

WKB Analysis of Higher Order Painlevé Equations with a Large Parameter. II. Structure Theorem for Instanton-Type Solutions of $(P_J)_m$ ($J = \text{I, 34, II-2 or IV}$) near a Simple P -turning Point of the First Kind

Dedicated to Professor Mikio Sato on his eightieth birthday

by

Takahiro KAWAI and Yoshitsugu TAKEI

Abstract

This is the third one of a series of articles on the exact WKB analysis of higher order Painlevé equations $(P_J)_m$ with a large parameter ($J = \text{I, II, IV}$; $m = 1, 2, 3, \dots$); the series is intended to clarify the structure of solutions of $(P_J)_m$ by the exact WKB analysis of the underlying overdetermined system $(\mathcal{DSL}_J)_m$ of linear differential equations, and the target of this paper is instanton-type solutions of $(P_J)_m$. In essence, the main result (Theorem 5.1.1) asserts that, near a simple P -turning point of the first kind, each instanton-type solution of $(P_J)_m$ can be formally and locally transformed to an appropriate solution of $(P_1)_1$, the classical (i.e., the second order) Painlevé-I equation with a large parameter. The transformation is attained by constructing a WKB-theoretic transformation that brings a solution of $(\mathcal{DSL}_J)_m$ to a solution of its canonical form (\mathcal{DCan}) (§5.3).

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: Primary 34M60; Secondary 34E20, 34M40, 34M55, 33E17.

Keywords: higher order Painlevé equations, Painlevé hierarchy, exact WKB analysis, instanton-type solutions, P -turning points.

This is a contribution to the special issue “The golden jubilee of algebraic analysis”.

Communicated by M. Kashiwara. Received September 18, 2009.

T. Kawai, Y. Takei: RIMS, Kyoto University, Kyoto 606-8502, Japan;
e-mail: takei@kurims.kyoto-u.ac.jp

§0. Introduction

This paper is the third of a series of articles on the exact WKB analysis of higher order Painlevé equations; the first of the series is [7], and the second one is [12]. In [7] we studied basic properties of higher order Painlevé equations $(P_J)_m$ with a large parameter η ($J = \text{I, II-1, II-2}$; $m = 1, 2, \dots$); we first constructed a particular formal solution called a 0-parameter solution, and we then clarified the relationship between

- (i) the Stokes geometry of the linearization $(\Delta P_J)_m$ of $(P_J)_m$ at the 0-parameter solution (often called the Fréchet derivative), and
- (ii) the Stokes geometry of (one of) the underlying pair $(L_J)_m$ of linear differential equations (Lax pair) with the 0-parameter solution substituted into the coefficients.

To avoid possible confusion we used in [12] the terms “ P -turning points” and “ P -Stokes curves” (following the suggestion of the referee) to mean “turning points of the Fréchet derivative” and “Stokes curves of the Fréchet derivative”, and in this paper we keep this terminology. The main subject of [12] was to establish a structure theorem for 0-parameter solutions of $(P_J)_m$ ($J = \text{I, II-1, II-2}$); any 0-parameter solution can be formally and locally transformed near a simple P -turning point of the first kind to a 0-parameter solution of the second order Painlevé-I equation with a large parameter η :

$$(0.1) \quad \frac{d^2 \lambda_{\text{I}}}{dt^2} = \eta^2 (6\lambda_{\text{I}}^2 + t).$$

In proving this result we made essential use of the geometric results obtained in [7]. The above structure theorem is a generalization of a result for the second order Painlevé equations ([8, Theorem 2.3]) to that applicable to an arbitrarily high order equation $(P_J)_m$. It is worth emphasizing that [8] covers only six equations, the classical Painlevé equations $(P_{\text{I}}), (P_{\text{II}}), \dots, (P_{\text{VI}})$, and that the results in [12] are applied to infinitely many equations. The purpose of this paper is to further generalize the results in [12] by replacing 0-parameter solutions with instanton-type $(2m)$ -parameter solutions ([23], [24]) of $(P_J)_m$; our main result (Theorem 5.1.1) means that Part 5 of the Toulouse Project ([10]) has been completed near a simple P -turning point of the first kind. In this paper we basically follow [17] concerning notational issues; this means that we use symbols that are slightly different from those in [7] and [12]. This is a nuisance, but it removes some clumsiness from the presentation of [12]. The point is that [17] presents three different ways of expressing the same higher order Painlevé equations, $(P_J)_m, (\tilde{P}_J)_m$ and $(G_J)_m$ ($J = \text{I, 34, II-2 and IV}$). The first one is given in terms of polynomials of unknown

functions and their derivatives, the second one is a system of first order non-linear differential equations, and the third one is given by choosing some suitable Garnier system and restricting it to an appropriate complex line; the symbol $(G_J)_m$ is not used in the literature, but for the sake of convenience we use it in this paper. Thus $(P_I)_m$ of [7] and [12] is designated as $(\tilde{P}_I)_m$ in this paper. The Lax pair that underlies $(P_J)_m$ or $(\tilde{P}_J)_m$ is respectively denoted by $(L_J)_m$ or $(\tilde{L}_J)_m$; we arrange the two equations in $(L_J)_m$ and $(\tilde{L}_J)_m$ so that the first one of them is deformed by means of the second one that contains differentiation with respect to the deformation parameter t , which is the independent variable of $(P_J)_m$ and $(\tilde{P}_J)_m$ in question. We emphasize that each of these three expressions of a higher order Painlevé equation has its own advantage. For example, $(P_J)_m$ and $(L_J)_m$ are amenable to the concrete computation because of their concise form and $(\tilde{P}_J)_m$ and $(G_J)_m$ most neatly explain the intrinsic meaning of the change of unknown functions from “ u ” to “ λ ” that is used in [12]. In [12] the meaning of the transformation was not explained well for $(P_{II-1})_m$ or $(P_{II-2})_m$; with the introduction of $(\tilde{P}_J)_m$ we clearly see that the unknown function u_j ($j = 1, \dots, m$) of $(\tilde{P}_J)_m$ is the j -th elementary symmetric polynomial of the unknown functions λ_k 's of $(G_J)_m$. The important role that $(G_J)_m$ plays in our paper is basically due to its Hamiltonian structure on which the construction of instanton-type solutions is based. (See [23] and [24].) For the convenience of the reader, we list up in Appendix A the symbols and equations used in this paper, following the presentation of [17].

The plan of this paper is as follows. In Section 1 we first rewrite the Lax pair $(L_J)_m$ as a pair of a Schrödinger equation $(SL_J)_m$ and its deformation equation $(D_J)_m$. As the derivation procedure of this system of scalar equations is essentially the same for all J ($J = \text{I}, 34, \text{II-2}, \text{IV}$), we present the explicit computation only for $J = \text{IV}$ (cf. [12], [14]). In Section 2 we summarize basic properties of $(2m)$ -parameter solutions of $(P_J)_m$, which have been constructed and called instanton-type solutions in [24]. These solutions are the main target of our study in this paper. We note that in studying the effect of substituting an instanton-type solution into the coefficients of $Q_{(J,m)}$, the potential of the Schrödinger equation $(SL_J)_m$, we make use of the third order equation (2.2.2) that $Q_{(J,m)}$ satisfies together with the function $\mathfrak{a}_{(J,m)}$ that appears in $(D_J)_m$ (Subsection 2.2). Although this equation is known to be a basic one in the theory of deformations of linear differential equations (cf., e.g., [11, (4.44)]), this is the first time that we have used it as an essential ingredient in the study of $(SL_J)_m$. The equation (2.2.2) plays an important role also in Section 3. Using the results of Section 2, we establish in Section 3 a WKB-theoretic theorem (Theorem 3.1) to the effect that $(SL_J)_m$ with instanton-type solutions substituted into its coefficients can be brought to a canonical equation called (Can) near its double turning point $x = \lambda_{j_0,0}(t)$; in

particular, we describe how an instanton-type solution λ_{j_0} of $(P_J)_m$ is related to the invariants $\rho^{(j_0)}$ and $\sigma^{(j_0)}$ that appear in the canonical equation. (See Theorems 3.1 and 3.2 for the precise statements.) In Section 4 we investigate the instanton structure of the invariants by making use of the Hamiltonian structure of $(G_J)_m$. The results on the instanton structure of the invariants are used in an essential manner in proving our main result (Theorem 5.1.1). In Appendix A we list up the symbols and notations used in this paper; we follow [17] as possible as we can. Subsections A.1–A.4 are concerned with P_1 -hierarchy with a large parameter η , Subsections A.5–A.8 are concerned with P_{34} -hierarchy with a large parameter η , and so on. Finally in Appendix B we explain the parity structure of instanton-type solutions which is used in Section 5.

§1. Derivation of a Schrödinger equation $(SL_J)_m$ and its deformation equation $(D_J)_m$

The purpose of this section is to rewrite $(L_J)_m$ (or $(\tilde{L}_J)_m$) as a pair of a Schrödinger equation $(SL_J)_m$ and its deformation equation $(D_J)_m$ so that the Lax pair may be analyzed in the framework of [8], [1] and [9]. Although we study only $(L_{IV})_m$ in a detailed manner, our procedure is uniformly applicable to any of $(L_J)_m$ or $(\tilde{L}_J)_m$ ($J = \text{I}, 34, \text{II-2}, \text{IV}$). To emphasize this fact we rewrite (A.15.1) in a somewhat abstract style:

$$(1.1) \quad \begin{cases} \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \begin{pmatrix} \psi_1 \\ \psi_2 \end{pmatrix} = \eta \begin{pmatrix} p & q \\ r & -p \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \psi_1 \\ \psi_2 \end{pmatrix}, \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \begin{pmatrix} \psi_1 \\ \psi_2 \end{pmatrix} = \eta \begin{pmatrix} \delta & 1 \\ \varepsilon & -\delta \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \psi_1 \\ \psi_2 \end{pmatrix}. \end{cases} \quad \begin{matrix} (1.1.a) \\ (1.1.b) \end{matrix}$$

Here all the coefficients are those given by (A.15.1) with a solution (u, v) of $(P_{IV})_m$ substituted. One can immediately see that any of $(L_J)_m$ or $(\tilde{L}_J)_m$ has this form with the exceptions of $(\tilde{L}_I)_m$ and $(\tilde{L}_{34})_m$; in $(\tilde{L}_I)_m$ and $(\tilde{L}_{34})_m$ the $(1, 2)$ component of the matrix in (1.1.b) is 2, not 1. (Cf. Subsections A.3, A.7, A.11 and A.15.) We try to find a system of scalar differential equations that ψ_1 satisfies. It follows from (1.1.a) that

$$(1.2) \quad \frac{\partial^2 \psi_1}{\partial x^2} - \frac{q_x}{q} \frac{\partial \psi_1}{\partial x} - \left(\eta^2 (p^2 + qr) + \eta \left(p_x - \frac{pq_x}{q} \right) \right) \psi_1 = 0.$$

Here and in what follows, q_x etc. and q_t etc. respectively stand for $\partial q / \partial x$ etc. and $\partial q / \partial t$ etc. To rewrite (1.2) in the form of a Schrödinger-type equation, we introduce

$$(1.3) \quad \psi = \exp \left(\frac{1}{2} \int^x \left(-\frac{q_x}{q} \right) dx \right) \psi_1 = q^{-1/2} \psi_1.$$

Then ψ satisfies

$$(1.4) \quad \frac{\partial^2 \psi}{\partial x^2} = \eta^2 Q_{(IV,m)} \psi$$

with

$$(1.5) \quad Q_{(IV,m)} = p^2 + qr + \eta^{-1} \left(p_x - \frac{pq_x}{q} \right) + \eta^{-2} \left(\frac{3q_x^2}{4q^2} - \frac{q_{xx}}{2q} \right).$$

The equation (1.4) corresponds to (SL_J) in [8], and we use a symbol $(SL_{IV})_m$ to denote the Schrödinger equation. The next thing to do is to find its deformation equation. For this purpose we note that (1.1.b) entails the following:

$$(1.6) \quad \frac{\partial \psi_1}{\partial t} = \eta \delta \psi_1 + \eta \psi_2.$$

Combining (1.6) with the first row of (1.1.a), we find

$$(1.7) \quad \frac{\partial \psi_1}{\partial x} = \eta p \psi_1 + q \left(\frac{\partial \psi_1}{\partial t} - \eta \delta \psi_1 \right).$$

Using (1.3) we obtain the following relation from (1.7):

$$(1.8) \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial x} (q^{1/2} \psi) = q \frac{\partial}{\partial t} (q^{1/2} \psi) + \eta q^{1/2} (p - q\delta) \psi.$$

Then we find

$$(1.9) \quad q \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial t} = \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial x} + \frac{1}{2} q^{-1} q_x \psi - \left(\frac{1}{2} q_t + \eta p - \eta q \delta \right) \psi.$$

We now substitute the following explicit values of p, q and δ into (1.9):

$$(1.10) \quad p = \frac{1}{4\gamma x} \left(-(2x - u)(\mathcal{K} + 2\gamma t) - \eta^{-1} \frac{d\mathcal{K}}{dt} - 2\eta^{-1} \gamma \right),$$

$$(1.11) \quad q = \frac{1}{2\gamma x} (\mathcal{K} + 2\gamma t),$$

$$(1.12) \quad \delta = -x + \frac{u}{2}.$$

Then we find

$$(1.13) \quad \frac{1}{2} q_t + \eta(p - q\delta) = \frac{1}{4\gamma x} \left[\mathcal{K}_t + 2\gamma - \eta(2x - u)(\mathcal{K} + 2\gamma t) - \mathcal{K}_t - 2\gamma - 2\eta(\mathcal{K} + 2\gamma t) \left(-x + \frac{u}{2} \right) \right] = 0.$$

Thus (1.9) assumes the following form:

$$(1.14) \quad \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial t} = q^{-1} \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial x} - \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x} q^{-1} \right) \psi.$$

Hence, if we choose

$$(1.15) \quad \mathbf{a}_{(\text{IV},m)} = q^{-1} = \frac{2\gamma x}{\mathcal{K} + 2\gamma t},$$

we obtain the required deformation equation:

$$(1.16) \quad (D_{\text{IV}})_m : \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial t} = \mathbf{a}_{(\text{IV},m)} \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial x} - \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial \mathbf{a}_{(\text{IV},m)}}{\partial x} \psi.$$

We note that the most peculiar part of $\eta^2 Q_{(\text{IV},m)}$, i.e.,

$$(1.17) \quad Q_2 = \frac{3q_x^2}{4q^2} - \frac{q_{xx}}{2q},$$

satisfies

$$(1.18) \quad \mathbf{a}_{(\text{IV},m)} Q_{2,x} + 2\mathbf{a}_{(\text{IV},m),x} Q_2 = \frac{1}{2} (\mathbf{a}_{(\text{IV},m)})_{xxx}.$$

In fact, one can readily see that both sides of (1.18) are equal to

$$(1.19) \quad \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{-6q_x^3}{q^4} + \frac{6q_x q_{xx}}{q^3} - \frac{q_{xxx}}{q^2} \right),$$

without using any specific feature of q .

We also note that, if we choose $\gamma = 2$, then

$$(1.20) \quad q = \frac{1}{2x}(U + C + 2t) = \frac{1}{2x} \prod_{j=1}^m (x - \lambda_j).$$

(Cf. (A.15.8) and (A.16.1); similar relations hold also for other J 's.)

Relations (1.18) and (1.20) play important roles in our WKB-theoretic study of $(SL_J)_m$ in the subsequent sections.

Remark 1.1. The simultaneous equations $(SL_{\text{IV}})_m$ and $(D_{\text{IV}})_m$ share with the pair of equations $(SL_J)_m$ and $(D_J)_m$ ($J = \text{I}, \text{II-2}$) the following property: the singular point $x = \lambda_{j,0}$ of $(D_{\text{IV}})_m$ is a double turning point of $(SL_{\text{IV}})_m$. Making use of this property, we can confirm all the results in [12] also for $J = \text{IV}$, that is, we can prove the regularity near $x = \lambda_{j,0}$ of S_{odd} for $(SL_{\text{IV}})_m$ with a 0-parameter solution substituted into its coefficients (cf. [12, Theorem 2.4]) and we can further prove the reduction theorem for a 0-parameter solution λ_j (cf. [12, Theorem 3.2]) not only for $J = \text{I}, \text{II-2}$ but also for $J = \text{IV}$ (and also for $J = 34$).

§2. Basic properties of instanton-type solutions

In Subsection 2.1 we recall basic properties of a $(2m)$ -parameter solution of $(P_J)_m$ constructed by Takei ([23], [24]). Such a solution is usually called an instanton-type solution. As is noted in Section 0, the argument of [24] applies to all

$J = \text{I, 34, II-2 and IV}$ thanks to the existence of a Hamilton–Jacobi system $(G_J)_m$ that is equivalent to $(P_J)_m$ ([16], [17]). By its definition an instanton-type solution contains a term of order $-1/2$ in η , and when substituted into the coefficients of $Q_{(J,m)}$ it may provoke the appearance of a term of the form $Q_{1/2}\eta^{-1/2}$ in the resulting potential Q . Fortunately we can confirm in Subsection 2.2 that $Q_{1/2}$ actually vanishes thanks to the compatibility of $(SL_J)_m$ and $(D_J)_m$, and hence we can develop the WKB analysis of $(SL_J)_m$ with an instanton-type solution substituted into its coefficients.

§2.1. Structure of an instanton-type solution ([24, Theorem 1])

Here, and in what follows, we use the symbol $\nu_j(t)$ to denote a root of the characteristic equation of the Fréchet derivative $(\Delta P_J)_m$ of $(P_J)_m$ at some 0-parameter solution. As is shown in [7] and [19], we may, and do, label ν_j 's so that

$$(2.1.1) \quad \nu_{j+m} = -\nu_j \quad (1 \leq j \leq m)$$

hold. To construct a $(2m)$ -parameter solution, we first fix a point t_0 for which the following conditions are satisfied:

$$(2.1.2) \quad t_0 \text{ is not a } P\text{-turning point of } (P_J)_m,$$

$$(2.1.3) \quad \sum_{j=1}^m n_j \nu_j(t) \text{ does not vanish identically for any } (n_1, \dots, n_m) \in \mathbb{Z}^m \setminus \{0\}.$$

Then, on a neighborhood of t_0 , we can construct an instanton-type solution $(u_j, v_j)_{1 \leq j \leq m}$ of $(\tilde{P}_J)_m$ which has the following form:

$$(2.1.4) \quad u_j(t, \eta; \alpha) = u_{j,0}(t) + \eta^{-1/2}u_{j,1/2}(t, \Psi, \Phi) + \eta^{-1}u_{j,1}(t, \Psi, \Phi) + \dots,$$

$$(2.1.5) \quad v_j(t, \eta; \alpha) = v_{j,0}(t) + \eta^{-1/2}v_{j,1/2}(t, \Psi, \Phi) + \eta^{-1}v_{j,1}(t, \Psi, \Phi) + \dots,$$

where $u_{j,l/2}(t, \Psi, \Phi)$ and $v_{j,l/2}(t, \Psi, \Phi)$ ($l = 1, 2, \dots$) are polynomials in (Ψ, Φ) of degree at most l which depend analytically on t . Here $\Psi = (\Psi_1, \dots, \Psi_m)$ and $\Phi = (\Phi_1, \dots, \Phi_m)$ are “instantons”, that is, formal series of exponential type of the form

$$(2.1.6) \quad \Psi_j = \alpha_j \exp \left\{ \eta \int^t \left(\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \eta^{-k} \sum_{|\mu|=k} (\mu_j + 1) g_{\mu+e_j}(t, \eta) \sigma^\mu \right) dt \right\},$$

$$(2.1.7) \quad \Phi_j = \alpha_{j+m} \exp \left\{ -\eta \int^t \left(\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \eta^{-k} \sum_{|\mu|=k} (\mu_j + 1) g_{\mu+e_j}(t, \eta) \sigma^\mu \right) dt \right\},$$

where $j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, α_j ($1 \leq j \leq 2m$) are free complex numbers, σ stands for $(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_m)$ with $\sigma_j = \alpha_j \alpha_{j+m}$, $\mu = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_m)$ ($\mu_j \in \mathbb{Z}, \mu_j \geq 0$), $e_j =$

$(0, \dots, 0, \overset{j}{1}, 0, \dots, 0)$ are multi-indices, and for each multi-index $\nu = (\nu_1, \dots, \nu_m)$, $g_\nu(t, \eta)$ is a formal power series in $\eta^{-1/2}$ with analytic coefficients of the following form:

$$(2.1.8) \quad g_\nu(t, \eta) = \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \eta^{-l/2} g_{\nu, l/2}(t).$$

Furthermore we obtain the following result concerning their structure.

Theorem 2.1.1 (T2, Theorem 1 and Remark 1). (i) *The part $(u_{j,0}, v_{j,0})$ of top order of $(u_j(t, \eta; \alpha, \beta), v_j(t, \eta; \alpha, \beta))$ coincides with the top order part $(\hat{u}_{j,0}, \hat{v}_{j,0})$ of the 0-parameter solution (\hat{u}_j, \hat{v}_j) .*

(ii) *The top order part of $g_{e_j}(t, \eta)$, i.e., $g_{e_j,0}(t)$, coincides with $\nu_j(t)$.*

Remark 2.1.1. Although we have given the statement for a solution $(u_j, v_j)_{1 \leq j \leq m}$ of $(\tilde{P}_J)_m$, the instanton structure of $\{\lambda_j\}_{j=1}^m$ is seen to be the same as that of $(u_j, v_j)_{1 \leq j \leq m}$ by the fact that λ_j ($j = 1, \dots, m$) are solutions of

$$(2.1.9) \quad U(x) + \tilde{C}(x, t) = 0,$$

where $U(x) = x^m - \sum_{1 \leq j \leq m} u_j x^{j-1}$ and $\tilde{C}(x, t)$ is 0 for $J = \text{I}$, $t/2$ for $J = \text{34}$, $C(x) = \sum_{1 \leq j \leq m} c_j x^{m-j}$ for $J = \text{II-2}$ and $C(x) + 2t$ for $J = \text{IV}$.

§2.2. Vanishing of $Q_{1/2}$

In view of the definition of the Borel transformation, wave functions discussed in the exact WKB analysis should have the form

$$(2.2.1) \quad \exp(\eta r_{-1}(x))(1 + o(\eta^0)).$$

On the other hand, the term of degree $-1/2$ in η in an instanton type solution may provoke the appearance of a term of degree $-1/2$ in η in the potential Q , i.e., $Q_{(J,m)}$ with an instanton-type solution substituted into its coefficients. If it were the case, we could not expect (2.2.1) in view of the way of constructing a WKB solution via the associated Riccati equation. Fortunately the compatibility of $(SL_J)_m$ and $(D_J)_m$ forces such a term to vanish. In fact, one expression of the compatibility condition is

$$(2.2.2) \quad \frac{\partial Q_{(J,m)}}{\partial t} = \mathbf{a}_{(J,m)} \frac{\partial Q_{(J,m)}}{\partial x} + 2 \frac{\partial \mathbf{a}_{(J,m)}}{\partial x} Q_{(J,m)} - \frac{1}{2} \eta^{-2} \frac{\partial^3 \mathbf{a}_{(J,m)}}{\partial x^3}.$$

(See [KT4, (4.44)] for example.) In view of Theorem 2.1.1(ii), $Q_{1/2}$ should be of the form

$$(2.2.3) \quad \sum_j a_j(x, t) \exp(\phi_j(t)\eta) + \sum_k b_k(x, t) \exp(-\phi_k(t)\eta)$$

with

$$(2.2.4) \quad \phi_j(t) = \int^t \nu_j(s) ds.$$

If it were not 0, the left-hand side of (2.2.2) should contain a non-zero term which is of degree $1/2$ in η . But the right-hand side of (2.2.2) cannot contain such a term, as it contains differentiation only with respect to x . Therefore

$$(2.2.5) \quad Q_{1/2} = 0.$$

We will use this result frequently without explicit mention.

§3. Local reduction of $(SL_J)_m$ to (Can) near a double turning point

Hereinafter we always assume that an instanton-type solution (u_j, v_j) ($1 \leq j \leq m$) of $(\tilde{P}_J)_m$ (or (λ_j, μ_j) ($1 \leq j \leq m$) of $(G_J)_m$) is substituted into the coefficients of the potential $Q_{(J,m)}$ of $(SL_J)_m$. Then, if we let τ be a simple P -turning point of the first kind of $(P_J)_m$ that does not coincide with any other P -turning point of $(P_J)_m$, there exists a pair of a double turning point $x = \lambda_{j_0,0}(t)$ and a simple turning point $x = a(t)$ of $(SL_J)_m$ which merge at $t = \tau$ ([7], [19]). Let t_* be a point sufficiently close to τ that lies on a P -Stokes curve emanating from τ , and let V be a sufficiently small neighborhood of t_* . Furthermore we suppose

$$(3.1) \quad \lambda_{j,0}(t_*) \neq \lambda_{k,0}(t_*) \quad (j \neq k)$$

for any (j, k) . Then we have the following

Theorem 3.1. *In the situation described above, we can find a neighborhood U of $x = \lambda_{j_0,0}(t)$, a formal series*

$$(3.2) \quad z(x, t, \eta) = z_0(x, t, \eta) + \eta^{-1/2} z_{1/2}(x, t, \eta) + \eta^{-1} z_1(x, t, \eta) + \dots,$$

whose coefficients $z_{1/2}(x, t, \eta)$ are holomorphic on $U \times V$, and formal series

$$(3.3) \quad E^{(j_0)}(t, \eta) = E_0^{(j_0)}(t, \eta) + E_{1/2}^{(j_0)}(t, \eta)\eta^{-1/2} + E_1^{(j_0)}(t, \eta)\eta^{-1} + \dots,$$

$$(3.4) \quad \rho^{(j_0)}(t, \eta) = \rho_0^{(j_0)}(t, \eta) + \rho_{1/2}^{(j_0)}(t, \eta)\eta^{-1/2} + \rho_1^{(j_0)}(t, \eta)\eta^{-1} + \dots,$$

whose coefficients are holomorphic on V , so that the following conditions hold:

$$(3.5) \quad z_0 \text{ is free from } \eta,$$

$$(3.6) \quad \frac{\partial z_0}{\partial x} \text{ never vanishes on } U \times V,$$

$$(3.7) \quad z_0(\lambda_{j_0,0}(t), t) = 0,$$

(3.8) $z_{1/2}$ *identically vanishes,*

$$(3.9) \quad \begin{aligned} & Q_{(J,m)}(x, t, \eta) \\ &= \left(\frac{\partial z}{\partial x} \right)^2 \left[4z(x, t, \eta)^2 + \eta^{-1} E^{(j_0)}(t, \eta) + \frac{\eta^{-3/2} \rho^{(j_0)}(t, \eta)}{z(x, t, \eta) - z(\lambda_{j_0}(t, \eta), t, \eta)} \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \frac{3\eta^{-2}}{4(z(x, t, \eta) - z(\lambda_{j_0}(t, \eta), t, \eta))^2} \right] - \frac{1}{2} \eta^{-2} \{z(x, t, \eta); x\} \end{aligned}$$

on $U \times V$, where $\{z; x\}$ stands for the Schwarzian derivative,

(3.10) *the η -dependence of $z_{1/2}(x, t, \eta)$, $E_{1/2}^{(j_0)}(t, \eta)$ and $\rho_{1/2}^{(j_0)}(t, \eta)$ is through the instanton terms that $\lambda_{j_0}(t, \eta)$ contains.*

Theorem 3.2. *The series $E^{(j_0)}(t, \eta)$ and $\rho^{(j_0)}(t, \eta)$ in the preceding theorem can be written down in terms of $\{\lambda_j\}_{j=1}^m$ and $z(x, t, \eta)$ in (3.2) in the following manner:*

$$(3.11) \quad \begin{aligned} & \rho^{(j_0)}(t, \eta) = \\ & - \eta^{-1/2} \left(\frac{\partial z}{\partial x}(\lambda_{j_0}(t, \eta), t, \eta) \right)^{-1} \left[\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \lambda_{j_0}(t, \eta) \right) \left(\frac{1}{(x - \lambda_{j_0}(t, \eta)) \mathbf{a}_{(J,m)}} \right) \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{a}_{(J,m)}/\partial x}{\mathbf{a}_{(J,m)}} + \frac{1}{(x - \lambda_{j_0}(t, \eta))} \right) + \frac{3}{4} \frac{\partial^2 z/\partial x^2}{\partial z/\partial x} \right] \Big|_{x=\lambda_{j_0}(t, \eta)}, \end{aligned}$$

$$(3.12) \quad E^{(j_0)}(t, \eta) = (\rho^{(j_0)}(t, \eta))^2 - 4(\eta^{1/2} z(\lambda_{j_0}(t, \eta), t, \eta))^2.$$

Remark 3.1. In what follows we use the symbol $\sigma^{(j_0)}(t, \eta)$ to denote

$$(3.13) \quad \eta^{1/2} z(\lambda_{j_0}(t, \eta), t, \eta).$$

Note that (3.7) implies that the degree of $\sigma^{(j_0)}(t, \eta)$ with respect to η is at most 0 despite multiplication by $\eta^{1/2}$ (if we count the degree of instanton terms to be 0, as usual).

Definition 3.1. The equation (Can) is, by definition, the following Schrödinger equation:

$$(3.14) \quad \left(-\frac{\partial^2}{\partial z^2} + \eta^2 Q_{\text{can}}(z, E, \rho, \sigma, \eta) \right) \varphi = 0,$$

where

$$(3.15) \quad Q_{\text{can}} = 4z^2 + \eta^{-1} E + \frac{\eta^{-3/2} \rho}{z - \eta^{-1/2} \sigma} + \frac{3\eta^{-2}}{4(z - \eta^{-1/2} \sigma)^2}$$

with

$$(3.16) \quad E = \rho^2 - 4\sigma^2.$$

To prove Theorems 3.1 and 3.2, we need the following

Lemma 3.3. *Let $c_l(t, \eta)$ ($l = -2, -1, 0, 1, \dots$) denote the coefficient of the term $(x - \lambda_{j_0}(t, \eta))^l$ in the expansion of $Q_{(J,m)}$ ($J = \text{I, 34, II-2, IV}$) in powers of $x - \lambda_{j_0}(t, \eta)$ with t being sufficiently close to t_* . Then*

$$(3.17) \quad c_0 = \eta^2 c_{-1}^2.$$

Proof. For the sake of definiteness we discuss the case $J = \text{IV}$. This is the situation that seems to be most complicated in its appearance. Actually the computation in other cases is slightly simpler than that given below, and the logical structure of the proof is the same in all cases. Throughout the proof of this lemma we let Q denote $Q_{(\text{IV},m)}$ with an instanton-type solution being substituted into its coefficients. As in Section 1, we let Q_2 denote

$$(3.18) \quad \frac{3q_x^2}{4q^2} - \frac{q_{xx}}{2q},$$

with q being given in (1.11), and we define \tilde{Q} by

$$(3.19) \quad \eta^2 Q - Q_2$$

(cf. (1.17)). For notational simplicity we assume $j_0 = 1$. We also set

$$(3.20) \quad X_j = x - \lambda_j(t, \eta).$$

Then for $J = \text{IV}$ with $\gamma = 2$, we see by (1.20) and (1.15) that

$$(3.21) \quad q = \frac{1}{2x} \prod_{j=1}^m X_j,$$

$$(3.22) \quad \mathbf{a} (= \mathbf{a}_{(\text{IV},m)}) = q^{-1} = \frac{2x}{\prod_{j=1}^m X_j}.$$

Note that the factor x^{-1} in q does not appear for $J = \text{I}$ or II-2 ; it appears only for $J = \text{34}$ or IV .

Our strategy of the proof is to write down the relation (2.2.2) in power series of X_1 (including negative degrees). We start with the following relation (3.23) that is obtained by the substitution of (1.18) into (2.2.2):

$$(3.23) \quad \eta^2 Q_t = Q_{2,t} + \tilde{Q}_t = \mathbf{a} \tilde{Q}_x + 2\mathbf{a}_x \tilde{Q},$$

where Q_t etc. stand for $\partial Q / \partial t$ etc. First we note

$$(3.24) \quad \frac{q_x}{q} = \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{1}{X_j} - \frac{1}{x}.$$

Since

$$\left(\frac{q_x}{q}\right)_x = -\frac{q_x^2}{q^2} + \frac{q_{xx}}{q},$$

we use (3.24) to find that

$$(3.25) \quad \begin{aligned} Q_2 &= \frac{3q_x^2}{4q^2} - \frac{q_{xx}}{2q} = \frac{1}{4} \frac{q_x^2}{q^2} - \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{q_x}{q}\right)_x \\ &= \frac{1}{4} \left(\sum_{j=1}^m \frac{1}{X_j}\right)^2 - \frac{1}{2x} \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{1}{X_j} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{1}{X_j^2} - \frac{1}{4x^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence we obtain

$$(3.26) \quad Q_{2,t} = \frac{1}{2} \left(\sum_{j=1}^m \frac{1}{X_j}\right) \left(\sum_{j=1}^m \frac{\lambda'_j}{X_j^2}\right) - \frac{1}{2x} \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{\lambda'_j}{X_j^2} + \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{\lambda'_j}{X_j^3},$$

where λ'_j etc. stand for $d\lambda_j/dt$ etc. On the other hand, in view of the explicit form (1.5) of Q , we see that \tilde{Q} has the form

$$(3.27) \quad \frac{\alpha(t, \eta)}{X_1} + \beta(t, \eta) + O(X_1)$$

when expanded in powers of X_1 , which is regarded as a small quantity. We now compute the coefficients of X_1^{-l} ($l = 3, 2$) in (3.23).

Let

$$(3.28) \quad \Lambda_j = \lambda_1 - \lambda_j \quad (j \geq 2).$$

We first compute the expansion of \mathbf{a} and \mathbf{a}_x in X_1 . If we write \mathbf{a} as

$$(3.29) \quad \mathbf{a} = \frac{1}{X_1} f(x) \quad \text{with} \quad f(x) = \frac{2x}{\prod_{j=2}^m X_j},$$

we readily find

$$(3.30) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbf{a} &= \frac{1}{X_1} \left(f(\lambda_1) + \frac{df}{dx}(\lambda_1) X_1 + O(X_1^2) \right) \\ &= \frac{f(\lambda_1)}{X_1} \left(1 + \left(\frac{d}{dx} \log f \right) \Big|_{x=\lambda_1} X_1 + O(X_1^2) \right) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$(3.31) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dx} \log \mathbf{a} &= -\frac{1}{X_1} + \left(\frac{d}{dx} \log f \right) \Big|_{x=\lambda_1} + O(X_1) \\ &= -\frac{1}{X_1} \left(1 - \left(\frac{d}{dx} \log f \right) \Big|_{x=\lambda_1} X_1 + O(X_1^2) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Hence we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 (3.32) \quad \mathbf{a}_x &= \mathbf{a} \frac{d}{dx} \log \mathbf{a} \\
 &= -\frac{f(\lambda_1)}{X_1^2} \left(1 + \left(\frac{d}{dx} \log f \right) \Big|_{x=\lambda_1} X_1 + O(X_1^2) \right) \\
 &\quad \times \left(1 - \left(\frac{d}{dx} \log f \right) \Big|_{x=\lambda_1} X_1 + O(X_1^2) \right) \\
 &= -\frac{f(\lambda_1)}{X_1^2} + O(1).
 \end{aligned}$$

Here the symbol $O(1)$ means that the part consists of terms which contain a factor of the form X_1^p ($p \geq 0$). We note that the absence of terms of order $O(X_1^{-1})$ in \mathbf{a}_x is observed for J 's other than IV; the existence of the extra factor x in \mathbf{a} has nothing to do with this fact. Since

$$(3.33) \quad f(\lambda_1) = \frac{2\lambda_1}{\prod_{j=2}^m \Lambda_j}$$

and

$$(3.34) \quad \left(\frac{d}{dx} \log f \right) \Big|_{x=\lambda_1} = \frac{1}{\lambda_1} - \sum_{j=2}^m \frac{1}{\Lambda_j},$$

it then follows from (3.27), (3.30) and (3.32) that

$$\begin{aligned}
 (3.35) \quad \mathbf{a}\tilde{Q}_x + 2\mathbf{a}_x\tilde{Q} &= \left(\frac{f(\lambda_1)}{X_1} + f(\lambda_1) \left(\frac{d}{dx} \log f \right) \Big|_{x=\lambda_1} + O(X_1) \right) \left(-\frac{\alpha}{X_1^2} + O(1) \right) \\
 &\quad + 2 \left(-\frac{f(\lambda_1)}{X_1^2} + O(1) \right) \left(\frac{\alpha}{X_1} + \beta + O(X_1) \right) \\
 &= \left[-\frac{\alpha f(\lambda_1)}{X_1^3} - \alpha f(\lambda_1) \left(\frac{d}{dx} \log f \right) \Big|_{x=\lambda_1} \frac{1}{X_1^2} + O(X_1^{-1}) \right] \\
 &\quad + \left[-\frac{2\alpha f(\lambda_1)}{X_1^3} - \frac{2\beta f(\lambda_1)}{X_1^2} + O(X_1^{-1}) \right] \\
 &= -\frac{3\alpha f(\lambda_1)}{X_1^3} - f(\lambda_1) \left[\alpha \left(\frac{d}{dx} \log f \right) \Big|_{x=\lambda_1} + 2\beta \right] \frac{1}{X_1^2} + O(X_1^{-1}) \\
 &= -\frac{6\alpha\lambda_1}{\prod_{j=2}^m \Lambda_j} \frac{1}{X_1^3} - \frac{2\lambda_1}{\prod_{j=2}^m \Lambda_j} \left[\alpha \left(\frac{1}{\lambda_1} - \sum_{j=2}^m \frac{1}{\Lambda_j} \right) + 2\beta \right] \frac{1}{X_1^2} + O(X_1^{-1}).
 \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, (3.26) and (3.27) entail that the left-hand side of (3.23), i.e.,

$$(3.36) \quad \eta^2 Q_t = Q_{2,t} + \tilde{Q}_t,$$

has the form

$$(3.37) \quad \left[\frac{3\lambda'_1}{2X_1^3} + \frac{\lambda'_1}{2} \left(\sum_{j=2}^m \frac{1}{X_j} - \frac{1}{x} \right) \frac{1}{X_1^2} + O(X_1^{-1}) \right] + \left[\frac{\alpha\lambda'_1}{X_1^2} + \frac{\alpha'}{X_1} + O(1) \right] \\ = \frac{3\lambda'_1}{2X_1^3} + \frac{\lambda'_1}{2} \left(\sum_{j=2}^m \frac{1}{\Lambda_j} - \frac{1}{\lambda_1} + 2\alpha \right) \frac{1}{X_1^2} + O(X_1^{-1}).$$

By comparing (3.35) and (3.37), we find

$$(3.38) \quad -6\alpha\lambda_1 = \frac{3}{2}\lambda'_1 \prod_{j=2}^m \Lambda_j$$

and

$$(3.39) \quad \frac{\lambda'_1}{2} \left(\sum_{j=2}^m \frac{1}{\Lambda_j} - \frac{1}{\lambda_1} + 2\alpha \right) = \left[2\alpha\lambda_1 \sum_{j=2}^m \frac{1}{\Lambda_j} - 2\alpha - 4\beta\lambda_1 \right] \frac{1}{\prod_{j=2}^m \Lambda_j}.$$

Thus we obtain

$$(3.40) \quad \alpha = -\frac{\lambda'_1}{4\lambda_1} \prod_{j=2}^m \Lambda_j$$

and

$$(3.41) \quad -\lambda'_1 \left(\sum_{j=2}^m \frac{1}{\Lambda_j} - \frac{1}{\lambda_1} \right) + \frac{\lambda_1'^2}{4\lambda_1} \prod_{j=2}^m \Lambda_j = \frac{4\beta\lambda_1}{\prod_{j=2}^m \Lambda_j},$$

i.e.,

$$(3.42) \quad \beta = \left(\frac{\lambda'_1}{4\lambda_1} \prod_{j=2}^m \Lambda_j \right)^2 - \frac{\lambda_1'}{4\lambda_1} \left(\sum_{j=2}^m \frac{1}{\Lambda_j} - \frac{1}{\lambda_1} \right) \prod_{j=2}^m \Lambda_j.$$

Next let us compute the contribution of Q_2 to $\eta^2 Q$, i.e., δ_{-1} and δ_0 given by

$$(3.43) \quad \delta_{-1} = \eta^2 c_{-1} - \alpha,$$

$$(3.44) \quad \delta_0 = \eta^2 c_0 - \beta.$$

To find these quantities we rewrite Q_2 in (3.25) in powers of X_1 as follows:

$$(3.45) \quad Q_2 = \frac{1}{4X_1^2} + \frac{1}{2X_1} \sum_{j=2}^m \frac{1}{X_j} + \frac{1}{4} \left(\sum_{j=2}^m \frac{1}{X_j} \right)^2 - \frac{1}{2xX_1} \\ - \frac{1}{2x} \sum_{j=2}^m \frac{1}{X_j} + \frac{1}{2X_1^2} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=2}^m \frac{1}{X_j^2} - \frac{1}{4x^2}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 &= \frac{3}{4X_1^2} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=2}^m \frac{1}{\Lambda_j} \left(\frac{1}{X_1} - \frac{1}{X_j} \right) + \frac{1}{4} \left(\sum_{j=2}^m \frac{1}{X_j} \right)^2 \\
 &\quad - \frac{1}{2\lambda_1} \left(\frac{1}{X_1} - \frac{1}{x} \right) - \frac{1}{2x} \sum_{j=2}^m \frac{1}{X_j} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=2}^m \frac{1}{X_j^2} - \frac{1}{4x^2} \\
 &= \frac{3}{4X_1^2} + \frac{1}{2} \left(\sum_{j=2}^m \frac{1}{\Lambda_j} - \frac{1}{\lambda_1} \right) \frac{1}{X_1} - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=2}^m \frac{1}{\Lambda_j^2} + \frac{1}{4} \left(\sum_{j=2}^m \frac{1}{\Lambda_j} \right)^2 \\
 &\quad + \frac{1}{2\lambda_1^2} - \frac{1}{2\lambda_1} \sum_{j=2}^m \frac{1}{\Lambda_j} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=2}^m \frac{1}{\Lambda_j^2} - \frac{1}{4\lambda_1^2} + O(X_1) \\
 &= \frac{3}{4X_1^2} + \frac{1}{2} \left(\sum_{j=2}^m \frac{1}{\Lambda_j} - \frac{1}{\lambda_1} \right) \frac{1}{X_1} + \frac{1}{4} \left(\sum_{j=2}^m \frac{1}{\Lambda_j} \right)^2 - \frac{1}{2\lambda_1} \sum_{j=2}^m \frac{1}{\Lambda_j} + \frac{1}{4\lambda_1^2} + O(X_1).
 \end{aligned}$$

Thus we find

$$(3.46) \quad \delta_{-1} = \frac{1}{2} \left(\sum_{j=2}^m \frac{1}{\Lambda_j} - \frac{1}{\lambda_1} \right),$$

$$(3.47) \quad \delta_0 = \frac{1}{4} \left(\sum_{j=2}^m \frac{1}{\Lambda_j} \right)^2 - \frac{1}{2\lambda_1} \sum_{j=2}^m \frac{1}{\Lambda_j} + \frac{1}{4\lambda_1^2} = \left[\frac{1}{2} \left(\sum_{j=2}^m \frac{1}{\Lambda_j} - \frac{1}{\lambda_1} \right) \right]^2.$$

Combining (3.40), (3.42), (3.46) and (3.47), we find

$$(3.48) \quad \eta^2 c_{-1} = -\frac{\lambda'_1}{4\lambda_1} \prod_{j=2}^m \Lambda_j + \frac{1}{2} \left(\sum_{j=2}^m \frac{1}{\Lambda_j} - \frac{1}{\lambda_1} \right),$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 (3.49) \quad \eta^2 c_0 &= \left(\frac{\lambda'_1}{4\lambda_1} \prod_{j=2}^m \Lambda_j \right)^2 - \frac{\lambda'_1}{4\lambda_1} \left(\sum_{j=2}^m \frac{1}{\Lambda_j} - \frac{1}{\lambda_1} \right) \prod_{j=2}^m \Lambda_j \\
 &\quad + \left[\frac{1}{2} \left(\sum_{j=2}^m \frac{1}{\Lambda_j} - \frac{1}{\lambda_1} \right) \right]^2 \\
 &= \left[\frac{\lambda'_1}{4\lambda_1} \prod_{j=2}^m \Lambda_j - \frac{1}{2} \left(\sum_{j=2}^m \frac{1}{\Lambda_j} - \frac{1}{\lambda_1} \right) \right]^2.
 \end{aligned}$$

Therefore we obtain the required relation:

$$(3.50) \quad (\eta^2 c_{-1})^2 = \eta^2 c_0,$$

i.e.,

$$(3.51) \quad c_0 = \eta^2 c_{-1}^2.$$

This completes the proof of Lemma 3.3. \square

Proof of Theorems 3.1 and 3.2. In proving Theorem 3.1 we construct the series $z(x, t, \eta)$ by induction on the degree of η . To explain how Lemma 3.3 is used in the induction procedure, we first examine the structure of the right-hand side of (3.9) assuming that the series z is given, regardless of the validity of the equality (3.9). In what follows we assume $j_0 = 1$ for notational simplicity, as in the proof of Lemma 3.3. In view of the relations

$$(3.52) \quad \left(\frac{\partial z}{\partial x}\right)^2 \frac{1}{z - z(\lambda_1, t, \eta)} = \frac{z'(\lambda_1)}{x - \lambda_1} + \frac{3}{2}z''(\lambda_1) + \cdots,$$

$$(3.53) \quad \left(\frac{\partial z}{\partial x}\right)^2 \frac{1}{(z - z(\lambda_1, t, \eta))^2} = \frac{1}{(x - \lambda_1)^2} + \frac{z''(\lambda_1)}{z'(\lambda_1)} \frac{1}{x - \lambda_1} + \left\{ \frac{2}{3} \frac{z'''(\lambda_1)}{z'(\lambda_1)} - \frac{1}{4} \left(\frac{z''(\lambda_1)}{z'(\lambda_1)}\right)^2 \right\} + \cdots,$$

where $z'(\lambda_1)$ etc. stand for the derivatives of $z(x, t, \eta)$ with respect to x that are evaluated at $x = \lambda_1$, we find that the right-hand side of (3.9) is of the form

$$(3.54) \quad \frac{3\eta^{-2}}{4(x - \lambda_1)^2} + \eta^{-3/2} \left\{ \rho^{(1)} z'(\lambda_1) + \frac{3}{4} \eta^{-1/2} \frac{z''(\lambda_1)}{z'(\lambda_1)} \right\} \frac{1}{x - \lambda_1} + \eta^{-1} \left\{ z'(\lambda_1)^2 E^{(1)} + \frac{3}{2} \eta^{-1/2} \rho^{(1)} z''(\lambda_1) + \frac{9}{16} \eta^{-1} \left(\frac{z''(\lambda_1)}{z'(\lambda_1)}\right)^2 \right\} + 4z'(\lambda_1)^2 z(\lambda_1)^2 + r_1,$$

where r_1 is a sum of terms of order $O(x - \lambda_1)$. If we further assume (3.12), we find that the coefficients \tilde{c}_l ($l = -1, 0$) of $(x - \lambda_1)^l$ in (3.54) satisfy

$$(3.55) \quad \tilde{c}_0 = \eta^2 \tilde{c}_{-1}^2.$$

Thus Lemma 3.3 lets us expect that we can construct the required series z by first adjusting the coefficients of $(x - \lambda_1)^{-1}$ on both sides of (3.9) and then defining the constant $E^{(1)}$ by (3.12). Note that the most singular part, i.e., the double pole part, is the same on both sides of (3.9). To realize these expectations, we use induction on the degree of η . In what follows we choose

$$(3.56) \quad z_0(x, t) = \left(\int_{\lambda_{1,0}}^x \sqrt{Q_{(J,m),0}} dx \right)^{1/2}.$$

We also note that the relation (2.2.5) enables us to choose

$$(3.57) \quad z_{1/2} = 0.$$

By convention we choose

$$(3.58) \quad \rho_{-1/2}^{(1)} = E_{-1/2}^{(1)} = 0.$$

Our task is to construct the series $z(x, t, \eta)$ so that (3.9) holds. In view of Lemma 3.3 and (3.54), the series should eventually satisfy

$$(3.59) \quad \rho^{(1)} = \eta^{3/2} \frac{c_{-1}}{z'(\lambda_1)} - \frac{3}{4} \eta^{-1/2} \frac{z''(\lambda_1)}{(z'(\lambda_1))^2},$$

$$(3.60) \quad E^{(1)} = \rho^{(1)2} - 4\eta z(\lambda_1, t, \eta)^2.$$

To construct the required series, we let $\Delta = \Delta_0 + \Delta_{1/2}\eta^{-1/2} + \Delta_1\eta^{-1} + \Delta_{3/2}\eta^{-3/2} + \dots$ (with $\Delta_{1/2} = 0$) denote the left-hand side of (3.9) minus its right-hand side. We then prove the following assertion $(\mathcal{A})_n$ by induction on n , starting with $n = -1$:

$(\mathcal{A})_n$ We can construct $z_{(j+2)/2}$, $\rho_{j/2}^{(1)}$ and $E_{j/2}^{(1)}$ ($j = 0, 1, \dots, n$) so that the following relations $(3.61)_n$ and $(3.62)_n$ are satisfied:

$$(3.61)_n \quad \Delta_{j/2} = 0 \text{ for } j = 0, 1, \dots, n + 2,$$

$$(3.62)_n \quad (3.59) \text{ and } (3.60) \text{ hold modulo terms of order at most } \eta^{-(n+1)/2}.$$

It is clear that $(\mathcal{A})_{-1}$ holds by (3.56)–(3.58). Suppose $(\mathcal{A})_{n-1}$ holds. We can then construct $\rho_{n/2}^{(1)}$ (resp., $E_{n/2}^{(1)}$) as the homogeneous part of degree $n/2$ (with respect to η^{-1}) of the right-hand side of (3.59) (resp., (3.60)). Note that in constructing $\rho_{n/2}^{(1)}$ through (3.59) we only need $z_{j/2}$ up to $j = n + 1$ since $c_{-1} = O(\eta^{-1})$ thanks to Lemma 3.3. Thus $(3.62)_n$ is attained. On the other hand, $\Delta_{(n+2)/2}$ has the form

$$(3.63) \quad \Delta_{(n+2)/2} = 8z_0^2 \left(\frac{\partial z_0}{\partial x} \right) \frac{\partial z_{(n+2)/2}}{\partial x} + 8z_0 \left(\frac{\partial z_0}{\partial x} \right)^2 z_{(n+2)/2} + R_{(n+2)/2},$$

where $R_{(n+2)/2}$ is a function defined by $\{z_{j/2}\}_{j \leq n+1}$, $\{\rho_{j/2}\}_{j \leq n-1}$ and $\{E_{j/2}\}_{j \leq n}$. Furthermore $(3.62)_n$ attained above guarantees that

$$(3.64) \quad \sum_{j=0}^{n+2} \Delta_{j/2} \eta^{-j/2}$$

has no singularity at $x = \lambda_1$ and that it vanishes there modulo terms of order at most $\eta^{-(n+3)/2}$, while the induction hypothesis entails

$$(3.65) \quad \Delta_{j/2} = 0 \quad (j = 0, 1, \dots, n + 1).$$

Therefore

$$(3.66) \quad \Delta_{(n+2)/2} = 0$$

at $x = \lambda_{1,0}$. Since

$$(3.67) \quad z_0(\lambda_{1,0}(t), t) = 0$$

by its definition, we conclude that

$$(3.68) \quad R_{(n+2)/2}(\lambda_{1,0}(t), t) = 0.$$

This means that we can divide the equation

$$(3.69) \quad \Delta_{(n+2)/2} = 0$$

by $z_0(x, t)$ to find an ordinary differential equation for $z_{(n+2)/2}$ with regular singularity at $x = \lambda_{1,0}(t)$ with the characteristic index -1 . Thus we can find a holomorphic solution $z_{(n+2)/2}$ of (3.69), as is required by (3.61)_n. This shows that the induction proceeds and hence the proof of Theorem 3.1 is completed. In particular we have obtained (3.59) and (3.60). Then (3.48) and (3.59) entail that, for $J = \text{IV}$,

$$(3.70) \quad \rho^{(1)} = -\eta^{-1/2} \left(\frac{\partial z}{\partial x}(\lambda_1(t, \eta), t, \eta) \right)^{-1} \\ \times \left[\frac{\lambda'_1}{4\lambda_1} \prod_{j=2}^m \Lambda_j - \frac{1}{2} \left(\sum_{j=2}^m \frac{1}{\Lambda_j} - \frac{1}{\lambda_1} \right) + \frac{3}{4} \left(\frac{\partial^2 z / \partial x^2}{\partial z / \partial x} \Big|_{x=\lambda_1(t, \eta)} \right) \right].$$

On the other hand the explicit form (3.22) of $\mathfrak{a}_{(\text{IV}, m)}$ readily implies

$$(3.71) \quad \frac{1}{X_1 \mathfrak{a}_{(\text{IV}, m)}} \Big|_{x=\lambda_1(t, \eta)} = \frac{\prod_{j=2}^m \Lambda_j}{2\lambda_1}$$

and

$$(3.72) \quad \left(\frac{\partial \mathfrak{a}_{(\text{IV}, m)} / \partial x}{\mathfrak{a}_{(\text{IV}, m)}} + \frac{1}{X_1} \right) \Big|_{x=\lambda_1(t, \eta)} = - \left(\sum_{j=2}^m \frac{1}{\Lambda_j} - \frac{1}{\lambda_1} \right).$$

Combining (3.70)–(3.72) we obtain (3.11) for $J = \text{IV}$. The computation for other J 's can be done in the same way. This completes the proof of Theorem 3.2. \square

§4. Splitting of the top order part of $(\Delta G_J)_m$

Once we obtain Theorems 3.1 and 3.2, the next thing to do would be to try to extend the domain of definition of the series $z(x, t, \eta)$ so that it contains the simple turning point $x = a(t)$ of $(SL_J)_m$ that merges with $x = \lambda_{j_0, 0}(t)$ at $t = \tau$. Such an extension is done in [9] when $m = 1$. As we will see in Section 5, to obtain such an extension when m is greater than 1, we need to prove some particular instanton structure of $\rho^{(j_0)}$ and $\sigma^{(j_0)}$; our reasoning there requires that the top degree parts $\rho_0^{(j_0)}$ and $\sigma_0^{(j_0)}$ of $\rho^{(j_0)}$ and $\sigma^{(j_0)}$ contain instanton terms whose phase functions are “related to” the P -turning point in question. Here a phase function related to

the P -turning point in question is, by definition,

$$(4.1) \quad \int_{\tau}^t \nu_{j_0}(t) dt \quad \text{or} \quad \int_{\tau}^t \nu_{j_0+m}(t) dt$$

in the labeling (2.1.1). To confirm (4.1) we use Theorem 4.1 below. Our proof of (4.1) in [13] is somewhat more complicated but more elementary in the sense that it does not use the Hamiltonian form of $(P_J)_m$.

Theorem 4.1. *The top degree part of the Fréchet derivative $(\Delta G_J)_m$ of $(G_J)_m$ ($J = \text{I, 34, II-2, IV}$) at a 0-parameter solution splits into a direct sum of 2×2 systems.*

Proof. Let K denote the Hamiltonian of $(G_J)_m$ and let $(\lambda^{(0)}, \mu^{(0)})$ denote a 0-parameter solution of $(G_J)_m$. An explicit way of the presentation of Theorem 4.1 is then given as follows:

$$(4.2) \quad \left(\frac{\partial^2 K}{\partial \lambda_j \partial \lambda_k} \Big|_{(\lambda, \mu) = (\lambda^{(0)}, \mu^{(0)})} \right)_0 = 0 \quad (j \neq k),$$

$$(4.3) \quad \left(\frac{\partial^2 K}{\partial \lambda_j \partial \mu_k} \Big|_{(\lambda, \mu) = (\lambda^{(0)}, \mu^{(0)})} \right)_0 = 0 \quad (j \neq k),$$

$$(4.4) \quad \left(\frac{\partial^2 K}{\partial \mu_j \partial \mu_k} \Big|_{(\lambda, \mu) = (\lambda^{(0)}, \mu^{(0)})} \right)_0 = 0 \quad (j \neq k).$$

Here

$$(4.5) \quad \left(\frac{\partial^2 K}{\partial \lambda_j \partial \lambda_k} \Big|_{(\lambda, \mu) = (\lambda^{(0)}, \mu^{(0)})} \right)_0$$

etc. denote the 0-th degree (in η) part of $\partial^2 K / \partial \lambda_j \partial \lambda_k$ etc. evaluated at the 0-parameter solution. In what follows let the symbol

$$(4.6) \quad \left[\frac{\partial^2 K}{\partial \lambda_j \partial \lambda_k} \right]_0$$

stand for (4.5). We also use the symbol N_j to denote

$$(4.7) \quad \prod_{k \neq j} (\lambda_j - \lambda_k)^{-1}.$$

To begin, we observe that the results in [16] and [17] (cf. Appendix A) imply that

$$(4.8) \quad K = \sum_{j=1}^m N_j F(\lambda_j, \mu_j, t)$$

for some polynomial $F(\lambda, \mu, t)$. Hence we find

$$(4.9) \quad \frac{\partial K}{\partial \mu_j} = N_j \left(\frac{\partial F}{\partial \mu} \right) (\lambda_j, \mu_j, t).$$

Therefore we have

$$(4.10) \quad \frac{\partial^2 K}{\partial \mu_j \partial \mu_k} = 0 \quad (j \neq k),$$

which immediately entails (4.4). It also follows from (4.9) that

$$(4.11) \quad \frac{\partial^2 K}{\partial \lambda_k \partial \mu_j} = \frac{\partial N_j}{\partial \lambda_k} \left(\frac{\partial F}{\partial \mu} \right) (\lambda_j, \mu_j, t)$$

if $j \neq k$. On the other hand, looking at the highest degree part of $(G_J)_m$ in η , we find

$$(4.12) \quad \left[\frac{\partial K}{\partial \mu_j} \right]_0 = 0, \quad j = 1, \dots, m.$$

Then (4.9) entails

$$(4.13) \quad \left[\frac{\partial F}{\partial \mu} (\lambda_j, \mu_j, t) \right]_0 = 0, \quad j = 1, \dots, m.$$

Therefore (4.11) proves (4.3). It remains to prove (4.2). We may assume without loss of generality that $(j, k) = (2, 1)$. We first show

$$(4.14) \quad \frac{\partial^2 K}{\partial \lambda_1 \partial \lambda_2} = (\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)^{-1} \frac{\partial K}{\partial \lambda_1} + (\lambda_2 - \lambda_1)^{-1} \frac{\partial K}{\partial \lambda_2}.$$

Since

$$(4.15) \quad \left[\frac{\partial K}{\partial \lambda_j} \right]_0 = 0, \quad j = 1, \dots, m,$$

by observing the highest degree part of $(G_J)_m$ in η , we can deduce (4.2) from (4.14). In what follows we use F_j and F'_j to denote respectively

$$(4.16) \quad F(\lambda_j, \mu_j, t)$$

and

$$(4.17) \quad \left(\frac{\partial F}{\partial \lambda} \right) (\lambda_j, \mu_j, t);$$

for example we have

$$(4.18) \quad \frac{\partial K}{\partial \lambda_1} = \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{\partial N_j}{\partial \lambda_1} F_j + N_1 F_1'.$$

Concerning $\partial N_j / \partial \lambda_1$ etc., we can readily deduce the following relations:

$$(4.19) \quad \frac{\partial N_1}{\partial \lambda_1} = - \left(\sum_{k \geq 2} (\lambda_1 - \lambda_k)^{-1} \right) N_1,$$

$$(4.20) \quad \frac{\partial N_j}{\partial \lambda_1} = (\lambda_j - \lambda_1)^{-1} N_j \quad (j \geq 2),$$

$$(4.21) \quad \frac{\partial N_1}{\partial \lambda_j} = (\lambda_1 - \lambda_j)^{-1} N_1 \quad (j \geq 2),$$

$$(4.22) \quad \frac{\partial N_2}{\partial \lambda_2} = - \left(\sum_{k \neq 2} (\lambda_2 - \lambda_k)^{-1} \right) N_2.$$

Hence

$$(4.23) \quad \frac{\partial^2 N_1}{\partial \lambda_1 \partial \lambda_2} = -2(\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)^{-2} N_1 - (\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)^{-1} \left(\sum_{k \geq 3} (\lambda_1 - \lambda_k)^{-1} \right) N_1,$$

$$(4.24) \quad \frac{\partial^2 N_2}{\partial \lambda_1 \partial \lambda_2} = -2(\lambda_2 - \lambda_1)^{-2} N_2 - (\lambda_2 - \lambda_1)^{-1} \left(\sum_{k \geq 3} (\lambda_2 - \lambda_k)^{-1} \right) N_2.$$

Combining these relations, we obtain

$$(4.25) \quad \frac{\partial K}{\partial \lambda_1} = N_1 F_1' - \left(\sum_{k \geq 2} (\lambda_1 - \lambda_k)^{-1} \right) N_1 F_1 + \sum_{j \geq 2} (\lambda_j - \lambda_1)^{-1} N_j F_j,$$

$$(4.26) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{\partial K}{\partial \lambda_2} &= N_2 F_2' - (\lambda_2 - \lambda_1)^{-1} N_2 F_2 - \left(\sum_{k \geq 3} (\lambda_2 - \lambda_k)^{-1} \right) N_2 F_2 \\ &\quad + (\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)^{-1} N_1 F_1 + \sum_{j \geq 3} (\lambda_j - \lambda_2)^{-1} N_j F_j, \end{aligned}$$

$$(4.27) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{\partial^2 K}{\partial \lambda_1 \partial \lambda_2} &= (\lambda_2 - \lambda_1)^{-1} N_2 F_2' - 2(\lambda_2 - \lambda_1)^{-2} N_2 F_2 \\ &\quad - (\lambda_2 - \lambda_1)^{-1} \left(\sum_{k \geq 3} (\lambda_2 - \lambda_k)^{-1} \right) N_2 F_2 \\ &\quad - 2(\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)^{-2} N_1 F_1 - (\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)^{-1} \left(\sum_{k \geq 3} (\lambda_1 - \lambda_k)^{-1} \right) N_1 F_1 \\ &\quad + (\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)^{-1} N_1 F_1' + \sum_{j \geq 3} (\lambda_j - \lambda_2)^{-1} (\lambda_j - \lambda_1)^{-1} N_j F_j. \end{aligned}$$

Then (4.25) and (4.26) imply

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.28) \quad & (\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)^{-1} \frac{\partial K}{\partial \lambda_1} + (\lambda_2 - \lambda_1)^{-1} \frac{\partial K}{\partial \lambda_2} \\
& = (\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)^{-1} N_1 F_1' - (\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)^{-2} N_1 F_1 \\
& \quad - (\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)^{-1} \left(\sum_{k \geq 3} (\lambda_1 - \lambda_k)^{-1} \right) N_1 F_1 - (\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)^{-2} N_2 F_2 \\
& \quad + (\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)^{-1} \sum_{j \geq 3} (\lambda_j - \lambda_1)^{-1} N_j F_j + (\lambda_2 - \lambda_1)^{-1} N_2 F_2' \\
& \quad - (\lambda_2 - \lambda_1)^{-2} N_2 F_2 - (\lambda_2 - \lambda_1)^{-1} \left(\sum_{k \geq 3} (\lambda_2 - \lambda_k)^{-1} \right) N_2 F_2 \\
& \quad - (\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)^{-2} N_1 F_1 + (\lambda_2 - \lambda_1)^{-1} \sum_{j \geq 3} (\lambda_j - \lambda_2)^{-1} N_j F_j.
\end{aligned}$$

Let us now compare (4.27) and (4.28). First, the coefficient of $N_1 F_1'$ (resp., $N_2 F_2'$) is $(\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)^{-1}$ (resp., $(\lambda_2 - \lambda_1)^{-1}$) in either case. Secondly the coefficient of $N_1 F_1$ is

$$(4.29) \quad -2(\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)^{-2} - (\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)^{-1} \sum_{k \geq 3} (\lambda_1 - \lambda_k)^{-1}$$

in either case. Note that $-(\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)^{-2} N_1 F_1$ originates from both $\partial K / \partial \lambda_1$ and $\partial K / \partial \lambda_2$ in (4.28), giving the factor $-2(\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)^{-2}$. The situation is the same for the coefficient of $N_2 F_2$. Finally let us compare the coefficients of $N_j F_j$ ($j \geq 3$). They are

$$(4.30) \quad (\lambda_j - \lambda_2)^{-1} (\lambda_j - \lambda_1)^{-1}$$

in (4.27), and

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.31) \quad & (\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)^{-1} (\lambda_j - \lambda_1)^{-1} + (\lambda_2 - \lambda_1)^{-1} (\lambda_j - \lambda_2)^{-1} \\
& = (\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)^{-1} ((\lambda_j - \lambda_1)^{-1} - (\lambda_j - \lambda_2)^{-1}) \\
& = (\lambda_j - \lambda_1)^{-1} (\lambda_j - \lambda_2)^{-1}
\end{aligned}$$

in (4.28). Thus they coincide. Summing up all these comparisons, we obtain (4.14). This completes the proof of Theorem 4.1. \square

§5. Structure theorem for instanton-type solutions of $(P_J)_m$ near a simple P -turning point of the first kind

The purpose of this section is to prove our main result (Theorem 5.1.1) which shows that near a simple P -turning point of $(P_J)_m$ of the first kind we can transform an instanton-type solution λ_J of $(G_J)_m$ associated with the P -turning point

to an appropriate 2-parameter solution of $(P_1)_1$, the classical (i.e., second order) Painlevé-I equation. In Subsection 5.1 we first fix our notations and then we present our main result. In Subsection 5.2 we recall the definition of the system (\mathcal{DCan}) , i.e., the simultaneous equations (Can) and its deformation equation (D_{can}) , which was introduced in [9]. Then in Subsection 5.3 we show the local equivalence near the double turning point $x = \lambda_{j_0,0}(t)$ between (\mathcal{DCan}) and the simultaneous equations $(SL_J)_m$ and $(D_J)_m$, which will be denoted by $(\mathcal{DSL}_J)_m$ in what follows. In Subsection 5.4 the local equivalence is further ameliorated to become a semi-global one, covering not only the double turning point but also a simple turning point $x = a(t)$ of $(SL_J)_m$ that is found (Subsection 5.1) in conjunction with the P -turning point τ in question. The resulting semi-global equivalence plays a key role in Theorem 5.1.1.

§5.1. The geometric setting for the main result

In order to state our main result in a precise manner, let us first clarify the geometric setting which we use in our subsequent discussion. It is basically the same as the situation we encountered in Section 3. See also [12, Section 3]. Let us start with a simple P -turning point τ of the first kind of $(P_J)_m$ ($J = \text{I, 34, II-2, IV}$) that does not coincide with any other P -turning point of $(P_J)_m$. As was noted in Section 3, there exists a pair of turning points of $(SL_J)_m$, one a double turning point $x = \lambda_{j_0,0}(t)$ and the other a simple turning point $x = a(t)$, which merge at $t = \tau$. These two turning points of $(SL_J)_m$ will play a central role in our analysis in Subsections 5.3 and 5.4. Next we fix a point σ ($\neq \tau$) that is sufficiently close to τ and that lies on a P -Stokes curve emanating from τ . A characteristic feature of σ is that the double turning point $x = \lambda_{j_0,0}(\sigma)$ and the simple turning point $x = a(\sigma)$ are connected by a Stokes curve γ (i.e., a Stokes “segment”) of $(SL_J)_m$. See [12, Appendix B] for the proof of such a characteristic feature of σ on a P -Stokes curve. Actually the definition of the “sufficient closeness of σ and τ ” is given through the appearance of this degeneration of the Stokes geometry of $(SL_J)_m$. Since τ is supposed to be of the first kind, we can find a pair of characteristic roots, say (ν_{j_0}, ν_{j_0+m}) , of the Fréchet derivative $(\Delta G_J)_m$ so that

$$(5.1.1) \quad \nu_{j_0+m} = -\nu_{j_0},$$

$$(5.1.2) \quad \nu_{j_0}(\tau) = \nu_{j_0+m}(\tau) = 0,$$

and

$$(5.1.3) \quad \int_{\tau}^t \nu_{j_0}(s) ds = 2 \int_{a(t)}^{\lambda_{j_0,0}(t)} \sqrt{Q_{(J,m),0}(x, t)} dx.$$

We let $\phi_{j_0}(t)$ denote

$$(5.1.4) \quad \int_{\tau}^t \nu_{j_0}(s) ds.$$

Note that the P -Stokes curve on which σ lies is given by

$$(5.1.5) \quad \text{Im } \phi_{j_0}(t) = 0.$$

Note also that Theorem 4.1 implies that the degree $-1/2$ part (in η) $\lambda_{j_0,1/2}$ of the instanton-type solution λ_{j_0} of $(G_J)_m$ is of the form

$$(5.1.6) \quad \alpha_{j_0,0}a(t) \exp(\eta\phi_{j_0}(t)) + \alpha_{j_0+m,0}b(t) \exp(-\eta\phi_{j_0}(t))$$

with some constants $\alpha_{j_0,0}$ and $\alpha_{j_0+m,0}$ and some analytic functions $a(t)$ and $b(t)$ (cf. (2.1.4) and (2.1.5)).

Using the setting so far described, we now present our main result which asserts that the solution $\lambda_{j_0}(t, \eta)$ of $(G_J)_m$ can be locally transformed near σ to an appropriate 2-parameter solution of the classical Painlevé-I equation.

Theorem 5.1.1. *Suppose*

$$(5.1.7) \quad E_0^{(j_0)} \neq 0.$$

Then there exist a 2-parameter solution $\tilde{\lambda}_I(\tilde{t}, \eta; \tilde{\beta}_1(\eta), \tilde{\beta}_2(\eta))$ of the equation

$$(5.1.8) \quad \frac{d^2 \tilde{\lambda}_I}{d\tilde{t}^2} = \eta^2(6\tilde{\lambda}_I^2 + \tilde{t}),$$

where $\tilde{\beta}_i(\eta) = \sum_{l \geq 0} \tilde{\beta}_{i,l} \eta^{-l}$ ($i = 1, 2$) with $\tilde{\beta}_{i,l}$ being a constant, a neighborhood ω of the point σ , a neighborhood Ω of the Stokes segment γ , $\tilde{x}(x, t, \eta) = \sum_{l \geq 0} \tilde{x}_{l/2}(x, t, \eta) \eta^{-l/2}$ with $\tilde{x}_{l/2}$ being holomorphic on $\Omega \times \omega$ and $\tilde{t}(t, \eta) = \sum_{l \geq 0} \tilde{t}_{l/2} \eta^{-l/2}$ with $\tilde{t}_{l/2}$ being holomorphic on ω for which the following hold:

$$(5.1.9) \quad \tilde{x}(\lambda_{j_0}(t, \eta), t, \eta) = \tilde{\lambda}_I(\tilde{t}(t, \eta), \eta; \tilde{\beta}),$$

$$(5.1.10) \quad \alpha_{j_0,0} = 2c\tilde{\beta}_{1,0} \text{ and } \alpha_{j_0+m,0} = 2c^{-1}\tilde{\beta}_{2,0} \text{ for a constant } c \text{ that depends only on } E_0^{(j_0)},$$

$$(5.1.11) \quad \tilde{x}_{1/2} \text{ and } \tilde{t}_{1/2} \text{ vanish identically,}$$

$$(5.1.12) \quad \text{the } \eta\text{-dependence of } \tilde{x}_{l/2} \text{ and } \tilde{t}_{l/2} \text{ is only through instanton terms that they contain, and } \tilde{x}_0, \tilde{x}_1, \tilde{t}_0 \text{ and } \tilde{t}_1 \text{ are free from instanton terms.}$$

§5.2. Systems $(DCan)$ and $(DSL_J)_m$

As is shown in [9, Proposition 2.1], the system (Can) in Definition 3.1 is compatible with another equation (deformation equation)

$$(5.2.1) \quad (D_{can}) : \quad \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial s} = A_{can} \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial z} - \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial A_{can}}{\partial z} \varphi$$

with

$$(5.2.2) \quad A_{\text{can}} = \frac{1}{2(z - \eta^{-1/2}\sigma_{\text{can}})},$$

on the condition that $(\rho_{\text{can}}(s, \eta), \sigma_{\text{can}}(s, \eta))$ satisfies the Hamiltonian system

$$(5.2.3) \quad (H_{\text{can}}) : \begin{cases} \frac{d\rho_{\text{can}}}{ds} = -4\eta\sigma_{\text{can}}, \\ \frac{d\sigma_{\text{can}}}{ds} = -\eta\rho_{\text{can}}. \end{cases}$$

In what follows we use the symbol (\mathcal{DCan}) to denote the simultaneous system of equations (Can) and (D_{can}) :

$$(5.2.4) \quad \begin{cases} \left(-\frac{\partial^2}{\partial z^2} + \eta^2 Q_{\text{can}}(z, E_{\text{can}}(s, \eta), \rho_{\text{can}}(s, \eta), \sigma_{\text{can}}(s, \eta), \eta) \right) \varphi = 0, \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial s} \varphi = A_{\text{can}} \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial z} - \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial A_{\text{can}}}{\partial z} \varphi. \end{cases}$$

In parallel with this notation we use the symbol $(\mathcal{DSL}_J)_m$ to denote the simultaneous system of equations $(SL_J)_m$ and $(D_J)_m$, that is,

$$(5.2.5) \quad \begin{cases} \left(-\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} + \eta^2 Q_{(J,m)} \right) \psi = 0, \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \psi = \mathbf{a}_{(J,m)} \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial x} - \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial \mathbf{a}_{(J,m)}}{\partial x} \psi. \end{cases}$$

Although Theorem 3.1 guarantees that

$$(5.2.6) \quad \psi(x, t, \eta) = \left(\frac{\partial z}{\partial x} \right)^{-1/2} \varphi(z(x, t, \eta), t, \eta)$$

solves $(SL_J)_m$ near $x = \lambda_{j_0,0}(t)$ if φ is a solution of (Can) with $(\rho_{\text{can}}, \sigma_{\text{can}}) = (\rho^{(j_0)}, \sigma^{(j_0)})$, ψ given by (5.2.6) does not satisfy $(D_J)_m$ in general; we have to find an appropriate correspondence between s and t besides the change of variables z and x . The results in [9] indicate that we should be able to find such a correspondence by requiring the existence of an infinite series

$$(5.2.7) \quad s(t, \eta) = \sum_{l \geq 0} s_{l/2}(t) \eta^{-l/2}$$

which satisfies

$$(5.2.8) \quad \rho^{(j_0)}(t, \eta) = \rho_{\text{can}}(s(t, \eta), \eta),$$

$$(5.2.9) \quad \sigma^{(j_0)}(t, \eta) = \sigma_{\text{can}}(s(t, \eta), \eta).$$

In the subsequent subsections we first construct the series $s(t, \eta)$ that contains some free parameters and then adjust the constants so that the series $z(x, t, \eta)$ and $s(t, \eta)$ thus constructed satisfy (5.1.9). As the first step we show in Subsection 5.3 that

$$(5.2.10) \quad \psi(x, t, \eta) = \left(\frac{\partial z}{\partial x} \right)^{-1/2} \varphi(z(x, t, \eta), s(t, \eta), \eta)$$

is a solution of $(\mathcal{DSL}_J)_m$ near $x = \lambda_{j_0, 0}(t)$ if $\varphi(z, s, \eta)$ is a solution of (\mathcal{DCan}) . In Subsection 5.4 we construct a semi-global equivalence between $(\mathcal{DSL}_J)_m$ and $(\mathcal{DSL}_1)_1$ on a neighborhood of the Stokes segment γ of $(SL_J)_m$ by appropriately combining the transformations constructed in Subsection 5.3, and then we prove that the constructed equivalence gives the required relation (5.1.9).

§5.3. Correspondence between $(\mathcal{DSL}_J)_m$ and (\mathcal{DCan})

The purpose of this section is to establish a local correspondence near $x = \lambda_{j_0, 0}(t)$ between a solution of (\mathcal{DCan}) and that of $(\mathcal{DSL}_J)_m$ by finding an appropriate transformation $s = s(t, \eta)$. Our first task is to construct $s(t, \eta)$ so that s satisfies (5.2.8) and (5.2.9). To do this we first note that the compatibility of $(SL_J)_m$ with the deformation equation $(D_J)_m$ entails the following invariance property of the constant $E^{(j_0)}(t, \eta)$ in Theorems 3.1 and 3.2.

Lemma 5.3.1. *The series $E^{(j_0)}(t, \eta)$ is independent of t .*

Proof. Let S_{odd} denote the odd part of $S_{(J, m)}$, that is,

$$(5.3.1) \quad \frac{1}{2}(S_{(J, m)}^+ - S_{(J, m)}^-),$$

where $S_{(J, m)}^\pm$ denotes the solution of the Riccati equation associated with $(SL_J)_m$, namely

$$(5.3.2) \quad S^2 + \frac{dS}{dx} = \eta^2 Q_{(J, m)},$$

whose highest degree part in η is $\pm \eta \sqrt{Q_{(J, m), 0}}$, respectively. An important property of S_{odd} , often denoted by $S_{(J, m), \text{odd}}$, is that

$$(5.3.3) \quad \frac{\partial S_{(J, m), \text{odd}}}{\partial t} = \frac{\partial}{\partial x}(\mathfrak{a}_{(J, m)} S_{(J, m), \text{odd}}),$$

as a consequence of the deformation equation $(D_J)_m$ that the wave function ψ satisfies (cf. [1, Section 2]). It is also well-known (e.g., [11, Corollary 2.1.7]) that (3.9) entails

$$(5.3.4) \quad S_{\text{odd}}(x, t, \eta) = \frac{dz}{dx} S_{\text{can, odd}}(z(x, t, \eta), t, \eta),$$

where we define $S_{\text{can,odd}}$ in the same way as S_{odd} by using Q_{can} instead of $Q_{(J,m)}$ in (5.3.2). As a consequence of these properties we obtain

$$(5.3.5) \quad \oint_{|x-\lambda_{j_0,0}|=\delta} S_{\text{odd}} dx = \oint_{|x-\lambda_{j_0,0}|=\delta} S_{\text{can,odd}}(z(x,t,\eta),t,\eta) \frac{\partial z}{\partial x} dx \\ = \oint_{|z|=\delta'} S_{\text{can,odd}} dz = \frac{\pi i}{2} E^{(j_0)}$$

for sufficiently small positive numbers δ and δ' . On the other hand, (5.3.3) and the definition of S_{odd} entail

$$(5.3.6) \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \oint S_{\text{odd}} dx = \oint \frac{\partial}{\partial x} (\mathbf{a}_{(J,m)} S_{\text{odd}}) dx = 0.$$

This completes the proof of the lemma. □

We also note that, if we define $E_{\text{can}}(s,\eta)$ by

$$(5.3.7) \quad E_{\text{can}} = \rho_{\text{can}}^2 - 4\sigma_{\text{can}}^2,$$

the series E_{can} is also independent of s ; in fact (H_{can}) implies

$$(5.3.8) \quad \frac{d}{ds} E_{\text{can}} = 2\rho_{\text{can}} \frac{d\rho_{\text{can}}}{ds} - 8\sigma_{\text{can}} \frac{d\sigma_{\text{can}}}{ds} \\ = -8\eta\rho_{\text{can}}\sigma_{\text{can}} + 8\eta\sigma_{\text{can}}\rho_{\text{can}} = 0.$$

Actually the series E_{can} can be explicitly expressed in terms of the constant defined by $(\sigma_{\text{can}}, \rho_{\text{can}})$, namely $(\sigma_{\text{can}}, \rho_{\text{can}})$ has the following form as a solution of (H_{can}) :

$$(5.3.9) \quad \sigma_{\text{can}}(s,\eta) = A(\eta) \exp(2\eta s) + B(\eta) \exp(-2\eta s),$$

$$(5.3.10) \quad \rho_{\text{can}}(s,\eta) = -2A(\eta) \exp(2\eta s) + 2B(\eta) \exp(-2\eta s),$$

where $A(\eta) = \sum_{l \geq 0} A_{l/2} \eta^{-l/2}$ and $B(\eta) = \sum_{l \geq 0} B_{l/2} \eta^{-l/2}$ with $A_{l/2}$ and $B_{l/2}$ being constants. It then follows from (5.3.7) that

$$(5.3.11) \quad E_{\text{can}} = -16A(\eta)B(\eta).$$

In particular,

$$(5.3.12) \quad E_{\text{can},0} = -16A_0B_0.$$

On the other hand, for the α -dependence of $E^{(j_0)}$ we have the following

Lemma 5.3.2. (i) *The highest degree part $E_0^{(j_0)}$ of $E^{(j_0)} = \sum_{l \geq 0} E_{l/2}^{(j_0)} \eta^{-l/2}$ satisfies*

$$(5.3.13) \quad E_0^{(j_0)} = C_0 \alpha_{j_0,0} \alpha_{j_0+m,0}$$

for some non-zero constant C_0 which is independent of the free parameters $\{\alpha_j\}_{1 \leq j \leq 2m}$ contained in an instanton-type solution.

(ii) For any odd integer l , $E_{l/2}^{(j_0)}$ vanishes.

Proof. It follows from (3.11) and (5.1.6) that

$$(5.3.14) \quad \begin{aligned} \rho_0^{(j_0)} = & - \left(\frac{\partial z_0}{\partial x}(\lambda_{j_0,0}) \right)^{-1} (\alpha_{j_0,0} a(t) \phi'_{j_0}(t) \exp(\eta \phi_{j_0}(t))) \\ & - \alpha_{j_0+m,0} b(t) \phi'_{j_0}(t) \exp(-\eta \phi_{j_0}(t)) / 2 \mathbf{b}_{(J,m),0}^{(j_0)}(\lambda_{j_0,0}) \end{aligned}$$

where

$$(5.3.15) \quad \mathbf{b}_{(J,m)}^{(j_0)}(x, t, \eta) = (x - \lambda_{j_0}(t, \eta)) \mathbf{a}_{(J,m)}(x, t, \eta).$$

On the other hand, (3.13) implies

$$(5.3.16) \quad \begin{aligned} \sigma_0^{(j_0)} = & \frac{\partial z_0}{\partial x}(\lambda_{j_0,0}(t)) (\alpha_{j_0,0} a(t) \exp(\eta \phi_{j_0}(t))) \\ & + \alpha_{j_0+m,0} b(t) \exp(-\eta \phi_{j_0}(t)). \end{aligned}$$

In order to compute $E_0^{(j_0)}$, we now prepare the following

Sublemma 5.3.3. For $J = \text{I, 34, II-2 or IV}$ we find

$$(5.3.17) \quad \left(\frac{\partial z_0}{\partial x} \right)^4 \Big|_{x=\lambda_{j_0,0}} = \nu_{j_0}^2 / (4 \mathbf{b}_{(J,m),0}^{(j_0)}(\lambda_{j_0,0}))^2$$

for z_0 in (3.2).

Proof of Sublemma 5.3.3. Let us first recall that

$$(5.3.18) \quad Q_{(J,m),0} = (\det B_0) / (\mathbf{a}_{(J,m),0})^2$$

for the matrix B used to define the Lax pair that underlies $(P_J)_m$ in the notation of Appendix A. (See [7] and [20] for the proof of (5.3.18).) Then the Taylor expansion of the highest degree part of (3.9) shows, with the help of (5.3.18),

$$(5.3.19) \quad \frac{\det B_0}{(x - \lambda_{j_0,0})^2 (\mathbf{a}_{(J,m),0})^2} \Big|_{x=\lambda_{j_0,0}} = 4 \left(\frac{\partial z_0}{\partial x} \right)^4 \Big|_{x=\lambda_{j_0,0}}.$$

Since we know ([7, Proposition 2.1.3 and (2.3.8)], [20]) that

$$(5.3.20) \quad \det B_0 \Big|_{x=\lambda_{j_0,0}} = \nu_{j_0}^2 / 4,$$

we conclude that

$$(5.3.21) \quad \left(\frac{\partial z_0}{\partial x} \right)^4 \Big|_{x=\lambda_{j_0,0}} = \nu_{j_0}^2 / (4 \mathbf{b}_{(J,m),0}^{(j_0)}(\lambda_{j_0,0}))^2.$$

This completes the proof of the sublemma. \square

We now resume the proof of Lemma 5.3.2. Since it follows from the definition of $E^{(j_0)}$ that

$$(5.3.22) \quad E_0^{(j_0)} = (\rho_0^{(j_0)})^2 - 4(\sigma_0^{(j_0)})^2,$$

we deduce the following relation from (5.3.14) and (5.3.16):

$$(5.3.23) \quad \begin{aligned} E_0^{(j_0)} &= (\alpha_{j_0,0}^2 a^2 \exp(2\eta\phi_{j_0}) + \alpha_{j_0+m,0}^2 b^2 \exp(-2\eta\phi_{j_0})) \\ &\times \left[\frac{1}{4} \left(\frac{\partial z_0}{\partial x}(\lambda_{j_0,0}) \right)^{-2} \phi_{j_0}'^2(\mathbf{b}_{(J,m),0}^{(j_0)}(\lambda_{j_0,0}))^{-2} - 4 \left(\frac{\partial z_0}{\partial x}(\lambda_{j_0,0}) \right)^2 \right] \\ &- \frac{1}{2} \alpha_{j_0,0} \alpha_{j_0+m,0} ab \left(\frac{\partial z_0}{\partial x}(\lambda_{j_0,0}) \right)^{-2} \phi_{j_0}'^2(\mathbf{b}_{(J,m),0}^{(j_0)}(\lambda_{j_0,0}))^{-2} \\ &- 8 \alpha_{j_0,0} \alpha_{j_0+m,0} ab \left(\frac{\partial z_0}{\partial x}(\lambda_{j_0,0}) \right)^2. \end{aligned}$$

As it follows from the definition that

$$(5.3.24) \quad \nu_{j_0} = \phi_{j_0}',$$

(5.3.17) and (5.3.23) entail

$$(5.3.25) \quad E_0^{(j_0)} = -16 \alpha_{j_0,0} \alpha_{j_0+m,0} ab \left(\frac{\partial z_0}{\partial x}(\lambda_{j_0,0}) \right)^2.$$

Then we find by Lemma 5.3.1 that

$$(5.3.26) \quad C_0(t) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} a(t)b(t) \left(\frac{\partial z_0}{\partial x}(\lambda_{j_0,0}(t), t) \right)^2$$

is independent of t . Thus we obtain (5.3.13). This completes the proof of (i). To prove (ii) we again note (3.12). Then by the “alternating parity” structure of instanton-type solutions (Appendix B), $E_{l/2}^{(j_0)}$ (l odd) is a sum of monomials in instantons of odd degree. This means that it cannot be a constant unless it vanishes identically. Therefore Lemma 5.3.1 shows (ii). \square

In view of our definition of instanton-type solutions (Appendix B), the assumption $\alpha_{j_0,0} \alpha_{j_0+m,0} \neq 0$ enables us to choose $(A(\eta), B(\eta))$ in (5.3.9) and (5.3.10) so that the following relations hold:

$$(5.3.27) \quad E_{\text{can}} = E^{(j_0)},$$

$$(5.3.28) \quad A_{l/2} = B_{l/2} = 0.$$

Fixing $(A(\eta), B(\eta))$ in this manner, we construct $s(t, \eta)$ so that it satisfies (5.2.8) and (5.2.9). To describe the precise structure of $s(t, \eta)$ we summarize its properties

in Lemma 5.3.4 below. We call the reader's attention to the fact that the series $s(t, \eta)$ relates the objects attached to $(\mathcal{DSL}_J)_m$ with those attached to (\mathcal{DCan}) . Thus its role is substantially different from that of the series $\tilde{t}(t, \eta)$ used in Theorem 5.1.1, which will be explicitly constructed in Theorem 5.4.1. The series $\tilde{t}(t, \eta)$ relates the objects attached to $(\mathcal{DSL}_J)_m$ with those attached to $(\mathcal{DSL}_I)_1$.

Lemma 5.3.4. *Consider the problem in the setting of Subsection 5.1. In particular, let ω denote a neighborhood of the point σ that is close to, but different from, the P -turning point τ in question. Then we can construct a series $s(t, \eta) = \sum_{l \geq 0} s_{l/2}(t, \eta) \eta^{-l/2}$ so that it satisfies the following conditions:*

$$(5.3.29) \quad \sigma_{\text{can}}(s(t, \eta), \eta) = \sigma^{(j_0)}(t, \alpha, \eta),$$

$$(5.3.30) \quad \rho_{\text{can}}(s(t, \eta), \eta) = \rho^{(j_0)}(t, \alpha, \eta),$$

$$(5.3.31) \quad \text{each } s_{l/2}(t, \eta) \text{ is holomorphic on } \omega,$$

$$(5.3.32) \quad s_0(t) = \frac{1}{2} \phi_{j_0}(t),$$

$$(5.3.33) \quad s_{1/2} = 0,$$

$$(5.3.34) \quad s_1(t) = \frac{1}{2} \log \left(A_0^{-1} \alpha_{j_0,0} a(t) \frac{\partial z_0}{\partial x}(\lambda_{j_0,0}(t), t) \right) \\ \left(= \frac{1}{2} \log \left(B_0 \alpha_{j_0+m,0}^{-1} b(t)^{-1} \frac{\partial z}{\partial x}(\lambda_{j_0,0}(t), t)^{-1} \right) \right),$$

$$(5.3.35) \quad s_{l/2}(t, \eta) \ (l \geq 3) \text{ is a polynomial in instantons of degree } l - 2.$$

Proof. Here and in what follows we use the symbol

$$(5.3.36) \quad [\sigma_{\text{can}}(s_0(t) + \eta^{-1} s_1(t), \eta)]_l$$

to denote the degree l part (in η^{-1}) of $\sigma_{\text{can}}(s_0(t) + \eta^{-1} s_1(t), \eta)$, counting the degree of an instanton to be 0 by convention. We first construct $(s_0, s_{1/2}(=0), s_1)$ by using

$$(5.3.37) \quad [\sigma_{\text{can}}(s_0(t) + \eta^{-1} s_1(t), \eta)]_0 = \sigma^{(j_0)}(t, \eta),$$

and then check that it also satisfies

$$(5.3.38) \quad [\rho_{\text{can}}(s_0(t) + \eta^{-1} s_1(t), \eta)]_0 = \rho^{(j_0)}(t, \eta).$$

We find by (5.3.16) that

$$(5.3.39) \quad A_0 \exp(2\eta s_0 + 2s_1) = \alpha_{j_0,0} a(t) \frac{\partial z_0}{\partial x}(\lambda_{j_0,0}(t)) \exp(\eta \phi_{j_0}(t))$$

and

$$(5.3.40) \quad B_0 \exp(-2\eta s_0 - 2s_1) = \alpha_{j_0+m,0} b(t) \frac{\partial z_0}{\partial x}(\lambda_{j_0,0}(t)) \exp(-\eta \phi_{j_0}(t))$$

should be satisfied. It is then clear that we should choose s_0 and s_1 so that

$$(5.3.41) \quad s_0(t) = \frac{1}{2} \phi_{j_0}(t),$$

$$(5.3.42) \quad A_0 \exp(2s_1(t)) = \alpha_{j_0,0} a(t) \frac{\partial z_0}{\partial x}(\lambda_{j_0,0}(t), t),$$

$$(5.3.43) \quad B_0 \exp(-2s_1(t)) = \alpha_{j_0+m,0} b(t) \frac{\partial z_0}{\partial x}(\lambda_{j_0,0}(t), t).$$

On the other hand, (5.3.12) and (5.3.25) tell us that (5.3.27) reads

$$(5.3.44) \quad -16A_0B_0 = -16\alpha_{j_0,0}\alpha_{j_0+m,0}a(t)b(t) \left(\frac{\partial z_0}{\partial x}(\lambda_{j_0,0}(t), t) \right)^2.$$

Note that

$$(5.3.45) \quad C_0(t) = a(t)b(t) \left(\frac{\partial z_0}{\partial x}(\lambda_{j_0,0}(t), t) \right)^2$$

is independent of t (cf. (5.3.26)). Thanks to (5.3.44), (5.3.42) and (5.3.43) are simultaneously solved if we choose $s_1(t)$ so that

$$(5.3.46) \quad \exp(2s_1(t)) = A_0^{-1} \alpha_{j_0,0} a(t) \frac{\partial z_0}{\partial x}(\lambda_{j_0,0}(t), t).$$

Furthermore the relation (5.3.21) guarantees that the functions $s_0(t)$ and $s_1(t)$ thus chosen also satisfy

$$(5.3.47) \quad [\rho_{\text{can}}(s_0(t) + \eta^{-1}s_1(t))]_0 = \rho_0^{(j_0)}(t, \eta)$$

(with the interchange of indices of j_0 and j_0+m so that the appropriate sign of ν_{j_0} is chosen in the relation (5.3.21)). In fact, (5.3.47) holds if (5.3.41) does together with

$$(5.3.48) \quad 2A_0 \exp(2s_1) \\ = \frac{1}{2} \alpha_{j_0,0} a(t) \left(\frac{\partial z_0}{\partial x}(\lambda_{j_0,0}(t), t) \right)^{-1} \phi'_{j_0}(t) (\mathfrak{b}_{(J,m),0}^{(j_0)}(\lambda_{j_0,0}(t), t))^{-1},$$

while (5.3.48) follows from (5.3.21), (5.3.24) and (5.3.42). Thus we have found s_0 and s_1 that satisfy (5.3.37) and (5.3.38).

Let us now embark on the construction of $s_{l/2}(t, \eta)$ ($l \geq 3$) by induction on l ; we construct $s_{l/2}$ by supposing that $s_{l'/2}$ ($l' \leq l-1$) have been given. The method is basically the same as that used in the proof of Lemma 3.1 of [9]. However, we have to be careful as $\rho^{(j_0)}$ and $\sigma^{(j_0)}$ may contain instanton terms other than $\exp(\pm n\eta\phi_{j_0}(t))$ ($n \in \mathbb{Z}$). To make our argument clearer we prepare the following

Sublemma 5.3.5. *Let T denote $\exp(\eta\phi_{j_0}(t))$ and let $f = \sum_{l=-p}^p a_l T^l$ and $g = \sum_{l=-p}^p b_l T^l$ be instanton-type solutions given by (2.1.4) and (2.1.5). Assume that*

$$(5.3.49) \quad (\alpha T - \beta T^{-1})f = (\alpha T + \beta T^{-1})g$$

for some instanton-free series α and β whose top degree parts α_0 and β_0 satisfy

$$(5.3.50) \quad \alpha_0 \beta_0 \neq 0.$$

Then there exists an instanton-type solution $h = \sum_{l=-p+1}^{p-1} c_l T^l$ which satisfies

$$(5.3.51) \quad f = (\alpha T + \beta T^{-1})h.$$

Furthermore c_l is a linear combination of a_k 's ($-p \leq k \leq p$) with coefficients that can be described in terms of α , β , α^{-1} and β^{-1} .

Proof of Sublemma 5.3.5. Let f_{even} denote the even degree (in T) part of f , and let f_{odd} , g_{even} and g_{odd} be defined similarly. By rewriting (5.3.49) as

$$(5.3.52) \quad (\alpha T^2 - \beta)f = (\alpha T^2 + \beta)g,$$

and equating the even degree parts and the odd degree parts, we find

$$(5.3.53) \quad (\alpha T^2 - \beta)f_{\text{even}} = (\alpha T^2 + \beta)g_{\text{even}},$$

$$(5.3.54) \quad (\alpha T^2 - \beta)f_{\text{odd}} = (\alpha T^2 + \beta)g_{\text{odd}};$$

hence

$$(5.3.55) \quad (\alpha T - \beta T^{-1})f_{\text{even}} = (\alpha T + \beta T^{-1})g_{\text{even}},$$

$$(5.3.56) \quad (\alpha T - \beta T^{-1})f_{\text{odd}} = (\alpha T + \beta T^{-1})g_{\text{odd}}.$$

Therefore it suffices to show the existence of h under the assumption that

- (i) f and g are both of even degree in T , or
- (ii) f and g are both of odd degree in T .

As the logical structure of the proof is the same in either case, we only consider the even degree case (i). Suppose

$$(5.3.57) \quad f = \sum_{l=-n}^n a_{2l} T^{2l},$$

$$(5.3.58) \quad g = \sum_{l=-n}^n b_{2l} T^{2l}.$$

Then, multiplying both sides by $\alpha^{-1}T^{2n+1}$, we find (5.3.55) can be written as

$$(5.3.59) \quad (T^2 - \alpha^{-1}\beta)(T^{2n}f) = (T^2 + \alpha^{-1}\beta)(T^{2n}g).$$

Hence it follows from (5.3.59) that

$$(5.3.60) \quad (T^{2n}f)|_{T^2=-\alpha^{-1}\beta} = 0.$$

In what follows we use the expressions

$$(5.3.61) \quad T^{2n}f = \sum_{l=-n}^n a_{2l}T^{2(l+n)} = \sum_{l=0}^{2n} \tilde{a}_l T^{2(2n-l)},$$

$$(5.3.62) \quad T^{2n}g = \sum_{l=-n}^n b_{2l}T^{2(l+n)} = \sum_{l=0}^{2n} \tilde{b}_l T^{2(2n-l)},$$

that is, we let $\tilde{a}_j = a_{2(n-j)}$ and $\tilde{b}_j = b_{2(n-j)}$ ($j = 0, \dots, 2n$). In this notation we can readily deduce the following “division” formula:

$$(5.3.63) \quad T^{2n}f = \sum_{l=0}^{2n} \tilde{a}_l T^{2(2n-l)} = (T^2 + \alpha^{-1}\beta) \sum_{l=0}^{2n-1} \tilde{c}_l T^{2(2n-1-l)} + \tilde{c}_{2n},$$

where $\tilde{c}_0 = \tilde{a}_0$ and

$$(5.3.64) \quad \tilde{c}_l = \tilde{a}_l + (-\alpha^{-1}\beta)\tilde{a}_{l-1} + \dots + (-\alpha^{-1}\beta)^l \tilde{a}_0$$

for $l = 1, \dots, 2n$. In particular, (5.3.60) implies

$$(5.3.65) \quad \tilde{c}_{2n} = (T^{2n}f)|_{T^2=-\alpha^{-1}\beta} = 0,$$

and hence we obtain

$$(5.3.66) \quad T^{2n}f = (T^2 + \alpha^{-1}\beta) \sum_{l=0}^{2n-1} \tilde{c}_l T^{2(2n-1-l)},$$

that is,

$$(5.3.67) \quad f = \alpha^{-1}(\alpha T + \beta T^{-1}) \left(\sum_{l=0}^{2n-1} \tilde{c}_l T^{2n-1-2l} \right).$$

Thus, letting

$$(5.3.68) \quad h = \alpha^{-1} \sum_{l=0}^{2n-1} \tilde{c}_l T^{2n-1-2l},$$

we obtain (5.3.51). This completes the proof of Sublemma 5.3.5. □

We now resume the proof of Lemma 5.3.4. By using the Taylor expansion of $\exp \pm 2(s_{3/2}\eta^{-1/2} + \cdots + s_{l/2}\eta^{-(l-2)/2})$, we deduce the relation (5.3.70) below from the requirement

$$(5.3.69) \quad [\sigma_{\text{can}}(s_0(t) + s_1(t)\eta^{-1} + s_{3/2}(t,\eta)\eta^{-3/2} + \cdots + s_{l/2}(t,\eta)\eta^{-l/2}, \eta)]_{(l-2)/2} = \sigma_{(l-2)/2}^{(j_0)}(t, \eta),$$

$$(5.3.70) \quad s_{l/2}(t, \eta) = \frac{X_{l/2}}{2(A_0 \exp(2\eta s_0 + 2s_1) - B_0 \exp(-(2\eta s_0 + 2s_1)))},$$

where $X_{l/2}$ is a polynomial in instantons of degree $l-1$ by the instanton structure of $\sigma^{(j_0)}$ (cf. Appendix B) together with the induction hypothesis, i.e., (5.3.35). Furthermore it follows from (5.3.69) and (5.3.27) that

$$(5.3.71) \quad [\rho_{\text{can}}(s_0(t) + \cdots + s_{l/2}(t,\eta)\eta^{-l/2}, \eta)^2]_{(l-2)/2} = [\rho^{(j_0)}(t, \eta)^2]_{(l-2)/2}.$$

Hence (5.3.38) entails

$$(5.3.72) \quad [\rho_{\text{can}}(s_0(t) + \cdots + s_{l/2}(t,\eta)\eta^{-l/2}, \eta)]_{(l-2)/2} = \rho_{(l-2)/2}^{(j_0)}(t, \eta).$$

Then, just as (5.3.70) was deduced from (5.3.69), we obtain from (5.3.72) the following relation:

$$(5.3.73) \quad s_{l/2}(t, \eta) = \frac{Y_{l/2}}{-4(A_0 \exp(2\eta s_0 + 2s_1) + B_0 \exp(-(2\eta s_0 + 2s_1)))},$$

where $Y_{l/2}$ is a polynomial in instantons of degree $l-1$ by the instanton structure of $\rho^{(j_0)}$ together with the induction hypothesis. Combining (5.3.70) and (5.3.73) we now find

$$(5.3.74) \quad (\alpha T - \beta T^{-1})X_{l/2} = -\frac{1}{2}(\alpha T + \beta T^{-1})Y_{l/2}$$

by choosing

$$(5.3.75) \quad \alpha = A_0 \exp(2s_1),$$

$$(5.3.76) \quad \beta = -B_0 \exp(-2s_1),$$

$$(5.3.77) \quad T = \exp(2\eta s_0).$$

Therefore Sublemma 5.3.5 guarantees that $X_{l/2}$ is divisible by $\alpha T + \beta T^{-1}$ in the polynomial ring generated by T and T^{-1} with instantons in the coefficients. Hence (5.3.70) implies that $s_{l/2}$ is of the required instanton structure (5.3.35). Thus the induction proceeds. This means that the proof of Lemma 5.3.4 is completed. \square

Remark 5.3.1. Although we have imposed constraints (5.3.27) and (5.3.28), there still remains arbitrariness in the choice of either $A_{2l/2}$ or $B_{2l/2}$, say $A_{2l/2}$. This arbitrariness is inherited by $s_{l/2}$.

The series $s(t, \eta)$ constructed in Lemma 5.3.4 together with the series constructed in Theorem 3.1 brings the simultaneous equation $(\mathcal{DSL}_J)_m$ to (\mathcal{DCan}) ; the precise statement is as follows.

Proposition 5.3.6. *Consider the problem in the setting of Subsection 5.1; in particular, assume (5.1.7). Let $\varphi(z, s, \eta)$ be a WKB solution of (Can) that also satisfies (D_{can}) , and let $\psi(x, t, \eta)$ be given by*

$$(5.3.78) \quad \psi(x, t, \eta) = \left(\frac{\partial z(x, t, \eta)}{\partial x} \right)^{-1/2} \varphi(z(x, t, \eta), s(t, \eta), \eta),$$

where $z = z(x, t, \eta)$ and $s = s(t, \eta)$ are the transformations given respectively by Theorem 3.1 and Lemma 5.3.4. Then $\psi(x, t, \eta)$ satisfies $(\mathcal{DSL}_J)_m$, i.e., the simultaneous equations (5.2.5) near $x = \lambda_{j_0, 0}(\sigma)$.

Proof. First we note that the s -dependence of Q_{can} is through E_{can} , ρ_{can} and σ_{can} . Since we obtain S_{can} by recursively solving the Riccati equation

$$(5.3.79) \quad S_{can}^2 + \frac{\partial S_{can}}{\partial z} = \eta^2 Q_{can}$$

in an algebraic way, the s -dependence of S_{can} is also only through E_{can} ($= \rho_{can}^2 - 4\sigma_{can}^2$), ρ_{can} and σ_{can} , that is,

$$(5.3.80) \quad S_{can}(z, s, \eta) = S_{can}(z, \rho_{can}(s, \eta), \sigma_{can}(s, \eta), \eta).$$

Now, as is well-known (e.g. [11, Corollary 2.1.7]), the relation between $Q_{(J,m)}$ and Q_{can} given by (3.9) implies the following relation between S_{odd} given by (5.3.1) and $S_{can, odd}$:

$$(5.3.81) \quad S_{odd}(x, t, \eta) = \frac{\partial z(x, t, \eta)}{\partial x} S_{can, odd}(z(x, t, \eta), \rho^{(j_0)}(t, \eta), \sigma^{(j_0)}(t, \eta)).$$

On the other hand, (5.3.29) and (5.3.30) mean that the right-hand side of (5.3.81) is identical with

$$(5.3.82) \quad \frac{\partial z}{\partial x} S_{can, odd}(z(x, t, \eta), \rho_{can}(s(t, \eta), \eta), \sigma_{can}(s(t, \eta), \eta)).$$

Hence, by using (5.3.80), we find

$$(5.3.83) \quad S_{odd}(x, t, \eta) = \frac{\partial z(x, t, \eta)}{\partial x} S_{can, odd}(z(x, t, \eta), s(t, \eta), \eta).$$

Then, differentiating (5.3.83) with respect to t , we obtain

$$(5.3.84) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{\partial S_{odd}}{\partial t} &= \frac{\partial^2 z}{\partial x \partial t} S_{can, odd}(z(x, t, \eta), s(t, \eta), \eta) \\ &+ \frac{\partial z}{\partial x} \left(\frac{\partial S_{can, odd}(z(x, t, \eta), s(t, \eta), \eta)}{\partial z} \frac{\partial z}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial S_{can, odd}(z(x, t, \eta), s(t, \eta), \eta)}{\partial s} \frac{\partial s}{\partial t} \right). \end{aligned}$$

It then follows from (5.3.3) and (5.3.83) that

$$(5.3.85) \quad \begin{aligned} & \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left\{ \mathbf{a}_{(J,m)} \frac{\partial z}{\partial x} S_{\text{can,odd}}(z(x,t,\eta), s(t,\eta), \eta) \right\} \\ &= \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left\{ \frac{\partial z}{\partial t} S_{\text{can,odd}}(z(x,t,\eta), s(t,\eta), \eta) \right\} + \frac{\partial z}{\partial x} \frac{\partial s}{\partial t} \frac{\partial S_{\text{can,odd}}(z(x,t,\eta), s(t,\eta), \eta)}{\partial s}. \end{aligned}$$

Since we know

$$(5.3.86) \quad \frac{\partial S_{\text{can,odd}}}{\partial s} = \frac{\partial}{\partial z} (A_{\text{can}} S_{\text{can,odd}}),$$

we can rewrite (5.3.85) as

$$(5.3.87) \quad \begin{aligned} & \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left\{ \left(\mathbf{a}_{(J,m)} \frac{\partial z}{\partial x} - \frac{\partial z}{\partial t} \right) S_{\text{can,odd}}(z(x,t,\eta), s(t,\eta), \eta) \right\} \\ &= \frac{\partial s}{\partial t} \frac{\partial z}{\partial x} \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \left\{ (A_{\text{can}} S_{\text{can,odd}})(z(x,t,\eta), s(t,\eta), \eta) \right\} \\ &= \frac{\partial s}{\partial t} \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left\{ (A_{\text{can}} S_{\text{can,odd}})(z(x,t,\eta), s(t,\eta), \eta) \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

that is,

$$(5.3.88) \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left\{ \left(\mathbf{a}_{(J,m)} \frac{\partial z}{\partial x} - \frac{\partial z}{\partial t} - A_{\text{can}} \frac{\partial s}{\partial t} \right) S_{\text{can,odd}}(z(x,t,\eta), s(t,\eta), \eta) \right\} = 0.$$

Here we recall [8, Proposition 2.2]; its proof applies to the current situation without any changes and it shows that the equality

$$(5.3.89) \quad \frac{\partial \psi(x,t,\eta)}{\partial t} = \mathbf{a}_{(J,m)} \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial x} - \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial \mathbf{a}_{(J,m)}}{\partial x} \psi$$

follows from the relation

$$(5.3.90) \quad \mathbf{a}_{(J,m)} \frac{\partial z}{\partial x} - \frac{\partial z}{\partial t} - A_{\text{can}} \frac{\partial s}{\partial t} = 0$$

on the condition that φ solves (\mathcal{DCan}) . Thus our task is to deduce (5.3.90) from (5.3.88). To do this we follow the reasoning in [9, Section 3]; that is, we introduce the following two symbols \mathcal{J} and \mathcal{K} and we deduce $\mathcal{J} = 0$ from the relation (5.3.93) below by using induction on the degree of \mathcal{J} with respect to $\eta^{-1/2}$:

$$(5.3.91) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{J} &= 2(z(x,t,\eta) - \eta^{-1/2} \sigma_{\text{can}}(s(t,\eta), \eta)) \\ &\quad \times \left(\mathbf{a}_{(J,m)} \frac{\partial z(x,t,\eta)}{\partial x} - \frac{\partial z(x,t,\eta)}{\partial t} - A_{\text{can}} \frac{\partial s(t,\eta)}{\partial t} \right), \end{aligned}$$

$$(5.3.92) \quad \mathcal{K} = \frac{\eta^{-1} S_{\text{can,odd}}(z(x,t,\eta), s(t,\eta), \eta)}{2(z(x,t,\eta) - \eta^{-1/2} \sigma_{\text{can}}(s(t,\eta), \eta))}.$$

It is then clear that (5.3.88) can be rewritten as

$$(5.3.93) \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial x}(\mathcal{JK}) = 0.$$

In order to make the induction argument run smoothly, we prepare the following sublemmas:

Sublemma 5.3.7. *In the current situation,*

$$(5.3.94) \quad \rho^{(j_0)}(t, \eta) \left[\left(2\mathfrak{b}_{(J,m)}^{(j_0)} \left(\frac{\partial z}{\partial x} \right)^2 \right) \Big|_{x=\lambda_{j_0}} - \frac{\partial s}{\partial t} \right] \\ = -\eta^{-1/2} \left[\left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left(\mathfrak{b}_{(J,m)}^{(j_0)} \right) \left(\frac{\partial z}{\partial x} \right) + \left(\frac{3}{2} \mathfrak{b}_{(J,m)}^{(j_0)} \frac{\partial^2 z}{\partial x^2} - \frac{\partial z}{\partial t} \right) \right\} \Big|_{x=\lambda_{j_0}} \right].$$

Sublemma 5.3.8. *Let X denote $x - \lambda_{j_0}$ and let $O(X^l)$ denote a sum of terms containing a factor X^m ($m \geq l$). Then*

$$(5.3.95) \quad \mathcal{J} = \left(\left[2\mathfrak{b}_{(J,m)}^{(j_0)} \left(\frac{\partial z}{\partial x} \right)^2 \right] \Big|_{x=\lambda_{j_0}} - \frac{\partial s}{\partial t} \right) \\ + \left[\left(3\mathfrak{b}_{(J,m)}^{(j_0)} \frac{\partial^2 z}{\partial x^2} + 2 \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left(\mathfrak{b}_{(J,m)}^{(j_0)} \right) \left(\frac{\partial z}{\partial x} \right) - 2 \frac{\partial z}{\partial t} \right) \frac{\partial z}{\partial x} \right] \Big|_{x=\lambda_{j_0}} X + O(X^2).$$

Proof of Sublemma 5.3.7. Using the definition of $\sigma^{(j_0)}$, we differentiate both sides of (5.3.29) with respect to t to find

$$(5.3.96) \quad \frac{d\sigma_{\text{can}}}{ds} \Big|_{s=s(t,\eta)} \frac{\partial s}{\partial t} = \eta^{1/2} \left(\frac{\partial z}{\partial x} \Big|_{x=\lambda_{j_0}(t,\eta)} \frac{d\lambda_{j_0}}{dt} + \frac{\partial z}{\partial t} \Big|_{x=\lambda_{j_0}(t,\eta)} \right).$$

On the other hand, (3.11) entails

$$(5.3.97) \quad \frac{d\lambda_{j_0}}{dt} = - \left[2\eta^{1/2} \rho^{(j_0)} \mathfrak{b}_{(J,m)}^{(j_0)} \frac{\partial z}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left(\mathfrak{b}_{(J,m)}^{(j_0)} \right) + \frac{3}{2} \mathfrak{b}_{(J,m)}^{(j_0)} \frac{\partial^2 z / \partial x^2}{\partial z / \partial x} \right] \Big|_{x=\lambda_{j_0}}.$$

Then by using (5.2.3), (5.3.30) and (5.3.97) we obtain

$$(5.3.98) \quad \eta^{1/2} \rho^{(j_0)} \left(2\mathfrak{b}_{(J,m)}^{(j_0)} \left(\frac{\partial z}{\partial x} \right)^2 \right) \Big|_{x=\lambda_{j_0}} - \eta^{1/2} \rho^{(j_0)} \frac{\partial s}{\partial t} \\ = - \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left(\mathfrak{b}_{(J,m)}^{(j_0)} \right) \left(\frac{\partial z}{\partial x} \right) + \frac{3}{2} \mathfrak{b}_{(J,m)}^{(j_0)} \frac{\partial^2 z}{\partial x^2} - \frac{\partial z}{\partial t} \right] \Big|_{x=\lambda_{j_0}}.$$

Thus we have confirmed (5.3.94). \square

Proof of Sublemma 5.3.8. Using (5.3.29), the definition of $\sigma^{(j_0)}$ and the Taylor expansion in X , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
(5.3.99) \quad \mathcal{J} &= 2 \left\{ \frac{\partial z}{\partial x} \Big|_{x=\lambda_{j_0}} X + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial^2 z}{\partial x^2} \Big|_{x=\lambda_{j_0}} X^2 + O(X^3) \right\} \\
&\times \left\{ \frac{1}{X} \left(\mathbf{b}_{(J,m)}^{(j_0)} \Big|_{x=\lambda_{j_0}} + \frac{\partial \mathbf{b}_{(J,m)}^{(j_0)}}{\partial x} \Big|_{x=\lambda_{j_0}} X + O(X^2) \right) \right. \\
&\times \left. \left(\frac{\partial z}{\partial x} \Big|_{x=\lambda_{j_0}} + \frac{\partial^2 z}{\partial x^2} \Big|_{x=\lambda_{j_0}} X + O(X^2) \right) - \left(\frac{\partial z}{\partial t} \Big|_{x=\lambda_{j_0}} + O(X) \right) \right\} - \frac{\partial s}{\partial t} \\
&= 2 \mathbf{b}_{(J,m)}^{(j_0)} \left(\frac{\partial z}{\partial x} \right)^2 \Big|_{x=\lambda_{j_0}} - \frac{\partial s}{\partial t} + \left[3 \mathbf{b}_{(J,m)}^{(j_0)} \frac{\partial z}{\partial x} \frac{\partial^2 z}{\partial x^2} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + 2 \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left(\mathbf{b}_{(J,m)}^{(j_0)} \right) \left(\frac{\partial z}{\partial x} \right)^2 - 2 \frac{\partial z}{\partial x} \frac{\partial z}{\partial t} \right] \Big|_{x=\lambda_{j_0}} X + O(X^2).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus we have verified (5.3.95). \square

Let us now resume the proof of Proposition 5.3.6. Our strategy is to employ (5.3.93) to prove that

$$(5.3.100) \quad \mathcal{J} = \sum_{k \geq 0} \eta^{-k/2} \mathcal{J}_{k/2}$$

vanishes by using induction on k . Let us first show $\mathcal{J}_0 = 0$. Since E_0 does not vanish by assumption (5.1.7),

$$(5.3.101) \quad \rho_0^{(j_0)} \neq 0.$$

Hence (5.3.94) shows

$$(5.3.102) \quad 2 \mathbf{b}_{(J,m),0}^{(j_0)} \left(\frac{\partial z_0}{\partial x} \right)^2 \Big|_{x=\lambda_{j_0,0}} - \frac{\partial s_0}{\partial t} = 0,$$

and then Sublemma 5.3.8 implies

$$(5.3.103) \quad \mathcal{J}_0|_{x=\lambda_{j_0,0}} = 0.$$

Since $\mathcal{K}_0 = 1$, this means

$$(5.3.104) \quad \mathcal{J}_0 \mathcal{K}_0|_{x=\lambda_{j_0,0}} = 0.$$

Therefore (5.3.93) proves that $\mathcal{J}_0 \mathcal{K}_0$, and hence also \mathcal{J}_0 , vanishes identically.

Let us now suppose

$$(5.3.105) \quad \mathcal{J}_{k/2} = 0 \quad \text{for } k \leq k_0.$$

Since

$$(5.3.106) \quad \left. \frac{\partial z_0}{\partial x} \right|_{x=\lambda_{j_0,0}} \neq 0,$$

$(\partial z/\partial x)|_{x=\lambda_{j_0}}$ is invertible and its inverse is of degree at most 0 in η . Hence Sublemma 5.3.8 entails

$$(5.3.107) \quad \left(\left. \frac{\partial \mathcal{J}}{\partial x} \right|_{x=\lambda_{j_0}} \right) / \left(\left. 2 \frac{\partial z}{\partial x} \right|_{x=\lambda_{j_0}} \right) = - \left(\left. \frac{\partial z}{\partial t} - \frac{3}{2} \mathfrak{b}_{(J,m)}^{(j_0)} \frac{\partial^2 z}{\partial x^2} - \frac{\partial \mathfrak{b}_{(J,m)}^{(j_0)}}{\partial x} \frac{\partial z}{\partial x} \right) \right|_{x=\lambda_{j_0}}.$$

Then (5.3.105) implies that the left-hand side of (5.3.107), and hence also its right-hand side, is of degree at most $-(k_0 + 1)/2$ in η . As the right-hand side of (5.3.94) is $(-1)\eta^{-1/2}$ times the right-hand side of (5.3.107), the left-hand side of (5.3.94) is of degree at most $-(k_0 + 2)/2$. Again using the assumption (5.1.7), we then find that

$$(5.3.108) \quad \left[\left(\left. 2 \mathfrak{b}_{(J,m)}^{(j_0)} \left(\frac{\partial z}{\partial x} \right)^2 \right) \right|_{x=\lambda_{j_0}} - \left. \frac{\partial s}{\partial t} \right]_{(k_0+1)/2},$$

i.e., the degree $-(k_0 + 1)/2$ part in η of the second factor of the left-hand side of (5.3.94), should vanish. Then Sublemma 5.3.8 implies

$$(5.3.109) \quad \mathcal{J}_{(k_0+1)/2}|_{x=\lambda_{j_0,0}} = 0.$$

On the other hand the induction hypothesis (5.3.105) and (5.3.93) entail

$$(5.3.110) \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial x}(\mathcal{J}_{(k_0+1)/2}\mathcal{K}_0) = 0.$$

Combining (5.3.109) and (5.3.110), we find

$$(5.3.111) \quad \mathcal{J}_{(k_0+1)/2}\mathcal{K}_0 = 0.$$

Thus we have shown

$$(5.3.112) \quad \mathcal{J}_{(k_0+1)/2} = 0,$$

as $\mathcal{K}_0 = 1$. This means that the induction proceeds and hence the proof of Proposition 5.3.6 is completed. \square

The zig-zag reasoning between (5.3.94) and (5.3.95), which is the core part of the induction used in the proof of Proposition 5.3.6, has proved the following results as a by-product.

Proposition 5.3.9. *In the situation of Proposition 5.3.6 the following relations hold:*

$$(5.3.113) \quad \frac{\partial s}{\partial t} = \left(2\mathbf{b}_{(J,m)}^{(j_0)} \left(\frac{\partial z}{\partial x} \right)^2 \right) \Big|_{x=\lambda_{j_0}},$$

$$(5.3.114) \quad \left(\frac{\partial z}{\partial t} - \frac{3}{2} \mathbf{b}_{(J,m)}^{(j_0)} \frac{\partial^2 z}{\partial x^2} - \frac{\partial \mathbf{b}_{(J,m)}^{(j_0)}}{\partial x} \frac{\partial z}{\partial x} \right) \Big|_{x=\lambda_{j_0}} = 0.$$

Combining (5.2.8), (5.2.9) and (5.3.113) with (H_{can}) , we obtain

Corollary 5.3.10. *In the above situation we have*

$$(5.3.115) \quad \begin{cases} \frac{\partial \sigma^{(j_0)}}{\partial t} = -2\eta \left(\mathbf{b}_{(J,m)}^{(j_0)} \left(\frac{\partial z}{\partial x} \right)^2 \right) \Big|_{x=\lambda_{j_0}} \rho^{(j_0)}, \\ \frac{\partial \rho^{(j_0)}}{\partial t} = -8\eta \left(\mathbf{b}_{(J,m)}^{(j_0)} \left(\frac{\partial z}{\partial x} \right)^2 \right) \Big|_{x=\lambda_{j_0}} \sigma^{(j_0)}. \end{cases}$$

Remark 5.3.2. An important consequence of (5.3.113) is that the series $s(t, \eta)$ is uniquely determined modulo an additive infinite series in η that is free from t .

§5.4. Semi-global equivalence of $(\mathcal{DSL}_J)_m$ and $(\mathcal{DSL}_1)_1$

Proposition 5.3.6 enables us to construct a local correspondence between $(\mathcal{DSL}_J)_m$ and $(\mathcal{DSL}_1)_1$ near the double turning point $x = \lambda_{j_0,0}(t)$ of $(SL_J)_m$ by using (\mathcal{DCan}) as an intermediary. Here $(\mathcal{DSL}_1)_1$ is the same as (\mathcal{DSL}_1) in [9] by its definition. The local correspondence thus constructed is an almost unique one, but it is not really unique; it inherits the arbitrariness contained in $s(t, \eta)$ that is noted in Remark 5.3.2. By appropriately getting rid of the arbitrariness we can analytically extend the local equivalence so that it may be defined on a neighborhood of a simple turning point $x = a(t)$ of $(SL_J)_m$ in the setting described in Subsection 5.1. As we will show at the end of this subsection, the semi-global equivalence thus obtained gives us the transformation $(\tilde{x}(x, t, \eta), \tilde{t}(t, \eta))$ used in Theorem 5.1.1. As three systems of differential equations, $(\mathcal{DSL}_J)_m$, (\mathcal{DSL}_1) ($= (\mathcal{DSL}_1)_1$) and (\mathcal{DCan}) are involved in the construction of the transformation, we use the following symbols to facilitate the identification of the differential equation studied at that spot: (x, t) (resp., (\tilde{x}, \tilde{t})) and (z, s) designates the independent variable of $(\mathcal{DSL}_J)_m$ (resp., (\mathcal{DSL}_1) and (\mathcal{DCan})), and we normally add a tilde (resp. a subscript “can”) to the quantities relevant to (\mathcal{DSL}_1) (resp., (\mathcal{DCan})), whenever possible. For example, the symbol $\tilde{S}_{\text{odd}}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{t}, \eta)$ means the odd part of a solution \tilde{S} of the Riccati equation associated with (SL_1) , and $S_{\text{odd}}(x, t, \eta)$ (resp., $S_{\text{can,odd}}(z, s, \eta)$) stands for a similar object which we encounter in analyzing $(\mathcal{DSL}_J)_m$ (resp., (\mathcal{DCan})).

We believe that the usage of symbols employed here is systematic and reasonable. In Theorem 5.4.1 below, we use the same symbols as in Subsection 5.1. The logical structure of the proof of Theorem 5.4.1 is essentially the same as that of Theorem 4.1 of [9], but for the sake of completeness we include it here without paring it down.

Theorem 5.4.1. *There exist a neighborhood V of σ , a neighborhood U of the Stokes segment γ that connects $\lambda_{j_0,0}(\sigma)$ and $a(\sigma)$, holomorphic functions $\tilde{x}_{l/2}(x, t, \eta)$ on $U \times V$ and $\tilde{t}_{l/2}(t, \eta)$ on V ($l = 0, 1, 2, \dots$) for which the following conditions are satisfied:*

(i) *The function $\tilde{t}_0(t, \eta)$ is independent of η , and it satisfies*

$$(5.4.1) \quad \phi_{j_0}(t) = \tilde{\phi}_I(\tilde{t}_0(t)),$$

where $\tilde{\phi}_I(\tilde{t})$ designates the phase function that appears in an instanton-type solution $\tilde{\lambda}_I$ of the classical Painlevé-I equation (5.1.8).

(ii) *$d\tilde{t}_0/dt$ never vanishes on V .*

(iii) *The function $\tilde{x}_0(x, t, \eta)$ is also independent of η , and it satisfies*

$$(5.4.2) \quad \tilde{x}_0(\lambda_{j_0,0}(t), t) = \tilde{\lambda}_{I,0}(\tilde{t}_0(t))$$

$$(5.4.3) \quad \tilde{x}_0(a(t), t) = -2\tilde{\lambda}_{I,0}(\tilde{t}_0(t)).$$

(iv) *$\partial\tilde{x}_0/\partial x$ never vanishes on $U \times V$.*

(v) *$\tilde{x}_{1/2}$ and $\tilde{t}_{1/2}$ vanish identically.*

(vi) *The η -dependence of $\tilde{x}_{l/2}$ and $\tilde{t}_{l/2}$ ($l \geq 2$) is solely through instanton terms originating from those in $\lambda_{j_0}(t, \eta)$, and $\tilde{x}_{l/2}$ and $\tilde{t}_{l/2}$ are polynomials in instantons of degree at most $l - 2$.*

(vii) *For $\tilde{x}(x, t, \eta) = \sum_{l \geq 0} \tilde{x}_{l/2}(x, t, \eta)\eta^{-l/2}$ and $\tilde{t}(t, \eta) = \sum_{l \geq 0} \tilde{t}_{l/2}(t, \eta)\eta^{-l/2}$, the following relation holds:*

$$(5.4.4) \quad Q_{(J,m)}(x, t, \eta) = \left(\frac{\partial\tilde{x}(x, t, \eta)}{\partial x} \right)^2 \tilde{Q}_I(\tilde{x}(x, t, \eta), \tilde{t}(t, \eta), \eta) - \frac{1}{2}\eta^{-2}\{\tilde{x}(x, t, \eta); x\},$$

where \tilde{Q}_I designates the potential that appears in (SL_I) and $\{\tilde{x}; x\}$ stands for the Schwarzian derivative.

Proof. Since $\tilde{x}_0(x, t)$ and $\tilde{t}_0(t)$, i.e., the top degree part of the transformation that satisfies (i)–(iv), have already been constructed in [12, Section 3.2], it suffices to construct higher degree parts of the transformation. Let us first fix a correspondence among parameters of $(\beta_1(\eta), \beta_2(\eta))$, $(A(\eta), B(\eta))$ and $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{2m})$. Using

the assumption (5.1.7) and Lemma 5.3.2, we can fix $(A(\eta), B(\eta))$ and $(\beta_1(\eta), \beta_2(\eta))$ so that

$$(5.4.5) \quad \tilde{E}_I = E_{\text{can}} = E^{(j_0)}.$$

Then Lemma 5.3.4 enables us to find $t^{(j_0)}(t, \eta)$ and $t_I(\tilde{t}, \eta)$ that satisfy the relations (5.4.6)–(5.4.9) below (note that the corresponding object is denoted by $s(t, \eta)$ in Lemma 5.3.4):

$$(5.4.6) \quad \sigma_{\text{can}}(t^{(j_0)}(t, \eta), \eta) = \sigma^{(j_0)}(t, \eta),$$

$$(5.4.7) \quad \rho_{\text{can}}(t^{(j_0)}(t, \eta), \eta) = \rho^{(j_0)}(t, \eta),$$

$$(5.4.8) \quad \sigma_{\text{can}}(t_I(\tilde{t}, \eta), \eta) = \tilde{\sigma}_I(\tilde{t}, \eta),$$

$$(5.4.9) \quad \rho_{\text{can}}(t_I(\tilde{t}, \eta), \eta) = \tilde{\rho}_I(\tilde{t}, \eta).$$

Here $(\tilde{\sigma}_I, \tilde{\rho}_I)$ denotes the infinite series corresponding to $(\sigma^{(j_0)}, \rho^{(j_0)})$ for (\mathcal{DSL}_I) , where j_0 is uniquely determined and usually not referred to.

In parallel with the above usage of the symbols $t^{(j_0)}(t, \eta)$ and $t_I(\tilde{t}, \eta)$ we let $(x^{(j_0)}(x, t, \eta), t^{(j_0)}(t, \eta))$ and $(x_I(\tilde{x}, \tilde{t}, \eta), t_I(\tilde{t}, \eta))$ denote respectively the transformation with which we find a WKB solution $\psi(x, t, \eta)$ of $(\mathcal{DSL}_J)_m$ from a WKB solution $\varphi_{\text{can}}(z, s, \eta)$ of (\mathcal{DCan}) by defining

$$(5.4.10) \quad \psi(x, t, \eta) = \left(\frac{\partial x^{(j_0)}(x, t, \eta)}{\partial x} \right)^{-1/2} \varphi_{\text{can}}(x^{(j_0)}(x, t, \eta), t^{(j_0)}(t, \eta), \eta)$$

and the transformation with which we find a WKB solution $\tilde{\psi}_I(\tilde{x}, \tilde{t}, \eta)$ of (\mathcal{DSL}_I) from a WKB solution $\varphi_{\text{can}}(z, s, \eta)$ of (\mathcal{DCan}) by defining

$$(5.4.11) \quad \tilde{\psi}_I(\tilde{x}, \tilde{t}, \eta) = \left(\frac{\partial x_I(\tilde{x}, \tilde{t}, \eta)}{\partial \tilde{x}} \right)^{-1/2} \varphi_{\text{can}}(x_I(\tilde{x}, \tilde{t}, \eta), t_I(\tilde{t}, \eta), \eta).$$

We note that both transformations were designated simply by $(z(x, t, \eta), s(t, \eta))$ in Proposition 5.3.6.

In order to construct the required series $\tilde{x}(x, t, \eta)$ and $\tilde{t}(t, \eta)$ using the above transformations, we first note that (5.3.32) together with (5.4.1) (or, originally, (3.2.6) of [12]) entails

$$(5.4.12) \quad t_0^{(j_0)}(t) = t_{I,0}(\tilde{t}_0(t)).$$

This means that $\tilde{t}_0(\sigma)$ is not a P -turning point of (P_I) ; that is,

$$(5.4.13) \quad \tilde{t}_0(\sigma) \neq 0.$$

On the other hand it follows from (5.3.32) that

$$(5.4.14) \quad \frac{dt_{I,0}(\tilde{t})}{d\tilde{t}} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{d\tilde{\phi}_I(\tilde{t})}{d\tilde{t}} = \sqrt{3\tilde{\lambda}_{I,0}(\tilde{t})} = \left(-\frac{3\tilde{t}}{2}\right)^{1/4},$$

and hence it does not vanish at $\tilde{t}_0(\sigma)$. Therefore $t_I(\tilde{t}, \eta)$ is invertible near $\tilde{t}_0(\sigma)$. Similarly (3.6) guarantees that $x_I(\tilde{x}, \tilde{t}, \eta)$ is also invertible near $(\tilde{x}_0(\lambda_{j_0,0}(\sigma), \sigma), \tilde{t}_0(\sigma)) = (\tilde{\lambda}_{I,0}(\tilde{t}_0(\sigma)), \tilde{t}_0(\sigma))$. Thus the transformation

$$(5.4.15) \quad \begin{cases} z = x_I(\tilde{x}, \tilde{t}, \eta), \\ s = t_I(\tilde{t}, \eta) \end{cases}$$

can be inverted as

$$(5.4.16) \quad \begin{cases} \tilde{x} = x_I^{-1}(z, s, \eta), \\ \tilde{t} = t_I^{-1}(s, \eta). \end{cases}$$

Using this inverse transformation, we now define

$$(5.4.17) \quad \begin{cases} \tilde{x}(x, t, \eta) = x_I^{-1}(x^{(j_0)}(x, t, \eta), t^{(j_0)}(t, \eta), \eta), \\ \tilde{t}(t, \eta) = t_I^{-1}(t^{(j_0)}(t, \eta), \eta), \end{cases}$$

near $(x, t) = (\lambda_{j_0,0}(\sigma), \sigma)$. The relation (5.4.17) may also be expressed as

$$(5.4.18) \quad \begin{cases} x_I(\tilde{x}(x, t, \eta), \tilde{t}(t, \eta), \eta) = x^{(j_0)}(x, t, \eta), \\ t_I(\tilde{t}(t, \eta), \eta) = t^{(j_0)}(t, \eta). \end{cases}$$

Then (5.3.83) entails

$$(5.4.19) \quad \begin{aligned} S_{\text{odd}}(x, t, \eta) &= \left(\frac{\partial x^{(j_0)}(x, t, \eta)}{\partial x} \right) S_{\text{can,odd}} \left(x^{(j_0)}(x, t, \eta), t^{(j_0)}(t, \eta), \eta \right) \\ &= \frac{\partial x_I(\tilde{x}(x, t, \eta), \tilde{t}(t, \eta), \eta)}{\partial x} \\ &\quad \times S_{\text{can,odd}} \left(x_I(\tilde{x}(x, t, \eta), \tilde{t}(t, \eta), \eta), t_I(\tilde{t}(t, \eta), \eta), \eta \right) \\ &= \left(\frac{\partial x_I}{\partial \tilde{x}} \right) (\tilde{x}(x, t, \eta), \tilde{t}(t, \eta), \eta) \frac{\partial \tilde{x}(x, t, \eta)}{\partial x} \\ &\quad \times S_{\text{can,odd}} \left(x_I(\tilde{x}(x, t, \eta), \tilde{t}(t, \eta), \eta), t_I(\tilde{t}(t, \eta), \eta), \eta \right) \\ &= \frac{\partial \tilde{x}(x, t, \eta)}{\partial x} \tilde{S}_{I,\text{odd}}(\tilde{x}(x, t, \eta), \tilde{t}(t, \eta), \eta). \end{aligned}$$

This relation means that the series $(\tilde{x}(x, t, \eta), \tilde{t}(t, \eta))$ enjoys the required properties near $(x, t) = (\lambda_{j_0,0}(\sigma), \sigma)$. However, it may be singular at $x = a(\sigma)$; our task is to adjust the free parameters that $\tilde{t}(t, \eta)$ contains so that $\tilde{x}_{I/2}(x, t)$ is holomorphic

near $(x, t) = (a(\sigma), \sigma)$. We also note that (5.4.18) enables us to deduce the following relations from (5.4.6)–(5.4.9):

$$(5.4.20) \quad \tilde{\sigma}_1(\tilde{t}(t, \eta), \eta) = \sigma^{(j_0)}(t, \eta),$$

$$(5.4.21) \quad \tilde{\rho}_1(\tilde{t}(t, \eta), \eta) = \rho^{(j_0)}(t, \eta).$$

To find an appropriate way of fixing the free parameters contained in $\tilde{t}(t, \eta)$ we first construct a transformation

$$(5.4.22) \quad \tilde{y}(x, t, \eta) = \sum_{l \geq 0} \tilde{y}_{l/2}(x, t, \eta) \eta^{-l/2}$$

that brings $(SL_J)_m$ to $(SL_1)_1$ near the simple turning point $x = a(\sigma)$. In contrast to the situation near $x = \lambda_{j_0, 0}(\sigma)$, $Q_{(J, m)}$ is non-singular near $x = a(\sigma)$. Hence the reasoning in [11, Section 2] readily applies to our situation, and we can construct the series $\tilde{y}(x, t, \eta)$ that satisfies

$$(5.4.23) \quad S_{(J, m), \text{odd}}(x, t, \eta) = \frac{\partial \tilde{y}(x, t, \eta)}{\partial x} \tilde{S}_{1, \text{odd}}(\tilde{y}(x, t, \eta), \tilde{t}(t, \eta), \eta)$$

near $(x, t) = (a(\sigma), \sigma)$. In the course of the construction of \tilde{y} , one finds that $\tilde{y}_{l/2}$ is a polynomial of instantons of degree at most $l - 2$ (cf. Appendix B).

For the computation required for the adjustment of the constants we prepare following series:

$$(5.4.24) \quad R(\tilde{x}, \tilde{t}, \eta) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \int_{-2\tilde{\lambda}_{1, 0}(\tilde{t})}^{\tilde{x}} \eta^{-1} \tilde{S}_{1, \text{odd}}(w, \tilde{t}, \eta) dw,$$

$$(5.4.25) \quad \mathcal{F}(x, t, \eta) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} R(\tilde{x}(x, t, \eta), \tilde{t}(t, \eta), \eta),$$

$$(5.4.26) \quad \mathcal{G}(x, t, \eta) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} R(\tilde{y}(x, t, \eta), \tilde{t}(t, \eta), \eta).$$

It then follows from (5.4.19) and (5.4.23) that

$$(5.4.27) \quad \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial x} = \eta^{-1} S_{(J, m), \text{odd}}(x, t, \eta),$$

$$(5.4.28) \quad \frac{\partial \mathcal{G}}{\partial x} = \eta^{-1} S_{(J, m), \text{odd}}(x, t, \eta).$$

Hence we find

$$(5.4.29) \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial x} (\mathcal{F} - \mathcal{G}) = 0.$$

Next we try to prove

$$(5.4.30) \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial t} (\mathcal{F} - \mathcal{G}) = 0.$$

To do this, we prepare the following

Sublemma 5.4.2. *The functions $\mathbf{a}_{(J,m)}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{a}}_{(I,1)}$ that appear in the deformation equation satisfy*

$$(5.4.31) \quad \frac{\partial \tilde{x}(x, t, \eta)}{\partial t} = \mathbf{a}_{(J,m)}(x, t) \frac{\partial \tilde{x}(x, t, \eta)}{\partial x} - \tilde{\mathbf{a}}_{(I,1)}(\tilde{x}(x, t, \eta), \tilde{t}(t, \eta)) \frac{\partial \tilde{t}(t, \eta)}{\partial t}.$$

Proof of Sublemma 5.4.2. Since we have proved (5.3.90) in the course of the proof of Proposition 5.3.6, we have

$$(5.4.32) \quad \mathbf{a}_{(J,m)}(x, t) \frac{\partial x^{(j_0)}}{\partial x} - \frac{\partial x^{(j_0)}}{\partial t} - A_{\text{can}}(x^{(j_0)}(x, t, \eta), t^{(j_0)}(t, \eta)) \frac{\partial t^{(j_0)}}{\partial t} = 0$$

and

$$(5.4.33) \quad \tilde{\mathbf{a}}_{(I,1)}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{t}) \frac{\partial x_I}{\partial \tilde{x}} - \frac{\partial x_I}{\partial \tilde{t}} - A_{\text{can}}(x_I(\tilde{x}, \tilde{t}, \eta), t_I(\tilde{t}, \eta)) \frac{\partial t_I}{\partial \tilde{t}} = 0.$$

On the other hand, we differentiate (5.4.18) with respect to x and t to find

$$(5.4.34) \quad \left. \frac{\partial x_I}{\partial \tilde{x}} \right|_{\substack{\tilde{x}=\tilde{x}(x,t,\eta) \\ \tilde{t}=\tilde{t}(t,\eta)}}} \frac{\partial \tilde{x}}{\partial x} = \frac{\partial x^{(j_0)}}{\partial x},$$

$$(5.4.35) \quad \left. \frac{\partial x_I}{\partial \tilde{x}} \right|_{\substack{\tilde{x}=\tilde{x}(x,t,\eta) \\ \tilde{t}=\tilde{t}(t,\eta)}}} \frac{\partial \tilde{x}}{\partial t} + \left. \frac{\partial x_I}{\partial \tilde{t}} \right|_{\substack{\tilde{x}=\tilde{x}(x,t,\eta) \\ \tilde{t}=\tilde{t}(t,\eta)}}} \frac{\partial \tilde{t}}{\partial t} = \frac{\partial x^{(j_0)}}{\partial t},$$

$$(5.4.36) \quad \left. \frac{\partial t_I}{\partial \tilde{t}} \right|_{\tilde{t}=\tilde{t}(t,\eta)} \frac{\partial \tilde{t}}{\partial t} = \frac{\partial t^{(j_0)}}{\partial t}.$$

Substituting (5.4.32) and (5.4.33) into (5.4.35), we obtain

$$(5.4.37) \quad \left. \frac{\partial x_I}{\partial \tilde{x}} \right|_{\substack{\tilde{x}=\tilde{x}(x,t,\eta) \\ \tilde{t}=\tilde{t}(t,\eta)}}} \frac{\partial \tilde{x}}{\partial t} + \left[\tilde{\mathbf{a}}_{(I,1)}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{t}) \frac{\partial x_I(\tilde{x}, \tilde{t}, \eta)}{\partial \tilde{x}} - A_{\text{can}}(x_I(\tilde{x}, \tilde{t}, \eta), t_I(\tilde{t}, \eta)) \frac{\partial t_I(\tilde{t}, \eta)}{\partial \tilde{t}} \right] \Big|_{\substack{\tilde{x}=\tilde{x}(x,t,\eta) \\ \tilde{t}=\tilde{t}(t,\eta)}}} \frac{\partial \tilde{t}(t, \eta)}{\partial t} \\ = \mathbf{a}_{(J,m)}(x, t) \frac{\partial x^{(j_0)}}{\partial x} - A_{\text{can}}(x^{(j_0)}(x, t, \eta), t^{(j_0)}(t, \eta)) \frac{\partial t^{(j_0)}(t, \eta)}{\partial t}.$$

Since (5.4.18) entails

$$(5.4.38) \quad A_{\text{can}}(x_I(\tilde{x}(x, t, \eta), \tilde{t}(t, \eta), \eta), t_I(\tilde{t}(t, \eta), \eta)) \frac{\partial t_I(\tilde{t}(t, \eta), \eta)}{\partial \tilde{t}} \frac{\partial \tilde{t}(t, \eta)}{\partial t} \\ = A_{\text{can}}(x^{(j_0)}(x, t, \eta), t^{(j_0)}(t, \eta)) \frac{\partial t^{(j_0)}(t, \eta)}{\partial t},$$

(5.4.36) and (5.4.37) imply

$$(5.4.39) \quad \frac{\partial x_I}{\partial \tilde{x}} \left(\frac{\partial \tilde{x}}{\partial t} + \tilde{\mathbf{a}}_{(I,1)}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{t}) \frac{\partial \tilde{t}}{\partial t} \right) \Big|_{\substack{\tilde{x}=\tilde{x}(x,t,\eta) \\ \tilde{t}=\tilde{t}(t,\eta)}} = \mathbf{a}_{(J,m)}(x,t) \frac{\partial x^{(j_0)}}{\partial x}.$$

It then follows from (5.4.34) that

$$(5.4.40) \quad \frac{\partial \tilde{x}}{\partial t} + \tilde{\mathbf{a}}_{(I,1)}(\tilde{x}(x,t,\eta), \tilde{t}(t,\eta)) \frac{\partial \tilde{t}(t,\eta)}{\partial t} = \mathbf{a}_{(J,m)}(x,t) \frac{\partial \tilde{x}(x,t,\eta)}{\partial x}.$$

Thus we have obtained (5.4.31). \square

Remark 5.4.1. An important point in Sublemma 5.4.2 is that we can deduce (5.4.31) despite the fact that $\tilde{x}(x,t,\eta)$ may be singular at the simple turning point $x = a(t)$. As [8, Proposition 2.2] shows, (5.4.31) rather straightforwardly follows from (5.3.3), the deformation equation for the odd part of a solution of the Riccati equation, if the transformation series involved is defined near a simple turning point.

We now resume the proof of Theorem 5.4.1. Using Sublemma 5.4.2, we find

$$(5.4.41) \quad \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial t} = \frac{\partial R}{\partial \tilde{x}} \frac{\partial \tilde{x}}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial R}{\partial \tilde{t}} \frac{\partial \tilde{t}}{\partial t} = \eta^{-1} \tilde{S}_{I,\text{odd}} \left(\mathbf{a}_{(J,m)} \frac{\partial \tilde{x}}{\partial x} - \tilde{\mathbf{a}}_{(I,1)} \frac{\partial \tilde{t}}{\partial t} \right) - \frac{\partial R}{\partial \tilde{t}} \frac{\partial \tilde{t}}{\partial t}.$$

On the other hand, the deformation equation (5.3.3) applied to $\tilde{S}_{I,\text{odd}}$ implies

$$(5.4.42) \quad \frac{\partial R}{\partial \tilde{t}} = \eta^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{a}}_{(I,1)}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{t}) \tilde{S}_{I,\text{odd}}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{t}, \eta).$$

Hence it follows from (5.4.19) that

$$(5.4.43) \quad \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial t} = \eta^{-1} \mathbf{a}_{(J,m)} S_{(J,m),\text{odd}}.$$

As we noted in Remark 5.4.1, (5.4.31) is valid if we replace $x(\tilde{x}, \tilde{t}, \eta)$ by $\tilde{y}(x,t,\eta)$. This means that the above computation of $\partial \mathcal{F} / \partial t$ is equally applicable to the computation of $\partial \mathcal{G} / \partial t$, that is,

$$(5.4.44) \quad \frac{\partial \mathcal{G}}{\partial t} = \eta^{-1} \mathbf{a}_{(J,m)} S_{(J,m),\text{odd}}.$$

Therefore we obtain (5.4.30).

It then follows from (5.4.29) and (5.4.30) that

$$(5.4.45) \quad \mathcal{F} - \mathcal{G} = \sum_{l \geq 0} C_{l/2} \eta^{-l/2}$$

with a genuine constant $C_{l/2}$.

Let us now prove the following assertion $(C)_l$ for any l by induction on l :

$(C)_l$ An appropriate choice of $t_{l/2}$ guarantees the vanishing of $C_{l/2}$ and the coincidence of $x_{l/2}$ and $y_{l/2}$.

It follows from the definition of x_0 and t_0 that $(C)_0$ holds. Since $x_{1/2} = y_{1/2} = 0$ and $t_{1/2} = 0$, $(C)_1$ is trivially valid. Let us now suppose $(C)_k$ holds for every $k < l$ and that l is even. Let $\mathcal{H}(l/2)$ denote the part of $\mathcal{F}_{l/2} - \mathcal{G}_{l/2}$ which is irrelevant to $\tilde{S}_{I,-1}$, that is,

$$(5.4.46) \quad \mathcal{H}(l/2) = \mathcal{F}_{l/2} - \mathcal{G}_{l/2} - \left[\int_{-2\tilde{\lambda}_{I,0}(\tilde{t}_0(t))}^{\tilde{x}(x,t,\eta)} \tilde{S}_{I,-1}(w, \tilde{t}(t, \eta)) dw - \int_{-2\tilde{\lambda}_{I,0}(\tilde{t}_0(t))}^{\tilde{y}(x,t,\eta)} \tilde{S}_{I,-1}(w, \tilde{t}(t, \eta)) dw \right]_{l/2}.$$

Thus $\mathcal{H}(l/2)$ consists of all terms originating from $\tilde{S}_{I,j}$ ($j \geq 0$). On the other hand each term in $\mathcal{H}(l/2)$ is of degree $-l/2$ in η by definition. Hence only $\tilde{x}_{l'/2}$ and $\tilde{y}_{l''/2}$ ($l', l'' \leq l - 1$) are relevant to $\mathcal{H}(l/2)$. Then the induction hypothesis implies that $\mathcal{H}(l/2)$ should vanish. Thus we concentrate on the terms relevant to $\tilde{S}_{I,-1}$. Then by using the Taylor expansion we find

$$(5.4.47) \quad \int_{-2\tilde{\lambda}_{I,0}(\tilde{t})}^{\tilde{x}(x,t,\eta)} \tilde{S}_{I,-1}(w, \tilde{t}) dw - \int_{-2\tilde{\lambda}_{I,0}(\tilde{t})}^{\tilde{y}(x,t,\eta)} \tilde{S}_{I,-1}(w, \tilde{t}) dw = \tilde{S}_{I,-1}(\tilde{x}_0, \tilde{t}) \{ (\eta^{-1}\tilde{x}_1 + \dots + \eta^{-l/2}\tilde{x}_{l/2} + \dots) - (\eta^{-1}\tilde{y}_1 + \dots + \eta^{-l/2}\tilde{y}_{l/2} + \dots) \} + \frac{1}{2!} \frac{\partial \tilde{S}_{I,-1}}{\partial \tilde{x}}(\tilde{x}_0, \tilde{t}) \{ (\eta^{-1}\tilde{x}_1 + \dots)^2 - (\eta^{-1}\tilde{y}_1 + \dots)^2 \} + \dots.$$

Hence terms that contain $\tilde{x}_{l/2}$ or $\tilde{y}_{l/2}$ and that contributed to $\mathcal{F}_{l/2} - \mathcal{G}_{l/2}$ are

$$(5.4.48) \quad \tilde{S}_{I,-1}(\tilde{x}_0, \tilde{t}_0)(\tilde{x}_{l/2} - \tilde{y}_{l/2})\eta^{-l/2}.$$

Recalling the concrete form of $\tilde{S}_{I,-1}$, we obtain

$$(5.4.49) \quad C_{l/2} = 2\sqrt{\tilde{x}_0 + 2\tilde{\lambda}_{I,0}(\tilde{t}_0(t))} (\tilde{x}_0 - \tilde{\lambda}_{I,0}(\tilde{t}_0(t)))(\tilde{x}_{l/2}(x, t, \eta) - \tilde{y}_{l/2}(x, t, \eta)).$$

We now apply the same reasoning to (5.4.19). The degree $-(l - 2)/2$ (in η) part in the last term in (5.4.19) is then seen to be of the form

$$(5.4.50) \quad \tilde{S}_{I,-1}(\tilde{x}_0, \tilde{t}_0) \frac{\partial \tilde{x}_{l/2}}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial \tilde{x}_0}{\partial x} \frac{\partial \tilde{S}_{I,-1}}{\partial \tilde{x}}(\tilde{x}_0(x, t), \tilde{t}_0(t)) \tilde{x}_{l/2} + \frac{\partial \tilde{x}_0}{\partial x} \frac{\partial \tilde{S}_{I,-1}}{\partial \tilde{t}}(\tilde{x}_0(x, t), \tilde{t}_0(t)) \tilde{t}_{l/2} + R_{l/2}(\tilde{x}_0, \dots, \tilde{x}_{(l-1)/2}, \tilde{t}_0, \dots, \tilde{t}_{(l-1)/2}),$$

where $R_{l/2}$ is determined by $\tilde{x}_{l'/2}$ and $\tilde{t}_{l''/2}$ with $l', l'' \leq l-1$. Then the top degree part of the deformation equation (5.3.3) applied to $\tilde{S}_{\text{I,odd}}$ entails

$$(5.4.51) \quad \frac{\partial \tilde{S}_{\text{I,-1}}}{\partial \tilde{t}} = \frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{x}} \left(\sqrt{\tilde{x} + 2\tilde{\lambda}_{\text{I,0}}(\tilde{t})} \right).$$

Thus it follows from (5.4.19) that

$$(5.4.52) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left(2\sqrt{\tilde{x}_0(x, t) + 2\tilde{\lambda}_{\text{I,0}}(\tilde{t}_0(t))} (\tilde{x}_0(x, t) - \tilde{\lambda}_{\text{I,0}}(\tilde{t}_0(t))) \tilde{x}_{l/2} \right) \\ + \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left(\sqrt{\tilde{x}_0(x, t) + 2\tilde{\lambda}_{\text{I,0}}(\tilde{t}_0(t))} \right) \tilde{t}_{l/2} \right) + R_{l/2} \\ = S_{(J,m),(l-2)/2}(x, t, \eta). \end{aligned}$$

Exactly the same reasoning applied to (5.4.23) entails

$$(5.4.53) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left(2\sqrt{\tilde{y}_0(x, t) + 2\tilde{\lambda}_{\text{I,0}}(\tilde{t}_0(t))} (\tilde{y}_0(x, t) - \tilde{\lambda}_{\text{I,0}}(\tilde{t}_0(t))) \tilde{y}_{l/2} \right) \\ + \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left(\sqrt{\tilde{y}_0(x, t) + 2\tilde{\lambda}_{\text{I,0}}(\tilde{t}_0(t))} \right) \tilde{t}_{l/2} \right) \\ + R_{l/2}(\tilde{y}_0, \dots, \tilde{y}_{(l-1)/2}, \tilde{t}_0, \dots, \tilde{t}_{(l-1)/2}) \\ = S_{(J,m),(l-2)/2}(x, t, \eta). \end{aligned}$$

Since $x_{l/2}$ is non-singular at $x = \lambda_{j_0,0}(t)$, comparison of (5.4.52) and (5.4.53) with the help of the induction hypothesis entails that $\tilde{y}_{l/2}$ has an at most simple pole near $x = \lambda_{j_0,0}(t)$. That is,

$$(5.4.54) \quad \begin{aligned} \tilde{y}_{l/2} = \frac{d_{l/2}(t, \eta) - \tilde{t}_{l/2}(t, \eta)}{2(\tilde{x}_0(x, t) - \tilde{\lambda}_{\text{I,0}}(\tilde{t}_0(t)))} \\ + (\text{non-singular function near } x = \lambda_{j_0,0}(t)), \end{aligned}$$

where $d_{l/2}$ is determined by $\tilde{x}_{l'/2}$ and $\tilde{t}_{l''/2}$ with $l', l'' \leq l-1$. Substituting (5.4.54) into (5.4.49) and evaluating the resulting function at $x = \lambda_{j_0,0}(t)$, we find

$$(5.4.55) \quad \sqrt{3\tilde{\lambda}_{\text{I,0}}(\tilde{t}_0(t))} (\tilde{t}_{l/2}(t, \eta) - d_{l/2}(t, \eta)) = C_{l/2}.$$

Since $\tilde{t}_{l/2}(t, \eta)$ contains a free parameter originating from the arbitrary parameter $(A_{l/2}, B_{l/2})$ contained in $(\rho_{\text{can}}, \sigma_{\text{can}})$, we can choose some point t_* at which $C_{l/2}$ in (5.4.55) vanishes. Then it follows from (5.4.49) that $\tilde{x}_{l/2} = \tilde{y}_{l/2}$. Since l is even by assumption, $l+1$ is odd. This means $C_{(l+1)/2}$ is a sum of monomials in instantons of odd degree. But then it should vanish to become a constant. Therefore we find $\tilde{x}_{(l+1)/2} = \tilde{y}_{(l+1)/2}$. This shows that the induction proceeds and hence the proof of Theorem 5.4.1 is completed. \square

The semi-global transformation $(\tilde{x}(x, t, \eta), \tilde{t}(t, \eta))$ found in Theorem 5.4.1 is the required one in Theorem 5.1.1. Actually Sublemma 5.4.2 entails

$$(5.4.56) \quad 2(\tilde{x}(x, t, \eta) - \tilde{\lambda}_I(\tilde{t}(t, \eta), \eta)) \frac{\partial \tilde{x}(x, t, \eta)}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial \tilde{t}(t, \eta)}{\partial t} \\ = 2\mathbf{b}_{(J,m)}^{(j_0)}(x, t) \left(\frac{\tilde{x}(x, t, \eta) - \tilde{\lambda}_I(\tilde{t}(t, \eta), \eta)}{x - \lambda_{j_0}(t, \eta)} \right) \frac{\partial \tilde{x}(x, t, \eta)}{\partial x},$$

as

$$(5.4.57) \quad \tilde{\mathbf{a}}_{(I,1)} = \frac{1}{2(\tilde{x} - \tilde{\lambda}_I(\tilde{t}, \eta))}.$$

Since the left-hand side of (5.4.56) is non-singular at $x = \lambda_{j_0}(t, \eta)$, we find

$$(5.4.58) \quad \tilde{x}(\lambda_{j_0}(t, \eta), t, \eta) = \tilde{\lambda}_I(\tilde{t}(t, \eta), \eta).$$

This is the required relation (5.1.9). Thus Theorem 5.4.1 together with Sublemma 5.4.2 proves Theorem 5.1.1.

§A. Basic properties of the (P_J) -hierarchy ($J = I, 34, II-2$ or IV) with a large parameter η

For the convenience of the reader we list up the symbols and equations we use in this paper. We basically follow the notation of [17], and therefore the symbols used here sometimes differ slightly from those in [7]. For example, the differential polynomial $\mathcal{F}_j(c)$ of u given by (A.1.2) below corresponds to \mathcal{G}_j in [7], the constant 2γ in (A.1.1) below is designated by g in [7], and so on. In this appendix we confine our attention to the notational aspect of the problem, and we refer the reader to [17] for the theoretical issues such as equivalence of two expressions etc.

§A.1. Definition of $(P_1)_m$ and $(\tilde{P}_1)_m$

As is discussed in [7, Appendix B], P_1 -hierarchy can be expressed in two different but equivalent ways. Here, and in what follows, we use the symbol $(P_1)_m$ to denote the equation

$$(A.1.1) \quad \mathcal{F}_{m+1}(c) + 2\gamma t = 0,$$

where $\mathcal{F}_j(c)$ is, by definition,

$$(A.1.2) \quad \mathcal{F}_j(c) = \sum_{k=0}^j c_k F_{j-k} \quad (\text{with } c_0 = 1).$$

Here F_l 's denote appropriately normalized Gel'fand–Dickey polynomials with a large parameter η ; they are polynomials of the (unknown) function u and its

derivatives, and they satisfy

$$(A.1.3) \quad \frac{dF_{l+1}}{dt} = \eta^{-2} \frac{d^3 F_l}{dt^3} + 4u \frac{dF_l}{dt} + 2 \frac{du}{dt} F_l$$

with

$$(A.1.4) \quad F_0 = 1/2.$$

We note that they are normalized as follows:

$$(A.1.5) \quad F_1 = u,$$

$$(A.1.6) \quad F_2 = 3u^2 + \eta^{-2} \frac{d^2 u}{dt^2},$$

$$(A.1.7) \quad F_3 = 10u^3 + \eta^{-2} \left(10u \frac{d^2 u}{dt^2} + 5 \left(\frac{du}{dt} \right)^2 \right) + \eta^{-4} \frac{d^4 u}{dt^4},$$

and so on. In the equation (A.1.1) we normally assume

$$(A.1.8) \quad c_1 = c_{m+1} = 0$$

by adding appropriate constants to u and t respectively. In practice, we usually abbreviate $\mathcal{F}_{m+1}(c)$ to \mathcal{F}_{m+1} .

Another expression of P_1 -hierarchy given below is denoted by $(\tilde{P}_1)_m$; it is denoted by $(P_1)_m$ in [7].

$$(A.1.9) \quad (\tilde{P}_1)_m : \begin{cases} \eta^{-1} \frac{du_j}{dt} = 2v_j & (j = 1, \dots, m), \\ \eta^{-1} \frac{dv_j}{dt} = 2(u_{j+1} + u_1 u_j + w_j) & (j = 1, \dots, m), \end{cases}$$

where

$$(A.1.10) \quad u_{m+1} = \tilde{\gamma} t$$

and

$$(A.1.11) \quad w_j = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^j u_k u_{j-k+1} + \sum_{k=1}^{j-1} u_k w_{j-k} - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^{j-1} v_k v_{j-k} + \tilde{c}_0 (2u_j - \sum_{k=1}^{j-1} u_k u_{j-k}) + \tilde{c}_j.$$

§A.2. Correspondence between $(P_1)_m$ and $(\tilde{P}_1)_m$

For a solution u of $(P_1)_m$, the equation $(\tilde{P}_1)_m$ is satisfied by $(u_j, v_j)_{1 \leq j \leq m}$ defined by (A.2.1) below through \mathcal{F}_j given in (A.1.2) if constants $\tilde{\gamma}$ and \tilde{c}_j ($0 \leq j \leq m$)

are chosen to satisfy (A.2.2) below:

$$(A.2.1) \quad u_j = -2^{-2j+1}\mathcal{F}_j, \quad v_j = -2^{-2j}\eta^{-1}\frac{d\mathcal{F}_j}{dt} \quad (1 \leq j \leq m),$$

$$(A.2.2) \quad \tilde{\gamma} = 4^{-m}\gamma, \quad \tilde{c}_j = 2^{-2j-3}\sum_{k=0}^{j+1}c_{j-k+1}c_k \quad (0 \leq j \leq m).$$

Conversely if $(u_j, v_j)_{1 \leq j \leq m}$ is a solution of $(\tilde{P}_1)_m$, then

$$(A.2.3) \quad u = -2(u_1 + \tilde{c}_0)$$

is a solution of $(P_1)_m$ on the condition that the relation (A.2.2) is satisfied.

§A.3. Lax pairs $(L_1)_m$ for $(P_1)_m$ and $(\tilde{L}_1)_m$ for $(\tilde{P}_1)_m$

The m -th member of (P_1) -hierarchy is the compatibility condition of the following system $(L_1)_m$ of linear differential equations, which we call the *Lax pair* underlying $(P_1)_m$:

$$(A.3.1) \quad (L_1)_m : \begin{cases} 2\eta^{-1}\gamma\frac{\partial\vec{\psi}}{\partial x} = A\vec{\psi}, & (A.3.1.a) \\ \eta^{-1}\frac{\partial\vec{\psi}}{\partial t} = B\vec{\psi}, & (A.3.1.b) \end{cases}$$

with

$$(A.3.2) \quad A = \begin{pmatrix} -\eta^{-1}\frac{\partial\mathcal{F}}{\partial t} & 2\mathcal{F} \\ -\eta^{-2}\frac{\partial^2\mathcal{F}}{\partial t^2} + 2(x-u)\mathcal{F} & \eta^{-1}\frac{\partial\mathcal{F}}{\partial t} \end{pmatrix} + N,$$

$$(A.3.3) \quad B = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ x-u & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

where

$$(A.3.4) \quad \mathcal{F} = \sum_{j=0}^m(4x)^{m-j}\mathcal{F}_j,$$

$$(A.3.5) \quad N = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ -(\mathcal{F}_{m+1} + 2\gamma t) & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Remark A.3.1. The Lax pair (A.3.1) is slightly different from that given in [5]. (See also [7, Appendix B].) We add a matrix N to A of [5] in such a way that the compatibility condition of (A.3.1) exactly becomes $\mathcal{F}_{m+1} + 2\gamma t = 0$ instead of $(d/dt)(\mathcal{F}_{m+1} + 2\gamma t) = 0$. For the role of the matrix N see also Remark A.7.1 below.

On the other hand, the Lax pair $(\tilde{L}_I)_m$ that underlies $(\tilde{P}_I)_m$ is given by:

$$(A.3.6) \quad (\tilde{L}_I)_m : \begin{cases} \eta^{-1} \tilde{\gamma} \frac{\partial \vec{\psi}}{\partial x} = \tilde{A} \vec{\psi}, & (A.3.6.a) \\ \eta^{-1} \frac{\partial \vec{\psi}}{\partial t} = \tilde{B} \vec{\psi}, & (A.3.6.b) \end{cases}$$

where

$$(A.3.7) \quad \tilde{A} = \begin{pmatrix} V(x)/2 & U(x) \\ (2x^{m+1} - (x - 2\tilde{c}_0)U(x) + 2W(x) + 2\tilde{\gamma}t)/4 & -V(x)/2 \end{pmatrix},$$

$$(A.3.8) \quad \tilde{B} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 2 \\ u_1 + x/2 + \tilde{c}_0 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

with

$$(A.3.9) \quad U(x) = x^m - \sum_{j=1}^m u_j x^{m-j},$$

$$(A.3.10) \quad V(x) = \sum_{j=1}^m v_j x^{m-j},$$

$$(A.3.11) \quad W(x) = \sum_{j=1}^m w_j x^{m-j}.$$

Note that the relation (A.2.1) entails that the $(1, 2)$ -component of the matrix A is the 4^m multiple of that of \tilde{A} .

To avoid some numerical complexity in the description of the associated Hamiltonian (to be given in Subsection A.4 below) we assume in this paper that $\tilde{\gamma} = 1/2$; this means that we can choose the constant Θ in [17] to be 1. This choice of $\tilde{\gamma}$ causes, however, a tiny difference between the Lax pair used here and that used in [7].

§A.4. The Hamiltonian structure of $(\tilde{P}_I)_m$ ([17, Theorem 1.10])

Let us choose $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_m, \mu_1, \dots, \mu_m)$ so that

$$(A.4.1) \quad U(x) = \prod_{j=1}^m (x - \lambda_j)$$

and

$$(A.4.2) \quad \mu_j = V(\lambda_j) \quad (1 \leq j \leq m)$$

for $U(x)$ and $V(x)$ defined respectively by (A.3.9) and (A.3.10). By letting N_j ($1 \leq j \leq m$) denote

$$(A.4.3) \quad \prod_{\substack{k=1, \dots, m \\ k \neq j}} (\lambda_j - \lambda_k)^{-1},$$

we define

$$(A.4.4) \quad H_1 = \sum_{j=1}^m N_j \left(\mu_j^2 - \left(\lambda_j^{2m+1} + \sum_{k=1}^m t_k \lambda_j^{m+k-1} \right) \right)$$

for complex numbers $\{t_k\}_{k=1}^m$. It is known ([17]) that H_1 is a Hamiltonian for the degenerate Garnier system $G(m + 5/2; m)$.

Set

$$(A.4.5) \quad t_1 = t + 2\tilde{c}_m,$$

$$(A.4.6) \quad t_j = 2\tilde{c}_{m-j+1} \quad (2 \leq j \leq m)$$

in H_1 , and let K denote the resulting function of $(t; \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_m, \mu_1, \dots, \mu_m)$. Then the system $(\tilde{P}_1)_m$ is equivalent to the following Hamiltonian system:

$$(A.4.7) \quad (G_1)_m : \begin{cases} \frac{d\lambda_j}{dt} = \eta \frac{\partial K}{\partial \mu_j} & (j = 1, \dots, m), \\ \frac{d\mu_j}{dt} = -\eta \frac{\partial K}{\partial \lambda_j} & (j = 1, \dots, m). \end{cases}$$

§A.5. Definition of $(P_{34})_m$ and $(\tilde{P}_{34})_m$

In view of the results in [2] we study (P_{34}) -hierarchy as an equivalent substitute of (P_{II-1}) -hierarchy in [7]. One advantage of studying (P_{34}) -hierarchy is its intimate connection with (P_I) -hierarchy; a similar connection is also observed between (P_{IV}) -hierarchy and (P_{II-2}) -hierarchy discussed in the subsequent subsections. We note that the awkward naming of (P_{34}) -hierarchy is due to its relevance to the equation numbered XXXIV in the classical study of the Painlevé property ([6, p. 340]).

The m -th member of (P_{34}) -hierarchy is, by definition,

$$(A.5.1) \quad (P_{34})_m : \quad 2\eta^{-2}(\mathcal{F}_m + 2\gamma t) \frac{d^2 \mathcal{F}_m}{dt^2} - \eta^{-2} \left(\frac{d\mathcal{F}_m}{dt} + 2\gamma \right)^2 + 4u(\mathcal{F}_m + 2\gamma t)^2 + \kappa^2 = 0,$$

where η is a large parameter, γ ($\neq 0$) and κ are constants and $\mathcal{F}_m = \mathcal{F}_m(c)$ is a sum of Gel'fand–Dickey polynomials given in (A.1.2). In what follows we use the

symbol I_m to denote the left-hand side of (A.5.1), i.e.,

$$(A.5.2) \quad I_m = 2\eta^{-2}(\mathcal{F}_m + 2\gamma t) \frac{d^2 \mathcal{F}_m}{dt^2} - \eta^{-2} \left(\frac{d\mathcal{F}_m}{dt} + 2\gamma \right)^2 + 4u(\mathcal{F}_m + 2\gamma t)^2 + \kappa^2.$$

Another expression of (P_{34}) -hierarchy is given by $(\tilde{P}_{34})_m$ below ([17, Theorem 2.3]):

$$(A.5.3) \quad (\tilde{P}_{34})_m : \begin{cases} \eta^{-1} \frac{du_j}{dt} = 2v_j & (1 \leq j \leq m), \\ \eta^{-1} \frac{dv_j}{dt} = 2(u_1 u_j + u_{j+1} + w_j) & (1 \leq j \leq m), \\ u_{m+1} = -w_m + \tilde{c}_0 u_m - \tilde{\gamma} t (u_1 + \tilde{c}_0) + \frac{(v_m - \eta^{-1} \tilde{\gamma}/2)^2 - \tilde{\kappa}^2}{2(u_m - \tilde{\gamma} t)}, \end{cases}$$

where w_j is a polynomial of $(u_l, v_l)_{1 \leq l, l' \leq j}$ which is recursively determined through (A.1.11) containing constants \tilde{c}_j , and $\tilde{c}_0, \tilde{\gamma}$ and $\tilde{\kappa}$ are also constants.

§A.6. Correspondence between $(P_{34})_m$ and $(\tilde{P}_{34})_m$ ([17, Theorem 2.3])

For a solution u of $(P_{34})_m$, the equation $(\tilde{P}_{34})_m$ is satisfied by $(u_j, v_j)_{1 \leq j \leq m}$ defined by (A.2.1) with the help of \mathcal{F}_j if the constants $\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{\kappa}$ and \tilde{c}_j ($0 \leq j \leq m$) satisfy

$$(A.6.1) \quad \tilde{\gamma} = 4^{-m+1} \gamma, \quad \tilde{\kappa} = 4^{-m} \kappa, \quad \tilde{c}_j = 2^{-2j-3} \sum_{k=0}^{j+1} c_{j-k+1} c_k.$$

Conversely, if $(u_j, v_j)_{1 \leq j \leq m}$ satisfies $(\tilde{P}_{34})_m$, then $u = -2(u_1 + \tilde{c}_0)$ is a solution of $(P_{34})_m$. (Note that [17, (2.3)] contains some typographical errors; $\tilde{\gamma} = 4^{m-1} \gamma$, $\tilde{\kappa} = 2^{-m} \kappa$ in [17, (2.3)] should be replaced by the first two relations of (A.6.1). In what follows we correct such errors of [17] without explicit mention when citing formulas in [17]. We refer the reader to [18] for a list of corrections of typographical errors in [17].)

§A.7. Lax pairs $(L_{34})_m$ and $(\tilde{L}_{34})_m$ ([5], [17])

We now give the Lax pair $(L_{34})_m$ (resp., $(\tilde{L}_{34})_m$) that underlies $(P_{34})_m$ (resp., $(\tilde{P}_{34})_m$). The first of these is as follows:

$$(A.7.1) \quad (L_{34})_m : \begin{cases} 4\eta^{-1} \gamma x \frac{\partial \vec{\psi}}{\partial x} = A \vec{\psi}, & (A.7.1.a) \\ \eta^{-1} \frac{\partial \vec{\psi}}{\partial t} = B \vec{\psi}, & (A.7.1.b) \end{cases}$$

where

$$(A.7.2) \quad A = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} -\eta^{-1} \left(\frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial t} + 2\gamma \right) & 2(\mathcal{F} + 2\gamma t) \\ -\eta^{-2} \frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{F}}{\partial t^2} + 2(x - u)(\mathcal{F} + 2\gamma t) & \eta^{-1} \left(\frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial t} + 2\gamma \right) \end{pmatrix} + N,$$

$$(A.7.3) \quad B = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ x - u & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

with

$$(A.7.4) \quad \mathcal{F} = \sum_{j=0}^m (4x)^{m-j} \mathcal{F}_j,$$

$$(A.7.5) \quad N = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ I_m / (4(\mathcal{F}_m + 2\gamma t)) & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Remark A.7.1. The purpose of adding the matrix N to the original Lax pair used in [5] is two-fold: first it fixes the expression of the Lax pair by eliminating the $2m$ -th derivative of u in A , and secondly it makes the compatibility condition of (A.7.1.a) and (A.7.1.b) coincide with $(P_{34})_m$ with the parameter κ^2 fixed. The first fact enabled Koike ([17]) to smoothly find the corresponding Lax pair $(\tilde{L}_{34})_m$ of $(\tilde{P}_{34})_m$, and the second fact is effectively used in his reasoning to relate $(\tilde{P}_{34})_m$, and hence $(P_{34})_m$, to a Garnier system. Note that the original formulation of [5] gives a family of $(P_{34})_m$ (parameterized by κ^2 in the notation of [17]) as the compatibility condition of their Lax pair. In practice we always substitute a solution of $(P_{34})_m$ into the coefficients of $(L_{34})_m$ in this paper and hence we may ignore N in analyzing the Lax pair.

With the help of Remark A.7.1, Koike ([17]) gives the Lax pair $(\tilde{L}_{34})_m$ of $(\tilde{P}_{34})_m$ as follows:

$$(A.7.6) \quad (\tilde{L}_{34})_m : \begin{cases} \eta^{-1} \tilde{\gamma} x \frac{\partial \vec{\psi}}{\partial x} = \tilde{A} \vec{\psi}, & (A.7.6.a) \\ \eta^{-1} \frac{\partial \vec{\psi}}{\partial t} = \tilde{B} \vec{\psi}, & (A.7.6.b) \end{cases}$$

where

$$(A.7.7) \quad \tilde{A} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{2}V(x) - \frac{1}{4}\eta^{-1}\tilde{\gamma} & U + \tilde{\gamma}t \\ \frac{1}{4}(2x^{m+1} - (x - 2\tilde{c}_0)U + 2W + \tilde{\gamma}t(x + 2u_1 + 2\tilde{c}_0) + 2u_{m+1}) & -\left(\frac{1}{2}V(x) - \frac{1}{4}\eta^{-1}\tilde{\gamma}\right) \end{pmatrix},$$

$$(A.7.8) \quad \tilde{B} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 2 \\ \frac{1}{2}x + u_1 + \tilde{c}_0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Here U , V and W are the polynomials given respectively by (A.3.9)–(A.3.11). In view of (A.2.1) the $(1, 2)$ -component of A is again found to be the 2^{2m-1} multiple of that of \tilde{A} .

In parallel with the study of $(\tilde{P}_1)_m$, we choose $\tilde{\gamma}$ to be $1/2$ in what follows. This choice of $\tilde{\gamma}$ enables us to assume that the constant Θ in [17] is 1.

§A.8. The Hamiltonian structure of $(\tilde{P}_{34})_m$ ([17, Theorem 2.19])

Let us choose $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_m, \mu_1, \dots, \mu_m)$ so that

$$(A.8.1) \quad U(x) + \frac{1}{2}t = \prod_{j=1}^m (x - \lambda_j)$$

and

$$(A.8.2) \quad \mu_j = \frac{1}{\lambda_j} \left(V(\lambda_j) - \tilde{\kappa} - \frac{1}{4}\eta^{-1} \right) \quad (1 \leq j \leq m).$$

By letting N_j ($1 \leq j \leq m$) denote

$$(A.8.3) \quad \prod_{\substack{k=1, \dots, m \\ k \neq j}} (\lambda_j - \lambda_k)^{-1}$$

we define

$$(A.8.4) \quad H_1 = \sum_{j=1}^m N_j \left(\lambda_j \mu_j^2 - 2\tilde{\kappa} \mu_j - \left(\lambda_j^{2m} + \sum_{k=1}^m t_k \lambda_j^{m+k-1} \right) \right)$$

for complex numbers $\{t_k\}_{k=1}^m$. It is known ([17]) that H_1 is a Hamiltonian for the degenerate Garnier system $G(1, m + 3/2; m)$. Set

$$(A.8.5) \quad t_1 = 4t + 2\tilde{c}_{m-1},$$

$$(A.8.6) \quad t_j = 2\tilde{c}_{m-j} \quad (2 \leq j \leq m)$$

in H_1 , and let

$$(A.8.7) \quad K(t; \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_m, \mu_1, \dots, \mu_m) = 4H_1|_{t_1=4t+2\tilde{c}_{m-1}, t_2=2\tilde{c}_{m-2}, \dots, t_m=2\tilde{c}_0}.$$

Then the system $(\tilde{P}_{34})_m$ is equivalent to the following Hamiltonian system:

$$(A.8.8) \quad (G_{34})_m : \begin{cases} \frac{d\lambda_j}{dt} = \eta \frac{\partial K}{\partial \mu_j} & (j = 1, \dots, m), \\ \frac{d\mu_j}{dt} = -\eta \frac{\partial K}{\partial \lambda_j} & (j = 1, \dots, m). \end{cases}$$

§A.9. Definition of $(P_{\text{II-2}})_m$ and $(\tilde{P}_{\text{II-2}})_m$

The $(P_{\text{II-2}})$ -hierarchy and the (P_{IV}) -hierarchy are defined in [3, 4] with the help of differential polynomials $(K_n, L_n)_{n \geq 0}$ of a pair of functions (u, v) and their deriva-

tives, which are recursively determined by the following relation:

$$(A.9.1) \quad \begin{cases} K_{n+1} = \frac{1}{2} \left(uK_n + 2L_n - \eta^{-1} \frac{dK_n}{dt} \right), & (A.9.1.a) \\ L_{n+1} = \frac{1}{4} \sum_{j=0}^n \left(vK_{n-j}K_j - L_{n-j}L_j + \eta^{-1} K_{n-j} \frac{dL_j}{dt} \right), & (A.9.1.b) \end{cases}$$

with

$$(A.9.2) \quad K_0 = 2, \quad L_0 = 0.$$

(See [22] for the background of the formula (A.9.1).) For the convenience of notation we introduce

$$(A.9.3) \quad \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{K}_n \\ \mathcal{L}_n \end{pmatrix} = c_0 \begin{pmatrix} K_n \\ L_n \end{pmatrix} + c_1 \begin{pmatrix} K_{n-1} \\ L_{n-1} \end{pmatrix} + \dots + c_n \begin{pmatrix} K_0 \\ L_0 \end{pmatrix},$$

where c_j 's are constants. Unless otherwise stated explicitly, we choose c_0 to be 1. For example,

$$(A.9.4) \quad \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{K}_3 \\ \mathcal{L}_3 \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{4} \left[\begin{pmatrix} u^3 + 6uv \\ 3u^2v + 3v^2 \end{pmatrix} + 3u\eta^{-1} \frac{d}{dt} \begin{pmatrix} -u \\ v \end{pmatrix} + \eta^{-2} \frac{d^2}{dt^2} \begin{pmatrix} u \\ v \end{pmatrix} \right] \\ + \frac{c_1}{2} \left[\begin{pmatrix} u^2 + 2v \\ 2uv \end{pmatrix} + \eta^{-1} \frac{d}{dt} \begin{pmatrix} -u \\ v \end{pmatrix} \right] + c_2 \begin{pmatrix} u \\ v \end{pmatrix} + c_3 \begin{pmatrix} 2 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

(Cf. [7, Remark 1.3.1].) The m -th member of (P_{II-2}) -hierarchy is, by definition, the following equation ([7, Definition 1.3.1]; note, however, that we have reversed the order of labeling the constants c_j 's so that our notation may become consistent with [17]):

$$(A.9.5) \quad (P_{II-2})_m : \begin{cases} \mathcal{K}_{m+1} + 2\gamma t = 0, & (A.9.5.a) \\ \mathcal{L}_{m+1} = 2\kappa, & (A.9.5.b) \end{cases}$$

with $\gamma (\neq 0)$ and κ being constants. Unless otherwise stated, we suppose $c_{m+1} = 0$ for simplicity.

Another expression (A.9.6) of $(P_{II-2})_m$ is given by Koike ([16]); it is denoted by $(\tilde{P}_{II-2})_m$ in [17].

$$(A.9.6) \quad (\tilde{P}_{II-2})_m : \begin{cases} \eta^{-1} \frac{du_j}{dt} = -2(u_1u_j + v_j + u_{j+1}) + 2c_ju_1 & (1 \leq j \leq m), & (A.9.6.a) \\ \eta^{-1} \frac{dv_j}{dt} = 2(v_1u_j + v_{j+1} + w_j) - 2c_jv_1 & (1 \leq j \leq m), & (A.9.6.b) \\ \text{with} & \\ u_{m+1} = \gamma t, \quad v_{m+1} = \kappa. & (A.9.6.c) \end{cases}$$

Here $\gamma (\neq 0)$, κ and c_j 's are constants used in the definition of $(P_{\text{II-2}})_m$, and w_j is a polynomial in $(u_k, v_k)_{k \leq j}$ that is recursively determined by the relation

$$(A.9.7) \quad w_j = \sum_{k=1}^{j-1} u_{j-k} w_k + \sum_{k=1}^j u_{j-k+1} v_k + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^{j-1} v_{j-k} v_k - \sum_{k=1}^{j-1} c_{j-k} w_k.$$

§A.10. Correspondence between $(P_{\text{II-2}})_m$ and $(\tilde{P}_{\text{II-2}})_m$
([17, Theorem 3.5])

For a solution (u, v) of $(P_{\text{II-2}})_m$, the equation $(\tilde{P}_{\text{II-2}})_m$ is satisfied by $(u_j, v_j)_{1 \leq j \leq m}$ defined through $(\mathcal{K}_j, \mathcal{L}_j)_{1 \leq j \leq m}$ by

$$(A.10.1) \quad \begin{cases} u_j = -\frac{1}{2} \mathcal{K}_j + c_j & (1 \leq j \leq m), \\ v_j = \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{L}_j & (1 \leq j \leq m). \end{cases}$$

Conversely, if $(u_j, v_j)_{1 \leq j \leq m}$ is a solution of $(\tilde{P}_{\text{II-2}})_m$, then

$$(A.10.2) \quad u = -2u_1, \quad v = 2v_1$$

is a solution of $(P_{\text{II-2}})_m$.

§A.11. Lax pairs $(L_{\text{II-2}})_m$ and $(\tilde{L}_{\text{II-2}})_m$ ([17, §3])

We give the Lax pair $(L_{\text{II-2}})_m$ (resp., $(\tilde{L}_{\text{II-2}})_m$) that underlies $(P_{\text{II-2}})_m$ (resp., $(\tilde{P}_{\text{II-2}})_m$). The first of these is as follows:

$$(A.11.1) \quad (L_{\text{II-2}})_m : \begin{cases} \gamma \eta^{-1} \frac{\partial \vec{\psi}}{\partial x} = A \vec{\psi}, & (A.11.1.a) \\ \eta^{-1} \frac{\partial \vec{\psi}}{\partial t} = B \vec{\psi}, & (A.11.1.b) \end{cases}$$

with

$$(A.11.2) \quad A = \frac{1}{4} \begin{pmatrix} -(2x-u)\mathcal{K} - \eta^{-1} \frac{d\mathcal{K}}{dt} & 2\mathcal{K} \\ -2\eta^{-1} \frac{d\mathcal{L}}{dt} - 2v\mathcal{K} & (2x-u)\mathcal{K} + \eta^{-1} \frac{d\mathcal{K}}{dt} \end{pmatrix} + N,$$

$$(A.11.3) \quad B = \begin{pmatrix} -x + u/2 & 1 \\ v & x - u/2 \end{pmatrix},$$

where

$$(A.11.4) \quad \mathcal{K} = \sum_{j=0}^m x^{m-j} \mathcal{K}_j, \quad \mathcal{L} = \sum_{j=0}^m x^{m-j} \mathcal{L}_j,$$

$$(A.11.5) \quad N = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} -\mathcal{K}_{m+1} - 2\gamma t & 0 \\ 2(\mathcal{L}_{m+1} - 2\kappa) & \mathcal{K}_{m+1} + 2\gamma t \end{pmatrix}.$$

Remark A.11.1. The role of the additional matrix N is essentially the same as for the case of $(L_{34})_m$.

The Lax pair $(\tilde{L}_{\text{II-2}})_m$ of $(P_{\text{II-2}})_m$ given by Koike ([17]) is

$$(A.11.6) \quad (\tilde{L}_{\text{II-2}})_m : \begin{cases} \gamma \eta^{-1} \frac{\partial \vec{\psi}}{\partial x} = \tilde{A} \vec{\psi}, & (A.11.6.a) \\ \eta^{-1} \frac{\partial \vec{\psi}}{\partial t} = \tilde{B} \vec{\psi}, & (A.11.6.b) \end{cases}$$

with

$$(A.11.7) \quad \tilde{A} = \begin{pmatrix} -(x^{m+1} + V + xC(x) + \gamma t) & U + C(x) \\ -2(xV + W + \kappa) & x^{m+1} + V + xC(x) + \gamma t \end{pmatrix},$$

$$(A.11.8) \quad \tilde{B} = \begin{pmatrix} -(x + u_1) & 1 \\ -2v_1 & x + u_1 \end{pmatrix},$$

where

$$(A.11.9) \quad C(x) = \sum_{j=1}^m c_j x^{m-j}$$

and U, V and W are polynomials of x given respectively by (A.3.9)–(A.3.11). Note that the $(1, 2)$ -component of A exactly coincides with that of \tilde{A} thanks to (A.10.1).

§A.12. The Hamiltonian structure of $(\tilde{P}_{\text{II-2}})_m$ ([16, Theorem 1.3])

Let us choose $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_m, \mu_1, \dots, \mu_m)$ so that

$$(A.12.1) \quad U(x) + C(x) = \prod_{j=1}^m (x - \lambda_j) \quad (j = 1, \dots, m)$$

and

$$(A.12.2) \quad \mu_j = -V(\lambda_j) \quad (j = 1, \dots, m).$$

By letting N_j ($1 \leq j \leq m$) denote

$$(A.12.3) \quad \prod_{\substack{k=1, \dots, m \\ k \neq j}} (\lambda_j - \lambda_k)^{-1}$$

and letting $A_m(z, t)$ denote

$$(A.12.4) \quad 2z^{m+1} + \sum_{j=1}^m j t_j z^{j-1},$$

we define

$$(A.12.5) \quad H_1 = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^m N_j (\mu_j^2 - A_m(\lambda_j, t) \mu_j - (2\alpha + 1) \lambda_j^m)$$

for a constant α . Then H_1 (for $\alpha \neq -1/2$) is a Hamiltonian of a degenerate Garnier system called the A_m -system ([21]). (The Hamiltonian H_1 used in [17] is the same as that of [21], which contains some additional terms depending only on t . As such terms independent of (λ_j, μ_j) are irrelevant in defining the Hamiltonian system, we eliminate them here.) Set

$$(A.12.6) \quad t_1 = 2t,$$

$$(A.12.7) \quad t_j = 2c_{m-j}/j \quad (2 \leq j \leq m),$$

and let K denote the resulting function of $(t; \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_m, \mu_1, \dots, \mu_m)$. Then $(\tilde{P}_{\text{II-2}})_m$ is equivalent to the following Hamiltonian system:

$$(A.12.8) \quad (G_{\text{II-2}})_m : \begin{cases} \frac{d\lambda_j}{dt} = \eta \frac{\partial K}{\partial \mu_j} & (1 \leq j \leq m), \\ \frac{d\mu_j}{dt} = -\eta \frac{\partial K}{\partial \lambda_j} & (1 \leq j \leq m), \end{cases}$$

if we choose

$$(A.12.9) \quad \kappa = -(\alpha + 1/2).$$

We note κ may vanish in (A.12.8).

§A.13. Definition of $(P_{\text{IV}})_m$ and $(\tilde{P}_{\text{IV}})_m$

With the help of differential polynomials \mathcal{K}_m and \mathcal{L}_m the m -th member of (P_{IV}) -hierarchy is given by

$$(A.13.1) \quad (P_{\text{IV}})_m : \begin{cases} \eta^{-1} \frac{d\mathcal{K}_m}{dt} = 2\mathcal{L}_m + u\mathcal{K}_m + 2\gamma t u - 4\theta_1 - 2\eta^{-1}\gamma, & (A.13.1.a) \\ \eta^{-1}(\mathcal{K}_m + 2\gamma t) \frac{d\mathcal{L}_m}{dt} = -v(\mathcal{K}_m + 2\gamma t)^2 + (\mathcal{L}_m - 2\theta_1)^2 - 4\theta_2^2, & (A.13.1.b) \end{cases}$$

with $\gamma, \theta_1, \theta_2$ and c_j 's ($1 \leq j \leq m$) being constants.

Another expression (A.13.2) of $(P_{\text{IV}})_m$ is found by Koike ([16]); it is denoted by $(\tilde{P}_{\text{IV}})_m$ in [17].

(A.13.2) $(\tilde{P}_{\text{IV}})_m :$

$$\begin{cases} \eta^{-1} \frac{du_j}{dt} = -2(u_1 u_j + v_j + u_{j+1}) + 2c_j u_1 & (1 \leq j \leq m), & \text{(A.13.2.a)} \\ \eta^{-1} \frac{dv_j}{dt} = 2(v_1 u_j + v_{j+1} + w_j) - 2c_j v_1 & (1 \leq j \leq m), & \text{(A.13.2.b)} \\ v_{m+1} = -(\gamma t u_1 + \theta_1 + \frac{1}{2} \eta^{-1} \gamma), & & \text{(A.13.2.c)} \\ v_{m+1} = -w_m - \gamma t v_1 - \frac{(v_m - \theta_1)^2 - \theta_2^2}{2(u_m - \gamma t - c_m)}, & & \text{(A.13.2.d)} \end{cases}$$

where the constants are as in $(P_{\text{IV}})_m$ and w_j is the polynomial determined by (A.9.7).

§A.14. Correspondence between $(P_{\text{IV}})_m$ and $(\tilde{P}_{\text{IV}})_m$ ([17, Theorem 3.6])

For a solution (u, v) of $(P_{\text{IV}})_m$ the equation $(\tilde{P}_{\text{IV}})_m$ is satisfied by $(u_j, v_j)_{1 \leq j \leq m}$ defined by (A.10.1), and for a solution $(u_j, v_j)_{1 \leq j \leq m}$ of $(\tilde{P}_{\text{IV}})_m$ the functions (u, v) given by (A.10.2) provide a solution of $(P_{\text{IV}})_m$; the situation is exactly in parallel with the situation of the pair $(P_{\text{II-2}})_m$ and $(\tilde{P}_{\text{II-2}})_m$.

§A.15. Lax pairs $(L_{\text{IV}})_m$ and $(\tilde{L}_{\text{IV}})_m$ ([17, Theorem 3.8 and 3.9])

We give the Lax pair $(L_{\text{IV}})_m$ (resp., $(\tilde{L}_{\text{IV}})_m$) that underlies $(P_{\text{IV}})_m$ (resp., $(\tilde{P}_{\text{IV}})_m$). The first of these is as follows:

$$(A.15.1) \quad (L_{\text{IV}})_m : \begin{cases} \gamma x \eta^{-1} \frac{\partial \vec{\psi}}{\partial x} = A \vec{\psi}, & \text{(A.15.1.a)} \\ \eta^{-1} \frac{\partial \vec{\psi}}{\partial t} = B \vec{\psi}, & \text{(A.15.1.b)} \end{cases}$$

with

$$(A.15.2) \quad A = \frac{1}{4} \begin{pmatrix} -(2x - u)(\mathcal{K} + 2\gamma t) - \eta^{-1} \frac{d\mathcal{K}}{dt} - 2\eta^{-1} \gamma & 2(\mathcal{K} + 2\gamma t) \\ -2\eta^{-1} \frac{d\mathcal{L}}{dt} - 2v(\mathcal{K} + 2\gamma t) & (2x - u)(\mathcal{K} + 2\gamma t) + \eta^{-1} \frac{d\mathcal{K}}{dt} - 2\eta^{-1} \gamma \end{pmatrix} + N$$

and

$$(A.15.3) \quad B = \begin{pmatrix} -x + u/2 & 1 \\ v & x - u/2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Here \mathcal{K} and \mathcal{L} are the polynomials given in (A.11.4) and

$$(A.15.4) \quad N = \frac{1}{4} \begin{pmatrix} I_m & 0 \\ 2J_m/(\mathcal{K}_m + 2\gamma t) & -I_m \end{pmatrix},$$

where

$$(A.15.5) \quad I_m = \eta^{-1} \frac{d\mathcal{K}_m}{dt} - u(\mathcal{K}_m + 2\gamma t) - 2\mathcal{L}_m + 4\theta_1 + 2\eta^{-1}\gamma,$$

$$(A.15.6) \quad J_m = \eta^{-1}(\mathcal{K}_m + 2\gamma t) \frac{d\mathcal{L}_m}{dt} + v(\mathcal{K}_m + 2\gamma t)^2 - (\mathcal{L}_m - 2\theta_1)^2 + 4\theta_2^2.$$

Remark A.15.1. The role of the additional matrix N is essentially the same as for the case of $(L_{34})_m$.

The Lax pair $(\tilde{L}_{IV})_m$ of $(\tilde{P}_{IV})_m$ given by Koike ([17]) is

$$(A.15.7) \quad (\tilde{L}_{IV})_m : \begin{cases} \gamma x \eta^{-1} \frac{\partial \vec{\psi}}{\partial x} = \tilde{A} \vec{\psi}, & (A.15.7.a) \\ \eta^{-1} \frac{\partial \vec{\psi}}{\partial t} = \tilde{B} \vec{\psi}, & (A.15.7.b) \end{cases}$$

with

$$(A.15.8) \quad \tilde{A} = \begin{pmatrix} -(x^{m+1} + V + xC(x) + \gamma xt - \theta_1) & U + C(x) + \gamma t \\ -2(xV + W + v_{m+1} + \gamma tv_1) & x^{m+1} + V + xC(x) + \gamma xt - \theta_1 \end{pmatrix}$$

and

$$(A.15.9) \quad \tilde{B} = \begin{pmatrix} -(x + u_1) & 1 \\ -2v_1 & x + u_1 \end{pmatrix},$$

where $C(x), U, V$ and W are polynomials of x respectively given by (A.11.9) and (A.3.9)–(A.3.11). The $(1, 2)$ -component of A again coincides with that of \tilde{A} .

§A.16. The Hamiltonian structure of $(P_{IV})_m$ ([16, Theorem 1.4])

Let us fix the constant γ to be 2 and choose $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_m, \mu_1, \dots, \mu_m)$ so that

$$(A.16.1) \quad U(x) + C(x) + 2t = \prod_{j=1}^m (x - \lambda_j)$$

and

$$(A.16.2) \quad \mu_j = -\frac{1}{2\lambda_j} (V(\lambda_j) - \theta_1 - \theta_2) \quad (j = 1, \dots, m).$$

Set

$$(A.16.3) \quad \kappa_0 = \theta_2,$$

$$(A.16.4) \quad \kappa_\infty = (\theta_1 + \theta_2)/2.$$

In parallel with the case of $(\tilde{P}_{\text{II-2}})_m$, we let N_j ($1 \leq j \leq m$) denote

$$(A.16.5) \quad \prod_{\substack{k=1, \dots, m \\ k \neq j}} (\lambda_j - \lambda_k)^{-1}$$

and define

$$(A.16.6) \quad H_1 = \sum_{j=1}^m N_j \left(\lambda_j \mu_j^2 - \left(\sum_{k=1}^m t_k \lambda_j^k + \lambda_j^{m+1} + \kappa_0 \right) \mu_j + \kappa_\infty \lambda_j^m \right),$$

where t_k 's are complex parameters. Then H_1 is a Hamiltonian of a degenerate Garnier system called the Kawamuko system ([15]). Set

$$(A.16.7) \quad t_1 = 2t + c_m,$$

$$(A.16.8) \quad t_k = c_{m-k+1} \quad (2 \leq k \leq m),$$

and let K denote the resulting function of $(t; \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_m, \mu_1, \dots, \mu_m)$. Then $(\tilde{P}_{\text{IV}})_m$ is equivalent to the following Hamiltonian system:

$$(A.16.9) \quad (G_{\text{IV}})_m : \begin{cases} \frac{d\lambda_j}{dt} = \eta \frac{\partial K}{\partial \mu_j} & (1 \leq j \leq m), \\ \frac{d\mu_j}{dt} = -\eta \frac{\partial K}{\partial \lambda_j} & (1 \leq j \leq m). \end{cases}$$

§B. Parity structure of instanton-type solutions

To prove Lemmas 5.3.2 and 5.3.4 we have used the ‘‘alternating parity’’ structure of instanton-type solutions in Section 5. In this appendix we explain this structure for $(P_J)_m$ ($J = \text{I}, 34, \text{II-2}$ or IV , $m = 1, 2, \dots$).

Let us start with a brief review of the core part of [24], concerning the construction of instanton-type solutions. Each member $(P_J)_m$ of the (P_J) -hierarchy can be expressed in the form of the Hamiltonian system

$$(B.1) \quad \begin{cases} \frac{dq_j}{dt} = \eta \frac{\partial H}{\partial p_j} & (j = 1, \dots, m), \\ \frac{dp_j}{dt} = -\eta \frac{\partial H}{\partial q_j} & (j = 1, \dots, m), \end{cases}$$

with the Hamiltonian $H = H(t, q, p; \eta^{-1})$ by introducing an appropriate canonical variable $(q, p) = (q_j, p_j)_{1 \leq j \leq m}$ through a canonical transform

$$(B.2) \quad u_j = u_j(t, q, p; \eta^{-1}), \quad v_j = v_j(t, q, p; \eta^{-1}).$$

For example, the variable (λ_j, μ_j) discussed in Appendix A (cf. Subsections A.4, A.8, A.12 and A.16) is one of such canonical variables. (See [24] for another choice

of canonical variables in the case of (P_1) -hierarchy.) To construct instanton-type solutions of $(P_J)_m$ we use the Hamiltonian form (B.1). We first note that the system (B.1) admits a formal power series solution (with respect to η^{-1}) of the form

$$(B.3) \quad \hat{q}_j = \hat{q}_j^{(0)}(t) + \eta^{-1}\hat{q}_j^{(1)}(t) + \cdots, \quad \hat{p}_j = \hat{p}_j^{(0)}(t) + \eta^{-1}\hat{p}_j^{(1)}(t) + \cdots,$$

which is called a *0-parameter solution*. We then introduce a new canonical variable (ψ_j, φ_j) defined by

$$(B.4) \quad q_j = \hat{q}_j + \eta^{-1/2}\psi_j, \quad p_j = \hat{p}_j + \eta^{-1/2}\varphi_j.$$

In the new variable (ψ_j, φ_j) (B.1) is expressed again in the Hamiltonian form as

$$(B.5) \quad \begin{cases} \frac{d\psi_j}{dt} = \eta \frac{\partial K}{\partial \varphi_j} & (j = 1, \dots, m), \\ \frac{d\varphi_j}{dt} = -\eta \frac{\partial K}{\partial \psi_j} & (j = 1, \dots, m), \end{cases}$$

where the Hamiltonian $K = K(t, \psi, \varphi; \eta^{-1/2})$ is given by

$$(B.6) \quad K = \sum_{|\mu+\nu| \geq 2} \frac{1}{\mu!\nu!} \eta^{-(|\mu+\nu|-2)/2} \frac{\partial^{|\mu+\nu|} H}{\partial q^\mu \partial p^\nu}(t, \hat{q}, \hat{p}) \psi^\mu \varphi^\nu$$

(cf. [24, (21), (22)]). Note that, if

$$(B.7) \quad K = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \eta^{-k/2} K^{(k)}(t, \psi, \varphi)$$

denotes the formal power series expansion of K in $\eta^{-1/2}$, each coefficient $K^{(k)}$ is a polynomial in (ψ, φ) of degree at most $k+2$ and has the following parity structure:

$$(B.8) \quad \text{When } k \text{ is an odd (resp., even) integer, } K^{(k)} \text{ is a sum of monomials of odd (resp., even) degree.}$$

As is shown in [24, Theorem 2], if we assume (2.1.2) and (2.1.3), in a neighborhood of an arbitrarily given point $t = t_0$ we can find a canonical transform

$$(B.9) \quad \psi_j = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \eta^{-k/2} \psi_j^{(k)}(t, \tilde{\psi}, \tilde{\varphi}; \eta^{-1/2}), \quad \varphi_j = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \eta^{-k/2} \varphi_j^{(k)}(t, \tilde{\psi}, \tilde{\varphi}; \eta^{-1/2}),$$

where $\psi_j^{(k)}$ and $\varphi_j^{(k)}$ are homogeneous polynomials of degree $k+1$ in $(\tilde{\psi}, \tilde{\varphi})$, that transforms (B.5) into its Birkhoff normal form

$$(B.10) \quad \begin{cases} \frac{d\tilde{\psi}_j}{dt} = \eta \frac{\partial \tilde{K}}{\partial \tilde{\varphi}_j} & (j = 1, \dots, m), \\ \frac{d\tilde{\varphi}_j}{dt} = -\eta \frac{\partial \tilde{K}}{\partial \tilde{\psi}_j} & (j = 1, \dots, m), \end{cases}$$

with the Hamiltonian \tilde{K} of the form

$$(B.11) \quad \tilde{K} = \tilde{K}(t, \sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_m; \eta^{-1/2})$$

(where $\sigma_j = \tilde{\psi}_j \tilde{\varphi}_j$). Since we can readily check that

$$(B.12) \quad \begin{cases} \tilde{\Psi}_j = \alpha_j \exp\left(\eta \int^t \frac{\partial \tilde{K}}{\partial \sigma_j} \Big|_{\sigma_1=\alpha_1\alpha_{m+1}, \dots, \sigma_m=\alpha_m\alpha_{2m}} dt\right), \\ \tilde{\Phi}_j = \alpha_{j+m} \exp\left(-\eta \int^t \frac{\partial \tilde{K}}{\partial \sigma_j} \Big|_{\sigma_1=\alpha_1\alpha_{m+1}, \dots, \sigma_m=\alpha_m\alpha_{2m}} dt\right), \end{cases}$$

($j = 1, \dots, m$) provides a solution of (B.10), we thus obtain a formal solution (2.1.4)–(2.1.5) of the original $(P_J)_m$ by substituting (B.12) successively into (B.9), (B.4) and (B.2). This is an outline of the construction of instanton-type solutions discussed in [24].

In the course of the proof of [24, Theorem 2] (cf. [24, Section 4]) we see that

$$(B.13) \quad \text{the coefficients } \psi_j^{(k)} \text{ and } \varphi_j^{(k)} \text{ in (B.9) are formal power series in } \eta^{-1} \text{ (not in } \eta^{-1/2}\text{), that is, } \psi_j^{(k)} \text{ and } \varphi_j^{(k)} \text{ contain no odd degree terms with respect to } \eta^{-1/2}.$$

Furthermore

$$(B.14) \quad \tilde{K} \text{ also contains no odd degree terms with respect to } \eta^{-1/2}.$$

In other words, writing \tilde{K} as

$$(B.15) \quad \tilde{K} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \eta^{-k} \sum_{|\nu|=k+1} g_\nu(t, \eta) \sigma^\nu$$

in accordance with the expressions (2.1.6) and (2.1.7) of instantons, we find that $g_\nu(t, \eta)$ is a formal power series in η^{-1} , that is, there are no odd degree terms with respect to $\eta^{-1/2}$ in the expansion (2.1.8). Hence every instanton contains terms with integral powers of η^{-1} only. It then follows from this fact and (B.13) that the coefficients $u_{j,l/2}(t, \Psi, \Phi)$ and $v_{j,l/2}(t, \Psi, \Phi)$ of instanton-type solutions (2.1.4) and (2.1.5) have the following “alternating parity” structure:

$$(B.16) \quad \text{When } l \text{ is an odd (resp., even) integer, } u_{j,l/2} \text{ and } v_{j,l/2} \text{ are sums of monomials of } (\Psi, \Phi) \text{ of odd (resp., even) degree (at most } l\text{).}$$

Finally, combining the parity structure (B.16) of instanton-type solutions with the definitions (3.11) and (3.13) of $\rho^{(j_0)}(t, \eta) = \sum_{l \geq 0} \eta^{-l/2} \rho_{l/2}^{(j_0)}$ and $\sigma^{(j_0)}(t, \eta) = \sum_{l \geq 0} \eta^{-l/2} \sigma_{l/2}^{(j_0)}$, respectively, we deduce the following:

(B.17) When l is an odd (resp., even) integer, $\rho_{l/2}^{(j_0)}$ and $\sigma_{l/2}^{(j_0)}$ are sums of monomials in (Ψ, Φ) of even (resp., odd) degree (at most $l + 1$).

As a consequence of (B.17) and the definition (3.12) we also find the following parity structure for $E^{(j_0)} = \sum_{l \geq 0} \eta^{-l/2} E_{l/2}^{(j_0)}$:

(B.18) $E_{l/2}^{(j_0)}$ is a sum of monomials in instantons of odd (resp., even) degree for an odd (resp., even) integer l .

Acknowledgements

This research was supported in part by JSPS grants-in-aid No. 20340028 and No. 21340029.

References

- [1] T. Aoki, T. Kawai and Y. Takei, WKB analysis of Painlevé transcendents with a large parameter, II. Multiple-scale analysis of Painlevé transcendents, in *Structure of solutions of differential equations* (Katata and Kyoto, 1995), World Sci., 1996, 1–49. Zbl 0894.34050 MR 1445330
- [2] P. A. Clarkson, N. Joshi and A. Pickering, Bäcklund transformations for the second Painlevé hierarchy: a modified truncation approach, *Inverse Problems* **15** (1999), 175–187. Zbl 0923.35170 MR 1675343
- [3] P. R. Gordoa, N. Joshi and A. Pickering, On a generalized $2 + 1$ dispersive water wave hierarchy, *Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci.* **37** (2001), 327–347. Zbl 0997.35094 MR 1855426
- [4] ———, Second and fourth Painlevé hierarchies and Jimbo–Miwa linear problems, *J. Math. Phys.* **47** (2006), 073504, 16 pp. Zbl 1112.37069 MR 2250304
- [5] P. R. Gordoa and A. Pickering, Nonisospectral scattering problems: a key to integrable hierarchies, *J. Math. Phys.* **40** (1999), 5749–5786. Zbl 1063.37544 MR 1722336
- [6] E. L. Ince, *Ordinary differential equations*, Dover, New York, 1944. Zbl 0063.02971 MR 0010757
- [7] T. Kawai, T. Koike, Y. Nishikawa and Y. Takei, On the Stokes geometry of higher order Painlevé equations, *Astérisque* **297** (2004), 117–166. Zbl 1086.34072 MR 2135677
- [8] T. Kawai and Y. Takei, WKB analysis of Painlevé transcendents with a large parameter, I, *Adv. Math.* **118** (1996), 1–33. Zbl 0848.34005 MR 1375950
- [9] ———, WKB analysis of Painlevé transcendents with a large parameter, III. Local reduction of 2-parameter Painlevé transcendents, *Adv. Math.* **134** (1998), 178–218. Zbl 0901.34057 MR 1612399
- [10] ———, Announcement of the Toulouse Project Part 2, *RIMS Kôkyûroku* **1397** (2004), 172–174.
- [11] ———, *Algebraic analysis of singular perturbation theory*, translated from the 1998 Japanese original, Amer. Math. Soc., 2005. Zbl 1100.34004 MR 2182990

- [12] ———, WKB analysis of higher order Painlevé equations with a large parameter — Local reduction of 0-parameter solutions for Painlevé hierarchies (P_J) ($J = \text{I, II-1 or II-2}$), *Adv. Math.* **203** (2006), 636–672. Zbl 1108.34065 MR 2228055
- [13] ———, Half of the Toulouse Project Part 5 is completed — Structure theorem for instanton-type solutions of $(P_J)_m$ ($J = \text{I, II or IV}$) near a simple P -turning point of the first kind, *RIMS Kôkyûroku Bessatsu* **B5** (2008), 99–115. MR 2405969
- [14] ———, WKB analysis of higher order Painlevé equations with a large parameter — Local reduction of 0-parameter solutions for Painlevé hierarchies $(P_J)_m$ ($J = \text{I, II-1, II-2 or IV}$), *RIMS Kôkyûroku* **1648** (2009), 1–16 (in Japanese).
- [15] H. Kawamuko, On the holonomic deformation of linear differential equations with a regular singular point and an irregular singular point, *Kyushu J. Math.* **57** (2003), 1–28. Zbl 1056.34101 MR 2069730
- [16] T. Koike, On the Hamiltonian structures of the second and the fourth Painlevé hierarchies, and the degenerate Garnier systems, *RIMS Kôkyûroku Bessatsu* **B2** (2007), 99–127. Zbl pre05152685 MR 2310024
- [17] ———, On new expressions of the Painlevé hierarchies, *RIMS Kôkyûroku Bessatsu* **B5** (2008), 153–198. Zbl 1177.34113 MR 2405973
- [18] ———, in preparation.
- [19] T. Koike and Y. Nishikawa, On exact WKB analysis for the fourth Painlevé hierarchy, *RIMS Kôkyûroku* **1424** (2005), 160–169.
- [20] T. Koike, Y. Nishikawa and Y. Takei, On the Stokes geometry of the fourth Painlevé hierarchy in WKB analysis, in preparation.
- [21] D. Liu, On the holonomic deformation of linear differential equations of the A_g type, *J. Math. Sci. Univ. Tokyo* **8** (2001), 559–594. Zbl 1016.34037 MR 1868295
- [22] Y. Nishikawa, Toward the exact WKB analysis of the P_{II} hierarchy, *Stud. Appl. Math.* **119** (2007), 1–71. MR 2324441
- [23] Y. Takei, Toward the exact WKB analysis for instanton-type solutions of Painlevé hierarchies, *RIMS Kôkyûroku Bessatsu* **B2** (2007), 247–260. Zbl pre05152695 MR 2310035
- [24] ———, Instanton-type formal solutions for the first Painlevé hierarchy, in *Algebraic analysis of differential equations. Festschrift in honor of Takahiro Kawai* (Kyoto, 2005), Springer, 2008, 307–319. Zbl 1184.34086