

Stokes Phenomenon and Yangians

Qian Tang and Xiaomeng Xu

January 30, 2025

Abstract

In this paper, we first establish a connection between Yangians and the unique formal solution of the quantum hypergeometric differential equations at irregular singularities. We then realize the Stokes matrices of the hypergeometric equations as infinite matrix products of representations of Yangians, with the help of the theory of difference systems. Along the way, we also investigate the algebroid structure associated with the Stokes matrices.

1 Introduction

Let us take the complex Lie algebra \mathfrak{gl}_ν and its universal enveloping algebra $U(\mathfrak{gl}_\nu)$ generated by $\{e_{ij}\}_{1 \leq i, j \leq \nu}$ subjected to the relation $[e_{ij}, e_{kl}] = \delta_{kj}e_{il} - \delta_{li}e_{kj}$. Let us consider the quantum confluent hypergeometric system

$$\frac{d}{dz}F(z) = (u - \hbar \mathbf{E}z^{-1}) \cdot F(z), \quad (1.1)$$

where the $\nu \times \nu$ matrix $\mathbf{E} := (e_{ij})_{\nu \times \nu}$ with entries valued in $U(\mathfrak{gl}_\nu)$, $u = \text{diag}(u_1, \dots, u_\nu)$ is seen as an $\nu \times \nu$ matrix with scalar entries in $U(\mathfrak{gl}_\nu)$, and \hbar is a complex parameter. For most of the time, we will take a finite-dimensional representation V of \mathfrak{gl}_ν , and consider the system (1.1) for an $\nu \times \nu$ matrix function $F^V(z)$ with entries in $\text{End}(V)$, i.e., a (block matrix) solution $F^V(z) \in \text{End}(V) \otimes \text{End}(\mathbb{C}^\nu)$. Here, the action of the coefficient matrix of (1.1) on $F^V(z)$ is given by matrix multiplication and the representation V of \mathfrak{gl}_ν .

Confluent hypergeometric systems have played important roles in many subjects, e.g. the study of Frobenius manifolds [11] and in particular the quantum cohomology of Fano manifolds [16], linearization in Poisson geometry [4], quantum Weyl group actions on Poisson groups [5], stability conditions [7, 8], long time asymptotics of some isomonodromy deformation equations [33] etc. The system (1.1) is a natural quantum analog of the confluent hypergeometric system. Its Stokes phenomenon and the WKB approximation have been used to give a transcendental realization of the quantum group $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_\nu)$ and its crystal structure in [34, 36]. Therefore, the system is worthy of further study.

The purpose of this paper is then twofold; one is to establish a new relation between the system (1.1) and the Yangian; the other is to deepen the relation between the Stokes phenomenon of (1.1) and quantum groups, using Darboux's method and a path algebroid arising from the resurgence theory.

1.1 Formal Solutions and Yangian $Y(\mathfrak{gl}_{\nu-1})$

For a positive integer m , the Yangian $Y_\hbar(\mathfrak{gl}_m)$ was introduced in the formulation of quantum inverse scattering method by Faddeev's school (see e.g. [12, 20, 32]) and by Drinfeld [10] in the study of the Yang-Baxter equation. It is a Hopf algebra that can be regarded as a deformation of the enveloping algebra $U(\mathfrak{gl}_m[x])$, where $\mathfrak{gl}_m[x]$ is the Lie algebra of \mathfrak{gl}_m -valued polynomials [24].

Definition 1.1. [10] The Yangian for \mathfrak{gl}_m is a unital associative algebra with countably many generators $\{t_{ij}^{(p)} : p \in \mathbb{N}^+, i, j = 1, \dots, m\}$, and the generating relations for all $i_0, i_1, j_0, j_1 \in \{1, \dots, m\}$,

$$\frac{1}{\hbar} [T(\lambda_1)_{i_1 i_0}, T(\lambda_2)_{j_1 j_0}] = \frac{T(\lambda_2)_{j_1 i_0} T(\lambda_1)_{i_1 j_0} - T(\lambda_1)_{j_1 i_0} T(\lambda_2)_{i_1 j_0}}{\lambda_1 - \lambda_2}. \quad (1.2)$$

Here $T(\lambda)_{ij}$ is the generating series $T(\lambda)_{ij} = \delta_{ij} + \sum_{p=1}^{\infty} t_{ij}^{(p)} \lambda^{-p}$.

Theorem 1.2. For $\hbar \notin \mathbb{Q}$, the system (1.1) has a unique formal solution

$$\hat{F}(z) = \left(I + \sum_{p=1}^{\infty} H_p z^{-p} \right) \cdot e^{uz} z^{-\hbar \delta \mathbf{E}}, \quad \delta \mathbf{E} = \text{diag}(e_{11}, \dots, e_{\nu\nu}), \quad (1.3)$$

where I is the identity matrix, and the coefficients $H_p \in \text{Mat}_n(U(\mathfrak{gl}_\nu))$ are recursively determined by the relations

$$(H_1)_{ik} = -\frac{\hbar e_{ik}}{u_k - u_i}, \quad (H_{p+1})_{ik} = \sum_{j \neq k} T_k(p)_{ij} (H_p)_{jk}, \quad (H_p)_{kk} = \sum_{j \neq k} \frac{\hbar e_{kj}}{p} (H_p)_{jk}. \quad (1.4)$$

Here for any $\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$, $T_k(\lambda)$ is an $(\nu - 1) \times (\nu - 1)$ -matrix with entries

$$T_k(\lambda)_{ij} := \frac{1}{u_k - u_i} \left((\lambda + \hbar(e_{kk} + 1))\delta_{ij} - \hbar e_{ij} - \hbar^2 \frac{e_{ik}e_{kj}}{\lambda} \right) \in U(\mathfrak{gl}_\nu), \quad i, j \in \{1, \dots, \nu\} \setminus \{k\}. \quad (1.5)$$

Furthermore, $T_k(\lambda)$ satisfies the Yangian relations (1.2) of $Y_{\hbar}(\mathfrak{gl}_{\nu-1})$, i.e., for indices i_0, i_j, j_0, j_1 ,

$$\frac{1}{\hbar} [T_k(\lambda_1)_{i_1 i_0}, T_k(\lambda_2)_{j_1 j_0}] = \frac{T_k(\lambda_2)_{j_1 i_0} T_k(\lambda_1)_{i_1 j_0} - T_k(\lambda_1)_{j_1 i_0} T_k(\lambda_2)_{i_1 j_0}}{\lambda_1 - \lambda_2} \in U(\mathfrak{gl}_{\nu}). \quad (1.6)$$

Remark 1.3. For convenience, we always require that the $\nu - 1$ indices of the $(\nu - 1) \times (\nu - 1)$ matrix $T_k(\lambda)$ are $\{1, \dots, k - 1, k + 1, \dots, \nu\}$. It should be emphasized that for different $\hbar \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$, the Yangians $Y_{\hbar}(\mathfrak{gl}_m)$ are canonically isomorphic.

Our first theorem states that the Yangian $Y_{\hbar}(\mathfrak{gl}_{\nu-1})$ naturally arises from the formal power series solutions of the system (1.1). Equivalently, for each $k = 1, \dots, \nu$, we get an algebra homomorphism

$$O(u)_k : Y_{\hbar}(\mathfrak{gl}_{\nu-1}) \rightarrow U(\mathfrak{gl}_{\nu}); \quad T(\lambda)_{ij} \mapsto T_k(\lambda)_{ij}, \quad i, j = 1, \dots, k - 1, k + 1, \dots, \nu. \quad (1.7)$$

Remark 1.4. Here the algebra homomorphism $O(u)_k$ is a (u_1, \dots, u_{ν}) -family of deformation of the homomorphism in the Olshanski centralizer construction [26, 27].

1.2 Stokes matrices as Infinite Product of Representations of Yangian

For any fixed u with distinct eigenvalues and nontrivial representation V , the series $I + \sum_{p=1}^{\infty} H_p z^{-p}$, in the corresponding formal solution $\hat{F}(z)$, is a divergent $\text{End}(V) \otimes \text{End}(\mathbb{C}^{\nu})$ valued formal power series. Thus $\hat{F}(z)$ is only a formal solution. The resummation (see, e.g., [2]) states that there exist certain sectorial regions around $z = \infty$, such that on each of these sectors there is a unique $\text{End}(V) \otimes \text{End}(\mathbb{C}^{\nu})$ valued holomorphic solution with the prescribed asymptotics $\hat{F}(z)$, see Proposition 2.6 for more details. These solutions are in general different (that reflects the Stokes phenomenon), and the transition between them can be measured by the Stokes matrices $S_{[\tau]} \in \text{End}(V) \otimes \text{End}(\mathbb{C}^{\nu})$ (see Definition 2.8), associated to the anti-Stokes direction $\tau = -\arg(u_j - u_i)$ for some $i \neq j$. For u_1, \dots, u_{ν} in generic position, the only none zero subdiagonal entry of $S_{[\tau]}$ is the (i, j) -entry. Our second result realizes the Stokes matrices as one-sided infinite matrix products of the $(\nu - 1) \times (\nu - 1)$ matrices $T_k(m) \in \text{End}(V) \otimes \text{End}(\mathbb{C}^{\nu-1})$.

Proposition 1.5. *Suppose that none of u_k , for all $k \neq i, j$, lies on the segment determined by u_i and u_j , then the (i, j) -entry of the Stokes matrix $S_{[\tau]}$ associated to the anti-Stokes direction $\tau = -\arg(u_j - u_i)$, as elements in $\text{End}(V)$, is given by (see Section 3 for the meaning of the infinite matrix product)*

$$(u_j - u_i)^{\hbar e_{ii}} \frac{(S_{[\tau]})_{ij}}{2\pi i} (u_j - u_i)^{-\hbar e_{jj}} = \lim_{p \rightarrow \infty} \frac{(u_j - u_i)^{p+1}}{p!} p^{\hbar(e_{ii} - e_{jj} - 1)} \left(\overleftarrow{\prod}_{m=1}^p T_j(m) \right)_{i\hat{j}} \left(-\frac{1}{u_j I - u_{j\hat{j}}} \hbar \mathbf{E}_{\hat{j}j} \right),$$

$$(u_j - u_i)^{\hbar e_{ii}} \frac{(S_{[\tau]})_{ij}}{2\pi i} (u_j - u_i)^{-\hbar e_{jj}} = \lim_{p \rightarrow \infty} \frac{(u_j - u_i)^p}{p!} (-\hbar \mathbf{E}_{i\hat{i}}) \left(\overleftarrow{\prod}_{m=-p}^{-1} T_i(m) \right)_{\hat{i}j} p^{\hbar(e_{ii} - e_{jj} + 1)},$$

where $\overleftarrow{\prod}_{m=1}^p T_j(m) := T_j(p) \cdots T_j(2) T_j(1)$. Here for a matrix A , we denote $A_{i\hat{j}}$ as the j -th column of A without the i -th row; $A_{\hat{i}j}$ as the i -th row of matrix A without the j -th column.

Since, for each $k = 1, \dots, \nu$, the $U(\mathfrak{gl}_{\nu})$ -module V can be seen as a representation of $Y_{\hbar}(\mathfrak{gl}_{\nu-1})$ via the algebra homomorphism $O_k : Y_{\hbar}(\mathfrak{gl}_{\nu-1}) \rightarrow U(\mathfrak{gl}_{\nu})$ in (1.7), the above proposition states that the Stokes matrices can be obtained as infinite product of the representations of Yangian.

Following [36], the Stokes matrices of the system (1.1) satisfy the Faddeev-Reshetikhin-Takhtajan's RLL relations of quantum groups [14]. As a consequence, we deduce that the one-sided infinite matrix products of the n representations $\{T_k(\lambda)\}_{k=1, \dots, \nu}$ of $Y(\mathfrak{gl}_{\nu-1})$ on V satisfy some commutative relations. That is

Theorem 1.6. *Let us introduce the matrix \mathcal{T} with entries*

$$\mathcal{T}_{ij} := \lim_{p \rightarrow \infty} \frac{(u_j - u_i)^{p+1}}{p!} p^{\hbar(e_{ii} - e_{jj} - 1)} \left(\overleftarrow{\prod}_{m=1}^p T_j(m) \right)_{i\hat{j}} \left(-\frac{1}{u_j I - u_{j\hat{j}}} \hbar \mathbf{E}_{\hat{j}j} \right), \quad (1.8)$$

where $T_k(m)$ is defined as in (1.5). Then

1. For distinct indices s_1, t_1, s_2, t_2 and disjoint segments $[u_{s_1}, u_{t_1}] \cap [u_{s_2}, u_{t_2}] = \emptyset$, we have

$$\mathcal{T}_{s_1 t_1} \mathcal{T}_{s_2 t_2} - \mathcal{T}_{s_2 t_2} \mathcal{T}_{s_1 t_1} = 0; \quad (1.9)$$

2. For distinct indices s_1, t_1, s_2, t_2 and disjoint segments $[u_{s_1}, u_{t_1}] \cap [u_{s_2}, u_{t_2}] \neq \emptyset$, $\arg(u_{t_2} - u_{s_2}) - \arg(u_{t_1} - u_{s_1}) \in (0, \pi)$, we have

$$\frac{\mathcal{T}_{s_1 t_1} \mathcal{T}_{s_2 t_2} - \mathcal{T}_{s_2 t_2} \mathcal{T}_{s_1 t_1}}{q - q^{-1}} = \frac{(u_{t_2} - u_{s_1})^{\hbar(e_{t_2 t_2} - e_{s_1 s_1} + 1)} (u_{t_1} - u_{s_2})^{\hbar(e_{t_1 t_1} - e_{s_2 s_2} + 1)}}{(u_{t_1} - u_{s_1})^{\hbar(e_{t_1 t_1} - e_{s_1 s_1} + 1)} (u_{t_2} - u_{s_2})^{\hbar(e_{t_2 t_2} - e_{s_2 s_2} + 1)}} \mathcal{T}_{s_1 t_2} \mathcal{T}_{s_2 t_1}; \quad (1.10)$$

3. For distinct indices s, m, t , we have

$$\frac{\left(\frac{u_s - u_m}{u_t - u_s}\right)^{\hbar} \mathcal{T}_{sm} \mathcal{T}_{mt} - \left(\frac{u_t - u_m}{u_t - u_s}\right)^{\hbar} \mathcal{T}_{mt} \mathcal{T}_{sm}}{(q - q^{-1})/2\pi i} = - \left(\frac{u_m - u_s}{u_t - u_s}\right)^{\hbar(e_{ss} - e_{mm})} \left(\frac{u_t - u_m}{u_t - u_s}\right)^{\hbar(e_{mm} - e_{tt})} \mathcal{T}_{st}, \quad (1.11a)$$

$$\mathcal{T}_{ms} \mathcal{T}_{mt} - \left(\frac{u_m - u_s}{u_t - u_m}\right)^{\hbar} \mathcal{T}_{mt} \mathcal{T}_{ms} = 0, \quad (1.11b)$$

$$\mathcal{T}_{sm} \mathcal{T}_{tm} - \left(\frac{u_m - u_s}{u_t - u_m}\right)^{\hbar} \mathcal{T}_{sm} \mathcal{T}_{tm} = 0, \quad (1.11c)$$

$$\frac{\mathcal{T}_{st} \mathcal{T}_{ts} - \mathcal{T}_{ts} \mathcal{T}_{st}}{(q - q^{-1})/2\pi i} = \frac{q^{e_{ss} - e_{tt}} - q^{e_{tt} - e_{ss}}}{2\pi i}. \quad (1.11d)$$

We require that for arbitrary indices s_1, t_1, s_2, t_2 (not necessarily distinct), the arguments satisfy $\arg(u_{t_2} - u_{s_2}) - \arg(u_{t_1} - u_{s_1}) \in (-\pi, \pi)$.

The commutative relation of bilateral infinite matrix product, associated to one representation, of Yangians was studied in the development of the R -matrix formulation of the quantum inverse scattering method, see e.g., Faddeev-Reshetikhin [13] for the semiclassical limit case. In the formulation, for any fixed $k = 1, \dots, \nu$, the Yangian relation (1.6) can be used to compute the commutative relation of the bilateral infinite matrix product

$$\lim_{p \rightarrow \infty} N_1(p) \left(\prod_{-p}^{\overleftarrow{p}} T_k(m) \right) N_2(p)$$

(with $N_1(p), N_2(p)$ certain normalizers). Our Theorem 1.6 can be seen as a generalization of this formulation to the case of multiple (related) Yangian representations: n representations T_1, \dots, T_n are given, and for different indices k and j , the commutator between T_k and T_j satisfies a quadratic relation similar to the Yangian relation (1.6). One can imagine that, these Yangian-like quadratic relations permit calculation of the commutators between the elements of the one-sided infinite matrix products showing to have forms (1.9)-(1.11d). Besides, given Proposition 1.5, one obtains a new interpretation of the quantum group relations of the Stokes matrices from this viewpoint. We hope to further develop this generalized formulation in future.

Let us mention that the system (1.1) can be seen as a Knizhnik–Zamolodchikov (KZ) type equation with an irregular singularity. The KZ equations with irregular singularities have been introduced from various perspectives. For example, it was introduced in [30], and was given a representation-theoretic interpretation in [15]. From the perspective of isomonodromy deformation, the works [28, 29] construct an equation via quantisation of the Hamiltonian systems of [6], and that equation reduces to KZ equation in the logarithmic case—so it is also an irregular version of KZ equation. These resulting differential equations can have arbitrary order pole and therefore have Stokes phenomenon. Theorem 1.2 states that the algebraic structure hidden behind the recursive relations of the formal solutions of KZ equation with a second order pole is the Yangian. It is then interesting to discover the algebraic structures hidden in the formal solutions of KZ equation with higher order poles.

1.3 Outlook: Classical Lie Algebra Cases and Twisted Yangians

Let us first discuss the generalization of the above results to other types. Let \mathfrak{g}_ν denote the rank ν simple complex Lie algebra of type B, C, or D, i.e.,

$$\mathfrak{g}_n = \mathfrak{o}_{2\nu+1}, \quad \mathfrak{sp}_{2\nu}, \quad \text{or} \quad \mathfrak{o}_{2\nu}.$$

For $-\nu \leq i, j \leq \nu$, let us introduce the generators of $U(\mathfrak{g}_\nu)$

$$K_{ij} = e_{ij} - \theta_{ij} e_{ji},$$

where

$$\theta_{ij} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{in the orthogonal case} \\ \text{sgn}(i) \cdot \text{sgn}(j), & \text{in the symplectic case.} \end{cases} \quad (1.12)$$

Given any finite-dimensional irreducible representation $L(\lambda)_{\mathfrak{g}_\nu}$ of \mathfrak{g}_n with a highest weight λ , let us consider the quantum confluent hypergeometric type equation

$$\frac{dF}{dz} = \hbar \left(u + \frac{K}{z} \right) \cdot F, \quad (1.13)$$


for $F(z) \in \text{End}(L(\lambda)_{\mathfrak{g}_n}) \otimes \text{End}(\mathbb{C}^m)$ with $m = 2\nu$ or $2\nu + 1$. Here the $m \times m$ matrix $K = (K_{ij})$ has entries valued in $U(\mathfrak{g}_\nu)$, and the $m \times m$ matrix u is diagonal with entries

$$u = \begin{cases} \text{diag}(u_\nu, \dots, u_1, 0, u_1, \dots, u_\nu), & \mathfrak{so}_{2n+1} \\ \text{diag}(u_\nu, \dots, u_1, u_1, \dots, u_\nu), & \mathfrak{so}_{2n} \text{ or } \mathfrak{sp}_{2n}. \end{cases} \quad (1.14)$$

We make the assumption that u is regular, i.e., u_1, \dots, u_ν and 0 are distinct. Similar to Theorem 1.2, the equation (1.13) has a recursively defined formal power series solution. We expect that the algebraic structure hidden behind the recursive

relation is the corresponding twisted Yangian. We remark that for the symplectic Lie algebra case, the Stokes matrices of the equation (1.13) (with u having distinct eigenvalues) are proved in [35] to be the K -matrix for the quantum symmetric pair of type C. Therefore, it is interesting to study further the relation between the analytic theory of (1.13) and the theory of various quantum algebras.

The organization of the paper is as follows. In Section 2, we introduce the basic concepts, including the Stokes matrices, in the study of confluent hypergeometric systems. In Section 3, we present the classical theory of difference equations, where the Stokes matrices are realized as canonical analytical solutions of some difference equations and are thus interpreted as infinite product of matrices. In Section 4, we discuss the algebroid structures underlying the Stokes matrices. The results of this section can help us obtain the commutation relations between the entries of the Stokes matrices given by infinite product of matrices. In Section 5, we establish the connection between the Stokes matrices of system (1.1) and Yangians. The connections between various lemmas and proposition used, and theorems proved in the paper can be summarized in the following diagram.



2 Monodromy Data of the Confluent Hypergeometric System

The n -th confluent hypergeometric system is a $n \times n$ system of the following form

$$\frac{d}{dz}F(z) = (u + Az^{-1}) \cdot F(z), \quad (2.1)$$

where the solution $F(z)$ is an $n \times n$ matrix-valued analytic function. System (2.1) has only two singularities, which are also the only singularities of its solution. The irregular singularity is $z = \infty$, and the regular singularity is $z = 0$.

In this section, we always impose the following conditions and notations:

- $u = \text{diag}(u_1 I_{n_1}, \dots, u_\nu I_{n_\nu})$, where u_1, \dots, u_ν are distinct, with multiplicity n_1, \dots, n_ν ;
- the residue matrix is divided into (n_1, \dots, n_ν) -blocks, denoted by $A = (A_{ij})_{\nu \times \nu}$ the blocked matrix.

Note that the system (1.1) associated to a representation V becomes a special case of the System (2.1) with rank $n = m\nu$. Actually, assume $m = \dim(V)$, then the system (1.1) associated to V is an $m\nu \times m\nu$ system, where $u = \text{diag}(u_1 I_m, \dots, u_\nu I_m)$, with distinct u_1, \dots, u_ν and multiplicity m, \dots, m , and the residue $A = -\hbar \mathbf{E}^V = -(\hbar e_{ij}^V)_{\nu \times \nu}$ is divided into (m, \dots, m) -blocks.

2.1 Notations and Basic Properties

To explicitly express the (formal) power series solution of system (2.1) under the above assumptions, we need to introduce the following notations and results. They can be found in monographs related to analytic ODEs, such as [2], or verified directly.

Notation 2.1. Denote $\tilde{\mathbb{C}} = \{re^{i\theta} : r > 0, \theta \in \mathbb{R}\}$ as the universal covering space of $\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$. For a matrix X and an invertible matrix D , denote $\text{Ad}(D)X := DXD^{-1}$. Denote the operator A^r and B^l as

$$A^r \cdot X := XA, \quad X \cdot B^l := BX. \quad (2.2)$$

For a matrix-valued function $F(z) = \sum_{p=0}^{\infty} F_p z^p$, denote

$$F(A^r) \cdot X := \sum_{p=0}^{\infty} F_p X A^p, \quad X \cdot F(B^l) := \sum_{p=0}^{\infty} B^p X F_p. \quad (2.3)$$

For $\nu \times \nu$ (block) matrix $A = (A_{ij})_{\nu \times \nu}$,

- denote A_{*j} as the j -th column of A ;
- denote $A_{\hat{i}j}$ as the j -th column of A but delete the i -th row;
- denote $A_{\hat{i}\hat{j}}$ as the matrix A with the i -th row and j -th column;
- denote $A_{\hat{i}*}$ as the matrix A with the i -th row,

and similarly define $A_{i*}, A_{i\hat{j}}, A_{*j}$. For example, we have

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} A_{11} & A_{1\hat{1}} \\ A_{\hat{1}1} & A_{\hat{1}\hat{1}} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} A_{\hat{\nu}\hat{\nu}} & A_{\hat{\nu}\nu} \\ A_{\nu\hat{\nu}} & A_{\nu\nu} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Denote the projection operator δ_u on $\nu \times \nu$ block matrix A as

$$\delta_u A := \text{diag}(A_{11}, \dots, A_{\nu\nu}). \quad (2.4)$$

Definition 2.2. Let $\text{Eigen}(A)$ denote the set of eigenvalues of matrix A . If

$$(\text{Eigen}(A) - \text{Eigen}(A)) \cap \mathbb{Z} = \{0\},$$

i.e. the difference between two eigenvalues of A does not take non-zero integers, we call A **non-resonant**. Otherwise, A is called **resonant**.

Definition 2.3. Define the k -th **recursive matrix** $L_k(z)$ of system (2.1) for $k = 0, 1, \dots, \nu$, as a $(\nu - 1) \times (\nu - 1)$ -block matrix with indices $(1, \dots, k - 1, k + 1, \dots, \nu)$,

$$L_k(z) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{u_k I - u_{\hat{k}\hat{k}}} \left((zI + A_{\hat{k}\hat{k}}) - A_{\hat{k}k} \frac{1}{zI + A_{kk}} A_{k\hat{k}} \right) & ; k = 1, \dots, \nu \\ -u^{-1}(zI + A) & ; k = 0 \end{cases}. \quad (2.5)$$

The following proposition is then given by a direct computation.

Proposition 2.4 (Formal solutions at irregular singularity). *If $A_{11}, \dots, A_{\nu\nu}$ are all non-resonant, then system (2.1) has a unique formal series solution of the following form*

$$F^{[\infty]}(z) = H^{[\infty]}(z) \cdot z^{\delta_u A} e^{uz}, \quad (2.6)$$

where

$$H^{[\infty]}(z) = I + \sum_{p=1}^{\infty} H_p^{[\infty]} z^{-p},$$

is a formal power series of $n \times n$ matrices. The solution $F^{[\infty]}(z)$ is called the **canonical formal fundamental solution** at $z = \infty$. For $k = 1, \dots, \nu$, we have

$$(H_p^{[\infty]})_{\hat{k}k} = \left(\prod_{m=1}^{\overleftarrow{p-1}} L_k(m - A_{kk}^r) \right) \cdot \left(\frac{1}{u_k I - u_{\hat{k}\hat{k}}} A_{\hat{k}k} \right), \quad (2.7a)$$

$$(H_p^{[\infty]})_{kk} = -\frac{1}{p - A_{kk}^r + A_{kk}} A_{k\hat{k}} \left(\prod_{m=1}^{\overleftarrow{p-1}} L_k(m - A_{kk}^r) \right) \cdot \left(\frac{1}{u_k I - u_{\hat{k}\hat{k}}} A_{\hat{k}k} \right), \quad (2.7b)$$

and we called $\delta_u A$ the **formal monodromy matrix** of $F^{[\infty]}(z)$, where $L_k(z)$ is defined in (2.5), $L_k(m - A_{kk}^r)$ is defined in (2.3).

Definition 2.5. Define the **anti-Stokes lines** of system (2.1) as the rays for which the arguments take the following values

$$\text{aS}(u) := \bigcup_{\substack{1 \leq i, j \leq \nu \\ i \neq j}} (-\arg(u_i - u_j) + 2\pi\mathbb{Z}) \subseteq \mathbb{R}, \quad (2.8)$$

The elements of (2.8) are denoted as $(\tau_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ and are arranged as $\dots < \tau_i < \tau_{i+1} < \dots$, and are called the **anti-Stokes arguments**.

It is direct to see that the anti-Stokes arguments $(\tau_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ are periodic. That is, there exists an l such that for any index i , we have $\tau_{i+l} = \tau_i + \pi$.

Proposition 2.6 (Analytic solutions at irregular singularity, [2]). *For $d \in (\tau_i, \tau_{i+1})$, there exists a unique analytic function $H_d(z)$ on $\tilde{\mathbb{C}}$, which is asymptotic to $H^{[\infty]}(z)$ on the sector*

$$\text{Sect}_d := \left\{ z \in \tilde{\mathbb{C}} : \arg z \in \left(\tau_i - \frac{\pi}{2}, \tau_{i+1} + \frac{\pi}{2} \right) \right\}, \quad (2.9)$$

such that the analytic function

$$F_d(z) := H_d(z) \cdot z^{\delta_u A} e^{uz}, \quad (2.10)$$

is a solution of system (2.1). We call $F_d(z)$ the **canonical (analytic) fundamental solution** at $z = \infty$.

The first part of the following proposition is well known from the general theory of linear differential equation (see e.g., [2, Chapter 2]) and the second part is given by a direct computation.

Proposition 2.7 (Solutions at regular singularity). *If A is non-resonant, then system (2.1) has a unique formal series solution of the following form*

$$F^{[0]}(z) = H^{[0]}(z) \cdot z^A = \left(I + \sum_{p=1}^{\infty} H_p^{[0]} z^p \right) \cdot z^A, \quad (2.11)$$

The series (2.11) is a convergent series with an infinite radius of convergence, called the **canonical fundamental solution** at $z = 0$. If we introduce

$$H^{[k]}(z) = I + \sum_{p=1}^{\infty} H_p^{[k]} z^p := H^{[0]}(z) e^{-u_k z}, \quad k = 0, 1, \dots, \nu, \quad (2.12)$$

then we have for $k = 1, \dots, \nu$,

$$(H_p^{[k]})_{\hat{k}*} = \left(\prod_{m=-p}^{\overleftarrow{-1}} L_k(m - A^r) \right)^{-1} \cdot I_{\hat{k}*}, \quad (2.13a)$$

$$(H_p^{[k]})_{k*} = -\frac{1}{-p - A^r + A_{\hat{k}k}} A_{k\hat{k}} \left(\prod_{m=-p}^{\overleftarrow{-1}} L_k(m - A^r) \right)^{-1} \cdot I_{\hat{k}*}; \quad (2.13b)$$

for $k = 0$, we conveniently assume that $u_k = 0$, and we have

$$H_p^{[0]} = \left(\prod_{m=-p}^{\overleftarrow{-1}} L_0(m - A^r) \right)^{-1} \cdot I, \quad (2.13c)$$

where $L_0(z)$ is defined in (2.5).

For convenience, we shall always set

$$H_0^{[k]} = I, \quad k = 0, 1, \dots, \nu, \infty. \quad (2.14)$$

Definition 2.8. (Monodromy data) Suppose that $A_{11}, \dots, A_{\nu\nu}$ are all non-resonant, $d \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \text{aS}(u)$ do not take the anti-Stokes arguments of system (2.1), $\tau \in \text{aS}(u)$ take the anti-Stokes arguments.

- Denote the following $\nu \times \nu$ block constant matrices

$$S_{[\tau]}(u, A) := F_{\tau+\varepsilon}(z)^{-1} F_{\tau-\varepsilon}(z), \quad \tau \in \text{aS}(u), \quad \varepsilon > 0 \text{ sufficiently small}, \quad (2.15a)$$

$$S_d^{\pm}(u, A) := F_{d \pm \pi}(z)^{-1} F_d(z), \quad d \notin \text{aS}(u), \quad (2.15b)$$

$$S_d(u, A) := S_d^+(u, A) - S_d^-(u, A). \quad (2.15c)$$

We call $S_{[\tau]}$ the **Stokes matrix** with respect to the anti-Stokes direction τ , and S_d the **(normalized) Stokes matrix** (in direction d);

- We additionally assume that A is non-resonant. Denote the following $\nu \times \nu$ block constant matrices

$$C_d(u, A) := F_d(z)^{-1} F^{[0]}(z), \quad (2.16)$$

$$e^{2\pi i M_d(u, A)} := F_d(z)^{-1} F_d(z e^{2\pi i}), \quad (2.17)$$

where M_d is the unique matrix that satisfies (2.17) and $\text{Eigen}(M_d) = \text{Eigen}(A)$. We call C_d the **central connection matrix** (in direction d), M_d the **monodromy matrix** (in direction d), and $e^{2\pi i M_d}$ the **monodromy factor** (in direction d).

When there is no ambiguity, we will omit u, A for $S_{[\tau]}(u, A), S_d^{\pm}(u, A), C_d(u, A), M_d(u, A)$.

The Stokes matrices of the system at the irregular singularity fully reflects the Stokes phenomenon of its canonical fundamental solutions. This paper will frequently use the following properties of these monodromy data, which can be directly verified from the definition.

Proposition 2.9. *Suppose that $A_{11}, \dots, A_{\nu\nu}$ are all non-resonant, $d \in \mathbb{R}$ does not coincide with the anti-Stokes arguments of system (2.1), then we have*

$$e^{2\pi i M_d} = (S_d^-)^{-1} \cdot e^{2\pi i \delta_u A} \cdot S_d^+, \quad (2.18a)$$

$$S_{d+2k\pi}^{\pm} = e^{-2k\pi i \delta_u A} \cdot S_d^{\pm} \cdot e^{2k\pi i \delta_u A}, \quad k \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad (2.18b)$$

$$S_{d \mp \pi}^{\pm} = (S_d^{\mp})^{-1}, \quad (2.18c)$$

$$S_d^{\pm}(cu + c_0 I, \text{Ad}(D)A + c_1 I) = \text{Ad}(Dc^{\delta_u A}) S_{d+\arg c}^{\pm}(u, A), \quad c \neq 0, \delta_u D = D, \quad (2.18d)$$

$$S_d^{\pm}(-u^{\top}, -A^{\top}) = S_d^{\pm}(u, A)^{-\top}. \quad (2.18e)$$

If we additionally assume that A is non-resonant, then

$$M_d = C_d \cdot A \cdot C_d^{-1}, \quad (2.19a)$$

$$C_{d+2k\pi} = e^{-2k\pi i \delta_u A} \cdot C_d \cdot e^{2k\pi i A}, \quad k \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad (2.19b)$$

$$C_{d \pm \pi} = S_d^\pm \cdot C_d, \quad (2.19c)$$

$$C_d(cu + c_0 I, \text{Ad}(D)A + c_1 I) = D c^{\delta_u A} \cdot C_{d+\arg c}(u, A) \cdot c^{-A} D^{-1}, \quad c \neq 0, \delta_u D = D, \quad (2.19d)$$

$$C_d(-u^\top, -A^\top) = C_d(u, A)^{-\top}. \quad (2.19e)$$

Proposition 2.10 (see e.g., [2]). For $j \neq k$ and anti-Stokes arguments $(\tau_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$,

- the diagonal blocks of $S_{[\tau_i]}$ are identity matrices;
- if $-\arg(u_k - u_j) \notin \tau_i + 2\pi\mathbb{Z}$, then $(S_{[\tau_i]})_{jk} = 0$;
- if $-\arg(u_k - u_j) \in \tau_i + 2\pi\mathbb{Z}$, then $(S_{[\tau_i]})_{jk} = (S_{\tau_i \pm \varepsilon})_{jk}$, where $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small;
- take $l \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $\tau_{i+l} = \tau_i + \pi$. If $d \in (\tau_i, \tau_{i+1})$, then

$$S_d^+ = S_{[\tau_{i+l}]} \cdots S_{[\tau_{i+2}]} S_{[\tau_{i+1}]}, \quad S_d^- = S_{[\tau_{i-l+1}]}^{-1} \cdots S_{[\tau_{i-1}]}^{-1} S_{[\tau_i]}^{-1}. \quad (2.20)$$

Proposition 2.11 (see e.g., [2]). Suppose that $d \in \mathbb{R}$ does not take the anti-Stokes arguments of system (2.1), and

$$\text{Im}(u_1 e^{id}) > \text{Im}(u_2 e^{id}) > \cdots > \text{Im}(u_\nu e^{id}), \quad (2.21)$$

- then the Stokes matrices S_d^+, S_d^- are block upper triangular matrix and lower triangular matrix respectively, with the identity matrix as the diagonal block;
- we have

$$(S_d)_{i,i+1} = (S_{[\tau_+]})_{i,i+1}, \quad \tau_+ = -\arg(u_{i+1} - u_i) \in (d, d + \pi), \quad (2.22a)$$

$$(S_d)_{i+1,i} = (S_{[\tau_-]})_{i+1,i}, \quad \tau_- = -\arg(u_i - u_{i+1}) \in (d - \pi, d). \quad (2.22b)$$

Proposition 2.10 and Proposition 2.11 each provide the basic structure and fundamental relations of $S_{[t]}$ and S_d , respectively. For example, in the generic case, each S_d^\pm has $\frac{n(n-1)}{2}$ nonzero entries. Therefore, the Stokes matrix S_d defined by (2.15c) generally has $n^2 - n$ nonzero entries other than diagonal entries, and it can directly recover S_d^\pm . In Section 4, we will introduce how to recover all the Stokes matrices $S_{[t]}$ from S_d for a given d . If condition (2.21) is not satisfied for a direction $d \in \text{aS}(u)$, then there exists a unique permutation of matrix indices such that (2.21) is valid and the corresponding Stokes matrices S_d^+, S_d^- are (blocked) upper and lower triangular matrices.

2.2 Borel-Laplace Transform

The definitions of the Borel transform and the Laplace transform used in this paper will be slightly different from the ones commonly used. Under our definitions, the Borel transform and the Laplace transform of the solution to the system (2.1) both satisfy the same new system (2.29).

Definition 2.12. Define the **formal Borel transform** \mathcal{B} at $z = \infty$ and the **formal Laplace transform** \mathcal{L} at $z = 0$ by


$$\mathcal{B} \left(\sum_{p=0}^{\infty} a_p z^{-p-s} e^{u_0 z} \right) := \sum_{p=0}^{\infty} a_p \frac{(u_0 - \xi)^{p+s}}{(p+s)!}, \quad u_0 \in \mathbb{C}, \quad (2.23)$$

$$\mathcal{L} \left(\sum_{p=0}^{\infty} a_p z^{p-s} e^{u_0 z} \right) := \sum_{p=0}^{\infty} a_p (\xi - u_0)^{-p+s} (p-s-1)!, \quad u_0 \in \mathbb{C}. \quad (2.24)$$

For the analytic function $f(z)$ on the logarithmic Riemann surface around $z = \infty$, define the **analytic Borel transform** \mathcal{B}_d with respect to direction d by

$$(\mathcal{B}_d f)(\xi) := \frac{1}{2\pi i} \left(\int_{N e^{i(d+\frac{\pi+\varepsilon}{2})}}^{\infty e^{i(d+\frac{\pi+\varepsilon}{2})}} + \int_{\gamma} + \int_{\infty e^{i(d-\frac{\pi+\varepsilon}{2})}}^{N e^{i(d-\frac{\pi+\varepsilon}{2})}} \right) f(z) e^{-\xi z} \frac{dz}{z}, \quad (2.25)$$

where $N > 0$ is sufficiently large, $\varepsilon > 0$ is sufficiently small. The integration path is taken as follows



For the analytic function $f(z)$ on the logarithmic Riemann surface around $z = 0$, define the **analytic Laplace transform** \mathcal{L}_d with respect to direction d by

$$(\mathcal{L}_d f)(\xi) := \int_0^{\infty e^{id}} f(z) e^{-\xi z} \frac{dz}{z}. \quad (2.26)$$

It can be seen that for an appropriate complex number ξ , both (2.25) and (2.26) are meaningful without the need to impose any argument requirements on $u_0 - \xi$ or $\xi - u_0$. However, to make the formal transformation (2.23) and (2.24) valid, ξ cannot be just some complex numbers, we must specify the arguments of $u_0 - \xi$ and $\xi - u_0$, respectively. Therefore, in order to establish the connection between the formal Borel/Laplace transform and the analytic Borel/Laplace transform, it is necessary to clarify the argument conditions as follows.

Lemma 2.13. *Suppose that $\tilde{f}(z) = \sum_{p=0}^{\infty} a_p z^{-p-s} e^{u_0 z}$ is a formal series at $z = \infty$ such that $(\mathcal{B}\tilde{f})(\xi)$ is a convergent series at $\xi = u_0$, and an analytic function $f(z) e^{-u_0 z}$ is asymptotic to $\tilde{f}(z) e^{-u_0 z}$ on the sectorial region $\{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| > N, \arg z \in (\tau_i - \frac{\pi}{2}, \tau_{i+1} + \frac{\pi}{2})\}$. If $d \in (\tau_i, \tau_{i+1})$, then*

- $(\mathcal{B}_d f)(\xi)$ is a convergent integral for $\arg(u_0 - \xi) \in (-d - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}, -d + \frac{\varepsilon}{2})$ with sufficiently small ε , and is compatible with each other when d varies;
- by assigning the argument $\arg(u_0 - \xi) \in (-\tau_{i+1}, -\tau_i)$ in series $(\mathcal{B}\tilde{f})(\xi)$ for sufficiently small $u_0 - \xi$, we have

$$(\mathcal{B}\tilde{f})(\xi) = (\mathcal{B}_d f)(\xi). \quad (2.27)$$

Lemma 2.14. *Suppose that $f(z) = \sum_{p=0}^{\infty} a_p z^{p-s} e^{u_0 z}$ is a (formal) series at $z = 0$ such that $(\mathcal{L}f)(\xi)$ is a convergent series at $\xi = \infty$, and $\operatorname{Re} s < 1$. Then*

- $(\mathcal{L}_d f)(\xi)$ is a convergent integral for $\arg \xi \in (-d - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}, -d + \frac{\varepsilon}{2})$ with sufficiently large ξ , sufficiently small ε , and is compatible with each other when d varies;
- by assigning the argument $\arg(\xi - u_0) \in (-d - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}, -d + \frac{\varepsilon}{2})$ in series $(\mathcal{L}f)(\xi)$ with sufficiently large ξ , we have

$$(\mathcal{L}f)(\xi) = (\mathcal{L}_d f)(\xi). \quad (2.28)$$

One checks that the formal/analytic solutions $F(z)$ of the confluent hypergeometric system (2.1), after the formal/analytic Borel/Laplace transform, will be transformed into the formal/analytic solutions $Y(\xi)$ of the system

$$(u - \xi I) \frac{d}{d\xi} Y(\xi) = A \cdot Y(\xi). \quad (2.29)$$

Therefore, the analytic solution $Y(\xi)$ is defined on the universal covering space of $\mathbb{C} \setminus \{u_1, \dots, u_\nu\}$, denoted as $\tilde{\mathbb{C}}(u)$. We will parameterize the elements in $\tilde{\mathbb{C}}(u)$ in two equivalent ways. One is by considering the arguments $\arg(u_k - \xi)$. The space $\tilde{\mathbb{C}}(u)$ with such parametrization is denoted by $\tilde{\mathbb{C}}^{\mathcal{B}}(u)$; the other is by considering the arguments $\arg(\xi - u_k)$. The same space $\tilde{\mathbb{C}}(u)$ with the latter parametrization is denoted by $\tilde{\mathbb{C}}^{\mathcal{L}}(u)$. Furthermore, we will consider the following principal branch

$$\mathbb{C}_d(u) := \mathbb{C} \setminus \bigcup_{k=1}^{\nu} \{\xi \in \mathbb{C} : \arg(\xi - u_k) = -d\}, \quad (2.30)$$

and the parameterizations defined on this set (here we use the upper indices to stress the different parameterization on the same space)

$$\mathbb{C}_d^{\mathcal{B}}(u) := \{\xi \in \tilde{\mathbb{C}}^{\mathcal{B}}(u) : \arg(u_k - \xi) \in (-d - \pi, -d + \pi), \text{ for all } k = 1, \dots, \nu\}, \quad (2.31a)$$

$$\mathbb{C}_d^{\mathcal{L}}(u) := \{\xi \in \tilde{\mathbb{C}}^{\mathcal{L}}(u) : \arg(\xi - u_k) \in (-d \pm \pi - \pi, -d \pm \pi + \pi), \text{ for all } k = 1, \dots, \nu\}. \quad (2.31b)$$

By applying Lemma 2.13 and 2.14, we obtain the following result:

- If we parameterize $\mathbb{C}_d(u)$ by $\mathbb{C}_d^{\mathcal{B}}(u)$, i.e., we assign the argument $\arg(u_k - \xi) \in (-d - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}, -d + \frac{\varepsilon}{2})$, then

$$(\mathcal{B}_d F_d)(\xi)_{*k} = \sum_{p=0}^{\infty} (H_p^{[\infty]})_{*k} \frac{(u_k - \xi)^{pI - A_{kk}}}{(pI - A_{kk})!}, \quad (2.32a)$$

$$(\mathcal{B}_d F_d)(\xi) = \sum_{p=0}^{\infty} H_p^{[\infty]} \frac{(u - \xi)^{pI - \delta_u A}}{(pI - \delta_u A)!}. \quad (2.32b)$$

Lemma 2.13 ensures that the left side of (2.32a) is a convergent definite integral, and the right side of (2.32a) is a convergent power series at $\xi = u_k$, which clarifies the meaning of (2.32a). We interpret (2.32b) as the analytic continuation of (2.32a);

- If we parameterize $\mathbb{C}_{d \pm \pi}(u)$ by $\mathbb{C}_{d \pm \pi}^{\mathcal{L}}(u)$, i.e., we assign the argument $\arg(\xi - u_k) \in (-d - \frac{\pi}{2}, -d + \frac{\pi}{2})$, then

$$(\mathcal{L}_d F^{[0]})(\xi) = \sum_{p=0}^{\infty} H_p^{[k]} ((p-1)I + A)! (\xi - u_k)^{-(pI+A)}, \quad k = 0, 1, \dots, \nu, \quad \operatorname{Re} \operatorname{Eigen}(A) > 0, \quad (2.33)$$

where ξ needs to be sufficiently large, and we conveniently assume that $u_0 = 0$.

It is directly to see that condition $\operatorname{Re} \operatorname{Eigen}(A) > 0$ is not essential, as it can always be achieved by replacing the residue matrix A with $A + cI$ instead.

2.3 Darboux's Method and Path Class with Arguments

The Darboux's method in this subsection refers to [1]. It was referred to the associate function method in [2, Chapter 9]. In this subsection, for canonical fundamental solution $F_d, F^{[0]}$, we will focus on the asymptotic behavior of $(\mathcal{B}_d F_d)(\xi), (\mathcal{L}_d F^{[0]})(\xi)$ at the singularities $\xi = u_1, \dots, u_\nu$ after analytic continuation. On the one hand, Proposition 2.20 states that these asymptotics can be used to give the monodromy data of the system (2.1). On the other hand, according to Darboux's method (Lemma 2.22), the same asymptotics can be expressed by the coefficients $H_p^{[k]}$. Therefore, we will ultimately be able to directly derive those monodromy data through the recursive matrix L_k applying (2.7a) and (2.13a). First, it follows from Definition 2.12 that

Lemma 2.15. $(\mathcal{L}_{d\pm\frac{\pi\pm\varepsilon}{2}} F_{d\pm\pi})(\xi)_{*t}$ is analytic on $\mathbb{C} \setminus \{\xi \in \mathbb{C} : \arg(\xi - u_t) = -d\}$.

Second, we have

Lemma 2.16. There exists a function $\text{hol}(u_s - \xi)$ holomorphic at $\xi = u_s$ such that on $\mathbb{C}_d^\beta(u)$

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathcal{B}_d F_d)(\xi)_{st} &= (I + O(u_s - \xi))(u_s - \xi)^{-A_{ss}} (A_{ss} - I)! \cdot \frac{e^{\pi i A_{ss}} (S_d^+)_{st} - e^{-\pi i A_{ss}} (S_d^-)_{st}}{2\pi i} \\ &\quad + \text{hol}(u_s - \xi), \quad \xi \rightarrow u_s. \end{aligned} \quad (2.34)$$

Proof. Without loss of generality, we assume that

$$\text{Re Eigen}(A) > 0, \quad \text{Eigen}(\delta_u A) \cap \mathbb{Z} = \emptyset. \quad (2.35)$$

Condition $\text{Re Eigen}(A) > 0$ ensures that

$$\mathcal{B}_d F_d = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \left(\mathcal{L}_{d+\frac{\pi+\varepsilon}{2}} - \mathcal{L}_{d-\frac{\pi+\varepsilon}{2}} \right) F_d = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \mathcal{L}_{d\pm\frac{\pi\pm\varepsilon}{2}} F_d \cdot \pm (I - e^{\mp 2\pi i M_d}).$$

Combining (2.19a) in Proposition 2.9, we have

$$\mathcal{B}_d F_d = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \mathcal{L}_{d\pm\frac{\pi\pm\varepsilon}{2}} F_{d\pm\pi} \cdot e^{\mp \pi i \delta_u A} (e^{\pi i \delta_u A} S_d^+ - e^{-\pi i \delta_u A} S_d^-). \quad (2.36)$$

From Lemma 2.15 and (2.32a), on $\mathbb{C}_d^\beta(u)$ we have

$$(\mathcal{B}_d F_d)_{st} = \frac{1}{2\pi i} (\mathcal{L}_{d\pm\frac{\pi\pm\varepsilon}{2}} F_{d\pm\pi})_{ss} \cdot e^{\mp \pi i A_{ss}} (e^{\pi i A_{ss}} (S_d^+)_{st} - e^{-\pi i A_{ss}} (S_d^-)_{st}) + \text{hol}(u_s - \xi), \quad (2.37a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathcal{B}_d F_d)_{ss} &= \frac{1}{2\pi i} (\mathcal{L}_{d\pm\frac{\pi\pm\varepsilon}{2}} F_{d\pm\pi})_{ss} \cdot e^{\mp \pi i A_{ss}} (e^{\pi i A_{ss}} - e^{-\pi i A_{ss}}) + \text{hol}(u_s - \xi) \\ &= (I + O(u_s - \xi)) \frac{(u_s - \xi)^{-A_{ss}}}{(-A_{ss})!}, \quad \xi \rightarrow u_s, \end{aligned} \quad (2.37b)$$

Condition $\text{Eigen}(\delta_u A) \cap \mathbb{Z} = \emptyset$ ensures that we can substitute (2.37b) into (2.37a), and deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathcal{B}_d F_d)(\xi)_{st} &= (I + O(u_s - \xi)) \frac{(u_s - \xi)^{-A_{ss}}}{(-A_{ss})!} \cdot \frac{1}{e^{\pi i A_{ss}} - e^{-\pi i A_{ss}}} \left(e^{\pi i A_{ss}} (S_d^+)_{st} - e^{-\pi i A_{ss}} (S_d^-)_{st} \right) \\ &\quad + \text{hol}(u_s - \xi), \end{aligned} \quad (2.38)$$

thus we finish the proof. \square

Corollary 2.17. If $Y(\xi)$ is a solution of system (2.29), then

1. there exists a unique $n_s \times n$ -matrix C_{s*} and an analytic function $\text{hol}(\xi - u_s)$ at $\xi = u_s$ such that

$$Y(\xi)_{s*} = (I + O(\xi - u_s))(\xi - u_s)^{-A_{ss}} \cdot C_{s*} + \text{hol}(\xi - u_s), \quad \xi \rightarrow u_s; \quad (2.39)$$

2. there exists a unique $n \times n$ -matrix C such that

$$Y(\xi) = (I + O(-\xi))(-\xi)^{-A} \cdot C, \quad \xi \rightarrow \infty. \quad (2.40)$$

Proof. The uniqueness is direct; we will only show the existence. Since there exists a constant matrix C such that $Y(\xi) = (\mathcal{B}_d F_d)(\xi) \cdot C$, by Lemma 2.16, we can prove (2.39). Similarly, from (2.33), we can obtain (2.40). \square

Definition 2.18. For $u_1, \dots, u_\nu \in \mathbb{C}$, $u_\infty := \infty$ and $s, t \in \{1, \dots, \nu, \infty\}$, take γ_{st} as a path in $\mathbb{C} \setminus \{u_1, \dots, u_\nu\}$ from u_s to u_t with the following real arguments

$$\theta_s = \begin{cases} \lim_{\xi \in \gamma_{st}, \xi \rightarrow u_s} \arg(\xi - u_s), & s \neq \infty \\ \lim_{\xi \in \gamma_{st}, \xi \rightarrow u_s} \arg(c - \xi), \quad \forall c \in \mathbb{C}, & s = \infty \end{cases}, \quad (2.41a)$$

$$\theta_t = \begin{cases} \lim_{\xi \in \gamma_{st}, \xi \rightarrow u_t} \arg(u_t - \xi), & t \neq \infty \\ \lim_{\xi \in \gamma_{st}, \xi \rightarrow u_t} \arg(\xi - c), \quad \forall c \in \mathbb{C}, & t = \infty \end{cases}. \quad (2.41b)$$

We call the equivalence classes of paths with real arguments $\gamma_{st} = [\gamma_{st}, \theta_s, \theta_t]$ under fixed-endpoint homotopy as the **path class with arguments**. For distinction, we always use boldface γ_{st} to represent the path class with arguments and regular typeface γ_{st} to represent its representative element.

Corollary 2.17 and the non-resonant condition on A and the diagonal block A_{ss} ensure that the following definition is well-defined.

Definition 2.19. Denote $n_\infty := n_1 + \dots + n_\nu$. If we continue in the reverse direction along γ_{st} , then we will take $\mathcal{S}_{u,A}(\gamma_{st}, \theta_s, \theta_t)$ as an $n_s \times n_t$ -matrix defined by

$$\sum_{p=0}^{\infty} (H_p^{[\infty]})_{st} \frac{(u_t - \xi)^{pI - A_{tt}}}{(pI - A_{tt})!} = (I + O(\xi - u_s))(\xi - u_s)^{-A_{ss}} (A_{ss} - I)! \cdot \frac{\mathcal{S}_{u,A}(\gamma_{st}, \theta_s, \theta_t)}{2\pi i} + \text{hol}(\xi - u_s), \quad s \neq \infty, \quad t \neq \infty, \quad (2.42a)$$

$$\sum_{p=0}^{\infty} (H_p^{[\infty]})_{*t} \frac{(u_t - \xi)^{pI - A_{tt}}}{(pI - A_{tt})!} = (I + O(-\xi))(-\xi)^{-A} (A - I)! \cdot \frac{\mathcal{S}_{u,A}(\gamma_{\infty t}, \theta_\infty, \theta_t)}{2\pi i}, \quad s = \infty, \quad t \neq \infty, \quad (2.42b)$$

$$\sum_{p=0}^{\infty} (H_p^{[s]})_{s*} \frac{((p-1)I + A)!(\xi - u_s)^{-(pI+A)}}{(A-I)!(-A)!} = (I + O(\xi - u_s))(\xi - u_s)^{-A_{ss}} (A_{ss} - I)! \cdot \frac{\mathcal{S}_{u,A}(\gamma_{s\infty}, \theta_s, \theta_\infty)}{2\pi i} + \text{hol}(\xi - u_s), \quad s \neq \infty, \quad t = \infty, \quad (2.42c)$$

$$\sum_{p=0}^{\infty} H_p^{[0]} \frac{((p-1)I + A)!\xi^{-(pI+A)}}{(A-I)!(-A)!} = (I + O(-\xi))(-\xi)^{-A} (A - I)! \cdot \frac{\mathcal{S}_{u,A}(\gamma_{\infty\infty}, \theta_\infty^{(s)}, \theta_\infty^{(t)})}{2\pi i}, \quad s = \infty, \quad t = \infty. \quad (2.42d)$$

Proposition 2.20. For distinct $s, t \in \{1, \dots, \nu\}$, denote the path class with arguments $\gamma_{st}^{(d)}$ as a path in $\mathbb{C}_d(u)$ from u_s to u_t with arguments

$$\theta_s \in \begin{cases} (-d - 2\pi, -d), & \text{Im}(u_s e^{id}) > \text{Im}(u_t e^{id}) \\ (-d, -d + 2\pi), & \text{Im}(u_s e^{id}) < \text{Im}(u_t e^{id}) \end{cases}, \quad \theta_t \in (-d - \pi, -d + \pi), \quad (2.43)$$

and denote the path class with arguments $\gamma_{s\infty}^{(d)} := ([u_s, \infty e^{-id}], -d, -d)$, $\gamma_{\infty t}^{(d)} := ((\infty e^{-id}, u_t], -d, -d)$ as a ray (see Figure 1), then we have

$$\mathcal{S}_{u,A}(\gamma_{st}^{(d)}) = (S_d)_{st}, \quad \mathcal{S}_{u,A}(\gamma_{s\infty}^{(d)}) = (C_d)_{s*} \cdot (e^{\pi i A} - e^{-\pi i A}), \quad \mathcal{S}_{u,A}(\gamma_{\infty t}^{(d)}) = (e^{\pi i A} - e^{-\pi i A}) \cdot (C_d^{-1})_{*t}. \quad (2.44)$$

Denote the path class with arguments (e_s^l) e_s^r as a simple loop starting from u_s in a (counter-) clockwise direction with arguments $\theta_s = \theta_t$ (see Figure 1), then we have

$$\mathcal{S}_{u,A}(e_s^l) = e^{2\pi i A_{ss}} - I, \quad \mathcal{S}_{u,A}(e_s^r) = I - e^{-2\pi i A_{ss}}, \quad A_{\infty\infty} := A. \quad (2.45)$$




Figure 1: Examples of $\gamma_{st}^{(d)}$ defined in Proposition 2.20 for $\nu = 3$

Proof. From (2.32a), (2.33), we reduce the series in (2.42a), (2.42c) to $(\mathcal{B}_d F_d)(\xi)$, $(\mathcal{L}_d F^{[0]})(\xi) \frac{1}{(A-I)!(-A)!}$. Thus, (2.45) follows from the definition; $\mathcal{S}_{u,A}(\gamma_{st}^{(d)}) = (S_d)_{st}$ is a direct corollary of Lemma 2.16. Here, ξ originates from the terminal point u_t , and is continued in the reverse direction along $\gamma_{st}^{(d)}$ to obtain the left-hand side of (2.34).

We can rewrite (2.37b) as

$$(\mathcal{L}_{d \pm \frac{\pi \pm \varepsilon}{2}} F_{d \pm \pi})_{ss} = (I + O(\xi - u_s))(\xi - u_s)^{-A_{ss}} (A_{ss} - I)! + \text{hol}(\xi - u_s), \quad (2.46)$$

where $\arg(\xi - u_s) \in (-(d \pm \pi) - \pi, -(d \pm \pi) + \pi)$. Thus we have

$$(\mathcal{L}_{d \pm \frac{\pi \pm \varepsilon}{2}} F^{[0]})_{s*} = (I + O(\xi - u_s))(\xi - u_s)^{-A_{ss}} (A_{ss} - I)! \cdot (C_{d \pm \pi})_{s*} + \text{hol}(\xi - u_s). \quad (2.47)$$

Here, ξ originates from the terminal point ∞ , and is continued in the reverse direction along $\gamma_{s\infty}^{(d \pm \pi)}$ to obtain the left-hand side of (2.47). Thus, we have completed the proof of (2.44). \square

Corollary 2.21. For $\xi \rightarrow \infty$, we have the following connection formula

$$(\mathcal{L}_d F^{[0]})(\xi) \frac{1}{(A-I)!(-A)!} = (\mathcal{B}_d F_d)(\xi) \cdot C_d \left(\frac{u_k - \xi}{\xi - u_k} \right)^A, \quad \arg(u_k - \xi) \in (-d - \pi, -d + \pi). \quad (2.48)$$

The monodromy factor of $\mathcal{B}_d F_d$ on $\mathbb{C}_d^{\mathbb{B}}(u)$ at $\xi = u_s$ (see Definition 2.8) is

$$U_d^{[m]} = \begin{cases} (I - E_{ss}(S_d^{\pm} - e^{\mp 2\pi i \delta_u A} S_d^{\mp}))^{\pm 1}, & s \neq \infty \\ e^{-2\pi i M_d}, & s = \infty \end{cases}. \quad (2.49)$$

If we consider a path class with arguments γ that can be homotopic to a segment or ray, then $\mathcal{S}_{u,A}(\gamma)$ can be directly related to the coefficients $(H_p^{[\infty]})_{p \in \mathbb{N}}$ or $(H_p^{[k]})_{p \in \mathbb{N}}$ of the corresponding canonical fundamental solutions $F^{[\infty]}$ or $F^{[k]}$, respectively.

Lemma 2.22 (Darboux's method). [1] Let $(c_p)_{p \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of complex numbers, $\alpha \geq 1$ be a real number, and $\beta, C \in \mathbb{C}$.

- If the following limit exists

$$\lim_{p \rightarrow \infty} p^{-\alpha+1} (v_t - v_s)^{p-\beta} \cdot c_p = C \cdot (v_t - v_s)^{-\alpha}, \quad (2.50)$$

then the convergent power series $f(\xi) = \sum_{p=0}^{\infty} c_p (v_t - \xi)^{p-\beta}$ can be analytically continued along the segment $[v_s, v_t]$ in the reverse direction, such that

$$f(\xi) = C \cdot (\xi - v_s)^{-\alpha} (\alpha - 1)! + o((\xi - v_s)^{-\alpha}), \quad \xi \rightarrow v_s, \xi \in [v_s, v_t]. \quad (2.51)$$


Here we fixed the arguments $\theta_s = \theta_t = \arg(v_t - v_s)$, making $[v_s, v_t]$ a path class with arguments.

- If the following limit exists

$$\lim_{p \rightarrow \infty} p^{-\alpha+1} (v_s - v_t)^{-p-\beta} \cdot c_p = C \cdot (v_s - v_t)^{-\alpha}, \quad (2.52)$$

then the convergent power series $f(\xi) = \sum_{p=0}^{\infty} c_p (\xi - v_t)^{-p-\beta}$ can be analytically continued along the ray $[v_s, \infty e^{i \arg(v_s - v_t)})$ in the reverse direction, such that

$$f(\xi) = C \cdot (\xi - v_s)^{-\alpha} (\alpha - 1)! + o((\xi - v_s)^{-\alpha}), \quad \xi \rightarrow v_s, \xi \in [v_s, \infty e^{i \arg(v_s - v_t)}). \quad (2.53)$$



Here we fixed the arguments $\theta_s = \theta_{\infty} = \arg(v_s - v_t)$, making $[v_s, \infty e^{i \arg(v_s - v_t)})$ a path class with arguments.

Corollary 2.23. Suppose that none of the elements u_1, \dots, u_{ν} lie inside the segment $[u_s, u_t]$, then we have

$$\mathcal{S}_{u,A}([u_s, u_t], -\tau, -\tau) = (S_{[\tau]})_{st}. \quad (2.54)$$

Proof. Since $[u_s, u_t] \simeq \gamma_{st}^{(\tau \pm \varepsilon)}$, from (2.44) in Proposition 2.20 we have $\mathcal{S}([u_s, u_t], -\tau, -\tau) = (S_{\tau \pm \varepsilon})_{st}$. Using Proposition 2.10, we concluded the proof. \square

Corollary 2.24. Suppose that $A, \delta_u A$ are diagonalizable, and fix the argument $\arg(u_t - u_s) = -\tau$. If the following limit exists, and none of u_1, \dots, u_{ν} lie inside the segment $[u_s, u_t]$ or the ray $[u_t, \infty e^{-i\tau})$, then we have

$$\lim_{p \rightarrow \infty} (u_t - u_s)^{A_{ss}} p^{-A_{ss}} \cdot \frac{(u_t - u_s)^p}{(p-1)!} (H_p^{[\infty]})_{st} \cdot p^{A_{tt}} (u_t - u_s)^{-A_{tt}} = \frac{(S_{[\tau]})_{st}}{2\pi i}, \quad (2.55a)$$

$$\lim_{p \rightarrow \infty} (u_t - u_s)^{A_{tt}} p^{-A_{tt}} \cdot (H_p^{[s]})_{t*} \frac{p!}{(u_t - u_s)^p} \cdot p^A (u_t - u_s)^{-A} = (C_{\tau \pm \varepsilon})_{t*}. \quad (2.55b)$$

Proof. Assume that A_{ss}, A_{tt} and A have diagonalization

$$\begin{aligned} P_s A_{ss} P_s^{-1} &= D_s = \text{diag}(\lambda_1^{(s)}, \dots, \lambda_{n_s}^{(s)}), \\ P_t A_{tt} P_t^{-1} &= D_t = \text{diag}(\lambda_1^{(t)}, \dots, \lambda_{n_t}^{(t)}), \\ P A P^{-1} &= D = \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n). \end{aligned}$$

Choose $c_i^{(s)}, c_j^{(t)} \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $\lambda_i^{(s)} + c_i^{(s)}, \lambda_j^{(t)} + c_j^{(t)} \geq 1$. By applying Corollary 2.23 and replacing the residue matrix A with $A + c_i^{(s)} I, A + c_j^{(t)} I$ respectively, from (2.18d) and (2.19d) in Proposition 2.9 we can rewrite (2.42a) and (2.42c) as

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{p=0}^{\infty} (P_s (H_p^{[\infty]})_{st} P_t^{-1})_{ij} \cdot \frac{(u_t - \xi)^{p - (\lambda_j^{(t)} + c_j^{(t)})}}{(p - (\lambda_j^{(t)} + c_j^{(t)}))!} \\ &= (\xi - u_s)^{-(\lambda_i^{(s)} + c_i^{(s)})} ((\lambda_i^{(s)} + c_i^{(s)}) - 1)! \cdot \frac{(P_s (S_{[\tau]})_{st} P_t^{-1})_{ij}}{2\pi i} + O((\xi - u_s)^{1 - (\lambda_i^{(s)} + c_i^{(s)})}), \end{aligned} \quad (2.56a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{p=0}^{\infty} (P_t (H_p^{[s]})_{t*} P^{-1})_{jl} \cdot (p - 1 + (\lambda_l + c_j^{(t)}))! (\xi - u_s)^{-(p + (\lambda_l + c_j^{(t)}))} \\ &= (\xi - u_t)^{-(\lambda_j^{(t)} + c_j^{(t)})} ((\lambda_j^{(t)} + c_j^{(t)}) - 1)! \cdot (P_t (C_{\tau \pm \varepsilon})_{t*} P^{-1})_{jl} + O((\xi - u_t)^{1 - (\lambda_j^{(t)} + c_j^{(t)})}), \end{aligned} \quad (2.56b)$$

with $\gamma_{st} = [u_s, u_t], \gamma_{t\infty} = [u_t, \infty e^{-i\tau}]$.

Let us only assume the existence of the limits in (2.55a), (2.55b). By applying Lemma 2.22 to (2.56a), (2.56b), we can deduce that (2.55a), (2.55b) holds entrywise, thus completing the proof. \square

We will provide the conditions for the existence of the limit in Corollary 2.24 in Section 3.

3 The Associated Difference Systems

In this section, we discuss the analytic property of the infinite matrix products in Corollary 2.24. We provide some explicit convergence conditions of the infinite matrix products, and interpret them as solutions of the closely related $\mu \times \mu$ -blocked difference equations for $k = 1, \dots, \nu$

$$\Psi(z+1) = L_k(z)\Psi(z). \quad (3.1)$$

3.1 Infinite Matrix Product as Solutions of Difference Systems

Let us first recall a bit more general case. Consider the $\mu \times \mu$ -blocked difference system

$$\Psi(z+1) = v\tilde{B}(z)\Psi(z), \quad (3.2)$$

where v is a diagonal matrix, and the coefficient matrix $\tilde{B}(z)$ has a convergent expansion of the following form at $z = \infty$,

$$\tilde{B}(z) = z \left(I + \frac{B}{z} + \sum_{p=2}^{\infty} \frac{B_p}{z^p} \right), \quad |z| > R. \quad (3.3)$$

Let us further impose the following conditions:

- $\tilde{B}(z)$ is a rational function with poles $\Lambda = \{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_m\}$ other than ∞ ;
- $v = \text{diag}(v_1 I_{n_1}, \dots, v_\mu I_{n_\mu})$ is invertible, where v_1, \dots, v_μ are distinct, with multiplicity n_1, \dots, n_μ ;
- Coefficients $B, (B_p)_{p \geq 2}$ of the system (3.3) is divided into (n_1, \dots, n_μ) -blocks, and we denote $B = (B_{ij})_{\mu \times \mu}$ as a $\mu \times \mu$ -block matrix.

Proposition 3.1. *Suppose that*

$$\frac{\varepsilon_B}{2} := \max\{\|B_{11}\|, \dots, \|B_{\mu\mu}\|\} < \frac{1}{4}. \quad (3.4)$$

For $z \notin \mathbb{Z}^{<0} + \Lambda$, if $|v_s| < \varepsilon|v_k|$ for every $k \neq s$, and for some sufficiently small $\varepsilon(z, \tilde{B}) > 0$, then the following limit exists

$$\lim_{p \rightarrow \infty} p^{-zI - B_{ss}} \frac{v_s^{-p}}{p!} \left(\prod_{m=1}^{\overleftarrow{p}} v\tilde{B}(m+z) \right)_{s*}. \quad (3.5)$$

For $z \notin \mathbb{Z}^{>0} + \Lambda$, if $|v_s| < \varepsilon|v_k|$ for every $k \neq s$, and sufficiently small $\varepsilon(z, \tilde{B}) > 0$, then the following limit exists

$$\lim_{p \rightarrow \infty} \left(\prod_{m=-p}^{\overleftarrow{-1}} v\tilde{B}(m+z) \right)_{*s} \frac{(-v_s)^{-p}}{p!} p^{zI + B_{ss}}. \quad (3.6)$$

Proof. Denote \mathcal{P}_{st} as the set of index sequences $(p_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \in \{1, \dots, \mu\}^{\mathbb{N}}$, where

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} p_i = s, \quad p_0 = t. \quad (3.7)$$

For $p \in \mathcal{P}_{st}$ and $m \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, denote

$$\beta_m^p(z) := \left(\prod_{k=1}^m \left(I + \frac{B_{p_m p_m}}{k+z} \right)^{-1} \right) \left(\delta_{p_m p_{m-1}} + \frac{B_{p_m p_{m-1}}}{m+z} + \sum_{p=2}^{\infty} \frac{(B_p)_{p_m p_{m-1}}}{(m+z)^p} \right) \prod_{k=1}^{m-1} \left(I + \frac{B_{p_{m-1} p_{m-1}}}{k+z} \right),$$

$$\beta^p(z) := \prod_{m=1}^{\overleftarrow{\infty}} \beta_m^p(z).$$

Note that for any $m \in \mathbb{N}^+$ there exist constants C_0, C_1 independent of p such that

$$\left\| \prod_{k=1}^m \left(I + \frac{B_{p_m p_m}}{k+z} \right)^{-1} \right\| \leq C_0(z, B) \cdot m^{\|B_{p_m p_m}\|}, \quad (3.8)$$

$$\left\| \prod_{k=1}^{m-1} \left(I + \frac{B_{p_{m-1} p_{m-1}}}{k+z} \right) \right\| \leq C_0(z, B) \cdot m^{\|B_{p_{m-1} p_{m-1}}\|}, \quad (3.9)$$

thus we have

$$\|\beta_m^p(z)\| \leq \begin{cases} \frac{C_1(z, \tilde{B})}{m^{1-\varepsilon_B}}, & p_m \neq p_{m-1} \\ 1 + \frac{C_1(z, \tilde{B})}{m^{2-\varepsilon_B}}, & p_m = p_{m-1} \end{cases}, \quad (3.10)$$

and $\beta^p(z)$ converges. To prove that the limit (3.5) exists, we only need to show that the series

$$\sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}_{st}} \varepsilon^{w(p)} \beta^p(z) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \varepsilon^n \sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}_{st}, w(p)=n} \beta^p(z) \quad (3.11)$$

is absolutely convergent, where $w(p) := \#\{i \in \mathbb{N}^+ : p_i \neq s\}$. Since

$$\sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}_{st}, w(p)=n} \|\beta^p(z)\| \leq 2^{n-1}(\mu-1)^n \cdot \left(\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{m^{2-2\varepsilon_B}} \right)^{2n} C_1(z, \tilde{B})^{2n} C_2(z, \tilde{B}), \quad (3.12)$$

the existence of the limit (3.5) is thus proved. The existence of the limit (3.6) is similar. \square

If the number of distinct diagonal elements of v is $\mu = 1$, then the control condition for v_s in Proposition 3.1 will automatically hold.

It is direct to verify that the limits (3.5) and (3.6) provide the canonical analytic solutions $\mathcal{L}^+(z; v_1, \dots, v_\mu)$, $\mathcal{L}^-(z; v_1, \dots, v_\mu)$ to the difference equation (3.2).

Definition 3.2. For a fixed invertible $v = \text{diag}(v_1 I_{n_1}, \dots, v_\mu I_{n_\mu})$, we introduce the canonical analytic solutions of (3.2), when the following limits exists

$$\mathcal{L}^+(1+z)^{-1} := v^{-(1+z)} \left(\lim_{p \rightarrow \infty} p^{-zI - \delta_v B} \frac{v^{-p}}{p!} \left(\prod_{m=1}^{\overleftarrow{p}} v \tilde{B}(m+z) \right) \right), \quad z \notin \mathbb{Z}^{<0} + \Lambda, \quad (3.13)$$

$$\mathcal{L}^-(z) := \left(\lim_{p \rightarrow \infty} \left(\prod_{m=-p}^{\overleftarrow{-1}} v \tilde{B}(m+z) \right) \frac{(-v)^{-p}}{p!} p^{zI + \delta_v B} \right) (-v)^z, \quad z \notin \mathbb{Z}^{>0} + \Lambda. \quad (3.14)$$

When the convergence conditions are invalid, the corresponding analytic functions obtained through analytic continuation are also denoted as $\mathcal{L}^+(1+z)^{-1}$, $\mathcal{L}^-(z)$.

Remark 3.3. The canonical solutions given in Definition 3.2 are the same as those discussed by Birkhoff [3], although the forms of the definitions differ slightly. Therefore, according to [3], the only singularities of $\mathcal{L}^+(z)^{-1}$ and $\mathcal{L}^-(z)$ are precisely $\mathbb{Z}^{<0} + \Lambda$ and $\mathbb{Z}^{>0} + \Lambda$.

Now back to our equation (3.1), in Proposition 3.1 and Definition 3.2, taking the diagonal matrix $v = \frac{1}{u_k I - u_{\hat{k}\hat{k}}}$, and the coefficient matrix $v\tilde{B}(z) = L_k(z)$, leads to the analytic matrix functions

$$\mathcal{L}_k^+(1+z)^{-1} := (u_k I - u_{\hat{k}\hat{k}})^{1+z} \left(\lim_{p \rightarrow \infty} p^{-zI - \delta_v B} \frac{(u_k I - u_{\hat{k}\hat{k}})^p}{p!} \left(\prod_{m=1}^{\overleftarrow{p}} L_k(m+z) \right) \right), \quad z \notin \mathbb{Z}^{<0} + \Lambda, \quad (3.15)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_k^-(z) := \left(\lim_{p \rightarrow \infty} \left(\prod_{m=-p}^{\overleftarrow{-1}} L_k(m+z) \right) \frac{(u_{\hat{k}\hat{k}} - u_k I)^p}{p!} p^{zI + \delta_v B} \right) (u_{\hat{k}\hat{k}} - u_k I)^{-z}, \quad z \notin \mathbb{Z}^{>0} + \Lambda. \quad (3.16)$$

and denote the canonical analytic solutions of the system (3.2) as $\mathcal{L}_k^+(z)$, $\mathcal{L}_k^-(z)$, with the block matrix indices being the same as those of $L_k(z)$, which is $(1, \dots, k-1, k+1, \dots, \nu)$.

Theorem 3.4. Denote $\arg(u_t - u_s) = -\tau$. Suppose that none of u_i lies on the segment determined by u_s and u_t , then we have the following results

$$\frac{(S_{[\tau]})_{st}}{2\pi i} = (u_t - u_s)^{A_{ss}} (\mathcal{L}_t^+(1 - A_{tt}^t)^{-1})_{s\hat{t}} \cdot \left(\frac{1}{u_t I - u_{\hat{t}\hat{t}}} A_{\hat{t}\hat{t}} \right), \quad (3.17a)$$

$$\frac{(S_{[\tau]})_{st}}{2\pi i} = (A_{s\hat{s}}) \cdot \mathcal{L}_s^-(-A_{ss}^t)_{\hat{s}t} (u_t - u_s)^{-A_{tt}}. \quad (3.17b)$$

If we additionally require that none of u_i lies on the line determined by u_s and u_t , then we have the following results

$$(C_{\tau \pm \varepsilon})_{*s} = (I_{*\hat{t}}(u_t I_{\hat{t}\hat{t}} - u_{\hat{t}\hat{t}})) \cdot \mathcal{L}_t^+(1 - A^t)_{\hat{t}s} (u_t - u_s)^{-A_{ss}}, \quad (3.17c)$$

$$(C_{\tau \pm \varepsilon})_{t*} = (u_t - u_s)^{A_{tt}} (\mathcal{L}_s^-(-A^t)^{-1})_{t\hat{s}} \cdot (I_{\hat{s}*}). \quad (3.17d)$$

Proof. First, assume that A_{kk} and A are diagonalizable and are all non-resonant. According to Proposition 3.1, the right side of (3.17a-3.17d) can be interpreted as matrix infinite products (3.15) and (3.16) under suitable parameters. Applying Propositions 2.4 and 2.7 to Corollary 2.24, and applying (3.15) and (3.16) to $v\tilde{B}(z) = L_k(z)$ or $v\tilde{B}(z) = z^2 L_k(z)^{-1}$, we obtain (3.17a) and (3.17d). The (3.17b) and (3.17c) can be obtained by considering the conjugate system with coefficient $-u - \frac{A^T}{z}$.

Since the dependence of $S_{[\tau]}$ and $C_{\tau \pm \varepsilon}$ on A is analytic and the infinite product on the right hand side of (3.17a-3.17d) locally uniformly converges with respect to A , the identities (3.17a-3.17d) also hold for non-diagonalizable A . Thus, the proof is completed. \square

Here the s -th row and column $(\mathcal{L}_k^+(z)^{-1})_{s*}, (\mathcal{L}_k^-(z))_{*s}$ are first defined for

$$v(t_0) = \text{diag}(v_1 I_{n_1}, \dots, t_0 v_s I_{n_s}, \dots, v_\mu I_{n_\mu})$$

with a sufficiently small real number t_0 (by Proposition 3.1 they are analytic), and then are defined for the original given v through the analytic continuation along $v(t) = \text{diag}(v_1 I_{n_1}, \dots, t v_s I_{n_s}, \dots, v_\mu I_{n_\mu})$ by varying t from t_0 to 1. Notice that in this process, the Stokes matrix on the left side of (3.17a-3.17b) in Theorem 3.4 is always analytic, ensuring the validity of this process.

3.2 Bilateral Infinite Matrix Product and Connection Matrices of Difference Systems

The connection matrix $\mathfrak{L}_k(z)$ between the canonical analytic solutions $\mathcal{L}_k^+(z)$ and $\mathcal{L}_k^-(z)$ of the differential equation (3.1) can be interpreted as a bilateral infinite matrix product. The sum of its residues (within one period) is given by the corresponding Stokes matrices. That is

Proposition 3.5. *The connection matrix $\mathfrak{L}_k(z) := \mathcal{L}_k^+(z)^{-1} \mathcal{L}_k^-(z)$ has period 1, and the sum of the residues in a period is*

$$\text{Res } \mathfrak{L}_k(z)_{st} = (u_k - u_s)^{-A_{ss}} \frac{(S_{[\tau]})_{sk} (S_{[\tau']})_{kt}}{4\pi^2} (u_t - u_k)^{A_{tt}}, \quad k \neq s, t, \quad (3.18)$$

where we take the arguments $\arg(u_k - u_s) = -\tau, \arg(u_t - u_k) = -\tau'$.

Proof. Note that we have

$$\mathfrak{L}_k(z) = \mathcal{L}_k^+(1+z)^{-1} \cdot L_k(z) \cdot \mathcal{L}_k^-(z).$$

The singularities of $L_k(z)$ are precisely the eigenvalues $\{-\lambda_1, \dots, -\lambda_{n_k}\}$ of $-A_{kk}$, which provide all the singularities of $\mathfrak{L}_k(z)$ in a period. The non-resonant condition ensures that $\mathcal{L}_k^+(1+z)^{-1}$ and $\mathcal{L}_k^-(z)$ are analytic at these eigenvalues $z = -\lambda_i$.

Without loss of generality, assume that A_{kk} is semisimple and has a spectral decomposition.

$$A_{kk} = \lambda_1 P_1 + \dots + \lambda_{n_k} P_{n_k},$$

from Theorem 3.4 we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Res}_{z=-\lambda_i} \mathfrak{L}_k(z)_{st} &= (\mathcal{L}_k^+(1-\lambda_i)^{-1})_{s\hat{k}} \cdot \left(-\frac{1}{u_k I - u_{\hat{k}\hat{k}}} A_{\hat{k}\hat{k}} P_i A_{k\hat{k}} \right) \cdot \mathcal{L}_k^-(-\lambda_i)_{\hat{k}t} \\ &= - \left((\mathcal{L}_k^+(1-A_{kk}^r)^{-1})_{s\hat{k}} \cdot \left(\frac{1}{u_k I - u_{\hat{k}\hat{k}}} A_{\hat{k}\hat{k}} \right) \right) P_i \cdot P_i \left((A_{k\hat{k}}) \cdot \mathcal{L}_k^-(-A_{kk}^l)_{\hat{k}t} \right) \\ &= -(u_k - u_s)^{-A_{ss}} \frac{(S_{[\tau]})_{sk}}{2\pi i} P_i \frac{(S_{[\tau']})_{kt}}{2\pi i} (u_t - u_k)^{A_{tt}}, \end{aligned}$$

and we finish the proof. \square

4 Path Algebraoid

We need to understand how to start from S_d to recover $(S_{[\tau]})_{st}$ in Corollary 2.24 for any fixed $d \notin \text{aS}(u)$. To achieve this, it is necessary to establish the connection between these Stokes matrices. We have already seen in Proposition 2.20 how the path class with arguments provides these monodromy data, which naturally leads to the concept of the path algebraoid \mathfrak{S} and its representation. The similar algebraoid structure has also appeared in resurgence theory [22]. Another work of this section is to provide a new interpretation of the action of the braid group on Stokes matrices using the language of the path algebraoid.

4.1 Path Algebraoid and its Representation

Definition 4.1 (Path algebraoid). The **path algebraoid** $\mathfrak{S}(u_1, \dots, u_\nu, \infty)$ is an unital algebraoid with

- $\nu + 1$ objects $u_1, \dots, u_\nu \in \mathbb{C}, u_\infty := \infty$;
- For any two objects u_s, u_t , the hom-set $\text{Hom}(u_s, u_t)$ is the complex linear space generated by $\delta_{st} := \begin{cases} 1_s, & s = t \\ 0, & s \neq t \end{cases}$ and all path classes with arguments in $\mathbb{C} \setminus \{u_1, \dots, u_\nu\}$ from u_s to u_t . For any morphisms $\gamma_{st} \in \text{Hom}(u_s, u_t)$, we have

$$1_s \gamma_{st} = \gamma_{st} = \gamma_{st} 1_t.$$

When there is no ambiguity, we will denote 1_s as 1.

- For any two morphisms $\gamma_{sm} \in \text{Hom}(u_s, u_m)$, $\gamma_{mt} \in \text{Hom}(u_m, u_t)$, the multiplication is defined by

$$\gamma_{sm}\gamma_{mt} := \gamma_{sm} \overset{r}{\circ} \gamma_{mt} - \gamma_{sm} \overset{l}{\circ} \gamma_{mt}. \quad (4.1)$$

For any path class with arguments γ_{sm} from u_s to u_m , and γ_{mt} from u_m to u_t , take the representative elements $\tilde{\gamma}_{sm} = (\gamma_{sm}, \theta_s, \theta_m)$ and $\tilde{\gamma}_{mt} = (\gamma_{mt}, \theta_m, \theta_t)$. Denote $\gamma_{sm} \overset{l}{\circ} \gamma_{mt}, \gamma_{sm} \overset{r}{\circ} \gamma_{mt}$ as paths in $\mathbb{C} \setminus \{u_1, \dots, u_\nu, \infty\}$, each obtained by deviating $\gamma_{sm} \circ \gamma_{mt}$ to the left and right at u_m , respectively (see Figure 2).

$$\tilde{\gamma}_{sm} \overset{l}{\circ} \tilde{\gamma}_{mt} := (\gamma_{sm} \overset{l}{\circ} \gamma_{mt}, \theta_s, \theta_t), \quad \tilde{\gamma}_{sm} \overset{r}{\circ} \tilde{\gamma}_{mt} := (\gamma_{sm} \overset{r}{\circ} \gamma_{mt}, \theta_s, \theta_t), \quad (4.2)$$

$$\gamma_{sm} \overset{l}{\circ} \gamma_{mt} := (\tilde{\gamma}_{sm} \overset{l}{\circ} \tilde{\gamma}_{mt}) / \sim, \quad \gamma_{sm} \overset{r}{\circ} \gamma_{mt} := (\tilde{\gamma}_{sm} \overset{r}{\circ} \tilde{\gamma}_{mt}) / \sim. \quad (4.3)$$

It can be seen that the composition $\overset{l}{\circ}, \overset{r}{\circ}$ is well-defined, associative and compatible with each other, i.e.

$$(\gamma_{sm_1} \overset{l}{\circ} \gamma_{m_1 m_2}) \overset{r}{\circ} \gamma_{m_2 t} = \gamma_{sm_1} \overset{l}{\circ} (\gamma_{m_1 m_2} \overset{r}{\circ} \gamma_{m_2 t}), \quad (\gamma_{sm_1} \overset{r}{\circ} \gamma_{m_1 m_2}) \overset{l}{\circ} \gamma_{m_2 t} = \gamma_{sm_1} \overset{r}{\circ} (\gamma_{m_1 m_2} \overset{l}{\circ} \gamma_{m_2 t}), \quad (4.4)$$

Therefore, the multiplication defined in (4.1) is also associative. Moreover, the composition $\overset{l}{\circ}, \overset{r}{\circ}$ each has e_s^l and e_s^r as its identity elements, and any path class with arguments from u_s to u_t ($t \neq \infty$) has the following inverse

$$(\gamma_{st}, \theta_s, \theta_t) \overset{l}{\circ}^{-1} = (\gamma_{st}^{\text{op}}, \theta_t + \pi, \theta_s - \pi), \quad (\gamma_{st}, \theta_s, \theta_t) \overset{r}{\circ}^{-1} = (\gamma_{st}^{\text{op}}, \theta_t - \pi, \theta_s + \pi). \quad (4.5)$$

Therefore, these path classes with arguments even form a groupoid.

Definition 4.2. A representation $(\mathcal{S}, V_1, \dots, V_\nu)$ of the path algebroid $\mathfrak{S}(u_1, \dots, u_\nu, \infty)$ refers to a family of complex vector spaces $\{V_s : s = 1, \dots, \nu, \infty\}$ with $V_\infty = V_1 \oplus \dots \oplus V_\nu$, and morphism \mathcal{S} satisfying

$$\mathcal{S}(u_s) = V_s, \quad \text{Hom}(u_s, u_t) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{S}} \text{Hom}(V_s, V_t), \quad \mathcal{S}(\gamma_{sm}\gamma_{mt}) = \mathcal{S}(\gamma_{sm})\mathcal{S}(\gamma_{mt}). \quad (4.6)$$




Figure 2: The composition (4.3) for $m \neq \infty$ and $m = \infty$

Remark 4.3. Note that we have

$$(\gamma_{st}, \theta_s, \theta_t) \overset{l}{\circ} e_t^r = (\gamma_{st}, \theta_s, \theta_t + 2\pi), \quad e_s^r \overset{l}{\circ} (\gamma_{st}, \theta_s, \theta_t) = (\gamma_{st}, \theta_s - 2\pi, \theta_t), \quad (4.7a)$$

$$(\gamma_{st}, \theta_s, \theta_t) \overset{r}{\circ} e_t^l = (\gamma_{st}, \theta_s, \theta_t - 2\pi), \quad e_s^l \overset{r}{\circ} (\gamma_{st}, \theta_s, \theta_t) = (\gamma_{st}, \theta_s + 2\pi, \theta_t), \quad (4.7b)$$

provided that when the set G contains at least one path class with arguments between any two distinct objects u_s and u_t , then G can generate the entire path algebroid together with $\{e_s^l, e_s^r\}_{s=1, \dots, \nu, \infty}$ and an additional relation $(1 + e_s^l)^{-1} = 1 - e_s^r$, under the multiplication (4.1).

Theorem 4.4. $(\mathcal{S}_{u, A}, V_1, \dots, V_\nu)$ is a representation of the path algebroid $\mathfrak{S}(u_1, \dots, u_\nu, \infty)$, where V_i is the eigenspace corresponding to the eigenvalue u_i of u .

Proof. We have the set of generators $G = \{e_s^l, e_s^r, \gamma_{st}^{(d)} : s, t = 1, \dots, \nu, \infty; s \neq t\}$. It suffices to prove that for any path class with arguments γ_{sm} and generator $\gamma_{mt} \in G$, we have $\mathcal{S}(\gamma_{sm}\gamma_{mt}) = \mathcal{S}(\gamma_{sm})\mathcal{S}(\gamma_{mt})$.

For $m = t$, according to (4.7a), (4.7b) and (2.45) in Proposition 2.20, we can first verify that $\mathcal{S}(1 - e_s^r) = e^{-2\pi i A_{ss}} = \mathcal{S}(1 + e_s^l)^{-1}$ and according to Definition 2.19 we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}(\gamma_{sm} e_m^l) &= \mathcal{S}(\gamma_{sm})(e^{2\pi i A_{mm}} - I) = \mathcal{S}(\gamma_{sm})\mathcal{S}(e_m^l), \\ \mathcal{S}(\gamma_{sm} e_m^r) &= \mathcal{S}(\gamma_{sm})(I - e^{-2\pi i A_{mm}}) = \mathcal{S}(\gamma_{sm})\mathcal{S}(e_m^r), \end{aligned}$$

where $A_{\infty\infty} := A$.

Next, we assume that $m \neq t$. For $t \neq \infty$, according to (2.42a), (2.42b) and Corollary 2.21 we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}(\gamma_{sm} \overset{r}{\circ} \gamma_{mt}^{(d)}) - \mathcal{S}(\gamma_{sm} \overset{l}{\circ} \gamma_{mt}^{(d)}) &= \begin{cases} \mathcal{S}(\gamma_{sm})(S_d^+ - e^{-2\pi i \delta_u A} S_d^-)_{mt}, & m \neq \infty, \text{Im}(u_m e^{id}) > \text{Im}(u_t e^{id}) \\ \mathcal{S}(\gamma_{sm})(e^{2\pi i \delta_u A} S_d^+ - S_d^-)_{mt}, & m \neq \infty, \text{Im}(u_t e^{id}) > \text{Im}(u_m e^{id}) \\ \mathcal{S}(\gamma_{sm})(e^{\pi i A} C_d^{-1} (I - U_d^{[\infty]}))_{*t}, & m = \infty \end{cases} \\ &= \mathcal{S}(\gamma_{sm}) \mathcal{S}(\gamma_{mt}^{(d)}). \end{aligned}$$

For $t = \infty$, according to (2.42c), (2.42d) and Corollary 2.21 we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}(\gamma_{sm} \overset{r}{\circ} \gamma_{mt}^{(d)}) - \mathcal{S}(\gamma_{sm} \overset{l}{\circ} \gamma_{mt}^{(d)}) &= \mathcal{S}(\gamma_{sm})((I - U_{d-\pi}^{[m]}) C_{d-\pi} e^{\pi i A})_{m*} \\ &= \mathcal{S}(\gamma_{sm})(E_{mm} S_{d-\pi}^+ (I - e^{-2\pi i M_d}) C_{d-\pi} e^{\pi i A})_{m*} \\ &= \mathcal{S}(\gamma_{sm}) \mathcal{S}(\gamma_{mt}^{(d)}). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we complete the proof. \square

In particular, starting from $e^{2\pi i \delta_u A}$ and S_d in a specific direction d , or $(S_{[\tau]})_{st}$ in Corollary 2.24, is sufficient to recover Stokes matrices in all directions.

4.2 Stokes Matrices and Quantum Groups

Let us first recall the quantum group relations of the Stokes matrices.

Let us take the standard R -matrix $R \in \text{End}(\mathbb{C}^\nu) \otimes \text{End}(\mathbb{C}^\nu)$ with $q = e^{\pi i h} \in \mathbb{C}$, see e.g., [17] [14],

$$R = \sum_{i \neq j, i, j=1}^n E_{ii} \otimes E_{jj} + q \sum_{i=1}^n E_{ii} \otimes E_{ii} + (q - q^{-1}) \sum_{1 \leq j < i \leq n} E_{ij} \otimes E_{ji}. \quad (4.8)$$

Theorem 4.5. [34] For any $h \notin \mathbb{Q}$ and distinct u_1, \dots, u_ν , consider the quantum confluent hypergeometric equation (1.1) associated to a representation V . Assume that the direction $d \notin aS(u)$ is such that

$$\text{Im}(u_1 e^{id}) > \text{Im}(u_2 e^{id}) > \dots > \text{Im}(u_\nu e^{id}),$$

then the (modified) Stokes matrices $L_\pm = q^{\mp \delta_u \mathbf{E}} S_d^\pm(u, -h\mathbf{E}) \in \text{End}(V) \otimes \text{End}(\mathbb{C}^\nu)$, of the quantum confluent hypergeometric equation (1.1) associated to a representation V , satisfy

$$R^{12} L_\pm^{(1)} L_\pm^{(2)} = L_\pm^{(2)} L_\pm^{(1)} R^{12}, \quad (4.9)$$

$$R^{12} L_+^{(1)} L_-^{(2)} = L_+^{(2)} L_-^{(1)}(u) R^{12}. \quad (4.10)$$

Here the convention is that if we write $L_\pm = \sum_{i,j} (L_\pm)_{ij} \otimes E_{ij} \in \text{End}(V) \otimes \text{End}(\mathbb{C}^\nu)$, then

$$L_\pm^{(1)} := \sum_{i,j} (L_\pm)_{ij} \otimes E_{ij} \otimes I, \quad L_\pm^{(2)} := \sum_{i,j} (L_\pm)_{ij} \otimes I \otimes E_{ij}, \quad \text{and } R^{12} := I \otimes R$$

as elements in $\text{End}(V) \otimes \text{End}(\mathbb{C}^\nu) \otimes \text{End}(\mathbb{C}^\nu)$.

Denote $\mathcal{J}_{ij}^\pm = S_d^\pm(u, -h\mathbf{E})_{ij}$ and $\hbar_i = e_{ii}$. By directly comparing both sides of (4.9), (4.10), we have the commutation relations between q^{\hbar_k} and other elements:

$$q^{\hbar_i} \cdot q^{\hbar_j} = q^{\hbar_j} \cdot q^{\hbar_i}, \quad (4.11a)$$

$$q^{\hbar_k} \cdot \mathcal{J}_{ij}^\pm = \mathcal{J}_{ij}^\pm \cdot q^{\hbar_k + \delta_{ik} - \delta_{kj}}, \quad (4.11b)$$

as well as the commutation relations when the indices i_1, j_1, i_2, j_2 are distinct:

$$\frac{\mathcal{J}_{i_1 j_1}^+ \mathcal{J}_{i_2 j_2}^+ - \mathcal{J}_{i_2 j_2}^+ \mathcal{J}_{i_1 j_1}^+}{q - q^{-1}} = \begin{cases} \mathcal{J}_{i_2 j_1}^+ \cdot \mathcal{J}_{i_1 j_2}^+, & i_2 < i_1 < j_2 < j_1 \\ -\mathcal{J}_{i_2 j_1}^+ \cdot \mathcal{J}_{i_1 j_2}^+, & i_1 < i_2 < j_1 < j_2 \\ 0, & \begin{matrix} i_2 < i_1 < j_1 < j_2 \\ i_1 < i_2 < j_2 < j_1 \\ i_1 < j_1 < i_2 < j_2 \\ i_2 < j_2 < i_1 < j_1 \end{matrix} \end{cases}, \quad (4.12a)$$

$$\frac{\mathcal{J}_{i_1 j_1}^- \mathcal{J}_{i_2 j_2}^- - \mathcal{J}_{i_2 j_2}^- \mathcal{J}_{i_1 j_1}^-}{q - q^{-1}} = \begin{cases} \mathcal{J}_{i_2 j_1}^- \cdot \mathcal{J}_{i_1 j_2}^-, & j_2 < j_1 < i_2 < i_1 \\ -\mathcal{J}_{i_2 j_1}^- \cdot \mathcal{J}_{i_1 j_2}^-, & j_1 < j_2 < i_1 < i_2 \\ 0, & \begin{matrix} j_1 < j_2 < i_2 < i_1 \\ j_2 < j_1 < i_1 < i_2 \\ j_2 < i_2 < j_1 < i_1 \\ j_1 < i_1 < j_2 < i_2 \end{matrix} \end{cases}, \quad (4.12b)$$

$$\frac{\mathcal{J}_{i_1 j_1}^+ \mathcal{J}_{i_2 j_2}^- - \mathcal{J}_{i_2 j_2}^- \mathcal{J}_{i_1 j_1}^+}{q - q^{-1}} = \begin{cases} \mathcal{J}_{i_2 j_1}^- \cdot \mathcal{J}_{i_1 j_2}^+, & i_1 < j_2 < j_1 < i_2 \\ -q^{2(\hbar_{i_1} - \hbar_{i_2})} \mathcal{J}_{i_2 j_1}^+ \cdot \mathcal{J}_{i_1 j_2}^-, & j_2 < i_1 < i_2 < j_1 \\ 0, & \begin{matrix} i_1 < j_1 < j_2 < i_2 \\ j_2 < i_2 < i_1 < j_1 \\ i_1 < j_2 < i_2 < j_1 \\ j_2 < i_1 < j_1 < i_2 \end{matrix} \end{cases}, \quad (4.12c)$$

and the commutation relations when some of the indices coincide:

$$\frac{q \cdot \delta_{i_1 j_1}^+ \delta_{i_2 j_2}^+ - \delta_{i_2 j_2}^+ \delta_{i_1 j_1}^+}{q - q^{-1}} = \begin{cases} q \cdot \delta_{i_2 j_1}^+, & i_2 < i_1 = j_2 < j_1 \\ \delta_{i_2 j_1}^+ \cdot \delta_{i_1 j_2}^+, & i_2 = i_1 < j_2 < j_1 \\ \delta_{i_1 j_2}^+ \cdot \delta_{i_2 j_1}^+, & i_2 < i_1 < j_2 = j_1 \\ 0, & i_1 = i_2 < j_1 < j_2 \\ & i_1 < i_2 < j_1 = j_2 \end{cases}, \quad (4.13a)$$

$$\frac{q \cdot \delta_{i_1 j_1}^- \delta_{i_2 j_2}^- - \delta_{i_2 j_2}^- \delta_{i_1 j_1}^-}{q - q^{-1}} = \begin{cases} \delta_{i_1 j_2}^-, & j_2 < j_1 = i_2 < i_1 \\ \delta_{i_2 j_1}^- \cdot \delta_{i_1 j_2}^-, & j_2 < j_1 < i_2 = i_1 \\ \delta_{i_1 j_2}^- \cdot \delta_{i_2 j_1}^-, & j_2 = j_1 < i_2 < i_1 \\ 0, & j_1 < j_2 < i_1 = i_2 \\ & j_1 = j_2 < i_1 < i_2 \end{cases}, \quad (4.13b)$$

$$\frac{q \cdot \delta_{i_1 j_1}^+ \delta_{i_2 j_2}^- - \delta_{i_2 j_2}^- \delta_{i_1 j_1}^+}{q - q^{-1}} = \begin{cases} q \cdot \delta_{i_2 j_1}^-, & i_1 = j_2 < j_1 < i_2 \\ \delta_{i_1 j_2}^+, & i_1 < j_2 < j_1 = i_2 \\ \delta_{i_1 j_1}^+ \cdot \delta_{i_2 j_2}^-, & i_1 < j_2 = j_1 < i_2 \\ -q \cdot q^{2(\hbar_{i_1} - \hbar_{i_2})} \delta_{i_2 j_1}^+, & j_2 < i_1 = i_2 < j_1 \\ -q^{2(\hbar_{i_1} - \hbar_{i_2})} \delta_{i_1 j_2}^-, & j_2 < i_1 < i_2 = j_1 \end{cases}, \quad (4.13c)$$

$$\frac{q \cdot \delta_{ij}^+ \delta_{ji}^- - q^{-1} \cdot \delta_{ji}^- \delta_{ij}^+}{q - q^{-1}} = 1 - q^{2(\hbar_i - \hbar_j)}, \quad i < j. \quad (4.13d)$$

Equivalently, the above theorem can be stated as follows.

Theorem 4.6. [34] *The Stokes matrices of the equation 1.1 induce a representation of $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_\nu)$ on V via the map*

$$q^{\pm \hbar_j} \mapsto q^{\pm \hbar_j}, \quad f_i \mapsto \frac{1}{q - q^{-1}} \delta_{i, i+1}^+, \quad e_i \mapsto -\frac{1}{q - q^{-1}} q^{\hbar_{i+1}} \delta_{i+1, i}^- q^{-\hbar_i} \in \text{End}(V). \quad (4.14)$$

Here recall that the Drinfeld-Jimbo quantum group $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_\nu)$ is an associative algebra with generators $\{f_i, e_i, q^{\pm \hbar_j} : 1 \leq i \leq \nu - 1, 1 \leq j \leq \nu\}$ and relations [9]

$$q^{-\hbar_j} = (q^{\hbar_j})^{-1}, \quad q^{\hbar_j} f_i q^{-\hbar_j} = q^{\delta_{ij} - \delta_{j, i+1}} f_i, \quad q^{\hbar_j} e_i q^{-\hbar_j} = q^{\delta_{i+1, j} - \delta_{j i}} e_i, \quad (4.15)$$

$$f_i e_i - e_i f_i = \frac{q^{\hbar_i - \hbar_{i+1}} - q^{\hbar_{i+1} - \hbar_i}}{q - q^{-1}}, \quad f_{i_2} e_{i_1} - e_{i_1} f_{i_2} = 0, \quad i_1 \neq i_2, \quad (4.16)$$

$$f_i^2 f_{i_2} - (q + q^{-1}) f_{i_1} f_{i_2} f_{i_1} + f_{i_2} f_{i_1}^2 = 0, \quad |i_1 - i_2| = 1; \quad f_{i_1} f_{i_2} = f_{i_2} f_{i_1}, \quad |i_1 - i_2| \geq 2, \quad (4.17)$$

$$e_{i_1}^2 e_{i_2} - (q + q^{-1}) e_{i_1} e_{i_2} e_{i_1} + e_{i_2} e_{i_1}^2 = 0, \quad |i_1 - i_2| = 1; \quad e_{i_1} e_{i_2} = e_{i_2} e_{i_1}, \quad |i_1 - i_2| \geq 2. \quad (4.18)$$

4.3 A Morphism from the Algebroid $\mathfrak{S}(u_1, \dots, u_\nu)$ to the Quantum Group $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_\nu)$

Theorem 4.4 and Theorem 4.5 indicate that there exists a morphism π from $\mathfrak{S}(u_1, \dots, u_\nu)$ to $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_\nu)$.

Corollary 4.7. *Suppose that for direction d we have*

$$\text{Im}(u_1 e^{id}) > \text{Im}(u_2 e^{id}) > \dots > \text{Im}(u_\nu e^{id}),$$

then there is a morphism $\pi : \mathfrak{S}(u_1, \dots, u_\nu) \rightarrow U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_\nu)$, induced by

$$\pi(\gamma_{i, i+1}^{(d)}) = (q - q^{-1}) f_i, \quad \pi(\gamma_{i+1, i}^{(d)}) = (q - q^{-1}) q^{-\hbar_{i+1}} e_i q^{\hbar_i}, \quad \pi(e_i^l) = q^{-2\hbar_i} - 1, \quad \pi(e_i^r) = 1 - q^{2\hbar_i}.$$

Moreover, equations (4.11a-4.13d) provide the commutation relations for each pair of generators. It is natural to consider the explicit commutation relation for other pairs of path classes under this morphism. In order to represent the commutation relation for the representative elements $\tilde{\gamma}_{s_1 t_1} = (\gamma_{s_1 t_1}, \theta_s^{(1)}, \theta_t^{(1)})$, $\tilde{\gamma}_{s_2 t_2} = (\gamma_{s_2 t_2}, \theta_s^{(2)}, \theta_t^{(2)})$ of path classes with arguments, we need to introduce the following notation

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\gamma}_{s_1 t_1} \wedge \tilde{\gamma}_{s_2 t_2} := & \sum_{m \in \gamma_{s_1 t_1} \cap \gamma_{s_2 t_2}} \text{sgn}_m(\gamma_{s_1 t_1}, \gamma_{s_2 t_2}) \left(\gamma_{s_1 t_1} \overset{m}{*} \gamma_{s_2 t_2}, \theta_s^{(1)}, \theta_t^{(2)} \right) \left(\gamma_{s_2 t_2} \overset{m}{*} \gamma_{s_1 t_1}, \theta_s^{(2)}, \theta_t^{(1)} \right) \\ & - \delta_{t_1 s_2} \begin{matrix} \delta_{\theta_t^{(1)} > \theta_s^{(2)}} \tilde{\gamma}_{s_1 t_1} \overset{r}{\circ} \tilde{\gamma}_{s_2 t_2} \\ \delta_{\theta_t^{(1)} < \theta_s^{(2)}} \tilde{\gamma}_{s_1 t_1} \overset{l}{\circ} \tilde{\gamma}_{s_2 t_2} \end{matrix} + \delta_{t_2 s_1} \begin{matrix} \delta_{\theta_t^{(2)} > \theta_s^{(1)}} \tilde{\gamma}_{s_2 t_2} \overset{r}{\circ} \tilde{\gamma}_{s_1 t_1} \\ \delta_{\theta_t^{(2)} < \theta_s^{(1)}} \tilde{\gamma}_{s_2 t_2} \overset{l}{\circ} \tilde{\gamma}_{s_1 t_1} \end{matrix}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.19)$$

where $|\theta_t^{(1)} - \theta_s^{(2)}|, |\theta_t^{(2)} - \theta_s^{(1)}| < \pi$, and the intersection point m does not include endpoints. Here sgn_m denotes the orientation of γ_1 and γ_2 at the intersection point m .

$$\text{sgn}_m(\gamma_{s_1 t_1}, \gamma_{s_2 t_2}) := \begin{cases} 1, & \begin{array}{ccc} t_2 & \swarrow & t_1 \\ & \bullet & \\ s_1 & \searrow & s_2 \end{array} \\ -1, & \begin{array}{ccc} t_1 & \swarrow & t_2 \\ & \bullet & \\ s_2 & \searrow & s_1 \end{array} \end{cases}, \quad (4.20)$$

And $\gamma_{s_1 t_1} \overset{m}{*} \gamma_{s_2 t_2}$ represents a path that starts along path $\gamma_{s_1 t_1}$ and, after reaching the intersection point m , turns onto path $\gamma_{s_2 t_2}$. For example, for distinct u_s, u_m, u_t and $u_m \notin [u_s, u_t]$, we have

$$[u_s, u_m] \wedge [u_m, u_t] = -[u_s, u_t].$$

Lemma 4.8. *The wedge defined in (4.19) satisfies the right Leibniz law. For the representative elements of path class with arguments,*

$$\tilde{\gamma}_{s_1 m} = (\gamma_{s_1 m}, \theta_s^{(1)}, \theta_m), \quad \tilde{\gamma}_{m t_1} = (\gamma_{m t_1}, \theta_m, \theta_t^{(1)}), \quad \tilde{\gamma}_{s_2 t_2} = (\gamma_{s_2 t_2}, \theta_s^{(2)}, \theta_t^{(2)}),$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\tilde{\gamma}_{s_1 m} \tilde{\gamma}_{m t_1}) \wedge \tilde{\gamma}_{s_2 t_2} &:= (\tilde{\gamma}_{s_1 m} \overset{r}{\circ} \tilde{\gamma}_{m t_1}) \wedge \tilde{\gamma}_{s_2 t_2} - (\tilde{\gamma}_{s_1 m} \overset{l}{\circ} \tilde{\gamma}_{m t_1}) \wedge \tilde{\gamma}_{s_2 t_2} \\ &= (\tilde{\gamma}_{s_1 m} \wedge \tilde{\gamma}_{s_2 t_2}) \tilde{\gamma}_{m t_1} + \tilde{\gamma}_{s_1 m} (\tilde{\gamma}_{m t_1} \wedge \tilde{\gamma}_{s_2 t_2}). \end{aligned} \quad (4.21)$$

Proof. Note that we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\tilde{\gamma}_{s_1 m} \overset{r}{\circ} \tilde{\gamma}_{m t_1}) \wedge \tilde{\gamma}_{s_2 t_2} &= \sum_{p \in \gamma_{s_1 m} \cap \gamma_{s_2 t_2}} \text{sgn}_p(\gamma_{s_1 m}, \gamma_{s_2 t_2}) \left(\tilde{\gamma}_{s_1 m} \overset{p}{*} \tilde{\gamma}_{s_2 t_2} \right) \left(\left(\tilde{\gamma}_{s_2 t_2} \overset{p}{*} \tilde{\gamma}_{s_1 m} \right) \overset{r}{\circ} \tilde{\gamma}_{m t_1} \right) \\ &+ \sum_{p \in \gamma_{m t_1} \cap \gamma_{s_2 t_2}} \text{sgn}_p(\gamma_{m t_1}, \gamma_{s_2 t_2}) \left(\tilde{\gamma}_{s_1 m} \overset{r}{\circ} \left(\tilde{\gamma}_{m t_1} \overset{p}{*} \tilde{\gamma}_{s_2 t_2} \right) \right) \left(\tilde{\gamma}_{s_2 t_2} \overset{p}{*} \tilde{\gamma}_{m t_1} \right) \\ &+ \begin{cases} \tilde{\gamma}_{s_1 m} \left(\tilde{\gamma}_{s_2 t_2} \overset{r}{\circ} \tilde{\gamma}_{m t_1} \right), & t_2 = m, \theta_m < \theta_t^{(2)} \\ 0, & \text{etc.} \end{cases} \\ &- \begin{cases} \left(\tilde{\gamma}_{s_1 m} \overset{r}{\circ} \tilde{\gamma}_{s_2 t_2} \right) \tilde{\gamma}_{m t_1}, & m = s_2, \theta_s^{(2)} < \theta_m \\ 0, & \text{etc.} \end{cases} \\ &+ \delta_{\theta_s^{(1)} < \theta_t^{(2)}} \tilde{\gamma}_{s_2 t_2} \overset{r}{\circ} \tilde{\gamma}_{s_1 m} \overset{r}{\circ} \tilde{\gamma}_{m t_1} - \delta_{t_1 s_2} \delta_{\theta_s^{(2)} < \theta_t^{(1)}} \tilde{\gamma}_{s_1 m} \overset{r}{\circ} \tilde{\gamma}_{m t_1} \overset{r}{\circ} \tilde{\gamma}_{s_2 t_2} \\ &\quad \delta_{\theta_s^{(1)} > \theta_t^{(2)}} \tilde{\gamma}_{s_2 t_2} \overset{l}{\circ} \tilde{\gamma}_{s_1 m} \overset{r}{\circ} \tilde{\gamma}_{m t_1} - \delta_{\theta_s^{(2)} > \theta_t^{(1)}} \tilde{\gamma}_{s_1 m} \overset{r}{\circ} \tilde{\gamma}_{m t_1} \overset{l}{\circ} \tilde{\gamma}_{s_2 t_2} \\ (\tilde{\gamma}_{s_1 m} \overset{l}{\circ} \tilde{\gamma}_{m t_1}) \wedge \tilde{\gamma}_{s_2 t_2} &= \sum_{p \in \gamma_{s_1 m} \cap \gamma_{s_2 t_2}} \text{sgn}_p(\gamma_{s_1 m}, \gamma_{s_2 t_2}) \left(\tilde{\gamma}_{s_1 m} \overset{p}{*} \tilde{\gamma}_{s_2 t_2} \right) \left(\left(\tilde{\gamma}_{s_2 t_2} \overset{p}{*} \tilde{\gamma}_{s_1 m} \right) \overset{l}{\circ} \tilde{\gamma}_{m t_1} \right) \\ &+ \sum_{p \in \gamma_{m t_1} \cap \gamma_{s_2 t_2}} \text{sgn}_p(\gamma_{m t_1}, \gamma_{s_2 t_2}) \left(\tilde{\gamma}_{s_1 m} \overset{l}{\circ} \left(\tilde{\gamma}_{m t_1} \overset{p}{*} \tilde{\gamma}_{s_2 t_2} \right) \right) \left(\tilde{\gamma}_{s_2 t_2} \overset{p}{*} \tilde{\gamma}_{m t_1} \right) \\ &- \begin{cases} \tilde{\gamma}_{s_1 m} \left(\tilde{\gamma}_{s_2 t_2} \overset{l}{\circ} \tilde{\gamma}_{m t_1} \right), & t_2 = m, \theta_m > \theta_t^{(2)} \\ 0, & \text{etc.} \end{cases} \\ &+ \begin{cases} \left(\tilde{\gamma}_{s_1 m} \overset{l}{\circ} \tilde{\gamma}_{s_2 t_2} \right) \tilde{\gamma}_{m t_1}, & m = s_2, \theta_s^{(2)} > \theta_m \\ 0, & \text{etc.} \end{cases} \\ &+ \delta_{t_2 s_1} \delta_{\theta_s^{(1)} < \theta_t^{(2)}} \tilde{\gamma}_{s_2 t_2} \overset{r}{\circ} \tilde{\gamma}_{s_1 m} \overset{l}{\circ} \tilde{\gamma}_{m t_1} - \delta_{t_1 s_2} \delta_{\theta_s^{(2)} < \theta_t^{(1)}} \tilde{\gamma}_{s_1 m} \overset{l}{\circ} \tilde{\gamma}_{m t_1} \overset{r}{\circ} \tilde{\gamma}_{s_2 t_2} \\ &\quad \delta_{\theta_s^{(1)} > \theta_t^{(2)}} \tilde{\gamma}_{s_2 t_2} \overset{l}{\circ} \tilde{\gamma}_{s_1 m} \overset{l}{\circ} \tilde{\gamma}_{m t_1} - \delta_{\theta_s^{(2)} > \theta_t^{(1)}} \tilde{\gamma}_{s_1 m} \overset{l}{\circ} \tilde{\gamma}_{m t_1} \overset{l}{\circ} \tilde{\gamma}_{s_2 t_2} \end{aligned}$$

Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\tilde{\gamma}_{s_1 m} \tilde{\gamma}_{m t_1}) \wedge \tilde{\gamma}_{s_2 t_2} &= \left(\sum_{p \in \gamma_{s_1 m} \cap \gamma_{s_2 t_2}} \text{sgn}_p(\gamma_{s_1 m}, \gamma_{s_2 t_2}) \left(\tilde{\gamma}_{s_1 m} \overset{p}{*} \tilde{\gamma}_{s_2 t_2} \right) \left(\tilde{\gamma}_{s_2 t_2} \overset{p}{*} \tilde{\gamma}_{s_1 m} \right) \right) \tilde{\gamma}_{m t_1} \\ &+ \tilde{\gamma}_{s_1 m} \left(\sum_{p \in \gamma_{m t_1} \cap \gamma_{s_2 t_2}} \text{sgn}_p(\gamma_{m t_1}, \gamma_{s_2 t_2}) \left(\tilde{\gamma}_{m t_1} \overset{p}{*} \tilde{\gamma}_{s_2 t_2} \right) \left(\tilde{\gamma}_{s_2 t_2} \overset{p}{*} \tilde{\gamma}_{m t_1} \right) \right) \\ &- \left(\delta_{m s_2} \begin{matrix} \delta_{\theta_s^{(2)} < \theta_m} \tilde{\gamma}_{s_1 m} \overset{r}{\circ} \tilde{\gamma}_{s_2 t_2} \\ \delta_{\theta_s^{(2)} > \theta_m} \tilde{\gamma}_{s_1 m} \overset{l}{\circ} \tilde{\gamma}_{s_2 t_2} \end{matrix} \right) \tilde{\gamma}_{m t_1} + \tilde{\gamma}_{s_1 m} \left(\delta_{t_2 m} \begin{matrix} \delta_{\theta_m < \theta_t^{(2)}} \tilde{\gamma}_{s_2 t_2} \overset{r}{\circ} \gamma_{12} \\ \delta_{\theta_m > \theta_t^{(2)}} \tilde{\gamma}_{s_2 t_2} \overset{l}{\circ} \gamma_{12} \end{matrix} \right) \\ &+ \left(\delta_{t_2 s_1} \begin{matrix} \delta_{\theta_s^{(1)} < \theta_t^{(2)}} \tilde{\gamma}_{s_2 t_2} \overset{r}{\circ} \tilde{\gamma}_{s_1 m} \\ \delta_{\theta_s^{(1)} > \theta_t^{(2)}} \tilde{\gamma}_{s_2 t_2} \overset{l}{\circ} \tilde{\gamma}_{s_1 m} \end{matrix} \right) \tilde{\gamma}_{m t_1} - \tilde{\gamma}_{s_1 m} \left(\delta_{t_1 s_2} \begin{matrix} \delta_{\theta_s^{(2)} < \theta_t^{(1)}} \tilde{\gamma}_{m t_1} \overset{r}{\circ} \tilde{\gamma}_{s_2 t_2} \\ \delta_{\theta_s^{(2)} > \theta_t^{(1)}} \tilde{\gamma}_{m t_1} \overset{l}{\circ} \tilde{\gamma}_{s_2 t_2} \end{matrix} \right) \\ &= (\tilde{\gamma}_{s_1 m} \wedge \tilde{\gamma}_{s_2 t_2}) \tilde{\gamma}_{m t_1} + \tilde{\gamma}_{s_1 m} (\tilde{\gamma}_{m t_1} \wedge \tilde{\gamma}_{s_2 t_2}), \end{aligned}$$

and we finish the proof. \square

Proposition 4.9. *Suppose that the representative element $\tilde{\gamma}_{s_2 t_2}$ of path class with arguments is not self-intersecting, particularly with $s_2 \neq t_2$. Under the morphism $\mathfrak{S}(u_1, \dots, u_\nu) \xrightarrow{\pi} U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_\nu)$ induced by Theorem 4.4 and Theorem 4.5, we have*

$$\pi(\tilde{\gamma}_{s_1 t_1} \wedge \tilde{\gamma}_{s_2 t_2}) = \frac{q^{-t(\tilde{\gamma}_{s_1 t_1}, \tilde{\gamma}_{s_2 t_2})} \pi(\tilde{\gamma}_{s_1 t_1}) \pi(\tilde{\gamma}_{s_2 t_2}) - q^{s(\tilde{\gamma}_{s_1 t_1}, \tilde{\gamma}_{s_2 t_2})} \pi(\tilde{\gamma}_{s_2 t_2}) \pi(\tilde{\gamma}_{s_1 t_1})}{q - q^{-1}}, \quad (4.22)$$

where $|\theta_s^{(2)} - \theta_s^{(1)}|, |\theta_t^{(2)} - \theta_s^{(1)}|, |\theta_t^{(2)} - \theta_t^{(1)}|, |\theta_s^{(2)} - \theta_t^{(1)}| < \pi$, and

$$s(\tilde{\gamma}_{s_1 t_1}, \tilde{\gamma}_{s_2 t_2}) := \delta_{s_1 s_2} \operatorname{sgn}(\theta_s^{(2)} - \theta_s^{(1)}) - \delta_{s_1 t_2} \operatorname{sgn}(\theta_t^{(2)} - \theta_s^{(1)}), \quad (4.23)$$

$$t(\tilde{\gamma}_{s_1 t_1}, \tilde{\gamma}_{s_2 t_2}) := \delta_{t_1 t_2} \operatorname{sgn}(\theta_t^{(2)} - \theta_t^{(1)}) - \delta_{t_1 s_2} \operatorname{sgn}(\theta_s^{(2)} - \theta_t^{(1)}). \quad (4.24)$$

Proof. By analytically moving the endpoint of $\tilde{\gamma}_{s_2 t_2}$, we can assume that it is a representative element of $\gamma_{s_2 t_2}^{(d)}$ without loss of generality. Subsequently, we only need to note that the right-hand side of equation (4.22) also satisfies the right Leibniz law. From Lemma 4.8, it suffices to verify the case where $\tilde{\gamma}_{s_1 t_1}$ is also a representative element of $\gamma_{s_1 t_1}^{(d)}$ or e_s^l , e_s^r , which reduces to equations (4.11a)-(4.13d) given by Theorem 4.5.

It can be checked that once the local behavior of $\gamma_{s_1 t_1}$ and $\gamma_{s_2 t_2}$ at their endpoints is fixed, the wedge defined in (4.19) remains invariant under homotopy. Thus, equation (4.22) actually provides the commutation relation between a path class with arguments $\gamma_{s_2 t_2}$ with a representative element that does not self-intersect and any path class with arguments $\gamma_{s_1 t_1}$. \square

Based on this proposition, we can also derive the commutation relations between any two path classes with arguments. However, in this paper, we will not explore them in further detail.

4.4 Braid Group Actions on Path Algebroids and Stokes Matrices

Let B_ν be the braid group with ν strands. For fixed $u_1, \dots, u_\nu \in \mathbb{C}$, each $\sigma \in B_\nu$ induces an isomorphism between two path algebroids

$$\mathfrak{S}(u_1, \dots, u_\nu, \infty) \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathfrak{S}(u_{\sigma 1}, \dots, u_{\sigma \nu}, \infty). \quad (4.25)$$

See Figure 3 for an illustration.




Figure 3: Example of the action of the element σ_1 in the braid group B_4

Proposition 4.10. Suppose that $(\mathcal{S}, V_1, \dots, V_\nu)$ is a representation of $\mathfrak{S}(u_1, \dots, u_\nu, \infty)$, and σ is an element of the braid group B_ν . For every path class with arguments γ , we denote

$$(\sigma \mathcal{S})(\gamma) := \mathcal{S}(\sigma^{-1} \gamma). \quad (4.26)$$

Then, $\sigma(\mathcal{S}, V_1, \dots, V_\nu) := (\sigma \mathcal{S}, V_{\sigma^{-1}(1)}, \dots, V_{\sigma^{-1}(\nu)})$ is a representation of $\mathfrak{S}(u_1, \dots, u_\nu, \infty)$.

In the rest of this section, let us take any fixed direction d such that

$$\operatorname{Im}(u_1 e^{id}) > \operatorname{Im}(u_2 e^{id}) > \dots > \operatorname{Im}(u_\nu e^{id}).$$

We define the generators σ_i of the braid group B_ν that interchange u_i and u_{i+1} by moving u_i anticlockwise around u_{i+1} (during this process, we require that the projections of u_i and u_{i+1} in the $-d$ direction do not pass through the projections of the other u_k 's). On the one hand, the representation $(\mathcal{S}, V_1, \dots, V_\nu)$ can be encoded into a pair of upper/lower triangular (n_1, \dots, n_ν) -block matrices $X^\pm = (X_{ij}^\pm)_{\nu \times \nu}$ with entries

$$X_{st}^+ := \begin{cases} \mathcal{S}(\gamma_{st}^{(d)}) & ; s < t \\ I & ; s = t \\ 0 & ; s > t \end{cases}, \quad X_{st}^- := \begin{cases} 0 & ; s < t \\ I & ; s = t \\ -\mathcal{S}(\gamma_{st}^{(d)}) & ; s > t \end{cases}. \quad (4.27)$$

Here recall that the paths $\gamma_{st}^{(d)}$ are defined in Proposition 2.20, and each entry X_{st}^\pm has size $n_s \times n_t$. On the other hand, the new representation $(\sigma_i \mathcal{S}, V_{\sigma_i^{-1}(1)}, \dots, V_{\sigma_i^{-1}(\nu)})$ gives rise to another pair of upper/lower triangular $(n_{\sigma_i^{-1}(1)}, \dots, n_{\sigma_i^{-1}(\nu)})$ -block matrices $(\tilde{X}^+, \tilde{X}^-)$ with

$$\tilde{X}_{st}^+ := \begin{cases} (\sigma_i \mathcal{S})(\gamma_{st}^{(d)}) & ; s < t \\ I & ; s = t \\ 0 & ; s > t \end{cases}, \quad \tilde{X}_{st}^- := \begin{cases} 0 & ; s < t \\ I & ; s = t \\ -(\sigma_i \mathcal{S})(\gamma_{st}^{(d)}) & ; s > t \end{cases}. \quad (4.28)$$

In this way, the braid group action of σ on the representations induce an action on the pair of upper/lower triangular (n_1, \dots, n_ν) -block matrices, to produce a pair of upper/lower triangular $(n_{\sigma^{-1}(1)}, \dots, n_{\sigma^{-1}(\nu)})$ -block matrices, by requiring

$$\sigma_i(X^+, X^-) := (\tilde{X}^+, \tilde{X}^-), \quad \text{for } \sigma_i \in B_\nu.$$

Here \tilde{X}^\pm are given by (4.28). Furthermore, by (4.28) the entries of $\sigma_i(X^+, X^-)$ can be written as explicit polynomials of entries of X^\pm . It is determined by the corresponding topological relation. For example, when $-d = \frac{\pi}{2}$, Figure 3 shows that the $(1, 4)$ -entry of the first component of $\sigma_1(X^+, X^-)$ is

$$(\sigma_1 \mathcal{S})(\gamma_{14}^{(d)}) = \mathcal{S}(\sigma_1^{-1} \gamma_{14}^{(d)}) = \mathcal{S}(\gamma_{24}^{(d)}) + \mathcal{S}(\gamma_{21}^{(d)}) \mathcal{S}(\gamma_{14}^{(d)}).$$

In general, we have the following result

Corollary 4.11. *Suppose that $X^\pm = (X_{ij}^\pm)_{\nu \times \nu}$ are upper/lower triangular (n_1, \dots, n_ν) -block matrices, and all the diagonal blocks $X_{11}, \dots, X_{\nu\nu}$ are identity matrices. Then the induced action of standard generator $\sigma_i (1 \leq i \leq \nu - 1)$ of braid group B_ν on (X^+, X^-) are pair of upper/lower triangular $(n_{\sigma_i^{-1}(1)}, \dots, n_{\sigma_i^{-1}(\nu)})$ -block matrices*

$$\sigma_i(X^+, X^-) = (K_i^- X^+ K_i^+, K_i^- X^- K_i^+), \quad 1 \leq i \leq \nu - 1, \quad (4.29)$$

where the block matrices K_i^\pm are

$$K_i^- = \text{diag} \left(I_{n_1}, \dots, I_{n_{i-1}}, \begin{pmatrix} -X_{i+1,i}^- & I_{n_{i+1}} \\ I_{n_i} & O \end{pmatrix}, I_{n_{i+2}}, \dots, I_{n_\nu} \right), \quad (4.30a)$$

$$K_i^+ = \text{diag} \left(I_{n_1}, \dots, I_{n_{i-1}}, \begin{pmatrix} -X_{i,i+1}^+ & I_{n_i} \\ I_{n_{i+1}} & O \end{pmatrix}, I_{n_{i+2}}, \dots, I_{n_\nu} \right). \quad (4.30b)$$

If we consider the representations of the path algebroids from the Stokes phenomenon of the differential equations, then we obtain the braid group action on the space of Stokes matrices. When all multiplicities n_1, \dots, n_ν equal to one, it recovers the well known braid group action on (non-blocking) Stokes matrices in the literature, see, e.g., [5, 11]. Here we give a new interpretation via the natural braid group action on the path algebroids.

The braid group action on the space of Stokes matrices was first introduced to characterize the monodromy representation of the nonlinear isomonodromy deformation equations of the linear system (2.1). It is a differential equation for the (n_1, \dots, n_ν) -block matrix valued function $A(u_1, \dots, u_\nu)$ with respect to the complex variables u_1, \dots, u_ν :

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial u_k} A(u) = [\text{ad}_u^{-1} \text{ad}_{\varepsilon_k} A(u), A(u)], \quad \text{for every } k = 1, \dots, \nu, \quad (4.31)$$

where

- $\varepsilon_k = \text{diag}(0, \dots, I_{n_k}, \dots, 0)$ as an (n_1, \dots, n_ν) -block diagonal matrix;
- For any $\nu \times \nu$ block matrix $(X_{ij})_{\nu \times \nu}$, denote $\text{ad}_u^{-1} X$ as an $\nu \times \nu$ block matrix with the (i, j) -block entry

$$(\text{ad}_u^{-1} X)_{ij} := \begin{cases} \frac{1}{u_i - u_j} X_{ij} & ; i \neq j \\ 0 & ; i = j \end{cases}. \quad (4.32)$$

The equation (4.31) is deduced by the conditions that the Stokes matrices of the system (2.1) with residue matrix $A(u)$ are locally constant while varying u . See [18] for more details. Following Miwa [23], the solutions $A(u)$ with $u_1, \dots, u_\nu \in \mathbb{C}$ have the strong Painlevé property: they are multi-valued meromorphic functions of u_1, \dots, u_ν and the branching occurs when u moves along a loop around the fat diagonal

$$\Delta = \{(u_1, \dots, u_\nu) \in \mathbb{C}^\nu \mid u_i = u_j, \text{ for some } i \neq j\}.$$

Under the Riemann-Hilbert-Birkhoff map, the monodromy of the solutions $A(u)$ after the continuation along paths on $\mathbb{C}^\nu \setminus \Delta$ can be described geometrically as the braid group action on the corresponding Stokes matrices.

Proposition 4.12. *Suppose that $A(u_1, \dots, u_\nu)$ satisfies the isomonodromy equation (4.31) corresponding to the system (2.1) and σ is an element of the braid group B_ν . Denote*

$$\sigma u := \text{diag}(u_1 I_{n_{\sigma^{-1}(1)}}, \dots, u_\nu I_{n_{\sigma^{-1}(\nu)}}), \quad (4.33a)$$

$$(\sigma A)(u_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, u_{\sigma(\nu)}) := P_\sigma \cdot A(\sigma \curvearrowright (u_1, \dots, u_\nu)) \cdot P_\sigma^{-1}, \quad (4.33b)$$

where $A(\sigma \curvearrowright (u_1, \dots, u_\nu))$ is the value of $A(u)$ after continuing from (u_1, \dots, u_ν) to $(u_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, u_{\sigma(\nu)})$ along σ , and $P_\sigma = (\delta_{i\sigma(j)} I_{n_j})_{\nu \times \nu}$ is the permutation matrix. As a representation of $\mathfrak{S}(u_1, \dots, u_\nu)$, we have

$$\sigma \mathcal{S}_{u,A} = \mathcal{S}_{\sigma u, \sigma A}, \quad (4.34)$$

$$\sigma(S_d^+(u, A), S_d^-(u, A)) = (S_d^+(\sigma u, \sigma A), S_d^-(\sigma u, \sigma A)). \quad (4.35)$$

Proof. One first verifies that $\sigma \mathcal{S}_{u,A}, \mathcal{S}_{\sigma u, \sigma A}$ are representations of $\mathfrak{S}(u_1, \dots, u_\nu)$,

$$\sigma \mathcal{S}_{u,A}(e_s^l) = \mathcal{S}_{\sigma u, \sigma A}(e_s^l), \quad s = 1, \dots, \nu.$$

According to Remark 4.3, we only need to verify that for any distinct $s, t \in \{1, \dots, \nu\}$, we have $(\sigma \mathcal{S}_{u,A})(\gamma_{st}^{(d)}) = \mathcal{S}_{\sigma u, \sigma A}(\gamma_{st}^{(d)})$, which can be guaranteed by the isomonodromy property. Then applying (4.34) in Proposition 4.12 and (4.26) in Definition 4.10, one verifies (4.35). \square

Remark 4.13. One can also consider the isomonodromy deformation of the quantum confluent hypergeometric equation (1.1), i.e., the equation

$$\frac{d}{dz}F(z) = (u - \hbar \mathbf{E}(u)z^{-1}) \cdot F(z), \quad (4.36)$$

where $\mathbf{E}(u)$ has the initial value $\mathbf{E}(u^0) = \mathbf{E}$ at a base point u^0 , and is such that the Stokes matrices are locally constant. Then the matrix function $E(u)$ satisfies the nonlinear equation of the form (4.31). Applying Proposition 4.12 to this case, while taking the base point u^0 , leads to a braid group action on the Stokes matrices of the equation (1.1). Together with Theorem 4.5 or 4.6, one gets an action of $\sigma \in B_\nu$ on the generators of quantum group $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_\nu)$. One checks by the formula in Corollary 4.11 that the braid group action coincides with the action, introduced by [21] and independently by [19] and [31].

5 Quantum Stokes Matrices and Yangian

Having the preliminary given in the previous sections, we give proofs of Theorem 1.2, Proposition 1.5 and Theorem 1.6 in this section.

5.1 Proof of Theorem 1.2 and Proposition 1.5

Proofs of Theorem 1.2. Under assumption $\hbar \notin \mathbb{Q}$, the existence and uniqueness of the formal solution follow from Proposition 2.4. But still to illustrate the process, we give a proof for our particular system.

The existence and uniqueness of the formal solution. Suppose that a representation $\rho : U(\mathfrak{gl}_\nu) \rightarrow \text{End}(V)$ is given. Let us first assume the system (1.1) associated to V ,

$$\frac{d}{dz}F(z) = \left(u - \hbar \mathbf{E}^V z^{-1}\right) \cdot F(z), \quad (5.1)$$

has a formal solution of the form given in (1.3), i.e.,

$$\hat{F}(z) = \left(I + \sum_{p=1}^{\infty} H_p^V z^{-p}\right) \cdot e^{uz} z^{-\hbar \delta \mathbf{E}^V}, \quad \delta \mathbf{E}^V = \text{diag}(e_{11}^V, \dots, e_{\nu\nu}^V).$$

Here we denote $X^V := \rho(X)$ for any $X \in U(\mathfrak{gl}_\nu)$, and each H_p^V is an $\nu \times \nu$ matrix with entries valued in $\text{End}(V)$.

Then plugging (1.3) into the equation (1.1) and comparing the coefficients of z^{-m-1} , we see that H_m^V satisfies

$$[u, H_{m+1}^V] = (-m + \hbar \mathbf{E}^V) \cdot H_m^V - H_m^V \cdot \hbar \delta \mathbf{E}^V \in \text{End}(V) \otimes \text{End}(\mathbb{C}^\nu). \quad (5.2)$$

Let $\{E_{kl}\}_{1 \leq k, l \leq \nu}$ be the standard basis of $\text{End}(\mathbb{C}^\nu)$. Recall that $\mathbf{E} = \sum_{k,l} e_{kl} \otimes E_{kl}$, and $u = \sum_i 1 \otimes u_i E_{ii}$. Plugging $H_m^V = \sum_{k,l} H_{m,k,l} \otimes E_{kl}$, with $H_{m,k,l} \in \text{End}(V)$, into the equation (5.2) gives rise to

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{k,l} \frac{u_k - u_l}{\hbar} H_{m+1,k,l} \otimes E_{kl} \\ &= - \sum_{k,l} \frac{m}{\hbar} H_{m,k,l} \otimes E_{kl} + \sum_{k,l,j} e_{kj}^V H_{m,j,l} \otimes E_{kl} - \sum_{k,l} H_{m,k,l} e_{ll}^V \otimes E_{kl}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.3)$$

That is for $k \neq l$

$$\frac{u_k - u_l}{\hbar} H_{m+1,k,l} = -\frac{m}{\hbar} H_{m,k,l} + \sum_{j=1}^{\nu} e_{kj}^V H_{m,j,l} - H_{m,k,l} e_{ll}^V \in \text{End}(V), \quad (5.4)$$

and for $k = l$ (replacing m by $m+1$ in (5.3)),

$$0 = \sum_{j \neq k} e_{kj}^V H_{m+1,j,k} - \frac{m+1}{\hbar} H_{m+1,k,k} + [e_{kk}^V, H_{m+1,k,k}] \in \text{End}(V). \quad (5.5)$$

Suppose H_m^V is given, let us check that the above recursive relation has a unique solution H_{m+1}^V . First note that, since $u_k \neq u_l$ for $k \neq l$, the identity (5.4) uniquely defines the "off-diagonal" part $H_{m+1,k,l}$ ($k \neq l$) of H_{m+1} from H_m . Furthermore, due to the assumption $\hbar \notin \mathbb{Q}$, we have $-\frac{m+1}{\hbar} \text{Id} + \text{ad}_{e_{kk}^V}$ is invertible on $\text{End}(V)$ for any integer $m+1$. Thus, the condition (5.5) uniquely defines the "diagonal" part $H_{m+1,k,k}$ of H_{m+1}^V from the off diagonal part.

The explicit form of H_p . Note that the system (1.1) associated to the representation V becomes a special case of the System (2.1) of rank $n = m\nu$, where $u = \text{diag}(u_1 I_m, \dots, u_\nu I_m)$, with distinct u_1, \dots, u_ν and multiplicity m, \dots, m , and the residue $A = -\hbar \mathbf{E}^V = -(\hbar e_{ij}^V)_{\nu \times \nu}$ is divided into (m, \dots, m) -blocks.

Therefore, we can apply Proposition 2.4 to the system (5.1). In particular, from (2.7a), (2.7b) we have

$$(H_1^V)_{\hat{k}k} = -\frac{1}{u_k I - u_{\hat{k}\hat{k}}} \hbar \mathbf{E}_{\hat{k}k}^V, \quad (5.6a)$$

$$(H_{p+1}^V)_{\hat{k}k} = L_k(pI + \hbar(e_{kk}^V)^r) \cdot (H_p^V)_{\hat{k}k}, \quad (5.6b)$$

$$(H_p^V)_{kk} = \frac{\hbar}{pI + \hbar(e_{kk}^V)^r - \hbar e_{kk}^V} \mathbf{E}_{k\hat{k}} \cdot (H_p^V)_{\hat{k}k}, \quad (5.6c)$$

where

$$L_k(z) = \frac{1}{u_k I - u_{\hat{k}\hat{k}}} \left(zI - \hbar \mathbf{E}_{\hat{k}\hat{k}}^V - \hbar^2 \frac{(\mathbf{E}_{\hat{k}\hat{k}} \mathbf{E}_{\hat{k}\hat{k}})^V}{(z - \hbar)I - \hbar e_{\hat{k}\hat{k}}^V} \right). \quad (5.7)$$

Let us inductively assume that for $p \geq 1$, we have

$$(e_{\hat{k}\hat{k}}^V)^r \cdot (H_p^V)_{\hat{k}\hat{k}} = (H_p^V)_{\hat{k}\hat{k}} e_{\hat{k}\hat{k}}^V = \text{diag}(\underbrace{e_{\hat{k}\hat{k}}^V + I, \dots, e_{\hat{k}\hat{k}}^V + I}_{n-1 \text{ terms}}) \cdot (H_p^V)_{\hat{k}\hat{k}}, \quad (5.8)$$

thus we have

$$(H_{p+1}^V)_{\hat{k}\hat{k}} = L_k((p + \hbar)I + \hbar e_{\hat{k}\hat{k}}^V) \cdot (H_p^V)_{\hat{k}\hat{k}} = T_k(p)^V \cdot (H_p^V)_{\hat{k}\hat{k}}, \quad (5.9a)$$

$$(H_p^V)_{kk} = \frac{\hbar \mathbf{E}_{\hat{k}\hat{k}}^V}{p} (H_p^V)_{\hat{k}\hat{k}}. \quad (5.9b)$$

It can be seen that the base case $p = 1$ holds for (5.8), and $T_k(p)$ commutes with $\text{diag}(e_{\hat{k}\hat{k}}^V + I, \dots, e_{\hat{k}\hat{k}}^V + I)$. Thus, (5.8) also holds for $p + 1$, and induction ensures that it holds for any $p \geq 1$. Therefore, (5.9a), (5.9b) also holds for any $p \geq 1$.

The above argument works for any V . Since the representations of $U(\mathfrak{gl}_\nu)$ separates the elements in $U(\mathfrak{gl}_\nu)$, we have (1.4).

Yangian relations. In the end, the relation (1.6) can be directly verified. There is another way to check it: our $T_k(\lambda)$, arising from the formal solution of the quantum confluent hypergeometric equation (1.1), defines a (u_1, \dots, u_ν) -family deformation $O(u)_k$ (as in (1.7)) of the map for each $k = 1, \dots, \nu$

$$O_k : Y_{\hbar}(\mathfrak{gl}_{\nu-1}) \rightarrow U(\mathfrak{gl}_\nu); T(\lambda)_{ij} \mapsto (\lambda + \hbar(e_{kk} + 1))\delta_{ij} - \hbar e_{ij} - \hbar^2 \frac{e_{ik}e_{kj}}{\lambda} \in U(\mathfrak{gl}_\nu), \quad i, j \in \{1, \dots, \nu\} \setminus \{k\}.$$

The map O_k is known as the Olshanski centralizer construction and is known to be an algebra homomorphism. See e.g., in [25, Theorem 1.12.1] for more details on the algebra homomorphism. Then one checks that the deformations $O(u)_k$ are also algebra homomorphisms. \square

Proof of Proposition 1.5. Suppose that a representation $\rho : U(\mathfrak{gl}_\nu) \rightarrow \text{End}(V)$ is given. Let us consider the system (1.1) associated to V . Such a system becomes a special case of the System (2.1), i.e., an $mn \times mn$ system (assume $m = \dim(V)$), where $u = \text{diag}(u_1 I_m, \dots, u_\nu I_m)$, with distinct u_1, \dots, u_ν and multiplicity m, \dots, m , and the residue $A = -\hbar \mathbf{E}^V = -(\hbar e_{ij}^V)_{\nu \times \nu}$ is divided into (m, \dots, m) -blocks.

Therefore, we can apply the results of Theorem 1.2 and Theorem 3.4 to the system (1.1) associated to V . It gives rise to the desired expressions in Proposition 1.5. \square

5.2 Proof of Theorem 1.6

Proof of Theorem 1.6. The matrix \mathcal{T} in Theorem 1.6 represents the infinite product of matrices $T_k(m)$, i.e.

$$\left(\prod_{m=1}^{\leftarrow p} T_k(m) \right) \left(-\frac{1}{u_k I - u_{\hat{k}\hat{k}}} \hbar \mathbf{E}_{\hat{k}\hat{k}} \right) \stackrel{p \rightarrow \infty}{\sim} \mathcal{T}_{\hat{k}\hat{k}}, \quad (-\hbar \mathbf{E}_{\hat{k}\hat{k}}) \left(\prod_{m=-p}^{\leftarrow -1} T_k(m) \right) \stackrel{p \rightarrow \infty}{\sim} \mathcal{T}_{\hat{k}\hat{k}}. \quad (5.10)$$

Thus by Proposition 1.5 we have

$$\mathcal{T}_{st} := (u_t - u_s)^{\hbar e_{ss}} \frac{(S_{[\tau]})_{st}}{2\pi i} (u_t - u_s)^{-\hbar e_{tt}}, \quad s \neq t. \quad (5.11)$$

Thus the commutation relations of the entries of \mathcal{T} can be reduced to the commutation relations of the weights \mathcal{S} of segments under quantum system (1.1), as guaranteed by Proposition 4.9.

The segments $[u_s, u_t]$ with argument, as the path class with arguments, under the morphism $\mathfrak{S}(u_1, \dots, u_\nu) \xrightarrow{\pi} U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_\nu)$ induced by Theorem 4.5, are mapped to

$$[u_s, u_t] \mapsto \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{st} := (u_t - u_s)^{-\hbar e_{ss}} \cdot 2\pi i \mathcal{T}_{st} \cdot (u_t - u_s)^{\hbar e_{tt}}.$$

According to Proposition 4.9, for distinct indices s_1, t_1, s_2, t_2 and $\arg(u_{t_2} - u_{s_2}) - \arg(u_{t_1} - u_{s_1}) \in (0, \pi)$, we have

$$\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{s_1 t_1} \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{s_2 t_2} - \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{s_2 t_2} \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{s_1 t_1} = 0, \quad [u_{s_1}, u_{t_1}] \cap [u_{s_2}, u_{t_2}] = \emptyset, \quad (5.12a)$$

$$\frac{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{s_1 t_1} \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{s_2 t_2} - \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{s_2 t_2} \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{s_1 t_1}}{q - q^{-1}} = \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{s_1 t_2} \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{s_2 t_1}, \quad [u_{s_1}, u_{t_1}] \cap [u_{s_2}, u_{t_2}] \neq \emptyset. \quad (5.12b)$$

For distinct indices s, m, t , we have

$$\frac{q \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{sm} \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{mt} - \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{mt} \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{sm}}{q - q^{-1}} = -\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{st}, \quad \arg(u_t - u_m) - \arg(u_m - u_s) \in (0, \pi), \quad (5.13a)$$

$$\frac{q^{-1} \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{sm} \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{mt} - \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{mt} \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{sm}}{q - q^{-1}} = -\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{st}, \quad \arg(u_t - u_m) - \arg(u_m - u_s) \in (-\pi, 0), \quad (5.13b)$$

$$\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{ms} \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{mt} - q \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{mt} \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{ms} = 0, \quad \arg(u_t - u_m) - \arg(u_s - u_m) \in (0, \pi), \quad (5.13c)$$

$$q^{-1} \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{sm} \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{tm} - \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{tm} \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{sm} = 0, \quad \arg(u_m - u_t) - \arg(u_m - u_s) \in (0, \pi), \quad (5.13d)$$

$$\frac{q \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{st} \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{ts} - q^{-1} \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{ts} \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{st}}{q - q^{-1}} = q^{2(e_{ss} - e_{tt})} - 1, \quad \arg(u_s - u_t) - \arg(u_t - u_s) = \pi. \quad (5.13e)$$

Applying $q^{ekk} \mathcal{T}_{st} q^{-ekk} = q^{\delta_{sk} - \delta_{kt}} \mathcal{T}_{st}$, we finish the proof. \square

Acknowledgements

The authors are supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 12171006) and by the National Key Research and Development Program of China (No. 2021YFA1002000).

References

- [1] W. Balser. Explicit evaluation of the Stokes' multipliers and central connection coefficients for certain systems of linear differential equations. *Mathematische Nachrichten*, 138(1):131–144, 1988.
- [2] W. Balser. *Formal power series and linear systems of meromorphic ordinary differential equations*. Springer New York, NY, 2013.
- [3] G. D. Birkhoff. General theory of linear difference equations. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 12(2):243–284, 1911.
- [4] P. Boalch. Stokes matrices, Poisson Lie groups and Frobenius manifolds. *Inventiones mathematicae*, 146(3):479–506, 2001.
- [5] P. Boalch. G-bundles, isomonodromy, and quantum Weyl groups. *International Mathematics Research Notices*, 2002(22):1129–1166, 2002.
- [6] P. Boalch. Simply-laced isomonodromy systems. *Publications mathématiques de l'IHÉS*, 116:1–68, 2012.
- [7] T. Bridgeland. Riemann-Hilbert problems from Donaldson-Thomas theory. *Inventiones mathematicae*, 216(1):69–124, 2019.
- [8] T. Bridgeland and V. Toledano Laredo. Stability conditions and Stokes factors. *Inventiones mathematicae*, 187:61–98, 2012.
- [9] J. Ding and I. B. Frenkel. Isomorphism of two realizations of quantum affine algebra. *Communications in mathematical physics*, 156(2):277–300, 1993.
- [10] V. G. Drinfel'd. Hopf algebras and the quantum Yang-Baxter equation. In *Yang-Baxter Equation in Integrable Systems*, pages 264–268. World Scientific, 1990.
- [11] B. Dubrovin. Geometry of 2D topological field theories. *Integrable systems and quantum groups*, pages 120–348, 1996.
- [12] L. Faddeev. Integrable models in 1 + 1 dimensional quantum field theory. Technical report, CEA Centre d'Etudes Nucleaires de Saclay, 1982.
- [13] L. Faddeev and N. Y. Reshetikhin. Hamiltonian structures for integrable models of field theory. *Theoret. and Math. Phys.*, 56:847–862, 1983.
- [14] L. Faddeev, N. Y. Reshetikhin, and L. A. Takhtajan. Quantization of Lie groups and Lie algebras. In *Algebraic analysis*, pages 129–139. Elsevier, 1988.
- [15] G. Felder and G. Rembado. Singular modules for affine Lie algebras, and applications to irregular WZNW conformal blocks. *Selecta Mathematica*, 29(1):15, 2023.
- [16] S. Galkin, V. Golyshev, and H. Iritani. Gamma classes and quantum cohomology of Fano manifolds: Gamma conjectures. *Duke Mathematical Journal*, 165(11):2005 – 2077, 2016.
- [17] M. Jimbo. A q -difference analogue of $U(\mathfrak{g})$ and the Yang-Baxter equation. *Letters in Mathematical Physics*, 10(1):63–69, 1985.
- [18] M. Jimbo, T. Miwa, Y. Môri, and M. Sato. Density matrix of an impenetrable Bose gas and the fifth Painlevé transcendent. *Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena*, 1(1):80–158, 1980.
- [19] A. N. Kirillov and N. Reshetikhin. q -Weyl group and a multiplicative formula for universal R -matrices. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 134(2):421 – 431, 1990.
- [20] P. P. Kulish and E. K. Sklyanin. Solutions of the Yang-Baxter equation. *Journal of Soviet Mathematics*, 19:1596–1620, 1982.
- [21] G. Lusztig. Quantum groups at roots of 1. *Geometriae Dedicata*, 35(1):89–113, 1990.
- [22] C. Mitschi, D. Sauzin, M. Loday-Richaud, and É. Delabaere. *Divergent series, summability and resurgence*, volume 2153. Springer, 2016.
- [23] T. Miwa. Painlevé property of monodromy preserving deformation equations and the analyticity of τ functions. *Publications of the Research Institute for Mathematical Sciences*, 17(2):703–721, 1981.
- [24] A. I. Molev. Yangians and transvector algebras. *Discrete mathematics*, 246(1-3):231–253, 2002.
- [25] A. I. Molev. *Yangians and classical Lie algebras*. 143. American Mathematical Soc., 2007.

- [26] G. I. Olshanski. Extension of the algebra $U(\mathfrak{g})$ for infinite-dimensional classical Lie algebras \mathfrak{g} and the Yangians $Y(\mathfrak{gl}(m))$. In *Doklady Akademii Nauk*, volume 297, pages 1050–1054. Russian Academy of Sciences, 1987.
- [27] G. I. Olshanski. Representations of infinite-dimensional classical groups, limits of enveloping algebras, and Yangians. *Topics in representation theory*, 2:1–66, 1991.
- [28] G. Rembado. Simply-laced quantum connections generalising KZ. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 368(1):1–54, 2019.
- [29] G. Rembado. Symmetries of the simply-laced quantum connections and quantisation of quiver varieties. *SIGMA. Symmetry, Integrability and Geometry: Methods and Applications*, 16:103, 2020.
- [30] Nicolai Reshetikhin. The Knizhnik-Zamolodchikov system as a deformation of the isomonodromy problem. *Letters in Mathematical Physics*, 26:167–177, 1992.
- [31] Y. S. Soibelman. Algebra of functions on a compact quantum group and its representations. *Algebra i analiz*, 2(1):190–212, 1990.
- [32] L. A. Takhtadzhan and L. D. Faddeev. The quantum method of the inverse problem and the Heisenberg XYZ model. *Russian Mathematical Surveys*, 34(5):11, 1979.
- [33] Q. Tang and X. Xu. The boundary condition for some isomonodromy equations. *arXiv: 2402.07269*, 2024.
- [34] X. Xu. Representations of quantum groups arising from Stokes phenomenon and their applications. *arXiv: 2012.15673*, 2020.
- [35] X. Xu. Stokes phenomenon and reflection equations. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 398:353–373, 2023.
- [36] X. Xu. Regularized limits of Stokes matrices, isomonodromy deformation and crystal basis. *arXiv:1912.07196v5*, 2024.