What are bounding chains, and why are they related to linking numbers?

Xujia Chen

Sept 21, 2021

Gromov-Witten invariants

 (X, ω) : compact symplectic manifold of dim 2n J: generic ω -tame almost complex structure $B \in H_2(X)$, $H_1, \ldots, H_l \subset X$: closed submanifolds in general position such that $2(c_1(TX) \cdot B + n - 3 + l) = \sum_i \operatorname{codim} H_i$, $[H_1], \ldots, [H_l] \in H_*(X)$: their homology classes,

Gromov-Witten invariants $\langle [H_1], \ldots, [H_l] \rangle_B^X \equiv$ Number of degree B J-holomorphic rational curves in X passing through H_1, \ldots, H_l



This number does not depend on the choices of J and H_1, \ldots, H_l in $[H_1], \ldots, [H_l]$.

Gromov-Witten invariants

 $\mathfrak{M}_l(B) \equiv \text{moduli space of deg } B$ rational J-holomorphic curves in X with l marked points (can be viewed as a smooth manifold)

 $\overline{\mathfrak{M}}_{l}(B) \equiv \text{moduli space of deg } B \text{ nodal rational}$ J-holomorphic curves in X with l marked points (can be viewed as a compact, smooth manifold)





$$\langle [H_1], \dots, [H_l] \rangle_B^X =$$
 intersection number of
 $\overline{\mathfrak{M}}_l(B) \xrightarrow{\mathsf{ev}} \underbrace{X \times \dots \times X}_{l \text{ times}} \longleftrightarrow H_1 \times \dots \times H_l$

 $(X, \omega), J$ as before $Y \subset X$ Lagrangian submanifold, oriented, Spin $\beta \in H_2(X, Y),$ $H_1, \ldots, H_l \subset X$: even-dimensional closed submanifolds, $p_1, \ldots, p_k \in Y$ points such that $\mu(\beta) + n - 3 + k + 2l = \sum_i \operatorname{codim} H_i + kn$,

Define Disk $(\beta, \{p_i\}_{i=1}^k, \{H_i\}_{i=1}^l) \equiv$ {degree β *J*-holomorphic disks in *X* with boundaries in *Y*, passing through $p_1, \ldots, p_k, H_1, \ldots, H_l$.}



$$\begin{split} \mathfrak{M}_{k,l}(\beta) &\equiv \text{moduli space of deg } \beta \text{ J-holomorphic disks} \\ \text{in } X \text{ whose boundary lies in } Y, \\ \text{with } k \text{ boundary and } l \text{ interior marked points} \\ \text{(can be viewed as a smooth manifold)} \end{split}$$



 $\overline{\mathfrak{M}}_{k,l}(\beta) \equiv \text{moduli space of deg } \beta \text{ nodal J-hol}$ disks in X whose boundary lies in Y, with k boundary and l interior marked points (can be viewed as a compact, smooth manifold with boundary)



$$\overline{\mathfrak{M}}_{k,l}(\beta) - \mathfrak{M}_{k,l}(\beta) = \left\{ \begin{array}{c} & & \\ & &$$

 $\left|\mathsf{Disk}(\beta, \{p_i\}, \{H_i\})\right|^{\pm} = \mathsf{intersection number of}$



Not an invariant: it may depend on $J, p_1, \ldots, p_k, H_1, \ldots, H_l$.



Q:How do we define invariant disk counts?

Some definitions relevant to today

Fukaya(2011) defined open GW-invariants for Calabi-Yau 3-folds in terms of A_{∞} -algebras of differential forms

Welschinger(2013) defined invariant disk counts when n = 3, which counts multi-disks with "self-linking numbers"

(Tian expressed belief that Welschinger's definition is a geometric interpretation of Fukaya-type algebra.)

Solomon-Tukachinsky(2016) defined open GW-invariants generalizing Fukaya(2011) for all n odd, if Y is a \mathbb{Q} -homology sphere. Their construction is based on the idea of "bounding chains" in FOOO(2006).

My work in 2019 translated Solomon-Tukachinsky's construction into a more geometric language, from which it immediate follows that these invariants are the same as Welschinger's when n = 3.

Today: show you what this construction looks like.

Welschinger(2013) defined invariant disk counts when n = 3 and $H_1(Y) \hookrightarrow H_1(X)$. Idea: count multi-disks weighted by "self-linking number".

Recall:

dim X=6, dim Y=3 For γ_1, γ_2 oriented loops in Y, such that $\gamma_1 \cap \gamma_2 = \emptyset, \gamma_1 = \partial b_1, \gamma_2 = \partial b_2$, their linking number is defined as $\mathsf{lk}(\gamma_1, \gamma_2) \equiv |\gamma_1 \cap b_2|^{\pm}$.



Idea: count multi-disks weighted by "self-linking number".



For u a multi-disk as shown, define

 $K_u = \text{complete graph with}$ vertex set $\{u_i\}$,



 $U = \{U_1, U_2, U_3, U_4\}$

 $\mathsf{lk}(u) \equiv \sum_{\substack{T: \text{ spanning tree} \\ \text{ in } K_u}} \prod_{\substack{e: \text{ an edge} \\ \text{ connecting } u_i, u_j}} \mathsf{lk}(\partial u_i, \partial u_j)$

Idea: count multi-disks weighted by "self-linking number".



We count u with weight $\pm lk(u)$.

The count is independent of the choices of $J, \{p_i\}$ and $H_i \in [H_i]$.

U= {U1, 12, 13, 143

Idea: count multi-disks weighted by "self-linking number".

Why invariant?

Let us move, say, H_1 around:

 $H_1 \longrightarrow H'_1 \longrightarrow H''_1$

$$\bigcirc \longrightarrow \bigotimes \longrightarrow \phi \leftarrow \text{count of single disks changes by 1}$$

Idea: count multi-disks weighted by "self-linking number".

Why invariant?

Let us move, say, H_1 around:



Attempt of generalizing to higher dimensions

$$\begin{split} \text{Recall: for } \beta \in H_2(X,Y), K \subset \{p_1,\ldots,p_k\}, L \subset \{H_1,\ldots,H_l\}, \\ \text{dim } \text{Disk}(\beta,K,L) = \mu(\beta) + n - 3 - |K|(n-1) - \sum_{H_i \in L} (\text{codim } H_i - 2) \end{split}$$

Suppose
$$(\beta, \{p_1, \dots, p_k\}, \{H_1, \dots, H_l\})$$
 is such that
dim Disk $(\beta, \{p_i\}, \{H_i\}) = 0$, and
 $\beta = \beta_1 + \beta_2, \{p_1, \dots, p_k\} = K_1 \sqcup K_2, \{H_1, \dots, H_l\} = L_1 \sqcup L_2$, then
dim Disk (β_1, K_1, L_1) +dim Disk $(\beta_2, K_2, L_2) = n - 3$.

Both terms can be positive, so "counting bi-disks" no longer makes sense.

Attempt of generalizing to higher dimensions

Suppose $(\beta, \{p_1, \dots, p_k\}, \{H_1, \dots, H_l\})$ is such that dim Disk $(\beta, \{p_i\}, \{H_i\}) = 0$, and $\beta = \beta_1 + \beta_2, \{p_1, \dots, p_k\} = K_1 \sqcup K_2, \{H_1, \dots, H_l\} = L_1 \sqcup L_2$, then

 $\dim \operatorname{Disk}(\beta_1,K_1,L_1) + \dim \operatorname{Disk}(\beta_2,K_2,L_2) = n - 3.$



the correct dimension to define linking numbers in Y.

Attempt of generalizing to higher dimensions

So, we can define "count of $(\beta_1, K_1, L_1), (\beta_2, K_2, L_2)$ -bi-disks" to be the linking number between $\text{Disk}(\widehat{\beta_1, K_1}, L_1), \text{Disk}(\widehat{\beta_2, K_2}, L_2)$, if they are closed.

Not the case: $\widehat{\mathsf{Disk}(\beta,K,L)}$ usually has boundary



Goal: for every triple $(\beta,K,L),$ we want to make $\mathrm{Disk}(\beta,K,L)$ closed.

We are going to "close up" $\widehat{\text{Disk}(\beta,K,L)}$ inductively, by gluing manifolds to its boundaries.



Suppose for every triple (β', K', L') such that

$$\beta' < \beta, K' \subset K, L' \subset L,$$

we have already constructed a closed submanifold $\mathfrak{bb}(\beta', K', L')$ of Y containing $\mathsf{Disk}(\widehat{\beta', K'}, L')$.

Since Y is a homology sphere, we can take $\mathfrak{b}(\beta',K',L')$ a submanifold with boundary in Y, such that

$$\partial \mathfrak{b}(\beta',K',L') = \mathfrak{b}\mathfrak{b}(\beta',K',L')$$

Then, for a boundary component of $Disk(\beta, K, L)$:



Then, for a boundary component of $Disk(\beta, K, L)$:



 $\bigcirc = \text{boundaries of disks} \\ \text{in } \mathsf{Disk}(\beta_1, K_1, L_1) \\ \text{passing through} \\ \widehat{\mathsf{Disk}(\beta_2, K_2, L_2)} \\ \end{gathered}$

Then, for a boundary component of $Disk(\beta, K, L)$:



We consider the boundaries of disks in $\text{Disk}(\beta_1, K_1, L_1)$ passing through $\mathfrak{b}(\beta_2, K_2, L_2)$, and glue this space to \bigcirc .

This closes up the red part of the boundary of $Disk(\beta, K, L)$.

More precisely... We define

$$\mathfrak{bb}(\beta, K, L) = \bigsqcup_{\eta} \overline{\mathsf{Disk}\Big(\beta_0, K_0 \sqcup \big\{\mathfrak{b}(\beta_i, K_i, L_i)\big\}_{i=1}^k, L_0\Big)},$$

where η stands for all possible ways to write

$$\beta = \beta_0 + \beta_1 + \ldots + \beta_k$$
$$K = K_0 \sqcup K_1 \sqcup K_2 \sqcup \ldots \sqcup K_k$$
$$L = L_0 \sqcup L_1 \sqcup L_2 \sqcup \ldots \sqcup L_k$$

i.e. all possible ways to split (β, K, L) into a "base" (β_0, K_0, L_0) and "branches" $(\beta_i, K_i, L_i), 1 \le i \le k$.



Why is $\mathfrak{bb}(\beta, K, L)$ closed?

 $\partial \mathfrak{bb}(\beta, K, L)$ are of two kinds:



and





Why is $\mathfrak{bb}(\beta, K, L)$ closed?

 $\partial \mathfrak{bb}(\beta, K, L)$ are of two kinds:





Because we are summing over all possible splits of (β, K, L) , they cancel with each other!

Now we have defined $\mathfrak{bb}(\beta, K, L)$ for each triple (β, K, L) , we can define open GW-invariants "counts of degree β disks passing through $\{p_0\} \sqcup K$ and L" to be $|\mathfrak{bb}(\beta, K, L) \cap \{p_0\}|^{\pm}$.

Morally, why invariant:



Thank you!