Y \mapsto Y, T \mapsto T,$$

exactly as for  $\mathcal{W}$  (there is no  $q$  here). The automorphisms  $\tau_{\pm}$ , the generators of  $\widetilde{SL(2, \mathbb{Z})}$ , are the preimages of  $\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$  and  $\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ , the standard generators of  $SL(2, \mathbb{Z})$ . The defining relation of  $\widetilde{SL(2, \mathbb{Z})}$  is simple:  $\tau_+\tau_-^{-1}\tau_+ = \sigma = \tau_-^{-1}\tau_+\tau_-^{-1}$ , which formally gives that  $\sigma^2$  is central. The element  $\sigma^{-1}$  is the (operator) *DAHA-Fourier transform*.

When  $t^{1/2} = 1$ ,  $T$  becomes the inversion  $s$  of  $X$  and  $Y$ , and we arrive at  $\mathcal{W}$ . Upon  $t = q$ , DAHA is closely related to quantum groups. The case  $t = q^k$  as  $q \rightarrow 1$  serves the Harish-Chandra theory and its  $k$ -generalization, called Heckman-Opdam theory (in mathematics), including spherical functions and Jack polynomials. Also,  $q \rightarrow 0$  is the  $p$ -adic limit and  $t \rightarrow 0$  is the Kac-Moody limit. The action of  $\widetilde{SL(2, \mathbb{Z})}$  generally collapses in the limits. However it survives in the important limit to rational DAHA and Hankel transforms, which is when  $X = q^x, Y = q^{-y}, t = q^k$  and  $q \rightarrow 1$  (for  $A_1$ ).

Also,  $\widetilde{SL(2, \mathbb{Z})}$  generally acts in finite-dimensional *rigid*  $\mathcal{H}$ -modules. *Perfect representations* are such: canonical irreducible quotients of polynomials representations at roots of unity  $q$  or for any  $q$  and *singular*  $k$ . The classical *Verlinde algebras* are symmetric (spherical) parts of perfect representations when  $t = q$  and  $q$  is a root of unity.

We omit the general definition of  $\mathcal{H}$ . For an arbitrary reduced irreducible root system  $R$  of rank  $n$ , it is generated by pairwise commutative  $X_{\lambda}$  for  $\lambda$  in the *the weight lattice*  $P$ , pairwise commutative  $Y_{\lambda}$  and  $T_i$  for  $1 \leq i \leq n$  such that  $(T_i - t^{1/2})(T_i + t^{-1/2}) = 0$ , where  $t_{sht}$  and  $t_{lng}$  can be generally used when  $\alpha_i$  is short and long. *Spherical DAHA* is defined as  $\mathcal{P}_+ \mathcal{H} \mathcal{P}_+$  for the  $t$ -symmetrizer  $\mathcal{P}_+ = \sum_{w \in W} t^{l(w)/2} T_w / \sum_{w \in W} t^{l(w)}$ .

**2.2. Polynomial representation.** The key property of DAHA is the *PBW theorem*: any element  $H \in \mathcal{H}$  can be uniquely represented as  $H = \sum c_{\lambda,w,\mu} X_\lambda T_w Y_\mu$  for  $\lambda, \mu \in P$  and  $w \in W$  (the non-affine Weyl group). Equivalently, there is a faithful action of  $\mathcal{H}$  in the *polynomial representation*  $\mathcal{X} = \mathbb{C}[X_\lambda]$ : the one induced from the character  $Y_\lambda \mapsto t^{(\rho,\lambda)}, T_i \mapsto t_i^{1/2}$ . It is a deformation of the classical *Fock representation* of the corresponding Heisenberg-Weyl algebra. We will need below the *DAHA coinvariant*:  $\{H\} = \sum c_{\lambda,w,\mu} t^{(\mu-\lambda,\rho)+\text{length}(w)/2}$ , which is  $H(1)(X_\lambda \mapsto t^{-(\rho,\lambda)})$ , where  $H(1)$  is the action of  $H \in \mathcal{H}$  at  $1 \in \mathcal{X}$ .

Technically, the simplest definition of  $\mathcal{H}$  is via the usage of  $T_0$  instead of  $Y_\lambda$ . This approach is directly related to the  $T \times \mathbb{C}^*$ -equivariant  $K$ -theory of affine flag varieties. Then  $Y_\lambda$  are defined as some products in terms of  $T_i$  for  $i \geq 0$  and their commutativity is some proposition. The construction of  $Y_\lambda$  via  $\{T_i\}$  is essentially due to Bernstein-Zelevinsky and Lusztig. Finding explicit defining relations between  $X_\lambda$  and  $Y_\mu$  is generally involved unless for  $A_n$  and in small ranks.

The exact connection with affine flag varieties was fully clarified by Garland-Grojnowski and Ginzburg-Kapranov-Vasserot (1995). We note that the action of  $\widetilde{SL(2, \mathbb{Z})}$  is far from obvious from the  $K$ -theoretical viewpoint in spite of various attempts in this direction. The key property of any Fourier transforms is that they send polynomials to delta-functions, which is not simple to incorporate geometrically.

Generally, there are 3 fundamentally different definitions (interpretations) of DAHA; more than 3 for  $A_n$ . The 2nd definition is via the *orbifold* fundamental group of the so-called *elliptic configuration space*:  $\pi_1^{orb}(\{x \in E^n \mid \prod_\alpha(x, \alpha) \neq 0\}/W)$ . Here  $E$  is an elliptic curve and  $W$  is the non-affine Weyl group acting in  $E^n$ . This action is well-defined because the roots  $\alpha \in R$  are with integer coefficients in terms of the fundamental weights, which are considered as coordinates of  $E^n$ .

Then we take group algebra of this  $\pi_1^{orb}$  and impose the quadratic relations for  $T_i$  as above, which elements are half-turns corresponding to simple reflections. The element  $\sigma$  becomes basically the transposition of the periods of  $E$ . The elliptic configuration space is the “big cell” in  $Bun_G(E)$  for the corresponding simple Lie group  $G$ .

The existence of the action of  $\widetilde{SL(2, \mathbb{Z})}$  is straightforward from the topological definition. However, the polynomial representation is far from immediate in this interpretation, which is almost by construction

via the  $K$ -theory of affine flag varieties. I constantly use both approaches and the one via harmonic analysis, the 3rd major approach.

The action of  $\widetilde{SL(2, \mathbb{Z})}$  becomes “natural” if DAHA is interpreted via the  $q$ -version of harmonic analysis on symmetric spaces. Namely,  $\sigma$  becomes the DAHA-Fourier transform, and  $\tau_+$  is associated with the multiplication by the Gaussian,  $q^{x^2/2}$ . Basically, this projective action is equivalent to the fundamental theorem of Fourier analysis: the Gaussian is an eigenfunction of the corresponding Fourier transform.

*Spherical DAHA* for  $GL_n$  can be interpreted as *elliptic Hall algebras* and are related to quantum groups due to Schiffmann -Vasserot and others. In spite of the usage of elliptic curves, the action of  $\widetilde{SL(2, \mathbb{Z})}$  is not “immediate” in this approach; further work is needed. Also, it can be interpreted via certain *shuffle algebras*.

Given a reduced irreducible root system  $R$ , the *nonsymmetric Macdonald polynomials*  $E_\lambda$  for  $\lambda \in P$  generalize the monomials  $X_\lambda$  for the corresponding Weyl algebra and form a basis of  $\mathcal{X}$ . They are eigenfunctions of  $Y_\mu$  normalized by the conditions  $E_\lambda = X_\lambda + (\text{lower terms})$ . In this approach, *Macdonald polynomials*  $P_\lambda$  are the  $t$ -symmetrizations of  $E_\lambda$  for  $\lambda \in P_+$ ; the normalization is  $P_\lambda = X_\lambda + (\text{lower terms})$ .

The action of  $\mathcal{H}$  in  $\mathcal{X}$  is sufficiently explicit. For  $A_1$ :  $T \mapsto t^{1/2}s + \frac{t^{1/2}-t^{-1/2}}{X^2-1}(s-1)$ ,  $X \mapsto X$ ,  $Y \mapsto spT$ , where  $s(X) = X^{-1}$ ,  $p(X) = q^{1/2}X$ . The divided differences here and for any root systems  $R$  are very standard in the theory of affine Hecke algebras and are quite common in related geometry and combinatorics.

For  $GL_n$ , the corresponding  $\mathcal{H}$  is generated by  $X_i^{\pm 1}, Y_j^{\pm 1}, T_k$ , where  $1 \leq i, j \leq n$  and  $1 \leq k \leq n-1$  for pairwise commutative  $\{X_i\}$  and  $\{Y_j\}$ . One has:  $\tau_+(Y_1) = q^{-1/2}X_1Y_1$ ,  $\tau_-(X_1) = q^{+1/2}Y_1X_1$  and so on. The action of  $Y_1$  in  $\mathcal{X}$  is via the formula  $Y_1 = \pi T_{n-1} \dots T_1$ , where  $\pi : X_1 \mapsto X_2, X_2 \mapsto X_3, \dots, X_n \mapsto q^{-1}X_1$ . These formulas are quite similar for any  $Y_i$ . We will use them below when calculating the DAHA-superpolynomial of trefoil (as an example).

Going back to the modular periods, the evaluation map  $X \mapsto t^{-\rho}$ , *the DAHA coinvariant*, plays a role of integration  $\int_0^{i\infty} \{\cdot\} \Phi dz$ ,  $E_\lambda$  replace  $z^k$ , and the action of  $\tilde{\gamma}$  corresponds to the change of the integration path to  $\gamma[0, i\infty]$ . The main deviation is that the action of  $\gamma$  plays a much more significant role for DAHA superpolynomials versus that for

the periods. In contrast to  $\int_0^{i\infty} \{\cdot\} \Phi dz$ , the DAHA coinvariant is not stable in any way with respect to the action of  $\widetilde{SL}(2, \mathbb{Z})$ .

When switching to the zeta-polynomials  $Z_\Phi(s)$ , special linear combinations of  $z^k$ -momenta must be considered, which resembles our usage of  $E_\lambda$ . Both constructions are “canonical” in a sense; the restriction  $0 \leq k \leq w - 2$  seems somewhat similar to those in Verlinde algebras.

The next topic, *DAHA-Verlinde algebras*, gives a direct link of DAHA at roots of unity to number theory. They are some counterparts of *Tate modules* for the towers of covers of an elliptic curve ramified at one point; the *absolute Galois group* acts there. The Verlinde algebras are one of the key ingredients of the *Witten-Reshetikhin-Turaev invariants*, generalize  $K_0$  of the *reduced category* in representation theory of *quantum groups* at roots of unity, and that of integrable modules of *Kac-Moody algebras* (Kazhdan-Lusztig, Finkelberg).

**2.3. Refined Verlinde algebras.** These algebras in the nonsymmetric variant are *perfect* finite-dimensional quotients of  $\mathcal{X}$ , those with the action of  $\widetilde{SL}(2, \mathbb{Z})$  and DAHA-invariant non-degenerate quadratic forms. They are commutative algebras, but can be non-semisimple, those related to *logarithmic* CFT in examples. Technically, we divide  $\mathcal{X}$  by the radical of the evaluation pairing. Such modules exist either when  $q$  is a root of unity or for *singular*  $k$ , where  $t = q^k$  as above.

In the case of  $A_1$ , let  $q = \exp(\frac{2\pi i}{N})$ ,  $k \in \frac{\mathbb{Z}_+}{2}$  and  $k < N/2$ . The map  $X(z) = q^z$  can be naturally extended to an  $\mathcal{H}$ -homomorphism  $\mathbb{C}[X^{\pm 1}] \rightarrow V_{2N-4k}$ . The latter is the *nonsymmetric Verlinde algebra*. It is the space of functions  $f : \{-\frac{N+k+1}{2}, \dots, -\frac{k+1}{2}, -\frac{k}{2}, \frac{k+1}{2}, \dots, \frac{N-k}{2}\} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  with pointwise multiplication and the action of  $X, T, Y$  induced from that in  $\mathcal{X}$ . These modules are *rigid*, which readily gives an action of  $\widetilde{PSL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$  there, and in  $V_{N-2k+1}^{sym} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{v \in V \mid Tv = t^{\frac{1}{2}}v\}$ . The low index is the dimension of the corresponding  $V$ :  $\dim V_{2N-4k} = 2N - 4k$ , and  $\dim (V_{2N-4k})^{sym} = N - 2k + 1$ . The operators  $X, Y, T$  become unitary in  $V_{2N-4k}$  if the  $q = e^{\frac{2\pi i}{N}}$ , the “minimal” primitive  $N$ th root.

We classified *rigid* modules for  $A_1$  in “*On Galois action in rigid DAHA modules*” (2017). They are: ( $\alpha$ )  $V_{2N-4k}$  as above, ( $\beta$ ) non-semisimple  $V_{2N+4|k|}$  for  $k \in -\mathbb{Z}_+$  such that  $-N/2 < k < 0$ , and ( $\gamma$ )  $V_{2|k|}$  for  $k = -\frac{1}{2} - m > -N/2$ , where  $m \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ . There is a similar list for the *little* DAHA  $\mathcal{H}' = \langle X^{\pm 2}, Y^{\pm 2}, T \rangle \subset \mathcal{H}$ . Importantly, families ( $\alpha, \gamma$ ) have

*flat*  $q$ -deformations from roots of unity to arbitrary  $q$ . The unimodular  $q$  such that  $\arg q \leq \frac{2\pi}{N}$  result in the positivity of the invariant form in type  $(\alpha)$ . Such a deformation leads to some relations between  $V, V'$  defined for  $N \mid N'$ , generalizing those for the *Tate modules*.

The usual *Verlinde algebra* is  $V_{N-1}^{sym}$  of type  $(\alpha)$ , which is for  $k = 1$ , i.e. for  $t = q$ . Then  $\tau_+$  becomes the  $T$ -operator, and  $\sigma = \tau_+ \tau_-^{-1} \tau_+$  becomes the Verlinde  $S$ -operator. The *reduced characters* in Verlinde algebras, generally become the images of the corresponding Macdonald  $E$ -polynomials for  $V$  and symmetric ones for  $V^{sym}$ .

Perfect representations are quotients of the ones obtained from  $\mathcal{X}$  by fixing the corresponding central characters, which are of dimension  $4N$ . For  $k = 1$ , the symmetrizations  $V^{sym}$  of the latter are connected with the category of representations of *small quantum group*. For instance,  $V_{N-1}^{sym}$  is the Grothendieck ring  $K_0$  of the so-called *reduced category* for  $A_1$ . The perfect representations for  $\mathbb{Z}/2 \ni k \neq 1$  are generally beyond quantum groups, though the ones of type  $(\beta)$  are connected with *logarithmic* conformal field theories and there are other links.

**2.4. The Galois action.** The rigidity provides that the *absolute Galois group* acts in the modules above (including the usual Verlinde algebras). We use that *elliptic braid group*  $\mathcal{B}_q$  generated by  $X, T, Y$  subject to the group relations in the definition of  $\mathcal{H}$  of type  $A_1$  is a renormalization of the orbifold fundamental group  $\pi_1^{orb}(E/\{1, s\})$ , where  $E$  is an elliptic curve,  $s : x \mapsto -x$ . If  $E$  and its origin  $o$  are defined over some field  $\mathbb{Q}[q^{1/4}] \subset K \subset \overline{\mathbb{Q}}$ , then  $\text{Gal}(\overline{\mathbb{Q}}/K)$  acts projectively in these modules.

More exactly, setting  $A = XT$ ,  $B = XTY$ ,  $C = T^{-1}Y$ , the relations of  $\mathcal{B}_q$  and the action of  $\tau_{\pm}$  there become as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} A^2 = 1 = C^2 = q^{1/2}B^2, \quad \text{where } ABC = A^2YT^{-1}Y = YY^{-1}T = T, \\ \tau_+ : A \mapsto A, B \mapsto q^{-1/4}C, C \mapsto q^{1/4}C^{-1}BC, \\ \tau_- : A \mapsto q^{1/4}ABA^{-1}, B \mapsto q^{-1/4}A, C \mapsto C. \end{aligned}$$

The classification of  $\mathcal{H}$ -modules at roots of unity  $q, t$  becomes the corresponding multiplicative *Deligne-Simpson problem* with specific quadratic relations for  $A, B, C, D = T^{-1}$ . They can be arbitrary quadratic for DAHA of type  $C^\vee C_1$  (Sahi, Noumi-Stokman); let me also mention Oblomkov-Stoica (2009). This algebra is generated by  $A, B, C, D$  such that  $ABCD = 1$  satisfying any quadratic relations: those for the monodromy of the *Heun equation*. There are links to SCFT.

The images of  $\mathcal{B}_q$  in type  $(\alpha)$  rigid modules with positive-definite invariant forms are finite and we obtain finite covers of  $\mathbb{P}^1$  ramified at  $0, 1, \infty$  and  $o \in E(K)$ , where  $A, B, C, D$  are the corresponding monodromies. When  $t = 1$ , we arrive at unramified covers of  $E$ .

The case of the Hermitian invariant forms *with one minus* is interesting. Then the images of  $\mathcal{B}_q$  are discrete groups. The smallest non-trivial such  $V$  is for *little  $\mathcal{H}$* ;  $\dim V = 3$ . In particular, we obtain then *all Livné lattices* in  $PU(2, 1)$ , which are examples of the *Mostow groups*. Livné used a branched 2-cover of degree 2 of the *universal elliptic curve*.

More generally (for the same  $V$ ), there is a direct connection with the theory of *equilateral triangle groups* in  $PU(2, 1)$ ; for instance, see “*Complex hyperbolic triangle groups*” (R.E. Schwartz, 2002) and “*Cone metrics on the sphere and Livné’s lattices*” (Parker, 2006).

We mention here that the (regular) *Inverse Galois Problem* is based on *rigid triples*, which are  $\{a, b, c\}$  generating a group  $G$  and satisfying  $abc = 1$ . They are assumed from given conjugacy classes in  $G$  and the rigidity means essentially the uniqueness of such  $\{a, b, c\}$  up to (simultaneous) conjugations in  $G$ . We need  $\{a, b, c, d\}$  here, 4 points in  $\mathbb{P}^1$  and the *linear rigidity* (in matrices) based on Katz’ theory of rigid systems (in the variant due to M. Dettweiler and others).

Such covers extend the Belyi’s theorem and Grothendieck’s program of *dessins d’enfants* to  $E$ ; let us mention Beilinson-Levin (1991). We deal only with very “small” covers: those from DAHA modules. Our towers are similar to those from Tate modules, though our (ramified) version of  $T_p(E) = \varprojlim (E/E_{p^n})$  is *not* a module over  $p$ -adic numbers. Here and above see “*On Galois action in rigid DAHA modules*”.

### 3. KNOT INVARIANTS VIA DAHA

**3.1. DAHA-Jones polynomials.** They can be defined for any reduced root system  $R$ ; in the non-reduced case, see author’s “*Jones polynomials of torus knots via DAHA*” and “*DAHA-Jones polynomials of torus knots*”. The system  $C^{\vee}C_1$  is discussed in the latter. Algebraic torus knots are for  $r, s > 0$  such that  $\gcd(r, s) = 1$ . They can be represented as  $T(r, s) = \{x^r = y^s\} \cap S_{\epsilon}^3$  for a small sphere  $S_{\epsilon}^3$  centered at 0. The formula for the corresponding *DAHA-Jones invariant* is:

$$J_{r,s}^{\lambda}(q, t) = \left\{ \tilde{\gamma} \left( \frac{E_{\lambda}}{E_{\lambda}(t^{-\rho})} \right) (1) \right\}, \{F(X)\} = F(X \mapsto t^{-\rho}), \lambda \in P_+.$$

where  $(r, s)^{tr}$  is the 1st column of  $\gamma \in SL(2, \mathbb{Z})$ ,  $\tilde{\gamma}$  is its action in  $\mathcal{H}$ , and the Laurent polynomial  $\tilde{\gamma}(E_\lambda)(1)$  is  $\tilde{\gamma}(E_\lambda) \in \mathcal{H}$  applied to  $1 \in \mathcal{X}$ . It is not necessary to assume that  $r, s > 0$  in this definition; the corresponding torus knots will be non-algebraic for  $rs < 0$ .

A remarkable theorem is that it is always a  $q, t$ -polynomial (up to some fractional power  $q^\bullet t^\bullet$ ) in spite of the  $q, t$ -singularities of  $E/E_\lambda(t^{-\rho})$ , which exist only for some  $\lambda$  at roots of unity  $q$  and for singular  $t$ . The product formula for  $E_\lambda(t^{-\rho})$  is the Macdonald evaluation conjecture in the nonsymmetric variant (now a relatively simple theorem).

The formulas for  $J_{r,s}^\lambda(q, t)$  and their generalizations below for iterated torus knots will give exactly the same invariants if  $E_\lambda$  is replaced by the *symmetric* Macdonald polynomials  $P_\lambda$  for  $\lambda \in P_+$ . Note that  $P_\lambda(t^{-\rho}) = P_\lambda(t^\rho)$ . We employ the  $t$ -symmetrization inside the coinvariant  $\{\cdot\}$ .

The  $P$ -polynomials become the Schur-Weyl characters for  $R$  when  $t = q$ ; they do not depend on  $q, t$  in this case; then  $P_\lambda(t^\rho)$  is the corresponding  $q$ -dimension. Colored *Jones polynomials* for  $T(r, s)$  are  $J^\lambda$  for  $A_1$ ,  $\lambda = m\omega_1$  and  $q = t$ , which is up to some power  $t^\bullet$ .

The usage of the  $E$ -polynomials is important. For instance,  $E_{\omega_i} = X_{\omega_i}$  in the  $A_n$ -case, and  $J_{r,s}^{\omega_i}(q, t)$  are closely related to the left-hand side of the *Shuffle Conjecture*,  $\nabla e_n[X]$ , proved by Carlsson-Mellit in their “*A proof of the shuffle conjecture*” (JAMS, 2018). The right-hand side of this conjecture (in the most general setting) is the corresponding *motivic superpolynomial* (below). In the uncolored case  $\lambda = \omega_1$ ; *we will omit  $\lambda$  in  $J^\lambda$  and other formulas in this case.*

*$A_n$ -stabilization.* For any  $G = 1 + q\mathbb{C}[[q, t]] + t\mathbb{C}[[q, t]] \in \mathbb{C}[q, t]$  and rational  $u, v$ , let  $(q^u t^v G)^\circ \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} G$ . If  $G$  also depends on  $a^{\pm 1}$  (below), then  $(q^\bullet t^\bullet a^\bullet G)^\circ \in 1 + q\mathbb{C}[q, t] + t\mathbb{C}[q, t] + a\mathbb{C}[q^{\pm 1}, t^{\pm 1}]$ .

Given a Young diagram  $\lambda = (\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_m > 0)$ ,  $\lambda = \sum_{i=1}^m c_i \omega_i$  is considered a weight for  $A_n$ , where  $n \geq m-1$  and  $c_i$  is the number of columns of size  $i$  in  $\lambda$ .

The claim is that given  $r, s$  as above, there exists a unique polynomial  $\mathcal{H}_{r,s}(q, t, a) \in \mathbb{C}[q, t^{\pm 1}, a]$  such that  $J_{r,s}^\lambda(q, t)^\circ = \mathcal{H}_{r,s}^\lambda(q, t, a = -t^{n+1})$  for  $J_{r,s}^\lambda$  of type  $A_n$  for  $n \geq m-1$ . Automatically,  $\mathcal{H}_{r,s}(q, t, a)^\circ = \mathcal{H}_{r,s}(q, t, a)$ .

*Comments.* The starting point of this theory was due to Aganagic-Shakirov (2011) and the author (2011). Concerning the related physics, let me mention at least the paper by Gukov, Iqbal, Kozcaz and Vafa (2010). The stabilization of  $J^\lambda$  for  $A_n$  is based on a DAHA theorem

due to Schiffmann-Vasserot (2012). Let me mention here the proof of the DAHA-superduality for torus knots by Gorsky-Negut (2013).

It was conjectured by the author that the  $a$ -stabilization holds for  $B, C, D$  too; topologically, we generalize *Kauffman polynomials*. Moreover, superpolynomials were calculated for a couple of knots by the author and R.Elliot (2016) for the exceptional series from (Deligne-Gross, 2002):  $A_0 \subset A_1 \subset A_2 \subset D_2 \subset F_4 \subset D_4 \subset F_4 \subset E_6 \subset E_7 \subset E_8$ . Our paper was mostly on the superpolynomials in the case of the *annulus*.

Let us state a version of the stabilization conjecture for  $C_n$  (from my paper). One has  $R_+ = \{\epsilon_i \pm \epsilon_j, 2\epsilon_i\}$  for  $1 \leq i, j \leq n$  such that  $i \leq j$ ,  $P_+ = \{\lambda = \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i \epsilon_i, \lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_n \geq 0\}$ . Assuming that  $\lambda_m > 0$ , they become dominant weights for  $C_n$  for any  $n \geq m$ . We will treat  $\lambda$  as Young diagrams. DAHA invariants depend now on  $q$ ,  $t = t_{\text{sh}} = q^{k_{\text{sh}}}$  and the additional parameter  $u = t_{\text{ln}} = q^{k_{\text{ln}}}$ . We set  $\rho_k = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\alpha > 0} k_\alpha \alpha$  and replace  $t^\rho \mapsto q^{\rho_k}$  in all formulas.

Given a torus knot  $T_{r,s}$  and  $\lambda = (\lambda_i)$  with  $\lambda_m > 0$ , conjecturally there exists a polynomial  $\mathcal{H}_{r,s}^C(\lambda; q, t, u, a)$  with integral coefficients in terms of positive powers of  $a, q, u$  and  $t^{\pm 1}$  such that for any  $n \geq m$

$$\mathcal{H}_{r,s}^C(\lambda; q, t, u, a = -t^{n-1}) = J_{r,s}^{C_n}(\lambda; q, t, u)^\circ.$$

The uncolored invariants are for  $\omega_1 = \epsilon_1$ , which is minuscule for  $C_n$ .

**3.2. The case of trefoil.** Let us calculate  $\mathcal{H}_{3,2}$  for uncolored trefoil; we begin with  $A_1$ . As above,  $\{H\} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} H(1)(X \mapsto t^{-\rho})$ , where  $t^{-\rho} = t^{-\frac{1}{2}}$  for  $A_1$ . By  $\sim$ , we mean “up to  $q^\bullet t^\bullet$ ”. One has:

$$\begin{aligned} J_{3,2} &= \{\tau_+ \tau_-^2(X)\} \sim \{(XY)(XY)X(1)\} \sim \{Y(X^2)\} \\ &= t^{-\frac{1}{2}} q^{-1} X^2 - t^{\frac{1}{2}} + t^{-\frac{1}{2}} \Big|_{X^2 \mapsto t^{-1}} \sim 1 + qt - qt^2. \end{aligned}$$

When  $q = t$ , we obtain the *Jones polynomial*:  $J_{3,2}(q \mapsto t)^\circ = 1 + t^2 - t^3$ .

We use that  $E_1 = X$ :  $Y(X) = (qt)^{-\frac{1}{2}} X$ . Using the formula for  $Y_1$  for  $A_n$  above and the action of  $\tau_\pm$  on  $X_1, Y_1$ , we obtain that  $J_{3,2}^\circ = 1 + qt - qt^{n+1}$ , which gives that  $\mathcal{H}_{3,2} = 1 + qt + aq$  for  $a = -t^{n+1}$ . The relations  $\mathcal{H}_{3,2}(a \mapsto -t) = 1$  and  $\mathcal{H}_{3,2}(a \mapsto -t^2) = 1 + qt - qt^2$  are sufficient to fix it uniquely if it is known that  $\deg_a \mathcal{H} = 1$ . Generally,  $\deg_a \mathcal{H}_{r,s}^\lambda = |\lambda|(\text{Min}(r, s) - 1)$ . A remarkable simplicity of  $\mathcal{H}_{3,2}$  is fully clarified in the approach via motivic superpolynomials (below).

The case of  $T(2p+1, 2)$  is quite similar. For  $p = 1, 2, \dots$ , one has:  $\mathcal{H}_{2p+1,2} = 1 + qt + q^2t^2 + \dots + q^p t^p + aq(1 + qt + \dots + (qt)^{p-1})$ . Similarly, the Khovanov-Rozansky polynomials are the simplest for these knots.

The formula becomes significantly more involved with colors. Let  $\lambda = m\omega_1 = \square \cdots \square$  ( $m$  boxes) for  $m = 1, 2, \dots$ . Then:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_{2p+1,2}^\lambda &= \frac{(q; q)_m}{(-a; q)_m (1-t)} \sum_{k=0}^m (-1)^{m-k} \\ & (qt)^{\frac{m-k}{2}} \left( (q^{\frac{m(m+1)}{2}} - q^{\frac{k(k+1)}{2}}) (t/q)^{\frac{m-k}{2}} \right)^{2p+1} \\ & \frac{(t; q)_k (-a; q)_{m+k} (-a/t; q)_{m-k} (1 - q^{2k}t)}{(q; q)_k (qt; q)_{m+k} (q; q)_{m-k}}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $(a; q)_n = (1-a) \cdots (1-aq^{n-1})$ . This formula was proposed by Dunin-Barkowski, Mironov, Morozov, Sleptsov, Smirnov (2011-12), and, independently, by Fuji, Gukov, Sulkowsky (2012). A somewhat different formula is  $\mathcal{H}_{3,2}^\lambda = \sum_{k=0}^m q^{mk} t^k \frac{(q; q)_m (-a/t; q)_k}{(q; q)_k (q; q)_{m-k}}$  (only for trefoil). The justifications were obtained via DAHA, i.e. for the DAHA superpolynomials. The Habiro's formula (2000) is for  $p = 1, a = -t^2, t = q$ .

Let us mention here "*Torus knots and quantum modular forms*" devoted to color Jones polynomials for  $T(2p+1, 2)$  (K.Hikami-Lovejoy, 2014), and the *Kontsevich-Zagier series* from "*Vassiliev invariants and a strange identity related to the Dedekind eta-function*" (Zagier, 2001). Presumably, our refined formulas above can be used in a similar way. See also Example 5 from "*Quantum modular forms*" (Zagier, 2010).

In the case of uncolored trefoil for the system  $C_n$ ,  $\mathcal{H}_{3,2}^C(\omega_1; q, t, u, a) = 1 + qt + a(qt - qu) + a^2(-qu + q^2u - q^2tu) + a^3(-q^2tu + q^2u^2)$ .

The superpolynomial for the *exceptional series* for  $T(3, 2)$  and for the adjoint representation is due to Cherednik-Elliot (2016):

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_{3,2}^E(adj; q, t, a) &= 1 + q(t - ta + a^2 - a^4 + t^{-1}a^5 - t^{-1}a^6) + q^2(t^2a^2 - ta^3 + \\ & a^4 + ta^5 + t^{-1}a^6 - 3a^6 + t^{-1}a^7 + a^7 - t^{-1}a^8 - t^{-1}a^9 + t^{-1}a^{10} - t^{-2}a^{11}) + \\ & q^3(t^{-1}a^6 - a^7 + ta^7 + t^{-1}a^8 - a^8 - ta^8 + a^9 - 2t^{-1}a^{10} + a^{10} + t^{-2}a^{11} - t^{-1}a^{11} - \\ & a^{11} - t^{-2}a^{12} + 2t^{-1}a^{12} - t^{-2}a^{13} + t^{-2}a^{15}) + q^4(t^{-2}a^{12} - t^{-1}a^{12} + t^{-1}a^{13} - a^{13} - \\ & t^{-2}a^{14} + t^{-1}a^{14} + t^{-2}a^{16} - t^{-1}a^{16} - t^{-3}a^{17} + t^{-2}a^{17}) + q^5(-t^{-3}a^{18} + t^{-2}a^{18}). \end{aligned}$$

Here  $a = -t^{\frac{h}{8}}$  for the Coxeter number  $h$  for the  $A, D, E$  there.

**3.3. Iterated links.** We will begin with the DAHA construction for iterated torus knots. For any sequence  $\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \dots, \gamma_\ell \in SL(2, \mathbb{Z})$ , we set

$J^\lambda = \left( \cdots \tilde{\gamma}_{\ell-1} \left( \tilde{\gamma}_\ell \left( \frac{E_\lambda}{E_\lambda(t^{-\rho})} \right) (1) \right) (1) \cdots \right) (t^{-\rho})$ . This is due to Cherednik-Danilenko; the invariant  $J^\lambda$  depends only on the isotopy type of the corresponding *iterated torus knot*; see an example below.

This is somewhat similar to Manin's work "*Iterated integrals of modular forms and noncommutative modular symbols*" (2005). Basically,  $\int_0^\infty$  is replaced by  $\int_p^q$  for rational  $p, q$  in this paper and multiple zeta values occur. When the coinvariant is replaced by the corresponding integral formula (a DAHA theorem), the similarity becomes less speculative.

For instance, one obtains for  $K = Cab(53, 2)Cab(13, 2)Cab(2, 3)$ :

$$J_{\mathcal{L}}^\lambda = \{ \mathcal{P}_\lambda \}, \quad \mathcal{P}_\lambda = \Downarrow \begin{pmatrix} 3 & * \\ 2 & * \end{pmatrix} \Downarrow \begin{pmatrix} 2 & * \\ 1 & * \end{pmatrix} \Downarrow \begin{pmatrix} 2 & * \\ 1 & * \end{pmatrix} \left( \frac{E_\lambda(X)}{E_\lambda(t^{-\rho})} \right),$$

where the  $\gamma$ -matrices act via their lifts to  $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{H})$ ,  $\Downarrow H \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} H(1)$ ,  $\{H\} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} H(1)(t^{-\rho})$  is the *coinvariant*, and  $E_\lambda$  is the  $E$ -polynomial for dominant  $\lambda$ . Here  $Cab(a, b)K$  is  $T(b, a)$  plotted at the boundary of the solid torus around a given knot  $K$  for the Seifert zero-framing.

Generally, given a sequence  $\begin{pmatrix} r_1 & r_2 & r_3 & \cdots \\ s_1 & s_2 & s_3 & \cdots \end{pmatrix}$  of the 1st columns of  $\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_3, \dots$ , which is  $\begin{pmatrix} 3 & 2 & 2 \\ 2 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$  in the example above, the corresponding cable is  $\cdots Cab(a_3, r_3)Cab(a_2, r_2)Cab(a_1, r_1)$  for  $a_1 = s_1$ ,  $a_2 = r_1 s_1 r_2 + s_2$ ,  $a_3 = a_2 r_2 r_3 + s_3$ , and so on. Note that  $Cab(s_1, r_1) = T(r_1, s_1) = Cab(r_1, s_1)$ ; the transposition of  $r_i, a_i$  for  $i > 1$  changes the knot.

The  $a$ -stabilization theorem is the same as for torus knots. Generally,  $\deg_a(\mathcal{H}^\lambda) = |\lambda|(mult - 1)$  for  $mult = \text{Min}(r_1, s_1) \cdot r_2 \cdot r_3 \cdots$ , which is the multiplicity of singularity. When  $a = 0$ ,  $\deg_t(\mathcal{H}^\lambda) = \delta \sum_i m_i^2$  for  $\lambda = (m_1 \geq m_2 \geq \cdots)$ , and  $\deg_q(\mathcal{H}^\lambda) = \delta \sum_i (m'_i)^2$  for the transposition  $\lambda'$  of  $\lambda$ ;  $\delta$  is the arithmetic genus of the singularity (below). The justification is under minor assumptions; the superduality and the specialization  $q=1$  provide the reduction to pure columns.

*Topological invariance.* For torus knots, the isotopy invariance means that  $T(r, s)$ ,  $T(s, r)$  and  $T(-s, -r)$  must have coinciding  $\mathcal{H}^\lambda$ , and that  $\mathcal{H}^\lambda = 1$  for any  $T(1, s)$ . Also, the superpolynomial of  $T(-s, r)$ , which knot is the mirror image of  $T(s, r)$ , must be the "conjugation"  $q, t, a \mapsto q^{-1}, t^{-1}, a^{-1}$  of  $\mathcal{H}^\lambda$  for  $T(s, r)$  up to a factor  $q^\bullet t^\bullet a^\bullet$ . This requires the usage of the DAHA-automorphism  $\eta$ , which we omit.

We note that the symmetry  $\mathcal{H}_{r,s}^\lambda = \mathcal{H}_{s,r}^\lambda$  can be a challenge for (other) algebraic and algebraic-geometric approaches even in the case of HOMFLY-PT polynomials. It is a simple DAHA lemma for us.

Generally, the theorem is that DAHA superpolynomials depend only the isotopy type of the corresponding iterated torus link. It is interesting, all fundamental properties of the *coinvariant* are needed, but not a difficult one. The case of iterated *links* is more involved, but this is mostly because *splice diagrams* are used, which are not too simple. The additional DAHA fact is the integral formula for action of  $\tau^{-1}$ , which we will provide below when discussing *DAHA vertex*.

*From knots to links.* The construction becomes more ramified for iterated torus *links*. We will provide here the procedure from in “*DAHA approach to iterated torus links*” (Cherednik-Danilenko, 2015).

First, we switch from  $P_\lambda$  to the so-called  $J$ -polynomials. For  $A_n$ :

$$\tilde{P}_\lambda \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} h_\lambda P_\lambda \quad \text{for} \quad h_\lambda = \prod_{\square \in \lambda} (1 - q^{\text{arm}(\square)} t^{\text{leg}(\square)+1}),$$

for the Macdonald polynomials  $P_\lambda$ . Here  $\text{arm}(\square)$  is the number of boxes in the same row as  $\square$  strictly after it;  $\text{leg}(\square)$  is the number of boxes in the column of  $\square$  strictly below it. The  $J$ -polynomials and the construction below are for any root systems  $R$ .

We now set  $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}^\lambda(X) = \left( \cdots \tilde{\gamma}_{\ell-1} \left( \tilde{\gamma}_\ell(\tilde{P}_\lambda)(1) \right) (1) \cdots \right)$ , called *basic prepolynomials*. General *prepolynomials* are defined inductively as follows. Given two prepolynomials  $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_1, \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_2$  and  $\gamma \in PSL(2, \mathbb{Z})$  (can be *id*), we define a new *prepolynomial*  $\left( \tilde{\gamma}(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_1 \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_2) \right) (1)$ .

Combinatorially, we obtain a union of trees with marked *last vertices* and the corresponding ends “colored” by the diagrams  $\{\lambda\} = \{\lambda^1, \dots, \lambda^\kappa\}$ , where  $\kappa$  is the number of connected components of a link. The prepolynomials for the (maximal) roads in this union are those for the connected components. A union of several trees is for a disconnected union of the corresponding links.

This is not the end. Given two prepolynomials,  $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}(X)$  and  $\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}(X)$ , for the components colored by the sequences  $\{\lambda^i\}$  and  $\{\mu^j\}$  of diagrams,

$$J^{\{\lambda\}, \{\mu\}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{ \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}(Y) \tilde{\mathcal{P}}(X) \} / LCM(\tilde{P}_{\lambda^i}(t^\rho), \tilde{Q}_{\mu^j}(t^\rho) \text{ for all } i, j).$$

The division by the LCM provides that  $J^{\{\lambda\},\{\mu\}}$  are polynomials in terms of  $q, t$  up to some (possibly fractional) powers of  $q$  and  $t$ . This can be extended to any root systems  $R$ . The  $a$ -stabilization theorem in type  $A$  is as for knots: we arrive at  $\mathcal{H}^{\{\lambda\},\{\mu\}}(q, t, a)$ .

Topologically, we consider the 1st link in the horizontal solid torus and the 2nd in the complementary vertical one. Applying the coinvariant  $\{\cdot\}$ , we obtain a topological invariant of the resulting link in  $S^3$ . Changing  $Y$  by  $Y^{-1}$  in this definition corresponds to changing the orientation of the 2nd link versus the 1st. Algebraic links are when  $\tilde{\gamma}$  are products of positive powers of  $\tau_{\pm}$  and the linking numbers between the components of the link for  $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$  and that for  $\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}$  are positive.

For instance,  $J = \{\tau_{-}(\tilde{P}_{\lambda^1}\tilde{P}_{\lambda^2})\}/LCM(\tilde{P}_{\lambda^1}(t^{\rho}), \tilde{P}_{\lambda^2}(t^{\rho}))$  for the Hopf 2-link  $L$  with the linking number  $+1$  (algebraic), colored by the Young diagrams  $\lambda^1$  and  $\lambda^2$ . When  $\lambda^1 = \square = \lambda^2$ , the corresponding  $\mathcal{H}$  becomes  $1 - t + qt + aq$ . Using the presentation of  $L$  with 2 solid tori, we obtain the alternative formula:  $J = \{\tilde{P}_{\lambda^1}(Y)\tilde{P}_{\lambda^2}(X)\}/LCM(\tilde{P}_{\lambda^1}(t^{\rho}), \tilde{P}_{\lambda^2}(t^{\rho}))$ . Their coincidence is one of the key DAHA identities in the proof of the topological invariance of  $J$  for links.

**3.4. Superduality and RH.** The DAHA-superduality is based on the  $q \leftrightarrow t$ -symmetry of type- $A$  *stable* Macdonald polynomials and some properties of the action of projective  $PSL_2(\mathbb{Z})$ .

In physics, the *superduality* is related to the *S-duality* in SCFT for the BPS states, and to the *CPT symmetry*. We note that various formulas and properties of superpolynomials were obtained and/or conjectured by physicists. Their works are mostly experimental, though the BPS states can be defined rigorously.

In topology, the superduality for the Khovanov-Rozansky polynomials, *KhR-polynomials*, is a difficult matter. As far as we know, it was justified only for positive iterated torus links when one of their components is colored by a row or a column (uncolored otherwise). A related problem is the definition of the *reduced* KhR-polynomials, which was resolved only partially; see “*Khovanov-Rozansky homology of two-bridge knots and links*” (Rasmussen, 2005). Our superpolynomials are counterparts of *reduced* KhR-polynomials. Also, considering *links* is generally involved in the KhR-theory. Let us mention here *Soergel modules*, an important tool in this theory.

The DAHA construction is for *any* iterated torus links and *arbitrary* colors. Moreover,  $J^{\{\lambda\},\{\mu\}}$  can be defined for any reduced root systems

and  $C^\vee C_1$ . When the theories overlap, it is expected that topological superpolynomials, the DAHA ones, motivic superpolynomials and those from physics coincide up to renormalizations. Also, there are combinatorial conjectures and connections with the *Heegard-Floer cohomology*. The Alexander polynomials and the  $\rho_{ab}$ -invariants, discussed below, are related to the latter.

The DAHA superduality, conjectured by the author, was justified by Gorsky-Negut for torus knots and Cherednik-Danilenko for iterated torus links. In terms of the standard DAHA parameters:  $\mathcal{H}^\lambda(q, t, a) = q^{\bullet t^\bullet} \mathcal{H}^{\lambda'}(\frac{1}{t}, \frac{1}{q}, a)$ , where by  $q^{\bullet t^\bullet}$ , we mean “up to some power of  $q, t$ ”;  $\lambda'$  is the transposition of the diagram  $\lambda$ .

The conjectural coincidence of the DAHA superpolynomials  $\mathcal{H}$  with motivic ones will be stated below for algebraic links and “rows” (weights  $m\omega_1$ ). The motivic superpolynomials are defined by now only in this generality. They are conjectured to coincide with the corresponding *flagged L-functions* (below). The superduality for  $L$ -functions is the *functional equation*, not very difficult to check (for  $m = 1$ ).

The  $a$ -stabilization and superduality are expected to hold for  $B, C, D$ . For the  $C$ -*hyperpolynomials* (above) and the transposition  $\lambda \mapsto \lambda'$ , the conjecture in “*Jones polynomials of torus knots via DAHA*” was:

$$\mathcal{H}^C(\lambda; q, t, u, a) = q^{\bullet t^\bullet} u^{\bullet} \mathcal{H}^C(\lambda'; t^{-1}, q^{-1}, u^{-1}t/q, -aqu).$$

We conjecture in the case of  $u = t$  that  $\mathcal{H}^C$  are in terms of  $q, t^{\pm 1}, \mathbf{a} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} qta^2$  (odd powers of  $a$  vanish) for iterated torus knots; then the superduality is that for  $A$ : it fixes  $\mathbf{a}$  and sends  $q \leftrightarrow t^{-1}$ . Let us provide the hyperpolynomial for  $T(4, 3)$  for  $u = t$ . One has:  $\mathcal{H}_{4,3}^C(\square; q, t, t, \mathbf{a}) =$

$$1 + qt + q^2t + q^2t^2 + q^3t^3 + \mathbf{a}(-1 + q^3 - 2qt - 2q^2t^2 - q^3t^3) + \mathbf{a}^2(qt - q^2t + q^2t^2).$$

We can take here  $\mathbf{a} = a^2t^2$ , which is super-invariant too. Then the restriction to  $C_n$  will be  $\mathbf{a} = t^{2n} = t^h$  for the Coxeter number  $h$ .

*HOMFLY-PT polynomials.* The  $a$ -stabilization of our  $J$  for  $q = t$  corresponds to the relation between the HOMFLY-PT polynomials,  $HOM(t, \mathbf{a}; \lambda)$ , and the quantum group invariants for  $A_n$  (the WRT invariants). Namely, the latter are essentially  $HOM(t, \mathbf{a} = t^{n+1}; \lambda)$ . The stabilization of the QG invariants is connected with the *Deligne category*  $Rep(GL(v))$ . See “*New realizations of deformed double current algebras and Deligne categories*” (Etingof, Kalinov, Rains, 2020). We note that

the symmetry  $k \mapsto 1/k, v \mapsto vk$  is discussed there in Section 4.3; with  $v \mapsto -vk$ , it occurs in Section 7.2 below in the context of Riemann's zeta (because of different reasons).

The definition of  $HOM(t, \mathbf{a}; \lambda)$  is especially simple in the uncolored case, which is for  $\lambda = \square$  (i.e. for  $\lambda = \omega_1$  for  $A_n$ ). The following *skein relation* is sufficient to define them (the reduced ones):

$$\mathbf{a}^{1/2} HOM(\overrightarrow{\times}) - \mathbf{a}^{-1/2} HOM(\overleftarrow{\times}) = (t^{1/2} - t^{-1/2}) HOM(\uparrow\uparrow), \quad HOM(\circ) = 1.$$

Given  $\lambda$  (type A),  $HOM^\circ(t, \mathbf{a}; \lambda) = \mathcal{H}^\lambda(q = t, t, \mathbf{a} = -a)$  for *iterated torus knots*, where  $\circ$  is as above (up to  $t^\bullet \mathbf{a}^\bullet$ ) and  $HOM$  is reduced: 1 for the unknot. The coincidence is due to Cherednik (torus knots), Morton-Samuels (iterated torus knots), and Cherednik-Danilenko (iterated torus links).

We note that the LCM-normalization of our  $\mathcal{H}^{\{\lambda\}, \{\mu\}}$  must be replaced by the division by *one*  $\tilde{P}_{\lambda^i}(t^\rho)$  (or that for one  $\mu^j$ ) to match *reduced* ‘‘HOMFLY-PT’’ for links. The reduced  $HOM$  is defined with respect to one ‘‘distinguished’’ components of a link. Both normalizations coincide for links with uncolored non-distinguished components or if all colors coincide. Even in these cases, the passage from non-reduced KhR polynomials of links to reduced ones is known only partially. In full generality, the LCM-normalization is ‘‘non-topological’’.

For the uncolored trefoil, i.e. for  $T(3, 2)$  and when  $\lambda = \omega_1 = \square$ :  $HOM = \mathbf{a}(t + t^{-1} - \mathbf{a})$ ,  $HOM^\circ = 1 + t^2 - t\mathbf{a}$ ; recall that  $\mathcal{H} = 1 + qt + qa$ . The Alexander polynomials  $Al(t)$  are generally  $HOM(t, \mathbf{a} = 1)(1 - t)^{\kappa - 1}$  for links with  $\kappa$  components; in particular,  $Al = t^{-1} - 1 + t$ ,  $Al^\circ = 1 - t + t^2$  for trefoil. The simplest link is the Hopf 2-plus-link, 2 unknots with the linking number +1. Then:

$$HOM = \mathbf{a}^{1/2} \frac{1 + \mathbf{a} - t - t^{-1}}{t^{1/2} - t^{-1/2}}, \quad HOM^\circ = 1 - t + t^2 - t\mathbf{a}, \quad Al^\circ = 1.$$

The superduality becomes  $t^{\frac{1}{2}} \rightarrow -t^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \mathbf{a}^{\frac{1}{2}} \rightarrow \mathbf{a}^{-\frac{1}{2}}$  for  $HOM$ ; it is obviously compatible with the skein relation above (in the uncolored case). Generally, the Young diagram  $\lambda$  goes to its transpose. The symmetry  $t^{\frac{1}{2}} \rightarrow -t^{-\frac{1}{2}}$  holds for  $Al$ . However, it does not hold for the Jones polynomials and for the (quantum group)  $A_n$ -invariants. The latter are basically  $HOM(t, \mathbf{a} = t^{n+1}; \lambda)$ , where the substitution  $\mathbf{a} = t^{n+1}$  is obviously incompatible with the superduality.

*RH for superpolynomials.* After our talks with Yu.I. in 2017, I focused on RH for DAHA superpolynomials. We need to adjust the parameters:  $\mathbf{H}(q, t, a) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{H}(qt, t, a)$ , i.e. we switch to  $q_{\text{new}} = q/t$ . Importantly,  $q_{\text{new}}$  is fixed under the superduality. Then  $\mathbf{H}(q, 1/(qt), a) = q^\bullet t^\bullet \mathbf{H}(q, t, a)$  and the “weak” (qualitative) RH is the claim that  $|\xi| = 1/\sqrt{q}$  for the  $t$ -zeros  $\xi$  of  $\mathbf{H}(q, t, a)$  for *sufficiently small*  $q$ . We consider RH only for uncolored algebraic knots; otherwise the transposition  $\lambda \mapsto \lambda'$  is necessary. There is a variant with colors: for *rectangle* Young diagrams.

Such *weak RH* can be justified for (uncolored) *motivic* superpolynomials, conjecturally coinciding with the DAHA ones. *Strong RH* for  $a = 0$  states:  $|\xi| = 1/\sqrt{q}$  holds for  $0 < q \leq 1/2$  for *any* algebraic knot. This is the exact bound conjecturally.

Let us mention that strong RH holds for any  $q > 0$  in the case of the family of uncolored  $T(2p+1, 2)$ . In this case  $\mathbf{H}(q, t, a=0) = \frac{1-(qt^2)^{p-1}}{1-qt^2}$ , where  $q$  is “new”, i.e. after the substitution  $q \mapsto qt$ . Experimentally, RH holds for any  $q < 1$  only for this family.

We note that the value  $q = 1$  is special for torus knots. Then  $\mathbf{H}(q=1, t, a=0)$  becomes then a product of cyclotomic polynomials due to the Shuffle Conjecture (now a theorem). However, we are looking for the minimal  $q_0$  such that RH holds for *any*  $q < q_0$ ; this bound  $q_0$  is smaller than 1 generally, including sufficiently large torus knots.

Numerically, the bound  $q_0$  tends to  $\frac{1}{2}$  for  $\text{Cab}(13+2m, 2)\text{Cab}(2, 3)$  as  $m \rightarrow \infty$ , which is not proven rigorously, but probably a very difficult to check. This is the only such family we found. These cables correspond to the singularity rings  $\mathcal{R} = \mathbb{C}[[z^4, z^6+z^{7+2m}]]$  (see below). Interestingly, the bound  $q_0$  frequently become greater (better!) for multiple cables or if the cables begin with torus knots different from  $T(3, 2)$ . For instance, it is somewhat better for  $\text{Cab}(53, 2)\text{Cab}(13, 2)\text{Cab}(2, 3)$  versus  $\text{Cab}(13, 2)\text{Cab}(2, 3)$ ; numerically, 0.6816 versus 0.6686 for  $a = 0$ .

This is from my paper *“Riemann hypothesis for DAHA superpolynomials and plane curve singularities”* (2018). There are many examples of superpolynomials there, including colored ones and links. Weak RH can be stated for algebraic links too; namely, the conjectural claim is that for  $a = 0$  sufficiently small the number of pairs of exceptional (non-RH) zeros is  $\kappa - 1$ , where  $\kappa$  is the number of components of an algebraic uncolored link. See the paper concerning rectangle diagrams.

Generally, RH totally fails for *non-algebraic* knots/links and beyond rectangle diagrams taken as colors for algebraic ones. It seems a really algebraic phenomenon. Another special feature of algebraic knots is the positivity of the coefficients of  $\mathcal{H}$  for algebraic knots colored by rectangles. The positivity conjecture for rectangles is the last unresolved problem from my initial paper. There is a version for the algebraic links (our papers with Danilenko).

The substitution  $q \mapsto qt$  in the passage from  $\mathcal{H}$  to  $\mathbf{H}$  occurs above as a technicality: the DAHA superduality  $q \leftrightarrow t^{-1}$  then becomes  $q \mapsto q, t \mapsto 1/(qt)$ . However, the latter is exactly the Hasse-Weil symmetry from the functional equation for curves over finite fields. There is some connection with  $q$ -deformations of Riemann's zeta and the Dirichlet  $L$ -functions (below); it is based on my "RH paper". Generally, it is the passage from the superpolynomials of links to those for Seifert 3-folds and their special infinite sums.

#### 4. PLANE CURVE SINGULARITIES

This section provides a conjectural formula for superpolynomials of algebraic links colored by "rows" in terms of the corresponding plane curve singularities. It corresponds to the most general case of affine Springer fibers of type  $A$  and matches well the DAHA formulas.

**4.1. Basic facts.** Algebraic links are intersections of plane curve singularities at  $(0, 0) \in \mathbb{C}^2$  with small  $S^3 \subset \mathbb{C}^2$  centered at  $(0, 0)$ ; they are *knots* for irreducible (unibranch) singularities. For such knots, the corresponding (local) singularity rings can be considered inside  $\mathbb{C}[[z]]$ , where  $z$  is the uniformizing parameter. They are any local rings  $\mathcal{R} \subset \mathbb{C}[[z]]$  with 2 generators in  $(z) = z\mathbb{C}[[z]]$  and the localization  $\mathbb{C}((z))$ . Such rings are always *Gorenstein*.

The simplest topological invariants of a singularity are its multiplicity  $\dim \mathbb{C}[[z]]/\mathbb{C}[[z]]\mathfrak{m}$  for the maximal ideal  $\mathfrak{m} \subset \mathcal{R}$ , and the arithmetic genus  $\delta = \dim \mathbb{C}[[z]]/\mathcal{R}$ , the *Serre number*.

The rings  $\mathcal{R} = \mathbb{C}[[x = z^r, y = z^s]]$  for  $r, s \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\gcd(r, s) = 1$  correspond to unibranch *quasi-homogeneous singularities*  $x^s = y^r$  and torus knots  $T(r, s)$ . The multiplicity is  $\text{Min}(r, s)$  and  $\delta = \frac{(r-1)(s-1)}{2}$ , which is actually due to Sylvester (the Frobenius coin problem). The simplest "non-torus" family is  $\mathcal{R} = \mathbb{C}[[z^4, z^6 + z^{7+2m}]]$  for  $m \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ , which are of multiplicity 4 and with  $\delta_m = 8 + m$ .

*From families to towers.* The simplest *family* is  $\mathcal{R} = \mathbb{C}[[z^r, z^{s+mr}]]$  for  $m \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ . Our families can be naturally interpreted as towers of extensions of  $\mathbb{C}[[x, y]]$  via the Puiseux theory. This is related to the theory of *Drinfeld-Vléduts bound* (1983) and the paper by Manin-Vléduts “*Linear codes and modular curves*” (1985). It is for growth of the arithmetic genus in some towers of curves  $X$ , which can be singular. The *Artin-Schreier towers* provide some important examples here.

We do plane curve singularities, when the “curve” is 1 point, and the problems becomes about finding some formulas-bounds for  $|\mathcal{J}_m(\mathbb{F}_q)|$  for the corresponding compactified Jacobians (below). These numbers are the values of motivic superpolynomials as  $t = 1, a = 0$ . For smooth projective curves  $X$  over  $\mathbb{F}_q$ , the Hasse-Weil-Deligne formula can be used in terms the eigenvalues of “Frobenius”. We use different tools, but the functional equation and even some form of Riemann Hypothesis work for plane curve singularities.

The formulas for  $|\mathcal{J}_m(\mathbb{F}_q)|$  and our superpolynomials can be viewed as counterparts of *Iwasawa polynomials* for class numbers in  $\Gamma$ -extensions. According to Barry Mazur:  $\Gamma$ -extensions can be considered as counterparts of abelian coverings of  $S^3$  ramified at a given link, where the Iwasawa polynomials can be seen as counterparts of Alexander polynomials ( $q = t, a = -1$  for us). This is for any links. For algebraic links, cyclic (algebraic) coverings of  $P^2$  branched over certain singular curves (can be assumed rational) are sufficient to consider; Libgober (1980) and others. This is similar to our towers.

*Valuation semigroup.* It is one of the key in the theory of curve singularities. The definition of this semigroup is as follows:  $\Gamma \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{ \nu_z(f), 0 \neq f \in \mathcal{R} \subset \mathcal{O} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbb{C}[[z]] \}$ , where  $\nu_z$  is the valuation, the order of  $z$ . We readily obtain that  $\delta = |\mathbb{Z}_+ \setminus \Gamma|$ . Importantly,  $\Gamma$  gives the topological type of the corresponding algebraic knot (considered up to isotopy), which is due to Zariski and others. Thus, topological invariants of rings  $\mathcal{R}$  are exactly those expressed in terms of  $\Gamma$ .

For instance, the Alexander polynomial is immediate via  $\Gamma$ . Namely,  $Al^\circ$  is  $(1 - t) \sum_{\nu \in \Gamma} t^\nu$  for any  $\mathcal{R} \subset \mathcal{O}$  (for its  $\circ$ -normalization). For instance, it is  $(1 - t)(\frac{1}{1-t} - t) = 1 - t + t^2$  for  $T(3, 2)$ . The theory of topological equivalence of algebraic *links* is significantly more ramified; *splice diagrams* are very helpful. Generally, the coincidence of semigroups for the components and the corresponding pairwise linking

numbers (all must be positive) is sufficient due to the Reeve theorem. The pairwise linking numbers can be algebraically calculated via the ring of singularity, which is not too involved.

For  $Cab(53, 2)Cab(13, 2)Cab(3, 2)$  above (note the change  $(2, 3) \mapsto (3, 2)$ ), the ring is  $\mathcal{R} = \mathbb{C}[[x = z^8, y = z^{12} + z^{14} + z^{15}]]$ . The Newton's pairs are generally  $\{r_1, s_1\}, \{r_2, s_2\}, \dots$ , and the Puiseux-type equation is  $y = x^{\frac{s_1}{r_1}} \left( 1 + c_1 x^{\frac{s_2}{r_1 r_2}} \left( 1 + c_2 x^{\frac{s_3}{r_1 r_2 r_3}} (\dots) \right) \right)$  for generic  $c_i$ . *We will assume that  $r_1 < s_1$ , which can be always imposed.*

The arithmetic genus is  $\delta = 42$ , and the valuation semigroup  $\Gamma = \langle 8, 12, 26, 53 \rangle$ . Generally,  $\Gamma = \langle r_1 r_2 r_3, a_1 r_2 r_3, a_2 r_3, a_3 \rangle$  for the cable parameters  $(a_i, r_i)$  above (here  $r_1 < s_1$  is used). Recall that  $a_1 = s_1$ ,  $a_2 = r_1 s_1 r_2 + s_2$ ,  $a_3 = a_2 r_2 r_3 + s_3$ , and so on for any number of  $\{r_i, s_i\}$ . In this example, the Newton's pairs are  $\{(2, 3), (2, 1), (2, 1)\}$ .

The passage from the base field  $\mathbb{C}$  to finite fields  $\mathbb{F}_q$  for  $q = p^k$  and prime  $p$  is sufficiently straightforward; it will be needed below. We begin with  $\mathcal{R}$  over  $\mathbb{C}$ , define it over  $\mathbb{Z}$ , which is always doable within a given isotopy type, and then consider  $\mathcal{R} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{F}_p$ . A prime number  $p$  is called a *prime of good reduction* if  $\Gamma$  remains unchanged over  $\mathbb{F}_p$  upon this procedure. This definition is adjusted to the topological invariance.

All primes  $p$  are good for the rings  $\mathbb{C}[[x = z^r, y = t^s]]$  as above. Presumably, there are no prime  $p$  of bad reduction in this sense within a given topological type for *any* algebraic knots: given any  $p$ , there exists  $\mathcal{R}$  representing a given knot where this  $p$  is good.

To give an example, let  $\mathcal{R} = \mathbb{Z}[[x = t^4, y = t^6 + t^7]]$ . Then  $\Gamma = \{0, 4, 6, 8, 10, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, \dots\}$  and  $\delta = 8$ . This  $\mathcal{R}$  has bad reduction only at  $p = 2$ . Indeed,  $\nu_z(y^2 - x^3) = 14$  in  $\mathbb{F}_2$ , which is 13 for  $p \neq 2$ . However, this singularity is equivalent over  $\mathbb{C}$  (analytically, not only topologically) to the one for  $\mathbb{Z}[[t^4 + t^5, t^6]]$ , where bad  $p$  is 3. We obtain that the corresponding cable has no primes of bad reduction.

**4.2. Compactified Jacobians.** Let  $\mathcal{R} \subset \mathcal{O} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbb{F}[[z]]$  be the ring of an irreducible plane curve singularity over any field  $\mathbb{F}$ . The corresponding *flagged compactified Jacobian*  $\mathcal{J}_\ell$ , considered as a set of  $\mathbb{F}$ -points by now, is formed by *standard flags*  $\vec{M} = M_0 \subset M_1 \subset \dots \subset M_\ell \subset \mathcal{O} = \mathbb{F}[[z]]$  of  $\mathcal{R}$ -submodules  $M_i$  of  $\mathcal{O}$  such that (a)  $M_0 \ni \phi = 1 + z(\cdot)$  (where  $(\cdot) \in \mathcal{O}$ ), (b)  $\dim M_i / M_{i-1} = 1$  and  $M_i = M_{i-1} \oplus \mathbb{C} z^{g_i} (1 + z(\cdot))$ , and (c) (important)  $g_i < g_{i+1}$ , where  $i \geq 1$ . We will call them  $\ell$ -flags.

When  $\ell = 0$  (0-flags), there is only one condition:  $\mathcal{O} \supset M \ni \phi = 1 + z(\cdot)$ . Equivalently,  $\Delta(M) \ni 0$ , where  $\Delta(M) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\nu_z(v) \mid 0 \neq v \in M\}$ .

Generally,  $\Delta(M)$  are  $\Gamma$ -modules for any  $\mathcal{R}$ -modules  $M$ , i.e.  $\Gamma + \Delta \subset \Delta$ . *Standard*  $\Delta$  are those in  $\mathbb{Z}_+$  containing 0 and, therefore, containing the whole  $\Gamma$ . Thus, standard  $M$  are those with standard  $\Delta(M)$ .

For quasi-homogeneous singularities  $\mathcal{R} = \mathbb{F}[[x = z^r, y = z^s]]$ , where  $\gcd(r, s) = 1$ ,  $r, s > 1$ , all standard  $\Gamma$ -modules  $\Delta$  come from some standard  $M$ . There are several ways to see this. Piontkowski used the method of syzygies, which also gives that the corresponding cells are affine spaces and result in combinatorial formulas for their dimensions. Also, the  $\mathbb{C}^*$ -action and the *Bialyncki-Birula theorem* can be used.

This is a special feature of quasi-homogeneous (plane curve, unibranch) singularities; generally, not all  $\Delta$  are present in the decomposition of  $\mathcal{J}_0$ . For instance, for  $\mathbb{F}[[z^4, z^6 + z^7]]$ , two from 25 such  $\Delta$  are not in the form  $\Delta(M)$  for any standard  $M$ , which phenomenon is due to Piontkowski. It seems that this is always the case unless for quasi-homogeneous singularities. Also, generally, not all Piontkowski cells are affine spaces.

Let us supply  $\mathcal{J}_0$  with a structure of a *projective* variety. We will describe the corresponding reduced scheme. By construction, this set is naturally a *disjoint* unions of quasi-projective varieties, those for different values of the deviations of  $M$  (below). Importantly, they can be combined in one projective variety. The main steps are as follows.

First, any standard  $M$  contains the ideal  $(z^{2\delta}) = z^{2\delta}\mathcal{O}$ . Indeed, the latter is the *conductor* of  $\mathcal{R}$  for any Gorenstein  $\mathcal{R}$ , the greatest ideal in  $\mathcal{O}$  that belongs to  $\mathcal{R}$ . Using this,  $\phi = 1 + z(\cdot) \in M$  (it is standard) implies that  $\phi \cdot (z^{2\delta}) = (z^{2\delta}) \subset M$ .

Second, let  $dev(M) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \delta - \dim(\mathcal{O}/\mathcal{R})$ , its *deviation* from  $\mathcal{R}$ ; this is for any  $\mathcal{R}$ -modules in  $\mathcal{O}$ . Then,  $dev(M) \geq 0$  for standard  $M$  and it is 0 if and only if  $M = \phi\mathcal{R}$  for some  $\phi$  as above. The latter modules are called *invertible*. They form the *generalized Jacobian variety* of this singularity, which is an algebraic group. The third step (the key) is based on the fact that  $z^{dev(M)}M \supset (z^{2\delta})$  for standard  $M$  due to Pfister-Steenbrink. Equivalently,  $dev(M) + \Delta(M) \supset 2\delta + \mathbb{Z}_+$ .

Finally, let  $M \mapsto M' \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} z^{dev(M)}M$ . Then  $dev(M') = dev(M) - dev(M) = 0$ . It establishes an identification of standard  $M$  with  $\mathcal{R}$ -modules  $(z^{2\delta}) \subset M' \subset \mathcal{O}$  such that  $dev(M') = 0$ . The inverse map is

$M' \mapsto z^{-d}M'$  for  $d = \text{Min}\{\nu_z(m) \mid 0 \neq m \in M'\}$ . Then  $\{M'\}$ , the *compactified Jacobian*, becomes a projective subvariety of the Grassmannian of the subspaces of the middle dimension in  $\mathcal{O}/(z^{2\delta})$ . It is irreducible (Rego), which holds only for plane curve singularities among all Gorenstein ones. Then  $\mathcal{J}_\ell$  become natural fiber spaces over  $\mathcal{J}_0$ ; the fibers are not too difficult to describe, which will be used below.

*Affine Springer fibers.* The definition requires the equation  $F(x, y) = 0$  for the generators  $x, y$  of  $\mathcal{R}$ . Let  $n$  and  $m$  be the top  $x$ -degree and  $y$ -degree of this equation, which we assume irreducible. Then our  $\mathcal{J}_0$  can be interpreted as a (parahoric) affine Springer fiber  $\mathcal{X}_\gamma$  defined either for  $GL_n$  or for  $GL_m$ ; the equation connecting  $x$  and  $y$  becomes the corresponding *characteristic equation*.

The case of *arbitrary*  $F(x, y)$ , not irreducible and not square-free, will be addressed below; topologically, this is the case of algebraic links colored by any rows.

Generally, ASF are due to Kazhdan-Lusztig (1988). Their description entirely in terms of  $\mathcal{R}$  is a remarkable feature of type  $A$ . The definition is via  $GL_n$  or via  $GL_m$ ; but the corresponding ASF are isomorphic. This is not immediate from their definition (below). The standard modules  $M$  and the definition of  $\mathcal{J}_0$  given above do *not* require the equation  $F(x, y) = 0$ ; only  $\mathcal{R} \subset \mathcal{O}$  is needed.

For semisimple Lie algebra  $\mathfrak{g}$  and any field  $\mathbb{F}$ , let  $\mathfrak{g}[[x]] = \mathfrak{g} \otimes_{\mathbb{F}} \mathbb{F}[[x]]$  and  $\mathfrak{g}((x)) = \mathfrak{g} \otimes_{\mathbb{F}} \mathbb{F}((x))$ . Accordingly, we define  $G[[x]]$  and  $G((x))$  for simply-connected  $G$  with  $\text{Lie}(G) = \mathfrak{g}$ .

Given  $\gamma \in \mathfrak{g}[[x]]$ ,  $\mathcal{X}_\gamma \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{g \in G((x))/G[[x]] \mid g^{-1}\gamma g \in \mathfrak{g}[[x]]\}$ , where we assume that the centralizer of  $\gamma$  in  $G((x))$  is *anisotropic* (the nil-elliptic case). Then  $\mathcal{X}_\gamma \cong \mathcal{J}_0$  in type  $A$ , where the singularity is  $P(x, y) = 0$  for the characteristic polynomial  $P(x, y) = \det(\mathbf{1}y - \gamma)$ . The corresponding *orbital integral* will become  $\mathcal{H}^{\text{mot}}(q, t = 1, a = 0)$  for the motivic superpolynomials defined below, where  $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{F}_q$ . It is conjectured to be a topological invariant, which implies that so is the orbital integral. For instance,  $\mathcal{H}^{\text{mot}}(q = 1, t = 1, a = 0)$  is conjecturally the Euler characteristic  $e(\mathcal{X}_\gamma)$ .

We note that our compactified Jacobians occur as *Jacobian factors* if projective *rational* singular curves are considered; they are basically *Hitchin fibers* over  $\mathbb{P}^1$ . However, *factorizable* Lie groups and algebras (below) are, generally, beyond Hitchin fibers. Given a *factorizable Lie*

*algebras*  $\mathfrak{G}$ , we considered the families of subtori  $\mathcal{T} \subset \mathcal{G}$  with fixed characteristic polynomials in the corresponding factorizable Lie group (Cherednik, 1983). The definitions are as follows.

The factorizable Lie algebras  $\mathfrak{G}$  are vector bundles over a smooth projective curve  $E$ , with the structure of *relative* Lie algebra over  $E$ . The generic fiber must be  $\mathfrak{g}$ , but some fibers can be non-semisimple Lie algebras (all are of the same dimension). The factorization conditions are  $H^0(E, \mathfrak{G}) = \{0\} = H^1(E, \mathfrak{G})$  for Čech cohomology, which readily implies that  $\text{genus}(E) \leq 1$ . If  $E$  is singular then  $\mathfrak{G}$  must be assumed torsion free. Main applications are for  $E = \mathbb{P}^1$ .

Such  $\mathfrak{G}$  are in 1-1 correspondence with *not necessarily unitary classical  $r$ -matrices*  $r(u, v) \in \mathfrak{g}^{\otimes 2}$ : those satisfying the identity  $[r^{12}, r^{13} + r^{23}] = [r^{13}, r^{32}]$ , where  $r^{ij}$  is  $r^{ij}$  for  $u = u_i, v = u_j$  considered with values in  $\mathfrak{g}^{\otimes 2}$  embedded in the components  $i, j$  of  $\mathfrak{g}^{\otimes 3}$ . The parameters  $u_i$  are *local*: near 0. Additionally, we assume that  $r - \Omega/(u - v)$  is regular at 0 for the “permutation matrix”  $\Omega \in \mathfrak{g}^{\otimes 2}$ , the Casimir element.

The link to ASF is basically as follows. Let  $\mathcal{G}$  be the group scheme over  $E$  with the Lie algebra  $\mathfrak{G}$ . We obtain that  $H^0(E, \mathcal{G})$  and  $H^1(E, \mathcal{G})$  are trivial. The starting point is a subscheme  $\mathcal{T} \subset \mathcal{G}$ , which is assumed a maximal subtorus at the generic point of  $E$ . Since  $H^1(E, \mathcal{G}) = \{0\}$ , any cocycle  $\phi$  in the *generalized Jacobian*, which is  $H^1(E, \mathcal{T})$ , becomes the boundary  $\{\phi_i \phi_j^{-1}\}$  for an open cover  $E = \cup_i U_i$  and  $\phi_i \in H^0(U_i, \mathcal{G})$ . Then  $\mathcal{T}_\phi = \phi_i^{-1} \mathcal{T} \phi_i \subset \mathcal{G}$  is another toric subscheme with the characteristic polynomial coinciding with that of  $\mathcal{T}$ .

Generally, any  $\mathcal{T}$  can be represented as  $\mathcal{T} = \mathbb{G}_m(C)$  for a projective curve  $C$  covering  $E$ , *possibly singular*. Let  $\overline{\text{Jac}}(C)$  be the compactification of the generalized Jacobian of  $C$ . Then the *Jacobian factors* will be the contributions of singular points of  $C$  to  $\overline{\text{Jac}}(C)$ . One can take here  $E = \mathbb{P}^1$  and consider rational curves  $C$  with only one singularity. Then it will give our  $\mathcal{J}_0$  for the corresponding  $\mathcal{R}$ .

**4.3. Motivic superpolynomials.** The rings  $\mathcal{R}$  and  $\mathcal{R} \subset \mathcal{O}$  will be now over  $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{F}_q$ . Following “*DAHA and plane curve singularities*” (Cherednik-Philipp, 2017), the *motivic superpolynomial* of  $\mathcal{R}$  is:

$$\mathcal{H}^{\text{mot}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{\{M_0 \subset \dots \subset M_\ell\} \in \mathcal{J}_\ell(\mathbb{F})} t^{\dim(\mathcal{O}/M_\ell)} a^\ell \text{ for } \ell\text{-flags } \vec{M} \subset \mathcal{O} \text{ and } \ell \geq 0.$$

The flags are actually not necessary in this definition due to the following theorem. Let  $rk_q(M) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \dim_{\mathbb{F}_q} M/\mathfrak{m}M$  for the maximal ideal  $\mathfrak{m}$  of  $\mathcal{R}$ . Then  $\mathcal{H}^{\text{mot}} = \sum_M t^{\dim(\mathcal{O}/M)} (1 + aq) \cdots (1 + aq^{rk_q(M)-1})$ , where

the summation is over all *standard*  $M \subset \mathcal{O}$ . The justification uses Proposition 2.3 from the paper mentioned above.

We conjectured there that  $\mathcal{H}^{mot} = \mathcal{H}$ , i.e. the motivic one for  $\mathcal{R}$  coincides with the uncolored DAHA superpolynomial  $\mathcal{H}(q, t, a)$  associated with the link of the singularity associated with  $\mathcal{R}$ . The definition of  $\mathcal{H}^{mot}$  and this conjecture were extended later (with Philipp) to torsion free sheaves of any rank  $= m$  over irreducible plane curve singularities, corresponding to the DAHA superpolynomials  $\mathcal{H}^\lambda$  for  $\lambda = m\omega_1$ . The latest development is the generalization to non-unibranch singularities to be considered below. As we mentioned above, this corresponds to affine Springer fibers of type  $A$  with the most general characteristic polynomials. So it is a natural setting here.

The DAHA superpolynomials depend on  $q$  polynomially by construction and are topological invariants (a theorem). Thus, this conjecture includes the claims that  $\mathcal{H}^{mot}$  polynomially depend on  $q$  and that these polynomials are *topological* invariants of the corresponding plane curve singularities. This was justified by the author for some families: when  $\Gamma$  has 2 generators (the case of torus knots), or 3 generators; the latter was with restrictions. Generally, algebraic/analytic types of plane curve singularities depend on “continuous” parameters; the classification is essentially known and we use its elements when considering  $\Gamma$  with 2 – 3 generators mentioned above.

We note that counterparts of the motivic superpolynomials can be defined in characteristic 0: for any  $p$ -adic integral domains  $\mathcal{O}$  instead of  $\mathbb{F}_q[[z]]$  and its *orders*  $\mathcal{R}$ , subrings with the same localization field. They count *standard*  $\mathcal{R}$ -modules  $M \subset \mathcal{O}$ , those containing a unit in  $\mathcal{O}$ , with the weights  $t^{deg} a^{rk}$ . Here  $|\mathcal{O}/M| = q^{\deg}$  for  $\mathcal{R}/\mathfrak{m}_{\mathcal{R}} = \mathbb{F}_q$  and  $rk = \dim_{\mathbb{F}_q} M/\mathfrak{m}_{\mathcal{R}}M$  for the maximal ideal  $\mathfrak{m}_{\mathcal{R}} \subset \mathcal{R}$ .

There will be no quasi-projective varieties and *Witt vectors* will be used, but the procedure is similar.

For instance, let  $\mathcal{O} = \mathbb{Z}_p[[\pi]]$  for the  $p$ -adic  $\mathbb{Z}_p$ ,  $\pi^s = p$  and  $\mathcal{R} = \mathbb{Z}_p[[x=p, y=\pi^r]] \subset \mathcal{O}$ , where  $r, s > 0$  and  $\gcd(r, s) = 1 = \gcd(p, s)$  (the tamely ramified case). The corresponding superpolynomial will be then the same as the one for  $\mathcal{R} = \mathbb{F}_p[[z^s, z^r]] \subset \mathcal{O} = \mathbb{F}_p[[z]]$ . Generally, there are many possible domains  $\mathcal{O}$  in the  $p$ -adic case. Counterparts of plane curve singularities are complete subrings in  $\mathcal{O}$  with one generator (and the same field of rationals). Our connection conjectures mostly require

plane curve singularities. Among other “deviations”, the action of  $\text{Gal}(\overline{\mathbb{Q}_p}/\mathbb{Q}_p)$  becomes significantly more involved in the  $p$ -adic theory.

*Piontkowski cells.* We set  $\Delta(\vec{M}) = \{\Delta(M_i)\}$ . It is standard for standard  $M$  in the following sense. An abstract sequence of  $\Gamma$ -modules  $\vec{\Delta} = \{\Delta_0 \subset \cdots \subset \Delta_\ell \subset \mathbb{Z}_+\}$  is called *standard* if  $\Delta_0$  contains  $\Gamma$ ,  $\Delta_i = \Delta_{i-1} \cup \{g_i\}$ , and  $g_i < g_{i+1}$  for  $1 \leq i \leq \ell$ . Given a standard  $\vec{\Delta}$ , the corresponding *Piontkowski cells* is  $\mathcal{J}_\ell(\vec{\Delta}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\vec{M} \in \mathcal{J}_\ell \mid \Delta(\vec{M}) = \vec{\Delta}\}$ .

These cells are subsets in  $\mathcal{J}_\ell$  and  $\mathcal{J}_\ell = \cup \mathcal{J}_\ell(\vec{\Delta})$ , where the union is disjoint. These cells are not always affine spaces  $\mathbb{A}^m$  and some can be empty. Empty cells always occur (in examples) unless for quasi-homogeneous singularities  $x^s = y^r$ ; all cells are non-empty affine spaces for them. Beyond them, all cells can be affine spaces for some “non-torus” exceptional “small” families. Then the lists of empty cells and  $\dim \mathcal{J}_\ell(\vec{\Delta})$  for the other cells are sufficient to know.

The varieties  $\mathcal{J}_\ell(\vec{\Delta})$  are conjectured to be *configurations of affine spaces*, i.e. unions and differences of affine spaces  $\mathbb{A}^m$  in a bigger  $\mathbb{A}^N$ , not always equidimensional and connected, including the non-unibranch generalization considered below. Then  $\mathcal{H}^{\text{mot}}$  becomes with the coefficients in terms of  $[\mathbb{A}^1] \in K_0(\text{Var}/\mathbb{F})$  instead of  $q$ , i.e. motivic indeed;  $K_0(\text{Var}/\mathbb{F}_q) \supset [X] \mapsto |X(\mathbb{F}_q)|$  is an important *motivic measure*.

Let us mention that the connection between the dimensions of these cells in  $\mathcal{J}_0$  and the *deviations* in the case of  $\mathbb{F}_q[[z^r, z^s]]$  was observed by Lusztig-Smelt (1995). This is a special case of superduality. The deviations are readily given in terms of  $\Delta(M)$ .

The coincidence of  $\mathcal{H}^{\text{mot}}$  with the DAHA superpolynomials  $\mathcal{H}^{\text{daha}}$  is checked in many examples, including the cases when some Piontkowski cells are *not* affine spaces. If all of them are such, the method of *syzygies* provides formulas for their dimensions, and the calculation of  $\mathcal{H}^{\text{mot}}$  is mostly reduced to the combinatorics of  $\Delta(M)$ ; Dyke paths occur for  $\mathcal{H}_{r,s}^{\text{mot}}$ , etc. Thus,  $\mathcal{H}^{\text{daha}} = \mathcal{H}^{\text{mot}}$  is actually an advanced version of the *Shuffle Conjecture*.

We note that motivic superpolynomials are always *significantly* faster to calculate than *flagged L-functions* defined below. This is especially true when explicit formulas for  $\dim \mathcal{J}_\ell(\vec{\Delta})$  are known (for  $T(r, s)$  and for several exceptional families of cables). Otherwise, DAHA calculations are, generally, faster than motivic ones, especially with colors.

If *some* covering of  $\mathcal{J}_0$  by affine cells exists, then the coefficient of  $q^i$  in  $\mathcal{H}^{mot}$  for  $t=1, a=0$  is the *Betti number*  $b_{2i} = \text{rk } H_{2i}(\mathcal{J}_0; \mathbb{R})$  and  $b_{2i+1} = 0$ . In particular,  $\mathcal{H}^{mot}(q=1, t=1, a=0)$  is the Euler number  $e(\mathcal{J}_0)$ . The latter is the rational Catalan number  $\frac{1}{r+s} \binom{r+s}{r}$  for  $\mathcal{R} = \mathbb{F}[[z^r, z^s]]$  (Beauville), where  $\text{gcd}(r, s) = 1$  as above. This is the number of all standard  $\Delta$  for such  $\mathcal{R}$ , which are 1-1 with Dyck paths in the rectangles “ $r \times s$ ”; the approach to  $e(\mathcal{J}_0)$  via the count of standard  $\Gamma$ -modules  $\Delta$  is due to Piontkowski. However, this number is bigger than  $e(\mathcal{J}_0)$  unless for torus knots (quasi-homogeneous singularities).

We conjectured with Ivan Danilenko that the relation to Betti numbers of  $\mathcal{J}_0$  always holds for the corresponding DAHA superpolynomials. More generally, the conjecture is that the *geometric superpolynomials* defined in terms of *Borel-Moore homology* of  $\mathcal{J}_\ell$  coincide with the DAHA superpolynomials for any algebraic knots. The geometric superpolynomials coincide with motivic ones if  $\mathcal{J}_\ell$  can be covered by affine spaces, which is by the definition of the Borel-Moore homology.

*From knots to links.* The consideration of non-unibranch plane singularities colored by  $m\omega_1$  (pure rows) is necessary for the theory of ASF of type  $A$  with arbitrary (not only irreducible) characteristic polynomials. Also, they occur in the inductive formulas for the superpolynomials, similar to the Rosso-Jones formula in topology, even if we begin with unibranch uncolored plane singularities.

The ring will be now  $\mathcal{R} \subset \mathcal{O} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigoplus_{i=1}^{\kappa} e_i \mathcal{O}_i$ , where  $\mathcal{O}_i = \mathbb{F}[[z_i]]$  and  $e_i e_j = \delta_{ij} e_i$ . We set  $z \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{i=1}^{\kappa} z_i$  and  $e \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{i=1}^{\kappa} e_i$ ; then  $z_i = z e_i$  and  $e$  is the unit element 1 in the ring  $\mathcal{O}$ . Generally,  $f_i$  will be the projection  $f e_i$  for any  $f \in \mathcal{O}$ . Here,  $\mathcal{R}$  must contain  $1 = e$  and have 2 generators:  $x = \sum_{i=1}^{\kappa} x_i$  and  $y = \sum_{i=1}^{\kappa} y_i$  in  $\mathfrak{m}_{\mathcal{O}} = z\mathcal{O}$ . Also, the localizations of the projection  $\mathcal{R}_i$  of  $\mathcal{R}$  onto  $\mathcal{O}_i$  must be full  $\mathbb{F}((z_i))$ .

By construction,  $\prod_{i=1}^{\kappa} F_i(x, y) = 0$ , where  $F_i(x_i, y_i) = 0$  for the corresponding irreducible polynomials  $F_i$  for  $\mathcal{R}_i$ , *which will be assumed all non-proportional*. The assumption that  $F(u, v) = \prod_{i=1}^{\kappa} F_i(u, v)$  is *square-free* is standard for curve singularities.

For  $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{C}$ , the equation  $F(u, v) = 0$  gives the corresponding singularity (with  $\kappa$  branches). The corresponding link is  $\{F(u, v) = 0\} \cap S_\epsilon^3$  in  $\mathbb{C}^2$  with the coordinates  $u, v$ ; it has  $\kappa$  components. Its isotopy type gives the topological type of the singularity.

The passage from  $\mathbb{C}$  to  $\mathbb{F}_q$  is the same as in the unibranch case. Namely, we pick  $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}[[z]]$  within a given topological type and then

switch to  $\mathbb{F}_q$  for  $q = p^m$  provided that  $p$  is a prime of *good reduction*. By definition, good  $p$  are such that the corresponding  $F_i$  remain irreducible and pairwise non-proportional over  $\mathbb{F}_q$ . The semigroups  $\Gamma_i$  for  $\mathcal{R}_i$  and the pairwise linking numbers must remain unchanged. The latter conditions are entirely algebraic: the linking numbers are the corresponding intersection numbers, which can be defined via  $\mathcal{R}$ .

The notion of good reduction is necessary for the conjectural coincidence of motivic superpolynomials with the DAHA superpolynomials and topology; the corresponding  $p$  must be good. The coincidence conjecture can be extended to  $F(u, v) = \prod_{i=1}^{\kappa} F_i(u, v)^{c_i}$ , i.e. to arbitrary  $F$ , not only square-free. The algebraic links colored by the sequence of weights  $\sigma = \{c_i \omega_1, 1 \leq i \leq \kappa\}$  occur on the DAHA side in this case. The sequence  $\sigma = \{c_i\}$  will be assumed ordered:  $c_1 \geq c_2 \geq \dots \geq c_\kappa > 0$ . These inequalities can be achieved by permuting  $\{F_i\}$ .

We extend the sequence of *uniformizing parameters*  $\{z_i, 1 \leq i \leq \kappa\}$ . It will be now  $\{\zeta_i, 1 \leq i \leq \tau\}$ , where  $\tau \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{i=1}^{\kappa} c_i$ . The connection is as follows:  $z_1 = \zeta_1 + \dots + \zeta_{c_1}, z_2 = \zeta_{c_1+1} + \dots + \zeta_{c_1+c_2}, \dots, z_\kappa = \zeta_{\tau-c_\kappa+1} + \dots + \zeta_\tau$ .

Accordingly,  $\{\epsilon_i, 1 \leq i \leq \tau\}$  will be the extended sequence of idempotents:  $e_1 = \epsilon_1 + \dots + \epsilon_{c_1}$ , and so on. We set  $\Omega = \mathbb{F}[[\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_\tau]] = \sum_{i=1}^{\tau} \Omega_i$  for  $\Omega_i = \epsilon_i \Omega$ , where  $1 \leq i \leq \tau$ , and  $\mathcal{O}_i = e_i \Omega$  for  $1 \leq i \leq \kappa$ . The prior  $\mathcal{R}$  can be naturally embedded in  $\Omega$ :  $\mathcal{R} \subset \mathcal{O} = \sum_{i=1}^{\kappa} \mathcal{O}_i \subset \Omega$ , i.e. we embed diagonally for the segments of  $\{\zeta_i\}$  associated with the multiplicities  $c_i$ .

*Standard modules*  $\mathcal{M}$  are by definition  $\mathcal{R}$ -invariant  $\mathbb{F}$ -subspaces  $\mathcal{M} \subset \Omega$  such that  $\Omega \mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}$ . As above,  $rk_q(\mathcal{M}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \dim_{\mathbb{F}_q} \mathcal{M} / \mathfrak{m}_{\mathcal{R}} \mathcal{M}$ , where  $\mathfrak{m}_{\mathcal{R}} = \mathcal{R} \cap z\mathcal{O}$ . The minimal  $q$ -rank is then  $rk_{min} = c_1$  and the maximal  $q$ -rank,  $rk_{max}$ , is that for  $\mathcal{M} = \Omega$ , which is  $\tau - 1 + \delta_\sigma$  for  $\delta_\sigma = \dim_{\mathbb{F}_q} \mathfrak{m}_\Omega / \mathfrak{m}_{\mathcal{R}}$ , where  $\mathfrak{m}_\Omega = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{\tau} \zeta_i \Omega$ . It equals  $\kappa - 1 + \delta$  for  $\delta = \dim_{\mathbb{F}_q} \mathfrak{m}_{\mathcal{O}} / \mathfrak{m}_{\mathcal{R}}$  in the uncolored case:  $\sigma = \{1, 1, \dots\}$ .

The *motivic superpolynomial* of  $\mathcal{R}, \sigma$  is defined as follows:

$$\mathcal{H}_\sigma^{mot} = \sum_{\mathcal{M}} t^{\dim(\Omega/\mathcal{M})} \prod_{j=rk_{min}}^{rk_q(\mathcal{M})-1} (1 + aq^j) \text{ summed over standard } \mathcal{M}.$$

The first product  $\Pi$  here (for  $rk_q(\mathcal{M}) = rk_{min} = c_1$ ) is 1. The conjecture is that  $\mathcal{H}^{mot}$  depend polynomially on  $q, t, a$  and coincide with the DAHA superpolynomials  $\mathcal{H}^\lambda(q, t, a)$  for the corresponding links colored

by the sequences  $\{\lambda\} = \{c_1\omega_1, c_2\omega_1, \dots, c_\kappa\omega_1\}$  (only pure rows). In particular, they are topological invariants. The conjecture is well-checked.

**4.4. Some examples.** Let us begin with  $\mathcal{J}_0$  for  $\mathcal{R} = \mathbb{F}[[z^4, z^6 + z^7]]$  with  $K = Cab(13, 2)Cab(2, 3)$  discussed above. All cells are affine spaces and we show only  $\dim = \dim J_0(\Delta)$  in the table below for the corresponding sets of gaps  $D \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Delta \setminus \Gamma$  for standard  $\Delta$ . One has  $dev(D) = |D|$  and  $\dim \mathcal{O}/M = \delta - |D|$ , which gives the power of  $t$ . Two standard  $\Delta$  from 25 have no standard  $M$ , namely for  $D = [2, 15]$  and  $D = [2, 11, 15]$ . The table of  $D$  and the corresponding dimensions of the cells  $\mathcal{J}_0(\Delta)$  is:

$D$ -sets	$dim$	$D$ -sets	$dim$
$\emptyset$	8	1,3,5,7,9,11,15	2
15	7	2,7,11,15	6
11,15	6	2,9,15	7
7,11,15	6	2,9,11,15	6
9,15	7	2,7,9,11,15	5
9,11,15	5	2,3,7,9,11,15	4
7,9,11,15	4	2,5,9,11,15	5
3,7,9,11,15	4	2,5,7,9,11,15	3
5,9,11,15	5	2,3,5,7,9,11,15	1
5,7,9,11,15	3	1,2,5,7,9,11,15	3
3,5,7,9,11,15	2	1,2,3,5,7,9,11,15	0
1,5,7,9,11,15	4	2,15 and 2,11,15	$\emptyset$

The whole (uncolored) superpolynomial is:  $\mathcal{H}(q, t, a) = 1 + qt + q^8 t^8 + q^2(t + t^2) + q^3(t + t^2 + t^3) + q^4(2t^2 + t^3 + t^4) + q^5(2t^3 + t^4 + t^5) + q^6(2t^4 + t^5 + t^6) + q^7(t^5 + t^6 + t^7) + a(q + q^2(1 + t) + q^3(1 + 2t + t^2) + q^4(3t + 2t^2 + t^3) + q^5(t + 4t^2 + 2t^3 + t^4) + q^6(t^2 + 4t^3 + 2t^4 + t^5) + q^7(t^3 + 3t^4 + 2t^5 + t^6) + q^8(t^5 + t^6 + t^7)) + a^2(q^3 + q^4(1 + t) + q^5(1 + 2t + t^2) + q^6(2t + 2t^2 + t^3) + q^7(2t^2 + 2t^3 + t^4) + q^8(t^3 + t^4 + t^5)) + a^3(q^6 + q^7 t + q^8 t^2)$ .

For instance, there are 3 cells of dimensions 7 in  $\mathcal{J}_0$  (for  $a = 0$ ). Namely, those with  $D = [15], [9, 15], [2, 9, 15]$  and  $t^7, t^6, t^5$ . Generally, the number of cells of  $\dim = \delta - 1$  is the multiplicity of singularity; it equals the coefficient of  $t$  for  $q = 1, a = 0$  due to the superduality, which is for  $\mathbb{Z}_+ \setminus \Delta = \{1\}, \{2\}, \{3\}$  in this example. Only  $\{1\}$  results in  $\dim = 1$  and  $qt$  in  $\mathcal{H}^{mot}$ . We note the *reciprocity involution* of standard

modules  $\Delta \mapsto \Delta^\vee - \min\{\Delta^\vee\}$  for  $\Delta^\vee = \Gamma \setminus \{(2\delta - 1) - D\}$ , which preserves their *dim*. For instance,  $[15] \mapsto [2, 9, 15]$   $[2, 9] \mapsto [2, 9]$ .

In the case of  $Cab(53, 2)Cab(13, 2)Cab(3, 2)$  discussed above and the corresponding ring  $\mathcal{R} = \mathbb{F}[[z^8, z^{12}+z^{14}+z^{15}]]$ , one has:  $\mathcal{H}(q, t=1, a=0) = q^{42} + 7q^{41} + 24q^{40} + 56q^{39} + 104q^{38} + 166q^{37} + 236q^{36} + 306q^{35} + 370q^{34} + 424q^{33} + 465q^{32} + 492q^{31} + 507q^{30} + 510q^{29} + 504q^{28} + 488q^{27} + 466q^{26} + 437q^{25} + 406q^{24} + 370q^{23} + 335q^{22} + 298q^{21} + 264q^{20} + 230q^{19} + 199q^{18} + 168q^{17} + 143q^{16} + 118q^{15} + 97q^{14} + 78q^{13} + 63q^{12} + 48q^{11} + 38q^{10} + 28q^9 + 21q^8 + 15q^7 + 11q^6 + 7q^5 + 5q^4 + 3q^3 + 2q^2 + q + 1$ .

Here  $\delta = 42$ , which corresponds to  $q^{42}$  (invertible modules). The coefficients of  $q^i$  are the Betty number  $b_{2i}$  (the odd ones vanish), and the Euler number  $e(\mathcal{J}_0)$  is 8512 (which is for  $a=0, t=1, q=1$ ).

The simplest  $\mathcal{H}^{mot}$  is for trefoil  $T(3, 2)$ . Its singularity ring is  $\mathcal{R} = \mathbb{F}_q[[z^2, z^3]]$  with  $\Gamma = \mathbb{Z}_+ \setminus \{1\}$ . There are no primes of bad reduction for this and any torus knots. The standard modules are  $M_\lambda = (1 + \lambda z)$  (invertible ones) of  $\dim \mathcal{O}/M = 1$  and  $M = \mathcal{O}$ , where there are 2 generators ( $\dim=0$ ). The standard flags for  $\ell = 1$  are  $\{M_0 = M_\lambda \subset M_1 = \mathcal{O}\}$ ; the dimension is  $\dim \mathcal{O}/M_1 = 0$  for them. Thus  $\mathcal{H}^{mot} = 1$  (for  $\mathcal{O}$ ) +  $qt$  (counting invertible modules) +  $aq$  (counting flags). This calculation is almost equally simple for  $T(2p+1, 2)$ .

*Links.* The simplest example is the uncolored Hopf (algebraic) 2-link, the one for  $F(u, v) = uv$ . We take  $\mathcal{O} = \mathbb{F}_q[[e_1, e_2, z_1, z_2]]$  for the idempotents  $e_i$  such that  $z_i e_j = \delta_{ij} z_i$ , and  $\mathcal{R} = \mathbb{F}_q[[e_1 + e_2, x = z_1, y = z_2]]$ , where  $e_1 + e_2$  is the unit 1 in  $\mathcal{O}$ . The standard modules are  $\mathcal{M}_o = \mathcal{O}$  of  $q$ -rank 2 and  $\dim(\mathcal{O}/\mathcal{M}) = 0$ , and  $\mathcal{M}_\alpha = (e_1 + \alpha e_2)\mathcal{R}$  for  $0 \neq \alpha \in \mathbb{F}_q$  of  $q$ -rank 1 (invertibles) and  $\dim(\mathcal{O}/\mathcal{M}) = 2$ . The latter contain  $z_1, z_2$ :  $(e_1 + \alpha e_2)x = \alpha z_1$ ,  $(e_1 + \alpha e_2)y = \alpha z_2$ . Thus,  $\mathcal{H}^{mot} = (q-1)t + (1+aq)$ .

Hopf links are quite interesting. Let us provide  $\mathcal{H}_{2,1,1}^{mot}$  for the Hopf 3-link with the linking numbers  $\{+1, +1, +1\}$  and the 1st component colored by  $2\omega_1 = \square\square$ . We take  $\mathcal{R} = \mathbb{F}_q[[1, x, y]]$  for  $x = \zeta_1 + \zeta_2 + \zeta_3 + \zeta_4$ ,  $y = \zeta_1 + \zeta_2 - \zeta_3 + c\zeta_4$ , where  $c \neq \pm 1$  and  $p \neq 2$ . The corresponding embeddings are:  $\mathcal{R} \subset \mathcal{O} = \mathbb{F}_q[\epsilon_1 + \epsilon_2, \epsilon_3, \epsilon_4, \zeta_1 + \zeta_2, \zeta_3, \zeta_4] \subset \Omega = \mathbb{F}_q[[\epsilon_i, \zeta_i, 1 \leq i \leq 4]]$ . One has:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_{2,1,1}^{mot} &= 1 + a^2 q^5 - 2t + q^2 t + q^3 t + t^2 - 2q^2 t^2 + q^4 t^2 + q^2 t^3 - q^3 t^3 - q^4 t^3 + \\ & q^5 t^3 + a(q^2 + q^3 - 2q^2 t + q^4 t + q^5 t + q^2 t^2 - q^3 t^2 - q^4 t^2 + q^5 t^2) \\ &= (q-1)^2(1+q)qt^2(1+qt) + ((q-1)t(2+2q+q^2+(q^2-1)t))(1+aq^2) + \\ & (1+aq^2)(1+aq^3). \end{aligned}$$

5. ZETAS FOR SINGULARITIES

5.1. **Generalizing Galkin’s zeta.** V.M. Galkin studied in 1973 zeta- and  $L$ -functions for Gorenstein rings in dimension one. Plane curve singularities are an important particular case. Let us consider the unibranch case: when  $\mathcal{R} \subset \mathcal{O} = \mathbb{F}_q[[z]]$  with 2 generators and the localization  $\mathbb{F}_q((z))$ . Recall that  $\delta = \dim_{\mathbb{F}_q} \mathcal{O}/\mathcal{R} = |\mathbb{Z}_+ \setminus \Gamma|$ . He and Stöhr (in 1998) considered links; adding  $a$  and the case of arbitrary ranks closely follow what we did for the superpolynomials.

The *admissible flags* of ideals in  $\mathcal{R}$  are  $\vec{M} = \{M_0 \subset M_1 \subset \dots \subset M_\ell \subset \mathcal{R}\}$  such that  $\{z^{-m_0} M_i \subset \mathcal{O}\}$  for  $m_0 = \text{Min}(\Delta_0)$  are *standard flags* in  $\mathcal{O}$  as in Section 4.2. The *flagged zeta function* is:

$$Z(q, t, a) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{\vec{M}} a^\ell t^{\dim(\mathcal{R}/M_\ell)} = \sum_M t^{\dim(\mathcal{R}/M)} (1+aq) \cdots (1+aq^{rk_q(M)-1}),$$

where the summation is over all admissible flags  $\vec{M} \subset \mathcal{R}$  and over all ideals  $M \subset \mathcal{R}$  in the 2nd formula;  $\dim = \dim_{\mathbb{F}_q}$ ,  $rk_q(M) = \dim M/\mathfrak{m}M$ .

The 2nd formula becomes with  $\prod_{i=rk_{min}}^{rk_q(M)-1} (1+aq^i)$  in the non-unibranch case, similar to that for the motivic superpolynomials;  $rk_{min}$  is the maximal multiplicity of irreducible factors in the factorization of the corresponding  $F(u, v)$ . The interpretation in terms of the standard flags, which is the 1st formula, becomes somewhat technical in the non-unibranch case.

The *flagged L-function* is then  $L(q, t, a) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (1-t)Z(q, t, a)$ ; it is a polynomial in terms of  $t, a$ , and  $t^{-\delta}L(q, t, a)$  is invariant under  $t \mapsto 1/(qt)$ , which is the *functional equation*; we note that  $Z(q, t, a)$  does not satisfy the latter. In contrast to the smooth case, the Riemann Hypothesis holds only for sufficiently small  $q$  (if we know that the dependence on  $q$  is polynomial).

The definition of the Galkin zeta, which is  $Z(q, t, a)$  for  $a = 0$  (no flags), is sufficiently standard: a Dirichlet series. The functional equation for  $L$  is actually surprising because there is no Poincaré duality for singular varieties (unless intersection cohomology is used or so). Stöhr found a short entirely combinatorial proof of this fact, a significant simplification of that from the John Tate’s thesis. Tate’s  $p$ -adic proof works well for curve singularities.

The key here is the following property of  $\Gamma$ , which is actually the defining property of *Gorenstein rings*: the map  $g \mapsto g' = 2\delta - 1 - g$

identifies  $\{g \in \mathbb{Z}_+ \setminus \Gamma\}$  (the set of ‘‘gaps’’) with  $\{g' \in \Gamma \setminus \{2\delta + \mathbb{Z}_+\}\}$ . For instance, the last gap, which is  $2\delta - 1$ , maps to  $g' = 0$ .

Let  $\mathbf{H}^{mot}(q, t, a) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{H}^{mot}(qt, t, a)$  for motivic  $\mathcal{H}^{mot}$  above: we switch to  $q_{new} = q/t$  as we did for the DAHA superpolynomials when defining  $\mathbf{H}(q, t, a)$ . The  $\mathbf{H}^{mot} \leftrightarrow L$  *coincidence conjecture* reads:

$$\mathbf{H}^{mot}(q, t, a) = L(q, t, a) \text{ for any plane curve rings } \mathcal{R} \subset \mathcal{O},$$

$$\mathbf{H}^{mot}(q, t, a = -1/q) = L_{\text{prncpl}}(q, t) \text{ for Gorenstein } \mathcal{R} \subset \mathcal{O}.$$

. The latter is the *Zúñiga zeta function*: for  $a = 0$  and when the summation is only over *principle*  $M \subset \mathcal{R}$ . It coincides with  $L(q, t, a = -1/q)$ , indeed; see the alternative formula for flagged  $L$  provided above. The conjecture can be extended to the non-unibranch case and to any ranks (in the DAHA setting, any colors  $m\omega_1$ ).

When  $q \rightarrow 1$  (for the ‘‘field’’ with 1 element):  $Z_{\text{prncpl}} = \sum_{\nu \in \Gamma} t^\nu$  and  $L_{\text{prncpl}} = (1 - t)Z_{\text{prncpl}}$  is the Alexander polynomial  $Al^\circ(t)$ . Namely,

$$\lim_{q \rightarrow 1} L_{\text{prncpl}} = (1 - t) \left( \sum_{i=1}^{\delta} t^{g_i} \right) + t^{2\delta} \text{ for } \{g_i\} = \Gamma \setminus (2\delta + \mathbb{Z}_+).$$

We obtain that  $(L_{\text{prncpl}} - t^{2\delta})/(1 - t)$  becomes  $\delta$  when  $q \rightarrow 1$  and  $t = 1$ .

The conjectural coincidence of  $\mathbf{H}(q, t, a)$  (DAHA),  $\mathbf{H}^{mot}(q, t, a)$  and  $L(q, t, a)$  identifies the superduality for the former with the functional equation for the later. Recall that the conjectural upper RH-bound for  $\mathbf{H}(q, t, a = 0)$  is  $q \leq 1/2$  in the unibranch uncolored case, which is far from ‘‘arithmetic’’  $q = p^m$  for  $L(q, t, 0)$ .

The coincidence  $\mathbf{H}^{mot}(q, t, a)$  and  $L(q, t, a)$  is simple for  $t = 1$  (for any rings  $\mathcal{R} \subset \mathcal{O}$ , not only Gorenstein ones). Indeed, any admissible flag of ideals  $\vec{M}' \subset \mathcal{R}$  is  $z^{m'} \vec{M}$  for standard  $\vec{M} \subset \mathcal{O}$ , where  $m', \vec{M}$  are uniquely determined by  $\vec{M}'$ . Vice versa, given a standard flag  $\vec{M}$ , let:

$$\{m \mid z^m \vec{M} \subset \mathcal{R}\} = \{0 \leq m_1 < m_2 < \dots < m_k < 2\delta\} \cup \{2\delta + \mathbb{Z}_+\}$$

for some  $k = k_M$  and  $\{m_i\}$ . The contribution of  $z^m \vec{M} \subset \mathcal{R}$  for such  $m$  to  $L(q, t, a) = (1 - t)Z(q, t, a)$  is  $(1 - t)t^{m - \text{dev}(M)}$ . Recall:  $\text{dev}(M) = \delta - \dim \mathcal{O}/M$ . Thus, all such  $z^m \vec{M}$  contribute  $(1 - t)t^{-\text{dev}} (\sum_{i=1}^{k_M} t^{m_i} + t^{2\delta}/(1 - t))$ . This will be 1 for  $t \rightarrow 1$  (and any  $q$ ). We obtain that  $L(q, t = 1, a) = \sum_{\ell=0}^{2\delta-1} |\mathcal{J}_\ell(\mathbb{F}_q)| a^\ell$ , which is  $\mathbf{H}^{mot}(q, t = 1, a)$ .

*Using Hilbert schemes.* For a *rational* projective curve  $C \subset \mathbb{P}^2$ , the following identity is a natural object for physicists and mathematicians (Gopakumar-Vafa and Pandharipande-Thomas):  $\sum_{n \geq 0} q^{n+1-\delta} e(C^{[n]}) = \sum_{0 \leq i \leq \delta} n_C(i) \left(\frac{q}{(1-q)^2}\right)^{i+1-\delta}$ , for the Euler numbers of *Hilbert schemes*  $C^{[n]}$ . The points of the latter are zero-cycles of  $C$ , collections of ideals at any points, of the (total) colength  $n$ . Here  $\delta$  is the arithmetic genus of  $C$ ,  $n_C(i)$  are some numbers. The passage from a series to a polynomial is far from obvious even in this relatively simple case. It is much more subtle to prove that  $n_C(i) \in \mathbb{Z}_+$  (Göttsche and then Shende for all  $i$ ); the usage of versal deformations of singularities appeared necessary in the Shende's proof.

Switching to local rings  $\mathcal{R}$  of singularities, the following conjecture is for *nested* Hilbert schemes  $\text{Hilb}^{[l \leq l+m]}$  formed by pairs of ideals  $\mathfrak{m}I' \subset I \subset I' \subset \mathcal{R}$  of colengths  $l, l+m$  for the maximal ideal  $\mathfrak{m} \subset \mathcal{R}$ . One needs the *weight  $t$ -polynomial*  $\mathfrak{w}(\text{Hilb}^{[l \leq l+m]})$  defined for the weight filtration of  $\text{Hilb}^{[l \leq l+m]}$  due to Serre and Deligne. The *Oblomkov-Rasmussen-Shende conjecture* (2012) states that

$$\sum_{l, m \geq 0} q^{2l} a^{2m} t^{m^2} \mathfrak{w}(\text{Hilb}^{[l \leq l+m]})$$

is proportional to the Poincaré series of the HOMFLY-PT triply graded homology of the corresponding link. The connection with the perverse filtration of  $\mathcal{J}_0$  is due to Maulik-Yun and Migliorini-Shende. The ORS series is a geometric variant of  $Z(q, t, a)$ .

The ORS-conjecture adds  $t$  to the formula we began with and the *Oblomkov-Shende conjecture*, which was extended by adding colors  $\lambda$  and then proved by Maulik.

The passage from series to polynomials required superpolynomials. The corresponding topological ones are *reduced* KhR-polynomials. The Cherednik-Danilenko conjecture was that they coincide with the uncolored DAHA  $\mathcal{H}(q, t, a)$ . The passage to polynomials is a nontrivial step. This is manifest for the DAHA and motivic superpolynomials. Though it is a conjecture that the motivic ones for plane curve singularity depend on  $q$  polynomially.

**5.2. The passage to links.** Let us provide the definition of  $L$ -functions for *non-unibranch* plane curve singularities colored by rows. Without the colors and for  $a = 0$ , such  $L$  are due to Galkin (1973) and Stöhr (1998). We note that the colored case may require further work.

Recall that  $\mathcal{H}_\sigma^{mot}$  was defined for  $\sigma = (c_1 \geq c_2 \geq \dots \geq c_\kappa > 0)$  and  $\mathcal{R} = \mathbb{F}_q[[x, y]] \subset \mathcal{O} = \mathbb{F}_q[[z, e_1, \dots, e_\kappa]] \subset \Omega = \mathbb{F}_q[[z, \epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_\tau]]$  for  $\tau = \sum_{i=1}^\kappa c_i$ ,  $\epsilon_i \epsilon_j = \epsilon_i \delta_{ij}$ ,  $e_1 = \epsilon_1 + \dots + \epsilon_{c_1}$ ,  $e_2 = \epsilon_{c_1+1} + \dots + \epsilon_{c_1+c_2}$ , etc. Accordingly,  $z_i = ze_i (1 \leq i \leq \kappa)$  and  $\zeta_i = z\epsilon_i (1 \leq i \leq \tau)$ . Let  $\varpi_m = 1 - (\epsilon_1 + \dots + \epsilon_{m_1}) - (\epsilon_{c_1+1} + \dots + \epsilon_{c_1+m_2}) - \dots$ ,  $\tilde{\mathcal{R}} = \mathbb{F}_q[[x\varpi_m]]$  for all sequences  $\mathbf{m} = (m_1, m_2, \dots, m_\kappa)$  such that  $0 \leq m_1 < c_1$ ,  $0 \leq m_2 < c_2$ , etc. We take  $\tilde{\Omega} = \cup_m \tilde{\mathcal{R}}\varpi_m$ . Note that  $\varpi_{(0,0,\dots,0)} = \sum_{i=1}^\tau \epsilon_i = 1$ , and  $\tilde{\Omega} = \tilde{\mathcal{R}} = \mathcal{R}$  in the uncolored case. We set:

$$Z_\sigma(q, t, a) = \sum_M t^{\dim(\tilde{\Omega}/M)} \prod_{j=c_1}^{rk_q(M)-1} (1 + aq^j), \quad L_\sigma(q, t, a) = (1-t)^\tau Z(q, t, a),$$

where  $M \subset \tilde{\Omega}$  are  $\mathcal{R}$ -invariant,  $rk_q(M) \geq c_1$ , and  $\dim_{\mathbb{F}_q}(\tilde{\Omega}/M) < \infty$ .

Setting  $\mathbf{H}_\sigma(q, t, a) = \mathcal{H}_\sigma^{mot}(qt, t, a)$  (as above), we conjecture that  $\mathbf{H}_\sigma(q, t, a) = L_\sigma(q, t, a)$  *at least in the uncolored case*, when  $\sigma = (1, \dots, 1)$ .

Let  $\sigma = (2, 1)$  for the Hopf 2-link. Namely,  $\mathcal{R} = \mathbb{F}_q[[x = \zeta_1 + \zeta_2, y = \zeta_3]]$  and  $M \subset \tilde{\Omega} = \mathbb{F}_q[[\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \zeta_3]] \cup \mathcal{R}(\epsilon_2 + \epsilon_3)$ . It is easy to calculate that  $\mathcal{H}_\sigma^{mot} = (1 + aq^2) + (q^2 - 1)t$ ; the corresponding  $L$  is as follows.

The modules  $M$  of  $rk_q(M) = 2$  are those generated over  $\mathcal{R}$  by  $\{1, \zeta_1^u, u \geq 1\}$ ,  $\{\epsilon_2 + \epsilon_3, \zeta_1^u, u \geq 1\}$ ,  $\{1, \epsilon_2 + \epsilon_3\}$ , and  $\{\zeta_1^u + \alpha\zeta_3^w, \zeta_2^v + \beta\zeta_3^w\}$ , where  $u, v, w \geq 1$ ,  $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{F}_q$  and the pair  $\alpha = 0 = \beta$  is excluded.

Their contribution to  $Z_\sigma(q, t, a)$  will be  $\frac{(q^2-1)t^3}{(1-t)^3} + \frac{1+t}{(1-t)}$ . The submodules of  $q$ -rank 3 are those generated by  $\{\zeta_1^u, \zeta_2^v, \zeta_3^w\}$ , which contribute  $(1 + aq^2)\frac{t^2}{(1-t)^3}$ . Combining,  $L_\sigma(q, t, a) = (q^2 - 1)t^3 + (1 + t)(1 - t)^2 + t^2(1 + aq^2) = q^2t^3 + 1 - t + t^2aq^2 = (1 + aq^2t^2) + (q^2t^2 - 1)t$ .

More generally, let  $\sigma = (m, 1)$ . Then  $\mathcal{H}_\sigma^{mot} = (1 + q^m a) + (q^m - 1)t$ ,  $\mathbf{H}_\sigma^{mot} = (1 + q^m t^m a) + (q^m t^m - 1)t = L_\sigma$ . The latter coincidence was checked only in very simple colored cases; generally, more work is necessary.

*Double trefoil.* Let us provide the motivic uncolored superpolynomial for  $T(6, 4)$  and comment on it and its  $L$ -counterpart. One has:  $\mathcal{H}_{6,4}^{mot}(q, t, a) = q^8 t^8 - q^7 t^8 + q^3 t^2 (q + t - 2qt + q^2 t - 2q^2 t^2 + 2q^3 t^2 - q^2 t^3 + q^4 t^3 - q^2 t^4 + q^4 t^4 - q^3 t^5 + q^4 t^5)(1 + aq) + q^2 t (1 + q - t + q^2 t - t^2 - qt^2 + q^2 t^2 + q^3 t^2 - qt^3 + q^3 t^3 - q^2 t^4 + q^3 t^4)(1 + aq)(1 + aq^2) + (1 - t + qt - qt^2 + q^2 t^2)(1 + aq)(1 + aq^2)(1 + aq^3)$ .

It coincides with  $\mathcal{H}_{6,4}^{daha}$  in formula (6.4) of Section 6.2 of “*DAHA approach to iterated torus links*” (Ch, Danilenko, 2015); the notation there

was  $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}^{min}$ . Also, it coincides with the reduced (uncolored) Khovanov-Rozansky polynomial defined and obtained via *Soergel modules*, which is from Example 1.3 in “*Torus link homology*” (Hogancamp-Mellit, 2019). Their expression is  $\mathcal{H}_{6,4}^{daha}(q \mapsto 1/t, t \mapsto q, a)$  multiplied by  $\frac{1+a}{(1-q)^2}$ .

Here  $\mathcal{R} = \mathbb{F}_q[[x = z_1^2 - z_2^2, y = z_1^3 + z_2^3]] \subset \mathcal{O} = \mathbb{F}_q[[e_1, e_2, z_1, z_2]]$ ; recall that all our rings contain  $1 = \sum_i e_i$ . A natural basis in  $\mathcal{O}/\mathcal{R}$  is formed by (the images of)  $\{e_1, z_1, z_2, z_1^2, z_1^3, z_1^4, z_1^5, z_1^7\}$ . We use different signs in  $x$  and  $y$  to have  $z_{1,2}^6$  in  $\mathcal{R}$ ; so are all  $z_{1,2}^m$  for  $m \geq 8$ . Thus,  $\dim_{\mathbb{F}_q} \mathcal{O}/\mathcal{R} = 8$  and the contribution of any *invertible modules*  $M$  (those with  $rk_q = 1$ ) to  $\mathcal{H}^{mot}$  is  $(q^8 - q^7)t^8$ . The difference  $(q^8 - q^7)$  here is because the cyclic generator of  $M$  must contain  $e_1 + \alpha e_2 + \dots$  for  $\alpha \neq 0$  (it must be standard).

Concerning large modules,  $rk_q(\mathcal{O}) = 4$ . There are 2 more families of standard modules with  $rk_q = 4$ :  $M'_\alpha$  generated by  $e_1 + \alpha e_2, z_1, z_2, z_1^2$  and  $M''_{\alpha,\beta}$  generated by  $e_1 + \alpha e_2 + \beta z_1, z_1 - \alpha z_2, z_1^2, z_2^2$ , where  $\alpha \neq 0$ . They give  $(1 + (q-1)t + q(q-1)t^2)(1 + aq)(1 + aq^2)(1 + aq^3)$  in  $\mathcal{H}^{mot}$ .

Let us discuss a bit the corresponding contributions to the  $L$ -function. The *conductor* of  $\mathcal{R}$  is  $\mathcal{C} = z^8 \mathcal{O}$ , the greatest  $\mathcal{O}$ -submodule in  $\mathcal{R}$ . It has 4 generators,  $z_{1,2}^8$  and  $z_{1,2}^9$ , over  $\mathcal{R}$  and  $\dim_{\mathbb{F}_q} \mathcal{R}/\mathcal{C} = 6$ . Thus, the contribution of ideals  $M_{i,j} = z_1^i \mathcal{C} + z_2^j \mathcal{C}$  for  $i, j \geq 0$  to  $Z$  is  $t^6(1 + aq)(1 + aq^2)(1 + aq^3)/(1 - t)^2$ . The other two families are based on  $z^8 M'$  and  $z^8 M''$  of  $q$ -rank 4 with the generators. They contribute  $t^6(1 + t(q-1) + t^2(q^2 - q)(1 + aq)(1 + aq^2)(1 + aq^3))$  to  $L$ . The expected general formula is:  $L_{6,4}(q, t, a) = \mathcal{H}_{6,4}^{mot}(qt, t, a) = 1 - 2t + t^2 + q^3 t^4 - 2q^3 t^5 + q^3 t^6 + q^4 t^6 - 2q^4 t^7 + q^4 t^8 + q^5 t^8 - 2q^5 t^9 + q^5 t^{10} + q^6 t^{10} - 2q^6 t^{11} + q^7 t^{12} + q^6 t^{14} - 2q^7 t^{15} + q^8 t^{16} + t(1 - t + qt - t^2 - qt^2 + q^2 t^2 + t^3 - qt^3 - 2q^2 t^4 + 2q^3 t^4 + 2qt^5 - q^3 t^5 + q^4 t^5 - qt^6 - 3q^3 t^6 + q^4 t^6 + 2q^2 t^7 + q^3 t^7 - q^4 t^7 + q^5 t^7 - q^2 t^8 - 3q^4 t^8 + q^5 t^8 + 2q^3 t^9 - q^5 t^9 + q^6 t^9 - 2q^5 t^{10} + 2q^6 t^{10} + q^4 t^{11} - q^5 t^{11} - q^5 t^{12} - q^6 t^{12} + q^7 t^{12} - q^6 t^{13} + q^7 t^{13} + q^7 t^{14})(1 + aq) + t^3(1 - t + qt + q^2 t^2 - t^3 - 2qt^3 + t^4 + 2q^3 t^4 - aq^4 t^4 + qt^5 - 3q^2 t^5 - q^3 t^5 + 2aq^4 t^5 - aq^5 t^5 + q^2 t^6 + 2q^4 t^6 - aq^4 t^6 - 2q^3 t^7 + aq^5 t^7 + q^5 t^8 - q^4 t^9 + q^5 t^9 + q^5 t^{10})(1 + aq)(1 + aq^2) + t^6(1 - t + qt - qt^2 + q^2 t^2)(1 + aq)(1 + aq^2)(1 + aq^3)$ .

The coincidence of  $L_{6,4}$  with  $\mathbf{H}_{6,4}$  was verified only partially. Recall that  $L(q, t, -1/q)$  is conjecturally the *Zúñiga L-function*.

**5.3. Quasi-rho-invariants.** The  $\rho_{ab}$ -invariant is the von Neumann invariant defined for the abelianization representation  $\pi_1(S^3 \setminus K) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ . We will define a superpolynomial for a certain *integer* variant of  $\rho_{ab}$  for algebraic knots  $K$ . The superduality  $q^\delta t^{2\delta} \mathbf{H}_K(q, \frac{1}{qt}, a) = \mathbf{H}_K(q, t, a)$

and the connection conjecture for  $a \rightarrow -1/q$  will be used; the dependence on the knot  $K$  will be shown. We set:

$$R_K(q, t, a) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\mathbf{H}_K(q, t, a) - t^\delta \mathbf{H}_K(q, t=1, a)) / ((1-qt)(1-t)),$$

$$\rho_K(q, t) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} R_K(q, t, a=-1/q), \text{ where } \mathbf{H}_K(q, 1, a=-1/q) = q^\delta.$$

Switching to  $L_{prncpl}$ , our  $\rho_K(q, t)$  is a sum of monic  $q^i t^j$  (of multiplicity one); see the next section for the exact formula. The superduality holds  $q^{\delta-1} t^{2\delta-2} R_K(q, \frac{1}{qt}, a) = R_K(q, t, a)$ ; the same holds for  $\rho_K$ .

Let us express  $\rho_K(1, 1) = \rho_K(q=1, t=1)$  in terms of  $\Gamma = \nu_z(\mathcal{R} \setminus \{0\})$ . We set  $G \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbb{Z}_+ \setminus \Gamma = \mathbb{Z}_+ \cap S$  for  $S = \cup_{i=1}^\infty [g_i, g'_i + 1]$ , a disjoint union of segments, where  $g_i \leq g'_i \in G \not\equiv g'_i + 1$ . Then  $\delta = \sum_{i=1}^\infty m_i$  for  $m_i \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} g'_i - g_i + 1$ . This is actually for any Gorenstein  $\mathcal{R} \subset \mathbb{C}[[z]]$ . Setting  $\varsigma(x) = x$  for  $x \in S$  and 0 otherwise,

$$\rho_K(1, 1) = \sum_{i=1}^\infty m_i (g'_i + 1 - \frac{m_i}{2}) - \frac{\delta^2}{2} = \int_0^\infty \varsigma(x) dx - \frac{\delta^2}{2}.$$

Geometrically,  $\rho_{ab} = \int_0^1 \sigma_K(e^{2\pi i x}) dx$  for the *Tristram-Levine signature*  $\sigma_K$ ; see e.g. “*Signatures of iterated torus knots*” (Litherland, 1979). Our  $\varsigma$  is some variant of  $\sigma_K$ ; taking  $\int_0^1$  in the formula for  $\rho_{ab}$ , makes  $\rho_{ab}$  “additive” for iterated knots (see below).

*Quasi-rho for cables.* For  $r, s > 0$  such that  $\gcd(r, s) = 1$ , one has:  $\rho_{r,s}(1, 1) = \frac{(r^2-1)(s^2-1)}{24}$ . The classical  $\rho_{ab}$  is  $-\frac{1}{3} \frac{(r^2-1)(s^2-1)}{rs}$ . Thus, we basically obtain the same formula up to some renormalization. The values of our  $\rho$  are always natural numbers; so it can be used for *cat-egorification*. This is not the case with  $\rho_{ab}$  due to its geometric origin. Our  $\rho$  is expected to have some natural geometric interpretation too, but this is not settled at the moment.

The classical  $\rho_{ab}$  for cables is known to be additive. For instance let  $K = Cab(m, n)Cab(s, r)$ . Then  $\rho_{ab} = -\frac{1}{3} \left( \frac{(m^2-1)(n^2-1)}{mn} + \frac{(r^2-1)(s^2-1)}{rs} \right)$ . This deviates from our  $\rho$ , which is additive with some weights.

Let  $\mathcal{R} = \mathbb{F}[[z^{vr}, z^{vs} + z^{vs+p}]]$ , where,  $\gcd(r, s) = 1$  as above,  $v > 1$  and  $\gcd(v, p) = 1$  for  $p \geq 1$ . Then  $\Gamma = \langle vr, vs, vrs+p \rangle$ ,  $2\delta = v^2 rs - v(r+s) + (v-1)p + 1$  and  $K = Cab(m=vrs+p, n=v)Cab(s, r)$ . One obtains:  $\rho_K(1, 1) = \frac{1}{24} ((m^2-1)(n^2-1) + v^2(r^2-1)(s^2-1))$ .

More generally,  $\rho_K(1, 1) = \frac{1}{24} \sum_{i=1}^k v_i^2 (a_i^2 - 1)(r_i^2 - 1)$  for the cable  $K = Cab(a_k, r_k) \cdots Cab(a_2, r_2)Cab(a_1, r_1)$ , where  $1 \leq i \leq k$ ,  $v_i =$

$r_k \cdots r_{i+1}$  and  $v_k = 1$ . We will post the details elsewhere. Here  $v_i = \gcd(u_1, \dots, u_{i+1})$  for  $\Gamma = \langle u_1, \dots, u_{k+1} \rangle$ , where  $u_i < u_{i+1}$  and  $v_{i+1} | v_i$ ; it is known that  $\delta = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^k v_i (a_i - 1) (r_i - 1)$ .

We note the following natural embedding for  $K' = Cab(a, r)K$  (if both are algebraic knots). If  $\delta$  is that for the ring  $\mathcal{R}$  of  $K$ , then  $\rho_K(q, t)$  is the sum of monomials  $q^i t^j$  in  $\rho_{K'}(q, t)$  such that  $j < 2\delta - 1$ .

*The case of  $Cab(13, 2)Cab(2, 3)$ .* Here  $\mathcal{R} = \mathbb{C}[[z^4, z^6 + z^7]]$ ,  $r = 3, s = 2, v = 2, \delta = 8$ . Then  $\rho(1, 1) = 25$  and its refined version is  $\rho(q, t) = 1 + qt + q^2 t^2 + q^3 t^3 + q^3 t^4 + q^4 t^4 + q^4 t^5 + q^5 t^5 + q^4 t^6 + q^5 t^6 + q^6 t^6 + q^5 t^7 + q^6 t^7 + q^7 t^7 + q^5 t^8 + q^6 t^8 + q^7 t^8 + q^6 t^9 + q^7 t^9 + q^6 t^{10} + q^7 t^{10} + q^7 t^{11} + q^7 t^{12} + q^7 t^{13} + q^7 t^{14}$ .

RH holds for  $\rho(q, t)$  when  $q < q_{sup} \approx 0.802$ . Presumably,  $\lim_{p \rightarrow \infty} q_{sup} = 1$  for  $Cab(2p+13, 2)Cab(2, 3)$ ; for instance,  $q_{sup} \approx 0.996$  for  $p = 2000$ .

Let us provide now full  $R(q, t, a)$  for  $\mathbb{C}[[z^4, z^6 + z^7]]$ . It is:

$$\begin{aligned} & 1 + t + qt + t^2 + 2qt^2 + q^2 t^2 + t^3 + 2qt^3 + 3q^2 t^3 + q^3 t^3 + t^4 + 2qt^4 + 4q^2 t^4 + 4q^3 t^4 + q^4 t^4 + \\ & t^5 + 2qt^5 + 4q^2 t^5 + 6q^3 t^5 + 4q^4 t^5 + q^5 t^5 + t^6 + 2qt^6 + 4q^2 t^6 + 7q^3 t^6 + 8q^4 t^6 + 4q^5 t^6 + q^6 t^6 + \\ & t^7 + 2qt^7 + 4q^2 t^7 + 7q^3 t^7 + 10q^4 t^7 + 8q^5 t^7 + 4q^6 t^7 + q^7 t^7 + qt^8 + 2q^2 t^8 + 4q^3 t^8 + 7q^4 t^8 + \\ & 8q^5 t^8 + 4q^6 t^8 + q^7 t^8 + q^2 t^9 + 2q^3 t^9 + 4q^4 t^9 + 6q^5 t^9 + 4q^6 t^9 + q^7 t^9 + q^3 t^{10} + 2q^4 t^{10} + \\ & 4q^5 t^{10} + 4q^6 t^{10} + q^7 t^{10} + q^4 t^{11} + 2q^5 t^{11} + 3q^6 t^{11} + q^7 t^{11} + q^5 t^{12} + 2q^6 t^{12} + q^7 t^{12} + q^6 t^{13} + \\ & q^7 t^{13} + q^7 t^{14} + a \left( qt + qt^2 + 2q^2 t^2 + qt^3 + 3q^2 t^3 + 3q^3 t^3 + qt^4 + 3q^2 t^4 + 6q^3 t^4 + 3q^4 t^4 + \right. \\ & qt^5 + 3q^2 t^5 + 7q^3 t^5 + 9q^4 t^5 + 3q^5 t^5 + qt^6 + 3q^2 t^6 + 7q^3 t^6 + 12q^4 t^6 + 10q^5 t^6 + 3q^6 t^6 + qt^7 + \\ & 3q^2 t^7 + 7q^3 t^7 + 13q^4 t^7 + 17q^5 t^7 + 10q^6 t^7 + 3q^7 t^7 + q^2 t^8 + 3q^3 t^8 + 7q^4 t^8 + 12q^5 t^8 + 10q^6 t^8 + \\ & 3q^7 t^8 + q^3 t^9 + 3q^4 t^9 + 7q^5 t^9 + 9q^6 t^9 + 3q^7 t^9 + q^4 t^{10} + 3q^5 t^{10} + 6q^6 t^{10} + 3q^7 t^{10} + q^5 t^{11} + \\ & 3q^6 t^{11} + 3q^7 t^{11} + q^6 t^{12} + 2q^7 t^{12} + q^7 t^{13} \left. \right) + a^2 \left( q^3 t^3 + q^3 t^4 + 2q^4 t^4 + q^3 t^5 + 3q^4 t^5 + 3q^5 t^5 + \right. \\ & q^3 t^6 + 3q^4 t^6 + 6q^5 t^6 + 3q^6 t^6 + q^3 t^7 + 3q^4 t^7 + 7q^5 t^7 + 8q^6 t^7 + 3q^7 t^7 + q^4 t^8 + 3q^5 t^8 + 6q^6 t^8 + \\ & 3q^7 t^8 + q^5 t^9 + 3q^6 t^9 + 3q^7 t^9 + q^6 t^{10} + 2q^7 t^{10} + q^7 t^{11} \left. \right) + a^3 \left( q^6 t^6 + q^6 t^7 + q^7 t^7 + q^7 t^8 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Recall that  $R(q, t, a) \mapsto \rho(q, t)$  upon the substitution  $a \mapsto -\frac{1}{q}$  in the parameters of  $\mathbf{H}(q, t, a)$ , which is generally the passage to the Heegaard-Floer homology and Alexander polynomials (when  $q = 1, a = -1$ ).

## 6. ON PHYSICS CONNECTIONS

Generally, a challenge is to associate the Riemann and Lindelöf hypotheses with some physics phenomena in SCFT or similar theories. SCFT is connected with quite a few recent mathematical developments. DAHA can be considered as its part; their origin was in the Knizhnik-Zamolodchikov equations. DAHA superpolynomials can be interpreted as some physics partition functions, those for knot operators.

The *p-adic strings* due to Witten and others must be mentioned in this context. The starting point of this theory was an adelic product formula for the *Veneziano amplitude*. In mathematics, we have a long history of understanding “geometry” via *p*-adic constructions and those over  $\mathbb{F}_q$ , including recent Peter Scholze theory (say, in his lectures at IHES, 2023-24). The figures below are about such and similar connections. For instance, we expect that *L*-functions of plane curve singularities over  $\mathbb{F}_q$  can be related to some Dirac operators; this can be connected with *p*-adic strings.

The *Lee-Yang circle theorems* provide a different perspective. The Ising model with an external magnetic field is the key example.

**6.1. Lee-Yang theorem.** For any lattice (of any dimension) with  $N$  vertices and the connected pairs of vertices denoted by  $\langle n, n' \rangle$ , let  $\mathcal{Z} = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log(Z_N)}{N}$  for the partition function  $Z_N = \sum_{\{\sigma_n\}} e^{-\beta \mathcal{H}}$ , where the Hamiltonian is  $\mathcal{H} = - \sum_{\langle n, n' \rangle} J_{n, n'} \sigma_n \sigma_{n'} - H \sum_n \sigma_n$  and  $\sigma = \pm 1$ . This is the Ising model with an external magnetic field  $H$ . Here  $\beta = (k_B T)^{-1}$  is the inverse temperature for the Boltzmann constant  $k_B$ . Assuming that  $J_{n, n'} \geq 0$  (the ferromagnetic case) and  $\beta > 0$ , Lee-Yang proved that the zeros of  $Z_N$  in terms of the “complex fugacity”  $\mu = e^{-2\beta H}$  belong to the unit circle  $|\mu| = 1$ ; the corresponding symmetry of  $Z_N$  is simply  $\sigma \mapsto -\sigma$ . For the square lattice with  $J = \text{const} > 0$ ,  $Z_N$  is a polynomial in terms of  $\mu$  and  $0 < u \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} e^{-4\beta J} < 1$ . There is a *q*-version of this theorem and other physics-statistical variants.

The Lee-Yang-Fisher zeros are when  $u$  is considered as a free parameter for complex  $T$ . Numerical experiments showed that  $|\mu| = 1$  for the  $\mu$ -zeros can hold for some  $u < 0$ . The physics calculations are mostly when  $\mu$  is fixed and the  $u$ -zeros are considered, but they can be used for the  $\mu$ -zeros too. This phenomenon resembles the behavior of the  $t$ -zeros of our  $\mathbf{H}(q, t, a)$ . Actually, DAHA is directly related to the *XXZ*-model, which is somewhat similar to the Ising model with  $H$  as above, though all attempts to “integrate” the latter failed.

Only  $\mathcal{Z}$  is physical; its phase transitions are positive *real* limits as  $N \rightarrow \infty$  of (complex)  $\mu$ -zeros of  $Z_N$ . Thus, these zeros can result in a phase transition only at  $\mu = 1$  due to RH for  $Z_N$ , which point is the intersection of the unit  $\mu$ -circle with  $\mathbb{R}_+$ . The relation between the failure of RH and “unwanted” phase transitions seems sufficiently general. Given  $u < 0$ , the  $\mu$ -zeros of  $Z_N$  quickly become wild near the

real line when  $N$  goes beyond  $N_u$ , the last  $N$  when RH still holds for  $u < 0$ . So do the corresponding points of phase transition. This can be clearly seen in the 1D Ising model.

*One-dimensional case.* The zeros of  $Z_N$  can be found explicitly in this case. One has:  $-\beta\mathcal{H} = \beta \sum_{n=1}^N J\sigma_n\sigma_{n+1} + \frac{\beta}{2}H(\sigma_n + \sigma_{n+1})$ , where the periodicity  $\sigma_{N+1} = \sigma_1$  is assumed. Then  $Z_N = \sum_{\{\sigma_n\}} e^{-\beta\mathcal{H}}$  can be calculated using the eigenvalues  $\lambda_1, \lambda_2$  of the *transfer matrix*  $\mathcal{T} = \begin{pmatrix} e^{\beta(J+H)} & e^{-\beta J} \\ e^{-\beta J} & e^{\beta(J-H)} \end{pmatrix}$ . Namely,  $Z_N = \text{tr}(\mathcal{T}^N) = \lambda_1^N + \lambda_2^N$  for  $\lambda_{1,2} = e^{\beta J} \cosh(\beta H) \pm \sqrt{e^{2\beta J} \sinh^2(\beta H) + e^{-2\beta J}}$ . Upon some algebraic manipulations, the  $\mu$ -zeros of  $Z_N$  are for  $H = i\theta_n/\beta$ , where  $\cos(\theta_n) = \sqrt{1-u} \cos \frac{(2n-1)\pi}{2N}$  for  $n = 1, \dots, N$  and  $u = e^{-4\beta J}$  as above. We obtain that RH, which is the condition  $\theta_n \in \mathbb{R}$  for any  $n$ , holds if  $\sqrt{1-u} \cos \frac{\pi}{2N} \leq 1$ , i.e. for  $u \geq -\tan^2\left(\frac{\pi}{2N}\right)$ . Thus, RH can hold for negative  $u$ , but the latter bound tends to 0 when  $N \rightarrow \infty$ .

This example provides some physical insight. A counterpart of  $N$  is our  $\deg_t \mathcal{H}^\lambda$ , which is  $\delta \sum_i m_i^2$  for  $\lambda = (m_i)$ . For instance,  $\deg_t \mathcal{H}^\lambda = \delta n$  as  $a = 0$  for  $n$ -columns  $\lambda$ . We note that the distribution of  $\mu$ -zeros above resembles our one for  $\mathbf{H}(q, t, a=0)$  in the case of uncolored  $T(2, 2p+1)$ .

**6.2. Landau-Ginzburg models.** Another physics approach to singularities is presented in paper “*Catastrophes and the classification of conformal theories*” (Vafa-Warner, 1989). The authors consider LGSM, Landau-Ginzburg Sigma Models, for *superpotentials*  $W(x, y)$  corresponding to isolated singularities. They can be with several variables, and more than one superpotential  $W$  can be considered. Let us mention here two publications by Alexander Zamolodchikov in 1986. We mention that there are many other classes of superpotentials, for instance those for quiver varieties and KZ. The correspondence between SCFT and LGSM is one of the key in string theory.

A lot of information can be obtained directly in terms of  $W(x, y)$  and the corresponding singularities. If only the topological class of singularity matters, then this is some “topological LGSM”. We note that analytic parameters of singularities can be interpreted as *modes* in physics, but motivic theory captures (by now) only topological types.

For instance, the *Milnor number*  $\mu = 2\delta$ , which is  $(r-1)(s-1)$  for  $W_{r,s}(x, y) = x^s - y^r$ , coincides with the number of (independent) chiral

operators or superfields. It is the *Witten index* for plane curve singularities: the number of zero energy bosonic vacuum states minus the number of zero energy fermionic vacuum states. The dimensions of superfields for  $W_{r,s}(x,y)$  are proportional to the corresponding quasi-homogeneity weights, which are  $1/s$  for  $x$ ,  $1/r$  for  $y$  and so on.

Another example is the central charge, which is  $c = 6\beta$  for  $\beta = (\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{r})(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{s})$  for  $W_{r,s}(x,y)$ . Generally,  $\beta$  is obtained from the asymptotic formula  $\int e^{i\lambda W(x_1, \dots, x_m)} \prod_{i=1}^m \lambda^{1/2} dx_i \sim O(\lambda^\beta)$  for large  $\lambda$ . Also, the adjacency of singularities plays an important role in this approach.

**6.3. Refined Witten index.** Refined Witten and BPS indices were studied in the literature; see e.g. Gaiotto-Moore-Neitzke (Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. 2013). Generally, the challenge is to “split” the vacuum states counted by these indices using some additional parameters.

Let us split  $\mu = 2\delta$  using  $\mathcal{H}^{mot}(q, t, a = -t/q)$ , though we will actually use  $L_{prncpl}$  in the following calculation. We begin with  $\delta_{q,t} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{\mathcal{H}^{mot}(q,t,a=-t/q)-(qt)^\delta}{1-t} = \frac{L_{prncpl}(\frac{q}{t},t)-(qt)^\delta}{1-t}$ . This formula is for any Gorenstein  $\mathcal{R} \subset \mathbb{C}[[z]]$ . The DAHA parameters  $q, t$  from  $\mathcal{H}$  are used (not  $q_{new}$  from the definition of  $\mathbf{H}$  and  $L$ ).

As above:  $G = \mathbb{Z}_+ \setminus \Gamma = \cup_{i=1}^\infty \{g_i \leq x \leq g'_i\}$ , where  $g'_i + 1 \in \Gamma$ , and  $m_i = g'_i - g_i + 1$ . Then  $\delta_{q,t} = \frac{1-t^{g_1}}{1-t} + \sum_{i=1}^\infty \frac{t^{g'_i+1} - t^{g_i+1}}{1-t} (\frac{q}{t})^{m_1 + \dots + m_i}$ , and  $\delta_{1,1} = \delta$ . This formula was actually used above in the definition of the refined quasi-rho invariant  $\rho_K(q, t)$ ; also, see below.

Let  $\mu_{q,t} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \delta_{q,t} + (qt)^{\delta-1} \delta_{t^{-1}, q^{-1}} = \sum_{x=0}^{2\delta-1} t^{v(x)-1} q^{g(x)}$ , where  $v(x) = |\{\nu \in \Gamma \mid 0 \leq \nu \leq x\}|$  and  $g(x) = |\{g \in G \mid 0 \leq g < x\}|$  for  $G$  as above. Then  $\mu_{1,1} = \mu$  and this definition ensures the superduality:  $(qt)^{\delta-1} \mu(1/t, 1/q) = \mu(q, t)$ . Not all monomials are monic in  $\mu(q, t)$ :  $\varpi$  of them are with coefficient 2, which correspond to  $x \in \Gamma \not\equiv x+1$ .

For example,  $\mu_{q,t} = 2 + q + q^2 + 2q^3t + 2q^4t^2 + 2q^5t^3 + 2q^6t^4 + q^7t^5 + q^7t^6 + 2q^7t^7$  for  $\mathcal{R} = \mathbb{C}[[z^4, z^6 + z^7]]$ . Upon  $q \mapsto qt$ , it satisfies RH for  $0 < q < 0.919090$ . For  $\mathcal{R} = \mathbb{C}[[z^6, z^9 + z^{460}]]$ , this range becomes  $0 < q < 0.852561$ . For  $\mathcal{R} = \mathbb{C}[[z^6, z^8 + z^{649}]]$ , it is  $0 < q < 0.846566$  and  $0.848063$  for  $z^8 + z^{3003}$ .

Compare with the formula for  $\varrho(q, t) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{\mathcal{H}(q,t,a=-t/q)-q^\delta}{(1-t)(1-q)} = \rho(\frac{q}{t}, t)$ :  
 $\varrho(q, t) = \sum_{x \in G} q^{g(x)} \frac{1-t^{v(x)}}{1-t} = \sum_{G \ni x > y \in \Gamma} q^{g(x)} t^{v(y)-1} = (qt)^{\delta-1} \varrho(t^{-1}, q^{-1})$ .  
 Recall that we use the DAHA parameters  $q, t$  from  $\mathcal{H}$  in this section.

*Adding colors.* The substitution  $a \mapsto -\frac{t}{q}$  has remarkable properties for  $\mathcal{H}^\lambda(q, t, a)$  for partitions  $\lambda$  more general than  $\square$  (the uncolored case). Let  $n$  be the number of rows of  $\lambda$  and  $m$  the number of its columns.

For *hooks*  $\lambda$ , we expect that  $\mathcal{H}^\lambda(q, t, a \mapsto -\frac{t}{q}) = (qt^{n-1})^{\delta(n-1)} r^\lambda(q, t)$  for  $r^\lambda(q, t) = r(q \mapsto t^{n-1}q^m, t \mapsto q^{m-1}t^n)$ . Here  $r(q, t) = \mathcal{H}(q, t, a \mapsto -\frac{t}{q})$  is for  $\lambda = \square$  considered above; its constant term is 1. For instance,  $1 - r^\lambda(q, t)$  is divisible by  $(1 - q^m)$  for  $n = 1$ . This was checked for pure columns/rows and several hooks with  $m = 2$  or  $n = 2$ . For example,  $(1 - r^{\square}(q, t))/(1 - q^2) = qt(1 + q^2 + q^4 + q^7t + q^{10}t^2 + q^{13}t^3 + q^{16}t^4 + q^{21}t^7)$  for  $K = Cab(13, 2)Cab(2, 3)$ .

This is far from being that simple beyond the hooks. For instance, for  $T(3, 2)$  and  $\lambda = 2 \times 2 = \boxplus$ :  $1 - r_{3,2}^{2 \times 2}(q, t) = q(1 - qt)(1 + q - q^2 + t - q^2t + q^4t + q^3t^2 - q^5t^2 + q^2t^3 - q^4t^3 + q^5t^4 + q^6t^4 + q^4t^5 - q^6t^5 - q^6t^6 + q^6t^7)$ .

The definition of the  $\varrho^\lambda(q, t)$  for *symmetric*  $\lambda$  can follow the uncolored case, but this is preliminary. For instance, one can set:  $\varrho_K^{2 \times 2}(q, t) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (r_K^{2 \times 2}(q, t) - q^{4\delta}t^{4\delta})/(1 - qt)^2$ . For the example above:  $\varrho_{3,2}^{2 \times 2}(q, t) = 1 - q - q^2 + q^3 + qt - q^2t + q^4t - q^5t + 2q^2t^2 - q^3t^2 - q^4t^2 + q^5t^2 + 2q^3t^3 - q^4t^3 + q^6t^3 + 2q^4t^4 - q^5t^4 - q^6t^4 + q^5t^5 - q^6t^5 + q^6t^6$ , which satisfies the superduality  $q \leftrightarrow t^{-1}$  with the multiplier  $q^6t^6$ . Presumably,  $\varrho_K^{2 \times 2}(1, 1) = 4\varrho_K(1, 1)$  for algebraic knots  $K$ , but there are negative terms in  $\varrho_{3,2}^{2 \times 2}(q, t)$ . Recall that we omit  $\lambda$  in uncolored  $\mathcal{H}_K, \varrho_K$  and so on, i.e. for  $\lambda = \square$ .

**6.4. S-duality.** The relation SCFT  $\leftrightarrow$  LGSM suggests that the *S-duality* in the former can be seen via the superpotential  $W(x, y)$ . The superduality of physics superpolynomials can be connected with that in *M-theory* and the symmetry  $\epsilon_1 \leftrightarrow \epsilon_2$  in *Nekrasov's instanton sums*. The general physics superduality (with  $\lambda$ ) for superpolynomials was considered by Gukov-Stosic (2012) (and in some prior works). For us, this correspondence is between DAHA, a “representative” of SCFT, and *L-functions* of singularities, which presumably “represent” LGSM.

More specifically, we focus on the DAHA superpolynomials, which are certain partition functions of knot operators and are related to the BPS states. They can be expected to coincide with motivic superpolynomials (a solid mathematical conjecture), which are presumably some partition functions of properly defined *motivic* LCSM for plane curve singularities. Then, switching to the *L-functions* of the latter, the *S-duality* from SCFT becomes the Hasse-Weil functional equation, with some potential toward various generalizations.

This link may be not too much surprising. The  $S$ -duality and mirror symmetry (CPT) are very universal in physics. The functional equation is certainly of the same calibre in mathematics. There are more than 20 different zeta-theories; RH does not always holds. By analogy with the Lee-Yang theorem, one can speculate that (topological) LGSM associated with plane curve singularities are “stable” when the “coupling constant”  $q$  is small enough to ensure RH for  $\mathbf{H}(q, t, a)$ . More generally, can the failure of RH be somehow connected with the presence of unwanted phase transitions? Something like this: “elementary particles” for  $W_{2,2p+1} = x^{2p+1} - y^2$  can be “observed” for any  $q > 0$ , but this requires  $q < 1/2$  or so for arbitrary superpotentials  $W(x, y)$ .


We took the bound  $1/2$  from *strong RH* for  $a = 0$ ; generally, we can make  $a$  a constant or any quantity invariant under the superduality. For instance, let  $a = -t/q$ , which is super-invariant. Then we arrive at  $\varrho_{2,2p+1}(q, t) = \frac{q^p - tq^{p+1} - t(qt)^p + (qt)^{p+1} + t - 1}{(q-1)(t-1)(qt-1)} = \sum_{0 \leq j \leq i < p} q^i t^j$ , and RH holds for  $\rho_{2,2p+1}(q, t) = \varrho_{2,2p+1}(qt, t)$  only for sufficiently small  $q$  (not all).

Let me finish this section with little something on Manin’s “*Mathematics as metaphor*”. Yu.I. obviously expected number theory to play a major role in the alliance of physics and mathematics. If RH has something to do with the absence of unwanted phase transitions in physics theories or their stability of any kind, then number theory will not be just a “metaphor”. Technically, DAHA accumulated quite a few integrable models and the fact that it appeared very “motivic” can be meaningful physically. I thank my friends-physicists for various talks on these matters (though they are not responsible for what I wrote).

## 7. ZETA-FUNCTIONS AS INVARIANTS

**7.1. The first figure.** Modern mathematics and physics very much rely (more than ever) on the progress in geometry. Any new geometric approaches to the classical zeta and  $L$ -functions can open new avenues toward the justification of “Grand Conjectures”. This of course does not diminish the role of analytic methods, including classical Fourier analysis and (more recently) the  $p$ -adic methods. The Dwork proof of the rationality of zeta-functions is an example of the latter.

In contrast to the Weil conjectures (proved by Deligne), the distribution of the zeros of Riemann’s  $\zeta(s)$  in the critical strip does not seem to reflect any “geometry”. Riemann’s zeta does occur in some geometric



For instance, Dirichlet L-functions have no counterparts among Weil's L-functions (and they have no  $q$ ) : two different universes. Also, *zeta-equivalence* of algebraic varieties over  $\mathbf{C}$  (N. Katz) generally results only in the coincidence of their Hodge numbers.

and physics considerations, but the interpretation of the Grand Conjectures geometrically or physically is (totally?) missing. We note here that the zeros of Selberg's zeta functions are much more "geometric" and have many analytic applications. The zeros of Hasse-Weil zetas are very geometric too, which was the key for the justification of the corresponding RH in special cases and in general (Deligne).


Nicolas Katz proved that the zeta-equivalence of algebraic varieties  $X$  results in the coincidence of their virtual Hodge numbers. One needs to add the coefficients of the equations of  $X$  to the corresponding rings of functions and then consider the zeta function  $\zeta_X$  of the resulting scheme over  $\mathbb{Z}$ . If  $\zeta_X = \zeta_Y$ , then we call  $X$  and  $Y$  zeta-equivalent. The coincidence of Hodge numbers is of course very far from the existence of any kind of isomorphism between  $X$  and  $Y$ .

Generally, *Kapranov's (motivic) zetas* are with the coefficients in the Grothendieck ring  $K_0(Var/\mathbb{F})$  of varieties over  $\mathbb{F}$ . The map  $X \mapsto |X(\mathbb{F}_q)|$  is a *motivic measures*. Conjecturally, our motivic superpolynomials can be lifted to  $K_0(Var/\mathbb{F})$ . Recall that we conjecture that the Piontkowski cells are configurations of affine spaces. Let me mention Manin's "*Lectures on zeta functions and motives*" (1995).

In the first figure, the following 4 theories are presented as disconnected blocks: (a) the Hasse-Weil zetas (over  $\mathbb{F}_q$ ), (b) the Selberg's

zetas (via the Laplace operators), (c) the Kubota-Leopoldt zetas, and (d) Riemann's  $\zeta(s)$  and the Dirichlet  $L$ -functions. They are really different, but not totally disconnected; there are some deep relations. For instance, the connection (not in this figure) of the Selberg's "*1/4 conjecture*" for arithmetic subgroups  $\Gamma \subset SL(2, \mathbb{R})$  to the Riemann's zeta is such.

The upper-left block is connected with the upper-right one: global fields and the product formulas are here and there. However this does not help much to understand the zeros of the classical  $\zeta(s), L(s)$ . The main difference is obvious: Riemann's  $\zeta(s)$  does not contain  $q$ . One needs, at least, its  $q$ -deformation. In the theory over  $\mathbb{F}_q$ , making  $q$  a "continuous parameter" is necessary for any links. This can be hopefully achieved via the passage to zeta-functions of of certain isolated singularities.



If they capture the topological (!) invariants of links or 3-folds, then these theories must be *a priori* equivalent!

**7.2. The second figure.** Upon the switch to isolated singularities  $\mathcal{X}$ , the corresponding zetas can be expected to capture the topological type for some "good"  $\mathcal{X}$ , which conjecturally holds for *any* plane curve singularities. The "Hasse-Weil block" of the 2nd figure, the upper-left one, is discussed in this note for plane curve singularities. Let us comment a bit on the "spectral block".

Algebraically, we study the covers of  $\mathbb{P}^2$  ramified at  $\mathcal{X}$ . This is closely related to the *Schottky uniformization* in the variant due to Tate-Mumford. Generally, it is for “relative curves” over  $\mathbb{C}[[z]]$  or  $\mathbb{Z}_p$  (2-dimensional schemes), with a singular rational curve as the closed fiber. Basically, the monoidal transformations are performed making the closed fiber a divisor with normal crossings. We need this for plane curve singularities, as closed fibers, and their deformations.

More analytically, one can consider the *versal deformations* of  $\mathcal{X}$  and the invariants of the zeta-function of the *Dirac operator* upon the corresponding *Schottky uniformization*. Let us provide one reference: “*Zeta functions that hear the shape of a Riemann surface*” (Cornelissen-Marcolli, 2008). This is in the smooth case, but Schottky uniformization is compatible with the passage to singularities. For plane curve singularities  $\mathcal{X}$ , the corresponding Selberg-type zetas are expected to be related to the superpolynomials of  $\mathcal{X}$ .

Let me mention the  $p$ -adic uniformization of modular curves associated with division algebras over totally real number fields (my PhD thesis). It was used in the  $\varepsilon$ -conjecture and Ribet’s theorem (in the proof of Last Fermat Theorem). See, for instance, recent “*On the  $p$ -adic uniformization of quaternionic Shimura curves*” (Boutot-Zink, 2022). This is an example of the role the  $p$ -adic block can play, which also shows the potential of the Schottky uniformization.

*The middle oval.* The DAHA approach provides a natural way of adding  $q$  to the Riemann’s  $\zeta(s)$  and Dirichlet  $L$ -functions, though without the symmetry  $s \leftrightarrow 1-s$ . The corresponding  $q$ -deformed zeros seem more regular at  $0 < q < 1$ . If true, then the stochastic behavior of the classical ones can be due to  $q \rightarrow 1$ .

I defined such  $q$ -analogs in “*On  $q$ -analogues of Riemann’s zeta function*” (2001) for  $A_1$ . The starting point was the  $q$ -Mehta-Macdonald formula, which is a product formula in terms of  $q$ -Gamma functions for  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \gamma(x) \mu(q^x) dx$  for the Gaussian  $\gamma(x) = q^{-x^2/2}$  and the measure-function  $\mu(q^x) = \prod_{\alpha, j \geq 0} \frac{(1-q^{(x,\alpha)+\nu_\alpha j})(1-q^{-(x,\alpha)+\nu_\alpha(j+1)})}{(1-t_\alpha q^{(x,\alpha)+\nu_\alpha j})(1-t_\alpha q^{(x,\alpha)+\nu_\alpha(j+1)})}$ , which makes the  $E$ -polynomials pairwise orthogonal. Here  $\alpha$  are positive roots of a given reduced irreducible root system  $R \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ , normalized by the condition  $(\alpha_{sht}, \alpha_{sht}) = 2$ ; we set  $\nu_\alpha = 1$  for short  $\alpha$ ,  $= 3$  for  $G_2$ , and  $2$  otherwise. Let  $t_{sht} = q^{k_{sht}}$  and  $t_{lng} = q^{k_{lng}}$ ;  $t_\alpha$  depends only on  $|\alpha|$ . Also, let  $\rho_k = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\alpha > 0} k_\alpha \alpha$  and  $\mu_1 = \mu/\text{CT}(\mu)$  for the constant term

functional CT for Laurent series in terms of  $X_b$  ( $\mu_1$  is such). From now on, we assume that  $0 < q < 1$  and  $t_\alpha > 1$ .

The link to the DAHA superpolynomials is due to the theorem that  $\int_{i\mathbb{R}^n} f(x)\gamma(x)\mu(q^x)dx$  is proportional to the *coinvariant* of  $f(x)$ , which is  $f(x = -\rho_k)$  in suitable spaces of functions. Here the integration can be replaced by taking CT; see below. We note that the integration can be over  $\mathbb{R}^n$  in this formula:  $\gamma$  must be replaced by  $\gamma^{-1} = q^{x^2/2}$  and the proportionality factor changes (significantly).

Let  $Z_n^+(q, t) = \frac{\int_{\varepsilon+iR^n} \gamma(x)/(1+\gamma(x))\mu(q^x)dx}{\int_{\varepsilon+iR^n} \gamma(x)\mu(q^x)dx}$ . Due to the *Stirling-Moak formula* (Moak, 1984):  $\lim_{q \rightarrow 1^-} Z_n^+(q, t) = \eta(s) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (1 - 2^{1-s})\zeta(s)$

for the Riemann's  $\zeta(s)$ , where  $s = k_{sht}|R_+^{sht}| + k_{lng}|R_+^{lng}| + \frac{n}{2}$ . The usage of  $\varepsilon$  improves the range of  $k_\nu$  where  $Z_n^+$  is analytic. The basic range is  $\Re k_\nu > 0$ , which is for  $\varepsilon = 0$ . If  $k_{lng} = k = k_{sht}$  and  $\varepsilon = \rho/h$  for the Coxeter number, then  $Z_n^+(q, t)$  is analytic for  $\Re k > -1/h$ , which corresponds to  $\Re s > 0$ , i.e. we cover the critical strip  $0 < s < 1$  in the limit. By the analytic continuation, the convergence to  $\eta(s)$  holds for any  $s \in \mathbb{C}$ . The analytic continuation is essentially by the procedure of "picking up residues" due to Weyl-Arthur-Heckman-Opdam.

*The case of  $A_n$ .* Setting  $v = n + 1$  and  $v^\circ = -kv$ , we obtain:

$$s = k \frac{v(v-1)}{2} + \frac{v-1}{2} = \frac{1}{2}(v-1)(kv^\circ + 1) = -\frac{1}{2}(v-1)(v^\circ - 1).$$

The integral  $\mathcal{I}_n^+ = \int_{\varepsilon+iR^n} \frac{\gamma(x)}{1+\gamma(x)}\mu(q^x)dx$  for  $\varepsilon = \rho/v$  is an analytic function for  $\Re k > -1/v$  and, accordingly, for  $s > -\frac{1}{v} \frac{v(v-1)}{2} + \frac{v-1}{2} = 0$ . Generally,  $\mathcal{I}_R^+$  defined by the same formula for a root system  $R$  is analytic if (a)  $k_{sht} > \max\{-(\varepsilon, \alpha_i), (\varepsilon, \theta_{sht}) - 1\}$ , where  $\alpha_i$  are short simple roots and  $\theta_{sht}$  is the maximal short root in  $R_+$ , and (b)  $k_{lng}$  satisfies the analogous inequalities for long instead of short.

We conjecture in type  $A$ , that there exists a meromorphic function  $\mathcal{Z}(q, t, \mathbf{a})$  in terms of  $q, t, \mathbf{a}$  such that  $\mathcal{Z}(t^{-1}, q^{-1}, \mathbf{a}) = \mathcal{Z}(q, t, \mathbf{a})$  and  $\eta(s)$  is the limit  $q \rightarrow 1^-$  of  $\mathcal{Z}(q, t = q^k, \mathbf{a} = t^v)$ . Note the usage of  $\mathbf{a} = -\mathbf{a}$  instead of  $\mathbf{a}$  in superpolynomials.

The superduality becomes  $k \mapsto 1/k, v \rightarrow -kv = v^\circ$  in terms of  $k, v$ . The corresponding  $s$  remains fixed under this symmetry (it must!). However, we have a non-trivial connection between the values of  $\mathcal{Z}$  at  $k$  and  $1/k$  in the  $q$ -theory. For instance, the  $\mathbf{a}$ -coefficients of  $\mathcal{Z}$

are (conditionally) bounded as  $|k| \rightarrow \infty$  and  $\Re s > 0$ , or its values for super-invariant  $\mathbf{a}$ , which is a variant of the *Lindelöf hypothesis*.

One can expect similar features for classical root systems. For  $C_n$  in the case  $t_{\text{lng}} = t_{\text{sht}}$ , briefly discussed above, the *hyperpolynomials* are conjectured to depend polynomially on  $q, t^{\pm 1}, \mathbf{a}$ , where the passage to  $C_n$  is  $\mathbf{a} = t^{2n}$ ; the superduality is  $q \leftrightarrow t, \mathbf{a} \mapsto \mathbf{a}$ , as that for the  $A$ -series.

In this case:  $k_{\text{sht}} = k = 2k_{\text{lng}}, v = n$ , and  $s = k(v(v-1)+v/2)+v/2$ . The superduality becomes  $k \mapsto 1/k, v \mapsto -kv$ , i.e. the same as for  $A$ ; however,  $s$  is different for  $C$ . As for  $A$ , this  $s$  is fixed under the superduality:  $s \mapsto \frac{1}{k}(kv)(\frac{1}{2} + kv) - k\frac{v}{2} = k(v^2 - \frac{v}{2}) + \frac{v}{2} = s$ .

*DAHA vertex.* The rationale for the existence of  $\mathcal{Z}(q, t, \mathbf{a})$  is the following theorem. Let  $\mathbb{J}_m = \text{CT}(\Theta^m(q^x) \mu_1)$  for  $\Theta(q^x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{b \in P} q^{b^2/2+(x,b)}$ . The latter is  $\gamma(x)$  “presented” as a Laurent series in terms of  $X_b = q^{(x,b)}$ ; its defining property is the  $P$ -periodicity of  $\gamma(x)^{-1}\Theta(q^x)$ . This series naturally occurs when we switch from  $\int_{\varepsilon+i\mathbb{R}^n} \{\dots\} \mu(q^x) dx$  to the integration over the periods of  $\mu(q^x)$ . For instance,  $\int_{\varepsilon+iR^n} \gamma(x) \mu_1(q^x) dx$  coincides with  $\mathbb{J}_1 = \text{CT}(\Theta \mu_1(q^x))$  up to a simple factor. To see this, replace  $\gamma(x)$  by  $\sum_{b \in Q} \gamma(x + 2\pi i \log(q) b)$  for the *root lattice*  $Q$ , use the functional equation for  $\Theta$ , and then switch to CT.

Given  $m \geq 1$ , the claim is that  $\mathbb{H}_m(q, t, \mathbf{a})$  exists such that  $\mathbb{H}_m(q, t, \mathbf{a} = t^{n+1}) = \mathbb{J}_m/\mathbb{J}_1^m$  for any  $A_n$ , and the superduality holds:  $\mathbb{H}_m(t^{-1}, q^{-1}, \mathbf{a}) = \mathbb{H}_m(q, t, \mathbf{a})$  (without any  $q, t$ -factors).

Technically, this theorem follows from the  $\mathbf{a}$ -stabilization and super-invariance of  $\frac{q^{b^2/2+k(\rho,b)}}{\langle \mathcal{P}_b, \mathcal{P}_b \rangle_1}$  and those for  $\mathcal{P}_b(q^{-c-k\rho})$  for any  $b, c \in P_+$ , where we set:  $\mathcal{P}_b(X) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} P_b(X)/P_b(t^\rho)$  for the Macdonald polynomials  $P_b$ , and  $\langle f, g \rangle_1 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{CT}(f(X)g(X^{-1})\mu_1(q^x))$ . For instance, let  $b = \boxplus = \omega_1 + \omega_2, c = \boxminus = \omega_1$ . Then  $\mathcal{P}_b(q^{-c-k\rho}) = 1 + \frac{(q^{-1}-1)(1-t)}{1-\mathbf{a}}(1+q^{-1}+t)$ , which is, indeed, super-invariant, as well as:  $\frac{q^{b^2/2+(b,\rho_k)}}{\langle \mathcal{P}_b, \mathcal{P}_b \rangle_1} =$

$$\left(\frac{q}{t}\right)^{5/2} \mathbf{a}^{-3/2} (1-\mathbf{a}) \frac{(1-t^{-1}\mathbf{a})(1-q\mathbf{a})(1-t^{-1}q\mathbf{a})(1-t^{-1}q^2\mathbf{a})(1-t^2q\mathbf{a})}{(1-q)^2(1-t^{-1})^2(1-qt^{-2})(1-q^2t^{-1})}.$$

These quantities are the key in the theory of *DAHA vertex* due to the author and Danilenko. Namely, the series  $\text{CT}(\Theta^m(q^x)\mu_1(q^x))$  can be expressed in terms of products of them using the expansion

$\Theta(q^x) = \sum_{b \in P_+} \frac{q^{b^2/2+k(b,\rho)}}{\langle \mathcal{P}_b, \mathcal{P}_b \rangle_1} \mathcal{P}_b(X) \text{CT}(\Theta\mu_1)$ . Here the formula for the proportionality coefficient is  $q$ -Mehta-Macdonald identity:  $\text{CT}(\Theta\mu_1) = \prod_{\alpha \in R_+} \prod_{j=1}^{\infty} \left( \frac{1-t_\alpha^{-1}q_\alpha^{(\rho_k, \alpha^\vee)+j}}{1-q_\alpha^{(\rho_k, \alpha^\vee)+j}} \right)$ . It follows from the theorem that the symmetric form  $\langle f, g \Theta(q^x) \rangle_1$  corresponds to a *Shapovalov-type* anti-involution of  $\mathcal{H}$  and is unique such up to proportionality.

When  $t = 0$ , our  $\mathbb{J}_m$  become generalized *Rogers-Ramanujan* series. Actually,  $\Theta$ -functions “with characteristics” are needed for them, where  $X_b \mapsto \xi(b)X_b$  for characters  $\xi : P \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^*$ , which are via  $P/Q = \mathbb{Z}_{n+1}$  for  $A_n$ . See our paper with Boris Feigin (2012). The case  $t = 0$  is incompatible with the super-invariance, but we obtain “instead” the modularity of the resulting  $q$ -series.

Without going into detail,  $\mathbb{H}_m$  can be interpreted as invariants of the *Lens spaces*  $L(m, 1)$ ; they are sums of colored superpolynomials for the  $m$ -chains of consecutive unknots with linking numbers  $-1$  between the neighboring ones. Not much is published in this direction. The necessary DAHA theory is still in progress. Let me mention “*BPS spectra and 3-manifold invariants* (Gukov-Du Pei-Putrov-Vafa, 2017).

The next level is the passage to  $q$ -zeta: when we consider special generating functions for the family  $\{\mathbb{H}_m\}$  and more general ones. Any “geometric” interpretation of this passage can be valuable. There are quite a few challenges, including the following one.

*Higher theta-functions.* Given  $m$ , the passage from the imaginary integration in  $\int_{\varepsilon+iR^n} \frac{\gamma(x)}{1+\gamma(x)} \mu(q^x) dx = \int_{\varepsilon+iR^n} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} (-1)^{m-1} \gamma^m(x) \mu(q^x) dx$  to CT results in  $\gamma^m(x) \mapsto \Theta(q^{mx})$ . The latter function has the same multiplier as  $\Theta^m(q^x)$  upon the action of  $P$  and behaves as  $\sim q^{-mx^2/2}$  when  $q \rightarrow 1_-$  with a proper proportionality factor. It is quite different from  $\Theta^m(q^x)$  for  $m \geq 2$ . To employ the theorem on super-invariance of the quantities above, one needs either a counterpart of  $\mathbb{Z}(q, t, a)$  defined in terms of  $\{\Theta^m(q^x)\}$ , which seems doable, or the theory of *DAHA vertex* based on  $\Theta(q^{mx})$  instead of  $\Theta^m(q^x)$ .

More generally, theta-function of level  $m$ , those with the same multiplier as for  $\Theta^m$ , are in 1-1 correspondence with the *DAHA coinvariants* of level  $m$ . The latter are defined algebraically using the action of  $\tau_+^m$  in DAHA. We note that finding relations between theta-functions of arbitrary levels  $m$  is a subtle algebraic problem even for  $A_1$ .

*Further comments.* The convergence of  $Z_n^+(q, t)$  above will become to  $\zeta(s)$  instead of  $\eta(s)$  when we switch to  $Z_n^-(q, t)$  with  $(1 - \gamma(x))$  instead of  $(1 + \gamma(x))$ . However, this will hold only for  $\Re s > n$ . It will diverge otherwise, which can be fixed upon multiplication by proper  $\omega^\bullet$  for  $q \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} e^{-1/\omega}$ ; the limit becomes then some  $\Gamma$ -type function (no zeta!).

For instance, let  $\mathcal{I}^-(k) = \frac{1}{i} \int_{1/2+i\mathbb{R}} (q^{x^2} - 1)^{-1} \mu(q^x) dx$  for  $n = 1$ . Then  $(\frac{\omega}{4})^{k-1/2} \mathcal{I}^-(k)$  converges to  $\Gamma(s)\zeta(s)$  for  $\Re k > \frac{1}{2}$ , where  $s = k + \frac{1}{2}$ . However, the limit of  $\omega^{2k-1} \mathcal{I}^-(k)$  becomes  $\tan(\pi k)\Gamma(k)^2$  when  $\Re k < \frac{1}{2}$ . Generally,  $\omega^{s-n} \mathcal{I}^\pm(k)$  converges to  $\zeta(s)$  or  $\eta(s)$  times proper products of  $\Gamma$ -factors when  $\Re s > n$  in the case of  $\mathcal{I}^-$  and  $\Re s > 0$  for  $\mathcal{I}^+$ . Using the analytic continuation,  $s$  can be arbitrary in the second case.

Interestingly, the  $q$ -zeros of  $\mathcal{I}^-(k)$  with  $\Re k \sim 0$  (not in the range  $\Re k > \frac{1}{2}$ ) approach the classical ones for  $q$  sufficiently close to  $1_-$  (but not too close!), and then  $\mathcal{I}$  slowly begin to “switch” to the Gamma-limit as  $q$  continues to approach  $1_-$ . This can be clearly seen numerically.

This can be potentially related to the *Gram law*. We change  $\mathcal{I}^-(k)$  to  $\tilde{\mathcal{I}}^-(k)$  with the limit to the classical  $\tilde{\zeta}(s) = \pi^{-s/2}\Gamma(\frac{s}{2})\zeta(s)$ , invariant under  $s \mapsto 1 - s$ ; this limit is only for  $\Re s > 1/2$  and upon  $\omega^\bullet$ . Then the zeros of proper linear combination of  $\mathcal{I}^-(k)$  and its complex conjugation approach those of  $\zeta(k + 1/2)$  for  $\Re k \sim 0$  and large  $\omega$  (but not too large), and then eventually tend to properly adjusted *Gram points* as  $\omega$  increases. This argument is of course qualitative. So is the Gram law: the zeros of  $\zeta(1/2 + k)$  “mostly” alternate with the Gram points.

We note (again) that the invariance of  $\tilde{\zeta}(s)$  under  $s \mapsto 1 - s$  fails for the  $q$ -deformations. However, a variant of “ $q$ -RH” can hold for  $A_1$ . This was discussed in my paper mostly for the *sharp  $q$ -zeta* introduced below. A qualitative version is that the tendency is strong for the *sharp  $q$ -deformations* of the classical zeros to stay in the half-plane  $\Re s > 1/2$  (in certain horizontal strips depending on  $q < 1$ ). The corresponding half-plane becomes  $\Re s < 1/2$  for the imaginary integration.

A direct counterpart of RH can hold too. This requires the consideration of a proper linear combination of  $\mathcal{I}^+(k)$  and  $\mathcal{I}^+(-k)$ . The  $q$ -zeros of the latter we were able to find satisfy  $\Re k = 0$ . The case of the simplest *sharp  $q$ -L-function* is touched upon below.

Peter Sarnak noted once that many applications are based on the absence of zeta-zeros with  $\frac{1}{2} < \Re s < 1$ . This is, basically, what we see

for “small”  $q$ -zeros. However, there was (and there is) uncertainty when the corresponding neighboring zeros of the classical  $\zeta(s)$  are getting “too close”. Namely, the linear approximations of sharp  $q$ -deformations of such “unusual” zeros of  $\zeta(s)$  can be with  $\Re s > 1/2$  (in the opposite half-plane). We think that the linear approximations can be irrelevant for such  $q$ -zeros; theoretically, the convergence of the corresponding Taylor expansions is not known. Let me quote Harold Edwards: “the existence of nearly coincident zeros must give pause to even the most convinced believer” (his “*Riemann’s Zeta Function*”).

**7.3. Sharp  $q$ -zeta.** As above,  $q = \exp(-1/\omega)$  for  $\omega > 0$ ; let  $\sigma \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sqrt{\pi\omega/2}$ . The integration path will be now  $\oint_{\infty-\sigma i}^{\infty+\sigma i}$  around zero. For  $A_1$  and  $\delta_k(x; q) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \prod_{j=0}^{\infty} \frac{(1-q^{j+2x})(1-q^{j-2x})}{(1-q^{j+k+2x})(1-q^{j+k-2x})}$ , the symmetric variant of  $\mu$ , the function  $\mathfrak{Z}_q^{\square}(k) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{2i} \oint_{\infty-\sigma i}^{\infty+\sigma i} \frac{\delta_k(x; q)}{1+q^{-x^2}} dx$  is analytic in the horizontal strip  $K^{\sharp} = \{-2\sigma < \Im k < +2\sigma\}$  as  $\Re k > -1/2$ . Its meromorphic continuation to *all*  $k \in \mathbb{C}$  via Cauchy’s theorem, the *sharp  $q$ -zeta*, is:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{Z}_q^{\sharp}(k) &= -\frac{\omega\pi}{2} \prod_{j=0}^{\infty} \frac{(1-q^{j+k})(1-q^{j-k})}{(1-q^{j+2k})(1-q^{j+1})} \times \\ &\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \frac{(1-q^{j+k})q^{-kj}}{(1-q^k)(q^{-\frac{(k+j)^2}{4}} + 1)} \prod_{l=1}^j \frac{1-q^{l+2k-1}}{1-q^l}. \end{aligned}$$

It has poles at  $\{-\frac{1}{2} - \mathbb{Z}_+\}$  in  $K^{\sharp}$ . This strip is between the first zeros of  $1 + q^{-\frac{k^2}{4}}$ . For all  $k$  apart from the poles,  $\lim_{\omega \rightarrow \infty} (\frac{\omega}{4})^{k-1/2} \mathfrak{Z}_q^{\sharp}(k) = \sin(\pi k)(1 - 2^{\frac{1}{2}-k})\Gamma(k + \frac{1}{2})\zeta(k + \frac{1}{2})$ .

Given a classical zero  $k = z$  of  $\zeta(1/2 + k)$ , let us assume that its  $\sharp$ -deformation  $z^{\sharp}(\omega)$  exists and is differentiable with respect to  $\varpi = 1/\omega$ . Then the formula for its linear approximation  $\tilde{z}^{\sharp}(\omega)$  is as follows:  $\tilde{z}^{\sharp}(\omega) = z(1 - \frac{4(z+\frac{1}{2})\zeta_+(z+\frac{3}{2}) - (z-1)\zeta_+(z-\frac{1}{2})}{12\omega\zeta'(z+\frac{1}{2})(1-2^{\frac{1}{2}-z})})$ . Thus, the linear  $\varpi$ -approximations of all classical zeros  $z$  exist if and only if all of them are simple, an interesting interpretation of the classical conjecture.

A similar approach can be employed for  $\mathfrak{Z}_q^{\sharp}(k; d)$  with for  $q^{-dx^2}$  instead of  $q^{-x^2}$  in  $\mathfrak{Z}_q^{\sharp}$  and for the *sharp  $L$ -functions*  $\mathfrak{L}_q^{\sharp}(k; d)$  that are for  $\frac{q^{x^2/2} - q^{-x^2/2}}{q^{(d+1)x^2/2} - q^{-(d+1)x^2/2}}$ . The  $q$ -deformations of  $L$ -functions are somewhat simpler to analyze numerically; the 1st  $L$ -zeros are smaller than those of  $\zeta(s)$ . The usage of  $d$  has some practical advantages too.

Taking the classical  $z = 14.1347i$  and  $\omega = 750$  for  $\mathfrak{Z}_q^\sharp(k; 2)$ :

$$z^\sharp = 0.1304 + 14.1450i, \tilde{z}^\sharp = 0.1302 + 14.1465i.$$

Other zeros in  $K^\sharp$  for  $\omega = 750, d = 2$  are:

<i>zeta</i>	<i>sharp - zeta</i>	<i>linear approx.</i>
21.0220i	0.3514 + 21.0702i	0.3504 + 21.0771i
25.0109i	0.5641 + 24.9586i	0.5745 + 24.9643i
30.4249i	0.9046 + 30.4014i	0.9134 + 30.4077i
32.9351i	1.1051 + 33.0341i	1.0998 + 33.0854i
37.5862i	1.6449 + 37.9660i	1.7675 + 38.1895i
40.9187i	1.9080 + 40.8119i	1.9141 + 40.7816i
43.3271i	2.2860 + 43.2485i	2.4497 + 43.3138i
48.0052i	2.9259 + 47.8424i	3.1103 + 47.5578i.

There is a clear tendency for  $z^\sharp$  to move to the right. If true, this would give the classical RH. A direct  $q$ -counterpart of RH was the observation at the end of paper “On  $q$ -analogs ...” that several (not too many) “small” zeros of  $\mathfrak{L}_q^\sharp(k; d) - \mathfrak{L}_q^\sharp(-k; d)$  were all with  $\Re k = 0$ . This is within the corresponding strips. The convergence is very good, including large  $\omega$ , but the calculations become involved for large  $\Im(k)$ ; this restricted our simulations. The passage from  $A_1$  to  $A_n$  and the stabilization add *superduality* to this approach.

Our calculations indicate that the zeros of the  $q$ -deformed zeta-functions and  $L$ -functions become more “regular” for  $q < 1$  than the corresponding classical zeros. It is expected that the zeros of Riemann zeta function in the critical strip are totally random subject to the distribution for the eigenvalues of random Hermitian matrices (Dyson, Montgomery, Odlyzko and others). This can be due to the limit  $q \rightarrow 1_-$  of “relatively regular”  $q$ -zeros. Similar quasi-classical limits, in physics and mathematics, are known to create chaotic behavior.

*Two bottom blocks.* Concerning the “ $p$ -adic block”, it is expected that there is a  $p$ -adic DAHA theory, where  $q$ -Gamma functions are replaced by their  $p$ -adic counterparts. This theory is important and doable. Technically, the cyclotomic  $q$ -Gauss-Selberg sums in the DAHA theory, where  $q$  are roots of unity, will be replaced by the classical

*modular* Gauss-Selberg sums, those over  $\mathbb{F}_q$ . The  $q$ -Mehta-Macdonald formulas is expected then to become in terms of the  $p$ -adic Gamma.

The “spectral block” has been partially discussed. The  $\rho_{ab}$ -invariants provide important links. Generally,  $\rho_\xi(M)$  is the value of at  $s = 0$  of  $\tilde{\eta}_M(s) - n\eta_M(s)$  for odd-dimensional closed oriented Riemannian manifolds  $M$ , where  $\eta_M(s)$  is due to Atiyah-Patodi-Singer and “twisted”  $\tilde{\eta}_M(s)$  is defined for the flat bundle over  $M$  associated with a representations  $\xi : \pi_1(M) \rightarrow U_n$ . We take  $M = S^3 \setminus K$  for a knot  $K$  and the abelianization of  $\pi_1(M)$  as  $\xi$ . Thus, our  $\rho_{q,t} = R_K(q, t, a = -1/q)$  from Section 5.3 can be considered as a  $q$ -version of  $\tilde{\eta}_M(s)$ . One can expect a “triply-graded” categorification of  $R(q, t, a)$ . Recall that they are defined in terms of  $\mathcal{H}^{mot}$ , which conjecturally coincide with superpolynomials in any other theories and, also, with the generalized  $L$ -functions of plane curve singularities. Thus, *quasi-rho invariants* connect the “Weil block” with the “spectral block” and then, potentially, with the “ $p$ -adic block” via the  $p$ -adic Schottky uniformization.

*Further perspectives.* Assuming that zeta functions of singularities  $\mathcal{X}$  and their corresponding  $a, q, t$ -versions are topological invariants/moduli of some sort, one can expect *a priori* links between the Hasse-Weil zetas, Selberg’s zetas and  $p$ -adic zetas for such  $\mathcal{X}$ . Then they would be different ways to describe the topological types of the same singularities. This is expected in the case of plane curve singularities.

A program is to switch from plane curve singularities to *surface* singularities serving Seifert 3-folds and more general *plumbed manifolds*. An example is our  $q, t, a$ -deformation of the Dirichlet  $\eta(s)$ , which deformation is, essentially,  $\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} (-1)^{m-1} \mathbb{H}_m(q, t, \mathbf{a})$ , i.e. an alternating sum of certain invariants of Lens spaces  $L(m, 1)$ . The invariants of the latter “replace”  $\frac{1}{m^s}$  in the classical  $\eta(s) = \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} (-1)^{m-1} \frac{1}{m^s}$ .

One can try to interpret such deformed sums geometrically: by looking for a manifold  $M$  such that its “triply-graded” homology reduces to the sums of those over its special submanifolds, Lens or Seifert spaces. In geometry, this can be due to the *localization* in certain (co)homology of  $M$  or via the count of *closed* totally-geodesic submanifolds in  $M$  (with proper weights). Also, it is not rare when some invariants of fibered spaces  $M$  reduce to sums over proper *special* fibers. However, here we have *infinite* sums and quite involved homology theories.

We note that the superduality holds for any (convergent) series in the form  $\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} c_m(q, t) \mathbb{H}_m(q, t, \mathbf{a})$  provided the super-invariance of  $c_m(q, t)$ . The superduality alone does not require specific  $\lim_{q \rightarrow 1^-} c_m(q, t) = \pm 1$  from  $\eta(s)$  and those for the  $L$ -functions. However, the fact that we “lift” the symmetry  $k \mapsto 1/k, v \mapsto -vk$  of  $s$  in  $\eta(s)$  to the fundamental superduality  $q \leftrightarrow t^{-1}$  in the theory of superpolynomials is of interest.

**7.4. Strong polynomial count.** There are significant restrictions for the types of singularities and their usage in the 2nd figure.

First, the motivic zetas are supposed to be *topological* invariants. This is not granted in their definition, which is in terms of the corresponding singularity ring. They are of course of “discrete nature”, which makes them potentially topological; however, the topological invariance is a conjecture even for general plane curve singularities.

Second, we need to check that  $\mathcal{X}$  can be defined over  $\mathbb{Z}$  within its topological type and has good reductions for almost all prime  $p$ .

Third, the varieties of “standard modules” and ideals of finite colength in the corresponding local rings must be of *strong polynomial count*: the number of their points over  $\mathbb{F}_q$  must depend polynomially on  $q$ .

The latter condition is very restrictive. It holds if a variety is paved by *configurations of affine spaces*, their unions and differences in a bigger affine space. This is conjectured for the *Piontkowski cells* in our varieties of standard modules  $\mathcal{J}_\ell$  and their multi-rank generalizations. We mention that affine Springer fibers can be *not* of strong polynomial count (unless in type  $A$ ). There is an example of Bernstein-Kazhdan where the counting their  $\mathbb{F}_q$ -points involves zeta-functions of elliptic curves over  $\mathbb{F}_q$ , certainly not  $q$ -polynomial. See Appendix to “*Fixed point varieties on affine flag manifolds*” by Kazhdan-Lusztig (1988).

Under these conditions, the corresponding  $\zeta_{\mathcal{X}}(q, t, a)$  or  $L_{\mathcal{X}}(q, t, a)$  can be expected powerful topological invariants of  $\mathcal{X}$ . Presumably, they can capture the topological types of  $\mathcal{X}$  in some cases. They certainly do this for plane curve singularities  $\mathcal{X}$ ; however, the topological invariance of the motivic superpolynomials  $\mathcal{H}^{mot}$  is a conjecture.

Plane curve singularities provide the main example by now. There is a bunch of constructions, theorems and conjectures in this case. One of the purposes of this work is to show that the theory of their superpolynomials can be developed in various directions, which, presumably, includes isolated surface singularities of toric type and the corresponding Seifert-type manifolds.

Needless to say that isolated singularities are (and always were) among the key objects of algebraic geometry. Smooth projective manifolds proved to be very helpful in their study, but they are not really necessary for many aspects of singularity theory. We try to do as much as we can directly in terms of the singularity rings.

*Knörrer's periodicity.* In topology, there is a fundamental connection between knots/links and 3-folds. Its certain algebraic counterpart is the Knörrer's periodicity for singularities: a connection between the plane curve singularities  $W(x, y) = 0$  and the ones given by the equations  $u^2 = W(x, y)$  is its important part. Actually, space singularities and 5-folds fit this picture too, but only "good" ones. For instance, the singularities in the form  $uv = W(x, y)$  naturally occur here; such Calabi-Yau threefolds were considered by Vafa-Dijkgraaf.

The expected connection between the *superpolynomials* of algebraic links and the *superseries* of the corresponding Seifert spaces resembles that between zeta-polynomials and the corresponding  $L$ -functions  $L_{\Phi}(s, \chi)$ , we began with. This is very far from being exact. Our superpolynomials are much simpler than the zeta-polynomials, and our superduality is that from the Hasse-Weil functional equation, very different from that for  $L$ -functions. The passage from the *superseries* of Lens spaces to  $q, t, a$ -deformations of Dirichlet  $L$ -functions can be viewed as an attempt to unify these two theories.

Let me mention (again) that this note is very incomplete concerning the names and contributions; only very few papers are mentioned. It is focused mostly on superpolynomials and some perspectives of their theory. We tried to outline some number theoretical perspectives of this direction and possible physics connections. The exposition is sketchy and speculative in several places. There are various omissions; for instance, we do not discuss much recent developments, even those directly related to the topics we touched upon.

To conclude, Manin's works and his vision of the role of number theory greatly influenced a lot of people, certainly all his students. We thank very much Yuri Tschinkel, Michael Finkelberg and the referee.

(I. Cherednik) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNC CHAPEL HILL, NORTH CAROLINA 27599, USA, CHERED@EMAIL.UNC.EDU