

GEOMETRY OF THE MIRROR MODELS DUAL TO THE COMPLETE INTERSECTION OF TWO CUBICS

MYKOLA POCHKAI

ABSTRACT. In many cases involving mirror symmetry, it is important to have concrete mirror dual families. In this paper, we construct crepant resolutions of the Batyrev–Borisov mirror dual family to the complete intersection of two cubic hypersurfaces in \mathbb{P}^5 . It is, similarly to the mirrors of quintic threefolds, a family over \mathbb{P}^1 with singular fibers over the set $\{0, \infty\} \cup \mu_6$. We have the Picard-Fuchs equation and limiting mixed Hodge structures of the singular fibers. We find that the singular fiber over ∞ has maximal unipotent monodromy, and 0 is of a new type compared to the quintic case.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
Acknowledgments	4
2. Description of the dual nef-partition for intersection of two cubics	4
3. Construction of the mirror dual family	8
4. Geometry of the mirror family	11
5. Picard-Fuchs equation and infinity	15
5.1. Existence of a cycle	16
5.2. Irreducibility of Picard-Fuchs	20
6. 0 is a K-point	22
References	27

1. INTRODUCTION

Mathematical mirror symmetry predicts that, for any given Calabi-Yau manifold X , there often exists a mirror dual Calabi-Yau manifold \mathcal{X} such that the symplectic invariants of X correspond to the complex invariants of \mathcal{X} . The idea has inspired several research programs aimed at providing a rigorous formulation of the phenomenon. One such program is the genus one mirror symmetry program, developed in the works [EFiMM18], [EFiMM21], and [EFiMM22]. This paper is a part of the project to state and prove the genus one mirror symmetry result for the complete intersection of two cubics. In order to do this (following the strategy of the aforementioned papers), the following ingredients are required:

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 14J32, 14J33; Secondary 14Q15, 32G20.

Key words and phrases. Mirror symmetry, toric geometry, computer-aided calculations.

Acknowledgments. This constitutes a part of the author's PhD thesis.

- An explicit choice of a mirror candidate family \mathcal{Y}_ψ with a distinguished MUM point $\psi = \infty$ and a smooth generic fiber (Sections 2 and 3).
- A good understanding of the geometry of the singular fibers of the family \mathcal{Y}_ψ (Section 4).
- A computation of the limiting mixed Hodge structures $H_{\text{lim},a}^3$ associated with the singular fibers of the family \mathcal{Y}_ψ (Sections 5 and 6).

In this paper, we carry out these steps.

The Batyrev–Borisov construction, introduced in [Bat94a] for the hypersurface case and in [BB96b] for the complete intersection case, provides a recipe to build the mirror family \mathcal{X}_ψ and, in [Bat94b], a recipe to build a crepant desingularization \mathcal{Y}_ψ of the family \mathcal{X}_ψ . A crepant desingularization $\mathcal{Y}_\psi \rightarrow \mathcal{X}_\psi$ is not unique and depends on the choice of regular, maximal, star triangulation τ of the polytope $\text{conv}(\Delta_1, \Delta_2)$, where $\Delta; \Delta_1, \Delta_2$ is the nef-partition encoding \mathbb{P}^5 together with two toric-invariant Weil divisors $[x_1 = 0] + [x_2 = 0] + [x_3 = 0], [x_4 = 0] + [x_5 = 0] + [x_6 = 0]$, here $[x_0 : \dots : x_5]$ are standard projective coordinates on \mathbb{P}^5 . There is a canonical such choice (at least when an ordered basis in the ambient space is fixed). Namely, the following theorem holds (Theorem 2.2, Corollary 2.3):

Theorem 1.1. *Let $P = \text{conv}(\Delta_1, \Delta_2) \subset N_{\mathbb{R}}$ be the face polytope of a defining fan Σ_{∇} of a toric ambient space for the Batyrev–Borisov mirror dual of two cubics in \mathbb{P}^5 . There is a natural lattice-affine projection $C : N_{\mathbb{R}} \times \mathbb{A}^1 \rightarrow N_{\mathbb{R}}$, that restricts to the map of polytopes $C : \text{Cayley}(\Delta_1, \Delta_2) \rightarrow \text{conv}(\Delta_1, \Delta_2)$.*

There exists a maximal regular star triangulation $\tau(P)$ of P , such that induced triangulation of the boundary $\tau(\partial P)$ is C -induced from the maximal regular triangulation $\tau(\text{Cayley}(\Delta_1, \Delta_2))$ with height function

$$\omega(x) = - \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq j \leq 8 \\ -3 \leq k \leq 3}} \left| \sum_{i \leq t \leq j} x_t - k \right|.$$

coming from the subdivision of $N_{\mathbb{R}} \times \mathbb{A}^1$ into affine Weyl chambers of type A_6 .

Coning the triangulation $\tau(\partial P)$ from 0 yields the complete smooth fan Π , which is a smooth crepant subdivision of the fan Σ_{∇} and induces a crepant desingularization of the Gorenstein Fano toric varieties $\mathbb{P}_{\Pi} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_{\Sigma_{\nabla}}$. The variety \mathbb{P}_{Π} is a smooth projective toric variety.

Here, by \mathbb{A}^1 we mean the affine space $\{(x_7, x_8) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : x_7 + x_8 = 1\}$, and by $N = \{(x_1, \dots, x_6) \in \mathbb{Z}^6 : x_1 + \dots + x_6 = 0\}$. The data $\nabla; \nabla_1, \nabla_2$ is the dual nef-partition to $\Delta; \Delta_1, \Delta_2$, meaning that it is the combinatorial data produced by the Batyrev–Borisov construction which encodes a mirror dual family \mathcal{X}_ψ living in \mathbb{P}_{∇} . The triangulation is a natural extension of the so-called edgewise subdivisions, constructed in [KKMSD73, Chapter III, Example 2.3], which play a role in the theory of semistable reductions and were later studied independently in [EG00].

So \mathcal{Y}_ψ is the distinguished crepant desingularization of the mirror dual family \mathcal{X}_ψ . We investigate its geometry and summarize it in the following theorem (Theorem 4.1):

Theorem 1.2. *Let $\mathcal{Y}_\psi = V(h_1, h_2)$ be a family with $\psi \in \mathbb{P}^1$ and total space $\mathcal{Y} \subset \mathbb{P}_{\Pi} \times \mathbb{P}^1$. The equations h_1 and h_2 are defined by formulas (18), (19).*

- (1) *The family \mathcal{Y}_ψ is a one-dimensional flat family with parameter space \mathbb{P}^1 .*
- (2) *The total space of the family $\mathcal{Y} \subset \mathbb{P}_{\Pi} \times \mathbb{P}^1$ is smooth, except for the points lying in $\mathcal{Y}_{\infty} \subset \mathcal{Y}$.*
- (3) *When $\psi \notin \mu_6 \cup \{0, \infty\}$, the fiber \mathcal{Y}_ψ is smooth.*

- (4) When $\psi \in \mu_6$, the fiber \mathcal{Y}_ψ has a unique ordinary double point, which lies in $\mathcal{Y}_\psi \cap \mathbb{T}_N$ and has coordinates $(\psi, \dots, \psi) \in \mathbb{T}_N$.
- (5) When $\psi = 0$, the fiber $\mathcal{Y}_0 = W_0 \cup W_1 \cup W_2$ is a union of three integral smooth components. The components are defined by the equations:

$$W_0 = V\left(\frac{h_1|_{\psi=0}}{v_{123}}, \frac{h_2|_{\psi=0}}{u_{456}}\right), W_1 = V\left(v_{123}, \frac{h_2|_{\psi=0}}{u_{456}}\right), W_2 = V\left(\frac{h_1|_{\psi=0}}{v_{123}}, u_{456}\right).$$

- (6) The components W_1 and W_2 are rational.
- (7) $W_1 \cap W_2 = \emptyset$, but $W_0 \cap W_1$ and $W_0 \cap W_2$ are codimension one subvarieties of \mathcal{Y}_0 .
- (8) $\mathcal{Y}_0 = W_0 \cup W_1 \cup W_2$ is a simple normal crossing divisor in the total space \mathcal{Y} , which means that all components are smooth and locally around each point $p \in \mathcal{Y}_0$, there is a neighborhood of $p \in \mathcal{Y}$ such that \mathcal{Y}_0 is given by an equation $z_1 z_2 \dots z_k = 0$, for independent parameters z_i .

The most pleasant surprise is that we have a simple normal crossing divisor at the fiber over 0, which simplifies many genus one mirror symmetry computations. There is no abstract reason to expect this, and it is unclear whether it holds for other choices of crepant desingularization $\mathcal{Y}_\psi \rightarrow \mathcal{X}_\psi$.

The final step is to compute Picard-Fuchs equation and limiting mixed Hodge structures for every singular fiber. Picard-Fuchs part has been done in [BvS95], but there technical points – apparently part of the folklore but not written explicitly – needed clarification; so we wrote those details for completeness in Section 5. Finally, we compute a limiting mixed Hodge structures, which we summarize in the following theorem (Proposition 5.8, Lemma 6.1, Theorem 6.5, [Ste77, Example 2.15]):

Theorem 1.3. *The point $\psi = \infty$ is a point with maximal unipotent monodromy, meaning that the local monodromy operator near $\psi = \infty$ is maximally unipotent, with the following Hodge-Deligne diamond:*

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & & 1 & & \\ & & 0 & & 0 \\ & 0 & & 1 & & 0 \\ 0 & & 0 & & 0 & & 0 \\ & 0 & & 1 & & 0 \\ & 0 & & 0 & & \\ & & 1 & & \end{array}$$

The point $\psi = 0$ is a K-point, meaning that the monodromy operator is unipotent, with the following Hodge-Deligne diamond:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & & 0 & & \\ & & 0 & & 0 \\ & 1 & & 0 & & 1 \\ 0 & & 0 & & 0 & & 0 \\ & 1 & & 0 & & 1 \\ & 0 & & 0 & & \\ & & 0 & & \end{array}$$

For $\psi \in \mu_6$, the fiber \mathcal{Y}_ψ has a unique ordinary double point, which implies that the monodromy operator is unipotent, with the following Hodge-Deligne diamond:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & & 0 & & \\ & & 0 & & 0 \\ & 0 & & 1 & & 0 \\ 1 & & 0 & & 0 & & 1 \\ & 0 & & 1 & & 0 \\ & & 0 & & 0 \\ & & 0 & & \end{array}$$

The appearance of the K -point here is the new phenomenon compared to the hypersurface case treated in [EFIMM22].

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author would like to thank Dennis Eriksson for introducing him to the problem, for many valuable discussions, and for reviewing the text. He is also grateful to Marcus Berg, Michele Rossi, and Omid Amini for their helpful discussions and suggestions for improving the paper.

2. DESCRIPTION OF THE DUAL NEF-PARTITION FOR INTERSECTION OF TWO CUBICS

All schemes are considered to be of finite type over \mathbb{C} . By a variety, we mean a reduced, not necessarily irreducible, scheme of finite type over \mathbb{C} . We write $=$ between two objects if they are canonically isomorphic or if the isomorphism is clear from the context, and we write \cong when they are abstractly isomorphic.

Consider a lattice N , which is a free abelian group of finite rank. Its dual lattice is denoted by $M = N^\vee$. A lattice polytope is defined as the convex hull of a finite set of points from N , and is a subset of $N_{\mathbb{R}} := N \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{R}$. The notation ∂P denotes the boundary of a polytope P .

If a full-dimensional polytope $P \subset N_{\mathbb{R}}$ contains 0_N in its interior, the dual polytope $P^\vee \subset M_{\mathbb{R}}$ can be defined in the standard way [CLS11, p.65]. By (n, m) where $n \in N_{\mathbb{R}}$ and $m \in M_{\mathbb{R}}$ we mean the standard perfect pairing between the \mathbb{R} -vector spaces $N_{\mathbb{R}}$ and its dual $M_{\mathbb{R}}$. Even if P is a lattice polytope, the dual polytope $P^\vee \subset M_{\mathbb{R}}$ is not necessarily a lattice polytope. A full-dimensional lattice polytope containing 0 is called reflexive if the dual polytope is also a lattice polytope. Reflexive polytopes will play a key role in later constructions since they correspond to Gorenstein Fano toric varieties [CLS11, Theorem 8.3.4]. All polytopes considered in this work will be lattice polytopes; hence, we will simply use the term "polytope" to refer to a lattice polytope. Throughout this paper, we will refer to the Cox quotient construction, which is summarized in [CLS11, Theorem 5.1.11].

Let's introduce the following lattices:

$$N = \{(x_1, \dots, x_6) \in \mathbb{Z}^6 : x_1 + \dots + x_6 = 0\},$$

$$M = N^\vee = \frac{\mathbb{Z}^6}{\mathbb{Z}\{e_1 + \dots + e_6\}}.$$

Sometimes, when we want to emphasize that M is the character lattice of the torus \mathbb{T}_N , we use a multiplicative basis t_1, \dots, t_6 with the condition $t_1 \dots t_6 = 1$. In this case, we can write:

$$(1) \quad M = \{t_1^{k_1} \dots t_6^{k_6} : (k_1, \dots, k_6) \in \mathbb{Z}^6, \quad t_1 \dots t_6 = 1\}.$$

We first need to choose a projective toric model of \mathbb{P}^5 . This requires constructing a rank 5 lattice N and a full-dimensional reflexive lattice polytope $\Delta \subset N_{\mathbb{R}}$ containing 0 in its interior such that $\mathbb{P}_{\Delta} \cong \mathbb{P}^5$. Here \mathbb{P}_{Δ} denotes the toric variety associated with the polytope Δ ; see [CLS11, Definition 2.3.14]. We choose the following polytope for the toric model of \mathbb{P}^5 :

$$(2) \quad \Delta = \text{conv}(6e_1 - \sum_{i=1}^6 e_i, 6e_2 - \sum_{i=1}^6 e_i, \dots, 6e_6 - \sum_{i=1}^6 e_i) \subset N_{\mathbb{R}}.$$

The normal fan Σ_{Δ} of the polytope Δ can be computed:

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma_{\Delta}(5) &= \{\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_6\}, \\ \sigma_i &= \text{cone}\{e_1, e_2, \dots, \widehat{e_i}, \dots, e_6\} \subset M. \end{aligned}$$

If Σ is a fan, we will use $\Sigma(k)$ for the family of its k -dimensional cones and we will use $\Sigma(1)^{\text{gen}}$ for the set of ray generators. We use the letter N for the character lattice instead of M as our attention will be focused on the mirror dual side, where the roles of N and M are reversed. We also write e_i to refer to the quotient class $e_i + \mathbb{Z}\{e_1 + \dots + e_6\}$.

We now recall the definition of a nef-partition. Let $\Delta \subset N_{\mathbb{R}}$ be a reflexive polytope, a decomposition $\Delta = \Delta_1 + \dots + \Delta_k$ into a Minkowski sum of k positive-dimensional (but not necessarily full-dimensional) polytopes, where $0_N \in \Delta_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, k$, is called a nef-partition. The decomposition is denoted as $\Delta; \Delta_1, \dots, \Delta_k$. The identity of Minkowski sums translates to the identity of torus-invariant Cartier divisors: $D_{\Delta_1} + \dots + D_{\Delta_k} = -K_{\mathbb{P}_{\Delta}}$.

We define two divisors on \mathbb{P}_{Δ} :

$$\begin{aligned} D_{\Delta_1} &= D_{e_1} + D_{e_2} + D_{e_3}, \\ D_{\Delta_2} &= D_{e_4} + D_{e_5} + D_{e_6}. \end{aligned}$$

These divisors correspond to

$$\begin{aligned} &V(x_1) + V(x_2) + V(x_3), \\ &V(x_4) + V(x_5) + V(x_6). \end{aligned}$$

Here, $V(x_i)$ refers to the coordinate hyperplane in \mathbb{P}^5 defined by the homogeneous equation $x_i = 0$. Thus, D_{Δ_1} and D_{Δ_2} are clearly basepoint-free Cartier divisors and $D_{\Delta_1} + D_{\Delta_2} = \sum_{\rho \in \Sigma_{\Delta}(1)} D_{\rho} = -K_{\Sigma_{\Delta}}$. We remind the reader that the fundamental polytope of a torus-invariant Cartier divisor $D = \sum_{\rho \in \Sigma_{\Delta}(1)} a_{\rho} D_{\rho}$ is defined as

$$(3) \quad P_D = \{n \in N_{\mathbb{R}} : (n, u_{\rho}) + a_{\rho} \geq 0 \text{ for every } \rho \in \Sigma_{\Delta}(1)\},$$

where u_{ρ} is the ray generator for a ray $\rho \in \Sigma(1)$, see [CLS11, Formula 6.1.1]. The fundamental polytopes of the divisors D_{Δ_1} and D_{Δ_2} are given by

$$(4) \quad \Delta_1 := P_{D_{\Delta_1}} = \text{conv}\{u_1, u_2, \dots, u_6\} \subset N_{\mathbb{R}},$$

$$(5) \quad \Delta_2 := P_{D_{\Delta_2}} = \text{conv}\{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_6\} \subset N_{\mathbb{R}}$$

where

$$(6) \quad u_i = 3e_i - e_1 - e_2 - e_3, 1 \leq i \leq 6,$$

$$(7) \quad v_i = 3e_i - e_4 - e_5 - e_6, 1 \leq i \leq 6.$$

The polytope Δ is a reflexive 5-dimensional polytope, and Δ_1, Δ_2 are full-dimensional polytopes such that $\Delta = \Delta_1 + \Delta_2$, so, $\Delta; \Delta_1, \Delta_2$ is a nef-partition. Following [BB96b, Definition 4.9], we can

construct a dual nef-partition $\nabla; \nabla_1, \nabla_2$, corresponding to the nef-partition constructed $\Delta; \Delta_1, \Delta_2$. The tuple of polytopes $\nabla; \nabla_1, \nabla_2$, defined by the formulas

$$(8) \quad \nabla_1 = \text{conv}\{0, e_1, e_2, e_3\} \subset M_{\mathbb{R}},$$

$$(9) \quad \nabla_2 = \text{conv}\{0, e_4, e_5, e_6\} \subset M_{\mathbb{R}},$$

$$(10) \quad \nabla = \text{conv}\{0, e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4, e_5, e_6, e_1 + e_4, \\ e_1 + e_5, e_1 + e_6, e_2 + e_4, e_2 + e_5, e_2 + e_6, \\ e_3 + e_4, e_3 + e_5, e_3 + e_6\} \subset M_{\mathbb{R}}$$

is a dual nef-partition to the nef-partition $\Delta; \Delta_1, \Delta_2$. We can also compute the normal fan Σ_{∇} , which is the next polyhedral pointed fan supported in $N_{\mathbb{R}}$:

$$(11) \quad \Sigma_{\nabla}(1)^{\text{gen}} = \{u_1, \dots, u_6, v_1, \dots, v_6\},$$

which is also the set of vertices of the polytope Δ . There are three types of maximal cones:

$$(12) \quad U_i = \text{cone}(u_1, \dots, \widehat{u_i}, \dots, u_6), 1 \leq i \leq 3,$$

$$(13) \quad V_j = \text{cone}(v_1, \dots, \widehat{v_j}, \dots, v_6), 4 \leq j \leq 6,$$

$$(14) \quad C_{i,j} = \text{cone}(u_1, \dots, \widehat{u_i}, \dots, \widehat{u_j}, \dots, u_6, v_1, \dots, \widehat{v_i}, \dots, \widehat{v_j}, \dots, v_6), 1 \leq i \leq 3, 4 \leq j \leq 6.$$

Here, the hat indicates that the corresponding vector is omitted. The vectors u_i and v_j are defined by formulas (6) and (7), respectively. Thus, we have

$$(15) \quad \Sigma_{\nabla}(5) = \{U_1, U_2, U_3\} \cup \{V_4, V_5, V_6\} \cup \{C_{i,j} : 1 \leq i \leq 3, 4 \leq j \leq 6\}.$$

The last piece of information that we need is the torus-invariant basepoint-free Cartier divisors $D_{\nabla_1}, D_{\nabla_2}$. These basepoint-free divisors can be recovered from their fundamental polytope using the formula:

$$D_P = \sum_{\rho \in \Sigma(1)} \left(- \min_{m \in P \cap M} (u_{\rho}, m) \right) D_{\rho},$$

see [CLS11, Theorem 6.1.7(g)], [CLS11, Theorem 4.2.12(b)], and [CLS11, Theorem 6.3.12]. Applying the formula above to our specific case, we obtain:

$$D_{\nabla_1} = D_{u_1} + \dots + D_{u_6}$$

$$D_{\nabla_2} = D_{v_1} + \dots + D_{v_6}$$

We can summarize the above discussion in the following theorem:

Proposition 2.1. *The polytopes $\nabla; \nabla_1, \nabla_2$, defined by formulas (8), (9), and (10), form the dual nef-partition to the nef-partition $\Delta; \Delta_1, \Delta_2$, where $\mathbb{P}_{\Delta} \cong \mathbb{P}^5$ and $D_{\Delta_1} = V(x_1) + V(x_2) + V(x_3)$, $D_{\Delta_2} = V(x_4) + V(x_5) + V(x_6)$. The normal fan Σ_{∇} has ray generators:*

$$\Sigma_{\nabla}(1)^{\text{gen}} = \{u_1, \dots, u_6, v_1, \dots, v_6\},$$

where $u_i, v_j \in N$ are vectors defined by the formulas (6) and (7). The set of maximal cones $\Sigma_{\nabla}(5)$ is given by the formula (15). The basepoint-free Cartier divisors associated to the polytopes ∇_1 and ∇_2 are

$$D_{\nabla_1} = D_{u_1} + \dots + D_{u_6},$$

$$D_{\nabla_2} = D_{v_1} + \dots + D_{v_6}.$$

Now, we construct the MPCP desingularization of \mathbb{P}_{∇} , as defined in [Bat94a, Definition 2.2.13]. By triangulation of a polytope $P \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, as usual, we mean a set of affinely embedded simplices $\tau(P)$ which covers the whole P , closed under taking subsimplices, and. In the paper [Bat94a], the procedure for constructing such desingularizations in the toric case is described, and we follow that procedure. This procedure requires selecting a maximal, regular, star triangulation of the polytope

$$P = \text{conv}(\Delta_1, \Delta_2) = \text{conv}\{u_1, \dots, u_6, v_1, \dots, v_6\} \subset N_{\mathbb{R}},$$

as outlined in [Bat94a, Theorem 2.2.24]. A star triangulation is a triangulation in which each maximal simplex contains 0_N as a vertex. We construct a canonical maximal, regular, star triangulation of the polytope $P = \text{conv}(\Delta_1, \Delta_2)$. In the following theorem we define $\mathbb{A}^1 := \{(x_7, x_8) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : x_7 + x_8 = 1\}$, and we remind the reader that $\text{Cayley}(\Delta_1, \Delta_2)$ is a polytope with vertices $(a, 1, 0)$ and $(b, 0, 1)$, where a is a vertex of Δ_1 and b is a vertex of Δ_2 :

Theorem 2.2. *Let $P = \text{conv}(\Delta_1, \Delta_2) \subset N_{\mathbb{R}}$ be the face polytope of a defining fan Σ_{∇} of a toric ambient space for the Batyrev–Borisov mirror dual of two cubics in \mathbb{P}^5 . There is a natural lattice-affine projection $C : N_{\mathbb{R}} \times \mathbb{A}^1 \rightarrow N_{\mathbb{R}}$, that restricts to the map of polytopes $C : \text{Cayley}(\Delta_1, \Delta_2) \rightarrow \text{conv}(\Delta_1, \Delta_2)$.*

There exists a maximal regular star triangulation $\tau(P)$ of P , such that induced triangulation of the boundary $\tau(\partial P)$ is C -induced from the maximal regular triangulation $\tau(\text{Cayley}(\Delta_1, \Delta_2))$ with height function

$$\omega(x) = - \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq j \leq 8 \\ -3 \leq k \leq 3}} \left| \sum_{i \leq t \leq j} x_t - k \right|.$$

coming from the subdivision of $N_{\mathbb{R}} \times \mathbb{A}^1$ into affine Weyl chambers of type A_6 .

Proof. Consider the cumulative coordinates $0 = y_0, y_1, \dots, y_8 = 1$ on $N_{\mathbb{R}} \times \mathbb{A}^1$ defined by $y_i = x_1 + \dots + x_i$ (we also have $y_6 = 0$). The regular subdivision associated with the height function ω above corresponds to the subdivision obtained by drawing all of the hyperplanes $y_j - y_i = k$ for $0 \leq i < j < 8, -3 \leq k \leq 3$ and the triangulation $\tau(\text{Cayley}(\Delta_1, \Delta_2))$ comes from dissecting the polytope $\text{Cayley}(\Delta_1, \Delta_2)$ along those hyperplanes. From this description, one can see that the triangulation $\tau(\text{Cayley}(\Delta_1, \Delta_2))$ is maximal and regular and coming from the subdivision of $N_{\mathbb{R}} \times \mathbb{A}^1$ into affine Weyl chambers of type A_6 .

To show that this induces a triangulation on P we will choose a polytopal subcomplex $A \subset \text{skel}_4 \text{Cayley}(\Delta_1, \Delta_2)$ that maps onto ∂P along the map C . Then a maximal regular triangulation of A will be mapped to some maximal regular triangulation $\tau(P)$. We choose a lattice polytopal subcomplex A of pure dimension 4 with the next maximal faces:

- For $1 \leq i \leq 3$. The face $(U_i \cap \partial P) \times \{(1, 0)\}$ that is mapped to $U_i \cap \partial P$.
- For $4 \leq j \leq 6$. The face $(V_j \cap \partial P) \times \{(0, 1)\}$ that is mapped to $V_j \cap \partial P$.
- For $1 \leq i \leq 3, 4 \leq j \leq 6$. The face $\text{Cayley}((u_1, \widehat{u}_i, \widehat{u}_j, u_6), (v_1, \widehat{v}_i, \widehat{v}_j, v_6))$ that is mapped to $C_{i,j} \cap \partial P$.

Those $3 + 3 + 3 \cdot 3$ faces of $\text{skel}_4 \text{Cayley}(\Delta_1, \Delta_2)$ are, by definition, the only maximal faces of A . This gives a maximal regular triangulation $\tau(\partial P)$. After adding $\{0\}$ to every maximal simplex, we obtain the maximal regular star triangulation $\tau(P)$. \square

Now we have a maximal regular star triangulation $\tau(P)$. Define the fan Π as the face fan of the triangulation $\tau(P)$ — that is, the cones of Π are in one-to-one correspondence with maximal simplices of $\tau(P)$. As stated in [Bat94a, Section 4.2], the canonical morphism $\mathbb{P}_\Pi \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_{\Sigma_\nabla}$ is a crepant resolution (we also check this in the next section directly). We can summarize this in the next corollary:

Corollary 2.3. *There is a smooth complete fan Π with ray generators in the lattice N which is a subdivision of the fan Σ_∇ . The fan Π has 110 rays, with the following set of ray generators:*

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi(1)^{gen} &= \{u_{ijk} : 1 \leq i \leq j \leq k \leq 6, (i, j, k) \neq (1, 2, 3)\} \\ &\cup \{v_{ijk} : 1 \leq i \leq j \leq k \leq 6, (i, j, k) \neq (4, 5, 6)\}, \\ u_{ijk} &= -e_1 - e_2 - e_3 + e_i + e_j + e_k, \\ v_{ijk} &= -e_4 - e_5 - e_6 + e_i + e_j + e_k, \end{aligned}$$

and the canonical morphism of the corresponding toric varieties $\pi : \mathbb{P}_\Pi \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_{\Sigma_\nabla}$ is a crepant resolution. \mathbb{P}_Π is a smooth projective toric variety.

3. CONSTRUCTION OF THE MIRROR DUAL FAMILY

By construction, the fan Π is a subdivision of the fan Σ_∇ . Hence, the identity morphism $id : M_\mathbb{R} \rightarrow M_\mathbb{R}$ induces a natural morphism of fans $\Pi \rightarrow \Sigma_\nabla$. This gives a morphism of algebraic varieties, denoted by $\pi : \mathbb{P}_\Pi \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_{\Sigma_\nabla}$, which is a crepant resolution. One can compute the Cartier divisors $\pi^*D_{\nabla_1}$ and $\pi^*D_{\nabla_2}$ in terms of the torus-invariant divisors of the variety \mathbb{P}_Π :

$$D_1 := \pi^*D_{\nabla_1} = \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i_1 \leq i_2 \leq i_3 \leq 6 \\ (i_1, i_2, i_3) \neq (1, 2, 3)}} D_{u_{i_1 i_2 i_3}}, \quad D_2 := \pi^*D_{\nabla_2} = \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i_1 \leq i_2 \leq i_3 \leq 6 \\ (i_1, i_2, i_3) \neq (4, 5, 6)}} D_{v_{i_1 i_2 i_3}},$$

using the standard techniques of [CLS11, Theorem 4.2.12].

As discussed in Section 2, the variety \mathbb{P}_Π is smooth and projective. From the computation above, we obtain

$$\pi^*(-K_{\mathbb{P}_\nabla}) = \pi^*(D_{\nabla_1} + D_{\nabla_2}) = D_1 + D_2 = \sum_{\rho \in \Pi(1)} D_\rho = -K_{\mathbb{P}_\Pi}.$$

Hence, the morphism π is crepant. This fact also follows from [Bat94a, Section 4.2]. Therefore, π is a crepant desingularization of the variety $\mathbb{P}_{\Sigma_\nabla}$. Now, we introduce the family $\mathcal{Y}_{\xi_1, a_1, a_2, a_3, \xi_2, a_4, a_5, a_6} = V(s_1, s_2)$, where:

$$(16) \quad s_1 = 3\xi_1 \prod_{\substack{(i_1, i_2, i_3) \neq \\ (1, 2, 3)}} u_{i_1 i_2 i_3} - \sum_{t=1}^3 a_t \left(\prod_{\substack{(i_1, i_2, i_3) \neq \\ (4, 5, 6)}} v_{i_1 i_2 i_3}^{\delta_{i_1}^t + \delta_{i_2}^t + \delta_{i_3}^t} \prod_{\substack{(i_1, i_2, i_3) \neq \\ (1, 2, 3)}} u_{i_1 i_2 i_3}^{\delta_{i_1}^t + \delta_{i_2}^t + \delta_{i_3}^t} \right),$$

$$(17) \quad s_2 = 3\xi_2 \prod_{\substack{(i_1, i_2, i_3) \neq \\ (4, 5, 6)}} v_{i_1 i_2 i_3} - \sum_{t=4}^6 a_t \left(\prod_{\substack{(i_1, i_2, i_3) \neq \\ (4, 5, 6)}} v_{i_1 i_2 i_3}^{\delta_{i_1}^t + \delta_{i_2}^t + \delta_{i_3}^t} \prod_{\substack{(i_1, i_2, i_3) \neq \\ (1, 2, 3)}} u_{i_1 i_2 i_3}^{\delta_{i_1}^t + \delta_{i_2}^t + \delta_{i_3}^t} \right).$$

The notation $V(s_1, s_2)$ denotes the common zero set of the sections s_1, s_2 . Each product is taken over all indices $1 \leq i_1 \leq i_2 \leq i_3 \leq 6$, except for those triples that are explicitly excluded. We

consider a family of varieties defined as the scheme-theoretic intersection of the zero sets of two sections, s_1 and s_2 , chosen from $H^0(\mathcal{O}(D_1))$ and $H^0(\mathcal{O}(D_2))$, respectively. The equation is written in affine coordinates on the Cox space $\mathbb{C}^{\Pi(1)} - Z(\Pi)$, where $Z(\Pi)$ is the toric irrelevant locus.

The symbols $v_{i_1 i_2 i_3}, u_{i_1 i_2 i_3}$ are used both for ray generators (elements of $\Pi(1)^{\text{gen}}$) and for corresponding variables in the Cox ring $\mathbb{C}[r : r \in \Pi(1)^{\text{gen}}]$, while all other symbols are merely parameters of the family \mathcal{Y} . More precisely, $(\xi_1, a_1, a_2, a_3) \in \mathbb{P}^3 \cong \mathbb{P}H^0(\mathcal{O}(D_1))$ and $(\xi_2, a_4, a_5, a_6) \in \mathbb{P}^3 \cong \mathbb{P}H^0(\mathcal{O}(D_2))$. Each fiber $\mathcal{Y}_{\xi_1, \dots, \xi_6}$ is naturally a subvariety of \mathbb{P}_{Π} . Note that u_{123} and v_{456} are not valid variables, as there are no ray generators denoted by those symbols. The symbol δ_a^b denotes the Kronecker symbol, which is equal to 1 when $a = b$ and equal to 0 otherwise.

As stated in [BB96b], the family $\mathcal{Y}_{\xi_1, \dots, \xi_6}$ is a mirror dual family to the complete intersection of two cubic hypersurfaces in \mathbb{P}^5 . Specifically, the Hodge diamond of the smooth complete intersection of two cubics is mirror-symmetric to the Hodge diamond of a sufficiently generic fiber of the family $\mathcal{Y}_{\xi_1, \dots, \xi_6}$. This follows from the [BB96a, Theorem 4.15]. The precise condition for genericity is given in the proof of [BB96a, Theorem 4.10]: we require the fiber of the family to intersect all toric strata of \mathbb{P}_{Π} transversally.

Hence, for sufficiently generic parameters, we have $h^{3-1,1}(\mathcal{Y}_{\xi_1, \dots, \xi_6}) = 1$ (see [BB96a, Theorem 4.15]). The number $h^{3-1,1}$ can be interpreted as the expected number of parameters. Although the family $\mathcal{Y}_{\xi_1, \dots, \xi_6}$ is 6-dimensional, we expect it to be effectively a 1-dimensional family. The overabundance hints that the family might be parameterized inefficiently, and that many fibers could actually be isomorphic. This is indeed the case: up to automorphisms, the family depends only on the product $a_1 \dots a_6$, at least whenever $a_i \neq 0$.

Consider the family $\mathcal{Y}_{\psi} = V(h_1, h_2)$, where h_1 and h_2 are defined by:

$$(18) \quad h_1 = 3\psi \prod_{\substack{(i_1, i_2, i_3) \neq \\ (1, 2, 3)}} u_{i_1 i_2 i_3} - \sum_{t=1}^3 \left(\prod_{\substack{(i_1, i_2, i_3) \neq \\ (4, 5, 6)}} v_{i_1 i_2 i_3}^{\delta_{i_1}^t + \delta_{i_2}^t + \delta_{i_3}^t} \prod_{\substack{(i_1, i_2, i_3) \neq \\ (1, 2, 3)}} u_{i_1 i_2 i_3}^{\delta_{i_1}^t + \delta_{i_2}^t + \delta_{i_3}^t} \right),$$

$$(19) \quad h_2 = 3\psi \prod_{\substack{(i_1, i_2, i_3) \neq \\ (4, 5, 6)}} v_{i_1 i_2 i_3} - \sum_{t=4}^6 \left(\prod_{\substack{(i_1, i_2, i_3) \neq \\ (4, 5, 6)}} v_{i_1 i_2 i_3}^{\delta_{i_1}^t + \delta_{i_2}^t + \delta_{i_3}^t} \prod_{\substack{(i_1, i_2, i_3) \neq \\ (1, 2, 3)}} u_{i_1 i_2 i_3}^{\delta_{i_1}^t + \delta_{i_2}^t + \delta_{i_3}^t} \right),$$

where the parameter ψ belongs to \mathbb{P}^1 , the total space is $\mathcal{Y} \subset \mathbb{P}_{\Pi} \times \mathbb{P}^1$, and the structural morphism is $f : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$. Since \mathcal{Y}_{ψ} is a subfamily of $\mathcal{Y}_{\xi_1, \dots, \xi_6}$, we continue to use the symbol \mathcal{Y} to denote both the total space of the new family and the family itself.

It is also useful to write down the equations in toric coordinates:

$$(20) \quad h_1|_{\mathbb{T}_N} = 3\psi - t_1 - t_2 - t_3, \quad h_2|_{\mathbb{T}_N} = 3\psi - t_4 - t_5 - t_6.$$

Specifically, we have $\mathcal{Y}_{\psi} \cap \mathbb{T}_N = V(h_1|_{\mathbb{T}_N}, h_2|_{\mathbb{T}_N}) \subset \mathbb{T}_N$. We claim that the family \mathcal{Y}_{ψ} qualifies as the mirror dual family. This is a rather imprecise statement, since, in general, there is no sufficiently broad and precise definition of "the mirror dual family" against which we can verify this claim.

As we said before, a simple change of coordinates transforms the family $\mathcal{Y}_{\xi_1, \dots, \xi_6}$ into the one-dimensional family \mathcal{Y}_{ψ} , which aligns with our Hodge-theoretical expectations: the dimension of the parameter space of the mirror dual family should be equal to 1. Subsequent constructions,

especially Proposition 5.8, will further support the claim that this family deserves to be called **the** mirror dual family to the complete intersection of two cubic hypersurfaces in \mathbb{P}^5 (or, at least, a crepant desingularization of the mirror dual family). We list below the reasons why this family is the right one:

- The general fiber is smooth, as shown in Theorem 4.1, and its Hodge diamond is mirror dual to the Hodge diamond of a smooth intersection of two cubic hypersurfaces in \mathbb{P}^5 , as established in [BB96a, Theorem 4.15].
- The family is nontrivial and one-dimensional, which is what we expect from **the** mirror dual family, since $h^{3-1,1}(\mathcal{B}_\psi) = 1$ for general ψ , and this Hodge number equals the dimension of the tangent space to the deformation space of complex structures on \mathcal{B}_ψ .
- The family has a maximal unipotent monodromy point, as shown in Proposition 5.8 – a feature we expect any true mirror dual family to have.
- The family is obtained from the full overabundant Batyrev–Borisov family using only the open torus coordinates, through what is arguably a natural pullback/change of coordinates.

In the further considerations we will also need the family \mathcal{X}_ψ , with fibers $\mathcal{X}_\psi \subset \mathbb{P}_{\Sigma_\nabla}$, which lives in $\mathbb{P}_{\Sigma_\nabla}$ and corresponds to the family \mathcal{B}_ψ before the crepant desingularization procedure. So, let $\mathcal{X}_\psi = V(r_1, r_2)$, where

$$\begin{aligned} r_1 &= 3\psi u_1 \dots u_6 - u_1^3 v_1^3 - u_2^3 v_2^3 - u_3^3 v_3^3, \\ r_2 &= 3\psi v_1 \dots v_6 - u_4^3 v_4^3 - u_5^3 v_5^3 - u_6^3 v_6^3, \\ r_1 &\in \Gamma(\mathbb{P}_{\Sigma_\nabla}, \mathcal{O}(D_{\nabla_1})), r_2 \in \Gamma(\mathbb{P}_{\Sigma_\nabla}, \mathcal{O}(D_{\nabla_2})). \end{aligned}$$

These equations are expressed in terms of the Cox ring of the variety $\mathbb{P}_{\Sigma_\nabla}$. For the definitions of the fan Σ_∇ and the divisors $D_{\nabla_1}, D_{\nabla_2}$ see Theorem 2.1. The canonical map

$$\pi : \mathbb{P}_\Pi \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_{\Sigma_\nabla}$$

contracts the divisors $V(u_{ijk}) = D_{u_{ijk}}$ and $V(v_{ijk}) = D_{v_{ijk}}$ to points (except when $i = j = k$), and restricts to the canonical map $\pi : \mathcal{B}_\psi \rightarrow \mathcal{X}_\psi$ for every $\psi \in \mathbb{P}^1$. In Section 4 we study the geometry of the family \mathcal{B}_ψ , but we will also need a little bit of geometry of the family \mathcal{X}_ψ as well, for the future mirror symmetry developments. The next proposition shows that the variety \mathcal{X}_0 and the total space \mathcal{X} are normal.

Proposition 3.1. *The following statements about the family \mathcal{X}_ψ hold:*

- (1) *The total space $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{P}_\Sigma \times \mathbb{P}^1$ is a normal variety.*
- (2) *The fiber $\mathcal{X}_0 \subset \mathbb{P}_\Sigma$ is a normal variety.*

Proof. To prove the first statement, we use Serre’s normality criterion, which states that \mathcal{X} is normal if and only if it satisfies conditions S_2 and R_1 . For the S_2 condition, note that \mathcal{X} is even Cohen-Macaulay since $\mathbb{P}_\Sigma \times \mathbb{P}^1$ is, and \mathcal{X} is a complete intersection inside $\mathbb{P}_\Sigma \times \mathbb{P}^1$.

Due to the symmetry of the problem, it is enough to compute $(\text{spec } \mathbb{C}[U_\sigma] \times \mathbb{P}^1) \cap \mathcal{X}$ only in the cases when σ is U_1 or $C_{3,6}$. To verify the R_1 condition, we need to prove that the singular locus of the following four affine algebraic \mathbb{C} -schemes has dimension at most 2:

$$\text{spec } \frac{\mathbb{C}[y_1, \dots, y_6, \psi]}{(y_2 y_3 y_4 y_5 y_6 - y_1^3, 3\psi y_1 - 1 - y_2 - y_3, 3\psi - y_4 - y_5 - y_6)},$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \operatorname{spec} \frac{\mathbb{C}[y_1, \dots, y_6, \psi]}{(y_1 y_2 y_4 y_5 - y_3^3 y_6^3, 3\psi y_3 - y_1 - y_2 - 1, 3\psi y_6 - y_4 - y_5 - 1)}, \\ & \operatorname{spec} \frac{\mathbb{C}[y_1, \dots, y_6, \psi^{-1}]}{(y_2 y_3 y_4 y_5 y_6 - y_1^3, 3y_1 - \psi^{-1}(1 + y_2^3 + y_3^3), 3 - \psi^{-1}(y_4 + y_5 + y_6))}, \\ & \operatorname{spec} \frac{\mathbb{C}[y_1, \dots, y_6, \psi^{-1}]}{(y_1 y_2 y_4 y_5 - y_3^3 y_6^3, 3y_3 - \psi^{-1}(y_1 + y_2 + 1), 3y_6 - \psi^{-1}(y_4 + y_5 + 1))}. \end{aligned}$$

This can be verified by standard techniques.

To show that \mathcal{X}_0 is normal, we again need to verify the S_2 and R_1 conditions. The S_2 condition is automatically satisfied: \mathbb{P}_{Σ_V} is Cohen-Macaulay, and \mathcal{X}_0 is a complete intersection. The R_1 condition can be checked by computing the dimension of the singular locus of:

$$\begin{aligned} & \operatorname{spec} \frac{\mathbb{C}[y_1, \dots, y_6]}{(y_2 y_3 y_4 y_5 y_6 - y_1^3, -1 - y_2 - y_3, -y_4 - y_5 - y_6)}, \\ & \operatorname{spec} \frac{\mathbb{C}[y_1, \dots, y_6]}{(y_1 y_2 y_4 y_5 - y_3^3 y_6^3, -y_1 - y_2 - 1, -y_4 - y_5 - 1)}. \end{aligned}$$

As before, we can check these using standard techniques. \square

4. GEOMETRY OF THE MIRROR FAMILY

This section focuses on computing the smooth fiber locus of the family \mathcal{Y}_ψ . For clarity, we introduce the notation $\zeta_6 = \exp(\frac{2\pi i}{6})$ to denote a primitive sixth root of unity, and $\mu_6 = \{1, \zeta_6, \dots, \zeta_6^5\}$ for the set of all sixth roots of unity. Additionally, we classify the singularities of the singular fibers. We will summarize all the propositions which we aim to prove in a single theorem, both for the sake of readability and to facilitate easier referencing:

Theorem 4.1. *Let $\mathcal{Y}_\psi = V(h_1, h_2)$ be a family with $\psi \in \mathbb{P}^1$ and total space $\mathcal{Y} \subset \mathbb{P}_\Pi \times \mathbb{P}^1$. The equations h_1 and h_2 are defined by formulas (18), (19).*

- (1) *The family \mathcal{Y}_ψ is a one-dimensional flat family with parameter space \mathbb{P}^1 .*
- (2) *The total space of the family $\mathcal{Y} \subset \mathbb{P}_\Pi \times \mathbb{P}^1$ is smooth, except for the points lying in $\mathcal{Y}_\infty \subset \mathcal{Y}$.*
- (3) *When $\psi \notin \mu_6 \cup \{0, \infty\}$, the fiber \mathcal{Y}_ψ is smooth.*
- (4) *When $\psi \in \mu_6$, the fiber \mathcal{Y}_ψ has a unique ordinary double point, which lies in $\mathcal{Y}_\psi \cap \mathbb{T}_N$ and has coordinates $(\psi, \dots, \psi) \in \mathbb{T}_N$.*
- (5) *When $\psi = 0$, the fiber $\mathcal{Y}_0 = W_0 \cup W_1 \cup W_2$ is a union of three integral smooth components. The components are defined by the equations:*

$$W_0 = V\left(\frac{h_1|_{\psi=0}}{v_{123}}, \frac{h_2|_{\psi=0}}{u_{456}}\right), W_1 = V\left(v_{123}, \frac{h_2|_{\psi=0}}{u_{456}}\right), W_2 = V\left(\frac{h_1|_{\psi=0}}{v_{123}}, u_{456}\right).$$

- (6) *The components W_1 and W_2 are rational.*
- (7) *$W_1 \cap W_2 = \emptyset$, but $W_0 \cap W_1$ and $W_0 \cap W_2$ are codimension one subvarieties of \mathcal{Y}_0 .*
- (8) *$\mathcal{Y}_0 = W_0 \cup W_1 \cup W_2$ is a simple normal crossing divisor in the total space \mathcal{Y} , which means that all components are smooth (item 5) and locally around each point $p \in \mathcal{Y}_0$, there is a neighborhood of $p \in \mathcal{Y}$ such that \mathcal{Y}_0 is given by an equation $z_1 z_2 \dots z_k = 0$, for independent parameters z_i .*

Points (1)–(4) follow directly from the Jacobian criterion. We therefore focus on points (5)–(8). The next four propositions establish these points. We begin with the case $\psi = 0$. In this case, we can see that h_1 is divisible by v_{123} and h_2 is divisible by u_{456} . We introduce the notation

$$\tilde{h}_1 := \frac{h_1|_{\psi=0}}{v_{123}}, \tilde{h}_2 = \frac{h_2|_{\psi=0}}{u_{456}}.$$

We will also use $\phi_{i_0} : \Pi(1)^{gen} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ for the function defined by

$$\phi_{i_0}(u_{ijk}) = \delta_{i_0}^i + \delta_{i_0}^j + \delta_{i_0}^k, \quad \phi_{i_0}(v_{ijk}) = \delta_{i_0}^i + \delta_{i_0}^j + \delta_{i_0}^k.$$

Proposition 4.2. *The variety \mathcal{Y}_0 has three irreducible components, W_1, W_2 and W_0 . They can be described in terms of Cox homogeneous coordinates as*

$$W_0 = V(\tilde{h}_1, \tilde{h}_2), W_1 = V(v_{123}, \tilde{h}_2), W_2 = V(\tilde{h}_1, u_{456}).$$

All three components are smooth.

Proof. The fan Π is smooth, so the Cox map $\mathbb{C}^{\Sigma(1)} - Z(\Pi) \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_{\Pi}$ is smooth as well. This means we can check the relevant properties directly at the level of the total Cox space $\mathbb{C}^{\Pi(1)} - Z(\Pi)$. By setting $\psi = 0$ in the equations (18) and (19), we obtain the following two equations:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{t=1}^3 \left(\prod_{\substack{(i_1, i_2, i_3) \neq \\ (4, 5, 6)}} v_{i_1 i_2 i_3}^{\delta_{i_1}^t + \delta_{i_2}^t + \delta_{i_3}^t} \prod_{\substack{(i_1, i_2, i_3) \neq \\ (1, 2, 3)}} u_{i_1 i_2 i_3}^{\delta_{i_1}^t + \delta_{i_2}^t + \delta_{i_3}^t} \right) &= 0, \\ \sum_{t=4}^6 \left(\prod_{\substack{(i_1, i_2, i_3) \neq \\ (4, 5, 6)}} v_{i_1 i_2 i_3}^{\delta_{i_1}^t + \delta_{i_2}^t + \delta_{i_3}^t} \prod_{\substack{(i_1, i_2, i_3) \neq \\ (1, 2, 3)}} u_{i_1 i_2 i_3}^{\delta_{i_1}^t + \delta_{i_2}^t + \delta_{i_3}^t} \right) &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

So, noticing that the first equation is divisible by v_{123} and the second by u_{456} , we can write:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Y}_0 &= V(v_{123} \tilde{h}_1, u_{456} \tilde{h}_2) = (V(\tilde{h}_1) \cup V(v_{123})) \cap (V(\tilde{h}_2) \cup V(u_{456})) = \\ &= V(\tilde{h}_1, \tilde{h}_2) \cup V(\tilde{h}_1, u_{456}) \cup V(v_{123}, \tilde{h}_2) \cup V(v_{123}, u_{456}). \end{aligned}$$

We now prove that $W_2 = V(\tilde{h}_1, u_{456})$ and $W_1 = V(v_{123}, \tilde{h}_2)$ are smooth. The only way W_2 could be singular is if there exists a point $p \in V(\tilde{h}_1, u_{456})$ such that $(\text{grad } \tilde{h}_1)|_p = 0$. This follows from the Jacobian criterion and the observation that $(\text{grad } u_{456})|_p$ (here, u_{456} considered as monic polynomial) has a 1 in the position corresponding to the variable u_{456} , while $(\text{grad } \tilde{h}_1)|_p$ has a 0 in that same position. Therefore, the gradients are not collinear-by-nonzero-scalars, so, we should have $(\text{grad } \tilde{h}_1)|_p = 0$. The existence of such a point p would imply the existence of a cone $\sigma \in \Pi(5)$ with the following properties:

- $u_{456} \in \sigma$, which ensures that $W_2 \cap U_{\sigma} \neq \emptyset$.
- There is a triple of not necessarily distinct u -ray generators $r_1, r_2, r_3 \in \sigma^{gen} - \{u_{456}\}$ such that $\phi_1(r_1) \geq 1, \phi_2(r_2) \geq 1$, and $\phi_3(r_3) \geq 1$. This follows from the identities

$$\frac{\partial \tilde{h}_1}{\partial v_{111}} = \frac{\partial \tilde{h}_1}{\partial v_{222}} = \frac{\partial \tilde{h}_1}{\partial v_{333}} = 0.$$

One can check that no such cone exists: the first condition forces σ to be a subcone of U_1, U_2 , or U_3 and the second condition eliminates even those possibilities.

To prove the smoothness of the component $W_0 = V(\tilde{h}_1, \tilde{h}_2)$ we once again apply the Jacobian criterion. For a point $p \in \tilde{\mathcal{D}}_0$ to be singular either $\text{grad}_p \tilde{h}_1 = 0$, or $\text{grad}_p \tilde{h}_2 = 0$, or both vectors are not 0 at the point p and they are collinear-by-nonzero-scalars. We show that all three cases are impossible.

Let

$$S = \{r \in \Pi(1)^{gen} : p^r = 0\}$$

be the set of vanishing coordinates of p . If $S = \emptyset$ then the Cox morphism maps a point p to a point in $W_0 \cap \mathbb{T}_N$, which cannot be singular, by an explicit computation in toric coordinates. Thus, $S \neq \emptyset$. For each j , define

$$S_j := \{r \in \Pi(1)^{gen} : p^r = 0 \text{ and } \phi_j(r) \geq 1\}.$$

Then $S = S_1 \cup \dots \cup S_6$.

Let's start with the $(\text{grad } \tilde{h}_1)|_p \neq 0, (\text{grad } \tilde{h}_2)|_p \neq 0$ case. Differentiating both equations along $v_{111}, v_{222}, \dots, v_{666}$, we can see that

$$\frac{\partial \tilde{h}_1}{\partial v_{111}} = \dots = \frac{\partial \tilde{h}_1}{\partial v_{666}} = 0.$$

This implies that $S_1 \neq \emptyset, \dots, S_6 \neq \emptyset$, which is impossible.

Now, consider the case when $(\text{grad } \tilde{h}_1)|_p = 0$. Let $\sigma = \text{cone } S$. Let $\tilde{\sigma}^{gen} := \sigma^{gen} - \{v_{123}\}$. From the condition $(\text{grad } \tilde{h}_1)|_p = 0$, it follows in particular that

$$\frac{\partial \tilde{h}_1}{\partial v_{111}} = \frac{\partial \tilde{h}_1}{\partial v_{222}} = \frac{\partial \tilde{h}_1}{\partial v_{333}} = 0.$$

Hence, we must have $S_1 \neq \emptyset, S_2 \neq \emptyset, S_3 \neq \emptyset$. Therefore, the only possible case is when $\sigma \subset V_i$ for some $i = 4, 5, 6$. The second observation is that only one of the following three statements, for $r = 4, 5$ or 6 :

$$\sum_{\rho \in \tilde{\sigma}^{gen}} \phi_r(\rho) \geq 1$$

can be true, since if two statements are true, the third is also true, since p should satisfy the equation $\tilde{h}_2 = 0$. But in such a case we would have a contradiction $S_1 \neq \emptyset, \dots, S_6 \neq \emptyset$.

The final observation is the following: if

$$\sum_{\rho \in \tilde{\sigma}^{gen}} \phi_r(\rho) \geq 2,$$

holds for some $1 \leq r \leq 3$ and there is $w \in \tilde{\sigma}^{gen}$ with $\phi_r(w) \geq 1$ and $\phi_s(w) \geq 1$ for some $1 \leq s \leq 3$, then

$$\sum_{\rho \in \tilde{\sigma}^{gen}} \phi_s(\rho) \geq 2.$$

This follows from

$$\frac{\partial \tilde{h}_1}{\partial w} = 0,$$

and the assumption $w \neq v_{123}$.

There is no cone $\sigma \in \Pi$ that satisfies the three properties listed above. Notice, that the cone $\sigma = \text{cone}\{v_{123}, v_{124}, v_{224}, v_{234}\} \in \Pi$ satisfies the three properties above if we replace $\tilde{\sigma}$ by σ everywhere, that is why our argument works for $W_0 = V(\tilde{h}_1, \tilde{h}_2)$ but not for $\mathcal{W}_0 = V(h_1, h_2)$. \square

Proposition 4.3. *The components W_1 and W_2 are rational.*

Proof. In order to show the rationality of the component W_1 , we can establish an explicit isomorphism between an open set of \mathbb{P}^3 and one of the affine patches of W_1 . The rationality of the component W_2 can be shown in a similar way. For $W_1 = V(v_{123}, \tilde{h}_2)$ take the cone

$$\sigma = \text{cone}\{v_{123}, v_{124}, v_{224}, v_{234}, v_{235}\} \in \Pi.$$

To obtain the corresponding equations for the variety $U_\sigma \cap V(v_{123}, \frac{h_2}{u_{456}})$, one can simply set all coordinates that are not in the cone σ equal to 1. This yields:

$$\begin{aligned} U_\sigma \cap V(v_{123}, \tilde{h}_2) &= V(v_{123}, v_{124}v_{224}v_{234} + v_{235} + 1) \subset \\ &\subset U_\sigma = \text{spec } \mathbb{C}[v_{123}, v_{124}, v_{224}, v_{234}, v_{235}]. \end{aligned}$$

One can see that the variety is isomorphic to \mathbb{C}^3 . The rationality of the component W_2 can be checked analogously. \square

Proposition 4.4. *\mathcal{W}_0 is a simple normal crossing divisor inside the total space \mathcal{W} . Moreover, the components W_0, W_1 and W_2 are connected smooth varieties, with $W_1 \cap W_2 = \emptyset$.*

Proof. One can see that $V(v_{123}, u_{456}) = \emptyset$. This follows from the fact that there is no cone $\sigma \in \Pi(5)$ such that $\text{cone}\{v_{123}, u_{456}\} \subset \sigma$.

In order to show that \mathcal{W}_0 is a simple normal crossing divisor inside \mathcal{W} notice that the variety $\mathcal{W} \subset \mathbb{P}_\Pi \times \mathbb{P}^1$ is described as the zero locus of the same equations (18), (19), only now $\psi \in \mathbb{P}^1$ is treated as a variable rather than a fixed parameter. We want to check that the intersection $W_0 \cap W_1$ is a simple normal crossing divisor inside \mathcal{W} ; for $W_0 \cap W_2$, the argument is the same.

In order to show that we have a simple normal crossing divisor, it is enough to prove that the variety

$$W_0 \cup W_1 = V(\tilde{h}_1, \tilde{h}_2, \psi) \cup V(v_{123}, \tilde{h}_2, \psi) = V((\tilde{h}_1, \tilde{h}_2, \psi) \cap (v_{123}, \tilde{h}_2, \psi))$$

is equal to the variety $V(\tilde{h}_1 v_{123})$ inside the variety $\mathcal{W} = V(h_1, h_2)$, in a neighborhood of the points of $W_0 \cap W_1$. We can regard \tilde{h}_1 and v_{123} as local coordinates, since $\text{grad } \tilde{h}_1$ and $\text{grad } v_{123}$ are linearly independent at every point. In other words we need to show the equality of the varieties:

$$V((\tilde{h}_1, \tilde{h}_2, \psi) \cap (v_{123}, \tilde{h}_2, \psi)) \cap U = V(h_1, h_2) \cap V(\tilde{h}_1 v_{123}) \cap U,$$

where U is a sufficiently small open neighborhood of a point in $W_0 \cap W_1$. The natural identifications lead us to

$$V(\tilde{h}_1 v_{123}, h_1, h_2) = V(\tilde{h}_1 v_{123}, \psi, h_2) = V(\tilde{h}_1 v_{123}, \psi, \tilde{h}_2 u_{456}),$$

and near the points of $W_0 \cap W_1$, the variable u_{456} is invertible. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} V(\tilde{h}_1 v_{123}, \tilde{h}_2 u_{456}, \psi) &= V(\tilde{h}_1 v_{123}, \tilde{h}_2, \psi) = \\ &= V(\tilde{h}_1, \tilde{h}_2, \psi) \cup V(v_{123}, \tilde{h}_2, \psi). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the two varieties are equal.

We already know that all three components W_0, W_1 and W_2 are smooth, as stated in Proposition 4.2. In order to show that they are irreducible, it is enough to show that they are connected.

Consider the points $p_1 = \pi(W_1), p_2 = \pi(W_2)$ in \mathcal{X}_0 (we use the notation \mathcal{X}_0 for the pre-resolution variety introduced at the end of Section 3). The components $W_1 = \pi^{-1}(p_1), W_2 = \pi^{-1}(p_2)$ are connected due to Zariski's connectedness theorem, which applies here because the variety \mathcal{X}_0 is normal, by Proposition 3.1.

We want to show that the component $W_0 = V(\tilde{h}_1, \tilde{h}_2)$ is connected. We argue that W_0 is the strict transform of \mathcal{X}_0 , denoted $\widetilde{\mathcal{X}}_0$. Indeed, suppose that

$$W_0 = \widetilde{\mathcal{X}}_0 \cup \bigcup_k E_k,$$

where E_k are exceptional connected components. Since the entire fiber \mathcal{Y}_0 is connected, each E_k must intersect either W_0, W_1 or W_2 . Any such intersection must be a singular point of \mathcal{Y}_0 , and hence must lie in $W_0 \cap W_1$ or $W_0 \cap W_2$. But we know that these are normal crossings, where one component comes from $\widetilde{\mathcal{X}}_0$ and the other from W_1 or W_2 . Hence, all the E_k must be empty. \square

5. PICARD-FUCHS EQUATION AND INFINITY

We begin by recalling the geometric setup. There is a smooth projective toric variety \mathbb{P}_Π , associated with a smooth complete fan Π . The support of Π lies in the real vector space $N_\mathbb{R} = N \otimes \mathbb{R}$, and there is a canonical embedding of the torus $\mathbb{T}_N = N \otimes \mathbb{C}^\times$ into \mathbb{P}_Π . We consider a family of projective varieties \mathcal{Y}_ψ over \mathbb{P}^1 , with total space $\mathcal{Y} \subset \mathbb{P}_\Pi \times \mathbb{P}^1$, and structural morphism $f : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$. Each fiber \mathcal{Y}_ψ is a projective subvariety of \mathbb{P}_Π . We denote by $U = \mathbb{P}^1 - \{0, \infty, 1, \zeta_6, \dots, \zeta_6^5\}$ the open subset where the fibers are smooth, where $\zeta_6 = \exp(2\pi i/6)$ is a primitive sixth root of unity. The family $\mathcal{Y}_\psi = V(h_1, h_2)$ is defined by equations (18) and (19). We write $Y_{1,\psi} = V(h_1), Y_{2,\psi} = V(h_2)$ for the corresponding hypersurfaces in \mathbb{P}_Π , so by definition, $\mathcal{Y}_\psi = Y_{1,\psi} \cap Y_{2,\psi}$.

We will construct a homological cycle $\gamma(\psi) \in H_3(\mathcal{Y}_\psi)$ (see Corollary 5.5) such that

$$\text{tube}_{1,\psi} \circ \text{tube}_{2,\psi}(\gamma(\psi)) = (S^1)^5,$$

where $(S^1)^5 \in H_5(\mathbb{T}_N - \mathcal{Y}_\psi)$ denotes a standard cycle defined by the equations $|t_1| = \dots = |t_5| = |t_6| = 1$ in the torus \mathbb{T}_N . See equations (28) and (27) for a description of the corresponding tube maps. This cycle will allow us to construct a global top-form $\omega = \omega(\psi) \in H^3(\mathcal{Y}_\psi, \mathbb{C})$, which varies holomorphically with the parameter ψ .

We utilize the toric Euler form Ω , described, for example, in [CLS11, p369]. The form is defined up to a sign ± 1 , but once an ordering of the basis $t_1, \dots, t_5 \in M$ is fixed, this ambiguity is resolved. We choose the ordering as written above. The form Ω is a differential 5-form on the Cox space $\mathbb{C}^{\Pi(1)} - Z(\Pi)$. After dividing by a polynomial of the appropriate Cox degree, the form descends to a differential form on \mathbb{P}_Π with meromorphic poles. Consider the following family, over \mathbb{P}^1 , of meromorphic differential forms on \mathbb{P}_Π :

$$(21) \quad \omega^\circ(\psi) = \frac{(3\psi)^2 \Omega}{h_1 h_2}.$$

The factor ψ^2 is introduced to ensure that the fiber at ∞ behaves well. The restriction of this form on the standard open torus $\mathbb{T}_N - (Y_{1,\psi} \cup Y_{2,\psi})$ is

$$(22) \quad \omega^\circ|_{\mathbb{T}_N - (Y_{1,\psi} \cup Y_{2,\psi})} = \frac{(3\psi)^2}{(3\psi - t_4 - t_5 - t_6)(3\psi - t_1 - t_2 - t_3)} \frac{dt_1}{t_1} \wedge \dots \wedge \frac{dt_5}{t_5},$$

where t_1, \dots, t_5, t_6 are standard characters on the torus \mathbb{T}_N ; see equation (1). The fiber $\omega^\circ(\psi)$ is a global section of the sheaf $K_{\mathbb{P}_\Pi}(Y_{1,\psi} + Y_{2,\psi})$, where $Y_{1,\psi} = V(h_1)$ and $Y_{2,\psi} = V(h_2)$ are hypersurfaces in \mathbb{P}_Π , and h_1, h_2 are defined by equations (18), (19). Here, by $K_{\mathbb{P}_\Pi}$ we mean the canonical sheaf, also we will use $K_{\mathcal{Y}/\mathbb{P}^1}$ for the relative canonical sheaf of the family \mathcal{Y}_ψ . By adjunction, the restriction to \mathcal{Y}_ψ defines an element of $K_{\mathcal{Y}_\psi}$:

$$(23) \quad \omega(\psi) = \frac{1}{(2\pi i)^5} \text{res}_{Y_{2,\psi}} \text{res}_{Y_{1,\psi}} \omega^\circ(\psi).$$

We note that this can be described explicitly via Poincaré residues.

Lemma 5.1. *The section $\psi \mapsto \omega(\psi)$ corresponds to a global section of $f_* K_{\mathcal{Y}/\mathbb{P}^1}$.*

Proof. Consider the form $\omega^\circ \wedge d\psi$. Since $d\psi$ is a (trivializing) section of $K_{\mathbb{P}^1}(2[\infty])$, this corresponds to a top-form on $\mathbb{P}_\Pi \times \mathbb{P}^1$ with simple poles along Y_1 and Y_2 , and a pole of order 2 at ∞ , hence of $K_{\mathbb{P}_\Pi \times \mathbb{P}^1}(Y_1 + Y_2)(2[\infty])$. Restricting this sheaf to \mathcal{Y} and applying adjunction provides a natural sequence of isomorphisms

$$(24) \quad K_{\mathbb{P}_\Pi \times \mathbb{P}^1}(Y_1 + Y_2)|_{\mathcal{Y}}(2[\infty]) = K_{\mathcal{Y}}(2[\infty]) = K_{\mathcal{Y}/\mathbb{P}^1} \otimes K_{\mathbb{P}^1}(2 \cdot [\infty]) = K_{\mathcal{Y}/\mathbb{P}^1}.$$

Hence this construction provides us with a global section of $f_* K_{\mathcal{Y}/\mathbb{P}^1}$. The isomorphism (24) is locally given by sending a top-form in $K_{\mathcal{Y}} = \Omega_{\mathcal{Y}}^4$, to a section of $\Omega_{\mathcal{Y}/\mathbb{P}^1}^3$, according to the rule:

$$\eta = \eta' \wedge d\psi \mapsto [\eta'].$$

This description makes sense around points where $\Omega_{\mathcal{Y}/\mathbb{P}^1}$ is locally free, i.e. the smooth points of \mathcal{Y}_ψ , and one sees by inspection that it is given by (23) for all ψ with smooth \mathcal{Y}_ψ . \square

For each fixed $\psi \in U$, the maps

$$(25) \quad \text{res}_{Y_{1,\psi}} : H^5(\mathbb{P}_\Pi - (Y_{1,\psi} \cup Y_{2,\psi})) \rightarrow H^4(Y_{1,\psi} - \mathcal{Y}_\psi),$$

$$(26) \quad \text{res}_{Y_{2,\psi}} : H^4(Y_{1,\psi} - \mathcal{Y}_\psi) \rightarrow H^3(\mathcal{Y}_\psi)$$

are dual to the tube maps

$$(27) \quad \text{tube}_{1,\psi} : H_4(Y_{1,\psi} - \mathcal{Y}_\psi) \rightarrow H_5(\mathbb{P}_\Pi - (Y_{1,\psi} \cup Y_{2,\psi})),$$

$$(28) \quad \text{tube}_{2,\psi} : H_3(\mathcal{Y}_\psi) \rightarrow H_4(Y_{1,\psi} - \mathcal{Y}_\psi).$$

By the previous lemma, both maps can be upgraded to the maps in families over whole \mathbb{P}^1 . Here, cohomology groups are de Rham cohomology with compact support, while homology refers to Borel-Moore homology. Both cohomology and homology groups are taken with coefficients in \mathbb{C} .

5.1. Existence of a cycle. The goal of this subsection (see Corollary 5.5) is to construct a homological cycle $\gamma(\psi) \in H_3(\mathcal{Y}_\psi)$ such that

$$\text{tube}_{1,\psi} \circ \text{tube}_{2,\psi}(\gamma(\psi)) = (S^1)^5,$$

where $(S^1)^5 \in H_5(\mathbb{T}_N - \mathcal{Y}_\psi)$ denotes a standard cycle defined by the equations $|t_1| = \dots = |t_5| = |t_6| = 1$ in the torus \mathbb{T}_N . The proof of the existence of such a cycle appears to be omitted from the related literature, so we include it for the sake of completeness.

In the following proposition, we will study the cycle $(S^1)^5$ in $\mathbb{T}_N \subseteq \mathbb{P}_\Pi$ given by $|t_i| = 1$, where t_i are the toric coordinates of \mathbb{T}_N . For $|\psi| > 1$, neither of the equations in (20) have solutions with $|t_i| = 1$, so in fact $(S^1)^5 \subseteq \mathbb{T}_N \setminus (Y_{1,\psi} \cup Y_{2,\psi})$.

Lemma 5.2. *For every $\psi \in U$, the following diagram*

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 H_6(\mathbb{P}_\Pi - \mathcal{Y}_\psi) & \xrightarrow{\delta} & H_5(\mathbb{P}_\Pi - (Y_{1,\psi} \cup Y_{2,\psi})) \\
 \nwarrow \text{tube}_\psi & & \nearrow \text{tube}_{1,\psi} \\
 & H_4(Y_{1,\psi} - \mathcal{Y}_\psi) & \\
 & \nearrow \text{tube}_{2,\psi} & \\
 & H_3(\mathcal{Y}_\psi) &
 \end{array}$$

commutes. Here, δ is the Mayer-Vietoris homomorphism, and $\mathcal{Y}_\psi = Y_{1,\psi} \cap Y_{2,\psi}$ is the smooth complete intersection of the smooth hypersurfaces $Y_{1,\psi}$ and $Y_{2,\psi}$.

Proof. Fix ψ . Let $\mathbb{C}^5 \cong U \subset \mathbb{P}^5$ be a local patch such that $U \cap Y_{1,\psi}, U \cap Y_{2,\psi}$ are locally defined by equations $z_1 = 0, z_2 = 0$ respectively. Let $c \in Z_3(\mathcal{Y}_\psi)$ be any 3-cycle. We have:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{tube}_{2,\psi}(c) \cap U &= \{|z_1| = 1\} \times \{0\} \times (c \cap U) \subset S^1 \times \{0\} \times \mathbb{C}^3, \\
 \text{tube}_{1,\psi} \circ \text{tube}_{2,\psi}(c) \cap U &= \{|z_1| = |z_2| = 1\} \times (c \cap U) \subset S^1 \times S^1 \times \mathbb{C}^3, \\
 \text{tube}_\psi(c) &= \{|z_1| + |z_2| = 2\} \times (c \cap U) \subset B^2 \times B^2 \times \mathbb{C}^3.
 \end{aligned}$$

Here, B^2 denotes the ball in \mathbb{C} with radius 2. We also think of $c \cap U$ as a subset of \mathbb{C}^3 . In these local coordinates, define two chains:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \Sigma_1 &= \{|z_1| \geq 1, |z_1| + |z_2| = 2\} \times (c \cap U), \\
 \Sigma_2 &= \{|z_2| \geq 1, |z_1| + |z_2| = 2\} \times (c \cap U).
 \end{aligned}$$

Note that $\text{tube}_\psi(c) = \Sigma_1 + \Sigma_2$ so we see that $\delta \text{tube}_\psi(c) = \partial \text{tube}_\psi(c) = \text{tube}_{1,\psi} \circ \text{tube}_{2,\psi}(c)$ and the claim follows. \square

Lemma 5.3. *To verify that a cycle $\gamma \in H_5(\mathbb{P}_\Pi - (Y_{1,\psi} \cup Y_{2,\psi}))$ lies in the image of $\text{tube}_{1,\psi} \circ \text{tube}_{2,\psi}$, it suffices to find a cycle $z \in H_6(\mathbb{P}_\Pi - \mathcal{Y}_\psi)$ such that $\delta(z) = \gamma$ and $i_*[z] = 0$, where $i : \mathbb{P}_\Pi - \mathcal{Y}_\psi \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_\Pi$ is the canonical open embedding. Here, δ is the Mayer-Vietoris homomorphism.*

Proof. By writing the long exact sequence of relative homology for the pair $(\mathbb{P}, \mathbb{P} - \mathcal{Y}_\psi)$, we get:

$$(29) \quad \dots \rightarrow H_7(\mathbb{P}_\Pi, \mathbb{P}_\Pi - \mathcal{Y}_\psi) \rightarrow H_6(\mathbb{P}_\Pi - \mathcal{Y}_\psi) \rightarrow H_6(\mathbb{P}_\Pi) \rightarrow H_6(\mathbb{P}_\Pi, \mathbb{P}_\Pi - \mathcal{Y}_\psi) \rightarrow \dots$$

Applying Poincaré-Lefschetz and Poincaré duality, we find that $H_7(\mathbb{P}_\Pi, \mathbb{P}_\Pi - \mathcal{Y}_\psi) = H^3(\mathcal{Y}_\psi) = H_3(\mathcal{Y}_\psi)$, and under these identifications, the first morphism in the sequence above is isomorphic to the tube map:

$$H_3(\mathcal{Y}_\psi) \xrightarrow{\text{tube}_\psi} H_6(\mathbb{P}_\Pi - \mathcal{Y}_\psi).$$

It follows that the image of tube_ψ is the kernel of the map $H_6(\mathbb{P}_\Pi - \mathcal{Y}_\psi) \rightarrow H_6(\mathbb{P}_\Pi)$. By Lemma 5.2, we know that $\delta \circ \text{tube}_\psi = \text{tube}_{1,\psi} \circ \text{tube}_{2,\psi}$, which completes the proof. \square

Lemma 5.4. *For every $\psi \in U$ such that $|\psi| > 1$, there exists a cycle $\gamma \in H_3(\mathcal{Y}_\psi)$ such that*

$$\text{tube}_{1,\psi} \circ \text{tube}_{2,\psi}(\gamma) = (S^1)^5,$$

where $(S^1)^5 \in H_5(\mathbb{P} - (Y_{1,\psi} \cup Y_{2,\psi}))$ is a 5-cycle defined by the equations $|t_1| = \dots = |t_5| = 1$ in \mathbb{T}_N .

Proof. We will write Y_1, Y_2, \mathbb{P} instead of $Y_{1,\psi}, Y_{2,\psi}, \mathbb{P}_\Pi$ throughout the proof. We will follow the strategy used in the proof of Theorem 5.3 by constructing the cycle explicitly. Let us define two cones, which are maximal cones of the fan Π :

$$\sigma_1 = \text{cone}(v_{111}, v_{112}, v_{113}, v_{114}, v_{115}) \in \Pi,$$

$$\sigma_2 = \text{cone}(u_{266}, u_{366}, u_{466}, u_{566}, u_{666}) \in \Pi.$$

The dual cones to the cones above are:

$$\sigma_1^\vee = \text{cone}((-1, -2, -2, -2, -2, 0)^T, (0, 1, 0, 0, 0, 0)^T, (0, 0, 1, 0, 0, 0)^T,$$

$$(1, 1, 1, 2, 1, 0)^T, (1, 1, 1, 1, 2, 0)^T) \subset M_{\mathbb{R}},$$

$$\sigma_2^\vee = \text{cone}((-1, 1, 0, 0, 0, 0)^T, (-1, 0, 1, 0, 0, 0)^T, (0, 0, 0, 1, 0, 0)^T,$$

$$(0, 0, 0, 0, 1, 0)^T, (1, -1, -1, -1, -1, 0)^T) \subset M_{\mathbb{R}}.$$

With the given ordering of the generators of the dual cones, we introduce coordinates:

$$U_1 := U_{\sigma_1} = \text{spec } \mathbb{C}[M \cap \sigma_1^\vee] = \text{spec } \mathbb{C}[x_1, \dots, x_5],$$

$$U_2 := U_{\sigma_2} = \text{spec } \mathbb{C}[M \cap \sigma_2^\vee] = \text{spec } \mathbb{C}[y_1, \dots, y_5].$$

The ordering of the coordinates corresponds to the given ordering of the generators of the dual cones. For example, $x_3 = t_3, y_1 = \frac{t_2}{t_1}$. Note that since $\sigma_1 \cap \sigma_2 = 0$, we have $U_1 \cap U_2 = \mathbb{T}_N$. We define our cycle as the sum of two parts $z = z_1 + z_2$ such that $\text{supp } z_1 \subset U_1 - Y_1 \subset \mathbb{P} - Y_1$ and $\text{supp } z_2 \subset U_2 - Y_2 \subset \mathbb{P} - Y_2$. Hence $\text{supp}(z_1 + z_2) \subset \mathbb{P} - \mathcal{Y}_\psi$ and $\delta(z_1 + z_2) = \partial(z_1)$.

We now define:

$$z_1 = \{(x_1, \dots, x_5) \in U_1 : |x_1| \leq 1, |x_2| = |x_3| = |x_4| = |x_5| = 1\},$$

$$z_2 = \{(y_1, \dots, y_5) \in U_2 : |y_1| \leq 1, |y_2| = |y_3| = |y_4| = |y_5| = 1\},$$

$$z = z_1 + z_2.$$

Notice that it is indeed a cycle, which means that $\partial(z_1 + z_2) = [(S^1)^5] - [(S^1)^5] = 0$, the minus sign comes from the fact that the canonical embedding $\mathbb{T}_N \rightarrow U_2$ is orientation-reversing. Notice that we have the identity $\delta(z) = \partial(z_1) = (S^1)^5$, by definition of the Mayer-Vietoris homomorphism. Indeed, the Mayer-Vietoris homomorphism sends the cycle $z = z_1 + z_2$ supported on $(U_1 - Y_1) \cup (U_2 - Y_2)$, with z_1 supported on the $U_1 - Y_1$ and z_2 supported on the $U_2 - Y_2$, to the boundary of z_1 , which is supported on the $(U_1 - Y_1) \cap (U_2 - Y_2)$.

To check that $\text{supp } z_1 \subset U_1 - Y_1$ we have to compute equations that define the variety $Y_1 \cap U_1$. The computation gives us

$$3\psi - t_1 - t_2 - t_3 = 0,$$

$$3\psi - x_1^3 x_2^2 x_3^2 x_4^2 x_5^2 - x_2 - x_3 = 0,$$

assuming that $(x_1, \dots, x_5) \in \text{supp } z_1$ and $(x_1, \dots, x_5) \in Y_1 \cap U_1$, we can deduce

$$3\psi = x_1^3 x_2^2 x_3^2 x_4^2 x_5^2 + x_2 + x_3,$$

$$3|\psi| \leq |x_1^3 x_2^2 x_3^2 x_4^2 x_5^2| + |x_2| + |x_3| \leq 3,$$

which contradicts the assumption that $|\psi| > 1$. Notice that the inequality $|x_i| \leq 1$ follows from the assumption $(x_1, \dots, x_5) \in \text{supp } z_1$ and definition of z_1 . Analogously, to prove $\text{supp}(z_2) \subset U_2 - Y_2$, we must write equations that define $Y_2 \cap U_2$. The computation gives us

$$3\psi - t_4 - t_5 - t_6 = 0,$$

$$3\psi - y_4 - y_5 - y_1^2 y_2^2 y_3^2 y_4^2 y_5^3 = 0,$$

the same sort of reasoning shows that $\text{supp}(z_2) \subset U_2 - Y_2$.

The last thing we have to check is that the cycle $z = z_1 + z_2$ is 0 as an element of $H_6(\mathbb{P})$. By Poincaré duality, $[z] = 0$ iff $PD([z])PD([y]) = 0$ for all $[y] \in H_4(\mathbb{P})$, where $PD : H_i(\mathbb{P}) \rightarrow H^{n-i}(\mathbb{P})$ is the Poincaré duality map. Since the cohomology ring of a complete smooth toric variety is generated by $H^2(\mathbb{P})$, it is enough to check that $PD([z])PD([D_{\rho_1}])PD([D_{\rho_2}])PD([D_{\rho_3}]) = 0$ for any $\rho_1, \rho_2, \rho_3 \in \Pi(1)$. We can check this statement using intersection theory on smooth manifolds.

Intersection theory on smooth manifolds shows that $PD(z)PD([D_\rho]) = 0$ when $\rho \notin \sigma_1(1) \cup \sigma_2(1)$, since $\text{supp } z \subset U_1 \cup U_2$. Thus, we assume that $\rho_1, \rho_2, \rho_3 \in \sigma_1(1) \cup \sigma_2(1)$. A direct computation in coordinates shows that

$$V(x_2) \cap (\text{supp } z) = \emptyset, \dots, V(x_5) \cap (\text{supp } z) = \emptyset,$$

$$V(y_2) \cap (\text{supp } z) = \emptyset, \dots, V(y_5) \cap (\text{supp } z) = \emptyset.$$

Indeed, to check, for example, that $V(x_2) \cap (\text{supp } z) = \emptyset$ we have to verify that $V(x_2) \cap (\text{supp } z_1) = \emptyset$ and $V(x_2) \cap (\text{supp } z_2) = \emptyset$. The statement $V(x_2) \cap (\text{supp } z_1) = \emptyset$ is equivalent to the statement that the system

$$x_2 = 0, |x_1| \leq 1, |x_2| = \dots = |x_5| = 1$$

has no solutions, and similarly, the statement $V(x_2) \cap (\text{supp } z_2) = \emptyset$ is equivalent to the non-existence of solutions to:

$$x_2 = 0, |y_1| \leq 1, |y_2| = \dots = |y_5| = 1.$$

A computation shows that $x_2 = y_2^{-1} y_3^{-1} y_4^{-1} y_5^{-1}$ (on \mathbb{T}_N), so there are indeed no solutions.

Thus, the identity $PD(z)PD([D_\rho]) = 0$ holds for all torus-invariant irreducible Weil divisors D_ρ except, possibly, two: the one which has equation $x_1 = 0$ when restricted to U_1 , and the one which has equation $y_1 = 0$ when restricted to U_2 . Hence, it is enough to show that $PD(z)PD([y_1 = 0]) = 0$ and $PD(z)PD([x_1 = 0]) = 0$, where, abusing notation, we write $[x_1 = 0]$ (resp. $[y_1 = 0]$) for the homological class of the unique toric-invariant Weil divisor $[D_\rho]$ such that $D_\rho \cap U_1$ (resp. $D_\rho \cap U_2$) has equation $x_1 = 0$ (resp. $y_1 = 0$).

Let us prove the first identity. Using intersection theory, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} PD(z)PD([x_1 = 0]) &= PD([\text{supp}(z) \cap \{(x_1, \dots, x_5)^T \in U_1 : x_1 = 0\}]) = \\ &= PD([\{(0, x_2, \dots, x_5)^T \in U_1 : |x_2| = \dots = |x_5| = 1\}]). \end{aligned}$$

This equality holds because $\text{supp } z \cap V(x_1) = \text{supp } z_1 \cap [x_1 = 0]$ set-theoretically, and $\text{supp } z_1$ intersects $[x_1 = 0]$ transversally. The cycle $z_1 \cap [x_1 = 0]$ is homologous to 0, as is any positive-dimensional cycle with support in U_1 . Hence, we have $PD(z)PD([x_1 = 0]) = 0$. The equality $PD(z)PD([y_1 = 0]) = 0$ can be proved analogously. \square

Corollary 5.5. *For any open set $W \subset U^{an} \cap \{|\psi| > 1\}$, there exists a section $\gamma \in \Gamma(W, (R^1 f_* \mathbb{C})^\vee)$ such that, $\text{tube}_{1,\psi} \circ \text{tube}_{2,\psi}(\gamma(\psi)) = (S^1)^5$ for each $\psi \in W$.*

We consider the period along the constructed cycle:

$$(30) \quad \Phi_0 := \int_{\gamma} \omega = \frac{1}{(2\pi i)^5} \int_{(S^1)^5} \omega^\circ = \sum_{n \geq 0} \frac{((3n)!)^2}{(n!)^6} (3\psi)^{-6n}.$$

The first equality follows from the definition of ω , given in (22). The class $\omega \in H^3(\mathcal{Y}_\psi)$ is a (double) residue, and the residue is a map dual to the (double) tube map — hence the first equality in (30). One can use the geometric expansion

$$\frac{1}{1 - \frac{t_1}{3\psi} - \frac{t_2}{3\psi} - \frac{t_3}{3\psi}} \frac{1}{1 - \frac{t_4}{3\psi} - \frac{t_5}{3\psi} - \frac{t_6}{3\psi}} = \sum_{k, l \geq 0} (3\psi)^{-k-l} (t_1 + t_2 + t_3)^k (t_4 + t_5 + t_6)^l.$$

Only the terms $(t_1 \dots t_6)^s = 1$ (with coefficient $(3\psi)^{-6s}$) will survive integrating via the Cauchy formula. A combinatorial counting argument shows that the expression

$$(t_1 + t_2 + t_3)^{3s} (t_4 + t_5 + t_6)^{3s}$$

includes a term

$$\frac{(3s)!(3s)!}{(s!)^6} (t_1 \dots t_6)^s$$

in its monomial expansion. This is a good time to introduce the new coordinate

$$(31) \quad z = (3\psi)^{-6},$$

since we can see from (30), that our period depends only on the variable z . The period (30) encodes significant about the family, and we will make extensive use of it in the following discussion. In the z -coordinate, the smooth fiber locus looks like $V = \mathbb{P}^1 - \{0, \infty, 3^{-6}\}$.

5.2. Irreducibility of Picard-Fuchs. Let $U = \mathbb{P}^1 - (\{0, \infty\} \cup \mu_6)$ be the locus of smooth fibers, and let $\mathcal{E} := \mathcal{O}_U \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} R^3 f_* \mathbb{C}$ be the algebraic coherent free \mathcal{O}_U -module equipped with an algebraic flat Gauss-Manin connection $\nabla : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \Omega_U^1 \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_U} \mathcal{E}$. Let $\mathcal{E}(\psi)$ be the fiber of \mathcal{E} over the point ψ ; sometimes $H^3(\mathcal{Y}_\psi)$ will be used instead, since the two vector spaces are canonically isomorphic.

We will need the Hodge numbers of \mathcal{Y}_ψ for $\psi \in U$. Since the family \mathcal{Y}_ψ was constructed as a (crepant desingularization of a) Batyrev–Borisov mirror dual to the intersection of two cubics in \mathbb{P}^5 . We can use the computations of the Hodge numbers for the intersection of two general cubics in \mathbb{P}^5 and [BB96a, Theorem 4.15], in order to obtain the Hodge numbers for \mathcal{Y}_ψ . The precise statement: we have $h^{p,q}(\mathcal{Y}_\psi) = 1$ for every $\psi \in U$ and every $p + q = 3$.

Let $T = T_{\psi_0} : \mathcal{E}(\psi_0) \rightarrow \mathcal{E}(\psi_0)$ be the local monodromy operator near the point ∞ , where $\psi_0 \in D_\infty - \{\infty\} = \{\psi \in U : |\psi| > 1\}$ is a fixed distinguished point. To prove that ∞ is a point of maximal unipotent monodromy, means that T is unipotent and $\log T$ is a nilpotent operator of the maximal possible degree. In other words, the Jordan normal form of the operator T consists of a single Jordan block with the eigenvalue 1. Following [Mor92], we will extract information about the operator T from the Picard-Fuchs equation, that we will introduce shortly.

Consider the following differential operator:

$$(32) \quad L = D^4 - 3^6 z \left(D + \frac{1}{3} \right)^2 \left(D + \frac{2}{3} \right)^2, \quad D = z \frac{d}{dz} \text{ or } D = z \nabla_{\frac{d}{dz}},$$

or, equivalently, in terms of the coordinate ψ ,

$$(33) \quad L = \frac{1}{6^4} (Q^4 - \psi^{-6} (Q-2)^2 (Q-4)^2), \quad Q = \psi \frac{d}{d\psi} \text{ or } Q = \psi \nabla_{\frac{d}{d\psi}}.$$

The operator has degree 4. In Theorem 5.6, we will show that it is the minimal-degree operator that annihilates the form ω — a property that defines the Picard-Fuchs operator. The associated differential equation $L[\phi] = 0$ is known as the Picard-Fuchs equation. It can be verified directly using the Taylor series expansion (30) that

$$(34) \quad L[\Phi_0] = 0,$$

where Φ_0 is the holomorphic period defined in (30).

Depending on the context, it may be more natural to express the operator in terms of the z -coordinate or the ψ -coordinate, which is why both expressions are provided. We will show that L annihilates the section ω and that L can't be decomposed into a product of two differential operators with coefficients in $\mathbb{C}(z)$. Such operators are called irreducible. Thus, L is the irreducible differential operator that annihilates ω .

Let

$$A = \mathbb{C}(z) \left[z \frac{d}{dz} \right]$$

be the ring of polynomial differential operators with coefficients in $\mathbb{C}(z)$. The ring A is a left Euclidean ring. Recall that a differential operator L in A is irreducible if it cannot be written as a product $P \cdot Q$, where P, Q are non-trivial polynomial differential operators with coefficients in $\mathbb{C}(z) = \mathbb{C}[z, z^{-1}, (z - 3^{-6})^{-1}]$.

The following proposition is essentially [Kat90, Proposition 2.11.9(2), $\alpha = 3^{-6}$]: the operator L is irreducible as an element of A . From this and some considerations on Yukawa couplings computation one can show:

Theorem 5.6. *The equation $L\omega = 0$ holds. The classes*

$$D^i \omega(z), i = 0, \dots, 3$$

form a basis of $\mathcal{E}(z)$ for each $z \in V$.

Proof. By a computation of the Hodge numbers, there exists a $\mathbb{C}(z)$ -linear dependence of the form

$$a_0 \omega + a_1 D\omega + \dots + a_4 D^4 \omega = 0,$$

for some $a_i \in \mathbb{C}(z)$. Hence, there exists an operator

$$P = a_0 + a_1 D + \dots + a_4 D^4$$

satisfying $P(\omega) = 0$. Furthermore, we assume that P has minimal possible order among all nonzero differential operators with coefficients in $\mathbb{C}(z)$ that annihilate ω , and that P is monic — that is, leading coefficient is equal to 1. Note that $\deg P \leq \deg L = 4$.

Integrating the equation $P(\omega) = 0$ along the cycle γ , we obtain

$$P \left(\int_{\gamma} \omega \right) = 0,$$

hence, $P(\Phi_0) = 0$. The period Φ_0 , defined in (30), is holomorphic when $z < 3^{-6}$. By the definition of P , we find the identity $P(\Phi_0) = 0$. As observed in (34), we have both $P(\Phi_0) = 0$ and $L(\Phi_0) = 0$ when $z < 3^{-6}$.

We apply the Euclidean algorithm in the left Euclidean ring A to show that $L = qP$ for some $q \in \mathbb{C}(z)$. We write $L = qP + r$ for some $q, r \in A$ with $\deg r < \deg P \leq 4$. Here, $\deg r$ (or $\deg P$) refers to the order of r (or P) as a differential operator. Since $L(\Phi_0) = 0$ and $P(\Phi_0) = 0$, it follows that $r(\Phi_0) = 0$.

If $r = 0$, then $\deg q = 0$, since $\deg q \neq 0$ would contradict the irreducibility of L in A , in that case, we have $L = qP$ for some $q \in \mathbb{C}(z)$, which is precisely what we want.

If $r \neq 0$, we can repeat the argument with the pair (L, r) instead of (L, P) , constructing a new decomposition $L = q_1 r + r_1$. We repeat the process until the remainder r_i is 0. After at most 4 steps, we conclude that $L = q_* r_*$ for some $q_*, r_* \in A$ with $\deg q_* + \deg r_* = 4$. Remainders r_i cannot be nonzero of degree 0 at any step, since this would imply $r_i \Phi_0 = 0$ for some nonzero $r_i \in \mathbb{C}(z)^\times$. Thus, we have $\deg r_* \geq 1$. If $\deg q_* \geq 1$ as well, we obtain a contradiction with the fact that L is irreducible, so $\deg q_* = 0$. Hence, $L = qP$ for some function $q \in \mathbb{C}(z)^\times$.

To show that $\omega(z), \dots, D^3 \omega(z)$ form a basis of $\mathcal{E}(z)$, we can consider a Yukawa coupling. In [BvS95, Section 5.6.1], it was shown that

$$\begin{aligned} Y(z) &= \int_{\mathcal{M}_z} \omega \wedge D^3 \omega, \\ DY &= -\frac{1}{2} \left(-\frac{2 \cdot 3^6 z}{1 - 3^6 z} \right) Y, \\ Y &= C \frac{1}{1 - 3^6 z}, \end{aligned}$$

for some nonzero constant C .

The statement that $\omega(z), \dots, D^3 \omega(z)$ form a basis of $\mathcal{E}(z)$ is equivalent to the condition that $0 \neq [D^3 \omega(z_0)]$ in the quotient $\mathcal{F}^0 \mathcal{E} / \mathcal{F}^1 \mathcal{E}(z_0)$, where $\mathcal{F}^k \mathcal{E}$ denotes the Hodge filtration on \mathcal{E} and $[D^3 \omega]$ represents the corresponding quotient class. Indeed, Griffiths transversality ensures that $D^i \omega \in \Gamma(V, \mathcal{F}^{3-i} \mathcal{E})$, and Hodge number computation shows that $\text{rank } \mathcal{F}^k \mathcal{E} / \mathcal{F}^{k+1} \mathcal{E} = 1$. \square

The following corollary shows that the statements corresponding to Theorem 5.6 hold over U , i.e., in the variable ψ .

Corollary 5.7. *The global section $\omega \in \Gamma(U, \mathcal{E})$ satisfies the equation $L\omega = 0$. The elements $D^i \omega(\psi), i = 0, \dots, 3$, form a basis of $\mathcal{E}(\psi)$ for each $\psi \in U$. Hence, L is the Picard–Fuchs operator associated with ω .*

Using the knowledge of the Picard–Fuchs equation and [Mor92, Section 1, Corollary], we can deduce.

Proposition 5.8. *The local system $R^3 f_* \mathbb{C}$ has maximally unipotent local monodromy near ∞ .*

6. 0 IS A K-POINT

In this section we investigate the special fiber \mathcal{M}_0 from a Hodge-theoretical perspective. For the purposes of this discussion, we define K -point as a point where the local monodromy is unipotent and has two Jordan blocks of size two. Points in the parameter space corresponding to fibers with

this property are sometimes referred to as K -points; see, for example, [DHT17]. We denote the Hodge–Deligne numbers of the limiting mixed Hodge structure near a point a by

$$(35) \quad h^{p,q} = h^{p,q}(H_{\lim,a}^3) = \dim_{\mathbb{C}} Gr_F^p Gr_{p+q}^W H_{\lim,a}^3.$$

In this section, we will prove that the Hodge–Deligne diamond of the limiting mixed Hodge structure near the 0 point is as follows:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} & & & & 0 & & \\ & & & & 0 & & 0 \\ & & & 1 & 0 & & 1 \\ 0 & & & 0 & 0 & & 0 \\ & & 1 & 0 & 0 & & 1 \\ & & 0 & & 0 & & \\ & & 0 & & & & \end{array}$$

(see Theorem 6.5). This indicates that the special fiber of the mirror family \mathcal{Y}_ψ , corresponding to the complete intersection of two cubics, has a new feature compared to the mirror family to the hypersurface in \mathbb{P}^n , which has been studied in [EFiMM22]. The main theorem of the section is Theorem 6.5.

Analogously to the usual Hodge diamond, we consider the Hodge–Deligne diamond of H_{\lim}^3 , with the numbers $h^{p,q}$ defined as in (35):

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} & & & & h^{3,3} & & \\ & & & & h^{3,2} & & h^{2,3} \\ & & & h^{3,1} & h^{2,2} & & h^{1,3} \\ h^{3,0} & & & h^{2,1} & h^{1,2} & & h^{0,3} \\ & & h^{2,0} & h^{1,1} & h^{0,2} & & \\ & & h^{1,0} & h^{0,1} & & & \\ & & h^{0,0} & & & & \end{array}$$

The diamond is symmetric with respect to both the vertical and horizontal axes. We also remind the reader that the differential operator

$$L = \left(-\frac{1}{6}Q\right)^4 - \psi^{-6} \left(-\frac{1}{6}Q + \frac{1}{3}\right)^2 \left(-\frac{1}{6}Q + \frac{2}{3}\right)^2,$$

$$Q = \psi \frac{d}{d\psi},$$

annihilates the section $\omega(\psi)$ for every $\psi \in U$, where, $U = \mathbb{P}^1 - (\{0, \infty\} \cup \mu_6)$ is the smooth fiber locus of the family \mathcal{Y}_ψ . The section ω is defined by the formula (23). Thus, the operator $\psi^6 Q^4 - (Q - 2)^2(Q - 4)^2$ annihilates the section $\omega(\psi)$, $\psi \in U$, and the operator $\psi^6(Q + 2)^4 - Q^2(Q - 2)^2$ annihilates the section $\psi^{-2}\omega(\psi)$, for all $\psi \in U$. Let us define

$$(36) \quad R := \frac{\psi^6}{1 - \psi^6} (Q + 2)^4 - \frac{1}{1 - \psi^6} Q^2 (Q - 2)^2.$$

The normalization is chosen in such a way to ensure that the leading coefficient is equal to 1. We begin by proving that the local system $R^3 f_* \mathbb{C}$ has a unipotent monodromy near 0. Let $N = \log T$;

note that:

$$N^2(N-2)^2 = 0,$$

which is the operator R evaluated at the point $\psi = 0$. Since N is a nilpotent operator, it follows that $N^2 = 0$. Again, using [Mor92, Corollary p.6] we can deduce:

Lemma 6.1. *The local system of analytic solutions to the equation*

$$(\psi^6(Q+2)^4 - Q^2(Q-2)^2)[f] = 0$$

on the punctured disk $0 < |\psi| < 1$ has unipotent monodromy. Hence, the local monodromy of the local system $R^3 f_ \mathbb{C}$ near 0 is unipotent as well.*

The vector bundle $\mathcal{E} = R^3 f_* \mathbb{C} \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} \mathcal{O}_U$ has a Hodge filtration by vector subbundles:

$$\mathcal{F}^3 \mathcal{E} \subset \mathcal{F}^2 \mathcal{E} \subset \mathcal{F}^1 \mathcal{E} \subset \mathcal{F}^0 \mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E},$$

which comes from the Hodge filtration of cohomology of fiber. Let $D = \{|\psi| < 1\} \subset \mathbb{P}^1$ be the analytic disk centered at 0. Since the local monodromy is unipotent, the Deligne extension of $\mathcal{F}^3 \mathcal{E}$ is $f_* K_{\mathcal{Y}/D}$ by [Kol86, Theorem 2.6]. The fiber at 0 of this sheaf is nothing but $H^0(\mathcal{Y}_0, K_{\mathcal{Y}_0})$. This is likewise the definition of $F^3 H_{\lim, 0}^3$ in [Ste77]. This description is useful for the following statement:

Lemma 6.2. *The class $(3\psi)^{-2}\omega$ extends as a holomorphic section over the Deligne extension of \mathcal{E} , and $((3\psi)^{-2}\omega)(0) \neq 0$ as an element of $H_{\lim, 0}^3$.*

Proof. Recall that the factor ψ^2 was introduced merely to ensure that ω behaves well near ∞ . It then follows from the construction and the discussion surrounding Lemma 5.1 that $\psi^{-2}\omega$ defines a section of $f_* K_{\mathcal{Y}/D}$, which proves the first part of the lemma. Now, from the discussion preceding the lemma, it suffices to show that the class is nonzero in $H^0(K_{\mathcal{Y}_0})$. For this, it is enough to verify that its restriction to $K_{\mathcal{Y}_0^{sm}}$ is nonzero, where $\mathcal{Y}_0^{sm} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}_0$ is the natural inclusion of the nonsingular locus.

Over this locus, the sheaf $K_{\mathcal{Y}_0^{sm}}$ can be described in terms of holomorphic top forms via the adjunction formula realized through Poincaré residues. Since this locus is contained in the open torus, we can compute $(3\psi)^{-2}\omega|_{\psi=0}$ in toric coordinates using the formula (22). For simplicity of notation, we write Y_1, Y_2 instead of $Y_{1,0}, Y_{2,0}$ and we assume that $\psi = 0$ throughout the computation except for the initial multiplication by $(3\psi)^{-2}$. We have:

$$(3\psi)^{-2}\omega^o|_{\mathbb{T}_N - (Y_1 \cup Y_2)} = \frac{1}{(t_1 + t_2 + t_3)(t_4 + t_5 + t_6)} \frac{dt_1}{t_1} \wedge \dots \wedge \frac{dt_5}{t_5}.$$

Note that for each $1 \leq i < j \leq 5$, we have:

$$d(t_1 + t_2 + t_3) \wedge d(t_4 + t_5 + t_6) = \frac{dt_i \wedge dt_j}{\text{Jac}(t_1 + t_2 + t_3, t_4 + t_5 + t_6; t_i, t_j)},$$

where t_6 is treated as a function of t_1, \dots, t_5 (see equation (1)). To show that the form is nonzero and well-defined at every point, we must choose appropriate i, j for every point $p \in \mathbb{T}_N \cap \mathcal{Y}_0$, such that $\text{Jac}(t_1 + t_2 + t_3, t_4 + t_5 + t_6; t_i, t_j)$ is nonzero at the point p . This is indeed possible. For $1 \leq i < j \leq 3$, $\text{Jac}(t_1 + t_2 + t_3, t_4 + t_5 + t_6; t_i, t_j)$ vanishes only along $t_i = t_j$. However, there is no point where $t_1 = t_2 = t_3$ on $\mathcal{Y}_0 \cap \mathbb{T}_N = V(t_1 + t_2 + t_3, t_4 + t_5 + t_6) \subset \mathbb{T}_N$.

To conclude, we need to prove that this is nonzero as a form on $\mathcal{Y}_0 = Y_1 \cap Y_2$. But this easily follows from the fact that this computation is over the smooth locus of $\mathcal{Y}_0 = Y_1 \cap Y_2$. \square

It will also be useful to state an analogous result for $\psi = \infty$, which will be needed in subsequent developments.

Lemma 6.3. $\omega(\infty) \neq 0$ as an element of $H_{\text{lim},\infty}^3$.

Proof. The proof is analogous to that of the previous lemma and is omitted. \square

Proposition 6.4. A fundamental system of solutions to the equation

$$R[\phi] = 0$$

consists of four linearly independent, multivalued solutions:

$$a_0, b_0 + \log(\psi)a_0, a_2, b_2 + \log(\psi)a_2$$

where a_0, a_2, b_0, b_2 are holomorphic in a neighborhood of 0.

Proof. After algebraic expansion of the expression (36), we obtain

$$Q^4 - \frac{8\psi^6 + 4}{1 - \psi^6}Q^3 - \frac{24\psi^6 - 4}{1 - \psi^6}Q^2 - \frac{32\psi^6}{1 - \psi^6}Q - \frac{16\psi^6}{1 - \psi^6} =$$

$$Q^2(Q - 2)^2 - \psi^6(12Q^3 + 20Q^2 + 32Q + 16) - \psi^{12}(12Q^3 + 20Q^2 + 32Q + 16) + \dots$$

Note that this is the same operator as L , but properly normalized. We did this to ensure that the leading coefficient is equal to 1. We will use the Frobenius method. For a detailed exposition of the method, see [CL55, Chapter 4, Section 8]. The indicial equation in this case is $d(\lambda) = \lambda^2(\lambda - 2)^2$. Following the method, we aim to find the formal series $\phi_\lambda(\psi) = \psi^\lambda + c_1\psi^{\lambda+1} + \dots$ such that $R[\phi_\lambda(\psi)] = d(\lambda)\psi^\lambda$. Formally applying the operator R to $\phi_\lambda(\psi)$, we obtain the formal series

$$R[\phi_\lambda(\psi)] = \psi^\lambda d(\lambda) +$$

$$\psi^{\lambda+6}(d(\lambda+6)c_6 - (12\lambda^3 + 20\lambda^2 + 32\lambda + 16)) + \dots$$

The coefficients of the solution can be constructed recursively, so that

$$\phi_\lambda = \psi^\lambda + \frac{(12\lambda^3 + 20\lambda^2 + 32\lambda + 16)\psi^{\lambda+6}}{(\lambda+6)^2(\lambda+4)^2} + \dots$$

It is a formal series with coefficients in $\mathbb{C}(\lambda)$ that satisfies $R[\phi_\lambda] = d(\lambda)\psi^\lambda$. The zeros of the denominators of the coefficients lie in the set

$$\{\dots, -18, -16, -12, -10, -6, -4\}.$$

Hence ϕ_0 and ϕ_2 are well-defined solutions. Two additional solutions are obtained by differentiating ϕ_λ with respect to λ and evaluating at $\lambda = 0$ and $\lambda = 2$. \square

Let T be a local monodromy operator near 0, and $N = \log T$ its logarithm. The following theorem states basically that the 0 point is a K point.

Theorem 6.5. *The Hodge–Deligne diamond of the limit mixed Hodge structure near the point $\psi = 0$ for the family \mathcal{Y}_ψ is given by:*

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 & & & & 0 & & \\
 & & & & 0 & & 0 \\
 & & 1 & & 0 & & 1 \\
 0 & & 0 & & 0 & & 0 \\
 & & 1 & & 0 & & 1 \\
 & & 0 & & 0 & & \\
 & & & & 0. & &
 \end{array}$$

Proof. We know that $N^3 = N^2 = 0$, see discussion at the beginning of this section, from this follows $T = 1 + N$. Also we know that the operator $N^k : Gr_{3+k}^W H_{\lim,0}^3 \rightarrow Gr_{3-k}^W H_{\lim,0}^3$ is an isomorphism [Sch73, Lemma 6.4]. Hence, the rows 0, 1, 5, and 6 of the Deligne-Hodge diamond are zero. Furthermore, according to [Sch73, Lemma 6.4], we know that

$$N : Gr_4^W H_{\lim,0}^3 \rightarrow Gr_2^W H_{\lim,0}^3$$

is an isomorphism. Additionally, from explicit computation of Hodge numbers, we know that

$$\dim Gr_F^i H_{\lim,0}^3 = 1$$

for $i = 0, 1, 2, 3$. For combinatorial reasons, only three possibilities remain:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 & & & & 0 & & \\
 & & & & 0 & & 0 \\
 & & 1 & & 0 & & 1 \\
 0 & & 0 & & 0 & & 0 \\
 & & 1 & & 0 & & 1 \\
 & & 0 & & 0 & & \\
 & & & & 0 & &
 \end{array}$$

or

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 & & & & 0 & & \\
 & & & & 0 & & 0 \\
 & & 0 & & 1 & & 0 \\
 1 & & 0 & & 0 & & 1 \\
 & & 0 & & 1 & & 0 \\
 & & 0 & & 0 & & \\
 & & & & 0 & &
 \end{array}$$

or

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 & & & & 0 & & \\
 & & & & 0 & & 0 \\
 & & 0 & & 0 & & 0 \\
 1 & & 1 & & 1 & & 1 \\
 & & 0 & & 0 & & 0 \\
 & & 0 & & 0 & & \\
 & & & & 0. & &
 \end{array}$$

We will show that if there exist two linearly independent multivalued (with non-removable singularities at 0) solutions, w_1 and w_3 , in a punctured neighborhood of 0 for the equation $R[w] =$

0, then the first possibility is realized. Suppose $\gamma_0, \dots, \gamma_3$ form a multivalued basis of the local system $(R^3 f_* \mathbb{C})^\vee$ on a punctured disk $0 < |\psi| < 1$, which is adapted to the weight filtration $W_0 \subset \dots \subset W_6 = H_{\lim, 0}^3$. Let $\tilde{\omega} = (3\psi)^{-2}\omega$. Then we have

$$w_i := (\gamma_i, \tilde{\omega}) = \left(\gamma_i - \frac{\log \psi}{2\pi i} N\gamma_i, \tilde{\omega} \right) + \frac{\log \psi}{2\pi i} (N\gamma_i, \tilde{\omega}).$$

The functions $(\gamma_i - \frac{\log \psi}{2\pi i} N\gamma_i, \tilde{\omega})$ and $(N\gamma_i, \tilde{\omega})$ are both holomorphic at 0, since they are pairings of holomorphic objects that extend over 0. Indeed, by Lemma 6.2 $\tilde{\omega}$ is naturally defined at 0; the cycle $\gamma_i - \frac{\log \psi}{2\pi i} N\gamma_i$ is invariant under local monodromy, since $N^2 = 0$; and $N\gamma$ is also invariant under local monodromy, again because $N^2 = 0$. Thus, the solutions w_i , can be listed as:

$$w_0 = a_0, w_1 = b_0 + a_0 \log \psi, w_2 = a_2, w_3 = b_2 + a_2 \log \psi,$$

where all functions a_0, b_0, a_2, b_2 are holomorphic in a neighborhood of $\psi = 0$. Since $a_i \neq 0$, it follows that $N\gamma_i \neq 0$. Given that w_0, \dots, w_3 form a fundamental system of solutions of the equation $L\phi = 0$, as stated in Proposition 6.4, we conclude that there are two linearly independent solutions whose logarithmic parts are nonzero. This implies that there are two linearly independent cycles — specifically γ_1 and γ_3 , such that $N\gamma_1 \neq 0$ and $N\gamma_3 \neq 0$.

So, we have proven $N\gamma_1 \neq 0$ and $N\gamma_3 \neq 0$. The remaining task is to show that $N\gamma \neq 0$ implies $Gr_2^W(N\gamma) \neq 0$ for $\gamma \in W_4$. Passing to the contrapositive: if $Gr_2^W[N\gamma] = 0$, then $N\gamma = 0$ for $\gamma \in W_4$. Indeed, the condition $Gr_2^W[N\gamma] = 0$ implies $N\gamma \in W_1$, but since $W_1 = 0$, it follows that $N\gamma = 0$, and thus the implication holds. \square

REFERENCES

- [Bat94a] V. Batyrev. Dual polyhedra and mirror symmetry for Calabi-Yau hypersurfaces in toric varieties. *J. Algebraic Geom.*, 3(3):493–535, 1994. [2](#), [7](#), [8](#)
- [Bat94b] V. Batyrev. Dual polyhedra and mirror symmetry for Calabi-Yau hypersurfaces in toric varieties. *J. Algebraic Geom.*, 3(3):493–535, 1994. [2](#)
- [BB96a] V. Batyrev and L. Borisov. Mirror duality and string-theoretic Hodge numbers. *Invent. Math.*, 126(1):183–203, 1996. [9](#), [10](#), [20](#)
- [BB96b] V. Batyrev and L. Borisov. On Calabi-Yau complete intersections in toric varieties. In *Higher-dimensional complex varieties (Trento, 1994)*, pages 39–65. de Gruyter, Berlin, 1996. [2](#), [5](#), [9](#)
- [BvS95] V. Batyrev and D. van Straten. Generalized hypergeometric functions and rational curves on Calabi-Yau complete intersections in toric varieties. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 168(3):493–533, 1995. [3](#), [22](#)
- [CL55] E. Coddington and N. Levinson. *Theory of ordinary differential equations*. McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., New York-Toronto-London, 1955. [25](#)
- [CLS11] D. A. Cox, J. Little, and H. Schenck. *Toric varieties*, volume 124 of *Graduate Studies in Mathematics*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2011. [4](#), [5](#), [6](#), [8](#), [15](#)
- [DHT17] Charles F. Doran, Andrew Harder, and Alan Thompson. Hodge numbers from Picard-Fuchs equations. *SIGMA Symmetry Integrability Geom. Methods Appl.*, 13:Paper No. 045, 23, 2017. [23](#)
- [EFiMM18] D. Eriksson, G. Freixas i Montplet, and C. Mourougane. Singularities of metrics on Hodge bundles and their topological invariants. *Algebr. Geom.*, 5(6):742–775, 2018. [1](#)
- [EFiMM21] D. Eriksson, G. Freixas i Montplet, and C. Mourougane. BCOV invariants of Calabi-Yau manifolds and degenerations of Hodge structures. *Duke Math. J.*, 170(3):379–454, 2021. [1](#)
- [EFiMM22] D. Eriksson, G. Freixas i Montplet, and C. Mourougane. On genus one mirror symmetry in higher dimensions and the BCOV conjectures. *Forum Math. Pi*, 10:Paper No. e19, 53, 2022. [1](#), [4](#), [23](#)
- [EG00] H. Edelsbrunner and D. R. Grayson. Edgewise subdivision of a simplex. *Discrete Comput. Geom.*, 24(4):707–719, 2000. ACM Symposium on Computational Geometry (Miami, FL, 1999). [2](#)

- [Kat90] N. Katz. *Exponential sums and differential equations*, volume 124 of *Annals of Mathematics Studies*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1990. [21](#)
- [KKMSD73] G. Kempf, F. Knudsen, D. Mumford, and B. Saint-Donat. *Toroidal embeddings. I*. Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Vol. 339. Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1973. [2](#)
- [Kol86] János Kollár. Higher direct images of dualizing sheaves. II. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 124(1):171–202, 1986. [24](#)
- [Mor92] D. Morrison. Picard-Fuchs equations and mirror maps for hypersurfaces. In *Essays on mirror manifolds*, pages 241–264. Int. Press, Hong Kong, 1992. [20](#), [22](#), [24](#)
- [Sch73] W. Schmid. Variation of Hodge structure: the singularities of the period mapping. *Invent. Math.*, 22:211–319, 1973. [26](#)
- [Ste77] J. H. M. Steenbrink. Mixed Hodge structure on the vanishing cohomology. In *Real and complex singularities (Proc. Ninth Nordic Summer School/NAVF Sympos. Math., Oslo, 1976)*, pages 525–563. Sijthoff & Noordhoff, Alphen aan den Rijn, 1977. [3](#), [24](#)

MYKOLA POCHKAI, CENTER FOR GEOMETRY AND PHYSICS, INSTITUTE FOR BASIC SCIENCE
Email address: mykola.pochekai@gmail.com