

Computational aspects of orbifold equivalence

Timo Kluck and Ana Ros Camacho

December 15, 2024

In this paper we study the computational feasibility of an algorithm to prove orbifold equivalence between potentials describing Landau-Ginzburg models. Through a comparison with leading results of Gröbner basis computations in cryptology, we infer that the algorithm produces systems of equations that are beyond the limits of current technical capabilities. As such the algorithm needs to be augmented by ‘inspired guesswork’, and we provide two new examples of applying this approach.

1. Introduction

Initially a model to describe superconductivity, Landau-Ginzburg models were promoted in the late 80s to 2-dimensional $(2, 2)$ -supersymmetric sigma models completely characterized by a polynomial W called *potential* [34]. Landau-Ginzburg models gained importance in string theory and algebraic geometry as they are a family of quantum field theories which are related under homological mirror symmetry [15, 35]. Furthermore, they are related to cohomological field theories via [28]. This makes it natural to ask whether we can define some notion of “equivalence” between different potentials. The notion of orbifold equivalence was inspired by the study of (defects in) topological quantum field theories (see [6, 11, 16]) and it was first defined in the context of the study of equivariant and orbifold completions of the bicategory of Landau-Ginzburg models. Several examples have been explored in detail in the recent years [9, 25, 26, 29].

An extra reason to study orbifold equivalences is that it may be used to generate examples of the so-called Landau-Ginzburg/conformal field theory (LG/CFT) correspondence (see e.g. [31] for a review). This physics result states that the infrared fixed point of a Landau-Ginzburg model with potential f is a 2-dimensional rational conformal field theory (CFT) with central charge c_f . At the defects level, this predicts some relation between two seemingly different mathematical entities: matrix factorizations (which

describe defects for Landau-Ginzburg models [4]) and representations of the vertex operator algebra of the CFT (describing defects for the rational CFT). We lack a precise mathematical statement for this result, yet there are several promising examples available of this correspondence. In the particular case of simple singularities, it was proven in [9] that via orbifold equivalence one finds exactly the predicted equivalences for the $N = 2$ supersymmetric minimal models. Furthermore, there are physics results suggesting that this might not be the only case, involving Landau-Ginzburg models with potentials describing singularities of modality greater than 0 [10, 22, 23]. Hence, finding further orbifold equivalences is potentially a source of further examples of equivalences within the LG/CFT correspondence. This would strongly enhance our understanding of this intriguing physics result.

The present paper is concerned with finding orbifold equivalences using computer search. The current state of the art is the algorithm presented in [29]. In pertinent examples, we quantify the size of these computations, and compare these sizes to current bests in solving these systems: the Fukuoka MQ challenge [36]. As such, we show that experimental infeasibility was not an accident that can be solved by choosing a different implementation (as was speculated in [29]) but that these computations lie well beyond what current technology enables.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Gunther Cornelissen for guidance, careful advice, proof-reads, coffee and the beers on Friday. Through this work ARC has been supported by the NWO Veni Fellowship 016.Veni.183.040 and the Marie Skłodowska-Curie Individual Fellowship “MACOLAB” with proposal number 747555. She also especially thanks Nicola Cruz and Robin Perkins for creating the soundtrack that accompanied the writing of this paper.

2. Orbifold equivalence

In this section we introduce the necessary background for defining orbifold equivalence. For the reader more familiar with higher categories, we refer to Appendix A for a complete description of orbifold equivalence in the context of the bicategory of Landau-Ginzburg models.

Potentials

Definition 2.1. Let \mathbb{k} be an algebraically closed field of characteristic zero. We will consider the category \mathcal{R} of polynomial rings in a finite number of variables over \mathbb{k} , each variable endowed with a fixed grading in $\mathbb{Q}_{>0}$.

We write

$$R = \bigoplus_{q \in \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}} R_q$$

for the equal-grading direct summands of $R \in \mathcal{R}$, and we call their elements *quasi-homogeneous*. Note that $R_0 = \mathbb{k}$.

Definition 2.2. For $R = \mathbb{k}[x_1, \dots, x_n] \in \mathcal{R}$ and $f \in R$, the *Jacobian ideal* I_f of f is the ideal generated by the partial derivatives of f :

$$I_f = (\partial_{x_1} f, \dots, \partial_{x_n} f)$$

The *Jacobian* of f is $\text{Jac } f = R/I_f$. We call (R, f) a *potential* if f is quasi-homogeneous and if $\text{Jac } f$ is a non-trivial finite-dimensional \mathbb{k} -vector space. We often write f to represent the pair (R, f) , and we may similarly write ‘let $f \in R$ be a potential’. We write $\mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{k}}$ for the set of potentials.

Remark 2.3. The polynomial f is quasi-homogeneous of degree $d \in \mathbb{Q}$ if and only if it satisfies:

$$\frac{|x_1|}{d} x_1 \partial_{x_1} f + \dots + \frac{|x_n|}{d} x_n \partial_{x_n} f = f$$

In particular, this implies that $f \in I_f$. We have an interesting converse in the case of power series[32]: there is a coordinate transformation making f quasi-homogeneous if and only if $f \in I_f$.

For future use, we record the following result.

Lemma 2.4. If f is a potential, then there exists an N such that $(x_1, \dots, x_q)^N \subseteq I_f$.

Proof. This only uses the facts that I_f is quasi-homogeneous (i.e. for every $g \in I_f$ with quasi-homogeneous decomposition $g = \sum_{\ell} g_{\ell}$, we have $g_{\ell} \in I_f$ for all ℓ) and that R/I_f is finite dimensional over \mathbb{k} .

Pick a variable x_i . We will first prove that $x_i^{M_i} \in I_f$ for some M_i . For this, pick a lexicographical monomial order such that x_i is smaller than all other variables. Under this order, x_i^M ($M \geq 1$) can only be a leading monomial of a polynomial g if g is a function of only x_i and no other variables. Let G be a Gröbner basis of I_f with respect to this monomial order. Because I_f is quasi-homogeneous, we may choose G such that every $g \in G$ is quasi-homogeneous as well.

Because R/I_f is finite-dimensional, for large M , x_i^M must be reducible by G . That means G contains a divisor of x_i^M as a leading monomial, and we write M_i so that $x_i^{M_i}$ is a leading monomial of some $g \in G$. But with the chosen monomial order g is a function of only x_i , and with g being quasi-homogeneous, we find $g = cx_i^{M_i}$ for some $c \in \mathbb{k}^*$. Then $x_i^{M_i} \in I_f$.

To see that $(x_1, \dots, x_q)^N \subseteq I_f$, we need to show that monomials of total degree N are in I_f for large enough N . But for

$$N > q \sum_i M_i$$

at least one variable x_i has, in such a monomial, an exponent greater than M_i , and so the monomial is a multiple of $x_i^{M_i} \in I_f$. It is therefore an element of I_f . \square

Graded modules

Convention 2.5. While R has a grading with values in $\mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}$, *graded R -modules* have a \mathbb{Q} -grading.

Definition 2.6. For $q \in \mathbb{Q}$ we define the graded R -module $R(n)$ ($n \in \mathbb{Q}$) as follows. As a non-graded R -module, it is isomorphic to R , and its grading is given by

$$R(n)_m = R_{n+m}.$$

A choice of grading on two R -modules induces a unique grading on the space of maps between such modules. Let us make this explicit for maps from $R(n)$ to $R(m)$. As non-graded modules we have

$$\mathrm{Hom}_R(R(n), R(m)) \cong \mathrm{Hom}_R(R, R) \cong R.$$

Comparing the quasi-homogeneous components of the left hand side and the right hand side, one readily obtains the following explicit form:

$$\mathrm{Hom}_R(R(n), R(m))_\ell \cong R_{m-n+\ell}.$$

Convention 2.7. We use the term *quasi-homogeneous map* for maps of any degree, whereas *morphism* is reserved for quasi-homogeneous maps of degree zero.

In particular, this convention implies that even though there is an invertible map between $R(n)$ and $R(m)$ for any n, m , they are *isomorphic* if and only if $n = m$.

Definition 2.8. A *finitely generated, free, graded R -module* X is a graded R -module X that has a decomposition

$$X \cong R(n_1) \oplus \dots \oplus R(n_\ell)$$

for some $n_1 \geq \dots \geq n_\ell \in \mathbb{Q}$.

The choice of such a decomposition is equivalent to the choice of an R -basis consisting of quasi-homogeneous elements.

Multi-variate residues We will make use of the multi-variate residue signal as described by Lipman [20]. It is completely characterized by three simple facts that we describe in this section. With a view towards our computational objective, we will prove that this characterization is effective, i.e. it gives an algorithm for computing it.

These three facts are as follows:

(F1)

$$\operatorname{res} \left(\frac{g dx_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge dx_q}{f_1, \cdots, f_q} \right) = 0 \text{ if } g \in (f_1, \cdots, f_q)$$

(F2)

$$\operatorname{res} \left(\frac{g dx_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge dx_q}{x_1^{d_1}, \cdots, x_q^{d_q}} \right) = \left(\text{the } x_1^{d_1-1} \cdots x_q^{d_q-1}\text{-coefficient of } g \right)$$

for all $d_1, \cdots, d_q \in \mathbb{N}$.

(F3) The transformation rule:

$$\operatorname{res} \left(\frac{g \det(M) dx_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge dx_q}{M(f_1, \cdots, f_q)} \right) = \operatorname{res} \left(\frac{g dx_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge dx_q}{f_1, \cdots, f_q} \right)$$

for any R -linear transformation $M: R^q \rightarrow R^q$.

Remark 2.9. Note that (F3) preserves the applicability of (F1): if $g \in (f_1, \cdots, f_q)$, then also $g \det(M) \in (Mf_1, \cdots, Mf_q)$. Namely, write $f = (f_1, \cdots, f_q)$ and suppose $g = \beta f$ for some R -linear $\beta: R^q \rightarrow R$. Writing M^\dagger for the adjoint of M , we have $M^\dagger M = \det(M) \operatorname{Id}$, and so we can write $g \det(M) = (\beta M^\dagger)(Mf)$, which expresses $g \det(M)$ in the generators of $Mf = (Mf_1, \cdots, Mf_q)$.

These facts suffice to compute any residue symbol:

Lemma 2.10. Let $R \in \mathcal{R}$ and let $f_1, \cdots, f_q \in I$ be generators for an ideal $I \subseteq R$ such that $(x_1, \cdots, x_n)^N \subseteq I$ for some $N \in \mathbb{N}$. Then there exists a $q \times q$ matrix M with coefficients in R such that for every i , $\sum_j M_{ij} f_j = x_i^{d_i}$ for some $d_i \in \mathbb{N}$. Moreover, this matrix can be computed explicitly.

Proof. The assumption guarantees that for every i , some power $x_i^{d_i}$ is an element of I , and this power d_i can be found algorithmically by a Gröbner basis computation as outlined in the proof of Lemma 2.4. This computation yields the coefficients M_{ij} for all j . Repeating the computation for all i yields the matrix M . \square

Proposition 2.11. For given $g \in R$ and $I = (f_1, \cdots, f_q)$ such that R/I is finite-dimensional, the residue symbol

$$\operatorname{res} \left(\frac{g dx_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge dx_q}{f_1, \cdots, f_q} \right)$$

can be computed algorithmically.

Proof. Write $I = (f_1, \dots, f_q)$. We first compute a Gröbner basis G of I . Then, we check whether $g \in I$. If it is, the residue is 0 and we have finished the computation.

If $g \notin I$, then we compute the matrix M such that $M \cdot (f_1, \dots, f_q)$ consists of a vector of monomials (Lemma 2.10). We can then use (F3) to replace g by $g \det(M)$, and (F2) to compute the residue as the appropriate coefficient of $g \det(M)$. \square

Matrix factorizations

Definition 2.12. A finitely generated, free, graded R -module X is *super-graded* if it has a decomposition

$$X = X_+ \oplus X_-$$

into an *even* and *odd* part, respectively, both of which are f.g., free, graded R -modules themselves.

Convention 2.13. There is some risk of confusion from using two gradings: the \mathbb{Q} -grading on R -modules and maps between them is not to be confused with the supergrading on $X_+ \oplus X_-$. These are our conventions:

- We use ‘grade’, ‘grading’, and ‘quasi-homogeneous’ exclusively to refer to the \mathbb{Q} -grading. We use ‘even’ and ‘odd’ exclusively to refer to the supergrading. We use ‘even/odd’ for super-homogeneity.
- Just like in the case of the \mathbb{Q} -grading (see Convention 2.7), maps may be even or odd, but morphisms are assumed even.
- We use the Koszul sign rule for tensor products of supergraded modules. In order to highlight its effect on the trace operator, we write str or *supertrace* to emphasize this. Explicitly, it is given by

$$\text{str } e_i \otimes e^j = (-1)^{\text{sign}(e_i) \text{sign}(e^j)} \delta_i^j$$

for a basis $\{e_i\}_i$ with dual basis $\{e^i\}_i$.

Definition 2.14. Let $f \in R$ be a potential. A *matrix factorization of f* is a finitely generated, graded, supergraded R -module X together with an odd, homogeneous map d_X such that $d_X^2 = f \cdot \text{Id}_X$.

Notation 2.15. We will write X to represent the pair (X, d_X) from this definition.

Orbifold equivalence

Definition 2.16. Let two potentials $f \in R$ and $g \in S$ be given. Write $T = R \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} S$. Then a *matrix factorization of $f - g$* is a matrix factorization Q over T of the potential

$$f \otimes 1 - 1 \otimes g \in T$$

Note that the existence of Q implies that f and g have the same grading, since d_Q and therefore d_Q^2 are quasi-homogeneous endomorphisms by assumption, and therefore so is $(f - g) \cdot \text{Id}_Q$.

Definition 2.17. Let $f \in \mathbb{k}[x_1, \dots, x_m]$, $g \in \mathbb{k}[y_1, \dots, y_n]$, and Q a matrix factorization of $f - g$. Its *quantum dimension with respect to f* is

$$\text{qdim}_f Q = \text{res} \left(\frac{\text{str } \partial_{x_1} Q \cdots \partial_{x_m} Q \partial_{y_1} Q \cdots \partial_{y_n} Q dx_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge dx_m}{\partial_{x_1} f, \dots, \partial_{x_m} f} \right)$$

The *left* and *right quantum dimensions* are, respectively, the quantum dimensions w.r.t. f and w.r.t. g .

Remark 2.18. Since at present we are only interested in the (non)zero-ness of quantum dimensions, we omit the signs [5, 9].

Definition 2.19. The potentials f and g are *orbifold equivalent* if there is a matrix factorization of $f - g$ with nonzero left and right quantum dimensions.

It is not quite trivial to see that this is an equivalence relation; in fact, even reflexivity already requires a rather complicated matrix factorization Q . Similarly, transitivity is ‘almost’ easy to obtain, namely through a suitably defined tensor product of bimodules, but this results in a non-finitely generated module and quite some machinery is needed to reduce it to one.

Here, we will content ourselves with citing the proof, contained at Section 2.1 of [9]:

Theorem 2.20. *Orbifold equivalence is an equivalence relation on the set of potentials $\mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{k}}$.* □

3. Search algorithm

Our task is as follows: given potentials $f \in R$ and $g \in S$, find out whether they are orbifold equivalent. We will present an algorithm that finishes in finite time if they are. It is not a decision procedure, however: the algorithm does not terminate if they are not. This section offers an exposition of parts of [29].

Let’s first describe an easy instance of the algorithm.

Example 3.1. Out of reflexivity of equivalence relations, it is clear that x^3 is orbifold equivalent to y^3 , but let us analyze this case as an illustration. One way of finding an orbifold equivalence is splitting the total grading 2 into $\frac{4}{3} + \frac{2}{3}$ and then writing the most general rank 2 odd matrix with entries of those gradings respectively:

$$d_Q = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & c_1x + c_2y \\ c_3x^2 + c_4xy + c_5y^2 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

with indeterminates $c_1, \dots, c_5 \in \mathbb{k}$. Then the equation

$$d_Q^2 = (x^3 - y^3) \cdot \text{Id}_Q$$

is equivalent to a set of equations in the variables c_1, \dots, c_5 . In detail, we find 4 distinct quadratic equations – one for each degree-3 monomial – in 5 variables.

We add to these equations the requirement that the quantum dimensions do not vanish. Thanks to Proposition 2.11, we can compute e.g. the left quantum dimension. It is a polynomial q_ℓ in c_1, \dots, c_5 , namely

$$q_\ell = -\frac{2}{3}c_2c_3 + \frac{1}{3}c_1c_4$$

Following [29], we encode the non-vanishing by adding a helper variable c_ℓ and adding

$$c_\ell q_\ell - 1 = 0$$

to our equations. This has at least one solution for c_ℓ, c_1, \dots, c_5 if and only if the original system has at least one solution for which q does not vanish.

Adding two such equations, for left and right quantum dimension respectively, we find 6 equations in 7 variables, and if they admit a solution in \mathbb{k}^7 , we found a matrix factorization proving orbifold equivalence of x^3 and y^3 .

The existence of such a solution can be established or refuted, thanks to the weak Nullstellensatz, by checking whether the ideal generated by these equations is not equal to (1). Algorithmically, this can be decided by computing a Gröbner basis for them.

It is straightforward to generalize this example to a search procedure. For this, we note the following:

- There are only countably many ranks $2m \in 2\mathbb{N}$ for Q ;
- For every m , we can enumerate the possible gradings (n_1, \dots, n_{2m}) of the free summands in

$$Q = R(n_1) \oplus \dots \oplus R(n_{2m})$$

Through a standard diagonal procedure, we can enumerate the union of all modules appearing in this way. The gradings n_1, \dots, n_{2m} fix the grading of the entries in d_Q through $|(d_Q)_{ij}| = n_j - n_i + |d_Q|$. Then a ‘most general’ version of $(d_Q)_{ij}$ for these gradings is given by a polynomial with

$$\dim_{\mathbb{k}} T_{n_j - n_i + |d_Q|}$$

free variables at the (i, j) entry – one free variable for every quasi-homogeneous monomial of grading $n_j - n_i + |d_Q|$ in T .

Having found this most general form, we compute the coefficient equations from the matrix equation

$$d_Q^2 = (f - g) \cdot \text{Id}$$

Suppose they are given by

$$\{s_i(c_1, \dots, c_N) = 0\}_{i \in I}$$

for some finite index set I . We augment this set with the two equations

$$\begin{aligned} c_\ell q_\ell(c_1, \dots, c_N) - 1 &= 0 \\ c_r q_r(c_1, \dots, c_N) - 1 &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

Just like in the example, the weak Nullstellensatz implies that determining whether these allow a simultaneous solution in \mathbb{k}^{N+2} is a finite computation.

We can summarize the discussion above in the following result:

Proposition 3.2. There is an algorithm that, given two potentials $f \in \mathbb{k}[x_1, \dots, x_q]$ and $g \in \mathbb{k}[y_1, \dots, y_n]$, terminates if and only if f and g are orbifold equivalent. \square

4. Computational feasibility

The algorithm described above consists of a discrete part and a continuous part: The discrete part is concerned with enumerating possible ranks and gradings, and the continuous part is concerned with solving geometric equations.

Compared to the way it is described above, it is possible to significantly optimize the enumeration of possible gradings by taking into account the possible factorizations of the monomials appearing in f and g . In fact, it is necessary to do so to avoid a combinatorial explosion. Details for such a significant optimization are provided in [29].

In this section we look at the feasibility of the continuous part. It is well known that Gröbner basis computations have a tendency to blow up; in fact, doubly-exponential runtime has been proved for pathological cases [24]. For this reason, algebraic problems such as the present one have attracted the interest of the cryptology community as a potentially quantum-computer resistant replacement for digital signatures now commonly implemented through a discrete logarithm problem [33, 21].

To quantify computational difficulty and feasibility, this community maintains lists of open problems for the public at large to submit solutions. One of these challenges is the *Fukuoka MQ Challenge* [36]. One of their published lists consists of $2N$ quadratic equations in N variables – much like the ones we encountered in the previous section – for ever increasing N .

In the remainder of this section, we will compare the difficulty of the Gröbner basis computation corresponding to known matrix factorizations to the top contenders in the MQ Challenge as of December 2018. This should give an indication of the workability of this algorithm in practice.

Remark 4.1. In contrast to our present work, cryptology focuses on finite fields and the MQ Challenge is no exception. We believe that a comparison for feasibility still makes sense, as finite fields often have very efficient computer implementations. If anything, a problem stated over a field of characteristic zero will be *less* feasible. If this belief holds true, the MQ Challenge offers a *lower bound* for the difficulty of the problem we are trying to tackle.

Another difference is that the MQ Challenge concerns itself with dense polynomials; i.e. with polynomials where almost all monomials of degree at most two have a nonzero coefficient. The polynomials that appear for us are less dense than that. In particular, no linear terms appear. We still believe that denseness is a reasonable comparison.

For explaining Table 1 let us go over one of its entries in detail. The three-variable potentials describing the singularities Q_{10} and E_{14} are known to be orbifold equivalent [25]. Explicitly, they are given by $f_{E_{14}} = x^4 + y^3 + xz^2$ and $f_{Q_{10}} = u^4w + v^3 + w^2$ respectively.

The matrix factorization testifying that is given by

$$Q = T \oplus T\left(\frac{1}{4}\right) \oplus T\left(\frac{1}{3}\right) \oplus T\left(\frac{7}{12}\right) \\ \oplus T \oplus T\left(\frac{1}{4}\right) \oplus T\left(\frac{1}{3}\right) \oplus T\left(\frac{7}{12}\right)$$

as a \mathbb{Q} -graded module over $T = \mathbb{k}[x, y, z, u, v, w]$. That implies that d_Q 's entries have gradings given by the following matrix:

$$\frac{1}{12} \begin{pmatrix} & & & & 12 & 15 & 16 & 19 \\ & & & & 9 & 12 & 13 & 16 \\ & & & & 8 & 11 & 12 & 15 \\ & & & & 5 & 8 & 9 & 12 \\ 12 & 15 & 16 & 19 & & & & \\ 9 & 12 & 13 & 16 & & & & \\ 8 & 11 & 12 & 15 & & & & \\ 5 & 8 & 9 & 12 & & & & \end{pmatrix}$$

Following the procedure from the last section, this results in the variables c_1, \dots, c_{106} to describe the most general version of d_Q with these gradings.

When taken coefficient-by-coefficient (both of the matrix and of the polynomial entries), the equation

$$d_Q^2 = (f_{E_{14}} - f_{Q_{10}}) \cdot \text{Id}_Q$$

Equivalence	indeterminates	equations
$f_{Q_{10}} \sim f_{E_{14}}$	108	237
$f_{Q_{18}} \sim f_{E_{30}}$ (*)	140	341
$f_{Q_{12}} \sim f_{E_{18}}$ (*)	116	263

Table 1: Gröbner basis challenge size for known orbifold equivalences. An asterisk (*) indicates equivalences first presented in this paper.

gives 470 equations in c_1, \dots, c_{106} . Adding the quantum dimension helper variables and constraints, we are faced with a system of 472 equations in 108 variables.

A significant optimization can be made. Since d_Q is odd, it is of the form

$$d_Q = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & d_Q^\# \\ d_Q^\flat & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

and $d_Q^2 = (f - g) \text{Id}_Q$ reduces to the two equations

$$\begin{aligned} d_Q^\# d_Q^\flat &= (f_{E_{14}} - f_{Q_{10}}) \cdot \text{Id}_{Q_+} \\ d_Q^\flat d_Q^\# &= (f_{E_{14}} - f_{Q_{10}}) \cdot \text{Id}_{Q_-} \end{aligned}$$

However, these two equations are equivalent to one another. We may therefore consider only the constraints arising from either one of them, and this cuts the number of independent constraints on c_1, \dots, c_{106} roughly in half. In the specific case above, we are left with 237 equations in 108 variables.

For comparison, the current top contender in the MQ Challenge solved a system of 148 equations in 74 variables over the field of 2 elements. This strongly suggests that the described algorithm would not have been able to find this orbifold equivalence within reasonable time.

Table 1 lists similar outcomes for different equivalences.

5. New examples of orbifold equivalence

Given this rather sobering view on computer explorations, it is useful to still combine some ‘inspired guessing’ to reduce the amount of equations and indeterminates with computer solution. We here present two new examples of orbifold equivalence apparently hopeless from the amount of indeterminates and equations to solve.

A way to detect natural candidates for orbifold equivalence is via the following result:

Lemma 5.1. Let $f \in \mathbb{k}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ be a potential with a \mathbb{Q} grading assigned to each variable which we will denote as $|x_i|$. Define the *central charge* associated to f to be:

$$c_f = \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - |x_i|).$$

If two potentials f, g are orbifold equivalent potentials, then they have the same central charge¹.

This is a necessary yet not sufficient condition, but it is still a useful source of potential candidates for orbifold equivalences. We here focus on some instances related to the so-called bimodal singularities (see e.g. [14]).

In the following we will describe in detail the procedure for the case of the singularities Q_{12} and E_{18} , described by the potentials

$$\begin{aligned} f_{Q_{12}} &= u^5 + v^3 + uw^2 \\ f_{E_{18}} &= x^5 z + y^3 + z^2 \end{aligned}$$

(both with central charge $c_{Q_{12}} = \frac{17}{15} = c_{E_{18}}$) and include the case of $Q_{18} \sim E_{30}$ in the Appendix B.

- First we split the total grading 2 into 3 different pairs of two adequate summands (consistent with the degree assigned to each of the variables). Note that in this case, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} |x| &= \frac{1}{5}, & |u| &= \frac{2}{5} \\ |y| &= \frac{2}{3}, & |v| &= \frac{2}{3} \\ |z| &= 1, & |w| &= \frac{4}{5} \end{aligned}$$

Inspired by the charge of the entries at [17], we choose to split 2 in the following way: $2 = 1 + 1 = \frac{4}{3} + \frac{2}{3} = \frac{4}{5} + \frac{6}{5}$.

- Then we distribute these entries in a $2^3 = 8$ odd matrix (again inspired by the V_0 indecomposable for $f_{Q_{12}}$ of [17]) as in:

$$\frac{1}{15} \begin{pmatrix} & & & & 15 & 7 & 10 & 12 \\ & & & & 23 & 15 & 18 & 20 \\ & & & & 20 & 12 & 15 & 17 \\ & & & & 18 & 10 & 13 & 15 \\ 15 & 15 & 7 & 10 & 12 & & & \\ 23 & 15 & 18 & 20 & & & & \\ 20 & 12 & 15 & 17 & & & & \\ 18 & 10 & 13 & 15 & & & & \end{pmatrix} \quad (1)$$

¹One can relate this to the so-called strange duality of singularities as described by Arnold [1, 2] (see e.g. [25] for a detailed discussion in the case of unimodal singularities).

- Here, notice that:
 - The most general polynomial we can generate of charge $\frac{2}{3}$ is $c_1u + c_2v$, and of charge $\frac{4}{3}$ is $c_1u^2 + c_2uv + c_3v^2$ ($c_i \in \mathbb{C}$).
 - There cannot be any monomials with associated charge $\frac{7}{15}, \frac{13}{15}, \frac{17}{15}, \frac{23}{15}$, so these entries in the matrix will be automatically zero.
 - Monomials of the required gradings factoring u^5 and z^2 are u^3 and u^2 (each of grading $\frac{6}{5}$ and $\frac{4}{5}$) and z (of grading 1) respectively.

Let us specify the non-zero blocks of the twisted differential as in Equation 4. We insert these entries in the matrix and adjust ± 1 coefficients so the determinant of the d_Q^\sharp is $u^5 + v^3 - y^3 - z^2 (= f_{Q_{12}} - f_{E_{18}} - uw^2 + x^5z)$ squared:

$$d_Q^\sharp = \begin{pmatrix} z & 0 & y - v & u^2 \\ 0 & z & -u^3 & -v^2 - yv - y^2 \\ v^2 + yv + y^2 & u^2 & -z & 0 \\ -u^3 & v - y & 0 & -z \end{pmatrix}$$

(with $d_Q^\flat = \sqrt{\text{Det}[d_Q^\sharp]}(d_Q^\sharp)^{-1}$).

- At this point, we write for each entry in the matrix all possible remaining monomials making them the most general instance of a polynomial of each charge we can have. We get 68 variables.
- Then we impose $d_Q^2 = (f_{Q_{12}} - f_{E_{18}}) \cdot \text{Id}_Q$, and we reduce the number of variables and equations to be satisfied solving by hand as many linear equations as possible (66 in total). We are then left with a system of 6 equations in 8 variables.
- And last we compute its left and right quantum dimensions. Imposing them to be non-zero we obtain two more inequalities to be satisfied.

Remark 5.2. The reader may notice that this method of reducing the amount of equations and variables in steps is similar to what was called “progressive perturbation” in [25, 26], where the shape of our starting ansatz is again suggested by the indecomposables of the triangulated categories of matrix factorizations in [17].

In this way we construct a matrix factorization with non-zero quantum dimensions and so we have proven:

Proposition 5.3. Consider the two potentials

$$\begin{aligned} f_{Q_{12}} &= u^5 + v^3 + uw^2 \\ f_{E_{18}} &= x^5z + y^3 + z^2 \end{aligned}$$

describing the bimodal singularities Q_{12} and E_{18} respectively. They are orbifold equivalent.

For the second new orbifold equivalence we refer for details to the Appendix B, and here we just state the result.

Proposition 5.4. Consider the two potentials

$$\begin{aligned} f_{Q_{18}} &= x^8 + y^3 + xz^2 \\ f_{E_{30}} &= u^8w - v^3 - w^2 \end{aligned}$$

describing the bimodal singularities Q_{18} and E_{30} respectively. They are orbifold equivalent.

Remark 5.5. In both instances of orbifold equivalence, we observe that the potentials related have the following nice property. Let us write $f_{Q_{18}}$ as $f_{Q_{18}} = \sum_{i=1}^3 \prod_{j=1}^3 x_j^{A_{ij}}$ with $A_{ij} = \begin{pmatrix} 8 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 3 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$ the matrix of coefficients. It turns out that $f_{E_{30}} = \sum_{i=1}^3 \prod_{j=1}^3 x_j^{A_{ji}}$, and similarly for $f_{E_{18}}$ and $f_{Q_{12}}$. This is what is called the ‘Berglund-Hübsch transposed potential’, and we refer to the literature for further details on this [3, 13, 19].

A. Categorical origins of orbifold equivalence

The concept of orbifold equivalence was first introduced in the context of the study of bicategories, and in particular that of Landau-Ginzburg models. Here, we aim to review the categorical origins of the definition of orbifold equivalence [6].

First, consider the following categories of matrix factorizations:

$\text{mf}(S, f)$: given a potential $f \in S$, objects are matrix factorizations of f as in Definition 2.14, and given two objects $(X, d_X), (Y, d_Y)$ morphisms are S -linear maps $\varphi: X \rightarrow Y$. This category is differential supergraded, and for such a φ there is a differential in the morphism space given by: $\delta\varphi = d_Y \circ \varphi - (-1)^{|\varphi|} \varphi \circ d_X$, where $|\varphi|$ is the degree of φ .

We say that two morphisms $\varphi, \psi: M \rightarrow N$ are *homotopic equivalent* if there exist a morphism θ of degree one such that $\varphi - \psi = d_N \circ \theta + \theta \circ d_M$. Homotopy equivalence is an equivalence relation.

$\text{hmf}(S, f)$: objects are those of $\text{mf}(S, f)$, and morphisms are those of $\text{mf}(S, f)$ that are even and compatible with the twisted differential (i.e. satisfying that $d_Y \circ \varphi = \varphi \circ d_X$) modulo homotopy.

$\text{hmf}(W)^\omega$: idempotent completion of the category $\text{hmf}(W)$. That means, we take objects isomorphic to direct summands of objects of $\text{hmf}(W)$.

Next, let us define a tensor product of matrix factorizations. Let $f_1 \in S_1, f_2 \in S_2, f_3 \in S_3$ be three potentials, X be a matrix factorization of $f_1 - f_2$ and Y be a matrix factorization of $f_2 - f_3$. The tensor product matrix factorization $X \otimes_{S_2} Y$ is the matrix factorization of $f_1 - f_3$ with base module over $S_1 \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} S_3$ and twisted differential $d_{X \otimes Y} = d_X \otimes \text{Id}_Y + \text{Id}_X \otimes d_Y$.

Remark A.1. Notice here that for $S_2 \neq \mathbb{k}$, $X \otimes_{S_2} Y$ is of infinite rank over $S_1 \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} S_3$. Yet the resulting matrix factorization is actually isomorphic to one of finite rank [18].

For the case $S_1 = S_2 = S$, note that under this tensor product,

Proposition A.2 ([5, 7]). $\text{hmf}(S^{\otimes 2}, f \otimes 1 - 1 \otimes f)^\omega$ is a tensor category.

In fact one can prove more general cases than just this one [5] and even compute dual matrix factorizations as well [5, 8], for which we refer to the literature. Hence a legitimate question is if this category is in addition pivotal. For future convenience, in order to answer this question let us go one step higher and define the following bicategory that we will denote as $\mathcal{LG}_{\mathbb{k}}$:

- Objects are potentials as in Definition 2.2,
- For any two objects $(S_1, f_1), (S_2, f_2)$, the morphism category is $\text{hmf}(S_1 \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} S_2, f_1 - f_2)^\omega$.

This is indeed a bicategory [7]. Furthermore,

Theorem A.3. $\mathcal{LG}_{\mathbb{k}}$ is a graded pivotal bicategory.

Graded pivotality means that the bicategory is pivotal up to shifts, and one needs a detailed discussion of how these and adjunction maps are compatible. For this we refer to the original source [5] for details. But, notice here that:

Remark A.4. The subcategory $\mathcal{LG}'_{\mathbb{k}}$ whose objects are potentials with an even number of variables is pivotal.

Moreover, we have explicit formulas for the adjunctions and more precisely of the evaluation and coevaluation maps. These were constructed in the one-variable case in [8] and then for more general cases in [5]. One may combine these for example to get the explicit expressions of the so-called *left and right quantum dimensions* as stated in Definition 2.17.

Using the theory of equivariant and orbifold completion of bicategories [7], one finds the following result for $\mathcal{LG}'_{\mathbb{k}}$:

Theorem A.5. Let $f_1 = f_1(x_1, \dots, x_m)$, $f_2 = f_2(y_1, \dots, y_n)$ be two potentials and $(M, d_M) \in \text{hmf}(f_2 - f_1)$ with invertible quantum dimension. Then

$$(M, d_M) : \left((S_1, f_1), M^\dagger \otimes M \right) \rightleftharpoons \left((S_2, f_2), I_{f_2 \otimes 1 - 1 \otimes f_2} \right) : (M, d_M)^\dagger$$

(where $(M, d^M)^\dagger$ is the right adjoint of (M, d^M)) is an adjoint equivalence in $\mathcal{LG}'_{\mathbb{k}}$, and $M^\dagger \otimes M$ is a symmetric separable Frobenius algebra object in $\text{hmf}(S_1 \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} S_1, f_1 \otimes 1 - 1 \otimes f_1)^\omega$.

Let's reformulate this theorem as an equivalence relation:

Definition A.6. Let $f_1 = f_1(x_1, \dots, x_m)$, $f_2 = f_2(y_1, \dots, y_n)$ be two potentials and $(M, d^M) \in \text{Ob}(\text{hmf}(f_2 - f_1))^\omega$. Assign to (M, d^M) two elements in \mathbb{k} , the left and right quantum dimensions $\text{qdim}_l(M)$ $\text{qdim}_r(M)$ as in Definition 2.17. If there exists such an (M, d^M) , then we say that V and W are *orbifold equivalent*.

Proposition A.7 ([9]). Denote as $\mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{k}}$ the set of potentials with any number of variables with coefficients in the field \mathbb{k} . Orbifold equivalence is an equivalence relation in $\mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{k}}$.

Notice here that:

- Following the notation in Definition A.6, if f_1 and f_2 are orbifold equivalent then clearly $m = n \pmod{2}$.
- We are considering implicitly a \mathbb{Q} -graded setting, and so the quantum dimensions take values in \mathbb{k} . This can be seen from counting degrees in the formulas of Definition 2.18.

- Quantum dimensions are independent of the \mathbb{Q} -grading of a matrix factorization.

Given two potentials f_1, f_2 and a matrix factorization X of $f_1 - f_2$ proving that f_1 and f_2 are orbifold equivalent, one finds as a corollary of Theorem A.5 that the following equivalence of categories holds:

Proposition A.8.

$$\text{hmf}(S, f_2)^\omega \simeq \text{mod}(X^\dagger \otimes X)$$

In the Introduction it was mentioned that orbifold equivalence could be used as a source of equivalences of categories in the context of the Landau-Ginzburg/conformal field theory correspondence, and Proposition A.8 is the key to do it. In the case of simple singularities [9], we found equivalences of categories of matrix factorizations of these potentials and the expected from CFT categories of modules over separable symmetric Frobenius algebra objects [27]. For more details we refer to [12, 30]. For the remaining existing orbifold equivalences we hope to find similar equivalences and their respective CFT counterpart (hopefully not so distant) in the future [31].

B. The orbifold equivalence $Q_{18} \sim E_{30}$

As stated in Section 4, here we describe the construction of the matrix factorization proving the orbifold equivalence $Q_{18} \sim E_{30}$. The procedure is pretty similar to the one we followed for $E_{18} \sim Q_{12}$: in this way, we reduce once more the computational load of the algorithm basically via ‘inspired guessing’.

Again, consider the two potentials:

$$\begin{aligned} f_{Q_{18}} &= x^8 + y^3 + xz^2 \\ f_{E_{30}} &= u^8w - v^3 - w^2 \end{aligned}$$

Then,

- First we assign the \mathbb{Q} -degree to the variables as:

$$\begin{aligned} |x| &= \frac{1}{4} & |u| &= \frac{1}{8} \\ |y| &= \frac{2}{3} & |v| &= \frac{2}{3} \\ |z| &= \frac{7}{8} & |w| &= 1 \end{aligned}$$

Using this we decompose 2 in three different ways as: $2 = 1 + 1 = \frac{4}{3} + \frac{2}{3} = \frac{9}{8} + \frac{7}{8}$.

- We distribute these pairs in a rank 2^3 odd matrix with charges distributed as:

$$\frac{1}{24} \begin{pmatrix} & & & & & & 21 & 32 & 24 & 29 \\ & & & & & & 16 & 27 & 19 & 24 \\ & & & & & & 24 & 35 & 27 & 32 \\ & & & & & & 13 & 24 & 16 & 21 \\ 27 & 32 & 24 & 35 & & & & & & \\ 16 & 21 & 13 & 24 & & & & & & \\ 24 & 29 & 21 & 32 & & & & & & \\ 19 & 24 & 16 & 27 & & & & & & \end{pmatrix}$$

This distribution is inspired from that of the case $Q_{12} \sim E_{18}$ (see Equation 1).

- Then we impose the following:
 - With this grading, we cannot generate monomials of degree $\frac{13}{24}$ and $\frac{29}{24}$, and these entries will be straightforward zero. For the entries with degree $\frac{19}{24}$ and $\frac{35}{24}$, we set them by hand to be zero as part of the ‘inspired guess’.
 - Similarly to the case of $Q_{12} \sim E_{18}$, the most general polynomial we can generate of charge $\frac{2}{3}$ is $c_1y + c_2v$, and of charge $\frac{4}{3}$ is $c_1y^2 + c_2yv + c_3v^2$ ($c_i \in \mathbb{C}$).

- Monomials potentially generating x^8 , w^2 and xz^2 could be x^4 and w (both of charge 1) and z and xz (each of charge $\frac{7}{8}$ and $\frac{9}{7}$) respectively.

We insert these entries in the matrix and adjust ± 1 coefficients so the determinant of the d_Q^\sharp is $v^3 + w^2 - x^8 - y^3 - xz^2 (= f_{E_{30}} - f_{Q_{18}} - u^8 w)$ squared:

Following the notation of the previous example, then we take:

$$d_Q^1 = \begin{pmatrix} z & v^2 + yv + y^2 & x^4 + w & 0 \\ y - v & -xz & 0 & x^4 + w \\ x^4 - w & 0 & -xz & -(v^2 + yv + y^2) \\ 0 & x^4 - w & v - y & z \end{pmatrix}$$

(again with $d_Q^0 = \sqrt{\text{Det}[d_Q^1]}(d_Q^1)^{-1}$).

- At this point, we write for each entry in the matrix all possible remaining monomials making them the most general instance of a polynomial of each charge we can have. We get 84 variables.
- Then we impose $d_Q^2 = (f_{E_{30}} - f_{Q_{18}}) \cdot \text{Id}_Q$, and we reduce the amount of variables and equations to be satisfied solving by hand as many linear equations as possible (77 in total). We are then left with a system of 5 equations in 7 variables.
- And last we compute its left and right quantum dimensions. Imposing them to be non-zero we obtain two more inequalities to be satisfied.

As described in Section 3, a Gröbner basis computation now determines whether this system admits a solution. The size of the system is now sufficiently small to complete this in reasonable time. This proves Proposition 5.4.

References

- [1] V. I. Arnol'd, *Critical points of smooth functions, and their normal forms*, Russ. Math. Surv. **30** 5 (1975), 1–75.
- [2] V. I. Arnol'd, S. M. Gusein-Zade and A. N. Varchenko, *Singularities of differentiable maps, Volume I. The classification of critical points, caustics and wave fronts*, translated from Russian by Ian Porteous and Mark Reynolds. Monographs in Mathematics **82**, Birkhäuser Boston, Inc. (Boston, MA), 1985.
- [3] P. Berglund and T. Hübsch, *A generalized construction of mirror manifolds*, Nucl. Phys. B **393** (1993), 377–391.
- [4] I. Brunner and D. Roggenkamp, *B-type defects in Landau-Ginzburg models*, JHEP **0708** (2007), 093.
- [5] N. Carqueville and D. Murfet, *Adjunctions and defects in Landau-Ginzburg models*, Adv. Math. **289** (2016), 480–566.
- [6] N. Carqueville and I. Runkel, *Orbifold completion of defect bicategories*, Q. Topol. **7** (2016), 203–279.
- [7] N. Carqueville and I. Runkel, *On the monoidal structure of matrix bi-factorisations*, J. Phys. A **43** (2010), 275401.
- [8] N. Carqueville and I. Runkel, *Rigidity and defect actions in Landau-Ginzburg models*, Comm. Math. Phys. **310** (2012), 135–179.
- [9] N. Carqueville, A. Ros Camacho and I. Runkel, *Orbifold equivalent potentials*, JPAA **220** 2 (2016), 759–781.
- [10] S. Cecotti and M. Del Zotto, *On Arnold's 14 'exceptional' $N = 2$ superconformal gauge theories*, JHEP **1110** (2011), 099.
- [11] A. Davydov, L. Kong and I. Runkel, *Field theories with defects and the centre functor*, Mathematical Foundations of Quantum Field and Perturbative String Theory, Proceedings of Symposia in Pure Mathematics **83** (2011), 354.
- [12] A. Davydov, A. Ros Camacho and I. Runkel, *$N = 2$ minimal conformal field theories and matrix bifactorisations x^d* , Comm. Math. Phys. **357** (2018), 597–629.
- [13] W. Ebeling, *Homological mirror symmetry for singularities*, arXiv:1601.06027 [math.AG].
- [14] W. Ebeling and D. Ploog, *A geometric construction of Coxeter-Dynkin diagrams of bimodal singularities*, Manuscripta Math. **140** (2013), 195–212.
- [15] H. Fan, T. Jarvis and Y. Ruan, *The Witten equation, mirror symmetry and quantum singularity theory*, Ann. Math. **178** (2013), 1.

- [16] J. Fröhlich, J. Fuchs, I. Runkel and C. Schweigert, *Defect lines, dualities, and generalised orbifolds*, Proceedings of the XVIth International Congress on Mathematical Physics (2010), 608–613.
- [17] H. Kajiura, K. Saito and A. Takahashi, *Triangulated categories of matrix factorizations for regular systems of weights of $\varepsilon = -1$* , Adv. Math. **220** 5 (2009), 1602–1654.
- [18] M. Khovanov and L. Rozansky, *Matrix factorizations and link homology*, Fund. Math. **199** (2008), 1–91.
- [19] M. Krawitz, *FJRW rings and Landau-Ginzburg mirror symmetry*, ProQuest LLC, Ann Arbor, MI, 2010. Thesis (Ph.D.-)University of Michigan, MS2801653.
- [20] J. Lipman, *Residues and traces of differential forms via Hochschild homology*, Contemp. Math. **61** (1987), AMS, Providence.
- [21] R.H. Makarim and M. Stevens, *M4GB: an efficient Gröbner-basis algorithm*, Proceedings of the 2017 ACM on International Symposium on Symbolic and Algebraic Computation (2017), 293–300.
- [22] E. Martinec, *Algebraic geometry and effective lagrangians*, Phys. Lett. B **217** 4 (1989), 431–437.
- [23] E. Martinec, *Criticality, catastrophes and compactifications*, In Brink, L. (ed.) et al.: *Physics and mathematics of strings* (1989), 389–433.
- [24] E.W. Mayr and A.R. Meyer, *The complexity of the word problems for commutative semigroups and polynomial ideals*. Adv. Math. **46** (3), (1982) 305–329.
- [25] R. Newton and A. Ros Camacho, *Strangely dual orbifold equivalence I*, J. Sing. **14** (2016), 34–51.
- [26] R. Newton and A. Ros Camacho, *Orbifold autoequivalent exceptional unimodal singularities*, arXiv:1607.07081.
- [27] V. Ostrik, *Module categories, weak Hopf algebras and modular invariants*, Transform. Groups **8** (2003), 177–206.
- [28] A. Polishchuk and A. Vaintrob, *Matrix factorizations and cohomological field theories*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **714** (2016), 1–122.
- [29] A. Recknagel and P. Weinreb, *Orbifold equivalence: structure and new examples*, arXiv:1708.08359.
- [30] A. Ros Camacho, *On the Landau-Ginzburg/conformal field theory correspondence*, to appear at Proceedings of the International Conference on Vertex Operator Algebras and Number Theory (Sacramento State University), Contemp. Math. AMS., arXiv:1901.05365 [math.QA].
- [31] A. Ros Camacho, work in progress.

- [32] K. Saito, *Quasihomogene isolierte Singularitäten von Hyperflächen*, Invent. Math. **14** (1971), 123–142.
- [33] P.W. Shor, *Polynomial-time algorithms for prime factorization and discrete logarithms on a quantum computer*, SIAM **41** 2 (1999), 303–332.
- [34] C. Vafa and N. Warner, *Catastrophes and the classification of conformal theories*, Phys. Lett. B, **218** (1989), 51.
- [35] E. Witten, *Phases of $N = 2$ theories in 2 dimensions*, Nucl.Phys. B **403** (1993), 159–222.
- [36] T. Yasuda, X. Dahan, Y.-J. Huang, T. Takagi and K. Sakurai, *MQ Challenge: Hardness Evaluation of Solving Multivariate Quadratic Problems*, NIST Workshop on Cybersecurity in a Post-Quantum World, Washington, D.C. April 2-3, 2015.