

# THE HIGHER DIMENSIONAL TROPICAL VERTEX

HÜLYA ARGÜZ AND MARK GROSS

**ABSTRACT.** We study log Calabi-Yau varieties obtained as a blow-up of a toric variety along hypersurfaces in its toric boundary. Mirrors to such varieties are constructed by Gross-Siebert from a canonical scattering diagram built by using punctured Gromov-Witten invariants of Abramovich-Chen-Gross-Siebert. We show that there is a piecewise linear isomorphism between the canonical scattering diagram and a scattering diagram defined algorithmically, following a higher dimensional generalisation of the Kontsevich-Soibelman construction. We deduce that the punctured Gromov-Witten invariants of the log Calabi-Yau variety can be captured from this algorithmic construction. This generalizes previous results of Gross-Pandharipande-Siebert on “The Tropical Vertex” to higher dimensions. As a particular example, we compute these invariants for a non-toric blow-up of the three dimensional projective space along two lines.

## CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Canonical scattering for log Calabi–Yau varieties	9
3. Pulling singularities out and an asymptotic equivalence	38
4. The structure of $\mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D})}^1$ and radiance.	55
5. Pulling singularities to infinity: scattering in $M_{\mathbb{R}}$	72
6. The main theorem	82
7. Example: The blow-up of $\mathbb{P}^3$ with center two lines	88
References	92

## 1. INTRODUCTION

**1.1. Background.** A log Calabi-Yau pair  $(X, D)$  is an  $n$ -dimensional smooth variety  $X$  over an algebraically closed field  $k$  of characteristic zero together with a reduced simple normal crossing divisor  $D$  in  $X$  with  $K_X + D = 0$ . In this article we study log Calabi–Yau pairs  $(X, D)$  where  $X$  is a projective variety obtained by a blow-up

$$X \longrightarrow X_{\Sigma} \tag{1.1}$$

---

*Date:* December 17, 2021.

of a toric variety  $X_\Sigma$  associated to a complete fan  $\Sigma$  in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , and  $D \subset X$  is given by the strict transform of the toric boundary divisor. We assume that the center of the blow-up is a union of disjoint general smooth hypersurfaces

$$H = H_1 \cup \cdots \cup H_s \tag{1.2}$$

where  $H_i \subset D_{\rho_i}$ , for the toric divisor  $D_{\rho_i}$  corresponding to a choice of ray  $\rho_i \in \Sigma$ .

Log Calabi–Yau pairs are very widely studied in the mathematics literature, and they attract broad interest, especially from the point of view of mirror symmetry, see e.g., [15, 11, 28, 43, 40, 42, 18]. In particular, they play significant role in the Gross–Siebert program [21], which is aimed at an algebro-geometric understanding of mirrory symmetry motivated by the Strominger–Yau–Zaslow conjecture [41]. This conjecture, roughly, suggests that mirror pairs of Calabi–Yau varieties admit dual (singular) torus fibrations. The dual to a torus fibration on a Calabi–Yau is obtained by a compactification of a semi-flat mirror that is constructed by dualizing the non-singular torus fibers. To obtain this compactification one considers appropriate corrections to the complex structure. It was shown by Kontsevich and Soibelman [29] in dimension two and by Gross and Siebert [21] in higher dimensions that the problem to determine these corrections could be reduced to a combinatorial algorithm encoded in a scattering diagram. In dimension two, Gross, Pandharipande and Siebert [19] then showed that this combinatorial algorithm, producing a *scattering diagram*, could be interpreted in terms of relative invariants of pairs  $(X, D)$  as described above, with  $X$  the blow-up of a toric surface.

In the two-dimensional case, Gross, Hacking and Keel [16] then used [19] to construct the homogeneous coordinate ring for the mirror to a log Calabi–Yau surface  $X \setminus D$ . This led Gross and Siebert to a general algebro-geometric mirror construction in all dimensions [24, 20, 25].

Before elaborating on the notion of a scattering diagram associated to pairs  $(X, D)$ , we will describe more general versions of these relative invariants which are needed in higher dimension. These are punctured Gromov–Witten invariants constructed by Abramovich, Chen, Gross and Siebert [2].

1.1.1. *Punctured Gromov–Witten invariants.* It is expected that the necessary corrections of the complex structure describing the mirror to  $(X, D)$  can be obtained by counts of certain holomorphic discs with boundary on a fiber of the SYZ fibration [41, 12]. A key motivation in the approach to mirror symmetry we are interested in is to interpret analogues of such holomorphic disks algebro-geometrically. One of the main contributions in this direction is provided in [19] showing that scattering diagrams carry enumerative information, and capture *log*

*Gromov–Witten invariants.* These invariants are obtained as counts of rational algebraic curves with prescribed tangency conditions relative to a (not necessarily smooth) divisor. This is in some sense a generalisation of relative Gromov–Witten theory developed in [31, 30, 26], where tangency conditions are imposed relative to smooth divisors. Although in the two-dimensional case these invariants captured by scattering diagrams suffice to provide the necessary geometric data to construct mirrors to log Calabi–Yau surfaces [16], in higher dimensions, due to the more complicated nature of the structure in scattering diagrams, one needs to use a generalization of these invariants provided by punctured Gromov–Witten theory [2]. In this set-up, one allows negative orders of tangency at certain marked points, referred to as punctured points. For a precise review of the definition of a punctured point, see §2.3. Roughly, if a punctured map  $f : C \rightarrow X$  has negative order of tangency with a divisor  $D \subseteq X$  at a punctured point of  $C$ , then the irreducible component of  $C$  containing this punctured point must map into  $D$ , and the negative order of tangency is encoded in the data of the logarithmic structure.

In general, to define a punctured invariant, one considers a combinatorial type  $\tau$  of tropical map to the tropicalization of  $X$ , and a curve class  $\underline{\beta}$ . With  $\tilde{\tau} = (\tau, \underline{\beta})$ , one can define a moduli space  $\mathcal{M}(X, \tilde{\tau})$  of punctured maps of class  $\underline{\beta}$  whose type is a degeneration of  $\tau$ . The type  $\tau$  in particular specifies the genus, the number of punctured points and their contact orders with the components of  $D$ . This moduli space carries a virtual fundamental class. The precise definitions are via the technology of [2] and punctured maps to the associated Artin fan [4].

The special case we are interested in here, still with  $(X, D)$  a log Calabi–Yau pair, is when  $\tau$  is the type of a genus zero tropical map with one puncture with fixed contact order. When  $\tau$  is the type of a  $(\dim X - 2)$ -dimensional family of tropical curves, the moduli space  $\mathcal{M}(X, \tilde{\tau})$  is virtually zero dimensional and hence carries a virtual degree, which we write as  $N_{\tilde{\tau}}$ , following the notation of [24]. (We note that [25] instead uses the notation  $W_{\tilde{\tau}}$ .) This provides the main ingredient to define the canonical scattering diagram, which was defined for higher dimensional log Calabi–Yau pairs in [24] and whose properties were determined in [25]. Although it is generally a challenging task to compute these virtual moduli spaces  $\mathcal{M}(X, \tilde{\tau})$  and extract the numbers  $N_{\tilde{\tau}}$  corresponding to punctured invariants, the key point in this paper is that these numbers can be captured from the combinatorics of scattering diagrams purely algorithmically.

1.1.2. *The canonical scattering diagram.* Associated to a log Calabi–Yau pair  $(X, D)$  is its tropicalization  $(B, \mathcal{P})$ , a polyhedral complex defined similarly as in the two dimensional case in [16, §1.2]. This polyhedral complex carries the

structure of an integral affine manifold with singularities, with singular locus  $\Delta \subset B$ . We fix a submonoid  $Q \subset N_1(X)$  containing all effective curve classes, where  $N_1(X)$  denotes the abelian group generated by projective irreducible curves in  $X$  modulo numerical equivalence [18, Defn 1.8]. The canonical scattering diagram associated to  $(X, D)$  is then given by pairs

$$\mathfrak{D}_{(X,D)} := \{(\mathfrak{d}, f_{\mathfrak{d}})\}$$

of walls  $\mathfrak{d} \subset B$ , along with attached functions  $f_{\mathfrak{d}}$  that are elements of the completion of  $\mathbb{k}[\mathcal{P}_x^+]$  at the ideal generated by  $Q \setminus \{0\}$ , where  $\mathcal{P}_x^+ = \Lambda_x \times Q$ ,  $x \in \text{Int } \mathfrak{d}$  is a general point and  $\Lambda$  is the local system of integral vector fields on  $B \setminus \Delta$ . These functions  $f_{\mathfrak{d}}$  are concretely given by

$$f_{\mathfrak{d}} = \exp(k_{\tau} N_{\tilde{\tau}} t^{\underline{\beta}} z^{-u})$$

where  $\tilde{\tau} = (\tau, \underline{\beta})$  ranges over types of  $\dim X - 2$ -dimensional families of tropical maps associated to punctured curves with only one puncture, as described previously. Here  $t^{\underline{\beta}} z^{-u}$  denotes the monomial in  $\mathbb{k}[\mathcal{P}_x^+]$  associated to  $(-u, \underline{\beta})$ . The wall  $\mathfrak{d}$  is swept out by the image of the leg of the type  $\tau$  corresponding to the punctured point, hence is determined purely combinatorially from  $\tau$ . The contact order of the punctured point is recorded in the tangent vector  $u \in \Lambda_x$  and  $k_{\tau}$  is a positive integer depending only on the tropical type  $\tau$  [24, §2.4] or [25, (3.10)].

**1.2. Main results.** In this article we show that punctured log invariants can be captured combinatorially from scattering diagrams. For this, we connect the canonical scattering diagram of  $(X, D)$ , defined using punctured Gromov-Witten invariants of  $X$ , where  $X$  is as in (1.1), to an algorithmically constructed toric scattering diagram associated to  $X_{\Sigma}$  and  $H$ . Here  $H$  is given as in (1.2) by hypersurfaces  $H_i \subset D_{\rho_i}$ . We denote the primitive generator of  $\rho_i$  by  $m_i$ , and write the decomposition of  $H_i$  into connected components as

$$H_i = \bigcup_{j=1}^{s_i} H_{ij}.$$

We define the toric scattering diagram  $\mathfrak{D}_{(X_{\Sigma}, H)}$  consisting of codimension one closed subsets  $\mathfrak{d} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ , referred to as walls, along with attached functions  $f_{\mathfrak{d}}$ . Here  $\mathbb{R}^n$  is the vector space in which the fan  $\Sigma$  lives. To define these functions, first take

$$P = M \oplus \bigoplus_{i=1}^s \mathbb{N}^{s_i},$$

where  $M$  is the cocharacter lattice associated with  $X_{\Sigma}$ . Let  $P^{\times}$  be the group of units of  $P$ , and  $\mathfrak{m}_P = P \setminus P^{\times}$ . Denote by  $\widehat{\mathbb{k}[P]}$  the completion of  $\mathbb{k}[P]$  with respect to  $\mathfrak{m}_P$ . We write  $e_{i_1}, \dots, e_{i_{s_i}}$  for the generators of  $\mathbb{N}^{s_i}$ , and  $t_{ij} := z^{e_{ij}} \in \widehat{\mathbb{k}[P]}$ . We

describe the initial scattering diagram  $\mathfrak{D}_{(X_\Sigma, H), \text{in}}$  whose walls are given by the tropical hypersurfaces associated to  $H_{ij}$ , forming the walls. We then set the attached functions to be powers of

$$f_{ij} := 1 + t_{ij}z^{m_i}$$

determined by the weights of the tropical hypersurface corresponding to  $H_{ij}$ . See §5.1.3 for more details.

For each wall  $\mathfrak{d}$ , we specify a primitive  $m_0 \in M \setminus \{0\}$  tangent to  $\mathfrak{d}$ , called the direction of the wall. We say the wall is *incoming* if  $\mathfrak{d} = \mathfrak{d} - \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}m_0$ . Moreover, for a sufficiently general path, we define the standard notion of a path ordered product by considering the composition of all the automorphisms attached to the walls  $\mathfrak{d}$  which are crossed by this path. These automorphisms are determined from the attached functions  $f_{\mathfrak{d}}$ . A scattering diagram is said to be *consistent* if all path ordered products around loops are the identity. We prove the higher dimensional analogue of the Kontsevich–Soibelman Lemma [29] in Theorem 5.6:

**Theorem 1.1.** *There is a consistent scattering diagram  $\mathfrak{S}(\mathfrak{D}) = \mathfrak{D}_{(X_\Sigma, H)}$  containing  $\mathfrak{D}_{(X_\Sigma, H), \text{in}}$  such that  $\mathfrak{D}_{(X_\Sigma, H)} \setminus \mathfrak{D}_{(X_\Sigma, H), \text{in}}$  consists only of non-incoming walls. Further, this scattering diagram is unique up to equivalence.*

We note that in theory, this statement can be extracted from [21], but because of the complexity of the global arguments used in [21], it is essentially impossible to extract a precise reference, and we find it better to present an independent proof here.

We then show that the associated consistent scattering diagram  $\mathfrak{D}_{(X_\Sigma, H)}$  indeed captures punctured log invariants. For this we compare  $\mathfrak{D}_{(X_\Sigma, H)}$  with the canonical scattering diagram associated to  $(X, D)$ . It follows essentially from the definition of the tropicalization of  $(X, D)$  that there is a natural piecewise-linear isomorphism

$$\Upsilon : (M_{\mathbb{R}}, \Sigma) \rightarrow (B, \mathcal{P}).$$

This allows us to compare the scattering diagrams  $\mathfrak{D}_{(X_\Sigma, H)}$  and  $\mathfrak{D}_{(X, D)}$  as follows. We first introduce some additional notation. Let  $E_i^j$  denote an exceptional curve of the blow-up (1.1) over the hypersurface  $H_{ij}$ . There is a natural splitting  $N_1(X) = N_1(X_\Sigma) \oplus \bigoplus_{ij} \mathbb{Z}E_i^j$  in which  $N_1(X_\Sigma)$  is identified with the set of curve classes in  $N_1(X)$  with intersection number zero with all exceptional divisors.

A wall of  $\mathfrak{D}_{(X_\Sigma, H)}$  is necessarily of the form

$$\left( \mathfrak{d}, f_{\mathfrak{d}} \left( \prod_{ij} (t_{ij}z^{m_i})^{a_{ij}} \right) \right)$$

for some non-negative integers  $a_{ij}$ , where the notation  $f_{\mathfrak{d}}\left(\prod_{i,j}(t_{ij}z^{m_i})^{a_{ij}}\right)$  indicates that  $f_{\mathfrak{d}}$  is a power-series in the expression  $\prod_{i,j}(t_{ij}z^{m_i})^{a_{ij}}$ , for some collection of exponents  $a_{ij} \in \mathbb{N}$ . We will define  $\Upsilon(\mathfrak{d}, f_{\mathfrak{d}})$ , a wall on  $B$ . The definition depends on whether  $(\mathfrak{d}, f_{\mathfrak{d}})$  is incoming or not. In any event, we may assume, after refining the walls of  $\mathfrak{D}_{(X_{\Sigma}, H)}$ , that each wall of this scattering diagram is contained in some cone  $\sigma \in \Sigma$ .

If the wall is incoming, then by construction of  $\mathfrak{D}_{(X_{\Sigma}, H)}$  it is of the form  $(\mathfrak{d}, (1 + t_{ij}z^{m_i})^{w_{ij}})$  for some positive integer  $w_{ij}$ . As  $m_i$  is tangent to the cone of  $\Sigma$  containing  $\mathfrak{d}$  and  $\Upsilon$  is piecewise linear with respect to  $\Sigma$ ,  $\Upsilon_*(m_i)$  makes sense as a tangent vector to  $B$ . We then define

$$\Upsilon(\mathfrak{d}, (1 + t_{ij}z^{m_i})^{w_{ij}}) = (\Upsilon(\mathfrak{d}), (1 + t^{E_i^j} z^{-\Upsilon_*(m_i)})^{w_{ij}}).$$

If the wall is not incoming, with  $\mathfrak{d} \subseteq \sigma \in \Sigma$ , then the data  $\mathbf{A} = \{a_{ij}\}$  and  $\sigma$  determine a curve class  $\bar{\beta}_{\mathbf{A}, \sigma} \in N_1(X_{\Sigma})$  – see §6 for the precise details of this curve class. Under the inclusion  $N_1(X_{\Sigma}) \hookrightarrow N_1(X)$  given by the above mentioned splitting, we may view  $\bar{\beta}_{\mathbf{A}, \sigma}$  as a curve class in  $N_1(X)$ , which we also denote by  $\bar{\beta}_{\mathbf{A}, \sigma}$ . We then obtain a curve class

$$\beta_{\mathbf{A}, \sigma} = \bar{\beta}_{\mathbf{A}, \sigma} - \sum_{ij} a_{ij} E_i^j.$$

Further, as  $m_{\text{out}} := -\sum_{ij} a_{ij} m_i$  is tangent to the cone of  $\Sigma$  containing  $\mathfrak{d}$ , as before  $\Upsilon_*(m_{\text{out}})$  makes sense as a tangent vector to  $B$ . We may thus define the wall

$$\Upsilon(\mathfrak{d}, f_{\mathfrak{d}}) = (\Upsilon(\mathfrak{d}), f_{\mathfrak{d}}(t^{\beta_{\mathbf{A}, \sigma}} z^{-\Upsilon_*(m_{\text{out}})})). \quad (1.3)$$

We then define

$$\Upsilon(\mathfrak{D}_{(X_{\Sigma}, H)}) := \{\Upsilon(\mathfrak{d}, f_{\mathfrak{d}}) \mid (\mathfrak{d}, f_{\mathfrak{d}}) \in \mathfrak{D}_{(X_{\Sigma}, H)}\}.$$

To compare this scattering diagram with the canonical scattering diagram  $\mathfrak{D}_{(X, D)}$  we consider a degeneration  $(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D})$  obtained from a blow-up of the degeneration to the normal cone of  $X_{\Sigma}$ , with general fiber  $(X, D)$ . We view the canonical scattering diagram  $\mathfrak{D}_{(X, D)}$  as a scattering diagram that is embedded into  $\mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D})}$ , and denote it by  $\iota(\mathfrak{D}_{(X, D)})$  in (2.36).

Our main result, Theorem 6.1, then states:

**Theorem 1.2.**  $\Upsilon(\mathfrak{D}_{(X_{\Sigma}, H)})$  is equivalent to  $\mathfrak{D}_{(X, D)}$ .

Here two scattering diagrams are equivalent if they induce the same wall-crossing automorphisms. To prove Theorem 6.1, we consider a degeneration  $(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D})$  obtained from a blow-up of the degeneration to the normal cone of  $X_{\Sigma}$ ,

with general fiber  $(X, D)$ . This generalizes a degeneration used in [19]. We investigate the canonical scattering diagram associated to  $(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D})$ , which has support in the tropicalization  $\tilde{B}$  of  $(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D})$ . This tropicalization comes naturally with a projection map

$$\tilde{p} : \tilde{B} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}.$$

Hence, we obtain a scattering diagram  $\mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D})}^1$  supported on  $\tilde{B}_1 := \tilde{p}^{-1}(1)$ , which is an integral affine manifold with singularities away from the origin. Effectively, this process pulls apart the singular locus of  $B$  into pieces of singular locus which take a standard form. As first hinted at in [23, §4] but carried out rigorously for the first time here, the monodromy around these standard pieces of singular locus go a long way to determining the structure of the canonical scattering diagram, see Lemmas 4.20, 4.21. Localizing to the origin  $0 \in \tilde{B}_1$  we obtain a scattering diagram

$$T_0\mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D})}^1 := \{(T_0\mathfrak{d}, f_{\mathfrak{d}}) \mid (\mathfrak{d}, f_{\mathfrak{d}}) \in \mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D})}^1, \quad 0 \in \mathfrak{d}\} \quad (1.4)$$

defined in (5.1), where  $T_0\tilde{B}_1$  denotes the tangent space to  $0 \in \tilde{B}_1$ . We then define a scattering diagram  $\nu(\mathfrak{D}_{(X_{\Sigma}, H)})$  in (6.4), where  $\nu$  is induced by a linear isomorphism  $M_{\mathbb{R}} \rightarrow T_0\tilde{B}_1$ . One of the key results is Theorem 6.2, which states that the scattering diagram  $T_0\mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D})}^1$  is equivalent to  $\nu(\mathfrak{D}_{(X_{\Sigma}, H)})$ .

At a second step we consider the asymptotic scattering diagram  $\mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D})}^{1, \text{as}}$ , given by Definition 3.12. Proposition 3.13 shows that  $\mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D})}^{1, \text{as}}$  is equivalent to  $\iota(\mathfrak{D}_{(X, D)})$ . In §6 we then define a piecewise-linear isomorphism

$$\mu : M_{\mathbb{R}} \longrightarrow \tilde{B}_0 = \tilde{p}^{-1}(0) \cong B$$

which induces the equivalence of scattering diagrams  $\mu(T_0\mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D})}^1)$  and  $\mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D})}^{1, \text{as}}$ , and hence  $\iota(\mathfrak{D}_{(X, D)})$ . The map  $\Upsilon$  is then given by the composition  $\Upsilon = \mu \circ \nu$ .

Using Theorem 6.1, we capture the punctured Gromov-Witten invariants of  $X$  appearing in the canonical scattering diagram  $\mathfrak{D}_{(X, D)}$ , combinatorially from the toric scattering diagram  $\mathfrak{D}_{(X_{\Sigma}, H)}$ . As a concrete example we analyse the punctured invariants of the log Calabi–Yau obtained from a non-toric blow-up of  $\mathbb{P}^3$  with center the union of two disjoint lines. The associated canonical scattering diagram in this case has infinitely many walls. However, after appropriate cancellations, we obtain a minimal scattering diagram equivalent to it. By the aid of computer algebra, in joint work with Tom Coates [7] we obtain punctured log invariants of log Calabi–Yau varieties as well as explicit equations of the coordinate ring to Fano varieties in higher dimensions in greater generality.

**1.3. Related work.** In [27], Keel and Yu obtain some analogous results using non-Archimedean techniques. In particular, there the authors work with log Calabi-Yau pairs  $(X, D)$  such that  $X \setminus D$  is affine and contains a copy of a  $\dim X$ -dimensional torus. They construct a scattering diagram, not using punctured invariants, but by detecting the influence of walls on broken lines. In the cluster variety case, when  $(X, D)$  is obtained as in our situation by blowing up a collection of hypertori in irreducible components of  $D$ , it follows from [27, §22] that this scattering diagram agrees with the canonical scattering diagram after pulling singularities to infinity as explained in §3. In the cluster case if the power series expansion of the function  $f_{\mathfrak{d}}$  attached to a wall  $\mathfrak{d}$  of the minimal canonical scattering diagram associated to a log Calabi-Yau  $(X, D)$  is given by

$$f_{\mathfrak{d}} = \sum_m c_m z^m$$

as in (2.20), then in [27] it is shown that the coefficients  $c_m$  are always non-negative integers which are counts of non-Archimedean cylinders. In our paper we give a direct enumerative interpretation of the coefficients of  $\log(f_{\mathfrak{d}})$  in terms of punctured log invariants which are in general rational numbers (see (2.33)). So, comparing these two interpretations, in the cluster case we obtain non-trivial relations between the counts of non-Archimedean cylinders and punctured log invariants. The integrality of the coefficients  $c_m$  however is not geometrically clear from the point of view of punctured log invariants.

In [9], Bousseau shows that in the two dimensional case a refined version of the toric scattering diagram captures higher genus log Gromov-Witten invariants of log Calabi-Yau surfaces as well. It is a natural question to ask if there is a higher genus version of our genus 0 results.

Earlier work of Mandel [32] explored the tropical enumerative interpretation of higher dimensional scattering diagrams in the case arising from cluster varieties (corresponding here to only blowing up hypertori). His interpretation was analogous to that given in [19, §2]. This description has connections with DT theories [6, 10], and thus combining our results with theirs should give a description of certain punctured invariants in terms of a sum over certain tropical curves which in some cases also correspond to DT invariants. Also related is the work of [33], where Mandel makes use, in the cluster case, to the same type of degeneration used here to analyze the Gromov-Witten invariants arising in the product rule for theta functions.

*Acknowledgements:* This project had its genesis in discussions with Rahul Pandharipande and Bernd Siebert in 2011 aiming to generalize the results of



[19] to higher dimension. However, it became clear at that time that the necessary Gromov-Witten technology had not yet been developed, and the project became dormant. The authors of this paper returned to that project in many useful conversations with Tom Coates, who provided important help with the computational tools that were necessary to understand concrete examples. We thank all of these collaborators, as well as Paul Hacking and Sean Keel, whose collaboration with the second author led to the search for a canonical scattering diagram in all dimensions. In addition, we would like to thank Pierrick Bousseau for several insightful discussions. During the preparation of this project H.A. received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (grant agreement No. 682603) and from Fondation Mathématique Jacques Hadamard, and M.G. would like to acknowledge support of EPSRC grant EP/N03189X/1 and a Royal Society Wolfson Research Merit Award.

## 2. CANONICAL SCATTERING FOR LOG CALABI–YAU VARIETIES

In this section we review the construction of the canonical scattering diagram, as announced in [24], and developed in [25], where it is called the canonical wall structure. This is a combinatorial gadget which provides a recipe for the construction of the coordinate ring of the mirror of a log Calabi-Yau pair  $(X, D)$ .

### 2.1. Tropical log Calabi–Yau spaces.

2.1.1. *The affine manifold  $(B, \mathcal{P})$ .* For this discussion, we fix an  $n$ -dimensional log Calabi–Yau pair  $(X, D)$ . We distinguish between two cases, the *absolute case*, where  $X$  is assumed to be projective over  $\mathbb{k}$ , and the *relative case*, where we are given a projective morphism

$$p : X \longrightarrow \mathbb{A}^1$$

with  $p^{-1}(0) \subset D$ . We further assume in this case that  $p$  is a normal crossings morphism, that is, that étale locally on  $X$ ,  $p$  is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{A}^n &\longrightarrow \mathbb{A}^1 \\ (x_1, \dots, x_n) &\longmapsto \prod_i x_i^{a_i} \end{aligned}$$

with  $a_i \geq 0$ . Further, in this local description, there exists an index set  $J \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$  with

$$D = V\left(\prod_{j \in J} x_j\right)$$

and  $p^{-1}(0) \subseteq D$ . In the language of logarithmic geometry used later, this makes  $p$  a log smooth morphism.

We define the *tropicalization*  $(B, \mathcal{P})$  of  $(X, D)$ , which we refer to as the *tropical space associated to*  $(X, D)$ , as a polyhedral cone complex as follows. Let  $\text{Div}(X)$  denote the group of divisors on  $X$ , and  $\text{Div}_D(X) \subseteq \text{Div}(X)$  be the subgroup of divisors supported on  $D$ , and

$$\text{Div}_D(X)_{\mathbb{R}} = \text{Div}_D(X) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{R}.$$

Let  $D = \bigcup_{i=1}^m D_i$  be the decomposition of  $D$  into irreducible components, and write  $\{D_i^*\}$  for the dual basis of  $\text{Div}_D(X)_{\mathbb{R}}^*$ . We assume throughout that for any index subset  $I \subseteq \{1, \dots, m\}$ , if non-empty,  $\bigcap_{i \in I} D_i$  is connected. Define  $\mathcal{P}$  to be the collection of cones

$$\mathcal{P} := \left\{ \sum_{i \in I} \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} D_i^* \mid I \subseteq \{1, \dots, m\} \text{ such that } \bigcap_{i \in I} D_i \neq \emptyset \right\}. \quad (2.1)$$

Then we have

$$B := \bigcup_{\tau \in \mathcal{P}} \tau \subseteq \text{Div}_D(X)_{\mathbb{R}}^*.$$

In what follows, we only consider pairs  $(X, D)$  which are *maximally degenerate*, that is, for which  $\dim_{\mathbb{R}} B = \dim X = n$ . This means there exists an index set  $I$  such that  $\bigcap_{i \in I} D_i \neq \emptyset$  and  $\dim \bigcap_{i \in I} D_i = 0$ .

Given any cone  $\rho \in \mathcal{P}$ , we can write  $\rho = \sum_{i \in I} \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} D_i^*$  for some index set  $I$ , and then

$$D_{\rho} := \bigcap_{i \in I} D_i \quad (2.2)$$

is the stratum of  $(X, D)$  corresponding to  $\rho$ . Hence, the polyhedral decomposition  $\mathcal{P}$  induces a natural stratification on  $X$ , given by all the strata corresponding to cones in  $\mathcal{P}$ .

We continue with the notational conventions of [18] from now on. More generally in the sequel, we will be working with pairs  $(B, \mathcal{P})$  where  $B$  is a topological space of dimension  $n$  and  $\mathcal{P}$  is a polyhedral decomposition of  $B$ . We refer to cells of dimensions 0, 1 and  $n$  as *vertices*, *edges* and *maximal cells*. The set of  $k$ -cells are denoted by  $\mathcal{P}^{[k]}$  and we write  $\mathcal{P}^{\max} := \mathcal{P}^{[n]}$  for the set of maximal cells. A cell  $\rho \in \mathcal{P}^{[n-1]}$  only contained in one maximal cell is said to lie on the *boundary* of  $B$ , and we let  $\partial B$  be the union of all  $(n-1)$ -cells lying on the boundary of  $B$ . Any cell of  $\mathcal{P}$  contained in  $\partial B$  is called a *boundary cell*. Cells not contained in  $\partial B$  are called *interior*, defining  $\overset{\circ}{\mathcal{P}} \subseteq \mathcal{P}$ . Thus  $\mathcal{P}_{\partial} := \mathcal{P} \setminus \overset{\circ}{\mathcal{P}}$  is the induced polyhedral decomposition of  $\partial B$ . If  $\tau \in \mathcal{P}$ , we denote the *(open) star* of  $\tau$  to be

$$\text{Star}(\tau) := \bigcup_{\tau \subseteq \rho \in \mathcal{P}} \text{Int}(\rho), \quad (2.3)$$

where  $\text{Int}(\rho)$  denotes the interior of the cell  $\rho$ .

For  $\sigma \in \mathcal{P}$ , we denote by  $\Lambda_\sigma$  the lattice of integral tangent vectors to  $\sigma$ . We do so similarly for any rational polyhedral subset of  $\sigma \in \mathcal{P}$ .

The tuple  $(B, \mathcal{P})$ , consisting of  $B$  endowed with the polyhedral decomposition  $\mathcal{P}$  defined in (2.1), can be given the structure of an affine manifold with singularities, following [24, §2.4], [25, §1.3] and [35]. Recall that an *affine manifold* is a topological manifold together with an atlas whose transition maps lie in the group of affine transformations

$$\text{Aff}(M_{\mathbb{R}}) := M_{\mathbb{R}} \rtimes GL_n(\mathbb{R}),$$

of  $M_{\mathbb{R}} = M \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{R}$  for a fixed lattice  $M \cong \mathbb{Z}^n$ . We refer to such an atlas as an *affine structure*. We call an affine manifold *integral* if the change of coordinate transformations lie in

$$\text{Aff}(M) := M \rtimes GL_n(\mathbb{Z}).$$

An (integral) *affine manifold with singularities* is a topological manifold  $B$  which admits an (integral) affine structure on a subset  $B \setminus \Delta$ , where  $\Delta \subset B$  is a union of submanifolds of  $B$  of codimension at least 2. The union of these submanifolds is called the *discriminant locus* of  $B$ .

In our situation, when  $(B, \mathcal{P})$  is the tropicalization of  $(X, D)$ , we take the discriminant locus  $\Delta \subseteq B$  to be the union of codimension  $\geq 2$  cones of  $\mathcal{P}$ . We describe an integral affine structure on  $B \setminus \Delta$  as follows. For every codimension one cone  $\rho$  contained in two maximal cones  $\sigma$  and  $\sigma'$ , we give an affine coordinate chart on  $\text{Int}(\sigma \cup \sigma') = \text{Star}(\rho)$ , induced by a piecewise linear embedding

$$\psi_\rho : \sigma \cup \sigma' \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n.$$

This embedding is chosen to satisfy the following conditions. Let  $m_1, \dots, m_{n-1}$  be the primitive generators of the edges  $\tau_1, \dots, \tau_{n-1}$  of  $\rho$ , and let  $m_n, m'_n$  be the primitive generators of the additional edges  $\tau_n, \tau'_n$  of  $\sigma$  and  $\sigma'$  respectively. We then require that  $\psi_\rho$  identifies  $\sigma \cup \sigma'$  with the support of a fan  $\Sigma_\rho$  in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , consisting of cones  $\psi_\rho(\sigma), \psi_\rho(\sigma')$  and their faces. Further, we require that  $\psi_\rho(\sigma), \psi_\rho(\sigma')$  are standard cones with integral generators

$$\{\psi_\rho(m_1), \dots, \psi_\rho(m_n)\} \quad \text{and} \quad \{\psi_\rho(m_1), \dots, \psi_\rho(m_{n-1}), \psi_\rho(m'_n)\}$$

respectively. Finally, we require that

$$\psi_\rho(m_n) + \psi_\rho(m'_n) = - \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} (D_{\tau_j} \cdot D_\rho) \psi_\rho(m_j). \quad (2.4)$$

Here  $\psi_\rho$  is determined by (2.4) up to elements of  $GL_n(\mathbb{Z})$ .

*Remark 2.1.* The motivation for (2.4) is that the fan  $\Sigma_\rho$  has the property that in the toric variety  $X_{\Sigma_\rho}$ ,

$$D_{\psi_\rho(\tau_j)} \cdot D_{\psi_\rho(\rho)} = D_{\tau_j} \cdot D_\rho,$$

where on the left we write  $D_\omega$  for the closed stratum of  $X_{\Sigma_\rho}$  corresponding to  $\omega \in \Sigma_\rho$ . This follows from [36], pg. 52.

*Remark 2.2.* In the relative case, the morphism  $p : X \rightarrow \mathbb{A}^1$  induces a canonical map

$$p_{\text{trop}} : B \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}.$$

This arises functorially from the logarithmic point of view introduced later. However, for now, we may view this as arising from the description of  $B$  as a subset of  $\text{Div}_D(X)_{\mathbb{R}}^*$ . We view the fibre  $X_0$  as a divisor on  $X$  supported on  $D$ , hence defining a functional on  $\text{Div}_D(X)_{\mathbb{R}}^*$ . Its restriction to  $B$  gives the map  $p_{\text{trop}}$ . It is easy to see that this is an affine submersion where the affine structure of  $B$  is defined, see [25, Prop. 1.14].

If  $t \in \mathbb{A}^1$  is general, then  $(X_t, D_t)$  is also a log Calabi-Yau variety with dual complex denoted as  $(B_0, \mathcal{P}_0)$ . It is easy to see that  $B_0 = p_{\text{trop}}^{-1}(0)$  and  $\mathcal{P}_0 = \{\sigma \cap p_{\text{trop}}^{-1}(0) \mid \sigma \in \mathcal{P}\}$ . Further, if  $(X_t, D_t)$  is maximally degenerate, i.e.,  $\dim X_t = \dim B_0$ , then  $B_0 = \partial B$ , and the affine structure on  $B_0$  is the natural affine structure inherited from the affine structure on  $B$ . See [25, Prop. 1.18].

While in the construction of the affine structure, we took  $\Delta$  to be the union of all codimension two cones of  $\mathcal{P}$ , it will be an important point for us that sometimes the affine structure on  $B \setminus \Delta$  extends to a larger subset of  $B$ , i.e., that we only need to take  $\Delta$  to be a union of *some* set of codimension  $\geq 2$  cones of  $\mathcal{P}$ . Note in this case that if  $\tau \in \mathcal{P}$  with  $\tau \not\subseteq \Delta$ , then  $\text{Star}(\tau) \cap \Delta = \emptyset$ . The following will be useful for analyzing the structure of  $B$  around  $\tau$ :

**Proposition 2.3.** *Let  $\tau \in \mathcal{P}$  be a cone satisfying the following conditions:*

- *The corresponding stratum  $D_\tau$  is toric with fan  $\Sigma_\tau \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ , where  $d = \text{codim } \tau$ .*
- *The restriction of the stratification on  $X$  induced by  $\mathcal{P}$  to  $D_\tau$  agrees with the stratification of  $D_\tau$  into its toric strata.*

*Then the affine structure on  $\text{Star}(\tau) \setminus \Delta$  extends to an affine structure on  $\text{Star}(\tau)$ . Further, there exists an affine submersion  $v : \text{Star}(\tau) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  such that for each  $\omega \in \Sigma_\tau$ ,*

$$v^{-1}(\text{Int}(\omega)) = \text{Int}(\rho)$$

*for some element  $\rho \in \mathcal{P}$  with  $\tau \subseteq \rho$ .*

*Proof.* We will give an affine chart  $\psi_\tau : \text{Star}(\tau) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  as follows. First, with  $n = \dim X$ , using (2.2), we can write  $D_\tau$  as the intersection of divisors

$$D_\tau = \bigcap_{j=1}^{n-d} D_{i_j}$$

for some distinct indices  $i_1, \dots, i_{n-d}$ . If  $\tau \subseteq \rho \in \mathcal{P}$ , then by assumption  $D_\rho$  is a toric strata of  $D_\tau$ , and there is a corresponding cone  $\rho_\tau \in \Sigma_\tau$ . In particular, if  $D_\rho$  is a divisor on  $D_\tau$ , let  $m_\rho \in \mathbb{Z}^d$  be the primitive generator of the ray  $\rho_\tau$ .

Now as  $\mathcal{O}_X(D_{i_j})|_{D_\tau}$  is a line bundle on  $D_\tau$ , it is determined, up to a linear function, by a function  $\psi_j : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  piecewise linear with respect to  $\Sigma_\tau$  and with integral slopes. Choose such a function for each  $j$ . We may then define an embedding

$$\psi_\tau : \bigcup_{\tau \subseteq \rho \in \mathcal{P}} \rho \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$$

as follows. Split  $\mathbb{R}^n = \mathbb{R}^{n-d} \oplus \mathbb{R}^d$ , and let  $e_1, \dots, e_{n-d}$  be the standard basis for  $\mathbb{R}^{n-d}$ . Then take

$$\psi_\tau(D_{i_j}^*) = -e_j, \quad 1 \leq j \leq n-d.$$

Further, if  $k$  is an index such that  $D_k \cap D_\tau$  is a non-empty divisor  $D_\rho$  on  $D_\tau$ , then define

$$\psi_\tau(D_k^*) = \sum_{j=1}^{n-d} \psi_j(m_\rho) e_j + (0, m_\rho),$$

where for the last term, we are using the splitting of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . We then extend  $\psi_\tau$  linearly on each cone containing  $\rho$ .

It is easy to check that this map is injective and thus defines an affine structure on  $\text{Star}(\tau)$ . Restricting to  $\text{Star}(\tau)$  the composition of  $\psi_\tau$  with the projection onto the  $\mathbb{R}^d$  factor gives an affine submersion. We claim that this is the desired map  $v$ . For this it suffices to check that the affine structure defined by  $\psi_\tau$  is compatible with the affine structure on  $B$ . To do this, fix cones  $\sigma, \sigma' \in \mathcal{P}^{\max}$  with  $\tau \subseteq \rho = \sigma \cap \sigma'$ , and  $\rho \in \mathcal{P}^{[n-1]}$ . We have corresponding cones  $\sigma_\tau, \sigma'_\tau, \rho_\tau \in \Sigma_\tau$ . Let  $i_{n-d+1}, \dots, i_n$  be indices so that  $D_{i_1}^*, \dots, D_{i_n}^*$  span  $\sigma$ , with  $D_{i_n}^* \notin \sigma'$  and let  $i'_n$  be an index so that  $D_{i_1}^*, \dots, D_{i_{n-1}}^*, D_{i'_n}^*$  span  $\sigma'$ . Then by (2.4), we need to show that

$$\psi_\tau(D_{i_n}^*) + \psi_\tau(D_{i'_n}^*) = - \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} (D_{i_j} \cdot D_\rho) \psi_\tau(D_{i_j}^*).$$

The right-hand side is

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n-d} \left( D_{i_j} \cdot D_\rho - \sum_{k=n-d+1}^{n-1} (D_{i_k} \cdot D_\rho) \psi_j(v(D_{i_k}^*)) \right) e_j - \sum_{j=n-d+1}^{n-1} (D_{i_j} \cdot D_\rho) (0, v(D_{i_j}^*)). \quad (2.5)$$

The left-hand side is

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n-d} (\psi_j(v(D_{i_n}^*)) + \psi_j(v(D_{i'_n}^*)))e_j + (0, v(D_{i_n}^*) + v(D_{i'_n}^*)). \quad (2.6)$$

In the fan  $\Sigma_\tau$  we have the equation, as in Remark 2.1,

$$v(D_{i_n}^*) + v(D_{i'_n}^*) + \sum_{j=n-d+1}^{n-1} (D_{i_j} \cdot D_\rho)v(D_{i_j}^*) = 0,$$

so the equality of the last terms in (2.5) and (2.6) follows immediately. The result then follows since

$$\psi_j(v(D_{i_n}^*)) + \psi_j(v(D_{i'_n}^*)) + \sum_{k=n-d+1}^{n-1} (D_{i_k} \cdot D_\rho)\psi_j(v(D_{i_k}^*)) = \deg \mathcal{O}(D_{i_j})|_{D_\rho} = D_{i_j} \cdot D_\rho$$

by standard toric geometry.  $\square$

*Remark 2.4.* The chart constructed in the proof of Proposition 2.3 identifies the collection of cones

$$\mathcal{P}_\tau := \{\rho \in \mathcal{P} \mid \text{there exists } \omega \in \mathcal{P} \text{ with } \tau, \rho \subseteq \omega\}$$

with a fan  $\Sigma$  in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . For a cone  $\rho \in \mathcal{P}_\tau$ , write  $\psi_\tau(\rho)$  for the corresponding cone in  $\Sigma$ . The relationship between  $X$  and the toric variety  $X_\Sigma$  is then as follows. First,  $D_\tau \cong D_{\psi_\tau(\tau)}$ , the stratum of  $X_\Sigma$  corresponding to the cone  $\psi_\tau(\tau)$ . Second, if  $\rho \in \mathcal{P}_\tau$  is an edge, then  $\mathcal{O}_X(D_\rho)|_{D_\tau} \cong \mathcal{O}_{X_\Sigma}(D_{\psi_\tau(\rho)})|_{D_{\psi_\tau(\tau)}}$ . This can be checked easily via the construction and standard facts of toric geometry.

2.1.2. *The MVPL function  $\varphi$ .* Let us define  $N_1(X)$  to be the abelian group generated by projective irreducible curves in  $X$  modulo numerical equivalence. We fix a finitely generated, saturated submonoid  $Q \subset N_1(X)$  containing all effective curve classes, such that

$$Q^\times := Q \cap (-Q) = \{0\}.$$

Let  $\mathfrak{m} \subseteq \mathbb{k}[Q]$  be the monomial ideal generated by monomials in  $Q \setminus Q^\times$ , and fix an ideal  $I \subseteq \mathbb{k}[Q]$  with  $\sqrt{I} = \mathfrak{m}$ . We write  $A_I := \mathbb{k}[Q]/I$ . For  $\beta \in Q$ , we write  $t^\beta \in \mathbb{k}[Q]$  for the corresponding monomial.

Another key piece of data is a *multivalued piecewise linear* (MVPL) function  $\varphi$  on  $B \setminus \Delta$  with values in  $Q_{\mathbb{R}}^{\text{gp}}$ , see [18, Def. 1.8]. This is determined by specifying a piecewise linear function  $\varphi_\rho$  on  $\text{Star}(\rho)$  for each  $\rho \in \mathring{\mathcal{P}}$  of codimension one, well-defined up to linear functions. Such a function is determined by specifying its kinks  $\kappa_\rho \in Q^{\text{gp}}$  for each codimension one cone  $\rho \in \mathring{\mathcal{P}}$ , defined as follows [18, Def. 1.6, Prop. 1.9].

**Definition 2.5.** Let  $\rho \in \mathring{\mathcal{P}}$  be a codimension one cone and let  $\sigma, \sigma'$  be the two maximal cells containing  $\rho$ , and let  $\varphi_\rho$  be a piecewise linear function on  $\text{Star}(\rho) \subset B \setminus \Delta$ . An affine chart at  $x \in \text{Int } \rho$  thus provides an identification  $\Lambda_\sigma = \Lambda_{\sigma'} =: \Lambda_x$ . Let  $\delta : \Lambda_x \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$  be the quotient by  $\Lambda_\rho \subseteq \Lambda_x$ . Fix signs by requiring that  $\delta$  is non-negative on tangent vectors pointing from  $\rho$  into  $\sigma'$ . Let  $n, n' \in \check{\Lambda}_x \otimes Q^{\text{gp}}$  be the slopes of  $\varphi_\rho|_\sigma, \varphi_\rho|_{\sigma'}$ , respectively. Then  $(n' - n)(\Lambda_\rho) = 0$  and hence there exists  $\kappa_\rho \in Q^{\text{gp}}$  with

$$n' - n = \delta \cdot \kappa_\rho. \quad (2.7)$$

We refer to  $\kappa_\rho$  as the *kink* of  $\varphi_\rho$  along  $\rho$ . Thus if  $\varphi$  is an MVPL function, it has a well-defined kink  $\kappa_\rho$  for each such  $\rho$ , and these kinks determine  $\varphi$ .

We assume in what follows that  $\varphi$  is *convex*, i.e.,  $\kappa_\rho \in Q \setminus \{0\}$  for all  $\rho$ . The choice of  $\varphi$  gives rise (see [18, Def. 1.15]) to a local system  $\mathcal{P}$  on  $B \setminus \Delta$  fitting into an exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \underline{Q}^{\text{gp}} \rightarrow \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \Lambda \rightarrow 0. \quad (2.8)$$

Here  $\underline{Q}^{\text{gp}}$  is the constant sheaf with stalk  $Q^{\text{gp}}$ , while  $\Lambda$  is the sheaf of integral tangent vectors on  $B \setminus \Delta$ . For an element  $m \in \mathcal{P}_x$ , we write  $\bar{m} \in \Lambda_x$  for its image under the projection of (2.8). We may give an alternative description of  $\mathcal{P}$  as in [16, Const. 2.2]. If  $\rho \in \mathring{\mathcal{P}}$  is codimension one, choose a local representative  $\varphi_\rho : \text{Star}(\rho) \rightarrow Q_{\mathbb{R}}^{\text{gp}}$  for  $\varphi$ , that is,  $\varphi_\rho$  is a single-valued piecewise linear function with kink  $\kappa_\rho$ . If  $\rho, \sigma \in \mathring{\mathcal{P}}$  with  $\rho$  codimension one and  $\sigma$  maximal, then there exists trivializations

$$\chi_\rho : \mathcal{P}|_{\text{Star}(\rho)} \cong \Lambda|_{\text{Star}(\rho)} \times Q^{\text{gp}} \quad (2.9)$$

and

$$\chi_\sigma : \mathcal{P}|_{\text{Star}(\sigma)} \cong \Lambda|_{\text{Star}(\sigma)} \times Q^{\text{gp}}. \quad (2.10)$$

If  $\rho \subseteq \sigma$ , so that  $\text{Int}(\sigma) = \text{Star}(\sigma) \subseteq \text{Star}(\rho)$ , we have on  $\text{Int}(\sigma)$  that

$$\chi_\rho \circ \chi_\sigma^{-1}(m, q) = (m, q + (d\varphi_\rho|_\sigma)(m)).$$

Alternately, this identification can be viewed as describing parallel transport between stalks of  $\mathcal{P}$ : if  $x \in \rho$  a codimension one cell and  $y \in \sigma$  an adjacent maximal cell, then parallel transport from  $\mathcal{P}_y$  to  $\mathcal{P}_x$  along a path contained in  $\sigma$  is given by

$$(m, q) \mapsto (m, (d\varphi_\rho|_\sigma)(m) + q).$$

We will make frequent use of this particular description of parallel transport to compare germs of  $\mathcal{P}$  at nearby points.

The sheaf  $\mathcal{P}$  contains via [18, Def. 1.16], a subsheaf  $\mathcal{P}^+ \subseteq \mathcal{P}$ . We can describe the stalk of  $\mathcal{P}^+$  at a point  $x \in B$  lying in the interior of a maximal cell, using the trivialization (2.10), as

$$\mathcal{P}_x^+ = \Lambda_x \times Q. \quad (2.11)$$

If  $x$  lies in the interior of a codimension one cell  $\rho$  which is not a boundary cell, we may, using the trivialization (2.9), write  $\mathcal{P}_x^+$  as

$$\mathcal{P}_x^+ = \{(m, (d\varphi_\rho|_\sigma)(m) + q) \mid \rho \subseteq \sigma \in \mathcal{P}^{\max}, m \in T_x\sigma \cap \Lambda_x, q \in Q\}. \quad (2.12)$$

Here  $T_x\sigma$  denotes the tangent wedge to  $\sigma$  at  $x$ . Alternatively,  $\mathcal{P}_x^+$  has the following description. Let  $\rho \subseteq \sigma, \sigma'$ , and let  $\xi \in \Lambda_x$  be a choice of vector pointing into  $\sigma$  such that its image in  $\Lambda_\sigma/\Lambda_\rho \cong \mathbb{Z}$  is a generator. Then

$$\mathcal{P}_x^+ = (\Lambda_\rho \oplus \mathbb{N}Z_+ \oplus \mathbb{N}Z_- \oplus Q) / \langle Z_+ + Z_- = \kappa_\rho \rangle. \quad (2.13)$$

For this, see the discussion in [18, §2.2]. Here, the projections to  $\Lambda_x$  in (2.8) of  $Z_+$  and  $Z_-$  are  $\xi$  and  $-\xi$  respectively. Under this description, if  $y \in \text{Int}(\sigma)$ ,  $y' \in \text{Int}(\sigma')$ , then the parallel transport from  $\mathcal{P}_x^+$  to  $\mathcal{P}_y^+$  and  $\mathcal{P}_{y'}^+$  takes the form

$$(\lambda_\rho, aZ_+, bZ_-, q) \mapsto \begin{cases} (\lambda_\rho + (a-b)\xi, b\kappa_\rho + q) \in \mathcal{P}_y^+, \\ (\lambda_\rho + (a-b)\xi, a\kappa_\rho + q) \in \mathcal{P}_{y'}^+. \end{cases} \quad (2.14)$$

In §2.1.1, we took  $\Delta \subseteq B$  to be the union of codimension two cells of  $\mathcal{P}$ . However, it is frequently the case, as in the sequel, that the affine structure on  $B \setminus \Delta$  extends to a larger subset of  $B$ . Thus in general we will only assume that  $\Delta$  is a union of *some* of the codimension two cells of  $\mathcal{P}$ . In this case,  $\varphi$  may also have a single-valued representative in larger open sets.

In detail, suppose that  $\tau \in \mathcal{P}$  is a cell with  $\text{Int}(\tau) \cap \Delta = \emptyset$ , and  $\varphi$  can be expressed as a single-valued function on  $\text{Star}(\tau)$ . This means that there exists a piecewise affine function  $\varphi_\tau : \text{Star}(\tau) \rightarrow Q_{\mathbb{R}}^{\text{gp}}$  whose kink along any codimension one cells  $\rho \supseteq \tau$  agrees with the kink of  $\varphi$ . In this case, the sheaf  $\mathcal{P}$  extends to a sheaf on  $\text{Star}(\tau)$  via a trivialization on  $\text{Star}(\tau)$  given again by  $\chi_\tau : \mathcal{P}|_{\text{Star}(\tau)} \rightarrow \Lambda|_{\text{Star}(\tau)} \times Q$ , and if  $\tau \subseteq \sigma \in \mathcal{P}^{\max}$ , then

$$\chi_\tau \circ \chi_\sigma^{-1}(\lambda, q) = (\lambda, q + (d\varphi_\tau|_\sigma)(\lambda)). \quad (2.15)$$

As before, for  $x \in \text{Int}(\tau)$ , we may define  $\mathcal{P}_x^+ \subseteq \mathcal{P}_x$  as:

$$\mathcal{P}_x^+ := \{(m, (d\varphi_\tau|_\sigma)(m) + q) \mid \tau \subseteq \sigma \in \mathcal{P}^{\max}, m \in T_x\sigma \cap \Lambda_x, q \in Q\}. \quad (2.16)$$

Here  $T_x\sigma$  denotes the tangent wedge to  $\sigma$  at the point  $x$ .



Alternatively, for each  $y \in \text{Int}(\sigma)$  for  $\sigma$  a maximal cell containing  $\tau$ , there is a canonical identification of  $\mathcal{P}_y$  with  $\mathcal{P}_x$  via parallel transport inside  $\text{Star}(\tau)$ . We then may define

$$\mathcal{P}_x^+ = \bigcap_{\tau \subseteq \sigma \in \mathcal{P}^{\max}} \mathcal{P}_y^+.$$

With this notation, given a monoid ideal  $I \subseteq Q$ , we obtain an ideal  $I_y \subseteq \mathbb{k}[\mathcal{P}_y^+] = \mathbb{k}[Q][\Lambda_y]$  generated by  $I$  under the inclusion of  $\mathbb{k}[Q]$  in  $\mathbb{k}[\mathcal{P}_y^+]$ . Since  $\mathcal{P}_x^+ \subseteq \mathcal{P}_y^+$  by the above equality, we may then define

$$I_x = \sum_{\tau \subseteq \sigma \in \mathcal{P}^{\max}} I_y \cap \mathbb{k}[\mathcal{P}_x^+]. \quad (2.17)$$

We finally record here for future use a key observation which underpins [21], analogous to [21, Prop. 2.6].

**Definition 2.6.** Let  $x \in B$  lie in the interior of a maximal cell,  $m \in \mathcal{P}_x^+$ . If  $m = (\bar{m}, q) \in \Lambda_x \oplus Q$  under the splitting (2.11), then we define the  $Q$ -order of  $m$  at  $x$  to be  $\text{ord}_x(m) := q$ .

**Proposition 2.7.** Let  $\tau \in \mathring{\mathcal{P}}$  with  $\tau \not\subseteq \Delta$  and suppose that  $B \setminus \Delta$  carries an MVPL function  $\varphi$  with a single-valued representative on  $\text{Star}(\tau)$ . Let  $\sigma, \sigma' \in \mathcal{P}^{\max}$  be two cells containing  $\tau$ . Let  $y \in \text{Int}(\sigma)$ ,  $y' \in \text{Int}(\sigma')$ ,  $x \in \text{Int}(\tau)$ , and let  $m \in \mathcal{P}_y^+$  be such that the parallel transport of  $\bar{m} \in \Lambda_y$  to  $\Lambda_x$  is a tangent vector pointing into  $\sigma$  and the parallel transport of  $-\bar{m}$  to  $\Lambda_x$  is a tangent vector pointing into  $\sigma'$ . Let  $m'$  be the parallel transport of  $m$  to  $\mathcal{P}_{y'}$  along a path in  $\text{Star}(\tau)$ . Then  $m' \in \mathcal{P}_{y'}^+$ , and there exists a non-zero  $q \in Q$  such that  $\text{ord}_{y'}(m') = \text{ord}_y(m) + q$ .

*Proof.* We may choose  $y$  and  $y'$  to lie close to a line passing through  $\text{Int}(\tau)$  with tangent direction  $\bar{m}$ . In particular, these may be chosen so that the straight line path between  $y$  and  $y'$  still has tangent vector  $\bar{m}$  but only passes through codimension zero and one cells of  $\mathcal{P}$ . Thus using parallel transport along this straight line path, it is sufficient to show the claim when  $\tau$  is codimension one. The result then follows from (2.14). Indeed, if  $m = (\bar{m}, q') \in \mathcal{P}_y^+$ , we may write  $\bar{m} = \lambda_\tau + a\xi$  for some  $\lambda_\tau \in \Lambda_\tau$  and  $a > 0$  by the assumption on  $\bar{m}$ . Then the parallel transport of  $m$  to  $\mathcal{P}_x^+$  can be written as  $(\lambda_\tau, aZ_+, 0, q') \in \mathcal{P}_x^+$ , and the further transport to  $\mathcal{P}_{y'}^+$  then takes the form  $(\bar{m}, a\kappa_\tau + q')$ , giving the claim with  $q = a\kappa_\tau$ .  $\square$

2.1.3. *The canonical choice of MVPL function.* Here we will make use of a canonical choice of MVPL function  $\varphi$ :

**Construction 2.8.** Following [16], [25], we define a canonical choice of MVPL function  $\varphi$  from the log Calabi-Yau pair  $(X, D)$  as follows. We simply take, for

$\rho \in \mathring{\mathcal{P}}$  a codimension one cell, the kink of  $\varphi$  to be  $\kappa_\rho = [D_\rho]$ . Note that  $\kappa_\rho \in Q$  by the assumption that  $Q$  contains all effective curve classes, and that  $\varphi$  is a convex MVPL function provided  $D_\rho$  is not numerically trivial for any such  $\rho$ .

As we saw in Proposition 2.3, under certain situations, the affine structure extends across  $\text{Star}(\tau)$ . Similarly, a single-valued representative for  $\varphi$  as constructed in Construction 2.8 may be found on this open subset of  $B$ . Before doing so, we review for this purpose and future use later in the paper certain toric facts.

If  $\Sigma$  is a complete, non-singular fan in  $M_{\mathbb{R}}$ , there is a standard description of  $N_1(X_\Sigma)$ . Set  $T_\Sigma := \mathbb{Z}^{\Sigma(1)}$ , the lattice with basis  $t_\rho$ , for  $\rho \in \Sigma(1)$ . There is a canonical map

$$\begin{aligned} s : T_\Sigma &\longrightarrow M \\ t_\rho &\longmapsto m_\rho \end{aligned} \tag{2.18}$$

where  $m_\rho$  denotes the primitive generator of  $\rho$ . Because  $\Sigma$  is assumed to be non-singular, this map is surjective, and there is a canonical isomorphism  $N_1(X_\Sigma) \cong \ker s$ , with the isomorphism given by

$$N_1(X_\Sigma) \ni \beta \longmapsto \sum_{\rho \in \Sigma(1)} (D_\rho \cdot \beta) t_\rho.$$

More generally, suppose given a collection of cones  $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_p \in \Sigma$  and elements  $m_1, \dots, m_p \in M$  with  $m_i$  tangent to  $\sigma_i$ . Suppose further that the  $m_i$  satisfy the balancing condition  $\sum_i m_i = 0$ . We then also obtain a curve class  $\beta \in N_1(X_\Sigma)$  as follows. Let  $\rho_{i1}, \dots, \rho_{in_i}$  be the one-dimensional faces of  $\sigma_i$ . Thus we may write  $m_i = \sum_j a_{ij} m_{\rho_{ij}}$  with the  $a_{ij}$  (possibly negative) integers. Take

$$a_\rho := \sum_{i,j \text{ s.t. } \rho = \rho_{ij}} a_{ij}.$$

Then  $\sum a_\rho t_\rho \in \ker s$ , hence represents a curve class  $\beta$ . Explicitly, this is characterized by the condition

$$D_\rho \cdot \beta = \sum_{i,j \text{ s.t. } \rho = \rho_{ij}} a_{ij}. \tag{2.19}$$

**Lemma 2.9.** *Let  $\Sigma, X_\Sigma$  be as above. Then:*

- (1) *There exists a piecewise linear function  $\psi : M_{\mathbb{R}} \rightarrow N_1(X_\Sigma) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{R}$  with kink along a codimension one cone  $\rho \in \Sigma$  being the class of  $D_\rho$ , the corresponding one-dimensional stratum of  $X_\Sigma$ .*
- (2) *This function  $\psi$  is universal, in the following sense. If  $D$  is a divisor on  $X_\Sigma$ , let  $\psi_D$  be the composition of  $\psi$  with the map  $N_1(X_\Sigma) \otimes \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  given by  $\beta \mapsto \beta \cdot D$ . Then up to linear functions,  $\psi_D$  is the piecewise linear function determined by the divisor  $D$ .*

- (3) If  $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_p \in \Sigma$  and  $m_1, \dots, m_p \in M$  satisfy  $m_i$  tangent to  $\sigma_i$  and  $\sum_i m_i = 0$ , then the corresponding class  $\beta \in N_1(X_\Sigma)$  is

$$\beta = \sum_{i=1}^p (d\psi|_{\sigma_i})(m_i).$$

*Proof.* (1) is [16, Lem. 1.13], while (3) follows immediately from the argument of the proof of [16, Lem. 1.13], generalizing [16, Lem. 3.32]. Finally, (2) follows as it is standard toric geometry that the kink of the piecewise linear function corresponding to a divisor  $D$  at a codimension one cone  $\rho$  is  $D \cdot D_\rho$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 2.10.** *If  $\tau \in \mathcal{P}$  is such that  $D_\tau$  satisfies the hypotheses of Proposition 2.3, then the MVPL function  $\varphi$  has a single-valued representative  $\varphi_\tau$  on  $\text{Star}(\tau)$ .*

*Proof.* By Lemma 2.9, there is a piecewise linear function  $\psi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow N_1(D_\tau) \otimes \mathbb{R}$  with respect to the fan  $\Sigma_\tau$  whose kink along a codimension one  $\rho \in \Sigma_\tau$  is the class of the corresponding one-dimensional stratum of  $D_\tau$ . Now we have a canonical map  $\iota : N_1(D_\tau) \rightarrow N_1(X)$  induced by the inclusion  $D_\tau \hookrightarrow X$ . Thus, using Proposition 2.3, we may take  $\varphi_\tau = \iota \circ \psi \circ \nu$ .  $\square$

**2.2. Wall structures on  $(B, \mathcal{P})$ .** The main ingredient of the construction of the family mirror to  $(X, D)$  is a *scattering diagram*, or *wall structure*, which lives on  $(B, \mathcal{P})$ . We will review this data from [18, §2.3] and its consequences in the remaining part of this section. While [18] and [25] use the term “wall structure,” we will instead use the term “scattering diagram” here.

We fix a general situation of a polyhedral affine manifold  $(B, \mathcal{P})$  as in [18, Constr. 1.1]. For our purposes, the reader may think of  $(B, \mathcal{P})$  as having come from a log Calabi-Yau variety  $(X, D)$ , or, in the relative case  $X \rightarrow \mathbb{A}^1$ , as a fibre  $p_{\text{trop}}^{-1}(1)$  of the induced map of Remark 2.2. We also fix a monoid  $Q$  with  $Q^\times = \{0\}$ , an MVPL function  $\varphi$  with values in  $Q_{\mathbb{R}}^{\text{gp}}$ , and a monoid ideal  $I \subseteq Q$  with  $\sqrt{I} = \mathfrak{m} = Q \setminus \{0\}$ .

**Definition 2.11.** A *wall* on  $B$  is a codimension one rational polyhedral cone  $\mathfrak{d} \not\subseteq \partial B$  contained in some maximal cone  $\sigma$  of  $\mathcal{P}$ , along with an element

$$f_{\mathfrak{d}} = \sum_{m \in \mathcal{P}_x^+, \bar{m} \in \Lambda_{\mathfrak{d}}} c_m z^m \in \mathbb{k}[\mathcal{P}_x^+]/I_x, \quad (2.20)$$

where  $I_x$  is the ideal defined in (2.17). Here  $x \in \text{Int}(\mathfrak{d})$  and  $\Lambda_{\mathfrak{d}}$  is the lattice of integral tangent vectors to  $\mathfrak{d}$ . We further require that for every  $m \in \mathcal{P}_x^+$  with  $c_m \neq 0$  and every  $y \in \mathfrak{d} \setminus \Delta$ , we have  $m \in \mathcal{P}_y^+$  lying in  $\mathcal{P}_y^+$  under parallel transport under a path in  $\mathfrak{d}$ . Finally, we require that  $f_{\mathfrak{d}} \equiv 1 \pmod{\mathfrak{m}_x}$ .

We say a wall  $\mathfrak{d}$  has *direction*  $v \in \Lambda_{\mathfrak{d}}$  if the attached function  $f_{\mathfrak{d}}$ , given as in (2.20), satisfies  $\bar{m} = -kv$  for some  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  whenever  $c_m \neq 0$ . In this case we denote  $f_{\mathfrak{d}}$  by  $f_{\mathfrak{d}}(z^{-v})$ .

A *scattering diagram* on  $(B, \mathcal{P})$  is a finite set  $\mathfrak{D}$  of walls.

If  $\mathfrak{D}$  is a scattering diagram, we define

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Supp}(\mathfrak{D}) &:= \bigcup_{\mathfrak{d} \in \mathfrak{D}} \mathfrak{d}, \\ \text{Sing}(\mathfrak{D}) &:= \Delta \cup \bigcup_{\mathfrak{d} \in \mathfrak{D}} \partial \mathfrak{d} \cup \bigcup_{\mathfrak{d}, \mathfrak{d}' \in \mathfrak{D}} (\mathfrak{d} \cap \mathfrak{d}'), \end{aligned}$$

where the last union is over all pairs of walls  $\mathfrak{d}, \mathfrak{d}'$  with  $\mathfrak{d} \cap \mathfrak{d}'$  codimension at least two. In particular,  $\text{Sing}(\mathfrak{D})$  is a codimension at least two subset of  $B$ .

A *joint*  $\mathfrak{j}$  of  $\mathfrak{D}$  is a codimension two polyhedral subset of  $B$  contained in the intersection of  $\text{Sing}(\mathfrak{D})$  with some  $\sigma \in \mathcal{P}^{\max}$ , such that for  $x \in \text{Int}(\mathfrak{j})$ , the set of walls  $\{\mathfrak{d} \in \mathfrak{D} \mid x \in \mathfrak{d}\}$  is independent of  $x$ . Further, a joint must be a maximal subset with this property.

If  $x \in B \setminus \text{Sing}(\mathfrak{D})$ , we define

$$f_x := \prod_{\mathfrak{d} \in \mathfrak{D}} f_{\mathfrak{d}}. \quad (2.21)$$

We say that two scattering diagram  $\mathfrak{D}, \mathfrak{D}'$  are *equivalent* if  $f_x = f'_x$  for all  $x \in B \setminus (\text{Sing}(\mathfrak{D}) \cup \text{Sing}(\mathfrak{D}'))$ .

*Remark 2.12.* Every scattering diagram  $\mathfrak{D}$  is equivalent to a *minimal* scattering diagram which does not have two walls with the same support and contains no trivial walls  $(\mathfrak{d}, f_{\mathfrak{d}})$  with  $f_{\mathfrak{d}} = 1$ . Indeed, if  $(\mathfrak{d}_1, f_1), (\mathfrak{d}_2, f_2) \in \mathfrak{D}$  with  $\mathfrak{d}_1 = \mathfrak{d}_2$ , then we can replace these two walls with the single wall  $(\mathfrak{d}, f_1 \cdot f_2)$  without affecting the wall crossing automorphisms. In addition we can remove any trivial wall.

*Remark 2.13.* The definition of a scattering diagram depends on the choice of an ideal  $I$ . If  $\mathfrak{D}, \mathfrak{D}'$  are scattering diagram defined using ideals  $I, I'$  and  $I'' \supseteq I, I'$ , then we will say  $\mathfrak{D}$  and  $\mathfrak{D}'$  are *equivalent modulo  $I''$*  if  $f_x = f'_x \pmod{I''}$  for all  $x \in B \setminus (\text{Sing}(\mathfrak{D}) \cup \text{Sing}(\mathfrak{D}'))$ . This allows us to compare scattering diagrams with different ideals.

The reader should bear in mind that in general we will be dealing with a compatible system of scattering diagrams, i.e., a scattering diagram  $\mathfrak{D}_I$  for each ideal  $I$ , such that  $\mathfrak{D}_I$  and  $\mathfrak{D}_{I'}$  are equivalent modulo  $I'$  whenever  $I \subseteq I'$ . Alternatively, one may pass to the completion by taking the limit over all  $I$ , but this tends to cause additional notational complexities.

*Remark 2.14.* The definition of scattering diagram [18, Def. 2.11] is somewhat more restrictive on the set of walls. In particular, it includes an additional condition that the underlying polyhedral sets of  $\mathfrak{D}$  are the codimension one cells of a rational polyhedral decomposition  $\mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{D}}$  of  $B$  refining  $\mathcal{P}$ . Further,  $\mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{D}}$  needs to satisfy some properties we do not enumerate here. These conditions make for easier technical definitions and constructions in [18], and given any scattering diagram, it is easy to construct an equivalent scattering diagram which does satisfy these properties. However, the scattering diagrams constructed naturally in this paper do not satisfy these conditions, and it is convenient not to impose them.

The definition of wall we give here is also slightly more restrictive than that in [18], which does not insist on  $f_{\mathfrak{d}} \equiv 1 \pmod{\mathfrak{m}_x}$  if  $\mathfrak{d}$  is contained in codimension one cell of  $\mathcal{P}$ . Allowing such a possibility is useful to incorporate the type of discriminant locus  $\Delta$  allowed in [21], where  $\Delta$  does not lie in the union of codimension two cells. However, that is not the case here.

In the remaining part of this subsection we will describe the notion of *consistency* of a wall-structure. Roughly put, one uses consistent scattering diagrams to glue together some standard open charts to build the coordinate ring for the mirror to a log Calabi–Yau [18, §2.4]. This definition involves testing a property for each joint, and we break into cases based on the codimension of the joint:

**Definition 2.15.** The codimension  $k \in \{0, 1, 2\}$  of a joint  $\mathfrak{j}$  is the codimension of the smallest cell of  $\mathcal{P}$  containing  $\mathfrak{j}$ .

We would like to emphasize that the terminology “codimension of a joint” in Definition 2.15, which is commonly used in the literature, does not refer to the codimension of the joint itself, viewed as a subset of  $B$  (as in that case, a joint is always of codimension two in  $B$  by definition).

We now give slight variants of the definition of consistency in [18]; it is easy to check the definitions given here are equivalent to the definitions given there, but the form given here is more suited for our purposes.

2.2.1. *Consistency around codimension zero joints.* For  $\sigma \in \mathcal{P}^{\max}$ , set, with  $x \in \text{Int}(\sigma)$ ,

$$R_{\sigma} := (\mathbb{k}[Q]/I)[\Lambda_{\sigma}] = \mathbb{k}[\mathcal{P}_x^+]/I_x. \quad (2.22)$$

Let  $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow \text{Int}(\sigma)$  be a piecewise smooth path whose image is disjoint from  $\text{Sing}(\mathfrak{D})$ . Further, assume that  $\gamma$  is transversal to  $\text{Supp}(\mathfrak{D})$ , in the sense that if  $\gamma(t_0) \in \mathfrak{d} \in \mathfrak{D}$ , then there is an  $\epsilon > 0$  such that  $\gamma((t_0 - \epsilon, t_0))$  lies on one side of  $\mathfrak{d}$  and  $\gamma((t_0, t_0 + \epsilon))$  lies on the other.

Assuming that  $\gamma(t_0) \in \mathfrak{d}$ , we associate a *wall-crossing* homomorphism  $\theta_{\gamma, \mathfrak{d}}$  as follows. Let  $n_{\mathfrak{d}}$  be a generator of  $\Lambda_{\mathfrak{d}}^{\perp} \subseteq \check{\Lambda}_x = \text{Hom}(\Lambda_x, \mathbb{Z})$  for some  $x \in \text{Int } \mathfrak{d}$ , with  $n_{\mathfrak{d}}$  positive on  $\gamma((t_0 - \epsilon, t_0))$  as a function on  $\sigma$  in an affine chart mapping  $x$  to the origin. Then define

$$\theta_{\gamma, \mathfrak{d}} : R_{\sigma} \longrightarrow R_{\sigma}, \quad z^m \longmapsto f_{\mathfrak{d}}^{(n_{\mathfrak{d}}, \overline{m})} z^m. \quad (2.23)$$

As  $f_{\mathfrak{d}} \equiv 1 \pmod{\mathfrak{m}_x}$ , we see that  $f_{\mathfrak{d}}$  is an element of  $R_{\sigma}^{\times}$ , so that this formula makes sense. We refer to  $\theta_{\gamma, \mathfrak{d}}$  as the automorphism associated to *crossing the wall*  $\mathfrak{d}$ .

We may now define the *path-ordered product*

$$\theta_{\gamma, \mathfrak{D}} := \theta_{\gamma, \mathfrak{d}_s} \circ \cdots \circ \theta_{\gamma, \mathfrak{d}_1}, \quad (2.24)$$

where  $\mathfrak{d}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{d}_s$  is a complete list of walls traversed by  $\gamma$ , in the order traversed. Note that if  $\gamma(t_0) \in \mathfrak{d}, \mathfrak{d}'$ , then since  $\gamma(t_0) \notin \text{Sing}(\mathfrak{D})$ , necessarily  $\mathfrak{d} \cap \mathfrak{d}'$  is codimension one so that  $\Lambda_{\mathfrak{d}} = \Lambda_{\mathfrak{d}'}$ . From their definitions,  $\theta_{\gamma, \mathfrak{d}}$  and  $\theta_{\gamma, \mathfrak{d}'}$  commute, so the ordering of  $\mathfrak{d}, \mathfrak{d}'$  in the path-ordered product is irrelevant.

**Definition 2.16.** Let  $\mathfrak{j}$  be a codimension zero joint contained in a maximal cell  $\sigma$ , and let  $\gamma$  be a small loop in  $\sigma$  around  $\mathfrak{j}$ . Then  $\mathfrak{D}$  is said to be *consistent at*  $\mathfrak{j}$  if

$$\theta_{\gamma, \mathfrak{D}} = \text{id}$$

as an automorphism of  $R_{\sigma}$ .

A scattering diagram  $\mathfrak{D}$  on  $(B, \mathcal{P})$  is *consistent in codimension zero* if it is consistent at any codimension zero joint  $\mathfrak{j}$ .

**2.2.2. Consistency around codimension one joints.** There is no condition for a codimension one joint contained in  $\partial B$ . Otherwise, let  $\rho$  be a codimension one cell of  $\mathcal{P}$  not contained in the boundary of  $B$ . Let  $x \in \text{Int}(\rho)$ . We define the ring

$$R_{\rho} := \mathbb{k}[\mathcal{P}_x^+] / I_x.$$

Note this is independent of the choice of  $x$ . It follows from the definition of wall that if  $\mathfrak{d} \in \mathfrak{D}$  is a wall with  $\mathfrak{d} \cap \text{Int}(\rho) \neq \emptyset$ , then  $f_{\mathfrak{d}}$  may be interpreted as an element of  $R_{\rho}$ .

Let  $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow \text{Star}(\tau)$  be path as in the previous subsection, transversal to  $\text{Supp}(\mathfrak{D})$  and with image disjoint from  $\text{Sing}(\mathfrak{D})$ . Assume further that if  $\gamma(t) \in \mathfrak{d}$  for some  $\mathfrak{d} \in \mathfrak{D}$ , then  $\mathfrak{d} \cap \text{Int}(\rho) \neq \emptyset$ . Then necessarily  $f_{\mathfrak{d}} \in R_{\rho}$ . Thus, we may define  $\theta_{\gamma, \mathfrak{d}} : R_{\rho} \rightarrow R_{\rho}$  using the formula (2.23), and hence define the path-ordered product  $\theta_{\gamma, \mathfrak{D}} : R_{\rho} \rightarrow R_{\rho}$  as in the codimension zero case.

**Definition 2.17.** We say a codimension one joint  $\mathfrak{j}$  contained in a codimension one cell  $\rho$  is *consistent* if, for a sufficiently small loop  $\gamma$  in  $\text{Star}(\rho)$  around  $\mathfrak{j}$ , we have

$$\theta_{\gamma, \mathfrak{D}} = \text{id}$$

as an automorphism of  $R_\rho$ .

*Remark 2.18.* This definition may appear to be quite different from the one given in [18, Def. 2.14]. The definition given there was designed to include a more complicated case where  $\Delta \cap \text{Int}(\rho) \neq \emptyset$  and  $f_{\mathfrak{d}} \not\equiv 1 \pmod{\mathfrak{m}}$  if  $\mathfrak{d} \subseteq \rho$ . The reader may verify that in our simpler case, the definition given here implies [18, Def. 2.14].

**2.2.3. Consistency around codimension two joints.** To check consistency in codimension two we first will review the theory of broken lines. For details we refer to [18, §3.1]. For a given scattering diagram  $\mathfrak{D}$  a *broken line* is a piecewise linear continuous directed path

$$\beta: (-\infty, 0] \longrightarrow B \setminus \text{Sing}(\mathfrak{D}) \tag{2.25}$$

with  $\beta(0) \notin \text{Supp}(\mathfrak{D})$  and whose image consists of finitely many line segments  $L_1, L_2, \dots, L_N$ , such that  $\dim L_i \cap \mathfrak{d} = 0$  for any wall  $\mathfrak{d} \in \mathfrak{D}$ , and each  $L_i$  is compact except  $L_1$ . Further, we require that each  $L_i \subseteq \sigma_i$  for some  $\sigma_i \in \mathcal{P}^{\max}$ . To each such segment we assign a monomial

$$m_i := \alpha_i z^{(v_i, q_i)} \in \mathbb{k}[\Lambda_{L_i} \oplus Q^{\text{gp}}].$$

Here  $\Lambda_{L_i}$ , as usual, denotes the group of integral tangent vectors to  $L_i$  and is hence a rank one free abelian group. Each  $v_i$  is non-zero and tangent to  $L_i$ , with  $\beta'(t) = -v_i$  for  $t \in (-\infty, 0]$  mapping to  $L_i$ . We require  $\alpha_1 = 1$  and set  $m_1 = z^{(v_1, 0)}$ . We refer to  $v_1$  as the *asymptotic direction* of the broken line. Roughly put, each time  $\beta$  crosses a wall of  $\mathfrak{D}$  it possibly changes direction and monomial in a specific way that respects the structure. Again, roughly,  $\beta$  bends in the direction given by linear combinations of  $\bar{m}$  which appear in (2.20).

In detail, given  $L_i$  and its attached monomial  $m_i$ , we determine  $L_{i+1}$  and  $m_{i+1}$  as follows. Let  $L_i$  be the image under  $\beta$  of an interval  $[t_{i-1}, t_i] \subset (-\infty, 0]$ . Let  $I = [t_i - \epsilon, t_i + \epsilon]$  be an interval with  $\epsilon$  chosen sufficiently small so that  $\beta([t_i - \epsilon, t_i])$  and  $\beta([t_i, t_i + \epsilon])$  are disjoint from  $\text{Supp}(\mathfrak{D})$ . There are two cases:

- $\beta(t_i) \in \text{Int}(\sigma_i)$  for  $\sigma \in \mathcal{P}^{\max}$ . Then we obtain a wall-crossing map  $\theta_{\beta|_I, \mathfrak{D}} : R_{\sigma_i} \rightarrow R_{\sigma_i}$ , and  $m_i$  may be viewed as an element of  $R_{\sigma_i}$  via the inclusion  $\Lambda_{L_i} \subseteq \Lambda_{\sigma_i}$ . We expand  $\theta_{\beta|_I, \mathfrak{D}}(m_i)$  as a sum of monomials with distinct exponents, and require that  $m_{i+1}$  be one of the terms in this sum.

- $\beta(t_i) \in \text{Int}(\rho)$  for  $\rho \in \mathcal{P}$  a codimension one cell. If  $y = \beta(t_i - \epsilon)$ ,  $y' = \beta(t_i + \epsilon)$ ,  $x = \beta(t_i)$ , we may view  $(v_i, q_i) \in \mathcal{P}_y^+$ . By parallel transport to  $x$  along  $\beta$ , we may view  $(v_i, q_i) \in \mathcal{P}_x$ . In fact,  $(v_i, q_i) \in \mathcal{P}_x^+$  by the assumption that  $\beta'(t_i - \epsilon) = -v_i$  and Proposition 2.7. Thus we may view  $m_i \in R_\rho$ , and then  $m_{i+1}$  is required to be a term in  $\theta_{\beta|_I, \mathfrak{D}}(m_i)$ . A priori,  $m_{i+1} \in R_\rho$ , but it may be viewed as a monomial in  $R_{\sigma_{i+1}}$  by parallel transport to  $y'$ .

Having defined broken lines, we proceed to the definition of consistency for a joint  $j$  of codimension two. Let  $\omega \in \mathcal{P}^{[n-2]}$  be the smallest cell containing  $j$ . Build a new affine manifold  $(B_j, \mathcal{P}_j)$  by replacing any  $\tau \in \mathcal{P}$  with  $\tau \supseteq j$  by the tangent wedge of  $\omega$  in  $\tau$ . Note that the inclusion  $\tau \subseteq \tau'$  of faces induces an inclusion of the respective tangent wedges. So  $B_j$  is a local model for  $(B, \mathcal{P})$  near  $j$  all of whose cells are cones. The scattering diagram  $\mathfrak{D}$  induces a scattering diagram  $\mathfrak{D}_j$  by considering only the walls containing  $j$  and replacing them with tangent wedges based at  $\omega$  for the underlying polyhedral subsets of codimension one. Since the only joint of  $\mathfrak{D}_j$  is the codimension two cell  $\Lambda_{j, \mathbb{R}}$  this scattering diagram is trivially consistent in codimensions zero and one. Now let  $m$  be an asymptotic monomial on  $(B_j, \mathcal{P}_j)$ . For a general point  $p \in B_j$ , say contained in  $\sigma \in \mathcal{P}_j^{\max}$ , define

$$\vartheta_m^j(p) := \sum_{\beta} a_{\beta} z^{m_{\beta}} \in R_{\sigma}. \quad (2.26)$$

The sum runs over all broken lines  $\beta$  on  $(B_j, \mathcal{P}_j)$  with asymptotic monomial  $m$  and endpoint  $p$ . Furthermore,  $a_{\beta} z^{m_{\beta}}$  denotes the monomial associated with the last domain of linearity of  $\beta$ .

**Definition 2.19.** The scattering diagram  $\mathfrak{D}$  is *consistent along the codimension two joint  $j$*  if the  $\vartheta_m^j(p)$  satisfy the following properties:

- (1) For  $p, p' \in \text{Int}(\sigma)$  with  $\sigma \in \mathcal{P}_j^{\max}$  and any path  $\gamma$  from  $p$  to  $p'$  for which  $\theta_{\gamma, \mathfrak{D}_j}$  is defined, we have

$$\theta_{\gamma, \mathfrak{D}_j}(\vartheta_m^j(p)) = \vartheta_m^j(p')$$

in  $R_{\sigma}$ .

- (2) If  $\rho \in \mathcal{P}_j$  is codimension one with  $\rho \subseteq \sigma, \sigma' \in \mathcal{P}_j^{\max}$ , and  $p \in \sigma, p' \in \sigma'$ , suppose there is in addition a path  $\gamma$  joining  $p$  and  $p'$  not crossing any walls of  $\mathfrak{D}_j$  not contained in  $\rho$ . Then  $\vartheta_m^j(p)$  and  $\vartheta_m^j(p')$  make sense as elements of  $R_{\rho}$  and

$$\theta_{\gamma, \mathfrak{D}_j}(\vartheta_m^j(p)) = \vartheta_m^j(p')$$

in  $R_{\rho}$ .



A scattering diagram  $\mathfrak{D}$  is *consistent* if it is consistent in codimensions zero, one and along each codimension two joint.

We now need to explain how consistent scattering diagrams may be constructed using punctured Gromov-Witten theory.

**2.3. Punctured Gromov–Witten theory.** We give here a quick review of punctured Gromov–Witten theory as set up in [2] and as used in [25]. We may also send the reader to [24] for a brief survey, but the reader should bear in mind that the definition of punctures evolved since the latter paper was written.

**2.3.1. Log schemes and their tropicalizations.** We assume the reader is familiar with the basic language of log geometry, but we review definitions to establish notation. A log structure on a scheme  $X$  is a sheaf of (commutative) monoids  $\mathcal{M}_X$  together with a homomorphism of sheaves of multiplicative monoids  $\alpha_X : \mathcal{M}_X \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X$  inducing an isomorphism  $\alpha_X^{-1}(\mathcal{O}_X^\times) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X^\times$ , allowing us to identify  $\mathcal{O}_X^\times$  as a subsheaf of  $\mathcal{M}_X$ . The standard notation we use for a log scheme is  $X := (\underline{X}, \mathcal{M}_X, \alpha_X)$ , where by  $\underline{X}$  we denote the underlying scheme. Throughout this paper all log schemes are fine and saturated (fs) [37, I,§1.3], except when explicitly noted. A morphism of log schemes  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  consists of an ordinary morphism  $\underline{f} : \underline{X} \rightarrow \underline{Y}$  of schemes along with a map  $f^b : f^{-1}\mathcal{M}_Y \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_X$  compatible with  $f^\# : f^{-1}\mathcal{O}_Y \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X$  via the structure homomorphisms  $\alpha_X$  and  $\alpha_Y$ .

The *ghost sheaf* is defined by  $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_X := \mathcal{M}_X/\mathcal{O}_X^\times$ , and captures the key combinatorial information about the log structure. In particular, it leads to the *tropicalization*  $\Sigma(X)$  of  $X$ , an abstract polyhedral cone complex, see [3], §2.1 for details. In brief,  $\Sigma(X)$  is a collection of cones along with face maps between them. There is one cone  $\sigma_{\bar{x}} := \text{Hom}(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{X,\bar{x}}, \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0})$  for every geometric point  $\bar{x} \rightarrow X$ , and if  $\bar{x}$  specializes to  $\bar{y}$ , there is a generization map  $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{X,\bar{y}} \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{X,\bar{x}}$  which leads dually to a map  $\sigma_{\bar{x}} \rightarrow \sigma_{\bar{y}}$ . The condition of being fine and saturated implies this is an inclusion of faces. Note that each cone  $\sigma_{\bar{x}} \in \Sigma(X)$  comes with a tangent space of integral tangent vectors

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

and a set of integral points

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

Tropicalization is functorial, with  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  inducing  $f_{\text{trop}} : \Sigma(X) \rightarrow \Sigma(Y)$ , with a map of cones  $\sigma_{\bar{x}} \rightarrow \sigma_{f(\bar{x})}$  induced by  $\overline{f}^b : \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{Y,f(\bar{x})} \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{X,\bar{x}}$ . In cases we consider in this article, after identifying  $\sigma_{\bar{x}}$  and  $\sigma_{\bar{y}}$  whenever  $\sigma_{\bar{x}} \rightarrow \sigma_{\bar{y}}$  is an isomorphism, we obtain an ordinary polyhedral cone complex. In particular, for us the most important example is the following:

**Example 2.20.** Let  $(X, D)$  be a pair satisfying the conditions of §2.1.1. The divisorial log structure on  $X$  coming from  $D$  is given by taking  $\mathcal{M}_X$  to be the subsheaf of  $\mathcal{O}_X$  consisting of functions invertible on  $X \setminus D$ . Then the abstract polyhedral cone complex  $\Sigma(X)$  agrees with  $(B, \mathcal{P})$ .

2.3.2. *The Artin fan.* Given an fs log scheme  $X$ , we have its associated *Artin fan*  $\mathcal{X}$ , as constructed in [5, Prop. 3.1.1]. 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 fs log structures, [38]. The morphism  $X \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$  is strict and the morphism  $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}og_{\mathbb{k}}$  is étale and representable by algebraic spaces.

In this paper, we will only need the Artin fan for the log Calabi-Yau pair  $(X, D)$  being considered here. In particular, if  $X$  is a toric variety and  $D$  is its toric boundary, then  $\mathcal{X} = [X/\mathbb{G}_m^n]$ , where  $\mathbb{G}_m^n$  is the big torus acting on  $X$ . Further, in this article, all log Calabi-Yau pairs being considered are obtained by blowing up a locus on the boundary of a toric pair, and this does not change the Artin fan.

The Artin fan  $\mathcal{X}$  encodes the tropicalization of  $X$  as an algebraic stack. In particular, a useful way of thinking about  $\mathcal{X}$  is given in [3, Prop. 2.10], which applies in particular to the log Calabi-Yau pairs  $(X, D)$  being considered here. In this case, if  $T$  is an fs log scheme, then the set of morphisms of log stacks over  $\mathrm{Spec} \mathbb{k}$ ,  $\mathrm{Hom}(T, \mathcal{X})$ , coincides with the set  $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbf{Cones}}(\Sigma(T), \Sigma(X))$  of morphisms of abstract cone complexes.

2.3.3. *Stable punctured maps.* The theory of stable log maps was developed in [22, 1], as a theory of curve counting invariants with target space a log scheme, as a special case,  $X = (X, D)$  as in Example 2.20. A stable log map with target  $X/\mathrm{Spec} \mathbb{k}$  is a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} C & \xrightarrow{f} & X \\ \pi \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ W & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{Spec} \mathbb{k} \end{array}$$

where  $\pi$  is a log smooth family of curves, which is required to be an integral morphism all of whose geometric fibres are reduced curves. Further,  $C/W$  comes with a set of disjoint sections  $p_1, \dots, p_n : \underline{W} \rightarrow \underline{C}$ , referred to as the *marked points*, disjoint from the nodal locus of  $C$ . Away from the nodal locus,

$$\overline{\mathcal{M}}_C = \pi^* \overline{\mathcal{M}}_W \oplus \bigoplus_{i=1}^n p_{i*} \underline{\mathbb{N}}.$$

*Remark 2.21.* Crucially, such a stable log map records *contact orders* at marked and nodal points. If  $p \in C_{\bar{w}}$  is a marked point of a geometric fibre of  $\pi$ , we have

$$\bar{f}^b : P_p := \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{X,f(p)} \longrightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{C,p} = \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{W,\pi(p)} \oplus \mathbb{N} \xrightarrow{\text{pr}_2} \mathbb{N},$$

which can be viewed as an element  $u_p \in P_p^\vee := \text{Hom}(P_p, \mathbb{N}) \subseteq \sigma_{f(p)}$ , called the *contact order at p*. Similarly, if  $x = q$  is a node, there exists a homomorphism

$$u_q : P_q := \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{X,f(q)} \longrightarrow \mathbb{Z}, \quad (2.27)$$

called *contact order at q*, see [22, (1.8)] or [3, §2.3.4]. In the case the target space is  $(X, D)$ , the contact order records tangency information with the irreducible components of  $D$ .

Punctured invariants, introduced in [2], allow negative orders of tangency at particular marked points by enlarging the monoid  $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{C,p}$ . This is done as follows.

**Definition 2.22.** Let  $(Y, \mathcal{M}_Y)$  be an fs log scheme with a decomposition  $\mathcal{M}_Y = \mathcal{M} \oplus_{\mathcal{O}_Y^\times} \mathcal{P}$ . Denote  $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{M} \oplus_{\mathcal{O}_Y^\times} \mathcal{P}^{\text{gp}}$ . A *puncturing* of  $Y$  along  $\mathcal{P} \subset \mathcal{M}_Y$  is a *fine* sub-sheaf of monoids  $\mathcal{M}_{Y^\circ} \subset \mathcal{E}$  containing  $\mathcal{M}_Y$  with a structure map  $\alpha_{Y^\circ} : \mathcal{M}_{Y^\circ} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_Y$  such that

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

We will also call the induced morphism of logarithmic schemes  $Y^\circ \rightarrow Y$  a *puncturing of Y along P*, or call  $Y^\circ$  a *puncturing of Y*. Although there may not be a unique choice of puncturing, once given a morphism to another log scheme, there is a canonical minimal choice:

**Definition 2.23.** A morphism  $f : Y^\circ \rightarrow X$  from a puncturing  $Y^\circ$  of  $Y$  is *pre-stable* if  $\mathcal{M}_{Y^\circ}$  is the fine submonoid of  $\mathcal{E}$  generated by  $\mathcal{M}_Y$  and  $f^b(f^{-1}(\mathcal{M}_X))$ .

**Definition 2.24.** A punctured curve over an fs log scheme  $W$  is given by the data  $C^\circ \rightarrow C \rightarrow W$  where:

- $C \rightarrow W$  is a log smooth curve with marked points  $\mathbf{p} = p_1, \dots, p_n$ . In particular,  $\mathcal{M}_C = \mathcal{M} \oplus_{\mathcal{O}_C^\times} \mathcal{P}$  where  $\mathcal{P}$  is the divisorial logarithmic structure on  $C$  induced by the divisor  $\bigcup_{i=1}^n p_i(W)$ .
- $C^\circ \rightarrow C$  is a puncturing of  $C$  along  $\mathcal{P}$ .

We now fix the target space  $X = (X, D)$  along with a log smooth morphism  $X \rightarrow S$ . In this paper, either  $S = \text{Spec } \mathbb{k}$  with the trivial log structure, or  $S = \mathbb{A}^1$  with the divisorial log structure coming from  $0 \in \mathbb{A}^1$ .

**Definition 2.25.** A punctured map to  $X/S$  consists of a punctured curve  $C^\circ \rightarrow C \rightarrow W$  and a morphism  $f$  fitting into a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} C^\circ & \xrightarrow{f} & X \\ \pi \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ W & \longrightarrow & S \end{array}$$

Further, we require that  $f$  is pre-stable and defines an ordinary stable map on underlying schemes. We use the notation  $(C^\circ/W, \mathbf{p}, f)$  for a punctured map.

The main point of increasing the monoid at a punctured point is that it now allows contact orders  $u_p \in P_p^* := \text{Hom}(P_p, \mathbb{Z})$ , rather than just in  $P_p^\vee$ . Here the contact order  $u_p$  is now given as a composition

$$\bar{f}^p : P_p \longrightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{C^\circ, p} \subset \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{W, \pi(p)} \oplus \mathbb{Z} \xrightarrow{\text{pr}_2} \mathbb{Z}. \quad (2.28)$$

A key point in log Gromov-Witten theory is the tropical interpretation. Suppose  $W = (\text{Spec } \kappa, Q \oplus \kappa^\times)$  for  $\kappa$  an algebraically closed field. Then by functoriality of tropicalization, we obtain a diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Gamma := \Sigma(C^\circ) & \xrightarrow{h=f_{\text{trop}}} & \Sigma(X) \\ \pi_{\text{trop}} \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \Sigma(W) & \longrightarrow & \Sigma(S) \end{array} \quad (2.29)$$

Here  $\Sigma(W) = \text{Hom}(Q, \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}) = Q_{\mathbb{R}}^\vee$  is a rational polyhedral cone, and for  $q \in \text{Int}(Q_{\mathbb{R}}^\vee)$ ,  $\pi_{\text{trop}}^{-1}(q)$  can be identified with the dual graph of the curve  $C^\circ$  obtained as follows.

**Construction 2.26.** The dual graph  $G$  of the curve  $C^\circ$  is a graph with sets of vertices  $V(G)$ , edges  $E(G)$ , and legs (or half-edges)  $L(G)$ , with appropriate incidence relations between vertices and edges, and between vertices and legs. Each vertex corresponds to an irreducible component of  $C^\circ$ . The edges correspond to nodes of  $C$ , with vertices of a given edge indexing the two branches of  $C$  through the node. A leg corresponds to either a marked point or a punctured point. In the marked point case, a leg is an unbounded ray. In the punctured case a leg is a compact interval, with one endpoint a vertex corresponding to the irreducible component containing the punctured point. The other endpoint

of this compact interval is not viewed as a vertex of  $G$ . By abuse of notation we denote the topological realization of this graph also by  $G$ . We denote the topological realization of  $G$  obtained by removing the endpoints of compact legs which do not correspond to vertices by  $G^\circ$ .

As explained in [3, §2.5] and [2, §2.2],  $\pi_{\text{trop}}$  can be viewed as determining a family of tropical curves  $(G, \mathbf{g}, \ell)$  where  $\mathbf{g} : V(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  is the genus function, with  $\mathbf{g}(v)$  the genus of the irreducible component corresponding to  $v$ , and  $\ell : E(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}$  a length function, so that in the fibre of  $\pi_{\text{trop}}$  over  $q \in \mathbb{Q}_{\mathbb{R}}^\vee$ , the edge  $E \in E(G)$  has length  $\langle q, \ell(E) \rangle$ . See [3, Def. 2.19, Constr. 2.20]. As all curves in this paper are genus 0, we omit the genus function in the sequel.

Further,  $h$  now defines a family of tropical maps to  $\Sigma(X)$  as defined in [3, Def. 2.21]. For  $s \in \text{Int}(\mathbb{Q}_{\mathbb{R}}^\vee)$ , write

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

for the restriction of  $h$  to  $G = \pi_{\text{trop}}^{-1}(s)$ . We remark that this family of tropical maps is abstract in the sense that it does not yet necessarily satisfy any reasonable balancing condition.

Associated to any family of tropical maps to  $\Sigma(X)$  is the type, recording which cones of  $\Sigma(X)$  vertices, edges and legs of  $G$  are mapped to, and tangent vectors to the images of edges and legs:

**Definition 2.27.** A *type* of tropical map to  $\Sigma(X)$  is data of a triple  $\tau = (G, \sigma, \mathbf{u})$  where  $\sigma$  is a map

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

with the property that if  $v$  is a vertex of an edge or leg  $E$ , then  $\sigma(v) \subseteq \sigma(E)$ . Next,  $\mathbf{u}$  associates to each oriented edge  $E \in E(G)$  a tangent vector  $\mathbf{u}(E) \in \Lambda_{\sigma(E)}$  and to each leg  $L \in L(G)$  a tangent vector  $\mathbf{u}(L) \in \Lambda_{\sigma(L)}$ .

**Definition 2.28.** We say a type  $\tau$  is *realizable* if there exists a tropical map  $h : G \rightarrow \Sigma(X)$  with  $h(v) \in \text{Int}(\sigma(v))$  for each vertex  $v \in V(G)$ ,  $h(\text{Int}(E)) \subseteq \text{Int}(\sigma(E))$  for each  $E \in E(G) \cup L(G)$ , and  $\mathbf{u}(E)$  is tangent to  $h(\text{Int}(E))$  again for each  $E \in E(G) \cup L(G)$ .

Associated to a realizable type is a moduli space of tropical maps of the given type, and this dually defines a monoid called the *basic monoid*:

**Definition 2.29.** Given a realizable type  $\tau = (G, \sigma, \mathbf{u})$ , we define the *basic monoid*  $Q_\tau = \text{Hom}(Q_\tau^\vee, \mathbb{N})$  of  $\tau$  by defining its dual:

$$Q_\tau^\vee := \left\{ ((p_v)_{v \in V(G)}, (\ell_E)_{E \in E(G)}) \mid p_{v'} - p_v = \ell_E \mathbf{u}(E) \text{ for all } E \in E(G) \right\}, \quad (2.30)$$

a submonoid of

$$\prod_{v \in V(G)} \sigma(v)_{\mathbb{Z}} \times \prod_{E \in E(G)} \mathbb{N}.$$

Here  $\sigma(v)_{\mathbb{Z}}$  denotes the set of integral points of the cone  $\sigma(v)$ , and  $v', v$  are taken to be the endpoints of  $E$  consistent with the chosen orientation of the edge.

Note that the corresponding real cone  $Q_{\tau, \mathbb{R}}^{\vee}$  naturally parameterizes a universal family of tropical maps of type  $\tau$ , defining for  $s = ((p_v), (\ell_E)) \in Q_{\tau, \mathbb{R}}^{\vee}$  a tropical map  $h_s : G \rightarrow \Sigma(X)$  given by  $h_x(v) = p_v$ , taking an edge  $E$  with endpoints  $v, v'$  to the straight line segment joining  $p_v$  and  $p_{v'}$  inside  $\sigma(E)$ , and taking a leg  $L$  to the line segment or ray

$$h_s(L_p) = (h_s(v) + \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \mathbf{u}(L_p)) \cap \sigma(L_p)$$

inside  $\sigma(L_p)^{\text{sp}}$ . The notion of type of a tropical map leads to the notion of type of a punctured map:

**Definition 2.30.** The *type* of a family of punctured curves  $C^{\circ} \rightarrow W$  for  $W = (\text{Spec } \kappa, \kappa^{\times} \oplus Q)$  a log point with  $\kappa$  algebraically closed, is the type  $\tau$  of tropical map defined as follows:

- (1) Let  $x \in C^{\circ}$  be a generic point, node or punctured point, with  $\omega_x \in \Gamma = \Sigma(C^{\circ})$  the corresponding cone. Define  $\sigma$  by mapping the vertex, edge or leg of  $G$  corresponding to  $x$  to the minimal cone  $\tau \in \Sigma(X)$  containing  $h(\omega_x)$ .
- (2) *Contact orders at edges.* Let  $E_q \in E(G)$  be an edge with a chosen order of vertices  $v, v'$  (hence an orientation on  $E_q$ ). Then there is an integral tangent vector  $u_q$  to  $\sigma$  such that if we consider the tropical map  $h_s : G \rightarrow \Sigma(X)$  for  $s \in \text{Int}(Q_{\mathbb{R}}^{\vee})$ , we have

$$h_s(v') - h_s(v) = \langle s, \ell(E_q) \rangle u_q. \quad (2.31)$$

We note that this agrees with the  $u_q$  of (2.27). We define  $\mathbf{u}(E_q) = u_q$ , noting this depends, up to sign, on the choice of orientation of  $E_q$ .

- (3) *Contact orders at punctures.* For a leg  $L_p \in L(G)$  corresponding to a puncture  $p$  and vertex  $v$ , we set  $\mathbf{u}(L_p) = u_p$ , as defined in (2.28).

*Remark 2.31.* A crucial notion of the theory is that of basicness. See [22, Def. 1.20] and [2, Def. 2.36] for the precise definition. But roughly, the punctured map  $f : C^{\circ}/W \rightarrow X$  of the previous remark is basic provided the corresponding family of tropical maps is universal. In particular, if  $W = (\text{Spec } \kappa, \kappa^{\times} \oplus Q)$  is a log point and the type of  $f$  is  $\tau$ , then  $f$  is basic if  $Q = Q_{\tau}$ . A more general punctured map  $f : C^{\circ}/W \rightarrow X$  is basic if  $f_{\bar{w}} : C_{\bar{w}}^{\circ}/\bar{w} \rightarrow X$  is basic for each strict

geometric point  $\bar{w}$  of  $W$ . It is the case that any punctured log map is obtained by base-change from a basic punctured log map.

*Remark 2.32.* We may also consider punctured maps  $f : C^\circ/W \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$  with target the Artin fan. We note that here we must remove the assumption of stability, as stability does not make sense for maps to the Artin fan. So we only insist on pre-stability. Note by the discussion of §2.3.2, if  $W$  is a log point, then giving a morphism  $C^\circ/W \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$  is the same thing as giving a family of tropical maps  $h : \Gamma \rightarrow \Sigma(X)$ . Thus maps to the Artin fan are purely tropical information.

2.3.4. *Moduli spaces and virtual cycles.* In [2], it is proved that the moduli space  $\mathcal{M}(X)$  of basic stable punctured maps defined over  $\text{Spec } \mathbb{k}$  is a Deligne-Mumford stack. Further, the moduli space  $\mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{X})$  of basic pre-stable punctured maps to the Artin fan  $\mathcal{X}$  is an algebraic stack. There is a natural morphism  $\varepsilon : \mathcal{M}(X) \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{X})$  taking a punctured map  $C^\circ \rightarrow X$  to the composition  $C^\circ \rightarrow X \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ , and a relative perfect obstruction theory for  $\varepsilon$  is constructed. At a geometric point of  $\mathcal{M}(X)$  represented by a stable punctured map  $f : C^\circ \rightarrow X$ , the relative virtual dimension of  $\varepsilon$  at this point is  $\chi(f^*\Theta_{X/\mathbb{k}})$ , where  $\Theta_{X/\mathbb{k}}$  denotes the logarithmic tangent bundle of  $X$ .

In general, when negative orders of tangency are allowed,  $\mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{X})$  may be quite unpleasant. In the usual stable log map case,  $\mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{X})$  is in fact log smooth over  $\text{Spec } \mathbb{k}$ , hence is toric locally in the smooth topology. However, once one allows punctures,  $\mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{X})$  becomes only idealized log smooth. This means that smooth locally, it looks like a subscheme of a toric variety defined by a monomial ideal. So in particular, it may not be reduced or equi-dimensional. Hence, to get useful invariants, it is helpful to restrict to strata, as follows.

One may decompose the reduction of  $\mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{X})$  into locally closed strata on which the corresponding type of map to  $\mathcal{X}$  is constant, in the sense of Definition 2.30. Thus given a type  $\tau$ , one defines  $\mathfrak{M}_\tau(\mathcal{X})$  as the closure of the union of strata of type  $\tau$ , with the reduced induced stack structure.<sup>1</sup> Note that in general  $\mathfrak{M}_\tau(\mathcal{X})$  may be empty. Setting  $\mathcal{M}_\tau(X) = \mathfrak{M}_\tau(\mathcal{X}) \times_{\mathfrak{M}(X)} \mathcal{M}(X)$ , we may write a disjoint union

$$\mathcal{M}_\tau(X) = \bigcup_{\bar{\tau}=(\tau,\beta)} \mathcal{M}_{\bar{\tau}}(X)$$

where  $\mathcal{M}_{\bar{\tau}}(X)$  is the open and closed substack of  $\mathcal{M}_\tau(X)$  parametrizing punctured curves which represent the curve class  $\underline{\beta}$ . Then [2] shows that  $\mathcal{M}_{\bar{\tau}}(X)$  is proper

<sup>1</sup>In [25], this is written as  $\mathfrak{M}_\tau(\mathcal{X}, \beta)$ , however the type  $\beta$  is redundant information and we omit it here.

over  $\text{Spec } \mathbb{k}$ . Thus we have by restriction a perfect obstruction theory for the map

$$\varepsilon : \mathcal{M}_{\tilde{\tau}}(X) \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}_{\tau}(\mathcal{X}),$$

and we denote by

$$\varepsilon^! : A_*(\mathfrak{M}_{\tau}(\mathcal{X})) \rightarrow A_*(\mathcal{M}_{\tilde{\tau}}(X))$$

the virtual pull-back defined by Manolache [34].

**2.4. The canonical scattering diagram.** Given a log Calabi-Yau pair  $(X, D)$  as in §2.1.1 with tropicalization  $(B, \mathcal{P})$  with affine structure on  $B$  as previously constructed, we review the construction of the canonical scattering diagram on  $B$  as announced in [24] and developed in [25]. As we will be constructing a scattering diagram on  $B$  using the choice of MVPL function  $\varphi$  given by Construction 2.8, we need to fix the additional data of the monoid  $Q \subseteq N_1(X)$ , and a monomial ideal  $I \subseteq Q$  with  $\sqrt{I} = \mathfrak{m}$ . Thus we obtain a  $Q_{\mathbb{R}}^{\text{gp}}$ -valued MVPL function  $\varphi$ .

Fix a curve class  $\underline{\beta} \in N_1(X)$ , a cone  $\sigma \in \mathcal{P}$  which is of codimension 0 or 1, and a non-zero tangent vector  $u \in \Lambda_{\sigma}$ . Further, choose a realizable type  $\tau = (G, \sigma, \mathbf{u})$  with basic monoid  $Q_{\tau}$  (Definition 2.29), and with dual cone  $Q_{\tau, \mathbb{R}}^{\vee} = \text{Hom}(Q_{\tau}, \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0})$ . We require that  $\tau$  be a *wall type* in the sense of [25, Def. 3.6], i.e.,

- $G$  is a genus zero graph with  $L(G) = \{L_{\text{out}}\}$  with  $u_{\tau} := \mathbf{u}(L_{\text{out}}) \neq 0$ .
- $\tau$  is balanced. In other words, for each vertex  $v \in V(G)$  with  $\sigma(v) \in \mathcal{P}$  of codimension zero or one, and  $x \in \text{Int}(\sigma(v))$  any point, suppose we have edges or legs  $E_1, \dots, E_m$  adjacent to  $v$  oriented away from  $v$ . Then  $\mathbf{u}(E_1), \dots, \mathbf{u}(E_m)$  may be viewed as elements of  $\Lambda_x$ , and the equality

$$\sum_{i=1}^m \mathbf{u}(E_i) = 0$$

holds in  $\Lambda_x$ .

- Let  $h : \Gamma \rightarrow \Sigma(X)$  be the corresponding universal family of tropical maps parametrized by  $Q_{\tau, \mathbb{R}}^{\vee}$ , and  $\tau_{\text{out}} \in \Gamma$  the cone corresponding to  $L_{\text{out}}$ . (See discussion in the following paragraph.) Then  $\dim Q_{\tau, \mathbb{R}}^{\vee} = n - 2$  and  $\dim h(\tau_{\text{out}}) = n - 1$ . Further,  $h(\tau_{\text{out}}) \not\subseteq \partial B$ .

In this case, along with  $\tilde{\tau} = (\tau, \underline{\beta})$  we have a map  $\varepsilon : \mathcal{M}_{\tilde{\tau}}(X) \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}_{\tau}(\mathcal{X})$ . It is proved in [25, Lem. 3.9] that

$$[\mathcal{M}_{\tilde{\tau}}(X)]^{\text{virt}} := \varepsilon^![\mathfrak{M}_{\tau}(\mathcal{X})]$$

is a zero-dimensional cycle. Hence we may define

$$N_{\tilde{\tau}} := \deg[\mathcal{M}_{\tilde{\tau}}(X)]^{\text{virt}}. \tag{2.32}$$



Now the wall type  $\tau$  gives rise to universal family of tropical maps of type  $\tau$ :

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Gamma & \xrightarrow{h} & \Sigma(X) = B \\ \pi_{\text{trop}} \downarrow & & \\ Q_{\tau, \mathbb{R}}^{\vee} & & \end{array}$$

Here we are viewing  $\Gamma$  as a polyhedral complex, containing a cone corresponding to each vertex, edge, or leg of  $G$ . In particular, as already mentioned in the definition of wall type,  $\Gamma$  contains an  $n - 1$ -dimensional cell  $\tau_{\text{out}}$ , such that for  $s \in \text{Int}(Q_{\tau, \mathbb{R}}^{\vee})$ ,  $\pi_{\text{trop}}^{-1}(s) \cap \tau_{\text{out}}$  is the leg  $L_{\text{out}}$  of  $G$ . Note also that the vertex  $v \in V(G)$  adjacent to  $L_{\text{out}}$  then gives a cell  $\tau_v \in \Gamma$  such that  $\pi_{\text{trop}}|_{\tau_v}$  is an isomorphism of  $\tau_v$  with  $Q_{\tau, \mathbb{R}}^{\vee}$ , and  $\tau_v$  is a face of  $\tau_{\text{out}}$ . Consider the wall

$$(\mathfrak{d}_{\tilde{\tau}}, f_{\tilde{\tau}}) := (h(\tau_{\text{out}}), \exp(k_{\tau} N_{\tilde{\tau}} t^{\beta} z^{-u})). \quad (2.33)$$

Here  $k_{\tau}$  is defined as follows. The map  $h$  is affine linear when restricted to  $\tau_{\text{out}}$ , inducing a map of integral tangent spaces  $h_* : \Lambda_{\tau_{\text{out}}} \rightarrow \Lambda_{\sigma}$ . We then set

$$k_{\tau} := |(\Lambda_{\sigma}/h_*(\Lambda_{\tau_{\text{out}}}))_{\text{tors}}|. \quad (2.34)$$

By (2.31), we may also write

$$h(\tau_{\text{out}}) = (h(\tau_v) + \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} u) \cap \sigma. \quad (2.35)$$

Note also that  $\exp(k_{\tau} N_{\tilde{\tau}} t^{\beta} z^{-u})$  makes sense as an element of  $(\mathbb{k}[Q]/I)[\Lambda_{\sigma}] \subseteq \mathbb{k}[\mathcal{P}_x^+]/I_x$  for  $x \in \text{Int}(\sigma)$ .

**Definition 2.33.** We define the *canonical scattering diagram* associated to  $(X, D)$  modulo the ideal  $I$  to be

$$\mathfrak{D}_{(X, D)} := \{(\mathfrak{d}_{\tilde{\tau}}, f_{\tilde{\tau}})\}$$

where  $\tilde{\tau} = (\tau, \underline{\beta})$  runs over all wall types and curve classes  $\underline{\beta} \in Q \setminus I$ .

One of the main results of [25], stated as Theorem 3.12 in that reference, is then:

**Theorem 2.34.**  $\mathfrak{D}_{(X, D)}$  is a consistent scattering diagram.

*Remark 2.35.* The definition of  $\mathfrak{D}_{(X, D)}$  depends on  $I$ , but it is obvious from the definition that if  $I \subseteq I'$ , then the scattering diagrams defined using  $I$  and  $I'$  are equivalent modulo  $I'$ . Thus we tend to view  $\mathfrak{D}_{(X, D)}$  as a compatible system of scattering diagrams, as in Remark 2.13. For the most part, when we discuss the canonical scattering diagram, generally we take a sufficiently small ideal  $I$  as needed without comment.

As we will also apply this consistency result in the relative case as described in §2.1.1, we quote another result from [25], using the notation in Remark 2.2. Let  $p : X \rightarrow \mathbb{A}^1$  be in that remark. Here  $\mathbb{A}^1$  now carries the divisorial log structure induced by  $0 \in \mathbb{A}^1$ , so that  $p$  is a log smooth morphism. Assume the fibre  $(X_t, D_t)$  over general  $t \in \mathbb{A}^1$  is maximally degenerate, so that  $(B_0, \mathcal{P}_0)$  is the boundary of  $(B, \mathcal{P})$ . We thus have two scattering diagrams,  $\mathfrak{D}_{(X_t, D_t)}$  and  $\mathfrak{D}_{(X, D)}$ , which we compare in what follows.

We first note from [25, Prop. 3.7]:

**Theorem 2.36.** *Let  $p : X \rightarrow \mathbb{A}^1$  be as above, and let  $p_{\text{trop}} : B \rightarrow \Sigma(\mathbb{A}^1) = \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  be the induced affine submersion. Then any punctured log map  $f : C^\circ/W \rightarrow X$  lying in a moduli space contributing to the canonical scattering diagram, with output leg contact order  $u$ , is in fact a punctured log map defined over  $S = \mathbb{A}^1$ . In particular, if  $W = (\text{Spec } \kappa, \kappa^\times \oplus Q)$  is a log point and  $f$  is of type  $\tau$ , we have the commutative diagram (2.29). If  $s \in Q_{\mathbb{R}}^\vee$  maps to  $1 \in \Sigma(S) = \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ , then the image of  $h_s$  lies in  $p_{\text{trop}}^{-1}(1)$ . Thus we have  $(p_{\text{trop}})_*(u) = 0$ .*

We have a natural map  $\iota : N_1(X_t) \rightarrow N_1(X)$  induced by the inclusion  $X_t \hookrightarrow X$ . Choose a monoid  $Q_t \subset N_1(X_t)$  as usual such that  $\iota(Q_t) \subseteq Q$ . This allows us to define, for any  $\sigma \in \mathcal{P}_0$  of codimension zero or one, a map

$$\iota_* : \mathbb{k}[\Lambda_\sigma][Q_t] \rightarrow \mathbb{k}[\Lambda_\sigma][Q].$$

We may then define

$$\iota(\mathfrak{D}_{(X_t, D_t)}) = \{(\mathfrak{d}, \iota_*(f_{\mathfrak{d}})) \mid (\mathfrak{d}, f_{\mathfrak{d}}) \in \mathfrak{D}_{(X_t, D_t)}\}. \quad (2.36)$$

**Definition 2.37.** In the above situation, the *asymptotic scattering diagram* of  $\mathfrak{D}_{(X, D)}$  is defined as

$$\mathfrak{D}_{(X, D)}^{\text{as}} = \{(\mathfrak{d} \cap p_{\text{trop}}^{-1}(0), f_{\mathfrak{d}}) \mid (\mathfrak{d}, f_{\mathfrak{d}}) \in \mathfrak{D}_{(X, D)} \text{ with } \dim \mathfrak{d} \cap p_{\text{trop}}^{-1}(0) = \dim X_t - 1\}.$$

Note that this makes sense as a scattering diagram on  $B_0$ : any non-trivial monomial  $ct^{\beta}z^{-u}$  appearing in a wall function  $f_{\mathfrak{d}}$  must have  $u$  tangent to  $B_0$  by Theorem 2.36.

We then also have from [25, Prop. 3.18]:

**Theorem 2.38.** *In the above situation, assuming that  $p^{-1}(0)$  is reduced, we have  $\iota(\mathfrak{D}_{(X_t, D_t)}) = \mathfrak{D}_{(X, D)}^{\text{as}}$ .*

**2.5. Balancing and consistency in higher codimension.** Here we gather a couple of results needed for the behaviour of tropical curves and consistency along codimension  $\geq 2$  cells of  $\mathcal{P}$  which are not contained in the discriminant locus.

Hence fix once and for all in this section a log Calabi-Yau pair  $(X, D)$  leading to  $(B, \mathcal{P})$  an affine manifold with singularities.

The following generalizes the balancing statement of [25, Lem. 2.1]:

**Theorem 2.39.** *Let  $f : C^\circ/W \rightarrow X$  be a punctured map, with  $W = (\text{Spec } \kappa, \mathbb{k}^\times \oplus Q)$  a log point. Let  $h_s : G \rightarrow B$  be the induced tropical map for some  $s \in \text{Int}(Q_{\mathbb{R}}^\vee)$ . Let  $\rho \in \mathcal{P}$  satisfy the hypotheses of Proposition 2.3. If  $v \in V(G)$  with  $h_s(v) \in \text{Int}(\rho)$ , then  $h_s$  satisfies the balancing condition at  $v$ . More precisely, if  $E_1, \dots, E_m$  are the legs and edges adjacent to  $v$ , oriented away from  $v$ , then the contact orders  $\mathbf{u}(E_i)$  may be interpreted as elements of  $\Lambda_{h_s(v)}$ , and in this group*

$$\sum_{i=1}^m \mathbf{u}(E_i) = 0.$$

*Proof.* As each  $\mathbf{u}(E_i)$  is a tangent vector to  $\sigma(E_i)$ , which is necessarily a cone of  $\mathcal{P}$  containing  $\rho$ , we may view this tangent vector as a tangent vector to  $B$  at  $h_s(v)$  via parallel transport in  $\Lambda$  via a path inside  $\sigma(E_i)$ .

Let  $C_v \subseteq C$  be the irreducible component corresponding to the vertex  $v$ . By splitting  $C^\circ$  at the nodes contained in  $C_v$  using [2, Prop. 5.2], we obtain a punctured map  $f_v : C_v^\circ/W \rightarrow X$  which has turned these nodes into punctures. In particular, the dual graph of  $C_v^\circ$  consists of one vertex  $v$  and  $m$  legs  $E_1, \dots, E_m$ . Further, the splitting process does not change the contact orders of legs or nodes. Thus it is enough to show that the induced map  $(f_v)_{\text{trop}} : \Sigma(C_v^\circ) \rightarrow \Sigma(X)$  is balanced at the vertex  $v$ .

To do so, first note that  $f_v$  factors through the strict inclusion  $D_\rho \hookrightarrow X$ . The log structure on  $D_\rho$ , pulled back from that on  $X$ , has an explicit description. Let  $D'_\rho$  be the log structure on  $\underline{D}_\rho$  induced by the toric boundary of  $D_\rho$ . On the other hand,  $D_\rho \subseteq D_{i_1}, \dots, D_{i_{n-d}}$  as in the proof of Proposition 2.3. Let  $\mathcal{M}_{i_j}$  be the restriction to  $D_\rho$  of the divisorial log structure on  $X$  induced by  $D_{i_j}$ . This log structure only depends on the restriction  $\mathcal{O}_X(D_{i_j})|_{D_\rho}$ . Then

$$\mathcal{M}_{D_\rho} = \mathcal{M}_{D'_\rho} \oplus_{\mathcal{O}_{D_\rho}^\times} \bigoplus_{j=1}^{n-d} \mathcal{M}_{i_j}.$$

Here, the push-outs are all over  $\mathcal{O}_{D_\rho}^\times$ .

Now recall from the proof of Proposition 2.3 the chart  $\psi_\rho$  which identifies the closure of the star of  $\rho$  with the support of a fan  $\Sigma$  in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . By Remark 2.4, if we consider instead  $X_\Sigma$  with its standard toric log structure,  $D_{\psi_\rho(\rho)} \hookrightarrow X_\Sigma$  the strict inclusion, then the log structure on  $D_{\psi_\rho(\rho)}$  has the same description, and the isomorphism  $D_\rho \cong D_{\psi_\rho(\rho)}$  also holds at the log level. Thus we may instead view  $f_v$  as a morphism  $f_v : C_v^\circ \rightarrow D_{\psi_\rho(\rho)} \hookrightarrow X_\Sigma$ . In other words,  $f_v$  can be viewed

as a punctured map to a toric variety. As the chart  $\psi_\rho$  defined in the proof of Proposition 2.3 gives an integral affine identification of  $\text{Star}(\rho)$  and  $\text{Star}(\psi_\rho(\rho))$ , it is enough to check that the tropicalization of  $f_v : C_v^\circ \rightarrow X_\Sigma$  is balanced at the vertex  $v$ . But this follows as in [22, Ex. 7.5].  $\square$

In [25], the canonical scattering diagram  $\mathfrak{D}_{(X,D)}$  was only considered as a scattering diagram on  $B$  when  $\Delta$  is the union of all codimension two cells. As we often take  $\Delta$  to be smaller here, we need to know that the wall functions for  $\mathfrak{D}_{(X,D)}$  still make sense in higher codimension, away from  $\Delta$ .

**Theorem 2.40.** *Let  $\rho \in \mathcal{P}$  satisfy the hypotheses of Proposition 2.3, and let  $(\mathfrak{d}, f_{\mathfrak{d}}) \in \mathfrak{D}_{(X,D)}$  with  $\mathfrak{d} \cap \text{Int}(\rho) \neq \emptyset$ . If  $x \in \text{Int}(\rho) \cap \mathfrak{d}$ ,  $y \in \text{Int}(\mathfrak{d})$  and  $f_{\mathfrak{d}} = \sum_{m \in \mathcal{P}_y^+} c_m z^m$ , then under parallel transport to  $x$ ,  $m \in \mathcal{P}_x^+$  whenever  $c_m \neq 0$ .*

*Proof.* A wall in  $\mathfrak{D}_{(X,D)}$  intersecting  $\text{Int}(\rho)$  arises from a choice of  $\tilde{\tau} = (\tau, \underline{\beta})$  with the type  $\tau$  having precisely one leg  $L_{\text{out}}$ , and  $\sigma(L_{\text{out}}) = \sigma \in \mathcal{P}$  with  $\rho \subseteq \sigma$ . Then  $\mathfrak{d} = h(\tau_{\text{out}})$ . Further,  $f_{\mathfrak{d}} = \exp(\alpha t^{\underline{\beta}} z^{-u})$  for some  $\alpha \in \mathbb{k}$ . Thus we need to show that  $(-u, \underline{\beta}) \in \mathcal{P}_y^+$  lies in  $\mathcal{P}_x^+$  under parallel transport. Note that this element of  $\mathcal{P}_x$  is, using (2.12),  $(-u, (d\varphi_\rho|_\sigma)(-u) + \underline{\beta})$ .

First suppose that  $x \notin h(\tau_v)$ . Then by (2.35), necessarily  $-u$  lies in the tangent wedge of  $\sigma$  along  $\rho$ . Then  $(-u, (d\varphi_\rho|_\sigma)(-u) + \underline{\beta}) \in \mathcal{P}_x^+$  by (2.12).

Second, suppose  $x \in h(\tau_v)$ . Let  $f : C^\circ/W \rightarrow X$  be a curve in  $\mathcal{M}_{\tilde{\tau}}(X)$ , with  $W$  a geometric log point. Such a curve must exist if the wall is non-trivial, i.e.,  $N_{\tilde{\tau}} \neq 0$ . With  $v$  the vertex of  $G$  adjacent to  $L_{\text{out}}$ , let  $C_v^\circ \subseteq C^\circ$  be the union of irreducible components corresponding to  $v$  (as the type of  $f$  may not be  $\tau$  but have a contraction to  $\tau$ , see [3, Def. 2.24], this may not be a single irreducible component). We then obtain  $f_v : C_v^\circ \rightarrow X$  by splitting, as in the proof of Theorem 2.39. Further,  $f_v$  factors through the strict embedding  $D_\rho \rightarrow X$ . Let  $D'_\rho$  be the log structure on  $\underline{D}_\rho$  induced by the toric boundary of  $D_\rho$ . Then there is a morphism of log schemes  $D_\rho \rightarrow D'_\rho$ , whose tropicalization is the map  $v$  of Proposition 2.3. We thus may compose to obtain a punctured map  $f'_v : C_v^\circ \rightarrow D'_\rho$ . If  $E_1, \dots, E_s$  are the legs and edges of  $G$  adjacent to  $v$ , say with  $E_1 = L_{\text{out}}$ , then  $C_v^\circ$  has corresponding punctures  $p_1, \dots, p_s$ , and  $m_i = v_*(\mathbf{u}(E_i))$  is the contact order of  $f'_v$  at  $p_i$ . By the balancing of Theorem 2.39,  $\sum_i m_i = 0$ . Let  $\Sigma_\rho$  be the fan defining  $D'_\rho$ . Each  $m_i$  lies in some minimal cone  $\sigma_i \in \Sigma_\rho$ . Then the data of the  $m_i, \sigma_i$  determine a class  $\underline{\beta}'_v \in N_1(D'_\rho)$  by the discussion preceding Lemma 2.9. It follows from [20, Cor. 1.14] that the class  $\underline{\beta}_v \in N_1(D_\rho)$  of the map  $f'_v$  in fact agrees with  $\underline{\beta}'_v$ . Indeed, the cited corollary precisely describes the intersection of  $\underline{\beta}_v$  with boundary divisors of  $D'_\rho$  in terms of the contact orders  $m_i$ , and recovers the relation (2.19).

Let  $\iota_* : N_1(D_\rho) \rightarrow N_1(X)$  be the map induced by the inclusion. Then  $\underline{\beta} = \iota_*(\underline{\beta}_v) + \underline{\beta}'$  for some  $\underline{\beta}' \in Q$ . Now note that  $m_1 = v_*(u)$ . By construction of  $\varphi_\rho$  in Proposition 2.10, it is the pull-back of the piecewise linear map  $\psi$  given in Lemma 2.9, (1) under  $v$ . Further, by Lemma 2.9, (3), since  $m_i \in \sigma_i$  for each  $i$ ,

$$\underline{\beta}_v = \sum_i \psi(m_i).$$

Thus, bearing in mind that  $u$  is in the tangent wedge to  $\sigma$  along  $\rho$  by (2.35),

$$\begin{aligned} (d\varphi_\rho)|_\sigma(-u) + \underline{\beta} &= -\psi(m_1) + \underline{\beta}_v + \underline{\beta}' \\ &= \sum_{i=2}^s \psi(m_i) + \underline{\beta}'. \end{aligned}$$

Thus we may write

$$(-u, (d\varphi_\rho)|_\sigma(-u) + \underline{\beta}) = (0, \underline{\beta}') + \sum_{i=2}^s (\mathbf{u}(E_i), \psi(\mathbf{u}(E_i))).$$

This is a sum of terms in  $\mathcal{P}_x^+$ , hence lies in  $\mathcal{P}_x^+$ , as desired.  $\square$

Finally, we check that consistency of  $\mathfrak{D}_{(X,D)}$  implies a consistency in higher codimension, away from  $\Delta$ , similar to consistency in codimensions zero and one.

**Theorem 2.41.** *Let  $\rho \in \mathcal{P}$  satisfy the hypotheses of Proposition 2.3,  $\mathfrak{D}_{(X,D)}$  the canonical scattering diagram on  $B$ . Let  $x \in \text{Int}(\rho)$ . Then for any path  $\gamma$  with endpoints in  $\text{Star}(\rho) \setminus \text{Supp}(\mathfrak{D}_{(X,D)})$  and image in  $\text{Star}(\rho) \setminus \text{Sing}(\mathfrak{D}_{(X,D)})$  and which only cross walls of  $\mathfrak{D}_{(X,D)}$  which meet  $\text{Int}(\rho)$ ,  $\theta_{\gamma, \mathfrak{D}_{(X,D)}}$  is an automorphism of  $\mathbb{k}[\mathcal{P}_x^+]/I_x$ . Further if  $\gamma$  is a loop, this automorphism is the identity.*

*Proof.* Recall that any wall-crossing automorphism associated with  $\gamma$  acts, a priori, on  $\mathbb{k}[\mathcal{P}_y^+]/I_y$  for  $y$  in the interior of a maximal cell containing the wall. However, by parallel transport to  $x$  inside of  $\text{Star}(\rho)$ , there is an inclusion  $\mathcal{P}_x^+ \subseteq \mathcal{P}_y^+$ . Further, by the description (2.17), under this inclusion,  $I_y \cap \mathcal{P}_x^+ \subseteq I_x$ . Thus  $\mathbb{k}[\mathcal{P}_x^+]/I_x$  is a subquotient of  $\mathbb{k}[\mathcal{P}_y^+]/I_y$ . Further, by Theorem 2.40, for each wall  $\mathfrak{d}$  crossed by  $\gamma$ ,  $f_{\mathfrak{d}}$  may be viewed as an element of  $\mathbb{k}[\mathcal{P}_x^+]/I_x$ . Thus the wall-crossing automorphism on  $\mathbb{k}[\mathcal{P}_y^+]/I_y$  restricts to a wall-crossing automorphism on  $\mathbb{k}[\mathcal{P}_x^+]/I_x$ , proving the first statement.

To prove that  $\theta_\gamma := \theta_{\gamma, \mathfrak{D}_{(X,D)}}$  is the identity for a loop  $\gamma$ , it is sufficient to prove that if  $\gamma$  is a loop around a joint  $j$  intersecting  $\text{Int}(\rho)$ , then  $\theta_\gamma$  is the identity. If the joint  $j$  is codimension zero or codimension one, this is already implied by the definition of consistency, so it suffices to show this for a codimension two joint. Thus we may pass to  $(B_j, \mathcal{P}_j)$  and  $\mathfrak{D}_{(X,D),j}$ . Note now that  $B_j \cong \mathbb{R}^n$  as an integral affine manifold, and consistency implies that for each  $m \in \mathbb{Z}^n$  and

general  $p \in B_j \setminus \text{Supp}(\mathfrak{D}_{(X,D),j})$ , there is a function  $\vartheta_m^j(p)$ , and these functions are related by wall-crossing as in Definition 2.19. But from the construction of broken lines and the definition of  $\vartheta_m^j(p)$ , it follows that  $\vartheta_m^j(p)$  can be viewed as an element of  $\mathbb{k}[\mathcal{P}_x^+]/I_x$ . Thus for a loop  $\gamma$  around  $j$ ,  $\theta_\gamma(\vartheta_m^j(p)) = \vartheta_m^j(p)$ . Since the  $\vartheta_m^j(p)$  for  $m \in \mathbb{Z}^n$  generate  $\mathbb{k}[\mathcal{P}_x^+]/I_x$  as a  $\mathbb{k}[Q]/I$ -module,  $\theta_\gamma$  hence acts as the identity, proving the result.

Note that if instead  $j \subseteq \Delta$ , this argument would not work, as there is no common ring in which to compare the  $\vartheta_m^j(p)$ .  $\square$

### 3. PULLING SINGULARITIES OUT AND AN ASYMPTOTIC EQUIVALENCE

In the remaining part of this paper we restrict our attention to log Calabi–Yau pairs  $(X, D)$  obtained by blowing up a toric variety along hypersurfaces in its toric boundary. Specifically, let  $X_\Sigma$  be a projective toric variety associated to a complete toric fan in  $M_{\mathbb{R}}$ . Fix a tuple of distinct rays of  $\Sigma$ ,

$$\mathbf{P} = (\rho_1, \dots, \rho_s). \quad (3.1)$$

Though all the upcoming discussion could be carried out in greater generality, it is vastly simplifying to make the following two assumptions, analogous to the two-dimensional case in [19, §4.2]:

- (1)  $X_\Sigma$  is non-singular.
- (2) There is no  $\sigma \in \Sigma$  with  $\rho_i, \rho_j \subseteq \sigma$  for  $i \neq j$ .

Note both of these conditions may be achieved by refining the fan  $\Sigma$ . Corresponding to the ray  $\rho_i$  is a divisor  $D_{\rho_i} \subseteq X_\Sigma$ . We note that by the second assumption above,  $D_{\rho_i} \cap D_{\rho_j} = \emptyset$  for  $i \neq j$ . Assume also given non-singular general hypersurfaces

$$H_i \subseteq D_{\rho_i} \quad (3.2)$$

meeting the toric boundary of  $D_{\rho_i}$  transversally. Then,  $X$  is obtained by the blow-up

$$\text{Bl}_H : X \longrightarrow X_\Sigma \quad (3.3)$$

with center  $H$  given by the union of the hypersurfaces  $H_i$ . Define  $D$  to be the strict transform of  $D_\Sigma$ . In this section, we further describe a degeneration  $(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D})$  of  $(X, D)$  and the associated canonical scattering diagram  $\mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D})}$ . We show that a slice of  $\mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D})}$  is asymptotically equivalent to  $\mathfrak{D}_{(X, D)}$ .

**3.1. A degeneration  $(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D})$ .** We construct a degeneration of  $(X, D)$  analogous to that constructed in two dimensions in [19, §5.3]. In higher dimensions, see also

[33, §5]. For this, first consider the toric variety  $X_{\overline{\Sigma}} := X_{\Sigma} \times \mathbb{A}^1$ , with associated toric fan in

$$\overline{M}_{\mathbb{R}} := M_{\mathbb{R}} \oplus \mathbb{R}$$

given by:

$$\overline{\Sigma} = \bigcup_{\sigma \in \Sigma} \{\sigma \times \{0\}, \sigma \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}\}.$$

We adopt the notation that if  $\sigma \in \Sigma$ , then we also view  $\sigma = \sigma \times \{0\} \in \overline{\Sigma}$ , and write  $\bar{\sigma} := \sigma \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \in \overline{\Sigma}$ . Now, consider the blow-up  $\text{Bl}_{\mathbf{D}}: X_{\overline{\Sigma}} \rightarrow X_{\overline{\Sigma}}$  with center

$$\mathbf{D} = \bigcup_{i=1}^s D_{\rho_i} \times \{0\}.$$

We note that as the  $D_{\rho_i} \times \{0\}$  are toric strata of  $X_{\Sigma} \times \mathbb{A}^1$ , the blow-up with these centers is a toric blow-up. We review the description of the toric fan  $\tilde{\Sigma}$  as a refinement of  $\overline{\Sigma}$  using standard toric methods in the following construction.

**Construction 3.1.** Note that the codimension two toric stratum  $D_{\rho_i} \times \{0\}$  of  $X_{\overline{\Sigma}} = X_{\Sigma} \times \mathbb{A}^1$  corresponds to the cone  $\bar{\rho}_i$ . By [36], Prop. 1.26, the blow-up of  $X_{\overline{\Sigma}}$  at  $\bigcup_{i=1}^m D_{\rho_i} \times \{0\}$  is given by the star subdivision of  $\overline{\Sigma}$  at the cones  $\bar{\rho}_i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq s$ . Recall that this is defined as follows. Note that  $\bar{\rho}_i$  is generated by  $(m_i, 0)$  and  $(0, 1)$ , where  $m_i$  is a primitive generator of  $\rho_i$ . If  $\bar{\rho}_i \subseteq \bar{\sigma} \in \overline{\Sigma}$ , then we can write the generators of  $\bar{\sigma}$  as  $(m_i, 0), (0, 1), u_1, \dots, u_r \in \overline{M}$ . One defines  $\Sigma_{\bar{\sigma}}^*(\bar{\rho}_i)$  to be the set of cones generated by subsets of  $\{(m_i, 0), (0, 1), u_1, \dots, u_r, (m_i, 1)\}$  not containing  $\{(m_i, 0), (0, 1)\}$ . Then we set

$$\tilde{\Sigma} := \left( \overline{\Sigma} \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^s \{\bar{\sigma} \in \overline{\Sigma} \mid \bar{\sigma} \supseteq \bar{\rho}_i\} \right) \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^s \bigcup_{\bar{\sigma} \supseteq \bar{\rho}_i} \Sigma_{\bar{\sigma}}^*(\bar{\rho}_i).$$

Note that if  $\bar{\sigma} \in \overline{\Sigma}$  does not contain any  $\bar{\rho}_i$ , then also  $\bar{\sigma} \in \tilde{\Sigma}$ , and we continue to use the notation  $\bar{\sigma}$  for this cone as a cone in  $\tilde{\Sigma}$ . On the other hand, if  $\bar{\sigma} \supseteq \bar{\rho}_i$ , then  $\bar{\sigma}$  is subdivided into two cones. Explicitly, if  $\bar{\sigma}$  is generated by  $\bar{\rho}_i$  and additional generators  $u_1, \dots, u_r$  as above, then the two subcones are

$$\tilde{\sigma} := \langle (m_i, 0), (m_i, 1), u_1, \dots, u_r \rangle \text{ and } \tilde{\sigma}' := \langle (m_i, 1), (0, 1), u_1, \dots, u_r \rangle.$$

Note that the divisor in  $X_{\tilde{\Sigma}}$  corresponding to the ray

$$\nu_i := \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}(m_i, 1) \tag{3.4}$$

is an exceptional divisor of the blow-up, which we write as  $\mathbb{P}_i \cong \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{O}_{D_{\rho_i}} \oplus \text{Norm}_{D_{\rho_i}/X_{\rho_i}})$ , with restriction of  $\text{Bl}_{\mathbf{D}}$  exhibiting the  $\mathbb{P}^1$ -bundle structure:

$$p_i : \mathbb{P}_i \rightarrow D_{\rho_i}. \tag{3.5}$$




FIGURE 3.1. Slices of the toric fan  $\tilde{\Sigma}$  at height zero and one for  $X_{\tilde{\Sigma}} = \mathbb{P}^2 \times \mathbb{A}^1$  and  $\mathbf{D} = \mathbb{P}^1 \times \{0\}$ .

The composition of  $\text{Bl}_{\mathbf{D}}$  with the projection to  $\mathbb{A}^1$  yields a flat family

$$\epsilon : X_{\tilde{\Sigma}} \rightarrow \mathbb{A}^1, \quad (3.6)$$

with the property that  $\epsilon^{-1}(\mathbb{A}^1 \setminus \{0\}) = X_{\Sigma} \times (\mathbb{A}^1 \setminus \{0\})$ , and  $\epsilon^{-1}(0)$  is the union of  $s + 1$  irreducible components, one isomorphic to  $X_{\Sigma}$  and the remaining  $s$  components the exceptional divisors  $\mathbb{P}_1, \dots, \mathbb{P}_s$  of the blowup  $\text{Bl}_{\mathbf{D}}$ .

Recall the hypersurfaces  $H_i \subseteq D_{\rho_i}$  from (3.2), meeting the toric boundary of  $D_{\rho_i}$  transversally. We now denote by  $\tilde{H}_i \subseteq X_{\tilde{\Sigma}}$  the strict transform of  $H_i \times \mathbb{A}^1 \subseteq X_{\tilde{\Sigma}}$ . We note:

**Lemma 3.2.** *We have*

- (1)  $\tilde{H}_i \cap \epsilon^{-1}(\mathbb{A}^1 \setminus \{0\}) = H_i \times (\mathbb{A}^1 \setminus \{0\})$ .
- (2)  $\tilde{H}_i \cap \epsilon^{-1}(0)$  is contained in the toric stratum  $D_{\tilde{\Sigma}, \tilde{\rho}_i}$  corresponding to  $\tilde{\rho}_i$  of  $X_{\tilde{\Sigma}}$ . Further, there is an isomorphism of pairs

$$(D_{\tilde{\Sigma}, \tilde{\rho}_i}, \tilde{H}_i \cap \epsilon^{-1}(0)) \cong (D_{\rho_i}, H_i).$$

*Proof.* (1) is obvious as  $\text{Bl}_{\mathbf{D}}$  is an isomorphism away from  $\epsilon^{-1}(0)$ . For (2), first note that  $H_i \subseteq D_{\rho_i}$ , and the divisor  $D_{\rho_i} \times \mathbb{A}^1 \subseteq X_{\tilde{\Sigma}}$  is the divisor corresponding to the ray  $\rho_i \in \tilde{\Sigma}$ . The strict transform of this divisor in  $X_{\tilde{\Sigma}}$  is again the divisor corresponding to  $\rho_i$ . Intersecting this divisor with  $\epsilon^{-1}(0)$  gives the toric stratum  $D_{\tilde{\rho}_i}$ .



Since  $\mathbf{D} \cap (D_{\rho_i} \times \mathbb{A}^1) = D_{\rho_i} \times \{0\}$ , a Cartier divisor on  $D_{\rho_i} \times \mathbb{A}^1$ , the strict transform of  $D_{\rho_i} \times \mathbb{A}^1$  is in fact isomorphic to  $D_{\rho_i} \times \mathbb{A}^1$  under  $\mathrm{Bl}_{\mathbf{D}}$ . Further, as  $H_i \times \mathbb{A}^1 \subseteq D_{\rho_i} \times \mathbb{A}^1$  intersects the centre of the blow-up in the Cartier divisor  $H_i \times \{0\}$ , in fact  $\tilde{H}_i$  is isomorphic to  $H_i \times \mathbb{A}^1$  under  $\mathrm{Bl}_{\mathbf{D}}$ . Restricting these isomorphisms to  $\epsilon^{-1}(0)$  gives the isomorphism of pairs.  $\square$

Now consider a further blow-up

$$\mathrm{Bl}_{\tilde{H}} : \tilde{X} \longrightarrow X_{\tilde{\Sigma}}, \quad (3.7)$$

with center

$$\tilde{H} = \bigcup_i \tilde{H}_i.$$

By composing (3.7) with  $\epsilon$  defined in (3.6) we obtain the flat family

$$\epsilon_{\mathbf{P}} : \tilde{X} \longrightarrow \mathbb{A}^1. \quad (3.8)$$

For  $t \neq 0$ , we have  $\epsilon_{\mathbf{P}}^{-1}(t) = X$ . The central fiber is of the form

$$\epsilon_{\mathbf{P}}^{-1}(0) = X_{\Sigma} \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^s \tilde{\mathbb{P}}_i \quad (3.9)$$

where  $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_i$  is the blow-up of  $\mathbb{P}_i$ , (see (3.5)) at the limits of the hypersurfaces  $H_i \subseteq D_{\rho_i}$  as  $t \rightarrow 0$ .

**3.2. The tropical space  $\tilde{B}_1$  associated to  $(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D})$ .** Let  $\tilde{X}$  be the degeneration in (3.8) and denote by  $\tilde{D}$  the strict transform of the toric boundary divisor  $D_{\tilde{\Sigma}} \subseteq X_{\tilde{\Sigma}}$  under the blow-up (3.7). We consider  $\tilde{X}$  as a log space with the divisorial log structure given by  $\tilde{D}$ .

From the construction of §2.1.1, we obtain polyhedral cone complexes  $(\tilde{B}, \tilde{\mathcal{P}})$  and  $(B_{\tilde{\Sigma}}, \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\Sigma}})$  from the log Calabi-Yau pairs  $(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D})$  and  $(X_{\tilde{\Sigma}}, D_{\tilde{\Sigma}})$  respectively. Note we may also view the fan  $\tilde{\Sigma}$  as a polyhedral cone complex  $(|\tilde{\Sigma}|, \tilde{\Sigma})$ . In what follows, for cones  $\rho \in \tilde{\mathcal{P}}$  (resp.  $\rho \in \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\Sigma}}$ ) we write  $\tilde{D}_{\rho}$  (resp.  $D_{\tilde{\Sigma}, \rho}$ ) for the corresponding stratum of  $\tilde{D}$  (resp.  $D_{\tilde{\Sigma}}$ ) as in (2.2).

**Proposition 3.3.** *There are canonical isomorphisms of polyhedral cone complexes:*

$$(\tilde{B}, \tilde{\mathcal{P}}) \cong (B_{\tilde{\Sigma}}, \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\Sigma}}) \cong (|\tilde{\Sigma}|, \tilde{\Sigma}). \quad (3.10)$$

*Proof.* The second isomorphism is obvious. The first isomorphism in (3.10) arises as follows. The map  $\mathrm{Bl}_{\tilde{H}}$  in (3.7) induces a one-to-one correspondence between the irreducible components of  $\tilde{D}$  and the irreducible components of  $D_{\tilde{\Sigma}}$ , with an irreducible component  $\tilde{D}_i$  of  $\tilde{D}$  corresponding to the irreducible component  $\mathrm{Bl}_{\tilde{H}}(\tilde{D}_i)$  of  $D_{\tilde{\Sigma}}$ . Because of the transversality assumption on  $H_i$ ,  $\tilde{H}_i$  does not

contain any toric stratum of  $X_{\tilde{\Sigma}}$ . Thus any stratum of  $\tilde{D}$  is the strict transform of any stratum of  $D_{\tilde{\Sigma}}$ , showing that the bijection between components induces an inclusion preserving bijection between the cones of  $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$  and  $\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\Sigma}}$ . Hence, we obtain the desired isomorphism as abstract polyhedral cone complexes.  $\square$

As a consequence of this proposition, we will freely identify cones in  $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$  and cones in  $\tilde{\Sigma}$ .

Recall from the construction of §2.1.1 that  $\tilde{B}$  and  $B_{\tilde{\Sigma}}$  both carry the structure of an affine manifold away from the codimension  $\geq 2$  cones. However, note that if a log Calabi–Yau pair is toric, given by a toric variety with fan  $\Sigma$  and its toric boundary divisor, then the associated pair  $(B, \mathcal{P})$  may be identified with  $(|\Sigma|, \Sigma)$ . In particular, the obvious affine structure induced by  $|\Sigma| \subseteq M_{\mathbb{R}}$  agrees, off of codimension two, with that constructed in §2.1.1 by Remark 2.1. Thus we may take the discriminant locus  $\Delta = \emptyset$ . So, in the case of the toric log Calabi–Yau pair  $(X_{\tilde{\Sigma}}, D_{\tilde{\Sigma}})$ , the integral affine structure on  $B_{\tilde{\Sigma}}$ , which was constructed away from the codim  $\geq 2$  cells in §2.1.1, extends to  $B_{\tilde{\Sigma}}$ .

As in Proposition 2.3, the affine structure on  $\tilde{B} \setminus \Delta$  extends to a larger subset of  $\tilde{B}$  in our situation. While we may use that proposition directly to describe this extension, it is more convenient now to give several large charts on  $\tilde{B}$ .

For this first note that from Proposition 3.3 there exists a piecewise linear homeomorphism

$$\tilde{B} \longrightarrow B_{\tilde{\Sigma}}. \quad (3.11)$$

Since we have integral affine identifications  $B_{\tilde{\Sigma}} = |\tilde{\Sigma}| = M_{\mathbb{R}} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ , this induces a piecewise linear homeomorphism

$$\Psi: \tilde{B} \longrightarrow M_{\mathbb{R}} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}. \quad (3.12)$$

We will now describe the affine structure on a larger subset of  $\tilde{B}$  explicitly using  $\Psi$ . To do so, we need one additional piece of information. Recall that  $H_i$  is a hypersurface in  $D_{\rho_i}$ , the toric variety defined by the fan  $\Sigma(\rho_i)$  in  $M_{\mathbb{R}}/\mathbb{R}\rho_i$  given by

$$\Sigma(\rho_i) = \{(\sigma + \mathbb{R}\rho_i)/\mathbb{R}\rho_i \mid \sigma \in \Sigma, \rho_i \subseteq \sigma\}. \quad (3.13)$$

In particular, there is a piecewise linear function on the fan  $\Sigma(\rho_i)$ ,

$$\varphi_i: M_{\mathbb{R}}/\mathbb{R}\rho_i \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \quad (3.14)$$

corresponding to the divisor  $H_i$  defined as follows: if  $H_i$  is linearly equivalent to a sum  $\sum a_{\tau} D_{\tau}$  of boundary divisors, where  $\tau$  ranges over rays in  $\Sigma(\rho_i)$ , then  $\varphi_i(m_{\tau}) = a_{\tau}$  for  $m_{\tau}$  a primitive generator of  $\tau$ . Note that the  $H_i$ 's are Cartier divisors, as  $X_{\tilde{\Sigma}}$  is smooth, so in particular the boundary toric divisors  $D_{\rho_i}$  are also smooth. Therefore, the values  $a_{\tau}$  define  $\varphi_i$  uniquely up to a linear function.

Now, recall that we denoted by  $\tilde{\rho}_i$  the cone of  $\tilde{\Sigma}$  generated by  $(m_i, 0)$  and  $(m_i, 1)$ . Further, recall from (2.3) the open star  $\text{Star}(\tilde{\rho}_i)$  of  $\tilde{\rho}_i$ . Let  $U, V \subset \tilde{B}$  be open subsets defined as follows:

$$U := \tilde{B} \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^m \bigcup_{\substack{\rho_i \subseteq \rho \in \Sigma \\ \dim \rho = n-1}} \tilde{\rho}, \quad (3.15)$$

$$V := \bigcup_{j=1}^m \text{Star}(\tilde{\rho}_j).$$

and let

$$\tilde{\Delta} = \tilde{B} \setminus (U \cup V). \quad (3.16)$$

One checks easily that  $U \cup V$  contains the interior of every codimension zero and one cone of  $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$ , and hence  $\tilde{\Delta} \subset \Delta$ , where  $\Delta$  is the union of all codimension two cones of  $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$ . We will show that the integral affine structure on  $\tilde{B} \setminus \Delta$  extends to  $\tilde{B} \setminus \tilde{\Delta}$ .

**Theorem 3.4.** *There is an integral affine structure on  $\tilde{B} \setminus \tilde{\Delta}$  extending the integral affine structure on  $\tilde{B} \setminus \Delta$ , with affine coordinate charts given by*

$$\psi_U : U \rightarrow \overline{M}_{\mathbb{R}}$$

with  $\psi_U := \Psi|_U$  where  $\Psi$  is as in (3.12), and

$$\psi_V : V \rightarrow \overline{M}_{\mathbb{R}}$$

given by, for  $(m, r) \in M_{\mathbb{R}} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  such that  $\Psi^{-1}(m, r) \in \text{Star}(\tilde{\rho}_i) \subseteq V$ ,

$$\psi_V(\Psi^{-1}(m, r)) = (m + \varphi_i(\pi_i(m))m_i, r) \quad (3.17)$$

where  $\pi_i : M_{\mathbb{R}} \rightarrow M_{\mathbb{R}}/\mathbb{R}\rho_i$  is the quotient map, and  $\varphi_i$  is defined as in (3.14).

*Proof.* While the homeomorphism  $\tilde{B} \rightarrow B_{\tilde{\Sigma}}$  in (3.11) is only piecewise linear in general, we first observe that it is in fact affine linear across any codimension one cone  $\rho$  of  $\tilde{\Sigma}$  such that neighbourhoods of  $\tilde{D}_{\rho} \subseteq \tilde{X}$  and  $\tilde{D}_{\rho} \subseteq X_{\tilde{\Sigma}}$  are isomorphic. Now the blow-up map  $\text{Bl}_{\tilde{H}} : \tilde{X} \rightarrow X_{\tilde{\Sigma}}$  in (3.7) induces an isomorphism in neighbourhoods of those one-dimensional strata disjoint from any of the  $\tilde{H}_i$ . But by Lemma 3.2,  $\tilde{H}_i$  only intersects those one-dimensional strata corresponding to cones  $\tilde{\rho} \in \tilde{\Sigma}$  with  $\rho \in \Sigma$ ,  $\dim \rho = n - 1$ , and  $\rho \supseteq \rho_i$ . Thus we immediately see that  $\Psi|_U$  is affine linear, and hence  $\psi_U$  defines an affine coordinate chart on  $U$  compatible with the affine structure on  $\tilde{B} \setminus \Delta$ .

Now choose  $\rho \in \Sigma$ ,  $\dim \rho = n - 1$ ,  $\rho \supseteq \rho_i$ . Let  $\sigma_1, \sigma_2$  be the maximal cones of  $\Sigma$  containing  $\rho$ . Then we wish to verify (2.4) for the chart

$$\psi_V|_{\text{Int}(\tilde{\sigma}_1 \cup \tilde{\sigma}_2)}.$$

Write  $\tau_1, \dots, \tau_{n-1}$  for the one-dimensional faces of  $\rho$ , taking  $\tau_1$  to be  $\rho_i$ , and let  $\tau_n, \tau'_n$  be the additional one-dimensional faces of  $\sigma_1$  and  $\sigma_2$  respectively. We will take primitive generators  $\mu_1, \dots, \mu_n, \mu'_n$  for these rays, noting that  $\mu_1 = m_i$ . Then  $\tilde{\rho}$  has one-dimensional faces  $\tau_1, \dots, \tau_{n-1}, \nu_i$  where  $\nu_i = \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}(m_i, 1)$ ,  $\tilde{\sigma}_1$  has one-dimensional faces  $\tau_1, \dots, \tau_n, \nu_i$ , and  $\tilde{\sigma}_2$  has one-dimensional faces  $\tau_1, \dots, \tau_{n-1}, \tau'_n, \nu_i$ . To check compatibility of the chart  $\psi_V|_{\text{Int}(\tilde{\sigma}_1 \cup \tilde{\sigma}_2)}$  with (2.4), we need to show that

$$\psi_V(\mu_n, 0) + \psi_V(\mu'_n, 0) = - \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} (\tilde{D}_{\tau_j} \cdot \tilde{D}_{\tilde{\rho}}) \psi_V(\mu_j, 0) - (\tilde{D}_{\nu_i} \cdot \tilde{D}_{\tilde{\rho}}) \psi_V(m_i, 1).$$

Here we note that  $\psi_V$  is defined on all arguments in the above formula as  $\psi_V$  extends continuously in an obvious way to the closure of  $V$  using (3.17). Now this is equivalent to the following:

- $\tilde{D}_{\nu_i} \cdot \tilde{D}_{\tilde{\rho}} = 0$
- $\mu_n + \mu'_n + (\varphi_i(\pi_i(\mu_n)) + \varphi_i(\pi_i(\mu'_n)))m_i = - \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} (\tilde{D}_{\tau_j} \cdot \tilde{D}_{\tilde{\rho}})(\mu_j + \varphi_i(\pi_i(\mu_j)))m_i$ .

Without loss of generality, we may assume that  $\varphi_i|_{(\sigma_1 + \mathbb{R}\rho_i)/\mathbb{R}\rho_i} = 0$ , as  $\varphi_i$  is only defined up to a choice of linear function. In this case, it is standard toric geometry that  $\varphi_i(\pi_i(\mu'_n)) = H_i \cdot D_\rho$ , where the intersection number is calculated in  $D_{\rho_i}$ . Further, applying (2.4) to  $X_{\tilde{\Sigma}}$ , we see that

$$(\mu_n + \mu'_n, 0) = - \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} (D_{\tilde{\Sigma}, \tau_j} \cdot D_{\tilde{\Sigma}, \tilde{\rho}})(\mu_j, 0) - (D_{\tilde{\Sigma}, \nu_i} \cdot D_{\tilde{\Sigma}, \tilde{\rho}})(m_i, 1).$$

Putting this together, it is thus enough to show that

$$\tilde{D}_{\tau_1} \cdot \tilde{D}_{\tilde{\rho}} = D_{\tilde{\Sigma}, \tau_1} \cdot D_{\tilde{\Sigma}, \tilde{\rho}} - D_\rho \cdot H_i, \quad (3.18)$$

$$\tilde{D}_{\tau_j} \cdot \tilde{D}_{\tilde{\rho}} = D_{\tilde{\Sigma}, \tau_j} \cdot D_{\tilde{\Sigma}, \tilde{\rho}}, \quad 2 \leq j \leq n-1 \quad (3.19)$$

$$\tilde{D}_{\nu_i} \cdot \tilde{D}_{\tilde{\rho}} = D_{\tilde{\Sigma}, \nu_i} \cdot D_{\tilde{\Sigma}, \tilde{\rho}} = 0. \quad (3.20)$$

**Proof of (3.18).** Recall here that we had selected  $\tau_1 = \rho_i$ . Thus  $D_{\tilde{\Sigma}, \tau_1}, \tilde{D}_{\tau_1}$  are the strict transforms of the divisor  $D_{\rho_i} \times \mathbb{A}^1 \subseteq X_\Sigma \times \mathbb{A}^1$  in  $X_{\tilde{\Sigma}}$  and  $\tilde{X}$  respectively. Since  $H_i \times \mathbb{A}^1 \subseteq D_{\rho_i} \times \mathbb{A}^1$ , we have  $\tilde{H}_i \subseteq D_{\tilde{\Sigma}, \rho_i}$ , and hence

$$\mathcal{O}_{\tilde{X}}(\tilde{D}_{\rho_i}) \cong \text{Bl}_{\tilde{H}}^* \mathcal{O}_{X_{\tilde{\Sigma}}}(D_{\tilde{\Sigma}, \rho_i}) \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\tilde{X}}(-\tilde{E}_{\rho_i}),$$

where  $\tilde{E}_{\rho_i}$  denotes the exceptional divisor over  $\tilde{H}_i$ . Now

$$D_{\tilde{\Sigma}, \rho_i} \cdot D_{\tilde{\Sigma}, \tilde{\rho}} = \deg \mathcal{O}_{X_{\tilde{\Sigma}}}(D_{\tilde{\Sigma}, \rho_i})|_{D_{\tilde{\Sigma}, \tilde{\rho}}}.$$

Thus, also using that  $\text{Bl}_{\tilde{H}}|_{\tilde{D}_{\tilde{\rho}}}$  induces an isomorphism between  $\tilde{D}_{\tilde{\rho}}$  and  $\tilde{D}_{\tilde{\Sigma}, \tilde{\rho}}$ , we obtain

$$\tilde{D}_{\rho_i} \cdot \tilde{D}_{\tilde{\rho}} = \deg \mathcal{O}_{\tilde{X}}(\tilde{D}_{\rho_i})|_{\tilde{D}_{\tilde{\rho}}} = D_{\tilde{\Sigma}, \rho_i} \cdot D_{\tilde{\Sigma}, \tilde{\rho}} - \deg \mathcal{O}_{\tilde{X}}(\tilde{E}_{\rho_i})|_{\tilde{D}_{\tilde{\rho}}}.$$




FIGURE 3.2. On the left is a two-dimensional fan  $\Sigma$ . The middle shows the height 1 slice of the fan  $\tilde{\Sigma}$ , while the right-hand picture shows one of the two charts for the affine manifold  $\tilde{B}_1$ , with the crosses indicating the discriminant locus.

However, as  $D_{\tilde{\Sigma}, \tilde{\rho}}$  is transverse to  $\tilde{H}_i$ , we may in fact calculate

$$\deg \mathcal{O}_{\tilde{X}}(\tilde{E}_{\rho_i})|_{\tilde{D}_{\tilde{\rho}}} = \#D_{\rho} \cap H_i = D_{\rho} \cdot H_i,$$

where the intersection is calculated in  $D_{\rho_i}$ . This gives (3.18).

**Proof of (3.19).** In this case, we note that  $\tilde{D}_{\tau_j}$  does not contain  $\tilde{H}_j$ , so that

$$\mathcal{O}_{\tilde{X}}(\tilde{D}_{\tau_j}) \cong \mathrm{Bl}_{\tilde{H}}^* \mathcal{O}_{X_{\tilde{\Sigma}}}(D_{\tilde{\Sigma}, \tau_j}).$$

Thus (3.19) immediate as before.

**Proof of (3.20).** Note that the central fibre of the morphism  $X_{\tilde{\Sigma}} \rightarrow \mathbb{A}^1$  is the divisor

$$D_{\tilde{\Sigma}, \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}(0,1)} + \sum_{j=1}^s D_{\tilde{\Sigma}, \nu_j}.$$

As this divisor is linearly equivalent to 0, we thus have

$$D_{\tilde{\Sigma}, \nu_i} \sim -D_{\tilde{\Sigma}, \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}(0,1)} - \sum_{j \neq i} D_{\tilde{\Sigma}, \nu_j}.$$

Similarly, we have

$$\tilde{D}_{\nu_i} \sim -\tilde{D}_{\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}(0,1)} - \sum_{j \neq i} \tilde{D}_{\nu_j}.$$

Now each divisor  $D_{\tilde{\Sigma}, \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}(0,1)}$  and  $D_{\tilde{\Sigma}, \nu_j}$ ,  $j \neq i$  are in fact disjoint from  $D_{\tilde{\Sigma}, \tilde{\rho}}$ , and the same is true for the  $\tilde{D}$ 's. Thus (3.20) holds.  $\square$

**3.3. The scattering diagram  $\mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D})}^1$  on  $\tilde{B}_1$ .** Let  $\tilde{X}$  be the total space of the degeneration defined in (3.8). Let

$$\tilde{p}: \tilde{B} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \quad (3.21)$$

be the canonical projection obtained by composition of the map  $\Psi$  in (3.12) with the projection onto the second factor. We note that  $\tilde{p}$  is the tropicalization of  $\epsilon_{\mathbf{P}}: \tilde{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{A}^1$ . Recalling that  $\tilde{B}$  carries the structure of an integral affine manifold with singularities defined by Theorem 3.4, it is easy to see that  $\tilde{p}$  is an affine submersion, either directly from the description of the affine structure or from [25, Prop. 1.14]. In particular, the fibres of  $\tilde{p}$  are affine manifolds with singularities, and the fibres over  $\mathbb{N} \subseteq \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  are integral affine manifolds with singularities. Set

$$\tilde{B}_i = \tilde{p}^{-1}(i), \text{ for } i = 0, 1 \quad (3.22)$$

and  $\mathcal{P}_i = \{\sigma \cap \tilde{p}^{-1}(i) \mid \sigma \in P\}$ . Note that  $(\tilde{B}_0, \mathcal{P}_0)$  is the tropicalization of  $(X, D)$ , see [25, Prop. 1.18,(1)]. This integral affine manifold has discriminant locus which is a cone over the origin, and the homeomorphism  $\Psi$  of (3.12) induces a piecewise linear identification

$$\mu := (\Psi|_{\tilde{p}^{-1}(0)})^{-1}: M_{\mathbb{R}} \longrightarrow \tilde{B}_0 \quad (3.23)$$

identifying  $\Sigma$  with  $\mathcal{P}_0$ . On the other hand,  $\tilde{B}_1$  can be viewed as a deformation of  $\tilde{B}_0$  in which the discriminant locus is pulled away from the origin. Fibres  $\tilde{p}^{-1}(r)$  as  $r \rightarrow \infty$  can then be seen as a “pulling out” of the discriminant locus to infinity. We frequently also use the piecewise linear identification

$$\Psi_1 := \Psi|_{\tilde{p}^{-1}(1)}: \tilde{B}_1 \rightarrow M_{\mathbb{R}}.$$

Now let us write  $\mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D})}$  for the canonical scattering diagram for  $\tilde{X}$ , living in  $\tilde{B}$ , and  $\mathfrak{D}_{(X, D)}$  for the canonical scattering diagram for  $X$ , living in  $\tilde{B}_0$ . Note that all vectors  $u_L$  appearing in the canonical scattering diagram satisfy  $p_*(u_L) = 0$  (i.e.,  $u_L$  is tangent to fibres of  $p$ ) by Theorem 2.36. Given a wall  $(\mathfrak{d}, f_{\mathfrak{d}})$  in  $\mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D})}$ , let

$$\text{ind}(\mathfrak{d}) := |\text{coker}(\tilde{p}_*: \Lambda_{\mathfrak{d}} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z})|.$$

We then obtain a wall  $(\mathfrak{d} \cap \tilde{B}_1, f_{\mathfrak{d}}^{\text{ind}(\mathfrak{d})})$ . We set

$$\mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D})}^1 = \{(\mathfrak{d} \cap \tilde{B}_1, f_{\mathfrak{d}}^{\text{ind}(\mathfrak{d})}) \mid (\mathfrak{d}, f_{\mathfrak{d}}) \in \mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D})}\}. \quad (3.24)$$

Since  $\mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D})}$  is consistent, so is  $\mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D})}^1$  by [25, Prop. 5.3]. Note that the exponent  $\text{ind}(\mathfrak{d})$  arises as we are reversing the procedure of [18, Def. 4.7].




FIGURE 3.3. The discriminant locus given by a point in red in  $\tilde{B}_1$  where  $X_\Sigma = \mathbb{P}^2$  and  $H \subset \mathbb{P}^2$  is a point along a divisor.

In the following sections we will analyze in more detail the affine geometry of  $\tilde{B}_1$  in which  $\mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D})}^1$  lives, and in particular describe the affine monodromy around the discriminant locus in  $\tilde{B}_1$ .

3.3.1. *The affine monodromy on  $\tilde{B}_1$ .* Recall the description (3.16) of the discriminant locus  $\tilde{\Delta} \subseteq \tilde{B}$  as the complement of the union of the open sets  $U$  and  $V$  described in (3.15). We may then write  $\tilde{\Delta} = \bigcup_{i=1}^m \tilde{\Delta}^i$  where

$$\tilde{\Delta}^i = \left( \bigcup_{\substack{\rho_i \subseteq \rho \in \Sigma \\ \dim \rho = n-1}} \tilde{\rho} \right) \setminus \text{Star}(\tilde{\rho}_j). \quad (3.25)$$

We set

$$\tilde{\Delta}_1 := \tilde{\Delta} \cap \tilde{B}_1, \quad \tilde{\Delta}_1^i := \tilde{\Delta}^i \cap \tilde{B}_1. \quad (3.26)$$

We may further decompose  $\tilde{\Delta}_1^i$  as follows. If  $\underline{\rho} \in \Sigma(\rho_i)$  is a codimension 1 cone, then  $\underline{\rho} = (\rho + \mathbb{R}\rho_i)/\mathbb{R}\rho_i$  for some codimension one cone  $\rho \in \Sigma$  containing  $\rho_i$ . We then obtain a piece of  $\tilde{\Delta}_1^i$  defined as

$$\tilde{\Delta}_\underline{\rho} := (\tilde{\rho} \setminus \text{Star}(\tilde{\rho}_j)) \cap \tilde{B}_1 = \tilde{\rho} \cap \tilde{\rho}' \cap \tilde{B}_1. \quad (3.27)$$

Further,

$$\tilde{\Delta}_1^i = \bigcup_{\underline{\rho} \in \Sigma(\rho_i)} \tilde{\Delta}_\underline{\rho},$$

where the union is over codimension one cones of  $\Sigma(\rho_i)$ .

If  $\underline{\sigma}^\pm \in \Sigma(\rho_i)$  are the maximal cones containing  $\underline{\rho}$ , with  $\underline{\sigma}^\pm = (\sigma^\pm + \mathbb{R}\rho_i)/\mathbb{R}\rho_i$  for some maximal cones  $\sigma^\pm \in \Sigma$ , then we also note that the maximal cells of  $\mathcal{P}_1$  containing  $\tilde{\Delta}_\underline{\rho}$  are the intersections of  $\tilde{\sigma}^+$ ,  $\tilde{\sigma}'^+$ ,  $\tilde{\sigma}^-$  and  $\tilde{\sigma}'^-$  with  $\tilde{B}_1$  as illustrated in blue in Figure 3.3.

Then the following result is immediate from the description of  $\tilde{\Delta}_1^i$  in (3.25).

**Proposition 3.5.** *Let  $\pi_i : M_{\mathbb{R}} \rightarrow M_{\mathbb{R}}/\mathbb{R}\rho_i$  be the quotient map. Then the restriction of  $\pi_i \circ \Psi_1$  to  $\tilde{\Delta}_1^i \subseteq \tilde{B}_1$  defined in (3.25) is a piecewise affine linear isomorphism with its image, the codimension one skeleton of  $\Sigma(\rho_i)$ .*

We turn to the description of the affine monodromy around  $\tilde{\Delta}_{\underline{\rho}}$  for  $\underline{\rho}$  a codimension one cone of  $\Sigma(\rho_i)$ .

Recalling from (3.14) the piecewise linear function  $\varphi_i$  on the fan  $\Sigma(\rho_i)$ , let  $\kappa_{\underline{\rho}}^i$  denote the kink of this function along  $\underline{\rho}$ , see Definition 2.5. To fix notation, let  $\underline{n}^{\pm} \in (M/\mathbb{Z}m_i)^*$  be the slopes of  $\varphi_i|_{\underline{\sigma}^{\pm}}$ . Let

$$\delta : M/\mathbb{Z}m_i \rightarrow \mathbb{Z} \quad (3.28)$$

be the quotient by  $\Lambda_{\underline{\rho}}$ . Fix signs by requiring that  $\delta$  is non-negative on tangent vectors pointing from  $\underline{\rho}$  into  $\underline{\sigma}^+$ . Then the kink  $\kappa_{\underline{\rho}}^i \in \mathbb{Z}$  satisfies

$$\underline{n}^+ - \underline{n}^- = \delta \cdot \kappa_{\underline{\rho}}^i. \quad (3.29)$$

We now see that the kink determines the affine monodromy around a general point of  $\tilde{\Delta}_{\underline{\rho}}$ .

It is useful to describe a local version of  $\tilde{B}_1$  in a neighbourhood of  $\tilde{\Delta}_{\underline{\rho}}$ . Taking  $j = \tilde{\Delta}_{\underline{\rho}}$ , we obtain an integral affine manifold  $(B_j, \mathcal{P}_j)$  as in §2.2.1. There is an obvious action by translation of the real tangent space  $\Lambda_{\tilde{\Delta}_{\underline{\rho}}, \mathbb{R}}$  on  $B_j$ , and dividing out by this action gives a two-dimensional integral affine manifold  $B'$  with one singularity  $0 \in B'$ . We may then choose a (non-canonical) integral affine isomorphism  $B_j \cong B' \times \Lambda_{\tilde{\Delta}_{\underline{\rho}}, \mathbb{R}}$ . Note that for a point  $x \in \text{Int}(\tilde{\Delta}_{\underline{\rho}})$ , there is a small open neighbourhood of  $x$  in  $\tilde{B}_1$  isomorphic to a neighbourhood of  $(0, 0) \in B' \times \Lambda_{\tilde{\Delta}_{\underline{\rho}}, \mathbb{R}}$ .

Using this local description, identify  $B'$  with  $B' \times \{0\}$ , and let

$$\begin{aligned} U' &= U \cap B', \\ V' &= V \cap B'. \end{aligned}$$

Choose  $p, p' \in U' \cap V'$  with the property that under  $\pi_i \circ \Psi_1$ ,  $p, p'$  map to  $\underline{\sigma}^+$  and  $\underline{\sigma}^-$  respectively. Now choose a small loop  $\gamma$  in  $B'$  starting at  $p$ , passing to  $p'$  through  $V'$ , and then passing back to  $p$  through  $U'$  as illustrated in Figure 3.4. We may then view  $\gamma$  as a loop in  $\tilde{B}_1$  around the piece of the discriminant locus  $\tilde{\Delta}_{\underline{\rho}}$ .

By definition the affine monodromy around  $\gamma$  is obtained by taking the compositions of the linear parts of the change of coordinate functions [8, Defn 3.1]. Note that the affine chart on  $U$  is given by  $\psi_U|_{U \cap \tilde{B}_1} = \Psi_1|_{U \cap \tilde{B}_1}$ , which allows






FIGURE 3.4. The left side figure illustrates the image of  $\gamma$  in  $V'$  and on the right hand side its image in  $U'$ . The dashed lines indicate the complements of the domains  $U'$  and  $V'$  respectively.

us to identify the tangent spaces  $\Lambda_p, \Lambda_{p'}$  with  $M$ . By Equation (3.17) in Theorem 3.4, the coordinate change between the coordinate chart  $\psi_U$  and  $\psi_V$  in a neighbourhood of  $p$  or  $p'$  is

$$(\psi_V \circ \psi_U^{-1})|_{U \cap V \cap \tilde{B}_1}(m) = m + \varphi_i(\pi_i(m))m_i. \quad (3.30)$$

If  $m$  lies close to  $p$ , then  $\varphi_i(\pi_i(m)) = \langle \underline{n}^+, \pi_i(m) \rangle$ , as  $\pi_i(m) \in \underline{\sigma}^+$ . Similarly, if  $m$  lies close to  $p'$ , then  $\varphi_i(\pi_i(m)) = \langle \underline{n}^-, \pi_i(m) \rangle$ . Putting this together, the monodromy around  $\gamma$  is then given by

$$T_\gamma(m) = m + (\underline{n}^+ - \underline{n}^-)(\pi_i(m)) \cdot m_i. \quad (3.31)$$

This then gives, by the definition of  $\kappa_\rho^i$ , the result:

**Lemma 3.6.** *The monodromy around the loop  $\gamma$  described above is given by*

$$T_\gamma(m) = m + \kappa_\rho^i \cdot \delta(m) \cdot m_i. \quad (3.32)$$

**Corollary 3.7.** *Around a generic point of the discriminant locus  $\tilde{\Delta}_\rho$ , the tangent space to  $\pi_i^{-1}(\underline{\rho})$  is monodromy invariant.*

*Proof.* This is immediate, as  $\delta$  vanishes on the tangent space to  $\underline{\rho}$  by definition.  $\square$

3.3.2. *The MVPL function  $\varphi$  on  $\tilde{B}_1$ .* We recall from Construction 2.8 a choice of MVPL function  $\varphi$  on  $\tilde{B}$  defined via kink  $\kappa_\rho = [\tilde{D}_\rho]$  for  $\rho \in \tilde{\mathcal{P}}$  of codimension one. This function takes values in  $Q_{\mathbb{R}}^{\text{gp}} = N_1(\tilde{X}) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{R}$ , with kinks in a chosen monoid  $Q \subseteq N_1(\tilde{X})$  with  $Q^\times = 0$  and  $Q$  containing all effective curve classes.

**Lemma 3.8.**  *$\varphi$  is a convex MVPL function, i.e.,  $\kappa_\rho \in Q \setminus \{0\}$  for all codimension one  $\rho \in \tilde{\mathcal{P}}$  not contained in the boundary of  $\tilde{B}$ .*




FIGURE 3.5. The codim 1 cells  $\rho^+$ ,  $\rho^-$  and  $\rho_0$  for  $X = \mathbb{P}^3$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\rho \in \tilde{\mathcal{P}}$  be codimension one not lying in the boundary of  $\tilde{B}$ , i.e.,  $\tilde{B}_0$ . Then  $\tilde{D}_\rho$  is contained in the central fibre of  $\epsilon_{\mathbf{P}} : \tilde{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{A}^1$ , and in particular is a proper curve. Hence  $\tilde{D}_\rho$  defines a class in  $N_1(\tilde{X})$ . Note next that there is necessarily a top-dimensional cone  $\sigma \supset \rho$ , and hence a unique ray  $\tau$  of  $\sigma$  not contained in  $\rho$ . Then  $\tilde{D}_\tau$  is a divisor intersecting  $\tilde{D}_\rho$  in one point. Hence  $\tilde{D}_\rho$  cannot be numerically trivial.  $\square$

A priori,  $\varphi$  is an MVPL function on  $\tilde{B}$ , but by restriction, it defines an MVPL functions on  $\tilde{B}_1$ . We continue to write  $\varphi$  for this restricted MVPL function. This restriction is defined in terms of kinks. Each codimension one  $\rho \in \mathcal{P}_1$  is the intersection  $\tilde{\rho} \cap \tilde{B}_1$  of a codimension one  $\tilde{\rho} \in \tilde{\mathcal{P}}$ . Thus we may take the kink  $\kappa_\rho$  to be  $\kappa_{\tilde{\rho}} = [\tilde{D}_{\tilde{\rho}}]$ .

For  $\rho \in \mathcal{P}_1$  with  $\rho = \tilde{\rho} \cap \tilde{B}_1$  for  $\tilde{\rho} \in \tilde{\mathcal{P}}$ , we also write  $\tilde{D}_\rho := \tilde{D}_{\tilde{\rho}}$ , and note that such a stratum is always contained in the fibre  $\epsilon_{\mathbf{P}}^{-1}(0)$ .

**Proposition 3.9.** *Let  $\bar{V}$  be the closure of  $V$  defined in (3.15). There is a single valued representative for  $\varphi$  on  $\tilde{B}_1 \setminus \bar{V}$ . We write a choice of such single-valued representative as  $\varphi_0$ .*

*Proof.* Recalling that 0 is a vertex of  $\mathcal{P}_1$ , note that  $\tilde{B}_1 \setminus \bar{V} = \text{Star}(0)$ . Also,  $\tilde{D}_0$  is a toric variety, isomorphic to  $X_\Sigma$ . Further, the stratification of  $\tilde{X}$  restricts to the toric stratification of  $X_\Sigma$ . Thus the result follows from Proposition 2.10.  $\square$

**3.4. Geometry around the discriminant locus at  $\tilde{B}_1$ .** We fix in this subsection  $\underline{\rho} \in \Sigma(\rho_i)$  of codimension one, with  $\rho \in \Sigma$  satisfying  $\underline{\rho} = (\rho + \mathbb{R}\rho_i)/\mathbb{R}\rho_i$ . Further, let  $\sigma^\pm \in \Sigma$  be the maximal cones containing  $\rho$ , as usual. We have the part  $\tilde{\Delta}_\underline{\rho}$  of the discriminant locus  $\tilde{\Delta}_1$  associated to  $\underline{\rho}$  as defined in (3.27). In what

follows we will adopt the following notation for the codimension one cells of  $\mathcal{P}_1$  containing  $\tilde{\Delta}_\rho$ :

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_\infty &:= \tilde{\rho} \cap \tilde{B}_1 \\ \rho_0 &:= \tilde{\rho}' \cap \tilde{B}_1 \\ \rho^+ &:= \tilde{\sigma}^+ \cap \tilde{\sigma}'^+ \cap \tilde{B}_1 \\ \rho^- &:= \tilde{\sigma}^- \cap \tilde{\sigma}'^- \cap \tilde{B}_1,\end{aligned}$$

In the notation of §3.3,  $\tilde{\Delta}_\rho$  is contained in four top-dimensional cells,  $\tilde{\sigma}^\pm \cap \tilde{B}_1$  and  $\tilde{\sigma}'^\pm \cap \tilde{B}_1$ .

3.4.1. *Geometry of the strata.* As  $\tilde{\Delta}_\rho$  contains the point  $\nu_i \cap \tilde{B}_1$ , where  $\nu_i$  is defined in (3.4), it follows that  $\tilde{D}_{\tilde{\Delta}_\rho}$  is a surface contained in  $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_i$ , and in particular is the inverse image of  $D_\rho \subseteq D_{\rho_i}$  under the composition

$$\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_i \xrightarrow{\text{Bl}_{\tilde{H}}} \mathbb{P}_i \xrightarrow{p_i} D_{\rho_i}. \quad (3.33)$$

Note that the toric stratum  $p_i^{-1}(D_\rho)$  of  $X_{\tilde{\Sigma}}$  is a  $\mathbb{P}^1$ -bundle over  $D_\rho$ . Denote the class of the fibre  $F_i$ . Further, this  $\mathbb{P}^1$ -bundle has two sections, the strata  $D_{\tilde{\Sigma}, \tilde{\rho}}$  and  $D_{\tilde{\Sigma}, \tilde{\rho}'}$ .

These curve classes have a relationship in  $N_1(p_i^{-1}(D_\rho))$ , which we now explain, along with some auxiliary notation which will be used in the sequel.

Fix notation as follows. Let  $u_1 = m_i, u_2, \dots, u_{n-1}$  generate  $\rho$ , and take additional generators of  $\sigma^+, \sigma^-$  to be  $u_n^+$  and  $u_n^-$  respectively. Thus we have generators

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\rho} &: (m_i, 1), (u_1, 0), \dots, (u_{n-1}, 0) \\ \tilde{\rho}' &: (m_i, 1), (0, 1), (u_2, 0), \dots, (u_{n-1}, 0) \\ \tilde{\sigma}^\pm \cap \tilde{\sigma}'^\pm &: (m_i, 1), (u_2, 0), \dots, (u_{n-1}, 0), (u_n^\pm, 0)\end{aligned}$$

Choose a primitive normal vector  $\bar{n}_{\rho^-} \in N_{\mathbb{R}} \oplus \mathbb{R}$  to the cone  $\tilde{\sigma}^- \cap \tilde{\sigma}'^-$ , positive on  $(m_i, 0)$ . Explicitly, we may take  $n_{\rho^-} \in N$  to be a primitive normal vector to the span of  $u_2, \dots, u_{n-1}, u_n^-$  positive on  $m_i$ . We then take  $\bar{n}_{\rho^-} = (n_{\rho^-}, -\langle n_{\rho^-}, m_i \rangle)$ . We may similarly define  $n_{\rho^+}, \bar{n}_{\rho^+}$ . Note that since  $u_1 = m_i, \dots, u_n^\pm$  span a standard cone, in fact

$$\langle \bar{n}_{\rho^\pm}, (m_i, 0) \rangle = \langle n_{\rho^\pm}, m_i \rangle = 1. \quad (3.34)$$

Denote  $\delta_\rho := \tilde{\rho} \cap \tilde{\rho}'$ , so that  $\tilde{\Delta}_\rho = \delta_\rho \cap \tilde{B}_1$ . Using the canonical identification between  $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$  and  $\tilde{\Sigma}$ , we also view  $\delta_\rho$  as a codimension two cone in  $\tilde{\Sigma}$ . Let  $\tilde{\Sigma}(\delta_\rho)$  denote the quotient fan of  $\tilde{\Sigma}$ , i.e., the two-dimensional fan defining the toric variety  $D_{\tilde{\Sigma}, \delta_\rho} = p_i^{-1}(D_\rho)$ .

Now  $\bar{n}_{\rho^-}$  defines a linear function on  $\widetilde{\Sigma}(\delta_{\underline{\rho}})$  and hence  $z^{\bar{n}_{\rho^-}}$  can be viewed as a rational function on  $D_{\widetilde{\Sigma}, \delta_{\underline{\rho}}}$ , hence defining a principal divisor supported on the boundary. Explicitly, the order of vanishing of this rational function on a toric divisor of  $D_{\widetilde{\Sigma}, \delta_{\underline{\rho}}}$  is obtained by evaluating  $\bar{n}_{\rho^-}$  on primitive generator of the corresponding ray of  $\widetilde{\Sigma}(\delta_{\underline{\rho}})$ . The one dimensional rays of  $\Sigma(\delta_{\underline{\rho}})$  are the generated by the images of  $(m_i, 0)$ ,  $(0, 1)$  and  $(u_n^\pm, 0)$ , corresponding to the divisors  $D_{\widetilde{\Sigma}, \bar{\rho}}$ ,  $D_{\widetilde{\Sigma}, \bar{\rho}'}$  and  $F_i$  respectively. Then, using (3.34), we obtain the linear equivalence relation

$$D_{\widetilde{\Sigma}, \bar{\rho}} - D_{\widetilde{\Sigma}, \bar{\rho}'} + \langle n_{\rho^-}, u_n^+ \rangle F_i \sim 0. \quad (3.35)$$

Next,

$$\mathrm{Bl}_{\widetilde{H}} : \widetilde{D}_{\widetilde{\Delta}_{\underline{\rho}}} \rightarrow D_{\widetilde{\Sigma}, \delta_{\underline{\rho}}}$$

is the blow-up at  $\kappa_{\underline{\rho}}^i$  distinct points on the section  $D_{\widetilde{\Sigma}, \bar{\rho}}$ .

We continue to write  $F_i$  for the fibre class of the induced fibration

$$p_i \circ \mathrm{Bl}_{\mathbf{P}} : \widetilde{D}_{\widetilde{\Delta}_{\underline{\rho}}} \rightarrow D_{\underline{\rho}},$$

and write  $s_{\rho_\infty}$  and  $s_{\rho_0}$  for the classes of the strict transforms of the sections  $D_{\widetilde{\Sigma}, \bar{\rho}}$  and  $D_{\widetilde{\Sigma}, \bar{\rho}'}$  respectively under the blow-up. We also write  $E_{\underline{\rho}}^j$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq \kappa_{\underline{\rho}}^i$  for the classes of the exceptional curves of the blow-up. As classes in  $N_1(\widetilde{X})$ , these may or may not be distinct, depending on whether they lie over different connected components of  $H_i$ . However, for bookkeeping purposes, it is convenient to distinguish all of these classes. Observe that the relation (3.35) now gives rise to a linear equivalence relation

$$s_{\rho_\infty} - s_{\rho_0} + \langle n_{\rho^-}, m_+ \rangle F_i \sim - \sum_{j=1}^{\kappa_{\underline{\rho}}^i} E_{\underline{\rho}}^j. \quad (3.36)$$

Note in this notation, the kinks of  $\varphi$  in  $\mathrm{Star}(\widetilde{\Delta}_{\underline{\rho}})$  are:

$$\kappa_{\rho_\infty} = s_{\rho_\infty}, \quad \kappa_{\rho_0} = s_{\rho_0}, \quad \kappa_{\rho^\pm} = F_i. \quad (3.37)$$

**3.4.2. Parallel transport.** We next turn to a description of a monodromy invariant subsheaf of  $\mathcal{P}$  on  $\mathrm{Star}(\widetilde{\Delta}_{\underline{\rho}})$ . We note that  $\Lambda_{\rho_\infty}$  and  $\Lambda_{\rho_0}$  are monodromy invariant on  $\mathrm{Star}(\widetilde{\Delta}_{\underline{\rho}})$  by Corollary 3.7. So if  $y \in \mathrm{Int}(\rho_\infty)$ ,  $y' \in \mathrm{Int}(\rho_0)$ , we may view  $\Lambda_{\rho_\infty} \subset \Lambda_y$ ,  $\Lambda_{\rho_0} \subseteq \Lambda_{y'}$ , and these two subgroups may then be identified canonically via parallel transport.

Next, using the splittings  $\mathcal{P}_y = \Lambda_y \oplus Q^{\mathrm{gp}}$ ,  $\mathcal{P}_{y'} = \Lambda_{y'} \oplus Q^{\mathrm{gp}}$  of (2.9) (induced by a choice of maximal cells containing  $y, y'$ ), if  $m \in \Lambda_y$  is tangent to  $\rho_\infty$ , we may parallel transport  $(m, 0) \in \mathcal{P}_y$  to  $\mathcal{P}_{y'}$  through either  $\rho^+$  or  $\rho^-$ , using the description (2.14). In particular, the parallel transport of  $(m, 0)$  is then  $(m, \langle n_{\rho^\pm}, m \rangle F_i)$ ,

with  $n_{\rho^\pm}$ ,  $F_i$ , as in §3.4.1. However, in the notation introduced in this previous subsection,  $\Lambda_{\rho_\infty}$  is generated by  $m_i, u_2, \dots, u_{n-1}$ . Noting that by the explicit descriptions of  $n_{\rho^\pm}$  given there,  $\langle n_{\rho^\pm}, u_j \rangle = 0$  for  $2 \leq j \leq n-1$ , while  $\langle n_{\rho^\pm}, m_i \rangle = 1$  by (3.34). Thus  $n_{\rho^+}$  and  $n_{\rho^-}$  take the same values on  $\Lambda_{\rho_\infty}$ . So  $(m, q)$  is invariant under monodromy in the local system  $\mathcal{P}$  whenever  $m \in \Lambda_{\rho_\infty}$ ,  $q \in Q$ .

In particular, we have a parallel transport map

$$\wp : \mathbb{k}[\Lambda_{\rho_\infty}][Q] \rightarrow \mathbb{k}[\Lambda_{\rho_0}][Q] \quad (3.38)$$

given by

$$t^q z^m \mapsto t^{q + \langle n_{\rho^\pm}, m \rangle F_i} z^m. \quad (3.39)$$

3.4.3. *Balancing along  $\tilde{\Delta}$ .* While Theorem 2.39 says that the tropicalization of a punctured map to  $\tilde{X}$  satisfies the standard balancing condition away from the discriminant locus, in our particular case, we still have a weaker balancing result at the discriminant locus.

**Proposition 3.10.** *Let  $f : C^\circ/W \rightarrow \tilde{X}$  be a punctured map, with  $W = (\text{Spec } \kappa, \kappa^\times \oplus Q)$  a log point. Let  $h_s : G \rightarrow \tilde{B}$  be the induced tropical map for some  $s \in \text{Int}(Q_{\mathbb{R}}^\vee)$ . Let  $v \in V(G)$  with  $h_s(v) \in \tilde{\Delta}^i$  for some  $i$ . If  $E_1, \dots, E_m$  are the legs and edges adjacent to  $v$ , oriented away from  $v$ , then the contact orders  $\mathbf{u}(E_j)$  determine well-defined elements  $u_j \in \Lambda_x/\mathbb{Z}m_i$  for  $x \in \tilde{B} \setminus \tilde{\Delta}$  a point close to  $h_s(v)$ . Further, we have*

$$\sum_{j=1}^m u_j = 0.$$

*Proof.* As each  $\mathbf{u}(E_i)$  is a tangent vector to  $\sigma(E_i)$ , it determines a tangent vector to some maximal cell of  $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$  containing  $h_s(v)$ . The parallel transport of this vector to  $x$  near  $h_s(v)$  is then well-defined modulo  $\mathbb{Z}m_i$  by Lemma 3.6.

As in the proof of Theorem 2.39, we may split the domain to obtain a punctured map  $f_v : C_v^\circ \rightarrow \tilde{X}$  with  $C_v^\circ$  the irreducible component of  $C^\circ$  corresponding to  $v$ . Now  $f_v$  factors through the strict inclusion  $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_i \hookrightarrow \tilde{X}$ . Let  $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}'_i$  be the log structure on  $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_i$  induced by the divisor which is the union of lower dimensional strata of  $\tilde{X}$  contained in  $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_i$ . Then we have a composition

$$f'_v : C_v^\circ \longrightarrow \tilde{\mathbb{P}}_i \longrightarrow \tilde{\mathbb{P}}'_i \xrightarrow{p_i \circ \text{Bl}_{\tilde{H}}} D_{\rho_i}$$

as in (3.33), noting all morphisms are defined at the logarithmic level (even though  $\text{Bl}_{\tilde{H}}$  is not). Note that  $\Sigma(\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_i)$ , the tropicalization of  $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_i$ , is just  $\text{Star}(\nu_i)$ , where  $\nu_i$  is as in (3.4). The tropicalization of  $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_i \rightarrow D_{\rho_i}$  is given by the composition of  $\Psi|_{\text{Star}(\nu_i)} : \text{Star}(\nu_i) \rightarrow M_{\mathbb{R}} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  with the map  $M_{\mathbb{R}} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow M_{\mathbb{R}}/\mathbb{R}m_i$  given by  $(m, r) \mapsto m \pmod{\mathbb{R}m_i}$ . In particular, this map is induced by the quotient map

by the subspace spanned by  $(m_i, 0)$  and  $(0, 1)$ . As  $D_{\rho_i}$  is toric, the tropicalization of  $f'_v$  is balanced, via [22, Ex. 7.5]. As  $\Lambda_x/\mathbb{Z}m_i$  may be identified with  $(M \oplus \mathbb{Z})/\mathbb{Z}(m_i, 0)$ , we see that  $\sum_{j=1}^m u_j = 0$  holds in  $\Lambda_x/\mathbb{Z}m_i$  modulo  $\mathbb{Z}(0, 1)$ . On the other hand, the composed map  $C_v^\circ \rightarrow \tilde{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{A}^1$  also tropicalizes to a balanced curve, and hence it follows that in fact  $\sum_{j=1}^m u_j = 0$  holds in  $\Lambda_x/\mathbb{Z}m_i$ .  $\square$

**3.5.  $\mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D})}^1$  is asymptotically equivalent to  $\mathfrak{D}_{(X, D)}$ .** We now note that  $\mathfrak{D}_{(X, D)}$  may be reconstructed from  $\mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D})}^1$  via Theorem 2.38.

First, we must analyze the map

$$\iota : N_1(X) \rightarrow N_1(\tilde{X})$$

induced by the inclusion of  $X$  into  $\tilde{X}$  as a general fibre of  $\epsilon_{\mathbf{P}} : \tilde{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{A}^1$ . We have:

**Lemma 3.11.** *The map  $\iota$  is injective. Further, its image is the subgroup of  $N_1(\tilde{X})$  of curve classes with intersection number 0 with all irreducible components of  $\epsilon_{\mathbf{P}}^{-1}(0)$ .*

*Proof.* Note that  $\epsilon_{\mathbf{P}}^{-1}(\mathbb{A}^1 \setminus \{0\}) = X \times (\mathbb{A}^1 \setminus \{0\})$ , and the inclusion  $X = X \times \{t\} \hookrightarrow X \times (\mathbb{A}^1 \setminus \{0\})$  for any  $t \in \mathbb{A}^1 \setminus \{0\}$  induces an isomorphism of Picard groups via pull-back under this inclusion. On the other hand, there is a surjective restriction map  $\text{Pic}(\tilde{X}) \rightarrow \text{Pic}(\epsilon_{\mathbf{P}}^{-1}(\mathbb{A}^1 \setminus \{0\}))$  with kernel generated by the irreducible components of  $\epsilon_{\mathbf{P}}^{-1}(0)$ . We obtain the result by dualizing.  $\square$

Now if  $(\mathfrak{d}, f_{\mathfrak{d}}) \in \mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D})}^1$ , let  $\text{Cone}(\mathfrak{d}) \subseteq \tilde{B}$  denote the cone over  $\mathfrak{d}$ . Explicitly,  $\mathfrak{d}$  is a polyhedral subset of some cell  $\sigma \cap \tilde{B}_1 \in \mathcal{P}_1$  for  $\sigma \in \tilde{\mathcal{P}}$ . Then we may take  $\text{Cone}(\mathfrak{d}) \subseteq \tilde{\rho}$  as the closure of the cone generated by  $\mathfrak{d}$  in  $\sigma$ . Thus we obtain a wall

$$(\text{Cone}(\mathfrak{d}), f_{\mathfrak{d}}^{1/\text{ind}(\text{Cone}(\mathfrak{d}))}) \in \mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D})}, \quad (3.40)$$

giving a one-to-one correspondence between  $\mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D})}^1$  and  $\mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D})}$ .

Thus the following definition is intrinsic to  $\mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D})}^1$ :

**Definition 3.12.** The *asymptotic scattering diagram* associated to  $\mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D})}^1$  is the scattering diagram

$$\mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D})}^{1, \text{as}} := \{(\mathfrak{d} \cap \tilde{B}_0, f_{\mathfrak{d}}) \mid (\mathfrak{d}, f_{\mathfrak{d}}) \in \mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D})}^1 \text{ with } \dim \mathfrak{d} \cap \tilde{B}_0 = n - 1\}. \quad (3.41)$$

We then may restate Theorem 2.38 in our context, noting that by Lemma 3.11, we lose no information in applying  $\iota$ :

**Proposition 3.13.** *The asymptotic scattering diagram  $\mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D})}^{1, \text{as}}$  is equivalent to  $\iota(\mathfrak{D}_{(X, D)})$ .*

4. THE STRUCTURE OF  $\mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D})}^1$  AND RADIANCE.

This section forms the technical heart of the paper. Here we carry out a deeper analysis of the scattering diagram  $\mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D})}^1$ . The key point in our analysis is a proof that this diagram is *radiant*, as defined below. Put roughly, recall we have a canonical piecewise linear identification  $\Psi|_{\tilde{B}_1}$  of  $\tilde{B}_1$  with  $M_{\mathbb{R}}$ . Radiance of  $\mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D})}^1$  can be interpreted as saying that each wall of this scattering diagram is contained in the inverse image of a codimension one linear subspace of  $M_{\mathbb{R}}$ . This will give us good control of how the scattering diagram behaves in radial directions from the origin. This eventually allows us to completely describe  $\mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D})}^1$  in terms of the structure of the diagram near the origin, see §6.1.

4.1.  $\mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D})}^1$  is a radiant scattering diagram. The following definition of a radiant manifold can be found in [14].

**Definition 4.1.** An affine structure on a topological manifold  $B$  is *radiant* if and only if the change of coordinate transformations of the atlas defining the affine structure on  $B$  lie in  $GL_n(\mathbb{R}) \subset \text{Aff}(M_{\mathbb{R}})$ . We call a radiant affine structure *integral* if the change of coordinate transformations further lie in  $GL_n(\mathbb{Z})$ . An (integral) *radiant manifold with singularities* is a topological manifold  $B$  which admits an (integral) radiant structure on a subset  $B \setminus \Delta$ , where  $\Delta \subset B$  is a union of submanifolds of  $B$  of codimension at least 2.

The notion of radiant vector field is defined as in [13, §6.5.1]; we do not review the general definition here. However, if  $B$  is radiant,  $B$  carries a radiant vector field constructed as follows. Let  $y_1, \dots, y_n$  be local linear coordinates, and set

$$\vec{\rho} := \sum_{i=1}^n y_i \frac{\partial}{\partial y_i}. \quad (4.1)$$

This yields a global vector field on  $B$  [13, § 1.5]. Indeed, observe that the formula for  $\vec{\rho}$  remains invariant under a linear change of coordinates. The following proposition can be found in [13, §6.5.1].

**Proposition 4.2.** *Let  $B$  be an affine manifold. Then the following are equivalent:*

- $M$  is a radiant manifold.
- $M$  possesses a radiant vector field.

**Definition 4.3.** If  $B$  is a radiant manifold,  $B'$  an affine linear submanifold of  $B$ , we say  $B'$  is a *radiant submanifold* if  $\vec{\rho}$  is tangent to  $B'$  at all points of  $B'$ . In this case,  $B'$  itself is a radiant manifold.

*Remark 4.4.* Just as a radiant manifold is modeled on a vector space  $M_{\mathbb{R}}$ , a radiant submanifold is modeled on a *linear* subspace of  $M_{\mathbb{R}}$ ; i.e., the only affine linear subspaces of  $M_{\mathbb{R}}$  which are radiant are the linear subspaces.

**Lemma 4.5.** *Let  $B$  be a radiant affine manifold with a point  $O \in B$  where the radiant vector field vanishes. Let  $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow B$  be an affine linear immersion. If  $O = \gamma(1)$ , then  $\gamma$  is tangent to  $\vec{\rho}$  defined as in (4.1) everywhere.*

*Proof.* We may find  $0 = t_0 < t_1 < \dots < t_n = 1$  and charts  $\psi_i : U_i \rightarrow M_{\mathbb{R}}$  with linear transition maps, where  $U_i$  is an neighbourhood of  $\gamma(t_i)$  and  $\{\gamma^{-1}(U_i) \mid 0 \leq i \leq n\}$  covers  $[0, 1]$  by connected intervals. Now because  $\gamma$  is an affine linear immersion,  $(\psi_i \circ \gamma)|_{\gamma^{-1}(U_i)}$  is an affine line, and the image is either always tangent to  $\vec{\rho}$  or never tangent. Now if  $\gamma(1) = O$ , then in the chart  $U_n$ , it is clear that this image is tangent to  $\vec{\rho}$ . Hence inductively the same is true on all of  $[0, 1]$ .  $\square$

Note that for an arbitrary log Calabi-Yau pair  $(X, D)$ , the affine structure constructed on the associated  $(B, \mathcal{P})$  is always radiant. In our situation, we would like to say a bit more: while  $\tilde{B}$  is automatically radiant, in fact  $\tilde{B}_1$  also is:

**Proposition 4.6.** *Let  $\tilde{B}_1$  be as in (3.22). Then  $\tilde{B}_1$  is radiant.*

*Proof.* The charts on  $\tilde{B}_1$  are the restrictions of the charts on  $\tilde{B}$  described in Theorem 3.4, so it suffices to check these restrictions are linear. But the transition map between  $U$  and  $\text{Star}(\tilde{\rho}_i)$  is given by

$$\psi_V \circ \psi_U^{-1}(m, 1) = (m + \varphi_i(\pi_i(m))m_i, 1).$$

This is defined on  $\tilde{B}_1 \cap \tilde{\sigma}$  for  $\tilde{\sigma} \in \tilde{\Sigma}$  a maximal cone containing  $\tilde{\rho}_i$ , and  $\varphi_i$  is linear on  $(\sigma + \mathbb{R}\rho_i)/\mathbb{R}\rho_i$ . Thus  $m \mapsto \varphi_i(\pi_i(m))m_i$  is a linear map on  $M_{\mathbb{R}}$ , and hence the transition maps are indeed linear after restricting to  $\tilde{B}_1$ .  $\square$

**Definition 4.7.** We say a scattering diagram  $\mathfrak{D}$  on a radiant affine manifold  $B$  is *radiant* if for each wall  $(\mathfrak{d}, f_{\mathfrak{d}}) \in \mathfrak{D}$ , the affine submanifold  $\mathfrak{d}$  is a radiant submanifold.

*Remark 4.8.* In the case of  $\tilde{B}_1$ , note that the piecewise linear map  $\Psi|_{\tilde{B}_1} : \tilde{B}_1 \rightarrow M_{\mathbb{R}}$  preserves the radiant vector fields where  $\Psi$  is linear. Indeed, the chart  $\psi_U$  on  $U$  is the restriction of  $\Psi$ , and hence identifies radiant vector fields on  $U \cap \tilde{B}_1$  and  $M_{\mathbb{R}}$ . As a consequence, an affine subspace  $B' \subseteq \tilde{B}_1$  is radiant if and only if  $\Psi|_{\tilde{B}_1}(B') \subseteq M_{\mathbb{R}}$  spans a linear subspace of  $M_{\mathbb{R}}$  of the same dimension as  $B'$ . This is even the case when  $B'$  is contained in the locus  $\tilde{B}_1 \setminus U$ , where  $\Psi$  is not linear, as this set is a union of cells of the form  $\rho_{\infty}$  (in the notation of §3.4) for  $\rho \in \Sigma$  a codimension one cone containing  $\rho_i$  for some  $i$ . However, if  $B' \subseteq \rho_{\infty}$ , then  $B'$



is radiant if and only if  $\psi_V|_{\tilde{B}_1}(B') \subseteq M_{\mathbb{R}}$  spans a linear subspace of the same dimension as  $B'$ , if and only if  $\Psi|_{\tilde{B}_1}(B') \subseteq M_{\mathbb{R}}$  spans a linear subspace of the same dimension as  $B'$ , as follows since  $\psi_V \circ \psi_U^{-1}$  is linear.

Our immediate goal is to prove:

**Theorem 4.9.** *The scattering diagram  $\mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D})}^1$  on  $\tilde{B}_1$  is equivalent to a radiant scattering diagram.*

*Remark 4.10.* Recall that the scattering diagram  $\mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D})}^1$  involves a choice of an ideal  $I$ . So the above statement should be interpreted as saying this holds for every ideal  $I$ .

*Remark 4.11.* Morally, there is a simple reason to expect the radiance of  $\mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D})}^1$ . Indeed, suppose instead of using the degeneration  $\epsilon_{\mathbf{P}} : \tilde{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{A}^1$ , we used a trivial degeneration  $\epsilon : X \times \mathbb{A}^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{A}^1$ . Then the the affine manifold associated to  $(X \times \mathbb{A}^1, (D \times \mathbb{A}^1) \cup (X \times \{0\}))$  is just  $B \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ . The corresponding scattering diagram is simply obtained from  $\mathfrak{D}_{(X, D)}$  by replacing each wall  $(\mathfrak{d}, f_{\mathfrak{d}})$  with  $(\mathfrak{d} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, f_{\mathfrak{d}})$ . It is then clear that restriction to  $B \times \{1\}$  gives a radiant scattering diagram.

Now in fact  $\tilde{X}$  and  $X \times \mathbb{A}^1$  are equal after removing their respective boundaries, and this equality extends to a birational map between  $\tilde{X}$  and  $X \times \mathbb{A}^1$ . Experience from [17] suggests that scattering diagrams associated with such birationally equivalent spaces should be closely related via moving worms (see [29, §3.3]), and in particular have the same support. However, the necessary theory of birational invariance of punctured invariants has not been developed in a way which would permit us to prove such a result directly.

Before we embark on several lemmas for the proof, we set up notation for proving this inductively.

**Definition 4.12.** Let  $\mathfrak{D}$  be a scattering diagram and let  $(\mathfrak{d}, f_{\mathfrak{d}}) \in \mathfrak{D}$  be a wall. We say a facet (i.e., a codimension one face)  $\mathfrak{j} \subseteq \mathfrak{d}$  is *repulsive* if  $f_{\mathfrak{d}} = f_{\mathfrak{d}}(z^{-v})$  and viewing  $v \in \Lambda_{\mathfrak{d}}$  as a tangent vector at a point  $y \in \mathfrak{j}$ , we have  $v$  pointing into  $\mathfrak{d}$ .

**Lemma 4.13.** *Every wall of  $\mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D})}^1$  has a repulsive facet.*

*Proof.* This is immediate from the construction of the canonical scattering diagram, and in particular (2.33) and (2.35).  $\square$

**Proposition 4.14.** *If  $(\mathfrak{d}, f_{\mathfrak{d}}) \in \mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D})}^1$  with one of the repulsive facets of  $\mathfrak{d}$  radiant, then  $\mathfrak{d}$  is radiant.*

*Proof.* Let  $\mathfrak{j} \subseteq \mathfrak{d} \subseteq \sigma \in \mathcal{P}_1$  be a repulsive facet. Recall that  $\Psi|_{\tilde{B}_1}$  induces a linear embedding of  $\sigma$  in  $M_{\mathbb{R}}$ . Using this embedding, we may describe  $\mathfrak{d}$ , locally near a

point  $y \in \mathfrak{j}$ , as  $\mathfrak{j} + \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}v$ . Further, under this embedding, the radiant vector field at a point  $x \in M_{\mathbb{R}}$  is just  $x$ . Thus if  $y' \in \mathfrak{j}$  near  $y$  then the radiant vector at  $y' + \epsilon v$  is  $y' + \epsilon v$ . By assumption,  $y'$  is tangent to  $\mathfrak{j}$ , and thus  $y' + \epsilon v$  is tangent to  $\mathfrak{d}$ .  $\square$

**Definition 4.15.** Fix once and for all a divisor  $A$  on  $\tilde{X}$  which is relatively ample for the morphism  $\epsilon_{\mathbf{P}} : \tilde{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{A}^1$  of (3.8). We assume that  $A^\perp \cap Q = \{0\}$ ; if necessary, we may shrink  $Q$ . Define

$$\mathfrak{m}_k := \{p \in Q \mid A \cdot p \geq k\}.$$

Note this is a monomial ideal in  $Q$ , and that  $\mathfrak{m}_1 = Q \setminus \{0\}$  is the maximal monomial ideal of  $Q$ . We will also denote by  $\mathfrak{m}_k$  the corresponding ideal in  $\mathbb{k}[Q]$ . If  $p \in Q$  or  $\alpha = ct^p \in \mathbb{k}[Q]$ , then we say the *order of  $p$  or  $\alpha$*  is  $A \cdot p$ . We say a wall  $(\mathfrak{d}, f_{\mathfrak{d}})$  is *trivial to order  $k$*  if

$$f_{\mathfrak{d}} \equiv 1 \pmod{\mathfrak{m}_{k+1}}.$$

Otherwise we say the wall is *non-trivial to order  $k$* .

*Remark 4.16.* Since any ideal  $I$  with  $\sqrt{I} = \mathfrak{m}$  must contain  $\mathfrak{m}_k$  for some sufficiently large  $k$ , it is enough to prove Theorem 4.9 for  $I = \mathfrak{m}_k$ , which we do inductively on  $k$ . Since the statement is only claimed to be true up to equivalence, we now make a good choice of equivalent scattering diagram. To do so, we make use of the following general observation:

**Lemma 4.17.** *Let  $M = \mathbb{Z}^n$ ,  $P$  be a monoid equipped with a monoid homomorphism  $r : P \rightarrow M$ , and let  $\mathfrak{m}_P = P \setminus P^\times$ . Write  $\widehat{\mathbb{k}[P]}$  for the completion of  $\mathbb{k}[P]$  with respect to the monomial ideal  $\mathfrak{m}_P$ . Let  $f \in \widehat{\mathbb{k}[P]}$  satisfy  $f \equiv 1 \pmod{\mathfrak{m}_P}$ . Then there is a unique convergent infinite product expansion*

$$f = \prod_{m \in M_{\text{prim}} \cup \{0\}} f_m, \tag{4.2}$$

where  $M_{\text{prim}}$  denotes the set of primitive elements of  $M$ , and  $f_m \in \widehat{\mathbb{k}[P]}$  has the properties that (1) every monomial  $z^p$  appearing in  $f_m$  satisfies  $r(p)$  positively proportional to  $m$  and (2)  $f_m \equiv 1 \pmod{\mathfrak{m}_P}$ .

*Proof.* We show this modulo  $\mathfrak{m}_P^k$  for each  $k \geq 1$ . The base case,  $k = 1$ , is vacuous. Suppose given a unique product expansion of  $f$  modulo  $\mathfrak{m}_P^k$  given as  $\prod f_{m,k}$  as in (4.2) with  $f_{m,k} = 1$  for all but a finite number of  $m$ . Then modulo  $\mathfrak{m}_P^{k+1}$ , we have

$$f - \prod_m f_{m,k} = \sum_i c_i z^{p_i}$$

for  $c_i \in \mathbb{k}$  and  $p_i$  distinct elements of  $P$  with  $z^{p_i} \in \mathfrak{m}_P^k \setminus \mathfrak{m}_P^{k+1}$ . We then have no choice but to modify the product expansion by taking

$$f_{m,k+1} = f_{m,k} + \sum_{i: r(p_i) \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0} m} c_i z^{p_i}.$$

□

**Construction 4.18.** For any  $k$ , let  $\mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D}), k}^1$  denote the scattering diagram with respect to the ideal  $\mathfrak{m}_k$ . Recall that this is a finite set. By Lemma 4.17, we may replace  $\mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D}), k}^1$  with a diagram equivalent modulo  $\mathfrak{m}_{k+1}$  with the property that for each  $x \in \text{Supp}(\mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D}), k}^1) \setminus \text{Sing}(\mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D}), k}^1)$ , and for each integral and primitive  $v$  tangent to  $\text{Supp}(\mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D}), k}^1)$  at  $x$ , there is at most one wall whose attached function involves monomials of the form  $t^\beta z^{-nv}$  for  $n > 0$ . Further, for any such  $x$ , the set of wall functions of walls containing  $x$  are then uniquely determined.

We first consider the consequences of consistency along the discriminant locus. This is slightly delicate as the definition of consistency there makes use of broken lines.

**Lemma 4.19.** *Fix a general point  $x$  on the discriminant locus  $\tilde{\Delta}_1^i \subseteq \tilde{B}_1$ . Suppose that  $m_i$  is tangent to any wall of  $\mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D}), k}^1$  containing  $x$ . Then if  $\mathfrak{d} \in \mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D}), k+1}^1$  with  $x \in \mathfrak{d}$  contained in a repulsive facet of  $\mathfrak{d}$ , we have  $m_i$  tangent to  $\mathfrak{d}$ . In particular,  $\mathfrak{d}$  is radiant.*

*Proof.* In the notation of (3.27), let  $\tilde{\Delta}_\rho \in \mathcal{P}_1$  be the codimension two cell containing the point  $x$ , for some codimension one cone  $\rho \in \Sigma(\rho_i)$ . Necessarily there is a joint  $\mathfrak{j}$  of  $\mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D}), k+1}^1$  with  $x \in \text{Int}(\mathfrak{j}) \subseteq \tilde{\Delta}_\rho$ , by the genericity assumption on  $x$ .

We need to use the definition of consistency at codimension two joints as reviewed in §2.2.3. In particular, the affine manifold  $B_{\mathfrak{j}}$  has already been discussed in §3.3, with a natural quotient  $B'$ , which is an affine surface with singularity. We also make use of the notation introduced in §3.4, and we write  $\rho_\pm, \rho_\infty, \rho_0$  also for the corresponding codimension one cells of  $\mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{j}}$ . The affine manifold  $(B_{\mathfrak{j}}, \mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{j}})$  carries a scattering diagram  $\mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D}), k+1}^{1, \mathfrak{j}}$ .

Write

$$\nu : B_{\mathfrak{j}} \rightarrow B'$$

for the affine submersion obtained by dividing out by the  $\Lambda_{\tilde{\Delta}_\rho, \mathbb{R}}$  action on  $B_{\mathfrak{j}}$ . This map will be useful for visualizing broken lines in  $B_{\mathfrak{j}}$ . It is immediate from Lemma 3.6 that the monodromy around the unique singularity of  $B'$  takes the form  $\begin{pmatrix} 1 & a \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$  for some integer  $a$ , and that  $\overline{m}_i := \nu_* m_i$  is a monodromy invariant




FIGURE 4.1. The polyhedral decomposition  $\mathcal{P}'$  on  $B'$ , the projection of a wall  $\mathfrak{d} \in B_j$  and a broken line  $\nu \circ \gamma$  ending at  $P'$  along with its possible translations.

tangent vector. The polyhedral decomposition  $\mathcal{P}_j$  projects to a polyhedral decomposition  $\mathcal{P}'$  of  $B'$ . Note that  $\nu(\rho_\infty)$  is a ray generated by  $\bar{m}_i$  and  $\nu(\rho_0)$  is a ray generated by  $-\bar{m}_i$ .

For each wall  $\mathfrak{d} \in \mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D}), k+1}^{1,j}$ ,  $\nu(\mathfrak{d})$  is a ray in  $B'$ . Let  $L = \rho_\infty \cup \rho_0 \subseteq B_j$ , so that  $B_j \setminus L$  consists of two connected components, which we write as  $U$  and  $U'$ , say with  $U$  intersecting  $\rho^+$ . In Figure 4.1, we depict  $B'$ , with the blue rays being one-dimensional cones in  $\mathcal{P}'$  and the black rays being additional images of walls in  $\mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D}), k+1}^{1,j}$ . Note that a wall may coincide with a codimension one cell of  $\mathcal{P}_j$ , and the image of such a wall coincides with a one-dimensional cell in  $\mathcal{P}'$ . Now let us assume there is a wall  $\mathfrak{d} \in \mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D}), k+1}^{1,j}$  for which the unique face of  $\mathfrak{d}$  (the tangent space to  $\Delta_\rho$ ) is repulsive. Suppose further that  $m_i$  is not tangent to  $\mathfrak{d}$ . We wish to arrive at a contradiction by showing that  $\mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D}), \ell+1}^1$  is not consistent for some sufficiently large  $\ell$ . Note that the hypothesis of the lemma implies that all walls of any such  $\mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D}), \ell+1}^1$  non-trivial modulo  $\mathfrak{m}_k$  are contained in  $L$ .

Without loss of generality, assume that  $\mathfrak{d}$  is contained in the closure of  $U$ . The assumption that  $m_i$  is not tangent to  $\mathfrak{d}$  tells us that  $\mathfrak{d} \not\subseteq L$ . We now construct a specific broken line  $\gamma : (-\infty, 0] \rightarrow B_j$  for the scattering diagram  $\mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D}), k+1}^{1,j}$ . This broken line will bend only at  $\mathfrak{d}$ , and will have asymptotic direction either  $m_i$  or  $-m_i$ . If  $\mathfrak{d} \subseteq \rho^+ \in \mathcal{P}_j$ , this sign may be chosen arbitrarily. Otherwise we choose the sign so that the broken line crosses  $\rho^+$  before bending. In Figure 4.1, we depict the image of  $\nu \circ \gamma$  of such a broken line as a dashed piecewise linear path.

Again without loss of generality, assume the asymptotic direction is  $m_i$ ; the argument is identical if the asymptotic direction is  $-m_i$ . First, the initial monomial attached to the broken line is then  $z^{m_i} \in \mathbb{k}[\mathcal{P}_x^+]$  for  $x$  any point in the interior of the maximal cell of  $\mathcal{P}$ , corresponding to  $\tilde{\sigma}_+$ . Here we use the description  $\mathcal{P}_x^+ = \Lambda_x \oplus Q$  of (2.11) and write for  $(m, q) \in \mathcal{P}_x^+$  the corresponding monomial as usual as  $t^q z^m$ . Further, using the chart  $\psi_U$  of Theorem 3.4, we may identify  $\Lambda_x$  with  $M$ . When we cross  $\rho^+$ , we need to use parallel transport of the monomial  $z^{m_i}$  to the new cell using (3.39). Assuming  $\mathfrak{d} \neq \rho^+$ , then as we are not bending at  $\rho^+$ , we may use (3.39) to accomplish this transport, and the monomial  $z^{m_i}$  becomes  $t^{\langle n_{\rho^+}, m_i \rangle F_i} z^{m_i}$ . By (3.34), this is  $t^{F_i} z^{m_i}$ .

We now continue our broken line until we reach  $\mathfrak{d}$ . Write

$$f_{\mathfrak{d}}(z^{-v}) = 1 + \alpha z^{-v} + \dots$$

with  $\alpha \in \mathfrak{m}_{k+1} \setminus \mathfrak{m}_{k+2}$ , i.e.,  $\alpha$  of order  $k+1$ . Then the monomial attached to this broken line after the bend is of the form  $\langle n_{\mathfrak{d}}, m_i \rangle \alpha t^{F_i} z^{m_i - v}$ , with  $n_{\mathfrak{d}}$  a primitive normal vector to  $\mathfrak{d}$  positive on  $m_i$ . In particular, as the tangent vector to the broken line after the bend is  $-(m_i - v) = -m_i + v$ , the fact that  $\mathfrak{d}$  is repulsive shows the broken line bends away from  $L$ , as shown in Figure 4.1.

If  $\mathfrak{d}$  coincides with  $\rho_+$ , we obtain similar behaviour, but the change from the kink and the bend occur at the same time.

Note that because  $F_i \in \mathfrak{m}_1$ , in fact  $\alpha t^{F_i} \in \mathfrak{m}_{k+2}$ . Thus we need to pass to higher order to detect the malicious effect of this broken line. Let  $\ell = k + 1 + A \cdot F_i$  be the order of  $\alpha t^{F_i}$ , and consider now the scattering diagram  $\mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D}), \ell+1}^{1, j}$ .

We next will prove:

*Claim.* For any point  $P'$  lying between  $\mathfrak{d}$  and  $\rho_0$ , any broken line for the scattering diagram  $\mathfrak{D}_{\tilde{X}, \ell+1}^1$  with asymptotic direction  $m_i$  ending at  $P'$  with final monomial  $\beta z^m \notin \mathfrak{m}_{\ell+1}$  bends at most once and is entirely contained in  $U$ . Further the only possible broken line with final monomial  $\alpha'' z^{m_i - v} \not\equiv 0 \pmod{\mathfrak{m}_{\ell+1}}$  is the one just described.

*Proof of claim.* First consider a broken line entirely contained in  $U$ . It may only bend at most once and still yield a coefficient non-trivial modulo  $\mathfrak{m}_{\ell+1}$ . Indeed, if it bends twice, the coefficient will be divisible by  $t^{F_i} \alpha_1 \alpha_2$ , where the  $t^{F_i}$  term arises from crossing  $\rho^+$  and  $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in \mathfrak{m}_{k+1}$ . Thus the order of  $t^{F_i} \alpha_1 \alpha_2$  is at least  $\ell + k + 1 \geq \ell + 1$ , so this term is trivial modulo  $\mathfrak{m}_{\ell+1}$ .

Next suppose that the broken line crosses between  $U$  and  $U'$ . Such a line may start in  $U'$  and cross into  $U$ , or worse start in  $U$ , cross into  $U'$ , and then cross back into  $U$ . Regardless, for this to happen, it must bend at least once at a wall not contained in  $L$ , it must cross either  $\rho^+$  or  $\rho^-$ , and it must cross  $L$ . As a

result, the final coefficient must be divisible by  $t^{\kappa_{\rho^{\pm}}}t^{\kappa'}\alpha$ , where as before  $\kappa_{\rho^{\pm}}$  is the kink of  $\varphi$  along either  $\rho^+$  or  $\rho^-$ , both of these being the class  $F_i$ , see (3.37). Further,  $\kappa'$  comes from the kink along either  $\rho_0$  or  $\rho_{\infty}$ , while  $\alpha \in \mathfrak{m}_{k+1}$  arises from the bend. However, as the order of  $\kappa'$  is at least one, the whole term has order at least  $\ell + 1$ , and hence the attached final monomial lies in  $\mathfrak{m}_{\ell+1}$ .

Now observe that if a broken line is wholly contained in  $U$  and bends only once, with an attached final monomial  $\alpha''z^{m_i-v} \notin \mathfrak{m}_{\ell+1}$ , it must bend at a wall whose attached function is  $f(z^{-v})$ . However,  $\mathfrak{d}$  is the unique such wall, given the assumption of Construction 4.18 that there is at most one wall with such an attached function.  $\square$

Now consider a point  $P \in U \setminus (\mathfrak{d} + \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}(v - m_i))$  which lies between  $\mathfrak{d}$  and  $\rho_0$ . Such a point exists as  $v$  is not tangent to  $L$  as  $L \cap \mathfrak{d}$  is repulsive a repulsive facet of  $\mathfrak{d}$ . Note that there is a broken line of the type constructed bending at  $\mathfrak{d}$  and ending at  $P'$  for any  $P' \in \mathfrak{d} + \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}(v - m_i)$ . However, there is no such broken line ending at  $P$ . From this and the claim, we can then deduce that

$$\vartheta_{m_i}^j(P') = t^{F_i}z^{m_i} + \alpha t^{F_i}z^{m_i-v} + \sum_j \alpha_j z^{v_j}$$

with  $\alpha_j \in \mathfrak{m}_{\ell}$ ,  $v_j \in M$ . The first term comes from a straight line, the second from the constructed broken line, and the sum comes from any other broken lines which bend once and end at  $P'$ . Further,  $v_j \neq m_i - v$  for any  $j$ . On the other hand,

$$\vartheta_{m_i}^j(P) = t^{F_i}z^{m_i} + \sum_j \alpha'_j z^{v'_j},$$

again with  $\alpha'_j \in \mathfrak{m}_{\ell}$ ,  $v'_j \in M$ , with  $v'_j \neq m_i - v$  for any  $j$ .

But we also have, for a path  $\delta$  connecting  $P$  to  $P'$ ,

$$\theta_{\delta, \mathfrak{d}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D}), \ell+1}}^{1,j}(\vartheta_{m_i}^j(P')) = \vartheta_{m_i}^j(P)$$

by consistency, Definition 2.19. However, as  $\delta$  only crosses walls of the form  $(\mathfrak{d}', f_{\mathfrak{d}'}(z^{v'}))$  with  $f_{\mathfrak{d}'} \equiv 1 \pmod{\mathfrak{m}_k}$ , we see easily that  $\theta_{\delta, \mathfrak{d}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D}), \ell+1}}^{1,j}$  leaves invariant modulo  $\mathfrak{m}_{\ell+1}$  all terms of  $\vartheta_{m_i}^j(P)$  except for the term  $t^{F_i}z^{m_i}$ . However, in order for  $\theta_{\delta, \mathfrak{d}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D}), \ell+1}}^{1,j}(t^{F_i}z^{m_i})$  to produce a term  $-\alpha t^{F_i}z^{m_i-v}$  necessary to cancel this term in  $\vartheta_{m_i}^j(P)$ ,  $\delta$  would have to cross  $\mathfrak{d}$ , which it does not. Thus we have obtained a contradiction to consistency.

We thus conclude that  $m_i$  is tangent to  $\mathfrak{d}$ . This implies that  $\mathfrak{d}$  is contained in either  $\rho_{\infty}$  or  $\rho_0$ . Both of these are contained in  $\bar{\rho} \cap \tilde{B}_1$ , which is identified with  $\rho$  under  $\Psi|_{\tilde{B}_1}$ . Thus by Remark 4.8,  $\bar{\rho} \cap \tilde{B}_1$  is radiant, and hence  $\mathfrak{d}$  is radiant.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 4.9.* We will show the result by induction by showing that  $\mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D}), k}^1$  is radiant for each  $k$ . The base case  $k = 1$  is trivial as  $\mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D}), 1}^1$  is empty. So assume the result is true for  $\mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D}), k}^1$ .

Suppose given a wall  $(\mathfrak{d}, f_{\mathfrak{d}}(z^{-v})) \in \mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D}), k+1}^1$ . Recall that by Proposition 4.14, to show  $\mathfrak{d} \in \mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D}), k+1}^1$  is radiant, it suffices to show that one of the repulsive facets of  $\mathfrak{d}$  is radiant.

If  $f_{\mathfrak{d}} \not\equiv 1 \pmod{\mathfrak{m}_k}$ , then  $\mathfrak{d}$  is already contained in a wall of  $\mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D}), k}^1$ , and hence is radiant. Thus we may assume that  $f_{\mathfrak{d}} \equiv 1 \pmod{\mathfrak{m}_k}$ .

Let  $\sigma_{\mathfrak{d}}$  be the smallest cell of  $\mathcal{P}_1$  containing  $\mathfrak{d}$ . Choose a general point  $x \in \text{Int}(\mathfrak{d})$ . This can be done sufficiently generally so that  $(x - \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}v) \cap \sigma_{\mathfrak{d}}$  (which makes sense inside  $\sigma_{\mathfrak{d}}$ ) does not intersect any  $(n-3)$ -dimensional face of any  $\mathfrak{d}' \in \mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D}), k+1}^1$ . Let  $\mathfrak{j} \subseteq \mathfrak{d}$  be the unique repulsive facet of  $\mathfrak{d}$  intersecting  $(x - \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}v) \cap \sigma_{\mathfrak{d}}$ , and let  $y$  be the only point of  $(x - \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}v) \cap \mathfrak{j}$ . Let  $\sigma_{\mathfrak{j}} \in \mathcal{P}$  denote the smallest cell containing  $\mathfrak{j}$ .

We may assume that  $\mathfrak{j}$  is not contained in  $\tilde{\Delta}_1$ . Indeed, if  $\mathfrak{j} \subseteq \tilde{\Delta}_1$ , then  $\mathfrak{d}$  is radiant by the induction hypothesis and Lemma 4.19. Thus we may assume  $y \notin \tilde{\Delta}_1$ .

Set

$$\mathfrak{T}_y := \{\Lambda_{\mathfrak{d}'} \mid y \in \mathfrak{d}' \in \mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D}), k+1}^1\},$$


where  $\Lambda_{\mathfrak{d}'}$  denotes the integral tangent space to  $\mathfrak{d}'$  as a sublattice of  $\Lambda_y$ . Note different walls may give rise to the same element of  $\mathfrak{T}_y$ .

We analyze two different possibilities:

*Case I.*  $\#\mathfrak{T}_y \leq 2$ . If there is any wall  $(\mathfrak{d}', f_{\mathfrak{d}'}) \in \mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D}), k+1}^1$  containing  $y$  with  $\Lambda_{\mathfrak{d}} = \Lambda_{\mathfrak{d}'}$ , and  $f_{\mathfrak{d}'} \not\equiv 1 \pmod{\mathfrak{m}_k}$ , then by the induction hypothesis  $\mathfrak{d}'$  is radiant, and hence so is  $\mathfrak{d}$ . Thus we may assume that all walls containing  $y$  and with the same tangent space as  $\mathfrak{d}$  are trivial modulo  $\mathfrak{m}_k$ . In particular, the wall-crossing automorphisms associated to crossing these walls commute with all other wall-crossing automorphisms modulo  $\mathfrak{m}_{k+1}$ .

If  $\#\mathfrak{T}_y = 2$ , let  $\Lambda \in \mathfrak{T}_y$  with  $\Lambda \neq \Lambda_{\mathfrak{d}}$ , and choose a  $m \in \Lambda \setminus \Lambda_{\mathfrak{d}}$ . If  $\#\mathfrak{T}_y = 1$ , take any  $m \in \Lambda_y \setminus \Lambda_{\mathfrak{d}}$ . Then the wall-crossing automorphism  $\theta$  associated to crossing a wall  $\mathfrak{d}'$  with  $\Lambda_{\mathfrak{d}'} = \Lambda$  satisfies  $\theta(z^m) = z^m$ . Thus if  $\gamma$  is a suitably oriented loop around  $\mathfrak{j}$  close to  $y$ , we find

$$\theta_{\gamma, \mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D})}^1}(z^m) = z^m f_1^{\langle m, n_{\mathfrak{d}} \rangle} f_2^{-\langle m, n_{\mathfrak{d}} \rangle}, \quad (4.3)$$

FIGURE 4.2. The local structure near  $j$  when  $\#\mathfrak{T}_y = 2$ .

where  $n_{\mathfrak{d}}$  is a primitive normal vector to  $\Lambda_{\mathfrak{d}}$ , and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{D}_1 &:= \{(\mathfrak{d}', f_{\mathfrak{d}'}) \in \mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D}), k+1}^1 \mid y \in \mathfrak{d}', \Lambda_{\mathfrak{d}} = \Lambda_{\mathfrak{d}'}, \dim \mathfrak{d} \cap \mathfrak{d}' = n - 1\}, \\ \mathfrak{D}_2 &:= \{(\mathfrak{d}', f_{\mathfrak{d}'}) \in \mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D}), k+1}^1 \mid y \in \mathfrak{d}', \Lambda_{\mathfrak{d}} = \Lambda_{\mathfrak{d}'}, \dim \mathfrak{d} \cap \mathfrak{d}' = n - 2\}, \\ f_i &:= \prod_{\mathfrak{d}' \in \mathfrak{D}_i} f_{\mathfrak{d}'}, \quad i = 1, 2. \end{aligned}$$

Note that by the definition of consistency in codimensions 0 and 1 (Definitions 2.16 and 2.17), the identity (4.3) holds in the ring  $\mathbb{k}[\mathcal{P}_y^+]/\mathfrak{m}_{k,y}$ .

We now distinguish further between three cases. If  $\dim \sigma_j = n$ , then  $\mathbb{k}[\mathcal{P}_y^+]/\mathfrak{m}_{k,y} = \mathbb{k}[\Lambda_y][Q]/\mathfrak{m}_k$ . Then (4.3) implies that  $f_1 = f_2 \pmod{\mathfrak{m}_{k+1}}$ . In particular, there must be a wall  $(\mathfrak{d}', f_{\mathfrak{d}'}(z^{-v})) \in \mathfrak{D}_2$ , with an  $\epsilon > 0$  such that  $y - \epsilon v \in \mathfrak{d}'$ . We may now replace  $\mathfrak{d}$  with  $\mathfrak{d}'$  and  $x$  with  $x' := y - \epsilon v$  and continue the process.

If  $\dim \sigma_j = n - 1$ , then  $\mathfrak{m}_{k+1,y}$  is the monomial ideal generated by the inverse image of the ideals  $\mathfrak{m}_{k+1} + \mathcal{P}_x^+$  and  $\mathfrak{m}_{k+1} + \mathcal{P}_{x'}^+$  under the maps  $\mathcal{P}_y^+ \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_x^+, \mathcal{P}_{x'}^+$  of (2.14). (4.3) implies that  $f_1 = f_2 \pmod{\mathfrak{m}_{k+1,y}}$ . It then follows from Proposition 2.7 that  $f_2$  must contain a term  $\alpha z^{-v}$  of order  $< k$ , so that  $f_2 \not\equiv 1 \pmod{\mathfrak{m}_k}$ . Thus by the induction hypothesis, one of the walls in  $\mathfrak{D}_2$  is non-trivial to order  $k$ , and hence by the induction hypothesis is radiant. Thus  $\mathfrak{d}$  is radiant.

If  $\dim \sigma_j = n - 2$ , then  $j$  is contained in a codimension two cell of  $\mathcal{P}_1$  which is not contained in the discriminant locus. However, all codimension two cells of  $\mathcal{P}_1$  not contained in the discriminant locus are radiant, by Remark 4.8. Thus  $j$  is radiant. So by Proposition 4.14,  $\mathfrak{d}$  is radiant.



*Case II.*  $\#\mathfrak{T}_y \geq 3$ . We will show that either (a) we have similar behaviour as in the previous case, or (b) there exists walls  $\mathfrak{d}_1, \mathfrak{d}_2$  containing  $y$  with  $f_{\mathfrak{d}_i} \not\equiv 1 \pmod{\mathfrak{m}_k}$  and  $\Lambda_{\mathfrak{d}_1} \neq \Lambda_{\mathfrak{d}_2}$ . Thus  $\mathfrak{d}_1, \mathfrak{d}_2$  are radiant, so their intersection is also radiant. So  $j$  is radiant, and hence so is  $\mathfrak{d}$ .

Case (a) occurs when there is at most one  $\Lambda \in \mathfrak{T}_y$  with the property that there exists a wall  $(\mathfrak{d}', f_{\mathfrak{d}'}) \in \mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D}), k+1}^1$  with  $y \in \mathfrak{d}'$ ,  $\Lambda_{\mathfrak{d}'} = \Lambda$ , and  $f_{\mathfrak{d}'} \not\equiv 1 \pmod{\mathfrak{m}_k}$ . If there is no such  $\Lambda$ , then pick some  $\Lambda \in \mathfrak{T}_y$  distinct from  $\Lambda_{\mathfrak{d}}$  for what follows.

Similarly to before, choose some  $m \in \Lambda \setminus \bigcup_{\Lambda' \in \mathfrak{T}_y \setminus \{\Lambda\}} \Lambda'$ . Let  $\gamma$  again be a small loop around  $j$  near  $y$ . All wall-crossing automorphisms involved in  $\theta_{\gamma, \mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D}), k+1}^1}$  commute except for those arising from crossing the walls with tangent space  $\Lambda$ . However, the latter wall-crossing automorphisms leave  $z^m$  invariant as  $m \in \Lambda$ . Thus we can write, the first equality by consistency,

$$z^m = \theta_{\gamma, \mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D}), k+1}^1}(z^m) = z^m \prod_{i=1}^n f_i^{a_i},$$

where this equality holds in  $\mathbb{k}[\mathcal{P}_y^+]/\mathfrak{m}_{k+1, y}$  as in Case I. Here  $f_1, \dots, f_n$  are wall functions associated to walls crossed by  $\gamma$  whose tangent space is not  $\Lambda$ , and all  $f_i \equiv 1 \pmod{\mathfrak{m}_k}$ . Further, the  $a_i$ 's are non-zero integers.

Now some  $f_i = f_{\mathfrak{d}}(z^{-v})$ . Thus in order to get the above equation, there must be another  $f_j$  which is a function of  $z^{-v}$ . Necessarily this wall  $(\mathfrak{d}_j, f_j)$  lies on the other side of  $j$  as  $\mathfrak{d}$ . Thus as in Case I, we have three possibilities. If  $\dim \sigma_j = n$ , we can replace  $\mathfrak{d}$  with  $\mathfrak{d}_j$  and  $x$  by  $y - \epsilon v$ . If  $\dim \sigma_j = n - 1$ , then  $f_j \not\equiv 1 \pmod{\mathfrak{m}_k}$ , and hence  $\mathfrak{d}_j$ , and so  $\mathfrak{d}$ , is radiant by the induction hypothesis. Finally, if  $\dim \sigma_j = n - 2$ , we argue as in Case I.

This gives case (a). Otherwise (b) holds, and as observed,  $\mathfrak{d}$  is radiant.

Now observe that the process described above, replacing a wall  $\mathfrak{d}$  with another wall and replacing  $x$  with  $y - \epsilon v$ , eventually stops. Indeed, as  $\mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D}), k+1}^1$  is finite, and this process stays within a cell of  $\mathcal{P}_1$ , we must eventually end up in one of the cases where we can conclude  $\mathfrak{d}$  is radiant.  $\square$

**4.2. Consequences of radiance.** We now use radiance and consistency to analyze more carefully the structure, up to equivalence, of  $\mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D})}^1$ . We work with the specific equivalent scattering diagrams  $\mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D}), k}^1$  of Construction 4.18, working with as large a  $k$  as is necessary for any given statement.

We first will give two lemmas concerning the structure of the diagram near the discriminant locus. In some sense, these two lemmas are the main idea of the paper. Lemma 4.20 gives a relationship between the walls on either side of the discriminant locus which is implied entirely by the monodromy of the sheaf  $\mathcal{P}$ . Using this relationship, we may then give in Lemma 4.21 a “pure

thought" calculation of contributions of multiple covers of the exceptional curves of the blow-up  $\tilde{X} \rightarrow X_{\tilde{\Sigma}}$  to the canonical scattering diagram. This replaces a localization argument which was used in [19]. See also [39] for a derivation of the multiple cover formula in the two dimensional case, via tropical geometric arguments.

For this analysis, choose a general point  $x \in \tilde{\Delta}_{\underline{\rho}}$ , for  $\underline{\rho}$  a codimension one cone in  $\Sigma(\rho_i)$ . In the notation of §3.4, let  $y, y'$  be points sufficiently close to  $x$  with  $y \in \rho_{\infty}$  and  $y' \in \rho_0$ . Since  $\mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D}), k}^1$  is finite, this choice may be made so that any wall containing  $x$  contains either  $y$  and  $y'$ . Here we use the fact that by radiance of  $\mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D}), k}^1$ , (Theorem 4.9), any wall of this scattering diagram containing  $x$  is necessarily contained in either  $\rho_{\infty}$  or  $\rho_0$ .

Recall for  $z \in \tilde{B}_1 \setminus \text{Sing}(\mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D}), k}^1)$  the notation  $f_z$  of (2.21). In particular, this gives elements  $f_y \in \mathbb{k}[\Lambda_{\tilde{\rho}}][Q]/\mathfrak{m}_k$  and  $f_{y'} \in \mathbb{k}[\Lambda_{\tilde{\rho}'}][Q]/\mathfrak{m}_k$ . Recall these may be compared via the map  $\wp$  of (3.38). We then have:

**Lemma 4.20.** *In the notation of §3.4, we have*

$$f_{y'} = \wp(f_y) \prod_{j=1}^{\kappa_{\underline{\rho}}^i} \left( t^{F_i - E_{\underline{\rho}}^j} z^{m_i} \right).$$

*Proof.* Let  $j$  be the joint of  $\mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D}), k}^1$  containing the point  $x$ . Necessarily  $j \subseteq \tilde{\Delta}_{\underline{\rho}}$  is a codimension two joint. Thus we make use of the consistency of §2.2.3 for the scattering diagram  $\mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D}), k}^{1, j}$ , similarly as in Lemma 4.19.

We need to be quite careful about the charts we use to describe  $B_j$ . The charts  $\psi_U, \psi_V$  of Theorem 3.4 induce charts on  $B_j$ , with  $U_j := B_j \setminus \rho_{\infty}$  and  $V_j = \text{Star}(\rho_{\infty})$ . Then we have charts  $\psi_{U_j} : U_j \rightarrow M_{\mathbb{R}}, \psi_{V_j} : V_j \rightarrow M_{\mathbb{R}}$ , with

$$\psi_{V_j} \circ \psi_{U_j}^{-1}(m) = m + \varphi_i(\pi_i(m))m_i,$$

on  $U_j \cap V_j$ , see (3.30).

In what follows, we use the chart  $\psi_{U_j}$  to identify tangent or cotangent vectors on  $B_j$  with elements of  $M$  or  $N$ , taking care when we need to compare such vectors via parallel transport across  $\rho_{\infty}$ . As such, we have normal vectors  $n_{\rho_{\pm}} \in N$  to  $\rho^+$  and  $\rho^-$ , as described in §3.4.1, always taken to be positive on  $\rho_{\infty}$ . In addition, take  $n_{\rho_{\infty}} = n_{\rho_0}$  to be primitive normal vectors to  $\rho_{\infty}$  and  $\rho_0$ , positive on  $\rho^+$ . By (3.32), this covector is monodromy invariant as  $m_i$  is tangent to  $\rho_{\infty}$  and  $\rho_0$ .

Pick a tangent vector  $m_+$  to  $\rho^+$  pointing away from  $\tilde{\Delta}_{\underline{\rho}}$  with the property that  $\langle n_{\rho_{\infty}}, m_+ \rangle = 1$ ; this can be chosen to be the vector  $u_n^+$  in the notation of §3.4.1.

Let  $p_{\pm}, p'_{\pm}$  be general points in the interior of the cells corresponding to  $\tilde{\sigma}^{\pm}$  and  $\tilde{\sigma}'^{\pm}$ . We will consider the theta functions  $\vartheta_{m_+}^j(p_{\pm})$  and  $\vartheta_{m_+}^j(p'_{\pm})$ . In particular,

$\vartheta_{m_+}^j(p_+) = \vartheta_{m_+}^j(p'_+) = z^{m_+}$ , as any broken line ending at  $p_+$  or  $p'_+$  with asymptotic monomial  $m_+$  never crosses a wall or a codimension one cell of  $\mathcal{P}_j$ , and in particular does not bend.

As  $\mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D})}^1$  is consistent, it then follows from condition (2) of Definition 2.19 that

$$\begin{aligned}\vartheta_{m_+}^j(p_-) &= t^{s_{\rho_\infty}} z^{m_+ + \kappa_{\underline{\rho}}^i m_i} f_y, \\ \vartheta_{m_+}^j(p'_-) &= t^{s_{\rho_0}} z^{m_+} f_{y'}.\end{aligned}$$

Here the factors  $t^{s_{\rho_0}}$ ,  $t^{s_{\rho_\infty}}$  arise from the kinks of  $\varphi$  along  $\tilde{\rho}$ ,  $\tilde{\rho}'$ , see (3.37), and the fact that  $\langle n_{\rho_\infty}, m_+ \rangle = 1$ . Recalling that we are identifying tangent vectors with elements of  $M$  via the chart  $\psi_{U_j}$ , we see that the factor  $z^{\kappa_{\underline{\rho}}^i m_i}$  arises from Lemma 3.6 as we must use parallel transport in the chart  $V_j$ .

Because there is no wall of  $\mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D})}^{1,j}$  between  $p_-$  and  $p'_-$ ,  $\vartheta_{m_+}^j(p_-)$  and  $\vartheta_{m_+}^j(p'_-)$  must agree under parallel transport across  $\rho^-$ , again by Definition 2.19, (2). Thus we have

$$t^{s_{\rho_\infty}} t^{(\langle n_{\rho^-}, m_+ \rangle + \kappa_{\underline{\rho}}^i) F_i} z^{m_+ + \kappa_{\underline{\rho}}^i m_i} \wp(f_y) = t^{s_{\rho_0}} z^{m_+} f_{y'}.$$

Here, using (3.34), the exponent  $(\langle n_{\rho^-}, m_+ \rangle + \kappa_{\underline{\rho}}^i) F_i$  accounts for the change in the monomial  $z^{m_+ + \kappa_{\underline{\rho}}^i m_i}$  caused by the kink of  $\varphi$  along  $\rho^-$ .

We now note that if we work with sufficiently high  $k$ , we may cancel the  $z^{m_+}$  on both sides. Indeed, the monomial  $z^{m_+}$  lies in  $\mathfrak{m}_1$  and is a zero-divisor, but if we are interested in proving the equality of the lemma modulo  $\mathfrak{m}_k$  for any given  $k$ , we may increase  $k$  and compare monomials, thereby getting, after using (3.36),

$$f_{y'} = t^{\kappa_{\underline{\rho}}^i F_i - \sum_j E_{\underline{\rho}}^j} z^{\kappa_{\underline{\rho}}^i m_i} \wp(f_y),$$

which gives the desired formula.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.21.** *We have*

$$f_y = g \prod_{j=1}^{\kappa_{\underline{\rho}}^i} (1 + t^{E_{\underline{\rho}}^j} z^{-m_i}), \quad f_{y'} = \wp(g) \prod_{j=1}^{\kappa_{\underline{\rho}}^i} (1 + t^{F_i - E_{\underline{\rho}}^j} z^{m_i})$$

for some  $g \in \mathbb{k}[\Lambda_{\tilde{\rho}}][Q]/\mathfrak{m}_k$ .

*Proof. Step I. Reduction to calculation of local terms.* Suppose we show that

$$f_y = g \prod_j (1 + t^{E_{\underline{\rho}}^j} z^{-m_i}), \quad f_{y'} = g' \prod_j (1 + t^{F_i - E_{\underline{\rho}}^j} z^{m_i}). \quad (4.4)$$

Then applying Lemma 4.20, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} f_{y'} &= \wp(f_y) \prod_j (t^{F_i - E_\rho^j} z^{m_i}) = \wp(g) \prod_j \left[ t^{F_i - E_\rho^j} z^{m_i} (1 + t^{E_\rho^j} t^{-F_i} z^{-m_i}) \right] \\ &= \wp(g) \prod_j (z^{F_i - E_\rho^j} z^{m_i} + 1). \end{aligned}$$

Here in the first line we use the fact that parallel transport of  $z^{-m_i}$  across  $\rho^+$  or  $\rho^-$  is given by (3.39). Thus we see that  $g' = \wp(g)$ .

To show (4.4), we will calculate contributions to the canonical scattering diagram arising from curves entirely contained in  $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_i$ , see (3.9). As we shall see, these contributions arise only from multiple covers of the curve classes  $E_\rho^j$  and  $F_i - E_\rho^j$ .

**Step II. Reduction to a simpler target space.** Since the contributions from curves mapping into  $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_i$  only depend on an open neighbourhood of  $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_i$ , it is sufficient to carry out the calculation for the target space where we only blow up  $\tilde{H}_i$ , and not  $\tilde{H}_j$  for  $i \neq j$ . Specifically, let  $\mathbf{P}_i = (\rho_i)$ , the sub-1-tuple of the  $s$ -tuple  $\mathbf{P}$ . Thus we obtain also a family  $\tilde{X}_i \rightarrow \mathbb{A}^1$ , and a corresponding scattering diagram  $\mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}_i, \tilde{D}_i)}^1$  on  $\tilde{B}_{1,i}$ . We note that in a neighbourhood of  $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_i$ ,  $\tilde{X}_i$  and  $\tilde{X}$  are isomorphic. Thus the desired contributions may be calculated in either space, and we now consider the canonical scattering diagram for  $\tilde{X}_i$ .

**Step III. The tropical analysis.** Let us now consider a type  $\tau = (G, \boldsymbol{\sigma}, \mathbf{u})$  and curve class  $\underline{\beta}$  contributing a non-trivial wall  $(\mathfrak{d}, f_{\mathfrak{d}}) \in \mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}_i, \tilde{D}_i)}^1$ . Recall from Theorem 2.36 that any curve in this moduli space is defined over  $\mathbb{A}^1$ . In particular, we obtain an induced map  $Q_{\tau, \mathbb{R}}^\vee \rightarrow \Sigma(\mathbb{A}^1) = \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ , and a general point  $s \in \tau$  mapping to  $1 \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  then yields a tropical map  $h_s : G \rightarrow \tilde{B}_{1,i}$ .

By Theorem 2.39, the map  $h_s$  satisfies the usual tropical balancing condition at each vertex  $v \in V(G)$  with  $h_s(v)$  not lying in the discriminant locus  $\tilde{\Delta}_1^i$  of  $\tilde{B}_{1,i}$ . On the other hand, by Proposition 3.10, if  $h_s(v)$  lies in the discriminant locus, then the balancing condition still holds modulo  $m_i$ .

The graph  $G$ , being genus 0, is a tree. Further, it has precisely one leg,  $L_{\text{out}}$ , corresponding to the unique punctured point. The graph then has a number of univalent vertices, i.e., leaves of the tree. There are two possibilities for a univalent vertex  $v$  with adjacent edge or leg  $E$ .

First, if  $h_s(v) \notin \tilde{\Delta}_1^i$ , then balancing implies that  $\mathbf{u}(E) = 0$ . In particular,  $E \neq L_{\text{out}}$ , as  $\mathbf{u}(L_{\text{out}}) \neq 0$  for types contributing to the scattering diagram. If  $v$  and  $E$  are removed from the graph  $G$  to obtain a new type  $\tau'$ , we note that  $\dim Q_{\tau', \mathbb{R}}^\vee = \dim Q_{\tau, \mathbb{R}}^\vee - 1$ , as the length of the edge  $E$  is a free parameter. On the other hand, if  $h : \Gamma/Q_{\tau, \mathbb{R}}^\vee \rightarrow \Sigma(\tilde{X})$  and  $h' : \Gamma'/Q_{\tau', \mathbb{R}}^\vee \rightarrow \Sigma(\tilde{X})$  are the universal

families of tropical maps of type  $\tau$  and  $\tau'$  respectively, it is clear that  $h(\tau_{\text{out}}) = h'(\tau'_{\text{out}})$ . Since the type  $\tau$  only contributes to  $\mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D})}$  if  $\dim Q_{\tau, \mathbb{R}}^{\vee} = n - 1$  and  $\dim h(\tau_{\text{out}}) = n$ , we obtain a contradiction. Thus no such univalent vertex occurs.

Second, if  $h_s(v) \in \tilde{\Delta}_1^i$ , we then have  $\mathbf{u}(E)$  proportional (positively or negatively) to  $m_i$ . The same argument as above shows  $\mathbf{u}(E)$  can't be 0.

Combining these two observations with balancing at vertices mapping to non-singular points of  $\tilde{B}_1$ , we see that the only possible tropical maps of the type being considered must have image in  $\tilde{B}_1$  a ray or line segment emanating from  $\tilde{\Delta}_i^1$  in the direction  $m_i$  or  $-m_i$ .

Note that curves in a moduli space  $\mathcal{M}_{(\tau, \beta)}(\tilde{X}_i)$  have image entirely contained in  $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_i$  if and only if  $h_s(G^\circ)$  is entirely contained in the open star of  $\nu_i$  defined in (3.4), where  $G^\circ$  is as given in Construction 2.26. If this is the case, the restrictions on  $\dim Q_{\tau, \mathbb{R}}^{\vee}$  and  $\dim h(\tau_{\text{out}})$  imply that  $G$  has one vertex  $v$ , one leg  $L_{\text{out}}$ , and no edges. Further,  $\mathbf{u}(L_{\text{out}})$  is proportional to  $m_i$ .

If the constant of proportionality is positive, we say we are in the *positive case*, and then the corresponding wall has support  $h(\tau_{\text{out}}) \cap \tilde{B}_1 = \rho_\infty$  for some codimension one  $\rho \in \Sigma$  containing  $\rho_i$ . If the constant of proportionality is negative, we say we are in the *negative case*, and then the corresponding wall has support  $h(\tau_{\text{out}}) \cap \tilde{B}_1 = \rho_0$  again for some such  $\rho$ .

**Step IV. Analysis of curve classes.** Now let  $f : C \rightarrow \tilde{X}_i$  be a punctured log map in the moduli space  $\mathcal{M}_{(\tau, \beta)}(\tilde{X}_i)$ . Then the image of  $f$  must lie inside the surface  $\tilde{D}_{\tilde{\Delta}_\rho}$ , with  $\underline{\rho} = (\rho + \mathbb{R}\rho_i)/\mathbb{R}\rho_i$  and  $\rho$  as in the previous step. We wish to determine the curve class  $\underline{\beta}$  expressed as a curve class in this surface.

To do so, note that in the positive and negative cases described above, the vector  $u = \mathbf{u}(L_{\text{out}})$  is a tangent vector to the cones  $\tilde{\rho}$  and  $\tilde{\rho}'$  respectively. One may then write  $u$  as a linear combination of the generators of this cone. We may in particular use the description of these generators in §3.4.1. In the positive case, we may write  $u = k(u_1, 0)$  for some  $k > 0$ . In the negative case, we may write  $u = k(0, 1) - k(m_i, 1)$  for some  $k > 0$ . Note that in the language of (2.1), we may equate the generator  $(u_1, 0)$  of  $\tilde{\rho}$  with  $\tilde{D}_{\rho_i}^*$ , and the generators  $(0, 1)$  and  $(m_i, 1)$  of  $\tilde{\rho}'$  with  $\tilde{D}_{\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}(0,1)}^*$  and  $\tilde{D}_{\nu_i}^*$  respectively.

Now [20, Cor. 1.14] implies that if  $\tilde{D}_j$  is any irreducible component of the boundary of  $\tilde{X}_i$ , we have  $\tilde{D}_j \cdot \underline{\beta} = \langle \tilde{D}_j, u \rangle$  where  $u$  is viewed as an element of  $\text{Div}_{\tilde{D}}(\tilde{X}_i)_{\mathbb{R}}^*$  as described above.

Explicitly in our situation, in the positive case, the only boundary divisor which intersects  $\underline{\beta}$  non-trivially is  $\tilde{D}_{\rho_i}$ . In the negative case,  $\tilde{D}_{\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}(0,1)}$  intersects  $\underline{\beta}$  positively and  $\tilde{D}_{\nu_i}$  intersects  $\underline{\beta}$  negatively, and all other intersections with boundary divisors are 0.

We now view  $\underline{\beta}$  as a curve class in the surface  $\tilde{D}_{\Delta_\rho}$ : this makes sense, as the image of  $f$  is contained in  $\tilde{D}_{\Delta_\rho}$ . Note that the curve classes  $s_{\rho_\infty}$  and  $s_{\rho_0}$  on  $\tilde{D}_{\Delta_\rho}$  are the classes of the intersection of  $\tilde{D}_{\Delta_\rho}$  with  $\tilde{D}_{\rho_i}$  and  $\tilde{D}_{\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}(1,0)}$  respectively. The curve class  $F_i$  may be viewed as the intersection of  $\tilde{D}_{\Delta_\rho}$  with another divisor which meets  $\underline{\beta}$  trivially. Thus, on the surface  $\tilde{D}_{\Delta_\rho}$ , we see that we have  $\underline{\beta} \cdot F_i = 0$  in both cases. In the positive case,  $\underline{\beta} \cdot s_{\rho_\infty} > 0$  and  $\underline{\beta} \cdot s_{\rho_0} = 0$ , while in the negative case  $\underline{\beta} \cdot s_{\rho_\infty} = 0$  and  $\underline{\beta} \cdot s_{\rho_0} > 0$ .

From this, we may conclude that in the positive case  $\underline{\beta} = \sum_j w_j E_\rho^j$ , while in the negative case  $\underline{\beta} = \sum_j w_j (F_i - E_\rho^j)$  for some collection of integers  $w_j$ . As  $\underline{\beta}$  is effective, all  $w_j$  must be non-negative. Note the  $E_\rho^j$  are a disjoint set of  $-1$  curves. Thus, in the positive case, if  $w_j > 0$ , then  $\underline{\beta} \cdot E_\rho^j < 0$ , and hence the image of  $f$  must contain the exceptional curve  $E_\rho^j$ . It then follows that the image of  $f$  is precisely the union of the  $E_\rho^j$  with  $w_j \neq 0$ . Since the image is connected, at most one  $w_j$  may be non-zero, so  $\underline{\beta} = w E_\rho^j$  for some  $j$ .

Similarly, the  $F_i - E_\rho^j$  form a disjoint set of  $-1$  curves, so the same argument implies that in the negative case,  $\underline{\beta} = w(F_i - E_\rho^j)$  for some  $j$ .

In particular, in the two cases,  $f$  must be a degree  $w$  cover of  $E_\rho^j$  or  $F_i - E_\rho^j$ .

**Step V. Application of Lemma 4.20 to finish the calculation.** Now let  $f_y, f_{y'}$  be the wall-crossing functions at  $y, y'$  for the canonical scattering diagram for  $\tilde{X}_i$ . By the above analysis, we may write

$$f_y = \prod_{j=1}^{\kappa_\rho^j} f_{y,j}(t^{E_\rho^j} z^{-m_i}), \quad f_{y'} = \prod_{j=1}^{\kappa_\rho^j} f_{y',j}(t^{F_i - E_\rho^j} z^{m_i}).$$

Here  $f_{y,j}, f_{y',j}$  should be viewed as polynomials in one variable. Now certainly  $f_{y,j}$  is independent of the choice of  $j$  by symmetry, and the same is true of  $f_{y',j}$ . Further, since  $f_y$  is a polynomial in  $z^{-m_i}$  and  $f_{y'}$  is a polynomial in  $z^{m_i}$ , Lemma 4.20 implies that  $f_y$  and  $f_{y'}$  are polynomials of degree  $\kappa_\rho^i$  in  $z^{-m_i}$  and  $z^{m_i}$  respectively. This now implies that each  $f_{y,j}, f_{y',j}$  is a linear polynomial. Again, Lemma 4.20 and symmetry tells us that

$$f_{y',j}(t^{F_i - E_\rho^j} z^{m_i}) = \wp \left( f_{y,j}(t^{E_\rho^j} z^{-m_i}) \right) t^{F_i - E_\rho^j} z^{m_i}.$$

We may use in addition the fact that by construction of the canonical scattering diagram, the constant term of each  $f_{y,j}$  must be 1, and the same for  $f_{y',j}$ . This

immediately gives only one choice for  $f_{y,j}$  and  $f_{y',j}$ , namely

$$f_{y,j}(t^{E_j^j} z^{-m_i}) = 1 + t^{E_j^j} z^{-m_i}, \quad f_{y',j}(t^{F_i - E_j^j} z^{m_i}) = 1 + t^{F_i - E_j^j} z^{m_i}.$$

This allows us to conclude the lemma.  $\square$

In the remainder of this section, we observe that  $\mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D})}^1$  is now determined completely by its behaviour near the origin.

To set up the notation, let  $S = (M_{\mathbb{R}} \setminus \{0\})/\mathbb{R}_{>0}$  be the sphere parameterizing rays from the origin. Given  $s \in S$ , we write  $\rho_s$  for the corresponding ray. For a fixed  $k$ , there is a subset  $S_0 \subset S$  whose complement is codimension  $\geq 2$ , with the property that for  $s \in S_0$ ,  $\dim \rho_s \cap \text{Sing}(\mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D}), k}^1) = 0$ .

**Theorem 4.22.** *Let  $s \in S_0$ . There are three possible behaviours:*

- (1) *There exists  $\sigma \in \mathcal{P}_1$  with  $\rho_s \subseteq \sigma$ . In this case,  $f_x$  is independent of  $x \in \rho_s$ .*
- (2) *There exists a maximal  $\underline{\sigma} \in \Sigma(\rho_i)$  with  $\rho_s \subseteq (\tilde{\sigma}' \cup \tilde{\sigma}) \cap \tilde{B}_1$ , but  $\rho_s \cap \tilde{\Delta}_1 = \emptyset$ . In this case,  $f_x$  for  $x \in \rho_s$  only depends on whether  $x \in \tilde{\sigma}' \cap \tilde{B}_1$  or  $x \in \tilde{\sigma} \cap \tilde{B}_1$ . Taking*

$$y \in \text{Int}(\rho_s \cap \tilde{\sigma}), \quad y' \in \text{Int}(\rho_s \cap \tilde{\sigma}'),$$

*$f_y$  and  $f_{y'}$  are related by parallel transport in  $\mathcal{P}^+$  along  $\rho_s$ .*

- (3) *There exists a codimension one cell  $\rho \in \Sigma$  with  $\rho_s \subseteq (\tilde{\rho}' \cup \tilde{\rho}) \cap \tilde{B}_1$ . In this case,  $\rho_s$  intersects  $\tilde{\Delta}_{\underline{\rho}}$  at a point. Again,  $f_x$  for  $x \in \rho_s$  only depends on whether  $x \in \tilde{\rho}' \cap \tilde{B}_1$  or  $x \in \tilde{\rho} \cap \tilde{B}_1$ . Taking*

$$y \in \text{Int}(\rho_s \cap \tilde{\rho}), \quad y' \in \text{Int}(\rho_s \cap \tilde{\rho}'),$$

*then  $f_y, f_{y'}$  can be written as in Lemma 4.21*

*Proof.* The three possibilities for the interaction of  $\rho_s$  with  $\mathcal{P}_1$  are immediate from the description of the polyhedral cone complex  $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$  in §3.2. Thus we only need to check the behaviour of  $f_x$  along  $\rho_s$ .

We consider case (1) first. Suppose that  $\rho_s$  intersects a joint  $j$  of  $\mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D}), k}^1$ . By the definition of  $S_0$ ,  $\rho_s$  only intersects  $j$  at one point, say  $x$ , so  $j$  cannot be radiant. Thus by radiance of  $\mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D}), k}^1$ , any wall containing  $j$  must intersect  $\rho_s$  in a one-dimensional set, as  $\rho_s$  is radiant. We may then argue similarly as in the proof of Theorem 4.9 that consistency of the scattering diagram implies  $f_y = f_{y'}$  for  $y, y' \in \rho_s$  near  $x$ , with  $y, y'$  lying on the two sides of  $j$ . This shows the claimed independence.

The argument is the same in cases (2) and (3), except that in passing from  $\tilde{\sigma}'$  to  $\tilde{\sigma}$  in case (2) we have to bear in mind parallel transport in  $\mathcal{P}^+$ , and in passing from  $\tilde{\rho}'$  to  $\tilde{\rho}$  in case (3), we apply Lemma 4.21.  $\square$

5. PULLING SINGULARITIES TO INFINITY: SCATTERING IN  $M_{\mathbb{R}}$ 

Let  $T_0\tilde{B}_1$  denote the tangent space to the origin  $0 \in \tilde{B}_1$ , thought of as a (radiant) affine manifold. Note that  $T_0\tilde{B}_1$  has a canonical identification with  $M_{\mathbb{R}}$ . Define a scattering diagram in  $T_0\tilde{B}_1$  obtained by localizing  $\mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D})}^1$  to the origin by

$$T_0\mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D})}^1 := \{(T_0\mathfrak{d}, f_{\mathfrak{d}}) \mid (\mathfrak{d}, f_{\mathfrak{d}}) \in \mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D})}^1, \quad 0 \in \mathfrak{d}\}. \quad (5.1)$$

Here  $T_0\mathfrak{d}$  denotes the *tangent wedge* to  $\mathfrak{d}$  at 0, in this case, just the cone generated by  $\mathfrak{d}$ . Note that  $T_0\mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D})}^1$  is a scattering diagram on  $M_{\mathbb{R}}$ . In this section we will describe another viewpoint on scattering diagrams in  $M_{\mathbb{R}}$ , and then construct another diagram which we associate to the toric variety  $X_{\Sigma}$  and the hypersurfaces  $H_i$ . This diagram is constructed purely algorithmically, using the method of [21], generalizing a two-dimensional construction of [29]. In the final section we will compare these two scattering diagrams in  $M_{\mathbb{R}}$ .

## 5.1. The higher dimensional tropical vertex.

5.1.1. *The general scattering setup.* Fix a lattice  $M$  of finite rank, and as usual let  $N = \text{Hom}_{\mathbb{Z}}(M, \mathbb{Z})$ ,  $M_{\mathbb{R}} = M \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{R}$ . In what follows, assume we are given a toric monoid  $P$  along with a map  $r : P \rightarrow M$ ; e.g., we might take  $P = M \oplus \mathbb{N}^p$  for some positive integer  $p$  with  $r$  the projection. Let  $P^{\times}$  be the group of units of  $P$ , and let  $\mathfrak{m}_P = P \setminus P^{\times}$ . This induces an ideal  $\mathfrak{m}_P$  in the monoid ring  $\mathbb{k}[P]$ . We write for any monomial ideal  $I \subseteq P$  the ring

$$R_I := \mathbb{k}[P]/I, \quad (5.2)$$

and we denote by  $\widehat{\mathbb{k}[P]}$  the completion of  $\mathbb{k}[P]$  with respect to  $\mathfrak{m}_P$ .

Fix a monomial ideal  $I$  with  $\sqrt{I} = \mathfrak{m}_P$ . We define the module of log derivations as usual as

$$\Theta(R_I) := R_I \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} N.$$

Here we write  $z^m \partial_n := z^m \otimes n$  for  $m \in P$ ,  $n \in N$ , and  $z^m \partial_n$  acts on  $R_I$  via

$$z^m \partial_n(z^{m'}) = \langle n, r(m') \rangle z^{m+m'}.$$

Thus in particular if  $\xi \in \mathfrak{m}_P \Theta(R_I)$ , then

$$\exp(\xi) \in \text{Aut}(R_I).$$

We note the commutator relation

$$[z^m \partial_n, z^{m'} \partial_{n'}] = z^{m+m'} \partial_{\langle r(m'), n \rangle n' - \langle r(m), n' \rangle n}$$



and obtain a nilpotent Lie subalgebra of  $\mathfrak{m}_P\Theta(R_I)$  defined by

$$\mathfrak{v}_I := \bigoplus_{\substack{m \in P \setminus I \\ r(m) \neq 0}} z^m (\mathbb{k} \otimes r(m)^\perp)$$

which is closed under Lie bracket and hence defines a group

$$\mathbb{V}_I := \exp(\mathfrak{v}_I).$$

This is the group whose set of elements is  $\mathfrak{v}_I$  and with multiplication given by the Baker-Campbell-Hausdorff formula.

We may then define the pro-nilpotent group

$$\widehat{\mathbb{V}} := \varprojlim \mathbb{V}_{\mathfrak{m}_P^k}.$$

This is the higher dimensional tropical vertex group. Note that it acts by automorphisms on  $\widehat{\mathbb{k}[P]}$ .

Let  $\mathfrak{j} \subseteq M_{\mathbb{R}}$  be a codimension two affine subspace with rational slope and let  $\Lambda_{\mathfrak{j}} \subseteq M$  be the set of integral tangent vectors to  $\mathfrak{j}$ . This is a saturated sublattice of  $M$ . Then we have the following Lie subalgebras of  $\mathfrak{v}_I$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{v}_{I,\mathfrak{j}} &:= \bigoplus_{\substack{m \in P \setminus I \\ r(m) \neq 0}} z^m (\mathbb{k} \otimes (r(m)^\perp \cap \Lambda_{\mathfrak{j}}^\perp)) \\ {}^\perp \mathfrak{v}_{I,\mathfrak{j}} &:= \bigoplus_{\substack{m \in P \setminus I \\ r(m) \notin \Lambda_{\mathfrak{j}}}} z^m (\mathbb{k} \otimes (r(m)^\perp \cap \Lambda_{\mathfrak{j}}^\perp)) \\ \parallel \mathfrak{v}_{I,\mathfrak{j}} &:= \bigoplus_{\substack{m \in P \setminus I \\ r(m) \in \Lambda_{\mathfrak{j}} \setminus \{0\}}} z^m (\mathbb{k} \otimes \Lambda_{\mathfrak{j}}^\perp) \end{aligned}$$

One notes easily that  $[\mathfrak{v}_{I,\mathfrak{j}}, {}^\perp \mathfrak{v}_{I,\mathfrak{j}}] \subseteq {}^\perp \mathfrak{v}_{I,\mathfrak{j}}$ , and that  $\parallel \mathfrak{v}_{I,\mathfrak{j}}$  is abelian. In particular, if we denote by  $\mathbb{V}_{I,\mathfrak{j}}$ ,  ${}^\perp \mathbb{V}_{I,\mathfrak{j}}$  and  $\parallel \mathbb{V}_{I,\mathfrak{j}}$  the corresponding groups, we see that

$$\parallel \mathbb{V}_{I,\mathfrak{j}} \cong \mathbb{V}_{I,\mathfrak{j}} / {}^\perp \mathbb{V}_{I,\mathfrak{j}}.$$

Similarly, taking inverse limits, we have subgroups  $\widehat{\mathbb{V}}_{\mathfrak{j}}$ ,  $\parallel \widehat{\mathbb{V}}_{\mathfrak{j}}$  and  ${}^\perp \widehat{\mathbb{V}}_{\mathfrak{j}}$ .

We next consider scattering diagrams in  $M_{\mathbb{R}}$ . Recall in §2.2 we defined the notion of a scattering diagram associated to an affine manifold together with a polyhedral decomposition  $(B, \mathcal{P})$ , a choice of a monoid  $Q$  and an MVPL-function  $\varphi$ . Here as a particular case, we consider the situation where  $B = M_{\mathbb{R}}$  and  $\mathcal{P}$  is the trivial polyhedral decomposition whose only cell is  $M_{\mathbb{R}}$ . For the monoid  $Q$  we take  $\mathbb{N}^p$  for some positive integer  $p$ , and we consider the trivial MVPL-function  $\varphi = 0$ . Under these choices the sheaf  $\mathcal{P}^+$  on  $B$  is the constant sheaf with stalk  $P = M \oplus \mathbb{N}^p$ . In this case we work with the algebra  $R_I$  of (5.2). For a wall  $\mathfrak{d}$ , the attached function  $f_{\mathfrak{d}}$  is an element of  $R_I$  and is a sum  $\sum c_m z^m$  with  $r(m)$  negatively proportional to a primitive vector  $m_0 \in M \setminus \{0\}$  tangent to  $\mathfrak{d}$ , called

the *direction* of the wall. This gives us a scattering diagram  $\mathfrak{D}$  over  $R_I$  as in §2.2, as a finite set of walls. By taking the inverse limit over all possible  $I$  we obtain the notion of a scattering diagram over  $\widehat{\mathbb{k}[P]}$ , which can have infinitely many walls. We may also generalize away from using the sheaf  $\mathcal{P}^+$ , and replace  $P = M \oplus \mathbb{N}^p$  with a more general choice of monoid equipped with the map  $r : P \rightarrow M$ . All definitions still apply without any difficulty.

Let  $\mathfrak{D}$  be a scattering diagram over  $\widehat{\mathbb{k}[P]}$ . For each  $k > 0$ , let  $\mathfrak{D}_k \subset \mathfrak{D}$  be the subset of walls  $(\mathfrak{d}, f_{\mathfrak{d}}) \in \mathfrak{D}$  with  $f_{\mathfrak{d}} \not\equiv 1 \pmod{\mathfrak{m}_P^k}$ . A wall defines an element of  $\mathbb{V}_{\mathfrak{m}_P^k}$  in a standard way (see e.g., [21, Rem. 2.16]), which in turn induces wall-crossing automorphisms of  $\mathbb{k}[P]/\mathfrak{m}_P^k$  which agree with (2.23). This allows us to define the wall-crossing automorphisms

$$\theta_{\gamma, \mathfrak{D}_k} : \mathbb{k}[P]/\mathfrak{m}_P^k \rightarrow \mathbb{k}[P]/\mathfrak{m}_P^k$$

as in (2.24). However, we may also view  $\theta_{\gamma, \mathfrak{D}_k} \in \mathbb{V}_I$ . We then obtain  $\theta_{\gamma, \mathfrak{D}}$ , which is an element of the tropical vertex group  $\theta_{\gamma, \mathfrak{D}} \in \widehat{\mathbb{V}}$ , by taking the limit as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ .

As we consider the trivial polyhedral decomposition  $\mathcal{P}$  on  $M_{\mathbb{R}}$ , all joints are of codimension zero in the sense of Definition 2.15. Therefore, the consistency of a scattering diagram is defined as in §2.2.1.

**Example 5.1.** The scattering diagram  $T_0\mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D})}^1$  as defined in (5.1) may be viewed as a scattering diagram as described above. If  $(T_0\mathfrak{d}, f_{\mathfrak{d}}) \in T_0\mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D})}^1$ , then a priori, in the setup of Definition 2.11, we have  $f_{\mathfrak{d}} \in \mathbb{k}[\mathcal{P}_x^+]/I_x$  for some any  $x \in \text{Int}(\mathfrak{d})$ . However, by Theorem 2.40, in fact  $f_{\mathfrak{d}} \in \mathbb{k}[\mathcal{P}_0^+]/I_0$ . Thus,  $T_0\mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D})}^1$  may be viewed in this revised setup, taking  $P = \mathcal{P}_0^+$  and  $r : P \rightarrow M$  given by  $m \mapsto \bar{m}$ .

Further, Theorem 2.41 then implies that  $T_0\mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D})}^1$  is consistent in the above sense.

5.1.2. *Widgets.* We now need to state the higher dimensional analogue of the Kontsevich-Soibelman lemma, see [29, Thm. 6] and [19, Thm. 1.4]. We cannot, however, start with an arbitrary scattering diagram. The basic objects we start with are as follows.

**Definition 5.2.** A *tropical hypersurface* in  $M_{\mathbb{R}}$  is a fan  $\mathfrak{T}$  in  $M_{\mathbb{R}}$  whose support  $|\mathfrak{T}|$  is pure dimension  $\dim M_{\mathbb{R}} - 1$ , along with a positive integer weight attached to each cone of  $\mathfrak{T}$  of dimension  $\dim M_{\mathbb{R}} - 1$ , which satisfies the following balancing condition. For every  $\omega \in \mathfrak{T}$  of dimension  $\dim M_{\mathbb{R}} - 2$ , let  $\gamma$  be a loop in  $M_{\mathbb{R}} \setminus \omega$  around an interior point of  $\omega$ , intersecting top-dimensional cones  $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_p$  of  $\mathfrak{T}$  of weights  $w_1, \dots, w_p$ . Let  $n_i \in N$  be the primitive element associated with the

crossing of  $\sigma_i$  by  $\gamma$  in the usual convention. Then

$$\sum_{i=1}^p w_i n_i = 0. \quad (5.3)$$

**Definition 5.3.** Suppose we are given

- (1) A complete toric fan  $\Sigma$  in  $M_{\mathbb{R}}$ .
- (2) A ray  $\rho_0 \in \Sigma$  with primitive generator  $m_0 \in M \setminus \{0\}$ .
- (3) A tropical hypersurface  $\mathfrak{T}$  in  $(M/\mathbb{Z}m_0) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{R}$  with support contained in the union of codimension one cones of the quotient fan  $\Sigma(\rho_0)$ .
- (4) An element  $f_0 \in \widehat{\mathbb{k}[P]}$  such that  $f_0 = \sum c_m z^m$  with  $r(m)$  positively proportional to  $m_0$ .

Let  $\pi : M_{\mathbb{R}} \rightarrow M_{\mathbb{R}}/\mathbb{R}m_0$  be the projection. Then the *widget* associated to this data is the scattering diagram

$$\mathfrak{D}_{m_0} := \{(\mathfrak{d}_{\sigma}, f_0^{w_{\sigma}}) \mid \sigma \in \mathfrak{T}_{\max}\}, \quad (5.4)$$

where  $\mathfrak{d}_{\sigma}$  is the unique codimension one cell of  $\Sigma$  containing  $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}m_0$  and with  $\pi(\mathfrak{d}_{\sigma}) = \sigma$ .

We illustrate two widgets  $\mathfrak{D}_{e_1}$  and  $\mathfrak{D}_{e_2}$  in Figure 5.1.

**Definition 5.4.** We say a wall of a scattering diagram  $(\mathfrak{d}, f_{\mathfrak{d}})$  with direction  $m_0$  is *incoming* if

$$\mathfrak{d} = \mathfrak{d} - \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}m_0.$$

Note that by definition a widget is a union of incoming walls. In what follows we denote the relative boundary of a widget  $\mathfrak{D}_{m_0}$  in  $M_{\mathbb{R}}$  by  $\partial(\mathfrak{D}_{m_0})$ .

**Lemma 5.5.** *Let  $\mathfrak{D}_{m_0}$  be a widget. Then*

$$\text{Sing}(\mathfrak{D}_{m_0}) \setminus \partial(\mathfrak{D}_{m_0}) = \left( \bigcup_{\rho \in \mathfrak{T}} \pi^{-1}(\rho) \right) \cap \text{Supp}(\mathfrak{D}_{m_0}),$$

where the union is over all  $\rho$  of dimension  $\dim M_{\mathbb{R}} - 3$ . If  $\gamma$  is a loop in  $\text{Star}(\rho_0) \setminus \text{Sing}(\mathfrak{D}_{m_0})$ , where  $\rho_0$  is as in Definition 5.3, then  $\theta_{\gamma, \mathfrak{D}_{m_0}} = \text{id}$ .

*Proof.* The first statement is obvious. For the second statement, it is enough to consider a loop  $\gamma$  around  $\pi^{-1}(\rho)$  for  $\rho$  of dimension  $\dim M_{\mathbb{R}} - 3$ . Let  $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_p \in \mathfrak{T}_{\max}$  contain  $\rho$  with weights  $w_1, \dots, w_p$ ,  $\mathfrak{d}_i = \pi^{-1}(\sigma_i)$ , and suppose that  $\theta_{\gamma, \mathfrak{d}_i}$  is

defined using  $n_i \in N$ , so that

$$\begin{aligned}\theta_{\gamma, \mathfrak{D}}(z^m) &= z^m \prod_{i=1}^n f_0^{w_i \langle n_i, r(m) \rangle} \\ &= z^m f_0^{\langle \sum_i w_i n_i, r(m) \rangle} \\ &= z^m\end{aligned}$$

by the balancing condition (5.3).  $\square$

Let  $\mathfrak{D}_{m_i}$  be a widget associated to a primitive vector  $m_i \in M \setminus \{0\}$ , for  $i \in 1, \dots, n$ . Denote their union by

$$\mathfrak{D} = \bigcup_{i=1}^n \mathfrak{D}_{m_i}$$

The higher-dimensional analogue of the Kontsevich-Soibelman Lemma is then:

**Theorem 5.6.** *There is a consistent scattering diagram  $S(\mathfrak{D})$  containing  $\mathfrak{D}$  such that*

$$S(\mathfrak{D}) \setminus \mathfrak{D}$$

*consists only of non-incoming walls. Further, this scattering diagram is unique up to equivalence.*

*Proof. Step I. Order by order construction of  $S(\mathfrak{D})$ .* We construct  $S(\mathfrak{D})$  order by order, assuming we have constructed  $\mathfrak{D}_{k-1} \supseteq \mathfrak{D}$  which is consistent modulo  $\mathfrak{m}_P^k$ . For the base case,  $k = 1$ , we take  $\mathfrak{D}_0 = \mathfrak{D}$ . This works as modulo  $\mathfrak{m}_P$ , all wall-crossing group elements are the identity.

We now construct  $\mathfrak{D}_k$  from  $\mathfrak{D}_{k-1}$ . Let  $\mathfrak{D}'_{k-1}$  consist of those walls in  $\mathfrak{D}_{k-1}$  such that  $f_{\mathfrak{D}} \not\equiv 1 \pmod{\mathfrak{m}_P^{k+1}}$ . By definition of scattering diagram, this is a finite set. We recall the notion of joint from Definition 2.11. We also define an *interstice* to be a facet of a joint, hence a dimension  $n - 3$  polyhedron. We denote  $\text{Joints}(\mathfrak{D}'_{k-1})$  and  $\text{Interstices}(\mathfrak{D}'_{k-1})$  to be the set of joints and interstices respectively of  $\text{Sing}(\mathfrak{D}'_{k-1})$ . These cells form the top-dimensional and codimension one cells of a polyhedral cell complex structure on  $\text{Sing}(\mathfrak{D}'_{k-1})$ .

We first carry out a standard procedure for each joint. Let  $\mathfrak{j} \in \text{Joints}(\mathfrak{D}'_{k-1})$ , and let  $\Lambda_{\mathfrak{j}} \subseteq M$  be the set of integral tangent vectors to  $\mathfrak{j}$ . If  $\gamma_{\mathfrak{j}}$  is a simple loop around  $\mathfrak{j}$  small enough so that it only intersects walls containing  $\mathfrak{j}$ , we note that every group element  $\theta_{\gamma_{\mathfrak{j}}, \mathfrak{D}}$  contributing to  $\theta_{\gamma_{\mathfrak{j}}, \mathfrak{D}'_{k-1}}$  lies in  $\mathbb{V}_{\mathfrak{m}_P^{k+1}, \mathfrak{j}}$ . Thus modulo  $\mathfrak{m}_P^{k+1}$  we can write

$$\theta_{\gamma_{\mathfrak{j}}, \mathfrak{D}'_{k-1}} = \exp \left( \sum_{i=1}^s c_i z^{m_i} \partial_{n_i} \right)$$

with  $c_i \in \mathbb{k}$ ,  $m_i \in \mathfrak{m}_P^k \setminus \mathfrak{m}_P^{k+1}$  and  $n_i \in r(m_i)^\perp \cap \Lambda_j^\perp$  primitive. Let

$$\mathfrak{D}[j] := \{(j - \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}m_i, 1 \pm c_i z^{m_i}) \mid i = 1, \dots, s \text{ and } r(m_i) \notin \Lambda_j\}.$$

Here the sign is chosen in each wall so that its contribution to  $\theta_{\gamma_j, \mathfrak{D}[j]}$  is  $\exp(-c_i z^{m_i} \partial_{n_i})$  modulo  $\mathfrak{m}_P^{k+1}$ .

We now take

$$\mathfrak{D}_k := \mathfrak{D}_{k-1} \cup \bigcup_j \mathfrak{D}[j].$$

**Step II. Analysis of joints of  $\mathfrak{D}_k$ .** Consider a joint  $j \in \text{Joints}(\mathfrak{D}_k)$ . There are three types of walls  $\mathfrak{d}$  in  $\mathfrak{D}_k$  containing  $j$ :

- (1)  $\mathfrak{d} \in \mathfrak{D}_{k-1} \cup \mathfrak{D}[j]$ .
- (2)  $\mathfrak{d} \in \mathfrak{D}_k \setminus (\mathfrak{D}_{k-1} \cup \mathfrak{D}[j])$ , but  $j \not\subseteq \partial \mathfrak{d}$ . This type of wall does not contribute to  $\theta_{\gamma_j, \mathfrak{D}_k}$ , as the associated group elements lie in the center of  $\mathbb{V}_{\mathfrak{m}_P^{k+1}, j}$ , and in addition this wall contributes twice to  $\theta_{\gamma_j, \mathfrak{D}_k}$ , with the two contributions inverse to each other.
- (3)  $\mathfrak{d} \in \mathfrak{D}_k \setminus (\mathfrak{D}_{k-1} \cup \mathfrak{D}[j])$  and  $j \subseteq \partial \mathfrak{d}$ . Necessarily  $f_{\mathfrak{d}} = 1 + c_i z^{m_i}$  for some  $m_i$  with  $r(m_i) \in \Lambda_j$ . So the associated group element lies in  $\mathbb{V}_{\mathfrak{m}_P^{k+1}, j}$ , and again lies in the center of  $\mathbb{V}_{\mathfrak{m}_P^{k+1}}$ .

From this we see that by construction of  $\mathfrak{D}[j]$ ,

$$\theta_{\gamma_j, \mathfrak{D}_k} \in \mathbb{V}_{\mathfrak{m}_P^{k+1}, j}.$$

A priori, this is not the identity, and we have, modulo  $\mathfrak{m}_P^{k+1}$ ,

$$\theta_{\gamma_j, \mathfrak{D}_k} = \exp \left( \sum_{m \in \mathfrak{m}_P^k \setminus \mathfrak{m}_P^{k+1}} z^m \partial_{n(m, j)} \right)$$

where the constants in  $\mathbb{k}$  have been absorbed into  $n(m, j) \in N \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{k}$ , and  $n(m, j) = 0$  if  $r(m)$  is not tangent to  $j$ . Note that if we fix an orientation on  $M_{\mathbb{R}}$ , then a choice of orientation on a joint  $j$  determines a choice of orientation for a loop  $\gamma_j$ , and changing the orientation on the loop changes the sign of  $n(m, j)$ . Thus we can view, for a fixed  $m \in \mathfrak{m}_P^k \setminus \mathfrak{m}_P^{k+1}$ , the map  $j \mapsto n(m, j)$  as an  $N \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{k}$ -valued  $(n-2)$ -chain for the polyhedral complex  $\text{Sing}(\mathfrak{D}_k)$ , the orientation on  $j$  being implicit.

We wish to show that in fact  $\theta_{\gamma_j, \mathfrak{D}_k}$  is the identity, i.e., show that  $n(m, j) = 0$  for any joint  $j$  and any  $m \in \mathfrak{m}_P^k \setminus \mathfrak{m}_P^{k+1}$ .

**Step III.  $j \mapsto n(m, j)$  is a cycle.** To show this, we consider an interstice  $\mathfrak{c} \in \text{Interstices}(\mathfrak{D}_k)$ , and let  $B = S^2 \subseteq M_{\mathbb{R}}$  be a small sphere contained in a three-dimensional affine subspace of  $M_{\mathbb{R}}$  which intersects the interior of  $\mathfrak{c}$  transversally

at one point. The sphere  $B$  should be centered at this point. Let  $j_1, \dots, j_n$  be the joints of  $\mathfrak{D}_k$  containing  $\mathfrak{c}$ ; then  $j_i$  intersects  $B$  at a single point,  $y_i$ .

Fix a base-point  $x \in B$ ,  $x \neq y_i$  for any  $i$ . After choosing an orientation on  $B$ , let  $\gamma_i$  be a positively oriented loop around  $y_i$  based at a point  $y'_i$  near  $y_i$ ; we can choose these along with paths  $\beta_i$  joining  $x$  to  $y'_i$  so that the loop

$$\gamma := \beta_1 \gamma_1 \beta_1^{-1} \cdots \beta_n \gamma_n \beta_n^{-1}$$

is contractible in  $B \setminus \{y_1, \dots, y_n\}$ , hence  $\theta_{\gamma, \mathfrak{D}_k} = \text{id}$ . On the other hand, by the inductive assumption,  $\theta_{\gamma_i, \mathfrak{D}_k} = \text{id} \pmod{\mathfrak{m}_P^k}$ , and hence  $\theta_{\beta_i}$  commutes with  $\theta_{\gamma_i} \pmod{\mathfrak{m}_P^{k+1}}$ . Thus

$$\theta_{\gamma, \mathfrak{D}_k} = \theta_{\gamma_n, \mathfrak{D}_k} \circ \cdots \circ \theta_{\gamma_1, \mathfrak{D}_k}.$$

Since  $\theta_{\gamma_i, \mathfrak{D}_k} = \exp\left(\sum_m z^m \partial_{n(m, j_i)}\right)$ , we see that

$$\sum_{i=1}^n n(m, j_i) = 0,$$

for each  $m$ . This is precisely the cycle condition, completing this step.

**Step IV.  $\mathfrak{D}_k$  is consistent modulo  $\mathfrak{m}_P^{k+1}$ .** It is sufficient to show that given  $m$ ,  $n(m, j) = 0$  for all joints  $j$ . First note that if  $r(m) = 0$ , then  $n(m, j) = 0$  anyway, as terms  $z^m \partial_n$  with  $r(m) = 0$  don't appear in  $\mathfrak{v}$ . Otherwise, for a joint  $j$ , consider the line  $L_x = x + \mathbb{R}r(m)$  for  $x \in \text{Int}(j)$ . Note that  $n(m, j) = 0$  anyway unless  $r(m)$  is tangent to  $j$ , so as  $x$  moves  $L_x$  varies in an  $(n-3)$ -dimensional family. Since the boundary of an interstice is dimension  $n-4$ , we can choose  $x$  so that for any interstice  $\mathfrak{c}$  that  $L_x$  intersects,  $L_x$  intersects only the interior of  $\mathfrak{c}$ . Thus there exists real numbers  $0 = \lambda_0 < \lambda_1 < \cdots < \lambda_s \leq \infty$  and joints  $j_1 = j, j_2, \dots, j_s$  with  $x + \lambda r(m) \in \text{Int } j_i$  for  $\lambda \in (\lambda_{i-1}, \lambda_i)$ , and  $\lambda_s$  maximal for this property. Suppose that  $j_i$  and  $j_{i+1}$  meet at an interstice  $\mathfrak{c}_i$ . Since  $r(m)$  is not tangent to  $\mathfrak{c}_i$  by the general choice of  $x$ , we see that  $r(m)$  can only be tangent to at most two joints containing  $\mathfrak{c}_i$ , and these must be  $j_i$  and  $j_{i+1}$ . By the cycle condition, it then follows that  $n(m, j_i) = n(m, j_{i+1})$ . Thus inductively  $n(m, j) = n(m, j_s)$ . Furthermore, if  $\lambda_s \neq \infty$ , then we can conclude that  $n(m, j_s) = 0$ .

Otherwise, since by construction,  $\theta_{\gamma_{j_s}, \mathfrak{D}_k} \in \parallel \mathbb{V}_{j_s}$ , we can compute  $\theta_{\gamma_{j_s}, \mathfrak{D}_k}$  in  $\mathbb{V}_{j_s} / \perp \mathbb{V}_{j_s}$ . If  $\mathfrak{d}$  contains  $j_s$ , then  $\theta_{\gamma_{j_s}, \mathfrak{d}}$  is non-trivial in  $\mathbb{V}_{j_s} / \perp \mathbb{V}_{j_s}$  only if the direction of  $\mathfrak{d}$  is tangent to  $j_s$ . There are two sorts of walls in  $\mathfrak{D}_k$  with this property: incoming walls contained in a widget containing  $j_s$ , and non-incoming walls. From Lemma 5.5 and the fact that  $\parallel \mathbb{V}_{j_s}$  is abelian, one sees in fact only the non-incoming walls contribute to  $\theta_{\gamma_{j_s}, \mathfrak{D}_k}$ . However, a non-incoming wall with  $z^m$  appearing in  $f_{\mathfrak{d}}$  must have direction negatively proportional to  $r(m)$ , and cannot be unbounded

in the direction  $r(m)$ . This contradicts the fact that  $\mathbf{j}_s$  is by choice unbounded in this direction. Hence  $n(\mathbf{j}_s, m) = 0$ .

**Step V. Uniqueness of  $\mathfrak{D}_k$  given uniqueness of  $\mathfrak{D}_{k-1}$ .** This is similar to the argument in Step VI of the proof of Theorem 1.28 in [17, App. C]. We omit the details.  $\square$

5.1.3. *The scattering diagram  $\mathfrak{D}_{(X_\Sigma, H)}$ .* We will now give details of the key scattering diagram arising from the setup in the previous subsection, which will be the higher dimensional analogue of the one constructed in [19]. Let  $\Sigma$  be a complete toric fan in  $M_{\mathbb{R}}$  and denote by  $X_\Sigma$  the associated complete toric variety, as in §3, along with the data of hypersurfaces  $H = (H_1, \dots, H_s)$  with  $H_i \subset D_{\rho_i}$  in its toric boundary divisor corresponding to rays  $\mathbf{P} = (\rho_1, \dots, \rho_s)$ . We now use this data to determine a scattering diagram  $\mathfrak{D}_{(X_\Sigma, H)}$ . First, decompose  $H_i = \bigcup_{j=1}^{s_i} H_{ij}$  into connected components. Take

$$P := M \oplus \bigoplus_{i=1}^s \mathbb{N}^{s_i}. \quad (5.5)$$

We write  $e_{i1}, \dots, e_{is_i}$  for the generators of  $\mathbb{N}^{s_i}$ , and write  $t_{ij} := z^{e_{ij}} \in \mathbb{k}[P]$ . We define  $r : P \rightarrow M$  to be the projection.

For each  $1 \leq i \leq s$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq s_i$ , we give the data determining a widget via Definition 5.3: First, take  $m_0 = m_i$ , the primitive generator of the ray  $\rho_i$ . Second, consider a tropical hypersurface

$$\mathcal{H}_{ij} \subseteq (M/m_i\mathbb{Z}) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{R}$$

determined by  $H_{ij} \subseteq D_{\rho_i}$ . This is the tropical hypersurface supported on the codimension 1 skeleton of the toric fan  $\Sigma(\rho_i)$  of the divisor  $D_{\rho_i}$  defined as in (3.13), with the weight on a cone  $(\sigma + \mathbb{R}\rho_i)/\mathbb{R}\rho_i$  being  $w_\sigma = D_\sigma \cdot H_{ij}$ , where the intersection number is calculated on  $D_{\rho_i}$ . Third, we take for  $f_0$  the function

$$f_{\rho_i} := 1 + t_{ij}z^{m_i}.$$


This data now determines a widget  $\mathfrak{D}_{ij}$  using (5.4). We then set

$$\mathfrak{D}_{(X_\Sigma, H), \text{in}} = \bigcup_{i=1}^s \bigcup_{j=1}^{s_i} \mathfrak{D}_{ij}. \quad (5.6)$$

We will denote the consistent scattering diagram obtained from (5.6) by

$$\mathfrak{D}_{(X_\Sigma, H)} := \mathfrak{S}(\mathfrak{D}_{(X_\Sigma, H), \text{in}}).$$

*Remark 5.7.* It will be convenient later to use a submonoid  $P' \subseteq P$ , the free submonoid with generators  $e'_{ij} = (m_i, e_{ij})$ . Then  $\mathfrak{D}_{(X_\Sigma, H), \text{in}}$  can be viewed as a

FIGURE 5.1. Walls of  $\mathfrak{D}_{\mathbb{P}^3, \text{in}}$ .

scattering diagram defined using this smaller monoid, and hence the same is true of  $\mathfrak{D}_{(X_\Sigma, H)}$ .

**Example 5.8.** This example was calculated in collaboration with Tom Coates. Let  $X_\Sigma = \mathbb{P}^3$ , corresponding to the fan with ray generators  $\langle e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4 = -e_1 - e_2 - e_3 \rangle$  and let  $D = \bigcup_i D_i$ , for  $1 \leq i \leq 4$ , be the toric boundary divisor. Choose  $H = \ell_1 \cup \ell_2$  where  $\ell_1 \subset D_1$  and  $\ell_2 \subset D_2$  are two general disjoint lines. The associated widgets are illustrated in Figure 5.1, where we denote by  $x = z^{e_1}, y = z^{e_2}, z = z^{e_3}$  the standard coordinates in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ . We display the walls of the minimal scattering diagram equivalent to the consistent scattering diagram  $\mathfrak{D}_{(X_\Sigma, H)}$  in Table 1, where the first two rows correspond to the walls of the initial scattering diagram  $\mathfrak{D}_{\mathbb{P}^3, \text{in}}$ . We denote by  $\langle e_i, e_j \rangle$  the support of the codimension one cone spanned by  $e_i$  and  $e_j$ , and we use analogous notation for cones generated by linear combinations of  $e_i$ 's and  $e_j$ 's in what follows. The attached functions on the walls in the last two rows are obtained from an infinite product

$$1 + t_2y + t_1t_2xy = (1 + t_2y)(1 + t_1t_2xy)(1 - t_1t_2^2xy^2)(1 + t_1t_2^3xy^3) \dots \quad (5.7)$$

$$1 + t_1x + t_1t_2xy = (1 + t_1x)(1 + t_1t_2xy)(1 - t_1^2t_2x^2y)(1 + t_1^3t_2x^3y) \dots \quad (5.8)$$

Each wall  $1 + (-1)^{b-1}t_1^a t_2^b x^a y^b$  in the expansion (5.7) has support in  $\langle e_1, (-a, -b, 0) \rangle$ . However, we also obtain walls  $1 + (-1)^b t_1^a t_2^b x^a y^b$  with support  $\langle -e_2, (-a, -b, 0) \rangle$  to achieve consistency around the joint generated by  $-e_2$ . Hence, after all cancellations there remains a single wall with the attached function  $1 + t_2y + t_1t_2xy$ ,



$\mathfrak{d}$	$f_{\mathfrak{d}}$
$\langle e_1, e_2 \rangle, \langle e_1, e_3 \rangle, \langle e_1, e_4 \rangle$	$1 + t_1x$
$\langle e_2, e_1 \rangle, \langle e_2, e_3 \rangle, \langle e_2, e_4 \rangle$	$1 + t_2y$
$\langle e_3, -e_1 \rangle, \langle e_4, -e_1 \rangle$	$1 + t_1x$
$\langle e_3, -e_2 \rangle, \langle e_4, -e_2 \rangle$	$1 + t_2y$
$\langle -e_2, -e_1 - e_2 \rangle, \langle -e_1, -e_1 - e_2 \rangle, \langle e_3, -e_1 - e_2 \rangle, \langle e_4, -e_1 - e_2 \rangle$	$1 + t_1t_2xy$
$\langle e_1, -e_2 \rangle$	$1 + t_2y + t_1t_2xy$
$\langle e_2, -e_1 \rangle$	$1 + t_1x + t_1t_2xy$

TABLE 1. Walls of  $\mathfrak{D}_{(\mathbb{P}^3, \ell_1 \cup \ell_2)}$




FIGURE 5.2. The projection along  $e_1$  of the walls of  $\mathfrak{D}_{(\mathbb{P}^3, \ell_1 \cup \ell_2)}$  whose support contain  $e_1$ .

whose support is  $\langle e_1, -e_2 \rangle$ . The wall with the attached function  $1 + t_1x + t_1t_2xy$ , whose support is  $\langle -e_1, e_2 \rangle$ , is obtained analogously.

We illustrate the projections of the walls of  $\mathfrak{D}_{(\mathbb{P}^3, \ell_1 \cup \ell_2)}$  around the joint generated by  $e_1 = \langle 1, 0, 0 \rangle$  in Figure 5.2. To check for consistency around this joint, we need to check that the wall crossing automorphisms defined in (2.23) along a loop  $\gamma$  as illustrated Figure 5.2 leaves each of the monomials  $x, y, z$  invariant.

This follows immediately for  $x$ . For  $y$  we have;

$$\begin{aligned} y &\xrightarrow{\langle e_1, e_3 \rangle} y(1+t_1x) \xrightarrow{\langle e_1, -e_2 \rangle} y(1+t_1x) \\ &\xrightarrow{\langle e_1, e_4 \rangle} y(1+t_1x)^{-1}(1+t_1x) = y \xrightarrow{\langle e_1, e_2 \rangle} y \end{aligned}$$

where the superscripts on the arrows indicate the support of the walls  $\gamma$  crosses. Similarly, for  $z$  we compute;

$$\begin{aligned} z &\xrightarrow{\langle e_1, e_3 \rangle} z \xrightarrow{\langle e_1, -e_2 \rangle} z(1+t_2y+t_1t_2xy) \xrightarrow{\langle e_1, e_4 \rangle} z(1+t_1x)(1+t_2y) \\ &\xrightarrow{\langle e_1, e_2 \rangle} z(1+t_1x)^{-1}(1+t_2y)^{-1}(1+t_1x)(1+t_2y) = z \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, consistency of  $\mathfrak{D}_{(\mathbb{P}^3, \ell_1 \cup \ell_2)}$  around the joint  $e_1$  follows. The computation around the other joints is analogous, and is left to the reader. Hence,  $\mathfrak{D}_{(\mathbb{P}^3, \ell_1 \cup \ell_2)}$  is consistent.

## 6. THE MAIN THEOREM

We now state a precise version of the main theorem of the paper, which shows that the canonical scattering diagram  $\mathfrak{D}_{(X, D)}$  defined using punctured invariants of  $(X, D)$  can be obtained from the scattering diagram  $\mathfrak{D}_{(X_\Sigma, H)}$  defined in §5.1.3. To do so, we introduce some additional notation. Recall the degeneration  $\tilde{X}$  of  $(X, D)$  defined in (3.8) has associated tropical space  $\tilde{B}$ , which comes together with the map

$$\tilde{p}: \tilde{B} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$$

defined in (3.21). We use the identification of  $\tilde{B}_0 := \tilde{p}^{-1}(0)$  with the tropical space  $B$  associated to  $(X, D)$  as explained in Remark 2.2. Thus the piecewise linear identification  $\mu: M_{\mathbb{R}} \rightarrow \tilde{B}_0$  of (3.23) induces a piecewise linear identification  $\Upsilon: M_{\mathbb{R}} \rightarrow B$ .

Let  $\mathbf{A} = (a_{ij})$  denote a tuple of integers,  $1 \leq i \leq s$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq s_i$ . Consider the collection of vectors

$$\{a_{ij}m_i \mid 1 \leq i \leq s, 1 \leq j \leq s_i\} \cup \{m_{\mathbf{A}}\}$$

with  $m_{\mathbf{A}} = -\sum_{i,j} a_{ij}m_i$ . To each vector in this collection we associate a cone in  $\Sigma$  as follows: to  $a_{ij}m_i$  we associate the cone  $\rho_i$ , and to  $m_{\mathbf{A}}$  we associate some arbitrary  $\sigma \in \Sigma$  such that  $m_{\mathbf{A}}$  is tangent to  $\sigma$ . This data then induces, as in Lemma 2.9, a class  $\bar{\beta}_{\mathbf{A}, \sigma} \in N_1(X_\Sigma)$ . Recalling the blow-up map  $\text{Bl}_H: X \rightarrow X_\Sigma$ , there is then a class

$$\beta_{\mathbf{A}, \sigma} := \text{Bl}_H^*(\bar{\beta}_{\mathbf{A}, \sigma}) - \sum_{i,j} a_{ij}E_i^j. \quad (6.1)$$

Here  $\text{Bl}_H^*(\bar{\beta}_{\mathbf{A},\sigma})$  is the unique curve class in  $N_1(X)$  whose push-forward to  $X_\Sigma$  under  $\text{Bl}_H$  is  $\bar{\beta}_{\mathbf{A},\sigma}$  and whose intersection with all exceptional divisors is 0. The curve class  $E_i^j$  is the class of an exceptional curve of  $\text{Bl}_H : X \rightarrow X_\Sigma$  over  $H_{ij}$ .

We may now define a scattering diagram  $\Upsilon(\mathfrak{D}_{(X_\Sigma,H)})$  as follows. First, we may refine  $\mathfrak{D}_{(X_\Sigma,H)}$  by replacing each wall with a union of walls with the same wall function. We do this so that any  $\mathfrak{d} \in \mathfrak{D}_{(X_\Sigma,H)}$  satisfies  $\mathfrak{d} \subseteq \sigma$  for some  $\sigma \in \Sigma$ . Note we do not need to refine any walls in  $\mathfrak{D}_{(X_\Sigma,H),\text{in}}$ . Define  $\Upsilon(\mathfrak{D}_{(X_\Sigma,H),\text{in}})$  to be the collection of walls of the form

$$\left( \Upsilon(\rho), \prod_{j=1}^{\kappa_\rho^i} (1 + t^{E_\rho^j} z^{-m_i}) \right) \quad (6.2)$$

with  $1 \leq i \leq s$  and  $\rho \in \Sigma$  running over codimension one cones containing  $\rho_i$ . The curve class  $E_\rho^j$  is now viewed as lying in  $N_1(X)$ , being one of the  $\kappa_\rho^i$  exceptional curves of  $\text{Bl}_H : X \rightarrow X_\Sigma$  mapping to the one-dimensional stratum  $D_\rho$  of  $X_\Sigma$ . Note each  $E_\rho^j$  coincides with  $E_i^{j'}$  for some  $i, j'$ .

Next, if  $(\mathfrak{d}, f_\mathfrak{d}) \in \mathfrak{D}_{(X_\Sigma,H)} \setminus \mathfrak{D}_{(X_\Sigma,H),\text{in}}$  with  $\mathfrak{d} \subseteq \sigma \in \Sigma$ , necessarily a monomial of  $f_\mathfrak{d}$  is of the form

$$\prod_{i,j} (t_{ij} z^{m_i})^{a_{ij}}.$$

for some tuple of integers  $\mathbf{A} = (a_{ij})$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq s$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq s_i$ . We define  $\Upsilon_*$  applied to this monomial to be  $t^{\beta_{\mathbf{A},\sigma}} z^{-\Upsilon_*(m_{\mathbf{A}})}$ . Note that  $\Upsilon$  is piecewise linear, hence defines a well-defined push-forward of tangent vectors to cones of  $\Sigma$ . This allows us to define  $\Upsilon_*(f_\mathfrak{d})$ , and then set

$$\Upsilon(\mathfrak{D}_{(X_\Sigma,H)} \setminus \mathfrak{D}_{(X_\Sigma,H),\text{in}}) := \{(\Upsilon(\mathfrak{d}), \Upsilon_*(f_\mathfrak{d})) \mid (\mathfrak{d}, f_\mathfrak{d}) \in \mathfrak{D}_{(X_\Sigma,H)} \setminus \mathfrak{D}_{(X_\Sigma,H),\text{in}}\}.$$

Finally, we define

$$\Upsilon(\mathfrak{D}_{(X_\Sigma,H)}) := \Upsilon(\mathfrak{D}_{(X_\Sigma,H),\text{in}}) \cup \Upsilon(\mathfrak{D}_{(X_\Sigma,H)} \setminus \mathfrak{D}_{(X_\Sigma,H),\text{in}}).$$

**Theorem 6.1.** *There is an equivalence of scattering diagrams between  $\Upsilon(\mathfrak{D}_{(X_\Sigma,H)})$  and  $\mathfrak{D}_{(X,D)}$ .*

This theorem will be proved in §6.2.

**6.1. Equivalence of  $\mathfrak{D}_{(X_\Sigma,H)}$  and  $T_0\mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X},\tilde{D})}^1$ .** We will compare the consistent scattering diagrams  $\mathfrak{D}_{(X_\Sigma,H)}$  and  $T_0\mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X},\tilde{D})}^1$ , the latter defined in (5.1) and discussed further in Example 5.1. To make this comparison, recall these scattering diagrams involve a choice of  $r : P \rightarrow M$ .

For the scattering diagram  $\mathfrak{D}_{(X_\Sigma,H)}$ , we take the monoid to be  $P' \subseteq M \oplus \bigoplus_{i=1}^s \mathbb{N}^{s_i}$  with generators  $e'_{ij} = (m_i, e_{ij})$  as in Remark 5.7.

For  $T_0\mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D})}^1$ , we take  $P = \mathcal{P}_0^+$ , which may be described explicitly as follows. After making a choice of representative  $\varphi_0$  for the MVPL function  $\varphi$  in the star of 0, as promised by Proposition 3.9, we may extend  $\varphi_0$  linearly on each cone of  $\Sigma$  to obtain a PL function  $\varphi_0 : M_{\mathbb{R}} \rightarrow Q_{\mathbb{R}}^{\text{gp}}$ . Using the description (2.12), we may then write

$$\mathcal{P}_0^+ = \{(m, \varphi_0(m) + q) \mid m \in M, q \in Q\} \subseteq M \oplus Q^{\text{gp}}. \quad (6.3)$$

We may now define a monoid homomorphism

$$\nu : P' \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_0^+$$

by

$$\nu(e'_{ij}) = (m_i, \varphi_0(m_i) + F_i - E_i^j).$$

Here we view  $E_i^j$  as a curve class on  $\tilde{X}$  under the inclusion  $X \hookrightarrow \tilde{X}$ . Note that this curve class is the class of an exceptional curve of  $\text{Bl}_{\tilde{H}} : \tilde{X} \rightarrow X_{\tilde{\Sigma}}$ .

Next, we define  $\nu_* : \mathbb{k}[P'] \rightarrow \mathbb{k}[\mathcal{P}_0^+]$  by  $\nu_*(z^p) = z^{\nu(p)}$ . This allows us to define, for a scattering diagram  $\mathfrak{D}$  with respect to the monoid  $P'$ ,

$$\nu(\mathfrak{D}) := \{(\mathfrak{d}, \nu_*(f_{\mathfrak{d}})) \mid (\mathfrak{d}, f_{\mathfrak{d}}) \in \mathfrak{D}\}, \quad (6.4)$$

a scattering diagram with respect to the monoid  $\mathcal{P}_0^+$ . It is immediate from definitions that if  $\mathfrak{D}$  is consistent, so is  $\nu(\mathfrak{D})$ .

The key comparison result is the following:

**Theorem 6.2.** *The scattering diagram  $T_0\mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D})}^1$  is equivalent to  $\nu(\mathfrak{D}_{(X_{\Sigma}, H)})$ .*

Before embarking on the proof, we will make some more generally useful observations about  $T_0\mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D})}^1$ . These statements all follow immediately from Theorem 4.22 and Lemma 4.21.

*Remarks 6.3.* (1)  $T_0\mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D})}^1$  is equivalent to a scattering diagram  $\mathfrak{D}_1 \cup \mathfrak{D}_2$  where

$$\mathfrak{D}_1 := \left\{ \left( \rho, \prod_{j=1}^{\kappa_{\underline{\rho}}} (1 + z^{(m_i, \varphi_0(m_i) + F_i - E_{\underline{\rho}}^j)}) \mid 1 \leq i \leq s, \underline{\rho} \in \Sigma(\rho_i) \text{ of codim } 1 \right) \right\}.$$

Here, the factor  $1 + z^{(m_i, \varphi_0(m_i) + F_i - E_{\underline{\rho}}^j)}$  arises simply by rewriting the factor  $1 + t^{F_i - E_{\underline{\rho}}^j} z^{m_i}$  appearing in Lemma 4.21 as an element of  $\mathbb{k}[\mathcal{P}_0^+]$ , using parallel transport in  $\mathcal{P}^+$  via (2.15).

Further, using the factorization of Lemma 4.17, we may assume that each wall  $(\mathfrak{d}, f_{\mathfrak{d}})$  of  $\mathfrak{D}_2$  has a direction  $m_{\mathfrak{d}} \in M \setminus \{0\}$ , i.e.,  $f_{\mathfrak{d}} = \sum_p c_p z^p$  with  $r(p)$  negatively proportional to  $m_{\mathfrak{d}}$  for each  $p$  occurring in the sum. We also note that for each  $\mathfrak{d} \in \mathfrak{D}_2$ ,  $\mathfrak{d} \subseteq \sigma$  for some  $\sigma \in \Sigma$ .

(2)  $\mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D})}^1$  may be recovered, up to equivalence, from  $\mathfrak{D}_1, \mathfrak{D}_2$ , as follows.

- (a)  $\mathfrak{D}_1$  gives rise to the following walls in  $\mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D})}^1$ . For each  $i$  and  $\rho_i \subseteq \rho \in \Sigma$  with  $\rho$  of codimension one, we have two walls in  $\mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D})}^1$ :

$$\left( \rho_0, \prod_{j=1}^{\kappa_{\rho}^i} (1 + t^{F_i - E_{\rho}^j} m_i) \right) \quad (6.5)$$

and

$$\left( \rho_{\infty}, \prod_{j=1}^{\kappa_{\rho}^i} (1 + t^{E_{\rho}^j} z^{-m_i}) \right). \quad (6.6)$$

- (b) Each wall  $(\mathfrak{d}, f_{\mathfrak{d}}) \in \mathfrak{D}_2$ , with  $f_{\mathfrak{d}}$  written with exponents in  $\mathcal{P}_0^+$ , gives precisely one or two corresponding walls in  $\mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D})}^1$  as follows. Let  $\sigma \in \Sigma$  be the smallest cone containing  $\mathfrak{d}$ . Suppose first that there is no  $i$  with  $\rho_i \subseteq \sigma$ . Then using the piecewise linear identification  $\Psi|_{\tilde{B}_1} : \tilde{B}_1 \rightarrow M_{\mathbb{R}}$ ,  $\mathfrak{d}$  can be considered as a wall in  $\tilde{B}_1$ . We use parallel transport in  $\mathcal{P}^+$  to rewrite  $f_{\mathfrak{d}}$  with exponents in  $\mathcal{P}_x^+$  for  $x \in \text{Int}(\bar{\sigma} \cap \mathfrak{d})$ .

Next suppose that  $\rho_i \subseteq \sigma$ . Then we get two walls with support  $\mathfrak{d} \cap \tilde{\sigma}'$  and  $\mathfrak{d} \cap \tilde{\sigma}$  respectively. The wall functions of these two walls come from  $f_{\mathfrak{d}}$ , after parallel transport in  $\mathcal{P}^+$  from  $\mathcal{P}_0^+$ . Note that in passing from  $\mathfrak{d} \cap \tilde{\sigma}'$  to  $\mathfrak{d} \cap \tilde{\sigma}$ , one must account for an additional kink, which we shall do explicitly later.

*Proof of Theorem 6.2.* Let us use the decomposition of  $T_0 \mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D})}^1 = \mathfrak{D}_1 \cup \mathfrak{D}_2$ , up to equivalence, of Remarks 6.3,(1).

Recall from Definition 5.4 the notion of an incoming wall. Note that all walls of  $\mathfrak{D}_1$  are incoming.

We first show that no wall of  $\mathfrak{D}_2$  is incoming. Suppose  $(\mathfrak{d}, f_{\mathfrak{d}}) \in \mathfrak{D}_2$  was incoming, with  $\mathfrak{d} \subseteq \sigma \in \Sigma$ . Let  $m_{\mathfrak{d}}$  be the direction of  $\mathfrak{d}$ , so that  $-m_{\mathfrak{d}} \in \mathfrak{d}$ . Suppose first that  $\sigma$  does not contain  $\rho_i$  for any  $i$ . Then by Remark 6.3, (2),  $\mathfrak{d}' = \Psi|_{\tilde{B}_1}^{-1}(\mathfrak{d})$  is a wall of  $\mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D})}^1$ , and necessarily  $\mathfrak{d}'$  does not have a repulsive face as  $-m_{\mathfrak{d}} \in \mathfrak{d}$ . However, by Lemma 4.13, every wall in the canonical scattering diagram has a repulsive face. We note, though, that the wall just described is only a wall in a scattering diagram *equivalent* to the canonical scattering diagram. Nevertheless, if such a wall were to exist, the ray  $\Psi|_{\tilde{B}_1}^{-1}(\mathbb{R}_{\leq 0} m_{\mathfrak{d}})$  would then have to pass through an infinite sequence of walls, all with direction  $m_{\mathfrak{d}}$ , in the original canonical scattering diagram. But, as we work over an ideal  $I$ , the canonical scattering diagram only contains a finite number of walls, so this can't happen. Thus we obtain a contradiction.

If instead  $\rho_i \subseteq \sigma$ , then as in Remark 6.3 (2), we obtain a wall with support  $\Psi_{\tilde{B}_1}^{-1}(\mathfrak{d}) \cap (\tilde{\sigma} \cap \tilde{B}_1)$ . The argument is then the same.

Having shown no wall in  $\mathfrak{D}_2$  is incoming, it follows from the uniqueness statement of Theorem 5.6 that  $T_0\mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D})}^1$  is equivalent to  $\mathfrak{S}(\mathfrak{D}_1)$ . It is thus enough to show that

$$\mathfrak{D}_1 = \nu(\mathfrak{D}_{(X_\Sigma, H), \text{in}}). \quad (6.7)$$

Let  $\rho \in \Sigma$  be codimension one with  $\rho_i \subseteq \rho$ . If we take the product of the wall functions of those walls of  $\mathfrak{D}_{(X_\Sigma, H), \text{in}}$  with support  $\rho$ , we obtain

$$\prod_{j=1}^{s_i} (1 + t_{ij} z^{m_i})^{D_\rho \cdot H_{ij}}.$$

Applying  $\nu$  gives

$$\prod_{j=1}^{s_i} (1 + z^{(m_i, \varphi_0(m_i) + F_i - E_i^j)})^{D_\rho \cdot H_{ij}}. \quad (6.8)$$

Noting that  $E_\rho^j$  represents the same class in  $N_1(\tilde{X})$  as  $E_i^{j'}$  for some  $j'$ , and for a given  $j'$  there are precisely  $D_\rho \cdot H_{ij'}$  of the  $E_\rho^j$  equivalent to  $E_i^{j'}$ , we see that the wall function of the wall of  $\mathfrak{D}_1$  with support  $\rho$  agrees with (6.8). This shows (6.7).  $\square$

## 6.2. From $T_0\mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D})}^1$ to $\mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D})}^{1, \text{as}}$ and the proof of the main theorem.

*Proof of Theorem 6.1.* First, Theorem 6.2 shows that  $\mathfrak{D}_{(X_\Sigma, H)}$  determines  $T_0\mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D})}^1$ . From Remark 6.3 (2),  $T_0\mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D})}^1$  determines  $\mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D})}^1$ , which in turn determines  $\mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D})}$  and  $\mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D})}^{1, \text{as}}$  as in Definition 3.12. By Lemma 3.11 and Proposition 3.13,  $\mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D})}^{1, \text{as}}$  determines  $\mathfrak{D}_{(X, D)}$ . Thus, we just need to trace through the identifications.

Before starting, we note that for  $(\mathfrak{d}, f_\mathfrak{d}) \in \mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D})}^1$  the exponent  $1/\text{ind}(\text{Cone}(\mathfrak{d}))$  arising in (3.40) in fact is always 1. Indeed, by radiance,  $\Lambda_{\text{Cone}(\mathfrak{d})}$  always contains  $(0, 1)$ , and hence  $\tilde{p}_* : \Lambda_{\text{Cone}(\mathfrak{d})} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$  is surjective. Thus in passing from  $\mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D})}^1$  to  $\mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D})}^{1, \text{as}}$ , we do not need to worry about this exponent.

From Remark 6.3 (2), there are three types of walls of  $\mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D})}^1$  which contribute to  $\mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D})}^{1, \text{as}}$ . Indeed, walls of type (6.5) do not contribute to the asymptotic scattering diagram: these arise from walls in  $\mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D})}$  with support  $\tilde{\rho}'$ , and  $\dim \tilde{\rho}' \cap \tilde{B}_0 = n - 2$ .

On the other hand, walls of the type (6.6) do contribute, and contribute precisely the walls of  $\Upsilon(\mathfrak{D}_{(X_\Sigma, H), \text{in}})$  as defined in (6.2). This is the first type of wall which contributes to the asymptotic scattering diagram.

Next, let  $(\mathfrak{d}, f_\mathfrak{d}) \in \mathfrak{D}_{(X_\Sigma, H)}$  be a non-incoming wall. Then  $(\mathfrak{d}, \nu_*(f_\mathfrak{d}))$  is a wall in  $T_0\mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{H})}^1$  and gives rise to a wall in the asymptotic scattering diagram in two

possible ways. Let  $\sigma \in \Sigma$  be the minimal cone containing  $\mathfrak{d}$ . The two possibilities are that  $\rho_i \not\subseteq \sigma$  for any  $i$ , or  $\rho_i \subseteq \sigma$  for some  $i$ . Recall from (3.23) we have a piecewise linear identification  $\mu : M_{\mathbb{R}} \rightarrow \tilde{B}_0$ .

First consider the case that  $\rho_i \not\subseteq \sigma$  for any  $i$ . In this case, the corresponding wall of the asymptotic scattering diagram is

$$(\mu(\mathfrak{d}), \nu_*(f_{\mathfrak{d}})),$$

where we now need to keep in mind that  $\nu_*(f_{\mathfrak{d}})$  has to be written, as indicated in Remark 6.3 (2), in terms of parallel transport from  $\mathcal{P}_0^+$  to  $\mathcal{P}_x^+$  for  $x \in \text{Int}(\sigma)$ . Let us keep track of the behaviour of a monomial in  $f_{\mathfrak{d}}$ .

Under the map  $\nu_*$ , a monomial of the form  $\prod_{i,j} (t_{ij} z^{m_i})^{a_{ij}}$  in  $f_{\mathfrak{d}}$  is mapped to

$$z^{(-m_{\mathbf{A}}, \sum_{i,j} a_{ij}(\varphi_0(m_i) + F_i - E_i^j))}.$$

If we then parallel transport this monomial into the interior of  $\sigma$  and apply  $\mu_* = \Upsilon_*$ , we get

$$t^{(d\varphi_0|_{\sigma})(m_{\mathbf{A}}) + \sum_{i,j} a_{ij}(\varphi_0(m_i) + F_i - E_i^j)} z^{-\Upsilon_*(m_{\mathbf{A}})}.$$

By Lemma 2.9, (3), bearing in mind that  $m_i \in \rho_i$  so that  $\varphi_0(m_i) = (d\varphi_0|_{\rho_i})(m_i)$ ,

$$\bar{\beta}_{\mathbf{A},\sigma} = (d\varphi_0|_{\sigma})(m_{\mathbf{A}}) + \sum_{i,j} a_{ij} \varphi_0(m_i).$$

We may now write

$$t^{(d\varphi_0|_{\sigma})(m_{\mathbf{A}}) + \sum_{i,j} a_{ij}(\varphi_0(m_i) + F_i - E_i^j)} z^{-\Upsilon_*(m_{\mathbf{A}})} = t^{\bar{\beta}_{\mathbf{A},\sigma} + \sum_{i,j} a_{ij}(F_i - E_i^j)} z^{-\Upsilon_*(m_{\mathbf{A}})}.$$

Here we view  $\bar{\beta}_{\mathbf{A},\sigma} \in N_1(\tilde{X})$  via the inclusion  $X_{\Sigma} \hookrightarrow \tilde{X}$  as a component of the central fibre. Thus we have a curve class  $\bar{\beta}_{\mathbf{A},\sigma} + \sum_{i,j} a_{ij}(F_i - E_i^j) \in N_1(\tilde{X})$ . The intersection number of this curve class with any irreducible component of  $\epsilon_{\mathbf{P}}^{-1}(0)$  is zero, and hence by Lemma 3.11, this curve class lies in  $N_1(X)$  (as must be the case by Proposition 3.13). Recalling the definition of  $\beta_{\mathbf{A},\sigma}$  from (6.1), we note that

$$\iota(\beta_{\mathbf{A},\sigma}) = \bar{\beta}_{\mathbf{A},\sigma} + \sum_{i,j} a_{ij}(F_i - E_i^j) \quad (6.9)$$

in  $N_1(\tilde{X})$ . Indeed, it is enough to intersect both classes with horizontal divisors on  $\tilde{X}$ , e.g., the closure  $\tilde{D}_{\rho}$  of the divisors  $D_{\rho} \times \mathbb{G}_m \subseteq X \times \mathbb{G}_m \subseteq \tilde{X}$  and the exceptional divisors  $\tilde{E}_{ij}$  over  $\tilde{H}_{ij}$ . Then noting that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{D}_{\rho} \cdot (\bar{\beta}_{\mathbf{A},\sigma} + \sum_{i,j} a_{ij}(F_i - E_i^j)) &= \begin{cases} D_{\Sigma,\rho} \cdot \bar{\beta}_{\mathbf{A},\sigma} & \rho \neq \rho_i \text{ for any } i \\ 0 & \rho = \rho_i \end{cases} \\ \tilde{E}_{kl} \cdot (\bar{\beta}_{\mathbf{A},\sigma} + \sum_{i,j} a_{ij}(F_i - E_i^j)) &= a_{kl}, \end{aligned}$$

we obtain (6.9).

Thus the wall of  $\mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D})}^{1, \text{as}}$  arising from  $(\mathfrak{d}, f_{\mathfrak{d}}) \in \mathfrak{D}_{(X_{\Sigma}, H)}$  is

$$(\Upsilon(\mathfrak{d}), f_{\mathfrak{d}}(t^{\iota(\beta_{\mathbf{A}, \sigma})} z^{-\Upsilon_*(m_{\mathbf{A}})})),$$

and agrees, up to applying  $\iota$  to the curve classes, with the corresponding wall in  $\Upsilon(\mathfrak{D}_{(X_{\Sigma}, H)})$  given by the definition of this latter scattering diagram.

We next consider the case that  $\rho_i \subseteq \sigma$ . In this case Remark 6.3 (2) shows we obtain two walls in  $\mathfrak{D}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{D})}^1$ , one contained in  $\tilde{\sigma}'$  and one contained in  $\tilde{\sigma}$ . But only the wall in  $\tilde{\sigma}$  contributes to the asymptotic scattering diagram. While a monomial in  $f_{\mathfrak{d}}$  of the form  $\prod_{i,j} (t_{ij} z^{m_i})^{a_{ij}}$  still contributes a term of the form

$$t^{(d\varphi_0|_{\sigma})(m_{\mathbf{A}}) + \sum_{i,j} a_{ij}(\varphi_0(m_i) + F_i - E_i^j)} z^{-(\Psi|_{\tilde{B}_1})_*^{-1}(m_{\mathbf{A}})}$$

to the corresponding wall in  $\tilde{\sigma}'$ , we still need to take into account the kink in  $\varphi$  to describe the corresponding monomial for the wall in  $\tilde{\sigma}$ . We obtain, following the same argument as in the previous case, a monomial of the form

$$t^{\bar{\beta}_{\mathbf{A}, \sigma} + \sum_{i,j} a_{ij}(F_i - E_i^j) + \langle n_{\sigma}, m_{\mathbf{A}} \rangle F_i} z^{-(\Psi|_{\tilde{B}_1})_*^{-1}(m_{\mathbf{A}})},$$

where  $n_{\sigma} \in N$  is a primitive normal vector to the facet of  $\sigma$  not containing  $\rho_i$  and positive on  $\rho_i$ .

The support of the corresponding wall in the asymptotic scattering diagram is still  $\Upsilon(\mathfrak{d})$ , and the monomial contribution above becomes

$$t^{\bar{\beta}_{\mathbf{A}, \sigma} + \sum_{i,j} a_{ij}(F_i - E_i^j) + \langle n_{\sigma}, m_{\mathbf{A}} \rangle F_i} z^{-\Upsilon_*(m_{\mathbf{A}})}.$$

We then find analogously to (6.9) that

$$\iota(\beta_{\mathbf{A}, \sigma}) = \bar{\beta}_{\mathbf{A}, \sigma} + \sum_{i,j} a_{ij}(F_i - E_i^j) + \langle n_{\sigma}, m_{\mathbf{A}} \rangle F_i.$$

The only difference with the previous calculation is that the intersection number of  $\tilde{D}_{\rho_i}$  with the right-hand side is  $\langle n_{\sigma}, m_{\mathbf{A}} \rangle$ . However, this integer is precisely the coefficient of  $m_i$  in the expression of  $m_{\mathbf{A}}$  as a linear combination of generators of  $\sigma$ . By (2.19), this is also the intersection number of  $\tilde{D}_{\rho_i}$  with the left-hand side. Thus the argument finishes as in the first case.  $\square$

## 7. EXAMPLE: THE BLOW-UP OF $\mathbb{P}^3$ WITH CENTER TWO LINES

Let  $\ell_1 \subset D_1$  and  $\ell_2 \subset D_2$  be two general lines in  $\mathbb{P}^3$  as in Example 5.8. Denote the blow-up of  $\mathbb{P}^3$  with center  $\ell_1 \cup \ell_2$  by  $\text{Bl}_{\ell_1 \cup \ell_2}(\mathbb{P}^3)$ , the strict transform of  $D$  by  $\tilde{D}$ , similarly the strict transform of  $D_i$  by  $\tilde{D}_i$ , and the fibers of the exceptional divisors over  $\ell_i$  by  $E_i$ , for  $1 \leq i \leq 2$ . Recall the walls of  $\mathfrak{D}_{(\mathbb{P}^3, \ell_1 \cup \ell_2)}$  are displayed in Table 1. We remark that this example does not precisely satisfy the hypotheses we placed on  $\Sigma$  and  $\mathbf{P}$  in §3, as the rays of the fan  $\Sigma$  for  $\mathbb{P}^3$  corresponding to



$D_1$  and  $D_2$  are contained in a common cone. We note this does not affect the construction of the scattering diagram  $\mathfrak{D}_{(X_\Sigma, H)}$ , but the discussions of §3 would need to be significantly modified. If the reader prefers, they may refine  $\Sigma$  by performing a toric blow-up along  $D_1 \cap D_2$ , which resolves this issue, and then suitably modify the discussion below. However, this only makes the geometry more complicated.

The walls of the minimal scattering diagram equivalent to the canonical scattering diagram  $\mathfrak{D}_{(\text{Bl}_{\ell_1 \cup \ell_2}(\mathbb{P}^3), \tilde{D})}$  are obtained from  $\mathfrak{D}_{(\mathbb{P}^3, \ell_1 \cup \ell_2)}$  by applying the piecewise linear isomorphism in Theorem 6.1. These are displayed in Table 2, where

$$\begin{aligned} x &= z^{e_1} = z^{(1,0,0)}, \\ y &= z^{e_2} = z^{(0,1,0)}, \end{aligned}$$

and  $L$  is the curve class corresponding to the strict transform of a general line in  $\mathbb{P}^3$ . We investigate each of these walls of  $\mathfrak{D}_{(\text{Bl}_{\ell_1 \cup \ell_2}(\mathbb{P}^3), \tilde{D})}$  and the associated

$\mathfrak{d}$	$f_{\mathfrak{d}}$
$\langle e_1, e_2 \rangle, \langle e_1, e_3 \rangle, \langle e_1, e_4 \rangle$	$1 + t^{E_1} x^{-1}$
$\langle e_2, e_1 \rangle, \langle e_2, e_3 \rangle, \langle e_2, e_4 \rangle$	$1 + t^{E_2} y^{-1}$
$\langle e_3, -e_1 \rangle, \langle e_4, -e_1 \rangle$	$1 + t^{L-E_1} x$
$\langle e_3, -e_2 \rangle, \langle e_4, -e_2 \rangle,$	$1 + t^{L-E_2} y$
$\langle -e_1, -e_1 - e_2 \rangle, \langle -e_2, -e_1 - e_2 \rangle, \langle e_3, -e_1 - e_2 \rangle, \langle e_4, -e_1 - e_2 \rangle$	$1 + t^{L-E_1-E_2} xy$
$\langle e_1, -e_2 \rangle$	$1 + t^{L-E_2} y + t^{L-E_1-E_2} xy$
$\langle e_2, -e_1 \rangle$	$1 + t^{L-E_1} x + t^{L-E_1-E_2} xy$

TABLE 2. Walls of  $\mathfrak{D}_{\text{Bl}_{\ell_1 \cup \ell_2}(\mathbb{P}^3), \tilde{D}}$

punctured Gromov-Witten invariants, by using the description of the walls of the canonical scattering diagram provided in (2.33):

$$(h(\tau_{\text{out}}), \exp(k_\tau N_{\tilde{\tau}} t^{\beta} z^{-u})).$$

Here  $\underline{\beta}$  is a curve class in  $\text{Bl}_{\ell_1 \cup \ell_2}(\mathbb{P}^3)$  and  $\tilde{\tau} = (\tau, \underline{\beta})$  records the type  $\tau$  of a punctured map  $f : C^\circ/W \rightarrow \text{Bl}_{\ell_1 \cup \ell_2}(\mathbb{P}^3)$ , with one punctured point mapping to  $\tilde{D}$  defined as in Definition 2.30. The cell containing the image of the leg  $L_{\text{out}}$  corresponding to the punctured point is denoted by  $\tau_{\text{out}}$  as in §2.3. The map  $h : \Gamma \rightarrow \Sigma(\text{Bl}_{\ell_1 \cup \ell_2}(\mathbb{P}^3))$  is the universal family of tropical maps obtained from  $f : C^\circ/W \rightarrow \text{Bl}_{\ell_1 \cup \ell_2}(\mathbb{P}^3)$ , and  $\kappa_\tau$  is defined as in (2.34). From the associated moduli space in §2.3.4 we obtained the description of the punctured log invariants  $N_{\tilde{\tau}}$ . Now we are ready to investigate each wall in Table 2.

- For  $(\mathfrak{d}, f_{\mathfrak{d}}) = (\langle e_1, e_i \rangle, 1 + t^{E_1}x^{-1})$ ,  $2 \leq i \leq 4$  :

$$\log(f_{\mathfrak{d}}) = \sum_{k \geq 1} k \frac{(-1)^{k+1}}{k^2} t^{kE_1} x^{-k}.$$

Consider the moduli space of punctured maps of class  $kE_1$  with one punctured point having contact order  $k$  with  $\tilde{D}_1$ . Such maps arise as  $k : 1$  multiple covers of fibers of the exceptional locus over  $\ell_1$ . In the associated tropical moduli space, there is a one-parameter family of tropical curves  $h : \Gamma \rightarrow Q_{\tau, \mathbb{R}}^{\vee}$ , where each curve has one vertex with image mapping onto the cone generated by  $e_i$ , and one leg  $L_{\text{out}}$  with direction vector  $u = (k, 0, 0)$  corresponding to the punctured point. In this case we get  $h(\tau_{\text{out}}) = \langle e_1, e_i \rangle$  as desired. This tropical family defines a type  $\tau$  with  $Q_{\tau} = \mathbb{N}$ . The corresponding punctured map of type  $\tau$  is a multiple cover of the fiber of the exceptional locus over the intersection point  $\ell_1 \cap D_i$ . From (2.34) we obtain  $\kappa_{\tau} = k$  and hence

$$N_{\bar{\tau}} = \frac{(-1)^{k+1}}{k^2}. \quad (7.1)$$

This gives the same multiple cover formula as in [19, Prop 6.1], but in higher dimension, and without recourse to localization techniques.

- For  $(\langle e_2, e_i \rangle, 1 + t^{E_2}y^{-1})$ , for  $i \in \{1, 3, 4\}$ , we obtain the multiple cover contribution (7.1) for  $k : 1$  multiple covers of the fiber of the exceptional locus over  $\ell_2 \cap D_i$ .
- For  $(\langle -e_1, e_i \rangle, 1 + t^{L-E_1}x)$ ,  $3 \leq i \leq 4$ , we obtain the multiple cover contribution (7.1) for  $k : 1$  multiple covers of strict transforms of lines passing through the points  $D_2 \cap D_3 \cap D_4$  and  $\ell_1 \cap D_i$ .
- $(\langle -e_2, e_i \rangle, 1 + t^{L-E_2}x)$ , for  $3 \leq i \leq 4$ , we obtain the multiple cover contribution (7.1) for  $k : 1$  multiple covers of strict transforms of lines passing through the points  $D_1 \cap D_3 \cap D_4$  and  $\ell_2 \cap D_i$ .
- For  $(\langle -e_i, -e_1 - e_2 \rangle, 1 + t^{L-E_1-E_2}xy)$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq 2$ , we obtain the multiple cover contribution (7.1) for  $k : 1$  multiple covers of strict transforms of lines passing through the points  $D_i \cap D_3 \cap D_4$  and  $\ell_j \cap D_i$ , where  $1 \leq j \leq 2$  and  $i \neq j$ .
- $(\langle e_i, -e_1 - e_2 \rangle, 1 + t^{L-E_1-E_2}xy)$ ,  $3 \leq i \leq 4$ , we obtain the multiple cover contribution (7.1) for  $k : 1$  multiple covers of strict transforms of lines passing through the points  $\ell_1 \cap D_i$  and  $\ell_2 \cap D_i$ .
- For  $(\mathfrak{d}, f_{\mathfrak{d}}) = (\langle e_1, -e_2 \rangle, 1 + t^{L-E_2}y + t^{L-E_1-E_2}xy)$  we have

$$\log(f_{\mathfrak{d}}) = \sum_{k \geq 1} \sum_{\ell=0}^k k \frac{(-1)^{k+1}}{k^2} \binom{k}{\ell} t^{k(L-E_2)-\ell E_1} x^{\ell} y^k. \quad (7.2)$$

Consider  $k : 1$  multiple covers of the line of class  $L - E_1 - E_2$  obtained as the strict transform of the line passing through the points  $D_1 \cap D_3 \cap D_4$  and  $\ell_2 \cap D_1$ . The inverse image of the point of intersection of this line with  $\ell_1$  consists of  $k$  points on the domain. Attach transversally to  $k - \ell$  points among these  $k$  points, a copy of a projective line and impose each of these additional projective lines to map to a fiber of the exceptional locus over  $\ell_1$ , so that the image will be of class  $k(L - E_1 - E_2) + (k - \ell)E_1$ . The choice of the  $k - \ell$  points among these  $k$  points contributes the coefficient  $\binom{k}{\ell}$  in (7.2), and the  $k : 1$ -multiple cover contribution is  $\frac{(-1)^{k+1}}{k^2}$  as in (7.1). The associated tropical family consists of tropical curves where  $h(L_{\text{out}})$  has support in  $\langle e_1, (-\ell, -k, 0) \rangle$  as illustrated on the left hand-side in Figure 7.1, where the vertex at the origin corresponds to images of the vertices corresponding to the transversally attached projective lines and the other vertex on the  $e_1$ -axis corresponds to the image of the  $k : 1$ -multiple cover. However, we also have a second family of punctured maps of the same class

$$k(L - E_1 - E_2) + (k - \ell)E_1 = (k - \ell)(L - E_2) + \ell(L - E_1 - E_2)$$

whose domain is a chain of three projective lines with images given as follows: the image of the first line is a  $(k - \ell)$ -fold multiple cover of the strict transform of a line passing through the points  $p = D_1 \cap D_3 \cap D_4$  and a point in  $\ell_2$ , the second line gets contracted to  $p$ , and the third line is an  $\ell$ -fold cover of the strict transform of the line passing through the points  $p$  and  $D_1 \cap \ell_2$ . In the right hand side of Figure 7.1 the image of the first line corresponds to the vertex at the origin, the image of the second line is the trivalent vertex moving along the  $e_2$ -axis and the image of the third line corresponds to the vertex moving along the  $e_1$ -axis. In this case the legs of the one parameter family of tropical curves trace out the wall with support  $\langle -e_2, (-\ell, -k, 0) \rangle$ . By the scattering computation after all cancellations we obtain a wall with support  $\langle e_1, -e_2 \rangle$  as desired. This gives us the prediction of the punctured log invariant corresponding to the second family to be equal to  $\frac{(-1)^k}{k^2} \binom{k}{\ell}$ . The analysis of the last row of Table 2 is analogous, and obtained by exchanging  $x$  and  $y$ .

*Remark 7.1.* The four walls with attached wall function  $1 + t^{L-E_1-E_2}xy$  may be viewed as providing additional geometric information. For each point  $x \in D_3 \cap D_4$ , there is precisely one line through  $x$ ,  $\ell_1$  and  $\ell_2$ , and so there is a one-dimensional family of lines through  $\ell_1$ ,  $\ell_2$  and  $D_3 \cap D_4$  parameterized by the intersection point with  $D_3 \cap D_4$ . We may blow up  $D_3 \cap D_4$ , with exceptional divisor  $E \cong \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$ .




FIGURE 7.1. Cancellations of walls

This corresponds to a star subdivision of the fan for  $\mathbb{P}^3$  along  $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}(-e_1 - e_2)$ . In this case, the intersection points with  $E$  of the strict transforms of the lines in the one-dimensional family trace out a curve  $C$  in  $E$ . The four walls instruct us that  $C$  intersects each boundary divisor of  $E$  once, and hence  $C$  is a curve of class  $(1, 1)$  in  $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$ .

We would like to note that in general, it is not obvious how to recover the punctured Gromov–Witten invariants  $N_{\tilde{\tau}}$  of a log Calabi–Yau  $(X, D)$  as in (1.1) from the data of the toric scattering diagram  $\mathfrak{D}_{(X_{\Sigma}, H)}$ . Indeed, from the main theorem 6.1 we can only deduce that the canonical scattering diagram, which encodes the data of  $N_{\tilde{\tau}}$ , is equivalent to the image of  $\mathfrak{D}_{(X_{\Sigma}, H)}$  under a PL isomorphism. Thus, we can recover the canonical scattering diagram from  $\mathfrak{D}_{(X_{\Sigma}, H)}$  only up to equivalence. This enables us in practice to determine explicit equations for the coordinate rings of mirrors to  $(X, D)$  in arbitrary dimension, and writing such equations will be focus of future work [7]. On the other hand, generally this does not immediately enable us to read off the punctured invariants for arbitrary  $(X, D)$ , as while defining equivalent scattering diagrams we allow cancellations of walls which have the same support. However, to read off the punctured log Gromov–Witten invariant associated to a wall produced in the scattering algorithm described in the proof of Theorem 5.6, we need to know how to read off the data of the combinatorial types  $\tau$  from the supports of the walls we add. If in the final consistent scattering diagram  $\mathfrak{D}_{(X_{\Sigma}, H)}$  we have cancellations of walls that are on top of each other, to detect the combinatorial type is not trivial and one may need to do appropriate perturbations of the widgets corresponding to the tropical hypersurfaces forming  $H$  to do it. This could be done analogously to the two dimensional case in [19, §1.4].

## REFERENCES

- [1] Dan Abramovich and Qile Chen. Stable logarithmic maps to Deligne–Faltings pairs II. *Asian Journal of Mathematics*, 18(3):465–488, 2014.

- [2] Dan Abramovich, Qile Chen, Mark Gross, and Bernd Siebert. Punctured logarithmic maps. *preprint arXiv:2009.07720*.
- [3] Dan Abramovich, Qile Chen, Mark Gross, and Bernd Siebert. Decomposition of degenerate Gromov-Witten invariants. *Compos. Math.*, 156:2020–2075, 2020.
- [4] Dan Abramovich, Qile Chen, Steffen Marcus, Martin Ulirsch, and Jonathan Wise. Skeletons and fans of logarithmic structures. In *Nonarchimedean and tropical geometry*, pages 287–336. Springer, 2016.
- [5] Dan Abramovich, Qile Chen, Steffen Marcus, and Jonathan Wise. Boundedness of the space of stable logarithmic maps. *J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)*, 19(9):2783–2809, 2017.
- [6] Hülya Argüz and Pierrick Bousseau. The flow tree formula for donaldson-thomas invariants of quivers with potentials. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.11200*, 2021.
- [7] Hülya Argüz, Tom Coates, and Mark Gross. Mirrors to Fano manifolds, *in preparation*.
- [8] Hülya Argüz and Thomas Prince. Real Lagrangians in Calabi-Yau threefolds. *Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society*, 2020.
- [9] Pierrick Bousseau. The quantum tropical vertex. *Geom. Topol.*, 24(3):1297–1379, 2020.
- [10] Man-Wai Cheung and Travis Mandel. Donaldson-Thomas invariants from tropical disks. *Selecta Mathematica*, 26(4):1–46, 2020.
- [11] Ron Donagi, Sheldon Katz, and Martijn Wijnholt. Weak coupling, degeneration and log Calabi-Yau spaces. *preprint arXiv:1212.0553*.
- [12] K Fukaya. Multivalued Morse theory, asymptotics analysis and mirror symmetry. *Available from the web page <http://www.math.kyoto-u.ac.jp/~fukaya/fukayagrapat.dvi>*, 2002.
- [13] William Goldman. Geometric structures on manifolds. <http://www.math.umd.edu/~wmg/gstom.pdf>, 2018.
- [14] William Goldman and Morris W Hirsch. The radiance obstruction and parallel forms on affine manifolds. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 286(2):629–649, 1984.
- [15] Mark Gross, Paul Hacking, and Sean Keel. Mirror symmetry for log calabi-yau surfaces i. *Publications mathématiques de l’IHÉS*, 122(1):65–168, 2015.
- [16] Mark Gross, Paul Hacking, and Sean Keel. Mirror symmetry for log Calabi-Yau surfaces I. *Publications mathématiques de l’IHÉS*, 122(1):65–168, 2015.
- [17] Mark Gross, Paul Hacking, Sean Keel, and Maxim Kontsevich. Canonical bases for cluster algebras. *Journal of the American Mathematical Society*, 31(2):497–608, 2018.
- [18] Mark Gross, Paul Hacking, and Bernd Siebert. Theta functions on varieties with effective anti-canonical class. *preprint arxiv:1601.07081*, to appear in *Memoirs of the AMS*.
- [19] Mark Gross, Rahul Pandharipande, and Bernd Siebert. The tropical vertex. *Duke Math. J.*, 153(2):297–362, 2010.
- [20] Mark Gross and Bernd Siebert. Intrinsic mirror symmetry. *preprint arxiv:1909.07649*.
- [21] Mark Gross and Bernd Siebert. From real affine geometry to complex geometry. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 174(3):1301–1428, 2011.
- [22] Mark Gross and Bernd Siebert. Logarithmic Gromov-Witten invariants. *Journal of the American Mathematical Society*, 26(2):451–510, 2013.
- [23] Mark Gross and Bernd Siebert. Local mirror symmetry in the tropics. In *Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians—Seoul 2014. Vol. II*, pages 723–744. Kyung Moon Sa, Seoul, 2014.

- [24] Mark Gross and Bernd Siebert. Intrinsic mirror symmetry and punctured Gromov-Witten invariants. In *Algebraic geometry: Salt Lake City 2015*, volume 97 of *Proc. Sympos. Pure Math.*, pages 199–230. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2018.
- [25] Mark Gross and Bernd Siebert. The canonical wall structure and intrinsic mirror symmetry. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.02502*, 2021.
- [26] Eleny-Nicoleta Ionel and Thomas H Parker. Relative Gromov-Witten invariants. *Annals of Mathematics*, pages 45–96, 2003.
- [27] Sean Keel and Tony Yue Yu. The Frobenius structure theorem for affine log Calabi-Yau varieties containing a torus. *preprint arXiv:1908.09861*, 2019.
- [28] János Kollár and Chenyang Xu. The dual complex of Calabi–Yau pairs. *Inventiones mathematicae*, 205(3):527–557, 2016.
- [29] Maxim Kontsevich and Yan Soibelman. Affine structures and non-Archimedean analytic spaces. In *The unity of mathematics*, volume 244 of *Progr. Math.*, pages 321–385. Birkhäuser Boston, Boston, MA, 2006.
- [30] An-Min Li and Yongbin Ruan. Symplectic surgery and Gromov-Witten invariants of Calabi-Yau 3-folds. *Invent. Math.*, 145(1):151–218, 2001.
- [31] Jun Li. Stable morphisms to singular schemes and relative stable morphisms. *Journal of Differential Geometry*, 57(3):509–578, 2001.
- [32] Travis Mandel. Scattering diagrams, theta functions, and refined tropical curve counts. *preprint arXiv:1503.06183*, 2015.
- [33] Travis Mandel. Theta bases and log Gromov-Witten invariants of cluster varieties. *preprint arXiv:1903.03042*, 2019.
- [34] Cristina Manolache. Virtual pull-backs. *J. Algebraic Geom.*, 21(2):201–245, 2012.
- [35] Johannes Nicaise, Chenyang Xu, and Tony Yue Yu. The non-archimedean SYZ fibration. *Compositio Mathematica*, 155(5):953–972, 2019.
- [36] Tadao Oda. *Convex bodies and algebraic geometry*, volume 15 of *Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete (3) [Results in Mathematics and Related Areas (3)]*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1988. An introduction to the theory of toric varieties, Translated from the Japanese.
- [37] Arthur Ogus. *Lectures on logarithmic algebraic geometry*, volume 178. Cambridge University Press, 2018.
- [38] Martin C. Olsson. Logarithmic geometry and algebraic stacks. *Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4)*, 36(5):747–791, 2003.
- [39] Brett Parker. Tropical enumeration of curves in blowups of the projective plane. *preprint arXiv:1411.5722*, 2014.
- [40] James Pascaleff. On the symplectic cohomology of log Calabi–Yau surfaces. *Geometry & Topology*, 23(6):2701–2792, 2019.
- [41] Andrew Strominger, Shing-Tung Yau, and Eric Zaslow. Mirror symmetry is  $T$ -duality. *Nuclear Phys. B*, 479(1-2):243–259, 1996.
- [42] Nobuyoshi Takahashi. Log mirror symmetry and local mirror symmetry. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 220(2):293–299, 2001.
- [43] Tony Yue Yu. Enumeration of holomorphic cylinders in log Calabi–Yau surfaces. I. *Mathematische Annalen*, 366(3-4):1649–1675, 2016.

INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY AUSTRIA, KLOSTERNEUBURG, 3400, AUSTRIA  
*Email address:* `hueya.arguez@ist.ac.at`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE, CAMBRIDGE, CB3 0WB,  
UNITED KINGDOM  
*Email address:* `mgross@dpms.cam.ac.uk`