

INTRINSIC MIRROR SYMMETRY

MARK GROSS AND BERND SIEBERT

CONTENTS

Introduction	2
1. The construction and its variants	7
1.1. Algebras associated to pairs	7
1.2. The log Calabi-Yau case	11
1.3. Mirrors, examples, basic properties, and auxiliary constructions	13
2. Preliminaries and review	22
2.1. Generalities on log geometry	22
2.2. Stable punctured maps	26
2.3. Some comments on stacks	33
3. Construction of the invariants $N_{p_1 p_2 r}^\beta$	35
3.1. Evaluation spaces	35
3.2. Moduli spaces and evaluation maps	38
3.3. Imposing point constraints	38
3.4. Virtual smoothness everywhere	40
3.5. The invariants	43
3.6. The tropical interpretation of point constraints	46
4. Sketch and first steps of the proof of the main theorem	48
4.1. Finiteness of the product rule	49
4.2. Commutativity	49
4.3. ϑ_0 is the unit element	49
4.4. Associativity	49
5. Forgetful maps: ϑ_0 is the unit	71
5.1. The case of curves	71
5.2. The case of punctured maps	76
5.3. Forgetful maps with point constraints and the proof of Theorem 4.3	80

Date: June 11, 2021.

This work was partially supported by EPSRC grant EP/N03189X/1 and a Royal Society Wolfson Research Merit Award.

AMS MSC: 14J33, 14N35, 14A21.

6.	The proof of Theorem 4.15	85
7.	The key gluing argument	93
7.1.	Review of gluing	93
7.2.	Alternative calculations for $N_{p_1 p_2 s}^{A_1}$	101
7.3.	The proof of Theorem 4.25	107
7.4.	The no-tail lemma	117
8.	The key comparison	121
8.1.	First steps	121
8.2.	Vanishing contributions from tails	127
8.3.	The first comparison	134
8.4.	The second comparison	135
9.	Remarks on the Frobenius structure conjecture	140
	Appendix A. Tools of the trade	142
A.1.	Charts for fibre products of fs log stacks	142
A.2.	Log fibre dimension	143
A.3.	Log structures on discrete valuation rings	149
A.4.	Some results concerning virtual fundamental classes	151
	References	154

INTRODUCTION

For some time, we have been developing a program for constructing mirror pairs and understanding mirror symmetry [GS06],[GS10],[GS11]. The last reference in particular gave a construction of mirrors to what we call toric degenerations of Calabi-Yau varieties. On the other hand, work with Hacking and Keel in two dimensions, [GHK15] and [GHKS20], has led to constructions of mirrors to either log Calabi-Yau pairs (X, D) or maximally unipotent degenerations of K3 surfaces $X \rightarrow S$. In the first case, X is a non-singular projective surface and $D \in |-K_X|$ is a reduced nodal anti-canonical divisor. In the second case, $X \rightarrow S$ is a relatively minimal but normal crossings degeneration. Based on this experience, in [GHS19], we, along with Paul Hacking, set up the general framework which incorporates known and anticipated constructions from both of the above points of view.

Roughly put, suppose we wish to construct the mirror to a log Calabi-Yau pair (X, D) or a maximally unipotent degeneration $X \rightarrow S$ of log Calabi-Yau manifolds. We call these the *absolute* and *relative* cases respectively. We would carry out the following steps:

- (1) Construct the dual intersection complex (B, \mathcal{P}) of (X, D) or $X \rightarrow S$. Construct a *wall structure* (also often called a *scattering diagram*) \mathfrak{D} on B . This is a data structure which controls the deformation theory of an open subset \check{X}_0° of a singular scheme \check{X}_0 combinatorially determined by B . This enables the construction of flat deformations $\check{X}_I^\circ \rightarrow \text{Spec } S_I$ of \check{X}_0° over some Artinian ring $S_I = \mathbb{k}[P]/I$, for some monoid P and co-Artinian monomial ideal I .
- (2) Assuming the wall-crossing structure is *consistent*, we may use *broken lines* to construct *theta functions*. In the absolute case, these will be functions on \check{X}_I° that generate $\Gamma(\check{X}_I^\circ, \mathcal{O}_{\check{X}_I^\circ})$ as an S_I -module. In the relative case, there is an ample line bundle \mathcal{L} on \check{X}_I° and the theta functions are sections of various powers of \mathcal{L} which generate $\bigoplus_{d \geq 0} \Gamma(\check{X}_I^\circ, \mathcal{L}^{\otimes d})$. We then obtain a (partial) compactification of \check{X}_I° by setting

$$\check{X}_I = \text{Spec } \Gamma(\check{X}_I^\circ, \mathcal{O}_{\check{X}_I^\circ}) \text{ or } \check{X}_I = \text{Proj } \bigoplus_{d \geq 0} \Gamma(\check{X}_I^\circ, \mathcal{L}^{\otimes d})$$

in the two cases. Taking the limit over all I gives the mirror family.

- (3) The multiplication rule for theta functions can then be described in terms of tropical geometry on B , essentially counting tropical trees with two inputs and one output. Thus the coordinate ring or the homogeneous coordinate ring of \check{X}_I can be described directly from the data of B and \mathfrak{D} without the intervening algebro-geometric constructions.

The paper [GHS19] explains the details of the above steps, but relies on input a consistent wall-crossing structure \mathfrak{D} , without providing an explanation for the source of such a diagram. To date, such wall-crossing structures have been constructed for nice toric degenerations [GS11], log Calabi-Yau surfaces (X, D) in [GHK15], and for maximally unipotent degenerations of K3 surfaces in [GHKS20].

In [GS18], we announced two breakthroughs which allow us to complete the above program in all generality. The key new ingredient which allowed for these breakthroughs is the introduction of *punctured Gromov-Witten invariants*, [ACGS20], jointly with Dan Abramovich and Qile Chen. This is the first of two papers devoted to these announced results. The second paper, [GS21], produces consistent wall-crossing structures in all dimensions analogous to those constructed in [GHK15] and [GHKS20] in dimension two. That will, by itself, complete the above program, but at the moment requires some assumptions on (X, D) which are only guaranteed in general by the existence of good minimal models in the sense of [NXY18]. This existence for log Calabi-Yau varieties is not in general known given the current state of the Minimal Model Program. The

current paper, however, short circuits the first two steps of the program, and describes the product rule for theta functions by interpreting the tropical counts of step (3) above in terms of (punctured) Gromov-Witten theory of the pair (X, D) or the degeneration $X \rightarrow S$.

A bit more precisely, the structure constants for the (homogeneous) coordinate ring of the mirror are described in terms of actual holomorphic curve counts of 3-pointed curves with two “input” points and one “output” point. In particular, the theta functions are indexed by integral points $B(\mathbb{Z})$ of the dual intersection complex B , and we write ϑ_p for the theta function indexed by $p \in B(\mathbb{Z})$. Then we desire structure constants for the product rule as an S_I -algebra

$$\vartheta_p \cdot \vartheta_q = \sum_{r \in B(\mathbb{Z})} \alpha_{pqr} \vartheta_r$$

with $\alpha_{pqr} \in S_I$. Typically, we take P a submonoid of $H_2(X, \mathbb{Z})$, and write

$$\alpha_{pqr} = \sum_{A \in P \setminus I} N_{pqr}^A t^A,$$

where $t^A \in \mathbb{k}[P]$ denotes the monomial corresponding to $A \in P$. According to logarithmic Gromov-Witten theory, we can view points of $B(\mathbb{Z})$ as specifying contact orders for marked points on stable maps. We shall give, in §3, a precise definition for the numbers N_{pqr}^A as a count of *punctured* log maps $f : (C, x_1, x_2, x_{\text{out}}) \rightarrow X$ with C of genus zero and with contact orders at the three points specified by p , q , and $-r$ and satisfying a point constraint at x_{out} .

The negative contact order at x_{out} is one of the novel features of our construction, and is a key feature of punctured log maps [ACGS20]. It may appear strange in algebraic geometry, but it fits well with the construction of symplectic cohomology. We defer further discussions of these invariants until §1 and §3.

While these invariants can be defined for any simple normal crossings or toroidal crossings pair (X, D) (subject to hypotheses on the log structure induced by D stated in §1), the main issue is to prove associativity of the resulting product rule. In general the product rule is not expected to be associative. Philosophically, that is because we are only building a part of an actual “relative quantum cohomology ring”, and are truncating the product rule rather crudely, so that associativity is not preserved. We show associativity under two situations. If $\Theta_{X/\mathbb{k}}$ denotes the logarithmic tangent bundle, then we require that either (1) $\pm c_1(\Theta_{X/\mathbb{k}})$ is nef, or (2) D is simple normal crossings and $K_X + D$ is numerically equivalent to an effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor supported on D . In the latter case, we do not use the entire dual intersection complex of the pair (X, D) , but only the Kontsevich-Soibelman

skeleton, see §1.2. This is a crucial point, as it allows us to avoid the existence of minimal models. Case (1) already includes the case of a minimal log Calabi-Yau manifold, where $K_X + D = 0$, but Case (2) allows non-minimal log Calabi-Yau manifolds. Thus we have no restriction on (X, D) arising from the Minimal Model Program.

While we do not wish to dwell on the philosophy behind this construction (see however [GS18] for more discussion) let us mention the most important point, namely that this construction should be viewed, in the log Calabi-Yau case, as an algebro-geometric version of $SH^0(X \setminus D)$ (symplectic cohomology). This fits well with the conjectures stated in the first preprint version of [GHK15] concerning the relationship between symplectic cohomology and the mirror construction given there, as well as [GP21]. For degenerations of Calabi-Yau manifolds, the case of elliptic curves and the relation between symplectic cohomology, tropical geometry and punctured invariants has been studied in detail by Hülya Argüz [Ar17], lending support to this philosophical point of view.

Most of the paper is devoted to a proof of the associativity theorems in these two cases, Theorems 1.9 and 1.12. We do not try to include arguments that we have really constructed the (homogeneous) coordinate ring of the mirror, and leave this for future work. The main argument here that we are constructing mirrors is the fact that this construction completes step (3) above, and the comparison with the results of steps (1) and (2) will be given in [GS21]. It should even be an interesting problem to confirm directly that the construction given here agrees with the mirror construction of [GS11], which is known to generalize the Batyrev-Borisov construction of mirrors, [BB96], [Gr05].

We defer further technical details of our results until the next section, which contains precise statements of the setup and main theorems. We try our best in §1 to avoid technical issues of log geometry, and that section should be easily readable to the algebraic geometer unfamiliar with the log world. After this, the structure of the paper is as follows. In §2, we review facts about logarithmic geometry, stable log maps and punctured log maps as needed for this paper. In §3, we set up the necessary machinery to define the invariants N_{pqr}^β described above.

§4 is both a sketch of the proofs of the main theorems and the beginning of said proofs. At its heart, the proof is exactly as one would expect following the proof of the WDVV equations, i.e., associativity of quantum cohomology. One considers ways in which a virtually one-dimensional moduli space of four-pointed punctured maps can degenerate. However, unfortunately everything becomes much harder

in the log world. We give many examples of phenomena which need to be taken into account, and reduce the proof of associativity to three key theorems. Each of the sections 6–8 then proves one of these theorems, while §5 is devoted to the study of forgetful morphisms in the logarithmic context, enabling us to prove ϑ_0 is a unit.

Finally, we remark that Sean Keel and Tony Yue Yu [KY19] have obtained results in the same direction as this paper, using Yu’s non-Archimedean approach to Gromov-Witten theory. However, at this point, their approach only applies to mirrors to affine log Calabi-Yau manifolds containing a copy of an algebraic torus as a dense open subset. We have no such constraints. On the other hand, in the case they consider, the Gromov-Witten invariants necessary to define structure constants for multiplication are proved to be enumerative, and in fact are positive integers, which is not something which is true in general. This is a quite powerful observation in many situations, e.g., it explains the positivity in cluster theory proved in [GHKK18].

Notation: We follow the convention that if X is a log scheme or stack, then \underline{X} is the underlying scheme or stack. We almost always write \mathcal{M}_X for the sheaf of monoids on X and $\alpha_X : \mathcal{M}_X \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X$ for the structure map. We write $\mathrm{Spec} \mathbb{k}^\dagger$ for the standard log point with sheaf of monoids $\mathbb{k}^\times \times \mathbb{N}$. If P is a monoid, we write $P^\vee := \mathrm{Hom}(P, \mathbb{N})$ and $P^* = \mathrm{Hom}(P, \mathbb{Z})$. We also write $P_{\mathbb{R}}$ for the real cone spanned by $P \subseteq P^{\mathrm{gp}} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{R}$. Given a rational polyhedral cone σ , a *tangent vector* to the cone is an element of the real span of σ .

Acknowledgements: Our various collaborations have played a key role in the development of the ideas presented here. This paper owes an obvious debt to the collaboration with Paul Hacking and Sean Keel, in which the tropical description of the product rule was first proved in the surface case. The collaboration with Dan Abramovich and Qile Chen developing punctured invariants and a gluing formula for log Gromov-Witten theory lies at the technical heart of this paper. Indeed, it was already in 2011 in conversations with Abramovich and Chen that it became clear that there would be new types of logarithmic invariants which might be useful for completing our program. Finally, it was in conversations of B.S. with Mohammed Abouzaid in 2012 and M.G. with Daniel Pomerleano in 2015 that the significance of constructing the ring in this paper became apparent, and the paper owes a great deal to discussions with them. Andrew Kresch kindly provided technical help with Chow groups of stacks, and in particular provided

the proof of Lemma A.12. Finally, we would also like to thank Y. Lekili, D. Ranganathan and J. Wise for useful conversations.

1. THE CONSTRUCTION AND ITS VARIANTS

1.1. Algebras associated to pairs.

Basic Setup 1.1. We work over an algebraically closed field \mathbb{k} of characteristic zero. We fix throughout a projective log smooth morphism $g : X \rightarrow S$ where X carries a Zariski log structure, and either $S = \mathrm{Spec} \mathbb{k}$ or S is a non-singular *non-complete* curve carrying a divisorial log structure coming from a single closed point $0 \in S$. We refer to these two cases as the *absolute* and *relative* cases. We further assume throughout that $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_X^{\mathrm{gp}} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Q}$ is globally generated, i.e., the natural map $\Gamma(X, \overline{\mathcal{M}}_X^{\mathrm{gp}} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Q}) \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{X,x}^{\mathrm{gp}} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Q}$ is surjective for all $x \in X$.¹

Example 1.2. For readers unfamiliar with logarithmic geometry, the basic example to keep in mind is that X is determined by an underlying smooth scheme \underline{X} and a simple normal crossings divisor $D \subseteq \underline{X}$, and we write this as $X = (\underline{X}, D)$. Here the condition that X be Zariski means D is simple normal crossings rather than just normal crossings, so that $\underline{X} = \mathbb{P}^2$ with D a nodal cubic is not allowed. This constraint is imposed here since logarithmic Gromov-Witten theory is best understood in the case of a Zariski target space, but we do not expect this restriction to be essential to the theory.

In the absolute case, there is no further constraint on X . However, if S is a curve, then a morphism $\underline{g} : \underline{X} \rightarrow \underline{S}$ induces a log morphism $g : X \rightarrow S$ provided that $\underline{g}^{-1}(0) \subseteq D$, and it will be log smooth if further \underline{g} is étale locally of the form $\mathbb{A}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{A}^1$ given by $(x_1, \dots, x_n) \mapsto \prod_{i=1}^r x_i^{a_i}$ for some collection of integers $a_i \in \mathbb{N}$ and $D \subseteq \mathbb{A}^n$ is given by $D = V(\prod_{j \in J} x_j)$ for some index set $J \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$ with $\{1, \dots, r\} \subseteq J$.

Thus a key example for us is a maximally unipotent degeneration $X \rightarrow S$ of Calabi-Yau manifolds, which we can then assume is log smooth via semi-stable reduction [KKMS73], p. 53.

More generally, if X is log smooth over $S = \mathrm{Spec} \mathbb{k}$ or S a curve with divisorial log structure, the log structure on X comes from a divisor $D \subseteq \underline{X}$ with (\underline{X}, D) *toroidal crossings*, i.e., étale locally \underline{X} is a toric variety and D is its toric boundary. \square

¹This assumption is currently necessary for a good theory of punctured invariants [ACGS20], see loc. cit. Thm. 3.11. It is possible that this assumption could be removed from the current paper, but this would not enhance readability, and at any rate the assumption always holds in the simple normal crossings case.

Basic Setup 1.3. Functorially associated to the log scheme X is its *tropicalization*, a generalized cone complex $\Sigma(X)$ with underlying topological space $|\Sigma(X)|$ presented as a colimit of a diagram of rational polyhedral cones with maps given by integral inclusions of faces, see [ACGS17], §2.1.4. See also §2.2.4 for a brief review. If S is a point, then $|\Sigma(S)|$ is a point, while if S is a curve, $|\Sigma(S)| = \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. In any event, the structure morphism $X \rightarrow S$ induces a map of cone complexes $\Sigma(X) \rightarrow \Sigma(S)$. We denote by $\Sigma(X)(\mathbb{Z})$ the set of points of $|\Sigma(X)|$ which are the image of some integral point $p \in \sigma$ for some $\sigma \in \Sigma(X)$. In particular, we obtain a map $\Sigma(X)(\mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow \Sigma(S)(\mathbb{Z}) = \mathbb{N}$ in the case that $\dim S = 1$.

We note that since X is Zariski and log smooth over $\text{Spec } \mathbb{k}$ in both the absolute and relative cases, there is a one-to-one correspondence between connected logarithmic strata of X and cones of $\Sigma(X)$, and that in fact $\Sigma(X)$ is a cone complex, rather than a generalised cone complex. In particular there are no self-identifications of faces — this is the classical case of toroidal embeddings in [KKMS73]. If further X is in fact toric with D its toric boundary, then $\Sigma(X)$ coincides, as an abstract cone complex, with the fan of X .

Example 1.4. Again, to describe these objects without reference to log geometry, suppose that we are in the simple normal crossings case described in Example 1.2. Then we can write $D = D_1 + \dots + D_s$ as a sum of irreducible divisors. Let us assume further that for any index set $I \subseteq \{1, \dots, s\}$,

$$D_I := \bigcap_{i \in I} D_i$$

is connected. Then it is useful to describe $\Sigma(X)$ as the dual cone complex to D in the following way. Let $\text{Div}_D(X)$ denote the group of divisors of X supported on D , and write $\text{Div}_D(X)^* = \text{Hom}(\text{Div}_D(X), \mathbb{Z})$, $\text{Div}_D(X)_{\mathbb{R}}^* = \text{Hom}(\text{Div}_D(X), \mathbb{R})$. Write D_1^*, \dots, D_s^* for the basis of the latter vector space dual to D_1, \dots, D_s . We then define $\Sigma(X)$ to be the collection of cones

$$\Sigma(X) := \left\{ \sum_{i \in I} \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} D_i^* \mid I \subseteq \{1, \dots, s\} \text{ an index set with } D_I \neq \emptyset \right\}.$$

We then have

$$|\Sigma(X)| = \bigcup_{\sigma \in \Sigma(X)} \sigma \subseteq \text{Div}_D(X)_{\mathbb{R}}^*$$

and

$$\Sigma(X)(\mathbb{Z}) = \left\{ \sum a_i D_i^* \mid a_i \in \mathbb{N}, \bigcap_{i: a_i > 0} D_i \neq \emptyset \right\}.$$

In the relative case, the map $\Sigma(g) : \Sigma(X) \rightarrow \Sigma(S)$ is then easily described as the map induced by the linear map $\text{Div}_D(X)_{\mathbb{R}}^* \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ given by evaluation on the (not necessarily reduced) divisor $g^*(0)$. \square

Examples 1.5. We consider two running examples. They are very similar and our construction is quite simple in these cases, but they exhibit slightly different features.

(1) Consider the log Calabi-Yau $(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{D} = \bar{D}_1 \cup \bar{D}_2 \cup \bar{D}_3)$ where the \bar{D}_i are lines, and blow up a point on \bar{D}_1 which is not a double point of \bar{D} to get X . Take D_i to be the strict transform of \bar{D}_i , getting a pair (X, D) with $D = \sum D_i$. In this case $\Sigma(X)$ consists of three two-dimensional cones; as a polyhedral complex in $\text{Div}_D(X)_{\mathbb{R}}^*$, it consists of the cones $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}D_i^* + \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}D_j^*$ for $i \neq j$ and their faces. Of course $|\Sigma(X)|$ is homeomorphic to \mathbb{R}^2 .

(2) As a second example, consider the case of $\underline{X} = \mathbb{P}^2$ and $D = D_1 + D_2$, with D_1 a line and D_2 a conic meeting transversally at two points. This does not satisfy the hypotheses of Example 1.4, but we can still easily describe $\Sigma(X)$, which consists of five cones: a zero dimensional cone 0 corresponding to the open stratum of X , two one-dimensional cones ρ_1 and ρ_2 corresponding to the open strata of D_1 , D_2 , and two two-dimensional cones σ_1 and σ_2 corresponding to the two points of $D_1 \cap D_2$. The boundary of each σ_i is $\rho_1 \cup \rho_2$, so that σ_1 and σ_2 are glued together along their entire boundaries. Again, $|\Sigma(X)|$ is homeomorphic to \mathbb{R}^2 , split into two two-dimensional cones. \square

Basic Setup 1.6. We choose additional data of a finitely generated abelian group $H_2(X)$ of possible degree data for curves on X . In the absolute case, this could be 1-cycles on X modulo algebraic or numerical equivalence, or it could be $\text{Hom}(\text{Pic}(X), \mathbb{Z})$. If we work over \mathbb{C} , we can use ordinary singular homology $H_2(X, \mathbb{Z})$. In the relative case, we can use the group generated by curves contracted by the morphism $X \rightarrow S$, modulo algebraic or numerical equivalence, or again, over \mathbb{C} , use $H_2(X, \mathbb{Z})$. There are three key requirements this group must satisfy:

- (1) Any stable map $\underline{f} : \underline{C}/\underline{W} \rightarrow \underline{X}$ induces a curve class $f_*[\underline{C}_{\bar{w}}] \in H_2(X)$ whenever $\bar{w} \in \underline{W}$ is a geometric point, and this class only depends on the connected component of \underline{W} .
- (2) If $f_*[\underline{C}_{\bar{w}}]$ is a torsion class in $H_2(X)$, then in fact \underline{f} is constant on $\underline{C}_{\bar{w}}$ and $f_*[\underline{C}_{\bar{w}}] = 0$.
- (3) The moduli space of (ordinary) stable maps of class $A \in H_2(X)$, genus g and n marked points to \underline{X} is of finite type.

We also choose a finitely generated monoid $P \subseteq H_2(X)$ such that (1) P contains the classes of all stable maps to \underline{X} ; (2) P is saturated; (3) the group of invertible elements of P coincides with the torsion part of $H_2(X)$.

Example 1.7. In Examples 1.5, in the first example we take $H_2(X) = \text{Pic}(X)^* = \mathbb{Z}[L - E] \oplus \mathbb{Z}[E]$, where L is the total transform of a line in \mathbb{P}^2 and E is the exceptional curve, and take P to be the submonoid generated by $[L - E]$ and $[E]$. In the second case, we take $H_2(X) = \text{Pic}(X)^* = \mathbb{Z}$, and $P = \mathbb{N}$, generated by the class of a line. \square

Construction 1.8. In what follows, we now choose any monoid ideal $I \subseteq P$ such that $P \setminus I$ is finite, i.e.,

$$S_I := \mathbb{k}[P]/I$$

is Artinian. We always confuse a monoid ideal I with the monomial ideal in $\mathbb{k}[P]$ it generates. We use the convention that given an element $A \in P$, $t^A \in \mathbb{k}[P]$ is the corresponding element. We then define

$$(1.1) \quad R_I := \bigoplus_{p \in \Sigma(X)(\mathbb{Z})} S_I \vartheta_p,$$

a free S_I -module, and our main goal is to define, in certain cases, an algebra structure on R_I by defining structure constants

$$(1.2) \quad \vartheta_{p_1} \cdot \vartheta_{p_2} = \sum_{r \in \Sigma(X)(\mathbb{Z})} \alpha_{p_1 p_2 r} \vartheta_r,$$

with only a finite number of $\alpha_{p_1 p_2 r} \in S_I$ non-zero. In turn, we can write

$$(1.3) \quad \alpha_{p_1 p_2 r} = \sum_{A \in P \setminus I} N_{p_1 p_2 r}^A t^A.$$

Here, in fact we will define $N_{p_1 p_2 r}^A \in \mathbb{Q}$, so that the construction yields schemes defined over \mathbb{Q} .

The notion of *contact order* specified by a tangent vector to a cone of $\Sigma(X)$ is reviewed in §2.2.2. Contact orders are a way of imposing tangency conditions on stable or punctured log curves. For example, in the situation of Example 1.4, if $p \in \text{Div}_D(X)^*$ is tangent to a cone of $\Sigma(X)$, then we interpret p as a possible tangency condition for a punctured stable map $f : (C, x) \rightarrow X$ at x , demanding that f make contact with the divisor D_i at x to order $\langle D_i, p \rangle$.

In Definition 3.21, we will define $N_{p_1 p_2 r}^A$ as a punctured Gromov-Witten invariant, as introduced in [ACGS20]. Roughly put, this is defined as the number of genus zero three-pointed punctured maps with marked points x_1, x_2, x_{out} with contact orders p_1, p_2 and $-r$ respectively with a certain point constraint at x_{out} .

The point with contact order $-r$, being of negative contact order provided $r \neq 0$, is made sense of using the notion of a punctured point in [ACGS20], reviewed in §2.2. We further impose a point constraint at x_{out} . This is done as follows. First, any $r \in \Sigma(X)(\mathbb{Z})$ determines a (locally closed) stratum $Z_r^\circ \subset X$. Indeed, let $\sigma \in \Sigma(X)$ be the smallest cone containing r . Then σ corresponds to a stratum Z_r° , whose closure we denote by Z_r . Second, choose a point $z \in Z_r^\circ$. At a schematic level, we only count punctured maps which map x_{out} to z . However, this constraint is imposed logarithmically, and to explain this properly requires more development. Thus we defer this definition to §3. We summarize the discussion there by stating that we define a moduli space $\mathcal{M}(X, \beta, z)$ associated to the choice of data A, p_1, p_2, r and z whose virtual dimension is $c_1(\Theta_{X/\mathbb{k}}) \cdot A$. We then define

$$N_{p_1 p_2 r}^A = \begin{cases} \deg[\mathcal{M}(X, \beta, z)]^{\text{virt}} & \text{if virt. dim } \mathcal{M}(X, \beta, z) = 0, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

□

The first main theorem of the paper is

Theorem 1.9. *If $c_1(\Theta_{X/\mathbb{k}})$ is nef or anti-nef, the structure constants $N_{p_1 p_2 r}^A$ define, via (1.2), a commutative, associative S_I -algebra structure on R_I with unit given by ϑ_0 .*

The proof of this theorem will be completed in §4–8.

1.2. The log Calabi-Yau case. We continue with the situation of Basic Setups 1.1, 1.3, and 1.6.

Definition 1.10. Suppose the divisor $D \subseteq \underline{X}$ is simple normal crossings. We say that the pair (\underline{X}, D) is *log Calabi-Yau* if $c_1(\Theta_{X/\mathbb{k}}) = K_X + D$ is numerically equivalent to an effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor supported on D . Similarly, if $\dim S = 1$, we say $X \rightarrow S$ is *relative log Calabi-Yau* if $c_1(\Theta_{X/S})$ is numerically equivalent to an effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor supported on D .

In either the relative or absolute cases, after an additional choice, we can define a sub-cone complex $B \subseteq \Sigma(X)$, known as the *Kontsevich-Soibelman skeleton*, as follows. Write $D = D_1 + \cdots + D_s$ with the D_i the irreducible components of D . We fix a choice of $a_i \in \mathbb{Q}$, $1 \leq i \leq s$, with $a_i \geq 0$ for all i and

$$(1.4) \quad c_1(\Theta_{X/S}) \equiv_{\mathbb{Q}} \sum_i a_i D_i.$$

The construction will depend on this choice.

In the absolute case, we call a divisor D_i *good* if $a_i = 0$.

In the relative case, if $D_i \subseteq g^{-1}(0)$, we define the *weight* of D_i to be $w_i := a_i/\mu_i$, where μ_i is the multiplicity of D_i in the divisor $g^*(0)$. We call a divisor D_i *good* if either (1) $g|_{D_i} : D_i \rightarrow S$ is surjective and $a_i = 0$, or (2) $g(D_i) = 0 \in S$, and $w_i = \min\{w_j \mid g(D_j) = 0\}$. Note that if $w = \min\{w_j \mid g(D_j) = 0\}$, then as the divisor $g^{-1}(0) = \sum_i \mu_i D_i$ is numerically equivalent to the zero divisor, we can replace the expression $\sum a_i D_i$ by the numerically equivalent expression $\sum a_i D_i - wg^{-1}(0)$, and then any divisor D_i is good if and only if $a_i = 0$.

There is a one-to-one correspondence between one-dimensional cones of $\Sigma(X)$ and the divisors D_i . Let \mathcal{P} be the collection of cones of $\Sigma(X)$ whose one-dimensional faces correspond to divisors D_i which are good, and set

$$B = \bigcup_{\sigma \in \mathcal{P}} \sigma.$$

This is the Kontsevich-Soibelman skeleton of X , see [KS06] and [NX16].

We remark that in this non-minimal log Calabi-Yau case, we restrict to the simple normal crossings case, rather than allowing more general toroidal crossings (log smooth). This is crucial because some key parts of the argument involve intersection numbers of curves with individual irreducible components of D , and thus we require these components to be Cartier. This only occurs in the normal crossings case. In any event, the normal crossings situation is the natural one from the point of view of the theory of [NX16] and [NXY18].

Remark 1.11. In general, there is very little that can be said about the topology of the topological space $|\Sigma(X)|$. However, in the log Calabi-Yau case, B is expected to be a strong deformation retract of $\Sigma(X)$, see [NX16]. The topological space B is expected to have nicer properties, see e.g., [KX16], where evidence is given for the folklore conjecture that if $\dim_{\mathbb{R}} B = \dim X$, then B is the cone over a finite quotient of a sphere.

We then define $B(\mathbb{Z}) = B \cap \Sigma(X)(\mathbb{Z})$. Using a choice of $P \subseteq H_2(X)$ as in §1.1, we define

$$R_I := \bigoplus_{p \in B(\mathbb{Z})} S_I \vartheta_p.$$

Similarly as before we define

$$(1.5) \quad \vartheta_{p_1} \cdot \vartheta_{p_2} = \sum_{r \in B(\mathbb{Z})} \alpha_{p_1 p_2 r} \vartheta_r,$$

with $\alpha_{p_1 p_2 r}$ defined as in (1.3).

Theorem 1.12. *The structure constants $N_{p_1 p_2 r}^A$ define, via (1.5), a commutative, associative S_I -algebra structure on R_I with unit given by ϑ_0 .*

This will also be proved in §4-8 in parallel with Theorem 1.9.

1.3. Mirrors, examples, basic properties, and auxiliary constructions.

The following result is generally useful for understanding when punctured stable maps might exist, and has many consequences for us. Recall first that any $s \in \Gamma(X, \overline{\mathcal{M}}_X^{\text{gp}})$ yields an \mathcal{O}_X^\times -torsor, under pull-back of s via the quotient map $\mathcal{M}_X^{\text{gp}} \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_X^{\text{gp}}$. We denote this torsor as \mathcal{L}_s^\times , with corresponding line bundle \mathcal{L}_s . Further, for $\eta \in X$ the generic point of a stratum of X , the section s can be evaluated on any element $u \in \text{Hom}(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{X,\eta}, \mathbb{Z})$, the space of integral tangent vectors to the cone $\sigma_\eta \in \Sigma(X)$ corresponding to the stratum. We write this evaluation as $\langle u, s \rangle$. We can now recall the following proposition from [ACGS20], Prop. 2.27:

Proposition 1.13. *Let $X \rightarrow S$ be as in §1.1, and suppose given a punctured map $f : (C, x_1, \dots, x_n) \rightarrow X$ with contact orders given by u_{x_1}, \dots, u_{x_n} , where u_{x_i} is an integral tangent vector to a cone $\sigma_i \in \Sigma(X)$. Then we must have, for any $s \in \Gamma(X, \overline{\mathcal{M}}_X^{\text{gp}})$,*

$$\deg \underline{f}^*(\mathcal{L}_s) = - \sum_{i=1}^n \langle u_{x_i}, s \rangle.$$

In the situation of Example 1.4, we can rephrase the above condition, bearing in mind that any tangent vector to a cone in $\Sigma(X)$ can be viewed as an element of $\text{Div}_D(X)^*$:

Corollary 1.14. *Suppose that $D = D_1 + \dots + D_s$ is simple normal crossings as in Example 1.4. Then in the situation of Proposition 1.13, for any divisor D' supported on D , we have*

$$\deg \underline{f}^* \mathcal{O}_X(D') = \sum_i \langle u_{x_i}, D' \rangle.$$

Proof. This is a restatement of the previous proposition, bearing in mind that in this case $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_X = \bigoplus_{1 \leq i \leq s} \mathbb{N}_{D_i}$, where \mathbb{N}_{D_i} is the constant sheaf on D_i with stalk \mathbb{N} . A section s given by $1 \in \mathbb{N}_{D_i}$ yields the line bundle $\mathcal{O}_X(-D_i)$, and the claim follows. \square

In what follows, write $B = \Sigma(X)$ in the general case of §1.1, and $B \subseteq \Sigma(X)$ the Kontsevich-Soibelman complex in the log Calabi-Yau case. In both cases, we write \mathcal{P} for the cones making up B .

We will prove the following lemma in §3.5.

Lemma 1.15. *If $A = 0$, then $N_{p_1 p_2 r}^A = 1$ if there exists a cone $\sigma \in \mathcal{P}$ containing p_1, p_2 and r with $p_1 + p_2 = r$ inside σ . Otherwise $N_{p_1 p_2 r}^A = 0$.*

Proposition 1.16. *Let $\mathfrak{m} = P \setminus P^\times$ be the maximal monomial ideal; recall by assumption, the invertible elements P^\times of P coincide with the torsion part of $H_2(X)$. Then the $S_{\mathfrak{m}} = \mathbb{k}[P^\times]$ -algebra structure on $R_{\mathfrak{m}}$ is given by*

$$\vartheta_{p_1} \cdot \vartheta_{p_2} = \sum_{\sigma} \vartheta_{r_{\sigma}}$$

where the sum is over all minimal cones σ of \mathcal{P} containing both p_1 and p_2 and r_{σ} is the sum of p_1 and p_2 inside the cone σ .

Proof. Recall from Basic Setup 1.6 that if a curve class $A \in P^\times$ is represented by a stable map, then the stable map must be constant, and in particular $A = 0$. Thus we have the structure constants

$$\alpha_{p_1 p_2 r} = N_{p_1 p_2 r}^0 t^0 = N_{p_1 p_2 r}^0.$$

Thus the result follows immediately from Lemma 1.15. \square

Example 1.17. Continuing with Examples 1.5, in the first case, let $v_i \in B(\mathbb{Z})$ be the primitive generators of the rays ρ_i corresponding to the D_i . Then one immediately obtains

$$R_{\mathfrak{m}} \cong \mathbb{k}[\vartheta_{v_1}, \vartheta_{v_2}, \vartheta_{v_3}] / (\vartheta_{v_1} \vartheta_{v_2} \vartheta_{v_3}).$$

In the second case, let $v_1, v_2 \in B(\mathbb{Z})$ be the primitive generators of the cones ρ_1, ρ_2 and let $v_{\sigma_1}, v_{\sigma_2}$ be the sum $v_1 + v_2$ inside either σ_1 or σ_2 respectively. Then from the above proposition, we have an isomorphism of $S_{\mathfrak{m}} = \mathbb{k}$ -algebras

$$R_{\mathfrak{m}} \cong \mathbb{k}[\vartheta_{v_1}, \vartheta_{v_2}, \vartheta_{v_{\sigma_1}}, \vartheta_{v_{\sigma_2}}] / (\vartheta_{v_1} \vartheta_{v_2} - \vartheta_{v_{\sigma_1}} - \vartheta_{v_{\sigma_2}}, \vartheta_{v_{\sigma_1}} \vartheta_{v_{\sigma_2}}).$$

Note $\text{Spec } R_{\mathfrak{m}}$ is a union of two planes intersecting along the union of coordinate axes on the planes.

Construction 1.18 (Mirrors to log Calabi-Yau manifolds). Morally, in the case that X is log Calabi-Yau (in particular the absolute case), one should view R_I as the ring of regular functions on a thickened neighbourhood of the large complex structure limit of the mirror family to $X \setminus D$. More explicitly, in the case that B is pure-dimensional with $\dim_{\mathbb{R}} B = \dim X$, we define the mirror family to $X \setminus D$ by taking the direct limit of families of schemes $\check{X}_I := \text{Spec } R_I \rightarrow \text{Spec } S_I$, getting a formal flat family of affine schemes

$$\check{\mathfrak{X}} \rightarrow \text{Spf } \widehat{\mathbb{k}[P]},$$

where $\widehat{\mathbb{k}[P]}$ is the completion of $\mathbb{k}[P]$ with respect to the maximal ideal \mathfrak{m} . Note flatness is obvious since R_I is a free, hence flat, S_I -module.

In the case that $\dim X = 2$, we have (X, D) a Looijenga pair, i.e., X is a projective non-singular rational surface and $D \in |-K_X|$ is a cycle of rational curves. In this case, mirrors have already been constructed in [GHK15], and the construction of the present paper agrees with that of [GHK15], as follows from [GS21], Ex. 3.14 and Thm. 6.1. Note that in any event, the definition of the product given here is a logarithmic version of the tropical product rule for theta functions on mirrors to Looijenga pairs described in [GHK15], Thm. 2.34, and generalized to all dimensions in [GHS19], Thm. 3.24. The fact that the logarithmic and tropical definitions of the product agree is [GS21], Thm. 6.1.

Even in dimension three, however, it is worth noting that the mirror family constructed in this way may not be exactly what one anticipates as a mirror. For example, Daniel Pomerleano has found an example for which the general fibre of our mirror family is a singular affine variety. In this example, X is a non-singular hypersurface in $\mathbb{P}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^2$ of bidegree $(1, 1)$, with $D = D_1 + D_2 + D_3$. One takes D_1 , D_2 and D_3 to be the intersections of X with a general hypersurface of bidegrees $(1, 0)$, $(0, 1)$ and $(1, 1)$ respectively. While it may be difficult to determine the precise mirror, one may use Proposition 1.13 to sufficiently constrain the equations of the mirror to guarantee the existence of a curve of singularities.

This raises a philosophical question as to what the correct mirror to (X, D) is. The recent paper [Po21] suggests that the wrapped Fukaya category of $X \setminus D$ is in fact a categorical crepant resolution of the mirror we have constructed here. Thus it may be natural to choose a crepant resolution of the mirror family, if one exists. Conjectures of Bondal and Orlov would then suggest that the derived category of the resolution is independent of the choice, and hence this resolution allows one to study questions of homological mirror symmetry. Alternatively, one may feel that as a crepant resolution does not necessarily exist and in any event is not canonical, it is more natural to keep the mirror family unresolved.

Alternatively, in many cases, one may potentially be able to degenerate the pair (X, D) to obtain a family $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{D}) \rightarrow S$, and apply Construction 1.19 below to obtain a non-singular mirror which is the resolution of the one obtained from (X, D) . This procedure has not been carried out in Pomerleano's example described above, but we expect this to be possible. From another point of view, we may expect that for a log Calabi-Yau pair (X, D) , the boundary has to be "sufficiently degenerate" in order for the mirror to be non-singular, just as a degeneration of Calabi-Yau varieties $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow S$ needs to be sufficiently degenerate (a

“large complex structure limit”) in order to guarantee a well-behaved mirror. It is an interesting question to determine when the mirror is non-singular. Methods applied in [GS11] or [GHK15] are insufficient to answer this question.

Of course, in general one does not necessarily expect the general fibre of the mirror family to be non-singular: already in [Ba94], [BB96], mirrors to Calabi-Yau manifolds of dimension ≥ 4 may be singular with no possible crepant resolution. However, these mirrors may still be viewed as non-singular orbifolds, and a natural categorical crepant resolution would then be the derived category of the non-singular orbifold.

Construction 1.19 (Mirrors to degenerations of log Calabi-Yau manifolds). In the relative log Calabi-Yau case, instead R_I can be viewed as the homogeneous coordinate ring of a family of mirrors to the degeneration $X \rightarrow S$. Explicitly, in this case we note that R_I carries a natural grading, defined as follows. Let $\rho \in \Gamma(X, \overline{\mathcal{M}}_X)$ be the pull-back of $1 \in \Gamma(S, \overline{\mathcal{M}}_S) \cong \mathbb{N}$, so that $\mathcal{L}_\rho \cong \mathcal{O}_X(-g^*(0))$. We can define the *degree function* on B by $\deg p = \langle p, \rho \rangle$ for $p \in B$. For $p \in B(\mathbb{Z})$, we can then set $\deg \vartheta_p = \deg(p)$. Noting that the divisor $g^*(0)$ is numerically equivalent to the divisor 0 on X , by Proposition 1.13 it follows that if $N_{p_1 p_2 r}^A \neq 0$, we must have

$$\deg \vartheta_r = \deg \vartheta_{p_1} + \deg \vartheta_{p_2}.$$

Hence the ring structure is graded, and we can define a mirror formal family as the direct limit of families of schemes $\check{X}_I = \text{Proj } R_I \rightarrow \text{Spec } S_I$ to get a flat family of formal schemes

$$\check{\mathfrak{X}} \rightarrow \text{Spf } \widehat{\mathbb{k}[P]}$$

as before. Of course $\text{Proj } R_I$ is projective over $\text{Spec } R_I^0$, where R_I^0 is the degree 0 part of R_I . It is easy to check that R_I^0 is precisely the ring obtained by applying our construction to a general fibre of g .

In the case that $g : X \rightarrow S$ is in fact a degeneration of Calabi-Yau manifolds, so that $D = g^{-1}(0)$ set-theoretically, we can in fact do better. We can define the ring

$$\widehat{R} = \bigoplus_{p \in B(\mathbb{Z})} \widehat{\mathbb{k}[P]} \vartheta_p,$$

and define the multiplication rule formally using (1.2) and (1.3). However, now (1.2) will always be a finite sum. Indeed, if p is a primitive generator of a ray of \mathcal{P} , corresponding to a divisor $D_p \subseteq g^{-1}(0)$, $\deg(p)$ is simply the coefficient of D_p in $g^*(0)$, and \deg is linear on each cone of \mathcal{P} . Thus one sees that $\deg^{-1}(d)$ is a compact subspace of B , and $B(\mathbb{Z}) \cap \deg^{-1}(d)$ is thus a finite set. Thus, since the product rule respects the grading, (1.2) only involves a finite number

of r . Further, from (1.3), we can view the $\alpha_{p_1 p_2 r} \in \widehat{\mathbb{k}[P]}$. Thus \widehat{R} carries a $\widehat{\mathbb{k}[P]}$ -algebra structure which is necessarily associative, as it is associative modulo each I by Theorem 1.12. We then define the mirror family, in the case that $\dim_{\mathbb{R}} B = \dim X$, to be the flat family

$$\check{\mathcal{X}} = \text{Proj } \widehat{R} \rightarrow \text{Spec } \widehat{\mathbb{k}[P]}.$$

Alternatively, one can apply Grothendieck existence to the formal family $\check{\mathcal{X}} \rightarrow \text{Spf } \widehat{\mathbb{k}[P]}$, but the above construction is more explicit.

Construction 1.20 (The Rees construction). This construction is motivated by [GHKK18], §8.5, and gives a cheap way of compactifying mirrors in the log Calabi-Yau case. Suppose in the log Calabi-Yau case that D supports a nef divisor D' . Then $\mathcal{O}_X(-D') = \mathcal{L}_s$ for some $s \in \Gamma(X, \overline{\mathcal{M}}_X^{\text{gp}})$. It then follows from Proposition 1.13 that if $N_{p_1 p_2 r}^A \neq 0$, we have

$$0 \leq A \cdot D' = \langle p_1, s \rangle + \langle p_2, s \rangle - \langle r, s \rangle,$$

and thus

$$\langle p_1, s \rangle + \langle p_2, s \rangle \geq \langle r, s \rangle.$$

This gives rise to a filtered ring structure on R_I , and we can then take the corresponding graded Rees algebra. Explicitly, we consider

$$\widetilde{R}_I = \bigoplus_{d \geq 0} \bigoplus_{\substack{p \in B(\mathbb{Z}) \\ \langle p, s \rangle \leq d}} u^d S_I \vartheta_p \subseteq R_I[u].$$

The above inequality shows that \widetilde{R}_I is a graded subring of $R_I[u]$, with grading given by the power of u . Thus we similarly obtain a family $\check{X}'_I := \text{Proj } \widetilde{R}_I \rightarrow \text{Spec } S_I$, and a corresponding formal family

$$\check{\mathcal{X}}' \rightarrow \text{Spf } \widehat{\mathbb{k}[P]}.$$

If further, the set of $p \in B(\mathbb{Z})$ with $\langle p, s \rangle \leq d$ is always finite, then a similar argument as in Construction 1.19 constructs a projective family

$$\check{\mathcal{X}}' \rightarrow \text{Spec } \widehat{\mathbb{k}[P]}.$$

Note that \check{X}'_I and $\check{\mathcal{X}}'$ contain \check{X}_I and $\check{\mathcal{X}}$ respectively as open subschemes, as can be seen by the fact that R_I is the degree 0 part of the localization of R'_I at u . Note these open subschemes are dense as u is a non-zero-divisor.

Example 1.21. Returning to Example 1.5, let us now compute the rings R_I for all ideals I . We consider the first example. From the form of R_m given in Example 1.17, it is sufficient to deform the equation $\vartheta_{v_1} \vartheta_{v_2} \vartheta_{v_3} = 0$ by computing

this triple product. We first calculate $\vartheta_{v_1}\vartheta_{v_2}$ by enumerating possible A and r for which $N_{v_1v_2r}^A$ may be non-zero. We can write a curve class $A = a_1(L-E) + a_2E$ and take $r = \sum b_i v_i$, where at least one of the b_i is zero. Note we must have all a_i, b_i non-negative. If $N_{p_1p_2r}^A \neq 0$, then by Corollary 1.14, applied with $\mathcal{L}_s = \mathcal{O}_X(-D_i)$, $1 \leq i \leq 3$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} a_2 &= A \cdot D_1 = \langle v_1, D_1 \rangle + \langle v_2, D_1 \rangle - \langle r, D_1 \rangle = 1 - b_1 \\ a_1 &= A \cdot D_2 = \langle v_1, D_2 \rangle + \langle v_2, D_2 \rangle - \langle r, D_2 \rangle = 1 - b_2 \\ a_1 &= A \cdot D_3 = \langle v_1, D_3 \rangle + \langle v_2, D_3 \rangle - \langle r, D_3 \rangle = -b_3 \end{aligned}$$

By the third equation we necessarily have $a_1 = b_3 = 0$, and hence by the second equation $b_2 = 1$. From the first equation we then have the options $b_1 = 0, a_2 = 1$ or $b_1 = 1, a_2 = 0$. In the latter case, we have a constant map, so by Lemma 1.15 the contribution is monomial, namely the term $\vartheta_{v_1+v_2}$. In the former case, $A = E$. However, any stable map with image E is disjoint from D_2 , and thus there is no such curve. Thus we see $\vartheta_{v_1}\vartheta_{v_2} = \vartheta_{v_1+v_2}$.

We next calculate $\vartheta_{v_1+v_2}\vartheta_{v_3}$. Again, with A and r represented as above, we now must have

$$\begin{aligned} a_2 &= A \cdot D_1 = \langle v_1 + v_2, D_1 \rangle + \langle v_3, D_1 \rangle - \langle r, D_1 \rangle = 1 - b_1 \\ a_1 &= A \cdot D_2 = \langle v_1 + v_2, D_2 \rangle + \langle v_3, D_2 \rangle - \langle r, D_2 \rangle = 1 - b_2 \\ a_1 &= A \cdot D_3 = \langle v_1 + v_2, D_3 \rangle + \langle v_3, D_3 \rangle - \langle r, D_3 \rangle = 1 - b_3 \end{aligned}$$

Thus we have potentially four possibilities $a_1 = 0, 1$ and $a_2 = 0, 1$, with the b_i being determined by the above equations, noting that necessarily $b_i = 0$ or 1 . However, if $a_1 = a_2 = 0$, we obtain $b_1 = b_2 = b_3 = 1$, which is not allowed. So we have possibilities for A being $E, L - E$ or L . We immediately rule out the case that $A = E$ as before. If $A = L - E$, then $r = v_1$. In this case, one picks a point $z \in D_1^\circ$. One can then check that the stable map $\mathbb{P}^1 \rightarrow \underline{X}$ identifying \mathbb{P}^1 with D_1 can be given in a unique way the structure of a punctured map with the desired tangency conditions realizing the constraint z , and that this punctured map is unobstructed. Thus $N_{v_1+v_2, v_3, v_1}^{[L-E]} = 1$. On the other hand, if $A = L$, then $r = 0$ and after fixing $z \in X \setminus D$, there is a unique line passing through z and $D_1 \cap D_2$, and similarly $N_{v_1+v_2, v_3, 0}^{[L]} = 1$. Thus we obtain

$$\vartheta_{v_1+v_2}\vartheta_{v_3} = t^{[L]}\vartheta_0 + t^{[L-E]}\vartheta_{v_1}.$$

Putting this together, and using that ϑ_0 is the unit element, we see that

$$(1.6) \quad R_I \cong S_I[\vartheta_{v_1}, \vartheta_{v_2}, \vartheta_{v_3}] / (\vartheta_{v_1}\vartheta_{v_2}\vartheta_{v_3} - t^{[L]} - t^{[L-E]}\vartheta_{v_1}).$$

Note this does not tell us what all products of theta functions are. In this case, it is possible to show the following. First, if p_1, p_2 both lie in the same one of the four cones $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}v_1 + \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}v_2$, $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}v_1 + \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}v_3$, $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}v_2 + \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}(v_2 + v_3)$ or $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}v_3 + \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}(v_2 + v_3)$, the multiplication is purely monomial², i.e.,

$$(1.7) \quad \vartheta_{p_1} \cdot \vartheta_{p_2} = \vartheta_{p_1+p_2}.$$

Second, one can also calculate as above that

$$(1.8) \quad \vartheta_{v_2}\vartheta_{v_3} = \vartheta_{v_2+v_3} + t^{[L-E]}.$$

The first term comes from the constant map and the second arises as there is a unique curve in the pencil $|L - E|$ passing through a given point $z \in X \setminus D$. From all products described so far, all remaining products can be calculated.

Turning to (2) of Examples 1.5, from the description of R_m in Example 1.17, it is enough to calculate the products $\vartheta_{v_1} \cdot \vartheta_{v_2}$ and $\vartheta_{v_{\sigma_1}} \cdot \vartheta_{v_{\sigma_2}}$ in all generality. This is quite easily done: using Corollary 1.14, we reduce the calculation to the calculation of two of the $N_{p_1 p_2 r}^A$. First consider the product $\vartheta_{v_1} \cdot \vartheta_{v_2}$. Take $r = a_1 v_1 + a_2 v_2$, with the sum calculated in one of σ_1, σ_2 . Then it follows from Corollary 1.14 that if $N_{v_1 v_2 r}^A \neq 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} A \cdot D_1 &= \langle v_1, D_1 \rangle + \langle v_2, D_1 \rangle - \langle r, D_1 \rangle = 1 - a_1 \\ A \cdot D_2 &= \langle v_1, D_2 \rangle + \langle v_2, D_2 \rangle - \langle r, D_2 \rangle = 1 - a_2 \end{aligned}$$

But since D_2 is a conic, $A \cdot D_2$ is always even, and hence there is no choice but for $a_2 = 1$, $A = 0$, and we are reduced to the constant map case already considered in Example 1.17. Thus $\vartheta_{v_1} \cdot \vartheta_{v_2} = \vartheta_{v_{\sigma_1}} + \vartheta_{v_{\sigma_2}}$ for any ideal I .

On the other hand, suppose $N_{v_{\sigma_1} v_{\sigma_2} r}^A \neq 0$, with r described as above. Then similarly we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} A \cdot D_1 &= \langle v_{\sigma_1}, D_1 \rangle + \langle v_{\sigma_2}, D_1 \rangle - \langle r, D_1 \rangle = 1 + 1 - a_1 \\ A \cdot D_2 &= \langle v_{\sigma_1}, D_2 \rangle + \langle v_{\sigma_2}, D_2 \rangle - \langle r, D_2 \rangle = 1 + 1 - a_2 \end{aligned}$$

²This claim is in fact quite non-trivial, as there may be many potential curve classes which are represented by actual punctured maps with the desired tangency conditions. However, all the non-constant maps which may contribute are in fact obstructed and contribute Gromov-Witten invariant 0. To actually show this claim, it is easiest to use the canonical scattering diagram approach to theta functions of [GHK15], in which the claim becomes straightforward. Indeed, [GS21], Ex. 3.14 and Thm. 6.1 show the construction of [GHK15] and the construction of this paper coincide. [GS21], Thm. 6.1 further shows that the canonical scattering diagram formalism constructs the same mirror as this paper in all dimensions.

and now we have the possibilities that $a_2 = 2$, in which case $A = 0$ and we are again in the situation analyzed in Example 1.17, or $a_2 = 0$, in which case A is the class of a line and $a_1 = 1$, so that $r = v_1$. Fixing any point $z \in Z_{v_1}^\circ = D_1 \setminus D_2$, it is easy to see there is exactly one punctured map $f : (C, x_1, x_2, x_{\text{out}}) \rightarrow X$ in $\mathcal{M}(X, \beta, z)$. Here $C \cong \mathbb{P}^1$ and f induces an isomorphism between \underline{C} and D_1 , taking x_i to the point of $D_1 \cap D_2$ corresponding to σ_i and x_{out} to z . Thus $N_{v_{\sigma_1} v_{\sigma_2} v_1}^A = 1$ is the only non-trivial contribution to the structure constants, and we obtain, with $I = (t^k) \subseteq \mathbb{k}[P] = \mathbb{k}[t]$,

$$R_I \cong (\mathbb{k}[t]/(t^k))[\vartheta_{v_1}, \vartheta_{v_2}, \vartheta_{v_{\sigma_1}}, \vartheta_{v_{\sigma_2}}]/(\vartheta_{v_1}\vartheta_{v_2} - \vartheta_{v_{\sigma_1}} - \vartheta_{v_{\sigma_2}}, \vartheta_{v_{\sigma_1}}\vartheta_{v_{\sigma_2}} - t\vartheta_{v_1}).$$

This result agrees with the one given by the procedure of [GHK15].

Note that in neither of these two cases do we need to work over the Artinian ring R_I or the formal setting as the product rule is actually polynomial.

Remark 1.22. The above example is a special case of a phenomenon observed for surfaces already in [GHK15], and which generalises as follows. Suppose that there is an *ample* divisor D' supported on D with $D' = \sum_i a_i D_i$ with all $a_i > 0$. (Here we are assuming D is normal crossings). Then the multiplication rule is polynomial, and hence defines a $\mathbb{k}[P]$ -algebra structure on

$$R = \bigoplus_{p \in B(\mathbb{Z})} \mathbb{k}[P]\vartheta_p.$$

Indeed, let $s \in \Gamma(X, \overline{\mathcal{M}}_X^{\text{gp}})$ be defined by taking the value a_i on the summand \mathbb{Z}_{D_i} of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_X^{\text{gp}}$, so that $\mathcal{L}_s \cong \mathcal{O}_X(-D')$. Then s defines a function $s : B \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by $s(p) = \langle s, p \rangle$ for $p \in B$. As s is positive on the generator of each ray of \mathcal{P} , necessarily $s^{-1}([0, d])$ is compact. Hence $B(\mathbb{Z}) \cap s^{-1}([0, d])$ is always finite, from which it follows as in Construction 1.20 that for any p_1, p_2 the sum on the right-hand side of (1.2) is finite. Further, each $\alpha_{p_1 p_2 r}$ is necessarily a finite sum. Indeed, by Proposition 1.13, $A \cdot D'$ is determined by p_1, p_2 and r , and because D' is ample, by the fact the Hilbert scheme is finite type, there are only a finite number of effective curve classes A with the given value of $A \cdot D'$. Thus $\alpha_{p_1 p_2 r} \in \mathbb{k}[P]$, and thus (1.3) defines a ring structure on R , necessarily associative.

Example 1.23. Here is a simple example of how in the log Calabi-Yau case, the ring we construct depends on the representative of the numerical equivalence class taken for $c_1(\Theta_{X/\mathbb{k}})$. Let $X = \mathbb{P}^1$, $D = D_1 + D_2 + D_3$ where the D_i 's are distinct points. In this case $c_1(\Theta_{X/\mathbb{k}})$ is nef, so we may apply our construction to get a ring. Here $\Sigma(X)$ consists of a union of three half-lines with a common origin. As the only curve class A with $A \cdot c_1(\Theta_{X/\mathbb{k}}) = 0$ is $A = 0$, in fact the only

contributions to the product are from constant maps, in which case Lemma 1.15 applies. With $S_I = \mathbb{k}[t]/(t^k)$ for some k , we thus immediately see that

$$R_I = S_I[\vartheta_1, \vartheta_2, \vartheta_3]/(\vartheta_1\vartheta_2, \vartheta_1\vartheta_3, \vartheta_2\vartheta_3),$$

and $\text{Spec } R_I$ is a union of three affine lines over $\text{Spec } S_I$.

On the other hand, if we write $c_1(\Theta_{X/\mathbb{k}}) \equiv_{\mathbb{Q}} D_3$ and pass to the Kontsevich-Soibelman skeleton, we have B a union of two half-lines with a common origin. Hence we throw out the theta function ϑ_3 , and obtain

$$R_I = S_I[\vartheta_1, \vartheta_2]/(\vartheta_1\vartheta_2).$$

Thus $\text{Spec } R_I$ is a union of two affine lines over $\text{Spec } S_I$.

Both of these can be viewed as mirrors to (\mathbb{P}^1, D) , in a certain sense. [AAEKO13] suggested as mirror to (\mathbb{P}^1, D) a Landau-Ginzburg model $W : \mathbb{A}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{A}^1$ given by $W = x_1x_2x_3$. The critical locus of this potential function is the union of three affine lines, and it is expected that this critical locus can also be viewed as a mirror, see [GKR17], as well as [Ru17].

For the choice of mirror which is a union of two affine lines, the partially wrapped Fukaya category on the thrice punctured sphere is isomorphic to a quotient of the derived category of $\text{Spec } \mathbb{k}[x_1, x_2]/(x_1x_2)$, see [LP18], §1.

From both points of view, we are not actually constructing the mirror, but rather a scheme related to the mirror.

As also explained to us by Y. Lekili, a choice of nowhere vanishing top dimension holomorphic form on $X \setminus D$ induces a grading on symplectic cohomology. For us, this choice is encoded in the representative for $c_1(\Theta_{X/\mathbb{k}})$. Without this choice, we obtain a piece of a non-graded symplectic cohomology ring, but with the choice, we select out the degree zero part of the ring.

Construction 1.24 (The torus action). Suppose we are in the situation of Example 1.4. Then there is a natural torus action on $\text{Spec } R_I$ which has proved to be very useful, see e.g., [GHK15], §5 or [GHS19], §4.4. Recall that $\text{Div}_D(X)$ is the free abelian group generated by the irreducible components of D . One can easily describe an action of the algebraic torus $\text{Spec } \mathbb{k}[\text{Div}_D(X)]$ on $\text{Spec } R_I$, as follows. Equivalently, it is sufficient to give a $\text{Div}_D(X)$ -grading on R_I . We do this by defining the D_i -component of the degree of ϑ_p to be $\langle p, D_i \rangle$, and define the D_i -component of the degree of $t^A \in \mathbb{k}[P]$ to be $D_i \cdot A$. That our product rule on R_I then respects the grading follows again from Corollary 1.14. Indeed, if the coefficient of $t^A\vartheta_r$ is non-zero in the product $\vartheta_p \cdot \vartheta_q$, we have by that corollary

that

$$\langle r, D_i \rangle + D_i \cdot A = \langle p, D_i \rangle + \langle q, D_i \rangle,$$

showing degrees are additive.

The same holds in the log Calabi-Yau case.

2. PRELIMINARIES AND REVIEW

2.1. Generalities on log geometry. We assume the reader is familiar with logarithmic geometry as is necessary to understand logarithmic Gromov-Witten invariants. However there are several more specific points we will be needing, and we review these quickly and give references. All log structures are fine and saturated (fs), except as explicitly mentioned, such as in the case of punctured log structures, which are only fine.

2.1.1. Tropicalization. We assume the reader is familiar with the notation of [ACGS17], §2, and in particular use freely the notion of generalized cone complexes (§2.1.2) and tropicalization of logarithmic stacks (§2.1.4). We write Σ for the tropicalization functor from the category of fine or fs log algebraic stacks to the category of generalized cone complexes. Recall **Cones** is the category whose objects are pairs (σ, N) where N is a lattice and $\sigma \subseteq N_{\mathbb{R}}$ is a rational polyhedral cone with $\sigma^{\text{gp}} = N_{\mathbb{R}}$, and morphisms are maps of cones induced by linear maps of the lattices. A generalized cone complex is a diagram in **Cones**, all of whose morphisms are face morphisms. The cones of the tropicalization of a log stack X are indexed by geometric points $\bar{x} \in |X|$ with the associated cone being

$$\sigma_{\bar{x}} := \text{Hom}(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{X, \bar{x}}, \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}),$$

and lattice

$$N_{\sigma_{\bar{x}}} := \text{Hom}(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{X, \bar{x}}, \mathbb{Z}).$$

The face maps of cones in $\Sigma(X)$ are induced by generization maps. See [ACGS17], §2.1.4 for details.

2.1.2. Artin fans. Given a log scheme X , we have its associated *Artin fan* \mathcal{X} , as constructed in [ACMW17], Prop. 3.1.1, (where it is denoted \mathcal{A}_X) see [ACGS17], §2.2 for a summary. There is a factorization

$$X \rightarrow \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}og_{\mathbb{k}}$$

of the tautological morphism $X \rightarrow \mathcal{L}og_{\mathbb{k}}$, where $\mathcal{L}og_{\mathbb{k}}$ is Olsson's stack parameterizing all fine saturated log schemes over $\text{Spec } \mathbb{k}$. As Olsson uses this notation for the stack of all fine log schemes over \mathbb{k} , in fact our usage agrees with Olsson's

stack $\mathcal{T}or_{\mathbb{k}}$ of [Ol03]. The morphism $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}og_{\mathbb{k}}$ is étale and representable by algebraic spaces, and is the initial such factorization. In particular, $X \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ is strict, and one should view \mathcal{X} as capturing the combinatorics of the log structure on X .

2.1.3. *Idealized log structures.* We recall the notion of *idealized log schemes* from [Og18], III,Def. 1.3.1. An idealized log scheme is a log scheme equipped with a sheaf of monoid ideals $\mathcal{K}_X \subseteq \mathcal{M}_X$ with the property that $\alpha_X(\mathcal{K}_X) = 0$. This then gives a category of idealized log schemes, with a morphism $f : X \rightarrow Y$ satisfying $f^{\flat}(\mathcal{K}_Y) \subseteq \mathcal{K}_X$.

Further, given a morphism $f : X \rightarrow Y$ of ordinary log schemes, and given an idealized structure $\mathcal{K}_Y \subseteq \mathcal{M}_Y$, we obtain an idealized structure on X , denoted by $f^{\bullet}\mathcal{K}_Y$, to be the sheaf of monoid ideals generated by $f^{\flat}(\mathcal{K}_Y)$.

The trivial idealized structure on X is given by $\mathcal{K}_X = \emptyset$, the empty ideal.

A standard example of an idealized log scheme is $A_{P,K} := \text{Spec } \mathbb{k}[P]/K$, where P is a fine saturated monoid and $K \subseteq P$ is a monoid ideal of P . Then $\mathcal{M}_{A_{P,K}}$ is the standard toric log structure induced by the pre-log structure $P \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{A_{P,K}}$, and \mathcal{K} is the ideal generated by K under the image of the canonical morphism $P \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{A_{P,K}}$.

Here we only consider *coherent* idealized log structures in fine or fs log schemes. This means that locally on X , the ideal \mathcal{K}_X is generated by its sections: see [Og18], II,Prop. 2.6.1.

2.1.4. *Fine saturated fibre products.* Fibre products in the category of fine or fs log schemes or stacks cause a great deal of difficulties. Given (fine, fs) log schemes X, Y, S with morphisms $X \rightarrow S, Y \rightarrow S$, we distinguish between $X \times_S Y$, $X \times_S^{\text{fine}} Y$ and $X \times_S^{\text{fs}} Y$ as the fibre products in the category of log schemes, fine log schemes and fs log schemes. In general, $\underline{X \times_S Y} = \underline{X} \times_{\underline{S}} \underline{Y}$, while the same does not hold for the other fibre products. However, there is an obvious functorial morphism $X \times_S^{\text{fine}} Y \rightarrow X \times_S Y$ if X, Y and S are fine, and this morphism is given by *integralization* of the log structure. This morphism is always a closed embedding. There is also an obvious functorial morphism $X \times_S^{\text{fs}} Y \rightarrow X \times_S^{\text{fine}} Y$ if X, Y and S are fs, and this morphism is given by *saturation*, which is always finite and surjective. See [Og18], III,Prop. 2.1.5.

If one of the morphisms $X \rightarrow S$ or $Y \rightarrow S$ is strict, then all three fibre products agree, and being strict is stable under base-change.

Remark 2.1. In the case that X, Y and S are stacks with fine or fs log structures, the construction of integralization and saturation in [Og18], III,Prop. 2.1.5, in

particular implies that $\underline{X} \times_S^{\text{fine}} \underline{Y} \rightarrow \underline{X} \times_S \underline{Y}$ or $\underline{X} \times_S^{\text{fs}} \underline{Y} \rightarrow \underline{X} \times_S \underline{Y}$ are finite and representable morphisms.

To understand the behaviour of fibre products at a tropical level, we recall [ACGS17], Prop. 5.2:

Proposition 2.2. *Let X, Y and S be fs log schemes, with morphisms $f_1 : X \rightarrow S$, $f_2 : Y \rightarrow S$. Let $Z = X \times_S^{\text{fs}} Y$, p_1, p_2 the projections. Suppose given geometric points $\bar{z} \in Z$, $\bar{x} = p_1(\bar{z})$, $\bar{y} = p_2(\bar{z})$, and $\bar{s} = f_1(p_1(\bar{z})) = f_2(p_2(\bar{z}))$. Then*

$$\text{Hom}(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{Z, \bar{z}}, \mathbb{N}) = \text{Hom}(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{X, \bar{x}}, \mathbb{N}) \times_{\text{Hom}(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{S, \bar{s}}, \mathbb{N})} \text{Hom}(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{Y, \bar{y}}, \mathbb{N})$$

and

$$\sigma_{\bar{z}} = \sigma_{\bar{x}} \times_{\sigma_{\bar{s}}} \sigma_{\bar{y}}.$$

2.1.5. *Transversality and flatness.* The goal in this subsection is to give an approach for working around a fundamental problem in log geometry: log smooth or log étale morphisms need not be flat. Indeed, they are only guaranteed to be flat if they are also integral morphisms. For the definition of integral morphism, see [Og18], III, Def. 2.5.1. More generally, log flat morphisms, defined in [Og18], IV, Def. 4.1.1, are flat if integral:

Proposition 2.3. *Let $f : X \rightarrow Y$ be a morphism of fs log schemes. Then*

- (1) *If f is log smooth, then f is log flat.*
- (2) *If X and Y are locally Noetherian fine log schemes and f is locally of finite presentation, then if f is log flat and integral, f is flat.*

Proof. (1) and (2) are [Og18], IV, Thms. 4.1.2, 1, and 4.3.5, 1 respectively. \square

Integrality of morphisms can often be tested combinatorially:

Proposition 2.4. *Let $\theta : \mathbb{N}^r = P \rightarrow Q$ be a morphism between saturated toric monoids, dual to a morphism of cones*

$$\theta^t : \sigma_Q = \text{Hom}(Q, \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}) \rightarrow \sigma_P = \text{Hom}(\mathbb{N}^r, \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}).$$

Then θ is integral if and only if the restriction of θ^t to every face of σ_Q surjects onto a face of σ_P .

Proof. By [Og18], I, Prop. 4.7.5, θ being integral is equivalent to θ being \mathbb{Q} -integral. This is where the assumption that $P = \mathbb{N}^r$ is used. The \mathbb{Q} -integrality in turn is equivalent to θ being locally exact by [Og18], I, Prop. 4.7.7, which means that for each face $G \subset Q$, the induced morphism of localized monoids $P_{\theta^{-1}(G)} \rightarrow Q_G$ is exact. By [Og18], I, Prop. 4.3.7,1, this exactness is equivalent to

surjectivity of the map of cones $\mathrm{Hom}(Q_G, \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}) \rightarrow \mathrm{Hom}(P_{\theta^{-1}(G)}, \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0})$. However, these cones can be described as faces of σ_Q and σ_P respectively, namely $G^\perp \cap \sigma_Q$ and $(\theta^{-1}(G))^\perp \cap \sigma_P$. Note that the latter face is the smallest face of σ_P containing $\theta^t(G^\perp \cap \sigma_Q)$. Hence the hypothesis on θ^t is equivalent to the desired exactness, completing the proof. \square

Remark 2.5. Alternatively, one can prove the above proposition by observing that the combinatorial condition on θ^t implies that all fibres of the induced morphism of toric varieties $\mathrm{Spec} \mathbb{k}[Q] \rightarrow \mathrm{Spec} \mathbb{k}[P]$ are equi-dimensional of dimension $\mathrm{rk} Q^{\mathrm{gp}} - \mathrm{rk} P^{\mathrm{gp}}$. Thus by “miracle flatness,” [Ma89], Thm. 23.1, this induced morphism is flat, which is equivalent to θ being integral. Since miracle flatness requires a non-singular target space, this gives another explanation for why we must take P to be the free monoid.

Definition 2.6. Let $f : X \rightarrow Y$ be a morphism between fs log stacks. We say a morphism $g : W \rightarrow Y$ is *transverse to f* if the first projection $W \times_Y^{\mathrm{fs}} X \rightarrow W$ is an integral morphism.

The idea is that if f is log smooth, \underline{f} may not be flat, but it may become flat after a judicious choice of base change by some g . In certain cases, there is a simple combinatorial test for transversality, which is a consequence of the following lemma.

Lemma 2.7. *Suppose given rational polyhedral cones σ_1, σ_2, τ with linear maps $f_i : \sigma_i \rightarrow \tau$, and consider the cone $\sigma := \sigma_1 \times_\tau \sigma_2$ with projections $p_i : \sigma \rightarrow \sigma_i$. Suppose that for each face F_2 of σ_2 , $f_1^{-1}(f_2(F_2))$ is a face of σ_1 . Then p_1 gives a surjection of each face of σ onto a face of σ_1 .*

Proof. Note that $\sigma_1 \times_\tau \sigma_2$ is the intersection of $\sigma_1 \times \sigma_2 \subset \sigma_1^{\mathrm{gp}} \times \sigma_2^{\mathrm{gp}}$ with the linear space $\ker f$, where $f : \sigma_1^{\mathrm{gp}} \times \sigma_2^{\mathrm{gp}} \rightarrow \tau^{\mathrm{gp}}$ is given by $f(a, b) = f_1(a) - f_2(b)$, confusing f_i with its linear extension. Thus, as each face of $\sigma_1 \times \sigma_2$ is of the form $F_1 \times F_2$ for F_i a face of σ_i , each face of σ is of the form $F_1 \times_\tau F_2$. We show that p_1 maps this face surjectively onto the face $F := f_1^{-1}(f_2(F_2)) \cap F_1$ of σ_1 .

Indeed, if $(a_1, a_2) \in F_1 \times_\tau F_2$, then $f_1(a_1) = f_2(a_2)$ so $a_1 \in f_1^{-1}(f_2(a_2)) \cap F_1 \subseteq F$. Thus $p_1(a_1, a_2) \in F$ and p_1 maps $F_1 \times_\tau F_2$ into F . Further, given $a_1 \in F$, there exists an $a_2 \in F_2$ such that $f_1(a_1) = f_2(a_2)$. Then $(a_1, a_2) \in F_1 \times_\tau F_2$, showing p_1 maps this face surjectively onto F . \square

Definition 2.8. An fs log stack W is *free* if all stalks of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_W$ are free monoids, i.e., isomorphic to \mathbb{N}^r for some r .

The crucial observation for us is:

Theorem 2.9. *Let $f : X \rightarrow Y$, $g : W \rightarrow Y$ be log morphisms between fs log stacks. Suppose further that W is free. Then g is transverse to f if for any geometric points $\bar{x} \in X$, $\bar{y} \in Y$ and $\bar{w} \in W$ with $f(\bar{x}) = \bar{y} = g(\bar{w})$, and for any face F of $\sigma_{\bar{x}}$, we have that $\Sigma(g)^{-1}(\Sigma(f)(F)) \subset \sigma_{\bar{w}}$ is a face of $\sigma_{\bar{w}}$.*

Proof. If \bar{z} is a geometric point of $W \times_Y^{\text{fs}} X$ with images \bar{w} and \bar{x} under the two projections, then $\sigma_{\bar{z}} = \sigma_{\bar{w}} \times_{\sigma_{\bar{y}}} \sigma_{\bar{x}}$ by Proposition 2.2. Integrality of the projection $W \times_Y^{\text{fs}} X \rightarrow W$ now follows from Proposition 2.4 and Lemma 2.7. \square

2.2. Stable punctured maps. Punctured log maps, developed in [ACGS20], are a crucial generalization of stable log maps of [GS13], [AC14], [Ch14]. The main point is they allow marked points with negative contact order.

We will review the most salient points.

2.2.1. Punctures and punctured maps. The general definition of a puncturing is given in [ACGS20], Def. 2.1. For the purposes of this paper, we only consider the situation of an fs log scheme (or stack) $Y = (\underline{Y}, \mathcal{M}_Y)$ where $\mathcal{M}_Y = \mathcal{M} \oplus_{\mathcal{O}_Y^\times} \mathcal{P}$ for some log structures \mathcal{M} and \mathcal{P} on Y . We further assume that \mathcal{P} is a DF(1) log structure, i.e., there is a surjective homomorphism $\underline{\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{P}}$ from the constant sheaf $\underline{\mathbb{N}}$ with stalk \mathbb{N} . Then a *puncturing* Y° of Y is a fine logarithmic structure

$$\mathcal{M}_{Y^\circ} \subset \mathcal{M} \oplus_{\mathcal{O}_Y^\times} \mathcal{P}^{\text{gp}}$$

containing \mathcal{M}_Y such that

- (1) The inclusion $\mathcal{M}_Y \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{Y^\circ}$ is a morphism of fine logarithmic structures on \underline{Y} .
- (2) For any geometric point \bar{y} of \underline{Y} let $s_{\bar{y}} \in \mathcal{M}_{Y^\circ, \bar{y}}$ be such that $s_{\bar{y}} \notin \mathcal{M}_{\bar{y}} \oplus_{\mathcal{O}_{\bar{y}}^\times} \mathcal{P}_{\bar{y}}$. Representing $s_{\bar{y}} = (m_{\bar{y}}, p_{\bar{y}}) \in \mathcal{M}_{\bar{y}} \oplus_{\mathcal{O}_{\bar{y}}^\times} \mathcal{P}_{\bar{y}}^{\text{gp}}$, we have $\alpha_{\mathcal{M}_{Y^\circ}}(s_{\bar{y}}) = \alpha_{\mathcal{M}}(m_{\bar{y}}) = 0$ in $\mathcal{O}_{Y, \bar{y}}$.

Note that we do not require the punctured log structure to be saturated, but only fine.

Puncturings suffer the problem that there may be many different choices of the puncturing log structure \mathcal{M}_{Y° . However, this non-uniqueness can be removed in the presence of a morphism $f : Y^\circ \rightarrow X$, by demanding that \mathcal{M}_{Y° be as small as possible. Formally:

Definition 2.10. A morphism $f : Y^\circ \rightarrow X$ from a punctured log scheme Y° is *pre-stable* if \mathcal{M}_{Y° is generated as a sheaf of fine monoids by \mathcal{M}_Y and the image of $f^* \mathcal{M}_X$ under f^\flat .

The only cases that we need to consider in this paper is when we are given a log smooth family of curves $\pi : C \rightarrow W$ with marked points $x_1, \dots, x_n : \underline{W} \rightarrow \underline{C}$. We use the convention as in [ACGS20] that the log structure \mathcal{M}_C is written as $\mathcal{M} \oplus_{\mathcal{O}_C^\times} \mathcal{P}$ where \mathcal{P} is the divisorial log structure associated to the marked points x_1, \dots, x_n , and \mathcal{M} is the log structure on C for which the points x_1, \dots, x_n are not marked.

A punctured log map is then a morphism $f : C^\circ \rightarrow X$ for some choice of puncturing C° . Throughout the entire paper, all such morphisms are assumed to be pre-stable in the sense just defined, and this hypothesis will generally not be mentioned.

Punctured maps allow negative contact orders as follows. Fix $\bar{w} \in W$ and one of the marked points $x = x_i \in C_{\bar{w}}$. Then f induces a composed morphism, denoted u_x ,

$$(2.1) \quad P_x := \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{X, f(x)} \xrightarrow{\bar{f}^\flat} \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{C^\circ, x} \subset \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{W, \bar{w}} \oplus \overline{\mathcal{P}}_x^{\text{gp}} = \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{W, \bar{w}} \oplus \mathbb{Z} \xrightarrow{\text{pr}_2} \mathbb{Z}$$

where pr_2 denotes the second projection. Here u_x is called the *contact order* of the point x , and we have $u_x \in P_x^* = \text{Hom}(P_x, \mathbb{Z})$, whereas in more traditional logarithmic Gromov-Witten theory the contact order u_x lies in $P_x^\vee = \text{Hom}(P_x, \mathbb{N})$.

We use the convention of [ACGS20] that if $u_x \in P_x^\vee$, we call x a *marked point*. However, if we call a point a punctured point, we do not exclude the possibility that it is a marked point. The assumption of pre-stability guarantees that marked points behave exactly as marked points in the original logarithmic Gromov-Witten theory, and only punctured points with $u_x \notin P_x^\vee$ present new phenomena.

2.2.2. Contact orders for punctured points. The issue of specifying contact orders at punctured points is rather subtle, and for an exhaustive discussion, we refer the reader to [ACGS20], §2.3 and Appendix A. However, for this paper we generally only need a relatively simple form of this discussion. We define the set of *global contact orders*

$$\mathfrak{C}(X) := \text{colim}_{\sigma \in \Sigma(X)} N_\sigma,$$

where N_σ , as before, is the integral lattice associated to σ . Here the colimit is defined in the category of sets rather than abelian groups.³

Thus, given a punctured log map $f : C^\circ/W \rightarrow X$, each punctured section $x : \underline{W} \rightarrow \underline{C}$ and each geometric point $\bar{w} \in W$ induces via (2.1) $u_{x(\bar{w})} \in N_{\sigma_{f(x(\bar{w}))}}$ and hence an element of $\mathfrak{C}(X)$, which we write as $\bar{u}_{x(\bar{w})}$. Further, $\bar{u}_{x(\bar{w})}$ is now

³This is in fact a special case of the general setup in [ACGS20], §2.3, where this set would be written as $\mathfrak{C}_0(X)$.

locally constant on W , see [ACGS20], Lem. 2.30. If $\bar{u}_{x(\bar{w})}$ is constant on W (e.g., if W is connected), then we call $\bar{u}_{x(\bar{w})}$ the *global contact order* of the puncture x , writing it as \bar{u}_x .

Note for any $\sigma \in \Sigma(X)$, there is a canonical map

$$\iota_\sigma : N_\sigma \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}(X).$$

We say that $\bar{u} \in \mathfrak{C}(X)$ has *finite monodromy* if for any $\sigma \in \Sigma(X)$, $\iota_\sigma^{-1}(\bar{u}) \subseteq N_\sigma$ is finite. We say \bar{u} is *monodromy-free* if $\iota_\sigma^{-1}(\bar{u})$ has at most one element for each $\sigma \in \Sigma(X)$.

In [ACGS20], §2.3.2, we construct, for $\bar{u} \in \mathfrak{C}(X)$ with finite monodromy, an *evaluation stratum*, i.e., a closed substack $\mathcal{Z}_{\bar{u}} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$, equipped with the pull-back log structure, and the subscheme $Z_{\bar{u}} := \mathcal{Z}_{\bar{u}} \times_{\mathcal{X}} X$ of X , with the following property. Given a punctured map $f : C^\circ/W \rightarrow X$ or $f : C^\circ/W \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$, and a puncture x given by a section $x : \underline{W} \rightarrow \underline{C}$ with global contact order \bar{u} , then the morphism

$$f \circ x : (\underline{W}, x^* \mathcal{M}_{C^\circ}) \longrightarrow C^\circ \longrightarrow X \text{ or } \mathcal{X}$$

factors through $Z_{\bar{u}}$ or $\mathcal{Z}_{\bar{u}}$.

As we review shortly, when we consider moduli spaces of punctured maps, we will need to specify families of contact orders for each punctured point. Infinite monodromy may well prevent these moduli spaces being finite type. Hence, as in [ACGS20], we must for now restrict to the case that $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_X^{\text{gp}} \otimes \mathbb{Q}$ is generated by its global sections as in Basic Setup 1.1. We do not believe that this restriction is essential to the theory, but it does not seem to us to be worth the extra pain at this point to remove this hypothesis. We remark that with this hypothesis, all contact orders are monodromy free, see [ACGS20], Rem. 3.13.

Remarks 2.11. (1) Frequently in this paper, we will be considering a contact order $u \in N_\sigma$ with $u \in \sigma$ or $-u \in \sigma$, representing a global contact order \bar{u} . Note first that we may then view $u \in \Sigma(X)(\mathbb{Z})$ or $-u \in \Sigma(X)(\mathbb{Z})$, so that a point $r \in \Sigma(X)(\mathbb{Z})$ can be viewed as determining two contact orders, one positive and one negative. Take $r = u$ or $-u$ in the two cases. Then the evaluation stratum $Z_{\bar{u}}$ coincides with the stratum Z_r defined in Construction 1.8. This follows immediately from the explicit construction of the evaluation stratum in [ACGS20], §2.3.2.

Note that we obtain an induced morphism $r : \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{Z_r} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ as follows. Let $\bar{\xi}$ be the generic point of Z_r . Then $r \in \text{Hom}(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{X, \bar{\xi}}, \mathbb{N})$. Thus given a section s of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{Z_r}$, we obtain its germ $s_{\bar{\xi}} \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{Z_r}$ and define $r(s) = r(s_{\bar{\xi}})$.

(2) In case that $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_X^{\text{gp}} \otimes \mathbb{Q}$ is globally generated as in Basic Setup 1.1, the natural surjective maps $\Gamma(X, \overline{\mathcal{M}}_X^{\text{gp}} \otimes \mathbb{Q}) \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{X,x}^{\text{gp}} \otimes \mathbb{Q}$ dualize to give injective maps $\sigma_x \hookrightarrow \sigma_x^{\text{gp}} \rightarrow V := \text{Hom}(\Gamma(X, \overline{\mathcal{M}}_X^{\text{gp}} \otimes \mathbb{Q}), \mathbb{R})$. Compatibility with generization then yields a continuous map $|\Sigma(X)| \rightarrow V$ which is not necessarily injective, but is injective on individual cones, see [ACGS20], Prop. 3.12. By choosing any representative $u \in N_\sigma$ for a global contact order $\bar{u} \in \mathfrak{C}(X)$, we obtain an element $u' \in V$ depending only on \bar{u} . Note that if $u \in N_\sigma$ is a representative for \bar{u} , then in the notation introduced in §1.3, we have $\langle u, s \rangle = u'(s)$ for $s \in \Gamma(X, \overline{\mathcal{M}}_X)$. Further, because the map $|\Sigma(X)| \rightarrow V$ is injective on cones, each $u' \in V$ arises from at most a finite number of global contact orders \bar{u} .

2.2.3. *Moduli of punctured maps.* A type β of punctured map ([ACGS20], Def. 3.8, (4)) is a choice of curve class $A \in H_2(X)$, a genus, a number of punctured points, and for each punctured point, a choice of global contact order $\bar{u}_x \in \mathfrak{C}(X)$. Generally, in this paper we will specify a choice of global contact order by specifying an integral tangent vector u_x to a cone $\sigma \in \Sigma(X)$ such that u_x is not tangent to a proper face of σ .

Most of the time, we will only need the cases considered in Remarks 2.11, (1). A point $u_x \in \Sigma(X)(\mathbb{Z})$ uniquely determines a minimal cone $\sigma \in \Sigma(X)$ containing u_x , and viewing $u_x \in N_\sigma$, we obtain a global contact order of a marked point. Similarly, $-u_x$ determines a contact order of a punctured point. However, more general contact orders will appear briefly in certain arguments.

Given a type β of punctured map, we have a moduli space $\mathcal{M}(X, \beta)$ of stable punctured maps of type β , with target space X . Here the stability condition is just on the underlying stable map of curves. This moduli space is a DM stack. After forgetting the curve class A from the data of β , we have a moduli space $\mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{X}, \beta)$ of pre-stable punctured maps with target space \mathcal{X} . This moduli space is an algebraic stack.

Both moduli spaces $\mathcal{M}(X, \beta)$, $\mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{X}, \beta)$ carry a canonical choice of log structure called the *basic log structure*, see [GS13], §1.5, [ACGS17], §2.3.7 and [ACGS20], Def. 2.36. In particular, we call the stalk of the ghost sheaf at a point corresponding to a given punctured log map the *basic monoid*.

Via composition of stable maps with the canonical morphism $X \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$, we obtain a strict morphism

$$\mathcal{M}(X, \beta) \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{X}, \beta),$$

and [ACGS20], §4.2, defines a perfect relative obstruction theory for this morphism, and hence a virtual pull-back of cycles via [Ma12]. In general, $\mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{X}, \beta)$ is

not equi-dimensional, so there is not necessarily a virtual fundamental class on $\mathcal{M}(X, \beta)$.

In fact, [ACGS20], §4.2, gives a somewhat more general setup. Let \mathbf{x} be a set of disjoint sections of the universal curve over $\mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{X}, \beta)$; these may include nodal sections. Then we set

$$(2.2) \quad \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}(\mathbf{x})}(\mathcal{X}, \beta) = \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta) := \mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{X}, \beta) \times_{\prod_{x \in \mathbf{x}} \mathcal{X}} \prod_{x \in \mathbf{x}} \underline{X}.$$

We use the second notation when \mathbf{x} is clear from context. The morphism $\mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{X}, \beta) \rightarrow \prod_{x \in \mathbf{x}} \underline{X}$ is given by evaluation at the sections in \mathbf{x} , which makes sense at the non-logarithmic level. There is then a natural morphism

$$\mathcal{M}(X, \beta) \xrightarrow{\varepsilon} \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta) \longrightarrow \mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{X}, \beta).$$

and a perfect relative obstruction theory for ε . More generally, if $\mathbf{x}' \subseteq \mathbf{x}$, we have a triple of spaces

$$\mathcal{M}(X, \beta) \xrightarrow{\varepsilon} \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}(\mathbf{x})}(\mathcal{X}, \beta) \xrightarrow{\pi} \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}(\mathbf{x}')}(\mathcal{X}, \beta).$$

with $\varepsilon' = \pi \circ \varepsilon$. Further, π is smooth, and hence carries a canonical choice of perfect relative obstruction theory given by the relative cotangent complex, and then Manolache's virtual pull-back $\pi^!$ coincides with flat pull-back π^* (see [Ma12], Rem. 3.10). This yields a compatible triple of obstruction theories. In particular, if $\mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{X}, \beta)$ is pure-dimensional, a virtual fundamental class can be defined using any of these obstruction theories, and they all coincide. In this situation and in similar situations encountered later, we say the obstruction theories for ε and ε' are *compatible*.

The virtual relative dimension of ε at a point of $\mathcal{M}(X, \beta)$ represented by $f : C^\circ \rightarrow X$ is

$$(2.3) \quad \chi \left(f^* \Theta_{X/\mathbb{k}} \left(- \sum_{x_i \in \mathbf{x}} x_i \right) \right),$$

see [ACGS20], Prop. 4.4.

Remark 2.12. One useful consequence of Remarks 2.11, (2), crucial for various finiteness results, is the following. We assume $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_X^{\text{gp}} \otimes \mathbb{Q}$ is globally generated, as in that remark. Suppose given a type of punctured map β with punctured points x_1, \dots, x_n , with contact orders at x_1, \dots, x_{n-1} specified by global contact orders $\bar{u}_{x_1}, \dots, \bar{u}_{x_{n-1}}$. Then $s \mapsto A \cdot c_1(\mathcal{L}_s)$ determines an element of $V = \text{Hom}(\Gamma(X, \overline{\mathcal{M}}_X^{\text{gp}} \otimes \mathbb{Q}), \mathbb{R})$, while $\bar{u}_{x_1}, \dots, \bar{u}_{x_{n-1}}$ determine elements $u'_{x_1}, \dots, u'_{x_{n-1}} \in V$ as in Remarks 2.11, (2). So by Proposition 1.13, if the global

contact order at x_n is given by \bar{u}_{x_n} , its image $u'_{x_n} \in V$ is completely determined by the data $A, u_{x_1}, \dots, u_{x_{n-1}}$, and hence again by the discussion of Remarks 2.11, (2), \bar{u}_{x_n} is determined up to a finite number of choices.

2.2.4. Tropical curves and maps. We follow [ACGS17], §2.5 for the notion of tropical curve, with a minor variation coming from the treatment of punctures, see [ACGS20], §2.2. We consider connected graphs G with sets of vertices $V(G)$, edges $E(G)$ and legs $L(G)$. However, unlike in the marked point case, a leg may be a compact interval or a ray. In either case, a leg has only one endpoint in $V(G)$. A tropical curve $\Gamma = (G, \mathbf{g}, \ell)$ of combinatorial type (G, \mathbf{g}) is the choice of a genus function $\mathbf{g} : V(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ and a length function $\ell : E(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{>0}$. As all curves in this paper will be of genus zero, we drop all future mention of \mathbf{g} .

We also consider *families* of tropical curves parameterized by a rational polyhedral cone ω defined in a lattice N_ω : this is a choice of combinatorial type G along with a length function $\ell : E(G) \rightarrow \text{Hom}(\omega \cap N_\omega, \mathbb{N}) \setminus \{0\}$. We will frequently write $\ell_E \in \tau^\vee$ instead of $\ell(E)$.

Associated to the data (G, ℓ) is a generalized cone complex $\Gamma(G, \ell)$ along with a morphism of cone complexes $\Gamma(G, \ell) \rightarrow \omega$ with fibre over $s \in \text{Int}(\omega)$ being a tropical curve, i.e., a metric graph, with underlying graph G and affine edge length of $E \in E(G)$ being $\ell_E(s)$. Associated to each vertex of G is a copy ω_v of ω in $\Gamma(G, \ell)$. Associated to each edge or leg $E \in E(G) \cup L(G)$ is a cone $\omega_E \in \Gamma(G, \ell)$ with $\omega_E \subseteq \omega \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and the map to ω given by projection onto the first coordinate. This projection fibres ω_E in compact intervals or rays over ω (rays only in the case of a leg representing a marked point).

A *family of tropical maps* to $\Sigma(X)$ over $\omega \in \mathbf{Cones}$ is a morphism of cone complexes

$$h : \Gamma(G, \ell) \rightarrow \Sigma(X).$$

If $s \in \text{Int}(\omega)$, we may view G as the fibre of $\Gamma(G, \ell) \rightarrow \omega$ over s as a metric graph, and write

$$h_s : G \rightarrow |\Sigma(X)|$$

for the corresponding tropical map with domain G . The *type* of such a family consists of the data $\tau := (G, \boldsymbol{\sigma}, \mathbf{u})$ where

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma} : V(G) \cup E(G) \cup L(G) \rightarrow \Sigma(X)$$

associates to $x \in V(G) \cup E(G) \cup L(G)$ the minimal cone of $\Sigma(X)$ containing $h(\omega_x)$. Further, \mathbf{u} associates to each (oriented) edge or leg $E \in E(G) \cup L(G)$ the corresponding *contact order* $\mathbf{u}(E) \in N_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}(E)}$, the image of the tangent vector $(0, 1) \in N_{\omega_E} = N_\omega \oplus \mathbb{Z}$ under the map h .

If $E \in E(G)$ is an edge with vertices v, v' , oriented from v to v' , and $s \in \text{Int}(\omega)$, the induced tropical map $h_s : G \rightarrow |\Sigma(X)|$ satisfies

$$(2.4) \quad h_s(v') - h_s(v) = \ell_E(s) \cdot \mathbf{u}(E)$$

as an equation in $N_{\sigma(E)} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{R}$.

Given a family of tropical maps h as above parameterized by ω , for v any vertex of G , we write

$$(2.5) \quad \begin{aligned} \nu_v : \omega &\longrightarrow \sigma(v) \\ s &\longmapsto h_s(v) \end{aligned}$$

Equivalently, ν_v is the restriction of h to the copy $\omega_v \in \Gamma(G, \ell)$ of ω indexed by v .

Stable log or punctured maps give families of tropical maps, see [ACGS17], §2.5 and [ACGS20], §2.2. Suppose we have a geometric point \bar{w} in any of the moduli spaces we consider in this paper, for example, $\mathcal{M}(X, \beta)$ or $\mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{X}, \beta)$ just mentioned. Denote the moduli space under consideration by \mathcal{M} . We obtain a diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} C_{\bar{w}}^{\circ} & \xrightarrow{f} & X \text{ or } \mathcal{X} \\ \pi \downarrow & & \\ \bar{w} & & \end{array}$$

After tropicalizing, we obtain a diagram (noting that $\Sigma(X) = \Sigma(\mathcal{X})$ is shown in Step I of the proof of [ACGS17], Prop. 2.10):

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Sigma(C_{\bar{w}}^{\circ}) & \xrightarrow{\Sigma(f)} & \Sigma(X) = \Sigma(\mathcal{X}) \\ \Sigma(\pi) \downarrow & & \\ \Sigma(\bar{w}) & & \end{array}$$

Note that $\Sigma(\bar{w}) = \sigma_{\bar{w}} = \text{Hom}(Q, \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0})$ where Q is the stalk of the ghost sheaf of \mathcal{M} at \bar{w} .

A fibre of $\Sigma(\pi)$ over a point in the interior of $\sigma_{\bar{w}}$ is homeomorphic to the dual intersection graph G of $C_{\bar{w}}^{\circ}$. The vertices $V(G)$ are indexed by the irreducible components of $C_{\bar{w}}^{\circ}$, the edges $E(G)$ are indexed by the nodes of $C_{\bar{w}}^{\circ}$, and the legs $L(G)$ are indexed by the marked or punctured points of $C_{\bar{w}}^{\circ}$. Marked points on $C_{\bar{w}}^{\circ}$ correspond to legs of G homeomorphic to $[0, +\infty)$ and punctured points correspond to legs of G homeomorphic to $[0, 1]$. Further, $\Sigma(\pi)$ provides a family of tropical curves, i.e., length functions $\ell_E \in Q \setminus \{0\}$ for each edge E of G .

Further, $h := \Sigma(f)$ now determines a tropical map to $\Sigma(X)$. The corresponding type $\tau = (G, \boldsymbol{\sigma}, \mathbf{u})$ satisfies, for each oriented edge E corresponding to a node q , $\mathbf{u}(E) = u_q$, the contact order of the node, see [ACGS17], §2.3.5,(iii), and for each leg L corresponding to a marked or punctured point x , $\mathbf{u}(L) = u_x$ as defined in (2.1).

It follows from [ACGS20], Prop. 2.21, that for $L \in L(G)$ with adjacent vertex $v \in V(G)$ giving $\omega_L, \omega_v \in \Gamma(G, \ell)$, we have

$$(2.6) \quad h(\omega_L) = (h(\omega_v) + \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}\mathbf{u}(L)) \cap \boldsymbol{\sigma}(L) \subseteq N_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}(L), \mathbb{R}}.$$

If \mathcal{M} carries the basic log structure, then this family of tropical maps is universal, see [ACGS20], §2.4. However, we may often deal with families that are not universal in this paper.

2.3. Some comments on stacks.

2.3.1. *Controlling the behaviour of the algebraic stacks appearing here.* All stacks appearing in this paper are algebraic, but do not necessarily satisfy the strictest notions such as those of [LMB00]. Indeed, if X is an algebraic stack over a scheme S , then [LMB00] assumes that the diagonal morphism $\Delta : X \rightarrow X \times_S X$ is representable, separated and quasi-compact. On the other hand, if S is a log scheme, Olsson's classifying stack $\mathcal{L}og_S$ of log schemes over S instead satisfies the condition that Δ be representable and of finite presentation, see [Ol03], (1.2.4) and (1.2.5), and in particular the diagonal need not be separated. In general, there is nothing which can be done about this: see [Ol03], Rem. 3.12 for a very simple example showing $\mathcal{L}og_{\mathbb{k}}$ has non-separated diagonal. However, fortunately this does not cause any problems, as Kresch's construction of Chow groups [Kr99] does not require a separated diagonal.

In general, the stacks $\mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{X}, \beta)$ inherit all the problems suffered by $\mathcal{L}og_S$. In particular, the fact that $\mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{X}, \beta)$ is not finite type will cause persistent problems, and in particular $\mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{X}, \beta)$ would be expected to contain an infinite number of logarithmic strata. We always deal with this issue in the following way. We will frequently have a situation where we have a strict morphism $\mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}$ where \mathcal{M} is some kind of moduli space of punctured maps to X , while \mathfrak{M} is a similar moduli space of punctured maps to \mathcal{X} . In every case, \mathcal{M} will be of finite type over $\text{Spec } \mathbb{k}$, and hence contain only a finite number of logarithmic strata. Thus we can replace \mathfrak{M} by the complement of all logarithmic strata whose closures do not intersect the image of $\mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}$, and in particular assume that \mathfrak{M} has only a finite number of logarithmic strata. Then \mathfrak{M} becomes finite type, and $|\Sigma(\mathfrak{M})|$

contains only a finite number of distinct cones. This procedure will generally be applied without comment, however some care will be necessary at certain points.

In order to apply results about virtual pull-backs, we will need our stacks to be stratified by global quotients as in [Ma12], Construction 3.6. This condition is necessary to use Kresch's result [Kr99], Prop. 4.3.2: if $E \rightarrow F$ is a vector bundle stack and F is stratified in global quotients, then the Chow groups of E and F are isomorphic. By [Kr99], Prop. 3.5.9, a stack is stratified by global quotients if the stabilizer group of every geometric point is affine. This is straightforward to check in all cases in this paper, and we omit discussion of this point in the sequel.

2.3.2. Log étale morphisms of log stacks. When a property of a (log) morphism $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is local in the (strict) smooth topology for the domain and range, then one gets a corresponding notion of the property for morphisms of (log) stacks as in [St], Tag 06FL. However, as we frequently use the notion of (log) étale, which is not local in the (strict) smooth topology, we recall:

Definition 2.13. A morphism $\underline{f} : \underline{X} \rightarrow \underline{Y}$ of stacks is *smooth* (resp. *étale*) if it is locally of finite presentation and formally smooth (resp. *étale*).

Remark 2.14. There are in fact a variety of definitions of étale morphisms of stacks in the literature. The definition given here is equivalent, by [Ry11], Cor. B.9, to the definition of an étale morphism of algebraic stacks given in [Ry11] (i.e., locally of finite presentation, flat, and with étale diagonal). By [St], Tag 0CJ1, Rydh's definition of étale is equivalent to that given in [St], Tag 0CIL, and in particular an étale morphism of stacks is of DM type by that definition.

Similarly, we have:

Definition 2.15. A morphism $f : X \rightarrow Y$ between log stacks is *log smooth* (resp. *log étale*) if it is locally of finite presentation and formally log smooth (resp. formally log étale), see [Og18], IV, Def. 3.1.1.

Idealized log smooth or log étale morphisms are defined similarly, as in [Og18], IV, §3.1.

We note that while not stated in this degree of generality, the arguments of [Ol03], Thm. 4.6 show that if $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is log smooth (log étale), then the induced morphism of ordinary stacks $\underline{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}og_Y$ is smooth (étale).

3. CONSTRUCTION OF THE INVARIANTS $N_{p_1 p_2 r}^\beta$

Throughout this section, we fix X as in Basic Setup 1.1. We will also fix an element $r \in \Sigma(X)(\mathbb{Z})$, so that $-r$ can be interpreted as a contact order for a puncture, as discussed in Remarks 2.11, (1).

3.1. Evaluation spaces. The first goal is to define a space parameterizing punctures with contact order given by $-r$, where $r \in \Sigma(X)(\mathbb{Z})$. This space is analogous to the evaluation spaces constructed in [ACGM10].

We define log stacks $\mathcal{P}(X, r), \widetilde{\mathcal{P}}(X, r)$. Here, $\mathcal{P}(X, r)$ is the “moduli space of punctures in X with contact order $-r$,” and $\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}(X, r)$ is the universal family of such punctures. This is made precise in Proposition 3.3.

Let $Z := Z_r$ be the closed stratum of X indexed by r as in Construction 1.8, with its induced log structure from X . Set

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}(X, r) := Z \times B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger.$$

Here $B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger$ denotes $B\mathbb{G}_m$ with its universal log structure, i.e., the pull-back of the divisorial log structure $B\mathbb{G}_m \subset [\mathbb{A}^1/\mathbb{G}_m]$ to $B\mathbb{G}_m$. On the other hand, we define $\mathcal{P}(X, r)$ to have the same underlying stack as $\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}(X, r)$, but with a sub-log structure defined as follows.

If we abuse notation by writing $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_Z$ also for the sheaf on $\mathcal{P}(X, r)$ given by pull-back of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_Z$ via the projection $\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}(X, r) \rightarrow Z$, then we define $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{\mathcal{P}(X, r)}$ as the subsheaf of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}(X, r)} = \overline{\mathcal{M}}_Z \oplus \mathbb{N}$ given by

$$(3.1) \quad \Gamma(U, \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{\mathcal{P}(X, r)}) = \{(m, r(m)) \mid m \in \Gamma(U, \overline{\mathcal{M}}_Z)\}$$

where r is viewed as an element of $\text{Hom}(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_Z, \mathbb{N})$, as in Remarks 2.11, (1). Note this gives a canonical isomorphism between $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_Z$ and $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{\mathcal{P}(X, r)}$.

We may now define the log structure on $\mathcal{P}(X, r)$ as

$$\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{P}(X, r)} := \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{\mathcal{P}(X, r)} \times_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}(X, r)}} \mathcal{M}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}(X, r)}.$$

Similarly, r defines a stratum \mathcal{Z} of the Artin fan \mathcal{X} of X , and we can define $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}, r), \widetilde{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{X}, r)$.

Remark 3.1. The stack $\mathcal{P}(X, r)$ can also be described as a quotient logarithmic stack $[Z/\mathbb{G}_m]$, where \mathbb{G}_m acts trivially on the underlying scheme Z but acts on a torsor \mathcal{L}_m^\times over $U \subseteq Z$ open with weight $r(m)$ for $m \in \Gamma(U, \overline{\mathcal{M}}_Z)$.

Proposition 3.2. *Let \mathcal{P} denote the log structure on $\mathcal{P}(X, r)$ which is the pull-back of the universal log structure on $B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger$ under the projection to $B\mathbb{G}_m$. If \mathcal{M}*

is the log structure of $\mathcal{P}(X, r)$, write

$$\mathcal{M}' = \mathcal{M} \oplus_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{P}(X, r)}^\times} \mathcal{P}.$$

Then $\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}(X, r)$ is a puncturing of \mathcal{M}' along \mathcal{P} , and this puncturing is pre-stable with respect to the composed morphism

$$f : \widetilde{\mathcal{P}}(X, r) \xrightarrow{\text{pr}_1} Z \hookrightarrow X$$

in the sense of Definition 2.10.

Proof. Note that $\overline{\mathcal{M}}' = \overline{\mathcal{M}} \oplus \mathbb{N}$, and there is a natural inclusion $\overline{\mathcal{M}}' \hookrightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}(X, r)} = \overline{\mathcal{M}}_Z \oplus \mathbb{N}$ given by $(m, n) \mapsto (m, r(m) + n)$. This induces an inclusion $\mathcal{M}' \hookrightarrow \mathcal{M}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}(X, r)}$. If $(\hat{m}, \hat{n}) \in \mathcal{M}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}(X, r)} \setminus \mathcal{M}'$ with image (m, n) in the ghost sheaf, then necessarily $0 \leq n < r(m)$, and $\alpha_Z(\hat{m}) = 0$ if $r(m) > 0$. Thus (\hat{m}, \hat{n}) is sent to zero by the structure map α of $\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}(X, r)$. Hence we obtain a puncturing. This puncturing is pre-stable, as $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}(X, r)}$ is generated by the image $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_Z \oplus 0$ of f^\flat and $(0, 1) \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}'$. \square

Proposition 3.3. *Let $f : C^\circ/W \rightarrow X$ be a pre-stable punctured log map with a punctured point $x : \underline{W} \rightarrow \underline{C}$ with contact order given by $-r$. Then there exists a canonical morphism $\text{ev} : W \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(X, r)$ with the property that*

$$W^\circ := W \times_{\mathcal{P}(X, r)}^{\text{fine}} \widetilde{\mathcal{P}}(X, r)$$

coincides with $(\underline{W}, x^* \mathcal{M}_{C^\circ})$.

The analogous statements for punctured maps $f : C^\circ/W \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ also hold.

Proof. Write $W' := (\underline{W}, x^* \mathcal{M}_{C^\circ})$ and $W^m := (\underline{W}, x^* \mathcal{M}_C)$ (recalling that \mathcal{M}_C treats x as a marked point). Then we can write $\mathcal{M}_{W^m} = \mathcal{M}_W \oplus_{\mathcal{O}_W^\times} \mathcal{P}_W$, where \mathcal{P}_W is the pull-back of the divisorial log structure $x(\underline{W}) \subset \underline{C}$ via x . Thus W' is a puncturing of W^m along \mathcal{P}_W , and the induced morphism $f \circ x : W' \rightarrow X$ is pre-stable, as f was pre-stable.

Next we define a morphism $W' \rightarrow \widetilde{\mathcal{P}}(X, r)$. First, by Remarks 2.11, (1), Z is the evaluation stratum induced by the contact order $-r$, so the morphism $f \circ x$ factors through Z . Second, there is a canonical strict morphism $(\underline{W}, \mathcal{P}_W) \rightarrow B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger$. We note that at the level of underlying stacks, the morphism $\underline{W} \rightarrow B\mathbb{G}_m$ is the morphism induced by the torsor on \underline{W} corresponding to $1 \in \overline{\mathcal{P}}_W = \mathbb{N}$, and this torsor is associated to the conormal line bundle $\mathcal{N}_{x(\underline{W})/\underline{C}}^\vee$. As there is a natural morphism $W' \rightarrow (\underline{W}, \mathcal{P}_W)$ given by the inclusion $\mathcal{P}_W \subset \mathcal{M}_{W'}$, we then obtain a morphism

$$(3.2) \quad \tilde{\text{ev}} : W' \rightarrow Z \times B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger = \widetilde{\mathcal{P}}(X, r).$$

We now have a diagram

$$(3.3) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} W' & \xrightarrow{\tilde{\text{ev}}} & \widetilde{\mathcal{P}}(X, r) & \longrightarrow & X \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\ W & \xrightarrow[\text{ev}]{} & \mathcal{P}(X, r) & & \end{array}$$

and we wish to define the dotted arrow ev to make the diagram commute. Since the vertical arrows are the identity on underlying stacks, it is enough to understand this diagram at the level of ghost sheaves.

Let $\bar{w} \in \underline{W}$, and let $Q = \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{W, \bar{w}}$, $P = \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{X, f(x(\bar{w}))}$. Then $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{W', \bar{w}} \subset Q \oplus \mathbb{Z}$, and (3.3) induces

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} Q \oplus \mathbb{Z} & \xleftarrow{\overline{\text{ev}}^b} & P \oplus \mathbb{N} & \xleftarrow{\text{id} \oplus 0} & P \\ \text{id} \oplus 0 \uparrow & & \uparrow \text{id} \oplus r & & \\ Q & \xleftarrow[\overline{\text{ev}}^b]{} & P & & \end{array}$$

By construction of $\tilde{\text{ev}}$, using the notation $\varphi_x := \bar{f}^b : P \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{W', \bar{w}} \subseteq Q \oplus \mathbb{Z}$,

$$\overline{\text{ev}}^b(m, n) = \varphi_x(m) + (0, n) = (\text{pr}_1 \circ \varphi_x(m), -r(m) + n).$$

Note that for $m \in P$, $\overline{\text{ev}}^b(m, r(m)) = (\text{pr}_1 \circ \varphi_x(m), 0)$. Hence $\overline{\text{ev}}^b$ induces a homomorphism $\overline{\text{ev}}^b$ making the diagram commute, with

$$(3.4) \quad \overline{\text{ev}}^b(m) = \text{pr}_1 \circ \varphi_x(m).$$

Thus by (3.1), $\tilde{\text{ev}}$ induces the morphism ev , turning (3.3) into a commutative diagram.

The commutativity of the square in (3.3) induces a morphism $W' \rightarrow W^\circ$. On the other hand, by [ACGS20], Def. 2.8, W° is the pull-back puncturing of the punctured log structure on $\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}(X, r)$, precisely a puncturing of W^m . Further this puncturing is pre-stable with respect to the morphism to X by Proposition 3.2 and [ACGS20], Cor. 2.9. Since the same is true for W' , it then follows from [ACGS20], Prop. 2.4, that the induced morphism $W' \rightarrow W^\circ$ is an isomorphism, as desired. \square

Definition 3.4. In the situation of Proposition 3.3, we write $\widetilde{W} \rightarrow W^\circ$ for the saturation of W° . Note that

$$(3.5) \quad \widetilde{W} = W \times_{\text{fs}, \mathcal{P}(X, r)}^{\text{fs}} \widetilde{\mathcal{P}}(X, r).$$

3.2. Moduli spaces and evaluation maps. We now fix a type of punctured map β for X . We shall assume that there is at least one punctured point x_{out} with contact order determined by $-r$ for $r \in \Sigma(X)(\mathbb{Z})$.

Definition 3.5. We write

$$\text{ev}_X : \mathcal{M}(X, \beta) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(X, r), \quad \text{ev}_{\mathcal{X}} : \mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{X}, \beta) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}, r)$$

for the evaluation maps given by Proposition 3.3 with $W = \mathcal{M}(X, \beta)$ or $\mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{X}, \beta)$ respectively.

Definition 3.6. We set

$$\mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta) = \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}(x_{\text{out}})}(\mathcal{X}, \beta) := \mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{X}, \beta) \times_{\underline{\mathcal{X}}} \underline{X},$$

where the morphism $\mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{X}, \beta) \rightarrow \underline{\mathcal{X}}$ is (schematic) evaluation at x_{out} .

Lemma 3.7. *There is a Cartesian diagram in all categories*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta) & \xrightarrow{\text{ev}_{\mathcal{X}}} & \mathcal{P}(X, r) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{X}, \beta) & \xrightarrow{\text{ev}_{\mathcal{X}}} & \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}, r) \end{array}$$

defining in particular the evaluation map $\text{ev}_{\mathcal{X}} : \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(X, r)$.

Proof. As the schematic evaluation map $\mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{X}, \beta) \rightarrow \underline{\mathcal{X}}$ factors through the closed substack $\mathcal{Z} := \mathcal{Z}_r$ by Remarks 2.11, (1), we may replace $\underline{\mathcal{X}}$ by $\underline{\mathcal{Z}}$ and \underline{X} by \underline{Z} in the definition of $\mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta)$. Since both vertical maps in the diagram are strict, it is enough then to check the diagrams are Cartesian at the level of underlying stacks, which is immediate. \square

3.3. Imposing point constraints.

Proposition 3.8. *Fix $r \in \Sigma(X)(\mathbb{Z})$ and a closed point $z \in Z_r^\circ$. There is a morphism of logarithmic stacks*

$$B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(X, r)$$

with image $z \times B\mathbb{G}_m$ which, on the level of ghost sheaves, is given by

$$r : P := \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{X, z} \cong \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{\mathcal{P}(X, r), z} \rightarrow \mathbb{N},$$

with the isomorphism induced by (3.1).

Proof. Using the definition of $\mathcal{P}(X, r)$, we can describe the restriction of the log structure on $\mathcal{P}(X, r)$ to $z \times B\mathbb{G}_m \subset \underline{Z}_r \times B\mathbb{G}_m$. The ghost sheaf of the restriction is the constant sheaf with stalk P , and the torsor associated to $m \in P$ is $\mathcal{U}^{\otimes r(m)}$, where \mathcal{U} is the universal torsor on $B\mathbb{G}_m$. Thus we can lift the stated map on the level of ghost sheaves to a log morphism, as the torsor on $B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger$ induced by $r(m) \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger}$ is also $\mathcal{U}^{\otimes r(m)}$. \square

Remark 3.9. While the morphism of log stacks defined in the above proposition is not unique, as there may be many choices of lifting to a log morphism, the key invariants N_{pqr}^A defined below can be seen to be independent of this choice by Theorem 7.10. Further, a priori these invariants depend on the choice of z , but again Theorem 7.10 demonstrates the independence on this choice.

Definition 3.10. We define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta, z) &:= \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta) \times_{\mathcal{P}(X, r)} B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger \\ &= \mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{X}, \beta) \times_{\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}, r)} B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger, \end{aligned}$$

where the morphisms $\mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(X, r)$, $\mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{X}, \beta) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}, r)$ are the evaluation maps $\text{ev}_{\mathcal{X}}$ at x_{out} defined in Lemma 3.7, the morphism $B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(X, r)$ in the first line is that given in Proposition 3.8, and the morphism $B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}, r)$ in the second line is the composed morphism $B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(X, r) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}, r)$. The equality follows from Lemma 3.7. We also similarly set

$$\mathcal{M}(X, \beta, z) := \mathcal{M}(X, \beta) \times_{\mathcal{P}(X, r)} B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger.$$

Remark 3.11. As discussed in §2.2.3, we have a perfect relative obstruction theory for the natural morphism $\mathcal{M}(X, \beta) \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta)$. The relative virtual dimension at a point of $\mathcal{M}(X, \beta)$ represented by a punctured map $f : C^\circ \rightarrow X$ is $\chi((f^*\Theta_{X/\mathbb{k}})(-x_{\text{out}}))$, see (2.3).

Proposition 3.12. *There is a perfect relative obstruction theory for $\mathcal{M}(X, \beta, z) \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta, z)$ of relative virtual dimension*

$$\chi((f^*\Theta_{X/\mathbb{k}})(-x_{\text{out}})) = A \cdot c_1(\Theta_{X/\mathbb{k}})$$

at a point represented by a punctured map $f : C^\circ \rightarrow X$.

Proof. We have a Cartesian diagram (in all categories)

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{M}(X, \beta, z) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{M}(X, \beta) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta, z) & \longrightarrow & \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta) \end{array}$$

The perfect relative obstruction theory for the right-hand vertical arrow of Remark 3.11 pulls back to a perfect relative obstruction theory for the left-hand vertical arrow. The dimension statement follows from Riemann-Roch. \square

3.4. Virtual smoothness everywhere. Many of the arguments in this paper ultimately reduce to the idea that while various moduli spaces of punctured log maps to X may be difficult to control, moduli spaces of punctured log maps to the Artin fan \mathcal{X} have good local models in the smooth topology as torus invariant closed subschemes of toric varieties. The model for this kind of result is [ACGS20], Thm. 3.24. We begin with a slight modification of this result.

Definition 3.13. Fix β a type of curve in X , with at least one punctured point x_{out} with contact order $-r$, where $r \in \Sigma(X)(\mathbb{Z})$. Assume that β has n additional punctured points. Let $\mathbf{M} = \mathbf{M}_{0,n+1}$ denote the moduli space of pre-stable curves of genus 0 with $n + 1$ marked points, labelled $x_1, \dots, x_n, x_{\text{out}}$. Give \mathbf{M} its basic log structure. There is a morphism $\mathbf{M} \rightarrow B\mathbb{G}_m$ induced by the cornormal bundle of x_{out} in the universal curve over \mathbf{M} . Similarly, there is a projection $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}, r) \rightarrow B\mathbb{G}_m$. Note here $B\mathbb{G}_m$ carries the trivial log structure. We then set

$$\mathbf{M}(\mathcal{X}, r) := \mathbf{M} \times_{B\mathbb{G}_m} \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}, r).$$

We give $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}, r)$ the structure of an idealized log stack as follows. We can view r as an element of $\text{Hom}(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_Z, \mathbb{N})$ as in Remark 2.11, (1), or equivalently as an element of $\text{Hom}(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}, r)}, \mathbb{N})$. Let $\overline{\mathcal{I}} \subset \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}, r)}$ be the sheaf of ideals given by $r^{-1}(\mathbb{Z}_{>0})$. Let \mathcal{I} be the induced ideal of $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}, r)}$. This defines a coherent idealized log structure on $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}, r)$, and the pull-back $\text{pr}_2^* \mathcal{I}$ of \mathcal{I} to $\mathbf{M}(\mathcal{X}, r)$ then defines a coherent idealized log structure on $\mathbf{M}(\mathcal{X}, r)$.

Proposition 3.14. *There is a natural idealized log étale morphism*

$$\Psi : \mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{X}, \beta) \rightarrow \mathbf{M}(\mathcal{X}, r).$$

Here the idealized log structure on $\mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{X}, \beta)$ is given by the puncturing log ideal \mathcal{K} , see [ACGS20], Defs. 2.42 and 2.49 for the definition. If the points x_1, \dots, x_n are in fact marked points, i.e., have non-negative contact order, then Ψ is also log étale.

Proof. It was shown in [ACGS20], Thm. 3.24, that the forgetful morphism $\mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{X}, \beta) \rightarrow \mathbf{M}$, taking a stable punctured map to its domain, is idealized log étale. Here \mathbf{M} is given the trivial idealized log structure, i.e., its ideal is the empty ideal.

Recalling that the Artin fan \mathcal{X} has an étale cover by toric log stacks \mathcal{A}_P , where P ranges over stalks $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{X,x}$, we see that $\mathcal{Z} = \mathcal{Z}_r$ has a cover by idealized toric

log stacks of the form $\mathcal{A}_{P,I}$ defined in Definition A.1, where P ranges over stalks $\mathcal{M}_{X,x}$ with $x \in Z$. Here the ideal I can be written as $\{m \in P \mid r(m) > 0\}$. Thus by [ACGS20], Lem. B.3, $\mathcal{A}_{P,I} \rightarrow \text{Spec } \mathbb{k} = \mathcal{A}_{0,\emptyset}$ is idealized log étale. So taking quotient of the domain and range of this morphism by \mathbb{G}_m , as in Remark 3.1, we see that $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}, r) = [\mathcal{Z}/\mathbb{G}_m] \rightarrow B\mathbb{G}_m$ is idealized log étale. By base-change, so is the projection $\text{pr}_1 : \mathbf{M}(\mathcal{X}, r) \rightarrow \mathbf{M}$.

To obtain the morphism $\mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{X}, \beta) \rightarrow \mathbf{M}(\mathcal{X}, r)$, let $\mathfrak{C} \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{X}, \beta)$ be the universal curve. By the construction of the proof of Proposition 3.3, the composition of $\text{ev}_{\mathcal{X}} : \mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{X}, \beta) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}, r)$ with the projection $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}, r) \rightarrow B\mathbb{G}_m$ is the morphism associated to the conormal bundle of $x_{\text{out}}(\underline{\mathfrak{M}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta))$ in $\underline{\mathfrak{C}}$. Since the morphism $\mathbf{M} \rightarrow B\mathbb{G}_m$ is also given by the conormal bundle at the section x_{out} , we obtain the desired morphism Ψ , with the composed morphism

$$\mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{X}, \beta) \xrightarrow{\Psi} \mathbf{M}(\mathcal{X}, r) \xrightarrow{\text{pr}_1} \mathbf{M}$$

being the forgetful morphism that only remembers the domain \mathfrak{C} .

We need to check that Ψ is an idealized morphism, i.e., that $\Psi^\bullet \text{pr}_2^\bullet \mathcal{I} \subset \mathcal{K}$. However, this immediately follows from the definition of \mathcal{K} in [ACGS20], Def. 2.42.

Since both $\text{pr}_1 \circ \Psi$ and pr_1 are idealized log étale it immediately follows that Ψ is idealized log étale by the lifting criterion for (idealized log) étale morphisms.

If furthermore the only punctured point of β that isn't marked is x_{out} , it follows again from the definition of $\overline{\mathcal{K}}$ that $\Psi^\bullet \text{pr}_2^\bullet \mathcal{I} = \mathcal{K}$. This is precisely the notion of ideally strict of [Og18], III, Def. 1.3.2. The last statement then follows from [Og18], IV, Variant 3.1.22. \square

Remark 3.15. Note that in general the morphism Ψ is not strict, even when it is ideally strict. Indeed, $\mathbf{M}(\mathcal{X}, r)$ carries a product log structure coming from the universal log structure on \mathbf{M} and the log structure on $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}, r)$, while $\mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{X}, \beta)$ carries the basic log structure for punctured maps.

Theorem 3.16. *The morphisms*

$$\text{ev}_{\mathcal{X}} : \mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{X}, \beta) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}, r), \quad \text{ev}_{\mathcal{X}} : \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}, r)$$

are idealized log smooth. If the points x_1, \dots, x_n are in fact marked, then further these morphisms are all log smooth.

Proof. From Proposition 3.14, the morphism $\mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{X}, \beta) \rightarrow \mathbf{M}(\mathcal{X}, r)$ is idealized log étale, so to show that the first morphism $\text{ev}_{\mathcal{X}}$ in the proposition is idealized log smooth, it is enough to check the projection $\mathbf{M}(\mathcal{X}, r) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}, r)$ is idealized log smooth. As the morphism is ideally strict by construction of the idealized

log structure on $\mathbf{M}(\mathcal{X}, r)$, it is sufficient to show it is log smooth by [Og18], IV, Variant 3.1.22. But this projection is a base-change of the morphism $\mathbf{M} \rightarrow B\mathbb{G}_m$. Base-changing this latter morphism via the universal torsor $\mathrm{Spec} \mathbb{k} \rightarrow B\mathbb{G}_m$ gives the morphism $(\mathcal{N}_{x_{\mathrm{out}}/\mathbf{C}}^\vee)^\times \rightarrow \mathrm{Spec} \mathbb{k}$, where the former denotes the torsor associated to the conormal bundle of x_{out} in the universal curve \mathbf{C}/\mathbf{M} . This morphism can be viewed as a composition of a strict smooth morphism $(\mathcal{N}_{x_{\mathrm{out}}/\mathbf{C}}^\vee)^\times \rightarrow \mathbf{M}$ and the log smooth morphism $\mathbf{M} \rightarrow \mathrm{Spec} \mathbb{k}$. Thus $\mathbf{M} \rightarrow B\mathbb{G}_m$, hence $\mathbf{M}(\mathcal{X}, r) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}, r)$, is log smooth.

The morphism $\mathrm{ev}_{\mathcal{X}} : \mathfrak{M}^{\mathrm{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(X, r)$ is then also idealized log smooth as it is obtained via strict base-change from $\mathrm{ev}_{\mathcal{X}} : \mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{X}, \beta) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}, r)$.

In the case that all other punctured points are in fact marked points, then the result follows from the above discussion and the last statement of Proposition 3.14. \square

Lemma 3.17. (1) *The projection $\mathfrak{M}^{\mathrm{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta, z) \rightarrow B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger$ at the level of underlying stacks is induced by the conormal bundle of x_{out} in the universal curve over $\mathfrak{M}^{\mathrm{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta, z)$.*

(2) *The projection $\mathfrak{M}^{\mathrm{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta, z) \rightarrow B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger$ is idealized log smooth. If the points x_1, \dots, x_n are in fact marked, then this morphism is log smooth.*

Proof. The first item follows from the construction of the proof of Proposition 3.3, while the second item is immediate by base-change from Theorem 3.16. \square

Lemma 3.18. *Let $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,n+1}$ denote the Deligne-Mumford moduli space of stable genus 0 curves with $n+1$ marked points, with its universal log structure, which is the divisorial log structure associated to the boundary of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,n+1}$. Then there are natural morphisms*

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi : \mathcal{M}(X, \beta, z) &\rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,n+1} \times B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger =: \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,n+1}^\dagger \\ \Phi : \mathfrak{M}^{\mathrm{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta, z) &\rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,n+1}^\dagger \end{aligned}$$

If the points x_1, \dots, x_n are in fact marked, then the second morphism is log smooth.

Proof. There is of course a morphism $\mathcal{M}(X, \beta, z) \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,n+1}$ given by forgetting the morphism and stabilizing the domain curve. Combining this with the projection $\mathcal{M}(X, \beta, z) \rightarrow B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger$ gives the first desired morphism. The second morphism is similar.

To show the second morphism Φ is log smooth, note it is a composition of morphisms

$$(3.6) \quad \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta, z) = \mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{X}, \beta) \times_{\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}, r)} B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger \rightarrow \mathbf{M} \times_{B\mathbb{G}_m} B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger \rightarrow \mathbf{M} \times B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0, n+1}^\dagger.$$

Here, the first morphism is a base-change of the morphism $\mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{X}, \beta) \rightarrow \mathbf{M}(\mathcal{X}, r) = \mathbf{M} \times_{B\mathbb{G}_m} \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}, r)$ by the morphism $\mathbf{M} \times_{B\mathbb{G}_m} B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger \rightarrow \mathbf{M}(\mathcal{X}, r)$ induced by $B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}, r)$. Since $\mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{X}, \beta) \rightarrow \mathbf{M}(\mathcal{X}, r)$ is log étale by Proposition 3.14, the first morphism of (3.6) is log étale. The second morphism fits into a Cartesian diagram (in both the ordinary and fs log categories)

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{M} \times_{B\mathbb{G}_m} B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger & \longrightarrow & B\mathbb{G}_m \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \Delta \\ \mathbf{M} \times_{\text{Spec } \mathbb{k}} B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger & \longrightarrow & B\mathbb{G}_m \times_{\text{Spec } \mathbb{k}} B\mathbb{G}_m \end{array}$$

Since the diagonal Δ is smooth and strict (here the log structures are trivial), the same is true of the left-hand vertical arrow. Thus the second morphism of (3.6) is also log smooth. The third morphism is induced by the stabilization morphism $\mathbf{M} \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0, n+1}$, which is log étale. Hence the composition Φ of the three morphisms is log smooth. \square

3.5. The invariants. We are now ready to define the key invariants. For the notion of log fibre dimension, see §A.2.

Proposition 3.19. *Let β be a type of punctured map with one point x_{out} with contact order $-r$ and n marked points. Then*

- (1) *The morphism $\Phi : \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta, z) \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0, n+1}^\dagger$ is of log fibre dimension 1, and the projection $\mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta, z) \rightarrow B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger$ is log fibre dimension $n - 1$.*
- (2) *$\mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta, z)$ is pure-dimensional of dimension $n - 2$, and hence $\mathcal{M}(X, \beta, z)$ carries a virtual fundamental class of dimension*

$$A \cdot c_1(\Theta_{X/\mathbb{k}}) + n - 2.$$

Proof. (1) For the first morphism, we have the factorization (3.6), with the first and third morphisms log étale and the second smooth of relative dimension one, and hence by properties of log fibre dimension, Propositions A.7,(3) and A.8, we obtain Φ is log fibre dimension one.

For the second morphism, we further compose with the projection $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0, n+1}^\dagger \rightarrow B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger$, which is of log fibre dimension $n - 2$, giving log fibre dimension $n - 1$ for the second morphism.

(2) By Proposition 3.12, it is sufficient to prove the dimension statement for $\mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta, z)$. First, as $\mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta, z) \rightarrow B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger$ is log smooth by Lemma 3.17, it is log flat by Proposition 2.3. Further, as the ghost sheaf on $B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger$ is \mathbb{N} , this morphism is also integral by [Og18], I, Prop. 4.6.3, 5. So the fibre dimension and the log fibre dimension of this morphism coincide, see Proposition A.7, (2). Thus the fibre dimension of $\mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta, z) \rightarrow B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger$ is $n - 1$, and hence $\mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta, z)$ is pure-dimensional of dimension $n - 2$. \square

Recall from Basic Setup 1.1 that we do not assume X is projective over $\text{Spec } \mathbb{k}$, but only over S . Note that if S is one-dimensional, we do not work with the moduli space of relative punctured maps, $\mathcal{M}(X/S, \beta)$, but with the moduli space $\mathcal{M}(X, \beta)$. This is necessary as the contact orders we wish to make use of do not define contact orders over S . In any event, $\mathcal{M}(X, \beta)$ would not be expected to be proper since S is not proper. To extract a number, we need a proper moduli space, and fortunately once we put on a point constraint, the moduli space becomes proper:

Lemma 3.20. *In either the absolute or relative cases in the sense of Basic Setup 1.1, with $\dim \underline{S} = 0$ or 1 respectively, we have:*

- (1) *There is a morphism $\underline{\mathcal{M}}(X, \beta) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}(\underline{X}/\underline{S}, A)$ where A is the underlying curve class of β . Furthermore, the composed map*

$$\underline{\mathcal{M}}(X, \beta) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}(\underline{X}/\underline{S}, A) \rightarrow \underline{S}$$

is proper.

- (2) *$\mathcal{M}(X, \beta, z)$ is proper over $\text{Spec } \mathbb{k}$.*

Proof. There is always a forgetful morphism $\underline{\mathcal{M}}(X, \beta) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}(\underline{X}, A)$, which is shown to be proper in [ACGS20], Thm. 3.17. Note that since \underline{S} is assumed to be non-complete in the relative case, the composition of any stable map $f : \underline{C}/\underline{W} \rightarrow \underline{X}$ with $\underline{X} \rightarrow \underline{S}$ must be constant on fibres of $\underline{C} \rightarrow \underline{W}$. Thus $\underline{\mathcal{M}}(\underline{X}, A) = \mathcal{M}(\underline{X}/\underline{S}, A)$. As the structure morphism $\mathcal{M}(\underline{X}/\underline{S}, A) \rightarrow \underline{S}$ is proper, given that $X \rightarrow S$ is projective, (1) follows.

For (2), in the absolute case, $\mathcal{M}(X, \beta)$ is proper over $\text{Spec } \mathbb{k}$. As $B\mathbb{G}_m$ is a closed substack of $\mathcal{P}(X, r)$, the ordinary fibre product $\underline{\mathcal{M}}(X, \beta) \times_{\mathcal{P}(X, r)} B\mathbb{G}_m$ is a closed substack of $\underline{\mathcal{M}}(X, \beta)$, hence proper. By Remark 2.1, the fs fibre product defining $\mathcal{M}(X, \beta, z)$ is finite over this ordinary fibre product, hence is proper.

In the relative case, one notes that if $s = g(z) \in S$, then any family of stable maps $f : C/W \rightarrow X$ in $\mathcal{M}(X, \beta, z)$ necessarily factors through X_s , and hence $\mathcal{M}(X, \beta, z) = \mathcal{M}(X_s, \beta, z)$. This is again proper as in the absolute case. \square

Definition 3.21. Let $p_1, p_2, r \in \Sigma(X)(\mathbb{Z})$, and let β be a type of punctured map with underlying curve class A and three punctured points x_1, x_2, x_{out} with contact orders p_1, p_2 and $-r$ respectively. We define

$$N_{p_1 p_2 r}^\beta := \begin{cases} \deg[\mathcal{M}(X, \beta, z)]^{\text{virt}} & A \cdot c_1(\Theta_{X/\mathbb{k}}) = 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We end this subsection by completing the calculation of these invariants in the constant map case:

Proof of Lemma 1.15. Let $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma \in \mathcal{P}$ be the minimal cones containing p_1, p_2 and r respectively. First, suppose given a basic stable punctured map

$$f : (C^\circ, x_1, x_2, x_{\text{out}}) / \text{Spec}(Q \rightarrow \mathbb{k}) \rightarrow X$$

of type β with $\underline{f}(x_{\text{out}}) \in Z_r^\circ$. Since $A = 0$ the underlying morphism \underline{f} is constant, and stability then implies that $\underline{C} \cong \mathbb{P}^1$. Necessarily $f(x_i) \in Z_{p_i}$, $i = 1, 2$. Thus we have $Z_r^\circ \subseteq Z_{p_1} \cap Z_{p_2}$, which is only possible if $\sigma \supseteq \sigma_1, \sigma_2$. So σ contains p_1, p_2 . It then immediately follows from the balancing condition [ACGS20], Prop. 2.25, that $p_1 + p_2 - r = 0$, i.e., $p_1 + p_2 = r$. Note this balancing can also be immediately deduced from Proposition 1.13. This proves vanishing of $N_{p_1 p_2 r}^0$ unless this condition holds.

Now suppose p_1, p_2, r lie in a common cone with $p_1 + p_2 = r$. We need to show $N_{p_1 p_2 r}^0 = 1$. To do so we will show $\mathcal{M}(X, \beta, z)$ is a reduced point.

Claim 3.22. *Given $z \in Z_r^\circ$, there is a unique basic punctured map over $\text{Spec}(Q \rightarrow \mathbb{k})$ (for Q the basic monoid) of type β with image z .*

Proof. Fix $\underline{f} : \underline{C} = \mathbb{P}^1 / \text{Spec } \mathbb{k} \rightarrow \underline{X}$ to be the constant map with image z . If \underline{f} has an enhancement to a punctured map of type β , it is immediate from the definition of the basic monoid [ACGS20], §2.4, that the basic monoid is $Q = P$, where $P = \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{X,z}$. Let C denote the log enhancement of \underline{C} to a log smooth curve over $\text{Spec}(Q \rightarrow \mathbb{k})$ with x_1, x_2, x_{out} marked points in the log structure. We first need to determine the only possibility for a puncturing C° of C . Indeed, if there is an enhancement of \underline{f} to a stable punctured map over $\text{Spec}(Q \rightarrow \mathbb{k})$, then in fact $\bar{f}^\flat : f^{-1}\overline{\mathcal{M}}_X \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{C^\circ}$ is completely determined by the contact orders at the three marked points, as follows. Write $\Gamma(C, \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{C^\circ}) \subset Q \oplus \mathbb{N}_{x_1} \oplus \mathbb{N}_{x_2} \oplus \mathbb{Z}_{x_{\text{out}}}$. Here the subscripts indicate the source of the particular factor. Then by the definition of contact order (2.1),

$$\bar{f}^\flat(m) = (m, \langle p_1, m \rangle, \langle p_2, m \rangle, -\langle r, m \rangle),$$

for $m \in P$. In particular, using pre-stability of the punctured morphism $f : C^\circ \rightarrow X$, we can define the punctured log structure by choosing $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{C^\circ} \subset \overline{\mathcal{M}}_C^{\text{gp}}$ so that its stalk at x_{out} is generated by $Q \oplus \mathbb{N}$ and $\{(m, -\langle r, m \rangle) \mid m \in P\}$, while $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{C^\circ}$ and $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_C$ agree away from x_{out} . We then take $\mathcal{M}_{C^\circ} = \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{C^\circ} \times_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}_C^{\text{gp}}} \mathcal{M}_C^{\text{gp}}$. Finally we define $\alpha_{C^\circ} : \mathcal{M}_{C^\circ} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_C$ to agree with the structure map $\alpha_C : \mathcal{M}_C \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_C$ on $\mathcal{M}_C \subset \mathcal{M}_{C^\circ}$ and to take the value 0 on $\mathcal{M}_{C^\circ} \setminus \mathcal{M}_C$. This defines the only possible punctured curve $C^\circ / \text{Spec}(Q \rightarrow \mathbb{k})$ which can appear as a domain of a stable punctured log map.

We now need to show that up to isomorphism, there is a unique lifting of \overline{f}^b to $f^b : f^{-1}\mathcal{M}_X \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{C^\circ}$. Note that the torsor $f^*\mathcal{L}_m^\times$ (corresponding to $m \in P$) is necessarily trivial as \underline{f} is constant, and the balancing condition is equivalent to the torsor $\mathcal{L}_{\overline{f}^b(m)}^\times$ being trivial for all $m \in P$. Thus it is sufficient to choose a collection of identifications $f^*\mathcal{L}_m^\times \cong \mathcal{L}_{\overline{f}^b(m)}^\times$ for $m \in Q^{\text{gp}}$ compatible with multiplication in $f^*\mathcal{M}_X$ and \mathcal{M}_{C° . It is clear that such a set of identifications can be chosen, and any two choices are related by a choice of element in $\text{Hom}(Q^{\text{gp}}, \mathbb{k}^\times)$. Thus in particular, any two such choices of punctured map are isomorphic over an automorphism of $\text{Spec}(Q \rightarrow \mathbb{k})$, proving the claim. \square

The above claim is insufficient to prove the result, as there may be infinitesimal deformations. But note that as $f^*\Theta_{X/\mathbb{k}}$ is trivial, $H^1(C, f^*\Theta_{X/\mathbb{k}}(-x_{\text{out}})) = 0$. This tells us that the morphism $\mathcal{M}(X, \beta) \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta)$ is smooth. Moreover, the morphism $\text{ev}_{\mathcal{X}} : \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(X, r)$ is log smooth by Theorem 3.16. Thus the composition $\mathcal{M}(X, \beta) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(X, r)$ is log smooth also. From the above calculation of the basic monoid, this morphism is also strict over the locus $Z_r^\circ \times B\mathbb{G}_m \subset \mathcal{P}(X, r)$. A strict log smooth morphism is also smooth, and hence $\mathcal{M}(X, \beta)$ is smooth over $\mathcal{P}(X, r)$, at least over $Z_r^\circ \times B\mathbb{G}_m$. In turn, by base-change, $\mathcal{M}(X, \beta, z)$ is smooth over $B\mathbb{G}_m$. This implies $\mathcal{M}(X, \beta, z)$ consists of one non-singular point, with trivial stabilizer by [ACGS20], Prop. 2.41. We conclude that $N_{p_1 p_2 r}^0 = 1$. \square

3.6. The tropical interpretation of point constraints. Note that the moduli spaces $\mathcal{M}(X, \beta, z)$, $\mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta, z)$ (Definition 3.10) carry a log structure coming from the fs fibre product, and thus it is not the basic log structure associated to the family of punctured log maps. It is useful to interpret these log structures tropically.

In particular, let $\bar{w} \in \mathcal{M}(X, \beta, z)$ be a geometric point with a corresponding punctured map $f : C_{\bar{w}}^\circ \rightarrow X$, and images $\bar{y} \in \mathcal{M}(X, \beta)$ and $\bar{s} \in \mathcal{P}(X, r)$. Note

that the tropicalization of ev_X then induces a map $\sigma_{\bar{y}} \rightarrow \sigma_{\bar{s}}$, as defined in §2.1.1. This can be described as follows.

Lemma 3.23. *Let G be the dual graph of $C_{\bar{w}}^\circ$ and v_{out} the vertex of G corresponding to the irreducible component of $C_{\bar{w}}^\circ$ containing the point x_{out} . Let $h : \Gamma \rightarrow \Sigma(X)$ be the induced universal family of tropical maps, defined over $\sigma_{\bar{y}}$, i.e., defined using the basic log structure. Then $\Sigma(\text{ev}_X) : \sigma_{\bar{y}} \rightarrow \sigma_{\bar{s}}$ is given by*

$$m \mapsto h_m(v_{\text{out}}).$$

Further, if $r \neq 0$, then $\sigma_{\bar{w}}$ can be identified with

$$\{m \in \sigma_{\bar{y}} \mid h_m(v_{\text{out}}) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}r \subset \sigma_{\bar{s}}\}$$

and the projection $\mathcal{M}(X, \beta, z) \rightarrow B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger$ tropicalizes to

$$\delta : \sigma_{\bar{w}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$$

with $m \in \sigma_{\bar{w}}$ mapping to the number $\delta(m)$ such that

$$h_m(v_{\text{out}}) = \delta(m)r.$$

If $r = 0$, then $\sigma_{\bar{w}} = \sigma_{\bar{y}} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, with projection to $\Sigma(B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger)$ being projection onto the second factor.

Proof. The description of $\Sigma(\text{ev}_X)$ follows immediately from dualizing (3.4) and the description of tropical maps associated to punctured maps given in [ACGS20], §2.2.

On the other hand, the tropicalization of $B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(X, r)$ is clearly the map $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \sigma_{\bar{s}}$ given by $1 \mapsto r$. The remaining statements then follow immediately from Proposition 2.2. \square

Definition 3.24. We use the notation δ interchangeably for:

- (1) $\delta \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger}$ the generator;
- (2) $\delta \in \Gamma(\mathcal{M}(X, \beta, z), \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{\mathcal{M}(X, \beta, z)})$ the image of δ defined in (1) under the map of ghost sheaves induced by the projection $\mathcal{M}(X, \beta, z) \rightarrow B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger$;
- (3) The tropicalization $\delta : \Sigma(\mathcal{M}(X, \beta, z)) \rightarrow \Sigma(B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger) = \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ of the projection $\mathcal{M}(X, \beta, z) \rightarrow B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger$. If one views a section of the ghost sheaf on a log stack Y as inducing a function $\Sigma(Y) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, then this is the function induced by δ as defined in (2). By Lemma 3.23, if $r \neq 0$, then δ is given on a cone of $\Sigma(\mathcal{M}(X, \beta, z))$ by

$$(3.7) \quad h_m(v_{\text{out}}) = \delta(m)r.$$




FIGURE 3.1. Tropical map without and with point constraints. We note in all depictions of tropical punctured maps, we only draw the legs corresponding to punctured points as arrows. By pre-stability, in fact these legs should extend as far as possible in the cone of $\Sigma(X)$ containing the leg, but this will make the figures harder to parse.

In cases (2) and (3), we also use the same notation δ with the stack $\mathcal{M}(X, \beta, z)$ replaced by the stack $\mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta, z)$.

More generally, the notation δ will appear in many different places in the sequel, and will always denote either a morphism to $B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger$ playing the same role as above, or denote the element of a stalk of a ghost sheaf measuring the distance of v_{out} from the origin, as indicated in (3.7).

In Figure 3.1, a general tropical map coming from tropicalizing a point in $\mathcal{M}(X, \beta)$ is depicted on the left: in this case v_{out} may fall anywhere in a cone containing r , e.g., the first quadrant. On the right, a general tropical map coming from tropicalizing a point in $\mathcal{M}(X, \beta, z)$ is depicted. In this case v_{out} is constrained to lie on the dotted line through r , and δ measures where v_{out} falls on this line.

4. SKETCH AND FIRST STEPS OF THE PROOF OF THE MAIN THEOREM

This section will break the proof of associativity and hence the main theorems, Theorems 1.9 and 1.12, into a number of steps, and illustrate why these steps are necessary, partly by way of some simple examples. This section should be viewed as both a reader's guide to the rest of the paper and the start of the actual proof of associativity.

We first divide the requirements of Theorems 1.9 and 1.12 into four pieces.

4.1. Finiteness of the product rule. We first show that (1.2) or (1.5) is always a finite sum:

Lemma 4.1. *With the hypotheses of either Theorem 1.9 or Theorem 1.12, with $(B, \mathcal{P}) = (|\Sigma(X)|, \Sigma(X))$ in the first case, fix $p_1, p_2 \in B(\mathbb{Z})$. Then all but a finite number of the $N_{p_1 p_2 r}^A$ for $A \in P \setminus I$, $r \in B(\mathbb{Z})$ are zero.*

Proof. Since I is assumed to be co-Artinian, there are only a finite number of classes $A \in P \setminus I$. Thus we may fix a curve class A , and only need to show there are only a finite number of choices of r such that $N_{p_1 p_2 r}^A \neq 0$. However, this follows immediately from Remark 2.12. \square

4.2. Commutativity. We simply state the completely obvious lemma, which follows immediately from the fact that the definition of the numbers $N_{p_1 p_2 r}^A$ is independent of the ordering of the input points x_1, x_2 .

Lemma 4.2. $N_{p_1 p_2 r}^A = N_{p_2 p_1 r}^A$, hence the multiplication operation defined using these structure constants is commutative.

4.3. ϑ_0 is the unit element. The fact that ϑ_0 is the unit in the ring is rephrased in terms of the numbers $N_{p_1 p_2 r}^A$ as follows:

Theorem 4.3. *With the hypotheses of either Theorem 1.9 or Theorem 1.12, with $(B, \mathcal{P}) = (|\Sigma(X)|, \Sigma(X))$ in the first case, we have for $A \in P \setminus I$, $p \in B(\mathbb{Z})$,*

$$N_{0pr}^A = \begin{cases} 0 & A \neq 0 \text{ or } p \neq r, \\ 1 & A = 0, r = p. \end{cases}$$

In particular ϑ_0 is the unit in R_I .

The proof of this theorem is given in §5.

4.4. Associativity. We will rephrase the main associativity result, and then sketch some of the main ideas of the proof while breaking the argument into smaller pieces, which will be proved in subsequent sections.

4.4.1. Restatement of associativity. Associativity is implied by the following theorem, by expanding out the products $(\vartheta_{p_1} \cdot \vartheta_{p_2}) \cdot \vartheta_{p_3}$ and $\vartheta_{p_1} \cdot (\vartheta_{p_2} \cdot \vartheta_{p_3})$.

Theorem 4.4. *With the hypotheses of either Theorem 1.9 or Theorem 1.12, with $(B, \mathcal{P}) = (|\Sigma(X)|, \Sigma(X))$ in the first case, we have for each $A \in P \setminus I$, $p_1, p_2, p_3, r \in B(\mathbb{Z})$,*

$$(4.1) \quad \sum_{\substack{A_1, A_2, s \\ A_1 + A_2 = A}} N_{p_1 p_2 s}^{A_1} N_{s p_3 r}^{A_2} = \sum_{\substack{A_1, A_2, s \\ A_1 + A_2 = A}} N_{p_2 p_3 s}^{A_1} N_{p_1 s r}^{A_2}.$$

Here we sum over $s \in B(\mathbb{Z})$.

So it will be sufficient to prove the above theorem to complete the proofs of Theorems 1.9 and 1.12.

4.4.2. *An extended example.*

Example 4.5. We consider a sample associativity statement in the case of Examples 1.5, (1). Consider the product $\vartheta_{p_1}\vartheta_{p_2}\vartheta_{p_3}$ where

$$p_1 = v_1 + 2v_2, \quad p_2 = v_2, \quad p_3 = 2v_3.$$

By the observations stated in Example 1.21, we can express the corresponding theta functions as monomials in the ϑ_{v_i} :

$$\vartheta_{p_1} = \vartheta_{v_1}\vartheta_{v_2}^2, \quad \vartheta_{p_2} = \vartheta_{v_2}, \quad \vartheta_{p_3} = \vartheta_{v_3}^2.$$

Thus, assuming that the ring R_I is as described in (1.6) (in particular assuming the product is associative), we can calculate the product of the ϑ_{p_i} 's as follows, using the given relations stated in Example 1.21,

$$\begin{aligned} \vartheta_{p_1}\vartheta_{p_2}\vartheta_{p_3} &\stackrel{(1.7)}{=} (\vartheta_{v_1}\vartheta_{v_2}\vartheta_{v_3})\vartheta_{v_2}^2\vartheta_{v_3} \\ &\stackrel{(1.6)}{=} (t^{[L]} + t^{[L-E]}\vartheta_{v_1})\vartheta_{v_2}^2\vartheta_{v_3} \\ &\stackrel{(1.8)}{=} t^{[L]}(\vartheta_{v_2+v_3} + t^{[L-E]})\vartheta_{v_2} + t^{[L-E]}(\vartheta_{v_1}\vartheta_{v_2}\vartheta_{v_3})\vartheta_{v_2} \\ &\stackrel{(1.6)}{=} t^{[L]}(\vartheta_{v_2+v_3} + t^{[L-E]})\vartheta_{v_2} + t^{[L-E]}(t^{[L]} + t^{[L-E]}\vartheta_{v_1})\vartheta_{v_2} \\ &\stackrel{(1.7)}{=} t^{[L]}\vartheta_{2v_2+v_3} + 2t^{[2L-E]}\vartheta_{v_2} + t^{[2L-2E]}\vartheta_{v_1+v_2}. \end{aligned}$$

We would like to study the term $2t^{[2L-E]}\vartheta_{v_2}$ and show how the geometry of a moduli space of punctured maps exhibits the fact that this term appears in both ways of associating the product.

To do so, set $A = 2L - E$ and $r = v_2$. This gives a class of four-pointed punctured maps β , with contact orders p_1, p_2, p_3 and $-r$ at the four points. Fix a point $z \in Z_r^\circ = D_2^\circ$. We describe the moduli space $\mathcal{M}(X, \beta, z)$, which will in fact be unobstructed and hence one-dimensional by Proposition 3.12. We omit the detailed analysis of this moduli space, leaving it to the reader to use the contact orders to verify the description we give here. Despite this moduli space being unobstructed, it is reducible and non-reduced, as we shall explain shortly. The underlying reduced stack of $\mathcal{M}(X, \beta, z)$ has two irreducible components isomorphic to \mathbb{P}^1 attached at a single point. Call these components \mathcal{M}_1 and \mathcal{M}_2 .

The general curve parameterized by \mathcal{M}_1 is as depicted on the left in Figure 4.1, with its tropicalization depicted on the right. The image of the map is the union




FIGURE 4.1.

of D_2 and the strict transform of the line through the center of the blowup and $D_2 \cap D_3$. The \mathbb{P}^1 worth of moduli is given by the location of the point x_2 . There are three ways this curve can degenerate: x_2 can either move towards the node of the domain contained in the same component as x_2 ; x_2 can move to x_{out} ; and x_2 can move to x_1 . In Figures 4.2 and 4.3 we draw the first and third of these possibilities; the second possibility will not play an important role in this discussion.

The moduli space $\mathcal{M}(X, \beta, z)$ is in fact generically non-reduced along the irreducible component \mathcal{M}_1 , a thickening of multiplicity 2. This may seem surprising given the statement that the moduli space is unobstructed, but unobstructedness in our context just says that $\mathcal{M}(X, \beta, z)$ is log smooth over $B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger$. Indeed, being unobstructed means that $\mathcal{M}(X, \beta, z) \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{X}, \beta, z)$ is a smooth morphism, and further $\mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{X}, \beta, z) \rightarrow B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger$ is log smooth by Lemma 3.17. By Lemma 3.23, if $Q = \mathbb{N}$ is the ghost sheaf at a general point of \mathcal{M}_1 , then $\delta : Q^\vee \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ is given by (3.7). Now Q is generated by $\ell \in Q$, which viewed as a function on the moduli space $Q_{\mathbb{R}}^\vee$ of tropical maps of the given type depicted in Figure 4.1, yields the affine length of either of the two edges (as opposed to legs) of the tropical curve. In particular, the location of the vertex adjacent to x_{out} is at distance 2ℓ from the origin. Thus $\delta = 2$. From this, it follows that étale locally at a general point of \mathcal{M}_1 , $\mathcal{M}(X, \beta, z)$ is of the form $\mathbb{A}^1 \times \text{Spec } \mathbb{k}[x]/(x^2)$, see [ACGS20], Prop. B.4.

The curve of Figure 4.2 lies at the intersection of the two components \mathcal{M}_1 and \mathcal{M}_2 , and we obtain \mathcal{M}_2 by smoothing the node at the intersection of the components containing x_2 and x_3 . The generic behaviour is then illustrated in Figure 4.4, with two further degenerations shown in Figures 4.5 and 4.6. The notation q , E_q will be explained later.




FIGURE 4.2.




FIGURE 4.3.




FIGURE 4.4.

The obvious forgetful and stabilization map $\mathcal{M}(X, \beta, z) \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4}$ induces an isomorphism $\mathcal{M}_1 \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4}$ and maps \mathcal{M}_2 to the divisor $D(x_2, x_3 | x_1, x_{out})$. Here we use standard notation for the irreducible divisor in the moduli space of (pre-)




FIGURE 4.5.




FIGURE 4.6.

stable curves whose general point represents a curve with two irreducible components with marked points distributed as indicated. Note that over the divisor $D(x_1, x_2 | x_3, x_{\text{out}})$ sits the curve of Figure 4.3. It is clear that this curve can be interpreted as calculating a contribution to $(\vartheta_{p_1} \cdot \vartheta_{p_2}) \cdot \vartheta_{p_3}$. Specifically, if we normalize at the node q , we obtain two curves. Roughly speaking, the component containing x_1 and x_2 contributes $t^0 \vartheta_{p_1+p_2} = \vartheta_{v_1+3v_2}$, and the other connected component then calculates the contribution $t^A \vartheta_r = t^{[2L-E]} \vartheta_{v_2}$ of the product $\vartheta_{p_1+p_2} \cdot \vartheta_{p_3}$. Note that the edge E_q of the tropical map in Figure 4.3 can have length going to ∞ , while keeping the location of the vertex attached to x_{out} fixed. To turn these observations into a proof, some caution is required. In particular, after normalizing, the component containing x_1, x_2 no longer satisfies a point constraint, here visible at the tropical level, comparing with Figure 3.1.

On the other hand, the fibre of the forgetful morphism over $D(x_2, x_3 | x_1, x_{\text{out}})$ is \mathcal{M}_2 , which is of course one-dimensional, despite the moduli space being unobstructed, and there is no way to assign a number to this fibre. Rather, as we shall see, this fibre is genuinely virtually one-dimensional as well as actually one-dimensional. How, then, do we select out a contribution to $\vartheta_{p_1} \cdot (\vartheta_{p_2} \cdot \vartheta_{p_3})$ which will also yield the same contribution $t^A \vartheta_r$?

The answer lies in using the power of log geometry to select out the part of the fibre over boundary points of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4}^\dagger$ with the correct tropical behaviour. Thus we turn to a more detailed analysis of the tropical maps appearing here.

4.4.3. The relevant tropical maps. We will consider families of tropical maps to $\Sigma(X)$ as summarized in §2.2.4. At this stage, we will not assume they arise as tropicalization of logarithmic maps, but the reader should keep in mind that these tropical maps should arise from a logarithmic curve with three marked points x_1, x_2, x_3 and a puncture x_{out} as previously, with a point constraint on x_{out} .

We fix $p_1, p_2, p_3, r \in \Sigma(X)(\mathbb{Z})$ as usual and a domain graph G of genus 0 with precisely four legs, labelled $E_{x_1}, E_{x_2}, E_{x_3}, E_{\text{out}}$ respectively, with the first three legs being rays and the fourth being a ray only if $r = 0$; otherwise E_{out} is a line segment.

Definition 4.6. The *spine* G' of G is the minimal connected subgraph of G containing all the legs of G .

Note that the underlying topological space of the spine G' of G is homeomorphic to the underlying topological space of either: (1) a graph G'' with one quadrivalent vertex, with four legs attached to this vertex; (2) a graph G'' with two trivalent vertices, v and w , one edge connecting v and w , and four legs, two adjacent to v and two adjacent to w . Note in case (2) that as G' is a subgraph of G , we can view v, w as vertices of G . If a leg E_{x_i} or E_{out} of G is contained in the leg of the underlying topological space of G'' adjacent to v (resp. w), we say that the leg E_{x_i} or E_{out} is *adjacent to* v (resp. w).

For the remainder of this subsection, we assume given a family of tropical maps $h : \Gamma(G, \ell) \rightarrow \Sigma(X)$ over a cone σ and with domain G in the sense of §2.2.4, with type given by $(G, \boldsymbol{\sigma}, \mathbf{u})$. We write as usual for $m \in \sigma$ the map

$$h_m : G \rightarrow |\Sigma(X)|$$

parameterized by m . We also assume given a function $\delta : \sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ which will play the same role as the function δ in Lemma 3.23.

Definition 4.7. We say h , along with the function δ , is a family of tropical maps with contact orders p_1, p_2, p_3 and $-r$ and constraint δ if the following conditions hold.

- (1) Let $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma_3$ and σ_{out} be the minimal cones of $\Sigma(X)$ containing p_1, p_2, p_3 and r respectively. Then $\sigma_i \subseteq \boldsymbol{\sigma}(E_{x_i})$ and $\mathbf{u}(E_{x_i}) = p_i$ for each i . Further $\sigma_{\text{out}} \subseteq \boldsymbol{\sigma}(E_{\text{out}})$ and $\mathbf{u}(E_{\text{out}}) = -r$.
- (2) Let v_{out} be the vertex adjacent to E_{out} . Then

$$(4.2) \quad h_m(v_{\text{out}}) = \delta(m)r.$$

Note that δ is determined by this condition if $r \neq 0$, but if $r = 0$, δ is genuinely an extra piece of data.

Definition 4.8. We say the family h of tropical maps parameterized by σ with contact orders p_1, p_2, p_3 and $-r$ and constraint δ is *universal* if for every family of tropical maps h' of the same type as h parameterized by σ' , with constraint δ' , there is a unique map $\sigma' \rightarrow \sigma$ such that h' is the pull-back of h and δ' is the pull-back of δ . We write $h_{\text{bas}}, \sigma_{\text{bas}}, \delta_{\text{bas}}$ for the universal family.

We say a family h parameterized by σ is *miniversal* if the tautological morphism $\sigma \rightarrow \sigma_{\text{bas}}$ induces an isomorphism of tangent spaces of cones (not necessarily respecting integral structures).

Remark 4.9. Note that if the family $h_{\text{bas}}, \delta_{\text{bas}}$ is universal and $r \neq 0$, then as before δ_{bas} is not additional data, being determined by (4.2). However, if $r = 0$, then $\sigma_{\text{bas}} = \sigma'_{\text{bas}} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, where $\delta_{\text{bas}} : \sigma_{\text{bas}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is the second projection, and σ'_{bas} itself is the universal family of tropical maps constrained by r , i.e., $h_m(v_{\text{out}}) = 0$ for $m \in \sigma'_{\text{bas}}$, without the additional data of δ_{bas} .

Definition 4.10. Suppose the spine G' of G has two vertices v and w , with E_{out} adjacent to v . We say that G lies in $D(x_1, x_2 | x_3, x_{\text{out}})$ if E_{x_3} is adjacent to v , so that E_{x_1}, E_{x_2} are adjacent to w . In this case, let $v = v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n = w$ be the sequence of vertices traversed in passing from v to w in G , and let E_i be the edge connecting v_i to v_{i+1} .

Let $\ell_i = \ell(E_i) : \sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ be the length function associated to the edge E_i , and set

$$\ell = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \ell_i.$$

See Figure 4.7 for a picture of a graph G lying in $D(x_1, x_2 | x_3, x_{\text{out}})$.




FIGURE 4.7. The spine of a four-pointed tropical curve. The solid lines are the spine, while the dotted lines indicate additional pieces of the tropical curve which are not contained in the spine. This tropical curve has a terminal tail.

We remark we can similarly say that G lies in $D(x_2, x_3 | x_1, x_{\text{out}})$ if E_{x_2}, E_{x_3} are adjacent to w instead, and everything said below for the case of $D(x_1, x_2 | x_3, x_{\text{out}})$ also goes for $D(x_2, x_3 | x_1, x_{\text{out}})$ with the obvious modifications.

Definition 4.11. In the situation of Definition 4.10, we say that G has a *terminal tail* if $v_{\text{out}} \neq v$.

We will see that terminal tails cause trouble at several points in the proof. Another type of tail, discussed later, called an *internal tail* (see Definition 4.23), will also cause problems. Let us observe for now that families of curves with terminal tails can indeed arise:

Example 4.12. In Example 1.5, (1), consider $A = D_1 + E$, where E is the exceptional curve of the blow-up, and take

$$p_1 = v_1 + v_2, \quad p_2 = v_1, \quad p_3 = v_3, \quad r = v_1.$$

Fix $z \in Z_r = D_1$ to be the point of intersection of E with D_1 . Then in the one-dimensional moduli space $\mathcal{M}(X, \beta, z)$, there is a curve as depicted in Figure 4.8. There the component containing x_3 maps isomorphically to D_1 , the component containing x_1 and x_2 is contracted to $D_1 \cap D_2$, the component containing x_{out} is contracted to $D_1 \cap E$, and the remaining unmarked component is mapped isomorphically to E .




FIGURE 4.8.

The tropicalization of this curve has a terminal tail, as is visible on the right in Figure 4.8. Here it is clear that if we had chosen z more generally, this tail wouldn't have appeared, perhaps supplying some intuition as to why such curves will not cause trouble at a virtual level.

4.4.4. *The first step: independence of modulus.*

Definition 4.13. Let $y \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4}$. We define a log stack $B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger$ and a morphism

$$\psi_y : B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4}^\dagger,$$

depending on y , where $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4}^\dagger$ has been defined in Lemma 3.18.

If y is not one of the three boundary points of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4}$, then we set $B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger = B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger$, and take ψ_y to be an isomorphism with the closed substack $y \times B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger$ of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4}^\dagger$.

If y is a boundary point, we select an auxiliary positive integer λ , which in general will be taken to be suitably large. Consider the group \mathbb{Z}^2 with basis ℓ, δ and define submonoids of \mathbb{Z}^2 and their duals given by

$$(4.3) \quad \begin{aligned} R &:= \mathbb{N}\ell \oplus \mathbb{N}\delta, & R_\lambda &:= \mathbb{N}(\ell - \lambda\delta) + \mathbb{N}\delta \subset R^{\text{gp}}, \\ R^\vee &= \mathbb{N}\ell^* \oplus \mathbb{N}\delta^* & R_\lambda^\vee &= \mathbb{N}(\lambda\ell^* + \delta^*) + \mathbb{N}\ell^* \subset R^*. \end{aligned}$$

Let $B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger$ denote $B\mathbb{G}_m$ with log structure having ghost sheaf R_λ , with torsor associated to $a\ell + b\delta \in R_\lambda$ given by $\mathcal{U}^{\otimes b}$, where \mathcal{U} is the universal torsor on $B\mathbb{G}_m$. On the other hand, the log structure on $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4}^\dagger$ pulled back to $y \times B\mathbb{G}_m$ has ghost sheaf R , where the factor $\mathbb{N}\ell$ comes from the divisorial log structure induced by $y \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4}$ and factor $\mathbb{N}\delta$ comes from $B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger$. Thus the torsor associated to $a\ell + b\delta$ is again $\mathcal{U}^{\otimes b}$, and there is a canonical log morphism $\psi_y : B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4}^\dagger$ with image

$y \times B\mathbb{G}_m$ and $\bar{\psi}_y^b : R \rightarrow R_\lambda$ the inclusion. Note that the tropicalization

$$(4.4) \quad \Sigma(\psi_y) : \Sigma(B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger) \rightarrow \Sigma(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4}^\dagger)$$

has image the subcone of $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^2$ generated by $\lambda\ell^* + \delta^*$ and ℓ^* .

Definition 4.14. Let $y \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4}$. Assume further fixed $p_1, p_2, p_3, r \in B(\mathbb{Z})$ and a type of curve β with four punctured points of contact orders p_1, p_2, p_3 and $-r$. Assume $z \in Z_r^\circ$ given. Then set

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}_y^\dagger &= \mathcal{M}_y^\dagger(X, \beta, z) := \mathcal{M}(X, \beta, z) \times_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4}^\dagger} B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger, \\ \mathfrak{M}_y^{\dagger, \text{ev}} &= \mathfrak{M}_y^{\dagger, \text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta, z) := \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta, z) \times_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4}^\dagger} B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger. \end{aligned}$$

Here the morphisms $\mathcal{M}(X, \beta, z), \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta, z) \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4}^\dagger$ are the morphisms Φ given by Lemma 3.18. We use the short-hand notation on the left when clear from context, which will essentially always be the case as we never consider more than one four-pointed curve type at a time.

As $\mathcal{M}_y^\dagger = \mathcal{M}(X, \beta, z) \times_{\mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta, z)} \mathfrak{M}_y^{\dagger, \text{ev}}$, there is a perfect relative obstruction theory for $\mathcal{M}_y^\dagger \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}_y^{\dagger, \text{ev}}$ pulled back from that of $\mathcal{M}(X, \beta, z) \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta, z)$.

The first of the key results, to be proved in §6, is the following.

Theorem 4.15. *Suppose that the virtual dimension of $\mathcal{M}(X, \beta, z)$ is 1 and either $\pm c_1(\Theta_{X/D})$ is nef or (X, D) is log Calabi-Yau. Let $y \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4}$. If either (1) y is a boundary point of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4}$ and λ is chosen to be sufficiently large in Definition 4.13 or (2) y is not a boundary point, then \mathcal{M}_y^\dagger carries a virtual fundamental class of dimension 0. Furthermore, $\deg[\mathcal{M}_y^\dagger]^{\text{virt}}$ is then independent of y , so that in particular $\deg[\mathcal{M}_y^\dagger]^{\text{virt}} = \deg[\mathcal{M}_{y'}^\dagger]^{\text{virt}}$ for y a boundary point and y' a non-boundary point.*

Remark 4.16. It is useful to keep in mind the nature of the tropicalization

$$\Sigma(\Phi) : \Sigma(\mathcal{M}(X, \beta, z)) \rightarrow \Sigma(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4}^\dagger).$$

The tropicalization of the map $\mathcal{M}(X, \beta, z) \rightarrow B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger$ has already been discussed in Definition 3.24, and is written as $\delta : \Sigma(\mathcal{M}(X, \beta, z)) \rightarrow \Sigma(B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger) = \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. On the other hand, the morphism $\mathcal{M}(X, \beta, z) \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4}$ factors through $\mathbf{M} = \mathbf{M}_{0,4}$, the moduli space of pre-stable curves.

We first review a standard description of the tropicalization of the stabilization map $\Sigma(\mathbf{M}_{0,4}) \rightarrow \Sigma(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4})$, see e.g., [ACP15] or [CCUW17], Lem. 8.8. Given a geometric point \bar{x} of $\mathbf{M}_{0,4}$, let C be the corresponding basic pre-stable curve. Suppose the stabilization C' of C is reducible, necessarily having two components.

If the dual graph of C is G , then the dual graph of C' is G' , the spine of G . Further, G' has two trivalent vertices, v and w , and let $v = v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n = w$, E_i be as in Definition 4.10. Recall that $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{\mathbf{M}, \bar{x}}$ is the free monoid with one generator for each node of C , with $\ell(E)$ the generator corresponding to an edge E of G . Set $\ell_i = \ell(E_i)$. Meanwhile, the ghost sheaf of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4}$ at the image of \bar{x} is \mathbb{N} , generated by an element ℓ . Then the stabilization map at the level of ghost sheaves sends ℓ to $\ell_1 + \dots + \ell_{n-1}$. Put another way, the tropicalization of the stabilization map at \bar{x} is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Hom}(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{\mathbf{M}, \bar{x}}, \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}) &\rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \ell^*, \\ m &\mapsto \left(\sum_i \ell_i(m) \right) \ell^*. \end{aligned}$$

So ℓ is the sum of the lengths of the edges E_1, \dots, E_{n-1} , and may be viewed as the tropical modulus of the tropical stabilization of the tropical curve parameterized by a point of $\text{Hom}(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{\mathbf{M}, \bar{x}}, \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0})$.

Under the forgetful map $\mathcal{M}(X, \beta, z) \rightarrow \mathbf{M}_{0,4}$, the elements $\ell_1, \dots, \ell_{n-1}$ are taken to the elements of the basic monoid corresponding to the nodes indexed by E_1, \dots, E_{n-1} , see [ACGS20], §2.4. So if instead \bar{x} is a geometric point of $\mathcal{M}(X, \beta, z)$, $C \rightarrow \bar{x}$ the corresponding curve, then we can write $\ell_1, \dots, \ell_{n-1}$ for the elements of the basic monoid indexed by the nodes corresponding to E_1, \dots, E_{n-1} . We continue to use the notation

$$\ell := \ell_1 + \dots + \ell_{n-1}.$$

Putting this together, we see that given $\bar{x} \in \mathcal{M}(X, \beta, z)$ mapping to a boundary point of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4}^\dagger$ with notation as above, the tropicalization is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_{\bar{x}} &\rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \ell^* \oplus \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \delta^* \\ m &\mapsto \ell(m) \ell^* + \delta(m) \delta^*. \end{aligned}$$

Given this description, along with Proposition 2.2, we can now tropically interpret the fibre product $\mathcal{M}(X, \beta, z) \times_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4}^\dagger}^{\text{fs}} \text{BG}_m^\dagger$ defining \mathcal{M}_y^\dagger for y a boundary point. From (4.4), we see that the fibre product defining \mathcal{M}_y^\dagger selects out that part of the moduli space $\mathcal{M}(X, \beta, z)$ where the value of ℓ (which from the above discussion can be viewed as the tropical modulus of the 4-pointed domain) is very large compared to δ , the distance of the image of the vertex v_{out} to the origin in $\Sigma(X)$. As long as the slope λ is taken sufficiently large, we will be able to guarantee that for any tropical map appearing in the family parameterized by

$\Sigma(\mathcal{M}_y^\dagger)$, the tropical modulus can be taken to infinity while keeping the distance of v_{out} from the origin fixed.

We note that this idea of considering four-pointed tropical curves and looking at families where the tropical modulus goes to infinity is a familiar one in tropical geometry: the first occurrence of this that we are aware of is in Gathmann and Markwig's proof of WDVV for tropical curves in the projective plane [GM08].

Remark 4.17. The possible existence of tails (in this case terminal tails) is important, and a certain amount of work is necessary in the course of the proofs here to eliminate their influence. The first time they cause potential problems is in the proof of Theorem 4.15. Indeed, the existence of curves in $\mathcal{M}(X, \beta, z)$ whose tropicalizations have terminal tails may result in correction terms, leading to the possibility that $\deg[\mathcal{M}_y^\dagger]$ as in Theorem 4.15 in fact depends on y . See Step 3 of the proof of Lemma 6.6, where we need to show that the contribution to the first Chern class of the conormal bundle at x_{out} coming from the divisor $D(x_1, x_2, x_3 | x_{\text{out}}) \subseteq \mathbf{M}_{0,4}$ vanishes.

In fact, it is expected that tails should play a role in defining a differential in a definition of an all-degree analogue of symplectic cohomology in our setting. In the course of the proofs of theorems in this paper comparing various invariants, the vanishing of potential corrections caused by tails might then be reinterpreted in terms of vanishing of the differential from degree one to degree zero, at least in the log Calabi-Yau case.

Example 4.18. We continue with Example 4.5. Recall that the component \mathcal{M}_2 sits over the boundary divisor $D(x_2, x_3 | x_1, x_{\text{out}})$ of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4}$. Let us consider $\Sigma(\Phi) : \Sigma(\mathcal{M}(X, \beta, z)) \rightarrow \Sigma(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4}^\dagger)$ when restricted to $\Sigma(\mathcal{M}_2)$. Figure 4.9 shows the quadrant $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}\ell^* \oplus \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}\delta^*$ with coordinates given by ℓ and δ , and the tropical maps corresponding to points in the inverse image of $\Sigma(\Phi)$. Here the red chain of edges is the chain E_1, \dots, E_{n-1} . The one curve depicted in the cone where $\delta \geq \ell$ is the curve shown in Figure 4.2, the curve over the diagonal where $\delta = \ell$ is shown in Figure 4.4, and the two curves lying over the cone where $\ell \geq \delta$ are the curves of Figure 4.5 and 4.6.

As long as the image of $\Sigma(\psi_y)$ (see (4.4)) is contained in the cone where $\ell \geq \delta$ (i.e., as long as we have taken $\lambda \geq 1$) \mathcal{M}_y^\dagger will consist of two points projecting to the two boundary points of $\mathcal{M}(X, \beta, z)$ corresponding to Figures 4.5 and 4.6. In this case \mathcal{M}_y^\dagger is non-singular and length two. Taking y instead to be the boundary point in the divisor $D(x_1, x_2 | x_3, x_{\text{out}})$, we may take $\lambda \geq 0$, and then \mathcal{M}_y^\dagger consists




FIGURE 4.9.

of one non-reduced point of length 2, with tropicalization given by Figure 4.3. So in both cases, $\deg[\mathcal{M}_y^\dagger]^{\text{virt}} = 2$, as desired.

4.4.5. *The key tropical analysis.* Here we show that given a certain type of family of four-pointed tropical maps to $\Sigma(X)$, there is a canonical choice of edge along which to split. A bit more explicitly, such families of tropical maps can be viewed as arising by tropicalizing a punctured map lying over a generic point of an irreducible component of $\mathfrak{M}_y^{\dagger, \text{ev}}$. We will eventually see that such a family of tropical maps is two-dimensional, parameterized by ℓ and δ , parameters described in §4.4.3. What we will show is that with certain assumptions on this family, the length ℓ_i of one of the edges E_i described in Definition 4.10 will be unbounded even when δ is fixed. Further, there is a preferred choice of such an edge. Splitting the domain of the tropical map at E_i into two curves allows us to decompose the tropical map as a gluing of two other tropical maps. Ultimately, we will then need to do the same splitting at the level of punctured maps, but here we focus only on the requisite tropical geometry.

Assumptions 4.19. For the remainder of this subsection, we assume given a family of tropical maps h to $\Sigma(X)$ with contact orders p_1, p_2, p_3 and $-r$ and

constraint δ as in Definition 4.7 parameterized by a two-dimensional cone σ and with underlying domain G . We write as usual for $m \in \sigma$ the map

$$h_m : G \rightarrow |\Sigma(X)|$$

parameterized by m . We assume further that this family satisfies the following properties, referring to Definition 4.10 for notation:

- (1) G lies in $D(x_1, x_2 | x_3, x_{\text{out}})$.
- (2) The family Σ is miniversal in the sense of Definition 4.8.
- (3) Using the notation of Definition 4.10, we assume that the image of the map

$$(\ell, \delta) : \sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}\ell^* \oplus \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}\delta^*$$

has image a two-dimensional cone containing ℓ^* .

Note (3) implies that the image of (ℓ, δ) may be written as the cone generated by $\lambda\ell^* + \delta^*$ and ℓ^* for some $\lambda > 0$, $\lambda \in \mathbb{Q}$.

Given such a family, for each $1 \leq i \leq n$, let

$$\tau_i := \nu_{v_i}(\sigma) \subseteq \sigma(v_i),$$

where ν_{v_i} is defined in (2.5). Let $u_i = \mathbf{u}(E_i) \in \sigma(E_i)^{\text{gp}}$ be the contact order of the edge E_i , oriented from v_i to v_{i+1} .

The following is perhaps the most important single fact in the proof of associativity. It will tell us that provided the tropical modulus of a tropical curve is always sufficiently large, there will be a good choice of edge along which to split.

Proposition 4.20. *Given Assumptions 4.19, assume in addition that G does not have a terminal tail. Then there exists a unique i such that u_i is tangent to τ_{i+1} . Further, for this i ,*

- (1) $\ell_1, \dots, \ell_{i-1}$ are proportional to δ .
- (2) ℓ_i and δ are linearly independent.
- (3) $u_i \in \sigma(E_i)$ (as opposed to in $\sigma(E_i)^{\text{gp}}$).

Proof. We first show existence. Write $\nu_i := \nu_{v_i}$ for brevity. If $r = 0$, then by the no-tail assumption, $\nu_1(m) = 0$ for any m by (4.2). Hence u_1 is proportional to $\nu_2(m)$ for any m by (2.4). Since ν_2 is linear, it follows in particular that u_1 is tangent to τ_2 , and we can take $i = 1$.

If $r \neq 0$, then $\nu_1(m)$ is determined by δ via (4.2). By (2.4), $\nu_{i+1}(m) = \nu_i(m) + \ell_i(m)u_i$. If there exists $m, m' \in \sigma$ with $\nu_i(m) = \nu_i(m')$ but $\nu_{i+1}(m) \neq \nu_{i+1}(m')$, then $\ell_i(m) \neq \ell_i(m')$. In this case, $(\ell_i(m') - \ell_i(m))u_i$ is a non-zero vector in τ_{i+1}^{gp} , and hence u_i is tangent to τ_{i+1} . Conversely, if there is no edge E_i with u_i tangent

to τ_{i+1} , then inductively $\nu_1(m), \dots, \nu_n(m)$ are determined entirely by $\nu_1(m)$. But then all ℓ_i , hence ℓ , are necessarily rationally proportional to δ , violating condition (3) of Assumptions 4.19. Note this also shows (1).

To show uniqueness, suppose there are two edges E_i, E_j , $i < j$, with u_i, u_j tangent to τ_{i+1}, τ_{j+1} respectively. We will argue that we can deform $\Gamma \rightarrow \Sigma(X)$ in a two-dimensional family if $r = 0$ and a three-dimensional family if $r \neq 0$, so that in both cases σ_{bas} is at least three-dimensional. Since $\dim \sigma = 2$ by assumption, this contradicts the miniversality assumption (2) of Assumptions 4.19. We will do this by constructing a two-dimensional family on which ν_1 is constant regardless of the value of r . Once this is accomplished, if $r = 0$, we are done, and if $r \neq 0$, we obtain a three-dimensional family as δ , hence ν_1 , is not constant on σ by (4.2).

Take $m \in \text{Int}(\sigma)$. Since u_i is tangent to τ_{i+1} and $\nu_{i+1}(m) \in \text{Int}(\tau_{i+1})$, we have $\nu_{i+1}(m) + \epsilon u_i \in \tau_{i+1}$ for ϵ sufficiently close to 0. Thus for each ϵ , there is an $m' \in \sigma$ with $\nu_{i+1}(m') = \nu_{i+1}(m) + \epsilon u_i$. This allows us to create a new tropical map $h_\epsilon : \Gamma \rightarrow \Sigma(X)$ as follows. Removing the edge E_i splits Γ into two connected components, Γ_1 and Γ_2 , with Γ_2 containing the leg E_{out} . Then we define $h_\epsilon|_{\Gamma_2} = h_m|_{\Gamma_2}$, and $h_\epsilon|_{\Gamma_1} = h_{m'}|_{\Gamma_1}$. Finally h_ϵ maps E_i to the segment joining $\nu_i(m)$ and $\nu_{i+1}(m')$. This gives a tropical map of the same type as h_m , since $\nu_{i+1}(m') - \nu_{i+1}(m)$ is a positive multiple of u_i for sufficiently small ϵ . In addition, this tropical map has the same value as h_m on v_1 .

The same procedure can be carried out at the edge E_j , completely independently of the adjustment to the length of E_i . This shows that we do have a two-parameter family as claimed, with ν_1 constant in this family.

To prove (2), note that if ℓ_i were proportional to δ , then similarly to the existence proof for $r \neq 0$ above, $\ell_{i+1}, \dots, \ell_{n-1}$ are then all proportional to δ also.

For (3), note that as ℓ_i and δ are linearly independent, then as σ is two-dimensional, we can write $\ell = a\ell_i + b\delta$ for some rational numbers a and b . Further, from Assumptions 4.19, (3), $a \neq 0$ and the image of the map (ℓ, δ) contains the half-line $L = \{\lambda'\ell^* + \delta^* \mid \lambda' \geq \lambda\}$, on which δ takes the constant value 1 and ℓ is unbounded. As a consequence, identifying σ with its image under (ℓ, δ) so that we may view the ℓ_i as linear functions on this image, we see that necessarily $a > 0$ and ℓ_i is unbounded on L . For $m \in L$, $\nu_i(m)$ is determined as before but $\nu_{i+1}(m) = \nu_i(m) + \ell_i(m)u_i \in \sigma(E_i)$. Since $\ell_i(m)$ is unbounded, necessarily $u_i \in \sigma(E_i)$, as claimed. \square

Example 4.21. Continuing on from Example 4.18, one sees that none of the tropical maps appearing there have terminal tails. In this case, Proposition 4.20 can be applied for the two types of tropical maps parameterized by the cone

$\sigma = \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}\ell^* + \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}(\delta^* + \ell^*)$. These curves are those appearing in Figures 4.5 and 4.6, also depicted on the right-hand side of Figure 4.9. In the case of these two families of curves, the unique i given by Proposition 4.20 is $i = 1$ and 2 for the first and second respectively. In those figures, we label this edge as E_q , and also indicate the corresponding node q of the domain curve.

Remark 4.22. We now see a second place where tails can cause problems, the first place being described in Remark 4.17. If G has a terminal tail in Proposition 4.20, there may not be an edge along which to split. This will cause problems in the final stage of the proof, namely in the proof of Theorem 4.26, as not all curves in the moduli space \mathcal{M}_y^\ddagger will have a choice of splitting. Again, we need to know contributions from such curves vanish.

As mentioned earlier, there is another type of tail which we will also have to deal with in the last steps of the proof:

Definition 4.23. In the situation of Assumptions 4.19, suppose G does not have a terminal tail. We say an edge E_i is of *splitting type* if ℓ_i and δ are linearly independent. We say that the family of tropical maps parameterized by σ has an *internal tail* if there is more than one edge E_i of splitting type. If either G has a terminal tail or the family has an internal tail, then we say the family of tropical maps parameterized by σ has a *tail*. Otherwise, we say the family is *tail-free*.

Example 4.24. We have already seen an example of a terminal tail in Example 4.12 and in fact internal tails can also happen. Take $\bar{X} = \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$ and \bar{D} the toric boundary, $\bar{D} = \bar{D}_1 + \cdots + \bar{D}_4$ in cyclic order. Blow up a point x in the interior of \bar{D}_1 to get X , and take D to be the inverse image of \bar{D} (rather than the strict transform!) So this is a non-minimal log Calabi-Yau manifold. We can write $D = D_1 + \cdots + D_4 + E$, where E is the exceptional divisor, and $K_X + D = E$. In this case the Kontsevich-Soibelman skeleton B is naturally identified with $\Sigma(\bar{X})$. On the other hand, $\Sigma(X)$ is obtained, abstractly as a cone complex, from $\Sigma(\bar{X})$ by adding an additional two-dimensional standard cone with rays generated by D_1^* and E^* , so that this cone intersects B in the ray generated by D_1^* . Note $|\Sigma(X)|$ is not a manifold.

Consider

$$p_1 = v_1 + v_2, \quad p_2 = v_4, \quad p_3 = v_3, \quad r = 0,$$

where v_i is the primitive generator of the ray of $\Sigma(X)$ corresponding to D_i . In addition, take the curve class

$$A \sim D_3 + D_4 \sim D_1 + (D_4 - E) + 2E.$$

The resulting curve type β will potentially contribute to the ϑ_0 term in the product $\vartheta_{p_1}\vartheta_{p_2}\vartheta_{p_3}$. If we place $z \in Z_r^\circ = X \setminus D$ to lie on the strict transform L of the line of class \overline{D}_4 passing through the point x , then Figure 4.10 depicts a general curve in the moduli space \mathcal{M}_y^\ddagger as defined in Definition 4.14, $y \in D(x_1, x_2 | x_3, x_{\text{out}}) \subset \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4}$. The picture is slightly misleading. The component drawn as an ellipse is a degree 2 cover of E . This cover must be ramified over $E \cap D_1$ but need not be ramified where E meets L . In particular, this moduli space is one-dimensional.

The essential part of the tropicalization of this curve is depicted on the right-hand side of Figure 4.10, with the quadrant corresponding to the double point $E \cap D_1$ depicted. All vertices of the tropical curve are mapped into this quadrant, whereas some of the legs are not, and we draw those legs as arrows. The reader should keep in mind these correspond to half-lines in other cones of $\Sigma(X)$. Both of the edges of the curve are of splitting type. Indeed, as $r = 0$, the value of δ has no impact on the tropical map, and $\ell_1 = \ell_2$.

The claim, shown in §8, is that curves with tails will not contribute to any virtual calculation. This may seem a bit puzzling, as in fact we expect a constant term in $\vartheta_{p_1}\vartheta_{p_2}\vartheta_{p_3}$, as is immediately visible if we had chosen z somewhat more generally. The answer lies in the magic of virtual irreducible decompositions, which we now explain.

If we degenerate the double cover of E to a reducible double cover, we obtain a particularly degenerate member of the family of curves \mathcal{M}_y^\ddagger , which tropicalizes to the left-hand picture in Figure 4.11. Along with the parameter δ , which is not visible in this picture, this yields a three-dimensional family of tropical maps. This degenerate curve lies over the intersection of two irreducible components of the moduli space $\mathfrak{M}_y^{\ddagger, \text{ev}}$ defined in Definition 4.14. One of these irreducible components contains the image of the family of curves described in Figure 4.10. Because $\mathfrak{M}_y^{\ddagger, \text{ev}}$ is insensitive to the precise location of $z \in Z_r^\circ = X \setminus D$, the other irreducible component can be seen as the one containing the image of what would have been \mathcal{M}_y^\ddagger if z had been chosen generally. In that case, the domain consists of three irreducible components, mapping to D_1 , E and a curve linearly equivalent to \overline{D}_4 passing through z . The tropicalization of this curve is shown on the right in Figure 4.11. It then makes sense that it is only this second irreducible component which contributes to $\vartheta_{p_1}\vartheta_{p_2}\vartheta_{p_3}$, as the first one would not contribute if z had been chosen generally.

4.4.6. *The second step: gluing.* The basic idea is now as follows. Let y be a boundary point of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4}$, either the divisor $D(x_1, x_2 | x_3, x_{\text{out}})$ or $D(x_2, x_3 | x_1, x_{\text{out}})$. Then, up to the issue of terminal tails, Proposition 4.20 essentially tells us that




FIGURE 4.10.




FIGURE 4.11.

the moduli space \mathcal{M}_y^\dagger described in §4.4.4 should decompose into (virtual) irreducible components over which the universal curve splits into two curves, at least if λ is large enough. If the original curve type was β , with underlying curve class A and with four marked points of contact order p_1, p_2, p_3 and $-r$, then we are interested in situations where the curve splits into two curves of types β_1 and β_2 with underlying curve classes satisfying, $A_1 + A_2 = A$, and β_1 having punctured points x_1, x_2, x_s of contact orders p_1, p_2 and $-s$ for some $s \in \Sigma(X)(\mathbb{Z})$ and β_2 having punctured points x'_s, x_3, x_{out} of contact orders s, p_3 and $-r$.

For example, if we continue with Example 4.5, we might see the curve of Figure 4.5 as obtained by gluing two pieces, a curve of type β_1 with $A_1 = L - E$ and $s = v_3$, and a curve of type β_2 with $A_2 = L$. The curve of type β_1 is just the

connected component of the partial normalization of the domain at the labelled node q containing the points x_2, x_3 .

In particular, we have moduli spaces $\mathcal{M}(X, \beta_1)$ and $\mathcal{M}(X, \beta_2, z)$, with $z \in Z_r^\circ$. Note that we don't put a point constraint in the first moduli space. We can see that this is reasonable at a tropical level. In Figure 4.5, if one restricts the tropical map to the sub-graph of G corresponding to the curve of type β_1 , one sees that the punctured leg (labelled E_q) with tangent vector $-s$ is not constrained to lie in the ray $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}s$.

Reviewing the methods of [ACGS20], we construct in §7.1 a moduli space of glued curves $\mathcal{M}^{\text{gl}}(X, \beta_1, \beta_2, z)$, parameterizing curves in $\mathcal{M}(X, \beta, z)$ with a splitting into curves of type β_1 and β_2 . Doing the same thing at the level of maps to the Artin fan gives moduli spaces $\mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1)$, $\mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_2, z)$ and a glued moduli space $\mathfrak{M}^{\text{gl, ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z)$, along with a morphism $\mathcal{M}^{\text{gl}}(X, \beta_1, \beta_2, z) \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}^{\text{gl, ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z)$. There is a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{M}^{\text{gl}}(X, \beta_1, \beta_2, z) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{M}(X, \beta, z) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathfrak{M}^{\text{gl, ev}}(X, \beta_1, \beta_2, z) & \longrightarrow & \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta, z) \end{array}$$

which is not Cartesian; rather, it induces an open and closed embedding of $\mathcal{M}^{\text{gl}}(X, \beta_1, \beta_2, z)$ into the fibre product. This is because as classes of maps to the Artin fan \mathcal{X} , β_1 and β_2 do not remember the curve classes in X , and hence we need to pick out those curves in the fibre product which split into curves of classes A_1 and A_2 . Now ideally we would like $\mathcal{M}^{\text{gl}}(X, \beta_1, \beta_2, z)$ to be of virtual dimension zero, and then the point of gluing would be to express the degree of this virtual fundamental class as $N_{p_1 p_2 s}^{A_1} N_{sp_3 r}^{A_2}$. Unfortunately, this is not always the case, which is again visible in Example 4.5.

Indeed, the curve of Figure 4.5 appears as a degeneration of a family of curves shown in Figure 4.4. The node q in Figure 4.5 is a limit of the node q indicated in Figure 4.4. As a consequence, $\mathcal{M}^{\text{gl}}(X, \beta_1, \beta_2, z)$, in this instance, is one-dimensional and is indeed unobstructed. Hence we cannot extract a number.

This problem is similar to an issue in §4.4.4: if y is a boundary point of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4}^\dagger$, then \mathcal{M}_y^\ddagger is only of the correct virtual dimension if the parameter λ is chosen to be sufficiently large. Tropically, we expect that a large choice of λ allows the parameter $\ell = \sum_i \ell_i$ to be unbounded for fixed value of δ . Here, we similarly force the length of the edge E_q associated to the node produced by gluing to be large compared to δ , so that it becomes unbounded for fixed δ .

For example, note in the tropical map in Figure 4.4, the edge E_q corresponding to the node q has length equal to the distance of the vertex adjacent to x_{out} to the origin. We can use logarithmic geometry to focus on the part of $\mathcal{M}^{\text{gl}}(X, \beta_1, \beta_2, z)$ where the length of E_q is large compared to the distance of the vertex adjacent to x_{out} from the origin.

Explicitly, in §7, we construct a morphism

$$\Psi : \mathfrak{M}^{\text{gl, ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z) \rightarrow BG_m^\dagger \times BG_m^\dagger.$$

The composition of Ψ with projection onto the first factor is just the composition $\mathfrak{M}^{\text{gl, ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z) \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta, z) \rightarrow BG_m^\dagger$ with the second morphism the projection. The composition of Ψ with projection onto the second factor is new, and the induced tropical map $\Sigma(\mathfrak{M}^{\text{gl, ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z)) \rightarrow \Sigma(BG_m^\dagger) = \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ takes a tropical map to the length of the edge E_q corresponding to the glued node q .

Analogously to (4.3), we define

$$(4.5) \quad \begin{aligned} T &:= \mathbb{N}\delta \oplus \mathbb{N}\ell_q, & T_\mu &:= \mathbb{N}\delta + \mathbb{N}(\ell_q - \mu\delta) \subseteq T^{\text{gp}}, \\ T^\vee &= \mathbb{N}\delta^* \oplus \mathbb{N}\ell_q^*, & T_\mu^\vee &= \mathbb{N}\ell_q^* + \mathbb{N}(\delta^* + \mu\ell_q^*) \subset T^*, \end{aligned}$$

where of course δ^*, ℓ_q^* is the dual basis to δ, ℓ_q . Here μ is a fixed positive integer, which we will eventually take to be large. We view T as the stalk of the ghost sheaf of $BG_m^\dagger \times BG_m^\dagger$, with δ and ℓ_q coming from the first and second factors respectively. We can then define a new log structure on BG_m^2 , which we write as $BG_m^{2, \mu}$, with $\mathcal{M}_{BG_m^{2, \mu}}^{\text{gp}} = \mathcal{M}_{BG_m^\dagger \times BG_m^\dagger}^{\text{gp}}$ but $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{BG_m^{2, \mu}} = T_\mu$. Thus there is a morphism

$$BG_m^{2, \mu} \rightarrow BG_m^\dagger \times BG_m^\dagger.$$

This tropicalizes to an inclusion of cones

$$\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}\ell_q^* + \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}(\delta^* + \mu\ell_q^*) \hookrightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}\delta^* \oplus \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}\ell_q^*.$$

We can then define modified moduli spaces via the fs log Cartesian diagrams

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}}(X, \beta_1, \beta_2, z) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{M}^{\text{gl}}(X, \beta_1, \beta_2, z) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ BG_m^{2, \mu} & \longrightarrow & BG_m^\dagger \times BG_m^\dagger \end{array}$$

and

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{gl, ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z) & \longrightarrow & \mathfrak{M}^{\text{gl, ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ BG_m^{2, \mu} & \longrightarrow & BG_m^\dagger \times BG_m^\dagger \end{array}$$

We can now state the key gluing result:

Theorem 4.25. *Suppose $\pm c_1(\Theta_{X/\mathbb{k}})$ is nef or (X, D) is log Calabi-Yau. Then we have a Cartesian diagram*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}}(X, \beta_1, \beta_2, z) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{M}^{\text{gl}}(X, \beta_1, \beta_2, z) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}, \text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z) & \longrightarrow & \mathfrak{M}^{\text{gl}, \text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z) \end{array}$$

The relative obstruction theory for the right-hand vertical arrow pulls back to a relative obstruction theory for the left-hand vertical arrow. If $\mu \gg 0$, then $\mathcal{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}}(X, \beta_1, \beta_2, z)$ is proper of virtual dimension $A \cdot c_1(\Theta_{X/\mathbb{k}})$, and assuming this virtual dimension is zero, then

$$\deg[\mathcal{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}}(X, \beta_1, \beta_2, z)]^{\text{virt}} = \begin{cases} N_{p_1 p_2 s}^{A_1} N_{s p_3 r}^{A_2} & s \in B(\mathbb{Z}) \\ 0 & s \notin B(\mathbb{Z}). \end{cases}$$

The proof of this theorem is given in §7.3. This is the first significant application of the logarithmic gluing technology set up in [ACGS20].

4.4.7. *The third step: Comparison of moduli spaces.* Now let $y \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4}$ be either the boundary point $D(x_1, x_2 \mid x_3, x_{\text{out}})$ or $D(x_2, x_3 \mid x_1, x_{\text{out}})$. Without loss of generality, we shall assume y is always the former. We fix $p_1, p_2, p_3, r \in B(\mathbb{Z})$ and an underlying curve class A , giving a curve type β . We fix $z \in Z_r^\circ$ as usual. After fixing a $\lambda \gg 0$, we obtain, from this data, moduli spaces \mathcal{M}_y^\ddagger and $\mathfrak{M}_y^{\ddagger, \text{ev}}$.

On the other hand, given $s \in \Sigma(X)(\mathbb{Z})$ and a decomposition $A = A_1 + A_2$, we obtain two types of punctured map β_1, β_2 with the given underlying curve classes, each with three punctures of contact orders $p_1, p_2, -s$ and $s, p_3, -r$ respectively. Fixing $\mu \gg 0$, this gives rise to the glued moduli spaces $\mathcal{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}}(X, \beta_1, \beta_2, z)$, $\mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}, \text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z)$, with the virtual degree of the former calculated by Theorem 4.25.

We wish to compare the virtual degree of \mathcal{M}_y^\ddagger with the virtual degree of $\coprod_{A_1, A_2, s} \mathcal{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}}(X, \beta_1, \beta_2, z)$. Here, when we index a union or sum over A_1, A_2, s , we mean we take the union or sum over all choices of $s \in \Sigma(X)(\mathbb{Z})$ and all decompositions $A = A_1 + A_2$, with the types β_1, β_2 then being determined by this data as in the previous paragraph. The main remaining theorem is:

Theorem 4.26. *Suppose $\pm c_1(\Theta_{X/\mathbb{k}})$ is nef or (X, D) is log Calabi-Yau. Suppose that μ is chosen sufficiently large, and that λ is chosen sufficiently large (depending on the choice of μ). Then, assuming $A \cdot c_1(\Theta_{X/\mathbb{k}}) = 0$, we have*

$$\sum_{A_1, A_2, s} \deg[\mathcal{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}}(X, \beta_1, \beta_2, z)]^{\text{virt}} = \deg[\mathcal{M}_y^\ddagger]^{\text{virt}}.$$

To prove this, we will need another intermediate moduli space. There are canonical morphisms

$$(4.6) \quad \mathcal{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}}(X, \beta_1, \beta_2, z) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}(X, \beta, z), \quad \mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}, \text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z) \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta, z).$$

We may compose each of these with the canonical morphism Φ of Lemma 3.18 to $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4}^\dagger$.

Fixing $\lambda \gg 0$, we obtain a morphism $\psi_y : B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4}^\dagger$ via Definition 4.13, and hence moduli spaces $\mathcal{M}_y^\dagger, \mathfrak{M}_y^{\dagger, \text{ev}}$ by Definition 4.14. We then obtain a diagram

(4.7)

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \coprod_{A_1, A_2, s} \mathcal{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}}(X, \beta_1, \beta_2, z) & \xleftarrow{i'} & \coprod_{A_1, A_2, s} \mathcal{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}}(X, \beta_1, \beta_2, z) \times_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4}^\dagger}^{\text{fs}} B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger & \xrightarrow{j'} & \mathcal{M}_y^\dagger \\ \downarrow k_1 & & \downarrow k_2 & & \downarrow k_3 \\ \coprod_s \mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}, \text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z) & \xleftarrow{i} & \coprod_s \mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}, \text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z) \times_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4}^\dagger}^{\text{fs}} B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger & \xrightarrow{j} & \mathfrak{M}_y^{\dagger, \text{ev}} \end{array}$$

All vertical arrows are strict. For k_1 and k_2 , note that as punctured maps to the Artin fan do not remember the curve class, specifying s alone is enough to specify the types β_1, β_2 of maps to \mathcal{X} . Each square is Cartesian in all categories, as will be shown in Lemma 8.1. Here i' and i are projections onto the first factor and j', j are induced by the morphisms (4.6). The morphisms k_1 and k_3 carry relative obstruction theories by Theorem 4.25 and Lemma 6.3 respectively. We shall see that these obstruction theories pull back to the same relative obstruction theory for k_2 .

In an ideal world, we would show that i and j are degree 1 morphisms, so that we may apply Costello's result [Co06], Thm. 5.0.1 or [Ma12]. Unfortunately, this is not true in general as there may be irreducible components of the various moduli spaces involving tails, and these components cause problems for i and j . However, we will show that such components contribute 0 to the degree of the virtual fundamental classes. It is only at this step that internal tails cause trouble.

4.4.8. *The proof of Theorem 4.4.* Theorem 4.4, hence the main results of the paper, Theorems 1.9 and 1.12, now follows immediately. Indeed, fix $A, p_1, p_2, p_3, r \in B(\mathbb{Z})$. If $A \cdot c_1(\Theta_{X/\mathbb{k}}) \neq 0$, then for each splitting $A = A_1 + A_2$, we have $A_i \cdot c_1(\Theta_{X/\mathbb{k}}) \neq 0$ for some i , and hence one of the two factors in the product $N_{p_1 p_2 s}^{A_1} N_{sp_3 r}^{A_2}$ is defined to be 0. Hence both sides of (4.1) are zero. Thus we may assume that $A \cdot c_1(\Theta_{X/\mathbb{k}}) = 0$, so that the virtual dimension of $\mathcal{M}(X, \beta, z)$ is 1.

Taking $y \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4}$ to be the boundary point $D(x_1, x_2 | x_3, x_{\text{out}})$ and y' to be the boundary point $D(x_2, x_3 | x_1, x_{\text{out}})$, Theorem 4.15 now tells us that $\deg[\mathcal{M}_y^\dagger]^{\text{virt}} =$

$\deg[\mathcal{M}_y^\ddagger]^{\text{virt}}$. However, combining Theorems 4.25 and 4.26, we see that these two degrees coincide with the left and right-hand sides of (4.1), hence the desired equality.

5. FORGETFUL MAPS: ϑ_0 IS THE UNIT

We give here the proof of Theorem 4.3. The proof is morally the same as the proof that the fundamental class of a smooth variety is the unit in quantum cohomology. However, as usual, life is made harder by difficulties in forgetting marked points in logarithmic geometry.

5.1. The case of curves. We discuss forgetting marked points of punctured log maps, following some of the ideas of [AMW14] and [AW18], but generalising to the punctured case.

Lemma 5.1. *Let $C^\circ \rightarrow W$ be a punctured curve with punctures x, x_1, \dots, x_n . Let $C_{\text{for}}^\circ \rightarrow W$ be the curve obtained by forgetting the puncture x , and let $\underline{\tau} : \underline{C} \rightarrow \underline{C}'$ be a partial stabilization such that for each geometric point $\bar{w} \in W$, the induced map of pointed curves*

$$\underline{\tau} : (\underline{C}_{\bar{w}}, x, x_1, \dots, x_n) \rightarrow (\underline{C}'_{\bar{w}}, x_1, \dots, x_n)$$

is stable, i.e., the only component possibly contracted is the component containing x . Then $\tau_ \mathcal{M}_{C_{\text{for}}^\circ}$ defines a log structure C'° on \underline{C}' making $C'^\circ \rightarrow W$ a punctured curve.*

Proof. This is a slight variation of ideas in [AMW14], App. B. By [AMW14], Lem. B.3, both $\underline{\tau}_* \mathcal{M}_{C_{\text{for}}}$ and $\underline{\tau}_* \mathcal{M}_{C_{\text{for}}^\circ}$ define log structures on \underline{C}' . (Here we continue to use the convention that C_{for} is the log curve with marked points x_1, \dots, x_n , rather than punctured points.) Write these two log schemes as C' and C'° , respectively; both are log schemes over W .

By [AMW14], Lem. B.5, C' is log smooth over W . We claim that C' has marked points $\underline{\tau} \circ x_i$, $1 \leq i \leq n$, and that C'° is a puncturing of C' .

We will first compute the stalks of the ghost sheaves of $\underline{\tau}_* \mathcal{M}_{C_{\text{for}}}$ and $\underline{\tau}_* \mathcal{M}_{C_{\text{for}}^\circ}$ at points in the image of $\underline{\tau} \circ x_i$, $1 \leq i \leq n$. As formation of $\tau_* \mathcal{M}_{C_{\text{for}}^\circ}$ commutes with strict base change in W by [AMW14], Lem. B.4, we may assume that W is a geometric point. Further, if $\underline{\tau}$ is an isomorphism in a neighbourhood of x_i , then of course there is nothing to compute.

Otherwise, $\underline{C} \rightarrow \underline{C}'$ contracts an irreducible component D containing x and x_i , and necessarily D contains precisely one node of $\underline{C}_{\text{for}}$. Let q be the node of \underline{C} contained in D . Let $y \in \underline{C}'$ be the image of D under $\underline{\tau}$.

Note that $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{C'^{\circ},y} \subseteq (\tau_* \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{C'_{\text{for}}^{\circ}})_y = \Gamma(D, \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{C'_{\text{for}}^{\circ}}|_D)$, and we have

$$\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{C'^{\circ},y} = \{\bar{s} \in \Gamma(D, \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{C'_{\text{for}}^{\circ}}|_D) \mid \mathcal{L}_{\bar{s}}^{\times} \cong \mathcal{O}_D^{\times}\}.$$

Let η be the generic point of D . The generization map $\chi_{x_i,\eta} : Q^{\circ} \rightarrow Q$ is given by projection onto the first factor, and the generization map $\chi_{q\eta} : Q \oplus_{\mathbb{N}} \mathbb{N}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ is given by $(m, (a, b)) \mapsto m + a\rho_q$, see [GS13], Rmk. 1.2. Then

$$\begin{aligned} & \Gamma(D, \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{C'_{\text{for}}^{\circ}}|_D) \\ &= \{((m', r), (m, (a, b))) \in Q^{\circ} \oplus (Q \oplus_{\mathbb{N}} \mathbb{N}^2) \mid \chi_{x_i,\eta}(m', r) = \chi_{q\eta}(m, (a, b))\} \\ &= \{((m + a\rho_q, r), (m, (a, b))) \in Q^{\circ} \oplus (Q \oplus_{\mathbb{N}} \mathbb{N}^2)\}. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, if $\bar{s} \in \Gamma(D, \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{C'_{\text{for}}^{\circ}}|_D)$ is given as $((m + a\rho_q, r), (m, (a, b)))$, then as in [GS13], Lem. 1.14, the degree of the corresponding line bundle $\mathcal{L}_{\bar{s}}$ is $-r + a - b$. Thus if this degree is 0, we may write \bar{s} as $((m + a\rho_q, r), (m, (a, a - r)))$, necessarily with $(m + a\rho_q, r) \in Q^{\circ}$, $m \in Q$ and $a, a - r \geq 0$. Thus we may write $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{C'^{\circ},y} = \{((m + a\rho_q, r), (m, (a, a - r))) \mid (m + a\rho_q, r) \in Q^{\circ}, m \in Q, a, a - r \geq 0\}$.

We may map $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{C'^{\circ},y}$ injectively into $Q \oplus \mathbb{Z}$ via

$$(5.1) \quad ((m + a\rho_q, r), (m, (a, a - r))) \mapsto (m + (a - r)\rho_q, r).$$

Identifying $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{C'^{\circ},y}$ with its image, we obtain

$$(5.2) \quad \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{C'^{\circ},y} = \{(m, r) \in Q \oplus \mathbb{Z} \mid (m + r\rho_q, r) \in Q^{\circ}\}.$$

Indeed, any element of the image of (5.1) lies in the right-hand side of (5.2). Conversely, if (m, r) lies in the right-hand side of (5.2), and if $r \geq 0$, then (m, r) is the image of $((m + r\rho_q, r), (m, (r, 0)))$, while if $r < 0$, then (m, r) is the image of $((m + r\rho_q, r), (m + r\rho_q, (0, -r)))$.

Note under this identification, the map $Q = \overline{\mathcal{M}}_W \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{C'^{\circ},y}$ is given by $m \mapsto (m, 0)$, and that if x_i were itself a marked point, so that $Q^{\circ} = Q \oplus \mathbb{N}$, then also $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{C'^{\circ},y} = Q \oplus \mathbb{N}$.

Returning to general W , applying the above discussion to $\tau_* \mathcal{M}_{C'_{\text{for}}}$, since $C' \rightarrow W$ is log smooth, necessarily $\tau \circ x_i$ is a marked point in the log structure of C' . Further, from the description of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{C'^{\circ},y}$, one sees that C'° is a puncturing of C' . \square

We may also reverse this procedure, starting with a punctured curve $\pi' : C'^{\circ} \rightarrow W$ and a choice of logarithmic section x' . Stabilization of this family modifies the curve when a point in the image of x' is a node or lies in the image of x_i for some i . In the latter case, a \mathbb{P}^1 is bubbled off, producing a new node. At the

logarithmic level, the smoothing parameter is determined by ρ_i defined in (4) of the following lemma.

Lemma 5.2. *Let $\pi' : C'^{\circ} \rightarrow W$ be a punctured curve with punctures x_1, \dots, x_n and let $x' : W \rightarrow C'^{\circ}$ be a section of π' as a morphism of log schemes. Then there exists a punctured curve $C^{\circ} \rightarrow W$ with punctures x_1, \dots, x_n and marked point x , unique up to choice of puncturing, along with a diagram*

$$(5.3) \quad \begin{array}{ccccc} & & \tau' & & \\ & & \curvearrowright & & \\ C^{\circ} & \longrightarrow & C_{\text{for}}^{\circ} & \xrightarrow{\tau} & C'^{\circ} \end{array}$$

where the first morphism forgets the marked point x , satisfying the following properties:

- (1) $\tau : (\underline{C}, x, x_1, \dots, x_n) \rightarrow (\underline{C}', x_1, \dots, x_n)$ is a partial stabilization.
- (2) For each geometric point $\bar{w} \in W$, the induced map

$$\tau : (\underline{C}_{\bar{w}}, x, x_1, \dots, x_n) \rightarrow (\underline{C}'_{\bar{w}}, x_1, \dots, x_n)$$

is stable.

- (3) If $x : W \rightarrow C_{\text{for}}^{\circ}$ is the logarithmic section corresponding to the marked point x , then $x' = \tau \circ x$.
- (4) Let \bar{s}_i be the global section of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{C'}$ which is 0 away from the image of x_i and has germ $(0, 1) \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{C', x_i(\bar{w})} = \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{W, \bar{w}} \oplus \mathbb{N}$ for any \bar{w} a geometric point of W . Define $\rho_i \in \Gamma(W, \overline{\mathcal{M}}_W)$ to be

$$\rho_i = \overline{(x')}^{\flat}(\bar{s}_i).$$

Then identifying \underline{W} with its image in \underline{C} and \underline{C}' under x_i , we have an isomorphism of line bundles

$$\mathcal{N}_{x_i/C}^{\vee} \otimes \mathcal{L}_{\rho_i} \cong \mathcal{N}_{x_i/C'}^{\vee}.$$

Further, if $W_i^{\circ}, W_i'^{\circ}$ denote the log schemes obtained by restricting the log structures of C° and C'° to the images of x_i , the restricted morphism $\tau : W_i^{\circ} \rightarrow W_i'^{\circ}$ induces, on the level of ghost sheaves, for $m \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}_W, r \in \mathbb{Z}$,

$$\bar{\tau}^{\flat}(m, r) = (m + r\rho_i, r).$$

Proof. **The diagram (5.3) at the level of marked log curves.** The existence of the diagram (5.3) at the level of underlying schemes is classical, see [Kn83], Thm. 2.4, or [ACG], Chap. 10, §8. Further, if C' is the corresponding log smooth (marked) curve over W , then x' also induces a section $x' : W \rightarrow C'$. Then the diagram (5.3) exists with $C_{\text{for}}^{\circ}, C^{\circ}$ replaced with the corresponding marked

log smooth curves C_{for}, C . This is standard, the morphism $C_{\text{for}} \rightarrow C'$ being seen as a logarithmic modification. As we need a more detailed analysis at marked points, we explain how this may be described as a logarithmic blow-up when the images of x' and x_i coincide.

Let \bar{s}_i, ρ_i be as in item (4) of the lemma. Let $w \in W$ be a scheme-theoretic point with $x_i(w) = x'(w)$, and replace W with any Zariski neighbourhood of w so that the image of x' is disjoint from the image of x_j for any $j \neq i$. Further shrinking W , we may assume the image of x' is disjoint from any node of any fibre of π' . Then $(\overline{\pi'})^{\flat}(\rho_i), \bar{s}_i$ generate a sheaf of monoid ideals in $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{C'}$. The pull-back of this sheaf of ideals under the quotient map $\mathcal{M}_{C'} \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{C'}$ is then a coherent sheaf of monoid ideals \mathcal{K} , and we take $C_{\text{for}} \rightarrow C'$ to be the logarithmic blow-up of \mathcal{K} (see [Ka21], §3 or [Og18], III, §2.6). Note that the pull-back ideal $(x')^{\bullet}\mathcal{K}$ is locally principal, so by the universal property of log blow-up, x' factors as

$$W \xrightarrow{x} C_{\text{for}} \longrightarrow C'.$$

As a log blow-up is log étale, the composed map $C_{\text{for}} \rightarrow W$ is still log smooth. To verify that this is a logarithmic curve, a local calculation, which we now carry out, suffices to check that all fibres are reduced and of dimension one.

Étale locally around w we may write W as $\text{Spec } A$ with chart $\alpha : Q \rightarrow A$, and then étale locally at $x_i(w)$, we may write $C' = \text{Spec } A[u]$, with chart $Q \oplus \mathbb{N} \rightarrow A[u]$ given by $(m, r) \mapsto \alpha(m)u^r$. Further, the section x' induces a monoid homomorphism $Q \oplus \mathbb{N} \rightarrow Q$ given by $(m, r) \mapsto m + r\rho_i$, and necessarily \underline{x}' is then induced by the A -algebra homomorphism $A[u] \rightarrow A$ defined by $u \mapsto \varphi \cdot \alpha(\rho_i)$ for some invertible function φ . The logarithmic ideal \mathcal{K} corresponds to the monoid ideal of $Q \oplus \mathbb{N}$ generated by $(\rho_i, 0)$ and $(0, 1)$, and the underlying scheme of the logarithmic blow-up is then

$$\text{Proj } A[u][v, w]/(vu - w\alpha(\rho_i)),$$

with v, w of degree 1, covered by the open affines

$$\begin{aligned} U_1 &:= \text{Spec } A[u, v]/(vu - \alpha(\rho_i)) \\ U_2 &:= \text{Spec } A[u, w]/(u - w\alpha(\rho_i)) = \text{Spec } A[w], \end{aligned}$$

with logarithmic structures given by charts

$$\begin{aligned} Q_1 &:= (Q \oplus \mathbb{N}) + \mathbb{N}(\rho_i, -1) \rightarrow A[u, v]/(vu - \alpha(\rho_i)) \\ Q_2 &:= (Q \oplus \mathbb{N}) + \mathbb{N}(-\rho_i, 1) \rightarrow A[u, w]/(u - w\alpha(\rho_i)). \end{aligned}$$

Here the monoids Q_1, Q_2 are submonoids of $Q^{\text{gp}} \oplus \mathbb{Z}$. In each of the two cases, the chart takes $(m, r) \in Q \oplus \mathbb{N}$ to $\alpha(m)u^r$. In the first case, $(\rho_i, -1) \mapsto v$

and in the second case $(-\rho_i, 1) \mapsto w$. Note further that there is an isomorphism $Q \oplus_{\mathbb{N}} \mathbb{N}^2 \cong Q_1$ (with the push-out defined using the map $\mathbb{N} \rightarrow Q$ given by $1 \mapsto \rho_i$). This isomorphism is given by the map $(m, (a, b)) \mapsto (m + b\rho_i, a - b)$. There is also an isomorphism

$$(5.4) \quad \begin{aligned} Q \oplus \mathbb{N} &\rightarrow Q_2 \\ (m, r) &\mapsto (m - r\rho_i, r). \end{aligned}$$

Finally, note that the lift x of the section x' has image in U_2 , and $x : \text{Spec } A \rightarrow U_2$ is defined by $w \mapsto \varphi$.

From the above explicit descriptions we see that indeed $C_{\text{for}} \rightarrow W$ is a log smooth curve. Marking the image of the section of x gives C . This now gives the diagram (5.3) at the level of log smooth curves, and now we need to construct the diagram for punctured curves.

The diagram (5.3) at the level of punctured curves. We define

$$C_{\text{for}}^{\circ} := C_{\text{for}} \times_{C'}^{\text{fine}} C'^{\circ}.$$

We need to check this is a puncturing of C_{for} . Note this just needs to be checked étale locally in neighbourhoods of points \bar{p} of \underline{C}' which lie in the image of both x' and x_i , and thus we may use the previous local description for C' and C_{for} to calculate the fibre product. Write the stalk of the ghost sheaf of C' at \bar{p} as $Q \oplus \mathbb{N}$ and the stalk of the ghost sheaf of C'° at \bar{p} as $Q^{\circ} \subseteq Q \oplus \mathbb{Z}$. Noting the inclusion $Q \oplus \mathbb{N} \hookrightarrow Q^{\circ}$ yields an isomorphism at the level of groups, we may use Proposition A.4, (3), to identify $Q_i \oplus_{Q \oplus \mathbb{N}}^{\text{fine}} Q^{\circ}$ with a submonoid of Q_i^{gp} .

Explicitly, for Q_1 , we obtain

$$Q_1 \oplus_{Q \oplus \mathbb{N}}^{\text{fine}} Q^{\circ} = Q_1.$$

Indeed, this follows if $Q^{\circ} \subseteq Q \oplus \mathbb{Z}$ is contained in $Q_1 = (Q \oplus \mathbb{N}) + \mathbb{N}(\rho_i, -1) \subseteq Q \oplus \mathbb{Z}$. But the section x' induces a map $Q^{\circ} \rightarrow Q$ given by $(m, r) \mapsto m + r\rho_i \in Q$, so if $(m, r) \in Q^{\circ}$ with $r < 0$, we may write $(m, r) = (m + r\rho_i, 0) - r(\rho_i, -1) \in Q_1$.

Using the identification of Q_2 with $Q \oplus \mathbb{N}$ of (5.4), we have

$$(5.5) \quad Q_2 \oplus_{Q \oplus \mathbb{N}}^{\text{fine}} Q^{\circ} = (Q \oplus \mathbb{N}) + \{(m, r) \in Q \oplus \mathbb{Z} \mid (m - r\rho_i, r) \in Q^{\circ}\} \subseteq Q \oplus \mathbb{Z}.$$

Now the fine fibre product is constructed by integralizing the log fibre product, which on the two charts $U_i := \text{Spec } B_i$ has underlying scheme $\text{Spec } B_i \times_{A[u]} A[u] = \text{Spec } B_i$, and log structure given by strict morphisms $\psi_i : \text{Spec } B_i \times_{A[u]} A[u] \rightarrow A_{Q_i \oplus_{Q \oplus \mathbb{N}} Q^{\circ}}$. The integralization is obtained by base-change via the closed embedding $A_{Q_i \oplus_{Q \oplus \mathbb{N}} Q^{\circ}} \rightarrow A_{Q_i \oplus_{Q \oplus \mathbb{N}} Q^{\circ}}$. However it is easy to check that in fact the morphisms ψ_i factor through these closed embeddings by showing the charts

$Q_i \oplus_{Q \oplus \mathbb{N}} Q^\circ \rightarrow B_i \otimes_{A[u]} A[u]$ for the log fibre product factor through the integralization morphism $Q_i \oplus_{Q \oplus \mathbb{N}} Q^\circ \rightarrow Q_i \oplus_{Q \oplus \mathbb{N}}^{\text{fine}} Q^\circ$. So integralization is an isomorphism. Hence we see that $\underline{C}_{\text{for}}^\circ = \underline{C}_{\text{for}}$, and the form of the push-outs $Q_i \oplus_{Q \oplus \mathbb{N}}^{\text{fine}} Q^\circ$ shows that C_{for}° is indeed a punctured curve, with ghost sheaf at the image of x_i being given by (5.5).

This construction now provides diagram (5.3) at the level of punctured curves, satisfying conditions (1)–(3).

Proof of (4). The given form for $\bar{\tau}^b$ follows from the description of the local models above, with $\bar{\tau}^b$ described at the level of the marked curves as the inclusion $Q \oplus \mathbb{N} \hookrightarrow Q_2 = (Q \oplus \mathbb{N}) + \mathbb{N}(-\rho_i, 1) \cong Q \oplus \mathbb{N}$ where the latter isomorphism is given by (5.4). Now writing $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{W_i^\circ}, \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{W_i'^\circ} \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{M}}_W \oplus \mathbb{Z}$, the line bundle corresponding to the section $(0, 1)$ of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{W_i'^\circ}$ is $\mathcal{N}_{x_i/C'}^\vee$, which is then isomorphic to the line bundle corresponding to the section $\bar{\tau}^b(0, 1) = (\rho_i, 1)$ of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{W_i^\circ}$, i.e., to $\mathcal{N}_{x_i/C}^\vee \otimes \mathcal{L}_{\rho_i}$, as claimed. \square

Remark 5.3. The sections ρ_i of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_W$ can be interpreted tropically as follows. Assume W is a geometric log point, and let G, G' be the dual intersection graphs of C°, C'° respectively. If the section x' is disjoint from nodes of C'° or punctures x_1, \dots, x_n , then G is obtained from G' simply by adding an additional unbounded leg attached to some vertex of G' . If, on the other hand, x coincides with x_i , then G is obtained from G' by subdividing the leg of G' corresponding to x_i by adding a new vertex to this leg, and attaching an additional leg to this vertex. In this case, ρ_i can be viewed as the length of the new edge created by this process.

5.2. The case of punctured maps. We now turn to forgetful maps for punctured maps. In this case, we may only forget marked points with contact order 0. Thus we consider for the remainder of this subsection the following fixed situation. Let β be a type of punctured curve for a target space X with punctures x, x_1, \dots, x_n with x having contact order given by $0 \in \Sigma(X)(\mathbb{Z})$. Suppose further the underlying curve class A of β is non-zero. Let β' be the type of punctured curve with the same underlying curve class and genus, but with only punctured points x_1, \dots, x_n . Let $\mathbf{x} \subseteq \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ be a subset of these marked points.

To understand the forgetful map at the virtual level, we need an intermediate space of maps to the Artin fan \mathcal{X} . This is a minor variant of the stack $\mathfrak{M}'(\mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{X})$ of [AW18], §3.

Definition 5.4. We define $\mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{X}, \beta/\beta')$ to be the log stack as follows. The objects of this stack over a log scheme W are pairs of pre-stable punctured maps

$$f : C^\circ/W \rightarrow \mathcal{X} \text{ and } f' : C'^\circ/W \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$$

of type β and β' respectively along with a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 C^\circ & & \\
 \downarrow & \searrow f & \\
 C_{\text{for}}^\circ & & \mathcal{X} \\
 \downarrow \tau & \nearrow f' & \\
 C'^\circ & &
 \end{array}$$

τ' (curved arrow from C° to C'°)

As in Lemmas 5.1,5.2, C_{for}° is the same curve as C° without the marked point x , $C^\circ \rightarrow C_{\text{for}}^\circ$ is the canonical morphism induced by the obvious inclusion of log structures, and τ satisfies conditions (1) and (2) of Lemma 5.2.

As usual, set

$$\mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}(\mathbf{x})}(\mathcal{X}, \beta/\beta') = \mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{X}, \beta/\beta') \times_{\prod_{x_i \in \mathbf{x}} \underline{X}} \prod_{x_i \in \mathbf{x}} \underline{X}.$$

The stack $\mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{X}, \beta/\beta')$ is an algebraic log stack via precisely the same argument given in [AW18], §3 for $\mathfrak{M}'(\mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{X})$. Alternatively, the following lemma gives an explicit description of $\mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}(\mathbf{x})}(\mathcal{X}, \beta/\beta')$. Also, $\mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{X}, \beta/\beta')$ carries the basic log structure inherited from the log morphism $f : C^\circ \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$, as this morphism determines f' : see the argument of [AW18], Lem. 4.1.

For brevity of notation, write

$$\mathfrak{M} := \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}(\mathbf{x})}(\mathcal{X}, \beta/\beta'), \quad \mathfrak{M}' := \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}(\mathbf{x})}(\mathcal{X}, \beta').$$

Theorem 5.5. *In the above situation, there is a diagram*

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \mathcal{M}(X, \beta) & \xrightarrow{\phi'} & \mathcal{M}(X, \beta') \\
 \varepsilon \downarrow & & \downarrow \varepsilon' \\
 \mathfrak{M} & \xrightarrow{\phi} & \mathfrak{M}' \\
 \psi \downarrow & & \\
 \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}(\mathbf{x})}(\mathcal{X}, \beta) & &
 \end{array}$$

such that:

- (1) ψ is strict étale.
- (2) Let $\pi' : C'_{\mathfrak{M}'} \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}'$ be the universal prestable punctured curve over \mathfrak{M}' .

Then there is a factorization

$$\mathfrak{M} \xrightarrow{\text{sat}} C'_{\mathfrak{M}'} \xrightarrow{\pi'} \mathfrak{M}'$$

of ϕ where sat is the saturation of $C_{\mathfrak{M}}^{\circ}$. In particular, ϕ is proper and representable.

- (3) The square is Cartesian in all categories, and ε' and $\psi \circ \varepsilon$ are the standard morphisms as in §2.2.3. The relative obstruction theory for ε' pulls back to give a relative obstruction theory for ε which is compatible with the standard relative obstruction theory for $\psi \circ \varepsilon$.

Proof. Construction of ψ and (1). Given a log morphism $W \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}$, corresponding to the data of f, f' and τ over W , we may forget the data of f' and τ to get $W \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}(\mathbf{x})}(\mathcal{X}, \beta)$. This defines ψ as a morphism of log stacks. Because the basic log structure on \mathfrak{M} is basic for f , this makes ψ strict. It is proved to be log étale precisely as in [AW18], §5.1. This gives (1).

Construction of ϕ' . As the contact order of x is 0, we see from (2.1) that the image of f^{\flat} at x is contained in $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{W, \bar{w}}$, for any geometric point \bar{w} of W . Thus we may forget the marked point without affecting the existence of the morphism f . So we may replace C° with C_{for}° . One then has a partial stabilization map $\tau : \underline{C} \rightarrow \underline{C}'$ defined over \underline{W} so that \underline{f} factors as $\underline{f}' \circ \underline{\tau}$ for an ordinary stable map $\underline{f}' : \underline{C}' \rightarrow X$ with marked points x_1, \dots, x_n . Necessarily, over each geometric point \bar{w} of W , $\underline{\tau}$ contracts at most the irreducible component of $\underline{C}_{\bar{w}}$ containing x .

Thus we are in the situation of Lemma 5.1, obtaining a log structure C'° on \underline{C}' via $\mathcal{M}_{C'^{\circ}} = \underline{\tau}_* \mathcal{M}_{C_{\text{for}}^{\circ}}$, making $C'^{\circ} \rightarrow W$ into a punctured curve. Further, by adjunction, the morphism $f : C_{\text{for}}^{\circ} \rightarrow X$ induces a morphism $f' : C'^{\circ} \rightarrow X$. The punctured map f' need not be pre-stable, but after shrinking the puncturing C'° via [ACGS20], Prop. 2.4, we may assume also that f' is pre-stable.

This gives the morphism ϕ' .

The morphism ϕ . The morphism ϕ takes the data of f, f' and τ over W to the punctured map f' . Note this morphism need not be strict, as the basic log structure on \mathfrak{M} need not be basic for f' .

Proof of (2). We first construct the factorization of ϕ through π' . Let

$$\tau' : C_{\mathfrak{M}}^{\circ} \longrightarrow C_{\mathfrak{M}, \text{for}}^{\circ} \xrightarrow{\tau} C'_{\mathfrak{M}}^{\circ}$$

be the universal data for \mathfrak{M} . Note that

$$C'_{\mathfrak{M}}^{\circ} = \mathfrak{M} \times_{\mathfrak{M}'}^{\text{fine}} C_{\mathfrak{M}'}^{\circ}$$

by [ACGS20], Prop. 2.15, (2). We can view the section $x : \mathfrak{M} \rightarrow C_{\mathfrak{M}}^{\circ}$ as inducing a strict log morphism $x : \mathfrak{M} \rightarrow C_{\mathfrak{M}, \text{for}}^{\circ}$, as x is not marked on $C_{\mathfrak{M}, \text{for}}^{\circ}$, and hence

we obtain

$$\tau \circ x : \mathfrak{M} \rightarrow C'_{\mathfrak{M}}.$$

Projection to $C'_{\mathfrak{M}'}$ then gives the desired morphism $\text{sat} : \mathfrak{M} \rightarrow C'_{\mathfrak{M}'}$ such that $\phi = \pi' \circ \text{sat}$.

As \mathfrak{M} is saturated, we thus obtain a factorization of $\tau \circ x$ as

$$\mathfrak{M} \rightarrow C'^{\text{sat}}_{\mathfrak{M}'} \rightarrow C'_{\mathfrak{M}'},$$

and we need to construct an inverse to this first morphism to show it is an isomorphism. To do so, we consider a test fs log scheme T along with a morphism $g : T \rightarrow C'_{\mathfrak{M}'}$: by the universal property of saturation, g must factor uniquely through the saturation of $C'_{\mathfrak{M}'}$. We need to construct a morphism $T \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}$, which we do by constructing the relevant data over T .

By composition of g with π' , we may pull back $C'_{\mathfrak{M}'}$ to T to obtain

$$C'^{\circ} := T \times_{\mathfrak{M}'}^{\text{fine}} C'_{\mathfrak{M}'},$$

along with a pre-stable punctured map $f' : C'^{\circ} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$. Note there is a section $x' : T \rightarrow C'^{\circ}$ induced by $\text{id} : T \rightarrow T$ and $g : T \rightarrow C'_{\mathfrak{M}'}$. Thus, by Lemma 5.2, we obtain the data of (5.3). We may then take $f = f' \circ \tau'$; it follows from the explicit description (5.5) of the puncturing monoids on C° that pre-stability of f' implies pre-stability of f . Thus we obtain an object of \mathfrak{M} , defining the desired inverse to the morphism sat . That this morphism is indeed the inverse to the morphism sat follows immediately by construction. Certainly, saturation is always finite and representable, and π' is proper and representable (by algebraic spaces), being a family of curves. Thus ϕ is proper and representable (by algebraic spaces). This completes the proof of (2).

Proof of (3). The morphism ε takes a stable punctured map $f : C^{\circ} \rightarrow X$ with $\phi(f)$ given by $f' : C'^{\circ} \rightarrow X$ to the pair of the compositions $C^{\circ} \rightarrow X \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ and $C'^{\circ} \rightarrow X \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$, with $\tau : C^{\circ} \rightarrow C'^{\circ}$ the stabilization map. In particular, ε is strict. The square of the theorem is then Cartesian exactly as in the proof of [AW18], Prop. 1.6.3.

The obstruction theory for ε' is given, for $\pi' : \mathcal{C}' \rightarrow \mathcal{M}(X, \beta')$ the universal curve and $f' : \mathcal{C}' \rightarrow X$ the universal map, by a morphism

$$\left[R\pi'_*(f')^* \Theta_{X/\mathbb{k}} \left(- \sum_{x_i \in \mathbf{x}} x_i \right) \right]^{\vee} \rightarrow \mathbb{L}_{\mathcal{M}(X, \beta')/\mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}(\mathbf{x})}(X, \beta')},$$

so, using the projection formula and $R\tau'_*\mathcal{O}_C = \mathcal{O}_{C'}$, the pull-back obstruction theory is similarly given by

$$\left[R\pi_* f^* \Theta_{X/\mathbb{k}} \left(- \sum_{x_i \in \mathbf{x}} x_i \right) \right]^\vee \rightarrow \mathbb{L}_{\mathcal{M}(X, \beta) / \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}(\mathbf{x})}(\mathcal{X}, \beta / \beta')} \cong \mathbb{L}_{\mathcal{M}(X, \beta) / \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}(\mathbf{x})}(\mathcal{X}, \beta)},$$

the latter isomorphism as ψ is strict log étale, hence étale. It is straightforward to check that the resulting obstruction theory for $\psi \circ \varepsilon$ then agrees with the relative obstruction theory for $\mathcal{M}(X, \beta) \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}(\mathbf{x})}(\mathcal{X}, \beta)$. \square

5.3. Forgetful maps with point constraints and the proof of Theorem

4.3. We now consider a curve type β as in Theorem 4.3: assume $A \neq 0$ and β has three punctured points x_1, x_2, x_{out} with contact orders $0, p$ and $-r$ respectively, with $p, r \in B(\mathbb{Z})$.

We can then apply Theorem 5.5 to get the diagram given there, taking $\mathbf{x} = \{x_{\text{out}}\}$, with ϕ forgetting the marked point x_1 . We write ev instead of $\text{ev}(\mathbf{x})$ as is usual.

We wish to obtain an analogous diagram for the corresponding moduli spaces with point constraints. For this purpose, note we have evaluation morphisms

$$(5.6) \quad \begin{aligned} \text{ev}_{\mathcal{X}} &: \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta / \beta') \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(X, r) \\ \text{ev}'_{\mathcal{X}} &: \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta') \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(X, r), \end{aligned}$$

with $\text{ev}'_{\mathcal{X}}$ the usual evaluation morphism at x_{out} given by Definition 3.5, while $\text{ev}_{\mathcal{X}}$ is given by evaluation at $x_{\text{out}} \in C^\circ$ (rather than $x_{\text{out}} \in C'^\circ$), using Proposition 3.3. Unfortunately, we do not have $\text{ev}'_{\mathcal{X}} \circ \phi = \text{ev}_{\mathcal{X}}$. This arises due to the change of normal bundle at x_{out} under stabilization, see Lemma 5.2, (4). Thus, the argument is a bit more subtle. We first examine the difference between $\text{ev}'_{\mathcal{X}}$ and $\text{ev}_{\mathcal{X}}$ at the ghost sheaf level.

A key ingredient for this is the section ρ_{out} of the ghost sheaf of $\mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta / \beta')$ obtained from Lemma 5.2, (4), with $\tau \circ x_1$ playing the role of the section x' and x_{out} playing the role of x_i .

Lemma 5.6. *In the setup of this subsection, we may identify the ghost sheaf of $\mathcal{P}(X, r)$ with $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{Z_r}$ and view r as defining a homomorphism $r : \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{Z_r} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$. Then in the notation of (5.6) and Theorem 5.5, for \bar{s} a section of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{\mathcal{P}(X, r)}$, we have*

$$\overline{\text{ev}'_{\mathcal{X}} \circ \phi}^\flat(\bar{s}) = \overline{\text{ev}_{\mathcal{X}}}^\flat(\bar{s}) + r(\bar{s})\rho_{\text{out}}.$$

Proof. Fix a morphism $W \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta / \beta')$. This means we are given the data of $C^\circ \rightarrow C'^\circ$, compatible maps $f : C^\circ \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$, $f' : C'^\circ \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$, and a factorization of $\underline{f} \circ x_{\text{out}}$ through $\underline{X} \rightarrow \underline{\mathcal{X}}$. In particular, if W°, W'° denote the log structures

on \underline{W} obtained by pull-back via x_{out} from C° and C'° respectively, we obtain a commutative diagram

$$(5.7) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} W^\circ & \xrightarrow{f_W} & Z \\ \tau \downarrow & \nearrow f'_W & \\ W'^\circ & & \end{array}$$

with $Z = Z_r$.

The morphism f_W, f'_W yield evaluation maps $\text{ev}, \text{ev}' : W \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(X, r)$ via Proposition 3.3. Note that then ev and ev' coincide with the composition of $W \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta/\beta')$ with $\text{ev}_{\mathcal{X}}$ and $\text{ev}'_{\mathcal{X}} \circ \phi$, respectively. Thus it is sufficient to understand the relationship between ev and ev' , which we do by following the construction of Proposition 3.3.

We first construct $\tilde{\text{ev}} : W^\circ \rightarrow \widetilde{\mathcal{P}}(X, r) = Z \times B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger$, $\tilde{\text{ev}}' : W'^\circ \rightarrow \widetilde{\mathcal{P}}(X, r)$ as $\tilde{\text{ev}} = f_W \times \beta$, $\tilde{\text{ev}}' = f'_W \times \beta'$, where the morphisms β and β' , with target $B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger$, are determined by sections $(0, 1) \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{W^\circ} \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{M}}_W \oplus \mathbb{Z}$, $(0, 1) \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{W'^\circ} \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{M}}_W \oplus \mathbb{Z}$ respectively. We may write, for \bar{s} a section of $(f'_W)^{-1}\overline{\mathcal{M}}_Z$,

$$\overline{f'_W}^\flat(\bar{s}) = (\varphi(\bar{s}), -r(\bar{s}))$$

for some homomorphism $\varphi : (f'_W)^{-1}\overline{\mathcal{M}}_Z \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_W$. Then for $(\bar{s}, n) \in (f'_W)^{-1}\overline{\mathcal{M}}_Z \oplus \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$\overline{(\tilde{\text{ev}}')}^\flat(\bar{s}, n) = (\varphi(\bar{s}), n - r(\bar{s}))$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{f'_W}^\flat(\bar{s}) &= \overline{\tau}^\flat \circ \overline{f'_W}^\flat(\bar{s}) \\ &= \overline{\tau}^\flat(\varphi(\bar{s}), -r(\bar{s})) \\ &= (\varphi(\bar{s}) - r(\bar{s})\rho_{\text{out}}, -r(\bar{s})), \end{aligned}$$

the last equality by Lemma 5.2, (4). Thus

$$\overline{\tilde{\text{ev}}'}^\flat(\bar{s}, n) = (\varphi(\bar{s}) - r(\bar{s})\rho_{\text{out}}, n - r(\bar{s})).$$

Restricting to $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{\mathcal{P}(X, r)} \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}(X, r)}$, we consider sections $(\bar{s}, r(\bar{s}))$ instead of the more general (\bar{s}, n) . This immediately gives the claimed result. \square

Remark 5.7. Continuing with the tropical interpretation of Remark 5.3, the above comparison can be interpreted as follows. Again assume W is a geometric log point with a morphism $W \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta/\beta')$ giving data of C°, C'° , etc. Suppose further that $\tau' : C^\circ \rightarrow C'^\circ$ is such that x_1 and x_{out} lie in the same irreducible component of C° , and this component is contracted by τ' . Tropically, the maps

$f : C^\circ \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$, $f' : C'^\circ \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ then give rise to two families of tropical maps $h_s : G \rightarrow \Sigma(X)$, $h'_s : G' \rightarrow \Sigma(X)$. Let v'_{out} be the vertex of G' adjacent to the leg L'_{out} corresponding $x_{\text{out}} \in C'^\circ$, and similarly let v_{out} be the vertex of G adjacent to the leg L_{out} corresponding to $x_{\text{out}} \in C^\circ$. Then as in Remark 5.3, v_{out} can be viewed as lying in the interior of L'_{out} , and ρ_{out} is the length of the segment of L'_{out} joining v'_{out} and v_{out} . Now by Lemma 3.23, $\Sigma(\text{ev}_{\mathcal{X}})(s) = h_s(v_{\text{out}})$, but by the above discussion $h_s(v_{\text{out}}) = h_s(v'_{\text{out}}) - r\rho_{\text{out}}(s) = \Sigma(\text{ev}'_{\mathcal{X}})(s) - r\rho_{\text{out}}(s)$. This is the transpose of the relation of Lemma 5.6.

Theorem 5.8. *Define*

$$\mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta/\beta', z) := \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta/\beta') \times_{\mathcal{P}(X,r)}^{\text{fs}} B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger,$$

where the morphism $\mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta/\beta') \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(X, r)$ is $\text{ev}_{\mathcal{X}}$. There is a diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{M}(X, \beta, z) & \xrightarrow{\phi'_z} & \mathcal{M}(X, \beta', z) \\ \varepsilon_z \downarrow & & \downarrow \varepsilon'_z \\ \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta/\beta', z) & \xrightarrow{\phi_z} & \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta', z) \\ \psi_z \downarrow & & \\ \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta, z) & & \end{array}$$

with the square Cartesian in all categories, ϕ_z proper and representable, ψ_z strict étale, and with the pull-back relative obstruction theory for ε'_z constructed in Proposition 3.12 being compatible with that for $\psi_z \circ \varepsilon_z$ also constructed in Proposition 3.12.

Proof. **The construction of ψ_z and ϕ_z .**

Here ψ_z is just a base-change of ψ , hence is strict étale. To construct ϕ_z , it is convenient to view

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta/\beta', z) &= \mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{X}, \beta/\beta') \times_{\mathcal{P}(X,r)}^{\text{fs}} B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger \\ \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta', z) &= \mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{X}, \beta') \times_{\mathcal{P}(X,r)}^{\text{fs}} B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger \end{aligned}$$

as in Definition 3.10. It is then sufficient to construct a (2-)commutative diagram

$$(5.8) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta/\beta', z) & \xrightarrow{\phi_{\text{opr}_1}} & \mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{X}, \beta') \\ \gamma \downarrow & & \downarrow \text{ev}'_{\mathcal{X}} \\ B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger & \xrightarrow{\zeta} & \mathcal{P}(X, r) \end{array}$$

Here we write pr_1, pr_2 for the projections of $\mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta/\beta', z)$ onto $\mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{X}, \beta/\beta')$ and $B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger$ respectively, and ζ is the map of Proposition 3.8. We first define γ . Let $C^\circ \rightarrow C_{\text{for}}^\circ \xrightarrow{\tau} C'^\circ$ be the universal data over $\mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{X}, \beta/\beta')$. Recall the section ρ_{out} of the ghost sheaf of $\mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{X}, \beta/\beta')$. Similarly, denoting as usual by δ the generator of the ghost sheaf \mathbb{N} of $B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger$, we take γ to be the log morphism which, at the level of ghost sheaves, is given by $\overline{\gamma}^\flat(\delta) = \overline{\text{pr}}_1^\flat(\rho_{\text{out}}) + \overline{\text{pr}}_2^\flat(\delta)$; this completely determines the morphism γ .

We now argue that commutativity of (5.8) can essentially be checked by checking at the level of ghost sheaves. Indeed, necessarily $\text{ev}'_{\mathcal{X}} \circ \phi \circ \text{pr}_1$ factors through the open stratum of $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}, r)$, i.e., $[\mathcal{Z}_r^\circ/\mathbb{G}_m]$ as per the description of Remark 3.1. Note that $\mathcal{Z}_r^\circ \cong \mathcal{A}_{P, P \setminus \{0\}}$ in the notation of Definition A.1, where P is the stalk of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_X$ at the generic point of the stratum Z_r . Now $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}, r)$ was constructed as a sub-log structure of $\mathcal{Z}_r \times B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger$, so $[\mathcal{Z}_r^\circ/\mathbb{G}_m]$ may be viewed as a sub-log structure of $\mathcal{A}_{P, P \setminus \{0\}} \times B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger \cong \mathcal{A}_{P \oplus \mathbb{N}, (P \oplus \mathbb{N}) \setminus \{(0,0)\}}$. This sub-log structure is induced by the sub-monoid $P' \subseteq P \oplus \mathbb{N}$, $P' = \{(p, r(p)) \mid p \in P\}$. We then have a canonical morphism $[\mathcal{Z}_r^\circ/\mathbb{G}_m] \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_{P'}$ via Proposition A.2, which necessarily factors through $\mathcal{A}_{P', P' \setminus \{0\}}$. Further we have the projection $[\mathcal{Z}_r^\circ/\mathbb{G}_m] \rightarrow B\mathbb{G}_m$, the latter with no log structure. These two maps in fact induce an isomorphism

$$[\mathcal{Z}_r^\circ/\mathbb{G}_m] \cong \mathcal{A}_{P', P' \setminus \{0\}} \times B\mathbb{G}_m,$$

corresponding to a splitting of the algebraic torus $\text{Spec } \mathbb{k}[(P \oplus \mathbb{N})^{\text{gp}}]$ as $\text{Spec } \mathbb{k}[(P')^{\text{gp}}] \times \text{Spec } \mathbb{k}[\mathbb{Z}(0, 1)]$.

Identifying P' with P , we have thus reduced the task of constructing ϕ_z to determining commutativity of the diagram

$$(5.9) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta/\beta', z) & \xrightarrow{\gamma} & B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger \\ & \searrow \text{ev}'_{\mathcal{X}} \circ \phi \circ \text{pr}_1 & \downarrow \zeta \\ & & \mathcal{A}_{P, P \setminus \{0\}} \times B\mathbb{G}_m \end{array}$$

This commutativity can be checked by composing with the first and second projections to $\mathcal{A}_{P, P \setminus \{0\}}$ and $B\mathbb{G}_m$. After composing with the first projection, it is enough to check commutativity at the ghost sheaf level by Proposition A.2, considering the maps $\overline{\text{ev}'_{\mathcal{X}} \circ \phi \circ \text{pr}_1}^\flat : P \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}$ and $\overline{\zeta \circ \gamma}^\flat : P \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}$, where $\overline{\mathcal{M}}$ is the ghost sheaf of $\mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta/\beta', z)$. However, by Lemma 5.6,

$$\overline{\text{ev}'_{\mathcal{X}} \circ \phi \circ \text{pr}_1}^\flat(p) = \overline{\text{pr}}_1^\flat(\overline{\text{ev}}_{\mathcal{X}}^\flat(p) + r(p)\rho_{\text{out}}),$$

while

$$\overline{\zeta \circ \gamma}^\flat(p) = r(p)(\overline{\text{pr}}_1^\flat(\rho_{\text{out}}) + \overline{\text{pr}}_2^\flat(\delta)),$$

the value of $\bar{\zeta}$ given by Proposition 3.8. Note however that because the fibre product defining $\mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta/\beta', z)$ is given by the maps $\text{ev}_{\mathcal{X}} : \mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{X}, \beta/\beta') \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}, r)$ and $\zeta : B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}, r)$, we in fact have

$$\overline{\text{pr}}_1^{\flat}(\overline{\text{ev}}_{\mathcal{X}}^{\flat}(p)) = \overline{\text{pr}}_2^{\flat}(r(p)\delta),$$

which shows that in fact $\overline{\text{ev}}_{\mathcal{X}}^{\flat} \circ \phi \circ \overline{\text{pr}}_1^{\flat} = \overline{\zeta} \circ \overline{\gamma}^{\flat}$, hence commutativity of (5.9) after composing with projection to $\mathcal{A}_{P, P \setminus \{0\}}$.

On the other hand, $\text{pr}'_2 \circ \text{ev}'_{\mathcal{X}} \circ \phi \circ \text{pr}_1$ is determined by the conormal bundle $\mathcal{N}_{x_{\text{out}}/C'}^{\vee}$. But $\text{pr}'_2 \circ \zeta$ is the identity, and thus $\text{pr}'_2 \circ \zeta \circ \gamma$ is determined by the line bundle $\mathcal{L}_{\overline{\text{pr}}_1^{\flat}(\rho_{\text{out}}) + \overline{\text{pr}}_2^{\flat}(\delta)} \cong \text{pr}_1^* \mathcal{L}_{\rho_{\text{out}}} \otimes \mathcal{N}_{x_{\text{out}}/C}^{\vee}$. By Lemma 5.2, (4), we then see that $\text{pr}'_2 \circ \text{ev}'_{\mathcal{X}} \circ \phi \circ \text{pr}_1$ and $\text{pr}'_2 \circ \zeta \circ \gamma$ agree (or rather are 2-isomorphic).

This completes the construction of ϕ_z .

Completion of the proof.

The cartesianity of the square in the statement of the theorem now follows from Theorem 5.5, (3). Now note that from the construction of ϕ_z there is a commutative (but not Cartesian) diagram

$$(5.10) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta/\beta', z) & \xrightarrow{\phi_z} & \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta', z) \\ \text{pr}_1 \downarrow & & \downarrow \text{pr}_1 \\ \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta/\beta') & \xrightarrow[\phi]{} & \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta') \end{array}$$

Both vertical arrows in this diagram are finite and representable by Remark 2.1, being a base-change of a (non-strict) closed embedding. Further, ϕ is proper and representable by Theorem 5.5, (2). Thus $\phi \circ \text{pr}_1 = \text{pr}_1 \circ \phi_z$ is proper and representable, hence ϕ_z is proper and representable.

The final statement involves compatibility of obstruction theories. There is a similar commutative square as (5.10) involving the moduli spaces $\mathcal{M}(X, \beta)$ etc., and a cube whose top face is this latter square and whose bottom face is (5.10), with all side faces Cartesian. The statement on compatibility of obstruction theories then follows immediately from the construction of the obstruction theories for $\mathcal{M}(X, \beta, z) \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta, z)$, $\mathcal{M}(X, \beta', z) \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta', z)$ in Proposition 3.12 and the compatibility statement of Theorem 5.5. \square

Proof of Theorem 4.3. If $A = 0$, the claim follows immediately from Lemma 1.15. Otherwise, we may apply Theorem 5.8.

If the virtual dimension of $\mathcal{M}(X, \beta, z)$ is non-zero, then $N_{0pr}^{\beta} = 0$ regardless by definition. Otherwise, by push-pull, ([Ma12], Thm. 4.1, (i)), writing $\varepsilon_z^!$ and $(\varepsilon'_z)^!$

for Manolache's virtual pull-back, we have

$$\begin{aligned} N_{0pr}^\beta &= \deg[\mathcal{M}(X, \beta, z)]^{\text{virt}} = \deg(\phi'_z)_*[\mathcal{M}(X, \beta, z)]^{\text{virt}} \\ &= \deg(\phi'_z)_*\varepsilon'_z![\mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta/\beta', z)] \\ &= \deg(\varepsilon'_z)! \phi_{z*}[\mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta/\beta', z)]. \end{aligned}$$

However, $\dim \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta/\beta', z) = \dim \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta, z) = 0$ by the fact that ψ_z is étale and Proposition 3.19, (2), while $\dim \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta', z) = -1$ by the same proposition. Thus $\phi_{z*}[\mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta/\beta', z)] = 0$, and hence $N_{0pr}^\beta = 0$. \square

6. THE PROOF OF THEOREM 4.15

We begin by setting up a slightly more general situation than that of Theorem 4.15.

Fix a boundary point $y \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4}$, and let $\sigma_y = \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}\ell^* \oplus \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}\delta^*$ denote the cone $\text{Hom}(R, \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0})$, where R is the stalk of the ghost sheaf of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4}^\dagger$ at y , with generators ℓ, δ as in (4.3). Let $\tau \subset \sigma_y$ be any subcone isomorphic to the standard two-dimensional cone. Dually, this defines an inclusion of monoids

$$R \subset R_\tau := \tau^\vee \cap R^{\text{gp}}.$$

We may then define a log stack $B\mathbb{G}_m^\tau$ whose ghost sheaf is the constant sheaf with stalk R_τ , with the torsor associated to $a\ell + b\delta \in R_\tau$ being $\mathcal{U}^{\otimes b}$, where \mathcal{U} is the universal torsor on $B\mathbb{G}_m$. Thus we obtain a morphism

$$(6.1) \quad \psi_\tau : B\mathbb{G}_m^\tau \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4}^\dagger$$

with image $y \times B\mathbb{G}_m$ and $\overline{\psi}_\tau^\flat : R \rightarrow R_\tau$ the canonical inclusion.

Definition 6.1. Let β be a curve type as in Definition 4.14. We set

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}_\tau &:= \mathcal{M}(X, \beta, z) \times_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4}^\dagger}^{\text{fs}} B\mathbb{G}_m^\tau \\ \mathfrak{M}_\tau^{\text{ev}} &:= \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta, z) \times_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4}^\dagger}^{\text{fs}} B\mathbb{G}_m^\tau \end{aligned}$$

Remark 6.2. The spaces $\mathcal{M}_y^\dagger, \mathfrak{M}_y^{\dagger, \text{ev}}$ of Definition 4.14 are special cases of the above definition, with τ the cone generated by $\lambda\ell^* + \delta^*$ and ℓ^* .

Lemma 6.3. \mathcal{M}_τ is a proper Deligne-Mumford stack over $\text{Spec } \mathbb{k}$ and has a perfect relative obstruction theory over $\mathfrak{M}_\tau^{\text{ev}}$, with relative virtual dimension at a point of \mathcal{M}_τ represented by a punctured map $f : C^\circ \rightarrow X$ being

$$\chi(f^*\Theta_{X/\mathbb{k}}(-x_{\text{out}})).$$

Proof. Write $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4} \times B\mathbb{G}_m$ for the underlying stack of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4}^\dagger$. First note that $\psi_\tau : B\mathbb{G}_m \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4} \times B\mathbb{G}_m$ is representable, hence of DM type, and being of DM type is stable under base-change, so

$$\mathcal{M}(X, \beta, z) \times_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4} \times B\mathbb{G}_m} B\mathbb{G}_m \rightarrow \mathcal{M}(X, \beta, z)$$

is of DM type. Since $\mathcal{M}(X, \beta, z)$ itself is Deligne-Mumford, i.e., of DM type over $\text{Spec } \mathbb{Z}$, and a composition of DM type morphisms is DM type, it follows that $B\mathbb{G}_m \times_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4} \times B\mathbb{G}_m} \mathcal{M}(X, \beta, z)$ is Deligne-Mumford. From Remark 2.1, the morphism

$$\mathcal{M}_\tau = \mathcal{M}(X, \beta, z) \times_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4}^\dagger}^{\text{fs}} B\mathbb{G}_m^\tau \rightarrow \mathcal{M}(X, \beta, z) \times_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4}^\dagger} B\mathbb{G}_m^\tau$$

is finite and representable. Thus \mathcal{M}_τ is Deligne-Mumford, as promised. Furthermore, since ψ_τ is also proper, being a closed immersion, and $\mathcal{M}(X, \beta, z)$ is proper over $\text{Spec } \mathbb{k}$ by Lemma 3.20, it follows that \mathcal{M}_τ is proper over $\text{Spec } \mathbb{k}$.

From the diagram Cartesian in all categories

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{M}_\tau & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{M}(X, \beta, z) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathfrak{M}_\tau^{\text{ev}} & \longrightarrow & \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta, z) \end{array}$$

the perfect relative obstruction theory for the right-hand vertical arrow pulls back to a perfect relative obstruction theory for the left-hand vertical arrow. In particular, the relative virtual dimension remains unchanged, given in Proposition 3.12. \square

Here we will prove the part of Theorem 4.15 involving virtual dimensions.

Lemma 6.4. (1) *Suppose $y \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4}$ is a boundary point, $\tau \subseteq \sigma_y$ a cone determining a morphism $\psi_\tau : B\mathbb{G}_m^\tau \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4}^\dagger$. Suppose ψ_τ is transverse to*

$$\Phi : \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta, z) \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4}^\dagger$$

in the sense of Definition 2.6. Then $\mathfrak{M}_\tau^{\text{ev}}$ (Definition 6.1) is of pure dimension zero, and \mathcal{M}_τ carries a virtual fundamental class of dimension $\chi((f^\Theta_{X/\mathbb{k}})(-x_{\text{out}}))$. In particular, as a special case, if $B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4}^\dagger$ is transverse to Φ , then the same dimension statements hold for $\mathfrak{M}_y^{\dagger, \text{ev}}$ and \mathcal{M}_y^\dagger (Definition 4.14).*

(2) *Suppose $y \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4}$ is not a boundary point. Then $\mathfrak{M}_y^{\dagger, \text{ev}}$ is of pure dimension zero, and \mathcal{M}_y^\dagger carries a virtual fundamental class of dimension $\chi((f^*\Theta_{X/\mathbb{k}})(-x_{\text{out}}))$.*

Proof. By Lemma 3.18, the base-change $\tilde{\Phi} : \mathfrak{M}_\tau^{\text{ev}} \rightarrow B\mathbb{G}_m^\tau$ of Φ is log smooth, and the transversality condition implies that it is integral. Now for $x \in \mathfrak{M}_\tau^{\text{ev}}$, we have, using Proposition A.7, (2) for the second equality,

$$\begin{aligned} \dim \mathfrak{M}_\tau^{\text{ev}} &= \dim \tilde{\Phi}^{-1}(\tilde{\Phi}(x)) + \dim B\mathbb{G}_m^\tau \\ &= \dim^{\text{log}} \tilde{\Phi}^{-1}(\tilde{\Phi}(x)) - 1. \end{aligned}$$

However, by the base-change result of Proposition A.7, (5) and Proposition 3.19, (1), the log fibre dimension of $\tilde{\Phi}$ is 1. This yields $\dim \mathfrak{M}_\tau^{\text{ev}} = 0$.

In (2), the fact that the morphism $\psi_y : B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4}^\dagger$ of Definition 4.13 is transversal to Φ is automatic, and a similar argument gives $\dim \mathfrak{M}_y^{\dagger, \text{ev}} = 0$. The dimension of the virtual fundamental class in both cases then immediately follows from the form of the obstruction theory given in Proposition 3.12. \square

One of the first steps in proving Theorem 4.15 is to compare enumerative invariants obtained from Lemma 6.4, (1) for different choices of τ . An important ingredient is the following lemma:

Lemma 6.5. *Let \mathbb{G}_m act with weight w on \mathbb{P}^1 for some positive integer w , i.e., by $(x_0 : x_1) \mapsto (\lambda^w x_0 : x_1)$ for $\lambda \in \mathbb{G}_m$. Write $0 = (0 : 1)$, $\infty = (1 : 0)$. Let \mathcal{L} be the universal line bundle on $[\mathbb{P}^1/\mathbb{G}_m]$, i.e., the pull-back of the universal line bundle under the canonical morphism $[\mathbb{P}^1/\mathbb{G}_m] \rightarrow B\mathbb{G}_m$. Then the relation*

$$[0/\mathbb{G}_m] - [\infty/\mathbb{G}_m] + wc_1(\mathcal{L}) \cap [\mathbb{P}^1/\mathbb{G}_m] = 0$$

holds in $A_{-1}([\mathbb{P}^1/\mathbb{G}_m])$, where A_ denotes Kresch's Chow group of Artin stacks, see [Kr99].*

Proof. As $\mathbb{P}^1 \rightarrow [\mathbb{P}^1/\mathbb{G}_m]$ is the universal torsor over the latter stack, the total space of the associated universal line bundle is $L = \mathbb{P}^1 \times^{\mathbb{G}_m} \mathbb{A}^1$, the quotient of $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{A}^1$ by the action $((x_0 : x_1), y) \mapsto ((\lambda^w x_0 : x_1), \lambda^{-1}y)$ for $\lambda \in \mathbb{G}_m$. Here we are using the convention that the universal line bundle over $B\mathbb{G}_m$ is the quotient of \mathbb{A}^1 by \mathbb{G}_m acting with weight -1 . This choice of convention will have no effect on the sequel. As in [Kr99], we write $A_*^\circ(L)$ for the naive Chow group of L . By [Kr99], Thm. 2.1.12, there is then a natural homomorphism $A_0^\circ(L) \rightarrow A_0(L)$ and an isomorphism $A_{-1}([\mathbb{P}^1/\mathbb{G}_m]) \cong A_0(L)$ given by pull-back of Chow classes, hence a homomorphism

$$s : A_0^\circ(L) \rightarrow A_{-1}([\mathbb{P}^1/\mathbb{G}_m]).$$

Note the field of rational functions of L is

$$k(L) = k(\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{A}^1)^{\mathbb{G}_m} = k(x = x_0/x_1, y)^{\mathbb{G}_m} = k(xy^w).$$

Thus there is a relation in $A_0^\circ(L)$ given by

$$0 = (xy^w) = [(0 \times \mathbb{A}^1)/\mathbb{G}_m] - [(\infty \times \mathbb{A}^1)/\mathbb{G}_m] + w[(\mathbb{P}^1 \times 0)/\mathbb{G}_m].$$

On the other hand, by [Kr99], Def. 2.4.2, $c_1(\mathcal{L}) \cap [\mathbb{P}^1/\mathbb{G}_m]$ is the image of the zero section of $L \rightarrow [\mathbb{P}^1/\mathbb{G}_m]$ under s . This zero section is $[(\mathbb{P}^1 \times 0)/\mathbb{G}_m]$, hence the result. \square

The first step in comparing \mathcal{M}_y^\dagger with $\mathcal{M}_{y'}^\dagger$ for y' not a boundary point is as follows. Morally, we would like to perform a logarithmic blow-up $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4}^\dagger \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4}^\dagger$ by refining σ_y so that $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4}^\dagger \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4}^\dagger$ is transverse to Φ , at least locally near y , and so that the fan Σ refining σ_y contains the cone $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}(\lambda\ell^* + \delta^*) + \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}\ell^*$. Note that if τ is taken to be this cone, then $\mathcal{M}_y^\dagger = \mathcal{M}_\tau$ by definition. This blow-up, up to the quotient by \mathbb{G}_m , would produce a chain of \mathbb{P}^1 's over y . Each double point in this chain of \mathbb{P}^1 's then corresponds logarithmically to a point $B\mathbb{G}_m^\tau$ in the log blow-up for the corresponding two-dimensional cone τ , and then we obtain a moduli space \mathcal{M}_τ . Integrality implies this moduli space is of virtual dimension zero, and we then just need to show that the virtual degree of \mathcal{M}_τ is independent of the two-dimensional cone $\tau \in \Sigma$. We do this by comparing these virtual degrees for adjacent cones. Unfortunately, the fact that we don't have a chain of \mathbb{P}^1 's but a \mathbb{G}_m -quotient thereof makes the argument a bit more difficult, causing potential problems with terminal tails: these problems are caused by the previous lemma.

Lemma 6.6. *Assume we are in the situation of Theorems 1.9 or 1.12, and β is a curve type as in Definition 4.14. Assume further that $A \cdot c_1(\Theta_{X/\mathbb{k}}) = 0$. Fix a boundary point $y \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4}$ and standard two-dimensional cones $\tau, \tau' \subset \sigma_y$ such that $\tau \cap \tau' = \omega$ is a one-dimensional ray in σ_y . Suppose further that the maps*

$$\psi_\tau : B\mathbb{G}_m^\tau \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4}^\dagger, \quad \psi_{\tau'} : B\mathbb{G}_m^{\tau'} \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4}^\dagger$$

are both transverse to $\Phi : \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta, z) \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4}^\dagger$. So $\mathcal{M}_\tau, \mathcal{M}_{\tau'}$ carry a virtual fundamental class of dimension zero by Lemma 6.4, (1). Then

$$\deg[\mathcal{M}_\tau]^{\text{virt}} = \deg[\mathcal{M}_{\tau'}]^{\text{virt}}.$$

Proof. Step 1. The interpolating moduli space \mathcal{M}_ω .

Let Σ be the fan in $\mathbb{R}\sigma_y = \text{Hom}(R, \mathbb{R}) = \mathbb{R}\ell^* \oplus \mathbb{R}\delta^*$ consisting of τ, τ' and their faces, and let X_Σ be the corresponding toric variety. This contains a one-dimensional closed stratum Z_ω corresponding to the common ray ω of τ, τ' , with $Z_\omega \cong \mathbb{P}^1$. Recalling the generators ℓ, δ of R , we define the slope of a ray ω' contained in σ_y to be $\delta(p)/\ell(p)$ for any $p \in \omega' \setminus \{0\}$. Order τ, τ' so that the boundary ray of τ which is not ω has slope greater than the slope of ω .

Giving X_Σ and $X_{\sigma_y} = \mathbb{A}^2$ their toric log structures, the canonical morphism of fans from Σ to σ_y gives a log morphism $\tilde{\psi}_\omega : X_\Sigma \rightarrow X_{\sigma_y}$, with $\tilde{\psi}_\omega(Z_\omega) = \{O\}$, where O is the origin in X_{σ_y} .

Let \mathbb{G}_m act on X_Σ via the one-parameter subgroup $\mathbb{Z}\delta^* \otimes \mathbb{G}_m \subset R^* \otimes \mathbb{G}_m$. Note that if $\omega = \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}(a\ell^* + b\delta^*)$ with a, b relatively prime, then $z^{-bl+a\delta}$ is a coordinate on Z_ω having a simple zero at Z_τ and a simple pole at $Z_{\tau'}$. From this, we see that if we identify Z_τ with $0 \in \mathbb{P}^1 = Z_\omega$ and $Z_{\tau'}$ with $\infty \in \mathbb{P}^1$, then the weight of this \mathbb{G}_m action on Z_ω is $w(\omega) := a$, in the sense of Lemma 6.5.

Now $\tilde{\psi}_\omega$ descends to a morphism of log stacks

$$\psi_\omega : [X_\Sigma/\mathbb{G}_m] \rightarrow [\mathbb{A}^2/\mathbb{G}_m] = \mathbb{A}^1 \times [\mathbb{A}^1/\mathbb{G}_m]$$

which induces by restriction and inclusion a composed morphism

$$\psi_\omega : [Z_\omega/\mathbb{G}_m] \rightarrow [O/\mathbb{G}_m] = \text{Spec } \mathbb{k}^\dagger \times B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger \hookrightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4}^\dagger,$$

the latter inclusion being strict with image $y \times B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger$. Note that the zero-dimensional strata $Z_\tau, Z_{\tau'} \subset Z_\omega$ are invariant under the torus action, and the compositions of the inclusions

$$B\mathbb{G}_m^\tau = [Z_\tau/\mathbb{G}_m] \hookrightarrow [Z_\omega/\mathbb{G}_m], \quad B\mathbb{G}_m^{\tau'} = [Z_{\tau'}/\mathbb{G}_m] \hookrightarrow [Z_\omega/\mathbb{G}_m]$$

with ψ_ω coincide with ψ_τ and $\psi_{\tau'}$ respectively.

We now define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}_\omega &:= [Z_\omega/\mathbb{G}_m] \times_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4}^\dagger}^{\text{fs}} \mathcal{M}(X, \beta, z) \\ \mathfrak{M}_\omega^{\text{ev}} &:= [Z_\omega/\mathbb{G}_m] \times_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4}^\dagger}^{\text{fs}} \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta, z) \end{aligned}$$

Note that since $[Z_\omega/\mathbb{G}_m] \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4}^\dagger$ is proper, the projection $\mathcal{M}_\omega \rightarrow \mathcal{M}(X, \beta, z)$, as in the proof of Lemma 6.3, is proper. Hence, by Lemma 3.20,(2), \mathcal{M}_ω is proper over $\text{Spec } \mathbb{k}$.

We now obtain a diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \mathcal{M}_\tau & \xrightarrow{q} & \mathcal{M}_\omega & \xleftarrow{q'} & \mathcal{M}_{\tau'} \\ h \downarrow & & \bar{h} \downarrow & & h' \downarrow \\ \mathfrak{M}_\tau^{\text{ev}} & \xrightarrow{p} & \mathfrak{M}_\omega^{\text{ev}} & \xleftarrow{p'} & \mathfrak{M}_{\tau'}^{\text{ev}} \\ \tilde{\Phi} \downarrow & & \bar{\Phi} \downarrow & & \tilde{\Phi}' \downarrow \\ B\mathbb{G}_m^\tau & \longrightarrow & [Z_\omega/\mathbb{G}_m] & \longleftarrow & B\mathbb{G}_m^{\tau'} \end{array}$$

Here h, \bar{h} and h' , as well as all horizontal arrows, are strict. All squares are Cartesian in both the category of underlying stacks and the fs log category. By

the transversality assumption, $\tilde{\Phi}$ and $\tilde{\Phi}'$ are integral. On the other hand, as any morphism $\mathbb{N} \rightarrow P$ is integral if P is an integral monoid, it then follows that $\bar{\Phi}$ is integral as the ghost sheaf of the log structure on $[Z_\omega/\mathbb{G}_m]$ is \mathbb{N} except at $B\mathbb{G}_m^\tau$ and $B\mathbb{G}_m^{\tau'}$. By Lemma 3.18, $\bar{\Phi}$ is also log smooth, hence flat by Proposition 2.3.

Step 2. Pull-back of cycles.

As in the proof of Lemma 6.4, the relative dimension of $\bar{\Phi}$ is 1, so we obtain a flat pull-back of cycles

$$\bar{\Phi}^* : A_*([Z_\omega/\mathbb{G}_m]) \rightarrow A_{*+1}(\mathfrak{M}_\omega^{\text{ev}}).$$

Note also that \bar{h} carries a relative obstruction theory pulled back from that of $\mathcal{M}(X, \beta, z) \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta, z)$, which further pulls back to the relative obstruction theories for h and h' . Denote by $h^!$, $(h')^!$ and $\bar{h}^!$ the virtual pull-backs of [Ma12] defined by these obstruction theories. It then follows from [Ma12], Thm. 4.1,(i) and (iii) that

$$q_*[\mathcal{M}_\tau]^{\text{virt}} = \bar{h}^! \bar{\Phi}^*[0/\mathbb{G}_m], \quad q_*[\mathcal{M}_{\tau'}]^{\text{virt}} = \bar{h}^! \bar{\Phi}^*[\infty/\mathbb{G}_m],$$

so it will be sufficient to show the equality

$$\deg \bar{h}^! \bar{\Phi}^*[0/\mathbb{G}_m] = \deg \bar{h}^! \bar{\Phi}^*[\infty/\mathbb{G}_m].$$

Now by Lemma 6.5, we have in $A_{-1}([Z_\omega/\mathbb{G}_m])$,

$$[0/\mathbb{G}_m] - [\infty/\mathbb{G}_m] + w(\omega)c_1(\mathcal{L}) \cap [Z_\omega/\mathbb{G}_m] = 0.$$

We thus must show that

$$\deg \bar{h}^! \bar{\Phi}^*(c_1(\mathcal{L}) \cap [Z_\omega/\mathbb{G}_m]) = \deg \bar{h}^!(c_1(\bar{\Phi}^* \mathcal{L}) \cap [\mathfrak{M}_\omega^{\text{ev}}]) = 0$$

to complete the proof.

Step 3. No tails: the vanishing of $\deg \bar{h}^!(c_1(\bar{\Phi}^* \mathcal{L}) \cap [\mathfrak{M}_\omega^{\text{ev}}])$.

What is $\bar{\Phi}^* \mathcal{L}$? Recall from Lemma 3.17, (1) that the projection $\mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta, z) \rightarrow B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger$ is given by the conormal bundle of x_{out} in the universal curve over $\mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta, z)$. Thus $\bar{\Phi}^* \mathcal{L}$ is this conormal bundle. Equivalently, if $\phi : \mathfrak{M}_\omega^{\text{ev}} \rightarrow \mathbf{M} = \mathbf{M}_{0,4}$ is the forgetful map just remembering the domain, then $\bar{\Phi}^* \mathcal{L} = \phi^* \mathcal{N}_{x_{\text{out}}/\mathbf{C}}^\vee$, where $\mathbf{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{M}$ is the universal curve. It is standard that $c_1(\mathcal{N}_{x_{\text{out}}/\mathbf{C}}^\vee)$ can be written as the divisor $D' + D(x_1, x_2, x_3 | x_{\text{out}})$, where D' is the pull-back of a point under the stabilization morphism $\mathbf{M} \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4}$. Indeed, if $(\underline{C}, x_1, x_2, x_3, x_{\text{out}})$ is a four-pointed rational curve, then the map to its stabilization is an isomorphism in a neighbourhood of x_{out} unless the curve lies in the irreducible divisor $D(x_1, x_2, x_3 | x_{\text{out}})$. Thus $c_1(\mathcal{N}_{x_{\text{out}}/\mathbf{C}}^\vee)$ can be written as $n'D' + nD(x_1, x_2, x_3 | x_{\text{out}})$ for some integers n, n' . It is standard that the conormal bundle of any marked

point of the universal curve over $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4} = \mathbb{P}^1$ is $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(1)$, so $n' = 1$. On the other hand, n is easily seen to be 1 by considering a one-parameter family of curves in \mathbf{M} transverse to $D(x_1, x_2, x_3 | x_{\text{out}})$.

Let \mathfrak{M} be an irreducible component of $\mathfrak{M}_\omega^{\text{ev}}$ with the reduced induced stack structure, $f : \mathfrak{C}^\circ/\mathfrak{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ the induced family of punctured maps. Let $\phi : \mathfrak{M} \rightarrow \mathbf{M}$ be the forgetful morphism as before, and let $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_\omega \times_{\mathfrak{M}_\omega} \mathfrak{M}$. It will be sufficient to show that $\deg \bar{h}^1(c_1(\bar{\Phi}^* \mathcal{L}) \cap [\mathfrak{M}]) = 0$.

As the image of $\mathfrak{M}_\omega^{\text{ev}}$ under the forgetful and stabilization map $\mathfrak{M}_\omega^{\text{ev}} \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4}$ is the point y , we may choose D' so that $\phi^{-1}(D') = \emptyset$. Thus we have two possibilities. Either (1) $\phi^{-1}(D(x_1, x_2, x_3 | x_{\text{out}})) = \mathfrak{M}$, or (2) $c_1(\bar{m}^* \mathcal{L}) \cap [\mathfrak{M}]$ is supported on the codimension one closed substack $\phi^{-1}(D(x_1, x_2, x_3 | x_{\text{out}}))$. As whether a given point of \mathfrak{M} maps into $D(x_1, x_2, x_3 | x_{\text{out}})$ can be determined from the tropicalization of the corresponding punctured map, necessarily in this case $\phi^{-1}(D(x_1, x_2, x_3 | x_{\text{out}}))$ is a union of strata of \mathfrak{M} .

Now set $\mathfrak{M}' = \mathfrak{M}$ in case (1) of the previous paragraph or set \mathfrak{M}' to be an irreducible component of $\phi^{-1}(D(x_1, x_2, x_3 | x_{\text{out}}))$ in case (2). Let $\mathcal{M}' = \mathfrak{M}' \times_{\mathfrak{M}} \mathcal{M}$. We are now in a position to apply the no-tail lemma, Theorem 7.14. In that theorem, take $F = \mathfrak{M}'$, S° to be the stratum of $\mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta)$ containing the image of the generic point of F under the composed morphism

$$\mathfrak{M}' \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{M} \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{M}_\omega^{\text{ev}} \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta, z) \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta),$$

where the last two maps are the obvious projections, and take $W = B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger$ with $g : W \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(X, r)$ the standard morphism determined by z by Proposition 3.8. Then the hypotheses of Theorem 7.14 are satisfied; in particular, all transversality statements in hypothesis (5) of that theorem are trivial since W has ghost sheaf \mathbb{N} . We thus conclude that $\bar{h}^1[\mathfrak{M}'] = 0$ in rational Chow.

Thus in case (1),

$$\deg \bar{h}^1(c_1(\bar{\Phi}^* \mathcal{L}) \cap [\mathfrak{M}]) = \deg c_1(\bar{h}^* \bar{\Phi}^* \mathcal{L}) \cap \bar{h}^1[\mathfrak{M}] = 0.$$

Here the second identity follows from $\mathfrak{M} = \mathfrak{M}'$ in this case.

In case (2), we have

$$\deg \bar{h}^1(c_1(\bar{\Phi}^* \mathcal{L}) \cap [\mathfrak{M}]) = \deg \sum_i a_i \bar{h}^1([\mathfrak{M}'_i]),$$

where \mathfrak{M}'_i ranges over codimension one strata of \mathfrak{M} in $\phi^{-1}(D(x_1, x_2, x_3 | x_{\text{out}}))$ and a_i are some rational numbers. The vanishing then follows as before from $\bar{h}^1[\mathfrak{M}'_i] = 0$ in rational Chow. \square

The second step of the proof is to compare the moduli spaces $\mathcal{M}_{y'}^\dagger$ for $y' \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4}$ for general y' and \mathcal{M}_τ , for $\tau \subseteq \sigma_y$ a cone with two boundary rays: $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}\delta^*$ and another ray of very large slope. The following lemma makes this comparison.

Lemma 6.7. *Assume we are in the situation of Theorems 1.9 or 1.12, and β is a curve type as in Definition 4.14. Assume further that $A \cdot c_1(\Theta_{X/\mathbb{k}}) = 0$. Suppose that for each boundary point $y \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4}$, we are given a standard two-dimensional cone $\tau_y \subset \sigma_y$ such that (1) one boundary ray of τ_y is $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}\delta^*$ and (2) $\psi_{\tau_y} : B\mathbb{G}_m^{\tau_y} \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4}^\dagger$ is transverse to $\Phi : \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta, z) \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4}^\dagger$. Let $y' \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4}$ be a non-boundary point. Note $\mathcal{M}_{\tau_y}, \mathcal{M}_{y'}^\dagger$ each carry a virtual fundamental class of dimension zero by Lemma 6.4. Then for each boundary point $y \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4}$,*

$$\deg[\mathcal{M}_{\tau_y}]^{\text{virt}} = \deg[\mathcal{M}_{y'}^\dagger]^{\text{virt}}.$$

Proof. The argument is very similar to that of Lemma 6.6, but in fact simpler because tails are not an issue here. Define a new log structure on $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4} \times B\mathbb{G}_m$ as follows. If \mathcal{M} and $\overline{\mathcal{M}}$ denote the log structure and its ghost sheaf on $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4}^\dagger$, we let $\overline{\mathcal{M}}' \subset \overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\text{gp}}$ be a subsheaf defined as follows. First, $\overline{\mathcal{M}}'$ agrees with $\overline{\mathcal{M}}$ away from the boundary points. At the boundary point y , the stalk $\overline{\mathcal{M}}'_y$ is the inverse image of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{B\mathbb{G}_m^{\tau_y}}$ under the homomorphism $\overline{\psi}_{\tau_y}^{\text{b}} : \overline{\mathcal{M}}_y^{\text{gp}} \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{B\mathbb{G}_m^{\tau_y}}^{\text{gp}}$, where ψ_{τ_y} is as defined in (6.1). We define a sheaf of monoids

$$\mathcal{M}' = \mathcal{M}^{\text{gp}} \times_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\text{gp}}} \overline{\mathcal{M}}' \subset \mathcal{M}^{\text{gp}}.$$

It is easy to check that the structure map $\alpha : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4}^\dagger}$ extends to \mathcal{M}' by sending all elements of $\mathcal{M}' \setminus \mathcal{M}$ to zero. We remark that this new log structure is a puncturing of the log structure on $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4}^\dagger$. Write $\overline{\mathcal{M}}'_{0,4}$ for $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4} \times B\mathbb{G}_m$ with this new log structure. We then have a factorization of ψ_{τ_y}

$$B\mathbb{G}_m^{\tau_y} \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}'_{0,4} \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4}^\dagger$$

with the first morphism strict.

Defining

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}' &:= \overline{\mathcal{M}}'_{0,4} \times_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4}^\dagger}^{\text{fs}} \mathcal{M}(X, \beta, z) \\ \mathfrak{M}' &:= \overline{\mathcal{M}}'_{0,4} \times_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4}^\dagger}^{\text{fs}} \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta, z) \end{aligned}$$

we see that the morphism

$$\mathfrak{M}' \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}'_{0,4}$$

is integral. Indeed, this is the case at each boundary point y because of the transversality assumption and elsewhere because the stalk of the ghost sheaf of

$\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4}$ is \mathbb{N} . In particular, we have a diagram with $\overline{\Phi}$ flat and all squares Cartesian in both the ordinary and fs log categories:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
\mathcal{M}_{\tau_y} & \xrightarrow{q} & \mathcal{M}' & \xleftarrow{q'} & \mathcal{M}_{y'}^{\ddagger} \\
\downarrow h & & \downarrow \bar{h} & & \downarrow h' \\
\mathfrak{M}_{\tau_y}^{\text{ev}} & \xrightarrow{p} & \mathfrak{M}' & \xleftarrow{p'} & \mathfrak{M}_{y'}^{\ddagger, \text{ev}} \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \overline{\Phi} & & \downarrow \\
B\mathbb{G}_m^{\tau_y} & \longrightarrow & \overline{\mathcal{M}}'_{0,4} & \longleftarrow & y' \times B\mathbb{G}_m
\end{array}$$

Now $[B\mathbb{G}_m^{\tau_y}]$ and $[y' \times B\mathbb{G}_m]$ define the same element in $A_{-1}(\overline{\mathcal{M}}'_{0,4})$. Thus we have

$$q_*[\mathcal{M}_{\tau_y}]^{\text{virt}} = \bar{h}'^! \overline{\Phi}^* [B\mathbb{G}_m^{\tau_y}] = \bar{h}'^! \overline{\Phi}^* [y' \times B\mathbb{G}_m] = q'_*[\mathcal{M}_{y'}^{\ddagger}]^{\text{virt}},$$

hence the result. \square

Proof of Theorem 4.15. Fix a boundary point $y \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4}^{\ddagger}$. Consider the map $\Sigma(\Phi) : \Sigma(\mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta, z)) \rightarrow \Sigma(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4}^{\ddagger})$. We can find a refinement Σ of $\sigma_y = \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}\ell^* \oplus \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}\delta^*$ into standard cones with the property that for any $\sigma \in \Sigma(\mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta, z))$ with $\Sigma(\Phi)(\sigma) \subset \sigma_y$, we can write $\Sigma(\Phi)(\sigma)$ as a union of cones in Σ . We can further assume that one cone in Σ is $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}(\lambda\ell^* + \delta^*) + \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}\ell^*$ for sufficiently large λ . Note to do this we need to shrink $\mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta, z)$ as in §2.3.1 to ensure $\Sigma(\mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta, z))$ only contains a finite number of cones.

It now follows from Theorem 2.9 that for any $\tau \in \Sigma$ of dimension two, $B\mathbb{G}_m^{\tau} \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4}^{\ddagger}$ is transversal to Φ . Thus we can apply Lemma 6.6 repeatedly to show that $\deg[\mathcal{M}_{\tau}]^{\text{virt}}$ is independent of $\tau \in \Sigma$, and then apply Lemma 6.7 to show Theorem 4.15. \square

7. THE KEY GLUING ARGUMENT

7.1. Review of gluing. We will begin by reviewing certain constructions in [ACGS20] for gluing punctured log maps, and adapt those constructions to our needs. That reference considers quite general gluing situations, and as here we only ever have to glue two punctured maps to obtain an additional node in the domain, we give a brief summary of the results of [ACGS20] in our context, using slightly different notation so as to avoid introducing the general notation of [ACGS20].

We assume given two types β_1, β_2 of punctured map to X , with underlying curve classes A_1, A_2 and with β_i having a puncture x_i and an additional set of

punctured points \mathbf{x}_i . We assume the global contact orders \bar{u}_{x_i} are related by $u_{x_1} = -u_{x_2}$ for some choice of representatives $u_{x_i} \in N_\sigma$ of \bar{u}_{x_i} and $\sigma \in \Sigma(X)$. Furthermore, we may take β to be the type of punctured map with underlying curve class $A = A_1 + A_2$ and a set of punctured points $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}_1 \cup \mathbf{x}_2$ with the punctures in \mathbf{x}_i having the same global contact orders as the corresponding points of the type β_i . As usual, all genera are assumed to be 0.

We may then define the stack $\mathfrak{M}^{\text{gl}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2)$ as follows. This is the stack of punctured maps $f : C^\circ/W \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ along with data of pre-stable curves $\underline{C}_i \rightarrow \underline{W}$ with marked points indexed by the set $\mathbf{x}_i \cup \{x_i\}$ and an isomorphism of marked pre-stable curves $\underline{C} \cong \underline{C}_1 \amalg_{x_1=x_2} \underline{C}_2$. Here, the latter notation denotes the gluing of \underline{C}_1 and \underline{C}_2 along the sections x_1, x_2 to produce a node, producing a nodal section $q : \underline{W} \rightarrow \underline{C}$. This data should satisfy the condition that the splitting of f at q (see [ACGS20], Prop. 5.2) yields punctured maps $f_i : C_i^\circ/W \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ of type β_i .

Note that there is a canonical morphism

$$\mathfrak{M}^{\text{gl}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2) \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{X}, \beta).$$

We may then define

$$\mathcal{M}^{\text{gl}}(X, \beta_1, \beta_2) \subseteq \mathfrak{M}^{\text{gl}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2) \times_{\mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{X}, \beta)} \mathcal{M}(X, \beta)$$

to be the open and closed substack of the latter defined as follows. Any object in the fibre product consists of a stable punctured map $f : C^\circ/W \rightarrow X$ along with a decomposition $\underline{C} = \underline{C}_1 \amalg_{x_1=x_2} \underline{C}_2$, and we require that $f|_{\underline{C}_i}$ be a stable map of curve class A_i . Thus we have a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{M}^{\text{gl}}(X, \beta_1, \beta_2) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{M}(X, \beta) \\ \varepsilon' \downarrow & & \downarrow \varepsilon'' \\ \mathfrak{M}^{\text{gl}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2) & \longrightarrow & \mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{X}, \beta) \end{array}$$

and the relative obstruction theory for ε'' pulls back to a relative obstruction theory for ε' , see [ACGS20], Prop. 5.19.

Remark 7.1. In the language of [ACGS20], the moduli spaces $\mathfrak{M}^{\text{gl}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta)$ and $\mathcal{M}^{\text{gl}}(X, \beta_1, \beta_2)$ are written as $\mathfrak{M}'(\mathcal{X}, \tau)$ and $\mathcal{M}'(X, \tau)$, where $\tau = (G, \mathbf{g}, \sigma, \bar{\mathbf{u}})$ with G a graph with two vertices, one edge connecting the two vertices, and a number of legs corresponding to \mathbf{x}_1 and \mathbf{x}_2 . The genus function \mathbf{g} takes value 0 on all vertices, the map σ assigns $0 \in \Sigma(X)$ to every leg, edge or vertex of G . Next $\bar{\mathbf{u}}$ assigns to each leg of G the corresponding global contact order $\bar{\mathbf{u}}_x$ for $x \in \mathbf{x}_1 \cup \mathbf{x}_2$ and to the edge of G the global contact order represented by $\pm u_{x_1}$,

depending on orientation. Further, the assignment of curve classes A_1 and A_2 to the two vertices of G determines τ .

We need to understand gluing at a virtual level. To do so, after choosing (possibly empty) subsets $\mathbf{x}'_1 \subseteq \mathbf{x}_1$ and $\mathbf{x}'_2 \subseteq \mathbf{x}_2$, we define as in (2.2):

$$\mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}(x_i, \mathbf{x}'_i)}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_i) := \mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_i) \times_{\underline{\mathcal{X}} \times \prod_{x \in \mathbf{x}'_i} \underline{\mathcal{X}}} \left(\underline{X} \times \prod_{x \in \mathbf{x}'_i} \underline{X} \right),$$

$$\mathfrak{M}^{\text{gl, ev}(q, \mathbf{x}'_1 \cup \mathbf{x}'_2)}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2) := \mathfrak{M}^{\text{gl}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2) \times_{\underline{\mathcal{X}} \times \prod_{x \in \mathbf{x}'_1 \cup \mathbf{x}'_2} \underline{\mathcal{X}}} \left(\underline{X} \times \prod_{x \in \mathbf{x}'_1 \cup \mathbf{x}'_2} \underline{X} \right).$$

Here, the map $\mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_i) \rightarrow \underline{\mathcal{X}} \times \prod_{x \in \mathbf{x}'_i} \underline{\mathcal{X}}$ is given by evaluation at x_i and $x \in \mathbf{x}'_i$, while the map $\mathfrak{M}^{\text{gl}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2) \rightarrow \underline{\mathcal{X}} \times \prod_{x \in \mathbf{x}'_1 \cup \mathbf{x}'_2} \underline{\mathcal{X}}$ is given by evaluation at the node q obtained by gluing and the points $x \in \mathbf{x}'_1 \cup \mathbf{x}'_2$. We omit the decoration on ev when clear from context. We then obtain a natural factorization of ε' :

$$\mathcal{M}^{\text{gl}}(X, \beta_1, \beta_2) \xrightarrow{\varepsilon} \mathfrak{M}^{\text{gl, ev}(q, \mathbf{x}'_1 \cup \mathbf{x}'_2)}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2) \xrightarrow{\pi} \mathfrak{M}^{\text{gl}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2).$$

As in §2.2.3 above, [ACGS20], §§4.2, 4.3 constructs a relative obstruction theory for ε . As π is smooth, there is a canonical choice of relative obstruction theory for π such that virtual pull-back coincides with flat pull-back of cycles. Together with the relative obstruction theories for ε and ε' , we obtain a compatible triple of obstruction theories, and we say the obstruction theories for ε and ε' are compatible.

The main gluing result of [ACGS20], Thm. C, then states in this case:

Theorem 7.2. *Given the above setup, there is a diagram Cartesian in all categories*

$$(7.1) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{M}^{\text{gl}}(X, \beta_1, \beta_2) & \xrightarrow{\psi'} & \mathcal{M}(X, \beta_1) \times \mathcal{M}(X, \beta_2) \\ \varepsilon \downarrow & & \downarrow \varepsilon_1 \times \varepsilon_2 \\ \mathfrak{M}^{\text{gl, ev}(q, \mathbf{x}'_1 \cup \mathbf{x}'_2)}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2) & \xrightarrow{\psi} & \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}(x_1, \mathbf{x}'_1)}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1) \times \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}(x_2, \mathbf{x}'_2)}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_2) \end{array}$$

where ψ is representable and finite, defined by splitting a punctured map at the glued node. Further, the product of the perfect relative obstruction theories for ε_1 and ε_2 pulls back to the perfect relative obstruction theory for ε .

As we will often need to glue when one of the moduli spaces has a point constraint, we need the following minor modification of the above result:

Corollary 7.3. *Given the above setup, suppose in addition that one of the punctures $x_{\text{out}} \in \mathbf{x}'_2$ has contact order specified by $-r$, for $r \in \Sigma(X)(\mathbb{Z})$, and let $z \in Z_r^\circ$. Set*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}^{\text{gl}}(X, \beta_1, \beta_2, z) &:= \mathcal{M}^{\text{gl}}(X, \beta_1, \beta_2) \times_{\mathcal{P}(X, r)}^{\text{fs}} \text{BG}_m^\dagger \\ \mathfrak{M}^{\text{gl, ev}(q, \mathbf{x}'_1 \cup \mathbf{x}'_2)}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z) &:= \mathfrak{M}^{\text{gl, ev}(q, \mathbf{x}'_1 \cup \mathbf{x}'_2)}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2) \times_{\mathcal{P}(X, r)}^{\text{fs}} \text{BG}_m^\dagger \end{aligned}$$

where the morphisms $\mathcal{M}^{\text{gl}}(X, \beta_1, \beta_2), \mathfrak{M}^{\text{gl, ev}(q, \mathbf{x}'_1 \cup \mathbf{x}'_2)}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(X, r)$ are the evaluation maps given by Proposition 3.3 at x_{out} (as in Lemma 3.7 in the case of $\mathfrak{M}^{\text{gl, ev}(q, \mathbf{x}'_1 \cup \mathbf{x}'_2)}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(X, r)$), and the morphism $\text{BG}_m^\dagger \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(X, r)$ is given by Proposition 3.8. Then there is a diagram Cartesian in all categories

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{M}^{\text{gl}}(X, \beta_1, \beta_2, z) & \xrightarrow{\psi'} & \mathcal{M}(X, \beta_1) \times \mathcal{M}(X, \beta_2, z) \\ \varepsilon \downarrow & & \downarrow \varepsilon_1 \times \varepsilon_2 \\ \mathfrak{M}^{\text{gl, ev}(q, \mathbf{x}'_1 \cup \mathbf{x}'_2)}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z) & \xrightarrow{\psi} & \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}(x_1, \mathbf{x}'_1)}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1) \times \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}(x_2, \mathbf{x}'_2)}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_2, z) \end{array}$$

Further, ε_2 carries a perfect relative obstruction theory pulled back from the right-hand morphism in the Cartesian diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{M}(X, \beta_2, z) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{M}(X, \beta_2) \\ \varepsilon_2 \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}(x_2, \mathbf{x}'_2)}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_2, z) & \longrightarrow & \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}(x_2, \mathbf{x}'_2)}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_2) \end{array}$$

that is compatible with the obstruction theory defined in Proposition 3.12. The product of the relative obstruction theories for ε_1 and ε_2 pulls back to a relative obstruction theory for ε , which is compatible with the pull-back perfect relative obstruction theory from the right-hand arrow in the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{M}^{\text{gl}}(X, \beta_1, \beta_2, z) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{M}^{\text{gl}}(X, \beta_1, \beta_2) \\ \varepsilon \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathfrak{M}^{\text{gl, ev}(q, \mathbf{x}'_1 \cup \mathbf{x}'_2)}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z) & \longrightarrow & \mathfrak{M}^{\text{gl, ev}(q, \mathbf{x}'_1 \cup \mathbf{x}'_2)}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2) \end{array}$$

Proof. The diagram (7.1) is a commutative diagram of log stacks over $\mathcal{P}(X, r)$. We have already explained how to view $\mathcal{M}^{\text{gl}}(X, \beta_1, \beta_2), \mathfrak{M}^{\text{gl, ev}(q, \mathbf{x}'_1 \cup \mathbf{x}'_2)}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2)$ as stacks over $\mathcal{P}(X, r)$, while we have a composed morphism

$$\mathcal{M}(X, \beta_1) \times \mathcal{M}(X, \beta_2) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}(X, \beta_2) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(X, r)$$

with first morphism the projection and second morphism the similarly defined evaluation map. One defines a morphism

$$\mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}(x_1, \mathbf{x}'_1)}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1) \times \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}(x_2, \mathbf{x}'_2)}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_2) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(X, r)$$

similarly. Thus, applying the fibre product $\times_{\mathcal{P}(X, r)}^{\text{fs}} B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger$ to (7.1), we obtain the claimed Cartesian diagram of the corollary. Note it is Cartesian in all categories as the vertical arrows are still strict. The statements on obstruction theories then follows, as the obstruction theories involved are all defined as pull-backs of the obstruction theories appearing in Theorem 7.2. \square

We next review the fibre product description of the glued moduli spaces given in §5.2 of [ACGS20]. If $C^\circ \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}^{\text{gl}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2)$ is the universal curve, then the glued node provides a nodal section $q : \mathfrak{M}^{\text{gl}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2) \rightarrow \underline{C}$, and we define

$$\widetilde{\mathfrak{M}}^{\text{gl}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2) := (\mathfrak{M}^{\text{gl}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2), q^* \mathcal{M}_{C^\circ}),$$

the log stack structure on the moduli space pulled back from the node. Similarly, if $C_i^\circ \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_i)$ is the universal curve, then we define

$$\widetilde{\mathfrak{M}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_i) := (\mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_i), x_i^* \mathcal{M}_{C_i^\circ})^{\text{sat}},$$

recalling that the log structure at a puncture need only be fine, and thus we saturate this pull-back log structure. This may change the underlying stack. Note we then have evaluation morphisms $\text{ev}_i : \widetilde{\mathfrak{M}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_i) \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ given by composing the saturation morphism with $f_i \circ x_i$.

Similarly, we may define $\widetilde{\mathfrak{M}}^{\text{gl, ev}(q, \mathbf{x}'_1 \cup \mathbf{x}'_2)}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2)$ and $\widetilde{\mathfrak{M}}^{\text{ev}(x_i, \mathbf{x}'_i)}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_i)$. Note because ev_i is defined at the logarithmic level, we in particular have

$$\widetilde{\mathfrak{M}}^{\text{ev}(x_i, \mathbf{x}'_i)}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_i) = \widetilde{\mathfrak{M}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_i) \times_{\mathcal{X} \times \prod_{x \in \mathbf{x}'_i} \underline{X}} X \times \prod_{x \in \mathbf{x}'_i} \underline{X}.$$

Thus we obtain similarly an evaluation morphism $\text{ev}_i : \widetilde{\mathfrak{M}}^{\text{ev}(x_i, \mathbf{x}'_i)}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_i) \rightarrow X$.

We have the following description, a special case of [ACGS20], Thms. 5.6 and 5.13.

Theorem 7.4. *Suppose that the global contact orders \bar{u}_{x_i} , $i = 1, 2$, are monodromy free. Then we have*

$$\widetilde{\mathfrak{M}}^{\text{gl}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2) \cong \widetilde{\mathfrak{M}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1) \times_{\mathcal{X}}^{\text{fs}} \widetilde{\mathfrak{M}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_2),$$

and

$$\widetilde{\mathfrak{M}}^{\text{gl, ev}(q, \mathbf{x}'_1 \cup \mathbf{x}'_2)}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2) \cong \widetilde{\mathfrak{M}}^{\text{ev}(x_1, \mathbf{x}'_1)}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1) \times_X^{\text{fs}} \widetilde{\mathfrak{M}}^{\text{ev}(x_2, \mathbf{x}'_2)}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_2),$$

with the fibre product defined using the morphisms ev_i defined above.

Remark 7.5. The log stack $\mathfrak{M}^{\text{gl}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2)$ has the same underlying stack as $\widetilde{\mathfrak{M}}^{\text{gl}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2)$ by the construction of the latter, and the log structure of the former is a sub-log structure of the latter. This may be seen explicitly as follows; for a deeper understanding of the gluing process, see the proof of [ACGS20], Thm. 5.6.

If locally near the node the universal curve over $\mathfrak{M}^{\text{gl}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2)$ is given by the equation $xy = 0$, then the coordinates x and y lift to sections s_x and s_y of the log structure on the universal curve with a relation $s_x s_y = s_t$ for some section s_t of the log structure pulled back from $\mathfrak{M}^{\text{gl}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2)$. Thus the log structure on $\widetilde{\mathfrak{M}}^{\text{gl}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2)$ may be seen as being generated by the log structure on $\mathfrak{M}^{\text{gl}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2)$ along with sections s_x, s_y subject to the relation $s_x s_y = s_t$.

On the other hand, there are morphisms

$$\widetilde{\mathfrak{M}}^{\text{gl}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2) \xrightarrow{\text{pr}_i} \widetilde{\mathfrak{M}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_i) \xrightarrow{s_i} \mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_i)$$

with pr_i the projection and s_i the morphism obtained by composing the saturation morphism with the canonical map $(\mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_i), x_i^* \mathcal{M}_{C_i^\circ}) \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_i)$. Then $s_i^{-1} \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{\mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_i)} \oplus \mathbb{N} \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{M}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_i)} \subseteq s_i^{-1} \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{\mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_i)} \oplus \mathbb{Z}$ by definition of a punctured log structure. In particular, there is a sub-log structure \mathcal{P}_i of the log structure on $\widetilde{\mathfrak{M}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_i)$ with ghost sheaf given by the factor \mathbb{N} , generated by sections s_x or s_y lifting coordinates x and y as before. These sections map via pr_i^\flat to the corresponding sections of the log structure on $\widetilde{\mathfrak{M}}^{\text{gl}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2)$.

There is then an inclusion of log structures $\mathcal{N} \subset \text{pr}_1^* \mathcal{P}_1 \oplus_{\mathcal{O}^\times} \text{pr}_2^* \mathcal{P}_2$ on the underlying space of $\widetilde{\mathfrak{M}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1) \times \widetilde{\mathfrak{M}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_2)$ corresponding to the inclusion of ghost sheaves the diagonal $\mathbb{N} \subseteq \mathbb{N} \oplus \mathbb{N}$. Then the log structure of $\mathfrak{M}^{\text{gl}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2)$ is the fine saturated sub-log structure of the log structure on $\widetilde{\mathfrak{M}}^{\text{gl}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2)$ generated by the images under $(s_i \circ \text{pr}_i)^\flat$ of $\mathcal{M}_{\mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_i)}$, $i = 1, 2$, and the image under $(\text{pr}_1 \times \text{pr}_2)^\flat$ of \mathcal{N} .

It will be useful to recast this fibre product description in the most important case we will need here.

Theorem 7.6. *Suppose that the global contact orders \bar{u}_{x_i} , $i = 1, 2$, are monodromy-free. Suppose further that \bar{u}_{x_1} is specified by $-s$ with $s \in \Sigma(X)(\mathbb{Z})$, and \bar{u}_{x_2} is specified by s . Then there are diagrams Cartesian in the fs log category*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathfrak{M}^{\text{gl}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2) & \longrightarrow & \mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \text{ev} \\ \mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_2) \times B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}, s) \end{array}$$

and

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{M}(X, \beta_1, \beta_2) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{M}(X, \beta_1) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \text{ev} \\ \mathcal{M}(X, \beta_2) \times B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{P}(X, s) \end{array}$$

where ev is as given in Proposition 3.3 using the puncture x_1 .

Proof. We consider the first diagram. For notational convenience, we write $W_i = \mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_i)$, $\widetilde{W}_i = \widetilde{\mathfrak{M}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_i)$, $W = \mathfrak{M}^{\text{gl}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2)$ and $\widetilde{W} = \widetilde{\mathfrak{M}}^{\text{gl}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2)$.

First consider the evaluation morphisms $\text{ev}_i : \widetilde{W}_i \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$. By Remark 2.11, (1), ev_i factors through the stratum $\mathcal{Z} := \mathcal{Z}_s$ of \mathcal{X} . Second, note that since x_1 has contact order given by $-s$, it follows from Proposition 3.3 and the construction of \widetilde{W}_1 that \widetilde{W}_1 is the saturation of $W_1 \times_{\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}, s)}^{\text{fine}} \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}, s)$, i.e., $\widetilde{W}_1 \cong W_1 \times_{\mathcal{P}(X, s)}^{\text{fs}} \mathcal{P}(X, s)$. This is compatible with (3.5).

On the other hand, note that the underlying stack of \widetilde{W}_2 coincides with \underline{W}_2 ; indeed, the contact order s of x_2 lies in $\Sigma(X)$, so that x_2 is a marked point. In particular, $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{\widetilde{W}_2} = \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{W_2} \oplus \mathbb{N}$.

We then have by Proposition 7.4 that \widetilde{W} coincides with

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{W}_1 \times_{\mathcal{X}}^{\text{fs}} \widetilde{W}_2 &\cong \widetilde{W}_1 \times_{\mathcal{Z}}^{\text{fs}} \widetilde{W}_2 \\ &\cong \widetilde{W}_1 \times_{\mathcal{Z} \times B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger}^{\text{fs}} (\widetilde{W}_2 \times B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger) \\ &\cong \widetilde{W}_1 \times_{\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}, s)}^{\text{fs}} (\widetilde{W}_2 \times B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger) \\ &\cong (W_1 \times_{\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}, s)}^{\text{fs}} \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}, s)) \times_{\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}, s)}^{\text{fs}} (\widetilde{W}_2 \times B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger) \\ &\cong W_1 \times_{\mathcal{P}(X, s)}^{\text{fs}} (\widetilde{W}_2 \times B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger). \end{aligned}$$

Here for the second isomorphism we use the morphism $\widetilde{\text{ev}} : \widetilde{W}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{Z} \times B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger = \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}, s)$ of (3.2) through which $\widetilde{W}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}$ factors. The morphism $\widetilde{W}_2 \times B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger \rightarrow \mathcal{Z} \times B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger$ is just given by the identity on the $B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger$ factor. For the fourth isomorphism, we use (3.5).

We next consider the sub-log structure on $\widetilde{W}_2 \times B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger$ defined as follows. The ghost sheaf of $\widetilde{W}_2 \times B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger$ is $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{W_2} \oplus \mathbb{N} \oplus \mathbb{N}$, and the torsors corresponding to $(0, 1, 0)$ and $(0, 0, 1)$ are $\mathcal{N}_{x_2/C_2}^\vee$ and \mathcal{U} respectively, where $C_2 \rightarrow W_2$ is the universal domain over W_2 and as usual \mathcal{U} is the universal torsor on $B\mathbb{G}_m$. Consider the subsheaf of this ghost sheaf generated by $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{W_2}$ and $(0, 1, 1)$. This defines the sub-log structure, which we call W_2' . Note there is an isomorphism $W_2' \rightarrow W_2 \times B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger$. This is defined by specifying morphisms $W_2' \rightarrow W_2$ and $W_2' \rightarrow B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger$. The first morphism is defined by noting that the composition $\widetilde{W}_2 \times B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger \rightarrow \widetilde{W}_2 \rightarrow W_2$

factors through W'_2 . On the other hand, the morphism $\underline{W}'_2 \rightarrow B\mathbb{G}_m$ is given by the line bundle $\mathcal{U} \otimes \mathcal{N}_{x_2/C_2}^\vee$, and this immediately lifts to a morphism $W'_2 \rightarrow B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger$ which on the level of ghost sheaves takes $1 \in \mathbb{N}$ to $(0, 1, 1) \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{W'_2}$.

Note the morphism $\widetilde{W}_2 \times B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}, s)$ factors through W'_2 . Indeed, by construction we have a factorization

$$(7.2) \quad \widetilde{W}_2 \times B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger \rightarrow \mathcal{Z} \times B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}, s),$$

which translates at the level of stalks of ghost sheaves as

$$(7.3) \quad Q_2 \oplus \mathbb{N} \oplus \mathbb{N} \leftarrow P \oplus \mathbb{N} \leftarrow P$$

with the first map given by $(p, n) \mapsto (q, s(p), n)$ for some q depending on p and the second map given by $p \mapsto (p, s(p))$. Thus the composition is $p \mapsto (q, s(p), s(p))$, which lies in the ghost sheaf of W'_2 by construction.

We now define W' to make the right-hand square of the following diagram Cartesian in the fs log category:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \widetilde{W}_1 \times_{\mathcal{Z}}^{\text{fs}} \widetilde{W}_2 & \longrightarrow & W' & \longrightarrow & W_1 \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \widetilde{W}_2 \times B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger & \longrightarrow & W'_2 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}, s) \end{array}$$

Since the big rectangle is Cartesian, so is the left-hand rectangle. We would like to show $W' \cong W$.

First note that by construction, $\widetilde{W}_2 \times B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger \rightarrow W'_2$ is an integral and saturated morphism, and the identity on underlying stacks. Thus the stack underlying the fs fibre product of the left square agrees with the ordinary fibre product, so $\widetilde{W}_1 \times_{\mathcal{Z}}^{\text{fs}} \widetilde{W}_2$ and W' have the same underlying stack, and W' is a sub-log structure of $\widetilde{W}_1 \times_{\mathcal{Z}}^{\text{fs}} \widetilde{W}_2$, as can easily be checked on the level of stalks of ghost sheaves.

Thus it is enough to check that W' is the same sub-log structure as that of W as described in Remark 7.5. Indeed, the ghost sheaf of W' is the smallest fine saturated subsheaf of the ghost sheaf of $\widetilde{W}_1 \times_{\mathcal{Z}}^{\text{fs}} \widetilde{W}_2$ containing the images of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{W_1}$ and $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{W'_2}$. The latter is generated by $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{W_2}$ and an \mathbb{N} factor. By tracing through the definition of the composed morphism $\widetilde{W}_1 \times_{\mathcal{Z}}^{\text{fs}} \widetilde{W}_2 \rightarrow \widetilde{W}_2 \times B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger \rightarrow W'_2$, one sees that this \mathbb{N} factor generates $\overline{\mathcal{N}}$, where \mathcal{N} is as described in Remark 7.5. Hence the result for the first diagram of the lemma.

For the second diagram, we proceed exactly as above, but replace the application of Proposition 7.4 with the analogous statement of [ACGS20], Cor. 5.13, and use Theorem 7.2 to pass from moduli spaces of maps to \mathcal{X} to moduli spaces of maps to X . \square

Corollary 7.7. *Suppose we are in the setup of Corollary 7.3. Suppose further that the contact order of x_1 is specified by $-s$, with $s \in \Sigma(X)(\mathbb{Z})$, and the contact order of x_2 is specified by s . Then there are fs Cartesian diagrams*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathfrak{M}^{\text{gl, ev}(q, \mathbf{x}'_1 \cup \mathbf{x}'_2)}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z) & \longrightarrow & \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}(x_1, \mathbf{x}'_1)}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}(x_2, \mathbf{x}'_2)}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_2, z) \times B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{P}(X, s) \end{array}$$

and

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathfrak{M}^{\text{gl, ev}(\mathbf{x}'_1 \cup \mathbf{x}'_2)}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z) & \longrightarrow & \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}(\mathbf{x}'_1)}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}(\mathbf{x}'_2)}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_2, z) \times B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}, s) \end{array}$$

Proof. We do the first case, the second being slightly easier. First, note that each stack in the first diagram of Theorem 7.6 comes with a morphism to $\underline{\mathcal{X}}$, given either by evaluation at the glued node, at x_1 or x_2 , or the canonical projection $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}, s) \rightarrow \underline{\mathcal{Z}}_s$ followed by the closed embedding $\underline{\mathcal{Z}}_s \hookrightarrow \underline{\mathcal{X}}$. Further, all these morphisms are compatible. Noting that $\mathcal{P}(X, s) = \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}, s) \times_{\underline{\mathcal{X}}} \underline{X}$, we then have from Theorem 7.6 an fs Cartesian diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathfrak{M}^{\text{gl}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2) \times_{\underline{\mathcal{X}}} \underline{X} & \longrightarrow & \mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1) \times_{\underline{\mathcal{X}}} \underline{X} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ (\mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_2) \times_{\underline{\mathcal{X}}} \underline{X}) \times B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{P}(X, s) \end{array}$$

It then follows from general properties of fibre products that

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathfrak{M}^{\text{gl, ev}(q, \mathbf{x}'_1 \cup \mathbf{x}'_2)}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2) & \longrightarrow & \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}(x_1, \mathbf{x}'_1)}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}(x_2, \mathbf{x}'_2)}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_2) \times B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{P}(X, s) \end{array}$$

is fs Cartesian, and a further base-change on the left by the projection morphism $\mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}(x_2, \mathbf{x}'_2)}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_2, z) \times B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}(x_2, \mathbf{x}'_2)}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_2) \times B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger$ then gives the desired fs Cartesian diagram. \square

7.2. Alternative calculations for $N_{p_1 p_2 s}^{A_1}$. We fix here a punctured map class β_1 , of genus zero with three marked points x_1, x_2, x_{out} , with contact orders specified by p_1, p_2 and $-s$ for $p_1, p_2, s \in \Sigma(X)(\mathbb{Z})$, and curve class A_1 . We return to the conventions of Definitions 3.6 and 3.10 for the notation $\mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1)$, $\mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, z)$.

In the key gluing result, Theorem 4.25, we glue the moduli space $\mathcal{M}(X, \beta_2, z)$ to a moduli space $\mathcal{M}(X, \beta_1)$ without a point constraint. Suppose given a punctured map $f_2 : (C_2, x'_s, x_3, x_{\text{out}}) \rightarrow X$ in $\mathcal{M}(X, \beta_2, z)$ which we wish to glue to punctured maps of the form $f_1 : (C_1, x_1, x_2, x_s) \rightarrow X$ in $\mathcal{M}_{\beta_1}(X, \beta_1)$, gluing x'_s to x_s . In order to glue, at the very least one needs $f_1(x_s) = f_2(x'_s)$, and this effectively imposes a point constraint on the maps of type β_1 . In particular, if $z' = f_2(x'_s)$, we would expect we would need to look at punctured maps of type β_1 with a constraint given by z' . Unfortunately, there is no reason why the point z' should lie in Z_s° , rather than just Z_s , and as a result it does not necessarily impose a point constraint of the type we have previously considered. So here we find a broader description of the numbers $N_{p_1 p_2 s}^{A_1}$ which allows more general point constraints. Effectively, this number should be thought of as a kind of “virtual log degree” of the morphism $\text{ev}_X : \mathcal{M}(X, \beta_1) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(X, s)$. However, this morphism has virtual log fibre dimension 1, so some care is needed in defining this degree.

Lemma 7.8. *Let $g : W \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(X, s)$ be a morphism from an fs log stack which is transverse to $\text{ev}_X : \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(X, s)$ in the sense of Definition 2.6. Then the projection*

$$(7.4) \quad W \times_{\mathcal{P}(X, s)}^{\text{fs}} \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1) \rightarrow W$$

is flat of fibre dimension 1.

Proof. As $\text{ev}_X : \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(X, s)$ is log smooth by Theorem 3.16 (since x_1, x_2 are marked), ev_X is also log flat. By transversality the projection (7.4) is integral, so (7.4) is in fact flat by Proposition 2.3, (2).

We compute the log fibre dimension of ev_X . By Lemma 3.7 and Proposition A.7, (5), this log fibre dimension is the same as that of $\text{ev}_X : \mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(X, s)$. This latter morphism factors as $\mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1) \rightarrow \mathbf{M}(\mathcal{X}, s) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(X, s)$ as in the proof of Theorem 3.16, with the first morphism being log étale and the second morphism, a base-change of $\mathbf{M} \rightarrow B\mathbb{G}_m$, being of fibre and log fibre dimension 1. Thus ev_X has log fibre dimension 1 by Proposition A.7, (3), and the same holds for (7.4), by Proposition A.7, (5). Thus the result follows from Proposition A.7, (2). \square

Definition 7.9. Suppose $g : W \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(X, s)$ is a morphism with W of pure dimension -1 . Suppose further that g is transverse to $\text{ev}_X : \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(X, s)$. Define a relative obstruction theory for

$$W \times_{\mathcal{P}(X, s)}^{\text{fs}} \mathcal{M}(X, \beta_1) \rightarrow W \times_{\mathcal{P}(X, s)}^{\text{fs}} \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1)$$

by pull-back of that for $\mathcal{M}(X, \beta_1) \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1)$. By Lemma 7.8, $W \times_{\mathcal{P}(X,s)}^{\text{fs}} \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1)$ is pure dimension zero, and hence it follows by Riemann-Roch as in the proof of Proposition 3.12 that $W \times_{\mathcal{P}(X,s)}^{\text{fs}} \mathcal{M}(X, \beta_1)$ is virtual dimension $A \cdot c_1(\Theta_{X/k})$. If $W \times_{\mathcal{P}(X,s)}^{\text{fs}} \mathcal{M}(X, \beta_1)$ is proper over \mathbb{k} , we define

$$N_{p_1 p_2 s}^{A_1, W} = \begin{cases} \deg[W \times_{\mathcal{P}(X,s)}^{\text{fs}} \mathcal{M}(X, \beta_1)]^{\text{virt}} & \text{virt. dim } W \times_{\mathcal{P}(X,s)}^{\text{fs}} \mathcal{M}(X, \beta_1) = 0, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Theorem 7.10. *Let $\underline{W} = B\mathbb{G}_m$, with log structure \mathcal{M}_W so that $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_W = Q$ for an fs monoid Q , and suppose there exists $\ell \in Q^\vee$ such that for $q \in Q$, the torsor contained in \mathcal{M}_W corresponding to q is $\mathcal{L}_q \cong \mathcal{U}^{\otimes \langle \ell, q \rangle}$. Suppose further that ℓ is a generator of a one-dimensional face of Q^\vee , and that $g : W \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(X, s)$ is given so that (1) g is transverse to ev_X ; (2) $\Sigma(g)(\ell) = s$ and (3) \underline{g} is a closed embedding identifying \underline{W} with $z \times B\mathbb{G}_m$ for some $z \in \underline{Z}$. Then*

$$N_{p_1 p_2 s}^{A_1, W} = N_{p_1 p_2 s}^{A_1}.$$

Proof. Step 1. Properness.

By transversality and the fact that $\underline{W} = B\mathbb{G}_m$, $N_{p_1 p_2 s}^{A_1, W}$ is defined provided that $W \times_{\mathcal{P}(X,s)}^{\text{fs}} \mathcal{M}(X, \beta_1)$ is proper over \mathbb{k} . For use later in the proof, we show a slightly more general properness, assuming that \underline{W} is a stack $\underline{T} \times B\mathbb{G}_m$ carrying some log structure and the morphism $\underline{W} \rightarrow \underline{\mathcal{P}}(X, s) = \underline{Z} \times B\mathbb{G}_m$ is of the form $\underline{g}' \times \text{id}$ for some morphism $\underline{g}' : \underline{T} \rightarrow \underline{Z}$. We then show that $W \times_{\mathcal{P}(X,s)}^{\text{fs}} \mathcal{M}(X, \beta_1)$ is proper over \underline{T} .

As $W \times_{\mathcal{P}(X,s)}^{\text{fs}} \mathcal{M}(X, \beta_1)$ is representable and finite over

$$\underline{W} \times_{\underline{\mathcal{P}}(X,s)} \underline{\mathcal{M}}(X, \beta_1) = \underline{T} \times_{\underline{Z}} \underline{\mathcal{M}}(X, \beta_1),$$

it is enough to show that the latter is proper over \underline{T} . But the evaluation map $\underline{\mathcal{M}}(X, \beta_1) \rightarrow \underline{Z}$ is proper as the composition with the proper map $\underline{Z} \rightarrow \underline{S}$ is proper by Lemma 3.20, (1). Thus $\underline{T} \times_{\underline{Z}} \underline{\mathcal{M}}(X, \beta_1)$ is proper over \underline{T} . In particular, with the choice of W given in the statement of the theorem, we see that $N_{p_1 p_2 s}^{A_1, W}$ is defined.

Note that $W \times_{\mathcal{P}(X,s)}^{\text{fs}} \mathcal{M}(X, \beta_1)$ is of virtual dimension zero precisely when $A_1 \cdot c_1(\Theta_{X/k}) = 0$, which is also the case when $\mathcal{M}(X, \beta_1, z)$ is virtual dimension zero. Since both $N_{p_1 p_2 s}^{A_1, W}$ and $N_{p_1 p_2 s}^{A_1}$ are defined to be zero if the virtual dimension of the relevant moduli space is non-zero, we restrict now to the case that $A_1 \cdot c_1(\Theta_{X/k}) = 0$.

Step 2. Construction of T .

To make the comparison, we will choose a discrete valuation ring R , a log structure T on $\underline{T} = \text{Spec } R$, and a careful choice of morphism $T \rightarrow Z = Z_s$.

With the image of g being $z \times B\mathbb{G}_m$, let $P = \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{Z, \bar{z}}$ and let P_K be the stalk of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_Z$ at the generic point of Z . These coincide with the stalks of the ghost sheaf of $\mathcal{P}(X, s)$ at the corresponding points. We have the generization map $\chi_P : P \rightarrow P_K$ and face $F = \chi_P^{-1}(0)$ of P . Note that

$$F^\vee = (P^\vee + P_K^*)/P_K^*.$$

As $\bar{g}^b : P \rightarrow Q$ is a local homomorphism between sharp monoids, i.e., $(\bar{g}^b)^{-1}(0) = \{0\}$, $(\bar{g}^b)^t(Q^\vee)$ is not contained in a proper face of P^\vee . Choose $u \in \text{Int}(Q^\vee)$ and set

$$u' = (\bar{g}^b)^t(u).$$

Note u' is not contained in a proper face of P^\vee , and thus the image of u' in F^\vee under the projection map $P^\vee \rightarrow F^\vee$ lies in the interior of F^\vee . We will denote this element also by u' .

Étale locally at \bar{z} we can write \underline{Z} as $\text{Spec } \mathbb{k}[F] \times \underline{\mathbb{A}}_{\mathbb{k}}^d$ for some $d \geq 0$, with \bar{z} corresponding to the point $(z, 0)$ where z is the torus fixed-point of $\text{Spec } \mathbb{k}[F]$. Write $\underline{\mathbb{A}}_{\mathbb{k}}^d = \text{Spec } \mathbb{k}[x_1, \dots, x_d]$. Note that the log structure on $\text{Spec } \mathbb{k}[F] \times \underline{\mathbb{A}}_{\mathbb{k}}^d$ arises from the natural chart $P \rightarrow \mathbb{k}[F] = \mathbb{k}[P]/(P \setminus F)$, $p \mapsto z^p$, and the factor $\underline{\mathbb{A}}_{\mathbb{k}}^d$ does not carry a log structure.

We now choose \underline{T} and a morphism $\underline{T} \rightarrow \underline{Z}$ as follows. We give a morphism $\mathbb{A}^1 = \text{Spec } \mathbb{k}[t] \rightarrow \text{Spec } \mathbb{k}[F] \times \underline{\mathbb{A}}_{\mathbb{k}}^d$ given at the ring level by $z^f \mapsto t^{u'(f)}$, $x_i \mapsto 0$. After passing to an étale neighbourhood $\underline{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{A}^1$ of the origin in \mathbb{A}^1 , with $x \in \underline{C}$ mapping to the origin in \mathbb{A}^1 , we may then assume that there is a morphism

$$(7.5) \quad \underline{C} \rightarrow \underline{Z}$$

with x mapping to \bar{z} and such that the induced homomorphism on strict Henselian local rings $\mathcal{O}_{\underline{Z}, \bar{z}} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\underline{C}, \bar{x}}$ coincides with the corresponding homomorphism of strict Henselian rings given by the constructed morphism $\mathbb{A}^1 \rightarrow \text{Spec } \mathbb{k}[F] \times \underline{\mathbb{A}}_{\mathbb{k}}^d$. Set $R = \mathcal{O}_{\underline{C}, x}$, a discrete valuation ring.

We now have a morphism $\underline{T} = \text{Spec } R \rightarrow \underline{Z}$. If T' denotes the pull-back log structure on \underline{T} from X , we note that this log structure is determined by the data P, F and u' of Lemma A.10. In what follows, ξ denotes the generic point of \underline{T} , and we write ξ^\dagger for the standard log point structure on ξ , which is, by construction, the restriction of the log structure on T to ξ .

On the other hand, consider a log structure T on \underline{T} given from Lemma A.10 by the data of the monoid Q , its face $\ell^\perp \cap Q$, and the chosen element $u \in \text{Int}(Q^\vee)$. By restriction to $\ell^\perp \cap Q$, we view $u \in \text{Int}((\ell^\perp \cap Q)^\vee)$. Note that $Q_K = \mathbb{N}$ as ℓ generates a one-dimensional face of Q^\vee .

We can now define a morphism $T \rightarrow T'$, hence a morphism $T \rightarrow Z$, using Lemma A.11. Such a morphism is determined by the data $\varphi = \bar{g}^b : P \rightarrow Q$ and $\varphi_K = s : P_K \rightarrow Q_K = \mathbb{N}$. Here we use the fact that $(\bar{g}^b)^t(\ell) = \Sigma(g)(\ell) = s$ to conclude φ_K takes the stated form.

Step 3. The comparison.

We can now act on T and Z with \mathbb{G}_m . The action is taken to be trivial on the underlying schemes, but acts on the log structure by acting on a torsor \mathcal{L}_q over T with weight $\ell(q)$ for $q \in Q$ and acting on a torsor \mathcal{L}_p over $U \subseteq Z$ for $p \in \Gamma(U, \overline{\mathcal{M}}_Z)$ with weight $\langle s, p \rangle$. By Remark 3.1, with this action we have $[Z/\mathbb{G}_m] \cong \mathcal{P}(X, s)$.

Because of compatibility of the weights of the \mathbb{G}_m action, the morphism $T \rightarrow Z$ descends to a morphism $[T/\mathbb{G}_m] \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(X, s)$ which is in fact transverse to $\text{ev}_{\mathcal{X}} : \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(X, s)$. Indeed, there is a closed embedding $W \hookrightarrow [T/\mathbb{G}_m]$ identifying W with the closed point of $[T/\mathbb{G}_m]$, and the composition $W \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(X, s)$ agrees at the level of ghost sheaves with the morphism g , assumed to be transverse. Transversality is obvious at the generic point $[\xi^\dagger/\mathbb{G}_m]$ of $[T/\mathbb{G}_m]$, as the monoid at that point is \mathbb{N} .

Now assume the composition $W \hookrightarrow [T/\mathbb{G}_m] \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(X, s)$ agrees precisely with g . We then have a diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
[\xi^\dagger/\mathbb{G}_m] \times_{\mathcal{P}(X,s)}^{\text{fs}} \mathcal{M}(X, \beta_1) & \xrightarrow{j} & [T/\mathbb{G}_m] \times_{\mathcal{P}(X,s)}^{\text{fs}} \mathcal{M}(X, \beta_1) & \xleftarrow{i} & W \times_{\mathcal{P}(X,s)}^{\text{fs}} \mathcal{M}(X, \beta_1) \\
p_\xi \downarrow & & p \downarrow & & \downarrow p_0 \\
[\xi^\dagger/\mathbb{G}_m] \times_{\mathcal{P}(X,s)}^{\text{fs}} \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1) & \xrightarrow{j} & [T/\mathbb{G}_m] \times_{\mathcal{P}(X,s)}^{\text{fs}} \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1) & \xleftarrow{i} & W \times_{\mathcal{P}(X,s)}^{\text{fs}} \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1) \\
q_\xi \downarrow & & q \downarrow & & \downarrow q_0 \\
\xi & \xrightarrow{j} & \underline{T} & \xleftarrow{i} & \text{Spec } \mathbb{k}
\end{array}$$

Here the morphism q is the composition of the projection to $[T/\mathbb{G}_m]$ whose underlying stack is $\underline{T} \times B\mathbb{G}_m$, followed by the further projection to \underline{T} . The morphisms q_0, q_ξ are defined similarly. All squares are Cartesian in all categories, with all horizontal arrows strict. The morphisms q_ξ, q, q_0 are flat of fibre dimension zero by Lemma 7.8.

The relative obstruction theory for p given by Definition 7.9 pulls back via the closed embedding i and the open embedding j to the corresponding relative

obstruction theories for p_ξ and p_0 . These give virtual fundamental classes on the three moduli spaces of the top row, which we write as α_ξ , α and α_0 respectively. By properties of virtual pull-back [Ma12], Thm. 4.1, it follows that $\alpha_\xi = j^*\alpha$, $\alpha_0 = i^!\alpha$.

From this it follows by a standard argument that $\deg \alpha_\xi = \deg \alpha_0$. Explicitly, note that by Step 1, $q \circ p$, $q_\xi \circ p_\xi$ and $q_0 \circ p_0$ are all proper. We can define $\deg \alpha \in \mathbb{Q}$ by the formula $(q \circ p)_*\alpha = (\deg \alpha)[\underline{T}]$, as α is a one-dimensional class.⁴ Further, we have

$$(q_0 \circ p_0)_*\alpha_0 = (\deg \alpha_0)[\text{Spec } \mathbb{k}], \quad (q_\xi \circ p_\xi)_*\alpha_\xi = (\deg \alpha_\xi)[\xi].$$

Then $\deg \alpha = \deg \alpha_\xi$ because

$$(\deg \alpha)[\xi] = j^*(q \circ p)_*\alpha = (q_\xi \circ p_\xi)_*j^*\alpha = (\deg \alpha_\xi)[\xi]$$

by compatibility of flat pull-back and proper push-forward. Also, $\deg \alpha = \deg \alpha_0$, as

$$(\deg \alpha)[\text{Spec } \mathbb{k}] = i^!(q \circ p)_*\alpha = (q_0 \circ p_0)_*i^!\alpha = (\deg \alpha_0)[\text{Spec } \mathbb{k}],$$

by compatibility of the Gysin map with proper push-forward, see [Kr99], Thm. 2.1.12,(xi). Thus we conclude that $N_{p_1 p_2 s}^{A_1, W} = N_{p_1 p_2 s}^{A_1, [\xi^\dagger/\mathbb{G}_m]}$.

If the composition $W \hookrightarrow [T/\mathbb{G}_m] \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(X, s)$ does not agree with g , we note that in fact the number $N_{p_1 p_2 r}^{A_1, W}$ only depends on the morphism g at the level of ghost sheaves. Indeed, in the above argument, take instead $\underline{T} = \text{Spec } \mathbb{k}[P^{\text{gp}}]$, with constant log structure given by $T = \text{Spec}(Q \rightarrow \mathbb{k}) \times \underline{T}$. Then $\Gamma(T, \mathcal{O}_T^\times) = P^{\text{gp}} \times \mathbb{k}^\times$, and there is a universal morphism $T \rightarrow \text{Spec}(P \rightarrow \mathbb{k})$ given at the logarithmic level by $P \rightarrow \Gamma(T, \mathcal{M}_T) = Q \times \Gamma(T, \mathcal{O}_T^\times)$ defined by $p \mapsto (\bar{g}^\flat(p), p \otimes 1)$. This then gives rise to a morphism $[T/\mathbb{G}_m] \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(X, s)$ as before. Any morphism $g' : W \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(X, s)$ agreeing with g at the level of underlying stacks and at the level of ghost sheaves then factors through some strict embedding $W \hookrightarrow [T/\mathbb{G}_m]$. The same argument as in the previous paragraphs then shows that $N_{p_1 p_2 s}^{A_1, W}$ defined using the composition $W \hookrightarrow [T/\mathbb{G}_m] \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(X, s)$ is independent of the choice of strict embedding $W \hookrightarrow [T/\mathbb{G}_m]$.

A similar but simpler argument then allows comparison of $N_{p_1 p_2 s}^{A_1, [\xi^\dagger/\mathbb{G}_m]}$ with $N_{p_1 p_2 s}^{A_1, B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger}$ for a morphism $B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(X, s)$ given by Proposition 3.8. Indeed, using the morphism $\underline{C} \rightarrow \underline{Z}$ given in (7.5), we may take a closed point $x' \in \underline{C}$ such that its image in \underline{Z} lies in \underline{Z}° . Indeed, such a point exists by the construction of this morphism. We now take $R = \mathcal{O}_{\underline{C}, x'}$, set $\underline{T} = \text{Spec } R'$ and equip \underline{T} with

⁴Here we work in the rational Chow groups of these Deligne-Mumford stacks so that we can work with proper, rather than projective, push-forward.

two log structures. The first log structure, T , is constructed from Lemma A.10 from the data $Q = \mathbb{N}$, $F = 0$, $u = 0$. The second log structure T' is pulled back from Z , and arises from the data $Q = P_K$, $F = 0$, and $u = 0$. Thus by Lemma A.11, there is a morphism $T \rightarrow T'$ induced by $s : P_K \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$. We may then repeat the argument above to show that $N_{p_1 p_2 s}^{A_1, [\xi^\dagger / \mathbb{G}_m]} = N_{p_1 p_2 s}^{A_1}$, which completes the proof. \square

7.3. The proof of Theorem 4.25. Fix $p_1, p_2, p_3, r \in B(\mathbb{Z})$ and $s \in \Sigma(X)(\mathbb{Z})$. We further fix punctured map classes β_1, β_2 , each of genus zero with three marked points and curve classes A_1, A_2 . We label the punctured points of β_1 as x_1, x_2 and x_s with contact orders $p_1, p_2, -s$, and label the punctured points of β_2 as x_3, x'_s and x_{out} with contact orders p_3, s and $-r$. We also fix $z \in Z_r$. In this section, when we write $\mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1)$, $\mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_2, z)$, we mean the moduli spaces defined in Definitions 3.6 and 3.10; otherwise, we will be careful in decorating the ev superscripts.

This data gives rise to moduli spaces

$$\mathcal{M}_1 := \mathcal{M}(X, \beta_1), \quad \mathcal{M}_2 := \mathcal{M}(X, \beta_2, z), \quad \mathcal{M}^{\text{gl}} := \mathcal{M}^{\text{gl}}(X, \beta_1, \beta_2, z)$$

and

$$\mathfrak{M}_1 := \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}(x_s)}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1), \quad \mathfrak{M}_2 := \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}(x'_s, x_{\text{out}})}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_2, z), \quad \mathfrak{M}^{\text{gl}} := \mathfrak{M}^{\text{gl, ev}(q, x_{\text{out}})}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z).$$

Note we have a diagram Cartesian in the fs log category

$$(7.6) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \mathfrak{M}^{\text{gl}} & \longrightarrow & \mathfrak{M}_1 \\ \Pi \downarrow & & \downarrow \text{ev}_{\mathcal{X}} \\ \mathfrak{M}_2 \times B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{P}(X, s) \end{array}$$

by Corollary 7.7.

Write $\delta : \mathfrak{M}_2 \rightarrow B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger$ for the composition

$$(7.7) \quad \mathfrak{M}_2 \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_2, z) = \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_2) \times_{\mathcal{P}(X, r)}^{\text{fs}} B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger \rightarrow B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger,$$

where the first morphism forgets evaluation at x'_s and is strict smooth and the last morphism is the second projection. We then have a composed morphism

$$(7.8) \quad \Psi : \mathfrak{M}^{\text{gl}} \xrightarrow{\Pi} \mathfrak{M}_2 \times B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger \xrightarrow{\delta \times \text{id}} B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger \times B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger.$$

Fix a non-negative integer μ and recall the definition of $B\mathbb{G}_m^{2, \mu}$ from §4.4.6 and the morphism

$$B\mathbb{G}_m^{2, \mu} \rightarrow B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger \times B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger.$$

We use δ, ℓ_q for the generators of the ghost sheaves of the first and second factors of $B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger \times B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger$. We may now define

$$(7.9) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}} &= \mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}, \text{ev}(q, x_{\text{out}})}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z) := \mathfrak{M}^{\text{gl}} \times_{B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger \times B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger}^{\text{fs}} B\mathbb{G}_m^{2, \mu} \\ \mathfrak{M}_2^\mu &= \mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{ev}(x'_s, x_{\text{out}})}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_2, z) := (\mathfrak{M}_2 \times B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger) \times_{B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger \times B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger}^{\text{fs}} B\mathbb{G}_m^{2, \mu} \\ \mathcal{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}} &= \mathcal{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}}(X, \beta_1, \beta_2, z) := \mathcal{M}^{\text{gl}}(X, \beta_1, \beta_2, z) \times_{\mathfrak{M}^{\text{gl}}} \mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}}. \end{aligned}$$

In the remainder of this section, we use the short-hand notations, spelling out these moduli spaces more fully in subsequent sections. We also write

$$(7.10) \quad \Pi^\mu : \mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}} \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}_2^\mu$$

for the base-change of Π from (7.6).

At times, we will also need to remove the evaluation at the node q , so we also define

$$(7.11) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}, \text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z) &:= \mathfrak{M}^{\text{gl}, \text{ev}(x_{\text{out}})}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z) \times_{B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger \times B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger}^{\text{fs}} B\mathbb{G}_m^{2, \mu} \\ \mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_2, z) &:= (\mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}(x_{\text{out}})}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_2, z) \times B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger) \times_{B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger \times B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger}^{\text{fs}} B\mathbb{G}_m^{2, \mu}. \end{aligned}$$

For the structure of \mathfrak{M}_2^μ , we note:

Lemma 7.11. *Given an fs log stack W equipped with a morphism $\delta : W \rightarrow B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger$, the projection*

$$W^\mu := (W \times B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger) \times_{B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger \times B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger}^{\text{fs}} B\mathbb{G}_m^{2, \mu} \rightarrow W \times B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger$$

is an isomorphism on underlying stacks.

Proof. First observe the morphism $\delta : W \rightarrow B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger$ is integral, as the ghost sheaf monoid on the target is $\mathbb{N}\delta$. As usual, we use the same notation δ for the morphism, the generator of the ghost sheaf on the target, and the pull-back of this generator to a section of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_W$. So $W \times B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger \rightarrow B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger \times B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger$ is an integral morphism. Therefore if W^μ were defined using the fibre product in the category of fine log structures, the statement would be true. Thus it is sufficient to check that this fibre product is already saturated. The construction of the fine fibre product (see [Og18], III, §2.1) implies the following. In a smooth neighbourhood of a geometric point \bar{x} of W , there is a chart for the log structure of the fine fibre product with monoid the fine push-out

$$(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{W, \bar{x}} \oplus \mathbb{N}\ell_q) \oplus_{\mathbb{N}\delta \oplus \mathbb{N}\ell_q}^{\text{fine}} (\mathbb{N}\delta + \mathbb{N}(\ell_q - \mu\delta)).$$

By Lemma A.4, this is the submonoid of $(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{W, \bar{x}} \oplus \mathbb{N}\ell_q)^{\text{gp}}$ generated by $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{W, \bar{x}} \oplus \mathbb{N}\ell_q$ and the image of $\ell_q - \mu\delta$ under the map $\mathbb{Z}\delta \oplus \mathbb{Z}\ell_q \rightarrow (\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{W, \bar{x}} \oplus \mathbb{N}\ell_q)^{\text{gp}}$. This is precisely the submonoid generated by $(-\mu\delta, \ell_q) \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{W, \bar{x}}^{\text{gp}} \oplus \mathbb{Z}\ell_q$ and $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{W, \bar{x}} \oplus 0$. This monoid is clearly saturated. \square

We turn to the structure of $\mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}}$.

- Proposition 7.12.** (1) *If $B\mathbb{G}_m^{2, \mu} \rightarrow B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger \times B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger$ is transverse to Ψ defined in (7.8), then $\mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}}$ is pure-dimensional of dimension $\dim X$. Further, the stalk of the ghost sheaf of $\mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}}$ at the generic point of any irreducible component of $\mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}}$ is rank two.*
- (2) *If $B\mathbb{G}_m^{2, \mu} \rightarrow B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger \times B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger$ is transverse to Ψ , and $S_2^\mu \subset \mathfrak{M}_2^\mu$ is the union of open strata of \mathfrak{M}_2^μ , then the composition*

$$S_2^\mu \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{M}_2^\mu \xrightarrow{\text{pr}_1} \mathfrak{M}_2 \times B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger$$

is transverse to Π .

- (3) *For μ sufficiently large, $B\mathbb{G}_m^{2, \mu} \rightarrow B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger \times B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger$ is transverse to Ψ .*

Proof. For (1), note that as $\text{ev}_\mathcal{X} : \mathfrak{M}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(X, s)$ is log smooth by Theorem 3.16, so is Π by base-change. Further, the morphism δ of (7.7) is log smooth by Lemma 3.17. Thus Ψ is log smooth, and we will first calculate log fibre dimensions. The log fibre dimension of Π is the same as that of $\text{ev}_\mathcal{X}$ by Proposition A.7, (5). The log fibre dimension of $\text{ev}_\mathcal{X}$ was already calculated in the proof of Lemma 7.8 to be 1. Thus Π has log fibre dimension 1. On the other hand, in the definition of δ , (7.7), the first morphism is strict and smooth of relative dimension $\dim X$ and the second is of log fibre dimension 1, by Proposition 3.19, (1). Putting this all together, we see that Ψ is log smooth of log fibre dimension $1 + \dim X + 1 = \dim X + 2$. The same is then true of the base-change $\mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}} \rightarrow B\mathbb{G}_m^{2, \mu}$.

Now let $\bar{\xi}$ be a generic point of an irreducible component \mathfrak{M}' of $\mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}}$. We now apply the definition (A.1) of log fibre dimension for Ψ , taking $x = \bar{\xi}$ in that formula. However, (A.1) needs to be appropriately interpreted for stacks, which one can do by passing to smooth charts and keeping track of the change of dimension. Since $\bar{\xi}$ is a generic point of an irreducible component, the stalk of the structure sheaf appearing in (A.1) should be interpreted as zero-dimensional, whereas the term $\text{tr.deg. } \kappa(x)/\kappa(y)$ should be interpreted in this case as $\dim \mathfrak{M}' - \dim B\mathbb{G}_m^{2, \mu} = \dim \mathfrak{M}' + 2$. With this interpretation, (A.1) then gives

$$\dim X + 2 = \dim \mathfrak{M}' + 2 + \text{rank } Q - 2 = \dim \mathfrak{M}' + \text{rank } Q,$$

with the two terms in the middle expression arising from the monoids. So it suffices to show that transversality of $B\mathbb{G}_m^{2, \mu} \rightarrow B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger \times B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger$ with Ψ implies $\text{rank } Q = 2$.

For any choice of μ , if $\text{rank } Q > 2$, consider the induced map

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_{\bar{\xi}} = \text{Hom}(Q, \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}) &\rightarrow \tau_{\mu} := \Sigma(B\mathbb{G}_m^{2,\mu}) = \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}(\delta^* + \mu\ell_q^*) + \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}\ell_q^* \\ &\subseteq \tau := \Sigma(B\mathbb{G}_m^{\dagger} \times B\mathbb{G}_m^{\dagger}) = \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^2. \end{aligned}$$

The image of $\sigma_{\bar{\xi}}$ must intersect the interior of τ_{μ} , as the induced morphism of stalks of ghost sheaves is local. Since $\text{rank } Q > 2$, it follows that there is a proper face σ' of $\sigma_{\bar{\xi}}$ whose image intersects the interior of τ_{μ} . By Proposition A.9 applied to the map $\mathfrak{M}^{\mu,\text{gl}} \rightarrow B\mathbb{G}_m^{2,\mu}$, it then follows that there exists a point $\bar{\xi}' \in |\mathfrak{M}^{\mu,\text{gl}}|$ with $\sigma_{\bar{\xi}'} = \sigma'$ and with $\bar{\xi}'$ specializing to $\bar{\xi}$. However, since $\bar{\xi}$ is the generic point of an irreducible component, there is no such point $\bar{\xi}'$.

If in fact $B\mathbb{G}_m^{2,\mu} \rightarrow B\mathbb{G}_m^{\dagger} \times B\mathbb{G}_m^{\dagger}$ is transverse to Ψ , then by Proposition 2.4, $\sigma_{\bar{\xi}}$ must surject onto a face of τ_{μ} . Again, by the local property, the image of $\sigma_{\bar{\xi}}$ intersects the interior of τ_{μ} , and hence the image is τ_{μ} . This shows that $\text{rank } Q \geq 2$. Thus $\text{rank } Q = 2$ and we obtain the desired dimension for $\mathfrak{M}^{\mu,\text{gl}}$.

(2) Take S_2 to be the union of open strata of \mathfrak{M}_2 . As δ is log smooth, the ghost sheaf on S_2 has stalk \mathbb{N} , and every two-dimensional cone of $\Sigma(S_2 \times B\mathbb{G}_m^{\dagger})$ surjects onto τ under the map $\Sigma(\delta \times \text{id})$. This surjection is in particular an isomorphism of rational polyhedral cones (not necessarily preserving the integral structure). If $S_2^{\mu} \subseteq \mathfrak{M}_2^{\mu}$ is the corresponding open subset of \mathfrak{M}_2^{μ} , then it follows that $\Sigma(S_2^{\mu}) \rightarrow \Sigma(B\mathbb{G}_m^{2,\mu})$ maps each two-dimensional cone isomorphically to τ_{μ} , by the tropical description of the fibre product, Proposition 2.2. If $B\mathbb{G}_m^{2,\mu} \rightarrow B\mathbb{G}_m^{\dagger} \times B\mathbb{G}_m^{\dagger}$ is transverse to Ψ , then every cone of $\Sigma(\mathfrak{M}^{\mu,\text{gl}})$ surjects onto a face of τ_{μ} , and via the factorization $\Sigma((\Pi^{\mu})^{-1}(S_2^{\mu})) \rightarrow \Sigma(S_2^{\mu}) \rightarrow \Sigma(B\mathbb{G}_m^{2,\mu})$ with Π^{μ} given in (7.10), we see that every cone of $\Sigma((\Pi^{\mu})^{-1}(S_2^{\mu}))$ surjects onto a cone of $\Sigma(S_2^{\mu})$, hence the desired transversality.

(3) To obtain transversality, we choose μ as follows. Consider the map

$$\Sigma(\Psi) : \Sigma(\mathfrak{M}^{\text{gl}}) \rightarrow \Sigma(B\mathbb{G}_m^{\dagger} \times B\mathbb{G}_m^{\dagger}) = \tau.$$

By §2.3.1, we can assume $\Sigma(\mathfrak{M}^{\text{gl}})$ contains only a finite number of one-dimensional cones. We can thus choose μ so that for any one-dimensional cone $\rho \in \Sigma(\mathfrak{M}^{\text{gl}})$, the intersection of $\Sigma(\Psi)(\rho)$ with τ_{μ} is either $\{0\}$ or the boundary ray $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}\ell_q^*$. Transversality then follows from Theorem 2.9. \square

The proof of Theorem 4.25. Step 1. The relative obstruction theories and calculation of the virtual dimension.

Note the diagram given in the theorem is obviously Cartesian in all categories, but we can replace it with the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}}(X, \beta_1, \beta_2, z) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{M}^{\text{gl}}(X, \beta_1, \beta_2, z) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}, \text{ev}(q, x_{\text{out}})}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z) & \longrightarrow & \mathfrak{M}^{\text{gl}, \text{ev}(q, x_{\text{out}})}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z) \end{array}$$

without any harm to the statements. Note in the notational convention in this subsection, this is

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{M}^{\text{gl}} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}} & \longrightarrow & \mathfrak{M}^{\text{gl}} \end{array}$$

First we spell out carefully the spaces involved in the relative obstruction theory for $\mathcal{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}} \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}}$. We have a diagram

$$(7.12) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{M}^{\text{gl}}(X, \beta_1, \beta_2, z) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{M}(X, \beta, z) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathfrak{M}^{\text{gl}, \text{ev}(x_{\text{out}})}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z) & \longrightarrow & \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}(x_{\text{out}})}(\mathcal{X}, \beta, z) \end{array}$$

which is not Cartesian but for which the upper left corner is an open and closed substack of the fibre product consisting of those punctured maps which split into maps of degree classes A_1, A_2 . The relative obstruction theory on the right pulls back to one on the left, of relative dimension $\chi((f^*\Theta_{X/\mathbb{k}})(-x_{\text{out}}))$. Now we have a factorization

$$\mathcal{M}^{\text{gl}}(X, \beta_1, \beta_2, z) \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}^{\text{gl}, \text{ev}(q, x_{\text{out}})}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z) \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}^{\text{gl}, \text{ev}(x_{\text{out}})}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z),$$

with a compatible obstruction theory for the first morphism of relative virtual dimension $\chi((f^*\Theta_{X/\mathbb{k}})(-x_{\text{out}} - q))$, where q is the glued node. This relative obstruction theory then pulls back to give the desired relative obstruction theory for $\mathcal{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}} \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}}$. In particular, the relative virtual dimension is still

$$\chi((f^*\Theta_{X/\mathbb{k}})(-x_{\text{out}} - q)) = A \cdot c_1(\Theta_{X/\mathbb{k}}) - \dim X,$$

see (2.3).

Now choose μ as in Proposition 7.12, (3). Then by (1) of that proposition, $\mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}}$ is pure-dimensional of dimension $\dim X$, and hence the virtual dimension of $\mathcal{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}}$ is $A \cdot c_1(\Theta_{X/\mathbb{k}})$, as claimed.

Here all squares are Cartesian in all categories. This diagram also induces a Cartesian diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \mathcal{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}} & \xrightarrow{(\beta'' \circ \alpha'') \times (q'' \circ p'')} & \mathcal{M}_1 \times \mathcal{M}_2 \\
 \alpha' \circ p'' = p' \circ \alpha'' \downarrow & & \downarrow p \times \alpha \\
 \mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}} & \xrightarrow{\beta' \times q'} & \mathfrak{M}_1 \times \mathfrak{M}_2
 \end{array}$$

with the obstruction theory for $\alpha' \circ p''$ the pull-back of that for $p \times \alpha$ by Corollary 7.3.

We now proceed with the necessary virtual intersection calculus. By [Ma12], Thms. 4.8 and 4.3,

$$(7.15) \quad [\mathcal{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}}]^{\text{virt}} = (\alpha' \circ p'')^! [\mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}}] = (p \times \alpha)^! [\mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}}] = p^! \alpha^! [\mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}}] = \alpha^! p^! [\mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}}].$$

In Step 3, we will show that $q' \circ p'$ and $q'' \circ p''$ are proper of DM type. This allows us to push-forward rational Chow classes. This is a technical issue. In [Kr99], push-forward of Chow classes on Artin stacks were constructed only for projective morphisms. However, in [Sk18], proper push-forward for DM type morphisms is constructed, assuming one works with rational Chow groups. As we are interested only in the degree of cycles, this is sufficient for our purpose. The compatibility of proper push-forward with virtual pull-back of [Ma12], Thm. 4.1,(i), can then be checked to hold for this push-forward also.

We may thus compute

$$(7.16) \quad \begin{aligned} \deg[\mathcal{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}}]^{\text{virt}} &= \deg \alpha^! p^! [\mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}}] = \deg(q'' \circ p'')_* \alpha^! p^! [\mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}}] \\ &= \deg \alpha^! (q' \circ p')_* p^! [\mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}}]. \end{aligned}$$

As Theorem 4.25 claims a value for $\deg[\mathcal{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}}]^{\text{virt}}$ when the virtual dimension of $\mathcal{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}}$ is zero, by the calculation of this virtual dimension in Step 1, we may now assume that $A \cdot c_1(\Theta_{X/\mathbb{k}}) = 0$. With this assumption, we will show

- Claim 7.13.** (1) *If $s \in B(\mathbb{Z})$, then both $\mathcal{M}_1(X, \beta_1, z')$ and \mathcal{M}_2 are virtual dimension zero for $z' \in Z_s^\circ$.*
(2) *If $s \notin B(\mathbb{Z})$, then \mathcal{M}_2 is of negative virtual dimension.*
(3) $(q' \circ p')_* p^! [\mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}}] = N_{p_1 p_2 s}^{A_1} [\mathfrak{M}_2]$.

The theorem will then follow from (7.16) and these claims, as $\alpha^! [\mathfrak{M}_2] = [\mathcal{M}_2]^{\text{virt}}$ and $\deg[\mathcal{M}_2]^{\text{virt}} = N_{sp_3 r}^{A_2}$. We will show (1) and (2) of the claim in Step 4 and (3) of the claim in Step 5.

Step 3. $q' \circ p'$ and $q'' \circ p''$ are proper of DM type.

There is a diagram of ordinary stacks

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 (\underline{\mathcal{M}}_2 \times B\mathbb{G}_m) \times_{\underline{\mathcal{P}}(X,s)} \underline{\mathcal{M}}_1 & \longrightarrow & \underline{\mathcal{M}}_1 \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 \underline{\mathcal{M}}_2 \times B\mathbb{G}_m & \longrightarrow & \underline{\mathcal{P}}(X,s) \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 \underline{\mathcal{M}}_2 & \longrightarrow & \underline{Z}_s
 \end{array}$$

Here the top square is obviously Cartesian and the bottom square, with vertical maps being projections using $\underline{\mathcal{P}}(X,s) = \underline{Z}_s \times B\mathbb{G}_m$, is also Cartesian. But $\underline{\mathcal{M}}_1' = \underline{\mathcal{M}}_2' \times_{\underline{\mathcal{P}}(X,s)}^{\text{fs}} \underline{\mathcal{M}}_1$ by definition, and $\underline{\mathcal{M}}_2' = \underline{\mathcal{M}}_2 \times B\mathbb{G}_m$ by Lemma 7.11. Hence there is a finite representable morphism

$$\underline{\mathcal{M}}_1' \rightarrow (\underline{\mathcal{M}}_2 \times B\mathbb{G}_m) \times_{\underline{\mathcal{P}}(X,s)} \underline{\mathcal{M}}_1.$$

Thus, since $\underline{\mathcal{M}}_1 \rightarrow \underline{Z}_s$ is a DM type morphism, as $\underline{\mathcal{M}}_1$ is already DM, we see that $q' \circ p'$ is DM type. Similarly, as $\underline{\mathcal{M}}_1 \rightarrow \underline{Z}_s$ is proper by Lemma 3.20, it follows that $q' \circ p'$ is proper. By base-change, $q'' \circ p''$ enjoys the same properties.

Note that as $\underline{\mathcal{M}}_2$ is proper over $\text{Spec } \mathbb{k}$, this also shows that $\mathcal{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}}$ is proper over $\text{Spec } \mathbb{k}$, so that $\text{deg}[\mathcal{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}}]^{\text{virt}}$ makes sense.

Step 4. Calculation of virtual dimensions.

We now show (1) and (2) of Claim 7.13. Recalling that we are assuming that $A \cdot c_1(\Theta_{X/\mathbb{k}}) = 0$, we see that if $\pm c_1(\Theta_{X/\mathbb{k}})$ is nef, and both moduli spaces $\underline{\mathcal{M}}_1$ and $\underline{\mathcal{M}}_2$ are non-empty, then necessarily $A_i \cdot c_1(\Theta_{X/\mathbb{k}}) = 0$ for $i = 1, 2$, and so $\underline{\mathcal{M}}_1(X, \beta_1, z')$ and $\underline{\mathcal{M}}_2$ are both virtual dimension zero, for $z' \in \underline{Z}_s^\circ$.

On the other hand, in the log Calabi-Yau case, where $c_1(\Theta_{X/\mathbb{k}}) \equiv_{\mathbb{Q}} -\sum_i a_i D_i$ for $a_i \geq 0$, we need to show that either (1) $s \in B(\mathbb{Z})$ and $A_i \cdot c_1(\Theta_{X/\mathbb{k}}) = 0$ for $i = 1, 2$ as above, or (2) $s \notin B(\mathbb{Z})$ and the virtual dimension of $\underline{\mathcal{M}}_2$ is negative.

Indeed, by Corollary 1.14, $A_i \cdot D_i = \langle p_1, D_i \rangle + \langle p_2, D_i \rangle - \langle s, D_i \rangle$ for any i . Now $p_1, p_2 \in B(\mathbb{Z})$ by assumption, so if $a_i \neq 0$, the right-hand side is $-\langle s, D_i \rangle$. If in fact $s \in B(\mathbb{Z})$, then further the right-hand side is 0, so $A_i \cdot D_i = 0$. Thus $A_1 \cdot c_1(\Theta_{X/\mathbb{k}}) = 0$. So necessarily $A_2 \cdot c_1(\Theta_{X/\mathbb{k}}) = 0$, showing (1).

On the other hand, if $s \in \Sigma(X)(\mathbb{Z}) \setminus B(\mathbb{Z})$, we similarly have $A_2 \cdot D_i = \langle s, D_i \rangle + \langle p_3, D_i \rangle - \langle r, D_i \rangle$. So if $a_i > 0$, the last two terms on the right-hand side are zero and $A_2 \cdot D_i \geq 0$. But there is at least one i with $a_i \neq 0$ and $\langle s, D_i \rangle \neq 0$ since $s \notin B(\mathbb{Z})$. Thus we see that $A_2 \cdot c_1(\Theta_{X/\mathbb{k}}) < 0$, and hence the virtual dimension of $\underline{\mathcal{M}}_2$ is negative, showing (2).

Step 5. Proof that $(q' \circ p')_* p^! [\mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}}] = N_{p_1 p_2 s}^{A_1} [\mathfrak{M}_2]$.

We now turn to proving (3) of Claim 7.13. The idea is fairly simple: morally, we have the cycle $p^! [\mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}}]$ sitting over \mathfrak{M}_2 , and we need to calculate the degree of this cycle over \mathfrak{M}_2 . To do this, it will be sufficient to restrict to a general point of \mathfrak{M}_2 and calculate the degree of $p^! [\mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}}]$ over such a point. We will do this in two steps, first by restricting to a connected open stratum of \mathfrak{M}_2 , and then passing to a point in this stratum.

Note \mathfrak{M}_2 is of pure dimension $\dim X$, by Proposition 3.19,(2). Thus $A_{\dim X}(\mathfrak{M}_2) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Q}$ is generated by the classes of the irreducible components of \mathfrak{M}_2 . Indeed, as \mathfrak{M}_2 is stratified by global quotients (see §2.3.1), we can use excision ([Kr99], Thm. 2.1.12,(iv),(v)) to replace \mathfrak{M}_2 with a dense open substack which is a disjoint union of irreducible global quotients without changing the group $A_{\dim X}$. However, for a global quotient stack, A_* coincides with the Edidin-Graham-Totaro Chow groups by [Kr99], Thm. 2.1.12,(iii), and it is clear from the definition of the latter that the top-dimensional Edidin-Graham-Totaro Chow group of an irreducible global quotient is rationally generated by the fundamental class of the global quotient.

Let S_2 be the union of open strata of \mathfrak{M}_2 , so that $\dim \mathfrak{M}_2 \setminus S_2 < \dim X$, so that again by excision, $A_{\dim X}(\mathfrak{M}_2) = A_{\dim X}(S_2)$. Let S_2^μ be the corresponding open subset of \mathfrak{M}_2^μ , and $S^\mu := (\Pi^\mu)^{-1}(S_2^\mu)$ with $\Pi^\mu : \mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}} \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}_2^\mu$ as in (7.10). We then have a diagram

$$(7.17) \quad \begin{array}{ccccccc} & & & & q' & & \\ & & & & \curvearrowright & & \\ \mathcal{M}'_1 \times_{\mathfrak{M}_2} S_2 & \xrightarrow{p'} & S^\mu & \longrightarrow & S_2^\mu & \longrightarrow & S_2 \\ j_4 \downarrow & & j_3 \downarrow & & j_2 \downarrow & & j_1 \downarrow \\ \mathcal{M}'_1 & \xrightarrow{p'} & \mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}} & \longrightarrow & \mathfrak{M}_2^\mu & \longrightarrow & \mathfrak{M}_2 \\ & & & & \curvearrowleft & & \\ & & & & q' & & \end{array}$$

with all squares Cartesian in all categories. Then

$$(7.18) \quad \begin{aligned} j_1^* (q' \circ p')_* p^! [\mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}}] &= (q' \circ p')_* j_4^* p^! [\mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}}] \\ &= (q' \circ p')_* p^! j_3^* [\mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}}] \\ &= (q' \circ p')_* p^! [S^\mu], \end{aligned}$$

the first equality by standard compatibility of flat pull-back and proper push-forward, the second by [Ma12], Thm. 4.1,(ii). Thus, it is sufficient to show that

$$(q' \circ p')_* p^! [S^\mu] = N_{p_1 p_2 s}^{A_1} [S_2].$$

Now take $W = S_2^\mu \times_{S_2} s_2$ in Definition 7.9. Then by (7.13),

$$\begin{aligned}
(7.22) \quad W \times_{\mathcal{P}(X,s)}^{\text{fs}} \mathfrak{M}_1 &\cong W \times_{\mathfrak{M}_2^\mu} (\mathfrak{M}_2^\mu \times_{\mathcal{P}(X,s)}^{\text{fs}} \mathfrak{M}_1) \\
&\cong (S_2^\mu \times_{S_2} s_2) \times_{\mathfrak{M}_2^\mu} \mathfrak{M}^{\mu,\text{gl}} \\
&\cong S^\mu \times_{S_2} s_2.
\end{aligned}$$

In particular, $\deg p^![S^\mu \times_{S_2} s_2] = \deg[W \times_{\mathcal{P}(X,s)}^{\text{fs}} \mathcal{M}(X, \beta_1)]^{\text{virt}} = N_{p_1 p_2 s}^{A_1, W}$ by Definition 7.9, and thus

$$(q' \circ p')_* p^![S^\mu \times_{S_2} s_2] = N_{p_1 p_2 s}^{A_1, W}[s_2].$$

To conclude, it is sufficient to check that the induced morphism $g : W \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(X, s)$ satisfies the hypotheses of Theorem 7.10, as then $N_{p_1 p_2 s}^{A_1, W} = N_{p_1 p_2 s}^{A_1}$, proving the desired result.

To check these hypotheses, first note that as $\underline{S}_2^\mu = \underline{S}_2 \times B\mathbb{G}_m$ and $s_2 \rightarrow S_2$ is strict, $\underline{W} = B\mathbb{G}_m$. Further, the stalk of the ghost sheaf of $S_2 \times B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger$ at any point is $\mathbb{N}\delta' \oplus \mathbb{N}\ell_q$, with $\delta = \nu\delta'$ the image of 1 under $\bar{\delta}^\flat$ with $\delta : S_2 \rightarrow B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger$, as in the proof of Lemma 7.11. Then the stalk Q of the ghost sheaf of S_2^μ is generated by $-\mu\delta + \ell_q$ and δ' in $\mathbb{Z}\delta' \oplus \mathbb{Z}\ell_q$, see the proof of Lemma 7.11. Then Q^\vee is generated by ℓ_q^* and $(\delta')^* + \mu\nu\ell_q^*$. We see from the description of the map (7.3) that $\Sigma(g)(\ell_q^*) = s$. The required transversality follows since, by Proposition 7.12, (2), $S_2^\mu \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(X, s)$ is transverse to $\text{ev}_{\mathcal{X}}$. The remaining hypotheses are clear. \square

7.4. The no-tail lemma. Here we prove the crucial no-tail lemma mentioned a number of times in §4 and already applied in the proof of Step 3 of the proof of Lemma 6.6. Since the basic idea is needed in a number of different contexts throughout the paper, we prove here the various cases needed simultaneously, making for a somewhat long statement.

Theorem 7.14. *Let β be a type of punctured map with $A \cdot c_1(\Theta_{X/\mathbb{k}}) = 0$ and $\pm c_1(\Theta_{X/\mathbb{k}})$ nef or X log Calabi-Yau. Suppose further that β has punctured points $x_1, \dots, x_n, x_{\text{out}}$ with contact orders $p_1, \dots, p_n, -r$, respectively, with $p_1, \dots, p_n, r \in B(\mathbb{Z})$. Set $Z = Z_r$. Suppose also given a log stack W with $\underline{W} = B\mathbb{G}_m$ and a morphism $g : W \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(X, r)$. Let F be an fs log Artin stack with \underline{F} integral and stratified by global quotients, equipped with a morphism $\psi : F \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta)$ such that there exists a (locally closed) stratum $S^\circ \subset \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta)$ with closure S such that:*

- (1) $\psi(F) \subset S$;
- (2) $\text{ev}_{\mathcal{X}}(S^\circ) \subset \underline{Z}^\circ \times B\mathbb{G}_m \subset \underline{\mathcal{P}}(X, r)$.

(3) The forgetful morphism $\phi : \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta) \rightarrow \mathbf{M}_{0,n+1}$ satisfies

$$\phi(S) \subset D(x_1, \dots, x_n | x_{\text{out}}).$$

(4) There is a morphism given by the dotted arrow in the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} F & \longrightarrow & \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \text{ev}_{\mathcal{X}} \\ W & \xrightarrow{g} & \mathcal{P}(X, r) \end{array}$$

making the square commute.

(5) W and g satisfy the following two conditions. First, they satisfy all hypotheses of Theorem 7.10; in particular, the required transversality is with respect to the morphism $\text{ev}_{\mathcal{X}} : \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(X, r)$. Second, suppose given a splitting $A = A_1 + A_2$ with A_1 and A_2 effective curve classes on X . This defines a type of punctured map β_1 with underlying curve class A_1 and two punctured points, labelled x_{out} and x respectively, with x_{out} having contact order specified by $-r$. By Remark 2.12, the contact order at x is then specified up to a finite number of choices. Each choice gives a moduli space and evaluation morphism at x_{out} , $\text{ev}_{\mathcal{X}} : \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(X, r)$. Then g is transversal to $\text{ev}_{\mathcal{X}}$.

Let $\varepsilon : M := F \times_{\mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta)} \mathcal{M}(X, \beta) \rightarrow F$ be the base-change of $\mathcal{M}(X, \beta) \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta)$, and let ε carry the pull-back relative obstruction theory. Then

$$\varepsilon^! [F] = 0$$

in the rational Chow group of M .

Proof. Step 1. Splitting the maps.

By Condition (1), we have a factorization $M \rightarrow F \rightarrow S \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta)$, and have universal punctured maps $f_M : C_M^\circ/M \rightarrow X$, $f_F : C_F^\circ/F \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ and $f_S : C_S^\circ/S \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$. We choose a node q of C_S as follows. Let η be the generic point of S , and let $C_{\bar{\eta}} \rightarrow \bar{\eta}$ be the generic fibre. Let $C'_{\bar{\eta}} \subset C_{\bar{\eta}}$ be the irreducible component of $C_{\bar{\eta}}$ containing x_{out} . By Condition (3), there is necessarily a unique node of $C_{\bar{\eta}}$ contained in $C'_{\bar{\eta}}$ whose removal disconnects $C_{\bar{\eta}}$ into two connected components, one containing x_{out} and the other containing x_1, \dots, x_n . Taking the closure of this node, we obtain a node of the universal curve C_S/S . Since C_F and C_M are pull-backs of this universal curve, we obtain a choice of node on these curves. We call this node q .

As the base F is integral, we can thus assume that C_F/F can be split at q using [ACGS20], Prop. 5.2, giving morphisms $f_{F,i} : C_{F,i}^\circ/F \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ with punctures $x \in C_{F,1}^\circ, x' \in C_{F,2}^\circ$ mapping to the node q , and $C_{F,1}^\circ$ containing x_{out} . We then also obtain a splitting of C_M , getting $f_{M,i} : C_{M,i}^\circ/M \rightarrow X$.

Without loss of generality, we can fix a splitting $A = A_1 + A_2$ and replace M with the union of connected components of M such that the maps $f_{M,1}, f_{M,2}$ represent A_1, A_2 . This is necessary as a priori the degree data of these two punctured maps is only locally constant on M .

Let β_i be the type of the punctured map $f_{M,i} : C_{M,i}^\circ \rightarrow X$.

Step 2. $A_1 \cdot c_1(\Theta_{X/\mathbb{k}}) \leq 0$.

In the case that $c_1(\Theta_{X/\mathbb{k}})$ is nef or anti-nef, the fact that $A \cdot c_1(\Theta_X) = 0$ implies that $A_1 \cdot c_1(\Theta_X) = 0$, provided that $\mathcal{M}(X, \beta_i)$ is non-empty for $i = 1, 2$. (If one of these moduli spaces is empty, then M is empty.)

In the log Calabi-Yau case (where we assume D is normal crossings), we have $-c_1(\Theta_{X/\mathbb{k}}) \equiv_{\mathbb{Q}} \sum_i a_i D_i, a_i \geq 0$. Suppose that $A_1 \cdot c_1(\Theta_{X/\mathbb{k}}) > 0$, i.e.,

$$A_1 \cdot \sum_i a_i D_i < 0.$$

Then there exists an i such that $a_i > 0$ but $A_1 \cdot D_i < 0$. However, by Corollary 1.14,

$$A_1 \cdot D_i = \langle u_{x_{\text{out}}}, D_i \rangle + \langle u_x, D_i \rangle.$$

Now $u_{x_{\text{out}}} = -r$, and since r is assumed to lie in $B(\mathbb{Z})$, rather than more broadly in $\Sigma(X)(\mathbb{Z})$, we have $\langle r, D_i \rangle = 0$. Thus $\langle u_x, D_i \rangle < 0$. By [ACGS20], Rmk. 2.19, this can only happen if the irreducible component $C'_{\bar{\eta}}$ is mapped by f_S into \mathcal{D}_i , the divisor of \mathcal{X} corresponding to D_i . But by Condition (2), $f_{\bar{\eta}}(x_{\text{out}}) \in \mathcal{Z}^\circ$ (where \mathcal{Z} is the stratum of \mathcal{X} corresponding to Z). Hence $C'_{\bar{\eta}}$ cannot have image contained in \mathcal{D}_i , as \mathcal{D}_i does not contain \mathcal{Z} . This is a contradiction, so in fact $A_1 \cdot c_1(\Theta_{X/\mathbb{k}}) \leq 0$ in this case also.

Step 3. The gluing diagram.

Note that the choice of node q induces an evaluation morphism $\text{ev}_q : F \rightarrow \underline{\mathcal{X}}$ at q , and we can then define

$$F^{\text{ev}(q)} := F \times_{\underline{\mathcal{X}}} \underline{X}.$$

As usual, we have a factorization

$$M \begin{array}{ccc} & \xrightarrow{\varepsilon} & \\ \xrightarrow{\varepsilon^{\text{ev}}} & F^{\text{ev}(q)} & \xrightarrow{p_1} \\ & & F \end{array}$$

with the second morphism p_1 the projection, smooth since it is the base-change of the smooth morphism $\underline{X} \rightarrow \underline{\mathcal{X}}$. We now have a diagram

$$(7.23) \quad \begin{array}{ccccc} M & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{M}^{\text{gl}}(X, \beta_1, \beta_2) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{M}(X, \beta_1) \times \mathcal{M}(X, \beta_2) \\ \varepsilon^{\text{ev}} \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ F^{\text{ev}(q)} & \longrightarrow & \mathfrak{M}^{\text{gl, ev}(q, x_{\text{out}})}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2) & \longrightarrow & \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}(x_{\text{out}}, x)}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1) \times \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}(x')}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_2) \end{array}$$

with each square Cartesian, and the relative obstruction theory for the right vertical arrow pulling back to the natural relative obstruction theories for the other two vertical arrows, as follows from the discussion of §7.1. In particular, the virtual fundamental class of M may be calculated as either $\varepsilon^![F]$ or $(\varepsilon^{\text{ev}})^![F^{\text{ev}(q)}]$.

By condition (4), the morphism $F^{\text{ev}(q)} \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}(x_{\text{out}}, x)}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1)$ factors through the composition

$$\mathfrak{M}_1^{\text{ev}} := (\mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1) \times_{\mathcal{P}(X, r)}^{\text{fs}} W) \times_{\underline{\mathcal{X}}} \underline{X} \cong \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}(x_{\text{out}}, x)}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1) \times_{\mathcal{P}(X, r)}^{\text{fs}} W \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}(x_{\text{out}}, x)}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1).$$

Set

$$\mathcal{M}_1 := \mathcal{M}(X, \beta_1) \times_{\mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}(x_{\text{out}}, x)}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1)} \mathfrak{M}_1^{\text{ev}}.$$

Then the outer Cartesian rectangle of (7.23) factors into two Cartesian diagrams

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} M & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{M}_1 \times \mathcal{M}(X, \beta_2) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{M}(X, \beta_1) \times \mathcal{M}(X, \beta_2) \\ \varepsilon^{\text{ev}} \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ F^{\text{ev}(q)} & \longrightarrow & \mathfrak{M}_1^{\text{ev}} \times \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}(x')}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_2) & \longrightarrow & \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}(x_{\text{out}}, x)}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1) \times \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}(x')}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_2) \end{array}$$

The relative obstruction theory for the right vertical arrow pulls back to a relative obstruction theory for the middle vertical arrow also. Now note that the relative virtual dimension of $\mathcal{M}(X, \beta_1)$ over $\mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}(x_{\text{out}}, x)}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1)$ is

$$\chi((f_{M,1}^* \Theta_{X/\mathbb{k}})(-x_{\text{out}} - x)) = A_1 \cdot c_1(\Theta_{X/\mathbb{k}}) - \dim X \leq -\dim X,$$

the equality by (2.3) and the inequality by Step 2. This is also the relative virtual dimension of \mathcal{M}_1 over $\mathfrak{M}_1^{\text{ev}}$. Thus, if we can show that

$$(7.24) \quad \dim \mathfrak{M}_1^{\text{ev}} - \dim X < 0,$$

then the virtual dimension of \mathcal{M}_1 is negative and Theorem A.13 shows that $\varepsilon^![F] = (\varepsilon^{\text{ev}})^!([F^{\text{ev}(q)}]) = 0$.

Step 4. The dimension of $\mathfrak{M}_1^{\text{ev}}$.

Note that

$$\dim \mathfrak{M}_1^{\text{ev}} = \dim(\mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1) \times_{\mathcal{P}(X, r)}^{\text{fs}} W) \times_{\underline{\mathcal{X}}} \underline{X} = \dim(\mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1) \times_{\mathcal{P}(X, r)}^{\text{fs}} W) + \dim X.$$

On the other hand, by Proposition 3.14, $\mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1)$ is idealized log étale over $\mathbf{M}(\mathcal{X}, r) = \mathbf{M} \times_{B\mathbb{G}_m} \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}, r)$, and hence

$$\mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1) \times_{\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}, r)}^{\text{fs}} W = \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1) \times_{\mathcal{P}(X, r)}^{\text{fs}} W$$

is idealized log étale over $\mathbf{M} \times_{B\mathbb{G}_m} W$. Since the punctured map of type β_1 has two marked points and the underlying curve is genus 0, $\mathbf{M} = \mathbf{M}_{0,2}$ is of dimension -1 , so $\dim \mathbf{M} \times_{B\mathbb{G}_m} W$ is of dimension -1 . Further, $\mathbf{M} \rightarrow B\mathbb{G}_m$ is log étale (being log smooth as in the proof of Theorem 3.16, and an isomorphism on a dense open subset of \mathbf{M}). Thus the projection $\mathbf{M} \times_{B\mathbb{G}_m} W \rightarrow W$ is log étale. Putting this together, we see that $\mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1) \times_{\mathcal{P}(X, r)}^{\text{fs}} W \rightarrow W$ is idealized log étale and by the transversality hypothesis of (5), is integral. Thus $\dim \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1) \times_{\mathcal{P}(X, r)}^{\text{fs}} W \leq \dim W = -1$ by Proposition A.8, (3), and so $\dim \mathfrak{M}_1^{\text{ev}} < \dim X$, showing (7.24) as desired. \square

8. THE KEY COMPARISON

We shall prove Theorem 4.26, so we fix in this section $p_1, p_2, p_3, r \in B(\mathbb{Z})$ and an underlying curve class A , giving a punctured map type β . We fix $z \in Z_r^\circ$ as usual, and assume $c_1(\Theta_{X/\mathbb{k}}) \cdot A = 0$.

The main point will be to study the diagram (4.7), with a detailed analysis of the morphisms i and j .

8.1. First steps. After fixing the data $A, p_1, p_2, p_3, r \in B(\mathbb{Z})$, we also fix a choice of splitting $A = A_1 + A_2$, and punctured map classes β_1 with three points of contact orders determined by $p_1, p_2, -s$ with $s \in \Sigma(X)(\mathbb{Z})$, and β_2 with three points of contact orders $s, p_3, -r$. In general, we continue to use the notation of §7.

We will use short-hand notation for the stacks appearing in (4.7),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}^{\ddagger, \mu, \text{gl}}(X, \beta_1, \beta_2, z) &:= \mathcal{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}}(X, \beta_1, \beta_2, z) \times_{\mathcal{M}_{0,4}^\ddagger}^{\text{fs}} B\mathbb{G}_m^\ddagger \\ \mathfrak{M}^{\ddagger, \mu, \text{gl}, \text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z) &:= \mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}, \text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z) \times_{\mathcal{M}_{0,4}^\ddagger}^{\text{fs}} B\mathbb{G}_m^\ddagger \end{aligned}$$

Thus (4.7) becomes

(8.1)

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \coprod_{A_1, A_2, s} \mathcal{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}}(X, \beta_1, \beta_2, z) & \xleftarrow{i'} & \coprod_{A_1, A_2, s} \mathcal{M}^{\ddagger, \mu, \text{gl}}(X, \beta_1, \beta_2, z) & \xrightarrow{j'} & \mathcal{M}_y^\ddagger \\ \downarrow k_1 & & \downarrow k_2 & & \downarrow k_3 \\ \coprod_s \mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}, \text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z) & \xleftarrow{i} & \coprod_s \mathfrak{M}^{\ddagger, \mu, \text{gl}, \text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z) & \xrightarrow{j} & \mathfrak{M}_y^{\ddagger, \text{ev}} \end{array}$$

Recall from (4.5) the ghost sheaves $T = \mathbb{N}\delta \oplus \mathbb{N}\ell_q$, $T_\mu \subseteq T^{\text{gp}}$ of $B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger \times B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger$ and $B\mathbb{G}_m^{2,\mu}$ respectively, generated by δ and $\ell_q - \mu\delta$. Here ℓ_q tropically measures the length of the glued edge while μ is the parameter we use to ensure that this length is sufficiently large, see the discussion of §4.4.6.

We also recall the notation from (4.3) of the monoid $R = \mathbb{N}\ell \oplus \mathbb{N}\delta$ and $R_\lambda \subseteq R^{\text{gp}}$ generated by $\ell - \lambda\delta$ and δ . Here R is the stalk of the ghost sheaf of $y \times B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4}^\dagger$ and R_λ is the stalk of the ghost sheaf of $B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger$. Now ℓ measures the tropical modulus of the stabilizer of a four-pointed curve, see Remark 4.16, while λ is the parameter we use to ensure this tropical modulus is sufficiently large, see the discussion of §4.4.4.

In order to use push-pull formulas in (4.7), we need:

Lemma 8.1. *All squares in (4.7) are Cartesian in all categories, and the morphisms i and j are finite and representable.*

Proof. The left-hand square in (4.7) is obviously fs log Cartesian, and the vertical arrows are strict, hence the square is Cartesian in all categories.

For the right-hand square, note that we have

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \coprod_{A_1, A_2, s} \mathcal{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}}(X, \beta_1, \beta_2, z) & \longrightarrow & \coprod_{A_1, A_2, s} \mathcal{M}^{\text{gl}}(X, \beta_1, \beta_2, z) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{M}(X, \beta, z) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \coprod_s \mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}, \text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z) & \longrightarrow & \coprod_s \mathfrak{M}^{\text{gl}, \text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z) & \longrightarrow & \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta, z) \end{array}$$

The first square is Cartesian by definition of the spaces in the left-hand column, while the right-hand square is Cartesian as in (7.12). Here, taking the union over all curve classes is necessary to achieve this, as (7.12) was not Cartesian. Applying $\times_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4}^\dagger}^{\text{fs}} B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger$ to the outer rectangle then gives the right-hand square of (4.7) Cartesian.

For the properties of i , as the morphism $B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4}^\dagger$ is a closed embedding of underlying stacks, finiteness and representability are immediate from Remark 2.1.

For the properties of j , the morphism $\mathfrak{M}^{\text{gl}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2) \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{X}, \beta)$ is representable and finite, see [ACGS20], Rmk. 3.29. We may then apply $\times_{\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{X}, s)}^{\text{fs}} B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger$ to the morphism to see, using Remark 2.1 again, that $\mathfrak{M}^{\text{gl}, \text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z) \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta, z)$ is finite and representable. The morphism $\mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}, \text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z) \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}^{\text{gl}, \text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z)$ is also finite and representable (as follows from the construction of the former stack and Remark 2.1), and thus we may compose the two morphisms to obtain $\mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}, \text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z) \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta, z)$ finite and representable.

We then apply $\times_{\mathcal{M}_{0,4}^\dagger}^{\text{fs}} B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger$ to get j , and thus j is similarly finite and representable. \square

Remark 8.2. We recall here that in a number of points of the arguments throughout the paper we need to replace the various moduli spaces of punctured maps to \mathcal{X} with finite type approximations. This does not always need to be done consistently in general: for example, the virtual fundamental class of $\mathcal{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}}(X, \beta_1, \beta_2, z)$ is impervious to which particular finite type open subset of $\mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}, \text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z)$ one uses, provided it contains the image of $\mathcal{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}}(X, \beta_1, \beta_2, z)$. Thus, in the proof of Theorem 4.25, one needs to choose an open set of $\mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}, \text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z)$ by choosing open subsets of the moduli spaces $\mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}(x_s)}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1)$ and $\mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}(x'_s, x_{\text{out}})}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_2, z)$ from which the glued moduli space is constructed. However, in Lemma 8.1, the three moduli spaces in the bottom row of (4.7) cannot be chosen arbitrarily, as then the finiteness of i and j will fail. Instead, note all three moduli spaces come with a canonical morphism to $\mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta, z)$ and i and j are compatible with these canonical morphisms. We choose a suitable finite type open subset of $\mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta, z)$ and pull these back to the three moduli spaces to obtain the desired finite type approximations. Then i and j will still be finite.

We will need one local calculation of a fibre product:

Lemma 8.3. *Let Q be a rank two fs monoid with elements $\ell_q, \delta \in Q^{\text{gp}}$ such that Q is rationally generated by δ and $\ell_q - \mu\delta$. Let R, R_λ be as defined in (4.3), and $J = R \setminus \{0\}$, $J_\lambda = R_\lambda \setminus \{0\}$ be the maximal monomial ideals of R and R_λ respectively. Let $K \subseteq Q$ be the ideal generated by δ and $\ell_q - \mu\delta$. Let $\theta : R \rightarrow Q$ be a homomorphism given by*

$$(8.2) \quad \delta \mapsto \delta, \quad \ell \mapsto a\ell_q + b\delta,$$

for some $a, b \in \mathbb{Q}$, $a > 0$. Then, using the notation of Definition A.1, for λ sufficiently large, assuming μ fixed, the projection

$$(\mathcal{A}_{Q,K} \times_{\mathcal{A}_{R,J}}^{\text{fs}} \mathcal{A}_{R_\lambda, J_\lambda})_{\text{red}} \rightarrow (\mathcal{A}_{Q,K})_{\text{red}}$$

is an isomorphism of integral stacks. Further, if $a = 1$, then the multiplicities of $\mathcal{A}_{Q,K} \times_{\mathcal{A}_{R,J}}^{\text{fs}} \mathcal{A}_{R_\lambda, J_\lambda}$ and $\mathcal{A}_{Q,K}$ coincide.

Proof. We first calculate $Q_\lambda := Q \oplus_R^{\text{fs}} R_\lambda$. Because $R^{\text{gp}} = R_\lambda^{\text{gp}}$, $Q^{\text{gp}} \oplus_{R^{\text{gp}}} R_\lambda^{\text{gp}} \cong Q^{\text{gp}}$, and thus by Proposition A.4, $Q_\lambda^{\text{gp}} = Q^{\text{gp}}$ and Q_λ is the saturated submonoid of Q^{gp} rationally generated by $\ell_q - \mu\delta, \delta$ and $\theta(\ell - \lambda\delta) = a\ell_q + (b - \lambda)\delta$. Note that if λ is taken sufficiently large, $\ell_q - \mu\delta$ lies in the saturated submonoid of

Q^{gp} rationally generated by δ and $\theta(\ell - \lambda\delta)$, and thus Q_λ is precisely this latter submonoid.

Next we consider the ideals. Note that J is generated by ℓ and δ while J_λ is generated by $\ell - \lambda\delta$ and δ . Thus, letting K', J'_λ be the ideals generated by the images of K, J_λ in Q_λ , we see that $K' \cup J'_\lambda$ is generated by $\delta, \ell_q - \mu\delta$ and $\theta(\ell - \lambda\delta)$. In particular, $\text{Spec } \mathbb{k}[Q_\lambda]/(K' \cup J'_\lambda)$ is finite length. Of course $\text{Spec } \mathbb{k}[Q]/K$ is finite length, so the projection (using Proposition A.4, (4))

$$(8.3) \quad \mathcal{A}_{Q_\lambda, K' \cup J'_\lambda} \cong \mathcal{A}_{Q, K} \times_{\mathcal{A}_{R, J}}^{\text{fs}} \mathcal{A}_{R_\lambda, J_\lambda} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_{Q, K}$$

induces an isomorphism on underlying reduced stacks.

Now assume that $a = 1$. By Pick's theorem, the length of $\mathbb{k}[Q]/K$ coincides with the area of the parallelogram with vertices $0, \delta, \ell_q - \mu\delta$ and $\ell_q - (\mu - 1)\delta$. Now with $a = 1$, $K' \cup J'_\lambda$ is generated by δ and $\ell_q + (b - \lambda)\delta$, provided again that λ is sufficiently large. Thus the length of $\mathbb{k}[Q_\lambda]/(K' \cup J'_\lambda)$ is the area of the parallelogram with vertices $0, \delta, \ell_q + (b - \lambda)\delta$, and $\ell_q + (b - \lambda + 1)\delta$. However, this parallelogram has the same area as the previous one, and hence the two stacks have the same multiplicities.⁵ \square

Lemma 8.4. *Suppose μ is chosen sufficiently large so that Proposition 7.12, (3) holds. Then for $\lambda \gg \mu$, we have:*

- (1) *Both $\mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}, \text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z)$ and $\mathfrak{M}^{\dagger, \mu, \text{gl}, \text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z)$ are pure-dimensional of dimension 0.*
- (2) *The rank of the stalk of the ghost sheaf at each generic point of*

$$\mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}, \text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z) \text{ and } \mathfrak{M}^{\dagger, \mu, \text{gl}, \text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z)$$

is 2.

- (3) *The induced morphism on reduced underlying stacks*

$$i_{\text{red}} : \underline{\mathfrak{M}^{\dagger, \mu, \text{gl}, \text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z)}_{\text{red}} \rightarrow \underline{\mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}, \text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z)}_{\text{red}}$$

is an isomorphism on the union of open strata of both spaces. Thus there is a one-to-one correspondence between irreducible components of the two spaces.

Proof. Step 1. Statements (1) and (2) for $\mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}, \text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z)$ follow immediately from Proposition 7.12, (1), bearing in mind that, in that proposition, $\mathfrak{M}^\mu = \mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}, \text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z) \times_{\mathcal{X}} \underline{X}$, hence the shift in dimension.

⁵Note the projection in (8.3) need not be an isomorphism!

Step 2. Analysis of i on open strata using Lemma 8.3.

Let $I = T \setminus \{0\}$, $I_\mu = T_\mu \setminus \{0\}$ be the maximal monomial ideals of $T = \mathbb{N}\delta + \mathbb{N}\ell_q$, and $T_\mu \subseteq T^{\text{gp}}$ generated by δ and $\ell_q - \mu\delta$, see (4.5). Note $B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger \times B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger = \mathcal{A}_{T,I}$ and $B\mathbb{G}_m^{2,\mu} = \mathcal{A}_{T_\mu, I_\mu}$.

Just as in the proof of Proposition 7.12, the morphism $\Psi : \mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}, \text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z) \rightarrow B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger \times B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger$ is log smooth, and thus so is its base-change

$$(8.4) \quad \Psi_\mu : \mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}, \text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z) \rightarrow B\mathbb{G}_m^{2,\mu}.$$

We continue to abuse notation by also writing ℓ_q, δ for sections of the ghost sheaf of $\mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}, \text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z)$ which are images of ℓ_q, δ in the ghost sheaf of $B\mathbb{G}_m^{2,\mu}$ under $\overline{\Psi}_\mu^\flat$.

Now consider an open stratum S of $\mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}, \text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z)$. Then the ghost sheaf is locally constant with some stalk Q , with Q of rank 2. In fact, the ghost sheaf is necessarily constant, as ℓ_q, δ span $Q^{\text{gp}} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Q}$, and hence there is no possibility of monodromy. The resulting isomorphism $Q \cong \Gamma(S, \overline{\mathcal{M}}_S)$ induces a unique strict morphism $S \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_Q$ by Proposition A.2. Consider the composition $S \rightarrow B\mathbb{G}_m^{2,\mu} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{A}_{T_\mu}$. This is determined by the homomorphism

$$\overline{\Psi}_\mu^\flat : T_\mu \rightarrow Q = \Gamma(S, \overline{\mathcal{M}}_S),$$

and hence $S \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_{T_\mu}$ factors as $S \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_Q \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_{T_\mu}$. Letting K be the ideal generated by the image of I_μ in Q , we thus obtain a factorization of $\Psi_\mu|_S$ as

$$S \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_Q \times_{\mathcal{A}_{T_\mu}} \mathcal{A}_{T_\mu, I_\mu} = \mathcal{A}_{Q, K} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_{T_\mu, I_\mu} = B\mathbb{G}_m^{2,\mu}.$$

Note that K is the ideal defined in the statement of Lemma 8.3. As Ψ_μ is log smooth and $\mathcal{A}_{Q, K} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_{T_\mu, I_\mu}$ is log étale by [ACGS20], Lem. B.3, it follows that $S \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_{Q, K}$ is strict log smooth, hence smooth.

Because $S \rightarrow B\mathbb{G}_m^{2,\mu}$ is integral by the choice of μ in Proposition 7.12, the image of the generators $\delta, \ell_q - \mu\delta$ of I_μ rationally generate Q , and hence Q, K satisfy the conditions of Lemma 8.3. Further, the composed morphism $S \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}, \text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z) \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4}^\dagger$ induces the stated morphism $\theta : R \rightarrow Q$ of (8.2) for some choice of $a, b \in \mathbb{Q}$, $a > 0$.

Give the point $y \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4}$ the induced log structure from $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4}$, so that y is a standard log point. Noting that $B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger \cong (y \times B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger) \times_{\mathcal{A}_{R,\lambda}} \mathcal{A}_{R_\lambda, J_\lambda}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} S \times_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4}^\dagger} B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger &\cong S \times_{y \times B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger}^{\text{fs}} ((y \times B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger) \times_{\mathcal{A}_{R,\lambda}} \mathcal{A}_{R_\lambda, J_\lambda}) \\ &\cong S \times_{\mathcal{A}_{R,\lambda}}^{\text{fs}} \mathcal{A}_{R_\lambda, J_\lambda}. \end{aligned}$$

Here the first isomorphism holds because $S \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4}^\dagger$ factors through the strict inclusion $y \times B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger \hookrightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4}^\dagger$. We thus have a diagram Cartesian in all categories

$$(8.5) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} S \times_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4}^\dagger}^{\text{fs}} B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger & \longrightarrow & S \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathcal{A}_{Q,K} \times_{\mathcal{A}_{R,J}}^{\text{fs}} \mathcal{A}_{R_\lambda, J_\lambda} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{A}_{Q,K} \end{array}$$

with vertical arrows strict and smooth. Thus the diagram remains Cartesian in the category of underlying stacks after taking the reduction of all spaces, and thus $(S \times_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4}^\dagger}^{\text{fs}} B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger)_{\text{red}} \rightarrow S_{\text{red}}$ is an isomorphism for $\lambda \gg \mu$ by Lemma 8.3 as claimed in item (3).

Step 3. i induces a continuous bijection on underlying topological spaces $|i| : |\mathfrak{M}^{\ddagger, \mu, \text{gl}, \text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z)| \rightarrow |\mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}, \text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z)|$.

Recall the morphisms from Remark 2.1

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}, \text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z) \times_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4}^\dagger}^{\text{fs}} B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger &\xrightarrow{\nu} \mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}, \text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z) \times_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4}^\dagger}^{\text{fine}} B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger \\ &\xrightarrow{\iota} \mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}, \text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z) \times_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4}^\dagger} B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger, \end{aligned}$$

with ν finite and surjective and ι a closed embedding. Since the underlying stack of the last space is $\mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}, \text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z)$, the result of Step 2 shows that $\underline{\iota} \circ \underline{\nu}$ is dominant, and hence $\underline{\iota}$ induces an isomorphism on the underlying reduced stacks. Thus $\underline{\iota} \circ \underline{\nu}$ is surjective on geometric points. On the other hand, ν is the saturation morphism, and in fact, is also one-to-one on geometric points. Indeed, if the stalk of the ghost sheaf of a geometric point $\bar{x} \in |\mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}, \text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z)|$ is Q , then the stalk of the ghost sheaf of the corresponding geometric point of $\mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}, \text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z) \times_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4}^\dagger}^{\text{fine}} B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger$ is $Q_\lambda^{\text{fine}} := Q \oplus_R^{\text{fine}} R_\lambda$. As $R^{\text{gp}} = R_\lambda^{\text{gp}}$, this is a submonoid of Q^{gp} by Proposition A.4, (3). Now Q^{gp} is torsion-free, and hence so is Q_λ , the saturation of Q_λ . It follows that $\text{Spec } \mathbb{k}[Q_\lambda] \rightarrow \text{Spec } \mathbb{k}[Q_\lambda^{\text{fine}}]$ is one-to-one on geometric points, and hence the fibre of $\underline{\iota} \circ \underline{\nu}$ over \bar{x} is a single (possibly non-reduced) point. Thus the projection morphism $\mathfrak{M}^{\ddagger, \mu, \text{gl}, \text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z) \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}, \text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z)$ is injective on geometric points, hence bijective.

Step 4. The pure-dimensionality of (1) for $\mathfrak{M}^{\ddagger, \mu, \text{gl}, \text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z)$ is then immediate from the pure-dimensionality of $\mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}, \text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z)$ and Step 3, and the stalk of the ghost sheaf at a generic point of this space is of the form Q_λ as in the proof of Lemma 8.3, which is rank 2, giving (2). \square

Lemma 8.5. *Let Q be the stalk at a generic point $\bar{\xi}$ of either $\mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}, \text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z)$, $\mathfrak{M}^{\dagger, \mu, \text{gl}, \text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z)$ or $\mathfrak{M}_y^{\dagger, \text{ev}}$, so that $\sigma = \sigma_{\bar{\xi}} := \text{Hom}(Q, \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0})$ parameterizes a family of tropical maps with target $\Sigma(X)$. Then this family of tropical maps satisfies Assumptions 4.19.*

Proof. In all three cases, Q is rank two. Indeed, in the first two cases, this is Lemma 8.4, (2). For the third case, this follows from log smoothness and integrality of $\mathfrak{M}_y^{\dagger, \text{ev}} \rightarrow B\mathbb{G}_m^{\dagger}$, along with Proposition A.9: see the proof of Proposition 7.12, (1) for an identical argument. We now check conditions (1)-(3) of Assumptions 4.19.

(1) is clear in all three cases. The miniversality of (2) is as follows. The moduli space $\mathfrak{M}^{\text{gl}, \text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z)$ carries the basic log structure, i.e., the morphism $\mathfrak{M}^{\text{gl}, \text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z) \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{X}, \beta, z)$ is strict. In particular, the image $\bar{\xi}'$ of $\bar{\xi}$ in this latter moduli space satisfies $\sigma_{\bar{\xi}'} = \sigma_{\text{bas}}$. By Proposition 2.2 and the definition of $\mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}, \text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z)$, $\sigma = \sigma_{\text{bas}} \times_{T_{\mathbb{R}}^{\vee}} T_{\mu, \mathbb{R}}^{\vee}$ is then a subcone of σ_{bas} of the same dimension, giving miniversality. Similar arguments show miniversality for the other two moduli spaces.

Condition (3) holds automatically for $\mathfrak{M}_y^{\dagger, \text{ev}}$ by construction. In the case of $\mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}, \text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z)$, ℓ_q is a summand of ℓ inside Q and σ is generated (over \mathbb{R}) by $\delta^* + \mu\ell_q^*$ and ℓ_q^* , where δ^*, ℓ_q^* are the dual basis to δ, ℓ_q of $Q^{\text{gp}} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{R}$. Thus ℓ_q is unbounded for fixed value of δ on σ , and so the same is true for ℓ . Thus the map (ℓ, δ) of Condition (3) has the claimed properties. Finally, the same is true in the case of $\mathfrak{M}^{\dagger, \mu, \text{gl}, \text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z)$ by construction. \square

This lemma allows us to make the following definition:

Definition 8.6. We say an irreducible component of

$$\mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}, \text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z), \mathfrak{M}^{\dagger, \mu, \text{gl}, \text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z) \text{ or } \mathfrak{M}_y^{\dagger, \text{ev}}$$

with generic point $\bar{\xi}$ is *tail-free* (resp. *does not have a terminal tail*, *does not have an internal tail*) if the same is true of the family of tropical maps parameterized by $\sigma_{\bar{\xi}}$.

8.2. Vanishing contributions from tails. We will see that it is precisely irreducible components with tails which cause trouble for comparing virtual fundamental classes using both the morphisms i and j in diagram (8.1). So we now show that irreducible components with tails do not contribute to the virtual count. We continue to use the notation $i, j, i', j', k_1, k_2, k_3$ for the morphisms of (8.1).

Lemma 8.7. *Let \mathfrak{M} be a (reduced) irreducible component of either*

$$\mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}, \text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z), \mathfrak{M}^{\dagger, \mu, \text{gl}, \text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z), \text{ or } \mathfrak{M}_y^{\dagger, \text{ev}}$$

with a terminal tail. Then $k_1^![\mathfrak{M}]$, $k_2^![\mathfrak{M}]$ or $k_3^![\mathfrak{M}]$ respectively vanishes in the rational Chow group.

Proof. The statement follows from an application of Theorem 7.14, as in Step 3 of the proof of Lemma 6.6. Take $F = \mathfrak{M}$, $\psi : F \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta)$ the tautological morphism, $W = B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger$ and $g : W \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(X, r)$ the standard morphism given by the choice of z and Proposition 3.8. Take S° to be the stratum of $\mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta)$ containing the image of the generic point of F , so that its closure S contains the image of ψ . Thus condition (1) of Theorem 7.14 is automatic, condition (2) holds since the image of $\text{ev}_{\mathcal{X}} : \mathfrak{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(X, r)$ is contained in $z \times B\mathbb{G}_m \subseteq \underline{Z}_r^\circ \times B\mathbb{G}_m$. Because G has a terminal tail, (3) holds. Condition (4) is clear as \mathfrak{M} is a component of a moduli space of punctured maps with point constraint at z . Finally, (5) is immediate: the transversality statements are trivial because the ghost sheaf on W is \mathbb{N} . Thus Theorem 7.14 allows us to conclude that $k_i^![\mathfrak{M}] = 0$ in the rational Chow group. \square

Lemma 8.8. *Let \mathfrak{M} be a (reduced) irreducible component of either*

$$\mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}, \text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z) \text{ or } \mathfrak{M}^{\dagger, \mu, \text{gl}, \text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z)$$

without a terminal tail but with an internal tail. Provided $\mu \gg 0$, we have $\deg k_1^![\mathfrak{M}] = 0$ or $\deg k_2^![\mathfrak{M}] = 0$ in the two cases.

Proof. We will reduce to a similar gluing situation as that of Theorem 4.25, and in particular use the setup of §7.3. For this purpose, we will make use of the notation of that section, in particular using the short-hand $\mathfrak{M}_1, \mathfrak{M}_2, \mathfrak{M}^{\text{gl}}, \mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}}$ as well as the maps $p, p', p'', q', q'', \alpha, \alpha'$ and α'' of the diagram (7.14).

Step 1. Reduction to the gluing situation of §7.3.

We first observe that if \mathfrak{M} is an irreducible component of $\mathfrak{M}^{\dagger, \mu, \text{gl}, \text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z)$ without a terminal tail but with an interior tail, then by Lemma 8.4, (3), $i_*[\mathfrak{M}]$ is the class of an irreducible component of $\mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}, \text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z)$. This irreducible component necessarily also has an internal tail. Note $i'_* k_2^![\mathfrak{M}] = k_1^! i_*[\mathfrak{M}]$ by [Ma12], Thm. 4.1, using the fact that i is finite and representable by Lemma 8.1, hence projective. Thus to show the desired vanishing, we may assume \mathfrak{M} is an irreducible component of $\mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}, \text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z)$.

Note we have a factorization of k_1 given by

$$\mathcal{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}}(X, \beta_1, \beta_2, z) \xrightarrow{p' \circ \alpha''} \mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}, \text{ev}(q, x_{\text{out}})}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z) \longrightarrow \mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}, \text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z),$$

with the second morphism smooth. Hence we may pull back \mathfrak{M} via the second morphism to obtain an irreducible component of $\mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}, \text{ev}(q, x_{\text{out}})}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z)$. Using the notation of (7.9), we write this irreducible component still as

$$\mathfrak{M} \subseteq \mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}, \text{ev}(q, x_{\text{out}})}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z) = \mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}},$$

hopefully with no confusion. It is then enough to show as in (7.15) that $\alpha^! p^! [\mathfrak{M}] = 0$ in the notation of the diagram (7.14).

Step 2. Vanishing if $q'|_{\mathfrak{M}}$ does not dominate an irreducible component of \mathfrak{M}_2 or $s \notin B(\mathbb{Z})$.

Suppose that either (1) $q'(\mathfrak{M})$ is not dense in an irreducible component of \mathfrak{M}_2 or (2) $s \notin B(\mathbb{Z})$. We show that the desired vanishing holds. Indeed,

$$\deg \alpha^! p^! [\mathfrak{M}] = \deg \alpha^! (q' \circ p')_* p^! [\mathfrak{M}]$$

as in (7.16), and $(q' \circ p')_* p^! [\mathfrak{M}]$ is supported on the closure of $q'(\mathfrak{M})$ and hence in case (1) has dimension smaller than $\dim \mathfrak{M}_2$. Now the relative virtual dimension of $\mathcal{M}_2 \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}_2$ is $\chi((f_2^* \Theta_{X/\mathbb{k}})(-x_{\text{out}} - x'_s)) = A_2 \cdot c_1(\Theta_{X/\mathbb{k}}) - \dim X$. As argued in Step 4 of the proof of Theorem 4.25, if we are in the case that $\pm c_1(\Theta_{X/\mathbb{k}})$ is nef, then either one of $\mathcal{M}(X, \beta_1)$ or $\mathcal{M}(X, \beta_2)$ is empty or $A_2 \cdot c_1(\Theta_{X/\mathbb{k}}) = 0$. If we are in the log Calabi-Yau case, then again either one of $\mathcal{M}(X, \beta_1)$, $\mathcal{M}(X, \beta_2)$ is empty or $A_2 \cdot c_1(\Theta_{X/\mathbb{k}}) \leq 0$, with strict inequality if $s \notin B(\mathbb{Z})$. Thus in any event, the relative virtual dimension of $\mathcal{M}_2 \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}_2$ is at most $-\dim X$, and in case (2) is at most $-\dim X - 1$. On the other hand, \mathfrak{M}_2 is pure-dimensional of dimension $\dim X$. So we conclude that in any case, $\alpha^! (q' \circ p')_* p^! [\mathfrak{M}]$ is of negative dimension and hence $\deg \alpha^! p^! [\mathfrak{M}] = 0$.

Step 3. Reduction to the no-tail lemma.

Now assume that \mathfrak{M} dominates the closure of an open stratum S_2 of \mathfrak{M}_2 and $s \in B(\mathbb{Z})$ in the log Calabi-Yau case, so that in any case we may assume that $A_i \cdot c_1(\Theta_{X/\mathbb{k}}) = 0$. We aim to show that $\deg \alpha^! (q' \circ p')_* p^! [\mathfrak{M}] = 0$ by showing that $(q' \circ p')_* p^! [\mathfrak{M}] = 0$. To do so, consider diagram (7.17) in our current situation. In that diagram S^μ is an open substack of $\mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}}$, and as such determines an open substack \mathfrak{M}° of \mathfrak{M} , with $|\mathfrak{M}^\circ| = |\mathfrak{M}| \cap |S^\mu|$. As in (7.18), it is then enough to show that $(q' \circ p')_* p^! [\mathfrak{M}^\circ] = 0$.

Consider now the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 \mathcal{M}'_1 \times_{\mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}}} \mathfrak{M}^\circ & \hookrightarrow & \mathcal{M}'_1 \times_{\mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}}} \mathfrak{M} & \xrightarrow{\iota} & \mathcal{M}'_1 \\
 p^\circ \downarrow & & \bar{p} \downarrow & & \downarrow p' \\
 \mathfrak{M}^\circ & \hookrightarrow & \mathfrak{M} & \hookrightarrow & \mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}} \\
 q^\circ \downarrow & & \bar{q} \downarrow & & \downarrow q' \\
 (S_2)_{\text{red}} & \hookrightarrow & (\bar{S}_2)_{\text{red}} & \xrightarrow{\iota'} & \mathfrak{M}_2
 \end{array}$$

Here $(\bar{S}_2)_{\text{red}}$ denotes the closure of S_2 with its reduced induced stack structure. All squares but the lower right-hand square are Cartesian in the fs category by definition, while the lower right-hand square is merely commutative. The left-hand horizontal arrows are open embeddings, while the right-hand horizontal arrows are closed embeddings. As $q' \circ p'$ is proper, so is $q' \circ p' \circ \iota = \iota' \circ \bar{q} \circ \bar{p}$, and hence $\bar{q} \circ \bar{p}$ is proper. By base-change $q^\circ \circ p^\circ$ is also proper.

Next we claim q° is flat. Indeed, it was shown in Step 5 of the proof of Theorem 4.25 that $q'|_{S^\mu} : S^\mu = \mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}} \times_{\mathfrak{M}_2} S_2 \rightarrow S_2$ is flat. Further, $\mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}}$ is pure-dimensional by Proposition 7.12, (1). Hence the fibres of $q'|_{S^\mu}$ are equidimensional. Thus the same holds for q° as \mathfrak{M}° is an irreducible component of $\mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}} \times_{\mathfrak{M}_2} S_2$. Further, $(S_2)_{\text{red}}$ is non-singular, and \mathfrak{M} is Cohen-Macaulay. Indeed, since $\Psi_\mu : \mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}} \rightarrow BG_m^{2, \mu}$ is log smooth, see (8.4), all (reduced) irreducible components of $\mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}}$ are, locally in the smooth topology, isomorphic to toric varieties and hence Cohen-Macaulay. Thus by [Ma89], Thm. 23.1, q° is flat.

We can now follow the last part of the argument of the proof of Theorem 4.25. Let $s_2 \rightarrow S_2$ be a choice of strict morphism from a standard log point with underlying scheme $\text{Spec } \mathbb{k}$. Similarly to (7.19), writing S_2 in place of $(S_2)_{\text{red}}$ and writing $S_2^\mu = S_2 \times_{\mathfrak{M}_2} \mathfrak{M}_2^\mu$ in place of $(S_2^\mu)_{\text{red}} = (S_2)_{\text{red}} \times_{\mathfrak{M}_2} \mathfrak{M}_2^\mu$ to simplify notation, we obtain the diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 & & & & & & q^\circ \\
 & & & & & & \curvearrowright \\
 (\mathcal{M}'_1 \times_{\mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}}} \mathfrak{M}^\circ) \times_{S_2} s_2 & \xrightarrow{p^\circ} & \mathfrak{M}^\circ \times_{S_2} s_2 & \longrightarrow & S_2^\mu \times_{S_2} s_2 & \longrightarrow & s_2 \\
 i_4 \downarrow & & i_3 \downarrow & & i_2 \downarrow & & i_1 \downarrow \\
 \mathcal{M}'_1 \times_{\mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}}} \mathfrak{M}^\circ & \xrightarrow{p^\circ} & \mathfrak{M}^\circ & \longrightarrow & S_2^\mu & \longrightarrow & S_2 \\
 & & & & & & \curvearrowleft \\
 & & & & & & q^\circ
 \end{array}$$

with all squares Cartesian in all categories. The same argument as in (7.20) and (7.21) shows that

$$i_1^!(q^\circ \circ p^\circ)_* p^![\mathfrak{M}^\circ] = (q^\circ \circ p^\circ)_* p^![\mathfrak{M}^\circ \times_{S_2} s_2].$$

Thus, as $i_1^![S_2] = [s_2]$, it is sufficient to show, with

$$(8.6) \quad F = \mathfrak{M}^\circ \times_{S_2} s_2,$$

that

$$(8.7) \quad p^![F] = 0.$$

As we wish to apply Theorem 7.14, we require \underline{F} integral. So to prove (8.7), we can replace F with a reduced irreducible component of F .

Step 4. Tropical analysis.

Consider the tropicalization $\Sigma(\text{pr}_2) : \Sigma(F) \rightarrow \Sigma(s_2)$ of the projection $\text{pr}_2 : F \rightarrow s_2$. As i_1 is strict and $\delta : \mathfrak{M}_2 \rightarrow B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger$ is log smooth, s_2 is equipped with the standard log point structure, i.e., has ghost sheaf \mathbb{N} . From the induced strict morphisms

$$F \xrightarrow{i_3} \mathfrak{M}^\circ \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{M} \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}}$$

and

$$s_2 \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}_2,$$

$\Sigma(F)$ and $\Sigma(s_2)$ both carry families of tropical maps, the first induced by a punctured map of type β and the second by a punctured map of type β_2 .

Let $\bar{\xi}$ be the generic point of F . Note the stalk of the ghost sheaf at $\bar{\xi}$ agrees with the stalk of the ghost sheaf of $\mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}}$ at the generic point of \mathfrak{M} . Call this stalk Q , necessarily of rank 2, and write $\sigma_{\bar{\xi}} = \text{Hom}(Q, \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0})$. Note $\Sigma(\text{pr}_2) : \sigma_{\bar{\xi}} \rightarrow \sigma_{s_2} = \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is necessarily a surjection.

$\Sigma(\text{pr}_2)$ can be described as follows, bearing in mind that the map $\mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}} \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}_2$ is the second component of the splitting map. A point $m \in \sigma_{\bar{\xi}}$ determines a tropical map $h_m : G \rightarrow \Sigma(X)$, while a point $m' \in \sigma_{s_2}$ determines a tropical map $h_{m'} : G_2 \rightarrow \Sigma(X)$. Here G_2 is obtained from G by deleting a point from the interior of the edge E_q , taking the connected component which contains the edge E_{out} , and replacing the segment of E_q with an unbounded leg, labelled $E_{x'_s}$. Then $\Sigma(\text{pr}_2)$ takes h_m to $h_m|_{G_2}$. This is a slight abuse of notation, as the map $h_m|_{G_2}$ needs to be extended to the whole of $E_{x'_s}$, mapping $E_{x'_s}$ to a ray parallel to $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}s$ (keeping in mind that $s \in \Sigma(X)(\mathbb{Z})$).

Similarly, we have a composition

$$\psi : F \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}} \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}_1,$$

where the second morphism is the first component of the splitting morphism. Let $\bar{\xi}'$ be the image of $\bar{\xi}$ under the morphism ψ . Then $\sigma_{\bar{\xi}'}$ parameterizes tropical maps of type β_1 , and $\Sigma(\psi) : \sigma_{\bar{\xi}} \rightarrow \sigma_{\bar{\xi}'}$ can be described via $h_m \mapsto h_m|_{G_1}$, where G_1 is obtained from G in the same way as G_2 , but now taking the connected component containing E_{x_1} and E_{x_2} . This time, the edge E_{x_s} becomes a bounded leg (unless $s = 0$) and is mapped to an edge in $\Sigma(X)$ parallel to $-\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}s$. View δ as a coordinate on σ_{s_2} , and as a function on $\sigma_{\bar{\xi}}$. If $r \neq 0$, then $h_m|_{G_2}$ varies in a one-dimensional family parameterized by δ , with $\delta(m)$ determined by (4.2). On the other hand, if $r = 0$, then $h_{m'} : G_2 \rightarrow \Sigma(X)$ is in fact independent of m' : this is similar to the discussion of Remark 4.9. In any event, if we fix $\delta(m) = 1$, $h_m|_{G_2}$ is fixed but h_m itself varies in a one-parameter family. In this family, ℓ_q is unbounded, by construction of $\mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}}$. In particular, using the notation of Definition 4.10, if $E_q = E_i$ for some i , then $\ell_1, \dots, \ell_{i-1}$, which yield lengths of edges of G_2 , are all necessarily proportional to δ , but ℓ_i is not proportional to δ . Thus i is the unique index given by Proposition 4.20. Since \mathfrak{M} has been assumed to have an internal tail, it follows from the definition (Definition 4.23) that there are at least two indices j with ℓ_j not proportional to δ . Thus there is at least one index $j > i$ with ℓ_j not proportional to δ . In particular, this implies that E_i is not the last edge in the chain E_1, \dots, E_{n-1} , and $\ell_{i+1} + \dots + \ell_{n-1}$ is also not proportional to δ (in particular non-zero).

We can, however, say more. Let $m \in \sigma_{\bar{\xi}}$ be such that $\delta(m) = 0$ but $m \neq 0$: such can be found as $\text{rank } Q = 2$ and δ rationally generates a one-dimensional face of Q . Then as $\ell_1, \dots, \ell_{i-1}$ are proportional to δ , necessarily the tropical map $h_m : G \rightarrow \Sigma(X)$ must satisfy $h_m(v_j) = 0$ for $j \leq i$. In particular,

$$(8.8) \quad h_m(v_{i+1}) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}s.$$

As $\ell_{i+1} + \dots + \ell_{n-1}$ is not proportional to δ , necessarily

$$(8.9) \quad \sum_{j=i+1}^{n-1} \ell_j(m) > 0.$$

Step 5. Verification of the hypotheses of the no-tail lemma.

Now let $W = S_2^\mu \times_{S_2} s_2$. Note that $\underline{W} = B\mathbb{G}_m$. We have a morphism $g : W \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(X, s)$ which is the composition of projection to S_2^μ , the inclusion into \mathfrak{M}_2^μ , and the composed morphism $\mathfrak{M}_2^\mu \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(X, s)$ in (7.13). As in (7.22),

$$(8.10) \quad W \times_{\mathcal{P}(X, s)}^{\text{fs}} \mathfrak{M}_1 \cong s_2 \times_{S_2} (S_2^\mu \times_{\mathfrak{M}_2^\mu} \mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}}).$$

The natural morphism $\mathfrak{M}^\circ \rightarrow S_2^\mu \times_{\mathfrak{M}_2^\mu} \mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}}$ along with the identity map $s_2 \rightarrow s_2$ then induces, via the description (8.10) and the description of F as an irreducible component of (8.6), a morphism

$$F \rightarrow W \times_{\mathcal{P}(X, s)}^{\text{fs}} \mathfrak{M}_1$$

such that the composition with the projection to \mathfrak{M}_1 is given by splitting the family of curves over F at the node q and taking the connected component of the domain of type β_1 .

We now need to find a stratum $S^\circ \subseteq \mathfrak{M}_1$ such that the data $\psi : F \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}_1$, W , g and S° satisfy the hypotheses of Theorem 7.14.

As in Step 4, with $\bar{\xi}$ still the generic point of F , let $m \in \sigma_{\bar{\xi}}$ be a point with $\delta(m) = 0$, $m \neq 0$, and let $m' = \Sigma(\psi)(m)$, so that m' represents a tropical map $h_m|_{G_1}$. Recalling the morphism $\text{ev}_{\mathcal{X}} : \mathfrak{M}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(X, s)$ tropicalizes to evaluation at the vertex of G_1 containing the puncture x_s , we have by (8.8) that $\Sigma(\text{ev}_{\mathcal{X}})(m') \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}s$. Let τ be the minimal face of $\sigma_{\bar{\xi}'}$ containing m' , with $\bar{\xi}' = \psi(\xi)$. Then necessarily $\Sigma(\text{ev}_{\mathcal{X}})(\tau)$ is contained in the minimal cone of $\Sigma(X)$ containing s . As $\text{ev}_{\mathcal{X}}$ is log smooth, Proposition A.9 implies there exists a stratum S° of \mathfrak{M}_1 whose closure contains $\bar{\xi}'$, hence $\psi(F)$, such that the cone of $\Sigma(\mathfrak{M}_1)$ corresponding to S° is τ . Further, we then have $\text{ev}_{\mathcal{X}}(S^\circ) \subseteq \underline{Z}_s \times B\mathbb{G}_m$.

We can now show the five conditions necessary to apply Theorem 7.14. Conditions (1) and (2) are satisfied immediately by construction. On the other hand, by (8.9), $h_{m'}$ does not contract all edges E_{i+1}, \dots, E_{n-1} . Thus if $\phi : \mathfrak{M}_1 \rightarrow \mathbf{M}_{0,3}$ is the forgetful map just remembering the domain, then $\phi(S) \subseteq D(x_1, x_2 | x_s)$, hence (3). Condition (4) again follows by construction.

For condition (5), the first transversality statement is as in the last paragraph of the proof of Theorem 4.25. We continue to use the notation δ', ν of that paragraph.

The second transversality comes as follows. By transposing the map (7.3), the morphism $s_2 \times B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(X, s)$ tropicalizes to $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}(\delta')^* \oplus \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}\ell_q^* \rightarrow \sigma \in \Sigma(X)$ given by $a(\delta')^* + b\ell_q^* \mapsto a\rho + bs$ for some $\rho \in \sigma$. Let τ_μ be the image of the map $\Sigma(g) : \Sigma(W) \rightarrow \Sigma(\mathcal{P}(X, s)) = \Sigma(Z_s)$. Just as in the last paragraph of Step 5 of the proof of Theorem 4.25, the tropicalization of W is the cone generated by $(\delta')^* + \mu\nu\ell_q^*$ and ℓ_q^* , so τ_μ is the cone in σ spanned by $\rho + \mu\nu s$ and s . Given any other subcone σ' of σ , we may thus choose μ sufficiently large so that $\sigma' \cap \tau_\mu$ is a (not necessarily proper) face of τ_μ . Thus by taking μ sufficiently large, given any

finite collection Σ of subcones of σ , we can assume τ_μ intersects every subcone in this collection in a face of τ_μ .⁶

We may now apply this observation to transversality as follows. First note that there are only a finite number of splittings $A_1 = A_{11} + A_{12}$ into effective curve classes, and for each choice of A_{11} there are only a finite number of types β_{11} of punctured maps with two punctures x_{out} and x with x_{out} of contact order $-s$, as the contact order at x is then determined up to a finite number of choices by Remark 2.12. Thus after replacing moduli spaces with finite type approximations, there are only a finite number of finite type moduli spaces $\mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_{11})$ for which transversality of g to $\text{ev}_\mathcal{X} : \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_{11}) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(X, s)$ needs to be checked. Take Σ of the previous paragraph to be the set of images under $\Sigma(\text{ev}_\mathcal{X})$ of all cones in $\Sigma(\mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_{11}))$ for this finite number of possible types β_{11} . We then choose μ sufficiently large as in the previous paragraph. Then by the transversality condition Theorem 2.9, we can guarantee that g is transversal to all possible $\text{ev}_\mathcal{X}$.

We have now shown that the hypotheses of Theorem 7.14 hold and we are able to conclude that $p^![F] = 0$ in the rational Chow group. As we saw in Step 3, this was sufficient to obtain the desired $k_1^![\mathfrak{M}] = 0$. \square

Remark 8.9. The reader may wonder why in Lemma 8.7 we showed if \mathfrak{M} was an irreducible component of $\mathfrak{M}_y^{\ddagger, \text{ev}}$ with a terminal tail, then $k_3^![\mathfrak{M}] = 0$, but in Lemma 8.8, we did not show this same vanishing if \mathfrak{M} instead had an internal tail. The reason is that the argument given in the latter lemma relies subtly on the construction of $\mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}, \text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z)$, and we do not yet know that every irreducible component of $\mathfrak{M}_y^{\ddagger, \text{ev}}$ with an internal tail is the image of an irreducible component of $\mathfrak{M}^{\ddagger, \mu, \text{gl}, \text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z)$. In the case that the irreducible component of $\mathfrak{M}_y^{\ddagger, \text{ev}}$ does not have a terminal tail but does have an internal tail, this will be shown in the course of the proof of Theorem 8.12.

8.3. The first comparison. We now are ready to make the comparisons of virtual degrees using the morphisms i and j in (8.1). In this subsection we make the comparison using i . This is the first time internal tails cause difficulties for us:

Lemma 8.10. *Suppose μ is chosen sufficiently large so that Proposition 7.12, (3) holds. For $\lambda \gg \mu$, the following holds. Let \mathfrak{M}' be a tail-free irreducible component of $\mathfrak{M}^{\ddagger, \mu, \text{gl}, \text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z)$. Then the multiplicities of $\mathfrak{M} = i(\mathfrak{M}')$ and \mathfrak{M}' in $\mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}, \text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z)$ and $\mathfrak{M}^{\ddagger, \mu, \text{gl}, \text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z)$ respectively are the same.*

⁶Note that if $s = 0$, then in fact τ_μ is a one-dimensional cone, and this statement then holds for all μ .

Proof. Following the notation of Definition 4.10, we have $\ell = \sum_i \ell_i$ and $\ell_q = \ell_i$ for some i , and ℓ_q and δ are linearly independent. It follows from Definition 4.23 that each ℓ_j for $j \neq i$ is proportional to δ , and hence $\ell = \ell_q + a\delta$ for some $a \in \mathbb{Q}$. Note that the coefficient of ℓ_q is 1, so that the result then follows immediately from Lemma 8.3 and (8.5), with S in the latter diagram taken to be the open stratum of \mathfrak{M} . \square

Theorem 8.11. $\deg[\mathcal{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}}(X, \beta_1, \beta_2, z)]^{\text{virt}} = \deg[\mathcal{M}^{\dagger, \mu, \text{gl}}(X, \beta_1, \beta_2, z)]^{\text{virt}}$.

Proof. Lemma 8.1 implies i' is finite, and hence we can apply [Ma12], Thm. 4.1 to see that

$$\begin{aligned} \deg[\mathcal{M}^{\dagger, \mu, \text{gl}}(X, \beta_1, \beta_2, z)]^{\text{virt}} &= \deg i'_*[\mathcal{M}^{\dagger, \mu, \text{gl}}(X, \beta_1, \beta_2, z)]^{\text{virt}} \\ &= \deg k_1^! i_*[\mathfrak{M}^{\dagger, \mu, \text{gl}, \text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z)]. \end{aligned}$$

Now $i_*[\mathfrak{M}^{\dagger, \mu, \text{gl}, \text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z)]$ and $[\mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}, \text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z)]$ are both linear combinations of irreducible components of $\mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}, \text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z)$. The coefficients of those irreducible components without tails agree by Lemma 8.10, while those irreducible components with tails contribute 0 to the virtual fundamental class, by Lemmas 8.7 and 8.8, hence the result. \square

8.4. The second comparison. The following, along with Theorem 8.11, immediately proves Theorem 4.26.

Theorem 8.12.

$$\sum_{A_1, A_2, s} \deg[\mathcal{M}^{\dagger, \mu, \text{gl}}(X, \beta_1, \beta_2, z)]^{\text{virt}} = \deg[\mathcal{M}_y^{\dagger}]^{\text{virt}}$$

Proof. Step 1. Sketch.

Fix some choice of $s \in \Sigma(X)(\mathbb{Z})$, leading to types β_1, β_2 of punctured maps to \mathcal{X} as usual. Recall that types of punctured maps to \mathcal{X} do not remember curve classes in X . By Lemmas 8.4, (1) and 6.4, (1), provided that one chooses λ sufficiently large after making a choice of μ sufficiently large, $\mathfrak{M}^{\dagger, \mu, \text{gl}, \text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z)$ and $\mathfrak{M}_y^{\dagger, \text{ev}}$ are both pure dimension zero. As the morphism j is finite and representable by Lemma 8.1, if \mathfrak{M} is an irreducible component of $\mathfrak{M}^{\dagger, \mu, \text{gl}, \text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z)$, then $j(\mathfrak{M})$ is an irreducible component of $\mathfrak{M}_y^{\dagger, \text{ev}}$. If \mathfrak{M} has a tail, either terminal or internal, then so does $j(\mathfrak{M})$. Thus in this case,

$$(8.11) \quad \deg k_3^! j_*[\mathfrak{M}] = \deg j'_* k_2^![\mathfrak{M}] = \deg k_2^![\mathfrak{M}] = 0$$

by Lemmas 8.7, 8.8, and push-pull for virtual pull-back, [Ma12], Thm. 4.1.

Define $\mathfrak{U}' \subseteq \coprod_s \mathfrak{M}^{\ddagger, \mu, \text{gl}, \text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z)$ and $\mathfrak{U} \subseteq \mathfrak{M}_y^{\ddagger, \text{ev}}$ to be the open substacks which are the unions of open strata which do not have a terminal tail. Also, let $\mathfrak{U}'_{\text{tf}} \subseteq \mathfrak{U}'$ and $\mathfrak{U}_{\text{tf}} \subseteq \mathfrak{U}$ be the union of those connected components of \mathfrak{U}' , \mathfrak{U} respectively which also do not have internal tails. Here tf stands for “tail-free.” Because j is finite and log morphisms take logarithmic strata into logarithmic strata, necessarily $j(\mathfrak{U}') \subseteq \mathfrak{U}$ and $j(\mathfrak{U}'_{\text{tf}}) \subseteq \mathfrak{U}_{\text{tf}}$. We write $\tilde{j} : \mathfrak{U}' \rightarrow \mathfrak{U}$ for $j|_{\mathfrak{U}'}$.

We will construct a morphism $\text{spl}^\circ : \mathfrak{U} \rightarrow \mathfrak{U}'$ which is a right inverse to \tilde{j} , so that \tilde{j} is surjective. In particular, any irreducible component \mathfrak{M} of $\mathfrak{M}_y^{\ddagger, \text{ev}}$ with an internal tail is the image of a component \mathfrak{M}' of $\mathfrak{M}^{\ddagger, \mu, \text{gl}, \text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z)$ with an internal tail, and hence $\deg k_3^![\mathfrak{M}] = 0$, by (8.11). On the other hand, any irreducible component \mathfrak{M} of $\mathfrak{M}_y^{\ddagger, \text{ev}}$ with a terminal tail satisfies $\deg k_3^![\mathfrak{M}] = 0$ by Lemma 8.7.

Thus it will be sufficient to show that $\tilde{j}|_{\mathfrak{U}'_{\text{tf}}} : \mathfrak{U}'_{\text{tf}} \rightarrow \mathfrak{U}_{\text{tf}}$ is an isomorphism, which we do by showing that $\text{spl}^\circ|_{\mathfrak{U}_{\text{tf}}}$ is its inverse.

Step 2. The splitting morphism.

We construct a splitting morphism $\text{spl}'' : \mathfrak{U} \rightarrow \coprod_s \mathfrak{M}^{\text{gl}, \text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z)$. The key point is showing that the universal family of punctured maps $f : \mathfrak{C}/\mathfrak{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ can be split at some node. For this step, replace \mathfrak{U} by a connected component with generic point $\bar{\xi}$, so that we get a family of tropical maps $h_m : G \rightarrow \Sigma(X)$ parameterized by $m \in \sigma_{\bar{\xi}}$. By assumption, this family of maps does not have a terminal tail. Let i be the unique index guaranteed by Proposition 4.20. Let Q be the stalk of the ghost sheaf at $\bar{\xi}$. Recall (4.3) that the stalk of $B\mathbb{G}_m^{\ddagger}$ is R_λ , generated by $\ell - \lambda\delta$ and δ . Then δ and ℓ_i are linearly independent in Q^{gp} and Q is rationally generated by $\ell - \lambda\delta, \delta$, as $\mathfrak{M}_y^{\ddagger, \text{ev}} \rightarrow B\mathbb{G}_m^{\ddagger}$ is integral by construction. We can write

$$(8.12) \quad \ell = a\ell_i + b\delta \text{ for some } a, b \in \mathbb{Q},$$

necessarily with $a > 0$. Note then that

$$\ell_i - \delta = \frac{1}{a}(\ell - \lambda\delta) + \left(\frac{\lambda - b}{a} - 1 \right) \delta.$$

Thus provided that λ is taken sufficiently large so that $(\lambda - b)/a - 1 \geq 0$, i.e., $\lambda \geq a + b$, we see that $\ell_i - \delta \in Q$ and hence ℓ_i is in the ideal generated by δ . Now any section of $\mathcal{M}_{B\mathbb{G}_m^{\ddagger}}$ whose image in $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{B\mathbb{G}_m^{\ddagger}}$ is δ necessarily has image 0 under the structure map $\mathcal{M}_{B\mathbb{G}_m^{\ddagger}} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{B\mathbb{G}_m^{\ddagger}}$. Thus the same is true of any section of $\mathcal{M}_{\mathfrak{U}}$ defined in a smooth neighbourhood of $\bar{\xi}$ and whose image in $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{\mathfrak{U}}$ is δ . By the observation that ℓ_i is in the ideal generated by δ , the same vanishing of structure map holds for any section of $\mathcal{M}_{\mathfrak{U}}$ lifting ℓ_i .




FIGURE 8.1.

Observing that $\ell_i \in Q$ is the smoothing parameter for the node q corresponding to the edge E_i , we may now apply [ACGS20], Prop. 5.2, to split the punctured map $f : \mathfrak{C}/\mathfrak{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ at the node q , obtaining two punctured maps $f_1 : \mathfrak{C}_1/\mathfrak{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$, $f_2 : \mathfrak{C}_2/\mathfrak{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ of types β_1 and β_2 . Here each curve has three punctured points, with β_1 having contact orders p_1, p_2 and $-s = -u_i$, with u_i the contact order of the edge E_i , and β_2 having contact orders s, p_3 and r . Note that $s \in \Sigma(X)(\mathbb{Z})$ by Proposition 4.20, (3). Thus we get from the universal property of the glued moduli space a tautological map $\mathfrak{U} \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}^{\text{gl, ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z)$. This defines spl'' .

Step 3. Construction of $\text{spl} : \mathfrak{U} \rightarrow \coprod_s \mathfrak{M}^{\dagger, \mu, \text{gl, ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z)$.

The diagram of Figure 8.1 summarizes the current situation, with all solid arrows already existing. Here we use short-hand $\mathfrak{M}^{\text{gl, ev}}$ for $\mathfrak{M}^{\text{gl, ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z)$ etc. There are three fs log Cartesian squares, i.e., the two squares defining $\coprod_s \mathfrak{M}^{\dagger, \mu, \text{gl, ev}}$

and $\mathfrak{M}_y^{\ddagger, \text{ev}}$ and the lower parallelogram defining $\coprod_s \mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}, \text{ev}}$. The morphism \tilde{j} was defined in Step 1 and the morphism spl'' in Step 2. The morphisms \bar{j} and \tilde{j} are the tautological morphisms, and *except for any commutativity involving spl''* , the diagram is commutative. In particular, $\Phi' = \Phi \circ \bar{j}$ by construction of Φ' , and j is obtained from \tilde{j} by applying the functor $\times_{\mathcal{M}_{0,4}^{\ddagger}}^{\text{fs}} B\mathbb{G}_m^{\ddagger}$. The morphisms ι and ι' are the inclusions. At this point, we do not make any statements about commutativity involving dashed arrows.

In fact, we have a somewhat restricted commutativity involving spl'' , namely,

$$(8.13) \quad \text{spl}'' \circ \tilde{j}|_{\mathfrak{U}'_{\text{tf}}} = \pi_5 \circ \pi_3 \circ \iota'|_{\mathfrak{U}'_{\text{tf}}}.$$

Indeed, let $\mathfrak{Y}' \subseteq \mathfrak{U}'_{\text{tf}}$ be a connected component with universal punctured map $f' : \mathfrak{C}'/\mathfrak{Y}' \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$, and with node q' obtained via the gluing. Let $\mathfrak{Y} \subseteq \mathfrak{U}_{\text{tf}}$ be the connected component with $\tilde{j}(\mathfrak{Y}') \subseteq \mathfrak{Y}$, with universal punctured map $f : \mathfrak{C}/\mathfrak{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$, with node q as chosen in Step 2. Note that f' is the pull-back of the family of punctured maps f via \tilde{j} . Thus if G is the dual graph of \mathfrak{C}' , it has two edges $E_q, E_{q'}$ corresponding to these two nodes, and neither ℓ_q nor $\ell_{q'}$ is proportional to δ , the first by our choice of q using Proposition 4.20 and the second because $\ell_{q'}$ and δ rationally generate the group of the stalk of the ghost sheaf at any point of \mathfrak{Y}' by construction. Thus both edges are of splitting type, and so by the tail-free hypothesis, $q = q'$. Now the identity $\text{spl}'' \circ \tilde{j}|_{\mathfrak{Y}'} = \pi_5 \circ \pi_3 \circ \iota'|_{\mathfrak{Y}'}$ follows from the universal property of the glued moduli space $\mathfrak{M}^{\text{gl}, \text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z)$.

To define η , we note that $\Psi \circ \text{spl}''$ factors through ϵ . Indeed, it is sufficient to check this factorization at the level of ghost sheaves. The morphism $\Psi \circ \text{spl}''$ is given, at the level of stalks of ghost sheaves, by $\delta \mapsto \delta, \ell_q \mapsto \ell_i$. Thus $\ell_q - \mu\delta \mapsto \ell_i - \mu\delta \in Q^{\text{gp}}$, and we need to ensure that $\ell_i - \mu\delta \in Q$. But recalling (8.12), we have

$$\ell_i - \mu\delta = \frac{1}{a}(\ell - \lambda\delta) + \left(\frac{\lambda - b}{a} - \mu \right) \delta,$$

so provided $\lambda \geq b + \mu a$, we obtain the desired factorization. Thus we can write $\Psi \circ \text{spl}'' = \epsilon \circ \eta$ for a uniquely determined morphism η .

The morphisms spl'', η give, by the universal property of fibre product, a morphism

$$\text{spl}' : \mathfrak{U} \rightarrow \coprod_s \mathfrak{M}^{\mu, \text{gl}, \text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z).$$

Now

$$\Phi' \circ \text{spl}' = \Phi \circ \bar{j} \circ \pi_5 \circ \text{spl}' = \Phi \circ \bar{j} \circ \text{spl}'' = \Phi \circ \pi_4 \circ \iota = \psi_y \circ \pi_2 \circ \iota.$$

Here the third equality holds as

$$(8.14) \quad \bar{j} \circ \text{spl}'' = \pi_4 \circ \iota$$

are both the tautological morphism $\mathfrak{U} \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta, z)$. Thus spl' and $\pi_2 \circ \iota$ induce, again by the universal property of fibre product, a morphism

$$\text{spl} : \mathfrak{U} \rightarrow \prod_s \mathfrak{M}^{\ddagger, \mu, \text{gl}, \text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z).$$

We pause here to comment on the overall choices of μ and λ for this construction. Having chosen the punctured map class β , we make one choice of λ , as we need λ to define $\mathfrak{M}_y^{\ddagger, \text{ev}}$. This choice has to satisfy a number of properties, as given in Theorem 4.15 and Lemma 8.3, the latter used in the proof of Lemma 8.4, (3). Note the latter choice depends on μ . On the other hand, the choice of μ has to satisfy a number of properties, given in Proposition 7.12, (3) and Lemma 8.8. However, the choice of μ may vary as s ranges over all points of $\Sigma(X)(\mathbb{Z})$, which may seem problematic. But, as $\mathcal{M}^{\ddagger, \mu, \text{gl}}(X, \beta_1, \beta_2, z)$ must be empty for all but a finite number of s and curve classes A_1 and A_2 (as $\mathcal{M}(X, \beta, z)$ is finite type) we may in fact shrink all but a finite number of the $\mathfrak{M}^{\ddagger, \mu, \text{gl}, \text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta_1, \beta_2, z)$ to the empty set. We then find that the parts of the proof imposing constraints on λ and μ only impose a finite number of constraints. Thus we may first choose μ which satisfies all necessary constraints given the choice of β , which is fixed, and then similarly choose λ given the choice of μ .

Step 4. $j \circ \text{spl} = \iota$ and construction of $\text{spl}^\circ : \mathfrak{U} \rightarrow \mathfrak{U}'$.

Indeed, to show $j \circ \text{spl} = \iota$, it is sufficient, by the universal property of fibre product, to show that

$$\pi_2 \circ j \circ \text{spl} = \pi_2 \circ \iota, \quad \pi_4 \circ j \circ \text{spl} = \pi_4 \circ \iota.$$

For the first equality,

$$\pi_2 \circ j \circ \text{spl} = \pi_1 \circ \text{spl} = \pi_2 \circ \iota,$$

(the last equality by the construction of spl) while for the second,

$$\pi_4 \circ j \circ \text{spl} = \bar{j} \circ \pi_5 \circ \pi_3 \circ \text{spl} = \bar{j} \circ \pi_5 \circ \text{spl}' = \bar{j} \circ \text{spl}'' = \pi_4 \circ \iota,$$

the last equality by (8.14).

We thus see in particular that spl is injective, and hence the image of spl is top-dimensional. Since log morphisms take log strata into log strata, necessarily $\text{spl}(\mathfrak{U}) \subseteq \mathfrak{U}'$, showing we can write $\text{spl} = \iota' \circ \text{spl}^\circ$ for a morphism $\text{spl}^\circ : \mathfrak{U} \rightarrow \mathfrak{U}'$. By restriction we obtain a morphism $\text{spl}^\circ : \mathfrak{U}_{\text{tf}} \rightarrow \mathfrak{U}'_{\text{tf}}$.

Step 5. $\text{spl}^\circ : \mathfrak{U}_{\text{tf}} \rightarrow \mathfrak{U}'_{\text{tf}}$ is inverse to $\tilde{j} : \mathfrak{U}'_{\text{tf}} \rightarrow \mathfrak{U}_{\text{tf}}$.

By Step 4, $\iota = j \circ \iota' \circ \text{spl}^\circ = \iota \circ \tilde{j} \circ \text{spl}^\circ$, the latter by commutativity properties of Figure 8.1. The same remains true after restricting to \mathfrak{U}_{tf} , and thus, restricting to $\mathfrak{U}'_{\text{tf}}$, we have $\tilde{j} \circ \text{spl}^\circ = \text{id}_{\mathfrak{U}'_{\text{tf}}}$. To show $\text{spl}^\circ \circ \tilde{j} = \text{id}_{\mathfrak{U}_{\text{tf}}}$, we need to show

$$\pi_1 \circ \iota' \circ \text{spl}^\circ \circ \tilde{j} = \pi_1 \circ \iota', \quad \pi_3 \circ \iota' \circ \text{spl}^\circ \circ \tilde{j} = \pi_3 \circ \iota'.$$

For the first,

$$\pi_1 \circ \iota' \circ \text{spl}^\circ \circ \tilde{j} = \pi_1 \circ \text{spl} \circ \tilde{j} = \pi_2 \circ \iota \circ \tilde{j} = \pi_2 \circ j \circ \iota' = \pi_1 \circ \iota'.$$

For the second, we need to check that

$$(8.15) \quad \pi_5 \circ \pi_3 \circ \iota' \circ \text{spl}^\circ \circ \tilde{j} = \pi_5 \circ \pi_3 \circ \iota', \quad \pi_6 \circ \pi_3 \circ \iota' \circ \text{spl}^\circ \circ \tilde{j} = \pi_6 \circ \pi_3 \circ \iota'.$$

For the first equality of (8.15), we have

$$\pi_5 \circ \pi_3 \circ \iota' \circ \text{spl}^\circ \circ \tilde{j} = \pi_5 \circ \text{spl}' \circ \tilde{j} = \text{spl}'' \circ \tilde{j} = \pi_5 \circ \pi_3 \circ \iota',$$

the last equality following from (8.13).

For the second equality of (8.15), we note that $\epsilon : B\mathbb{G}_m^{2,\mu} \rightarrow B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger \times B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger$ is a monomorphism in the category of fs log stacks, since if Y is any fs log stack, a homomorphism $T_\mu \rightarrow \Gamma(Y, \overline{\mathcal{M}}_Y)$ is determined by the composition with $T \rightarrow T_\mu$. Thus we may check this equality after composing on the left by ϵ , and

$$\epsilon \circ \pi_6 \circ \pi_3 \circ \iota' \circ \text{spl}^\circ \circ \tilde{j} = \epsilon \circ \pi_6 \circ \text{spl}' \circ \tilde{j} = \epsilon \circ \eta \circ \tilde{j} = \Psi \circ \text{spl}'' \circ \tilde{j} = \Psi \circ \pi_5 \circ \pi_3 \circ \iota' = \epsilon \circ \pi_6 \circ \pi_3 \circ \iota',$$

showing the desired identity. Here the second equality follows from the construction of spl' and the fourth equality again follows from (8.13). \square

9. REMARKS ON THE FROBENIUS STRUCTURE CONJECTURE

In the first arXiv version of [GHK15], a conjecture was made concerning the coefficient of ϑ_0 in products of theta functions $\prod_{i=1}^n \vartheta_{p_i}$. In the language of this paper, we can make precise the conjecture as follows. We assume we are in the absolute log Calabi-Yau case. Fix $p_1, \dots, p_n \in B(\mathbb{Z})$ and a curve class A in X . Let β be the type of punctured map with curve class A , genus 0, and $n+1$ marked points, $x_1, \dots, x_n, x_{\text{out}}$, with contact orders determined by $p_1, \dots, p_n, 0$ respectively. Fix a general point $z \in X$, to obtain a moduli space $\mathcal{M}(X, \beta, z)$ of virtual dimension $n-2$, by Proposition 3.19. We then set

$$N_{p_1 \dots p_n 0}^A := \int_{[\mathcal{M}(X, \beta, z)]^{\text{virt}}} \psi_{x_{\text{out}}}^{n-2}.$$

Here $\psi_{x_{\text{out}}}$ denotes the ψ class associated to the point x_{out} , i.e., the first Chern class of the cotangent line at x_{out} . Note this invariant only involves “classical” log Gromov-Witten invariants, i.e., no punctures are involved.

Remark 9.1. It may be more appropriate to rephrase this conjecture in terms of ancestor invariants instead of descendent invariants, i.e., to take $\psi_{x_{\text{out}}}$ to be the ψ class associated to x_{out} pulled back from $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,n+1}$. Travis Mandel has sketched an argument for us suggesting these in fact agree here. In any event, the proof of the theorem below in fact shows the equality of the two invariants for $n = 3$.

The Frobenius structure conjecture can then be partially rephrased as

Conjecture 9.2. *The coefficient of ϑ_0 in the product $\vartheta_{p_1} \cdots \vartheta_{p_n}$ is*

$$\sum_A N_{p_1 \dots p_n 0}^A t^A.$$

In fact, the philosophy of the Frobenius structure conjecture is slightly different, in the sense that it predicts that there is a unique choice of structure constants $\alpha_{p_1 p_2 r}$ determined by the above values of the constant term for the products $\prod_{i=1}^n \vartheta_{p_i}$. So in fact here we are just asking that our construction be compatible with the Frobenius structure conjecture. See [Ma19a],[Ma19b] for some additional discussion on this conjecture. In particular, Mandel has shown the Frobenius structure conjecture for all cluster varieties, which includes the case of all log Calabi-Yau surfaces as originally considered in [GHK15]. More generally, see [KY19] for a proof of the Frobenius structure conjecture under the hypotheses that $X \setminus D$ is affine and contains a dense torus.

Here we observe our results give

Theorem 9.3. *Conjecture 9.2 holds for $n = 2$ and 3 .*

Proof. The case of $n = 2$ is immediate by definition of our structure constants $\alpha_{p_1 p_2 r}$. On the other hand, from Theorems 4.15, 4.25, and 4.26, it follows that the coefficient of $t^A \vartheta_0$ in $\vartheta_{p_1} \vartheta_{p_2} \vartheta_{p_3}$ is $\text{deg}[\mathcal{M}_y^\dagger]^{\text{virt}}$ for $y \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4}$ a non-boundary point. We have a diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{M}_y^\dagger & \xrightarrow{i''} & \mathcal{M}(X, \beta, z) \\ h' \downarrow & & \downarrow h \\ \mathfrak{M}_y^{\dagger, \text{ev}} & \xrightarrow{i'} & \mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta, z) \\ \Phi' \downarrow & & \downarrow \Phi \\ y \times B\mathbb{G}_m^\dagger & \xrightarrow{i} & \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4}^\dagger \end{array}$$

with all squares Cartesian in all categories, as i is strict. Note that Φ is flat over a neighbourhood of the image of i . Indeed, Φ is an integral morphism as the ghost sheaf over $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4}^\dagger$ is \mathbb{N} in a neighbourhood of the image of i . Further, Φ is log smooth, and log smooth and integral morphisms are flat. As i is also a closed embedding, it is finite and we have

$$\deg[\mathcal{M}_y^\dagger]^{\text{virt}} = \deg i_*''[\mathcal{M}_y^\dagger]^{\text{virt}} = \deg h^! i_*'[\mathfrak{M}_y^{\dagger, \text{ev}}] = \deg h^!(c_1(\Phi^* \mathcal{L}) \cap [\mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta, z)]),$$

where \mathcal{L} is the pull-back of $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(1)$ on $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4} \cong \mathbb{P}^1$ to $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4}^\dagger$. That

$$\deg h^!(c_1(\Phi^* \mathcal{L}) \cap [\mathfrak{M}^{\text{ev}}(\mathcal{X}, \beta, z)]) = \int_{[\mathcal{M}(X, \beta, z)]^{\text{virt}}} \psi_{x_{\text{out}}}$$

now follows exactly as in Step 3 of the proof of Lemma 6.6. \square

APPENDIX A. TOOLS OF THE TRADE

We collect in this appendix a number of technical aspects of log geometry which are needed in the main text. It may be skipped by the casual reader, and referred to only when necessary.

A.1. Charts for fibre products of fs log stacks. Here we give several results useful for understanding local models for fs fibre products of log stacks, and recall some notation.

We fix a ground field \mathbb{k} of characteristic 0, as usual, and all schemes and stacks are defined over $\text{Spec } \mathbb{k}$.

We have the following standard definition:

Definition A.1. Given P a fine monoid and $K \subseteq P$ a monoid ideal, we define

$$\begin{aligned} A_P &:= \text{Spec } \mathbb{k}[P], & A_{P,K} &:= \text{Spec}(\mathbb{k}[P]/K) \\ \mathcal{A}_P &:= [A_P / \text{Spec } \mathbb{k}[P^{\text{gp}}]], & \mathcal{A}_{P,K} &= [A_{P,K} / \text{Spec } \mathbb{k}[P^{\text{gp}}]]. \end{aligned}$$

Here both stacks carry a canonical log structure coming from P , and the second stack carries a canonical idealized log structure induced by the monoid ideal K , see [Og18], III, §1.3.

Proposition A.2. *Given P a fine (fine and saturated) monoid, \mathcal{A}_P represents the functor $T \mapsto \text{Hom}(P, \Gamma(T, \overline{\mathcal{M}}_T))$ in the category of fine (fs) logarithmic stacks, and A_P similarly represents the functor $T \mapsto \text{Hom}(P, \Gamma(T, \mathcal{M}_T))$. In particular, the set of two-isomorphism classes of log morphisms $T \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_P$ is in bijection with $\text{Hom}(P, \Gamma(T, \overline{\mathcal{M}}_T))$.*

Proof. The statement for \mathcal{A}_P is [Ol03], Prop. 5.17, while the statement for A_P is obvious. \square

Remark A.3. If P is a fine monoid, define $\overline{P} = P/P^\times$. Then $\mathcal{A}_P \cong \mathcal{A}_{\overline{P}}$.

Proposition A.4. *Given fine monoids Q, P_1 and P_2 with morphisms $\theta_i : Q \rightarrow P_i$ inducing morphisms $\mathcal{A}_{P_i} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_Q$, $A_{P_i} \rightarrow A_Q$, we have*

- (1) $\mathcal{A}_{P_1} \times_{\mathcal{A}_Q}^{\text{fine}} \mathcal{A}_{P_2} \cong \mathcal{A}_{P_1 \oplus_Q^{\text{fine}} P_2}$ and $A_{P_1} \times_{A_Q}^{\text{fine}} A_{P_2} \cong A_{P_1 \oplus_Q^{\text{fine}} P_2}$, where \oplus^{fine} denotes push-out in the category of fine monoids.
- (2) If P_1, P_2 and Q are also saturated, then $\mathcal{A}_{P_1} \times_{\mathcal{A}_Q}^{\text{fs}} \mathcal{A}_{P_2} \cong \mathcal{A}_{P_1 \oplus_Q^{\text{fs}} P_2}$ and $A_{P_1} \times_{A_Q}^{\text{fs}} A_{P_2} \cong A_{P_1 \oplus_Q^{\text{fs}} P_2}$, where \oplus^{fs} denotes push-out in the category of fs monoids.
- (3) $P_1 \oplus_Q^{\text{fine}} P_2$ is the image of the canonical map $P_1 \oplus P_2 \rightarrow P_1^{\text{gp}} \oplus_{Q^{\text{gp}}} P_2^{\text{gp}}$, while if P_1, P_2, Q are saturated, then $P_1 \oplus_Q^{\text{fs}} P_2$ is the saturation of $P_1 \oplus_Q^{\text{fine}} P_2$.
- (4) If in addition, $I \subseteq Q$, $J_i \subseteq P_i$ are monoid ideals with $\theta_i(I) \subseteq J_i$, then

$$\mathcal{A}_{P_1, J_1} \times_{\mathcal{A}_{Q, I}}^{\text{fs}} \mathcal{A}_{P_2, J_2} \cong \mathcal{A}_{P_1 \oplus_Q^{\text{fs}} P_2, J'_1 \cup J'_2}$$

and

$$A_{P_1, J_1} \times_{A_{Q, I}}^{\text{fs}} A_{P_2, J_2} \cong A_{P_1 \oplus_Q^{\text{fs}} P_2, J'_1 \cup J'_2},$$

where $J'_i \subseteq P_1 \oplus_Q^{\text{fs}} P_2$ is the ideal generated by the image of J_i . The same isomorphisms hold if instead the fibre product is taken in the category of idealized fs log stacks.

Proof. Statements (1) and (2) follow immediately from Proposition A.2. The third statement is [Og18], I, Prop. 1.3.4 in the fine case, and is immediate from this in the fs case. Finally, (4) is immediate from (2). \square

A.2. Log fibre dimension. Again we fix a ground field \mathbb{k} of characteristic 0, and all schemes and stacks are defined over $\text{Spec } \mathbb{k}$.

The following definition is from [AS03], pg. 41, which allows one to state a logarithmic analogue of invariance of fibre dimension of flat morphisms.

Definition A.5. Let $f : X \rightarrow Y$ be a morphism of log schemes with f locally of finite presentation and $x \in X$. Let $y = f(x)$, and let X_y be the scheme-theoretic fibre with the induced log structure, and $\kappa(x), \kappa(y)$ the residue fields at x and y respectively. Choose geometric points $\bar{x} \rightarrow x, \bar{y} \rightarrow y$. Then we define

$$(A.1) \quad \dim^{\log} f^{-1}(f(x)) := \dim \mathcal{O}_{X_y, \bar{x}} / \langle \alpha_X(\mathcal{M}_{X, \bar{x}} \setminus \mathcal{O}_{X, \bar{x}}^\times) \rangle + \text{tr.deg. } \kappa(x) / \kappa(y) + \text{rank } \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{X, \bar{x}}^{\text{gp}} - \text{rank } \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{Y, \bar{y}}^{\text{gp}}.$$

Here we remark that for a fine log scheme X , $\mathcal{O}_{X,\bar{x}}/\langle\alpha_X(\mathcal{M}_{X,\bar{x}} \setminus \mathcal{O}_{X,\bar{x}}^\times)\rangle$ is the (Henselian) local ring at \bar{x} of the log stratum of X containing \bar{x} .⁷

We also write

$$(A.2) \quad \dim \underline{f}^{-1}(\underline{f}(x)) = \dim \mathcal{O}_{X_y, \bar{x}} + \text{tr.deg. } \kappa(x)/\kappa(y)$$

for the usual fibre dimension.

The following should be standard, but we have been unable to find a reference:

Lemma A.6. *Let $f : X \rightarrow Y$ be a log flat morphism between fs log schemes with \underline{f} locally of finite presentation, and $x \in X$, $y = f(x)$. Then*

$$A_{\bar{x}} := \mathcal{O}_{X,\bar{x}}/\langle\alpha_X(\mathcal{M}_{X,\bar{x}} \setminus \mathcal{O}_{X,\bar{x}}^\times)\rangle$$

is flat over

$$B_{\bar{y}} := \mathcal{O}_{Y,\bar{y}}/\langle\alpha_Y(\mathcal{M}_{Y,\bar{y}} \setminus \mathcal{O}_{Y,\bar{y}}^\times)\rangle.$$

Proof. First, suppose $\theta : Q \rightarrow P$ is an injective homomorphism of fs monoids, and take $X = A_P$, $Y = A_Q$, and $f : X \rightarrow Y$ induced by θ . Take $x \in A_P$ such that $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{X,\bar{x}} = \overline{P} := P/P^\times$. By localizing Q along a face if necessary, we may assume that $f(x) = y \in Y$ with $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{Y,\bar{y}} = \overline{Q} = Q/Q^\times$. If $X^+ := \text{Spec } \mathbb{k}[P]/\langle P \setminus P^\times \rangle$, $Y^+ := \text{Spec } \mathbb{k}[Q]/\langle Q \setminus Q^\times \rangle$ viewed as closed subschemes of X, Y respectively, then $x \in X^+$, $y \in Y^+$, and $A_{\bar{x}} = \mathcal{O}_{X^+, \bar{x}}$, $B_{\bar{x}} = \mathcal{O}_{Y^+, \bar{y}}$. On the other hand, $X^+ \cong \text{Spec } \mathbb{k}[P^\times]$, $Y^+ \cong \text{Spec } \mathbb{k}[Q^\times]$, and $\theta : Q^\times \rightarrow P^\times$ is an injective map of abelian groups, so X^+ is flat over Y^+ . This shows the claim in this case.

In general, note that the claim is local for X and Y in the (strict) fppf topology. We may then apply [Og18], IV, Lem. 4.1.3 and assume that there is a $\theta : Q \rightarrow P$ as above and a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X & \longrightarrow & A_P \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ Y & \longrightarrow & A_Q \end{array}$$

with horizontal arrows strict, $A_P \rightarrow A_Q$ induced by θ , and the induced morphism $X \rightarrow Y \times_{A_Q} A_P$ flat. Then the desired flatness follows from this diagram and the case already considered in the first paragraph. \square

⁷We note that this formula is not precisely the one given in [AS03], where the last two terms are replaced with $\text{rank } \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{X,\bar{x}}^{\text{gp}}/\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{Y,\bar{y}}^{\text{gp}}$, which is not the same if $\bar{f}^b : \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{Y,\bar{y}}^{\text{gp}} \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{X,\bar{x}}^{\text{gp}}$ is not injective. However, Lemma 3.10, 2 of [AS03] fails with their definition, and the formula we give here makes that statement true.

Proposition A.7. *Let $f : X \rightarrow Y$ be a log flat morphism between fs log schemes, with f locally of finite presentation. Then:*

- (1) $\dim^{\log} f^{-1}(f(x))$ is a locally constant function of x .
- (2) If f is \mathbb{Q} -integral (see [Og18], I, Def. 4.7.4) in a neighbourhood of x or if f is strict, then

$$\dim^{\log} f^{-1}(f(x)) = \dim \underline{f}^{-1}(\underline{f}(x)).$$

- (3) If $g : Y \rightarrow Z$ is also log flat, and $x \in X$, $y = f(x)$, $h = g \circ f$, then

$$\dim^{\log} h^{-1}(h(x)) = \dim^{\log} f^{-1}(f(x)) + \dim^{\log} g^{-1}(g(y)).$$

- (4) Given an injective homomorphism of fs monoids $\theta : Q \rightarrow P$, the induced morphism $f : A_P \rightarrow A_Q$ has log fibre dimension $\text{rank } P^{\text{gp}} - \text{rank } Q^{\text{gp}}$.
- (5) If Y' is an fs log scheme with a morphism $Y' \rightarrow Y$, $f' : X' = X \times_Y^{\text{fs}} Y' \rightarrow Y'$ the base-change of f , $\pi : X' \rightarrow X$ the projection, then

$$\dim^{\log} (f')^{-1}(f'(x')) = \dim^{\log} f^{-1}(f(\pi(x')))$$

for $x' \in X'$.

Proof. (1) is [AS03], Lem. 3.10, 2.

The first case of (2) is the implication (1) \Rightarrow (7) of [Og18], III, Thm. 2.2.7, comparing the formula given there with (A.1) and (A.2). We also need to apply [Og18], IV, Prop. 4.1.9 to verify the needed hypothesis of solidity of the idealized fibre. If instead f is strict, the claim follows immediately from the definition, bearing in mind that necessarily $\alpha_Y(s)|_{\bar{y}} = 0$ for any $s \in \mathcal{M}_{Y, \bar{y}} \setminus \mathcal{O}_{Y, \bar{y}}^{\times}$, and the ideal $\langle \alpha_X(\mathcal{M}_{X, \bar{x}} \setminus \mathcal{O}_{X, \bar{x}}^{\times}) \rangle$ in $\mathcal{O}_{X_y, \bar{x}}$ is generated by pull-backs of such $\alpha_Y(s)$ in the strict case.

- (3) From the definitions, we need to show that

$$\begin{aligned} \dim \mathcal{O}_{X_z, \bar{x}} / \langle \alpha_X(\mathcal{M}_{X, \bar{x}} \setminus \mathcal{O}_{X, \bar{x}}^{\times}) \rangle = \\ \dim \mathcal{O}_{X_y, \bar{x}} / \langle \alpha_X(\mathcal{M}_{X, \bar{x}} \setminus \mathcal{O}_{X, \bar{x}}^{\times}) \rangle + \dim \mathcal{O}_{Y_z, \bar{y}} / \langle \alpha_Y(\mathcal{M}_{Y, \bar{y}} \setminus \mathcal{O}_{Y, \bar{y}}^{\times}) \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

This follows from the flatness statement of Lemma A.6 and additivity of fibre dimension for ordinary flat morphisms.

- (4) First note that f is log flat, so by (1) we may compute the log fibre dimension at any point $x \in \text{Spec } \mathbb{k}[P^{\text{gp}}] \subseteq A_P$. Since f maps $\text{Spec } \mathbb{k}[P^{\text{gp}}]$ into $\text{Spec } \mathbb{k}[Q^{\text{gp}}]$, and the log structures are trivial on these open sets, the log fibre dimension at x coincides with the ordinary fibre dimension by (2), which is clearly $\text{rank } P^{\text{gp}} - \text{rank } Q^{\text{gp}}$.

(5) Let $x = \pi(x')$, $y = f(x)$, $y' = f'(x')$.

We first consider the case that $Y' \rightarrow Y$ is strict. As $X'_{y'} \rightarrow X_y$ is a strict base-change via $y' \rightarrow y$, strata of $X'_{y'}$ are, locally, base-changes of strata of X_y by $y' \rightarrow y$. Thus by [St], Tag 02FY and the definition of log fibre dimension, the result is immediate.

Now consider $Y' \rightarrow Y$ arbitrary. To prove the desired result, by (1) we can assume that x and y are closed points. By the additivity statement (3) for ordinary fibre dimension for compositions of (strict) flat morphisms, we may replace X and Y with fppf neighbourhoods of x and y . In particular, by [Og18], IV, Lem. 4.1.3, we may assume the existence of a chart $Y \rightarrow A_Q$ inducing an isomorphism $Q \cong \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{Y, \bar{y}}$ and a flat chart for f , i.e., an injective map $\theta : Q \rightarrow P$ and a chart $X \rightarrow A_P$ such that $g : X \rightarrow Y \times_{A_Q} A_P$ is flat. We thus obtain a diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 X' & \longrightarrow & X & & \\
 g' \downarrow & & \downarrow g & & \\
 Y' \times_{A_Q} A_P & \longrightarrow & Y \times_{A_Q} A_P & \longrightarrow & A_P \\
 h' \downarrow & & \downarrow h & & \downarrow \\
 Y' & \longrightarrow & Y & \longrightarrow & A_Q
 \end{array}$$

Then g, g' are strict flat, and hence the ordinary and the log fibre dimensions of g (resp. g') agree at x (resp. x'). Further, by [St], Tag 02FY again, g and g' have the same ordinary fibre dimensions. Thus by (3) of the proposition, it is enough to show that h' has the same log fibre dimension as h . First, as $Y \rightarrow A_Q$ is strict, by the case of the result already shown, the log fibre dimension of h is the same as that of $A_P \rightarrow A_Q$, which by (4) is $\text{rank } P^{\text{gp}} - \text{rank } Q^{\text{gp}}$.

Second, again by the strict case, we may replace Y' with an fppf neighbourhood of y' and assume given a chart $Y' \rightarrow A_{Q'}$. Thus we have a diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 Y' \times_{A_Q} A_P & \longrightarrow & A_{P'} & \longrightarrow & A_P \\
 h' \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 Y' & \longrightarrow & A_{Q'} & \longrightarrow & A_Q
 \end{array}$$

with the left-hand square Cartesian in all categories and the right-hand square Cartesian in the fs log category. In particular, $P' = P \oplus_Q^{\text{fs}} Q'$ by Proposition A.4, (2). Thus, again by the strict case already proved, the log fibre dimension of h' agrees with that of $A_{P'} \rightarrow A_{Q'}$. Now since $\theta : Q \rightarrow P$ is injective, so is the induced homomorphism $Q' \rightarrow P'$, as the same is true at the group level. Thus

the log fibre dimension of $A_{P'} \rightarrow A_{Q'}$ is

$$\begin{aligned} \text{rank}(P')^{\text{gp}} - \text{rank}(Q')^{\text{gp}} &= (\text{rank } P^{\text{gp}} + \text{rank}(Q')^{\text{gp}} - \text{rank } Q^{\text{gp}}) - \text{rank}(Q')^{\text{gp}} \\ &= \text{rank } P^{\text{gp}} - \text{rank } Q^{\text{gp}}. \end{aligned}$$

This shows invariance of log fibre dimension under fs base-change. \square

While the above statements are all given for morphisms of schemes, they will often be applied to morphisms of stacks. It is easy to adapt the above statements using suitable smooth charts, and this will in general be done without comment.

Here is an immediate application of the above results.

Proposition A.8. *Let $f : X \rightarrow Y$ be a morphism of fs log stacks.*

- (1) *If f is log étale, then f has log fibre dimension 0.*
- (2) *If f is integral, log étale and Y pure-dimensional, then $\dim X = \dim Y$.*
- (3) *If X and Y carry coherent idealized structures and f is integral and idealized log étale (but not necessarily log étale), then $\dim X \leq \dim Y$.*

Proof. For (1), choosing $\bar{x} \in |X|$, $\bar{y} = f(\bar{x}) \in |Y|$, we have strict étale neighbourhoods X' , Y' of \bar{x} , \bar{y} respectively with $X' \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_P \times_{\mathcal{A}_Q} Y'$ strict étale by [ACGS20], Prop. B.4. An ordinary étale morphism of stacks always has fibre dimension 0. Indeed, this follows immediately by passing to a schematic étale chart for the morphism using the definition of an étale morphism of stacks given in [St], Tag 0CIL (see Remark 2.14). As $X' \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_P \times_{\mathcal{A}_Q} Y'$ is strict étale, it is thus étale, and hence has log fibre dimension 0 by Proposition A.7, (2). On the other hand, the composition $\mathcal{A}_P \times_{\mathcal{A}_Q} Y' \rightarrow Y'$ has the same log fibre dimension as $\mathcal{A}_P \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_Q$, which has log fibre dimension 0. Indeed, we pass to the smooth chart $A_P \rightarrow A_Q$ for the morphism $\mathcal{A}_P \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_Q$, and conclude by Proposition A.7, (4). Thus $X' \rightarrow Y'$ has log fibre dimension 0 by Proposition A.7, (3) applied to the composition $X' \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_P \times_{\mathcal{A}_Q} X' \rightarrow Y'$. We conclude that $f : X \rightarrow Y$ also has log fibre dimension 0.

For (2) as log étale morphisms are log flat, by Proposition A.7, (2) the result follows immediately from (1) and the dimension formula for flat morphisms.

For (3), again by [ACGS20], Prop. B.4, we can assume the existence of étale neighbourhoods X' and Y' of X and Y with a morphism $X' \rightarrow Y'$ factoring as $X' \rightarrow Y' \times_{\mathcal{A}_{Q,J}} \mathcal{A}_{P,K} \rightarrow Y'$ and the first morphism étale. Now there is a

commutative diagram with the left-hand square Cartesian:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 Y' \times_{\mathcal{A}_{Q,J}} \mathcal{A}_{P,K} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{A}_{P,K} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{A}_P \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \theta \\
 Y' & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{A}_{Q,J} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{A}_Q
 \end{array}$$

By integrality, θ is a flat morphism, necessarily of fibre dimension 0, and because the right-hand horizontal arrows are closed embeddings, $Y' \times_{\mathcal{A}_{Q,J}} \mathcal{A}_{P,K}$ is a closed substack of $Y' \times_{\mathcal{A}_Q} \mathcal{A}_P$. By flatness of θ , the latter stack has the same dimension as Y' , and hence $\dim X' \leq \dim Y'$, as desired. \square

The last observation we make here is often useful for determining dimensions of various log stacks which appear in this paper.

Proposition A.9. *Let $f : X \rightarrow Y$ be a log smooth morphism of fs log stacks, with $\bar{x} \in |X|$, $\bar{y} = f(\bar{x})$ geometric points. We then obtain a morphism of cones $\Sigma(f) : \sigma_{\bar{x}} \rightarrow \sigma_{\bar{y}}$. Let τ be a face of $\sigma_{\bar{x}}$. Then the following are equivalent:*

- (1) *There is a geometric point $\bar{x}' \in |X|$ which is a generization of \bar{x} and such that the induced inclusion of faces $\sigma_{\bar{x}'} \rightarrow \sigma_{\bar{x}}$ identifies $\sigma_{\bar{x}'}$ with τ .*
- (2) *There is a generization $\bar{y}' \in |Y|$ of \bar{y} inducing an inclusion $\sigma_{\bar{y}'} \subseteq \sigma_{\bar{y}}$ with $\sigma_{\bar{y}'}$ the minimal face of $\sigma_{\bar{y}}$ containing $\Sigma(f)(\tau)$.*

Proof. For (1) \Rightarrow (2), note that if \bar{x}' exists, then $\bar{y}' = f(\bar{x}')$ is a generization of \bar{y} . Thus $\sigma_{\bar{y}'}$ is identified with a face of $\sigma_{\bar{y}}$, and since \bar{f}^\flat is a local homomorphism of monoids, $\Sigma(f)(\tau)$ must intersect the interior of $\sigma_{\bar{y}'}$, so that $\sigma_{\bar{y}'}$ is the minimal face of $\sigma_{\bar{y}}$ containing $\Sigma(f)(\tau)$.

For the converse, assume (2). It is sufficient to show (1) holds after replacing X and Y with schematic smooth neighbourhoods of \bar{x} and \bar{y} , so we can assume there is a diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 X & \longrightarrow & A_P \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 Y & \longrightarrow & A_Q
 \end{array}$$

with the right-hand vertical arrow induced by an injective monoid homomorphism $\theta : Q \rightarrow P$, the horizontal morphisms strict, and X strict smooth over $Y \times_{A_Q} A_P$. The right-hand vertical arrow tropicalizes to

$$\theta^\flat : \sigma_{\bar{x}} = \text{Hom}(P, \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}) \rightarrow \sigma_{\bar{y}} = \text{Hom}(Q, \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}).$$

It is then standard toric geometry that the torus orbit of A_P corresponding to a face $\tau \subseteq \sigma_{\bar{x}}$ surjects onto the torus orbit of A_Q corresponding to the minimal face τ' of $\sigma_{\bar{y}}$ containing $\theta^t(\tau)$.

Now let $\bar{z} \in Y \times_{A_Q} A_P$ be the image of \bar{x} , necessarily with image $\bar{y} \in Y$. Let $\bar{w} \in A_P$ be the image of \bar{z} in A_P and $\bar{s} \in A_Q$ be the image of \bar{y} in A_Q .

Suppose that there is a generization \bar{y}' of \bar{y} with $\sigma_{\bar{y}'} = \tau'$, so that the image \bar{s}' of \bar{y}' in A_Q lies in the stratum corresponding to τ' . Then by the above mentioned surjectivity of strata, there is a point $\bar{w}' \in A_P$ which specializes to \bar{w} , satisfies $\sigma_{\bar{w}'} = \tau$, and the image of \bar{w}' in A_Q is \bar{s}' . Then there is a point \bar{z}' of $\bar{y}' \times_{\bar{s}'} \bar{w}'$ which specializes to \bar{z} . Since a smooth morphism is locally of finite presentation and flat, hence open, there is a generization \bar{x}' of \bar{x} mapping to \bar{z}' , showing the result. \square

A.3. Log structures on discrete valuation rings. In this subsection, we let R be a discrete valuation ring with field of fractions K . Set $T = \text{Spec } R$, with generic point ξ and closed point 0 . Also let $U = \text{Spec } K$, and let $t \in R$ be a choice of uniformizing parameter.

Lemma A.10. *Let Q be a sharp fs monoid. The set of isomorphism classes of Zariski fs log structures \mathcal{M}_T on T with $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{T,0} = Q$ is canonically in bijection with the set of pairs (F, u) where $F \subseteq Q$ is a face and $u \in \text{Int}(F^\vee)$.*

For a log structure \mathcal{M}_T corresponding to (F, u) , we have $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{T,\xi} = Q_K := (F^{-1}Q)/(F^{-1}Q)^\times$.

Proof. Note $u \in \text{Int}(F^\vee)$ is equivalent to $u : F \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ being a local homomorphism. Suppose given the data (F, u) . Then the chart

$$\alpha : Q \rightarrow R, \quad \alpha(q) = \begin{cases} 0 & q \in Q \setminus F, \\ t^{u(q)} & q \in F \end{cases}$$

defines a log structure \mathcal{M}_T on T . Then by [Og18], II, Prop. 2.1.4, $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{T,0} = Q/\alpha^{-1}(R^\times) = Q$, as u local implies that $u(q) \neq 0$ unless $q = 0$. On the other hand, $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{T,\xi} = Q/\alpha^{-1}(R \setminus 0) = Q/F = Q_K$.

Conversely, suppose given a Zariski fs log structure \mathcal{M}_T with ghost sheaf stalks Q, Q_K at 0 and ξ , respectively. Let $\chi : Q \rightarrow Q_K$ be the generization map, with $\chi^{-1}(0) = F$. Now there are (non-canonical) splittings

$$(A.3) \quad \Gamma(T, \mathcal{M}_T) = R^\times \times Q, \quad \Gamma(U, \mathcal{M}_T) = K^\times \times Q_K.$$

This follows, for example, from the splitting statement in [Og18], III, Thm. 1.2.7, 2, The restriction map $\rho : \Gamma(T, \mathcal{M}_T) \rightarrow \Gamma(U, \mathcal{M}_T)$ must then take the form

$$\rho(r, q) = (r\rho'(q), \chi(q))$$

for some homomorphism $\rho' : Q \rightarrow K^\times$. Writing ν_R for the discrete valuation on K , we can write

$$\rho'(q) = \rho''(q)t^{\nu_R(\rho'(q))}$$

for some $\rho'' : Q \rightarrow R^\times$. Set $u = \nu_R \circ \rho' : Q \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$.

Note we can modify the splitting of $\Gamma(T, \mathcal{M}_T)$ via an automorphism of the form $(r, q) \mapsto (r\rho''(q)^{-1}, q)$. This has the effect of setting $\rho'' \equiv 1$, so that the restriction map is given by $\rho(r, q) = (rt^{u(q)}, q)$. Furthermore, we can modify the splitting of $\Gamma(U, \mathcal{M}_T)$ via an automorphism $(r, q) \mapsto (rt^{\bar{u}(q)}, r)$ for any $\bar{u} : Q_K \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$. This has the effect of replacing u with $u + \bar{u} \circ \chi$, so that the restriction map is given by $(r, q) \mapsto (rt^{u(q) + \bar{u} \circ \chi(q)}, r)$. Thus u can be viewed as an element of $Q^*/Q_K^* \cong F^*$.

Thus the data of F and u determine, up to isomorphism, the sheaf \mathcal{M}_T . Now let us consider possible structure maps $\alpha_T : \mathcal{M}_T \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_T$. Necessarily, $\alpha_T : \Gamma(U, \mathcal{M}_T) \rightarrow K$ is given by

$$(r, q) \mapsto \begin{cases} r & q = 0, \\ 0 & q \neq 0. \end{cases}$$

For the structure map $\alpha_T : \Gamma(T, \mathcal{M}_T) \rightarrow R$ to be compatible with restriction, we thus need for $(r, q) \in R^\times \times Q$ that

$$\alpha_T(r, q) = \begin{cases} rt^{u(q)} & \chi(q) = 0, \\ 0 & \chi(q) \neq 0. \end{cases}$$

Note that if u is replaced by $u + \bar{u} \circ \chi$, the value of $u(q)$ doesn't change when $\chi(q) = 0$, so α_T is well-defined. In particular, u must be non-negative on F . Thus $u \in F^\vee$. Furthermore, the requirement that $\alpha_T^{-1}(R^\times) \cong R^\times$ then also implies $u(q) > 0$ if $q \neq 0$ but $\chi(q) = 0$. Thus $u \in \text{Int}(F^\vee)$. This gives the pair (F, u) . \square

Lemma A.11. *Let $\mathcal{M}_T, \mathcal{M}'_T$ be two log structures on \underline{T} given by the data $F \subset Q, u \in \text{Int}(F^\vee)$ and $F' \subset Q', u' \in \text{Int}((F')^\vee)$ respectively.*

Given local homomorphisms φ, φ_K in a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} Q & \xleftarrow{\varphi} & Q' \\ x \downarrow & & \downarrow x' \\ Q_K & \xleftarrow{\varphi_K} & Q'_K \end{array}$$

satisfying $u(\varphi(q)) = u'(q)$ for $q \in F'$, there exists a morphism of log schemes $f : (\underline{T}, \mathcal{M}_T) \rightarrow (\underline{T}, \mathcal{M}'_T)$ with \underline{f} the identity and f inducing the maps φ, φ_K on stalks of ghost sheaves.

Proof. Given the data, choose an extension of u to a homomorphism $u : Q \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$. Then $u \circ \varphi$ is an extension of u' to a morphism $u' : Q' \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$. We may then choose splittings for $\mathcal{M}_T, \mathcal{M}'_T$ as in (A.3) so that the restriction maps are given by $(r, q) \mapsto (rt^{u(q)}, \chi(q)), (r, q) \mapsto (rt^{u'(q)}, \chi'(q))$ for $\mathcal{M}_T, \mathcal{M}'_T$. Then define f^b on sections by

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma(T, \mathcal{M}'_T) &\rightarrow \Gamma(T, \mathcal{M}_T), & (r, q) &\mapsto (r, \varphi(q)), \\ \Gamma(U, \mathcal{M}'_T) &\rightarrow \Gamma(U, \mathcal{M}_T), & (r, q) &\mapsto (r, \varphi_K(q)). \end{aligned}$$

One then checks compatibility of these maps with restriction and with $\alpha_T, \alpha_{T'}$ to see we obtain a log morphism. \square

A.4. Some results concerning virtual fundamental classes. We prove several general results about the behaviour of virtual fundamental classes as operational Chow classes. We feel that there should be a good reference for these results, but we have been unable to find one. The proof of the following lemma was provided to us by Andrew Kresch.

Lemma A.12. *Suppose given a Cartesian diagram of algebraic stacks over a field of characteristic zero*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} M' & \xrightarrow{g'} & M \\ f' \downarrow & & \downarrow f \\ F' & \xrightarrow{g} & F \end{array}$$

with:

- M Deligne-Mumford;
- F' integral, and F and F' stratified by quotient stacks in the sense of [Kr99], Def. 3.5.3;
- f is equipped with a perfect relative obstruction theory of relative virtual dimension p , and $p + \dim F < 0$.

Then $[M']^{\text{virt}} = f^!([F']) = 0$ in the rational Chow group of M' , where $f^!$ is the virtual pull-back of Manolache [Ma12] defined using the given obstruction theory, and the virtual fundamental class is calculated using the pull-back obstruction theory.

Proof. If F'' denotes the closure of the image of g with its reduced induced stack structure, the morphism g factors as $F' \rightarrow F'' \rightarrow F$. Pulling back the relative obstruction theory for f to $M'' := M \times_F F'' \rightarrow F''$, we note that M'' is still DM and $p + \dim F'' < 0$ as $\dim F'' \leq \dim F$. Thus the hypotheses of the lemma still hold if we replace F and M by F'' and M'' . So we may make this replacement, and can therefore assume that F is integral and g is dominant.

By [Te12], Thm 5.1.1, there exists a projective resolution of singularities $\rho : \tilde{F} \rightarrow F$. Let \tilde{F}' be the unique irreducible component of $\tilde{F} \times_F F'$ dominating F' ; in particular, the induced morphism $\rho' : \tilde{F}' \rightarrow F'$ is birational and projective. Let $\tilde{g} : \tilde{F}' \rightarrow \tilde{F}$ be the induced projection. We write $\tilde{M} = M \times_F \tilde{F}$, $\tilde{M}' = M \times_F \tilde{F}'$.

We have a diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 \tilde{M}' & \longrightarrow & \tilde{F}' \times \tilde{M} & \xrightarrow{\text{pr}_2} & \tilde{M} & \longrightarrow & M \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \tilde{f} & & \downarrow f \\
 \tilde{F}' & \xrightarrow{\Gamma_{\tilde{g}}} & \tilde{F}' \times \tilde{F} & \xrightarrow{\text{pr}_2} & \tilde{F} & \xrightarrow{\rho} & F
 \end{array}$$

Here $\Gamma_{\tilde{g}}$ denotes the graph of \tilde{g} . Note that because \tilde{F} is non-singular, $\Gamma_{\tilde{g}}$ is an lci morphism, as follows from [St], Tag 0CJ2. In this case, [Kr99] defines a Gysin pull-back map $\Gamma_{\tilde{g}}^!$.

We now obtain

$$f^![\tilde{F}'] = f^! \Gamma_{\tilde{g}}^![\tilde{F}' \times \tilde{F}] = \Gamma_{\tilde{g}}^! f^![\tilde{F}' \times \tilde{F}] = \Gamma_{\tilde{g}}^! f^! \text{pr}_2^*[\tilde{F}] = \Gamma_{\tilde{g}}^! (\text{pr}_2)^* f^![\tilde{F}] = 0.$$

Here the first equality follows from the fact that the Gysin pull-back of the fundamental class is the fundamental class. The second equality comes from compatibility of virtual pull-back with Gysin pull-back along regular embeddings, as follows from [Ma12], Thm. 4.3 and the fact that Gysin pull-back along regular embeddings can be described as a virtual pull-back, see [Ma12], Rmk. 3.9. The third comes from the fact that pr_2 is flat, and the fourth by compatibility of virtual pull-back with flat pull-back, [Ma12] Thm. 4.1, (ii). The final equality follows from dimension reasons, as $f^![\tilde{F}]$ is a Chow class of negative degree, and as ρ is projective, hence representable, \tilde{M} is DM and so has no negative degree rational Chow classes.

We next observe we have a cube with all vertical faces Cartesian:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 & & M' & \longrightarrow & M \\
 & \nearrow \rho'' & \downarrow & & \downarrow f \\
 \widetilde{M}' & \longrightarrow & \widetilde{M} & & \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow & \nearrow \tilde{f} & \downarrow \\
 & & F' & \longrightarrow & F \\
 \downarrow & \nearrow \rho' & \downarrow & & \downarrow \rho \\
 \widetilde{F}' & \longrightarrow & \widetilde{F} & &
 \end{array}$$

By compatibility of virtual pull-back with projective push-forward, [Ma12], Thm. 4.1, (i), $0 = \rho''_* f^![\widetilde{F}'] = f^! \rho'_*[\widetilde{F}'] = f^![F']$, as desired. Finally, note that $f^![F'] = (f')^![F']$, where $(f')^!$ is virtual pull-back defined using the pull-back obstruction theory, by [Ma12], Thm. 4.1, (iii). However by definition $(f')^![F'] = [M']^{\text{virt}}$. \square

Lemma A.12 is needed for the following theorem, which can be interpreted in a stable map context as saying that if we glue two families of curves, one of which has negative virtual dimension, then the virtual fundamental class of the glued family is zero, even if it has positive virtual dimension.

Theorem A.13. *Suppose given algebraic stacks M, M_1, M_2, F, F_1, F_2 over a field of characteristic zero and a Cartesian diagram*

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 M & \longrightarrow & M_1 \times M_2 \\
 f \downarrow & & \downarrow f_1 \times f_2 \\
 F & \longrightarrow & F_1 \times F_2
 \end{array}$$

with:

- M, M_1, M_2 Deligne-Mumford;
- F, F_1, F_2 stratified by quotient stacks;
- f_1, f_2 are equipped with perfect relative obstruction theories, with f_1 having relative virtual dimension p and $p + \dim F_1 < 0$;
- F is pure-dimensional.

Then $(f_1 \times f_2)^![F] = 0$ in the rational Chow group of M , i.e., the virtual fundamental class of M induced by the pull-back relative obstruction theory vanishes in the rational Chow group of M .

Proof. We have the following larger diagram with all squares Cartesian:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 & & & & M_2 \\
 & & & & \downarrow f_2 \\
 & & & & F_2 \\
 M & \longrightarrow & M_1 \times M_2 & \nearrow & \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow & \nearrow & \\
 M' & \longrightarrow & M_1 \times F_2 & \longrightarrow & M_1 \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow f_1 \\
 F & \longrightarrow & F_1 \times F_2 & \longrightarrow & F_1
 \end{array}$$

By replacing F by an irreducible component, we can assume F is integral. By [Ma12], Thm. 4.8 and Thm. 4.1, (iii), $(f_1 \times f_2)^! = f_2^! \circ f_1^!$. However, by Lemma A.12, $f_1^!([F]) = 0$ in rational Chow, and hence the result. \square

REFERENCES

- [AS03] A. Abbes and T. Saito: *Ramification of local fields with imperfect residue fields II*, Doc. Math. 2003, Extra Vol., 5–72.
- [AAEKO13] M. Abouzaid, D. Auroux, A. Efimov, L. Katzarkov, and D. Orlov: *Homological mirror symmetry for punctured spheres*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **26** (2013), 1051–1083.
- [ACP15] D. Abramovich, L. Caparaso, S. Payne: *The tropicalization of the moduli space of curves*, Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Supér. (4) **48** (2015), 765–809.
- [AC14] D. Abramovich, Q. Chen: *Stable logarithmic maps to Deligne-Faltings pairs II*, Asian J. Math. **18** (2014), 465–488.
- [ACGM10] D. Abramovich, Q. Chen, W. Gillam, S. Marcus: *The Evaluation Space of Logarithmic Stable Maps*, preprint, 2010.
- [ACMW17] D. Abramovich, Q. Chen, S. Marcus, and J. Wise: *Boundedness of the space of stable logarithmic maps*, J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS) **19** (2017), 2783–2809.
- [ACGS17] D. Abramovich, Q. Chen, M. Gross and B. Siebert: *Decomposition of degenerate Gromov-Witten invariants*, Compos. Math. **156** (2020), 2020–2075.
- [ACGS20] D. Abramovich, Q. Chen, M. Gross and B. Siebert: *Punctured Gromov-Witten invariants*, preprint, 2020, arXiv2009.07720.
- [AMW14] D. Abramovich, S. Marcus, J. Wise: *Comparison theorems for Gromov-Witten invariants of smooth pairs and of degenerations*, Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) **64** (2014), 1611–1667.
- [AW18] D. Abramovich, J. Wise: *Birational invariance in logarithmic Gromov-Witten theory*, Compos. Math. **154** (2018), 595–620.
- [ACG] E. Arbarello, M. Cornalba, P. Griffiths: *Geometry of algebraic curves. Volume II*. Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften, **268**. Springer, Heidelberg, 2011. xxx+963 pp.

- [Ar17] H. Argüz: *Tropical and log corals on the Tate curve with a view toward symplectic cohomology*, preprint, 2017.
- [Ba94] V. Batyrev: *Dual polyhedra and mirror symmetry for Calabi-Yau hypersurfaces in toric varieties*. J. Algebraic Geom. **3** (1994), 493–535.
- [BB96] V. Batyrev, and L. Borisov: *On Calabi-Yau complete intersections in toric varieties*, in *Higher-dimensional complex varieties (Trento, 1994)*, 39–65, de Gruyter, Berlin, 1996.
- [CCUW17] R. Cavalieri, M. Chan, M. Ulirsch, J. Wise: *A moduli stack of tropical curves*, preprint, 2017.
- [Ch14] Q. Chen: *Stable logarithmic maps to Deligne-Faltings pairs I*, Ann. of Math. (2) **180** (2014), 455–521.
- [Co06] K. Costello: *Higher genus Gromov-Witten invariants as genus zero invariants of symmetric products*, Ann. of Math. (2) **164** (2006), 561–601.
- [Fu98] W. Fulton: *Intersection theory*. Second edition. Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete. 3. Folge. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1998. xiv+470 pp.
- [GP21] S. Ganatra, D. Pomerleano: *A log PSS morphism with applications to Lagrangian embeddings*, J. Topol. **14** (2021), 291–368.
- [GM08] A. Gathmann, H. Markwig: *Kontsevich’s formula and the WDVV equations in tropical geometry*, Adv. in Math. **217**, (2008) 537–560.
- [Gr05] M. Gross: *Toric Degenerations and Batyrev-Borisov Duality*, Math. Ann. **333**, (2005) 645–688.
- [GHK15] M. Gross, P. Hacking, S. Keel: *Mirror symmetry for log Calabi-Yau surfaces I*, Publ. Math. Inst. Hautes Études Sci., **122**, (2015) 65–168.
- [GHKK18] M. Gross, P. Hacking, S. Keel, M. Kontsevich, *Canonical bases for cluster algebras*. J. Amer. Math. Soc. **31** (2018), 497–608.
- [GHKS20] M. Gross, P. Hacking, S. Keel, and B. Siebert: *Theta functions for K3 surfaces*, in preparation.
- [GHS19] M. Gross, P. Hacking, and B. Siebert: *Theta functions on varieties with effective anti-canonical class*, to appear in *Memoirs of the AMS*.
- [GKR17] M. Gross, L. Katzarkov, H. Ruddat: *Towards mirror symmetry for varieties of general type*, Adv. Math. **308** (2017), 208–275.
- [GS06] M. Gross, and B. Siebert: *Mirror symmetry via logarithmic degeneration data I*, J. Diff. Geom., **72**, (2006) 169–338.
- [GS10] M. Gross, and B. Siebert: *Mirror symmetry via logarithmic degeneration data II*, J. Algebraic Geom., **19**, (2010) 679–780
- [GS11] M. Gross and B. Siebert: *From affine geometry to complex geometry*, *Annals of Mathematics*, **174**, (2011), 1301–1428.
- [GS13] M. Gross and B. Siebert: *Logarithmic Gromov-Witten invariants*, J. Amer. Math. Soc., **26** (2013). 451–510.
- [GS18] M. Gross and B. Siebert: *Intrinsic mirror symmetry and punctured Gromov-Witten invariants*, Algebraic geometry: Salt Lake City 2015, 199–230. Proc. Sympos. Pure Math., 97.2, AMS, Providence, RI, 2018.
- [GS21] M. Gross and B. Siebert: *The canonical wall structure*, in preparation.

- [Ii77] S. Iitaka: *On logarithmic Kodaira dimension of algebraic varieties*, in *Complex analysis and algebraic geometry*, 175–189, Iwanami Shoten, Tokyo, 1977.
- [Ka21] F. Kato: *Integral morphisms and log blow-ups*, to appear in *Israel. J. Math.*, preprint, 2021.
- [KY19] S. Keel and T. Yu: *The Frobenius structure Conjecture for affine log CYs containing a torus*, preprint, 2019.
- [KKMS73] G. Kempf, F. Knudsen, D. Mumford and B. Saint-Donat: *Toroidal Embeddings I*, Springer, LNM 339, 1973.
- [Kn83] F. F. Knudsen, *The projectivity of the moduli space of stable curves. II. The stacks $M_{g,n}$* . *Math. Scand.* **52** (1983), 161–199.
- [Ko13] J. Kollár: *Singularities of the minimal model program*, Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics, **200**, CUP, 2013.
- [KX16] J. Kollár and C. Xu: *The dual complex of Calabi-Yau pairs*, *Invent. Math.* **205** (2016), 527–557.
- [KS06] M. Kontsevich, Y. Soibelman: *Affine structures and non-Archimedean analytic spaces*, in: *The unity of mathematics* (P. Etingof, V. Retakh, I.M. Singer, eds.), 321–385, *Progr. Math.* 244, Birkhäuser 2006.
- [Kr99] A. Kresch: *Cycle groups for Artin stacks*, *Invent. Math.* **138** (1999), 495–536.
- [LMB00] G. Laumon, L. Moret-Bailly: *Champs algébriques*, Springer 2000.
- [LP18] Y. Lekili and A. Polishchuk: *Homological mirror symmetry for higher dimensional pairs of pants*, preprint, 2018.
- [Ma19a] T. Mandel: *Theta bases and log Gromov-Witten invariants of cluster varieties*, preprint, 2019.
- [Ma19b] T. Mandel: *Fano mirror periods from the Frobenius structure conjecture*, preprint, 2019.
- [Ma12] C. Manolache: *Virtual pull-backs*, *J. Algebraic Geometry*, **21**, (2012) 201–245.
- [Ma89] H. Matsumura: *Commutative ring theory*, C.U.P., 1989.
- [NX16] J. Nicaise and C. Xu: *The essential skeleton of a degeneration of algebraic varieties*, *Amer. J. Math.* **138** (2016), 1645–1667.
- [NXY18] J. Nicaise, C. Xu, and T. Yu: *The non-archimedean SYZ fibration*, preprint, 2018.
- [Og18] A. Ogus: *Lectures on logarithmic algebraic geometry*, Cambridge University Press, 2018.
- [Ol03] M. Olsson: *Logarithmic geometry and algebraic stacks* *Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup* **36** (2003), 747–791.
- [Ru17] H. Ruddat: *Perverse curves and mirror symmetry*, *J. Algebraic Geom.* **26** (2017), 17–42.
- [Ry11] D. Rydh: *The canonical embedding of an unramified morphism in an étale morphism*, *Math. Z.* **268** (2011), 707–723.
- [Po21] D. Pomerleano: *Intrinsic mirror symmetry and categorical crepant resolutions*, preprint, 2021, arXiv2103.01200.
- [Sk18] J. Skowera: *Proper pushforward of integral cycles on algebraic stacks*, University of Zürich thesis, 2018.
- [St] The Stacks Project Authors: *Stacks Project*, <https://stacks.math.columbia.edu>

- [Te12] M. Temkin: *Functorial desingularization of quasi-excellent schemes in characteristic zero: the non-embedded case*, Duke Math. J., **161** (2012), 2207-2254.

DPMMS, CENTRE FOR MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, WILBERFORCE ROAD, CAMBRIDGE, CB3 0WB, UK

Email address: `mgross@dpms.cam.ac.uk`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, RLM 9.160, UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN, 2515 SPEEDWAY STOP C1200, AUSTIN TX 78712

Email address: `siebert@math.utexas.edu`