

COMPUTING DYNAMICAL DEGREES OF RATIONAL MAPS ON MODULI SPACE

SARAH KOCH AND ROLAND K. W. ROEDER

ABSTRACT. The dynamical degrees of a rational map $f : X \dashrightarrow X$ are fundamental invariants describing the rate of growth of the action of iterates of f on the cohomology of X . When f has nonempty indeterminacy set, these quantities can be very difficult to determine. We study rational maps $f : X^N \dashrightarrow X^N$, where X^N is isomorphic to the Deligne-Mumford compactification $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,N+3}$. We exploit the stratified structure of X^N to provide new examples of rational maps, in arbitrary dimension, for which the action on cohomology behaves functorially under iteration. From this, all dynamical degrees can be readily computed (given enough book-keeping and computing time). In this article, we explicitly compute *all* of the dynamical degrees for all such maps $f : X^N \dashrightarrow X^N$, where $\dim(X^N) \leq 3$ and the first dynamical degrees for the mappings where $\dim(X^N) \leq 5$. These examples naturally arise in the setting of Thurston's topological characterization of rational maps.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let X be a smooth, compact, complex algebraic variety of dimension N . A rational map $f : X \dashrightarrow X$ induces a pullback action $f^* : H^{k,k}(X; \mathbb{C}) \rightarrow H^{k,k}(X; \mathbb{C})$ (defined in Section 2). A typical starting point for studying the dynamics associated to iterating f is to compute the *dynamical degrees*

$$(1) \quad \lambda_k(f) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|(f^n)^* : H^{k,k}(X; \mathbb{C}) \rightarrow H^{k,k}(X; \mathbb{C})\|^{1/n},$$

which are defined for $0 \leq k \leq N$. Given the dynamical degrees of f , there is a precise description of what ergodic properties f *should* have; see, for example, [Gu1]. These properties have been established when $\lambda_N(f)$ is maximal [Gu2, DNT] or when $\dim(X) = 2$, $\lambda_1(f) > \lambda_2(f)$, and certain minor technical hypotheses are satisfied [DDG].

Dynamical degrees were originally introduced by Friedland [Fr] and later by Russakovskii and Shiffman [RS] and shown to be invariant under birational conjugacy by Dinh and Sibony [DS2]. Dynamical degrees were originally defined with a limsup instead of a limit in line (1) above; however, it was shown in [DS2, DS1] that the limit always exists.

If the map f has points of indeterminacy, then the iterates of f may not act functorially on $H^{k,k}(X; \mathbb{C})$, which can be a formidable obstacle to computing the dynamical degree $\lambda_k(f)$. If the action of f^* on $H^{k,k}(X; \mathbb{C})$ is functorial; that is, for all $m > 0$

$$(f^*)^m : H^{k,k}(X; \mathbb{C}) \rightarrow H^{k,k}(X; \mathbb{C}) \quad \text{equals} \quad (f^m)^* : H^{k,k}(X; \mathbb{C}) \rightarrow H^{k,k}(X; \mathbb{C})$$

then the map $f : X \dashrightarrow X$ is said to be *k-stable*. In this case, it immediately follows that the dynamical degree $\lambda_k(f)$ is the spectral radius of $f^* : H^{k,k}(X; \mathbb{C}) \rightarrow H^{k,k}(X; \mathbb{C})$. If $f : X \dashrightarrow X$ is *k-stable* for all $1 \leq k \leq N$, then the map $f : X \dashrightarrow X$ is said to be *algebraically stable*. Note that f^* is automatically functorial on $H^{N,N}(X; \mathbb{C})$ and $\lambda_N(f)$ is the topological degree of f . For more background and discussion of dynamical degrees and algebraic stability, we refer the reader to [B, R].

Given an arbitrary map $f : X \dashrightarrow X$, the problem of verifying that f is algebraically stable (or modifying X in order to conjugate f to an algebraically stable map) can be quite subtle, as is the problem of determining all of the dynamical degrees $\lambda_1(f), \lambda_2(f), \dots, \lambda_N(f)$. The purpose of this article is to study these problems for a specific family of maps $f_\rho : X^N \dashrightarrow X^N$ where both the map f_ρ and the space X^N have additional structure.

More specifically, the space X^N will be isomorphic to $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,n}$, the Deligne-Mumford compactification of $\mathcal{M}_{0,n}$, where $\mathcal{M}_{0,n}$ is the moduli space of genus 0 curves with n labeled points. The space $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,n}$ is a smooth projective variety of dimension $N = n - 3$ [Kn, KM]. Given a permutation $\rho \in S_n$, we build a map

The research of the first author was supported in part by the NSF DMS-1300315 and the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation.

The research of the second author was supported in part by NSF grant DMS-1102597 and startup funds from the Department of Mathematics at IUPUI.

$N \setminus k$	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
0	1						
1	1	1					
2	1	5	1				
3	1	16	16	1			
4	1	42	127	42	1		
5	1	99	715	715	99	1	
6	1	219	3292	7723	3292	219	1

TABLE 1. Table of dimensions of $H^{k,k}(X^N)$.

$f_\rho := g_\rho \circ s : X^N \dashrightarrow X^N$, where $s : X^N \dashrightarrow X^N$ is a relatively simple map to understand (although it has a nonempty indeterminacy set), and $g_\rho : X^N \rightarrow X^N$ is an automorphism of X^N induced by the permutation ρ . The resulting f_ρ has topological degree $\lambda_N(f_\rho) = 2^N$, so it remains to consider the other dynamical degrees $\lambda_k(f_\rho)$ for $1 \leq k < N$.

We can prove stability is a somewhat wider context: For a fixed $N \geq 1$, let \mathcal{F}^N denote the semi-group of rational self-mappings of X^N generated under composition by all of the mappings of the form $f_\rho : X^N \dashrightarrow X^N$. Our first main result is:

Theorem 1.1. *For any fixed $N \geq 1$ the semi-group \mathcal{F}^N acts functorially on all cohomology groups of X^N , i.e. for any $f_1, f_2 \in \mathcal{F}^N$ and any $1 \leq k \leq N$ we have*

$$(f_1 \circ f_2)^* = f_2^* \circ f_1^* : H^{k,k}(X^N; \mathbb{C}) \rightarrow H^{k,k}(X^N; \mathbb{C}).$$

An immediate corollary is:

Corollary 1.2. *For any $N \geq 1$ any $f \in \mathcal{F}^N$ is an algebraically stable self-map of X^N . In particular, for any $1 \leq k \leq N$ we have that $\lambda_k(f)$ equals the spectral radius of*

$$f^* : H^{k,k}(X^N; \mathbb{C}) \rightarrow H^{k,k}(X^N; \mathbb{C}).$$

For the remainder of the paper we focus on computing the dynamical degrees of the generators f_ρ of \mathcal{F}^N . By Corollary 1.2 they *should* be easy to compute. However, we are confronted with another challenge: the dimension of $H^{k,k}(X^N; \mathbb{C})$ grows exponentially with N (see Table 1). These numbers were computed using a theorem of S. Keel (Theorem 3.4 below, published in [Ke]) which provides generators and relations for the cohomology ring $H^*(X^N; \mathbb{C})$. Keel's Theorem will play a central role in all of our calculations. Computing $(f_\rho)^*$ on $H^{k,k}(X^N; \mathbb{C})$ is rather difficult as because $\dim(H^{k,k}(X^N; \mathbb{C}))$ is large.

Our second main result is that we provide an algorithmic approach to computing $(f_\rho)^* : H^{1,1}(X; \mathbb{C}) \rightarrow H^{1,1}(X; \mathbb{C})$, which is presented in Section 6. This allows us to readily compute $\lambda_1(f_\rho)$ for any N and ρ , using the computer algebra system Sage [Sa]. Values of $\lambda_1(f_\rho)$ for $N = 2, 3, 4, 5$ and various ρ are tabulated in Section 7.

It is far more technical to compute $(f_\rho)^*$ for $k \geq 2$ because a subvariety $V \subset X^N$ of codimension greater than or equal to 2 may have preimage $f^{-1}(V)$ lying entirely in the indeterminacy set $I(f_\rho)$. Our final main result is computation of

$$(f_\rho)^* : H^{2,2}(X^3; \mathbb{C}) \rightarrow H^{2,2}(X^3; \mathbb{C})$$

in Section 6. The resulting values for $\lambda_2(f_\rho)$ tabulated in Section 7. With sufficient book-keeping, we expect that this can be done for all N and k .

Remark 1.3. *For a given ρ , the space X^N may not be optimal, meaning that there is a space Z^N , obtained by blowing down certain hypersurfaces, on which (a conjugate of) f_ρ is still algebraically stable. (For example, certain choices of ρ , including $\rho = \text{id}$, result in a mapping f_ρ that is algebraically stable on \mathbb{P}^N .) Similarly, if one is only interested in k -stability for a particular value of k , there may be a blow down Z^N of X^N on which all of the mappings f_ρ are k -stable (see Remark 7.1). The merit of working with X^N is that every mapping f_ρ is k -stable for all $1 \leq k \leq N$ on the same space X^N .*

In the literature. Dynamical degrees have been extensively studied for maps $f : X \dashrightarrow X$ where X is a surface. If f is a bimeromorphic map of a compact Kähler surface, J. Diller and C. Favre [DF] proved

that there is a proper modification $\pi : \widehat{X} \rightarrow X$ so that f lifts to an algebraically stable map $\widehat{f} : \widehat{X} \dashrightarrow \widehat{X}$. The space \widehat{X} and lifted map \widehat{f} are called a *stabilization* of f . However in [Fa], C. Favre found examples of monomial maps $f : \mathbb{P}^2 \dashrightarrow \mathbb{P}^2$ of topological degree ≥ 2 for which no such stabilization exists.

In the higher dimensional case $f : X \dashrightarrow X$, the question of the functoriality of f^* on $H^{1,1}(X; \mathbb{C})$ (that is, whether or not f is 1-stable) has been extensively studied [BK2, BK3, BT, JW, HP]. The functoriality of f^* on $H^{k,k}(X; \mathbb{C})$ for $2 \leq k \leq N - 1$ is typically even more delicate. In [Li2], Lin computes all of the dynamical degrees for monomial maps $\mathbb{P}^3 \dashrightarrow \mathbb{P}^3$. In [BK1, BCK], Bedford-Kim and then Bedford-Cantat-Kim study pseudo-automorphisms of 3-dimensional manifolds, computing all dynamical degrees for a certain family of such maps. In [Am], Amerik computes all dynamical degrees for a particular map $f : X \dashrightarrow X$, where X is a 4-dimensional smooth compact complex projective variety arising in an algebro-geometric context. In [FaW, Li1], Favre-Wulcan and Lin compute all dynamical degrees for monomial maps $\mathbb{P}^n \dashrightarrow \mathbb{P}^n$, and [LW], Lin-Wulcan study the problem of stabilizing certain monomial maps $\mathbb{P}^n \dashrightarrow \mathbb{P}^n$. There is also a notion of the *arithmetic degree* (of a point) for dominant rational maps $\mathbb{P}^n \dashrightarrow \mathbb{P}^n$ defined in [Si].

Motivation. The maps $f : X^N \dashrightarrow X^N$ in Theorem 1.2 constitute a new family of examples for which algebraic stability is known and for which all of the dynamical degrees can be systematically computed (with enough book-keeping). They also fit nicely within the context of stabilization, since Kapranov’s Theorem [Ka] expresses X^N as an iterated blow up of the projective space \mathbb{P}^N . We initially studied (conjugates of) these mappings on \mathbb{P}^N and later discovered that *all of them* stabilize when lifted to X^N .

Moreover, the maps $f_\rho : X^N \dashrightarrow X^N$ naturally arise in the setting of Thurston’s topological characterization of rational maps [Ko]. As a general rule, dynamical quantities associated to iterating the maps f_ρ should correspond to dynamical quantities associated to iterating the *Thurston pullback map* on a Teichmüller space.

Outline. We begin the paper in Section 2 with some background on the action of a rational map $f : X \dashrightarrow X$ on cohomology and statement of the criterion for functoriality of a composition (Proposition 2.1) that will be used to prove Theorem 1.1. In Section 3 we discuss several important properties of the moduli space $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,n}$, including Keel’s Theorem and Kapranov’s Theorem. Basic properties of the mapping f_ρ are presented in Section 4. Section 5 is dedicated to the proof of Theorem 1.2. Computations of $(f_\rho)^*$ are done in Section 6. A catalog of dynamical degrees for specific examples is presented in Section 7.

Acknowledgments. We are very grateful to Omar Antolín Camarena for convincing us to use the Sage computer algebra program in our calculations and for helping us to write the scripts. We are also very grateful to Tuyen Truong who informed us of the universal property for blow ups, which plays a central role in the proof of Theorem 1.2. We have benefited substantially from discussions with Eric Bedford, Xavier Buff, and Jeffrey Diller, and Kevin Pilgrim. We also thank the anonymous referee for his or her careful reading of this paper and for making several comments that have improved its exposition.

The research of the first author was supported in part by the NSF DMS-1300315 and the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation. The research of the second author was supported in part by NSF grant DMS-1102597 and startup funds from the Department of Mathematics at IUPUI.

2. ACTION ON COHOMOLOGY

We begin by explaining how a dominant rational map $f : X \dashrightarrow Y$ between smooth complex projective varieties of dimension N induces a well-defined pullback $f^* : H^{k,k}(Y; \mathbb{C}) \rightarrow H^{k,k}(X; \mathbb{C})$ even though f may have a nonempty indeterminacy set I_f (necessarily of codimension 2). We will first work with the singular cohomology $H^i(Y; \mathbb{C}) \rightarrow H^i(X; \mathbb{C})$, and we will then remark about why this definition preserves bidegree.

For the remainder of the paper we will use the term *projective manifold* to mean smooth, compact, complex projective variety. If V is a k -dimensional subvariety of a projective manifold X of dimension N , then V determines a *fundamental homology class* $\{V\} \in H_{2k}(X; \mathbb{C})$. The *fundamental cohomology class* of V is $[V] := \text{PD}^{-1}(\{V\}) \in H^{2N-2k}(X; \mathbb{C})$, where $\text{PD}_M : H^j(M) \rightarrow H_{(\dim_{\mathbb{R}}(M)-j)}(M)$ denotes the Poincaré duality isomorphism on a manifold M .

Let

$$\Gamma_f = \overline{\{(x, y) \in X \times Y : x \notin I_f \text{ and } y = f(x)\}}$$

be the *graph* of f and let $[\Gamma_f] \in H^{2N}(X \times Y; \mathbb{C})$ denote its fundamental cohomology class. Let $\pi_1 : X \times Y \rightarrow X$ and $\pi_2 : X \times Y \rightarrow Y$ denote the canonical projection maps. For any $\alpha \in H^i(Y; \mathbb{C})$, one defines

$$(2) \quad f^* \alpha := \pi_{1*}([\Gamma_f] \smile \pi_2^* \alpha).$$

Here, π_2^* is the classical pullback on cohomology, as defined for regular maps, and π_{1*} is the pushforward on cohomology, defined by $\pi_{1*} = \text{PD}_{\tilde{X}}^{-1} \circ \pi_{1\#} \circ \text{PD}_{X \times Y}$, where $\pi_{1\#}$ denotes the push forward on homology. If f is regular (i.e. $I_f = \emptyset$) then (2) coincides with the classical definition of pullback.

Suppose that there exists a projective manifold \tilde{X} and holomorphic maps pr and \tilde{f} making the following diagram commute (wherever $f \circ \text{pr}$ is defined)

$$(3) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \tilde{X} & & \\ \downarrow \text{pr} \searrow \tilde{f} & & \\ X & \xrightarrow{f} & Y \end{array}$$

Then, one can show that

$$(4) \quad f^* \alpha = \text{pr}_* \left(\tilde{f} \right)^* \alpha;$$

see, for example, [R, Lemma 3.1]. Notice that for any rational map $f : X \dashrightarrow Y$, the space \tilde{X} and maps pr and \tilde{f} always exist: for example, \tilde{X} can be obtained as a desingularization of Γ_f , with the maps pr and \tilde{f} corresponding to the lifts of $\pi_1|_{\Gamma_f}$ and $\pi_2|_{\Gamma_f}$.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \tilde{X} & \\ \text{pr} \swarrow & \downarrow & \searrow \tilde{f} \\ X & \Gamma_f & Y \\ \pi_1|_{\Gamma_f} \swarrow & & \searrow \pi_2|_{\Gamma_f} \\ X & \xrightarrow{f} & Y \end{array}$$

For any Kähler manifold X , there is a natural isomorphism

$$\bigoplus_{p+q=i} H^{p,q}(X; \mathbb{C}) \rightarrow H^i(X; \mathbb{C}),$$

where the former are the Dolbeault cohomology groups and the latter is the singular cohomology. This induces a splitting on the singular cohomology of X into bidegrees. To see that (2) preserves this splitting, observe that (4) can be applied to any $\bar{\partial}$ -closed (p, q) -form β , with $\left(\tilde{f}\right)^*$ interpreted as the pullback on smooth forms and pr_* interpreted as the proper push-forward on currents of degree (p, q) . As both of these operations induce a well-defined map on cohomology, we see that the $f^*[\beta] = \text{pr}_* \left(\tilde{f}\right)^* [\beta] = \left[\text{pr}_* \left(\tilde{f}\right)^* \beta\right] \in H^{p,q}(X; \mathbb{C})$. In particular, the pullback defined by (2) can be used in the definition of the dynamical degree λ_k for any $1 \leq k \leq N$.

We note that many authors define the pullback on cohomology using forms and currents as above, rather than the singular cohomology approach we have used. For more discussion of the latter approach, see [R].

We will use the following criteria for functoriality of compositions, which is proved in [DS3, Am, R]:

Proposition 2.1. *Let X, Y , and Z be projective manifolds of equal dimension, and let $f : X \dashrightarrow Y$ and $g : Y \dashrightarrow Z$ be dominant rational maps. Suppose that there exists a projective manifold \tilde{X} and holomorphic maps pr and \tilde{f} making the following diagram commute (wherever $f \circ \text{pr}$ is defined)*

$$(5) \quad \begin{array}{ccccc} \tilde{X} & & & & \\ \downarrow \text{pr} \searrow \tilde{f} & & & & \\ X & \xrightarrow{f} & Y & \xrightarrow{g} & Z \end{array}$$

with the property that $\tilde{f}^{-1}(x)$ is a finite set for every $y \in Y$. Then, $(g \circ f)^* = f^* \circ g^*$ on all cohomology groups.

Remark 2.2. Note that it follows from the criterion of Bedford-Kim [BK3, Thm. 1.1] that if $f_{X \setminus I_f} : X \setminus I_f \rightarrow X$ is finite then f is 1-stable. This is not sufficient for k -stability, when $k > 1$, as shown in [R, Prop. 6.1]. This is why we use the stronger sufficient condition in Proposition 2.1.

The following lemma (see, e.g. [Fu, Lem. 19.1.2]) will be helpful when using (4) to compute pullbacks.

Lemma 2.3. Suppose that $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is a proper holomorphic map between projective manifolds. For any irreducible subvariety $V \subseteq X$ we have

- (i) if $\dim(f(V)) = \dim(V)$, then $f_*([V]) = \deg_{\text{top}}(f|_V)[f(V)]$, where $\deg_{\text{top}}(f|_V)$ is the number of preimages under $f|_V$ of a generic point from $f(V)$.
- (ii) Otherwise, $f_*([V]) = 0$.

3. MODULI SPACE

Let $P = \{p_1, \dots, p_n\}$ be a finite set consisting of at least three points. The moduli space of genus 0 curves marked by P is by definition

$$\mathcal{M}_P := \{\varphi : P \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}^1 \text{ up to postcomposition by Möbius transformations}\}.$$

3.1. Projective space. Every element of \mathcal{M}_P has a representative $\varphi : P \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$ so that

$$\varphi(p_1) = 0 \text{ and } \varphi(p_2) = \infty,$$

and the point $[\varphi] \in \mathcal{M}_P$ is determined by the $(n-2)$ -tuple

$$(z_1, \dots, z_{n-2}) \in \mathbb{C}^{n-2} \quad \text{where } z_i := \varphi(p_{i+2}) \quad \text{for } 1 \leq i \leq n-2,$$

up to scaling by a nonzero complex number. In other words, the point $[\varphi] \in \mathcal{M}_P$ is uniquely determined by $[z_1 : \dots : z_{N+1}] \in \mathbb{P}^N$, where $N := n-3$. There are some immediate constraints on the complex numbers z_i in order to ensure that $\varphi : P \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$ is injective. Indeed, \mathcal{M}_P is isomorphic to the complement of $(n-1)(n-2)/2$ hyperplanes in \mathbb{P}^N . We state this in the following proposition.

Proposition 3.1. Define $z_0 := 0$. The moduli space \mathcal{M}_P is isomorphic to $\mathbb{P}^N \setminus \Delta$ where Δ is the following collection of hyperplanes

$$\Delta := \{z_i = z_j \mid 0 \leq i < j \leq N+1\}.$$

In particular, \mathcal{M}_P is a complex manifold of dimension N .

Proof. This follows immediately from the normalization above. □

The following fact is straight-forward, but we state it explicitly as it will be used in subsequent sections.

Proposition 3.2. Let $Q = \{q_1, \dots, q_n\}$, and let $\iota : P \rightarrow Q$ be a bijection. Then ι induces an isomorphism

$$\iota^* : \mathcal{M}_Q \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_P$$

Proof. Let $m \in \mathcal{M}_Q$, and let $\varphi : Q \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$ be a representative of m . Then $\iota^*(m) \in \mathcal{M}_P$ is represented by $\varphi \circ \iota : P \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$. □

The moduli space \mathcal{M}_P is not compact.

3.2. The Deligne-Mumford compactification. A stable curve of genus 0 marked by P is an injection $\varphi : P \hookrightarrow C$ where C is a connected algebraic curve whose singularities are ordinary double points (called nodes), such that

- (1) each irreducible component is isomorphic to \mathbb{P}^1 ,
- (2) the graph, G_C , whose vertices are the irreducible components and whose edges connect components intersecting at a node, is a tree
- (3) for all $p \in P$, $\varphi(p)$ is a smooth point of C , and
- (4) the number of marked points plus nodes on each irreducible component of C is at least three.

The marked stable curves $\varphi_1 : P \hookrightarrow C_1$ and $\varphi_2 : P \hookrightarrow C_2$ are isomorphic if there is an isomorphism $\mu : C_1 \rightarrow C_2$ such that $\varphi_2 = \mu \circ \varphi_1$. The set of stable curves of genus 0 marked by P modulo isomorphism can be given the structure of a smooth projective variety [Kn, KM], called the *Deligne-Mumford compactification*, and denoted by $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_P$. The moduli space \mathcal{M}_P is an open Zariski dense subset of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_P$. In this subsection we will state some of the well-known properties of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_P$.

Let $P = \{p_1, \dots, p_n\}$ be a set with at least three elements. The compactification divisor of \mathcal{M}_P in $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_P$ is the set of all (isomorphism classes) of marked stable curves with at least one node. Generic points of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_P \setminus \mathcal{M}_P$ consist of the (isomorphism classes) of marked stable curves $\varphi : P \hookrightarrow C$ with at exactly one node. For each such generic boundary point, taking φ^{-1} of the connected components of $C \setminus \{\text{node}\}$ induces a partition of P into two sets $S \cup S^c$, where $S^c := P \setminus S$. The set of generic boundary components inducing a given partition of P is an irreducible quasiprojective variety and its closure in $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_P$ is an algebraic hypersurface denoted $\mathcal{D}^S \equiv \mathcal{D}^{S^c}$, and it is a boundary divisor of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_P$.

If $|S| = n_1$ and $|S^c| = n_2$ then there is an isomorphism

$$\mathcal{D}^S \approx \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0, n_1+1} \times \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0, n_2+1}.$$

The $n_1 + 1$ points in the first factor consist of the n_1 points of S together with the node, and similarly for the second factor.

Any k distinct boundary divisors $\mathcal{D}^{S_1}, \dots, \mathcal{D}^{S_k}$ intersect transversally and if this intersection is nonempty, the result is an irreducible codimension k boundary stratum. This corresponds to the set of marked stable curves which induces a stable partition of P into $k + 1$ blocks. There is an analogous description in terms of trees.

Marked Stable Trees. Let $\varphi : P \hookrightarrow C$ be a marked stable curve of genus 0. As mentioned in point (2) above, there is a graph G_C associated to $\varphi : P \hookrightarrow C$, which is a tree. Let V_C be the set of vertices of G_C ; the marking $\varphi : P \hookrightarrow C$ induces a map $\varphi_* : P \rightarrow V_C$, sending $p \in P$ to the vertex corresponding to the irreducible component which contains $\varphi(p)$. We will call

$$T_{\varphi: P \hookrightarrow C} := (G_C, \varphi_* : P \rightarrow V_C)$$

the *marked stable tree* associated to the marked stable curve $\varphi : P \hookrightarrow C$. More generally, any graph G which is a tree, together with a map $\psi : P \rightarrow V_G$ will be a marked stable tree if for all $v \in V_G$,

$$\text{degree}(v) + |\psi^{-1}(v)| \geq 3.$$

Given two generic points $\varphi : P \hookrightarrow C$ and $\varphi' : P \hookrightarrow C'$ of the (nonempty) intersection $\mathcal{D}^{S_1} \cap \dots \cap \mathcal{D}^{S_k}$, the trees $T_{\varphi: P \hookrightarrow C}$ and $T_{\varphi': P \hookrightarrow C'}$ are *isomorphic* in the following sense: there is a graph isomorphism $\beta : G_C \rightarrow G_{C'}$ so that $\varphi'_* = \beta \circ \varphi_*$. The stratum $\mathcal{D}^{S_1} \cap \dots \cap \mathcal{D}^{S_k}$ can be labeled by the isomorphism class of $T_{\varphi: P \hookrightarrow C}$.

It is well-known that there is a bijection between the following sets:

$$\begin{aligned} &\{\text{codimension } k \text{ boundary strata in } \overline{\mathcal{M}}_P\} \longleftrightarrow \\ &\{\text{isomorphism classes of marked stable trees with } k + 1 \text{ vertices}\} \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 3.3. *Let Z be a boundary stratum of codimension k in $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_P$. There is a unique set $\{\mathcal{D}^{S_1}, \dots, \mathcal{D}^{S_k}\}$ of boundary divisors so that $Z = \mathcal{D}^{S_1} \cap \dots \cap \mathcal{D}^{S_k}$.*

Proof. This result follows immediately from the remarks above. \square

3.3. Keel's theorem. In [Ke], Keel exhibits generators and relations for the cohomology ring of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_P$. Let $[\mathcal{D}^S]$ denote the fundamental cohomology class of the boundary divisor \mathcal{D}^S .

Theorem 3.4 (Keel, [Ke]). *The cohomology ring $H^*(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_P; \mathbb{C})$ is the ring*

$$\mathbb{Z} [[\mathcal{D}^S] : S \subseteq P, |S|, |S^c| \geq 2]$$

modulo the following relations:

- (1) $[\mathcal{D}^S] = [\mathcal{D}^{S^c}]$
- (2) For any four distinct $p_i, p_j, p_k, p_l \in P$, we have

$$\sum_{\substack{p_i, p_j \in S \\ p_k, p_l \in S^c}} [\mathcal{D}^S] = \sum_{\substack{p_i, p_k \in S \\ p_j, p_l \in S^c}} [\mathcal{D}^S] = \sum_{\substack{p_i, p_l \in S \\ p_j, p_k \in S^c}} [\mathcal{D}^S].$$

(3) $[\mathcal{D}^S] \smile [\mathcal{D}^T] = 0$ unless one of the following holds:

$$S \subseteq T, \quad T \subseteq S, \quad S \subseteq T^c, \quad T^c \subseteq S.$$

Implicit in Keel's Theorem is the assertion that the codimension k boundary strata are complete intersections:

Corollary 3.5. *We have*

$$[\mathcal{D}^{S_1} \cap \dots \cap \mathcal{D}^{S_k}] = [\mathcal{D}^{S_1}] \smile \dots \smile [\mathcal{D}^{S_k}].$$

We now construct Kapranov's space X^N which is isomorphic to $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_P$.

3.4. Kapranov's Theorem. We may choose coordinates and identify \mathcal{M}_P with $\mathbb{P}^N \setminus \Delta$ as stated in Proposition 3.1. In this concrete setting, there is a description of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_P$ as a *sequential blow up* of \mathbb{P}^N due to Kapranov [Ka].

Normalize to identify \mathcal{M}_P with $\mathbb{P}^N \setminus \Delta$ as in Proposition 3.1, and consider the following subsets of \mathbb{P}^N . Let

$$A^0 := \{[1 : 0 : \dots : 0], [0 : 1 : 0 : \dots : 0], \dots, [0 : \dots : 0 : 1], [1 : 1 : \dots : 1]\},$$

and for $1 \leq i \leq N-2$, let A^i be the set of all $\binom{N+2}{i+1}$ projective linear subspaces of dimension i in \mathbb{P}^N , which are spanned by collections of $i+1$ of distinct points in A^0 . Let $X_0 := \mathbb{P}^N$, and for each $0 \leq i \leq N-2$ define $\alpha^i : X_{i+1} \rightarrow X_i$ to be the blow up of X_i along the proper transform \tilde{A}^i of A^i under $\alpha^0 \circ \dots \circ \alpha^{i-1}$.

Theorem 3.6 (Kapranov, [Ka]). *Let $P = \{p_1, \dots, p_n\}$ contain at least three points. Normalize to identify \mathcal{M}_P with $\mathbb{P}^N \setminus \Delta$ where $N = n-3$ as in Proposition 3.1. Then the Deligne-Mumford compactification $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_P$ is isomorphic to the space $X^N := X_{N-1}$ constructed above.*

The proof of Kapranov's Theorem is a bit subtle, establishing the isomorphism using the space of Veronese curves. For a different perspective, closer to that of the present paper, we refer the reader to the paper of Harvey and Lloyd-Phillips [HL].

Remark 3.7. *Via the isomorphism $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_P \approx X^N$ from Theorem 3.6, we will use Theorem 3.4 to find appropriate bases for the cohomology groups $H^{k,k}(X^N; \mathbb{C})$ in Section 6. To this end, we adopt the following notation. Let $\mathcal{D}^S \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{M}}_P$ be a boundary divisor. We will use the notation $D^S \subseteq X^N$ to denote the image of \mathcal{D}^S under the explicit isomorphism $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_P \approx X^N$ from Theorem 3.6.*

For $|P| = 3$, $\mathcal{M}_P = \overline{\mathcal{M}}_P$ is a point. For $|P| = 4$, \mathcal{M}_P is isomorphic to $\mathbb{P}^1 \setminus \{0, 1, \infty\}$, and $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_P$ is isomorphic to \mathbb{P}^1 .

Example 3.8. *Let $P = \{p_1, p_2, p_3, p_4, p_5\}$. Following Proposition 3.1, \mathcal{M}_P is isomorphic to $\mathbb{P}^2 \setminus \Delta$, where*

$$\Delta = \{z_1 = 0, z_2 = 0, z_3 = 0, z_1 = z_2, z_2 = z_3, z_1 = z_3\}.$$

The space $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_P$ is isomorphic to X^2 , which is equal to \mathbb{P}^2 blown up at the four points comprising A^0 :

$$\{[1 : 0 : 0], [0 : 1 : 0], [0 : 0 : 1], [1 : 1 : 1]\}.$$

There are 10 boundary divisors in X^2 : the proper transforms of the six lines comprising Δ , plus the four exceptional divisors. The ten boundary divisors correspond to the $\binom{5}{2}$ stable partitions of P into two blocks. The space X^2 is depicted in Figure 1.

Example 3.9. *If $|P| = 6$, then $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_P$ is isomorphic to X^3 , the sequential blow up of \mathbb{P}^3 where*

$$A^0 = \{[0 : 0 : 0 : 1], [0 : 0 : 1 : 0], [0 : 1 : 0 : 0], [1 : 0 : 0 : 0], [1 : 1 : 1 : 1]\},$$

A^1 is the set of 10 = $\binom{5}{2}$ lines spanned by pairs of points in A^0 . A depiction of X^3 is shown in Figure 2

Example 3.10. *If $|P| = 7$, then $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_P$ is isomorphic to X^4 , the sequential blow up of \mathbb{P}^4 where*

$$A^0 = \{[0 : 0 : 0 : 0 : 1], [0 : 0 : 0 : 1 : 0], [0 : 0 : 1 : 0 : 0], [0 : 1 : 0 : 0 : 0], [1 : 0 : 0 : 0 : 0], [1 : 1 : 1 : 1 : 1]\},$$

A^1 is the set of 15 lines spanned by pairs of points in A^0 , and A^2 is the set of 20 planes spanned by triples of points in A^0 . Let $[x_1 : x_2 : x_3 : x_4 : x_5] \in \mathbb{P}^4$, and let L be the element of A^2 spanned by

$$\{[0 : 0 : 0 : 0 : 1], [0 : 0 : 0 : 1 : 0], [0 : 0 : 1 : 0 : 0]\},$$




FIGURE 1. Depiction of X^2 . Left: boundary divisors are labeled as proper transforms of lines in \mathbb{P}^2 and exceptional divisors. Right: boundary divisors are labeled according to Remark 3.7.




FIGURE 2. Depiction of X^3 with all boundary divisors corresponding to exceptional divisors over A^0 and over proper transforms of lines from A^1 labeled. (The remaining 10 boundary divisors corresponding to hyperplanes in \mathbb{P}^3 are not labeled.)

that is, the locus in \mathbb{P}^4 given by $x_1 = x_2 = 0$, and let M be the element in A^2 spanned by

$$\{[0 : 1 : 0 : 0 : 0], [1 : 0 : 0 : 0 : 0], [1 : 1 : 1 : 1 : 1]\},$$

that is, the locus in \mathbb{P}^4 given by $x_3 = x_4 = x_5$. Note that L and M intersect at the point $[0 : 0 : 1 : 1 : 1]$ which is not in $A^0 \cup A^1$, so a priori, the order of the blow ups in the construction above might matter in constructing the space X^4 . However, this is not the case since L and M intersect transversally. Indeed, this phenomenon occurs in the general setting for $|P|$ arbitrary, but these intersections are always transverse and are therefore irrelevant in the blow up construction (see Lemma 5.3 and Lemma 5.4).

3.5. Automorphisms of X^N . The automorphism group of X^N is clearly isomorphic to the automorphism group of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_P$. We will study automorphisms of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_P$ that extend automorphisms of \mathcal{M}_P . If $|P| = 4$, then the automorphisms of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_P \approx \mathbb{P}^1$ that extend the automorphisms of \mathcal{M}_P consist of the Möbius transformations that map the set of three points comprising the boundary of \mathcal{M}_P in $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_P$ to itself; that is, $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{M}_P)$ is isomorphic to the permutation group on three letters. If $|P| > 4$, then $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{M}_P)$ is isomorphic to S_P , the group of permutations of elements of the set P (see [T], and compare with Proposition 3.2).

Proposition 3.11. *Suppose that $|P| > 4$, and let $\rho \in S_P$. Then the automorphism $g_\rho : \mathcal{M}_P \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_P$ extends to an automorphism $g_\rho : \overline{\mathcal{M}}_P \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_P$.*

Proof. Let $P = \{p_1, \dots, p_n\}$, and let $\rho \in S_P$. The permutation ρ relabels the points in P , which effectively just changes coordinates on $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_P$. This is evident using Kapranov's theorem from Section 3.4. Indeed, in the construction of X^N , we began with a choice of normalization: we identified \mathcal{M}_P with a $\mathbb{P}^N \setminus \Delta$ by choosing a representative $\varphi : P \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$ so that $\varphi(p_1) = 0$, and $\varphi(p_2) = \infty$, and setting $z_i := \varphi(p_{i+2})$ for $1 \leq i \leq n-2$, we identified the point $[\varphi] \in \mathcal{M}_P$ with the point $[z_1 : \dots : z_{N+1}] \in \mathbb{P}^N$. To build X^N , we performed the appropriate sequential blow up of this copy of \mathbb{P}^N .

Carrying out the same construction, but taking the permutation into account, we normalize so that for the representative $\varphi : P \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$

$$\varphi(p_{\rho^{-1}(1)}) = 0, \quad \text{and} \quad \varphi(p_{\rho^{-1}(2)}) = \infty,$$

and by setting $z_i := \varphi(p_{\rho^{-1}(i)})$, for $1 \leq i \leq n-2$, we identify the point $[\varphi] \in \mathcal{M}_P$ with the point $[z_1 : \dots : z_{M+1}] \in \mathbb{P}^M$, where $M := n-3$. Build a space Y^M which is the sequential blow up of \mathbb{P}^M as prescribed in Section 3.4 (we have changed notation so as not to confuse the two constructions of the 'same' space). The spaces X^N and Y^M are clearly isomorphic, and we see that ρ induces an automorphism $g_\rho : \overline{\mathcal{M}}_P \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_P$ which extends $g_\rho : \mathcal{M}_P \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_P$. \square

4. THE MAPS $f_\rho : X^N \dashrightarrow X^N$

As previously mentioned, the maps $f_\rho : X^N \dashrightarrow X^N$ will be a composition of two maps: an automorphism $g_\rho : X^N \rightarrow X^N$ and a map $s : X^N \dashrightarrow X^N$, which we now define.

Let $P = \{p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n\}$, and normalize to identify \mathcal{M}_P with $\mathbb{P}^N \setminus \Delta$ as in Proposition 3.1, and via Kapranov's construction (Theorem 3.6), build the space X^N as a sequential blow up of \mathbb{P}^N . Consider the squaring map $s_0 : \mathbb{P}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^N$ given by

$$s_0 : [z_1 : \dots : z_{N+1}] \mapsto [z_1^2 : \dots : z_{N+1}^2],$$

which is clearly holomorphic. Note that the critical locus of s_0 consists precisely of the union of hyperplanes

$$\text{Crit}(s_0) = \bigcup_{i=1}^{N+1} \{z_i = 0\}.$$

Moreover, every component of Δ is mapped to itself by s_0 .

The map $s : X^N \dashrightarrow X^N$ is simply the lift of $s_0 : \mathbb{P}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^N$ under the map $\mathcal{A} := \alpha_0 \circ \dots \circ \alpha_{N-2} : X_{N-1} \rightarrow X_0$ where $X^N := X_{N-1}$ and $X_0 := \mathbb{P}^N$ in the Kapranov construction (see Theorem 3.6). The map $s : X^N \dashrightarrow X^N$ is not holomorphic (unless $N = 1$, or equivalently, $|P| = 4$); indeed, there are points of indeterminacy arising from extra preimages of varieties that were previously blown up. For example, consider $P = \{p_1, \dots, p_5\}$ (as in Example 3.8). The space X^2 is \mathbb{P}^2 blown up at $[0 : 0 : 1]$, $[0 : 1 : 0]$, $[1 : 0 : 0]$, and $[1 : 1 : 1]$. Let $\zeta \in (s_0^{-1}([1 : 1 : 1]) \setminus \{[1 : 1 : 1]\})$. Then $s : X^2 \dashrightarrow X^2$ has a point of indeterminacy at $\alpha_0^{-1}(\zeta)$. In fact, for any $N > 1$ the indeterminacy set for $s : X^N \dashrightarrow X^N$ has dimension $N-2$. Notice that $\{z_1 = z_2 = -z_3\} \in s_0^{-1}(\{z_1 = z_2 = z_3\})$, with $\{z_1 = z_2 = z_3\} \in A^{N-2}$. Since $\{z_1 = z_2 = -z_3\}$ is not a center of blow up, it's proper transform under \mathcal{A} is in the indeterminacy locus I_s .

By Proposition 3.11, every permutation $\rho \in S_P$ induces an automorphism $g_\rho : \overline{\mathcal{M}}_P \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_P$, which maps the compactification divisor of \mathcal{M}_P to itself (since g_ρ extends an automorphism of \mathcal{M}_P). We abuse notation and denote the corresponding automorphism of $X^N \rightarrow X^N$ as $g_\rho : X^N \rightarrow X^N$.

For any $\rho \in S_P$, define the map $f_\rho := g_\rho \circ s : X^N \dashrightarrow X^N$. This map also has indeterminacy locus of dimension $N-2$, since $I_{g_\rho \circ s} = I_s$. We now prove that the maps $f_\rho : X^N \dashrightarrow X^N$ are algebraically stable.

5. ALGEBRAIC STABILITY

The goal of this section is to prove the following proposition, which will imply Theorem 1.1 and will be used to compute the linear maps $(f_\rho)^* : H^{k,k}(X^N; \mathbb{C}) \rightarrow H^{k,k}(X^N; \mathbb{C})$.

Proposition 5.1. *For any $N \geq 1$ there is an N -dimensional projective manifold Y^N and holomorphic maps $\text{pr} : Y^N \rightarrow X^N$ and $\tilde{s} : Y^N \rightarrow X^N$ that make the following diagram commute (wherever $s \circ \text{pr}$ is defined),*

$$(6) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} Y^N & & \\ \downarrow \text{pr} & \searrow \tilde{s} & \\ X^N & \xrightarrow{s} & X^N \end{array}$$

with $\tilde{s}^{-1}(x)$ a finite set for every $x \in X^N$.

Proof of Theorem 1.1, supposing Proposition 5.1: Using the factorization $f_\rho = g_\rho \circ s$ with g_ρ an automorphism of X^N , we obtain the following diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} Y^N & & & & \\ \downarrow \text{pr} & \searrow \tilde{s} & \xrightarrow{\tilde{f}_\rho} & & \\ X^N & \xrightarrow{s} & X^N & \xrightarrow{g_\rho} & X^N \end{array}$$

Since \tilde{s} has finite fibers, so does $\tilde{f}_\rho := g_\rho \circ \tilde{s}$. It follows from Proposition 2.1 that for any rational map $h : X^N \dashrightarrow X^N$ we have $(h \circ f_\rho)^* = f_\rho^* \circ h^*$ on all cohomology groups. By induction it follows that for any word $f_{\rho_k} \circ \cdots \circ f_{\rho_1}$ we have

$$(f_{\rho_k} \circ \cdots \circ f_{\rho_1})^* = f_{\rho_1}^* \circ \cdots \circ f_{\rho_k}^*$$

on $H^{k,k}(X^N; \mathbb{C})$ for $1 \leq k \leq N$. This implies that the semi-group \mathcal{F}^N acts functorially on all of the cohomology groups of X^N . \square

In order to prove Proposition 5.1, we will use the universal property of blow ups, following the treatment in [EH, GW]. Let X be any scheme and $Y \subseteq X$ a subscheme. Recall that Y is a Cartier subscheme if it is locally the zero locus of a single regular function.

Universal Property. Let X be a scheme and let Y be a closed subscheme. The blow up of X along Y is a scheme $\tilde{X} \equiv \text{BL}_Y(X)$ and a morphism $\pi : \tilde{X} \rightarrow X$ such that $\pi^{-1}(Y)$ is a Cartier subscheme and which is universal with respect to this property: if $\pi' : \tilde{X}' \rightarrow X$ is any morphism such that $(\pi')^{-1}(Y)$ is a Cartier subscheme, then there is a unique morphism $g : \tilde{X}' \rightarrow \tilde{X}$ such that $\pi' = \pi \circ g$.

Recall that the Cartier subscheme $E = \pi^{-1}(Y)$ is called the exceptional divisor of the blow up and Y is called the center of the blow up.

There is an immediate corollary of the definition, see for example [GW, Prop. 13.91]:

Corollary 5.2. *Let X be a scheme, let Y be a closed subscheme, and let $\pi : \text{BL}_Y(X) \rightarrow X$ be the blow up of X along Y . Let $f : X' \rightarrow X$ be any morphism of schemes. Then, there exists a unique morphism $\text{BL}_Y(f) : \text{BL}_{f^{-1}(Y)}(X') \rightarrow \text{BL}_Y(X)$ making the following diagram commute:*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{BL}_{f^{-1}(Y)}(X') & \xrightarrow{\text{BL}_Y(f)} & \text{BL}_Y(X) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ X' & \xrightarrow{f} & X \end{array}$$

In our context, X will be an projective manifold and $Y \subseteq X$ will be an projective submanifold.

The following is well-known, but we include a proof for completeness.

Lemma 5.3. *Suppose that X is an projective manifold and $Y, Z \subseteq X$ are projective submanifolds that intersect transversally (i.e. $T_x Y + T_x Z = T_x X$ at any $x \in Y \cap Z$). Then,*

- (1) *If $\pi : \text{BL}_Y(X) \rightarrow X$ is the blow up, the proper transform $\tilde{Z} = \overline{\pi^{-1}(Z \setminus Y)}$ and total transform $\pi^{-1}(Z)$ coincide.*
- (2) $\text{BL}_{\tilde{Z}}(\text{BL}_Y(X)) \cong \text{BL}_{\tilde{Y}}(\text{BL}_Z(X))$.

Proof. Since the blow up along a submanifold is a local construction, it suffices to check this statement when $X = \mathbb{C}^N$, $Y = \text{span}(e_1, \dots, e_k)$, and $Z = \text{span}(e_l, \dots, e_N)$, where e_1, \dots, e_N are the standard basis vectors in \mathbb{C}^N . Since Y and Z are assumed transverse, $l \leq k + 1$. We have

$$\text{BL}_Y(X) = \{(x_1, \dots, x_N) \times [m_{k+1} : \dots : m_N] \in \mathbb{C}^N \times \mathbb{P}^{N-k-1} \mid (m_{k+1}, \dots, m_N) \sim (x_{k+1}, \dots, x_N)\},$$

where $\mathbf{u} \sim \mathbf{v}$ means that one vector is a scalar multiple of the other. Notice that

$$\tilde{Z} = \{(0, \dots, 0, x_l, \dots, x_N) \times [m_{k+1} : \dots : m_N] \in \mathbb{C}^N \times \mathbb{P}^{N-k-1} \mid (m_{k+1}, \dots, m_N) \sim (x_{k+1}, \dots, x_N)\},$$

which coincides with $\pi^{-1}(Z)$, proving (1).

If we blow up \tilde{Z} , we find

$$\begin{aligned} \text{BL}_{\tilde{Z}}(\text{BL}_Y(X)) = \\ \{(x_1, \dots, x_N) \times [m_{k+1} : \dots : m_N] \times [n_1 : \dots : n_{l-1}] \in \mathbb{C}^N \times \mathbb{P}^{N-k-1} \times \mathbb{P}^{l-2} \mid \\ (m_{k+1}, \dots, m_N) \sim (x_{k+1}, \dots, x_N) \text{ and } (n_1, \dots, n_{l-1}) \sim (x_1, \dots, x_{l-1})\} \end{aligned}$$

This is clearly isomorphic to the result we would obtain if we had first blown up Z and then blown up \tilde{Y} , proving (2). \square

We will break the proof of Proposition 5.1 into Lemmas 5.6 and 5.8, below. In order to keep notation as simple as possible, we will usually drop the dimension N from the notation, writing $X \equiv X^N$ and $Y \equiv Y^N$.

In order to construct Y , we first recall the construction of X . Recall

$$A_0 = \{[1 : 0 : \dots : 0], [0 : 1 : 0 : \dots : 0], \dots, [0 : \dots : 0 : 1], [1 : 1 : \dots : 1]\} \subseteq \mathbb{P}^N,$$

and that for any $1 \leq i \leq N - 2$, A_i is the set of all $\binom{N+2}{i+1}$ linear subspaces of dimension i spanned by $i + 1$ distinct points from A_0 . The space X was constructed as an iterated blow up

$$X := X_{N-1} \xrightarrow{\alpha_{N-2}} X_{N-2} \xrightarrow{\alpha_{N-3}} \dots \xrightarrow{\alpha_2} X_2 \xrightarrow{\alpha_1} X_1 \xrightarrow{\alpha_0} X_0,$$

where $X_0 = \mathbb{P}^N$, and for each $0 \leq i \leq N - 2$ we have that $\alpha_i : X_{i+1} \rightarrow X_i$ is the blow up of X_i along the proper transform \tilde{A}_i of A_i under $\alpha_0 \circ \dots \circ \alpha_{i-1}$.

The following lemma helps keep track of intersections between centers of the blow ups. It is a restatement of [Ll, Lemma 3.2.3].

Lemma 5.4. *Let L and M be irreducible components of A_i and A_j . Then either:*

- (1) $L \cap M = \emptyset$,
- (2) $L \cap M$ is an irreducible component of A_k for some $k \leq \min(i, j)$, or
- (3) L intersects M transversally.

In particular, if L and M are two distinct centers of the same dimension and (1) or (2) holds, then by the time we blow them up they will be disjoint. Otherwise, (3) holds and (since transversality is preserved under blowing up) the order of blow ups will not matter, by Lemma 5.3.

Let $Y_0 = X_0 = \mathbb{P}^N$ and let $s_0 : Y_0 \rightarrow X_0$ be the squaring map

$$s_0 : [x_1 : \dots : x_{N+1}] \mapsto [x_1^2 : \dots : x_{N+1}^2].$$

For each $0 \leq i \leq N - 2$, let $B_i := s_0^{-1}(A_i)$, and let $C_i := B_i - A_i$. The space Y is constructed by the following sequence of blow ups

$$Y := Y_{N-1} \xrightarrow{\beta_{N-2}} Y_{N-2} \xrightarrow{\beta_{N-3}} \dots \xrightarrow{\beta_2} Y_2 \xrightarrow{\beta_1} Y_1 \xrightarrow{\beta_0} Y_0$$

where $\beta_i : Y_{i+1} \rightarrow Y_i$ is the blow up of Y_i along the proper transform \widehat{B}_i of B_i under $\beta_0 \circ \dots \circ \beta_{i-1}$.

Since Properties (1), (2), and (3) of Lemma 5.4 persist under taking inverse images by s_0 , we also have the following lemma.

Lemma 5.5. *Let L and M be irreducible components of B_i and B_j . Then either:*

- (1) $L \cap M = \emptyset$,

- (2) $L \cap M$ is an irreducible component of B_k for some $k \leq \min(i, j)$, or
- (3) L intersects M transversally.

Lemma 5.6. *There exist maps $\text{pr} : Y \rightarrow X$ and $\tilde{s} : Y \rightarrow X$ making Diagram (6) commute (where $s \circ \text{pr}$ is defined).*

Proof. Consider the diagram

$$(7) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} Y_{N-1} & \xrightarrow{\text{pr}_{N-1}} & X_{N-1} \\ \downarrow \beta_{N-2} & & \downarrow \alpha_{N-2} \\ Y_{N-2} & \xrightarrow{\text{pr}_{N-2}} & X_{N-2} \\ & \vdots & \vdots \\ & \vdots & \vdots \\ Y_1 & \xrightarrow{\text{pr}_1} & X_1 \\ \downarrow \beta_0 & & \downarrow \alpha_0 \\ Y_0 & \xrightarrow{\text{pr}_0 = \text{id}} & X_0 \end{array}$$

We will use induction to prove that for every $0 \leq i \leq N - 1$ there are mappings $\text{pr}_i : Y_i \rightarrow X_i$ making the diagram commute with the following two additional properties:

- (1) for any $i \leq l \leq N - 2$ we have that

$$D_l := \overline{\text{pr}_i^{-1}(\tilde{A}_l)} \setminus \hat{A}_l$$

is a Cartier subscheme of Y_i , where tilde denotes proper transform under $\alpha_{i-1} \circ \cdots \circ \alpha_0$ and hat denotes proper transform under $\beta_{i-1} \circ \cdots \circ \beta_0$, and

- (2) for every $i \leq l, m \leq N - 2$ we have $\hat{A}_l \not\subseteq D_m$.

Remark 5.7. *When $N = 2$ and, therefore $i = 0$, $D_l = \emptyset$. However, D_l is typically nonempty, including the case of $N = 3$ and $i = 1$, where*

$$D_1 = E_{[1:-1:1:1]} \cup E_{[1:1:-1:1]} \cup E_{[1:1:1:-1]}.$$

These are the exceptional divisors obtained when blowing up the points of $B_0 \cap A_1$. In general, D_l can be thought of as the “extra” exceptional divisors lying over A_l produced in the construction of Y_i that were not produced in the construction of X_i .

As the base-case of the induction, notice that $\text{pr}_0 = \text{id} : Y_0 \rightarrow X_0$ trivially satisfies both (1) and (2).

We now suppose that there is a mapping $\text{pr}_i : Y_i \rightarrow X_i$ for which Properties (1) and (2) hold. We’ll use the universal property of blow ups to construct $\text{pr}_{i+1} : Y_{i+1} \rightarrow X_{i+1}$ for which Properties (1) and (2) hold as well.

By Lemmas 5.5 and 5.3 we can perform the blow ups of irreducible components of \hat{B}_i in any order we like; recall that $C_i := B_i \setminus A_i$. Let us first blow up \hat{A}_i and then \hat{C}_i , factoring β_i as a composition $Y_{i+1} \xrightarrow{\mu_i} Z_{i+1} \xrightarrow{\lambda_i} Y_i$, where λ_i is the blow up along \hat{A}_i and μ_i is the further blow up along \hat{C}_i . Let $\eta_i := \text{pr}_i \circ \lambda_i$ and consider the following diagram.

$$(8) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} & Y_{i+1} & \\ & \downarrow \mu_i & \\ \beta_i \curvearrowright & Z_{i+1} & X_{i+1} \\ & \downarrow \lambda_i \quad \searrow \eta_i & \downarrow \alpha_i \\ & Y_i & X_i \\ & \xrightarrow{\text{pr}_i} & \end{array}$$

We will use the universal property to construct $q_{i+1} : Z_{i+1} \rightarrow X_{i+1}$ making the diagram commute. Then, $\text{pr}_{i+1} := q_{i+1} \circ \mu_i$ will be the desired map.

$$(9) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} & Y_{i+1} & \\ & \downarrow \mu_i & \searrow \text{pr}_{i+1} \\ \beta_i \curvearrowright & Z_{i+1} & X_{i+1} \\ & \downarrow \lambda_i \quad \searrow \eta_i & \downarrow \alpha_i \\ & Y_i & X_i \\ & \xrightarrow{\text{pr}_i} & \end{array}$$

By the induction hypothesis, $\text{pr}_i^{-1}(\tilde{A}_i) = \hat{A}_i \cup D_i$, where D_i is an Cartier subscheme. By Property (1) of the induction hypothesis

$$\eta_i^{-1}(\tilde{A}_i) = \lambda_i^{-1}(\text{pr}_i^{-1}(\tilde{A}_i)) = \lambda_i^{-1}(\hat{A}_i \cup D_i) = E_{\hat{A}_i} \cup \lambda_i^{-1}(D_i)$$

is a Cartier subscheme (where $E_{\hat{A}_i}$ denotes the exceptional divisor). By the universal property of blow ups, there exists a map $q_{i+1} : Z_{i+1} \rightarrow X_{i+1}$ making the diagram commute.

We now must check that $\text{pr}_{i+1} := q_{i+1} \circ \mu_i$ satisfies Properties (1) and (2). We'll first show that q_{i+1} satisfies these properties. We will continue to use tildes to denote proper transforms living in X_i . When taking a further proper transform under α_i , we will append '. Similarly, we will continue to use hats to denote proper transforms living in Y_i and we'll append ' to denote a further proper transform under λ_i and '' to denote a further proper transform under μ_i .

Suppose $i+1 \leq l \leq N-2$. Consider the proper transform of \tilde{A}_l under α_i , which is given by $\tilde{A}'_l = \overline{\alpha_i^{-1}(\tilde{A}_l \setminus \tilde{A}_i)}$. Since $q_{i+1} : Z_{i+1} \rightarrow X_{i+1}$ is continuous and closed, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (q_{i+1})^{-1}(\tilde{A}'_l) &= (q_{i+1})^{-1}\left(\overline{\alpha_i^{-1}(\tilde{A}_l \setminus \tilde{A}_i)}\right) = \overline{(\alpha_i \circ q_{i+1})^{-1}(\tilde{A}_l \setminus \tilde{A}_i)} \\ &= \overline{\lambda_i^{-1} \circ \text{pr}_i^{-1}(\tilde{A}_l \setminus \tilde{A}_i)}, \end{aligned}$$

using commutativity of (9). By the induction hypothesis, $\text{pr}_i^{-1}(\tilde{A}_l) = \hat{A}_l \cup D_l$ and $\text{pr}_i^{-1}(\tilde{A}_i) = \hat{A}_i \cup D_i$ with D_i and D_l both Cartier subschemes and $A_l \not\subseteq D_i$. We have

$$\text{pr}_i^{-1}(\tilde{A}_l \setminus \tilde{A}_i) = (\hat{A}_l \cup D_l) \setminus (\hat{A}_i \cup D_i) = (\hat{A}_l \setminus (\hat{A}_i \cup D_i)) \cup ((D_l \setminus D_i) \setminus \hat{A}_i).$$

Since $\hat{A}_l \not\subseteq D_i$, we have that

$$\overline{\lambda_i^{-1}(\hat{A}_l \setminus (\hat{A}_i \cup D_i))} = \hat{A}'_l.$$

Meanwhile, since D_l and D_i are Cartier subschemes of Y_i

$$H_l := \overline{\lambda_i^{-1}((D_l \setminus D_i) \setminus \hat{A}_i)} \subseteq Z_{i+1}$$

is a (potentially empty) Cartier subscheme. Thus,

$$(q_{i+1})^{-1}(\tilde{A}'_l) = \overline{\lambda_{i+1}^{-1} \circ \text{pr}_i^{-1}(\tilde{A}_l \setminus \tilde{A}_{i+1})} = \hat{A}'_l \cup H_l.$$

By the induction hypothesis, we have that for all $i+1 \leq l, m \leq N-2$, $\hat{A}_l \not\subseteq D_m$ so that $\hat{A}_l \cap D_m$ is a proper subvariety of \hat{A}_l . Since \hat{A}_i is of lower dimension than \hat{A}_l , there is a point $y \in \hat{A}_l \setminus (\hat{A}_i \cup D_m)$. Since λ_i is surjective, any element of $\lambda_i^{-1}(y)$ gives a point of $\hat{A}'_l \setminus H_m$. Thus, $\hat{A}'_l \not\subseteq H_m$.

We will now pull everything back via the total transform under μ_i and check that Properties (1) and (2) hold for $\text{pr}_{i+1} := q_{i+1} \circ \mu_i$. Consider any $i+1 \leq l \leq N-2$. It follows from Lemma 5.4 that for any irreducible components L of \widehat{C}'_i and M of \widehat{A}'_l we have either $L \cap M = \emptyset$, L and M are transverse, or $L \subseteq M$. In the first case, the total transform of M under the blow up of L coincides with the proper transform M'' . This also holds in the second case, by Lemma 5.3. In the last case, the total transform of M is $M' \cup E_L$, where E_L is the exceptional divisor over L . Therefore,

$$\mu_{i+1}^{-1}(\widehat{A}'_l) = \widehat{A}''_l \cup E_l,$$

where E_l is the union of exceptional divisors over the components of \widehat{C}'_i lying entirely within \widehat{A}'_l . Meanwhile

$$K_l := \mu_i^{-1}(H_l)$$

is a Cartier subscheme. Thus,

$$\text{pr}_{i+1}^{-1}(\widetilde{A}'_l) = \mu_i^{-1}(\widehat{A}'_l \cup H_l) = \widehat{A}''_l \cup E_l \cup K_l$$

where $E_l \cup K_l$ is a Cartier subscheme. In particular, Property (1) holds.

To see that Property (2) holds, notice that for any $i+1 \leq l, m \leq N-2$ we have $\widehat{A}'_l \not\subseteq E_{\widehat{C}'_i}$ since \widehat{A}'_l is of greater dimension than \widehat{C}'_i . Taking a point $y \in \widehat{A}'_l \setminus (\widehat{C}'_i \cup H_m)$, we see that $\mu_i^{-1}(y)$ is a nonempty subset of $\widehat{A}''_l \setminus (E_m \cup K_m)$. Thus, $\widehat{A}'_l \not\subseteq (E_m \cup K_m)$ establishing that Property (2) holds.

By induction, we conclude that for each $0 \leq i \leq N-1$ there exist mappings $\text{pr}_i : Y_i \rightarrow X_i$ making Diagram 7 commute.

We'll now construct the map $\widetilde{s} : Y \rightarrow X$. Let $s_0 : \mathbb{P}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^N$ be the squaring map. Since $B_0 = s_0^{-1}(A_0)$, Corollary 5.2 gives that $s_0 \equiv \widetilde{s}_0 : Y_0 \rightarrow X_0$ lifts to a holomorphic map $\widetilde{s}_1 : Y_1 \rightarrow X_1$:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} Y_1 & \xrightarrow{\widetilde{s}_1} & X_1 \\ \downarrow \beta_0 & & \downarrow \alpha_0 \\ Y_0 & \xrightarrow{\widetilde{s}_0} & X_0 \end{array}$$

Notice that $\widehat{B}_1 = (\widetilde{s}_1)^{-1}(\widetilde{A}_1)$, so that we can again apply Corollary 5.2 to lift \widetilde{s}_1 to a holomorphic map $\widetilde{s}_2 : Y_2 \rightarrow X_2$ making the following diagram commute:

$$(10) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} Y_2 & \xrightarrow{\widetilde{s}_2} & X_2 \\ \downarrow \beta_1 & & \downarrow \alpha_1 \\ Y_1 & \xrightarrow{\widetilde{s}_1} & X_1 \\ \downarrow \beta_0 & & \downarrow \alpha_0 \\ Y_0 & \xrightarrow{\widetilde{s}_0} & X_0 \end{array}$$

Continuing in this way, we obtain holomorphic map $\widetilde{s}_i : Y_i \rightarrow X_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq N-1$ making the following diagram commute:

$\tilde{s}^{-1}(x)$ lie. Thus, for any such z and w it suffices show that

$$(14) \quad \tilde{s}|_{\mathcal{B}^{-1}(w)} : \mathcal{B}^{-1}(w) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}^{-1}(z)$$

has finite fibers.

If $\mathcal{A}(x)$ is not a critical value of \tilde{s}_0 , then for any $y \in \tilde{s}^{-1}(x)$ there is a neighborhood U of $\mathcal{B}(y)$ so that $\tilde{s}_0 : U \rightarrow \tilde{s}_0(U) =: V$ is a biholomorphism. Iteratively applying Corollary 5.2 to \tilde{s}_0 and its inverse gives that $\tilde{s} : \mathcal{B}^{-1}(U) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}^{-1}(V)$ is a biholomorphism.

If $\mathcal{A}(x)$ is a critical value, the proof is more subtle. We will use the recursive structure of X^N and Y^N in order to express these fibers as products of lower dimensional X^i and Y^i , which will allow us to express (14) in terms of $\tilde{s}^i : Y^i \rightarrow X^i$ and $\text{id}^i : X^i \rightarrow X^i$, for $0 \leq i < N$, where id^i is the identity mapping.

Notice that the construction of $\tilde{s} : Y \rightarrow X$ commutes with permutations

$$\sigma : [z_1 : z_2 : \cdots : z_{N+1}] \mapsto [z_{\sigma(1)} : z_{\sigma(2)} : \cdots : z_{\sigma(N+1)}]$$

of the coordinates on \mathbb{P}^N . In particular, we can suppose without loss of generality that $z = \mathcal{A}(x) = [0 : \cdots : 0 : z_{l+1} : \cdots : z_{N+1}]$ with $z_i \neq 0$ for $l+1 \leq i \leq N+1$ and that the remaining z_i are grouped so that repeated values come in blocks. (Note that one can have $l = 0$.) Commutative Diagram (13) implies that $w = [0 : \cdots : 0 : w_{l+1} : \cdots : w_{N+1}]$, with $w_i \neq 0$ for $l+1 \leq i \leq N+1$.

We need a more precise description of centers of the blow ups A_l^N . Let

$$q_1 = [1 : 0 : \cdots : 0], \dots, q_{N+1} = [0 : \cdots : 0 : 1], q_{N+2} = [1 : 1 : \cdots : 1] \in \mathbb{P}^N$$

and for any $\{i_1, \dots, i_{m+1}\} \subseteq \{1, \dots, N+2\}$, let

$$\Pi_{i_1, \dots, i_{m+1}} := \text{span}(q_{i_1}, \dots, q_{i_{m+1}}) \subseteq \mathbb{P}^N.$$

Note that

$$A_m = \bigcup_{\{i_1, \dots, i_{m+1}\}} \Pi_{i_1, \dots, i_{m+1}}$$

where the union is taken over all subsets $\{i_1, \dots, i_{m+1}\} \subseteq \{1, \dots, N+2\}$.

We will need a more precise description of which components of z are equal. Let's suppose that

$$\begin{aligned} z_{l+1} &= z_{l+2} = \cdots = z_{l+j_1}, \\ z_{l+j_1+1} &= z_{l+j_1+2} = \cdots = z_{l+j_1+j_2}, \\ &\vdots \\ z_{l+j_1+\cdots+j_{a-1}+1} &= z_{l+j_1+\cdots+j_{a-1}+2} = \cdots = z_{l+j_1+\cdots+j_a}, \end{aligned}$$

with no equality between any pair of lines. In other words, the first j_1 nonzero entries are equal, the next j_2 nonzero entries are equal and distinct from the first j_1 nonzero entries, etc... We assume that each $j_1, \dots, j_a \geq 2$ and that all values appearing in the remaining components of z occur only once.

We'll show that

$$(15) \quad \mathcal{A}^{-1}(z) \cong X^{l-1} \times X^{j_1-2} \times \cdots \times X^{j_a-2},$$

$$(16) \quad \mathcal{B}^{-1}(w) \cong Y^{l-1} \times X^{j_1-2} \times \cdots \times X^{j_a-2},$$

and that (in the coordinates given by these isomorphisms)

$$(17) \quad \tilde{s}|_{\mathcal{B}^{-1}(w)} = \tilde{s}^{l-1} \times \text{id}^{j_1-2} \times \cdots \times \text{id}^{j_a-2},$$

where $\text{id}^i : X^i \rightarrow X^i$ denotes the identity mapping. By the induction hypothesis, (17) will imply that $\tilde{s}|_{\mathcal{B}^{-1}(w)} : \mathcal{B}^{-1}(w) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}^{-1}(z)$ has finite fibers and thus complete the proof.

We'll first check that (15) holds. Let $V \subseteq \mathbb{P}^N$ be a neighborhood of z chosen small enough so that it intersects $\Pi_{i_1, \dots, i_{m+1}}$ if and only if $z \in \Pi_{i_1, \dots, i_{m+1}}$. In order to study $\mathcal{A}^{-1}(z)$ we'll work with $\mathcal{A}^{-1}(V)$.

Associated to the particular points $z \in \mathbb{P}^N$ above, we have the following sets. Let $S = \{1, \dots, N+2\}$, and let

$$\begin{aligned} S^0 &:= S \setminus \{1, \dots, l, N+2\}, \\ S^1 &:= S \setminus \{l+1, \dots, l+j_1\}, \\ S^2 &:= S \setminus \{l+j_1+1, \dots, l+j_1+j_2\}, \\ &\vdots \\ S^a &:= S \setminus \{l+j_1+\dots+j_{a-1}, \dots, l+j_1+\dots+j_a\}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $z \in \Pi_{i_1, \dots, i_{m+1}}$ if and only if $S^b \subseteq \{i_1, \dots, i_{m+1}\}$ for some $0 \leq b \leq a$. We will call each of the centers Π_{S^b} for $0 \leq b \leq a$ *primitive center* since any center of blow up through z will contain at least one of them. Since $S_b \cup S_c = S$ for any $b \neq c$, any center through z that is blown-up contains a unique primitive center. Thus, any further center that is blown up is of the form

$$\Pi_T \quad \text{where} \quad T = S^b \cup \{i_0, \dots, i_m\}.$$

We will call Π_T *subordinate* to Π_{S^b} .

Since $S_b \cup S_c = S$ for $b \neq c$, it also follows that any center subordinate to Π_{S^b} is transverse to any center subordinate to Π_{S^c} . Since blow ups preserve transversality, this will also hold for the proper transforms. Therefore, by Lemma 5.3, we can exchange the order of blow up between two centers subordinate to distinct primitive centers and still get the same result for $\mathcal{A}^{-1}(V)$. In particular, we can first blow up each of the primitive centers. After doing so, we can blow up all of the (proper transforms of) centers subordinate to Π_{S^0} , by order of increasing dimension. We can then blow up all (proper transforms of) centers subordinate to Π_{S^1} by order of increasing dimension, etc...

Let $[v_1 : v_2 : \dots : v_{N+1}]$ be homogeneous coordinates on \mathbb{P}^N . Blowing up Π_{S^0} produces

$$\{[v_1 : v_2 : \dots : v_{N+1}] \times [m_1^0 : \dots : m_l^0] \in V \times \mathbb{P}^l : (v_1, \dots, v_l) \sim (m_1^0, \dots, m_l^0)\},$$

where \sim indicates that one vector is a multiple of another.

Blowing-up each of the remaining primitive centers $\Pi_{S^1}, \dots, \Pi_{S^a}$ produces the subset of $V \times \mathbb{P}^{l-1} \times \mathbb{P}^{j_1-2} \times \dots \times \mathbb{P}^{j_a-2}$ given in the coordinates

$$\{[v_1 : \dots : v_{N+1}] \times [m_1^0 : \dots : m_l^0] \times [m_1^1 : \dots : m_{j_1-1}^1] \times \dots \times [m_1^a : \dots : m_{j_a-1}^a]\}$$

by the conditions

$$\begin{aligned} (m_1^0, \dots, m_l^0) &\sim (v_1, \dots, v_l), \\ (m_1^1, \dots, m_{j_1-1}^1) &\sim (v_{l+2} - v_{l+1}, v_{l+3} - v_{l+1}, \dots, v_{l+j_1} - v_{l+1}) \\ &\vdots \\ (m_1^a, \dots, m_{j_a-1}^a) &\sim (v_{l+j_1+\dots+j_{a-1}+2} - v_{l+j_1+\dots+j_{a-1}+1}, \dots, v_{l+j_1+\dots+j_a} - v_{l+j_1+\dots+j_{a-1}+1}). \end{aligned}$$

Let us denote this blow up at all of the primitive centers by $\nu : V^\# \rightarrow V$. The fiber over z is $\nu^{-1}(z) \cong \mathbb{P}^{l-1} \times \mathbb{P}^{j_1-2} \times \dots \times \mathbb{P}^{j_a-2}$. We'll now check that blow ups along the proper transforms of the centers subordinate to $\Pi_{S^0}, \dots, \Pi_{S^a}$ result in suitable blow ups of $\nu^{-1}(z)$ in order to transform it into $X^{l-1} \times X^{j_1-2} \times \dots \times X^{j_a-2}$.

Each of the centers subordinate to Π_{S^0} will be of the form Π_T where $T = S^0 \cup \{i_1, \dots, i_m\}$, for $\{i_1, \dots, i_m\} \subseteq \{1, \dots, l, N+2\}$. There are precisely $l+1$ centers of one dimension greater than the dimension of Π_{S^0} ; they are

$$\Pi_{S^0 \cup \{1\}}, \dots, \Pi_{S^0 \cup \{l\}}, \Pi_{S^0 \cup \{N+2\}}.$$

One can check that the proper transforms of these intersect $\mathbb{P}^{l-1} \times \mathbb{P}^{j_1-2} \times \dots \times \mathbb{P}^{j_a-2}$ at

$$\begin{aligned} (18) \quad &\{[1 : 0 : \dots : 0]\} \times \mathbb{P}^{j_1-2} \times \dots \times \mathbb{P}^{j_a-2}, \\ &\vdots \\ &\{[0 : 0 : \dots : 1]\} \times \mathbb{P}^{j_1-2} \times \dots \times \mathbb{P}^{j_a-2}, \text{ and} \\ &\{[1 : 1 : \dots : 1]\} \times \mathbb{P}^{j_1-2} \times \dots \times \mathbb{P}^{j_a-2}, \end{aligned}$$

respectively. In other words, the centers of dimension one greater than Π_{S^0} that are subordinate to Π_{S^0} intersect $\nu^{-1}(z)$ in $A_0^{l-1} \times \mathbb{P}^{j_1-2} \times \dots \times \mathbb{P}^{j_a-2}$.

If we let

$$\hat{q}_1 = [1 : 0 : \dots : 0], \dots, \hat{q}_l = [0 : 0 : \dots : 1], \hat{q}_{l+1} = [1 : 1 : \dots : 1] \in \mathbb{P}^{l-1},$$

then for any $\{i_1, \dots, i_m\} \subseteq \{1, \dots, l, N+2\}$, one can check that the proper transform of

$$\Pi_{S^0 \cup \{i_1, \dots, i_m\}}$$

intersects $\nu^{-1}(z)$ in $\hat{\Pi}_{i_0, \dots, i_m} \times \mathbb{P}^{j_1-2} \times \dots \times \mathbb{P}^{j_a-2}$, where

$$\hat{\Pi}_{i_1, \dots, i_m} = \text{span}\{\hat{q}_{i_1}, \dots, \hat{q}_{i_m}\} \subseteq \mathbb{P}^{l-1}.$$

In particular, for any $1 \leq b \leq l-1$, the centers of dimension b greater than the dimension of Π_{S^0} that are subordinate to Π_{S^0} intersect $\nu^{-1}(z)$ in $A_{b-1}^{l-1} \times \mathbb{P}^{j_1-2} \times \dots \times \mathbb{P}^{j_a-2}$.

Therefore, blowing up all of the centers subordinate to Π_{S^0} in order of increasing dimension results in a sequential blow up of the first factor \mathbb{P}^{l-1} transforming it into X^l . It leaves each of the remaining factors unchanged.

Matters are almost the same for the remaining factors. Let us illustrate the only difference by discussing the second factor \mathbb{P}^{j_1-2} . Each of the centers subordinate to Π_{S^1} will be of the form

$$\Pi_{S^1 \cup \{i_1, \dots, i_m\}} \quad \text{where} \quad \{i_1, \dots, i_m\} \subseteq \{l+1, \dots, l+j_1\}.$$

Thus there are j_1 centers of dimension one greater:

$$\Pi_{S^1 \cup \{l+1\}}, \dots, \Pi_{S^1 \cup \{l+j_1\}}.$$

One can check that their proper transforms intersect $\nu^{-1}(z)$ in:

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}^{l-1} \times \{[1 : 1 : \dots : 1]\} \times \mathbb{P}^{j_2-2} \times \dots \times \mathbb{P}^{j_a-2}, \\ & \mathbb{P}^{l-1} \times \{[1 : 0 : \dots : 0]\} \times \mathbb{P}^{j_2-2} \times \dots \times \mathbb{P}^{j_a-2}, \text{ and} \\ & \quad \vdots \\ & \mathbb{P}^{l-1} \times \{[0 : 0 : \dots : 1]\} \times \mathbb{P}^{j_2-2} \times \dots \times \mathbb{P}^{j_a-2}, \end{aligned}$$

respectively. Using similar reasoning to that from the analysis of the first factor, we can see that the centers of dimension b greater than Π_{S^1} that are subordinate to Π_{S^1} will intersect $\nu^{-1}(z)$ in $\mathbb{P}^{l-1} \times A_{b-1}^{j_1-2} \times \mathbb{P}^{j_1-2} \times \dots \times \mathbb{P}^{j_a-2}$. In particular, blowing up all centers subordinate to Π_{S^1} in order of dimension will result in blowing up the second factor from \mathbb{P}^{j_1-2} to X^{j_1-2} .

We conclude that (15) holds.

We will now prove (16) and (17). Let U be the component of $\tilde{s}_0^{-1}(V)$ containing w . We will study $\mathcal{B}^{-1}(U)$ in order to understand $\mathcal{B}^{-1}(w)$ and $\tilde{s}|_{\mathcal{B}^{-1}(w)}$.

Each of the centers B_i that are blown up in the construction of Y are obtained as preimages of the centers A_i under \tilde{s}_0 . In particular, the only centers that will be blown up to construct $\mathcal{B}^{-1}(U)$ are the preimages of the centers subordinate to the primitive centers $\Pi_{S^0}, \dots, \Pi_{S^a}$.

Each of the points q_1, \dots, q_{N+1} is totally invariant under \tilde{s}_0 so that there are no additional preimages of them. Meanwhile, q_{N+2} has 2^N preimages, consisting of all points of the form $[1 : \pm 1 : \pm 1 : \dots : \pm 1]$. Each of the centers from B_i is the span of $i+1$ of these $N+1+2^N$ points.

Each primitive center $\Pi_{S^0}, \dots, \Pi_{S^a}$ has a unique preimage under \tilde{s}_0 that contains the point w (as can be explicitly verified). Let $\Lambda^0, \dots, \Lambda^a$ be the unique preimages of the primitive centers that contain w . Each of the further centers that is blown up will be subordinate to one of these primitive centers and those subordinate to distinct primitive centers intersect transversally. In particular, we can blow up to form $\mathcal{B}^{-1}(U)$ in precisely the same order as we did to form $\mathcal{A}^{-1}(V)$.

Let us first blow up the primitive centers, replacing U by the subset of $U \times \mathbb{P}^{l-1} \times \mathbb{P}^{j_1-2} \times \dots \times \mathbb{P}^{j_a-2}$ given in the coordinates

$$\{[u_1 : u_2 : \dots : u_{N+1}] \times [n_1^0 : \dots : n_l^0] \times [n_1^1 : \dots : n_{j_1-1}^1] \times \dots \times [n_1^a : \dots : n_{j_a-1}^a]\}$$

by

$$\begin{aligned}
(n_1^0, \dots, n_l^0) &\sim (u_1, \dots, u_l), \\
(n_1^1, \dots, n_{j_1-1}^1) &\sim (u_{l+2} \pm u_{l+1}, u_{l+3} \mp u_{l+1}, \dots, u_{l+j_1} \mp u_{l+1}) \\
&\vdots \\
(n_1^j, \dots, n_{j_a-1}^j) &\sim (u_{l+j_1+\dots+j_{a-1}+2} \mp u_{l+j_1+\dots+j_{a-1}+1}, \dots, u_{l+j_1+\dots+j_a} \mp u_{l+j_1+\dots+j_{a-1}+1}),
\end{aligned}$$

Let us denote the blow up of U along all of the primitive centers $\Lambda^0, \dots, \Lambda^a$ by $\mu : U^\# \rightarrow U$. In particular, the fiber over w is $\mu^{-1}(w) \cong \mathbb{P}^{l-1} \times \mathbb{P}^{j_1-2} \times \dots \times \mathbb{P}^{j_a-2}$.

Notice that $\tilde{s}_0 : U \rightarrow V$ is given by

$$[v_1 : \dots : v_{N+1}] = \tilde{s}_0([u_1 : \dots : u_{N+1}]) = [u_1^2 : \dots : u_{N+1}^2].$$

By Corollary 5.2, this lifts to a holomorphic mapping $s^\# : U^\# \rightarrow V^\#$ whose restriction $s^\#|_{\mu^{-1}(w)} : \mu^{-1}(w) \rightarrow \nu^{-1}(z)$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
s^\#|_{\mu^{-1}(w)} &\left([n_1^0 : \dots : n_l^0], [n_1^1 : \dots : n_{j_1-1}^1], \dots, [n_1^k : \dots : n_{j_a-1}^k] \right) \\
&= \left([(n_1^0)^2 : \dots : (n_l^0)^2], [n_1^1 : \dots : n_{j_1-1}^1], \dots, [n_1^k : \dots : n_{j_a-1}^k] \right).
\end{aligned}$$

In other words, the restriction $s^\#|_{\mu^{-1}(w)} : \mu^{-1}(w) \rightarrow \nu^{-1}(z)$ is the squaring map on the first factor and the identity on each of the remaining factors.

We now blow up all of the centers that are subordinate to Λ^0 . They are preimages under \tilde{s}_0 of the centers subordinate to Π_{S^0} . In particular, the places where their proper transforms intersect $\mu^{-1}(w)$ are obtained as the preimages under $s^\#$ of the places where the centers subordinate to Π_{S^0} intersect $\nu^{-1}(z)$. Thus, for all $0 \leq i \leq l-3$, we have

$$B_i^{l-1} \times \mathbb{P}^{j_1-2} \times \dots \times \mathbb{P}^{j_a-2} = (s^\#)^{-1}(A_i^{l-1} \times \mathbb{P}^{j_1-2} \times \dots \times \mathbb{P}^{j_a-2}).$$

Blowing these centers up, in order of dimension modifies $\mu^{-1}(w)$ to become

$$Y^{l-1} \times \mathbb{P}^{j_1-2} \times \dots \times \mathbb{P}^{j_a-2}$$

and the map $s^\#$ lifts to a holomorphic map

$$\tilde{s}^\# : Y^{l-1} \times \mathbb{P}^{j_1-2} \times \dots \times \mathbb{P}^{j_a-2} \rightarrow X^{l-1} \times \mathbb{P}^{j_1-2} \times \dots \times \mathbb{P}^{j_a-2}$$

whose action on the first term in the Cartesian product is $\tilde{s}^{l-1} : Y^{l-1} \rightarrow X^{l-1}$ (by the uniqueness in Corollary 5.2). The action on each of the remaining terms of the product is the identity.

We now blow up the centers that are subordinate to Λ^1 . They are preimages under \tilde{s}_0 of the centers subordinate to Π_{S^1} . In particular, the places where their proper transforms intersect the fiber over w are obtained as the preimages under $\tilde{s}^\#$ of the places where the centers subordinate to Π_{S^1} intersect the fiber over z . Thus, for all $0 \leq i \leq j_1-3$, we have

$$Y^{l-1} \times A_i^{j_1-2} \times \dots \times \mathbb{P}^{j_a-2} = (\tilde{s}^\#)^{-1}(X^{l-1} \times A_i^{j_1-2} \times \dots \times \mathbb{P}^{j_a-2}).$$

Blowing these centers up in order of dimension modifies the fiber over w to become

$$Y^{l-1} \times X^{j_1-2} \times \mathbb{P}^{j_2-2} \times \dots \times \mathbb{P}^{j_a-2}$$

and the map $\tilde{s}^\#$ lifts to a holomorphic map

$$\widehat{s}^\# : Y^{l-1} \times X^{j_1-2} \times \mathbb{P}^{j_2-2} \times \dots \times \mathbb{P}^{j_a-2} \rightarrow X^{l-1} \times X^{j_1-2} \times \mathbb{P}^{j_2-2} \times \dots \times \mathbb{P}^{j_a-2}$$

whose action on first term in the Cartesian product remains as $\widehat{s}^{l-1} : Y^{l-1} \rightarrow X^{l-1}$ and whose action on each of the remaining terms is the identity.

Continuing this way through each of the factors in the Cartesian product, we conclude that (16) and (17) hold. In particular, $\widehat{s}|_{\mathcal{B}^{-1}(w)}$ has finite fibers.

We ultimately conclude that $\widehat{s} : Y \rightarrow X$ has finite fibers.

□(Lemma 5.8)

□(Proposition 5.1)

$N \setminus k$	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
0	1						
1	1	1					
2	1	5	1				
3	1	25	105	1			
4	1	56	490	1260	1		
5	1	119	1918	9450	17325	1	
6	1	246	6825	63193	197774	310677	1

TABLE 2. Number of strata of codimension k in X^N .

6. COMPUTING DYNAMICAL DEGREES

We now focus our attention on computing the dynamical degrees $\lambda_k(f_\rho)$, $1 \leq k \leq N$, for all of the generators f_ρ of the semi-group \mathcal{F}^N . The following three facts simplify our task.

- (1) Corollary 1.2 establishes that for all $n \geq 3$, for all $\rho \in S_n$, the map $f_\rho : X^N \dashrightarrow X^N$ is algebraically stable. As a consequence,

$$\lambda_k(f_\rho) = \text{the spectral radius of } (f_\rho)^* : H^{k,k}(X^N; \mathbb{C}) \rightarrow H^{k,k}(X^N; \mathbb{C}).$$

- (2) By Proposition 2.1, since $\tilde{s} : Y^N \rightarrow X^N$ has finite fibers, $f^* = (g \circ s)^* = s^* \circ g^*$ on all $H^{k,k}(X^N; \mathbb{C})$.
(3) Keel's theorem 3.4 presents the cohomology ring $H^*(X^N; \mathbb{C})$ as quotient of the ring generated by all boundary strata by combinatorial relations.

Point (1) reduces the computation of $\lambda_k(f_\rho)$ to the nondynamical problem of computing

$$(f_\rho)^* : H^{k,k}(X^N; \mathbb{C}) \rightarrow H^{k,k}(X^N; \mathbb{C}).$$

Point (2) replaces the computation of $(f_\rho)^*$ by the computation of $(g_\rho)^* : H^{k,k}(X^N; \mathbb{C}) \rightarrow H^{k,k}(X^N; \mathbb{C})$ and $s^* : H^{k,k}(X^N; \mathbb{C}) \rightarrow H^{k,k}(X^N; \mathbb{C})$. This factorization splits the computation into two natural parts: the combinatorial difficulties arising from the permutation $\rho \in S_n$ are confined to the automorphism $g_\rho : X^N \rightarrow X^N$, and the difficulties arising from indeterminacy of f_ρ are confined to a *single map* $s : X^N \dashrightarrow X^N$.

One major complication is that the number of boundary strata, and the dimensions of the cohomology groups both grow quickly with N as displayed in Table 2 (above) and Table 1 (in Section 1).

6.1. Pullback under the automorphism $g_\rho : X^N \rightarrow X^N$.

Proposition 6.1. For $[D^{S_1} \cap \dots \cap D^{S_k}] \in H^{k,k}(X^N; \mathbb{C})$,

$$(g_\rho)^* ([D^{S_1} \cap \dots \cap D^{S_k}]) = [D^{\rho^{-1}(S_1)} \cap \dots \cap D^{\rho^{-1}(S_k)}].$$

Proof. It follows from Proposition 3.11 and the fact that g_ρ is unramified that $(g_\rho)^*(D^S) = D^{\rho^{-1}(S)}$, as divisors. Thus, on the level of cohomology classes we have $[g_\rho^* D^S] = [D^{\rho^{-1}(S)}]$.

It then follows easily for the codimension k stratum by Corollary 3.5 and taking cup products:

$$\begin{aligned} g_\rho^* ([D^{S_1} \cap \dots \cap D^{S_k}]) &= (g_\rho)^* ([D^{S_1}] \smile \dots \smile [D^{S_k}]) = g_\rho^* ([D^{S_1}]) \smile \dots \smile g_\rho^* ([D^{S_k}]) \\ &= [D^{\rho^{-1}(S_1)}] \smile \dots \smile [D^{\rho^{-1}(S_k)}] = [D^{\rho^{-1}(S_1)} \cap \dots \cap D^{\rho^{-1}(S_k)}]. \end{aligned}$$

Note that we are using that g_ρ is continuous so that it preserves cup products. \square

We will construct an explicit basis \mathbf{B}_k^N of $H^{k,k}(X^N; \mathbb{C})$ consisting of fundamental cohomology classes of certain codimension k boundary strata. By Proposition 6.1, g_ρ^* induces a permutation on the set of all codimension k boundary strata and Keel's Theorem 3.4 can be used to express $g_\rho^*(\mathbf{B}_k^N)$ in terms of \mathbf{B}_k^N . The stratified structure of X^N coupled with the resulting beautifully simple combinatorics of Keel's Theorem make it possible to directly implement these computations on the computer for all $\rho \in S_n$. (Our computations were done in Sage [Sa].)

6.2. Pullback action on $H^{1,1}(X^N; \mathbb{C})$ under the rational map $s : X^N \dashrightarrow X^N$. It will be very helpful for us that $H^{1,1}(X^N; \mathbb{C})$ is spanned by the fundamental cohomology classes of the boundary divisors D^S . This follows immediately from Keel's Theorem 3.4. However, in order to construct an explicit basis, we recall that for any iterated blow up Z of projective space, a basis of $H^{1,1}(Z; \mathbb{C})$ is the fundamental cohomology class of the proper transform of any hyperplane, together with the fundamental cohomology classes of each of the exceptional divisors [GH, p. 605].

Each of the centers of blow up used in the construction of X^N is (the proper transform of) a linear space of the form

$$0 = z_{i_1} = \cdots = z_{i_j} \quad \text{or} \quad z_{i_1} = \cdots = z_{i_j}.$$

In the isomorphism given by Kapranov's Theorem (Theorem 3.6), the exceptional divisors over these centers correspond to the boundary divisors D^S , where

$$S = \{p_1, p_{i_1+2}, \dots, p_{i_j+2}\} \quad \text{or} \quad S = \{p_{i_1+2}, \dots, p_{i_j+2}\},$$

respectively. Thus, one can take the following as an ordered basis for $H^{1,1}(X^N; \mathbb{C})$

$$\mathbf{B}_1^N = \{[D^{S_1}], \dots, [D^{S_\ell}]\}$$

where $S_1 = \{p_1, p_3\}$ corresponds to the proper transform of the hyperplane $z_1 = 0$ and S_2, \dots, S_ℓ are all subsets of P with $2 < |S_i| \leq n - 2$ and $p_2 \notin S_i$. In particular, $\ell = 2^{n-1} - \binom{n}{2} - 1$. We order the S_i so that the $2^{n-2} - n + 1$ containing p_1 are listed before those not containing p_1 .

Let us begin by pulling back $[D^S]$ under \tilde{s}^* for any boundary divisor D^S , independent of whether it appears in \mathbf{B}_1^N . If $|S \cap \{p_1, p_2\}| = 1$, then by replacing S with S^C , if necessary, we have $S = \{p_1, p_{i_1}, \dots, p_{i_j}\}$ with $i_q \geq 3$ for $1 \leq q \leq j$. Let \mathcal{D}^S denote the divisor in Y^N obtained as the proper transform of the exceptional divisor obtained by blowing up (the proper transform of) $0 = z_{i_1} = \cdots = z_{i_j}$.

Lemma 6.2. *If $|S \cap \{p_1, p_2\}| = 1$, then $\tilde{s}^*([D^S]) = 2[\mathcal{D}^S]$.*

Proof. Notice that the whole construction of $\tilde{s} : Y^N \rightarrow X^N$ from $s_0 : \mathbb{P}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^N$ that is outlined in Diagram (11) commutes with any permutation of the underlying homogeneous coordinates of \mathbb{P}^N . Therefore, without loss of generality, we can suppose that $S = \{1, 3, 4, \dots, j+2\}$ with D^S corresponding to the proper transform of $0 = z_1 = \cdots = z_j$.

We will use the notation (D^S) when we consider D^S as a locally principal divisor with multiplicity. It will be somewhat easier to pull back the divisor (D^S) instead of pulling back the cohomology class $[D^S]$. This will be sufficient for our purposes, because of the following commutative diagram, which is adapted to our setting from [GH, p. 139]:

$$(19) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} H^1(X^N, \mathcal{O}^*) & \xrightarrow{\tilde{s}^*} & H^1(Y^N, \mathcal{O}^*) \\ \downarrow c & & \downarrow c \\ H^{1,1}(X^N; \mathbb{C}) & \xrightarrow{\tilde{s}^*} & H^{1,1}(Y^N; \mathbb{C}) \end{array}$$

The cohomology groups in the first row describe the linear equivalence classes of locally principal divisors and the vertical arrows denote the Chern class.

Throughout our calculations, we will appeal to $s_0 : \mathbb{P}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^N$ which is given by

$$[w_1 : \cdots : w_{N+1}] = [z_1^2 : \cdots : z_{N+1}^2] = s_0([z_1 : \cdots : z_{N+1}]).$$

The case $j = 1$ is special since $D^S \equiv D^{\{p_1, p_3\}}$ corresponds to the proper transform of $w_1 = 0$ under all of the blow ups used to construct X^N and \mathcal{D}^S corresponds to the proper transform of $z_1 = 0$ under all of the blow ups used to construct Y^N . Moreover, it's clear from the commutative diagram (11) that $\tilde{s}^{-1}(D^S) = \mathcal{D}^S$. It remains to keep track of multiplicities. The affine coordinates $v_1 = \frac{w_1}{w_{N+1}}, \dots, v_N = \frac{w_N}{w_{N+1}}$ serve as local coordinates on X^N in a neighborhood of generic points of D^S and the affine coordinates $u_1 = \frac{z_1}{z_{N+1}}, \dots, u_N = \frac{z_N}{z_{N+1}}$ serve as local coordinates on Y^N in a neighborhood of generic points of \mathcal{D}^S . (Here, "generic" means points which are not on any of the exceptional divisors). Since (D^S) is given locally at generic points by $v_1 = 0$ and $\tilde{s}(u_1, \dots, u_N) = (u_1^2, \dots, u_N^2)$ we have that $\tilde{s}^*((D^S))$ is given locally at generic points by $u_1^2 = 0$. This gives $\tilde{s}^*((D^S)) = 2(\mathcal{D}^S)$ and hence $\tilde{s}^*([D^S]) = 2[\mathcal{D}^S]$, by Diagram (19).

The case $j > 1$ will be similar, except that we need to describe generic points of D^S and \mathcal{D}^S using blow up coordinates. Let us again use the affine coordinates (v_1, \dots, v_N) on $\mathbb{P}^N \setminus \{w_{N+1} = 0\}$ and (u_1, \dots, u_N) on $\mathbb{P}^N \setminus \{z_{N+1} = 0\}$. At points of the proper transform of $0 = v_1 = \dots = v_j$ not lying on any exceptional divisors resulting from blow ups of lower dimensional centers, the blow up of this center is given by

$$\{(v_1, \dots, v_N) \times [n_1 : \dots : n_j] \in \mathbb{C}^N \times \mathbb{P}^{j-1} \mid (v_1, \dots, v_j) \sim (n_1, \dots, n_j)\}.$$

Local coordinates on X^N in a neighborhood of generic points of D^S are given by $\left(\frac{n_1}{n_j}, \dots, \frac{n_{j-1}}{n_j}, v_j, \dots, v_N\right)$ and in these coordinates (D^S) is given by $v_j = 0$.

Generic points of \mathcal{D}^S can be described by the blow up of $0 = u_1 = \dots = u_j$, which is given by

$$\{(u_1, \dots, u_N) \times [m_1 : \dots : m_j] \in \mathbb{C}^N \times \mathbb{P}^{j-1} \mid (u_1, \dots, u_j) \sim (m_1, \dots, m_j)\}.$$

Similarly, local coordinates on Y^N in a neighborhood of generic points of \mathcal{D}^S are given by $\left(\frac{m_1}{m_j}, \dots, \frac{m_{j-1}}{m_j}, u_j, \dots, u_N\right)$. In these systems of local coordinates, we have

$$\tilde{s}\left(\frac{m_1}{m_j}, \dots, \frac{m_{j-1}}{m_j}, u_j, \dots, u_N\right) = \left(\left(\frac{m_1}{m_j}\right)^2, \dots, \left(\frac{m_{j-1}}{m_j}\right)^2, u_j^2, \dots, u_N^2\right)$$

Therefore, at generic points of \mathcal{D}^S , $\tilde{s}^*((D^S))$ is given by $u_j^2 = 0$. This gives $\tilde{s}^*((D^S)) = 2(\mathcal{D}^S)$ and hence $\tilde{s}^*([D^S]) = 2[\mathcal{D}^S]$, by Diagram (19). \square

If $|S \cap \{p_1, p_2\}| = 0$ or 2 , then replacing S with S^C , if necessary, we have $S = \{p_{i_1}, \dots, p_{i_j}\}$ with $i_q \neq 1, 2$ for $1 \leq q \leq j$. Let $\mathcal{D}_{\pm\pm\pm\pm}^S$ denote the divisor in Y^N obtained as proper transform of the exceptional divisor obtained by blowing up (the proper transform of)

$$(20) \quad z_{i_1} = \pm z_{i_2} = \dots = \pm z_{i_j}.$$

Lemma 6.3. *If $|S \cap \{p_1, p_2\}| = 0$ or 2 , then*

$$(21) \quad \tilde{s}^*([D^S]) = \sum [\mathcal{D}_{\pm\pm\pm\pm}^S],$$

where the sum is taken over the 2^{j-1} possible choices of signs in (20).

Proof. The proof will be quite similar to that of Lemma 6.2. It will again be simpler to pull back the divisor (D^S) rather than the cohomology class $[D^S]$ and we can again assume, without loss of generality, that $S = \{3, 4, \dots, 2+j\}$.

If $j = 2$, $D^S \equiv D^{\{p_3, p_4\}}$ is the proper transform of $z_1 = z_2$ under all of the blow ups used to construct X^N from \mathbb{P}^N . Similarly, \mathcal{D}_{\pm}^S is the proper transform of $z_1 = \pm z_2$ under all of the blow ups used to construct Y^N . The local coordinates v_1, \dots, v_N on $\mathbb{P}^N \setminus \{w_{N+1} = 0\}$ from Lemma 6.2 serve as local coordinates on X^N in a neighborhood of generic points of D^S . Meanwhile, the local coordinates u_1, \dots, u_N in $\mathbb{P}^N \setminus \{z_{N+1} = 0\}$ serve as local coordinates on Y^N in a neighborhood of generic points in a neighborhood of \mathcal{D}_{\pm}^S . Moreover, it's clear from the commutative diagram (11) that $\tilde{s}^{-1}(D^S) = \mathcal{D}_{+}^S \cup \mathcal{D}_{-}^S$. Thus, it remains to keep track of multiplicities. The divisor (D^S) is locally given at generic points by $v_1 - v_2 = 0$. At points of Y^N where u_1, \dots, u_N serve as coordinates and at points of X^N where v_1, \dots, v_N serve as coordinates, the map \tilde{s} is given by $\tilde{s}(u_1, \dots, u_N) = (u_1^2, \dots, u_N^2)$. Since (D^S) is locally given by $v_1 - v_2 = 0$, it follows that $\tilde{s}^*((D^S))$ is given at generic points by $u_1^2 - u_2^2 = (u_1 - u_2)(u_1 + u_2)$. Since the first factor describes (\mathcal{D}_{+}^S) and the second factor describes (\mathcal{D}_{-}^S) , we conclude that $\tilde{s}^*((D^S)) = (\mathcal{D}_{+}^S) + (\mathcal{D}_{-}^S)$. By commutative diagram (19), this implies $\tilde{s}^*([D^S]) = [\mathcal{D}_{+}^S] + [\mathcal{D}_{-}^S]$.

The case $j > 2$ will be similar, except that we will need to use blow up coordinates. It's clear from the commutative diagram (11) that

$$\tilde{s}^{-1}(D^S) = \bigcup \mathcal{D}_{\pm\pm\pm\pm}^S.$$

Thus, it remains to compute the multiplicity of each contribution. Let us again use the affine coordinates (v_1, \dots, v_N) on $\mathbb{P}^N \setminus \{w_{N+1} = 0\}$ and (u_1, \dots, u_N) on $\mathbb{P}^N \setminus \{z_{N+1} = 0\}$. At points of the proper transform of $v_1 = \dots = v_j$ not lying on any exceptional divisors resulting from blow ups of lower dimensional centers, the blow up of this center is given by

$$\{(v_1, \dots, v_N) \times [n_1 : \dots : n_{j-1}] \in \mathbb{C}^N \times \mathbb{P}^{j-2} \mid (v_1 - v_j, \dots, v_{j-1} - v_j) \sim (n_1, \dots, n_{j-1})\}.$$

Local coordinates on X^N in a neighborhood of generic points of D^S are given by

$$\left(\frac{n_1}{n_{j-1}}, \dots, \frac{n_{j-2}}{n_{j-1}}, v_{j-1} - v_j, v_j, \dots, v_N \right).$$

Generic points of $\mathcal{D}_{\pm\pm\dots\pm}^S$ can be described by the blow up of $z_1 = \pm z_2 = \pm z_j$, which is given by

$$\{(u_1, \dots, u_N) \times [m_1 : \dots : m_{j-1}] \in \mathbb{C}^N \times \mathbb{P}^{j-2} \mid (v_1 \mp v_j, \dots, v_{j-1} \mp v_j) \sim (m_1, \dots, m_{j-1})\}.$$

Local coordinates on Y^N in a neighborhood of generic points of $\mathcal{D}_{\pm\pm\dots\pm}^S$ are given by

$$\left(\frac{m_1}{m_{j-1}}, \dots, \frac{m_{j-2}}{m_{j-1}}, u_{j-1} \mp u_j, u_j, \dots, u_N \right).$$

In these local coordinates,

$$\tilde{s} \left(\frac{m_1}{m_{j-1}}, \dots, \frac{m_{j-2}}{m_{j-1}}, u_{j-1} \mp u_j, u_j, \dots, u_N \right) = \left(\frac{m_1}{m_{j-1}}, \dots, \frac{m_{j-2}}{m_{j-1}}, u_{j-1}^2 \mp u_j^2, u_j^2, \dots, u_N^2 \right).$$

Since (D^S) is given by $v_{j-1} - v_j = 0$, in these coordinates $\tilde{s}^*((D^S))$ is given by $u_{j-1}^2 \mp u_j^2 = (u_{j-1} - u_j)(u_{j-1} + u_j)$. Since $(\mathcal{D}_{\pm\pm\dots\pm}^S)$ is given locally by exactly one of these two linear factors, we see that for each combination of \pm , the preimage $\mathcal{D}_{\pm\pm\dots\pm}^S$ is counted with multiplicity one. Thus, we have

$$(22) \quad \tilde{s}^*((D^{S_i})) = \sum (\mathcal{D}_{\pm\pm\dots\pm}^{S_i}),$$

By commutative diagram (19) this gives (21). \square

Remark 6.4. We will refer to divisors D^S with $|S \cap \{p_1, p_2\}| = 1$ as ramified divisors and those with $|S \cap \{p_1, p_2\}| = 0$ or 2 as unramified divisors.

We now return to our basis

$$\mathbf{B}_1^N = \{[D^{S_1}], \dots, [D^{S_\ell}]\}$$

where $S_1 = \{p_1, p_3\}$ corresponds to the proper transform of the hyperplane $z_1 = 0$ and S_2, \dots, S_ℓ are all subsets of P with $2 < |S_i| \leq n - 2$ and $p_2 \notin S_i$.

Proposition 6.5. With respect to the ordered basis \mathbf{B}_1^N

$$s^* : H^{1,1}(X^N; \mathbb{C}) \rightarrow H^{1,1}(X^N; \mathbb{C}) \text{ is given by } s^* = \text{diag}(2, \dots, 2, 1, \dots, 1),$$

where the first $2^{n-2} - n + 1$ entries of the diagonal are 2, corresponding to the ramified divisors D^S (those with $|S \cap \{p_1, p_2\}| = 1$), and the remaining entries are 1, corresponding to the unramified divisors D^S (those with $|S \cap \{p_1, p_2\}| = 0$).

Proof. For any $[D_i^S]$ we compute $s^*([D_i^S]) = \text{pr}_*(\tilde{s}^*([D_i^S]))$. We will use Lemmas 6.2 and 6.3 to compute $\tilde{s}^*([D_i^S])$. We will then use Lemma 2.3 to determine the affect of pr_* on each of the fundamental classes in $\tilde{s}^*([D_i^S])$.

Since $\text{pr} : Y^N \rightarrow X^N$ is a birational morphism, it follows from Zariski's Main Theorem [H, Ch. III, Cor. 11.4] that the fibers of pr are connected. In particular, for any irreducible subvariety $V \subseteq Y^N$ we will either have $\dim(\text{pr}(V)) < \dim(V)$ or $\deg_{\text{top}}(\text{pr}|_V) = 1$.

First, suppose that $S_i = \{p_1, p_{i_1}, \dots, p_{i_j}\}$ with $i_q \neq 2$ for $1 \leq q \leq j$. According to Lemma 6.2 we have $\tilde{s}^*([D^{S_i}]) = 2[\mathcal{D}^{S_i}]$. The homogeneous coordinates $[z_1 : \dots : z_{N+1}]$ serve as coordinates on generic points of Y^N and the homogeneous coordinates $[w_1 : \dots : w_{N+1}]$ serve as coordinates on generic points of X^N . It follows from commutativity of (7) that in these coordinates $\text{pr}([z_1 : \dots : z_{N+1}]) = [z_1 : \dots : z_{N+1}]$. Since the proper transform of $0 = z_{i+2} = z_{i_j+2}$ is blown up to construct Y^N , corresponding to \mathcal{D}^{S_i} , and the proper transform of $0 = w_{i+2} = w_{i_j+2}$ is blown up in the construction of X^N , corresponding to D^{S_i} , it follows that pr maps \mathcal{D}^{S_i} onto D^{S_i} . Therefore,

$$s^*([D^{S_i}]) = \text{pr}_*(\tilde{s}^*([D^{S_i}])) = \text{pr}_*(2[\mathcal{D}^{S_i}]) = 2[D^{S_i}].$$

Now, suppose that $S_i = \{p_{i_1}, \dots, p_{i_j}\}$ with $i_q \neq 1, 2$ for $1 \leq q \leq j$. According to Lemma 6.3 we have

$$\tilde{s}^*([D^{S_i}]) = \sum [\mathcal{D}_{\pm\pm\dots\pm}^{S_i}].$$

As in the previous paragraph, $\text{pr}(\mathcal{D}_{+\dots+}^{S_i}) = D^{S_i}$ implying that $\text{pr}_*([\mathcal{D}_{+\dots+}^{S_i}]) = [D^{S_i}]$. Now, consider the case that not all of the signs indexing $\mathcal{D}_{\pm\dots\pm}^{S_i}$ are '+'. First, notice that since $\mathcal{D}_{\pm\dots\pm}^{S_i}$ is irreducible, so is $\text{pr}(\mathcal{D}_{\pm\dots\pm}^{S_i})$. By commutativity of (7), we have that $\text{pr}(\mathcal{D}_{\pm\dots\pm}^{S_i})$ lies within

$$\mathcal{A}^{-1}(z_{i_1-2} = \pm z_{i_2-2} = \pm z_{i_j-2})$$

where $\mathcal{A} : X^N \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^N$ is the composition of all of the blow ups used to construct X^N . Moreover, $\text{pr}(\mathcal{D}_{\pm\dots\pm}^{S_i})$ contains at least one point in each \mathcal{A} -fiber over $z_{i_1-2} = \pm z_{i_2-2} = \pm z_{i_j-2}$. However, since at least one of the \pm is minus, generic points of this linear subspace aren't on any of the centers of blow up. Thus, there are points of $\text{pr}(\mathcal{D}_{\pm\dots\pm}^{S_i})$ which have a neighborhood in $\text{pr}(\mathcal{D}_{\pm\dots\pm}^{S_i})$ that is contained within a dimension $< N - 1$ analytic set. Since $\text{pr}(\mathcal{D}_{\pm\dots\pm}^{S_i})$ is irreducible, this implies that $\dim(\text{pr}(\mathcal{D}_{\pm\dots\pm}^{S_i})) < N - 1$. Therefore, if not all of the signs are +, we have $\text{pr}_*([\mathcal{D}_{\pm\dots\pm}^{S_i}]) = 0$. We conclude that

$$s^*([D^{S_i}]) = \text{pr}_*(\tilde{s}^*([D^{S_i}])) = \text{pr}_*\left(\sum[\mathcal{D}_{\pm\dots\pm}^{S_i}]\right) = \text{pr}_*([\mathcal{D}_{+\dots+}^{S_i}]) = [D^{S_i}].$$

□

6.3. Pullback action on $H^{2,2}(X^3; \mathbb{C})$ under the rational map $s : X^3 \dashrightarrow X^3$. For any projective manifold X and any dominant rational map $f : X \dashrightarrow X$, it can be quite subtle to keep track of inverse images of subvarieties $V \subseteq X$ of codimension at least 2, since they may lie in the indeterminacy locus I_f . For this reason, one must compute preimages (set-theoretic and cohomological) using a resolution of singularities as in (3).

This is even more subtle for the map $s : X^N \dashrightarrow X^N$ because $\text{pr} : Y^N \rightarrow X^N$ is defined implicitly by a universal property. Because of these challenges and the computational complexity arising from the dimensions of the $H^{k,k}(X^N; \mathbb{C})$ growing exponentially with N , we will limit ourselves in this section to $N = 3$. The case for $N = 3$, and $k = 1$ has already been analyzed in Section 6.2, so we will focus on $k = 2$. With enough computational power and careful book-keeping about preimages lying in the indeterminacy locus, we expect these techniques to extend to arbitrary N and k .

One further challenge is that we don't know if the action can be expressed by a diagonal matrix:

Question 1. *For any N and any $k \geq 2$ does there exist an ordered basis for $H^{k,k}(X; \mathbb{C})$ consisting of fundamental classes of boundary strata, in which the action of s^* is expressed by a diagonal matrix? (Compare to Proposition 6.7, below.)*

The following proposition is stated for general k and N .

Proposition 6.6. *Let $Z := D^{S_1} \cap \dots \cap D^{S_k} \subseteq X^N$ be a codimension k boundary stratum and let $W_1, \dots, W_\ell \subseteq X^N$ be the irreducible components of $s^{-1}(Z) := \text{pr}(\tilde{s}^{-1}(Z))$ that have codimension exactly k .*

We have

$$s^*[Z] = \sum_{m=1}^{\ell} 2^r [W_m]$$

where r is the number of the boundary divisors among $\{D^{S_1}, \dots, D^{S_k}\}$ that are ramified, i.e. those satisfying $|S_i \cap \{p_1, p_2\}| = 1$.

Some comments are in order:

- (1) Since \tilde{s} has finite fibers, every irreducible component of $s^{-1}(Z)$ has codimension at least k . We ignore any preimages of codimension greater than k , even those lying entirely in $I_s \subseteq X^N$.
- (2) By Lemma 3.3, Z is uniquely represented as an intersection of boundary divisors, so that the number r is well-defined.

Proof. Recall that $s^*([Z]) := \text{pr}_*(\tilde{s}^*([Z]))$. Without loss of generality, we can suppose that the first r divisors are ramified and the remaining ones are unramified. From Lemmas 6.2 and 6.3 we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{s}^*([Z]) &= \tilde{s}^*([D^{S_1}] \cup \dots \cup [D^{S_k}]) = \tilde{s}^*([D^{S_1}]) \cup \dots \cup \tilde{s}^*([D^{S_k}]) \\ &= 2[\mathcal{D}^{S_1}] \cup \dots \cup 2[\mathcal{D}^{S_r}] \cup \left(\sum[\mathcal{D}_{\pm\dots\pm}^{S_{r+1}}]\right) \cup \dots \cup \left(\sum[\mathcal{D}_{\pm\dots\pm}^{S_k}]\right) \\ &= 2^r \sum_{m=1}^j [V_m]. \end{aligned}$$

where each V_m is an irreducible component of $\tilde{s}^{-1}(D^{S_1}) \cap \dots \cap \tilde{s}^{-1}(D^{S_k})$. Each of these components has codimension k since \tilde{s} has finite fibers. Notice that each k -fold iterated cup product obtained when expanding the sum corresponds to k fundamental classes of divisors intersecting transversally. This is why the fundamental cohomology class of each component V_m does not get an extra multiplicity.

According to Lemma 2.3, any V_m with $\dim(\text{pr}(V_m)) < \dim(V_m)$ will have $\text{pr}_*([V_m]) = 0$. Removing any such V_m from our list (and re-ordering if necessary), we can assume that the first ℓ components V_1, \dots, V_ℓ are mapped by pr onto W_1, \dots, W_ℓ of the same dimension and the remaining components are decreased in dimension by the map pr . It follows from Zariski's Main Theorem [H, Ch. III, Cor. 11.4] that $\deg_{\text{top}}(\text{pr}|_{V_m}) = 1$ for $1 \leq m \leq \ell$. In conclusion

$$s^*([Z]) = \text{pr}_*(\tilde{s}^*([Z])) = \text{pr}_*\left(2^r \sum_{m=1}^j [V_m]\right) = 2^r \sum_{m=1}^{\ell} [W_m].$$

□

We will construct an ordered basis \mathbf{B}_2^3 for $H^{2,2}(X^3, \mathbb{C})$ using intersections of the boundary divisors indexed by the following subsets of $P = \{p_1, \dots, p_6\}$:

$$\begin{array}{llll} S_1 := \{p_1, p_3, p_4, p_5\} & S_6 := \{p_1, p_3, p_4\} & S_{11} := \{p_1, p_5, p_6\} & S_{16} := \{p_1, p_2, p_6\} \\ S_2 := \{p_1, p_3, p_4, p_6\} & S_7 := \{p_1, p_3, p_5\} & S_{12} := \{p_1, p_2\} & S_{17} := \{p_1, p_4\} \\ S_3 := \{p_1, p_3, p_5, p_6\} & S_8 := \{p_1, p_3, p_6\} & S_{13} := \{p_1, p_2, p_3\} & S_{18} := \{p_3, p_4\} \\ S_4 := \{p_1, p_4, p_5, p_6\} & S_9 := \{p_1, p_4, p_5\} & S_{14} := \{p_1, p_2, p_4\} & \\ S_5 := \{p_1, p_3\} & S_{10} := \{p_1, p_4, p_6\} & S_{15} := \{p_1, p_2, p_5\} & \end{array}$$

By Keel's theorem 3.4, $\dim(H^{2,2}(X^3; \mathbb{C})) = 16$. We will use as many ramified codimension 2 boundary strata as possible in order to make the expression of s^* in \mathbf{B}_2^3 as close to being diagonal as possible. Our first 11 strata are obtained as intersections of two ramified divisors:

$$\begin{array}{llll} Z_1 := D^{S_1} \cap D^{S_5} & Z_4 := D^{S_2} \cap D^{S_5} & Z_7 := D^{S_2} \cap D^{S_{10}} & Z_{10} := D^{S_4} \cap D^{S_{17}} \\ Z_2 := D^{S_1} \cap D^{S_7} & Z_5 := D^{S_2} \cap D^{S_6} & Z_8 := D^{S_3} \cap D^{S_5} & Z_{11} := D^{S_5} \cap D^{S_7} \\ Z_3 := D^{S_1} \cap D^{S_9} & Z_6 := D^{S_2} \cap D^{S_8} & Z_9 := D^{S_3} \cap D^{S_{11}} & \end{array}$$

Let $Z = D^{S_i} \cap D^{S_j}$ be any one of these 11 boundary strata. Since each is ramified we have $\tilde{s}^{-1}(D^{S_i}) = \mathcal{D}^{S_i}$ and $\tilde{s}^{-1}(D^{S_j}) = \mathcal{D}^{S_j}$. Hence, $\tilde{s}^{-1}(Z) = \mathcal{D}^{S_i} \cap \mathcal{D}^{S_j}$. Similarly to the proof of Proposition 6.5 we have $\text{pr}(\mathcal{D}^{S_i} \cap \mathcal{D}^{S_j}) = Z$. Since D^{S_i} and D^{S_j} both are ramified, it follows from Proposition 6.6 that $s^*([Z]) = 2^2[Z]$. In summary:

$$s^*([Z_i]) = 2^2[Z_i], \text{ for all } 1 \leq i \leq 11.$$

There are four more ramified strata of codimension 2 we will use for our basis:

$$Z_{12} := D^{S_1} \cap D^{S_{16}}, \quad Z_{13} := D^{S_2} \cap D^{S_{15}}, \quad Z_{14} := D^{S_3} \cap D^{S_{14}}, \quad \text{and} \quad Z_{15} := D^{S_4} \cap D^{S_{13}}.$$

For each of them, the first term in the intersection is ramified and the second one is unramified.

First consider $Z_{12} = D^{S_1} \cap D^{S_{16}}$. Recall that we use the normalization

$$(23) \quad \varphi(p_1) = 0, \quad \varphi(p_2) = \infty, \quad \varphi(p_3) = z_1, \quad \varphi(p_4) = z_2, \quad \varphi(p_5) = z_3, \quad \text{and} \quad \varphi(p_6) = z_4.$$

With respect to the coordinates obtained from this normalization

$$D^{S_1} = \mathcal{A}^{-1}([0 : 0 : 0 : 1]) \cong X^2$$

and $\mathcal{D}^{S_1} = \tilde{s}^{-1}(D^{S_1}) = \mathcal{B}^{-1}([0 : 0 : 0 : 1]) \cong Y^2$. As in the proof of Lemma 5.8, under these identifications of the fibers with X^2 and Y^2 we have that

$$\tilde{s}|_{\mathcal{B}^{-1}([0:0:0:1])} : \mathcal{B}^{-1}([0 : 0 : 0 : 1]) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}^{-1}([0 : 0 : 0 : 1])$$

is $\tilde{s}^2 : Y^2 \rightarrow X^2$ and

$$\text{pr}|_{\mathcal{B}^{-1}([0:0:0:1])} : \mathcal{B}^{-1}([0 : 0 : 0 : 1]) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}^{-1}([0 : 0 : 0 : 1])$$

is $\text{pr}^2 : Y^2 \rightarrow X^2$. (We are using superscripts on the names of the maps to denote the dimensions of the domain/codomain, as in Lemma 5.8.) Therefore, computing $s^{-1}(Z_{12}) := \text{pr}(\tilde{s}^{-1}(Z_{12}))$ amounts to computing $(s^2)^{-1}(W) := \text{pr}^2((\tilde{s}^2)^{-1}(W))$, where W is the divisor in X^2 obtained from intersecting $\mathcal{A}^{-1}([0 : 0 : 0 : 1]) \cong X^2$ with $D^{S_{16}}$. Recall that X^2 is the blow up of \mathbb{P}^2 at $[0 : 0 : 1], [0 : 1 : 0], [1 : 0 : 0]$ and $[1 : 1 : 1]$, where in this context \mathbb{P}^2 is the exceptional divisor over $[0 : 0 : 0 : 1]$ obtained in the first round of blow ups of

\mathbb{P}^3 used to construct X^3 . Since $D^{S_{16}}$ is obtained by blowing up the proper transform of $z_1 = z_2 = z_3$, the intersection W corresponds in $\mathcal{A}^{-1}([0 : 0 : 0 : 1])$ to the blow up of \mathbb{P}^2 at $[1 : 1 : 1]$. Therefore, the preimages under \tilde{s}^2 will correspond in $\mathcal{B}^{-1}([0 : 0 : 0 : 1])$ to the blow ups of \mathbb{P}^2 at $[1 : \pm 1 : \pm 1]$. As in the proof of Proposition 6.5, pr^2 will crush each of these blow ups other than the one at $[1 : 1 : 1]$. Therefore, the only component of $(s^2)^{-1}(W) := \text{pr}^2((\tilde{s}^2)^{-1}(W))$ of dimension 1 is the blow up of \mathbb{P}^2 at $[1 : 1 : 1]$. Considered in X^3 , this is just Z_{12} .

Essentially the same proof shows that for $13 \leq i \leq 15$, the only component of $s^{-1}(Z_i)$ having dimension one is Z_i . Proposition 6.6 gives that

$$s^*([Z_i]) = 2[Z_i], \text{ for all } 12 \leq i \leq 15.$$

We require one more basis element, which unfortunately will not pullback to a multiple of itself. Let

$$Z_{16} := D^{S_{12}} \cap D^{S_{18}}.$$

It can be readily verified from Theorem 3.4 that the ordered set

$$\mathbf{B}_2^3 = \{[Z_1], \dots, [Z_{16}]\}$$

is a basis of $H^{2,2}(X^3; \mathbb{C})$.

We'll again need to use coordinates from the blow up description of X^3 given in Section 3.4 to compute $s^*([Z_{16}])$. To simplify notation, let's write $Z \equiv Z_{16}$. Since neither $D^{S_{12}}$ or $D^{S_{18}}$ is ramified, Proposition 6.6 gives that $s^*[Z]$ will be the sum of fundamental classes of the components of $s^{-1}(Z)$ of dimension 1, each with multiplicity one.

Recall that we use the normalization stated in Line (23). In these coordinates, Z is the intersection of $E_{[1:1:1:1]}$ with the proper transform of the hyperplane $z_1 = z_2$. Consider the preimages $[1 : \pm 1 : \pm 1 : \pm 1] \in s_0^{-1}([1 : 1 : 1 : 1])$. Because these points are not critical, there are neighborhoods $\mathcal{B}^{-1}(U)$ and $\mathcal{A}^{-1}(V)$ of $\mathcal{B}^{-1}([1 : \pm 1 : \pm 1 : \pm 1])$ and $\mathcal{A}^{-1}([1 : 1 : 1 : 1])$, respectively, so that

$$\tilde{s}|_{\mathcal{B}^{-1}(U)} : \mathcal{B}^{-1}(U) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}^{-1}(V)$$

is a biholomorphism (see the proof of Lemma 5.8). In particular, there are eight irreducible preimages $\mathcal{Z}_{\pm, \pm, \pm}$ of Z under \tilde{s} , with one of them in each such neighborhood $\mathcal{B}^{-1}(U)$. We must determine which of them have image under pr of dimension 1.

There is a sufficiently small neighborhood U of $[1 : 1 : 1 : 1]$ so that pr maps $\mathcal{B}^{-1}(U)$ biholomorphically onto $\mathcal{A}^{-1}(U)$. In particular, $\text{pr}(\mathcal{Z}_{+, +, +}) = Z$, so that $[Z]$ contributes to $s^*([Z])$.

Now consider the three components indexed by two minus signs. Since the points $[1 : \pm 1 : \pm 1 : \pm 1]$ with exactly two minus signs are not on $A_0 \cup A_1$, for these points we have that $\mathcal{A}^{-1}([1 : \pm 1 : \pm 1 : \pm 1])$ is a single point. Commutativity of the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} Y^3 & & \\ \downarrow \text{pr} & \searrow \tilde{s} & \\ X^3 & \xrightarrow{s} & X^3 \\ \downarrow \mathcal{A} & & \downarrow \mathcal{A} \\ \mathbb{P}^3 & \xrightarrow{s_0} & \mathbb{P}^3 \end{array}$$

implies $\text{pr}(\mathcal{Z}_{\pm, \pm, \pm}) \subseteq \mathcal{A}^{-1}([1 : \pm 1 : \pm 1 : \pm 1])$. Therefore, the fundamental classes of these preimages do not contribute to $s^*([Z])$.

The remaining four components $\mathcal{Z}_{-1,1,1}$, $\mathcal{Z}_{1,-1,1}$, $\mathcal{Z}_{1,1,-1}$, and $\mathcal{Z}_{-1,-1,-1}$ require a more careful analysis because the corresponding points in \mathbb{P}^3 satisfy

$$[1 : -1 : 1 : 1], [1 : 1 : -1 : 1], [1 : 1 : 1 : -1], [1 : -1 : -1 : -1] \in A^1$$

resulting in

$$\text{pr}|_{\mathcal{B}^{-1}([1:\pm 1:\pm 1:\pm 1])} : \mathcal{B}^{-1}([1 : \pm 1 : \pm 1 : \pm 1]) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}^{-1}([1 : \pm 1 : \pm 1 : \pm 1])$$

being a map from the two-dimensional manifold $\mathcal{B}^{-1}([1 : \pm 1 : \pm 1 : \pm 1]) \cong X^2$ to the one-dimensional manifold $\mathcal{A}^{-1}([1 : \pm 1 : \pm 1 : \pm 1]) \cong X^1$.

Consider $\tilde{s}|_{\mathcal{B}^{-1}([1:-1:1:1])} : \mathcal{B}^{-1}([1:-1:1:1]) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}^{-1}([1:1:1:1])$. The fiber $\mathcal{B}^{-1}([1:-1:1:1])$ is obtained by first blowing up the point $[1:-1:1:1]$ and then blowing up the proper transforms of the lines

$$(24) \quad z_1 = -z_2 = z_3, \quad z_1 = -z_2 = z_4, \quad z_1 = z_3 = z_4, \quad -z_2 = z_3 = z_4.$$

Similarly, the fiber $\mathcal{A}^{-1}([1:1:1:1])$ is obtained by first blowing up the point $[1:1:1:1]$ and then blowing up the proper transforms of the lines

$$(25) \quad z_1 = z_2 = z_3, \quad z_1 = z_2 = z_4, \quad z_1 = z_3 = z_4, \quad z_2 = z_3 = z_4.$$

Consider just the point blow ups at $[1:-1:1:1]$ and $[1:1:1:1]$, respectively. There are coordinates

$$([y_1 : y_2 : y_3 : y_4], [m_1 : m_2 : m_3]) \quad \text{where} \quad (m_1, m_2, m_3) \sim (y_1 - y_4, y_2 + y_4, y_3 - y_4),$$

and

$$([x_1 : x_2 : x_3 : x_4], [n_1 : n_2 : n_3]) \quad \text{where} \quad (n_1, n_2, n_3) \sim (x_1 - x_4, x_2 - x_4, x_3 - x_4)$$

in neighborhoods of $E_{[1:-1:1:1]}$ within Y_1^3 and of $E_{[1:1:1:1]}$ within X_1^3 . In fact, these serve as coordinates in a neighborhood of the generic points of $\mathcal{B}^{-1}([1:-1:1:1])$ and $\mathcal{A}^{-1}([1:1:1:1])$, within Y^3 and X^3 , respectively. (By generic, we mean points that are not altered by the blow ups of the proper transforms of the lines (24) and (25).)

In these coordinates, $\tilde{s}|_{\mathcal{B}^{-1}([1:-1:1:1])} : \mathcal{B}^{-1}([1:-1:1:1]) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}^{-1}([1:1:1:1])$ is given by

$$\tilde{s}|_{\mathcal{B}^{-1}([1:-1:1:1])}([m_1 : m_2 : m_3]) = [m_1 : m_2 : m_3].$$

At generic points of $\mathcal{A}^{-1}([1:1:1:1])$, Z is described by the equation $n_1 = n_2$. Therefore, $\mathcal{Z}_{-,+,+} = (\tilde{s}|_{\mathcal{B}^{-1}([1:-1:1:1])})^{-1}(Z)$ is described at generic points of $\mathcal{B}^{-1}([1:-1:1:1])$ by

$$(26) \quad m_1 = m_2.$$

The fiber $\mathcal{A}^{-1}([1:-1:1:1])$ is a result of blowing up the line $\{z_1 = z_3 = z_4\} \in A^1$. Coordinates in a neighborhood of this fiber are given by

$$([z_1 : z_2 : z_3 : z_4], [p_1 : p_2]), \quad \text{where} \quad (p_1, p_2) \sim (z_1 - z_4, z_3 - z_4).$$

Notice that generic points of Y^3 (i.e. those not in $\mathcal{B}^{-1}(B^0 \cup B^1)$) can be described by the homogeneous coordinates $[y_1 : y_2 : y_3 : y_4]$ on \mathbb{P}^3 and generic points on X^3 (those not in $\mathcal{A}^{-1}(A^0 \cup A^1)$) can be described by the homogeneous coordinates $[z_1 : z_2 : z_3 : z_4]$. At these generic points we have $\text{pr}([y_1 : y_2 : y_3 : y_4]) = [y_1 : y_2 : y_3 : y_4]$. Since pr is continuous, this implies that at generic points of the fiber $\mathcal{B}^{-1}([1:-1:1:1])$, we have

$$[p_1 : p_2] = \text{pr}([m_1 : m_2 : m_3]) = [m_1 : m_3].$$

In particular, Equation (26) places no restriction on the values $[p_1 : p_2]$, so we conclude that $\dim(\text{pr}(\mathcal{Z}_{-,+,+})) = 1$ and hence that $\text{pr}(\mathcal{Z}_{-,+,+}) = \mathcal{A}^{-1}([1:-1:1:1])$.

If we repeat the previous calculation over $[1:1:-1:1]$, the homogeneous coordinates on $\mathcal{B}^{-1}([1:1:-1:1])$ are given by

$$(27) \quad ([y_1 : y_2 : y_3 : y_4], [m_1 : m_2 : m_3]) \quad \text{where} \quad (m_1, m_2, m_3) \sim (y_1 - y_4, y_2 - y_4, y_3 + y_4),$$

and again, $(\tilde{s}|_{\mathcal{B}^{-1}([1:1:-1:1])})^{-1}(Z)$ is given at generic points of $\mathcal{B}^{-1}([1:1:-1:1])$ by

$$(28) \quad m_1 = m_2.$$

Meanwhile, the fiber $\mathcal{A}^{-1}([1:1:-1:1])$ is a result of blowing up the line $\{z_1 = z_2 = z_4\} \in A^1$. Coordinates in a neighborhood of this fiber are given by

$$([z_1 : z_2 : z_3 : z_4], [p_1 : p_2]), \quad \text{where} \quad (p_1, p_2) \sim (z_1 - z_4, z_2 - z_4).$$

At generic points of the fiber $\mathcal{B}^{-1}([1:-1:1:1])$, we have

$$[p_1 : p_2] = \text{pr}([m_1 : m_2 : m_3]) = [m_1 : m_2].$$

In particular, Equation (26) places the restriction $[p_1 : p_2] = [1:1]$ on points in $\text{pr}(\mathcal{Z}_{+,-,+})$. We conclude that $\dim(\text{pr}(\mathcal{Z}_{+,-,+})) = 0$.

Using very similar calculations, one finds that the component of $\text{pr}(\mathcal{Z}_{+,+,-})$ over $[1:1:1:-1]$ is a single point on $\mathcal{A}^{-1}([1:1:1:-1])$ and that the component of $\text{pr}(\mathcal{Z}_{-,-,-})$ over $[1:-1:-1:-1]$ is the whole one-dimensional fiber $\mathcal{A}^{-1}([1:-1:-1:-1])$.

In summary, Proposition 6.6 gives

$$(29) \quad s^*[Z] = [Z] + [\mathcal{A}^{-1}([1 : -1 : 1 : 1])] + [\mathcal{A}^{-1}([1 : -1 : -1 : -1])].$$

It remains to project $[\mathcal{A}^{-1}([1 : -1 : 1 : 1])]$ and $[\mathcal{A}^{-1}([1 : -1 : -1 : -1])]$ back into the basis \mathbf{B}_2^3 . The divisor $D^{S_{14}}$ is obtained as the blow up of the proper transform of $\{z_1 = z_3 = z_4\}$ within X_1^3 . It is biholomorphic to $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$, with the first factor parameterized by points of the line $z_1 = z_3 = z_4$ and the second factor parameterized by the fibers of the blow up. In particular, any two fibers have cohomologous fundamental class. Thus,

$$[\mathcal{A}^{-1}([1 : -1 : 1 : 1])] \cong [D^{S_3} \cap D^{S_{14}}] = [Z_{14}],$$

because $D^{S_3} \cap D^{S_{14}}$ is the fiber of the blow up over the intersection of the proper transform of $\{z_1 = z_3 = z_4\}$ with $E_{[0:1:0:0]}$. Using similar reasoning, we have

$$[\mathcal{A}^{-1}([1 : -1 : -1 : -1])] \cong [D^{S_4} \cap D^{S_{13}}] = [Z_{15}].$$

We summarize our calculation with:

Proposition 6.7. *With respect to the basis \mathbf{B}_2^3 , $s^* : H^{2,2}(X^3; \mathbb{C}) \rightarrow H^{2,2}(X^3; \mathbb{C})$ is given by the matrix*

$$s^* = \begin{bmatrix} 4 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 4 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 4 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 4 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 4 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 4 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 4 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 4 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 4 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 4 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 4 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 2 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 2 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 2 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

7. DYNAMICAL DEGREE DATA

Let $P = \{\mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{p}_2, p_3, \dots, p_n\}$ contain at least three points, and recall $N := n - 3$. We distinguish the points \mathbf{p}_1 and \mathbf{p}_2 in boldface, as these are precisely the distinguished points in our coordinate system (see Section 3.1). Using the bases from Section 6, we explicitly computed the following dynamical degrees:

- $|P| = 5$ (equivalently $N = 2$), for all $\rho \in S_P$, we compute $\lambda_1(f_\rho)$,
- $|P| = 6$ (equivalently $N = 3$), for all $\rho \in S_P$, we compute $\lambda_1(f_\rho)$, and $\lambda_2(f_\rho)$,
- $|P| = 7$ (equivalently $N = 4$), for all $\rho \in S_P$, we compute $\lambda_1(f_\rho)$,
- $|P| = 8$ (equivalently $N = 5$), for all cyclic permutations $\rho \in S_P$, we compute $\lambda_1(f_\rho)$.

They are presented in Tables 3-6, below. As previously mentioned, the methods employed in Section 6 should generalize to computing the dynamical degrees $\lambda_k(f_\rho)$ for $f_\rho : X^N \dashrightarrow X^N$ for arbitrary N and $1 \leq k \leq N$.

Question 2. *To what extent does the structure of the permutation affect the dynamical degrees? There are some patterns that are evident in the tables below. For instance, when $\rho \in S_P$ consists of just one cycle of length n , the dynamical degrees are “more complicated” from an algebraic point of view (they tend to have higher algebraic degree). A somewhat related question concerns the characteristic polynomials: in almost all examples, the degree of the eigenvalue corresponding to $\lambda_k(f_\rho)$ is strictly less than the dimension of $H^{k,k}(X^N; \mathbb{C})$, and the characteristic polynomial factors. What is the dynamical significance of i) the number of factors, and ii) the algebraic multiplicity of each factor?*

Remark 7.1. *One can easily notice from the tables that the first dynamical degree of $f_\rho : X^N \dashrightarrow X^N$ is always an algebraic integer of degree $\leq N + 3$ which is significantly less than $\dim(H^{1,1}(X^N; \mathbb{C})) = 2^{N+2} - \binom{N+3}{2} - 1$ when $N \geq 3$. This can be explained as follows: Let Z^N be the blow up of \mathbb{P}^N at the $N + 2$ points from A^0 and let $\pi : X^N \rightarrow Z^N$ be the resulting blow down map. One can check that $\pi \circ f_\rho \circ \pi^{-1} : Z^N \dashrightarrow Z^N$ is 1-stable so that its dynamical degree is an algebraic integer of degree less than or equal to*

$\dim(H^{1,1}(Z^N; \mathbb{C})) = N + 3$. The result follows for f_ρ since dynamical degrees are invariant under birational conjugacy.

$\mathbf{p}_1 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_3 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_1$	$\mathbf{p}_2 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_4 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_5 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_2$
$\lambda_1(f_\rho) \approx 2.2292085$	$\lambda^4 + \lambda^3 - 2\lambda^2 - 8\lambda - 8$
$\mathbf{p}_1 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_3 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_2 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_4 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_5 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_1$	
$\lambda_1(f_\rho) \approx 2.2755888$	$\lambda^5 - \lambda^4 - 8\lambda - 16$
$\mathbf{p}_1 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_2 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_3 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_4 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_5 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_1$	
$\lambda_1(f_\rho) \approx 2.2667836$	$\lambda^5 - 2\lambda^3 - 4\lambda^2 - 16$

TABLE 3. Data for $f_\rho^* : H^{1,1}(X^2; \mathbb{C}) \rightarrow H^{1,1}(X^2; \mathbb{C})$; the permutation $\rho \in S_P$ is given in terms of cycles, an approximate value of the dynamical degree $\lambda_1(f_\rho)$ is given as well as the minimal polynomial for $\lambda_1(f_\rho)$. There are 120 such maps $f_\rho : X^2 \dashrightarrow X^2$ corresponding to all permutations $\rho \in S_P$. The examples in this chart (and all maps which are birationally conjugate to any of these examples) are the only maps $f_\rho : X^2 \dashrightarrow X^2$ for which $\lambda_1(f_\rho) \neq 2$.

REFERENCES

- [Ab] William Abikoff. Degenerating families of Riemann surfaces. *Ann. of Math.*, 105:29–45, 1977.
- [Am] Ekaterina Amerik. A computation of invariants of a rational self-map. *Ann. Fac. Sci. Toulouse Math. (6)*, 18(3):445–457, 2009.
- [B] Eric Bedford. The dynamical degrees of a mapping. In *Proceedings of the International Workshop Future Directions in Difference Equations*, pages 3–14. Publicacions da Universidade de Vigo, Vigo, Spain, 2011.
- [BCK] Eric Bedford, Serge Cantat, and Kyounghee Kim. Pseudo-automorphisms with no invariant foliation. *J. Mod. Dyn.* 8(2):221250, 2014.
- [BK1] Eric Bedford and Kyounghee Kim. Dynamics of (pseudo) automorphisms of 3-space: Periodicity versus positive entropy. *Publ. Mat.* 58(1):65–119, 2014.
- [BK2] Eric Bedford and Kyounghee Kim. On the degree growth of birational mappings in higher dimension. *J. Geom. Anal.*, 14(4):567–596, 2004.
- [BK3] Eric Bedford and Kyounghee Kim. Degree growth of matrix inversion: Birational maps of symmetric, cyclic matrices. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.*, 21(4):977–1013, 2008.
- [BT] Eric Bedford and Tuyen Trung Truong. Degree complexity of birational maps related to matrix inversion. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 298(2):357–368, 2010.
- [DF] J. Diller and C. Favre. Dynamics of bimeromorphic maps of surfaces. *Amer. J. Math.*, 123(6):1135–1169, 2001.
- [DDG] Jeffrey Diller, Romain Dujardin, and Vincent Guedj. Dynamics of meromorphic maps with small topological degree I: from cohomology to currents. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, 59(2):521–561, 2010.
- [DNT] Tien-Cuong Dinh, Viet-Anh Nguyen, and Tuyen Trung Truong. Equidistribution for meromorphic maps with dominant topological degree. Preprint: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1303.5992>.
- [DS1] Tien-Cuong Dinh and Nessim Sibony. Regularization of currents and entropy. *Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4)*, 37(6):959–971, 2004.
- [DS2] Tien-Cuong Dinh and Nessim Sibony. Une borne supérieure pour l’entropie topologique d’une application rationnelle. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 161(3):1637–1644, 2005.
- [DS3] Tien-Cuong Dinh and Nessim Sibony. Super-potentials of positive closed currents, intersection theory and dynamics. *Acta Math.*, 203(1):1–82, 2009.
- [EH] David Eisenbud and Joe Harris. *The geometry of schemes*, volume 197 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2000.
- [Fa] Charles Favre. Les applications monomiales en deux dimensions. *Michigan Math. J.*, 51(3):467–475, 2003.
- [FaW] Charles Favre and Elizabeth Wulcan. Degree growth of monomial maps and McMullen’s polytope algebra. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, 61(2):493–524, 2012.
- [Fr] Shmuel Friedland. Entropy of polynomial and rational maps. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 133(2):359–368, 1991.
- [Fu] William Fulton. *Intersection theory*, volume 2 of *Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete. 3. Folge. A Series of Modern Surveys in Mathematics [Results in Mathematics and Related Areas. 3rd Series. A Series of Modern Surveys in Mathematics]*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, second edition, 1998.
- [GW] Ulrich Görtz and Torsten Wedhorn. *Algebraic geometry I*. Advanced Lectures in Mathematics. Vieweg + Teubner, Wiesbaden, 2010. Schemes with examples and exercises.
- [GH] Phillip Griffiths and Joseph Harris. *Principles of algebraic geometry*. Wiley Classics Library. John Wiley & Sons Inc., New York, 1994. Reprint of the 1978 original.
- [Gu1] Vincent Guedj. Entropie topologique des applications méromorphes. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, 25(6):1847–1855, 2005.

$\mathbf{p}_1 \mapsto p_3 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_1$	$\mathbf{p}_2 \mapsto p_4 \mapsto p_5 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_2$	$p_6 \mapsto p_6$
$\lambda_1(f_\rho) \approx 2.2292085$	$\lambda^4 + \lambda^3 - 2\lambda^2 - 8\lambda - 8$	
$\lambda_2(f_\rho) \approx 4.4584171$	$\lambda^4 + 2\lambda^3 - 8\lambda^2 - 64\lambda - 128$	
$\mathbf{p}_1 \mapsto p_3 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_2 \mapsto p_4 \mapsto p_5 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_1$	$p_6 \mapsto p_6$	
$\lambda_1(f_\rho) \approx 2.2755888$	$\lambda^5 - \lambda^4 - 8\lambda - 16$	
$\lambda_2(f_\rho) \approx 4.5511777$	$\lambda^5 - 2\lambda^4 - 128\lambda - 512$	
$\mathbf{p}_1 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_2 \mapsto p_3 \mapsto p_4 \mapsto p_5 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_1$	$p_6 \mapsto p_6$	
$\lambda_1(f_\rho) \approx 2.2667836$	$\lambda^5 - 2\lambda^3 - 4\lambda^2 - 16$	
$\lambda_2(f_\rho) \approx 4.5335672$	$\lambda^5 - 8\lambda^3 - 32\lambda^2 - 512$	
$\mathbf{p}_1 \mapsto p_3 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_1$	$\mathbf{p}_2 \mapsto p_4 \mapsto p_5 \mapsto p_6 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_2$	
$\lambda_1(f_\rho) \approx 2.3461556$	$\lambda^4 - \lambda^3 - 4\lambda - 8$	
$\lambda_2(f_\rho) \approx 4.6658733$	$\lambda^9 - 3\lambda^8 - 16\lambda^6 - 192\lambda^5 + 384\lambda^4 + 128\lambda^3 + 6144\lambda - 8192$	
$\mathbf{p}_1 \mapsto p_3 \mapsto p_4 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_1$	$\mathbf{p}_2 \mapsto p_5 \mapsto p_6 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_2$	
$\lambda_1(f_\rho) \approx 2.4675038$	$\lambda^3 - \lambda^2 - 2\lambda - 4$	
$\lambda_2(f_\rho) \approx 4.7900395$	$\lambda^6 - \lambda^5 - 4\lambda^4 - 64\lambda^3 - 16\lambda^2 - 64\lambda + 256$	
$\mathbf{p}_1 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_2 \mapsto p_3 \mapsto p_4 \mapsto p_5 \mapsto p_6 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_1$		
$\lambda_1(f_\rho) \approx 2.4316847$	$\lambda^5 + 2\lambda^4 + 2\lambda^3 - 8\lambda^2 + 8\lambda - 16$	
$\lambda_2(f_\rho) \approx 4.80241001$	$\lambda^{14} - 4\lambda^{13} + 12\lambda^{12} - 88\lambda^{11} + 256\lambda^{10} - 1152\lambda^9 + 768\lambda^8 - 3072\lambda^7$ $+ 12288\lambda^6 + 24576\lambda^5 - 65536\lambda^4 + 458752\lambda^3 + 1048576\lambda - 4194304$	
$\mathbf{p}_1 \mapsto p_3 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_2 \mapsto p_4 \mapsto p_5 \mapsto p_6 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_1$		
$\lambda_1(f_\rho) \approx 2.4576736$	$\lambda^6 - \lambda^5 - 4\lambda^4 - 16\lambda - 32$	
$\lambda_2(f_\rho) \approx 4.84568805$	$\lambda^{13} - 3\lambda^{12} - 16\lambda^{10} - 256\lambda^8 - 3584\lambda^7 + 7168\lambda^6$ $+ 2048\lambda^5 + 32768\lambda^3 + 1572864\lambda - 2097152$	
$\mathbf{p}_1 \mapsto p_3 \mapsto p_4 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_2 \mapsto p_5 \mapsto p_6 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_1$		
$\lambda_1(f_\rho) \approx 2.4675037$	$\lambda^3 - \lambda^2 - 2\lambda - 4$	
$\lambda_2(f_\rho) \approx 4.7900395$	$\lambda^6 - \lambda^5 - 4\lambda^4 - 64\lambda^3 - 16\lambda^2 - 64\lambda + 25$	

TABLE 4. Data for $f_\rho^* : H^{1,1}(X^3; \mathbb{C}) \rightarrow H^{1,1}(X^3; \mathbb{C})$ and $f_\rho^* : H^{2,2}(X^3; \mathbb{C}) \rightarrow H^{2,2}(X^3; \mathbb{C})$; the permutation $\rho \in S_P$ is given in terms of cycles, an approximate value of the dynamical degrees $\lambda_1(f_\rho)$ and $\lambda_2(f_\rho)$ are given as well as the minimal polynomials for $\lambda_1(f_\rho)$ and $\lambda_2(f_\rho)$. There are 720 such maps $f_\rho : X^3 \dashrightarrow X^3$ corresponding to all permutations $\rho \in S_P$. The examples in this chart (and all maps which are birationally conjugate to any of these examples) are the only maps $f_\rho : X^3 \dashrightarrow X^3$ for which $\lambda_1(f_\rho) \neq 2$, and they are also the only maps $f_\rho : X^3 \dashrightarrow X^3$ for which $\lambda_2(f_\rho) \neq 4$.

- [Gu2] Vincent Guedj. Ergodic properties of rational mappings with large topological degree. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 161(3):1589–1607, 2005.
- [H] Robin Hartshorne. *Algebraic geometry*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1977. Graduate Texts in Mathematics, No. 52.
- [HL] W. J. Harvey and A. Lloyd-Philippis. Symmetry and moduli spaces for Riemann surfaces. In *Quasiconformal mappings, Riemann surfaces, and Teichmüller spaces*, volume 575 of *Contemp. Math.*, pages 153–170. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2012.
- [HP] Boris Hasselblatt and James Propp. Degree-growth of monomial maps. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, 27(5):1375–1397, 2007.
- [JW] Mattias Jonsson and Elizabeth Wulcan. Stabilization of monomial maps. *Michigan Math. J.*, 60(3):629–660, 2011.
- [Ka] M. M. Kapranov. Veronese curves and Grothendieck-Knudsen moduli space $\overline{M}_{0,n}$. *J. Algebraic Geom.*, 2(2):239–262, 1993.
- [Ke] Sean Keel. Intersection theory of moduli space of stable n -pointed curves of genus zero. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 330(2):545–574, 1992.
- [Kn] F. Knudsen. The projectivity of the moduli space of stable curves II: the stacks $M_{g,n}$. *Math. Scand.*, 52:161–199, 1983.
- [KM] F. Knudsen and D. Mumford. The projectivity of the moduli space of stable curves I: Preliminaries on “det” and “div”. *Math. Scand.*, 39:19–55, 1976.
- [Ko] S. Koch. Teichmüller theory and critically finite endomorphisms. *Advances in Mathematics*, 248:573–617, 2013.
- [Li1] Jan-Li Lin. Pulling back cohomology classes and dynamical degrees of monomial maps. *Bull. Soc. Math. France*, 140(4):533–549 (2013), 2012.
- [Li2] Jan-Li Lin. On degree growth and stabilization of three-dimensional monomial maps. *Michigan Math. J.*, 62(3):567–579, 2013.

$\mathbf{p}_1 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_2 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_3 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_4 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_5 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_1$ $p_6 \mapsto p_6$ $p_7 \mapsto p_7$ $\lambda_1(f_\rho) \approx 2.2667836$ $\lambda^5 - 2\lambda^3 - 4\lambda^2 - 16$
$\mathbf{p}_1 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_2 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_3 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_4 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_5 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_1$ $p_6 \mapsto p_7 \mapsto p_6$ $\lambda_1(f_\rho) \approx 2.2667836$ $\lambda^5 - 2\lambda^3 - 4\lambda^2 - 16$
$\mathbf{p}_1 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_3 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_2 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_4 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_5 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_1$ $p_6 \mapsto p_6$ $p_7 \mapsto p_7$ $\lambda_1(f_\rho) \approx 2.2755888$ $\lambda^5 - \lambda^4 - 8\lambda - 16$
$\mathbf{p}_1 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_3 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_2 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_4 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_5 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_1$ $p_6 \mapsto p_7 \mapsto p_6$ $\lambda_1(f_\rho) \approx 2.2755888$ $\lambda^5 - \lambda^4 - 8\lambda - 16$
$\mathbf{p}_1 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_3 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_1$ $\mathbf{p}_2 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_4 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_5 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_2$ $p_6 \mapsto p_6$ $p_7 \mapsto p_7$ $\lambda_1(f_\rho) \approx 2.2292085$ $\lambda^4 + \lambda^3 - 2\lambda^2 - 8\lambda - 8$
$\mathbf{p}_1 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_3 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_1$ $\mathbf{p}_2 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_4 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_5 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_2$ $p_6 \mapsto p_7 \mapsto p_6$ $\lambda_1(f_\rho) \approx 2.2292085$ $\lambda^4 + \lambda^3 - 2\lambda^2 - 8\lambda - 8$
$\mathbf{p}_1 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_2 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_3 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_4 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_5 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_6 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_1$ $p_7 \mapsto p_7$ $\lambda_1(f_\rho) \approx 2.4316847$ $\lambda^5 - 2\lambda^4 + 2\lambda^3 - 8\lambda^2 + 8\lambda - 16$
$\mathbf{p}_1 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_3 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_2 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_4 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_5 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_6 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_1$ $p_7 \mapsto p_7$ $\lambda_1(f_\rho) \approx 2.4576736$ $\lambda^6 - \lambda^5 - 4\lambda^3 - 16\lambda - 32$
$\mathbf{p}_1 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_3 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_4 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_2 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_5 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_6 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_1$ $p_7 \mapsto p_7$ $\lambda_1(f_\rho) \approx 2.4675038$ $\lambda^3 - \lambda^2 - 2\lambda - 4$
$\mathbf{p}_1 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_2 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_3 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_4 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_5 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_6 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_7 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_1$ $\lambda_1(f_\rho) \approx 2.5339057$ $\lambda^7 - 2\lambda^5 - 4\lambda^4 - 8\lambda^3 - 16\lambda^2 - 64$
$\mathbf{p}_1 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_3 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_2 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_4 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_5 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_6 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_7 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_1$ $\lambda_1(f_\rho) \approx 2.5746797$ $\lambda^7 - \lambda^6 - 4\lambda^4 - 8\lambda^3 - 32\lambda - 64$
$\mathbf{p}_1 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_3 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_4 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_2 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_5 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_6 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_7 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_1$ $\lambda_1(f_\rho) \approx 2.5985401$ $\lambda^7 - \lambda^6 - 2\lambda^5 - 16\lambda^2 - 32\lambda - 64$

TABLE 5. Data for $f_\rho^* : H^{1,1}(X^4; \mathbb{C}) \rightarrow H^{1,1}(X^4; \mathbb{C})$; the permutation $\rho \in S_P$ is given in terms of cycles, an approximate value of the dynamical degree $\lambda_1(f_\rho)$ is given as well as the minimal polynomial for $\lambda_1(f_\rho)$. There are 5040 such maps $f_\rho : X^4 \dashrightarrow X^4$ corresponding to all permutations $\rho \in S_P$. The examples in this chart (and all maps which are birationally conjugate to any of these examples) are the only maps $f_\rho : X^4 \dashrightarrow X^4$ for which $\lambda_1(f_\rho) \neq 2$.

$\mathbf{p}_1 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_2 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_3 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_4 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_5 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_6 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_7 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_8 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_1$ $\lambda_1(f_\rho) \approx 2.5986551$ $\lambda^7 - 2\lambda^6 + 2\lambda^5 - 8\lambda^4 + 8\lambda^3 - 32\lambda^2 + 32\lambda - 64$
$\mathbf{p}_1 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_3 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_2 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_4 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_5 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_6 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_7 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_8 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_1$ $\lambda_1(f_\rho) \approx 2.6494359$ $\lambda^3 - 4\lambda - 8$
$\mathbf{p}_1 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_3 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_4 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_2 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_5 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_6 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_7 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_8 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_1$ $\lambda_1(f_\rho) \approx 2.68518317$ $\lambda^7 - 3\lambda^6 + 4\lambda^5 - 8\lambda^4 + 8\lambda^3 - 16\lambda^2 - 52$
$\mathbf{p}_1 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_3 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_4 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_5 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_2 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_6 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_7 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_8 \mapsto \mathbf{p}_1$ $\lambda_1(f_\rho) \approx 2.6980689$ $\lambda^4 - \lambda^3 - 2\lambda^2 - 4\lambda - 8$

TABLE 6. Data for $f_\rho^* : H^{1,1}(X^5; \mathbb{C}) \rightarrow H^{1,1}(X^5; \mathbb{C})$; the permutation $\rho \in S_P$ is given in terms of cycles, an approximate value of the dynamical degree $\lambda_1(f_\rho)$ is given as well as the minimal polynomial for $\lambda_1(f_\rho)$. Of the 40,320 such maps $f_\rho : X^5 \dashrightarrow X^5$ corresponding to all permutations $\rho \in S_P$, we present the data for representative examples corresponding to the cyclic permutations $\rho \in S_P$.

[LW] Jan-Li Lin and Elizabeth Wolcan. Stabilization of monomial maps in higher codimension. *Annales de l'institut Fourier*, 64(5):2127-2146, 2014.

[LI] A. Lloyd-Phillips. *Exceptional Weyl Groups and Complex Geometry*. PhD thesis, Kings College London, 2007.

[R] Roland Roeder. The action on cohomology by compositions of rational maps. To appear in *Math Research Letters*. See also <http://arxiv.org/abs/1306.2210>.

[RS] Alexander Russakovskii and Bernard Shiffman. Value distribution for sequences of rational mappings and complex dynamics. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, 46(3):897-932, 1997.

[Sa] Sage mathematics software. <http://www.sagemath.org>

- [Si] Joseph Silverman. Dynamical degree, arithmetic entropy, and canonical heights for dominant rational self-maps of projective space *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems* 34(2):647-678, 2014.
- [T] Toshiaki Terada. Quelques propriétés géométriques du domaine de f_1 et le groupe de tresses colorées. *Publ. RIMS, Kyoto Univ.*, 17:95–111, 1981.

E-mail address: `kochsc@umich.edu`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN, EAST HALL, 530 CHURCH STREET, ANN ARBOR MI 48109, UNITED STATES

E-mail address: `rroeder@math.iupui.edu`

IUPUI DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, LD BUILDING, ROOM 224Q, 402 NORTH BLACKFORD STREET, INDIANAPOLIS, INDIANA 46202-3267, UNITED STATES