

# SEMICLASSICAL LIMITS OF STRONGLY PARABOLIC HIGGS BUNDLES AND HYPERPOLYGON SPACES

LYNN HELLER, SEBASTIAN HELLER, AND CLAUDIO MENESES

**ABSTRACT.** We investigate the Hitchin hyperkähler metric on the moduli space of strongly parabolic  $\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C})$ -Higgs bundles on the  $n$ -punctured Riemann sphere and its degeneration obtained by scaling the parabolic weights  $t\alpha$  as  $t \rightarrow 0$ . Using the parabolic Deligne–Hitchin moduli space, we show that twistor lines of hyperpolygon spaces arise as limiting initial data for twistor lines at small weights, and we construct the corresponding real-analytic families of  $\lambda$ -connections. On suitably shrinking regions of the moduli space, the rescaled Hitchin metric converges, in the semiclassical limit, to the hyperkähler metric on the hyperpolygon space  $\mathcal{X}_\alpha$ , which thus serves as the natural finite-dimensional model for the degeneration of the infinite-dimensional hyperkähler reduction. Moreover, higher-order corrections of the Hitchin metric in this semiclassical regime can be expressed explicitly in terms of iterated integrals of logarithmic differentials on the punctured sphere.

## CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Twistor theory for strongly parabolic Higgs bundles	4
3. Hyperpolygon spaces	10
4. Construction of twistor lines	19
5. The semiclassical limit of the Hitchin metric	31
Appendix A. Loop algebra lemmas	35
Acknowledgements	36
References	37

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Moduli spaces of Higgs bundles on Riemann surfaces represent a fundamental class of examples of hyperkähler manifolds which arise from gauge theory via infinite-dimensional hyperkähler reduction. In his work [31], Hitchin showed that the moduli space of stable Higgs bundles over a compact Riemann surface carries a natural hyperkähler metric, and as a real manifold, it is diffeomorphic to the moduli space of flat irreducible connections via solutions of the self-duality equations. Simpson [51] later extended this correspondence to noncompact Riemann surfaces using parabolic

bundles and proving a non-abelian Hodge correspondence between stable parabolic Higgs bundles and flat connections with prescribed local monodromy. These moduli spaces have been studied extensively from algebro-geometric, analytic, differential-geometric and topological perspectives.

In this work we will focus on *strongly parabolic*  $\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C})$ -Higgs bundles over the Riemann sphere. Thus we fix a finite subset  $\{p_1, \dots, p_n\} \subset \mathbb{CP}^1$  and consider holomorphic bundles  $E \rightarrow \mathbb{CP}^1$  of degree 0 and rank 2 enhanced with complex lines  $\ell_j \subset E|_{p_j}$  and parabolic weights  $0 < \alpha_j < \frac{1}{2}$ . The parabolic Higgs fields  $\Phi$  are constrained to have at most simple poles at each  $p_j$ , whose residues are nilpotent and annihilate each line  $\ell_j$ . For generic weights  $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)$ , the resulting moduli space  $\mathcal{M}_{\text{Higgs}}(\alpha)$  is a smooth complex symplectic manifold of dimension  $2n - 6$ . The birational geometry resulting from the dependence on parabolic weights was described by Thaddeus [54]. On the analytic side, Konno [37] constructed a complete hyperkähler metric on  $\mathcal{M}_{\text{Higgs}}(\alpha)$  which is a natural generalization of the Hitchin metric in the case of compact Riemann surfaces without marked points. As the construction proceeds through an infinite-dimensional hyperkähler quotient, the metric is inherently non-explicit. In particular, even though the real-analytic dependence of the metric on parabolic weights follows from the work of Kim–Wilkin [34], it is by no means accessible in closed form.

Simpson’s parabolic non-abelian Hodge correspondence determines a real-analytic diffeomorphism between  $\mathcal{M}_{\text{Higgs}}(\alpha)$  and the moduli space  $\mathcal{M}_{\text{dR}}(\alpha)$  of irreducible logarithmic  $\text{SL}(2, \mathbb{C})$ -connections on the punctured surface  $\Sigma_0 = \mathbb{CP}^1 \setminus \{p_1, \dots, p_n\}$  with fixed eigenvalues  $\pm \alpha_j$  of its residues. A natural framework to encode this correspondence is provided by the *parabolic Deligne–Hitchin moduli space*  $\mathcal{M}_{\text{DH}}^{\text{par}}$ , which parametrizes parabolic  $\lambda$ -connections and interpolates between parabolic Higgs bundles and logarithmic connections. From the twistorial point of view, solutions of Hitchin’s self-duality equations are determined as distinguished *real holomorphic sections* of  $\mathcal{M}_{\text{DH}}^{\text{par}} \rightarrow \mathbb{CP}^1$ , called *twistor lines*. The full hyperkähler metric can be recovered from the geometry of these sections via the *twisted holomorphic symplectic form* [33, 52]. This perspective played a central role in the analysis of the large-scale asymptotic geometry of Hitchin moduli spaces in the work of Gaiotto–Moore–Neitzke [24].

We study an analogous *semiclassical limit* of parabolic Higgs bundle moduli spaces obtained by scaling down the parabolic weights. We fix a generic weight vector  $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)$  and consider the one-parameter family

$$\mathcal{M}_\alpha(t) = \mathcal{M}_{\text{Higgs}}(t\alpha), \quad t \geq 0.$$

For sufficiently small  $t > 0$ , the moduli spaces  $\mathcal{M}_\alpha(t)$  are smooth and biholomorphic to each other. However, as  $t \rightarrow 0$  the parabolic structure degenerates, and the nilpotent cone of the Higgs bundle moduli space — the central fiber of the Hitchin fibration, together with a shrinking neighbourhood thereof — collapses in the limit. In this regime of parabolic weights, Godinho–Mandini [25] established an algebro-geometric correspondence between a Zariski open subset of  $\mathcal{M}_\alpha(t)$  and the hyperpolygon space  $\mathcal{X}_\alpha$  introduced by Konno [38]. This correspondence was later shown in [7] to extend at the level of holomorphic symplectic structures. It is thus natural to ask whether the corresponding hyperkähler metrics are also related. Addressing this question is the main theme of this work.

The hyperpolygon spaces are defined as hyperkähler quotients of a finite-dimensional quaternionic vector space, and in this sense they are natural generalizations of the Eguchi–Hanson space. The conceptual analogy between the Eguchi–Hanson metric and the Hitchin metrics was already observed in [32]. In the case under consideration, the analogy becomes explicit in Konno’s constructions [37, 38], as the geometry governing the residue data of parabolic Higgs fields at each marked point is that of an Eguchi–Hanson space. From a geometric perspective, our results show that the hyperkähler quotient description of hyperpolygon spaces can be viewed as a semiclassical limit of the infinite-dimensional hyperkähler reduction defining the Hitchin moduli space. We show that in the  $t = 0$  limit, the twisted hyperkähler moment maps degenerate to those of the hyperpolygon space, and the hyperpolygon spaces appear as a natural resolution of the singularity at the origin of the  $\mathcal{M}_\alpha$  for  $\alpha = 0$ . Our motivation is the work [29] by the first two authors in collaboration with Traizet, where, in the case  $n = 4$ , all four parabolic weights are taken to be equal and simultaneously scaled to zero, and an orbifold quotient of the Eguchi–Hanson space is recovered as a geometric model for the degeneration of the Hitchin moduli space of the four-punctured sphere.

At a technical level, our strategy is a natural extension of that of [29]; we show that the twistorial data associated to a stable hyperpolygon can be used to construct twistor lines for the Hitchin moduli space with parabolic weights  $t\alpha_j$  on the corresponding stable strongly parabolic Higgs bundle for sufficiently small  $t > 0$ . This is achieved by formulating the problem of constructing real holomorphic sections as a monodromy problem for loop-valued connections and solving it via an implicit function theorem on suitable Banach spaces of loop algebras. In this formulation, the initial conditions for the implicit function theorem are naturally identified with the twistor lines of the hyperpolygon spaces. We then show that the resulting real holomorphic sections are in fact twistor lines, corresponding to genuine solutions of Hitchin’s self-duality equations with parabolic weights  $t\alpha$ . Finally, after rescaling by  $t^{-1}$ , the Hitchin metric converges on subsets of bounded energy of the form  $\mathcal{E}_t \leq tC$  to the hyperpolygon metric on  $\mathcal{X}_\alpha$  as  $t \rightarrow 0$ . As in the setup of Gaiotto–Moore–Neitzke [24] for large parabolic Higgs fields, the correction terms of the asymptotic expansion of the hyperkähler metric in the degeneration parameter  $t$  can be computed explicitly. The Deligne–Hitchin twistorial interpretation leads to their description in terms of iterated integrals (polylogarithms) on the  $n$ -punctured sphere. Furthermore, from a Hamiltonian point of view, the rescaled Hitchin energy generating the natural  $S^1$ -action on  $\mathcal{M}_\alpha(t)$  also converges to the hyperpolygon Hamiltonian generating the corresponding circle action on  $\mathcal{X}_\alpha$ . In this sense the hyperpolygon spaces are semiclassical limits of Hitchin moduli spaces.

Our results fit into a broader program aimed at understanding degenerations and asymptotic regimes of non-abelian Hodge moduli spaces. Related phenomena appear in the study of wild character varieties and irregular connections by Boalch [8–11], as well as in the twistorial analysis of hyperkähler metric degenerations developed by Gaiotto–Moore–Neitzke [24]. Studies of the asymptotic geometry of the Hitchin metric by Mazzeo–Swoboda–Weiß–Witt [39] and Fredrickson [21] focus on degeneration regimes in which parabolic Higgs fields are scaled to infinity. A key distinction in the present work lies in the nature of the degeneration: here it concentrates near the core of the moduli space and is driven instead by simultaneously scaling the parabolic

weights to zero. In the simplest nontrivial case  $n = 4$ , Heller–Heller–Traizet [29] study precisely this degeneration by scaling four equal weights to zero. In this setting, the correspondence between Hitchin metrics and ALG gravitational instantons established by Fredrickson–Mazzeo–Swoboda–Weiß [22] may be juxtaposed with the Kummer-type construction of Biquard–Minerbe [5]. This comparison, together with earlier work [26] of the first two authors, suggests that our methods can be applied to establish an analogous degeneration governed by Eguchi–Hanson spaces, arising from deformations of the parabolic weights in a regime near the apex  $\alpha = (\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{4})$ . Finally, the extensions of the Godinho–Mandini correspondence to higher rank by Fisher–Rayan [20], as well to higher genus by Rayan–Schaposnik [49], provide natural frameworks in which the results of the present work may be generalized by replacing hyperpolygon spaces by Nakajima quiver varieties [45].

We would like to note that, after sharing a draft of our work, Fredrickson and Yae [23] informed us that they have independently obtained the same result in the case  $n = 4$  using entirely different analytical methods.

**Organization of the paper.** In Section 2 we review the necessary background on strongly parabolic Higgs bundles, the parabolic non-abelian Hodge correspondence, and the parabolic Deligne–Hitchin moduli space. In Section 3 we recall the construction of hyperpolygon spaces as hyperkähler quotients and their identification with moduli spaces of parabolic Higgs bundles for their respective  $I$ -complex structures. Section 4 contains the core analytic results: the construction of real holomorphic sections via a monodromy problem and the proof that these sections are twistor lines. Technical lemmas are moved into the Appendix A. Finally, in Section 5 we study the semiclassical limit of the Hitchin metric and prove its convergence, after rescaling, to the hyperkähler metric on the hyperpolygon space.

## 2. TWISTOR THEORY FOR STRONGLY PARABOLIC HIGGS BUNDLES

The purpose of this section is to recall the twistorial description of the hyperkähler structure on moduli spaces of strongly parabolic Higgs bundles. The Deligne–Hitchin moduli space encodes the complex-analytic facets of the non-abelian Hodge correspondence, and provides a unified framework in which the full hyperkähler geometry can be studied from holomorphic data. In particular, solutions to Hitchin’s self-duality equations correspond to distinguished real holomorphic sections of the Deligne–Hitchin moduli space, and the hyperkähler metric is determined via the twisted-holomorphic symplectic form.

**2.1. Strongly Parabolic Higgs Bundles.** Let  $\Sigma$  be a compact Riemann surface and let  $\mathbf{D} = p_1 + \cdots + p_n$  a divisor of pairwise distinct points on  $\Sigma$ . A parabolic structure  $\mathcal{P}$  on a holomorphic rank-2 vector bundle  $E \rightarrow \Sigma$  with trivial determinant is a choice at each puncture  $p_j$  of a complex (*quasi-parabolic*) line  $\ell_j \subset E|_{p_j}$  together with a *parabolic weight*  $0 < \alpha_j < \frac{1}{2}$  assigned to  $\ell_j$ . The parabolic degree  $\text{pardeg}(L)$  of a holomorphic line subbundle  $L$  of  $E$  with respect to  $\mathcal{P}$  is defined to be

$$\text{pardeg}(L) = \deg(L) + \sum_j \nu_j$$

where  $\nu_j = \alpha_j$  if  $L_{p_j} = \ell_j$  and  $\nu_j = -\alpha_j$  otherwise. A holomorphic bundle  $E$  equipped with parabolic structure  $\mathcal{P} = (p_j, \ell_j, \alpha_j)_{j=1,\dots,n}$  is called *stable* if for every

holomorphic line subbundle  $L \subset E$ , one has

$$(1) \quad \text{pardeg}(L) < \text{pardeg}(E) := 0.$$

By Mehta-Seshadri [40] (see [1, 14] for the conventions used here), stable parabolic bundles are in one-to-one correspondence to conjugacy classes of irreducible unitary representations of  $\pi_1(\Sigma \setminus \mathbf{D})$  whose holonomy around each puncture  $p_j$  has eigenvalues  $e^{\pm 2\pi i \alpha_j}$ . Equivalently, for each stable parabolic structure  $\mathcal{P}$  there is a unique unitary *compatible logarithmic connection*, i.e. a logarithmic  $\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C})$ -connection  $\nabla$  on  $E$  with unitary monodromy and with simple poles along  $\mathbf{D}$  which is *compatible* with  $\mathcal{P}$  in the sense that its residues  $\text{Res}_{p_j} \nabla$  have  $\ell_j$  as eigenlines with eigenvalues  $\alpha_j$ .

A strongly parabolic  $\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C})$ -Higgs bundle on  $(\Sigma, \mathbf{D})$  consists of a pair  $(\mathcal{P}, \Phi)$ , where  $\mathcal{P}$  is a parabolic structure on a holomorphic vector bundle  $E$  as above, and

$$\Phi \in H^0(\Sigma, K_\Sigma \otimes \mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C}) \otimes \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D}))$$

is a meromorphic  $\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C})$ -valued 1-form defining a *strongly parabolic Higgs field* with respect to  $\mathcal{P}$ . This means that, at each point  $p_j \in \mathbf{D}$ , the residue satisfies

$$(\text{Res}_{p_j} \Phi) \ell_j = 0.$$

Note that two logarithmic connections are compatible with the same parabolic structure  $\mathcal{P}$  if and only if their difference is a strongly parabolic Higgs field compatible with  $\mathcal{P}$ .

A parabolic Higgs bundle  $(\mathcal{P}, \Phi)$  as above is *stable* if it satisfies the inequality (1) for every  $\Phi$ -invariant subbundle. We call  $(\mathcal{P}, \Phi)$  *polystable* if it is either stable or a direct sum of two parabolic line bundles of parabolic degree zero with  $\Phi = 0$ .

For a parabolic weight vector  $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)$  consider the moduli space

$$\mathcal{M}_{\text{Higgs}} = \mathcal{M}_{\text{Higgs}}(\alpha)$$

of polystable strongly parabolic Higgs bundles on  $(\Sigma, \mathbf{D})$ . An important feature of the parabolic setting is that the moduli problem depends on the choice of the weight vector  $\alpha$ . The space of admissible weights can be identified with a convex bounded polytope, which is subdivided by a finite collection of hyperplanes, called *semi-stability walls*. By the definition of parabolic stability, semi-stability walls correspond to hyperplanes of the form  $\text{pardeg}(L) = 0$  intersecting  $(0, \frac{1}{2})^n$  nontrivially for some holomorphic line subbundle  $L \subset E$  (see [13] for details). They can be expressed in the form

$$(2) \quad \sum_{j \in S} \alpha_j - \sum_{j \notin S} \alpha_j = -\deg(L),$$

where  $S \subset \{1, \dots, n\}$  is the index subset of quasi-parabolic lines interpolated by  $L$ .

The connected components of the complement of the union of these walls are convex regions known as *open chambers*. For weights lying in the interior of an open chamber, every polystable strongly parabolic Higgs bundle is in fact stable. We refer to [13, 41, 54] for a detailed discussion of this wall-and-chamber structure.

**Convention:** In the following we will only consider parabolic weights  $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)$  that are *generic*, i.e. not contained in a semi-stability wall in the weight polytope,

and *small* in the sense that the following inequality is satisfied

$$(3) \quad \sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_j < 1.$$

The genericity constraint implies that every polystable Higgs pair is in fact stable; in particular, both the de Rham moduli space and the parabolic Higgs bundle moduli space are smooth complex manifolds. The small weight constraint is justified in Remark 3.12 and ensures that no semi-stability wall is crossed by scaling down a generic choice of  $\alpha$  to the vertex  $(0, \dots, 0)$ . It is important to remark that the only semi-stability walls intersecting the small-weight region nontrivially are those for which the right-hand side in (2) is equal to 0, and these are precisely the walls that remain invariant under parabolic-weight scaling.

**2.2. Simpson's Non-Abelian Hodge Correspondence.** Hitchin [31] showed that for a compact Riemann surface (without punctures) the moduli space of stable Higgs bundles carries a natural hyperkähler metric, and is in particular diffeomorphic, via solutions of Hitchin's self-duality equations, to the moduli space of flat  $\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{C})$ -connections. See [50] for the generalization to the  $\mathrm{SL}(n, \mathbb{C})$ -case. Simpson [51] later extended this *non-abelian Hodge correspondence* to non-compact Riemann surfaces by introducing parabolic Higgs bundles.

*Tame harmonic metrics.* The parabolic non-abelian Hodge correspondence between the moduli space of strongly parabolic Higgs bundles and the moduli space of logarithmic connections is realized via *tame harmonic metrics*, or equivalently via solutions of Hitchin's self-duality equations satisfying prescribed growth conditions at the punctures  $p_j$ , determined by the parabolic weights.

More precisely, given a strongly parabolic Higgs pair  $(\mathcal{P}, \Phi)$ , there exists a unique Hermitian metric  $h$  on  $E|_{\Sigma \setminus \mathbf{D}}$  of determinant 1 such that the associated Chern connection  $D_h$  satisfies the self-duality equations

$$F_{D_h} + [\Phi, \Phi^{*h}] = 0, \quad \bar{\partial}^{D_h} \Phi = 0,$$

on  $\Sigma \setminus \mathbf{D}$ , and is *tame* around each  $p_j \in \mathbf{D}$ , i.e. in a local coordinate  $z$  centered at  $p_j$ , it has the model growth  $(z\bar{z})^{\alpha_j}$ ; see [51, Section 2] (or Section 4.4 below) for details.

The metric  $h$  determines an equivariant harmonic map from the universal cover of  $\Sigma \setminus \mathbf{D}$  into hyperbolic 3-space. Here the hyperbolic 3-space is identified with the space of positive-definite Hermitian inner products of determinant 1, and the equivariance is with respect to the monodromy of the flat  $\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{C})$ -connection

$$(4) \quad \nabla = D_h + \Phi + \Phi^{*h},$$

obtained by adding the Higgs field and its  $h$ -adjoint  $\Phi^{*h}$  to the Chern connection. Although  $\Phi^{*h}$  is in general singular at the points  $p_j$ , there is a natural extension of the underlying holomorphic bundle induced by  $\bar{\partial}^\nabla$  across  $\mathbf{D}$  which turns  $\nabla$  into a logarithmic connection with residues  $\mathrm{Res}_{p_j} \nabla$  conjugate to  $\mathrm{diag}(\alpha_j, -\alpha_j)$ . In particular, the local monodromies lie in the prescribed conjugacy classes. This completes one direction of the correspondence.

Conversely, starting from an irreducible logarithmic connection on  $\Sigma \setminus \mathbf{D}$  with the prescribed residue data, one recovers a parabolic Higgs bundle by solving the harmonic metric equations; see Donaldson's work [18] in the compact case. We refer to Simpson's original paper [51] for the full analytical details in the non-compact case. Simpson's result for the case of strongly parabolic  $\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C})$ -Higgs bundles can be stated as follows.

**Theorem 2.1.** (*Parabolic non-abelian Hodge correspondence [51]*). *Let  $\mathcal{M}_{\text{Higgs}}$  be the moduli space of polystable strongly parabolic  $\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C})$ -Higgs bundles on  $(\Sigma, \mathbf{D})$  with fixed parabolic weights  $0 < \alpha_j < \frac{1}{2}$ , and let  $\mathcal{M}_{\text{dR}}$  be the moduli space of irreducible flat  $\text{SL}(2, \mathbb{C})$ -connections on  $\Sigma \setminus \mathbf{D}$  with fixed conjugacy classes of local monodromy, specified by the eigenvalues  $e^{\pm 2\pi i \alpha_j}$  at each  $p_j \in \mathbf{D}$ . Then there exists a real-analytic diffeomorphism*

$$\mathcal{M}_{\text{Higgs}} \cong \mathcal{M}_{\text{dR}},$$

*which maps a strongly parabolic Higgs bundle  $(\mathcal{P}, \Phi)$  to the equivalence class of a flat connection  $\nabla$  (cf. (4)) arising from a tame solution of Hitchin's self-duality equations for that Higgs data.*

This correspondence is one-to-one between stable (respectively polystable) parabolic Higgs bundles and irreducible (respectively totally reducible) flat connections. Moreover, as first shown by Konno [37], it induces a hyperkähler structure on the moduli space: in particular,  $\mathcal{M}_{\text{Higgs}}$  and  $\mathcal{M}_{\text{dR}}$  are identified as *real* manifolds of real dimension  $4n + 12g - 12$ , where  $n$  is the number of marked points and  $g$  is the genus of  $\Sigma$ . They carry distinct (indeed anti-commuting) complex structures, denoted  $I$  and  $J$  respectively, both compatible with the underlying hyperkähler metric.

**2.3. Parabolic Deligne-Hitchin Moduli Spaces.** The different complex structures of a hyperkähler manifold can be encoded in its twistor space; see [33]. The complex-analytic construction of the twistor space of the Hitchin moduli space is due to Deligne (in unpublished notes) and Simpson [52]. In the strongly parabolic setting, this construction was carried out by Simpson [53] and by Alfaya-Gómez [3]. We outline the construction here in the rank-2 case; see also [29].

Fix a generic parabolic weight vector  $\alpha$ . For each complex number  $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ , consider the moduli space of parabolic  $\lambda$ -connections on  $(\Sigma, \mathbf{D})$ . By a parabolic  $\lambda$ -connection we mean a triple

$$\mathcal{D} = (E, \mathcal{P}, D^\lambda)$$

consisting of a holomorphic bundle  $E$  with parabolic structure  $\mathcal{P}$  as above together with

$$D^\lambda = \begin{cases} \lambda \partial^\nabla & \text{if } \lambda \neq 0 \\ \Phi & \text{if } \lambda = 0 \end{cases},$$

where  $\nabla$  is a logarithmic connection compatible with the parabolic structure  $\mathcal{P}$ , and  $\Phi$  is a strongly parabolic Higgs field.

Note that for a parabolic  $\lambda$ -connection, the residue  $\text{Res}_{p_j} D^\lambda$  has the quasi-parabolic line  $\ell_j$  as an eigenline with eigenvalue  $\lambda \alpha_j$  at each  $p_j \in \mathbf{D}$ . Concretely, in a local holomorphic trivialization near  $p_j$ , the operator  $D^\lambda$  can be written as

$$D^\lambda = \lambda \partial + \begin{pmatrix} \lambda \alpha_j & * \\ 0 & -\lambda \alpha_j \end{pmatrix} \frac{dz}{z} + (\text{holomorphic 1-form}),$$

so that  $\ell_j$  is indeed an eigenline of the residue with eigenvalue  $\lambda\alpha_j$ .

In particular, for  $\lambda = 0$  the data  $(E, \mathcal{P}, D^0)$  coincide with a strongly parabolic Higgs bundle, while for  $\lambda = 1$  the operator  $D^1$  is an ordinary logarithmic connection compatible with the parabolic structure  $\mathcal{P}$ . More generally, for  $\lambda \neq 0$ , the operator  $\frac{1}{\lambda}D^\lambda$  is the  $(1, 0)$ -part of a logarithmic connection compatible with  $\mathcal{P}$ . Conversely, every logarithmic connection  $\nabla$  compatible with  $\mathcal{P}$  gives rise, by scaling, to a parabolic  $\lambda$ -connection  $(E, \mathcal{P}, \lambda\partial^\nabla)$ .

*The Hodge moduli space.* Fix a generic parabolic weight vector  $\alpha$ . Let  $\mathcal{M}_{\text{Hod}}$  denote the moduli space of pairs  $(\lambda, \mathcal{D})$ , where  $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$  is arbitrary and  $\mathcal{D}$  is a polystable parabolic  $\lambda$ -connections on  $(\Sigma, \mathbf{D})$ . It is a smooth complex analytic variety equipped with a holomorphic projection

$$\pi_{\text{Hod}}: \mathcal{M}_{\text{Hod}} \rightarrow \mathbb{C},$$

sending  $(\lambda, \mathcal{D})$  to the parameter  $\lambda$ . By construction, for each  $\lambda \neq 0$ , the fiber is analytically isomorphic to the de Rham moduli space  $\mathcal{M}_{\text{dR}}$  of logarithmic connections with prescribed residues

$$(5) \quad \pi_{\text{Hod}}^{-1}(\lambda) \cong \mathcal{M}_{\text{dR}}.$$

The fiber  $\pi_{\text{Hod}}^{-1}(0)$  is naturally identified with the moduli space  $\mathcal{M}_{\text{Higgs}}$  of polystable strongly parabolic Higgs bundles.

*The Deligne–Hitchin moduli space.* Let  $\bar{\Sigma}$  denote the Riemann surface with complex structure conjugate to that of  $\Sigma$ , and let  $\bar{\mathbf{D}}$  denote the divisor on  $\bar{\Sigma}$  corresponding to  $\mathbf{D}$  on  $\Sigma$ . Note that the deRham moduli spaces of logarithmic connections on  $\Sigma$  and  $\bar{\Sigma}$  with prescribed residue data at  $\mathbf{D}$  respectively  $\bar{\mathbf{D}}$  are naturally isomorphic. In fact, each of them is biholomorphic (via the Deligne extension for the fixed choices of logarithms at the punctures) to the Betti moduli space  $\mathcal{M}_{\text{Betti}}$ , consisting of irreducible representations of  $\pi_1(\Sigma \setminus \mathbf{D})$  with fixed local conjugacy classes up to overall conjugation.

Using (5) on  $\Sigma$  and  $\bar{\Sigma}$ , the moduli space of parabolic  $\lambda$ -connections on  $\Sigma$  is canonically identified with the corresponding moduli space of parabolic  $\lambda^{-1}$ -connections on  $\bar{\Sigma}$  for each  $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}^*$ . Using this identification, one glues  $\mathcal{M}_{\text{Hod}}(\Sigma)$  and  $\mathcal{M}_{\text{Hod}}(\bar{\Sigma})$  along  $\mathbb{C}^*$  to obtain the *parabolic Deligne–Hitchin moduli space*

$$\pi: \mathcal{M}_{\text{DH}}^{\text{par}} \rightarrow \mathbb{CP}^1.$$

By construction, the fibers of  $\pi$  are given by

$$\pi^{-1}(0) = \mathcal{M}_{\text{Higgs}}(\Sigma), \quad \pi^{-1}(\infty) = \mathcal{M}_{\text{Higgs}}(\bar{\Sigma}),$$

while for every  $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}^*$  one has by (5)

$$\mathcal{M}_{\text{dR}}(\Sigma) \cong \pi^{-1}(\lambda) \cong \mathcal{M}_{\text{dR}}(\bar{\Sigma}).$$

*Real structure.* The fibration  $\mathcal{M}_{\text{DH}}^{\text{par}} \rightarrow \mathbb{CP}^1$  comes equipped with a natural *real structure*  $\tau: \mathcal{M}_{\text{DH}}^{\text{par}} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{\text{DH}}^{\text{par}}$ , i.e. an anti-holomorphic involution covering the antipodal map on  $\mathbb{CP}^1$ ,

$$\lambda \mapsto -\bar{\lambda}^{-1}.$$

Concretely,  $\tau$  sends a parabolic  $\lambda$ -connection  $(E, \mathcal{P}, D^\lambda)$  to the parabolic  $(-1/\bar{\lambda})$ -connection on the same underlying  $C^\infty$  bundle, obtained by complex conjugation of



the connection data and of the quasi-parabolic lines; see [29, Sections 2.3–2.4] for details. In particular,  $\tau$  exchanges the moduli spaces of parabolic Higgs bundles for  $\Sigma$  and  $\bar{\Sigma}$  as fibers over  $\lambda = 0$  and  $\lambda = \infty$ , respectively.

Let  $\mathcal{D}$  be a parabolic  $\lambda$ -connection on  $\Sigma$ , and denote by  $\rho_{\mathcal{D}} : \pi_1(\Sigma \setminus \mathbf{D}) \rightarrow \mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{C})$  the associated monodromy representation. The  $\lambda$ -connection  $\tau(\mathcal{D})$ , defined on the conjugate Riemann surface  $\bar{\Sigma}$ , determines a representation  $\rho_{\tau(\mathcal{D})} : \pi_1(\bar{\Sigma} \setminus \mathbf{D}) \rightarrow \mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{C})$  which is complex conjugate to  $\rho_{\mathcal{D}}$ . Equivalently,  $\rho_{\tau(\mathcal{D})}$  is naturally identified with the complex conjugate of the contragredient representation  $\overline{(\rho_{\mathcal{D}}^T)^{-1}}$ .

**2.4. Twistor Lines.** Consider a (tame) solution  $(E, \mathcal{P}, \Phi, h)$  of Hitchin's self-duality equations, and define the associated family of connections

$$(6) \quad \nabla^\lambda = D_h + \lambda^{-1}\Phi + \lambda\Phi^{*h}.$$

One finds that  $\nabla^\lambda$  is flat for all  $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}^*$  due to the harmonicity of the metric  $h$ . Moreover, for each  $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}^*$ ,  $\nabla^\lambda$  has a natural extension as a logarithmic connection into the singular points  $p_j \in \mathbf{D}$  by the results of Simpson [51].

Using the identification (5) one obtains a holomorphic family of parabolic  $\lambda$ -connections

$$(7) \quad \lambda \in \mathbb{C}^* \mapsto (\lambda, \mathcal{D}^\lambda)$$

parametrized by the spectral parameter  $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}^*$ . Note that in general, the underlying parabolic structure of  $\mathcal{D}^\lambda$  varies with  $\lambda$ . This family extends to  $\lambda = 0$  and coincides with the given strongly parabolic Higgs field at  $\lambda = 0$ . At  $\lambda = 1$ ,  $\mathcal{D}^1$  is via the non-abelian Hodge correspondence the logarithmic connection in Theorem 2.1. This construction was explained for compact surfaces in [52], and established for the strongly parabolic setup in full analytic detail by Mochizuki [43, 44].

Given a solution of Hitchin's self-duality equations on a parabolic bundle, the family (7) therefore defines a holomorphic section

$$s : \mathbb{CP}^1 \longrightarrow \mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{DH}}^{\mathrm{par}}, \quad \lambda \longmapsto (\lambda, \mathcal{D}^\lambda),$$

which is called the *twistor line* associated to the solution. By construction, the section  $s$  satisfies a reality condition with respect to the real structure  $\tau$  on  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{DH}}^{\mathrm{par}}$ , namely

$$(8) \quad \tau(s(-\bar{\lambda}^{-1})) = s(\lambda) \quad \text{for all } \lambda \in \mathbb{CP}^1.$$

A general holomorphic section  $s$  of  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{DH}}^{\mathrm{par}}$  satisfying (8) is called *real holomorphic*.

*Remark 2.2.* Not every real holomorphic section of the Deligne–Hitchin moduli space arises from a solution of Hitchin's equations. First examples of real holomorphic sections which are not twistor lines were constructed in [27].

## 2.5. Twisted holomorphic symplectic form for Fuchsian $\lambda$ -connections.

The parabolic Deligne–Hitchin moduli space  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{DH}}^{\mathrm{par}}$  carries a canonical fiberwise holomorphic 2-form twisted by  $\mathcal{O}(2)$ . More precisely, there is a natural holomorphic section

$$\varpi \in H^0(\mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{DH}}^{\mathrm{par}}, \Lambda^2 T_{\mathrm{fib}}^* \otimes \mathcal{O}(2)),$$

where  $T_{\mathrm{fib}}$  denotes the holomorphic tangent bundle along the fibers of the projection  $\pi : \mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{DH}}^{\mathrm{par}} \rightarrow \mathbb{CP}^1$ . In the twistorial description of hyperkähler manifolds [33],  $\varpi$  plays the role of the holomorphic symplectic form on the fibers.

After trivializing  $\mathcal{O}(2)$  over  $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}^*$ , the restriction of  $\varpi$  to the fiber  $\pi^{-1}(\lambda)$  can be written as

$$(9) \quad \varpi|_{\pi^{-1}(\lambda)} = \lambda^{-1}(\omega_J + i\omega_K) - 2\omega_I - \lambda(\omega_J - i\omega_K),$$

where  $\omega_I, \omega_J, \omega_K$  are the Kähler forms associated with the hyperkähler metric and the complex structures  $I, J, K$ , respectively. This expression encodes the full hyperkähler metric [33].

In the present setting of Deligne–Hitchin moduli spaces, these forms admit concrete interpretations. Up to normalization,  $\omega_J + i\omega_K$  coincides with the canonical holomorphic symplectic form on the Higgs moduli space, while  $\varpi|_{\pi^{-1}(1)}$  agrees with the Atiyah–Bott–Goldman holomorphic symplectic form on the de Rham moduli space. More generally, for each  $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}^*$ ,  $\varpi|_{\pi^{-1}(\lambda)}$  is given by a Goldman-type holomorphic symplectic form on the moduli space of parabolic  $\lambda$ -connections.

In the following, we restrict to  $\Sigma = \mathbb{CP}^1$  and to the Zariski-open subset of the de Rham moduli space consisting of logarithmic connections on the trivial bundle, i.e., classical Fuchsian systems. Then,  $\Omega_J = \varpi|_{\pi^{-1}(1)}$  can be written explicitly in terms of residues; see [2] or [29, Section 3.4] for details.

Let  $\mathbf{D} = p_1 + \cdots + p_n$  with  $p_j \in \mathbb{C} \subset \mathbb{CP}^1$ , and consider a connection of the form

$$\nabla = d + \sum_j A_j \frac{dz}{z - p_j},$$

where  $A_j \in \mathfrak{sl}_2(\mathbb{C})$  satisfy  $\det(A_j) = -\alpha_j^2$  and  $\sum_j A_j = 0$ , ensuring regularity at infinity. Tangent vectors  $X, Y$  to the moduli space at  $\nabla$  may be represented by meromorphic  $\mathfrak{sl}_2(\mathbb{C})$ -valued 1-forms

$$X = \sum_j X_j \frac{dz}{z - p_j}, \quad Y = \sum_j Y_j \frac{dz}{z - p_j},$$

with  $\sum_j X_j = \sum_j Y_j = 0$  and  $\mathrm{tr}(A_j X_j) = \mathrm{tr}(A_j Y_j) = 0$  for all  $j$ , expressing infinitesimal preservation of the residue conjugacy classes. The holomorphic symplectic  $\Omega_J$  form arises via symplectic reduction for the conjugation action of  $\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{C})$  with moment map  $\mu = \sum_j A_j$ , and is given by the residue formula

$$(10) \quad \Omega_J(X, Y) = \sum_j \frac{1}{8 \mathrm{tr}(A_j^2)} \mathrm{tr}(A_j [X_j, Y_j]).$$

Each summand is the Kirillov–Kostant–Souriau form on the adjoint orbit of  $A_j$ .

For arbitrary  $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ , an entirely analogous residue formula describes the holomorphic symplectic form  $\varpi|_{\pi^{-1}(\lambda)}$  on the moduli space of parabolic  $\lambda$ -connections; compare with [29, Section 2.7]. For  $\lambda = 0$  and weights lying in the proper subpolytope for which stable parabolic bundles exist [1, 13], this reduces (up to scale) to the canonical Liouville symplectic form on the cotangent bundle of the moduli space of stable parabolic bundles [31, 37].

### 3. HYPERPOLYGON SPACES

In this section we recall the definition and basic properties of hyperpolygon spaces, viewed as finite-dimensional hyperkähler quotients. These spaces provide explicit hyperkähler models which are useful to study the geometry of strongly parabolic

Higgs bundles with complex structure  $I$  [25]. Our main interest in the hyperpolygon spaces lies in their role as models for the degeneration of the parabolic Higgs bundle moduli as the parabolic weights tend to zero. In particular, their hyperkähler quotient description and explicit twistor geometry will later allow us to compare the limiting hyperkähler metric with the rescaled Hitchin metric arising from the parabolic Higgs bundle side.

**3.1. The Eguchi–Hanson space.** The holomorphic cotangent bundle  $T^*\mathbb{CP}^1$  is naturally equipped with a holomorphic symplectic form  $\Omega$ . Moreover, for each  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$  there exists a Kähler form  $\omega = \omega_\alpha$  on  $T^*\mathbb{CP}^1$  whose restriction to the zero section  $\mathbb{CP}^1 \subset T^*\mathbb{CP}^1$  is the multiple  $\alpha \omega_{\text{FS}}$  of the Fubini–Study Kähler form. Together,  $(\omega, \Omega)$  determine a hyperkähler structure on  $T^*\mathbb{CP}^1$ . The resulting metric is the well-known Eguchi–Hanson metric [15]. It is most conveniently constructed via the hyperkähler quotient construction; see [33]. We briefly recall this construction and refer to [32, 38] for further details.

Let  $V = \mathbb{C}^2$  and consider the vector space  $V \oplus V^*$ . We equip  $V$  (and  $V^*$ ) with the standard Hermitian inner product  $(\cdot, \cdot)$ . Let

$$*: V \rightarrow V^*, \quad v \mapsto v^* := (\cdot, v),$$

denote the complex anti-linear isomorphism induced by the Hermitian form, and use the same symbol for its inverse, so that  $(\cdot, w^*) = w$  for  $w \in V^*$ .

Then  $V \oplus V^*$  carries a natural flat hyperkähler structure  $(g_0, I, J, K)$ , where  $g_0 = \text{Re}(\cdot, \cdot)$  is the Euclidean metric on  $M := V \oplus V^* \cong \mathbb{R}^8$ , the complex structure  $I$  is multiplication by  $i$ , and

$$J(v, w) = (-w^*, v^*) \in V \oplus V^*.$$

Writing  $z_\ell = x_\ell + iy_\ell$ , the Kähler form and holomorphic symplectic form with respect to  $I$  are

$$\omega = \omega_I := \text{Im}(\cdot, \cdot) = -g_0(\cdot, I\cdot) = \frac{i}{2} \sum_{\ell} dz_\ell \wedge d\bar{z}_\ell,$$

and

$$\Omega = \Omega_I := \omega_J + i\omega_K = dz_1 \wedge dz_3 + dz_2 \wedge dz_4.$$

Consider the  $S^1$ -action on  $V \oplus V^*$  given by

$$\varphi \cdot (v, w) := (\varphi v, \bar{\varphi} w).$$

The associated Killing field is given by

$$X_{(v, w)} = (iv, -iw).$$

**Lemma 3.1.** *The  $S^1 = \text{U}(1)$ -action is tri-holomorphic, i.e. it preserves  $I$ ,  $J$ , and  $K$ , and it is tri-hamiltonian, i.e. Hamiltonian with respect to  $\omega_I$ ,  $\omega_J$ , and  $\omega_K$ . Identifying  $\mathfrak{u}(1) = i\mathbb{R} \cong \mathbb{R}$ , the moment maps are given by*

$$\mu_I(v, w) = \frac{1}{2}(|v|^2 - |w|^2),$$

and

$$\mu_{\mathbb{C}}(v, w) := (\mu_J + i\mu_K)(v, w) = iw(v).$$

For  $\alpha > 0$ , the flat hyperkähler structure on  $V \oplus V^*$  descends to a complete hyperkähler metric on the quotient

$$\mu^{-1}(2\alpha, 0)/S^1 \cong T^*\mathbb{CP}^1,$$

where  $\mu = (\mu_I, \mu_{\mathbb{C}})$  is the full hyperkähler moment map. This hyperkähler quotient is the *Eguchi–Hanson space*, the simplest non-flat asymptotically locally Euclidean hyperkähler manifold. The Kähler form with respect to the complex structure  $I$  is the scaled Fubini-Study metric  $\alpha \omega_{\text{FS}}$  on the zero section  $\mathbb{CP}^1$ .

There is also a natural action of  $\text{SU}(2)$  on  $V \oplus V^*$  given by

$$A \cdot (v, w) = (Av, w \circ A^{-1}).$$

For  $\xi \in \mathfrak{su}(2) \cong \mathfrak{su}(2)^*$ , the associated Killing field is

$$X_{\xi}(v, w) = (\xi v, -w\xi).$$

**Lemma 3.2.** *The  $\text{SU}(2)$ -action on  $V \oplus V^*$  is tri-holomorphic and tri-hamiltonian. The corresponding moment maps are*

$$\nu_I(v, w) = \frac{i}{2}(v \otimes v^* - w^* \otimes w)_0,$$

and

$$\nu_{\mathbb{C}}(v, w) := (\nu_J + i\nu_K)(v, w) = -(v \otimes w)_0,$$

where  $(\cdot)_0$  denotes the trace-free part of an element of  $\mathfrak{gl}(2, \mathbb{C})$ .

3.1.1. *Twistor lines.* Let  $(x, y) \in \mathbb{C}^2 \setminus \{0\}$  and

$$a = \frac{\sqrt{2\alpha + |x|^2 + |y|^2}}{\sqrt{|x|^2 + |y|^2}} > 0.$$

Define

$$(11) \quad v = a \begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \end{pmatrix} \in V, \quad w = (y, -x) \in V^*.$$

Then

$$\mu_I(v, w) = 2\alpha, \quad \mu_{\mathbb{C}}(v, w) = 0.$$

Define

$$(12) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathfrak{A} &:= \lambda^{-1} \nu_{\mathbb{C}}(v, w) - 2i \nu_I(v, w) - \lambda \nu_{\mathbb{C}}(w^*, v^*) \\ &= \lambda^{-1} a \begin{pmatrix} -xy & x^2 \\ y^2 & xy \end{pmatrix} + \frac{1+a^2}{2} \begin{pmatrix} |x|^2 - |y|^2 & 2x\bar{y} \\ 2y\bar{x} & |y|^2 - |x|^2 \end{pmatrix} + \lambda a \begin{pmatrix} \bar{x}\bar{y} & \bar{y}^2 \\ -\bar{x}^2 & -\bar{x}\bar{y} \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

It satisfies

$$(13) \quad \det(\mathfrak{A}) = -\alpha^2, \quad \mathfrak{A}^* = -\mathfrak{A},$$

where, for  $A: \mathbb{C}^* \rightarrow \mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C})$ ,

$$(14) \quad A^*(\lambda) := -\overline{A(-\bar{\lambda}^{-1})}^T.$$

Its quasi-parabolic line, i.e. the kernel of the  $\lambda^{-1}$ -part, is the span of  $v$ .

*Remark 3.3.* Up to the factor  $i$ , the matrix  $\mathfrak{A}$  coincides with the twisted-holomorphic moment map for the complexified  $\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{C})$ -action with respect to the twisted-holomorphic symplectic form

$$\Omega_\lambda = \lambda^{-1}\Omega_I - 2\omega_I - \lambda\bar{\Omega}_I.$$

This is the standard description of the twistor space of a hyperkähler quotient; see [33]. For the twistorial description of (co)adjoint orbits and the corresponding hyperkähler structures, see also [4].

**3.1.2. Bottom Component.** Consider  $\mathfrak{A}$  in (12) when scaling the vector  $\tilde{w} = r(y, -x)$  to zero. In the limit  $r \rightarrow 0$  we obtain

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \mathfrak{A} = \frac{\alpha}{|x|^2 + |y|^2} \begin{pmatrix} |x|^2 - |y|^2 & 2x\bar{y} \\ 2y\bar{x} & |y|^2 - |x|^2 \end{pmatrix} \in i\mathfrak{su}(2)$$

which is independent of  $\lambda$ . Its eigenvalues are  $\pm\alpha$ , and the eigenline with respect to the eigenvalue  $\alpha$  is given by the quasi-parabolic line, i.e. it is spanned by the limit

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} v = \sqrt{2\alpha} \begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \end{pmatrix} \neq 0.$$

**3.2. The hyperpolygon space.** We next recall the *hyperpolygon spaces* introduced by Konno [38] as hyperkähler quotients of a product of Eguchi–Hanson spaces. Equivalently, they can be obtained as hyperkähler quotients of flat quaternionic vector spaces. Let  $n \geq 4$  and consider

$$M_n := \bigoplus_{j=1}^n (V \oplus V^*) \cong \mathbb{C}^{4n},$$

equipped with the product hyperkähler structure  $(g_0, I, J, K)$ , where each summand  $V \oplus V^*$  carries the flat hyperkähler structure described above. We write points of  $M_n$  as

$$(v, w) = ((v_1, w_1), \dots, (v_n, w_n)), \quad v_j \in V, w_j \in V^*.$$

Let

$$G := \mathrm{SU}(2) \times (S^1)^n$$

act on  $M_n$  as follows. The  $\mathrm{SU}(2)$ -factor acts diagonally via the action described in the previous subsection,

$$A \cdot (v_j, w_j) = (Av_j, w_j \circ A^{-1}),$$

while the  $j$ -th  $S^1$ -factor acts on the  $j$ -th summand by

$$\varphi_j \cdot (v_j, w_j) = (\varphi_j v_j, \bar{\varphi}_j w_j),$$

and trivially on the remaining summands. Altogether, this defines a tri-holomorphic action of  $G$  on  $M_n$ .

Identifying  $\mathfrak{u}(1)^n \cong \mathbb{R}^n$  and using the notation of the previous subsection, the hyperkähler moment map for the  $(S^1)^n$ -action is  $\mu = (\mu_I, \mu_{\mathbb{C}})$ , with components

$$\mu_I(v, w) = \left( \frac{1}{2}(|v_1|^2 - |w_1|^2), \dots, \frac{1}{2}(|v_n|^2 - |w_n|^2) \right),$$

and

$$\mu_{\mathbb{C}}(v, w) = (i w_1(v_1), \dots, i w_n(v_n)).$$

Similarly, the  $SU(2)$ -moment map is the sum of the individual contributions,  $\nu = (\nu_I, \nu_{\mathbb{C}})$ , where

$$\nu_I(v, w) = \frac{i}{2} \sum_{j=1}^n (v_j \otimes v_j^* - w_j^* \otimes w_j)_0,$$

and

$$\nu_{\mathbb{C}}(v, w) = - \sum_{j=1}^n (v_j \otimes w_j)_0.$$

**Lemma 3.4.** *The  $G = SU(2) \times (S^1)^n$ -action on  $M_n$  is tri-hamiltonian with moment map*

$$(\nu, \mu): M_n \rightarrow \mathfrak{su}(2)^* \oplus (\mathbb{R}^n \oplus \mathbb{C}^n).$$

Fix a *hyperpolygon weight* vector

$$\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n.$$

The *hyperpolygon space* associated to  $\alpha$  is defined as the hyperkähler quotient

$$\mathcal{X}_\alpha := \nu^{-1}(0) \cap \mu_I^{-1}(2\alpha) \cap \mu_{\mathbb{C}}^{-1}(0) / G.$$

Equivalently, since  $(S^1)^n$  and  $SU(2)$  commute,  $\mathcal{X}_\alpha$  may be viewed as the hyperkähler quotient of  $M_n$  by  $(S^1)^n$  at level  $(2\alpha, 0)$ , followed by reduction by  $SU(2)$  at level 0. By construction,  $\mathcal{X}_\alpha$  carries a natural hyperkähler metric induced from the flat metric on  $M_n$ . The identification of this hyperkähler quotient with a complex-analytic quotient, and hence the global description of  $\mathcal{X}_\alpha$  as a smooth hyperkähler manifold, relies on a Kempf–Ness–type result [33, 35, 38], which we recall below.

**3.3. Complex orbits, stability, and the hyperkähler metric.** We now discuss the notion of stability and compare the description of hyperpolygon spaces as hyperkähler quotients with their interpretation as complex-analytic moduli spaces. Recall the complex moment maps

$$\mu_{\mathbb{C}}: M_n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n, \quad \nu_{\mathbb{C}}: M_n \rightarrow \mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C}),$$

and consider the complex zero set

$$\hat{\mathcal{X}} := \nu_{\mathbb{C}}^{-1}(0) \cap \mu_{\mathbb{C}}^{-1}(0).$$

For a point

$$(v, w) = ((v_1, w_1), \dots, (v_n, w_n)) \in \hat{\mathcal{X}},$$

the defining equations are

$$w_j(v_j) = 0, \quad \sum_{j=1}^n (v_j \otimes w_j)_0 = 0.$$

These equations are preserved by the holomorphic action of

$$G^{\mathbb{C}} = SL(2, \mathbb{C}) \times (\mathbb{C}^*)^n,$$

and hence determine a complex orbit

$$\mathcal{O}_{(v,w)} := G^{\mathbb{C}} \cdot (v, w) \subset \hat{\mathcal{X}}.$$

Fix a hyperpolygon weight vector  $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n$ . As shown by Konno [38], the choice of  $\alpha$  determines a notion of (semi)stability for the  $G^{\mathbb{C}}$ -action on  $\hat{\mathcal{X}}$ . We

follow the stability notion introduced by Konno as adapted by Godinho–Mandini [25] (see [36] for its introduction on moduli of polygons). This definition is equivalent to Nakajima’s original definition; see [45].

A hyperpolygon weight vector  $\alpha$  is called *generic* if for every subset  $S \subset \{1, \dots, n\}$  one has

$$\epsilon_S(\alpha) := \sum_{j \in S} \alpha_j - \sum_{j \notin S} \alpha_j \neq 0.$$

In the following, we restrict to generic hyperpolygon weights.

A subset  $S \subset \{1, \dots, n\}$  is called  $\alpha$ -*short* if  $\epsilon_S(\alpha) < 0$ , and  $\alpha$ -*long* otherwise. Given  $(v, w) \in \hat{\mathcal{X}}$ , a subset  $S$  is called *straight* at  $(v, w)$  if

$$\det(v_j, v_k) = 0 \quad \text{for all } j, k \in S.$$

**Definition 3.5.** A point  $(v, w) = ((v_1, w_1), \dots, (v_n, w_n)) \in \hat{\mathcal{X}}$  is called  $\alpha$ -*stable* if the following conditions hold:

- $v_j \neq 0$  for all  $j = 1, \dots, n$ ;
- if  $S \subset \{1, \dots, n\}$  is straight at  $(v, w)$  and  $w_j = 0$  for all  $j \notin S$ , then  $S$  is  $\alpha$ -short, i.e.

$$\sum_{i \in S} \alpha_i < \sum_{i \notin S} \alpha_i.$$

If at least one of the previous inequalities is non-strict then  $(v, w)$  is called  $\alpha$ -*semistable*. This can only happen for non-generic  $\alpha$ .

We denote by

$$\hat{\mathcal{X}}_\alpha^s, \quad \hat{\mathcal{X}}_\alpha^{ss}$$

the  $\alpha$ -stable and  $\alpha$ -semistable loci, respectively. If  $\alpha$  is generic, then  $\hat{\mathcal{X}}_\alpha^{ss} = \hat{\mathcal{X}}_\alpha^s$ . It is known (see [25] and references therein) that in this case  $\hat{\mathcal{X}}_\alpha^s$  is smooth.

It remains to solve the real moment map equations  $\nu_I = 0$  and  $\mu_I = 2\alpha$  inside a given complex orbit  $\mathcal{O}_{(v,w)}$ . In this setting, Konno [38] proved the following Kempf–Ness-type result.

**Proposition 3.6.** *Let  $(v, w) \in \hat{\mathcal{X}}$  and let  $\alpha$  be generic. Then the following are equivalent:*

- $(v, w)$  is  $\alpha$ -stable for the  $G^{\mathbb{C}}$ -action;
- the complex orbit  $\mathcal{O}_{(v,w)}$  contains a representative satisfying the real moment map equations, i.e. there exists  $g \in G^{\mathbb{C}}$  such that

$$g \cdot (v, w) \in \nu_I^{-1}(0) \cap \mu_I^{-1}(2\alpha).$$

Moreover, such a representative is unique up to the action of the compact group

$$G = \mathrm{SU}(2) \times (S^1)^n.$$

In particular, for  $\alpha$ -stable points the intersection

$$\mathcal{O}_{(v,w)} \cap (\nu_I^{-1}(0) \cap \mu_I^{-1}(2\alpha))$$

is a single  $G$ -orbit. Consequently, for generic  $\alpha$  the hyperpolygon space admits the equivalent descriptions

$$\mathcal{X}_\alpha = \nu_I^{-1}(0) \cap \mu_I^{-1}(2\alpha) \cap \hat{\mathcal{X}}/G \cong \hat{\mathcal{X}}_\alpha^s/G^\mathbb{C},$$

and the resulting quotient is a smooth hyperkähler manifold. Geometrically, this description realizes  $\mathcal{X}_\alpha$  as a moduli space of weighted polygons in  $\mathbb{R}^3$  equipped with additional “momentum” variables, which motivates the terminology *hyperpolygon space*.

*Remark 3.7.* We emphasize a difference of conventions between the hyperpolygon and Higgs bundle hyperkähler quotient constructions. On the hyperpolygon side, the  $\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{C})$ -action on the data  $(v_j, w_j)$  is written as a left action, as is customary in the hyperkähler quotient and quiver variety literature. On the Higgs bundle side, by contrast, the  $\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{C})$ -action arises from the gauge group and is therefore naturally a right action. These conventions are equivalent: passing from a left to a right action amounts to composition with inversion in  $\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{C})$ . All constructions and statements below are independent of this choice of convention.

*Hyperkähler metric.* We now describe the hyperkähler metric on the hyperpolygon space  $\mathcal{X}_\alpha$  from the twistorial point of view in the spirit of [4]. The description below combines the hyperkähler quotient construction of hyperpolygon spaces [38] with the general fact that hyperkähler quotients inherit the full twistor family of holomorphic symplectic forms [33]. This interpretation provides a convenient reformulation of the standard hyperkähler reduction picture which makes the dependence on the twistor parameter explicit. In addition, we use the identification of the holomorphic Kirillov–Kostant–Souriau form on (co)adjoint orbits with the canonical holomorphic symplectic form on (twisted) cotangent bundles. For a single factor  $V \oplus V^*$ , this reduces to the explicit description of the  $\lambda$ -dependent holomorphic moment map recalled in Remark 3.3; see also [4, Théorème 4].

Fix a generic hyperpolygon weight vector  $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n$  and consider

$$M_n := (V \oplus V^*)^n$$

with its flat hyperkähler structure  $(g, I, J, K)$  and the tri-hamiltonian action of

$$G = \mathrm{SU}(2) \times (S^1)^n$$

as described above. Let  $\omega_I$  denote the Kähler form and  $\Omega_I := \omega_J + i\omega_K$  the  $I$ -holomorphic symplectic form on  $M_n$ . For  $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}^*$ , consider the *twisted-holomorphic symplectic form*

$$\Omega_\lambda := \lambda^{-1}\Omega_I - 2\omega_I - \lambda\bar{\Omega}_I.$$

For  $(v_j, w_j) \in V \oplus V^*$ , let

$$\nu_I(v_j, w_j) = \frac{i}{2}(v_j \otimes v_j^* - w_j^* \otimes w_j)_0, \quad \nu_\mathbb{C}(v_j, w_j) = -(v_j \otimes w_j)_0$$

be the  $\mathrm{SU}(2)$  moment maps as in Lemma 3.2.

*Remark 3.8.* The formal similarity of the moment maps for the hyperkähler reduction of the hyperpolygon spaces, with the moment maps of the Hitchin equations has been observed in various places, see for example [5] and [49].



Define the  $\lambda$ -dependent  $\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C})$ -matrix

$$(15) \quad \mathfrak{A}(v_j, w_j) := \lambda^{-1} \nu_{\mathbb{C}}(v_j, w_j) - 2i \nu_I(v_j, w_j) - \lambda \nu_{\mathbb{C}}(w_j^*, v_j^*).$$

If  $(v_j, w_j)$  satisfies the  $(S^1)$ -moment map equations  $\mu_I(v_j, w_j) = 2\alpha_j$  and  $\mu_{\mathbb{C}}(v_j, w_j) = 0$ , then  $\mathfrak{A}(v_j, w_j)$  lies in the semisimple adjoint orbit in  $\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C})$  with eigenvalues  $\pm\alpha_j$ . In this case, the map

$$(v_j, w_j) \mapsto i \mathfrak{A}(v_j, w_j)$$

is the twisted-holomorphic moment map (see [33, Section 3 (F)]) for the complexified  $\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{C})$ -action with respect to  $\Omega_{\lambda}$ .

**Theorem 3.9.** *Let  $\alpha$  be generic and let  $p = (v, w) \in \mathcal{X}_{\alpha}$  be a point in the hyperpolygon space. Then the associated twistor line  $s_p$  is given by*

$$(\mathfrak{A}(v_1, w_1), \dots, \mathfrak{A}(v_n, w_n)).$$

*Moreover, the twisted-holomorphic symplectic form on  $\mathcal{X}_{\alpha}$  is obtained by holomorphic symplectic reduction of  $\Omega_{\lambda}$  with respect to the  $\lambda$ -dependent moment map*

$$\mu_{\lambda}(v, w) = i \sum_{j=1}^n \mathfrak{A}(v_j, w_j).$$

Theorem 3.9 together with (9) gives an expression for the twisted-holomorphic symplectic form for the hyperpolygon space in terms of the Kirillov–Kostant–Souriau form on adjoint orbits. We have seen in (10) that the twisted-holomorphic symplectic form on the moduli of Fuchsian  $\lambda$ -connections is also determined in terms of residues. This provides the link between the twistor geometry of hyperpolygon spaces and that of parabolic Higgs bundle moduli spaces as discussed in Section 2.

**3.4. Hyperpolygons and strongly parabolic Higgs bundles.** We recall the Godinho–Mandini correspondence [25] between the holomorphic quotients  $\hat{\mathcal{X}}_{\alpha}^s / \mathrm{G}^{\mathbb{C}}$  and the moduli space of stable strongly parabolic Higgs bundles on the trivial holomorphic bundle over  $\mathbb{CP}^1$ . We fix a divisor  $\mathbf{D} = p_1 + \dots + p_n$  on  $\mathbb{C} \subset \mathbb{CP}^1$ . To

$$(v, w) \in \hat{\mathcal{X}}$$

one associates a rank-2 quasi-parabolic Higgs bundle  $(E, \Phi)$  as follows. The underlying holomorphic bundle is the trivial holomorphic bundle

$$E = \mathbb{CP}^1 \times \mathbb{C}^2,$$

equipped at each marked point  $p_j \in \mathbf{D}$  with the quasi-parabolic line

$$\ell_j := \mathrm{Span}(v_j) \subset E_{p_j}.$$

The Higgs field  $\Phi$  is the meromorphic  $\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C})$ -valued 1-form with simple poles at the marked points determined by its residues

$$\mathrm{Res}_{p_j}(\Phi) = (v_j \otimes w_j)_0.$$

The condition  $w_j(v_j) = 0$  implies that each residue is nilpotent and preserves the quasi-parabolic line, so that  $\Phi$  is *strongly parabolic*. Moreover, the equation

$$\sum_{j=1}^n (v_j \otimes w_j)_0 = 0$$

guarantees, by the residue theorem, that  $\Phi$  has no further singularity at  $\infty \in \mathbb{CP}^1$ . In order to complete the construction of a parabolic Higgs bundle, the hyperpolygon weight vector must additionally satisfy  $0 < \alpha_j < \frac{1}{2}$  for  $j = 1, \dots, n$ .

**Proposition 3.10.** *[25] If  $\alpha$  is small, then a point  $(v, w) \in \hat{\mathcal{X}}$  is  $\alpha$ -stable in the sense of hyperpolygons if and only if the associated parabolic Higgs bundle  $(E, \Phi)$  is stable with respect to the parabolic weight vector  $\alpha$  (see Section 2.1).*

Thus, for generic small weights  $\alpha$ , the hyperpolygon space  $\mathcal{X}_\alpha^s$  is biholomorphic to a Zariski open subset of the moduli space  $\mathcal{M}_{\text{Higgs}}(\alpha)$  of parabolic Higgs bundles on  $\mathbb{CP}^1$ . This biholomorphism preserves the respective holomorphic symplectic forms [7]. In summary, we have the following result.

**Theorem 3.11.** *[7, 25] Let  $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n) \in (0, \frac{1}{2})^n$  be generic and small, and let  $\mathcal{X}_\alpha$  denote the associated hyperpolygon space. Let  $\mathcal{M}_{\text{Higgs}}(\alpha)$  be the moduli space of stable strongly parabolic  $\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C})$ -Higgs bundles on  $(\mathbb{CP}^1, \mathbf{D})$ , and let  $\mathcal{H}_{\text{Higgs}}(\alpha) \subset \mathcal{M}_{\text{Higgs}}(\alpha)$  denote the Zariski-open subset where the underlying holomorphic bundle is trivial. There exists a natural biholomorphic symplectomorphism*

$$\Psi: (\mathcal{X}_\alpha, I) \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathcal{H}_{\text{Higgs}}(\alpha).$$

*If  $\Omega_{\mathcal{X}_\alpha}$  denotes the holomorphic symplectic form on  $(\mathcal{X}_\alpha, I)$ , and  $\Omega_{\text{Higgs}}$  denotes the canonical holomorphic symplectic form on  $\mathcal{M}_{\text{Higgs}}(\alpha)$ , then*

$$\Psi^* \Omega_{\text{Higgs}} = \Omega_{\mathcal{X}_\alpha}.$$

*Remark 3.12.* Since parabolic semi-stability walls (2), which intersect the small-weight region (3) nontrivially, are necessarily hyperpolygon semi-stability walls, the corresponding parabolic and hyperpolygon genericity conditions coincide in the small-weight region and can be unambiguously exchanged. The small-weight condition (3) is necessary and sufficient for the holomorphic cotangent bundle of the bottom component of the nilpotent cone (see [13, section 4.2] for its construction) to be entirely contained in the Zariski open subset  $\mathcal{H}_{\text{Higgs}}(\alpha)$ . The case  $n = 4$  is described in detail in [41]. In the case of parabolic weights for which stable parabolic bundles exist, this can also be inferred from [1, remark 5.4]. This is why we exclusively consider small parabolic weight vectors within the parabolic weight polytope as initial degeneration data for scaling transformations towards the vertex  $(0, \dots, 0)$ .

Although  $\mathcal{X}_\alpha$  and  $\mathcal{M}_{\text{Higgs}}(\alpha)$  are birational as complex symplectic manifolds, their hyperkähler metrics are not isometric, since for arbitrary  $\alpha$  both metrics are complete but we have that

$$\mathcal{M}_{\text{Higgs}}(\alpha) \setminus \mathcal{H}_{\text{Higgs}}(\alpha) \neq \emptyset.$$

Moreover, when  $n = 4$ , the Higgs bundle moduli space carries an ALG metric [22], whereas the corresponding hyperpolygon space is known to be ALE. In general, the hyperkähler metric on  $\mathcal{X}_\alpha$  is defined without any reference to the choice of the divisor  $\mathbf{D}$ , while the hyperkähler metric on the Higgs bundle moduli space is known to depend on the conformal structure of the  $n$ -punctured sphere.

#### 4. CONSTRUCTION OF TWISTOR LINES

The goal of this section is to construct real holomorphic sections of the parabolic Deligne–Hitchin moduli space  $\mathcal{M}_{\text{DH}}^{\text{par}}(t\alpha)$  which converge, as  $t \rightarrow 0$ , to the hyperpolygon twistor lines arising from the hyperkähler reduction picture. In particular, we show that every twistor line of the hyperpolygon space occurs as the *limiting direction* of a  $t$ -family of twistor lines for the moduli space  $\mathcal{M}_{\text{Higgs}}(t\alpha)$ .

The proof proceeds by formulating a loop-group valued monodromy problem for a family of  $\lambda$ -connections and solving it by an implicit function theorem argument. The resulting real holomorphic sections are then shown to be twistor lines by a global Iwasawa factorization and a tameness (boundedness) analysis near the punctures.

**4.1. Setup and initial conditions.** We set up necessary loop group background for constructing twistor lines of Deligne–Hitchin moduli spaces.

*Loop algebras and loop groups.* We first fix notations. Define the loop algebra

$$\Lambda\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C}) := \{ \xi: S^1 \rightarrow \mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C}) \mid \xi \text{ is real analytic} \}.$$

Writing  $\xi(\lambda) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \xi_k \lambda^k$ , we equip  $\Lambda\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C})$  with the  $\ell^1$ -norm

$$\|\xi\| := \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} |\xi_k|,$$

where  $|\cdot|$  denotes a fixed matrix norm on  $\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C})$ . The loop algebra  $\Lambda\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C})$  is the Lie algebra of the loop group

$$\Lambda\text{SL}(2, \mathbb{C}) := \{ g: S^1 \rightarrow \text{SL}(2, \mathbb{C}) \mid g \text{ is real analytic} \}.$$

We define an anti-holomorphic involution on  $\Lambda\text{SL}(2, \mathbb{C})$  by

$$g^*(\lambda) := \left( \overline{g(-\bar{\lambda}^{-1})}^T \right)^{-1}.$$

The corresponding unitary loop group is

$$\Lambda\mathcal{U} := \{ g \in \Lambda\text{SL}(2, \mathbb{C}) \mid g^* = g \}.$$

It is a real Banach–Lie group. We also consider the induced anti-linear involution on the loop algebra  $\Lambda\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C})$ , given by

$$\xi^*(\lambda) = -\overline{\xi(-\bar{\lambda}^{-1})}^T.$$

Clearly,  $*$  is continuous and satisfies

$$(16) \quad [\xi, \mu]^* = [\xi^*, \mu^*]$$

and

$$\left( \sum_k \xi_k \lambda^k \right)^* = - \sum_k \overline{\xi_k}^T \lambda^{-k}.$$

We define the real subspaces

$$\Lambda\mathcal{U} := \{ \xi \in \Lambda\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C}) \mid \xi^* = \xi \}, \quad \Lambda\mathfrak{H} := \{ \xi \in \Lambda\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C}) \mid \xi^* = -\xi \}.$$

Then  $\Lambda\mathcal{U}$  is the Lie algebra of  $\Lambda\mathcal{U}$ , and

$$\Lambda\mathfrak{H} = i \Lambda\mathcal{U}.$$

For  $Y \in \Lambda \mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C})$  we write

$$(17) \quad Y = Y^u + Y^h := \frac{1}{2}(Y + Y^*) + \frac{1}{2}(Y - Y^*) \in \Lambda \mathfrak{U} \oplus \Lambda \mathfrak{H},$$

and refer to  $Y^u$  and  $Y^h$  as the *unitary* and *Hermitian symmetric* parts of  $Y$ , respectively.

**Example 4.1.** Consider  $\mathfrak{A}$  as in (12). Then

$$(18) \quad \mathfrak{X} := i\mathfrak{A} \in \Lambda \mathfrak{U}.$$

We consider the closed subspaces

$$\Lambda^0 \mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C}) = \mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C}), \quad \Lambda^+ \mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C}), \quad \Lambda^- \mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C})$$

of constant loops, of loops extending holomorphically to the unit disc and vanishing at  $\lambda = 0$ , and of loops extending holomorphically to the complement of the closed unit disc and vanishing at  $\lambda = \infty$ , respectively. All three are Lie subalgebras of  $\Lambda \mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C})$ .

We further set

$$\Lambda^{\geq 0} \mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C}) := \mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C}) \oplus \Lambda^+ \mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C}), \quad \Lambda^{\geq -1} \mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C}) := \lambda^{-1} \Lambda^{\geq 0} \mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C}).$$

Note that  $\Lambda^{\geq -1} \mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C})$  is not a Lie subalgebra.

In analogy with the decomposition of the loop algebra, we define the positive loop group

$$\Lambda^{\geq 0} \mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{C}) := \{ g \in \Lambda \mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{C}) \mid g \text{ extends holomorphically to } |\lambda| < 1 \}.$$

Its Lie algebra is  $\Lambda^{\geq 0} \mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C})$ .

We further set

$$\Lambda_B^{\geq 0} \mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{C}) := \{ g \in \Lambda^{\geq 0} \mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{C}) \mid g(0) \in \mathcal{B} \},$$

where  $\mathcal{B} \subset \mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{C})$  denotes the subgroup of lower triangular matrices with real entries on the diagonal.

The following result can be deduced from the Birkhoff factorization in [48].

**Theorem 4.2.** *There exists an open dense subset (the big cell) of  $\Lambda \mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{C})$  such that every element  $g$  in this subset admits a unique factorization*

$$g = pu, \quad p \in \Lambda_B^{\geq 0} \mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{C}), \quad u \in \Lambda \mathcal{U}.$$

*The factorization depends real analytically on  $g$  wherever it exists.*

**Example 4.3.** [30] Let  $\alpha > 0$ ,  $r \geq 0$ , and let  $\sqrt{1 + 4r^4} > 0$  denote the positive branch of the square root. Set

$$A := \alpha \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{1 + 4r^4} & -\frac{2r^2}{\lambda} \\ 2\lambda r^2 & -\sqrt{1 + 4r^4} \end{pmatrix} \in \Lambda \mathfrak{H}.$$

Consider the map

$$\Psi: \mathbb{R}^{>0} \rightarrow \Lambda \mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{C}), \quad x \mapsto \exp(-A \log x).$$

For  $x \in (0, 1)$  define

$$B(x) = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\sqrt{-\sqrt{1+4r^4}(x^{4\alpha}-1)+x^{4\alpha}+1}}{\sqrt{2}x^\alpha} & 0 \\ -\frac{\sqrt{2}r^2(x^{4\alpha}-1)}{x^\alpha\sqrt{-\sqrt{1+4r^4}(x^{4\alpha}-1)+x^{4\alpha}+1}} \lambda & \frac{\sqrt{2}x^\alpha}{\sqrt{-\sqrt{1+4r^4}(x^{4\alpha}-1)+x^{4\alpha}+1}}} \end{pmatrix} \in \Lambda_B^{\geq 0} \mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{C}),$$

and

$$F(x) = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{-\sqrt{1+4r^4}(x^{2\alpha}-1)+x^{2\alpha}+1}{\sqrt{2}\sqrt{-\sqrt{1+4r^4}(x^{4\alpha}-1)+x^{4\alpha}+1}}} & \frac{\sqrt{2}r^2(x^{2\alpha}-1)}{\sqrt{-\sqrt{1+4r^4}(x^{4\alpha}-1)+x^{4\alpha}+1}}} \lambda^{-1} \\ \frac{\sqrt{2}r^2(x^{2\alpha}-1)}{\sqrt{-\sqrt{1+4r^4}(x^{4\alpha}-1)+x^{4\alpha}+1}}} \lambda & \frac{-\sqrt{1+4r^4}(x^{2\alpha}-1)+x^{2\alpha}+1}{\sqrt{2}\sqrt{-\sqrt{1+4r^4}(x^{4\alpha}-1)+x^{4\alpha}+1}}} \end{pmatrix} \in \Lambda \mathcal{U},$$

and observe that

$$(19) \quad \Psi(x) = B(x) F(x).$$

The factorization fails only at the real positive zero

$$x_r = \left( \frac{\sqrt{4r^4 + 1} + 1}{\sqrt{4r^4 + 1} - 1} \right)^{\frac{1}{4\alpha}} > 1$$

of the denominator of  $F$  (or equivalently  $B$ ), ensuring existence for all  $x \in (0, 1)$ . Note that (19) extends to  $r = 0$ , for the constant unitary part  $F_{r=0} = \mathrm{Id}$ .

If instead one considers

$$\tilde{A} := \alpha \begin{pmatrix} -\sqrt{1+4r^4} & -\frac{2r^2}{\lambda} \\ 2\lambda r^2 & \sqrt{1+4r^4} \end{pmatrix} \in \Lambda \mathfrak{H}, \quad \tilde{\Psi}(x) = \exp(-\tilde{A} \log x),$$

then the corresponding Iwasawa factorization fails at  $\tilde{x}_r = 1/x_r \in (0, 1)$ . In fact,  $\tilde{B}$  and  $\tilde{F}$  are obtained from  $B$  and  $F$  by replacing  $\sqrt{1+4r^4}$  with  $-\sqrt{1+4r^4}$  throughout.

*The monodromy problem.* Consider the  $n$ -punctured sphere

$$\mathbb{CP}^1 \setminus \{p_1, \dots, p_n\}.$$

Without loss of generality, we assume that  $p_j \in \mathbb{C} \subset \mathbb{CP}^1$  for all  $j$ . Fix simple closed loops  $\gamma_j$  in  $\mathbb{C} \setminus \{p_1, \dots, p_n\}$ , based at a point  $q$ , winding once positively around  $p_j$ , such that

$$\gamma_n * \dots * \gamma_1 = 1 \quad \text{in} \quad \pi_1(\mathbb{CP}^1 \setminus \{p_1, \dots, p_n\}, q).$$

We consider real analytic families of  $\Lambda \mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C})$ -connections

$$\nabla_t = d + \xi(t), \quad t \in [0, \varepsilon),$$

with  $\xi(0) = 0$  and

$$\xi(t) \in H^0(\mathbb{CP}^1, K(p_1 + \dots + p_n) \otimes \Lambda^{\geq -1} \mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C})).$$

Let

$$\rho_t: \pi_1(\mathbb{CP}^1 \setminus \{p_1, \dots, p_n\}, q) \rightarrow \Lambda \mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{C})$$

be its monodromy representation, and set  $M_j(t) := \rho_t(\gamma_j)$ . We define the logarithmic derivatives of the monodromy by

$$B_j(t) := M_j(t)^{-1} M_j'(t) \in \Lambda \mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C}), \quad j = 1, \dots, n.$$

Fix a small generic weight vector  $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)$ , and a stable strongly parabolic Higgs bundle with Higgs field  $\Phi \neq 0$  whose underlying holomorphic bundle is trivial. In particular, the quasi-parabolic lines  $\ell_1, \dots, \ell_n$  are fixed. Our goal is to construct a family  $\xi(t)$  as above such that the following conditions are satisfied:

- (i)  $B_j(t) \in \Lambda\mathfrak{U}$  for all  $j = 1, \dots, n$ ;
- (ii)  $\xi_{-1}(t) = \text{Res}_{\lambda=0}\xi(t) = t\Phi$ , with fixed quasi-parabolic lines  $\ell_j$ ;
- (iii)  $\det\left(\frac{1}{t}\text{Res}_{p_j}\xi(t)\right) = -\alpha_j^2$  for all  $j = 1, \dots, n$  and all  $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}^*$ .

We refer to this system of conditions as the *monodromy problem*.

*Remark 4.4.* Using  $\xi = \sum_{k \geq -1} \xi^{(k)} \lambda^k$  together with (iii), the eigenline of  $\text{Res}_{p_j}\xi(t)$  with respect to the eigenvalue  $t\alpha$  extends to  $\lambda = 0$ . We call this the induced quasi-parabolic line of  $d + \xi(t)$  at  $\lambda = 0$ .

The quasi-parabolic line  $\ell_j$  at  $p_j$  induced by  $d + \xi(t)$  at  $\lambda = 0$  is given by

$$\ell_j = \ker(\text{Res}_{p_j} \Phi),$$

whenever  $\text{Res}_{p_j} \Phi \neq 0$ . In this situation, the quasi-parabolic line  $\ell_j$  is independent of  $t$ , since  $\xi_{-1}(t) = t\Phi$ .

**4.2. Solving the monodromy problem.** We first address condition (ii) in the monodromy problem. Let  $(v, w) \in \mathcal{X}^\alpha$  correspond to the strongly parabolic Higgs field  $\Phi$  via Proposition 3.10. For  $j = 1, \dots, n$  let  $\mathfrak{A}_j = \mathfrak{A}(v_j, w_j)$  be as in (15). By Proposition 3.6 and stability of  $\Phi$ , we may assume (after  $\text{SL}(2, \mathbb{C})$ -conjugation) that all moment map conditions for the hyperpolygon are solved, i.e.

$$\sum_{j=1}^n \mathfrak{A}_j = 0,$$

and define

$$(20) \quad \underline{\xi} := \sum_{j=1}^n \mathfrak{A}_j \frac{dz}{z - p_j}.$$

Consider the ansatz

$$(21) \quad \xi(t) = t(\underline{\xi} + \hat{\xi}(t)),$$

where  $\hat{\xi}(t)$  is  $\Lambda^{\geq 0}\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C})$ -valued and satisfies  $\hat{\xi}(0) = 0$ . In particular, this means that the Higgs field of  $\xi(t)$  (determined by the residue at  $\lambda = 0$ ) is given by  $\underline{\xi}$ .

Write

$$(22) \quad \hat{\xi}(t) = \sum_{j=1}^n P_j(t) \frac{dz}{z - p_j}, \quad P_j(t) \in \Lambda^{\geq 0}\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C}).$$

For technical reasons, we initially allow  $\hat{\xi}(t)$  to have a simple pole at  $z = \infty \in \mathbb{CP}^1$ , i.e. we do not impose the condition  $\sum_j P_j(t) = 0$ . Although this might introduce a pole at infinity, the monodromy along the loops  $\gamma_j$  (which avoid  $\infty$ ) is still well defined and can be computed.

We next observe that the monodromy problem is solved at  $t = 0$ .

**Lemma 4.5.** *Let  $\xi(t)$  be given by (21), where  $\underline{\xi}$  is defined in (20) and  $\hat{\xi}(0) = 0$ . Then conditions (i), (ii), and (iii) of the monodromy problem are satisfied at  $t = 0$ .*

*Proof.* Condition (ii) holds by construction of  $\underline{\xi}$ , and condition (iii) follows from (15) (by analytic continuation to  $t = 0$ ). To verify (i), let  $\Psi_t$  be the solution of

$$d\Psi_t + \xi(t)\Psi_t = 0, \quad \Psi_t(q) = \text{Id}.$$

Then, for small  $t$  we expand using the assumption  $\hat{\xi}(0) = 0$

$$\Psi_t(z) = \text{Id} - t \int_q^z \underline{\xi} + O(t^2).$$

By the residue theorem we obtain

$$B_j(0) = -2\pi i \mathfrak{A}_j \in \Lambda \mathfrak{U},$$

which proves the claim.  $\square$

We now study the monodromy problem for  $t \neq 0$  sufficiently small. The strategy is to view conditions (i) and (iii) as a system of equations for the unknown correction term  $\hat{\xi}(t)$  and to solve this system by an implicit function theorem argument between the closed subspaces  $\Lambda \mathfrak{H} \cap \mathcal{K}_{\mathfrak{X}}$  and  $\Lambda^{\geq 0} \mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C})$  of the Banach space  $\Lambda \mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C})$ , (see Appendix A).

Condition (i) of the monodromy problem requires that

$$(23) \quad B_j(t) := M_j(t)^{-1} M'_j(t) \in \Lambda \mathfrak{U}, \quad j = 1, \dots, n.$$

Equivalently, this condition can be written as

$$(24) \quad (B_j(t))^* = B_j(t), \quad j = 1, \dots, n.$$

Similarly, condition (iii) prescribes the determinant of the residues of  $\xi(t)$ . Using (21) and (22), we compute

$$\frac{1}{t} \text{Res}_{p_j} \xi(t) = \mathfrak{A}_j + P_j(t),$$

where  $\mathfrak{A}_j$  are the residues of  $\underline{\xi}$ . Thus condition (iii) is equivalent to

$$(25) \quad \det(\mathfrak{A}_j + P_j(t)) = -\alpha_j^2, \quad j = 1, \dots, n,$$

for all  $t$ .

Equations (24) and (25) form a coupled system of nonlinear equations for the unknowns  $P_j(t)$ . By Lemma 4.5, this system is satisfied at  $t = 0$ . We now linearize it at  $t = 0$ .

Let  $\delta P_j \in \Lambda^{\geq 0} \mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C})$  denote variations of  $P_j$  at  $t = 0$ . Differentiating (23) at  $t = 0$  and using the computation of Lemma 4.5 yields

$$\delta B_j = -2\pi i \delta P_j.$$

Similarly, differentiating (25) gives

$$(26) \quad \text{tr}(\mathfrak{A}_j \delta P_j) = 0, \quad j = 1, \dots, n.$$

Consider the closed subspaces

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{K}_j &:= \ker (\delta P_j \in \Lambda \mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C}) \mapsto \mathrm{tr}(\mathfrak{A}_j \delta P_j) \in \Lambda \mathbb{C}) \\ \mathcal{K}_j^{\geq 0} &:= \ker (\delta P_j \in \Lambda^{\geq 0} \mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C}) \mapsto \mathrm{tr}(\mathfrak{A}_j \delta P_j) \in \Lambda^{\geq -1} \mathbb{C})\end{aligned}$$

of  $\Lambda^{\geq 0} \mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C})$ , and the real projection

$$\pi^{\mathfrak{H}}: \Lambda \mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C}) \rightarrow \Lambda \mathfrak{H}.$$

From (12) and Subsection 3.1.1 we know that the eigenline of  $\mathfrak{A}_j$  with respect to the eigenvalue  $\alpha_j > 0$  extends to  $\lambda = 0$ , and coincides with  $\ell_j$ . We define

$$\mathring{\mathcal{K}}_j^{\geq 0} := \{ \delta P_j \in \mathcal{K}_j^{\geq 0} \mid \delta P_j^{(0)}(\ell_j) \subset \ell_j \}$$

as those elements in  $\mathcal{K}_j^{\geq 0}$  which preserve  $\ell_j$ . Note that for  $\mathrm{Res}_{p_j} \Phi \neq 0$  we have

$$\mathring{\mathcal{K}}_j^{\geq 0} = \mathcal{K}_j^{\geq 0}$$

by Remark 4.4.

The key point is that the continuous linear map

$$(27) \quad (\delta P_1, \dots, \delta P_n) \in (\mathring{\mathcal{K}}_1^{\geq 0}, \dots, \mathring{\mathcal{K}}_n^{\geq 0}) \longmapsto (\pi^{\mathfrak{H}} \delta B_1, \dots, \pi^{\mathfrak{H}} \delta B_n) \in \Lambda \mathfrak{H}^n \cap (\mathcal{K}_1, \dots, \mathcal{K}_n)$$

is bijective (as  $\beta_j \neq 0$ ). This follows from Proposition A.1 in the Appendix A, applied pointwise to each residue (after appropriate  $\mathrm{SU}(2)$ -conjugation).

As a consequence, the linearization of the full monodromy problem at  $t = 0$  is an isomorphism between the relevant Banach spaces. The implicit function theorem therefore applies and yields the following result.

**Lemma 4.6.** *Let  $\underline{\xi}$  be given by (20). There exists  $\epsilon > 0$  such that for all  $t \in (-\epsilon, \epsilon)$  there is a unique real analytic family*

$$\hat{\xi}(t) = \sum_{j=1}^n P_j(t) \frac{dz}{z - p_j}, \quad P_j(t) \in \Lambda^{\geq 0} \mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C}),$$

with  $\hat{\xi}(0) = 0$ , satisfying conditions (i), (ii), and (iii) of the monodromy problem. The maps  $t \mapsto P_j(t)$  depend real analytically on  $t$  and on the initial data  $\underline{\xi}$ .

To obtain real holomorphic sections, the remaining condition is  $\sum_j P_j(t) = 0$ . This will be arranged in the next section.

**4.3. Construction of real holomorphic sections.** We now show that, for arbitrary initial data  $\underline{\xi}$ , the monodromy problem can be modified in such a way that the correction terms  $\bar{P}_j(t)$  satisfy an additional normalization condition. More precisely, we will arrange that

$$(28) \quad \sum_j P_j(t) \in \mathfrak{su}(2) \oplus \Lambda^+ \mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C}) \subset \Lambda^{\geq 0} \mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C})$$

for  $t$  sufficiently small. We then show that this condition implies  $\sum_j P_j(t) = 0$ .

To achieve this, we allow the Higgs field to vary with  $t$  within its  $\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{C})$ -orbit, with the variation chosen orthogonally to  $\mathfrak{su}(2)$  at  $t = 0$ . Equivalently, we allow a  $t$ -dependent conjugation of the residues  $\mathfrak{A}_j^{(-1)}$  by elements of  $\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{C})$ . Note that



conjugation by elements of  $\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{C}) \setminus \mathrm{SU}(2)$  does not change the gauge class of the underlying Higgs field, but modifies its representative

$$\sum_j \mathfrak{A}_j^{(-1)} \frac{dz}{z - p_j},$$

which is regular at  $z = \infty$ , in such a way that the matrix

$$0 \neq \sum_j \mathfrak{A}_j \in i\mathfrak{su}(2).$$

This observation indicates that the normalization condition (28) is attainable and motivates the following modified monodromy problem, where only condition (ii) is replaced by

- (iia) for all  $t$  sufficiently small, the residue  $\mathrm{Res}_{\lambda=0}\xi(t)$  lies in the  $\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{C})$ -orbit of the Higgs field  $t\Phi$ , and  $\mathrm{Res}_{p_j}\xi(t)$  induces the corresponding  $\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{C})$ -conjugated quasi-parabolic line at  $\lambda = 0$ .

As in Remark 4.4 above, the second condition in (iia) follows from the first condition in (iia) if  $\mathrm{Res}_{p_j}\Phi \neq 0$ .

**Lemma 4.7.** *The modified monodromy problem (i), (iia), and (iii) admits a solution such that*

$$(29) \quad \sum_j P_j \in \mathfrak{su}(2) \oplus \Lambda^+ \mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C}) \subset \Lambda^{\geq 0} \mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C}).$$

*The solution is unique up to (time-dependent) overall  $\mathrm{SU}(2)$ -conjugation, and can be chosen to depend real analytically on  $t$  and on  $\underline{\xi}$ .*

*Proof.* We must show that the infinitesimal action of  $i\mathfrak{su}(2)$  on the Higgs field produces precisely the  $i\mathfrak{su}(2)$ -part of the residue  $\sum_j P_j(t)$  at  $z = \infty$ .

Recall that the Higgs field and the zeroth-order components of  $\underline{\xi}$  are given by

$$(30) \quad \begin{aligned} \Phi &= \underline{\xi}^{(-1)} = \sum_j \nu_{\mathbb{C}}(v_j, w_j) \frac{dz}{z - p_j}, \\ \underline{\xi}^{(0)} &= -2i \sum_j \nu_I(v_j, w_j) \frac{dz}{z - p_j} \in i\mathfrak{su}(2). \end{aligned}$$

The infinitesimal action of  $\eta \in i\mathfrak{su}(2)$  on  $\Phi$  and  $\Phi^*$  is given by the commutator  $[\eta, \cdot]$ . Since both  $\Phi$  and  $\Phi^*$  have vanishing residue at  $z = \infty$  (by the assumption  $p_1, \dots, p_n \in \mathbb{C}$ ), this action does not produce any residue in the  $\lambda^{-1}$ - or  $\lambda$ -terms.

It therefore suffices to analyze the  $\lambda^0$ -component  $\underline{\xi}^{(0)}$ . Let  $v_j \in \mathbb{C}^2$ ,  $w_j \in (\mathbb{C}^2)^*$ , and let  $\eta \in i\mathfrak{su}(2)$ . A direct computation shows

$$(31) \quad \begin{aligned} \eta \cdot (v_j \otimes v_j^* - w_j^* \otimes w_j)_0 &= (\eta v_j \otimes v_j^* + v_j \otimes v_j^* \eta^\dagger + \eta^\dagger w_j^* \otimes w_j + w_j^* \otimes w_j \eta)_0 \\ &= (\eta v_j \otimes v_j^* + v_j \otimes v_j^* \eta + \eta w_j^* \otimes w_j + w_j^* \otimes w_j \eta)_0 \\ &= (|v_j|^2 + |w_j|^2) \eta, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\eta^\dagger = \bar{\eta}^T$ . Note that  $\mathrm{Res}_{p_j}\Phi = 0$  is equivalent to  $w_j = 0$ , but  $v_j \neq 0$  spans the quasi-parabolic line  $\ell_j$  as in Subsection 3.1.2. Thus  $\sum_j (|v_j|^2 + |w_j|^2) \neq 0$ , and the

infinitesimal action of  $i\mathfrak{su}(2)$  on  $\xi^{(0)}$  is a linear isomorphism onto  $i\mathfrak{su}(2)$ . Hence, by the implicit function theorem and the previous monodromy construction, we can uniquely solve for condition (iii). Clearly, (infinitesimal) conjugation does not change conditions (i) and (iii).  $\square$

**Lemma 4.8.** *Consider the solution  $\hat{\xi}(t)$  of the modified monodromy problem in Lemma 4.7 such that (29) holds. Then*

$$\sum_j P_j(t) = 0.$$

*Proof.* Consider the monodromy of  $d + \xi(t)$  based at  $q$  as a representation

$$\pi_1(\mathbb{CP}^1 \setminus \{p_1, \dots, p_n, \infty\}, q) \rightarrow \mathrm{ASL}(2, \mathbb{C})$$

of the  $(n+1)$ -punctured sphere. Let  $\gamma_\infty$  be a simple loop winding once around  $z = \infty$  and satisfying

$$\gamma_\infty * \gamma_n * \dots * \gamma_1 = 1.$$

We compute the corresponding logarithmic derivative  $B_\infty(t)$  in two ways. On the one hand, it is given by the logarithmic derivative of

$$M_\infty(t) = (M_n(t) M_{n-1}(t) \dots M_1(t))^{-1} \in \mathrm{ASL}(2, \mathbb{C}).$$

Since  $B_j(t) \in \Lambda\mathfrak{U}$  and  $M_j(0) = \mathrm{Id}$  for  $j = 1, \dots, n$ , we have  $M_j(t) \in \Lambda\mathfrak{U}$  for  $t$  sufficiently small. Hence  $M_\infty(t) \in \Lambda\mathfrak{U}$ , and therefore

$$B_\infty(t) \in \Lambda\mathfrak{U}.$$

On the other hand, we expand the residue at  $z = \infty$  in terms of  $t$  at  $t = 0$ :

$$\sum_j P_j(t) = \mathcal{C}^{(k)} t^k + o(t^k),$$

for some  $k \geq 1$  and some

$$\mathcal{C}^{(k)} \in \mathfrak{su}(2) \oplus \Lambda^+ \mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C})$$

by Lemma 4.7. Arguing as in the proof of Lemma 4.5 (by expanding the parallel frame  $\Psi_t$  solving  $d\Psi_t + \xi(t)\Psi_t = 0$  with  $\Psi_t(q) = \mathrm{Id}$  in  $t$ ), we obtain (for some  $k \geq 1$ )

$$B_\infty(t) = 2\pi i \mathcal{C}^{(k)} t^k + o(t^k).$$

Thus

$$2\pi i \mathcal{C}^{(k)} \in 2\pi i (\mathfrak{su}(2) \oplus \Lambda^+ \mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C})) \cap \Lambda\mathfrak{U} = \{0\},$$

and since  $B_\infty(t)$  is real analytic in  $t$ , we conclude that  $B_\infty(t) = 0$  for all  $t$  sufficiently small. Equivalently,

$$\sum_j P_j(t) = 0.$$

This completes the proof.  $\square$

*Remark 4.9* (Perturbed moment map). Let

$$\pi^{\mathfrak{h}}: \Lambda^{\geq 0} \mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C}) \rightarrow i\mathfrak{su}(2); \sum_{k \geq 0} x_k \lambda^k \mapsto \frac{1}{2}(x_0 + \bar{x}_0^T)$$

be the projection onto  $i\mathfrak{su}(2)$ . Identify strongly parabolic Higgs bundles with twistor lines (20) at  $t = 0$ . Consider the map

$$\nu_I(t): \mathcal{M}_{Higgs}(t\alpha) \rightarrow \mathfrak{su}(2); \underline{\xi} \mapsto -i \pi^{\mathfrak{h}} \left( \sum_j P_j(t) \right)$$

where  $P_1(t), \dots, P_n(t)$  are obtained from Lemma 4.6. By Lemma 4.7 and Lemma 4.8 (together with the uniqueness of the implicit function theorem) the map  $\nu_I(t)$  is equivariant and can be seen as the perturbation of the real moment map  $\nu_I$  for the  $SU(2)$ -action, see Subsection 3.1.1 and Remark 3.3.

**Theorem 4.10.** *Let  $\alpha$  be small and generic. Let  $(\mathcal{P}, \alpha, \Phi)$  be a stable strongly parabolic Higgs pair on  $(\mathbb{CP}^1, p_1 + \dots + p_n)$  with trivial underlying holomorphic bundle, and let  $\underline{\xi}$  be the associated initial  $\lambda$ -dependent 1-form defined in (20). Then there exists  $\epsilon > 0$  such that for all  $t \in (-\epsilon, \epsilon)$  there is a real analytic family*

$$\hat{\xi}(t) \in H^0(\mathbb{CP}^1, K(p_1 + \dots + p_n) \otimes \Lambda^{\geq 0} \mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C})), \quad \hat{\xi}(0) = 0,$$

with the following properties:

(i) *The connection*

$$d + t\underline{\xi} + t\hat{\xi}(t)$$

*represents the Higgs pair  $(\mathcal{P}, t\alpha, t\Phi)$  at  $\lambda = 0$ .*

(ii) *The monodromy of  $d + t\underline{\xi} + t\hat{\xi}(t)$ , based at  $q$ , satisfies*

$$B_j(t) = M_j^{-1}(t)M_j'(t) \in \Lambda\mathfrak{U} \quad \text{for all } j = 1, \dots, n,$$

*that is, the monodromy representation is  $\Lambda\mathfrak{U}$ -valued.*

(iii) *The residues satisfy*

$$\det \left( \frac{1}{t} \text{Res}_{p_j} (t\underline{\xi} + t\hat{\xi}(t)) \right) = -\alpha_j^2 \quad \text{for all } j = 1, \dots, n.$$

*The family  $\hat{\xi}(t)$  is unique up to  $t$ -dependent conjugation by  $SU(2)$ . Moreover,  $\hat{\xi}(t)$  can be chosen to depend locally real analytically on  $t$  and on the Higgs data  $(\Phi, \alpha)$ ; in particular, the existence interval can be chosen locally uniformly in  $(\Phi, \alpha)$ .*

*Proof.* Locally in the moduli space, we can normalize the Higgs field with respect to the  $SU(2)$ -freedom, for instance by fixing suitable non-vanishing residues. Under such a local normalization, the form  $\underline{\xi}$  depends real analytically on the Higgs field and on the weight vector  $\alpha$ , as long as  $\alpha$  does not cross stability walls. Moreover, under this normalization, the solution of the modified monodromy problem depends real analytically on  $t$  and on  $\underline{\xi}$ , which proves the theorem.  $\square$

This completes the analytic construction of real holomorphic sections; the next task is to identify these sections as genuine twistor lines. In view of the hyperpolygon interpretation discussed after Theorem 3.9, the result can be viewed as a deformation of hyperpolygon twistor lines for small weights.

**4.4. Twistor lines.** In this subsection we show that the  $\Lambda^{\geq -1}\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C})$ -connections  $d + t\underline{\xi} + t\hat{\xi}(t)$  constructed in Theorem 4.10 give rise to twistor lines in the parabolic Deligne–Hitchin moduli space corresponding to the parabolic weight vector  $t\alpha$ . We first show that  $d + t\underline{\xi} + t\hat{\xi}(t)$  defines a real holomorphic section.

**Lemma 4.11.** *Let  $\alpha$  be a generic weight vector. Let  $t > 0$  be sufficiently small, and let  $d + t\underline{\xi} + t\hat{\xi}(t)$  be as constructed in Theorem 4.10. Then there exists a real holomorphic section  $s$  of the parabolic Deligne–Hitchin moduli space  $\mathcal{M}_{\text{DH}}^{\text{par}}(\alpha)$  such that, for all  $\lambda$  with  $|\lambda| \leq 1$ , the trivial holomorphic bundle together with the logarithmic  $\lambda$ -connection*

$$D_\lambda := \lambda(\partial + t\underline{\xi} + t\hat{\xi}(t))$$

*represents a point  $s(\lambda) \in \pi^{-1}(\lambda) \subset \mathcal{M}_{\text{DH}}^{\text{par}}(\alpha)$ .*

*Proof.* First note that, by construction,  $\lambda t(\underline{\xi} + \hat{\xi}(t))$  extends holomorphically to  $\lambda = 0$  and gives rise to a stable strongly parabolic Higgs field by condition (i) in Theorem 4.10. Moreover, by condition (iii) in the same theorem,  $d + t\underline{\xi} + t\hat{\xi}(t)$  defines a parabolic  $\lambda$ -connection corresponding to the weight vector  $\alpha$  for all  $\lambda$  in an open neighbourhood  $U$  of the closed unit disc. We therefore obtain a holomorphic section  $s$  of  $\mathcal{M}_{\text{DH}}^{\text{par}}(\alpha)$  over  $U$ .

By condition (ii), the monodromy of  $d + t\underline{\xi} + t\hat{\xi}(t)$  based at  $q$  is  $\Lambda\mathcal{U}$ -valued. In particular, for all  $\lambda \in S^1$  we have

$$\tau(s(-\bar{\lambda}^{-1})) = s(\lambda),$$

see Section 2.3. Hence, by Schwarz reflection,  $s$  extends to a global holomorphic section of  $\mathcal{M}_{\text{DH}}^{\text{par}}(\alpha) \rightarrow \mathbb{CP}^1$  which is real by construction.  $\square$

The real holomorphic sections constructed in Lemma 4.11 are in fact twistor lines. To see this, we need a few preparatory results.

*Harmonic maps.* The relation between harmonic maps to hyperbolic 3-space and solutions of Hitchin’s self-duality equations is classical [18]. For further details, see [47, Section 3.2] or [6, Section 2.5]. Let  $\Sigma$  be a Riemann surface, and let  $h$  be a Hermitian metric on a holomorphic rank 2 vector bundle  $V \rightarrow \Sigma$  with trivial determinant. Let  $D_h$  be the Chern connection associated to  $h$  and  $V$ , and let  $\Phi^*$  denote the adjoint of a Higgs field  $\Phi$  with respect to  $h$ . Assume that  $D_h + \Phi + \Phi^*$  is flat, i.e. that  $(V, h, \Phi)$  is a solution of Hitchin’s self-duality equations. In particular,  $D_h - \Phi - \Phi^*$  is also flat, and the corresponding monodromy representations are complex-conjugate contragredient representations of each other.

Consider parallel frames  $F_\pm$  with respect to  $D_h \pm \Phi \pm \Phi^*$ , normalized by  $F_\pm(q) = \text{Id}$  at a fixed base point  $q \in \Sigma$ . Then

$$(32) \quad f = F_-^{-1}F_+ = \bar{F}_+^T F_+ : \tilde{\Sigma} \rightarrow \mathbb{H}^3 \cong \{f \in \text{SL}(2, \mathbb{C}) \cap i\mathfrak{su}(2) \mid f > 0\}$$

defines an equivariant harmonic map to hyperbolic 3-space. Here, hyperbolic 3-space is identified with the space of positive definite Hermitian matrices of determinant 1.

4.4.1. *Loop group factorization method.* The loop group factorization method was introduced for harmonic maps from simply connected surfaces into compact symmetric spaces by [19]. See [29] for details in the case of equivariant harmonic maps to  $\mathbb{H}^3$  from surfaces with non-trivial topology.

Consider  $\eta \in H^0(\Sigma, K \otimes \Lambda^{\geq -1} \mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C}))$ , and let  $\Psi$  be a solution of

$$d\Psi + \eta\Psi = 0, \quad \Psi(q) = \text{Id}.$$

In general,  $\Psi$  may have non-trivial monodromy and is therefore well defined only on the universal cover  $\tilde{\Sigma}$ . Assume that the Iwasawa decomposition

$$\Psi(z) = B(z)F(z), \quad B(z) \in \Lambda_B^+ \text{SL}(2, \mathbb{C}), \quad F(z) \in \Lambda\mathcal{U},$$

exists for all  $z \in \tilde{\Sigma}$ . Furthermore, assume that the monodromy of  $\Psi$  based at  $q$  is contained in  $\Lambda\mathcal{U}$ . Then the uniqueness of the Iwasawa decomposition implies that the monodromy of  $B$  based at  $q$  (and hence everywhere) is trivial.

Moreover,

$$(d + \eta).B = dF.F^{-1} \in \Omega^1(\Sigma, \Lambda\mathcal{U})$$

is well-defined on  $\Sigma$ . Using that  $B$  extends holomorphically to  $\lambda = 0$ , and comparing the left-hand side and the right-hand side of the above equation, shows that  $(d + \eta).B$  has the form of the associated family of flat connections  $\nabla_\lambda$  as in (6).

Finally,  $F_\pm := F(\lambda = \pm 1)$  are parallel frames for  $\nabla_{\pm 1}$ , and (32) yields an (equivariant) harmonic map to hyperbolic 3-space.

4.4.2. *Tameness.* Let  $\alpha > 0$  and fix an  $\text{SL}(2, \mathbb{C})$ -frame  $(e_1, e_2)$ . The Hermitian metric

$$h_{\text{mod}}(z) = \begin{pmatrix} (z\bar{z})^\alpha & 0 \\ 0 & (z\bar{z})^{-\alpha} \end{pmatrix}$$

is called the *model metric* with respect to the weight  $\alpha$  and the complex line  $\ell := \mathbb{C}e_1$ .

Following [51], a map

$$h: \mathbb{D} \setminus \{0\} \longrightarrow \mathbb{H}^3$$

is called *tame* at 0 with respect to the weight  $\alpha > 0$  and the complex line  $\ell \subset \mathbb{C}^2$  if its hyperbolic distance to the corresponding model metric is bounded, i.e. if there exists  $C > 0$  such that

$$d^{\text{hyp}}(h(z), h_{\text{mod}}(z)) < C \quad \text{for all } z \in \mathbb{D} \setminus \{0\}.$$

*Remark 4.12.* Note that tameness of  $h$  is not measured with respect to a parallel frame, but rather with respect to a frame of the underlying holomorphic bundle. However, in the case of a solution of Hitchin's equations, we will also call the induced equivariant harmonic map  $f$  a *tame harmonic map*.

**Proposition 4.13.** *Let  $(E, \Phi)$  be a rank 2 strongly parabolic Higgs bundle on the disc  $\mathbb{D}$  with parabolic weight  $0 < \alpha < \frac{1}{2}$  at  $p \in \mathbb{D}$ . Let  $h$  be a Hermitian metric on  $E|_{\mathbb{D} \setminus \{p\}}$  solving Hitchin's equations. Denote by  $f$  the equivariant harmonic map associated to the solution of the self-duality equations. Then  $h$  is tame at  $p$  if and only if  $f$  is bounded near  $p$ .*

*Proof.* This follows from [51, Section 7], since the residue of the Higgs field is nilpotent. For rational weights, this also follows from [46], as the harmonic map lifts to an equivariant harmonic map with rotational symmetry on the covering.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.14** (Model solution at one puncture). *Let  $0 < \alpha < \frac{1}{2}$ ,  $\beta \in \mathbb{C}$ , and set  $\mu = i\sqrt{\alpha^2 + \beta\bar{\beta}}$ . Consider*

$$(33) \quad \mathfrak{X} = \lambda^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \beta \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} \mu & 0 \\ 0 & -\mu \end{pmatrix} + \lambda \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ \bar{\beta} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \in \Lambda\mathcal{U},$$

*and define  $\eta = A \frac{dz}{z}$  with  $A := -i\mathfrak{X}$ . Then the monodromy of  $\eta$  has values in  $\Lambda\mathcal{U}$ , and the parallel frame  $\Psi$  of  $d+\eta$  admits an Iwasawa decomposition for all  $z \in \mathbb{D} \setminus \{0\}$ . The corresponding equivariant harmonic map is tame, and constant if  $\beta = 0$ .*

*Proof.* On the universal cover, a solution of the parallel frame equation is given by

$$\Psi(z) = \exp(-A \log z),$$

with monodromy around  $z = 0$  given by

$$\exp(2\pi i A) \in \Lambda\mathcal{U}.$$

That the Iwasawa decomposition exists for all  $z \in \mathbb{D} \setminus \{0\}$  follows from Example 4.3 as follows. It works completely analogous to the proof of Proposition 19 in [16]. Using the  $S^1$ -action (by rotation in the loop parameter  $\lambda$ ), we may assume without loss of generality that  $\beta > 0$ . Writing  $z = xe^{i\varphi}$  with  $x > 0$  and  $\varphi \in \mathbb{R}$ , we obtain the Iwasawa decomposition of  $\Psi$  to be

$$(34) \quad \Psi(z) = \exp(-A \log x) \exp(-iA\varphi) = B(x)(F(x) \exp(-iA\varphi)),$$

for  $F(x) \in \Lambda\mathcal{U}$ ,  $B(x) \in \Lambda^{\geq 0}\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{C})$  are given in Example 4.3, and  $\exp(-iA\varphi) \in \Lambda\mathcal{U}$ .

Using this explicit factorization (34) together with the Sym–Bobenko formula (32), one checks directly that the corresponding equivariant harmonic map  $f$  is bounded near  $z = 0$ . We omit the details. If  $\beta = 0$ ,  $\mathfrak{X}$  and hence  $\Psi$  are independent of  $\lambda$ . Hence, (32) gives a constant map.  $\square$

**Theorem 4.15.** *Let  $\alpha$  be generic and let  $t > 0$  be sufficiently small. Let  $s$  be the real holomorphic section of the parabolic Deligne–Hitchin moduli space  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{DH}}^{\mathrm{par}}(t\alpha)$  constructed in Lemma 4.11. Then  $s$  is a twistor line.*

*Proof.* Let  $t > 0$ . By the previous discussion, the real holomorphic section  $s$  of  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{DH}}^{\mathrm{par}}(t\alpha)$  given by  $d + t\underline{\xi} + t\hat{\xi}(t)$  is a twistor line if and only if the following two conditions are satisfied:

- (1) There exists a well-defined gauge transformation

$$B = B_t: \mathbb{CP}^1 \setminus \{p_1, \dots, p_n\} \rightarrow \Lambda^{\geq 0}\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{C})$$

such that

$$(d + t\underline{\xi} + t\hat{\xi}(t)).B =: d + \omega \quad \text{with} \quad \omega \in \Omega^1(\mathbb{CP}^1 \setminus \{p_1, \dots, p_n\}, \Lambda\mathcal{U}).$$

In this case,  $d + \omega$  has the form of an associated family of flat connections  $\nabla_\lambda$  as in (6).

- (2) The equivariant harmonic map obtained via (32) is bounded in a neighbourhood of each  $p_j$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, n$ .

For (1), consider a solution of

$$d\Psi_t + (t\xi + t\hat{\xi}(t))\Psi_t = 0, \quad \Psi_t(q) = \text{Id},$$

where  $q \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{p_1, \dots, p_n\}$  is the base point of the fundamental group, as in Theorem 4.10. On compact subsets  $\tilde{K}$  of the universal covering of  $\mathbb{CP}^1 \setminus \{p_1, \dots, p_n\}$ , we have the uniform expansion

$$\Psi_t = \text{Id} + O(t).$$

Since the Iwasawa decomposition exists on an open subset of  $\Lambda\text{SL}(2, \mathbb{C})$  containing the identity, there exists  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that the Iwasawa decomposition of  $\Psi_t(z)$  exists for all  $0 \leq t < \varepsilon$  and all  $z \in \tilde{K}$ . After possibly choosing  $\varepsilon$  smaller, we may assume without loss of generality that  $\tilde{K}$  contains the endpoints of the lifts of the generators  $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n$  of the fundamental group, all starting at the base point  $q$ . Since the monodromy of  $\Psi_t$  is contained in  $\Lambda\mathcal{U}$  by construction, uniqueness of the Iwasawa decomposition implies that the positive factor  $B_t$  has trivial monodromy. In particular, the positive part of the factorization is well defined on the image  $K \subset \mathbb{CP}^1 \setminus \{p_1, \dots, p_n\}$  of  $\tilde{K}$  under the covering map.

Next, we analyze the factorization of  $\Psi_t$  near a singular point  $p_j$ . For  $t$  sufficiently small and around  $p_j$  fixed, the difference between  $\Psi_t$  and the solution for a single puncture, see Lemma 4.14, can be uniformly controlled by Grönwall inequality. (The details are completely analogous to the proof of Lemma 24 in [16] and will be omitted here.) Using again that the Iwasawa decomposition exists on an open subset of  $\Lambda\text{SL}(2, \mathbb{C})$ , together with the fact that the Iwasawa decomposition  $\Psi_t = B_t F_t$  exists for solutions with a single puncture by Lemma 4.14, we obtain that, for  $t$  sufficiently small, the Iwasawa decomposition exists on the entire universal covering of  $\mathbb{CP}^1 \setminus \{p_1, \dots, p_n\}$ . As a consequence,  $B = B_t$  is well defined on  $\mathbb{CP}^1 \setminus \{p_1, \dots, p_n\}$ , and

$$(d + t\xi + t\hat{\xi}(t)).B_t = dF_t.F_t^{-1} \in \Omega^1(\mathbb{CP}^1 \setminus \{p_1, \dots, p_n\}, \Lambda\mathcal{U}).$$

For point (2), we first note that  $F_t$  depends continuously on  $t$  and is (uniformly) close to the unitary part of the factorization (19) used in Lemma 4.14. Thus, by Lemma 4.14 together with (32) implies that the corresponding harmonic map is bounded, i.e. the metric is tame. This completes the proof.  $\square$

## 5. THE SEMICLASSICAL LIMIT OF THE HITCHIN METRIC

The aim of this section is to describe the semiclassical limit of the Hitchin metric on moduli spaces of strongly parabolic Higgs bundles as the parabolic weights  $t\alpha$  tend to zero. More precisely, we show that, after restricting to energy sublevel sets of order  $Ct$  and rescaling the metric by  $t^{-1}$ , the Hitchin metric converges to the hyperkähler metric on the corresponding hyperpolygon space. This comparison is carried out via the degeneration of the associated twistor lines constructed in Section 4.

**5.1. Energy.** Fix a generic and small weight vector  $\alpha$  and a constant  $C > 0$ . Let  $\mathcal{M}_{\text{Higgs}}(\alpha)$  be the moduli space of rank 2 stable strongly parabolic Higgs bundles with parabolic weights  $\alpha$ , equipped with the Hitchin hyperkähler metric  $g^{\text{Hit}}$ , and let

$$\mathcal{E}: \mathcal{M}_{\text{Higgs}}(\alpha) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}; (\mathcal{P}, \Phi) \mapsto 2i \int_{\mathbb{CP}^1} \text{tr}(\Phi \wedge \Phi^*)$$

denote the harmonic map energy.

To compute the energy on a  $n$ -punctured sphere, we first give the contribution of each puncture. Let

$$A = \sum_{k \geq -1} A_k \lambda^k = \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & -a \end{pmatrix} \in \Lambda^{\geq -1} \mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C})$$

such that  $\det(A) = -\alpha_0^2$  for some  $\alpha_0 > 0$ . Write

$$a = \sum_{k \geq -1} a_k \lambda^k, \quad b = \sum_{k \geq -1} b_k \lambda^k, \quad c = \sum_{k \geq -1} c_k \lambda^k.$$

Then

$$(35) \quad a_{-1}^2 + b_{-1}c_{-1} = 0 = 2a_0a_{-1} + b_0c_{-1} + b_{-1}c_0.$$

Motivated by [29, (110)], see also [12, Section 5], we define

$$E(A) := \begin{cases} -\alpha_0 + a_0 + b_0 \frac{c_{-1}}{a_{-1}} & \text{if } a_{-1} \neq 0, \\ -\alpha_0 + a_0 - b_0 \frac{a_{-1}}{b_{-1}} & \text{if } b_{-1} \neq 0, \\ -\alpha_0 - a_0 + c_0 \frac{a_{-1}}{c_{-1}} & \text{if } c_{-1} \neq 0, \\ 0 & \text{if } a_{-1} = b_{-1} = c_{-1} = 0. \end{cases}$$

By (35), the different expressions for  $E(A)$  coincide in the generic case  $a_{-1}b_{-1}c_{-1} \neq 0$ . In fact, if  $A_{-1} \neq 0$ , there exist  $0 \neq v \in \mathbb{C}^2$  and  $0 \neq w \in (\mathbb{C}^2)^*$  with  $w(v) = 0$  such that  $A_{-1} = v \otimes w$ . In this case,

$$E(A) = -\alpha_0 + w(A_0 v).$$

Moreover, for all  $g \in \mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{C})$ ,

$$E(g^{-1}Ag) = E(A).$$

Finally, for  $\mathfrak{A}$  as in (12) with  $x, y$  from (11) and  $\det(\mathfrak{A}) = -\alpha_0^2$ , we obtain

$$(36) \quad E(\mathfrak{A}) = |x|^2 + |y|^2,$$

which is the standard energy of the Eguchi–Hanson space.

**Proposition 5.1.** *Let  $s$  be a twistor line in  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{DH}}^{\mathrm{par}}(t\alpha)$  given by a Fuchsian system  $d + t\xi + t\hat{\xi}(t)$  as in Theorem 4.15, with residues  $A_j \in \Lambda^{\geq -1} \mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C})$  at its singular points  $p_1, \dots, p_n$ . Then*

$$\mathcal{E}(s) = \sum_j E(A_j).$$

*Proof.* If the weight vector is rational,  $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n) \in \mathbb{Q}^n$ , let  $k > 0$  be the smallest positive integer such that  $k\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ . Consider a branched covering  $\Sigma_k \rightarrow \mathbb{CP}^1$  of degree  $k$  which is totally branched at  $p_1, \dots, p_n$ . Then the pullback of  $s$  to  $\Sigma_k$  gives rise to a smooth solution of Hitchin's self-duality equations on  $\Sigma_k$ ; see [46] or [29, Section 3.2.1] for details. The solution upstairs has  $k$  times the energy of the solution downstairs. As in [29, Section 6.4] or [28, Corollary 18], the energy of the smooth solution on  $\Sigma_k$  can be computed in terms of residues, and the statement follows along the same lines.



For small generic weights, we approximate solutions by solutions with rational weights. Since the solutions depend real analytically on the initial data [34], the result follows by continuity.  $\square$

*Remark 5.2.* Proposition 5.1 shows that on twistor lines the Hitchin Hamiltonian  $\mathcal{E}$  admits a description in terms of the residue data. By (36), after rescaling by  $t^{-1}$ , the Hitchin energy reduces in the limit  $t \rightarrow 0$  to the classical Hamiltonian of rotational  $S^1$ -action on the hyperpolygon space, and is there a Kähler potential for the complex structure  $J$ . In this sense, the hyperpolygon Hamiltonian appears as the *semiclassical Hamiltonian* governing the low-energy regime of the Hitchin metric.

**5.2. The Hyperkähler metrics.** We now introduce the low-energy subsets and the natural identifications needed to compare the Hitchin and hyperpolygon hyperkähler metrics.

For  $\alpha$  small let  $\mathcal{X}_\alpha$  be the hyperpolygon space with weight  $\alpha$ , endowed with its hyperkähler metric  $g^{HP}$  and energy function

$$\mathcal{E}_{HP}: \mathcal{X}_\alpha \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, \quad \mathcal{X}_\alpha^{\leq C} := \{x \in \mathcal{X}_\alpha : \mathcal{E}_{HP}(x) \leq C\}.$$

Let

$$\mathcal{M}_{Higgs}(t\alpha)_{\leq Ct} := \{(\mathcal{P}, \Phi) \in \mathcal{M}_{Higgs}(t\alpha) : \mathcal{E}_t(\mathcal{P}, \Phi) \leq Ct\}$$

and let  $\mathcal{H}_{Higgs}(t\alpha)$  denote the subset of parabolic Higgs bundles on the trivial holomorphic bundle. By [42] (see Remark 3.12 or also [31, Proposition 7.1] for the case of compact Riemann surfaces or [29, Section 6.6] for the case of the 4-punctured sphere) there exist for any small  $\alpha$  and  $C > 0$  some  $\epsilon > 0$  such that for all  $0 < t < \epsilon$

$$(37) \quad \mathcal{M}_{Higgs}(t\alpha)_{\leq Ct} \subset \mathcal{H}_{Higgs}(t\alpha).$$

Let

$$\Psi_\alpha: \mathcal{X}_\alpha \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathcal{H}_{Higgs}(\alpha) \subset \mathcal{M}_{Higgs}(\alpha)$$

be the natural isomorphism of Godinho–Mandini; see Theorem 3.11. For small  $\alpha$ , stability does not depend on scaling the weights by a positive real factor  $0 < t \leq 1$ .

For  $0 < t \leq 1$ , we define the biholomorphic map

$$\varphi_t: \mathcal{H}_{Higgs}(\alpha) \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathcal{H}_{Higgs}(t\alpha), \quad (\mathcal{P}, \alpha, \Phi) \mapsto (\mathcal{P}, t\alpha, t\Phi).$$

Here  $\mathcal{P}$  denotes the quasi-parabolic structure, i.e. the collection of quasi-parabolic lines up to overall conjugation. Moreover, for the natural holomorphic symplectic form  $\Omega_\alpha$  on  $\mathcal{H}_{Higgs}(t\alpha)$  we have

$$\varphi_t^* \Omega_{t\alpha} = t \Omega_\alpha.$$

Finally, we set

$$\Gamma_t := \varphi_t \circ \Psi_\alpha: \mathcal{X}_\alpha \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathcal{H}_{Higgs}(t\alpha).$$

We can now state and prove our main theorem:

**Theorem 5.3.** *Let  $\alpha$  be generic and small, and let  $C > 0$  be a regular value of the hyperpolygon energy  $\mathcal{E}_{HP}$ . Then for all sufficiently small  $t > 0$  the value  $tC$  is a regular value of  $\mathcal{E}_t$ , and the hypersurfaces*

$$\Gamma_t^{-1}(\mathcal{E}_t^{-1}(tC)) \subset \mathcal{X}_\alpha$$

*converge real analytically to  $\mathcal{E}_{HP}^{-1}(C)$  as embedded submanifolds. In particular, the domains*

$$\Gamma_t^{-1}(\mathcal{M}_{Higgs}(t\alpha)_{\leq tC}) \subset \mathcal{X}_\alpha$$

*converge to  $\mathcal{X}_\alpha^{\leq C}$  as domains with smooth boundary.*

*Moreover, on every compact subset of  $\mathcal{X}_\alpha^{\leq C}$  the rescaled metrics  $t^{-1}\Gamma_t^*g_t^{Hit}$  converge real analytically to the hyperpolygon hyperkähler metric  $g^{HP}$ .*

In particular, the convergence in Theorem 5.3 implies  $C^\infty$  Cheeger–Gromov convergence [17] on shrinking compact sets.

*Proof.* The first claim follows from the existence of twistor lines for  $t > 0$  (Theorem 4.15) together with their limiting behaviour as  $t \rightarrow 0$  (Theorem 4.10), and the energy identity (36) combined with Proposition 5.1. The real-analytic convergence follows from the real-analytic dependence of the twistor lines and of the twisted-holomorphic symplectic form on the parameter  $t$ .

The second claim follows similarly, using Theorem 3.9 and (9) together with (10) as well as Theorems 4.10 and 4.15.  $\square$

**5.3. Higher order expansion of the Hitchin metric.** Completely analogous to [29], one can compute the Taylor expansion of the hyperkähler metric coefficients in the deformation parameter  $t$  at  $t = 0$ . Indeed, expanding the associated family of flat  $\lambda$ -connections with respect to  $t$  yields an iterative system determining the coefficients of the connection 1-forms. At each order, these coefficients solve a finite-dimensional linear problem. The dimension of the linear system for the  $k$ -th order terms grows linearly in  $k$ . Both the linear system and its solutions are expressed explicitly in terms of the initial hyperpolygon/Higgs data  $\underline{\xi}$  and iterated integrals of logarithmic 1-forms on the  $n$ -punctured sphere. Equivalently, the Taylor coefficients of the twisted holomorphic symplectic form—and hence of the hyperkähler metric—can be written in terms of multiple polylogarithms of increasing depth and weight. The details are as in [29, Section 7] for the case of the four-punctured sphere with equal weights.

**Theorem 5.4** (Higher order expansion of the Hitchin metric). *Let  $\alpha$  be small and generic. For every  $C > 0$  there exists  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that the Hitchin hyperkähler metric  $g_t$  on  $\mathcal{M}_{Higgs}(t\alpha)_{\leq tC}$  admits a convergent expansion*

$$g_t = t \left( g^{HP} + \sum_{k \geq 1} t^k g^{(k)} \right) \quad \text{for } 0 < t < \varepsilon,$$

*where  $g^{HP}$  is the hyperkähler metric on the hyperpolygon space  $\mathcal{X}_\alpha$ .*

Moreover, for each  $k \geq 1$ , the coefficient  $g^{(k)}$  can be written explicitly in terms of iterated integrals of logarithmic 1-forms on the  $n$ -punctured sphere and the coefficients of  $\underline{\xi} \in \mathcal{X}_\alpha$ , i.e. the coefficients of  $g^{(k)}$  are given by explicit combinations of multiple polylogarithms of depth and weight at most  $k + 1$ .

In particular, this provides an effective algorithm for computing arbitrarily high order corrections to the hyperkähler metric in the small-weight regime.

## APPENDIX A. LOOP ALGEBRA LEMMAS

This appendix collects the loop-algebraic linear results needed to solve the monodromy problem in Section 4.

Let  $\mathfrak{X} \in \Lambda\mathfrak{U}$  be as in (33), and define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{K}_\mathfrak{X} &:= \{C \in \Lambda\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C}) \mid \text{tr}(\mathfrak{X}C) = 0\}, \quad \mathcal{K}_\mathfrak{X}^{\geq 0} := \mathcal{K}_\mathfrak{X} \cap \Lambda^{\geq 0}\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C}), \\ \mathring{\mathcal{K}}_\mathfrak{X}^{\geq 0} &:= \{C = \sum_{k \geq 0} C^{(k)} \lambda^k \in \mathcal{K}_\mathfrak{X}^{\geq 0} \mid C^{(0)} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \subset \mathbb{C} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}\}. \end{aligned}$$

$\mathcal{K}_\mathfrak{X}$ ,  $\mathcal{K}_\mathfrak{X}^{\geq 0}$  and  $\mathring{\mathcal{K}}_\mathfrak{X}^{\geq 0}$  are closed subspaces of  $\Lambda\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C})$ .

**Proposition A.1.** *Let  $\pi^\mathfrak{H}$  be the orthogonal projection onto  $\mathfrak{H} \subset \Lambda\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C})$ . Then,*

$$\pi^\mathfrak{H}: \mathcal{K}_\mathfrak{X}^{\geq 0} \rightarrow \Lambda\mathfrak{H} \cap \mathcal{K}_\mathfrak{X}$$

*is an isomorphism between real Banach spaces.*

*Proof.* Since the projection  $\pi^\mathfrak{H}$  is continuous, we only need to show bijectivity. Note that

$$\Lambda\mathfrak{U} \cap \Lambda^{\geq 0}\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C}) = \mathfrak{su}(2)$$

Thus, for  $\beta \neq 0$ , injectivity follows from  $\mathfrak{su}(2) \cap \mathcal{K}_\mathfrak{X} = \{0\}$ . If  $\beta = 0$ ,

$$\mathfrak{su}(2) \cap \mathcal{K}_\mathfrak{X} = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \gamma \\ -\bar{\gamma} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \mid \gamma \in \mathbb{C} \right\}$$

and therefore  $\Lambda\mathfrak{U} \cap \mathring{\mathcal{K}}_\mathfrak{X} = \{0\}$  implies injectivity.

The proof of surjectivity is given in Lemma A.4 below.  $\square$

We first establish some elementary lemmas.

**Lemma A.2.** *For every  $Y \in \mathcal{K}_\mathfrak{X}$  there exists  $\hat{Y} \in \Lambda\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C})$  such that*

$$Y = [\mathfrak{X}, \hat{Y}].$$

*Moreover,  $\hat{Y}$  is unique up to adding  $f\mathfrak{X}$ , where  $f: S^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  is real analytic. The map  $Y \mapsto \hat{Y}$  can be chosen to be linear and continuous.*

*Proof.* Uniqueness up to adding  $f\mathfrak{X}$  is immediate, since  $\mathfrak{X}$  is non-vanishing on  $S^1$ , and the corresponding statement holds in  $\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C})$ . For existence, consider the operator

$$(38) \quad \mathcal{D}: \Lambda\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C}) \rightarrow \Lambda\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C}), \quad Y \mapsto D^{-1}YD,$$

where  $D = \text{diag}(1, \lambda)$ . Clearly,  $\mathcal{D}(YZ) = (\mathcal{D}Y)(\mathcal{D}Z)$  and  $\mathcal{D}[Y, Z] = [\mathcal{D}Y, \mathcal{D}Z]$ . Furthermore,  $\mathcal{D}\mathfrak{X} \in \mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C})$  is independent of  $\lambda$  by construction. Writing  $\mathcal{D}Y = \sum_k c_k \lambda^k$ , we solve for each coefficient  $c_k = [\mathcal{D}\mathfrak{X}, \hat{c}_k]$ , to obtain the result.  $\square$

**Lemma A.3.** *Let  $\mathfrak{X} \in \Lambda\mathfrak{U}$  be as above, and let  $Y = [\mathfrak{X}, \hat{Y}] \in \mathcal{K}_{\mathfrak{X}}$ . Then, the respective unitary and hermitian parts satisfy*

$$Y^u = [\mathfrak{X}, \hat{Y}^u] \quad \text{and} \quad Y^h = [\mathfrak{X}, \hat{Y}^h].$$

*Proof.* This is a direct consequence of (16) and  $\mathfrak{X}^* = \mathfrak{X}$ .  $\square$

**Lemma A.4.** *Let  $\mathfrak{X} \in \Lambda\mathfrak{U}$  be as above, and let  $H \in \mathcal{K}_{\mathfrak{X}} \cap \Lambda\mathfrak{H}$ . Then there exists*

$$P \in \mathring{\mathcal{K}}_{\mathfrak{X}}^{\geq 0}$$

*such that*

$$\pi^{\mathfrak{H}} P = H.$$

*Proof.* By Lemma A.2 and Lemma A.3 we can write  $H = [X, \hat{H}]$  for some  $\hat{H} \in \Lambda\mathfrak{H}$ . Decompose  $\hat{H} = \hat{H}^- + \hat{H}^0 + \hat{H}^+$ .

Then  $(\hat{H}^0)^* = -\hat{H}^0$ , i.e.  $\hat{H}^0 \in i\mathfrak{su}(2)$ , and  $\hat{H}^+ = -(\hat{H}^-)^*$ . Define  $\hat{P}^+ := \hat{H}^+$ .

Then

$$[\mathfrak{X}, \hat{P}^+] \in \Lambda^{\geq 0}\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C})$$

and

$$\pi^{\mathfrak{H}}[\mathfrak{X}, \hat{P}^+] = [\mathfrak{X}, \pi^{\mathfrak{H}}\hat{P}^+] = [\mathfrak{X}, \hat{H}^+ - (\hat{H}^+)^*] = [\mathfrak{X}, \hat{H}^+ + \hat{H}^-].$$

Let

$$\hat{H}^0 = \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ \bar{b} & -a \end{pmatrix},$$

which is Hermitian symmetric by assumption, so in particular  $a \in \mathbb{R}$ . Define

$$\hat{P}^0 := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 2b \\ -2\frac{a\bar{b}}{\mu}\lambda & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then (by computation)

$$[\mathfrak{X}, \hat{P}^0] \in \Lambda^{\geq 0}\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C})$$

and

$$\pi^{\mathfrak{H}}[\mathfrak{X}, \hat{P}^0] = [\mathfrak{X}, \hat{H}^0]$$

since  $a \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $\mu \in i\mathbb{R}$ . Thus, using Lemma A.3 and (16),

$$P := [\mathfrak{X}, \hat{P}] \quad \text{for} \quad \hat{P} := \hat{P}^0 + \hat{P}^+$$

satisfies the stated equations, and that  $P \in \mathring{\mathcal{K}}_{\mathfrak{X}}^{\geq 0}$  can be directly verified.  $\square$

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors acknowledge the use of ChatGPT as an editorial tool for language editing, rephrasing, and improving the clarity and structure of the exposition. The second author acknowledges financial support from the Beijing Natural Science Foundation IS23003. The third author acknowledges financial support from the SPP 2026 "Geometry at infinity" DFG-priority programme, and would like to warmly thank Carlos Florentino for fruitful discussions on moduli of hyperpolygons, as well as BIMSA for its hospitality during the development of this work.

## REFERENCES

- [1] S. Agnihotri and C. Woodward, *Eigenvalues of products of unitary matrices and quantum Schubert calculus*, Math. Res. Lett. **5** (1998) 817–836.
- [2] A. Alekseev, A. Malkin, *Symplectic structure of the moduli space of flat connections on a Riemann surface*, Commun. Math. Phys. **169** (1995) 99–119.
- [3] D. ALFAYA, T. L. GÓMEZ, *Torelli theorem for the parabolic Deligne-Hitchin moduli space*, J. Geom. Phys. **123** (2018) 448–462.
- [4] O. Biquard, *Twistors des orbites coadjointes et métriques hyper-pseudokähleriennes*, Bull. Soc. Math. Fr. **126** (1), 79–105 (1998).
- [5] O. Biquard and V. Minerbe, *A Kummer construction for gravitational instantons*, Commun. Math. Phys. **308** no. 3 (2011) 773–794.
- [6] I. Biswas, S. Bradlow, S. Dumitrescu, S. Heller, *Uniformization of branched surfaces and Higgs bundles*, Int. J. Math. **32** no. 13 (2021).
- [7] I. Biswas, C. Florentino, L. Godinho, A. Mandini, *Symplectic form on hyperpolygon spaces*, Geom. Dedicata **179** no. 1 (2015) 187–195.
- [8] Ph. Boalch, *Irregular connections and Kac–Moody root systems*, 2008, arXiv:0806.1050.
- [9] Ph. Boalch, *Hyperkähler manifolds and nonabelian Hodge theory on (irregular) curves*, 2012, arXiv:1203.6607.
- [10] Ph. Boalch, *Geometry and braiding of Stokes data; fission and wild character varieties*, Ann. Math. **179** no. 1 (2014) 301–365.
- [11] Ph. Boalch, *Wild character varieties, meromorphic Hitchin systems and Dynkin diagrams*, In Geometry and Physics Vol. II, 433–454, Oxford University Press (2018).
- [12] A.I. Bobenko, S. Heller, N. Schmitt, *Minimal reflection surfaces in  $S^3$ . Curvature line foliations and new examples based on fundamental pentagons*, J. Geom. Phys. **209** (2025) 105407.
- [13] H. Boden, K. Yokogawa, *Moduli spaces of parabolic Higgs bundles and parabolic  $K(D)$  pairs over smooth curves I*, Int. J. Math. **7** no. 05 (1996) 573–598.
- [14] H. Boden, K. Yokogawa, *Rationality of moduli spaces of parabolic bundles*, J. London Math. Soc. **59** no. 2 (1999) 461–478.
- [15] E. Calabi, *Métriques kähleriennes et fibrés holomorphes*, Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Supér. **12** no. 2, (1979) 269–294.
- [16] S. Charlton, L. Heller, S. Heller, and M. Traizet, *Minimal surfaces and alternating multiple zetas*, arXiv:2407.07130.
- [17] J. Cheeger, M. Gromov, *Collapsing Riemannian manifolds while keeping their curvature bounded I*, J. Differ. Geom. **23** (1986) 309–346.
- [18] S. Donaldson, *Twisted harmonic maps and the self-duality equations*, Proc. London Math. Soc. (3) **55** no. 1 (1987) 127–131.
- [19] J. Dorfmeister, F. Pedit, Wu, *Weierstrass type representation of harmonic maps into symmetric spaces*, Comm. Anal. Geom. **6** no. 4 (1998) 633–668.
- [20] J. Fisher and S. Rayan, *Hyperpolygons and Hitchin systems*, Int. Math. Res. Not. Vol. 2016, no. 6 (2016) 1839–1870.
- [21] L. Fredrickson, *Exponential decay for the asymptotic geometry of the Hitchin metric*, Commun. Math. Phys. **375** (2020), no. 2, 1393–1426.
- [22] L. Fredrickson, R. Mazzeo, J. Swoboda, H. Weiss, *Asymptotic geometry of the moduli space of parabolic  $SL(2, \mathbb{C})$ -Higgs bundles*, J. London Math. Soc. 1–72 (2022).
- [23] L. Fredrickson, A. Yae, Private email communication, 2025-12-22.
- [24] D. Gaiotto, G. W. Moore, and A. Neitzke, *Wall-crossing, Hitchin systems, and the WKB approximation*, Adv. Math. **234** (2013), 239–403.
- [25] L. Godinho, A. Mandini, *Hyperpolygon spaces and moduli spaces of parabolic Higgs bundles*, Adv. Math. **244** (2013) 465–532.
- [26] L. Heller, S. Heller, N. Schmitt, *Navigating the Space of Symmetric CMC Surfaces*, J. Differ. Geom., **110**, no. 3 (2018), pp. 413–455.
- [27] L. Heller, S. Heller, *Higher solutions of Hitchin’s self-duality equations*, J. Int. Sys. **5** (2020).
- [28] L. Heller, S. Heller, and M. Traizet, *Area estimates for High genus Lawson surfaces via DPW*, J. Differ. Geom. **124** (2023) 1–35.

- [29] L. Heller, S. Heller, and M. Traizet, *Loop group methods for the non-abelian Hodge correspondence on a 4-punctured sphere*, Math. Ann. **392** no. 3 (2025) 2981–3064.
- [30] S. Heller, *Self-duality solutions near infinity*, unpublished manuscript, 2025.
- [31] N. J. Hitchin, *The self-duality equations on a Riemann surface*, Proc. London Math. Soc. (3) **55** no. 1 (1987) 59–126.
- [32] N. J. Hitchin, *Hyperkähler manifolds*, Séminaire N. Bourbaki, 1991–1992, exp. no 748, 137–166.
- [33] N. J. Hitchin, A. Karlhede, U. Lindström, and M. Rocek, *Hyperkähler Metrics and Supersymmetry*, Commun. Math. Phys. **108** (1987) 535–589.
- [34] S. Kim, G. Wilkin, *Analytic convergence of harmonic metrics for parabolic Higgs bundles*, J. Geom. Phys. **127** 55–67 (2018).
- [35] F. C. Kirwan, *Cohomology of Quotients in Symplectic and Algebraic Geometry*, Mathematical Notes, vol. 31, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1984.
- [36] A. Klyachko, *Spatial polygons and stable configurations of points in the projective line*, In Algebraic geometry and its applications (Yaroslavl, 1992), Aspects Math., Vieweg, Braunschweig (1994) 67–84.
- [37] H. Konno, *Construction of the moduli space of stable parabolic Higgs bundles on a Riemann surface*, J. Math. Soc. Japan, **45** No. 2 (1993) 253–276.
- [38] H. Konno, *On the cohomology ring of the hyperKähler analogue of the polygon spaces*, Contemp. Math. **309** Amer. Math. Soc, RI (2002) 129–149.
- [39] R. Mazzeo, J. Swoboda, H. Weiß, F. Witt, *Asymptotic geometry of the Hitchin metric*, Comm. Math. Phys. **367** no. 1 (2019) 151–191.
- [40] V.B. Mehta, C.S. Seshadri, *Moduli of vector bundles on curves with parabolic structures*, Math. Ann. **248** (1980) 205–239.
- [41] C. Meneses, *Geometric models and variation of weights on moduli of parabolic Higgs bundles over the Riemann sphere: a case study*, SIGMA **18** (2022) 062, 41 p.
- [42] C. Meneses, *Stability variations for moduli of rank 2 parabolic bundles on the Riemann sphere I. Geometric models for wall-crossing*, in preparation.
- [43] T. Mochizuki, *Kobayashi-Hitchin correspondence for tame harmonic bundles and an application*, Astérisque, **309**, (2006).
- [44] T. Mochizuki, *Asymptotic behaviour of tame harmonic bundles and an application to pure twistor D-modules. I.*, Mem. Am. Math. Soc. **869** (2007) 324 p.
- [45] H. Nakajima, *Quiver varieties and Kac-Moody algebras*, Duke Math. J. **91** (1998) 515–560.
- [46] B. Nasatyr, B. Steer, *Orbifold Riemann surfaces and the Yang-Mills-Higgs equations*, Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa **22** no. 4 (1995) 595–643.
- [47] A. Ott, J. Swoboda, R. Wentworth, M. Wolf, *Higgs bundles, harmonic maps and pleated surfaces*, Geom. Topol. **28** no. 7 (2024) 3135–3220.
- [48] A. Pressley and G. Segal, *Loop Groups*, Oxford Mathematical Monographs, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1986.
- [49] S. Rayan and L. P. Schaposnik, *Moduli spaces of generalized hyperpolygons*, Q. J. Math. **72** no. 1-2 (2021) 137–161.
- [50] C. Simpson, *Constructing variations of Hodge structure using Yang-Mills theory and applications to uniformization*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **1** (1988) 867–918.
- [51] C. Simpson, *Harmonic bundles on noncompact curves*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **3** no. 3 (1990) 713–770.
- [52] C. Simpson, *The Hodge filtration on nonabelian cohomology*. Algebraic geometry–Santa Cruz 1995, 217–281, Proc. Sympos. Pure Math. 62, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, (1997).
- [53] C. Simpson, *The twistor geometry of parabolic structures in rank two*, Proc. Indian Acad. Sci., Math. Sci. **132** No. 2, Paper No. 54, 26 p. (2022).
- [54] M. Thaddeus, *Variation of moduli of parabolic Higgs bundles*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **547** (2002) 1–14.

BEIJING INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES AND APPLICATIONS (BIMSA), BEIJING, CHINA

*Email address:* `lynn@bimsa.cn`

BEIJING INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES AND APPLICATIONS (BIMSA), BEIJING, CHINA

*Email address:* `sheller@bimsa.cn`

MATHEMATISCHES SEMINAR, CHRISTIAN-ALBRECHTS-UNIVERSITÄT ZU KIEL, GERMANY

*Email address:* `meneses@math.uni-kiel.de`