

**MONODROMY OF GENERALIZED LAMÉ EQUATIONS WITH
DARBOUX-TREIBICH-VERDIER POTENTIALS:
A UNIVERSAL LAW**

ZHIIJIE CHEN AND CHANG-SHOU LIN

ABSTRACT. The Darboux-Treibich-Verdier (DTV) potential $\sum_{k=0}^3 n_k(n_k + 1)\wp(z + \frac{\omega_k}{2}; \tau)$ is well-known as doubly-periodic solutions of the stationary KdV hierarchy (Treibich-Verdier, Duke Math. J. **68** (1992), 217-236). In this paper, we study the generalized Lamé equation with the DTV potential

$$y''(z) = \left[\sum_{k=0}^3 n_k(n_k + 1)\wp(z + \frac{\omega_k}{2}; \tau) + B \right] y(z), \quad n_k \in \mathbb{N}$$

from the monodromy aspect. We prove that the map from (τ, B) to the monodromy data (r, s) satisfies a surprising universal law $d\tau \wedge dB \equiv 8\pi^2 dr \wedge ds$. Our proof applies Painlevé VI equation and modular forms. We also give applications to the algebraic multiplicity of (anti)periodic eigenvalues for the associated Hill operator.

1. INTRODUCTION

Throughout the paper, we use the notations $\omega_0 = 0$, $\omega_1 = 1$, $\omega_2 = \tau$, $\omega_3 = 1 + \tau$ and $\Lambda_\tau = \mathbb{Z} + \mathbb{Z}\tau$, where $\tau \in \mathbb{H} = \{\tau \mid \text{Im } \tau > 0\}$. Define $E_\tau := \mathbb{C}/\Lambda_\tau$ to be the elliptic curve and $E_\tau[2] := \{\frac{\omega_k}{2} \mid k = 0, 1, 2, 3\} + \Lambda_\tau$ to be the set consisting of the lattice points and 2-torsion points in E_τ .

Let $\wp(z) = \wp(z; \tau)$ be the Weierstrass elliptic function with periods Λ_τ and define $e_k(\tau) := \wp(\frac{\omega_k}{2}; \tau)$, $k = 1, 2, 3$. It is well known that

$$\wp'(z; \tau)^2 = 4 \prod_{k=1}^3 (\wp(z; \tau) - e_k(\tau)) = 4\wp(z; \tau)^3 - g_2(\tau)\wp(z; \tau) - g_3(\tau),$$

where $g_2(\tau), g_3(\tau)$ are invariants of the elliptic curve E_τ . Let $\zeta(z) = \zeta(z; \tau) := -\int^z \wp(\xi; \tau) d\xi$ be the Weierstrass zeta function with two quasi-periods $\eta_k(\tau)$:

$$(1.1) \quad \eta_k(\tau) := 2\zeta(\frac{\omega_k}{2}; \tau) = \zeta(z + \omega_k; \tau) - \zeta(z; \tau), \quad k = 1, 2,$$

and $\sigma(z) = \sigma(z; \tau) := \exp \int^z \zeta(\xi; \tau) d\xi$ be the Weierstrass sigma function. Notice that $\zeta(z)$ is an odd meromorphic function with simple poles at Λ_τ and $\sigma(z)$ is an odd holomorphic function with simple zeros at Λ_τ .

This is the final one in our project of studying the generalized Lamé equation (denoted by $H(\mathbf{n}, B, \tau)$)

$$(1.2) \quad y''(z) = (I_{\mathbf{n}}(z; \tau) + B)y(z), \quad z \in \mathbb{C},$$

with the *Darboux-Treibich-Verdier potential* [18, 34, 35, 36, 37]

$$(1.3) \quad I_{\mathbf{n}}(z; \tau) := \sum_{k=0}^3 n_k(n_k + 1)\wp(z + \frac{\omega_k}{2}; \tau),$$

where $\mathbf{n} = (n_0, n_1, n_2, n_3)$ with $n_k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\max n_k \geq 1$, and $B \in \mathbb{C}$ is a parameter. By changing variable $z \rightarrow z + \frac{\omega_k}{2}$ if necessary, we can always assume $n_0 \geq 1$.

In the 19th century, Darboux introduced $H(\mathbf{n}, B, \tau)$ as the elliptic form of the well-known Heun equation (i.e. a second order Fuchsian differential equation with four regular singular points). About 100 years later, $H(\mathbf{n}, B, \tau)$ was introduced in the soliton theory by Treibich and Verdier [34, 35, 36]. In a series of papers [29, 30, 31, 32, 33] by Takemura, $H(\mathbf{n}, B, \tau)$ was also studied as the eigenvalue problem for the Hamiltonian of the BC_1 (one particle) Inozemtsev model [21]. When $\mathbf{n} = (n, 0, 0, 0)$, $H(\mathbf{n}, B, \tau)$ becomes the classical Lamé equation

$$(1.4) \quad y''(z) = [n(n+1)\wp(z; \tau) + B]y(z), \quad z \in \mathbb{C}.$$

See the classic texts [19, 27, 38] and recent works [4, 13, 23, 24] for introductions about (1.4).

Since the works of Treibich and Verdier [34, 35, 36], the DTV potential $I_{\mathbf{n}}(z; \tau)$ is famous as an algebro-geometric finite-gap potential associated with the stationary KdV hierarchy. In the literature, a potential $q(z)$ is called an *algebro-geometric finite-gap potential* if there is an odd-order differential operator

$$(1.5) \quad P_{2g+1} = \left(\frac{d}{dz}\right)^{2g+1} + \sum_{j=0}^{2g-1} b_j(z) \left(\frac{d}{dz}\right)^{2g-1-j}$$

such that $[P_{2g+1}, d^2/dz^2 - q(z)] = 0$, or equivalently, $q(z)$ is a solution of stationary KdV hierarchy equations (cf. [15, 16]).

For the DTV potential $I_{\mathbf{n}}(z; \tau)$, we let P_{2g+1} be the unique operator of the form (1.5) satisfying $[P_{2g+1}, d^2/dz^2 - I_{\mathbf{n}}(z; \tau)] = 0$ such that its order $2g+1$ is *smallest*. Then a theorem of Burchnall and Chaundy [3] implies the existence of the so-called *spectral polynomial* $Q_{\mathbf{n}}(B; \tau)$ of degree $2g+1$ in B associated to $I_{\mathbf{n}}(z; \tau)$ such that

$$P_{2g+1}^2 = Q_{\mathbf{n}}\left(\frac{d^2}{dz^2} - I_{\mathbf{n}}(z; \tau); \tau\right).$$

The number g , i.e. the arithmetic genus of the associate hyperelliptic curve $\{(B, C) | C^2 = Q_{\mathbf{n}}(B; \tau)\}$, was computed by Gesztesy and Weikard [18] (see also [33]): Let m_k be the rearrangement of n_k such that $m_0 \geq m_1 \geq m_2 \geq m_3$,

then

$$(1.6) \quad g = \begin{cases} m_0 & \text{if } \sum m_k \text{ is even and } m_0 + m_3 \geq m_1 + m_2; \\ \frac{m_0 + m_1 + m_2 - m_3}{2} & \text{if } \sum m_k \text{ is even and } m_0 + m_3 < m_1 + m_2; \\ m_0 & \text{if } \sum m_k \text{ is odd and } m_0 > m_1 + m_2 + m_3; \\ \frac{m_0 + m_1 + m_2 + m_3 + 1}{2} & \text{if } \sum m_k \text{ is odd and } m_0 \leq m_1 + m_2 + m_3. \end{cases}$$

In this paper, we continue our study, initiated in [6], on $H(\mathbf{n}, B, \tau)$ from the monodromy aspect. Since the local exponents of $H(\mathbf{n}, B, \tau)$ at $\frac{\omega_k}{2}$ are $-n_k, n_k + 1$ and $I_n(z; \tau)$ is even elliptic, it is easily seen (cf. [18, 29]) that any solution is meromorphic in \mathbb{C} , i.e. the local monodromy matrix at $\frac{\omega_k}{2}$ is the identity matrix I_2 . Thus the monodromy representation $\rho : \pi_1(E_\tau) \rightarrow SL(2, \mathbb{C})$ is a group homeomorphism, which is abelian and hence reducible. More precisely, let $\ell_j, j = 1, 2$, be two fundamental cycles $z \rightarrow z + \omega_j$ of E_τ , and let $(y_1(z), y_2(z))$ be any basis of solutions of $H(\mathbf{n}, B, \tau)$. Then there are monodromy matrices $\rho(\ell_j) \in SL(2, \mathbb{C})$ such that

$$\begin{pmatrix} y_1(z + \omega_j) \\ y_2(z + \omega_j) \end{pmatrix} = \rho(\ell_j) \begin{pmatrix} y_1(z) \\ y_2(z) \end{pmatrix}, \quad j = 1, 2,$$

$$\rho(\ell_1)\rho(\ell_2) = \rho(\ell_2)\rho(\ell_1),$$

and the monodromy group is generated by $\rho(\ell_1), \rho(\ell_2)$. Consequently, there are two cases (see [6, 18]):

- (a) If $Q_n(B; \tau) \neq 0$, the monodromy is completely reducible, namely up to a common conjugation, $\rho(\ell_1)$ and $\rho(\ell_2)$ can be diagonalized simultaneously and expressed as

$$(1.7) \quad \rho(\ell_1) = \begin{pmatrix} e^{-2\pi is} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{2\pi is} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \rho(\ell_2) = \begin{pmatrix} e^{2\pi ir} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{-2\pi ir} \end{pmatrix}$$

for some $(r, s) \in \mathbb{C}^2 \setminus \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}^2$. In particular,

$$(1.8) \quad (\text{tr}\rho(\ell_1), \text{tr}\rho(\ell_2)) = (2 \cos 2\pi s, 2 \cos 2\pi r) \notin \{\pm(2, 2), \pm(2, -2)\}.$$

Define an equivalent relation

$$(r, s) \sim (r', s') \quad \text{if } (r, s) \equiv \pm(r', s') \pmod{\mathbb{Z}^2}.$$

Since $\text{tr}\rho(\ell_j)$ is independent of the choice of solutions, so (r, s) is unique in $(\mathbb{C}^2 \setminus \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}^2) / \sim$, and we refer it as the *monodromy data* of $H(\mathbf{n}, B, \tau)$.

- (b) If $Q_n(B; \tau) = 0$, then the monodromy is not completely reducible (i.e. the space of common eigenfunctions is of dimension 1), and up to a common conjugation, $\rho(\ell_1)$ and $\rho(\ell_2)$ can be expressed as

$$(1.9) \quad \rho(\ell_1) = \varepsilon_1 \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \rho(\ell_2) = \varepsilon_2 \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ \mathcal{C} & 1 \end{pmatrix},$$

where $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2 \in \{\pm 1\}$ and $\mathcal{C} \in \mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}$. In particular,

$$(1.10) \quad (\text{tr}\rho(\ell_1), \text{tr}\rho(\ell_2)) = (2\varepsilon_1, 2\varepsilon_2) \in \{\pm(2, 2), \pm(2, -2)\}.$$

Remark that if $\mathcal{C} = \infty$, then (1.9) should be understood as

$$\rho(\ell_1) = \varepsilon_1 \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \rho(\ell_2) = \varepsilon_2 \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

In view of Case (a), a natural question that interests us is *how to characterize the monodromy data (r, s) in terms of (τ, B)* . Define

$$(1.11) \quad \Sigma_{\mathbf{n}} := \{(\tau, B) \in \mathbb{H} \times \mathbb{C} \mid Q_{\mathbf{n}}(B; \tau) \neq 0\},$$

which is clearly an open connected subset of $\mathbb{H} \times \mathbb{C}$. Then the map

$$(1.12) \quad \varphi_{\mathbf{n}} : \Sigma_{\mathbf{n}} \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}^2 \setminus \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}^2) / \sim, \quad \varphi_{\mathbf{n}}(\tau, B) := (r, s)$$

is well-defined. It was proved in [7, Lemma 2.3] that

$$(1.13) \quad \varphi_{\mathbf{n}}(\tau, B_1) \neq \varphi_{\mathbf{n}}(\tau, B_2) \quad \text{if} \quad B_1 \neq B_2.$$

Remark 1.1. Given any $(\tau_0, B_0) \in \Sigma_{\mathbf{n}}$, take $(r_0, s_0) \in \mathbb{C}^2 \setminus \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}^2$ to be a representative of the monodromy data of $H(\mathbf{n}, B_0, \tau_0)$. Since there is a small neighborhood $V \subset \mathbb{C}^2 \setminus \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}^2$ of (r_0, s_0) such that $(r, s) \not\sim (r', s')$ for any $(r, s), (r', s') \in V$ satisfying $(r, s) \neq (r', s')$, there is a small neighborhood $U \subset \Sigma_{\mathbf{n}}$ of (τ_0, B_0) such that $\varphi_{\mathbf{n}}|_U : U \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}^2 \setminus \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}^2) / \sim$ can be seen as

$$\varphi_{\mathbf{n}}|_U : U \rightarrow V \subset \mathbb{C}^2 \setminus \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}^2,$$

and so we can consider the local analytic properties of $\varphi_{\mathbf{n}}$. Our main result of this paper is the following surprising universal law.

Theorem 1.2. *Given \mathbf{n} . Then the map $\varphi_{\mathbf{n}}$ is holomorphic and locally one-to-one, and satisfies*

$$(1.14) \quad d\tau \wedge dB \equiv 8\pi^2 dr \wedge ds, \quad \forall (\tau, B) \in \Sigma_{\mathbf{n}}.$$

Remark 1.3. This universal law (1.14) is quite mysterious to us. Is there any geometric explanation of this universal law? This question is worthy to be explored.

On the other hand, as in [15, 17], for simplicity we call an elliptic function $q(z)$ an *elliptic KdV potential* if $q(z)$ is a solution of the stationary KdV hierarchy. The DTV potential $I_{\mathbf{n}}(z; \tau)$ is the simplest elliptic KdV potential. A natural question is *whether any analogue of Theorem 1.2 holds for other elliptic KdV potentials*. More precisely, it was proved by Gesztesy, Unterkofler and Weikard [17, Theorem 1.1] that $q(z)$ is an elliptic KdV potential if and only if up to adding a constant, $q(z)$ is expressed as

$$(1.15) \quad q(z) = q(z; \tau) = \sum_{j=1}^n m_j(m_j + 1) \wp(z - p_j(\tau); \tau),$$

where $m_j \in \mathbb{N}$, $p_j(\tau) \in E_{\tau}$ satisfies $p_i(\tau) \neq p_j(\tau)$ for $i \neq j$ and the following conditions

$$(1.16) \quad \sum_{j=1, \neq i}^n m_j(m_j + 1) \wp^{(2k-1)}(p_i(\tau) - p_j(\tau); \tau) = 0 \quad \text{for} \quad 1 \leq k \leq m_i, \quad 1 \leq i \leq n.$$

By (1.16), it is reasonable that $p_j(\tau)$'s are holomorphic in τ and $p_i(\tau) \neq p_j(\tau)$ for $i \neq j$ for τ belonging to some open subset $O \subset \mathbb{H}$. Consider the corresponding differential equation

$$(1.17) \quad y''(z) = \left[\sum_{j=1}^n m_j(m_j + 1)\wp(z - p_j(\tau); \tau) + B \right] y(z), \quad \tau \in O,$$

and denote its spectral polynomial by $Q_p(B; \tau)$. Then like the DTV case, the map

$$\{(\tau, B) \in O \times \mathbb{C} \mid Q_p(B; \tau) \neq 0\} \ni (\tau, B) \mapsto (r, s)$$

is well-defined. Is there any analogue of the universal law (1.14) holding for this map? One can see that our approach does not work for the general elliptic KdV potentials, and this question remains open.

Our proof of this universal law is based on Painlevé VI equation and the so-called *pre-modular form* $Z_{r,s}^n(\tau)$ constructed in [7] which characterizes the monodromy data (r, s) in a precise way.

Definition 1.4. *A function $f_{r,s}(\tau)$ on \mathbb{H} , which depends meromorphically on two parameters $(r, s)(\bmod \mathbb{Z}^2) \in \mathbb{C}^2$, is called a pre-modular form if the following hold:*

- (1) *If $(r, s) \in \mathbb{C}^2 \setminus \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}^2$, then $f_{r,s}(\tau) \neq 0, \infty$ and is meromorphic in τ . Furthermore, it is holomorphic in τ if $(r, s) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}^2$.*
- (2) *There is $k \in \mathbb{N}$ independent of (r, s) such that if (r, s) is any m -torsion point for some $m \geq 3$, then $f_{r,s}(\tau)$ is a modular form of weight k with respect to $\Gamma(m)$.*

The main result of [7] is following

Theorem 1.5. [7] *There exists a pre-modular form $Z_{r,s}^n(\tau)$ defined in $\tau \in \mathbb{H}$ for any pair $(r, s) \in \mathbb{C}^2 \setminus \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}^2$ such that the following hold.*

- (a) *If $(r, s) = (\frac{k_1}{m}, \frac{k_2}{m})$ with $m \in 2\mathbb{N}_{\geq 2}$, $k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ and $\gcd(k_1, k_2, m) = 1$, then $Z_{r,s}^n(\tau)$ is a modular form of weight $\sum_{k=0}^3 n_k(n_k + 1)/2$ with respect to*

$$\Gamma(m) := \{\gamma \in SL(2, \mathbb{Z}) \mid \gamma \equiv I_2 \pmod{m}\}.$$

- (b) *Given $(r, s) \in \mathbb{C}^2 \setminus \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}^2$ and $\tau_0 \in \mathbb{H}$ such that $r + s\tau_0 \notin \Lambda_{\tau_0}$, there is $B \in \mathbb{C}$ such that (r, s) is the monodromy data of $H(\mathbf{n}, B, \tau_0)$, i.e. the monodromy matrices of $H(\mathbf{n}, B, \tau_0)$ are given by (1.7)*

$$\rho(\ell_1) = \begin{pmatrix} e^{-2\pi i s} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{2\pi i s} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \rho(\ell_2) = \begin{pmatrix} e^{2\pi i r} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{-2\pi i r} \end{pmatrix}$$

if and only if $Z_{r,s}^n(\tau_0) = 0$.

Theorem 1.5 for the Lamé case $n_1 = n_2 = n_3 = 0$ was first proved in [23]. We emphasize that Theorem 1.5 has important applications to nonlinear PDEs; see [7, 23] for details.

In this paper, we prove that the assumption $r + s\tau_0 \notin \Lambda_{\tau_0}$ in Theorem 1.5-(b) can be deleted, i.e.

Theorem 1.6. *Given $(r, s) \in \mathbb{C}^2 \setminus \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}^2$ and $\tau_0 \in \mathbb{H}$, there is $B \in \mathbb{C}$ such that (r, s) is the monodromy data of $H(\mathbf{n}, B, \tau_0)$ if and only if $Z_{r,s}^{\mathbf{n}}(\tau_0) = 0$.*

After Theorem 1.6, a further question arises: *What are the explicit expressions of these pre-modular forms?* This question is very difficult because the weight $\frac{1}{2} \sum n_k(n_k + 1)$ is large for general \mathbf{n} . Define

$$(1.18) \quad \begin{aligned} Z_{r,s}(\tau) &:= \zeta(r + s\tau; \tau) - r\eta_1(\tau) - s\eta_2(\tau) \\ &= \zeta(r + s\tau; \tau) - (r + s\tau)\eta_1(\tau) + 2\pi is, \end{aligned}$$

where we used the Legendre relation $\tau\eta_1 - \eta_2 = 2\pi i$. It is known from [13, 23] that (write $Z = Z_{r,s}(\tau)$, $\wp = \wp(r + s\tau|\tau)$ and $\wp' = \wp'(r + s\tau|\tau)$ for convenience):

$$(1.19) \quad \begin{aligned} Z_{r,s}^{(1,0,0,0)} &= Z, \quad Z_{r,s}^{(2,0,0,0)} = Z^3 - 3\wp Z - \wp', \\ Z_{r,s}^{(3,0,0,0)} &= Z^6 - 15\wp Z^4 - 20\wp' Z^3 + \left(\frac{27}{4}g_2 - 45\wp^2\right) Z^2 \\ &\quad - 12\wp\wp' Z - \frac{5}{4}(\wp')^2. \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} Z_{r,s}^{(4,0,0,0)} &= Z^{10} - 45\wp Z^8 - 120\wp' Z^7 + \left(\frac{399}{4}g_2 - 630\wp^2\right) Z^6 - 504\wp\wp' Z^5 \\ &\quad - \frac{15}{4}(280\wp^3 - 49g_2\wp - 115g_3) Z^4 + 15(11g_2 - 24\wp^2)\wp' Z^3 \\ &\quad - \frac{9}{4}(140\wp^4 - 245g_2\wp^2 + 190g_3\wp + 21g_2^2) Z^2 \\ &\quad - (40\wp^3 - 163g_2\wp + 125g_3)\wp' Z + \frac{3}{4}(25g_2 - 3\wp^2)(\wp')^2. \end{aligned}$$

The above formulas are all for the Lamé case. For $n \geq 5$, the explicit expression of $Z_{r,s}^{(n,0,0,0)}(\tau)$ is not known so far. See [10, 13, 23] for applications of the above formulas.

Here are new examples of $Z_{r,s}^{\mathbf{n}}(\tau)$ for the DTV case:

$$\begin{aligned} Z_{r,s}^{(1,1,0,0)} &= Z^2 - \wp + e_1, \\ Z_{r,s}^{(1,0,1,0)} &= Z^2 - \wp + e_2, \quad Z_{r,s}^{(1,0,0,1)} = Z^2 - \wp + e_3, \\ Z_{r,s}^{(2,1,0,0)} &= Z^4 + 3(e_1 - 2\wp)Z^2 - 4\wp' Z - 3(\wp^2 + e_1\wp + e_1^2 - \frac{g_2}{4}), \end{aligned}$$

and similarly, the expression of $Z_{r,s}^{(2,0,1,0)}$ (resp. $Z_{r,s}^{(2,0,0,1)}$) is obtained by replacing e_1 in $Z_{r,s}^{(2,1,0,0)}$ with e_2 (resp. e_3). See [7].

In order to prove Dahmen and Beukers' conjectural formula of counting integral Lamé equations with finite monodromy, we proved in [9] that $Z_{r,s}^{(n,0,0,0)}(\tau)$ has at most simple zeros. This result is not trivial at all due to two reasons: (1) The explicit expression of $Z_{r,s}^{(n,0,0,0)}(\tau)$ is not known for $n \geq 5$; (2) Even for $n = 2, 3, 4$, the expressions of $Z_{r,s}^{(n,0,0,0)}(\tau)$ are already so complicated that we can not obtain this simple zero property by calculating

the highly nontrivial derivative $\frac{d}{d\tau} Z_{r,s}^{(n,0,0,0)}(\tau)$. In [9] we proved this simple zero property by showing that $Z_{r,s}^{(n,0,0,0)}(\tau)$ appears in the denominator of expressions of solutions to certain Painlevé VI equation. We believe that this assertion should also holds for $Z_{r,s}^{\mathbf{n}}(\tau)$, i.e. $Z_{r,s}^{\mathbf{n}}(\tau)$ should also appear in the denominator of expressions of solutions to certain Painlevé VI equation. But this assertion has not been confirmed so far.

In this paper, we develop a new idea to extend the simple zero property to include the DTV potential.

Theorem 1.7. *Given \mathbf{n} . Then for any fixed $(r, s) \in \mathbb{C}^2 \setminus \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}^2$, $Z_{r,s}^{\mathbf{n}}(\tau)$ has at most simple zeros in \mathbb{H} .*

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we briefly review the construction of the pre-modular form $Z_{r,s}^{(\mathbf{n})}(\tau)$ from [6, 7] and prove Theorem 1.6. In Section 3, we establish the connection between Painlevé VI equation and the pre-modular form $Z_{r,s}^{(\mathbf{n})}(\tau)$. In Section 4 we prove Theorem 1.7. In Section 5, we prove the universal law for two simplest Lamé case. In Section 6, we prove the universal law for general DTV cases via an induction approach, where Painlevé VI equation plays a crucial role. Finally in Section 7, we apply the universal law to the algebraic multiplicity of (anti)periodic eigenvalues of the associated Hill operator.

2. PRE-MODULAR FORMS

In this section we prove Theorem 1.6. For this purpose we need to briefly review the constuction of the pre-modular form $Z_{r,s}^{(\mathbf{n})}(\tau)$ from [6, 7]. Denote

$$|\mathbf{n}| := \sum_k n_k \quad \text{for } \mathbf{n}.$$

(i) Any solution of $H(\mathbf{n}, B, \tau)$ is meromorphic in \mathbb{C} . Given any $B \in \mathbb{C}$, there exist a unique pair $\pm \mathbf{a} := \pm\{a_1, \dots, a_{|\mathbf{n}|}\} \subset E_\tau$ and constants $c(\pm \mathbf{a}) \in \mathbb{C}$ (see (2.4) below) such that

$$(2.1) \quad y_{\mathbf{a}}(z) := e^{c(\mathbf{a})z} \frac{\prod_{i=1}^{|\mathbf{n}|} \sigma(z - a_i)}{\prod_{k=0}^3 \sigma(z - \frac{\omega_k}{2})^{n_k}}, \quad y_{-\mathbf{a}}(z) := e^{c(-\mathbf{a})z} \frac{\prod_{i=1}^{|\mathbf{n}|} \sigma(z + a_i)}{\prod_{k=0}^3 \sigma(z - \frac{\omega_k}{2})^{n_k}}$$

are solutions of $H(\mathbf{n}, B, \tau)$. Since the DTV potential $I_{\mathbf{n}}(z; \tau)$ is an even function, $y_{\mathbf{a}}(-z)$ is also a solution of $H(\mathbf{n}, B, \tau)$ and has the same zeros as $y_{-\mathbf{a}}(z)$, so $y_{\mathbf{a}}(-z)$ and $y_{-\mathbf{a}}(z)$ are linearly dependent. From here and the transformation law (let $\eta_3 = 2\zeta(\frac{\omega_3}{2}) = \eta_1 + \eta_2$)

$$(2.2) \quad \sigma(z + \omega_k) = -e^{\eta_k(z + \frac{\omega_k}{2})} \sigma(z), \quad k = 1, 2, 3,$$

it is easy to see that $y_{-\mathbf{a}}(z) = (-1)^{n_1+n_2+n_3} y_{\mathbf{a}}(-z)$ and $c(-\mathbf{a}) = -c(\mathbf{a}) - \sum_{k=1}^3 n_k \eta_k$.

(ii) Recalling the spectral polynomial $Q_{\mathbf{n}}(B; \tau)$, $y_a(a)$ and $y_{-a}(z)$ are linearly independent if and only if $Q_{\mathbf{n}}(B; \tau) \neq 0$, which is also equivalent to

$$(2.3) \quad \{a_1, \dots, a_{|\mathbf{n}|}\} \cap \{-a_1, \dots, -a_{|\mathbf{n}|}\} = \emptyset \quad \text{in } E_{\tau}.$$

In this case,

$$(2.4) \quad c(\mathbf{a}) = \sum_{i=1}^{|\mathbf{n}|} \zeta(a_i) - \sum_{k=1}^3 \frac{n_k \eta_k}{2},$$

and the (r, s) defined by

$$(2.5) \quad \begin{cases} \sum_{i=1}^{|\mathbf{n}|} a_i - \sum_{k=1}^3 \frac{n_k \omega_k}{2} = r + s\tau \\ \sum_{i=1}^{|\mathbf{n}|} \zeta(a_i) - \sum_{k=1}^3 \frac{n_k \eta_k}{2} = r\eta_1 + s\eta_2 \end{cases}$$

satisfies $(r, s) \in \mathbb{C}^2 \setminus \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}^2$, and

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{pmatrix} y_a(z + \omega_1) \\ y_{-a}(z + \omega_1) \end{pmatrix} &= \begin{pmatrix} e^{-2\pi i s} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{2\pi i s} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} y_a(z) \\ y_{-a}(z) \end{pmatrix}, \\ \begin{pmatrix} y_a(z + \omega_2) \\ y_{-a}(z + \omega_2) \end{pmatrix} &= \begin{pmatrix} e^{2\pi i r} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{-2\pi i r} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} y_a(z) \\ y_{-a}(z) \end{pmatrix}, \end{aligned}$$

i.e. with respect to $y_a(z)$ and $y_{-a}(z)$, the monodromy matrices are given by

$$(2.6) \quad \rho(\ell_1) = \begin{pmatrix} e^{-2\pi i s} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{2\pi i s} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \rho(\ell_2) = \begin{pmatrix} e^{2\pi i r} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{-2\pi i r} \end{pmatrix}.$$

(iii) Define

$$(2.7) \quad Y_{\mathbf{n}}(\tau) := \left\{ \mathbf{a} = \{a_1, \dots, a_{|\mathbf{n}|}\} \in \text{Sym}^{|\mathbf{n}|} E_{\tau} \mid \begin{array}{l} y_a(z) \text{ defined in} \\ (2.1) \text{ is a solution of } H(\mathbf{n}, B, \tau) \text{ for some } B \end{array} \right\}.$$

Then $\overline{Y_{\mathbf{n}}(\tau)} = Y_{\mathbf{n}}(\tau) \cup \{\infty_0\}$ is a hyperelliptic curve with arithmetic genus g with

$$\infty_0 := \left(\overbrace{0, \dots, 0}^{n_0}, \overbrace{\frac{\omega_1}{2}, \dots, \frac{\omega_1}{2}}^{n_1}, \overbrace{\frac{\omega_2}{2}, \dots, \frac{\omega_2}{2}}^{n_2}, \overbrace{\frac{\omega_3}{2}, \dots, \frac{\omega_3}{2}}^{n_3} \right).$$

The affine part

$$(2.8) \quad Y_{\mathbf{n}}(\tau) \simeq \{(B, C) \mid C^2 = Q_{\mathbf{n}}(B; \tau)\},$$

and the branch points of $Y_{\mathbf{n}}(\tau)$ are precisely those $\{a_i\}_{i=1}^{|\mathbf{n}|} \in Y_{\mathbf{n}}(\tau)$ such that

$$(2.9) \quad \{a_1, \dots, a_{|\mathbf{n}|}\} = \{-a_1, \dots, -a_{|\mathbf{n}|}\} \quad \text{in } E_{\tau}.$$

(iv) The first formula of (2.5) motivates us to study the addition map $\sigma_{\mathbf{n}} : \overline{Y_{\mathbf{n}}(\tau)} \rightarrow E_{\tau}$ (also called a covering map in [32, Section 4]):

$$(2.10) \quad \sigma_{\mathbf{n}}(\mathbf{a}) := \sum_{i=1}^{|\mathbf{n}|} a_i - \sum_{k=1}^3 \frac{n_k \omega_k}{2}.$$

Since $2 \sum_{k=1}^3 \frac{n_k \omega_k}{2} = 0$ in E_τ , we have

$$\sigma_{\mathbf{n}}(-\mathbf{a}) = - \sum_{i=1}^N a_i - \sum_{k=1}^3 \frac{n_k \omega_k}{2} = -\sigma_{\mathbf{n}}(\mathbf{a}) \quad \text{in } E_\tau.$$

Since the algebraic curve $\overline{Y_{\mathbf{n}}(\tau)}$ is irreducible, $\sigma_{\mathbf{n}}$ is a *finite morphism* and $\deg \sigma_{\mathbf{n}}$ is well-defined. We proved in [6] that

$$\deg \sigma_{\mathbf{n}} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=0}^3 n_k (n_k + 1).$$

Let $K(\overline{Y_{\mathbf{n}}(\tau)})$ be the field of rational functions on $\overline{Y_{\mathbf{n}}(\tau)}$. Then $K(\overline{Y_{\mathbf{n}}(\tau)})$ is a finite extension of $K(E_\tau)$ and

$$\left[K(\overline{Y_{\mathbf{n}}(\tau)}) : K(E_\tau) \right] = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=0}^3 n_k (n_k + 1).$$

(v) Define $\mathbf{z}_{\mathbf{n}} : \overline{Y_{\mathbf{n}}(\tau)} \rightarrow \mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}$ by

$$\mathbf{z}_{\mathbf{n}}(a_1, \dots, a_N) := \zeta \left(\sum_{i=1}^N a_i - \sum_{k=1}^3 \frac{n_k \omega_k}{2} \right) - \sum_{i=1}^N \zeta(a_i) + \sum_{k=1}^3 \frac{n_k \eta_k}{2}.$$

Then $\mathbf{z}_{\mathbf{n}} \in K(\overline{Y_{\mathbf{n}}(\tau)})$ is a primitive generator of the finite field extension of $K(\overline{Y_{\mathbf{n}}(\tau)})$ over $K(E_\tau)$, and there is a minimal polynomial (2.11)

$$W_{\mathbf{n}}(X) = W_{\mathbf{n}}(X; \sigma_{\mathbf{n}}, \tau) \in \mathbb{Q}[e_1(\tau), e_2(\tau), e_3(\tau), \wp(\sigma_{\mathbf{n}}; \tau), \wp'(\sigma_{\mathbf{n}}; \tau)][X]$$

of the field extension $K(\overline{Y_{\mathbf{n}}(\tau)})$ over $K(E_\tau)$ which defines the covering map $\sigma_{\mathbf{n}}$ between algebraic curves. Then the pre-modular form $Z_{r,s}^{\mathbf{n}}(\tau)$ is construct from $W_{\mathbf{n}}(X)$ by the following result.

Theorem 2.1. [7, Theorem 2.4]

(1) $W_{\mathbf{n}}(X; \sigma_{\mathbf{n}}, \tau)$ is a monic polynomial of X -degree $\frac{1}{2} \sum_k n_k (n_k + 1)$ such that

$$W_{\mathbf{n}}(\mathbf{z}_{\mathbf{n}}(\mathbf{a}); \sigma_{\mathbf{n}}(\mathbf{a}), \tau) = 0.$$

Moreover, $W_{\mathbf{n}}$ is homogenous of weight $\frac{1}{2} \sum_k n_k (n_k + 1)$, where the weights of X , $\wp(\sigma_{\mathbf{n}})$, e_k 's, $\wp'(\sigma_{\mathbf{n}})$ are 1, 2, 2, 3 respectively.

(2) Fix any τ . For each $\sigma \in E_\tau \setminus E_\tau[2]$ being outside the branch loci of $\sigma_{\mathbf{n}} : \overline{Y_{\mathbf{n}}(\tau)} \rightarrow E_\tau$, $W_{\mathbf{n}}(\cdot; \sigma, \tau)$ has $\frac{1}{2} \sum_k n_k (n_k + 1)$ distinct zeros.

(3) Define $Z_{r,s}^{\mathbf{n}}(\tau) := W_{\mathbf{n}}(Z_{r,s}(\tau); r + s\tau, \tau)$. Then $Z_{r,s}^{\mathbf{n}}(\tau)$ is the desired pre-modular form as stated in Theorem 1.5.

Here we have the following simple observation.

Lemma 2.2. Fix any τ_0 . There is a polynomial $g_{\mathbf{n}}(s)$ of degree $\frac{1}{2} \sum_k n_k (n_k + 1)$ such that if $(r_0, s_0) \in \mathbb{C}^2 \setminus \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{Z}^2$ satisfies $r_0 + s_0 \tau_0 = 0$ and $Z_{r_0, s_0}^{\mathbf{n}}(\tau_0) = 0$, then $g_{\mathbf{n}}(s_0) = 0$.

Proof. Clearly $Z_{r_0, s}^{\mathbf{n}}(\tau_0)$ is meromorphic in s . Denote $\alpha = r_0 + s\tau_0$, i.e. $\alpha \rightarrow 0$ as $s \rightarrow s_0$. It is well known that

$$\begin{aligned}\zeta(\alpha; \tau_0) &= \frac{1}{\alpha} + \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} a_j \alpha^{2j+1}, \\ \wp(\alpha; \tau_0) &= \frac{1}{\alpha^2} - \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} (2j+1) a_j \alpha^{2j}, \\ \wp'(\alpha; \tau_0) &= \frac{-2}{\alpha^3} - \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} 2j(2j+1) a_j \alpha^{2j-1},\end{aligned}$$

where $a_j \in \mathbb{Q}[g_2(\tau_0), g_3(\tau_0)] \subset \mathbb{Q}[e_1(\tau_0), e_2(\tau_0), e_3(\tau_0)]$. Then (1.18) gives

$$Z_{r_0, s}(\tau_0) = \frac{1}{\alpha} + 2\pi i s - \eta_1(\tau_0)\alpha + \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} a_j \alpha^{2j+1}.$$

Recalling (2.11) and Theorem 2.1 that

$$(2.12) \quad Z_{r_0, s}^{\mathbf{n}}(\tau_0) = Z_{r_0, s}(\tau_0)^{\frac{1}{2} \sum_k n_k(n_k+1)} + \sum_{j=0}^{\frac{1}{2} \sum_k n_k(n_k+1) - 2} b_j Z_{r_0, s}(\tau_0)^j,$$

where

$$b_j \in \mathbb{Q}[\wp(\alpha; \tau_0), \wp'(\alpha; \tau_0), e_1(\tau_0), e_2(\tau_0), e_3(\tau_0)]$$

is homogeneous weight of $\frac{1}{2} \sum_k n_k(n_k+1) - j$, where the weights of $\wp(\alpha; \tau_0)$, $e_k(\tau_0)$, $\wp'(\alpha; \tau_0)$ are 2, 2, 3 respectively. Inserting the above expansions into (2.12), we obtain

$$Z_{r_0, s}^{\mathbf{n}}(\tau_0) = \sum_{j=-\frac{1}{2} \sum_k n_k(n_k+1)}^{+\infty} d_j \alpha^j,$$

where

$$d_j = d_j(s) \in \mathbb{Q}[\eta_1(\tau_0), e_1(\tau_0), e_2(\tau_0), e_3(\tau_0)][2\pi i s],$$

in particular,

$$d_0(s) = (2\pi i s)^{\frac{1}{2} \sum_k n_k(n_k+1)} + \text{lower order terms}$$

is of degree $\frac{1}{2} \sum_k n_k(n_k+1)$. Now by $Z_{r_0, s_0}^{\mathbf{n}}(\tau_0) = 0$ and $\alpha \rightarrow 0$ as $s \rightarrow s_0$, we obtain

$$d_j(s_0) = 0 \quad \text{for all } j \leq 0.$$

The proof is complete by letting $g_{\mathbf{n}}(s) = d_0(s)$. \square

Now we apply the above theory to prove Theorem 1.6.

Proof of Theorem 1.6. Fix any $(r_0, s_0) \in \mathbb{C}^2 \setminus \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}^2$ and $\tau_0 \in \mathbb{H}$ such that $r_0 + s_0\tau_0 \in \Lambda_{\tau_0}$. By replacing (r_0, s_0) with $(r_0 + m_1, s_0 + m_2)$, $m_1, m_2 \in \mathbb{Z}$, if necessary, we may assume $r_0 + s_0\tau_0 = 0$.

Step 1. We prove the sufficient part. Suppose there is B_0 such that (r_0, s_0) is the monodromy data of $H(\mathbf{n}, B_0, \tau_0)$, we need to prove $Z_{r_0, s_0}^{\mathbf{n}}(\tau_0) = 0$.

By $Q_{\mathbf{n}}(B_0; \tau_0) \neq 0$, there is small $\varepsilon > 0$ such that for any $|B - B_0| < \varepsilon$, $Q_{\mathbf{n}}(B; \tau_0) \neq 0$. Consequently, we may assume that the monodromy data of $H(\mathbf{n}, B, \tau_0)$ is $(r(B), s(B)) \notin \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}^2$ satisfying $(r(B), s(B)) \rightarrow (r_0, s_0)$ as $B \rightarrow B_0$. Since the addition map $\sigma_{\mathbf{n}}$ is a finite morphism, the pre-image $\sigma_{\mathbf{n}}^{-1}(0)$ is finite, so except finite B 's we have $r(B) + s(B)\tau_0 \notin \Lambda_{\tau_0}$ and then Theorem 1.5 implies $Z_{r(B), s(B)}^{\mathbf{n}}(\tau_0) = 0$. From here and the continuity of $Z_{r,s}^{\mathbf{n}}(\tau_0)$ with respect to (r, s) , we obtain $Z_{r_0, s_0}^{\mathbf{n}}(\tau_0) = 0$.

Step 2. We prove the necessary part. Suppose $Z_{r_0, s_0}^{\mathbf{n}}(\tau_0) = 0$, we need to prove the existence of B_0 such that (r_0, s_0) is the monodromy data of $H(\mathbf{n}, B_0, \tau_0)$.

Since $Z_{r,s}^{\mathbf{n}}(\tau_0)$ is meromorphic in $(r, s) \notin \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}^2$, there is small $\varepsilon > 0$ such that for any $|s - s_0| < \varepsilon$, $Z_{r,s}^{\mathbf{n}}(\tau_0)$ as a function of r has a zero $r(s)$ satisfying $r(s) \rightarrow r_0$ as $s \rightarrow s_0$. Then by Lemma 2.2 and by taking ε smaller if necessarily, we have $(r(s), s) \notin \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}^2$ and $r(s) + s\tau_0 \notin \Lambda_{\tau_0}$ for any $0 < |s - s_0| < \varepsilon$. From here and $Z_{r(s), s}^{\mathbf{n}}(\tau_0) = 0$, it follows from Theorem 1.5 that there is $B(s)$ such that $(r(s), s)$ is the monodromy data of $H(\mathbf{n}, B(s), \tau_0)$. Recalling (2.4)-(2.5) that the corresponding $c(\mathbf{a}) = r(s)\eta_1(\tau_0) + s\eta_2(\tau_0)$, since we proved in [6, (5.7)] that $B(s) \rightarrow \infty$ if and only if the corresponding $c(\mathbf{a}) \rightarrow \infty$, we conclude from $(r(s), s) \rightarrow (r_0, s_0)$ that $B(s)$ are uniformly bounded as $s \rightarrow s_0$ and so up to a subsequence, $B(s) \rightarrow B_0$ for some B_0 . Consequently, (r_0, s_0) is the monodromy data of $H(\mathbf{n}, B_0, \tau_0)$. This completes the proof. \square

3. PAINLEVÉ VI EQUATION AND PRE-MODULAR FORMS

Our proofs of Theorems 1.2 and 1.7 are based on the connection between $H(\mathbf{n}, B, \tau)$ and Painlevé VI equation. First we briefly review some basic facts about Painlevé VI equation.

3.1. Painlevé VI equation. The well-known Painlevé VI equation (PVI) with four free parameters $(\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta)$ is written as

$$(3.1) \quad \frac{d^2\lambda}{dt^2} = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{\lambda} + \frac{1}{\lambda-1} + \frac{1}{\lambda-t} \right) \left(\frac{d\lambda}{dt} \right)^2 - \left(\frac{1}{t} + \frac{1}{t-1} + \frac{1}{\lambda-t} \right) \frac{d\lambda}{dt} + \frac{\lambda(\lambda-1)(\lambda-t)}{t^2(t-1)^2} \left[\alpha + \beta \frac{t}{\lambda^2} + \gamma \frac{t-1}{(\lambda-1)^2} + \delta \frac{t(t-1)}{(\lambda-t)^2} \right].$$

Due to its connection with many different disciplines in mathematics and physics, PVI has been extensively studied in the past several decades. We refer the readers to the texts [14, 22] for a detailed introduction of PVI.

One of the fundamental properties for PVI is the so-called *Painlevé property*, which says that any solution $\lambda(t)$ of PVI has neither movable branch points nor movable essential singularities; in other words, for any $t_0 \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0, 1\}$, either $\lambda(t)$ is holomorphic at t_0 or $\lambda(t)$ has a pole at t_0 . Therefore, it is reasonable to lift PVI to the covering space $\mathbb{H} = \{\tau \mid \text{Im } \tau > 0\}$ of

$\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0, 1\}$ by the following transformation:

$$(3.2) \quad t = \frac{e_3(\tau) - e_1(\tau)}{e_2(\tau) - e_1(\tau)}, \quad \lambda(t) = \frac{\wp(p(\tau); \tau) - e_1(\tau)}{e_2(\tau) - e_1(\tau)}.$$

Then $\lambda(t)$ solves PVI if and only if $p(\tau)$ satisfies the following *elliptic form* of PVI (EPVI):

$$(3.3) \quad \frac{d^2 p(\tau)}{d\tau^2} = \frac{-1}{4\pi^2} \sum_{k=0}^3 \alpha_k \wp' \left(p(\tau) + \frac{\omega_k}{2}; \tau \right),$$

with parameters given by

$$(3.4) \quad (\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3) = \left(\alpha, -\beta, \gamma, \frac{1}{2} - \delta \right).$$

See e.g. [1, 25] for the proof. The Painlevé property implies that function $\wp(p(\tau)|\tau)$ is a single-valued meromorphic function in \mathbb{H} . This is an advantage of making the transformation (3.2).

Remark 3.1. Clearly for any $m_1, m_2 \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\pm p(\tau) + m_1 + m_2\tau$ is also a solution of the elliptic form (3.3). Since they all give the same solution $\lambda(t)$ of PVI via (3.2), we always identify all these $\pm p(\tau) + m_1 + m_2\tau$ with the same one $p(\tau)$.

From now on we consider PVI with parameters

$$(3.5) \quad (\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta) = \left(\frac{1}{2}(n_0 + \frac{1}{2})^2, -\frac{1}{2}(n_1 + \frac{1}{2})^2, \frac{1}{2}(n_2 + \frac{1}{2})^2, \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2}(n_3 + \frac{1}{2})^2 \right), \quad n_k \in \mathbb{N} \text{ for all } k,$$

and denoted it by $\text{PVI}_{\mathbf{n}}$; or equivalently EPVI with parameters

$$(3.6) \quad \alpha_k = \frac{1}{2}(n_k + \frac{1}{2})^2, \quad n_k \in \mathbb{N} \text{ for all } k,$$

and denoted it by $\text{EPVI}_{\mathbf{n}}$.

First we recall Hitchin's famous formula for the case $\mathbf{n} = \mathbf{0}$. For any $(r, s) \in \mathbb{C}^2 \setminus \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}^2$, let $p_{r,s}^0(\tau)$ be defined by

$$(3.7) \quad \wp(p_{r,s}^0(\tau); \tau) := \wp(r + s\tau; \tau) + \frac{\wp'(r + s\tau; \tau)}{2Z_{r,s}(\tau)}.$$

In [20] Hitchin proved the following remarkable result for $\text{EPVI}_{\mathbf{0}}$.

Theorem 3.2. [20] *For any $(r, s) \in \mathbb{C}^2 \setminus \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}^2$, $p_{r,s}^0(\tau)$ given by (3.7) is a solution to $\text{EPVI}_{\mathbf{0}}$; or equivalently, $\lambda_{r,s}^0(t) := \frac{\wp(p_{r,s}^0(\tau); \tau) - e_1(\tau)}{e_2(\tau) - e_1(\tau)}$ via (3.7) is a solution to $\text{PVI}_{\mathbf{0}}$.*

It is known (cf. [8, Section 5]) that solutions of $\text{EPVI}_{\mathbf{n}}$ could be obtained from solutions of $\text{EPVI}_{\mathbf{0}}$ via the well-known Okamoto transformations ([26]).

Notation: Denote by $p_{r,s}^{\mathbf{n}}(\tau)$ to be the solution of $\text{EPVI}_{\mathbf{n}}$ obtained from $p_{r,s}^0(\tau)$ in Theorem 3.2 via the Okamoto transformations.

Then by applying Hitchin's formula (3.7) and the Okamoto transformation, we proved in [8, Remark 5.2] that

Lemma 3.3. [8, Remark 5.2] *Given \mathbf{n} , there is a rational function $\Xi_{\mathbf{n}}(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot, \cdot, \cdot, \cdot)$ of six independent variables with coefficients in \mathbb{Q} such that for any $(r, s) \in \mathbb{C}^2 \setminus \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}^2$, there holds*

$$\wp(p_{r,s}^{\mathbf{n}}(\tau); \tau) = \Xi_{\mathbf{n}}(Z_{r,s}(\tau), \wp(r+s\tau; \tau), \wp'(r+s\tau; \tau), e_1(\tau), e_2(\tau), e_3(\tau)).$$

For example, by writing

$$Z = Z_{r,s}(\tau), \quad \wp = \wp(r+s\tau; \tau), \quad \wp' = \wp'(r+s\tau; \tau)$$

for convenience, we have

$$(3.8) \quad \wp(p_{r,s}^{(1,0,0,0)}(\tau); \tau) = \wp + \frac{3\wp'Z^2 + (12\wp^2 - g_2)Z + 3\wp\wp'}{2(Z^3 - 3\wp Z - \wp')}.$$

Note from (1.19) that $Z_{r,s}^{(2,0,0,0)}(\tau) = Z^3 - 3\wp Z - \wp'$ appears in the denominator of $\wp(p_{r,s}^{(1,0,0,0)}(\tau); \tau)$. We will study the general relation between $Z_{r,s}^{\mathbf{n}}(\tau)$ and PVI in Section 3.2.

On the other hand, we proved in [5] that $\text{EPVI}_{\mathbf{n}}$ governs the isomonodromic deformation of the following generalized Lamé equation (denoted it by $\text{GLE}(\mathbf{n}, p, A, \tau)$)

$$(3.9) \quad y'' = \left[\sum_{k=0}^3 n_k(n_k+1)\wp(z + \frac{\omega_k}{2}; \tau) + \frac{3}{4}(\wp(z+p; \tau) + \wp(z-p; \tau)) \right. \\ \left. + A(\zeta(z+p; \tau) - \zeta(z-p; \tau)) + B \right] y =: I(z)y,$$

where $\pm p \notin E_{\tau}[2]$ and

$$(3.10) \quad B = A^2 - \zeta(2p; \tau)A - \frac{3}{4}\wp(2p; \tau) - \sum_{k=0}^3 n_k(n_k+1)\wp(p + \frac{\omega_k}{2}; \tau).$$

Note that (3.10) is equivalent to saying that $\pm p \notin E_{\tau}[2]$ are always *apparent singularities* (i.e. any solution of (3.9) has no logarithmic singularities at $\pm p$).

Fix any base point $q_0 \in E_{\tau}$ that is not a singularity of (3.9). The monodromy representation of GLE (3.9) is a homomorphism $\rho : \pi_1(E_{\tau} \setminus (\{\pm p\} \cup E_{\tau}[2]), q_0) \rightarrow \text{SL}(2, \mathbb{C})$. Since $n_k \in \mathbb{N}$ and the local exponents of (3.9) at $\frac{\omega_k}{2}$ are $-n_k$ and $n_k + 1$, the local monodromy matrix at $\frac{\omega_k}{2}$ is the identity matrix I_2 . Thus the monodromy representation of (3.9) is reduced to $\rho : \pi_1(E_{\tau} \setminus \{\pm p\}, q_0) \rightarrow \text{SL}(2, \mathbb{C})$. Let $\gamma_{\pm} \in \pi_1(E_{\tau} \setminus (\{\pm p\} \cup E_{\tau}[2]), q_0)$ be a simple loop encircling $\pm p$ counterclockwise respectively, and $\ell_j \in \pi_1(E_{\tau} \setminus (\{\pm p\} \cup E_{\tau}[2]), q_0)$, $j = 1, 2$, be two fundamental cycles of E_{τ} connecting q_0 with $q_0 + \omega_j$ such that ℓ_j does not intersect with $L + \Lambda_{\tau}$ (here L is the straight segment connecting $\pm p$) and satisfies

$$\gamma_+ \gamma_- = \ell_1 \ell_2 \ell_1^{-1} \ell_2^{-1} \text{ in } \pi_1(E_{\tau} \setminus \{\pm p\}, q_0).$$

Since the local exponents of (3.9) at $\pm p$ are $\{-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{2}\}$ and $\pm p \notin E_\tau[2]$ are apparent singularities, we always have $\rho(\gamma_\pm) = -I_2$. Denote by $N_j = \rho(\ell_j)$ the monodromy matrix along the loop ℓ_j of (3.9) with respect to any linearly independent solutions. Then $N_1 N_2 = N_2 N_1$ and the monodromy group of (3.9) is generated by $\{-I_2, N_1, N_2\}$, i.e. is always *abelian and so reducible*. It is known (cf. [6]) that expect finitely many A 's for given (τ, p) , N_1 and N_2 can be diagonalized simultaneously, and more precisely, there exists $(r, s) \in \mathbb{C}^2 \setminus \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}^2$ such that

$$N_1 = \begin{pmatrix} e^{-2\pi i s} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{2\pi i s} \end{pmatrix}, \quad N_2 = \begin{pmatrix} e^{2\pi i r} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{-2\pi i r} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Let U be an open subset of \mathbb{H} such that $p(\tau) \notin E_\tau[2]$ for any $\tau \in U$. Then we proved in [5] that $p(\tau)$ is a solution of EPVI $_{\mathbf{n}}$ if and only if there exist $A(\tau)$ (and the corresponding $B(\tau)$ via (3.10)) such that $\text{GLE}(\mathbf{n}, p(\tau), A(\tau), \tau)$ is monodromy preserving as $\tau \in U$ deforms. Furthermore, $(p(\tau), A(\tau))$ satisfies the following new Hamiltonian system

$$(3.11) \quad \begin{cases} \frac{dp(\tau)}{d\tau} = \frac{\partial \mathcal{H}}{\partial A} = \frac{-i}{4\pi} (2A - \zeta(2p; \tau) + 2p\eta_1(\tau)) \\ \frac{dA(\tau)}{d\tau} = -\frac{\partial \mathcal{H}}{\partial p} = \frac{i}{4\pi} \begin{pmatrix} (2\wp(2p; \tau) + 2\eta_1(\tau))A - \frac{3}{2}\wp'(2p; \tau) \\ -\sum_{k=0}^3 n_k(n_k + 1)\wp'(p + \frac{\omega_k}{2}; \tau) \end{pmatrix} \end{cases}.$$

where $\mathcal{H} = \frac{-i}{4\pi}(B + 2p\eta_1(\tau)A)$. In other words, this Hamiltonian system is equivalent to EPVI $_{\mathbf{n}}$. We refer the reader to [5] for the more general statement and the proof. Here we need to apply the following result [8].

Theorem 3.4. ([8, Theorem 5.3]) *For \mathbf{n} , let $p^{\mathbf{n}}(\tau)$ be a solution to EPVI $_{\mathbf{n}}$. Then the following hold:*

- (1) *For any τ satisfying $p^{\mathbf{n}}(\tau) \notin E_\tau[2]$, the monodromy group of the associated $\text{GLE}(\mathbf{n}, p^{\mathbf{n}}(\tau), A^{\mathbf{n}}(\tau), \tau)$ is generated by*

$$(3.12) \quad \rho(\gamma_\pm) = -I_2, \quad N_1 = \begin{pmatrix} e^{-2\pi i s} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{2\pi i s} \end{pmatrix}, \quad N_2 = \begin{pmatrix} e^{2\pi i r} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{-2\pi i r} \end{pmatrix}$$

if and only if $(r, s) \in \mathbb{C}^2 \setminus \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}^2$ and $p^{\mathbf{n}}(\tau) = p_{r,s}^{\mathbf{n}}(\tau)$ in the sense of Remark 3.1.

- (2) $\wp(p_{r_1, s_1}^{\mathbf{n}}(\tau); \tau) \equiv \wp(p_{r_2, s_2}^{\mathbf{n}}(\tau); \tau) \iff (r_1, s_1) \equiv \pm(r_2, s_2) \pmod{\mathbb{Z}^2}$.

3.2. Relation between PVI and $Z_{r,s}^{\mathbf{n}}(\tau)$. In this subsection, we study the deep connection between PVI and the pre-modular form $Z_{r,s}^{\mathbf{n}}(\tau)$. For $\mathbf{n} = (n_0, n_1, n_2, n_3)$, we define

$$(3.13) \quad \mathbf{n}_0^\pm := (n_0 \pm 1, n_1, n_2, n_3).$$

Lemma 3.5. [5, Lemma 3.1] *Fix any $\tau_0 \in \mathbb{H}$ and $c_{n_0}^2 \in \{\pm i \frac{2n_0+1}{2\pi}\}$. Then for any $h \in \mathbb{C}$, EPVI $_{\mathbf{n}}$ has a solution $p_h^{\mathbf{n}}(\tau)$ satisfying the following asymptotic behavior*

$$(3.14) \quad p_h^{\mathbf{n}}(\tau) = c_{n_0}(\tau - \tau_0)^{\frac{1}{2}}(1 + h(\tau - \tau_0) + a(\tau - \tau_0)^2 + O((\tau - \tau_0)^3)) \text{ as } \tau \rightarrow \tau_0,$$

with

$$a = \frac{-h^2}{2} - \frac{(n_0 + \frac{1}{2})^2 g_2(\tau_0)}{240\pi^2} - \frac{1}{24\pi^2} \sum_{k=1}^3 (n_k + \frac{1}{2})^2 \wp''(\frac{\omega_k}{2}; \tau_0).$$

Moreover, these two 1-parameter families of solutions give all solutions $p^n(\tau)$ of $EPVI_n$ satisfying $p^n(\tau_0) = 0$.

Recall Remark 3.1 that we identify the solutions $p_h^n(\tau)$ and $-p_h^n(\tau)$, so (3.14) gives two 1-parameter families (one family is given by $c_{n_0}^2 = i\frac{2n_0+1}{2\pi}$ and the other by $c_{n_0}^2 = -i\frac{2n_0+1}{2\pi}$) of solutions of $EPVI_n$.

The first result of this subsection is

Theorem 3.6. *Let $(r, s) \in \mathbb{C}^2 \setminus \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}^2$ and $p_{r,s}^n(\tau)$ be a solution of $EPVI_n$. Suppose $p_{r,s}^n(\tau_0) = 0$ for some $\tau_0 \in \mathbb{H}$. Then $p_{r,s}^n(\tau) = p_h^n(\tau)$ for some $h \in \mathbb{C}$. Furthermore, by defining*

$$(3.15) \quad B_0 := 2\pi i c_{n_0}^2 (4\pi i h - \eta_1(\tau_0)) - \sum_{j=1}^3 n_j(n_j + 1)e_j(\tau_0),$$

the following hold.

(1) *If $c_{n_0}^2 = -i\frac{2n_0+1}{2\pi}$, then $Z_{r,s}^{\mathbf{n}_0^+}(\tau_0) = 0$ and the monodromy of $H(\mathbf{n}_0^+, B_0, \tau_0)$ is generated by*

$$(3.16) \quad \rho(\ell_1) = \begin{pmatrix} e^{-2\pi i s} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{2\pi i s} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \rho(\ell_2) = \begin{pmatrix} e^{2\pi i r} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{-2\pi i r} \end{pmatrix}.$$

(2) *If $c_{n_0}^2 = i\frac{2n_0+1}{2\pi}$, then $Z_{r,s}^{\mathbf{n}_0^-}(\tau_0) = 0$ and the monodromy of $H(\mathbf{n}_0^-, B_0, \tau_0)$ is generated by (3.16).*

Proof. The assertion $p_{r,s}^n(\tau) = p_h^n(\tau)$ for some $h \in \mathbb{C}$ follows from Lemma 3.5. Furthermore, letting B_0 be given by (3.15), we proved in [5, Theorem 3.1] that

(1) if $c_{n_0}^2 = -i\frac{2n_0+1}{2\pi}$, then as $\tau \rightarrow \tau_0$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{k=0}^3 n_k(n_k + 1)\wp(z + \frac{\omega_k}{2}; \tau) + \frac{3}{4}(\wp(z + p_{r,s}^n(\tau); \tau) + \wp(z - p_{r,s}^n(\tau); \tau)) \\ & + A(\tau)(\zeta(z + p_{r,s}^n(\tau); \tau) - \zeta(z - p_{r,s}^n(\tau); \tau)) + B(\tau) \\ & \rightarrow (n_0 + 1)(n_0 + 2)\wp(z; \tau_0) + \sum_{k=1}^3 n_k(n_k + 1)\wp(z + \frac{\omega_k}{2}; \tau_0) + B_0, \end{aligned}$$

so the associated $GLE(\mathbf{n}, p_{r,s}^n(\tau), A(\tau), \tau)$ converges to $H(\mathbf{n}_0^+, B_0, \tau_0)$;

(2) if $c_{n_0}^2 = i\frac{2n_0+1}{2\pi}$, then as $\tau \rightarrow \tau_0$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{k=0}^3 n_k(n_k+1)\wp(z + \frac{\omega_k}{2}; \tau) + \frac{3}{4}(\wp(z + p_{r,s}^{\mathbf{n}}(\tau); \tau) + \wp(z - p_{r,s}^{\mathbf{n}}(\tau); \tau)) \\ & + A(\tau)(\zeta(z + p_{r,s}^{\mathbf{n}}(\tau); \tau) - \zeta(z - p_{r,s}^{\mathbf{n}}(\tau); \tau)) + B(\tau) \\ & \rightarrow (n_0 - 1)n_0\wp(z; \tau_0) + \sum_{k=1}^3 n_k(n_k+1)\wp(z + \frac{\omega_k}{2}; \tau_0) + B_0, \end{aligned}$$

so the associated GLE $(\mathbf{n}, p_{r,s}^{\mathbf{n}}(\tau), A(\tau), \tau)$ converges to $H(\mathbf{n}_0^-, B_0, \tau_0)$.

Recalling Theorem 3.4 that the monodromy of this GLE $(\mathbf{n}, p_{r,s}^{\mathbf{n}}(\tau), A(\tau), \tau)$ is given by (3.12), it follows from [8, Theorem 6.2] that the monodromy of $H(\mathbf{n}_0^+, B_0, \tau_0)$ for $c_{n_0}^2 = -i\frac{2n_0+1}{2\pi}$ (resp. $H(\mathbf{n}_0^-, B_0, \tau_0)$ for $c_{n_0}^2 = i\frac{2n_0+1}{2\pi}$) is given by (3.16). This, together with Theorem 1.6, implies that $Z_{r,s}^{\mathbf{n}_0^+}(\tau_0) = 0$ for $c_{n_0}^2 = -i\frac{2n_0+1}{2\pi}$ (resp. $Z_{r,s}^{\mathbf{n}_0^-}(\tau_0) = 0$ for $c_{n_0}^2 = i\frac{2n_0+1}{2\pi}$). \square

The converse statement of Theorem 3.6 is also true, which strongly suggests that $Z_{r,s}^{\mathbf{n}}(\tau)$ appears in the denominators of the expressions of both $\wp(p_{r,s}^{\mathbf{n}_0^+}(\tau); \tau)$ and $\wp(p_{r,s}^{\mathbf{n}_0^-}(\tau); \tau)$.

Theorem 3.7. *Let $(r, s) \in \mathbb{C}^2 \setminus \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}^2$ such that $Z_{r,s}^{\mathbf{n}}(\tau_0) = 0$ for some $\tau_0 \in \mathbb{H}$, namely there is a unique $B_0 \in \mathbb{C}$ such that the monodromy of $H(\mathbf{n}, B_0, \tau_0)$ is generated by (3.16). Then*

(1) $p_{r,s}^{\mathbf{n}_0^+}(\tau_0) = 0$ and $p_{r,s}^{\mathbf{n}_0^+}(\tau) = p_h^{\mathbf{n}_0^+}(\tau)$ with $c_{n_0+1}^2 = i\frac{2n_0+3}{2\pi}$ and h satisfying

$$(3.17) \quad B_0 = 2\pi i c_{n_0+1}^2 (4\pi i h - \eta_1(\tau_0)) - \sum_{j=1}^3 n_j(n_j+1)e_j(\tau_0).$$

(2) $p_{r,s}^{\mathbf{n}_0^-}(\tau_0) = 0$ and $p_{r,s}^{\mathbf{n}_0^-}(\tau) = p_h^{\mathbf{n}_0^-}(\tau)$ with $c_{n_0-1}^2 = -i\frac{2n_0-1}{2\pi}$ and h satisfying

$$(3.18) \quad B_0 = 2\pi i c_{n_0-1}^2 (4\pi i h - \eta_1(\tau_0)) - \sum_{j=1}^3 n_j(n_j+1)e_j(\tau_0).$$

Proof. Note that the existence of B_0 follows from Theorem 1.6 and the uniqueness of B_0 follows from (1.13).

By defining h in terms of B_0 via (3.17), Lemma 3.5 implies the existence of a solution $p_h^{\mathbf{n}_0^+}(\tau)$ of EPVI $_{\mathbf{n}_0^+}$ such that

$$p_h^{\mathbf{n}_0^+}(\tau) = c_{n_0+1}(\tau - \tau_0)^{\frac{1}{2}}(1 + h(\tau - \tau_0) + O(\tau - \tau_0)^2) \text{ as } \tau \rightarrow \tau_0,$$

with $c_{n_0+1}^2 = i\frac{2n_0+3}{2\pi}$. Then as mentioned in the proof of Theorem 3.6, the associated GLE $(\mathbf{n}, p_h^{\mathbf{n}_0^+}(\tau), A(\tau), \tau)$ converges to $H(\mathbf{n}, B_0, \tau_0)$. Since the monodromy of $H(\mathbf{n}, B_0, \tau_0)$ is given by (3.16), [8, Theorem 6.2] says that the

monodromy of $\text{GLE}(\mathbf{n}, p_h^{\mathbf{n}_0^+}(\tau), A(\tau), \tau)$ is given by (3.12). From here and Theorem 3.4, we conclude that $p_h^{\mathbf{n}_0^+}(\tau) = p_{r,s}^{\mathbf{n}_0^+}(\tau)$. This proves the assertion (1), and the assertion (2) can be proved similarly. \square

Given $\mathbf{n} = (n_0, n_1, n_2, n_3)$, we define

$$(3.19) \quad \mathbf{n}_k := (n_{k,0}, n_{k,1}, n_{k,2}, n_{k,3}) = \begin{cases} (n_1, n_0, n_3, n_2) & \text{if } k = 1, \\ (n_2, n_3, n_0, n_1) & \text{if } k = 2, \\ (n_3, n_2, n_1, n_0) & \text{if } k = 3. \end{cases}$$

Then it follows from (3.3) that

$$(3.20) \quad p^{\mathbf{n}}(\tau) \text{ solves } \text{EPVI}_{\mathbf{n}} \text{ if and only if } p^{\mathbf{n}}(\tau) - \frac{\omega_k}{2} \text{ solves } \text{EPVI}_{\mathbf{n}_k}.$$

Given (r, s) we define

$$(3.21) \quad (r_k, s_k) := \begin{cases} (r + \frac{1}{2}, s) & \text{if } k = 1, \\ (r, s + \frac{1}{2}) & \text{if } k = 2, \\ (r + \frac{1}{2}, s + \frac{1}{2}) & \text{if } k = 3. \end{cases}$$

This following result will play a crucial role in our proof of Theorem 1.2.

Lemma 3.8. $p_{r_k, s_k}^{\mathbf{n}}(\tau) - \frac{\omega_k}{2} = p_{r, s}^{\mathbf{n}_k}(\tau)$ in the sense of Remark 3.1.

Proof. Denote $p^{\mathbf{n}_k}(\tau) := p_{r_k, s_k}^{\mathbf{n}}(\tau) - \frac{\omega_k}{2}$, which is a solution of $\text{EPVI}_{\mathbf{n}_k}$. By Theorem 3.4, to prove $p^{\mathbf{n}_k} = p_{r, s}^{\mathbf{n}_k}$ is equivalent to prove that the monodromy of the associated $\text{GLE}(\mathbf{n}_k, p^{\mathbf{n}_k}(\tau), A^{\mathbf{n}_k}(\tau), \tau)$ is given by (3.12).

Theorem 3.4 says that the monodromy group of the associated $\text{GLE}(\mathbf{n}, p_{r_k, s_k}^{\mathbf{n}}(\tau), A^{\mathbf{n}}(\tau), \tau)$ is generated by

$$\rho(\gamma_{\pm}) = -I_2, \quad N_1 = \begin{pmatrix} e^{-2\pi i s_k} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{2\pi i s_k} \end{pmatrix}, \quad N_2 = \begin{pmatrix} e^{2\pi i r_k} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{-2\pi i r_k} \end{pmatrix}.$$

More precisely, since the local exponents of $\text{GLE}(\mathbf{n}, p_{r_k, s_k}^{\mathbf{n}}(\tau), A^{\mathbf{n}}(\tau), \tau)$ at $\pm p_{r_k, s_k}^{\mathbf{n}}(\tau)$ are $\{-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{2}\}$ and $\pm p_{r_k, s_k}^{\mathbf{n}}(\tau) \notin E_{\tau}[2]$ are apparent singularities, it was proved in [8] that $\text{GLE}(\mathbf{n}, p_{r_k, s_k}^{\mathbf{n}}(\tau), A^{\mathbf{n}}(\tau), \tau)$ has a linearly independent solutions of the form

$$y_1(z) = \Phi_{p_{r_k, s_k}^{\mathbf{n}}}(z) \hat{y}(z), \quad y_2(z) = \Phi_{p_{r_k, s_k}^{\mathbf{n}}}(z) \hat{y}(-z),$$

where

$$\Phi_p(z) := \frac{\sigma(z)}{\sqrt{\sigma(z-p)\sigma(z+p)}},$$

and $\hat{y}(z)$ is meromorphic in \mathbb{C} and satisfies the transformation law

$$(3.22) \quad \hat{y}(z+1) = e^{-2\pi i s_k} \hat{y}(z), \quad \hat{y}(z+\tau) = e^{2\pi i r_k} \hat{y}(z),$$

namely $\hat{y}(z)$ is elliptic of the second kind. Note that $\Phi_p(z)^2$ is an even elliptic function.

Now since $p^{\mathbf{n}_k}(\tau) = p_{r_k, s_k}^{\mathbf{n}}(\tau) - \frac{\omega_k}{2}$ and (recall $\eta_3 = \eta_1 + \eta_2$ and $\tau\eta_1 - \eta_2 = 2\pi i$)

$$\frac{d}{d\tau} \frac{\omega_k}{2} = \frac{-i}{4\pi} (\omega_k \eta_1 - \eta_k),$$

it follows from the first equation of (3.11) that the corresponding $A^{\mathbf{n}_k}(\tau) = A^{\mathbf{n}}(\tau)$. Then it is easy to see that

$$\tilde{y}_1(z) := y_1(z - \frac{\omega_k}{2}) = \Phi_{p_{r_k, s_k}^{\mathbf{n}}}(z - \frac{\omega_k}{2}) \hat{y}(z - \frac{\omega_k}{2}),$$

$$\tilde{y}_2(z) := y_2(z - \frac{\omega_k}{2}) = \Phi_{p_{r_k, s_k}^{\mathbf{n}}}(z - \frac{\omega_k}{2}) \hat{y}(-z + \frac{\omega_k}{2}),$$

are linearly independent solutions of $\text{GLE}(\mathbf{n}_k, p^{\mathbf{n}_k}(\tau), A^{\mathbf{n}_k}(\tau), \tau)$. It suffices to prove that the monodromy matrix of $\text{GLE}(\mathbf{n}_k, p^{\mathbf{n}_k}(\tau), A^{\mathbf{n}_k}(\tau), \tau)$ with respect to $(\tilde{y}_1, \tilde{y}_2)$ are given by (3.12).

By the transformation law (2.2) we have

$$\sigma(z - p^{\mathbf{n}_k} - \omega_k) = -e^{-\eta_k(z - p^{\mathbf{n}_k} - \frac{\omega_k}{2})} \sigma(z - p^{\mathbf{n}_k}),$$

so

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_{p_{r_k, s_k}^{\mathbf{n}}}(z - \frac{\omega_k}{2}) &= \frac{\sigma(z - \frac{\omega_k}{2})}{\sqrt{\sigma(z - p^{\mathbf{n}_k} - \omega_k) \sigma(z + p^{\mathbf{n}_k})}} \\ &= \Phi_{p^{\mathbf{n}_k}}(z) \tilde{\zeta}_k(z), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\tilde{\zeta}_k(z) := \epsilon_k e^{\frac{\eta_k}{2}(z - p^{\mathbf{n}_k} - \frac{\omega_k}{2})} \frac{\sigma(z - \frac{\omega_k}{2})}{\sigma(z)}, \quad \epsilon_k \in \{\pm i\}.$$

Again by the transformation law (2.2), a direct computation gives

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\zeta}_k(z+1) &= e^{\frac{\eta_k - \omega_k \eta_1}{2}} \tilde{\zeta}_k(z) = \begin{cases} \tilde{\zeta}_k(z) & \text{if } k = 1, \\ -\tilde{\zeta}_k(z) & \text{if } k = 2, 3, \end{cases} \\ \tilde{\zeta}_k(z+\tau) &= e^{\frac{\tau \eta_k - \omega_k \eta_2}{2}} \tilde{\zeta}_k(z) = \begin{cases} \tilde{\zeta}_k(z) & \text{if } k = 2, \\ -\tilde{\zeta}_k(z) & \text{if } k = 1, 3. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Now for $\text{GLE}(\mathbf{n}_k, p^{\mathbf{n}_k}(\tau), A^{\mathbf{n}_k}(\tau), \tau)$, recalling that $\ell_j, j = 1, 2$, are two fundamental cycles of E_τ connecting q_0 with $q_0 + \omega_j$ such that ℓ_j does not intersect with $L + \Lambda_\tau$ (here L is the straight segment connecting $\pm p^{\mathbf{n}_k}$), it was proved in [6, Lemma 2.2] that

$$\ell_j^* \Phi_{p^{\mathbf{n}_k}}(z) = \Phi_{p^{\mathbf{n}_k}}(z), \quad j = 1, 2,$$

where $\ell_j^* y(z)$ denotes the analytic continuation of $y(z)$ along ℓ_j . Together these with $\tilde{y}_1(z) = \Phi_{p^{\mathbf{n}_k}}(z) \tilde{\zeta}_k(z) \hat{y}(z - \frac{\omega_k}{2})$, (3.22) and (3.21), we finally obtain

$$\ell_1^* \tilde{y}_1(z) = \Phi_{p^{\mathbf{n}_k}}(z) \tilde{\zeta}_k(z+1) \hat{y}(z - \frac{\omega_k}{2} + 1) = e^{-2\pi i s} \tilde{y}_1(z),$$

$$\ell_2^* \tilde{y}_1(z) = \Phi_{p^{\mathbf{n}_k}}(z) \tilde{\zeta}_k(z+\tau) \hat{y}(z - \frac{\omega_k}{2} + \tau) = e^{2\pi i r} \tilde{y}_1(z).$$

Similarly, we obtain from $\tilde{y}_2(z) = \Phi_{p^{\mathbf{n}_k}}(z) \tilde{\zeta}_k(z) \hat{y}(-z + \frac{\omega_k}{2})$ that

$$\ell_1^* \tilde{y}_2(z) = e^{2\pi i s} \tilde{y}_2(z), \quad \ell_2^* \tilde{y}_2(z) = e^{-2\pi i r} \tilde{y}_2(z).$$

In conclusion, the monodromy matrix of $\text{GLE}(\mathbf{n}_k, p^{\mathbf{n}_k}(\tau), A^{\mathbf{n}_k}(\tau), \tau)$ with respect to $(\tilde{y}_1, \tilde{y}_2)$ are given by (3.12), and so Theorem 3.4 implies $p^{\mathbf{n}_k}(\tau) = p_{r,s}^{\mathbf{n}_k}(\tau)$ in the sense of Remark 3.1. This completes the proof. \square

4. SIMPLE ZERO PROPERTY OF $Z_{r,s}^{\mathbf{n}}(\tau)$

This section is devoted to the proof of Theorem 1.7.

Proof of Theorem 1.7. Fix $(r_0, s_0) \in \mathbb{C}^2 \setminus \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}^2$. Assume by contradiction that $Z_{r_0, s_0}^{\mathbf{n}}(\cdot)$ has a zero τ_0 of order $k \geq 2$. Then there is a small open neighborhood V of τ_0 such that $Z_{r_0, s_0}^{\mathbf{n}}(\tau)$ has no zeros in $\bar{V} \setminus \{\tau_0\}$.

We divide the proof into several steps.

Step 1. We show that there is a small open neighborhood $U \subset \mathbb{C}^2 \setminus \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}^2$ of (r_0, s_0) such that for any $(r, s) \in U$, $Z_{r,s}^{\mathbf{n}}(\cdot)$ has a zero $\tau(r, s)$ of order k satisfying $\tau(r, s) \rightarrow \tau_0$ as $(r, s) \rightarrow (r_0, s_0)$ and $Z_{r,s}^{\mathbf{n}}(\cdot)$ has no zeros in $V \setminus \{\tau(r, s)\}$.

Since $Z_{r,s}^{\mathbf{n}}(\tau)$ is meromorphic in τ , it follows from Rouché's theorem that there is a small open neighborhood $U \subset \mathbb{C}^2 \setminus \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}^2$ of (r_0, s_0) such that for any $(r, s) \in U$, $Z_{r,s}^{\mathbf{n}}(\cdot)$ has exactly k zeros

$$\tau_1(r, s), \dots, \tau_k(r, s) \quad \text{up to multiplicity in } V$$

and $\tau_j(r, s) \rightarrow \tau_0$ for all $1 \leq j \leq k$ as $(r, s) \rightarrow (r_0, s_0)$. On the other hand, we define

$$F_{r,s}(\tau) := \frac{1}{\wp(p_{r,s}^{\mathbf{n}_0}(\tau); \tau)},$$

which is meromorphic in τ . Then by Theorem 3.7-(1) and Lemma 3.5, we see that τ_0 is a *simple zero* of $F_{r_0, s_0}(\tau)$ and $F_{r_0, s_0}(\tau)$ has no other zeros in \bar{V} . Again by Rouché's theorem, the zero number of $F_{r,s}(\tau)$ is also 1 in V for any $(r, s) \in U$ (by taking U smaller if necessary). This, together with the fact that $\tau_j(r, s) \in V$ is a *simple zero* of $F_{r,s}(\tau)$ for each $1 \leq j \leq k$, implies

$$\tau_1(r, s) = \dots = \tau_k(r, s),$$

namely $\tau(r, s) := \tau_1(r, s)$ is a zero of $Z_{r,s}^{\mathbf{n}}(\tau)$ of order k for any $(r, s) \in U$.

Step 2. We prove that $U \ni (r, s) \rightarrow \tau(r, s)$ is holomorphic. Consequently,

$$(4.1) \quad \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial r} Z_{r,s}^{\mathbf{n}}\right)(\tau(r, s)) = \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial s} Z_{r,s}^{\mathbf{n}}\right)(\tau(r, s)) = 0, \quad \forall (r, s) \in U.$$

Indeed, we define

$$G_{r,s}(\tau) := \frac{\partial^{k-1}}{\partial \tau^{k-1}} Z_{r,s}^{\mathbf{n}}(\tau),$$

which is meromorphic in τ . By Step 1 we know that $\tau(r, s)$ is a simple zero of $G_{r,s}(\tau)$ for any $(r, s) \in U$, so the implicit function theorem yields that $U \ni (r, s) \rightarrow \tau(r, s)$ is holomorphic. Now since $Z_{r,s}^{\mathbf{n}}(\tau(r, s)) \equiv 0$, we obtain

$$\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial r} Z_{r,s}^{\mathbf{n}}\right)(\tau(r, s)) + \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \tau} Z_{r,s}^{\mathbf{n}}\right)(\tau(r, s))\tau_r(r, s) = 0,$$

$$\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial s} Z_{r,s}^{\mathbf{n}}\right)(\tau(r,s)) + \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \tau} Z_{r,s}^{\mathbf{n}}\right)(\tau(r,s))\tau_s(r,s) = 0,$$

where $\tau_r(r,s) := \frac{\partial \tau(r,s)}{\partial r}$ and $\tau_s(r,s) := \frac{\partial \tau(r,s)}{\partial s}$. Since Step 1 and $k \geq 2$ imply $\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \tau} Z_{r,s}^{\mathbf{n}}\right)(\tau(r,s)) = 0$, we obtain (4.1).

Step 3. Recall Theorem 2.1-(3) and (2.11) that

$$\begin{aligned} Z_{r,s}^{\mathbf{n}}(\tau) &= W_{\mathbf{n}}(Z_{r,s}(\tau); r + s\tau, \tau) \\ &\in \mathbb{Q}[e_1(\tau), e_2(\tau), e_3(\tau), \wp(r + s\tau; \tau), \wp'(r + s\tau; \tau)][Z_{r,s}(\tau)]. \end{aligned}$$

Since (1.18) implies

$$\frac{\partial Z_{r,s}(\tau)}{\partial s} = -(\tau\wp + \eta_2) = -\tau(\wp + \eta_1) + 2\pi i = \tau \frac{\partial Z_{r,s}(\tau)}{\partial r} + 2\pi i,$$

we easily obtain

$$(4.2) \quad \frac{\partial Z_{r,s}^{\mathbf{n}}(\tau)}{\partial s} = \tau \frac{\partial Z_{r,s}^{\mathbf{n}}(\tau)}{\partial r} + 2\pi i \frac{\partial W_{\mathbf{n}}}{\partial X}(Z_{r,s}(\tau); r + s\tau, \tau).$$

From here and (4.1), we obtain

$$(4.3) \quad \frac{\partial W_{\mathbf{n}}}{\partial X}(Z_{r,s}(\tau(r,s)); r + s\tau(r,s), \tau(r,s)) \equiv 0, \quad \forall (r,s) \in U.$$

Step 4. Since $(r_0, s_0) \in \mathbb{C}^2 \setminus \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}^2$ and $Z_{r_0, s_0}^{\mathbf{n}}(\tau_0) = 0$, as mentioned in Theorem 3.7, there is a unique $B_0 \in \mathbb{C}$ such that the monodromy data of $H(\mathbf{n}, B_0, \tau_0)$ is given by this (r_0, s_0) and in particular $Q_{\mathbf{n}}(B_0; \tau_0) \neq 0$. Then there is $\varepsilon > 0$ such that for any $|B - B_0| < \varepsilon$, we have $Q_{\mathbf{n}}(B; \tau_0) \neq 0$, i.e. the monodromy of $H(\mathbf{n}, B, \tau_0)$ is given by (1.7) for some $(r, s) = (r(B), s(B)) \notin \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}^2$ such that $(r(B), s(B)) \rightarrow (r_0, s_0)$ as $B \rightarrow B_0$. Then Theorem 1.5 says

$$(4.4) \quad Z_{r(B), s(B)}^{\mathbf{n}}(\tau_0) = 0.$$

By taking ε smaller we may assume $(r(B), s(B)) \in U$. Then (4.4) and Step 1 together imply

$$(4.5) \quad \tau(r(B), s(B)) \equiv \tau_0, \quad \forall |B - B_0| < \varepsilon.$$

On the other hand, recalling the addition map (2.10):

$$\sigma_{\mathbf{n}} : \overline{Y_{\mathbf{n}}(\tau_0)} \rightarrow E_{\tau_0},$$

the branch loci of which is a discrete set. So we can take B satisfying $|B - B_0| < \varepsilon$ such that

$$\sigma := r(B) + s(B)\tau_0 \notin E_{\tau_0}[2] \text{ is outside the branch loci of } \sigma_{\mathbf{n}}.$$

Then Theorem 2.1 says that $W_{\mathbf{n}}(\cdot; \sigma, \tau_0)$ has $\frac{1}{2} \sum_k n_k(n_k + 1)$ distinct roots and so $Z_{r(B), s(B)}^{\mathbf{n}}(\tau_0)$ is a *simple zero* of $W_{\mathbf{n}}(\cdot; \sigma, \tau_0)$, i.e.

$$\frac{\partial W_{\mathbf{n}}}{\partial X}(Z_{r(B), s(B)}^{\mathbf{n}}(\tau_0); \sigma, \tau_0) \neq 0.$$

However, (4.3) and (4.5) imply

$$\frac{\partial W_{\mathbf{n}}}{\partial X}(Z_{r(B), s(B)}^{\mathbf{n}}(\tau_0); \sigma, \tau_0) = 0,$$

clearly a contradiction.

Therefore, any zero τ_0 of $Z_{r_0, s_0}^n(\cdot)$ must be simple. This completes the proof. \square

5. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.2: THE SPECIAL CASES

In this section, we prove Theorem 1.2 for the first two Lamé case $(n, 0, 0, 0)$ with $n = 1, 2$. We recall the following formulas (see e.g. [2]):

$$\begin{aligned}
(5.1) \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau} \zeta(z; \tau) &= \frac{i}{4\pi} \left[\wp'(z; \tau) + 2(\zeta(z; \tau) - z\eta_1(\tau))\wp(z; \tau) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + 2\eta_1(\tau)\zeta(z; \tau) - \frac{1}{6}zg_2(\tau) \right], \\
\frac{\partial}{\partial \tau} \wp(z; \tau) &= \frac{-i}{4\pi} \left[2(\zeta(z; \tau) - z\eta_1(\tau))\wp'(z; \tau) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + 4(\wp(z; \tau) - \eta_1(\tau))\wp(z; \tau) - \frac{2}{3}g_2(\tau) \right], \\
\frac{\partial}{\partial \tau} \wp'(z; \tau) &= \frac{-i}{4\pi} \left[6(\wp(z; \tau) - \eta_1(\tau))\wp'(z; \tau) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + (\zeta(z; \tau) - z\eta_1(\tau))(12\wp^2(z; \tau) - g_2(\tau)) \right], \\
\frac{d}{d\tau} \eta_1(\tau) &= \frac{i}{24\pi} [12\eta_1(\tau)^2 - g_2(\tau)], \\
\wp''(z; \tau) &= \frac{1}{2} [12\wp(z; \tau)^2 - g_2(\tau)].
\end{aligned}$$

By applying these formulas and

$$(5.2) \quad Z_{r,s}(\tau) = \zeta(r + s\tau; \tau) - (r + s\tau)\eta_1(\tau) + 2\pi is,$$

a direct computation leads to

$$\begin{aligned}
(5.3) \quad \frac{\partial Z_{r,s}(\tau)}{\partial \tau} &= -s\wp + \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \tau} \zeta(z; \tau) \right) \Big|_{z=r+s\tau} - s\eta_1 - \frac{i(r + s\tau)}{24\pi} [12\eta_1^2 - g_2] \\
&= \frac{i}{4\pi} \wp' + \frac{i}{2\pi} (\wp + \eta_1)Z,
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
(5.4) \quad \frac{\partial \wp(r + s\tau; \tau)}{\partial \tau} &= s\wp' + \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \tau} \wp(z; \tau) \right) \Big|_{z=r+s\tau} \\
&= \frac{-i}{2\pi} [Z\wp' + 2\wp^2 - 2\wp\eta_1 - \frac{1}{3}g_2],
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
(5.5) \quad \frac{\partial \wp'(r + s\tau; \tau)}{\partial \tau} &= s\wp'' + \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \tau} \wp'(z; \tau) \right) \Big|_{z=r+s\tau} \\
&= \frac{-i}{4\pi} [Z(12\wp^2 - g_2) + 6(\wp - \eta_1)\wp'],
\end{aligned}$$

where as before, we write

$$Z_{r,s}(\tau) = Z, \quad \wp(r + s\tau; \tau) = \wp, \quad \wp'(r + s\tau; \tau) = \wp'$$

freely for convenience when there is no confusion arising.

5.1. The case $n = 1$. For this simplest case, $Z_{r,s}^{(1,0,0,0)}(\tau) = Z_{r,s}(\tau) = Z$.

By Theorem 1.6, the monodromy data of

$$(5.6) \quad y'' = [2\wp(z; \tau) + B]y(z)$$

is $(r, s) \notin \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}^2$ if and only if

$$Z_{r,s}(\tau) = 0, \quad B = \wp(r + s\tau; \tau).$$

Since τ is a simple zero of $Z_{r,s}(\cdot)$, it follows from the implicit function theorem that $\tau = \tau(r, s)$ is holomorphic in $(r, s) \in U$, where U is a small open subset in $\mathbb{C}^2 \setminus \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}^2$. By $Z_{r,s}(\tau(r, s)) = 0$ and (5.2)-(5.3), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_r &:= \frac{\partial \tau(r, s)}{\partial r} = -\frac{\frac{\partial Z_{r,s}(\tau)}{\partial r}}{\frac{\partial Z_{r,s}(\tau)}{\partial \tau}} = \frac{\wp + \eta_1}{4\pi\wp'}, \\ \tau_s &:= \frac{\partial \tau(r, s)}{\partial s} = -\frac{\frac{\partial Z_{r,s}(\tau)}{\partial s}}{\frac{\partial Z_{r,s}(\tau)}{\partial \tau}} = \frac{\tau(\wp + \eta_1) - 2\pi i}{\frac{i}{4\pi}\wp'} = \tau\tau_r - \frac{8\pi^2}{\wp'}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly by $B = \wp(r + s\tau(r, s); \tau(r, s))$ we have

$$B_r := \frac{\partial B}{\partial r} = \wp' + \frac{\partial \wp}{\partial \tau} \tau_r, \quad B_s := \frac{\partial B}{\partial s} = \tau\wp' + \frac{\partial \wp}{\partial \tau} \tau_s.$$

Therefore,

$$\tau_r B_s - \tau_s B_r = (\tau\tau_r - \tau_s)\wp' = 8\pi^2,$$

i.e. $d\tau \wedge dB = 8\pi^2 dr \wedge ds$. This proves Theorem 1.2 for the case $(1, 0, 0, 0)$.

5.2. The case $n = 2$. For this case,

$$Z_{r,s}^{(2)}(\tau) := Z_{r,s}^{(2,0,0,0)} = Z^3 - 3\wp Z - \wp'.$$

For the corresponding Lamé equation

$$(5.7) \quad y''(z) = [6\wp(z; \tau) + B]y(z),$$

the well-known associated spectral polynomial $Q_2(B; \tau) := Q_{(2,0,0,0)}(B; \tau)$ is given by

$$(5.8) \quad Q_2(B; \tau) = (B^2 - 3g_2)(B^3 - \frac{9}{4}g_2B + \frac{27}{4}g_3).$$

Define $\pm C$ by $C^2 = Q_2(B; \tau)$. Then the monodromy data of (5.7) is $(r, s) \notin \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}^2$ if and only if $Z_{r,s}^{(2)}(\tau) = 0$ and the following formulas hold (see [23, Theorem 5.3, Example 5.8])

$$(5.9) \quad \wp = \wp(r + s\tau; \tau) = \frac{B^3 + 27g_3}{9(B^2 - 3g_2)},$$

$$(5.10) \quad \wp' = \wp'(r + s\tau; \tau) = C \frac{2(B^3 - 9g_2B - 54g_3)}{27(B^2 - 3g_2)^2},$$

$$(5.11) \quad Z = Z_{r,s}(\tau) = C \frac{2}{3(B^2 - 3g_2)}.$$

Clearly $(-r, -s)$ corresponds to $-C$ in these formulas. By (5.9)-(5.11), a direct computation gives

$$(5.12) \quad B = 3(Z^2 - \wp).$$

On the other hand, by (5.3)-(5.5) and $\wp'' = 6\wp^2 - \frac{g_2}{2}$, a direct computation gives

$$(5.13) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{\partial Z_{r,s}^{(2)}(\tau)}{\partial \tau} &= 3(Z^2 - \wp) \frac{\partial Z_{r,s}(\tau)}{\partial \tau} - 3Z \frac{\partial \wp(r+s\tau; \tau)}{\partial \tau} - \frac{\partial \wp'(r+s\tau; \tau)}{\partial \tau} \\ &= \frac{3i(\wp + \eta_1)}{2\pi} Z_{r,s}^{(2)}(\tau) + \frac{3i}{4\pi} [3\wp' Z^2 + (12\wp^2 - g_2)Z + 3\wp\wp'], \end{aligned}$$

$$(5.14) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{\partial Z_{r,s}^{(2)}(\tau)}{\partial r} &= 3(Z^2 - \wp) \frac{\partial Z_{r,s}(\tau)}{\partial r} - 3Z \frac{\partial \wp(r+s\tau; \tau)}{\partial r} - \frac{\partial \wp'(r+s\tau; \tau)}{\partial r} \\ &= -3(Z^2 - \wp)(\wp + \eta_1) - (3Z\wp' + 6\wp^2 - \frac{g_2}{2}), \end{aligned}$$

$$(5.15) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{\partial Z_{r,s}^{(2)}(\tau)}{\partial s} &= 3(Z^2 - \wp) \frac{\partial Z_{r,s}(\tau)}{\partial s} - 3Z \frac{\partial \wp(r+s\tau; \tau)}{\partial s} - \frac{\partial \wp'(r+s\tau; \tau)}{\partial s} \\ &= \tau \frac{\partial Z_{r,s}^{(2)}(\tau)}{\partial r} + 6\pi i(Z^2 - \wp). \end{aligned}$$

Now by $Z_{r,s}^{(2)}(\tau) = 0$ and the implicit function theorem, $\tau = \tau(r, s)$ is holomorphic in $(r, s) \in U$, where U is a small open subset in $\mathbb{C}^2 \setminus \frac{1}{2}Z^2$. Consequently, inserting (5.9)-(5.12) into (5.13)-(5.15) leads to

$$\frac{\partial Z_{r,s}^{(2)}(\tau)}{\partial \tau} = \frac{3i}{4\pi} [3\wp' Z^2 + (12\wp^2 - g_2)Z + 3\wp\wp'] = \frac{iC}{6\pi},$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial Z_{r,s}^{(2)}(\tau)}{\partial r} &= -3(Z^2 - \wp)(\wp + \eta_1) - (3Z\wp' + 6\wp^2 - \frac{g_2}{2}) \\ &= -\frac{1}{3}(B^2 + 3\eta_1 B - \frac{3}{2}g_2), \end{aligned}$$

and so

$$(5.16) \quad \tau_r = -\frac{\frac{\partial Z_{r,s}^{(2)}(\tau)}{\partial r}}{\frac{\partial Z_{r,s}^{(2)}(\tau)}{\partial \tau}} = -2\pi i \frac{B^2 + 3\eta_1 B - \frac{3}{2}g_2}{C},$$

$$(5.17) \quad \frac{\tau_s}{\tau_r} = \frac{\frac{\partial Z_{r,s}^{(2)}(\tau)}{\partial s}}{\frac{\partial Z_{r,s}^{(2)}(\tau)}{\partial r}} = \tau + \frac{6\pi i(Z^2 - \wp)}{\frac{\partial Z_{r,s}^{(2)}(\tau)}{\partial r}} = \tau - \frac{6\pi i B}{B^2 + 3\eta_1 B - \frac{3}{2}g_2}.$$

On the other hand, (5.12) gives

$$(5.18) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{B_r}{3} &= \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \left(Z_{r,s}(\tau(r,s))^2 - \wp(r + s\tau(r,s); \tau(r,s)) \right) \\ &= -(2Z(\wp + \eta_1) + \wp') + \left(2Z \frac{\partial Z_{r,s}(\tau)}{\partial \tau} - \frac{\partial \wp(r + s\tau; \tau)}{\partial \tau} \right) \tau_r. \end{aligned}$$

Inserting (5.3)-(5.4) and (5.9)-(5.11) into this formula and by a direct computation, we obtain

$$(5.19) \quad \begin{aligned} 2Z(\wp + \eta_1) + \wp' &= \frac{2C}{9} \frac{B + 6\eta_1}{B^2 - 3g_2}, \\ \frac{2Z \frac{\partial Z_{r,s}(\tau)}{\partial \tau} - \frac{\partial \wp(r + s\tau; \tau)}{\partial \tau}}{\partial \tau} &= \frac{i}{2\pi} Z [\wp' + 2(\wp + \eta_1)Z] + \frac{i}{2\pi} [Z\wp' + 2\wp^2 - 2\wp\eta_1 - \frac{1}{3}g_2] \\ &= \frac{i}{9\pi} (B^2 + 3\eta_1 B - \frac{3}{2}g_2), \end{aligned}$$

and so

$$(5.20) \quad \frac{B_r}{3} = -\frac{2C}{9} \frac{B + 6\eta_1}{B^2 - 3g_2} + \frac{i}{9\pi} (B^2 + 3\eta_1 B - \frac{3}{2}g_2) \tau_r.$$

Similarly, by (5.11) and (5.17)-(5.19), we also have

$$(5.21) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{B_s}{3} &= \frac{\partial}{\partial s} \left(Z_{r,s}(\tau(r,s))^2 - \wp(r + s\tau(r,s); \tau(r,s)) \right) \\ &= 4\pi i Z - \tau(2Z(\wp + \eta_1) + \wp') + \left(2Z \frac{\partial Z_{r,s}(\tau)}{\partial \tau} - \frac{\partial \wp(r + s\tau; \tau)}{\partial \tau} \right) \tau_s \\ &= 4\pi i Z + \tau \frac{B_r}{3} - \left(2Z \frac{\partial Z_{r,s}(\tau)}{\partial \tau} - \frac{\partial \wp(r + s\tau; \tau)}{\partial \tau} \right) \frac{6\pi i B}{B^2 + 3\eta_1 B - \frac{3}{2}g_2} \tau_r \\ &= \frac{8\pi i C}{3(B^2 - 3g_2)} + \tau \frac{B_r}{3} + \frac{2B}{3} \tau_r. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by (5.16)-(5.17) and (5.20)-(5.21), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_r B_s - \tau_s B_r &= \det \begin{pmatrix} \tau_r & \tau_r \left(\tau - \frac{6\pi i B}{B^2 + 3\eta_1 B - \frac{3}{2}g_2} \right) \\ B_r & \tau B_r + 2B\tau_r + \frac{8\pi i C}{(B^2 - 3g_2)} \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \tau_r \det \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -\frac{6\pi i B}{B^2 + 3\eta_1 B - \frac{3}{2}g_2} \\ B_r & 2B\tau_r + \frac{8\pi i C}{(B^2 - 3g_2)} \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \tau_r \left(2B\tau_r + \frac{8\pi i C}{(B^2 - 3g_2)} + \frac{6\pi i B}{B^2 + 3\eta_1 B - \frac{3}{2}g_2} B_r \right) \\ &= \tau_r \left(\frac{8\pi i C}{(B^2 - 3g_2)} - \frac{4\pi i C B (B + 6\eta_1)}{(B^2 - 3g_2)(B^2 + 3\eta_1 B - \frac{3}{2}g_2)} \right) \end{aligned}$$

$$= \frac{4\pi i \tau_r C}{B^2 + 3\eta_1 B - \frac{3}{2}g_2} = 8\pi^2,$$

i.e. $d\tau \wedge dB = 8\pi^2 dr \wedge ds$. This proves Theorem 1.2 for the case $(2, 0, 0, 0)$.

5.3. A remark for the general case. For general \mathbf{n} , it is impossible to prove Theorem 1.2 via direct computations. Instead, we will develop an induction approach to prove Theorem 1.2 in Section 6. Here we note that the following general result holds.

Theorem 5.1. *Fix \mathbf{n} . Then there exist rational functions*

$$R_0(B; \tau), R_1(B; \tau) \in \mathbb{Q}[\eta_1, e_1, e_2, e_3, g_2, g_3](B) = \mathbb{Q}[\eta_1, e_1, e_2, e_3](B)$$

such that

$$\tau_r = \frac{\pi i}{C} R_0(B; \tau), \quad \frac{\tau_s}{\tau_r} = \tau + \pi i R_1(B; \tau).$$

In particular, for the Lamé case $\mathbf{n} = (n, 0, 0, 0)$, there holds

$$(5.22) \quad R_0(B; \tau), R_1(B; \tau) \in \mathbb{Q}[\eta_1, g_2, g_3](B).$$

Proof. By $e_k(\tau) = \wp(\frac{\omega_k}{2}; \tau)$ and (5.1) we have

$$(5.23) \quad e'_k(\tau) = \frac{i}{\pi} \left[\frac{1}{6} g_2(\tau) + \eta_1(\tau) e_k(\tau) - e_k(\tau)^2 \right].$$

Recall Theorem 2.1-(3) and (2.11) that

$$\begin{aligned} Z_{r,s}^{\mathbf{n}}(\tau) &= W_{\mathbf{n}}(Z_{r,s}(\tau); r + s\tau, \tau) \\ &\in \mathbb{Q}[e_1(\tau), e_2(\tau), e_3(\tau), \wp(r + s\tau; \tau), \wp'(r + s\tau; \tau)][Z_{r,s}(\tau)]. \end{aligned}$$

Clearly it follows from

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \wp(r + s\tau; \tau)}{\partial r} &= \wp', \quad \frac{\partial \wp'(r + s\tau; \tau)}{\partial r} = \wp'' = 6\wp^2 - g_2/2, \\ \frac{\partial Z_{r,s}(\tau)}{\partial r} &= -\wp - \eta_1, \end{aligned}$$

that

$$\frac{\partial Z_{r,s}^{\mathbf{n}}(\tau)}{\partial r} \in \mathbb{Q}[e_1, e_2, e_3, \eta_1, \wp, \wp'] [Z_{r,s}(\tau)].$$

Similarly we see from (5.3)-(5.5) and (5.23) that

$$\frac{\partial Z_{r,s}^{\mathbf{n}}(\tau)}{\partial \tau} \in \frac{i}{\pi} \times \mathbb{Q}[e_1, e_2, e_3, \eta_1, \wp, \wp'] [Z_{r,s}(\tau)],$$

and so

$$(5.24) \quad \tau_r = -\frac{\frac{\partial Z_{r,s}^{\mathbf{n}}(\tau)}{\partial r}}{\frac{\partial Z_{r,s}^{\mathbf{n}}(\tau)}{\partial \tau}} \in i\pi \times \mathbb{Q}[e_1, e_2, e_3, \eta_1, \wp, \wp'] (Z_{r,s}(\tau)).$$

On the other hand, it was proved by Takemura [32, Theorem 2.3] that there are rational functions

$$(5.25) \quad \tilde{R}_1(B), \tilde{R}_2(B), \tilde{R}_3(B) \in \mathbb{Q}[e_1, e_2, e_3](B)$$

such that

$$(5.26) \quad Z_{r,s}(\tau) = C \tilde{R}_1(B), \quad \wp'(r + s\tau; \tau) = C \tilde{R}_3(B), \quad \wp(r + s\tau; \tau) = \tilde{R}_2(B).$$

Inserting these into (5.24) leads to the existence of rational functions $R_0(B) = R_0(B; \tau)$, $\hat{R}_0(B) = \hat{R}_0(B; \tau) \in \mathbb{Q}[e_1, e_2, e_3, \eta_1](B)$ such that (note $C^2 = Q_n(B)$)

$$\frac{\tau_r}{\pi i} = \frac{R_0(B)}{C} + \hat{R}_0(B).$$

Since $(\tau, B) \rightarrow \pm(r, s)$ leads to $\tau(r, s) = \tau(-r, -s)$ and

$$(5.27) \quad (r, s) \longleftrightarrow C, \quad (-r, -s) \longleftrightarrow -C \quad (\text{see(5.26)}),$$

we have $\tau_r(r, s) = -\tau_r(-r, -s)$, i.e.

$$\frac{R_0(B)}{C} + \hat{R}_0(B) = -\left(\frac{R_0(B)}{-C} + \hat{R}_0(B)\right),$$

and so $\hat{R}_0(B) \equiv 0$. This proves

$$\frac{\tau_r}{\pi i} = \frac{R_0(B)}{C}.$$

Similarly, we recall (4.2) that

$$\frac{\tau_s}{\tau_r} = \frac{\frac{\partial Z_{r,s}^n(\tau)}{\partial s}}{\frac{\partial Z_{r,s}^n(\tau)}{\partial r}} = \tau + \pi i \frac{2 \frac{\partial W_n}{\partial X}(Z_{r,s}(\tau); r + s\tau, \tau)}{\frac{\partial Z_{r,s}^n(\tau)}{\partial r}},$$

with

$$\frac{2 \frac{\partial W_n}{\partial X}(Z_{r,s}(\tau); r + s\tau, \tau)}{\frac{\partial Z_{r,s}^n(\tau)}{\partial r}} \in \mathbb{Q}[e_1, e_2, e_3, \eta_1, \wp, \wp'](Z_{r,s}(\tau)),$$

so there are rational functions $R_1(B) = R_1(B; \tau)$, $\hat{R}_1(B) = \hat{R}_1(B; \tau) \in \mathbb{Q}[e_1, e_2, e_3, \eta_1](B)$ such that

$$\frac{2 \frac{\partial W_n}{\partial X}(Z_{r,s}(\tau); r + s\tau, \tau)}{\frac{\partial Z_{r,s}^n(\tau)}{\partial r}} = \frac{\hat{R}_1(B)}{C} + R_1(B).$$

By $\frac{\tau_s}{\tau_r}(-r, -s) = \frac{\tau_s}{\tau_r}(r, s)$ and (5.27) we obtain $\hat{R}_1(B) \equiv 0$, so we have

$$\frac{\tau_s}{\tau_r} = \tau + \pi i R_1(B).$$

Finally, for the Lamé case $\mathbf{n} = (n, 0, 0, 0)$, it was proved in [23] that

$$Z_{r,s}^n(\tau) \in \mathbb{Q}[g_2(\tau), g_3(\tau), \wp(r + s\tau; \tau), \wp'(r + s\tau; \tau)][Z_{r,s}(\tau)],$$

and (5.25) can be improved as

$$\tilde{R}_1(B), \tilde{R}_2(B), \tilde{R}_3(B) \in \mathbb{Q}[g_2, g_3](B).$$

Therefore, the above argument actually implies (5.22). This completes the proof. \square

6. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.2: AN INDUCTION APPROACH

This section is devoted to the proof of Theorem 1.2 for general \mathbf{n} , which can not be proved by direct computations due to the lack of explicit expressions of $Z_{r,s}^{\mathbf{n}}(\tau)$, and new ideas are needed. We will introduce an induction approach to overcome this difficulty.

6.1. The linearized equation of EPVI. Fix any \mathbf{n} . Recall Lemma 3.3 that $\wp(p_{r,s}^{\mathbf{n}}(\tau); \tau)$ depends meromorphically on $(r, s) \in \mathbb{C}^2 \setminus \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}^2$. Thus

$$(6.1) \quad Y_{1;r,s}^{\mathbf{n}}(\tau) := \frac{\partial p_{r,s}^{\mathbf{n}}(\tau)}{\partial r}, \quad Y_{2;r,s}^{\mathbf{n}}(\tau) := \frac{\partial p_{r,s}^{\mathbf{n}}(\tau)}{\partial s}$$

are well-defined and solve the linearized equation of $\text{EPVI}_{\mathbf{n}}$ as functions of τ :

$$(6.2) \quad \frac{d^2}{d\tau^2} Y(\tau) = \left[\frac{-1}{8\pi^2} \sum_{k=0}^3 (n_k + \frac{1}{2})^2 \wp'' \left(p_{r,s}^{\mathbf{n}}(\tau) + \frac{\omega_k}{2}; \tau \right) \right] Y(\tau).$$

Consequently, the Wronskian

$$(6.3) \quad W_{\mathbf{n}}(r, s) := \frac{dY_{1;r,s}^{\mathbf{n}}(\tau)}{d\tau} Y_{2;r,s}^{\mathbf{n}}(\tau) - \frac{dY_{2;r,s}^{\mathbf{n}}(\tau)}{d\tau} Y_{1;r,s}^{\mathbf{n}}(\tau)$$

is independent of τ and meromorphic in $(r, s) \in \mathbb{C}^2 \setminus \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}^2$.

The following result is the key observation of proving Theorem 1.2.

Lemma 6.1. *Fix \mathbf{n} , the following assertions are equivalent.*

- (1) $W_{\mathbf{n}}(r, s) \equiv -1$.
- (2) For $\mathbf{n}_0^- = (n_0 - 1, n_1, n_2, n_3)$ with $n_0 \geq 1$, the map $\varphi_{\mathbf{n}_0^-} : (\tau, B) \mapsto (r, s)$ satisfies

$$(6.4) \quad d\tau \wedge dB = 8\pi^2 dr \wedge ds.$$

- (3) For $\mathbf{n}_0^+ = (n_0 + 1, n_1, n_2, n_3)$, the map $\varphi_{\mathbf{n}_0^+} : (\tau, B) \rightarrow (r, s)$ satisfies (6.4).

Proof. (1) \Leftrightarrow (2). Fix any (τ_0, B_0) satisfying $Q_{\mathbf{n}_0^-}(B_0; \tau_0) \neq 0$ and let $(r_0, s_0) = \varphi_{\mathbf{n}_0^-}(\tau_0, B_0) \notin \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}^2$ be the monodromy data of $H(\mathbf{n}_0^-, B_0, \tau_0)$, i.e. $Z_{r_0, s_0}^{\mathbf{n}_0^-}(\tau_0) = 0$. Then there is a small open neighborhood $U \subset \mathbb{C}^2 \setminus \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}^2$ of (r_0, s_0) such that $Z_{r,s}^{\mathbf{n}_0^-}(\cdot)$ has a unique zero $\tau = \tau(r, s)$ in a small open neighborhood $V \subset \mathbb{H}$ of τ_0 for any $(r, s) \in U$. Let $B = B(r, s)$ be the unique B such that $(r, s) = \varphi_{\mathbf{n}_0^-}(\tau(r, s), B(r, s))$ is the monodromy data of $H(\mathbf{n}_0^-, B(r, s), \tau(r, s))$. Then by Theorem 3.7-(1) and Lemma 3.5, we have

$$(6.5) \quad p_{r,s}^{\mathbf{n}}(\tilde{\tau}) = c_{n_0} (\tilde{\tau} - \tau(r, s))^{\frac{1}{2}} [1 + h(\tilde{\tau} - \tau(r, s)) + a(\tilde{\tau} - \tau(r, s))^2 + O((\tilde{\tau} - \tau(r, s))^3)]$$

for $\tilde{\tau}$ near $\tau(r, s)$, where

$$(6.6) \quad h = h(r, s) = \frac{B(r, s) + \vartheta_{\mathbf{n}}(\tau(r, s))}{-8\pi^2 c_{n_0}^2},$$

$$\vartheta_{\mathbf{n}}(\tau) := 2\pi i c_{n_0}^2 \eta_1(\tau) + - \sum_{j=1}^3 n_j(n_j + 1)e_j(\tau) \quad \text{with } c_{n_0}^2 = i \frac{2n_0 + 1}{2\pi}.$$

Here and following, we use $\tilde{\tau}$ to denote the variable of $p_{r,s}^{\mathbf{n}}(\cdot)$ and $\tau = \tau(r, s)$ to denote the zero of $Z_{r,s}^{\mathbf{n}_0}(\cdot)$.

Consequently,

$$(6.7) \quad \wp(p_{r,s}^{\mathbf{n}}(\tilde{\tau}); \tilde{\tau}) = \frac{1}{c_{n_0}^2(\tilde{\tau} - \tau(r, s))} - \frac{2h}{c_{n_0}^2} + O((\tilde{\tau} - \tau(r, s))).$$

Since Lemma 3.3 says that $\wp(p_{r,s}^{\mathbf{n}}(\tilde{\tau}); \tilde{\tau})$ depends meromorphically on $(r, s) \in U$, and $\tau(r, s)$, as a simple zero of $Z_{r,s}^{\mathbf{n}_0}(\cdot)$, is holomorphic in $(r, s) \in U$, we easily see from (6.7) that $h = h(r, s)$ is also holomorphic in $(r, s) \in U$ and so does $B = B(r, s)$ by (6.6), and

$$(6.8) \quad h_r = \frac{B_r + \vartheta'_{\mathbf{n}}(\tau)\tau_r}{-8\pi^2 c_{n_0}^2}, \quad h_s = \frac{B_s + \vartheta'_{\mathbf{n}}(\tau)\tau_s}{-8\pi^2 c_{n_0}^2}.$$

For $\tilde{\tau}$ near $\tau = \tau(r, s)$, it follows from (6.5) that

$$\begin{aligned} Y_{1,r,s}^{\mathbf{n}}(\tilde{\tau}) &= \frac{\partial p_{r,s}^{\mathbf{n}}(\tilde{\tau})}{\partial r} = -\frac{c_{n_0}}{2}\tau_r(\tilde{\tau} - \tau)^{-\frac{1}{2}} - \frac{3c_{n_0}h}{2}\tau_r(\tilde{\tau} - \tau)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\quad + (c_{n_0}h_r - \frac{5c_{n_0}a}{2}\tau_r)(\tilde{\tau} - \tau)^{\frac{3}{2}} + O((\tilde{\tau} - \tau)^{\frac{5}{2}}), \\ Y_{2,r,s}^{\mathbf{n}}(\tilde{\tau}) &= \frac{\partial p_{r,s}^{\mathbf{n}}(\tilde{\tau})}{\partial s} = -\frac{c_{n_0}}{2}\tau_s(\tilde{\tau} - \tau)^{-\frac{1}{2}} - \frac{3c_{n_0}h}{2}\tau_s(\tilde{\tau} - \tau)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\quad + (c_{n_0}h_s - \frac{5c_{n_0}a}{2}\tau_s)(\tilde{\tau} - \tau)^{\frac{3}{2}} + O((\tilde{\tau} - \tau)^{\frac{5}{2}}), \end{aligned}$$

and so

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{d\tilde{\tau}} Y_{1,r,s}^{\mathbf{n}}(\tilde{\tau}) &= \frac{c_{n_0}}{4}\tau_r(\tilde{\tau} - \tau)^{-\frac{3}{2}} - \frac{3c_{n_0}h}{4}\tau_r(\tilde{\tau} - \tau)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\quad + \frac{3}{2}(c_{n_0}h_r - \frac{5c_{n_0}a}{2}\tau_r)(\tilde{\tau} - \tau)^{\frac{1}{2}} + O((\tilde{\tau} - \tau)^{\frac{3}{2}}), \\ \frac{d}{d\tilde{\tau}} Y_{2,r,s}^{\mathbf{n}}(\tilde{\tau}) &= \frac{c_{n_0}}{4}\tau_s(\tilde{\tau} - \tau)^{-\frac{3}{2}} - \frac{3c_{n_0}h}{4}\tau_s(\tilde{\tau} - \tau)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\quad + \frac{3}{2}(c_{n_0}h_s - \frac{5c_{n_0}a}{2}\tau_s)(\tilde{\tau} - \tau)^{\frac{1}{2}} + O((\tilde{\tau} - \tau)^{\frac{3}{2}}). \end{aligned}$$

From here and the Wronskian $W_{\mathbf{n}}(r, s) = \frac{dY_{1,r,s}^{\mathbf{n}}(\tilde{\tau})}{d\tilde{\tau}} Y_{2,r,s}^{\mathbf{n}}(\tilde{\tau}) - \frac{dY_{2,r,s}^{\mathbf{n}}(\tilde{\tau})}{d\tilde{\tau}} Y_{1,r,s}^{\mathbf{n}}(\tilde{\tau})$ is independent of the variable $\tilde{\tau}$, a direct computation gives

$$(6.9) \quad W_{\mathbf{n}}(r, s) = c_{n_0}^2(\tau_r h_s - \tau_s h_r) = \frac{\tau_r B_s - \tau_s B_r}{-8\pi^2}, \quad \text{for } (r, s) \in U,$$

where we used (6.8) to obtain the second inequality.

Now if (6.4) holds, we have $\tau_r B_s - \tau_s B_r = 8\pi^2$, so $W_{\mathbf{n}}(r, s) \equiv -1$ for $(r, s) \in U$ and hence for all $(r, s) \in \mathbb{C}^2 \setminus \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}^2$, because $W_{\mathbf{n}}(r, s)$ is meromorphic in $(r, s) \in \mathbb{C}^2 \setminus \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}^2$. This proves (2) \Rightarrow (1).

Conversely, if $W_{\mathbf{n}}(r, s) \equiv -1$, (6.9) gives $\tau_r B_s - \tau_s B_r = 8\pi^2$ for any $(r, s) \in U$, namely (6.4) holds for (τ, B) in a small neighborhood of (τ_0, B_0) . Since (τ_0, B_0) is arbitrary, we conclude (6.4) holds for $\varphi_{\mathbf{n}_0^-}$. This proves (1) \Rightarrow (2).

(1) \Leftrightarrow (3). Again fix any (τ_0, B_0) satisfying $Q_{\mathbf{n}_0^+}(B_0; \tau_0) \neq 0$ and let $(r_0, s_0) = \varphi_{\mathbf{n}_0^+}(\tau_0, B_0) \notin \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}^2$ to be the monodromy data of $H(\mathbf{n}_0^+, B_0, \tau_0)$, i.e. $Z_{r_0, s_0}^{\mathbf{n}_0^+}(\tau_0) = 0$. Then there is a small open neighborhood $U \subset \mathbb{C}^2 \setminus \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}^2$ of (r_0, s_0) such that $Z_{r, s}^{\mathbf{n}_0^+}(\cdot)$ has a unique zero $\tau = \tau(r, s)$ in a small open neighborhood $V \subset \mathbb{H}$ of τ_0 for any $(r, s) \in U$. Let $B = B(r, s)$ be the unique B such that $(r, s) = \varphi_{\mathbf{n}_0^+}(\tau(r, s), B(r, s))$ is the monodromy data of $H(\mathbf{n}_0^+, B(r, s), \tau(r, s))$.

Now by Theorem 3.7-(2) and Lemma 3.5, we still have (6.5)-(6.6), where the only different thing is $c_{n_0}^2 = -i\frac{2n_0+1}{2\pi}$. Therefore, the same argument as (6.9) implies

$$\tau_r B_s - \tau_s B_r = -8\pi^2 W_{\mathbf{n}}(r, s), \quad \text{for } (r, s) \in U.$$

The rest proof is the same as that of (1) \Leftrightarrow (2). \square

6.2. Proof of Theorem 1.2. Now we can prove Theorem 1.2 via an induction approach.

Proof of Theorem 1.2. We prove via induction that for any $\mathbf{n} = (n_0, n_1, n_2, n_3)$ with $n_k \geq 0$ and $\max_k n_k \geq 1$,

$$(6.10) \quad d\tau \wedge dB = 8\pi^2 dr \wedge ds$$

holds for $\varphi_{\mathbf{n}} : (\tau, B) \rightarrow (r, s)$.

Step 1. We prove (6.10) for the Lamé case $\mathbf{n} = (n, 0, 0, 0)$, $n \geq 1$.

In Section 5, we have proved (6.10) for $n = 1, 2$. From here and Lemma 6.1, we easily conclude via induction that (6.10) holds for all $n \geq 1$. Furthermore,

$$(6.11) \quad W_{(n, 0, 0, 0)}(r, s) \equiv -1, \quad \text{for any } n \geq 0.$$

Step 2. We prove (6.10) for $\mathbf{n} = (n_0, n_1, 0, 0)$ with $n_1 \geq 1$, $n_0 \geq 0$.

Since $y(z)$ solves $H((n_1, 0, 0, 0), B, \tau)$

$$y''(z) = [n_1(n_1 + 1)\wp(z; \tau) + B]y(z)$$

if and only if $\tilde{y}(z) := y(z + \frac{\omega_1}{2})$ solves $H((0, n_1, 0, 0), B, \tau)$

$$y''(z) = [n_1(n_1 + 1)\wp(z + \frac{\omega_1}{2}; \tau) + B]y(z),$$

so $\varphi_{(0, n_1, 0, 0)} = \varphi_{(n_1, 0, 0, 0)}$. Together with Step 1, we obtain that (6.10) holds for $(0, n_1, 0, 0)$, $n_1 \geq 1$.

On the other hand, Lemma 3.8 says $p_{r,s}^{(0,n_1,0,0)}(\tau) - \frac{\omega_1}{2} = p_{r+\frac{1}{2},s}^{(n_1,0,0,0)}(\tau)$, which implies

$$Y_{1;r,s}^{(0,n_1,0,0)}(\tau) = Y_{1;r+\frac{1}{2},s}^{(n_1,0,0,0)}(\tau), \quad Y_{2;r,s}^{(0,n_1,0,0)}(\tau) = Y_{2;r+\frac{1}{2},s}^{(n_1,0,0,0)}(\tau).$$

From here and (6.11), we obtain

$$W_{(0,n_1,0,0)}(r,s) = W_{(n_1,0,0,0)}(r + \frac{1}{2}, s) \equiv -1.$$

This together with Lemma 6.1-(3) implies that (6.10) holds for $(1, n_1, 0, 0)$. From here and (6.10) holding for $(0, n_1, 0, 0)$, we easily conclude from Lemma 6.1 that (6.10) holds for all $(n_0, n_1, 0, 0)$. Furthermore,

$$(6.12) \quad W_{(n_0,n_1,0,0)}(r,s) \equiv -1, \quad \text{for any } n_0, n_1 \geq 0.$$

Clearly the similar argument implies that (6.10) holds for both $\mathbf{n} = (n_0, 0, n_2, 0)$ with $n_2 \geq 1$ and $\mathbf{n} = (n_0, 0, 0, n_3)$ with $n_3 \geq 1$, and

$$(6.13) \quad W_{(n_0,0,n_2,0)}(r,s) = W_{(n_0,0,0,n_3)}(r,s) \equiv -1, \quad \text{for any } n_0, n_2, n_3 \geq 0.$$

Step 3. We prove (6.10) for $\mathbf{n} = (n_0, n_1, n_2, 0)$ with $n_2 \geq 1, n_0, n_1 \geq 0$.

Since $y(z)$ solves $H((n_1, 0, 0, n_2), B, \tau)$

$$y''(z) = [n_1(n_1 + 1)\wp(z; \tau) + n_2(n_2 + 1)\wp(z + \frac{\omega_3}{2}; \tau) + B]y(z)$$

if and only if $\tilde{y}(z) := y(z + \frac{\omega_1}{2})$ solves $H((0, n_1, n_2, 0), B, \tau)$

$$y''(z) = [n_1(n_1 + 1)\wp(z + \frac{\omega_1}{2}; \tau) + n_2(n_2 + 1)\wp(z + \frac{\omega_2}{2}; \tau) + B]y(z),$$

so $\varphi_{(0,n_1,n_2,0)} = \varphi_{(n_1,0,0,n_2)}$. Together with Step 2, we obtain that (6.10) holds for $(0, n_1, n_2, 0)$, $n_2 \geq 1$.

On the other hand, Lemma 3.8 says $p_{r,s}^{(0,n_1,n_2,0)}(\tau) - \frac{\omega_1}{2} = p_{r+\frac{1}{2},s}^{(n_1,0,0,n_2)}(\tau)$.

From here and (6.13), we obtain

$$W_{(0,n_1,n_2,0)}(r,s) = W_{(n_1,0,0,n_2)}(r + \frac{1}{2}, s) \equiv -1.$$

This together with Lemma 6.1-(3) implies that (6.10) holds for $(1, n_1, n_2, 0)$. From here and (6.10) holding for $(0, n_1, n_2, 0)$, we easily conclude from Lemma 6.1 that (6.10) holds for all $(n_0, n_1, n_2, 0)$. Furthermore,

$$(6.14) \quad W_{(n_0,n_1,n_2,0)}(r,s) \equiv -1, \quad \text{for any } n_0, n_1, n_2 \geq 0.$$

Step 4. We prove (6.10) for $\mathbf{n} = (n_0, n_1, n_2, n_3)$ with $n_3 \geq 1, n_0, n_1, n_2 \geq 0$.

Since $y(z)$ solves $H((n_3, n_2, n_1, 0), B, \tau)$ if and only if $\tilde{y}(z) := y(z + \frac{\omega_3}{2})$ solves $H((0, n_1, n_2, n_3), B, \tau)$, so $\varphi_{(0,n_1,n_2,n_3)} = \varphi_{(n_3,n_2,n_1,0)}$. Together with Step 3, we obtain that (6.10) holds for $(0, n_1, n_2, n_3)$, $n_3 \geq 1$.

On the other hand, Lemma 3.8 says $p_{r,s}^{(0,n_1,n_2,n_3)}(\tau) - \frac{\omega_3}{2} = p_{r+\frac{1}{2},s+\frac{1}{2}}^{(n_3,n_2,n_1,0)}(\tau)$.

From here and (6.14), we obtain

$$W_{(0,n_1,n_2,n_3)}(r,s) = W_{(n_3,n_2,n_1,0)}(r + \frac{1}{2}, s + \frac{1}{2}) \equiv -1.$$

This together with Lemma 6.1-(3) implies that (6.10) holds for $(1, n_1, n_2, n_3)$. From here and (6.10) holding for $(0, n_1, n_2, n_3)$, we easily conclude from Lemma 6.1 that (6.10) holds for all (n_0, n_1, n_2, n_3) . Furthermore,

$$(6.15) \quad W_{(n_0, n_1, n_2, n_3)}(r, s) \equiv -1, \quad \text{for any } n_0, n_1, n_2, n_3 \geq 0.$$

This completes the proof. \square

7. APPLICATIONS

In this final section, we give an application of the universal law. Define $\Delta_j(B) = \Delta_j(B; \tau)$ to be the trace of the monodromy matrix $\rho(\ell_j)$, i.e.

$$(7.1) \quad \Delta_1(B; \tau) := 2 \cos(2\pi s), \quad \Delta_2(B; \tau) := 2 \cos(2\pi r).$$

It is well known that $\Delta_j(B; \tau)$ are *holomorphic* in both B and τ .

Lemma 7.1. *For any $(\tau, B) \in \Sigma_{\mathbf{n}}$,*

$$(7.2) \quad \Delta_{1,B} := \frac{\partial}{\partial B} \Delta_1 = -\frac{1}{2\pi} \sin(2\pi s) \tau_r,$$

$$(7.3) \quad \Delta_{2,B} := \frac{\partial}{\partial B} \Delta_2 = \frac{1}{2\pi} \sin(2\pi r) \tau_s.$$

Proof. Taking derivatives with respect to r and s respectively to $\Delta_1(B; \tau) = 2 \cos(2\pi s)$, we obtain

$$\begin{pmatrix} \tau_r & B_r \\ \tau_s & B_s \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \Delta_{1,\tau} \\ \Delta_{1,B} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ -4\pi \sin(2\pi s) \end{pmatrix},$$

where $\Delta_{1,\tau} = \partial \Delta_1 / \partial \tau$. From here and $\tau_r B_s - \tau_s B_r = 8\pi^2$ we easily obtain (7.2). The proof of (7.3) is similar. \square

We will see that Lemma 7.1 has interesting applications to the algebraic multiplicity of (anti)-periodic eigenvalues for the Hill operator with the DTV potential

$$(7.4) \quad L_{\mathbf{n}} := \frac{d^2}{dx^2} - I_{\mathbf{n}}(x; \tau), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Let B_0 be any zero of the spectral polynomial $Q_{\mathbf{n}}(B; \tau)$. It follows that

$$\Delta_1(B_0; \tau) = \pm 2,$$

so B_0 is a (anti)-periodic eigenvalue of (7.4) with respect to $x \rightarrow x + 1$. Denote

$$d(B_0) := \text{ord}_{B_0}(\Delta_1(\cdot; \tau)^2 - 4)$$

to be the order of B_0 as a zero of $\Delta_1(\cdot; \tau)^2 - 4$. It is well known (cf. [16]) that $d(B_0)$ equals to the *algebraic multiplicity* of B_0 as a (anti)periodic eigenvalue of (7.4). For generic τ 's the algebraic multiplicity $d(B_0) = 1$. However, for special τ 's the algebraic multiplicity is no longer 1 and how to compute it remains a long-standing open problem. Here we provide an algorithm of computing the algebraic multiplicity.

Theorem 7.2. *Recalling the rational function $R_0(B; \tau) \in \mathbb{Q}[\eta_1, e_1, e_2, e_3](B)$ in Theorem 5.1, there holds*

$$(7.5) \quad d(B_0) = 2\text{ord}_{B_0} R_0(\cdot; \tau) + 2 - \text{ord}_{B_0} Q_{\mathbf{n}}(\cdot; \tau),$$

namely the algebraic multiplicity $d(B_0)$ can be computed by counting $\text{ord}_{B_0} R_0(\cdot; \tau)$ and $\text{ord}_{B_0} Q_{\mathbf{n}}(\cdot; \tau)$.

Proof. In the following argument we omit the notation τ since it is fixed. Clearly

$$\sin(2\pi s) = \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{4 - \Delta_1(B)^2},$$

and recall Theorem 5.1 that

$$\tau_r = \pi i \frac{R_0(B)}{C} = \pi i \frac{R_0(B)}{\sqrt{Q_{\mathbf{n}}(B)}}.$$

Inserting these into (7.2) leads to

$$\frac{\Delta_{1,B}(B)}{\sqrt{4 - \Delta_1(B)^2}} = \frac{-i}{4} \frac{R_0(B)}{\sqrt{Q_{\mathbf{n}}(B)}}.$$

From here and

$$4 - \Delta_1(B)^2 \sim (B - B_0)^{d(B_0)}, \quad \Delta_{1,B}(B) \sim (B - B_0)^{d(B_0)-1},$$

we easily obtain (7.5). \square

Example 7.3. The first Lamé case $\mathbf{n} = (1, 0, 0, 0)$ is simple. Let us consider the second Lamé case $\mathbf{n} = (2, 0, 0, 0)$, where we have computed in (5.16) that

$$R_0(B; \tau) = -2(B^2 + 3\eta_1 B - \frac{3}{2}g_2).$$

Recall (5.8) that

$$(7.6) \quad \begin{aligned} Q_2(B; \tau) &= (B^2 - 3g_2)(B^3 - \frac{9}{4}g_2 B + \frac{27}{4}g_3) \\ &= (B^2 - 3g_2) \prod_{k=1}^3 (B + 3e_k). \end{aligned}$$

It is easy to prove that

$$\{-3e_1, -3e_2, -3e_3\} \cap \{(3g_2)^{1/2}, -(3g_2)^{1/2}\} = \emptyset,$$

so $-3e_k$'s are always simple zeros of $Q_2(B; \tau)$.

Let B_0 be any zero of $Q_2(B; \tau)$. There are two cases.

Case 1. $B_0 = \pm(3g_2)^{1/2}$. It is well known that $g_2(\tau) = 0$ if and only if

$$\tau \in \mathfrak{S} := \left\{ \frac{ae^{\pi i/3} + b}{ce^{\pi i/3} + d} \mid \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} \in SL(2, \mathbb{Z}) \right\}.$$

First we consider $\tau \in \mathfrak{S}$, i.e. $g_2(\tau) = 0$. Then $B_0 = 0$ and $\text{ord}_0 Q_2(\cdot; \tau) = 2$. Furthermore,

$$R_0(B; \tau) = -2B(B + 3\eta_1(\tau)).$$

Since $\eta_1(e^{\pi i/3}) = \frac{2\pi}{\sqrt{3}}$ and

$$\eta_1\left(\frac{a\tau + b}{c\tau + d}\right) = (c\tau + d)^2\eta_1(\tau) - 2\pi ic(c\tau + d), \quad \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} \in SL(2, \mathbb{Z})$$

imply that $\eta_1(\tau) \neq 0$ for $\tau \in \mathfrak{S}$, we have $\text{ord}_0 R_0(\cdot; \tau) = 1$. Therefore, we see from (7.5) that

$$d(B_0) = d(0) = 2 \quad \text{for } \tau \in \mathfrak{S}.$$

Next we consider $\tau \notin \mathfrak{S}$, i.e. $g_2(\tau) \neq 0$. Then $B_0 \neq 0$ and so $\text{ord}_{B_0} Q_2(\cdot; \tau) = 1$. Clearly

$$\frac{-1}{2}R_0(B; \tau) = (B - B_0)(B + B_0 + 3\eta_1(\tau)) + \frac{1}{2}B_0(B_0 + 6\eta_1(\tau)),$$

so we easily obtain

$$\text{ord}_{B_0} R_0(\cdot; \tau) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } B_0 + 6\eta_1(\tau) \neq 0, \\ 1 & \text{if } B_0 + 6\eta_1(\tau) = 0. \end{cases}$$

From here and (7.5) it follows that

$$d(B_0) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } B_0 + 6\eta_1(\tau) \neq 0, \\ 3 & \text{if } B_0 + 6\eta_1(\tau) = 0. \end{cases}$$

In conclusion,

$$d(\pm(3g_2)^{1/2}) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \tau \notin \mathfrak{S}, \pm(3g_2)^{1/2} + 6\eta_1 \neq 0, \\ d(0) = 2 & \text{if } \tau \in \mathfrak{S}, \\ 3 & \text{if } \pm(3g_2)^{1/2} + 6\eta_1 = 0. \end{cases}$$

Recently, we proved in [11] that there are infinitely many τ 's such that $12\eta_1(\tau)^2 - g_2(\tau) = 0$, so for such τ 's, either $d((3g_2)^{1/2}) = 3$ or $d(-(3g_2)^{1/2}) = 3$.

Case 2. $B_0 = -3e_k(\tau)$. Then $\text{ord}_{-3e_k} Q_2(\cdot; \tau) = 1$ and

$$\frac{-1}{2}R_0(B; \tau) = (B + 3e_k)(B - 3e_k + 3\eta_1) - 9\pi i e'_k(\tau),$$

where we used

$$e'_k(\tau) = \frac{i}{\pi} \left[\frac{1}{6}g_2(\tau) + \eta_1(\tau)e_k(\tau) - e_k(\tau)^2 \right].$$

So if $e'_k(\tau) \neq 0$, we have $\text{ord}_{-3e_k} R_0(\cdot; \tau) = 0$ and so $d(-3e_k) = 1$. If $e'_k(\tau) = 0$ and $2e_k - \eta_1 \neq 0$, we have $\text{ord}_{-3e_k} R_0(\cdot; \tau) = 1$ and so $d(-3e_k) = 3$. If $e'_k(\tau) = 0$ and $2e_k - \eta_1 = 0$, or equivalently

$$(7.7) \quad 3\eta_1^2 + 2g_2 = 0, \quad 6e_k^2 + g_2 = 0,$$

then $\text{ord}_{-3e_k} R_0(\cdot; \tau) = 2$ and so $d(-3e_k) = 5$. In conclusion,

$$d(-3e_k) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } e'_k(\tau) \neq 0, \\ 3 & \text{if } e'_k(\tau) = 0, 2e_k - \eta_1 \neq 0 \\ 5 & \text{if } e'_k(\tau) = 0, 2e_k - \eta_1 = 0. \end{cases}$$

Recently, we proved in [12] that there are infinitely many τ 's such that $e'_k(\tau) = 0$, so for such τ 's, $d(-3e_k) \in \{3, 5\}$. Whether there exist τ satisfying (7.7) remains as an interesting open problem.

Acknowledgements. Z. Chen was supported by NSFC (No. 12222109, 12071240).

REFERENCES

- [1] M.V. Babich and L.A. Bordag; *Projective differential geometrical structure of the Painlevé equations*. J. Differ. Equ. **157** (1999), 452-485.
- [2] Y.V. Brezhnev; *Non-canonical extension of ϑ -functions and modular integrability of ϑ -constants*. Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A **143** (2013), 689–738.
- [3] J. Burchnall and T. Chaundy; *Commutative ordinary differential operators*. Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. **21** (1923), 420-440.
- [4] C.L. Chai, C.S. Lin and C.L. Wang; *Mean field equations, Hyperelliptic curves, and Modular forms: I*. Cambridge Journal of Mathematics, **3** (2015), 127-274.
- [5] Z. Chen, T.J. Kuo and C.S. Lin; *Hamiltonian system for the elliptic form of Painlevé VI equation*. J. Math. Pures Appl. **106** (2016), 546-581.
- [6] Z. Chen, T.J. Kuo and C.S. Lin; *The geometry of generalized Lamé equation, I*. J. Math. Pures Appl. **127** (2019), 89-120.
- [7] Z. Chen, T.J. Kuo and C.S. Lin; *The geometry of generalized Lamé equation, II: Existence of pre-modular forms and application*. J. Math. Pures Appl. **132** (2019), 251–272.
- [8] Z. Chen, T.J. Kuo and C.S. Lin; *The geometry of generalized Lamé equation, III: one-to-one of the Riemann-Hilbert correspondence*. Pure Appl. Math. Q. **17** (2021), 1619–1668.
- [9] Z. Chen, T.J. Kuo and C.S. Lin; *Proof of a conjecture of Dahmen and Beukers on counting integral Lamé equations with finite monodromy*. arXiv: 2105.04734v1 [math.NT]
- [10] Z. Chen, T.J. Kuo, C.S. Lin and C.L. Wang; *Green function, Painlevé VI equation, and Eisenstein series of weight one*. J. Differ. Geom. **108** (2018), 185-241.
- [11] Z. Chen and C.S. Lin; *Critical points of the classical Eisenstein series of weight two*. J. Differ. Geom. **113** (2019), 189-226.
- [12] Z. Chen and C.S. Lin; *Spectrum of the Lamé operator and application, II: When an endpoint is a cusp*. Comm. Math. Phys. **378** (2020), 335-368.
- [13] S. Dahmen; *Counting integral Lamé equations by means of dessins d'enfants*. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **359** (2007), 909-922.
- [14] A.S. Fokas, A.R. Its, A.A.Kapaev and V.Yu.Novokshenov; *Painlevé transcendents. The Riemann-Hilbert approach*. Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, Vol. 128, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2006.
- [15] F. Gesztesy and H. Holden; *Soliton equations and their algebro-geometric solutions. Vol. I. (1 + 1)-dimensional continuous models*. Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, vol. 79, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2003. xii+505 pp.
- [16] F. Gesztesy and R. Weikard; *Picard potentials and Hill's equation on a torus*. Acta Math. **176** (1996), 73-107.
- [17] F. Gesztesy, K. Unterkofler and R. Weikard, *An explicit characterization of Calogero-Moser systems*. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **358** (2006), 603-656.
- [18] F. Gesztesy and R. Weikard; *Treibich-Verdier potentials of the stationary (m)KdV hierarchy*. Math. Z. **219** (1995), 451-476.
- [19] G.H. Halphen; *Traité des Fonctions Elliptiques et de leurs Applications II*, Gauthier-Villars et Fils, Paris, 1888.
- [20] N.J. Hitchin; *Twistor spaces, Einstein metrics and isomonodromic deformations*. J. Differ. Geom. **42** (1995), no.1, 30-112.
- [21] V.I. Inozemtsev; *Lax representation with spectral parameter on a torus for integrable particle systems*. Lett. Math. Phys. **17**, (1989), 11-17.

- [22] K. Iwasaki, H. Kimura, S. Shimomura and M. Yoshida; *From Gauss to Painlevé: A Modern Theory of Special Functions*. Springer vol. E16, 1991.
- [23] C.S. Lin and C.L. Wang; *Mean field equations, Hyperelliptic curves, and Modular forms: II*. J. Éc. polytech. Math. **4** (2017), 557-593.
- [24] R. Maier; *Lamé polynomail, hyperelliptic reductions and Lamé band structure*. Philos. Trans. R. Soc. A **366** (2008), 1115-1153.
- [25] Y. Manin; *Sixth Painlevé quation, universal elliptic curve, and mirror of \mathbb{P}^2* . Amer. Math. Soc. Transl. (2), **186** (1998), 131-151.
- [26] K. Okamoto; *Studies on the Painlevé equations. I. Sixth Painlevé equation P_{VI}* . Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. **146** (1986), 337-381.
- [27] E. Poole; *Introduction to the theory of linear differential equations*. Oxford University Press, 1936.
- [28] K. Takemura; *The Hermite-Krichever Ansatz for Fuchsian equations with applications to the sixth Painlevé equation and to finite gap potentials*. Math. Z. **263** (2009), 149-194.
- [29] K. Takemura; *The Heun equation and the Calogero-Moser-Sutherland system I: the Bethé Ansatz method*. Comm. Math. Phys. **235** (2003), 467-494.
- [30] K. Takemura; *The Heun equation and the Calogero-Moser-Sutherland system II: perturbation and algebraic solution*. Elec. J. Differ. Equ. **2004** (2004), no. 15, 1-30.
- [31] K. Takemura; *The Heun equation and the Calogero-Moser-Sutherland system III: the finite-gap property and the monodromy*. J. Nonl. Math. Phys. **11** (2004), 21-46.
- [32] K. Takemura; *The Heun equation and the Calogero-Moser-Sutherland system IV: the Hermite-Krichever Ansatz*. Comm. Math. Phys. **258** (2005), 367-403.
- [33] K. Takemura; *The Heun equation and the Calogero-Moser-Sutherland system V: generalized Darboux transformations*. J. Nonl. Math. Phys. **13** (2006), 584-611.
- [34] A. Treibich and J.-L. Verdier, with an appendix by J. Esterlé, *Solitons Elliptiques*. The Grothendieck Festschrift III, Progress in Math., 88, Birkhäuser-Boston, 1990, 437-480.
- [35] A. Treibich and J.-L. Verdier, *Varietes de Krichever des solitons elliptiques*. Proceedings of the Indo-French Conference on Geometry (Bombay, Feb. 1989), Ed. : A. Beauville & S. Ramanan, Hindustan book Agency, 187-232.
- [36] A. Treibich and J. L. Verdier; *Revetements exceptionnels et sommes de 4 nombres triangulaires*. Duke Math. J. **68** (1992), 217-236.
- [37] A.P. Veselov; *On Darboux-Treibich-Verdier potentials*. Lett. Math. Phys. **96** (2011), 209-216.
- [38] E. Whittaker and G. Watson; *A course of modern analysis*. Cambridge University Press, 1996.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, YAU MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES CENTER, TSINGHUA UNIVERSITY, BEIJING, 100084, CHINA
 Email address: zjchen2016@tsinghua.edu.cn

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, TAIWAN UNIVERSITY, TAIPEI 10617, TAIWAN
 Email address: cslin@math.ntu.edu.tw