

On holographic duals of certain isolated weighted Gorenstein cDV singularities.

Yuanyuan Fang^a, Zekai Yu^b

^a*Dept. of Mathematics, Tsinghua University, Beijing, 10084, China*

^b*Qiuzhen College, Tsinghua University, Beijing, 10084, China*

E-mail: fangyy21@mails.tsinghua.edu.cn, yuzk23@mails.tsinghua.edu.cn

ABSTRACT: Based on an important mathematical conjecture, together with hypothesis of homological mirror symmetry in the context of Landau-Ginzburg models, we show that a class of compound Du Val singularities do not admit a crepant resolution. Most of these singularities sit in the type cE_n . This implies that those singularities are not dual to four dimensional $\mathcal{N}=1$ superconformal quiver gauge theories through stacks of $D3$ branes placed at the singularities. We verify this statement on the physics side by enumerating consistent gauge theories.

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	General strategies	4
2.1	K -stability of the singularities	5
2.2	Reduction of the problem	5
2.3	Symplectic cohomology	7
2.4	Homological mirror symmetry and Hochschild cohomology of equivariant matrix factorizations	9
3	Computation of symplectic cohomology of singularities with $J = E_6$ and E_7	13
3.1	$J = E_6$ cases	13
3.2	$J = E_7$ cases	18
4	Verification from the physics side	22
4.1	Consistency conditions for superconformal quiver gauge theory duals	22
4.2	Implementation of the search	28
5	Conclusions and future directions	29

1 Introduction

Three-fold isolated compound Du Val(cDV) singularities [1] have been important mostly due to its role in birational geometry. They are the three dimensional Gorenstein terminal singularities and hence are the "best" singularities in the sense of birational geometry. In particular, all crepant birational morphisms to them are small. Moreover, their \mathbb{Q} -factorializations can be often studied via tracing back to resolutions of canonical surface, a.k.a. *ADE*, singularities. On the other hand, they are defined by a single analytic equation in the affine space, hence one can perform explicit calculations in various contexts. In particular, one can deform the singularities in the sense of classical theory of singularity [2]. It also makes it possible, via the celebrated correspondence between Landau-Ginzburg models and geometries, to apply techniques of matrix factorizations through homological mirror symmetry, which nevertheless largely remains conjectural.

cDV singularities appear to be significant as well in string theory. An important source is type IIB geometric engineering, where one obtains four-dimensional Argyres-Douglas superconformal field theories (SCFTs) using three-fold weighted hypersurface Gorenstein singularities [3]. A large class of weighted isolated cDV singularities were introduced in [4] to give an alternative characterization of a certain Argyres-Douglas theories, commonly engineered by compactification from six dimensions. Isolated cDV singularities also play a role in M-theory geometric engineering [5–7], where the resulting five-dimensional superconformal field theories are of rank zero.

There is still another place where three-fold singularities appear in the broad context of geometric engineering. Probing these singularities in type IIB string theory via D3-branes yield four-dimensional $\mathcal{N}=1$ superconformal field theories. When the number of branes become large, the latter fits into the picture of holographic duality [8–10]. Holography in this context may be interpreted as the fact that the coordinate ring of the singularity is expected to be related to the chiral ring of the corresponding $\mathcal{N}=1$ conformal field theory [11, 12]. Due to the insufficient amount of supersymmetry, it remains unclear to what extent the geometry of the singularity determines the structure of the field theory. A philosophy that is relatively clear is that when the singularity admits non-commutative crepant resolutions (NCCRs), there exists a dual 4d $\mathcal{N}=1$ conformal field theory which can be described by a quiver gauge theory [13]: The quiver gauge theory and superpotential are given exactly by the quiver and potential underlying the NCCR. Restricting to the case of isolated cDVs, it is known that having crepant resolutions (CRs) is equivalent to having non-commutative crepant resolutions [14]. Therefore, existence of superconformal quiver gauge theory is related again to birational geometry of the singularities. In particular, if the singularity in question cannot be resolved crepantly, one concludes that the dual field theory does not have a gauge theory description, or the dual theory may not exist.

Later it was noticed that the singularities had to obey some other constraints such as K -stability with respect to a certain conic \mathbb{C}^* -action [11, 12], in order for a consistent $\mathcal{N}=1$ superconformal dual to exist. Understanding the quiver gauge theory duals is one of the most important original motivation of this work. As mentioned above, this has to do with understanding the crepant resolutions of such singularities, which turns out to be another

independent motivation of this work.

As far as we are concerned, a detailed comprehension of existence of the crepant resolutions are absent, especially in cEn cases. Therefore it would be desired if results can be obtained regarding their properties of crepant resolutions.

For physics interests, and also for simplicity, we focus on the singularities in the list of Wang and Xie [4] as follows

J	singularity	K -stable range of parameters
A_{N-1}	$x_1^2 + x_2^2 + x_3^N + z^k = 0$	$\frac{N}{2} < k < 2N, N \geq 2$
	$x_1^2 + x_2^2 + x_3^N + x_3 z^k = 0$	$\frac{N^2-1}{2N-1} < k < 2N-2, N \geq 2$
D_N	$x_1^2 + x_2^{N-1} + x_2 x_3^2 + z^k = 0$	$\frac{2N^2-8N+6}{2N-3} < k < 4N-4, N \geq 4$
	$x_1^2 + x_2^{N-1} + x_2 x_3^2 + z^k x_3 = 0$	$(N = 4, 5, 1 < k < 2N)$ $(N \geq 6, \frac{N^2-4N}{2N-2} < k < 2N)$
E_6	$x_1^2 + x_2^3 + x_3^4 + z^k = 0$	$1 < k < 24$
	$x_1^2 + x_2^3 + x_3^4 + z^k x_3 = 0$	$1 < k < 18$
	$x_1^2 + x_2^3 + x_3^4 + z^k x_2 = 0$	$1 < k < 16$
E_7	$x_1^2 + x_2^3 + x_2 x_3^3 + z^k = 0$	$1 < k < 36$
	$x_1^2 + x_2^3 + x_2 x_3^3 + z^k x_3 = 0$	$1 < k < 28$
E_8	$x_1^2 + x_2^3 + x_3^5 + z^k = 0$	$1 < k < 60$
	$x_1^2 + x_2^3 + x_3^5 + z^k x_3 = 0$	$2 < k < 48$
	$x_1^2 + x_2^3 + x_3^5 + z^k x_2 = 0$	$1 < k < 40$

Table 1: Three-fold isolated weighted compound Du Val singularities in [3, 4]. The rightmost row shows the K -stable range of parameters.

These isolated Gorenstein weighted hypersurface singularities engineer 4d $\mathcal{N}=2$ generalized Argyres-Douglas theories. They admit an alternative description from 6d $(2, 0)$ theories, labeled by an ADE Lie algebra indicated in the leftmost column¹. The hypersurface equations in the list are defined only up to weight-one deformations, i.e. deformations that preserve the original \mathbb{C}^* -actions.

As mentioned, we restrict the tunable parameter k to sit within the K -stable range (w.r.t. the obvious \mathbb{C}^* -action) due to physical interest. However, generalizations out of the K -stable region is straightforward, using our methods.

An important observation is that all singularities in the list above are invertible in the sense of Berglund and Hübsch [15]. We will show in two approaches - the first based on a conjecture raised in [16] (Conjecture 2.3) and the well-known hypothesis in homological mirror symmetry of invertible singularities, and the second based on constructions of superconformal quiver gauge theories.

¹ J may not be directly related to the underlying simple singularity. For example, for small k , $x_1^2 + x_2^2 + x_3^N + x_4^k = 0$ defines a cA_{k-1} singularity, not cA_{N-1} .

Claim 1.1 *A singularity with $J = E_n$ in the list above, within the K -stable range, admits a crepant resolution if and only if it is, up to weight-one deformations, one of the following four types:*

$$\begin{aligned}x^2 + y^3 + z^4 + w^{12} &= 0, \\x^2 + y^3 + yz^3 + w^{18} &= 0, \\x^2 + y^3 + z^5 + w^{30} &= 0, \\x^2 + y^3 + yz^3 + w^2z &= 0.\end{aligned}$$

That is to say, there is a unique representative for $J = E_6, E_7$ and E_8 , respectively, in addition to the famous Morrison-Pinkham example.

Note that most of the singularities with $J = E_n$ will be genuinely of cE_n type. The holographic dual field theories are already presented conjecturally in [17, 18], and the shape of quivers² are Dynkin diagrams of affine ADE Lie algebras. In the context of holographic duality, weight-one deformations are merely exactly marginal deformations in the field theory. They do not invalidate the quiver gauge theory description, hence the NCCR may remain the same under continuous weight-one deformations and the crepant resolution is not affected.

Our strategy is as follows. We start from surveying known results to reduce the problem at hand. It turns out that we only have to deal with two families of singularities of the Table 1. Based on a conjecture in [16], which relates the notion of symplectic cohomology of the Milnor fiber of singularities and the existence of crepant resolutions of a cDV singularity, the problem of determining whether a given singularity admits crepant resolutions or not is reduced to the problem of computing symplectic cohomology of its Milnor fiber at negative degrees. Homological mirror symmetry present a practical way to do this, i.e. computing the Hochschild cohomology of equivariant matrix factorizations of the mirror singularity. They are all demonstrated in section 2. In section 3, we verify the claim from physics side by enumerating all consistent $\mathcal{N}=1$ superconformal quiver gauge theories, and find that no candidate exists other than the four mentioned in Claim 1.1. Some necessary notions involved in the physics of the problem are given in section 4. In section 5 we present conclusions and make final remarks.

2 General strategies

In this section, we give a brief review of the mathematical ingredients. Some background in K -stability can be found in e.g. [12]. The role of K -stability from physics perspectives will be mostly deferred to section 4. Useful facts in birational geometry have been collected in e.g. [19].

²One cannot rule out theories that are conformally dual to them. More precisely, even if the superconformal field theory on its entire conformal manifold can be described by a quiver gauge theory, it is still possible that there exists another, possibly non-Lagrangian, theory with exactly the same visible BPS spectra.

2.1 K -stability of the singularities

The first ingredient comes from a nontrivial requirement for a singularity to admit a 4d $\mathcal{N}=1$ superconformal field theory (not necessarily gauge theory) dual. For physics consideration, we require the existence of the Ricci flat conic metric, which is ensured by K -stability of the singularity with respect to a certain \mathbb{C}^* -action [11]. The generator of this \mathbb{C}^* -action consists of two parts, one being the real rescaling along the radial direction of the singularity³, the other being Reeb vector along the (Sasaki-Einstein) link manifold. The $U(1)_R$ symmetry is identified with the generator of Reeb vector, normalized such that the canonical top form has weight two⁴. We will follow this normalization in this paper.

The Reeb flow belongs to the isometry group of the link manifold. These isometries generically come from the manifest $U(1)$ actions on the defining equations of the singularities. All the cDV singularities in the table admit one manifest such action; there is an extra $U(1)$ action for suspended singularities (i.e. if they can be expressed in terms of $uv + f(z, w) = 0$), or equivalently of cA_n type which is not relevant to us. Thus for our purpose we expect the Reeb flows to be generated by the manifest $U(1)$ symmetries. The condition for K -stability with respect to those symmetries can be computed using the methods in [12], and the results are inequalities in N and k shown in Table 1. The physical importance of K -stability will be explained in more detail in section 4.

2.2 Reduction of the problem

We aim at understanding crepant resolutions of the weighted terminal Gorenstein singularities in the list. Admitting crepant resolutions is equivalent to having NCCRs for these singularities. By [13, 14], the mathematical fact of having an NCCR corresponds to the physical statement that the singularity has a 4d $\mathcal{N}=1$ superconformal quiver gauge theory dual in the large N limit.

The resolution of cAn singularities have been completely understood in the [20]. In the same paper, a criterion for existence of crepant resolutions of cDn singularities were also presented. However, crepant resolutions of the cEn type singularities remain largely unknown. Fortunately, there are some mathematical constraints to reduce the problem at hand, which are summarized as follows:

Resolutions via semi-universal unfolding. For singularities of type $F(x, y, z, w) = f_{ADE}(x, y, z) + w^k = 0$, Brieskorn ([21], see also [22], Theorem 3.10) gave a powerful criterion: They admit crepant resolutions if and only if k is multiple of the Coxeter number of the Lie algebra corresponding to the ADE singularity at $w = 0$. However it does not help to deal with for example $F = f_{ADE}(x, y, z) + zw = 0$ which is singular, as opposed to the situation $F = f_{ADE}(z, y, z) + w$.

³Recall that the general philosophy of AdS/CFT from D3-branes is that, in the near horizon geometry, the radial direction of the normal bundle combines with the world-volume of branes to make AdS_5 , while the angular direction remains internal. The radial direction in the current setup is just the radial direction of singular 3-folds.

⁴Such normalization is due to the fact that the coordinates x, y, z, w are identified as gauge invariant operators on the field theory side via holographic duality. To identify the Reeb vector with the generator of the $U(1)_R$ symmetry in the field theory, we adopt such a normalization.

Topology of the link and number of exceptional curves. For hypersurface singularities, the following theorem relates its birational geometric properties and topology of its link structures⁵

Theorem 2.1 [22, 23]: *If a rational 3-fold isolated hypersurface singularity X admits a small resolution, whose exceptional sets consist of l irreducible curves, then $b_2(L) = b_3(L) = \rho(X) = l$.*

Here b_2 and b_3 denote the corresponding Betti numbers of the link L of the singularity X . $\rho(X)$ denotes the rank of local divisor class group of X .

In [7], a stronger statement was recorded, due to M. Caibar⁶: $\rho(X)$ coincides with number f of mass deformations of the singularity, regarded as defining a 4d $\mathcal{N}=2$ Argyres-Douglas SCFT. Namely, it is the number of deformations of mass dimension 1. Together with the statement above, we conclude that f is precisely the number of irreducible exceptional curves if there is a crepant resolution of the singularity.

The theorem above suggests that in order for a crepant resolution to exist, $b_2(L)$ shall not be zero: If a crepant resolution of X renders no exceptional curves to it, then X must be smooth. We do not consider a smooth X , hence one can immediately conclude that the singularities with $b_2(L) = 0$ do not admit crepant resolutions. The importance is that $b_2(L)$ for a weighted hypersurface singularity can be computed efficiently in a combinatorial way, see for example [7]. Thus it provides us with an important simplification of the problem.

The values of $b_2(L)$ for singularities in Table 1 have been computed in the appendix of [24], which is recorded in Table 2 below.

Singularity	$b_2(L)$	Constraints from K -stability
$x_1^2 + x_2^2 + x_3^N + z^k = 0$	$\text{g.c.d.}(N, k) - 1$	$\frac{N}{2} < k < 2N, N \geq 2$
$x_1^2 + x_2^2 + x_3^N + x_3 z^k = 0$	$\text{g.c.d.}(N - 1, k)$	$\frac{N^2 - 1}{2N - 1} < k < 2N - 2, N \geq 2$
$x_1^2 + x_2^{N-1} + x_2 x_3^2 + z^k = 0$	$\frac{\text{g.c.d.}(2N-2, k)+2}{2}$ for $\frac{2N-2}{\text{g.c.d.}(2N-2, k)}$ odd; 1 for k and $\frac{2N-2}{\text{g.c.d.}(2N-2, k)}$ even; 0 for k odd	$\frac{2N^2 - 8N + 6}{2N - 3} < k < 4N - 4, N \geq 4$
$x_1^2 + x_2^{N-1} + x_2 x_3^2 + z^k x_3 = 0$	$\text{g.c.d.}(N, k)$ for $\frac{N}{\text{g.c.d.}(N, k)}$ odd; 0 otherwise	$(N = 4, 5, 1 < k < 2N)$ $(N \geq 6, \frac{N^2 - 4N}{2N - 2} < k < 2N)$
$x_1^2 + x_2^3 + x_3^4 + z^k = 0$	6 for $k = 0(\text{mod}12)$; 2 for $k = 3, 6, 9(\text{mod}12)$; 0 for $k \neq 0(\text{mod}3)$	$1 < k < 24$
$x_1^2 + x_2^3 + x_3^4 + z^k x_3 = 0$	6 for $k = 0(\text{mod}9)$; 0 otherwise	$1 < k < 18$
$x_1^2 + x_2^3 + x_3^4 + z^k x_2 = 0$	6 for $k = 0(\text{mod}8)$; 2 for $k = 4(\text{mod}8)$; 1 for $k \neq 0(\text{mod}4)$	$1 < k < 16$
$x_1^2 + x_2^3 + x_2 x_3^3 + z^k = 0$	7 for $k = 0(\text{mod}18)$; 1 for k even and $k \neq 0(\text{mod}18)$; 0 for k odd	$1 < k < 36$
$x_1^2 + x_2^3 + x_2 x_3^3 + z^k x_3 = 0$	7 for $k = 0(\text{mod}14)$; 1 for k even and $k \neq 0(\text{mod}14)$; 0 for k odd	$1 < k < 28$
$x_1^2 + x_2^3 + x_3^5 + z^k = 0$	8 for $k = 0(\text{mod}30)$; 0 otherwise	$1 < k < 60$
$x_1^2 + x_2^3 + x_3^5 + z^k x_3 = 0$	8 for $k = 0(\text{mod}24)$; 0 otherwise	$1 < k < 48$
$x_1^2 + x_2^3 + x_3^5 + z^k x_2 = 0$	8 for $k = 0(\text{mod}20)$; 0 otherwise	$1 < k < 40$

Table 2: Mass parameters, i.e. $b_2(L)$ of the cDV singularities in questions, along with their range of K -stability.

As a sanity check, one finds that $b_2(L) = N$ precisely for the following families of

⁵We thank Prof. Dan Xie for pointing out this statement.

⁶We cannot find his PhD thesis on the internet, where the statement is supposed to appear initially.

singularities

$$\begin{aligned}x_1^2 + x_2^2 + x_3^{N+1} + z^{N+1} &= 0, \\x_1^2 + x_2^{N-1} + x_2 x_3^2 + z^{2N-2} &= 0,\end{aligned}$$

and $b_2(L) = 6, 7, 8$ respectively for the following singularities

$$\begin{aligned}x_1^2 + x_2^3 + x_3^4 + z^{12} &= 0, \\x_1^2 + x_2^3 + x_2 x_3^3 + z^{18} &= 0, \\x_1^2 + x_2^3 + x_3^5 + z^{30} &= 0,\end{aligned}$$

up to weight-one deformations. Moreover, $b_2(L) = 1$ for Morrison-Pinkham example $x^2 + y^3 + yz^3 + zt^2 = 0$. These are the correct values of exceptional curves of known singularities admitting crepant resolutions. Other singularities typically admit small values of $b_2(L)$, as expected.

In summary, the set of cE_n singularities in Table 1 which

1. do not fit into the criteria of Brieskorn and
2. do admit non-zero value of $b_2(L)$ and
3. are not up to weight-one deformations equivalent to the known ones that can be resolved crepantly

are summarized in the following problem 2.2.

Problem 2.2 *How to determine the existence of crepant resolutions of the following singularities?*

$$\begin{aligned}cE_6 : x^2 + y^3 + z^4 + yt^k : k = 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15 (b_2 = 1); k = 4, 12 (b_2 = 2). \\cE_7 : x^2 + y^3 + yz^3 + zt^k : k = 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 16, 18, 20, 22, 24, 26 (b_2 = 1).\end{aligned}$$

Here we attach the values of b_2 for convenience.

Then we aim at showing the absence of crepant resolutions for the singularities above.

2.3 Symplectic cohomology

In this subsection, we explain briefly the notion of symplectic cohomology and its implications on the existence of crepant resolutions. The main references are [16, 25, 26] and also the nice review [22].

Given a hypersurface singularity $f(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{n+1}) = 0$, embedded in $(n+1)$ -dimensional affine space with an isolated singular point at the origin, one can always study its property of deformations. There is a canonical such deformation defined by

$$F(x_1, \dots, x_{n+1}, t) := f(x_1, \dots, x_{n+1}) + t = 0,$$

where $t \in \mathbb{C}$. This can be viewed as a family of hypersurface singularities varying over the complex plane. For sufficiently small t , one can take the fiber and intersect it with a ball at a given radius r

$$M_X(t) := \{f^{-1}(t)\} \cap B(0, r),$$

where the right hand side sits in \mathbb{C}^{n+1} . This is called a *Milnor fiber*. As the inverse image is affine, boundary of the Milnor fiber is given by intersection of $\{f^{-1}(t)\}$ and a small sphere S_r^{2n+1} , which is diffeomorphic to the link of the original singularity

$$L_X := \{f^{-1}(0)\} \cap S_r^{2n+1}$$

as small deformations do not affect the behavior at a far distance. The link has real dimension $2n - 1$.

To any such Milnor fiber $M_X(t)$ of the singularity X , the subject of symplectic geometry allows one to associate its *symplectic cohomology* $SH^*(M_X(t))$, with degree ranging over all integers. Roughly speaking, symplectic cohomology at degree k counts Reeb orbits of *Conley-Zehnder index* $n - k$ at the boundary of the Milnor fiber, i.e. the link manifold of X . A precise definition involves an appropriate version of Floer cohomology which is beyond the scope of the present paper. Suffice it to say that there are two kinds of contributions to the symplectic cohomology, called *positive* and *negative* symplectic cohomology. They receive contributions from non-constant Reeb orbits and constant Reeb orbits, respectively. The latter can be reduced to a model of Morse cohomology, which coincides with the usual singular cohomology. One has the following long exact sequence

$$\dots \rightarrow H^{*-1}(M_X) \rightarrow SH_+^*(M_X) \rightarrow SH^*(M_X) \rightarrow H^*(M_X) \rightarrow \dots,$$

where SH_+ denotes the positive symplectic cohomology. As it turns out, the symplectic cohomology does not depend on the choice of Milnor fiber, so it is denoted simply by M_X . The symplectic cohomology carries the structure of a graded cohomology ring, which is a symplectic invariant of the Milnor fiber [27], and in some situations define a contact invariant of the link (See Chapter 5.3 of [22]).

In the current situations, the singularities in question are isolated Gorenstein cDV type, in which case the symplectic cohomology is subject to the following

$$\begin{cases} \text{rank } SH^3(M_X) &= \mu, \\ SH^k(M_X) &= 0 \text{ for } k = 2 \text{ or } k \geq 4. \end{cases} \quad (2.1)$$

where μ denotes the Milnor number of the singularity.

An interesting conjecture was brought up in [16]

Conjecture 2.3 *A compound Du Val singularity has crepant resolution with l irreducible exceptional curves if and only if the symplectic cohomology of its Milnor fiber in all negative degrees has rank l .*

The conjecture was supported in [16] by results of several classes of weighted isolated cDV singularities. It was later proved for all cA_n singularities in [26].

We will show in section 3 that, only in the the four cases mentioned in the introduction, the rank of symplectic cohomology at all negative degrees can be identical and equal to the number of exceptional curves in a crepant resolution. In particular, they are nonzero. Assuming that the "only if" part of the conjecture above is correct, this leads to the main claim of this paper:

Claim 2.4 *Any singularity with $J = E_n$ in the Table 1, within the K -stable range, admits a crepant resolution if and only if it is, up to weight-one deformations, one of the following four types:*

$$\begin{aligned}x^2 + y^3 + z^4 + w^{12} &= 0, \\x^2 + y^3 + yz^3 + w^{18} &= 0, \\x^2 + y^3 + z^5 + w^{30} &= 0, \\x^2 + y^3 + yz^3 + w^2z &= 0.\end{aligned}$$

That is, unique for cE_6 , cE_7 and cE_8 , respectively, besides the famous Morrison-Pinkham example.

It is definitely too optimistic to take the conjecture as an assumption, but as we have mentioned, physical evidences will be provided in section 4 to support the conjecture and our claim.

In practice, it is hard to compute the symplectic cohomology in a straightforward manner. This is where the machinery of homological mirror symmetry and Hochschild cohomology enters in.

2.4 Homological mirror symmetry and Hochschild cohomology of equivariant matrix factorizations

Homological mirror symmetry (HMS) plays an important role in understanding the geometry of Calabi-Yau varieties. It can be understood as equivalence of categories of D-branes in topological A/B models of a mirror pair of Calabi-Yau varieties. When the geometries are singular, in particular when they are defined by a hypersurface equation which develops a singularity at the origin, the usual statement in HMS is invalidated. The philosophy of Landau-Ginzburg/Calabi-Yau (LG/CY) correspondence [28, 29] and its generalization in terms of non-compact models [30] indicate another way out. That is to pass to the LG model defined by a superpotential and consider the corresponding (homotopy) categories of matrix factorizations, the LG B-branes, or the (derived) wrapped Fukaya category of a Milnor fiber, the LG A-branes. In that context, there is a notion of mirror symmetry initially introduced by Berglund and Hübsch [15]. It is defined as follows: Suppose one has a polynomial W of $n + 1$ variables, consisting of $n + 1$ monomials, one can define a matrix A by

$$W(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{n+1}) = \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} \prod_{j=1}^{n+1} x_j^{A_{ij}}.$$

Taking the transpose of A then yields the *Berglund-Hübsch mirror* polynomial

$$\check{W}(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{n+1}) = \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} \prod_{j=1}^{n+1} x_j^{A_{ij}^T}.$$

Now an invertible polynomial is defined to be such a polynomial with A invertible. It comes naturally with a \mathbb{C}^* -action. The normalization of the weights that is frequently used by mathematician is the following

$$W(\lambda^{d_1} x_1, \dots, \lambda^{d_{n+1}} x_{n+1}) = \lambda^h W(x_1, \dots, x_{n+1}).$$

where $g.c.d.(d_1, d_2, \dots, d_{n+1}, h) = 1$ for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}^*$. The usual condition that the singularity sits at finite distance in the moduli space [31] $\hat{c} = \sum_{i=1}^4 (1 - 2q_i) < 2$ now translates into the "log Fano condition"

$$d_0 := h - \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} d_i < 0.$$

Although it may appear that the invertible polynomial w is subject only to the \mathbb{C}^* -action, the genuine symmetry is indeed a finite extension of \mathbb{C}^* . One defines the following group

$$\Gamma_W := \left\{ (t_0, t_1, \dots, t_{n+1}) \in (\mathbb{C}^*)^{n+2} : \prod_{j=1}^{n+1} t_j^{A_{ij}} = t_0 t_1 t_2 \dots t_{n+1} \right\}.$$

Here the purpose of introducing t_0 is to relate two forms of mirror symmetry conjectures, one with $n + 1$ variables and the other with $n + 2$ variables.

The homological mirror symmetry conjectures for Berglund-Hübsch mirror pairs can be stated as follows (See conjecture 2.2 and 2.3 of [16])

Conjecture 2.5 *There is a quasi-equivalence of idempotent complete A_∞ -categories*

$$\mathcal{F}(\check{W}) \simeq \text{mf}(\mathbb{C}^{n+1}, \Gamma_W, W) \quad (2.2)$$

between the Fukaya-Seidel category of a Morsification of \check{W} and the dg-category of Γ_W -equivariant matrix factorizations of W .

Conjecture 2.6 *There is a quasi-equivalence of idempotent complete A_∞ -categories*

$$\mathcal{W}(\check{W}^{-1}(1)) \simeq \text{mf}(\mathbb{C}^{n+2}, \Gamma_W, W + x_0 x_1 \dots x_{n+1}) \quad (2.3)$$

between the wrapped Fukaya category of the Milnor fiber $\check{W}^{-1}(1)$ and the dg-category of Γ_W -equivariant matrix factorizations of $W + x_0 x_1 \dots x_{n+1}$.

They have been proved in several situations. Using either of these conjectures and the fact $SH^*(M_X) \cong HH^*(\mathcal{W}(M_X))$ which relates the symplectic cohomology of the Milnor fiber and the Hochschild cohomology of its wrapped Fukaya category, it was proved in [16] that vanishing of $HH^2(\text{mf}(\mathbb{C}^{n+2}, \Gamma_W, W))$ implies

$$SH^*(M_{\{\check{W}=0\}}) \cong HH^*(\text{mf}(\mathbb{C}^{n+2}, \Gamma_W, W)) \quad (2.4)$$

as Gerstenhaber algebras⁷, where the left hand side involves the Milnor fiber of the mirror singularity, defined by $\check{W} = 0$. Therefore, once we can prove that the second Hochschild cohomology actually vanishes for the singularities W , we can compute all their relevant symplectic cohomology groups via Hochschild cohomology at the mirror side. The latter is computable, albeit often very tedious. Recall that the symplectic cohomology of isolated Gorenstein cDV singularities in fact vanish at degree two and all degrees larger than three, the isomorphism (2.4) is plausible at least when the singularities are defined by an invertible polynomial.

There is a formula to determine the Hochschild cohomology of the equivariant matrix factorizations [25]. From a physics perspective its role is computing the Hilbert spaces of a Landau Ginzburg orbifold. Before quoting the formula, it is necessary to introduce several fundamental notations.

Elements in Γ_W act canonically on the coordinates via coordinate-wise multiplications

$$(t_0, \dots, t_{n+1}) \cdot (x_0, x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{n+1}) = (t_0 x_0, t_1 x_1, \dots, t_{n+1} x_{n+1}).$$

Note that x_0 does not appear directly in the polynomials, or it can be absorbed by formal redefinition of coordinates that preserves the Γ_W -action. The character χ of the group Γ_W is defined as

$$\Gamma_W \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^*, \quad \chi(t_0, t_1, \dots, t_{n+1}) = t_0 t_1 \dots t_{n+1} = \prod_{j=1}^{n+1} t_j^{A_{ij}}. \quad (2.5)$$

It is simply the overall factor of each monomial contained in W when acted on by $(t_0, \dots, t_{n+1}) \in \Gamma_W$. The kernel is the finite subgroup

$$\ker \chi = \left\{ (t_0, \dots, t_{n+1}) \in (\mathbb{C}^*)^{n+2} : \prod_{j=1}^{n+1} t_j^{A_{ij}} = 1, t_0 = t_1^{-1} \dots t_{n+1}^{-1} \right\}.$$

With this action, for each element γ in the subgroup $\ker \chi$, one can figure out which coordinates x_i are fixed by γ and which are not. Now one denotes the set of fixed coordinates by V_γ , and those that are unfixed by N_γ . N_γ is a Γ_W -stable complement of V_γ in the \mathbb{C} -vector space with basis x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{n+1} . Given a choice of $\gamma \in \ker \chi$, restricting W to the set V_γ , i.e. the set of γ -fixed variables, is denoted W_γ . Let Jac_{W_γ} be the associated Jacobian ring of W_γ . One picks a basis of the Jacobian ring as a vector space and label it by J_γ : The choice turns out to be eventually immaterial.

We also need the notion of dual coordinates, labeled by $x_i^\vee, i = 0, 1, \dots, n + 1$. The action of elements in Γ_W is the following

$$(t_0, \dots, t_{n+1}) \cdot x_i^\vee = t_i^{-1} x_i^\vee.$$

⁷A Gerstenhaber algebra is roughly speaking a supercommutative algebra with a Lie bracket. It is one of the underlying algebraic structure of the well-known Batalin–Vilkovisky formalism [32]. The Hochschild cohomology of topological B-branes as a Gersteinhaber algebra was conjecturally the algebra of gravitational primaries in topological string theory [33].

Namely, the character of x_i is inverse the character of x_i . We adopt the convention that each dual coordinate x_i^\vee contribute -1 to the exponent b_i of x_i . Thus one can a monomial $\underline{m} := x_0^{b_0} x_1^{b_1} x_2^{b_2} x_3^{b_3} x_4^{b_4}$ where $b_i \geq -1$ and compute its character by multiplying together all factors. It will be denoted by $\chi_{\underline{m}}$.

Now we can state the formula, which reads [25]

$$HH^t(\text{mf}(\mathbb{C}^{n+2}, \Gamma_W, W)) \cong \bigoplus_{\substack{\gamma \in \ker \chi, l \geq 0, \\ t - \dim N_\gamma = 2u}} \left(H^{-2l}(dW_\gamma) \otimes \Lambda^{\dim N_\gamma} N_\gamma^\vee \right)_{(u+l)\chi} \oplus \quad (2.6)$$

$$\bigoplus_{\substack{\gamma \in \ker \chi, l \geq 0, \\ t - \dim N_\gamma = 2u+1}} \left(H^{-2l-1}(dW_\gamma) \otimes \Lambda^{\dim N_\gamma} N_\gamma^\vee \right)_{(u+l+1)\chi}, \quad (2.7)$$

where $H^*(dW_\gamma)$ is cohomology of the associated Koszul complex, Λ denotes (full) anti-symmetric product. Although the Koszul complex looks horrible, one not have to care about the details of the Koszul complex, since its cohomology actually concentrates at at most two degrees when the singularity W_γ is isolated. More precisely, given a $\gamma \in \ker \chi$, there are two possible situations

1. x_0 is not fixed by γ : In this case, w_γ has an isolated critical point at the origin. The cohomology of Koszul complex is concentrated in degree 0 which is isomorphic to Jac_{W_γ} , hence only the term $l = 0$ in the first bracket contributes to the summand. Under the chosen basis of Jacobian rings, each monomial in the right hand side looks schematically like $\underline{m} = px_0^\vee x_{j_1}^\vee \dots x_{j_{n+1-k}}^\vee$, where k is the number of fixed coordinates, $x_{j_1}, \dots, x_{j_{n+1-k}}$ label the unfixed coordinates and $p \in J_\gamma$ ⁸. As mentioned before, one can compute the character $\chi_{\underline{m}}$. Contributions come from monomials with character u -times the character of W , $\chi_{\underline{m}} = u\chi$. One has to sum over all integer u in the above formula.
2. x_0 is fixed by γ : The cohomology of Koszul complex is now concentrated in cohomological degree 0 and -1 . Still, only the terms $l = 0$ contribute to the summand, but one for each bracket. Monomials contributing to the first summand ($t - \dim N_\gamma = 2u$) are schematically $\underline{m} = x_0^{b_0} px_{j_1}^\vee \dots x_{j_{n+1-k}}^\vee$ such that $\chi_{\underline{m}} = u\chi$, where β is a non-negative integer and $p \in J_\gamma$. Monomials contributing to the second summand ($t - \dim N_\gamma = 2u + 1$) look $\underline{m} = x_0^{b_0} px_0^\vee x_{j_1}^\vee \dots x_{j_{n+1-k}}^\vee$ such that $\chi_{\underline{m}} = u\chi$.

Finally, the elements $\gamma \in \ker \chi$ have to be summed over.

In summary, there are three types of monomials that may potentially contribute to

⁸Note that we do not care about the overall sign since eventually only the rank of HH^t counts.

the Hochschild cohomology for a given $\gamma \in \ker \chi$. These are called $A_\gamma, B_\gamma, C_\gamma$ in [16]

$$\begin{aligned}
A_\gamma &= \begin{cases} \{x_0^\beta p x_{j_1}^\vee \cdots x_{j_{n+1-k}}^\vee : p \in J_\gamma, \beta = 0, 1, 2, \dots\} & \text{if } x_0 \text{ is fixed by } \gamma \\ \emptyset & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}, \\
B_\gamma &= \begin{cases} \{x_0^\beta p x_0^\vee x_{j_1}^\vee \cdots x_{j_{n+1-k}}^\vee : p \in J_\gamma, \beta = 0, 1, 2, \dots\} & \text{if } x_0 \text{ is fixed by } \gamma \\ \emptyset & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}, \\
C_\gamma &= \begin{cases} \emptyset & \text{if } x_0 \text{ is fixed by } \gamma \\ \{p x_0^\vee x_{j_1}^\vee \cdots x_{j_{n+1-k}}^\vee : p \in J_\gamma\} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.
\end{aligned}$$

These monomials \underline{m} will be called "good" once their characters obey $\chi_{\underline{m}} = u\chi$. Each A_γ monomial contribute rank one to $HH^{2u+n-k+1}$; each B_γ and C_γ monomials contribute rank one to $HH^{2u+n-k+2}$, where k is the number of coordinates in $\{x_1, \dots, x_{n+1}\}$ that are fixed by γ .

The problem of determining ranks of corresponding Hochschild cohomology groups is then reduced to the problem of counting solutions to a set of integral linear (congruence) equations. In the next section, we will apply this tool to compute the symplectic cohomology of the candidate singularities in Problem 2.2. As we are considering singularities in \mathbb{C}^4 , n is specialized to be 3.

3 Computation of symplectic cohomology of singularities with $J = E_6$ and E_7

Our goal in this section is to compute symplectic cohomology of (Milnor fiber of) the singularities $W = 0$ in Problem 2.2. To apply the techniques from the mirror side, we first observe that the defining polynomials are all invertible. Then we have to at first make sure that $HH^2(\text{mf}(\mathbb{C}^5, \Gamma_{\check{W}}, \check{W}))$ vanish.

3.1 $J = E_6$ cases

These singularities are

$$W = x^2 + y^3 + z^4 + yw^k : 1 < k < 16.$$

The Berlund-Hübsch mirrors are (after relabeling the coordinates)

$$\check{W} = x^2 + y^4 + z^3w + w^k : 1 < k < 16.$$

Our goal is to show that the rank of Hochschild cohomology groups of these mirror singularities is zero at degree 2, and stabilizes at all negative degrees if and only if $k = 8$.

Example $k = 8$: This case is a bit more difficult than the computation of Brieskorn-Pham singularities considered in [16], due to the mixing of \mathbb{C}^* -actions on z and w . We follow and slightly generalize a method proposed in [26]. We illustrate the method for $k = 8$ as follows.

First, one can compute the normalized weights: $(d_0, \dots, d_4) = (-4, 12, 6, 7, 3)$ and $h = 24$. The basis of Jacobian algebra is taken to be

$$J = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} 1, z, z^2, w, \dots, w^7, zw, \dots, zw^7 \quad \text{if both } z, w \text{ are fixed.} \\ 1, w, \dots, w^6 \quad \text{if } w \text{ is fixed but } z \text{ is not.} \\ 1 \quad \text{if } w \text{ is not fixed.} \end{array} \right\} \otimes \left\{ \begin{array}{l} 1 \quad \text{if } y \text{ is not fixed.} \\ 1, y, y^2 \quad \text{if } y \text{ is fixed.} \end{array} \right\}. \quad (3.1)$$

In the presence of the mixing of \mathbb{C}^* -actions, one can simplify the problem by lifting the group $\Gamma_{\tilde{W}}$ to its covering. To simplify notation, we write Γ for $\Gamma_{\tilde{W}}$ in the following. We define a map Ψ

$$\Psi : (\mathbb{C}^*)^4 \rightarrow \Gamma, \quad (u_1, u_2, u_3, \tau) \mapsto (\tau^{d_0} u_1^{-1} u_2^{-1} u_3^2, \tau^{d_1} u_1, \tau^{d_2} u_2, \tau^{d_3} u_3, \tau^{d_4} u_3^{-3}) = (t_0, t_1, \dots, t_4). \quad (3.2)$$

This map is certainly surjective. Demanding that the image is contained in Γ imposes the following

$$u_1^2 = u_2^4 = u_3^{24} = 1.$$

With this new parametrization, the character $\chi \circ \Psi = \tau^h$. The kernel of map Ψ is precisely \mathbb{Z}_h . Now consider the $\ker \chi \circ \Psi = \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_4 \times \mathbb{Z}_{24} \times \mathbb{Z}_h$, hence $\ker \chi = \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_4 \times \mathbb{Z}_{24}$ with generators the roots of unity. An element $\gamma \in \ker \chi$ acts on coordinates via $(x_0, \dots, x_4) \mapsto (u_1 u_2^3 u_3^2 x_0, u_1 x, u_2 y, u_3 z, u_3^{-3} w)$ where we have made an identification $x_1 = x, x_2 = y, x_3 = z, x_4 = w$.

Now one can compute the character of any monomial $\underline{m} = x_0^{b_0} x_1^{b_1} \dots x_4^{b_4}$ to be $\chi_{\underline{m}} = \tau^{n_0} u_1^{n_1} u_2^{n_2} u_3^{n_3}$ where

$$\begin{cases} n_0 &= -4b_0 + 12b_1 + 6b_2 + 7b_3 + 3b_4, \\ n_1 &= b_1 - b_0, \\ n_2 &= b_2 - b_0, \\ n_3 &= -3b_4 + b_3 + 2b_0. \end{cases} \quad (3.3)$$

The existence of a corresponding $\gamma \in \ker \chi$ then means: $b_i = 0$ if x_i is fixed by γ ; $\prod_{j \in I \subset \{1,2,3,4\}} x_j \in J_\gamma$ if $x_j \in I$ are coordinates fixed by γ . Recall the order of u_i , we see that the condition for \underline{m} to be "good" is

$$2|n_1, \quad 4|n_2, \quad 24|m_3, \quad 24|n_0. \quad (3.4)$$

Then one concludes that $u = n_0/h$. This monomial will hence contribute to the Hochschild cohomology at a certain degree, depending on u and on which type it belongs to.

In principle, the algorithm for computing the rank at a certain value of u is the following: One has to enumerate all γ , first identifying whether it fixes x_0 or not to cast the corresponding monomials into one of the three types. Then one enumerates on all monomials in the Jacobian algebras of the fixed variables, and apply constraints (3.3),(3.4) to find number of integral solutions (b_0, b_1, \dots, b_4) .

In the case at hand, there is a short-cut. Observe that $b_1 \equiv b_2 \pmod{2}$. The only possibilities for (b_1, b_2) are thus $(-1, -1), (-1, 1), (0, 0)$ and $(0, 2)$. First we discuss the A -type monomials. There are only few choices of γ . Let ζ be an 24 -th root of unity.

1. $\gamma = (1, 1, 1)$: In this case, z, w are fixed, so they appear as monomials in the Jacobian.
 - If $b_1 = b_2 = 0$, the constraints imply that $4|b_0$ and $24|(b_0 + b_3 - 3b_4)$. A computation then shows that $b_0 \equiv 0, 4 \pmod{12}$. There are two possible monomials, x_0^{12k} and $x_0^{12k+4}zw^3$, which contribute two generators in HH^{-4k} ($k \geq 0$);
 - If $b_1 = 0, b_2 = 2$, the constraints imply that $4|(b_0 - 2)$ and $24|(b_0 + b_3 - 3b_4)$. One concludes that $b_0 \equiv 6, 10 \pmod{12}$. The monomials $x_0^{12k+6}y^2w^4$ and $x_0^{12k+10}y^2zw^7$ contribute two generators in HH^{-4k} .
2. $\gamma = (1, 1, -1)$: In this case, z, w are not fixed, so they appear as $z^\vee w^\vee$.
 - If $b_1 = b_2 = 0$, the constraints imply that $4|b_0$ and $24|(b_0 + 2)$. There is no solution;
 - If $b_1 = 0, b_2 = 2$, the constraints imply that $4|(b_0 - 2)$ and $24|(b_0 + 2)$. Again, no solution.
3. $\gamma = (-1, 1, \pm i)$: $b_1 = -1, b_2 = 1$. The constraints impose that $4|(b_0 - 1)$ and $24|(2b_0 + 2)$. There is no solution.
4. $\gamma = (-1, -1, 1)$: $b_1 = b_2 = -1, 4|(b_0 + 1), 24|(2b_0 + b_3 - 3b_4)$. One concludes that $b_0 \equiv -1, 3$ or $7 \pmod{12}$. The case $b_0 \equiv -1 \pmod{12}$ requires extra care. When $b_0 = -1$ there is a good monomial $x_0^\vee x^\vee y^\vee z^2$. It contributes to HH^3 . Otherwise, there are three monomials $x_0^{3+12k}x^\vee y^\vee w^2, x_0^{7+12k}x^\vee y^\vee zw^5, x_0^{11+12k}x^\vee y^\vee z^2$ where $k \geq 0$. Two of them contribute to HH^{-4k} and the remaining one contributes to HH^{-4k-2} .
5. $\gamma = -1, -1, -1$: $b_1 = b_2 = -1, 4|(b_0 + 1), 24|(2b_0 + 2)$. One concludes that $b_0 \equiv -1 \pmod{12}$. The case $b_0 = -1$ yields a good monomial $x_0^\vee x^\vee y^\vee z^\vee w^\vee$. It contributes to HH^3 . Otherwise, $x_0^{11+12k}x^\vee y^\vee z^\vee w^\vee$ contributes to HH^{-4k-2} .
6. $\gamma = (-1, i, \pm \zeta^9)$: $4|(b_0 + 1), 24|(2 + 2b_0)$. One concludes that $b_0 \equiv -1 \pmod{12}$. For the same reason, both HH^3 and HH^{-4k-2} acquire two generators, since there are two possible choices of γ .
7. $\gamma = (-1, -i, \pm \zeta^3)$: The same as in case 6.

To summarize, one obtains Hochschild cohomology groups of rank 6 at all nonpositive even degrees, and also at degree 3. The contributions to HH^3 are in fact due to B -type monomials. Nevertheless, one performs the following trick: Write $1 = x_0 x_0^\vee$ and insert it to the A -type monomials obtained above. This produces all the remaining B -type monomials. One finds that they contribute exactly to Hochschild cohomology groups at one degree higher than the corresponding A -monomials. In this way, one obtains HH^t of rank 6 at all odd degree less than or equal to one.

It remains to analyze the C -type monomials. There are 66 possible choices of γ that does not fix x_0 ; each of them may lead to one C -type monomial. 2 of them fix z, w . 6 of them fix w without fixing z , while the others fix neither of z and w . One finds that, except for these 6 elements, all 66 elements contribute one generator respectively to HH^3 . In total, we obtain

$$\begin{cases} HH^3(\mathrm{mf}(\mathbb{C}^5, \Gamma, \check{W})) = 66, \\ HH^{d \leq 1}(\mathrm{mf}(\mathbb{C}^5, \Gamma, \check{W})) = 6, \\ HH^{d=2 \text{ or } d \geq 4}(\mathrm{mf}(\mathbb{C}^5, \Gamma, \check{W})) = 0. \end{cases} \quad (3.5)$$

At positive degrees, this coincide with the known symplectic cohomology of the original singularities $W = 0$. The second Hochschild cohomology of $\check{W} = 0$ vanishes as expected, and so (2.4) can be applied. As a sanity check, we see that the Milnor number of $W = 0$ is precisely 66. We then conclude that the symplectic cohomology groups of the Milnor fiber of $W^{-1}(0)$ have rank 6 at all negative degrees, which supports Conjecture 2.3.

General values of k : With the experience of dealing with $k = 8$, it is now straightforward to compute the Hochschild cohomology for general values of k .

We do not have to evaluate d_i in general, since only the proportion $\omega_i = \frac{d_i}{h}$ matters. We have $(\omega_0, \dots, \omega_4) = (\frac{1}{4} - \frac{k+2}{3k}, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{4}, \frac{k-1}{3k}, \frac{1}{k})$. The $h : 1$ covering homomorphism is given by (3.2) again, but the kernel of χ is now

$$u_1^2 = u_2^4 = u_3^{3k} = 1.$$

It acts via $(x_0, \dots, x_4) \mapsto (u_1 u_2^3 u_3^2 x_0, u_1 x, u_2 y, u_3 z, u_3^{-3} w)$. The choice of monomial basis is the following

$$J = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} 1, z, z^2, w, \dots, w^{k-1}, zw, \dots, zw^{k-1} \quad \text{if both } z, w \text{ are fixed.} \\ 1, w, \dots, w^{k-2} \quad \text{if } w \text{ is fixed but } z \text{ is not.} \\ 1 \quad \text{if } w \text{ is not fixed.} \end{array} \right\} \otimes \left\{ \begin{array}{l} 1 \quad \text{if } y \text{ is not fixed.} \\ 1, y, y^2 \quad \text{if } y \text{ is fixed.} \end{array} \right\}. \quad (3.6)$$

Good monomials obey the following conditions

$$2|(b_1 - b_0), \quad 4|(b_2 - b_0), \quad 3k|(b_3 - 3b_4 + 2b_0).$$

And it is required that $u = (\frac{1}{4} - \frac{k+2}{3k})b_0 + \frac{b_1}{2} + \frac{b_2}{4} + \frac{(k-1)b_3}{3k} + \frac{b_4}{k}$ is integral. Again, there are four choices of the tuple (b_1, b_2) . The elements γ that fix x_0 can be case into one of the five classes

1. $\gamma = (1, 1, 1)$: In this case, z, w are fixed, so they appear as monomials in the Jacobian.

- $b_1 = b_2 = 0$. In all, number of generators contributed to HH^{2u} is the number of integral tuples (b_0, b_3, b_4) obeying the following constraints

$$\begin{cases} u = (\frac{1}{4} - \frac{k+2}{3k})b_0 + \frac{(k-1)b_3}{3k} + \frac{b_4}{k}, \\ b_0 \geq 0, \quad 4|b_0, \quad 3k|(2b_0 + b_3 - 3b_4), \\ z^{b_3} w^{b_4} \in J. \end{cases}$$

- $b_1 = 0, b_2 = 2$. In all, number of generators contributed to HH^{2u} is the number of integral tuples (b_0, b_3, b_4) obeying the following constraints

$$\begin{cases} u = \left(\frac{1}{4} - \frac{k+2}{3k}\right) b_0 + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{(k-1)b_3}{3k} + \frac{b_4}{k}, \\ b_0 \geq 0, \quad 4|(b_0 - 2), \quad 3k|(2b_0 + b_3 - 3b_4), \\ z^{b_3} w^{b_4} \in J. \end{cases}$$

2. $\gamma = (1, 1, -1)$: In this case, z, w are not fixed, so they appear as $z^\vee w^\vee$.

- Number of generators contributed to HH^{2u+2} is the number of integral tuples (b_0, b_3, b_4) obeying the following constraints

$$\begin{cases} u = \left(\frac{1}{4} - \frac{k+2}{3k}\right) b_0 - \frac{(k+2)}{3k}, \\ b_0 \geq 0, \quad 4|b_0, \quad 3k|(2b_0 + 2), \\ z^{b_3} w^{b_4} \in J. \end{cases}$$

- Number of generators contributed to HH^{2u+2} is the number of integral tuples (b_0, b_3, b_4) obeying the following constraints

$$\begin{cases} u = \left(\frac{1}{4} - \frac{k+2}{3k}\right) b_0 - \frac{(k+2)}{3k} + \frac{1}{2}, \\ b_0 \geq 0, \quad 4|b_0, \quad 3k|(2b_0 + 2), \\ z^{b_3} w^{b_4} \in J. \end{cases}$$

3. $\gamma = (-1, -1, 1)$: Number of generators contributed to HH^{2u+2} is the number of integral tuples (b_0, b_3, b_4) obeying the following constraints

$$\begin{cases} u = \left(\frac{1}{4} - \frac{k+2}{3k}\right) b_0 - \frac{3}{4} + \frac{(k-1)b_3}{3k} + \frac{b_4}{k}, \\ b_0 \geq 0, \quad 4|(b_0 + 1), \quad 3k|(2b_0 - b_3 + 3b_4), \\ z^{b_3} w^{b_4} \in J. \end{cases}$$

Note that for $b_0 = -1$ there is an extra generator of HH^3 , at $u = 0$.

4. $\gamma = (-1, -1, -1)$: Contributions to HH^{2u+4} are from integral tuples (b_0, b_3, b_4) obeying the following constraints

$$\begin{cases} u = \left(\frac{1}{4} - \frac{k+2}{3k}\right) b_0 - \frac{3}{4} - \frac{k+2}{3k}, \\ b_0 \geq 0, \quad 4|(b_0 + 1), \quad 3k|(2b_0 + 2), \\ z^{b_3} w^{b_4} \in J. \end{cases}$$

Note that for $b_0 = -1$ there is an extra generator of HH^3 , at $u = -1$.

5. $\gamma = (-1, 1, \pm i)$: This is only possible when $4|k$. Contributions to HH^{2u+3} are from integral tuples (b_0, b_3, b_4) obeying the following constraints

$$\begin{cases} u = \left(\frac{1}{4} - \frac{k+2}{3k}\right) b_0 - \frac{1}{4} - \frac{k+2}{3k}, \\ b_0 \geq 0, \quad 4|(b_0 - 1), \quad 3k|(2b_0 + 2), \\ z^{b_3} w^{b_4} \in J. \end{cases}$$

6. $\gamma = (-1, i, \pm\sqrt{-i})$ or $(-1, -i, \pm\sqrt{i})$: Contributions to HH^{2u+4} are from integral tuples (b_0, b_3, b_4) obeying the following constraints

$$\begin{cases} u = \left(\frac{1}{4} - \frac{k+2}{3k}\right) b_0 - \frac{1}{4} - \frac{k+2}{3k}, \\ b_0 \geq 0, \quad 4|(b_0 + 1), \quad 3k|(2b_0 + 2), \\ z^{b_3} w^{b_4} \in J. \end{cases}$$

Note that there are in total four extra tuples contributing to HH^3 for this class.

As in the example where $k = 8$, B -monomials contribute the same amount to cohomology groups at one degree higher (but not to HH^4). C -monomials contribute in total $9k - 12$ generators to $HH^3(\text{mf}(\mathbb{C}^5, \Gamma, \check{W}))$ only. Hence one finds that $\text{rank}(HH^3) = 9k - 6$, which reproduces the Milnor number of W as expected.

We implement the above computations using `Mathematica`. The results at degree $-10 \leq d \leq 2$ are listed in Table 3. In particular, we find that $HH^2(\text{mf}(\mathbb{C}^5, \Gamma, \check{W})) = 0$

k	$\text{rank } HH^d, d = -10, -9, \dots, 1, 2$
2	3, 3, 2, 2, 3, 3, 2, 2, 2, 2, 3, 3, 0
3	2, 2, 2, 2, 1, 1, 3, 3, 3, 3, 2, 2, 0
4	2, 2, 3, 5, 5, 5, 2, 2, 3, 5, 5, 5, 0
5	3, 3, 1, 1, 4, 4, 3, 3, 2, 2, 4, 4, 0
6	5, 5, 3, 3, 3, 3, 3, 3, 3, 3, 5, 5, 0
7	2, 2, 4, 4, 3, 3, 5, 5, 1, 1, 5, 5, 0
8	6, 6, 6, 6, 6, 6, 6, 6, 6, 6, 6, 6, 0
9	2, 2, 5, 5, 3, 3, 5, 5, 1, 1, 6, 6, 0
10	5, 5, 3, 3, 3, 3, 5, 5, 3, 3, 6, 6, 0
11	6, 6, 3, 3, 5, 5, 4, 4, 2, 2, 6, 6, 0
12	6, 6, 2, 2, 6, 6, 3, 5, 5, 5, 6, 6, 0
13	5, 5, 3, 3, 6, 6, 2, 2, 4, 4, 6, 6, 0
14	3, 3, 3, 3, 6, 6, 3, 3, 5, 5, 6, 6, 0
15	3, 3, 5, 5, 6, 6, 1, 1, 5, 5, 6, 6, 0

Table 3: $HH^d(\text{mf}(\mathbb{C}^5, \Gamma, \check{W}))$ for $-10 \leq d \leq 2$.

for all k , and $\text{rank}(HH^{d < 0}(\text{mf}(\mathbb{C}^5, \Gamma, \check{W})))$ stabilizes only if $k = 8$, which is the case shown in detail in the previous example. Hence we assert that only in that case there exists a crepant resolution of $W^{-1}(0)$, based on Conjecture 2.3.

3.2 $J = E_7$ cases

The singularities are

$$W = x^2 + y^3 + yz^3 + zw^k : 2 \leq k \leq 26, 2|k.$$

The corresponding Berglund-Hübsch mirrors are

$$\check{W} = x^2 + y^3z + z^3w + w^k : 2 \leq k \leq 26, 2|k.$$

Our goal is to show that the rank of Hochschild cohomology groups of these mirror singularities is zero at degree 2, and stabilize at all negative degrees if and only if $k = 2$ or $k = 14$.

Hochschild cohomologies of these singularities are much more difficult to compute than the E_6 cases, due to the mixing of characters. We follow and slightly generalize the trick in [16]. Define the group $G \subset \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_3 \times (\mathbb{C}^*)^2$ which contains elements (s, μ, ρ, τ) with relation $\rho^3 = \mu^2 \tau^{4k+2}$. This can be mapped surjectively to Γ via

$$\Psi : G \rightarrow \Gamma, \quad (s, \mu, \rho, \tau) \mapsto (s\rho^{-1}\mu^2\tau^{k-4}, s\tau^{3k}, \rho, \mu\tau^{2k-2}, \tau^6) = (t_0, t_1, \dots, t_4). \quad (3.7)$$

Now $\chi \circ \Psi = \tau^{6k}$. One can see that $\ker \Psi$ is the following subgroup

$$\left\{ \left(s = 1, \mu = \tau^{2-2k}, \rho = 1, \tau \right) \mid \tau^6 = 1 \right\}.$$

This is an order 6 subgroup, so one concludes that the map Ψ is 6 to 1.

One picks the monomial basis

$$\begin{aligned} J_\gamma \text{ fixes } y, z, w &= \begin{cases} y^l z^i w^j, & l = 0, 1; i = 0, 1, 2; j = 0, 1, \dots, k-2, \\ y^2 w^j, & j = 0, 1, \dots, k-2, \\ y^l z^i w^{k-1}, & l = 0, 1; i = 0, 1, 2, \end{cases} \\ J_\gamma \text{ fixes } z, w &= \begin{cases} z^i w^j, & i = 0, 1; j = 0, 1, \dots, k-1, \\ z^2, \end{cases} \\ J_\gamma \text{ fixes } z, y &= \begin{cases} y^i z^j, & i = 0, 1; j \geq 0, \\ y^2, \end{cases} \\ J_\gamma \text{ fixes } w &= \begin{cases} w^j, & j = 0, 1, \dots, k-1. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

We note that if γ fixes z, y but not w , then the singularity $\check{W}_\gamma = 0$ is not isolated, and the simplification below (2.7) may break down. However, as we will see, it is expected that the caveat is immaterial in the current context.

As before, consider first the case that γ fixes x_0 . This means the following

$$\begin{cases} s\tau^{k-4} = \rho\mu, \\ \rho^3 = \mu^2\tau^{4k+2}, \\ \tau^{6k} = 1. \end{cases} \quad (3.8)$$

Eliminating ρ yields $s\mu = \tau^{k+14}$ and in particular $\tau^{84} = 1$. Hence the details depend on the g.c.d. of $6k$ and 84 . Since $\text{g.c.d.}(6k, 84) = 12$ for all $k \neq 14$, we find that there are two possible γ , given by $\tau^6 = 1$ and $\tau^6 = -1$ ⁹, respectively, that fix x_0 for each such k . One such γ fixes all coordinates, while the other fixes x_0 only. When $k = 14$, τ can only be determined up to $\tau^{84} = 1$, hence there are fourteen elements γ . One of them fixes all, six of them fix x_0, x and the remaining seven fix x_0 only. In that case, one finds the following

$$(s, \mu, \rho, \tau) = (1, \zeta^{4m}\tau^4, \zeta^{11m}, \tau \mid \tau^6 = \zeta^m, m = 0, 1, \dots, 13), \quad (3.9)$$

⁹Recall that Ψ is 6 to 1, so each possibility yields only one element γ .

where one picks a 14-th root of unity and let it be ζ .

Hence, denote a monomial $\underline{m} = x_0^{b_0} x^{b_1} \dots w^{b_4}$ as before, we can compute its character and look at the following

1. γ fixes all variables: $\chi_{\underline{m}} = \chi^{\otimes u}$ means that, s, μ and ρ must be eliminated by only applying the defining relations $s^2 = \mu^3 = 1$ and $\rho^3 = \mu^2 \tau^{4k+2}$. Hence there are contributions to HH^{2u} from integral tuples (b_0, b_2, b_3, b_4) obeying the following constraints

$$\begin{cases} b_0 \geq 0, & 2|b_0, & 3|(b_2 - b_0), & 3 \left| \left(2b_0 + b_3 + 2\frac{b_2 - b_0}{3} \right) \right., \\ 6ku = (4k + 2) \frac{b_2 - b_0}{3} + b_0(k - 4) + b_3(2k - 2) + 6b_4, \\ x_0^{b_0} y^{b_2} z^{b_3} w^{b_4} \in J. \end{cases}$$

2. γ fixes x_0 only: $b_1 = b_2 = b_3 = b_4 = -1$. The character condition says that there are contributions to HH^{2u+4} from the integer b_0 obeying the following constraints

$$\begin{cases} b_0 \geq 0, & 2|(b_0 - 1), & 3|(1 + b_0), & 3 \left| \left(2b_0 + 2 - 2\frac{b_0 + 1}{3} \right) \right., \\ 6ku = -(4k + 2) \frac{1 + b_0}{3} + b_0(k - 4) - 5k - 4. \end{cases}$$

3. γ fixes x_0 and x only: This is possible only when $k = 14$. $b_2 = b_3 = b_4 = -1$; b_1 can only be 0 in the Jacobian algebra. There are contributions to HH^{2u+3} from integer b_0 obeying the following constraints

$$\begin{cases} b_0 \geq 0, & 2|b_0, & 3|(1 + b_0), & 3 \left| \left(2b_0 + 2 - 2\frac{b_0 + 1}{3} \right) \right., \\ 6ku = -(4k + 2) \frac{1 + b_0}{3} + b_0(k - 4) - 2k - 4, & u \text{ is integral.} \end{cases}$$

These exhaust all possible A -monomials. Some remarks are in order. First of all, one can still perform the substitution to obtain B -monomials which contribute to one degree higher, but as in the E_6 case there can be extra B -monomials with $b_0 = -1$. To find them, note that as the character of x_0 contains s , $\chi_{\underline{m}}$ depends merely on τ only if b_0 is even or b_0 is odd with $b_1 = -1$. If one further demands that γ fixes x_0 , then the only source for those extra B -monomials are from class 2 of the above, with $\underline{m} = x_0^\vee x^\vee y^\vee z^\vee w^\vee$. Each such γ contributes one generator to HH^3 . Therefore we exhaust all possible A - and B -monomials from this procedure.

A second remark is that, by implementing the above computations in **Mathematica**, we found that no A - and B -monomial obtained in the procedure above contributes to $HH^2(\text{mf}(\mathbb{C}^5, \Gamma, \check{W}))$, as one may expect. On the other hand, stabilization at negative degrees happens precisely when $k = 2$ and $k = 14$. Class 3 in fact contributes nothing; This is desired since it yields generators of cohomology at odd degrees.

It remains to analyze C -monomials. We will show that they contribute only to $HH^3(\text{mf}(\mathbb{C}^5, \Gamma, \check{W}))$. We do not aim to count the precise rank of HH^3 ; In fact, it suffices to ensure that they do not contribute to HH^2 in order for (2.4) to hold.

Again, we work by enumeration. To obtain a good monomial, γ must not fix x once it does not fix x_0 . Observe from (3.7) that once γ fixes y and w it must then fix z . The constraints read

$$\begin{cases} b_0 = -1, & 3|(b_2 + 1), & 3 \mid \left(1 + b_3 + 2\frac{b_2+1}{3}\right), \\ 6ku = (4k + 2)\frac{b_2+1}{3} + 4 - 4k + b_3(2k - 2) + 6b_4, & u \text{ is integral.} \end{cases}$$

There are the following cases

1. γ fixes y only. One concludes that $\rho = 1$. The only possible \underline{m} appears $x_0^\vee x^\vee z^\vee w^\vee$. $b_0 = 0$ violates the constraints.
2. γ fixes y, z . $\underline{m} = x_0^\vee x^\vee y^2 w^\vee$. This contributes to HH^3 .
3. γ fixes y, z, z . $\underline{m} = x_0^\vee x^\vee y^2 w^i$ where $i = 0, 1, \dots, k - 2$. Then $u = (b_4 + 1)/k$ cannot be integral.
4. γ fixes z only. $\underline{m} = x_0^\vee x^\vee y^\vee w^\vee$. Constraints violated by $b_3 = 0$.
5. γ fixes z, w . It is only possible that $\underline{m} = x_0^\vee x^\vee y^\vee z^2$. This contributes to HH^3 .
6. γ fixes w only. $\underline{m} = x_0^\vee x^\vee y^\vee z^\vee w^i$ where $i = 0, 1, \dots, k - 2$. No integral u exists.
7. γ fixes nothing. $\underline{m} = x_0^\vee x^\vee y^\vee z^\vee w^\vee$. One finds that $u = 1$; this contributes to HH^3 .

Combined with the remarks in the previous paragraph, we assert that all the cE_7 singularities in Problem 2.2 admit no crepant resolutions, again based on Conjecture 2.3. The results at degree $-10 \leq d \leq 2$ are listed in Table 4.

k	rank $HH^d, d = -10, -9, \dots, 1, 2$
2	1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 0
4	2, 2, 1, 1, 1, 1, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 0
6	2, 2, 3, 3, 2, 2, 1, 1, 3, 3, 3, 0
8	2, 2, 2, 2, 4, 4, 1, 1, 3, 3, 4, 0
10	5, 5, 1, 1, 4, 4, 3, 3, 2, 2, 5, 0
12	3, 3, 4, 4, 2, 2, 5, 5, 1, 1, 6, 0
14	7, 7, 7, 7, 7, 7, 7, 7, 7, 7, 7, 0
16	3, 3, 5, 5, 2, 2, 6, 6, 1, 1, 7, 0
18	6, 6, 3, 3, 4, 4, 5, 5, 2, 2, 7, 0
20	7, 7, 1, 1, 6, 6, 4, 4, 3, 3, 7, 0
22	6, 6, 1, 1, 7, 7, 3, 3, 4, 4, 7, 0
24	4, 4, 3, 3, 7, 7, 2, 2, 5, 5, 7, 0
26	2, 2, 5, 5, 7, 7, 1, 1, 6, 6, 7, 0

Table 4: $HH^d(\text{mf}(\mathbb{C}^5, \Gamma, \check{W}))$ for $-10 \leq d \leq 2$.

In all, we establish Claim 2.4 in this section.

4 Verification from the physics side

In this section, we verify Claim 2.4 on the physics side using the general framework of the AdS/CFT correspondence :

$$\text{4d } \mathcal{N}=1 \text{ quiver SCFT} \longleftrightarrow K\text{-stable 3-fold singularity with NCCR.}$$

In particular, the shape of the gauge theory quiver and superpotential is given by the NCCR. In this paper, we have restricted our attention to isolated terminal singularities where there is a nice correspondence between NCCRs and crepant resolutions, hence a reasonable physics interpretation of the duality.

One aspect of holographic duality in this context is that it relates - but does not identify in general - the chiral ring of SCFT and the coordinate ring of the singularity. There are many evidences for this duality by comparing corresponding data on the two sides,[18] such as central charges a in the leading order and Hilbert series. In fact, central charge a of the SCFT can be computed from the quiver or quiver Hilbert series [34], agrees with those proportional to the inverse of volume of the link, which can be computed from the Hilbert series of the singularity. Once the Hilbert series of both sides coincides, the central charges a at leading order coincides, too. Therefore, we use one of the necessary conditions that the Hilbert series of the singularity $H_{sing}(t)$, equals the quiver Hilbert series at the distinguished node 0 $H_{00}(t)$:

$$H_{sing}(t) = H_{00}(t)$$

to find possible holographic dualities.

With the assumption of the holographic duality, one can determine whether a crepant resolution exists or not by searching for all possible quiver SCFTs, without specifying the superpotential: we look for all scale invariant quiver gauge theories whose quiver Hilbert series at some node 0 is the same as the Hilbert series of the singularity. The field theory has to obey other consistency conditions. We elaborate them in subsections 4.1. Our goal is to verify that there is no such field theory candidate for all singularities in Problem 2.2, hence these singularities admit no quiver SCFT duals. This is only possible because they have no crepant resolutions. We implement this in subsection 4.2.

It is worthwhile to make a remark here. It is for sure that the correspondence is conjectural: the Hilbert series agree is a necessary condition of the holographic duality, even if the Hilbert series agree, one cannot tell whether they are truly dual to each other without comparing other quantities from both sides, e.g. the operator spectrum in the field theory and the spectrum of functions and differential forms in the geometry. For our purpose, it suffices to compare the Hilbert series, as we aim at obtaining a "No Go" result.

4.1 Consistency conditions for superconformal quiver gauge theory duals

Sclae invariance, unitarity and a -maximization. The most important consistency condition is the vanishing of NSVZ beta functions [35] for gauge couplings. The vanishing

of beta functions of G_i is equivalent to the vanishing of ABJ R -anomaly coefficients

$$\text{Tr}(RG_iG_i) = 0. \quad (4.1)$$

where Tr is trace taken over all fermions for each simple gauge group G_i . This means

$$C_2(G_i) + \sum_{k \text{ chiral}} T(\text{Rep}_k)(R_k - 1) = 0, \quad (4.2)$$

for each simple gauge group G_i . $T(\text{Rep}_k)$ denotes the Dynkin index of the nontrivial irreducible representation Rep_k , where the k -th chiral superfield transforms. In our setting, only adjoint chiral multiplets and bifundamental chiral multiplets are relevant to us. We record their values of Dynkin indices for $SU(N)$ gauge groups

$$T(\text{adj}) = N = C_2(SU(N)), \quad T(\text{fund}) = \frac{1}{2}.$$

The R_k denotes the R charge of the k -th chiral under Rep_k representation of G_i . Note that each bifundamental contributes twice in the sum. This formula is quite useful in the following.

Another important requirement is the unitarity. This implies that all gauge invariant chiral operator has scaling dimension $\Delta \geq 1$. Together with the shortening condition for $\mathcal{N}=1$ chiral scalar from superconformal algebra

$$\Delta = \frac{3}{2}R,$$

we see that $R \geq \frac{2}{3}$. Any gauge invariant chiral operator saturating this bound is free. Note that the R charge of an operator composed of several chiral fields is the sum of the R charges of each such field.

There is another consistency condition purely field theoretical. It is known that a 4d $\mathcal{N}=1$ infra-red SCFT must obey the a -maximization condition [36]. This means that if there are several possible $U(1)$ symmetries, one has to study its mixing with the pertinent R -symmetry. The genuine superconformal R -symmetry is determined by maximizing the trial central charges a and c of the SCFT. The central charges a and c depend on the $U(1)_R$ symmetry via the 't Hooft anomalies $\text{Tr } R$ and $\text{Tr } R^3$ [37]:

$$a = \frac{3}{32}(3 \text{Tr } R^3 - \text{Tr } R), \quad c = \frac{1}{32}(9 \text{Tr } R^3 - 5 \text{Tr } R).$$

One can calculate the 't Hooft anomalies from the quiver. On the other hand, the central charge a, c can be extracted from the Hilbert series as follows [38]. Let's define $t = \exp(-s)$, then $H_{00}(t)$ has the expansion

$$H_{00}(\exp(-s)) = \frac{a_0}{s^3} + \frac{a_1}{s^2} + \dots.$$

Then the central charge of the dual theory is given as

$$a = c = \frac{27}{32} \frac{1}{a_0} N^2. \quad (4.3)$$

Stability of chiral ring. The stability of the chiral ring is equivalent to the K -stability on the singularity side [12]. Conceptually it means that the polarized chiral ring of an $\mathcal{N}=1$ SCFT obeys the generalized a-maximization condition [12, 39] with respect to some test $U(1)$ configurations. A chiral ring that is unstable usually fails to define a superconformal field theory. The obstructions may be due to irrelevance of the superpotential or operators hitting the unitarity bound, even if the corresponding singularity may admit NCCRs. The simplest way to rule out such possible field theories is by imposing (K -)stability.¹⁰

This is the reason we demand that the singularity is K -stable and we explain how to compute the K -stable region shown in Table 1 and narrow our attention to geometries in this region [12, 40] as follows:

1. (Theorem 3.1 of [40]) Futaki invariants $F(X, \zeta, \eta)$ of some test configurations generated by η are positive. ζ is the symmetry corresponding to the R charges of x, y, z, w ¹¹. The Futaki invariant is given by

$$F(X, \zeta, \eta) = -[v_4 w_1 w_2 w_3 (w_1 + w_2 + w_3 - 2w_4 - d) + v_3 w_1 w_2 w_4 (w_1 + w_2 + w_4 - 2w_3 - d) + v_2 w_1 w_3 w_4 (w_1 + w_3 + w_4 - 2w_2 - d) + v_1 w_2 w_3 w_4 (w_2 + w_3 + w_4 - 2w_1 - d)], \quad (4.4)$$

where (w_1, w_2, w_3, w_4) and (v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4) are charges correspond to the symmetry ζ and η .

2. The R charges of the x, y, z, w should be greater than or equal to $\frac{2}{3}$. This is required by unitarity, as x, y, z, w correspond to gauge invariant operators in the chiral ring.

Example: Consider the singularity X defined as $x_1^2 + x_2^2 + x_3^4 + z^k = 0$. The R charges of $(x_1, x_2, x_3, z; d)$ is $(\frac{12k}{k+12}, \frac{8k}{k+12}, \frac{6k}{k+12}, \frac{24}{k+12}; \frac{24k}{k+12})$. Consider the test configuration η with charge $(0, 0, 0, 1)$, the Futaki invariant $F(X, \zeta, \eta)$ is given by

$$F(X, \zeta, \eta) = -\frac{1152(-24+k)k^3}{12+k)^4} > 0.$$

This gives the constraints $0 < k < 24$. The k should be greater than 1 since it is an isolated singularity. Within the range $1 < k < 24$, the R charges of (x_1, x_2, x_3, z) are all larger than $\frac{2}{3}$, which satisfies the unitarity requirements.

¹⁰In fact, for a singularity that is not K -stable but admit an NCCR, one can compute the quiver Hilbert series of the quiver associated to the NCCR and compare it to the Hilbert series of the singularity. We found for (resolvable) cA_n singularities and for Laufer's singularities $x^2 + y^3 + wz^2 + w^{2n+1}y = 0$ they coincide. However, it is known that the quivers from NCCRs of cA_n singularities fail to define an SCFT due to the irrelevance of superpotential [12]. This suggests that the obstructions mentioned above cannot be simply detected by known techniques algorithmically, so it is better to directly impose stability. It is not clear whether an unstable chiral ring may possibly define a SCFT, though.

¹¹We normalize the weights, a.k.a. R -charges, of x, y, z, w by requiring the $(3, 0)$ form

$$\Omega = \frac{dx \wedge dy \wedge dz \wedge dw}{df}$$

has R charge two, i.e.

$$w_1 + w_2 + w_3 + w_4 - d = 2.$$

NCCR and Shape of the quiver. As the shape of gauge quiver is given by NCCR of the singularity, we have to examine all possible NCCRs. There is a relation between quivers underlying the NCCR and resolution graphs of the singularity admitting a crepant resolution. As first shown in [41], all possible small resolutions of an isolated Gorenstein threefold can only be among those shown in Figure 1.




Figure 1: The possible shape of the quivers corresponding to the (one-node-deleted) NCCR of the cDV singularities. [42] The dotted arc represents that there may be an adjoint chiral or may be not.

More precisely, what is shown are the quivers of NCCR with the distinguished node deleted¹². Viewing the nodes (with labels inside) as exceptional smooth rational curves and the pairs of arrows as transverse intersections, one obtains the resolution graphs.

The gauge quiver is obtained by (see [43])

- Regarding each node as an SU type gauge node. Their ranks are all proportional to N , the number of $D3$ branes placed at the singularity.
- Adding a node to the crepant resolution diagram above, although the position may not be fixed.
- Regarding each pair of arrow as a pair of bifundamentals.

¹²The deleted distinguished node corresponds to the coordinate ring itself as its module. It appears as a summand in any tilting module whose endomorphism algebra produces an NCCR.

- Regarding the solid loops associated to each node as adjoint chiral multiplets. For dashed loops, there may or may not be adjoint chirals.

Note that when a singularity is known to admit crepant resolution, it is usually possible to compute its NCCR directly by e.g. matrix factorizations. When it is not known, as in our problem, a complete search of field theory candidates requires enumerations. The purpose of quoting the above result is to avoid inappropriate or unnecessary enumerations.

Since we only care about the $b_2(L) = 1, 2$ case, i.e. two-node and three-node quivers. Only A_n and \overline{D}_n type of the quiver shown in Figure 1 includes the two and three-node quivers. Therefore, most general configurations of the two-node and three-node quivers are shown in Figure 2.




Figure 2: There are at most two adjoints on the distinguished node N_1 . There may be a pair of bifundamental chirals between all the other nodes and the distinguished node.

For $b_2 = 1$ case, $G = SU(N_1), SU(N_2)$, the beta functions are

$$\begin{cases} N_1(1 + R_{a_1} - 1 + R_{a_2} - 1) + \frac{1}{2}(R_{c_1} - 1 + R_{d_1} - 1)N_2 = 0, \\ N_2(1 + R_{b_1} - 1 + R_{b_2} - 1) + \frac{1}{2}(R_{c_1} - 1 + R_{d_1} - 1)N_1 = 0. \end{cases} \quad (4.5)$$

One can solve N_1, N_2 from the beta functions when the R charges of the quiver is known. The rank of the gauge node should be positive, i.e. $N_1, N_2 > 0$. This is one of the physical constraints of the quiver configurations.

Given a quiver gauge theory, we can calculate the matrix Hilbert series [18, 44] as follows:

$$H(Q, t) = \frac{1}{1 - M_Q(t) + t^2 M_Q^T(t^{-1}) - t^2}.$$

Here adjacent matrix M_Q can be read from the quiver and R charges:

1. If $i \neq j$, the matrix element M_{ij} of M_Q is

$$M_{ij} = \sum_{\text{bifund chirals in } (N_i, \overline{N}_j)} t^{R_{ij}}.$$

2. If $i = j$, the matrix element M_{ii} is

$$M_{ii} = \sum_{\text{adjoint chiral fields}} t^{R_{ii}}.$$

Here R_{ij} is the R charge of a bifundamental chiral field in $(\mathbb{N}_i, \bar{\mathbb{N}}_j)$. The meaning of the entry H_{ij} counts the oriented path from the node i to node j with the R charge grading. The Hilbert series $H_{00}(Q, t)$ is the 00-component of the matrix $H(Q, t)$, which counts the gauge invariant scalar operators (closed loop in the quiver which passes through node 0). In our case, the distinguished node is taken as node 0.

The H_{00} is believed to be identified with the Hilbert series of the dual geometry.

Example: For two node quiver shown in Figure 2a, the matrix M_Q is

$$\begin{pmatrix} t^{R_{a_1} + t^{R_{a_2}}} & t^{R_{c_1}} \\ t^{R_{d_1}} & t^{R_{b_1} + t^{R_{b_2}}} \end{pmatrix}.$$

The quiver Hilbert series is

$$H_{00} = \frac{(t^{R_{b_1}} - t^{2-R_{b_1}} + t^{R_{b_2}} - t^{2-R_{b_2}})}{(t^{R_{a_1}} - t^{2-R_{a_1}} + t^{R_{a_2}} - t^{2-R_{a_2}})(t^{R_{b_1}} - t^{2-R_{b_1}} + t^{R_{b_2}} - t^{2-R_{b_2}}) - (t^{R_{c_1}} - t^{2-R_{c_1}})(t^{R_{d_1}} - t^{2-R_{d_1}})}.$$

Similarly, quiver Hilbert series of the three node quiver shown in Figure 2b can be calculated. Each node can be viewed as the 0-node and the quiver Hilbert series are different. When we go through searching, all possible quiver Hilbert series are considered.

Now let us give an example of K -stable cDV singularity which is known to have CRs, along with the field theory dual.

Morrison-Pinkham example:
$$N \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\frac{1}{2}} \\ \xleftarrow{\frac{1}{2}} \end{array} 2N \begin{array}{c} \curvearrowright \\ \curvearrowleft \end{array}$$

The R charges are $R(c) = R(d) = \frac{1}{2}$, $R(b_1) = \frac{3}{4}$, $R(b_2) = \frac{1}{2}$. The quiver Hilbert series is

$$H_{00} = \frac{1 - t^{\frac{18}{4}}}{\left(1 - t^{\frac{9}{4}}\right) \left(1 - t^{\frac{6}{4}}\right) \left(1 - t^{\frac{4}{4}}\right) \left(1 - t^{\frac{7}{4}}\right)}.$$

So the generators for the dual geometry ring have charges $(x, y, z, w) = \left(\frac{9}{4}, \frac{6}{4}, \frac{4}{4}, \frac{7}{4}\right)$. Since x^2, y^3, yz^3, w^2z are all the possible combinations with degree $18/4$, we can write down the singularity as follows:

$$x^2 + y^3 + yz^3 + w^2z = 0.$$

We can check this is stable. This is the cD_4 Morrison-Pinkham example, which has a NCCR [13]. The leading order of central charge a from the gravity side is $\frac{567N^2}{512}$, which is the same as that from the field theory side.

4.2 Implementation of the search

Finally let us discuss the searching program. We hope to find the possible quiver such that the quiver Hilbert series and the Hilbert series of the singularities in Problem 2.2 is the same. There may be numerous quivers satisfying this restriction. But bearing in mind that the constraints mentioned in the previous subsection, in particular scale invariance, unitarity and shape of quiver, along with the fact that the number of the gauge groups is $b_2(L) + 1$, the computations are largely reduced. We also restrict to the case that all R charges of the chiral fields of the quiver are in the range $[0, 2]$ for simplicity.¹³ Using those setups, we can search all possible AdS/CFT pairs with nodes number one, two or three in practice. First of all, we can recover Morrison-Pinckham example by going through the searching program.¹⁴ We then need to show that there is no superconformal quiver duals with prescribed number of nodes for the following singularities:

$$J = E_6 : \quad x^2 + y^3 + z^4 + yt^k : k = 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15(2 - \text{nodes}); k = 4, 12(3 - \text{nodes}).$$

$$J = E_7 : \quad x^2 + y^3 + yz^3 + zt^k : k = 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 16, 18, 20, 22, 24, 26(2 - \text{nodes}).$$

To reduce the computation for such a searching procedure, we have two additional assumptions: 1) The R charges of a pair of bifundamental chiral fields are the same. 2) If all the R charges of the variable x, y, z, w have a common denominator m , then R charges of all the chiral fields should have the denominator m , since x, y, z, w are composites of the fundamental chiral fields. We search possible configurations with R charges of all the chiral fields taken from $0, \frac{1}{m}, \frac{2}{m}, \dots, \frac{2m}{m}$.

Under these assumptions, we assert that there is indeed no pertinent quiver gauge theory duals of the singularities above. This verifies our main claim and supports Conjecture 2.3 at the same time.

Laufer's example : These physical constraints will delete many possible duals derived

from the Hilbert series. The Laufer's example is one of such example.

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \frac{2}{n+1} & & \frac{2n+1}{2n+2} \\
 \curvearrowright & & \curvearrowright \\
 N & \xrightleftharpoons{\frac{n}{n+1}} & 2N \\
 & & \curvearrowleft \\
 & & \frac{1}{n+1}
 \end{array}$$

Laufer's example degenerates into Morrison-Pinckham for $n = 1$. The singularity is not K -stable when $n \geq 2$. But it satisfies all the other physical constraints.

The R charges are $R(c) = R(d) = \frac{n}{n+1}, R(a_1) = \frac{2}{n+1}, R(a_2) = \frac{2n+1}{2n+2}, R(b_2) = \frac{1}{n+1}$.

The superpotential is

$$W = b_2^{2n+2} + a_2^2 b_2 + dcb_2^2 + a_1^{n+1} + dca_1.$$

The Laufer's singularity is

$$x^2 + y^3 + wz^2 + w^{2n+1}y = 0.$$

¹³There are two reasons of the simplification: 1) outside this range, there are some terms of the Hilbert series has negative powers of t . Therefore, the Hilbert series is hard to coincide those from the singularity side. 2) the quiver with R charges outside this range is much more difficult to find a sensible superpotential.[45]

¹⁴One can see this in our attached `Mathematica` notebook `Find dual.nb`.

The weight of (x, y, z, w) is $(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{3}, \frac{6n+1}{6(2n+1)}, \frac{2}{3(2n+1)})$ with degree is normalized to 1. Since we should have $\sum_i w_i - d = 2$, the weight and degree should multiplied a constant $\delta = \frac{2}{\sum_i w_i - 1} = \frac{3(2n+1)}{n+1}$. Therefore the weights and degree is $(\frac{3(2n+1)}{2(n+1)}, \frac{(2n+1)}{n+1}, \frac{6n+1}{2(n+1)}, \frac{2}{n+1}, \frac{3(2n+1)}{n+1})$

The quiver Hilbert series of the quiver is the same as the Hilbert series of the Laufer's singularity:

$$H_{00} = \frac{(1 - t^{\frac{3(2n+1)}{n+1}})}{(1 - t^{\frac{3(2n+1)}{2(n+1)}})(1 - t^{\frac{(2n+1)}{n+1}})(1 - t^{\frac{6n+1}{2(n+1)}})(1 - t^{\frac{2}{n+1}})}.$$

One can compute $b_2(L)$ as well. It is one for all $n \geq 1$.

5 Conclusions and future directions

Two major tasks are fulfilled in this paper. First, we establish Claim 2.4 based on Conjecture 2.3. This gives a complete understanding of the existence of crepant resolutions of all singularities in Table 1, with $J = E_6, E_7$ and E_8 . Most of the singularities are of cE_n types, although the famous cD_4 Morrison-Pinkham example is also in the list. The implication of the claim is that all the singularities in Problem 2.2 should admit no 4d $\mathcal{N}=1$ superconformal quiver gauge theory duals. Second, we verify this implication from the physics side, by searching for all possible field theory candidates. Although the search is subject to the constraint on denominators of R charges of the chiral fields, this is a sufficiently convincing test. Still, there are many open questions. We list some of them which may be interesting.

More general singularities One may consider more general singularities. The most obvious generalizations are e.g. canonical singularities or even Kawamata-log-terminal(klt) singularities. Canonical singularities in general admit crepant divisors in a birational transform. Although we are not able to find any systematic study in the literature along that line of generalizations, it is plausible that one can put D7 branes on it to produce gauge theory from physics perspectives. However, in such situations, the relation between NCCRs and crepant resolutions are not clear to us, and so it does not seem straightforward to interpret the quivers with potential produced from NCCRs as the genuine gauge theory quivers and superpotentials. For klt singularities, little can be said.

In such a general framework, it is natural to take into account non-isolated singularities. In this case, the link is in general not smooth [11]. Some of these singularities already appear in [39]¹⁵. They may admit NCCRs as can be produced by matrix factorizations. Again, being non-isolated means that any crepant resolution must be divisorial, so we currently do not understand the underlying relationship between NCCRs and gauge quivers. Assuming the NCCRs are physical, these quiver gauge theories have a common feature that the chiral fields have irrational R charges and hence irrational scaling dimensions.

It is also tempting to discuss quotient singularities. Most of the cyclic quotients have been investigated before. As shown in [46], apart from (product of) cyclic quotient, the

¹⁵We note as well that the non-isolated singularities considered in that paper admit at least two \mathbb{C}^* actions. This signals the possibility for irrational R charges.

singularities are non-isolated. In particular, \mathbb{C}^3 quotient by finite subgroups of $SO(3)$ as considered in [18, 43] are generally non-isolated. The candidate field theory dual is convincing, though.

Of course, we may as well try to find dual pairs of cDV singularities that are not on the list of Xie and Wang. It is known that for threefolds, terminal Gorenstein implies (isolated) cDVs. If we want terminal non-Gorenstein, they are not hypersurfaces. Complete intersections may also be considered.

Dualities between superconformal quiver gauge theories When we implemented the search in section 4, we realized that the searching program can also be applied to obtain implicit dualities between superconformal quiver gauge theories. For instance, there may be more than one quiver theory with the same quiver Hilbert series. We present some examples here. One can compute their large N superconformal indices and single trace indices [47] as well to see if they are really conformal dual to each other. We give two inspiring examples without detailed calculations in the following:

Example 1: There are several three-node quiver gauge theories whose quiver Hilbert series at node 0 are identical to the affine A_2 theory (with all adjoint integrated out). However, their superconformal indices are different. Hence they are not dual to each other. Therefore, if these two quivers admit some gravity duals, they may be different from the A_2 singularity.




Figure 3: The leftmost quiver is the correct field theory dual of the A_2 singularity $:x_1^2 + x_2^2 + x_3^3 + x_4^3 = 0$. One can check that the $U(N)$ index in the Large N limit and single trace index of the middle and rightmost quiver is different from the leftmost quiver.

Example 2: $U(N)$ duality. There are some examples where the pertinent quiver theories share the same large N superconformal indices and central charges in addition to the Hilbert series. The gauge groups should be viewed as U type instead of SU type. Hence we view them as instances of $U(N)$ dualities. They may have the some holographic dual. These dualities are worth studying, as they do not belong to the Seiberg duality [48] or the Seiberg-like dualities [45, 49]. Unfortunately, these theories are not holographic dual to any singularity that we are concerned about.




Figure 4: A pair of three-node gauge theories, where each node is now viewed as an unitary gauge group. They have $TrR = 0$. TrR^3 are all $\frac{2560N^2}{81}$. We have checked that the $U(N)$ index in the large N limit of theory (a) and (b) are the same.

In fact, one can find more such dualities by equating the quiver Hilbert series and check other physical quantities such as central charges and superconformal indices. The quiver Hilbert series may not be restricted to the Hilbert series of the singularity discussed in this paper. This is another algorithm to find conformal dualities.

Acknowledgments

We are grateful to our advisor Prof. Dan Xie for useful comments and insights. ZY would like to thank Fulin Xu for various informative and inspiring conversations on birational geometry, and Ban Lin for interesting discussions.

References

- [1] M. Reid, *Minimal models of canonical 3-folds*, in *Algebraic varieties and analytic varieties*, vol. 1, pp. 131–181, Mathematical Society of Japan (1983).
- [2] V.I. Arnold, *Singularity Theory*, London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series, Cambridge University Press (1981).
- [3] D. Xie and S.-T. Yau, *4d n=2 scft and singularity theory part i: Classification*, 2015.
- [4] Y. Wang and D. Xie, *Classification of argyres-douglas theories from m5 branes*, *Physical Review D* **94** (2016) .
- [5] K. Intriligator, D.R. Morrison and N. Seiberg, *Five-dimensional supersymmetric gauge theories and degenerations of calabi-yau spaces*, *Nuclear Physics B* **497** (1997) 56–100.
- [6] F. Apruzzi, C. Lawrie, L. Lin, S. Schäfer-Nameki and Y.-N. Wang, *5d superconformal field theories and graphs*, *Physics Letters B* **800** (2020) 135077.
- [7] C. Closset, S. Schäfer-Nameki and Y.-N. Wang, *Coulomb and higgs branches from canonical singularities. part i. hypersurfaces with smooth calabi-yau resolutions*, *Journal of High Energy Physics* **2022** (2022) .
- [8] J.M. Maldacena, *The Large N limit of superconformal field theories and supergravity*, *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.* **2** (1998) 231 [[hep-th/9711200](#)].
- [9] I.R. Klebanov and E. Witten, *Superconformal field theory on three-branes at a Calabi-Yau singularity*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **536** (1998) 199 [[hep-th/9807080](#)].
- [10] R. Eager, J. Schmude and Y. Tachikawa, *Superconformal indices, sasaki-einstein manifolds, and cyclic homologies*, *arXiv preprint arXiv:1207.0573* (2012) .

- [11] D. Xie and S.-T. Yau, *Singularity, Sasaki-Einstein manifold, Log del Pezzo surface and $\mathcal{N} = 1$ AdS/CFT correspondence: Part I*, [1903.00150](#).
- [12] T.C. Collins, D. Xie and S.-T. Yau, *K stability and stability of chiral ring*, *arXiv preprint arXiv:1606.09260* (2016) .
- [13] P.S. Aspinwall and D.R. Morrison, *Quivers from matrix factorizations*, *Communications in Mathematical Physics* **313** (2012) 607–633.
- [14] M. Van den Bergh, *Non-commutative crepant resolutions*, in *The Legacy of Niels Henrik Abel: The Abel Bicentennial, Oslo, 2002*, pp. 749–770, Springer (2004).
- [15] P. Berglund and T. Hübsch, *A generalized construction of mirror manifolds*, *Nuclear Physics B* **393** (1993) 377.
- [16] J.D. Evans and Y. Lekili, *Symplectic cohomology of compound du val singularities*, 2022.
- [17] S. Gubser, N. Nekrasov and S. Shatashvili, *Generalized conifolds and 4-Dimensional $\mathcal{N}=1$ Superconformal Field Theory*, *JHEP* **05** (1999) 003 [[hep-th/9811230](#)].
- [18] Y. Fang, J. Feng and D. Xie, *Three dimensional quotient singularity and 4d $\mathcal{N} = 1$ ads/cft correspondence*, 2023.
- [19] A. Grassi, T. Weigand and with an Appendix by V. Srinivas, *On topological invariants of algebraic threefolds with (\mathfrak{n} -factorial) singularities*, 2018.
- [20] S. Katz, *Small resolutions of gorenstein threefold singularities*, in *Algebraic geometry: Sundance 1988*, vol. 116 of *Contemp. Math.*, (United States), pp. 61–70, American Mathematical Society, 1991, [DOI](#).
- [21] E. BRIESKORN, *Die auflösung der rationalen singularitäten holomorpher abbildungen.*, *Mathematische Annalen* **178** (1968) 255.
- [22] C. Peters, *On isolated hypersurface singularities: algebra-geometric and symplectic aspects*, 2024.
- [23] H. Flenner, *Divisorenklassengruppen quasihomogener singularitäten.*, *Journal für die reine und angewandte Mathematik* **328** (1981) 128.
- [24] S. Giacomelli, *Rg flows with supersymmetry enhancement and geometric engineering*, *Journal of High Energy Physics* **2018** (2018) .
- [25] Y. Lekili and K. Ueda, *Homological mirror symmetry for milnor fibers of simple singularities*, 2021.
- [26] N. Adaloglou, F. Pasquotto and A. Zannardini, *Symplectic cohomology of quasihomogeneous ca_n singularities*, 2024.
- [27] P. Seidel, *Disjoinable lagrangian spheres and dilations*, *Inventiones mathematicae* **197** (2013) 299–359.
- [28] E. Witten, *Phases of $n = 2$ theories in two dimensions*, *Nuclear Physics B* **403** (1993) 159–222.
- [29] C. Vafa and N.P. Warner, *Catastrophes and the Classification of Conformal Theories*, *Phys. Lett. B* **218** (1989) 51.
- [30] S. Cecotti, *$N=2$ Landau-Ginzburg versus Calabi-Yau sigma models: Nonperturbative aspects*, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **6** (1991) 1749.

- [31] S. Gukov, C. Vafa and E. Witten, *Cft's from calabi–yau four-folds*, *Nuclear Physics B* **584** (2000) 69–108.
- [32] P. Xu, *Gerstenhaber algebras and bv-algebras in poisson geometry*, 1997.
- [33] A. Kapustin and L. Rozansky, *On the relation between open and closed topological strings*, *Communications in Mathematical Physics* **252** (2004) 393–414.
- [34] R. Eager, *Equivalence of a -maximization and volume minimization*, *Journal of High Energy Physics* **2014** (2014) 1.
- [35] V.A. Novikov, M.A. Shifman, A.I. Vainshtein and V.I. Zakharov, *Exact Gell-Mann-Low Function of Supersymmetric Yang-Mills Theories from Instanton Calculus*, *Nucl. Phys.* **B229** (1983) 381.
- [36] K.A. Intriligator and B. Wecht, *The Exact superconformal R symmetry maximizes a* , *Nucl. Phys. B* **667** (2003) 183 [[hep-th/0304128](#)].
- [37] D. Anselmi, D.Z. Freedman, M.T. Grisaru and A.A. Johansen, *Nonperturbative formulas for central functions of supersymmetric gauge theories*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **526** (1998) 543 [[hep-th/9708042](#)].
- [38] D. Martelli, J. Sparks and S.-T. Yau, *The Geometric dual of a -maximisation for Toric Sasaki-Einstein manifolds*, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **268** (2006) 39 [[hep-th/0503183](#)].
- [39] M. Fazzi and A. Tomasiello, *Holography, matrix factorizations and k -stability*, *Journal of High Energy Physics* **2020** (2020) .
- [40] T. Collins and G. Székelyhidi, *Sasaki–einstein metrics and k -stability*, *Geometry & Topology* **23** (2019) 1339.
- [41] D.R. Morrison, *The birational geometry of surfaces with rational double points.*, *Mathematische Annalen* **271** (1985) 415.
- [42] J. August, *The tilting theory of contraction algebras*, 2020.
- [43] A.N. de Celis and Y. Sekiya, *Flops and mutations for crepant resolutions of polyhedral singularities*, 2015.
- [44] R. Bocklandt, *Graded calabi yau algebras of dimension 3*, *Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra* **212** (2008) 14.
- [45] B. Bajc, *Kutasov-Seiberg dualities and cyclotomic polynomials*, *JHEP* **06** (2019) 083 [[1901.02846](#)].
- [46] B. Chen, D. Xie, S.S.T. Yau, S.-T. Yau and H. Zuo, *4d $n=2$ scft and singularity theory part iii: Rigid singularity*, 2017.
- [47] A. Gadde, L. Rastelli, S.S. Razamat and W. Yan, *On the Superconformal Index of $\mathcal{N} = 1$ IR Fixed Points: A Holographic Check*, *JHEP* **03** (2011) 041 [[1011.5278](#)].
- [48] N. Seiberg, *Electric - magnetic duality in supersymmetric nonAbelian gauge theories*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **435** (1995) 129 [[hep-th/9411149](#)].
- [49] Y. Fang, J. Feng and D. Xie, *On duality of four dimensional $\mathcal{N} = 1$ gauge theory*, [2403.01750](#).