

TOPOLOGICAL RECURSION FOR MONOTONE ORBIFOLD HURWITZ NUMBERS: A PROOF OF THE DO-KAREV CONJECTURE

R. KRAMER, A. POPOLITOV, AND S. SHADRIN

ABSTRACT. We prove the conjecture of Do and Karev that the monotone orbifold Hurwitz numbers satisfy the Chekhov-Eynard-Orantin topological recursion.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
1.1. Monotone orbifold Hurwitz numbers	1
1.2. Topological recursion	1
1.3. The Do-Karev conjecture	2
1.4. Proof	2
1.5. Organization of the paper	3
1.6. Acknowledgments	3
2. The cut-and-join operator	3
3. Holomorphic expression	6
4. Quadratic loop equations	8
References	10

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Monotone orbifold Hurwitz numbers. A sequence of transpositions $\tau_1, \dots, \tau_m \in S_d$, $\tau_i = (a_i, b_i)$, $a_i < b_i$, $i = 1, \dots, m$, is called monotone if $b_1 \leq b_2 \leq \dots \leq b_m$. For the entire paper, fix a positive integer q . The disconnected monotone q -orbifold Hurwitz numbers $h_{g,\mu}^\bullet$, $\mu = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_\ell)$ are defined as

$$(1) \quad h_{g,\mu}^\bullet := \frac{|\text{Aut}(\mu)|}{|\mu|!} \left| \left\{ (\tau_0, \tau_1, \dots, \tau_m) \left| \begin{array}{l} \tau_i \in S_{|\mu|}, \tau_0 \tau_1 \cdots \tau_m \in C_\mu, \tau_0 \in C_{(q, \dots, q)}, \\ m = 2g - 2 + \ell + \frac{|\mu|}{q}, \text{ and} \\ \tau_1, \dots, \tau_m \text{ is a monotone sequence of transpositions} \end{array} \right. \right\} \right|.$$

Here, $|\mu| = \sum_{i=1}^\ell \mu_i$ and $\text{Aut}(\mu) = \{\sigma \in S_\ell \mid \mu_j = \mu_{\sigma(j)} \forall j\}$.

The connected monotone Hurwitz numbers $h_{g,\mu}^c$ are defined by the same formula, but with an extra addition that $\tau_0, \tau_1, \dots, \tau_m$ generate a transitive subgroup of $S_{|\mu|}$.

The double monotone Hurwitz numbers were first introduced by Goulden, Guay-Paquet, and Novak, ‘double’ allowing for τ_0 to be any permutation, in [20] in their study of the HCIZ integral, and their orbifold, i.e. $\tau_0 \in C_{(q, \dots, q)}$, version that we study in this paper was first considered explicitly as an object of research by Do and Karev in [10]. These numbers were very intensively studied in the recent years due to their rich system of connections to integrability, combinatorics, representation theory, and geometry, see e.g. [19, 18, 21, 24, 3, 23, 22, 2].

1.2. Topological recursion. The topological recursion of Chekhov, Eynard, and Orantin [17] is a recursive procedure that associates to some initial data on a Riemann surface Σ a sequence of meromorphic differentials $\omega_{g,n}$ on $\Sigma^{\times n}$. The initial data consist of Σ itself, two non-constant meromorphic functions x and y on Σ , and a choice of a symmetric bi-differential B on $\Sigma^{\times 2}$ with a double pole with bi-residue 1 on the diagonal.

We assume that x has simple critical points $p_1, \dots, p_s \in \Sigma$, and by σ_i we denote the local deck transformation for x near the point p_i . We also assume that the p_i are not critical points of y . We use the variables z_i as the placeholders for the arguments of the differential forms to stress dependence on

the point of the curve, and we denote by z_I the set of variables with indices in the set I . Finally, $\llbracket n \rrbracket$ denotes the set $\{1, \dots, n\}$.

The topological recursion works as follows: first define $\omega_{0,1} := ydx$, $\omega_{0,2} := B$, and for $2g-2+n+1 > 0$

$$(2) \quad \omega_{g,n+1}(z_0, z_{\llbracket n \rrbracket}) := \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^s \operatorname{Res}_{z \rightarrow p_i} \frac{\int_z^{\sigma_i z} B(\cdot, z_0)}{ydx(\sigma_i z) - ydx(z)} \left[\omega_{g-1,n+2}(z, \sigma_i z, z_{\llbracket n \rrbracket}) \right. \\ \left. \sum_{\substack{g_1+g_2=g, I_1 \sqcup I_2 = \llbracket n \rrbracket \\ (g_1, |I_1|) \neq (0,0) \neq (g_2, |I_2|)}} \omega_{g_1,1+|I_1|}(z, z_I) \omega_{g_2,1+|I_2|}(\sigma_i z, z_{I_2}) \right].$$

Originally, this procedure was designed to compute the cumulants of some class of matrix models [8], but since then it has evolved a lot and nowadays it is intensively studied on the crossroads of enumerative geometry, integrable systems, and mirror symmetry, see e.g. [16, 27] for a survey of applications. In particular, it is the key ingredient of the so-called remodeling of the B-model conjecture proposed in [7], which suggests that topological recursion is the right version of the B-model for a class of enumerative problems, in the context of mirror symmetry theory.

1.3. The Do-Karev conjecture. Denote by $H_{g,n}$ the n -point generating function for the connected q -orbifold monotone Hurwitz numbers:

$$(3) \quad H_{g,n}(x_1, \dots, x_n) := \sum_{\mu_1, \dots, \mu_n=1}^{\infty} h_{g, \mu_1, \dots, \mu_n}^{\circ} \prod_{i=1}^n x_i^{\mu_i}.$$

Consider the spectral curve data given by $\Sigma = \mathbb{C}$, $x(z) = z(1 - z^q)$ and $y(z) = z^{q-1}/(1 - z^q)$, $B(z_1, z_2) = dz_1 dz_2 / (z_1 - z_2)^2$ (our definition of y differs by a sign from the one in [10] since we use a different sign in the definition of the recursion kernel than *op. cit.*). The critical points of $x(z)$ are $p_j = (q+1)^{-1/q} \exp(2\pi\sqrt{-1}j/q)$, $j = 1, \dots, q$.

Consider the symmetric multi-differentials $\omega_{g,n}(z_1, \dots, z_n)$, $g \geq 0$, $n \geq 1$, defined on \mathbb{C}^n by the Chekhov-Eynard-Orantin topological recursion. The conjecture of Do-Karev claims that

$$(4) \quad \omega_{g,n}(z_1, \dots, z_n) = d_1 \otimes \dots \otimes d_n H_{g,n}(x_1, \dots, x_n),$$

where we consider the Taylor series expansion near $x_1 = \dots = x_n = 0$ and substitute $x_i \rightarrow x(z_i)$. This conjecture is proved for $(g, n) = (0, 1)$ in [10] and for $(g, n) = (0, 2)$ in [26] and in an unpublished work of Karev. It is also proved in [9, 11] for all (g, n) in the case $q = 1$. In this paper we prove it in the general case:

Theorem 1.1. *The conjecture of Do-Karev holds.*

In addition to settling an explicitly posed open conjecture, this theorem is interesting in several different contexts. Firstly, it can be considered as a mirror symmetry statement in the context of the remodeling of the B-model principle of [7]. Secondly, it is a part of a more general conjecture for weighted double Hurwitz numbers proposed in [2] and its proof might be useful for the analysis of this more general conjecture. Thirdly, once the Do-Karev conjecture is proved, one can use the results of [15, 14] to express the monotone orbifold Hurwitz numbers as the intersection numbers of the tautological classes on the moduli spaces of curves (for $q = 1$, this is done in [3, 10]).

1.4. Proof. For the proof we use a corollary of [6, Theorem 2.2] (see also [4]). Namely, in order to prove that the differentials $d_1 \otimes \dots \otimes d_n H_{g,n}(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ satisfy the topological recursion on a given *rational* spectral curve, it is sufficient to show that

- (1) The conjecture holds for $(g, n) = (0, 1)$ and $(0, 2)$.
- (2) $H_{g,n}(x_1, \dots, x_n)$, $2g-2+n > 0$, are the expansion at the point $x_1 = \dots = x_n = 0$ of a finite linear combination of the products of finite order d/dx_i -derivatives of the functions $\xi_j(z_i) := 1/(z_i - p_j)$, $x_i = x(z_i)$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, $j = 1, \dots, q$.
- (3) The differential forms $d_1 \otimes \dots \otimes d_n H_{g,n}(x_1, \dots, x_n)$, considered as globally defined differentials on the spectral curve rather than formal power series expansions, satisfy the so-called *quadratic loop equations*. For a collection of symmetric differentials $(\omega_{g,n})_{g \geq 0, n \geq 1}$ on a spectral curve, the quadratic loop equations state that for all $g \geq 0$ and $n \geq 1$

$$(5) \quad \omega_{g-1,n+1}(z, \sigma_i(z), z_{\llbracket n-1 \rrbracket}) + \sum_{\substack{g=g_1+g_2 \\ \llbracket n-1 \rrbracket = I \sqcup J}} \omega_{g_1,|I|+1}(z, z_I) \omega_{g_2,|J|+1}(\sigma_i(z), z_J)$$

is holomorphic in z near p_i , with a double zero at p_i itself, cf. [6, (2.2)].

The relation between [6, Theorem 2.2] and the list above is given by lemma 3.1.

As we mentioned above, the unstable cases are proved in [10, 26], and in an unpublished work of Karev. The second property is proved in [26]. So, the only thing that we have to do to complete the proof is to formulate and prove the quadratic loop equations. It is done in proposition 4.1 below. \square

Remark 1.2. This approach to proving the topological recursion was used before in [13, 11] (where the quadratic loop equations followed directly from the cut-and-join equation) and in [5, 12], where a system of formal corollaries of the quadratic loop equations was related to the cut-and-join operators of completed r -cycles. In this paper we combine the latter result with the formula in [3, Example 5.8] that expresses the partition function of the monotone orbifold Hurwitz numbers in terms of an infinite series of the operators of completed r -cycles.

1.5. Organization of the paper. This paper is very essentially based on the results of [12] and [3]. However, in this paper, we work exclusively in the so-called bosonic Fock space, i.e. the space of symmetric functions instead of the fermionic Fock space, or semi-infinite wedge formalism, as in *op. cit.*. By the classical boson-fermion correspondence [25, 28], we can translate the necessary results in the fermionic Fock space to the language of differential operators in the ring of symmetric functions.

In section 2 we derive the so-called “cut-and-join” evolutionary equation for the exponential partition function of monotone orbifold Hurwitz numbers and discuss its convergence issues. In section 3 we use the cut-and-join operator to construct a particular expression holomorphic at the critical points of the spectral curve, which is needed for the proof of the quadratic loop equations. In section 4 we formulate and prove the quadratic loop equations.

1.6. Acknowledgments. We thank A. Alexandrov, P. Dunin-Barkowski, M. Karev, and D. Lewański for useful discussions. We also thank an anonymous referee for useful suggestions. A.P. would like to thank Korteweg-de Vries Institute for hospitality and flourishing scientific atmosphere. R.K. and S.S. were supported partially by the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research. A.P. was supported in part by the grant of the Foundation for the Advancement of Theoretical Physics “BASIS”, by RFBR grants 16-01-00291, 18-31-20046 mol.a.ved and 19-01-00680 A.

2. THE CUT-AND-JOIN OPERATOR

Define the function $\zeta(z) = e^{z/2} - e^{-z/2}$ and for a partition λ (viewed as its Young diagram), and a box $\square = (i, j) \in \lambda$, let $cr_{\square}^{\lambda} = i - j$ be its content. The partition function of the monotone q -orbifold Hurwitz numbers can be defined as [24]

$$(6) \quad Z := \sum_{g=0}^{\infty} \sum_{\mu} \frac{\hbar^{2g-2+l(\mu)+|\mu|/q}}{|\text{Aut}(\mu)|} \hbar_{g,\mu}^{\bullet} \prod_{i=1}^{l(\mu)} p_{\mu_i} = \sum_{\lambda} s_{\lambda}(\delta_q) \left(\prod_{\square \in \lambda} (1 - \hbar cr_{\square}^{\lambda})^{-1} \right) s_{\lambda}(p),$$

where the s_{λ} are Schur functions expressed as polynomials in the power sums p_i , and the left Schur function is evaluated at the point $p_j = \delta_{j,q}$.

Define the series of operators $Q(z) = \sum_{r=1}^{\infty} Q_r z^r$ as

$$(7) \quad Q(z) := \frac{1}{\zeta(z)} \sum_{s=1}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{\substack{n \geq 1 \\ k_1, \dots, k_n \geq 1 \\ k_1 + \dots + k_n = s}} \frac{1}{n!} \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{\zeta(k_i z) p_{k_i}}{k_i} \right) \left(\sum_{\substack{m \geq 1 \\ \ell_1, \dots, \ell_m \geq 1 \\ \ell_1 + \dots + \ell_m = s}} \frac{1}{m!} \prod_{j=1}^m \zeta(\ell_j z) \frac{\partial}{\partial p_{\ell_j}} \right).$$

Define the operator J as

$$(8) \quad \begin{aligned} J &:= \frac{\frac{\partial}{\partial \hbar}}{\zeta(\hbar^2 \frac{\partial}{\partial \hbar})} \sum_{r=1}^{\infty} \hbar^r Q_r (r-1)! - \frac{1}{\hbar} Q_1 \\ &= \sum_{r=2}^{\infty} \hbar^{r-2} Q_r (r-1)! + \sum_{\alpha=1}^{\infty} c_{\alpha} \sum_{r=1}^{\infty} \hbar^{r-2+2\alpha} Q_r (r-1+2\alpha)!. \end{aligned}$$

Here c_{α} are the coefficients of the expansion $\frac{z}{\zeta(z)} = \sum_{\alpha=0}^{\infty} c_{\alpha} z^{2\alpha}$, that is, $c_1 = -\frac{1}{24}$, $c_2 = \frac{7}{5760}$, and in general c_{α} can be expressed in terms of the Bernoulli numbers as $c_{\alpha} = \frac{2^{1-2\alpha} B_{2\alpha}}{(2\alpha)!}$.

Proposition 2.1. *We have: $\frac{\partial}{\partial \hbar} Z = JZ$.*

Proof. Recall [3, proposition 5.2], which states that the operator $\mathcal{D}(\hbar)$ acting on the space of symmetric functions as $\mathcal{D}(\hbar)s_\lambda := \left[\prod_{\square \in \lambda} (1 - \hbar c_{\square})^{-1} \right] s_\lambda$ as in equation (6) can be expressed by the formula

$$(9) \quad \mathcal{D}(\hbar) = \exp \left(\left[\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_0(\hbar^2 \frac{\partial}{\partial \hbar}) / \zeta(\hbar^2 \frac{\partial}{\partial \hbar}) - \mathcal{F}_1 \right] \log(\hbar) \right),$$

where $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_0(z) = \sum_{r=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{F}_r \frac{z^r}{r!} = z \sum_{r=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{F}_r \frac{z^{r-1}}{r!}$, and \mathcal{F}_r is the operator whose action in the basis of Schur polynomials is diagonal and is given by

$$(10) \quad \mathcal{F}_r s_\lambda = \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \left((\lambda_i - i + \frac{1}{2})^r - (-i + \frac{1}{2})^r \right) s_\lambda$$

for $\lambda = (\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_\ell)$ [3, equation (2.4)]. The operators \mathcal{F}_r can be expressed as differential operators in the variables p as $\mathcal{F}_r s_\lambda = r! Q_r s_\lambda$, $r \geq 1$ ([30, theorem 5.2], see also [1, 29]). Note that

$$(11) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial \hbar} \mathcal{D}(\hbar) &= \frac{1}{\hbar^2} \cdot \hbar^2 \frac{\partial}{\partial \hbar} \mathcal{D}(\hbar) = \mathcal{D}(\hbar) \cdot \frac{1}{\hbar^2} \left(\left[\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_0(\hbar^2 \frac{\partial}{\partial \hbar}) / \zeta(\hbar^2 \frac{\partial}{\partial \hbar}) - \mathcal{F}_1 \right] \hbar \right) \\ &= \mathcal{D}(\hbar) \cdot \left(\frac{1}{\hbar^2} \left(\frac{\hbar^2 \frac{\partial}{\partial \hbar}}{\zeta(\hbar^2 \frac{\partial}{\partial \hbar})} \sum_{r=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{F}_r \frac{\hbar^r}{r} \right) - \frac{1}{\hbar} \mathcal{F}_1 \right) \end{aligned}$$

and, therefore,

$$(12) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial \hbar} Z &= \sum_{\lambda} s_{\lambda}(\delta_q) \mathcal{D}(\hbar) \left[\frac{\frac{\partial}{\partial \hbar}}{\zeta(\hbar^2 \frac{\partial}{\partial \hbar})} \sum_{r=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{F}_r \frac{\hbar^r}{r} - \frac{1}{\hbar} \mathcal{F}_1 \right] s_{\lambda}(p) \\ &= \sum_{\lambda} s_{\lambda}(\delta_q) \mathcal{D}(\hbar) \left[\frac{\frac{\partial}{\partial \hbar}}{\zeta(\hbar^2 \frac{\partial}{\partial \hbar})} \sum_{r=1}^{\infty} \hbar^r Q_r (r-1)! - \frac{1}{\hbar} Q_1 \right] s_{\lambda}(p) = JZ. \end{aligned}$$

□

Corollary 2.2. *For $2g - 2 + n > 0$ we have:*

$$(13) \quad \begin{aligned} &\left(2g - 2 + n + \frac{1}{q} \sum_{i=1}^n D_{x_i} \right) \tilde{H}_{g,n} = \\ &\sum_{\substack{m \geq 1, d \geq 0 \\ m+2d \geq 2}} \frac{(m+2d-1)!}{m!} \sum_{\ell=1}^m \frac{1}{\ell!} \sum_{\substack{\{k\} \sqcup \bigsqcup_{j=1}^{\ell} K_j = \llbracket n \rrbracket \\ \bigsqcup_{j=1}^{\ell} M_j = \llbracket m \rrbracket \\ M_j \neq \emptyset \\ g-d = \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} g_j + m - \ell \\ g_1, \dots, g_{\ell} \geq 0}} Q_{d, \emptyset, m}^{(k)} \left[\prod_{j=1}^{\ell} \tilde{H}_{g_j, |M_j| + |K_j|}(\xi_{M_j}, x_{K_j}) \right] \\ &+ \sum_{\alpha=1}^g c_{\alpha} \sum_{\substack{m \geq 1, d \geq 0 \\ m+2d \geq 1}} \frac{(m+2d-1+2\alpha)!}{m!} \sum_{\ell=1}^m \frac{1}{\ell!} \sum_{\substack{\{k\} \sqcup \bigsqcup_{j=1}^{\ell} K_j = \llbracket n \rrbracket \\ \bigsqcup_{j=1}^{\ell} M_j = \llbracket m \rrbracket \\ M_j \neq \emptyset \\ g-d-\alpha = \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} g_j + m - \ell \\ g_1, \dots, g_{\ell} \geq 0}} Q_{d, \emptyset, m}^{(k)} \left[\prod_{j=1}^{\ell} \tilde{H}_{g_j, |M_j| + |K_j|}(\xi_{M_j}, x_{K_j}) \right], \end{aligned}$$

where $D_{x_i} = x_i \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}$,

$$(14) \quad \sum_{d \geq 0} Q_{d, K_0, m}^{(k)} z^{2d} = \frac{z}{\zeta(z)} \prod_{i \in \{k\} \sqcup K_0} \frac{\zeta(z D_{x_i})}{z D_{x_i}} \circ \prod_{j=1}^m \frac{\zeta(z D_{\xi_j})}{z} \Big|_{\xi_j = x_k}, \quad D_{\xi_j} = \xi_j \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi_j},$$

$$(15) \quad \tilde{H}_{0,1}(\xi) = H_{0,1}(\xi)$$

$$(16) \quad \tilde{H}_{0,2}(\xi, x) = H_{0,2}(\xi, x) + H_{0,2}^{\text{sing}}(\xi, x), \quad H_{0,2}^{\text{sing}}(\xi, x) = \log \left(\frac{\xi - x}{\xi x} \right),$$

$$(17) \quad \tilde{H}_{0,2}(\xi_1, \xi_2) = H_{0,2}(\xi_1, \xi_2),$$

$$(18) \quad \tilde{H}_{g,n} = H_{g,n} + \sum_{\alpha=0}^g c_{\alpha} \frac{(2g-2+n+2\alpha)!}{2g-2+n}, \quad 2g-2+n > 0.$$

The contribution $H_{0,2}^{\text{sing}}(\xi, x)$ is called the *singular part*. Note that we introduce more general operators $Q_{d;K_0,m}^{(k)}$ than the ones used in the statement of the corollary (where only have $K_0 = \emptyset$), since we need them below in the proof.

Proof. The proof repeats *mutatis mutandis* the proof of [5, proposition 10], so we only give a sketch of the idea, with the analogy explained. The operator J is a linear combination of the Q_r . Hence, comparing proposition 2.1 to [5, equation (3)]: $\frac{1}{r!} \frac{\partial}{\partial \beta} Z^{r,q} = Q_{r+1} Z^{r,q}$, we can manipulate the first equation as the second. So, we map p_μ to monomial symmetric functions $M_\mu(x_1, \dots, x_n)$, using [5, equation (5)] for the effect of this map on the operators Q_r acting on a partition function Z . The next step is incorporating the factors $\frac{x_i}{x_k - x_i}$ as part of $\tilde{H}_{0,2}$, which is given by (16) and explained in the proof of [5, proposition 10]. As in that proof, this adds a term on the right-hand side of equation (13) where all factors are singular parts, and this is the extra term in (18). This corresponds to the case $m = \ell = n - 1$, and can equivalently be written in the shape of [5, proposition 6], with $m = \ell = 0$. This gives

$$(19) \quad \sum_{d \geq \min\{0, 3-n\}} (n+2d-2)! \sum_{\{k\} \sqcup K_0 = \llbracket n \rrbracket} \delta_{g,d} Q_{d,K_0,0}^{(k)} \prod_{j \in K_0} \frac{x_j}{x_k - x_j} + \sum_{\alpha=1}^g c_\alpha (n+2d+2\alpha-2)! \sum_{\{k\} \sqcup K_0 = \llbracket n \rrbracket} \delta_{g,d} Q_{d,K_0,0}^{(k)} \prod_{j \in K_0} \frac{x_j}{x_k - x_j}.$$

The condition $d \geq \min\{0, 3-n\}$ excludes the unstable cases $(g, n) = (0, 1), (0, 2)$, and for $2g - 2 + n > 0$ it simplifies to

$$(20) \quad \sum_{\alpha=0}^g c_\alpha (n+2g+2\alpha-2)! \sum_{\{k\} \sqcup K_0 = \llbracket n \rrbracket} \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{\zeta(zD_{x_i})}{zD_{x_i}} \prod_{j \in K_0} \frac{x_j}{x_k - x_j}$$

$$(21) \quad = \sum_{\alpha=0}^g c_\alpha (n+2g+2\alpha-2)! \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{\zeta(zD_{x_i})}{zD_{x_i}} \sum_{k=1}^n \prod_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq k}}^n \frac{x_j}{x_k - x_j}.$$

As calculated in [5, proposition 10],

$$(22) \quad \sum_{k=1}^n \prod_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq k}}^n \frac{x_j}{x_k - x_j} = -1$$

and therefore, there cannot be any derivatives acting on it.

Now we use induction on $2g - 2 + n$, with the induction hypothesis being that $H_{g,n} - \tilde{H}_{g,n}$ is a constant. This holds for the $(0, 1)$ case, while the $(0, 2)$ case is taken care of by the previous argument. Using the induction hypothesis, we get from the previous calculation that

$$(23) \quad \left(2g - 2 + n + \frac{1}{q} \sum_{i=1}^n D_{x_i}\right) (H_{g,n} - \tilde{H}_{g,n}) = \sum_{\alpha=0}^g c_\alpha (n+2g+2\alpha-2)!,$$

as all constants from previous $H - \tilde{H}$ are annihilated on the right-hand side by derivatives.

As both $H_{g,n}$ and $\tilde{H}_{g,n}$ are power series in the x_i and the D_{x_i} preserve degree and vanish on constants, this shows that

$$(24) \quad H_{g,n} - \tilde{H}_{g,n} = \sum_{\alpha=0}^g c_\alpha \frac{(n+2g+2\alpha-2)!}{2g-2+n}.$$

□

Remark 2.3. It is proved in [26] that each $H_{g,n}$ is an expansion of a globally defined meromorphic function on \mathbb{C}^n with known positions of poles and bounds on their order. More precisely, for $2g - 2 + n > 0$, $H_{g,n}(x_{\llbracket n \rrbracket})$ is the expansion of a function of $z_{\llbracket n \rrbracket}$, $x_i = x(z_i)$, which, by a slight abuse of notation, we also denote by $H_{g,n}(z_{\llbracket n \rrbracket})$, with the poles in each variable only at the points p_1, \dots, p_q , where the order of poles is bounded by some constants that depend only on g and n .

Remark 2.3 implies, in particular, that the right hand side of equation (13) is an infinite sum of meromorphic functions on \mathbb{C}^n with the natural coordinates z_1, \dots, z_n , $x_i = x(z_i)$, with the poles in each variable only at the points p_1, \dots, p_q and on the diagonals, where the order of poles is bounded by some constants that depend only on g and n . Let us prove that this infinite sum converges absolutely and uniformly on every compact subset of $(D \setminus \{p_1, \dots, p_q\})^n \setminus \text{Diag}$ to a meromorphic function with the same restriction on poles (and, therefore, equation (13) makes sense). Here, D is the unit disc.

Lemma 2.4. *Corollary 2.2 holds on the level of meromorphic functions on the unit disc D in the variables z_i , $i = 1, \dots, n$: the right hand side converges absolutely and uniformly on every compact subset of $(D \setminus \{p_1, \dots, p_q\})^n \setminus \text{Diag}$ to a meromorphic function with the poles in each variable only at the points p_1, \dots, p_q and on the big diagonal, the locus where at least two coordinates are equal. The order of poles is bounded by some constants that depend only on g and n .*

Proof. In order to see the convergence, we have to rewrite each of the summands on the right hand side (the first summand and the coefficients of c_α) in a way that collects all but finitely many terms in a series that can be analysed well. We claim that the only source of infinite summation are factors $D_\xi \tilde{H}_{0,1}(\xi)$. To see this, let us first analyse the summation range of (13) for a given (g, n) . Let us work it out for the first summand, the computation for all other summands is exactly the same. One summation condition is $g - d = \sum_{j=1}^\ell g_j + m - \ell$, which can be rewritten as $g = d + \sum_{j=1}^\ell (g_j + |M_j| - 1)$. As $g_j + |M_j| - 1 > 0$ unless $(g, |M_j|) = (0, 1)$, and furthermore there are only finitely many x_i to distribute, this does show that the sum over m, d (which bounds the number of D), decompositions of $\llbracket n \rrbracket$, and g_j is finite if we exclude $D_{x_k} \tilde{H}_{0,1}$. Furthermore, each such term obtains an infinite ‘tail’ of $D_{x_k} \tilde{H}_{0,1}$, as follows, where the variable m on the first line is split into m and t on the second and third line:

$$(25) \quad \sum_{\substack{m \geq 1, d \geq 0 \\ m+2d \geq 2}} \frac{(m+2d-1)!}{m!} \sum_{\ell=1}^m \frac{1}{\ell!} \sum_{\substack{\{k\} \sqcup \bigsqcup_{j=1}^\ell K_j = \llbracket n \rrbracket \\ \bigsqcup_{j=1}^\ell M_j = \llbracket m \rrbracket \\ M_j \neq \emptyset \\ g-d = \sum_{j=1}^\ell g_j + m - \ell \\ g_1, \dots, g_\ell \geq 0}} Q_{d, \emptyset, m}^{(k)} \left[\prod_{j=1}^\ell \tilde{H}_{g_j, |M_j| + |K_j|}(\xi_{M_j}, x_{K_j}) \right] = \\ \sum_{m, d \geq 0} \frac{1}{m!} \sum_{\ell=0}^m \frac{1}{\ell!} \sum_{\substack{\{k\} \sqcup \bigsqcup_{j=1}^\ell K_j = \llbracket n \rrbracket \\ \bigsqcup_{j=1}^\ell M_j = \llbracket m \rrbracket \\ M_j \neq \emptyset \\ g-d = \sum_{j=1}^\ell g_j + m - \ell \\ g_1, \dots, g_\ell \geq 0}} \left[Q_{d, \emptyset, m}^{(k)} \left[\prod_{j=1}^\ell \tilde{H}_{g_j, |M_j| + |K_j|}(\xi_{M_j}, x_{K_j}) \right] \right]_{\text{no } D_{x_k} \tilde{H}_{0,1}(x_k)} \\ \times \sum_{\substack{t=0 \\ t+m \geq 1 \\ t+m+2d \geq 2}}^{\infty} \frac{(m+t+2d-1)!}{t!} \left(D_{x_k} \tilde{H}_{0,1}(x_k) \right)^t.$$

Here we mean that in the second line, we exclude any factors $D_{x_k} \tilde{H}_{0,1}(x_k)$ left after the action of Q , and we collect these in the third line. Now the first two summations are finite, the coefficients

$$(26) \quad \left[Q_{d, \emptyset, m}^{(k)} \left[\prod_{j=1}^\ell \tilde{H}_{g_j, |M_j| + |K_j|}(\xi_{M_j}, x_{K_j}) \right] \right]_{\text{no } D_\xi \tilde{H}_{0,1}(\xi)}$$

are meromorphic functions with the desired restriction on poles, and the sum over t determines the explicit functions $\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \frac{(m+t+2d-1)!}{t!} u^t = \left(\frac{d}{du} \right)^{m+2d-1} \frac{u^{m+2d-1}}{1-u}$ of its argument $u = z^q = xy = D_{x_k} \tilde{H}_{0,1}(x_k)$, which converge on the unit disc. \square

3. HOLOMORPHIC EXPRESSION

In this section we analyse a symmetrization of equation (13) near one of the critical points of the function $x(z)$. For the rest of this paper we fix $p = p_j$, $j = 1, \dots, q$, and by $z \mapsto \bar{z}$ we denote the deck transformation near p .

We define the *symmetrizing operator* S_z and the *anti-symmetrizing operator* Δ_z by

$$(27) \quad \begin{aligned} S_z f(z) &:= f(z) + f(\bar{z}); \\ \Delta_z f(z) &:= f(z) - f(\bar{z}), \end{aligned}$$

and use the identity [5, 12]

$$(28) \quad S_z \left(f(z_1, \dots, z_r) \Big|_{z_i=z} \right) = 2^{1-r} \left(\sum_{\substack{I \sqcup J = \llbracket r \rrbracket \\ |J| \text{ even}}} \left(\prod_{i \in I} S_{z_i} \right) \left(\prod_{j \in J} \Delta_{z_j} \right) f(z_1, \dots, z_r) \right) \Big|_{z_i=z}, \quad r \geq 1.$$

Recall remark 2.3. Another direct corollary of the results of [26] is the linear loop equations for the n -point functions that can be formulated as the following lemma:

Lemma 3.1. *For any $g \geq 0$ and $n \geq 1$ we have: $S_{z_i} H_{g,n}(z_{\llbracket n \rrbracket})$ is holomorphic at $z_i \rightarrow p$.*

Proof. By [26, theorem 5.2 & proposition 6.2], cf. the statement after the proof of that proposition, the $H_{g,n}$ are linear combinations of polynomials in $\{\frac{d}{dx_i}\}$ acting on $\prod_{i=1}^n \xi_{\alpha_i}(x_i)$, where, up to a linear change of basis given in [26, Section 6.1], $\xi_{\alpha}(z) = \frac{1}{z-p_{\alpha}}$. In particular, $S_{z_i} \xi_{\alpha}(z_i)$ is holomorphic at $z_i \rightarrow p$ (trivially if $p \neq p_{\alpha}$ and because the pole is odd if $p = p_{\alpha}$). Because x itself is invariant under the involution by definition, this holomorphicity is preserved under any amount of applications of $\frac{d}{dx_i}$. \square

In order to simplify the notation, consider equation (13) for $H_{g,n+1} = H_{g,n+1}(x_0, \dots, x_n)$, and substitute $x_i = x(z_i)$. We apply the operator S_{z_0} to both sides of this equation. From the linear loop equations we immediately see that the left hand side of this equation is holomorphic at $z_0 \rightarrow p$, as well as all summands on the right hand of this equation with $k \neq 0$ (it is an infinite sum that converges in the sense of lemma 2.4). Thus we know that

Lemma 3.2. *The expression*

$$(29) \quad S_{z_0} \left[\sum_{\substack{m \geq 1, d \geq 0 \\ m+2d \geq 2}} \frac{(m+2d-1)!}{m!} \sum_{\ell=1}^m \frac{1}{\ell!} \sum_{\substack{\sqcup_{j=1}^{\ell} K_j = \llbracket n \rrbracket \\ \sqcup_{j=1}^{\ell} M_j = \llbracket m \rrbracket \\ M_j \neq \emptyset \\ g-d = \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} g_j + m - \ell \\ g_1, \dots, g_{\ell} \geq 0}} Q_{d, \emptyset, m}^{(0)} \left[\prod_{j=1}^{\ell} \tilde{H}_{g_j, |M_j| + |K_j|}(\xi_{M_j}, x_{K_j}) \right] \right. \\ \left. + \sum_{\alpha=1}^g c_{\alpha} \sum_{\substack{m \geq 1, d \geq 0 \\ m+2d \geq 1}} \frac{(m+2d-1+2\alpha)!}{m!} \sum_{\ell=1}^m \frac{1}{\ell!} \sum_{\substack{\sqcup_{j=1}^{\ell} K_j = \llbracket n \rrbracket \\ \sqcup_{j=1}^{\ell} M_j = \llbracket m \rrbracket \\ M_j \neq \emptyset \\ g-d-\alpha = \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} g_j + m - \ell \\ g_1, \dots, g_{\ell} \geq 0}} Q_{d, \emptyset, m}^{(0)} \left[\prod_{j=1}^{\ell} \tilde{H}_{g_j, |M_j| + |K_j|}(\xi_{M_j}, x_{K_j}) \right] \right]$$

is holomorphic at $z_0 \rightarrow p$.

It is convenient to introduce the notation

$$(30) \quad W_{g,n+m}(\xi_{\llbracket m \rrbracket}, x_{\llbracket n \rrbracket}) := D_{\xi_1} \cdots D_{\xi_m} D_{x_1} \cdots D_{x_n} \tilde{H}_{g,m+n}(\xi_{\llbracket m \rrbracket}, x_{\llbracket n \rrbracket});$$

$$(31) \quad \mathcal{W}_{g,m,n}(\xi_{\llbracket m \rrbracket} \mid z_{\llbracket n \rrbracket}) := \sum_{\ell=1}^m \frac{1}{\ell!} \sum_{\substack{\sqcup_{j=1}^{\ell} K_j = \llbracket n \rrbracket \\ \sqcup_{j=1}^{\ell} M_j = \llbracket m \rrbracket \\ M_j \neq \emptyset \\ g = \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} g_j + m - \ell \\ g_1, \dots, g_{\ell} \geq 0}} \prod_{j=1}^{\ell} W_{g_j, |M_j| + |K_j|}(\xi_{M_j}, x_{K_j}),$$

where we assume that $\xi_i := x(w_i)$, $i = 1, \dots, m$, and $x_j := x(z_j)$, $j = 1, \dots, n$. Denote also

$$(32) \quad \sum_{d \geq 0} \mathcal{Q}_{d,m}(z_0) t^{2d} = \frac{t}{\zeta(t)} \frac{\zeta(t D_{x(z_0)})}{t D_{x(z_0)}} \circ \prod_{j=1}^m \left([w_j = z_0] \circ \frac{\zeta(t D_{x(w_j)})}{t D_{x(w_j)}} \right),$$

where

$$(33) \quad [w_j = z_0] F(w) := \text{Res}_{w=z} F(w) \frac{dx(w)}{x(w) - x(z)}.$$

These notations allow us to rewrite expression (29) and to reformulate lemma 3.2 as

Corollary 3.3. *The expression*

$$(34) \quad S_{z_0} \left[\sum_{\substack{m \geq 1, d \geq 0 \\ m+2d \geq 2}} \frac{(m+2d-1)!}{m!} \mathcal{Q}_{d,m}(z_0) \mathcal{W}_{g-d,m,n}(w_{\llbracket m \rrbracket} \mid z_{\llbracket n \rrbracket}) \right. \\ \left. + \sum_{\alpha=1}^g c_{\alpha} \sum_{\substack{m \geq 1, d \geq 0 \\ m+2d \geq 1}} \frac{(m+2d-1+2\alpha)!}{m!} \mathcal{Q}_{d,m}(z_0) \mathcal{W}_{g-d-\alpha,m,n}(w_{\llbracket m \rrbracket} \mid z_{\llbracket n \rrbracket}) \right].$$

is holomorphic at $z_0 \rightarrow p$.

4. QUADRATIC LOOP EQUATIONS

In this section we use corollary 3.3 and results of [12] for the proof of the quadratic loop equations that can be formulated as the following proposition:

Proposition 4.1. *For any $g \geq 0$, $n \geq 0$ we have: $\mathcal{W}_{g,2,n}(w, \bar{w} \mid z_{[n]})$ is holomorphic at $w \rightarrow p$.*

Remark 4.2. In order to see that this really gives the quadratic loop equation, as given in (5), note that

$$(35) \quad \mathcal{W}_{g,2,n}(w, \bar{w} \mid z_{[n]}) = W_{g-1,n+2}(w, \bar{w}, z_{[n]}) + \sum_{\substack{K_1 \sqcup K_2 = [n] \\ g = g_1 + g_2}} W_{g_1,1+|K_1|}(w, z_{K_1}) W_{g_2,1+|K_2|}(\bar{w}, z_{K_2}).$$

Furthermore, $d_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes d_n H_{g,n}(z_{[n]}) = W_{g,n}(z_{[n]}) \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{dx(z_i)}{x(z_i)}$. Therefore, $\mathcal{W}_{g,2,n}(w, \bar{w} \mid z_{[n]})$ is holomorphic at $w \rightarrow p$ if and only if (5) is holomorphic with double zero there.

Let us explain the strategy of the proof. We prove this proposition by induction on the negative Euler characteristic, that is, on $2g - 2 + (n + 1)$. We split the known to be holomorphic at $z_0 \rightarrow p$ expression (34), which is an infinite sum of meromorphic functions converging in the sense of lemma 2.4, into a sum of two converging infinite sums, where one sum is holomorphic once the quadratic loop equations hold for all (g', n') with $2g' - 2 + (n' + 1) < 2g - 2 + (n + 1)$, and the other sum is holomorphic if and only if the quadratic loop equation holds for (g, n) .

To this end, we have to recall some of the results of [12]. First of all, we need a change of notation in the case when we apply $\Delta_{w_i} \Delta_{w_j}$ and $S_{w_i} S_{w_j}$ operators to $W_{0,2}(\xi_i, \xi_j)$, $\xi_i = x(w_i)$, $\xi_j = x(w_j)$ (which is a possible factor in \mathcal{W})—see [12, section 3.1] for a motivation of this change of notation. So, we redefine

$$(36) \quad \begin{aligned} \widetilde{\Delta_{w_i} \Delta_{w_j}} W_{0,2}(\xi_i, \xi_j) &:= \Delta_{w_i} \Delta_{w_j} W_{0,2}(\xi_i, \xi_j) - \frac{2}{(\log \xi_i - \log \xi_j)^2}; \\ \widetilde{S_{w_i} S_{w_j}} W_{0,2}(\xi_i, \xi_j) &:= S_{w_i} S_{w_j} W_{0,2}(\xi_i, \xi_j) + \frac{2}{(\log \xi_i - \log \xi_j)^2}. \end{aligned}$$

From now on, we use this modified definition, and abusing notation we always omit the tildes.

Recall that all $H_{g,n}$'s satisfy the linear loop equations (lemma 3.1). Under the assumption that the quadratic loop equations hold for all (g', n') with $2g' - 2 + (n' + 1) < 2g - 2 + (n + 1)$ the following two lemmas hold:

Lemma 4.3. *For any $r \geq 0$ and any $h, k \geq 0$ such that $2h - 1 + k - r \leq 2g - 2 + n$, the expression*

$$(37) \quad \sum_{m=1}^{r+1} \frac{1}{m!} \sum_{\substack{2\alpha_1 + \cdots + 2\alpha_m \\ + m = r+1}} \prod_{j=1}^m \left([w_j = z_0] \frac{D_{x(w_j)}^{2\alpha_j}}{(2\alpha_j + 1)!} \right) \sum_{\substack{I \sqcup J = [m] \\ |I| \in 2\mathbb{Z}}} \prod_{i \in I} \Delta_{w_i} \prod_{j \in J} S_{w_j} \mathcal{W}_{h-\alpha_1-\dots-\alpha_m, k}(w_{[m]} \mid z_{[k]})$$

as well as its arbitrary $D_{x(z_0)}$ -derivatives, is holomorphic at $z_0 \rightarrow p$.

Proof. This is a direct corollary of [12, corollary 3.4]. \square

Lemma 4.4. *For any $r \geq 1$*

$$(38) \quad \begin{aligned} & \sum_{\substack{k, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{2k} \\ \ell, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_\ell \\ 2k + 2\alpha_1 + \cdots + 2\alpha_{2k} \\ + \ell + 2\beta_1 + \cdots + 2\beta_\ell = r+1}} \frac{1}{\ell!(2k)!} \prod_{i=1}^{\ell} [w'_i = z_0] \frac{D_{x(w'_i)}^{2\beta_i}}{(2\beta_i + 1)!} S_{w'_i} \prod_{i=1}^{2k} [w_i = z_0] \frac{D_{x(w_i)}^{2\alpha_i}}{(2\alpha_i + 1)!} \Delta_{w_i} \mathcal{W}_{g+(2k+\ell-r-1)/2, \ell+2k, n}(w'_{[\ell]}, w_{[2k]} \mid z_{[n]}) \\ & - \sum_{2k+\ell=r+1} \frac{1}{\ell!(2k)!} \binom{k}{1} (S_{z_0} W_{0,1}(x(z_0)))^\ell (\Delta_{z_0} W_{0,1}(x(z_0)))^{2k-2} [w_1 = z_0] [w_2 = z_0] \Delta_{w_1} \Delta_{w_2} \mathcal{W}_{g,2,n}(w_1, w_2 \mid z_{[n]}) \end{aligned}$$

is holomorphic at $z_0 \rightarrow p$.

Proof. This is a direct corollary of [12, corollary 3.4 and remark 3.3]. Note that the sum over α s and β s in the first line is the same as the sum over α s in (38), but split depending on whether S or Δ acts on the corresponding variable. \square

Another statement that we need is the following. Let $f_i(z)$, $i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ be a sequence of meromorphic functions defined on an open neighborhood U of the point p with the orders of poles bounded by some constant. Assume $\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} f_i(z)$ converges absolutely and uniformly on every compact subset of $U \setminus \{p\}$ to a function of the same type, that is, to a meromorphic function $f(z)$ on U with a possible pole only at the

point p with the order of the pole bounded by the same constant. Assume that we can split $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ into a sequence of pairwise disjoint finite subsets I_k , $k = 1, 2, 3, \dots$, $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} = \bigsqcup_{k=1}^{\infty} I_k$, such that $\sum_{i \in I_k} f_i(z)$ is holomorphic at $z \rightarrow p$ for every k . Then we have:

Lemma 4.5. *The sum $f(z) = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} f_i(z)$ is holomorphic at $z \rightarrow p$.*

Now we are ready to prove proposition 4.1.

Proof of proposition 4.1. As stated before, the proof works by induction on $2g - 2 + (n + 1)$. First, equation (28) and the holomorphicity at $z_0 \rightarrow p$ of the expression (34) imply that the following expression is holomorphic at $z_0 \rightarrow p$:

$$(39) \quad \sum_{\substack{m \geq 1, d \geq 0 \\ m+2d \geq 2}} \frac{(m+2d-1)!}{m!2^m} \mathcal{Q}_{d,m}(z_0) \sum_{\substack{I \sqcup J = \llbracket m \rrbracket \\ |I| \in 2\mathbb{Z}}} \prod_{i \in I} \Delta_{w_i} \prod_{j \in J} \mathcal{S}_{w_j} \mathcal{W}_{g-d,m,n}(w_{\llbracket m \rrbracket} \mid z_{\llbracket n \rrbracket}) \\ + \sum_{\alpha=1}^g c_{\alpha} \sum_{\substack{m \geq 1, d \geq 0 \\ m+2d \geq 1}} \frac{(m+2d-1+2\alpha)!}{m!2^m} \mathcal{Q}_{d,m}(z_0) \sum_{\substack{I \sqcup J = \llbracket m \rrbracket \\ |I| \in 2\mathbb{Z}}} \prod_{i \in I} \Delta_{w_i} \prod_{j \in J} \mathcal{S}_{w_j} \mathcal{W}_{g-d-\alpha,m,n}(w_{\llbracket m \rrbracket} \mid z_{\llbracket n \rrbracket}).$$

We split this expression into three parts and analyse them separately.

The first part is the second summand. We consider

$$(40) \quad \sum_{\alpha=1}^g c_{\alpha} \sum_{\substack{m \geq 1, d \geq 0 \\ m+2d \geq 1}} \frac{(m+2d-1+2\alpha)!}{m!2^m} \mathcal{Q}_{d,m}(z_0) \sum_{\substack{I \sqcup J = \llbracket m \rrbracket \\ |I| \in 2\mathbb{Z}}} \prod_{i \in I} \Delta_{w_i} \prod_{j \in J} \mathcal{S}_{w_j} \mathcal{W}_{g-d-\alpha,m,n}(w_{\llbracket m \rrbracket} \mid z_{\llbracket n \rrbracket}).$$

Note that this expression is an infinite sum of the products of derivatives of the function $\{\tilde{H}_{g,n}\}_{g,n}$, and it absolutely uniformly converges to a meromorphic function on $U \setminus \{p\}$ in the variable z_0 , where U is an open neighborhood of the point p . The proof of that is exactly the same as the proof of lemma 2.4: we have a finite number of terms with no factors of $\mathcal{S}_w D_{\xi} \tilde{H}_{0,1}(\xi(w))$ and $\Delta_w D_{\xi} \tilde{H}_{0,1}(\xi(w))$ multiplied by a geometrically converging series in $\mathcal{S}_w D_{\xi} \tilde{H}_{0,1}(\xi(w))$ and $\Delta_w D_{\xi} \tilde{H}_{0,1}(\xi(w))$. On the other hand, we can rewrite this expression as the sum over $r + 1 = m + 2d$ and then for each fixed $r + 1$ we have a finite expression, which is holomorphic at $z_0 \rightarrow p$ according to lemma 4.3, and using the induction hypothesis along with the fact that $\alpha \geq 1$. Thus expression (40) satisfies the conditions of lemma 4.5, and therefore (40) converges to a holomorphic function on U .

Introduce a new notation:

$$(41) \quad \sum_{d \geq 0} \mathcal{Q}_{d,m}^{\text{red}}(z_0) t^{2d} := \prod_{j=1}^m \left(\llbracket w_j = z_0 \rrbracket \circ \frac{\zeta(t D_{x(w_j)})}{t D_{x(w_j)}} \right).$$

This is the ‘leading order’ part of $\mathcal{Q}_{d,m}$ in the sense that it does not include the global derivatives of z_0 or the extra $\frac{z}{\zeta(z)}$, which would lead to terms that have been shown to be holomorphic in earlier steps of the induction. The second part is then all these extra terms, the ‘genus defect’ part of the first summand in (39). We consider

$$(42) \quad \sum_{\substack{m \geq 1, d \geq 0 \\ m+2d \geq 2}} \frac{(m+2d-1)!}{m!2^m} (\mathcal{Q}_{d,m}(z_0) - \mathcal{Q}_{d,m}^{\text{red}}(z_0)) \sum_{\substack{I \sqcup J = \llbracket m \rrbracket \\ |I| \in 2\mathbb{Z}}} \prod_{i \in I} \Delta_{w_i} \prod_{j \in J} \mathcal{S}_{w_j} \mathcal{W}_{g-d,m,n}(w_{\llbracket m \rrbracket} \mid z_{\llbracket n \rrbracket}).$$

Literally the same argument as in the case of expression (40) proves that (42) converges to a holomorphic function on U .

The third part is equal to

$$(43) \quad \sum_{\substack{m \geq 1, d \geq 0 \\ m+2d \geq 2}} \frac{(m+2d-1)!}{m!2^m} \mathcal{Q}_{d,m}^{\text{red}}(z_0) \sum_{\substack{I \sqcup J = \llbracket m \rrbracket \\ |I| \in 2\mathbb{Z}}} \prod_{i \in I} \Delta_{w_i} \prod_{j \in J} \mathcal{S}_{w_j} \mathcal{W}_{g-d,m,n}(w_{\llbracket m \rrbracket} \mid z_{\llbracket n \rrbracket}) \\ = \sum_{r=1}^{\infty} \frac{r!}{2^{r+1}} \sum_{\substack{k, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{2k} \\ \ell, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_{\ell} \\ 2k + \alpha_1 + \dots + \alpha_{2k} \\ + \ell + \beta_1 + \dots + \beta_{\ell} = r+1}} \frac{1}{\ell! (2k)!} \\ \prod_{i=1}^{\ell} \llbracket w'_i = z_0 \rrbracket \frac{D_{x(w'_i)}^{2\beta_i}}{(2\beta_i + 1)!} \mathcal{S}_{w'_i} \prod_{i=1}^{2k} \llbracket w_i = z_0 \rrbracket \frac{D_{x(w_i)}^{2\alpha_i}}{(2\alpha_i + 1)!} \Delta_{w_i} \mathcal{W}_{g+2k+\ell-r-1, \ell+2k, n}(w'_{\llbracket \ell \rrbracket}, w_{\llbracket 2k \rrbracket} \mid z_{\llbracket n \rrbracket}),$$

and it must be holomorphic as $z_0 \rightarrow p$, as it is the difference of equations (39) and (40), (42). Each of the r -summands of equation (43) corresponds to the first part of the equation in lemma 4.4. By the same arguments as before, the sum over all r of the expression in lemma 4.4,

$$(44) \quad \sum_{r=1}^{\infty} \frac{r!}{2^{r+1}} \text{Expr}_r,$$

where Expr_r is equal to (38), still converges absolutely and uniformly on $U \setminus \{p\}$ in the variable z_0 , and is holomorphic as $z_0 \rightarrow p$. Because of this, the difference between equations (43) and (44) must also be holomorphic. Explicitly, this is

$$(45) \quad \sum_{\substack{k \geq 1 \\ \ell \geq 0}} \frac{(2k + \ell - 1)!}{2^{2k + \ell} \ell! (2k)!} \binom{k}{1} (S_{z_0} W_{0,1}(x(z_0)))^\ell (\Delta_{z_0} W_{0,1}(x(z_0)))^{2k-2} \\ \times [[w_1=z_0] [[w_2=z_0] \Delta_{w_1} \Delta_{w_2} \mathcal{W}_{g,2,n}(w_1, w_2 \mid z_{[n]})].$$

To analyse this expression, let us first consider the sum

$$(46) \quad \sum_{\substack{k \geq 1 \\ \ell \geq 0}} \frac{(2k + \ell - 1)!}{2^{2k + \ell} \ell! (2k)!} k s^\ell \delta^{2k-2} = \frac{1}{2((2-s)^2 - \delta^2)}.$$

For $s = S_{z_0} W_{0,1}(x(z_0))$ and $\delta = \Delta_{z_0} W_{0,1}(x(z_0))$ both $(s + \delta)/2$ and $(s - \delta)/2$ belong to the unit ball for z_0 near p , as $W_{0,1}(x(p)) = \frac{1}{q+1}$. Therefore, this expression defines a holomorphic function on U in the variable z_0 , non-vanishing at $z_0 \rightarrow p$. This implies that

$$(47) \quad [[w_1=z_0] [[w_2=z_0] \Delta_{w_1} \Delta_{w_2} \mathcal{W}_{g,2,n}(w_1, w_2 \mid z_{[n]})$$

is holomorphic at $z_0 \rightarrow p$.

Then equation (28) and lemma 3.1 (in the case $g = 0, n = 0$ one also has to recall equation (36)) imply that $\mathcal{W}_{g,2,n}(z_0, \bar{z}_0 \mid z_{[n]})$ is holomorphic at $z_0 \rightarrow p$ (cf. also the arguments in [6, section 2.4] and [12, section 3.2]). \square

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Alexandrov, *Matrix models for random partitions*, Nuclear Phys. B. **851.3** (2011), 620–650.
- [2] A. Alexandrov, G. Chapuy, B. Eynard and J. Harnad, *Weighted Hurwitz numbers and topological recursion: an overview*, J. Math. Phys. **59.8** (2018), 081102.
- [3] A. Alexandrov, D. Lewanski and S. Shadrin, *Ramifications of Hurwitz theory, KP integrability and quantum curves*, J. High Energy Phys. **2016** (2016), 30.
- [4] G. Borot, B. Eynard and N. Orantin, *Abstract loop equations, topological recursion and new applications*, Commun. Number Theory Phys. **9.1** (2015), 51–187.
- [5] G. Borot, R. Kramer, D. Lewanski, A. Popolitov and S. Shadrin, *Special cases of the orbifold version of Zvonkine’s r -ELSV formula*, Michigan Math. J. **Advance publication** (2021), 34.
- [6] G. Borot and S. Shadrin, *Blobbed topological recursion: properties and applications*, Math. Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc. **162** (2017), 39–87.
- [7] V. Bouchard, A. Klemm, M. Mariño and S. Pasquetti, *Remodeling the B-model*, Comm. Math. Phys. **287.1** (2009), 117–178.
- [8] L. Chekhov and B. Eynard, *Hermitian matrix model free energy: Feynman graph technique for all genera*, J. High Energy Phys. **2006** (2006), 014.
- [9] N. Do, A. Dyer and D. V. Mathews, *Topological recursion and a quantum curve for monotone Hurwitz numbers*, J. Geom. Phys. **120** (2017), 19–36.
- [10] N. Do and M. Karev, *Monotone orbifold Hurwitz numbers*, J. Math. Sci. (NY). **226.5** (2017), 568–587.
- [11] P. Dunin-Barkowski, R. Kramer, A. Popolitov and S. Shadrin, Sergey, *Cut-and-join equation for monotone Hurwitz numbers revisited*, J. Geom. Phys. **137** (2019), 1–6.
- [12] P. Dunin-Barkowski, R. Kramer, A. Popolitov and S. Shadrin, *Loop equations and a proof of Zvonkine’s qr -ELSV formula*, arXiv preprint 1905.04524 (2019).
- [13] P. Dunin-Barkowski, D. Lewanski, A. Popolitov and S. Shadrin, *Polynomiality of orbifold Hurwitz numbers, spectral curve, and a new proof of the Johnson-Pandharipande-Tseng formula*, J. Lond. Math. Soc., II. Ser. **92.3** (2015), 547–565.
- [14] P. Dunin-Barkowski, N. Orantin, S. Shadrin and L. Spitz, *Identification of the Givental formula with the spectral curve topological recursion procedure*, Comm. Math. Phys. **328.2** (2014), 669–700.
- [15] B. Eynard, *Invariants of spectral curves and intersection theory of moduli spaces of complex curves*, Commun. Number Theory Phys. **8.3** (2014), 541–588.
- [16] Eynard, Bertrand, “Counting surfaces”, Progress in Mathematical Physics **70**, CRM Aisenstadt chair lectures, Birkhäuser, Basel, 2016.
- [17] B. Eynard and N. Orantin, *Invariants of algebraic curves and topological expansion*, Commun. Number Theory Phys. **1.2** (2007), 347–452.
- [18] I. P. Goulden, M. Guay-Paquet and J. Novak, *Monotone Hurwitz numbers in genus zero*, Canad. J. Math. **65.5** (2013), 1020–1042.

- [19] I. P. Goulden, M. Guay-Paquet and J. Novak, *Polynomiality of monotone Hurwitz numbers in higher genera*, Adv. Math. **238** (2013), 1–23.
- [20] I. P. Goulden, M. Guay-Paquet and J. Novak, *Monotone Hurwitz numbers and the HCIZ integral*, Ann. Math. Blaise Pascal. **21.1** (2014), 71–89.
- [21] M. Guay-Paquet and J. Harnad, *2D Toda τ -functions as combinatorial generating functions*, Lett. Math. Phys. **105.6** (2015), 827–852.
- [22] M. A. Hahn, *A monodromy graph approach to the piecewise polynomiality of simple, monotone and Grothendieck dessins d'enfants double Hurwitz numbers*, Graphs Combin. **35.3** (2019), 729–766.
- [23] M. A. Hahn, R. Kramer and D. Lewanski, *Wall-crossing formulae and strong piecewise polynomiality for mixed Grothendieck dessins d'enfant, monotone, and double simple Hurwitz numbers*, Adv. Math. **336** (2018), 38–69.
- [24] J. Harnad and A. Yu. Orlov, *Hypergeometric τ -functions, Hurwitz numbers and enumeration of paths*, Comm. Math. Phys. **338.1** (2015), 267–284.
- [25] V. G. Kac, “Infinite-dimensional Lie algebras”, Third edition, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1990.
- [26] R. Kramer, D. Lewański and S. Shadrin, *Quasi-polynomiality of monotone orbifold Hurwitz numbers and Grothendieck’s dessins d’enfants.*, Doc. Math. **24** (2019), 857–898.
- [27] C.-C. M. Liu and M. Mulase, eds., “Topological recursion and its influence in analysis, geometry, and topology”, Proceedings of Symposia in Pure Mathematics **100**, 2016 AMS von Neumann Symposium Topological Recursion and its Influence in Analysis, Geometry, and Topology, July 4–8, 2016, Charlotte, North Carolina, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2018.
- [28] T. Miwa, and M. Jimbo and E. Date, “Solitons: Differential equations, symmetries and infinite-dimensional algebras”, Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics **135**, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000.
- [29] P. Rossi, *Gromov-Witten invariants of target curves via symplectic field theory*, J. Geom. Phys. **58.8** (2008), 931–941.
- [30] S. Shadrin, L. Spitz and D. Zvonkine, *On double Hurwitz numbers with completed cycles*, J. Lond. Math. Soc. (2). **86.2** (2012), 407–432.

(R. Kramer) MAX-PLANCK-INSTITUT FÜR MATHEMATIK, VIVATSGASSE 7, 53111 BONN, GERMANY
Email address: rkramer@mpim-bonn.mpg.de

(A. Popolitov) MOSCOW INSTITUTE FOR PHYSICS AND TECHNOLOGY, DOLGOPRUDNY, RUSSIA; INSTITUTE FOR INFORMATION TRANSMISSION PROBLEMS, MOSCOW 127994, RUSSIA; AND ITEP, MOSCOW 117218, RUSSIA
Email address: popolit@gmail.com

(S. Shadrin) KORTEWEG-DE VRIESINSTITUUT VOOR WISKUNDE, UNIVERSITEIT VAN AMSTERDAM, POSTBUS 94248, 1090GE AMSTERDAM, THE NETHERLANDS
Email address: s.shadrin@uva.nl